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](#)

Wecklein's *Iphigenia in Tauris* of Euripides *Euripidis Fabulae*. Ed. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. *Iphigenia Taurica*. Ed. N. Wecklein. Lipsiae in aed. B. G. Teubneri. MDCCCXCVIII. M. 2.40.

E. B. England

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 06 / July 1899, pp 308 - 309
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0008063X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0008063X

How to cite this article:

E. B. England (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 308-309 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0008063X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

doubt that the names Ἐρεχθεύς and Ἐριχθόνιος belong together. The form Ἐριχθέως, which occurs twice on the Parian stone,¹ has been held to supply the link. Yet it seems very hazardous to build upon an isolated form in an inscription of that kind. It would be quite a different thing if it occurred on a stone concerning a local cult, where primitive forms may be expected to be preserved. It is safer to regard this spelling as an error, not as a survival. This however does not affect the truth of the connexion of Erechtheus with Erichthonios. But the question has been obscured by the unsatisfactory and, as it seems to me, impossible derivation which has been accepted for Ἐριχθόνιος. The old man of the sea, ἄλιος γέρων, could never have been called *ἐρι-άλιος; nor could a heavenly deity be called *ἐρι-ουράνιος. And it would be equally absurd to call a chthonian deity, or an earthborn god, ἐρι-χθόνιος: he must be either χθόνιος or not; there are no degrees. It follows that ἐριχθόνιος is not formed from χθόνιος with the prefix ἐρι-, but is formed from *ἐρίχθων. The clue to the signification is given by the identity of Erechtheus with

Poseidon; for we know the relation of Poseidon to the earth; it is expressed in the epithets σείσυχθων, ἐνοσίχθων. We can hardly doubt that the designation of Poseidon from which ἐριχθόνιος was formed had the same meaning; and we can easily derive it from ἐρεχθ<ο-χθ>ων 'earth-river' (from ἐρέχθω), one of those common lightened forms, like ἄμφ<ιφ>ορεύς, τέτρα<δρα>χμον, κελαιν<ο-ν>εφής, &c.² For the form of the compound, compare such forms as ἀρχέπολις, ἀρχέλαος, Ἀγέλαος, &c.

Ἐρεχθεύς then is a Kurzname for this designation of Poseidon.³ Erichthonios, which should have been Erechthonios, got its *i* from the false and most natural derivation ἐρι + χθόνιος. Moreover, it meant originally not Erechtheus, but 'of Erechtheus'—a patronymic. And if Erichthonios was the son of Poseidon-Erechtheus, we have a new starting-point for the development of the myths. Or is it possible that the Erichthonian was, first of all, the snake of Erechtheus, who would, from another aspect, be Erechtheus himself?

J. B. BURY.

Die attische Autochthonensage, which was reviewed by Miss Harrison above, vol. xii. p. 172 *sqq.* But the conclusion of these scholars does not exclude the possibility of a stage still further back, in which Erechtheus and Erichthonios though closely connected were not quite the same.

¹ *Marmor Parium*, 24 and 27.

² In the case of these syllabic reductions it is the second, not the first, of the two similar syllables that generally falls out; and this is natural, as one can learn by vocal experiment. ἄμφορεύς is ἄμφ<ιφ>ορεύς, not ἄμ<φι>φορεύς.

³ Like Οἰνεύς for Οἰνέμαος, &c.

WECKLEIN'S *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS* OF EURIPIDES.

Euripidis Fabulae. Ed. R. PRINZ et N. WECKLEIN. *Iphigenia Taurica*. Ed. N. WECKLEIN. Lipsiae in aed. B. G. Teubneri. MDCCCXCVIII. M. 2.40.

As a record of the MSS. readings and of the sources of emendations of the MSS., this edition of the Tauric *Iphigeneia* is greatly superior to any of its predecessors, and may with some confidence be pronounced final. It is needless to say that great weight attaches also to the editor's judgment in the constitution of the text.

As in his *Aeschylus*, he puts at the foot of the page, along with the discarded MSS. readings, such variants as are either adopted in the text or have gone near to be so. In an appendix follow such conjectures as

in Wecklein's judgment are worthy of record, though '*minus probabiles*.'

As to the MSS., which for this play were collated by Prinz, the original editor of the series, Wecklein follows Vitelli (for this play, as for the *Electra*, the *Helena*, the *Supplices*, the *Heraclidae* and the *Herc. Fur.*) in denying to P (as to its complementary part G) any independent authority. He says P is a copy of L. His reason is that in ten passages where P has a mistake, the right letter is so written in L as to look like the wrong one which P has. This, however, is not absolutely conclusive, for, either P may have erred (and P is very apt to err) independently of L's indistinctness, or the original from which both copied may have been indistinct too. On the other hand, to

pass over smaller points, at v. 1006 P ends a line τὰ δὲ γυναικὸς ἀσθενή, where L has τὰ δὲ γυναικῶν ἀσθενή, and after v. 1441 L alone has the line (first discovered by Musgrave in a Paris copy of L):

τῶν νῦν παρόντων πημάτων ἀναψυχάς.

