

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](#)



The *Bacchae* of Euripides

R. Y. Tyrrell

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 07 / July 1894, pp 294 - 296

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196386, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196386

How to cite this article:

R. Y. Tyrrell (1894). The *Bacchae* of Euripides. The Classical Review, 8, pp 294-296
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196386

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

οὐκοῦν γίγνεται μὲν, the οὐκοῦν having been lost after μὲν οὖν just preceding.

575 A. τυραννικῶς ἐν αὐτῷ ἢ Ἔρως...ζῶν, ἄτε αὐτὸς ὢν μόναρχος, τὸν ἔχοντά τε αὐτὸν ὡς περ πόλιν ἄξει ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τόλμαν, ὅθεν αὐτὸν τε καὶ τὸν περὶ αὐτὸν θόρυβον θρέψει, τὸν μὲν ἔξωθεν εἰσεληλυθότα ἀπὸ κακῆς ὀμιλίας, τὸν δ' ἐνδοθεν ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπων καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνεθέντα καὶ ἐλευθερωθέντα.

The τε after τὸν ἔχοντα is omitted by Stallbaum, nor do I see how Baiter could justify its retention, unless we are to suppose something omitted like τὸν ἔχοντά τε <καὶ τρέφοντα>. Cf. 575 D μητρίδα τε... καὶ πατρίδα ἔξει τε καὶ θρέψει. Again ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπων καὶ ἑαυτοῦ is nonsense. I conjecture ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπων ἑαυτῷ, or possibly ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπων καὶ αὐτὸν (cf. 451 E εἰ ἄρα ταῖς γυναιξίν ἐπὶ ταῦτά χρῆσόμεθα καὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσι, ταῦτά καὶ διδασκτέον αὐτάς, where καὶ goes closely with ἐπὶ ταῦτά) in the sense of 'the same habits, or manners, that have set him (Ἔρως) free.'

577 A. ἐν τε ταῖς κατ' οἰκίαν πράξεσιν, ὡς πρὸς ἐκάστους τοὺς οἰκείους ἔχει, ἐν οἷς μάλιστα γυμνὸς ἂν ὀφθῆι τῆς τραγικῆς σκευῆς.

Probably ἐν αἰς.

577 B. βούλει.. προσποιησόμεθα ἡμεῖς εἶναι τῶν δυνατῶν ἂν κρίναι; καὶ ἤδη ἐντυχόντων τοιοῦτοις.

I do not think τῶν δυνατῶν ἂν could be defended by the parallel of Eur. Alc. 182 σέ δ' ἄλλη τις γυνὴ κεκτῆσεται, σῶφρων μὲν οὐκ ἂν μᾶλλον, εὐτυχῆς δ' ἴσως and the parody in Ar. Eq. 1252. In prose it is surely impossible to attach ἂν to an adjective. We have

τοῦ δυνατοῦ μὲν κρίναι a few lines above, which tells against the genuineness of ἂν here. Can ἂν represent ὄν(των)? Or should we read τῶν δυνατῶν ἂν ὄντων?

579 D. δούλος τὰς μεγίστας θωπείας καὶ δουλείας. Surely we ought with two MSS. (Schneider) to read δουλείας καὶ θωπείας. The only thing that could make δούλος θωπείας tolerable would be that δούλος δουλείας should lead up to it.

585 A. ὡς περ δὲ πρὸς μέλαν φαῖον ἀποσκοπούντες ἀπειρία λευκοῦ, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄλυπον οὕτω λύπην ἀφορῶντες ἀπειρία ἡδονῆς ἀπατώνται.

Thompson was undoubtedly right in principle when he proposed καὶ πρὸς λύπην οὕτω τὸ ἄλυπον: but I should rather incline to write καὶ τὸ ἄλυπον οὕτω πρὸς λύπην. One or the other is absolutely necessary.

586 C. ὅς ἂν αὐτὸ τοῦτο διαπράττηται. The sense seems to require something like ταῦτο τοῦτο or αὐ τοιοῦτον.

592 B. Ἄλλ', ἦν δ' ἐγὼ, ἐν οὐρανῷ ἴσως παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται τῷ βουλομένῳ ὄραν καὶ ὀρῶντι ἑαυτὸν κατοικίζειν.

Herwerden seems right in taking exception to ἑαυτὸν κατοικίζειν, but neither αὐτὸ κατοικίζειν nor ὀρῶντι πρὸς αὐτό ('keeping it in view') is satisfactory. I should suppose Plato to have written ἑαυτὸν <αὐτόσε> (or <εἰς αὐτὴν>) κατοικίζειν. Cf. 543 B ἄγοντες τοὺς στρατιώτας κατοικιοῦσιν εἰς οἰκήσεις: Tim. 69 D κατοικίζουσιν εἰς ἄλλην τοῦ σώματος οἴκησιν τὸ θνητόν. By itself ἑαυτὸν κατοικίζειν is incomplete.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

(To be continued.)

