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 Euripides

W. Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 01 / February 1901, pp 15 - 25

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029358, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029358

How to cite this article:

W. Headlam (1901). Notes on Euripides. The Classical Review, 15, pp 15-25 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029358

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

προς this would become unmeaning and be omitted. It may be observed that prepositions are exposed to various dangers in the MSS. of Pindar as may be seen from Schröder, p. 10. An instance of a prep. omitted in the archetype (so Schröder) and in Codex A is at Ol. 8, 40 *δρουνσε* A for

ἀνδρουνσε the true reading: cf. also [ἐκ] *διδάσκησεν* Pyth. 4, 217 Ambrr. [*προσ*] *βάλλοντα* Pyth. 4, 271 Ambrr. while at Pyth. 9, 62 the missing syllable has been similarly supplied, <*προς*> *θηκάμεναι* (others *καθήκ.*).

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

NOTES ON EURIPIDES.

THE numeration is that of Kirchhoff's text, which has been the basis of my work. My plan has been the same which I follow in all authors,—to read a plain text first, and then, after making what I can of it myself, to turn and see what others think. Hitherto I have been content to compare Kirchhoff's notes and Paley and Nauck's text; and their omissions have sometimes led me to publish as my own conjectures made already—even by Musgrave and Hermann long ago. But that has done no harm, since Dr. Wecklein has undertaken, and nearly completed, for Euripides what he has performed for Aeschylus, the immense task of collecting all conjectures and assigning them to their original inventors; in which he may be relied upon for the most scrupulous accuracy. Considered even from this point of view alone—for the body of suggestion it contains—his work is of incalculable help to students; I cannot sufficiently express my grateful sense of the service he has done for both these authors. His text gives also more perfect collations of the MSS., which I have consulted, and the next time I read Euripides it will be with Dr. Wecklein's text; but at present I have only had leisure to consult it for these new contributions. Many of mine, as usual, I have found anticipated; but a few of these, not being generally accepted, are mentioned here with the name of their originator for the sake of the consideration they may claim from coincident opinion.

Except to critics, it might seem ungrateful to welcome a new text by proposing alterations in it, but critics know how the effect of any marked advance is to quicken and help them in removing blemishes that still remain. The few small suggestions on Sophocles dispersed among these notes are chiefly the result of studying the text published by Sir Richard Jebb in 1897 on the completion of his great edition. It leaves but scanty grains for others to glean after;

there is nothing among mine so good as Prof. Tyrrell's *ἀλλ' εἰ θελόντων γ'* in *O.C.* 590 or his *ἐπὶων* in 145 f.

ALCESTIS (with Wecklein 1899).

The earlier lyrics in this play have been grievously interpolated. So far as metre goes, this is my view of the original:

218 *ὦ Ζεῦ πᾶ τις ἂν πόρος κακῶν*
γένοιτο καὶ λυσις τύχας

220
ἔξεισι τις; ἢ τέμω τρίχα καὶ
μέλανα στολμόν πέπλων

223 *ἀμφιβαλώμεθ' ἥδη;*

= 232 *παπαὶ ὦ παῖ Φέρητος οἶοι;*

234
ἄρ' ἀξία καὶ σφαγῆς τάδε καὶ
πλέον ἢ βρόχῳ δέρην
οὐρανίῳ πελάσσαι;

In 218 I write *πᾶ τις ἂν* or *πᾶ τίς ἂν* . . . ejecting *πῶς* which is an explanation of *πᾶ*¹ (schol. *τίς ἂν πόρος τῶν κακῶν ἡμῖν γένοιτο ἢ πῶς ἢ ποῦ*).—In 220 = 234 it seems to me that the metre was either *ἀ πάρα κοιράνοισιν* as 223, 225, 265 (and this accounts best for the MS. *ἀ πάρεστι κοιράνοισι*), or *ἀ κοιράνοισι πάρεστι* as 263. But what Musgrave conjectured, *ἀ πάρεστιν κοιράνοισι* = *ξας δάμαρτος σᾶς στερεῖς* is quite foreign to this metre—or I would invite those who approve it to produce a parallel.

228 *πόριζε δὴ πόριζε· καὶ πάρος γὰρ*
τοῦδ' ἐφεύρες, καὶ νῦν
λυτήριος ἐκ θανάτου γενοῦ

= 242 *βόασον ὦ στέναξον ὦ Φεραία*
χθὼν τὰν ἀρίσταν
γυναῖκα μαραινομένην νόσῳ

¹ So in *Philoct.* 834 where L gives *ποῖ δε βάση· πῶς δέ μοι τὰνρεῦθεν*...the original I suppose was *πᾶ δέ...βάση; Hec.* 1059 *πᾶ βῶ;*

I do not know how to restore it, but the metre of 243 should be $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$ as 412, 455, 587, 589, frequently in *Andr.* 118 sqq., 764, and *O.C.* 1690 which ought to be divided thus:

οὐ κάτοιδα· κατά με φόνιος Ἀΐδας ἔλοι
πατρὶ
ξυνθανεῖν γεραῖω
τάλαιναν, ὡς ἔμοιγ' ὁ μέλλων βίος οὐ
βιωτός.

The schol. explains τοῦδ' ἐφέυρες by understanding μηχανήν (from 227 ἐξευρε μηχανάν τιν' Ἀδμήτω κακῶν): καὶ πρώην γὰρ τούτου τοῦ θανάτου εὗρες μηχανήν: but I do not suppose anyone will think that likely Greek: if Euripides had meant that, he would surely have written τοῦτ', which is given by cod. c; yet if the truth were τοῦτ', why should it have been changed to such a difficult genitive as τοῦδ'? Again, if you make the line metrical by reading ἐφέυρε the verb is not appropriate to Admetus. In 710 his father taunts him σοφῶς δ' ἐφέυρες ὥστε μὴ θανεῖν ποτε 'you have found out, discovered, invented, a method of escaping death for ever'; but what the Chorus should say here is 'for in time past also he obtained this boon, enjoyed this favour,'—and so I believe they do say:

καὶ πόρος γὰρ
τοῦδ' ἐπ' ἦν ὁρᾶ, καὶ νῦν
λυτήριος ἐκ θανάτου γενοῦ

which accounts at once for τοῦδε. The form of appeal 'as before, so now' is exactly the same in *O.T.* 52 ὄρνιθι γὰρ καὶ τὴν τότε αἰσίῳ τύχην παρέσχες ἡμῖν, καὶ τανὺν ἴσος γενοῦ: and 694 ὅς τ' ἐμὴν γὰρ φίλαν ἐν πόνοισιν σαλεύουσιν κατ' ὀρθὸν οὐρίσας, τανὺν τ' εὐπομπὸς ἂν γένοιτο. The usual form is 'if ever before, so now,' that is 'no occasion was ever more urgent than the present'; e.g. *Dem.* 882. 17 δέομαι δ' ὑμῶν πάντων, εἴπερ ἄλλω τινὶ πώποτε πράγματι τὸν νοῦν προσέσχετε, καὶ τούτῳ προσέχειν: *Isaeus* viii. 5 p. 69. 6 εἴ τι νιν οὖν καὶ ἄλλῃ πώποτε δίκη προσέσχετε τὸν νοῦν, δέομαι ὑμῶν καὶ ταύτῃ προσέχειν ὁμοίως: for examples see Blomfield on *Agam.* 503 (525 W.) εἴ που² πάλαι, φαιδροῖσι τοιοῖδ' ὀμμασιν δέξασθε 'with bright eyes now,' *Blaydes* on *Ar. Nub.* 356, *Thesm.* 1157, *Leaf* on *Hom. Ω* 704, *Stat. Achill.* i. 509 *si quando, avidissimus hauri*. Whence at last may be emended *Agam.* 146

¹ Ithyphallic, of which the best example is the poem quoted by *Ath.* 253 c, *Bergk PLG* III p. 674

² Auratus for ἦπου: the εἴ is certainly right, but one would expect rather εἴ ποω, if not εἴπερ.

τόσον περ εὐφρων <δέ>, Καλά, . . .
θηρῶν ὀβρικάλοις, εἴ περ τινά,
τοῦ τῶν αἰνεί³ ξύμβολα κρᾶναι,
δεξιὰ μὲν κατάμομφα δέ, στρουθῶν

'consent to ratify, if ever any, the portents of these fowls.' That is merely to write ΟΒΡΙΚΑΛΟΙCΙΠΕΡΤΙΝΑ for ΟΒΡΙΚΑΛΟΙCΙΤΕΡΠΝΑ, obtaining the usual formula of invocation, justifying (as in no other way it can be justified) the emphatic place of τούτων, and abolishing the superfluous and inappropriate τερπνὰ which had been already bracketed by Paley.

