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](#)

Tucker's *Choephor*i of Aeschylus *The Choephor*i of Aeschylus with Critical Notes, Commentary, Translation, and a Recension of the Scholia, by T. G. Tucker Litt. D., Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Melbourne. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1901, 8vo. pp. civ, 318. 12s. 6d.

W. Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 07 / October 1902, pp 347 - 354

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206549, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206549

How to cite this article:

W. Headlam (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 347-354 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206549

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

A LATIN TRIBUTE FROM DEAN VINCENT TO WARREN HASTINGS.

In a copy of Dean Vincent's *Voyage of Nearchus*, translated (Oxford 1809) lately given to University College, Sheffield, by Professor J. E. B. Mayor of Cambridge, the appended verses by Vincent and his letter enclosing them are inserted.

The letter is addressed to Mr. James Boswell (1778-1822) second son of Johnson's biographer, a barrister at law and, as an old Westminster boy, probably a former pupil of Vincent's. The book itself no doubt belonged to Boswell, (it is a gift 'from the author') and no doubt it was he who pasted in it Vincent's verses on the eighty-fourth birthday of Warren Hastings.

These verses written by a famous scholar in honour of a great builder of the empire have no little interest at the present time.

The 'Impey' mentioned in the letter is not Sir Elijah Impey, Hastings' contemporary and schoolfellow, who had died in 1809, but one of his sons, probably Elijah Barwell Impey, who like his father and Hastings himself had been educated at Westminster. It is noteworthy that Gleig's *Memoirs of Warren Hastings* (vol. iii. p. 500), gives a letter from Hastings to Elijah Barwell Impey dated 'Daylesford House [Worcestershire] 19th Dec. 1816,' which begins 'Yesterday was my 84th birthday.' The day which Dean Vincent honoured by his verses was therefore the 18th December 1816.

The *Dictionary of National Biography* while stating that Warren Hastings was born in 1732 gives the date of his birth as the 6th December. If that is not an error, we must suppose that in his later years Hastings in commemorating his birthday took account of the change from Old to New Style.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

[ENCLOSING LETTER].

DEAR BOSWELL,

If you had not been in a hurry, you might have had the enclosed yesterday. I trust to your honour that it be not seen till the principal has got his copy: in that copy I have unfortunately written auspice where it ought to have been omine. Can Impey correct it?

Yours truly,

W. V.

Dec. 16.

MR. BOSWELL,
GARDEN COURT, TEMPLE.

GUARRENO HASTINGS, AET^a. 84.

O decus imperii, cui Ganges paruit ingens,
Cujusque auspiciis Belli flagrante procella,
Res stetit Angligenum, fracti cessere
Marattae,—

Intima Mysoreus repetens sua regna
Tyrannus

Delituit, versis doluitque inglorius armis.
Nec tumidae valuereminae, nec Martius ardor
Gallorum, insidiaque Indos ad bella cientes.

Vivis adhuc, Venerande Senex, rurisque
recessu

Contemplantur tuo quae gesseris omine,—
quosque

Tentandos aliis promoveris ante triumphos.

Namque per Oceanum qui lambit littora
Sinae,

Et patet ad fines tellus ubi prominet Afra,
Post acies terrâ, post classes aequore victas,
Vexillum imperii jam sola Britannia pandit.

His fruere: at meritis si patria parca
favorem

Abneget, et justae suspendat praemia
laudis,—

Esto: sed egregias constanti in pectore vires,
Justitiam, purasque manus, mentemque
capacem

His saltem accumulem donis,—nec munera
Musae

Respue, Pierias nam tu colis ipse sorores.

REVIEWS.

TUCKER'S *CHOEPHORI* OF AESCHYLUS.

The Choephoroi of Aeschylus with Critical Notes, Commentary, Translation, and a Recension of the Scholia, by T. G. TUCKER Litt. D., Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Melbourne. Cam-

bridge, at the University Press. 1901. 8vo. pp. civ, 318. 12s. 6d.

THIS edition, excellently printed, is arranged on the same plan as Sir Richard

Jebb's of Sophocles ; it is dedicated to him, and has made good use of his admirable introduction to the *Electra*. Mr. Tucker's edition of the *Supplices* was ably reviewed in these columns by Prof. Housman,¹ and a great deal of that criticism is applicable still, but with a certain difference in detail. In 1084 lines of the *Supplices* Mr. Tucker introduced some 200 conjectures of his own, among which Mr. Housman considered 4 quite certain ; I gladly adopted more like 12 in my prose version : but hardly one stone was left upon another, and many of them had hardly any relation to the MS. Mr. Tucker now claims it as a merit that his text is exceptionally conservative, faithful to the MS. Perhaps it may prove to be a merit ; but there is much loose thinking and loose language on this point. If the MS. is good, it is a merit to maintain it ; if the MS. is bad, it is a fault : to assume it as a merit without proving the correctness of the MS. is to beg the question. Mr. Tucker does not acknowledge any modification of his critical principles, merely holding that the *Supplices* was desperately corrupted, whereas the text of the *Choephoroi* is much sounder than is usually supposed. But the truth appears to be that in the interval he has come under the influence of Dr. Verrall, with whom he avows having found himself habitually in agreement. Now Dr. Verrall's method is well-known : he treats almost every reading in any MS. he happens to be dealing with as true if only we knew how to interpret it ; and having more faith in the elastic power of the Greek tongue, moves easily what we had thought were mountains. Mr. Tucker's belief in this elasticity is not so great, but it is a very different thing from what it was.

