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## PREFACE.

§ I. In writing a Preface to this volume, my first and most pleasant duty is, to acknowledge the debt of gratitude which I owe to my kind friend Mrs Steel for the loan of her late husband's notes on the Oedipus Tyrannus.

They comprise 300 closely written pages; and, as they cite no editor later than Wunder, they were evidently written not less than 35 years ago for a purposed but never published edition. Their character is strictly exegetic, not aesthetic. They are a continuous commentary, explanatory and illustrative, on the Greek text of the play from the first to the last verse. Of the plot and its development, of characters and chorus, of the distinctive parts, and of metres, they contain no notice; such topics being probably left for future treatment in appendices and introduction. The same remark applies to manuscripts and editions, also to lection generally, of which no special account is given. The editors chiefly cited are Elmsley, Hermann and Wunder, but older authorities, Brunck, Musgrave, Bothe, are also mentioned occasionally. Matthiae's Greek Grammar is largely quoted throughout. To myself-besides the value belonging to the accurate learning and sound criticism of my old friend Mr Steel-the usefulness of these notes lies in the large illustration which they supply not only from dramatic poetry, but from the whole cycle of Greek literature, and also from grammarians and scholiasts. By the passages so cited much trouble has been spared me, my judgment has been cor-
rected or fortified, and my commentary enriched. While the Lection in this volume, the Outlines of plot, the Excursions (excepting Exc. x.) and the Index, necessarily belong to my own editorial labours, I wish ( ${ }^{*} \sigma o \nu \nu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \omega \nu$ ) to ascribe one half of the Commentary to Mr Steel's notes. He is cited by name in the earlier part; but I ceased to do this after a while, because my own remarks and his became so much intermingled, that distribution would have been an absurd attempt.
§ 2. I proceed to say a few words on the general principles by which I am guided in dealing with readings of codices and with proposed emendations. Those scholars who have seen the Introduction to my and Edition of the Agamemnon, are acquainted with my feeling on these questions. It agrees exactly with that of Prof. Karsten, and with that of the lamented John Wordsworth, both quoted by me in that Introduction. We ought to be thankful to those who have managed to preserve for us these codices, containing so many valuable relics of ancient literature. We are thankful even for the single MS. by which we gain the Choephoroe. But we have no ground of thankfulness to the ignorant or careless scribes, and the halflearned and injudicious correctors, who have defaced these relics, and bequeathed to modern scholars the difficult task of first detecting and then emending their corruptions. Subservience to such guidance is a mere Fetish-worship, which I, for one, can neither myself share nor approve in others who undertake to edit an ancient work. But as little would I commend groundless and rash change. A middle course between the two bad extremes is that which I proposed to myself as desirable, and which I have therefore striven to keep with my best endeavour. In that grandest of ancient dramas, the Agamemnon, I have indeed gone far in exhibiting what I hope is a readable Greek text: but in doing this I have taken care to show distinctly that what I thus offer to readers I cannot always warrant to be the very words of Aeschylus, though I deserve the severest censure if I have anywhere misrepresented the poet's
mind, or placed beside his immortal words others which could not have been written by him.
§ 3. In the Oedipus I have had no temptation to carry correction so far. There is but one place where I believe a line to be lost, namely, after v. 1134; and here I am content to record in my note a verse which seems to supply the required sense. In every chorus more or less of corruption exists, but nowhere (except in the antistrophe of the hyporcheme, ro98rio6) is it carried so far as in all, or nearly all, the lyric portions of the Agamemnon.

The principle that codd. are to be followed, when all agree, is manifestly untenable. Even one, who carries it as far as any editor I know since Wellauer and Scholefield, finds himself obliged in ro6r to write $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ where all codices have vooovo $\sigma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega$, and in $35 \mathrm{I} \pi \rho 0 \epsilon i \pi a s$, where they have $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon i \pi a s$. His successor has no such scruples, as he shows by reading, against all codices (and rightly, as I think), not only $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ and $\pi \rho o \epsilon i \pi a s$, but also $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota o \hat{\mu}$ in 538 for $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \sigma о \iota \mu \ell, \hat{\eta}$ оv่к in 539 for коงък; and

 for $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, in 458 avitòs for av̉тós, in 624 ผ́s àv for ö öav, in 640 סvoîv $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \imath ̂ ~ \delta \rho a ̂ \nu ~ f o r ~ \delta \rho a ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ \delta \iota к a \iota o ̂ ̀ ~ \delta v o ̂ ̀ v, ~ i n ~ 741 ~ \tau i ́ v o s ~ f o r ~ \tau i ́ v a ~ \delta ', ~$ in $79 \circ \pi \rho o v ้ \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ for $\pi \rho o v \dot{\phi} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta$, in all which places and in $\mathbf{1 2 6 4}$ I maintain the readings of codd. against his corrections.
§ 4. On the other hand, I hold that, in $7^{2}$, $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$ aor. opt., which all codd. give, is wrong, and $\rho v \sigma o i ́ \mu \eta \nu$ fut. opt. the true reading; while both the scholars of whom I speak uphold $\rho v \sigma a i \mu \eta v$. In the decision upon this word is involved the precisely similar place, áooi $\mu \eta \nu$ in Soph. El. 34, which they make aor. opt. midd. of $\alpha \grave{\rho} \rho \omega$, while I call it fut. opt. Linwood, Dindorf and some other editors read, as I do, $\rho v \sigma o i ́ \mu \eta \nu$. I have discussed this point at some length in Exc. iv, but I think the ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \gamma$ os would be a simpler one, if the supporters of $\rho v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$ would ask themselves, and candidly answer, this question:-how they would translate severally -



```
\eta้\rho\epsilon\tauó \tau\iotas ö \tau\iota \epsiloṅ\gamma\omega \delta\rhoа́\sigmaо\iotaц.
```

The true answer to this question would show that my view is right.

How stands the question as to $\dot{\alpha} \rho o i ́ \mu \eta \nu(\breve{\alpha})$ in El. 34? Thus:Sophocles once, in lyrics, Aj. 247, uses the Homeric aor. 2 inf. ${ }_{a} \rho_{\epsilon} \epsilon_{\sigma} \theta a \iota(\breve{a})$; but in another lyric passage of the same play 193 , he uses the Attic aor. i. subj. $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \rho \eta^{c}(\bar{\alpha})$ : in O. T. 1225 he has the fut. ind. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta$, and again in O. C. $460 \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta \epsilon(\breve{a})$. Do these facts give any right to infer that his form ${ }_{\alpha} \rho o{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu(\breve{a})$ in dialogue, is the Homeric aor. rather than the Attic fut. opt., which makes, at least, equally good sense ; for, by admission, the only difference is that the fut. is a shade more confident than the aor.; and when this is made an argument for the aor., the reply is clearly true, that the confidence of the speaker (Oedipus or Orestes) is not placed in his own powers, but in the truthfulness and sure fulfilment of the divine oracle. Therefore no such right is given.

Excursus iv was written and printed many months ago. Its main argument, and its conclusion as to the two parallel passages, I maintain now as I did then. But, were I rewriting it, I should modify some things said, and explain myself more fully on others. Such modification and such explanation I venture to append here.

The construction of the verbs in each place is not that of an aor. opt. after a past verb and final conjunction, which would be normally and indisputably right; but of such an opt. after a past verb and indirect interrogation pointing to future time ( ${ }_{0}^{\circ} \tau$ and $\tau i$ in O . T., ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \varphi \tau \rho o ́ \pi \omega$ in El.); and my contention is, that in this case the fut. opt. is more correct in grammar than the aor. opt. This I hold to be normally true ; but I ought to have limited the induction to tragedy, merely setting aside two places which seem to militate against it, viz. кíxo of codd. in
O. T. 1257 (for which I read $\kappa i \chi \chi \eta$ ) and $\pi \rho \alpha \xi^{\prime} a \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ of codd. in Antig. 272 (for which I would read $\pi \rho a ́ \xi o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ ). But the practice of Attic prose-writers is not so free from question. I have, in the close of my Excursus, allowed this as to the texts of Plato and Xenophon, to whom I should have added the Orators, and sometimes even Thucydides. Rare passages can be cited, as Madvig observes in his Syntax § 134 (citing Thuc. I. $25 \epsilon i \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta o \hat{\epsilon} \nu)$. I still think that many of these exceptions may be due to scribes, who knew the aorist better than the future optative, and, with this instinct, wrote - $\sigma a \iota \tau o$ and - $\sigma \alpha \iota \tau \sigma$ for -бoוтo and -aoıvo. To such manipulation may be due, e.g. $\chi \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau$ (Plat. Protag. $320 \mathrm{~A}, 32 \mathrm{I}$ C, Xen. Cyr. v. 5. i, H. Gr. iv. 4. 39) for the more normal $\chi \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma o t \tau$. But this I cannot prove; nor can I venture to write $\epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma o t$ for $\epsilon_{v}^{\prime} \rho o \iota$ Protag. 32 I D, or $\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma$ oc for $\delta o i ́ \eta, 322 \mathrm{C}$, though I may observe (for what it is worth), that the excepted cases ( $\pi \alpha \rho a \delta o i \epsilon \nu, ~ \epsilon v \rho o \iota$, doín) belong to the second form of aor.: and that, in childhood, I was taught to believe in a second fut., which later grammars expel as a figment. May we suppose such a future ascribed in olden time to verbs having no first aorist? To sum up. In the face of so many exceptional instances, I cannot venture to affirm that the aor. opt. is never used without $\stackrel{\alpha}{\nu} \nu$ after indirect questions in the current texts of Attic prose-writers, and with this admission I leave the debate, commending it to the watchful care of future students in their travels through the best Greek literature; and repeating that I consider the future forms established on just grounds in O. T. 72, El. 34, and Antig. 272, also as to кíдך or кíхои (a very small matter) in O. T. $1257^{1}$. In short, my three-page

[^0]excursus is not an exhaustive treatment of a subject (the uses of aor. I opt.), which I do not find exhausted in any Greek Grammar, which probably cannot be exhausted, until some thorough Greek scholar shall take the trouble of following it specially through all classical Greek writings, perhaps even through later authors, such as Polybius, Plutarch, Arrian, and, above all, that clever imitator, Lucian.
§ 5. In Excursus xir. I have indicated my own judgment upon most of the controverted readings in the O. T. I first read the drama when I was a child at school, and I have therefore had some acquaintance with it for about 70 years. But the solution of its many difficulties, so far as it has been my good fortune to solve them, has been the work of subsequent years, growing ever as I studied and pondered it again and again in the process of teaching.

Referring to the pages cited above, and to the interpretations specified in Exc. xir., I wish to say that my views as to vv. 11-13, 72, 1257; as to 43-5, 1078, 1085, 1296, 1380,1383 , were held by me, I can safely say, 35 years ago. My views as to 328-9, 696, 1464, 1526 , were not formed till within the last 20 years. Those which affect $\mathrm{I}_{55-6,179, ~ 182, ~ 194, ~}^{\text {1 }}$ 198-9, 464, 517, 624, 127 I , 1310 , 1494-5, $1528-9$, have been formed within the last two or three years, chiefly while I have been engaged with this edition. Of these last the most certain and most valuable is the discovery of the true reading and interpretation at $1494-5$. The latest are my suggestions at 179,182 , and 1310 . My assurance of the corruption of $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$ $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho a$ in $463-4$ is entirely due to Prof. Jebb's note, which is this: ' $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$ factum est in $L$ post deletum verbum quod non dubito quin $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon$ fuisset, praesertim cum in Flor. Abb. 152 ( $\Gamma$ )
may be compared with O. T. 791-3, where we find imperf. $\chi \rho$ 位 along with future optatives. I also find Xen. H. Gr. vi. 4. $2 \mathrm{I}, \xi \pi \epsilon \mu \pi{ }^{*} \nu \sigma \pi o v \delta \hat{\eta}$
 the indirect question put is one of declared doubt, but the fut. opt. is used none the less on that account, not the aor. $\dot{a} \pi \circ \beta a i \eta$.
$\epsilon i \delta \epsilon$ a pr. m. scriptum recentior in $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i \pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon$ correxerit. Noverat scholiasta $\epsilon i \delta \delta$ illud, quod tamen huic loco ita est alienum, ut vix aliunde quam ex incuria librorum gigni potuerit.' Thus he cites three of the most ancient testimonies bearing witness to the reading $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon$ in place of $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$. But he adds (without giving a reason for the judgment) that the combined testimony of these three old and independent witnesses can only have arisen from the carelessness of scribes because $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i} \delta \boldsymbol{\delta}$ 'is so alien from this place'. Strange is the difference in the constitution of two minds, both familiar with Greek writings. By me this notice of the older reading $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon$ was welcomed as a flash of light, showing the corruption of $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$ and therefore of $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \rho a$ also, showing that Sophocles had not written the bad Greek єint $\tau \in \lambda$ '́ $\sigma a v \tau a$, showing that he could not be charged with the ugly
 'the inspired Delphian priestess', and not ' $a$ rock inspired to speak by a god': though unhappily it does not show what word was displaced by the intruding $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \rho \alpha$ of the not 'careless scribe', but 'meddling and mischievous corrector'. See my Commentary. The simplest suggestion is $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ or $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$.
§ 6. I think that commentators have often erred by flying for refuge from an obvious difficulty to an easier reading or an erroneous construction, instead of striving to gain a profounder and truer insight into the mind and manner of Sophocles. The most signal instance of course is found in the lines 328-9. I had passed my 60th year before I discerned the right explanation of this difficult passage: but, having at last discovered it by careful thought and study, I have never flinched from it since, and never should flinch as long as life and intellect were extended to me. My view is fully exhibited and defended in Excursus vi, and I dq not shrink from saying that any one who feels unable to reach and rest in this explanation, as suggested by Wilbrandt and completed in that Excursus, should hesitate to regard himself as a competent editor of Sophocles, until he is prepared to confute this, and to propose a sounder K. OE.
interpretation. I will mention a few other passages in regard to which a similar error seems to have been made. I allude to the substitution of $\lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \omega_{\nu}$ or $\lambda_{0}{ }^{\prime} \omega$ for $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ in 360 , of $\pi \rho o v^{\prime}$ $\phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ for $\pi \rho o v{ }^{\prime} \phi a ́ v \eta$ in 790 , and of $\eta{ }^{\eta} \nu$ фó $\beta o v s ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \eta$ for $\epsilon i$ фó $\beta o v s$ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o \iota$ in 917. On 790, I have expressed my feeling in Excursus viri, and on the other two places in Lection and Commentary. The more difficult reading, which has some claim to preference on the ground of being more difficult (provided it be not inadmissible), has in each of these cases been supplanted by the easier, and, as I believe, in each case to the disadvantage of interpretation ${ }^{2}$.
§ 7. In Exc. II. I have cited a crowd of passages proving that, when an absolute $\omega$ s clause is dependent on a second person imperative, the clause precedes the verb, always in tragedy,
 cannot be referred to $\phi \rho a ́ \zeta \epsilon$. I may add the following from Xen.

 оच゙т $\omega \mathrm{S}$ 光 $\chi \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \eta$.

Verse 838, $\pi \epsilon \phi a \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \epsilon o v ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau i ́ s \pi o \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \theta v \mu i a ;$ is rendered by Prof. Jebb, and when he has appeared, what would'st thou have of him? the second clause with manifest inadequacy. I give it in my Comm., what hopeful thought have you? which is nearer the mark. But Xenophon shows the exact meaning,
 Thus $\pi \rho o \theta v \mu i a$ is interpreted by its opposite $\dot{a} \theta v \mu i ́ a$, dejection,
${ }^{2}$ If I am asked why, giving this advantage to the more recondite construction, I have not received the reading $\chi \epsilon \rho \nu \iota \beta o s{ }^{\epsilon} \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$ in 240 , I reply that, in spite of its slender authority, I was much inclined to do so. But, on looking into the matter, I found two facts: the one, that $\chi \epsilon \cdot \rho \nu \iota \psi$ is much oftener plural than singular; the other, that, although $\nu \epsilon \mu \omega$ is a verb of large use in tragedy and in Plato, no instance of its taking a gen. appears in the indices or in Madvig's or Kühner's syntaxes. Therefore I refrained: but, when other editors choose to establish a novel precedent in this place, 1 offer no protest against it. The rendering is the same with gen. or accus., to give him lustral water.
which is the mood of Oedipus at this point. Jocasta asks, what is there to inspirit you, when the shepherd arrives?
§ 8. A long but ever occupied life has given me no chance of collating manuscripts. But, as respects Sophoclean criticism, I do not think my loss on this ground a very serious one. If we may trust Prof. Campbell's testimony in the note at the close of his text (edition 1873), there must exist in Europe not less than 70 codices containing the Oedipus Tyrannus. Of these Prof. Jebb says he has himself collated $1_{3}$, and that he knows with more or less intimacy the collations of io more, making 23 in all. There remain then, unknown to him, a further number approaching 50 . Their value, I presume, is small, because they chiefly belong to the 15 th, some even to the r6th century:-and the Aldine edition is possibly more useful to scholars than all these put together.

The value of Prof. Jebb's collations, as a whole, it is not for me to pretend to estimate, and I have no desire to do so. That I have some reason to be grateful for them, I have already indicated in speaking of v. $463-4$; and further reason will appear in the course of my criticism. But I have to speak now of the testimony they afford to the character of the documents with which they deal, that is, to the trustworthiness of the codices which supply all our Sophoclean literature, and of the various correctors who have from time to time done their best to improve or explain them.

The oldest, and for that reason the most famous and most often cited of Sophoclean manuscripts, is the Medicean codex (L), in the Laurentian library at Florence. It is of the 1 Ith century, while no other codex is of earlier date than the 13 th. Yet in this highly favoured document and in all the 23 manuscripts more or less known to Prof. Jebb he finds so much corruption, so many blunders, that he is obliged, in editing, to depart from all codices (not reckoning the last three stasima, which I have passed over) 60 times or more; and from cod. L itself, as compared with others, about as often: that is to say, he
finds many more than 120 errors in the oldest and most trusted authority for the text of Sophocles.

Of the absurdities perpetrated by would-be correctors let one specimen suffice as reported by Prof. Jebb:

```
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Variam lect. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi i \zeta \epsilon \iota \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ notat Schol. in marg. L, quae cum plane supervacua et eadem insulsa sit, docet quanta muttundi licentia grammatici interdum uterentur."
§ 9. Left to such hands, who shall wonder that codd. exexhibit so many corruptions and such confusion as we find noted, for instance, at vv. $322,376,445,478,509,517,525$, $570,598,640,656,689-696,74 \mathrm{I}, 763,8 \mathrm{I}_{5}-825,876-879$,
 1279-1281, 1349-5I, 15 I6 and elsewhere?

The codices collated by Prof. Jebb besides L are (1) the four at Paris (A. B. E. T.), of which A has the best repute, but B and T often show a good reading; (2) four at Venice (V. V². $\mathrm{V}^{3} . \mathrm{V}^{4}$.) which are now and then useful; (3) three in the Bodleian Library, not often cited; (4) one in the Library of Trinity Coll. Cambridge, of slender use. It may be regretted that he did not fully collate two other Florentine codices, one marked by Dindorf as $\Gamma$, another called $L^{2}$. Both these were probably copies of L, but surely they were copied by able hands: for both (more especially $\Gamma$ ) often exhibit readings by which the errors of $L$ are corrected. This, it would seem, cannot be said of another Florentine copy, marked $\Delta$.

In illustration of the merit of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ special attention may be drawn to its readings at $200,317,525,528,598,604,779$, 852, 917 , 1030, 1138 , 1445.
$\mathrm{L}^{2}$ supports $\Gamma$ in several of these places, while it is notable as the only codex which has $\chi \chi^{\prime} \rho v<\beta$ os in 240: and $\Gamma$ as the only one which reads $\tau$ óv $\delta \epsilon$ for $\tau 0$ óv $\gamma \in$ in 852 , a reading which Prof. Jebb stigmatises as 'nicili', though it is adopted by

Hermann, and to my mind looks very like a true one ${ }^{3}$.

At 202, $\Gamma$ has $\tau \hat{\alpha} \nu \dot{\omega} \pi v \rho \phi o ́ \rho \omega v$, thus, though with incorrectness ( $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ being omitted), forecasting Hermann's addition of

 now prefer) at 604: $\mu$ '́ $\theta \eta$ (neglecting $\iota$ subscr.) at 779: $\epsilon i \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o \iota$ at 917 : $\sigma 0 \hat{v} \delta^{\prime} \ldots \sigma \omega \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho \epsilon$ at $1030: \gamma^{\prime}{ }_{\alpha} \nu\left(\right.$ with $L^{2}$ ), perhaps rightly, at 1445 . All these readings, with 852 , above considered, are in my judgment, important. One remains of those cited by Prof. Jebb, $\chi \epsilon \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ os at ${ }^{1}{ }^{1} 38$. This I cannot adopt, for want of a connecting particle; but as it has in marg. $\gamma \rho$. $\chi \epsilon \ell \mu \omega \nu$, this tends to prove that the scribe of $\Gamma$ preferred the latter reading, which has such wide support from codd. and edd., to $\chi \epsilon \mu \bar{\omega} \nu a$, which rests on L only: and my preference of $\chi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega} a$ is shaken by this circumstance. $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ also gives $\sigma \eta \mu \dot{\eta} v a s$ at 957 ; but as the only other examples of $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma v o \mu a \iota$ with participle are prohibitive ( $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ ), I cannot act on its authority.

I have before stated my reason for supporting the more refined reading $\epsilon i \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma o \iota$, which $\Gamma$ gives at 917 . Prof. Jebb's note is: "H $\nu$ фóßovs $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma^{\mathrm{H}}$, i. e. $\lambda_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \eta$. Post $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma$ facta est rasura. Potuit quidem prima manus $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o \iota$ scribere vel $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ : nihil

[^1]tamen superest quod aut hanc l. aut illam firmet." Of course I do not doubt the writer's 'bona fides': but two things must here be asked: ( $\mathbf{\varepsilon}$ ) By what right has he written 'i.e. $\lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \eta$ ', when he ought to have written 'i.e. supra rasuram duarum litterarum corrector addidit H'? (2) When he begins by writing $\mathrm{H} \nu$, he cannot mean that this is what stands in Cod. L.; a 'lapsus plumae' must be supposed. According to four printed accounts now before me, what stands in L. is $\epsilon i$ (over which $\ddot{\eta} \nu$ a. m. ant.) $\lambda$ '́ ${ }^{\prime}$ oı (over the latter vowels $\eta$ ). I assume that these editors have printed small letters for capitals. But again I ask, why Prof. Jebb has omitted $\epsilon i$ (or $\mathrm{E}_{\ell}$ ), and why (if he cannot read the second word) does he doubt what nobody else seems to have doubted, that $\epsilon i \lambda$ '́ $\gamma o \iota$ was written by the 'prima manus' of $L$ ? With the evidence of this grand copy $\Gamma$ in view, I feel not the slightest doubt, and I suppose that Linwood, Dindorf, Schneidewin, as well as the four already cited (Nauck, Wolff, Ritter, Van Herwerden), who all read $\epsilon i \lambda \epsilon$ 'yoc, were of the same opinion. Prof. Campbell, by a strange compromise, reads $\epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \eta$, but surely (as he takes $\epsilon i$ from the first hand of L) he cannot deny that the same hand wrote $\lambda$ '́roo, copied afterwards by $\Gamma$.

I may observe, in passing, that the construction of the opt. is that of indef. generality, as at 979, єiк $\hat{\eta}$ крá $\tau \iota \sigma \tau o v ~ \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu, o ̈ \pi \omega \varsigma$ סv́vatió $\tau \mathrm{s}$.
§ ro. It seems to me that a scholar, engaged in a controversy of this kind, ought to lay down for himself these two rules: (r) not to use any argument which does not logically conduce to prove a proposition of his own, or to disprove one urged on the other side; (2) not to adduce any passage from authors which will, on examination, fail to support the principle he desires to establish. In my several Excursus, numbered if, iII, iv, vi, Ix, and elsewhere, I have shown that arguments are used against me which do not conform to the first of these laws. I shall now notice two places in which the second is forgotten.
(I) In $198-9$, writing

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tau o \hat{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}^{’} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho \underset{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha l,
\end{aligned}
$$

Prof. Jebb wishes to establish the construction $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\eta} \mu a \rho \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha$ $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \tau o v ̂ \tau o$, and accordingly writes thus:
$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ is the infin. expressing purpose, as often after a verb of going or sending, where the future participle might have been used: cp. Her. 7. 208

 $\sigma \kappa є \psi a \sigma \theta a l$, каі кпри̂乡au.

Here we find no example from tragedy, none from poetry, none of a verb of going, but only of sending. He does not cite $\beta \hat{\eta} \delta^{\circ}{ }^{i} i^{\prime}$ val of Homer, knowing perhaps that it would not avail: for where purpose is implied, Homer uses the fut. part. after
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon_{\rho} \rho \chi о \mu \alpha \iota$, not to speak of $\epsilon \rho \chi o \mu \alpha \iota$, which is found with fut. part. of purpose so constantly that I will not waste space by citing the Greek. See O. C. 366, Ant. 286, Ph. 328 ; Eur. Rhes. 264, 271 , Andr. 1059, Suppl. 648 ; Ae. Pr. 945, Cho. 598, Eum. 546. As for verbs of sending, their action comprises the idea of command, and the infin. is thus justified, like ix ${ }^{2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota$ at 475. I am surprised that he did not cite the single instance favourable to his view, and the more so as it comprises the same infin., Oed. Col. 12 ,
$\mu \alpha \nu \theta a ́ v \epsilon \tau \nu \quad \gamma \grave{\rho} \ddot{\eta}^{\kappa о \mu} \mu \nu$

I should also be surprised (as he reads, with Musgrave, єv̈ $\xi \in \tau a \iota$ for ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \xi_{\epsilon} \epsilon a \iota$ at 895 ) that he has left it for me to suggest what I believe to be right here, $\epsilon{ }^{\prime} \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ for ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$, which would suit $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, as it suits my reading $\sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$-were it not that he has failed to discern the true sense of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \mu a \rho$, in the course of the day, which I have proved from a Sophoclean fragment: and also that his explanation (anticipated by Dindorf in his Lex.) does not remove the crushing objection to any rendering here,
which does not make Ares the subject. As to metre, which $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ satiṣfies, while $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ does not, Prof. Jebb, who somewhere speaks of Triclinius as 'securus metri or de metro', is little less 'secure' than that grammarian, being satisfied to have $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi$ ovoov in strophe with 'A $\rho \tau \epsilon \dot{\mu} \mu \delta o s$ in antistr., and here $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \gamma \gamma^{\alpha} \rho$ answered by oiv $\hat{\omega} \pi \alpha$, while before it is $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \delta \omega \nu \breve{\alpha}$, the $\breve{a}$ of which wants lengthening by $\sigma \tau$. I hold much stricter views of antistrophic correspondence in the stasima of Tragedy.
(2) The other passage I have in mind comprises the lines 515-17, which stand thus in most editions:



where, rejecting Hartung's emendation $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime} s \tau^{\prime} \mu^{\mu} v$, which Dindorf adopts, he proceeds to defend $\epsilon$ is $\beta \lambda \alpha{ }_{\beta} \beta \eta \nu \phi$ 'ि $\rho o v$ as the object of $\pi \epsilon \pi o \nu \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \alpha a l$ without $\tau \iota$, a construction which I do not believe to be good Greek. He quotes in its support




But not one of these citations affords a shadow of support to $\phi \epsilon \rho o v$, without $\tau \iota$, as an object of $\pi \epsilon \pi o v \theta \theta^{\prime} v a l$. As to Ag. 26 I , if $\epsilon \ell \neq \iota$ were not read (though I deem it certain), $\kappa \epsilon \delta \nu \grave{\partial} \boldsymbol{\tau} \pi v \theta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ would mean $\kappa \epsilon \delta \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon v \theta \omega \pi$., as in Plat. Sophist. $\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi o ̀ v ~ \eta{ }_{\eta} \rho o v$ means $\bar{\epsilon} \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta \mu \alpha$ クै $\rho o v$, while in Meno $\tau \iota$ is conveyed by impli-

 not chained, and therefore (as the legend was) capable of running away. Hence I have much faith in my conjecture
 1325), it was not so much the triple use of $\phi \epsilon \rho \omega$ within four lines that I sought to avoid, as that of $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota v$ єis within three. I could keep $\phi$ '́́oov if the preceding change were made. But I have noted so much tendency to 'assimilate' on the part of
the scribes and correctors, that I have less scruple than I should otherwise feel in adopting a manifest improvement not handed down by them. I now keep $\phi$ '́pov, reading форov̂vтı 519.
§ ir. At p. LX of his prefatory matter, under the head of Text, § 7, Prof. Jebb gives a table of conjectural readings adopted by him, in which I appear as the suggester of $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu a \chi o \nu$ (really due to G. Wolff, whose edition is in the Professor's hands, being referred to at $478: \mathrm{cp}$. also at $\mathbf{1 5 5 - 6 , 1 2 8 0}$ ) and of $\tau \dot{a} \delta^{\prime}$ for $\tau a \delta^{\prime}$ in 666 , which (whether mine or another's, de minimis non curans, I cannot remember) is no very notable feat of conjectural criticism. In $\S 8$ he adds some which he regards as due to himself, and which are placed in his text, followed by others which he has suggested in places which he believes to be corrupt, though the 'principles of editing which he has sought to observe would not permit' him to place these conjectures in the text. Unhappily what he has written in this portion of his prefatory matter, especially when compared with what he has actually done in the way of selection and emendation, does not afford any sufficient clue to the 'principles' which he has sought to observe. In some cases it would seem that one of those principles is 'stat pro ratione voluntas.' Take for instance 696, a place of admitted corruption. The testimony respecting it is, that

 סúvalo $\gamma \in v o u$. The metre required is manifestly (see Strophe) $\checkmark|--|-\cup-\cup-\cong$. The correction, by Mr. Blaydes, which
 lates who now also art like to prove our prospering guide,
 Greek, but 'thou wouldest become' under some condition which a context ought to show : but here is no context to show anything. I therefore hold the clause, so read, to be void of
 now art ably wafting us to the best of thy power, the very mean-
ing required to complete the passage. As both these readings eliminate $\delta$ v́vaı or dóvaıo, our first premiss is the same, that this word is a corrupt gloss. Strike it out then ; and ( $\tau \alpha v \hat{v} \nu \tau$ ' $\epsilon v \pi о \mu \pi o s$ being in both readings) the words left are $\epsilon i \gamma \epsilon \nu o \hat{v}$ : and (without going into minutiae as to the manner of the supposed corruption) I think it cannot be justly denied that $\epsilon i \not \tau o ́ \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma o \grave{\imath}$
 Blaydes strikes out $\epsilon i$ and puts in $\stackrel{\Delta}{\alpha}$, I keep $\epsilon \hat{i}$ and put in $\tau o ́$, $\gamma \epsilon$ '́ooo, which remains, being no nearer to $\gamma \in \nu 0 \hat{v}$ than $\gamma \epsilon v \sigma o \iota$ is. On what principle, then, Prof. Jebb proceeds in printing the unmeaning conjecture of Mr. Blaydes instead of mine, I am at a loss to discern, and he, I think, would find himself at a loss to explain to any competent and impartial critic.
§ 12. Reverting to his list of accepted emendations, I find them amounting in number to 68. On this list I shall have to make a few remarks. It contains 3I, which most scholars have accepted, and will now accept, with little hesitation. These are at $200,248,351,376,537$ (though Ca. $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu \iota^{\prime}$ ), 657 (though Ca. omits $\sigma^{\prime}$ ), 666 (though Ca. каi $\tau \alpha^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}$ ),


 1193 (though Ca. тò), rig6 (though Ca. ov̊ $\delta \in ́ v a$ ), 1205 (not so
 (though Ca. vopá $\delta 0$ ) , $1360,1365,1505,152 \mathrm{I}$. To these I willingly add 478 (though Ca. $\pi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha i ̂ o s ~ o i ~ \tau a \hat{v} \rho o s$ ), 693 (though Ca. vooфi'̧opą). But I observe many omissions: at 18 i $\in \rho \bar{\eta} s$;



As to others in the list:-198-9. See above $360 . \| 696$. See also above, Lect. and Comm. \| 741. See Lect. and Comm. (I now rather prefer ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega \nu{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \beta \eta \eta$ ). $\| 790$. See Exc. viil. $\| 8{ }_{15} 5$. Prof. Jebb overlooks the fact that $\tau i s ~ \tau o v ̂ \delta \epsilon ~ \nu \hat{v} \nu \stackrel{\jmath}{\epsilon} \sigma \tau{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s$ (which 'he supposed to be his own') stands in the text of my first edition: but see Lect., where $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ is now treated as a
gloss. \| 817. See Lect. \| 876-77. See Lect. and Comm. Prof. Jebb, in my opinion, mistakes the meaning of $\omega^{\prime} \rho o v \sigma \epsilon \nu$ єis à ${ }^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \kappa \alpha \nu$, which he renders leaps on the abyss of doom, a sense inconsistent with the words following, and not expressed by the Greek cited. || 891. See Lect. and Comm. || 893. I concur in adopting Hermann's $\theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$ for $\theta v \mu \hat{\varphi}$, but see Lect. and Comm. || 906. See Lect. || 943. I reach the same conclusion that J. does as to the reading of this corrupt and worried place, only remarking that he ascribes to Erfurdt a correction first made by Bothe. || $\mathbf{\text { 2 }}$ I6. It was almost indifferent to me whether I gained the syllable required by reading as Wu. ムaḯıov, or as Erf. \aitioov ©. I happen to have taken the former. $\|$ 1218. See Lect. and Comm. || 1245. I cannot see by what right Prof. Jebb calls the reading $\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ ' mendum', while he reads $\gamma \circ \hat{\alpha} \tau o$ in $\mathbf{1 2 4 9}$, and ${ }^{\boldsymbol{i} \epsilon \tau \boldsymbol{\tau}}$ (imperf.) stands in $\mathbf{1 2 4 2}$. Of course the pres. hist. калєícan stand here, but why it must do so in the speech of an ${ }^{2} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda 0 s$, referring to 1249 , I do not find. $\|$ 1264. See
 a corrupt gloss, Musgr. proposed $\delta \iota a \pi \omega \tau \hat{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota$ (which Prof. Jebb edits) a compound, not elsewhere found, of an epic form, $\pi \omega$ тúo $\mu \alpha \iota$ : see $482 \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi о \tau \hat{a} \tau \alpha \iota$. I had adopted Heath's $\pi \epsilon \in \tau a \tau a \iota$, a Pindaric form: but I now suggest $\delta c a \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$, run abroad, used by Thuc. Xen. and Plato. || $\mathbf{I} 348$, see Lect. || $\mathbf{1 4 0 1}$ : see Lect. || 1495. See Lect. || 1526. See Exc. ix. and Comm.

Passing on to § 8-227. See Comm. || 493. See Comm. Schneider suggests $\beta a \sigma \alpha \nu \epsilon$ v́ $\omega v$, which Prof. Jebb improves by the more classical $\beta a \sigma \alpha v i ́ \xi \omega \nu$, and for $\beta a \sigma a ́ v \omega$, which word occurs soon after, I propose $\pi \iota \theta a \nu \omega \bar{s}$, avoiding the hiatus. || 624. Kvicala's proposed $\omega \stackrel{a}{a} \stackrel{a}{v}$, which Prof. Jebb adopts, becomes needless, and all dilaceration of the lines 622-626 is obviated by the acceptance of the simple and easy reading $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho o v \epsilon i v$ in 624 for $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{o} \phi \theta o v \epsilon i v . \| 640$. See Lect. and Comm. || 877. See Lect.: metre suggests an iambic base, not a trochaic, here. || ro9r. See Lection. M. Schmidt's suggestion, Oiסímovv for Oiסínovs, is accepted by Prof. Jebb, and I willingly
receive it. || I280. See Lection. ката̀ is read for кака̀ here by Otto and G. Wolff, and adopted by Prof. Jebb. I cannot, however, like it, and have preferred $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \rho a . \|$ 1405. See Lection.

As to the conjecture of Mr P. N. Papageorgius, supplied by Prof. Jebb (as the last accession to the host already contributed by various scholars with a view to eliminate the genuine words of Sophocles, $\omega^{\prime} \stackrel{a}{a} \nu$, in 328 ), '̇s $\sigma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu \varepsilon \epsilon i \pi \omega$, Schäfer edits it ; but

 proclaim loudly to thee $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha}$, my things, would be right, either in point of Greek idiom or in suitableness to the place.

And now, casting my eye over these selected emendations, I do not find that they afford any light enabling me to discern Prof. Jebb's 'principles of editing'-principles by virtue of which he is himself enabled to discern three classes of conjecture:
(r) Those which deserve to be received into the text itself;

 ovi, $\tau \alpha i ̂ s, ~ \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon ́ \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu$ in 1526 :
(2) Those which deserve only to be commemorated in a



(3) Those which by the same judgment are deemed unworthy to have any record at all ; for instance (a) a reading already noticed, $\epsilon{ }^{*} \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ for ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ in 199 , a reading so easy, that $\epsilon \ddot{v} \xi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ is by all received for $\epsilon_{\rho} \rho \xi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ in 890 ; and the only reading by which the parenthesis in which it stands is rescued from being grammatically soloecistic and logically absurd; (b) the reading $\pi \alpha \rho \omega^{\prime} \nu \tau^{\prime} \mu^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \sigma \delta \omega \nu$ in 445 , instead of which Prof. Jebb reads $\pi \alpha \rho \omega ่ \nu \sigma v \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi o \delta \omega \nu$, not only omitting to mention my various reading, but likewise neglecting to record the facts of mss. lection which tend to prove that $\tau \alpha^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime}$ was an
older reading than $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma^{\prime}$, and one that opens a just field for conjectural emendation ${ }^{4}$. He merely subjoins $\tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} B$.
§ 13 . When a word of questionable sense is under discussion, all meanings ascertained and all authorities citable should be considered, and not those alone which are favoured in the place by the commentator. But, treating of $\delta a \not \mu o{ }^{2} \nu \omega \nu$ $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \eta$ in 886 , Prof. Jebb writes as follows: " $\epsilon \delta \eta$, images of gods, whether sitting or standing, but always with the added notion that they are placed in a temple or holy place as objects of worship." Surely this, statement is neither adequate nor accurate. It is inadequate, because the reader should have been told that this use of the word $\begin{gathered}\text { e } \\ \eta\end{gathered}$, images, was unknown to Homer, unknown to Pindar, not clearly shown by Aeschylus
 Iph. A. I526: and because he does not even cite Plato Phaed. iri, the very passage which Timaeus had in view ; where we
 єival, by $\epsilon \delta \eta$ obviously meaning shrines. It is inaccurate, because we do not find 'the added notion' always present when " $\delta\rangle \eta$ is used. Thus, allowing images to be meant in S. El. 1074, they stand in the vestibule ( $\pi \rho \circ \sigma^{\prime} \pi \nu \lambda a$ ), not itself a holy place, except as far as the presence of such shrines makes it so. I do not object to the rendering images there or here; but neither should I consider shrines a wrong translation in either place, the two being so correlated that one suggests the other ; as, when we speak of a lantern or a lamp, we almost always understand a light. And so, when Dionysius Hal. calls the 'penates'

[^2]of Aeneas $\epsilon \delta \eta$, he thinks of the small shrines or stands which they occupied in the Trojan house of that hero, and in which he took them to Italy.

Prof. Jebb's Notes on the Sphinx at p. 300 , and on the star Arcturus at 305 , are very useful and learned contributions to the mythic and astronomical lore of Hellas and of other ancient people.
§ 14. In my present edition the reading of all or most codices is mentioned at the foot of the page where the text as edited departs from it; and in some cases, where the reading of codd. is kept in the text but obelized as probably corrupt, a direction is given to show where a remedy will be found.

After the text comes Lection, an account of the various readings with careful reference to the editors or commentators by whom they are suggested or supported. Then follows the Commentary, of which I have spoken in § 1 ; and afterwards, as an Appendix, stand the Excursus and an Index of words.

Exc. I treats of the Attic Drama. Exc. xi of Sophocles and the Oedipodean myth. XII is a syllabus of readings. xiII contains notes on the prosody of the play, with a conspectus of the choral metres. xiv notes on the syntax. Excursus iI, III, vi, are controversial arguments in favour of the interpretations given in this edition to the passages $11-12$, $42-45,328-29$, severally. iv defends the reading $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ against $\rho v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$ in 72 . v discusses punctuation and interpretation in the first strophe of the Parodos. vir shows the easy elucidation of the much disputed lines $622-25$, obtained by the admission of the reading $\tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho o v \epsilon i v$ for $\tau \grave{o} \phi \theta o v \epsilon i v$ in 624. viil defends the mss. reading $\pi \rho o v{ }^{\prime} \phi$ áv $\eta$ in 790 against Wunder's or Hermann's proposal of $\pi \rho o u ̋ \phi \eta \nu \in \nu$. Ix defends the
 veyed by it, against other competing emendations. Exc. x adds some notes of Mr Steel, accompanied with observations of mine.
§ 15 . My former edition of the Oed. T. was of slight
texture, containing few notes. Its chief purpose was to place before the eyes of Greek Scholars those new interpretations of many passages which had commended themselves to my mind during more than fifty years of work as a teacher. Professor Jebb in his edition has opposed every one of these interpretations, and striven to set them aside. After carefully reading and considering all that he has written concerning them, I am as strongly convinced of their truth as I was in 1882, having found no force in anything written by him against them, but many fresh reasons and authorities in favour of my views. Considering my advanced age, I thought it right to lose no time in defending what seems to me the truth in Greek scholarship and Sophoclean criticism, and accordingly I sent to press a small volume with the title Studia Sophoclea Part II. In this all the disputed passages, with some others, are reviewed; my published explanations are justified against his published objections; and some new suggestions are added. I then addressed myself to the work, happily facilitated by Mr Steel's notes, of preparing a second edition of this drama. I have now been permitted to complete it, and I offer it to the learned world with deep regret that it should labour under the signal disadvantage of what is, in some respects, a controversial preface. I can only say that I would have avoided this, had it been possible: but it has been forced upon me, and was unavoidable. What I said in dedicating my Studia Sophoclea to the Greek Scholars of Great Britain and Ireland, I repeat now.--If any such scholars shall honour what is here written with their perusal, I shall receive the communication of their assent or dissent with equal gratitude. Confirmation by other scholars of that which one believes to be right is naturally agreeable; and correction of what is wrong ought to be always welcome. For my own part, I can safely promise to consider with respectful care any argument against a view of mine; and, if I find that argument unanswerable, to acknowledge its validity by renouncing my previous conclusion. For I have always
held with Cicero that "cujusvis hominis est errare, nullius, nisi insipientis, in errore perseverare."

All I ask of my readers is, to keep in mind the wise words of Horace, Epist. II. I, 75 :

Indignor quicquam reprehendi, non quia crasse
Compositum illepideve putetur, sed quia nuper:
and, with these, the motto prefixed to the little volume named above, and now affixed to this Preface:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Tó } \tau 0 \iota \text { vo } \mu \iota \sigma \theta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i ́ a s \text { к } \rho a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

тov́tov фрoveîv фával $\tau \epsilon \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ тov̉vavtiov.
фávaı $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \chi \rho \eta \dot{\prime}, T a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta$ c̀s $i \sigma \chi \hat{v} o \nu \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \omega$.
B. H. K.
P.S. I have adopted in the Parodos, and discussed under the head of Lection, several new and valuable emendations, which have occurred to me since the Commentary and Excursus were printed.

## इOФОК $\triangle$ ЕОУ $\Sigma$

## OIDIIOY TYPANNOE.

## 


 $\eta^{\jmath} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \pi v \theta_{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \Pi v \theta \iota \kappa \omega \bar{\nu} \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi \iota \sigma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$
 $\epsilon \mathcal{v} \rho \omega ̀ \nu$ ס̀ $\tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu a i ̂ s ~ \dot{a} \mu a \xi \iota \tau o i ̂ s$







 ö $\theta \epsilon \nu \mu a \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ éavtò̀ Oiơínovs тá入as $\pi o ́ \rho \pi a \iota \sigma \iota ~ \delta \iota \sigma \sigma a ̀ s{ }^{2}$ ' $\mathfrak{\xi} \xi a \nu a ́ \lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$ кó $\rho a s$,

${ }^{1}$ The Codex ascribes this Argument to the grammarian Aristophanes: but Dindorf denies this authorship.
${ }^{2}$ Codd. $\delta \iota \sigma \sigma \alpha i ̂ s ~ \tau \epsilon \chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i \nu$. J. $\delta \iota \sigma \sigma a ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon \chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i \nu$. Br. ut supra.
K. OE.

## $\triangle I A$ TI TYPANNOE EHIГEГPAMTAI．

＇O Tv́pà 1


 ठıà тò̀s र $\rho o ́ v o u s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda \iota \omega \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a ~ a ̉ \lambda \eta ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ p ~$














## $A \Lambda \Lambda \Omega \Sigma$ ．





## XPHEMO乏 O $\triangle$ OӨEI乏 $\Lambda A I \Omega \iota T \Omega \iota$ ӨHBAI $\Omega \iota$.


 $\sigma o \hat{v} \pi a \iota \delta o ̀ s ~ \chi \epsilon i \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota ~ \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \phi a ́ o s . ~ i ̀ s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \epsilon ै ~ t \nu \varepsilon v \sigma \epsilon ~$ Zєìs Kроviò $\bar{s}$ ，Пє́入oтоs $\sigma \tau v \gamma \epsilon \rho a i ̂ s ~ a ̉ \rho a i ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$,

${ }^{3}$ In a note given in Prof．Jebb＇s edition（p．5）Dr Peile refers the word rúpanvos to the Vedic root Tar（by－form Tur），which seems to imply that the noun virtually means＇a conqueror．＇He says，＇I think that from being an adjective（？＝mighty），it became with the Greeks a title．＇

TO AINIГMA TH乏 $\Sigma \Phi І Г Г О \Sigma$.





$\Lambda \Upsilon \Sigma I \Sigma$ TOY AINILMATOE.
 $\phi \omega \nu \eta ̂ s$ í $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \eta s$ $\sigma o ̀ \nu \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda o s$ ả $\mu \pi \lambda a \kappa i ́ \eta s . ~$




${ }^{4}$ For an account of the dramatic representations in the Atherian theatre, see Excursus I., 'the Attic Drama.' For the literary career of Sophocles, and for the plot and analysis of the Oedipus Tyrannus, see Excursus XI., 'Sophocles and the Oedipodean Myth.'

## TA TOT $\triangle$ PAMATOミ ПPOミ $\Omega \Pi A$.

