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](#)

Euripidean Notes. (I.)

Mortimer Lamson Earle

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 04 / April 1893, pp 150 - 152

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197264, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197264

How to cite this article:

Mortimer Lamson Earle (1893). Euripidean Notes. (I.). The Classical Review, 7, pp 150-152
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197264

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

AESCHYLUS, *AGAMEMNON* 560-563.

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσανλίας
σπαρνὰς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους τί δ' οὐ
στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες ἡματος μέρος
τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ κ.τ.λ.

I print this difficult passage without stops. That τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ begins a new sentence there can be no doubt. A full stop, either interrogative or not interrogative, should be placed after μέρος. It appears to me to be quite certain that lines 560-2 refer to sea troubles, with no hint of the land: τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ shows this. There is however in these lines (apart from the inexplicable παρήξεις) no word with a flavour of the sea; and δυσανλίας has a flavour of the land (unless any one will be bold enough to say that there is a pun and that we are to think of the time when 'the fleet at Aulis lay enchained'). It is impossible to understand μόχθους in line 560 of labour at sea, unless δυσανλίας 'suffer a sea change.' Even if παρήξεις meant 'berths' it would come too late to give μόχθους the sense we want. Therefore δυσανλίας must be wrong. I cannot find any plausible emendation, but I will propose δυσκυμίας for purpose of illustration.

The most important matter is the construction of 561-562 and the meaning of ἡματος μέρος. The phrase recurs, as I believe, in Plutarch, *De Def. Or.* p. 414A. One of the two best MSS. has there ἡμέρας μέρος, and it is significant that this violates the law of the hiatus. The others have μέρος ἡμέρας. In a forthcoming edition of this treatise I have ventured to print ἡματος μέρος. There is no doubt about the meaning of the phrase in Plutarch's prose. It is almost the same as ἔργον ἡμέρας, 'a day's job.' Plutarch, I think, took the phrase from Aeschylus. Aeschylus took it from common parlance. ἡματος μέρος is 'a big part of a day,' 'a long time.' If I am right in this matter (and the fact that this explanation struck me

and commended itself to Mr. Verrall, when I was still ignorant of the reading ἡμέρας μέρος for μ. ἡμ. in the Plutarch MS., induces me to think I am), then there can be no doubt about the construction and punctuation of the passage in the *Agamemnon*. ἡματος μέρος is the apodosis: τί δ' οὐ στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες is an interjection not subordinated to the rest of the construction. There remains the word παρήξεις, to which no intelligible sense can be assigned. I would read τ' ἀρήξεις and understand ἀρηξίς as equivalent to βοήθεια in its medical sense 'relief from toil,' or 'rest.' The whole passage should then, I think, be written thus

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσανλίας
(-κυμίας?),
σπαρνὰς τ' ἀρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους—τί δ'
οὐ
στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες—ἡματος μέρος.
τὰ δ' αὖτε κ.τ.λ.

I cannot agree with Mr. Verrall that οὐ λαχόντες is subordinate to στένοντες. This seems to me a construction far more artificial than this interjectional phrase can bear. In στένοντες we have the groaning before the mast or at the oars expressed, in οὐ λαχόντες we have the want of home comforts expressed: τί οὐ depends on both participles στένοντες and οὐ λαχόντες. Thus στένοντες refers to the μόχθοι, οὐ λαχόντες to the σπαρνὰι ἀρήξεις because they were σπαρνὰι and κακόστρωτοι. I should paraphrase the whole thus: 'Were I to tell of their toil at the oars and sails, and their trouble on the deep, and of their rare and uneasy moments of repose from this toil and trouble—groaning their souls out when they laboured and grumbling them in when they rested—it would take me most part of the day.'

W. R. PATON.

EURIPIDEAN NOTES. (I.)

Eurip. *Suppl.* 232-237.

νέους παραχθείς, οἵτινες τιμώμενοι
χαίρουσι πολέμους τ' αὐξάνουσ' ἄνευ δίκης,
φθείροντες ἀστούς, ὁ μὲν ὅπως στρατηλατῇ,
ὁ δ' ὡς ὑβρίζῃ δύναμιν ἐς χεῖρας λαβών,
ἄλλος δὲ κέρδους οὔνεκ', οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶν
τὸ πλῆθος εἴ τι βλάπτεται πάσῃον τάδε.

