

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](#)



Upon Aeschylus—I

W. Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 02 / March 1900, pp 106 - 119

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00079440, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00079440

How to cite this article:

W. Headlam (1900). Upon Aeschylus—I. The Classical Review, 14, pp 106-119

doi:10.1017/S0009840X00079440

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

from Suidas is not improbable; but it in no way supports the attribution to Tyrtæus of these lines, which Dr. Christ recognises as written 'in the spirit of' Callinus, an admission pointing to their authenticity. For it cannot be conceded that any of the other poems which he includes in this appreciation, that is, any of the undoubted poems of Tyrtæus, are written 'in the spirit of Callinus'; they are written, largely, in his words; his spirit, his inspiration is exactly what they lack.

Having sought to show *how* Tyrtæus made his elegiacs, I have not ventured here to touch the question *when* he wrote them; a question which has recently been raised by Dr. Verrall in his interesting articles on 'Tyrtæus' in a form involving the reconsideration of historical data, but not necessarily affecting the discussion of the literary relationship between Callinus and Tyrtæus.

Whether Tyrtæus lived twenty years or two hundred years after Callinus, his debt to him is the same. It may, perhaps, be allowable to say that, as a result of fresh investigation of the date of Callinus, I am

inclined to suspect that Tyrtæus lived neither in the seventh century, nor in the fifth, but in the sixth; a supposition, which, I think, may possibly meet some of Dr. Verrall's objections to the traditionary view, and at the same time satisfy the requirements of Mr. Macan's very able argument in reply.

But leaving Tyrtæus, I would return, for a moment, to Callinus. Whether he actually invented Elegy, or adopted the form from some earlier unknown¹ poet or minstrel, he wrote it in words which were part of the vocabulary of his own native dialect. He was an original poet. His theme was his own; and he said what he said out of the fulness of his heart. Except the metre there was nothing artificial in the process.

Of the majestic rhythm and all the music of his lines when taken together, it has not seemed needful to speak. On such a matter argument is either superfluous or unconvincing.

J. M. SCHULHOF.

¹ That is, of course, apart from the old claim, which requires separate discussion, of Archilochus to the fatherhood of Elegy as well as of Iambics.

UPON AESCHYLUS—I.

PROMETHEUS

370 Τυφῶνα θούρον πᾶσιν ὃς ἀντέστη θεοῖς

EVER since I began to study the phenomena of texts, I have felt sure that πᾶσιν is an interpolation; for on the slightest warrant the text-makers were as ready to insert πάντες as modern printers to insert commas. The way to learn the nature of corruptions that take place is to study various readings; the way to understand their reasons is to study scholia. This is the kind of thing you find: Eur. *Phoen.* 685 φίλα Δαμάτηρ θεά] schol. πᾶσιν. *Med.* 1185 = 1196 πλὴν τῷ τεκόντι κάρτα δυσμαθῆς ἰδέω] schol. λείπει τὸ πᾶσι: and thus in Soph. *O.T.* 118 a late MS. gives θνήσκουσι γὰρ πάντες πλὴν εἰς τις. But it was only the other day I discovered that Blomfield p. 31 quotes from Porson a cloud of examples of this word inserted into texts. Thus if a word had dropped out after θούρον, πᾶσιν was ready to their hand to patch the metre with; just as a well-known fragment of Euripides appears thus in Apostol. XV 81 C σύ δ' ὦ κάκιστε πάντων θεῶν τε κἀνθρώπων, ἢ μὴ δίδασκε . . . Ἔρως being omitted and πᾶν

των foisted in. Now what is the likeliest word to have been omitted here? Nothing would be easier to omit before OC than ΘC, that is θεός, which gives good rhythm and sense, for θεός ὃς ἀντέστη θεοῖς is a peculiarly Greek manner of expression, as φίλος φίλους, μόνος μόνου, ἴσον ἴσῳ, κοινὸς ἐν κοινοῖς, ἀξί' ἀξίῳ and so on; e.g. in this play, 29 θεός θεῶν γὰρ . . . , 92 οἶα πρὸς θεῶν πάσχω θεός, 92, 120.

The doubt will occur whether Typhon or Typhoeus is properly described as θεός. Hesiod, who ought to know, had no such doubt: *Theog.* 824 κρατεροῦ θεοῦ, 871 his sons are ἐκ θεοφιν γενεή. Hesych. gives Τυφῶεύς: θεός τις γηγενής, and Aeschylus himself supposed so too: *Theb.* 497 ξυνοίετον δὲ πολεμίους ἐπ' ἀσπίδων θεούς, ὁ μὲν γὰρ πύρπνοον Τυφῶν' ἔχει, . . . in the schol. on which, τοὺς θεοὺς οὗς ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσι φοροῦσιν, cod. M. omits οὗς for the same reason that θεός was omitted here.

Exactly the same thing I believe took place in Soph. *Philoct.* 727

ἴν' ὁ χάλκασπις ἀνῆρ θεοῖς
πλάθει πᾶσι θεῶν πυρὶ παμφαῖς
Οὔτας ὑπὲρ ὀχθῶν.

The corresponding verses are

λεύσσω δ' ὅπου γνοίη στατὸν εἰς ὕδωρ
αἰεὶ προσενώμα.

Hermann was the first to eject *πάσι* and restore the omitted *θεός*, reading *πλάθει θεός θείω* . . . (*θεός | πλάθει θεοῖς* Schneidewin). This is very simple; though it has occurred to me that *ὅπου γνοίη* was—it certainly might be—an interpolation, and *πάσι θείω* insertions to correspond, in which case we should have

λεύσσω δὲ στατὸν εἰς ὕδωρ
αἰεὶ προσενώμα
= θεός πλάθει πυρὶ παμφαῆς
Οἴτας ὑπὲρ ὄχθων

mere glyconic metre. I confess that I prefer this, and it affords a reason for the choice of the word *στατόν*, to lengthen *δέ*. Lucian i. 746 *Hermitoi*. ἡ ἀνέρχεται ὡσπερ φασὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἐν τῇ Οἴτῃ κατακαυθέντα θεὸν γενέσθαι· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνος ἀποβαλὼν ὄπισσον ἀνθρώπειον εἶχε παρὰ τῆς μητρὸς καὶ καθαρὸν τε καὶ ἀκήρατον φέρων τὸ θείον ἀνέπατο ἐς τοὺς θεοὺς διευκρινηθὲν ὑπὰ τοῦ πυρός. i. 402–405.

561 As at present advised, it appears to me that metre requires the following arrangement:

φέρ' ὅπως χάρις ἂ χάρις, ὦ φίλος, εἶπέ, ποῦ
τίς ἀλάκῃ;
τίς ἐφαμερίων ἄρηξις; οὐδ' ἐδέρχθης

565 ὀλιγοδρανίαν ἄικυον ἰσόνειρον ᾗ τὸ φωτῶν
ἀλαῶν γένος ἐμπεποδισμένον; οὐποτε
θνατῶν τὰν Διὸς ἀρμονίαν παρεξίασι
βουλαί.

Here I have altered the position of *θνατῶν*. In the concluding verses of the *antistrophe* I eject *ἔδνοις* and read *πεπιθῶν* for *πείθων* or *πιθῶν*:

575 τόδ' ἐκείνο θ' ὄτ' ἀμφὶ λουτρὰ καὶ λέχος
σὸν ὕμεναίου
ἰσταὶ γάμων ὅτε τὰν ὀμοπάτριον
ἄγαγες Ἡσιόναν πεπεπιθῶν δάμαρτα κοινό-
λεκτρον.

Exact correspondence would be given here by *ἔδνοις ἀγαγες Ἡσιόναν δάμαρτα κοινόλεκτρον*; but that degree of exactness is not required with a dactylic phrase; and it appears more likely that *ἔδνοις* (as Lachmann thought) is an explanatory interpolation, for the schol. is *πείθων δάμαρτα*: *ἔδνοις πείθων τὴν ἰσομένην σοὶ δάμαρτα κοινόλεκτρον*.

The rhythm is of that delightful lilting movement found in fragments of Cratinus, 239 *ἀπαλὸν δὲ σισύμβριον ἢ ῥόδον ἢ κρίνον παρ' οὗς ἐθάκει*, 238 *ἀγανόφρονος ἠδυλόγου σοφίας δρόσφ περισοκαλλεῖς*: cf. 231, 322,

323 (Archilochian, Hephaest. 15).¹ 565–6 should be, as I have printed them, one verse. Other verses where the division in the MSS. still remains to be corrected are *Theb.* 729–30 (= 722–3)

παρβασίαν ὠκύποινον αἰῶνα δ' ἐς τρίτον μένει
Cho. 595–6 (= 586–7)

παντόλμοις ἔρωτας ἄταισι συννόμοις βροτῶν.

596 Schol. *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐμοί...* is rightly referred by Kueck to *ἔπνοδόταν* in 597 'sleep-giving—but not to me.'

