

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1912

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES, *ICHNEUTAE*, AND *EURYPYLUS*.

Ichneutae.

I. 7 ff. τέχνα[ισιν] is somewhat awkwardly isolated, if it means 'owing to the devices (of the thieves).' The run of the sentence would be improved by the substitution of ἰόντων . . . τεχνά[σματ'], and in the preceding line I should prefer ἔπειτ' ἀφρ[ούρων ἀρπαγῇ]ν ἰχνοσκοπῶ. After τεχνάσμιτ' perhaps ἄλλ' is better than ὥς.

II. 7 If ἐν λόγῳ παρίσταται is correct, as seems probable, it supports τοῖσδε μάρτυς ἐν λόγοις in *Phil.* 319, which has been the object of some suspicion.

II αὐτόχρομα does not mean *forthwith*, and is unsuitable to the context. Probably τὸ χρῆμα, used vaguely as in 17, V. 14, etc., should be restored, with a participle such as πράξας or ἀνύσας preceding and governing it.

14 σπουδῇ, with ἡ πάρεστι πρεσβύτη, qualifies ἐπεσσύτην, and the hyperbaton of τάδε scarcely requires defence.

18 Perhaps: τ[ὸ] γὰρ γέ[ρα]ς μοι κείμενον χρ[υ]σο[σ]τεφέ[ς] | μά[λι]στ' ἐπ[ιστολ]αῖσ[ι] π[ρ]οσθέσθ[αι] χρεῶν. 'Above all, you must see that to your behests is added the golden prize as my secure reward.' χρυσεοστεφές may have been written, just as some MSS. give χρυσεοστεφάνων in *Pind. Ol.* 8, 1.

III. 20 Surely εἰθ[υ]ντήριε rather than εἰθ[υ]ντήριε was the variant of Aristophanes. For the confusion of εὐθύνω, etc., with ἰθύνω, see *Eur. Hipp.* 1227, *Blomfield on Aesch. Pers.* 779. Recent critics incline to restore εὐθύνω (*Nauck on Aesch. fr.* 200).

NO. CCXXIX. VOL. XXVI.

26 Perhaps rather παντελής, a word used four times by Sophocles (including I. 13), but never by Euripides.

IV. 10 διπλοῦς, with ὀκλάζων following, seems to me preferable to the suggested substitute δίπους. ὦδε κεκλιμένος in V. 14 and the following lines show that the chorus were on all-fours, and apparently they exaggerated the command of Silenus to bend over the track. For διπλοῦς in this sense cf. *Eur. El.* 492.

IV. 15 Perhaps μὴ [π]ρ[όσω πά]τει.

18 Presumably there is not room for [ἐλα]ύνομεν.

V. 1 It is incredible to me that ροίβδημ' was applied to the lowing of cattle, as the text of the *editio princeps* requires. The clue is given by the employment elsewhere of ροίζος and ροίβδησις to express the whistling of shepherds (*Hom. ι* 315) or herdsmen (*Eur. I.A.* 1086). It is true that Monk took the contrary view on the latter passage, where he read ἐν ροιβδήσει βουκολιῶν, but he has failed to persuade subsequent critics, with the exception of Paley. Here we might substitute τῶν [ἔσω] for τῶν [βοῶν]; or, of course, the text might be otherwise modified.

8 In spite of the accent, I should prefer to punctuate after δέδορκεν, and to read αὐτὰ δ' εἰσίδε. The position and emphasis of αὐτὰ are paralleled in *Eur. Hel.* 421 αὐτὰ δ' εἰκάσαι πάρεστι ναὸς ἔκβολ' οἷς ἀμπίλομαι.

VI. 12 If the conditions permit, I should much prefer σχήματ' to σώματ'—

mere shapes without substance. Cf. Eur. fr. 25 γέροντες οὐδέν ἐσμεν ἄλλο πλὴν ψόφος καὶ σχῆμ'. id. fr. 360, 27 μὴ σχήματ' ἄλλως ἐν πόλει πεφυκότα. I cannot find that σῶμα was used contemptuously for *hulk* or *carcase*.