Most modern editors follow Markland in pronouncing this line spurious. It is hard to believe that the very fallible scribe of P should have been able to correct L when he offended against Porson's canon, and have been so prematurely sceptical as to rival Markland's critical acumen. It is conceivable that γυναικὸς for γυναικῶν (the ων in an abbreviation) is a lucky accident, but chance cannot account for the omission of the spurious line. The question, however, though difficult, is of no great importance. In no passage in this play at all events would its decision one way or other affect the constitution of the text.

It is perhaps worth notice that in many instances late corrections of L (marked *l* by Wecklein) were evidently made *from* the Aldine edition. This will be clear to anyone who compares (*e.g.*) the readings of *l* on p. 21 of this edition with those of the Aldine text (*cp.* also on vv. 579, 636, 1121, 1138, and 1232).

The following readings adopted by Wecklein are among the novelties of this edition; 300 πέλανον (*p*) for πέλαγος, 355 ἐπήγαγ' (M. Haupt) for ἀπήγαγ', 364 ἔλεξα (Paley) for λέγουσα, 391 οὐδὲν (Nauck) for οὐδένα, 409 ἔκελσαν (?) (Stadtmüller) for ἐπλευσαν, 444 ἐλιχθείσα (*l*, i.e. Ald.) for εἰλιχθείσα, 813 ἤκουσ' ἃ χρυσῆς ἄρνός ἦν νείκη πέρι (Mekler) for ἤκουσα and ἦνικ' ἦν, 815 χρίμπτῃ (Editor) for κάμπτῃ (the last two emendations show that the editor does not err by being too conservative), 875 πελέκεως (Reiske) for πολέως, 943 ἐμμανή (Weil) for ἐνθεν μοι, 957 μεταστενάζω (Editor) for μέγα στενάζω, 1059 συννόμον (Editor) for συγγόνον, 1106 ὃ πολλὰ δακρύνων λιβὰς ἃ...ἔπεσεν (suggested, but not adopted by the Editor) for ὃ πολλὰ...λιβάδες αἰ...ἔπεσον, 1242 μάτερ (?) (Editor) for μάτηρ, 1321 δλείζων (?) (Ed.) for σε μείζων, 1420 ἦ ν' (Ed.) for ἦ. It may also be noticed that Wecklein writes Κλυταιμῆστρα, πανταχῇ, ἱερέα (priestess), ἐξαιρετός and not ἐξαιρετός, 2nd sing. of primary midd. and pass. tenses in ἦ, εἵνεκα for οὐνεκα as a preposition, a *rough breathing* to mark crasis where the second word began with one.

The only misprint I have observed is on p. 7, 9 from bottom, where ὕδραιον *p* should be ὕδραιον *P*.

E. B. ENGLAND.

ZACHER ON THE KNIGHTS OF ARISTOPHANES.

Aristophanesstudien, von KONRAD ZACHER.

Erstes Heft: Anmerkungen zu Aristophanes' Rittern. Leipzig, 1898. Pp. 147, Price 5 Mk.

In 1897 Professor Zacher of Breslau published a second edition of A. von Velsen's text of the *Equites* with full critical apparatus. He has now issued this volume mainly for the purpose of explaining or defending his view of passages where he had altered Velsen's reading. Velsen held that even our best manuscripts give a corrupt text: his judgment, especially in making conjectures of his own, was unfortunately not very good: and Zacher's more conservative treatment will be satisfactory to most scholars. It is noticeable that in several passages he has become more conservative since 1897: for instance he now keeps in 213 ταῦθ' ἅπερ ποιεῖς, where ταῦθ' had been adopted by several editors from Lentin and Cobet. This is a minute point: but Zacher's discussion makes the manu-

script reading seem the more likely one. Again in 423 he very properly withdraws the objections he formerly had to εἰ δ' οὖν ἴδοι τις αὐτῶν: it is very strange that any objection should ever have been raised: if there is a sentence in all Greek literature where the peculiar sense of εἰ δ' οὖν is exactly in point, it is this.

The pleasure of reading such notes as those on lines 9, 66, 174, 292, 503, 872, where Prof. Zacher gives the plain and sensible explanation of the Greek which is ample defence for the old readings, is naturally mixed with some wonder at the perverseness or ignorance which has made such a defence necessary. So on 814 he gives the right explanation of ἐποίησεν τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν μεστὴν εὐρὼν ἐπιχειλῇ: ἐπιχειλῆς means something short of μεστός, as Pollux plainly says and as Paley pointed out on *Agam.* 790. (One is surprised to find ἐπιχειλῆς still rendered *brimful*, and ὑπερχειλῆς *running over*, in Liddell and Scott.)