To my mind the most satisfactory part of the work is the translation. Prose can never represent such verse aesthetically, and ought frankly to be prose, content if it can explain without offence how the Greek is to be construed. If Mr. Tucker's renderings are often incorrect, they are nearly always good and vigorous English.

We are not likely, I think, to get much forwarder with Aeschylus without new illustration and more study of ideas. Verbal emendations we may make, and every true thing helps ; but they do not greatly matter now unless they give us new significances, literary and artistic. I will take one passage to show doubly what I mean by an idea. The most familiar attributes of

Justice were her *balance* and her *all-regarding eye* : Δίκας ῥέπει τάλαντον Bacchyl. xvi. 25, *Agam.* 261 ; she was the personification of τὸ ἴσον, τὸ ἰσόρροπον, and the *inconnivens iustitiae oculus* (Amm. Marc. xxix. 2. 20), Δίκης ὀφθαλμός, πάντοκτον ὄμμα Δίκης A.P. vii. 580, was an even commoner conception, so that an epithet applied to her, or to her servant Νέμεσις, was ἐπισκοπος, Plat. *Legg.* 717 D, 872 E, Perictyona Stob. *Flor.* 79. 50. When therefore in *Cho.* 59 we find ῥοπή δ' ἐπισκοπεῖ Δίκας² ταχεία τοὺς² μὲν ἐν φάει..., it is reasonable to see a combination of these two,—not a confusion, for ἐπισκοπή meant ἐκδίκησις. Now in our latest editors there is no dream of either ; Dr. Verrall thinks 'the figure suggested is that of a bird of prey,' while in Prof. Tucker's interpretation neither ῥοπή nor ἐπισκοπεῖ are even attributes of Δίκη : he retains the corrupted text δίκαν and explains it 'The turn of events looks to justice.' Further, Plutarch *de sera numinis vindicta* 22 p. 564 E relates how a ψυχή informed Aridaeus in his vision that Adrasteia, daughter of Ἀνάγκη and Zeus, employs three ministers to deal with three classes of offenders, none of whom escape ; the first are punished in their flesh at once (εὐθὺς ἐν σώματι, ἐν τῷ βίῳ) by Πονὴ ταχεία, with treatment comparatively mild ; the second who require more drastic remedies, are handed over by ὁ δαίμων³ after death to Δίκη : while the utterly incurable, whom Δίκη quite rejects, are chased and worried by Erinyes, the most savage, till she has plunged them into utter darkness, ἡφάνισε καὶ κατέδυσεν εἰς τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ ἀόρατον. *Cho.* 59 is to this effect :

ῥοπή δ' ἐπισκοπεῖ Δίκας
ταχεία τοὺς μὲν ἐν φάει,
τὰ δ' ἐν μεταίχμιῳ σκότον
μένει χρονίζοντι⁴ βρῦει,
τοὺς δ' ἄκρατος⁵ ἔχει νύξ.

'But the scale of Justice visiteth sinners either in the light of day, or else in twilight teems with wrath deferred, or else they are immersed in utter night.' The Twilight is the intermediate Purgatory between the light of life and the utter darkness of Hell : the longer punishment is deferred, the worse it grows, εἰ δὲ Δίκη σε παρπὸδα μὴ τιμωρὸς ἐτίσατο, δις τόσον αἰθὺς ἔσσειται ἐν πλεόνεσσι παλίσκοτος : ⁶ hence implacable enemies prayed that the

² The reading of the schol.

³ Plat. *Phaedo* 107 D.

⁴ M. Schmidt ; χρονίζουσα (Schuetz) or χρονίζοντα come to the same thing.

⁵ Schuetz for ἄκρατος.

⁶ Quoted by Suid. s.v. παρπὸδα.

¹ C.R. 1890 p. 105.

wicked might continue in their wickedness, and this is what *Ἀτῆ* suffers them to do in 66 sqq. I cannot think that any one who will compare the language of Aeschylus and Plutarch will deny that the three classes are the same in both; and when those two are considered together with the numerous Platonic passages upon the subject, it is reasonable to refer them all to a common Orphic or Pythagorean source. But for anything of this kind we shall look in vain to Mr. Tucker: religious or philosophical ideas which meant so much to Aeschylus have little interest for him; he is more at home in discussing the *ἀναγνώρισις* from Aristotle's point of view. His version of *Cho.* 59 is:

ῥοπα δ' ἐπισκοπεῖ δίκαν
ταχεία τοῖς μὲν ἐν φάει,
τὰ δ' ἐν μεταίχμιῳ σκότου
μένει χρονίζοντα βάρει
τοὺς δ' ἄκραντος ἔχει νύξ.

which he explains to mean 'The fall of the scale looks to justice for its cue: where it *sees clearly*, the fall is swift; where it *dimly discerns*, it lingers ('*βάρει* i.e. in the falling scale'); where darkness quite conceals, it is baffled.' To say nothing of the Greek, the meaning, I submit, is ludicrous; the whole point is that Justice is never baffled, that the sinners never do escape; and indeed Mr. Tucker feels this should be so, but in his view it was superfluous to express it; you are to supply '(though the time of punishment will come after all)', and this rather important reservation, unexpressed, is to serve as a connection with the following sentence, 'the connection being "(punishment comes at last)", and'.—I quoted Plutarch's passage to explain the Aeschylean in the *Journal of Philology*, 1895, p. 313, but Mr. Tucker is not a reader of our English journals; my last paper in the *Classical Review* (May, 1900) was not available much more than a year before he dates his preface, and he is good enough to mention it with regret that it appeared too late for him to use; but other papers of mine he gives no sign of having seen.