In *Alc.* 229 you could equalise the metre by reading σοῦ πῆνρε, but I do not think it can have been so; σοῦ γ' ἐπῆνρε would be good.—*Hesych.* gives ἐπῆνρον: ἐπέτυχον. παρὰ τὸ ἐπαυρεῖν: *Pind. P.* iii. 36 has πολλοὶ ἐπαῦρον: and there is the same corruption in *Ar. Eth.* p. 1163^a 20 ὅσον ἐπῆνρατο, with variants ἀπῆνρατο and ἐφεύρετο.—In *Hel.* 1354 ὦν οὐ θέμις οὐθ' ὅσια ἐπύρωςας ἐν θαλάμοις, I thought, like Hartung, that ἐπῆνρω might be hidden, or some form of this verb; it would account for ὦν: ὦν μὴ θέμις μήθ' (or μῆδ') ὅσια | πῆνρω would mend the metre. Euripides has τοῦδ' ἐπαυρέσθαι *I.T.* 517, ἥς ἐπῆνρόμην *Hel.* 470.

The metre of 262 = 270 is $\cup \cup \cup$ followed by $\cup \cup \cup$ (a most common consecution, e.g. *I.A.* 189, 1045, *Rhes.* 244, *Ion* 1242, *Supp.* 1007)

νεκῶν δὲ πορθμεὺς
ἔχων χεῖρ' ἐπὶ κόντῳ μ' | ἤδη καλεῖ 'τί
μέλλεις';

therefore Matthiae was right in ejecting Χάρων: but it pains me to see that these lines are commonly taken for *iambic*:

ἔχων χέρ' ἐπὶ κόντῳ Χάρων μ' ἤδη καλεῖ 'τί
μέλλεις'

= ὑπ' ὀφρῶσι κυναυγῆς βλέπων

The long syllables I have marked should be enough to show that cannot be; for Lyric never uses such a rhythm.

1129 *HP.* οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τήνδ' ὄρε³ δάμαρ-
τα σὴν.

ΑΔ. ὅρα γε μὴ τι φάσμα νερτέρων τόδ'
εἰσὼρῶ

with γρ. τόδ' ἦ superscribed. But that is not enough to make the line correct, because ὅρα γε would mean 'yes, see', whereas what he means is 'yet see', ὅρα γε μὴν μὴ φάσμα νερτέρων τόδ' ἦ (or with *Herwerden* τόδε), as

³ Gilbert for αἰρεῖ, which Dr. Verrall takes to be the second person passive 'thou art prayed'.

Soph. *O.C.* 587 ὄρα γε μὴν. *El.* 1243 ὄρα γε μὲν δὴ When μὴν had been omitted before μῆ, the metre was filled out with τι.

ANDROMACHE (with Wecklein 1900)

137 δμῶις ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίας πόλεῦς
 ξὺν θ' οὐ φίλαν τιν' εἰσορᾶς
 = 143 ἡσυχίαν ἄγομεν τὸ δὲ σὺν
 οἴκῳ φέρουσα τυγχάνω

Bothe for πόλεως. The tribrach is a link between two rhythmical phrases.

279 ἔριδι στυγερά κεκορυθμένον εὐμορφίας
 = 288 παραβαλλόμεναι Κύπρις εἶλε λόγους
 δολίοις

Though Wecklein places my suggestion as well as Musgrave's in his margin, I incline to think now that Musgrave was right in taking δολίοις to be the faulty word. For the rhythm with εὐμορφίας and αἰόλοις compare *Ran.* 675=706.

466 μίαν μοι στεργέτω πόσις γάμοις
 ἀκινώνητον ἀνδρὸς εὐνάν
 = 471 τεκτόνουν θ' ὕμνοι ἐργάταιν δυοῖν
 ἔριν Μοῦσαι φιλοῦσι κραίνειν

There is no doubt about the metre of the strophe, 466 like 121=130, 294=302, *Supp.* 601, 604, *H.F.* 408, and the consecution of the pair like 281—2=291—1; but in 471 L has τεκτόνων θ' ὕμνοι ἐργάταιν with a correction ὕμνοι ἐργάται, P τεκτόνουν θ' ὕμνοι (with final s erased) ἐργάται. First, τεκτόνουν is not open to suspicion; see Blaydes on τέκτονες εὐπαλάμων ὕμνων in *Ar. Eq.* 530; and the usual explanation of it would have been τεχνιτῶν or ποιητῶν, as e.g. on *Eq.* 530 τέκτονες πάντες οἱ τεχνίται. Therefore it is unlikely that ἐργάταιν should be ejected. The MSS. readings have the air to me of being corruptions of an unfamiliar compound, and there are two ways by which you can regain metre: δυοῖν θ' ὕμνοιο τεκτονεργάταιν, or δυοῖν ὕμνεργάταιν τε τεκτόνουν, of which the second seems the better; it is more favoured by the MS., and the compound is more in character with others formed of ἐργάτης that I have noted—they are few at present: μυλεργάτας ἀνὴρ *A.P.* vii. 394 σιδαρον αὐλακεργάταν of a plough-share *A.P.* ix. 742, in Doricising epigrams; ναρδεργάτης, κακεργάτης.¹ It would seem that with this termination they formed their words in -εργ- rather than in -οεργ- or -ουργ-: cf. Lobeck *Path.* i. 303, *Phryn.* 675.—It is worth noting the various

distortions experienced by the compound καρικευργός as Bergk writes it in Anacreon *fr.* 91 (iii. p. 279) διὰ δηῖτε Καρικευργός ὀχάνοιο χεῖρα τιθέμεναι:—this is what various MSS. make of it: by one process καρικοεργός, καριοεργός, καριεργός: by another καρικοεργός, καρικά ὁ ἔργεος, καρικά δεγός, καρικά εὐεργός, καρικὸν εὐεργός, καρικοῦ εὐεργός.

It was as natural,—far more, for Greek poetry to form compounds at its will than in English to connect them with a hyphen; Shakespeare says 'thought-executing', Aeschylus τελεσιφρων: and it cannot be too often repeated that this is the way in which the baffled scribes habitually deal with them. Few, probably, realise how many of those which they are most familiar with are due to modern restoration, as ἰσάργυρον, καρδιόδηκτον, διοσδότῳ γάνει, δορυκανεῖ μόρφ, δρακονθόμιλον, ἀνελληνόστολον, θετοσκυθρωπῶν, τοσουτάριθμον, οὐρανοστεγῇ, ἀπρικτόπληκτα. They were not of course used by Euripides so freely or so boldly as by Aeschylus in whose style they were so notorious a feature; but they frequently occur, and when they do, they are mostly mangled in the MSS., as in *Andr.* 463 ἀμφὶ μάτερας v.l. for ἀμφιμάτορας, 1016 δορὶ μήστορι, ἔρημος πόλις *Tro.* 605 for ἐρημόπολις, ἄπειροι δρόσον for ἀπειρόδροσοι *El.* 732, δώδεκα στόλοι ναῶν for δωδεκάστολοι ναῆς *I.A.* 272, ἀμφ' ἑλίκτον *H.F.* 399, θηρῶν λάχνα γυῖων for λαχνογυῖων *Hel.* 379. It would be easy to fill pages with the like, as in *Dion. Hal. de comp. verb.* 17 for πολεμοκέλαδε the variants πολέμοιο κέλαδε and πολεμοικέλαδε: but I will only invite consideration for one or two new-comers: *Plut. Mor.* 950 E says οὐ γὰρ εἰς τοῦναντίον ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐναντίου φθείρεται τῶν ἀπολλυμένων ἕκαστον, ὥσπερ τὸ πῦρ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος εἰς τὸν ἀέρα. τὸ γὰρ ὕδωρ ὁ μὲν Αἰσχύλος, εἰ καὶ τραγικῶς, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς εἶπε 'παυὲ ὕβριν δίκην πυρός'. The old reading was παῦ ὕδωρ which has misled Nauck (*fr.* 360) and Mr Sidgwick, but Bernardakis gives it as παυὲ ὕβριν. What then was the term 'true, if tragic,' that Aeschylus applied to water? Plainly what Bernardakis has now restored, παύσῃ ὕβριν δίκην πυρός, an adjective like φίλῃςβρις (which he quotes) and μίσῃςβρις 'the justice that stops the insolence of fire': nothing could be more Aeschylean.—I am convinced that πολλὰ δ' ἔγγραμμα παιδότηρωτα πάθεα προσμένει τοκεῦσιν μεταῦθις ἐν χρόνῳ in *Eum.* 499 should be ἐγμωπαιδότηρωτα πάθεα 'from wounds dealt by their own ἔγγραμοι παῖδες': for ἔγγραμμα πάθεα could only mean 'real', 'genuine', implying that the πάθος of Clytemnestra had not been a real one; as in *Opp. Hal.* v. 305 when he says τότε δὴ

¹ Add μαρμαεργατεῖν, πρωτεργάτης.

