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As far as I know, Kaibel is the only champion of the soundness of our text in this passage. In his edition of the Electra he has the following note: 'Zu τὸν ἄει πατρὸς ist, wie Haupt gezeigt hat (Op. II. 301), der Nominalbegriff (wie στεναχμὸν) aus dem Verbum zu ergänzen, genau wie in μίαν δικαίων, δειπτὴν παίσαι u. a. statt des Adjektivs steht das durch den Artikel gestützte Adverbium, vgl. Arist. Ran. 191 νευμαχής τὴν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν und das sprichwörtliche τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς (δρόμων) τρέχειν. So ist auch der Komikervers (fr. adesp. 104 K) ganz in Ordnung εὐφ. τὸν ἄλλον, ἀνδρές, ἐτεθνήκη πᾶλαι ἀπαινθ', δν ἔζην, wo zu ἔζην und also auch zu ἐτεθνήκη sich ein Nominalbegriff wie βιβών oder χρόνον von selbst ergänzt; denn auf ein bestimmtes Nomen kommt nichts an, da kein Griecher thatsächlich ein Nomen ergänzte, sondern den Begriff aus dem Verbum heraushörte.' He concludes: 'So unzweifelhaft richtig Haupts Erklärung ist, so pflegt man sie neuerdings doch wieder zu ignoriren oder zu verwerfen und die allerungläublichsten “Emendationen” zu bevorzugen.’ With the latter part of his assertion I fully agree, and am prepared to throw all emendations that have been so far suggested overboard. But with due diffidence I beg to try my hand once more at emending this passage, as I firmly believe that Sophocles has not written it as handed down to us. τὸν ἄει . . . στενάξουσ’ is intolerably weak. It is far more likely that we have here a case of the wrong division of words. In uncials we should have read: ἩΛΕΚΤΡΑΤΟΝ, which ought to have been transcribed ἩΛέκτρα ἀτον. I therefore read—

πρόδοτος δὲ μόνα σαλεύει
'Ἡλέκτρα, τὸν ἄει πατρὸς
dειλαία στενάξουσ’ ὄπως
ἀ πάνυδυρτος ἄρδων κτέ.
Jebb’s translation would run: ‘Electra, forsaken, braves the storm alone; she bewails alway, hapless one, her father’s fate insatiably, like the nightingale unwearied in lament.’

And this correction is admirably borne out by another passage in the same piece, a passage which is remarkable for its close similarity both in word and thought, viz., 121 sqq.:

\[\delta\,\pi\alpha\,\tau\alpha\,\delta\nu\varsigma\tau\alpha\nu\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\] 'Ηλέκτρα ματρός, τίν' ἀεὶ τάκεις ὅδ' ἀκόρεστον οἴμωγάν τον πάλαι ἐκ δολερᾶς ἀδεητάτα ματρός ἀλώντ' ἀπάταις 'Ἀγαμέμνοναι κακᾶ τε χειρὶ πρόδοτον.'

In this passage ἀκόρεστον reflects ἄτον as restored. In Homer we find ἀκόρεστος (ἀκόρητος) and ἄτος used as synonyms.

Cf. Apollon. Lex. 46, 1, ἄτος · ἀκόρεστος. It is therefore not surprising to find ἄτον in lyrics. I may note that this emendation gives more weight to Baunack’s correction in the Delphian inscription, 2561 C, v. 32, Sammlung der griech. Dialektinschriften, Collitz-Bechtel, who proposes ἄτος ‘satietas’ for the unintelligible ἄγος:

\[
\tauηνεὶ \; δ’ \; εν \; \acute{\alpha}τος \; \acute{\epsilon}στω \; (sc. \; \acute{\sigma}τοτύξεων).
\]