He has made, however, excellent emendations in his time, and I should like to welcome two outside this play, *προσέφατο* in *Agam.* 770 and *βάλλεται γὰρ ὅσοις Διόθεν κάρανα* (for *κεραυνός*) in 476. In the *Choeph.* the following seem to me the best of the new readings: on 811 πολλὰ δ' ἄλλα φανεῖ *χρηζῶν κρυπτά* one schol., τὰ δὲ κρυπτά νῦν *φανερῶσει*, is evidently written on *φανεῖ* or *ἀμφανεῖ*, but there is another, *θέλων* πολλὰ

κρυπτά εὐρίσκει, which T. points out is an explanation (it is the regular one) of *ἀλφάνει*. Which is genuine is another matter; either in itself might well be said of *Hermes*: here I am still inclined to think that *ἀμφανεῖ* is right, in opposition to the sentence following, especially since I suspect that *ἐπιφορώτατος* should be *ἐπεὶ τορώτατος*.—70 πόροι τε πάντες *ἐκ μᾶς* ὁδοῦ | <φοι>βαίνοντες τὸν | *χερομυσῇ* corresponding to *αἰανῆς ἅτα* | *διαφέρει*, the *καθαίροντες* which follows now in 72 being a gloss; it is the regular explanatory word, as in the *Et. Mag.* 797. 6 (for *φοιβαίνω* is not preserved by Hesychius alone) *παρὰ τὸ φοιβαῖναι, τὸ καθάραι, ὡς τὸ 'φοιβανᾶτω δέ τις ἀσάμινθον'*. The passage is too much mutilated for one to feel sure of this conjecture, but it gains probability with me from having occurred to two minds independently, for I have made the same proposal.¹—835 τὸν αἴτιον δ' ἐξαπόλλυε σπόρον 'utterly destroy the germ of guilt', for *ἐξαπολλύσμορον*, is the sort of sense I had been seeking, but I had thought of nothing better myself than *ἐξαπόλλυ' ἡμερον*.—692 καὶ νῦν 'Ορέετης—*ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχειν ἔξω νομίζων ὀλεθρίου πηλοῦ πόδα*—'And now Orestes . . . for he was fancying (*ἦν νομίζων*) that he was shrewdly keeping his foot out of the mire', where the vulgate is *ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχων ἔξω κομίζων* (the schol.'s reading) . . . 'for he was in prudent case, in extricating his foot', as though it were *εὐβουλος ἦν κομίζων* . . . It is not easy to decide, but Mr. Tucker's view may very well be right.—196 ἀλλ' ἐν σαφ' ἦναι for εἶ.—415 θάρσaea (plural of *θάρσος*) where Turnebus' *θρασέα* is not admitted by the metre.—926 πατὴρ γὰρ αἶσα τόνδ' ἐσουρίζει μόρον 'Thy father's fate wafts events to this slaying'.—611 ἄλλα δ' ἦν τιν' ἐν λόγοις στυγεῖν, *φονία σκύλαξ* (a play on the name *Κύλλα*) for *ἄλλα δὴ τιν'* . . . *σκύλλαν* is an ingenious notion, but will hardly be convincing until Mr. Tucker can produce a parallel to the expression *ἦν τιν' ἐν λόγοις στυγεῖν*, which he explains 'and there was another for (= to help) men to utter abhorrence'.—1017 οὐτις . . . *διὰ πάντ' <ἀγ>άτιμος ἀμείψει, μόχθος δ' ὁ μὲν αὐτίχ' ὁ δ' ἤξει*: but *μόχθος* should be the antithesis to something like *ἀνατος* or *ἀχειμος*.—639 sqq. he interprets 'For unrighteousness doth not lie trodden under heel, and leave us to trespass with lawfulness on 'all that Zeus makes holy', reading τὸ πᾶν Διὸς σέβας *παρεκβάντ' ἐὰ θεμίστως* for *παρεκβάντες οὐ θεμίστως* (altered from *ἀθεμίστως*). Surely Aeschylus would have said *Righteousness*, not *unrighteousness*. But

¹ *Camd. Univ. Reporter* Dec. 4, 1900.

παρεκβάντ' I suspect is part of the truth; my notion was 'But the sword of Justice wounds him that transgresses, trampled under foot, the holiness of Zeus and turns aside unto unrighteousness', *λὰς πέδοι πατούμενον τὸ πᾶν Διὸς σέβας παρεκβάντ' ἐς οὐ θεμιστά* (the last word having been supposed adverbial with *παρεκβάντες*, and glossed in the usual way by *ἀθεμίστως* or *οὐ θεμιστῶς*), like *A.P.* xvi. 243 *ἦν δὲ παρεκβαίης ἐς ἃ μὴ θέμις*.—In another place a conjecture of Mr. Tucker's helps, I think, towards the restoration of the true reading: 388 *τί γὰρ κεύθω φρέν', ὃ θεῖον ἔμπας ποτᾶται*; (for *φρενός* *θεῖον*) 'Why hide the heaven-sent presage—for 'tis none else—that visits me!' For several reasons I cannot think this right; they don't say *κεύθειν φρένα* but *ἐνὶ φρεσί*, *μὴ κεύθε νόφ*, *μὴ κεύθε* *ἔνδον καρδίας*; if we had *φρενί*, I could understand the grammar of it; but I do not see the force of *θεῖον* here: the Chorus cannot hide their hatred, but how is it a presage, and why should they ascribe their feeling to the inspiration of divinity? I had been trying, on account of the figure, to read *σεῖον*, and had thought of *φρένα σεῖον*: but this did not account for *φρενός*, and there was nothing for the neuter participle to agree with: *ΦΡΕΝΟCΕΙΟΝ* will account for everything; *τί γὰρ κεύθω φρέν' ὃ σεῖον ἔμπας ποτᾶται*; 'for how can I hide what still keeps quivering my breast?'—442 *κλύειν*.—577 *ξύν οὖν*.—569–71 *εἰ δ' οὖν ἀμείψω . . .*,

