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](#)

Notes on the Scholia to the Ayes

John Williams White

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 09 / December 2004, pp 436 - 440

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990917, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990917

How to cite this article:

John Williams White (1904). Notes on the Scholia to the Ayes. The Classical Review, 18, pp 436-440 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990917

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA TO THE AVES.

In these notes the accentuation and punctuation of quotations from the Manuscripts and from the *Princeps* have been normalized.

1 τὸ μὲν παρὰ τὸ πείθεσθαι, τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὸ εὔχειν τὴν ἐλπίδα. *Princeps*. For πείθεσθαι read πείθειν τὸν ἐταῖρον, i.e. πειθῆταιρ. πειθῆταιρ was mistaken for πείθεσθαι. (Mehler proposes πείθεσθαι <τῷ ἐταίρῳ>, but the meaning is wrong, Blaydes simply πείθειν.) This gives the form Πειθέταιρος, with meaning that befits the character, and the comment accounts for both parts of the compound.—τὸ μὲν, τὸ δέ are read in VTE. The alternative reading (inferior) would be not τῷ μὲν, τῷ δέ (RM), adopted by the editors, but τοῦ μὲν, τοῦ δέ.

13 οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀρνεοπώλων. *Princeps*. For ὀρνεοπώλων (MSS.) read ὀρνεοπωλίων. ἐκ requires a word signifying the place, not the person. Cf. ὀρνεοπολίων (VI², ὀρνεοπωλείων *Princeps*) and χυτροπωλίων (Γ²E, χυτροπωλείων *Princeps*) in the next Scholium, and Hesychius s.v. ὀρνεα.

31 Ἀκέστορα γὰρ ὁμῶς εἰκὸς λαβεῖν πληγὰς, ἐὰν μὲ συστρέψῃ τὰ πράγματα. *Princeps*. Read

Ἀκέστορ, σέ γ' ἄρ' ὁμῶς εἰκὸς λαβεῖν
πληγὰς, ἐὰν μὴ σὺ στρέψῃ τὰ πράγματα.

The division of the tribrach after the second short syllable in the received text (Dindorf, Dübner) is suspicious. In Aristophanes, at least, there are only three instances of this, where the second word is γάρ (*Ach.* 71 is corrupt), and all three occur in the first foot. For σέ, cf. the reading of V in the next verse, σὺ στρέψῃ. Here στρέψῃ is inadmissible, but it suggests the right form. Bentley proposed συστρέψῃ.

66 καὶ τάχα ἂν εἴη κατὰ τὴν πάλαι σημασίαν τὸ ἔρω ἔρον μετεβλήθη δὲ εἰς τὸ ὦ. *Princeps*. Read καὶ τάχα ἂν εἴη κατὰ τὴν παλαιάν (MSS.) σημασίαν γεγραμμένου (MSS.) τὸ ἔρον (MSS.) ἔρω (ἔρω MSS.), μετεβλήθη (MSS.) δὲ εἰς τὸ ὦ. The form ἔρω is required. For the meaning of παλαιὰ σημασία, as here used, cf. Schol. *Il.* A 104 ὦ: ὅτι Ζηρόδοτος γράφει 'ὄν ποτ' Ἀχιλλεύς'. μήποτε δὲ πεπλάνηται, γεγραμμένου τοῦ ο ὑπ' ἀρχαϊκῆς σημασίας ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ, προσθεὶς τὸ ν. Schol. *Pind. Nem.* i. 34 καταλείπεται δὲ τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ σημασίᾳ τὸ 'ἑσλός'. ἡ γὰρ ἀντίστροφος ἀπῆται τὸ ν (i.e. ἑσλούς). Cf. the Scholium on 935.

68 φασιανὸς δὲ συκοφάντης παρὰ τὸ φαίνειν μετὰ φασιανῶν εὐρισκόμενος. *Princeps*. Read φασιανικός (ΓΜ): συκοφάντης, παρὰ τὸ φαίνειν, <ἡ> 'μετὰ φασιανῶν εὐρισκόμενος.' The definitions obviously are alternatives.