20 Reading αἰχμαῖσιν, I should reduce the stop at the end of the line to a comma or remove it altogether. αἰχμαῖσιν might be equivalent to our 'by the sword,' but is perhaps better rendered 'in battle.' Cf. Eur. fr. 16 λαμπροὶ δ' ἐν αἰχμαῖς Ἄρεος ἐν τε συλλόγοις. Phoen. 1273 αἰχμὴν ἐς μίαν καθέστατον. Soph. Phil. 1307 κακούς | θύτας πρὸς αἰχμὴν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς λόγοις θρασεῖς. See also Wilamowitz on *Her.* 158.

VII. 7 The triple repetition of αὐτός with παρεῖναι points to the punctuation γνώσει γάρ, αὐτὸς ἂν παρήσ κτέ.

8 προσβιβῶ λόγῳ is not 'I will urge you on by my voice,' but 'I will win you over by argument.' So προσβιβῶ λέγων in Ar. Av. 425 and elsewhere. We might render 'I'll persuade you.' Silenus professed that his persuasion would be vocal, but probably the by-play hinted at something more forcible.

10 I think the right reading is [ἀ]φίστω, which at once explains the genitive οἴμου, and gives an improved sense: *don't turn aside*. The difficult *Trach.* 339 does not help here, except as illustrating the use of βάσιν, for which cf. also *Al.* 42 τήνδ' ἐπεμπίπτει βάσιν and Eur. *Hclid.* 802 ἐκβάς πόδα. But there is another consideration which to my mind is decisive. To stand at the cross-roads, i.e. at a point where the road bifurcates (as explained by Gildersleeve on Pind. *Pyth.* 11. 38 κατ' ἀμυνσιπόρους τριόδους ἐδινήθην, | ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρῶν), was a proverbial image typical of hesitation: Theogn. 911 ἐν τριόδῳ δ' ἔσθηκα· δὴ εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν ὁδοὶ μοι· | φροντίζω τούτων ἥντιν' ἴω προτέρην. Oppian. *halieut.* 3. 501 εἰκελὸς ἀνδρὶ | ξείνῳ, ὃς ἐν τριόδοισι πολυτρίπτοις κυρήσας | ἔστιν ἐφορμαίνων, κραδίη τε οἱ ἄλλοτε λαιήν, | ἄλλοτε δεξιτερὴν ἐπιβάλλεται ἀτραπὸν ἐλθεῖν· | παπταίνει δ' ἐκάτερθε, νόος δέ οἱ ἥντε κύμα | εἰλεῖται, μάλα δ' ὄφρ' ἐμὴς ὠρέξατο βουλῆς. Thus here the meaning is 'hesitate no longer'; and it will be observed how well that agrees with the

use of ἀπειθυνῶ in the following line. The termination of τριζύγης is not more remarkable than e.g. ἀδμήτης in *O.C.* 1321: otherwise τριζυγοῦς would be the obvious remedy.

