

# 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](#)



---

## Adversaria (Aesch. *Agam.*)

T. G. Tucker

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 08 / October 1893, pp 340 - 343

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00198415, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00198415](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00198415)

### How to cite this article:

T. G. Tucker (1893). Adversaria (Aesch. *Agam.*). The Classical Review, 7, pp 340-343  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00198415

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

corresponds to a certain field of European *l*; Sanskrit *l* covers a wider field than Vedic *l*, but this wide field of *l* corresponds remarkably to European *l*, therefore it cannot have come through the narrower Vedic field and so represents a different dialect. This is good reasoning, true or untrue, but the exceptions to F.'s law, which B. discusses, are partly *Vedic words* and therefore by explaining them as due to dialect he is introducing dialectal differences into the Vedic hymns, which is a very different matter and highly improbable on the face of it. By way of showing up Brugmann's harsh treatment of F., Bechtel proceeds to imply that he accepts a rule of Weise's in the *Grundriss*, whereas Brugmann merely parenthetically observes that Weise has formulated it. I think a very little study of the *Grundriss* shows that more weight is given to a view which is discussed and refuted than to one which is simply credited to the authority on which it rests.

These remarks are not made with any view to contentiousness, for the only object of attack should be error, but they are

necessary for the very reason that the attack is veiled. There is quite enough to criticize in Brugmann's system without attacking him personally or making insinuations of unfairness: and I sum up my view of Bechtel's book by saying that the controversial parts are mostly barren, the original matter negligible, and the historico-critical parts excellent.

What then are the main points of the system which these two books represent? They are three in number. Vocalic formation, sonants, and the guttural system. It must be pointed out to begin with that these three are of very various importance: the last is merely a question of phonology, while the former two are fundamental and radical differences which can hardly be separated in discussion. As is well known, the accepted view places *l* *r* *m* and *ŋ* approximately on a level with *i* and *u* and, as I have said, I would go a step further . . . [The MS. ends here. Fick's exclusion of *i* and *u* from the list of vowels was commended above.]

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

#### ADVERSARIA (AESCH. AGAM.).

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 468—470.

τὸ δ' ὑπερκόπως κλύειν εὖ  
βαρὺ· βάλλεται γὰρ ὅσσοις  
Διόθεν κεραυνός.

Wecklein records sixteen attempts to emend the last four words. But all the correctors apparently think *κεραυνός* right, and *ὅσσοις* wrong. On general principles one would naturally suppose the rarer word and form *ὅσσοις* less likely to be the copyist's than the common word and form *κεραυνός*. Moreover it is universally admitted that *βάλλεται τις ὅσσοις* is more acceptable Greek than *βάλλεται κεραυνός*. But editors, unable to keep both *κεραυνός* and *ὅσσοις*, fall back on quotation from Herodotus (vii. 10) *φιλεί γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούει*, and claim that we require here an equivalent to *τὰ ὑπερέχοντα*. Which saying is true; but Herodotus goes on with *ὁ θεὸς φθονήσας* in the same connection, and, if we are to deal in quotation, we must have our equivalent to *φθονήσας*, which is given in *ὅσσοις*. Moreover we can counter-quote *Ag.* 947 *μή τις πρόσωθεν ὁμματος βάλῃ φθόνος*. But editors quote again Lucret. v.

1131 '*invidia quoniam, ceu fulmine, summa vaporant*,' from which however '*ceu fulmine*' could be structurally eliminated. The fact is, we seem to desiderate three things, *φθόνος*, *τὰ ὑπερέχοντα*, *κεραυνός*, and we cannot have them (without the simile of Lucretius). Of the possible combinations of two out of the three things, one combination is impossible to our text, viz. *φθόνος* with *κεραυνός*. Keeping *ὅσσοις* we may read

βάλλεται γὰρ ὅσσοις  
Διόθεν κάρανα.

where *κάρανα* = *τὰ ὑπερέχοντα* = *summa*.

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 545—549.

KH. ποθεῖν ποθοῦντα τήνδε γῆν στρατὸν  
λέγεις;  
XO. ὥς πόλλ' ἀμανρᾶς ἐκ φρένός μ' ἀναστέ-  
νειν.  
KH. † ποθέν τὸ δύσφρον τοῦτ' ἐπὶν στύγος  
στρατῶ; †  
XO. πάλαι τὸ σιγᾶν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω.  
KH. καὶ πῶς ἀπόντων κοιράνων ἔτρεψιν τινάς;

Every one rejects *στρατῶ*. For conjectures

see Wecklein: I propose the minimum change

πόθεν τὸ δύσφρον; τοῦ τ' ἐπὶν στύγος κρά-  
τους;

= 'and what loathed oppression lay on  
you?'