96 εἴξασιν ἐπιτρίψαι σε: δύναται μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔποπος λέγειν, οὗτοι ζητοῦσί σε ἐπιτρίψαι διὰ τὴν ὄψιν. δύναται δὲ ἐφ' ἐαυτῶν λέγειν, εἰκόασιν οὗτοι ἡμᾶς ἐπιτετριφέναι ὥδε ἐλθόντες, εἰ ἐφόβει αὐτοὺς τὸ προσωπεῖον. τὸ δὲ εἴξασιν, ἡ εἰκόασιν ἢ παρεγένοντο. *Princeps*. This is the reading also in V, except that V has δύνανται καὶ ἐφ' and omits the last clause, which is found in ΓE. Read the alternative clause thus: δύναται δὲ καὶ ἐφ' ἐαυτῶν λέγειν 'ἡξασιν οὗτοι ἡμᾶς ἐπιτετριφέναι ὥδε ἐλθόντες,' ἐκφοβεῖ γὰρ (R) αὐτοὺς κτέ.

The alternative definition of εἴξασιν at the end of the Scholium, ἡ εἰκόασιν ἢ παρεγένοντο, points unmistakably to ἡξασιν or possibly ἡκασιν (both these forms occur in late Greek): these fellows (the Epops and his attendant) have come out to do us, to judge from their looks. ὥδε ἐλθόντες balances διὰ τὴν ὄψιν of the preceding interpretation, to judge from your appearance. After ὥδε ἐλθόντες the commentator adds ἐκφοβεῖ γὰρ αὐτοὺς τὸ προσωπεῖον. Note that ἡξασιν is the reading in the text of the play in both M and U, and that the editors of Suidas before Gaisford read ἡξουσιν s.v. ὑγεία. Küster even says: 'apud Aristophanem hodie minime recte legitur εἴξασιν.'

102 πότερον ὄρνις: ἔπαιξε· δέον εἰπεῖν ἀνθρωπος ἢ ταῶς· ὀξύνεται δὲ καὶ περισπᾶται. *Princeps*. V has πότερον ὄρνις ἢ ταῶς: ἔπαιξε· δέον εἰπεῖν ἀνθρωπος ταῶς εἶπεν· ὀξύνεται δὲ καὶ περισπᾶται. Read πότερον ὄρνις ἢ ταῶς: ἔπαιξε· δέον γὰρ (E) εἰπεῖν 'ἀνθρωπος,' 'ταῶς' εἶπε· δασύνεται (Suidas) δὲ καὶ περισπᾶται.

VE have the proper lemma; in Γ and the *Princeps* the lemma conforms to the mistaken interpretation of the text of the play which substituted ἀνθρωπος for ὄρνις, not for ταῶς. The correct interpretation in V appears rewritten in M: ἔδει γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἀνθρωπος, καὶ εἶπε ταῶς. The form of the note in E (εἶπεν ἢ ταῶς) shows how the error arose. Van Leeuwen's interpretation of the text, 'homo an nugator,' assumes the wrong form of the Scholium.—For Suidas's δασύνεται (Cod. AV), cf. *Athen.* ix. 398 A: οἱ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ δασύνουσι καὶ περισπῶσι (on the authority of Seleucus). Cf. also 379 E

(Trypho). Suidas (Cod. V) has the lemma ταῶς.

107 Read the lemma νό; βροτώ. The following interpretation clearly indicates the sharp separation of the two words. Γ has νό, βροτώ; and νό; βροτώ is found in the text of the play in BC and Pal. 167.

109 μὴ ἀλλὰ θατέρου τρόπου πέπονθε. Princeps. This is repeated by Dindorf (Dübner). Read μάλα θατέρου τρόπου(V): πέπονθε τοῦτο (τοῦτο Suidas), the text is corrupt.