```
OI\DeltaI\PiOY\Sigma.
IEPEY\Sigma.
KPE\OmegaN.
XOPO\Sigma \GammaEPONT\OmegaN ӨHBAI\OmegaN.
TEIPE\SigmaIA\Sigma.
IOKA\SigmaTH.
АГГЕムO\Sigma.
ӨEPA\Pi\OmegaN \AIOY.
E\XiAГГEMO\Sigma.
```


## SIGLARIUM．

＊stands before a word varying from that in codd．，and such words are spaced，as＊${ }^{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\xi} \rho \iota \sigma o \nu 194$.
＊．．．＊above the line inclose emended words，as ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \mu^{\prime} * 436$ ．
Greek words suspected of corruption are printed in smaller type．

The numeration is that of Dindorf＇s Poetae Scenici．

## OIDIПOY

## OIDIMOヘะ．



 $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \varsigma ~ \delta ’ ~ o ́ \mu o v ̂ ~ \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \theta v \mu \iota a \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \gamma є ́ \mu є \iota, ~$ ó $\mu o \hat{v} \delta \grave{̀} \pi a \iota a ́ \nu \omega \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \kappa a \grave{\iota} \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.

 ó $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu o ̀ s ~ O i o i ́ t \pi o v s ~ к а \lambda о u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s . ~$


 є่ $\mu о \hat{v} \pi \rho о \sigma а \rho \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu ~ \pi \hat{a} \nu \cdot \delta v \sigma a ́ \lambda \gamma \eta \tau o s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \grave{a} \nu$


IEPETミ．
 ó $\rho a ̂ s ~ \mu \grave{̀} \nu$ そ̀ $\mu a ̂ s ~ \dot{\eta} \lambda i ́ \kappa о \iota ~ \pi \rho о \sigma \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ I 5 $\beta \omega \mu o i ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \sigma o i ̂ s, ~ o i ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o u ́ \delta \epsilon ́ \pi т \omega ~ \mu а \kappa \rho a ̀ \nu ~$

I1．Codd．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \xi \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ；or $\sigma \tau \epsilon \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ；Cf．Exc．II．
$\pi \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, oi $\delta$ è $\sigma \grave{\nu} \nu \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho a \quad \beta a \rho \epsilon i ̂ s$

 à уораїбı Өакєі̂, т $\rho o ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ П а \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \delta o s ~ \delta \iota \pi \lambda о i ̂ s ~$


 $\beta v \theta \hat{\omega \nu}$ єै $\tau$ ’ ov̉ $\chi$ oüa $\tau \epsilon$ фoıvíov $\sigma a ́ \lambda o v$, $\phi$ Өívov $\sigma a$ цє̀v ка́ $\lambda v \xi \iota \nu$ є̀ $\gamma \kappa \alpha ́ \rho \pi о \iota s ~ \chi \theta o \nu o ́ s, ~$




"Аıঠŋs $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu а \gamma \mu о i ̂ s ~ к а і ̀ ~ \gamma o ́ o ı s ~ \pi \lambda о v т і \zeta є \tau а \iota . ~$
$\theta \epsilon o i ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \nu \nu v \nu$ ov̉к í $\sigma o v \not \mu \epsilon \nu o ̛ \nu \sigma^{\prime}$ є่ $\gamma \omega$







 $\nu \hat{\nu} \tau^{\prime}$, ${ }^{\hat{\omega}} \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \nu \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ Oíoimov кá $\rho a$, 40 ікєтєи́o $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ $\sigma \epsilon \pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ ої $\delta \epsilon \pi \rho о ́ \sigma \tau \rho о \pi о \iota$


 $\zeta \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \varsigma \dot{\delta} \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ßov $\lambda \epsilon \nu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.

 $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \hat{\rho} a \kappa \lambda \grave{y} \zeta \epsilon \iota \tau \eta \hat{\varsigma} \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho o \varsigma \pi \rho \circ \theta \nu \mu i a \varsigma$,
18. Codd. iepeîs. Cf. Lect. 43. Cod. L. rov. Cf. Lect. et Exc. III.

## OIDIПOYミ TYPANNOE.

$\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} \varsigma \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \quad \sigma \hat{\eta} \varsigma \quad \mu \eta \delta a \mu \hat{\omega} \varsigma \quad \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \theta a$ $\sigma \tau a ́ v \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau ’$ є’s ỏ $\theta$ Ө̀v каі $\pi \epsilon \sigma o ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ ข ̂ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$, $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda ’ \dot{a} \sigma \phi a \lambda \epsilon i ́ a ~ \tau \eta \prime \eta \delta \delta^{\prime}$ à $\nu o ́ \rho \theta \omega \sigma o \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$.


 $\xi \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \iota \nu \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \iota o \nu \ddot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu \eta ̂ \varsigma \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$,


OI. ஸ̂ $\pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon \varsigma ~ o i ̋ \tau \tau \rho o i ́, ~ \gamma \nu \omega \tau a ̀ ~ \kappa о v ̉ \kappa ~ a ̈ \gamma \nu \omega \tau a ́ ~ \mu о \iota ~$ $\pi \rho о \sigma \eta^{\prime} \lambda \theta \epsilon \theta^{\prime}$ i $\mu \epsilon i ́ \rho о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma^{\cdot} \epsilon \hat{u} \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ oîd’ o"т८ $\nu 0 \sigma \epsilon i ̂ \tau \epsilon \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \kappa a \grave{\iota} \nu 0 \sigma o \hat{\nu} \nu \epsilon \varsigma, \omega \varsigma$ є่ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$


 $\psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ̀ ~ \kappa a \grave{\imath} \sigma^{\prime} \dot{o} \mu о \hat{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \nu \epsilon \iota$.

 $\pi о \lambda \lambda a ̀ \varsigma \delta^{\prime}$ ó óov̀s è $\lambda$ Oóvta ф $\rho о \nu \tau i ́ \delta o s ~ \pi \lambda a ́ \nu o \iota s . ~$



 $\delta \rho \hat{\nu} \nu \ddot{\eta} \tau i ́ \phi \omega \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \eta \eta_{\nu} \delta \epsilon * \dot{\rho} v \sigma o i ́ \mu \eta \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$.
 $\lambda v \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau i ́ \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \cdot$ тô $\gamma$ रà $\rho$ єiко́тos $\pi \epsilon ́ \rho a$ äтєбтє $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ 'i $\omega$ то̂ каӨं́коขтоs $\chi$ рóvov.

$\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\nu \epsilon i \not \eta \nu \quad \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta^{\prime}$ ö $\sigma^{\prime}$ à $\nu \quad \delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\imath} \theta \epsilon o ́ s$.
 К $\rho$ є́оута троббтєі'Хоута бпиаі́עоибі $\mu о \iota$.

$\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \iota \beta a i ́ \eta ~ \lambda a \mu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ő $\mu \mu a \tau \iota$.
 $\pi о \lambda v \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \grave{\eta} \varsigma \hat{\omega}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \hat{i} \rho \pi \epsilon \pi а \gamma \kappa а ́ \rho \pi о v ~ \delta a ́ \phi \nu \eta s$.

 85 $\tau i \nu ’ \dot{\eta} \mu i \nu \quad \ddot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \phi \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ ф＇́ $\rho \omega \nu$ ；

## KPE $\Omega$ ．










ä $\nu \omega \gamma є \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \varsigma$ Фоîßos $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \mu \phi а \nu \hat{\omega} \varsigma$ ä $\nu a \xi$
 є่ $\nu \tau \hat{\eta} \delta^{\prime}, ~ \epsilon ่ \lambda a \nu ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu, \mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ à $\nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \epsilon \sigma \tau о \nu \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu$.

KP．à $\nu \delta \rho \eta \lambda a \tau o v ̂ \nu \tau a s, ~ \grave{\eta}$ фóvఱ фóvov $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda ı \nu$ $\lambda \dot{o} о \nu \tau a \varsigma, ~ \omega ́ \varsigma ~ \tau o ́ \delta ’ ~ a i ̂ \mu a ~ \chi є \iota \mu a ́ \zeta о \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu . ~$
OI．$\pi o i ́ o v ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ a ̀ \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ́ \nu \delta є ~ \mu \eta \nu v ̀ є \iota ~ \tau v ́ \chi \eta \nu ;$



KP．тои́тоv $\theta a \nu o ́ \nu \tau о s ~ \nu \hat{v} \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon ่ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota ~ \sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} s$ тov̀s aủ $\tau о$ évtas $\chi \in \iota \rho i ̀ ~ \tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu a s . ~$
 ¿ $\chi \nu 0 s$ талаıâs $\delta v \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \kappa \mu а \rho т о \nu ~ a i \tau i a s ;$

105．Codd． $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ ．Cf．Lect．



 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ o i ̂ \kappa o \nu ~ o u ̉ \kappa \epsilon ́ \theta ' ~ i ̂ \kappa \epsilon \theta ’ ~ \omega ̀ s ~ a ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau a ́ \lambda \eta . ~$




 $\dot{a} \rho \chi \eta ̀ \nu$ ß $\rho a \chi \epsilon i ̂ a \nu ~ \epsilon i ̉ \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta о \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ єं $\lambda \pi i ́ \delta o s$.
KP. $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \grave{a} \varsigma$ €̋фабкє $\sigma v \nu \tau v \chi o ́ \nu \tau a \varsigma$ ơ $\mu \iota \hat{a}$ $\dot{\rho} \omega \dot{\mu} \eta \kappa \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \nu \iota \nu, \vec{a} \lambda \lambda a ̀ \sigma \nu ̀ \nu \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota \quad \chi \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$.




OI. како̀ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi о і ̂ o \nu ~ \epsilon ́ \mu \pi о \delta \omega ́ \nu, ~ \tau v \rho a \nu \nu i ́ \delta o s ~$

KP. $\dot{\eta} \pi о \iota \kappa \iota \lambda \omega \delta o ̀ s ~ \Sigma \phi i \gamma \xi$ тò $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi о \sigma \grave{\iota} \sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu \quad 130$ $\mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau a s \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \varsigma \tau \dot{a} \phi a \nu \hat{\eta} \pi \rho о \sigma \eta \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \tau о$.
 $\grave{\epsilon} \pi a \xi^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \omega \varsigma$ रà $\rho$ Фоîßos, $\dot{\alpha} \xi^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \omega \varsigma ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \grave{v}$
 $\omega ̈ \sigma \tau^{\prime}$ є̀ $\nu \delta i ́ \kappa \omega \varsigma \quad$ oै $\psi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ̀ ~ \sigma \dot{u} \mu \mu a \chi o \nu$, $\gamma \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\imath} \delta \delta \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \circ \hat{\nu} \nu \tau a \tau \hat{\omega} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \theta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \mu a$. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon ̀ \rho \gamma a ̀ \rho$ oủ $\chi \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\nu} \dot{a} \pi \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega$ фí $\lambda \omega \nu$,
 ő $\sigma \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \epsilon \in \kappa \epsilon i \nu o \nu ~ o ́ ~ \kappa \tau а \nu \omega ̀ \nu ~ \tau a ́ \chi ’ ~ a ̀ \nu ~$

 $a ̉ \lambda \lambda ’ \omega s ~ \tau a ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau a$, $\pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon \varsigma, ~ \dot{v} \mu \epsilon i ̂ \varsigma ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \beta a ́ \theta \rho \omega \nu$




IE．$\hat{\omega} \pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon \varsigma, ~ i \sigma \tau \omega \prime \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \cdot \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \gamma \grave{a} \rho \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu$

Фоі̂ßos $\delta$ ’ ó тє́ $\mu \psi a s ~ \tau a ́ \sigma \delta є ~ \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i ́ a s ~ a ̈ \mu a ~$ $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \dot{\rho} \theta^{\prime}$ їкоито каі עо́боv таvбти́рıоs．

## XOPOZ．

$\omega^{\circ} \Delta \iota o ̀ s ~ a ́ \delta v \epsilon \pi \epsilon ̀ s ~ \phi a ́ \tau \iota, ~ \tau i ́ s ~ \pi o \tau \epsilon ~ \tau a ̂ ৎ ~ \pi o \lambda v \chi \rho u ́-~$ oov
$\Pi v \theta \hat{\omega} \nu o s$ à $\gamma \lambda a \grave{a} \varsigma$ é $\beta a s$
 í̆ïє $\Delta \dot{a}^{\lambda} \iota \epsilon$ Пaıáv，
 I 55


 $\nu a$ ， ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \tau \tau . a^{\prime}$.
 160
 $\kappa а i ̀$ Фоîßор є́каßó入од，i $\omega$
$\tau \rho \iota \sigma \sigma о \grave{\alpha}$ à $\lambda \xi i \mu о \rho о \iota \pi \rho о \phi \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \tau \epsilon \in \mu о \iota$,

 ஸ̉ тóтоь，à $\nu \alpha ́ \rho \iota \theta \mu a ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ ф є ́ \rho \omega ~ \sigma \tau \rho . ~ \beta ' . ~$ $\pi \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu a \tau a \cdot \nu о \sigma \epsilon i ̂ ~ \delta \epsilon ́ ~ \mu о \iota ~ \pi \rho o ́ \pi a s ~ \sigma \tau o ́ \lambda o s, ~ o v ̉ \delta ’ ~ \epsilon ै \nu \iota ~ ф \rho o \nu-~$ тíoos ${ }^{\text {é } \gamma \chi o s, ~}$
 $\kappa \lambda \nu \tau \hat{a} \varsigma \chi$ Өovòs av̀ $\xi_{\epsilon \tau \alpha \iota}$ ，ou้тє ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \kappa о \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$

153－7．Cf．Excurs．v．159．Cf．Lect．et Comm．171． Codd．$\dot{\mathbf{\omega}}$ ．Cf．Lect．173．Codd．тóкoггг．Cf．Lect．
 $\kappa \rho \epsilon і ̈ \sigma \sigma o \nu ~ a ̉ \mu а \iota \mu а к є ́ т о v ~ \pi v \rho o ̀ s ~ o ̋ \rho \mu є \nu о \nu ~$ ảктà̀ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ є ́ \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho o v ~ \theta \epsilon o v ̂ . ~$

 $\dot{\alpha} \nu о \iota \kappa \tau \varsigma{ }^{\circ}$


* $\neq \delta \rho a \nu \pi a \rho a \beta \omega ́ \mu \iota o \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda o \theta \varepsilon \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda a \iota$
${ }^{\Gamma} \lambda v \gamma \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o ́ \nu \omega \nu{ }^{*} i \kappa \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon \varsigma \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu o \hat{v} \sigma \iota .{ }^{*}$ I 85 $\pi a \iota a ̀ \nu ~ \delta \grave{~} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau о \nu o ́ \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \gamma \hat{\eta} \rho v s$ ö $\mu a v \lambda$ оs.
* $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ viv $\pi \epsilon \rho$, $\hat{\omega}$ र $\rho v \sigma \epsilon ́ a ~ \forall u ́ \gamma a \tau \epsilon \rho ~ \Delta \iota o ́ s, ~$

 $\phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta$ óaтos à àтıá $\zeta \omega \nu$,


$\theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \mu о \nu$ ' $\mathrm{A} \mu \phi \iota \tau \rho і т а$,

$\Theta \rho \grave{1} \kappa \iota o \nu \kappa \lambda u ́ \delta \omega \nu a$.


тóv, ${ }^{\omega} * \tau \hat{a} \nu \pi v \rho \phi o ́ \rho \omega \nu$
200
$\dot{a} \sigma \tau \rho a \pi a ̂ \nu \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta ~ \nu \epsilon ́ \mu \omega \nu$,


 205
à $\omega \gamma \dot{\alpha}$ т $\rho о \sigma \tau a \theta$ є́ $\nu \tau a, \tau \alpha ́ \varsigma ~ \tau \epsilon \pi v \rho \phi o ́ \rho o v s$


I79. Codd. $\nu \eta \lambda \epsilon ́ a$. Cf. Lect. I82. Codd. $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \grave{\alpha} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \grave{\alpha} \beta \dot{\omega} \mu \iota o \nu$. Cf. Lect. 185. Codd. iктर̂pєs є̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o \nu a \chi \circ \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota$ Cf. Lect. 187.
 et Comm. 198-9. Codd. $\tau \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \ldots{ }^{\prime} \epsilon_{\rho} \rho \in \tau \alpha \iota$. Cf. Lect. et Comm. 200. $\tau \hat{a} \nu$ abest a codicibus. Cf. Lect. 206. Mallem $\pi \alpha \mu \phi \alpha \epsilon \hat{\imath} s . ~ C f . ~ L e c t . ~$

тò̀ $\chi \rho v \sigma o \mu i ́ \tau \rho a \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \iota \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ， $\tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \delta^{\circ} \epsilon \in \pi \omega \dot{\nu} \nu \mu o \nu \gamma \hat{a} \varsigma$ ，
оі̀ $\omega \pi$ та Ва́кхоу є兀̛̈ov， Маıуáठ $\omega \nu$ ó $\mu o ́ \sigma \tau о \lambda o \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \quad \phi \lambda \in ́ \gamma \sigma \nu \tau$ ， $\dot{a} \gamma \lambda a \hat{\omega} \pi \iota * \sigma v^{\prime} \mu \mu a \chi o \nu$


 $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu \lambda a ́ \beta o \iota s ~ \grave{a} \nu \kappa \mathfrak{\nu} \nu \alpha \kappa о и ́ \phi \iota \sigma \iota \nu \kappa а \kappa \omega ิ \nu$.



 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \pi \rho о \phi \omega \nu \hat{\omega} \pi a \hat{\sigma} \iota \iota \mathrm{~K} a \delta \mu \epsilon i ́ o \iota s ~ \tau a ́ \delta \epsilon$.
 $\kappa а ́ т о \iota \delta \epsilon \nu ~ a ̀ \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \kappa ~ \tau i ́ \nu o s ~ \delta \iota \omega ́ \lambda \epsilon \tau о$ ，


 $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon ̀ s$ oú $\delta \epsilon \in \nu, \gamma \eta \hat{\eta}^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}$ ä $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \beta \lambda a \beta \eta^{\prime}{ }^{\circ}$
 тò̀ aủ $o ́ \chi \chi \epsilon \rho \rho a, \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \iota \omega \pi a \dot{a} \tau \omega$ тò $\gamma a ̀ \rho$
 $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime} a v ̊ ~ \sigma \iota \omega \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，каí $\tau \iota \varsigma \ddot{\eta} \phi i \lambda o v$

 $\tau o ̀ \nu ~ a ̈ \nu \delta \rho ’ ~ a ̉ \pi a v \delta \hat{\omega}$ тov̂тov，ő $\sigma \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \grave{\prime}, \gamma \hat{\eta} \varsigma$
 $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau ’ \epsilon i \sigma \delta \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \eta \quad \tau \epsilon \pi \rho о \sigma \phi \omega \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu \tau \iota \nu a$ ，
 $\kappa о \iota \nu o ̀ \nu ~ \pi о \iota \epsilon і ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ \mu \eta ं т \epsilon ~ \chi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \iota \beta a s ~ \nu \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \iota \nu$,

[^3]
## OIDIIOOミ TYPANNOE．







 како̀ какюิs $\nu t \nu$＊ả $\mu о \rho о \nu$ ѐктрî廿аı ßíov．


$\pi a \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu \stackrel{\prime}{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \rho$ тоî $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ à $\rho \tau i \omega \varsigma$ ク’ $\rho a \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．




 ả $\nu \delta \rho o ́ s ~ \gamma ’ ~ a ̉ \rho i ́ \sigma \tau o v ~ \beta a \sigma ı \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega s ~ \tau ’ ~ o ̀ \lambda \omega \lambda o ́ \tau o s, ~$

 є́ $\chi \omega \nu$ ठ̀̀ $\lambda \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \rho a$ каi $\gamma \nu \nu a i ̂ \chi ’ ~ o ́ \mu o ́ \sigma \pi о \rho o \nu, ~$
 $\mu \grave{~}$＇$\delta v \sigma \tau u ́ \chi \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ，ท̉̀ $\nu \grave{a} \nu$ є̇ктєффкко́та．
 à $\nu \theta^{\prime} \omega_{\nu}^{\nu}$ є่ $\gamma \omega ̀ ~ \tau a ́ \delta ’, ~ \grave{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \grave{\imath} \tau o \cup ̉ \mu о \hat{v} \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s$, $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \chi o \hat{v} \mu a \iota, \kappa a ̉ \pi i ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau ’ a ̉ \phi i \xi o \mu a \iota$
$\zeta \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тò̀ aùтó $\chi є \rho a$ тov̂ фóvov $\lambda a \beta \epsilon \imath ̂ \nu$
 $\tau o \hat{v} \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \epsilon \mathrm{~K} \dot{\alpha} \delta \mu o v$ тov̂ $\pi a ́ \lambda a \iota ~ \tau ' ~ ' A \gamma \eta ́ \nu o \rho o s . ~$

 270 $\mu \eta \tau^{\prime}$ oủv $\quad$ vvalk $\hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \hat{\iota} \delta a \varsigma, ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \pi o ́ \tau \mu \omega$


[^4]



 $\delta \in i ̂ \xi a l$ ．тò $\delta_{\text {è }} \zeta \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \mu a$ то̂̂ $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi a \nu \tau o s ~ \eta े \nu$






$\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ Фоiß̧ T $\epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \sigma i a \nu, \pi a \rho ’$ ố $\tau \iota \varsigma a ̈ \nu \quad 285$
$\sigma \kappa о \pi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a ́ \delta ’, ~ \grave{龴} \nu a \xi$ ，є่к $\mu a ́ \theta o \iota ~ \sigma a \phi \in ́ \sigma \tau a \tau a$.





XO．$\theta a \nu \epsilon ̂ ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \lambda \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \eta ~ \pi \rho o ́ s ~ \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu ~ ¿ ́ \delta o \iota \pi o ́ \rho \omega \nu . ~$


$\tau a ̀ s ~ \sigma a ̀ s ~ a ̉ \kappa o v ́ \omega \nu ~ o u ̛ ~ \mu \epsilon \nu є \hat{\imath} ~ \tau о \iota a ́ \sigma \delta ' ~ a ̉ \rho a ́ s . ~$



$\tau \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \varsigma \quad \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon ́ \phi \cup \kappa \epsilon \nu \quad \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega^{\prime} \pi \omega \nu \quad \mu о ́ \nu \omega$.
OI．$\hat{\omega}^{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \nu \omega \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ T $\epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \sigma i ́ a, \delta \iota \delta a \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$
à $\rho \rho \eta \tau a ́ ~ \tau ’$ ，ov̉ $\rho a ́ \nu ı a ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к а i ~ \chi ~ \chi о \nu о \sigma т \iota \beta \hat{\eta}$ ，

oía עó $\sigma \omega$ $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ • $\hat{\eta} s$ $\sigma \epsilon \pi \rho о \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \eta \nu$

28r．Codd．à vel ä̀．294．Codd．pl．$\tau$＇，

## OIDIMOYミ TケPANNOミ．

Фоîßos $\gamma a ́ \rho, \epsilon i$ каì $\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \in \lambda \omega \nu, 305$ $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi a \sigma \iota \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \stackrel{\imath}{\nu}$ à $\nu \tau \in \in \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \epsilon \nu,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \nu \sigma \iota \nu$
 $\epsilon i$ тоv̀s ктауóvтая ムá̈̈ov $\mu a \theta$ о́vтєs єv̉








## TEIPEZIA乏．


 $\epsilon i \delta \omega ̀ s ~ \delta \iota \omega \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \sigma^{\prime}$ oủ $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ à $\nu \delta \epsilon \hat{v} \rho$ ’ iкó $\mu \eta \nu$ ．
OI．$\tau i \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu ; ~ \omega s$ ă $\theta \nu \mu o s \in i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda v \theta a s$ ．


 $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta^{\prime}, \not{ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma^{\prime}$ 光 $\theta \rho \epsilon \psi \epsilon, \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi \tau \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \phi \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \nu$.
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ к а \iota \rho o ́ \nu . ~ \omega ं s ~ o u ̉ \nu ~ \mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ є́ $\gamma \omega$ т таùtò̀ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega-325$
 $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \sigma \epsilon \pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \nu о \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ oí $\delta^{\prime}$ iктท่рıol．






3г5．$\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \omega \nu$ ．Cf．Lect．317．入úp．Cf．Lect．322．Cf．Lect． 328－9．Cf．Lect．et Exc．VI．

335

 $\nu a i ́ o v \sigma a \nu$ ou катєîठєऽ，ả入入’ є̇ $\mu$ è $\psi \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma$.



$$
340
$$






 $\kappa а i ̀ ~ \xi v \mu \phi \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a \iota ~ \tau о v ̌ \rho \gamma о \nu, \epsilon i \rho \gamma a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota \theta^{\prime}$ ö $\sigma о \nu$










TE．$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma o v ̂ . ~ \sigma u ̀ ~ \gamma a ́ \rho ~ \mu ’ ~ a ̉ к о \nu \tau а ~ \pi \rho о u ̛ \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \psi ~ \psi \omega ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu . ~$
OI．тоîov $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu ; ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma ' ~ a u ̂ \theta \iota s, ~ \omega ' s ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \mu a ́ \theta \omega . ~$

OI．ờ $\chi \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota ̂ \nu * \gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ \nu \cdot a ̉ \lambda \lambda ’$ aû $\theta \iota \varsigma ~ \phi \rho a ́ \sigma o \nu . ~$
TE．фоעє́a $\sigma \epsilon \phi \eta \mu \grave{\iota} \tau a ̉ \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ o र ̉ ~ \zeta \eta \tau \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \kappa v \rho \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~$



$35^{1}$ ．Codd．$\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon i \pi a s .360$ ．Cf．Lect． 36 I．Codd．$\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau o ́ v$. Cf．Lect．

TE. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta$ évaı $\sigma \epsilon \phi \eta \mu i$ $\sigma \grave{\nu} \nu$ тoîs $\phi \iota \lambda \tau a ́ \tau o \iota \varsigma$



 $\tau v \phi \lambda o ̀ s ~ \tau \alpha ́ ~ \tau ’ ~ ف ̂ \tau a ~ \tau o ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \nu o ̂ v \nu ~ \tau \alpha ́ ~ \tau ’ ~ o ’ \mu \mu a \tau ’ ~ \epsilon i . ~ . ~$
TE. $\sigma \grave{v} \delta^{\prime}$ ä $\theta \lambda \iota o ́ s ~ \gamma \epsilon \tau a \hat{v} \tau$ ’ òvєı $\delta i \zeta \omega \nu, \dot{a}$ $\sigma o \grave{~}$

OI. $\mu \iota \hat{a} s$ т $\rho \in ́ \phi \epsilon \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \nu v \kappa т o ́ s, ~ \check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \eta^{\prime} \tau ’$ є’ $\mu \epsilon ̀$






 ő $\sigma o s ~ \pi a \rho ’$ v $\mu i ̂ \nu ~ o ́ ~ \phi \theta o ́ \nu o s ~ \phi v \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon ̇ \tau a \iota, ~$ $\epsilon i$ т $\eta \sigma \delta \epsilon ́ ~ \gamma ’ ~ a ̉ \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ oű $\nu \epsilon \chi$ ’, ґ̀ $\nu$ є’ $\mu o i$ тó入ıs $\delta \omega \rho \eta \tau o ́ \nu$, ои’к аiтทтóv, єi $\sigma \epsilon \chi \epsilon i \rho \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$,

 íфєìs $\mu a ́ \gamma o \nu ~ \tau o \iota o ́ v \delta є ~ \mu \eta \chi a \nu o \rho \rho a ́ \phi o \nu, ~$

 є่ $\pi \epsilon i ́, \phi \in ́ \rho ’ \epsilon i \pi \epsilon ́, \pi o v ̂ ~ \sigma u ̀ ~ \mu a ́ \nu \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \epsilon i ̂ ~ \sigma a \phi \eta ̀ s ; ~ 390 ~$


 ả $\nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta \iota \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon i ̀ \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i ́ a \varsigma ~ \epsilon ้ \delta \epsilon \iota$,




K. OE.

$\pi а \rho a \sigma \tau a \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota \nu$ тоîs $\mathrm{K} \rho \epsilon о \nu \tau \epsilon i o \iota s ~ \pi \epsilon \grave{\lambda} \alpha$ s．
400
$\kappa \lambda a ́ \omega \nu$ бокєîs $\mu о \iota ~ к а \grave{\iota} \sigma \grave{v} \chi \omega$ бvขӨєis тáסє
 єỉval，$\pi a \theta \omega ̀ \nu$ є̋ $\gamma \nu \omega s$ à $\nu$ oỉá $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ф $\rho o \nu \epsilon i ̂ s . ~$


 $\mu a \nu \tau \in \hat{\imath}$ ă $\rho \iota \sigma \tau a \quad \lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，тód $\epsilon \kappa о \pi \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ ．













$\pi o i ̂ o s \mathrm{~K} \iota \theta a \iota \rho \omega ̀ \nu$ où $\chi i$ í $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \omega \nu o s ~ \tau a ́ \chi a$ ，





 $\kappa \alpha ́ \kappa \iota о \nu$ ӧ $\sigma \tau \iota \varsigma ~ Є ่ \kappa \tau \rho \iota \beta \grave{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau а і$ тотє．
 ov̉к єis ö $\lambda \epsilon \theta \rho o \nu$ ；oủ $\chi \grave{\imath}$ Өâ $\sigma \sigma o \nu$ ；oủ $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu$
$a ̈ \psi о \rho \rho o s ~ о \stackrel{ }{\prime} \kappa \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i \varsigma \quad \ddot{a} \pi \epsilon \iota$ ；






TE. $\eta \delta^{\prime} \delta^{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \phi v ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \sigma \epsilon \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \epsilon i ̂ . ~$










 $\zeta \eta \tau \epsilon i ̂ \varsigma \quad \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \iota \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu а \kappa \eta \rho \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ фóvo $\nu$

 фаvทं $\sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ఆ $\eta \beta a i ̂ o s, ~ o v ̉ \delta ’ ~ \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$


 $\phi a \nu \eta ं \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ס̀̀ $\pi a \iota \sigma i ̀ ~ \tau o \imath ̂ S ~ a u ́ \tau o \hat{v} ~ \xi \nu \nu \omega \nu$
 дидаıкòs viòs каі̀ то́б九s, каì то̂ татрòs ó $о$ ó $\sigma \pi о \rho o ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к а i ̀ ~ ф о \nu \epsilon v ́ s . ~ к а i ̀ ~ \tau а \hat{v} \tau$ ' ì̀v 460


434. Cf. Lect. 435. Codd. $\mu \grave{̀} \nu \sigma o i$. Cf. Lect. 445. Codd. $\tau \dot{a}$

 à $\rho \rho \eta \tau^{\prime}$ à $\rho \rho \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma a \nu \tau a$ фо८vía८б८ $\chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i \nu ; 465$ $\ddot{\omega} \rho a \nu \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \in \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \delta \omega \nu$
$彳 \pi \pi \omega \nu \quad \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu a \rho \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$
$\phi v \gamma \hat{a}$ тó $\delta a \quad \nu \omega \mu \hat{a} \nu$ ．

$\pi \nu \rho i$ каi $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \pi a i ̂ s ~ o ̀ ~ \Delta i o ̀ s ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon ́ \tau а я . ~$

K $\eta \rho \in s \dot{\alpha} \nu a \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \eta \tau о \iota$.

 фоぃтâ $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ ví $\pi^{\prime}$ àjpíav
v̋ $\lambda a \nu$ à $\nu \alpha ́ ~ \tau ’ ~ a ̈ \nu \tau \rho a ~ к а i ~$
$\pi$ є́т $\rho a s$＊íóт $\quad$ uvoos，


$\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i ̂ a r ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \delta ’ ~ a ́ \epsilon \grave{\imath}$
$\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi о \tau \hat{a} \tau a \iota . \quad\left[\sigma \tau \rho . \beta^{\prime}\right.$. $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu a ́{ }^{*} \mu \epsilon \nu \hat{v} \nu^{*}, \delta \epsilon \iota \nu a ̀ ~ \tau a \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \sigma o \phi o ̀ s ~ o i \omega \nu o \theta \epsilon ́ \tau a s, ~$
 $\dot{a} \pi о \rho \hat{\omega}$.


 є̈ $\gamma \omega \gamma$＇oư $\tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \nu \hat{v} \nu \pi \omega$
є＂$\mu a \theta o \nu$ ，$\pi \rho o ̀ s$ ö $т о v ~ \delta \grave{\eta}{ }^{*} \beta a \sigma a \nu i \zeta \omega \nu \pi \iota \theta a \nu \hat{\omega} \varsigma^{*}$


 $\beta \rho о \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$ $\stackrel{a}{\alpha} \tau . \beta^{\prime}$.

463．Codd．$\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \pi \bar{\epsilon} \tau \rho a$ ，sed L．a pr．m，ut J．testatur，$\epsilon \bar{\delta} \bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \tau \rho a$ ．Cf． Lect．et Comm．478．Cod．L．$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \alpha \sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \tau a \hat{v} \rho o s$. Cf．Lect． 483. Codd．$\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ oûv．Cf．Lect．493．Codd．$\beta a \sigma \alpha \dot{d} \varphi$ ．Cf．Lect．et Comm．
 $\tau \alpha \iota$

500

$\pi a \rho a \mu \epsilon i ́ \psi \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu$ à $\nu \dot{\eta} \rho$.
 фоرє́v$\nu \nu$ à̀ катафаíך $\nu$.

 $\dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime} \epsilon \in \mu \hat{a} \varsigma$

510
$\phi \rho є \nu o ̀ s ~ o u ̈ \pi о т ’ ~ o ́ \phi \lambda \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ к а к і ́ а \nu . ~$
 $\kappa а \tau \eta \gamma о \rho \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \mu o v ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \tau u ́ \rho a \nu \nu o \nu ~ O i ́ \delta i ́ \pi o v \nu, ~$


 оӥтоє ßíov ноє той $\mu а к р а i ́ \omega \nu o s ~ \pi o ́ \theta o s ~$

 ả入入’ Є’s $\mu \in ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau o \nu, ~ \epsilon i ~ \kappa а к o ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota, ~$ $\kappa а \kappa o ̀ s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma о \hat{v} \kappa а \grave{̀} \phi i \lambda \omega \nu \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \dot{\sigma о \mu а є . ~}$


 $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$ ó $\mu a ́ \nu \tau \iota s ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v s ~ \psi \epsilon v \delta \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma o u . ~$
XO. $\eta u ̛ \delta a ̂ \tau o ~ \mu e ̀ v ~ \tau a ́ \delta ', ~ o i ̂ \delta a ~ \delta ’ ~ o v ~ \gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu \eta ~ \tau i ́ \nu \iota . ~$
 катךүорєі̂то тои̇тікл $\eta \mu a$ тои̂то́ $\mu о v ;$
XO. oưк oî $\delta^{\prime} \cdot a ̀$ à $\gamma$ à $\rho \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma$ oi кратоv̂עtes ov' $\chi$ ó $\rho \hat{\omega} .530$



 фépovit. $5^{2} 5$. Codd. pl. toû $\pi \rho o ̀ s$. Cf. Lect.


$\phi \epsilon ́ \rho ’$ єimè $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$ ，$\delta \epsilon \iota \lambda i ́ a \nu$ ท̀ $\mu \omega \rho i a \nu$

$\hat{\eta} \tau o v ̌ \rho \gamma o \nu \omega_{s}$ ov＊$\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota o i ̂ \mu i ́ \sigma o v ~ \tau o ́ \delta \epsilon ~$

å $\rho$ ’ oủ $\chi \grave{\imath} \mu \hat{\omega} \rho o ́ \nu$ є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota ~ \tau о u ̛ \gamma \chi є i ́ \rho \eta \mu a ́ ~ \sigma o v, ~$

$\theta \eta \rho a \hat{\nu}$, ò $\pi \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota \quad \chi \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu a \sigma i \nu \quad \theta$ à $\lambda i \sigma \kappa \kappa \tau \alpha \iota ;$
KP．oî $\theta$＇$\omega$ s $\pi о i ́ \eta \sigma o \nu$ ；$\dot{a} \nu \tau i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$

OI．$\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ бv̀ $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s, \mu a \nu \theta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \delta$＇є่ $\gamma \omega$ какòs
$\sigma o \hat{v} \cdot \delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \gamma$ à $\rho$ каì $\beta a \rho v ́ \nu ~ \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon v i \rho \eta \kappa ’$ є $\mu о$ í．




OI．Єi゙ то८ voui弓є८ऽ aै $\nu \delta \rho a \quad \sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa а \kappa \omega ิ \varsigma$

KP．$\xi^{\prime} \mu \phi \eta \mu i ́ ~ \sigma o \iota ~ \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau^{\prime}$ ěv $\delta \iota \kappa ’ ~ \epsilon i \rho \eta \eta \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$


$\tau o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu o ́ \mu a \nu \tau \iota \nu$ ä $\nu \delta \rho a \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi a \sigma \theta a i ́ ~ \tau \iota \nu a ;$

OI．$\pi o ́ \sigma o \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu ’ ~ \eta ้ \delta \eta ~ \delta \delta \hat{\eta} \theta$ ó $\Lambda$ а́ïos $\chi \rho o ́ v o \nu$


KР．$\mu а к \rho о і ̀ ~ \pi а \lambda а \iota o i ́ ~ \tau ’ ~ a ̀ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \theta є i ̂ \epsilon \nu ~ \chi р о ́ \nu o \iota . ~$



537．Codd．$\epsilon \nu$ є̇ $\mu$ оi．538．Codd．$\gamma \nu \omega$ рíioul．539．Codd．коік． 541．Codd．$\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ ous．Cf．Lect．






KP. $\pi o i ̂ o \nu ~ \tau o ́ \delta ’ ; ~ \epsilon i ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ o i ̂ \delta a ́ ~ \gamma ’, ~ o v ̉ \kappa ~ a ̉ \rho \nu \eta ́ \sigma o \mu a l . ~$
 ovk ä̀ $\pi о \tau$ ' єiтє $\Lambda$ ailov $\delta \iota a \phi \theta o \rho a ́ s . ~$
KP. $\epsilon \grave{\imath} \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau a ́ \delta ', ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ s ~ o i ̂ \sigma \theta ' ~ \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega ~ \delta \epsilon ́ ~ \sigma o v ~$

OI. $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \mu a ́ \nu \theta a \nu$ ' ov̉ $\gamma a ̀ \rho$ ठ̀̀ форєv̀s à $\lambda \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu a \iota$.

OI. ă $\rho \nu \eta \sigma \iota \varsigma$ ov̉к $\notin \nu \in \sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{\omega} \nu$ ả̀ $\nu \sigma \tau о \rho \epsilon i ̂ s$.




 $\sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi a \iota ~ \delta є ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau o ~ \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu, ~ \epsilon \grave{l} \tau \iota \nu ’$ à̀ סокєîs ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ є $\lambda \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \xi ̀ ̀ \nu \nu ~ \phi o ́ ß o \iota \sigma \iota ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \ddot{\eta}$

 тúpavDos єîvaı $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \hat{\eta}$ тúpavעa $\delta \rho \hat{\nu} \nu$, oưт' ä $\lambda \lambda o \varsigma ~ o ̈ \sigma \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \sigma \omega ф \rho o \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \pi i ́ \sigma \tau a \tau a \iota . ~$





 $\nu \hat{v} \nu \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \chi a i \rho \omega, \nu \hat{v} \nu \mu \epsilon \pi \hat{a} \varsigma \dot{a} \sigma \pi a ́ \zeta \epsilon \tau a \iota$, 570. Cf. Lect.

## ミOФOKムEOTミ


 $\pi \omega \hat{}$





 605
 $\psi \eta \prime \phi \omega, \delta \iota \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \delta^{\prime}, \tau \hat{\eta} \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \in \mu \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha i \quad \sigma \hat{\eta}, \lambda a \beta \omega^{\prime}{ }^{-}$






$\chi \rho o ́ \nu o s ~ \delta i ́ к а \iota o \nu ~ a ̈ \nu \delta \rho a ~ \delta є i ́ \kappa \nu v \sigma \iota \nu ~ \mu o ́ \nu o s, ~$

XO．ка入 $\omega \varsigma \varsigma{ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \xi \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu ̉ \lambda a \beta o v \mu \epsilon \prime \nu \omega \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ ，

 $\chi \omega \rho \hat{\eta}, \tau a \chi \nu ̀ \nu \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \alpha ̉ \mu \epsilon ̀ \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \iota \nu \pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu$. $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \sigma \nu \chi \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega}, \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau 0 \hat{v} \delta \epsilon \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$
$\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu ’$ єै $\sigma \tau a \iota, \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu a ̀ \delta^{\prime} \grave{\eta} \mu a \rho \tau \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a$.




KP．oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ф $\rho o \nu o v ̂ \nu \tau \alpha ́ ~ \sigma ’ ~ \epsilon ̂ ̉ ~ \beta \lambda e ́ \pi \omega . ~ O I . ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \gamma o v ̂ \nu ~ є ่ \mu o ́ \nu . ~$

598．Cf．Lect．624．$\gamma$＇abest a codicibus．Codd．iò $\phi \theta o v \epsilon i v$. Cf． Lect．et Exc．vir．


KP．кả $\mu o \grave{\iota} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ $\mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ，ov̉ $\chi \grave{\imath}$ бо̀ $\mu o ́ \nu \varphi$.




## IOKAミTH．

$\tau i ́ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu{ }^{\alpha} \beta o v \lambda o \nu, \vec{\omega}^{\tau} \tau a \lambda a i ́ \pi \omega \rho o \iota, \sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \iota \nu$


 $\kappa a i ̀ \mu \eta ̀ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \eta \delta \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ a ̆ \lambda \gamma o s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma ’ ~ o l ̄ \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon ;$
KP．ö $\mu a \iota \mu \epsilon$ ，סєıvá $\mu$ ’ Oíठítovs ó $\sigma o ̀ s ~ \pi o ́ \sigma \iota s ~$ סрâбaı סıкаьо̂̂，סvoî̀ àтокрivas какоîv，

OI．$\xi^{v} \mu \phi \eta \mu \iota \cdot \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \quad \gamma a ́ \rho ~ \nu \iota \nu$ ， $\mathfrak{\omega}^{\prime} \gamma v i v a \iota$ ，как $\omega \hat{s}$



IO．$\hat{\omega} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \omega ิ \nu \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon v \sigma o \nu$ ，Oidítovs，тá $\delta \epsilon$ ， $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ ̀ ~ \tau о ́ \nu \delta ' ~ \% о к о \nu ~ a i ́ \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon i s ~ \theta \epsilon \omega ิ \nu$,

XO．$\pi \iota \theta o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a s ~ ф \rho o \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a \varsigma \tau^{\prime},{ }_{a} \nu a \xi, \lambda i \sigma \sigma o \mu a \iota . \quad \sigma \tau \rho . a^{\prime}$ ．
OI．$\tau \ell$ бo८ $\theta$ é $\lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \delta \hat{\eta} \tau$＇єiка́ $\theta \omega$ ；



 $\sigma v ̀ \nu ~ a ̀ \phi a \nu \epsilon i ̂ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi ~ * ~ * ~ ' ~ a ’ т \iota \mu o \nu ~ \beta a \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~$
 $\zeta \eta \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ ö $\lambda \epsilon \theta \rho o \nu$ ทे $\phi \nu \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu$ є̇к $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta \epsilon \gamma \hat{\eta} s$.

640．Cf．Lect．657．$\sigma$ abest a codicibus．

## ミOФOKムEOTミ





 $\pi \rho о \sigma a ́ \psi \in \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi a ́ \lambda a \iota ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma \phi \hat{\iota} \nu$.
 $\hat{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta} \varsigma \quad$ ä $\tau \mu о \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta^{\prime}$ à $\pi \omega \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \beta i ́ a$. тò үà $\rho$ бóv，oủ тò тои̂ס＇，є̀ єтоьктєі́рш бтó $\mu a$

KP．$\sigma \tau v \gamma \nu o ̀ s ~ \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon i ้ \kappa \omega \nu ~ \delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o s ~ \epsilon i, \beta a \rho v ̀ s ~ \delta ' ~ o ̋ \tau a \nu ~$





IO．$\mu a \theta o \hat{v} \sigma a ́ \quad \gamma^{\prime} \eta{ }^{\prime} \tau \iota s$ ท̀ $\tau u ́ \chi \eta$ ．


［ $\lambda$ ó ${ }^{\prime}$ os；
IO．ả $\mu \phi$ oì à ${ }^{\prime}$ av̀тoî̀；XO．vaíұı．IO．каì тís $\eta \nu$
 685



 $\pi a \rho a ф \rho o ́ \nu \iota \mu о \nu, a ̈ \pi о \rho o \nu ~ є ̇ \pi i ~ ф \rho o ́ v \iota \mu a ~$ 690
 ös $\tau$ ’ $\epsilon \mu a ̀ \nu ~ \gamma a ̂ \nu ~ \phi i ́ \lambda a \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ * \pi o ́ \nu o \iota \sigma \iota ~$
＊$\sigma a \lambda \epsilon \dot{o} o v \sigma a \nu ~ \kappa a \tau ं ~ o ̀ ~ \rho \theta o ̀ \nu ~ o v ̌ \rho ı \sigma a s, ~$


667．Cf．Lect．691．Codd．$\sigma \in$ עooфísoual．694．Codd．$\pi$ bvocs．


## OIDIIOYミ TYPANNOE.





OI. фоvéa $\mu є$ фทбi $\Lambda$ aîov каӨєбтával.
IO. aủzòs $\xi v \nu \epsilon \iota \delta \omega \prime s, ~ \grave{\eta} \mu a \theta \omega ̀ \nu$ ä̀ $\lambda \lambda o v \pi a ́ \rho a ;$
OI. $\mu a ́ \nu \tau \iota \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o u ̉ \nu ~ \kappa а к о \hat{\rho} \rho \gamma o \nu ~ \epsilon i \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi a s$, є̇тєì 705

IO. $\sigma \grave{v} \nu \hat{v} \nu$ ảфєis $\sigma \epsilon a v \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \grave{\omega} \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \iota$, є́ $\mu о \hat{v}$ 'та́коvбоу каі̀ $\mu a ́ \theta ' ~ о и ̆ \nu \epsilon \kappa ' ~ є ่ \sigma \tau i ́ ~ \sigma о \iota ~$
 $\phi a \nu \hat{\omega}$ ह́є $\sigma o \iota ~ \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ a ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma v ́ \nu \tau о \mu a$.


 ö $\sigma \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \gamma ย ́ \nu o \iota \tau ’ ~ \epsilon ’ \mu о \hat{v} \tau \epsilon ~ к a ̉ \kappa \epsilon i ́ \nu o v ~ \pi a ́ \rho a . ~$



 є́ $\rho \rho \iota \psi \epsilon \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i \nu$ єis äßaтov ő $\rho о \varsigma$. $\kappa a ̉ \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta$ ' 'А $\pi o ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ oư ${ }^{\prime}$ ' $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu o \nu ~ \eta ้ \nu v \sigma \epsilon \nu$
 тò $\delta \in \iota \nu o ̀ \nu ~ o v i \phi o \beta \epsilon i ̂ t o, ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi a \iota \delta o ̀ s ~ \theta a \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~$
то九аи̂тa фर̂भaı $\mu a \nu \tau \iota \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \iota \omega \rho \iota \sigma a \nu$,


 $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta} \varsigma \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \mu a \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu a \kappa i \nu \eta \sigma \iota \varsigma \quad \phi \rho \in \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$.

 $\kappa а т а \sigma ф а \gamma \epsilon i \eta \eta$ тоòs т $\rho \iota \pi \lambda a i ̂ \varsigma ~ \grave{a} \mu a \xi \iota \tau о i ̂ s$.
722. Cf. Lect. 728. Codd. pl. inoor $\rho a \phi e i s . ~ C f . ~ L e c t . ~$

IO．$\eta u ̛ \delta a ̂ \tau o ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau ', ~ o u ̛ \delta ́ ́ ~ \pi \omega ~ \lambda \eta ' \xi a \nu \tau ' ~ Є ้ ~ Є \epsilon \iota . ~$

IO．Факі̀ऽ $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \hat{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta} \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \zeta \epsilon \tau a \iota, \sigma \chi \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\eta} \delta$ óóòs Є’s тaùtò $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \pi o ̀ o ~ \Delta a v \lambda i ́ a s ~ a ै \gamma \epsilon \iota . ~$
OI．каì тís $\chi$ рóvos тоî $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ Є̇ $\sigma \tau i ̀ \nu$ ov́ $\xi \in \lambda \eta \lambda v \theta \omega \dot{\omega}$ ；
IO．$\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta o ́ \nu \tau \iota \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \grave{v} \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega \nu \chi$ Өovòs





IO．$\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a \varsigma, \chi \nu \circ \alpha ́ \zeta \omega \nu$ ápтє $\lambda \epsilon v \kappa \alpha \nu \theta \epsilon ̀ \varsigma \kappa \alpha ́ \rho a$ ，
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OI．$\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \varsigma \dot{a} \theta v \mu \hat{\omega} \mu \grave{\eta} \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega \nu \nu$ ó $\mu a ́ \nu \tau \iota \varsigma \hat{\eta}$ ．


 750 ằ $\delta \rho a s \lambda o \chi i ́ \tau a s$ o $\widehat{i}$ à $\nu \eta ̀ \rho$ ả $\rho \chi \eta \gamma \epsilon ́ \tau \eta \varsigma$ ；





OI．ท̉ кả้ סó $\mu о \iota \sigma \iota ~ \tau v \gamma \chi a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota ~ \tau а \nu v ̂ \nu ~ \pi a \rho \omega ́ \nu ; ~$









IO．$\pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu . ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau i ́ ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau ’ ~ \epsilon ́ ф ' є ́ \epsilon \sigma a \iota ;$


IO．à入入’ ¿＇$\xi \in \tau a \iota \mu \epsilon \in \nu \cdot a \xi i a ~ \delta \epsilon ́ ~ \pi o v ~ \mu a \theta \epsilon i ̄ \nu$









 $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \pi a \rho ’$ ö̀ $\nu \omega, \pi \lambda a \sigma \tau o ̀ s ~ \omega \dot{s} \epsilon i \not \eta \nu \pi a \tau \rho i . \quad 780$ $\kappa \dot{a} \gamma \omega \bar{\omega} \beta a \rho v \nu \theta \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ ov̉ $\sigma a \nu$ ท̀ $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu$ $\mu o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ \kappa а \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \chi o \nu, ~ \theta a ̀ \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \delta ' ~ i \omega ̀ \nu ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \lambda a s ~$
$\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi а т \rho o ́ s ~ \tau ’ ~ \eta ̉ \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi o \nu \cdot$ oi $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \delta v \sigma \phi o ́ \rho \omega s$



$\lambda a ́ \theta \rho a$ ठ̀̀ $\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ к а i ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi о \rho є v ́ o \mu a \iota ~$
$\Pi \nu \theta \omega ́ \delta \epsilon$ ．каí $\mu$ ’ ó Фoîßos $\hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ i \kappa o ́ \mu \eta \nu ~$

$\kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon ı \nu a ̀ ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta u ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu a ~ \pi \rho о v ́ \phi a ́ \nu \eta ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu$,
ผ́s $\mu \eta \tau \rho i ̀ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu . \chi \rho \epsilon i ́ \eta ~ \mu \epsilon \mu \iota \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ ，耳є́vos $\delta$ ’

фоעєùs $\delta$＇є่ $\sigma o i ́ \mu \eta \nu ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ ф \nu \tau \epsilon v ́ \sigma а \nu \tau o s ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s . ~$
$\kappa a ̉ \gamma \omega े ~ ' т а к о v ่ \sigma а \varsigma ~ \tau a и ̂ \tau a, ~ \tau \grave{\eta \nu ~ K o \rho \iota \nu \theta i a \nu ~}$ 763．Codd．$\dot{o} \gamma$ ．780．Cf．Lect．
ä $\sigma \tau \rho o \iota s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \lambda o \iota \pi o ̀ ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \kappa \mu \epsilon \tau \rho o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ \chi \theta o ́ v a, ~$
 $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ỏ $\nu \epsilon i ́ \delta \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \in \lambda \sigma \cup \cup \mu \epsilon \nu a$ ．
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 $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha \hat{v} \theta \dot{\alpha} \mu \circ \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} \rho \nu \xi \quad \tau \varepsilon \kappa \dot{a} \pi \grave{\imath} \pi \omega \lambda \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} \varsigma$
 $\xi v \nu \eta \nu \tau i a \zeta o \nu{ }^{\cdot} \kappa \dot{a} \xi \dot{o} \delta o \hat{v} \mu^{\prime}$＂̈ $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \gamma є \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$
 $\kappa \alpha \dot{\gamma \omega}$ тò̀ є̇ктрє́ $\pi о \nu \tau a$ ，тò̀ т $\tau о \chi \eta \lambda a ́ \tau \eta \nu$ ，

 $\kappa \alpha ́ \rho a ~ \delta \iota т \lambda о \imath ̂ s ~ \kappa є ́ \nu \tau \rho о \iota \sigma i ~ \mu o v ~ к а Ө i ́ к є т о . ~$














 ＊$\mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ є’ $\mu \beta a \tau \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$ тaтрíסos，$\grave{\eta}$ үá $\mu o \iota s ~ \mu \epsilon \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \quad 825$
815．Cod．L．$\nu \hat{v} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau$＇．Cf．Lect． $8_{17}$ ．Codd．$\hat{\omega} \mu \grave{\eta} . . . \tau \nu \nu \alpha$ ．Cf． Lect． 818 ．Codd．．．．tiva．Cf．Lect．825．Cod．L．$\mu \eta^{\prime} \sigma \tau^{\prime}$ ．
$\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \zeta \nu \gamma \eta ̂ \nu a \iota ~ к а i ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ к а \tau а к т а \nu \epsilon \imath ̂ \nu ~$



$\mu \eta े \delta \hat{\eta} \tau a \mu \grave{\eta} \delta \hat{\eta} \tau$, $\hat{\omega} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ á $\gamma \nu o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma \epsilon ́ \beta a \varsigma$,





OI. каì $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ тобойтóv $\gamma$ ’ є่ $\sigma \tau i ́ \mu o \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma ~ \epsilon ่ \lambda \pi i ́ \delta o s, ~$

IO. $\pi \epsilon \phi a \sigma \mu$ évov סè тís $\pi o \theta^{`}$ ŋ̀ $\pi \rho o \theta v \mu i ́ a ;$

















$\kappa а т \epsilon ́ \kappa \tau а \nu ’, ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda ’ ~ a u ́ \tau o ̀ s ~ \pi a ́ \rho o \iota \theta \epsilon \nu ~ \omega ̈ \lambda \epsilon \tau о . ~$ $\stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \sigma \tau^{\prime}$ oủ $\chi \grave{i} \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a s \gamma^{\prime}$ àע oü $\tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon ่ \gamma \omega$
843. Cod. L. какактє́vaıย. Cf. Lect. 852. Codd. тóv $\gamma \epsilon$. Cf. Lect.


$\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \Psi \circ \nu \tau \iota \nu a ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda o v ̂ \nu \tau a, \mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau o \hat{\tau}{ }^{\prime}$ à $\phi \hat{\imath} s . \quad 860$


XO．єi̋ $\mu \circ \iota$ छ̀vvєíך фє́роуть $\sigma \tau \rho . a^{\prime}$.
$\mu o i ̂ \rho a ~ \tau a ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon v ̉ \sigma \epsilon \pi \tau o \nu ~ a ́ \gamma \nu \epsilon i ́ a \nu ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ € $\rho \gamma \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu, \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{\prime} \mu о \iota \pi \rho о ́ к \epsilon \iota \nu \tau а \iota$
vұíтodes，oùpavíà

$\pi a \tau \grave{\rho} \rho \mu o ́ v o s$, oủ $\delta$ é $\nu \iota \nu$
$\theta \nu a \tau \grave{a}$ фv́ $\sigma \iota \varsigma$ à $\nu \in ́ \rho \omega \nu$



${ }^{\alpha} \nu \tau . a^{\prime}$.

$\ddot{a} \mu \eta$＇тікааьа $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma v \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho о \nu \tau а$ ，
875
＊та́кро́татоע єi $\sigma a \nu a \beta$ â ${ }^{\prime}$

${ }^{\prime} \nu \theta^{\prime}$ où $\pi o \delta i \grave{ } \chi \rho \eta \sigma i \mu \omega$


$\theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu$ ov̉ $\lambda \eta^{\prime} \xi \omega$ тoтє̀ $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau a \nu$ î $\sigma \chi \omega \nu$ ．


$\kappa а \kappa \alpha ́ ~ \nu \iota \nu$ є̈ $\lambda о \iota \tau о ~ \mu о \imath ̂ \rho a, ~ \delta v \sigma \pi о ́ т \mu о v ~ \chi ́ a ́ \rho \iota \nu ~ \chi \lambda \iota \delta a ̂ \varsigma, ~$




876．Codd．àкротáтav．877．Cod．L．－－ă $\pi о \tau \mu o \nu . ~ 889 . ~ C o d d . ~$




тí $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \chi$ Х $\rho \epsilon \cup \cup \in \iota \nu ;$
 $\sigma \epsilon \in \beta \omega \nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau . \beta^{\prime}$.





$\phi \theta^{\prime} \nu \bar{\nu}$
$\theta \in ́ \sigma \phi a \tau ’$ є’ $\xi a \iota \rho o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ グ $\eta \eta$ ，

є́ $\rho \rho є \iota$ סѐ тà $\theta$ єîa．
 $\nu a o v ̀ s ~ i \kappa \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu, ~ \tau \alpha ́ \delta ’ ~ \epsilon ’ \nu ~ \chi \epsilon \rho o i ̂ \nu ~$ $\sigma \tau є ́ \phi \eta ~ \lambda a ß o v ́ \sigma \eta ~ к а ̇ т \iota \theta \nu \mu \iota a ́ \mu a \tau a$.


 $\grave{c} \lambda \lambda ’$ є̇ $\sigma \tau i ̀ ~ \tau o ̂ ̀ ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma o \nu \tau o s, ~ \epsilon i ̀ ~ \phi o ́ ß o v s ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma o ı . ~$

 $\epsilon \hat{i}$,


ćs $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ òк $\nu о \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ є̇к $\kappa \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu о \nu$


## АГГЕムOミ．



几atov．Cf．Lect．917．Cf．Lect．

K．OE．









IO．тà тoîa тav̂ta；mapà тìvos $\delta$＇à à८ү $\mu$ évos； 935



АГ．тúpavขov aù $\frac{1}{2} \nu$ oúmı $\chi$ ढ́pıo८ $\chi$ Өovòs



IO．$\pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma ~ \epsilon i ̂ \pi a s ; ~ \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon$ Пó $\lambda v \beta o s$ ，＊${ }^{*} \gamma \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu ; *$










OI．oủtos $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ тís тот’ є่ $\sigma \tau \grave{\iota}$ каì тí $\mu \circ \iota$ 入є́ $\gamma \in \iota$ ；



935．Cf．Lect．936．Codd．$\tau$ á $\chi$ a．943－ł．Cf．Lect．957．Cf．Lect．

## OIDIMO؟ミ TエPANNOE.






АГ. каi т $\hat{\varphi} \mu а \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \sigma \nu \mu \mu \epsilon \tau \rho о и ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о s ~ \chi \rho о ́ \nu \omega$.


$\kappa \lambda a ́ \zeta o \nu \tau a s$ ő $\rho \nu \iota \varsigma, ~ \grave{\omega} \nu \dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ є่ $\gamma \omega \dot{\omega}$



 $\tau a ̀ \delta^{\prime}$ oủv $\pi a \rho o ́ \nu \tau a \quad \sigma u \lambda \lambda a \beta \grave{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi i \sigma \mu a \tau a$







 $\sigma \grave{v} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon i s$ тà $\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \phi o \beta o v ̂ ~ \nu v \mu \phi \epsilon v ́ \mu a \tau a . ~ 980 ~$






IO. каì $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \mu_{\epsilon ́ \gamma}{ }^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime}$ ò $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu o ̀ s ~ o i ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ́ \phi o \iota . ~$
OI. $\mu \in ́ \gamma a s, ~ \xi v \nu i \not \eta \mu$ ' $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma ~ \zeta \omega ́ \sigma \eta \varsigma ~ \phi o ́ \beta o s . ~$

967. Cf. Lect.




OI．$\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ́ ~ \gamma ’ ~ \epsilon i ̉ \pi \epsilon ~ \gamma a ́ \rho ~ \mu \epsilon ~ \Lambda o \xi i a s ~ \pi o \tau \grave{\epsilon}$
$\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \mu \iota \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \mu \eta \tau \rho i ̀ \tau \hat{\eta}$＇$\mu a v \tau o v$ ，$\tau o ́ ~ \tau \epsilon$ 995



$\tau \grave{a} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \kappa о ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ò $\mu \mu a \theta^{\prime}$ ク̈ $\delta \iota \sigma \tau о \nu \quad \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．

OI．татрós $\tau \epsilon \chi \rho \grave{\zeta} \zeta \omega \nu$ ù̀ фоעєùs єival，$\notin ́ \rho o \nu$.
 є่ $\pi \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ ưvovs $\grave{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \lambda v \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu ;$

АГ．каì $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \tau о \hat{v} \tau ’$ àфьо́ $\mu \nu$ ，öт $\pi \omega \varsigma \quad 1005$
бov $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta o ́ \mu o v s ~ \epsilon ่ \lambda \theta o ́ \nu \tau o s ~ \epsilon v ̉ ~ \pi \rho \alpha ́ \xi a \iota \mu i ́ ~ \tau \iota . ~$


OI．$\pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma, \omega^{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \rho a \iota \epsilon ́ ; \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ סíठaбкє́ $\mu \epsilon$ ．





OI．$\pi \hat{\omega} s \delta^{\prime}$ ou $\chi i$ ，$\pi a i ̂ s ~ \gamma ’ ~ \epsilon i ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ é $\phi \nu \nu$ ；IOI 5





OI．à $\lambda \lambda ’ \dot{a} \nu \tau i ̀ \tau o \hat{v} \delta \grave{\eta} \pi a i ̂ \delta \alpha ́ ~ \mu ’ ~ \omega \nu о \mu a ́ \zeta є \tau o ;$ roir．Codd．pl．$\tau \alpha \beta \beta \hat{\omega}$ ．Cf．Lect．




АГ. єvip $\omega \nu \nu a \pi a i ́ a \iota s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{~K} \iota \theta a \iota \rho \omega \nu o s \pi \tau v \chi a i ̂ s$.










OI. $\hat{\omega} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu, \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu \eta \tau \rho o ́ s, ~ \grave{\eta} \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s ; ~ ф \rho a ́ \sigma o \nu . ~$





OI. خ̂ $\tau o \hat{v} ~ \tau v \rho a ́ \nu \nu o v ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta \epsilon ~ \gamma \hat{\eta} s ~ \pi a ́ \lambda a \iota ~ \pi o \tau \epsilon ́ ; ~ ;$
АГ. $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$. тov́тov тả $\nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ o v ̂ \tau o s ~ \eta ̄ \nu ~ \beta o \tau \eta ́ \rho . ~$

АГ. $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \varsigma ~ \gamma ’ ~ a ้ \rho \iota \sigma \tau ’ ~ \epsilon i \delta \epsilon i \tau ’ ~ a ̀ \nu ~ o v i \pi \iota \chi \chi ' \rho \iota o \iota . ~$
OI. ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \tau \nu \tau \iota \varsigma \quad \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega ่ \tau \omega \nu \cdot \pi \epsilon \in \lambda a \varsigma$,

 $\sigma \eta \mu \eta ́ \nu a \theta$ ', $\omega$ s ó каı $\rho o ̀ s ~ \epsilon र ् v \rho \eta ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon . ~$
 ò $\nu$ к $\dot{\mu} \mu a ́ \tau \epsilon v \epsilon \varsigma ~ \pi \rho о ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \delta \epsilon i ̂ \nu \cdot ~ a ̀ \tau \grave{\alpha} \rho$
 1025. Codd. $\tau \epsilon \kappa \omega ́ v . ~ 103$ r. Cf. Lect.
 $\mu о \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ є́ $\phi \iota \in ́ \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ тóv $\delta^{\prime}$ ov̉тos $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in \iota$ ；
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 $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ a ~ \tau o \iota a u ̂ \tau ’ ~ o u ̉ ~ \phi a \nu \omega ̂ ~ \tau o v ̀ \mu o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon ́ \nu o s . ~$
IO．$\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，$\epsilon \grave{\iota} \pi \epsilon \rho$ т८ тov̂ $\sigma a v \tau o \hat{v} \beta i o v$ IO6O

 $\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \phi а \nu \hat{\omega} \tau \rho i ́ \delta o v \lambda o s ~ \epsilon ̇ \kappa \phi а \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa а к \eta$ خ．





 $\tau а u ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \delta ’ ~ є ́ a ̂ \tau \epsilon ~ \pi \lambda o v \sigma i ́ \omega ~ \chi a i \rho \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota . ~$ 1070
IO．iov̀ ioú，$\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \eta \nu \epsilon \cdot$ тov̂тo خá $\sigma^{\prime}$＇้ $\chi \omega$ $\mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ，ä $\lambda \lambda o \delta^{\prime}$ oü $\pi o \theta^{\prime}$ v̌ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$ ．
XO．тí тотє $\beta \epsilon \in \beta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ，Oíítovs，ím’ àүрias
 $\mu \grave{\eta}$＇к $\tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \quad \sigma \iota \omega \pi \hat{\eta} \varsigma \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta{ }^{\prime}$ à $\nu a \rho \rho \dot{\eta} \xi \in \iota \kappa$ кака́． 1075


 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta v \sigma \gamma \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota a \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ є́ $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ aỉ $\chi \chi$ v́vєтal．






ro55．Codd．L．A．тóv $\theta^{\prime}$ ．Cf．Lect．1062．Codd．ä̀ $̇$ €́ ．

 ov̉к $\notin \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau$ т $̀ \nu$ aưpıov $\pi a \nu \sigma \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \nu o \nu$,

$\kappa a i ̀ \tau \rho о ф o ̀ v ~ \kappa a i ̀ \mu a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho ’$ aı゙ $\xi є \iota$,
$\kappa а \grave{\imath} \chi о \rho є \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$


 Пavòs ó $\rho \in \sigma \sigma \iota \beta$ á $\sigma^{*} \pi a \tau \rho$ òs $\pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \sigma^{\prime}{ }^{*}$ I 100
 $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \epsilon s$ à $\gamma \rho o ́ v o \mu o \iota \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma a \iota ~ \phi i ́ \lambda a \iota . ~$
$\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \theta^{\prime}$ ó $\mathrm{K} v \lambda \lambda a ́ \nu a s$ à $\nu a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu * \sigma^{\prime}$
єi $\theta^{\prime}$ ò $\mathrm{B} a \kappa \chi є i o s ~ \theta є o ̀ s ~ \nu a i-~$
1105

$\nu \nu \mu \phi \hat{a} \nu *^{`} \mathrm{E} \lambda \iota \kappa \omega \nu i ́ \delta \omega \nu$, aîs $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau a \sigma \nu \mu \pi a i \zeta \epsilon \iota ;$
OI. $\epsilon \grave{\imath} \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \kappa a ̉ \mu \epsilon ̀ \mu \grave{\eta} \xi v \nu a \lambda \lambda \dot{a}^{\prime} \xi a \nu \tau a ́ \quad \pi \omega$,
IIIO


 ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma \tau \epsilon \tau o u ̀ \varsigma ~ a ̈ \gamma o \nu \tau a \varsigma ~ \omega ̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ о і к є ́ т а \varsigma ~$








rogo. Codd. Oiditiou. rog6. Codd. $\sigma$ ol $\delta \grave{\text { è }}$. rog9. Codd. ápa.
 1104. See Lection. 1107. Codd. $\sigma^{\prime}$ єïp $\mu \mu$. 1108. Codd.


## ӨЕРАП $\Omega$ ．


OI．${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma о \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ то̂̂ov $\grave{\eta}$ ßíov тíva；
ఆE．$\pi о i ́ \mu \nu a \iota s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau \tau a$ тô $\beta i ̂ o v ~ \xi v \nu \epsilon \iota \pi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．
OI．$\chi \omega^{\rho} \rho o \iota s ~ \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau i ́ \sigma \iota ~ \xi u ́ v a u \lambda o s ~ \grave{\omega} \nu$ ；



OI．тóv $\delta$ ’ òs $\pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \cdot \hat{\eta} \xi v \nu a \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \xi a s ~ \tau i ́ * \pi o v ; ~ I I 3 O$




ó $\mu$ è $\nu \delta \iota \pi \lambda o i ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \pi о \iota \mu \nu i ́ o \iota s ~ \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega ̀ ~ \delta ' ~ e ̀ v i ́, ~$



グ入avvov oîtós т＇$\epsilon i s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \Lambda a i ̂ o v ~ \sigma \tau a \theta \mu a ́ . ~$
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \tau \iota \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ท̀ oủ $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu ; ~ I I 40$






OI．$\hat{a}, \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa o ́ \lambda a \zeta \epsilon, \pi \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \beta v$ ，тóv $\delta^{\prime}, ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \epsilon \grave{\iota} \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \grave{\alpha}$

ЄE．тí $\delta^{\prime}$ ，$\omega$ фє́ $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi о \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, á $\mu a \rho \tau a ́ \nu \omega$ ；

ӨE．$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \epsilon i ̉ \partial \omega \varsigma ~ o u ̛ \delta \in ́ v, a ̀ \lambda \lambda ’ a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma ~ \pi o \nu \epsilon i ̂ . ~$







OI. ả $\lambda \lambda$ ’ єis тó $\delta^{\prime} \ddot{\eta} \xi \epsilon \iota \varsigma \mu \eta$ خ̀ $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega \nu \gamma \epsilon \tau о и ้ \nu \delta \iota \kappa о \nu$.
ЄE. $\pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu, \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \phi \rho a ́ \sigma \omega$, $\delta \iota o ́ \lambda \lambda v \mu a \iota$.

ӨE. ov̉ $\delta \hat{\eta} \tau^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \omega \gamma^{\prime}, a ̉ \lambda \lambda ’$ єîmov $\omega$ s $\delta o i ́ \eta \nu \pi a ́ \lambda a \iota$.
OI. $\pi o ́ \theta \varepsilon \nu ~ \lambda a \beta \omega \prime \nu ; ~ o i к \epsilon i o \nu, ~ \grave{\eta} ’ \xi$ ä $\lambda \lambda o v ~ \tau \iota \nu o ́ s ;$

OI. $\tau i \nu \rho \varsigma \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \pi о i a s ~ \sigma \tau \in ́ \gamma \eta \varsigma ;$


$\Theta \mathrm{E}$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ 人aîov тoívvע $\tau \iota \varsigma$ ท̂̀ $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.






OI. $\omega \varsigma \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau i ́ ~ \chi \rho \epsilon i a s ; ~ \Theta E . ~ \omega s ~ a ̀ \nu a \lambda \omega ́ \sigma a \imath \mu i ~ \nu \iota \nu . ~ I I 74 ~$
OI. $\tau \epsilon \kappa о \hat{v} \sigma a \tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$; ЄЕ. Өє $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \gamma^{\prime}$ oैк $\nu \omega \kappa \kappa \kappa \kappa \hat{\nu} \nu$.

OI. $\pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma \delta \tilde{\eta} \tau ’ \dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \Omega \tau \hat{\omega}$ rє́ $\rho о \nu \tau \iota \tau \hat{\iota} \delta \epsilon \sigma \dot{v} ;$




OI. iov̀ iov́ тà $\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau^{\prime}$ à̀ є̀ $\xi \mathfrak{\eta} \kappa о \iota \sigma a \phi \eta$.
$\hat{\omega}^{3} \phi \hat{\omega} s, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \tau a i ̂ o ́ \nu ~ \sigma \epsilon \pi \rho o \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \psi a \iota \mu \iota ~ \nu \hat{v} \nu$,



XO．ic̀ $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon a i$ ßрот $\hat{\nu}$ ， $\sigma \tau \rho . a^{\prime}$.
 тís $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ，тís à $\nu \grave{\rho} \rho$ т $\pi$ éov $\tau \hat{a} \varsigma ~ \epsilon u ̉ \delta a \iota \mu o \nu i ́ a s ~ \phi e ́ p \epsilon \iota ~$ クे тобои̂тор őбоע бокєî̀，
 ＊тò̀ $\sigma o ́ \nu$ тоє $\pi a \rho a ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu$ ’ ${ }^{\text {é }} \chi \omega \nu$ ， $\tau o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma o ̀ \nu ~ \delta a i ́ \mu o v a, ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma o ̀ \nu, ~ \hat{\omega} ~ \tau \lambda a ̂ \mu o \nu ~ O i ́ \delta ı \pi o ́ \delta a, ~$ $\beta \rho о \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
＊ov̉ठє̀̀ $\mu \alpha \kappa a \rho i \zeta \omega$.
ö $\tau \iota \varsigma \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta$ одà $\nu \quad \dot{a} \nu \tau . a^{\prime}$ ．

ऊ̂ $Z \epsilon \hat{v}$ ，катà $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \phi \theta i ́ \sigma a s$




 Өท่ßaıбıv ảvá $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ ．

тís äтаıбı à àpíaıs，тís à $\lambda \lambda a \gamma \hat{a}$ 1205
ßiov छ̀́vouкоs є̀v тóvoıs；

$\mathscr{S}_{\hat{S}} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \mu \eta े \nu \quad \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a s$
 $\pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma \pi о \tau \epsilon \pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma \pi o \theta^{\prime}$ ai $\pi a \tau \rho \hat{\omega} a i ́ \sigma^{\prime}$ ä̀окєs $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ ， $\tau \dot{\lambda} \lambda a \varsigma$,




1193．Codd．тò oóv．1196．Codd．oướva．izor．Codd．pl．
 Lection．1208．Codd． $\bar{\varphi} .12$ 10．Cf．Lect．

тєк $о$ о̂̀та каі̀ тєк $о и ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \nu$.
 $\epsilon^{*} \theta_{\epsilon}{ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \pi о т \epsilon^{*}$
$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi o \tau^{\prime} * \epsilon \hat{i} \delta o \nu \cdot$ ò $\delta \dot{v} \rho o \mu a \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho{ }^{*} \dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ íá $\lambda \epsilon \mu \circ \nu$ $\chi^{\epsilon} \omega \nu^{*}$
 $\epsilon \epsilon_{\epsilon} \kappa \sigma_{\epsilon} \theta_{\epsilon} \nu$


## Е引АГГЕИOさ．




$\tau \omega \nu \nu a \beta \delta a \kappa \epsilon i ́ \omega \nu$ є่ $\nu \tau \rho \epsilon ́ т \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \delta \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$.

 $\kappa \epsilon v^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota$ ，тà $\delta^{\prime}$ aúтiк＇єis тò $\phi \hat{\omega} s$ фалєî какà єєко́ขта кои้к ӓкоута．т $\hat{\omega} \nu$ ठѐ $\pi \eta \mu о \nu \omega \hat{\nu}$
$\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \quad \lambda \nu \pi o \hat{v} \sigma^{\prime} a i ̂ \phi a \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma^{\prime}$ av̀ $\theta a i \rho \in \tau o \iota$ ．
XO．$\lambda \epsilon i \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ ov̉ $\delta^{\prime}$ à $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu * \eta ้ \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ тò $\mu \eta े ~ o u ̛ ~$

E引．ó $\mu$ èv $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi \iota \sigma \tau o \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu \epsilon i \pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa a i ̀$



ä $\lambda \gamma \iota \sigma \tau^{\prime}$ ä $\pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu^{\cdot} \dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ oै $\psi \iota s$ ov̀ $\pi a ́ \rho a$ ．


${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega \varsigma \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ o $\rho \gamma \hat{\eta} \eta \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu \eta \pi a \rho \eta \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta^{\prime}$＂$\sigma \sigma \omega$


 1218．Codd．$\epsilon i \delta o ́ \mu a \nu . . . \dot{\omega} s \pi \epsilon \rho i a \lambda \lambda a l a \chi \neq \omega \nu$ ．1232．Codd．pl．$\eta_{\eta} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \in \nu$ ．
 $\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \eta ̋ \delta \emptyset \eta ~ \Lambda a ́ i o \nu ~ \pi a ́ \lambda а \iota ~ \nu є к \rho o ́ v, ~$
















 ồ $\delta \grave{\eta} \kappa \rho \epsilon \mu a \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \gamma v \nu a i ̂ \kappa$＇$\epsilon \sigma \epsilon i ́ \delta o \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，
 ő $\pi \omega \varsigma$ ó $\rho \hat{\imath}$ $\nu \iota \nu, \delta \epsilon \iota \nu a ̀ ~ \beta \rho v \chi \eta \theta \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \tau \alpha ́ \lambda a \varsigma$,









 1257．Codd．кiхoı．1264．Cf．Lect．127r．Cf．Lect．




 à $\lambda$ ’ $\dot{a} \nu \delta \rho i ̀ ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \gamma \nu \nu а \iota \kappa i ̀ ~ \sigma \nu \mu \mu \iota \gamma \hat{\eta} \kappa а \kappa \alpha ́ . ~$





Eヨ．$\beta$ oâ $\delta \iota o i ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \lambda \hat{\imath} \theta \rho a \kappa \alpha i ̀ \delta \eta \lambda o v ิ \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu a$







סьoí $\epsilon \tau a \iota \cdot$ Ө́́a $\mu a \delta^{\prime}$ єiбó廿єє тá $\chi a$

XO．$\omega^{\delta} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ̀ \nu ~ i \delta \epsilon \epsilon i \nu ~ \pi a ́ \theta o s ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o \iota s, ~$

$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon ́ \kappa v \rho \sigma^{\prime} \not ้ \delta \eta$ ．тís $\sigma$ ， $\boldsymbol{w}^{\tau} \tau \hat{\eta} \mu o \nu$ ， $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon ́ \beta \eta$ ца⿱亠䒑ia；тís ó $\pi \eta \delta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma$ s
$\mu \epsilon i \zeta о \nu a \delta a i \mu \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu a \kappa i \sigma \tau \omega \nu$

$\phi \epsilon \hat{v} \phi \in \hat{v}, \delta \dot{v} \sigma \tau a \nu$＇．

$\pi o ́ \lambda \lambda ’ \dot{a} \nu \epsilon \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota, \pi o \lambda \lambda a ̀ \pi v \theta \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$,
$\pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \theta \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota^{\circ}$
тоі́ау фрі́кך тарє́ $\chi \in \iota \varsigma$ моь．
1279．Cf．Lect． 1280 ．Codd．какd́．t286．Codd．év tiv．

## , $\Sigma$ OФOK

OI. aiaî aiâ̂.
$\phi \epsilon \hat{v} \phi \epsilon \hat{v}$ dv́ $\sigma \tau a \nu o s$ є่ $\gamma \omega$, $\pi o \hat{\imath} \gamma \hat{a} s$


* $\delta \iota a \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ фора́ס $\eta \nu$;

1310


OI. iఉ $\sigma \kappa о ́ т о v$
 á $\delta a ́ \mu a \tau o ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \delta v \sigma o u ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \nu ~ * o ̉ \nu . ~$
ой $\mu о \iota$,

$\kappa \in ́ \nu \tau \rho \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta ’$ ої $\sigma \tau \rho \eta \mu a \kappa a i ̀ \mu \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \eta$ как $\omega \nu$.
 $\delta_{\iota} \pi \lambda \hat{a} \sigma \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \kappa a \grave{\imath} \delta_{\iota} \pi \lambda \hat{a}$ * $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \alpha ́$. 1320
OI. ic̀ фídos, $a^{\prime} \nu \tau . a^{\prime}$.

viто $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \tau v \phi \lambda o ̀ \nu \kappa \eta \delta \epsilon v ́ \omega \nu$.
$\phi \epsilon \hat{v} \phi \epsilon \hat{v}$.
 I 325
$\kappa а i ́ \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \sigma \kappa о \tau \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s, \tau \eta \prime \nu \gamma \epsilon \sigma \eta ̀ \nu$ aủ $\delta \grave{\eta} \nu$ ö $\mu \omega \varsigma$.




 $\tau i ́ \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ é $\delta \epsilon \iota \mu$ ’ ó $\rho \hat{a} \nu$,


OI. $\tau i ́ \delta \eta \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \in \mu o \grave{\iota} \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ \nu, \dot{\eta}$ $\sigma \tau \rho . \gamma^{\prime}$.


 Codd. форєì.

## OIDIПOYミ TYPANNOE.


I 340

тòv катарато́татоу, ёть סє̀ каі̀ $\theta \in o i ̂ s$
є̀ $\chi \theta \rho о ́ т а т о \nu ~ \beta \rho о т \hat{\nu \nu . ~}$
XO. $\delta \epsilon i ́ \lambda a \iota \epsilon \tau o \hat{v} \nu o \hat{v} \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \tau \epsilon \sigma v \mu \phi o \rho \hat{a} \varsigma$ i' $\sigma o \nu$,



 то́тє $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\alpha} \nu \quad \theta a \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$

XO. Ө́́ ${ }^{\prime}$
OI. ov̉k oû̀ тatoós $\gamma$ 'à $\begin{aligned} & \text { фovev̀s }\end{aligned}$ ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{2} \tau . \gamma^{\prime}$.

 $\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta^{\prime} * a ̉ \theta \epsilon o s ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu ~ \epsilon i \mu ’, ~ a ̀ \nu o \sigma i ́ \omega \nu ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi a i ̂ s, ~ I 360$
 $\epsilon i$ б́є т८ $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta$ र́тє $\rho о \nu$ ёть какой како́ข, 1365 тои̂т’ è̉ $\lambda a \chi$ ’ Oioímous.




 $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a \pi o \tau ’$ à̀ $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon i ̂ \delta o \nu ~ \epsilon i \varsigma ~ " A \iota \delta o v \mu o \lambda \omega \prime \nu$,


 $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \sigma^{\prime}$ ö $\pi \omega \varsigma \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \epsilon, \pi \rho о \sigma \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ є่ $\mu о i ́$. oủ $\delta \bar{\eta} \tau a$ тoîs $\gamma$ ' є́ $\mu o i ̂ \sigma \iota \nu ~ o ̉ \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i ̂ s ~ \pi о т \epsilon . ~ . ~$

 1360 . Codd. atidios.

## ミOФOKムEOণミ

 à $\gamma a ́ \lambda \mu a \theta^{\prime} \quad i \epsilon \rho a ́, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ó $\pi a \nu \tau \lambda \eta^{\prime} \mu \omega \nu$ є่ $\gamma \omega$＇




 ò $\rho \theta o i ̂ s ~ \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \mu \in \lambda \lambda о \nu$ ő $\mu \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$ тои́тоvs ó $\rho \hat{a} \nu$ ；




 i $\omega \mathrm{K} \iota \theta a \iota \rho \omega ́ \nu$ ，тí $\mu$ ’ є́ $\delta \in \epsilon ́ \chi o v$ ；тí $\mu$ ’ où $\lambda a \beta \omega ̀ \nu$


 $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \pi a \lambda a \iota a ̀$ $\delta \omega^{\prime} \mu a \theta$ ，oîov $\hat{a} \rho a ́ a \epsilon$
$\kappa a ́ \lambda \lambda o s ~ \kappa а \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ ひ́тоu入ov $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \in \theta \rho \epsilon ́ \psi a \tau \epsilon$ ．






 є́фv́ $\sigma \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \varsigma$ ，каì фvтєv́ $\sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon i ̂ \tau \epsilon \tau а \nu ̉ \tau \grave{\tau} \nu \quad \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu a, \kappa \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon i \xi a \tau \epsilon$
$\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a s, \dot{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o v ́ s, \pi a i ̂ \delta a s, a i ̂ \mu ’ \dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi v^{\lambda} \iota o \nu$, $\nu v ́ \mu \phi а \varsigma, ~ \gamma v \nu a i ̂ \kappa a s, \mu \eta \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a s ~ \tau \epsilon, \chi \omega ं \pi о ́ \sigma a$

 1383．Cf．Lect．1401．Codd．örı．


 ${ }^{\prime}(\tau), ~ a ́ \xi \iota \omega \prime \sigma a \tau ’ a ̉ \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \theta \lambda i ́ o v ~ \theta \iota \gamma \epsilon i \nu$. * $\pi i \theta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon, \mu \grave{\eta} \delta \epsilon i \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$. т $\dot{a} \mu \grave{a} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha \kappa \grave{a}$





 $\pi a ́ \rho o s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a u ̛ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a ́ v \tau ’ ~ \epsilon ́ \phi є u ́ \rho \eta \mu a \iota ~ к а к о ́ s . ~$







 тoîs є̣̀ $\gamma \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau \dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \theta$ ' ópâ $\nu$




KP. каì то̂ $\mu \in \chi \rho \epsilon i a s \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon \quad \lambda \iota \pi a \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \varsigma \tau v \chi \epsilon i ̂ \nu ;$




 1440
 1414. Codd. $\pi \epsilon \in \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$.
K. OE.

KP．oüт $\omega \varsigma$ є̀ $\lambda \in ́ \chi \theta \eta \tau a \hat{v} \theta$＇＂$\mu \omega \varsigma \delta^{\prime}$＇ $\bar{\nu}$ ’ ধ̀ $\sigma \tau a \mu \epsilon \nu$



OI．каì боí $\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \kappa \eta \prime \pi \tau \omega ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к а і ~ \pi \rho о \sigma \tau \rho є ́ \psi о \mu a \iota, ~$
 $\theta o \hat{v}$ ．каì $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \dot{\partial} \rho \theta \hat{\omega} \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \epsilon \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \varsigma ~ \ddot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$ ． є́ $\mu \circ \hat{v}$ ठє̀ $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi о \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \xi \iota \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$ тó $\delta \epsilon$





каїто८ тобоиิтóv $\gamma^{\prime}$ oî $\delta a, \mu \eta ं \tau \epsilon \mu$ ’à̀ עóбov 1455






таî̀ $\delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \theta \lambda i ́ a \iota \nu ~ o i к \tau р а i ̂ ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \pi a \rho \theta \epsilon ́ \nu o \iota \nu ~ \epsilon ́ \mu a i ̂ \nu, ~$



таî̀ $\mu о \iota ~ \mu e ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ к а \grave{\iota} \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \chi є \rho o i ̂ \nu ~$ $\psi a \hat{v} \sigma a i ́ ~ \mu ’ ~ ’ ’ a \sigma o \nu, ~ \kappa \alpha ̇ \pi о к \lambda а v ́ \sigma а \sigma \theta a \iota ~ к а к а ́ . ~$ ＇${ }^{\prime} \theta$ ’ ${ }^{\prime} \nu a \xi$ ，

 тi $\phi \eta \mu i$ ；
 סакрирроои́ขтоьу，каі́ $\mu$ ’ є̇тоьктєípas K ${ }^{\prime}$ é $\omega \nu$
$\mathbf{1}^{4+5}$ ．Cod．L．$\tau^{\prime}$ äv．Cf．Lect．${ }^{1446}$ ．Cf．Lect．$\quad$ r 466 ．Codd．pl．aiv．

$\lambda$＇́ $\gamma \omega \tau \iota$ ；





 aî тô̂ фvтovpyô $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ v i \mu i ̀ \nu ~ \grave{\omega} \delta$＇ó $\hat{\alpha} \nu$




 oîov $\beta \iota \omega ิ \nu a \iota \sigma \phi \omega ̀ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu \chi \rho \epsilon \omega \nu$. тоías $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \ddot{\eta} \xi \in \tau ’$ єis ó $\mu \iota \lambda i ́ a s ;$

$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ o i ̂ \kappa o \nu ~ ' ‘ ~ ' ~ \xi ~ \epsilon \sigma \theta ’ ~ a ̀ \nu \tau i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma ~ \theta \epsilon \omega \rho i ́ a s ; ~ ;$
 тís oن̉тоя єै $\sigma \tau a \iota$ ，тís тараррí廿є८，тє́кขа，
 रovaî $\iota \iota$＊$\notin \epsilon \tau \tau a \iota ~ \sigma \phi \hat{\iota} \nu \quad \theta^{\prime}$ ó $\mu o \hat{v}$ ठ $\eta \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu a \tau a$ ；
$\tau i ́ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \kappa а \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ ；тò̀ татє́ $\rho a \operatorname{\pi a\tau \grave {\eta }\rho }$






 $\tau а u ́ \tau a \iota \nu ~ \lambda e ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi a \iota, \nu \grave{\omega}$ خáp，$\ddot{\omega}^{\prime} \phi v \tau \epsilon v ́ \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，
ò $\bar{\omega} \lambda a \mu \epsilon \nu \delta u ̈$ ő $\nu \tau \epsilon, \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \phi \epsilon * \pi \epsilon \rho \iota i ̈ \partial \eta \rho$,
${ }^{1}+94-5$ ．Codd．$\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ \epsilon \mu \mu i ̂ s ~ \mid ~ \gamma o v \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \nu . ~ I 505 . ~ C o d d . ~ \pi a \rho i \delta ŋ \eta s . ~$

## 52 ミOФOKムEO؟ミ OIDIПO؟ミ TイPANNOミ．












 $\kappa \lambda v ́ \omega \nu$.
OI．$\gamma \hat{\eta} \varsigma \mu^{\prime}$ öт $\pi \omega \varsigma \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ äтоькоу．KP．то̂̀ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \mu$ ’

 тá $a$.
 $\mu a ́ \tau \eta \nu$.

1520
 $\delta^{\prime}$ à $\phi o \hat{u}$.
OI．$\mu \eta \delta a \mu \omega ิ \varsigma \tau a u ́ \tau a \varsigma ~ \gamma ’ e ̂ \lambda \eta ~ \mu o v . ~ K P . ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau a ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \beta o u ́ \lambda o v ~$ $\kappa \rho а т \epsilon i ̂ \nu$.








 Codd．$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \in \nu \eta \nu$ ． 1529 ．Codd．$\mu \eta \bar{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu^{\prime}$ ．Cf．Comm．

## LECTION.

[The list of Editors and Commentators cited, with their Sigla, will be seen on p. 70. For the Codices see Preface.]
II. Cod. L. $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$; m. pr. sed rec. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$; Cod. A. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in-$ $\xi$ §ares; On this and the next lines see Excursus II.
13. Cod. L. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov̀ A. B. $\mu \eta^{\prime}$, which Schn. adopts, wrongly.
18. i $i \in \rho \bar{\eta} s \mathrm{Br}$. Codd. $i \in \rho \epsilon \bar{i} s$, but most edd. prefer the Attic plural. -oi $\delta \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \eta^{\prime} \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \omega \nu$. So most edd. Cod. L. oi $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \eta^{\prime} \iota \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \omega \nu$, which has led Di. to edit oi $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon^{\prime} \omega \nu \mid \lambda_{\epsilon \kappa \tau о i}$.
43. Cod. L. rov m. pr. $\pi$ rov rec. A. with most codd. $\pi o v . ~ S o$ edd. generally. On vv. 41-45 see Exc. III.
49. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \omega^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ codd. and Di. Wu. Wo. Bl. Wh. Ca. J. But Eustathius, H. Erf. Do. Li. Schn. read opt. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \omega_{\rho} \mu \epsilon \theta a$. R. Vh. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \theta a$.
72. Codd. $\rho v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$, with many edd., H. Wu. Wo. R. Wh. Bl. Ca. J. But Di. Li. Vh. N. ṕvoó $\mu \eta \nu$ rightly. See Exc. IV.
105. Codd. $\gamma \epsilon \pi \omega$. And so most edd. But with Di. Ht. Vh. I read $\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \omega^{\prime}$. Bl. $\gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi o v$. The passages cited by J. do not show that $\pi \omega$ was used in tragedy for $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon$, referring to bygone time: and the pronoun here has a tragically ironical power.
107. tivas. The weight of evidence and internal probability strongly favour this reading rather than $\tau i \nu a$.

155-6. á̧ó $\mu \in \nu \varsigma^{*} . . . . . \chi \rho$ є́os. On the punctuation of this strophe, see Exc. v.
159. It seems probable that the words $\theta$ v́ $\gamma a \tau \epsilon \rho \Delta{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \beta \rho o \tau^{\prime}$ are corrupt (see 187) and that Soph. wrote $\Delta i o ̀ s ~ ধ ̈ к \gamma о \nu \epsilon, ~ \Pi a \lambda \lambda a ́ s . ~ C p . ~$ O.C. Iogo, and see Commentary.

I71. Codd. $\hat{\varphi}$. I have edited $\tau \hat{\varphi}$, for the sake of metre. Many cases of the article $\delta$ beginning with $\tau$ are used by Soph. as rela-
 aip $\eta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \iota \nu$ ठокш.
173. Codd. то́коьбı $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. I edit тєкойбаи, believing that what Soph. wrote was superseded by the 'assimilating craze' which fetched то́коьт from 26 to spoil this place, where the sense differs. In 26 it is said that babes are still-born ; here, that mothers do not recover after labour.
179. Codd. $\nu \eta \lambda \epsilon ́ a$. For this epithet I have now edited $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho a ́$, which has every consideration in its favour. The presence of $\nu \eta \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} a$ together with àvoikr $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ s must be displeasing to every critic of good taste and judgment: though it cannot be doubted that the presence of àvoikт being the tendency in the dark times of learning, as countless examples prove. It is also possible that such a corrector, not understanding the sense of $\theta a v a \tau a ́ \phi o \rho a$, might suppose $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho a ̀$ superfluous. But, in respect of sense, $\nu \in \kappa \rho a ̀$ is clearly wanted; $\nu \in \kappa \rho \grave{a}$ $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \in \theta \lambda a=\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho o i ́$, corpses. Metre seconds the indications of good sense and good taste. N $\epsilon \kappa \rho a ̀$ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \theta \lambda a$ corresponds exactly with the strophic $\pi \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a, \nu o \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \delta \epsilon$. The scansion had hitherto been taken to exhibit $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \bar{\epsilon} \theta \lambda a ̆$, a tribrach answering to $-\sigma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \delta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$, a trochee.
 O.C. 972, though it is true that the fem. subst. $\gamma \in \nu \nu^{\prime} \theta \lambda \eta$ occurs twice in El. $(129,226)$ with the middle syllable short, where the rhythm is anapaestic. But, as $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho a ̀$ ó $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \varphi \bar{\epsilon} \bar{\epsilon} \theta \lambda a$ avoids that concurrence of
 this fact, added to that of exact correspondence, very powerfully strengthens the argument for $\nu \in \kappa \rho a ́$.

181-185. Here $\grave{\alpha} \kappa \pi a ́ v$, the reading of codd., recurs in a dubious sense, having been used in its ordinary sense three lines before, 178. This indicates that a corrupting hand has been at work: and the failure of metrical agreement between $\kappa \lambda \nu \tau a \hat{s}$ (171) and ảkтáv (182), strengthens that opinion. J. reads $\pi$ aןà $\beta \omega \omega^{\mu} \mu \nu$ with a few inferior codd. But L. A. \&c. (the most and best) read $\pi a \rho a \beta \omega^{\prime} \mu o \nu$. But how then is the accus. constructed? ${ }^{\prime} A \lambda \lambda o \theta \epsilon \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda a \iota$ does not mean (as J. makes it) 'some here, some there', but 'from various quarters': i.e. they come crowding from all sides to some favourite altar. And they come as suppliants (ikє $\boldsymbol{\eta} \tilde{\eta} \rho s$ ). Do such suppliants then come to an altar and do nothing but groan there ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \dot{a}-$ $\chi^{\text {oval }}$ ? S Such is not the procedure in the opening of this play. Those suppliants symbolize their prayer by a kind of sacramental $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi о \rho a i$, iкєтךрial, $\sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon \phi \eta$, wool-wreathed rods to be laid on the altar as propitiatory offerings. Again, if the verb with which this place is wound up denotes a choir of women groaning around an altar, how improper, how absurd is the further mention of the $\sigma \tau 0$ $\nu \dot{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \sigma a$ र $\eta \hat{\eta}$ us in the next verse! This train of thought had long caused me to regard the passage as corrupt, but I had failed (till
within a few days before that on which I write) to find the remedy. I have now strong hope that it is at last found. For $\dot{a} \kappa \tau a ̀ \nu$ I read
 translating the three lines thus: 'meanwhile ( $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\epsilon}$ ' ) young wives (ä入oxoı) and grey-haired mothers with them ( $\left.\pi \circ \lambda \iota a i \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \pi \iota \mu \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon s\right)$ from various sides (ả $\lambda \lambda o \theta \epsilon \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda a \iota)$ fill with wreathed rods ( $\bar{\pi} \pi / \sigma \tau \epsilon-$
 for their doleful troubles ( $\lambda \nu \gamma \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ пóv $\omega \nu$ iк $\epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$ ). Compare the opening of the play, and observe that $\pi a a a ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к а і ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu а \gamma \mu a ́ t \omega \nu ~$ there follows the mention of the suppliant seat and the wreaths, just as $\pi a \iota a ̀ \nu$ and $\sigma \tau o v o ́ \epsilon \sigma \sigma a$ री̃pus do here, if my reading is adopted. The corrupter, I think, was led by $\boldsymbol{\sigma \tau o \nu o ́ \epsilon \sigma \sigma a}$ to write $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau o v a \chi o v َ \sigma \iota$.
185. iкє $\bar{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$ cod. A., and so Di. Schm. Most codd. and edd.

187. For $\hat{\omega} \nu \tilde{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho$ I read $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tilde{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$, metri causa.
191. àvтáá $\omega_{\nu \nu}$. H. conjectured àv átá $\zeta \omega$, which may be true, but does not seem certain.
194. Codd. $\epsilon \pi \pi o v \rho o \nu$ or änovpov. The antistrophic word is 'A $\rho$ $\tau \epsilon ́ \mu \kappa \delta o s$, and the sentence beginning "A $\rho \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$ wants a verb to construct it. These defects are remedied by reading $\mathfrak{e} \xi \in \dot{\prime} \rho \iota \sigma o \nu$, which


198-9. Codd. $\tau \in \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \iota . . . . .{ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$. On the readings adopted to remedy corruption here, $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $\tau \in \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota$, and $\epsilon \tilde{v}^{\prime} \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$ for $\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$, see Comm. That good sense, good grammar, and metrical advantage are thereby gained, seems unquestionable.
200. $\tau \hat{v} \nu$. H. thus supplied the defect of a syllable, and most edd. receive it. But Wu. Wo. N. Schm. Bl. Ca. leave the gap unfilled.
206. I cannot believe that Soph. would within a few lines have applied the same epithet $\pi v \rho \phi \rho_{\rho} \rho o s$ to the lightnings of $Z \epsilon \dot{v} s$ and the moonlight of Artemis. Therefore I regard $\pi v \rho \phi$ ópous here as spurious; but who shall say what the poet wrote? Панфаєis for the full moon would be very suitable, but it might be $\pi$ avvúxovs.
214. A word with the quantity -- is wanting. Wo. suggests $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu a \chi o \nu$, which J. receives with myself.
221. Cod. L. aùró, and so Di. Be. Vh. R. Schm. Bl. Ca. But Cod. A. aùrós, which most editors adopt, including Wh. J.
 Bl. Heims. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \epsilon i \nu$, J. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ aù $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\prime} \nu$. I find no ground for change. See Comm.
229. Cod. L. à $\sigma \phi a \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} s:$ and so Be. Wo. Schn. N. R. Vh. Wh.
 Li. Ht. Di. Bl. J.
240. $\chi^{\epsilon} \rho \nu \imath \beta a s$. So L. with most codd. and edd. One cod. $\chi^{\prime} \rho \nu i \beta o s$, adopted by Be. Vh. R. Wh. Ca. J.
248. Codd. ä aоo $\rho o \nu . \quad$ Pors. wrote ä $\mu$ ooo rightly.
258. Codd. $\kappa v \rho \hat{\omega} \tau^{\prime}$. But Erf. Di. Vh. Schm. Wh. кvрڤ̂ $\gamma^{\prime}$.
270. Codd. $\gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$, except two Ven. (see J.) which have $\gamma \boldsymbol{\eta} s$, formerly conjectured by Vauvillers, and generally adopted.
293. Codd. rò̀ $\delta^{\circ}$ ' ióóvt'. An anonymous conjecture is tò̀ $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ $\delta \rho \hat{\nu} \nu \tau^{\prime}$, received by Di. N. Vh. Heims. Bl.
294. Most codd. סєíparós $\tau^{\prime}$, which has no sense. $\delta \in i \mu a \pi o ́ s ~ \gamma ’$ (which J. discerns in Cod. L.) is generally edited. But Ht. R. Vh. Schm. Wh. Ca. $\delta є \not \epsilon a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.
305. єi kai codd. and most edd. But Di. Wu. Ht. N. єì тı.
308. Codd. $\epsilon \hat{v}$, and so most edd. But Mein. Di. N. $\eta^{\prime \prime}$.
 generally preferred as the more elegant. But Elms. Wu. N. aóvos.
317. The best codd. have $\lambda \dot{v} \eta$, but some $\lambda \hat{v} \epsilon$. Most edd. $\lambda \dot{v} \eta$. But H. Li. R. Schm. $\lambda \dot{v} \epsilon$.
322. Codd. in this line show great confusion of ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ evooua or ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \nu o \mu o \nu, \pi \rho o \sigma \phi i \lambda \hat{\eta}$ or $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi i \lambda \lambda^{\prime} s$. But there seems no doubt that the two plural forms are right. So Di. Wu. Wo. N. Ca. J. Wh. and other editors.

328-9. On the interpretation of this purposely dark passage see Exc. vi.
 by edd.
337. $\sigma \grave{\eta} \nu$ most codd. One or two $\sigma o i ́$, received by Di.

35 I . Codd. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon i \pi a s$. The correction of Br., $\pi \rho o \epsilon i \pi a s$, is universally adopted.
355. $\pi o \hat{v}$, as more suitable to the menacing mood of Oed., is preferred by Pors. Elms. Bo. Ebn. Be. Wo. R. Schn. N. Ca. J. Wh. The ironical enclitic $\pi o v$ has the support of Br. Erf. H. Wu. Li. Di. Vh. Ht.
360. Codd. $\hat{\eta}$ ' $k \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ̣ ̂ ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu$; See Comm. Cod. L. has o over the first $\epsilon$ of $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, showing an idea of emending. Br. Wo. read $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$. Heath, Bo. Ht. R. J. $\lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \omega \nu$. Ca. Wh. $\lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$. N. Vh. are dubious. The ms. reading is kept by Elms. Erf. Schäf. H. Li. Di. Be. Wu.
 є̇клєєра́тодаи.
361. Codd. $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau$ óv. So Wu. Li. Wo. Ht. R. Schn. Be. Ca. J. Wh. But Elms. Do. H. Di. Vh. Bl. N. Schm. $\gamma$ votóó.
376. Codd. corruptly read $\mu \epsilon \ldots \gamma \epsilon \sigma o v ̂$. Br. restored $\sigma \epsilon \ldots \gamma$ ' $\epsilon \mu o \hat{v}$.
405. Codd. oioíitov. But Elms. Reis. Di. Ht. N. Vh. R. Oỉí$\pi o v s$, which they hold to be the only vocative form.
434. Codd. $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma^{\prime}$. But Suidas $\sigma_{\chi}{ }^{0} \lambda \hat{\eta} \gamma$, followed by Pors. Erf. H. Li. Vh. Bl. placing $\sigma$ ' after ${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{mov} s$. The choice is doubtful.
435. Codd. $\mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu$ $\sigma o i$. . I have edited $\sigma o \grave{~} \mu \grave{\iota} \nu$ with Elms. Schäf. See Comm.
445. Cod. L. has $\sigma v \gamma^{\prime}$, but $\sigma v ́$ over an erasure, and also by a different hand in the margin. This proves that another word was in that MS. before $\sigma v$, , and it is shown that the earlier word was $\tau \dot{\alpha}$, by the fact that $\Gamma$, the best copy of L , has $\tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime}$, with $\sigma \grave{v}$ above $\tau \dot{\alpha}$, thus supplying proof that $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ was the word erased in L. Also Par.
 of being, what J. strangely calls it, 'a weak conjecture', is in truth a reading with earlier authority than $\sigma v v^{\prime}$. It is edited by Br. H. Schäf. I cannot however adopt it; but, deeming it a corruption of $\tau \epsilon \mu^{\prime}$, I have written this, which brings in the idiomatic antithesis $\pi a \rho \omega \dot{\nu} \tau \epsilon \ldots \sigma v \theta \epsilon i s \tau \epsilon$, and supplies the pronoun object $\mu \epsilon$, thus improving the passage greatly. As to the scorn (J.), or indignation (H.), supposed to be conveyed by $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma \epsilon$, at rogo $\sigma \epsilon \in \epsilon$ appears in a context of strong eulogy. I assume that the recurring letters TEMEM confused a scribe, and engendered corruption.
