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](#)

Aesch. Choeph. 623—630

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 03 / March 1893, pp 103 - 103

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197045, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197045

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1893). Aesch. Choeph. 623—630. The Classical Review, 7, pp 103-103
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197045

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

AESCH. *CHOEPH.* 623—630.

IN reading the three orations of Choricus, a sophist contemporary with Justinian, which have been edited within the last two years by Prof. Richard Förster of Breslau—the *Miltiades* and the two *Orationes Nuptiales*—I came on a formula which he seems to have affected, occurring as it does twice.

Milt. 81 (p. 14 F.), ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμνήσθην, εἰς ἑτέρου χρησιμοῦ μνήμην ἀφίγμαι. *Orat. Nupt.* ii. 33 (p. 23 F.), ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἀχλλέως ἐμνήσθην, εἰσῆλθέ μοι μνήμη καὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος ἐκείνου ἣν ἐποίησεν Ἥφαιστος. In both cases the rhetorician passes from one legend to another which it helps to recall.

The similarity of this formula to the well-known difficulty in *Choeph.* 623 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπεμνησάμην ἀμειλίχων πόνων κ.τ.λ. is striking. It suggests that the outline of construction in both cases was the same. As Choricus makes his apodosis begin, now with ἀφίγμαι, now with εἰσῆλθέ μοι μνήμη, so Aeschylus must have done if we had his words as he wrote them. But the metre of 628 ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ δηίοις ἐπικότως ἔβας (so *M*) is wrong, and proves that the text of the MSS. is corrupt. An anonymous critic quoted by Scholefield proposed to alter ἐπικότως ἔβας into ἐπικότως ἔβαν. This would agree very nearly with Choricus' εἰς ἑτέραν μνήμην ἀφίγμαι, and

restore the metre of the verse adequately and satisfactorily. We still lack however a construction for the accusatives γαμήλευμα, μῆτιδας. This I propose to find in δηίοις, which with a very slight change I would write δηλοῖς = δηλοῦσα—

ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ δηλοῖς ἐπικότως ἔβαν,

'I pass, in natural order, to tell of a nuptial rite that ended in the wife plotting to kill her husband,' sc. the marriage of Clytaemnestra with Agamemnon.

Agam. 1537, 8.

δίκα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα θήγει βλάβης
πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάταις † μοῖρα.

Musgrave conj. μάχαιρον for μοῖρα, Housman would read θηγάταισιν ἄορ. I fancy the word may be αἶραν, an axe. Callimachus used this rare word in the sense of 'hammer,' *fr.* 129 Schneider. One of the authorities there cited will show this. Eustath. on *Od.* x. 75, p. 1648, 10 αἱ σφῦραι ὅτε μὲν ραισστήρες κοινότερον, ὅτε δὲ αἶραι, ὡς καὶ ἄλλαχού ἐδηλώθη, οὐ χρήσεις (! χρήσις) ἐν τῷ αἰράων ἔργα διδασκόμενοι. But it had another meaning, 'axe.' Hesych. αἶρα· σφύρα, ἄξιν. 'Justice is sharpening on other whetstones for another deed of wrong its axe.'

ROBINSON ELLIS.

TWO PELIGNIAN INSCRIPTIONS IN SATURNIAN METRE.

The thirteenth inscription in Zvetaieff, *Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dialecticae*, is one from the neighbourhood of Corfinium, written in alliterative language which reminds one of the Saturnian epitaphs of the Scipios¹—

pracom x
usur pristafalacirix prismu petiedu ip uidadu
uibdu omnitu uranias ecuc empratois
x lisuist cerfum sacaracirix semunu suad

¹ Prof. Thurneysen objects that the carrying on of the final word of a clause to the beginning of the next line, praicime Perseponas | Afded, (*in regnum* (?) *Proserpinae* | *Abiit*), is not in the Saturnian style. But we have exactly the same thing in one of the Scipio epitaphs (*C.I.L.* i. 33: Quare lubens te in gremiu, Scipio, recipit | Terra).

In the Pelignian inscription I indicate by dots under the letters that the first letters of vv. 1, 2, 3, 5, and the last of v. 2, are not quite certain, and by crosses that the first of v. 4 and the last of v. 1 are completely illegible. The letters *v* and *u* are not distinguished on the stone.

aetatu firata fertlid praicime perseponas
afded. eite uus pritrome pacris puus ecic
lexe. lifar dida uus deti hanustu herentas

(See Zvetaieff *l.c.*, and the corrections by Pauli *Altital. Stud.* v.) Each word is separated by a triangular mark, but after afded v. 6, and lexe v. 7 is a round dot. In the Pelignian dialect of Corfinium, which seems closely related to the Oscan, are a few other inscriptions (*Zv.* 14 *sqq.*), the largest of which (no. 14) is, like no. 13, alliterative, and probably metrical:

pes pros ecuf incubat
casnar oisa aetate
c anaes solois des forte
faber

One of the peculiarities of the dialect is the use of a crossed D, which I have