THE BACCHAE OF EURIPIDES.

I BEGIN by withdrawing the expression *mendacissimus*, which in my hot youth I applied to Henry Stephens. I think it was my opinion at that time that one might say anything in Latin. I remember that on the appearance of the edition of 1871 I was courteously admonished in a long-defunct magazine, the *Dark Blue*, by a young Cambridge scholar who had even then given earnest of his future brilliant achievements in scholarship, I mean Prof. Jebb, that it was unadvisable to revive the asperities of the Brunckian era. I have followed that advice, and have adopted a far less emphatic tone in my recent edition of the *Bacchae*.

But I still hold the belief that Stephens' *vetustissima exemplaria* had no existence. I know nothing about the case of Isaac Voss instanced by Mr. England, but I think he has been singularly fortunate if scholars have taken his word for the existence of MSS. seen by nobody but himself. Bosius (Du Bos), a fellow countryman of H. Stephens (Henri Estienne), has not gained such credence. His X and Y have been universally rejected by scholars. Baiter declares that all readings depending on them alone are *furca expellendae* and in relating the circumstances of the death of Bosius he writes *Bosium cito scelus suum*

morte luisse a latronibus trucidatum. It is true that Mendelssohn has lately raised the question whether these *codices* may not have been genuine; but the answer of scholars seems to be unanimous: 'If those *codices* existed how is it that no one has ever seen them?' Scholars of the revival were very ready to give full information about their *exemplaria* when they really existed. By an extraordinary vagary of human ambition some of them were capable of resorting to imposture to gain admittance into the early editions, and consequently a good chance of permanent acceptance, for their own conjectures, which were in many cases so good that they would have been universally accepted as certain conjectural emendations if candidly put forward as such.

I heartily admire Mr. England's scholarship, and appreciate highly the work he has done on Euripides. Moreover I completely agree with him in his admiration for the brilliant services of Stephens to scholarship. He is polite enough not to apply the objectionable superlative (even in Latin) to me, but, in the face of a significant aposiopesis on his part, I should like to show that even a less courteous disputant than he is himself would not be justified in applying to me the adjective even in the positive degree (and in Latin).

Kirchhoff does not believe in Stephens' *vetustissima exemplaria*. He gives a full account of the MSS. on which the text of the *Bacchae* depends, and he makes no mention at all of Stephens' *codices Italici*. He gives Stephens' quotations from them as the conjectures of that admirable scholar, and when he does not approve of them as conjectures he does not mention them. For instance, in 1060 he does not make any mention of *μόθων*, though Stephens is very instant in claiming for it MS. authority. This being so, I perhaps did not use the most appropriate language when I said that Kirchhoff has shown that the *codices* were fabricated when he had only shown that he believed them to be fabricated. Yet, if I proclaimed that I had won the Derby, and if Mr. England, on referring to a list of Derby winners generally accepted as accurate, and finding there no mention of my name, should declare that the list had shown that I was making an untrue statement, it would not be to Mr. England that the defamatory attribute would be most applicable.

Mr. England says that Stephens published the readings of his Italian *codices* along with conjectures of his own 'in such

a way that it is nearly always possible to distinguish the readings from the conjectures.' The fact seems to be that he published as his conjectures such emendations as he thought sure of general acceptance, and appealed to MSS. authority for those which he deemed to need such support. For instance, he writes *repono πανδήμοισι pro πανδόμοισι* in 227, but in 235, desiring to read *εἰκοσμος κόμην*, his tone is very different: *in vet. cod. legitur εἰκοσμος quam esse veram lectionem persuasum habeo*. Sometimes, but very rarely, he overrates the certainty of his own conjecture, and gives it as such, e.g. *ἠρρηνομένης* in 688; but nearly always when his emendation is good enough in his judgment to dispense with MSS. support, it has proved sufficiently convincing to win universal acceptance. When he corrects *σπονδῆς* to *σπονδῆς* and *λογχατόν* to *λογχωτόν* he says *non est dubium quin reponendum sit*; but when the case admits of doubt he claims the authority of his *codices*. And the worse the conjecture the more earnest his appeal to the *codices*. This is illustrated by his note in defence of his worst conjecture *μόθων*, which Kirchhoff does not even record. It is worth noticing that Stephens never thought of *μόθων* as anything but the gen. plur. of *μόθος*; he was too good a scholar to think of introducing such a word as *μόθων* (-ωνος) into a tragedy. His practice is the same as regards the conjectures of other scholars. For instance the brilliant correction of Brodaeus, Πανός for καπνός in 952, is accepted as a certain emendation, but to the same scholar's φόβη for φόβω in 1187 and περισσάν for περισσάς in 1197 he calls the aid of his *codices*.

