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](#)

The Elision of the Dative Iota in Attic Tragedy

C. J. Brennan

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 1-2 / February 1893, pp 17 - 18

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196659, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196659

How to cite this article:

C. J. Brennan (1893). The Elision of the Dative Iota in Attic Tragedy. The Classical Review, 7, pp 17-18 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196659

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

'under the influence of haste' and 'with haste' are easily fused.

W. WYSE.

THUCYDIDES, VIII. 10.

καταδιώκουσιν ἐς Πειραιὸν τῆς Κορινθίας· ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν ἐρήμος καὶ ἔσχατος πρὸς τὰ μεθόρια τῆς Ἐπιδαυρίας.

Ptolemy (iii. 16, 12) enumerates the places on the coast between Epidaurus and Cenchreae in the following order; 'Ἐπίδαυρος, Σπείραιον ἄκρον, Ἀθηναίων λιμὴν, Βουκέφαλος λιμὴν, Κεγχρεαί. Plin. *H.N.* iv. 9 has: Epidauri oppidum Aesculapi delubro celebre, Spiraem promontorium, portus Anthedus et Bucephalus, et quas supra dixeramus, Cenchreae. Bloomfield wished to identify the place mentioned by Thucydides here and in cc. 11. 4, 5, 14. 2, 15. 2, 20 with Ptolemy's Ἀθηναίων λιμὴν, K. O. Müller on the other hand proposed ἐς Σπείραιον. This conjecture, so far as I can trace, has not been admitted into any text, but it has been confirmed by

an inscription discovered at Epidaurus in 1886 and published in *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.* 1887, p. 11, Collitz, *Sammlung d. Dialektinschr.* n. 3025, *Recueil des Inscriptions Juridiques Grecques* p. 342: I quote from the last work. The inscription is placed between 242/1 and 234/3 B.C., and contains a judgment settling a dispute between Corinth and Epidaurus touching the possession of certain border lands. The opening words (after the date) are: κατὰ τὰδε ἔκριναν τοὶ Μεγαρεῖς τοῖς [Ἐπ]ιδανρίοις καὶ Κορινθίοις περὶ τῆς χώρας ὡς ἀμφελλέγον καὶ [περ]ὶ τοῦ Σελλανύου[υ] καὶ τοῦ Σπιραίου: cp. l. 17 τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀμαξιοῦ [τὰς κα]ταγούσας ἐπὶ τὸ Σπείραιον. This evidence disposes finally of the Πειραιὸς of Stephanus Byzantius, which Poppo accepts, and clears up an old confusion: there was indeed a Πείραιον in the Corinthian territory but it was on the Crissaeon gulf, in the neighbourhood of τὸ Ἑπραιον and Οἰνὸγ (*Xen. Hell.* iv. 5, 1, 3, 5).

W. WYSE.

THE ELISION OF THE DATIVE IOTA IN ATTIC TRAGEDY.

It is the general practice of scholars, when a rule has been observed, to correct all exceptions to it. This method is however suspicious when applied to the by no means regular usage of the poets. Aeschylus has but a single example of the final optative with ἄν, yet this, as 'an archaism and therefore part of the literary style,' has appeared in every text from Vettori to Verrall without a single attempt being made to oust it. Yet when our MSS. offer us, in some half-dozen passages of the Tragedians, the elision of the dative ι of the third declension, an archaism which these poets might have used as well as many another, the critics at once endeavour to get rid of it by all means. But by what logic is the one admitted and the other denied? Which is the more reasonable assumption, that our copyists have preserved the true reading, or that on several occasions they have either by miraculous blunder or out of their extensive Homeric knowledge introduced an archaism into the 'regular' dialect of the Athenian poets? I believe it is an established fact that the copyists have more often changed what was rare into what was common than *vice versa*.

So much by way of prelude. Let us now examine the single passages as they are

NO. LVII. VOL. VII.

corrected. In Eur. *Alc.* 1118 the MS. reading is καὶ δὴ προτείνω, Γοργόν' ὡς καρατόμῳ, with which no fault has been found but that of the elided dative ι. Hence Lobeck wrote καρατομῶν, which is in reality ridiculous, for Perseus was a model of courage, and when the Choephoroe would urge Orestes to 'accomplish the baneful woe,' it is the spirit of Perseus they bid him to uplift in his heart. In Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1435 sq. σφῶν δ' εἰ διδοίη Ζεὺς, τὰδ' εἰ τελείτέ μοι θανόντ'· ἐπεὶ οὐ μοι ζῶντί γ' αὖθις ἔξετον, I think that the position of the word θανόντ' adds to its force and pathos, and that it is only on this word that the words ἐπεὶ οὐ κ.τ.λ. can follow, if they are to make any impression. Sophocles, I believe, knew his art and understood the power that lies in cunning arrangement of words better than to write τὰδ' εἰ θανόντι μοι τελείτ'· ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ., and if he did so write, then I fail to see how the passage was 'corrupted.' The error is as hard to trace in *Trach.* 675 if Sophocles there wrote ἀργῆς οἶδς εὐείρου πόκος, and not, as the MS. gives, ἀργῆτ' οἶδς εὐείρου πόκῳ. Euripides in a fragment of the *Aeolus* (*fr.* 21 Nauck) has ἄ μὴ γὰρ ἔστι τῷ πένηθ' ὁ πλούσιος δίδωσι: Erfurdt would write τῷ πένητι πλούσιος, yet the article seems re-

C

quired before πλούσιος as much as before πένητι, and so Euripides has written in the words immediately following, ἃ δ' οἱ πλοιοῦντες οὐ κεκτήμεθα, τοῖσιν πένησι χρώμενοι τιμώμεθα.

