ON SOME IONIC ELEMENTS IN ATTIC TRAGEDY.

AMONG the happy circumstances which in the fifth century B.C. favoured the development of Hellenic art must be reckoned as an important element the peculiar distinctions and relations of the Hellenic dialects. These relations were such as it would probably be difficult to parallel. The several idioms, most of them separately cultivated up to the standard of literature, differed from each other sufficiently to make their broad characters readily perceptible, and yet resembled each other sufficiently to be mutually intelligible. Each of the great branches of the cousinhood had its own characteristic product, and the total of these was the common inheritance of the nation. The language thus resembled an organ with several sets of stops; poetry was at once provincial and classic; and the literature enjoyed by a felicitous balance the conflicting advantages of fixed and fluctuating speech. That the great artists of Athens perceived their own strength is in a general way sufficiently obvious. The distinction between the Doric chorus and the Attic dialogue is alone a proof of the fact. But it seems not unlikely that closer examination may reveal to us more subtle applications of the same method, and that, besides the keener perception which we may thus gain of the tone and feeling of particular passages, we may even be able to employ our knowledge of such laws as an instrument of criticism and interpretation. This paper is an attempt to represent under this aspect the facts respecting the use by the three tragedians of the substantives and adjectives in *-οοσυρος* and *-οοσυρη*.¹

As it happens that some of the words so formed are among the most wide-spread and familiar in the Greek language, we

¹ For a very full list of these forms see Lobeck, *Pathologia*, Diss. IV. cap. 6.

perhaps hardly realise the extremely limited and special range which belongs to them as a class. As free elements of composition ready to combine with a fresh stem at the pleasure of the writer, these terminations can hardly be said to exist out of the dactylic verse of the rhapsodists and the gnomic writers who borrowed their instruments. There we find them in profusion, not only *σωφροσύνη*, *δικαιοσύνη*, and such trite terms, but *ὑποθημοσύνη*, *κερδοσύνη*, *κλεπτοσύνη*, *ζηλοσύνη*, *γηθόσυνος*, even *θεμιστοσύνη*, with many more. In fact the class appears in the dactylic poets as a perfectly normal formation, limited, we must suppose, only in the number of words actually current, and not in the possibility of further production. But to these conditions the Greek language generally, and in particular the idiom of Attic prose, presents a sharp contrast. Not only is the character of the class narrowly defined, but its productiveness is altogether extinct.

If we may take Thucydides—and where else are we to look?—as representing the prose Attic vocabulary of the middle and latter part of the fifth century, we find that with the exception of *μνημέσυνον*, a *monument* (v. 11), the few terms of the kind which he employs are all *ethical*, *σωφροσύνη*, *ἀπραγμοσύνη*, *ἀνεπιστημοσύνη*, *δικαιοσύνη*, *ἀφροσύνη*, and possibly one or two which I have overlooked. Now it is obvious that the mere existence of these words in the literary Attic of Thucydides' time is no proof that the suffix *-οσύνη* was native to Athens or familiar to her streets. Ethical abstract terms of this sort are only required after a certain progress in thought and style, and as a matter of fact the first ethical writers in Greece were the gnomic poets, in whom these forms are actually found in great frequency. How and whence they came there has been already hinted.

But much more significant than the frugality of Thucydides in this species is the caution and reluctance, so to speak, with which he employs it at all: *σωφροσύνη* and *ἀπραγμοσύνη* occur with moderate frequency, but *δικαιοσύνη* is more than once avoided by the periphrasis *τὸ δίκαιον*, and allowed only in iii., 64, *τὰς ὁμοίας χάριτας μὴ ἀντιδιδόναι αἰσχρὸν μᾶλλον ἢ τὰς μετὰ δικαιοσύνης μὲν ὠφεληθείσας ἐς ἀδικίαν δὲ ἀποδοιμένας*, where it is plain that the substantive is necessary to the antithesis; *ἀνεπιστημοσύνη* in like manner is forced upon him

(v. 7) by the need of a euphonious counterpoise to *ἐμπειρία*, and *ἀφροσύνη* (i. 122) is introduced with an explanation very like an apology to the effect that it is the proper word to express the exact negative idea which the speaker desires to denote—*ἐπὶ τὴν πλείστον δὴ βλάβασαν καταφρόνησιν κεχωρήκατε, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ πολλοῦς σφάλλῃν τὸ ἐνάντιον ὄνομα ἀφροσύνη μετωνόμασται*. In the later Attic writers we have a larger list, but apparently of the same quality. As we are concerned only with the fifth century, it is unnecessary to descend further. Now this contrast between the language of the rhapsodists and that of Attic prose cannot be wholly explained—if it be an explanation—by classing the forms in question as poetical, for Pindar is quite as scanty as Thucydides. *εὐφροσύνα*, *good cheer*, is in some vogue with him, but if we add to that a few single examples, *μνημοσύνα* (*Ol.* viii. 74), *δεσπόσυνος* (*Pyth.* iv. 267), *φιλοφρόσυναι* (*Ol.* vi. 96), we shall be near the full amount. Further, the practice of the rhapsodists in respect of this termination is more liberal than that of Attic prose or of other literature generally, not only in the sense, but in the etymological form of the words for which it is permitted. With the remarkable and perhaps unique exception of *δικαιοσύνη*, every extant Attic word of this type is based upon a recognised stem in *-ον-*, *σωφρον-* *σωφροσύνη*, *ἀπραγμον-* *ἀπραγμοσύνη*, and so forth. Even *δεσπόσυνος* (if this really was in the fifth century counted an Attic word at all) is scarcely beyond the rule, for *δέσποινα* has the appearance of a feminine from a stem in *ν* (*δεσπον-γα*), though as a matter of fact it appears that this *ν* was part of a suffix, *δεσποτ-νια* (Curtius). But ‘Epic’ use ignores the rule altogether; *κερδον-* (*κέρδων* Lat. *cerdo*) no doubt existed, but *δουλοσύνη*, *κλεπτοσύνη*, *ἵπποσύνη*, *τοξοσύνη*, *θεμιστοσύνη*, and others, amply prove that in the Epos such a form as *δικαιοσύνη* would exhibit no peculiarity. We may add that the cognate adjective in *-όσυνος* seems scarcely to have gained any footing in common Attic at all.¹ If now we ask the cause of this difference between the literary language of different schools, the explanation suggests itself that it is due to the Ionian or Asiatic origin of Epic poetry, and that the forms in *-όσυνος*, *-οσύνη* were in their

¹ Compare Lobeck, *l. c.*

free development a characteristic mark of the Greek spoken in Asia, which passed thence into other idioms, and ultimately into the common language of the Hellenic world, under conditions determined by the historical descent of the various species of literature and branches of knowledge. The History of the Asiatic Herodotus, though composed for general audiences at a time when intercourse must have been tending to obliterate local peculiarities in cultivated persons, nevertheless does exhibit, together with its many other Ionic peculiarities, a treatment of *-οσυνη* quite different from the Attic as represented in Thucydides. Herodotus has no scruple about *δικαιοσύνη*, he uses *δουλοσύνη* readily, and upon occasion *δεσποσύνη* (*arbitrary power*), and he even slips into the provincialism, as we might call it, of iii. 27, *πάγχυ σφέας καταδόξας ἑωντοῦ κακῶς πρήξαντος χαρμόσυνα ταῦτα ποιεῖν*. In this state of the question it becomes a matter of considerable interest to examine the examples offered by the Attic Tragedians, who employ such words, not indeed very frequently, but certainly without respect to the Attic rule as we should gather it from other evidence. If we are right in conjecturing that, during the period in which the great tragedians wrote, the termination *-οσυνη* stood in the prose and colloquial speech of Athens upon a narrow if not precarious footing, while in the large mass of popular poetry, the tale of the bard and the proverb of the moralist, the same termination was prevalent and characteristic — then it is impossible to suppose that Aeschylus and his successors can have introduced such forms into the midst of their works without regard to the association which they would carry to the ears of the audience, any more than a poet of our own day could suddenly and without reason introduce a fragment in the idiom of Burns, or make the archaisms of the Elizabethan age fit unobserved into a composition essentially modern, or use the familiar phraseology of the Bible or the Prayer-book exactly as if it had never been heard before. Such associations may of course be utilised with the most admirable effect, indeed to have power over them is the very perfection of linguistic art; but they cannot with impunity be ignored. The practice of the tragedians then will give us a crucial test for the correctness of our hypothesis, and at the same time if a large number of examples should prove to be

consistent with the hypothesis, we shall understand them better by their mutual aid, and also obtain the means of discrimination in others of more difficulty.

