

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](#)



Two Notes on the *Agamemnon*

W. M. Calder

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 7-8 / November 1922, pp 163 - 163

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00017030, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00017030

How to cite this article:

W. M. Calder (1922). Two Notes on the *Agamemnon*. The Classical Review, 36, pp 163-163
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00017030

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

TWO NOTES ON THE *AGAMEMNON*.

1. ll. 494-5:

μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι κάσις
πηλοῦ ξίνουρος διψία κόσις τάδε . . .

When a Greek runs, he sweats, and is quite frank about it. Walter Headlam has shown that the dust [on the herald's body] is a stock indication of speed, and quotes Lucian I. 623: οὐχ ὄρῃς δὲ τὸν Ἑρμῆν αὐτὸν ἰδρῶτι βέβημενον καὶ τῷ πόδε κεκοιμημένον καὶ πνευστιῶντα; μεστὸν γοῦν ἀσθματος αὐτῷ τὸ στόμα. τί ταῦτα, ὦ Ἑρμῆ, ἢ σπουδῆ; the same passage gives a hint of the meaning of πηλοῦ ξίνουρος. The dust is thirsty, and absorbs the sweat, forming borders of mud. Translate, 'Yon dust, fraternally fringed with mud, is my witness to this. . . .' The picture, as usual with Aeschylus, is taken from life.

2. l. 1655. A suggestion communicated to me by the late F. W. Haskins, of Trinity College, Cambridge, deserves record. After all the bloodletting in the play, the MS. μηδὲν ἡματώμεθα, cure it as you will, is startling, even on the lips of Clytaemnestra. Haskins proposed ΜΗΔΕΝΑΛΛΑΤΩΜΕΘΑ, understanding that ἡματώμεθα was an attempt at correction after the two lambdas had coalesced into M.

W. M. CALDER.

ARISTOPHANES, *ECCLES*. 51-2.

καὶ τὴν Φιλοδηρήτου τε καὶ Χαρητῆδος
ὄρῳ προσιοῦσας καὶ ἕτερας πολλὰς πάνυ, κτλ.

'POST alterum καὶ articulus τὴν negligentius est omissus,'—van Leeuwen. But the omission of the article in such cases is a common negligence. What is peculiar here is the position of τε. If the passages adduced by Blaydes *ad loc.* (to illustrate the omission of τὴν) are examined, it will be seen that they are of two kinds: (1) e.g. Lucian, *D.D.* 20. 12 τὴν Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Λυδίαν, *Nigr.* 31 τὸ ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις τε καὶ κωμῳδίαις λεγόμενον, Plat. *Lys.* 206E ἐν τοῖς αἰσί τε καὶ νεανίσκοις; and (2) Plat. *Apol.* 19B ζητῶν τά τε ὑπὸ γῆς καὶ οὐράνια, Aeschin. *c. Ctes.* 91 τηλικαῦται δυνάμεις . . . ἢ τε Φιλίππου καὶ Θηβαίων. In the first class the two things are combined to form one concept ('the country comprising Phrygia and Lydia,' 'the theatre,' etc.), in the second they are kept distinct. It is the position of τε which makes the difference. Aeschines could not have said ἢ Φ. τε καὶ Θ.; and so Plat. *Lys.* 206D ἀναμειγμένοι ἐν ταῦτῳ εἰσιν οἱ τε νεανίσκοι καὶ οἱ παῖδες, though doubtless the repetition of the article here helps the distinction. Similarly Sophocles could say, *El.* 991, καὶ τῷ λέγοντι καὶ κλύοντι σύμμαχος, but not τῷ λ. τε καὶ κλ. In Thuc. VII. 56. 4 τοῦ ξυμπαντος ὄχλου τοῦ ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ πρὸς τὴν Ἀθηναίων τε πόλιν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων (ξυνελθόντος), the position of πόλιν justifies the singular, while the position of τε shows that Athens and Sparta are to be regarded as forming one concept—the protagonists of the Peloponnesian war.