129 Read ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν μου πρῶ: νῦν οὐ 'τὴν πρῶταν', ἀλλ' ἴσον τῷ 'ἐν ὥρᾳ πρῶ'. οὕτω γὰρ μονοσυλλάβως λέγουσι τὸ 'πρῶ'. Εὐπολις Βάπταις

ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἔξεις ἄγαθα πολλὰ δὴ πρῶ.

τοῦ 'πρῶ' γὰρ συναίρεσις ἐστὶ τὸ 'πρῶ'. διὸ δέξνεται τὸ δὲ 'πρῶν' περισπᾶται. Καλλιμαχος

οὐ πρῶν μὲν ἡμῖν ὁ τραγῳδὸς ἤγειρε.

None of the MSS. contain the whole Scholium, but its elements are found in VRTEM, in clear order, except the quotation from Callimachus, which is due to Suidas (s.v. πρῶ), but in a connexion that warrants the belief that it was a part of the original Scholium. Cf. Io. Alex. 32, 7 (Herodian, i. 494, 7); Cramer, *An. Ox.* ii. 463, 13; Hesych. πρῶ; Eustath. 1025, 38; Schol. *Ecd.* 291.

The important word is πρῶν (τὸ δὲ πρῶν περισπᾶται). This stands as πρῶ V, πρῶν Γ and Suidas (Cod. AV.), πρῶν EM. M places the iota subscript with care. Cf. Herodas v. 62.—For ἐν ὥρᾳ πρῶ at the beginning of the Scholium, cf. Thuc. vii. 39: τῆς ὥρας πρότερον.

149 Read Δίδυμος δέ φησι Λέπρεον ὀνομάσθαι ἢ διὰ τὸ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν (RΓ² αὐτόν V) λεπρὰν εἶναι (Toup for λέπειν). διαφαίνονται γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς πέτρας γὰρ εἶναι αὐτόθι ποικίλας τῷ χρώματι καὶ διαλεύκους ὁμοίας τοῖς τὰς ὄψεως λεπρῶσι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ὀνομάσθαι ἐκ τοῦ πάθους ἢ διὰ τὸ τοὺς πρῶτως οἰκήσαντας κτέ.

This is the reading of V, except in the two places indicated, confirmed in the main by RΓ²EM, but R omits the whole of the alternative clause, ἢ διὰ τὸ τοὺς πρῶτως κτέ., and this fact has confused the interpretation. Didymus offered two (ἢ... ἢ...) explanations of the name Λέπρεον. The place was so called either because it was situated in a rocky, scaly, 'leprous-looking' country, or because its inhabitants were in fact lepers.

Here διαφαίνονται ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς means occupy a conspicuous position at the foot of the mountains, and (as the mood shows) is parenthetical and probably not a part of the original explanation of Didymus. The fact has been observed by modern travellers (cf. Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, ii. 64) that the ruins of ancient Lepreum lie on a spur of the mountains that overlook the valley of the Strovitz. Cf. ἀπὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου τραχέος ὄρους in the abbreviated form of the Scholium in Photius (s.v. Λέπρεον), which is repeated by Suidas.

167 οὗτος δὲ διαβάλλεται ὡς μετάβλητος (εὐμετάβλητος MSS.) τοὺς τρόπους· πρὸς γὰρ τῇ κιναιδίᾳ καὶ δειλίᾳ καὶ ὀψοφαγίᾳ καὶ νοσησμῷ καὶ πονηρίᾳ, ὀνειδίζουσι τὸν Τελέαν. Princeps. For τὸν Τελέαν at the end V has τὸ Τελέα, Γ² τῷ Τελέα. Read ὀνειδίζουσι τὸδε Τελέα, cast this reproach on Teleas, namely εὐμεταβλήτω εἶναι. The ordinary interpretation of the vulgate, in addition to his unnatural lust, Teleas is reproached also with cowardice, etc., ignores γὰρ and violently separates δειλίᾳ and the following datives from κιναιδίᾳ, with which they are naturally construed in dependence on πρὸς. Küster, observing the difficulty, read καὶ ἐπὶ δειλίᾳ in both Suidas and the Scholium, but this leaves γὰρ unexplained.