But before entering upon this examination I wish to limit precisely the conclusion to which it is intended to lead. With the vexed questions relating to the history of the Ionic and old Attic dialects we have not any immediate concern. It would be nothing or very little to my present purpose if there was once a time when the speech of Athens was indistinguishable from the speech of Miletus, and if at that time words in *-οσυνη* were equally familiar at both places. We are to look neither forward nor backward from the fifth century, the age of tragedy. In tragedy, as will appear, these words are used in such circumstances only as point to language and literature of Asiatic growth or descent. The instances are far too numerous and diverse to be attributed to accident, and the fact of peculiarity remains equally true and important, whether it be the peculiarity of archaism or of modernism. Indeed both explanations might be true at once. Some words might be survivals from an older Attic, others recent or contemporary importations from the living Ionic. However, I dismiss this extraneous discussion and come to our proper field.

We will begin upon a knot quite sufficiently tough to try the edge of our instrument—

μηδὰμ' ὁ πάντα νέμων
 θεῖτ' ἐμᾷ γνώμα κράτος ἀντίπαλον Ζεὺς,
 μηδ' ἐλινύσαιμι θεοὺς ὁσίοις θοίλαις ποτινισσομένα
 βουφόνοις, παρ' Ὀκεανοῦ πατρὸς ἄσβεστον πόρον,
 533 μηδ' ἀλίτοιμι λόγοις.
 ἀλλά μοι τόδ' ἐμμένει
 καὶ μήποτ' ἐκτακείη
 ἡδὺ τι θαρσαλέαις
 τὸν μακρὸν τείνειν βίον ἐλπίσι, φαναῖς
 θυμὸν ἀλδαίνουσιν ἐν εὐφροσύναις. (Aesch. *P.* V. 529).

The lines of the antistrophe answering to 533-5 are these :

Ζῆνα γὰρ οὐ τρομέων
 543 ἰδία γνώμα σέβει
 θνάτους ἄγαν, Προμηθεύ.

The metrical discrepancy between 534 and 543 has been much discussed; *τοῦτ'* for *τόδ* may be easily accepted, but with deference to the opinion of Hermann, who wrote *μάλα*, I will venture to insist that *ἀλλά* is right and necessary, and so is Dindorf's punctuation (as above), according to which *τοῦτο* refers to the words *ἡδύ τι, κ.τ.λ.* The commencement of the sentence *μάλα μοι* without a conjunction is highly objectionable, and the proposed use of *μάλα* different, as the index will show, from the use of Aeschylus. Moreover when it is prayed that *this* may not be *erased* from the wax tablet of mind—for that is the metaphor implied in *ἐκτακεῖν*—'this' must be some maxim or sentence which might naturally be inscribed there. We do not pray that we may remember our own prayers. Such a sentence we have in what follows, *Surely it is sweet to increase the lengthening life with hope assured, satisfying the soul in festal cheer*—a prudent reflection upon the advantages of contented comfort and the danger of risking your peace for a forbidden ideal. It is so far then encouraging for our search that these lines containing the word *εὐφροσύναι* are not so disposed in the context but that we may *rationaly* suppose them quoted or adapted from some other place. It remains to see whether they offer any positive evidence that they are. Now their vocabulary is highly peculiar; *θαρσαλέος* seems to be used this once only in the whole of extant tragedy, and that although it is fairly common in Attic prose, early and late; it occurs also in Homer; *φανός* again is found in Aristophanes, Plato, Xenophon, but not in Sophokles, not in Euripides, and in Aeschylus only this once; *ἀλδαίνειν* and (we may add without assuming the point we are to prove) *εὐφροσύναι* descend at least from the Epos, where *θυμὸς εὐφροσύνησιν λαίνεται* actually occurs (L. and Sc., s. v. *εὐφροσύνη*). Taking all this together, the reader will, I think, agree that such an aggregation of curiosities can hardly be fortuitous, and that Aeschylus in these lines must have had a precedent in some other poet, presumably not an Attic dramatist, and must have followed him somewhat closely. As a matter of fact he followed him word for word, for the maxim as it stands is an elegiac *γνώμη* scarcely modified,

*ἡδύ τι θαρσαλέαις μακρὸν βίον ἔλπισι τείνειν
φαναῖς τ' ἀλδαίνειν θυμὸν ἐν εὐφροσύναις.*

(It appears that we are hardly justified in altering the η of ἡδύ —so the *Med.*—into α ; if we are to alter at all, we had better replace the η in *θαρσαλέαις φαναῖς* and *εὐφροσύναις*.) To the *μουσικοί* in the theatre this reminiscence would probably give half its charm to the passage, just as a fine line in Tennyson or Milton is a thousand times finer when we can hear in it the echo of the prophets or the psalms.

I ought not perhaps to pass on without offering my word upon *ἰδίᾳ* in 543, which is of course more suspicious in proportion as the reasons for retaining *ἀλλά* in 534 have become stronger. Various suggestions have been made, *αὐτόνῳ*, *οἰόφρων*, *αὐτόβουλος ὦν* (Paley, *ad loc.*), and probably others. The objection to them is the difficulty of accounting for the MS. text; until this is done nothing is done. The correctors assume a gloss, but *αὐτόνους* and *αὐτόβουλος* would scarcely challenge explanation, while *οἰόφρων* would challenge it,—and defy it. We must try for something more scientific. The permutation of Δ and Λ is proved from so many cases in the MSS. of Aeschylus, that it has a strong advantage over almost any other assumption. Will it do anything for us here? *ἰλίᾳ* does not look hopeful, but we must remember that words have affinities of sound as well as of shape, and that such affinities have exercised a powerful influence upon copyists, as we may see from the confusion of κ and χ . Now if we pronounce the syllables *ἰδιᾱ* and *ἠδεᾱ* in the ‘itacizing’ fashion of later Greek, we can hardly distinguish them. If then the uncial copy from which the Cod. Mediceus is descended had **ΗΛΕΑΙ** and this was by mistake read **ΗΔΕΑΙ**, we may safely affirm that the next scribe, particularly if he wrote from dictation, would be far more likely to wander on into *ἰδίᾳ* than to return to the unfamiliar and probably unintelligible *ἠλεᾱ*. That Aeschylus did use this Homeric word for *vain* or *foolish* we know from Hesychius, *ἀλεός ὁ παλαιός* (leg. *οὐκ ἀλαιός*?) *ἄφρων*, *Αἰσχύλος* (L. and Sc. s. v.); and though we ought probably to write *ἄλεᾱ*, our MS. exhibits η for the Doric α with such frequency, not to say regularity, in all positions not final, that this difference does not affect the question. It is a confirmation of this correction that upon the analogy of it we can put right a perfectly senseless *ἰδίᾱς* in Eur. *Ion* 101. The Delphian ministers of Phoebus are bidden upon the day of his festival—

φήμας ἀγαθὰς τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν
μαντεύεσθαι
γλώσσης ἰδίας ἀποφαίνειν.

With whose tongue but *their own* should they utter words good or bad? For **ΙΔΙΑC** write **ΙΛΕΑC**, genitive feminine from ἴλεως, as πλέας from πλέως, and scanned, like ἴλεως itself, as a spondee. From a *propitious* tongue good words come naturally enough.

To proceed: the case of *Persae*, 584 foll. scarcely needs more than mention—

τοὶ δ' ἀνὰ γῆν Ἀσιηνήν
οὐκ ἔτι περσονομοῦνται,
οὐκ ἔτι δασμοφοροῦσιν
δεσποσύνοισιν ἀνάγκαις,
οὐδ' ἐς γῆν προπίτνοντες
ἄζονται. (Halm for MS. ἀρξονται).

The Persian councillors are lamenting the downfall of their empire, which, as they forbode, must quickly follow the defeat of Salamis. *Throughout the land of Asia the people suffer no more the Persian rule, nor pay tribute by masterful compulsion, nor worship with bowings down to the ground.* The 'Oriental' tone of the chorus from which this quotation comes has been often noticed, but the quotation is pure Asiatic. To Ionic belong the pronoun *τοί*, and the *η* of the terminations *γῆν* and *Ἀσιηνήν*. The MS. gives *Ἀσίαν δὴν*, but it is extremely probable from the rhythm alone that Meineke was right in restoring the adjective *Ἀσιηνός*; the MS. reading is accounted for if we suppose the Ionic form **ΑCΙΗΝῆΝ** to be the original. A corrector, hastily condemning this form in a Doric chorus, wrote **Α** over the line; the cursive scribe reading this **Α** as so often for a **Δ**, put it into the line, and Doricizing as usual *γῆν* and *Ἀσίην* made what we now have. I have already suggested (*Journal of Philology*, ix. 147) that in the Cod. Med. the *final η* when it occurs in a Doric chorus ought to be regarded as a fact requiring explanation. I shall presently show that the irregular use of these Ionic forms for *special effect* was known to Attic drama. *δασμός* and *δασμοφορεῖν* we know that the Ionians used in reference to their Persian governors, and we may

presume the same of *περσονομείσθαι*; ἄζεσθαι again, which, if *δασμοφοροῦνται* and *περσονομείσθαι* are present tenses, seems a certain correction of the MS. ἄρξονται, is from the Ionic vocabulary. It is needless to observe how much this Persian lament, or rather Hellenic paeon, for the deliverance of Ionian Hellas is enhanced by the significant transition to the phrases of the enslaved. Here then we may almost say that the presence of *δεσπόσυνος* would be strange if it were *not* a term borrowed from Ionic literature, and recognisable as such. But indeed if we could be sure that our 'Tyrtæus' is genuine we might make short work, for the lines of Aeschylus are either the copy or the model of Tyrt. fragm. 4 (Bergk)—