Mr. England did very well in calling the attention of the readers of the *Classical Review* to the fact that certain verses restored from *B* to the *Troades* in two passages, 193—196 and 232—234, are quoted from his *codices* by Stephens, who certainly did not know *B*. It is to be observed that of the second passage Kirchhoff writes 'mutilatos exhibet Ald. cum *AB*, supplevit in *A* m. sec.' Could Stephens have seen *A*? In any case it would seem better to accept the hypothesis suggested by Mr. England himself in his note than to believe in the existence of those *exemplaria* which both in the life of Stephens and since his death have evaded the search of every scholar save the brilliant Frenchman.

I would add a word or two in reference to Mr. Page's note on *Bacch.* 506. I have printed

that verse with *obelis* because I believe it has never been restored. I do not believe Euripides would have written οὐκ οἶσθ' ὃ τι ζῆς in the sense of 'you do not know what (blind) life you are leading' or 'that you have (but) the life of a mortal.' I think the word which I have in each version enclosed in parenthesis would be essential to the sense, yet it is not in the Greek. 'You do not know that you are a mere mortal' could be expressed in scores of ways. Mr. Page, who is a most skilful verse-writer, would not think of such an expression as οὐκ οἶσθ' ὃ τι ζῆς as a rendering of this sentiment. Why then should he ascribe it to Euripides? Still less do I believe that Euripides having written such an inelegant expression as οὐκ οἶσθ' ὃ τι ζῆς οὐθ' ὅστις εἶ

would have further encumbered the line with such a superfluous and clumsy *additamentum* as οὐδ' ὄρας, which adds nothing to the sense and brings in a most ungraceful οὐδ' between οὐκ and οὐθ'. Mr. Page complains that the verse is now 'buried beneath a heap of learned rubbish, the proper place for which is the dustbin.' Just so. That is why I obelized the verse and put all the suggestions for its restoration, none of which seemed quite satisfactory, into the dustbin, my note. The only difference between us is that Mr. Page would put his little armful into the text, not the note, into the casket which holds the precious jewels, not into the dustbin which stands beside it.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

ON THE TERM ἔκτημόροι OR ἔκτημόριοι.

IN Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* the word ἔκτημόριος is interpreted thus—'of a sixth part': hence οἱ ἔκτημόριοι = τὸ ἕκτον τῶν γυνομένων τελοῦντες, *those who paid a sixth of the produce* as rent, Plut. *Sol.* 13; also ἔκτημόροι Hesych.'

In the April number of this *Journal*, Mr. Wayte in a list of 'corrections of Liddell and Scott' proposed to correct this interpretation. His arguments were as follows:

'The text of 'Aθ. Πολ. ch. 2 (*pace* Dr. Sandys) supports the contention that the cultivators paid five-sixths of the produce and retained only one-sixth. This is also the common-sense view: if the proportions were reversed, it is difficult to see where the oppression came in.'

May I suggest that these are inadequate reasons for 'correcting' a statement of fact distinctly made by Plutarch, repeated—as Liddell and Scott indicate—by Hesychius, and indirectly supported—as I shall presently show—by Isocrates. Mr. Wayte's first argument I am unable to answer, because he does not say *how* the text of 'Aθ. Πολ. supports his interpretation. But it is easy to show how, in my opinion, it supports that of Liddell and Scott. The relevant phrases are these:—

...ἐκαλοῦντο πελάται καὶ ἔκτημόροι κατὰ ταύτην γὰρ τὴν μίσθωσιν εἰργάζοντο τῶν πλουσίων τοὺς ἀγρούς...καὶ εἰ μὴ τὰς μισθώσεις ἀποδοίεν, ἀγώγμοι καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ παῖδες ἐγίγνοντο.

It seems to me (1) that the pronominal

reference in ταύτην to ἔκτημόροι implies clearly that the μίσθος or μίσθωσις was τὸ ἕκτον μέρος, while (2) the phrase εἰ μὴ τὰς μισθώσεις ἀποδοίεν shows that the μίσθωσις was paid and not received—was, as Dr. Sandys says, 'rent and not wages.'

The authority of the 'Aθ. Πολ. seems to me, therefore, entirely on the side of Plutarch and Liddell and Scott. But, says Mr. Wayte, the other interpretation is required by 'common sense,' because, if the πελάται only paid one-sixth, 'it is difficult to see where the oppression came in.' Surely it came in where our authorities describe it as coming in, viz. through a severe law of debt, administered by oligarchical judges independent of popular control. It is against this that Solon's remedies are directed: we are not told that he attempted to introduce 'fair rents.' If it be said that the law of debt could not have done so much harm, if the tenants had only paid one-sixth, the answer is that Solon's language indicates a wide-spread economic distress among proprietors as well as tenants; since his first boast is that he 'removed many mortgage-pillars.' Surely, if the economic difficulties of the small proprietors were so great as to require the revolutionary remedy of a σεισάχθεια, the distress of mere tenants might be sufficiently severe, even if they only paid a rent of one-sixth.

In any case I hardly think that 'common sense,' in so obscure a subject as the economic history of Attica before Solon,