*τάπερ ὁ Λοξίας ὁ Παρνάσιος
μέγαν ἔχων μυχὸν χθονὸς ἐπωρθίαξ-
εν ἀδόλως δόλι' ἐν χρόνους
θεῖσ' ἄγαν ἐποίχεται.*

5 *κρατεῖ τᾶδέ πως τὸ θεῖον, παρὰ τὸ μὴ*
6 *ὑπουργεῖν κακὰ κακοῖς,*
ἴσον δ' οὐρανοῦχον ἀρχὰν σέβειν.

In a piece of Paeonic and dochmiac 152—63 he introduces this, 157 *σέβας ὦ δέσποτα τᾶξ ἀμαυρὰς φρενός*, and alters the concluding line *σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα*¹ *νωμῶν βέλη* (two dochmiacs) to *σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα νωμῶν* 'which, besides making the best sense, is more rhythmical.' *σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα νωμῶν* by itself is *epitrite*, which has no sort of relation to the rest. It is the same with a pair of epitrites introduced into cretic metre at 605 *πυρδαῖν<δη>πρόνοιαν*, where *δη* is 'demanded by the sense as well as by the metre.'

¹ This he explains in the old way, and accounts for *Κυθικά βέλη* by the remark that 'the Scythian police (*τοξόται*) had been established at Athens from B.C. 480.' Possibly; but would Aeschylus make his Chorus cry for the police?

ἦ καὶ μολὼν ἔπειτά μοι κατὰ στόμα, 'But if I cross . . . , or should he afterwards come', would be better for a parallel to the construction and for some explanation of *ἔπειτα*.—So would 479 *χρεῖαν ἔχω φυγεῖν μέγαν παρθέϊσαν Αἰγίσθω <ψόγον>* 'To escape the great reproach—"Sold to Aegisthus!"' an ingenious thought, but we have only his word as yet that 'the accus. is the proper exegesis of *ψόγον*, i.e. *φυγεῖν μέγαν ψόγον, ὅτι ἐπράθην*.'

New interpretations that seem most worth mentioning are 601 *ἴστω δ' ὅστις οὐχ ὑπόπτερος φροντίσιν* not 'flighty' here but 'fledged with thought', i.e. quick of wit.—587 *πεδαίχμοι λαμπάδες πεδάμαροι* not 'meteors' but 'lightning'.—154 *πρὸς ἔρμα τόδε κρέ*.

Many of the conjectures are out of court, because they are not metrical. Greek lyric metre cannot be learnt without an ear to start from, and an ear for metre is a gift from God; but to lack it is a misfortune especially in dealing with so great a lyric poet. I know one serious student of Aeschylus who refrains entirely from the lyrics on this ground; that perhaps is overdiffident, but it would certainly be more agreeable to have the lyrics in all the corruption of the MS. than as Mr. Tucker gives them. In the *Supplices* his one study was to equalize the corresponding lines, and that is still the only condition he seems conscious of; even that is not always successfully achieved; 952=963

*τάχα δὲ παντελὴς χρόνος ἀμείψεται
πρόθυρα δωμάτων ὅταν ἀφ' ἐστίας
μύσος ἅπαν ἐλάσῃ καθαρ-
μοῖς ἄρᾶν λυτήριον.*

5 *τύχαι δ' εὐπροσωποκοῖται τὸ πᾶν*
6 *ιδεῖν ἀκοῦσαί τ' ἐρομένους
μέτοικοι δόμων πεσοῦνται πάλιν.*

622 *πόνων, ἀκρῶσαι δεῖ δυσφίλεις γαμή-*
= 630 *λόγῳ, γοῶται δ' ἀδήποθ' ἐν κατάπτ-*
815 *καὶ τότ' ἤδη πῶν τὸν (or πλοῦτον)
δωμάτων λυτήριον*
790 *ἴσθι δ' ἀνδρὸς φίλου πῶλον εὖ-
νιν ζυγόντ' ἐν ἄρματι
πημάτων ἐν οἷ δρόμῳ προστιθεῖς
μέτρον τό τις ἂν σφάζομενον ῥυθμὸν
θεῖν' ιδεῖν δι' ἀπεδὸν
ἀνομένων βαμάτων ὄρεγμα,*

'And set thou before him such a measure to be run as one might shew a steady pace unbroken o'er the level,' which seems to me unintelligible in two languages, even with the explanation that the inserted *τὸ* in 793 '—ὃ ('over which') the accus. of extent.' These will be enough to show what rhythm is

preserved in the sort of measure Mr. Tucker sets before us.