458. Codd. aùrós, and so Erf. Elms. H. Li. H. Ca. Wh. But Schäf. Di. Ht. Wu. Wo. Be. N. R. Vh. Schm. J. autuós. See Comm. 46 r . Codd. differ as to the retention of $\mu^{\prime}$ after $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \beta_{\eta} \eta$. Erf. Schäf. H. L. keep it ; but most edd. omit it with cod. L. See Comm.
464. That the words $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \in \rho \rho a$ are corrupt appears from several facts: (I) J. testifies that $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon$, not $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$, was the older reading in L. This is confirmed by r , which has cioit pr . m., with the correction $\pi \epsilon$ above it. (2) A scholiast explains thus-- $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ is $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ oûtos $\hat{\circ} \nu$


 conclude ( I ) from the absurdity involved in the notion of a rock 'inspired to speak', (2) from the ugly hiatus $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \rho a \mid$ "' $\rho \rho \eta \tau^{\prime}$, (3) from
noting that the corrupter was misguided by the mention of Parnassus in the antistrophe, and by the expression of Euripides,
 $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s$ sufficiently describes the Pythian priestess. Sophocles may have written $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ or $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$, or some more significant word. The construction is complete without the lost word, 'who is the unknown one, whom the inspired Delphian maid discerned to have wrought deeds, \&oc.' See Comm.
466. Codd. $\dot{a} \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \pi o ́ \delta o \nu \nu$. Hesychius $\dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \lambda \lambda a ́ o \delta \omega \nu$, which edd. adopt.
 show the true reading àvaпда́кптo.
478. Cod. L. $\pi \epsilon \tau \rho a$.. s o o tav̂pos, whence H. Wo. Schn. Wh. Vh. $\pi \epsilon \tau \rho a i ̂ o s ~ o ̀ ~ \tau a v ̂ \rho o s . ~ W o . ~ L i . ~ C a . ~ \pi e ́ \tau p a s ~ \omega ̀ s ~ \tau a v ̂ p o s . ~ D o r v i l l e ~ c o n j e c-~$ tured $\pi \epsilon ́ \tau \rho a s$ ärє $\tau a v ̂ \rho o s$, received by Di. Wu. Ht. N. Bl. $\pi \epsilon ́ \tau \rho a s$ íóravpos, conjectured by Martin, also (as J. says) by E. L. Lushington, and favourably mentioned by Di. in his Leipzig ed., is received by J.
483. Codd. and most edd. $\mu \in \grave{\nu} \nu$ oủv. N. $\mu \epsilon$ עồv. Be. Vh. $\mu \epsilon$ $\nu \hat{v} \nu$, which seems best suited to the place : terribly doth the seer now disturb me, who can neither assent nor deny.
 four syllables than the antistrophe : either $-\cdots$ - is wanted before the word $\beta a \sigma a ́ v \varphi$, or . - - after it. Schneider conjectured及agavevív $\beta$ aráv $\varphi$, which J. takes in the more classical form $\beta a$ $\sigma a v i \xi \omega \nu$. This last word seems probable, but not in connection with $\beta a \sigma a ́ v \varphi$, which occurs in a later verse, and was probably transferred to this place by an assimilating corrector. I have therefore ventured to replace it with $\pi \imath \theta a \nu \hat{\omega} s$, which I connect with $\epsilon i \mu \mathrm{l}$ in the next verse.

5 1o. The suggestion of Vh., to introduce $\rho$ ' for $\dot{\rho} a$ after $\tau \hat{\varphi}$, avoids an unpleasant hiatus.
516. Cod. L. has $\pi \rho o o_{s} \tau^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu o v$ over an erasure; and J., with most edd., assumes that $\pi \rho^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \notin \mu o \hat{\imath}$ was the true reading. Ht. and Di. read $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \tau_{i}^{\prime} \mu \rho v$, considering that the part. $\phi \hat{\rho} \rho o \nu$ in 517 cannot $\operatorname{stan}$ as it does without $\tau \iota$. I share that opinion, but I dislike their remedy. Hence I venture to read in $517{ }^{\prime} \rho \gamma \not \rho \sigma \sigma i \tau \iota \beta \lambda a ́ \beta \eta \nu$
 the latter verb twice in the next lines. See Comm. "Exov is as
good Greek as $\phi \hat{\rho} \rho o \nu$, but I now keep $\phi \hat{\rho} \rho o \nu$, and for $\phi \in ́ \rho o \nu \tau \iota$ in 519 I read фooov̀va (carrying about with me), a word more suitable to the place. The instances cited by J. in defence of $\phi$ ¢ $\rho o \nu$ without $\tau \iota$ are unavailing for that purpose. See Preface.
 $\delta^{\prime}$, which Br. Li. Ht. edit. Many editors have taken $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ f r o m ~$ L., among them Schn. R. Wh. Ca. J. The latter calls it 'veram lectionem'; but in my Comm. it is shown to be 'falsissima'. This is confirmed by the two best copies of L., $\Gamma$ and $\mathrm{L}^{2}$, which correct
 'originated', as J. thought, but was published, was spread abroad, as $\phi a \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$ with $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{v u} \pi \pi o s$ in 848 . Creon says: 'the language used (by Oed.) was commonly reported to be, that the seer induced by me spake falsely'. The Chorus reply : 'such words were used, but I know not on what foundation'. See $608, \gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \eta$ à $\delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega$.
537. Codd. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu o i$. Reis. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \mu o t$, and so H. and most edd., but Wo. Ca. Wh. keep $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \notin \mu o i$.
538. Codd. (indocti omnes) $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \sigma o \mu$, and so most edd. Li. Wo. R. Ca. Wh. al., unwisely. Elms. Di. Wu. N. Bl. Vh. J. restore the Attic form $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota o i \mu$.
539. Codd. кoviк. Spengel conjectured $\hat{\eta}$ ov̀к, and is followed by Di. N. Bl. Wo. J. But Li. R. Ca. Wh. al. retain кoùk.
541. Codd. $\pi \lambda \dot{j} \theta_{o v s}$. Heims. conjectures $\pi \lambda o u ́ \tau o v$, which I edit, as a great, and (Blaydes says) necessary improvement. See Comm. N. and Vh. adopt it ; but most edd., as Li. R. Wo. Ca. J. Wh., keep $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{o v s}$, the fruit, as I believe, of assimilating fancy.
570. Cod. L. тò $\sigma \grave{\partial} \nu \delta \epsilon ́ \gamma^{\prime}$ oív $\theta a$. A manifest blunder, though Br. Ht. Di. Schm. R. N. receive it. Some, H. Li. Wu. Wo. Be.
 so Erf. Bl. Ca. Wh. J.
 there is little doubt that aùvoî $\sigma \pi \hat{\pi} \nu$, favoured by the valuable copies $\Gamma$ and $\mathrm{L}^{2}$, is the true reading. So H. Ht. Be. Vh. Bl. Ca. J. Wh.
624. With Mein. I add $\gamma^{\prime}$ to $\pi \rho o \delta \in i \xi \eta$ ys, and for $\tau \grave{o} \phi \theta o v \epsilon i v$ I have edited the simple and highly probable conjecture $\tau \dot{a} \phi \rho o v e i v$, thus averting the dilaceration which Li . and J . adopt in the lines 623-6. See Exc. vir. and Comm.
637. All codd. but one have $K \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$. But the Voc. form K $\rho$ '́ $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is read by many edd., whom J. follows.
640. J. reads סvoîv סıkaıồ סpâv. See Comm.
644. N $\hat{\nu} \nu$ is read by Erf. H. Schaef. Neue, Li. Ht. Schn. N. Wo. Ell. See Ellendt's Lex. Soph. pvy by Di. Be. Wu. Vh. Schm. Ca. J. Wh. The same discrepancy recurs in 658 . See Comm.
657. Cod. L. $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu$ ä $\tau \mu \mu o \nu$ with $\gamma \omega$ over $\gamma o \nu$. Most copies have $\lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omega$, some $\lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omega \nu$. H. inserted $\sigma$ after $\lambda \dot{o} \gamma \varphi$, and this is generally received; but Ca. keeps the hiatus.
667. Cod. L. каì тád $\epsilon$ i. H. threw out кaí, and I have read $\tau \grave{a}$ $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon i$ for $\tau a ́{ }^{\circ} \epsilon i$.
689. The $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ is perhaps wanted to follow $\mu$ é $\nu$, but at all events a comma should stand after ${ }_{\imath} \sigma \theta \theta \iota \delta \hat{\delta}$, for the infin. $\pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta a \iota$ cannot depend on ${ }^{\imath} \sigma \theta \iota$, but on $\epsilon i$ inov.
 ham, $\epsilon^{\ell l} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \nu 0 \sigma \phi \iota \zeta \zeta^{\prime} \mu a \nu$, is justly received by Di. N. J.
 emendation of Do., aadeúovaà follows in 695, as Heims. Di. N. Schm., with myself, wish. See Conim.

696-7. Codd. here give $\tau a v \hat{\nu} \nu \tau^{\prime}$ єữoutos $\epsilon i$ §ivalo $\gamma \in \nu o \hat{v}$. Any sound critic examining this corrupt place will at once set down the word dívau or סívauo as belonging to an intrusive gloss. The sense evidently required by the context is: 'and art now doing thy best to waft it well'. This I have supplied by the conjecture $\tau a \nu v \nu$

 of these is nearer to the ductus litterarum than my correction.
722. Cod. L. has $\operatorname{\theta aveiv,~which~Elms.~H.~Ca.~J.~Wh.~receive.~}$ Many copies have $\pi a \theta \epsilon i v$, edited by Br. Erf. Di. Ht. Wu. Wo. Li. N. Bl. Vh. Schm.
 Schm. edit.
741. Codd. $\eta_{\beta} \beta \eta{ }^{\epsilon \prime}{ }_{\epsilon} \chi \omega \omega$. For the reasons which induce me to read $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \beta a \iota \nu$ ' ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi \omega \nu$ see Comm. That $\eta \neq \beta \eta s$ ought to be ejected I have no doubt, and I believe that $a^{k} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ can dispense with a gen. I also think a verb is to be supplied; but what verb nobody can say with full assurance. "E $\beta a \nu \nu \epsilon$ (or $\epsilon \beta \eta$ ) makes good sense.
749. Most codd. $\hat{a} \delta^{\prime} \not a ̀ \nu \nLeftarrow \rho \eta$, and so Li. Ca. Wh. But edd. generally $\hat{a} \nu \delta \delta^{\prime} \notin p \eta$, the reading of two codd.
 where $\gamma$ ' should have been omitted.
779. Whether $\mu \mu^{\prime} \theta \eta s$ or $\mu^{\prime} \theta_{\eta}$ should be read here may reasonably seem doubtful, both from variation in codd., and because $\mu^{\prime} \theta^{\prime} \eta$ generally signifies 'excess in drinking', 'intoxication', pointing to a causal dative. But if it may also mean 'strong drink', 'strong wine', which produces intoxication, then the sense of the participle $i \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ is turns the scale in favour of the genitive. And that $\mu^{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \eta$ has that meaning here, J. seems to admit by translating 'full of wine', though in his note he argues to the contrary effect. But the following passage in Plato Rep. IX. 47 seems decisive in favour
 $\sigma \kappa \iota \rho \tau a ̆ a ̀$ к.т.入. Words of fulness lay strong claim to that case. See

790. In Exc. viii. I have defended $\pi$ moúpáv, the reading of all codd., against the conjecture $\pi \rho o u \not \phi \eta \nu \in \nu$.
814. I accept Aaî $\omega$ in deference to codd. rather than to J.'s
 and Plato's usage shows that dat. or gen. can follow either. But the two datives are certainly not elegant nor usual. See Plat.

815. For the corrupt $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \tau^{\prime}$ of cod. L., I simply read '̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ with cod. A., regarding $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ as an intrusive gloss, and believing the antithesis of present and future time to be sufficiently marked by the verbs $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \nu$ and $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \tau \tau$.

817-18. Codd. begin 817 with $\hat{\psi}$, end it with $\tau \iota \nu a$, and likewise end 818 with $\tau \iota v a$ : which H. Li. R. Ca. Wh. are able to receive, though it seems that the negative $\mu \dot{\eta}$ should have deterred them from doing so, since the relative pertains to a definite person Oedipus ( $\tau o v o \partial \hat{c}^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime}$ dà $\left.\nu \delta \rho o ́ s\right)$. Schaef. reads ồv for $\hat{\varphi}$, and so Wu. Ht. Di. J., who also write $\tau \iota \nu \iota$ for $\tau \iota \nu a$ in 817 . Wo. $\begin{gathered}\nu \nu \\ \text {, but not } \tau \nu \nu \iota \text {. Amid }\end{gathered}$ these conflicting views, I join a small minority, N. Vh., who read $\epsilon i$ for $\hat{\varphi}$, which is a lighter change than ${ }_{o} \nu$, , also $\tau \iota \nu$ in $8_{17}$, but $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \in$ for $\tau \iota v a$ in 818 . This last may seem over-bold, but, if we consider that a scribe might repeat the $\tau \iota v a$ of 817 in 818 , either by a clerical error, or by recollection of the $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \omega \nu \epsilon i \nu \tau \tau \nu a$, which occurs in the à $\rho \grave{a}$ of Oed. 238 , we may look upon $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \mu$ ' as restored to a place from which it was moved by misadventure. Finally, I think that, by the reading $\epsilon i, \mu \grave{\eta}$ and $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ are grammatically justified, not without it-
 ing ós $\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \xi \xi \in \lambda v \sigma a s$ in 35 .
825. Codd. $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau^{\prime}$ or $\mu \eta^{\prime} \sigma \tau^{\prime}$. Di. $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$, which is generally received.
843. Cod. L. and some others seem to read катактєivaıє, which Schm. Ca. J. Wh. retain. But Di. N. Ell. al. prefer the form катактєірєєav.
 which, though stigmatised by J. as 'nihili', seems very like a true reading: 'the death of Laius as described by you.' The $\gamma \epsilon$, when ${ }_{o} \nu \gamma \in$ follows, seems cumbrous and inelegant.
870. Codd. support $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \pi о \tau \epsilon$ more strongly than $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi о \tau \epsilon$.

878-9. Corruption exists here. Codd. have ákporárav, for which Erf. àкро́тaтov, generally received. As the hiatus after $\sigma v \mu \phi \dot{\rho} \rho o \nu \tau a$ is very awkward, I have ventured to read $\tau$ đ̇крóтatov. In 879 the base $(--)$ corresponding to $\delta i$ ai $\theta$ - in 867 is wanting. J. supplies the trochee äккov, I edit ó $\rho \epsilon$ ' $\omega \nu$. The word which follows in Cod. L. is $\ddot{a} \pi о \tau \mu о \nu$, with o over $\tau \mu$, suggesting àóтoнov. But this is unmetri-
 See Comm.
888. Corruption again sets in here, and continues to 895. See Comm.
889. Codd. $\mu \grave{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ó. I edit $\mu \eta$ '̇є.

891. Codd. $\hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. I edit кaì $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. Believing the next word, $\dot{i} \theta_{i} i \tau \omega \nu$, to be spurious (see 898), I suggest $\dot{d} \pi \epsilon v \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ as a possible substitute, without placing it in the text. For $\epsilon_{\xi} \xi \tau a \iota$ Bl. J. $\theta i \xi \in \tau a \iota$ by conjecture.
892. This verse and the next are in codd. ris é $\epsilon \tau \iota \pi o \tau^{\prime}$ ' $\boldsymbol{\nu} \nu$ тoî $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ $\dot{a} \nu \grave{\eta} \rho \theta v \mu \hat{\omega} \beta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mid \epsilon \epsilon \rho \xi \epsilon \tau a \iota \psi v \chi \hat{a} s$ à $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \nu$; which is grossly corrupt, and not in harmony with the antistrophic verse, also corrupt. "E $\tau \iota$ $\pi o \tau$ ' seems a gloss, drawn from 1084-5. Striking out or obelizing
 $\theta v \mu o \hat{v})$ is a senseless word here, and may have been meant to
 Musgrave's correction for ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \xi \in \tau \pi a$. I have ventured to place $\beta_{\epsilon} \epsilon \lambda \eta$ before $\theta \epsilon \bar{\omega} \nu$. Most other editors read $\theta v \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \beta^{\prime} \lambda \eta$. Ca. retains all the corruptions, obelizing $\theta_{\nu} \mu \bar{\omega}$ and $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \tau a a$. From these corruptions and emendations the general sense emerges without loss.
905. ádávatov is neither in agreement with the strophe, nor good with aiév. I venture to write ă $\phi \theta$ aprov.
906. Corruption recurs here. I have followed Triclinius by
reading $\pi a \lambda a \iota a ̀$ from the Scholia. Arndt, Li. J. (who keep étı $\pi=\tau^{\prime}$ in the strophe) read here $\Lambda$ aiov $\pi$ aлaiфata, which I would not link with $\theta$ 白бфатa. Schn. Wh. $\pi v \theta_{o ́ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau a ~ \Lambda a i ̈ o v . ~ C a . ~ l e a v e s ~ a ~ g a p . ~}^{\text {g. }}$
917. On $\epsilon i . \lambda \epsilon ́$ 'you, as a more refined and better attested reading than $\hat{\eta}^{\nu} . \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \eta$, see Preface. Di. Be. Li. Wu. Wo. Schn. N. Ht. R. Bl. Vh. Schm. read $\epsilon i . \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o$. Ca. Wh. $\epsilon i . \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \eta$. Schäf. J. ${ }^{\eta} \nu . \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \eta$.
931. av̂ros. The breathing of this adverb is one of those moot questions which can never be securely settled. I agree with J. that autros, which MSS. favour, is founded on a false analogy; but there is no proof that this false analogy did not prevail in the old times. The accent (which from aưròs should be aù $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ) is not less inconsistent, and both breathing and accent may have succumbed to those of oṽ $\tau \omega \mathrm{s}$. " $\Omega \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} a^{\prime} \tau \omega \mathrm{s}$, which J. cites from Tr. 1040, manifestly means $\tau \hat{\varphi} \delta^{\prime}$ a $\dot{\tau} \hat{\omega} \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \rho o ́ \pi \omega$, , in this very manner. In any case, whether we write $a \tilde{v} \tau \omega s, a v ̃ \tau \omega s$, or $a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega} s$, we get a faulty word, and if we write aù $\tau \hat{\omega}$ s authorities are against us. H. Li. J. aủt $\omega$ s. All other edd. aṽ $\tau \omega \mathrm{s}$.
935. Cod. L. pr. m. $\pi a \rho a ́$, rec. m. $\pi \rho o$ ós. L² $^{2}$. Pal. $\pi a \rho a ́ . ~ A . ~ a l . ~$ $\pi \rho o ́ s$. Thus $\pi a \rho a ̀$ is well supported, and preferable, as $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ would
 answer $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ Kopiv ${ }^{\prime}$ ov gives no indication. Wo. Schn. J. $\pi \rho o ́ s$. All other edd., I think, read $\pi a \rho a ́$.
936. Codd. táza. And so H. Li. Schn. N. Wo. Ca. J. Wh. But Br. Elms. Erf. Schäf. Di. Be. Bl. Wu. Ht. R. Vh. Schm. Ell. т ${ }^{\prime} \chi^{\prime}$ 'àv.

943-4. This is a corrupt place, and the correction now generally adopted, though satisfactory as to sense, can hardly be regarded as the assured words of Soph. Codd. L. A. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \tau^{\prime} \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon$ Пó̀v-
 $\pi o v$ Пódvßos $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$; | $\epsilon i \not \mu \eta \eta^{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \tau a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \in s$. From which Bothe framed
 Li. Wu. Schn. N. Wo. Ht. J. Wh. edit. But N. conjectures $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \tau^{\prime} \hat{\theta}-$ $\nu \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ oìíinov $\pi a \pi \eta \dot{\rho}$; Br. leaves a lacuna. Ca. incloses $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \gamma^{\prime} \rho o \nu$.
957. Cod. L. pr. m. $\sigma \eta \mu \eta_{\nu}$ as, with marg. correction $\sigma \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \rho$. Though Cod. r has $\sigma \eta \mu \eta \eta_{\nu} a s$ (most others $\sigma \eta \mu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \rho$ ), I find great weight in the argument of J. against $\sigma \eta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu a s$, and I observe that the Sophoclean use of $\gamma$ i $\gamma$ vo $\mu$ a with past part. is elsewhere in prohibitive construction only, $\mu \grave{\eta} \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \eta$. I have therefore read $\sigma \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \rho$
with Br. H. Ebn. Schäf. Wo. N. J. But $\sigma \eta \mu \eta^{\prime} a_{a s}$ has most support from edd.
967. ктavєiv ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda$ ov appears in all codd. except one cited by J. as $\mathrm{V}^{2}$. But as there is no other instance of aor. inf. with $\mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ in Soph., I concur with him in reading $\kappa \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon i \nu$ after Elms. Di. Bl. Br. N. R. Vh. But Schäf. H. Wu. Wo. Schn. Ht. Ca. Wh. кraveiv. I cannot but believe that the words $\boldsymbol{\tau} \grave{\nu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\partial} \nu$ ó óe are corrupt, not only because Soph. would not have written eight consecutive short syllables, but also because $\dot{\delta} \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ in this context should rather be $\dot{o}$ $\mu \epsilon \ell$, with ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ as antithesis. I suspect therefore that he wrote
 a blundering glossarist. But I content myself with obelizing these words.
 with $\kappa \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \epsilon \iota$ intrans. and with $\delta \dot{\eta}$, but I leave them untouched. He reads кát $\kappa$ кє́кєv $\theta \epsilon \gamma \hat{\eta} s$.
ioil. Most codd. $\tau a \rho \beta \hat{\omega} \gamma \epsilon$. Erf., from two, $\tau a \rho \beta \omega \bar{\omega} \gamma \epsilon$, rightly, I believe. $\gamma \epsilon$ suits the participle better: Soph. could have written

1025. Codd. $\tau \epsilon \kappa \omega \dot{\nu}$. Bo. $\tau v \chi \omega \dot{\nu}$, followed by all editors except Ca. Wh. who keep $\tau \epsilon \kappa \omega ́ \nu$.
iozo. Most codd. $\sigma o \hat{v} \gamma$ '. But cod. r, improving L., as often, has $\sigma o \hat{v}$ ס', and so Elms. Di. Wu. Ca. J. Wh.
 $\nu \epsilon \epsilon$; Whether $\Gamma$ and L.2. repeat or correct this corruption, I should like to know, but J. does not mention them. A. and most other codd. have $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu$ какоîs $\mu \epsilon$, some omit $\mu \epsilon$. I agree with those who
 of L. points to a true reading. He suggests $\epsilon \gamma \kappa \nu \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, but $\epsilon \nu \tau v \chi \dot{\omega} \nu$ seems better of the two. The verse might be filled up by many conjectures, if we assumed that $\mu \epsilon \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{a} \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ is also corrupt. But, unwilling to think so, I have edited Wunder's conjecture $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \kappa a \lambda \hat{\varphi}$, opportunely, in a lucky moment, which appears in El. $3^{8} 4 \nu^{\nu} \nu \nu$ jàp $\grave{e} v$


1055. Most codd. тóv $\theta^{\prime}$, but J. cites $\tau \dot{\prime} v \delta^{\prime}$ from three, a decidedly better reading. I remove the preceding note of interrogation, thinking it better for Oed. to assume that Jocasta remembers. 1056. Codd. fluctuate between $\tau i s$ and $\tau i$. I had edited $\tau$ is
with Li., but now I prefer ri, what matters it whom he spoke of? Bl. compares Aesch. Pr. V. 766, $\tau i \delta^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \tau \iota \nu^{\prime}$;

106I. All codd. (immane quantum stolide) read $\epsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega$ for $\epsilon \quad \gamma \omega$.
1062. Codd. oư $\delta^{\prime}$ ầ $\nu \epsilon^{\prime} k . ~ H . ~ o v \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} a ̂ \nu \in i$ and so Di. Li. Be. Ca. But Erf. ov $\delta^{\prime}$ ' éá $\nu$, followed by Elms. Wu. Wo. N. Ht. R. J. Wh.
 rightly.
rogo. Codd. Oidímov. Schm. J. conjecture Oioínov̀. See Comm.

1096. Codd. $\sigma o i ̀ \delta^{\prime}$. I conjecture $\sigma o i ̀ \delta^{\prime}$ oủ $\nu$ for metre's sake.
1099. In this corrupt antistrophe large correction becomes inevitable, if sense and metre are to be preserved. Codd. ápa. Bl. $\kappa \kappa \rho a ̂ \nu$.

1 100. Codd. $\pi \rho o \sigma \pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma^{\prime}$. Lachmann, $\pi a \pi \rho o ̀ s \pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma$ '.



IIO4. Codd. $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \theta^{\prime}$. Probably corrupt. Query: $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\delta} . . \mid{ }_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime} \dot{\prime} .$.

I Iog. Codd. 'E $\lambda \iota \kappa \omega \nu \iota a ́ \delta \omega \nu$. Pors. ${ }^{〔} \mathrm{E} \lambda \iota \kappa \omega \nu i \delta \omega \nu$.
ifir. Cod. L. $\pi \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \beta \epsilon \iota$ (wanting s). Hence Wu. Di. Wo. Be. Schn. N. Schm. Vh. R. J. Ca. Wh. $\pi \rho \epsilon \in \epsilon \beta \epsilon \iota s$. But Br. Schäf. Li. Bl. $\pi \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \beta v$.

II 3o. Cod. L. probably read $\pi 0 v$ pr. m. So Bl. N. and I with them. Di. Be. Wu. Li. Wo. Vh. $\pi \omega$ s. But Schäf. R. Schm. Ca. J. Wh. $\pi \omega$, which, without negation, I cannot regard as Attic.
1131. Codd. and most edd. $i \pi \pi$, which is admissible, but with Bl. N. Vh. I think ä ámo a more refined idiom.

II 34. A verse seems to have been lost after this one: its probable nature may be guessed at as resembling $\boldsymbol{\omega} \kappa о \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu$ ä $\mu \phi \boldsymbol{\omega}$ катà $\nu о \mu a ̀ s ~ a ̉ \lambda \omega ́ \mu \in \nu o t$.

II37. Codd. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \dot{\eta} \nu o v s$, except Trin. which has $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta} \nu o v s . ~ H e n c e ~$ Pors. $\hat{\epsilon}_{\kappa} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{v}$, which has been generally received.
1193. Codd. and other edd. тò $\sigma$ óv. Camerarius tòv $\sigma o ́ v$, followed by Elms. Di. Wu. Ht. Li. N. Bl. Vh. R. J. But Wo. Ca. Wh. keep тó.
1195. $\tau \lambda \hat{a} \mu o \nu$. I would gladly read $\delta v v^{\prime} \sigma \tau a \nu$, on account of metre.
i196. Codd. ovó́éva. And so Br. Schäf. Ht. Bl. Ebn. Wo. Ca. But Elms. H. Wu. Di. Ht. N. Vh. R. Li. J. Wh. ové̊́ćv.
K. OE.


 read àvagrís, which seems a necessary sequence of кađà $\mu \dot{\iota} \nu \phi$ tías.
 its place I doubt not, but the previous epithet is lost. It might
 (lion), $\delta i \pi \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \nu, \pi \alpha ́ \mu \phi a \gamma o \nu$, may be named; none with certainty.

1205. Codd. tis èv $\pi$ óvoos tís äraıs àpoías. H. inverts the clauses, and is followed by most edd, But, assuming erroneous inversion here, we cannot say how far it went : and I feel sure the

 who that dwells with a toilsome reverse of life (is more wretched?)
1208. For $\hat{\varphi}$ I read $\hat{\varphi}^{\hat{j}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$.
1209. Codd. $\pi a \tau \rho i$. Wu. Bl. $\pi \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \mathrm{l}$. This conjecture is an improvement in sense, and essential to metre.
1214. Codd. $\delta \iota \kappa a ́ S ̧ \iota ~ т o ́ v . ~ H . ~ D i . ~ L i . ~ N . ~ B l . ~ R . ~ V h . ~ \delta ı к a ́ s \epsilon \iota ~ t ' . ~$ I now adhere to codd. with Elms. Schäf. Wu. Wo. J. Ca. Wh.
 tékvod Erf. Be. N. R. Vh. J. Wh. תaïíod tékvod Wu. Li. Wo. Bl. Deeming $i \omega$ and $\tau \epsilon \in \gamma \nu \nu$ bad here, and knowing no word which can

 ing with the dolorous climax of this pathetic ode.
 read $\epsilon i \hat{\delta} o v^{\circ} \dot{\delta} \delta \hat{v} \rho o \mu a u$. There is no call for the middle aorist: and óóvopat is the Sophoclean form. Codd. $\omega$ s $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\beta} a \lambda \lambda a$ ia $\chi^{\prime} \epsilon \nu$. The elegant conjecture of J. $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ iä $\lambda \epsilon \mu \nu \nu \chi^{\dot{\epsilon}} \omega \nu$ seems true.
1232. Codd. $\eta \neq \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$. Elms. $\nexists \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, adopted, I think, by all edd. before J ., who upholds the form of codd., citing $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \in \epsilon \mu \in \nu$ from Aeschines and $\ddot{\eta} \delta \epsilon i \tau \epsilon$ from Demosthenes, as if their variation of form decided that of the Sophoclean age and of tragedy. The established form $\hat{\eta} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu(=\tilde{\eta} \delta \mu \epsilon \nu)$ is sufficient to establish $\eta \delta \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ as the transitional stage. See Veitch on the Greek verb.

1245. Codd. кá̀єı. So Schäf. éккá̀є $\operatorname{Bl}$. калєî Erf. and most cdd., including J., who speaks of the reading ќd $\lambda \epsilon \iota$, as 'mendum',
 1249, acknowledging the liberty occasionally taken by tragic poets to omit the augment in a speech, like this, of an epic character. Soph. was thercfore just as free to use the imperf. кá $\lambda \epsilon \iota$ as the hist. present $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}$, and none of us can determine which he meant to use. In such a case it seemed to me the simplest way to abide by the codd., which I should not do if I saw good reason to depart from them. It may be observed that $\tilde{o} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \ldots \kappa a ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$, when he had entered...he began to call on is exactly the same construction as in
 passed in...he went rushing \&c. The optatives $\theta \dot{a} v o \iota, ~ \lambda i m o \iota ~ p r o v e ~$ nothing, for they might follow a hist. present.
1257. Codd. кixoı. My reasons for reading кixŋ will be found in the Preface, compared with Exc. IV. My belief is that those who introduced кixoc were misled by the false analogy of the optatives above, which refer to past time, while time future is in question here.
1264. Cod. L. $\pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \epsilon ’ \omega ́ \rho a ı s ~ \epsilon ’ \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu \cdot$ ó $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ ö $\pi \omega s$ ôpậ $\nu \iota \nu$, where $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \mu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \eta \nu$ is written by mere misadventure, and $\delta^{\prime}$ inserted after ${ }_{o}^{\circ} \pi \omega s$ : but most of the copies write aićpass. Hence
 This J. adopts, but with $\delta \delta^{\prime} \omega_{s}$ for ${ }_{\circ}^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega s \delta^{\prime}$, saying that ai $\omega^{\prime} \rho a$ is the only classical form. He overlooks the express testimony of Eustathius (on Il. III. 108) to the classical use of $\epsilon \in \rho(\rho a$ and to its pre-


 $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega \rho o s, \tilde{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \tau \epsilon \rho o \iota \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma \omega \nu \iota \zeta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega \sigma a \nu$. In the face of this evidence I would not exclude é $\omega^{\prime} \rho a \iota s$. The fact that aíópa is the more usual word, and therefore adopted in the copies, is really an argument in favour of $\epsilon \in \omega \rho a$, and $\delta \delta \dot{\epsilon} o ̃ \pi \omega s$ is quite free from objection. I follow Cod. L. with Di. Li. Schäf. H. Wo. R. Bl.

127I. I agree with Hermann and Bishop Thirlwall in regarding ő $\psi o \iota \nu \tau o$ as certainly corrupt. But I cannot believe in "́ $\psi$ aıvтo. See my note appended to Excursus XI.
 $\tau^{\prime}$ after aïцatos, and one cod. has aíát $\omega \nu$. Pors. conjectured $\chi a ́ \lambda a \zeta a ́ \theta^{\prime}$ aiцatov̂ $\sigma \sigma^{\prime}$, and so Di. Schm. Vh. has $\chi a \lambda a \zeta \eta ̂ s ~ a i \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.


Wu．Wo．Ca．J．Wh．$\chi$ a入áşŋs aiparov̂s．Elms．Erf．Musgr．Bo．Li． edit as I do．H．（ad Orph．Argon．766）justly says＇vocabulo $\chi^{a-}$ $\lambda a ́ \xi \eta s$ intellegi aquosum umorem una cum sanguine ex oculis deflu－ entem＇．I doubt not the supposed likeness of a tear－drop to a hailstone brought in $\chi^{a \lambda a ́\langle ́ \eta s, ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ e p i t h e t ~} \mu$ é $\lambda a s$ indicates the

 in O．C．I 502，except that the use of $\chi^{a} \lambda a \zeta a$ favoured the addition of ${ }^{\circ} \mu \beta$ р $о$ ．

1280．oú $\mu$ óvov đááa．This I conjecture for the MS．ov́ $\mu$ óvov какá．Porson où久 évòs $\mu$ óvov．Lachmann où hóvov $\mu o ́ v \varphi$ ．Otto， Wo．Weckl．ov̀ $\mu$ óvov kára，which J．edits．H．condenses two lines


1284．豹 $\tau \iota \nu \iota \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{\eta}$ ．All codd．，and all edd．before Linwood， had written $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad r^{i} \nu \nu$ ．He first saw that the enclitic is proper here． Ca．J．Wh．have followed him，as I do．

I 302．Codd．pl．$\phi \in \hat{v}, \phi \in \hat{v}$ dúgravos，whence Ca．J．$\phi \in \hat{\varepsilon}$ óvóvaavos． T．$\phi \epsilon \hat{v} \phi \epsilon \hat{v}$ iv́orav＇．So Elms．H．Wh．Dindorf omits the clause．

13io．סıaл́̇тatat，the reading of most codd．is clearly a corrupt gloss；but סıaтตтârat，which Musgr．suggested，and J．edits， labours under the double disadvantage of being epic in form（see $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o \pi a ̂$ âa 482 ）and nowhere else found．I had edited $\pi$ ítaral， and so Wh．，but Moeris will not allow $\pi$ т́тaцaı in Attic Greek，and $\pi$ є́тєтає，which Schäf．has，would be fitter．See $\pi$ ध́тодаı 486．But is the $\delta i a ̀$ to go for nothing here？I now suspect that the true reading is $\delta \iota a \theta \epsilon \bar{l}$ ，run abroad，a word used by Thuc．Xen．and Plato： for I see no reason why Soph．may not have taken his metaphor from the rush of racers or dispersing crowds，as willingly as from the flight of birds．But a corrector not recognising this，and ignorant of metre，might think ס就自aral an improvement．The monometer is more pleasing here than the dimeter．Ca．keeps סıatétatal．
 Li．Ca．Wh．

1315．H．supplied $\begin{array}{r}\partial \nu \\ \nu\end{array}$ ，which is not in codd．
1320．Codd．форєiv．J．фє́ $\rho \epsilon i v$.
1323．Codd．$\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu$ ．I had edited $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \omega^{\prime} \nu$ with Be．Li．R．， but I now think it safer to retain $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \dot{i}^{\prime} \omega \nu$ ，though not in exact corre－ spondence with strophe，unless the diphthong may be made short．
 Bl. N. Wo. J. Wh. But Di. Ca. tò $\nu$ ú $\lambda \epsilon \theta \rho o \nu \mu_{\epsilon} \gamma a \nu$, which is not good grammar.



1349. Codd. á $\boldsymbol{r}^{\prime}$ áypías. Triclinius removed the prep.
 as a mere corruption, caused by some blunderer who moved the prep. which stood here to the previous verse. I therefore edit $\dot{a} \pi \boldsymbol{o}$

1360. Codd. ä $\theta \lambda_{\imath o s}$. Erf. ä ${ }^{\prime}$ eos, received generally.
1361. Codd. $\dot{\delta} \mu о \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \dot{\prime} s$. Mein. conjectures $\dot{\delta} \mu о \lambda \epsilon \chi \eta{ }^{\prime} s$.

1383. I place a full stop after à ${ }^{2}$ a ${ }^{2} \nu o \nu$, none after $\Lambda a i ̂ o v . ~ S e e ~$ Comm.

140I. Codd. ítı. And so Di. Wu. Be. Li. R. Schm. But Heims. Wo. Schn. N. Vh. Bl. $\not \approx \tau \iota$. Elms. Ht. Ca. J. Wh. $\tau \iota$.
1405. Codd. тaúróv. J. conj. тaủroû.
1413. Codd. $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Elms. and edd. $\pi i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$.
1422. Codd. фavoûpat. Mein. $\theta a \nu o v ̂ \mu a \iota, ~ r e c e i v e d ~ b y ~ N . ~$
1445. Codd. L. A. $\tau^{\prime} \stackrel{\imath}{a} \nu=\tau a ̂ ̀ \nu . ~ \Gamma . ~ L 2 . ~ \gamma^{\prime} \stackrel{a}{a} \nu$, and so H. W. Ht. Bl.
1446. Codd. are divided between $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \rho є ́ \psi о \mu a \iota$ and $\pi \rho о т \rho є ́ \psi о-$ $\mu a \iota . ~ \pi \rho о \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \psi о \mu a \iota ~ B e . ~ W o . ~ H t . ~ N . ~ V h . ~ B l . ~ J . ~ \pi \rho о т \rho є ́ \psi о \mu a \iota ~ B r . ~$ Erf. H. Di. Li. Wu. R. Schm. Ca. Wh. I prefer the former as more forcible here.
1466. Codd. gen. aîv, two raîv. Schäf. Heath, Reis. Br. Erf. Ht. Wo. raiv. Other edd. aîv.
 and regard $\sigma \phi \hat{\varphi} \nu$ as genitive case, not dative: which will be disasters to my children and to yours alike. Oed. asks 'who will run the risk of marrying girls who, disgraced themselves, will entail disgrace on their progeny?' J. reads $\gamma \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \sigma \iota \iota$, which he would have to mean the sons of Oedipus. But those sons ought not to be specified here, and $\gamma^{\prime} \nu o s$, though used in the singular for 'a son', is not used in the plural at all. The word $\gamma o \nu a i ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ however includes the whole progeny. See O. C. I192, Ant. 641.
1505. Codd. $\pi$ apiô $\eta s . \quad$ Dawes $\pi \epsilon \rho i \hat{\delta} \eta \bar{\eta}$, generally received.

 omit $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{0}$.
1526. Codd. ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \tau \iota s$. I read $\omega^{\prime \prime} \tau \tau s$, and this reading is defended at full in Exc. Ix.
1528. Codd. ${ }_{\text {éкє }} \mathbf{i} \nu \eta \nu$. For this I read ä $\mu \in \iota \nu o \nu$.
1529. Codd. $\mu \eta \delta \delta_{\epsilon} \nu^{\prime}$. I read $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \tau \nu^{\prime}$. See Comm.

The Editors and Commentators, whom I have more or less consulted in preparing this edition, and whom in Lection and Commentary I have cited by the Sigla appended, are as follows :

| Be. | Bergk. | Mein. | Meineke. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bl. | Blaydes. | Musgr. Musgrave. |  |
| Bo. | Bothe. | N. | Nauck. |
| Br. | Brunck. |  | Neue. |
| Ca. | Prof. Campbell. | Pors. | Porson. |
| Di. | W. Dindorf. | R. | Ritter. |
| Död. | Döderlein. | Reis. Resig. |  |
| Do. | Dobree. | Schäf. Schäfer. |  |
| Ebn. | Ebner. | Schn. Schneidewin. |  |
| Ell. | Ellendt. | Schm. | M. Schmidt. |
| Elms. | Elmsley. | St. | Steel. |
| Erf. | Erfurdt. | Vh. Van Herwerden. |  |
| Ht. | Hartung. | Weckl. Wecklein. |  |
| Heim. | Heimsoeth. | Wh. Prof. White. |  |
| H. | G. Hermann. | Wo. | G. Wolff. |
| J. | Prof. Jebb. | Wu. Wunder. |  |
| Li. | Linwood. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Some names, occurring once or twice only, are printed at full: Arndt, Badham, Burges, Dawes, Dorville, Heath, Lachmann, Martin, Otto, Schneider, Seidler, Spengel.

Note. Readers are requested to observe, that several important corrections in the Parodos and in Stasimon iv. have been added since the Commentary and the Preface were printed. They are duly noticed $\mathrm{i}_{1}$ the Lection.

## COMMENTARY ON OEDIPUS TYRANNUS.

## I. PROLOGOS. (I-I50.)

I. (Preface.) (i) In the first Excursus some account is given of the Greek theatre, especially that of Dionysus at Athens, which, lying on the southern slope of the Acropolis, had a prospect inclining to the East of South.
(2) The Scene of the Oedipus Tyrannus represents the front of the royal palace at Thebes. On each side of the central or royal door is another door, the eastern, which leads to the women's apartments, the western, probably, to the residence of Creon. At each extremity of the palace-front is another inlet to the stage, that on the E. being for strangers from foreign parts, that on the W . for persons coming out of the city. These adjoin the Periactoi.
(3) When the spectators, who could be (says Plato) 30,000 , have taken their seats in the Koilon, the action of the drama begins with the silent entrance, through the western passage (parodos) into the orchestra, of a procession, consisting of priests, youths and children. They are led by the Priest of Zeus, an aged and venerable man. When they have reached the proscenium, either by way of the choral platform, as yet vacant, or by other stairs, they seat themselves, as directed by the priest, on the steps of several altars ( $15, \& \mathrm{c}$. ), of which the nearest to the palace is the altar of Apollo Lyceus (919). They are suppliants, who come to the palace, seeking relief from the miseries of the plague which afflicts Thebes, and addressing their supplication to the gods of Oedipus, and to Oedipus himself, their venerated king. Each one brings the customary token of his suppliant character, a small bough or rod of olive, festooned with wool.
 carry them are said to be $\epsilon \xi \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \iota(3,19)$. Each iкє $\boldsymbol{\xi} \eta \rho i a$ was to be laid on the altar and left there, if the petition were not granted. But, as Oedipus takes upon himself to fulfil the desire of these suppliants, they are told (143) to take their rods away with them. See Andocides $\pi \epsilon \rho i \mathrm{M} v \sigma \tau$. and notes on 3. Whether, when Oed. comes out of the palace, the suppliants
have already laid their rods on the altars, or hold them out to him in token of supplication, is a doubtful point. My reasons for inclining to the latter view will be given on 3 .
(4) The Prologos of a Greek play is that portion which precedes the Parodos or entry of the Chorus. Two plays of Aeschylus, the Supplices and the Persae, have no Prologos. But in every extant drama of Sophocles this part is of considerable extent. In the Oedipus Rex it contains 150 lines, forming two dialogues: one between Oedipus and the Priest of Zeus, the other between Oedipus and Creon. These lay the foundation of the plot.
II. (Outline of the Prologos.) Oedipus addresses first the suppliants, as his children, generally, and then the Priest of Zeus especially, desiring to know the feeling which brings them to the palace, declaring his affectionate sympathy, and his determined purpose to give his utmost help. The Priest, in his reply, describes the miseries inflicted on Thebes by the prevailing pestilence, and explains why the suppliant people look to Oedipus for counsel and relief. He had formerly rescued them from the cruel tyranny of the riddling Sphinx ; and the wisdom which had enabled him to do this was supposed to be a divine gift. Can he not find a remedy for this new affliction, whether shown to him by the voice of a god, or perhaps by the suggestion of some man : for men of sage experience are not only the best counsellors, but also most accustomed to compare counsels mutually? (42-45.) The priest concludes his speech by entreating Oedipus to sustain his high reputation; to save a reign happily begun from an unhappy close, and himself from becoming the insignificant ruler of a depopulated land. In his reply (58) Oedipus declares his cordial sympathy with the suppliants. The aid which they ask he has already striven to supply by sending his brother-in-law Creon to consult the Delphic oracle of Phoebus. His return may be momently expected. The priest announces the approach of Creon ( 78 ) who is seen crowned with bay, and of cheerful aspect, as the bearer of good news. In the second dialogue ( $8_{5}$ ) Creon, answering the king's questions, apprises him that Phoebus, in his oracular answer, requires the Theban people, as the condition of their release from the plague, to extirpate from their land a certain pollution : to wit, the murderer or murderers of the late king Laius. In his subsequent answers Creon states all that had been officially discovered as to the circumstances of that crime. Oedipus declares ( 132 ) that he will devote himself to the detection of the criminal, not only for the sake of the city, but in his own interest also, since the same murderous hand, by which Laius fell, might be armed against himself. This is one of the many instances of the $\epsilon i \rho \omega \nu \epsilon i a$ which pervades this drama from its outset to the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota a$ of the plot.

He bids the children rise and take up their suppliant boughs ; despatching a messenger to summon the Theban councillors. The priest, seconding his directions, prays to Phoebus for a blessing (147).
III. (Notes on 1-150.) 1. $\hat{\omega}$ rє́кva. Oedipus speaks not to the children only, but to all the suppliants, as the father of his people. His popularity as a beneficent ruler is testified by the Chorus in Stasimon I. So 58 , $\hat{\omega} \pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon s$ oiктрol. It is said in Homer (Od. xiii.) of
 The legend is, that Cadmus, son of Agenor, king of Tyre, embroiled with his father, seized vessels, fled to Hellas, and there founded the Boeotian Thebes, introducing the Semitic letters, which were the source of the Greek, Latin, and other European alphabets. This event is ascribed to the 15 th century в. C.; the reign of Oedipus to the 13 th. Hence (267) Soph. counts five generations from Agenor to Laius, inclusive. The Hellenic nations liked to commemorate their heroic princes in their own and in local names. So the Thebans called themselves Kaj $\mu \in i o c$,
 $\mu \epsilon \hat{i o} \nu$, their citadel the Kajucia (see 29, 35, 144): as the Athenians are called K $\epsilon \kappa \rho \circ \pi i \delta a \iota$ from Cecrops, ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \rho \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \hat{i} \delta a \iota$ from Erechtheus, ${ }_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \hat{i} \delta a \iota$ from Theseus : and a favourite name for Athens was K $\rho a \nu \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$, from an old hero king Kranaos. Hence the Athenians are called K $\rho a \nu$ áov $\pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon s$ in Aesch. Eum. ioly. \| rồ $\pi$ ádal, the ancient. An adverb of time or place with the article prefixed, becomes adjectival by an ellipse of the participle $\dot{\omega} \nu$. So $\dot{o} \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota=\dot{o} \pi a \lambda \alpha \iota o ́ s$, and similarly we find $\dot{o} \nu \hat{v} \nu$, $\dot{o}$ тó $\tau \epsilon$, $\dot{o} \pi \rho(\nu$,
 Observe the elegant antithesis rov̂ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \iota ~ \nu \epsilon ́ a$. So Ae. Sept. 740, véo $\pi a \lambda a c o ̂ ̃ \sigma \iota \sigma v \mu \mu \iota \epsilon i ̂ s$. N'́os can mean new, young, or modern as here : render latest. \| $\tau \rho 0 \phi \dot{\eta}^{\prime}=\theta \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu a \tau a$, abstract for concrete, nurture for nurslings : it may be rendered offspring or progeny: Eur. Cycl. $189 \mu \eta \kappa \alpha ́ \delta \omega \nu$ ảp $\nu \hat{\rho} \nu \tau \rho о ф a i$.
2. tivas $\pi 0 \theta$ '...; 'quasnam sedes has (or quamnam sessionem hanc) mihi sedetis?' =why sit ye thus solemnly before me? Hot'́, thus used to strengthen an interrogative (see 151), is like the colloquial English ever, or pray (what ever are you doing? what do you want, pray?). \| The con-
 frequent in classical poetry. Blaydes cites io33, $\tau \ell \tau 0 \hat{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha \hat{\imath} o \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \iota s$
 quis novus hic nostris successit sedibus hospes? Steel adds: Aesch. Pr.

 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \hat{O}$ ' |  |
| :---: | Greek poetry, of one indirectly interested, a special case of the larger 'dativus commodi vel incommodi.' \| $\theta \circ \alpha$ ' $\epsilon \tau \tau$. It is certain that two verbs

exist having the same form $\theta o a ́ j \omega$. One of these, from the root $\theta \epsilon F$, run, is a derivative of $\theta o o ́ s$, swift ( $\theta 0$ Fós), and therefore anciently $\theta_{0} F \dot{a} \zeta \omega$, meaning, move swiftly, hasten. It is used by Eurip. as trans. and intrans. Hermann, Erfurdt, take it to be the word here used. But two passages occur (Ae. Suppl. 595, and a fragment of Empedocles in Sext. Empir.
 Again, Plutarch, Hesych., Etym. M., with all grammarians and scholiasts, ascribe that sense to the verb here, which the context confirms. We must therefore assume a root $\theta a$, sit, which by strengthening became $\theta a a$, $\theta \bar{a}, \theta o a$ or $\theta o \bar{a}$, and took (1) the suffix $\kappa$, whence $\theta \hat{a} \kappa o s, \theta \hat{\omega} \kappa o s$, seat, $\theta a \kappa \epsilon \in \omega$, sit, (2) the suffixes $\sigma \sigma, \zeta$, whence $\theta a \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, $\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, $\theta o \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$, sit, \&c. See J.'s note, p. 286. || é $\delta \rho a s$ $\theta o \alpha ́ \zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ is the construction of the cognate accus. The words are not cognate in stem like $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{a} \nu \gamma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \omega \tau \tau a$, $\theta \rho \epsilon \in \mu \mu a \quad \theta \rho \epsilon ́ \psi a \sigma \theta a l$, and many more, but cognate in sense, like $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\delta} \delta_{o}^{\prime} \nu, \epsilon \ddot{\delta} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \ddot{u} \pi \nu 0 \nu$ \&c. See
 ' $\delta \rho \rho a s$ from Eurip., insists that the posture of the suppliants was a kneeling one. This cannot be certainly determined. It might be something between sitting and kneeling. But sitting itself is often represented as a mournful attitude. See Isaiah iii. and Verg. Aen. XI. 349, totamque videmus consedisse urbem luctu.
3. iкт. к $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta$. $\epsilon_{\xi} \xi \sigma \sigma$. exhibiting wreathed supplicative branches. This use of the particip. from $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \omega$ (see lex.), is peculiar: for, though attributed to the suppliants, it really describes the rods wreathed with wool which they brought with them as symbols of supplication. Chryses in Homer brings a golden staff festooned with $\sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon \mu \mu a \tau a$, Il. á, 14, $\sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon \mu \mu \tau \tau^{\prime} \notin \chi \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
 'A $\chi a \iota o u ́ s$. In later times a small branch or rod of olive was so used,
 (whence iкє́ $\tau \eta s$, a suppliant). Another name was $\epsilon i \rho \epsilon \sigma \iota \omega \nu \eta$, from ${ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \rho \nu$, wool, Aristoph. Plut. 383. The Romans called them velamina or velamenta. Hence Verg. Aen. vir. 154, centum oratores augusta ad moenia regis Ire jubet, ramis velatos Palladis omnes. Comp. Ae. Suppl. 192,

 $\nu \omega s \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu 0 \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} \tau \iota \mu a \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$. Wunder, in his Excursus on this place (which is very useful), says: 'As soon as those who came to pray for anything had seated themselves at the altar, they placed these branches on it; and, if the help they sought was promised, they took them up and retired ; if not, they quitted the place, and left the branches behind.'

 shows that it was customary for those, who did not receive a promise of
 $\pi o ́ v o v . ~ S o ~ i n ~ E u r . ~ S u p p l . ~ s e e ~ 258 ~ \& c ., ~ a n d ~ a f t e r w a r d s ~ 359, ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda, ~ ف ̂ ~ \gamma \epsilon \rho a \iota a i ́, ~$
 äpa⿱亠乂єs iкт $\hat{\eta} \rho a s$ к $\kappa$ á $\delta o u s$ ．In the face of these passages it is not easy to deny the conclusion of Wunder and J．，that the $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \phi \eta$ had been laid on the altars before Oed．appeared．Yet some indication of this fact stronger than the word ápaytes at 143 might have been expected ：and many places appear in Greek and Latin（besides Hom．$a^{\prime} . \mathbf{1}_{4}$ ），which speak of them as held in the hands，and stretched out in token of entreaty．See（as cited by
 manibus vittas ac verba precantia．Liv．xxiv． 30 ，ramos oleae ac velamenta alia supplicum porrigentes．Ov．Met．II．279，velamenta manu praetendens supplice．Hence Ritter comes to another conclusion，saying，＇the sup－ pliants held out the branches in their hands in token of prayer to Apollo and Oed．，and would have laid them on the altar，had not Oed．promised his help，and directed them to carry the $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \phi \eta$ home．＇

4．$\pi \dot{\prime} \lambda_{\iota \iota} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \ldots \gamma^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \iota$ к．т．$\lambda$ ，while the city is fraught \＆c．What is implied seems to be＇Why are ye gathered round the royal palace，while Thebans in general are burning incense to propitiate the gods，or singing hymns of prayer for Apollo＇s aid，or bemoaning their sufferings and woes？＇ Perhaps Oed．points to the Periactos on his left hand，where an artist＇s skill has painted a perspective view of some part of Thebes，probably including the Cadmea．$\quad \Gamma \epsilon \mu \omega$ is properly used of the full freightage of a laden vessel．As a verb of fulness it takes the partitive gen．\｜$\dot{o} \mu o \hat{v} \mu \dot{e} \nu . .$. $\dot{c} \mu o \hat{v} \delta \dot{\delta}$ ．This mode of dividing clauses by repeating the same word with $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \ldots \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ，is a favourite idiom of Soph．See 25－6 $\phi \theta i \nu 0 v \sigma a \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \ldots \phi \theta i \nu o v \sigma \alpha$
 such examples occur in his extant works．\｜$\theta v \mu \iota a \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ，incense－fumes． These would be discerned by the sense of smelling ；the paean－hymns and cries of woe by that of hearing．

5．$\pi \alpha \iota a \dot{\nu} \omega \nu$ ．A paean（epic $\pi \alpha \iota \eta \dot{\prime} \omega \nu$ ）might be either a hymn of prayer to the healing god（ $\Pi a \iota \omega \nu$ ，Apollo），as here，or a song of praise，as Eur． Alc． 424 ；or of triumph and joy，as Ae．Sept．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \iota \mu о \nu \pi \alpha \iota a \hat{a}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \xi \iota a \kappa \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma a s$.
 $\gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \nu . \| \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu a$ ．Oed．repeats this affectionate word，where he says his interest in their sad case is such that he cannot be satisfied with the tales of messengers，but must see and hear everything in person．

7．Steel＇s note on $\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ is as follows－＂$\Pi a \rho \rho^{\prime} \dot{a} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu \ddot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ $=\pi a \rho^{\prime} a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu,{ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \in \lambda \omega \nu(\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu)$ ．So Eur．Or．532，$\tau i \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\prime} \rho \omega \nu$
 with Erfurdt to make $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ redundant as in Plato Gorg．§ $64 \dot{v} \pi \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ каi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \quad \xi \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ ，where see Heindorf＇s note；and as in

Aristoph. Pax 759 , $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi_{0} \lambda \epsilon \mu i \zeta \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{i} \chi \circ \nu \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \dot{i}, \kappa \alpha i \hat{i} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ $\nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \nu$. But in all these cases Wunder's excellent observation on Phil. 38 holds good, that 'when two or more things are mentioned which all belong to some one genus, the Greeks are accustomed so to join the pronoun ${ }^{a} \lambda \lambda$ os, by a sort of attraction, with that noun which indicates the species, that the meaning of the pronoun must be referred, not to the noun with which it is connected, but to the noun indicating the genus, and so that the noun with which $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda$ os is connected must be looked upon as containing an explanation of that pronoun, and of the substantive to which the meaning of the pronoun refers.' So for example in Eur. Med. 297, $\chi \omega \rho$ is
 are the two species of one genus, the two sorts of disadvantage under which oi $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega}$ s $\sigma \phi \phi$ oi labour: and we may translate the pronoun in English, besides, in addition, over and above; 'For not to mention the character of slothfulness which they have over and above, they incur \&c.'" Here (as $\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ follows its noun) render, from messengers at second hand, i.e. from messengers over and above my own observation.
8. Though self-satisfaction is among the faults of Oed., yet here he desires to inspire the suppliants with confidence in his power to help them. It is also the purpose of a Prologos to bring to the notice of the audience the leading characters by name. Hence the Priest repeats the name,
 Oedipus the all-renowned. His renown came from his victory over the Sphinx. See Introd. $\| \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ is dat. ethicus, depending on $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, 'renowned in the estimation of all.' So 40, $\hat{\omega}$ крáтıбтоע $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ Oidíтov кápa. O. C. 1446 , ávástaı $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \hat{a} \sigma i \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{\delta} v \sigma \tau v \chi \epsilon i \nu$.
9. Oed. now, with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, but or therefore, addresses specially the priest of Zeus, whose age, dignified form, attire, and position point him out as the leading personage. $\hat{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \rho a t \epsilon$, aged sire, or (as J.), thou venerable

 See Periphrasis in Introd. ধौ申us, you were constituted by nature, therefore you are: almost invariable use of $\notin \phi v \nu$. Griffiths on Prom. 335.
10. $\pi \rho \grave{o} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon$, on the part of these, i.e. as representing them. Сp. O. C. 8 II . $\| \tau i \nu \iota \tau \rho o ́ \pi \omega \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon$, in what mood ye are come. A question after $\phi \rho a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ is always indirect. к $\alpha \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon$, sync. for $\kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon}$ 2nd p.pl. perf. (intrans.) of ккөiбтךul, to place, 'ye have placed yourselves,' $=y e$ are come. In $703 \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \iota$ is, 'to stand in the position of,' to be.

11-13. Render: affrighted, or reposing in the trust that I shall willingly give full assistance: yes, I were hard-hearted otherwise, in not pitying a supplication such as this. On the constructions in these lines, see Excursus II. \|| G. Wolff observes that the lines in the opening speech of Oed.
run thus: $3+2 ; 3 ; 2+3$ : also that in the first 3 there is a prevalence of the palatal sounds $\tau, \sigma$, in the next 2 of the nasals $\mu, \nu$. The middle 3 , tender in feeling, bring out the gutturals $\gamma, \kappa$, along with the soft liquid $\lambda$ : in what follows there is first a prominence of the firm labials $\phi$, $\pi$, while in the three closing lines, tender yet resolute, palatals again appear, strengthened by labials, and softened by vowels and diphthongs. Nowhere is found the canine letter $\dot{\rho}$ in its native roughness ( $\left.{ }^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \epsilon, \epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho \pi \epsilon, \mathrm{K} \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s\right)$ : either it is softened by a palatal before it ( $\tau \rho_{0} \phi \dot{\eta}, \tau \rho_{0}^{\prime} \pi \varphi$ ), or it makes a firm labial yet firmer ( $\phi \rho a ́ \delta \epsilon, \pi \rho \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ), or melts into a guttural ( $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \xi \bar{\xi} \alpha \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$, $\dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ), or it is smothered in soft vowels and diphthongs (катокктєip $\omega \nu$ ). This observation does not indicate the process followed by the poet's mind, but the result achieved by his fine ear and taste.
14. The priest's reply also begins with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$, well then. It implies that he has given attention to the words of Oed., but has something to add.
15. $\dot{o} \rho \hat{q} s ~ \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$. The $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ corresponding to this $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ is in $1.19, \tau o ̀ \delta$, $\alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda 0 \phi \hat{u} \lambda o v . \| \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ is an instance of that attraction, so frequent in Greek poetry, by which a noun, which might be subject of a dependent clause, is drawn back to become the object of the principal clause: i.e. $\dot{o} \rho \hat{q} s \dot{\eta} \lambda i \kappa \kappa o$


 of what age, rel. pron.
16. $\beta \omega \mu$ oíб $\tau$ тois $\sigma o i ̂$. The altar of Apollo $\Lambda$ úкєьos is the only one mentioned by name ( 919 ), as ä $\gamma \chi \iota \sigma \tau o s$. Hence Ritter believes it the only one in front of the palace, and takes the plural here in a sing. sense, like $\delta \dot{\prime} \mu o t, \delta \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a, \& \mathrm{c}$. This is surely improbable. We cannot indeed say with certainty what other deities had altars here, though Pallas, Artemis, Dionysus, are the most likely names, being those invoked afterwards by the Chorus, as well as Zeus $\epsilon \rho \kappa \epsilon \iota o s$. Since the proscenium was narrow, and the Chorus not yet present, we may fairly suppose that the choral platform itself was occupied by some of the suppliants, and perhaps that even the thymele, or altar of Bacchus, at its northern extremity, was among those here noticed. See Ae. Ag. 485 \&c. $\|$ oi $\mu \epsilon \nu$, some: i.e. the young children, here likened to newly-fledged birds,

 $\beta a \rho v \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota ~ a \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\varphi}$.
 implies ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \iota \delta \epsilon \grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$, which is left for the mind to supply. Z $\epsilon \in \dot{s}$,
 a marriageable (but unmarried) youth. They were employed in temples, as Ion in the play of Euripides.
19. Tò $\delta$ ' $\mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda o \phi u ̂ \lambda o \nu . J$. renders, 'the rest of the folk.' So Ritter 'das and're Volk', and this seems to be the general view. I doubt its correctness. Can $\phi \hat{u} \lambda o \nu$ stand for the population of a town? Would not $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os be more likely? And is it imaginable that all Thebes was gone with $i \kappa \epsilon \tau \eta \rho i a \iota\left(\xi_{\xi} \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon_{\nu}^{\prime} \nu \nu\right)$ to supplicate in public places on the same day and at the same early hour (see 65) by common consent? Looking at the words $\tau \grave{\partial} \not \partial \lambda \lambda o$, and considering that $\phi \hat{u} \lambda o \nu$ implies a similarity of component persons, I cannot help suspecting that we ought to render-' the rest of our number' (or 'of our body'); and to understand that the priestly order in Thebes had organised a company of suppliants, consisting of themselves, of youths selected by themselves ( $\lambda_{\epsilon \kappa \tau о i}$ ), and of children, and so distributed and instructed these, that various parties should at the same time appear in suppliant guise at important points and places of the city; the principal troop, headed by the priest of Zeus, being destined for the royal palace.
20. ajoopaīt, in the market-squares: dat. loci. The Agora, being the oldest part of an Hellenic city, naturally became the focus, not only of commercial, but of religious and political life. Here (say Guhl and Köner) even in Homer's time the citizens assembled in consultation; hence it was supplied with seats: here were the oldest sanctuaries, here statues and altars of the gods: here were held the first festive games. Zeus, Hermes, Athene were its presiding deities (áropaîol): Artemis is named at 16 I . Its usual form was a quadrangular court, surrounded by colonnades. See S. El. 7. \| $\Pi a \lambda \lambda a ́ \delta o s ~ \delta \iota \pi \lambda o i ̂ s ~ \nu \alpha o i ̂ s . ~ W e ~ d o ~ n o t ~ k n o w ~ w h i c h ~ a r e ~ m e a n t, ~ P a l l a s ~$ being worshipped at Thebes under various titles, as "О ${ }^{\circ} \kappa \alpha$, ' $\mathrm{I} \sigma \mu \eta \nu i a$, Ka $\mu \mu i a$, \&c., we may suppose the first and third of these. \|J. suggests that Soph., in mentioning two temples of Pallas, wished to remind the audience of those two at Athens, which stood on the Acropolis above the theatre: the Erechtheion, and the Parthenon. The Er. contained a temple of Pallas, besides which and her Parthenon, as the virgin goddess, she had also on that hill her great statue, as Polias, tutelar of the city. Steel says: 'the $\nu$ aòs was that part of the temple which contained the altars and image of the deity, i.e. the shrine (cella, sacellum) : iepor the whole building ; $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \omega$ s the sacred precinct round it $:=$ chancel, church, churchyard.'

2I. $\quad \epsilon \pi{ }^{\prime}$ ' $I \sigma \mu \eta \nu o \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i ́ q \sigma \pi o \delta \hat{\varphi}$. Ismenus, a Theban seer, gave his name to the river Ladon, S. of Thebes. The temple of Ismenian Apollo there was oracular, divination being drawn from the sacrifices ( $\epsilon \mu \pi \nu \rho o-$ $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i(a)$. Cp. Ant. 1005 \&c. where such omens are described. Hence $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a \operatorname{\sigma \pi o\delta } \hat{\omega}$ the prophetic altar-ash. See Herod. vili. 132, and J.'s note on this place.
 sea. $\|$ '̈ $\tau$ ' oủ oía $\tau \epsilon=$ oủk $\epsilon$ ' oi"a $\tau \epsilon(\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i)$ hath power no longer. oî́s $\tau \epsilon=$

 both of manner and matter, describing in what the wasting consists. Herod. says (vi. I39), after the Pelasgi had slain their children and wives

26. $\beta$ ovv $\delta \mu o \iota s=\beta 0 \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \nu \epsilon \mu о \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$, of pasturing kine. \| $\tau 6 \kappa o s$, travail, labour (of child-birth). Hesiod Op. D. ${ }^{242}$, oủôè $\gamma v \nu a \hat{\imath} \kappa \epsilon s$ tiккоvбıv.
27. ärovos, bringing not to birth, abortive, barren. \|| $\dot{\nu}$. Some would join this (as separated by tmesis) with $\sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \psi a s:$ but rather it is adverbial: at the same time, meanzwhile. See 183, O. C. 55, Ant. 420, 1274, Tr. 207, $\mathrm{Aj} .675 . \| \theta \epsilon o ́ s$, the plague is deified, and called $\pi \dot{v} \rho \phi о \rho o s$ as bringing fever.
28. $\sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \psi a s$, swooping. $\sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \pi \tau \omega$, to strike, as a thunderbolt falling to earth. \| $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda$ aúvєl, assails, ravages. See $167-185 . \|$ Cp. the account of the plague of Athens in Thuc. in. Lucr. vi.
29. Thebes is called the home of Cadmus its founder. || Observe the elision of $\epsilon$ in $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ at the close of this verse : a liberty often taken by Soph., never by Aesch. or Eurip. See 785, 791, 1224, O. C. 17, Ant. 103 1.
30. "Aı $\delta \eta s$, Hades (Pluto), god of the shades below.
31. iбoú $\mu \epsilon \nu o ́ v \sigma \epsilon$ depends on крivovtєs in 33 .
33. $\sigma u \mu \phi o p a i ̂ s, ~ c o m m o n ~ e v e n t s, ~ i n ~ c o n t r a d i s t i n c t i o n ~ t o ~ \xi u v a \lambda \lambda a \gamma a i ̂ s, ~$ visitations, or interventions in 34 .
35. ös $\gamma \epsilon$ (quippe qui) \&c. seeing thou didst come to the city of Cadmus and loose off from us ( $\epsilon \xi \in \lambda v \sigma a s) \& \mathrm{c}$. i.e. release us from.
36. The $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho a ̀$ áoıòs (cruel songstress or poetess) is the Sphinx, whose riddle was in verse. See Excursus XI., and 391-308.
37. кal râ̂ $\alpha$, and that too. So Ant. 322, El. 614. \|| ovi $\delta \dot{e} \nu ~ \grave{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\omega} s$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{0}$, having gained no kelpful information; nothing more ( $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{0}$ ) than you knew already.
39. $\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \nu \nu \mu i \zeta \epsilon \theta^{\prime}$, Attic for $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \eta \nu \circ \mu i \zeta \eta \theta^{\prime}$, Pres. p. 2nd p. s. \|I Soph. has $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu$ as trochee 26 times, $\dot{v} \mu i \nu \mathbf{1 2}$; Aesch. and Eur. never.
40. Oiठímov кápa, a frequent periphrasis for a person dignified or beloved.

41-45. Render these lines, all we who are suppliants here besecch thee to find some help for us, whether thou hast learnt it from hearing any god's voice, or, it may be, from a man, since I perceive that experienced counsellors do also, most of any, keep alive the habit of conferring in counsel. On the just interpretation of this passage, so commonly and so grievously misinterpreted, see Excursus iir.

46, 47. $i \theta_{l}$, imperat. of $\epsilon i \mu l$, ibo. Here used interjectionally, on! or
 (lest thy great renown be impaired).
48. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho o s \pi \rho o \theta v \mu i a s$, gen. of cause; on account of thy former zeal. See 233. $\pi \rho \rho \mu \eta \theta i a s$ is an inferior reading.

49, 50. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$. Subjunctive of $\mu \epsilon \in \mu \nu \eta \mu a l$, Perf. of $\mu \nu$ áo $\mu a l$, gov. gen. II $\mu \eta \delta a \mu \omega \hat{s} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ne'er let this be our remembrance of thy reign, that we stood upright at first, and fell afterwards. Cp. О. С. ${ }_{7}{ }_{74}, \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \hat{\eta} r^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$.

5 I. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \epsilon i ́ a$. Dat. of manner : = $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{\omega}$, or $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{\eta} \epsilon i v a l$.
52. öp $\nu_{l} \theta_{l}$ aioi $\varphi$ (alite fausto), with happy omen. Divination taken from birds was so usual a practice of Greeks and Romans, that bird became a common term for omen. Cp. Hor. C. i. 15,5 mala avi. Aristoph. Av. 719-21,




53. $\tau \alpha \nu \hat{v} \nu=\nu \hat{v} \nu$. II 'ioos equal (to thy former self); thine own equal.
56. Doubling of negatives in Greek commonly strengthens negation, as here; but cancels it in English. $\|$ Cp. Thucyd. vil 77 , ä $\nu \delta \rho \in s$ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ o u ̉ ~ \tau \epsilon i \chi \eta ~ o v ं \delta \grave{\delta ̀ ~} \nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon s$ à $\nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ кєvai.
57. $\mu \dot{\eta} \xi \nu \nu \circ \iota \kappa o u ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$ is an idiomatic Greek epexegesis of $\notin \rho \eta \mu o s$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, destitute of men (without any) to dzvell with thee thercin. || Hermann says that this use of a participle with $\mu \grave{\eta}$ is scarcely ever to be found, except when a noun signifying action with negative result, as $\epsilon \rho \eta \mu o s$ here, is placed instead of a verb. \| Observe $\epsilon \sigma \omega$ for the more correct ${ }^{\ell} \nu \delta o \nu$.
58. $\gamma \nu \omega \tau \grave{\alpha}$ коüк ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \nu \omega \tau \alpha$. Of this idiom, so frequent in tragedy, J. says that it is used when the speaker feels that he has to contend against an impression existing in the minds of his hearers. I can only say that it is one of those forms which grew out of the love of epexegesis and emphasis common to Greeks and Orientals. See other instances, $6_{3}, 38_{4}, 1_{2} 30$, 1275, O. C. 935 , 1653 , Tr. 962 , Aj. 289, El. 865 , 929 , 1283 . So in SS. 'live and not die.' $\|$ On the forms $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o$ 's, $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \pi$ ós, see 36 r .
59. $i \mu \epsilon i \rho \omega$ here with accus., elsewhere with gen. Middle $i \mu \epsilon i \rho \epsilon \tau a \iota$ with infin. is used 386 .
 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ö $\sigma \tau \iota s$. $\| \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ í $\sigma o v \dot{\omega} s \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \sigma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$, is as sick as $I$ am. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ í $\sigma o v$ an adverbial phrase formed by prep. and adj. Many such occur in Soph.
 himself alone.
65. The suppliants had reached the palace at an early hour. \| $\ddot{\pi} \pi \nu \omega \gamma$ $\varepsilon \ddot{\delta} \delta o \nu \tau a$, a redundant expression resembling the construction of a cognate accus.; and needing no correction. Steel says: "the addition of the noun strengthens the verb, as Verg. Aen. I. 680 'somno sopitum.' Comp. 344, 1229. O.C. $1^{625}$, фó $\beta \varphi \delta$ єi $\sigma a \nu r a s$. The use of $\epsilon \dot{v} i \omega$ for inaction is common. See 586."
 tic. not an infin., follows verbs of seeing, hearing, knowing, \&c. \| $\delta \dot{\eta}$ strengthens $\delta а \kappa \rho$., having perhaps its original temporal force, $\ddot{\eta} \delta \eta$ : it also strengthens such words as $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a \dot{a}$.

 noun: $\pi \lambda a \dot{\nu} \eta$ being more usual.
68. єӥр८бкоข. Elmsley and Schneidewin write $\eta \dot{v} \rho \iota \sigma \kappa о \nu$, but later scholars, as Ellendt, prefer the form $\epsilon \dot{\omega}$. See Curtius.

70-71. In spite of differing quantities, it is suggested that $\Pi \nu \theta \dot{\omega}$ had its

$7 \mathrm{I}-2$. ő $\tau \iota \delta \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \nu, \hat{\eta} \tau i \phi \omega \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$. Phil. $905, \delta \rho \hat{\mathrm{~s}}$ oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \phi \omega \nu \epsilon i \hat{s}$. On the true reading $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ (not $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu)$ see Exc. Iv. Render $I$ should rescue.

73-5. These lines are very crabbed Greek, and cannot be rendered literally into good English. ${ }^{~}{ }^{\top} H \mu a \rho \eta{ }^{\eta} \delta \eta$ can only mean 'the present day,' though a strange expression : and $\chi$ oó $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ can only mean 'the time of Creon's departure.' The phrase $\lambda v \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau i \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota$ finds a parallel in Aj .
 following. Render freely: and the reckoning of time from that day to the present makes me painfully doubtful how he fares: for he is away longer than I naturally expected, outstaying the time required.

76-7. какós, a dastard, unprincipled. \|| $\mu \dot{\eta} \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, if I fail to do. \|| $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\imath}$ subjunctive for $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ \eta$.

78-79. The approach of Creon is now signified to the priest by some of the suppliants. \|| $\epsilon$ is ка入óv, at the happy moment. Eur. H. F. 728, ès ка入ò $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \chi \epsilon$. Plato, Meno, 90, Euthyd. 275. Ant. 386, єis סє́ov. || $\sigma \dot{v}$ $\tau \epsilon \epsilon i \pi a s$ oí $\delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ $\sigma \eta \mu a i \nu o v \sigma \iota$, lit. both thou hast spoken, and these make sign to me:=thou hast spoken at the hafpy moment when \&c. \| $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon i \chi o y \tau a$. See 66. $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \epsilon i \chi o \nu \tau a$ was a false reading retained by some editors; but corrected by Erf. Schäf. H. Wu., \&c.
$80-8 \mathrm{r}$. " $\hat{\omega} \nu a \xi$. The term ${ }^{\alpha} \nu a \xi$, given throughout to Oed., is here applied to Apollo, at 284 to his seer Teiresias, at 85 to Creon, And at 9II the Chorus are addressed as $\chi \omega$ 'ि as ävaктєs. The word anciently meant one to whom any duty was assigned: as Ae. Pers. $378 \kappa \omega ́ \pi \eta \xi$ äva ${ }^{\prime}, 397$ $i \pi \pi \iota a ́ v a \kappa \tau \epsilon s$. So $\chi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega \dot{\nu} a \xi$," St. $\| \epsilon i \gamma^{\prime} \alpha, \epsilon i, \epsilon i \theta \epsilon, O$ that, (it would be well if), have the force of the Lat. utinam, as well as $\dot{\omega} s, \pi \hat{\omega} s \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \nu$, and are joined with an optative, as with $\beta$ aim here. So in Latin Verg. Aen. viri. 560 , O mihi praeteritos referat si Juppiter annos. Hor. S. II. 6, 8-Io, O si angulus ille proximus accedat... O si urnam argenti fors quae mihi monstret. \| $\epsilon^{\nu} \tau \dot{\tau} \chi \eta \gamma \dot{\gamma} \tau \varphi($ for $\tau \nu \nu i)$. The $\gamma \epsilon$ throws its emphasis on $\tau \dot{\prime} \chi \eta$ $\tau \varphi$, as if it followed $\tau \omega$. Ae. Sept. 472, $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \tau u ́ \chi \eta \delta \epsilon ́ \tau \psi$. Cho. ı3 ${ }^{8}, \sigma \dot{v} \nu$ $\tau u ́ \chi \eta \tau \iota \nu i$. S. Aj. 853, $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \tau \alpha ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \tau \iota \nu i ́$. Ellendt says $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau u ́ \chi \eta=\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ̀ \tau u ́ \chi \eta s$. K. OE.

We might say $=\sigma \dot{v} \nu$, as above. Other instances in Soph. of this almost redundant $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ are El. 1141, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\xi} \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota \sigma \iota \chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i \kappa \eta \delta \epsilon v \theta \epsilon i s:$ Ant. 1093, $\sigma \pi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \chi \eta \lambda \alpha i ̂ \sigma \iota \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o v s: ~ T r . ~ 886, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu ~ \tau o \mu \hat{a} ~ \sigma \iota \delta a ́ \rho o v . ~ W u n d e r ~ s a y s ~(o n ~ P h i l . ~$ 60) ' $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ with its case and also $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ with its case often $=$ the case of the instrument (dat. Gr., abl. Lat.) ; $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ indicating in what the power of action lies, $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ from what the power of action proceed.' || $\sigma \omega \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ as a fem. epithet occurs in Soph. only here; but in Phil. 1470, the nymphs are invoked $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho a s$ i $\kappa \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$. But Aeschylus uses $\sigma \omega \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ as a fem. adj. several times, as Ag. $66_{4}$, $\tau \dot{\prime} \chi \eta \sigma \omega \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$. Euripides once, Med. 360 , in whom we also find

 bright with some saving fortune as (he comes) with beaming eye.

82-3. á $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ á, nay. I| єiкќбal, infin. used absolutely without $\dot{\omega}$, to make a guess, i.e. seemingly. Cp. S. El. 410 , סокєî̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \mu o i ́ . ~\| \| ~ \dot{\delta} \delta u ̀ s ~ i . e . ~$ Baivet, he comes in gladness, i.e. 'with glad tidings.' || $\gamma$ à $\rho$ refers to a suppressed protasis, $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{v} s \quad \notin \beta a \iota \nu \epsilon$ : for otherwise, else, oủk ä $\begin{gathered} \\ \epsilon\end{gathered} \rho \pi \epsilon$, he would not be approaching. See äv in Exc. xiv. \| кápa, accus. of respect, dep. on $\pi_{0} \lambda \nu \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \eta_{s}$, richly crowned, with gen. of fulness, $\pi a \gamma \kappa \alpha ́ \rho \pi o v$ $\delta a ́ \phi \nu \eta s$, berry-laden bay. $\pi a ̂ s$ in compos. has an intensive or superlative force. \| Steel says: "Those only returned home crowned with chaplets who had received favourable answers from the oracle. If the answer was unfavourable, or if anything unfortunate happened on their return, they put off

 Fabius Pictor on his return to Rome from his embassy to Delphi says, 'Se jussum ab templi antistite, sicut coronatus laurea corona et oraculum adiisset et rem divinam fecisset, ita coronatum navem ascendere, nec ante deponere eam, quam Romam pervenisset.' "
84. そú $\mu \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \circ$ ( $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu)$ $\dot{\omega} \kappa \lambda \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$, lit. 'he is within distance so as to hear ' = he is within hearing.
85. к $\eta \delta \epsilon v \mu \alpha$ for $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha ́$ (abstr. for concrete) kinsman by marriage, from the noun $\kappa \hat{\eta} \delta o s$, marriage-alliance, Aesch. Ag. The tragic poets are fond of applying abstract nouns, especially those formed from ist pers.



 figure is in use among the Latins also: Verg. Ecl. 7. 21, Nymphae, noster amor, Libethrides ; Ecl. 3, 66, meus ignis Amyntas: Cic. de Or. III. 42, quo item in genere et virtutes et vitia pro ipsis, in quibus illa sunt, appellantur. We also use the word relation for person as well as for thing. St.

87-8. Editors seem not to have observed that in these lines Soph., wishing to make Creon speak cheerfully, and to justify his bright countenance and chaplet of bay with berries, puts in his mouth a humorous play of words. He has to tell what is $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \phi \circ \rho o v$, ill to bear (a pollution difficult to trace, a cruel expiation troublesome to apply), yet, he says, if this happen to turn out right, it will be all good hap. The $\delta v \sigma$ - and the $\tau \dot{u} \chi \eta$ will not be $\delta v \sigma \tau v \chi \hat{\eta}$, but altogether $\epsilon \dot{v} \tau v \chi \hat{\eta}$. Shakespeare plays upon words with equal zest, as in Hamlet, 'a little more than kin, and less than
 $\delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{\partial} \rho \theta \hat{\eta} s(\kappa \nu \beta \epsilon \rho \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega s)$ Ant. 994. \|| $\tau \cup ́ \chi o \iota \epsilon \xi \xi \in \lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau a$. See Periphrasis. . II $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$, adverbial, but may agree with $\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \dot{v} \sigma \phi o \rho a$.

90. oû́' ô̂v $\pi \rho o \delta \epsilon i \sigma a s ~ \epsilon i \mu l$, neither (because I am not bold) am $I$ therefore (ouv) frightened before the time. See Part. and Periphr.
 of being is constantly omitted: probably to denote continuousness of action.
93. 's $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a s$, before all. \| The following construction $=\tau \grave{o} \gamma \dot{a} \rho \pi \epsilon \nu \theta$ os
 shown by its position before $\tau \grave{o} \pi \epsilon \nu \theta o$ s.
95. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \not \mu^{\prime} a^{\prime} \nu$ is a softened fut. (as 218,281 ) deferentially used.
98. à $\hat{\eta}^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau o \nu \tau \rho^{\prime} \phi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, nurture it till past cure: proleptic use of adj. which seems the right construction here. It would be past cure if the murderer of Laius were to die undiscovered and prospering.
99. tís ó toómos $\tau \hat{\eta} s \xi v \mu \phi o \rho \hat{a s}$; The usual rendering is: 'what is the nature of the calamity (the $\mu i a \sigma \mu a)$ ?' But a question thus distinct seems to need a connecting $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ or $\gamma$ á $\rho$ : and Creon only replies to $\pi о \dot{\prime} \varphi \boldsymbol{\varphi} \kappa a \theta a \rho \mu \hat{\varphi}$; Hence I think $\tau \eta s \xi v \mu \phi \circ \rho \hat{a} s=\tau o \hat{v} \xi \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, what is the mode of com-

roo-1. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \eta \lambda a \tau o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau a s$. Referred to $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s \ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \nu \omega \gamma \epsilon \nu$ in 96 . This verb occurs in Ae. Ag. 1586 , Eum. 22 r, Plato Rep. viII. 565 c. \|| фóv $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ фóvov $\pi$ á̀ı $\lambda$ duovtas, repaying (or atoning) death with death. Steel thinks the metaphor is from unweaving a web. Eur. Or. 593, $\mu i a \sigma \mu a \lambda \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$. This verb (to do away with) has also such objects as עєîкos, $\pi$ óvous. II is $\kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, seeing that this blood (фóvov) afficts the city: acc. absolute. The metaphor ( $\chi \in \iota \alpha \dot{\zeta} \zeta \epsilon \iota$ ) is that of a storm-tossed vessel. On $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \dot{\delta} \delta^{\prime}$ ai $\mu a \mathrm{cp}$.
 to what immediately precedes, or to what next follows.

102-4. $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ here may be rendered then. \| à $\pi \in v \theta \dot{v} v \in \nu$, direct, govern, as a pilot steers a ship. See $695-6,923$. On $\pi \rho i \nu$ see Particles.
105. $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о v^{\prime} \omega \nu$ (not $\left.\dot{\alpha} \kappa о v ́ \sigma a s\right)$, the hearsay being continuous. \| The merit of the reading $\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \gamma \omega^{\prime}$ is that the king, in his ignorance, distinguishes himself from Creon and the priests, saying, ' $I$ never saw Laius, as you often did'.

 El. 264. The more common form ( $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \omega \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \rho \nu$, as Phrynichus calls it) is aù $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\iota} \tau \eta s$, used by Ae. Eur. and the historians. \| $\tau \iota \nu a s=o i ̈ \tau \iota \nu \epsilon s$ oùv $\epsilon i \sigma \iota$, whoever they be.
ro8-9. oi, article as demonstr. pron., they. \| $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$, gen. part. with adv. of place. || $\delta v \sigma \tau \epsilon \kappa \mu a \rho \tau o s$, hard to make out, dim.

I13. $\sigma v \mu \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon l$ (hist. pres.) meet with, Aj. 424, какоîs тоюỗ $\delta \in \sigma v \mu \pi \epsilon \pi$ $\tau \omega \kappa о ́ \tau а$.
114. $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho o ́ s$ (see lex.) : any missionary sent by his country for a religious purpose was so called, whether his destination were Delphi or any other oracular temple, or the public games. $\epsilon \kappa \delta \eta \mu \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$, 'going (or being) abroad,' as we say : travelling. \| $\dot{\omega} \dot{s} \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$, from the time he set out ( $\dot{\omega} s=\mathrm{ex} q u o$ ).
117. See Lection. катє̂̂ठє ( $\kappa a \theta$ ор $\dot{\omega} \omega$ ). кат $\alpha$ compounded with a verb of seeing or hearing implies distinctness. \| örou Att. form for oû̃ıvos (from $\partial ̈ \sigma \tau(s)$, dep. on $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \mu a \theta \omega^{\prime} \nu$. $\| \epsilon \notin \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a \tau^{\prime} a^{\prime} \nu$, und. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$.
ri8-19. $\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa 0 \cup \sigma_{\iota} \gamma{ }^{\prime} \rho$. The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ refers to a supposed negative: no! The verb is hist. pres. \| $\epsilon i \chi \in \epsilon i \delta \dot{\omega} s \phi \rho a ́ \sigma a \iota$, was able to state from know-
 we suppose $\omega^{\top} \nu \epsilon \operatorname{li\delta \epsilon }$ a gen. of cause dep. on $\phi \dot{\beta} \beta \varphi$, flying in terror at what he saw. Some so construe : but I cannot adopt their view, though specious.
 learn': i.e. might procure much information. If àpरウ̀ ${ }^{\nu} \beta \rho a \chi \epsilon i ̂ a \nu, ~ a ~ m e r e ~$ starting-point. || $\mu \dot{q} \hat{\rho} \dot{\rho} \omega \hat{\eta}$, by one man's strength. $\| \nu \nu \nu=a u ̉ r o ́ v$. $\|$ We are to understand that the fugitive (who appears in 1117 as the shepherd entrusted with the exposure of the infant), ashamed of confessing that one man had defeated five, ascribed the death of Laius to a band of robbers, and afterwards, recognising in Oed. the murderer, entreated Jocasta to send him away from Thebes, without giving his motive. See $756-766$. I cannot suppose, with Bothe, that he had made known to her the guilt of Oed. He kept his own counsel, as he had done about sparing the infant. \| Steel says of $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \pi \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota \chi \epsilon \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ : " $\Sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$ here, as also in the next line, $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu{ }^{\prime} \rho \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \rho \varphi$, gives a meaning somewhat different from the dative of the instrument, and is rather by the assistance of, than by means of, as $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \in \hat{\varphi}$, with God's
 $\pi \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \sigma a s \quad \phi a \nu \hat{\eta} s$. But the distinction cannot be expected to be always very apparent. In English we commonly use with to express a mean or instrument, whilst the Romans in that sense carefully avoided cum, which always denoted accompaniment, though oiv and with by no means do so necessarily."

124-5. i $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\prime}$, the robber, poet. sing., adopted by Soph. for an evident purpose: would then any robber have gone to so daring a length, unless some intrigue were being carried on with bribery from this city (Thebes). The verb $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega$ is used in a similar sense of unfair dealing.
 no allusion to Creon here, as some suggest. The king does not suspect him before he has heard Teiresias.
126. $\delta о к о \hat{v} \nu \tau \alpha$ тầ $\tau^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \nu$, such ofinions were afloat.



 alone things out of sight, and regard what was close (lit. at our feet : we should say 'close at hand'). Causation (3rd use of middle voice) is contained in the verb $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \tau \sigma$.
132. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{v} \pi a \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s . . . \phi a \nu \hat{\omega}, I$ will start afresh and bring them into sight again. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\nu} \dot{\tau}$. is adverbial. $\phi a \nu \hat{\omega}$ ( $\tau \dot{a} \phi a \nu \hat{\eta})$, ' what was out of sight then I will bring into sight again now : i.e. I will revive the inquest concerning the death of Laius.' $\| a u{ }^{\prime} r^{\prime}=a u u^{\prime}$, them.
 attention to the dead man's cause. Though Creon has only reported the oracle and the facts respecting Laius, Oedipus already regards him as a leader in the movement, and is thus prepared to imagine him afterwards a conspirator with Teiresias against himself.
136. $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau a$, redressing or avenging, with dat. In 140 this verb, with accus. $\left({ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon\right)$, means, to wreak wrath upon.

143. iv $\tau \tau a \sigma \theta \epsilon$, for $\alpha \nu i \sigma \tau a \sigma \theta \epsilon$, rise $u p$.

144-6. äג入os $\delta \dot{\epsilon} . . . \delta \rho a ́ \sigma o \nu \tau o s$, let some one else collect hither the people of Cadmus, saying that I shall do all. \|I Any translation, which throws oìv $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ into parenthesis, fails to bring out the force of the passage, which lies in those words. Oed. is meant to say: 'we are now altogether in the god's hands, and, whether we are to prove fortunate or the reverse, depends upon him, and him alone'. Here, as everywhere, Soph. brings into strong relief the two really inconsistent features in the king's character and conduct: ( I ) he is blindly self-confident ( $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \pi \hat{a} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\nu} \hat{v} \delta \rho a ́ \sigma o \nu \tau o s$ ), and yet (2) he has the most entire pious confidence in Apollo, who is all the while


148. кal, emphatic: we did in fact come hither. \| $\epsilon \xi a \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota$, sends to announce, third sense of the middle voice: that of indirect agency: causation of action.

## II. PARODOS. ( $15 \mathrm{I}-2 \mathrm{I} 5$.)

(Outine.) Oedipus retires into the palace through the central door: Creon, probably, through that on its western side. The procession of suppliants, reforming itself, leaves the theatre by its former route. After a short pause, the Chorus enters the orchestra through the same passage (parodos). It consists of 15 Theban councillors, elderly but hale men. In three ranks, of five each, they march, preceded by a flute-player, under the seats of the spectators ( $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \tau \rho \circ \nu$ or коі̂入оע), probably singing on their way the first strophe, after which they ascend the choral platform, where they form themselves into two semichoruses, divided by the thymele, or altar of Dionysus; and, turning their faces to the spectators, sing the rest of their opening song, which bears the name Parodos (entrance song), and is in its nature a Paean. It contains three strophes, each with its correspondent antistrophe. Knowing, from the messenger, that they are sent for to hear an oracle which has arrived from Delphi, in the first strophe they express their anxious curiosity respecting its purport. In its antistrophe they invoke the protection of three deities, revered as $\dot{\operatorname{a}} \lambda \epsilon \xi i-$ какос (averrunci), averters of evil. These are Pallas Athene, Artemis, and Apollo. The second strophe, and its antistrophe, describe and deplore in melancholy strains the affliction caused by the raging pestilence. In the third strophe and antistrophe the old men resume prayerful invocation. Impersonating the cruel plague under the title of the war-god Ares, they entreat Athene to defeat and drive him from the land, again desiring the help of Phoebus and Artemis, besides that of Zeus the Thunderer himself. And finally they implore their native Theban deity, Dionysus or Bacchus, to join this alliance against a deity so disesteemed among gods.

A limited Doric dialect was used in Choral Odes by the Attic poets.
 $\Delta a ́ \lambda \iota \epsilon$ for $\Delta \eta$., Пaià $\nu$ for $-\omega \dot{\nu}, \phi \dot{a} \mu a$ for $\phi \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$.

On the Choric Metres see Metrical Appendix.
(Notes). 151. $\Delta i o ̀ s \phi \dot{\prime} \tau \iota$. The Delphic oracle was that of Zeus: Ae.

 the oracular answer, afterwards called фápa. So Verg. Aen. 111. 25 I, quae Phoebo Pater omnipotens, mihi Phoebus Apollo praedixit. Again Eum. 594, O. C. 623, 793. It is remarkable that the same terms which Aeschylus applies to Phoebus with respect to Zeus, are applied by Pindar to
 || tis $\pi 0 \tau \epsilon$; of what nature, I wonder. I| $\pi 0 \lambda u \chi \rho \dot{v} \sigma o v$. Delphi is so called from the magnificent presents made to the shrine, and from the
treasures deposited there by many commonwealths．See Eur．Ion 54－6； Herod．I．50；Pausan．Phoc．9．Soph．has borrowed the epithet from Hom．$\lambda^{\prime} .46$ ，where it is applied to Mycenae．E．Andr．2，$\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \nu \chi \rho \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ $\chi \lambda \iota \delta \hat{\eta}, "$ St．

152．＇$\Pi v \theta \dot{\omega}$ ，－ô̂s，$\Pi u \theta \dot{\omega} \nu,-\hat{\omega} \nu o s$, are variant forms．（So Tup＇́s and $\mathrm{T} u \phi(\omega \nu)$ ．This was the oldest name of the district of Phocis at the foot of Parnassus，in which lay the town of Delphi；it was also the oldest name of the town itself．But Homer and Hesiod speak of the district alone：Il．$\beta^{\prime}$ ． $5^{19}$ ，$\Pi \nu \theta \omega ิ \nu \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \rho \dot{\eta} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$ ．It first appears as a town in Herod．I．54， and Pind．Ol．vir．ıo．＇St．

153．＇$\Theta \dot{\eta} \beta$ 人as．Accus．of place after verb of motion（ $\xi \beta a s$ ），poetic， especially epic．The name of this city is used both in sing．and plur．by Homer and Sophocles．Aeschylus uses the word only once，and that in the plural，Pers．36．In his Theban play he only uses Ká $\delta \mu o v \pi o ́ \lambda c s$ and K $\alpha \delta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} o$ ．Eurip．uses it as plural always in iambics（except in a fragm．） and singular in choric parts．In Attic prose it is always plural．There were three cities of this name：one in Asia Minor，$\theta \dot{\eta} \beta \eta \dot{v} \pi о \pi \lambda \alpha \kappa i \eta$ ；a second in Egypt，$\Theta \hat{\eta} \beta a \iota \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \alpha \tau \delta \mu \pi \nu \lambda o \iota$ ；the third，the capital of Boeotia， $\Theta \hat{\eta} \beta a \iota \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \cup \lambda o \iota . ~ M \nu \kappa \eta \dot{\nu} \eta$ and $\Pi \lambda a \tau \alpha i a$ are singular in the earlier writers， plural in the later，the Attic；except in choric Greek，as Iph．A． 265 ，
 $\tau \alpha \mu a \iota ~ \phi о \beta \epsilon \rho \grave{\nu} \nu \phi \rho \in ́ v a: m y$ timid heart is on the stretch（to learn）．This I regard as the best punctuation－making $\delta \epsilon i \mu \alpha \tau \iota \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ intrans．while $I$
 $\dot{\alpha} \zeta \dot{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 s$, musing on thee with holy awe．Here I place a colon，regarding

 anxiety）．$\phi \rho \in \ell \nu a$ is acc．of respect．$\phi \rho \grave{\eta} \nu$ properly means the midriff，i．e． the muscle which separates the heart and viscera：hence Aesch．Prom．88r，


154．Пaıáv，for חaı$\iota \nu$ ，Apollo＇s title as the healing god ：$\Delta \dot{a} \lambda \iota o s$ ，his title as born（with Artemis）of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \alpha \tau \dot{\omega}$（Latona）in the isle Delos：of iグios Steel says：＇Soph．uses iñ̈os three times：twice as an epithet of Apollo， here and 1096 ，but in 173 we have $i \eta i \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ ，applied to the pains of child－birth．He seems to derive it from ín $l \eta{ }^{\prime}$ ，just as $\epsilon$ ưióos in 2 Ir comes from the Bacchic shout $\epsilon \dot{0} 0 \hat{i}$ ，and is applied to Dionysus（Bacchus）．The exclamation $l \grave{\eta}$ seems to have been expressive of grief，as well as of joy and triumph．We need not wonder therefore that Apollo is called líios，as being both the author and the stayer of pestilence．See Hom．Il．$a^{\prime}$ ，and
 is the Epic and Ionic form of $\pi a<a d$, as the healing god，and as the paean．



 (A. Av. 696). In a pure Greek writer $\ddot{\omega}^{\rho} \rho a$ never means hour, only season. $\| \nu \epsilon \in \circ \nu \eta ̈ \pi . \dot{\omega} . \pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu ;$ novel, or brought back in the revolution of seasons, so that $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu=\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \nu \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\delta} \nu$. This interpr. I am glad to restore to its true author, G. Wolff. The old view made $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \nu=\nu \hat{v} \nu n o w$, and $\pi$. $\dot{\omega}$. $\pi \dot{a} \lambda \iota \nu=$ recurring in the revolution of seasons hereafter. If $\mu_{0}$ is in the nature of an ethic dative.
158. The oracle is called 'daughter of Hope,' because those who consulted the god did so in hope of obtaining a favourable answer.
159. Elmsley edits $\kappa є \kappa \lambda о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \varphi$ to agree with $\mu 0 \iota$, but the nom. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \delta_{-}^{-}$ $\mu \epsilon \nu o s$ is one of the constructions called d́vakódov $\theta a$ (unconsecutive). They
 I implore you to appear, is what the poet had in mind here. So Plato Legg.
 $\kappa є \kappa \lambda о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs (see кє́ $\lambda о \mu \alpha \iota$ in lex.) is used as a present, though $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda о ́ \mu \eta \nu$ or $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda o ́ \mu \eta \nu$, is a syncopated aorist with reduplication in Homer. || It is improbable that Soph. would write such a word as ä aß $\mu \rho \tau \epsilon$ in two contiguous lines, having no need to do so, even though the second line is in the antistrophe. But I cannot suppose that he, a most patriotic Athenian, would apply the epithet 'immortal,' dignified enough for $\phi \dot{\alpha} \mu a$, to the great goddess Pallas, daughter of Zeus, and tutelar of Athens. Here then I find a grievous blot; and I look about for its cause and its correction. Both are, I think, soon discernible. Nobody can be familiar with the habits of scribes and scholiasts in the decline of learning, without noticing their restless endeavour to hunt out passages which are, or seem to be, in pari materia, and to assimilate them by transferring to the one the phrases of the other. Thus in the Agamemnon, the words $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi^{\prime}$ ' $A \lambda \epsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \rho \rho \varphi$ are foisted into anapaests where they ought not to be, because they afterwards appear in anapaests where they have their fitting place. So here, some meddling