ὥσπερ ὄνοι μεγάλοις ἄχθεσι τειρόμενοι
δεσποσύνοισι φέροντες ἀναγκαίης ὑπὸ λυγρῆς
ἥμισυ πᾶν ὅσσον καρπὸν ἄρουρά φέρει—

which, like most dactylic poetry, Athenian or Lacedaemonian, is palpably Ionic. Even if the resemblance of the two passages is accidental, we can see that 'Tyrtæus' and Aeschylus drew from the same stock. Following the dramatist, I should myself read in the elegy—

δεσποσύνοισι φέροντες ἀναγκαίης ὑπὸ λυγρῆς,

under pitiable compulsion of their lords. In the other text, *δεσπόσυνος* is taken to be a substantive, a use much more than doubtful. The cognate *δεσποσύνη* appears, as has been already mentioned, in Herodotus (vii. 102), ἀρετὴ τῇ διαχρεωμένη ἢ Ἑλλάς τὴν τε πενίην ἀπαμύνεται καὶ τὴν δεσποσύνην. The adjective itself is attributed to no prose writer except Xenophon, in this as in other matters a very uncertain 'Atticitatis auctor,' especially for the earlier half of the fifth century. Euripides puts both *δεσπόσυνος* and the correlative *δουλόσυνος* into the mouth of the Asiatic captive women who form the chorus of the *Hecuba*; they introduce themselves with their native 'Epic'—

Ἐκάβη, σπουδῇ πρὸς σ' ἐλιάσθην,
τὰς δεσποσύνους σκηνὰς προλιποῦσ',
ἴν' ἐκληρώθην...
δούλη. (100 foll.)

they recur to it in their self-lamentations—

τῷ δουλόσυνος πρὸς οἴκων
κτηθείς' ἀφίξομαι ; (448).

and it is their last utterance before leaving the stage—

ἴτε πρὸς λιμένας σκηνάς τε, φίλαι,
τῶν δεσποσύνων πειρασόμεναι
μόχθων, στερρὰ γὰρ ἀνάγκη.

We know whence Euripides took *λιάζομαι*, and may safely suppose that he took *δεσπόσυνος* also from the same vocabulary and with the same purpose, namely, to give the speech of his Asiatic women what we should call a little local colour. That *δεσπόσυνοι σκηναὶ* was for some reason a remarkable phrase to Athenian ears we may be sure from the parody upon it by the slave of Agathon, with which Aristophanes commences his most elaborate attack upon the Euripidean school of poetry—

εὐφημος πᾶς ἔστω λαὸς
στόμα συγκλήσας' ἐπιδημεῖ γὰρ
θίασος Μουσῶν ἔνδον μελάθρων
τῶν δεσποσύνων μελοποιῶν (*Thesm.* 39).

Now with all this in our minds we shall perhaps be a little astonished when on turning to *Choeph.* 942, the triumph-song of the handmaidens over the deaths of Aegisthus and Klytaemnestra, in a passage free from suspicion of Ionism we read as follows—

ἐπολολύξατ' ὦ δεσποσύνων δόμων
ἀναφυγὰς κακῶν καὶ κτεάνων τριβᾶς
ὑπαὶ δυοῖν μιστόροις
δυσοίμου τύχας.

Pindar, who so often illustrates Aeschylus, no doubt has *σὺν ὀρθαῖς κίονεσσι δεσποσύναις* (or *δεσποσύνοις*?), where no Epic or other such influence is visible. But then we have no evidence that Pindar shared the feelings which we find characteristic of the Attic poets. His words in *-οσύνη* are rare, even very rare, but not used with consciousness of their origin. How Aeschylus handled *δεσπόσυνος* we have just seen. But what can we say then of *δεσποσύνων δόμων*? We can say that

whatever may be the likelihood of such a phrase in Aeschylus, it is perfectly natural in the four lines above quoted. In spite of a certain clumsiness in their grammatical structure they are fine lines and a worthy pendant to the rest of the song. But they are only a pendant, and not an integral part of it. I have recently argued (*Journal of Philology*, ix. 114) from the contents and metrical structure of this ode that it contained, besides two strophes and two antistrophes, a 'burden,' which was sung after each 'verse,' though written only after the first, and which is in fact this very quatrain, ἐπολολύξατ' ὦ...τύχας. The song therefore is complete without it, and the notion that it was added by a later though fairly competent hand for musical or theatrical reasons is not in itself inadmissible. Let us examine the internal evidence. It is not perhaps much that we find a seemingly solitary instance of *τριβή* (instead of *τρίβος*) in the sense of *material* waste as distinguished from the spending of *time, attention, &c.* When we consider the large range of authors, including Aeschylus, who establish the contrary rule, we are justified in noticing it as a peculiarity. But as it would not be less peculiar in a writer of 400 B.C. than in one of 450 B.C., it does not go far towards our point. But *ἀναφυγή* is doubly and trebly suspicious. Neither *ἀναφεύγω* nor any of its kindred are cited from any other Attic author, nor from any classical author at all, except Xenophon. And this is the smallest part of the objection. The force of *ἀνά* in the compound is somewhat obscure, but must apparently be that of the prefix *re-*. Now Aeschylus among several compounds with this preposition has scarcely one of this force. Accident, it may be said. Yet Sophokles has six at least, *ἀναλαμβάνειν, ἀναμιμνήσκειν, ἀναπνεῖν, ἀναστρέφειν, ἀναστροφή, ἀνατίθηναι*. But there is much more yet. The compounds of *φυγή* were at no time common; the introduction into Attic literature of the few which obtained vogue *can be traced, and it commenced long after the date of the Choephoroe*. In the fourth century we have *καταφυγή, ἀποφυγή*, and *διαφυγή* (Plato); for *ὑποφυγή* and *περιφυγή* we must descend to Josephus and Plutarch. Of these words *καταφυγή* only can be traced near to the period of Aeschylus. We find it in Herodotus, but among Attic writers not until Euripides who has it several times, in prose first in Antiphon and then in Plato and Aristotle

(once only, for in *Eth. Nic.* vii. 1, ἐν πενίᾳ καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς δυστυχίαις—

μόνην οἶονται καταφυγὴν εἶναι [τούς] φίλους—

we have a citation or adaptation from the New Comedy ; compare the quotation

σύν τε δὴ ἐρχομένω,

immediately below it). Of ἐκφυγή, προφυγή, and other convenient forms there is no trace. To this negative and presumptive evidence we may add a positive proof of a very curious kind. The first seven books of Thucydides are apparently free from any such compound—this is what we should expect—and so is the eighth book, *with the exception of a parenthetical clause in Chapter cvi.* ναὺς μὲν ὀλίγας ἔλαβον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι (στενὸς γὰρ ὢν ὁ Ἑλλήσποντος βραχείας τὰς ἀποφυγὰς τοῖς ἐναντίοις παρείχε) τὴν μέντοι νίκην ταύτην τῆς ναυμαχίας ἐπικαιροτάτην δὴ ἔσχον, a sentence, observe, separable from the context, and found among the last words which Thucydides wrote *where we have every reason to look for the hand of his editor Xenophon.* In short, ἀναφυγή is a word which from all indication no writer would have been likely to use before the close of the fifth century, and which no careful writer would have used at all. In a chorus of the *Choephorae* it is somewhat startling.

Either then this burden of four lines was inserted as I have suggested, or Aeschylus, for some reason which I do not at present perceive, filled it with peculiarities of phraseology. The choice between these alternatives is for our present purpose indifferent.

Passing to the *Prometheus*, 1054 foll., we strike into an entirely new vein—

τοιᾷδε μέντοι τῶν φρενοπλήκτων
 βουλευμάτων ἔπη τ' ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι.
 τί γὰρ ἐλλείπει μὴ παραπαίειν
 ἢ τοῦδε τύχῃ ; τί χαλᾷ μανιῶν ;
 ἀλλ' οὖν ὑμεῖς γ' αἱ πημοσύναις
 ξυγκάμνουσαι ταῖς τοῦδε τόπων
 μετὰ ποι χωρεῖτ' ἐκ τῶνδε θοῶς,
 μὴ φρένας ὑμῶν ἡλιθιώσῃ
 βροντῆς μύκημ' ἀτέραμνον.