599 *ποῖ μ' ἄγοισι <χθονός>* would seem the natural thing to write; and the reason for the omission would be that the scribe was looking for the subject of *ἄγοισι*.

778 *ἢ δυσπετῶς ἀν τούς <γ'> ἐμοὺς ἄθλους φέροις*

γ' is habitually omitted, and after the letter C is particularly easy to omit. So in Eur. *Hipp.* 413 *ὅταν γὰρ αἰσχρὰ τοῖσιν ἐσθλοῖσιν δοκῆ, ἢ κάρτα δόξει τοῖς κακοῖς γ' εἶναι καλά* I find what I expected, 'κακοῖς γ' AB, omisum *γ'* in ceteris.' But where *γε* has been used in the first clause, perhaps it is less readily used in the second: *Soph. Ant.* 66

εἰ γὰρ δὴ τά γ' ἐγγενῆ φύσει
ἄκοςμα θρέψω, κάρτα τοὺς ἔξω γένους

though there too it has a place prepared for it.

910 The schol. may be corrected from schol. rec.

PERSAE.

13 *νέον δ' ἄνδρα βαύζει*: since *βαύζειν* means 'to growl at', *latrare*, I do not see who can be referred to by *νέον ἄνδρα* except Xerxes, who *νέος ἐὼν νέα φρονεῖ* 784, 746.

276–80 ... *λέγεις φέρεσθαι...*; ΑΓΓΕΛΟC οὐδὲν γὰρ ἤρκει τόξα... All the editions I have seen put a full stop at 280, making it a statement. If it had been so, we should have had *φερόμενα*: the infinitive shows it is a question. This does not appear to have been recognised. Thus the critics have been troubled with Ar. *Plut.* 705

ΓΥ. *λέγεις ἄγροικον ἄρα σύ γ' εἶναι τὸν θεόν*;
ΚΑ. *μὰ Δί' οὐκ ἔγωγ' ἀλλὰ σκατοφάγον.*

because they have all taken it to be a comment. In that case we should have had *λέγεις ἄγροικον (τὸν) θεόν* without the verb. Similarly *Ag.* 545–51

¹ Add Ar. *Av.* 1313–22.

XO. ἔρωσ πατρίδας τῆσδε γῆς σ' ἐγύμ-
νασεν ;

KH. ὦστ' ἐνδακρύειν γ' ὄμμασιν χαρᾶς
ἵπο.

550 KH. ποθεῖν ποθοῦντα τήνδε γῆν στρατὸν
λέγεις ;

XO. ὡς πόλλ' ἀμαυρᾶς ἐκ φρενός <γ' >
ἀναστένειν.

'Do you mean that you longed for the army as it longed for home?' 'So much that oft I sighed...' When it is seen that 551 is the answer to a question (as Heath took it), it is plain that the natural supplement is γ', 'Ay',¹ which is besides most easily omitted. This has been proposed by Herwerden already, but as I have not seen his note, I do not know whether he takes τήνδε γῆν, as I do, to be governed by ποθοῦντα.

561 πειρὸς δὲ καὶ θαλασσίους
αἱ δ' ὀμόπτεροι κνανώπιδες
νᾶες μὲν ἄγαγον, ποποῖ
νᾶες δ' ἀπώλεσαν, τοτοῖ

The smallest alteration in v. 562 gives us

διδυμότεροι κνανώπιδες

and this rings true to me. The Chorus are lamenting the disastrous naval ambitions of their sovereigns, and this is their description of his battle-ships. These are called triremes in v. 681, ἐξέφθινται τρισκαλμοὶ νᾶες ἄναες ἄναες—and 'the trireme carried two masts' (Dr. Warre in *Dict. Ant.* ii. p. 218). Since ordinary vessels had but one, the epithet would be distinctive.

I had doubts at one time whether the metre would admit such variations; but I do not doubt it now. It was an habitual practice with the Greeks, and the study of it reveals most interesting niceties,—to suit their rhythms to their themes. That is the reason that in the *Persae* we find the trochaic tetrameter employed so largely, because it was an Ionic metre; so of course was the *Ionicum a minore*, which is freely used in this play and for the Oriental Dionysus in the *Bacchae* and Ar. *Ran.* 323 sqq., 340 sqq. Now this iambic dimeter also was a metre of Anacreon; Hephaestion says that whole songs of his were written in it: and among the few fragments that remain (Bergk iii. p. 279) two out of eight lines have just this variation

διὰ δεῦτε Καρικευργέος
ὀχάνοιο χεῖρα τιθέμεναι.

¹ Eur. *Or.* 1122, *Phoen.* 1349, *Cycl.* 215, *El.* 666, Ar. *Nub.* 469.

In Comedy, where iambic dimeters were freely used, this anapaest in the first foot occurs in Cratin. *fr.* 256. 3, Ar. *fr.* 192. 1, *Eq.* 371, 372, 442, 917, *Nub.* 1108, 1450, *Ach.* 1040. There is another example in Tragedy if the right reading in *Theb.* 842

τὰν ἄστονον μελάγκροκον
νεκουστόλον θεωρίδα

as Butler inferred from the schol. τὴν διάγουσαν τοὺς νεκρούς: certainly this gives a point which is lacking in the MS. ναύστολον. But νεκουστόλον is a possible form.

The other variation, an anapaest (κνανώπιδες) beginning the second half of the line, is much less common; I have noted only two examples: Ar. *Eq.* 921 τῶν δαλίων ἀπαρυστέον and *Ran.* 984 τίς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπεδήδοκεν. It is possible, as I have observed before, that Aeschylus made one compound of the whole, διδυμοπτεροκνανώπιδες.

601 The normal form of sentence would be

φεῦ φεῦ, φίλοι, κακῶν μὲν ὡς ὅταν κλύδων
βροτοῖς ἐπέλθῃ, πάντα δαιμαίνειν φιλεῖ,
ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων εὐροῆ, . . .

as Eur. *Supp.* 464 φεῦ φεῦ κακοῖσιν ὡς ὅταν δαίμων διδώ καλῶς, ὑβρίζουσ' ὡς αἰεὶ πράζοντες εὔ. This φεῦ φεῦ . . . ὡς is very common later; Soph. *O.T.* 316, Eur. *Hec.* 1216, *Med.* 332, *Alc.* 739, *fr.* 25, 211, 218, 329, 333, 536, 637, 684, 739, 961, 1034, Ar. *Plut.* 782, 802, Apollonid. *fr.* 1 p. 825 Nauck; and we have φεῦ . . . ὡς in *Pers.* 288. Such an exclamation is commonly followed by an application, introduced by γάρ, to the present case, as here we have ἐμοὶ γάρ in v. 606: Soph. *O.T.* 317, Ar. *Plut.* 786, 804, Plat. *Tim.* 26 B; or it follows merely a general reflective statement, Theognis 968, Soph. *Aj.* 650, *Ant.* 178, 1161, *Trach.* 298, Plaut. *Persa* 471. But the addition ὅστις ἔμπορος κυρεῖ ἐπίσταται will seem idle, I think, and out of place to any one who compares the passages I have cited; the point is not that an ἔμπορος knows it, but 'how true it is that . . .' Besides, the κλύδων here is entirely metaphorical, and there is no reason why an ἔμπορος should know it better than any one else. I believe the original stood practically as I have written it, and that the words I have ejected were merely an unskilful bit of patchwork—unskilful beyond what I have remarked, because to eke out the measure of the lines another κακῶν is interpolated! The reason may simply have been that φεῦ φεῦ had been omitted.

816

κινδύνω κακῶν

κρηνὶς ἀπέσβηκ', ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἐκπιδύεται

κρηνὶς ὑπεστιν: corr. Housman. ἐκπαιδύεται: corr. Schuetz.

ἐκπιδύεται has been generally approved, but the other alteration may appear so bold that approval will not be superfluous, and I shall therefore permit myself the rare pleasure—which only a reviewer or an editor enjoys by right—of commending rather than opposing. The metaphor is a natural one in Greek; compare for instance *Supp.* 478, *Max. Tyr.* ii. καὶ ποῖ βαδιέεται τὸ κακὸν καὶ ποῦ στήσεται; οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτι πηγῆν ἀέναον κινεῖς ποιηρίας;¹ There is no place for κρηνὶς here, and mature consideration persuades me that Mr. Housman's reading is correct. The verb was liable to be corrupted; thus in *Plut. Mor.* 1090 c (quoting *Eur. fr.* 971. 2) for ἀστήρ ἀπέσβη there is a *v.l.* ἀπέστη: in

Aesch. Ag. 879 f gives κατεσβηκασιν.

984 μυρία μυρία πεμπαστάν as *Plat. Apol.* 18 B τὰ τε μετέωρα φροντιστής.

1008 XO. ἰὼ ἰὼ, δαίμονες,

ἔθεσθ' ἀελπτον κακόν

διαπρέπον οἶον δέδορκεν ἅτα.