189 Read Βοιωτοὺς δίοδον αἰτούμεθα: πολέμοι ἦσαν οἱ Βοιωτοὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις συλλαβόντες Λακεδαιμονίοις κτέ. The MSS. have συμβαλόντες, but συμβάλλω expresses the idea of hostile encounter, not assistance. The confusion of λαβών and βαλόν in the MSS. is frequent.

267 τοροτιξ: οἱ μὲν καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ ἔποπος λέγουσιν εἶναι, οἱ δὲ ὀρνίθος τιнос περιπταμένον. Princeps repeated by Dindorf (Dübner). With Γ read οἶμαι καὶ ταῦτα (πάντα V) τοῦ ἔποπος ἐπικαλουμένου (ποικιλλομένου V), οἱ δὲ κτέ. The reading ποικιλλομένου may be sound; it would refer to the art with which the Epops has embellished his song (227–262) by the new word of call, τοροτιξ. Cf. the use of ποικίλλω in the rhetoricians.

299 Read φησι δὲ Δίδυμος τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα κηρύλος λέγεσθαι. VI² have κηρύλος, but the testimony of the MSS. in such a case is of slight weight. τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα, however, points to this form. Didymus held the view that most birds received their names from their peculiar notes (σχεδὸν γὰρ τὰ πλείστα τῶν ὀρνέων ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς ἔχει τὴν ὀνομασίαν Athen. 392 f), and von Leutsch suggests that Didymus associated the κηρύλος with the cry κῆρυξ. Cf. Dion. de Av. ii. 7:

καὶ τὰς ψῆδς δ' εἰ καταπαύειν μέλλοιεν (i.e. αἱ ἀλκύνες), κῆνξ, κῆνξ συνεχῶς ἐπειποῦσαι σιγῶσιν. Schol. Luc. i. 178 identifies the κῆνξ (the male ἀλκυνών) with the κηρύλος.

Similarly read at the end of the Scholium : τοῦτο οὖν ἔστω σημεῖον τοῦ καὶ τὸν κηρύλον ἴσως παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἡτυμολογηκέναι τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην· ἀντέθηκε γοῦν αὐτῷ κουρέα. (VI² have κηρύλον.) The Scholiast's text of 299, therefore, read ὅστις ἔστί; κηρύλος, and κηρύλος, found in all the best MSS., in the text, is right. The form κειρύλος is a pure fiction. To foist it into Aristophanes's verse is a mistake, since it is not the poet's practice to explain his puns.

303 καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους τὸν πρῶός τις ὦν κεβλήπυρς τις ὀνομάζεται. Princeps repeated by Dindorf (Dübner).

The quotation from Hermippus is a crux. 'Non expedio.' Meineke. 'In Hermippo qu. an legendum κοπρώνης. Nescio; sed credo ὡς τις ὦν κοπρώνης.' Dobree. Küster desiderated better MSS. This help seems to be furnished by V, which has Θεμιστοκλέα (supported by Γ), πρῶν (i.e. πρῶην), and ὅστις. These readings were overlooked by Dindorf and Dübner. τὸν before πρῶν in V disturbs the rhythm, but τ might easily displace τό or γέ or δέ. τὸ πρῶην, *nuper*, seems to be possible. Read :

A. καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα τὸ πρῶην, ὅστις ὦν κεβλήπυρς—

B. τίς ὀνομάζεται ;

The Scholiast, after quoting the fragment of Hermippus, remarks ὥστε ἐνθάδε ἢ (H. Jackson, ἢ the previous Editors) ἐκεῖ ἡμάρτηται τὸ ἐν περὶ τὴν γραφήν, so that in the verse of our poet (ἐνθάδε) as in that of Hermippus (ἐκεῖ) the single word is a scribe's error. The verse of Hermippus, then, admitted the same sort of double interpretation as the verse of Aristophanes, which the Scholiast erroneously proposed to read :

νέρος ἱέραξ φάττα κόκκυξ ἐρυθρόπους κέβλη πυρίς.