Now it was by no means through the Epos only, and by the mouth of the rhapsodists, that Hellas in Asia gave lessons to Hellas in Europe. Two important sciences, two beneficent and civilizing arts, had in Ionia, if not their earliest origin, at least their chief existing centre at the date of Attic tragedy—the arts or sciences of medicine and music. It is needless to prove or dwell upon so notorious a fact. The literary monuments of the Ionic *φυσική* remain in part to this day; and though their music has unhappily become an almost insoluble problem, the place of its genius is stamped upon its very terms, *ἄρμονία* *Λυδία*, *ἄρμονία* *Φρυγία*, *νόμος* *Ἰγόνιος*, and the rest. The medical works which we know, and which date, the oldest of them, from the Euripidean rather than from the Aeschylean age, are in prose, and have suffered every possible depravation from the hand of time, but we may be sure that the Ionian Hippocrates had precursors, and we have seen, or shall see, reason enough to believe that these students (whether their maxims were expressed in prose, or, which is not less probable, in verse) could not designate *disease* by any word more natural and characteristic than the word *πημόσυναι*. But how are we to tell that *πημόσυναι* in the *Prometheus* signifies *disease* at all? We could not tell with certainty from that one passage. In fact the received translation of *αἱ πημοσύναις συγκάμνουσαι ταῖς τοῦδε* appears to be *Ye who sympathize with his sufferings*. But the rendering *Ye who are affected with his disorder*, is equally admissible, and much more pointed. Or rather the point lies in this very ambiguity. ‘The words of Prometheus,’ says Hermes, ‘are those of one clean out of his wits; ye too are touched with his complaint: beware then lest the bellowing thunder turn your giddy heads.’ But to feel sure of this view we ought to have some independent evidence that *πημόσυναι* was distinguished from other words for *suffering* by its association with the Ionic medical vocabulary. Fortunately we have it, in a famous fragment of Euripides, cited by two authorities, Clement of Alexandria and Themistius (No. 965, Dind. ed. 1865, No. 902, Dind. ed. 1868. Is any advantage gained by such changes of numeration?)—

ὄλβιος ὅστις τῆς ἱστορίας
ἔσχε μάθῃσιν,

μήτε πολιτῶν ἐπὶ πημοσύνης,
μητ' ἐς ἀδόξους πρήξιας ὁρμῶν,
ἀλλ' ἀθανάτου καθορῶν φύσιος
κόσμον ἀγέρων, τῇ τε συνέσθη
[καὶ ὅπη καὶ ὅπως.]
τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις οὐδέποτ' αἰσχροῶν
ἔργων μελέτημα προσήξει.

Now here at least is a passage in which the Ionic forms are not a matter of speculation. *πρήξιας* in 4, *φύσιος* in 5, are both of them MS. readings (see Dindorf, ed. 1868); in 3, Clement has *πημοσύνη*, in Themistius the quotation commences thus, *οὔτε πολιτῶν φησιν ἐπὶ πημοσύνας οὐτ' εἰς ἀδόξους* (or *ἀδίκους*) *πρήξιας ὁρμᾶν*. The hypothesis that *πημοσύνης* was the original reading accounts, as no other will, for these varieties. Properly considered Themistius really gives us *ἐπὶ πημοσύναις*; citing a part without reference to the whole, he takes those words with *ὁρμᾶν*, and alters *πημοσύναις* to *πημοσύνας*, a slight error, but an error, as we see from the context given by Clement; indeed *ὁρμᾶν ἐπὶ πημοσύνας* would be rather doubtful Greek: *πημοσύναις* then and *πημοσύνη* point unmistakably to their common origin, *πημοσύνης*. (We may observe that many of these forms appear chiefly in the plural, as *εὐφροσύναι*, *τεκτοσύναι*, *ἵπποσύναι*.) All these peculiarities the editors have pruned away. But to prefer the ordinary *πράξεις* to the exceptional *πρήξιας* is clearly against the simplest principles of criticism if the Ionic forms can be justified. Justified? We ought to have put them back if the copyists had ejected every one. It is a matter of common knowledge (Ueberweg, *Hist. Phil.* § 24, *s.f.*) that this fragment is an apology for the Ionian Anaxagoras of Klazomenae, and of the physical studies which he followed, against the prejudices of the Athenian public. But it seems not to have been observed how deeply the lines are coloured by the phraseology of the very 'physicians' whom they defend. We brush away *πρήξιας*, *φύσιος*, *πημοσύνης*, and regard with complacency our well-swept Attic. But we shall not so easily get rid of *μελέτημα*, Ionic as it is not in form but in substance. This exceedingly rare word is cited by lexicographers from two passages only of pure Attic literature (we shall hardly be satisfied with the loose *δοκιμασία* of Xenophon). That it

was a property, and a characteristic property, of the Ionian physicists we may learn from Plato, who, although he naturally does not use it himself, tells us plainly, if we attend, that others did. οὐκοῦν τοῦτό γε θάνατος ὀνομάζεται, λύσις καὶ χωρισμός ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος;...Λύειν δέ γε αὐτήν, ὡς φαμεν, προθυμούνται ἀεὶ μάλιστα καὶ μόνοι οἱ φιλοσοφοῦντες ἑρθῶς, καὶ τὸ μελέτημα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων, λύσις καὶ χωρισμός ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος. (Plat. *Phaedo*, 67. D.) Remembering Plato's habit of allusion, we might well suspect that beneath the words 'This and nothing else is the μελέτημα or study of the true philosopher' lurks the implication that other persons claiming that title had professed another μελέτημα? This suspicion will of course be immensely strengthened when we notice the rarity of the word. Now who may these persons have been? Doubtless those from whom Plato took the almost unique χωρισμός, *analysis*, the separation of elements from a compound. This, as the dictionary will show, is the true Platonic sense of χωρίζειν, and we shall not be at a loss to conjecture where the verb first took this signification when we observe that though rare and semi-technical in Attic it is used by Herodotus in a way which shows that it was for him in familiar and colloquial use. Indeed we are not left to such indirect deduction, for Anaxagoras himself, when he wishes to distinguish his own subtle theory of the ὁμοιομέρειαι from the crude analysis of his predecessors, does so in these terms, οὐ κεχώρισται τὰ ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ κόσμῳ, οὐδὲ ἀποκέκοπται πελέκει, οὔτε τὸ θερμὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ, οὔτε τὸ ψυχρὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ θερμοῦ (Fr. 13 Mullach). If time and space permitted it might be shown that throughout all the remarks on the true 'separation' and the true 'study' from which the above extract is taken, Plato has in his thoughts the language of the Ionic school and their ἱστορία φύσεως, which, as every reader will remember, he openly criticises at a later point in the dialogue (*Phaedo*, 96 foll.). Not to be wearisome, I will but point to 67 A: καὶ οὕτω μὲν καθαροὶ ἀπαλλαττόμενοι τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀφροσύνης, ὡς τὸ εἶκος, μετὰ τοιούτων τε ἐσόμεθα καὶ γνωσόμεθα δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν πᾶν τὸ εἰλικρινές· τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν ἴσως τὸ ἀληθές. Of ἀφροσύνη in this curious physical aspect we shall hear again, but notice the last words. Since Plato, it appears, meant τὸ ἀληθές, why did he not say so at first, and why does he pretend to doubt (ἴσως) the

meaning of his own expression? Because he borrows *εἰλικρινές* from the vocabulary which he parodies, and thinks it safer to add the interpretation of his analogy. τὸ *εἰλικρινές* was a technical term for the ultimate uncompounded and inseparable unit which it was the object of *χωρισμός* to discover; see one example out of many in Aristotle, *Prob.* xxxi. 28, ed. Berol. 960 a 30: τὰ στοιχεῖα τὰ εἰλικρινῇ ἀδιάφορα, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων ἢ διαφορά. It was this very process of analysis which formed the essence of the science known as *ἱστορίη φύσιος* or *inquiry into the constitution of things*; so much so, indeed, that *ἱστορία* itself, the name of the science, almost signified such a process, as we may see from a passage like Dem. *de Cor.* 275, s. f. ἦτις δ' ἡ φύσις, ᾧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι γέγονε τούτων τῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ τίνος εἵνεκα ταῦτα συνεσκευάσθη καὶ πῶς ἐπράχθη, νῦν ὑπακούσατε ἐπειδὴ τότε ἐκωλύθητε καὶ γὰρ εὖ πρᾶγμα συντεθὲν ὄψεσθε καὶ μεγάλη ὠφελήσεσθε πρὸς ἱστορίαν τῶν κοινῶν. Nothing could be more disconnected, or indeed more pointless, than the concluding clause, unless we remember that to an Athenian *ἱστορία* was a term of art merely, and recognise the metaphor suggested by the use of this word and the preceding *φύσις*, *συνεσκευάσθη*, and *συντεθὲν*. *What this plan was, gentlemen, in its constitution, what was the end and method of its construction, you were at the time not permitted to learn. If you will now give me your attention, you shall see an excellent piece of composition and receive an important aid towards the analysis of politics.* When therefore Euripides, speaking for the professors of the *ἱστορίη φύσιος*, protests that 'study of foul deeds to such as these shall ne'er belong,' and selects for *study* this very word *μελέτημα*, it is impossible to doubt that he is speaking not only the sentiments, but the language of his clients. What were the *αἰσχρὰ ἔργα* and the *ἄδοξοι πρῆξεις* imputed by ignorance to a science much occupied with the constitution of the human body (Plat. *Phaedo*, 96 D); it would not be difficult to divine, even if Euripides did not specify in line 3 the insinuation that it was a science of murder. The student of nature learns, he says, *not with purpose to produce 'disease' in his fellow-man nor bent upon 'practices' unseemly, but gazing upon the ageless order of immortal nature, the way, the mode, the manner of its coming together.* Of course ἐπὶ *πημοσύνης* is constructed with the principal verb, as in ἐπὶ *τυραννίδι τι ποιεῖν*. *πρῆξις* and

καθορᾶν (*cf.* Plat. *Phaed.* l. c. 66 D, καθορᾶν τάληθές) cling to the language of surgery in the form of 'practice' and 'catopsis' ('a morbid intentness of vision') to this day. It is of the Doctor of Phisik that Chaucer says, 'He was a very perfit practisour.'