στύγος κράτους like δεσπότου στύγει ('loathed  
master') in *Cho.* 770. Cf. Τυδέως βία etc.  
v. 546 implies that things have been wrong  
at home. v. 549 *ἔτρεϊς τινάς* shows that,  
though speaking darkly, the interlocutors  
understood each other.

*Agamemnon* 649.

χειμῶν 'Αχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς.

I think this is sound and means 'a storm  
which ought to (or 'will') stir the wrath of  
the gods of (= favourable to) the Achaeans.'  
*ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς* is like *νόσοις ἄθικτον* of *Suppl.*  
562 (Dind.), where I have pointed out the  
distinction between such negative verbals  
with the dative and with the genitive.  
*ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς* = 'propter quam dei irasci non  
*debent*,' and οὐκ ἄ. θεοῖς = 'propter quam dei  
irasci debent.'

*Agamemnon* 778 sqq.

τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἔδεθλα σὺν πίνῳ  
χερῶν  
παλιντρόποις ὄμμασι λιποῦσ' ὅσια προσέβα  
τοῦ  
δύναμιν οὐ σέβουσα πλούτου παράσημον αἶνω.

It is granted that *προσέβα τοῦ* is without  
structure or metre. But Hermann's *προσέ-  
μολε* is very far from a cure. Why not  
*προσέφατο*? This implies *προσέμολε* and  
gives a more poetical turn. 'She addresses  
herself to the righteous.'

*Agamemnon* 1348—1371.

The tone and action of the chorus here  
appear to me to have been wholly mis-  
understood. Mr. Sidgwick is very hard  
upon the 'grave and reverend' seniors. He  
finds them 'a helpless and hesitating mob,'  
charges them with 'sententious incom-  
petence' and 'shuffling off of responsibility.'  
Dr. Verrall is harder still, going so far as  
to say at one place 'this speaker is utterly  
helpless, the next almost idiotic with terror.'  
To me it is inconceivable

(1) that the chorus which has previously  
been so consistently sage and dignified  
should become 'almost idiotic' or 'sententi-  
ously incompetent';

(2) that a chorus which becomes either  
of these things should subsequently (vv.  
1399 to the end) prove so steadily cour-  
ageous;

(3) that Aeschylus should in any case  
place his chorus, particularly one of reverend  
old men, in the humiliating position of talk-  
ing worse nonsense than Launcelot Gobbo  
answered by Dogberry on the one side and  
Polonius on the other.

That a chorus should express fear or  
lamentation is common and natural enough,  
but I cannot discover any chorus which is  
rendered absolutely contemptible. *Actoris  
partes chorus officiumque virile defendat* says  
Horace, but there is nothing *virile* about  
the present chorus, as its action is usually  
conceived. It utterly lacks the *ἐπιείκεια*  
demanded by Aristotle and ruins the *ἦθος*  
of the tragedy. A contemptible chorus is  
comic and not tragic.

No doubt there is often a certain clumsi-  
ness, a hitch in the action, observable in  
the construction of a Greek play, when we  
treat it as literature. Stage exigencies  
often demand that time, which can ap-  
parently be ill spared, should be passed in  
discussion which we should on matter-of-  
fact grounds regard as somewhat tedious  
or frivolous. But, with only the text and  
not the action or the stage-directions before  
us, we are apt to misjudge even these  
instances, and to suppose the Greek play-  
wrights guilty of more awkwardness than  
they actually committed. If we could see  
the chorus at this juncture acting and moving  
as the stage-manager of Aeschylus made  
them act and move, and if we could hear their  
tones and emphasis as they uttered these  
lines, we should form a very different notion  
of their attitude.

Inasmuch, however, as we cannot enjoy  
this advantage, we must do our best to  
realize their tone by (1) translating correctly,  
(2) emphasizing the proper words. We may  
also, perhaps, now that we have begun to  
re-enact Greek plays and to apply to  
dramatic literature something more than  
verbal criticism, endeavour to supply our  
own stage-directions. I should suggest, as  
the crudest stage-directions, that (α) each  
member of the chorus should speak with  
rapidity and eagerness and with vehement  
gesture, (β) that each speaker should move  
or make as if to move towards the palace,  
and that they should only be stopped from  
approaching it at v. 1371 by 'enter Clytaem-  
nestra.'