In the scurrilous tetrameter of Hermippus Θεμιστοκλέα depends in construction on some verb in the context, and the situation is similar to that in *Aves* 1290 ff., where birds' names are given to men : A. *And lately we brought Themistocles to book, who is indeed a κεβλήπυρς*— B. *What's the name he gets?* The Scholiast, insisting that κεβλήπυρς is two words, erroneously interprets the verse thus : καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα τὸ πρῶην, ὅστις ὦν κέβλη πυρίς τις ὀνομάζεται !

450 ἐν τοῖς πινακίοις : ἐπεὶ ἔθος ἦν τούς

ταξιάρχους διὰ κήρυκος ἀπαγγέλλειν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ στρατιώταις τὰ δεδογμένα. Princeps and the Editors, following the MSS. Read διὰ κηρύγματος, for the fact cannot be established that the proclamation was oral. For κήρυγμα, the order inscribed on the πινακίον, cf. Schol. Pac. 1183 : ἐν οἷς ἐγράφοντο οἱ στρατιωτικοὶ κατάλογοι καὶ τὰ κηρύγματα.

465 λαρινὸν ἔπος : . . . ὡς ἐν Λαρίσση μεγάλων βοῶν γινομένων ἔστι δὲ πόλις Θεσπρωτίας. The MSS. have Λαρίση (V) or Λαρίσση (ΓM). Read Λαρίνη, and cf. Athen. 376 c : ἡ ἀπὸ τίνος κόμης Ἡπειρωτικῆς Λαρίνης. Cf. also Eustath. 1383, 2.

476 τεθνεὺς Κεφαλῆσιν : προσέπειξε τὸν δῆμον, Κεφαλεῖς γὰρ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος φυλῆς. The Scholium, which occurs in ΓM, confirms Κεφαλεῖς as the designation of the member of the deme. Cf. *C.I.A.* I. 398 ; IV. 2, 251b ; and Steph. Byz. s.v. βοὸς κεφαλαί.

484 Δαρείου καὶ Μεγαβύζου : Δαρείος βασιλεὺς ἦν, Μεγαβύζος δὲ στρατηλάτης πορθήσας Μεμφίδα. Princeps. Read Μεμφίτας. In the MSS. we find Μέμφιδας V, Μεμφίδ... Γ, Μέμφιν M. The Princeps alone has Μεμφίδα, but the accusative of the name of the town is Μέμφιν, not Μεμφίδα. The accent of the word as reported on the incomplete form in Γ strongly supports the correction suggested by V. The construction is unobjectionable. One could say in the street even in Aristophanes's time (*Ach.* 164) πορθεῖν τινά τι. Cf. also Diod. xi. 32.

501 προκυλινδεῖσθαι : ἔαρος ἀρχομένου, ἵκτινος φαίνεται εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐφ' ᾧ ἡδόμενοι κυλινδόνται ὡς ἐπὶ γόνυ· παίξας οὖν ὡς βασιλεῖ φησι τὸ κυλινδεῖσθαι ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων. Princeps. In the last part of the Scholium read : ἐφ' ᾧ ἡδόμενοι κυλινδοῦνται ὡς ἐπὶ γόνυ πέσας οὖν βασιλεῖ φησι τὸ 'κυλινδεῖσθαι,' ἴδιον γὰρ βασιλέως τὸ γονυπετεῖσθαι ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων. The last clause, ἴδιον γὰρ βασιλέως κτέ, occurs in VRGM.