[I should add that *ἱστορίης* for *ἱστορίας* in 1, *τῇ* for *πῇ* in 6, *προσῆξει* for *προσίζει*, in 9, are my own corrections. The first two hardly require comment. The copy which gives us *φύσιος* would have given *ἱστορίης* if it had included line 1. *πῇ . . . ὅπη* cannot, it is admitted, be right, and when the semi-Ionic phraseology of the passage is perceived, my slight alteration, will, I think, be preferred to any other. I do not write *κατορῶν, ὅκη, ὅκως*, as it seems safer not to carry correction beyond authority.¹ As for *προσίζει*, *sits by*, if the reader finds it intelligible he will not trouble himself with my figment; if not, —ι is precisely similar to η in sound, and ζ (compare *ἄρξονται* —*ἄζονται*, *supra*, p. 267) as near as possible to ξ in appearance.]

For want of the assistance afforded to criticism by observing the occurrence of a form in -οσυνη as a trace of the author's probable train of thought, a beautiful phrase of Sophokles (Fr. 658) has, if I mistake not, been utterly distorted. It is given by Dindorf from Stobaeus in this form:—

χρόνος αὖ χρόνος ἅμα κραταῖᾱ
 τερμοσύνη βίου
 πόλλ' ἀνευρίσκει σοφὰ μαιομένοις.

Attempts have been made to lighten the darkness of this saying by changing *τερμοσύνη* into *χρημοσύνη* or *ἀρχημοσύνη*. 'Si haece librarii permutavissent, actum esset de critica.' *τερμοσύνη* is the last word in the sentence that should be suspected, a word so rare that this is apparently the only extant example, and yet perfectly unexceptionable, for we might have safely predicted the possibility of such a form from the well-known *τέρμων*, a *boundary*. Yet it is clear that the idea, *ending of life*, is wholly foreign to a description of Time as the Great Discoverer. But is this the true subject of these verses? Time does, we know, bring slow revelations to the race, but it is not in this aspect only, or principally, that he presents himself to the individual inquirer. *Ars longa, vita brevis*, has been the word of searchers

¹ Is not ὅπη, ὅπως a mere explanation of τῇ τε (dative fem. of ὅστε) incorporated with the text through misunderstanding of the τε?

into nature from Hippokrates downwards. Many are the delays which retard their efforts, and even if they partially succeed,

χρόνος αὖ χρόνος ἀμᾶ κραταιᾷ
 τερμοσύνα βίου
 πόλλ' ἀνευρίσκειν σοφὰ μαιομένους.

Time, cruel Time, mows them down, with peremptory bounding of their days, while yet they yearn after rich discoveries. The reader will not need to be reminded of Milton's 'blind Fury with the abhorred shears.' We shall scarcely then be rash in supposing that the poem of which this fragment is left to us bewailed the burdens and crosses of the φύσιος ἴστωρ, and that τερμοσύνα (or τερμοσύνη ?) is to be set beside the πημοσύνης of Euripides. The resemblance of the language to Soph. *Ant.* 599—

νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὑπὲρ
 ῥίζας ὃ τέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπου δέμοις
 κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν
 νερτέρων ἀμᾶ κόπις—

will perhaps remove doubts which have been expressed as to the authorship.

It will be convenient to take here as belonging to the topic of the Ionic medicine Eur. *Hipp.* 161. The chorus of Troezenian women are conjecturing the cause of Phaedra's sickness, of which it will be remembered that the chief symptom was obstinacy in fasting. It occurs to them that it may be connected with pregnancy or some other disorder peculiar to the sexual constitution of women—

φιλεῖ δὲ τᾷ δυστρόπῳ γυναικῶν
 ἁρμονία κακὰ δύστανος ἀμαχανία συνοικεῖν
 ὠδίνων τε καὶ ἀφροσύνας.
 δι' ἐμᾶς ἦξέν ποτε νηδύος ἄδ' αὔρα·
 τὰν δ' εὐλοχὸν οὐρανίαν τόξων μεδέουσιν ἄντευν' Ἀρτεμιν,
 καί μοι πολυζήλωτος αἰεὶ σὺν θεοῖσι φοιτᾷ.

After the passages which we have just examined, the presence of ἀφροσύνη here will cause us little surprise. The connection of loss of appetite with disorders of the womb will be found noticed in the 'Hippokratean' treatise περὶ γυναικῶν φύσιος, which, whatever its date, may be assumed to

represent ancient tradition, ἤν γυναιῖκα ὑστέρας ἀλγέουσαν ἀσιτίη λαμβάνη, κ.τ.λ. (§ 50 ed. Littré). The word ἀφροσύνη I have not noticed there (though it is very likely to be found): παραφροσύνη however occurs several times, and I have already called attention to ἡ τοῦ σώματος ἀφροσύνη, found in Plato (*Phaedo*, l. c.) among many traces of language adapted from Ionic writers on the physics of the body. It is even more striking that the physician-poet Nikander, himself an Ionian Asiatic writing some centuries later but in thoroughly antique phraseology, employs ἀφροσύνη several times in this precise sense, *the whims of the appetite*, for example—

ἤν δέ τις ἀφροσύνη ταύρου μέλαν αἷμα πάσῃται.

Alexipharmaka.

ἄρμονία or ἄρμονίη again is in Attic writers a purely technical term, belonging sometimes to medicine in the sense of *constitution*, sometimes to music in the sense of *harmony* (or rather *tune*), and in Ar. *Eg.* 533, of the ‘joining’ of the musical instrument by which the tune is produced. In the Epos, on the other hand, and in Herodotus we find it applied without technical restrictions to any *joining* or *joint* (as between persons covenanting or the timbers of a ship, see Lex. s. v.), a sign that in Asia it was at home, and travelled thence with the spread of Asiatic teaching. It might perhaps be objected that in Aesch. *P. V.* 551, ἄρμονία stands for *government* (so Lex. and Comm.)

οὐπω

τὰν Διὸς ἄρμονίαν

θνατῶν παρεξίασι βουλαί.

I should reply that such a rendering could not anywhere be more improbable than there, for παρεκβάσεις ἄρμονίας was actually a technical term of music; Aristotle (*Pol.* 43, al.) quotes it as such, and illustrates by it his own phrase παρεκβάσεις τῆς ἀρίστης πολιτείας, *deflexions from the ideal constitution*; and this is surely an indication that if ἄρμονία ever meant *scheme of government* Aristotle was unaware or oblivious of the fact; for what could be more idle than to *illustrate* the expression *deflexion from a constitution* by another expression which meant *deflexion from a constitution*? That Aeschylus in the maxim above cited had for some reason the language of Ionic poetry in

his mind we see from the introduction of the Homeric *not yet* for *never*. Until the supposed *ἀρμονία* government is better established than it is now, I shall be disposed to credit Aeschylus with a quainter but more picturesque metaphor—*Not so soon shall the counsels of man play out of the tune of God*. But now let us return to Phaedra and her friends, and let me ask the reader to notice, if he has not done so before, one of the most exquisite devices of art which poet ever employed. The Ionic language was not only the language of healing, it was also the language of worship, of those invocations or rhapsodies to the gods composed in the flowing hexameter, which must once have been a literature in themselves but are represented to us by a small and dubious collection. With admirable skill Euripides avails himself of this pre-established harmony between the tone of suffering and the tone of thanksgiving, and from 'the helplessness of travail and wood wits' passes, as by an expected modulation, into the cry of the afflicted, heard, we may be sure, not then for the first time,—

εὐλοχον οὐρανίην τόξων μεδέουσας αὐτευν
Ἄρτεμιν.

The meddling of mediaeval ignorance has blurred with its *οὐρανίαν* the visible character of the hymnist's hand, but as the copyists acknowledge our title to *μεδέουσας* and *αὐτευν*, we shall make bold to reclaim *οὐρανίην* too.