μιν ἐτήτυμος ὄρσεν ὄλεθρος.—στύγος στρατῶ
in *Ag.* 552 I think should simply be στεγγο-
στράτῳ, and in *Aesch. fr.* 206

ἐξευλαβοῦ δὲ μή σε προσβάλῃ στόμα
πέμφιξ· πικρὰ γὰρ ΚΟΥ ΔΙΑ ΖΩΗC 'ΑΤ-
ΜΟΙ

nothing could be more appropriate to the
sense and closer to the MS. than πικρὰ γὰρ,
κοῦλιαζόεις ἀτμοί 'and deadly-scorching
its hot breaths'—parching like the Sun or
Sirius, οὐλιος ἀστὴρ *Hom.* Δ 62, κεφαλὴν καὶ
γούνατα Σείριος ἄξει, αἰαλέος δέ τε χρῶς ὑπο
καύματος *Hes. Op.* 585, εἰσόκεν ἄζης Ἡέλιος
παῦσταιτο καὶ οὐλομένον κυνὸς ἀστὴρ *Opp. Cyn.*
iii. 324: cf. *Eum.* 138 ἀτμῶ κατισχναίνουσα,
νηδύος πυρί, and for the crasis, κοῦλομένης
ἀλόχου in the epigram *Bergk* ii. p. 344; for
the plural form, κίχλας ὑψιπετῆεις in *Matro's*
Epic parody (*Ath.* 136 c), *Nicand. Alex.* 266
ἀμπελόεις ἔλικας, 293 πόσιες φαρμακόεις, *fr.*
74. 26 κάλυκες ἀργῆεις p. 101 *Schneider*.

TROADES

- 513 ἀμφί μοι Ἴλιον ὦ
Μοῦσα καινῶν ὕμνων
515 ἐν δακρύοις αἰδεῖν
ὠδᾶν ἐπικηδεῖον

515 = 535 πεύκα ἐν οὐρείᾳ, and there can be
no doubt that is the right metre (cf. *Med.*
833 sqq., *Philoct.* 827 sqq.) The MS. αἰεσον
ἐν δακρύοις must be a gloss,—I suppose upon
αἰδεῖν, as *Hom. hymn.* xxxi. Ἥλιον ὕμνεῖν
αἶτε. In explaining such infinitives, they
often use the *aorist* imperative though the
infinitive is in the present tense.

597 This in Mr. Coleridge's version is the
passage immediately preceding: ANDROM.
'Come my husband come to me! HECUBA.
Ah hapless wife, thou callest on my son
who lieth in the tomb. ANDR. Thy wife's
defender, come! HEC. Do thou, who erst
didst make the Achaeans grieve, eldest of
the sons I bare to Priam in the days gone
by, take me to thy rest in Hades halls!—
Then, as I understand it, Andromache says

οἶδε πόθοι μεγάλοι· σχετλιασὰ δὲ πάσχομεν
ἄλγῃ
οἰχομένας πόλεως, ἐπὶ δ' ἄλγεσιν ἄλγεα κέται

sorrow upon sorrow, the public ruin besides
the private losses, πόλει μὲν ἔλκος ἐν τῷ
δήμιον τυχεῖν, πολλοὺς δὲ πολλῶν ἐξαγισθέντας
δόμων ἀνδρας διπλῇ μαστίγι τὴν Ἄρης φιλεῖ,
δίλογχον ἄτην φοινίαν ξυνωρίδα *Ag.* 645.
That surely is her meaning; therefore you

want δὲ to contrast these other ἄλγῃ with
οἶδε πόθοι. The MS. has σχέτλια τάδε, and
my first notion was σχέτλιοι· τὰ δὲ πάσχομεν
ἄλγῃ, but σχετλιασὰ δὲ (a synonym of
ἀγανακτητά) seems to me altogether better—
in rhythm for instance, and because σχέτλια
παθεῖν is such a common phrase in Euripides
and elsewhere. The alteration is of course
the smallest possible, and reminds me of
Weeklein's excellent correction of *Pers.*
1019 τί δ' οὐκ ὄλωλεν, μέγ' ἄλαστε, Περσᾶν;
for μεγάλατε Περσᾶν.

- 1090 εἴθ' ἀκάτου Μενέλα
μέσον πέλαγος ἰούσας
δίπαλτον ἱερὸν ἀνὰ μέσον πλάταν πέσοι
Αἰγαίου κεραυνοφαῆς πῦρ
Ἰλιόθεν ὅτε με πολύδακρυν
Ἑλλάδι λάτρευμα γᾶθεν ἐξορίζει.

πλάταν *Seidler* corrected to πλατᾶν: but
how are you to explain Αἰγαίου? Scholiasts
can explain anything, and the scholiast
here has no hesitation in explaining, πο-
ρευομένης τῆς νεῦς τοῦ Μενελάου κατὰ τὸ μέσον
πέλαγος τοῦ Αἰγαίου. But no one is likely
to feel as easy as the scholiast about it, and
attempts have been made already to emend
it, Αἰγαίων 'the Aegean lightning' *Paley*,
ἀγρόν *Hermann*. Now, studying these
lyrics from the metrical side, I came to the
conclusion, before I had examined the
sentence and before I knew of other views,
that Αἰγαίου is metrically impossible; and
that the scansion required is — — —, the true
division of the verses being this:

εἴθ' ἀκάτου Μενέλα μέσον
πέλαγος ἰούσας δίπαλτον
ἱερὸν ἀνὰ μέσον πλατᾶν

- 1092 πέσοι — — —
κεραυνοφαῆς πῦρ,
Ἰλιόθεν ὅ σ τ ε με πολύδακρυν

In the strophe read φθίμενος with *Musurus*,
but retain τείχεα in 1078. The verse
corresponding to 1092 is σκάφος αἴσσον.
Well, assuming this to be correct, what is
αἰγαίου a mistake for? I imagine, for
ἀγαῖον—unless Διός could be understood
with Ἀγαῖον. It is a poetical adjective¹
recorded in several lexicons, as *Hesych.*
ἀγαῖον: ἐπίφθονον. *Bekk. An.* 334. adds οἱ
δέ, θαυμαστόν. οἱ δέ, φθονερόν. *Suid.* ἀγαί-
μαι: φθονοῦμαι (meaning φθονῶ). καὶ ἀγαῖος
ὁ ἐπίφθονος. And *jealous* was probably its
only meaning; θαυμαστόν is ἀγαστόν, ἀξιά-
γαστον: cf. *Eust.* 734. 63 ἔστι δὲ ἀγαίεσθαι
μὲν φθόνον, ἀγάσασθαι δὲ ἐκπλήξεως.—It is

¹ See the *Thesaurus*. *Liddell* and *Scott* requires
correction.

possible there may be other places where this adjective should be restored, just as the substantive, which we know to have been used by Aeschylus in the *Θρήσσαι*, has been restored by Hermann in *Ag.* 136 *οἷον μή τις ἄγα θεόθεν*...*Ag.* 654 occurs as a possible place, *χειμῶν' ἀγαίων οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεῶν*—If *ὅτε* or *εὔτε* were right in 1094, we should have to read *ἐξορίζοι*. With Nauck's *ὅς* we could read *πολυδάκρυον* as in *H.F.* 425.