In Aeschylus, Septem contra Thebas, 848 (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff) we may have to do with another wrong division of words. In the best MS. the paroxytone accent points to διδύμα. It may be possible that the original letters were ΔΙΔΤΜΑΙΑΝΟΡΑΚΑΚΑ, which ought to have been transcribed, δίδυμ' αἶαν ὅρα κακά. Scholars as a rule (Nauck, Kaibel) doubt the existence of an adjective αἰανός, which they consider to be a late formation from the adjective αἰανής. But we must note that Hesychius knew the neuter αἰανῶν · χαλέπτων, αἶνῶν. For fuller information I may refer to Schmidt’s edition, p. 67, 65. Wilamowitz says: ‘fuerit, puto, φανερὰ δὴ κακά.’ But the change is too violent. The singular ὅρα I would explain with Wecklein as a dialogue between two choreutae. He says, 833-836 (847-860, Wilamowitz): ‘duo, ut uidetur, choreutae colloquuntur.’

A. διπλαίν μερίμναι δίδυμ' αἶαν ὅρα κακά.
B. αὐτοφόνα δίμορα τέλεα τάδε πάθη τί φῶ;

I may now turn to another epic word used by Sophocles in lyrics. In the newly-discovered Indagatores, verses 71-2, we read:

προφήνας
ἀρίζηλα χρυσοῦ παραδείγματα.

Münscher (Rhein. Mus., 1914, p. 171) bases his interpretation of ἀρίζηλα on the Hesychian gloss:

ἀρι· μεγάλως. ὅθεν καὶ ἀρίζηλος ὁ μεγάλως ζηλατός.
I grant that ἀμίξηντος may have occurred in this sense, but when we grasp the true meaning of another word that has to do with our interpreting ἀμίξηνα there can be no doubt that ἀμίξηνα has in this passage its usual meaning of 'glittering,' etc. The word I refer to is found in line 156:

χρυσόφαντον,
πλοῦτον ἐκ χρυσόφαντον ἔξαφτετε.

We know that the πλοῦτος is of gold; cf. 45 : χρυσόν στέφε. We read of ἀγαθοῦ καὶ χρυσοῦς πλοῦτον, Plat. Legg. 801 B. Gold is described as shining. We come to the conclusion that χρυσόφαντος is a compound adjective equivalent to two distinct epithets, χρυσόν and φαντός. For further information I may refer to Jebb’s edition, s.v.: ‘Index ii. Matters, adj. compound = two distinct epithets.’ Cf. Ant. 146: δικρατεὶς λόγχας = δύο and κρατοῦσαι.

We should expect to find in -φαντος a passive sense, but in χρυσόφαντος it is decidedly intransitive. In Aesch. Theb. 162 (ed. Wilamowitz) we have πολεμόκρατον as meaning ‘finishing the war,’ which would become more intelligible if somebody proposed to read ΙΚΑΙ for the tasteless ΚΑΙ at the beginning of the line:

ἦσαν Διόθεν πολεμόκρατον ἀγρόν
tέλος ἐν μάχαι· σὺ τε μάκαρι ἀνασο’
"Ογκα κτὲ.

As so often happens in Homer in an even contest, Zeus brings decisive victory by throwing his power into the balance to tip the scales in favour of one party or the other.

In ν 93 we have the adjective φαύντατος. I would now with Ehrlich (Die Epische Zerdehnung, Rhein. Mus., 1908, p. 109) take φαύντατος as the superlative of φαντός. When he wrote he was naturally still ignorant of the compound χρυσόφαντος. So too ἐφαίνη need not be derived from ἐφαίνθη, but rather from φαίνομαι ἐφάνθη. Van Leeuwen needlessly writes φαύντατος (Enchiridion Dictionis Epicæ, p. 246, 14). Bechtel (Lexilogus zu Homer, p. 324) and Thumb (Gr. Gr., p. 229, 1; 383, 1) derive it from φαύντατος.

I would further point out that Diehl's supplement of line 2 of the Indagatores, καὶ δόρα χρυσόφαντον cannot be right, as the meaning of χρυσόφαντος at the beginning of the piece would be obscure.

In the Indagatores, Col. V. 1 (v. 107) the editors read :

ῥοῖβδημα' ἐἀν τις τῶν [βοῶν δ]’ όν [λάβη.