The occurrence here of the Ionic contraction *αὐτευν* will naturally direct our attention to the only other passage of Euripides in which a similar contraction has been noticed as a MS. reading, *Med.* 422. We find indeed *μυθεῦσαι* for *μυθέουσαι* from an otherwise unknown *μυθῶ* in *Iph. A.* 790, but the place (see below) is either insanely corrupt or else full of gross solecisms, and there can hardly be a doubt that it is spurious. No such objection lies against *ὑμνεῦσαι* for *ὑμνεούσαι* in the lines which follow—

τὰν δ' ἐμὴν εὔκλειαν ἔχειν βιοτὰν στρέψουσι φάμαι.
ἔρχεται τιμὰ γυναικείῳ γένει·
οὐκέτι δυσκέλαδος φάμα γυναικας ἔξει.
μοῦσαι δὲ παλαιγενέων λήξουσ' αἰοιδῶν
τὰν ἐμὴν ὑμνεῦσαι ἀπιστοσύναν.

The reader will probably be able to recall the context. The chorus of women are anticipating the effect which the tale of Jason and Medea must have upon the comparative reputation of the two sexes in respect of truth and honour. After the signal instance of masculine infidelity displayed by Jason the world will repent of its outcry upon the falseness of the fair, and even the poets will abandon the topic. The last two lines, as a glance at the explanatory commentaries will show, have caused a great deal of trouble. For *ἀοιδᾶν* the common reading, the Copenhagen MS., of some independent weight, gives *ἀοιδῶν*. Which of these two we are to read, whether *ἀοιδᾶν* (if the overwhelming majority of MSS. be right) depends upon *μοῦσαι* or upon *λήξουσιν*, whether *ὑμνεῖσαι* is to be explained by a 'scilicet τὸ πρὶν,' or to be construed with *λήξουσιν*, and in the latter case what becomes of *ἀοιδᾶν*—upon these points there have been almost as many opinions as editors. All or almost all these difficulties are dispelled by the observation that the phraseology of the lines is Ionic *throughout*, and imitates with sarcastic purpose the diction of the rhapsodists (*ἀοιδοί*), at whom it is pointed. That the conjunction of *ὑμνεῖσαι* with *ἀπιστοσύναν* is a strong indication of some such purpose, I think I may by this time venture to take for granted. Now the phrases *ἄρχειν* or *ἄρχεσθαι ἀοιδῆς*, and *λήγειν ἀοιδῆς*, were poetical commonplaces, the *Μοῦσαι* or some other patron of poesy being invited almost as a matter of course to 'open' and to 'close' the strain. The most notorious example is the *ἐφίμερος ὕμνος* of the first idyll of Theokritus, in which Thyrsis, the 'preserver' of the sacred tradition of song (Theokr. 1, 63), invokes the Muses nearly twenty times in some eighty lines, in the earlier part with

ἄρχετε βωκολικᾶς, Μῶσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς—

towards the end with

λήγετε βωκολικᾶς, Μῶσαι, ἵτε λήγετ' ἀοιδᾶς.

We may compare the double or treble commencement of the 'Hesiodic' *Theogonia*—

1 Μουσάων ἐλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' εἰδεῖν,

and again,

35 Τύνη Μουσάων ἀρχώμεθα, ταῖ Διὶ πατρὶ
ὑμνεῖσαι τέρπουσι μέγαν νόον,

and again,

48 ἀρχόμεναί θ' ὑμνεῦσι θεαὶ λήγουσιν τ' αἰδῆς,

which last is the more to our purpose if it be, as some think, a spurious 'tag' inserted to stop an imaginary gap. Other illustrations might be given. It is upon the triteness and well-known significance of this phrase that the whole point of Euripides' delicate satire depends. We must remember that in Greece the art of recitation at feasts and on other occasions was a hereditary or at least traditional art, practised by professional singers (αἰδοί), who handed down from generation to generation the method, the subjects, and the substance of dactylic poetry. In what tone these persons found it profitable to speak of women we see from the invective of the *Theogonia* (591 foll).

τῆς γὰρ ὀλῳίον ἐστι γένος καὶ φύλα γυναικῶν,

to which the editors of Euripides refer us, and which may be taken for a specimen of the vast mass of rhapsodic poetry that has perished, and indeed was never put into a form fitted for permanent existence. It is to the poets as a class rather than to any individual poet that Euripides directs this chivalrous rebuke for their attacks upon those who could not answer them in kind :

οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἀμετέρᾳ γνώμᾳ λύρας
ᾠπασε θέσπιν αἰοιδᾶν
Φοῖβος—

a rebuke which alone is sufficient to raise questions as to the much misunderstood 'misogynism' of the tragedian. *Henceforth*, say the Chorus, *the Muses, harping on woman's 'faithlessness,' shall 'stint' those long-descended 'lays,' for shame to find them so untrue, and thus the worn-out formula of the bards shall for once have an earnest meaning. This cruel theme has been 'their first and their last' (ἀρχόμεναί θ' ὑμνεῦσι θεαὶ λήγουσιν τ' αἰδῆς ὑμνεῖσθαι)*; now it shall be in a new and truer sense 'their last.' From this point of view we can understand both the prevalent reading αἰοιδᾶν and the single variant αἰοιδῶν; αἰοιδῶν or perhaps αἰοιδέων is original, the genitive plural of αἰοιδῆ; the Greek editors supposing, as the modern have done,

that *δοιδῶν* in a Doric Chorus could only be the genitive of *δοιδός*, and seeing that 'songs,' not 'singers,' was the word required, altered it to *δοιδᾶν*, as in all probability they altered *ἀπιστοσύνην* and *δοιδήν* to the corresponding forms in *α*. We can also account for the remarkable fact that *all the MSS.* read in defiance of the metre *λήξουσιν*. It is the work of a corrector who understood the allusion and restored without sufficient reflection the dactylic rhythm. It would be out of my purpose to consider here the similar Ionic contractions in the *Prometheus Vincit*, *εἰσοιχνεύσιν* (122), and *πωλεύμεναι* (645). Either some reason (which I do not at present see) must exist for the use of them, or they are erroneous. If I add here that in the best commentaries upon the *Hippolytus* and the *Medea αὔτευν* and *ὑμνεύσαι* are passed without any observation beyond a mere reference to the other real or supposed examples of the same form in tragedy, and that Elmsley himself actually doubted, as he well might, whether so strange a variation as *ὑμνεύσαι* could be genuine, I do so merely to justify my promise that attention to the Ionic quality of *-οσύνη* would prove useful in criticism and explanation.

If any doubt could remain whether the selection of the form *ἀπιστοσύνη* was or was not deliberate, we might remove it by the unimpeachable testimony of the author himself. For Euripides was sufficiently pleased with his views upon the relations between poets and women to repeat them substantially, and in part verbally in the *Ion*, where the chorus take the desertion of Kreusa by Xuthus for the text of a closely similar admonition.

ὅρᾱθ' ὅσοι δυσκελάδοισιν
κατὰ μούσαν ἰέντες αἰδέθ' ὕμνοις
ἀμέτερα ἔχεα καὶ γάμους
Κύπριδος ἀθέμιτος ἀνοσίους,
ὅσον εὐσεβία κρατοῦμεν
ἄδικον ἄροτον ἀνδρῶν.

1096 παλίμψαμος δοιδὰ
καὶ μούσ' εἰς ἄνδρας ἵτω
δυσκέλαδος ἀμφὶ λέκτρων.
δείκνυσι γὰρ ὁ Διὸς ἐκ
παίδων ἀμνημοσύναν.

We might be surprised, if we were not in possession of the key, to notice that here as in the *Medea* the sin of the traitor is denoted by a unique word of the type we are considering. Now we shall not hesitate to read the one passage by the light of the other. But it happens—and it seems likely to prove something more than a coincidence—that our clue has again led us to a place of well-known critical perplexity. It is worth while therefore to see whether the new light will help to unravel it. The chief ground of difficulty is the want of metrical correspondence. 1096–1100 answer to the first five lines of the following extract from the strophe, the subject of which is the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries.

χορεύει δὲ Σελάνα
1081 καὶ πεντήκοντα κόραι
Νηρέος, αἱ κατὰ πόντον
ἀενάων τε ποταμῶν
δίνας χορεύόμεναι,
τὰν χρυσοστέφανον κόραν
καὶ ματέρα σεμνάν.

It will be seen that 1081–3 differ considerably from 1097–9, and the first question naturally is which should be altered. I will show briefly that the fault is not in the strophe. The sole word to which any exception can be taken is *χορεύόμεναι* in 1084; but as this participle is quite meaningless, and no correction both simple and satisfactory has been suggested, doubt has necessarily rested upon the whole clause. I venture to think that this doubt can be finally quieted. Euripides wrote *κορεύόμεναι*. *The moon, and the fifty maids of Nereus, whose maiden life is in the sea and the curling ever-flowing streams, do dance in honour of the Maid gold-crowned and Mother worshipful.* *κορεύω*, a rare and probably archaic synonym of *παιδεύω*, occurs in *Alc.* 313, *σύ δ' ὦ τέκνον μοι πῶς κορευθήσει καλῶς*; here *κορεύεσθαι*, *to live maidenly, live in maidenhood*, is parallel to *παιδεύεσθαι*, *to spend the time of childhood*, in *Ion* 953, *ᾗδου δ' ἐν δόμοις παιδεύεται*, and elsewhere. I shall return to this word hereafter.

