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](#)

Eur. Medea, 1056—1058

K. E. Crosby

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 06 / June 1892, pp 253 - 254

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185877, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185877

How to cite this article:

K. E. Crosby (1892). Eur. *Medea*, 1056—1058. The Classical Review, 6, pp 253-254
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185877

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

β. ναύκραροι.

We may then reject the identification of the *ἐφέται* with the old Council at Athens; we must now consider Wecklein's theory that the *ναύκραροι* formed a sort of council to the King and Archons. As is well known, the only support for it is a single passage in Herodotus.¹ Speaking of the conspiracy of Cylon the historian says: *τούτους ἀνιστάσι μὲν οἱ πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων, οἱ περ ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας*. This statement has naturally caused much difficulty; a few authors have based on it the theory of a council of *ναύκραροι*; others have more wisely almost entirely disregarded it. It is not however satisfactory to have to put aside a deliberate statement of Herodotus, and there is, I think, a simple explanation of the expression.

We have besides the chapter of Herodotus an account of the conspiracy of Cylon by Thucydides.² He says nothing about the *ναύκραροι* at all, but says: *τότε δὲ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἔπρασσον*. This is generally supposed to be a deliberate correction of Herodotus. There is however in Thucydides an expression which explains how it is that the *ναύκραροι* have got into the other account. Thucydides says that when the alarm was sounded the people *ἐβοήθησαν πανδημὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν*, i.e. all the villagers from Attica came to help against the tyrants. Now in the time before Cleisthenes the smallest local division of Attica was the *ναυκρῆς*: it was a financial unit and apparently also a military unit. Each *ναυκρῆς* had to supply two *ἱππεῖς* and perhaps a ship; direct taxation when levied was levied according to *ναυκρῆς*. Cleisthenes after-

wards substituted organisation by *Demes* for that by *ναυκρῆς*. A *ναυκρῆς* was then almost certainly a collection of men living in the same place, forming a unit for financial and military purposes. When then all the Athenians trooped into Athens they would come in their *ναυκρῆς*; the members of each *ναυκρῆς* would march in together and bivouac together and would be under the leadership of their *ναύκραρος*. This is the only way to explain how the *ναυκρῆς* have got into the story at all; the coming in *πανδημὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν* is the same as coming in *κατὰ ναυκρῆας*.

It does not at all follow that Herodotus is right in saying that at this time *οἱ πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων ἔνεμον τὰς Ἀθήνας*. He may have made a mistake. It is however something to be able to show that his mistake naturally arises from the fact that at this crisis the *ναυκρῆς* had an unusual importance. Whether the expression *πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων* is simply a mistake for *ναυκρῶν* and is identical with *ναύκραροι*, or whether there really were some leaders chosen from among the *ναύκραροι*, we have no means of determining; whatever is the truth as to this, in neither case is there any reason to suppose a permanent government of Athens by a council of *ναύκραροι*: an organisation by *ναυκρῆς* of the militia called out for a sudden emergency is all that is necessary.

We may then I think put aside all thought of *ἐφέται* or *ναύκραροι* in attempting to paint a picture of the early Council which probably existed at Athens. I hope in another paper to be able to discuss what other evidence there is on the constitution of this Council.

J. W. HEADLAM.

EUR. *MEDÆA*, 1056—1058.

μὴ δῆτα, θυμὲ, μὴ σὺγ' ἐργάσῃ τάδε.
ἔασον αὐτοὺς, ὦ τάλαν' φείσαι τέκνων.
ἐκεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν ζῶντες εὐφρανοῦσί σε.

THESE lines have been universally regarded as forming a portion of Medea's farewell to her infant sons. In them the mother is recognized as revolting for the second time from her plan to slay her innocent babes, and the whole passage, according to the ordinary rendering, might be analyzed thus: (1) Medea's resolve to murder her children (ll. 1019—1039); (2) change of resolve and determination to

spare them (1040—1048); (3) return to former purpose of slaying them (1049—1055); (4) second repentance and change of feeling (1056—58); (5) final return to original design (1059—to end of passage).

There is, no doubt, great beauty and truthfulness to nature in thus depicting the mother's double recoil from the slaughter of her children, but the passage in question as it stands presents great difficulties, and after a careful study of it I cannot but believe that this idea, however beautiful, of passion's double victory over that most obstinate of foes, a mother's love, never

belonged to Euripides, but that the lines in question (1056—58) were originally given to the chorus and read thus :

μὴ δῆτα θύμα, μὴ σύγ' ἐργάσῃ τόδε.
 ἔασον αὐτοὺς, ὦ τάλαν· φεύσαι τέκνων.
 ἐπεὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ζῶντες εὐφρανουσί σε.