Diehl remarks: δι’ όν si recte singulariter dictum. expectaveris δι’ ὁτός uel δι’ ὁτον.’ The words supplied are not Greek, and we have to try something else. I take τις as referring to the cattle, of which τῶν βοῶν is the partitive genitive. In prose we would expect to find the order, τῶν τις βοῶν. But in Ellendt’s lexicon we find other examples of the indef. pronoun before the partitive genitive. The three letters όν with the circumflex must therefore point to the fem. nom. sing. of a verb in -εω—e.g., κινούσα’. The verb
lost at the end can be only ἀλφ. With this supplement we see that in the preceding line we can confidently accept Roberts' conjecture ἡσθημένος.

So the sentence runs:

ἡσθημένος
ῥοίδδημ' εάν τις [τῶν βοῶν κι]νοῦν' [ἀλφ).

Indagatores, Col. III. 11 (v. 64) read διανύτων ὡ[δόν. It is not the acute, but the rough breathing that must be read over the ο. Cf. Pap. Ox. 22, Oed. Tyr. 375, where the rough breathing over the ο in ὡστις is practically the same as the acute.

In v. 117 translate τῶν βοηλάτην by 'cattle-lifter' rather than by 'cow-herd.' Cf. II. XI. 671.

In Col. VI. 21 (v. 153) read ἄπορρυπαίνεται, as we gather from the context and the formation of ἄποθυμαίνεις (v. 122), in which cases the preposition strengthens the meaning of the simple verb. For the composition of ἄπορρυπαίνω compare that of ἄπολαμπρύνω (Hdt. I. 41).

In Col. XII. 14 (v. 303) the papyrus has:

[. . . . . . . .] λο[. . .]ορεινή συγγονος τωστρακρεων.

The last word is corrupt. Wilamowitz thinks that it is a mixture of ὀστράκων and ὀστρέων.

Theon has the variant συγγόνοις ὀστρε[. Why does he lengthen the last syllable by writing συγγόνοις? Is the explanation not to be sought in the fact that he too had in his copy τωστρακρέων, and as a grammarian he saw that this could not be right? To my mind it is clear that he dropped the article, and consequently had a word of four syllables following συγγόνοις.

What further change the sentence underwent under his hands we are at a loss to say. Is συγγόνοις acc. plural, or are we to take it from a verb, συγγονέω? Our scribe therefore could not have made this mistake. In that case we should have expected to read one syllable too many: τῶν ὀστρακρέων.

This difficulty seems to me to be insurmountable.

I would therefore suggest that the ν at the end was added by some Egyptian, to whom as a rule this nasal sound had hardly any value. Instances of this we find scattered broadcast through the papyri. Cf. Mayser, Gr. Griech. Pap., pp. 191 sq. I would suggest that Sophocles wrote τωστρακρέω —i.e. τῷ ὀστρακρέω, a nickname for the κεράστης κάνθαρος. I do not consider κεράστης as 'simply an added extravagance.' Any entomologist of repute will tell you that the Oryctes Nasicornis is meant. It is found in Sicily, and the male has a horn of considerable size on its nose, so much so that it can carry the female by means of it. We may specially note that in size it becomes one of the largest of known insects.

As regards the formation of the word ὀστρακρέως, I do not think it offers any serious difficulty. It is compounded of ὀστρε+ακρεως. ι+α before ρ in Attic contracts to α, not η, as in Ionic. We find the form ἀκραία for ἀκραία
attested by the MSS. of Hippocrates. For the shortening of ai>e we may compare ποταίνων from ποταίαι. This question is treated of by Dindorf in the Thes. s.v. παλαιός. We may now add Timoth. Pers. 90, παλεομίσημα, and verses 21 and 120, παλεά and παλεωνυμφαγών.

In Aeschylus too we find an example of ai>e—viz. Septem contra Thebas, v. 239, ποταίνων κλίσοντας πάταγον ἀμα λύγω.

Here ποταίνων responds to διὰ θεῶν, line 233. We have to scan ποτάνων ~ ~ ~ — rather than ποτάνων, with synizesis of the e ~ ~ =, as done by Tucker. For the unintelligible ἈΜΜΙΓΑ of M I read ἈΜΑΛΙΓΑ, as required by sense and metre.

