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](#)

Soph. Trach. 56 and Eurip. Med. 13

Mortimer Lamson Earle

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 08 / November 1895, pp 395 - 396

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202539, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202539

How to cite this article:

Mortimer Lamson Earle (1895). Soph. Trach. 56 and Eurip. Med. 13. The Classical Review, 9, pp 395-396 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202539

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

to men and its use with reference to gods can hardly be maintained. He admits that *ἐθέλω* is used to express a mere wish, where he would expect *βούλομαι*, as in H 182, quoted above. Furthermore, *ἐθέλω* is used of the gods to signify *will*, while, according to Buttmann, *βούλομαι* is also thus used. See ρ 424, Ξ 120, T 274, ε 169. The subject of *βούλομαι* in Homer has reference to gods 16 times, 12 in the *Iliad* and 4 in the *Odyssey*. The greater frequency of this use in the *Iliad* is explained chiefly by the fact that there the phrase *βούλεσθαι νίκην* occurs 5 times, whereas it is not found in the *Odyssey*. The subject has reference to persons 22 times, 7 in the *Iliad* and 15 in the *Odyssey*. This difference is also to be explained by the subject-matter. If *βούλομαι* always signifies preference, no distinction can well be drawn between its use with gods and its use with men.

There are other indications that we have given the correct interpretation to *βούλομαι* in Homer:

1. *βούλομαι* occurs 38 times and *ἐθέλω* 294 times. This large excess in favour of *ἐθέλω* is unexplained, at least by their meanings, if we suppose that *ἐθέλω* expresses a wish combined with design, and *βούλομαι* a mere wish or willingness.

2. *βούλομαι* is never used with a negative, while *ἐθέλω* is thus used 81 times. It is natural to say 'I am unwilling,' and *οὐκ ἐθέλω* is often used in this sense, but it is quite unnecessary to use a verb of preference negatively.

3. There is a difference between these verbs as regards the position they occupy in the clause and the line. There are indications that the first place in the clause and the first in the line are emphatic, certainly far more emphatic than the second place in the clause, which has been shown by Wackernagel (*Indog. Forsch.* i. p. 333 ff.) to be unemphatic. *βούλομαι* takes the first place in the clause or line in 30 per cent. of its occurrences, in 10 per cent. it is used with *πολύ* or *μάλα*, and in 23 per cent. it is placed just before the main caesura. *ἐθέλω*

stands first in the clause or line in 12 per cent. of its occurrences. In estimating the place of *ἐθέλω* we have eliminated 40 participial forms and 48 cases where the verb is used in a clause consisting of but two or three words, of which αἴ κ' ἐθέλῃσι is a type. Taking the remaining cases we find *ἐθέλω* standing second in the clause, or as near second as possible, in 37 per cent. of the occurrences. Here we have considered such combinations as εἰ δ', αἴ κ', ἐπεὶ οὐκ, ἦ ῥ', &c., as a single element of the clause. When *ἐθέλω* follows these combinations, it is as near second as it can be placed. δέ, κέ, οὐκ, &c., occupy strictly the second position, according to Wackernagel. *ἐθέλω* recognizes their prior claim but still shows an unmistakable fondness for the second place. On the other hand *βούλομαι* is found second in the clause but twice, ο 21, π 387, about 5 per cent. of the examples, and these instances may perhaps be accounted for by the emphasis of the preceding word and the exigencies of the verse. This tendency to give prominence to *βούλομαι* as over against *ἐθέλω* accords with the meaning of 'to prefer,' which we found to be always contained in it. This difference of position can be illustrated by μ 348,

εἰ δὲ χολωσάμενός τι βοῶν ὀρθοκραϊράων
νῆ' ἐθέλῃ δλέσαι, ἐπὶ δ' ἔσπωνται θεοὶ ἄλλοι,
βούλομ' ἅπαξ πρὸς κύμα χανὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν
δλέσσαι,
ἢ δηθὰ στρέψασθαι ἔων ἐν νήσῳ ἐρήμῃ.

'But if he be somewhat wroth for his high-horned cattle, and is fain to wreck our ship, and the other gods follow his desire, rather with one gulp at the wave would I cast my life away, than be slowly straitened to death in a desert isle.' In later Greek *βούλομαι* shows traces of this early use, as in *Anab.* 3, 4, 41, 42, but in general it appears to have been extended in its application and to have taken on new meanings.