VIII. 17 ff. In defence of the suggestion communicated to Dr. Hunt, I would add that μέν' εἰ θέλεις seems to me very much better than μέν' εἰ δύνα, and that its tone 'do please stay' or 'won't you stay?' is exactly suitable to the occasion, if the chorus are now aware that Silenus is rather more frightened than the rest of them. Whether we read δύνα or θέλεις in the next line does not so much matter. The grotesque cowardice of Silenus after his vapourings in VI. 16 ff. may be illustrated by what Nonnus (14. 121) says of the satyrs in general: ἐν δὲ κυδοιμοῖς | πάντες ἀπειλητῆρες ἀεὶ φεύγοντες Ἐννώ, | νόσφι μόθιοι λέοντες, ἐνὶ πτολέμοις δὲ λαγωοί. The only serious objection to this arrangement is the presence of the paragraphus after IX. 1, indicating a change of speaker at that point. To suppose that this was an error—if indeed it is not excused by the change from lyrics to the speech of the coryphaeus—is a much less violent expedient than the alterations advocated by Wilamowitz. In IX. 2 perhaps rather ὅδ', with τοῖσιν instrumental: 'he won't come out for that: well, then . . .' The speaker turns to address the occupant of the cave, and there is no need to alter εἰ to ἦ in IX. 5. Why τοῖσιν should not be instrumental I do not know: there are several examples in tragedy like *El.* 549 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὐκ εἰμὶ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις | δύσθυμος or Eur. *Suppl.* 1042 φυλακὰς ἀνήκα τοῖς παρεστῶσιν κακοῖς. Still bolder is Antiph. 5. 3 ἄπιστοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ἀληθέσιν, αὐτοῖς τούτοις ἀπώλοντο.

IX. 9 ff. is a most puzzling passage. The following are the difficulties in the text as printed: (1) It is unusual for Silenus to be described as δεσπότης of the Satyrs: l. 12 precludes a reference to Dionysus. (2) What were the toils undergone by the Satyrs in order to gratify Silenus? If the service of Dionysus is meant, it is strange to describe it as laborious and irksome. (3) The corruption of εἶχες to εἶπες is improbable. (4) ὑμῖν has no obvious

meaning. (5) I cannot find any evidence elsewhere that the nymphs were daughters of Silenus—or of Dionysus, for that matter. Silenus is often their lover, and that agrees with II. 8. (6) *παίδων* is hardly a necessary correction in any case, but its adoption increases the awkwardness of *δεσπότη* and *ὑμῖν*. The marginal note shows that some doubt was felt concerning the soundness of the text, and its restoration is perhaps impossible. Still, it may be worth while to remark that if we adopt *εὐίαζες*, read *ὅς* for *οὗς*, and omit the words from *εἶχες*—*ὑμῖν ὅς*, all difficulty disappears. Though *ἔγγονος* and *ἔκγονος* are now identified, there was probably also an *ἔγγονος* (*ἔνγονος*) with the sense of *ἔγγενής*, and the relationship of nymphs and satyrs is attested by Hesiod (fr. 129 Goettl.) in Strabo 471. *ποδῶν ὄχλῳ* is a good enough phrase for the dancing rout of the followers of Dionysus. Whether the words *εἶπες*¹ *δεσπότη χάριν φέρων* were introduced as an alternative to *εὐίαζες ἀμφὶ τὸν θεόν*, or referred to a description by Silenus of his own exploits, it would be hazardous to speculate.

XI. 9 [*ἄπαν*] *στος* might be suggested in place of [*μέγχι*] *στος*.

II [*τύπου*], as the object of *ἐρείδει*, would give the required sense. With *τύπους παιδός*, 'his childish mould,' we might compare Eur. *Hclid.* 857 *νέων βραχιόνων* . . . *ἡβητὴν τύπον*, Aesch. *Suφrl.* 288 *γυναικείους τύπους*, Soph. *Trach.* 12 *ἀνδρείῳ τύπῳ* (so the MSS). So also Aesch. *Theb.* 475, Eur. *Bacch.* 1331.

14 Instead of *δυσεύρετος* we should expect a word expressing intentional concealment. Since *ἐγκληστής* will not serve, perhaps *κατάσχετος*.

XII. 9 The fact that *ὥς* follows *πέφυκεν* (*ἐστὶν* . . . *φυήν*) in ll. 7, 11 makes it at least arguable that it also follows *πέφυκεν* rather than *προσφέρεις* here, and that we should understand: 'is he not then the very image of an ichneumon (*ὥς ἰχνεύμονι προσφέρεις*)?' We know too little of the acatalectic tetrameter to condemn the anapaest.