1011 ΞΕ. πεπλήγμεθ' οἶαι δι' αἰῶνος τύχαι.

XO. πεπλήγμεθ', εὐδῆλα γάρ.

1011, because of πεπλήγμεθ' in the following line, was accidentally omitted, and is supplied in the margin by m together with another reading, γρ. δαίμονος τύχαι. This I believe is right, the king re-echoing their exclamation in a most natural phrase; *Pind. O.* viii. 67; *Med.* 666 and *I.T.* 850 δαίμονος τύχα τυνός, *Hipp.* 827 τύχαν δαιμόνων, *fr.* 37 τὰς δὲ δαιμόνων τύχας, *Rhes.* 719 ἰὼ ἰὼ δαίμονος τύχα βαρεία. Further, τύχαι will appear to be the dative on comparison of *Eur. H.F.* 1381 Ἦρας μᾶ πηγιέντες ἀθλίῳ τύχη, *Alc.* 417 and 868 βαρεία ξυμφορὰ πεπλήγμεθα, *Aesch. Eum.* 512 ξυμφορὰ τετυμμένος, *Ag.* 1660 δαίμονος χηλῇ βαρεία δυστυχῶς πεπληγμένοι. If this is so, what remains to be restored is something which does not affect the construction; and I am led therefore to suppose the original was

πεπλήγμεθ', οἶδ' οἶδα, δαίμονος τύχα

'We are stricken, I know it, I know, by a stroke of fate.' οἶδα parenthetical is common, as *Soph. Aj.* 560, 938, *O.C.* 1615, *fr.* 237, *Eur. El.* 683; and οἶδ' οἶδα repeated occurs in *Ar. Plut.* 1080, *Ran.* 580, 584, *Eq.* 998, and in *Soph. El.* 846, *Eur. Alc.* 887, emotional passages that may be compared with ours.

¹ *Com. Frag. adesp.* 353 Kock.

THEB.

10 It is worth, I think, suggesting that *v.* 12 is an illustrative quotation, and that the passage can be constructed very well without it:

ὑμᾶς δὲ χρὴ νῦν,—καὶ τὸν ἐλλείποντ' ἐπι
ἤβης ἀκμαίας, καὶ τὸν ἔξηβον χρόνῳ
ῶραν ἔχονθ',—ἐκαστον, ὡς τι συμπρεπές,
πόλει τ' ἀρήγειν καὶ . . .

'in the offices that befit your several ages.' When *Dem.* 38. 16, speaking of duties to the country, says τοῦ ποιεῖν τοῦθ' ὃ τι καθ' ἡλικίαν ἕκαστος ἔχει καὶ ὅτον καιρὸς εἴη. that is ὡς τι συμπρεπές. *Phrynichus Bekk. An.* 37 observes Ἐξηβον: τοῦτο καινόν. καθωμλημένον τὸ ἔξωρον. If, as I suggest, it was an epithet of ῶραν, that supplies at once a reason for the coinage. *v.* 12 βλαστημὸν ἀλδαινόντα σώματος πολύν means 'supporting much issue of his body' (*subolem*), and the only point that I can find in it is this, that the aged father of many sons can contribute them to the service of his country. That may have been what the annotator meant; but it seems to me that if the line had been contrasted with ἔξηβον, the antithesis would have been pointed by a δέ, τὸν ἔξηβον (μὲν) χρόνῳ βλαστημὸν ἀλδαινόντα δ' αἵματος πολύν.

79 The Chorus hear and see—or rather, being in hysterical alarm, imagine that they hear and see—the signs of an approaching army:

ρεῖ πολὺς ὄδε λέως πρόδρομος ἰππότας·
αἰθερία κόνις με πείθει φανείσθ'
ἀνανδος σαφῆς ἔτυμος ἄγγελος·
ἔλε δὲ τὰς ἐμὰς πεδί' ὄπλοκτυπ' ὠπιχρίμματα
βοᾶ

ποτᾶται βρέμει δ'
ἀμαχέτον δίκαν ὕδατος ὀροτύπου
—ἰὼ ἰὼ θεοὶ
θεαί τ' ὀρόμενον κακὸν ἀλεύσατε—
βοᾶ ὑπὲρ τειχέων.

The MS. version and the scholia (which are necessary here) may best be seen in Wecklein. The point I wish definitely to urge is that ἔλε is correct: 'I am persuaded of it by the dust rising to the sky—I am convinced by the thunder of hoofs upon the plain.' That is the main meaning of it here; it is a meaning which the dictionary will illustrate. But the suggestion of the word goes further, 'I am overborne, with no room left for doubt or hope, my spirit is overcome.' That seems to be the sense in *Supp.* 794 where the Chorus are in a similar condition. Hitherto, under their father's

δισσὴ στρατηγῷ, διέλαχον σφυρηλάτῳ
Σκόθῃ σιδήρῳ κτημάτων παμπησίαν.

So much only, but certainly so much, appears to my judgment to be genuine Aeschylus.

981 schol. σὺ δὲ οὐ μετουπολὸν οὐδὲ ὕστερον ἔμαθες <ἀλλ' > ἀντικρυσ.

976 δίνυρα τριπάλτων πημάτων schol. δίνυρα : ζῶντα πήματα χέομενα καὶ πολλά. I ought not to have wavered in believing the original to have been διερά (Hiemsoeth), as long ago I had independently inferred; because διωρός and ζῶν were the generally accepted explanations of διερός (see *Thesaur.* or Ebeling *Lex. Hom. s.v.*). The epithet would suit well with my conjecture τροπαῖα (cf. Eur. *El.* 1174) if referred to the slain bodies of the combatants, 'trophies each of flesh and blood.' διερά may have been scanned as a dissyllable like ἱερά: and possibly a mysterious gloss in Hesych. δείρα : δ[ε]ίμοιρα may be a mistaken explanation of this place.

It seems to me impossible that τρίπαλτα should be true, or τρι- in any form; the calamity was not *triplex* but *duplex*, and that is what the sisters harp upon continually: δίπαλτα therefore might have been applied.

SUPPLICES.

Fifty daughters of Danaus fly oversea from Egypt to avoid being forced into marriage with their fifty cousins. This raises two questions: why do the men wish to marry these women? and why do the women regard the prospect with such horror? The second question has been differently answered; the first, so far as I can find, has never occurred to any one to ask. Yet surely it is a curious thing that the inclinations of fifty brothers should be so alike, and so monotonous, and so unenterprising; plusquam-fraternal unanimity.

I do not propose to discuss the question fully, but merely to contribute one material fact. *It is a general custom in the Levant to marry the first cousin*; and cousins thus married continue to call each other 'cousins' even after marriage, and not 'husband and wife'; because the tie of first-cousinship is universally regarded as more sacred than that of matrimony, which may be, and frequently is, dissolved at the momentary caprice of either party. Thus the man calls his wife in the house 'O daughter of my uncle' [of my father's brother]; and

the wife says to her husband 'O son of my uncle' [of my father's brother]. I am quoting from Burckhardt's *Arabie* [Cairene] *Proverbs* No. 620; what he says is entirely corroborated by Lane and Burton. Now that is precisely the relationship between the parties in the *Supplices*, our Egyptian play: πρὶν ποτε λέκτρων ὦν θέμις εἶργει, σφετεριξάμενοι πατραδέλφειαν τήνδ', ἀεκόντων ἐπιβῆναι v. 37.

Here then we get some very pretty little problems, which will afford the ingenious food for speculation. One or two points may be remarked. The sons of Aegyptus appear to be claiming this marriage as a legal right. The question is put in the most practical manner by Pelasgus 392, 'If the sons of Aegyptus are your masters by law of the land, as claiming to be the next of kin, who would care to contest their right? You must plead according to the laws of your own country that they have no authority over you.' But the only answer that the women give is that they won't *hear* of becoming subject to the mastery of males! As regards their motive, it is plain that they dislike their cousins, and dread being forced into the position of their bondslaves; but considering certain phrases used of the relation which they shun, I am unable to accept the view of those who see no more than a revolt of Hellenic liberty of action against Oriental or barbarian tyranny. These phrases are the following: v. 8 αὐτογενῆ γάμον ἀσεβῆ τ' ὀνοταζόμεναι, 37 λέκτρων ὦν θέμις εἶργει, 237 ἐχθρῶν ὁμαίμων καὶ μιανόντων γένος with the same metaphor of hawks and doves as in *P.V.*, where we have 881 φεύγουσα συγγενῆ γάμον ἀνεψιῶν, 884 θηρεύσοντες οὐ θηρασίμους γάμους. According to the view so strongly urged by Weil p. vi, there is no suggestion here of anything incestuous: I confess I am at a loss to see in that case what is the meaning of 'sinful marriage of the same blood,' 'enemies of the same blood who would pollute the race,' or of the references to consanguinity at all. When, however, the King enquires their reason for objection, 338 πότῆρα κατ' ἐχθραν ἢ τὸ μὴ θέμις λέγεις; 'hate or unlawfulness?' their answer is again evasive, 'And who would object to masters that they loved?'¹

It can hardly be that this obscurity is other than designed. We have traces, I think, of an ancient conflict of ideas upon this question of legitimate degrees; and perhaps it was a question Aeschylus did not

¹ That *ὄνοτα* is the true text, and this the meaning of the line, is shown by the order of the words.

care to argue. We may remember that Hypermestra took a different line.

