

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Blaydes' *Eumenides of Aeschylus Aeschyli Eumenides*. Annotations critica et commentario exegetico instruxit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes. Halis Saxonum. 1900. 3 M. 60.

R. Y. Tyrrell

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 07 / October 1900, pp 364 - 365

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083177, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083177

How to cite this article:

R. Y. Tyrrell (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 364-365 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083177

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BLAYDES' *EUMENIDES OF AESCHYLUS*.

Aeschyli Eumenides. Annotatione critica et commentario exegetico instruxit FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Saxonum. 1900. 3 M. 60.

DR. BLAYDES asks indulgence if he should be found to blunder or should appear too daring, reminding his readers of the difficulty of the task essayed. We are not likely to find rifts in the scholastic panoply of Dr. Blaydes, nor do we complain of too great boldness under certain conditions. But certain conditions we think we have a right to exact. A conjecture which does not make the slightest attempt to account for the supposed corruption, and which bears in itself no kind of verisimilitude on palaeographic grounds, is 'from the purpose' of criticism. Such conjectures bring the art of criticism into contempt and do not advance the study of classics. For instance, in *Eum.* 44,

λήναι μεγίστω σωφρόνως ἐστεμμένον,

the adjective *μεγίστω* cannot be right. Aeschylus would not have said 'crowned with a great big flock of wool.' Dr. Blaydes mentions a dozen conjectures, some of which have hardly a letter in common with the reading of the MSS. What is the use of suggesting that for *λήναι μεγίστω* we should read *οἷς νεοπόκω*? Aeschylus might have written these words, as he might have written scores of other substantives and adjectives. But how did *οἷς νεοπόκω* suffer corruption into *λήναι μεγίστω*? There is no attempt to account for so curious a transformation of common words, and the suggestion is therefore mere trifling with an interesting problem. Of the other conjectures recorded all but one lie open to the same criticism, though not quite in the same degree. The single exception is that of Davies who would read *λήναι γεμιστόν*. For *κλάδον λήναι γεμιστόν* he compares *colunt lana gravem* Ov. Her. ix. 115. We do not think this is what Aeschylus wrote; but it is worthy of the name of a conjecture, for if Aeschylus had written *γεμιστόν* the first copyist would very probably have changed that rare word to the common *μέγιστον*, and the next would have assimilated it to the case of *λήναι*. Other conjectures put forward by Dr. Blaydes without any palaeographic probability, and without any attempt to

account for corruptions which completely transform the tradition of the MSS., are the following: *καρδίας ἐμῆς* for *καρδία σέθεν* 103, *ἐστὶ σοι* for *ἡρέκσω* 213, *γυμνὸν* for *ὀρθὸν* 294, *πράσσομεν* for *μαυροῦμεν* 359, *πρόσω δίκης ἐστ'* or *οὔτοι δίκαιον* for *πρόσω δικάων* 414, *χοιροκτόνοις δρόσοισι* (Wecklein) for *οἰκοῖσι καὶ βοτοῖσι* 452, *ἐστὶν ἢ τιν'* *εἰδέναι* for *εἴ τις οἴεται τὸδε* (with five other suggestions equally far from the MSS.) 470, *ἀμηνίτως σφ'* *ἀμηχάνως ἔχω* for *δυσπήμαντ'* *ἀμηχάνως ἐμοί* 481, *παλαῖοντ'* for *λέπαδον* 562, *φίλησον* for *κατὰ χθόν'* 901. Now be it observed that what we condemn is not the wide divergence from the MSS., but the absence of any attempt to account for it. Prof. Housman in his very able and brilliant paper on the Agamemnon in the *Journal of Philology* vol. xvi. often travels as far from the MSS., but he never fails to essay an answer to the question *unde irrepsit corruptela*? The criticism which neglects this question is naught. Moreover, in all these passages the MS. reading is either defensible or admits of far less violent correction. For instance, in 452 Weil reads

πάλαι πρὸς ἄλλοις ταῦτ' ἀφιερώμεθα
οἰκοῖσι, καὶ βατοῖσι καὶ ῥυτοῖς πόροις,

'Long have I thus been sanctified at homes
Of other men, by trodden and liquid paths.'
The conjecture of Weil *βατοῖσι* for *βοτοῖσι* gives an excellent poetic parallel to our 'by land and sea,' 'by fell and flood,' 'over moist and dry' (Milton), and is a variant such as the Greek poets loved of the epic *τραφερὴν τε καὶ ὕγρην*. Orestes says that in all his travels over land and sea he has had the rite of purification renewed whenever the occasion offered itself. Again, in 481 the scholium *πέμπειν αὐτὰς ἀμηνίτως δυσχερές ἐστὶν ἐμοί* shows that *ἀμηχάνως* in the MSS. is the corruption of *ἀμηνίτως*, which the scholiast must have found in his text, while *δυσχερές* answers to *δυσποίμαντα* (*δυσπήμαντα* MSS.). The passage should run:

ἀμφότερα, μένειν
πέμπειν τε, δυσποίμαντ' ἀμηνίτως ἐμοί,

'both alternatives, that they should remain and that I should send them away, are difficult for me to manage without exciting wrath.' In 562 we agree with the editor in condemning *λαπαδνόν* as a by-form of

ἀλαπαδόν, but we cannot accept παλαιόντα which could not have arisen from λέπαδον. Very possibly ἰδὼν (which ought to be ὄρων, as Dr. Blaydes suggests) was added, to secure a regimen for τὸν αὐχοῖντα, by some scribe who did not see that γελᾷ takes two constructions, the dative with ἐπὶ and the accusative as the direct object. We should then read

τὸν οὐ ποτ' αὐχοῖντ' ἀμαχάνου δῦας
δύνει (or δύναι) λέπαδον.

Everyone will remember ἀνάγκας ἔδν λέπαδον in Agam. 217, and δύνει (or δύναι) would fall out after δῦας. In the antistrophe we would read πάμπολλα not ἅπαντα for τὰ πολλὰ.

In 248 Dr. Blaydes suggests ἀνδροδμήσι for ἀνδροκμήσι, but the vowel could not be shortened before δμ, and the same may be said of φρενοβλαβῆς read in 330. A short vowel before βλ is found in Tragedy only before βλαστάνω and its derivatives (and never in thesis), and there may have been some special reason why it should be shortened in those cases and not before other words in βλ. Is there any authority for κνέφα, introduced into the text 387 as dative of κνέφας and for the λάμπα of the MSS? In 393 Herwerden's τεθέντα for δοθέντα is accepted. But θεσμόν. . . τεθέντα is a poor phrase; would not κείμενον, as the passive of τίθημι, certainly have been used? The fine verse 423

ὅπου τὸ χαίρειν μηδαμοῦ νομίζεται

is explained in the commentary by the note 'μηδαμοῦ νομίζεται *nusquam extat*.' But surely μηδαμοῦ must be taken closely with the infinitive, 'where the law of life is *never*

a throb of joy,' (or 'Farewell comfort'). Davies appositely observes that *Fin d'aïse* was the name of the condemned cell in the *Donjon du Châtelet*. Another clever comment by the same editor is in 181, where λαβοῦσα = ἐν χορῇ κομισαμένη. He points out that slingstones have been found with λαβέ 'take that' on them. This curious use of λαμβάνειν is neglected by the other editors and is not referred to by L. and S., though of course λαμβάνειν νόσον, κακόν τι, is like it.

We cannot refrain from moralising on the very fleeting and subjective nature of the critic's certitudes, in connexion with line 803, βρωτήρας αἰχμὰς σπερμάτων ἀνημέρους, in which Athena calls the foam-flakes of the Awful Goddesses 'cruel shafts consumers of the seeds.' We see nothing to condemn in this. The masc. form of βρωτήρας need not offend anyone who remembers τύχη σωτήρι in Soph. Oed. Rex and the commentators thereon. But we have no doubt that Wieseler had considerable confidence in his conjecture when, accepting Weil's βοτήρας he proposed ἄχνας 'the sheaths of the young seeds,' though to us it seems that to call the σταλάγματα of the *Euменίδες* 'ungentle shepherds of the sprouting seeds' would be an example of ultra-Aeschylean boldness. Davies is ecstatic. 'Corrections such as these' he writes 'are like beautiful poems.' But alas! Wieseler subsequently withdrew his conjecture, and few editors have even mentioned it. It is sad to think with how little enthusiasm most of us can regard the conjectures of others, and how, as time rolls on, we come to consider even our own dispassionately.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

GRADENWITZ'S EINFÜHRUNG IN DIE PAPYRUSKUNDE.

Einführung in die Papyruskunde, von OTTO GRADENWITZ, Professor an der Universität Königsberg. I. Heft: Erklärung ausgewählter Urkunden. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1900.) 5 M.

THE study of papyri is rapidly becoming a separate branch of philology. Six years ago, the recognised students of it in all Europe could have been counted on the fingers of one hand; now they have become a respectable band, with a periodical and a literature of their own. The book now before us is a

striking proof of the changed situation; for it owes its origin to a course of lectures given by Prof. Gradenwitz in Berlin, which (if we may assume that a lecture implies pupils) indicates a methodical study of the subject, characteristic, no doubt, of Germany, and tending to produce a trained body of expert papyrologists in the near future.

Prof. Gradenwitz's book is described as a first part only. There is nothing to show what the scheme of the entire work is intended to embrace; but at present its scope