 takes a fancy to the word $\theta \dot{\prime} \gamma a \tau \epsilon \rho$, and strives to replace it here: but this he can only do by finding for 'A $\theta$ áva some trochaic epithet, beginning with a vowel. $a^{\alpha} \mu \beta \rho o \tau^{\prime}$, of the previous verse, stares him in the face. If $\phi \dot{\alpha} \mu a$ is immortal, so by prior claim is Athene; and down goes á $\mu \beta \rho o \tau^{\prime}$ into the MS., dribbling afterwards into cod. L. and its copies. But I think his transposing mania did not rest there. If he liked $\theta \dot{\prime} \gamma a \tau \epsilon \rho$, he liked $\chi \rho v \sigma \epsilon a$ as well, and could not have too much of that exquisite Pindaric epithet. So, finding $\phi i \lambda i a s$, an epithet of Hope, in the verse from which he had pilfered ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \beta \rho \circ \tau \epsilon$, this busy corrector substituted $\chi \rho v \sigma \epsilon a s$.

Moved by these probabilities，I have suggested，without editing，$\phi i \lambda i a s$ and $\Delta c \dot{c} s{ }_{\epsilon} \kappa \gamma \gamma \nu \epsilon, \Pi a \lambda \lambda \grave{s}$ ．The fitness of the latter will perhaps commend it to those who feel the badness of $\ddot{a}^{\prime} \mu \beta \rho o \tau \epsilon$ ．Cp．O．C．rogo，$\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \pi a i ̂ s$ חa入入às＇A $\theta$ áva．The former may not find equal favour：for Soph．was quite at liberty to call Hope $\chi \rho v \sigma \notin a$ ．But my suspicion will remain．I agree with those scholars who，as Ellendt，think that Soph．follows Pindar， as to the doubtful quantity of the first syll．in $\chi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \sigma$ ．

160．＇racaoxov．Usually this epithet is in a wider sense applied to Poseidon；once to Zeus ：here alone it is transferred to Artemis in the re－ stricted sense of mo入っôरos，guardian of the land（of Boeotia），in which character she had a temple at Thebes，as Pausanias，Boeot．c．${ }_{17}$ ，mentions． Plutarch also in Aristides c． 20 says of a certain Euchidas，who ran from Plataea to Delphi，to fetch light from the sacred fire，and back again before sunset， 1000 stadia in one day，that the Plataeans buried him in the temple of Artemis Eucleia，the name of Eucleia，he adds，being given by most persons to Artemis，though some make her to be a daughter of Hercules and Myrto．An altar and statue were erected to her in every ápopá，and sacrifices offered to her by those who were about to enter into the state of marriage．＇St．\｜$\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \epsilon \dot{\alpha}$ is the ancient and poetic form for $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \dot{\eta}$ ． Elsewhere in ancient poetry the title of sister is given to Artemis only in reference to her brother Apollo．
 the agora，as in Phil． $1123 \pi 0 \lambda \iota \hat{a} s \pi \delta \nu \tau o v ~ \theta \iota \nu o ̀ s ~ f o r ~ \pi o \lambda \iota o ̂ ~ \pi . ~ \theta . ~ b y ~ a ~$ transposition of epithets frequent in the tragic poets．Ant． $793, \nu \epsilon i \kappa \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$
 $\dot{a} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \xi \omega \nu$ ．\｜As to the form of the $\dot{\alpha} \gamma o \rho a i, \mathrm{~J}$ ．justly says the word кúклоs （encircling boundary）does not define that form to be necessarily circu－
 Il．$\sigma^{\prime}$ ． 504 ，$\epsilon i a \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \xi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \tau o i \sigma \iota \lambda i \theta o \iota s, i \epsilon \rho \hat{\varphi} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu i \kappa v ́ \kappa \lambda \varphi$ ．Neue takes it to mean ＇full of ки́клоc，＇bands of people surrounding the altar．So Simonides in
 of the expression is not free from doubt．\｜On $\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \theta \rho \dot{\partial} \nu o \nu$ see 2 ，note on

 vi． 75 ．

164．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \xi i \mu о \rho o \iota=\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \xi i \kappa a \kappa o l$ ，or $\dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \xi \eta \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \iota \iota$ ，or $\dot{a} \pi о \tau \rho b \pi a \iota o l$ ，averrunci．
16\％．v̈ $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ，in resistance to，or to avert，$\pi \beta o \tau \epsilon \in \rho a s ~ a ̈ t a s, ~ a ~ f o r m e r ~ b a l e, ~$ meaning the Sphinx ：a better construction than that which writes $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho o \rho-$ $\nu \nu \mu \notin v a s$, making the gen．abs．So $187 \hat{\omega} \nu$ v̈r $\epsilon \rho$ ．Aesch．Sept． 112 סovio－ бúvas v̈r $\pi \epsilon$ ．\｜$\dot{\partial} \rho \nu$ ．$\pi \dot{o} \lambda \epsilon \iota$, rushing on the city．

166．$\dot{\eta} \nu \mathbf{v} \sigma a \tau \quad \epsilon \in \kappa \tau о \pi i a v, ~ y e ~ d e s p a t c h e d ~ o u t ~ o f ~ t h e ~ r e g i o n . ~ \| ~ \phi \lambda o ́ \gamma a ~$ $\pi \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau о s=\phi \lambda о \gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \partial \nu \pi \hat{\eta} \mu$ ．So Cic．has incendium invidiae，Cat．I．II：
 $\kappa a i \nu \hat{v} \nu$. With this form cp. Dem. Ol. I. 4, каi $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \mu \varphi \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \pi 0 \tau \epsilon \in$, каi $\nu \hat{v} \nu$. Aristoph. P. 302, $\hat{\omega}$ Пavé $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu \epsilon s, \beta o \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\pi \omega ́ \pi о т \epsilon$.
167. $\hat{\omega} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\boldsymbol{\prime} \pi o c . ~ T h e s e ~ t w o ~ w o r d s ~ a r e ~ g e n e r a l l y ~ f o u n d ~ t o g e t h e r, ~ a l w a y s ~}^{\text {a }}$ so in Homer: which gives some countenance to the interpretation based
 $\delta a i \mu o \nu a s(\kappa a \lambda o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota)$. Eustathius ad Il. $\alpha$. p. 98 ult., and the Etym. Mag. confirm this. See Blomf. Gloss. on Agam. 1039 (1072). Lycophron's use of the word only proves that the Dryopian derivation was fashionable in
 $\delta \hat{a}$. It is an exclamation either of surprise, sorrow or anger; strange! dreadful! alas! shameful! || àápı $\theta \mu a$. Sophocles uses both this form and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho \ell \theta \mu$ os in chorica: $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho \iota \theta \mu o s$ alone in iambics. Aesch. uses $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho \ell \theta \mu \nu$ once in iambics, Prom. 90, never á $\nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu o \nu$. Eurip. ávápi $\theta \mu$ os once only, and that in iambics, Bacch. 1335. He uses however $\dot{\alpha} \nu \breve{a} \rho i \theta \mu \eta \tau o s$ twice, in iambics, Ion 837, Hel. 1679.
169. $\sigma$ ró入os= $\lambda a$ òs here, as in El. 749 , $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ s$. It may mean not only people, but 'all I have'-persons, live stock, land. || $\phi \rho \circ \nu \tau i \delta o s ~ \epsilon ै ~ \gamma \chi o s, ~$ rueapon of thought, i.e. weapon furnished by thought, a bold phrase, meaning a plan to avert calamity.
171. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{\xi} \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ fut. m. from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \omega$. See lex.
172. $\kappa \lambda u \tau$ âs $\chi$ Өovós. $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \grave{s}$ and $\kappa \lambda u \tau o ̀ s$ are both used by Homer as laudatory epithets, great, excellent, \&c.; as 'worthy to be celebrated,' rather than as being really so. Buttm. Lexil. p. 384. So here we might give it the meaning fertile, that being the character for which land would be celebrated. \| For тóкоьбь I read $\tau \epsilon к о \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$. See Lection.
174. i $\eta_{i ̈ \omega \nu}^{\omega} \kappa \alpha \mu$. à $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi o v \sigma \iota$, recover not from their shrieking pains: i.e. they die in child-bed. Some (Schneidewin followed by J.) take the sense to be, 'are not raised from their throes by births, i.e. do not bring forth living babes, but remain ärovoc, without offspring. I decidedly prefer the former view. || Huschke on Tibullus in. 5. 9I compares Herod. inf. 68, A. Pac. 1320, Aesch. Eum. 938, and mentions that the ancients in their solemn prayers united these three points as of the greatest importance to public well-being ; fruitfulness in the earth, in cattle, and in women.

175-8. ä $\lambda \lambda$ ò ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \mu$, one upon (or after) another. The $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ in $\pi \rho o \sigma i-$ סocs may, as J. says, soften the bold constr. Steel cites S. El. 235, $\tau i \kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$
 Tr. 2, $\dot{\alpha} \nu \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \mu \dot{\alpha} \theta o \iota s$, where Brunck treats of this use of the 2nd pers. $\| \ddot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\epsilon \ddot{\pi} \pi \tau \epsilon \rho \frac{\nu}{\circ} \rho \nu \iota \nu$, like a fleet-winged bird. This image refers merely to rapidity, that of the fire to violence also. We are not to think, with the Schol., of birds crowding one upon another in their flight, nor of the multitude of the
dead being too great to be consumed by the funeral fires，as in Thuc．II．52， and his imitator，Lucretius vi．1276．This last idea is too much in detail for poetry．With the image of the bird cp．Eur．Hipp．827，ó $\rho \nu$ cs $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$




 by no one else to Pluto．The idea is taken probably from the notion of darkness being connected with sunset and the west．$\theta \in o \hat{v}$ is here a mono－ syllable．




180．For $\nu \eta \lambda \epsilon \in a$ I read $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho a ́$ ．See Lection，and add，that $\nu \eta \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} s$ unpitied is without authority．In Aeschylus and in Euripides only $\nu \eta \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} s$ occurs，and that once only in each，Prom．42，and Cycl．368，in the sense merciless；$\nu \eta \lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$ ，mercilessly，is twice in Aeschylus，Prom．248，Cho． $234 \cdot$ $\gamma \in \in \in \theta \lambda a$ ，her children．\｜$\theta a \nu a \tau a \phi o ́ \rho a, ~ d e a t h-s p r e a d i n g ~ i . e . ~ b y ~ i n f e c t i o n . ~$ ｜｜dेoiкт $\omega \mathrm{s}$ ，with none to mourn them．

181－5．＇̇v adverbial，among them．\｜ä入oxol，young wives，distingu． from $\pi$ о入ıal $\mu a \tau \epsilon \in \rho \epsilon s . \| \dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ besides，adverbial．$\| \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \grave{\alpha} \nu \pi a \rho \dot{\alpha} ~ \beta \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \iota \nu, b y$ the altar－steps．áктá，an elevated edge，here a step．Aesch．Cho．722，àктウ̀ $\chi \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \tau o s . \quad$ N．reads $\dot{\alpha} \chi \grave{\alpha} \nu \pi \alpha \rho a \beta \omega \dot{\omega} \mu \nu \nu$.

Since the foregoing was written，I have gained a new and as it seems to me a better view of this place，which has led me to read $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \rho a \nu \pi a \rho a-$ $\beta \dot{\omega} \mu \iota \circ \nu$ for $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu ~ \pi \alpha \rho a \beta \omega \mu \mu o \nu$ ，and in $145 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota$ ，for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau o \nu a \chi 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota$ of codd．See it explained and defended in Lection．\｜$\pi \delta \delta \nu \omega \nu$ ，gen．causae dep．on iкє $\tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$.
 Phil． 189 ；what belongs to the sense of sight being transferred to that of hearing．I｜$\delta \mu \alpha u \lambda o s$, in unison，here $=\sigma v \mu \mu \iota \gamma \dot{\prime}$ ，intermingled．Cp．with


189．$\epsilon \dot{v} \hat{\omega} \pi a$ ，properly beautiful in countenance，as in Antig． $53^{\circ}$ ，$\tau \in ́ \gamma-$




 ${ }^{*} A \rho \eta,{ }^{\prime} A \rho \epsilon a$ ，and＂$A \rho \eta \nu$（see Pors．ad Phoen． 134 ；Dindorf edits＂A $A \eta$ ），Voc． ${ }^{*}$ A $\rho \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ ．The ist syllable is long in Il．$\epsilon^{\prime} .8_{2} 7,829$ ，yet short in $\epsilon^{\prime} .824,830$ ， and generally，even in Homer．It is always short in Attic．＂Apєa here is
either the pestilence itself, so called from its destructive effects, or the god Mars, considered as he was by the ancients as the author not merely of wars but of every kind of calamity, especially pestilential diseases. The first sense is right, as the distinctive attribute $\tilde{a} \chi a \lambda \kappa o s \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i \delta \omega \nu$ clearly shows. The plague is personified as an unarmed Mars, with all the destructive power of that god. \| $\mu$ a $\epsilon \epsilon$ pós (see lex.), fierce, violent, used of fire in Hom. Hence, Aesch. Cho. $3^{25}$, $\pi v \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu a \lambda \epsilon \rho a ̀ ~ \gamma \nu a \theta o ́ s . ~ T h i s ~ m a y ~ j u s t i f y ~ u s ~ i n ~ r e n-~$ dering it fiery here. \|| ä $\chi a \lambda \kappa о$ à $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi$. $=a ̈ \tau \epsilon \rho \chi a \lambda \kappa \epsilon ́ \omega \nu \dot{a} \sigma \pi$. S. El. $3^{6}$, ä $\sigma \kappa \epsilon v o s$

191. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta$ óa $\alpha \rho=\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta o \hat{\omega} \nu$ according to Musgr., who takes it actively,
 Pors. on Hec. $\mathrm{III}_{7}$ ) they are usually passive. Here render amid surrounding cries (i.e. of woe). $\phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \dot{a} \zeta \omega \nu$, encounters and inflames me.
192. $\nu \omega \tau i \sigma a l$. The only resource hitherto suggested to obtain a grammatical construction in this long sentence, is to supply $\delta o s^{s}$ mentally from $\pi \pi^{\prime} \mu \psi o \nu$ in 189 : $\delta o s^{\prime}$ "A $\rho \epsilon a \quad \nu \omega \tau i \sigma a \iota ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. That Soph. would leave such a gap in the nexus of his language, is highly improbable; and the
 us to look for a governing verb in that place. This I think suitably and probably found in $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\rho} \rho \iota \sigma o \nu$. We gain the construction $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\rho} \rho \iota \sigma o \nu \tau \epsilon \pi a \dot{a} \rho a s$ $\nu \omega \tau i \sigma a \iota \pi \alpha \lambda i \sigma \sigma v \tau o \nu \quad \delta \rho a ́ \mu \eta \mu a \tau \grave{\nu} \mu a \lambda \epsilon \rho o ̀ \nu$ " $A \rho \epsilon a$, ös $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ к.т.入. and drive to make a rapid retreat from our country's borders that fiery Ares, who now \&c. We have also gained a word admirably conspiring with $\pi^{\prime} \epsilon \mu \psi_{0 \nu}$, and corresponding metrically with the antistrophic 'A $\rho \tau \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \delta s$. \| $\nu \omega \tau i \sigma a \iota$ $\pi \alpha \lambda . \delta \rho$. is an instance of cognate accus. The verb is intrans. in Eur.
 cover the back;' see Herc. F. 362. It is also trans. in Ae. Ag. 286, róvтov $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \omega \tau i \sigma a l$, so as to skim the sea. See $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \circ \rho i \zeta \omega$ in lex.

194-5. That $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma a \nu$ $\theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \mu o \nu$ 'A $\mu \phi \iota \tau \rho i \tau a s ~ t h e ~ g r e a t ~ c h a m b e r ~ o f ~ A m p h i-~$ trite (spouse of Poseidon) means the Atlantic Ocean is amply proved by J., who cites (besides Eur. Hipp. 3, $\tau \epsilon \rho \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu \tau$ ' 'A $\tau \lambda a \nu \tau \iota \kappa \omega \hat{\nu}$ ), Herod. I. 202, Plat. Phaedo 109, E. Herc. F. 234, ${ }^{2} \sigma \tau \tau^{\prime}$ 'A $\tau \lambda a \nu \tau \tau \kappa \omega ̂ \nu \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \phi \epsilon \cup ̛ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ö $\rho \omega \nu$ ${ }^{\alpha} \nu$.

196-7. The Black Sea (its modern name) is here called $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\prime}{ }_{\xi} \xi \nu \nu \nu$ ö $\rho \mu o \nu$, the roadstead that keeps strangers aloof, probably on account of the savage tribes on its coasts, not of its navigation. Hence perhaps Soph. introduces it as $\Theta \rho \eta \eta_{\kappa}<\nu \nu \kappa \lambda \dot{\prime} \delta \omega \nu a$. At a later time, when Greek colonies, like Byzantium, grew and prospered there commercially, its old name ${ }^{*} A \xi \in \operatorname{los}\left(=\dot{a} \pi \dot{o}_{\xi} \xi \in \nu 0 s\right)$ was changed to Eú $\xi \in \iota \nu o s$ the Euxine. J. cites the wellknown lines of Ovid, who was banished to Tomi on that coast ; Trist. IV. 4, 55.: frigida me cohibent Euxini litora ponti : dictus ab antiquis Axenus ille fuit.

198-9. This is another grossly corrupt passage, which I have tried to restore by two emendations, $\sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota$ and $\epsilon{ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ for $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$. See Lection. As written in mss., it produces an absurdly incoherent sequence of thought in the passage $187-202$. That passage, abridged, runs thus : "O Pallas, help us, and drive far away the pestilential Ares (for, whatever night leaves undone, day follows to complete); him, O Zeus, destroy beneath thy thunderbolt." J., the latest editor, has not made any attempt to explain what nexus the parenthesis, with its $\gamma$ á $\rho$, has with the context before and after it ; or what just link of thought it forms between the two. What, as it strikes me, ought to be at once apparent to any logical mind is this:-the parenthesis, so construed, must be corrupt: for no subject can be reasonably conceived in it except that same Ares, who is spoken of immediately before, and immediately after it. With this conviction I turn to the parenthesis, and perceiving at once that $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$, its first word, ought to give place to an infin. (as J. has perceived). I discern also (what he has not seen) that the principal verb must have "A $\rho \eta$ s for its subject, or nothing is done for the sense. But $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$ is a bad verb for this purpose, not only because it does not take an infin., but also because Ares is at work all along, and cannot well be said to come to finish in the day what night may leave undone. This perception at once suggests the true reading $\epsilon \ddot{\chi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau a l$, which is good both for Ares as its subject, and for an infin. following. The metrical inadequacy of $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ finally makes itself clear, and this leads to the detection of $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$, as the only word which satisfies both sense and metre. The darkness thus becomes light. For if night spare aught, this he boasts to despatch ( $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \grave{a} \nu ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \rho o v ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{u}$ ) during the day: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ ' $\hat{\eta} \mu a \rho$ has this meaning. Soph. Fragm. Thyest. XIV. 250, $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon$ Báк $\chi \epsilon \iota \circ$
 $\epsilon \ddot{\zeta} \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ read by most edd. for ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \xi \epsilon \epsilon \tau a \iota 890$. $\| \epsilon i$ with subjunctive is well established in tragedy. See 874 , v̋ß $\beta \iota s \epsilon i \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \mu a ́ \tau \eta \nu$. O. C.



202. $\phi \theta i \sigma \circ \nu$. $\phi \theta i \sigma \omega$ and $\epsilon^{\prime} \phi \theta \iota \sigma a$, from $\phi \theta^{\prime} \omega$, are transitive.
203. ムúкє८' äva̧. Under this title of Lyceus, Apollo is frequently represented by the tragic poets in his character of a destroyer. See Aesch.
 note on Ag. 1257. And in their minds it is evidently connected with some tradition like the Sicyonian (see Pausan. Corinth. c. 9, where Apollo is said to have recommended that the bark from a log of some unknown wood which lay in his temple should be mixed up with flesh for the wolves). He is in fact styled 入uкоктóvos $\theta$ eós, the destroyer of wolves, in S. El. 6. But we cannot suppose that it was this character of a destroying power which gave
a name even to whole countries. It is far more probable that the name Lyceus is connected with the ancient root $\lambda v \kappa$, lux, light. Hence $\lambda v \kappa \alpha ́ \beta a s$, course of the light, and also no doubt $\Lambda v \kappa \eta \gamma \in \nu \eta$ 's, applied to Apollo by Homer, born of light. See Müller's Dorians B. II. St.
204. $\chi \rho \cup \sigma \sigma \sigma \tau \rho \dot{\phi} \phi \omega \nu \dot{a} \pi^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa v \lambda a ̂ \nu$, from gold-twisted bow-strings. à $\gamma_{\kappa v \lambda \grave{\eta}}$ is applied to any kind of rope, thong or string, to a ship's cable in Iph. T, 1408, to a javelin thong, Or. 1476.
205. ̇̇vסateío $\theta a l$, to be distributed, dealt out, shot forth. It has usually a middle sense, but it is passive in Nicand. Ther. 509. The sense in Tr , 791 'to abuse,' which Brunck well illustrates from Plautus Pseud., "jam ego te differam dictis meis," is of course here unsuitable.
206. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau a \theta \epsilon \in \tau \alpha$, from $\pi \rho o i \sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$. This partic. is found here only; but Dindorf's r. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau a \chi \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$ is bad. áp $\omega \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho$., our vanzuard succours.
207. ai' $\lambda \lambda a s$. Artemis is represented as $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi i \pi v \rho o s$ in Tr . 214, and this epithet is probably to be explained as= $\delta \iota \pi \dot{u} \rho o u s \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi o v \sigma a \lambda a \mu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma a s$, the expression applied to Hecate by Aristophanes, Ran. 1362. These two goddesses are frequently confounded (see Keightley's Mythology, pp. 60, 102-4), from the principle of theocrasy so often occurring : two similar deities, of different tribes perhaps at first, being thus made into one. But in the passage of the Ranae quoted above the two goddesses are invoked separately, as altogether distinct. St.
208. Av́кi' b $\rho \in \alpha$ б $\delta(\underset{\prime}{\prime} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota$, she speeds over the mountains of Lycia. Bacchus is represented by Eurip. Ion $7 \mathrm{I} 6-7$, as wandering over Parnassus in the
 as in v .212 he is said to be Malvád $\omega \nu$ ó $\mu \dot{o} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o s$.
209. Tòv $\chi \rho v \sigma o \mu i \tau \rho a \nu$, him of the golden snood. In Homer $\mu i \tau \rho a$ was a bandage of wool, plated in front with brass, worn round the body, somewhat like the Highland kilt. In later writers, as here, it is a turban.
 not like the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \mu o s \dot{a}^{\prime} \rho \chi \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \nu \mu o \iota ~ \eta ั \rho \omega \epsilon s$ at Athens, who gave their names to the year and tribes. Bacchus was called Cadmean as son, by Zeus, of Semele, daughter of Cadmus. See 154 .
212. $\dot{o} \mu \dot{\prime} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o \nu=\sigma v \nu 0 \delta o \iota \pi o ́ \rho o \nu$. Words compounded with $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$ and $\dot{o} \mu 0 \hat{v}$ often take the gen. instead of the dative. \| Bacchus is thus invoked in Ant.

213. $\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ is usually intransitive in the active; we have it however intrans. in the passive Phil. ${ }_{3} 327$ X $\rho v ́ \sigma \eta s \pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon i s ~ \phi u ́ \lambda a \kappa o s . ~$
215. à $\pi o ́ \tau c \mu o \nu$, dishonoured, disesteemed, despised. For this character



## EPEISODION I. (216-462.)

Oedipus had probably re-entered a minute or two before the singing of the Parodos ended. He now addresses the Chorus, or rather its coryphaeus (aircis) in the first instance, in a long speech, and explains the measures which he intends to take for the discovery of the murderer of Laius. Disclaiming personal knowledge, they call the attention of the king to the aged seer Teiresias, as a man generally believed to possess, by the inspiration of Apollo, a true knowledge of the past and foresight of the future. Oedipus says that, by Creon's advice, he has already sent for him. The blind old prophet is introduced, and the momentous dialogue between Oedipus and him fills the remainder of this Epeisodion. At the close Oedipus retires within the palace, Teiresias to his home.
(Outline, 216-275). The substance of what Oedipus says in this proclamation is: "Citizens, I hear what you pray for, and if you will help me and help yourselves, as I shall suggest, perhaps you will achieve your wish. When the murder of Laius was reported and inquiry made, I was a foreigner (had I not been, I myself should not have traced it far, having no clue to guide me): now I am a citizen, and to all other citizens I make this proclamation. Let any one who can give information come in and give it. Even the murderer himself, if he confess, shall not die, but quit the country : any man, who knows the murderer, but cannot enable us to seize him, shall be rewarded for his tidings. But let any who know and withhold the truth, take note that I place the murderer under solemn ban, forbidding all to entertain or address him, or share with him any religious rite, commanding all to exclude him from their dwellings. Such is the help I now give. Furthermore, the murderer himself, or the murderers, I lay under a curse: myself I lay under a curse, if I should voluntarily conceal him. It was the will of heaven that you should not be able at the time to pursue the search. I am now settled on the throne; it becomes my plain duty to pursue it to the end, and I will. May heaven afflict such as do not help me, but bless all good patriotic Thebans."
(Notes.) 216-18. á $\delta^{\prime}$ aireîs. These words, pendent here, are explained by those which follow in $218, \dot{a} \lambda \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu а к о и ́ \phi \iota \sigma \iota \nu ~ к а к \hat{\omega} \nu . \| \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \delta \sigma \omega$ $\dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon i v$, to assist in stemming the plague. The verb implies that their part will be a subordinate one: the self-reliant king had promised 'to do all'. \| $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \quad \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta s-\lambda \alpha ́ \beta o \iota s a ̈ \nu$. Soph. ventures to use the latter more modest form for $\lambda \dot{\eta} \psi \epsilon \iota$, the stricter apodosis of $\epsilon \dot{a} \nu \quad \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta s$. With all his selfconfidence, Oed. is too clear-headed to promise certain success. See I45-6. We also find examples of fut. indic. protasis accompanying apodosis with




219-21. $\xi \in \nu 0 s$ here combines the senses 'foreign' and 'ignorant'. \|
 held at Thebes. This just interpretation is due to Mr Barton, tutor of Pembroke Coll. Oxford. What is here $\tau \grave{o} \pi \rho a \chi \theta \epsilon \nu$ is at 246 called $\tau \grave{o}$
 $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \beta 0 \lambda o \nu$. See 12, iз. Here $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ might be rendered 'anyhow': it indicates a suppressed thought-'nay, that matters not.' The suppressed
 subsequent protasis $\mu \grave{\eta}$ oủ ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi \omega \nu \tau \iota \sigma$. The sense is as follows: 'On my having been a foreigner at the time of the deed, I lay no stress; for had I been no foreigner, but one of the citizens, I myself (whatever my native shrewdness, as in guessing the riddle of the Sphinx) should not have traced the matter far, seeing that I had not ( $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ои́к $\begin{gathered} \\ \chi \\ \\ \end{gathered} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ) any token (i.e. any clue to guide me).' And the imperf. ' $\quad \chi \chi \in v o \nu$ instead of $i^{\prime} \chi \nu \in v \sigma a$ implies that the difficulty from want of clue continues to the present time. The sense would be nearly the same, if we rendered aútòs by myself.

222-24. vôv dè but under present circumstances. || v̈́rтєpos, since that time. \|I count, $\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$. E. Bacch. 822, $\epsilon$ is $\gamma v \nu a i ̂ \kappa a s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \xi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \omega$. Ae.


227-32. кєi $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ к.т.入. Edd. have found difficulties in these lines which I do not recognise, and have made changes which I cannot accept.
 cathedra (for he gives no reason for this judgment) that $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \xi \epsilon \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \nu$ and aúròs are 'indefensible'. Both words, which all mss. show, are, in my view, not only defensible, but excellently true. aútòs ка日' aúтô̂ is an idiomatic phrase, in which the attracted aúvòs is, to an English ear, redundant. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \nu$, aor. part. of $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \xi \in \iota \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$, to take away secretly (as Thuc. Iv. 83)
 secretly suppressed, $\tau \circ \dot{\pi} \pi i \kappa \lambda \eta \mu a$ (aivòs) $\kappa a \theta^{\prime}$ aútô̂, the accusation against himself, i.e. if from fear he has kept his crime hidden in his own bosom. \| The bold ellipsis of the Greek for let him speak out in 228 seems to me quite in the manner of Sophocles. I find no difficulty in supplying $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \omega \pi \dot{a} \tau \omega$ from the next clause, looking at $\kappa \epsilon i \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ followed by $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ a $\hat{v}$. But those who deem this harsh, have a resource in repeating $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ $\sigma \eta \mu a i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu, I$ bid him tell, from 1. 226. See Stud. Soph. P. II. p. 53. \| $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon$ s, discomforting, intolerable. \| $\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ ' $\gamma \omega$, I will pay Attic Fut. for $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma$. \| кai $\dot{\eta}$ $\chi$ ápıs $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$, and the service moreover shall be gratefully recorded: like that of Mordecai in the Book of Esther.

233-5, $\sigma \iota \omega \pi \dot{\alpha} \alpha \omega$, fut. $\sigma \iota \omega \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a l$; so $\sigma \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \omega \sigma \iota \gamma \eta \sigma \sigma \mu a l$. \| $\delta \in i \sigma a s \phi i \lambda o v ~ \hat{\eta}$ кai aúzoû fearing for a friend or even for himself, gen. causae, as 48, 88. J. is therefore wrong when, following Schneidewin and Nauck, he makes these cases to depend on $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, shall repulse. \| $\dot{\epsilon}_{\kappa}^{\tau} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon$, thereupon.

236-43. The object of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha v \delta \hat{\omega}$ is $\tau \iota \nu \grave{\alpha}$ in 238, I forbid any dweller of this land \&c. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu a ̈ \nu \delta \rho a ~ \tau o \hat{v} \tau o \nu$ is the object of the infinitives $\epsilon i \sigma \delta \epsilon \in \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$,



 $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$, $\epsilon^{\prime} \chi^{\epsilon} \rho \nu \iota \beta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} s \beta a ́ \psi \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu$. But in the Odyssey $\chi \epsilon \in \rho \nu \iota \psi$ is merely water for the hands before and after a meal. $\chi \epsilon$ 白 $\iota \boldsymbol{\beta}$ os, which some edd. read as genitive partitive is possible, and makes no difference in sense. $\| \dot{\omega} \theta \epsilon i \nu$
 is und. after $\mu \eta^{\prime} \mu^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \epsilon i \lambda \eta \tau \epsilon$. E. Or. 515, 900. Phoen. 1218. \|is $\mu$. seeing that \&c. See ir. ior. 145 . \|| is $\tau$, as \&c. \| Cp. Eur. Or. $4^{6}$




246-9. катєن́ $о \mu a \iota, ~ I ~ s o l e m n l y ~ p r a y . ~ \| ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \nu . ~ S o m e ~ u n d . ~ \delta \epsilon \delta \rho a к \omega ́ s, ~$ whether one individual is the unseen perpetrator. But it can be joined with $\ddot{\omega} \nu$, whether he is some one unknown person. || какòv как $\omega \mathrm{s}$, that the wetich may wretckedly. $\| \nu \nu \nu=a \dot{v} \tau b \nu$, redundant here, as aúroîs at 270 . See El. ${ }^{1} 36$, Tr. 287. It happens even in prose, as Thuc. ii., 62. \| ${ }^{2} \mu о \rho о \nu=к а к о$ $\mu o \rho o \nu$, illfated. \|I є́кrрîqaı. When futurity is sufficiently implied in the princ. verb (as $\epsilon \cup \cup \chi o \mu a \iota, ~ \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$ ) the infin. may be aor. for fut.

249-5 1. Є̇ $\pi \epsilon \dot{\prime} \chi о \mu a \iota . . . \pi a \theta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, I pray that I myself may suffer \&c. || oi้коьбь єi $\kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, if he should become a sharer of my home and hearth with my privity.
254. $\dot{\omega} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \omega s \kappa \dot{d} \theta \epsilon \omega s \dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta a \rho \mu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \eta s$, thus ruined with the loss of its produce and protecting deities. But other modes may be suggested of rendering this bold language. Cp. El. ı ı8ı, $\hat{\omega} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \tau i \mu \omega \omega \kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \theta^{\prime} \omega \mathrm{s} \dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta a \rho \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu 0 \nu$.

255-8. $\tau \delta \pi \rho \hat{\gamma} \gamma \mu a$, the investigation: see 220. \|| $\theta \in \dot{\eta} \lambda a \tau o \nu, a$ behest from heaven. \| $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta a \rho \tau о \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda ., ~ i t ~ w a s ~ n o t ~ s e e m l y ~ t h a t ~ y o u ~ s h o u l d ~ l e a v e ~ i t ~ t h u s ~$ unexpiated. \| ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \epsilon v \nu \hat{\alpha} \nu$, und. єiкoेs $\hat{\eta} \nu$.

 as it was (see 222), fate fell heavy on his head. Cp. 1300-I; Ant. 1345,


 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon(a \dot{u} \tau o \hat{v})$, I will fight this battle in his behalf. A pronoun or adj. in acc. neuter, generally plural, is thus often joined to verbs of every class in such a way as to be attributed to a subst. whose meaning is contained or implied


 K. OE.
 is twice cited by Eustathius on Homer Il．$\beta^{\prime}$ ． $54, \mathrm{~N} \epsilon \sigma \tau 0 \rho \epsilon \bar{\eta} \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \nu \eta i \quad \Pi \nu \lambda \eta$－
 dative is used by Soph．by a sort of compulsion for the gen．，to intervene between the gen．$\phi \dot{\nu} \nu 0 u$ before $\pi a \iota \delta t$ and those which follow it．It depends on tòv aúr．$\tau . \phi$ ．，the perpetrator of the murder committed on the son of $\& \mathrm{c}$ ． But some，as J，make this dative to mean for \＆c．，in behalf of，to which I was myself favourable once．The order of descent is Agenor，Cadmus， Polydorus，Labdacus，Laius．See 1 ，note．

269－73．As regards the pron．aưroîs it may be observed that the words каi $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ тoîs $\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ have a sort of pendent position，and as to those who perform not these things－－for them I pray that the gods neither raise up any produce from earth，nor yet children from their wives，\＆c．For the construc－ tion here cp．A．Thesm．350，$\tau \alpha i ̂ s \delta^{\prime} a ̈ \lambda \lambda \alpha \iota \sigma \iota \nu$ vi $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu \tau o u ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon a \dot{s} \epsilon \ddot{\chi} \chi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon \pi a ́ \sigma a \iota s$



 change from the pres．inf．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \iota \in \mathcal{\nu}$ a to this fut．is noticeable and rare：but，as the destruction of the Thebans here meant lies in the future，that tense can be used．The middle fut．of $\phi \theta \in i \rho \omega$ takes here a passive force＊．
（Outline．276－299．）The Chorus deny all knowledge of the crime and the criminal，adding that Phoebus，who raised the question，ought to answer it．We cannot compel gods，says Oed．，to do what they do not choose．They mention Teiresias as a seer having nearly the same insight as Phoebus．Yes， replies Oed．，and I have sent for him at Creon＇s suggestion．They then converse about another vague report，nearer to the fact，namely，that the murderers of Laius were not robbers，but travellers，after which Teiresias is led in by a guide，and Oed．addresses him．
 speak，i．e．I will speak candidly and truly．The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ which follows is a Greek idiom which English translators may neglect，having nothing which represents it．\｜ $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ò $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ 广ク̆т $\eta \mu a$ к．т．入．These words may be construed in several ways，between which there is little to choose．J．makes tò jŋ́q $\eta \mu a$ pendent，which will do very well；and takes $\tau o ́ \partial \epsilon$ with $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu$ ，but perhaps it is quite as good to take it with elp paatal：as for the question itself，it is for Phoebus who sent it to say who can ever have done this deed．

282－3．$\tau \dot{a}$ 狛 $\tau \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \delta^{\prime} \kappa . \tau . \lambda ., I$ would fain say what seems to me next best after this，i．e．after being told by Phoebus．II єi каi к．т．ג．，even if it is third－best，omit not to say it．See $\mathbf{I} \mathbf{2 3 2}^{2}$ and Particles，Intr．
＊Ribbeck strongly contended that vv．246－51 should be placed after v． 272 ；and some edd．（Schn．N．Wo．）so transpose them．I cannot follow the example．

284-6. ävакт' ${ }^{\text {äракть к.т.入. The seer-king who most of all has the same }}$ insight as the seer-king Phoebus I know to be Teiresias. On àva $\xi$ see 80 . It is possible to take $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha a$ as modifying $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a$, 'nearly' the same. But I prefer the first explanation.

287-9. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' оט́к к.т. $\lambda .$, this too is a thing I arranged with no little care.
 he is not here. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ is used on account of the construction $\theta a v \mu \dot{a} \xi \epsilon \iota \nu i \mu \grave{\eta}$ $\pi \dot{a} \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$. $\| \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \iota$ with pres. tense, like jampridem in Latin, continues a past action to the present time. K $\rho$ éovtos $\epsilon i \pi \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ in 288 must be specially noted as an important link in the plot. This advice of Creon afterwards caused the king's suspicion of him as plotting treason with Teiresias. See 378 , 535, 705.
290. каi $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ к.т. $\lambda$. , well, everything else was poor and stale rumour. Particles, Exc. xiv. The meaning is: 'besides suggesting Teiresias, I can only mention \&c.'
293. As yet Oed. does not know who was the eyewitness alluded to by Creon, ir8. He learns this from Jocasta, 756 .

294-5. These words give some colour to the conj. $\delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau$ ' for $i \delta \dot{\partial} \nu \tau$ ', 293, for evidently the Chorus here allude to the murderer. \|| ou $\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, he will not wait-will not abide the quest, but hurry away to a distance-or else confess. 296. Nay, says Oed., one, who is fearless in the act, is not scared by a word.

(Outline of $300-462$.) Teiresias is led in. Oedipus addresses him courteously, acquaints him with the purport of the oracle, and begs him to rescue the city and people by disclosing the truth known to him as an inspired seer. Startled and alarmed by this demand, Teiresias begs that he may be allowed to go home. The Chorus unite in praying him to speak. He repeats his refusal five times, till at length Oedipus, incensed to the utmost, charges him with being an accomplice of the criminal. Teiresias, not less enraged at this calumny, retorts by declaring the king himself the guilty polluter of the land; and in the angry dialogue which follows he imputes to him also the stain of incest. Suddenly a suspicion arises in the mind of Oedipus, that Teiresias is the agent of Creon, suborned to destroy himself and place Creon on the throne of Thebes. Teiresias denies this, but in vain: for Oedipus outpours his conviction in an impassioned burst of eloquence. In reply, denying the charge, Teiresias predicts in words studiously dark the approaching culmination of the king's calamities. In another interchange of angry words he adds further obscure hints, which he will not explain, but declares that the passing day will bring all to light. The seer is now contemptuously dismissed; but, before his departure, he describes with more distinctness the position and impending fate of the murderer of Laius.

$$
7-2
$$

300-r. N $\omega \mu a \dot{\omega} \omega$ (wield, ply), ponder, meditate, contemplate. This last word is perhaps best. \|| As teaching implies the use of words, things unspoken or unspeakable, $a^{\prime} \rho \rho \eta \eta \tau a$, are in antithesis to $\delta \iota \delta a \kappa \tau \alpha$, , things that may
 $\nu 0 \sigma \tau \kappa \beta \eta^{\prime}$, lit. treading earth. Similar compounds of $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \beta \omega$, tread, are $\pi \epsilon$ $\delta o \sigma \tau \iota \beta \eta^{\prime} s, \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \tau \beta \eta^{\prime} s, \nu \in \phi 0 \sigma \tau \iota \beta \dot{\eta} s, \mu \circ \nu \circ \sigma \tau \iota \beta \dot{\eta} s$, and in passive sense $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \iota \beta \eta^{\prime} s$, untrodden O. C. 126 . Ant. 657 .

 pion, defender. $\hat{\eta} s$ could be referred to $\pi \dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota \nu$, because $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \in \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, of which $\pi \delta \lambda \iota s$ is the subject, immediately precedes. But $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta \nu$ and $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho a$ are better taken as governing $\hat{\eta} s$, and then we render, from which plaguce. $\| \mu \circ \hat{\nu} \nu 0 \nu$. This Ionic form for $\mu \dot{\rho} \nu o s$ is not used by the other tragic poets.

3०5-9. єi каі $\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \lambda$ úєєs, if indeed thou hast not heard. Here $\epsilon i$ каi cannot mean although, as usual. \| The use of $\kappa \lambda i^{\prime} \omega$ with perf. force is not infrequent. See Heindorf on Plat. Gorg. ir6. \| $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \psi a \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \mu i ̀ \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \epsilon \nu$, sent this answer to our message. $\| \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \mu \psi$ ai $\mu \epsilon \theta a$, rather perhaps middle of indirect agency-have them sent out-than of reference to self-out of our land.

310-15. $\phi \theta$ ov $\dot{\sigma} \sigma a s$, grudging. || $\dot{a}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ oi $\omega \nu \omega \hat{\omega}$. See 395-8, 483. Ant.
 $\mu \epsilon \mu \iota a \sigma \mu \dot{\prime} \nu \circ \nu$, all that hath defilement from. $\| \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \sigma 0 i \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$, on thee we depend.

 from his means and powers. On this use of the imperf. opt. (indef. gene-
 Render freely, a man's noblest toil is to use his means and powers in doing good.
 where it profits not; $\mu \dot{\eta}$ on account of indef. generality. See Lection and 123I, aì $\phi \alpha \nu \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \iota$. \|| $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \gamma^{\alpha} \rho$. J. expresses this $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ by aye. It refers to $\phi \epsilon \hat{v}$, and might be neglected in Engl. \|| $\delta \omega \omega \bar{\omega} \epsilon \sigma a$, forgot, so $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$. \| oú $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. for else (suppressed prot. $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta} \delta \iota \omega \bar{\lambda} \epsilon \sigma \sigma a) \quad I$ should not have come hither. See 12, 220. Stud. Soph. P. 11. pp. 10, 5 I. In $433 \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon$ is used for this $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$.
321. $\delta \iota o i \sigma \omega$, carry through, sustain (perform). The difficult nature of their several parts is implied in the word.
323. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, usually 'depriving', here withholding. Thuc. I. 40,


324-5. The oúdè $\sigma o l$ here with the corresp. $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ are so unlike - English idiom, that the former can only be rendered by an emphasis on $\sigma o l$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$. The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ points to a suppressed $\dot{a} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}$. Aye, for I see that THY speech is unseasonably uttered: in order that I myself then may avoid the same mishap-(now he turns to go).

326-7. Oed. stops him, saying: if thou hast knowledge ( $\phi \rho 0 \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \boldsymbol{\gamma}), I$ adjure thee, turn not away.

328-9. On this much-disputed passage see Lection and Excursus VI. Render: Aye, for ye all are without knowledge: but never will I speak my secrets-in whatever way, lest I disclose thine-evil.
331. $\pi \rho 0 \delta o \hat{\nu} a l$, to abandon.

 can only be paraphrased: unsoftened thus to never-ending time.

337-8. It is manifest that $\dot{\delta} \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ is here used to express a temper which provokes others to anger. \| $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \dot{\eta}_{\nu} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\partial} \mu 0 \hat{v} \nu a i o v \sigma a \nu$, that (irritating temper) which resides with thee. Eustathius had a fancy (which seems to me out of place) that Jocasta is implied in these words, yet both Steel and J. favour
 ciean to iterate an idea, which seems to call for stronger emphasis.
340. ä...ä $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\jmath} \zeta \epsilon \iota$, wherein thou slightest (scornest by insultingly and injuriously refusing). Of such refusal, à $\tau \iota \mu o s, \dot{a} \tau \iota \mu \dot{a} j \omega$, are used in tragedy.


341. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ refers to the implied thought, ' I will not speak these things:' $\ddot{\eta \xi \epsilon \iota}$ rà $\rho$ aúrá, why, they will come to light of themselves.
342. oưkoûv. Elmsley reads oủk oûv, with query (;) at the end of the line. Nauck follows him. J. renders oùкои̂̀ then ( $=$ therefore) without any discussion of this usage, which is one of the difficulties in Greek; for how is the presence of oúk explained, when it is assumed that there is no negation in the sentence? The change of accent from oúкоuv to oưкоû̀ is merely a conventional sign that oúk is neutralized; but there it is still. See Particles : Fxc. Hermann on Vig. discusses the point, but does not seem to elucidate it. Elmsley's method of writing alone seems rational, though I have not exhibited it. Rost, like J., is content with accepting the conventional distinction.

343-4. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon, ~ s o ~ t h e n: ~ t h i s ~ p h r a s e ~ a n d ~ \pi \rho o ' s ~ \tau a \hat{v} \tau a$ are commonly used with a more or less strong shade of defiance. \| $\theta v \mu 0 \hat{v} \delta i \dot{i} \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} s{ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \tau s$

 Pis. 2I, poenas...eas quae gravissimae sunt.

 been an actual (кai) complotter of the deed.

350-3. ä $\lambda \eta \theta \epsilon s$; indignant or scornful question : ha! really? A. Av. 175,



 $\rho v^{\prime} \mu \mu a \tau \iota$. II As $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \epsilon \in \pi \omega$ could take a dat., this case is adopted in 353, wis


354-5. '̇ं $\epsilon \kappa i \nu \eta \sigma a s$, hast thou blurted out? I| Steel, with Br., takes $\pi o v$ as enclitic and ironical, you think perhaps. But Elms. Ell. J. read $\pi o \hat{\text {, }}$ which seems fitter for the menacing mood of Oed. how do you expect to escape its due?
356. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} s \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ i $\sigma \chi \hat{v} 0 \nu \tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$, for $I$ possess truth in all its strength $=$ $I$ possess truth, and truth is strong.
358. $\pi \rho o u ́ \tau \rho \epsilon \psi \omega$, hast goaded me: middle of indirect agency. It was not by entreaty or persuasion, but by provocation, that Oed. caused Teir. to speak.
360. $\hat{\eta}$ ' $\kappa \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{a ̂} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu$; or art thou tempting me to speak? i.e. art thou striving in that indirect way to make me say all that I know? See Lection. The $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \kappa \eta$ of a $\sigma \tau \iota \chi \circ \mu \nu \theta i a$ enforces the harsh condensation.
$3^{61}$. oủ $\chi \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma$ ' $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ \nu$, 'not so as to call it known,' i.e. not so as to say that I know it.' Then Teiresias speaks more plainly.
362. ov̂ ̧ $\eta \tau \epsilon i ̂ s$, und. тò̀ фovéa.
363. oư $\tau \iota$ रaip $\omega \nu$, not with impunity, so $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \eta \theta \omega$ 's, 368 . On the other hand, to your sorrow is expressed by $\kappa \lambda \alpha^{\alpha} \omega \nu$. See $401, I_{52} \kappa \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \omega \nu \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \rho \epsilon i ̂ s$.

$3_{3} 6_{4}$. єiँ $\pi \omega \tau \iota$, must I say, $\tau \iota$ каi $\alpha \lambda \lambda о$, something else too? Interrog. use of subjunctive.
 thou art unconsciously linked in foulest union with thy nearest kin (i.e.
 see 1474. Eurip. often uses it for parent, husband or wife, children : see Hipp. 965. \| Plural for sing. appears often, as $118_{4}$, ל̀̀̀ ois $\tau$ ' oú $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\delta} \mu t \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ oü's $\tau \in \mu^{\prime}$ oúк $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \tau \alpha \nu \omega \dot{\nu} \nu$. This happens especially when abstract nouns plural are used for a person in the singular: as E. Hipp. in $\pi a \iota \delta \in u ́-$ $\mu a \tau \alpha$, Tro. $2_{52} \nu v \mu \phi \epsilon v \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota a$ for Cassandra, S. Ant. $568 \nu v \mu \phi \epsilon i a$ for Antigone. So Phil. $3^{6 \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a}$ for a single cup, and other instances. Ov. Met. xv. 163, cognovi clipeum laevae gestamina nostrae. See Pors. on


369. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \alpha s$. The article is prefixed to these abstract nouns: Ant. $1195, \dot{\partial} \rho \theta \dot{o} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \in \epsilon^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \dot{\prime}$.

370-r. 'Certainly,' says Oed. 'there is power in truth,' but not in respect of you, for your words are not true; you are as blind in all senses as in that of sight. \| Cp. with the alliteration here the line from Ennius, $O$ Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti. See 425, 1481 of this play, and

Med. 476 with Porson's note. || voûs is the mind regarded as the understanding, $\theta v \mu \grave{s}$ the mind as the seat of the passions, $\psi v \chi \grave{\eta}$ the vital part.
373. oú $\delta \epsilon i$ is ồs oú $\chi i=\pi$ âs $\tau \iota$ s or $\pi \alpha \dot{a} \nu \tau \epsilon$ s.

374-5. $\mu \hat{a}$ s $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \phi \epsilon \iota$ т $\pi \rho$ ós $\nu v \kappa \tau o ́ s$, night is thy only trainer, is, I am sure, the true sense, and $\mu l \hat{\alpha} s=\mu o ́ v \eta s$. The verb $\tau \rho^{\prime} \notin \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ has many shades of meaning: (r) To feed, support, nurture, rear, educate, train; (2) to keep (horses, dogs, birds, plants, armies, fleets, ruvaîka, \&c.) ; (3) to cherish, maintain (a) a physical object (long hair, a lock of hair \&c.), (b) a habit, principle, feeling, a good or an evil ( $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \epsilon \iota a u, \zeta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu, \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} s, \theta \nu \mu \dot{\partial} \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta a$,
 Aeschylus and Plato we find no meanings but those under (r). Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, and other writers supply the rest. The words on both sides carry on a metaphor from the gymnasium. Oedipus virtually says: 'A man reared and trained in darkness (i.e. a blind man) cannot hurt his fellow-man, for obvious physical reasons.' And Teiresias virtually replies: 'I am not the swordsman or wrestler by whom thou wilt be laid prostrate ( $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ): Apollo will do that.' See Plat. Rep. III. 409 :
 $\kappa \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a \ldots \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \mathrm{~K} a \delta \mu о \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota$.
379. K $\rho \in \epsilon \omega \nu \delta \epsilon ́ \sigma o \iota \pi \hat{\eta} \mu^{\prime}$ ov $\delta \epsilon \in \nu$, Creon is not thy harmer. $\delta \hat{k}$ retains its adversative force, though we do not usually express it, in answers which contain something that is to be refuted.
380. $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta \tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta s$. Kingcraft was supposed to be the highest art of
 $\tau o ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon i o \nu \nu \Delta o ̀ s ~ \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho o \nu \dot{a} \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \iota$, i.e. 'the art and knowledge of him who holds the sceptre excels all other art.' And so Xen. Mem. iv. 2. if, $\mu \epsilon-$

382. ö $\sigma o s, \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, how great the store of envy laid in wait beside youl

383-6. $\delta \omega \rho \eta \tau o ́ s, a i \tau \eta \tau o ́ s$, adjectives of two terminations. || $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, stealing on, 'coming under' to trip up, a metaphor from the palaestra.

387-9. نंфєís к.т.入., having suborned a plot-patching conjuror like this. \|| סó̀ıov á $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \tau \eta \nu$, a deceitful quack, from á $\gamma \epsilon i \rho \epsilon \iota \nu(\chi \rho \eta \dot{\mu} \mu \tau \alpha$ ) 'collecting money'; a practice of low priests, who carried about an image of their god, begging money up and down the country in its behalf, which they
 $\pi \tau \omega \chi \chi^{\prime} s, \tau \alpha \dot{\lambda} \alpha \iota \nu a, \lambda_{\iota} \mu \circ \theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}, \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \sigma \chi{ }^{b} \mu \eta \nu$. See the character and pretentions

 $\delta \epsilon \delta о \rho к \epsilon$, one who is clear-sighted in gain alone. Cicero, Tusc. v. $3^{8}$, says of Cn . Aufidius, who was blind, 'videbat in litteris.' || |  |
| :---: |
| $\phi$ | . See 9.

390-2. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$, nam, for, frequent in this sense of challenging with an imperative, as here. Cp. El. 352. E. Hec. 1208, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta i \delta a \xi \circ \nu$, or simply

 conveys indignant denial. $\| \dot{\eta} \dot{\rho} a \psi \varphi \delta \dot{s} s$ кú $\omega \nu$, the riddling (lit. songcomposing) monster, i.e. the Sphinx. Kú $\omega \nu$ often has such a sense, generally with an idea of pursuit. Thus we find the term used of the Furies: El. ${ }^{1}{ }^{8} 7$, $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\delta} \rho \rho \mu о \iota к а к \hat{\omega} \nu \pi а \nu о \nu \rho \gamma \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ äфиктоє кúvєs, and of the Harpies
 Aesch. 1228 Cassandra (in a remarkable and debated passage) calls Clytaemnestra $\mu \iota \sigma \eta \tau \grave{\eta} \kappa \dot{v} \omega \nu$. Aesch. also calls the eagle (Pr. 1022, Ag. 136), $\Delta i o ̀ s ~ \pi \tau \eta \nu o ̀ s ~ \kappa u ́ \omega \nu$, 'Jove's winged hound.' || The men called $\dot{\rho} a \psi \omega \delta o l$ were persons who pieced together short extracts from famous poets, Homer, Archilochus, Mimnermus \&c. for recitation at games or festivals.

393-5. каiтol... $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, and yet, $\tau$ ò alvı $\gamma \mu a$ к.т. $\lambda$. , the riddle was not one for the first comer to explain ( $\delta \iota \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu})$. Thuc. VI. 22, $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ovi $\sigma a(\dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \alpha ́)$

 ойтє...oü $\tau \epsilon$. We frequently find, as in 56 , the negative put first and then divided into two negatives. So here, ou might have been placed before
 didst not display thyself.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \cup \chi \omega \dot{\omega}$, succeeding by judgment, i. e. by force of intellect. \| $\hat{o} \nu \quad \delta \dot{\eta}, I$, whom forsooth. \| $\delta_{0 \kappa \omega}^{\omega} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda .$, expecting to stand near Creon's throne (i.e, high in rank and influence). $\pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta s$ is 'next in rank,' $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta s$, 'next in file.'

401-3. $\kappa \lambda a ́ \omega \nu$, to your sorrow; $\pi a \theta$ ć̀ $\nu$, to your cost. \| $\dot{o}$ $\sigma v \nu \theta \epsilon i s ~ \tau a ́ d \epsilon$, he who contrived this plot. E. Ion 833, oi $\sigma v \nu \tau \iota \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon s$ è $\kappa \delta \iota \kappa$ ' $\epsilon i \tau a \mu \eta \chi a \nu a i ̂ s$

 devices. $\|$ Cp. the threats of Pentheus to Teiresias, E. Bacch. ${ }^{25} 8, \epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}$

 we have no need. || бкотєî̀ und. סєi. || $\lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma о \mu \epsilon \nu$ äpıбтa, we shall best fulfil $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a$, lit. the oracles, implying the duties laid on us by the oracles; the oracular mandate of the god.
 least as replying on equal terms, i.e. so much equality between us must be allowed as consists in $\boldsymbol{i} \sigma \eta \gamma \circ \rho i a$, freedom of speech. With $\dot{\epsilon} \xi . \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i$ is understood. But there are three ways of explaining the construction; one, by regarding $\tau 0 \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \xi a \iota$ as subject of $\hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i$ and $\hat{\epsilon} \xi$. as predicate, 'equal replying at least is an equality proper to be established (between us)': another by making $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau$. the object of $\dot{\epsilon} \xi / \sigma \omega \tau \epsilon_{0} \nu$, 'we must establish equally between us at least the equal replying'; a third, which treats $\tau \grave{o}$ as $=\omega \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau$, 'we
must establish equality between us, so far at least as to reply on equal terms. This last seems to me the most probable view. See Kühner, Gr. Gr. § 479 -

4ro-ri. Loxias is Apollo's name as the obscure seer-god: $\dot{o} \lambda_{o} \xi \grave{\alpha}$ $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon v o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s . \| \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau$ ' ó к.т.入., so that I will not (better than 'shall not ') be enrolled as under Creon's patronage. The paulo-post future, being the future of the perfect, denotes the continuance of the state: thus $\kappa \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha l$, he will have the name given to him, but $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$, he will bear the name. Every $\mu \epsilon$ тоткоs at Athens was obliged $\nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \pi \rho о \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta \nu$, to select a patron, through whom alone he could transact any civil business, and to have the fact recorded in the public registers. An action called aंтробтa⿱iou $\delta i \kappa \eta$ lay against any sojourner who neglected this.
413. $\sigma \grave{v}$ каi $\delta \epsilon \delta о \rho к а s, ~ к \tau . \lambda$. thou both possessest sight and perceivest

 r6, i7. Isaiah vi. 9, 10, XLII. 20. Jerem. v. 21. Ezek. XII. 2. Matthew xiII. 14. Mark iv. 12, viIf. i8. Luke viII. ro. See 367.

415-9. $\mathfrak{a} \rho$ ' ồ $\sigma \theta$, dost thou know? ( = thou knowest not). Hence it can be followed by каi $\lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \eta \theta a s$, thou art even ignorant. This verb is always joined with a participle: but in $\mathrm{I}_{47}$ it only implies concealment, though the participle attends it there. \| rois $\sigma o i \sigma \iota \nu$, to thine own: that is, to thy parents. $\| \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \xi$, active $=\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi o \tau \epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \theta \epsilon \nu \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma o v \sigma \alpha$ Hesych. See Phil. 687,

 approaching with dreadful speed. El. 491, $\chi a \lambda \kappa o ́ \pi o v s$ 'Epıv'́s: Hor. C. iII. 2. 32 , pede Poena claudo. Curses were supposed to be attended with Furies to put them in execution. Hence 'Apá stands for the attendant


 $\sigma \kappa o ́ \tau \iota o \nu ~ є i \sigma o \rho a ̣ ̂ ~ к \nu \epsilon ́ \phi a s . ~$

420-1. Some take $\lambda_{\mu \mu} \mu^{\prime} \nu$ to mean 'a retired spot,' a valley, as distinguished from mountains (represented by $\mathrm{K} \iota \theta a \iota \rho \omega \dot{\nu}$ ), and make $\beta$ oñs depend on $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \phi \omega \nu 0 s$, a possible constr. But it is better to make $\beta o \hat{\eta} s$ dep. on $\lambda_{i \mu \grave{\eta} \nu}$ in its usual sense, 'haven': what haven of thy cry will there not be? i.e. whither will not thy cry penetrate? understanding aủ $\hat{\eta}$ with $\sigma \dot{u} \mu \phi \omega \nu$ os; what Cithaeron (put for all Boeotian mountains) will not ring with it?

 Ma viii. 305 , consonat omne nemus strepitu, collesque resultant.

422-5. These lines, as all the language of Teir. here, are ä $\gamma \alpha \nu$ alvıктd
$\kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \phi \hat{\eta}$ (439). \|T The marriage of Oed. is likened to a harbour with a bad
 $\epsilon \dot{v} \pi \lambda o i a s \tau v \chi \dot{\omega} \nu$, alluding to the solution of the enigma. $\delta \delta \mu o \iota s$ is a dat. of place indicating where the harbour was situated, in yon palace. \| $\boldsymbol{a}^{\prime \prime} \sigma^{\prime}$ $\epsilon \xi \iota \sigma \omega \sigma \epsilon \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda .$, which shall place thee on a level with thyself and thy children: with thyself, as showing thee what thou really art, a parricide, and an incestuous husband; with thy children, as proving thee to be their brother. But this could only be done by the discovery mentioned in the two previous lines, not by the ä $\lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\alpha} \kappa а \kappa \alpha ́$. These can only apply to the subsequent misfortunes of the family, those namely which grew out of the curse spoken by Oed. Elmsley reads $\vec{a} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \dot{\epsilon} \xi_{\iota} \sigma \omega \cdot \sigma \epsilon \iota$, understanding 'what the 'A $\rho \dot{\alpha}$ will inflict equally on thyself and thy children'. Porson and Schäfer read ä $\sigma \sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \iota \sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, 'which shall equally befall'. And this, which might seem to be the sense required, would equally result from $\ddot{o}^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \xi_{\iota} \sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, a slight change from one MS. ó $\sigma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \iota \sigma \omega \sigma \epsilon \iota$. J. believes that vv. $422-25$ correspond with the actual progress of the drama : that while the two former (öтал катаi $\sigma \theta \eta$ ) refer to the first discovery concerning the death of Laius (726-860), the two latter ( $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \delta \dot{c}$ ) comprise those scenes in which the parentage of Oed. is brought to light. When it is remembered that the whole action lies within the hours of one day, and that the second discovery follows the first so quickly, it is hard to suppose either that 'the clear perception' does not imply the full detection of all the miseries involved in the marriage, or that the language of 1.425 , о๖์ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \iota \sigma \theta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon$, is satisfactorily explained by the contents of epeisodia 3,4. We seem almost compelled to include in the $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os $\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ all the calamities of Oed. and his children as described in the Oed. Coloneus and the Antigone. I have sometimes been tempted to conjecture


 ings. But, where Sophocles has so manifestly meant to be dark, it seems almost profane to let in more light by conjectural reading or forced interpretation, lest his shade whisper to us, $\sigma \kappa$ ко́тos $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\partial} \nu \phi \alpha^{\prime} s^{*} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \beta \epsilon \in \beta \eta \lambda o \nu$ $\epsilon i \sigma i \tau \omega$.

 be worn down, crushed. \| $\|$ oté, ever. It means 'at any time', and so either 'formerly' or 'hereafter', as the case may be.
 789, Equ. 892, ои́к є̀s ко́ракаs $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}$; $\| \theta \hat{a} \sigma \sigma о \nu$ is often used in these forms of execration. Hom. Od. $\kappa^{\prime} \cdot 72$. A. Nub. 1253. Plut. 604. \|I ä $\psi o \rho \rho o s$, returning. Aj. 369. Ant. 386. ä $\psi$ oppov adverbially, El. 53, 1430, Tr. 902. Obs. the angry alliteration, á $\psi$ oppos... $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i s \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \iota$;

433-4. रáp. I did send for you, for \&c.; then $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{\imath}$ instead of another $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$. See 3r8. \| $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{\eta}$, by leisure, slowly, scarcely $=$ by no means. Elms. cites Shakesp. Titus And. i. 2, ' I'll trust by leisure him that mocks me once.'

435-6. Steel, reading with mss. $\dot{\omega}$ 's $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ бoi $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, writes: ' we should
 last indeed seems to be the construction which was in the poet's mind ; $\dot{\omega}$ however being omitted, $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ was necessarily thrown back so as not to be the first word in the sentence. The same observation holds good in Phil. 279,


 $\sigma o l ~ \mu \grave{̀} \nu$ with Elmsley and Schäfer I was moved not by 'concinnitas dictionis', but by rhythmical fitness, $\dot{\omega} s \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \sigma o i ~ \delta o к \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ seeming in effect a termination by spondee $\dot{\omega} s-\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ and cretic $\sigma o i-\delta o \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, since $\sigma o i$ is necessarily emphatic and $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ always unemphatic. \| $\mu \hat{\omega} \rho o \iota$, subjoined to explain $\tau o \iota o i \delta \epsilon$. See Phil.
 might stand as ethic dative. See 8. || The Greek fulness of expression in $\gamma o v \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma_{\iota}$ of $\sigma^{\prime} \notin \phi \cup \sigma a \nu$ is very usual, even when there is no such emphasis as would warrant the use of similar fulness in English. See Scyr. Frag. ii. 2,



440. оั่коиิข. Dindorf reads, as Elmsley, oủk oûv, with interr. at close. See 342, note.
443. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \sigma \omega \sigma^{\prime}$. This could be $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \sigma \omega \sigma \epsilon$ or $\epsilon \xi \xi \in \sigma \omega \sigma a$, but, as $\tau \dot{\prime} \chi \eta$ was the subject used by Teir., he would naturally suppose it repeated.

445-6. See Lection. \| коцıگєть $\delta \hat{\eta} \theta^{\prime}$, aye, let him conduct yout let him by all means. \|I $\epsilon \mu \pi o \delta \omega \dot{\omega} \nu \quad \partial \chi \lambda \epsilon i ̂ s ~(w i t h ~ \pi a \rho \omega \dot{\nu})$, your presence hinders and annoys me. Elms. cites Ae. Pr. 1001 ò $\chi \lambda \epsilon i \hat{s} \mu \dot{a} \tau \eta \nu \mu \epsilon$. See E. Hel. 439

448. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi\langle\nu$. Hor. C. iii. 3,3 , non voltus instantis tyranni \&c.
 $283 \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \delta \epsilon \delta^{\prime} \ddot{̈} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ єi $\sigma o \rho \hat{s} . . . \chi \omega \rho o \hat{v} \sigma \iota$. Verg. Aen. i. 577 , urbem quam statuo vestra est.
 alien. Soph. has in view the $\mu$ ќтoккос at Athens-the class of foreigners sojourning with certain civic privileges. See 4 II note. || The regular construction would require $\phi a \nu \eta \sigma \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu o s \delta \epsilon$, which is changed by an anacoluthon into the finite verb, єīa $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \phi \alpha \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \tau a \iota$. Cp. v. izor. Any careful student of Sophocles will be at no loss to find examples of the free construction adopted by the poet. $\nu \hat{v} \nu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ or $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ are sometimes thus omitted in the first
clause, when they may be readily understood, as here, from the subsequent

 $\pi a ́ \lambda a \iota ~ u n d e r s t o o d ~ f r o m ~ \tau a v \hat{v} \nu$ which follows.
454. $\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{\xi} v \mu \phi \circ \rho \hat{q}$, by his good fortune, a sense sometimes though rarely



 $\pi \rho o \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v} s \pi a ́ \nu \tau o \theta \in \nu$. Seneca Oed. 656, repet incertus viae baculo senili tristc praetentans iter. The word is also used, as Lat. praeludo, of preparatory action in the gymnasia or in war. $\| \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \pi o \rho \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha l$, shall travel, properly as a
 sense is later. Sophocles uses it merely in the sense of a traveller.
 є́ $\mu \pi$ орє́́єє ;
458. See Lection. Whether aútòs or aúròs should be read here, is a very nice question; and possibly neither is wrong. As there is, however, no doubt that aúròs would be right, if the words кai жar $\dot{\rho} \rho$ were away, I have thought it justifiable to read aúrós, carrying in mind that it is to be supplied again after $\pi a \tau \eta \rho$. If the pronoun stood first or last, I believe it would take the article, aúvòs $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o ̀ s ~ \kappa a i ~ \pi a \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$, or $\dot{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o ̀ s ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \pi a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ aúrós. But this is one of those questions on which scholars may take different sides without disparagement to either party.
460. $\dot{\delta} \mu \sigma \sigma \pi \dot{\prime} \rho o s$, in active sense, as $\dot{\delta} \mu \circ \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} s$ (or $\dot{\partial} \mu 0 \lambda \epsilon \chi \eta{ }_{\eta} s$ ) in $1350 .=$ husband of the same wife. But it is passive ( $\dot{0} \mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi o \rho o s) 260$.
 I have, with some hesitation, concurred with those who omit $\mu$ ' after $\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \beta \eta s$ on account of $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}$ closely following. Those who keep it might cite in their
 $\kappa \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \boldsymbol{\psi} \psi \dot{\eta} \phi \psi$, where the pronoun is repeated. But the strong $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}$ makes some distinction between the two places.
462. $\phi a ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $\phi a ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, so S. El. 9, Phil. 1 111, 57 , ( $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu)$; and elsewhere frequently. The infin. stands also instead of the 3 rd person imp. as well as of the 2nd pers. Matthiæ thinks the phrase is probably a remnant of the older and simpler language, the action required being expressed by means of the verb used absolutely. \|| In this concluding speech, Teiresias uses such plain language that we can hardly conceive his being misunderstood by Oedipus, whom he had already declared the murderer of Laius. But an answer to all these difficulties appears in the remarks made in the first edition. It was the will of fate and heaven that Oedipus should continue to live in blind security till the destined hour of discovery arrived
[Teiresias is now led out through the passage adjoining the western Periaktos, after which Oedipus retires into the palace, and the Chorus sing their first Stasimon. This term (from $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ to stand) is applied to the Odes which the two semichoirs chant when stationary; as distinguished from the Parodos, and from Anapaests, which are attended with marching movement.]

## STASIMON I. (463-5i2.)

(Outline.) In the first strophe and antistrophe of this short Stasimon, the Chorus delineate the miserable state of the unknown murderer, flying in conscious guilt from the unerring pursuit of the divine oracle. In the second strophe and antistrophe they declare their unwillingness to believe in the guilt of Oedipus, being unable to imagine any cause of quarrel between him and Laius: and they would rather doubt the science of a seer than the innocence of one to whom their country owes so great a debt of gratitude.
(Notes.) 463-5. $\quad \tau$ is öv $\partial \tau \nu a$, und. $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$, who is it whomsoever, i.e. who is the unknown one whom..., $\dot{a} \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi \iota \epsilon \pi \pi \epsilon a$, poetic form fem.; but $\dot{\alpha} \delta v \epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} s$ fem. in $\mathrm{I}_{5} \mathrm{I}$. In this form we find an accessory argument that the subst. understood is not either a rock or an oracle, but a person, a priestess. II In the Lection I have briefly stated (in Stud. Soph., more fully) the reasons which convince me that the words $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \in \tau \rho a$ are not those of Sophocles. Here, as in countless places, we have an illustration of the well-known maxim-'a little learning is a dangerous thing.' The scribes and grammarians of the dark ages were always poring over ancient writings in search of parallel passages which they often did not know how to use judiciously when they found them. Assuming that Soph. wrote $\Delta_{\epsilon} \lambda \phi i s$ $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \pi \rho b \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ (though this last word is a mere guess of mine, chosen for its simplicity) such a Scholiast ( $\tau i{ }^{\prime}$ ö ơ $\tau \iota \nu^{\prime}$;) would know that $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s$ is an adjective, would certainly observe חapvaбov̂ in this ode, would probably find $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \tau a l \pi \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha$ in Eur. And. 998, perhaps $\Pi \nu \theta i a \nu \pi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \nu$ in Ion $55^{\circ}$, and (forgetting altogether that $\dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi \iota \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota a \Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s$ is in itself a sufficient title of 'the prophetic Delphian maid' or priestess) he would say $\epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \eta \kappa a$, I have found in $\pi \epsilon \tau \tau \rho a$ the desirable substantive with which the adj. $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s$ agrees. So he wrote it down instead of the trochee ending in a consonant- $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ or some other word-which Soph. had placed there. But $\epsilon\lceil\delta \epsilon$, which ample proof shews to have been the Sophoclean verb, remained. Some later sciolist, with less knowledge of grammar, followed after a time. It struck him that a rock (place for person) might allowably be said to speak-because the voice came from behind it, but a rock with a pair of eyes was too absurd an image: and so (not having the wit to discern his resource in oije, not familiar perhaps with the $\epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ of Eurip.)
he wrote, as the cod. L. proves, $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$ for $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon$, so crediting Soph. with the solecism $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma a \nu \tau a$ for $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma a l$. \| The city itself and temple of Apollo were situated on Mount Parnassus. See 473-4, also Strabo IX. Justin xxiv. 6, Liv. xlif. I5. \| á $\rho \rho \eta \tau^{\prime}$ à $\rho \rho \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu$, a Greek poetic superl. most unutterable i.e. most heinous, direst of the dire. О. С. 1238 , кака̀ как $\hat{\nu}$. Phil. 65, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi \chi a \tau$ ' ̇ $\sigma \chi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \alpha ́$.

466-8. $\ddot{\omega}_{\rho} \rho$ ( $\left.\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i\right)$, it is time. \| á $\epsilon \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\delta} \omega \nu$, storm-swift. Hom. uses

 $\sigma \theta \epsilon \nu a \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ can either be an adverb, more vigorously (than steeds), or an epithet of $\pi \dot{\delta} \delta a$, stronger than (the feet of ) steeds. Erfurdt quotes Hom. Il. $\theta^{\prime} .505,{ }^{\prime \prime} A \tau \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \alpha \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \kappa a i \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau i \pi o s$ to prove that the word implies swiftness. Wunder also says that the sense of vehemence applied to flight readily slides into that of swiftness. Neue thinks it implies firmness and steadiness, and therefore perseverance. \| $\phi v \gamma \hat{q} \hat{q}$ is dat. of manner, in flight. See 5 I, E. Bacch. 437, H. F. 1081, El. 218, S. Phil. 1149, Verg. Aen. Iv. 28 I , ardet abire fuga. $\| \nu \omega \mu \hat{a} \nu$, to ply, move.
 So Zeus in Phil. 1198 is called $\pi v \rho \phi \dot{\rho} \rho o s \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \pi \eta \tau \eta$ 's, the hurler of fiery thunderbolts. Apollo and Pallas are sometimes represented as armed with the lightnings of their sire. Verg. Aen. I. 42, Ipsa (Pallas) Jovis rapidum
 Instead of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ aúrò̀ it might have been $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ aúr $\hat{\varphi}$ as Hom. Il. $\lambda^{\prime} .70, \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \pi$ ' $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o \iota \sigma \iota$ Oopóv $\tau \epsilon s$. But in a chase the accus. is better. \| $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \in \tau a s$, son, so E. Ion 916, elsewhere it means father, as E. Or. ioir, or is used as an adj. \| K $\hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Fates (or Furies?), Ae. Sept. 1055 , K $\hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$ 'E $\rho \iota \nu \dot{\prime} \epsilon s$. In Hom. $\kappa \grave{\eta} \rho$ means 'evil fate'; it is usually joined with death ( $\theta \dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau o \nu ~ к а i ~ к \hat{\eta} \rho a$ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda a(\nu a \nu)$ and seems nearly equivalent to it. In Ae. Sept. 777 the Sphinx is so called. It is applied to the wound of Philoctetes, 42, 1166 : and generally the tragic poets use it of anything terrible. Consult Lidd. and Sc.
 though he keeps $\mu$ in E. Phoen. 23, Med. ir6. As the metre often requires its omission, never its insertion, Monk on Hipp. 145, Alc. 248, and Elmsley on Med. ı 16 would reject it always: but Hermann would insert it when the first syll. is long. Blomfield on Sept. 795 thinks $\mu$ in such words the addition of a later age before labials, as in ö $\mu \beta \rho \stackrel{\mu}{ }$ derives the word (on Prom. in2) from $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \xi$, cause to wander, with a pleonastic or intensive, like $\ddot{a} \sigma \tau \alpha \chi v s, \dot{a} \beta \lambda \eta \chi \rho \dot{\sigma} s, \dot{a} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \gamma \omega$. The word in this place means zunerring, 'not missing their prey', or 'from whom is no escape'.

473-4. $\quad$ е̉ $\lambda \alpha \mu \psi \epsilon$. See i86. II фá $\mu a$, oracle, here=command.
 463 above. $\| \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau^{\prime}$ i $\chi \nu \in \dot{\prime} \varepsilon \iota \nu$. Wunder in his first edition agreed with Brunck
in taking $\pi a \dot{d} \nu \tau a$ as masc. and subject of $i \chi \nu \in \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$, 'that every one should search for.' But in his second he rejects this view, and makes $\pi \dot{\prime} \nu \tau a$ neuter and adverbial, so that $\pi a^{\prime} \nu \tau a$ i $\chi \nu \epsilon \cup \in \epsilon \nu=\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu i \chi \nu \epsilon i a \nu i \chi \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$, make every search for, the infin. depending on $\epsilon \lambda a \mu \psi \epsilon$ фá $\mu a$ which in sense $=a$ command was proclaimed (to hunt out \&c.). This view J. takes, and it is the right one.

476-82. фoıтâ, he roams. \| $\pi$ 白 $\tau \rho a s$ loótavpos. See Lection. Not 'fierce as a bull' (so J. renders ioóтavpos) but restless as a bull. Vergil's description of the wanderings of the defeated bull in Geo. iII. should be compared. \| $\mu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon o s$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., straying in solitude ( $\chi \eta \rho \epsilon$ ú $\omega \nu$ ) poor wretch with zeretched foot. \|I $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \sigma o ́ \mu \phi a \lambda a \gamma$ âs $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a$, the oracles of earth's centre. On constr. see 161. The Greeks regarded Delphi as the centre of the earth's circular plane; having an old legend that Zeus despatched two eagles (or doves) of equal speed from opposite points of the circumference, and that these birds met at Delphi. \|\| a $\pi=\nu 0 \sigma \phi i \zeta \omega \nu$, keeping aloof (from himself), i. e. avoidingthem. Hom. uses the simple verb in middle voice twice in the Iliad, in the sense keeping oneself aloof from=shunning, without any case: $\beta^{\prime} .8 \mathrm{I}, \omega^{\prime}$.
 with the sense of leavings, either with gen., $\psi^{\prime} .98, \tau i \phi \theta^{\prime}$ oü $\tau \omega \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s \nu o \sigma \phi i-$

 or transitively, removing, $\delta^{\prime} .263$, $\pi \alpha \hat{\imath} \delta a \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \nu 0 \sigma \phi \iota \sigma \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$. So in this play


483-7. See Lection, where I read $\mu \epsilon \nu \hat{v} \nu$ for ms. $\mu \epsilon \grave{\nu} \nu$ oî $\nu$, taking $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \grave{\alpha}=$ $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\omega s}$, and the participles oürє $\delta о к о \hat{\nu} \nu \tau^{\prime}$ ои้ $\tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi о ф \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa о \nu \theta^{\prime}$ as agreeing with $\mu \epsilon$, who neither agree nor deny.
488. oür' '̇v $\nu$ ád' $\dot{o} \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ ov̉r' òmio $\omega$, having no clear view of the present or the future, i.e. seeing no ground at present for believing the truth of his words, nor understanding what the future can bring forth to establish it. So Wunder. Also Elmsley, Hermann, Ellendt rightly regard óni$\sigma \omega$ as meaning the future. Musgrave took it for the past, from an erroneous interpre-
 and Damm's note. Add Phil. ino5, where єiбomi $\sigma \omega$ manifestly means hereafter.

491-7. $\quad \tau i \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \ddot{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda .$, for what cause of quarrel there was either on the part of the Labdacidae or on that of the son of Polybus, \&c., the Labdacidae implying Laius, son of Labdacus. || See Lection. трòs öтоv к.т.入., from which drawing clear proof (lit. by a touchstone, $\beta$ aravi $\zeta \omega \nu$ ), I may confidently attack ( $\pi \iota \theta a \nu \omega \hat{s} \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \epsilon \pi i$ ) the popular fame of Oedipus by coming forward to avenge a mysterious murder. The ধ̇miठauos фátıs cannot be, as Ellendt interprets, the denunciation of Teir. against Oed. which had not yet been

138. So too 127, \atov ajphyós, avenger. Seneca Agam. 905, paternae mortis auxilium unicum. \| Oiסımó $\delta a$ for -ao, from Oidınódjs, another form of the name. This Doric form of gen. is retained by the Attics in proper names and some other nouns.

 but that, of men, a diviner claims more than myself (i.e. has more knowledge than I$)=$ there is no sure criterion to prove. Cp. Herod. vil. 168, $\eta^{\prime} \lambda \pi \iota \zeta 0 \nu$
 aíє котє $\dot{\cup} \mu \epsilon ́ \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \rho о ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$. $\| \pi a \rho a \mu \epsilon i \psi \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu$ ä̀ , may surpass.

505-8. ä̀入’ ойтот' к.т.入., but never would I, till I sazv rishtful proof, ( $\partial \rho \theta \partial ̀ \nu$ ध̈ $\pi o s$ ), assent ( $\kappa a \tau a \phi a i \eta \nu \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu$ ) when men blame him. Aristot. Met. III. $7, \dot{\eta} \delta \iota \alpha ́ \nu o l a \ddot{\eta} \kappa a \tau \dot{a} \phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu \ddot{\eta} \dot{a} \pi \delta \delta \phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu$. \| $\pi \rho i \nu i \delta \delta \iota \iota \iota$. If $\pi \rho i \nu$ follows a past or opt. negation, as here, $\pi \rho i \nu$ takes optative. If the negation is of future


509-12. $\beta a \sigma a ́ \nu \varphi \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\delta} u \pi 0 \lambda \iota s$, by proof, i. e. by experience (lit. touchstone) pleasant to the city; i. e. 'a good and popular ruler.' \| $\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\rho} a$, for that reason then $(\dot{\rho} a=\ddot{a} \rho \alpha)$. \| оӥтот' $\dot{o} \phi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ какiav, he shall never be pronounced
 E. Alc. ı093, $\mu \omega \rho i ́ a \nu$ ó $\phi \lambda \iota \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \iota$.
(Creon now enters the stage.)

## EPEISODION II. (513-862.)

This second Epeisodion falls into two parts, divided from each other by a Comma or Commation, that is, by a short lyric dialogue which begins at 649 , and ends (with interruption of nine lines, 669-677) at 697 .
(Outline of Part 1. 513-697.) Creon joins the Chorus, and indignantly notices the reports which have reached him of the charge of treason made against him by Oedipus. The Chorus try to soothe him, till Oedipus, coming out of the palace, assails him with reproaches, and for a time will hear no answer. At length Creon, getting leave to speak, rebuts the charge of treason with powerful arguments, but fails to convince the king of his innocence. Fierce reproach and indignant denial recur, till at length Jocasta, aroused by the noise, comes out and interferes. Creon confirms his denial by an oath, and the Chorus, supporting Jocasta, at length prevail on Oedipus to recall the sentence of death, which he does with reluctance. Thus the kinsmen part on bad terms, Creon returning home. The intervening Commation consists chiefly of persuasive words, and assurances of love and loyalty from the Chorus to Oedipus, with his replies: and a few words of explanation between them and Jocasta.
(Notes). $5^{1} 3^{-22}$. $\delta \in i \nu^{\prime} \notin \pi \eta$ кат $\eta \gamma \quad \rho \in i ̂ \nu \mu$, accused me in formidable language, imperf. \| $\tau$ úpav ${ }^{\prime} 0 \nu$. See 925 . Hermann thinks these two verses gave to this drama its title Oiסimous rúpapvos. \| $\dot{a} \tau \lambda \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, indignant (part. of


 thing to his injury. See Lection. I know no example of a part. standing as $\phi \epsilon \in \rho o \nu$ in the mss. here without $\tau \iota$. (See Ag. 26I, where for $\epsilon$ ' $\tau \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \delta \nu \partial ̀ \nu$
 so close together, and the same constr., $\epsilon i$ s $\beta \lambda \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta \eta \nu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu, ~ \epsilon i s ~ a ̀ m \lambda o u ̂ \nu ~ \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota, ~$ within three lines, we cannot deny that this betrays sad negligence of style. For these combined reasons I had written $\tau \iota \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \eta \nu \quad{ }_{\epsilon} \chi^{\prime} \chi \nu$ for $\epsilon$ is
 phrase oú $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota \epsilon$ is $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda o u ̂ \nu$, has no simple (unimportant) influence, such intransitive use of $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega$ is by no means rare, and is shared with many of its compounds. I now keep $\phi \epsilon \in \rho o \nu$, reading $\phi \circ \rho 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \iota$ for $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \circ \nu \tau \iota$.
$5^{2} 3^{-4}$. $\dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \ldots \tau \alpha \chi^{\prime}{ }^{a} \nu \ldots \beta l a \sigma \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$. There is great variety of opinion among scholars about the construction here. The question is a very difficult one, and I dare not speak ex cathedra concerning it. Hermann, Wunder, Steel would refer $\tau \dot{a} \chi^{\prime}{ }^{a} \nu$ to $\beta \iota a \sigma \theta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, to which view Li. and J. are decidedly opposed. The latter (joining it with $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ ) says, 'the form of the Greek sentence, by putting $\tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ first, was able to suggest the virtual equivalence here of the conditional $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu$ to a positive $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$,' adding 'cp. the use of the optat. with $\hat{\alpha} \nu$ in mild assertion of probable fact: $\epsilon i \eta \eta \sigma a \nu \delta^{\prime} a ̈ \nu$ ồzou K $\rho \bar{\eta} \tau \epsilon s$, Her. I. 2.' I am utterly unable to see how this use of $\epsilon i \eta \sigma a \nu \partial{ }^{\prime} \nu$, verb and particle combined, assists us in explaining the use of indic. with $\tau a ́ \chi \not{ }^{\prime} a ̈ \nu$ following it at some distance. Elms. thought the äv useless, and badly proposed oiv. The words of Linwood deserve to be considered. 'Has particulas unam quandam notionem efficere, et äv ad optativum suppressum cogitatione referri arbitror, ut constructio sit, $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ रoviv $\epsilon \delta \delta o s$,



 aưrò $\beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \pi v \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$. See Stud. Soph. P. II. p. 39, and Steel's note p. I44.

525-6. тoüтоs $\delta^{\prime}$ є́фáv $\theta \eta$, the language published (by common report) was. My reasons for adopting this reading, which appears in two codd., for the more common rồ $\pi \rho \dot{o} s$, are these: (I) There is no ground, metrical or grammatical, for inverting the pronoun and preposition ; hence several editors read $\pi \rho \delta \partial s$ тoú. (2) Creon has no motive for asking who originated the report, nor does the Chorus reply to such a question. He says: 'the language bruited was, that the seer was persuaded by me to speak false. K. OE.
hoods．＇（3）That qoünos is the true reading I regard as not merely indi－ cated but absolutely proved by the place， $848, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda$＇$\dot{\omega}$ s $\phi a \nu \dot{\prime} \nu \gamma \epsilon \tau 0 u ̛ \pi 0 s \ddot{\omega} \delta \delta^{\prime}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma o$ ，＇nay，be well assured that the statement made public was this．＇ Van Herwerden illustrates the corruption of $\tau 0 u ̈ \pi o s$ into $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ b y ~ r e f e r-~$ ence to Aesch．Pr．49，where mss．give $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho a ́ \chi \theta \eta$ for $\grave{\epsilon} \pi a \chi \theta \hat{\eta}$ ．\｜$\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma o \iota$ ， indirect optat．referred to the mind or opinion of those who so reported．

528－9．$\dot{\epsilon} \xi{ }_{\xi} \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ к．т．入．，was this accusation uttered against me with stedfast eyes and mind？i．e．was he quite sane when he brought this charge ？The prep．$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa, \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ ，is often used to express a state，or the circum－
 longer free．

53 I ．ö $\delta \epsilon$ announces some one＇s entrance．$\| \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{a}$ ，comes forth．Ant．

 （Oedipus enters from the palace and speaks．）
532．oûtos $\sigma \dot{v}$ ，hark you！1121，oûtos $\sigma \dot{u}, \pi \rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \beta v$ ．oũ̃os is also found with－ out $\sigma \dot{v}, \mathrm{Tr} .407$ ，oũ̃os，$\beta \lambda \epsilon \phi^{\prime} \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon$. Aj． $7 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{IOI2}$ ．Or $\hat{\omega}$ is introduced； O．C．${ }^{6} 6_{2} 7$ ，$\hat{\omega}$ oûtos，oûtos Oíítious．Aj．89，$\hat{\omega}$ oûtos，Aîav．A．Av． 1 199， Eccl．464，aü $\eta \eta \sigma$ ט́．The address is sometimes without oũ ка入ós $\pi \epsilon \kappa а i$ бофós，Plat．H．Maj．p．95．A．Ach．54，oi тоఢ̆о́тац．
 a front．Greek poets express qualities of persons and things by genitives of substantives，with or without adjective，which in Latin is required ：those genitives having an attributive power，and being therefore called attributive or descriptive．Such are 1403，ßopâs $\tau \rho a ́ \pi \epsilon 广$ डa，dinner－table，Tr． $357 \pi o ́ \nu \omega \nu$
 Thuc．I． $140 \tau$ às $\xi \cup \mu \phi \circ \rho \dot{d} s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ，actual events．See 44．$\| \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ i＇kou，so that thou art come．$\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon$ iк＇$\sigma \theta a l$ would mean，so as to come．\｜｜$\tau 0 \hat{o} \delta \epsilon$


538－9．$\dot{\omega} s$ ov．und．$\dot{v} \pi 0 \lambda a \beta \omega \dot{\prime} \nu$ ，supposing（to be supplied from $i \delta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ）that $I$ should not recognise $(\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota \circ \hat{\mu}) \ldots$ or should not defend myself $(\dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \xi \circ \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ ，see 171）．The former would show folly，the latter cowardice．$\hat{\eta}$ оúk for коúк is therefore a just emendation．The fut．opt．always follows past verbs with a real fut．force，without $a \partial \nu$ ．See $\dot{\rho} v \sigma 0 i \mu \eta \nu 72$ ，and Exc．iII．Also 792－3， 796， 127 I ，1274．\｜l $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \stackrel{\imath}{\mu} \mu \mathrm{Att}$ ．for $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \sigma o \iota \mu$ ．
$54 \mathrm{I}-2$ ．The mass of commentators，who are content to retain $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ ous in 54 I along with $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota$ in 542 ，probably regard $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$ as corresponding to $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu$ ，whom they understand as wealthy and powerful friends，taking the word $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{0}$ s in both lines to mean＇numbers＇，＇a multitude＇．Ellendt is so well satisfied that he calls Heimsoeth＇s conj．$\pi$ 分oúrou，which I have ven－ tured to edit，＇inutilis＇．My reasons for adopting it are these：（r）the repetition of $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{0}$ here must be displeasing to every reader of good taste：
but it is just what the tasteless scribes and scholiasts would plume themselves on effecting; (2) to suppose a correspondence between $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu$ and $\chi \rho \eta \eta_{\mu} \mu \sigma \iota \nu$ rather than between $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu$ and $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota$ is to my mind very unsatisfactory; (3) the $\chi \iota a \sigma \mu o ́ s$ (cross-correspondence) $\pi \lambda o u ́ \tau o v-\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \sigma \iota \nu, \phi i \lambda \omega \nu-\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota$, is quite in the manner of Soph., who delights in variety, and shuns stiffness. He has adopted it immediately before, in 536-9, where after $\delta \epsilon i \lambda i a \nu \ddot{\eta}$ $\mu \omega \rho i a \nu$ follows, $\ddot{\eta} \dot{\omega} s$ oú $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota o ̂ \mu \iota$ (corresponding to $\mu \omega \rho i a \nu$ ), $\ddot{\eta}$ oúк $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \xi \circ i \mu \eta \nu$ (corresponding to $\delta \epsilon i \lambda i a \nu)$. (4) $\pi \lambda o u ̛ t o v ~ i s ~ n o t ~ f a r ~ r e m o v e d ~ f r o m ~ t h e ~ l i t e r a-~$ tion of $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ ous. Such is my case for $\pi \lambda$ oúrov. $\|$ of a thing which, referred
 Thuc. I. 122, vil. 62.

543-4. oî $\sigma$ ' $\dot{\omega} s \pi o i \eta \sigma o \nu$; idiomatic constr. $=\pi o i \eta \sigma o \nu$, oî $\sigma$ ' $\dot{\omega}$; lit. ' act, dost thou know how?' i. e. shall I tell thee what to do?1 Cp. E. Hel. 315 , 1233. Heracl. 45 I. Ion, ı039. See also O. C. $75,0 \hat{i} \sigma \theta^{\prime}$, $\hat{\omega} \xi \in \dot{\xi} \dot{\nu}$, $\dot{\omega} s \nu \hat{v} \nu \mu \dot{\eta}$ $\sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{\eta} s=\mu \dot{\eta} \nu \hat{v} \nu \sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{\eta} s, \dot{\omega} \xi \in \hat{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$, ol $\sigma \theta$ ' $\dot{s} ;$; 'avoid going wrong, stranger, dost thou know how?' i.e. shall I tell thee how to avoid going wrong? || "' $\sigma$ ' à $\nu \tau \alpha$ '-


545-6. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \sigma \dot{v} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\prime} s$, thou art an able speaker. See lex. $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ 's. $\| \mu a \nu \theta$. $\delta$ ' $\epsilon \gamma \dot{\omega}$ како̀s $\sigma o \hat{0}$, lit. ' I am bad to learn from thee'=thou'lt find me a poor scholar: the place of $\sigma o \hat{u}$ is emphatic. \| $\beta a \rho u v^{\prime}$, danserous, so Steel's note ; and this is the proper word, which I have always adopted. J. does not represent it here, but in 673 , where again dangerous is the right English, he renders it, very wrongly, vehement, a word in no place suitable to it. Cp . Ant. 767,1251, O. C. 402,1204, \&c. Such examples show that $\beta$ apeia $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu \iota s$ or $\dot{\partial} \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ means dangerous anger, not vehement.

