

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](#)



Adnotatiunculae

R. Y. Tyrrell

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 301 - 302

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186159, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186159

How to cite this article:

R. Y. Tyrrell (1892). Adnotatiunculae. The Classical Review, 6, pp 301-302 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186159

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of its contents are opposite to it, as the corporeal to the incorporeal for instance; it is independent of corporeal conditions. But this statement is made about the human reason as appears from the reference to memory a line or two below. Zeller, however, translates χωρισθείς (*op. cit.* 571) vom Körper getrennt, a rendering which is difficult to reconcile with the passages already quoted, and seems to imply a reference to a life apart from the body, which is alien to Aristotle's present point of view. The reason is passive and affected by corporeal conditions, so far as it uses the φαντάσματα grasping the εἶδη from among them. It is purely active only when it concerns itself with νοητά, among which itself is included.

One or two considerations may explain Aristotle's use of the term νοητός. In the

first place, he was occupied with the theory of knowledge even more than with that of the soul. He was more occupied for example with the question, How does the reason apprehend its objects? than with the question, Can the reason exist apart from the bodily life in which we know it? Further, the intellectual objects in the world are logically prior to the reason itself. 'For the reason is moved by the object of reason' (*Meta.* 1072 a. 30). The reason finds itself in a world intellectually constituted, of which indeed itself is the highest part. But it depends for its exercise on the presence of intelligible objects (νοητά). By participation in them it apprehends external objects and itself (ἐαυτὸν δὲ νοεῖ ὁ νοῦς κατὰ μετάληψιν τοῦ νοητοῦ *Meta.* 1072 b. 20).

FRANK GRANGER.

ADNOTATIUNCULAE.

Herodas iv. 54.

KY. ἀλλ' ἡμερη τε κηπὶ μέζον ὠθεῖται.

Such is the form in which this *locus conclamatus* appears in Herwerden's edition of Herodas. He says rightly in the note that the sense which we should expect is *at vero socors est, et semper crescit eius socordia*. It will be perceived that Herwerden gives up the beginning of the verse, and indeed he rightly shows dissatisfaction with the latter half, in which ὠθεῖται is supposed to mean the same as ἔρχεται, which seems impossible. I suggest that Cynno's complaint about her maidservant was

ἀλλ' ἡρέμη τε κηπὶ μέζον νοθεῖται

'but she is so easy-going, and gets lazier every day.' The rare and late form ἡρέμη for ἡρεμαία would have puzzled the copyist and caused him to write ἡμέρη for ἡρέμη. Again the ἀπαξ εἰρημένον, the word νοθεῖται, would have lost its N after μέζον. The verb νοθεύομαι is related to νοθής as εὐλαβέομαι to εὐλαβής and προμηθέομαι to προμηθής.

Aesch. *Eum.* 530.

γελᾷ δὲ δαίμων ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ θερμῷ
τὸν οὔ ποτ' αἰχλὺντ' ἰδὼν ἀμαχάνους δύαις
λάπαδνον.

But the MSS. give λέπαδνον for λάπαδνον, which is Musgrave's conjecture, and the Schol. explains τὸν μηδέποτε προσδοκῆσαντα τιμωρεῖσθαι ἰδὼν ἐν μέσῃ τῇ δύνῃ ὑπεξευγμένον

NO. LIII. VOL. VI.

καὶ χαλινωθέντα· τοῦτο γὰρ δηλοῖ τὸ λέπαδνον. Thus the Schol. distinctly recognises λέπαδνον, and we should read

τὸν οὔ ποτ' αἰχλὺντ' ἀμαχανίας δύνει
λέπαδνον,

which corresponds perfectly to the strophic verse as given by the MSS.

τὸν ἀντίτολμον δὲ φαμὶ παραιβάταν.

We thus escape the necessity of inserting with Hermann καὶ before παραιβάταν, of which Paley can only say 'The καὶ is required by the metre and is by no means superfluous to the sense'; we preserve λέπαδνον of the MSS.; and we gain a verse very Aeschylean and very like *Agam.* 211

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνάγκας ἔδυν λέπαδνον.

We have to correct δύαις to δύνει, and to omit ἰδὼν, which may very well have been inserted by some copyist who did not see that αἰχλὺντα is governed by γελᾷ, which here takes its two regimens the dat. with ἐπὶ and the accus., or (to express the same thing differently) γελᾷ is to be supplied in thought again before τὸν αἰχλὺντα. It was probably this slight anomaly which gave rise to the corruption. *Cp.* for it the double constr. of παύω with gen. and accus. in Eur. *Bacch.* 513. Again, the corruption was assisted by the fact that Aesch. here (in a lyric passage) follows the epic quantity in δύνει, which is δύνει in Attic. In like measure we find ἰσόθεος in lyrical passages in Aesch. *Pers.* 80

Y

and Soph. *Ant.* 836, though we have ἰσόθεος in dialogue in Eur. *Troad.* 1169 and *Iph. Aul.* 626. Emendations are hardly ever certain unless they involve an anomaly.