For the translation, I should draw atten-  
tion to the following emphatic words in

particular, viz. δρᾶν (1353), βουλῆς and δρᾶντος (1358—9), λόγοισι (1361). That these words *are* emphatic is shown either by strong position or by antithesis. By putting the proper stress upon these words I believe it will be found that, after the first speaker, *all the members of the chorus alike are bent on immediate action*, that they display no hesitating incompetence whatever; and that it is merely stage exigencies which prevent them from rushing on to the stage with one accord, one speaker taking up another with the *same view variously expressed*.

A rough literal translation (in which I must be permitted to express emphasis by *italics*) would read as follows:—

A. 'For my part I give you my judgment, that we summon a rescue of the citizens to the palace.'

B. 'Nay, best, *I* think, to rush in *at once*, and prove the deed by witness of the sword still freshly dripping.'

C. 'And I too, sharing in that view, vote for *doing*. It is no moment for delay.'

D. 'It is plain to see. They are sounding the prelude which betokens subjection of the realm.'

E. 'Yes, for we are *tarrying*: while they, treading underfoot awe of the Future, are wakeful and a-doing.'

F. 'I know not what *counsel* I can utter to good purpose. It is the man who *acts* that can also form a counsel.'

G. 'That is my view too; for I see no way *by words* to raise again a man when he is dead.'

H. 'Are we, just to prolong our lives, to yield to the rule of these shamers of the house?'

I. 'Nay, it is not tolerable. Better to die. For that is a milder lot than tyranny.'

J. 'Nay, shall we by signs from groans augur of the man that he is dead?'

K. 'We must know the facts with certainty, and then talk of them (*μυθεῖσθαι*). Guessing and certainty are things apart.'

L. 'My judgment is wholly in favour of that view—to know with certainty the plight of Atreus' son.'

Thus all the chorus makes for the palace. The inducements are variously expressed:—

A. opens the question.

B. says 'let us convict them in the act.'

C. agrees: 'yes, let us be doing.'

D. says 'let us nip their usurpation in the bud.'

E. agrees: 'yes, they must not work while we stand still.'

F. says 'if we act first, we can deliberate afterwards.'

G. assents: 'yes, talking will not bring him to life again.'

H. says 'let us beard them at the risk of death.'

I. assents: 'yes, better death than servitude.'

J. says 'moreover, he may not yet be dead.'

K. assents: 'yes, let us settle that point at least.'

L. sums up.

It is the couplet marked F which has chiefly led commentators astray. βουλῆς and δρᾶντος represent of course the λόγος and ἔργον, and the meaning is 'if we talk, we may be too late to act, whereas if we act we shall put ourselves in a position to debate to some purpose'; literally 'to him who *acts* belongs also the coming to a conclusion on a matter.' Editors can also have adopted θυμοῦσθαι in v. 1368 only in ignorance of the whole position, and that unfortunate conjecture has probably been the means of diverting many a student from discovering the truth.

In the couplet E, I have translated 'awe of the Future' from a correction of my own, which does not, of course, affect the general sense even of that couplet separately. The editions have (vv. 1356—7)

χρονίζομεν γάρ· οἱ δὲ τῆς μελλούσης κλέος  
πέδοι πατοῦντες οὐ καθεύδουσιν χερί.

The MSS. give πέδον and τῆς μελλούσης κλέος or οἱ δὲ μελλούσης κλέος. Trypho records ὦδε τῆς μελλούσης χάριν. Obviously τῆς μελλούσης is right; and obviously also μελλούσης may have come directly from ignorance of the form μελλοῦς and conscious alteration to the participle. But the -ης of μελλούσης may have had a less obvious origin. As in *Cho.*

160 we find a MS. reading σκυ<sup>ησ</sup>θιτά for Σκυθικά, where κ, written as correction of τ, became ισ and thence ησ (so Mr. Housman, *Journal of Philology* vol. xvi. no. 32), so here -ης may be another trace of inter-linear Κ becoming ΙC and thence -ησ. That κ is the κ of κλέος, which is itself spurious. The true reading I believe to be

οἱ δὲ τῆς Μ ε λ λ ο ὦ σ δ έ ο ς  
πέδοι πατοῦντες

'treading down the awe of Mello.' Μελλώ, like Πευθώ, is a goddess, the personification, not of delay, but of that which is to be. The process of corruption starts from ΜΕΛΛΟΥCΔΕΟC by Δ becoming Λ. The κ to make κλέος may have been written over

Κ

thus ΜΕΛΛΟΥCΛΕΟC. At the same time it is perhaps not necessary to assume more than a corruption (1) of δέος to κλέος and (2) a 'correction' of μελλοῦς to μελλούσης.  
T. G. TUCKER.