The scholiast also is in the conspiracy to baffle us. Paley p. 4 remarks that he 'always evades this interpretation of γάμον ἀσεβῆ, τὸ μὴ θέμις &c.' Thus his explanation of ἀσεβῆ v. 9 is ὃν οὐ σέβομεν ἡμεῖς οὐδὲ τιμῶμεν, and of v. 37 ὢν τὸ δίκαιον ἡμᾶς εἶργει, διὰ τὸ μὴ θανατωθῆναι τὸν πατέρα ('i.e. ne pater a genero interficiatur, ex oraculo, ab Aeschylō alieno, quod memorant schol. Hom. A 42 et schol. A Aesch. *Prom.* 853' Weil); and of τὸ μὴ θέμις v. 338 ἢ ὅτι ἀθέμιτος ὁ γάμος; ᾗτο γὰρ αὐτὰς ἐκδεδοσθαι ἦδη ἄλλοις ἀνδράσιν. A Levantine, as I have shown, might have his reasons for misunderstanding.

My prose translation of this play represents my view in most things of the text, and I need add little to what is said upon readings that are given there :

8 ἀλλ' αὐτογενῆ τῶν φλυξάγορᾶν
γάμον Αἰγύπτου παιδῶν ἀσεβῆ τ'
ὀνοταζόμεναι

'but in abhorrence of kindred and sinful wedlock with the folly-prating sons of Aegyptus.' (1064 γάμον Αἰγυπτογενῆ, P. V. 1064 φεύγουσα συγγενῆ γάμον, 884 οὐ θηρασίμους γάμους). M has αὐτογένητον φυλαξάνοραν¹ with an accent erased over the last a and the letters υλαξ written in erasure (according to an examination of the MS. which I made some years ago). In the margin is written γρ. φυξάνοραν, and the schol. was written on this reading; φυλαξάνοραν: γάμον φν γ ἦ ν ἄ ν δ ρ ὦ ν ἡμῶν ἐμποιοῦντα. Other compounds of -αγόρας are λαβραγόρης, ὑφαγόρας (Lobeck *Phryg.* p. 703), and a large number of proper names (given by Pape-Benseler p. xxvii), as Πραξαγόρας, Ὑβραγόρας. What I am unable to decide is whether the form was φλυξάγορᾶν or φλυξάγορᾶν: either, so far as I can judge, was possible. φλυξάγορᾶν would imply φλύξις from φλύξ- as φύξις, τύξις, βάξις and the like. But the compound φλυξογράφος is recorded by the schol. on Nicand. *Alex.* 214 *μανίης ὑπο μύρια φλύξων*] φλύξων, φλυαρῶν ὑπὸ τῆς μανίας· καὶ οἱ Ἰταλιῶται τοὺς φλυαρογραφοῦντας φλυξογράφους ἐκάλοιν. In the first volume of his edition of the Greek Comic fragments p. 184 Prof. Kaibel remarks upon this scholium 'inepte hoc, quoniam φλυξός nomen nec fuit nec potuit esse'; which, if I understand him rightly, means that the compound is impossible, because there could be no such noun as φλυξός. If it existed, it would probably be an adjective as βυξός,

¹ Similarly in Hesych. s.v. *καυκαλῖς* ii p. 452 *φυλάκταινα* is a mistake for *φλύκταινα*.

κνίζός,² *κνισός*, *ρυσός*: though Hesych. gives *Φλυσός*: *στυβή* (*στυβή* Mus.) οἱ δὲ φλοιός, and *ροῖζος* is a substantive. But I can see no reason why there should not have been a substantive *φλύζα*, which it will be seen upon comparison is a perfectly legitimate formation:

<i>ρύομαι</i>	<i>ρύσις</i>	<i>ρύζα</i> ³	—	<i>ρύμα</i>
<i>κνύω</i>	—	<i>κνύζα</i> ⁴	<i>κνύος</i>	<i>κνύμα</i>
<i>φλύω</i>	—	? <i>φλύζα</i>	<i>φλύος</i>	—
<i>φλύζω</i>	? <i>φλύξις</i>	—	—	—
<i>βλύω</i>	<i>βλύσις</i>	—	—	—
<i>βλύζω</i>	—	—	—	<i>βλύσμα</i>
<i>βρύω</i>	<i>βρύσις</i>	—	—	<i>βρυσμός</i>
<i>κλύζω</i>	<i>κλύσις</i>	—	—	<i>κλύσμα</i>
<i>φύω</i>	<i>φύσις</i>	—	—	<i>φύμα</i>
<i>τεύχω</i>	<i>τύξις</i>	—	—	—
<i>φεύγω</i>	<i>φύξις</i>	<i>φύζα</i>	—	—
<i>ψύχω</i>	<i>ψύξις</i>	—	—	<i>ψύγμα</i>
<i>μάσσω</i>	—	<i>μάζα</i>	—	<i>μάγμα</i>
<i>σχίζω</i>	<i>σχίσις</i>	<i>σχίζα</i> , <i>σχίξη</i>	—	<i>σχίσμα</i>

Besides these we have *ἄζα* and *σκύζα* (Hesych. *Σκύζης*: παρὰ Φιλητᾶ 'παύσω σε τῆς σκύζης' ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς κάπρας) and *ψῶζα* or *ψῶζα* (Lob. *Proll.* 359, *Com. Att.* Kock I 311). The diminutive *φλυζάκιον* is not open to suspicion, nor the adjective *σχιζόπτερος*.

860 αἰμονεσῶσπέαμιδα

The schol. *ἡμαγμένον σε καθίζω* means that he took his text to be αἰμον' ἔσω σ' . . . It is true that *καθίζω* was colloquially used in similar phrases, *κλαίοντα καθίζειν* 'to reduce to tears' Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 2. 14, 15 (ter), *Symp.* 3. 11, Plat. *Ion* 535 E, cf. Theocr. i. 51; and in the passive Ar. *Ach.* 840 οἰμῶζων *καθεδεῖται*, fr. 620 οἰμῶζων *κάθου*, Cratin. 277 *τὴν χεῖρα μὴ πῖβαλλε*, μὴ κλάων *κάθη*.⁵ But a future *ἔσω* is not known, and to my mind the *sigmatismus* tells against it strongly here. The threat would be equally well conveyed by what I read, αἰμον' ἐγὼ σ' ἐπ' ἀμ(ι)δα—for according to my restoration of what follows, the herald breaks his sentence off: cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 569 *πρόσθεσις μόνον*, *κἀγὼ σε νῆ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν—ΓΥ. τί δράσεις*; *Vesp.* 643 *ἢ μὴν ἐγὼ σε τήμερον σκύτη βλέπειν ποιήσω*. 1443 ἀλλ' ἀράμενος ἐγὼ σε—ΦΙ. τί ποιεῖς; Herodas iii. 66 ἐγὼ σε θήσω *κοσμώτερον κοῦρης*. Ag. 1666 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σ' ἐν ὑστέραισιν ἡμέραις μέτεμ' ἔτι. The error is most easy: Mr. Tucker restored ἔσω for ἐγὼ in v. 461, as I did lately in Pind. fr. 168.

890 Possibly ὃς ἐρᾶ (*νομίε*) γᾶς ὁ μέγας Νεῖλος ὑβρίζοντας or ὃ σ' ἐράσας: cf. Bergk *Poet. Lyr.* iii p. 714.

² Lobeck *Rhem.* 277, *Parall.* 207.

³ Hesych. *Ρύζα*: βία. ἢ τοῦ τόξου τᾶσις.

⁴ Anacr. fr. 87 Bergk: spelt *κνυσα* in Herodas vii. 95.

⁵ Kock is plainly mistaken in desiring to read *καθῆς*.

AGAMEMNON.