πέσας (late aorist), found in the MSS. (παίξας only in the Princeps), seems to have misled Musurus, who joined ὡς ἐπὶ γόνυ with what precedes, omitted ἴδιον γὰρ... γονυπετεῖσθαι, and read as above. This is critical procedure run wild. His reading παίξας has been adopted by subsequent editors. Suidas (s.v. γονυπετεῖσθαι), as it frequently happens, is nearer the mark. Translate, *he uses the word κυλινδεῖσθαι, then, as if he had prostrated himself before the king.* The Scholiast represents Peithetaerus

as conceiving himself in the situation described. If this seems too imaginative, read πέσαντος (Suidas has πίπτοντες). For βασιλεῖ, cf. Herod. v. 86 : ἐς γούνατα γάρ σφι αὐτὰ πεισύν and the usage with γονυπετεῖν.

521 Λάμπων δ' ὄμνυνσι : τῶν εἰκῇ δαιμόνων ὅτι πρῶτοι οἱ Σωκρατικοὶ οὕτως ἐπετήδευσαν ὀμνύναι. Princeps. This is practically the reading in the MSS. and is adopted by Dindorf (Dübner). Read <κατὰ> τῶν εἰκῇ δαιμόνων <οὐ> πρῶτοι οἱ Σωκρατικοὶ ἐπετήδευσαν οὕτως ὀμνύναι.

The introductory clause cannot be left in mid-air without construction. For κατὰ τῶν εἰκῇ δαιμόνων, cf. below κατὰ τῶν θεῶν and κατὰ τοῦ χηρός. οὐ was suggested by Bothe. The negative is required, since the following quotation from Sosicrates is introduced to prove (πολὺ γάρ) that this form of oath began in the time of Rhadamanthus. Furthermore, the phrase τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ Σωκράτους ὅρκοι ('of Socrates also') is a fixed part of the accounts of the 'Oath.' Cf. Suidas, Photius (both s.v. Ῥαδαμάνθυνος ὅρκος); Schol. Plat. *Apol.* 21 ε; Apost. xv. 17; Eustath. 1871, 5.

574 αὐτίκα Νίκη πέταται : νεωτερικὸν το τὴν Νίκην καὶ τὸν Ἑρωτα ἐπετεώσθαι. Ἀρχένινος γάρ φησι, καὶ τὸν Βουπάλον καὶ Ἀθήνιδος πατέρα, οἱ δὲ, Ἀγλαοφάντα τὸν Θάσιον ζωγράφον, πτηνὴν ἐργάσασθαι τὴν Νίκην. Princeps. In the second sentence the MSS. have ἄρχεννος γάρ φησι καὶ τὸν βουπάλον καὶ ἀθήνιδος πατέρα, and Dindorf (Dübner) read Ἀρχένινος γάρ φησι, τὸν Βουπάλον καὶ Ἀθήνιδος πατέρα.

Probably we should read Ἀρχερμον γάρ φασί τινες τὸν Βουπάλον καὶ Ἀθήνιδος πατέρα. No Ἀρχεννος is known, and the word would naturally seem to be a corruption of the name of the father of Bupalus and Athenis. This was Ἀρχερμος. Cf. Plin. *N.H.* xxxvi. 11 (Cod. Bamberg.); Tzetzes in Cramer, *An. Ox.* iii. 366, 4. For the name, cf. also Löwy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 1; *C.I.A.* IV. 1, 350 a and 373 (p. 181). With the corruption of the name the case shifted and the common interchange of φασί and φησί occurred. καί has no meaning in the vulgate; τινές, although a mere conjecture, furnishes a proper antithesis to the following οἱ δέ.

639 οὐδὲ μελλονικιᾶν : ὅτι βραδὺς ἦν περὶ τὰς ἐξόδους καὶ ὡς οἱ διαβάλλοντες οὐχὶ προνοητικὸς ἦν, ἀλλ' ἀμελητής· τινὲς δὲ φασὶ τὸ προνοητικὸν καὶ μὴ προπετές τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν εἶναι. VR.