Another passage is *Suppl.* 6 sq.

οὕτω' ἐφ' αἵματι δημηλασίαι
ψήφῳ πόλεως γνωσθεῖσαι.

So the MS. 'Editors agree,' says Prof. Tucker, 'in reading δημηλασίαι, since οὕτω' = οὕτινι is an impossible elision, and γνωσθεῖσαι with dative equally impossible.' But, as he goes on to show, γνωσθεῖσαι cannot stand with the accusative as equal to καταγνωσθεῖσαι, and change to δημηλασίαν demands further change to γνωσθεῖσαν. Yet the MS. really offers the dative δημηλασίᾳ, for the accentuation is of no importance; a scribe would be more likely to interpret ΓΝΩΣΘΕΙCΑΙ as nominative plural than as dative singular. And I believe that Aeschylus wrote a dative here, and in the corrupt v. 8; for no one with an ear for rhythm—and Aeschylus had a very good ear—could endure such a sequence of accusatives as χθόνα σύγχορτον...δημηλασίαν γνωσθεῖσαν...αὐτογενῇ φυξανορίαν...γάμον...ἄσεβῇ διάνοϊαν (or whatever accusative was lost in v. 10) all within the narrow compass of six anapaestic lines: whereas on the contrary the two accusatives γάμον and διάνοϊαν are well balanced by the two datives δημηλασίᾳ and φυξανορίᾳ. It is amusing to observe how the editors, after testifying to the 'Homeric thought and diction' of this play, proceed to remove the first trace of Homeric diction they meet.

It may seem presumptuous on my part to deny what so many scholars hold for certain, and to reopen a question regarded as closed; still I cannot but regard this attempt to elevate a general usage into a universal law by 'correction,' at all costs of the contradictory passages, as Porson's most unhappy legacy to his descendants. The sour grapes which our forefathers in philology have eaten are setting our teeth on edge. I could have wished that an abler hand than mine had flung down the gauntlet. Perhaps Dr. Verrall, in that edition of Aeschylus whose speedy completion is to be desired, may investigate this matter more thoroughly than I have done.

C. J. BRENNAN.

NOTES ON AESCHYLUS AND EURIPIDES.

Cho. 433. For τὸ πᾶν ἀτίμως Dr. Verrall ingeniously wrote ταφὰν ἀτίμων, which Mr.

Sidgwick modified into ταφὰς ἀτίμων. Neither of these is entirely satisfactory, for the first ignores the ς of ἀτίμως, the second the ν of τὸ πᾶν. I think we should write ταφέντ' ἀτίμως, which gains confirmation from this, that the poet uses it also in *Theb.* 1012. And Aeschylus is fond of repeating phrases he has once used. Thus the whole verse *Pers.* 813 recurs as *Agam.* 532; θεοὺς τοὺς τῆς ἀλούσης *Theb.* 204, *Agam.* 351; *Agam.* 1281 recurs as *Cho.* 1040 with the change of only one word; δαίμονος περὶώμενος *Agam.* 1663, *Cho.* 511; δύσθεος γυνὰ of Clytaemnestra twice in the *Choephori* 45, 523.

Suppl. 104 sqq.

βίαν δ'
105 οὕτω' ἐξοπλίζει
τὰν ἄπονον δαιμονίων
ἤμενον ὃν φρόνημά πως
αὐτόθεν ἐξέπραξεν ἔμπας
ἐδράνων ἐφ' ἀγνῶν.

106. ἄποινον M corr. Wellauer, 107 ἄν M, ὃν Paley.

This *locus vexatus* admits of easy interpretation with the admission of only the two slight changes above recorded: 'Zeus uses not that force, unlabouring though it be, of the lesser gods; but his will, seated on its holy throne, accomplishes itself at once in some mysterious way.' Prof. Tucker, who would limit φρόνημα to 'animi, pride proper or improper...high, stubborn, or wicked thought, not simply thought,' forgets that it is used for 'thought' simply, in the widest sense of the word, in *Soph. Ant.* 355. Can we interpret it as 'pride' in *Prom.* 392 ἔστ' ἂν Διὸς φρόνημα λωφύσῃ χόλου? or in *Cho.* 593? or in *Soph. Ant.* 169? φρόνημα seems to mean *animus* 'courage' in *Thuc.* ii. 61, and 'disposition' in *Plato, Rep.* ix. 573 B.

Agam. 1595. 'καθημένους (Casaubon) will not pass,' says Dr. Verrall; rightly, if it is taken alone. But if we continue it with Dindorf's ἄσσημ' ὃ δ', the passage is cured at small expense, thus

ἔθρυπτ' ἄνωθεν, ἀνδρακὰς καθημένους
ἄσσημ' ὃ δ' κ.τ.λ.

Pers. 148 f. Mr. Housman has rightly impeached τὸ πατρωνύμιον γένος ἡμέτερον, but his conjecture γένος ἡμέτερόν τε πατρωνύμιον is somewhat violent. It saves the transposition and in letters is very near to the MS. to read

τὸ πατρωνύμιον Τ' ἔΘΝΟC ἡμέτερον.