49 τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν οἷ τ' ἐκπάγλοις
 ἄλγεσι παιδῶν ὑπατῆλεχέων
 στροφοδιούνται
 πετέρῳν ἐρεμύοισιν ἐρεσσόμενοι

'in exceeding anguish for their lofty-cradled children.' Mr. Housman (*Journ. Philol.* xvi 247) first pointed out in his trenchant and effective style that ὑπατοὶ λεχέων could not mean 'high above their eyries,' and there cannot be any question he is right. ὑπατος means ὑψιστος, and is always a *superlative*: ὑπατε κρειόντων Hom. © 31, σὸν δὲ κράτος πάντων ἐσθ' ὑπατον Theognis 376, Ap. *Rhod.* iv. 146 θεῶν ὑπατον, hymn. ap. Aristid. i 452 Δία τὸν πάντων ὑπατον, Pind. *O.* x. 10 παιδῶν. The genitive is of the partitive nature, as in ἀντιξή πυματή θεῶν ἀσπίδος Hom. Z 118, τὸν δ' ὑστατον εἶρεν ὀμίλου ἐσταότα N 459, οἰακος ὑστάτου νεῶς Aesch. *Supp.* 725, ὁ δ' ὑστατός γε τοῦ χρόνου *Ag.* 1299, ἐσχάτη χθονός *P.V.* 872, ἤδη γὰρ ἔδρα Ζεὺς ἐν ἐσχάτῃ θεῶν; Soph. *fr.* 821: so ὑπατός τε χώρας Ζεὺς *Ag.* 514 means 'supreme in the land,' as Pind. *O.* xiii. 24 ὑπατ' εὐρύ-ανασσων Ὀλυμπίας, and in Tim. *Locr.* 100 Α ὡς τἄλλα μέρεα ὑπηρετεῖν τούτῳ καθάπερ ὑπάτῳ τῷ σκάνεος ἅπαντος, translate it as you may, it will be seen that ὑπάτῳ is still *superlative*, and τῷ σκάνεος a partitive genitive; and this is the sense which is impossible in ὑπατοὶ λεχέων. That can no more be a synonym of ὑπέρτεροι than πρῶτοι of πρότεροι or ὑστατοὶ¹ of ὑστεροι. It never occurred even to the scholiast to take it so, desperate as his explanation is compelled to be: οἷτνες ὑπατοὶ ὄντες . . . ἐπὶ τῶν λεχέων στροφοδιούνται.

Mr. Housman, comparing Soph. *Ant.* 630 Αἴμων . . . ἀπάτας λεχέων ὑπεραλγῶν ('grieving for the cheat of his marriage') and *Theb.* 278 ὡς τις τέκνων ὑπερδέδοικεν λεχαιῶν (MS. λεχέων) . . . πελειάς, conjectured

οἷ τ' ἐκπάγλοις
 ἄλγεσι, παιδῶν ἀπάτῃ λεχαιῶν,

But the second dative produces an effect of awkwardness, and the shortening of λεχαιῶν is another improbability. I believe we have simply the corruption of a compound, to be added to the many adjectives in -λεχής, as πρωτολεχής, μονο-, κοινο-, αἰνο-, δεινο-, ἀπειρο-, εὖ-, ἴππο-, ὄρει-, γῆ-, χαμαι-. The formation would first be ὑπατολεχέων, and in Epic the

¹ Liddell and Scott *s.v.* ὑστερος quote Pind. *O.* x. 41 καὶ κείνος ἀβουλία ὑστατος ἀλώσιος ἀντάσιαι θάνατον αἰπὴν οὐκ ἐξέφυγεν, wrongly rendering 'all too late for.' But *s.v.* ἀντάω they rightly take ἀλώσιος to depend on ἀντάσιαι.

λ might merely be doubled in pronunciation, as πολύλλιστος Hom., μονόλλυκος Arat. 1124; but the usual plan for metrical purposes or for euphony was to substitute η for ο, as θανατηφόρος, αἱματηφόρος, θεσφατηλόγος, ἐλαφθόλος, πολεμηδόκος, ξηνηδόκος, γλαυκητόρος, ὀμφαλητόμος, νεφέατος, νεθηαλής, and countless others, to which I will add only ὀφηβοσίη from the *Inscriptions of Cos* p. 113. The whole subject is treated with his unique learning by Lobeck *Phryg.* p. 633-713.²

Similar words are πυματήγορος, and ἐσχατόγηρος (γέρων ἐς τὸ ἐσχατον Lucian iii. 82) which also gets corrupted; L. Dindorf in the *Thesaurus* restores it in Diod. Sic. xx. 72 for *vv.ll.* ἐσχατόγηρος and ἐσχατῶ γῆρα, noting that both in Strabo p. 650 and Sirach 41, 4 ἐσχατῶ γῆρα is a *v.l.* for ἐσχατογῆρα.

In *A.P.* i. 47 Πατὴρ ἀπ' ἀθανάτου μεγασθενὲς ἤλυθε πνεῦμα, Stadtmueller was ill-advised in adopting the *v.l.* μέγα σθένος: even if the reading of P were not μέγα σθενῶ (the hyphen after the usual fashion, indicating the compound), the adjective should have been restored. I have another such to restore in *Supp.* 584, where the MSS. give

βία δ' ἀπημάντω σθένει
 καὶ θείαις ἐπιπνοίαις
 πάυεται

The subject is Io. My inference that this should be

βία δ' ἀπηματοσθενεῖ

was drawn before I had observed the schol. on 584 λείπει ὁ καί, which indicates (as Weil remarks) that he read βία or βία as the dative (the final ι is commonly, of course, omitted), and took the construction to be βία δὲ καὶ ἀπημάντω σθένει.

A corruption that resembles this is *Cho.* 967, where I am now convinced that Hermann's restoration is correct:

ταχὰ δὲ παντελῆς χρόνος ἀμείψεται
 πρόθυρα δωμάτων . . . ,
 967 τύχα δ' εὐπροσωποκοίτα τὸ πᾶν
 ἰδεῖν θροεμένους
 μέτοικοι δόμων πεσοῦνται πάλιν³

² From stems in α or η the formation may be called legitimate. In Soph. *fr.* 122. 1 (Hesych. ii. 526) ἡμιουτὸν κοῦρειον ἡρέθη πόλει should perhaps be ΤΙΜΗΘΥΤΟΝ τιμήθυτον or τιμῶθυτον κοῦρεῖον 'chosen as an honourable sacrifice.' It looks at any rate like a compound such as ἱερόθυτος, πρωτόθυτος, εἰδωλόθυτος.

³ It gives also μεταικοδοῦμαι, the reason for which is that μεταικοδομεῖν was a word in late use. The schol. had μέτοικοι.

χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγροῖ Πριάμου πόλιν ἄδε κέλευθος
 πάντα δὲ πύργων
 κτήνη πρόσθε τὰ δημοσιπληθῆ
 μοῖρα λαπάξει πρὸς τὸ βίαιον·
 οἷον μὴ τις ἄγα θεόθεν κνεφάσῃ προτυπὲν
 στόμιον μέγα Τροίας
 στρατωθέν· ὁ κνῶ γάρ· ἐπίφθονος· Ἄρτεμις ἄγνὰ
 πτανοῖσιν κυσὶ πατρὸς

139 οἶκω MSS.

οἷον μὴ κνεφάσῃ means *μόνον φράζεσθαι* or *φυλακτέον μὴ* . . . and this is the saving clause which it appears from some amusing parodies was proper to a prophecy: *A.P.* xi. 163 a wrestler, a pentathlete, and a runner come to find out from a *μάντις* which will win. 'πάντες' ἔφη 'νικᾶτε· *μόνον μὴ τις* σὲ παρέλθῃ, καὶ σὲ καταστρέψῃ, καὶ σὲ παρατροχάσῃ.' In xi. 365 a farmer consults an astrologer on his prospects. 'If it rains enough' is the response 'and not too much, and the furrows are not spoiled by frost, nor young shoots crushed by hail, nor the crop devoured by deer, and nothing else unfavourable befalls from earth or air, I foretell you a good harvest—*μoύνας δεῖδιθι τὰς ἀκρίδας*.'

For οἶκω γάρ ἐπίφθονος . . . Casaubon conjectured οἶκω. The word is quite superfluous, yet here the chief stress of the sentence must be placed upon it. It would signify in Greek 'for it is out of compassion that Artemis is jealous . . .' The same objection holds equally against οἶκω, which other objections have been strong enough to discredit with most critics. The only way you can translate it is to take it in apposition to *κυσί*: 'for Artemis is wroth against the house—her Father's winged hounds for sacrificing a poor hare . . .' Who does not feel that to be most awkward writing? Besides, though the two eagles do of course in the prophet's mind symbolize the two Atreidae, it is by symbols that he speaks; it is not the part of the soothsayer to be scholiast upon his own deliverance: ἄλλος μὲν ὁ χρησμοφδός, ἄλλος δὲ ὁ ἐρμηνεύς.

What I take the seer to say is this: 'In course of time I see the fall of Priam's town—if only no jealousy from heaven dull the great embattled¹ bit that should hold the mouth of Troy—for I have misgivings; Artemis is wroth against her Father's winged hounds for sacrificing a poor timorous hare with all her unborn young.' Artemis is both the befriender of young creatures and the patroness of child-bed; there is reason therefore to apprehend that she may show resentment.

¹ στρατωθέν is an epithet 'limiting' the metaphor.

Then he proceeds (146) 'But though so kindly² to all young wild creatures, yet consent to grant fulfilment of this sign, which though partly favourable, is partly nevertheless untoward.'