The method might with advantage have owed more to Prof. Jebb's example. Every one knows how carefully he deals with various opinions, and speaking for myself, it is very rarely that I do not acquiesce in his judicial summing-up. In Dr. Verrall and Prof. Tucker we have rather the special pleader than the judge; they seldom give us more than one side of the argument, and Mr. Tucker is very apt not to discuss or not to mention views that have been thought to have at least a reasonable case. For instance in 730 Αἰγισθὸν ἢ κρατοῦσα τοὺς ξένους καλεῖν ἄνωγεν all critics except V. and T. now read τοῖς ξένοις 'The mistress (*Trach.* 405) bids call Aegisthus for the guests' (*Ar.* *Av.* 80 τὸν δεσπότην ἡμῖν κάλεσον, *Lys.* 701 τοῖσι παῖσι τὴν ἐταῖραν ἐκάλεσα, 871 σὺ δ' ἐμὲ τοῦτῳ μὴ κάλει, *Eur.* *El.* 499, 789), and think τοὺς ξένους was an easy inadvertence for a scribe: neither V. nor T. quotes anything in favour of this reading, and T. ignores it, giving us his own conjecture ἢ κρατοῦσα τοῦ στέγους.—In 277 T. reads τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ γῆς δυσφρόνων μελίγματα βροτοῖς πιφαύσκων εἶπε τὰς γεννῇ νόσους: neither V. nor T. mentions Lobeck's *μηρίματα* which seems to me unquestionably right; T. does mention Hermann's *τάσδ' αἰνῶν νόσους*, 'The correction is technically good, but the word *αἰνῶν* is unconvincing and the general sense unsatisfactory.' On what grounds? I still believe it to be true, and my ignorance is not enlightened.—In 1038 we get a natural sentence if with Blomfield we transpose two lines, καὶ μαρτυρεῖν μὲν ὡς (or πῶς) ἐπορσύνθη κακά | τὰδ' ἐν χρόνῳ μοι πάντας Ἀργείους λέγω ἐγὼ δὲ... (μαρτυρεῖν μενέλεως MS): thus μὲν marks a contrast with ἐγὼ δέ, the pronoun, as T. observes, being antithetic to Ἀργείους. The antithesis however is with him no argument for μὲν, nor does he mention Blomfield's view, but reads τὰ δ' ἐν χρόνῳ μοι πάντας Ἀργείους λέγω καὶ μαρτυρεῖν μὴ νηλεῶς < πορεῖν μ' ὅσα ἐς τὴν τεκοῦσαν μέλει > ἐπορσύνθη κακά, 'And, as for that fell work

(τὰ δ'), let every Argive in time to come e'en bear me witness (καὶ μαρτυρεῖν) that I wrought it not ruthlessly.' And is that the defence which the witness of all Argos is to plead, 'He murdered his mother, it is true; but he was not ruthless'? Is not that rather in the style of Mr. Gilbert? Hitherto we have supposed with Cicero *de invent. rhet.* I. xii. 18 *Orestes, si accusetur matricidii, nisi hoc dicat 'Iure feci, illa enim patrem meum occiderat,' non habet defensionem.* The whole case turns on the question whether it was justifiable homicide, whether it was done δικαίως, *Eum.* 471, 615, 618; that is the plea that he himself desires a witness for (*Cho.* 985), nor so long as he retains his senses (1024) does he dream of any other.

Much of the originality is now displayed in championing long-exploded readings: 14 ἢ πατρὶ τῷμῳ τάσδ' ἐπείκασας τύχῃ χοῆς φερούσας νεπτέροις μελίγμασιν; was corrected by Casanbon to μελίγματα, as *Pers.* 613 χοῆς φέρουσ', ἅπερ νεκροῖσι μελικτήρια. Dr. Verrall maintains the MS. text, as meaning 'Shall I liken the bringing of offerings by these women to a subsequent (νεπτέροις) propitiation of my father?' while Mr. Tucker takes νεπτέροις μελίγμασιν in apposition to πατρὶ τῷμῳ, the plural implying 'one who is wont to be appeased.'—The corrected reading of 32 is τορὸς γὰρ ὀρθόθριξ φόβος δόμων ὄνειρόμαντις (ὁ σαφὴς φόβος δι' ὀνείρων μαντευόμενος schol.), to which Orestes refers in 928 ἢ κάρτα μάντις οὐδ' ὄνειράτων φόβος. Since the terms describing this dream-terror are throughout the terms applied to prophecy, φοῖβος was an easy error for a scribe; Dr. Verrall keeps his version, τορὸς γὰρ Φοῖβος ὀρθόθριξ, but Mr. Tucker avoids the false quantity by reading τορὸς γε Φοῖβος ὀρθόθριξ (which would mean 'Phoebus was clear!'): Φοῖβος they hold stands for 'an inspiring power', 'divining spirit,' which it never does, and the word would be particularly inappropriate here, since terrifying dreams did not come from Phoebus but from his very opposite, the powers of Earth and Darkness. In 42 most people read with Elmsley

τοιάνδε¹ χάριν | ἀχάριτον | ἀπότροπον κακῶν
= 53 σέβας δ' ἄμαχον | ἀδάματον | ἀπόλεμον τὸ πρὶν

as *Phoen.* 1757 χάριν ἀχάριτον ἐς θεοὺς διδοῦσα. Mr. Tucker, prudently omitting this illustration which other commentators quote, says 'The reading ἀχάριτον is unhappy, weakening a form of antithesis much affected by the Greeks,' and inserts with Hartung δὲ after τοιάνδε, which is not in accordance

with Greek usage. Dr. Verrall scans ἀπότροπον, 'but it is altogether more probable,' says T., 'that ἀπότροπον exactly answers metrically to ἀπόλεμον.' Yet that is precisely the ground on which Elmsley's ἀχάριτον has been generally approved.—In 69 οἰγόντι δ' οὔτι νυμφικῶν ἐδωλίων ἄκος, the correction of Stephanus and Scaliger, *θιγόντι*, is accepted by every one except V. and T. It is a