In this passage of the *Ecclesiastusae*, if the two women are seen separately, one expects τὴν τε Φ. καὶ X. or καὶ τὴν Φ. καὶ X.; if together—

say approaching arm in arm—τὴν Φ. τε καὶ X. Hence Meineke's conjecture γε (adopted by van Leeuwen). But it would perhaps be a nearer conjecture to read προσιοῦσαν in l. 52, and to suppose only one woman is seen. A joke has been made at the expense of the last two women who have entered the scene, and another will not be out of place. We may imagine a well-known rumour of a *ménage à trois* or a single act of adultery condoned.

A. W. GOMME.

EURIPIDES' *HELENA*.

122. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὅσσοις εἰδόμεν καὶ νοῦς ὄρῃ.
? ὅσσοις εἰδόμεν, ἂ νῦν σ' ὄρῃ. ὄρῃ would assist the corruption of νῦν σ' to νοῦς, with consequent substitution of καὶ for δ.

284. τὴν τοῦ Διὸς δὲ λεγομένην Διοσκύρω . . .
? διούσω κῶρω: the name would naturally arise in the copyist's mind. Cf. 1643, 1664.

296-7. ἀλλ' ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς | ξυνηῖ γυναῖκα, καὶ τὸ
σῶμ' ἐστὶν πικρόν.

? καὶ τὸ σῶν εἶναι πικρόν: 'Living with a man one hates makes security itself hateful.' CΩN misread as CΩM would lead to ἐστὶν for εἶναι.

302. σμικρὸν δ' ὁ καιρὸς ἀρτ' ἀπαλλάξει βίον.
? ἀκρὸς δ' ὁ κ. ἀρ' ἀπ. β.: 'Ripe of a truth is the opportunity to be rid of life: such is the depth of woes whereinto we are fallen.' For ἀρα cf. *Phoen.* 1675, *Andromache* 1114, *Soph. Ai.* 738.

325-6. τὰληθῆ φράσαι
ἔχου' ἐν οἴκοις τοῦδε, τί βλέπεις πρόσω;
? ἢ 'χου' . . . : 'She that can tell thee the truth,' etc.

364-5. πολὺ δὲ δάκρυον, ἀχεῖ τ' ἀχεῖ,
δάκρυα δάκρυον ελαβε πάθει.
? κρύσα κρύσει, βλάβει, πάθει: δακρύει (from 364) being the intermediate stage of corruption.

389. ἐν θεοῖς λιπεῖν βίον.
ἐν θεοῖς looks like a corruption due somehow to ἐς θεοῖς in 388. ? ἦθεος λ. β.: cf. πρὶν γεννῆσαι, 390.

607. λιποῦσα σεμνὸν ἄντρον οὐ σφ' ἐσώζομεν.
But the cave was not sacred, for all we are told. ? σεμνῶς, an error of assimilated terminations.

818. ἐρεῖ δὲ τίς μ' οὐ γνώσεται' ὅς (or γνώσεται ὅς) εἰμ' ἐγώ, MSS.
? ἐρεῖ δὲ τίς; ποῦ γνώσεται δ' (or perhaps μ') ὅς, κ.τ.λ. ποῦ = 'how': *Iph. Ai.* 406, *Orest.* 802. Deferred δὲ has caused trouble in 688, 1125, and 1150 in this play.

936. καὶ μὲν θανὼν δδ' ἐν πυρῷ κατεσφάγη . . .
? κατεφλέγη: ΦΑΕΓΗ misread as ΦΑΓΗ.

961. λέξω τὰδ' ἀμφὶ μῆμα σου πατὴρ πόθω.
? Read πολλῶν for πόθω: cf. *Orest.* 1271 and *Alcest.* 29.

1051. εἰ δὲ κερδανῶ λέγειν
ἔτοιμός εἰμι μὴ θανῶν λόγῳ θανεῖν.
? κερδανεῖ λέγειν: 'If the report shall reap any profit.' For substantival infinitive without article, cf. *Alcest.* 782, Aesch. *Ag.* 584, Goodwin *M.T.* 745: corruption through misunderstood construction and assimilation to εἰμι in next line.