ὀκνῶ γάρ (= οὐ θαρρῶ γάρ) is in this sense 'Ιωνικώτερον and used accordingly by Xenophon and Sophocles: e.g. *Phil.* 907.

178 'I can find none' the Chorus say 'to put my trust in, but Zeus alone':

οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι
 πλὴν Δίος εἰ τὸ μάταν ἀπὸ φροντίδος ἄχθος
 χρῆ βαλεῖν ἐτητύμως.
 οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας, παμμάχω
 θράσει βρύων
 οὐδὲν λέξει πρὶν ὧν,
 ὅς δ' ἔπειτ' ἔφω, τριακτῆρος οἴχεται τυχών

Paley says 'ὅστις cannot be used of a definite person,' and reads οὐθ' ὅς τοῖς πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας, 'neither he who to those of old was a god of power' which leads one to expect a different antithesis from ὅς δ' ἔπειτ' ἔφω. The natural opposition would be οὐθ' ὅς νῦν. I am aware that ὅστις may be argued for, but probability is very much against it, and when we find the sentence beginning with οὐδ' ὅστις, suspicion is considerably increased. For what is certain is that οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν or οὐδ' ὅς τοῖς πάροιθεν could only mean 'not even he that was great *aforetime*,' the stress being on πάροιθεν. That is pointless here. The only plausible conjecture I have seen is οἶδ' ὅστις (Pauw). The reading I propose, because it proceeds by an unexpected path, will be somewhat startling at first sight; but it appears to me to make a natural and effective sentence. For ΟΥΔΟCTIC I merely write ΟΥΛΟCTIC

οὐλός τις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας, παμμάχω θράσει βρύων

'A violent one was great of old, swelling with boisterous puissance.' The metaphor throughout is of a combat—*τριακτῆρος* and *παμμάχω*, a word which it will be seen in the *Thesaurus* was properly used of the pancratiast. οὐλός, the epithet applied by Homer to Ares and Achilles, is eminently suitable to this turbulent swasher.

It cannot stand for an argument, but it may be suggested not unfairly, that if Aeschylus did use this word, he would have

² Perhaps *τόσον περ εὐφρων* <δὲ>, *Καλά δρόσοισι λεπτοῖς μαλερῶν λεόντων*, though one rather desiderates *εὐφρων, Καλά, οὐδ' ἔρσοισι*. That at any rate should be the metre. *Καλά*, the well-known epithet of Artemis, is used here after the usual custom, to flatter and conciliate the goddess.

recalled that celebrated saying of Xenophanes (p. 35 Karsten) οὔλος ὄρα, οὔλος δὲ νοεῖ, οὔλος δέ τ' ἀκούει: though the identity is only one of sound, for οὔλος there meant ὄλος.

405 λιτῶν δ' ἀκούει μὲν οὐδεις θεῶν
τὸν δ' ἐπίστροφον τῶν
φῶτ' ἀδίκων καθαίρει

may be suggested, though such a position of words is rare even in Homer (Λ 186 τὸν Ἐκτορι μῦθον ἐνίσπες). Yet in *Eum.* 487 (as it stands) τὸν εἰς ἅπαντ' ἐγὼ θήσω χρόνον ἰς εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον.

702 Ἴλιψ δὲ κῆδος ὀρθ-
ώνυμον τελεσσίφρων
μήνις ἤλασεν

ἤλασεν will not bear enquiry. It cannot mean 'drove to Troy'; while if Ἴλιψ is translated rightly 'for Troy,' ἤλασεν must mean, as always, 'drove away.' Besides, the κῆδος was not driven, or even brought, to Troy to take vengeance for the κῆδος: what was brought there was the Grecian army; and it was then the Trojans found that Ἴλιψ αἰπεινῶ Πάρις οὐ γάμον ἀλλά τι' ἄταν ἀγάγει' εὐναίαν εἰς θαλάμους Ἑλέναν *Eur. Andr.* 103. ἤλασεν is a mistake for ἤνυσεν, a synonym of ἔκρανεν, ἐξέπραξεν, ἐτελείωσεν 'brought to fulfilment,' and is constructed with ὀρθώνυμον exactly as *Soph. Ant.* 1178 τοῦτος ὡς ἄρ' ὀρθὸν ἤνυσας: cf. *O.C.* 454 παλαίφραθ' ἄμοι Φοῖβος ἤνυσεν ποτε, *O.T.* 166 ἤνυσαν' ἐκτοπίαν φλόγα, *Hom.* τ 567 οἶ ρ' ἔτυμα κραινοσιν. *Theb.* 870 ἀληθῆ . . . ἐπέκρανεν.

The same error was corrected by Reiske *Eur. Heracl.* 788, reading διήνυσεν ἐλευθερώσαι for διήλασεν.

779 Weil reads

πολλοὶ δὲ βροτῶν τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι οἱ
προτίουσι

in place of εἶναι. The very phrase is used by *Lucian* iii. 274 where he is reminding Samippus, who had wished to be a king, what the drawbacks of the position would have been: ἐπιβουλαὶ μυρίαὶ καὶ φθόνος παρὰ τῶν συνόντων καὶ μίσος καὶ κολακεία, φίλος δὲ οὐδεις ἀληθής, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ δέος ἅπαντες ἢ πρὸς τὴν ἐλπίδα εἶναι δοκοῦντες εἶναι.

784 καὶ συγχαίρουσιν ὁμοιοπρεπεῖς
ἀγέλαστα πρόσωπα βιαζόμενοι

I agree with Hermann in believing a paroemiac to have been lost that contained the finite verb; and from the following passages I should expect that the purport of it was 'they smile only with the lips':

Hom. O 101 ἢ δὲ γέλασεν χεῖλεσιν, οὐ δὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὄφρουσι κυανέησιν ἰανθῆ 'smiled at him with her lips, not with her eyes' as Mr. Stephen Phillips has it. *Lucian* iii. 153 προσίεται μὲν καὶ προσμειδῶ τοῖς χεῖλεσιν ἄκροισι, μισεῖ δὲ καὶ λάβρα τοὺς ὀδόντας διαπρίει. *Fronto* p. 243 Naber ὁ τοι γέλωσ, οὕτως τὸ πρὶν ἄδολος εἶναι πεφυκῶς ὡς καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας τῶν γελώντων ἐπιδεικνύει, εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤδη περιέστηκεν κακομηχανίας καὶ ἐνέδρας ὡς καὶ τὰ χεῖλη κρύπτει τῶν ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς προσγελώντων. *Plaut. Capt.* 484 nemo ridet. scivi extempore rem de confecto geri. ne canem quidem irritatam voluit quisquam imitariet, saltem, si non adriderent, dentis ut restringerent. *Schol. Plat. Rep.* 337 a p. 926 μήποτε οὖν τὸ Ὀμηρικόν, ὅθεν καὶ ἡ παροιμία, ἴσως ἐρρήη, 'μειδῆσε δὲ θυμῷ σαρδάνιον μάλα τοῖον' τὸν ἄπ' αὐτῶν τῶν χεῖλῶν γέλωτα καὶ μέχρι τοῦ σεσηρῆναι γυγόμενον σημαίνει (cf. *Theb.* s.v. σαιρω). But, continues *Aeschylus*, οὐκ ἔστι λαθεῖν ὁ μ μ α τ α, their eyes bewray them.

790 'At that time,' say the Chorus, 'when you were marshalling an expedition for the sake of Helen, I will freely confess that you appeared in our sight ill-advised in seeking to recover a willing impudence at the cost of lives of men':

θάρσος ἐκούσιον
ἀνδράσι θνητσοῦσι κομίζων.

