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 *Od.* iv. 544–7

C. M. Mulvany

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 05 / June 1897, pp 243 - 244

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00031930, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00031930

How to cite this article:

C. M. Mulvany (1897). Note on *Od.* iv. 544–7. The Classical Review, 11, pp 243–244
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00031930

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

a form of the qualitative τοῖος, and we may find another case, or rather, perhaps, an extension, of this at δ 227 (cf. Eur. *Med.* 718 and 789), if we lighten the pointing at the close of v. 226. Similar to this last is the use of the quantitative τόσος in ι 243. Other (and better) instances of forms of τόσος in the type of sentence we are considering are: ξ 326, τ 295, E 863, I 546. The demonstrative adverb οὕτω, without a following adjective, appears similarly used at ι 262. The absence of the adjective differentiates (though not essentially) this example from *Alc.* 332 sq.

We come now to the passage that prompted the writing of this note—A 418. According to the traditional text Thetis says to Achilles (v. 414 sqq.):—

ὦ μοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ
τεκούσα;
αἰθ' ὄφελες παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ
ἀπήμων 415
ἦσθαι, ἐπεὶ νυ τοι αἴσα μίνυνθά περ, οὐ τι
μάλα δὴν,
νῦν δ' ἅμα τ' ὠκύμορος καὶ διζυρὸς περὶ
πάντων
ἔπλεο· τῷ (or τῶι) σε κακῇ αἵσῃ τέκον ἐν
μεγάρουσιν.

But 'therefore ill-starred did I bring thee forth in the hall' is not what we expect here, and I have for some time believed a slight change in the text (really only an interpretation of the MS. tradition) to be necessary. Write τῶς σε κακῇ αἵσῃ τέκον ἐν μεγάρουσιν, and we have an instance of the form of expression we have been discussing: 'So ill-starred did I bear thee in the hall' (= οὕτω σε κτέ.).

This seems to be the only case in Homer where τῶς has given place to τῷ (τῶι): but, if we examine the few passages in which τῶς appears (we may well think, with van Leeuwen, that it was once more frequent), we shall find one that should, it seems, by a trifling transposition be reduced to the type

of sentence we are dealing with. In τ 232 sqq. we read:—

τὸν δὲ χιτῶν' ἐνόησα περὶ χροὶ σιγαλόεντα,
οἷόν τε κρομόιο λοπὸν κάτα ἰσχαλίοιο,
τῶς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, λαμπρὸς δ' ἦν ἥελιος
ὥς·
ἦ μὲν πολλαὶ γ' αὐτὸν ἐθήσαντο γυναῖκες. 235

Here the οἷον clause is explanatory of σιγαλόεντα. The τῶς sentence immediately following, with its μαλακός, which is not in point after ἰσχαλίοιο, and its λαμπρὸς ἥελιος ὥς, which makes a homely comparison ridiculous by contrast, is, furthermore, awkwardly and unusually connected with v. 235. We have only to reverse the order of vv. 234 and 235 (the present order is easily to be explained by a careless reader's ready connection of τῶς with οἷον and by the similar position of μὲν in the two verses) to have the arrangement that is normal in such sentences, as well as a greatly improved sense,—indeed, I would fain believe, the original form of the passage. Thus we shall read:—

τὸν δὲ χιτῶν' κτέ.
ἦ μὲν πολλαὶ γ' αὐτὸν ἐθήσαντο γυναῖκες· 235
τῶς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, λαμπρὸς δ' ἦν ἥελιος
ὥς. 234

There is a passage in Aeschylus (*Prom.* 907 sqq.) that belongs with those discussed above, and should be read thus:—

ἦ μὴν ἔτι Ζεὺς, καίπερ αὐθάδῃ φρονῶν,
ἔσται ταπεινός· τοῖον ἐξαργύεται κτέ.

Faith in the text of the Mediceus has led scholars, since Hermann, to reject the vulgate for αὐθάδης φρενῶν in v. 907 (though that does not so much concern us now) and to cling to οἷον where τοῖον is clearly demanded, as Robertello long ago saw.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College.

NOTE ON OD. IV. 544-7.

ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
πείρα, ὅπως κεν δὴ σὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκηαι·
ἦ γάρ μιν ζῶον γε κικήσεται, ἦ κεν Ὀρέστῃς
κτεῖνεν ἐν ὑποφθάμενος, σὺ δὲ κεν τάφου ἀντι-
βολήσῃς.