This passage is interesting as an illustration of a feature common to Euripides and Thucydides, though by no means confined to them—the use of synonymous constructions which to their minds were evidently entirely equivalent. We have here three expressions of finality: (1) ὅπως

στρατηλατῇ, (2) ὡς ὑβρίζῃ, (3) κέρδους οὐνεκα = ὡς (ὅπως) κερδαίνῃ. Cf. such passages as Thuc. i. 37, 4 (οὐχ ἵνα μὴ ξυναδικήσωσιν—, ἀλλ' ὅπως—ἀδικῶσι, καὶ ὅπως—βιάζονται), i. 73, 1 (οὐ—ἀντεροῦντες—, ἀλλ' ὅπως μὴ—βουλεύσῃθε, καὶ ἅμα βουλόμενοι—δηλωσάι). The feature of style just noted, which is but one phase of a more general characteristic—a constant striving to vary the form of expression—is far-reaching in Thucydides and has been rightly described by Mahaffy, as it appears in the speeches, as 'a crowding of curious and distorted aphorisms about some leading idea, which is reiterated in all sorts of forms.' I cannot accept Wilamowitz' view, that the 'synonymik' of Prodicus was 'seriously employed' by Thucydides (Eur. *Herakl.* i. p. 27); for the peculiarity of Prodicus' theory (*vid.* Plat. *Protag.*, particularly 337 A—C) is the hair-splitting tendency of all 'synonymik,' whereas Thucydides uses a variety of expressions with (apparently) no conscious distinction; nay, he goes so far as to stretch the meaning of an expression or word in order to use it as a synonym for variety's sake. Cf. *e.g.* vi. 54, 3 ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἀξιώσεως ('quantum pro sua auctoritate poterat' Classen), where ἀξιώσεως = δυνάμεως is employed because of τὴν Ἰπάρχου δύναμιν just before. Thucydides is a synonym-monger in quite a different sense from Prodicus. What Thucydides has, in common with Prodicus, Euripides and the other sophists, is rather an extreme self-consciousness in the use of language.—To return to the passage in hand, it may be further noted that the MSS. reading πάσχον seems preferable to the emendation of Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz, πάσχει. Young men πολέμους αὐξάνουσι for various purposes: one, ὅπως στρατηλατῇ; another, ὡς ὑβρίζῃ δύναμιν ἐς χείρας λαβών; another to make gain. Why add πάσχει τὰδε? He experiences, is made the victim of—what? Were such an expression as πάσχει τὰδε to appear on a page of Thucydides in such a context, editors of the Cobetian school would long ago have enclosed it '*uncis quadratis*.' It should at least be πράσσει τὰδε. It is the πλήθος which suffers, βλάπτεται πάσχον τὰδε, *i.e.* the various ὕβρεις of the νέοι.—With this passage we may compare Thucydides vi. 12, 2, also vi. 15 (character of Alcibiades and the νεώτεροι). On our Euripidean passage Paley notes: 'There can be little doubt, from the tone of this passage, that Euripides had some particular party or person in view, whom he regarded as chiefly responsible for the continuance of the

disastrous war,—some Lamachus, Demosthenes or Cleon, whose ambitions he desired to rebuke.' The similarity of the passages in Thucydides just cited to the verses of Euripides is striking,—if nothing more. Cf. particularly τιμώμενοι χαίρουσι = ἄρχειν ἄσμενος αἰρεθείς (Thuc. vi. 12, 2. cf. τιμῶμαι ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου *ibid.* 9, 2); οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶν τὸ πλήθος κτέ. = τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον σκοπῶν (Thuc. vi. 12, 2); κέρδους οὐνεκα = διὰ δὲ πολυτέλειαν καὶ ὠφελήθητι ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς (Thuc. *loc. cit.*; the ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς is to be compared with ὅπως στρατηλατῇ in Eurip.); ὡς ὑβρίζῃ δύναμιν ἐς χείρας λαβών = ὦν γὰρ ἐν ἀξιώματι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστῶν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις μείζουσιν ἢ κατὰ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν οὐσίαν ἐχρήτο ἐς τε τὰς ἱπποτροφίας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δαπάνας (Thuc. vi. 15, 3). To endeavour to establish anything beyond an accidental resemblance between the Euripidean and Thucydidean passages would perhaps be unjustifiable. That there is however a striking similarity no one can deny.

Suppl. 253—256.

οὐ τοι δικαστὴν σ' εἰλόμην ἔργων ἐμῶν,
οὐδ' εἰ τι πράξας μὴ καλῶς εὐρίσκομαι
τούτων κολαστὴν κάπιτιμητὴν, ἀναξ,
ἀλλ' ὡς ὀναίμην.