This is Dr. Verrall's interpretation ('a consenting wanton'), and I have never had a moment's doubt that it was right. Curiously enough it so happened that this was singled out by two of his critics for rejection on the face of it; which shows how hard it is for an unfamiliar view to win its way. Yet it need not have been altogether unfamiliar, for two critics had already given its correct meaning to κομίζων and referred θάρσος ἐκούσιον to Helen. M. Weil suggested 'Fortasse τῆς θηλείας vel tale quid excidit, ut hoc dicat poeta: *feminae audaciam voluntariam* (sponte enim Helene adulterum secuta erat), i.e. *feminam perfidam, virorum morte recuperare conans*,' illustrating κομίζων by *Pind.* O. xiii. 58, P. iv. 106. Mr. Margoliouth, using the same passages and adding *Eur. Supp.* 275, made a further step by taking the text to be complete: 'Helenaē impudicitiam libenter admissam, non vi coactam, virorum morte reducens,' quoting for the sentiment *Eur. Tro.* 370 sqq. And the final step is made by Dr. Verrall, who takes θάρσος ἐκούσιον to be a description of Helen actually herself. If it could be used so, it is plainly better; but this is the point where hesitation may be felt and for which illustration

may not be unwelcome. Dr. Verrall says 'Nor is *θάρασος* difficult in itself. Like *μῖσος* and *στύγος*, so *θάρασος* or *θράσος* is used in a personal sense (e.g. Eur. *Andr.* 261 ὁ βάρβαρον σὺ θρέμμα καὶ σκληρὸν θράσος), and it is of course common as a synonym of *ἀναίδεια*.' This is perfectly correct; but the example is a vocative: would such a phrase be used in the third person? Yes, where the meaning is sufficiently defined, there is not the least objection: *ἐλέγχεα* (vocative Hom. B 235, E 787) Ω 260 τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λείπεται. *ὄνειδος* Teles (Stob. *Fl.* 40. 8) τὰ δὲ ὄνειδη τῆς δημοκρατίας ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις τάφοις (τεθαμμένοι εἰσὶ). Eur. *Cycl.* 293 τὰ δ' Ἑλλάδος δυσφρονά γ' ὄνειδη (Helen¹) Φρυξὶν οὐκ ἐδώκαμεν. Aesch. *Theb.* 526 τὸ γὰρ πόλεως ὄνειδος... Σφίγγα. Ar. *Ach.* 855 *Λυσίστρατος*... Χολαργέων ὄνειδος. Lycurg. p. 148. 25 τούτων... τῆς τε πατρίδος ὄνειδος γεγενημένων... Dem. 558. 5, 11. *στύγος* (voc. *Theb.* 640, Apoll. Rhod. iv. 445) *Cho.* 1025 *μητέρα*... πατροκτόνον μῖασμα καὶ θεῶν, *στύγος*, 530 ὑπὸ *στύγους* 'by the loathsome creature,' *A.P.* vii. 405 *Βουπάλειον ἐς στύγους* i.e. τὸν *Βούπαλον*: so probably *Cho.* 766 *δεσπότην στύγει* 'our hated master,' cf. *δείματα θηρῶν, θηρῶν δάκη, θήρειον δάκος. μῖσος* (voc. *Philoct.* 991, *Med.* 1312) *Ag.* 1411, *Antiq.* 760 *ἄγετε τὸ μῖσος*, Eur. *fr.* 530. 4 *Κύπριδος δὲ μίσσημ*, *Ἄρκας Ἀταλάντη, Hērpp.* 409, *Eum.* 73. Forms in *-μα* are commonly so used, as *ἀπαιόλημα Cho.* 1000, τὸν *αἰμυλώτατον, ἐχθρὸν ἄλημα Soph.* *Aj.* 389, *πάνσοφον κρότημα Λαέρτου γόνος fr.* 827, *Πολυκράτης δέ...*, *λόγων τι παιπάλημα καὶ κακὴ γλώσσα Aeschrio* (*Ath.* 335d). Finally, besides ὁ *θράσος* in *Andr.* 261, we have *κρατούσα μὲν γὰρ (γυνή) οὐχ ὀμιλητὸν θράσος (ἔστί)*: so there need be no hesitation about the use of the contemptuous neuter here. The name has been already named, and a Greek audience would not experience the least difficulty in understanding what was meant. Nothing can have been more familiar to them than this view of Helen as a ground of discontentment both at home and in the camp. It was bad enough that men's blood should be shed for a woman's sake at all (*Ag.* 62, 455, cf. *Supp.* 486), especially when that woman was another's wife (*Ag.* 455, Achilles in Hom. A 154, I 327, 339); but for a woman who went off with her lover of her own accord (add Eur. *Andr.* 592 *sqq.*), this was indeed a thing intolerable.²

¹ So I understand it; but this explanation does not appear to have occurred to editors.

² See the Asiatic view of this very matter as represented by Herodotus i. 4; when women were carried off, it was folly to make exertions for re-

Another instance of *κομίζειν* in this case is Pind. *N.* vii. 27.

1269

ἐποπτεύσας δέ με
κάν τοῖσδε κόσμοις καταγελωμένην μετὰ
φίλων ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν οὐ διχορρόπως μάτην

'having regarded me even in this raiment laughed to scorn by foes and friends alike without distinction.' The form of phrase, which from its unfamiliarity has occasioned a good deal of doubt and alteration, may be illustrated by the proverbial sayings *ἐρρέτω φίλος σὺν ἐχθρῶ* (Plut. *Mor.* 50 F, Macar. iv. 12), *σφάλλουν σὺν ἐχθροῖς καὶ φίλους κέρδος φέρει* and *ἀπόλοιτο καὶ φίλος σὺν ἐχθροῖς* (Macar. vii. 95). Bergk's reading in Pind. viii. 74 *πολλοῖς σοφοῖς* (for *σοφός*) *δοκεῖ πεδ' ἀφρόνων βίον κορυσσέμεν ὀρθοβούλοισι μαχαναῖς* would be just such another phrase, 'is thought not only by fools but by many wise men also.'

If the original had been

καταγελωμένην μάτην
φίλων ὑπ', ἐχθρῶν οὐ διχορρόπως μετὰ,

to take this for ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν would have been a natural error, and to transpose *μετὰ* and *μάτην* a ready expedient for making a construction; but the MS., which throws the stress on *ἐχθρῶν*, has a very obvious meaning, 'laughed at now in Argos as before at Troy.' That meaning would have been as well expressed by *φίλων μέτ'*, *ἐχθρῶν οὐ διχορρόπως ὑπο*.

1432 *καὶ τήνδ' ἀκούεις ὀρκίων ἐμῶν θέμιν* cannot be correct, for *ἀκούεις* would mean 'you hear, 'you have heard now'; it is after the law has been recited that the orator says *ἀκούεις τὸν νόμον*, and the same is the case invariably with *ἀκούεις* or *κλύεις*. Greek would be *καὶ τήνδ' ἀκουσον* (Casaubon) as *Cho.* 498, or *ἄκούε γ'* (Herwerden), or as I suggest *ἀκούση γ'* or *ἀκούσει γ'* (ΑΚΟΥΣΙΓ), as *Eum.* 306, *Soph. Aj.* 1141.

1444

ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην
ὁ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως· ἡ δὲ τοι . . .
κέϊται, φιλήτωρ τοῦδ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν
εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς.

The more I look at this, the less I like it. In the first place I never saw in genuine Greek such an inexplicable collocation of genitives as *εὐνῆς τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς*. But allow it, for the sake of argument, to pass; what can we suppose it means? As a matter of fact, almost every critic supposes something different. Paley gives some of the various

venge, δηλα γὰρ δὴ ἔτι, εἰ μὴ αὐτὰ ἐβούλοντο, οὐκ ἂν ἠρπάζοντο.

interpretations that have been advanced, to which those of Enger and Schneidewin may be added, while Wecklein's Appendix will show numerous conjectures. The view which I think the most necessary to combat is that which makes Clytemnestra say 'Cassandra by her death has added to the enjoyment of my bed.' How has she done it? Revenge may have added to Clytemnestra's enjoyment of life generally; but how to the particular enjoyment she is supposed to name? I confess I am unable to perceive. If it were so, we should get a reasonable construction by reading *χλιδή* 'triumph,' 'exultation' as the subject to *ἐπήγαγεν*.

But the aesthetic objection is too strong. There are few women, however dissolute, abandoned, shameless, that I can imagine making so hideous an avowal; and I am sure that the Clytemnestra of Aeschylus is not among them. How far her guilty connexion with Aegisthus was a motive to her act, is a question asked by Pindar (*P.* xi 22), but not answered,—as indeed you could not answer it; and Aeschylus with rare artistic judgment leaves us to conjecture. But it is a motive not admitted by herself at all; never admitted, I imagine, even to her own mind. Her justification, asserted before and after (1395-7, 1402-5, 1412-20, 1433-4, 1524-31, 1554) in the plainest and most solemn terms, is righteous vengeance for her daughter's life: Aegisthus is her 'sympathetic¹' friend and ally, who will continue to light the fire upon her hearth. That is all she says; all, surely, that any woman could say. The reticence of the expression is in the strongest contrast with the frank and emphatic declaration that immediately precedes it. But having made that declaration, she then permits herself to vent in passionate invective the jealous hate and fury of an injured wife.