1280 *πάτερ ἀνάξια Δαρδάνον*
γονᾶς τάδ' οἷα πάσχομεν ἰδέορκας ;

ejecting *tās* or *tῆς* or *τῆσδε* before *Δαρδάνον*

1285 *λέλαμπεν Ἴλιος <τὰ> Περ-*
γάμων τε πυρὶ καταίθεται τέραμνα

1296 *τιθείσα μέλεα καὶ*
χέρεσσι γαῖαν...

1305 *ἄταφος <ἄταφος> ἄφιλος <ἄφιλος>*
= 1322 *μόν ἴχνος ἐπὶ τάλαναν ἱτ' ἴτε.*

SUPPLICES (with Wecklein 1898)

οἱ δ' οὐκ ἔχοντες καὶ σπανίζοντες βίου
δεινοί, νέμοντες τῷ φθόνῳ πλέον μέρος,
εἰς τοὺς ἔχοντας κέντρ' ἀφίενα κακά ;

that is, *δεινοί* *εἰσιν ἀφίενα* 'are very prone, apt, much given to', as *e.g.* *Mimnermus* (?) *Trag. fr.* p. 829 *Ναυκ δεινοί γὰρ ἀνδρὶ πάντες ἔσμεν εὐκλεεῖ ζῶντι φθονῆσαι καθανόντα δ' αἰνέσαι*. The scribe, not perceiving the construction, wrote *ἀφίᾳσι*—for I cannot believe that Euripides did not write *ἀφίενα*: at any rate the conjecture, which is *Musgrave's*, I made also independently.—In *v.* 242 *οἱ δ' οὐδὲν ὄντες* (*v.* *Wilamowitz-Moellendorff*) would be better, as *ὁ δ' οὐδὲν οὐδεὶς...νικᾷ* in *fr.* 285. 15, a passage worth comparing.

377=381 For reasons of metre this I think should run as follows :

τί μοι πόλις κραεῖ ποτ' ; ἄρα φίλιά μοι
377 *τεμεῖ <τε> καὶ τέκνοις ταφὰς ληψό-*
μεσθα
= *σύ τοι σέβεις δίκαν τὸ δ' ἥσσον ἀδικίᾳ*
381 *νέμουσ' αἰεὶ τὰ δυστυχῇ πάντα ῥῆν*

Antig. 363=375 is an example. The MS. reading is *νέμεις αἰεὶ τὴν δυστυχῇ*, and I take *νέμουσ'* from *Canter*. The neuter *τὰ δυστυχῇ* is of course good Greek, as *τὰ μὲν πανοῦργα καὶ παλιντριβῆ...τὰ δὲ δίκαια καὶ τὰ χρηστά Philoct.* 448.—With *τε* καὶ they are apt to omit the *τε*.

604 *γένοντ' ἂν κέρδος· εἰ δ' ἀρείφατοι*
φόνου, μάχαι, στερνοτυπείες ἂμ πόλιν

κόποι, κτύποι φανήσεται,
607 *τίν' ὧ τάλαινα ψόγον,*
τίν' ἂν τῶνδ' αἰτίαν λάβοιμι ;
= 614 *φόβῳ γὰρ τῷ πάρος διόλλυσται·*
δίκαι δίκαν δ' <ἐξ> ἐκάλεσε καὶ φόνος
φόνου, κακῶν δ' ἀναψυχὰς
617 *θεοὶ βροτοῖσιν νέμουσ'*
ἅπαντων τέρμ' ἔχοντες αὐτοί.

This I feel sure is the right metre, a few examples of which are indicated in my note on *Andr.* 471. The MSS. give in 607 *ὧ τάλαινα τίνα λόγον* and in 617 *θεοὶ βροτοῖς νέμουσι* L, *θεοὶ βροτοῖσι νέμουσι* P altered to *νέμουσιν* and *πάντων* altered to *ἅπαντων*. In 605-6 they give *στερνοτυπείς γ' ἂν ἀνὰ τόπον πάλιν κτύποι φανήσονται* : for the conjectures see *Wecklein's Appendix*. There is no place in this metre for a choriambus *στερνοτυπείς*, and it must have been some form which scanned _ _ _ _ . *ἀνὰ πόλιν* (*Markland*) or *ἂμ πόλιν* seems probable, as 724 *βοῇ δὲ καὶ κωκυτός ἦν ἀνὰ πόλιν*, and *κόποι* or *κόπων* or some form of it may possibly have been the origin of *τόπον*.

946 'No', says Theseus, 'the mothers must not go and see their fallen sons ; ὄλουντ' ἰδοῦσαι τοῦσδ' ἂν ἡλλοιωμένους. 'True', says Adrastus,

πικραὶ γὰρ ὄψεις κάμα τῷ τέλει νεκρῷ

L taking this to be *καὶ ἅμα*, writes it so in full ('ut videtur' *Wecklein*), a very common practice : it has been altered to *χ' ἅμα*. P has been altered to *χ' ἀμάτω πέλει*. *Kirchoff's* account is 'καμάτω πέλει νεκρῷ a prima manu B. *χᾶμα* τῷ τέλει C. *χᾶμα* etiam in B dedit man. sec.' What I conjectured from this does not appear to have been proposed ; it has the advantage of explaining *καὶ*, and seems to me to account better for the MSS. than other readings that have been suggested,—*κῶμμάτων* 'Even the look' or 'the sight (*πικρὰ γὰρ ὄψις* *Reiske*) of dead men's eyes is grievous', apart from any wounds they may have suffered. Let one *μ* be omitted (which often happens with doubled letters), and you get *κῶμάτων*.

974 *μέλεα παιδὸς ἐν οἴκοις*
κέιται μνήματα, πένθιμοι
κουραὶ κοῦ στέφανοι κόμας

977 *λοιβαὶ δὲ φθιμένων αἰδοί—*
αἱ τε τὰς ὧ χρόσοκόμας
'Απόλλων οὐκ ἐνδέχεται,
γόοισιν δ' ὀρθρευομένα

981 *δάκρυσι νοτέρ' αἰεὶ πέπλων*
982 *προστέρων πτύχα τέγξω.*

This is the form that, consulting metre, I would present the passage in. 977 is omitted in the MSS., but supplied by Plutarch—quoting no doubt from memory—in *Mor.* 394 B λουβαὶ νεκῶν φθιμένων αἰδαὶ ἃς ὁ χρυσοκόμας Ἀπόλλων οὐκ ἐνδέχεται. By omitting Plutarch's νεκῶν and combining the rest with the MS. αἰδαὶ τὰς χρυσοκόμας I get both metre and what is much to be desired, the article with χρυσοκόμας.—In 981, where the MSS. have νοτρὸν, I read νοτέρ' for metre's sake, instead of νοτερόν: and in 982 προστέρων or πρόστερνον as *Cho.* 29 πρόστερνοι στολμοὶ πέπλων: if it had been read as προστερνω, that would easily cause πρόσ στέρνω.

993 Evadne lamenting her dead husband Capaneus; the metre is bacchiac leading to glyconic:

- τί φέγγος, τίν' αἴγλαν
 ἐδίφρευε τόθ' Ἄλιος
 995 Ξελάνα τε κατ' αἰθέρ' ἃ
 λαμπάδ' ὠκυθόαν ἄνυμφ'
 ἱππεύουσα δι' ὄρφνας...
 =1015 ὁρῶ δὴ τελευτὰν
 ἵν' ἔστακα· τύχα δέ μοι
 1017 ξυνάπτει ποδὸς ἄλμα τὰς
 εὐκλείας χάριν ἔνθεν ὄρμ-
 ἄσω τὰςδ' ἀπὸ πέτρας.

995 'and Selene, that chariots her swift lamp unwedded through the gloom,'—in unwedded state (ἄνυμφα as an adverb, *Soph. El.* 926 ἄλεκτρα γηράσκουσιν ἄνυμναί τε) and therefore without sympathy—'when Argos hymned the happiness of my fatal marriage?' My contributions here are ἃ in 995 and ἄνυμφ': λαμπάδ' ὠκυθόαν and ἱππεύουσα had been restored already. The prime origin of the MS. reading λαμπάδ' ἵν' ὠκυθόαι νύμφαι ἱππεύουσι may have been

ΛΑΜΠΑΔΩΚΥΘΟΑΝΑΝΥΜΦΑ

meaning λαμπάδι ὠκυθόα (but of course the accusative λαμπάδα is as easy as ἄρμα ἱππεύουσα). ὠκυθόαι would lead to νύμφαι, and that to ἱππεύουσι.

