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](#)

Notes on Sophocles *Trachiniae*

Mortimer Lamson Earle

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 10 / December 1893, pp 449 - 451

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199007, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199007

How to cite this article:

Mortimer Lamson Earle (1893). Notes on Sophocles *Trachiniae*. The Classical Review, 7, pp 449-451 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199007

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

872 B, ἐὰν δὲ δοῦλος ἐλεύθερον ἐκὼν, εἴτε αὐτὸς ὁ χεῖρ εἴτε βουλευσας ἀποκτείνῃ. Cf. 872 A, ἐὰν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ χεῖρ μὲν μή, βουλεύσῃ δὲ θάνατον τις ἄλλος ἐτέρῳ.

No one doubts that αὐτοχειρία ἔκτεινεν is good Greek. I only insist that αὐτόχειρ ἀπέκτεινεν is equally good.

J. E. SANDYS.

SOPH. OED. COL. 527.

In the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xiii. p. 152, I proposed to write here ἡ πατρόθεν, ὡς ἀκούω, δυσώνυμα λέκτρ' ἐπάσω; and I added *i.e. didst thou wed thy father's widow?* No. xix. of *Hermathena* contains an article by Prof. Tyrrell, full of his usual kindness and generosity, in which the following remarks occur (p. 307):

But what is most puzzling to me is to guess why . . . Prof. Housman thinks that he has improved the sense by reading πατρόθεν for ματρόθεν, and how he has persuaded himself that πατρόθεν λέκτρα could mean 'his father's widow,' unless πατρόθεν can take

the place of πατρός; and if it can, then ματρόθεν = ματρός, and ματρόθεν λέκτρα means 'thy mother's bed,' and there is no difficulty in the passage.

I take πατρόθεν with the verb: ἡ πατρόθεν λέκτρ' ἐπάσω; means *came thy bride unto thee from thy father's arms?* My paraphrase *didst thou wed thy father's widow?* is in sense the exact equivalent of this; but since its form has misled Prof. Tyrrell, and may therefore mislead others, into thinking that I took πατρόθεν λέκτρα to mean *thy father's widow*, I desire to make this explanation.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

PERSIUS, SAT. VI. 79.

I am glad to see that Dr. Reid has proposed *bulgam* for *rugam* in the disputed phrase *iam decies redit in rugam*. I have the same suggestion now for many years down in the margin of my Conington; but I never ventured to publish it. Palaeographically, the conjecture is perfect; for B and R are habitually confounded, and the omission of *l* or its equivalent *i* is very common. The only objection is the anti-

quity of the word, for Persius seldom goes as far back as Lucilius for his vocabulary. Dr. Reid rightly rejects the meaning 'purse' for *rugam*, and the explanation of 'frowning' based on Juvenal xiv. 326. The only possible explanation of *rugam* is that of the scholiast: 'ἀλληγορικῶς αὐτὸς vestibis dixit, quod in rugam plicantur.' But I believe *bulgam* is right.

A. PALMER.

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES TRACHINIAE.

V. 1.

λόγος μὲν ἔστ' ἀρχαῖος ἀνθρώπων φανείς.

Mr. Margoliouth's remark that 'ἀνθρώπων is hardly tolerable with βροτῶν in the same place in the following line' appears to me, in view of the context, eminently just. However, I am not inclined to accept his ἀνθρώπων, or to regard ἀνθρώπων as a gloss on βροτῶν. The original reading was, I believe (quite independently of Mr. Blaydes), ἀρχαῖος ἐκ τινος φανείς. The partitive ἀνθρώπων was added to τινος and finally sup-

planted ἐκ τινος in the text. Mr. Blaydes, although he quotes *Ant.* 621 (σοφαί γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται) in support of ἐκ τινος, does not seem to have appreciated the intrinsic probability of his conjecture; for he offers also λόγος παλαιὸς ἔστ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις φανείς.

V. 55.

ἀνδρὸς κατὰ ζήτησιν οὐ πέμπεις τινά.

Neither Mr. Blaydes nor Professor Jebb notices what I believe to be the most

apposite parallel to *κατὰ ζήτησιν* here, viz. Eur. *Cycl.* 14 *σέθεν κατὰ ζήτησιν*.

V. 56 sq.

εἰ πατρός
νέμοι τιν' ὦραν τοῦ καλῶς πράσσειν δοκεῖν.