All MSS. and Herodian read ἦ κεν: in the next line the Medicean (G, saec. x.) has κτεῖναι, the Florentine (F, saec. xi.) has κτείνεν, and the Palatine (P, 1201 A.D.) has κτάνεν, corrected to κτείνεν by a later hand,

and to κτείνει by a still later (Molhuysen, *De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis* p. 50). Modern critics accept κτείνεν, but many read καὶ instead of κεν. But neither ἡ κεν...κτείνεν nor ἡ καὶ...κτ. is satisfactory, and we must either accept κτείναι from G, or make the very slight alteration to κτείνει = κτείνῃ, 3. sg. aor. subj.

The words quoted are addressed by Proteus to Menelaus, who has to return to Egypt and there sacrifice, before he can set out on the homeward voyage to Argos. All this involves so much time, that if Aegisthus were already dead, Menelaus could not possibly arrive in time for the τάφος. Accordingly the translation of Butcher and Lang, 'or it may be Orestes was beforehand with thee and slew him', is objectionable in point of meaning, even if the meaning could be got out of the Greek. But it cannot, for ἡ κεν...κτείνεν can only mean 'or else O. would have slain him, but did not;' it can only give the supposed consequence of an unfulfilled condition. Monro, *H.G.*² p. 295, compares X 108-110:

ἔμοι δὲ τότ' ἂν πολὺν κέρδιον εἴη
ἄντην ἢ Ἀχιλλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι
ἥ κε αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἐν κλειῷς πρὸ πόλῃος.

But this is very different, for the infinitive is equivalent to a clause with εἰ and optative:—ἔμοι ἂν κέρδιον εἴη, ἡ εἰ Ἀχιλλῆα κατα-

κτείνας νεοίμην, ἡ εἰ κεν (κεν emphasizes the alternative) αὐτὸς ὀλοίμην. For εἰ κεν with the optative we can find Homeric parallels, e.g. I 14 (cf. Monro, *H.G.*² p. 285), but none for κεν with the aorist indicative in the sense proposed.

Another interpretation makes a future perfect of the aorist with κεν, vide Merry *ad loc.* ('O. will have been his slayer'); which gives good sense, but bad grammar.

On the other hand ἡ καὶ...κτείνεν is good in grammar, but, for the reason stated, bad in sense. We must have a verbal form that refers to future time.

The readiest solution is presented by the aor. opt. κτείναι in G: 'either you will find him alive, or Orestes might be beforehand with you and kill him, while you would come in for the funeral-feast.' But we can more easily explain the variations in the MS. reading, if we suppose that the original was κτείνει, 3rd sg. aor. subj., with -ει corresponding to -ομεν, -ετε in the plural of subjunctives from non-thematic indicatives: cf. Schulze, *Hermes* xx. 493 and *K.Z.* xxxiii. 134, and Stolz, *Ind. Forsch.* ii. 154. For the construction cf. A 431-3:

σήμερον ἡ δοιοῖσιν ἐπεύξεται Ἰππασίδῃσι

ἡ κεν ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δονρὶ τυπείς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσης.

C. M. MULVANY.

NOTE ON CICERO, *AD FAM.* 1, 2, 2 AND 1, 1, 2.

In the March number of the *Classical Review*, p. 108, Mr. Gretton has discussed some of the many difficulties involved in the information which has come down to us concerning the debates in the Roman senate early in the year 56 B.C., on the proposed restoration of Ptolemaeus Auletes to his kingdom. Mr. Gretton's remarks bear chiefly upon Cic. *Ad Fam.* 1, 2, 2: 'proxima erat Hortensi sententia, cum Lupus, tribunus plebis, quod ipse de Pompeio retulisset, intendere coepit ante se oportere discessionem facere quam consules. Eius orationi vehementer ab omnibus reclamatum est; erat enim et iniqua et noua. Consules neque concedebant neque ualde repugnabant, diem consumi uolebant, quod est factum; perspiciebant enim in Hortensi sententiam multis partibus pluris ituros, quamquam aperte Volcacio adsentirentur. Multi roga-

bantur, atque id ipsum consulibus inuitis, nam ei Bibuli sententiam ualere cupierunt.' In this passage the two most recent editors, Mendelssohn and C. F.W. Mueller, keep the reading of the MSS., *inuitis*, whereas most of their predecessors insert *non* before the word. Mr. Gretton also supports the traditional text but from a different point of view; they refer *ei* to the consuls, he to *multi*. I will discuss the former view first, but must begin by mentioning that the two editors follow Madvig in changing *cupierunt* to *cupierant*. No necessity exists for this alteration; Cicero may just as well have written that the consuls *did*, earlier in the debate, favour the rejected motion of Bibulus, as that they *had* favoured it. Apart from that matter, the lection of the *codices* gives a curious succession of considerations in the minds of the consuls: (1) they saw that the