With respect to the similarity between the χελώνη and the κάνθαρος, we may note the Hesychian gloss: χελώνιας ἡ ποικίλη κανθαρίς.

In the preceding line the question was put:

τι δ' αὐτό τὸ φωνοῦν ἐστίν αὐτοῦ, τὸῦτὸς ἢ τοῦξῳ, φράσον.

The answer must relate to the concavity of the tortoise-shell turned upside down. The fem. ὀρεινή points to the animal endowed with the voice. In the first lacuna of nine letters I would therefore restore [ἡ φωνήσα]. For the second lacuna I would suggest λο[ρδή], assuming a synizesis of the η before the ο of ὀρεινή. Suidas has:

λεοντάτον τὸ ἀποσειμωμένον καὶ ἐναντίον τῷ κυρτῷ.

The synizesis of η and e before o in Greek is frequent, and may be expected in a Satyric play. In fact, it is very much in point here, as the true poet by this irregularity portrays the awkwardness of the tortoise turned upside down.

This line would therefore run:


As regards the synizesis of the vowels η, e before o, I may refer to August Scheindler, Metrische Studien zu Sophokles; Die Synizese und Aphaerese, Serta Harteliana, pp. 14 sqq.

In the Indagatores, v. 9, the papyrus has ἐγωῦκ, which points to Scheindler's view that we must write ἐγὼῦκ and ἐγὼῦτ in Sophocles. See pp. 19 and 20 op. l.

I may give another new case of the synizesis of e before o.

In Satyrus's Life of Euripides, Pap. Ox. 1176, fr. 38, Col. I. 16 sqq. we read:

τίς [ ... ] ὀθεός [κ]α[π]ραδάιμων

With Koerte (Archiv für Papyrusforschung, VI. 1913, p. 249) I hold that the editor's emendation βαρυδαίμων for παραδαίμων is weak. He rightly points out that παραδαίμων is formed like παράμουσας.
Wilamowitz suggests τὸς [ὁ δὲ] ἄθεος; but Hunt assures us that ἄθεος did not stand in the papyrus. He admits that the adverb ὁδὲ is required, as seen by Wilamowitz. So the conjecture of Diehls and Murray, ἀτιμόθεος, is ruled out of court. What the poet wrote was:

τὸς ὁδὲ ἄπόθεος καὶ παραδαίμων κτέ.

But Satyros for the purpose of his citation does not require the conjunction δέ. The papyrus only had τὸς [ὁ ὁπ]όθεος κτέ. To get the anapaestic metre we have to scan ἄπόθεος — —. For the synizesis of θεὸς I may refer to Porson's note to Eur. Or. 399.

Koerte compares παραδαίμων with παράμονος. We may now add: ἄπόθεος as ἄμονος: ἄθεος. Hesychius has the gloss: ἄπόθεα ἔκτος θεῶν Σωφοκλῆς Θεόστη. In Aesch. Prom. 20 we have the adj. ἄπάνθρωπος. We now see more clearly that the prepositions ἄτο and παρά in these compounds give the required sense.

With respect to the nickname ὀστράκρεος for the beetle, I may note that the tortoise is called φερέοικος. Etym. M.: φερέοικος ὁ κοχλιας καὶ ἡ χελώνη. Now in line 307 of the Indagatores we read:

δέρμα κ[...]στ[.

Wilamowitz suggests δέρμα κ[ὁ]στρ[ακον]; δέρμα would then refer to the cow-hide. But δέρμα may as well stand for the tortoise-shell. Cf. Aristoph. Vespae, 429, 1292. And as we require two letters before the στ it is clear that καί, and not κω, must be read. Sophocles may therefore have written something like:

δέρμα κ[αί] στέγας φέρει
('He carries his shell and hut').

The editor assures us that more stood in the papyrus than is supplied by Wilamowitz. And this space is taken up by φέρει.

In line 311 I would read κοι]λάδος from κοιλάς as referring to the hollow of the shell rather than κέλαδος with Schenkl, who ignores the paroxytone in the papyrus.
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