Soph. *Phil.* 83.

Perhaps it is worth observing that by a slight change in the order of the words we could introduce the much-needed article into this verse, thus :—

μέρος νυν ἐς τάναιδὲς ἡμέρας βραχὺ
δὸς μοι σεαντόν.

The enclitic νυν is quite as suitable here as νῦν.

Phil. 533.

ἴωμεν, ὦ παῖ, προσκύσαντε τὴν ἔσω
δοικὸν εἰσοίκησιν.

What we require is a participle which could go with εἰς οἴκησιν, and would enable us to get rid of such an objectionable form as εἰσοίκησιν. I suggest προσκάσαντε from προσκάζω 'to limp forward'; Philoctetes would readily apply to Neoptolemus also, as his companion, a word strictly applicable only to himself. The tense, as well as the compound verb, would be ἀπαξ εἰρημένον.

Trach. 196.

τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν ἕκαστος ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων
οὐκ ἂν μεθεῖτο πρὶν καθ' ἡδονὴν κλύειν.

Prof. Jebb's admirable note so clearly shows that τὸ ποθοῦν regarded as a pres. partic. cannot be satisfactorily construed, that I am emboldened to regard this as a strong case of omitted augment—the passage is a messenger's speech—and to understand the words to mean 'what they desired.' The change of τὸ to ὁ is not necessary.

Trach. 302.

ὦ Ζεῦ τροπαῖε μή ποτ' εἰσίδοιμί σε
πρὸς τοῦμόν οὕτω σπέρμα χωρήσαντά ποι.

The use of χωρεῖν πρὸς for hostile advance may be compared with τοῦτ' ἐπ' ἡμᾶρ ἔρχεται *Oed.* R. 199, and both these passages defend my proposed correction of *Oed. Col.* 1453 ὄρᾳ ὄρᾳ ταῦτ' αἰεὶ χρόνος ἐπεὶ μὲν ἕτερα, where for ἐπεὶ I propose to read ἐπιῶν 'assailing,' as far nearer to the MSS. than the generally received στρέφων. Moreover this reading dispenses with the necessity of changing δέδια to δέδοικα in the antistrophe, which now runs without any change exactly as the strophe

τί μὲν ἀφήσει τέλος; δέδια τόδ' οὐ γὰρ ἄλιον.

Trach. 600.

ᾔθεν μόλοι πανάμερος.

The word πανάμερος certainly admits of no explanation if it is supposed to be connected with ἡμέρα. But may it not be connected with ἡμερος and mean 'all peaceful' after war's alarms? The change to πανίμερος would thus be obviated.

Trach. 830.

The verse should perhaps run thus :

ἔτι ποτ' ἔτ' ἐπὶ πόνους πόνων ἔχοι θανὼν
λατρίαν;

and the antistrophic line :

ὑποφόνια δολόμυθα κέντρ' ἄκεντρ' ἐπιζέσαντα.

In the latter verse as given by the MSS. Νέσσου looks very like a gloss which might have been inserted to make up the length of the verse when ἄκεντρ' fell out after κέντρ'. Moreover ἐπίπονον would be a likely corruption of ἐπὶ πόνους πόνων, and after κέντρα nothing could be more probable than the loss of such a word as ἄκεντρα, and that is just the word which Soph. would have chosen to show that κέντρα was metaphorical. A similar mistake has been made by the printers of *Esther Vanhomrigh*, who have given 'He was at least wearisome man I have ever met,' where I would read 'He was at least the least wearisome,' &c.

Eur. Bacch. 451.

μαίνεσθε χειρῶν τοῦδ' ἐν ἄρκυσιν γὰρ ὦν

So I have long believed that this verse should be read and punctuated. The connecting χειρῶν and ἄρκυσιν is further rendered probable by *Alc.* 985

καὶ σ' ἐν ἀφύκτοις χειρῶν εἴλε θεὰ δεσμοῖς.

Aristoph. Lysistr. 111—116.

ΛΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΗ.

ἐθέλουτ' ἂν οὖν, εἰ μηχανὴν εὐροιμ' ἐγώ,
μετ' ἐμοῦ καταλῦσαι τὸν πόλεμον;

ΜΥΡΡΙΝΗ.

ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἂν κ.τ.λ. νῆ τῷ θεῷ.

ΚΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ.

ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἂν, κὰν ὥσπερ εἰ ψήγταν δοκῶ
δοῦναι 'ν ἐμαντῆς παρταμοῦσα θῆμιν.

This is explained by the Schol. as if Calonice said no more than that she would do anything to end the war, even to the cutting of herself in two. But does she not refer to her name? 'I would cut my name in two and give up the half of it,' that is νίκη. I would make them a present of the honours of war. The joke is not a very good one, but this explanation would give some point to verses otherwise quite pointless.

R. Y. TYRRELL.