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](#)

Note on Euripides, *Hecuba*, LI. 1214–15

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 06 / July 1901, pp 295 - 295

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030766, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030766

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1901). Note on Euripides, *Hecuba*, LI. 1214–15. The Classical Review, 15, pp 295-295 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030766

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTE ON EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*, LL. 1214-15.

'Αλλ' ἡνίχ' ἡμεῖς οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει,
καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμεν' ἄστν πολέμιων ὑπο,
ξένον κατέκτας.

It is impossible to render the second of these lines unless what Paley calls 'a singular ellipse' be assumed. The editors of elementary editions say that a participle is to be supplied. But Nauck saw that no satisfactory defence had been put forward, and fell back on conjecture.

The scholiast says that ἐσήμεν' is for ἐσήμενε τὸ ἡμᾶς μηκέτι εἶναι ἐν φάει, and the note looks as if he read the passage correctly punctuated, as follows :

'Αλλ' ἡνίχ' ἡμεῖς οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει
(καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμεν' ἄστν) πολέμιων ὑπο,
ξένον κατέκτας.

The parenthesis is thrown in to show how Polymestor knew that the Trojans were

lost, and it heightens the bitterness of the reproach. οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει πολέμιων ὑπο go together. It should be added that the change of tense—ἐσμὲν, ἐσήμεν'—becomes clearer with this explanation, which, I hope, disposes of the inferior reading ἦμεν.

A very similar correction of *Phoenissae* l. 275 was made by Weil in the *Journal des Savants* for April 1889, where for

'Αλλ' ἐγγὺς ἀλκή· βώμιοι γὰρ ἐσχάροι
πέλας πάρεισι, κοῦκ ἔρημα δώματα.
φέρ' ἐς σκοτεινὰς περιβολὰς μεθ' ἑξίφος

he gives

'Αλλ' ἐγγὺς ἀλκή (βώμιοι γὰρ ἐσχάροι
πέλας πάρεισι) κοῦκ ἔρημα δώματα,
φέρ' ἐς σκοτεινὰς περιβολὰς μεθ' ἑξίφος.

This seems to me clearly right.

E. C. MARCHANT.

PLATONICA.—III.

(Continued from p. 116.)

EUTHYDEMUS.

276 E Ω Ζεῦ, ἔφην ἐγώ, ἧ μὴν καὶ τὸ πρότερον γε καλὸν ἡμῖν ἐφάνη.

καλόν should I think be ἱκανόν, a word often confused with it. The point is that one such dialectical display was quite enough. Cf. 278 D.

277 C πότερον οὖν εἰσὶν οἱ λαμβάνοντες ὅτι οὖν οἱ ἔχοντες ἤδη ἢ οἱ ἂν μὴ; οἱ ἂν μὴ ἔχωσιν.

Schanz writes 'ἔχωσιν delevi, post ἢ οἱ ἂν μὴ transposuit Badham.' Another alternative is to leave ἔχωσιν alone, but in the preceding sentence to write ἢ οἱ μὴ, omitting ἂν.

282 E For ὥσπερ Hermann writes ὥς γάρ, Schanz ὥς ὥσπερ. I would suggest ὥς ὅπερ. Cf. 305 A.

295 A ἥδιστα ταῦτα ἐξελέγχομαι.

The context excludes the possibility of this being a general statement, nor can it refer to the present moment, as the ἐλεγχος has not begun. It ought therefore to be in the future, corresponding to the ἐπιδείξω and

ἐπιδείξεις before and after. I do not find the future passive ἐξελέγχομαι anywhere, but either that or ἐξελεγχ<θής>ομαι ought to be read.

301 C ἐπεὶ τὰ ἄλλα μοι δοκεῖτε, ὥσπερ οἱ δημιουργοὶ ἂ ἐκάστοις προσήκει ἀπεργάζεσθαι, καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸ διαλέγεσθαι παγκάλως ἀπεργάζεσθαι.

Heindorf was inclined to omit the first ἀπεργάζεσθαι. Rather alter it to ἀπεργάζονται, which has been accidentally assimilated to the other. To say nothing of any other objection, the cacophony is intolerable.

302 D οὐκοῦν καὶ οὗτοι σοὶ θεοὶ ἂν εἶεν;

Add οἱ before θεοί. σοί alone is predicate. So just below καὶ ζῶα εἰσὶν οὗτοι οἱ θεοί. Perhaps there should be a γε after πρόγονοι.

303 D τούτους τοὺς λόγους πάνν μὲν ἂν ὁ
λίγοι ἀγαπῶεν· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι οὕτω νοοῦσιν B }
αὐτοὺς ὥστε κ.τ.λ. ἀγνοοῦσιν T }

Neither νοοῦσιν nor ἀγνοοῦσιν makes any sense and various substitutes have been proposed. (δυσχερ) αἰνοῦσιν would be very suitable.