XIV. 12 *ἄκαρπον* can hardly be the attribute of a person. The beginnings of 10 ff. may be supplied thus [*οὐτ' ἐγγενὲς μὲν ἡτρωσιν* . . . [*σὺ δ' ἄλλος* (*El.* 1454) *ὄστ' ἵς* (or *εἴ τις*) *ἐστὶ* . . . [*καὶ γῆν* (or *ἄγρον τ')* *ἄκαρπον*.

18 f. The order of the words shows that *ἐκ θεῶν* bears the main stress. Then we may accept *ὥς ἐγὼ γελῶ* from the margin: 'will not *the gods* punish your foolish jests and give me cause for laughter?' She reverts to the thought of l. 13. For *ἐκ θεῶν* cf. fr. 303.

Eurypylus.

Fr. 3 This fragment seems to belong to a dialogue between Eurypylus and someone (Astyoche?) who is urging him not to go into battle under unfavourable auspices. The indications are *φήμη*, *κράζει*, *ἄλλων ἀκηδής* on the one side, and *ἐδεξάμην*, *ἐπάδει* and *ἔργον δειλόν* on the other.

Fr. 5 I. 8 *ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδότη* cannot satisfactorily be combined with the vestiges of l. 10, and I was at one time inclined to think that fr. 768 belonged to another place in the play. But since Plutarch's quotation must have come from the messenger's speech describing the duel, and the very same part of his narrative was comprised in this column, the coincidence is too remarkable to be ignored. *τε* is not essential to Badham's correction (for the asyndeton cf. Eur. *Alc.* 173); and I suggest that *ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδότη* should be placed before *δ[ιαβεβλην] μένοι* in l. 8, understanding 'whose enmity was declared without vaunt or boasting.' *διαβάλλω* 'to set at variance'—i.e. to set opposite or apart—is inadequately treated in the lexicons, but cannot be discussed here. The notion of *slander* is secondary, and is often unnecessarily imported by the critics: thus *διαβληθῆς* should not be altered in Eur. *I.A.* 1372. *διαβάλλομαι* is not unlike our 'to come to logger-heads with,' and is usually followed by the dative (Eur. *Hec.* 863, *Hclid.* 422); here, if *ἀλλήλοις* was not expressed, it could doubtless have been supplied from the context.

II. 10 *ἀγχοῦ προσεῖπας* means (I think) 'thy words are near the truth.' Cf. *Ichneut.* XII. 12 *νῦν ἐγγὺς ἔγνωσ*. *Ant.* 933 *θανάτου τοῦτ' ἐγγυτάτω τοῦπος*

¹ But the *ed. minor* attributes *εἶδες* to the papyrus.

ἀφίεται. Eur. *Her.* 916 οὐκ ἂν τις εἴποι
μᾶλλον ἢ πεπόνθαμεν (Wilamowitz).

11 ἐπισπάσει με: 'will catch me.' The metaphor is from a fisherman hauling in his line: see fr. 137 and cf. Solon fr. 29 περιβαλὼν δ' ἄγραν, ἀγασ-
θεὶς οὐκ ἐπέσπασεν μέγα | δίκτυον. Since δίκαι here means 'punishment,' there is no logical inconsistency in reading δίκαι in l. 18. The echoed repetition of δαίμων there has rhetorical value; and fr. 686 shows that it is Sophoclean.