¹ I think with Schuetz it ought to be τοιῶνδε.

technical word in this connexion and has every other argument in its favour, the schol. (τῷ ἐπιβάντι νυμφικῆς κλήνης), the rhythm, the tense, and the construction; but 'θιγόντι,' says V., 'could scarcely be accepted even if it were given by the MS.'; T. follows; 'it is unsuited to ἐδωλίων'—as though ἀθικτος were not used in prose and verse alike of inviolable places—and reduces the contents of the expression.—In 404 other critics adopt the correction of Bamberger and Paley πόποι δᾶ, νερτέρων τυραννίδες (or ποποὶ δᾶ), the same exclamation that Cassandra uses; V., keeping the MS. ποὶ ποὶ¹ δὴ, translates it 'How long then?', T. 'Of what avail are . . .?' But ποὶ δὴ; means 'Where are you going?' ὦ φίλε Φαῖδρε, ποὶ δὴ καὶ πόθεν; T. has curious notions of its meaning: 881 ποὶ Κλυταιμίστρα; 'Where has Clytemnestra gone to?' (as Ar. *Eccl.* 311) he translates 'What keepeth Clytemnestra?' and 728 ποὶ δὴ πατεῖς . . . πύλας; 'How comest thou to set foot in the gates?' That would be πῶς in Greek, not ποὶ.—In 534 ἀνῆλθον ἐκτυφλωθέντες σκότῳ λαμπτήρες other critics read ἀνῆθον with the confirmation of the schol. ἀνέλαμψαν (αἶθω being regularly explained by λάμπω): no aorist-form of αἶθω was in use, but we have the imperfect in *Ajax* 286 λαμπτήρες οὐκέτ' ἦθον where also there is a *v.l.* ἦλθον. V. boldly says 'ἀνέλαμψαν was not written upon ἀνῆθον,' and tells us that ἀνῆλθον means 'recovered their health,' an intransitive verb from the same root as ἀλθαίνω: T. thinks that lamps 'came up' like the sun from beneath the earth.—551 τοὺς δ' ἐν τι ποιεῖν τοὺς δὲ μή τι δρᾶν λέγων MS. and V., τοὺς δ' ἐν τι T.; τοὺς μὲν τι Stanley.—711 αἰὼν δὲ πράσσειν ὡς ὑπευθύνῳ τάδε Turnebus; scholl. ὑποδίκω and ὡς δάσονται δίκην (δίκας ὀφείλων schol. *Pers.* 213): ὡς ἐπευθύνῳ cod. M. and V., ὡς ἐπ' εὐθύνῳ T. (as cod. Guelf., which has the gloss ὑποδίκω).—738 ἡ δὴ κλύων ἐκείνος εὐφρανεῖ νόον, εὐτ' ἂν πύθῃται μῦθον Robortelli; ἐκείνον MS., 'that cruel mind of his' T.; 'ἐκείνον i.e. τὸν μῦθον' V.—841 ἄχθος αἵματος σταγὲς Portus; δειματοσταγὲς (ΔΙΜ for ΑΙΜ) MS., 'a drop-weight formidable to the old sore' V., 'a burden dripping with dread' T.—242 πιστὸς δ' ἀδελφὸς ἦσθ' ἐμοὶ σέβας φέρων μόνος κράτος τε καὶ δίκη . . . συγγένειό μοι V. and T. with the MS.: 'τε and so, not to be joined with καὶ' V., but T. holds that 'The asyndeton and abrupt prayer impart a dramatic touch which is ruined by the prosaic conjecture

μόνον.'—451 τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ὄργα μαθεῖν 'one bout hath ended thus: be stubborn to try the next.' ὄργα² does not mean 'be stubborn' (τόλμα, τλήθι, καρτέρει); it means 'be passionately desirous'; but little words that won't mean what they ought to mean must be made to mean it.—In 882 εἴοικε νῦν αὐτῆς ἐπὶ ξυροῦ πέλας αὐχὴν πεσεῖσθαι πρὸς δίκην πεπληγμένους, if ἐπὶ ξυροῦ were genuine, we should have to understand εἶναι with εἴοικεν and take the future πεσεῖσθαι as depending on ἐπὶ ξυροῦ (εἶναι): but the conjecture of Abresch, ἐπιέξῃνον πέλας, allows πεσεῖσθαι to depend on εἴοικεν and makes everything quite plain. Mr. Tucker does not discuss this or any other conjecture, but from the MS. text obtains this meaning, 'Her own neck now, nigh to the razor's edge, bids fair to fall by rights beneath its stroke.' Let Mr. Tucker try to strike any one's head off with a razor; he has more patience than I credit him with if he does not presently substitute an axe.

This ἐπιέξῃνον has been one of the small arguments in favour of the view that an axe was Clytemnestra's weapon. I am inclined to think that Aeschylus left it purposely to the imagination, and that elsewhere he has intentionally left external details vague; but Mr. Tucker, p. 263-6, differing from the opinion held by the late Mr. G. C. Warr,³ is positive that she used nothing but a sword. It may be so; but his evidence is only partial, and not always soundly treated; with regard to ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμῳ for example in *Ag.* 1497 he argues that 'the insistence on the "double edge" agrees better with the notion of a thrusting sword. As applied to an axe the adjective would be otiose, since she could not turn the weapon round.' It would at least be no more otiose than in the many places where ἀμφιτόμος and similar epithets describe an axe (βουπλήξ, πέλεκυς, δίρηννις).