For ἀλλ' ἀμελητής, which is repeated by Dindorf (Dübner), read, with E and Hesychius (s.v. μελλονικιᾶν), ἀλλὰ μελητής. Γ

has ἀλλὰ μελητής, and this is read also in the Princeps and Suidas (Med.). The very word μελλονικιᾶν implies ἀλλὰ μελητής.—The following τὸ προνοητικὸν καὶ μὴ προπετές must mean *in respect of his qualities of foresight and caution*, but this 'causal' accusative is doubtful. Musurus inserted διὰ in the Princeps. The rewritten form of the note in M, τινὲς δὲ φασὶ τῷ προνοητικὸν εἶναι τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν, suggests τῷ προνοητικὸν καὶ μὴ προπετῇ εἶναι τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν εἶναι (εἶναι lost before εἶναι), or possibly τῷ προνοητικῷ καὶ μὴ προπετεῖ τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν εἶναι.

648 Read ἀτὰρ τὸ δεῖνα : πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοῦτό φασι. In R (which has φησι) the relation of the note to the text is indicated by a signum before 648; in E (which omits τοῦτό φασι) the note is an interlinear above δεῖνα.

The tradition is preserved in some of the MSS. that the words ἀτὰρ τὸ δεῖνα (as ἴωμεν in the preceding verse) were spoken by Peithetaerus and Euelpides in concert. To 648 Γ prefixes the direction ἀνθρώπῳ ἢ ἔποψ and U οἱ δύο.

701 Read ξυμμιγνυμένων δ' ἑτέρων : τὰς συνουσίας μετέδωκεν. The note (omitted by VTM and the Princeps) is an interlinear over ξυμμιγνυμένων in Γ²E. For the accusative, cf. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 5 : εἰ μὴ μεταδοῖεν αὐτοῖς πυρούς.

767 τοῦ πατρὸς νεόττιον : ὡς καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, τοιοῦτου ὄντος, ἀποδρᾶναι ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς πανουργίας. Princeps. This is the reading of the Scholium also in the MSS. Read τοῦ πατρὸς νεόττιον : ὡς καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ τοιοῦτου ὄντος, <ἐκπερδικίσαι δὲ> ἀποδρᾶναι, ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ πέρδικος πανουργίας. In support of the two corrections, cf. Suidas (s.v. ἐκπερδικίσαι) : τὸ διαδρᾶναι ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν περδίκων, πανούργων ὄντων. And Zonaras (s.v. ἐκπερδικίσαι) : διαδρᾶναι πανούργως ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν περδίκων, πανούργων γὰρ τὸ ζῶον καὶ διαδιδράσκει τοὺς θηρευτάς. Cf. also Hesych. s.v. ἐκπερδικίσαι; Apost. vi. 96 = Diog. ii. 57 (where ἀποδρᾶναι occurs).

778 ἄλλως (i.e. κύματά τ' ἔσβεσε) : ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσύχασεν ἢ θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα κατακληλουμένη. The Scholium occurs only in Γ. Dindorf (Dübner) follow Victorius in reading κατακληλουμένη for κατακληλουμένη, but cf. Hesych. (s.v. κατακληλούμενοι) : ἐξοιστρούμενοι ('oestro liberati' Hemsterhuys), καταθελγόμενοι, and Phot. (s.v. κατακληλοῦσαν) : θέλγουσιν, πραινδουσιν.

It is significant that Victorius has this note, although it occurs only in Γ of existing MSS.

793 Read εἴ τε μοιχεύων : ἀντὶ τοῦ 'μοιχὸς ὅστις ὦν ὑμῶν.' The scholium appears in this form in VRTE, except that VR read ἄν for ὦν. Dindorf (Dübner) read ἐστὶν for ὦν, but erroneously, since μοιχὸς ὅστις ὦν ὑμῶν is a perfect paraphrase of εἴ μοιχεύων τις ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ὅστις of the text of the play.