555-6. $\chi \rho \in i \eta$. When that which was said or thought by another in past time is cited as such, the optat. is used after öt $\tau$, 这. See 79 I д $\rho$ ei $\eta$. Or
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \theta \epsilon \mathrm{s}$, did you advise? || $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\rho} \mu a \nu \tau \iota \nu$, reverend seer, so O. C. го97, $\psi \epsilon v \delta \dot{-}$
 (by my order, indirect agency).
557. aitós, the same man, i.e. of the same mind.

[^5]$558-560$ ．The question of Oed．is not completed：he is made to hesi－ tate，and Creon inquires what he means to ask about Laius ；then he com－ pletes the sentence．This is obliged by the $\sigma \tau \tau \chi o \mu v \theta i a$ or line－for－line debate here used，as often in tragedy．\｜äфavtos ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \rho \in \iota \theta$ ．$\chi$ ．has disappeared by an act of deadly violence．
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu o c$ ．It would be a period of great extent and beginning long ago， should it be measured $:=$ long and far back would be the count of time．

562－4．$\hat{\eta} \nu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \in \chi \nu \eta$ ；was engaged in his profession？Plato Protag．



564．$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau o$, make mention，Homeric，for Attic $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$ ．
565．oüкоvv，no，not at least when I was standing anywhere near． 342 ．
566－7．Є̈ $\rho \in \nu \nu a \nu$ ё $\sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ，—institute a search．We say，had a search． II $\pi \bar{\omega} s \delta^{\prime}$ oủ $\chi$ ；how could we help it？

569．$\dot{\epsilon} \phi$＇oîs $\mu \dot{\eta} \phi \rho o \nu \hat{\omega}$ ，on matters I know not．$\phi \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$, I am wont．
570．$\epsilon \hat{\Delta} \phi \rho o \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，if you were loyal．ó $\theta$ oúveка（see lex．）either means lecause as in v．1016，Tr．27，57，Aj．123，553，1052，El．1190，or that，as here，and in O．C．853，944，1005，Tr．813，El．47，6г7，izo8．
 distructions of Laius．The plur．$\delta \iota a \phi \theta o \rho a ̀ s ~ i s ~ u s e d ~ i n ~ b i t t e r ~ c o n t e m p t, ~ " h e ~$ would never have told fables about Laius＇s death as brought about by me．＂
 the same manner that you have now learnt from me：i．e．Creon claims the right of questioning Oed．and being answered by him，as Oed．had just been doing towards himself．Oed．replies，$\epsilon \kappa \mu a ́ \nu \theta a \nu \epsilon$ ，inquiire and learn．！！
 ävous $\tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha$ к $\gamma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu \ddot{a} \mu a$ ．
 past part．is frequent in Soph．，less so in Eur．and only found once in a

 agree with the former view：dost thou rule the land alike（ $\tau$ autà）with her， having equal sway．$\| \hat{a} \nu$ for $\hat{a} a ̆ \nu$ ．$\hat{\eta} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda o v \sigma a=\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \eta$ ．all that she wishes at any time，she receives from me（ $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\nu}$ ко $\mu \boldsymbol{\zeta} \varsigma \tau a \iota$ ）．

581．ойкои้ к．т．入．，am I not a third in parity with yout twain？ 342 ．
582．$̇ \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ 并，yes，for in this very point of view（каi какòs фaiveı $\phi$ iरos）you specially shew yourself a false friend．

583．$\epsilon i$ it $\delta o i \eta s ~ \sigma a v \tau \hat{\varphi}$ 入ó $o v$, if thou wouldst debate the matter with thy． silf as I do，i．e．$\dot{\omega} s \epsilon \operatorname{\epsilon } \gamma \dot{\omega} \dot{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \hat{\omega}$ ．Cp．E．Med．872， $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \hat{\eta} \delta i a ̀ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$
 III． 25 ．
585. ä̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$, would prefer.
586. äт $\rho \in \sigma \tau о \nu \epsilon \ddot{\partial} \delta o \nu \tau a$, sleeping without fear. The literal rendering is best here. See Shakespeare, 'Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.' II ${ }_{\xi} \xi \epsilon \epsilon$. The future here expresses not simply a future action, but one which is considered as predetermined by circumstances and the state of affairs, if he is to have.
 IoI3, where Hippolytus defends himself against a like charge, ending with the words $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \gamma \dot{a} \rho \pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$, кivovvós $\tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi \dot{\omega} \nu \kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \omega$ $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota \tau \hat{\eta} s$ тupav $\dot{\text { ídos }} \chi$ d́pıv.
 $\nu_{0} \nu \sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu^{\prime} \notin \chi \omega \nu$. Aesch. Prom. $7^{6} \mathrm{I}$, $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ \tau u ́ \rho a \nu \nu a ~ \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a \sigma u \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$;

590. $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega$, receive, obtain; a sense frequent in Soph. See lex.
591. $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ aj̇iòs к.т.入., but, were I myself ruling, I should do (lit. should have been doing) many things even against my will. Public policy often obliges a ruler to do things which he would rather leave undone, or would do differently.
596. $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \chi a i \rho \omega$, now all men give me joy, say to me $\chi$ ầ $\rho$. This (in common with Li. J.) I regard as the true interpr., $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ being ethic dat. See 8.
597. їккалой $\sigma$ i $\mu \epsilon$, invoke my aid (lit. 'call me forth'). This reading I prefer to aiкá $\lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota$, flatter, fawn on, the ingenious conj. of L. Dindorf.
598. See Lection. Reading, with Di. J. aúroî $\iota \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$, I take the words
 (i.e. in me and my intercession) their (to them) success (in gaining what they ask) altogether lies.

600. The order is $\nu$ oûs ка入ิ̂s $\phi \rho o \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$, a mind weell judging oủк ä̀ $\gamma^{\prime}$ ขоוто как 6 s, would not become traitorous.
 $\delta \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ os. || Monk on Hipp. 285 has defined the different senses in which $\tau 0 \lambda \mu \hat{a} \nu$ and the aorist $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} v a l$ are used by the tragic poets. I. To have the courage. 2. To have the effrontery. 3. To condescend, or submit. 4. To prevail upon one's self, when in affliction. 5. To have the cruelty. Blomfield (Quarterly Review, No. xxix.) well remarks that a shorter general expression would be to bear.

603-7. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \chi{ }^{\circ} \nu$, as a test of these things, i.e. to try the truth and sincerity of the feelings I have expressed (do this). ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi_{0 \nu}$ is an accus. subst. in precedent apposition to all that follows as far as $\lambda a \beta \omega_{\nu} 607$. (We may imagine $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \pi o i \epsilon \iota$, or $\tau \delta \nu \delta \epsilon \epsilon \lambda$. $\pi o i \epsilon \epsilon$.) \| $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$, in the first place, would be properly followed by $\tau o \hat{u} \tau o ~ \delta \dot{\epsilon}$, but here we have $\tau o \hat{\tau} \tau$ $a ̈ \lambda \lambda 0$. Antig. 167 , $\tau 0 \hat{u} \tau^{\prime}$ aî $\theta \iota s$. The text then divides itself into two offers :
(1) go to Delphi ( $\Pi u \theta \dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon$ ), O Oedipus, and there find out whether I have reported the oracle correctly ; (2) ascertain if I have had any conferences with Teiresias ( $\tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \epsilon \rho a \sigma \kappa \delta \pi \varphi$, the observer of prodigies) and if you discover any such, let me die by my own vote as well as by thine. \| $\beta$ ou$\lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \nu \tau a$. $\beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ is properly advise, $\beta$ ov̀єúoual, take counsel, deliberate, plan: but Soph. uses the act. in the latter sense. \|| $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \nu$ seems a little redundant: and some make it a repetition of the protasis $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \eta s$, but this is harsh and not in the manner of Soph.
608. $\gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \mu \eta \delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \mu \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \chi \omega \rho i s$ ait $\omega \hat{\omega}$. Probably there is no line in this play more difficult to translate with accurate certainty than this. J. treats it without acknowledging its difficulties. He renders $\mu \grave{\eta}$ aicı̂ 'make me not guilty :' but I doubt if he can produce a place where aicia $\sigma \theta a \iota$ means more than to accuse or charge. He renders $\chi \omega \rho i s$ in a corner; and I come near to him in the version 'behind my back'. He gives $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \mu \eta$ $\dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega$, 'on unproved surmise' from which 'by unproved opinion' scarcely differs. All he says in a note is ' $\chi \omega \rho$ is, ' $a_{p}$ part;' i.e. solely on the strength of your own guess ( $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta \alpha^{\alpha} \delta \eta \lambda o s$ ), without any evidence that I falsified the oracle or plotted with the seer." That is-he makes $\chi \omega \rho i s$ and $\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \dot{a} \dot{\delta} \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega$ to be one and the same thing-mere tautology. The difficulty which confronts us here is this:-We are sure that Soph. means to say-'do not condemn me without proof, merely because you think me guilty.' But we are puzzled to find out how he expresses this sentiment in the words received as his: 'do not blame (or accuse) me privately by unproved opinion.' Oed. does not accuse him privately, but face to face in presence of the Theban councillors. Nor can Creon be said here to appeal from his private judgment to a public trial, though this is hinted afterwards in reply to $\dot{c}^{*} \pi \pi^{\prime} \lambda c s, \pi \dot{o} \lambda \iota s$. Here he appeals only to the conscience and common sense of the king. The attempts to correct $\chi \omega$ pis are failures. I would render : accuse me not on proofless surmise without other support.

609-12. $\mu a ́ \tau \eta \nu$, without grood ground. \|itov каi к. $\tau$. $\lambda .$, I call it just the same as casting away one's own life, which one loves most. map' à̇t $\hat{\omega}=a \dot{v} \tau 0 \hat{v}$. So
 ciently introduced by aì $\frac{\hat{\omega}}{}$. i' $\sigma o \nu \kappa a i$ is a favourite construction with Ionic and old Attic writers, as also кai after $8 \mu o \iota o s, \dot{\delta}$ aúrbs, $\pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota o s$.
 dat. see 8) of any one who has a cautious dread of erring (lit. 'of falling'). $\sigma o i$ is respectfully avoided, but the hint is for Oed. On $\pi \in \sigma \epsilon i \nu$, to crr, cp. El. 398 , $\grave{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \beta$ oùias $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i \nu .429$, $\dot{\alpha} \beta o u \lambda i ́ a ~ \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i \nu$.

 $\tau a \chi \epsilon i ̂ s$, where Wunder cites Ph. 526, $\dot{\rho} \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \omega$ тaxús. 808, עó $\sigma a s \tau a \chi \in \hat{\imath}$ '

 $\chi \alpha^{\alpha} \rho \nu \nu \tau \chi \epsilon \hat{\imath} a \nu, \hat{\omega} \pi a \hat{\imath}, \pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon s$. \| $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho a$. In Hom. always $\lambda \dot{a} \theta \rho \eta$, but in Hymn to Dem. 24I, $\lambda \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \rho \bar{a}$. In tragedy $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \bar{a}$, which many edd. write $\lambda \alpha ́ \theta \rho a$, but Di. Li. J. $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho a$. Hesych. cites an adj. $\lambda a \theta \rho \delta s$, not found in use.
619. $\lambda^{\top} \omega \rho \hat{\eta}$ advances (to assault). \| $\beta$ où $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau$. See 606 , note. $\|$ rảuà $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu a \rho \tau \eta \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha$, and $m y$ plans will have failed.

622-6. See Lection and Excursus, where it is shown that the reading $\tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon i \nu \quad$ removes all difficulty from these lines. $\|$ tò $\gamma 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\partial} \nu, I$ amı (rational) at all events in respect of $m y$ own interest.

627-30. $\vec{\epsilon} \xi$ í $\sigma o v ~ \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \dot{a} \mu \delta \nu$. With $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ supply $\epsilon \hat{v}$ ф $\rho о \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \sigma \epsilon$. кả $\mu \dot{\partial} \nu$ is boldly Sophoclean for кai $\tau \grave{\grave{\prime}} \epsilon \mu \dot{\boldsymbol{\prime}}$, , thou shouldest be equally rational in respect of my interest also. \| $\epsilon i$ iè $\xi v \nu i \eta s ~ \mu \eta \delta \varepsilon ́ \nu$, but suppose thou misunderstandest utterly. \| da $\rho \kappa \tau \in \epsilon_{0} \gamma^{\prime} \partial \not \mu \omega \mathrm{s}$. There has been much controversy whether $\dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \epsilon_{0} \nu$ is active, must rule, or passive, must be ruled. Agreeing as I do with J., that $\dot{a}$. is active, one must rule nevertheless, I let slain errors sleep. The maxim is general : 'a ruler must rule'. Creon contradicts or rather modifies it (as England did in 1688), saying oüто七 как $\omega$ s $\gamma^{\prime}$ ä $\rho \chi \circ \nu$ ros, not, I ween, when one ( $\tau \iota \nu \partial \mathrm{s}$ und.) rules ill. \| Oed. appeals to the city, which hitherto he had ruled well, and in which he would find love and gratitude. Creon, in his modest reply, virtually makes the same appeal.
(focasta now, hearing the noise, comes out of the palace.)
$63 \mathrm{I}-3$. 'Iока́ $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$. She is called ' $\mathrm{E} \pi \iota \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta$ in Hom. Od. $\chi^{\prime} .27 \mathrm{I}, \mu \eta \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha$
 form in Plato and Thucyd. from the best mss. \| $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon \hat { v }} \theta \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$. S. El. 1434, $\tau \dot{\alpha}$
 aútós $\tau \iota s$ aù $\hat{\varphi} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \beta \lambda \alpha \beta^{\beta} \eta \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \phi \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$. For instances of its use in Eurip. see Elms. on Med. 896. Matthiæ well observes (v. 915 ed. Matth.) that $\epsilon \hat{\nu}$ or $\kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega s} \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu a \iota$ is used as well as $\epsilon \hat{v}$ or $\kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} s \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$, the former however with reference to others' affairs, the latter to our own. тò $\pi a \rho o ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon \hat{v} ~ \theta \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a u$, to make the best of the present, is a common proverb, being a metaphor from the game of the $\pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma o i$. See Ae. Ag. 3I. It is, to make the best move of the dice, as in backgammon. $\epsilon \hat{\dot{v}}$ is sometimes omitted; Thuc. I. ${ }^{25}$, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi o ́ \rho \varphi ~ \epsilon i ́ \chi o \nu \tau o ~ \theta ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi a \rho o ́ v, ~ a s ~ i n ~ E n g l i s h, ~ t o ~ t u r n ~ t o ~(g o o d) ~ a c c o u n t . ~ . ~$ Cp. Ter. Ad. Iv. 7. $2 \mathrm{r}-\mathbf{2 4}$, "Illa vita 'st hominum, quasi si ludas tesseris. Si illud quod maxume opus est jactu, non cadit, illud quod cecidit forte, id arte ut corrigas."
634. $\hat{\omega}$ тa入ait $\omega \rho o \iota$, unhappy men.

634-8. $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu \quad \gamma \lambda \omega^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \eta s$, quarrel of tongue, altercation. Tr. 1120,
 the best mss. is approved by Elms., and adopted by Dindorf, Wunder, Nauck, and J. Elms. cp. Dem. de Cor. p. 302, $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \tau \grave{\eta \nu} \phi \omega \nu \dot{\eta} \nu$

 may be followed by a participle of the operative cause, which in Latin is expressed by quod, or by accus. with infin. ióla кıvoûv $\tau \epsilon s$ кıcià $=\phi \iota \lambda 0$. $\nu \epsilon \iota \kappa о \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$. \|| ov̉к єî...каi $\mu \dot{\eta}$. Examples of this use of ov and $\mu \grave{\eta}$ in an interrog. sentence of two clauses are numerous. In the first clarise ou with 2nd pers. fut. commands, and in the second ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (ov่ being continued from the




 кат $\dot{\alpha}$ to govern oikous, which can be accus. of 'place whither.' See $1_{53}$,


$639^{-4} \mathrm{I}$. $\quad \delta v o i ̂ \nu$ is here a monosyllable by synizesis: as $\delta \omega \dot{\omega} \epsilon \epsilon \alpha$ for $\delta \nu \dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$. Hermann quotes in Latin the writer of Phoenix. v. 28, duodecies undis irrigat omne nemus. Dindorf quotes duas as a monosyllable from Plaut. Rud. I. 2. 4I, and II. 2. 14; and duarum as a disyllable from Plaut. Trin. Iv. 3. 46, and Ter. Heaut. 1i. 3. 85. Dúo and $\delta \dot{v} \omega$ are indeclinable in Homer. But if $\tau 0 i \nu \delta$ ' were read with Elmsley for $\delta v o i v$, or $\theta \dot{a} \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \delta v o i ̂ \nu$ with Dindorf for $\delta$ voî̀ àmoкрivas, the synizesis would be avoided. See Lection. \| $\dot{a} \pi \sigma_{0} \rho i \nu a s ~ a d j u d g i n g ~ f r o m, ~ i . ~ e . ~ s e n t e n c i n g ~ m e ~ t o ~ o n e ~(o f ~ t w o ~$ evils).




 take accus. obj. See 55 I . Ant. ${ }^{1} 54$. Also $\delta \rho \hat{a} \nu$ with two accusatives is frequent. See $\delta \rho a \hat{\sigma} a \iota \delta \epsilon \iota \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon$ above, and $\epsilon \mathfrak{l} \sigma_{\epsilon} \tau \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \kappa \alpha 6_{45}$. O. C. $8_{54}$, \&c. $\|$ On $\sigma \grave{\nu} \nu$ see 123 .

644-5. $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \hat{v} \nu$ ỏvaíuך $. ~ m a y ~ I ~ n o t ~ p r o s p e r . ~ O . C . ~ 1042, ~ ठ ั \nu a \iota o, ~$ Ө $\eta \sigma \epsilon \hat{v}$, , $o \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu a i o v ~ \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota \nu, ~ g o o d ~ f o r t u n e ~ b e f a l ~ t h e e!~ o ̀ \nu i \nu \eta \mu l, ~ I ~ h e l p, ~ f u t . ~ . ~$
 aor $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu-\eta \sigma 0-\eta \tau 0 \& c$., part. ò $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu$ os. But the other moods have $a$, as opt. óvai $\mu \eta \nu$, inf. ö $\nu \alpha \sigma \theta a l$. As to the order of words cp. 31, 125 I . Such irregular order is called Hyperbaton in grammar. $\| \nu \hat{u} \nu$. Monk and Blomfield had held the quantity of the enclitic $\nu \nu \nu$ to be short or long in tragedy. Ellendt contends that it is always short : and that $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ can be used not only temporally but transitionally also: ' $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ certa ratione pro $\nu v \nu$ dicitur, non $\nu v \nu$ pro $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ '. So Wo. : ' $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ dient bei den Tragikern auch zur Folgerung, wenn das Metrum
das enklitische kurze $\nu v \nu$ nicht zulässt.' El. 616, Phil. 1240, Aj. 1129, $\mu \dot{\eta}$
 inclines in favour of Ellendt's view, I edit $\boldsymbol{\nu} \hat{\imath} \nu$, which is in all mss. See Lection, and Ellendt's Lex. Dindorf's practice seems inconsistent.
 It was held impious to refuse belief to one who had bound himself by an oath, as the person so refusing was thought to disbelieve the existence of
 aitias à $\pi о \sigma \tau \rho о ф \dot{\eta} \nu$, ö $\rho к о и s ~ \pi a \rho a \sigma \chi \hat{\omega} \nu, \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ov่ $\sigma \mu \kappa \kappa \alpha \dot{\nu}, \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$.
 $\theta \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \iota$ is here used as $\beta o v i \lambda \epsilon \iota$, which frequently takes after it such a subjunc-
 $\| \epsilon i \kappa \alpha ́ \theta \omega$. Ellendt, on $\dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \nu a \theta \epsilon i \nu$, agrees with Elmsley on Med. 186 and 995 , that all verbs of this termination in Attic writers are aorists ; $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu, \dot{a} \mu \nu-$ $\nu a \theta \epsilon i \nu, \delta \omega \omega \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon i \nu$, ciкa $\theta \epsilon i \nu, \epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a \theta \epsilon i \nu, \sigma \chi \epsilon \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, with the single exception of $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$, and that in fact they have no present form. He excludes from this class those which; intransitive in their nature, denote condition, disposition, or character, as $\theta a \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \theta \omega, \mu \iota \nu \dot{v} \theta \omega, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \theta \omega, \phi \theta \iota \nu v ́ \theta \omega, \phi \lambda \epsilon$ $\gamma^{\epsilon} \theta \omega$.

652-3. $\nu \dot{\prime} \pi{ }^{\prime} \cos$, infant, and $\mu$ '́ $\gamma$ as grown person, are in antithesis. Here render the former weakling, the latter strong in his oath.
655. фрáje $\delta \dot{\eta} \tau i \phi \eta y^{\prime} s$. $\tau i s$ is used both in direct and indirect interrogation; in the latter ö $\sigma \tau \iota s$ normally : but after $\phi \rho \alpha \dot{\jmath} \omega$ a question is always
 ${ }^{15}$, $\sigma \grave{v} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu i \nu \epsilon i \pi \grave{\epsilon} \tau i \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota$.
 (Demosth.) adv. Timoth. 1204. II. This is a common form of expression in the orators. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu a \gamma \hat{\eta}$ refers here to $\dot{a} \rho a i ̂ o s ~ \dot{\partial} \lambda o i \mu \eta \nu$ in v. 645 , and $=\dot{\epsilon} \nu a ̈ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ofvta, i.e. one who renders himself liable to the divine curse in case he violates his oath.

656-7. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ airía $\beta a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu=\bar{\epsilon} \mu \beta a \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ airía. So Plato, Epist. vil. 341 ,


 $\delta ’ \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \mu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon-a i \tau \iota \hat{\omega}$, v. 608. Hermann compares Antiphon de cæde

 words thou lay thine oath-bound friend under a charge that dishonours him.
658. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \omega$, the more usual form in Attic prose; but $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma o$ in 848 . $\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi} \epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma o$ in O. C. 1650 , so $i \sigma \tau \omega$ in Aj. 775 A, Eccl. 732, but $\mu \in \theta i \sigma \tau a \sigma o$
 A. Vesp. 286. So for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma a \iota$ the Attics use $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau a$ rarely ; Ae. Eum. 86.
 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \Delta i o ̀ s ~ a ́ \sigma \tau p a \pi \alpha ́ \nu$. 1238 , oủ $\tau \alpha ̀ \nu ~ " A \rho \tau \epsilon \mu \nu \nu$. So also $\mu a ̀ ~ i s ~ o m i t t e d ~ i n ~ A n t . ~$ 758 , E. Ion 870 . He swears by the sun, because the sun by seeing all things is privy to every thing.

660-4. $\pi \rho o ́ \mu o s$, foremost, in rank, a Homeric word, but used by all the tragic poets. \| ö $\tau \iota \pi \dot{\cup} \mu a \tau o \nu=\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$ s, to the uttermost. Cp. 344, 并 $\tau \iota$ a $\gamma \rho \iota \omega$ $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \eta$. \| $\phi \rho \delta \rho \nu \eta \tau \iota$, animum Ell. intention. \| Elms. takes $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \alpha ́ \psi \epsilon \iota$ as transitive, rendering 'addita habeat'. I prefer however, with Erfurdt, Ellendt, and Neue, the intransitive sense; so $\sigma \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \tau \epsilon \nu$ El. 2 I , $\xi_{\nu \nu a ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \epsilon \tau \nu} \lambda o ́ \gamma o \iota \sigma \iota \nu$, Ae.
 Monk's note, Phoen. 709. Rejecting кai with H., I read $\tau \dot{\alpha} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon i$, rendering and (the dread) if the ills from you twain shall be joined with the former ills.

669-72. $\dot{\mathbf{o}} \delta^{\prime}$ oiv ${ }^{\boldsymbol{i} \tau \omega}$, let him go (escape) then. it $\omega$ for $\dot{a} \pi i \tau \omega$. So
 $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \chi \epsilon \iota$. See note on v. 143. $\| \sigma \tau \delta \mu a$, language. See 426 . $\| \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \dot{\nu}$. As
 never using $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu o ̀ s$ any more than $\delta \epsilon-\epsilon \omega \partial \delta s$, $\kappa \lambda \epsilon-\epsilon \epsilon \nu o ́ s$. I am inclined to think that oú $\tau \dot{o} \tau o u \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi o \iota \kappa \tau \in i \rho \omega$ may be taken parenthetically: but see J. on the other side. $\| \sigma \tau v \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$. The Attics delighted in the passive use of this form, which grammarians call 'the Future Middle'. For examples Monk's note on E. Hipp. 460 may be consulted. This is one of four forms of future having a passive signification, the other three being the Paulo-post-future and the first and second futures passive, the last of which is rare in tragedy.
673. $\sigma \tau v \gamma \nu o ̀ s ~ \mu \in \nu \nu . \tau . \lambda .$, when yielding, thou art manifestly full of hatred (sullen), and dangerous when angered to excess. $\sigma \tau v \gamma \nu \partial{ }^{s}$ referring to $\sigma \tau v \gamma \eta$ '$\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$. \| $\beta$ apùs in the sense of dangerous (a quo grave quid metuendum. Wu.),

 $\pi o \rho \epsilon v \theta \hat{\eta} s \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ rightly.
677. $\sigma o \hat{v} \mu \grave{̀} \nu$ к. $\tau, \lambda$. , having found thee ignorant (of my character), but esteemed by these to be the same that $I$ was before. On àvo's see 1133 . It usually means 'unknown'. \| J. makes ioos just; Li. also favours that sense : but editors generally, and I think rightly, take it 'der ich frïher war', 'the man I was before'. So the Scholiast: $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau$ roúrols $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{o} \mu o i a s ~ \delta o ́ \xi \eta s$
 cited from Dem. to support the rendering just only show loos = 'impartial' (a sense unavailable here), not $=\delta i \kappa a \iota o s$. The passage (Phil. 685) $\imath \sigma o s \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ i$\sigma o c s$, whatever its precise meaning, is not clear enough to prove that $i \sigma o s$ can have the full sense of just.
(Creon now retires from the stage.)
680. $\mu a \theta_{0} \hat{\sigma} \sigma \alpha$ $\gamma^{\prime} \eta \ddot{\eta} \tau \iota \dot{\eta} \tau \cup ́ \chi \eta$. Supply ко $\mu \omega \hat{\omega}$. Yes, (I will do so), when $I$ have learnt what the circumstance is (which caused the contention).
681. סóкךбьs к.т.入., vague fancy (i.e. suspicion) was uttered in words (i.e. by Oed.), and what is not just stings (the mind of Creon).
685. râs $\pi \rho o \pi o v o v \mu e ́ v a s, ~ w h e n ~ o u r ~ c o u n t r y ~ i s ~ a f f i c t e d ~ a l r e a d y . ~$
687. Do you see what consequences you have reached with all the goodness of your disposition, by relaxing (paralysing) and blunting the edge of my temper? mapinut is almost equivalent to $\pi a \rho a \lambda u ́ \omega$. So E. Or. 88ı, $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \iota-$
 $\pi a \rho \epsilon \iota \mu \notin \nu a \iota:$ Alc. 204, Cyc. 591 , Herc. F. 1043, Supp. 1070. This is the only instance of this meaning in Soph., nor is the word ever thus employed by Aeschylus. ' $A \mu \beta \lambda \dot{v} \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is applied by Thucydides to the mind, II. 87 , and so $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda u ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s$ II. 4 I , and $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \mathrm{C}$ II. $6_{5}$, less sensible of, less keenly alive to, more callous.
 that I should be showing myself ämopov $\grave{\epsilon \pi i}$ ф póvıua, literally, helpless for (i.e. incapable of) prudent counsels. $\epsilon^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \bar{\iota} \nu \sigma \sigma \phi \zeta \zeta \mu a \nu$, zvere I deserting (separating myself from) thee. See note on 482. $\pi \epsilon \not \subset a ́ \nu \theta a \iota ~ a ̈ \nu$, is plup.,

 $\tau \alpha \nu \hat{v} \nu$ l' $\sigma o s \quad \gamma \in \nu o \hat{v}$, where the same meaning is expressed as here; and for the collocation of the particles $\tau \epsilon-\tau \epsilon$ compare 35-40. $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \iota$ is understood here with ov̋pıoas. Hermann here reads 0 ö $\tau$ ', and draws the following distinctions in his note. os simply defines a thing; o's $\gamma \epsilon$ with a restriction, to the exclusion of others, who particularly. ö $\sigma \tau \iota s$ is one who, and answers to the Latin ut qui. See $1184, \hat{\omega} \phi \hat{\omega} s, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau a \hat{i} o ́ v ~ \sigma \epsilon \pi \rho о \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \psi a ı \mu \iota$ $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$, ö $\sigma \tau \iota s \pi \epsilon \in \phi a \sigma \mu a \iota \phi v{ }^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \phi \prime \hat{\omega} \nu$ óv $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$. ö ö $\tau \epsilon=q u i q u e$, which is not the same as кai ös=et qui; кai and et joining those things which are necessarily connected, $\tau \epsilon$ and que those which are connected by chance. In assigning a reason ö́ $\tau \epsilon$ expresses who undoubtedly, who, under whatever aspect you view the matter. ö of $\epsilon$ seems to suggest a more detailed account of what is already involved in the preceding words, or already known; os some additional circumstance. Among the Attics Aeschylus only has öб $\sigma \epsilon$ in iambics, Prom. 297 ; Soph. and Eurip. only in lyric parts. The common language retained $\tau \epsilon$ only in $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ and oiós $\tau$ ' $\epsilon i \mu i$.
695. $\sigma \alpha \lambda \epsilon$ úouval, tossing. I have received Dobree's reading for the sake of the metaphor, but there is no objection to the MS. reading ádóovoav, distraught, distressed, perplexed. In $\alpha \lambda \hat{v} \omega$ the $v$ is four times short in Homer; Il. $\epsilon^{\prime} .3^{2}$, $\omega^{\prime}$ 12, Od. $\sigma^{\prime} \cdot 333,393$; once long, Od. $i .398$. It is always long in the dramatic poets. \| $\kappa a \tau^{\prime}$ ' $\rho \theta \delta \nu$ may imply steady and prosperous course, so that $\kappa$. o. oüpıбas=didst impel it with a favourable wind in a straight


 with thy best powers. See Lection. Whatever be the fate of the conjecture $\epsilon \hat{i} \tau \dot{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma o i$, three things cannot be denied by any candid mind : it supplies good Greek and good rhythm : its sense is exactly suited to the place : it is not far from the 'ductus litterarum', $\epsilon i$ óvol being excluded as a manifest gloss. Add to which that nothing has hitherto appeared here before my edition, which can justly claim the approbation of judicious scholars. (Here ends the Commation, and the Second Part of Epeisodion II. begins.)
(Outline of Part 2. 698-762. Jocasta and Oedipus, remaining on the proscenium, hold a momentous dialogue. The queen, dissuading Oedipus from placing any faith in seers, refers to the oracle spoken to Laius, which declared that he should die by the hand of his and Jocasta's son. And yet, she adds, that son was exposed to death on Cithaeron, and robbers slew Laius at the meeting of three roads. The mention of this locality startles Oedipus, who remembers what befell him at such a spot many years ago. Eager questions which he now puts to the queen only confirm by her answers the shocking belief that he did kill Laius there and then, and that he has laid himself under a terrible curse. But as the one survivor of the five persons whom Oedipus encountered bore witness that the deed was that of robbers, he determines to see the fugitive and ascertain the facts. He gives Jocasta a sketch of his life previous to the sad event, having been reared by Polybus and Merope, king and queen of Corinth, as their son and heir. A drunkard at a wine-bout twitted him with being a supposititious child. The next day he questioned his parents, who repudiated the insult with anger against the utterer. Oedipus, not quite satisfied, quitted Corinth without informing the royal pair, in order to learn the truth from the oracle of Apollo at Delphi. The god withheld the information he sought, but foretold to him a terrible future : he should wed his own mother, and slay his father. Horrified by such a prospect, he resolved never to revisit Corinth, and turned his steps in the opposite direction. In that route it was that he arrived at the spot mentioned by Jocasta, and met a party such as she described, consisting of five persons, one being a herald, and the principal personage who answered to the portrait of Laius, riding in a pony-carriage. A quarrel arose. Oedipus, insulted and struck, retaliated in wrath, and slew, as he thought, the whole party, not observing that one of the five escaped. Recognising the evident probability that it was indeed Laius who had thus fallen by his hand, he wildly laments his cruel fate in becoming husband of his victim's widow, and in being subject to the dreadful curse which he had himself
invoked on the murderer．The chorus and the queen strive to console him ：and，admitting that one shred of hope（before mentioned）remains， he will await the coming of the fugitive eye－witness．Hereupon Oedipus and Tocasta retire into the palace．）
（Notcs）．698－9．öтоu тотѐ $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau o s=\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$ öтои $\pi о \tau \grave{\epsilon}$ the matter whereat $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$ é $\chi \epsilon \iota$ thou hast firmly conceived $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu \iota \nu$ тoб $\dot{\eta} \nu \bar{\delta} \epsilon$ so great anger． For the＇gen．causae＇see Ant． 1177 ，$\mu \eta \nu i \sigma a s$ фóvov．For the attraction

 in prose．

700－1．Steel suggests that the reason why Oed．speaks somewhat slightingly of the Chorus here is their wish to hush up the contention 685 ，
 $\tau \epsilon 0 s: \| \mathrm{K}_{p}$ tov os answers to örou in 698：at Creon，（he is the cause whereat
 such plots against me．See 699， 577.

702．$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma$＇$\epsilon i$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．speak，if you can do so（ $\epsilon i \dot{\epsilon} \rho \in i \hat{s}$ ）with clear im－ putation of the quarrel（i．e．if you can clearly shew that it was Creon＇s fault）．She does not forget that，if Oed．is her husband，Creon is her brother．

703．$\kappa \alpha \theta \in \sigma \tau a \dot{\nu} a \iota \mu \epsilon$ ，that I have made myself $=$ that I am．
705－6．$\quad \mu$ ย̀v oûv＇immo vero＇，a corrective particle $=n a y, \mu a ́ \nu \tau \iota \nu ~ к а к о и ̂ \rho-~$
 himself at any rate，$\pi \hat{a} \nu ~ \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \in \theta \epsilon \rho \circ \hat{\imath} ~ \sigma \tau o ́ \mu a, ~ h e ~ k e e p s ~ h i s ~ m o u t h ~ q u i t e ~ f r e e: ~$ i．e．he declares himself quite innocent．

707－10．á $\phi \epsilon i s$ 的avtóv，absolving yourself，reliezing yourself from care，

 oüvєка learn that є่ $\sigma \tau i$ ool к．т．入．，you will find nothing in mortal life possessed of prophetic skill．｜｜$\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \operatorname{\sigma o\iota }$（eth．d．）＝you will find．｜｜$\beta$ pór $\epsilon \iota \circ$
 $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta s$ ．Soph．uses simple verbs in this way for compounds．See 14．3，
 $\kappa \rho^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $a^{2} \nu \alpha \kappa \rho^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu:$ El．699，$\tau \epsilon \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ for à $\nu \alpha \tau \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ：Phil．67，Tr． 940 ， $\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ：Tr．916，Phil．1028，$\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ：Tr． 597 ， $\pi i \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ ：Ant．ı $69, \mu \epsilon \in \nu \epsilon \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．So Homer uses $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ in the sense of addressing with accus．Il．$\mu^{\prime} .60,210 ; \nu^{\prime} .725 ; \rho .^{\prime} 237 ; v^{\prime} .375$.
 would become his fate．See $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ I519．But Nauck conj． $\left.\begin{array}{c}\xi \\ \xi\end{array}\right)$ ，citing Phil．

 should be born，optat．of indef．generality，dep．on fut．opt．$\ddot{\eta}$ 保．
715. Tò̀ $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$. The article $\dot{o}$ is frequently used in this way when followed by $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu, \delta \epsilon, \gamma \alpha ́ \rho$, for the demonstrative pronouns oîtos and $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu o s$. In Attic prose, unless in some few particular phrases, these particles are always used, but not necessarily in the Ionic prose of Herodotus. Aeschylus often omits them, as Eum. 7. Sophocles has tòv for rov̂tov in a lyric passage, O. C. 1699 , and $\epsilon \kappa \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ for $\tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ in O. C. 742 , but in no other passage does he use the article for the demonstrative pronoun, without employing one of the particles $\mu \dot{\prime} \nu$, $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$, nor does Euripides, as far as I recollect, do so in any instance.
 roads meet. The word $\dot{\alpha} \mu$, is also used by Hom. Il. $\chi^{\prime}$. 146: Od. $\kappa$ '. 103: Pind. Nem. vi. 87 : Pyth. Iv. 440.
 $\pi \alpha i \delta \alpha$ and translated it as accus. pend., so that $\delta \iota \epsilon \in \sigma \chi \circ \nu$ was taken intransitively $=\delta \iota \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$, elapsed: but Matthiae well observes that $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau a ̀ s$ s $\delta$ is governed by $\delta \iota \epsilon \in \sigma \chi \circ \nu$, 'not three days separated the birth of the boy (from that which now took place)', i.e. not yet three days elapsed from the birth, when, \&c. кai is used after definitions of time, when we should use a particle of time, Thuc. 1. 50. $\quad \eta \delta \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \hat{\eta} \nu \dot{o} \psi \dot{\epsilon}$ кai \&c., it was already late
 proper obj. of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \zeta$. is $a_{\rho} \rho \theta \rho a$, and the other accus. $\nu \iota \nu$ (the whole of which $a \dot{a} \rho \theta \rho a$ is a part) is a Greek poetic idiom: thus $\nu \nu \nu$ virt. $=a v ่ \tau o \hat{v}$, which would be clumsy in poetry because of $\pi 0 \delta o i v$. "A $\rho \theta \rho a$ is generally taken here to mean the ankles, but the words at $1034 \delta \iota a \tau o ́ p o u s ~ \pi o \delta \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu a ́ s$, make it questionable whether the insteps may not be meant.

720-2. $\ddot{\eta}^{2} \nu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu$, brought it to pass, =caused. \|I If in $7^{23} \theta a \nu \epsilon i \nu \nu$ be read,
 he was dreading. If $\pi a \theta \epsilon i \nu$, they are simply the obj. of this verb.

724-5. $\dot{\omega} \nu \hat{a} \nu \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \grave{s} \chi \rho \epsilon i a \nu \hat{\epsilon} \rho \in \nu \nu \hat{a}$, lit. 'of whatever things the god searches the need' $=$ whatsoever the god seeks as needful.
728. See Lection. The reading I have taken makes the gen. dep. on the prep. v̈ro. under what anxious feeling do you turn and speak thus? ミrpaфєis seems to imply that he half turns his back on the queen, and speaks without looking at her. He felt the shock, as he says, on hearing the words $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \rho \iota \pi \lambda a i ̂ s \dot{a} \mu a \xi \iota \tau o i ̂ s$. He must then have strongly quelled his emotion, and heard her to the end without following the sense of her words, his brain whirling in the $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s \pi \lambda \alpha \nu^{\prime} \eta \mu a$. When she is silent, he moves away, speaking slowly with heart and voice oppressed.
 ả $\gamma \rho o u ̀ s-\kappa a ̉ \pi i ~ \pi o \iota \mu \nu i \omega \nu \nu \nu \mu a ́ s$. Of Daulia Strabo, p. 473, says, $̇ \nu \nu \grave{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\eta}$
 way is now called $\tau \dot{\delta} \sigma \tau \alpha v \rho \circ \delta \rho \grave{~} \mu \tau \hat{\eta} s \mathrm{M} \pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho \pi a \nu a s$.
735. кai тis к.т.入. and what time is it that has elapsed since these

 $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ a u ́ \tau o v ̂ ~ \chi \rho o ́ v o u . ~$
736. $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \dot{\nu} \tau \iota \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}$, a little before $=j u s t$ before. The coincidence of time and place wrings from Oed. a despairing cry.
738. Solemnly and slowly spoken, as the want of rhythm marks.
739. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \dot{v} \mu \mathrm{\mu} \circ \mathrm{\nu}$ is usually said of what lies upon the mind as matter of
 $\xi \mu \pi \rho \eta \eta_{\sigma} \alpha \nu \iota \iota$ tò ipò he was visited by pangs of conscience for having burnt the temple. Thuc. VII. 50, èv $\theta \dot{v} \mu \iota o \nu$ moьov́mevol, raising religious scruples. But render here: what is this on your mind (i.e. alarming and distressing you) ?
 That $\ddot{\eta} \beta \eta$ s is corrupt I have no doubt. $\alpha \kappa \mu \dot{\eta} \eta \ddot{\eta} \beta \eta$ s is an unparalleled and impossible phrase: and $\ddot{\eta} \beta \eta$, bloom of youth or early manhood, cannot be applied to a grizzled $\pi \rho \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \beta \nu$ s ( $80_{5}-7$ ). Tívos- $\ddot{\eta} \beta \eta s$, Nauck's conj. adopted by J., is bad on this and other grounds. I once conjectured $\tau i \nu a \delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\eta ้ \delta \eta \beta i \rho v$; but now, assured that ảkù itself can here mean era of life, I prefer keeping ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$ by means of a verb, either ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \overline{ } \chi \bar{\epsilon}{ }^{\epsilon} \beta \eta$ or ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \alpha a \nu{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi \omega \nu$ which I have edited. Render, at what time of life was he travelling? Schm. reads $\eta_{\eta}^{\rho} \rho \eta \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \chi \omega \nu$; did he perish? This is possible. See ${ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \epsilon \iota, 560$.

742-3. $\quad \mu$ é $\gamma a s$, tall, answers the first question as to stature ( $\phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \iota s$ ). The second, as to stage of life ( $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta}$ ), is answered by $\chi \nu \circ \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega \nu \not \partial \rho \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon \cup \kappa \alpha \nu \theta \epsilon \in s \kappa \dot{\alpha} \rho a$, which both Liddell and Scott and also J. no doubt understand and explain rightly, when the former, citing Shakespeare, speaks of the hair as 'silversabled', the latter of 'the silver just lightly strewn among his hair'. I make it a principle of translation to retain my author's thought as far as possible. The idea conveyed by the word $\chi \nu 0 a j \zeta \omega \nu$ is not brought out fully by either of these renderings, but J. in some measure conveys it by the word lightly. I venture to offer, with the first white bloom thin upon his head. The first white hairs are to the sable crop what the first $\chi$ vous is to the smooth face, an $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta}$, an era of transition: the $\chi^{\nu o v ̂ s ~ m a r k s ~ t h e ~ e n d ~ o f ~ c h i l d h o o d ~ a n d ~ b e-~}$ ginning of $\ddot{\eta} \beta \eta$, the white hairs mark the end of $\ddot{\eta} \beta \eta$ and beginning of old age. Observe that Soph. does not use the word кó $\mu \eta$, 'hair', at all : it lurks, beautifuily, in $\chi^{\nu o \alpha} \zeta \omega \nu$.
 myself unwittingly $=$ to have unconsciously exposed myself.
747. $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \dot{a} \theta v \mu \hat{\omega}$ к.г.入., I am sadly afraid that the seer has sight, i.e.
 indeed of clear sense in all these respects.
749. $\mu a \theta o \hat{v} \sigma a=$ when you have told me: see 680.

750-1. $\beta$ acos, in a small way=with a small attcndance; $\| \frac{a}{} \boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \rho a s$ $\lambda_{0 \chi i \tau a s,}$ troopers. $\| \dot{a} \nu \grave{\eta} \rho \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \gamma \dot{\rho} \tau \eta s$, a chieftain. This and $\dot{a} \rho \chi \eta \gamma o ́ s, \kappa v \nu \eta \gamma o ̀ s$ and кuv ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \eta s$, also $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o ́ s, \chi o \rho \eta \gamma o ́ s$, keep $\eta$, but the Doric $\bar{a}$ is taken by $\lambda о \chi a \gamma o ́ s, \lambda o \chi a \gamma \epsilon \in \tau \eta s, \xi \in \nu a \gamma o ́ s$, є́ $\beta \delta o \mu a \gamma \epsilon ́ \tau \eta s$.

752-3. oi $\xi \dot{\prime} \mu \pi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$, the total number. || $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho v \xi$. Heralds were regarded as sacrosanct, and kings took them in company for security's sake. $\| \dot{a} \pi \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$, originally, a carriage or wagon, generally drawn by mules and sometimes, by oxen. It is interchanged with ${ }^{2} \mu a \xi^{\prime} a$ in Od. $\zeta^{\prime} \cdot 72,75,78$; (in Il. $\omega^{\prime}$
 here. The chariot for war and racing was $\delta i \phi \rho o s$ and $\dot{d} \rho \mu a$. \| $\hat{\eta} \gamma \epsilon$, was conveying.
 סoúdos, considered as a slave; to whom their owners were slow to acknowledge special obligations. See 1078 . In this case the slave was the instrument of the great crime committed in exposing the infant.
$76_{5}$. $\pi \omega \hat{\omega}$ à к. $\tau . \lambda .$, could he possibly come, \&c. meaning, I wish he could \&c.
765. $\pi$ á $\rho \in \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, it is quite possible.
767. $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta 0 \iota \kappa$ ' $\epsilon \mu a v \tau \delta \nu$. See 15,224 . The construction following is anacoluthic, for instead of $\mu \dot{\eta} \epsilon i \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega$, 'lest I may have said', Soph. writes $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \nu a \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \lambda ’$ ä $\gamma a \nu$. But we must translate as if $\epsilon i \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ were written : $I$ fiar that I myself may have said too much, and on account of this I wish to see him. He alludes to the curse in which he was involyed.
769. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} i_{\xi}^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \alpha_{\iota} \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$, well, for that matter ( $\mu \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ ), he shall come.
 pitch of expectation. ' $\mathrm{E} \lambda \pi i$ is is sometimes used, as here, to express anxiety. See 1432 .
 $m y$ present (peculiar) position (lit. when passing through such a fortune).
 фóvou.

777-8. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta$, suddenly befoll me. \| $\sigma \pi o v \delta \eta \hat{\eta}$, serious care.
779-34. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ would not be used in English idiom here. \| $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ pres. hist. which justifies the constr. $\dot{\omega}^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime \prime \eta} \nu$, see 79r. \| $\pi \lambda a \sigma \tau \grave{s} s \pi a \tau \rho i ́, ~ l i t$. 'fictitiously presented to my father' (i.e. by my supposed mother Merope) : meaning what is called a supposititious child. \|| $\beta a \rho v \nu \theta \epsilon i s, ~ i n d i g n a n t$,
 refrained (myself, or, my wrath). Br. cites A. Nub. $136_{3}$, $\kappa \dot{a} \gamma \dot{\omega} \mu_{o ́ \lambda ı s ~} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda ’ \quad \ddot{\mu} \omega \bar{\eta} \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \sigma \chi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ тò $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$. \|| ${ }_{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi o \nu$, questioned them. \| $\delta v \sigma \phi o ́ \rho \omega s$

 $\pi 0 \lambda u$. Although some high authorities, as Liddell and Scott, Ellendt, and J.,
take this to mean 'for it spread widely by rumour', referring to Aesch. Ag. $\dot{v} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ äd $\gamma$ os ${ }^{\prime} \rho \pi \epsilon \epsilon$, I am yet fully persuaded that the mass of scholars are right, who supply $\mu \epsilon$ again, and render, for it sank deeper and deeper (imp.) into
 (in the minds of people)': for we also find in Aesch. रa $\rho a \mu^{\prime} \dot{v} \phi \dot{\varphi} \rho \pi \epsilon \iota$, and $\tau \rho o ́ \mu o s \mu^{\prime} \dot{v} \phi \notin \rho \pi \epsilon$. Wu. cites Sallust, Jug. if, quod verbum in pectus Jugurthae altius quam quisquam ratus descendit.

 $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \omega \phi \rho a ́ \sigma \alpha a$.
790. I was almost tempted to accept Heimsoeth's conj. $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \phi \eta \mu a$ for $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \eta \nu a$ which seemed to add nothing to the first epithet $a^{\prime} \theta \lambda c a$. But I am now satisfied that $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \tau \eta \nu o s$ itself as well as $\tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ has sometimes the sense of wicked, abominable. See 888. \| Wunder's conj. $\pi \rho o u ̈ \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ has been largely accepted for that of mss. $\pi \rho \circ \dot{v} \phi a ́ \nu \eta \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu$. But that $\pi \rho o v ̌ \phi a ́ \nu \eta$ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$, he was heard to say, is what Soph. wrote, I feel no doubt. See my Excursus. Steel also prefers $\pi \rho \circ$ ó ár $_{\nu} \eta$. \|| On $\chi \rho \epsilon$ ì к. $\tau . \lambda$. see Verbs, Exc. xiv.
 this redundancy of expression are cited. Add to them the following:
 $\pi a i ̂ \delta a \mu \grave{\eta} \tau \rho \epsilon \in \phi \epsilon \iota \nu \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s$. And also Jerem. xvi. 3, 'their mother that bare them', xxii, 26, 'thy mother that bare thee'. Prov. xxiii. 22, 'hearken to thy father that begat thee'. Jerem. xvi. 3, 'their fathers that begat them', Zech. xiii. 3, 'his father and mother that begat him'.

794-7. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \mathrm{K}_{o \rho \nu \nu \theta\{a \nu . . . \not ้ \nu \theta a \text {. After reading much that is written and }}$ cited on these words, I find nothing which need prevent me from under-
入oımòv ä $\sigma \tau \rho o \iota s$, measuring my distance from the Corinthian land for the


8or. $\hat{\eta}, I$ was. On this form or $\hat{\eta} \nu$ for rst pers. see Excursus.
802. $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho v \xi$. Apollodorus 3. 5. p. 273 preserves his name as חoגvaoi$\tau \eta s . \| \pi \omega \lambda \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \nu \eta s$, drawn by young horses, to distinguish it, the $\alpha \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$ being usually drawn by mules, 753. \| ö $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$, sc. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \dot{o} \delta o \hat{v}$, the charioteer $=\tau \rho 0 \chi \eta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta s$ in 806 . $\| \pi \rho o \dot{s} \beta \dot{a} a \nu=\beta \iota a i \omega s$, with violence. There are many similar instances of the adverbial phrase formed by $\pi \rho o{ }^{\circ}$ with the acc. So also кат̀ with the acc.; Ae. Prom. 212, кат' i $\sigma \chi \chi^{\prime} \nu$, and $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$ with the genitive as $807, \delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{\partial} \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} s$. Aj. 822, $\delta i \alpha ̀ ~ \tau a ́ x o u s . ~ \| ~ \dot{\eta} \lambda a v \nu \epsilon ́ \tau \eta \nu$, attempted to drive. So $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi \nu \nu \tau a$ in the next line, and $\dot{a} \pi \omega \lambda \lambda \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \nu 1454 . \quad$ Cp. O. C. 993, ro09. || The $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho \nu \xi$ seems to have acted as charioteer. He, after Laius, was first slain. Two slaves hastening to help them or arrest Oed. met the same fate. The shepherd fled unobserved in despair, and afterwards at Thebes recognised in Oed. the author of the deed. See 760-4.
K. OE.

806-12. $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\epsilon}$., $\tau \grave{o} \nu \tau \rho o \chi \eta \lambda a ́ \tau \eta \nu$, by $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \gamma \eta \sigma \iota \varsigma$ as it is called, to explain more fully who is intended; so in 837 , ròv ä $\partial \delta \rho a$ $o \grave{\nu} \nu \beta o \tau \hat{\eta} \rho a$. Cp. Aristoph.

 $\sigma \tau a \sigma 0$. \| каi $\mu^{\prime} \dot{o} \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta u s \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, and the old man when he saw me (strike the charioteer) watching the moment when I was going alonsside, from the chariot smote me with a double-weighted goad on the middle of my head. ơxov is to be taken with каӨiкєто. See note on $\mathbf{I}_{43}$. каөıкขєî $\theta a \iota$ in Homer takes the acc., Il. $\xi^{\prime}$. 104. Od. $a^{\prime}$. 342. In later writers it takes a gen. as here : so Eustath. on Il. $\xi^{\prime}$. observes $i \sigma \eta \nu$, sc. $\delta i \kappa \eta \nu$ or $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho i \alpha \nu$, or $\pi<\iota \nu \eta \nu$.

813-4. $\epsilon i$ ס̀ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$. but if this stranger has any relationship to Laius. The reading of Latov in which Dindorf follows Bothe is perhaps more probable than Laitu on account of the dative preceding. Wunder also reads Aat̂ov $\tau \iota \sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in$ s.

815-27. See Lection. To the reasons there given in favour of $\epsilon i$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}$ add, that the resumption of $\epsilon i$ from $8_{13}$ seems more probable here with the definite $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon$, than the use of the indefinite relative $\dot{\psi}$ or $\hat{o} \nu$ with $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$, in a place where Oed. so distinctly puts forward himself $\left(8_{15}\right)$ and the curse pronounced by and on himself, $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}{ }^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \hat{\varphi}(8 \mathrm{r} 9-20)$. ॥ $\tau \dot{d} \delta \epsilon$, these things, hangs loosely here, being immediately explained by $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \delta{ }^{\prime}$ ápás. \| $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu \chi \epsilon \rho o i ̀ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu a i ̂ \nu . ~ S e e ~ 8 o . ~ \| ~ \chi ~ \chi p a i ̀ \nu \omega, ~ p o l l u t e . ~ R u h n k e n ~(o n ~ T i m æ u s ~ L e x . ~$ $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \rho i \mu \pi \tau \epsilon \iota)$ says that the verbs $\chi \rho a ́ \omega, \chi \rho a v i \omega, \chi \rho a i \nu \omega, \chi \rho i \omega, \chi \rho i \pi \tau \omega, \chi \rho i \mu \pi \tau \omega$, $\chi \rho o ́ \omega, \chi \rho \notin j \omega, \chi \rho \omega \nu \nu \dot{v} \omega$, have the same origin and the same primary meaning. This first meaning was to graze the skin or any surface; whence arose the other meanings of pricking, stinging, touching, slightly zoounting; also of anointing or besmearing. Custom however attached different senses to the different verbs afterwards. The sense of besmearing alone, according to Ruhnken, settled in $\chi \rho a i \nu \omega, \chi \rho \rho^{\prime} \omega, \chi \rho \Psi^{\prime} \zeta \omega, \chi \rho \omega \nu \nu v v^{\prime} \omega$ : in $\chi \rho \rho^{\prime} \omega, \chi \rho a \dot{v} \omega$ and $\chi \rho^{\prime} \omega$ not that only, but also the other senses of pricking and stinging. In E. Or. 919,
 From besmearing the sense of polluting would readily arise. || $\hat{a} \rho$ ' ' $\not \subset \nu \nu$ како́s; $\hat{a} \rho a$ alone can mean 'nonne'. See O. C. 753, 7So. Aj. 1283. Monk on Alc. $35^{1}$ cites instances from Eurip. But here oux $\chi^{i}$ can be supplied from

 El. 1497, $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \hat{\nu} \gamma \kappa \eta$ : Tr. 91, $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \nu-\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu$. || Пó $\nu \cup \beta o \nu$. Wunder and others reject 1.827 with much probability.

828-9. र̂ $\rho$ ' оэ̉к к.т.入., would not any one speak aright if he judged these
入óros.

830-3. $\quad \sigma \epsilon \hat{\beta}$ as, majesty. Ae. Prom. Іо91, $\hat{\omega} \mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\eta} s ~ \sigma \epsilon \in \beta a s . \| \kappa \eta \lambda i ̂ \delta a$
 $\kappa \eta \lambda i s ~ к а к \omega \hat{\nu}$ द'v́voккоs. On the gen. see note on 532 .

838-41. Tis $\pi 0 \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \theta v \mu i a ;$ what is your mind bent on? ze hat hopeful thought have you? || $\epsilon \kappa \pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon v \gamma \circ i \eta \nu$. The opt. in -oı $\bar{\nu}$ for -ot $\mu t$ is the most usual form in the Attic writers (but not to the exclusion of the other; as $\dot{\boldsymbol{a} \pi o \rho o \hat{i}}$, Plat. Rep. p. 557 D ) in the contracted conjugations in $\epsilon \omega$ and $\dot{o} \omega$ (that in $\dot{\alpha} \omega$ being $\dot{\varphi} \eta \nu \nu)$. It is also sometimes found, as here, in barytone verbs, not merely in the present, but also in the perf., aor. 2, and future. \| $\pi \in \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o \sigma_{\nu}$, important (lit. what is over and above). Eur. Hipp. 437.
 the ist aor. opt. was used by the Attics, after the example of the Ionians and Dorians, but only in the 2nd and 3 rd pers. sing and 3 rd pers. plur. The common form however also occurs in Homer and the Attic writers. aj$\lambda \boldsymbol{v} v-$
 but we must render, if he still speak of many, as before, grammatical terms not having been in those days introduced. \| $\boldsymbol{\tau} 0 \mathrm{i} s$ modnoîs, the many, spoken of as the murderers of Laius. \| oio $\xi^{\circ} \omega \nu 0 \nu$, alone. The latter part of the compound word (from కஸ́vעvatal, to gird one's self, for a journey \&c.) must not be accounted useless, as it confines the application of the word to one travelling alone. This apparent redundancy in Greek compound adjectives
 $\pi \alpha \nu \delta \eta_{\mu} \mu \nu \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau o \hat{v}:$ E. Alc. $427, \mu \epsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \mu \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \hat{\eta}$. So in this play 26, $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \bar{\epsilon} \lambda a \iota s$ ßouvó $\mu o \iota s$. As a traveller is here called oló ${ }^{\prime} \omega \nu o s$, a sailor is called

 The $\epsilon$ is lengthened in arsis before initial $\dot{\rho}$.
 occurs for 0 o $\tau \iota$ with the finite verb or for the mere participle after the verbs
 with the infin. is used. These last verbs, in this case, usually assume oüt $\omega$ (here $\hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon$ ) and generally come in the sentence after the participle. Phil. 253,
 A noun or accus. part. with $\dot{\omega} s$ sometimes follows the verbs 'to say, to announce, to think.' See $625,955 . \| \phi a \nu \epsilon \nu$. $\phi$ aivect is frequently used by the Attic poets in this sense of to publish, to declare. See 474, 525. Ant.

 See note on 90. Cp. also áxら̀ $\tau \eta \lambda \epsilon \phi a \nu \grave{\eta} s$ a sound heard from afar, Phil.
 again', and therefore, to retract: the notion of change in retracting being conveyed by the word $\pi \alpha^{\hat{\alpha}} \lambda \nu$, the sense of which word is frequently the same as that of $\begin{gathered}\text { valutiov, according to Toup on Suidas, vol. II. p. 16. Cp. Callim. }\end{gathered}$
 sense of $\pi \alpha \lambda \iota \nu$ is very clear in the term $\pi a \lambda \iota \nu \varphi \delta i a$, palinode.

851－8．$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \rho \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi о \iota \tau о$, swerve from．\｜oüto к．т．入．He certainly will never show the murder of Laius done with strict propriety（ $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega s$ óp $\rho o \dot{\nu}$ ），since Loxias distinctly declared that from $m y$ son he was fated to meet his denth．II $\sigma o ́ \nu \gamma \epsilon$ ，the reading adopted by Wunder and Dindorf，is a conj．of Bothe for
 corresponds to quippe quem in Latin．\｜ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu o s$ is the only form used in prose； $\kappa \in \hat{i} v o s$ is used for it in Attic poetry only where elegance or necessity of metre requires．Again， $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ makes $\kappa \epsilon$ ivos emphatic as it does $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a s . \| \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \kappa$ к．т．入．， so that on account of（oüveкa）the prophetic art I would neither look this way nor that hereafter（so little do I value it）．So Teucer，wishing to shew his contempt for Menelaus，says，Aj． $1116, \tau o \hat{u} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma o \hat{v} \psi o ́ \phi o v$ oủk ä̀ $\sigma \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i \eta \nu$. Cp．724，$\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi o v \sigma \dot{v} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ，and 1226．The sense of turning oneself to look at，readily passes into that of regarding，valuing．
 especially of farming work．\｜$\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda o u ̀ \nu \tau a, ~ t o ~ f e t c h ~(l i t . ~ t o ~ m a k e ~ h i m ~ s e t ~ o f f) . ~$



## STASIMON II．（863－910）．

（Outline）．In this second Stasimon Sophocles designs by the mouth of the Chorus to express the displeasure and alarm excited by the impious sentiments of the queen，and the criminal acts of which both she and Oedipus were guilty；she in exposing to death her newborn babe，he by yielding to the impulse of sudden wrath and killing four persons for a mere act of rudeness．They pray that they may be enabled ever to obey the laws prescribed from heaven．＂$\kappa \beta \rho \iota s$ ，they say，overweening and insolent pride，is the source of tyranny，which proceeds in its evil and dangerous course，till destruction comes．They pray to the god their champion that the city may not be arrested in the struggle which honour and duty require． The doer of unholy deeds，the speaker of unholy words，deserve an evil destiny．For if such things are to be unpunished，what avail religious acts， like those of a Chorus？What avails the worship offered in the temples？ They invoke the protection of almighty Zeus at a moment when Apollo and all the sanctities of religion seem to be set at nought．
（Notes）．863－5．Et $\mu$ oc．．．к．т．入．I pray that it may be my lot to main－ tain（lit．I wish that fate may dwell with me maintaining）the reverent purity of all words and deeds．．．．When $\epsilon i$ is used，as here，in the sense of $I$ wish that，the sentence is elliptical，the apodosis，such as $\epsilon \hat{u} \hat{u} \nu \ddot{\epsilon} \chi o l$ ，being omitted．E $l \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \rho$ is more commonly used when the fulfilment is possible，

 ( $=\phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota)$ cp. Ant. 10go. For the use of the particip. $29^{6} \hat{\psi} \mu \grave{\eta}$ ' $\sigma \tau i \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$
 $=\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\omega} \nu 890$.
 are the laws written in the heart of man, which were supposed to have been enacted by the gods. Cp. Xen. Mem. Iv. 4. 19. Plat. Legg. vir. p. 793. Aristot. Eth. v. 15. Polit. III. 18 and our poet himself Ant. 450, \&c. $\dot{v} \psi i \pi o \delta \epsilon s$, lufty, transcendental. The poet perhaps intends to express by this epithet that they are not affected by locality, having authority over all mankind.
867. $\delta i$ ait ${ }^{\prime} \rho a$. $\delta \iota a$ with acc. : through, as with the gen.: in Homer, Pindar, and Tragedy. Hence in, when the whole extent of a place is meant. In the prose writers this usage is not found. Alə $\dot{\eta} \rho$ is the upper clear blue sky; $\dot{a} \eta \rho \rho$ the lower, the atmosphere. See Hom. Il. $\xi^{\prime} .288, \delta i$
 air, is masc. according to Damm, and fem. when it means mist. \| "Oגv $\mu$ $\pi o s$, the seat of the gods, is taken here for the gods themselves, as we use heaven frequently for God in heaven.
 that which is attributed to anything, as belonging to it by nature. \| ката-
 the god (the divine power) residing in them.
 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \dot{\partial} \sigma \epsilon \pi \tau o \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \epsilon i a \nu$ in $v .864$ ) produces (the temper and disposition of) $a$ tyrant: i. e. the violator of the divine laws is ever ready to oppress his country's freedom. Soph. uses $\tau \dot{u} \rho a \nu \nu o s$ here in the sense it had acquired in his own time, i.e. of a person who usurps the sovereign power in a state; a private person, not a king ; one who establishes a monarchy in an aristocratic or democratic state, such as those of Greece and Sicily. As the sentiment seems not to have any close reference to the conduct either of Oedipus or of Jocasta, Wunder follows Musgrave in thinking that Soph. alludes here to his own times, and wishes to caution Athens against Alcibiades. So in $\mathrm{Aj} . \mathrm{I} 58-\mathrm{r} 6 \mathrm{I}$, he is said to blame the fickleness of his fellow-citizens, and their wanton conduct towards the leaders of the state. But these views do not consist with the date ascribed to the Oed. Tyr., B.c. 429 , Ol. 83, 3 ; for Alcibiades was not a prominent politician till 8 years later.

874-5. $\epsilon i \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ к. $. \lambda .$, ,, if it be gorged for no good with many things which are neither seasonable nor advantageous; i.e. when it shall have gained wealth and power by many crimes. On $\epsilon i$ with the subjunctive see 198.

876-7. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho_{0}^{\prime} \tau а \tau о \nu ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ O n ~ r e a d i n g s ~ i n ~ t h i s ~ c o r r u p t ~ p l a c e ~ s e e ~ L e c-~$ tion. Render, by climbing to the highest mountain peak it hath hurried to
a helpless strait, where the use of the foot is useless. This reminds us of the story of the emperor Max., who, hunting the chamois on the Martinswand, found himself on a ledge, from which he could not move up or down : the legend says he was saved by an angel's help. \|| With $\pi о \delta i \quad \chi \rho \eta \sigma i \mu \varphi ~ \chi \rho \eta \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ cp. El. 742 , $\dot{\omega} \rho \theta 0 \hat{v} \theta$ ' o $\tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ ó $\rho \theta$ òs $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ o $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \delta i \phi \rho \omega \nu$.
 is honourable to the city, (that of the good against the bad citizens, in defence of the divine laws), I pray that the god may never abolish. This is Wunder's interpr., who adds that the Chorus in this general expression intimate also their wish that Apollo would cause the investigation into the murder of Laius to be completed. If we confine the meaning of the clause to this latter thought, we may render $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma a l$, break off, i. e. leave incompleti. || $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau a ́ \tau a \nu$, patron, champion.

883-8. Musgr. finds in these lines many characteristic traits of Alcibiades; his violence, his contempt of justice, his luxury, and his irreverence towards the gods, in the opinion, at least, of his fellow-citizens. See Thucyd. vi. ${ }^{27}, 8,9$. But even if Soph. intended this allusion, the passage refers primarily to Oedipus and Jocasta. See note on 873 .

883-6. vंт́́ $\rho о \pi \tau a$ торєи́єтal, walks or proceeds insolently i.e. conducts himsclf with insolence. vintporta (the neuter plural, which is generally used in the case of verbals) for $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho o ́ \pi \tau \omega s$. E. Ion $7^{1} 7, \lambda a \iota \psi \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \delta \dot{a}$. Nauck reads imépot $\lambda$ a. \|| Diкas àфóßntos, having no fiar of $\mathcal{F} u s t i c e$; in an active sense,






887-8. Є̈入оь, seize upon; є̈入oเто, seize upon as her own so as to carry

 also is used in the same sense, El. 275 , Phil. $363 . \| \chi \lambda \iota \delta \hat{c} s$, priae; properly that which arises from luxury and wealth.

889-94. The corrections edited in these lines do not change the general sense, but they are meant to be improvements in Greek expression and in elegance. In places like this no scholar can venture to suppose he has restored exactly what the poet wrote : he can only do his best. In 889-92 the sequence of particles, $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}, \kappa a i, \not \geqslant$, is unperspicuous and bad: and the agglomeration of articles inelegant and unnecessary. To remedy these blots, I have written $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ for $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \grave{o}, \mu \dot{\eta} \tau{ }^{\prime}$ oív for кai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, and кai (taking this from 890) for $\eta$. These changes are very slight, while the improvement is great. I have printed the Attic form $\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \xi \in \tau a l$, though it is possible that in a chorus Soph. may have chosen to use the Homeric ${ }_{\varphi}{ }_{\rho} \xi_{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau a l$. I have not
altered ${ }_{\xi}^{\xi} \xi \epsilon \tau a l$, because I strongly doubt the genuineness of $\dot{\alpha} \theta i \kappa \tau \omega \nu$, as the word follows so soon. . I have suggested $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon v \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} v$, abominable things, as very suitable to the two verbs following. The next verse, and the antistrophic one, are both so corrupt that all editors are obliged, more or less, to apply an äкos $\tau о \mu a i \neq \nu$. Whether my best is the best, I do not pretend to determine. All I can say is-it is Greek, and gives fair sense. \| $\mu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ouvv $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \pi \pi \tau \nu \in \epsilon^{\Pi} \rho \xi \epsilon \tau a l$, and will therefore (because he does not get his gain justly) not refrain himself from impious acts. See 864. ${ }^{*} \rho \gamma \omega, \epsilon \epsilon^{l} \rho \gamma \omega$, inclose, keep Iff, the first form in Homer and Herod. ; Homer also has frequently $\dot{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega$, hut $\epsilon l \rho \gamma \omega$ only once, II. $\psi^{\prime} \cdot 72$. The Attics use $\epsilon l \rho \gamma \omega$ in the sense of kecp off, especially in the compounds $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon i \rho \gamma \omega \& c$.; in the sense of inclose some think they aspirate it. \| кai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, and shall in his rashness cling to things abominable. Aesch. Ag. àrєuктà $\pi \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a$. "A $\theta \iota \kappa \tau a$ would be 'things that should be sacred from his touch'. To suit this J., after Bl., reads $\theta i \xi \epsilon \tau a \iota$, but would Soph. write so two lines after $\kappa \epsilon \in \rho \delta o s \kappa \epsilon \rho \delta a \nu \epsilon \hat{i}$ ? \| $\mu a \tau \alpha ̣ ́ \zeta \omega \nu$ from $\mu a ́ \tau \eta \nu$, in rash folly. See 874.

892-4. тis $̇ \nu$ тooîo $\delta^{\prime}$ к.т. $\lambda .$, what man amid such acts shall boast that he wards off from his life the shafts of gods, i. e. that he is safe from divine vengeance? N. reads $\theta v \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which would be specious, if $\theta v \mu \delta$ s were ever found in the plural. $\|$ For the readings in these lines see Lection. I have treated ' $\epsilon \tau \iota \pi o \tau$ ' as a corrupt gloss drawn from 1084, I read $\tau 0 \omega \hat{\omega} \sigma \delta^{\prime}$ for $\tau 0 \hat{\sigma} \sigma \delta$ ', $\beta \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta \theta \epsilon \omega \nu$ for $\theta u \mu \hat{\varphi} \beta \epsilon \lambda \eta, \epsilon \ddot{\xi} \xi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ for ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \xi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$.

S96. $\tau i \quad \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon$ रopev́єıl ; The sacred dancing at the festivals of the gods, especially in the theatre of Dionysus, is taken here for the reverence and worship due to the gods in general.

897-9. ádiктov, sacred, inviolable, is applied to the whole temple and oracle at Delphi, indicated here by its most remarkable feature, the $\delta \mu \phi a$ $\lambda \dot{s}$, which in itself was the white stone that stood within the temple, and was supposed to be the centre of the earth, as being the place where the two eagles or doves met, that had been let loose by Zeus from the extremi-
 the temple at Abae in Phocis was plundered and burnt in the invasion of

 plov aưróol. Pausanias, Phoc. $\S 35$, gives a full des'cription of it. It is one of the six Grecian oracles, to which, as Herod. I. 46 mentions, Crœesus sent to make inquiry. These were Delphi, Abae, Dodona, those of Amphiaraus and Trophonius, and Branchidae near Miletus. $\| \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu$ 'O $0 \mu \mu \pi i a \nu$, to Olympia (in Elis). Divination by fire-omens ( $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi v \rho o \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a)$ in the temple of Zeus at Olympia was the duty of the Iamidae, an hereditary priesthood there, and was regarded as most authoritative. See Pind. Ol. viii. 2,


901-2. єi $\tau$ ád ${ }^{\text {if }}$ these things $\mu \dot{\eta}$ à $\rho \mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$, shall not agree with events
 freely, 'if the principles I have laid down shall not be brought home to the minds of all men by the issues of human life'; alluding specially to the prospects of Oedipus and Jocasta. But the sentiment is very obscurely expressed.
 ruler of all things. Cp. Hor. Sat. II. 6. 20 Matutine pater, seu Jane libentius audis, and Milton, Par. Lost, III. 8, "Or hear'st thou rather pure


 $\gamma \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \nu a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \beta a \rho \beta \dot{\rho} \rho o \iota \sigma \iota \beta^{\prime} \rho \beta a \rho o s$, and so with both cases in Homer Il. $a^{\prime} .3^{8,}$ 288. But an adverbial construction belongs to $\pi a ́ v \tau a$, as to neuter pronouns, which would not be excusable with other words. Cp. 575 , $\pi$ áv $\tau^{`}$ i $\chi \nu \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu$,



905-906. $\phi \theta \ldots \epsilon \xi \xi a \iota \rho o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \nu$, they (alluding to Jocasta) are casting off to decay; the participle $\phi \theta_{i \nu}{ }^{2} \nu \tau a$ being proleptically used. This is better than the interpretation of the Scholiast, which Wunder adopts, $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha a \dot{a}, \pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda \eta$ -入u $\theta_{o ́ r a . ~| | ~ \pi a \lambda a \iota a ̀ ~ \Lambda a i ̈ o v ~}^{\theta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \phi a \tau a, ~ t h e ~ o r a c l e s ~ g i v e n ~ o f ~ y o r e ~ t o ~ L a i u s, ~ t a k i n g ~}$ the Scholiast's $\pi \alpha \lambda a i \alpha$ into the text with Triclinius. See Lection. $\| \tau \iota \mu a i s$




## EPEISODION III. (91I-1085).

(Outline). In this third Epeisodion, the plot finds a new development. Jocasta comes out of the palace, carrying wreaths and incense for the altars of the gods, whom she wishes to propitiate. While she is so engaged, from the eastern stage entrance comes in a Messenger from Corinth, inquiring for the royal palace and for Oedipus. The Chorus give him the information, noticing the presence of the queen. The Messenger salutes her respectfully in the third person, and, after receiving courteous replies, he informs her that Polybus king of Corinth is dead, and that the choice of his successor seems likely to fall on Oedipus. Astonished and in fact rejoiced by this apparent proof of the falsehood of the oracle given to Oedipus, Jocasta sends for him. On his appearance he questions the Corinthian, and learns from his mouth the truth of the announcement. Now he concurs with Jocasta in declaring the fallacy of oracles, but, in spite of this opinion, he is still superstitious enough to say that he will never visit Corinth while Merope lives, on account of the evil prophecy,
affecting, as he believes, her and himself. The attention of the Messenger being awakened by this language, he ventures to inquire what the peril is which Oedipus dreads. On learning it, he, in his zeal and hope of conferring an obligation on the king, hastens to assure him that he is not in reality the son of Polybus and Merope. The eager interrogation from Oedipus which ensues brings to light the story of his exposure as an infant on Cithaeron, of his being given by a shepherd of Laius to this Corinthian messenger, who carried him to his own city and there gave him to Merope. She, with the consent of Polybus, being childless, reared him as their own son. On Oedipus asking if the messenger knew his real parentage, he denies this, and refers him to the shepherd from whom he received the infant. The Chorus, being questioned, express their belief that the person meant is the very shepherd, already sent for, who had witnessed the death of Laius : but this, they say, queen Jocasta will best know. To her Oedipus turns. But she, who had listened to the tale in silent horror, which the diverted attention of the rest had hindered them from noting, answers in broken words, earnestly beseeching Oedipus to pursue the inquiry no farther. He, totally mistaking her motive, and supposing that her highborn pride repels with disgust the proof that she had stooped to become the wife of a base-born peasant's son, insists on completing the discovery of his parentage, declaring that he regards himself as the child of bounteous Fortune, who found him little, but made him great. With the terrible irony of his ignorance he therefore avers that he has no just motive for hesitating to unveil the whole truth. Jocasta had already rushed in frantic agony through the palace door, after bidding a last farewell to the doomed man.



 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta$, has presented itself to me. The verb $\pi a \rho i \sigma \tau a \sigma \theta a \iota$ is frequently thus used, with $\delta o \xi \xi a$ for the most part, or at least $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o$, but sometimes alone, of thoughts which arise from the circumstances of the time, Cp. Plut. Nic. c. 9.

 $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu v \sigma \theta a \iota$. Plat. Phaed. $\S 5$ with Heindorf's note. Elmsley quotes
 is used, but in another sense. \| vaoús, here not shrines, but altars. \| $\sigma \tau \notin \phi \eta$ $=\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \mu a \tau a$, wreathed boughs or rods: see 3. \| $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \tau a$, offerings of incense; see 5 .
914. í $\psi 0 \hat{v}$ aï $\rho \in \quad \theta u \mu b \nu$, keeps his mind in an excited state. So

$\mu \in \tau \mathcal{\epsilon} \omega \rho o s$ каì $\theta u \mu o \hat{u} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \eta s$. The metaphor seems to be derived from a ship being $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \omega \rho o s$, on the high seas, and tossed by the waves. The Greeks assign a voluntary character to involuntary effects, bodily or mental. Thus $\phi u ́ \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \phi \rho \in ́ v a s, ~ О . ~ C . ~ 804 . ~ E l . ~ 1463 . ~ H e r o d . ~ I I . ~ 68, ~ \gamma \lambda \omega ̂ \sigma \sigma a \nu ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \mu o ̂ ̂ \nu o \nu ~$


 ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon$, said of Socrates when dying. E. Hel. 632, $\gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \gamma \eta \theta$, краті $\delta$ ' ó $\rho$ $\theta i o u s ~ \epsilon ̇ \theta \epsilon i \rho a s ~ a ̀ \nu \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \kappa a$. Homer says of a dead body, Il. $\lambda^{\prime} 99, \pi v \rho \hat{\eta} s$
 (oracles) by the old, i.e. judges not of the prophecies of Teiresias by the oracle given to Laius, which in Jocasta's opinion is proved false. \| $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma \\ \\ \tau \tau v \\ \tau\end{gathered}$ $\lambda \epsilon$ 'ुovтos к.т.入., he gives himself up to any speaker, if he speak alarms.





 votive offerings. Wu.'s r. катáp $\mu \mu \sigma \iota \nu$, first-fruits, is unneeded. \| єúar $\hat{\eta}$.
 same effect Pollux, Onom. p. i2, ed. Dind., каi $\tau \dot{a} ~ \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a, ~ \tau \grave{c} ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$,


 Latin sacio, sancio, sanctus, sacer, sagmen, \&c.' The first meaning of $a^{\prime}$ 'os is purity producing veneration. The second meaning is a thing devoted to God. And as the Romans called a man sacer, whose life they had devoted to the Deity for some crime, so the Greeks also came to use äros of a crime that required an expiation. The opposite meanings of the word may be seen in the derivatives, $\epsilon^{2} \nu a \gamma \dot{\eta} s$, polluted by crime, $\epsilon \dot{u} a \gamma \dot{\eta} s$, pure, chaste. We may render єv̇arर̂ $\lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota$ a deliverance free from guilt: but the word itself clearly refers to Oedipus, and the expression is equivalent
 the connection of $\epsilon \dot{u} a \gamma \hat{\eta}$ with $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ instead of Oioímous cp. O. C. ı062, 1243, 1495. Ant. 355, 999. Tr. 609. Phil. 208, 692, 1091. El. 699. Ae. Ag. ıо, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \iota \mu о \nu \quad \beta \dot{\alpha} \dot{\xi} \iota \nu$. Sept. 635 , $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\omega} \dot{\sigma} \iota \mu \nu \nu$ malâva. The expectation of such a $\lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota s$ from the Corinthian messenger is fearfully disappointed.
923. $\dot{\text {. }} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \beta \epsilon \rho \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \nu \nu \epsilon \omega \dot{s}$ as though he were the pilot of a vessel in which we were embarked, or, being, as he is, the pilot of the vessel of our state. This metaphor is frequent in this play. See 22.694-6.

Here the Corinthian messenger enters from the castern passage.
924. The messenger who now comes on the stage to announce the death of Polybus and the choice of Oedipus to be king of Corinth, turns out to be the person who received Oedipus when exposed, and gave him to Polybus.
928. $\gamma v \nu \grave{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$. These two words are perhaps, as Musgr. imagines, intended to strike the mind by their ill-boding conjunction.

929-30. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{o} \lambda \beta i a$, blessed then. $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ is frequently thus used before a prayer or wish. \| $\pi a \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} s$, complete, is a word difficult to render, as an epithet of סómap. Perhaps our idiom happy wife, may fairly answer to the Greek idea.

931-4. aüт $\omega$, 'exactly so', from $\dot{o}$ aúrós, in the Attic poets, particularly Soph.: as we say, the same to you. \|| $\tau \hat{\eta} s \in \dot{\cup} \epsilon \pi \epsilon l a s, ~ y o u r ~ c o u r t e o u s ~$ speech. \| $\delta \delta \mu о \iota s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к а i ~ \pi o ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \hat{\varphi}$. $\tau \epsilon-\kappa a l$ are often thus used like the Latin, quum-tum, the first marking the class, the second the individual. Cp. Homer's T $\rho \hat{\omega} \notin ́ s \tau \epsilon \kappa а i{ }^{\prime \prime}$ E $^{\prime} \tau \omega \rho$. See 64.
935. Jocasta asks what are those tidings? but in the same breath inquires from whom he is come, surprised that a person of his inferior rank should bring good news, and therefore desiring to know his authority. Whether $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́$ (as I edit) or $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ be read, $\tau i \nu o s$ of course means, what person. But the Corinthian first answers whence he came, evading his authority, and saying I come from Corinth; then alludes to his news as of a chequered nature; but, in a true Greek spirit, he takes care to merit the $\epsilon v^{\prime} a \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \iota a$ first by announcing the expected succession of Oed. to the throne of Corinth.



 force upon $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda o \iota s$, but perhaps thou may'st grieve.

943-9. See Lection. || 'ע' '̇ $\sigma \tau \epsilon$, the pass ye've reached! an exclamation, not a question. \| Observe the distinction of $\pi \rho \delta{ }^{\prime}$ and $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\delta}$ with gen., the former expressing indirect agency, through chance, the latter direct agency, ly this man. I| oú $\delta \epsilon$, and not, or not alone; in Latin 'non'. Matthiae says: 'if a positive proposition is opposed to a negative one, so that what was first affirmed in one shape (o ${ }^{*} \lambda \omega \lambda \epsilon \nu$ ) is denied in another, not only is ou


953-6. $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \alpha$, ironically used : $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \partial{ }^{-1}=\sigma \epsilon \beta$ - $\nu 0$ s. \|ís. See note on 848 .
957. Though I edit $\sigma \eta \mu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \rho$, $\sigma \eta \mu \eta^{\prime} \nu a s$ is quite admissible, cp. Aj. 588, $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o \delta o \dot{v} s \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta$, Phil. 772, $\mu \grave{\eta} \ldots \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu a s \gamma^{\ell} \nu \eta$.

959-61. $\theta a \nu \alpha \sigma^{\prime} \tau \mu \nu=\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho 6 \nu$. So Aj. 513. E. Hec. ro33. With the

 tion of disease: see note on 34. \| $\dot{\rho} 0 \pi \dot{\eta}$, impulse. It is properly the sinking of one side of a balance, the turn of the scale. Compare with the whole line Plato, Rep. viII. p. 556 , $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \nu 0 \sigma \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon s \mu \tau \kappa \rho a \hat{s} \dot{\rho} \circ \pi \hat{\eta} s \epsilon_{\xi}^{\xi} \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ бєîтal $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \lambda a \beta \notin \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \kappa \alpha ́ \mu \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$.
963. каi $\tau \hat{\omega}$ к.r.入. yes, and also in accordance with his advanced time of life. See 73 .

965-7. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi v \theta \dot{\prime} \mu a \nu \tau \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i ́ a \nu=\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu a \nu \tau \iota \kappa \eta ̀ \nu ~ \Pi \nu \theta o u ̂ s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i ́ a \nu . ~ A e . ~ C h o . ~$
 from its original sense, the domestic hearth, hence the altar of the household gods, passes into that of any consecrated place, a temple, as here. \|| $\kappa \lambda$ á §ov $\quad$ as, screaming; see Ant. 1002. \| $\hat{\omega} \nu \dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$, sc. ồ $\tau \omega \nu$, according to whose
 $\kappa \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu, I$ was destined to kill. After $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ the infin. of the future is most common; next that of the aorist, then that of the present: never that of the perfect. || Eight concurrent short syllables, $\pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho a \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu o ́ \nu, \dot{o} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ are a metrical boldness, somewhat eased by the pause after $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\rho} \nu$.

 without touching a weapon. Cp. 885. v̈тотtos, $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o ́ s, \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o ́ s, ~ a ̀ \mu \phi i-$ $\pi \lambda \eta \kappa \tau o s, \dot{a} \theta \iota \kappa \tau o s$ are all thus used at times in an active sense. $\| \tau \dot{u} \mu \hat{\psi}$ $\pi o ́ \theta \varphi$, through regret for me. As the genitive is often used objectively, the possessive pronouns too are used, though rarely, in the same sense: cp. 16, 337, 572. O.C. 332, 1413 . El. 343. || кат $\xi \phi \theta \iota \tau о$, he pined to death.

971-2. $\sigma u \lambda \lambda a \beta \omega \nu$, having taken away with him. So O. C. 1384, $\sigma v \lambda$ -
 so that they are worthless = as worthless.
 $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ advances an objection: $\pi \hat{\epsilon} \mathbf{s} \kappa a i$ asks for information.
 fortune is all-powerful, and who has no clear foreknowledse of anything; tà $\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau u ́ \chi \eta s=\dot{\eta} \tau u ́ \chi \eta$. Cp. 785. As to the former part of the sentiment cp .




 regard to. Tr. $121 \mathrm{I}, ~ \epsilon i$ фоßєî $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau o . ~ i i ~ \pi a \rho ' ~ o u ̛ \delta ' ́ v, ~ o f ~ n o ~ a c c o u n t . ~$ See Cic. Div. I. 29, Plat. Rep. p. 572.

986-8. тâ $\sigma^{\prime} \dot{a}^{\nu} a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta$. See 823. \|| $\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o ́ s, ~ c o m f o r t . ~ E . ~ A n d r . ~ 406, ~$
 $\gamma \cup \nu а \iota \kappa o ̀ s ~ a i \chi \mu a \lambda \omega \tau i \delta o s ~ \phi o ́ \beta \varphi . ~$

991．Ti $\delta^{\prime}$ ё $\sigma \tau^{\prime}$ к．т．入．，what is there in her tending to fear？See 517.



996．That $\pi a \tau \rho \hat{\psi} 0 \nu$ aî $\alpha a \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ means to shed my father＇s blood，i．e．to slay him，is clear；but not so clear the analysis of the phrase．E．Or．284， （cited by J．）$\epsilon^{i} \rho \gamma a \sigma \tau a \iota \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu o i \quad \mu \eta \tau \rho \hat{\varphi} o \nu$ ai $\mu a$ ，helps us，as showing aî $a=$ bloodshed，which is not an uncommon use．Cp．ıог，tó $\delta^{\prime}$ aî $\mu$ a．

997．$\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \iota ~ \mu а к р a ̀ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi \varphi \kappa \kappa i ̀ \tau o, ~ h a d ~ l o n g ~ b e e n ~ q u i t t e d ~ f o r ~ a n o t h e r ~ h a b i t a-~-~$ tion，a very bold phrase，in which the imperf．$=$ pluperf．

1003．After $\tau i$ ov́ an aor．often follows where a pres．might be looked for：the action being thus represented as one which should have happened already．Cp．Ae．Pr．741，E．Herac．805，A．Vesp．213，Lys． 181.

1005－6．то仑̂то，râ̂ta very often mean on this account，ä，ö，ötı on


 known sense of $\epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ．
 The mother alone survives：but the original motive included both．See ir 76 ， where $\tau o \dot{s} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \kappa \delta \nu \tau a s$ applies to the latter only，but the plural is loosely used．

1008．ка入ิิs：often so used with verbs of knowing；here it strengthens $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\delta} \hat{\eta}$ रos．Render ：thou very clearly knowest not what thou art doing．






rorg．кai $\pi \hat{\omega} s \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, and how is $m y$ father equal to no father at all？ Oed．still speaks of Polybus as $\dot{o}$ фúvas，while he is sure the messenger is not his father．

1023．$\epsilon \epsilon \xi$ ä $\lambda \lambda \eta s \chi \epsilon \rho o ́ s$ ，und．$\lambda a \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ．
1029．$\theta \eta \tau \epsilon i a$ ，servitude for hire；$\theta \grave{\eta}$ s a hired servant．$\dot{\epsilon \pi i} \theta \eta \tau \epsilon i \neq o n$ hire：as Bergamese shepherds tend flocks now in the Engadine．

1030．The words here are those of wounded feeling．
1031．See Lection．what pain was I suffering when you took me up at a lucky moment（ $\bar{\nu} \nu \kappa \lambda \hat{\omega}$ ）so as to be my $\sigma \omega \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho$ ：from which word in ro30 Oed．understands that he was saved from something besides cold and famine．For $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ see El． $384, \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa a \lambda \hat{\varphi} \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ．
 See I 194，$\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \rho a \pi u \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \dot{d} \delta \epsilon$ ．Such enallage of cases is frequent．

than the ankles，this phrase leads me to suspect that the perforation was at the extremity of the insteps adjoining the toes．Neue would take dıató－ pous as active，and render points（pins）perforating the feet．

 But Br ．and Wu ．understand $\sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho \gamma a v a$ to mean＇crepundia＇or＇monu－ menta＇，little ornaments hung round the necks of infants as $\gamma \nu \omega p i \sigma \mu a r a$ ， tokens by which they could be recognised．This view would make the gen．after ot $v \in \iota \delta o s=$＇in the way of tokens＇instead of＇from infancy＇．

1036．ôs $\epsilon \hat{i}=\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu 0$ ồs $\epsilon \hat{i}$ ，i．e．Oiठímous＝＇swoln－foot＇．E．Phoen．27，


1037－8．$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \eta ̈ \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s ; ~ T r i c l i n i u s ~ u n d e r s t a n d s ~ ध ̈ \pi a 甘 o \nu ~ \tau o u ̂ \tau o, ~ i . e . ~$ ＇were my feet pierced＇．\｜ф $\rho 0 \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, knows． $3^{26,328,569 . ~ P h i l . ~ S ı o, ~} \sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} s$ фpóvel．\｜｜rux＇̀v having found．
ro40．oúk．The negation affects the latter portion of a question having two parts．Plat．Gorg．p． 453 D．$\Sigma \Omega$ ．öбтıs $\delta i \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota ~ o ̀ ~ \tau \iota o u ̀ \nu ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a, ~ \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon-~$



 the affirmation．See El． $3{ }^{12}$ ，$\hat{\eta} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \alpha$ ，sc．$\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \kappa \delta^{\circ} \mu \omega \nu$ ．

1041－2．$\hat{\eta}$ кárol $\sigma \theta \alpha$ $\delta \eta \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma a l ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$, ，do you know him so as to indi－ cate him by name？｜｜$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Nal̈ov $\tau \iota s$ ，one of the people（servants）of Laius． ס向 $\pi o v, I$ an pretty sure．

1043．$\hat{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{u} \tau v \rho a ́ v \nu 0 v ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta \varepsilon \gamma \hat{\eta} s \pi a ́ \lambda a l ~ \pi o \tau \epsilon ́ ; ~ f o r ~ \tau o ̂ ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \lambda a l ~ \tau u \rho a ́ \nu \nu o v . ~$



1050．ó kalpós，the time is come．
 $\epsilon i \sigma \iota \delta \in i v$, thou wast actually（каi）on the look out to see．\｜ovंх $\ddot{\eta}^{\kappa} \iota \sigma \tau \alpha=\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ or $\lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau a$ ．The first $a ̈ \nu$ belongs to $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \sigma$ ，the second brings oú $\ddot{\eta}^{\prime \prime} \kappa \sigma \tau \alpha$ into the sphere of condition．

1054－5．It seems to me best to place a colon after $\epsilon \phi \iota \epsilon \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ ，so making Oed．assume that Joc．bears in mind the person whoever he be whom（ $\delta \nu \tau \imath \nu a)$ they both equally desired to see in person：then adding the question，is that the person whom this man（the messenger）means？

1056－7．Jocasta，having heard this dialogue in silent horror，but un－ observed，now answers wildly，yet with evasive purpose，question for ques－ tion；who is it，whonsoever he spoke of？Elms．Wu．J．read $\tau i \delta^{\prime}$ övtı， єite；why ask whom \＆c．See 1129．｜｜$\beta$ oúnov к．т．入．resolve not even to remember for no good（ $\mu a ́ \tau \eta \nu$ ）．Though $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$ and $\beta$ ov́خopal are often used
alike, yet, as a rule, $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ implies inclination, $\beta$ oú $\lambda_{o \mu} \mu \mathrm{a}$, resolve. See 623 ,




 says that Joc. here contemplates suicide, and Steel follows him. But I think that Wu. justly denies this.

 whose mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother were slaves. So
 $\tau \rho i s \nu b \theta o s$.
1066. фpovov̂ $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \hat{v}$ has two senses, either of which is suitable here: perhaps in loyal kindness is rather the better.

1073-5. $\beta \epsilon \in \beta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$. Joc. has frantically rushed into the palace. Soph. studies such effects. See Ant. 766, 1244. Tr. 823. \|| $\delta \epsilon \delta 0 \iota \chi$ ' ö $\pi \omega s \mu \dot{\eta}$ к.т.入. For this constr. with fut. indic. cp. Dem. Phil. III. p. I 30 , é $\pi \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha$

 intrans. burst forth.
 glad. See 1057. Cp. O. C. 1289. E. And. 289.
 (i.e. considered as a woman). J., quite erroneously, gives to $\omega$ is the sense 'quippe', 'as being', and renders, 'for she has a woman's pride'. He thinks Sophocles would (by the mouth of Oedipus) represent woman as being naturally proud. I am sure this is not the sentiment he would ascribe to Oedipus. Jocasta is not consulted about the plague; the priest does not advise Oed. to consult her. He (Oed.) says of her, 580 , 'She obtains from me all that she desires.' He does not answer her entreaty, 648. Out of humour with the Chorus, he says to her, $\sigma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}, ~ \hat{\omega}$ $\gamma^{\prime} \nu a l, \pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon \beta \omega$. Soon after, in a mood of abject terror (Epeisodion in.), he is driven to take her into confidence: but, at $98_{4}$, her advice does not move him, and his language from 1054 is even insulting. There is nothing in the relations and antecedents of Jocasta, nothing in Greek institutions, manners and customs, tending to show that women were regarded as $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ $\phi \rho o \nu o \hat{v} \sigma \alpha l$, much to the contrary effect. See Thuc. II. 45. A woman ex-
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho o ́ \phi \rho \omega \nu$ (Fr.). It is quite enough, then, for Oedipus to say that Jocasta has a high spirit for a woman. Can any example be shown justifying such use of $\dot{\omega}$ as J. gives? I do not mean of $\dot{\omega}=q u i p p c$, for that is frequent
 as in $\gamma \nu \nu \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$, the word or phrase does not, by itself, indicate the fitness of the causal reference. In support of the sense given to $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s}$, refer to $\dot{\omega}$

 question. Ellendt, Dindorf, Steel agree, the two former rendering 'quantum quidem mulieris est.' See also 5526 .

1080-1. $\pi a i ̂ \delta a ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \tau u ́ \chi \eta s$. Eurip. (apud Plut.) $\dot{\text { o }} \tau \hat{\eta} s \tau u ́ \chi \eta s \pi a i ̂ s ~ \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho o s$. Horace Sat. II. 6. 49, luserat in campo ; Fortunae filius ! omnes. Plutarch