His fidelity to the MS. is by no means proof, however, against over 60 conjectures of his own, some of which seduce him rather easily. In 1019 he rejects the correction ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν εἰδῇτ'—οὐ γὰρ οἷδ' ὅπη τελεί, in favour of ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν εἰδῇτ', οὐ τὰδ' οἷδ' ὅπη τελεί ὥσπερ σὺν ἵπποις ἡνιοστρόφου δρόμον (sic) telling us that this accounts better for the MS. εἰ δὴ τοῦτ' ἄρ . . . In 805 sense and metre⁴ are restored by reading καὶ νιν ἐλευθερίως | λαμπρὸν ἰδεῖν φίλοις | ὁμασι<ν

² τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ὄργαι M, but altered from αὐτοῖς: I still think it should be τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ὄργα μαθεῖν.

³ *C.R.* 1898 p. 348.

⁴ The same consecution as in *Supp.* 857-9=867-9, *Ag.* 993-5=1007-9.

¹ The corruption is of a common type, as παῖ παῖ for παπαῖ in Eur. *Alc.* 226.

ἐκ>δνοφερᾶς καλύπτρας: but neither V. nor T. will have anything to say to this insertion; V. renders *λευθερίως*—*λαμπρὸν*—*καλύπτρας* 'bright with liberation from the gloomy veil,' while T., retaining *λαμπρῶς*, holds that 'We can hardly retain ὄμμασι,' and so reads οἷγμασι, 'look brightly forth through kindly openings of the murky veil.' He had made the same alteration before in Ag. 525, ἦ που, πύλαι, φαιδροῖσι τοισὶδ' οἷγμασι or τοῖς διοίγμασι δέξεσθε, 'with your openings bright and cheerful'; the image apparently being such a smile as parts the face of Sir John Tenniel's Cheshire Cat.

For illustration he has put together what was collected by Blomfield, Paley, and others, and arrays it more agreeably in a literary dress. This is all to the good; but as in the *Supplices*, he contributes hardly any new, and is often at a loss where it was most required for language: e.g. for the use of πρὸς τὸ with infin. in 416 πρὸς τὸ φανῆσαι καλῶς: for ἦ πῶς; in 763 'doubtless a conversational idiom'; *doubtful*, surely, until something like it can be found. 750 τρόπῳ φρενός 'as well as we know how', 'in the style of one's judgement': this is also contrary to the order of the words, and so is 469 <οὐ>δόμασιν ἔμμοτον τῶνδ' ἐκάς 'Except this way' (what way?) 'the house can find no stanching of its wound': that would be οὐ τῶνδ' ἄτερ ἔμμοτον δόμασιν. He does not indeed insist quite so habitually as Dr. Verrall upon stressing the last word of a clause (the usual result of which is to italicise the least emphatic word), but he asserts it often. Greek is the *opposite* of English in this matter, and one of the consequences is that Greek can have a pause after an unemphatic word at the beginning of a verse, while English cannot.

In default of parallels Mr. Tucker seems to think—and I mention it because it is the way that schoolboys now are taught to think—that a construction is canonised when it has been labelled with a grammatical appellation. 724 should be, I think, τοῖσδ' ἐφορεῦσαι ξιφοδηλήτρουσιν ἀγῶσιν 'to act as ἐφορος or ἐπόπτης (technical in this connexion, Poll. iii. 140) at this contest of the sword', exactly like the synonymous ἐποπτεύσαι in 581 and 487. Mr. Tucker does not mention this reading of Heyse's, but understands the MS. ἐφοδεῦσαι (a purely prose word) to mean 'see to the watch on behalf of these encounters'. 'The dative is of behalf' is a formula which serves him to explain that difficult passage 319 χάριτες δ' ὁμοίως κέκληνται γόος εὐκλεῆς προσθοδομοῖς Ἀτρεΐδαις, which he renders 'When Atridae stand before thy doors, is a lament of laud and honour still counted to

them for a deed of grace?' If doubts arise whether τοῦτο χάρις κέκληται αὐτοῖς could mean this, Mr. Tucker expects to quiet them by saying 'The dat. is of behalf: "Is it reckoned unto them?"' Again, in 565 the MS. gives us μενούμεν οὕτως ὥστ' ἐπικάζειν τινὰ δόμοις παραστείχοντα καὶ τὰδ' ἐννέπειν Boissonade and Hermann reasonably thought it should be δόμοις, but Dr. Verrall takes δόμοις with ἐπικάζειν 'conjecture at the house', and Mr. Tucker follows: 'δόμοις: dat. incomm. with ἐπικάζειν directly, and indirectly with ἐπικάζειν καὶ τὰδ' ἐννέπειν', translating it 'may make surmise and chide the house'.

So far as I see, there is no solecism which could not be defended on this plan; for example, τύπτω σοι I beat you, 'dativus incommodi'. But if a pupil were to offer that to Mr. Tucker, I believe—at least I hope—he would object. And why? Because the Greeks themselves happened always to say τύπτω σε. Exactly; the appeal would be at once to usage; did they speak this way or not?