These words cannot be sound as they stand. A comparison of vv. 65 sq. (*σὲ πατρός οὕτω δαρὸν ἐξενωμένον | τὸ μὴ πυθέσθαι ποῦ ἐστὶν αἰσχύνῃν φέρει<ν>*) seems to show clearly that the slave-woman's speech contained a more pointed reflection on Hyllus than our present text gives. Therefore I propose to read *πάρος | νέμει* (the latter word is thus given in some MSS.). The Homericism in the construction of *πάρος* with the present is, I think, justifiable. Certainly 'if hitherto he has shown any regard for fair fame' is the sort of sentiment we should expect here under the circumstances.

V. 74 sq.

Εὐβοῖδα χώραν φασὶν, Εὐρύτου πόλιν,
ἐπιστρατεύειν αὐτὸν, ἣ μέλλειν ἔτι.

In v. 75 I suspect that *αὐτὸν* has supplanted *αὐ νιν* (cf. *Ant.* 602). *φασὶν—νιν* in the present passage thus repeats *φασί νιν* in v. 70, the *αὐ* answering to *μὲν* in v. 69.

V. 92 sq.

χώρει νιν, ὦ παῖ· καὶ γὰρ ὑστέρωι τό γ' εὖ
πράσσειν, ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο, κέρδος ἐμπολαῖ.

πύθοιτο has been made from *πύθοιο* in L,—a *Verschlimmerung* of the most pronounced sort. We should read thus:

καὶ γὰρ ὑστέρωι τό γ' εὖ
πράσσειν—ἐπεὶ πύθοιο—κέρδος ἐμπολαῖ.

'For even though one be late, yet success—for I pray that you may get news—brings gain.' The prayer of Deianira thus echoes the promise of Hyllus (vv. 90 sq.). Mr. Blaydes, with his accustomed acuteness, remarks that '*πύθοιο* may perhaps be the true reading,' but goes no farther,—indeed he does not seem to appreciate the merits of the case.

V. 148 sqq.

ἕως τις ἀντὶ παρθένου γυνή,
κληθῇ, λάβημι τ' ἐν νυκτὶ φροντίδων μέρος,
ἥτοι πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἣ τέκνων φοβουμένη.

The expression of vv. 148—9 is charming. But the delicacy of *λάβημι τ' ἐν νυκτὶ φρον-*

τίδων μέρος seemed to some one to need a little explanation; therefore he added *ἥτοι πρὸς ἀνδρὸς*: some one else seems to have added *ἣ τέκνων*: yet another, who was skilled to 'roll out a rhesis' and 'stiffen' words (but not 'by wisdom') 'out into a line,' completed for us the fair trimeter numbered 150, which it were a kindness to Sophocles to bracket—at least. (I am, of course, aware that others have rejected the verse.)

Vv. 166 sq.

τότ' ἢ θανεῖν χρεῖη σφε τῷδε τῷ χρόνῳ
ἢ τοῦθ' ὑπεκδραμόντα τοῦ χρόνου τέλος
τὸ λοιπὸν ἤδη ζῆν ἀλυνήτῳ βίῳ.

ὑπεκδραμόντα should not be altered. It is a familiar Euripidean metaphor drawn from a slip that outruns, or outrides, a storm. But *τοῦ χρόνου* so soon after *τῷ χρόνῳ* (and nearly under it) has been justly called in question. I cannot think highly of Mr. Margoliouth's *σὺν θεοῖς*. My own conjecture is *πὺν μόρον*, which I find confirmed (so far, at least, as the latter word is concerned) by Euripides (as we might indeed expect); for in *Andr.* 414 we read *ἦν δ' ὑπεκδράμης μόρον* (quoted also by Mr. Blaydes but not utilized).

Vv. 178 sqq.

ἐπεὶ καταστεφῇ
στείχονθ' ὦρ' αὐτὰ πρὸς χαρὰν λόγων.

Professor Jebb says that *π. χ. λόγων* 'refers to *καταστεφῇ*'; but I cannot so understand it. *καταστεφῇ στείχοντα* forms too close a unity to be thus separated. Rather join *π. χ. λόγων* with the second element *στείχοντα* (which amounts to joining with *κατ. στείχ.*). This supports the conjecture *είσορμῶσι πρὸς χαρὰν βορᾶς* in *Ant.* 30, in which I was long anticipated by Mr. Blaydes; *καταστεφῇ στείχ. π. χ. λόγων*, which depicts a mutual joy, seems well illustrated by *Ant.* 148 sqq. *ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἃ μεγαλῶννμος ἦλθε Νίκα | ταῖς πολυαρμάταις ἀντιχαρεῖσα Θῆβαι*.

Vv. 196 sqq.

τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν ἕκαστος ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων
οὐκ ἂν μεθεῖτο, πρὶν καθ' ἡδονὴν κλύειν.

τὸ ποθοῦν is one of those phrases that (*mea quidem sententia*) carries about it an air of genuineness. The trouble seems to lie solely in *ἐκμαθεῖν*. Why may we not suppose this to have arisen from *ἐκπληῖσαι*, with *μαθῶν* added as an explanatory gloss?

V. 516.

μόνα δ' ἑλεγκτος ἐν μέσῳ Κύπρις ῥαβδονόμει
ξυνούσα.

Is ξυνέῖσα possible here (notwithstanding the sense that ξυνιέναι elsewhere bears in the tragedians) as a Homericism, in the sense of *committere*? Certainly 'acted as umpire after bringing them together in strife' is more vigorous than the sense conveyed by the traditional text. μάχαι for μόνα were perhaps too rash.

Vv. 608 sqq.

πρὶν κείνος αὐτὸν φανερὸς ἐμφανῶς σταθεὶς
δείξει θεοῖσιν ἡμέραι ταυροσφάγῳ.

φανερὸς ('made from φανερός in L') is pretty clearly a gloss on ἐμφανῶς that has got into the text and ejected something. I would suggest αὐτὸν ἐμφανῶς, θυτῆρ σταθεὶς (suggested by v. 1192, as was Froelich's conjecture φανερόν ἐμφανὴς θυτῆρ).

Vv. 672 sqq.

τοιοῦτον ἐκβέβηκεν, οἶον, ἣν φράσω,
γυναῖκες ὑμῖν (v. l. ἡμῖν) θαυμ' ἀνέλπιστον
μαθεῖν.

The second verse seems clearly wrong. The dative in the pronoun cannot well be construed, nor does the emendation ὑμᾶς seem to touch the root of the evil. The corruption lies most probably, as it seems to me, in γυναῖκες, which I conjecture to have sup-
planted a word with which the dative was

to be construed. This word was, I believe, πάρεστιν. The presence of γυναῖκες can easily be accounted for as a gloss explaining ὑμῖν, or rather clearly indicating the second person, not the first. γυναῖκες has, I think, similarly affected an entrance in Eur. *Hipp.* 294 (as a gloss on αἰδε), where I conjecture πάρεσιν.

V. 903.

κρύψας' εαυτὴν ἔνθα μή τις εἰσίδῃ.

Professor Jebb's explanation of ἔνθα—εἰσίδῃ as an outgrowth of the 'deliberative construction' calls for an emphatic protest. The local-temporal ἔνθα is here, as elsewhere, merely following in the footsteps of ἵνα, which itself is sometimes followed by the future after the usual fashion of ἔνθα: cf. e.g. *Trach.* 1157 sqq. In such a passage as Eur. *Cycl.* 345 sqq. ἀλλ' ἔσπετ' εἶσω, τῷ κατ' αὔλιον θεῷ | ἵν'—εὐωχῇτέ με it may not be unfair to give ἵνα a local sense.

Vv. 941 sqq.

κλαίων ὁθύνεκ' ἐκ δυοῖν ἔσοιθ' ἄμα,
πατρός τ' ἐκείνης τ', ὠρφανισμένος βίον.

For βίον Wakefield corrected βίον, which is accepted by Jebb, though seemingly without sufficient warrant. βίαι would seem far more natural. It may be noted that in v. 1015 we find what looks like the same corruption. Here for βίον Wakefield reads βίαι.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

THE TEXT OF PLINY'S *NATURAL HISTORY* PRESERVED IN ENGLISH MSS.

In a recently published essay¹ Karl Welzhofer has shown strong evidence, in the citations of Pliny by Bede and Robert of Cricklade, for believing that a distinct tradition of the text of the *Natural History* was preserved in England through the Middle Ages, and can be traced back to the seventh century. This essay came into my hands after I had arrived at the same conclusions by a different route; but it may be worth while to set forth some additional evidence on the subject.

¹ In *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*, Wilhelm v. Christ dargebracht. Munich, 1891.

While inspecting the MSS. of Pliny preserved at London and Oxford, I have found two—Ar. 98, in the British Museum, and no. 274 in the library of New College—which show the closest connection with one another. The only variants are in the case of transcribers' blunders, and a few passages where the Museum MS. has been corrected apparently by the original hand: both are written by English scribes, and both date from about 1200—the Museum MS. being probably the earlier. The readings of these two MSS. are in almost every instance identical with those of Robert of Cricklade's excerpts: the resemblance is so close,