We can now proceed with more assurance to the correction of the antistrophe, observing however that we are at liberty to

scan 1083 either thus — — — — — reading *ἀενάων*, or thus — — — — — reading *ἀεινάων* (cf. *ἀεινῶν*, Aristophanes), the choice between these forms being, as a mere question of palaeography, indifferent. The corresponding line *δείκνυσσι γὰρ ὁ Διὸς ἐκ* shows that *ἀεινάων* is the true form; again, since *γὰρ* represents a long syllable, we see that *ὁ* cannot be right. The words *ὁ Διὸς ἐκ παιδῶν* are taken to mean *he that is of the children of Zeus*, that is Xuthus, who was the descendant of Zeus in the second generation; but just objection has been made to this merely as Greek, and it is even worse when considered with reference to the context. What has this genealogical description to do with the question? It is Xuthus *the man*, not Xuthus the grandson of Zeus, whose infidelity has given the women occasion to retort. What we should naturally expect them to say would be to this effect: 'For now one of the male sex is proving himself ungrateful.' Now this is the point at which it will serve us to know the peculiar import of the form *ἀμνημοσύνη*. It is a sign namely that Euripides intends to pay the rhapsodists in their own coin. Holding fast to this clue and retracing the faulty sentence, we may perhaps see a new possibility of significance in *Διὸς παῖδες*. According to the traditional genealogy of the bards, as we see it in the *Theogonia* of 'Hesiod,' *the female sex were not children of Zeus at all*. While men, in the tables of these partial antiquaries, were allowed to trace their pedigree through this or that god up to the father of gods and men,

Ζῆνα θεῶν πατέρ' ἦδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν (*Theog.* 47),

women, that is the sex in general, were thought too wicked and mischievous for so respectable an origin, and were derived, according to the famous legend, from a deceitful temptress fashioned by Hephaestus to humour the wrath of Zeus against mankind (*Theog.* 570 foll.). Now this Hesiodic fable is immediately followed by the fierce denunciation of the female character to which I have already referred, and though that particular passage cannot have been intended by Euripides (for as Professor Paley observes in his note there it makes no mention of infidelity), it may be taken for a characteristic specimen, and the habitual attacks to which Euripides does

refer were probably conceived in the same vein and introduced in the same way. (It will be observed that we are in no way concerned with the genuineness of the passage cited as professing to date from the age of the historic Hesiod.) We shall restore therefore to Euripides both the required sense and an appropriate allusion if (reserving the consideration of δ), for $\Delta\iota\delta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$ we read $\Delta\iota\delta\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$, *one of the children of Zeus*. For the palaeographical ground of this correction I must refer the reader to Cobet, *Var. Lect.*, pp. 14, 124, &c., where he will find ample illustration of the confusion between $\iota\sigma$ (IC) and κ (K). The difference between the two is a matter of hair-breadths. Of course the slight emphasis on $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ and the fact that Xuthus actually traced from Zeus only improves the point. It remains to deal with δ , which is now more impossible than ever. Here, however, speculation is confined to the narrowest limits, for the Greek language scarcely offers a dozen words which satisfy the conditions. We require to complete the metre a short monosyllable beginning with a consonant. The problem thus presented might well appear insoluble if we were bound by the use of common Attic. It does not offer the slightest difficulty if we have been led to expect traces of Epic idiom. In the ballad poetry the force of the Latin *etenim*, or Attic $\tau\epsilon \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ (Shilleto, *Fals. Leg.* § 176), might be given by the conjunctions in the order $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\epsilon$ (see *Lexicon* s. vv., $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and $\tau\epsilon$). The use of this idiom here would be exactly in keeping with the context—

$\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\sigma\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\epsilon \Delta\iota\delta\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$
 $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\nu.$

To an editor ignorant of the principle of Euripides' Ionisms this $\tau\epsilon$ would seem simply absurd, and the necessity of getting rid of it would facilitate the perversion of $\epsilon\iota\kappa$ into $\epsilon\kappa$. To offer this as certain would be impertinent, but it is a new thread in an old maze, and may at least lead others to something better. That $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is the right word I am strongly disposed to believe. In 1098, as the sense is exactly right and the corresponding 1082 is completely above suspicion, I should accept the substitution of $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ for the equivalent $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$ (Paley), though I cannot satisfy myself as to the cause of the corruption.

To one of the sources of dactylic poetry which have thus been indicated—the Epic, the Elegiac, and the Gnomic—may be assigned at the first inspection most of the examples which we have to consider. Euripides has in the *Andromache* a short passage in elegiac couplets, and in the *Troades* one still shorter in the hexameter. Both exhibit among the characteristics of their respective styles the form in -οσυνη—

αὐτὰ δ' ἐκ θαλάμων ἀγόμεν ἐπὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης
δουλοσύναν στυγερὰν ἀμφιβαλοῦσα κάρᾳ (*Andr.* 109) ;

and again—

†οἱ δὲ ποθοὶ μεγάλοι, † σχετλία, τάδε πάσχομεν ἄλγη
οἰχομένας πόλεως ἐπὶ δ' ἄλγεσιν ἄλγεα κέλται
592 εὐφροσύναισι θεῶν, ὅτι σὸς γόνος ἔκφυγεν Ἀἶδαν
ὃς λεχέων στυγερῶν χάριν ὤλεσε Πέργαμα Τροίας.

ὅτι (Nauck) for ὅτε is obviously right. These lines will again exemplify the necessity of tracing the *associations* which had formed about words employed by the tragedians if we would understand the tragedians themselves. In 592 the reading of the Aldine edition is εὐφροσύναισι, which was for some time accepted. Victorius in his marginal notes gives δυσευφροσύναισι (Matthiae, *ad loc.*), which being impossible may be safely accepted as a genuine extract from his MSS. The prevalent reading of our MSS. is δυσφροσύναισι ; Nauck (*Studien*, p. 143) speaks of 'geringfügige Einzelheiten,' among which may be traces of εὐφροσύναισι. None, however, are noted in the books before me. That the Aldine editors did not deliberately invent εὐφροσύναισι is clear from the fact that no one has ever given a tolerable interpretation of it, the old *cum deorum lactitia* being out of the question, whereas δυσφροσύναισι, which has a semblance of meaning, may very well have sprung from a correction. It has, however, a semblance of meaning and nothing more. δυσφροσύναι is the contrary of εὐφροσύναι, and signifies *evil cheer, melancholy*, as opposed to *good cheer, festivity* (see *Lexicon*). I find no evidence whatever that either word could have any other signification. The use of the Doric form δυσφρόνα confirms it, and even δύσφρων has in Euripides no other sense than *sad*, the statement to the contrary in the

Lexicon notwithstanding. And if *δύσφρων* *hostile* were frequent in Tragedy instead of depending upon a single passage (Aesch. *Agam.* 834 is ambiguous), we might still demur to *δυσφροσύναι*, *hostility*: *εὐφρων*, *friendly*, is moderately frequent, but where is *εὐφροσύναι*, *friendliness*? The Attic writers did not form these words: *they took them from the dactylic poets with their senses already determined*. The proper translation of *δυσφροσύναισι θεῶν* is not *by the hostility* but *by the sadness of the gods*, which being fixed, we shall perhaps be inclined to see what can be made of *εὐφροσύναισι*. This word came by a natural transition from denoting a cheerful state of mind to denote the material comforts producing it, just as we speak in English of ‘a festivity,’ or ‘the good cheer upon the table.’ Indeed from Homer to the tragedians it has scarcely any other sense, in the tragedians no other, than that of ‘festival.’ Is there any reason why it should not have that sense here? These lines are addressed—in a tone of reproach (*σχετλία*)—by the captive Andromache to the captive Hecuba. They refer in an allusive way to the familiar story of Paris, his escape when exposed as a child, his judgment, and its consequences. Now the preservation of the infant Paris was connected with his ‘detested bridal’ by an important link, the fall of the apple in the ‘fair Peleian banquet-hall,’ and it was therefore, as Andromache says, *along of the gods’ festival* (causal dative) that he became the destroyer of Troy. The marriage of Peleus and Thetis is not described in the rhapsodies which time has left to us, but it was part of the best known cycle, and a Greek audience must have heard a hundred times descriptions of the *θεῶν εὐφροσύναι* upon that occasion, such as Catullus gives us in a Latin dress.

Not liking to quote what I cannot construe, I am obliged to add a remark upon 590. Considering that these lines have been much talked over, it is odd if no one has fallen foul of the words *οἶδε πόθοι μεγάλοι*, which are not only without grammatical construction but contain the very questionable plural *πόθοι*. The evidence producible for it apparently consists of (1) *Oed. Col.* 333—

ΟΙ. τέκνον, τι δ’ ἦλθες; ΙΣ. σὴ πάτερ προμηθία.