In 1015 she thinks of suicide—and chance fits with her design; she is standing on a high rock and will leap down from it. Punctuating at ξυνάπτει (as rhythm indicates), we have merely to write ἄλμα for ἄλλα as in Menander *fr.* 312 (*Strabo* 452) ῥίψαι πέτρας ἀπὸ τηλεφανοῦς ἄλμα... Wordsworth for ἄλλα. Hermann had conjectured ἄλματι for ἄλλα τῆς, but the long final syllable was my first requirement in the corresponding line 995.

HELENA (with Wecklein 1898).

124 οὐκουν ἐν Ἀργεὶ <γ'> οὐδ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα
 ῥοαῖς

Mr. Coleridge mistranslates this, 'No; he is neither in Argos, nor yet by the streams of Eurotas.' Paley is right in saying "the γ' added by Musgrave is as essential to the sense as to the metre; for οὐν—γε is equivalent to γοῦν. The meaning is 'Certainly he is not at Argos nor at Sparta' (wherever else he may be)." Concerning particles combined with οὐν there is a radical misconception which it is important to correct. It is generally assumed that the inferential sense of οὐν is primary, whereas it is acquired. When used by itself as a connecting particle, it comes to mean 'so' or 'well then': so does δὲ, but in combination with another particle it has no more inferential sense than δὲ has, or than τοι, which is another of its equivalents. It merely strengthens and emphasises or *italicises* what it is combined with. οὐκουν... γε is the negative of γοῦν (in which it is the γε that is essential to the meaning, not the οὐν, just as in δ' οὐν it is the δέ which is essential); for though you could say γοῦν οὐκ you could not use οὐ γοῦν any more than οὐ γε. Thus *Eccles.* 343 οὐκουν λαβεῖν γ' αὐτὰς ἐδυνάμην οὐδαμοῦ means—'at any rate I couldn't find them anywhere.' γε is there omitted by two MSS.; but it cannot be omitted, nor could it be omitted in *Ar. Eq.* 465, nor in *Soph. Ant.* 320

KP. οἴμ' ὡς ἀλήημα (or ἄλημα) δῆλον ἐκπεφυκὸς¹ ἐλ.

ΦΥ. οὐκουν τό γ' ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας ποτέ.

where τό γ' is Reiske's correction of τόδ': and equally in *Philoct.* 872

οὐκουν Ἀτρεΐδαι τοῦτ' ἔτλησαν εὐφόρως
 οὕτως ἐνεγκεῖν

where the meaning is '—at any rate the Atridae never submitted to endure them so patiently,' the sentence is incapable of that meaning without γε. It might be inserted after οὕτως, but I have no doubt that what Sophocles wrote was οὐκουν Ἀτρεΐδαί γ' αὐτ' ἔτλησαν εὐφόρως οὕτως ἐνεγκεῖν.—Again in 'Euripides' *fr.* 953

27 φέρ' ἦν ὁ νῦν δὴ λαμβάνειν μέλλον μ'
 ἀνήρ
 —ὁ μὴ γένοιτο, Ζεῦ φίλ', οὐδ' ἔσται ποτέ

¹ If ἐκπεφυκός is correct, ποιήσας will depend on δηλός εἰμι or γεήσομαι, implied from δηλον. But I may suggest that ἐκπεφνός would be natural for it to depend upon (as *Pers.* 788, *Trach.* 666, 1129, *O.C.* 804). It is a common enough confusion.

[οὐκ οὖν θελούσης οὐδὲ δυναμένης ἐμοῦ]—
ἦν (δ') οὗτος αὖθις ἀποβάλλη τὴν οὐσίαν

it is necessary (before ejecting the verse) to insert γ' after θελούσης: the place is of course vacant to insert it in. But Wecklein justly questions the use of δυναμένης, and I think that (as Nauck suggests) the verse is spurious. It was added by some one who imagined that the absolute assertion οὐδ' ἔσται ποτέ required to be so qualified, not knowing that it was a formula: Aristotle's will in Diog. Laert. v. l. 11 ἔσται μὲν εἴ· ἐὰν δέ τι συμβαίῃ, . . . 12 ἐὰν δέ τῇ παιδί συμβῇ τι—ὃ μὴ γένοιτο οὐδ' ἔσται—, . . . Eur. Ion 456 εἰ δ'—οὐ γὰρ ἔσται, τῷ λόγῳ δὲ χρήσομαι—, δίκας βιαιῶν δώσετε: cf. Aesch. Supp. 737.

362 ἰὼ Τροία τάλαινα <φεῦ φεῦ> for metre: cf. *Alc.* 887=904.

367 Read ὄλεσαν for metre instead of ὤλεσαν.

371 is mutilated; ἄνανδρον would be a most appropriate adjective, and if written with a stroke for the -ον it will be seen how easily it might be omitted: βοὰν βοὰν δ' ἄνανδρον Ἑλλάσ' ἐκελάδῃσ' ἀνωτότυξεν.

380. For σχῆμα λεαίνης I had conjectured σχῆμ' ἀλεαίνεις 'Keep your shape warm in your furry coat,' but I see that there is much to take account of on this line. Kirchhoff thought it was the remnant of a passage referring to the Boeotian Atalanta; it had not occurred to me it should be ejected altogether. But Dingelstadt ejects it, and it is bracketed by Wecklein. Is it their theory that σχῆμα λεαίνης was a marginal comment on v. 377, to be explained by Ar. *Lys.* 231 schol.?

1218 Ποῦ δαὶ τὸ πεμφθὲν ἀντὶ σοῦ Τροία κακόν; for ποῦ δὲ, as πῶς δαὶ in 1246, seems to me eminently in character with the blatant Theoclymenus, as it is with Polus in the *Gorgias*, and with the Chorus in the *Cyclops* 417. It expresses violence or impatience, and is suitable therefore to Electra in *El.* 1116; nor would I venture to alter it for Pylades in *Cho.* 899. Sir Richard Jebb's judgment on the subject (*Ant.* 318 Appendix) generally seems to me, as usual, right.

1354 seqq. ὦν οὐ θέμις οὐθ' ὅσια ἐπύρσας ἐν θαλάμοις . . . is the passage that most piques me in Euripides. It looks as though it were quite capable of being explained and restored, but I have done no more than gather some material and only call attention

to it here in the hope that others will turn their hands to it. But it seems clear that Helen is exhorted to propitiate the deities of love and joy and revelry.

1485-6 and 1502-3 do not correspond. I am persuaded by metrical reasons that 1485 ποιμένος ὃς ἄβροχα is sound and the error is in 1502 γλαυκὸν ἐπ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον. Now ἐπ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον¹ and ἐπὶ πόντιον οἶδμα are familiar stock poetic phrases, and I take it that one of them has been substituted where Euripides varied it to the plural, γλαυκ' ἐφ' ἄλι' οἶδματα.

1536 ταρσόν τε χειρὶ λευκά θ' ἰστί' εἰς ἐν ἦν: van Herwerdén, I find, has conjectured and renounced εἰσένει (from εἰς—νέω like ἐπινέω, προσνέω) 'heaped in the sails,' and I also thought of εἰσόνουν, the plural: ἦν is apt to be substituted for οὖν. A yachtsman perhaps would know what they should be doing with the sails: they are not yet hoisting them, of course. In Theocr. xiii. 69 the heroes waiting for Heracles filled their time up with cleaning the sails, ἰστία . . . ἐξέκάθαιρον.

1590 καί τις τόδ' εἶπε, 'δόλιος ἡ ναυκληρία, πάλιν πλέωμεν,' ἃ ξιῶν 'κέλευε σύ, σὺ δὲ στρέφ' οἶακ'

exactly as in the *Phaethon* fr. 779. 8 πατήρ δ' ὀπισθε . . . ἵππεν, παῖδα νουθετῶν 'ἐκείσ' ἔλα, τῇδε στρέφ' ἄρμα, τῇδε.' The MS. is ἀξίαν, for which Hermann had already conjectured ἀξιώ. The first requisition is addressed to the κελυστής, the second to the steerer.