The variance of construction in this passage resembles that in the former and furnishes an excellent instance of final apposition. Moreover it proves that the writer himself was conscious of the final force. (Of course the 'final force' of any subordinate construction is not to be regarded as necessarily originally inherent in it.) Were we to attempt to bring the sentence before us into uniformity, we must either write ὡς βοηθόν (a word which Euripides does not, I think, employ), or, better, ὡς δικάζοις—ὡς κολάζοις κάπιτιμῶης, or even employ fut. participles with ὡς. It is not difficult to find other instances of final apposition, though I have no other example to cite in which the varying from final appositive to final clause shows the author so fully conscious of the finality in the appositival construction. Cf. *e.g.* Thuc. i. 53, 4 βοηθοὶ ἤλθομεν (= βοηθοῦντες or βοηθήσοντες ἤλθομεν: cf. *ib.* 63, 2 προήλθον ὡς βοηθήσοντες); *ib.* 94, 1 στρατηγὸς—ἐξεπέμφθη; *ib.* 95, 6 ἐκπέμπουσιν ἄρχοντα (cf. *ib.* 109, 2 πέμπει—ἄνδρα—, ὅπως—ἀπαγάγοι). In all these cases, as well as in our Euripidean passage, a final clause containing the cognate verb in the subjunctive might easily have been written. Indeed, it is the verbal force felt in such substantives

that renders them readily nominal equivalents of verbal expressions. One is surprised to observe that this mode of indicating finality finds no mention among the many varieties cited in the first section of Widmann's excellent and careful dissertation *De Finalium Enuntiatorum Usu Thucydideo* (Gött. 1875).

Suppl. 899 *sqq.*

πολλοὺς δ' ἐραστὰς κατὰ θηλειῶν † ὅσας
ἔχων κτέ.

Canter emended ἴσας, which would naturally suggest itself to any one. Perhaps

the MSS. reading is a contamination arising

from a variant ICAC (i.e. ὁμῶς).
OMWC

Suppl. 1232.

στέιχουμεν, *Ἀδρασθ', ὄρκια δῶμεν.

Equivalent to στέιχουμεν, ἴν' ὄρκια δῶμεν. An excellent survival of the paratactic construction out of which the final clause (in stricter sense) with subj. grew. This indicates the original hortatory character of this subj.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

THE TEXT OF THUCYDIDES VII.

III.

It is well known that from vi. 92, 5 onwards the *Vatican* and its Paris copy H (as far as it goes) contain a version of the text which varies very considerably from that given by all the other MSS. It is equally certain, after all that has been written on the subject, that it is useless to say that either version—the *Vatican* or the *Laurentian*—is the better. We must test each passage wherever there is a difference on its own merits.

Any one who observes the two versions closely soon notices that the *Vatican* constantly contains a little word—generally it is τε—which is wanting in other MSS. Probably the scribe used a better MS. from vi. 92, 5 onwards. Sometimes he may be emending the text on his own account. Some one has called him 'a great grammarian,' perhaps only half in earnest. But, in any case, the minute addition does, in nine cases out of ten, carry conviction with it. To give instances of what is perfectly well known to all who are concerned with the text of Thuc. would be merely tedious.

What I wish to suggest is that it is highly probable that there is a large number of omissions in the received text of Books i.—v. 92; for, if we had the second version of these books, we should certainly find small words often in that text where they do not appear in our MSS. Further, it appears that the addition of a small word where it seems to be required and where the omission can be properly accounted for, is a scientific method of emendation in Thuc. We can-

not always be certain; but at least we should not be ridiculed for trying this method.

That there are occasional *lacunae* in the text, all are agreed; but I suggest that omissions of small words are far commoner than is supposed.

I believe that some of the greatest difficulties which we encounter in the generally simple Seventh Book would disappear if we could recover here and there a word or two still wanting even in the *Vatican*. In c. 2, 4 for τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ τοῦ κύκλου, I believe we should read τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ <ἄνω> τοῦ κύκλου; and hope to be able to show in my notice of Professor Freeman's *Shorter History of Sicily* that not one of the suggested explanations of the vulgate is possible. In c. 7, 1 for μέχρι τοῦ ἐγκαρσίου τείχους, it would be better to read μέχρι <τοῦ Εὐρυήλου> or <τοῦ τέλους> τοῦ ἐγκαρσίου τείχους than either to bracket μέχρι with some, or to explain the text as Freeman does. I shall have more to say on this passage also.

In c. 7, 4 for τρόπῳ ᾧ ἂν ἐν ὀλκάσιν ἡ πλοίοις ἢ ἄλλως ὅπως ἂν προχωρήῃ, I feel fairly confident that we ought to read τρόπῳ ᾧ ἂν ἐνῇ, ὀλκάσιν ἡ πλοίοις ἢ ἄλλως ὅπως ἂν προχωρήῃ. The dative without ἐν occurs in the same way a little further on; or even if it were impossible, we could fairly read <ἐνῇ>, ἐν.

In c. 56, 4 we at present read ἔθνη γὰρ πλείστα δὴ ἐπὶ μίαν πόλιν ταύτην ξυνήλθε, πλὴν γε δὴ τοῦ ξύμπαντος ὄχλου τοῦ ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ πρὸς τὴν Ἀθηναίων τε πόλιν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων. But Stahl rightly objects