Among the passages collected by Blomfield to illustrate *παροψώνημα* is a fragment of Aristophanes (*Ath.* 368 c) *πάσαις γυναιξίν ἐξ ἑνός γε τοῦ τρόπου ὡσπερ παροψίς μοιχὸς ἐσκενασμένος*. That, as he observes, 'apprime huc facit'; 'nempe *παροψίς* erat ferculum delicatum, quod praeter solitos cibos apponebant: gallice, *entremets*.' But yet he missed the meaning, for he reads with Musgrave *χλιδῆ*. No, the phrase is not only in the same direction, but abso-

lutely parallel. What the *μοιχὸς* is in relation to the wife and husband, that, she says, was *Cassandra* in relation to Agamemnon and herself; this woman was *εἰνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς*, to the bed that belonged by right to me. The phrase is not the accusative and object to *ἐπήγαγεν*, but the nominative and subject of it—or better, perhaps, it is in apposition to the previous nominative *ἡ δέ τοι*. And it follows that the object must be *χλιδῆν*:

*ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην·
ὁ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως· ἡ δέ τοι . . .
κέῖται, φιλήτωρ τοῦδ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν,
εἰνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς, χλιδῆν.*

To appreciate the construction of the passage it should be understood that she is contemplating the relations that all three have held to one another, and gloating with sardonic joy upon their different issues; and these things are expressed by closely-knit antitheses: 'Low lies the wronger of his wife; and she, his paramour (1439 *sqq.*), lies there beside him. They have met with their deserts; for thus it is with *him*; and *she*, that was *his* lover, is laid low—she, that chose to trespass upon my wifely rights, hath but afforded *me* the exquisite delight of triumph.' That is how they have severally come off; herself alone is left victorious at all points.

A new force, that before was lacking, is now gained by *φιλήτωρ τοῦδε*; it is directly balanced by *εἰνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς*, and it may well be that the active word was selected with the intention of conveying Clytemnestra's view of Cassandra, as an enemy who had dared to side with Agamemnon, and had thereby offered a challenge to herself.

ἐπάγειν is used by Pindar thus, like *ἐπιδούναι*: *P.* viii. 64 to Apollo, *τὸ μὲν μέγιστον τόθι χαρμάτων ὤπασσας, οἴκοι δὲ πρόσθεν ἀρπαλέαν δόσων . . . ἐπάγαγε*: cf. *O.* ii. 10, 41, *Soph. Aj.* 1189.

The schol. has *τὴν ἐκ περιουσίας τρυφήν*, which Blomfield took to be an explanation of *παροψώνημα* merely. It must have included *χλιδῆς*, for of that word *τρυφή* is the grammarians' regular equivalent² (see

² When I was studying scholia first, and reading those on Sophocles, I came upon *τρυφᾶν καὶ ἐναβρύνεσθαι* (without a lemma) on *O. T.* 1070, and turned at once to see whether the text was *χλίειν* or *χλιδᾶν*. I found *ταύτην δ' ἔατε πλουσίῳ χαίρειν γένει*. It is against all probability that *χαίρειν* should have been the lemma; but of *ΧΛΙΕΙΝ* those are the proper explanations: e.g. *Pind. O.* x. 99 *χλιδῶσα δὲ μοιπᾶ*: schol. p. 256 *ἀντι τοῦ τρυφῶσα, ἐναβρυνόμενη*. Nauck for the same reason had conjectured *χλιδᾶν*. It is

¹ This is the nearest equivalent of *εὖ φρονῶν ἐμοὶ* 1437, as in other places, e.g. *Ag.* 283, *Cho.* 770.—In 1654 where she implores him to refrain from bloodshed, the appeal is by her love for him, *ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν*; but that is a different thing from talking of her *εὐνή* with him to the public.

Ruhnken *Tim.* 276 = 230, Moeris 408 = 370) : thus (to quote passages some of which will at the same time illustrate the sense of *luxuriating triumph*) Aesch. *Supp.* 925 Ἐλλησιν ἐγγλίεις, 242 χλίοντα, schol. τρυφῶντα, *Cho.* 137 ἐν . . . πόνοισι χλίουσιν, schol. τρυφῶσιν. Hesych. Ἐγγλίει: ἐντρυφᾷ. Χλίει: θρύπτει: *P. V.* 1003 χλιδᾶν ζοικας τοῖς παρούσι πράγμασι: schol. τρυφᾶν, ἀνίσσθαι. Soph. *Trach.* 281 ὑπερχλίοντες: schol. ὑπερεντρυφῆσαντες.

χλιδῆν was conjectured by Auratus, but it is unfortunately impossible to know how he understood the sentence. M. Weil, to whose judgment and penetration I am accustomed in such a case to look with hope, now reads (after Karsten) θοίνης παροψώνημα τῆσδ' εὐνῆς χλιδῆν. But in his edition of 1861 he had been upon the track that I have followed: 'Vulgata per breviliquentiam a graeco sermone non abhorrentem, bis cogitato παροψώνημα, fortasse sic expediri potest, ut Agamemno dicatur quam sibi adduxerit εὐνῆς παροψώνημα, Clytaemnestrae adduxisse παροψώνημα χλιδῆς.' It is unnecessary to dwell upon the objection to the sentence this would make; but there alone is the suggestion to be found that by εὐνῆς παροψώνημα might be meant Cassandra.

1479 ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἔρωσ αἱματολοχὸς
νείρει τρέφεται, πρὶν καταλῆξαι
τὸ παλαιὸν ἄχος, νέος ἴχαρ.

νείρει τρέφεται may be, I think, a corruption of a compound νειριτροφεῖται, like σκιατροφεῖσθαι: cf. νυκτιγορεῖσθαι *Theb.* 29. To write it as we find it would be the natural tendency of a copyist; thus we get in MSS. ἀγει κνήμων schol. Pind p. 312 (*fr.* 82) for ἀγκίρημον, ὀνήσει πόλιν Simonides in Plat. *Prot.* 346 c for ὀνήσιπολι, κάμψει διάυλον Telestes in Ath. 637 a for καμψιδιάυλον: while for the strengthened form of the verb they tend to write the simple form; thus (to take a case in which this often happens) in Eur. *fr.* 1063. 5 for ἀναστρωφωμένη (*Gesner*) the MSS. of

possible, indeed, to conceive and argue that Sophocles might wish to suggest ἐάτε χαιρεῖν 'let her go'; but no one ever saw that word so glossed; and χλείν is the most appropriate word in this connexion: e.g. Eur. *fr.* 986 πλοῦτῳ χλιδῶσα, *P. V.* 918 πλοῦτῳ διαθρυπτομένῳ (ἐντρυφῶντων schol.)... γέννα μεγαλυνομένων.

Stobaeus and Choricus vary between ἀναστρωφωμένη and ἀναστρεφωμένη.

The form might also be νειριτροφεῖται, as σκιατροφεῖται. This word too supplies an example of the tendency to break up compounds: in Stob. *Flor.* 97. 17 (Eur. *fr.* 546. 8) there is a *v.l.* σκιᾷ τροφούμενος.

1573 To save space I will give at once what I believe to have been the history of our text:

κτεάνων τε μέρος
ἀπόχρη
βαῖον ἔχουση πᾶν ἐπαρκὲς ἔμοιγ'
ἀλληλοφόνους
μανίας μελάθρων ἀφελούση.

The next step was πᾶν ἀπόχρη 'μοιγ': but since πᾶν ἀπόχρη cannot be constructed together, πᾶν was taken to be a predicate; and that necessitated a connecting particle in the following clause: and so we get κτεάνων τε μέρος βαῖον ἔχουση πᾶν, ἀπόχρη μοι δ'. . . The rhythm alone is enough to show that cannot be genuine; but to confirm my view that this was supposed to be the construction, cod. f has actually that punctuation, a comma after πᾶν. I had long looked with suspicion upon ἀπόχρη, for it is a prose word, not a poetical, and neither in Epic, Lyric, or Tragedy is ever used at all. Thus it would be a natural synonym for explanatory purposes: Moeris p. 262 Οὐκ ἀπῆρκει ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἀπέχρη, Ἄριστοφάνης Πολυίδῳ. But poetry uses ἀρκῶ and compounds, verbs and adjectives, as *Ag.* 390 ἀπῆμαντον ὥστ' ἀπαρκεῖν, *Pers.* 240 πλοῦτος ἀξαρκής, *A. P.* x. 76 πλοῦτον ἔχειν ἐθέλω τὸν ἐπάρκιον, *Anon.* (*Suid.* Παλαμῆδης) εἶη μοι βίσιος πανεπάρκιος 'all-sufficient.' And so here I believe that Aeschylus (who has παναρκεῖς *Theb.* 152) wrote πανεπαρκὲς ἔμοιγ' . . . while the copyist, after the habit of such with unexpected compounds, made two words of it. In *Iambl. Vit. Pyth.* § 147 *Cobet Coll. Crit.* p. 378 for τὸ λεγόμενον πᾶν ἀληθὲς restored παναληθὲς, and the tendency is seen in *Theb.* 709 where παναληθεῖ was the first attempt at ΠΑΝΑΛΗΘΗ. ἔμοιγε is quite suitable: Plat. *Prot.* 346 c ἐγώ, ὦ Πιττακέ, οὐ διὰ ταῦτά σε ψέγω ὅτι εἰμι φιλόσοφος, ἐπεὶ ἔμοιγε ἐξαρκεῖ ὅς . . . *Pherecrat.* 145. 17. ἀλλ' οὖν ἔμοιγε χούτος ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνήρ.

W. HEADLAM.