1082-3. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma_{\text {à }} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \notin \cup \kappa \alpha$. See note on 715. || oi $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{i} s \mu \hat{\eta} \nu \epsilon \epsilon$, the coeval months, i.e. 'all the months of my life.' O.C. $7, \chi \dot{\omega}$ रpóvos $\xi v \nu \omega ̀ \nu ~ \mu a \kappa \rho o ́ s . ~ A e . ~ A g . ~ 107, ~ \sigma u ́ \mu ф u \tau o s ~ a i \omega ̀ \nu . ~ E . ~ H e r c . ~ F . ~ 1293, ~ \sigma u \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \omega ̂ s ~$ סú $\sigma \tau \eta \nu o s \not \omega \nu$ 'ill-fated all my life', or 'from my very birth'. \| $\mu \in \mu \iota к \rho \grave{\nu}$ каi $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a \nu ~ \delta \iota \omega \rho \iota \sigma a \nu$, marked me at one time as lowly, at another great.

1084-5. тоóo $\delta \epsilon \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa \phi$ '́s к. $\tau . \lambda$., such being my parentage, I can never hereafter turn out to be another, so as to be unwilling to discover my origin. So Neue and Steel. J. treats the place wrongly. It is clear that Oed. says: 'knowing myself to be Fortune's child, I need not care what my birth in the flesh may prove to be.' $\|$ Пore is condemned by Elms. as beginning a line, as $\delta \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha$ in Aj .965 ; but Herm. justly observes, that, when the sentence begins towards the end of a line, the connection is such as to admit, at the close of one and beginning of the other, what otherwise could only be allowed in the middle. See 1074. Aj. ro8y.
(Oedipus and the Corinthian enter the palace.)

## STASIMON III (Hyporchema). (io86-riog.)

 (ironically introduced when Oedipus is on the brink of destruction), the Chorus, adopting a cheerful tone, address Mount Cithaeron gratefully, as his protectress in infancy: and wonder in a series of guesses, which of the many rural deities were his parents. The Ode being very corrupt, especially its antistrophe, I am compelled to print many conjectural emendations of various scholars, two being my own. For all these see Lection.
(Notes). 1086-7. єì $\pi \epsilon \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. Cp. El. 472, $\epsilon i \quad \mu \grave{\eta}$ ' $\gamma \omega$ т $\pi а \rho a ́ \phi \rho \omega \nu$

there be aught of presage in the mind, this day will be remarkable in my life. \| $\kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \alpha \nu$ ¿ঠpts, skilful in judgment.
 $\pi a \nu \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \nu \circ \nu$, accus. of time, during tomorrow's full moon.
ro90-I. Reading Oiסimouv with Schm. J., I take it as object of avi $\epsilon \iota \nu$, of which $\sigma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$ (Cithaeron) is the subject. Cp. O. C. ${ }_{15}{ }^{6} 7$, $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \nu \sigma \epsilon$ (Oidi$\pi о v \nu) \delta a i \mu \omega \nu \delta i \kappa a l o s ~ a u ̋ \xi o \iota$. Cith. exalts Oed. by being his sire-land, his nurse, his mother. His descent is as old as the hills.

1093-5. кai $\chi 0 \rho$. $\pi \rho \circ \stackrel{s}{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, and that thou art honoured in our dance, (the present hyporcheme). Cp. E. Iph. T. aù $\epsilon \epsilon i \tau a l ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi a ̂ \nu ~ \mu e ̂ \lambda a \theta \rho o \nu, ~ H e l . ~$
入eitaı $\delta^{\prime} a ̈ \sigma \tau v$, Verg. G. II. 487, virginibus bacchata Lacaenis Taygeta. For


1097. At this moment of assumed joy, they dare not forget the dreaded Phoebus, whom they invoke by bis mournful epithet 'I $\dot{\eta} i \mathbf{o}$ s. See $\mathbf{I}_{52}$, 3 .
ro98-ıIog. See Lection. \| $\mu$ акрає $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega \nu$. Hesiod said the nymphs live ten times the age of a palm-tree: and Pindar says of them in a fragm. ioo $\delta \dot{\prime} \nu$ -
 (water-nymphs, Undines), or Oreads (mountain-nymphs). The Nereids, daughters of Nereus, were sea-nymphs (mermaids). See Ant. 987, Moípaı $\mu а к \rho а i ́ \omega \nu \epsilon s$.
inoi. $\pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma^{\prime}$, approaching, from the trans. v. $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, also used as
 '่s $\tau 0 \dot{v} \sigma \delta \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \pi$ ous. A poetic form is $\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \omega$, whence the form $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\theta} \eta \eta \nu$. Ae.
 $\pi \lambda a \theta \epsilon i \sigma a \quad \xi \epsilon \nu \varphi$. E. And. ${ }^{25}, \pi \lambda a \theta \epsilon i \bar{\sigma}{ }^{\prime}$ ' $A \chi \iota \lambda \lambda \epsilon \omega s \pi a \iota \delta i$. Compounds and derivatives of the simple verb are often used. Tr. 17, $\pi \rho i \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta \epsilon$ кoi $\tau \eta$ s $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$. Phil. $6_{7} 7, \tau o ̀ \nu \nu \epsilon \lambda a ́ \tau a \nu \lambda \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \rho \omega \nu \pi o \tau \epsilon ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \Delta t o ́ s$. Hence $\pi \lambda a \tau i ́ s$ wife, A. Ach. 132.

 the poetic form, whereby in propositions consisting of two clauses, with pronoun in common, the pron. is repeated in the second clause with a certain emphasis, and generally with $\gamma \epsilon$. So Hom. Od. $\theta .{ }_{4} 88, \Delta \eta \mu o \delta o \chi$ ',
 $\gamma^{\prime}$ 'A $\pi \dot{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, also Il. $\gamma^{\prime} .409, \epsilon^{\prime} .184, \kappa^{\prime} .{ }^{2} 35$. Sometimes the pronoun occurs only in the second clause. cp. Hor. C. I. 9, i 6 , nec dulces amores, sperne, puer, neque tu choreas. $\| \tau \hat{\varphi} \gamma$ áp. See note on 715 .
 level spot, is used of almost any sort of place. Aesch. uses it of plain alone, Prom. 704, 914, Eum. 285: Soph. of a height in Aj. 499, áкрау
K. OF.

 $\pi o \iota ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi \lambda a ́ к \epsilon s ~ \epsilon ै \mu a \rho \psi a \nu$, the meaning must be abysses, and in O. C. 1560,


 Пapvaбov̂ $\pi \lambda a ́ \kappa \epsilon s$. Herc. F. $958,{ }^{"} \mathrm{I} \sigma \theta \mu 0 v \nu a \pi a l a s ~ \pi \lambda a ́ \kappa a s, ~ a n d ~ m e r e l y ~ r e g i o n, ~$
 translate it heights with the Scholiast, who explains the word by ai
 animals feed; a sense which seems to be approved by both Wunder and
 $\dot{a} \gamma \rho o \nu o ́ \mu o \iota s ~ a \dot{u} \lambda a i ̂ s$, its meaning evidently is rustic, rural.
1105. I have edited $\mu \eta^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime}$ for $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \theta^{\prime}$ because the hiatus after $\phi i \lambda a \iota$, where a long syll. is required, seems intolerable. The double ciтє, though frequent, is not essential. In fact I do not think the first cïre here good Greek in a direct question. \|i $\dot{o} \mathrm{~K} \nu \lambda \lambda \alpha^{v} \nu a s ~ \dot{a} \nu \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, Hermes, to whom this mountain, on which he was born, was sacred. Verg. Aen. vili. 138, vobis Mercurius pater est, quem candida Maia Cyllenes gelido conceptum vertice fudit.
 $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \ell \Delta i o ́ v v \sigma o s ~ \epsilon ̇ \mu \beta a \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota$. By a similar circumlocution Neptune is called
 'E $\lambda \iota \kappa \omega \nu i \delta \omega \nu$, Porson's correction (Orest. 614) for 'E $\lambda \iota \kappa \omega \nu \iota a ́ \delta \omega \nu$. So 'A $\mu \mu \omega$ $\nu i \delta a s$ E. Alc. 116 , Musgrave's correction for ' $A \mu \mu \omega \nu i a \delta a s$, and ' $A \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi \iota \delta \omega \bar{\nu}$ Phil. 1333 for ' $A \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi \iota a \delta \hat{\omega} \nu$. \|| $\sigma \nu \mu \pi a i \zeta \epsilon \iota$. Anacreon in Dion Chrysost.
 $\delta i \tau \eta \sigma v \mu \pi a i \zeta 0 v \sigma \iota \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \notin \phi \epsilon a l \delta^{\prime} \dot{v} \psi \eta \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ корифàs óp $\bar{\epsilon} \omega \nu$.

## EPEISODION IV. (IIIo-iI85).

[Oedipus and the Corinthian come out of the palace: the shepherd entering through the eastern stage-passage.]
(Outline). In this Epeisodion the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \iota a$ of the plot culminates. The shepherd appears, and by a severe examination is forced to confess that Oedipus is the son of Laius and Jocasta. No question is asked about the murder of Laius, as Oedipus no longer doubts his guilt in that transaction. At the close the king, full of anguish, bids farewell to the daylight, and retires into the palace.
(Notes). 1110-16. к $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon$. The delicate and often (as compared with modern idiom) superfluous use of kai, both in Attic Greek generally, and
in Soph．and Thucyd．particularly，is noticeable here；where its meaning is explained later in III5 as contrasted with $\sigma$ v：＇if even I must conjecture－ when you（the Chorus and Coryphaeus）are better judges than I am．＇See $\kappa a ̈ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \mu 0 i ~ 1239 . \| ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \xi_{v \nu a \lambda \lambda a ́ \xi a \nu \tau a ́ ~}^{\pi \omega}$ ，who never had any dealings with hinn （dramatic irony）：not dreaming that this was the man who had scarcely escaped his homicidal hand in Phocis，who had left Thebes to avoid en－ countering him as king，who had been commissioned to expose him to death when a babe，and had spared him for this fatal issue．His identity with the babe is yet unknown to the shepherd（see 1146）：his guilt in the murder is known．\｜$\pi \rho \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \iota s$ ．See Lection．\｜$\sigma \tau a \theta \mu \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，lit．＇to measure


 $\pi o v$, perhaps，I ween，a slight redundancy in expression．\｜io iov，if you have seen：the $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ following seems an answer to this shade of doubt．Yet see 1051.

II17－18．$\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ，yes：the second $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ Engl．idiom would omit．\｜ aaîou $\dot{\eta} \nu$ ，he belonged to Laius．\｜єimep．．．тьoтós，trusted as much as any．\｜is $\nu 0 \mu \in \dot{s} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho$ ，for a man who grazed cattle．See $\omega$＇s $\gamma v \nu \dot{\eta}, 1078$.

1121－31．oûtos $\sigma \dot{v}$ к．т．入．，hark＇ee，old man，look this way and answer me．Cp．Tr．402，oütos $\beta \lambda \epsilon \phi^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon$ ．\｜｜$\xi \dot{v} v a v \lambda o s$, hutted or lodged．｜｜In line $1128 \mu a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ depends on oî $\sigma \theta a$ ，${ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho a$ on $\mu a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ．Render ：$\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \not \partial \nu \delta \rho a \tau \delta \nu \delta \delta^{\prime}$ ouv，yonder man then－oioda，do you remember，$\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ nov $\mu a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ，that you
 The shepherd＇s conscience is uneasy ：he＇fights shy＇，as we say，and even asks，what man dost thou specially mean？see 976,1076 ．\｜$\dot{\eta} \xi v \nu a \lambda \lambda d \xi a s ~ \tau i$ mov，or that you had some transaction with him perhaps？carrying on the question from $\mu a \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ above．\｜oủ $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \kappa$ к．.$\lambda$ ．not so as to speak at once from recollection：cp． $3^{6 \mathrm{r}}$ ，oủ $\ddot{\omega}^{\sigma} \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \gamma \nu \omega \tau \delta \nu$ ．The rendering is alike， whether ä $\pi 0$ or $\ddot{u} \pi o$ be read．

1133－40．à $\gamma \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega \bar{\tau} \alpha$ ，as he forgets，cp．677．｜｜After кároi $\delta \in \nu$ I place a colon，feeling sure that a line has fallen out after this，the purport of which might be $\dot{\varphi} \kappa \circ \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \omega$ катà $\nu 0 \mu a ̀ s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota$ ，when we were both inhabiting the district of Cithaeron，and wandering in search of pasturage．\｜$\dot{\epsilon \pi \lambda r \sigma i a-~}$乌ov к．т．入．I was in this man＇s neighbourhood three full half：years，from spring to the rising of Arcturus．Polyb．p．888，$\Sigma$ т $\rho a \tau о \kappa \lambda \notin o u s ~ \pi \rho v \tau a \nu \epsilon v o \nu-~$
 all about the star Arcturus（＂A 1 ктоv oûpos，bear－ward）and its import in ancient astronomical calculations，will do well to consult J．＇s note at p． 305 in his edition of Oed．Tyr．The heliacal rising of Arcturus took place， according to Pliny II．47，eleven days before the autumnal equinox，i．e．the 12 th of September；but Columella says on the 5 th．From the begin－
ning of spring therefore（which was counted as the last week in Febr．）， when the flocks in those countries left their $\sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \dot{\alpha}$ ，or winter stations，up to the rising of Arcturus，there would be very nearly this time（six months）． Nauck says the same custom is still carried on by Greek shepherds．\｜$\chi$ єt－ $\mu \hat{\nu} a$, during the winter，unless $\chi \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \iota$ ，in the winter，be read．See Lec－ tion．$\| \notin \pi a v \lambda \alpha$ and $\sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \alpha ̀$ equally mean stalls．\｜$\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon \in \nu o \nu$, a fact．
 own nursling＇＝rear it as my own child．

1144．$\tau i \delta^{\prime}$ є́ $\sigma \tau i \nu ;$ See 938．N．also cites Tr．339，Phil．896，El．
 question？Besides this sense of enquiring，iбтopé $\omega$ is used by the tragic poets in the sense of knowing，very unusual in prose．See 1484，oü $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\circ} \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，
 $\delta^{\prime} i \sigma \tau 0 \rho \epsilon i \hat{s} \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$ ．Soph．Tr．282，$\delta \hat{\eta} \theta \in \nu$ ở $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu i \sigma \tau 0 \rho \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ ．The tragic writers never employ it in the sense of relating or explaining．

 ко入á乡єı．There is no idea of personal chastisement in the verb．

II49．$\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ，as if from a comparative $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \iota \omega \nu$ ．Homer uses all three forms $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau o s, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \tau \epsilon \rho o s, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \tau a \tau o s . ~ A e s c h . ~ u s e s ~ \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau o s, ~ S e p t . ~ 39 . ~ \phi ' ́ \rho-~$ $\tau \epsilon \rho \circ s, \operatorname{Pr} .770$ ．Soph．only uses $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau o s$, and in this passage alone．Eurip． only $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Hel． $35^{2}$.

1151－9．ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，in vain．\｜$\pi$ pòs $\chi$ ápı $\nu$ ，in kindness（to oblige）．\｜i $\kappa \lambda \alpha^{\omega} \omega \nu$, to your sorrow $=$ under durance here．See 363 ．$\|$ aiкion．See Aj．ini，$\mu \dot{\eta}$
 him，i．e．pinion him．Slaves were thus bound，lifted into the air and scourged to make them speak．\｜$\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \eta \nu o s, u n h a p p y ~ t h a t ~ I ~ a m . ~ S o ~ T r . ~$ 337，$\delta \dot{v} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ os $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ ．The reference of $\delta \dot{u} \sigma \tau \eta \nu 0 s$ to Oed．here，which J． adopts，seems highly improbable．\｜$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i$ roû，what for？\｜$\tau i \not \pi \rho \circ \sigma \chi \rho n_{j}^{j} \omega \nu$ $\mu a \theta \epsilon i v$, what more requiring to learn？The prep．can hardly be otiose．II
 honest truth．

 used of short intervals，see 1157. El．676，$\theta a \nu \dot{\nu} \nu \tau$＇＇Opé $\sigma \tau \eta \nu \nu\langle ̂ \nu \nu \epsilon$ кai $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda a c \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ ．\｜$\dot{\omega} s \delta_{o i \eta \nu}$ ．See 780 ．

1166．ó $\lambda \omega \lambda$ as．Since in the perfect the chief regard is paid to the permanence of the consequences of an action，and the action itself is almost left out of view，it is also used to express rapid execution．So in Latin， ＇si Antonius perierit，vicimus＇：in English，＂You are undone，if \＆c．＂

ェ $167 . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Laïov $\tau \iota s \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ ，one of those born belonsing to Laius．

$\nu \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$（what is meant，not expressed）as it is termed．Porson and Schaefer give many instances of this figure in their note on E．Phoen．1730，and Elmsley also quotes here E．Tro．735，© $\phi$ i $\lambda \tau a \tau^{\prime}$ ， $\mathfrak{\omega} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma a ̀ ~ \tau \iota \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i s \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu 0 \nu$.
 $\kappa \alpha \tau \theta a \nu b \nu \theta \prime \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \hat{.}$ A．Ach．8ıг，ஸ̂ $\chi a i ̂ \rho \epsilon, ~ к о \lambda \lambda \iota к о ф а ́ \gamma \epsilon ~ B o \iota \omega \tau i \delta \iota o \nu . ~ A e . ~ C h o . ~$ 893，oì＇$\gamma \dot{\omega} \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa a s, \phi i \lambda \tau a \tau '$ Aiүiб $\theta o v \beta i a$ ．So＇mea Glycerium＇，Ter．



 ful）to hear．
 called，whether he were so in reality or not，I do not say．
 in thought；in which sense it is often found with the partic．fut． Cp ．



1175．$\tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ ，wretched woman，which may here either mean poor sufferer，or have the active sense audacious，wicked，which is common to it
 $\tau \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \nu$ ．Phil． $3^{6} 3, \tau \lambda \eta \mu 0 \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau a \tau o \nu$ 入órov．So in Latin＇miser＇is used for scelestus or perditus，and in Engl．＇miserable．＇

1176． $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ovs $\tau \epsilon \kappa \delta \nu \tau a s$. Plural for singular：but vague language suits the speaker here．
 frequent usage of $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s．

1178．The order is $\omega$ s $\delta o \kappa \omega \hat{\nu}$ a $\pi \pi o l \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu(\epsilon i s) d ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \chi \theta \delta \nu a$ ．So E．Herc．F．
 סок $\hat{\nu} \nu$ ．

1182－4．àv $\epsilon \xi \dot{\eta} \kappa 0$, will have come out．See note on v．IOII．N．reads á $\rho$ ’ $\epsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \kappa \epsilon$ ．But，as the guilt of the death of Laius is not brought in question，but tacitly assumed，the form $\hat{a} \nu \epsilon \xi \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \circ$ is used to imply this．\｜ $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu$ ois $\tau$＇．On the apostrophe $\tau$＇see 29 ．

STASIMON IV．（ 1 r86－1222）．
（Oitline．）Oedipus enters the palace：the shepherds quit the stage： and the Chorus，after a melancholy recognition of the uncertain condition of all human happiness，express their sympathy with the miserable fate of Oedipus，to whom they are indebted for so many benefits in former times．
（Notes．）ェı88．它．．．＇̇vapi $\theta \mu \hat{\omega}$ ，＇how do I count you living equivalent to nothing！＇i．e．how truly do I count your lives as mere vanity！So

Ecclesiastes xii．8，Vanity of vanities！all is vanity．\｜Upon toa кai $\tau \delta \mu \eta \delta \not \subset \boldsymbol{\nu}$
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \sigma \nu$ ．каi is thus used after $\dot{\rho} \mu o \hat{o} o s, \pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota o s, \dot{o}$ aúròs \＆c．，and after $\dot{o} \mu o i \omega s, \dot{\omega} \sigma a u ́ \tau \omega s$, lo $\sigma \omega s, \kappa a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau a u ̇ \tau a ́, ~ w h e r e ~ t h e ~ L a t i n s ~ u s e ~ a c, ~ a t q u e, ~$ or even et，but the English＇as＇．For the sentiment cp．Aj．ı26，$\dot{j} \rho \hat{\omega} \gamma \mathrm{a} \rho$
 Pyth．vili．ı35，$\tau i \delta \epsilon \epsilon \tau \iota s ; \tau i \delta^{\prime}$ oütıs；$\sigma \kappa \iota a ̂ s$ ồ $\nu a \rho a ̈ \nu \nu \rho \omega \pi o s$, and Ae．Sept． 769－84．
$1189 . \phi \epsilon \rho \rho \epsilon$. See note on 590 ．


 too far，i．e．becoming perilously prosperous．Cp．876－8．．\｜ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ávt＇，ad－ verbial，as often．See $477,823,1429$, Aj． $911,1415 \& c . \| \chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \omega \delta \delta \nu$. See Lection．The position of the adj．might be explained by rendering it＇when she sang her riddles＇：but there is still the metrical discord．

1200．$\theta a \nu \dot{\prime}$ á $\omega \nu$ múpros，a tower against（＝protection from）the deaths caused by the Sphinx．We should have expected d $\nu a \sigma \tau \alpha s$ ，as this latter clause is opposed to $\kappa a \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \phi \theta i \sigma a s \& c$ ．，but this freedom is not unusual．

1205．тís к．т．入．This constr．is peculiar and difficult．Gúvookos has usually been taken as $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \hat{\xi}$ ．，borrowing $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ from the preceding comparative．But I am now disposed to supply $\dot{a} \theta \lambda \iota \omega \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \sigma \dot{s} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ to this place，and calling back $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ to äracs，to render：who amid cruel woes，who amid toils，dwelling with them by a reverse of life，is more wretched？

1208－9．I have edited the reading $\pi \delta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ for $\pi a \tau \rho i$ ．But I subjoin Steel＇s note，in which however there is no notice of the metrical difference．Our views as to sense coincide．＇For whom the same great haven was sufficient to enter into，as child and as wedded father．It is called $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \operatorname{as} \lambda \mu \mu \eta_{\nu}$ ，as being greater than it ought to have been，receiving the same person as husband whom it had received as child．Instead of $\pi a \tau \rho i \quad \theta a \lambda a \mu \gamma \pi \delta \lambda\rangle \omega$ we
 But the contrast between the relation of child and father was that which the poet wished to express most strongly，and $\theta a \lambda a \mu \eta \pi o ́ \lambda o s ~(=\nu u ́ \mu \phi \iota o s)$ pre－ sents at the same time the relation of $\pi \dot{\prime} \sigma \iota s$ ．On the use of $\kappa a i$ see note on vv．612，1187．＇｜｜$\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i \nu$ ，enter into．E．Ion，673，グע $\tau \iota s$ द́s $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \eta$ $\xi \in \notin 0$ ．Others refer $\pi a \tau \rho i$ to Laius，as I myself formerly did．
 father＇s furrowes．We have the same metaphor $\mathbf{1 2 5 7}^{2}, 1485,1497$ ，E．Phoen．
 sulcos inertes．


O.'C. ${ }^{\prime} 549$, Ant. $582,980,1276$, Aj. 665 , Phil. 534,848 , El. $49^{2}$, 1154. The words $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu о \hat{\nu} \nu \tau a$ каi $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \circ$ ú $\mu ย \nu \nu$, implying Oedipus and Jocasta, are with some boldness attached to $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \mu o \nu$, the meaning therefore being, time sits in judgment on the incestuous marriage, which had long continued to beget and bring forth children. || My reading of the next passage is shown in the text and defended in Lection.

1218-20. Here I have read $\epsilon i \delta o \nu$ for $\epsilon i \delta o ́ \mu a v$, keeping $\dot{\delta} \delta \dot{u} \rho o \mu a \iota ~ a n d ~$ adopting J.'s elegant correction $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ iá $\lambda \epsilon \mu \circ \nu \chi^{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, as one who pours a airge. Elmsley was certainly wrong in desiring to substitute $\delta \dot{\circ} \rho o \mu a \iota ~ e v e r y-$ where for ódípoдат. See Ant. 693, O. C. 1439, Aj. 383.

## EPEISODION V. (1223-1297).

(Outline). In this fifth Epeisodion, the Second Messenger ( $\bar{\xi} \xi \dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda o s)$ comes out of the palace, and relates to the Chorus the terrible events which have occurred in it : the suicide of Jocasta, who had hanged herself, and the frantic conduct of Oedipus, who had destroyed his own eyesight, and might every moment be expected to come forth to public view.
(Notes). 1225. $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega}$, with native loyalty.
1227-31. "I $\sigma \tau \rho 0 \nu, \Phi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$. The Ister (Danube) and the Phasis are taken as the greatest rivers well known in Europe and Asia. The waters of the sea or of a running stream were supposed necessary to wash out the stain of blood. Cp. Verg. Aen. II. 718, E. Hipp. 653, E. Iph. T. II92, 3. II
 part hides, and part will bring to light ere long \&c. i.e. the suicide of Jocasta and the self-blinding of Oedipus. The ellipse by which the former of two correlatives is omitted, being mentally understood from the presence of the second, is not infrequent in Pindar and the tragic poets, as Pind.

 oủ ákovoıa, act. for pass. wrought by voluntary act. Nauck refers to O. C. 240, 977, Phil. 1318. See 58, $\gamma \nu \omega \tau$ d̀ коűk ä $\gamma \nu \omega \tau \alpha$. \| aî $\phi \nu \nu \omega \bar{\sigma} \iota$. See
 adapted for expressing an actually possible contingency in the most indefinite way: and hence it is commonly found in general sentences. He refers to S. Tr. 147, 25 I, O. C. 395, Aj. 76 I, El. 77 I, Ae. Sept. 243, Eum. $3^{21-4}$, E. Med. $5^{16}$, El. 792; ; and from a comparison of these with other passages, Ae. Eum. 33, Thuc. vir. 62, where $\ddot{\nu} \nu$ is inserted, he shews that the presence of $\hat{a} \nu$ denotes that the action itself is considered as consequent and certain, and not merely contingent, though it is left uncertain and contingent, who or what may be the subject, object, or circumstances of
the action; whereas when $\hat{\alpha} \nu$ is not inserted, not only these last are not defined, but the action itself is represented as contingent and uncertain, not as consequent and certain.

1232-3. $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota(=\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota)$ к.т. $\lambda$. 'What we knew before falls not short of being grievously lamentable' =little room is left by what we knew before, for heavier lamentation. On $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov่ see $\mathbf{~} 3$. $\| \ddot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ is the correction of Elmsley for ${ }_{\eta} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, which is found in all mss. It is adopted by Wunder, Dindorf and Hermann. In his note on A. Ach. 323 Elmsley maintains that from the analogy of the 3 rd person plural, which is $\eta \eta \delta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$, and never $\eta_{\eta} \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha \nu$, the short form in the ist and 2nd persons also should be restored in the Attic authors. He reads therefore $\eta_{\eta} \delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ in E. Bacch. 1345 instead of $\epsilon^{\prime} \delta \delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, and in A. Lys. 1098 , $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \pi \delta^{\prime} \nu \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \mathrm{s}$, instead of $\pi \epsilon \pi \boldsymbol{o}^{\prime} \nu \theta a \mu \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$, and is followed by Dindorf in both passages. In his note Elmsley remarks also that from these passages we learn that the Attics did not always say $\hat{\eta} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu, \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$, which was the current opinion.

1234-5. $\delta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. the first clause is in apposition to the second: we might say as the specdiest word for me to speak and for you to hear \&ic. The $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ implies that more is to come: indeed the $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ in $\mathbf{1 2 3 7}$ takes it up. \| $\theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$. The belief in the divine descent of a royal family gave its members this title.


 $\theta v \mu \hat{\varphi} \chi \rho \hat{a} \tau a l . \| \pi a \rho \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \prime$ ' $\epsilon \sigma \omega$ $\theta v \rho \hat{\omega} \nu o s$, she entered within the vestibule (entrance-hall leading to the central court). \|| $\tau \grave{\alpha} \nu v \mu \phi \iota \kappa \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \in \chi \eta$ means the $\theta$ áda $\mu o s$. See $\mathrm{I}_{2} 62$.
1243. $\dot{a} \mu \phi \iota \delta \epsilon \xi i o l s \dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu a i ̂ s=\dot{a} \mu \phi o i v \nu \chi \in 0 i ̂ \nu$, Sch. Min. The proper sense of ambidexter cannot of course apply here, but we may say with both hands
 $\delta \in \xi i o t s ~ \chi \in \rho \sigma i$ from the Telephus of Aesch.
 probably belongs to $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ as E. And. 876 , $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon i \sigma \iota \theta^{\prime} \epsilon i \sigma \omega$. Cp. Hom.


 forms for epic $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \rho \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$. N. cites Dionys. Hal. viri. $18, \pi \rho i \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \rho$ $\rho a \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi u ́ \lambda a s . ~| | ~ T h e ~ v . ~ 1246 ~ r e f e r s ~ t o ~ O e d . ~| | ~ \tau \grave{\eta \nu ~ \tau i к \tau o v \sigma a \nu, ~ t h e ~}$ mother. The opt. Aávol, $\lambda i \not \pi o l$ come after virtually past time, and as referred to the mind of Joc. \| $\lambda i \pi o \iota \delta \epsilon ́$. Soph. might have written $\lambda \iota \pi \omega \dot{\omega}$. But this is a very common arrangement of a sentence, the author seeming unwilling to relinquish the construction with which he began. Cp. O.C.


 $\mu \in \nu 0 s$ únò \&c. Verg. Aen. iv. 70, I, Quam procul incautam nemora inter Cresia fixit pastor agens telis, liquitque volatile ferrum nescius. \| roîs oĩ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ aúrov̂, to his own son, plur. for sing., so $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \omega \nu$ 1250. See Pron. Exc. XV. II
 concrete, with some tautology ( $\tau \in \kappa \nu 0 \nu, \pi a i s)$.

1249-50. $\delta \iota \pi \lambda o \hat{s}$, a double race (so Herm.) $=\delta \iota \pi \lambda o u ̂ \nu \gamma^{\prime} \nu 0 s$ : agreeing in plur. number with $a \mathfrak{a} \nu \rho \rho a+\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu a$, but in gender attracted to the nearer noun: so we must say; for the sexes of her children by Oed. were equally divided. \| As to the absence of augment in roâto, to correspond with which $\kappa \dot{a} \lambda_{\epsilon \iota}$ is to be written in $\mathbf{1 2 4 5}$, Curtius on the Greek Verb (cited also by J.), I. 138, says that the omission of the syllabic augm. in Homer was purely a matter of choice, and that post-Homeric poetry, adopting that license, makes greater use of it in proportion as it is removed from the language of ordinary life. Hence it is rare in iambics; and its instances in tragedy are some in the lyric parts, a few in the speeches of messengers, these being chiefly narrative, and Homer having dropped the augm. more freely in narrative parts than in speeches: see O. C. 1606.
1251. For the order of words here (hyperbaton) N. cp. El. 688, $\chi \omega ̈ \pi \omega s$


1253-4. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \theta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$, to see out (to the end). \| $\boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \rho \lambda o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$. $\pi \epsilon \rho \imath-$ $\epsilon \rho \chi \chi^{\delta} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu \ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \not \epsilon \mu \mu \nu \hat{\eta}$, Schol.
1255. É $\gamma \chi$ os, weapon generally, specifically sword, as $\mathrm{Aj} .95,287,658$, 907. Ant. 1232, 1236 . Tr. 1034. Сp. 170, 969.

1256-7. ö $\pi о v \kappa i \chi \eta$. The constr. is zeugmatic, $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \iota \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ containing the added sense of $\zeta \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ or $\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. I read $\kappa i \chi \eta$ for the vulg. $\kappa i \chi o l$, which is ungrammatical here. ä̀ $\kappa i \chi o c$ would stand, but not aor. opt. without $\dot{a} \nu$. See on $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ 72. Cp. Ae. Ag. 1532, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu \hat{\omega}$ ö $\pi a \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\pi} \pi \mu \mu \alpha$. Thuc. II.

 The same metaphor occurs 1485, 1497.

1258-60. N. cites Aj. 243, $\dot{\rho} \eta^{\prime} \mu a \theta^{\prime}$ à $\delta a i \mu \omega \nu \kappa o \dot{\delta} \delta \epsilon i s \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \delta i \delta \alpha \xi \epsilon \nu$. ср. Ae. Ag. 663 . \|| $\dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma \eta r o v$. . see 966.
 $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \rho a$. After reading very much controversy respecting these words, my impression is, that not one of the commentators writes with entire confidence in favour of the particular explanation which he finally selects. I shall certainly make no exception in my own favour. It seems to me that Liddell and Scott, under $\kappa \lambda \epsilon i \theta \rho \rho \nu$ and $\pi \nu \theta \mu \eta^{\prime} \nu$, avoid interpretation of this place, and under кoîlos they do not cite it. How Joc. had secured herself in the $\theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \mu o s$, there is but one word to indicate, $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \rho \rho a ́ \xi \alpha \sigma a$, and as this is
explained to mean 'having dashed to', it appears that this single act prevented entrance from outside; and that no elaborate act of barring or locking was performed: but that the simple shutting with force fastened the door by a spring lock or bolt. My feeling therefore inclines me to agree with those who take $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \rho \alpha$ to mean 'the panels' themselves of the doors, and $\pi v \theta \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon s$ 'the door-posts' in which they were imbedded: understanding коі̂̀а $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \iota \nu \epsilon$ to mean he broke inzward (a sort of excavation)=he burst open the yielding panels. Vergil writes, in a passage cited below, 'cavavit robora'.

I subjoin however a fuller discussion of the words by Mr Steel, which seems to reach the foregoing conclusion. "This is usually taken to mean, He forced the hollow bars from their sockets. The $\kappa \lambda \hat{y} \theta \rho a$ wouid thus be what are usuaily called $\mu 0 \chi \lambda o i$, one or more of which were used. This bar, having one end firmly fastened by a staple in one of the door-posts, was drawn across the door and let into the other post by a groove made to receive the end of it. In this end of the bar a hole was made, in the direction of its length. There was a corresponding hole in the post, and from the other side of the post the bolt or $\beta$ ádavos was passed through, extending into the hole of the $\mu 0 \chi \lambda \delta$ s, which was thus retained firmly in its place; the $\beta a ́ \lambda a \nu o s$ was drawn out by an instrument called $\beta a \lambda a \nu a ́ \gamma \rho a$, and the orifice in which it was inserted was called $\beta a \lambda a \nu 0 \delta \delta \kappa \eta$. This is the substance of Mr Bloomfield's note on Thuc. II. 4. Dr Arnold on that passage says that the $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \nu o s$ was a sort of pin or bolt inserted into the bar, and going through it into the gates. It is difficult to conceive how this could serve to keep the $\mu 0 \chi$ dos in its position. The manner of fastening the door among the ancients is on many occasions involved in much obscurity. See Hom. Il. $\xi^{\prime} .168,9$, and Heyne's note. In the passage before us the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \rho a$ may be called коìa from this hole made at the one end of the bar as we have described. Wunder dissents however entirely from the usual method of translating the passage, and takes $\pi v \theta \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ to mean hmgees, and $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \rho a$ postes, the door-posts; quoting Verg. Aen. II. 480. Limina perrumpit postesque a cardine vellit aeratos; jamque excisa trabe firma cavavit robora, et ingentem lato dedit ore fenestram: and v. 493 labat ariete crebro janua, et emoti procumbunt cardine postes; in both of which passages however we must evidently follow Heyne in taking postes to mean the door itself or the ieaves of the door. If $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \rho a$ may be taken for postes in this sense, a sense which agrees very well with the other passages in which the word is found in Sophocles, 1287, 1294, Ant. 1186 , ëк $\kappa \iota \nu \epsilon$ коî入a may perhaps be taken together as equivalent to Vergil's cavavit, bent inwards; for the epithet кoì $\lambda a$ can scarcely be itself applicable to either door-posts or door-leaves, Theocritus however, Id. xxiv. 15 has $\sigma \tau a \theta \mu a ̀ ~ к o i ̂ \lambda a ~ \theta u \rho a ́ \omega \nu . ~$ The Scholiast interprets, à $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \epsilon \psi \epsilon \tau a ̀ s ~ \theta \dot{v} \rho a s, \kappa a i \kappa a \tau \epsilon \in \beta a \lambda \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \nu \theta \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \omega \nu$."
1262. к $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \eta$, and rushed into the chamber. The $\theta a ́ \lambda a \mu o s$ was on the ground floor, and its door opened into the $\pi a \sigma \tau a ́ s$, or open hall in which we must suppose Oed. to be ( $\phi o \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ) surrounded by domestics, among whom was this $\bar{\xi} \dot{a}^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda$ дs. (See Guhl and Köner, Life of the Greeks and Romans Engl. Tr. p. 80.)
1264. $\pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau a i ̂ s ~ \epsilon ' \omega ́ \rho a / s ~ \epsilon ̇ \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu$ hanging by the neck (lit. entwined) in a twisted noose. J. adds ' of swinging cords', and supposes the use of $\epsilon \in \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$ to imply that the body is still oscillating, which I cannot suppose, though $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\omega} \rho a$ or ai $\dot{\omega} \rho a$ means a swing. See Lection, and the citation there given by Wu. from Eustathius.
 $\tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$. Though, when an adjective is thus added for the sake of definition, it has usually the article with it, yet this is sometimes omitted by the tragedians with $\tau$ á $\lambda a s, \tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$, $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \tau \eta \nu 0 s$. See Tr. rio4, Aj. 905 , El. 160, $450 \| \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \grave{a} \delta^{\prime} \tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \nu$. This $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ in the apodosis is repeated from the $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ in the protasis, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i \delta \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \hat{\eta} \& c$. See Buttm. Exc. XiI. ad Dem. Meid. § 2. No doubt however it is used here for more emphatic designation, and the passage may be compared with El. 293, 4, $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ ötav $\kappa \lambda$ ún $\tau \iota \nu o ̀ s ~ \eta ̈ \xi o \nu \tau '$ 'Op $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \nu, \tau \eta \nu \iota \kappa a \hat{u} \tau a \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu a \nu \grave{\eta} s \beta o a ̂ \pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \tau \hat{a} \sigma^{\prime} \cdot$ where $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ in the protasis, being equivalent to $\delta \epsilon \in$, leads to the use of the subsequent $\delta \epsilon \in$. \| $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon$, what followed. So O. C. 47 6, El. 1307, Phil. 895.
1269. $\pi \epsilon \rho o ́ \nu a s$, brooches. The $\pi \epsilon \rho \delta \nu \eta$ or $\pi \dot{\rho} \rho \pi \eta$ ( $\pi \epsilon i \rho \omega, \pi \epsilon \rho a ́ \omega$, pierce) was common to the Doric tribes, who wore a short tunic without sleeves, fastened at the shoulders by a brooch, which also, as in modern times, served as an ornament. Herodotus (v. 87.) mentions that on occasion of a defeat of the Athenians by the Aeginetans, and the return of one man alone out of the expedition, the widows of those that had been slain put to death the single survivor by piercing him with the pins of their brooches, and that the Athenians in consequence ordered their women in future to wear the Ionian dress, originally the Carian, which was a long flowing robe, not requiring the $\pi \epsilon \rho \delta \rho^{\prime} \eta$, but fastened by a zone. He adds that what was then called the Dorian dress, was formerly used by all the Greek women. Eurip. Phoen. 62 also describes Oed. as $\chi \rho v \sigma \eta \lambda a ́ \tau o \iota s ~ \pi o ́ \rho \pi a \iota \sigma \iota \nu ~$ ai $\mu a ́ \xi a s$ к $\dot{\rho}$ as. The brooch was either worn on one shoulder, or, as is evidently the case here, on both. For another instance of the destructive
 which she wore. á $\theta \rho \alpha$ кv́к $\lambda \omega \nu$, the pupils of her eyes. Ant. 974, Phil. 1354.
 perceived what ills he had been suffering or what he had been doing (i.e. the exposure, the murder, the marriage); but in darkness for the future they should see (i.e. should not see at all) those whom they ought not (to have seen), and should not recognise those whom he had desired (to behold).

Hermann's proposed ơ $\psi a \iota \nu \tau o$ is certainly inadmissible. I assume that an unwise scribe, fond of assimilating, substituted ơ ${ }^{\prime} \psi o \iota \nu \tau o$ for ał $\sigma \theta o \iota \nu \tau o$ because he saw the same opt. o$\psi$ oiaco occurring afterwards. See note
 see at all: those whom they ought never to have seen are his unhappy children: those whom he had so long wished to see are his true parents. The relation of the tenses here gives to the imperfects pluperfect force, and, as they all refer to facts, they are indic., not opt. \| On $\dot{\delta} \theta o \dot{v} \nu \epsilon к \alpha$ see 572 . Whether it mean that or because, it takes indic. in oratio recta, as in 572, but opt. in oratio obliqua here and O.C. 944, which compare.

1275-81. $\epsilon \phi \nu \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$, 'decantans', repeating this refrain. \| $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a \dot{k} \kappa$ s $\tau \epsilon$ кои̉ $\chi a ̈ \pi a \xi ~ \eta ้ \rho a \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, he continued to tear again and arain. See Herod. viI. 46. \| $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a i \rho \omega \nu$, sc. $\tau \dot{a} s \pi \epsilon \rho o ́ v a s$, the brooches. \| $\mu v \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma a s ~ \sigma \tau a \gamma \dot{b} a s$ clammy drops: $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' $\dot{o} \mu o \hat{v}$ к.т.. ., but a black shower of hail and blood together was streaming down, reading $\chi a \lambda a ́ j \eta s$ aì $\mu a \tau o ́ s ~ \tau '$ with most codd. The mixture of tears ( $\chi \alpha \lambda a ́ \zeta \eta s$ ) and blood seemed black. \|| $\tau \dot{\alpha} \delta{ }^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ रvoîv к.т.入., these blended woes have burst from twain, not from one alone, but involving man and wife. || 1286. vôv $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \theta$ ' к.т. $\lambda .$, has the sufferer now any respite from pain? Linwood supplied $\tau \iota \nu \iota$ for the old r. rivt, and later edd. have followed him.
 one who hates. This verb has no other meaning in Soph.: J.'s view is therefore erroneous. For the sentiment $\mathrm{cp} . \mathrm{Aj} .924$, wंs каi $\pi \alpha \rho \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \chi \theta \rho o i ̀ s$ $a \mathfrak{a} \xi_{\iota} \iota s \theta \rho \dot{p} \nu \omega \nu \tau v \chi \epsilon i v$. Verg. Aen. XI. 259 vel Priamo miseranda domus.

$$
\text { EXODOS. ( } 1297-\mathrm{r} 530 \text { ). }
$$

(Outline.) The Chorus, in the anapaests (with which the Exodos begins), express to Oedipus the horror which they feel in beholding him. He replies with lamentation; and in the dialogue which ensues ( $\mathrm{r}_{3} \mathrm{I} 3$ ), at first lyrically commatic, afterwards returning to iambics, he gratefully acknowledges their kindness, and charging Apollo as the author of his woes, he confesses his act of self-mutilation, declaring it impossible for him to look any mortal in the face, or to remain among the haunts of men. He curses the man who saved him in childhood, shewing what misery death would have spared him. As things are, he has attained the very climax of human wretchedness. The Chorus think death would have been better for him than a life of blindness ( 1367 .) He gives reasons at some length for having deprived himself of sight. He would, had it been possible, have destroyed his sense of hearing also. He then bursts into a pathetic lamentation, apostrophizing all the places and things connected with the events of his past life. Finally he prays them to remove him from contact with human life by killing or exiling him (1416.) Creon, they say, is coming:
he will determine. Oedipus shrinks from the interview with one whom he had wronged. Creon enters (1422) and blames the public exhibition of the wretched man. In the dialogue between them Oedipus first entreats that he may be removed from the land of Thebes. Creon says he will take time to consult the oracle. Oedipus respects his wish: commends to Creon the funeral of Jocasta, and the care of his daughters. (1446.) Hearing their voices, he learns that Creon has sent for them to console their father. He addresses them in words of tender sympathy and love, and again commits them to the charge of their uncle. (1480.) A short trochaic dialogue follows, in which Creon separates the father and daughters. ( 1515 .) The drama concludes with moral reflections of the Chorus, who from this example deduce the ancient maxim, that no man ought to be called happy before the end of life. ( $155^{2}$.)
(Notes) 1297. The use of anapaestic rhythm here shows that the Chorus first shrinks back from the sight of the bleeding Oed. who is led out by attendants, then, turning back addresses him ( $r i s \sigma^{\prime}$ ), then recoils again ( $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oú $\delta^{\prime}$ ). In the four anapaestic lines spoken by Oed., we must suppose him to move up and down in agitation, watched and guarded by his slaves. See G. Wolff.
1299. ö $\sigma a-\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \kappa v \rho \sigma a$. The dative is the usual case after this verb: but such compounds frequently take either the case which the sense of the verb itself, or that which the proposition governs. So $\epsilon \pi \tau \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon v \in \omega$ will govern either dat. or accus. The present tense of this verb is $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \kappa v \rho \epsilon \epsilon$, though the aor. is derived from a form not in use, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa \dot{v} \rho \omega$.
 genius is it that has leapt greater than the greatest (i.e. larger than the
 $=\pi \rho \partial s \sigma o \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \delta \nu \sigma \mu \rho \rho \varphi$, as Schneid. says. It is scarcely right perhaps to say with Valckenaer on Hipp. 817 and Brunck on this passage, that the tragic poets use the Doric $\mu$ á $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, $\mu$ áкı $\sigma \tau o s$ (from $\mu \hat{\eta} \kappa о s$ ) for $\mu \epsilon i ́ \zeta \omega \nu$, $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau o s$. But it is evident that the sense of the former readily passes into that of the latter, and that they may be used promiscuously, as here.
r306. $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \chi \epsilon \epsilon s$, cause, excits; a sense very common in Eurip. So



 1515. Woe is me for the leap which thou didst take! We have the same
 $\pi о \delta o i ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon े \nu \dot{\lambda} \lambda o v ~ \pi a \nu \tau \imath ~ \Pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \iota \kappa \hat{\varphi} \gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \iota$.
1312. Es $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. yea to a dread calamity 'quum auditu crudelem, tum visu nefariam': in the words of Cic. pro Plancio 4 r .

1313-18. The lamentations of Oed. ( $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{\partial} \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta} s$ ) are in dochmiac metre specially suited to such moods, and made still more so, as Wolff observes, by the tremulous resolution of long into short syllables. The pauses of his anguish are supplied by the iambics of the Chorus. \| $\sigma \kappa \delta \tau o u$ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ é $\phi$ os, cloud of darkness, i.e. dark cloud, which overspreads my eyes. So Ant. II4, גıóvos $\pi \tau \epsilon \in \rho v \gamma \iota$, El. 19, ä $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \nu$ єú申póvך, starry night. See also
 what one would turn away from with horror, abominable. || $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \lambda^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu$ ăфatov, assailing me indescribably. || ádá $\mu a \tau o \nu$, insuperable. || $\delta v \sigma o \cup ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \nu$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\nu} \nu$, with a fair breeze wafting woe, cp. 423 . \|I oiov $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \delta \nu-\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$, with what violence hath entered me the maddening pain arising from these points, and the recollection of my woes.
1319. toбoî $\delta$ e, so great. The sense 'so many' for toroi $\delta \epsilon$ is only found once in Soph., Tr. 54.

1322-3. $\epsilon \pi i \pi n o \lambda o s$, attendant, not always in a servile condition like
 with me as my friendly watcher. See Lection. If we can defend the quantity $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \check{v} \omega \nu$, this reading can be kept.
1326. $\sigma \kappa о \tau \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, in the dark, blind. Cp. 419, $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \frac{\nu \tau \alpha}{} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ ö $\rho \theta^{\prime}$,




1327-8. $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ 解 $\lambda \eta \mathrm{s}$, how didst thou endure? See note on 602 . $\|$ тolaûta.
 $\rho \hat{\nu} \alpha a$, ruin. $\|$ ris $\sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \pi \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon$ $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu$; what god incited thee? Cp. E. Or.
 governs an acc. of the thing as well as one of the person. \| The answers to these questions are given, as Wolff notes, in chiastic order: Oed. first answers the second question, $\tau i \prime s \sigma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon$; then the former, $\pi \hat{\omega} s{ }_{\mathrm{s}} \epsilon \tau \lambda \eta s \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. Soph. often writes thus: see 536-42.
1329. Instead of $\hat{\eta} \nu$ here we might have expected $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau l$, but $\dot{\eta} \nu$ is often used where other languages use the present, either when a conclusion is drawn that something is not as it might have seemed to be (in which case $\hat{\eta} \nu$ is generally accompanied by äpa, as E. Hipp. 359, Kún $\rho \iota s$ oúk ă $\rho^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \nu$
 made to something said before. In his Phaedo, 68 B . Plato says of one who is reluctant to die, oúk áp’ $\hat{\eta} \nu \phi \iota \lambda o ́ \sigma o \phi o s ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \phi \iota \lambda o \sigma \omega \prime \mu a \tau o s . ~ H e i n d o r f$, in his note here, cites many passages illustrating this use of $a_{\rho \rho a} \hat{\eta} \nu$, and ends by saying: 'illud certum puto, his locis omnibus praesens quoque poni potuisse, usurpari autem $\tilde{\eta}^{\nu} \nu \alpha^{\prime \prime} \rho a$ pro $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ ibi fere ubi contra quam expectaverit aliquis rem habere se reperit'. Among the places he cites are Soph. O. C. ${ }_{150} 1697$. Phil. 978 . E. Iph. A. 944 . A. Av. 280. Equ. 382.

Vesp．821．Pax 22，566，819．Hesiod，＇E $\rho \gamma$ ．if．Theognis，519．Xen． Oec．I．20．Plat．Rep．II．p．362，A．

1330．ó кака̀－$\pi \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta є a$ ．Ср．377，1382，1440－ı．
1331．aúró $\chi \in \iota \rho$ ．The position of this word is strange．We should have expected it to be connected with $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \tau \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \omega \nu$ ．Nauck．cp．Il．$\phi^{\prime} .275$ ，

 $\pi \rho a ́ \xi ̆ a \nu \tau o s ~ o ́ \tau \iota o u ̂ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\eta}$ モ̇autov̂ $\chi \epsilon \rho i ́$ ．See 266．Ant． 900.
 or converse with，so as to listen to，with pleasure？$\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu a ̣ ̂(=\dot{\eta} \delta \hat{\epsilon} \omega s)$ is referred to each adjective．Considering that the dat．is unusual for the frequent constr．$\pi \rho \dot{\rho} s$ or $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \delta o \nu a ́ v$, I would now read nom．$\dot{j} \delta o \nu \dot{a}$ ，which varies the form，but not the sense；what pleasure to me henceforth is aught that can be seen or fonaled，or addressed and listened to？
 great destroyer．See Lection．Wolff cites Ae．Pr． $6_{4} 8, \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma ่ \epsilon ย ้ \delta a ı \mu о \nu ~ к о ́ \rho \eta . ~$


1347－8．סei入ale к．т．入．O zerretched for thy state of mind and thy calamity alike（gen．caus．）how I could have wished never to have known thee anywhere．Cp．Tr． 734.
 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \rho l a s-\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, who took me，when exposed in the pasture，（עamaiais $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\mathrm{K} \ell \theta a \iota \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{os} \pi \tau v \chi a i ̂ s, 1026)$ ，from the cruel fetter on my feet，and delivered me from death and saved me，doing nothing thankworthy．But I now remove $\nu o \mu \alpha^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}$ ，as a corruption，reading for it à $\pi^{\prime} \mu^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ．See Lection．

 $\mu \iota, \dot{\rho} \dot{v} \mu \iota=\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \omega$ ．Elsewhere in Homer it is always a contracted imperfect，as
 protection of the girdle is implied．

1356．$\theta \epsilon \lambda o \nu \tau \iota-\hat{\eta} \nu$ ．The verbs $\epsilon i \nu a \iota$ and $\gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ are often accom－ panied by a participle of the verb＇to wish＇，\＆c．in the dative；and the participle only，as the leading idea，is translated by the finite verb．
 in Latin ；Sallust，Jug．roo，uti militibus exaequatus cum imperatore labor volentibus esset．Tacit．Agr．18，quibus bellum volentibus erat．Ann．I．59， bellum invitis aut cupientibus erat．Render：this $I$ also would wish（ $\dot{\eta} \nu$ being imperfect）．
 $=\dot{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta$ ov，see 101 I ，as $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ in 1519 ，$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \theta \epsilon o i s \gamma^{\prime} \notin \chi \theta \tau \sigma \tau 0 s \ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ ，is used in the sense of $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ ，betokening result．Cp．El．1о5б，öтау є́v какоі今
 joint parent with her from whom \＆c．，in an active sense；the passive being usual．See Lection．
 is usually employed in a good sense，as the Latin＇antiquius＇．Eur．fr．
 Herod．v． $6_{3}$ ，$\tau$ à $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{u} \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho a \dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \iota \epsilon \hat{v} \nu \tau o \eta_{\eta}^{n} \tau \grave{a} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ ．Plat．
 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．Cic．uses both the comparative and superlative of＇antiquus＇in this derivative sense very frequently；e．g．Ep．Att．II．22，nihil sibi antiquius amicitia nostra fuisse．$\kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ ，like $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta v i \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ here，is also used in a
入órov $\tau$ ò $\epsilon \hat{i} \delta o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \nu \dot{i} \sigma o v . ~ I I . ~ 64, ~ \dot{\eta} ~ \nu o ́ \sigma o s, ~ \pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta o s ~ \kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma o \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \circ \nu$ ，worse than one could expect．\｜The termination of these laments with the name Oifinous is，as Wolff justly says，most pathetic，offering a sad contrast to his boastful words at $8, \dot{o} \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{o} s$ Oiditous калоч́цєขоs．This was the lot of Oedipus．

1371－4．The idea that injuries inflicted in this life remained in another is strikingly shown by Vergil in his description of Deiphobus in Orcus，
 фaעeis $\mathrm{T} \epsilon \lambda a \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \iota$ ；$\|$ oiv к．т．入．，to whom alike $I$ have done deeds too bad for death by the halter to atone．Cp．on dat．A．Vesp．1350，mo入入ois $\gamma$ à ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \eta$
 E．Bacch． 246 ．

1375－6．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ ．This $\dot{i} \pi 0 \phi o \rho a ́ i n$ Demosthenes is usually $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \nu \grave{\eta} \Delta^{\prime} \dot{a} a$ ， corresponding to the Latin＇at enim＇，Engl．but，it is said．\｜$\dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \omega \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \tau$＇ $\epsilon \psi \psi \varsigma \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \phi i \mu \epsilon \rho o s \beta \lambda a \sigma \tau o \hat{\sigma} \sigma a$ ．We might have expected $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \dot{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ to be used referring to $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \omega \nu$ ；but the combination in such cases being regarded as a mere circumlocution containing one principal idea，the word in concord frequently thus refers not to the genitive，but to the governing word．Cp． 1400，roủuòv aîua matpobs，the blood of my father shed by me．Ant．793，
 form of gently passing over a disagreeable subject．See O．C． 273 ，iкó $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma a \quad \theta \epsilon о \mu a \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \pi \dot{\prime} \tau \mu \varphi$ ．｜｜$\pi \rho \rho \sigma \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．This pleonastic use of infin．is
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \mu \mu \theta \epsilon i \nu . \quad$ Phil．848．Ae．Prom．766．Pers．387．A．Av． 17 I 3.
 Thebes at least who had been most nobly educated．This is perhaps a stroke of clap－trap on the part of Soph．，to gratify his Athenian friends，who would relish a sneer at their hereditary enemies，the Thebans．These were so much a by－word for ignorance that their own poet Pindar dreads the
danger of incurring the $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha i \hat{\imath} \nu \nu \delta^{\delta} \epsilon \iota \delta o s$ Bot $\omega \tau i \alpha \nu \hat{v} \nu$. Oed. had been reared in Corinth, which Soph. would regard as a better training-school than
 mentator, so far as I am aware, should have discerned that the words $\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \quad \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i s$ mean that Oed., having had a Corinthian education (where the Isthmian games, as well as the frequented locality, insured an excellent education), was better qualified than any Theban to appreciate and use the aesthetic opportunities afforded by so many grand works of art,


r383. Since it is not true that Oed. did in his $\dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\alpha}$ require all men to thrust out ( $\omega \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu)$ one of the race of Laius, and since the transference of the
 sense to the whole passage, it seems the merest perversity to insist on retaining what is manifestly bad and false. What can be more suitable inthe mouth of Oed. here than this question: 'How could I, who in my own person have entailed such foul disgrace on the family of Laius, have ventured to look steadily in the face the departed members of that family in the world below ? Surely I could not.' $\|$ Bentley, in his note on Hor. C. I. 3, 18 where he would read 'rectis oculis', brings a crowd of examples like
 Hor. C. ii. 2. 23, 'oculo irretorto'.
 obstructing ( $\phi \rho a \gamma \mu \delta s$ ) the fount of hearing through the ears. т $\bar{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \kappa 0 v o v o \eta s$ $\delta i \dot{\omega} \omega \tau \omega \nu \pi \eta \gamma \hat{\eta} s$, the hearing fountain, a remarkable phrase.
1387. oủк à̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi o ́ \mu \eta \nu ~ \tau \delta ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota, I$ would not have refrained from closing up; the metaphor being kept up, by which the senses are looked upon as fountains flowing from the body. The infin. frequently takes the article when it is looked upon as the subject, or, as here, the object of the main action. Also, as here, the infin. is put with the accus. of the article, where the genitive might have been expected. Ant. 778 , $\tau \epsilon \dot{\cup} \xi \epsilon \tau a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu}$. $\|$ ' $\bar{\prime}$ ' $\hat{\eta}$. In which case I should have now been \&c., $\hat{\eta}$ being evidently the imperfect in sense. "I $\nu a$, in which case, is thus used with the indicative of a past tense to express what zoould have happened if \&c.; the imperfect being used as here, when the result is present, the aorist or pluperfect when it is past. $\dot{\omega} s, o ̈ \pi \omega s$, and ö ó $\rho a$ have the same construction as iva. Elmsley in his note correctly observes that the preceding clause must intimate not a thing that has taken place, but a thing that ought to have taken place. It can also be rendered as if final, that $I$ might now have been (or be) \&c. Other examples of this constr. are: in poetry with iva, E. Hipp. 647-9; with ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$, Ae. Pr. $75^{\mathrm{I}-3}$; A. Pax, ${ }^{1} 3^{6-7}$; with $\omega^{6}$, E. Hipp. $9^{25-7}$, ro79-8o. Many occur in Plato and K. OE.

Demosth．，all with iva．See Kühner Gr．Gr．§ 553．\｜it $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \phi \rho o \nu \tau i \delta^{\circ}$ к．г． ．，that thought should dwell outside of miseries is a sweet consolation． He means that his senses would not have had the power of aggravating his misfortunes．





 For similar instances of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ placed after its verb see $255^{\circ}$ O．C． $1365^{-}$ Phil． 67,653 ．El．993．But it must be noted that this can happen only when $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is attracted to some word（after the verb）on which it has to throw its emphasis，as here to $\pi o \tau \epsilon ́$, in 255 to $\theta \epsilon \dot{\eta} \lambda \alpha \tau \sigma \nu$ ，in Phil． 67 to $\tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau \alpha$ ，in 653 to $\tau \mu$ ，in El．to $\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ ．\｜$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \alpha \nu \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \nu \theta \epsilon \nu$ ．see 15 ．

1394．$\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \iota a$ $\lambda_{o ́ \gamma \varphi, ~ b y ~ r e p o r t ~ m y ~ f a t h e r ' s . ~ \pi a ́ \tau \rho l o s ~ h a s ~ b o t h ~ s e n s e s, ~}^{\text {a }}$ patrius and paternus；the former clearly in Ant．806，Phil．1213；the latter
 the same as $\pi \dot{a} \tau \rho \iota o s$ ，because in fact our country，or native land or city （ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \iota o s$ ）is also the abode of our father and ancestors，$\pi \alpha \tau \rho \not \hat{\varphi} o s$ ．But $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \iota o s$
 Thuc．viii．6）or $\pi a \tau \rho \hat{\text { onos．Matthiae on E．Hec．} 78 \text { thus corrects Porson＇s }}$ observation that the Attics used $\pi \dot{a} \tau \rho \iota o s$ and $\pi a \tau \rho \hat{\not o s}$ promiscuously．It is worth remarking perhaps that，while $\pi a \tau \rho \hat{\varphi} o s$ is used very frequently by all three tragic poets，$\pi \dot{a} \tau \rho l o s$ is scarcely used a dozen times by Eurip．，less often still by Soph．，and only once by Aesch．Ag．1157，and that $\pi a \tau \rho \kappa \kappa \grave{s}$ is only used once by any of them in Eurip．Ion I 304．\｜oiov ápá $\mu \mathrm{\epsilon}$ ．See Aj． $3^{6} 7$ ，oì $\mu 0 九 \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \omega \tau \sigma$ ，oîo $\nu \dot{v} \beta \rho i \sigma \theta \eta \nu a ̈ \rho a$ ．
 The genitive как $\hat{\nu} \nu$ depends upon ü $\pi o u \lambda o s$, as $83, \pi o \lambda v \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \eta े s ~ \delta a ́ \phi \nu \eta s$ ． vinounos is said of an unhealed wound beneath a scar．

1399．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \omega \pi \delta$ s，properly an adjective．$\sigma \tau$ ．sc．òós，narrow pass，glen．
1400．$\tau 0 \dot{1} \mu o ̀ \nu ~ a i \mu a ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s, ~ t h e ~ b l o o d ~ o f ~ m y ~ f a t h e r ~ s h e d ~ b y ~ m e . ~ S e e ~ 1375 . ~$


1401－3．If with Nauck，myself，and others， $\begin{gathered}\text { 分 } \tau \iota \\ \text { be read here，or if } \tau \iota \text { be }\end{gathered}$ read with J．and others，the constr．is simple and easy．But if ö $\tau \iota$ ，the r．of codd．，be kept，a very unpleasing anacoluthic constr．is the result．\｜$\vec{\omega} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \mu 0$ ：， $\gamma{ }^{\alpha} \mu o c$ ．On the use of plur．for sing．Wolff cites Longinus $\S 23$ ，光 $\sigma \theta^{\prime}$ ov

 ＇Іока́бт

1405-6. àveite. In the plural of the aor. 2 of the compounds of in $\mu$, and especially in the middle voice, the Attics instead of $\epsilon$ more commonly use $\epsilon \iota$, which is regarded as the augment. \| к $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon \ell \xi a \tau \epsilon \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. The last words $\nu \dot{v} \mu \phi a s ~ \gamma u v a i ̂ \kappa a s ~ \mu \eta \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ c l e a r l y ~ r e f e r ~ t o ~ o n l y ~ o n e ~ p e r s o n, ~$ Jocasta. It would therefore seem most probable that the corresponding terms in the preceding verse refer to Oedipus alone; and then the meaning must be: you have combined in one person the relation of father, brother and son, and in one person also, those of bride, wife, and mother. The sense thus required for $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta e i \kappa \nu v \mu l$, cause, bring to pass, render, with two accusatives, is very frequent in Xenophon as well as elsewhere. But the difficulty lies in $a \neq \mu^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \phi v^{\prime} \lambda \iota o \nu$, to which violence must be done, to force it into the sense required. We must therefore render it more plainly; you have produced fathers, brothers, sons, mingled of one race, brides, wives and mothers; in other words, you have produced confusion or mixture in the relationship of father, brother and son, and of bride, wife and mother: the plural in the second line, where Jocasta alone is meant, arising from the use of that number in the previous line, where probably all the different persons in the family are alluded to, who bore to each other the relations mentioned.
1409. à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ov $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. but since Evc. Cp. with the sentiment Isocr.
 IV. Іо, кри́лт Sentent. 792, quod facere turpe est, dicere ne honestum puta. Cp. Phil. 86.

 afraid (of contracting pollution from my touch), for my misery no mortal save myself is able to bear. Musgr. Thyestes (Enn., ap. Cic. Tusc. III. 12, 26 cited by N.) says 'nolite, hospites, ad me adire, ne contagio mea bonis obsit: tanta vis sceleris in corpore haeret'.
 demand's, here is Creon coming to meet the present need, action and advice. It is a mistake to say that $\tau \dot{\partial}$ stands for $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$. The gen. $\hat{\omega_{\dot{\omega}} \nu}$ is either of general relation, dep. on $\delta \epsilon \in \nu$, or perhaps it is partitive in character, referred to the verbs $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon t \nu$ and $\beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu$ (as to some of your demands).

1420-1. tis Moı фaveîtal $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ èvঠıкos; what fair claim to confidence shall I find? for this use of míбтıs cp. Aesch. Fragm. oủk à $\nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ 8 \rho к о \iota ~$ $\boldsymbol{\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta \partial^{\prime} \rho \omega \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho$, a noble sentiment, which might have been aptly quoted in some parliamentary debates. \| $\pi$ ávza кaкós, utterly unjust.

1424-31. I would not move these lines, as Nauck does: but the transition is certainly violent : and one is tempted to suspect the loss of a line or two of courteous preface addressed to the Chorus.
 т $\rho \in ́ \phi o \nu \tau o s$ ' $\mathrm{H} \lambda i o v \chi$ đovòs фúбiv.


 $\sigma o ̀ v ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu \lambda u \gamma \rho \hat{\varphi} \gamma \dot{\eta} \rho \underline{a} \pi \rho o \lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega \nu$. \| ä $\gamma o s$. Elmsley writes it ä $\gamma o s$. See 92 I, note. Its proper sense of a crime requiring expiation must be changed here into the person guilty of such a crime; a common use of the abstract for the concrete, as it is called.
1428. ö $\mu \beta \rho o s$ iєpós. ờ $\mu \beta \rho o s$ is properly rain, but here the element of water. The Greeks deemed the elements sacred.

1430-I. If here we do not read with Dobree $\mu$ óvoss for $\mu \dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$, I cannot think with Nauck that it can be supplied from $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu o u s \tau \epsilon$ in $\mathbf{1 4 3 1}$; for besides the grammatical harshness, $\mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ thus becomes nonsensical, referred, as it must be, to $\tau 0 i \hat{s} \epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \gamma^{\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \iota}$, for I utterly reject the reference of it to $\epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \beta \omega \bar{s} \epsilon_{\chi} \chi \epsilon \iota$. See 44-5. I am therefore obliged to render : for it is the pious function of kindred especially to see, and alone to hear, the woes of their kin; supposing that Soph. allows that other than kin must sometimes see such sufferers, but ought never to hear the expression of their anguish.

1432-4. $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta o s \mu$ ' $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \pi a \sigma a s$, hast deceived my expectation (or, hast relieved me from anxiety, lit. hast torn me from) : see 77 I . $\|$ äpıoros к. $\tau . \lambda$. by coming, a most noble man, to me a very vile one: note the absence of articles. $\| \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma o \hat{v}$, in thy interest.
1435. каl то仑̂ $\mu \epsilon$ रрєias, к.т.入. And what desire dost thou thus earnestly beg of me that thou mayest obtain? Cp. S. O. C. 1755, tivos, $\dot{\omega}$ $\pi a \hat{\delta} \delta \epsilon s$, र $\rho \epsilon i a s \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{v} \sigma a l$; with this use of the infin. cp. Od. $\lambda^{\prime} .530$, $\dot{o} \delta \epsilon \in \epsilon$

 $\lambda a \beta \epsilon i ̂ v$, und. aürós. Tac. Ann. I. I5, petivere ut ederent ludos. II. 8i. III. 72.
1437. $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu o ́ s . ~ \mu \grave{\eta}$ instead of ov is determined by the indef. ö $\pi o v$, ' wherever'. The same reason holds good in 1409, 1412, $\mathbf{1 4 2 7}$. $\| \pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\eta}$ roopos may be act. or pass. : reference to 238 seems to make the latter more proper here, =where nobody shall be seen to accost me. Meineke's r. Өavô̂ual is specious.
1438. $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \rho \alpha \sigma^{\prime}$ ă $\nu, \ldots . . . a^{2} \nu, I$ should have done it, be well assured I should $\left(\alpha^{\prime} \nu\right)$. J. says 'join $\tau o \hat{v} \tau o$ with $\imath \sigma \theta \iota$, it could not here go with ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \rho a \sigma a$ '. Such an hyperbaton seems to me not at all inconsistent with Sophoclean style; roûto may be taken with ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \theta \iota$; but it is not certain.
1440. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \delta \eta \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \theta \eta$, was fully declared: $\phi \dot{\tau} \tau \stackrel{\prime}{ }=\phi \dot{a} \mu a 475$.
1444. oütcs. As edd. are generally agreed, when they notice this word, in joining it with $\dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda \hat{i} o v, a \operatorname{man}$ so wretched, I am afraid to gainsay them : yet it seems to me that Soph. might have left no doubt by writing
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \partial_{s} \gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ov̈ $\tau \omega s$ ，and that vill ye then make such（so solemn）an inquiry concerning a miserable man？would be equally strong sense．

1445．каi $\gamma$ àp к．т．入．Yes：for now indeed thou wilt put faith in the god．$\tau \dot{a} \nu$ for $\tau o \iota \dot{a} \nu$ ．At first sight these words seem cruelly ironical． But Oed．is so abjectly humble，that he is amazed by finding his case held worthy of a solemn inquiry at Delphi．Creon therefore reassures him by adding，as a further motive，his conviction that Oed．will no longer question the wisdom of obeying the oracle，after so terrible an experience of its infallibility．See El． $735 \tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau i \sigma \tau \iota \nu \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$ ．

1446－8．кai бoi $\gamma$＇к．т．入．Yes：and to thee $I$ address this charge，and will entreat thee：$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \bar{\pi} \omega$ and $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \rho \xi \pi о \mu a \iota$ are equally used in the sense of supplicating．See Lection．\｜Tá申ov tomb for taфウ̀̀ funeral．\｜$\theta o \hat{v}$ take on



1449－50．$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi o \tau^{\prime}$ a $\xi_{\iota} \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$ ，be ne＇er judged deserving $=$ never be re－ quired．Aj．494，$\mu \dot{\eta} \mu^{\prime} \dot{a} \xi \iota \omega \sigma \eta s \beta a \dot{\xi} \iota \nu \dot{a} \lambda \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda a \beta \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ．The rule of gram－ marians that the prohibitive $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is only used with the present tense of the imperative mood，and with the aorist of the subjunctive，applies only to the second，and not to the first and third persons．But with these persons there is the same distinction also as with the second in the employment of the present and aorist tenses；the present with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ being used of that which we are doing and ought to leave off doing，and the aorist of that which we are not doing and ought not to do now or at any other time．This distinc－ tion may be seen in the following passages．Hom．Il．$\lambda^{\prime} .435, \mu \eta \kappa \epsilon \in \tau \iota \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$



 $\tau \epsilon \tau v \mu \mu \epsilon \in \nu o s$, let all cease to invoke．But Prom．ıоо1，$\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \epsilon \tau \omega \sigma \epsilon \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \pi o \theta^{\prime}$ ，
 $\delta 0 \kappa \eta \sigma \dot{\partial} \tau \omega \tau \iota \nu \prime$ ， $1040, \mu \eta \delta \delta^{\epsilon} \tau \psi \delta \delta \xi \eta \pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ ，the imper．and subj．moods being used in these two last passages with the same meaning，the tense being the same．The 3 rd person of the aorist imper．is also found in Ae．Pr．332，$\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma a ́ \tau \omega$ ．Suppl． $587, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \omega$ ．E．Tro．1049，$\epsilon i \sigma \beta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$ and in this passage $\dot{\alpha} \xi \iota \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$ ．The subj．however occurs much more frequently than the imper．，especially in prose．But even with respect to the second person the precept of the grammarians does not hold inviolably，as will appear probable，when we inquire into the reason of the idiom．The fact is that the subj．$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi o \iota \eta \sigma \eta s$ is the form of fearing，and is employed generally for the form of forbidding $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi o i \eta \sigma o \nu$ ，because usually we only warn a person not to attempt to do anything when we are afraid that he will do it ：but the subj．is not used to the entire exclusion of the imper．

 S．Pel．fr．$\mu \dot{\eta} \nu o ́ \mu \iota \sigma o \nu$ ．But $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi o \imath \hat{\eta} s$ is not used for $\mu \eta \eta^{\pi o \prime} \epsilon \iota$ ，because it would be absurd to say that we are afraid lest a person should do something which we see him actually doing．The imper．having no first person，the subj．of exhortation is used，which is peculiar to that person．See 49， $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ．In the case of the the third person，if we employ the imper． we invariably forbid，if the subj．，we express our fear only and not our wish．This is the sum of Hermann＇s excellent note on S．Aj． 1085 ，каi $\mu \grave{\eta}$ $\delta_{0 \kappa \omega}^{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．

145 1．$\neq a$ ，a monosyllable here，as also O．C． 1 192，Ant． 95 ，E．Ion，
 $\kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \zeta \epsilon \tau a \iota ~ o u ́ \mu \partial े s ~ K . ~ o u ̃ t o s, ~ l i t e r a l l y, ~ w h e r e ~ t h a t ~ C i t h a e r o n ~ o f ~ m i n e ~ i s ~ r e n o w n e d, ~$ i．e．where Cithaeron is situate，renowned by my fortunes．

1453．宅白 $\sigma \theta \eta \nu$ кúpıov，determined，appointed，destined．The middle may perhaps give the additional meaning in their own minds．\｜$\zeta \omega \hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon$ ， while they lived．I now think the arguments valid in favour of this ms． reading against Toup＇s specious conj．$\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$ ．

1454－7．of $\mu^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi \omega \lambda \lambda \dot{\prime} \tau \eta \nu$ ，who meant to kill me．The present and imperfect tenses of verbs are frequently used thus to express not so much an action as an intention or purpose．So O．C．993，ктєlvol should wish to slay．E．Or．ir99，$\kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ．This is very usual in prose as well as in verse．See Buttmann on Dem．Meid．§ 23 E．\｜｜à̀ $\pi \epsilon \in \rho \sigma a l$ ，will destroy．\｜ $\theta \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$ ，when on the point of perishing，$\mu \dot{\eta} ' \pi i \tau \psi \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\varphi} \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\psi}$ ，unless for some dire ill．

1460．$\mu \eta^{\prime} \mu o \iota \pi \rho o \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\rho} \rho \iota \mu \nu a \nu$, take upon thee no anxiety，I pray．$\mu o \iota$ ， ethic dative．

1463．aiv oṽ $\pi \circ \theta^{\prime}$ к．т．$\lambda$. ，apart from whom my dinner－table（ $\beta$ opâs т $\quad$ ár $\epsilon \zeta a)$ ne＇er was set without ny bidding：i．e．never but on special occasions， by my own direction．For this use of $\alpha \nu \epsilon v$ ，without adopting which every attempt to explain these words is merely absurd，see Ae．Suppl．392，oúк ávєv

 חarpòs $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ．I have found numerous instances in Thuc．and the orators． See Thuc．i．128，viii． 89 ，Dem．\＆c．ăv $\nu v \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$（several times），ă $\nu \epsilon v$ aúrov， $a ̈ \nu \epsilon v^{\prime} A \theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu, \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．When Oed．received a party of male guests at a ban－ quet，he would order the meal of his daughters to be laid elsewhere than in the banquet－hall：but on all other occasions his daughters dined with him．

1466．тaîע $\mu_{0 \iota} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，of them I pray thee to take care．Infin．for imper．So Ae．Prom． 711 ，ois $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \lambda a ́ \zeta \epsilon \nu$ ．See note on 462 and Lection．
 кїтоклаи́бабөaı тúxas．
1469. 'ं $\gamma o \nu \hat{n} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu a i ̂ \epsilon$, 'noble by birth.' O truly noble Sir. Opposed to this we have Aj . ro94, $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\jmath} \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ rovaî $\iota \nu$. There is probably an allusion to the contrast presented by himself as $\phi u{ }^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \nu$ ou $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ II 84 and $\dot{a} \nu \sigma \sigma i \omega \nu$ $\tau \varepsilon \pi a i ̂ s 1360$.
 The Attics in particular often make the article pronouns and participles masculine before fem. nouns of the dual number. We have thus $\tau \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\omega}$ $\kappa \alpha \sigma \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega-\dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon$ in El. 977, 980 and both masc. and fem. in O.C. 1676, ióóvтє каil $\pi a \theta_{0} \hat{v} \sigma a$. In Homer also, Il. $\theta^{\prime} .455, \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \rho a v \nu \hat{\varphi}$ is
 Aidòs кal N $\epsilon$ $\mu \epsilon \sigma \iota$. Probably only one form of the dual in such words existed originally, the masc.
 thou feelest now from that old delight of thine.
1478. $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\prime} \tau u \chi o i \eta s . \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a \dot{a}$ is frequently thus used before a prayer, see 929, an entreaty, or a wish; and also before an interrogation with the sense also of an objection. Cp. Ae. Cho. 1063 , $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ єívvरoljs, кaí

 ö $\sigma \omega \nu \bar{\epsilon} \rho \hat{q} s$. $\| \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{j} \delta o \hat{u}$ in requital of thus fetching, or conducting $m y$ daughters hither. í $\delta o \hat{v}$ is used in a transitive sense, as El. ı63, $\Delta i \dot{\prime} s \in u ̈-$ $\phi \rho o \nu \iota$ ßj' $\mu a \tau \iota$, by Fove's kind guidance. It is the gen. of price depending upon the notion contained in the words $a^{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu-\tau \dot{\chi} \chi o r$. I would gladly $\operatorname{read} \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta^{\prime} \dot{\delta} \delta o \hat{v} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu$.

148 f . $\dot{\text { w }}$ (of motion) to, with case, is only used when its object is personal: and here we must consider 'the fraternal hands' of Oed. as = himself.

1482-3. ait $\boldsymbol{\text { roû...ó } \mu \mu a \tau a \text { , which caused your father's once brilliant eyes to }}$ see in such manner as they now appear to you (imiv), i. e. not to see at all. \| $\pi \rho \circ \hat{\xi} \xi \downarrow \eta \sigma a \nu . \quad \pi \rho \circ \xi \in \nu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ is properly, to receive the public guests of the state from other countries. Thus the kings of Macedon were $\pi \rho^{\prime} \xi \in \nu 0<$ of Athens. The family of Alcibiades were $\pi \rho o ́ \xi \in \nu o c$ to the state of Sparta. $\xi \in \nu 0 s$ is host or guest; so $\pi \rho^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \xi \in \nu 0 s$ is public host, or public guest. The second sense of the verb is to supply, procure, be the cause of, either good or evil; of evil, as


1484. iбтop̄̄ע, knowing. See note on 1144 .
1486. каi $\sigma \phi \grave{\omega} \delta a \kappa \rho v ́ \omega . ~ C p . ~ E . ~ P h o e n . ~ 1440-1, ~ \phi \omega \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ oủk $\dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\eta} \kappa \in \nu$,


1487-8. vooú $\mu \in \nu 0 \mathrm{~s}$, к.т.入., while $I$ think upon the future ( $\tau \grave{a}$ 入oı $\pi \dot{a}$ ) of that bitter life, oĩo $\beta \iota \hat{\omega} \nu a \iota \sigma \phi \dot{\omega} \pi \rho \delta \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi \omega \nu \chi \rho \epsilon \omega \dot{\nu}$, such as ye both will have to lead at the hands of men. The middle voice $\nu o \in i \sigma \theta a l ~ i m p l i e s ~ s e l f-~$ debate, mental reflection. $\pi \rho \rho_{s}$ is frequently thus used with intransitives
that have a passive meaning, or with sentences that involve a passive mean-
 used exactly in the same way. We have both prepositions in one line, 949,

 and in Ae. Ch. 457, 731, as 'one who has wept and retains the traces of it', wet with tears. And so most editors. It seems more probable however that it merely means weeping bitterly, without any reference to the past; and this sense suits the two passages of Aeschylus better also. This is the only perfect of $\kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, and it is used both in an active sense as here, and

1491. àv $\mathrm{a}_{i} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \theta \epsilon \omega \mathrm{pias}$, instead of (all the gladness of) the spectacle.
1492. $\pi \rho \dot{\rho}{ }^{s} \gamma^{\alpha} \mu \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu a ́ s$, to a marriageable age; plural because the two girls are in question.
 questions in one clause (see note on II44), so also, to give greater spirit to the language, they sometimes used the interrogative pronoun twice where we use the interrogative and relative. Elmsley wishes to substitute this latter form here, and to read $\tau i$ is ovitós $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ös $\pi$. But compare Theocr.
 venture $=\pi \alpha \rho a \kappa \iota \nu \delta \nu \nu \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$, will run a needless risk. $\pi a \rho a \rho \rho i \pi \tau \epsilon \nu \nu$ is here in-
 тои̂бı. We may suppose кivסvעov or кúßov understood. $\pi \alpha \rho a \rho \rho i \psi \epsilon \iota ~ \lambda a \mu \beta \alpha \dot{-}$
 as will be, taîs $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a i ̂ s ~ \gamma o v a i ̂ \sigma \iota \nu, ~ t o ~ m y ~ o f f s p r i n g, ~ \sigma \phi \hat{\psi} \nu ~ \theta^{\prime} \dot{j} \mu o \hat{v}$, and to yours alike, $\delta \eta \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a$ disasters. See Lection. $\tau \alpha i ̂ s \epsilon \epsilon \mu i ̂ s ~ \gamma o \nu a i ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ is my correction for the absurd ms. reading $\tau 0 i \hat{s} \dot{\epsilon} \mu o i ̂ s ~ \gamma o \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ : and its closeness to the vulg. as well as its suitableness of sense make me regard it as certainly true. The scandalous history of Oed. will entail disgrace on his children and on his children's children. Cóvos is not used in the plural number like roví.
 believes the whole passage to be corrupt, and conjectures $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \notin \pi \epsilon \phi \nu, \delta \delta \theta \epsilon \nu$
 would be a bold restoration; but I think it well deserves to be true.
1502. $\chi^{\prime}$ ¢ $\rho$ oovs, barren, childless; properly applied to land in the sense of untilled, uncultivated. See Ant. 251. || $\phi \theta a \rho \hat{\eta} \nu a l$, perish, waste away.
 suddenly from a narration to an address, or passes in an address from one person to another, the vocative is commonly put first: Hesiod, "E $\rho \gamma .211$, $\hat{\omega} \Pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta, \sigma \grave{v} \delta^{\prime}$ áкоvє $\delta i \kappa \eta$ s. Also with adversative particles (as here) Il.


1505. $\pi$ epiions, neglect, overlook. This word has been adopted for ms. $\pi$ api $\delta \eta$ s, from a conjecture of Dawes, by most editors. Porson on E. Med. 284, denies that the tragic poets ever admit $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ in composition before a vowel into iambic, trochaic or anapaestic verse, and even in the choric portions such license is permitted only in the case of an adjective or adverb ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota o \rho \gamma \gamma \omega s, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \omega \delta \nu \nu 0 s$ ) and that seldom, but never in the case of a verb or substantive. But perhaps Hermann is right in saying that it was not the hiatus in such words that was displeasing so much as their being used in the language of common life; and that $\pi \epsilon p u i ̈ \epsilon i \nu$ may have seemed to them less objectionable on this ground. We find it in A. Eccl. $369, \mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ $\mu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho u \delta \eta s, 1054 \mu \eta \delta a \mu \omega \hat{s} \mu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho u \delta \delta_{\eta}$. The word means to look round, whon we ought to be paying attention: and therefore, to allow a thing to be done: to neglect.
 should have expected a word of kindred signification with the others; but Erf. cp. E. Heracl. 223-5, бoi $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ тód' ai $\sigma \chi \rho o ́ \nu, \chi \omega \rho i s ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota ~ к а к o ́ \nu, ~$
 $\beta i q$. Translate, being as they are your relations. 'E $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon i s$ is properly persons of the same stock or race, and includes $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in i s$, persons of the same family. Dindorf would prefer $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon i \varsigma s, ~ a ~ w o r d ~ p e r h a p s ~ f o r m e d ~ b y ~ S o p h o c l e s, ~$

 ả $\lambda \omega \mu$ évas.
1507. $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \iota \sigma \omega \sigma \eta \mathrm{s} \tau \dot{\sigma} \sigma \delta \epsilon-\kappa а к о і \mathrm{~s}$, nor let these girls sink to the livel of my misfortunes.
1510. $\sigma \hat{\eta} \psi$ av́ $\sigma a s \chi \in \rho$. This was considered as an assurance of a promise. So E. Med. 21, à $\nu a \kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} ~ \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon \xi \iota a ̂ s ~ \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau \eta \nu, ~ o n ~ w h i c h ~ s e e ~$ Mr Verrall's note. Heracl. 307. Hel. 838.
${ }_{15} 1$ I. $\epsilon i \chi \epsilon ́ \tau \eta \nu$. Elmsley on A. Ach. 733 and E. Med. 1041 first shewed that the 2 nd and 3 rd persons dual were identical. These end in $\eta \nu$ in the indicative of the historic tenses and in the optative mood always, and in ov in the indic. of the primary tenses and in the subjunctive mood. \| $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu$
 consequent clauses is thus used for present time, or when the time is quite indefinite. Translate: if you zeve of understanding age, I would give you much advice, but now pray at my desire ( $\mu \mathrm{oc}$ eth. dat.) \&oc.
 AEI), and is adopted by most edd. Thus all the difficulty of the passage vanishes, and the sense becomes clear: that ye may live where occasion allows, and that you may obtain a life better than your father's hath been. See Lection.
1515. The metre here becomes and continues to the end trochaic
 reached in weeping; i.e. you have wept long enough.
1517. '̇' $\phi^{\prime}$ ois, on what conditions. Cp. A. Plut. 1108, oủкoû̀ '̇ $\pi i$ roú-
 єïбоца.. Plaut. Pseud. if. 2, 62, scin quid te orem, Syre? Ps. sciam, si dixeris?
 land to dwell elsewhere: äтоккоу being proleptic.
1519. $\eta_{\eta} \kappa \omega=\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ or $\bar{\xi} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, I have turned out, have proved to be. ॥ $\tau e \dot{\xi} \in \iota ~ \tau a ́ \chi a$, thou wilt soon obtain thy wish. See 1357 .
 yes, what I do not mean I am not wont to speak idly. (i.e. to waste words by saying.) J., misunderstanding $\phi \rho \circ \nu \hat{\omega}$ here, translates wrongly.

1522-3. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \ldots \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \ldots \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \dot{́} \tau \eta \sigma a s$. Such pronoun accusatives in neut. plur. would be licensed exceptions to the general rule that the verb $\kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon i \nu$ usually governs a genitive. See 54-5. But in O. C. 1380 we find excepted substantives, $\tau o \iota \gamma$ à $\rho$ т̀̀ $\sigma \grave{\nu} \nu$ $\theta$ áк $\eta \mu a$ каì $\tau o u ̀ s ~ \sigma o u ̀ s ~ \theta \rho o ́ v o u s ~ к \rho a-~$
 Two datives often depend on one verb by the grammatical $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \quad \nu$



 $\pi o \delta \hat{\omega} \nu$. Not less often two accusatives: Hom. Il. $\lambda^{\prime} .240, \tau \delta \nu \nu \delta^{\prime}$ ãopl $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \xi^{\prime}$
 cases may stand in some other relation to the first than that of $\mu \epsilon \rho o s$ to ö $\lambda o \nu$, as $\tau \hat{\varphi} \beta i \varphi$ here to $\sigma o \iota$. So Pind. Ol. viil. $83, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \pi o \iota \kappa \epsilon \nu$ K $\alpha \lambda \lambda \mu \mu a ́ \chi \varphi$
 $u \dot{\eta} \sigma o \iota \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \mu \pi o \delta \omega ̀ \nu \epsilon i \eta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \epsilon i \xi \epsilon \iota$.

1524-7. Euripides has copied these lines almost word for word at the


 v. 1526 stands in my text with üs $\tau \iota s$ for the MS. reading ö $\sigma \tau \iota s$, a change so slight as hardly to deserve the name. Rend. considered as one who never eyed jealously the aspiring hopes ( $\dot{\eta} \lambda \omega$ lit. emulation) and fortunes of the citizens. On this use of $\dot{\omega}$ see 1078 , ini8. J. has printed a verse which contains three violent changes: oṽ for ös, raîs for $\kappa a i, \bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu$ for $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$
 fortunes which of the citizens did not gaze with envy?' a complex of genitives and datives which ought not to be intruded into a work of Sophocles on any ground: least of all for the purpose of importing a sense so farfetched. See Excursus ix.

1528-30. I cannot doubt that these concluding lines of the drama
 read $\not \alpha \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \nu \nu$ : also $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \iota \nu^{\prime}$ for $\mu \eta \delta \delta^{\prime} \nu^{\prime}$. The verses will then be:



Wherefore it is better not to call any one happy who is a mortal looking onward to behold the final day, until he shall have passed the goal of life without suffering any afliction. But I am unwilling to recognise in Sophocles so strange a construction of the verb $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \kappa 0 \pi \epsilon \omega$ as we find here. I know no other instance of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, 'to look forward', and certainly none with infin. following, as $i \delta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ in this place. I therefore suspect that $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\sigma к о \pi о \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$ is the gloss of a scholiast for some other word, perhaps for $\epsilon \pi a \mu$ $\mu \notin \nu 0 \nu \tau a$, waiting. 'E $\pi a \mu \mu \notin \nu \epsilon \iota$ stands twice in Aesch. Pr. impersonally with inf.; in Aristoph. personally with acc. and inf. and with accus. alone. Hermann and Dindorf adopt $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \mu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \epsilon$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \iota$ in O. C. 1719. I should therefore consider its construction here justified, especially as its sister compound
 $\kappa \rho \iota \tau \grave{\eta} s \pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau \omega \nu \gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. Theaet. $173 \mathrm{C}, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \epsilon \iota \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota .| |$ The sentiment conveyed in these lines is one of the most trite in ancient literature. Its earliest record occurs in the words of Solon to Croesus, which Herodotus thus reports I. 32, $\sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \chi \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau o s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 $\epsilon \dot{\cup} \epsilon \sigma \tau 0 \hat{\imath}$ фì $\eta$. Ov. Met. HII. 136, ultima semper expectanda dies homini, dicique beatus ante obitum nemo supremaque funera debet. Cp. Eurip. Andr. 100, Aristot. Eth. Nic. I. 10, and many other places.

## ADDENDA.

1095. The reading $\overline{\epsilon \pi i} \hat{\eta} \rho a$, for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \eta \rho a$, is adopted by J . who follows Buttmann, Lexil. $\hat{\eta} \rho a$. The case is this: $\hat{\eta} \rho a \phi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ stands in Hom. four times, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \eta \rho a \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ twice. Is this a tmesis, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \hat{\eta} \rho a \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, or is $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \eta \rho o s$ an adj.? It is certain that many ancients took it as an adj.: for as such it was used by Emped., Apoll. R. and others. Why not by Soph.? All the lexicographers take this view, Passow, L. and S., Ell., Dind. : and I do not feel myself at liberty to oppose them.
1096. Euripides, by the mouth of Theseus, describes the wretchedness of a rupavis, as compared with a free commonwealth, in his Supplices, 429 , ov̇ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau v \rho a ́ \nu \nu o v \delta \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \pi \dot{\delta} \lambda \epsilon t$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.

## EXCURSUS I.

## THE TRAGIC DRAMA AT ATHENS.

§ i. The dramatic contests at Athens were not, like the stage plays at Rome, and those of modern nations, mere popular amusements. They belonged to religious cult. Their tutelar was the jocund and widely-worshipped Theban deity Dionysus or Bacchus. They were held in theatres dedicated to him, and at his festivals : first at the Feast of the Wine-press ( $\lambda \hat{\eta} \nu 0 s$ ) called the Lenaea, when the new wine of the last autumn was first tapped in the month Gamelion (January), afterwards also, and chiefly, at the greater Dionysia ( $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \alpha \sigma \tau v$ ), which began on the 8th day of Elaphebolion (March). When the theatre of Dionysus was built on the southern slope of the Hill of the Acropolis, about 500 b.c., the Thymele (altar of Bacchus) was placed in the centre of its orchestra, and its presidential chair was occupied by the priest of Dionysus Eleuthereus.

The exact site of that theatre was discovered and its remains brought to light in 1862 by the German architect Strack. The seats of the spectators thus laid bare in the solid rock are stated by Guhl and Köner to be in about one hundred rows, divided into thirteen kerkides (cunei) by means of fourteen staircases. The lowest row contains sixty-seven arm-chairs, shown by their inscriptions to have been appropriated to priests, archons, thesmothetae and other dignitaries, the central one especially, decorated with bas-reliefs, for the priest of Bacchus. The wall of the Proscenium also contains basreliefs, and was erected by the archon Phaedrus, perhaps in the 3 rd century A.D. The earlier proscenium of the Sophoclean age undoubtedly stood much farther to the south, affording a larger orchestra for the choral action.
§ 2. The orchestra corresponded, so far as relative situation is concerned, to the pit of modern theatres. But its purpose and use were different. Its floor, when empty, was called кoví $\tau \rho a$, being strewn with sand (кól $\boldsymbol{\prime}$ ). But in earlier times it was used for exhibitions of dancing in the
dithyrambic contests; and from that ancient practice it gained the name o $\rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \rho a$, dancing-hall. For dancing exhibitions it was boarded over its whole space or nearly so; but the floor thus constructed was naturally low. When prepared for dramatic contests it took a different aspect. Vitruvius likens it to a circle containing an inscribed square. The upper circumference of such circle would be the frontal diazoma of the Koilon (cavea) or spectators' seats : while the southern side of the square (say $A B$, the chord of a quadrant) would form (produced) with the tangent parallel to it a parallelogram approximately showing the acting-ground of the drama, the $\Sigma_{\kappa \eta \nu \grave{\eta}}$ with its appurtenances. This would leave for the orchestra a segment of $270^{\circ}$; but the Koilon was not continued on either side to $A B$ : spaces (say of six feet) were left for the two passages ( $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \rho o \delta o t$ ) which admitted the spectators, and through one of which (the western) the Chorus entered to reach its platform. This platform, a wooden temporary (?) erection, extended from the central thymele to the proscenium, being about two feet in height below it. The two were connected by steps : and other steps, we believe, elsewhere rose from the $\kappa \frac{\nu}{} / \sigma \tau \rho a$ to the stage.