N.B.—In p. 250 a (*Iph. Aut.* 573) ῥσθα is wrongly written for ῥδσθα.

## NOTES ON SOPHOCLES.

Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 723—725.

τοιαῦτα φῆμαι μαντικαὶ διώρισαν,  
ὦν ἐντρέπου σὺ μηδέν· ὦν γὰρ ἂν θεὸς  
χρεῖαν ἐρευνᾷ ῥαδίως αὐτὸς φανεί.

The editors, who accept the text as above, follow in the line of the Scholiast's explanation of the words ὦν ἂν θεὸς χρεῖαν ἐρευνᾷ. His comment is ἂ ὁ θεὸς ζητῇ πρόποντα κρίνας ζητεῖσθαι. Now, even assuming that ὦν χρεῖαν is the equivalent of ἂ χρήσιμα ὄντα, there would be something to be said as to the appositeness of the expression in this context. But the only legitimate meaning of the sentence is: 'God will readily disclose those matters, whose advantage he investigates': cf. *Plat. Rep.* 371 E where hired labourers are defined as πωλοῦντες τὴν τῆς ἰσχύος χρεῖαν. L. and S. adopt this meaning of χρεῖα and elicit some kind of sense by treating ὦν as adverbial, which is impossible. Again, if χρεῖα means 'need,' it is surely nonsense to introduce the god as *searching for* a need of something. On the other hand Elmsley confessed himself unable to understand the meaning, Musgrave proposed ἦν for ὦν ('quod negotium') which is not specially attractive, and Blaydes has several improbable conjectures. I believe that χρεῖαν means 'need' or 'necessity' and would replace ἐρευνᾷ by ἀνεύρη. Mr. Housman has more than once called attention to the curious trick of the scribes in changing the order of letters in a word, and if Sophocles wrote ε for η the two words contain exactly the same letters.

*Oed. Tyr.* 1526.

ὁστις οὐ ζήλω πολιτῶν καὶ τύχαις ἐπιβλέπων.

There are two serious difficulties in these concluding lines of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The lesser concerns the construction of ὀλβίζειν in v. 1529, but the greater arises from the MSS. reading of v. 1526, which is

undoubtedly corrupt. All editors seem to have made Οἰδίπους in v. 1524 the subject to ἐλήλυθεν and εἰς ὅσον dependent on λεύσσετε. Blaydes rightly observes that we should expect Οἰδίπουν τόνδε, and I should prefer to supply ἐστίν in 1524 'See, here is Oedipus,' and connect εἰς ὅσον with the verb contained in ἐπιβλέπων. If this point is once grasped, it becomes easy to write (partly after Musgrave) ὦν τίς οὐ ζήλω πολιτῶν καὶ τύχαις ἐπιβλέπει; ὅστις naturally passed to ὅστις, even apart from the ὅς of the preceding line, and βλέπων for βλέπει is a mere blunder, perhaps due to the influence of the last syllable of πολιτῶν. ζήλω καὶ τύχαις is a kind of hendiadys, and for the meaning of ζήλος cf. *Al.* 503. This view of the passage has the further advantage of clearing up the construction of ὀλβίζειν, for we may put a comma after ἐλήλυθεν, and find a subject for the infinitive in the words τίς οὐ πολιτῶν now that the influence of these words is extended throughout the following line. It may still be a question whether θνητὸν ὄνθ' agrees with μηδέν or with the subject of ὀλβίζειν, but it seems very harsh to separate ὄνθ' from ἐπισκοποῦντα which is involved in the former alternative. Prof. Jebb now treats ὀλβίζειν as an imperative of the third person, but surely a subject is needed. If it be objected to the view given above that θνητὸν ὄνθ'.....ἐπισκοποῦντα ought to be in the nom., we may reply (1) that the usage of the language is not constant, *Thuc.* i. 12, 1 (*Stahl*), vii. 34, 6; and (2) that the symmetry of the passage is interfered with by the intervening subordinate clause.

Soph. *Trach.* 903.

κρύψας' ἑαυτὴν ἔνθα μή τις εἰσίδου.

On p. 7 of the *Classical Review* for this year Prof. Sonnenschein writes (doubtless unintentionally) as though ἔνθα μή τις εἰσίδου