1667 ὅταν δὲ κάμψῃς καὶ τελευτήσῃς βίον

So *El.* 954, *Hipp.* 86, *O.C.* 91. I can never read *O.C.* 1551 without thinking it should be

ἦδη γὰρ ἔρπω τὸν τελευταῖον βίον
κάμψων παρ' Αἰδην

'I am now upon the road to make the final turn (πύματον καμπτήρα Meleag. *A.P.* xii. 257, οὐπέκεινα τοῦ βίου καμπτήρ, beyond 60 years, Herodas) and ending of my life—to reach its goal—with Hades': ἐς Ἀιδαν καταλύσουσ' ἔμμοχθον βίον Eur. *Supp.* 1007. As indeed it had been foretold to him ἐνταῦθα κάμψει τὸν ταλαίπωρον βίον, v. 91. If the MSS. reading κρίψων is an error, it would be the easier because μοῖρ' ἀνδρὶ τῷδε τῇδε κρυφθῆναι χθονὶ had been written a few lines before in 1546. It is the adjective

¹ It was unworthy of Bergk to alter Pind. fr. 221.

³ τέρεται δὲ καὶ τις ἐπ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον.

τελευταῖον that seems to me to call for κάμψων.

CYCLOPS (with Wecklein 1898)

63 οὐ τὰδε Βρόμιος, οὐ [τάδε] χόροι
βάχχαι τε θυρσοφόροι

Metre shows that the second τὰδε should be ejected. The sentence then is exactly like 202 οὐχὶ Διόνυσος τὰδε, οὐ κρόταλα χαλκοῦ τυμπάνων τ' ἀράγματα: *Andr.* 168 οὐ γὰρ ἐσθ' Ἐκτωρ τὰδε, οὐ Πρίαμος οὐδὲ χρυσός: *Eriphus*, (*Ath.* 137d, *Kock* ii p. 430) τὰδ' οὐ Κόρωνθος οὐδὲ (*Dindorf* for οὔτε) Λαῖς ὦ Σῦρε, οὐδ' εὐτραπέζων Θερταλῶν ξένων τροφαί.—It is their way in repeating a phrase to repeat it *in full*; as in *Trach.* 98 for πόθι μοι, πόθι παῖς they write πόθι μοι, πόθι μοι παῖς.

366 νηλῆς, ὦ τλᾶμον (τλᾶμων?) ὅστις
δομάτων ἐφεστίους

368 ἰκτῆρας ἰκθύει δόμων
κόπτων, βρύκων,

ἔφθά τε δαινύμενος μυσάροισιν ὁδοῦσιν
371 θέρμ' ἀπ' ἀνθράκων κρέα.

ξενικούς before ἰκτῆρας in 368 I think with Bothe and Hermann should be ejected; and I feel sure with Hermann that ἀνθρώπων should be removed from the beginning of 371. Then the metre will be that which is repeated in *Ar. Ran.* 814–829, as 824 ῥήματα γομφοπαγῇ πινακῆδον ἀποσπῶν | γηγενεῖ φουσηματι. It is a Dorian rhythm, and used there because it was associated with big and *Herculean* themes, whether the hero were ascending to Heaven through his ἀρετή, or eating oxen whole: as in the fragment of Pindar I was emending in the February number of last year, *fr.* 168 (*Ath.* 411b) which ends βαρὺν ἦν αἰόντα διακρῖναι στεναγμῶν πολλὸς ἐν καιρῷ χρόνος. Heracles there is ἀπανθρακίζων oxen as the Cyclops is preparing ἀπανθρακίζειν men (242). They were the oxen of Theiodamas, *Philostr. Imag.* ii. 24, and the story is told also by Pherecydes in *schol. Apoll. Rhod.* i. 1212, *Apollodor.* p. 97 *Wagner*, *Tzetz. Chil.* ii. 465; another story of Heracles βουφάγος ('*Lucian*' ii. 401, *A.P.* ix. 59. 7), βουθοῖνας (*A.P.* xvi. 123) is that he took one of the oxen from a cart and ate it while the βοηλάτης cursed him from a hill, *Apollod.* p. 86, *Tzetz. Chil.* ii. 386: add *Eur. fr.* 687 (*Philo* ii p. 461), *Ar. Ran.* 506 βοὺν ἀπηνθράκιζ' ὅλον for Heracles, and cf. *Blaydes* on *Acharn.* 85.—I take the first occasion of withdrawing my advocacy of λευρὸν (v. *Herwerden*) in *Pind. N.* viii. 46: it is right in so far as λάβρον is clearly wrong, but the true correction is *Cookesley's*

Χαριάδαις τ' ἐλαφρόν, as *N.* vii. 77 and *P.V.* 279, 'is a light task.'

434 εἰ γὰρ τήνδ' ἵδοιμεν ἡμέραν

Κύκλωπος ἐκφυγόντες ἀνόσιον κάρα·

ὥς διὰ μακροῦ γε τὸν σίφωνα τὸν φίλον

χρεῖόμεν τόνδ' οὐκ ἔχομεν καταφαγεῖν.

The clue to this is διὰ χρόνου, which the editors accept in the sense 'for a long time past'; but the Greek for that would be ἐκ πολλοῦ or πολλὴν ἤδη χρόνον, whereas διὰ μακροῦ means 'after a long interval'. ὥς, therefore, does not mean 'since', but 'in order that', and must be followed by ἔχομεν or σχοῖμεν, a sentence like *Vesp.* 1251 τὸ δεῖπνον συσκεύαζε νῶν, ἵνα καὶ μεθύσθωμεν (*μεθύωμεν* *Cobet*) διὰ χρόνου. I would offer merely as a tentative suggestion

ὥς διὰ μακροῦ γοῦν, οἳ γε τόνδε τὸν φίλον
χρεῖόμεν σίφων', ἔχομεν καταφαγεῖν

if καταφαγεῖν is the right word—for even as a matter of language καταφαγεῖν ἔχω (in spite of καταφαγᾶς) sounds as strange as καταπιεῖν δίδωμι, φέρω, would be for πιεῖν: the simple verb of course is good, φαγεῖν ἔδωκε. *Antiphanes* 248 (*Ath.* 71e) ἐνθάδ' οἴσεις [τι] καταφαγεῖν; cannot be urged, because the line is incomplete.—One of the copies has καταφυγεῖν, and Hermann conjectured καταφυγήν: *Supp.* 269 ἔχει γὰρ καταφυγήν.

HECUBA (with Prinz 1883)

I Ἦκω νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας
λιπὼν ἔν' Ἀίδης χωρὶς ψικισται θεῶν.

'apart' that is 'from the Gods of Heaven' (τῶν οὐρανίων as the scholiast explains it), occupying οἰκία...τὰ τε στυγέουσι θεοὶ περ *Hom. Y* 64, *regna...dis invisae* *Verg. A.* viii. 245. So *Orpheus* says it was assigned for men χωρὶς ἀπ' ἀθανάτων ναίειν ἔδος (*Proclus Tim.* p. 38 A). θεοὶ and ἀθάνατοι are often used in discrimination from the χθόνιοι δαίμονες: *Apollodor.* p. 14 *Wagner*, *Persephone* was compelled to remain the third part of the year μετὰ Πλούτωνος, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς: frequently by *Aeschylus* in the *Eumenides*, 109, 352, 363,¹ 414, who have λάχῃ θεῶν διχυστατοῦντα 389. Explain accordingly *Agam.* 642, which has been in-

¹ This should be perhaps σπενδομένα δ' ἀφελεῖν τινα τάσδε μερίμνας θεῶν—ἀτέλειαν ἐμαῖς (μελέταις) ἐπικραίνειν μὴδ' εἰς ἄγκρισιν ἐλθεῖν 'and while I am at such pains to relieve (Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 1. 44) one of the gods (Apollo) of this troublesome concern,—that he should make my (determinations) of none effect! annul them, without even coming to first question,—for we are debarred from speech with Zeus.'

terpreted in many ways but never, I think, in the only way the Greek admits :

εὐφημον ἡμαρ οὐ πρέπει κακαγέλω
γλώσση μαινεῖν· χωρὶς ἢ τιμὴ θεῶν·

‘—that observance is separate from the Gods of Heaven’, χωρὶς θεῶν ἔστιν ἢ τιμή. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 361.

1057 σφακτὰν κυσί τε φονίαν δαῖτ’ ἀνήμερον
οὐρείαν τ’ ἐκβολάν

This, which is no metre as it stands, should probably be three dochmiacs. Hesych. explains φόνος: ὁ διὰ σφαγῆς θάνατος, and I take σφακτὰν here to be an adscript. Then you can easily get metre with

κυσί τε δαῖτ’ ἀνήμερον φόνιον οὐρ—
εἰαν τ’ ἐκβολάν.