As will be observed, only three slight changes have been made, *θυμέ* into *θύμα*, *τάδε* to *τόδε*, and *ἐκεῖ* to *ἐπεὶ*, and by these emendations the otherwise obscure line 1058 has been rendered completely intelligible. Medea has just fully and finally determined not to yield to her own timidity and tenderness of heart. She has bidden those present who were unworthy (or unwilling) to attend her sacrifice (*θύματα*) to keep away, when most naturally the chorus exclaims in answer to this direct address to themselves : 'Let there be no sacrifice, we pray thee ; do thou not do this thing. Let the boys live, O wretched one, and spare thy children, since living here with us (in *Corinth*) they will rejoice thy heart.' Medea then in accordance with her set resolve answers passionately : 'Nay, by the avenging powers below, I shall never leave my children here (in *Corinth*) to suffer insult at my enemies' hands. They must die.' In favour of my emendation, I may add :

(1) This interference on the part of the chorus conforms exactly with the *μὴ προβαίη* of line 907, the *μὴ τέκνα φονεύσης* of 855 and the *ἀπενέπω τάδε* of 813.

(2) *θύμα* well re-echoes the *θύμασιν* of line 1054, and *ἔστω* may be easily understood ; or we may regard it with *τόδε* as the object of *ἐργάσῃ*, *ἐργάζομαι* being used like *ἔρδω* or *ῥέζω* in the sense of 'performing' a sacrifice. I might even suggest *θῦε* in place of *θύμα*.

(3) The earnest entreaty *μὴ δῆτα*, 'I pray thee,' and the expression *ὦ τάλαν* are both better suited to the chorus than to Medea (cf. ll. 990 and 436). *τάλαν* for *τάλαινα*, masc. for fem., is frequently found (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 559).

(4) *ἐκεῖ*, in 1058, could only refer to Athens where Medea purposed going, but the three following lines show that Medea rejects the thought not of leaving them in Athens, but *Corinth*.

(5) The occurrence of *ἡμῶν* with *σέ* in the same line, both referring to Medea herself is scarcely allowable. Medea in this whole speech of hers has spoken of herself in the singular number only.

I wonder indeed that the use of the pronouns alone in these lines has never before convinced any commentator of the propriety of transferring the three lines to the chorus. After all, do we lose much by making Medea renounce her resolve but once instead of twice? Is not the double victory over her own inward repugnance and the remonstrance of the chorus even more powerful and more dramatic?

K. E. CROSBY.

Princeton.

ON THE USE OF *προδανείζειν*.

It is stated in the dictionaries that *προδανείζειν*, *προδανειστής*, *προδανεισμός* mean respectively 'to lend before or first,' 'a first lender,' 'a previous loan.' I shall endeavour to show that this meaning is sometimes excluded by the context and nowhere required.

I begin with the examples cited in the Paris edition of Stephanus, and in Liddell and Scott. They are (1) *Dio Cass.* 51. 17 *τοὺς τε προδανείσασί τι πάντα ἀπηλλάγη*, (2) *Lucian De Sacrif.* c. 3 *ὁ Χρύσης.....ἐπειδὴ ἀπρακτος ἀπῆε παρὰ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὡς ἂν καὶ προδανείσας τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τὴν χάριν δικαιολογείται καὶ ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν ἀμοιβὴν καὶ μόνον οὐκ ὀνειδίζει* (L. and S. give this reference as illustrating the middle ; Jacobitz in his critical preface mentions no variant, and

προδανείσας is given in the Index verborum ac phrasium Luciani published by Reitz in 1746, the ultimate source of most of the quotations from Lucian in our dictionaries), (3) *Plut. Per.* c. 13 *ἡ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν εὐχέρεια καὶ ταχύτης οὐκ ἐντίθησι βάρος ἔργῳ μόνιμον οὐδὲ κάλλους ἀκρίβειαν· ὁ δ' εἰς τὴν γένεσιν τῷ πόνῳ προδανεισθεὶς χρόνος ἐν τῇ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γενομένου τὴν ἰσχὴν ἀποδίδωσιν*. I submit that in these three passages the notion of a 'previous loan' is otiose and inapt, I should even have said impossible, had not so many distinguished scholars acquiesced in this translation. But surely no one will tolerate a temporal reference of *πρό* in a fourth passage which L. and S. mention as 'Inscr. in Newton's Halicarn.' but do not quote. The inscription will be