ΟΙ. πότερα πόθοισι; ΙΣ. καὶ λόγων γ’ αὐτάγγελος,

itself on various grounds doubtful—*ποθοῦσα* has been suggested.

(2) *Iph. A.* 556—

εἴη δέ μοι μετρία μὲν χάρις πόθοι δ' ὅσιοι;

of which it is enough to say that if it came from a less dubious text it would be little more to the point than the citation in the Lexicon from the *Philebus*, τὰς ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις καὶ πόθοις ἡδονάς, where the plural gives what is vaguely but intelligibly called a 'general' sense, 'cases of πόθος.' Considering how very common the word is in all sorts of literature, this is a slender base on which to rest οἶδε πόθοι. Moreover this nominative is, as was said, unconstruable. The source of mischief is, I conceive, to be sought in *μεγάλοι*, which has absorbed an independent syllable, like ἐπολολυξάτω (ἐπολολύξατ' ᾧ) in the uncorrected MS. of Aesch. *Cho.* 942. **ΜΕΓΑΝΩ** has been misread **ΜΕΓΑΛΩ**, and this error has drawn after it, *μεγάλον* being impossible, the attraction of τόνδε πόθον into τοῖδε πόθοι, and the separation of the first three words from the context, for in the Vatican MS. (see Dindorf's *App. crit.*) they are assigned to the chorus, absurdly no doubt but by no means without excuse. The step to the ordinary οἶδε would be a matter of course. I would read then—

τόνδε πόθον μέγαν, ᾧ σχετλία, τάδε πάσχομεν ἄλλη.

To dispose at once of *εὐφρόσυναι*, I will say here what need be said about Eur. *Bacchae*, 375—

τὸν Βρόμιον,
τὸν Σεμέλας, τὸν παρὰ καλλιστεφάνοις
εὐφροσύναις δαίμονα πρῶτον μακάρων.

Here the epithet *καλλιστεφάνοις* gives the sense of *εὐφροσύναις*—*banquet*—at a glance. The repetition of the article, by a well-known use, marks the appellations before which it stands as quoted not bestowed by the speaker (*Soph. Aí.* 726, Eur. *Hipp.* 587, *Med.* 206, &c). I need not, however, go about to prove what no one could ever doubt, that these lines are intended to recall the titles by which Dionysus was invoked in the songs and hymns which were the chief ornament of 'crowned festivities.' Nothing therefore could be more natural than the use of the hymnic word.

Bearing this passage in mind, we will pass to a pair upon which it will throw much light. In each of the plays which Euripides wrote upon the story of the chaste Hippolytus, we naturally hear something of his *σωφροσύνη* (*Hipp.* 1365, and *Fr.* 447), though it is well worthy of attention how little we do hear. In the extant play, the speaker is Hippolytus himself, carried dying on to the stage and inviting compassion for his undeserved destruction—

ὁδ' ὁ σεμνὸς ἐγὼ καὶ θεοσέπτωρ
ὁδ' ὁ σωφροσύνη πάντας ὑπερσχῶν
προὔπτον ἐς Ἄιδαν στείχω κατὰ γᾶς.

Looked at from the dramatic point of view, these phrases introduced with the repeated article (ὁ...ὁ) mark merely the established character, and in the mouth of Hippolytus as a *dramatis persona* have of course no literary reference. But it by no means follows that no such reference was to be made by the audience; and we observe the presence not only of *σωφροσύνη* but of *θεοσέπτωρ*, a form, as I must here assume but may elsewhere show, assignable to the same peculiar sources. But by what channel either *σωφροσύνη* or *θεοσέπτωρ* descended we might scarcely have discovered, had we not been put upon the track by the allusion to the titles of Dionysus in the *Bacchae*. We know that the virtues of the canonized Hippolytus—if I may venture to use a term which really conveys the force of the Greek *ἥρως* much better than the completely different word which modern languages have made out of it—were celebrated at Troezen by a regular festival with its accompaniment of hymns, according to the promise of Artemis (*Hipp.* 1423)—

σοὶ δ', ὦ ταλαίπωρ' ἀντὶ τῶνδε τῶν κακῶν
τιμὰς μεγίστας ἐν πόλει Τροιζηνία
δώσω.....
ἀεὶ δὲ μουσικοῖς ἐς σὲ παρθένων
ἔσται μέριμνα κοῦκ ἀγώνυμος πεσῶν
ἔρως ὁ Φαίδρας ἐς σὲ σιγηθήσεται.

In fact it is more than likely that these hymns furnished Euripides with the plot of his play. Under these circumstances it

would not be a very great stretch of hypothesis to suppose without further evidence that the appeal of the dying martyr gained effect by justifying in advance the ascriptions of his worshippers, and that if we had the Hippolytean hymns we should find many preludes in such a form as this—

ἦρῶ Ἰππόλυτον, σεμνὸν, θεοσέπτορ' αἰίδα
πάντας ὅσθ' ὄρκῳ τε σωφροσύνη τ' ἐκέκαστο.

But conjecture becomes affirmation when we find that in the fragment of the lost *Hippolytus*, which, we may reasonably suppose, praised his *σωφροσύνη* as much and named it as little as the play which is left to us, the testimony cited for the virtue is that of these very rites by which it was renowned and rewarded (Eur. *Fr.* 447)—

ὦ μάκαρ οἷας ἔλαχες τιμὰς
Ἰππόλυθ' ἥρως διὰ σωφροσύνην.

With these examples to guide us, we shall not be inclined to attribute to accident the curious difference of phraseology between the preface and the prayer which compose the speech of Antigone in Eur. *Phoen.* 185, foll. The lines are not quite clear to me in metre, but the general drift and the contrast which I am about to point out can be sufficiently ascertained—

ὁδ' ἐστὶν αἰχμαλωτίδας
ὅς δόρι Θηβαίας Μυκήναισι εὐχεται...
δώσειν, ... δουλείαν περιβαλὼν;
μήποτε μήποτε τάνδ', ὦ πότνια
χρυσεοβόστρυχον ὦ Διὸς ἔρνος Ἄρτεμι
δουλοσύναν τλαίην.

Here, although *δουλοσύναν* is a mere repetition of *δουλείαν* (*τάνδε*), the word is changed in order that the religious formula of the petition may be duly concluded in religious language. To the same influence we can assign the two remaining instances in Aeschylus (*Theb.* 111, 240), though we should hardly have detected it without the previous comparison of more strongly-marked examples—

ἴω ἴω θεοὶ πολιοχοὶ χθονὸς, ἵτ' ἵτε πάντες ὦδ'
ἴδετε παρθένων ἱκέσιον λόχον δουλοσύνας ὕπερ.

And again,

ποτίφατον κλύουσα πάταγον ἀναμίξ
ταρβοσύνη φόβῳ τάνδ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν
τίμιον ἔδος ἱκόμαν.

The chorus of the *Seven against Thebes* exercises, especially in the earlier part of the play, a function essentially religious. The greater part of their first song is a solemn supplication for help addressed to the protecting gods of the city, each of whom is invoked with his or her accustomed titles—*Διογενὲς Πάλλας, ἵππιος ποντομέδων Ποσειδῶν, Λύκειε ἄναξ, πότνια Διὸς δάμαρ*. The commencement of the hymn proper is marked, as will be seen by a glance at the context, by the first citation, which is similar to that from the *Phoenissae* and considering the common subject of the two plays can hardly have been absent from Euripides' mind; so that here we have a commentary upon Aeschylus of the first order, and may listen to the older poet with the ear of the younger. The piety of these Theban women has a dramatic even more than an ethical purpose. Their terror is not in sharper contrast with the courage of Eteokles, than their dependent faith (*θεοῖς πίσυνος*, 212) with his self-reliant and contemptuous pride. In the development of this contrast (182–241) the poet has employed his utmost art. The rebukes of the prince are in the smooth iambic, while the chorus reply in the passionate rhythm of their hymn. Calmed, or rather quelled by his authority, they subside at length into dialogue, and the close of the first mood is marked by the second citation—

*Look, O our lords, upon us and upon our supplication :
And deliver us not into captivity...
On a sudden I heard a mingled noise, and I was horribly afraid :
So I came up into the sanctuary, even unto the holy hill.*

By the prayer of Antigone and the prayer of the women of Thebes we may set—and the comparison will be comment enough—the thanksgiving of the old counsellors of Kreon in the

Antigone of Sophokles (148) for the rolling away of the same danger—

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἃ μεγαλῶνυμος ἦλθε Νίκα
 τῇ πολυαρμάτῳ ἀντιχαρεῖσα Θήβα,
 ἐκ μὲν δὴ πολέμων τῶν νῦν θέσθε λησμοσύναν,
 θεῶν δὲ ναοὺς χοροῖς
 παννυχίοις πάντας ἐπελθῶμεν, ὃ Θηβας δ' ἐλελίχθων
 Βάκχιος ἄρχοι.

Notice the *Ionic* 'auxiliary' θέσθε for ποιεῖσθε (Cobet, *Nov. Lec.* 261).

A. W. VERRALL.

(*To be continued.*)