BACCHAE (with Wecklein 1898)

Has it ever been suggested that the name Βρόμος is not originally derived from βρόμος meaning *fremitus*, but from the grain called βρόμος? so that the title is virtually equivalent to *John Barleycorn* (Frazer *The Golden Bough* i 284) and the same as the Mariandynian Βῶρμος of Bithynian Thrace. If it has not been worked out, it would be an interesting enquiry—not least from an ethnological point of view, considering the Malay word *bram* or *brum* ‘an intoxicating liquor made from burnt palm-sugar or molasses, and fermented rice’, from which Prof. Skeat (*Etymological Dictionary*) derives our English *rum*. References must be sought in Hehn *Kulturpflanzen* pp. 536 sq. and the *Thesaurus* s.vv. βρόμος, Βώρμος: to which I may add an epigram by the Emperor Julian on a *Celtic* corn-liquor, where the meaning of βρόμον has commonly been misunderstood; *A.P.* ix. 368. 3

ἦ ρά σε Κελτοὶ
τῇ πενίῃ βοτρύων τεύξαν ἀπ’ ἀσταχύων·
τῷ σε χρὴ καλέειν Δημήτριον, οὐ Διόνυσον,
πυρογενὴ μᾶλλον, καὶ Βρόμον, οὐ
Βρόμιον.

‘πυρογενῇ’ instead of ‘πυριγενῇ’. It is very clever; but Βρόμιος, as I suggest, was actually Βρόμος, and Σεμελίῳν certainly no other than Δημήτριον, for Σεμέλη, Mr. J. H. Moulton tells me, is merely ‘Phrygian-Thracian’ for *Earth*, and appears in *Nova Zembla*: see Hehn *op. cit.* pp. 69, 552.

233 ἀνασεύοντά τε κόμας: metre requires this verb in *Cycl.* 75 ξανθὰν χαίταν <ἀνα> σείεις, and it should be restored I think in

Autocrates Com. (Ael. *N.A.* xii. 9) i p. 807 Kock :

οἶα παίζουσιν φίλαι
παρθένου Λυδῶν κόραι
κούφα πηδῶσαι <ποσὶν
κἀνασεύονσαι> κόμας v.l. κόμας
κἀνακροῦνσαι χεροῖν
Ἐφεσίαν παρ’ Ἄρτεμιν
καλλίσταν, [καὶ] τοῖν ἰσχύιον

326 καὶ μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος ὡς σὺ
φῆς,
παρὰ σοὶ λεγέσθω

The sense appears to require what Paley suggests, καὶ μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν οὗτος, ὡς σὺ φῆς, θεός or καὶ μὴ θεός γὰρ ἔστιν.

330 ὄρᾱς τὸν Ἀκταίωνος ἄθλιον μόνον;
‘Look at Actaeon’s miserable fate!’ This use of ὄρᾱς; in pointing to an example occurs in *fr.* 420. 1, 1052. 3, *Soph. Ant.* 712, *Menand.* 350 and commonly enough in later prose, Lucian, Dion Chrysostom, Maximus Tyrius; but when Polus employs it in the *Gorgias* 471 D, he is snubbed by Socrates: ΠΩΛ. Ἀρχέλαον δῆπον τοῦτον τὸν Περδίκκου ὄρᾱς ἄρχοντα Μακεδονίας; ΣΩ. εἰ δὲ μή, ἀλλ’ ἀκούω γε. It may have been one of the rhetorician’s mannerisms.

395 ἐκοίμαν ποτὶ Κύπρον
νᾶσον τὰς Ἀφροδίτας
ἐν ᾗ θελξίφρονες νέμονται θνατοῖσιν
Ἐρωτες,
Πάφον θ’, ἃν <θ’> ἐκατόστομοι
βαρβάρου ποταμοῦ ῥοαὶ
καρπιζοῦσιν ἀνομβρίον (ἀνομβρον *Matthiae*)

‘Cyprus and Paphos (which Strabo remarks and illustrates as being habitually named together so, p. 33, p. 341) and’ of course ‘Egypt’, which also, as Herodas says was οἶκος τῆς θεοῦ: the *unshowered* land made fruitful by the *barbarous* river *many-mouthed*—what other could it be but Egypt, which is constantly called *barbarous* in the *Helena*? To describe it by a relative ἃν θ’ (as Schoene and Prof. Tyrrell rightly read) is a very common form of expression, e.g. Callim. *h. Del.* 20 καὶ Μακρὶς Ἀβαντίας Ἐλλοπιήων, Σαρδῶ θ’ ἰμερόεσσα, καὶ ἦν ἐπενήξατο Κύπρις... —Dr. Verrall’s view (*Class. Rev.* 1894, p. 86), that these are aspirations which the Bacchanals repudiate, is to me convincing.

446 ἐκ παρασκευῆς ‘Hermann monente Kirchhoff’. See Lucian i. 206, and compare Alexis 264 (*Ath.* 565 b) ἃν πιττοκοπούμενόν τιν’ ἢ ξυρούμενον ὄρᾱς, one of two things must

be the matter with him: ἡ γὰρ ἐρατεύειν¹ ἐπινεῖν μοι φαίνεται καὶ πάντα τῷ πάγωνι δρᾶν ἐναντία, ἡ πλουσιακὸν τούτῳ τι προσπίπτει κακόν 'it is either because he intends to play the ἐρατός, or else it is one of the vices belonging to the πλουσιακὴ διαγωγὴ' (see Gataker on Marc. Antonin. i. 3).

419 σοφὸν δ' ἀπέχειν πραπίδα φρένα τε
περισσῶν παρὰ φωτῶν

I cannot mend this, but it is worth remarking, that ἀπέχω τι παρὰ τινος is 'I have received a debt', the perfect of ἀπολαμβάνω: in acknowledging the receipt of a debt you said ἀπέχω (τὸ χρέος παρὰ σοῦ δηλ.).

623 It strikes me that δώματ' ἔρρηξεν χαμάζε should be ἔρραξεν 'dashed', and that in *H.F.* 856 we should read καταρράξω for καταρρήξω, and in 1045 καταρ<ρ>άζω with the MSS., as in 1129 συνήραξ' οἶκον. Ordinary Greek used ῥήσσω, ῥήξαι in this sense, and the error at any rate is common.

996 τὸ σοφὸν οὐ φθονῶ should in my opinion be τὸ σοφὸν οὐ ζηλῶ (*Journ. Philol.* xxvi. p. 235), of which φθονῶ is a mistaken explanation. Observe now that in substituting it in the text for ζηλῶ the copyist has got not only wrong meaning but wrong Greek. You could say οὐ φθονῶ σοι τοῦ σοφοῦ, or with an infinitive οὗτοι φθονῶ σοι δαιμόνων τιμᾶν γένος: and that you could continue by saying τοῦτο μὲν οὐ φθονῶ, but τοῦτο there would be the equivalent of that infinitive. Thus in *I.T.* 491 when Iphigeneia says τί δὲ φθονεῖς τοῦτο; she means τί δὲ φθονεῖς τὸ ὄνομά μοι λέγειν; but she could not have said τί δὲ φθονεῖς μοι τοῦτομα; It would be Greek for the Chorus to say τὸ σοφὸν οὐ φθονῶ σοι διώκει, but not οὐ φθονῶ τὸ σοφόν. And there are numbers of verbs to which the same applies, with which you could use εἶν or τοῦτο, but only because it was the equivalent of an infinitive; ἀξίω in Herodas and Xenophon is one.

τὰ δ' in 997 belongs perhaps to 998 so that it should be τὰδε τὰ καλὰ βίου,² 'this is the real beauty of life, to be reverent and holy day and night', ἐπὶ being a mistake for ἐστὶ which of course is inserted often. One of the places I think is *Soph. Phil.* 655

¹ So read for στρατεύειν (cf. for instance Muson. περὶ κουρᾶς in Stob. *Flor.* vi. 62). I should like to read this verb in the clever epigram of Sophocles on Euripides (Ath. 604 d) σοὶ δ' ἐρατευομένην Βορρᾶς ὤμιλησε, taking φιλοῦντι ἐταῖραν or ἐτέραν to be explanations of a corrupted reading ἐταρεν- or ἐτερεν-.