L. R. HIGGINS.

Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

SOPH. *TRACH.* 56 AND EURIP. *MED.* 13.

THE next best thing to being the first to put forth a successful emendation of the traditional text of a classical author is to be an independent second. Of this I have been twice reminded within a comparatively

short space of time. In the correction πάρος for πατρός in Soph. *Trach.* 56 (see *Class. Rev.* vii. 450) I was anticipated by Mr. H. W. Hayley (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* iv. 203 sq.). In my dis-

cussion *Of Two Passages in Euripides' Medea* included in the *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (Macmillan, 1894) I corrected the ἀντὶ of *Med.* 13 to αὐτῶι—'a necessary correction' in the words of the late Professor Merriam. But this emendation I now find had been made several years earlier by a native Hellenist, Geórgios M. Sakorráphos, Δ. Φ., whose *Medea* with modern Greek notes issued from the press of Sakellários at Athens in 1891 (the preface is dated at Leipsic, 11th August, 1891). I may add that in the further discussion of the passage (vv. 6-16) Mr. Sakorráphos and I do not agree in all respects. He keeps the (to me) impossible φυγῆι of vs. 12 and makes the τε of vs. 13

correlative to μὲν in vs. 11. The latter is rather strange, for Mr. Sakorráphos understands the words ἐχθρὰ πάντα essentially as I do. (Cf. ἐχθρὰ πάντα· δηλ. πάντες οἱ πολῖται, οὓς ὑπαινίσσεται ἡ Μήδεια ἐν 218 κ. ἐφ. with 'Does not then ἐχθρὰ πάντα refer to the other class alluded to above, the people of Corinth, who were formerly friendly to Medea, but are now, as represented in their royal family, become her foes?') Curiously too he explains τὰ φίλτατα in vs. 16 as equivalent to οἱ σύζυγοι instead of as=τὰ τοῦ λέχους. However to Mr. Sakorráphos belongs the credit of the emendation αὐτῶι, until a prior claimant to that honour be produced.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

THE CORRECTIONS IN THE FLORENCE MS. OF NONIUS.

THE late Mr. J. H. Onions, in his posthumous edition of Nonius Marcellus *De Conpendiosa Doctrina* i.—iii., just issued from the Clarendon Press, points out the immense importance of certain corrections found in the ninth century Florence MS. of that author (Laur. xlviii. 1).

These corrections have been made in a lighter ink than that used by the original scribe or his first corrector. Mr. Onions refers to them in his edition of Nonius by the sign F³; but as the result of the method followed in his critical apparatus he has noted only those readings where F³ is at variance with all or the majority of the other MSS. It seems of importance therefore, as these corrections are all that remains to us of an undoubted *codex optimus*, that scholars should have access to a complete list of them all: of those which conform to the usual text as well as those which depart from it.

Acting under the advice of my friend Mr. W. M. Lindsay of Jesus College, Oxford, who has been engaged in seeing Mr. Onions' edition of Nonius through the press, I have accordingly spent some time in providing the following conspectus of the corrections of F³. It includes erasures which from ink-marks or some strong peculiarity of the consequent reading are plausibly assigned to this corrector by Mr. Onions, but not those which have nothing to show their origin. Some of these may of course have been due to F³, but with this inevitable exception I believe the list will be found complete.

If any apology be needed for the appearance of such a conspectus in the pages of the *Classical Review*, it lies ready to hand in the preface to the Clarendon Press edition of Nonius. Mr. Onions there argues that the lost codex now represented by F³ was not vitiated by the transposition of a leaf from Book iv. to the beginning of Book i., and must therefore have been derived from a different archetype from that of all the other MSS. of this author, which without exception show this mistake. If this be so, then F³ represents a source which is of the same paramount importance for the text of Nonius as—to compare small things with great—the Milan Palimpsest has for that of Plautus.

In the following list italics are used to indicate the precise letters with which F³ has interfered, and in cases of erasure or punctuation the appropriate signs are employed for the same purpose. A = addidit; C = correxit; Conj. = conjunxit; D = deleuit; Dist. distinxit; E = erasit; N.L. = novum lemma. The references are made to the pages of Mercier's edition and the lines of Onions' pages.

- 1, 13 mauis C.
- 18 hic A.
- 2, 3 Si C.
- 15 Se-nium A. E. Conj.
Veliterna A.
- 26 Lucios C.
- 3, 13 *A marg.
- 28 causa ^ E?
- 4, 5 ponti—ca E, Conj.