19 f. These lines are unsatisfactory for the following reasons: (1) αὐτὸν is meaningless, for the order of the words is decisive against its connexion with τὸν νεκρὸν as *cadaver ipsum*. (2) There is no evidence that γέλωτ' ἔχειν τινά could be used for γέλωτα ποιεῖσθαι (or τίθεσθαι) τινά = 'to make a mock of another.' Rather, following the analogy of αἰσχύνῃν ἔχειν, θαύμα ἔχειν, οἶκτον ἔχειν, ὀργὴν ἔχειν, φροντίδα ἔχειν, and many other examples collected by Ellendt s.v. ἔχω p. 293b, we may feel confident that Sophocles used γέλωτ' ἔχειν simply as a substitute for γελάω. (3) But the most serious difficulty is the use of βία, which can neither be combined with βεβᾶσι nor with γέλωτ' ἔχοντες. If joined to the latter, it ought to express forced laughter, which is exactly the opposite of the real intention. For the general meaning—to add insult to injury—is free from doubt: cf. Eur. fr. 1063, 15 καὶ πρὸς κακοῖσι τοῦτο δὴ μέγας γέλως. In place of αὐτὸν I would suggest ἄδρῶν, for which cf. ἄδρῶν γελάσαι, 'to laugh loudly,' in Antiphan. fr. 144 (II. 70 K.). But what is to be made of βεβᾶσι . . . βία? Even if βία were tolerable in this conjunction, the emphasis thrown upon βεβᾶσι, as if the departure of the Argives were the important point, is unnatural. The answer shows the object of Astyoche's question. Now, the Greek thought it fair enough to laugh at his enemy's misfortunes (*At.* 79), but felt more compunction in trampling on his prostrate form, or in spurning or jeering at his corpse. So in answer to Agamemnon's οὐ γὰρ θανόντι καὶ προσεμβῆναι σε χρή; Odysseus replies μὴ χαῖρ', Ἀτρεΐδῃ, κέρδεσιν τοῖς μὴ καλοῖς (*At.* 1348 f.). Hence the

proverbial ἐπεμβαίνειν κειμένῳ, copiously illustrated by Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 550. That ἐμβαίνειν as well as ἐπεμβαίνειν was used appears from Menander's μὴ μβαίνει δυστυχούντι · κοινὴ γὰρ τύχη. I hope it may now seem probable that ἢ κάμβεβᾶσι (καὶ μβεβᾶσι) should be read here. Observe how the position of Ἀργεῖοι, recurring to the verb, justifies that of βία. It is unnecessary to require τῷ νεκρῷ, for the accusative may well be governed by γέλωτ' ἔχειν after the pattern of O.C. 223 δέος ἴσχετε μηδὲν ὅσ' αὐδῶ (Jebb's n.) or Eur. *Or.* 1069 ἐν μομφᾷ ἔχω.

24 The suggestion that δάκη τόσ' should be read involved some such restoration of the following words as δ δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἀσχημόνως | λύμην Ἀχαιῶν δις τόσῃν ἤσχυμμένος. The deictic use of τόσα, recognised by the schol. on *Trach.* 53, does not need defence, but that δάκος could be used for a spear-wound is, I think, to be inferred from Aesch. *Theb.* 386 λόφοι δὲ κώδων τ' οὐ δάκνουσ' ἄνευ δορός, and *Cho.* 842 τῷ πρόσθεν ἐλκαίνοντι καὶ δεδηγμένῳ. For the form cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2. 53.

III. 12 f. The grammatical difficulty might be solved by reading διδόντος, if we could suppose that ἀνδρὸς referred to Priam. But the contrast implied in the juxtaposition of γυναικῶν and ἀνδρὸς is not easy to justify, and the passage awaits elucidation.

17 This line was probably explained by the earlier descriptions of Eurypylos. Dr. Hunt rightly observes that παῖδα must be 'boy' rather than 'son.' To suppose that Eurypylos was still a 'child at heart' is hardly a Greek idea, and it is better to guess that he was βούπαις, ἀντίπαις—like Achilles in fr. 139—or ἀνδρόπαις—like Troilus in fr. 562 and Parthenopaeus in Aesch. *Theb.* 520. Thus the meaning would be: 'one who, while a boy in years, was both counsellor and warrior.' Cf. Eur. fr. 508, *Paroem.* I. 436.

21 ἐλπίδων ἀρωγαί of Orestes in *El.* 858. But since τε so easily disappears—an error which, strangely enough, may be illustrated by the same passage—we should probably read μεγίστην <τ'>.

A. C. PEARSON.