He prints the Scholia at the end with notes, and has made a careful study of them which I am glad has not been fruitless; I have mentioned his recovery of a v.l. ἀλφάνει in 811. The note on μοι in 985 he refers to 975, reading ξυνόμοσάν μοι θάνατον ἀθλίως πατρί. I looked for some solution of 324 ἡ γνάθος συνήθης, ὡς ὁ κρημνός λέγει Πίνδαρος καὶ ἡ ἡχώ Κυμωνίδης, but only find that it 'appears to be a note on genders'; I suspect it means 'as "the Rugged" says and "the Melodious."' T. suggests γναθὸς in the text. 842 οὐ παρακαλυφθέντι ἀλλ' αἰμνήστω, which T. (p. xcvi) refers to ἐλκαίνοντι, was surely written on a v.l. δεδειγμένῳ (Abresch). 445 ἀφερκτός] κατάκλειστος περὶ τὴν εἰρκτὴν he thinks points to the locative μυχοί, as though you could be shut up round about a prison; Abresch corrected it to κατάκλειστος, παρὰ τὴν εἰρκτὴν. The value of scholia lies in their application, and here I cannot think that Mr. Tucker shows much tact: he has himself recovered from the scholia the reading ἀλφάνει and readily adopts it; but readings which other people have seen to be indicated by the scholia do not fare so fortunately (32, 59, 69, 250, 534, 645, 703, 711, 879). In 542 οὐφείσετᾱσα σπαργανηπλίεζο, like Conington and Paley, he observes the schol. ἐπιμελείας ἡξιοῦτο, and disregards it, because 'not much can be made of it,' reading οὐφίς, ἃ πᾶσι ἄν, σπάργαν' ἡμφωπλίεζο, a picture rather of an embolstered Tweedledee than of a swaddled infant. His suggestions that the schol. on 350 may

have used the word *τηλωπών*, and that *κτείνει* in 440 may have arisen from *θείνει* glossing *κτίσαι* show that the dialect of scholia is still as much to learn as when he held that *μαινόλιν* and *ἀχέων* were glosses in the *Supplices*.

Elsewhere he appears too little sensitive to the difference between verse and prose; in 954 reading *ἐν χρόνους θέϊσα* to mean *χρόνους ἐμπούησασα*, and in 687 suggesting *κατ' ἄκρας ἐνστάσεως πορθούμεθα*, a prose word in a novel sense, 'our last place of resistance'; printing however *εἴπας ὡς πορθούμεθα* which would mean 'you have stated that we are destroyed,' but in the sense 'your tale imports our ruin' is a usage I had pointed out has no support in Greek.¹ In 914 *διχῶς ἐπράβην ὦν ἐλευθέρου πατρός* he does not indeed, like Dr. Verrall, translate it as though it were *διπλῶς*, but *διχῶς* is a purely prose word of the prosiest, most common in the language of grammar-

¹ The true reading, strange as it may look, I now believe to be M. Schmidt's *νηλεῶς*.

ians, *διχῶς*, *ἐξαχῶς*, *πολλαχῶς*, *λέγεται*, 'the word is used in 2, 6, many different senses;' and so far from Bothe's *αἰκῶς* being 'feeble' (V.), it seems to me to mark the point:—to be sold would be *οὐδὲν ἀεικὲς* for the slave-born; for the *son of a free father* it was *αἰκία*, a foul outrage.

While thinking, then, that in these 400 pages the professional scholar will not fail to find some gain, I also think that for a pupil there is a far larger balance of Aeschylus in the editions of Paley and Mr. Sidgwick, because for any step that Mr. Tucker has made forward he perversely makes so many backward. I do not think this work is worthy of him: perhaps too much Aristotle has allowed his natural instinct for the language to grow blunter; otherwise I cannot help feeling he must often do it violence. If he would foster it and give it freer play, I think he would do greater justice to his capabilities.

W. HEADLAM.

RECENT EDITIONS OF PLAYS OF ARISTOPHANES

1. *The Knights of Aristophanes*. Edited by R. A. NEIL. Cambridge, 1901. Pp. xiv. 229. 10s.
2. *Aristophanis Equites*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. VAN LEEUWEN, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCC. Pp. xviii. 246. 6 M.
3. *Aristophanis Acharnenses*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. VAN LEEUWEN, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCCXI. Pp. xviii. 198. 5 M.
4. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*. Edited, translated, and explained by B. B. ROGERS. ix. The Frogs, x. The Ecclesiazusae. London: Bell & Sons. 1902. Pp. xlviii. 274 and xxxv. 238. Price 15s.

IN R. A. Neil Cambridge lost a true scholar. His premature death is also a real loss to the study of Aristophanes, for the book before us shows that he was in many ways admirably qualified for the work of a commentator on that fascinating but far from easy author. I should judge that Neil was not greatly interested in textual questions, for he dwells little on them and makes (I think), no valuable suggestion. Nor does his strength show itself in solving the riddle of very difficult passages and find-

ing a key to anything that has long been a mystery. It is to be found rather in two things. One is the care and the width of reading which he brings to bear on every ordinary point as it arises, calling the reader's attention to very many things that would probably escape him, and furnishing a neat and often convincing commentary on many little Aristophanic touches and matters of Attic life. The other is the nicety with which he often points out to us the proper sense, the special literary uses of individual words, helping us very greatly to take in their exact power and associations, a matter of extreme importance in the art of Aristophanes. A scholar of much ability and taste, with unusually wide interests and reading, who had for many years delighted in Attic comedy, sparing no pains in its study, and especially in the study of the *Knights*—this is the impression we carry away; and we regret that the knowledge and tact patiently acquired will not now be available for other plays.

Mr. Neil's death left his interesting Introduction apparently but half written, for about the *Knights* itself there is in it practically nothing. The notes however were virtually complete, and his two friends