² For the phrase, add Hyperides *fr.* 209 Blass.

NE. ἡ ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ κλεινὰ τόξ' ἃ νῦν ἔχεις;
PI. ταῖτ', οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα γ', ἀλλ' ἃ βαστάζω
χεροῖν.

'This and no other,—this that I carry in my hand', where the negative is naturally followed by ἄλλα as in Longus iv. 21 to the question οὐ ταῦθ' ἡμεῖς συνεξεθήκαμεν; the answer is οὐκ ἄλλα μὲν οὖν, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα. The ΑΛΛΑΓΑΛΛΑ has caused various corruptions in the MSS.

A has ταῦτ' οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα γ' ἔσθ' ἃ
L ταῦτ' οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ἃ
Γ ταῦτ' οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἔσθ' (? or ἔστ') ἀλλ' ἃ

ἔστι, I think, could not stand rightly in that place: ταῦτ', οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἔστι would be 'for there is no other' as in Ar. *Plut.* 106.

1145 ὅς τὰν θηλυγενῆ στολὰν
νάρθηκά τε πιστὸν αἶδαν
ἔλαβεν εὐθυρσον

There need be no excuse for offering another suggestion on this place. Among previous conjectures I like Heath's πιστὸν αἶδα 'a warrant of death' the best, and after that Prof. Tyrrell's ἐπακτὸν 'Αἶδαν—if only the MS. had πλείστον, there could be no gain-saying that. But it was Kirchhoff's proposal ἐπὶ στοναχαῖς that suggested a better rhythm, and Tyrwhitt's Βιοτονίδων, which I learn from Wecklein, has the same. My thought was

ναρθηκά τ' ἐπιστολάδαν
ἔλαβεν εὐθυρσον

The adverb is used by Hesiod *Scut.* 286 to describe the way that labourers arrange their dress in digging, οἱ δ' ἀροτῆρες ἤρεικον χθόνα διαν, ἐπιστολάδην δὲ χιτῶνας ἐστόλατο, where the schol. interprets it by κοσμίως καὶ ἀνεσταλμένως. Christodor. *A.P.* ii. 139 uses the verb in describing how a priestess of Athena (that is, the statue) was attired, παρθένος Αὐγῆς, φᾶρος ἐπιστεῖλασα κατωμαδόν· οὐ γὰρ (οὐδ' ἄρ' Brunck) ἐθείρας κρηδέμῳ συνέεργεν 'with a cloak arranged over her shoulders': cf. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 44 Medea stealing out, λαίῃ μὲν χειρὶ πέπλον ἐπ' ὀφρύσιν ἀμφὶ μέτωπα στελαμένη 'drawing her robe over her brows to veil her face'. Over or upon should be the meaning always of the preposition ἐπὶ in this compound: ἀναστέλλειν is to arrange or tuck up (Nonn. *D.* 48. 316, for wading 338 ἐκ ποδὸς ἄχρι καρῆνον...ἀναστεῖλασα χιτῶνα) καταστέλλειν to dress down, (Ar. *Thest.* 256, Mnesilochus in woman's garb, ἴθι νυν κατάστειλόν με τὰ περὶ

τὼ σκέλη, Plut. *Mor.* 69 c when small children fall down, their nurses ἤγειραν καὶ περιέπλυναν καὶ κατέστειλαν), συστέλλειν to gather the dress together close—and so on; all the prepositions have distinct significations, therefore ἐπὶ should describe a method of

arranging on, as upon the shoulder, and that must be taken for the meaning of νάρθηκά τ' ἐπιστολάδαν ἔλαβε.—θύρους ἀνάπτειν is the phrase in 169.

W. HEADLAM.

(To be continued).

PLATONICA.—I.

PHAEDRUS.

234 E οἷε ἂν τινα ἔχειν εἰπεῖν ἄλλον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἕτερα τούτων μείζω καὶ πλείω περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος;

μείζω is quite the wrong word to use with regard to the plain everyday style of Lysias and of the ἐρωτικός λόγος here ascribed to him. It would be much more in keeping with the style of such a λόγος as begins with p. 244, a style which is indeed elevated and great. It would not be difficult in any case to see what word Plato must have used, but the parallel passages within a page or two indicate it very clearly. 235 B μηδέν' ἂν ποτε δύνασθαι εἰπεῖν ἄλλα πλείω καὶ πλείονος ἄξια: *ib.* C πού συ βελτίω τούτων ἀκήκοας; and παρὰ ταῦτ' ἂν ἔχειν εἰπεῖν ἕτερα μὴ χείρω: *ib.* D μὴ ἐλάττω ἕτερα ἐπιχίρει εἰπεῖν: 236 B ἕτερα πλείω καὶ πλείονος ἄξια εἰπὼν τῶν Λυσίου. Plato wrote ἀμείνω. [Dr. Postgate points out to me that, though the Bodleian MS. (B) has ἕτερα τούτων μείζω, the Venetian (T) has ἕτερα μείζω τούτων. If this was the order of words, the error would be still easier.]

237 B καὶ ποτε αὐτὸν αἰτῶν ἐπειθεν τοῦτ' αὐτό, ὥς μὴ ἐρῶντι πρὸ τοῦ ἐρῶντος δέοι χαρίζεσθαι, ἔλεγεν τε ὧδε.

Neither αἰτῶν nor ἐρῶν seems quite the right word, nor does either of them exactly account for the other. ΔΕΙΩΝ may perhaps account for both and is very suitable.

242 A B οἶμαι. . . μηδένα πλείους (λόγους) ἢ σὲ πεποικέναι γεγενῆσθαι ἥτοι αὐτὸν λέγοντα ἢ ἄλλους. . . προσαναγκάζοντα· καὶ νῦν αὖ δοκεῖς αἰτιός μοι γεγενῆσθαι λόγῳ τινὶ ῥηθῆναι.

Badham has altered the second γεγενῆσθαι to γενήσεσθαι, I think with reason, as the λόγος is still in the future. But the first γεγενῆσθαι seems to me more clearly wrong. Surely after πεποικέναι we could not have another perfect, but only the aorist γενέσθαι.

ib. C καὶ τινα φωνὴν ἔδοξα αὐτόθεν ἀκοῦσαι, ἢ με οὐκ ἔῃ ἀπιέναι.

I think ἔῃ should be εἶα. So a little below (243 A) in ἐγὼ τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ποιεῖ εἰθύς, οὐκ ἔστ' κ.τ.λ. the imperfect ἐποίει seems called for.

244 C τὴν γε τῶν ἐμφρόνων ζήτησιν τοῦ μέλλοντος διὰ τε ὀρνίθῳ ποιουμένων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σημείων.

Schanz brackets ποιουμένων, which is certainly a very awkward word. The expedient of separating ζήτησιν from τὴν γε τῶν ἐμφρόνων and supplying τέχνην with the latter words seems forced and difficult. The old conjecture ποιουμένην would be attractive, if it were not tolerably certain that Plato would have written not ποιουμένην but γιγνομένην, γίγνομαι being the usual passive of ποίω. I am inclined to suggest διὰ τε ὀρνίθων πετομένων.

250 C καθαροὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀσήμενοι τούτου, δὲ νῦν σῶμα περιφέροντες ὀνομάζομεν, ὁστρέου τρόπον δεδεδεσμενένοι.

Ἀσήμενοι is explained with reference to the σῶμα σῆμα of *Crat.* 400 c, *Gorg.* 493 A. 'It means' says Thompson, '(1) unmarked i.e. unpolluted, and (2) unentombed, unimprisoned, according to the two senses of σῆμα.' But is this quite satisfactory? There is nothing in the context to indicate that Plato has σῶμα σῆμα in his mind, and how is the reader to find it out? Also 'without mark of the body' is perhaps not quite the happiest way of expressing the supposed effect of body on soul. Although therefore the common view may be right, it seems just worth while to suggest ἀπήμαντοι as an alternative reading. Parallel to these words we have two or three lines above δλόκληροι μὲν αὐτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπαθεῖς κακῶν. The words of 248 c must also be taken into account; θεσμός δ' Ἀδραστείας ὧδε ἦτις ἂν ψυχὴ θεῶ ξυνοπαδὸς γενομένη κατὶδῇ τι τῶν ἀληθῶν, μέχρι τε τῆς ἑτέρας περιόδου εἶναι