800 Read μεγάλη πράττει κἀστὶ νυνί : παραγραφέντα ἐκ Μυρμιδόνων Αἰσχύλου. The MSS. have παρὰ τὰ γραφέντα, except Γ which reads παραγραφέντα.

807 ταυτὶ μὲν ἡκασμέθα : διεσκέμμεθα. Princeps. Read ἡκασμεσθα : διεσκώμμεθα. Musurus is responsible for διεσκέμμεθα, which occurs in none of the MSS. that have the note (VEM). For the form διεσκώμμεθα, cf. Suid. (s.v. ἀνεικάσασθε) : ἀνασκώψατε (= Hesych. s.v. ἀνεικάσασθε, Bekker, *An. Graec.*, 596, 24), and Hesych. (s.v. εἰκάζειν) : σκώπτειν, εὐικάζειν ('fort. γελοιάζειν' Meineke), τὸ λέγειν 'ὅμοιος εἶ τῷδε.'

822 ἄλλως (i.e. ἵνα καὶ τὰ Θεαγένους) λέγεται ὅτι μεγαλέμπορος τις ἐβούλετο εἶναι περαίτης ἀλαζῶν ψευδόπλουτος, ἐκαλείτο δὲ

'καπνὸς' ὅτι πολλὰ ὑπισχνόμενος οὐδὲν ἐτέλει. Εὐπολις ἐν Δήμοις.

The Scholium is found in this form in VT²E, except that V omits ἐν before Δήμοις. It does not occur in RGM. περαίτης has given serious offence, and various substitutes have been proposed : περιλαλητής Casaubon ; καίπερ αἵτης (?) Toup ; ἐπαίτης or προσαίτης Meineke ; πράκτης Kock ; πένης ὦν or καίπερ πένης ὦν Blaydes ; πράτης H. Jackson.

The Scholium furnishes another interesting case of the possible recovery of verses from a play now lost. The order of words in the Scholium is not possible in *prose*, and indicates that the writer unconsciously followed the order of words in Eupolis's verses. Adopting Mr. Jackson's substitute for περαίτης, the verses in the *Demi* may have run :

μεγαλέμπορος τις εἶναι βούλεται
πράτης ἀλαζῶν ψευδόπλουτος, Θεογένης,
καπνὸς δὲ καλεῖται, πολλὰ γὰρ ὑπισχνόμενος
οὐδὲν τελεῖ.

JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE.

THE DATE OF THE DIONYSALEXANDER.

PAP. OXYR. 663.

I AM not sure that the argument does not fix the date for this play even more precisely than its beneficent discoverers think. This is certainly the case if the corruption noted by them in l. 8 is, as I would suggest, nothing more than the writing of Π for Π' so that ΠΥΩΝΠΟΙ¹ stands for περὶ ὑῶν

ποιήσεως. When the insignificant omission is made good, a sense emerges which implies that when the Dionysalexander was produced the project for the legitimizing of the younger Pericles was either debating or accomplished. — 'Turning to the audience they talk with one another on the question how men may get themselves sons.'

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

THE OPENING SENTENCE OF THE VERRINES.

Cic. *Div. in Caec.* i. § 1. Si quis vestrum, iudices, aut eorum qui adsunt, forte *miratur* me ad accusandum descendere una et id quod facio probabit, et putabit.

Instead of the vulgate *miratur*, all the MSS. have *mirantur*, until corrected in the fifteenth century. This is true of Par. 7776 (eleventh century) : it is true also of Par.

7823, which, though late, can be shown to have faithfully preserved the tradition which the now mutilated codex of Claudius Puteanus (Par. 7775, thirteenth century) derived from what must have been the archetype also of the famous ninth century MS., Regius 7774 A.

The explanation is that *mirantur* must have been a copyist's error for *mirabitur*.