§ 3. The term $\Sigma_{\kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}}$, scene, is loosely used in common parlance. Literally it means 'tent', and (according to Guhl and Köner) its use dates 'probably from the time when at the back of the orchestra a scaffolding was erected, from which the actors entered as from a kind of tent'. Afterwards the expression, say they, came to mean 'the whole stage-building', more properly called 'Scenarium' or $\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \eta \nu i \kappa \alpha ́$. In its narrowest sense it was the back wall of the stage. In this latter well-defined sense let us now speak of it.

The discovered rudera of ancient Greek theatres give a very clear idea of the Koilon. Also the orchestra, and its parodoi, are sufficiently intelligible; while the choral platform, though not represented by any remains (being, as we suppose, a wooden temporary erection), is pretty well understood, partly from Vitruvius and other ancient writers, partly because its manifest purposes suggest the means taken to satisfy them. But, as respects the Scenarium (if we may so call the parallelogram mentioned), though we have much accurate information on many points, supported by the general relations between its now vacant space and the Orchestra and Koilon which it confronted, yet the want of rudera leaves other points in the dark, and open to conjecture.

It is, then, a well-established fact, that the ancient Greek theatres did possess that which in the narrowest sense came to be known as $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$, a permanent stone wall, so constructed and divided, as to be adaptable, by means of manifold decorations and machinery, to the scenic requirements of various dramas. The space between this $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$, so decorated and manipulated for dramatic action, and the frontal line $(A B)$ of the stage, was called 'pros-
cenium', within the limits of which the action took place. By the term入ofeiov is to be understood that part of the proscenium in which dialogue was held between the actors present on the stage, and also between any of them and the Chorus on its platform. That is to say, the $\lambda o \gamma \epsilon i o \nu$ was the portion of the proscenium which satisfied the three conditions of being (1) equidistant between $A$ and $B:(2)$ adjoining to the front of the stage where it rose above the choral platform: (3) extensive enough for the relative positions of three actors, as, for instance, in Epeisodia 3 and 4 of Oed. Tyr. By these conditions alone, and in no other way was it distinguished from the rest of the proscenium, which was as long in front as the line $A B$, and at the back as long (in this play) as the decorated $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$ which represented the front of the royal palace at Thebes, flanked by the two Periactoi, Western and Eastern, beside which were passages for those who came (W.) from the city, (E.) from other places. Of these we shall speak later on.
§ 4. What other portions of the stage-buildings (scenarium) were of a permanent kind, besides the $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$, there seems to be no definite certainty: and it may well be supposed that different theatres were differently constituted in this respect, and much of change must have occurred in the centuries succeeding 400 b.c. As to the Athenian theatre of that date, it seems highly probable, that, besides the machinery and decorations, some portions also of the buildings, being moveable woodwork, were kept in a public depôt, for the use of the choregoi and didascaloi during the few months of each year in which they were required for rehearsals ( $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda i a \iota$ ) and finally for the competitive performances in Elaphebolion. We may however believe with assurance that the $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$ and the parodoi were connected by permanent mural structures included under the term $\pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu a$, also that a permanent wall having doors, and in height below the proscenium if not the choral platform, divided the stage from the orchestra, thus corresponding with the imaginary line $A B$. But I do not know that any rudera define the extent and character of these structures. The flooring of the proscenium must have been wooden, and as such, moveable, though perhaps rarely, if ever, moved except for repair. The cavity beneath it was called $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi о \sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu \iota \nu$, and was no doubt very useful in dramatic action, as now. It contained $\kappa \lambda i \mu a \kappa \epsilon s$ (stairs), and much of the stage machinery must have been kept here under state protection. When choruses were assigned by the " $A \rho \chi \omega \nu$ to the choregoi, these properties would be entrusted to their charge under due regulations; and the $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o \iota$, or contending poets, would have the use of them for training the actors and choreutai in rehearsals. As to the assembling and dressing-rooms for the performers I know not that we are well-informed. Perhaps they were temporary wooden sheds, erected by the choregoi each year. See thearticles Archon, Choregus, Chorus, Tragoedia in Smith's Dictionary of Classical Antiquities.
§ 5. In treating of dramatic action in the Greek theatre the able guidance of Karl Otfried Müller and Theodor Bergk will now be followed.

Its most characteristic feature was the chorus. When it passed from lyric to dramatic poetry the chorus underwent a change of form. In the lyric or dithyrambic contests it was an independent body of fifty dancers and singers, who danced singing in the orchestra round the central altar of Bacchus, the Thymele. Hence the lyric choruses and contests were called ки́клıo. When it became dramatic, it was dependent on the action of the stage, and interested in what passed there. It therefore fronted the stage. Old grammarians speak of its form as quadrangular: i.e. so arranged that the dancers ( $\chi$ орєutai) standing in their regular places in rows and groups ( $\sigma$ ríxoc or $\sigma \tau o \imath ̂ \chi o \iota$, j' $\gamma$ a) formed right angles rank and file. In this form the chorus marched through the wide mápoios to the stairs of its platform, where it arranged itself between the thymele and the stage in straight lines. Müller's opinion is that the whole number of $\chi o \rho \epsilon u \tau a i$ at the service of the choregoi was 48 , (two of the original 50 being dispensed with); and that these in the Aeschylean age were divided into four groups of 12 each, for of this number the dramatic chorus then consisted, being afterwards increased by Sophocles to $15{ }^{1}$. The places taken on the platform by the choral dancers were determined by the previous rehearsals. They were so arranged as to give the audience the most favourable view of the chorus, and to bring forward the handsomest and best-dressed dancers. The tragic style of dancing was called $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota a$, and it is described as the most grave and solemn of the public dances. The dialogue of the Chorus with the actors was conducted by its speaker (корифaios, i.e. head-man or head-woman) who alone spoke, though all sang in their turn, as belonging to one or the other semi-chorus.
§6. The spectators looked over the choral platform to the proscenium where the actors stood, and so discerned the relation between these and the chorus. The actors belonged to the old mythic world : and their aspect, determined by size and dress, bespoke something mightier than humanity. The chorus belonged to the people; and their part was to show the impression made by the incidents of the drama on commoner minds, thus interpreting them to the audience, with whom they owned a more kindred

[^6]nature. The form of the proscenium, exceedingly long, but of little depth, was founded on the artistic taste of the ancients, and influenced their dramatic action remarkably. As the sculpture of the Greeks delighted in the long lines of figures shown on their pediments and friezes, so the actors
 stood in long rows on the narrow stage. Persons from a distance were never seen advancing from the back, but from the side, whence they had to move for some distance before they could converse with those on the $\lambda_{o \gamma \epsilon i} \boldsymbol{\nu}$. See Creon's approach and entrance in Oed. Tyr. 78, \&c. The $\Sigma_{\kappa \eta \nu \grave{\eta}}$ was dressed and divided so as to represent the dwelling of the chief personage, as the palace of Oedipus in our play. It might represent a camp with the hero's tent, as in the Ajax ; a scene of wood and rock witl a cave, as in the Philoctetes, a temple, as in the Ion of Euripides. But in every case the front is all that is shown, not the interior. If that front is a palace, besides the central or royal door, there are two others: one (W.) to guest-chambers, the other (E.) to some part not soon gained by the chief door, as a shrine, or prison, or women's apartments.

In those days and in Greek life, everything important passed in open air or in the view of men. Even social meetings were held in public halls and agorai, rather than in private rooms. This made it proper that the action of the drama should come forth from the interior. Hence the heroes give utterance to their thoughts in the court outside their houses; and the choreutai assemble, like friends or neighbours, to sympathize or advise. Nor was even the performance of choral dances in such spots at variance with Greek usage. The sides of the stage and orchestra had an established significance. Any one entering by a W. passage was understood to come from the city, or, if by an E. passage, from the country or from afar.
§ 7. In the infancy of the drama a single actor was detached from the chorus, and made by Thespis and Phrynichus to represent in succession all the persons of the piece, and, with the chorus, to conduct the whole action. Aeschylus (as we have said) added a second actor, and Sophocles a third. On the relations of these three great stress was laid : they were distinguished as protagonist, deuteragonist, and tritagonist. Plotinus observes that the poet ( $\delta \delta \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o s$ ) does not create these, but only assigns to each actor his proper part. The protagonist usually gives name to the play; though not always. In six of the Sophoclean plays it is so: Oedipus (twice), Antigone, Ajax, Electra, Philoctetes: the 7 th is called from its chorus, Trachiniae: it had been better named Deianeira. So Prometheus, Medea, Alcestis, Hecuba, Ion, and others. The person whose passion and fate rivet the chief sympathy of the audience, like Oedipus, is the protagonist. It was an invariable rule that he should never enter or leave the stage through either of the side doors.
K. OE.

The $\delta \epsilon u \tau \epsilon \rho a \gamma \omega \nu l \sigma \tau a l$ in the Oed. Tyr. are, the Priest of Zeus, Jocasta, Shepherd, and Exangelos: the $\tau \rho \iota \tau a \gamma \omega \nu i \sigma \tau a \iota$ Creon, Teiresias, Corinthian Messenger. If we suppose Creon to have changed his travelling for his ciric attire after v. I50, then to have slipt over this the seer's mantle and assumed the mask of a blind old man, before v. 300 , discarding these and resuming his civic mask again before $\mathbf{5 1 2}$, there is no difficulty in supposing this cast of characters for the three actors.
§ 8. Ancient tragedy seldom needed changes of scene. Actions such as the suicide of Jocasta and the self-blinding of Oedipus are imagined as passing behind the scene and are only related on the stage. Hence the frequency of messengers and heralds. The reason was not only that assigned by Horace, that bloody spectacles and monstrous events are too horrible to appear on the stage, but also one far deeper, that it is never the outward act with which the interest of tragedy is most closely bound up. The action which forms the basis of all ancient tragedy is inward and spiritual : the reflections, resolutions, feelings, the mental or moral phenomena, which can be expressed in speech, are developed on the stage. For outward action the epic form, narration, is the appropriate vehicle. Battles, single combats, murders, suicides, and the like, all things belonging to strength of hand, pass elsewhere, even where they might with little difficulty be acted on the stage. Exceptions, such as the chasing of Prometheus, and the suicide of Ajax, are more apparent than real, and serve to confirm the general rule: for it is the psychological state of these characters that leads to the exhibition of their misfortunes. Moreover the costume of tragic actors, which fitted them for declamation, unsuited them for action. Their heightened and padded figures would have had an awkward, almost a ludicrous effect, in combat or other violent gesticulation. The complete change of scenic decorations, so usual in the modern theatre, was first effected at Rome by the 'scena ductilis et versilis'. At Athens all changes needed were wrought by means of the Periactoi, already mentioned, at each end of the $\Sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$. These were usually in the form of a triangular prism, which turned round rapidly and presented three different painted surfaces. On the E. side, where foreign parts were represented, they afforded at each turn a different perspective view, while on the home or city side some single near object alone was changed.
§9. It was occasionally necessary to place before the spectator a scene confined to the interior of the house: for instance, when the phase and the idea of the piece required what is called a tragic situation, that is, a vivid picture, in which a whole series of affecting images are brought together. Scenes of this tremendous power are that in which Clytaemnestra with the bloody axe stands over the bodies of Agamemnon and Cassandra, holding the garment in which she has entangled her unfortunate husband; and
that in the Choephori, where Orestes is seen on the same spot, and the same bathing robe now covers the bodies of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra. Or again, in the tragedy of Sophocles, where Ajax, standing among the beasts he has slaughtered in his frenzy, taking them for Achaian chiefs, now, plunged in deep melancholy, contemplates the work of his madness. It is, in these cases, not the act alone at the time of execution, but the circumstances arising fronı the accomplishment of that act, which occupy the feelings and meditations of the chorus and the audience. To bring on the stage groups such as these (in the choice and disposal of which we recognise the plastic genius of the age which produced a Pheidias) and to bring into view interiors hidden behind the scenes, were employed machines called $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \dot{\kappa} \kappa \lambda \eta \mu a$ (the out-roller) and $\epsilon \xi \xi \sigma \tau \rho a$ (the out-pusher), the exact application of which is very obscurely reported, though the effects are known ${ }^{1}$. Machinery also for raising figures from the $i \pi \sigma o \sigma \kappa \eta_{\nu}, \nu$, for imitating thunder and lightning, for wafting actors or chariots through the air, belonged to the age of the three great tragic poets. In the Prometheus of Aeschylus we find winged cars and strange hippogryphs transporting Oceanus and his daughter to the tragic scene on Caucasus.
§ ı. The songs of the Chorus have a determinate influence on the whole tragedy. The song sung by the Chorus while advancing through the side entrance into the orchestra and moving towards its platform, was called Parodos: it might be finished after reaching the platform. But a subsequent song, when the Chorus was settled in its place, and the drama in progress, was called Stasimon. The Parodos used often to open with anapaests, but Sophocles follows this custom in the Ajax only. It usually explains the motive for the appearance of the Chorus, and its interest in the business of the drama, so far as yet known, while the stasima develop that interest in the various forms which the progress of the drama causes it to assume. As the chorus generally represents the ideal spectator, whose views were to guide and control the assembled people, so was it the province of the stasimon, amidst the tumult of the action to maintain that composure which the Greeks deemed essential to the perfection of art, and to divest the action of the accidental and personal elements, in order to place in clearer light its inward meaning and the thoughts which lay beneath the surface. Stasima therefore intervene at certain pauses in the plot: and they have the further merit of affording to the

[^7]actors time for changes of costumes and masks. In this manner the songs of the complete Chorus divide the tragedy into certain parts, which may be compared to the 'acts' of modern plays: and the Greeks called that part which went before the Parodos by the title Prologos; the parts between the choral songs, Epeisodia : the part after the last stasimon, Exodos. No numerical rule limits the development of these several parts: their length and arrangement, also the number of epeisodia, admit of great variety, dependent on the plots and characters. This will be manifest to those who compare the Oed. C. with the Oed. Tyr., or the Antigone with the Philoctetes.
§ 11. The Epeisodia (with Prologos and Exodos) contain the dialogue, which is conducted usually in iambic trimeters; at rare intervals, in trochaic tetrameters catalectic. They are liable to be occasionally interrupted by lyric interludes of various kinds. That called Commos or Commation takes the name (which means a 'wailing') from having originally been used in lamentation over the dead. In its actual use it often is a lament; but it may also be an expression of some lively sympathy, or an eager endeavour to prevail on some person for a good purpose.
 play. Lyrical interludes called $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta} s$ are those in which an actor speaks in lyric measures, and they are usually, but not necessarily, sad complaints. Such are those which Oedipus speaks in this drama 1313-66. The tragic poets have also interspersed separate smaller choral songs, depicting joyous or enthusiastic feeling. They are called by ancient writers $\dot{i \pi} \pi \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau a$ hyporchemes, because they were accompanied with more animated and expressive dancing than the usual grave $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon a$. Stasimon iii. at 1086, is a hyporcheme of this kind. The arrangement of dialogue in the Epeisodia exemplifies that studious attention to symmetry which distinguishes Greek art. The opinions and desires which come into conflict are as it were poised in the balance throughout, till at last some weighty decision is thrown into one of the scales. Hence the frequent scenes (as in this play $532-630$ ) so artfully contrived that verse answers to verse ( $\sigma \tau \iota \chi \circ \mu v \theta i a)$ like stroke to stroke, while at other times two verses answer two, and sometimes a single verse is divided between two disputants (626-629).
§ 12. There is no comparison to be drawn (says K. O. Müller) between the scenic and the plastic costume of the ancient gods and heroes: the former cannot be judged of from the latter. Statements of old grammarians and extant monuments prove that there was but one general $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda \dot{\eta}$ (costume) for tragedy. It was nothing more than an improvement on the gay and brilliant apparel worn in the Dionysiac festivals. Tragic actors wore long $\chi \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ s of various gay colours, falling in ample folds to the feet ( $\pi 0 \delta \dot{\eta} \rho \epsilon \iota s$ );
i $\mu a ́ \tau \iota a, ~ \sigma \cup ́ \rho \mu a \tau a, ~ \chi \lambda a ́ \mu \nu \delta \epsilon s$ of light colours richly embroidered, and embellished by brilliant gold ornaments; very broad embroidered girdles ( $\mu a \sigma \chi a-$ $\left.\lambda_{\iota} \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s\right)$ sitting high on the breasts. The кó $\theta o \rho \nu o s$, or high-heeled boot, was worn to elevate the person, and became a proverbial emblem of tragedy. The chest, body, arms and legs were padded to a corresponding size: so that a tragic actor was made a strange and monstrous being, fitted only for declamation, his natural flexibility being thus to a great extent controlled. But the Greeks had contrived for him a system of expressive gestures, founded on their own temperament and manners. On the tragic stage this seemed raised to its highest pitch, in correspondence with the emotions wich the action called forth. Owing to the immense extent of the $\theta$ '́a arpov or кoì $\lambda_{0 \nu}$, acoustical and optical means were invented, to convey the words and movements of the actors to the more distant spectators. For these purposes chiefly, we cannot doubt, the mask ( $\pi \rho o \sigma^{\prime} \sigma-$ $\omega \pi \sigma \nu$ ) was used, while its often very high ö $\gamma \kappa 0 s$, or head-dress, also served to exaggerate height. These canvas masks, derived from the ancient practice in the festivals of painting the face with wine-lees or minium, could be changed so as to render the varieties of passion required by the transitions of the plot. Thus in the Oed. Tyr. the disgraced, despairing, blinded, tortured Oedipus appears in a mask different from that which he wore while honoured, confident and happy.
§ i3. The assembled people in a crowded theatre (say Guhl and Köner 58) must have been an imposing spectacle, in which the gorgeous colours of the dresses were contrasted with the azure of a southern sky. No antique rendering of this subject remains. The spectators began to assemble at early dawn, for each wished to secure a good seat after paying his entrance fee ( $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \iota \kappa o ́ v)$. This, not exceeding two obols $(=3 d$.), was payable to the manager of the theatre. After the erection of stone theatres at Athens, the fee was paid for the poorer classes by government, and formed a heavy item in the budget. For not only at the theatre, but on many other festive occasions, the people clamoured for free admission, supported by the demagogues. Often the money reserved for the emergency of a war had to be spent for this purpose. The seats, as in modern theatres, varied in price, and the police ( $\dot{\rho} \alpha \beta \delta o u \chi o c$ ) had to see that every one took his seat in the row marked on his ticket. Most of the spectators were men. In olden time women were allowed to attend only at tragedies, excepting hetairai. It is almost certain the seats of the sexes were separate. Such too was the case with youths of rank, whose places were called $\tau \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime} E \phi \eta \beta \iota \kappa \delta \nu$. Whether any slaves were admitted is also doubtful. Favourite poets and actors received applause and flowers : others had to encounter whistling and other marks of disapprobation. The tempers of mankind have been much the same in all ages.
§ r4. The Alexandrine scholiasts ascribed to Aeschylus 90 dramas, to Sophocles 113 (some a larger number), to Euripides 92. Of these are surviving only 7 of Aeschylus, 7 of Sophocles, 18 (or, adding the spurious Rhesus, 19) of Euripides, 33 in all, with a good many fragments of other plays. But, besides the earlier authors, Thespis, Choerilus, Pratinas, Phrynichus, \&c., the names of 20 later tragic dramatists are preserved, who wrote and represented plays during the century, of which the closing years saw the deaths of Euripides and Sophocles, the capture of Athens and the rule of the 30 oligarchs. Among these poets, Suidas ascribes to Iophon, a son of Sophocles, 50 plays. Bergk, in his History of Greek Literature, Vol. iII. (published since the author's death) thinks that the tragedies and satyr-plays of this age cannot have been fewer in all than 1500 or 1600 . If to these we add comedies, the number might be almost doubled. These facts deserve to be carefully noted and pondered by those scholars who think themselves entitled to reject or disparage a reading or an interpretation in which no demerit can be shown but this, that no parallel examples can be cited from the scanty fragments of tragic poetry which time has spared to us. When the possible uses of $\sigma v \mu \phi \circ \rho \dot{\alpha}$, or the fitness in tragedy of such words as $\dot{\alpha} \phi \theta o \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu, \dot{a} \phi \theta a \rho \tau o s$, are under consideration, let the fact be duly considered at the same time, that we possess scarce three per cent. of the dramas written and acted in the greatest dramatic age of Athens.
§ I5. In concluding this Excursus, let me say that I have read with amusement and gratification Mr Henry Norman's account of the Oedipus Tyrannus as acted at Harvard, U.S.A., a college affiliated, as it were, to our English Cambridge through its founder and its site. Great and laudable pains seem to have been successfully taken with the costumes and scenery; though, as Mr Norman owns, the full conditions of the Athenian performance are unattainable in any theatre of these days. To adopt modern music for the choral songs, instead of any futile attempt to produce an imaginary rifacciamento of the ancient Greek melodies, was surely a very wise decision. If I may offer one slight criticism, I do not think it right at v. 1146 to make the shepherd swing his staff as if he meant to strike the Corinthian. 'Voies de fait' are alien to the genius of Greek tragedy: the words of Oedipus, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ кó入aらє, imply no more than verbal rebuke: and a timorous old slave would not have ventured upon so rash an act in the royal presence. All classical scholars must rejoice that the interest so widely shown in this successful enterprise promises well for the maintenance and extension of Greek learning on the American continent.

## EXCURSUS II．vv．9－ıı．


So I edit，without note of interrogation，treating the question as indirect． depending on фрásє．The edition of Wunder，revised by Badham with English notes（1867），punctuates as I do．Editors in general print $\sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\rho}$－ そavtes；

Inform me then，old sire，since thou art naturally fitted to speak as re－ presenting these，in what mood ye attend here，affrighted，or reposing in the trust that I shall willingly supply full assistance：yes（ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ），I were hard－ hearted otherwise，in not pitying a supplication such as this．

I．$\S 2$ 2．Let the verb $\phi \rho a ́ \zeta є$ and its dependence be viewed first．This verb is graver than $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$ or $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$ ，and means inform or explain．An interrogative attached to it is always（in Sophocles at least）indirect．See O．T．655，






 $\ddot{\eta} \tau i \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̈ \nu \delta \rho \rho^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi o ́ \pi \tau \pi \nu, \phi \rho \dot{\jmath} \xi \epsilon \mu \circ \iota$ ，are rightly punctuated without the note of interrogation after $\delta \rho \hat{\nu} \nu$ ，і́ло́m $\tau \alpha \nu$ ，which Di．，as well as Ca．，has wrongly printed．Here I also catch a trait of light enabling me to elucidate a passage in Antig．233－4，which has hitherto baffled interpreters：



Instead of $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau o l$ read $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu \tau l$ ，translating，why at last however the choice of coming hither prevailed，to thee，even if my statement shall be worthless， $I$ will nevertheless explain ${ }^{1}$ ．

The conclusion from these premises is，that all editors who have placed any note of interrogation in these lines have erred in doing so．And I fear this censure applies to every published edition except the one named．
${ }^{1}$ Dindorf has rightly removed the interrogation before фоá⿱宀八⿱人，in Ae．Pers．350， 717. S．El． 1345 should be tis ovizós è $\sigma \tau^{2}$, a $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \dot{\epsilon}, \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \omega \bar{\nu} \nu \rho a ́ \sigma o \nu$.
§3. It has been imagined by Di., N., J., and apparently by almost all interpreters, that upon $\phi \rho a ́ s \epsilon$ depends the absolute $\dot{\omega}$ s clause in in-I2. Thus Di. writes: ' '山s rationem reddit imperativi $\phi \rho a ́ s \epsilon$ '. N. ' $\phi \rho a ́ \zeta \epsilon ~ \dot{\omega} s ~ \theta \epsilon \lambda o \nu \tau o s$ $a ̈ \nu \epsilon \mu 0 \hat{v}, \nu \rho \mu i \xi \omega \nu \theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu a ̈ \nu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$.' For J.'s view see Stud. Soph. P. II. p. 2 \&c. This imagination is demonstrably erroneous. We deduce from the uniform practice of Greek writers that an absolute $\dot{\omega}$ s clause always stands in close proximity to the verb or participle on which it depends. An example such as that wrongly suggested here of an absolute $\dot{\omega}$ s clause following the word it depends on at such a distance, and with two clauses intervening ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{i} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. and $\tau i \nu \iota \tau \rho \delta \pi \varphi \kappa$ к. $\tau$.. .) cannot, I feel sure, be found in all our extant classical literature: (for the $\dot{\omega}$ s in iol depends on $\phi \delta \nu 0 \nu \lambda$ dóoveas, not on the distant $\dot{d} \nu \omega \gamma \epsilon \nu$, that in 24 I on $\dot{\omega} \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, not on the distant $\dot{\alpha} \pi a u \delta \hat{\omega})$. But more than this: if the principal verb is an imperative 2nd person, as $\phi \rho a \zeta \epsilon$ here, I believe it to be true, that in tragedy always, in prose generally, an absolute $\dot{\omega}$ clause stands before that imperative. Let the following ex-









 (so that the following instances are comparatively rare: Thucyd. vir. 15 ,
 ap. Athen. IX., $\tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \epsilon \mu a \gamma \epsilon i \rho \omega \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda v \mu a i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta^{\prime} \dot{\omega}^{\prime} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\circ} \psi \psi \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad{ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu, \delta \pi$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \partial{ }^{\circ} \nu \tau \omega \nu, \psi v \chi \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ óv $\left.\nu \omega \nu\right)$. Next follows a class of examples, closely allied to the preceding, as being information addressed to some person, and showing the same precedence of the $\dot{\omega}$ clause: Aesch. Prom. $7^{62}$, wis $\tau 0 i \nu u \nu$


 $\dot{\omega}$ clause comes first, though the verb is not imperative actually or by im-

 $\nu o \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$; Meno, 95 , 它 $\delta \iota \delta a \kappa \tau o \hat{v}$ ov̈ $\sigma \eta s \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$. Lastly, of the instances in which the ws clause follows the word on which it depends, every one shows that the connection between them is close, and never distant and interrupted as it would be here, if the clause depended upon $\phi \rho a ́ s \epsilon$. One or two places may be cited, chiefly from poetry. Soph. O. T.

 крaтós, wंs $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o u ̂ ~ \tau \iota \nu o s ~ \phi o ́ ß o v ~ \phi a \nu e ́ v \tau o s ~ o u ́ \delta ’ ~ a ̀ \nu a \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau o u ̂ ~ \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu . ~ A l e x i s ~ a p . ~$





Any number of examples might be added to these, establishing the truth, that it is impossible to refer an absolute wis clause to a verb so distantly preceding it as this $\phi \rho a \mathfrak{\zeta}$, and divided from it by dependent clauses such as the two which begin with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i . .$. and $\tau i \nu c \tau \rho \delta \pi \psi$ severally.

Therefore, it being shown that wis does, most certainly, not depend on $\phi \rho \alpha \oint \epsilon$, it can only depend on $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, which immediately precedes it. And $\sigma \tau \hat{\epsilon} \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ does, with not less certainty, mean 'being resigned', 'having acquiesced', i.e. reposing ( $\omega$ is in the trust that \&c.).
§ 4. The notion that $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ could, by any possibility, mean 'having formed a desire', is a palpable blunder. The verb $\sigma \tau \notin \rho \gamma \omega$ has two meanings (1) to love (chiefly of kindred affection), (2) to be contented or resigned. In one peculiar choral passage (O.C. ro94) it could, as far as sense goes, be rendered $I$ pray: $I$ entreat; but it could also be $I$ am content (or satisfied), and so it should be rendered. 'Desire' it never means.

The alternative $\delta \epsilon l \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \tilde{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$, rendered 'with what dread or what desire', is in itself sheer nonsense, exhibiting no disjunction. For, as Nauck and Wolff observe, those who have come in dread, have come with a desire and a prayer to be relieved from the dread.
 which he must mean, 'resigned' in the sense of 'content to suffer'. This indeed is much less unmeaning than the rendering having desired, which gives no just contrast to $\delta$ eigave $\epsilon$, being alarmed; whereas 'in a terrified or apathetic mood' does exhibit contrast. Both views are, however, without meaning in this respect, viz. that no reason appears in either, why Oedipus should ask a question implying two states of feeling. Surely it would have been enough to say something in form and spirit like:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a \tau^{\prime} \quad \dot{\epsilon} \theta a ́ \delta \epsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

Є่ $\mu \circ \hat{\nu} \pi \rho о \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa є \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$;
'Are ye present here in the opinion that I shall willingly give you full assistance?' But when the $\omega$ 's clause is taken as depending on the word expressing the second alternative, then the mention of states of feeling becomes intelligible and proper.

The reference of the $\dot{\omega} s$ clause to $\phi \rho \alpha \dot{\zeta} \epsilon$ being thus impossible, and the meaning of desire being shown not to belong to the verb $\sigma \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, it is hardly necessary to repeat that the reference to $\phi \rho \dot{\rho} \xi \epsilon$ would make the question about the mental feelings of the suppliants not merely superfluous, but even nonsensical. Their variety of feeling is of no importance if the priest, who speaks $\pi \rho \grave{~} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, speaks in assurance that Oedipus will supply full assistance; rather I should say that such variety is a contradiction in terms; for what the priest says is said for all, and he is assumed to speak in confident expectation of aid from Oedipus. All therefore must have shared the confident expectation: so that none among them could have come $\delta \in i$ $\sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$, in vague terror ${ }^{2}$.
II. § 5. As to the succeeding clause, in which Oedipus confirms the supposition that he is willing to help, and declares that he should be hardhearted if he felt no pity for the suppliants, I shall briefly notice the grammatical rationale of the words.

I am willing to accept the proposition that $\delta \nu \sigma \sigma^{\lambda} \lambda \eta \eta \tau o s$ may be treated as a negative word, and the matter of fact, that $\mu \dot{\eta} o^{\circ}$ is found with a participle in protasis when a negative appears in the apodosis, is admitted. But J. makes no attempt to account for the principle on which this usage is founded, and treats it merely as a fact. The use of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ou is among the most difficult questions in Greek syntax. In tragedy, however, there are found only two instances of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov with a participle in conditional protasis, this and another at 22 I : (the use in O.C. $3^{6 \mathrm{I}}$ is not similar). Here, and in O.T. 22 I , I suggest an element of causality in the participial clause, imported by ov: 'I should be hard-hearted in that I pitied not.' 'I myself should not have traced the matter far, seeing I had no clue.'

But as to the suppressed protasis, $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \theta^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \wedge o \iota \mu$, before $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, I regard it as both certain from analogy, and tending to account for $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oủ катогктєip $\omega \nu$, which repeats it with added force. Were it not implied, I would read $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with Schneidewin. Such instances of suppressed protasis before $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ abound in Sophocles. See O. T. 82, 317-318; Ellendt, Lex. S. p. 123. In my translation it is expressed by otherwise, i.e. if I did not wish.

[^8]
## EXCURSUS III. vv. 40-45.

$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \tau \iota \nu$ ' $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu i \nu, \epsilon i ̈ \tau \epsilon \tau \operatorname{\tau ov} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$

My translation is:
And now, Oedipus, $O$ thou noblest in universal esteem, all we who are suppliants here beseech thee to find some help for us, whether thou hast learnt it (oĩ $\theta a$ ) by hearing some god's voice, or perchance from a man, since I perceive that counsellors of experience do also, most of any, keep in lively use the practice of mutual consultation.
J. renders (having colon after $\pi 0 v$ ) :
'And now, Oedipus, king glorious in all eyes, we beseech thee, all we suppliants, to find for us some succour, whether by the whisper of a god thou knowest it or haply as in the power of man; for I see that, when men have been proved in deeds past, the issues of their counsels, too, most often have effect.'
§ 2. Ere passing on to $\mathbf{v v .} 44,45$, I must refer to 42,43 . 'Whisper' for $\phi \eta^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ is unjustifiable (see 86,157 ), and 'as in the power of man' for
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu$. I take it, with full confidence, as depending on oi $\sigma \theta a$. True it is, that I cannot cite an instance of oifa $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial}$ any more than he can cite one of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma_{o}$. The verb is not one which, as a rule, has a preposition following
 in no doubt that $o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial}$ is legitimate, and is here the true construction, enforced by the double duty which the verb has to perform. Also the logic of language clearly shows that the antithesis is between two modes of coming to the knowledge of help : one by hearing a god's voice, the other by learning from a man. Between 'knowing help by hearing a god's voice', and 'knowing help as in the power of a man', there is no antithesis at all; for the help taught by a god's voice might be help in the power of a man, and conversely. 'A $\nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ i s ~ n o t ~ ' m a n ', ~ b u t ~ ' a ~ m a n ' . ~$.
§ 3. This clears the way for the consideration of vv. 44, 45, well-worn lines, of which I am thoroughly weary, having stated and proved again and again their true meaning, and finding no pleasure in having to slay the slain errors concerning them thrice. But I cannot escape the unwel-
come task of here examining the polemic set up against what is to my mind the certain truth in this place, that $\tau \dot{\alpha} s \xi \nu \mu \phi \rho \dot{\alpha} s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ means the comparing of counsels, and $\zeta \omega \dot{\sigma} \alpha{ }^{s}$ means remains in lively use ${ }^{1}$.

In Studia Sophoclea, Part I. I have shown that the common interpretation is bad in logic, bad in poetic taste; while that of Dr Young and others is excellent in both respects. I have shown that кai has no real emphasis in the former, but just value in the latter: that the meanings of $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho a \dot{s}$ and $\xi^{\prime} \sigma \sigma a s$ are in the first untenable, legitimate in the second.

It is there then that readers must look for system; with the later polemic I must deal as it comes before me partly in a footnote, partly in an excursus on these lines. In both places the chief weight of discussion is thrown upon the meanings of $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho \dot{\alpha} s$ and $\zeta \dot{\omega} \sigma a s$, and therefore we begin by examining what is said about these words. And first let us look at乡u $\mu \phi о \rho a ́ s$.
§ 4. In discussing the meanings of this word, we must avoid being led astray by the ambiguities of language, whether Greek or English. In the first place, we must settle the senses in which the words event and issue are to be used, and confine ourselves to those senses. Etymologically they are much the same, both meaning out-come; event from evenire, issue from exire. Both can be used in the sense of ending: as, 'the event (or the issue) of the battle of Tel-el-Kebir was the defeat of Arabi'. But we could not say, 'the event of the battle was the surrender of Cairo', though we might say 'the issue' \&c. In short, event may not be used in the sense of 'result' or 'consequence'; issue may be so used. I shall therefore here confine the word event to the meaning occurrence, Fr. événement, i.e. that which happens, or has happened; and the word issue to result or consequence, in which sense I shall understand it to be used by J., though in
${ }^{1}$ Dr T. Young, of Glasgow, was the first to propose the true interpretation about the year 1792. His note was this: "Ita interpretes: sed $\sigma \nu \mu \phi o \rho a \grave{\nu}$ pro eventu consilii sumi posse non credo : ea enim vox fortuitum aliquid semper innuere videtur; hic autem potius in primitivo sensu sumitur; locusque adeo totus ita reddi potest:

> 'Sicubi alicuius deorum vocem audisti, vel etiam a mortalium quocumque quicquam acceperis: video enim apud prudentes expertosque viros etiam collationes consiliorum maxime in usu esse.'

Ipsius sapientiam supra laudaverat; nunc etiam alios consuluisse posse addit: quae ratio vulgata multo melior videtur; otiosum enim alias foret кaí, neque tota sententia loco suo digna." T. Y. My own view to the same effect, independently formed in ignorance of Dr Young's note, was printed in a Cambridge Philological Journal in 1854, dating however some 5 years earlier. Mr Shilleto subsequently announced his own independent concurrence as to $\xi \nu \mu \phi o p a ́ s$, which had also been accepted by Prof. Dalzel. To these precursors as well as to Sophocles and to truth I owe the duty of reprinting here my reply to J.'s polemic on this passage.
p. 22 he seems to confuse the words events and issues, as if they were identical, when he writes: '(2) $\tau \grave{a} s \xi_{v \mu \phi o \rho a ̀ s ~}^{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, the events, issues of their counsels, Thuc. I. r40.' Now in that place the Greek words

 little to be surely calculated upon as the counsels of men.' Jowett: 'The movement of events is often as wayward and incomprehensible as the course of human thought.' Crawley: 'Sometimes the course of things is as arbitrary as the plans of men.' Sheppard: 'The incidents to which circumstances give rise are wont to take a course which can be as little determined as the schemes of men.' And he justly adds: 'I do not like to translate $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho a \dot{s}$ by results, for the notion of a fixed result is the one most entirely foreign to the word.' For my part, I should render: 'The course of actual events is often as little discoverable by study as that of human thought.' $\pi \rho a \gamma^{\mu} \alpha^{\prime} \tau \nu \nu$ is attributive or descriptive gen., not possessive.
 consists of words in which I find no weight. I allude to what is printed on pp. 288-9 under the heads $\mathrm{I}, 2$.

As to (I) Lucian's jests (dating in the second century of our era), I decline to trouble myself with anything so irrelevant to the question.

As to the discussion in (2) of what the editor supposes an Athenian audience would or would not have understood, I think his argument carries him out of the depth of any modern scholar, and I shall not follow him far. The Athenian audience knew no language but their own, the finest the world has known. In the seven plays and fragments which remain to us of Sophocles we find something like 1000 words which occur in him only once, and are found by us nowhere else. How do we know that many of these were not used in his lost works, or in those of Aeschylus, Euripides, Phrynichus, Philocles, and a crowd of other poets, whose numerous plays are lost? As to $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho a$, I contend that it is a verbal which any poet might have used in any sense corresponding to the senses of $\xi \nu \mu \phi \dot{\rho} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$, $\xi v \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, as $\phi o \rho a ̀$ has been used in so many of those corresponding to $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu, \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. $\Phi \epsilon \rho$ - fer- Sk. bhar, is perhaps the most widely diffused of all Aryan verb-roots: it is compounded with every one of the eighteen Greek prepositions; and fourteen of these compounds exhibit the verbal substantive - $\phi \circ \rho a$. I therefore assert with full conviction that $\xi \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ to compare proves $\xi v \mu \phi о \rho \dot{a}$ comparison: and a fortiori $\xi v \mu \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ ßovicv́ $\mu a \tau a$ proves $\xi \nu \mu \phi о \rho a ̀ ~ \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$. On the other hand there is nothing but the poor gloss of a mediaeval scholiast to show that $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho a ̀ ~ c a n ~ m e a n ~ i s s u e: ~$ and, if ever a reckless question was asked, it is this: 'Would any hearer in the theatre doubt that $\xi v \mu \phi o p a s$ meant "issues", or divine that it was going to bear the unexampled sense of "comparisons"? The reply is: as $\xi v \mu$ -

фopà does not and cannot bear the sense issue ( $=$ result), the word in that sense would be unintelligible: but, as $\xi v \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ does mean to compare, its substantive $\xi v \mu \phi о \rho a ̀ ~ a ~ c o m p a r i n g ~ w o u l d, ~ i n ~ p r o p e r ~ c o n t e x t, ~ b e ~ i n t e l l i g i b l e ~$ quite as much as any of the so-called $\ddot{a} \pi \alpha \xi \bar{\xi} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\mu} \mu \in \alpha$ in any poet's works: though none of us know what words were $a^{\circ} \pi \alpha \xi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ to an Athenian audience: and this truth it is that makes the whole discussion in (2) merely nugatory ${ }^{2}$.

Z $v \mu \phi о \rho \dot{\alpha}$ (in its common use) certainly means $\hat{o} \xi v \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon$, something which happens or has happened, un événement, an occurrence, whether indifferent (as $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho a i ~ \beta i o v, ~ a i ~ \xi v \mu \phi o \rho a i ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, actual events), happy, as in El. 1230, O. T. 454; or calamitous, which, owing to the superstitious euphemism of the Greeks, is its most frequent use, like that of casus in Latin. It has therefore always a terminal use, and cannot be properly rendered issue (i.e. result). If further proof were needed, it would be found in the words which J. himself has cited on p. 22: 'Thuc. ii. 87,

 would be by the issue of the issue, quod absurdum est.
§ 6. How, then, does the question about $\xi v u \neq 0 \rho a s$ stanđ between us? He claims for it a meaning (issues) against which the arguments above stated are arrayed, a meaning for which he can only cite a phrase in Thucydides, not so interpreted by Jowett or Crawley, by Arnold, Sheppard, Shilleto, myself; a meaning which another passage, also cited by himself (ii. 87), shows to be absurd. And this meaning, so void of strong support, having against it this weight of argument and authority, he speaks of as the meaning which all male Athenians attending the theatre of Bacchus at Athens in the highly cultured age of Sophocles, would naturally assign to the word $\xi \nu \mu \phi о \rho a s$ in connection with $\beta o u \lambda \epsilon v \mu a \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu$, however familiar they might be with the phrase in Aesch. Pers. 534, $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota ~ \beta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a . ~ H a s ~\end{gathered}$ he justified such an assumption?

On the other hand Prof. Young of Glasgow, by his independent insight, Prof. Dalzel of Edinburgh in agreement (probably) with him, myself and Shilleto (each of us by his independent insight) were led to the conviction that $\tau \dot{\alpha} s \xi v \mu \phi o \rho a ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ means 'the comparisons of counsels', i.e. 'mutual consultation'.

Well then: neither of these two versions, 'issues of counsels', or 'comparisons of counsels', is supported by other passages containing $\xi v \mu \phi о \rho a ̀$ in one or the other sense. Do they, then, stand on equal terms? Is the

[^9]contest a drawn one? Surely not; for while I and many other scholars
 contend that it cannot mean comparison, since $\xi v \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ does mean to compare. While we contend that ai $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho a i ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ for the issues of counsels is, upon the face of it, a phrase not only unexampled, but impossible, no scholar will dare to contend that 'the comparisons of counseis' is an impossible rendering, since Aeschylus has written $\xi v \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \tau \nu \beta o v-$ $\lambda \epsilon u ́ \mu a \tau a$ 'to compare counsels'. The logical result of this is, that issues of counsels must be dismissed as an erroneous rendering, and the place must be duly examined to see whether comparisons of counsels is suitable to the context.
§ 7. We proceed to $\zeta \omega \sigma a s$, which J., abandoning Prof. Campbell's word successful, now makes to mean effective or operative, translating it have effect. I hold both renderings to be alike erroneous and incapable of proof. My position is, that the verb $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ (one of the most widely diffused words in the Greek of all times and topics and writers) has but one general meaning, which can always be given to it in English, whatever shade of force it may assume; and by this test any suggested rendering must be tried. $\mathrm{Z} \hat{\eta} \nu$ always means to live, to be alive, as opposed to $\kappa a \tau \theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$, to die or be dead. Its stronger shades are two: ( 1 ) one of emphatic irony, to live (in the best sense), to live well, as opposed to the death-in-life of misery or vice; (2) to survive, to remain alive, as distinguished from what is dead and gone.

 $3^{2} 9$, $\tau \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ov́ $\delta \dot{\delta} \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$. In fragments of the New

 vita.' (2) The sense of surviving is frequent: O. T. $y^{85}, \epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \kappa \dot{v} \rho \epsilon \iota \zeta \omega \hat{\omega}$ ' $\dot{\eta}$

 ing that the flames of Troy are burning still.

But no passage can be cited in which it is either necessary or even proper to use the terms effective, operative, or successful in rendering $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ or $\zeta \hat{\nu} \nu$. In O. T. $4^{81}$, where it is said of the oracles, $\tau \dot{a} \delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \epsilon i \quad \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \circ \tau \hat{a}-$ ral, J. renders but that doom ever lives; yet there is no place where the word effective could be applied more speciously (though fallaciously) than this. Of moral laws we read in Ant. 457, óv $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \tau \iota \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta \epsilon \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda ’ \dot{a} \epsilon i$ $\pi о \tau \epsilon \zeta \hat{\eta} \tau a \hat{v} \tau a$ кov̉סєis oî $\delta \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ örov 'фávך. Here the context shows that $\zeta \hat{\eta}$ must be rendered live, not have effect ${ }^{3}$.

[^10]We say, then, that issues of counsels cannot be said to live; but 'mutual' consultation', in so far as between experienced men it survives and continues in use, may be said to live, as the Keltic is said to be still a living language in Wales, as it is said to be no longer a living language in Cornwall: as the belief in pixies and witches is said to be still alive in some localities.

Such, though inevitably long drawn out, are the arguments and facts by which I consider the common renderings of ai $\xi u \mu \phi o \rho a i ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o u \lambda \epsilon v \mu a i \tau \omega \nu$ and $\zeta \omega \sigma a s$ to be proved erroneous, and those ascribed by myself and others to be established.
§ 8. The classical word for issue is shown to be $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \dot{\eta}$ by Herodotus,
 $\epsilon \pi \kappa \imath i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. What could have been easier than for Sophocles, had he wished to express the sentiment required by those who cling to the old error, to use current Greek instead of a strange phraseology nowhere else found?
as

> iss $\dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \grave{\eta} \tau 0 і \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon i \rho o \iota s ~ \kappa a \lambda \grave{\eta}$
> $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.
(See O. C. 1198.)
or
ws $\tau o i \sigma \iota \nu{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \iota \sigma \iota \nu \in \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \lambda o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a$
$\tau \grave{a} \pi o ́ \lambda \lambda \prime$ ó $\rho \hat{\omega} \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.
or any given number of varieties.
J. renders $\mu \dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ most often, a rendering rarely possible (ir73, O. C.
 $\zeta \dot{\omega} \sigma a s$, it means $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \dot{\partial} \tau \omega \nu=\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\epsilon} \rho o \iota s$.
§ 9. At this point I will touch upon his method of accounting for the emphatic $\kappa$ кal. He writes:
'Oedipus has had practical experience ( $\ddagger \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho i ́ a)$ of great troubles; when the Sphinx came, his wisdom stood the trial. Men who have become thus $\check{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \rho \rho \frac{1}{}$ are apt to be also (кai) prudent in regard to the future. Past facts enlighten the counsels which they offer on things still uncertain; and we observe that the issues of their counsels are not usually futile or dead but effectual. Well may we believe, then, that he who saved us from the Sphinx can tell us how to escape from the plague. Note these points: (r) the words $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi е \dot{\rho} \rho o \iota \sigma \iota$ and $\beta o v \lambda e v \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ imply the antithesis ( $\alpha$ ) between past and future, ( $\beta$ ) between є $\rho$ ру and $\lambda$ óyor,' \&c.

I discern no such implication of antithesis as his fancy paints, either between past and future, or between deeds and words. The vv. 44, 45,
as to $\zeta \dot{\omega} \sigma a s$, but I desire to state that I never had any discussion with him on this or any other question. As he had been my pupil from 1827 to 1830 , I always avoided disputation with him; and I do not allow that his cursory mention of $\zeta \omega \sigma \sigma$, is to be regarded as an elaborate and final judgment as to its meaning here, though it shows that he had not reached my point of view concerning it.
contain a general maxim, which, as he views it, is, 'experienced men also make their counsels effectual': as I view it, 'experienced men also compare their counsels together.' In either case the maxim is not of the future only, but of all time, ov̀ $\tau \iota \nu \hat{v} \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta \hat{\epsilon} s, \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \epsilon i \pi \pi \tau \epsilon$. Neither is there any contrast of deeds and words. A deed successfully done by an $\epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho o s$ in time past succeeded because it was well considered, counselled, and planned before it was executed. See Herod. above. The $\begin{gathered} \\ \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho o \iota ~ a r e ~ t h e r e f o r e ~ t o ~\end{gathered}$ be regarded as sage counsellors, and the emphasis of the кai is that they are not only men who can counsel sagely, but men who also compare their own counsels with those of other men, and keep alive the habit of conferring in mutual consultation. And this, immediately following $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ o f \sigma \theta a ́$ $\pi o v$, manifestly contains an apology for the suggestion that Oedipus might possibly ( $\pi 0 v$ ) have gained the knowledge of help from some man. This brings me to the first words in his note: namely

[^11]It is surprising that a scholar of his mark should thus overlook two facts. One is, that, by doing this, he makes the words $\epsilon i \not \tau \epsilon$. . . $\pi$ ou null and void, nay, even ridiculous: and, if he were right, then Sophocles ought, instead of $\epsilon \ddot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \tau 0 v \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$, to have written $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \lambda \nu \sigma \iota \nu \nu \delta \sigma o v$, or $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \tau \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota o \nu$, or some equivalent, omitting v. 43. The other fact is-that $\omega$ s, since, is used about 60 times by Sophocles, and in each place it is referred to words immediately going before it. Thus in this play we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \mid \bar{j} \in \iota
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 55 \xi \xi_{\nu े \nu}^{\nu} \nu \delta \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \iota o \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} s \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu} . \\
& \text { is où } \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \tau \iota \nu \text { к.т. } \lambda \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ஸ́s } \nu \hat{v} \nu \text { óк }{ }^{2} 0 \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s \text {. . . }
\end{aligned}
$$

The other places to which I refer are: O.C. 562, 937, 1016, 1028, 1075 , 1229, 1528, 1691; Ant. 66, 499, 624, 765, 1337; Tr. $3^{85}, 391,453,488$, 592, 596, 599, 92 I , 1120; Ai. 39, 92, 131, 141, 789, 1314; El. 17, 21, 324, 369, 470, 633, 821, 1112, 1319, 1337, 1446, 1489; Ph. 46, 53, 117, $464,807,812,847,91_{4}, 1043,1442$, and a few in the fragments. I have examined all, and find the fact to be as I state it; and I must confess myself amazed that any scholar can look at this passage carefully without discern-
K. OE.
 even without the clinching proof supplied by this crowd of examples.
§ ro. In his discussion J. has omitted to mention the argument against the common interpretation, founded on the tasteless and revolting bathos which it ascribes to such a dramatist as Sophocles. He has omitted to exhibit the logical nexus, forming an important link in the plot, which the newer interpretation creates and establishes. Since he has thus withheld these very important points, I find myself obliged to reprint here what I have said of them elsewhere.

The substance of the Priest's speech up to these lines is as follows:
After describing the misery of the Thebans under the visitation of pestilence, the Priest goes on to say: 'We come as suppliants to your altars, Oedipus, not because we deem you a god; but considering you the first of $m e n$ in all affairs human or divine. For you came to Thebes, a stranger, and relieved us from the sway of the Sphinx, by solving her riddle: this you did without any aid from us: you are believed to have saved us by divine inspiration. So now, most excellent Oedipus, we beseech you to find some help for us, whether suggested to you by the voice of a god, or, it may be ( $\pi 00$ ), by a man: since $I$ see that men of experience are also most accustomed to compare their counsels together.'

The ordinary interpretation is $I$ see that, where men have experience, their counsels live and have a prosperous end (or as J. have effect). What is there to account for the bathos of this descent from a god to a man, from superhuman skill to experience? And if the advice resting on experience is merely that of Oedipus himself, is not the disparaging suggestion ( $\epsilon i \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ o i \tau \sigma \theta a ́ \pi o v$ ) worse than superfluous? is it not absurd?

The two lines 44,45 , rightly understood, convey to Oedipus an excuse for the suggestion that such as he might possibly have learnt a mode of help from some man: and $\xi v \mu \phi o p a i \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v \mu u^{i} \tau \omega \nu$ is the substantival form of $\xi \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ fou $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau a$, which occurs in Aesch. Pers. 534.

Here the logical nexus is close and consistent : and quite in the manner of Sophocles.

The priest gives no formal advice: he suggests the possibility that Oedipus may have profited by ( $o i \sigma \theta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi o v$ ) the advice of another man: and apologizes for this suggestion by a compliment to the eminent $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho i a$ which would lead him to consult others. But why the digression at all? It belongs to the consummate skill with which the great dramatist has worked out his conception of the plot and of its central person. Oedipus is shown in the first part of the play as a man of eminent abilities and noble aspirations, but of overweening self-confidence and fierce self-will. These merits and these faults would be no secret to any of the Thebans, least of all to the chief minister of their religion, the priest of their chief god. From his
mouth, therefore, the suggestion that Oedipus might already have profited by the counsel of another man (a suggestion for which the great poet makes the priest apologize by a graceful compliment) does in fact become a delicate admonition-an admonition not otherwise than 'consistent with the laudatory tone of the address', but rather admirably supplementing and qualifying it. For if there is one virtue more than another recommended by the religious poets Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Pindar, and by the religious historian Herodotus, that virtue is modesty, the violation of which draws down on the offender the $\phi \theta \dot{\circ} \nu 0$ s $\theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu}$, and thereby destruction. By whom was such a lesson more needed than by Oedipus? From whom could it come more fitly than from the priest of Zeus? How could it be conveyed more courteously than it is conveyed here? But while this is sufficient to account for the digressive lines, I think still further reason of them can be rendered. The priest supposes a possible $\theta \in 0 \hat{v} \phi \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$ given to help the sufferers. 'Yes', says Oedipus in his reply (v. $6 \mathbf{5 - 7 2}$ ), 'I have sought such aid: I have sent Creon to consult the Pythian oracle.' The oracle is brought, is reported: the suppliants quit the stage: the Theban Chorus enter the orchestra, and their first song is addressed to that oracle from which so much is expected. But has the priest's delicate admonition borne no fruit? It has not been unnoted by Oedipus. The oracle wants explanation. He has consulted his brother-in-law Creon, another $\epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \varphi \rho \circ s$, on this difficulty: and by his advice he has sent for the seer Teiresias. See v. 279;

How this momentary condescension of the arrogant prince leads to a new outbreak of self-will, and brings him to the edge of the precipice, we know. Thus then it appears that these three lines are nothing less than a studied and contrived link in the plot of this artistic drama ${ }^{4}$.

I cannot leave this much-disputed passage without summing up shortly and distinctly the points which I consider irrefragably proved in this

(I) In I. $43 \dot{a} \pi^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ d e p e n d s ~ o n ~ o i ̂ \sigma \theta a, ~ o r ~ w h e t h e r ~ p e r c h a n c e ~ t h o u ~$ knowest it ( $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu)$ from a man.
(2) In $44, \dot{\omega} s$, since, can refer only to the clause immediately going


[^12](seven times in O. T., 60 in the whole) shows. And such reference is thoroughly suitable here as a respectful apology for supposing that Oed. might possibly have gained some knowledge from a man, when they had previously said, that, although they did not rank him with the gods, yet they did regard him as foremost among men on all occasions, ordinary or extraordinary, since he had vanquished the Sphinx without any hint or teaching from them, but, as was universally believed, by divine assistance ${ }^{5}$.
(3) $\Sigma v \mu \phi о \rho a ̀ ~ g e n e r a l l y ~ m e a n s ~ ' a n ~ o c c u r r e n c e ', ~ ' a n ~ e v e n t ', ~ g o o d, ~ e v i l, ~ o r ~$ indifferent: the second sense (evil) gradually suppressed all other uses. But as $\phi$ ood̀ has many senses, corresponding to those of its primitive verb $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega$, $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \rho \mu a \iota$, so, by the analogy of language, $\sigma v \mu \phi o \rho \dot{\alpha}$ could have had those which belong to $\sigma v \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \rho \omega$, $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \rho \mu a l$, and when we find Aeschylus writing $\sigma v \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau a$, 'to compare counsels', we are justly entitled to say that $\sigma u \mu \phi о \rho \dot{a} \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, 'comparing of counsels', is a phrase we ought to welcome whenever and wherever we find it suitable, as here. And, if we find it here and nowhere else in the few fragments of Attic literature surviving from the prolific age of the great tragic poets, it has as much claim to our recognition as any other of the words only once occurring, which are so numerous in what is left of that age. On the other hand ovuфooà meaning 'issue', i.e. 'result' or consequence, has no such claim in itself (from analogy) or as exhibited in use. For, if a blundering scholiast interprets it as $\dot{a} \pi \sigma^{\prime} \beta a \sigma \iota s$ in Thuc. i. i40, that interpretation is rejected by all the best English translators, and shown to be absurd by another passage, Thuc. ii. 87 , where we find $\tau \hat{\eta} s \xi_{\nu \mu ф о \rho a ̂ s ~}^{\tau \hat{\varphi}} \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi о \beta \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \iota$.
(4) The sense claimed by the old interpretation for $\zeta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma a s$, whether 'successful' or 'effective', is not established by any testimony; while the sense of 'remaining alive', 'continuing to exist' which the later explanation gives, belongs to the essence of the verb $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$, as opposed to $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu a \iota$ 'being dead'.
(5) If all Sophocles wanted here was to make the priest tell Oed. that they sue for his aid because they perceive that the counsels of experienced men are usually successful or effective, he could easily have conveyed this sentiment in simple and intelligible Greek, without adopting a strange and obscure phraseology. But if his purpose was that stated in my foot-note

[^13]here, and if, as seems probable, he borrowed the phrase $\tau \grave{\alpha} s \xi v \mu \phi o \rho a ̀ s \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\beta o u \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu \dot{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ from Ae. Pers. 528, $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o i ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ̀ ~ \xi u \nu \phi \notin \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon u ́ \mu a \tau a$, then I think it also probable that he saw no other predicate so fit to complete his clause as the participle $\rfloor \dot{\omega} \sigma a s$.
(6) The emphatic $\kappa a i$, as Dr Young truly saw, has no just force in the old rendering, but gains it in the later.
(7) The absurd bathos perpetrated in the former view, and (8) the fitness of the latter view in the context, with its importance as a link in the plot of the drama, have been so lately and so fully set forth, that I need only refer to § 10 as completing this summary.

It was not in early life that I reached the just conclusion upon this passage, though, whenever I lectured on this most artistic of all dramas, as I often did, I had an uneasy sense of revolt against the bathos, and against the neglect of $\kappa$ al. I had passed my fortieth year before the perception (I imagine) of $\sigma u \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \beta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{u} \mu a \tau a$ became a flash of light showing me the true sense of $\tau \dot{\alpha} s \xi_{u \mu \phi o \rho a ̀ s} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o u \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu \dot{d} \tau \omega \nu$. But from that time to the present no doubt has arisen in my mind; and within the last few years I have been enabled to strengthen the argument by discovering the law of $\dot{\omega} s$, since, as always referred by Soph. to a clause immediately preceding it.

## EXCURSUS IV. vv. 69-72.

§ I. ...................тaîoa $\gamma$ à $\rho$ Mevoıкєшs
 ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \mu \psi$ Ф Фoißou $\delta \dot{\omega} \mu \mu \theta^{\prime}$, $\dot{\omega} s \pi \dot{\prime} \theta o \iota \theta^{\prime} o^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota$ $\delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \ddot{\eta} \tau i \dot{\chi} \phi \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon \dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$.
$I$ sent Creon, son of Menoeceus, my wife's brother, to the Pythian dwelling of Phoebus, that he might learn by doing or speaking what I should save this city.
J. reads $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$, as most edd., rendering $I$ might deliver.

An exactly parallel construction occurs only once again in Soph. El. 32-4:

 ठiкаs ápoí $\eta \eta$......
 to $\dot{\omega} s \pi \dot{v} \theta o \iota \theta^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota \ldots$ : and $\dot{\alpha} \rho o i ́ \mu \eta \nu$ to $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ or $\dot{\rho} v \sigma \alpha i \mu \eta \nu$.

I am fully persuaded that Dindorf, Linwood, Nauck, Van Herwerden and myself rightly read $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$, and also that in El. $34 \dot{\alpha} \rho o i \mu \eta \nu$ is Fut. Opt. not Aor. Opt.
J. has not mentioned $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ under the head of lection, nor the name of any one of the editors who adopt it. Is this justifiable in such a case?

But he has, in his note, given reasons for reading $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$, and those reasons will now be examined, and, as I believe, confuted. The note is:
' $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$. The direct deliberative form is $\pi \hat{\omega} s \dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma \omega \mu a \iota$; the indirect $\dot{\epsilon} p \omega \tau \hat{\omega}$ ö $\pi \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ (or $\pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma$ ) $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \iota, \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$ ő $\pi \omega \varsigma$ (or $\pi \omega \varsigma$ ) $\dot{\rho} v \sigma \alpha i ́ \mu \eta \nu . \dot{\rho} v \sigma o i ́ \mu \eta \nu$ (oblique for $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ ) would imply that he was confident of a successful result, and doubtful only concerning the means; it is therefore less suitable.'
§ 2. (I) In the first place I deny that, for the sense here required, the indirect construction after a past verb is $\dot{\eta} \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \nu$ ö $\boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \omega$ ( or $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ ) $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$. I say that it is either $\dot{\eta} \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \nu \ddot{o} \pi \omega s$ (or $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ ) $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu \ddot{a} \nu$, or else $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ without $a{ }^{2} \nu$.
(2) In the next place, as to 'deliberative form', there is no room for deliberation here. A question is addressed to the Pythian oracle, and an answer expected. If Oedipus put the question to the Pythia directly, he would do it in the Fut. Indic., $\tau i \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \eta \eta \geqslant i \phi \omega \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma o \mu a \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$; and he would expect a direct answer, $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu . .$. , declaring the means which by deed or word he must use for that end. By asking such a question in Fut. Indic., the questioner expresses confidence in the god whom he consults, not in himself, and, if he gets an answer detailing the means, he will use those means in confidence that their result will be successful, because the god has told him so. Hence he says immediately
 therefore, that $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ does express more confidence than $\lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma \alpha a \mu^{\prime}{\underset{a}{u}}^{\nu}$ (which would be grammatical here rather than $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$ ), I say that such confidence is not 'less suitable', but far more so, because it rests upon the pious faith of Oedipus in the god's declaration.
(3) Since he has taken ${ }_{o} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ (and $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ ) as representing the $\ddot{o} \pi i$ (and $\tau i)$ of Sophocles, I must observe that $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ (direct interr.) is found in Soph. with Fut. Ind. 14 times, with $\ddot{a r \nu}$ and Opt. 32 times ( 14 Aor., several with verbs which form no Aor.); once only with Conjunctive, Ai. 50. חûs oî̀ $\mu a ́ \chi \omega \mu a \iota$ in a fragment should probably be read $\mu a \chi o \hat{\nu} \mu a \iota$. Of $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ indirect only two instances occur, both after ovк $\notin \chi \omega$ : in one (O. C. 1711) $\chi \rho \grave{\eta}$ follows; in the other ( Tr .992 ) à $\nu \quad \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \xi a \iota \mu \iota$. " $0 \pi \omega \varsigma$, how, is chiefly followed by Ind. (mostly Fut. or Pres.), sometimes by Conjunctive (as Ai. 428). Of Opt. there is but one instance, Ant. 272, where for $\pi \rho a_{\xi} \xi_{\alpha l}$ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ I should not hesitate to read $\pi \rho \alpha \xi_{0} \quad \mu \epsilon \nu$, having a firm conviction that in many passages of Greek authors a was substituted for o by ignorant scribes, who did not recognise the just use of Fut. Opt., which exists for the sole purpose of avoiding the confusion which would arise if the Aor. Opt. without $\alpha^{\prime \prime} \nu$ (the proper use of which is in oblique past construction,
when not indefinitely general) were used with a future signification. Cp.

(4) Tis (direct interr.) occurs in Soph. about 30 times with Fut. Ind., $3^{6}$ times with Opt. and $a^{\prime} \nu$ (2I being Aor.), 7 times with Conjunctive. Of the oblique ${ }_{0} \sigma \tau \iota s$ with Opt. no instance occurs except the two cited-
 expresses future indefinite generality (a child who should be born) the child being not yet in existence. Of ris obl. with Opt. I find no example but the one before us.
§ 3. I say then that, as $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu, I$ should save, is the oblique form of $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma \mu a l, I$ shall save, so $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu, I$ had saved, is the oblique form of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \rho \cup \sigma \alpha \dot{\mu} \eta \nu, I$ saved or have saved; and in such a place as this it can have no other force. Therefore $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$, not $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$, is the true reading here; and the conjecture $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma a l \mu^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu$, which has been proposed, must not be received, because the language of an oracle requires the more decisive Fut. Opt. as O. T. 790-3:

For similar reasons, in the parallel place, El. 34, $\dot{a} \rho o t \mu \eta \nu$ is Fut. Opt. of aifooual, not Aor. Opt. I am not unaware that a few places may be cited against my conclusion from the usual texts of Xenophon and Plato; but I should reply that the readings are corrupt, a having been introduced instead of $o$, which should be restored.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EXCURSUS V. vv. } 15 \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{r} 58 . \\
& \text { § I. } \quad \dot{\omega} \Delta i o ̀ s ~ \dot{d} \delta v \epsilon \pi \epsilon ̀ s ~ \phi a ́ \tau \iota, ~ \tau i s ~ \pi o \tau \epsilon ~ \tau a ̂ s ~ \pi o \lambda v \chi \rho u ́ \sigma o u ~ \\
& \Pi \nu \theta \hat{\omega} \nu o s \text { à } \gamma \lambda a \text { às } \epsilon \in \beta a s
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { in̆ïє } \Delta a ́ \lambda \iota \epsilon ~ \Pi a ı a ́ \nu, ~
\end{aligned}
$$

The interpretation of this first strophe of the Parodos involves several questions which shall here be considered.
§ 2. In v. 153 , the first comma has usually been placed after $\phi \rho^{\prime} \nu \alpha$, as in my text. But some scholars, as Schn. N. Ca. J., place it after $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \mu a \iota$, making $\phi \rho \hat{\epsilon} \nu a$ object of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, which derives some support from Aesch.
 superfluous, and the bareness of $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu a \iota$ without $\phi о \beta \epsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \nu \phi \rho \hat{\nu} \nu a$ is unpleasing. Therefore I prefer the old punctuation.
§ 3. Does $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi i$ $\sigma o \grave{i}$ in $v . ~{ }^{1} 55$ depend on $\delta \epsilon i \mu a \tau \iota \pi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ or on $\dot{\alpha} \zeta_{o}^{\prime}-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ ? The former seems better on some grounds, but the Greek idiom, which favours the order voc. pron. verb, gives probability to the second view.
§4. The words $\hat{\eta} \nu \epsilon \circ \nu \tilde{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota s \ddot{\omega} \rho a \iota s \pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ had usually been interpreted, either now ( $\nu \hat{\epsilon} \circ \nu=\nu \hat{\nu} \nu)$ or in the revolution of seasons hereafter; but Gustav Wolff, and J. (who follows him), understand it to mean either novel or returning in the revolution of seasons ( $\left.\pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \iota \nu=\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \nu \epsilon \lambda \theta o \partial \nu\right)$. After much consideration I am inclined to accept this suggestion of Wolff.
§ 5. The largest question is this. Should a period or colon stand after $\chi \rho \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{o}^{\prime}$ (as usually seen), and a comma or no stop after $\dot{\alpha} \zeta^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 s$, whereby $\tau i$ $\mu_{0 \iota} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. is made to depend on this participle, and the $\sigma \dot{v}$ of $\dot{\epsilon} \xi a \nu \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ to signify Apollo? Or should a comma only stand after $\chi \rho \dot{\epsilon} o s$, and a colon after á̧ó $\mu \epsilon \nu o s$, the effect of which is to make the words $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \epsilon \dot{\tau} \tau \mu \mu \alpha . . . .$. $\dot{a} \zeta^{\circ} \mu \epsilon \nu \mathcal{L}$ a parenthesis, and $\tau i \mu o c \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. dependent on $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \mu 0 \iota$ ? The former is the punctuation which exists, I believe, in all previous editions. Is there nothing to be said in favour of the latter punctuation? Much, I think, may be said for it. First (as to the construction of the strophe), it begins with addressing the oracle ( $\dot{\alpha} \delta \nu \epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} s$ фárcs) as that of Zeus, a greater than Apollo; it ends with again addressing it as $\dot{a} \mu \beta \rho \circ \tau \epsilon \Phi \dot{a} \mu a$. It begins with asking a direct question ( $\tau i s \pi o \tau \epsilon$ ) of the oracle. Why should not its resumed indirect question $\tau i \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. be also addressed to the oracle, which is in fact (by the words $\epsilon l \pi \epsilon \mu \circ \iota$ ) invited to answer it: and why is that invitation to be severed from the general construction, and awkwardly placed in a separate sentence? Will it be said that the parenthesis addressed to Apollo is an awkwardness more objectionable? I have no such feeling. The fact that the oracle is addressed as that of Zeus gives to the parenthesis a significance and a power which are very striking. The oracle is Jove's:but Apollo! what of him who delivers it? Is he to be forgotten? Far from it. True-the Chorus do not know the purport of the oracle: they do not know that Apollo is the god who sends the plague: so little do they know this, that they twice invoke him to appear as their deliverer: first as one of the 'di averrunci' ( $1 \sigma_{3}$ ), next as the Lyceian archer-king (203). But Soph. never loses sight of Homer. And, although the myth of Oedipus is earlier than the Trojan war, the poet would think of the pestilence inflicted on the G̣recian host, and he would have his Cadmean chorus regard Apollo
as an awful god, dangerous to displease. Hence the parenthesis (if parenthesis there be) is fully explained, fully justified, and in this point of view very beautiful. If it be said that the verb $\xi_{\xi} \xi^{2} v \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ is peculiarly suited to the god, we reply that in the Antigone, rif8, it is said of Teiresias, $\dot{\omega} \mu a ́ \nu \tau \iota$,
 foretells, much more may this be said of the oracle from the god's own mouth. My vote then is cordially given for the colon after $\dot{a} \zeta_{0}^{\prime} \mu \in \nu=s$ and comma after $\chi \rho$ 白os. But, as the other view gives the same general sense, it is likely to be preferred by many readers as the 'good old way'.
§ 6. Render: 'O sweet-spoken oracle of Zeus, what, I wonder, art thou that hast come from Pytho rich in gold to brilliant Thebes?-My timid heart is on the stretch, and I quiver with fear, $O$ Ieian, $O$ Delian Healer, musing on thee with holy awe-: what purpose thou wilt achieve for me either novel or brought back in the revolution of seasons, tell me, O child of golden Hope, immortal Oracle.

## EXCURSUS VI. vv. 326-329.

## OI. $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \rho \grave{s} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \phi \rho o \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \hat{\eta} s, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \grave{\imath}$




Oe. If thou knowest, do not, I adjure thee, turn away, since all we who are present bow before thee with suppliant entreaty.
Tei. Aye, for ye are all without knowledge; but I will never speak my (secrets)-in whatever way-lest I display thine-evil.
As this view has to encounter a vast amount of prejudice, I wish to say that I have long seen and still see in it the only possible explanation of these dark, but certainly genuine, words.
J. prints the last of these lines thus:

$$
\tau \ddot{a}^{\prime} \mu^{\prime}, \dot{\varphi} s \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \grave{l} \pi \omega \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime}, \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \kappa \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \omega \text { кака́, }
$$

rendering-'but never will I reveal my griefs, that I say not thine.'
His note is the following:-

[^14]

 cp. 255, Phil. 66, єi $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \dot{c}^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota \mu \eta \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$. (2) The emphatic position of $\tau a \not{ }^{\prime} \mu$ ' suits this version [!]. (3) $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \omega$ is more forcible than $\epsilon i \pi \omega$. If the meaning were "I will not reveal my griefs, in order that I may not (mention) thy griefs", the clauses would be illbalanced.'

On this note I have some remarks to make.
It is intolerable to translate кака́, griefs. It is intolerable to make Teiresias call his secrets, which bring salvation to Thebes, $m y$ griefs.
' $\Omega s \hat{a} \nu \bar{\nu} \epsilon / \pi \omega$, used as here suggested, requires similar instances to sustain it, for it does alter the meaning; $\dot{\text { is }} \mathfrak{a} \nu$, , as a final conjunction, always implying by which means $=$ in order that by such means. So the place cited from Ar. Av. is (literally) 'hold over me the sunshade, by which means the gods will not see me' = 'that by such means the gods may not see me.'
is $\ddot{a} \nu \epsilon \ddot{i} \pi \omega \mu \grave{\eta}$ for $\dot{\omega} s{ }_{\alpha} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon \neq \pi \omega$ is not justified by either of the places cited. If $\mu \grave{\eta}$ follow its verb, it must be in order to lay its emphasis on a word coming after, as on $\theta \epsilon \dot{\eta} \lambda a \tau o \nu$ in O. T. 246, not heavensent-on $\tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$ in Phil. 66, not these things (but something else). Or, after an imperative, and before a stop, it is emphatic itself. But in this place no such explanation can be given.

I was familiar with this expedient forty years ago, but I regarded it then, as I regard it still, with the most intense dislike, not to use a stronger term. And I begin by giving reasons which get rid of this (in my eyes) 'monstrum horrendum, informe, cui lumen ademptum:' of which Dindorf says in his Lexicon Soph.: 'quae tanto ineptior collocatio verborum est quo facilius vitari poterat, nihilque excusationis habens ab quaesita quadam verborum in ore vatis obscuritate, quae verbis recte collocatis manet.'
(1) First, then, a scholar looking at the words $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \ldots$...какà should discern several things : namely-
(a) The words $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \omega$ кака̀ are genuine as they stand, and ought not to be meddled with. Even the elision $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime}$ cannot be tolerated with the comma following; for that in the line 405, кai $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma$, Oiठímov, סокє $\hat{\imath}$ is on a different footing, the word $\nLeftarrow \pi \eta$, to which $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\alpha}$ belongs, having gone before, and the vocative Oi $\delta i \pi o v$ also easing the elision.
 That $\dot{\omega}$ s $\ddot{a}^{\nu} \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \epsilon \ell \pi \omega$, taken finally, is not on the same footing with ïva $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\epsilon_{i}^{i} \pi \omega$ I have already shown; and it may be instructive here to note the marvellous order into which the words thus fall: 'but I never my-that by
 $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \grave{\alpha}$ is indefensible here, as I have also shown.
(c) $\epsilon_{\kappa}^{\kappa} \phi \eta^{\prime} \nu \omega$ has a suitable object in $\tau \dot{a} \sigma \dot{a}$, not in $\tau \dot{a} \mu \dot{a}$, while $\epsilon \ddot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ has a suitable object in $\tau \dot{a} \mu a ́$, not in $\tau \dot{a} \sigma a ́$.
(d) Griefs (I repeat) is a rendering which какà will not bear; and to make Teiresias call his concealed knowledge, which contains the salvation of the city, my evils is a frightful misrepresentation of the poet's design in this scene, of the character of Teiresias, and of the position which he and Oedipus hold towards each other.
(2) Rhythm is so often unduly put forward to bolster up a weak case, that, having a strong one, I am almost unwilling to mention it; yet, if ever the solemn adagio of a poet's words was destroyed by shifting the pauses, surely that effect is wrought by this redistribution.

I have to thank J . for saving me the trouble of demolishing the other rendering of the same dislocation, 'I will never display my evils in order that I may not mention thine.' For, while nearly all the objections above urged apply to it equally, it has the special disadvantage to which the Professor alludes, that so 'the clauses would be ill-balanced', whatever this may mean.
J. has a note (IX. in Appendix) which states my view of this passage. correctly, so far as grammar is concerned, though without touching the considerations upon which it is founded. These (since he nowhere alludes to them) seem to have made no impression on his mind as a scholar and critic. He passes no judgment on my view, sparing his own arrow, perhaps because, like Artemis in the case of Actaeon, he delivers me over to the hounds, of whom he is very sure that a large pack is afield; among them the dozen emendators, whose conjectures he proceeds to set forth, not
 To these may be added the Saturday Reviewer, who, in an article generally candid, courteous, and scholar-like, likens my explanation here to the feat of 'getting a beaver up a tree'. Well! be it a beaver or an opossum, I believe in the execution of the feat so undoubtingly, that I class this interpretation as one upon the truth of which I would cheerfully stake my credit as a Greek scholar.

I have said elsewhere 'that the admitted difficulty of these words arises from the design of Sophocles to hide their exact meaning from the hearers behind the veil of an unusual and obscure construction.' Unless this fact, and the full weight of the impurtant words of Oedipus, 439, ©ंs $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime}$ ä $\gamma a \nu$ aivıктà кá $\sigma \phi \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota s$, have been duly noted and appreciated, a just judgment of my explanation can hardly be formed. These words were meant to be 'riddling and unclear' to Oedipus, an accomplished Greek, who ( $\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda$ -
 Naturally, then, they are such to us who, being students of ancient Greek, know more or less of that language. And they are more obscure to us than any other verses in this scene, because, having read the play, we know what Teiresias means to say when he has lost his temper, though even then
some of his words are obscure to us, as 420-425, where we must be satisfied with a general and vague, rather than an exact, explanation. What is 'riddling and unclear' Teiresias may speak, for he is the confidant of an oracular deity; what is untrue he must not and will not speak, for he is the trusted servant of an $\dot{\alpha} \psi \epsilon v \delta \dot{\eta} \bar{s} \quad \theta \epsilon$ ós: as he says of himself, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} s i \sigma \chi \hat{v} o \nu$ $\tau \rho \in ́ \phi \omega$. Why does he not speak out that truth intelligibly to Oedipus and the Thebans? We might answer, because this does not suit the plot devised by Sophocles. The poet might say, from the point of view of Teiresias, because he does not feel himself commissioned by Apollo to do so, and he is glad to be spared so sad and terrible an office; as he says virtually at 376 ,

In this place then he is struggling for permission to be silent. He wishes to tell nothing; but the prayer of an afflicted people and the demand of an authoritative king press him sore. So he endeavours to escape by hinting to Oedipus that what he could tell ( $\tau \dot{a} \mu \dot{\alpha}$ ) would disclose evil (какá) for him. But a lie he must not tell; he must not, he will not, say that his things (his secrets) are какá, for they are truths entrusted to him by a god, truths which, when discovered, will release Thebes from the pestilence, $\dot{v} \phi$ '
 an ambiguous and dark phrase (mine-in whatever sense spoken), equivalent to $\tau \not{ }_{\alpha} \mu^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \pi o \hat{\iota}{ }^{\prime} a ̀ \nu \hat{\eta}$ (mine-of whatever kind they be). He knows them to be ára $\theta \dot{\alpha}$, the opposite of the какג̀ which he is about to name. But this is not the time for saying so. He would not shock the Thebans and enrage Oedipus by saying that he knows what is good for them, but refuses to tell it. He therefore merely throws out a hint to Oedipus, $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon^{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \dot{\eta}_{\nu} \omega$ какá, not to be rendered 'lest I display thy evils', but 'lest I display thy things (=thy secrets) evil'. Everything here must be as dim as possible. Sophocles will not even write oi' ${ }^{\prime} \nu$, lest the keen ears of an Oedipus-a master in language-should detect the latent antithesis $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \dot{\alpha}$; therefore he writes $\dot{\omega} s \dot{a} \nu \nu$. Enough that by $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\alpha} . . . к а к \dot{a}$ Oedipus is, if possible, to be alarmed and diverted from further inquiry. In vain! The unconscious, prosperous, self-confident king, solely bent on prosecuting the search and delivering Thebes, overlooks or despises the personal threat, and fastening


I can imagine a doubter saying:-
'Well; granted that Teiresias speaks here and there to Oedipus in "riddling and unclear" terms, yet surely he will always speak Greek that can be construed. The very words, which Oedipus calls aivıктגं каं $\sigma a \phi \hat{\eta}$,
are as easy to construe as any verse in Sophocles. The same cannot be said of $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \delta^{\prime}$
 speak like a Triballian?'

Certainly I would not. But the unclearness in the two places is obviously of different kinds. In 439 all the words, and their construction, are as clear as daylight, but the meaning that underlies this day shall beget the and destroy is dark as night to Oedipus. In the place before us, the phrases $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha}$ and $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\alpha}$ are unclear, as also the construction of $\dot{\omega} s \ddot{\alpha}^{\nu} \nu$, but ov $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \pi \tau \epsilon$ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\alpha} \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega$ cannot be mistaken, and Oedipus is deaf to everything else.

Of $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha}$ and $\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \grave{a}$ I need only say that I regard them as objects of $\epsilon \ddot{i} \pi \omega$ and $\epsilon \kappa \phi \eta^{\prime} \nu \omega$ severally; of $\kappa \alpha \kappa \alpha$, that I regard it as an oblique predicative adjective agreeing with $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\alpha}$.

The obscurity of the place lies ( I ) in the less frequent, though amply testified, meaning of $\dot{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \nu$, hozusoever; (2) in its position before the verb $\epsilon i \pi \omega$, which, as it stands in the text, belongs to the nexus ov $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon i \pi \omega$, $I$ will never speak, though the same verb must be supplied to $\dot{\omega} \dot{\Delta} \stackrel{\Delta}{\nu}\left(\epsilon_{i}^{\prime} \pi \omega\right)$, however I may speak.

On this latter head (2) it is that I must try to satisfy the scruples of a doubter.

And here let me set out with saying that, if asked how I explain this passage, my answer is given in three words, 'adverbiascit $\dot{\omega}$ s a $\alpha$ ': i.e. ćs $d \nu$ assumes the function of an adverb. This I now indicate by commas before and after it. In the Latin the word corresponding to this $\dot{\omega} \Delta \nu$, utcumque, would regularly stand before the verb, if these words were translated: 'ego vero numquam mea utcumque dicam,' 'but never will I in whatsoever way speak my secrets,' and utcumque is a conjunctional particle, which in such a place 'adverbiascit': i.e. numquam mea utcumque dicam = numquam

 $\ddot{a} \nu$ in the light of a conjunctional particle 'adverbiascens'. A certain degree of awkwardness there is, arising from two causes:-(a) ou $\mu \eta^{\prime} \pi o \tau \epsilon$ and $\dot{\text { w }}$ $a_{a}^{\prime}:$ alike require a verb in the subjunctive mood; (b) $\dot{\omega} \dot{a} \ddot{a}^{\nu}$ has another and more frequent sense, 'in order that by such means'. But I reply:-this very awkwardness-this very ambiguity of usage it is, in my conviction, which led Soph. to adopt this form; for ambiguity causes that obscurity in which he meant to shroud the language of Teiresias here. Observe, moreover, that the ambiguity lies in that former part of the sentence which he (though vainly) wished to make less prominent, while the words $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma$ ' $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \omega$ какà have no such ambiguity, and, by coming last, are meant (though they fail) to impress the king's mind most powerfully.

Passages in which $\dot{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \nu$ means howsotver are numerous:-Hom. Il. ii.






 Add to these Soph. Ai. 1117, w's $\partial \nu \nu$ fis oiós $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon i \hat{i}$, which, rightly translated, is however thou may'st be the man thou art, i. e., however thou may'st be brother of the commander-in-chief, Agamemnon ${ }^{1}$.

That no place can be cited in which $\dot{\omega}^{\prime} \hat{\alpha} \nu$ appears without a verb, I admit. But I am far from deeming this a conclusive argument against its elliptical use in this peculiar passage, where, by allowing it that position, all difficulty of interpretation is at once removed, while no other tolerable solution appears. ' $\Omega$ s (Lat. $u t$ ) is the most variously used particle in Greek; and the modal adverb $a^{\prime \prime} \nu$ is, I am sure, more widely and boldly used than grammarians hitherto have been found to admit. All, however, that is here claimed for $\dot{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu$ is an ellipse of subjunctive verb, giving it an adverbial character like that of 'utcumque'.

I had until very lately supposed that the view of this passage, which I have now been defending, occurred first to myself. But within the last year I have discovered an earlier claimant. In a German treatise on this drama by Christian Wilbrandt (Rostock, 1836 ) these lines are thus translated in near agreement with my English version :

Ihr alle schauet nicht; ich aber möge nie, wie ich auch reden mag, mein Wissen aussprechen, damit ich nicht deine Uebel zu Tage bringe.
And in his note (which I translate) he says:
'I read these verses as punctuated and explained by Reisig:


Taं $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ means my knowledge, and depends on $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \eta^{\prime} \nu \omega$, which I accordingly take twice:



In this last proposal it will be seen that Wilbrandt suggests the most important feature in my view: ' $\dot{s} \grave{\alpha} \nu$ adverbiascit.' He fails to notice the antithesis of the clauses, $\tau \dot{a} \mu \dot{a}(\dot{a} \gamma a \theta a \dot{a})$ to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \kappa \dot{a}$, and $\epsilon \dot{l} \pi \omega$ to $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \omega$, nor does he see that как $\dot{\alpha}$ should be taken as a predicate. He was also wrong in looking with favour on Reisig's resumption of $\epsilon \kappa \phi \eta^{\prime} \nu \omega$, but this he redeems by the better suggestion, which it is strange that no scholar should have at an earlier time discovered to be the only possible-the assuredly true one.
${ }^{1}$ The constr. in Soph. El. 716, of $\dot{\omega}$ s with opt. ( $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda o l$ ) in past time, as well explained by Linwood, corresponds to this of $\dot{\omega} \dot{s} \dot{\alpha} \nu$, utcumque, with subjunct. in time present or future.

## EXCURSUS VII. vv. 622-626.

§ i. The verses occur near the close of the quarrelsome dialogue between Oedipus and Creon. They stand in Codd. thus:






The difficulties which editors find in them are concentrated in the third and fourth lines. They concern ( 1 ) assignment, (2) interpretation, (3) text. The questions to be determined are :-
(I) Does line $6_{24}$ properly belong to Creon or to Oedipus?

Does line $6_{25}$ properly belong to Oedipus or to Creon?
(2) How is line 624 to be interpreted?

How is $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \nu$ to be interpreted?
(3) Is emendation necessary in 624,625 ? If so, what?

Is the loss of a line to be assumed? If so, where?
The answers to questions ( 1 ) and (3) depend very materially on the answers to be given to questions ( 2 ).
§ 2. J. advocates a radical change. He edits the lines thus, supposing the loss of a verse after the fourth line:





```
OI. * * * *
KP. ov̉ \(\gamma\) à \(\phi \rho о \nu o u ̂ \nu \tau a ́ ~ \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \hat{v} \beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \omega\).
```

The conjecture $\dot{\omega} \dot{s} a ̃ \nu$ had been already proposed by Kvicala. J. under-
 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \tau \partial \phi \theta 0 \nu \in i v$, ' what manner of thing is envy', he explains, 'how dread a doom awaits him who plots to usurp a throne'. He translates $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \xi \omega \nu$ as $\epsilon \epsilon \xi \omega \nu$, 'yield', see $6_{74}$. He suggests as the sense of the lost line,
' N o, for thou persuadest me not that thou art worthy of belief', adding that it was lost by an error which the repeated ov $\gamma$ à $\rho$ produced.
§ 3. These views, in some respects specious, are in others so much opposed to my judgment, that I cannot accept them as a true solution of the difficulty.

The speciousness lies in the strong prima facie probability of the meaning ascribed to oî́v $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \tau \grave{o} \phi \theta o \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$. J. cites two places, Ant. 1242, El. 1382 , where the effect of punishment is introduced by $\delta \in \iota \kappa \nu u ́ v a l$. I see no weight in his other citations. He gives no instance with oios, though he might have quoted $403, \pi \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega$ sà oía $\pi \epsilon \rho \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon i \hat{s}$. But when he says that
 that such scholars as Hermann, Brunck, Elmsley, and others have believed that it can mean 'what is the nature of your grudge against me', or 'what is the nature of my envy': the latter seeming more probable on account of Creon's argument in 583-615. And when he says: 'It is a mere accident that $\pi \rho o \delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu \nu \mu \iota$ does not elsewhere occur as = to show forth; that sense is as natural for it as for $\pi \rho \sigma \delta \eta \lambda o ́ \omega, \pi \rho \circ \phi a i \nu \omega, \pi \rho o \kappa \eta \rho \dot{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega, \& c$.', I question this proposition. As $\pi \rho \circ \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu \nu \mu \iota$ does occur in this very play, $4_{5} 6, \sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \pi \tau \rho \varphi$ $\pi \rho o \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu$ v́s, with a strong sense belonging to the preposition, this indicates that the preposition must have a strong sense everywhere. And has it not a strong sense in $\pi \rho \circ \phi a i \nu \omega$ ? This objection, then, defeats hisinterpretation, which, moreover, requires an emendation to prop it up. Furthermore, I do not like the assigning two lines to Oedipus here. It strikes me that an unbroken $\sigma \tau i \chi o \mu v \theta i a$ at this point ought to lead on to that keen interpellation by half lines, which forms the climax of an angry dispute. Again, oí $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon i \xi \omega \nu$ in the mouth of Creon is too disrespectful ; it should rather be ovi $\pi o \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \ell_{\xi} \omega \nu$. Again, the lost verse, as supplied, does not seem to be logically answered by Creon's oú $\gamma$ á $\rho$, which should rather be $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' oú.
§ 4. I will now set down the usual translation of these lines, taking Brunck's interpretation of the third, which Elmsley and many others have accepted. And, with Meineke, I read $\pi \rho o \delta \epsilon i \xi \eta s \gamma^{\prime}$.

Cr. What, then, desirest thou? to expel me from the land ?
Oe. Not at all ; I will have thee die, not go into exile.
Cr. Aye, when thou shalt first have shown my ground of envy.
OE. Thou speakest as resolved not to submit or obey (believe).
Cr. No; for I see thee unwise.
The correction (besides the $\gamma^{\prime}$ ), which presents itself to my mind as probable, is $\tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ for $\tau \dot{\partial} \phi \theta o v \epsilon i ̂ v$.

'Aye, after first displaying what manner of thing folly is' : i.e. to what excess folly can go.
Creon, being threatened with death for no crime, might well say so much as this. He had already spoken to the same effect, $535^{-6}$ :
 єival $\tau \iota$ roû vô̂ $\chi \omega \rho i ' s$, oủk ó $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s$ фpoveîs.
He says below:

The sentence of death passed on Creon would, before its execution, be a $\pi \rho o ́ \delta \varepsilon \iota \xi \iota s$ of the great folly of Oedipus.

The verb $\dot{a} \phi \rho 0 \nu \epsilon \omega$ is found in Homer, Il. xv. 104,

and, being of perfect analogy, derived from ä $\begin{aligned} & \rho \rho \omega \nu \text {, cognate to such words }\end{aligned}$ as $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \omega \nu$, $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, како́ф $\rho \omega \nu$, какофро $\hat{\epsilon} \omega$, and others, no reasonable scholar can dispute its right to be used by Sophocles; while its appositeness here confirms that right. The path of corruption is obvious: tá $\phi \rho o \nu \epsilon i v$, тофрорєiv, тоф $\theta o \nu \epsilon i v$. $\Pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \nu$ in the mouth of Oedipus need not be rendered obey: believe (my menace) is quite admissible.

EXCURSUS VIII. v. 790.
$\pi \rho o u ́ \phi a ́ \nu \eta \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \omega \nu$.
§ 1. Wunder's conjecture $\pi \rho o ঠ \varnothing \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ (which some ascribe to Hermann), is adopted by Di., Ht., N., Vh., Bl., Wo. and J. Also Li., though not editing $\pi \rho \circ \not{ }^{\circ} \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$, says of it-'non displicet'. The only editors, since 1830, whom I find retaining $\pi \rho o u ́ \phi d \nu \eta$ are Linwood, Neue, Campbell, Bergk, Ritter, and Schneidewin (in his own text). The last of these justly says that the conj. $\pi \rho o u ̈ \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ 'verwässert den Dichter', dilutes the poet. This note his later editor, Nauck, suppresses, and, reading $\pi \rho \circ$ й $\phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$, merely says in the Anhang ' $\pi \rho o v ̋ \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ Wunder'. Ellendt (Lex. S.) supports and explains $\pi \rho o u ́ \phi a ́ \nu \eta$.
§ 2. It is with diffidence that I withhold my concurrence from so strong an array of eminent scholars as those first mentioned. But, as I have been unable to convince myself that $\pi \rho \circ \dot{\prime} \phi a ́ \nu \eta$ is wrong and $\pi \rho o u ̈ \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ the true reading, I am bound to say so, and to give reasons, which are these:
(I) $\Pi \rho o u \dot{\alpha} \dot{a} \eta \eta$ is the reading of all MSS.; it has the right of possession, and ought not to be dispossessed on any but strong grounds.
(2) It is the more difficult reading, and the rule of criticism is, that of two readings, both admissible, the more difficult has the stronger claim. $\Pi \rho o u ̈ \phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ foreshozved, foretold, is so well-known, so obvious, so recognised, K. OE.
that it enlists a host of supporters at once. Not so $\pi \rho o \dot{u} \phi \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta$. Wolff shows this by his note: 'Nur sehr gezwungen ist $\pi \rho o v ́ \phi a ́ \nu \eta ~ z u ~ e r k l a ̈ r e n: ~ i c h ~ h a b e ~$ daher Hermann's Conjectur aufgenommen'; i.e. ' $\pi \rho o u ̛ \phi a ́ \nu \eta$ admits none but a very forced explanation : therefore I have received Hermann's conjecture.'
(3) Can any reason be suggested why a scribe of any date, finding $\pi \rho o v ̌ \phi \eta \nu \in \nu$ in his MS., should write $\pi \rho o u ̛ \phi a ́ \nu \eta$ in its stead? I see none.
(4) The older editors (Brunck, Erfurdt, \&c.) received $\pi \rho o v \dot{\circ} \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta$ without hesitation, not even annotating upon it. They must, therefore, have interpreted it to their satisfaction. But, as soon as Wunder (or Hermann?) proposes an easier word, almost all welcome it with open arms. Does this prove it to be what Sophocles wrote? I cannot think so.
§ 3. Having always been able to interpret $\pi \rho \circ$ ó $\phi a ́ \nu \eta$ to my full satisfaction, I cannot be expected to discard it until my view of it is shown to be wrong. I find no argument in any note except that of J., which is as follows (the italics being his own):

[^15]A strained metaphor! Then $\pi \rho o u ́ \phi \alpha ́ \nu \eta ~ к \tau u ́ \pi o s ~ P h i l . ~ 202, ~ \pi \alpha i a \nu ~ d e ̀ ~ \lambda a ́ \mu \pi \epsilon \iota ~$
 phors', and open to suspicion; then, when the Chorus invokes Athene,
 either they hope to see these deities in person 'flash on' them, or else they use a 'strained metaphor'. And, when Oedipus says to Teiresias in 395


I have always rendered $\pi \rho o \dot{\phi} \phi a ́ \nu \eta ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu$, was heard to say. I suppose most people are now agreed (except those who assume diabolic agency) that oracles were managed by an ably organised priestcraft. How they were arranged at Delphi we cannot exactly describe. But my assumption is, that an indistinct voice from behind the shrine was heard by all ( $\pi \rho o v^{\prime}$ $\phi a ́ \nu \eta$ к $\tau \dot{\prime} \pi \sigma s$ ), which the Pythia ('quae tripode ex Phoebi lauroque profatur') then interpreted to those who had come to consult the god. This explanation (which does not seem 'gezwungen') has always satisfied my mind. If it can be proved false, I am open to conviction.

In illustration of my view may be cited Vergil's lines (Aen. iii. 90)
describing what followed the questions asked by Aeneas of Apollo's oracle in the Isle of Delos:

Vix ea fatus eram; tremere omnia visa repente, liminaque laurusque dei, totusque moveri mons circum, et mugire adytis cortina reclusis. summissi petimus terram et vox fertur ad auris.
Mr Steel also supports $\pi \rho o u ́ \phi a ́ v \eta$, saying: 'the notion of appearing, coming forward, which belongs to $\pi \rho o v \dot{\text { ávin }}$ and is thought by Wunder inadmissible here, may be allowed, as indicating the sudden and unexpected character of the god's answer.'

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EXCURSUS IX. vv. 1524-1527. }
\end{aligned}
$$

In 1526 codd. have ö $\sigma \tau \iota s$, for which I edit ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s} \tau \iota s$ : rendering
'Ye that dwell in Thebes our country, lo, this Oedipus, who knew those famed riddles (mighty man he was, for one who never eyed jealously the aspiring hopes and fortunes of the citizens), into what a whelming surge of dire misfortune he is come!'

My note is: 'For one, (i. e. considered as one) who never eyed jealously the aspiring hopes and fortunes of the citizens, ẅs $\tau \iota s$ ov่ $\pi \circ \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega \nu} \zeta \dot{\zeta} \lambda \omega \omega$ кai $\tau \dot{u} \chi a \iota s$ $\epsilon \pi \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$. See 1078 , note. Z $\hat{\eta} \lambda o s$, emulation. ' $\mathbf{E} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu \nu$ (Lat. invidere), to look with (evil) eye on. By the simple and easy reading 籼 $\tau$ cs for c̈ $\sigma \tau \iota s$ we obtain an admirable sense. Oedipus, it is said, was a wise and liberal ruler, not an ordinary $\tau u ́ p a \nu \nu o s$, like Periander or Tarquin, who were always scanning the fortunes and aspirations of the citizens, and cutting off (like poppies) those who became taller than the rest.' See Liv. i. 54 . On w's, considered as, see ro78, with note and examples in commentary.

Erfurdt (an excellent scholar who died too early) has the following note
 dictum ait hoc sensu: qui civium prosperitati numquam invidebat. Bonum quippe regem intellegi a Graecis eum, qui in civium salute salutem suam consistere putaret: tyrannum contra, qui tutum se illorum miseria opinaretur. Hinc Hieronem Syracusarum regem a Pindaro dici $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ a \pi \rho a_{\nu} \nu$

tyranni definitione haec quoque commemorari: $\phi \theta 0 \nu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota$ रà $\rho$ $\tau 0 i \bar{\sigma} \iota \dot{a} \rho i \sigma \tau o \iota \sigma \iota$
 gendum esse monet usum linguae latinae, in qua nullum reperiri verbum, quo $\phi \theta_{0} \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ exprimi possit, nisi invidere, cui plane congruat $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$, ac Ciceronem (Tusc. iii. 9), ubi nomen invidiae a nimis intuendo fortunam alterius derivet, Sophocleum $\tau u ́ \chi \alpha \iota s \in \epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \pi \nu \nu$ verbis totidem transferre.'

The sense which I ascribe to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$, that of its literal Latin, invideo, is endorsed by Steel, Ellendt and Dindorf, and by Liddell and Scott.
$J$. has printed v. 1526 thus:
'on whose fortunes which of the citizens did not gaze with envy?' Such an idea is a libel on the city, at variance with 3I-5I, and with Stasima iI. iv.

He thus changes ôs into oviv, кai into $\tau \alpha \hat{i} s, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \omega \nu$ into $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu$, and makes the $\tau \iota s$ of $0 \sigma \tau \iota s$ an interrogative. Let this large divergence from mss. be compared with mine, which merely puts long $\bar{o}(\dot{\omega})$ for $\dot{o}$. Let
 with envy on the fortunes' is a tenable phrase, and whether Sophocles ought to be taxed with such an intricate medley of genitives and datives as as oư $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \tau u ́ \chi a \iota s ~ \tau i s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oúk $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu \quad \zeta_{\eta}^{\eta} \lambda \varphi$; finally whether the sense supposed to emerge from this medley is superior to that which results from the slight correction $\ddot{\omega} \tau \tau \iota$ for $\begin{aligned} & \text { ö } \sigma \tau \iota s \text {. I should await with confidence }\end{aligned}$ the verdict of those who are at once sound scholars and tasteful critics.

In his appendix (XVII.) J. argues against my use of $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$ thus :

[^16]My answer is: (1) 'yes, we are warranted in using $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$ with a dative, by the facts stated in this very note, as well as by the example of the writer, who so uses it with rais rúzais: (2) yes, we are warranted in giving to $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$ the sense 'looking jealously on', by Liddell and Scott, who write: ‘ $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega$...to eye with envy, Lat. in-videre, $\tau \dot{\prime} \chi$ aıs Soph. O. T. I526, like $\epsilon \pi \pi \phi \theta a \lambda \mu L \hat{a} \nu$ ': by Erfurdt and Coray in the Latin note above cited: by Ellendt and Dindorf, each of whom writes ' $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$, invideo'. That is, all these scholars, and I with them, find this sense inherent
in the verb itself; and we do not call in $\zeta \dot{\eta} \lambda \varphi$ to confer it. We know moreover that $\zeta \hat{\eta} \lambda o s$ is not $\phi \theta \delta \nu o s$, but means 'honourable emulation', rendered by me 'aspiring hopes'. I would never call it 'prosperity': not even in Aj. 503, but ö $\sigma 0 v \zeta \dot{\eta} \lambda o v$, a lot how greatly enviable. Ellendt's is a very rambling discussion, and a lame conclusion : for (writing only rais for $\kappa \alpha i$ ) he makes $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \omega \nu=\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \beta \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu$, and mistranslating $\zeta \dot{\eta} \lambda \mu$ he writes 'qui non invideret civium fortunis propter obtrectandi studium'!! Dindorf emends also, not quite so badly, but far too audaciously: $\pi$ âs ồ $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\zeta} \dot{\eta} \lambda o v ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ кaì $\tau u ́ \chi a \iota s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \sigma \nu$ (surely he meant to write $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu$ ). I turn to Hermann, whom I find a useful auxiliary, though he failed to discern the value of $\omega$ s. He writes ốs $\tau$ is (cur acute hoc, says Ell.) oú к. $\tau . \lambda$. , understanding $\hat{\eta} \nu$, and renders 'qui fuit aliquis non invidens studiis et fortunis civium'. Evidently his ös ( $\left.\tilde{\eta}^{*} \nu\right)$ ris is untenable; but, had he been lucky enough to discover $\dot{\omega} s$, he could have written with perfect correctness, 'ut aliquis (considered as one) non invidens studiis et fortunis civium'. His Latin word 'studis' adequately represents my English phrase 'aspiring hopes'.

## EXCURSUS X.

## Additional Notes of Mr Stefl.

13. Todar $\delta \epsilon$ such as this. $\tau o l a y$ such. The first syllable is here short, as is usually the diphthong oc in motєiv \&c., oios, toooûtos \&c.; so also

 the diphthong $\epsilon \iota$ being never shortened before a vowel by the Attic poets see Valckenaer on Phoen. 1475 .
[In Aristoph. Aves 1233-4, codd. and edd. have II. molots $\theta$ cois; I. $\pi$ oiocol ; For this latter word I have read imoiol $\sigma \iota \nu$, shortening the second syll., and feeling surprise that so obvious a correction has not occurred to any previous editor. Mr Blaydes defends aoioloıv by citing four places where the usual antapodosis is not read. These are
(1) A. Nub. 664. $\Sigma \mathrm{II} . \pi \hat{\omega} s \delta \dot{\eta}, \phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon$. $\quad$ 上 $0 . \pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$;

Read $\phi \epsilon \rho^{\prime}$ -
 Read $\sigma \grave{v} \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta^{\prime}-\dot{\delta} \pi \delta \theta \epsilon \nu$;
 Read $\tau i \nu^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \pi \delta \hat{\lambda} \iota s ;-\eta \eta^{\prime} \nu \tau \iota \nu a ;$

Read $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu v \dot{\rho} \not \subset \delta i \omega s$ for $\pi \omega \bar{s}$; $\dot{\rho} a \delta i \omega s$.
I am here reminded of a place in Euripides, Hec. 396-8, where I think the antapodosis of $\overline{o ̈ \pi} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ s to $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s explains the difficulty found by interpreters. Hecuba and Odysseus are disputing about the purposed sacrifice of Polyxena.



I must perforce (she says) die with my daughter.
How so? (he replies); I know not that I have any master to force me.
The how is-(she rejoins)-I will cling to her, as ivy to an oak. B. H. K.]
68. єüрьбкоу. Elmsl. alone has $\eta \ddot{0} \rho \iota \sigma \kappa o \nu$. Matthiae, § 167.6 , says, "The grammarians vary from one another : Herodian, Eustathius, Suidas, approve $\epsilon \dot{v}$, Moeris and the Etym. M. $\eta \dot{v} . ~ \epsilon \dot{v}$ appears to have been the older, $\eta \dot{u}$ the more recent orthography; $\epsilon \hat{v} \rho o \nu$ remained from the former, and $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho \eta \kappa a$, which alone prevailed even in later writers." See also note on Hec. 18. The editors neither agree with each other, nor always with themselves. Porson generally uses the augment, and Dindorf uses it with ev́xomal, though not with $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{l} \sigma \kappa \omega$ or $\epsilon \dot{v} \tau v \chi \epsilon \in \omega$. Ellendt, with Matthiae, always uses the unaugmented forms.
70. $\gamma$ a $\mu \beta$ рóv. Properly, according to Jul. Pollux III. 3I, 'a relative on the husband's side', $\pi \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \rho o{ }^{\prime} s$, 'on the wife's'; but, he adds, 'they are frequently confounded by the poets, as in Hipp. 63I and here, where $\gamma a \mu \beta$ oos means wife's brother.' 「a $\mu \beta \rho$ òs is used generally for any kinsman by marriage, often a son-in-law. Пє $\epsilon \theta \epsilon \rho o ̀ s ~ a ~ f a t h e r-i n-l a w ~ m e a n s ~ a ~ s i s t e r ' s ~ h u s b a n d ~$ in E. Elect. 1286.
114. $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho$ 's. The word is derived from $\theta \epsilon \grave{s}$ and $\ddot{\omega}_{p}$ a, care. Laius had gone either $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \epsilon \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a$ a $\pi a ̂ \delta a \mu a \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu \mu a \theta \epsilon i \nu, \epsilon i \mu \eta \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \tau^{\prime} \epsilon i \eta$, Phoen. $3^{6}$, or perhaps to enquire how the ravages of the Sphinx might be stopped.
 particular ằ $\nu$ frequently is thus used twice in one member of a proposition. The first case is when the words belonging to the same part of the construction are separated by a parenthesis, and $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ which already stands at the beginning, to render the uncertainty sensible at the first, is repeated after the parenthesis, see v. 505 . The second case is where the one $\ddot{a} \nu$ must be connected with the verb, and the other with some other word of the proposition. It is not however always easy to determine which is this other word. Hermann on Viger. has gone through all the passages in this play in which $\dot{\partial} \nu$ is repeated and has joined the second $\dot{a} \nu$ either to those
particles in each sentence which allow of a limitation of meaning, such as $\kappa \alpha a i$ in $\kappa a ̈ \nu, ~ o v, ~ \pi \omega \hat{\omega}$, or to those words which indicate something in itself doubtful, as $\tau i$, $\pi$ oios, or any substantive or adjective. Here all agree in joining one $\hat{\alpha} \nu$ to $\theta \in \lambda o c$, but the other $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ is by Hermann attached to $\kappa \tilde{a} \mu \epsilon-$ even myself perhaps; by others with less probability to $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \in i v$, by Schaefer, quite against Hermann's opinion, to $\tau$ áx $\alpha$. " $A \nu$ is in fact usually subjoined to other particles in a sentence, except where it is joined to the most important and emphatic word in a proposition; so that it is subjoined to adverbs and to neuter adjectives and pronouns, which serve

 rogatives. This frequent junction in position would lead to a junction in construction, and this seems to have been so much the case with $\tau \alpha \chi^{\prime} a^{d} \nu$, that it is used by Plato in Phaedrus p. 265 в for $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi a$ simply, the verb being disregarded. See Matth. § 599 c. We have other instances of this in 523 of this play, and in $\tau \alpha \chi^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \mu \eta \nu i o v \sigma \iota \nu$, O. C. 969 . Ellendt agrees with Schaefer in thus attaching $\not{ }^{a} \nu$ in construction to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi a$ here. He adds that in those cases where $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi^{\prime} \ddot{\alpha} \nu$ is joined to the potential optative, it is $\tilde{\alpha}^{\nu} \nu$ which derives strength from the addition of rá $\alpha$, it is very possible that: but in the examples of the indicative mood, the force of the sentence rests upon $\tau \alpha \dot{\chi} \chi a$, while $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ is used for the purpose of softening or extenuating, perhaps indeed. We may add that the repetition of $a ̉ \nu$ is most usual with potential optatives. It is more rarely repeated with the indicative, or the infinitive, and very rarely with the subjunctive (not, as Elmsley would have
 Matth. § 600 , and, on the whole note, Rost § 120 , notes (2) and (3). Ellendt thinks, and apparently with good reason, that the use of the double $\alpha, \nu$ is frequently to be accounted for merely from the graceful negligence of a luxuriant language.
640. á $\pi$ öкрivas. Dawes's first prosodiacal canon (that 'a short vowel before the slender consonants $\pi, \kappa, \tau$, or the aspirates $\phi, \chi, \theta$, followed by any liquid; or before the middle consonants $\beta, \gamma, \delta$, followed by $\rho$; always remains short ';) is true when applied to the Comic writers alone. Porson on Or. 64 says that in tragedy the proportion of examples of syllables thus remaining short to those which are made long is that of three to one; and that the species of license which lengthens such syllables is by far the most frequent in uncompounded words, as $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu 0 \nu$, $\pi a ́ \tau \rho o s ;$ much rarer in compound words where the syllable coincides with the joining, as in $\pi 0 \lambda \dot{\prime} \chi \rho v \sigma o s$, Andr. 2, and in augments as in $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$, Or. 12, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$; S. El. 366. but rarer still where a preposition is joined to a word, as $\dot{a} \pi \delta \dot{\sigma} \rho o \pi o \iota$, Phoen. 586. This is the case here, and in Prom.




 $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho o \nu . ~ H e ~ a d d s, ~ t h a t ~ t h e r e ~ i s ~ n o ~ c a s e ~ o f ~ a ~ s y l l a b l e ~ b e i n g ~ m a d e ~ l o n g, ~$ where a word ends in a short vowel followed by a word beginning with two consonants such as to allow it to remain short.
801. In four passages of this play Elmsley has edited $\hat{\eta}$ instead of $\tilde{\eta}_{\nu}$, $I$ was; in two of them, 1123 and 1389 , he has the authority of mSs.; but here and in 1393, he has done so from conjecture merely. He suspects the passages in Euripides, in which $\hat{\eta} \nu$ is found before a vowel, of being corrupt, and supposes $\tilde{\eta}$ to be the only form of the 1st person sing. used by the tragic writers, leaving the form $\dot{\eta} \nu$ for Aristophanes's latest play, the Plutus. He derives his authority no doubt from Porphyrius, who in the Venetian scholia upon Iliad $\epsilon^{\prime} 553$ says, that the more ancient Attic writers used $\hat{\eta}$, and the more modern $\dot{\eta} \nu$; and from Aelius Dionysius in Eustathius, p. 1761 , 5 I . But Herodian and Photius and the writer in Horti Adonidis, p. 73 b. are authorities for the use of $\dot{\eta}$ : and Plato on the other hand, many of whose writings are later than the Plutus, frequently uses $\hat{\eta}$. In fact Bekker always prints $\hat{\eta}$ not $\hat{\eta} \nu$, in Plato, so that we cannot subscribe to the notion that $\hat{\eta}$ was used by the earlier writers and $\dot{\eta} \nu$ by the later. Hermann thinks that it would be a more probable assertion to affirm that both Tragic and Comic writers used $\hat{\eta} \nu$, when they wished to avoid an hiatus; but his own opinion is that every passage, where $\hat{\eta} \nu$ is required by the hiatus, either requires or admits the imperfect, whereas $\hat{\eta}$ in some passages evidently has rather the force of an aorist; as in Av. 97, $\hat{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho, \hat{\omega} \xi \notin \nu 0 \iota$, ä $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os, I formerly was, fui not eram. He concludes that the Homeric $\begin{gathered}e \\ a\end{gathered}$ or $\dot{\eta} a$ is always an aorist, and though he allows that the Attic $\dot{\eta}$ arose from the Ionic imperfect ${ }^{\prime} a$, he thinks that, there being two forms of the imperfect, the one, $\hat{\eta}$, was employed for an aorist ; the other, $\hat{\eta} \nu$, retained for the imperfect.
[W. Dindorf has none of Hermann's wavering on this subject. In his Lex. Soph. p. 141, he writes: 'In imperfecti persona prima propria Atticorum forma est $\hat{\eta}$, quam apud Sophoclem servavit cod. L. in O. C. 973, 366, quo in loco manus multo recentior $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ adscripsit; $\dot{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ est in locis reliquis O. T. 801, 1123,1335, r 389 , 1393 , O. С. 768 , 1386 , Ај. 1377 , Tr. 414, 564, El. 1023, Phil. 1219, quibus non dubitandum quin ipsis quoque $\dot{\eta}$ restituendum sit cum Elmsleio propter rationes ab L. Dindorfio expositas in Thesauro, vol. 3, p. 262. Et $\dot{\eta}$ ex O. T. ir23, diserte citatur ab Porphyrio in Schol. Hom. Il. $\epsilon^{\prime} 533$ et Od. $\eta^{\prime}$ 186.' B. H. K.]

## EXCURSUS XI.

## SOPHOCLES AND THE OEDIPODEAN MYTH.

§ i. Sophocles, son of Sophilus, was born at Colonus, the famous borough near Athens. He describes the scenery of his native place in the lovely choral ode, 668 \&c., of his last drama, the Oedipus Coloneus. His father was a prosperous sword-maker, whose property he seems to have inherited, for the offices he filled in the course of his life show that he had high rank among Athenian citizens. His birth-year is stated with slight variation by different authorities; but, if we take it as B. C. 495 , Ol. $7 \mathrm{I}, 2$, we cannot be far wrong. He died in his 9oth year, B. c. 406, Ol. 93, 3 ; Euripides having in the same year died before him. In the Frogs of Aristophanes, which play was produced in 405 , ample proof appears of their recent decease.

The young Sophocles, under his father's care, received the best education of that time. The Greeks had no language to learn except Greek, the noblest ever framed by human thought. Its dialects, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, were easily acquired by one who could speak and write well in Attic style. Natural Science and Mathematics were not advanced enough to become subjects of youthful study. Geography, so far as known, and the current rules of number and measure, were naturally learnt at home and in the commerce of daily life. The poetry, epic or lyric, and the mythic tales at that time circulated, would attract the interest and dwell in the memory of any well-reared child adapted to enjoy them. Of written prose little was extant before Herodotus, of philosophy little before the Sophists and Socrates. Gymnic exercises of every kind, embracing the science of attack and defence, music, comprising also the knowledge of metre and the practice of composing words for lyre and flute accompaniment -such were the chiel subject-matter of a well-born Athenian's education.

By the mastery of such acquirements and the performance of legally required religious duties, was trained the кa入òs кáräòs of Athens in the Aeschylean age, the age of Marathon and Salamis, of Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristeides. During the next half-century arose and grew the art of prose composition. By the teaching of the so-called sophists, Protagoras, Prodicus, Gorgias, and their opponent Socrates, were formed public speakers and political leaders like Pericles, authors like Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, legists and pleaders like Antiphon and Lysias, who were followed after a while by the still more renowned names of Demo-
sthenes, Aeschines, Lycurgus, and others, with whom expired the freedom and renown of the republic; though Athens, as a seat of learning, was frequented by students through many subsequent centuries, even to the times of the Byzantine empire.
§ 2. Sophocles was conspicuous among his contemporaries for his proficiency in all youthful accomplishments, especially in music, which art he studied under the famous Lamprus. His ancient anonymous biographer relates especially that he was appointed to lead ( $\bar{\xi} \dot{\xi} \alpha \rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu)$ the paean sung in celebration of the victory of Salamis, being then in his sixteenth year; on which occasion he appeared naked, anointed with oil and holding a lyre in his left hand.

Having chosen dramatic art for his chief pursuit, he studied its principles and practice under the best guidance, that of Aeschylus. And wonderful indeed was the success, rich the reward, that crowned his industrious emulation: for in his first dramatic contest in B.c. 468, Ol. 77,4 , he won the first prize against Aeschylus his master and senior in age by thirty years. The prestige of this success was enhanced by the peculiar fact, that the archon Aphepsion, regarding the occasion as difficult and important, entrusted the award to Kimon and his nine colleagues, who had newly returned from the campaign signalised by the glorious victory of the river Eurymedon. The play which gained this distinction was called Triptolemus, the name of that Eleusinian prince whom Demeter sent forth to teach all mankind the cultivation of corn and other useful arts.
§ 3. This eminent success unquestionably placed Sophocles in the foremost rank as a dramatic poet and a $\delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o s$ in the contests of the Dionysian festivals. Yet of his numerous tragedies only seven remain to us, the earliest of these being the Antigone, brought out B. C. 440, Ol. 84, 4. It gained the first prize amid great popular acclamation: and its merit induced the Athenian people to elect him as one of the $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o l$ for the ensuing year. In this office he was a colleague of Pericles, with whom he conducted the war against the oligarchs of Samos. It was probably during the discharge of his various duties at this time that he became acquainted with Herodotus, for whom he is said to have composed a lyric paean. Other public offices, a treasurership, a priesthood, a post as one of the $\pi \rho o^{\prime} \beta$ ov $\lambda o$ after the Sicilian calamity, have been attributed to him by various writers. But we may safely say that such functions were not suited to his taste, perhaps not to his capacity. What great poet has ever been great as a statesman? what great statesman has ever been more than a dilettante versifier? This however we do know,-for it is testified on all handsthat Sophocles was a high-bred and most amiable Athenian gentleman. Dionysus is made to say of him in Aristophanes (Ranae 82), $\dot{\delta} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \ddot{\kappa} \kappa о \lambda о s$ $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \dot{a} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \ddot{\jmath} \kappa c \lambda o s \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{L}$. Again, when Euripides (who even after death
was pursued by the comic poet's scorn and hate) is represented as intriguing shabbily to supersede Aeschylus in the tragic throne below, Sophocles is said to resign modestly all claim in favour of his old master : Ranae 787.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { च. ... кä̃ } \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha \pi \hat{\omega} s
\end{aligned}
$$

Should Aeschylus win (Aeacus goes on to say), Sophocles will rest content, if not, he means to have a tussle for the throne with Euripides. And, in fact, if the 'via media' is really best, the tragic style of Sophocles does hold a middle place between the audacious grandiloquence of Aeschylus, and the (often) undignified realism of Euripides.
§ 4. It has been already stated in the First Excursus, $\S \S 5,7$, that by Sophocles the Chorus was raised in number from 12 to 15 ; and that a third actor was allowed to appear in the dialogue, as the Corinthian messenger in epeisodia 3 and 4 of this play. A further important alteration is due to his influence, namely, the discontinuance of the old rule, by which the three tragedies exhibited in the contest (along with a satyric drama) constituted one subject, forming a connected trilogy, like that still extant of Aeschylus, the Agamemnon, Choephoroe, and Eumenides. Sophocles, Euripides and most others of their age brought forward three unconnected tragedies, with the satyric play as usual.
§ 5. Of the seven Sophoclean tragedies only three can be dated with certainty: the Antigone, before mentioned; the Philoctetes, B.c. 409, Ol. $9^{2}, 3$; the Oedipus Coloneus, which was brought out five years after its author's death, by his grandson and namesake, the younger Sophocles, son of Ariston, B.c. 40I, Ol. 94, 3. A story is told by the biographer, that the elder son Iophon, afraid of losing much of the paternal estate through his father's fondness for Ariston, endeavoured to withdraw the control of his property from Sophocles, on the ground of senile incapacity; but, when the case was heard before the court of wardsmen ( $\phi \rho a \tau \rho i a$ ) which had the jurisdiction, Sophocles read to them the ode, called the Mápooos ( $668 \& \mathrm{c}$.) from the yet unpublished Oedipus Coloneus, in proof of his mental power; and thus established it to the satisfaction of the court. For the sake of human nature we should wish to disbelieve this story, were it not added, that the great poet pardoned the undutiful act of his eldest son, thus giving at the close of his life a pleasing proof of that єúкo入ía which characterised him from its earliest years.

We may naturally suspect that the Antigone was soon succeeded by the Electra. This suspicion grows out of the double analogy-that of the two
leading characters, and that of the two plots, in the one of which tyrannic legal rule suppresses the pious revolt of private duty, while in the other the pious vengeance of personal duty prevails against tyrannic wrong. To the date of the Trachiniae there is no clue. Of the Ajax all we can say is that, as belonging to the Trojan myth, and as having Odysseus for a prominent character, it may seem to stand in time not far from the Philoctetes. We might have wished it to be the later of the two, as it places Odysseus in a more amiable light. But this is hardly possible, and after all in both dramas the Ithacan prince is shown as a thorough-going politician, who prefers the public good to all considerations, even of mercy for the living; though in the Ajax he disdains and prevents the petty triumph of injuring and insulting the dead.

There remains only the play before us-the Oedipus Tyrannus, or Oedipus Rex, as it is often called, and with justice, for the ancient qúpav 0 corresponded much more nearly to the modern idea of a king, than to the notion always suggested by the word tyrant. If the elder and younger Dionysius are types of bad rúpap ool, good types in history are Hiero of Syracuse, Gelo of Agrigentum, and in the mythic times Theseus, Oedipus, Polybus, and many more.

The date of the Oed. T. is a question of conjecture, and assigned with much probability to the year в.c. 429, Ol. 87,4 ; first, because a passage in Athen. vir. 276 indicates that its date was near to that of Eurip. Medea, acted first in 43 I ; next, because the plague at Thebes seems to point to that of Athens in 430. Sophocles did not obtain the first prize, which was awarded to Philocles, who in Bergk's opinion gained it by reviving a tetralogy of Aeschylus, not by a drama of his own composition: while others suppose the feelings of the judges to have been shocked by the ultratragic character of the plot, and by the horrible sight of the blinded and despairing Oedipus in the Exodos.
§ 6. Let us turn now to the plot of this play, and the story on which it rests, the Oedipodean myth.

Briefly told, it is this:
Oedipus was the first and only child of Laius and Jocasta, who reigned in Thebes. Apollo's oracle told them that the son they hoped for should kill his father. Tempted thus to commit a crime, they doomed the babe to die by exposure. But the slave entrusted with the task spared him. Carried to Corinth, Oedipus was adopted by the king and queen who ruled there, and was reared with every advantage. In early manhood, a drunkard's insult led him to doubt his parentage. He went to Delphi to learn the truth, but, without answering his inquiry, the oracle told him it would be his fate to slay his father and wed his mother. In horror, he resolved to return to Corinth no more. Hastening on the opposite road, he
met his father Laius, and, receiving ill-usage, killed him. He reached Thebes, which was then tormented by the Sphinx, and destroyed her by solving her riddle. In reward for this service, he received the throne of Thebes, and the hand of its queen, his mother Jocasta. Years passed away, during which he reigned a seemingly happy husband and father, and certainly a wise and popular ruler. At length came a reverse. Thebes and its lands were desolated by a terrible pestilence. The Delphian oracle, being consulted, made answer, that the plague would never cease until the murderers of Laius were detected and punished. Oedipus devotes himself to this task, and begins by pronouncing publicly a solemn curse on the perpetrator and on all who entertain and conceal him, specially including himself among the persons thus denoted. Events, crowded within the space of a single day, remove the veil. Oedipus and Jocasta learn the truth of his bloody deed and of his parentage. She commits suicide; he destroys his eyesight, and surrenders himself in abject despair to the penal consequences required by the Delphian god.

Be it here observed, that the events, which lay the foundation of this drama, as narrated by its various characters, extend over hardly fewer than 40 years. But the action itself lies within the hours of a single day. It is one awful peripeteia, the most tragic, as Aristotle says, of all tragedies: the precipitation of Oedipus from the height of royal dignity and happiness to the lowest depth of degradation and misery. Lear and Othello may command equal sympathy; but to the sudden completeness of the fall of Oedipus there is no parallel.
§ 7. Yes: we repeat it: though the discovery alone of these facts, the culmination of the story, is enacted in this drama of a single day, the whole is told fragmentally by the various actors : and almost every actor has some part to tell. Jocasta ( $707 \& \mathrm{c}$.) relates the oracle given to Laius and the exposure of the infant by him (she says, hiding her own share in the deed): see 1173. The Corinthian messenger (ror4-1044) states how he received Ued. from the Laian shepherd, took him to Corinth and gave him to Polybus. He is confirmed by the confession of the shepherd, who owns to have received the babe from Jocasta for exposure, and to have been informed why it was so dealt with ( $1167-1181$ ). Oedipus himself tells the tale of his own life at Corinth, his inquiry at Delphi, and his killing of Laius ( $774-833$ ). Creon describes how Laius came to be travelling abroad; how his murder, ascribed to robbers, was reported at Thebes; how an inquiry respecting it was commenced and carried on for a short time, but broken off and cast into oblivion by the appearance of the terrible Sphinx, and the misery which she inflicted on Thebes for some time ( $103-131,558-569$ ). The Priest of Zeus testifies that Oedipus destroyed the Sphinx, releasing Thebes from her cruel tribute, and that all the people
believed him to have achieved this victory by divine assistance ( $3 \mathrm{I}-53$ ). With this view the Chorus conspires (504-511). Teiresias adds nothing to these facts, but explains them all by taxing Oed. with the guilt of murder and incest, and by hinting that he is in truth a born Theban. But Oed., untaxed as yet by his own conscience, scouts his words as those of an impostor and traitor, whom he now suspects to be an instrument of Creon. When the whole has been disclosed in the 4 th epeisodion, the Exangelos in the $5^{\text {th, }}$, according to the dramatic rule, describes the dreadful deeds wrought within the palace by the wretched pair. On the Exodos I need not dwell here: it is in part a long lamentation, in part a forecast of the future destinies of the Oedipodean race. It paves the way for the last great work of Soph., the posthumously acted Oedipus Coloneus.
§ 8. The Oedipodean myth, and this drama, as founded upon it and containing it, have always been subject to severe criticism on two distinct grounds.

One ground is, that it implies manifest improbabilities, some of which are too startling to be tolerated. For instance:

Oed. is displayed to us as a young man of singular ability (see above), singularly well educated ( $\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ т $\rho \alpha \phi \epsilon i$ is 380 ). Yet the myth implies that such a young man, having been led to doubt the genuineness of his Corinthian parentage ( $779-786$ ), having consequently travelled to consult the Delphic oracle concerning it, having there been told that he was destined to kill his father and marry his mother, did, in spite of this warning, not refrain from killing, soon after, four men, one of whom was a dignified person of middle age, riding in a chaise, and driven by a herald: and did, soon after this, not refrain from marrying a woman old enough to be his mother. He is further represented as having reigned in Thebes about twenty years (?) in marriage union with Jocasta, yet at the end of that time unacquainted with all the circumstances attending the mysterious death of her first husband, his own predecessor, Laius.

I do not think it worth while, at this point, to recite the excuses which have been attempted by various writers for these and other similar inconsistencies. It is enough for me now to say that Soph. could not fail to discern them, but that they did not deter him from casting the plot of his Oed. T. as we have received it.
§ 9. The other ground of objection is of graver kind: it affects the ethical character of the Sophoclean plot, it questions the moral justice, the religious propriety of the Oedipus Tyrannus.

Those who question the moral justice, argue thus: Oedipus is placed before us as a benefactor of Thebes, a wise and affectionate ruler, beloved by his people: a kind and generous husband ( $580,77^{2}$ ), a loving father ( $1462,1480, \& c$.): yet he is left at the close in the deepest wretchednes:, plunged $\epsilon i s \kappa \lambda u ́ \delta \omega \nu \alpha \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\eta} s \sigma_{\nu \mu \phi o p a ̂ s ~(~}^{5} 52 \sigma$ ). Is this right?

Let us reply for the moment: how could Sophocles help it? he has only followed the tradition of the myth.

A few writers would account for the ruin of Oedipus by ascribing it to the criminal conduct of his father Laius. Neither they nor I can prove that Sophocles had this design: but I would not venture to assert that the thought never crossed his mind. The Mosaic law was unknown to the Greeks of that time : but no civilized nation could help seeing that the sins of parents are in numberless cases visited on their innocent children and descendants. See 149, 4-5. But Laius, worse off than Louis XIV. and Louis XV., drew the thunder on his own head also.

Many others have found a resource in blackening the character of Oedipus. His worrying of Polybus and Merope about a drunkard's idle word, his slinking from Corinth to Delphi, his refusing to return, were acts (they say) wickedly proud, cruelly selfish, ungrateful and heartless. In retaliating to the direst extremity for an unimportant provocation on the road from Delphi, he was rash, ruthless, ruffianly. To forget so easily the slaughter of four men was proof of a case-hardened conscience. His marriage with Jocasta was unnatural and unwise, the craving of ambition not of love. In the opening of the drama and in his subsequent proclamation he shews himself vain, conceited, self-confident : in the scenes with Teiresias and Creon insolent, impetuous, angrily violent.

To this harshly exaggerated indictment I cannot subscribe. But it does note some peculiar defects in the character of Oedipus which had an unhappy influence on the shifting current of his life.
§ io. Polybus and Merope, having taken charge of Oedipus, whose high birth they might possibly suspect, did their duty by him nobly, giving him all the advantages of education due to the prince of Corinth, and to his own great talents. The faults inherent in his nature were not discerned, for nothing called them into play. What were these faults? Extreme. sensitiveness was one; another, a tendency to form hasty judgments, and to persist in them when once formed. These were first shewn in the resentment caused by the drunkard's insult, and in the secret journey to Delphi. His conduct when there has been viewed unfairly. In justice to him it must be assumed, that the silence of the oracle on the question asked led him to conclude that Polybus and Merope were his true parents. His abandonment of Corinth after hearing the Pythia's dreadful warning was a hasty and erroneous act: but it was not selfish ingratitude: it was adopted for the sake of his supposed parents as much as for his own. His conduct in the fray with Laius has also been pressed against him too severely. The law of those times allowed retaliation of wrong. He was unduly insulted by the driver, and retaliated with a not immoderate blow: he received
from Laius a blow which had a deadly purpose, and retaliated hastily with one that proved fatal. If a modern jury were to call this 'manslaughter' in England or 'Todtschlag' in Germany, the punishment would be merely nominal : but 'justifiable homicide' would be a more likely verdict. It would have been better in every way, beyond question, to have passed onward in silent contempt: but allowance should be made for the difference of times as well as for the impulsive temperament of Oedipus. The temptation of the Theban throne to the outcast prince of Corinth, conscious of his own powers and honest purposes, was too strong to be resisted; and in Jocasta there was nothing to revolt a youth who had no tie of love elsewhere. In the drama itself Teiresias seems more blameable in losing his temper than even Oedipus was: and the king, unconscious of his own real position, can see no motive for the seer's frightful imputations but a treasonable purpose, in which he could only be the agent of another, and that other could be none but Creon. These then I find to be the faults of Oedipus: over-sensitiveness, hastiness of judgment, undue confidence in his own opinions. I do not find him lightly moved to wrath, but, when once moved, liable to the loss of self-control.
§ ir. The question touching the religious propriety of the Oedipodean story is harder to deal with, and I cannot pretend to treat it exhaustively; for indeed it belongs to a subject which never has been, and never will be, exhausted on this planet which holds mankind. I shall first say a few words of my own, which may help to reconcile readers to the conduct of Soph. in writing the play: and then cite those of another writer, who will speak with greater authority.

Is the Oed. T. a Fate-drama? Did Soph. mean to represent all things around us, and ourselves with them, all that we are wont to call truth and falsehood, right and wrong, innocence and guilt, as mere playthings of an irresistible Power named Moira, which sits high aloof, and moves the puppets on earth at its own discretion?

I believe nothing of the kind. What I do believe is, that Sophocles, having written the Antigone, and being always on the look-out for good mythic material, discerned in the fate of Oedipus himself opportunity for a drama of a single day, affording an available series of tragic situations. How admirably he used that opportunity, the drama itself, which we happily possess, abundantly proves ${ }^{1}$ : see $\S 7$.
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But I believe something more, which I cannot indeed prove; but which may be fairly stated for others to consider more maturely. I believe that when he had brought out his 'magnum opus' the Oed. T. (say in B.c. 429) he was not content with the position in which Oedipus and his myth were thereby left. I believe that his mind, if not his pen, began immediately to work upon the Oedipus Coloneus, in which play he designed to bring Oedipus to his last peaceful rest on Athenian soil in the beloved deme of Sophocles himself. How strong a patriotic motive was added to the aesthetic and religious considerations which dictated this scheme, the Oed. Col. itself indicates. How strongly such a motive would operate at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, when Plataea, the staunch ally of Athens, fell before the assault of their bitterest foes, the Thebans, is obvious enough. The intervention of the Philoctetes certainly, the Ajax probably, the Trachiniae possibly, so far from telling against my suggestion, tends even to strengthen it: for a dramatist at the head of his profession was obliged to produce piece after piece as occasion required, and might all the while have a favourite piece on the stocks, which time failed him to complete, though his mind, if not his pen, was ever at work upon it. After all, we know, he left it for his grandson to produce, though (according to his biographer) he read a portion of it to his wardsmen during life.
§ 12. I conclude this Excursus with an extract from Bishop Thirlwall's Essay on 'The Irony of Sophocles', from the Philological Museum, Vol. ir. Those readers who have not had an opportunity of seeing this excellent treatise, will have reason to thank me for thus drawing their attention to it.

The Bishop begins his Essay by speaking of verbal irony: then treats of practical irony, as shown first, in the lives of individuals; next, in the history of states and institutions; thirdly, in judicial proceedings and in the conflicts of party. After which, when he comes to speak of the drama, our extract (pp. 490-503) commences:
" The dramatic poet is the creator of a little world, in which he rules with absolute sway, and may shape the destinies of the imaginary beings to whom he gives life and breath according to any plan that he may choose. Since however they are men whose actions he represents, and since it is human sympathy that he claims, he will, if he understands his art, make his administration conform to the laws by which he conceives the course of mortal life to be really governed. Nothing that rouses the feelings in the history of mankind is foreign to his scene, but, as he is confined by artificial limits, he must hasten the march of events, and compress within a narrow compass what is commonly found diffused over a large space, so that a faithful image of human existence may be concentrated in his mimic sphere. From this sphere however he himself stands aloof. The eye, with which he views his microcosm and the creatures who move in it, will not be one K. OE.
of human friendship, nor of brotherly kindness, nor of parental love; it will be that with which he imagines that the invisible power who orders the destiny of man might regard the world and its doings. The essential character therefore of all dramatic poetry must depend on the poet's religious or philosophical sentiments, on the light in which he contemplates history and life, on the belief he entertains as to the unseen hand that regulates their events.
" If any of these remarks should appear questionable as a general proposition, we may at least safely assume their truth as beyond doubt, when they are applied to Sophocles. Not even the most superficial reader of his works can fail to observe, that they are all imprest with a deep religious character, that he takes every opportunity of directing the attention of his audience to an overruling Power, and appears to consider his own most important function to be that of interpreting its decrees. What then was the religion of Sophocles? what was his conception of this Power whom he himself represents in conducting the affairs of his ideal world? On the answer we give to this question must evidently depend our apprehension of the poet's main design, and our enjoyment of the art he has exerted in its execution. Unquestionably the religion of Sophocles was not the religion of Homer, and the light in which he viewed destiny and providence was not that in which they are exhibited by the Homeric poems. In the interval which separated the maturity of epic and dramatic poetry, the human mind had taken some great strides : and men of a vigorous and cultivated intellect could no longer acquiesce in the simple theology of the Homeric age. The dogma which to the hearers of the old bard seemed perhaps the best solution that could be found for their moral difficulties, that the father of gods and men was, like the humblest of his children, subject to the sway of an irresistible fate, against which he often might murmur in vain : this dogma was supprest or kept in the back ground, and on the other hand the paramount supremacy of Jupiter was brought prominently forward. The popular mythology indeed still claimed unabated reverence, even from the most enlightened Greeks. But the quarrels of the gods, which had afforded so much entertainment to their simplehearted forefathers, were hushed on the tragic scene : and a unity of will was tacitly supposed to exist among the members of the Olympian family, which would have deprived Homer of his best machinery. The tendency of these changes was to transfer the functions of Destiny to Jupiter, and to represent all events as issuing from his will, and the good and evil that falls to the lot of mortals as dispensed by his hand. It is evident that, so far as this notion prevailed, the character of destiny was materially altered. It could no longer be considered as a mere brute force, a blind necessity working without consciousness of its peans or its ends. The power indeed still remained, and was still
mysterious in its nature, inevitable and irresistible in its operation; but it was now conceived to be under the direction of a sovereign mind, acting according to the rules of unerring justice. This being the case, though its proceedings might often be inscrutable to man, they would never be accidental or capricious.
" How far these ideas had acquired clearness and consistency in the mind of Sophocles, it is impossible precisely and certainly to determine. But it seems indisputable that indications of them appear in his works, and it is interesting to observe the traces of their influence on his poetry. It has indeed been often supposed that some of his greatest masterpieces were founded on a totally different view of the subject from that just described: on the supposition that mankind were either subject to an iron destiny, which without design or forethought steadily pursued its immutable track, insensible of the victims which in its progress it crushed beneath its car : or else that they were at the mercy of reckless and wayward deities, who sported with their happiness, and sometimes destroyed it merely to display their power. We do not deny that the former at least of these suppositions may be adapted to the purposes of dramatic poetry, and that the contrast between man with his hopes, fears, wishes, and undertakings, and a dark, inflexible fate, affords abundant room for the exhibiticn of tragic irony : but we conceive that this is not the loftiest kind, and that Sophocles really aimed at something higher. To investigate this subject thoroughly, so as to point out the various shades and gradations of irony in his tragedies, would require much more than the space which can here be devoted to it. We shall content ourselves with selecting some features in his compositions which appear most strikingly to illustrate the foregoing remarks. One observation however must be premised, without which the works of Sophocles can scarcely be viewed in a proper light. That absolute power which we have attributed to the dramatic poet over his creatures, may be limited by circumstances: and in the Greek theatre it was in fact restricted by peculiar causes. None but gods or heroes could act any prominent part in the Attic tragedy; and as the principal persons were all celebrated in the national poetry, their deeds and sufferings were in general familiar to the audience. The poet indeed enjoyed full liberty of choice among the manifold forms which almost every tradition assumed: and he was allowed to introduce considerable variations in subordinate points. But still he was confined within a definite range of subjects, and even in that he could not expatiate with uncontrolled freedom. Now the legends from which his scenes were to be drawn, were the fictions, at least the tales, of a simple but rude age : the characters of his principal persons were such as had struck the vigorous but unrefined imagination of a race who were still children of nature: their actions were such as exhibited the qualities most
esteemed in the infancy of society ; and their fate corresponded to the view then entertained of the manner in which the affairs of the world are directed by natural or supernatural agency. While the poet's materials were thus prescribed for him, it was scarcely possible that he should infuse his spirit equally into all, and so mould and organize them, as never to betray the coarseness of their original texture. Duly to estimate the art of Sophocles, and rightly to understand his designs, we must take into account the resistance of the elements which he had to transform and fashion to his purposes. When we consider their nature we shall not perhaps be surprised to find that he sometimes contents himself with slight indications of his meaning, and that everything does not appear exactly to harmonize with it. We shall rather admire the unity that pervades works framed out of such a chaos, and the genius which could stamp the ancient legends with a character so foreign to their original import.
" The irony in which Sophocles appears to us to have displayed the highest powers of his art, is not equally conspicuous in all his remaining plays, though we believe the perception of it to be indispensable for the full enjoyment of every one of them. We shall for this reason be led to dwell less upon some of his greatest masterpieces, than upon works which are commonly deemed of inferior value. But we shall begin with those in which the poet's intertion is most apparent, and shall thus perhaps be enabled to find a clue to it where it is less clearly disclosed. We are thus led in the first place to consider two of those founded on the Theban legends.
" Though it is not certain whether Oellipus King and Oedipus at Colonus were parts of one original design, it is at least probable that the contrast by which the effect of each is so much heightened entered into the poet's plan. Each indeed is complete in itself, and contains everything requisite for the full understanding and enjoyment of it; and yet each acquires a new force and beauty from a comparison with the other. We shall therefore consider them successively.
"The opening scene of the first Oedipus exhibits the people of Cadmus bowed down under the weight of a terrible calamity. A devouring pestilence is ravaging its fields, and desolating its city. The art of man has hitherto availed nothing to check its progress: the aid of the gods has been implored in vain. The altars have blazed, and the temples reeked with incense: yet the victims of the Destroying Power continue to fall on every side, frequent as ever. The streets are constantly resounding with the paean ; but its strains are still interrupted by the voice of wailing. In this extremity of affliction however a gleam of hope shoots from one quarter through the general gloom. The royal house has been hitherto exempt from the overwhelming evil. The king, happy in the affection of his consort, and surrounded by a flourishing family, seems alone to stand erect

## SOPHOCLES AND THE OEDIPODEAN MYTH.

above the flood of evils with which his people are struggling, and under which they are ready to sink. To his fortune and wisdom the afflicted city now looks for deliverance. It has not been forgotten that, on a former occasion, when Thebes was smitten with a scourge almost equally grievous, the marvellous sagacity of Oedipus solved the enigma on which its fate depended. There is therefore good ground for hoping that his tried prudence, aided by the favour of the gods, may once more succeed in penetrating to the mysterious cause of the present calamity, and may contrive means of relief. With this belief a throng of suppliants of all ages, headed by the ministers of the temples, has come in solemn procession to the royal palace, and has seated itself on the steps of the altars before its vestibule, bearing the sacred ensigns with which the miserable are wont to implore succour from the powerful. Informed of their approach, the king himself comes forth to hear their complaints, and receive their requests. His generous nature is touched by the piteous spectacle, and though himself unhurt, he feels for the stroke under which his people suffer. The public distress has long been the object of his paternal cares: already he has taken measures for relieving it: he has sent a messenger to the oracle which had guided his steps in other momentous junctures by its timely warnings, and had brought him to his present state of greatness and glory: the answer of the Delphic god is hourly expected, without which even the wisdom of Oedipus himself can devise no remedy.
"At this moment the envoy arrives with joyful tidings. Apollo has revealed to him the cause of the evil and the means of removing it. The land labours under a curse drawn upon it by the guilt of man: it is the stain of blood that has poisoned all the sources of life ; the crime must be expiated, the pollution purged. Yet the oracle which declares the nature of the deed is silent as to the name of the criminal; he is denounced as the object of divine and human vengeance ; but his person is not described, his abode is not disclosed, except by the intimation that the land is cursed by his presence. The sagacity of Oedipus is still required to detect the secret on which the safety of his people depends; and he confidently undertakes to bring it to light. The suppliant multitude, their worst fears quieted, better hopes revived, withdraw in calm reliance on the king and the god; and the Chorus appearing at the summons of Oedipus, cheered yet perplexed by the mysterious oracle, partially soothed by its promises, but still trembling with timid suspense, pours forth a plaintive strain, in which it describes the horrors of its present condition, and implores the succour of its tutelary deities.
" During this pause the spectator has leisure to reflect, how different all is from what it seems. The wrath of heaven has been pointed against the afflicted city, only that it might fall with concentrated force on the head of
a single man; and he who is its object stands alone calm and secure: unconscious of his own misery he can afford pity for the unfortunate; to him all look up for succour: and, as in the plenitude of wisdom and power, he undertakes to trace the evil, of which he is himself the sole author, to its secret source.
"In the meanwhile the king has deliberated with his kinsman Creon, and now appears to proclaim his will and publish his measures. To the criminal, if he shall voluntarily discover himself, he offers leave to retire from the country with impunity: to whoever shall make him known, whether citizen or stranger, large reward and royal favour: but should this gracious invitation prove ineffectual, then he threatens the guilty with the utmost rigour of justice; and finally, should man's arm be too short, he consigns the offender by a solemn imprecation to the vengeance of the gods. The same curse he denounces against himself, if he knowingly harbours the man of blood under his roof, and a like one against all who refuse to aid him in his search. The Chorus, after protesting its innocence, offers advice. Next to Apollo the blind seer Teiresias is reputed to possess the largest share of supernatural knowledge. From him the truth which the oracle has withheld may be best ascertained. But Oedipus has anticipated this prudent counsel, and on Creon's suggestion has already sent for Teiresias, and is surprised that he has not yet arrived. At length the venerable man appears. His orbs of outward sight have long been quenched : but so much the clearer and stronger is the light which shines inward, and enables him to discern the hidden things of heaven and earth. The king conjures him to exert his prophetic power for the deliverance of his country and its ruler. But instead of a ready compliance, the request is received with expressions of grief and despondency: it is first evaded, and at length peremptorily refused. The indignation of Oedipus is roused by the unfeeling denial, and at length he is provoked to declare his suspicion that Teiresias has been himself, so far as his blindness permitted, an accessory to the regicide. The charge kindles in its turn the anger of the seer, and extorts from him the dreadful secret which he had resolved to suppress. He bids his accuser obey his own recent proclamation, and thenceforward, as the perpetrator of the deed which had polluted the land, to seal his unhallowed lips. Enraged at the audacious recrimination, Oedipus taunts Teiresias with his blindness : a darkness, not of the eyes only, but of the mind; he is a child of night, whose puny malice can do no hurt to one whose eyes are open to the light of day. Yet who can have prompted the old man to the impudent calumny? Who but the counsellor at whose suggestion he had been consulted? the man who, when Oedipus and his children are removed, stands nearest to the throne? It is a conspiracy-a plot laid by Creon, and hatched by Teiresias. The suspicion once admitted
becomes a settled conviction, and the king deplores the condition of royalty, which he finds thus exposed to the assaults of envy and ambition. But his resentment, vehement as it is, at Creon's ingratitude, is almost forgotten in his abhorrence and contempt of the hoary impostor who has sold himself to the traitor. Even his boasted art is a juggle and a lie. Else, why was it not exerted when the Sphinx propounded her fatal riddle? The seer then was not Teiresias but CEdipus. The lips then closed by the consciousness of ignorance have now been opened by the love of gold. His age alone screens him from immediate punishment : the partner of his guilt will not escape so easily. Teiresias answers by repeating his declaration in still plainer terms ; but as at the king's indignant command he is about to retire, he drops an allusion to his birth, which reminds Edipus of a secret which he has not yet unriddled. Instead however of satisfying his curiosity, the prophet once again, in language still more distinct than before, describes his present condition and predicts his fate.
"This scene completes the exposition that was begun in the preceding one. The contrast between the real blindness and wretchedness of CEdipus and his fancied wisdom and greatness can be carried no further than when he contemptuously rejects the truth which he is seeking and has found, and makes it a ground of quarrel with a faithful friend. The Chorus, in its next song, only interprets the irony of the action, when it asks, who is the guilty wretch against whom the oracle has let loose the ministers of vengeance? Where can be his lurking-place? It must surely be in some savage forest, in some dark cave, or rocky glen, among the haunts of wild beasts, that the miserable fugitive hides himself from his pursuers. Who can believe that he is dwelling in the heart of the city, in the royal palace ! that he is seated on the throne!
"It does not belong to our present purpose to dwell on the following scenes, in which the fearful mystery is gradually unfolded. The art with which the poet has contrived to sustain the interest of the spectator, by retarding the discovery, has been always deservedly admired. It has indeed been too often considered as the great excellence of this sublime poem, the real beauty of which, as we hope to shew, is of a very different kind, and infinitely more profound and heart-stirring than mere ingenuity can produce. But the attentive reader who shall examine this part of the play from the point of view that has been here taken, will not fail to observe, among numberless finer touches of irony with which the dialogue is inlaid, that the poet has so constructed his plot, as always to evolve the successive steps of the disclosure out of incidents which either exhibit the delusive security of Edipus in the strongest light, or tend to cherish his confidence, and allay his fears. Thus the scene with Jocasta in which his apprehensions are firstawakened, arises out of the suspicion he has conceived
of Creon, which, unjust and arbitrary as it is, is the only refuge he has been able to find from the necessity of believing Teiresias. The tidings from Corinth, by which he and Jocasta are so elated as to question the prescience of the gods, leads to the discovery which fixes her doom. Still more remarkable is the mode in which this is connected with the following and final stage of the solution. Edipus has reason to dread that the arrival of the herdsman may confirm his worst fears as to the death of Laius. Yet he forgets this as a slight care in his impatience to ascertain his parentage : hence the Chorus bursts out into a strain of joy at the prospect of the festive rites with which Cithæron-a spot to be henceforth so dear to the royal family -will be honoured, when the happy discovery shall be made: and Cdipus presses the herdsman on this subject with sanguine eagerness, which will bear no evasion or delay, and never ceases to hope for the best, until he has extorted the truth which shews him the whole extent of his calamity.
"No sooner has the film dropped from his eyes than he condemns himself to perpetual darkness, to the state which, but a short time before, had been the subject of his taunts on Teiresias. The feeling by which he is urged thus to verify the seer's prediction, is not the horror of the light and of all the objects it can present to him, but indignation at his own previous blindness. The eyes which have served him so ill, which have seen without discerning what it was most important for him to know, shall be for ever extinguished. And in this condition, most wretched, most helpless, he enters once more, to exhibit a perfect contrast to his appearance in the opening scene, and thus to reverse that irony, of which we have hitherto seen but one side. While he saw the light of day, he had been ignorant, infatuated, incapable of distinguishing truth from falsehood, friend from foe. Now he clearly perceives all that concerns him ; he is conscious of the difference between his own shrewdness and the divine intelligence : he is cured of his rash presumption, of his hasty suspicions, of his doubts and cares: he has now a sure test of Creon's sincerity, and he finds that it will stand the trial. Creon's moderation, discretion, and equanimity, are beautifully contrasted in this scene, as in that of the altercation, with the vehement passion of OEdipus. The mutual relation of the two characters so exactly resembles that between Tasso and Antonio in Goethe's Tasso, that the German play may serve as a commentary on this part of the Greek one. And here it may be proper to remark that Sophocles has rendered sufficiently clear for an attentive reader, what has nevertheless been, too commonly overlooked, and has greatly disturbed many in the enjoyment of this play: that Edipus, though unfortunate enough to excite our sympathy, is not so perfectly innocent as to appear the victim of a cruel and malignant power. The particular acts indeed which constitute his calamity were involuntarily committed: and
hence in the sequel he can vindicate himself from the attack of Creon, and represent himself to the villagers of Colonus as a man more sinned against than sinning. But still it is no less evident that all the events of his life have arisen out of his headstrong, impetuous character, and could not have happened if he had not neglected the warning of the god. His blindness, both the inward and the outward, has been self-inflicted! Now, as soon as the first paroxysm of grief has subsided, he appears chastened, sobered, $\}$ humbled: the first and most painful step to true knowledge and inward $\{$ peace, has been taken; and he already feels an assurance, that he is henceforward an especial object of divine protection, which will shield him from all ordinary ills and dangers.
"Here, where the main theme of the poet's irony is the contrast between the appearance of good and the reality of evil, these intimations of the opposite contrast are sufficient. But in EEdipus at Colonus this new aspect of the subject becomes the ground-work of the play. It is not indeed so strikingly exhibited as the former, because the fate of Edipus is not the sole, nor even the principal object of attention, but is subordinate to another half political, half religious interest, arising out of the legends which connect it with the ancient glories and future prospects of Attica, and with the sanctuary of Colonus. Still the same conception which is partially unfolded in the first play is here steadily pursued, and, so far as the Theban hero is concerned, is the ruling idea. In the first scene the appearance of CEdipus presents a complete reverse of that which we witnessed at the opening of the preceding play. We now see him stript of all that then seemed to render his lot so enviable, and suffering the worst miseries to which human nature is liable. He is blind, old, destitute: an outcast from his home, an exile from his country, a wanderer in a foreign land: reduced to depend on the guidance and support of his daughter, who herself needs protection, and to subsist on the scanty pittance afforded him by the compassion of strangers, who, whenever they recognize him, view him with horror. But a change has likewise taken place within him, which compensates even for this load of affliction. In the school of adversity he has learnt patience, resignation, and content. The storm of passion has subsided, and has left him calm and firm. The cloud has rolled away from his mental vision, and nothing disturbs the clearness and serenity of his views. He not only contemplates the past in the light of truth, but feels himself instinct with prophetic powers. He is conscious of a charmed life, safe from the malice of man and the accidents of nature, and reserved by the gods for the accomplishment of high purposes. The first incident that occurs to him marks in the most signal manner the elevation to which he has been raised by his apparent fall, and the privilege he has gained by the calamity which separates him from the rest of mankind. He has been driven out of Thebes
as a wretch polluted, and polluting the land. Yet he finds a resting place in the sanctuary of the awful goddesses, the avengers of crime, whose unutterable name fills every heart with horror, whose ground is too holy for any human foot to tread. For him there is no terror in the thought of them: he shrinks not from their presence, but greets them as friends and ministers of blessing. He is, as he describes himself, not only a pious but a sacred person. But the arrival of Ismene exhibits him in a still more august character. Feeble and helpless as he appears, he is destined to be one of Attica's tutelary heroes: and two powerful states are to dispute with one another the possession of his person and the right of paying honours to his tomb. The poet on this occasion expresses the whole force of the contrast, which is the subject of the play, in a few emphatic lines.
©d. How speaks the oracle, my child?
Ism. Thou shalt be sought by them that banished thee, Living and dead, to aid the common weal.
(Ed. Why, who may prosper with such aid as mine?
lsm. On thee, 'tis said, the might of Thebes depends.
ED. Now, when all's lost, I am a man indeed.
Ism. The gods now raise the head they once laid low.
"In the following scenes the most prominent object is undoubtedly the glory of Attica and of Theseus. The contest indeed between the two rivals for the possession or the friendship of the outcast, the violence of Creon and the earnest supplication of Polynices, serves to heighten our impression of the dignity with which Gedipus is now invested by the favour of the gods. But still, if the poet had not had a different purpose in view, he would probably have contented himself with a less elaborate picture of the struggle. As it is, Creon's arrogance and meanness place the magnanimity of the Attic hero in the strongest relief. It is not quite so evident what was the motive for introducing the interview with Polynices, which seems at first sight to have very little connexion either with the fate and character of Edipus, or with the renown of Theseus. In this scene Edipus appears to modern eyes in a somewhat unamiable aspect: and at all events it is one which will effectually prevent us from confounding his piety and resignation with a spirit of Christian meekness and charity. But to the ears of the ancients there was probably nothing grating in this vindictive sternness, while it contributes a very important service to the poet's main design. That the resolution of Edipus should not be shaken by the solicitations of Creon, backed by threats and force, was to be expected; we now see that his anger is not to be softened by the appeal which Polynices makes to his pity and his parental affection. He is for ever alienated from his unnatural sons and from Thebes, and unalterably devoted to the generous strangers
who have sheltered him. Their land shall retain him a willing sojourner, and in his tomb they shall possess a pledge of victory and of deliverance in danger. Nothing now remains but that he should descend into his last resting place, honoured by the express summons of the gods, and yielding a joyful obedience to their pleasure. His orphan daughters indeed drop some natural tears over the loss they have sustained : but even their grief is soon soothed by the thought of an end so peaceful and happy in itself, and so full of blessing to the hospitable land where the hero reposes.
"We have already remarked that the irony we have been illustrating is not equally conspicuous in all the plays of Sophocles. In the two CEdipuses we conceive it is the main feature in the treatment of the subject, clearly indicated by their structure, and unequivocally exprest in numberless passages."

In a note upon the lines O. T. 1271-1274 Bishop Thirlwall says: 'Hermann's correction and interpretation of this passage seem indispensably necessary, and restore one of the most beautiful touches in the play.' The lines as they stand in mss. are

Hermann reads oै $\psi$ alvтo for ö $\psi о \iota \nu \tau 0$, giving to $\dot{\delta} \theta$ oúvєка the sense because, which it has in ros 6 and elsewhere in Soph., the sense that being not less frequent. The rendering then becomes: because they had not seen what deeds \&oc., yet in darkness for the future they should see \&-c. (i.e. should not see at all, being extirpated). I should have been glad to ask the bishop, while he lived, whether he could really believe that Soph. ever wrote ${ }^{\prime} \psi \alpha a \iota \nu \tau o$ for $i \delta o \iota \epsilon \nu$ or $i \delta \delta o \iota \nu \tau o$, while I fully grant that the sense does seem to demand a past (not future) opt. in the first line. But in making $\dot{\delta} \theta o v i v e \kappa a$ mean because there is this difficulty, that we have then in the fourth line the suggestion of another $\dot{\delta} \theta о \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \kappa а$, that, introducing two fut. optatives; which seems awkward and without parallel. These considerations now lead me to surmise that ô $\psi o w v o$ is a corrupt gloss, and that the true reading is aı$\sigma \theta o \iota \nu \tau o$, unless Soph. has adopted the Homeric form b̈ $\sigma \sigma o t \nu \tau o . ~ H e r e$, as in ${ }_{1} 59,463,517,54 \mathrm{I}$, a meddling scribe may have spoilt the place by the stupid inclination to assimilate, taking ő $\psi$ оьv 0 from $\dot{o} \psi$ oíaro following, as in $54 \mathrm{I} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ ous from $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota$ following. If so, render : speaking to this effect: that they had not perceived either the evils he suffered (i. e. his exposure on Cithaeron), or those which he did (i. e. the murder and the marriage), but Erc. Evc. So $\dot{j} \theta o v i v \in \kappa a$, that, introduces the three optatives, and the second line gets a good meaning, which I think it does not obtain while $6 \psi 0 \iota \nu \tau 0$ stands. Because is hereby implied, and need not be expressed.

## EXCURSUS XII.

## REVIEW OF LECTION.

(Readings marked $\dagger$ are suggestions of the Editor.)
The reading adopted stands first: the vulgate follows inclosed: reference is made to Lection, Commentary or Excursus.

72. $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu(\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$ codd.) Exc. IV.
105. $\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \gamma \omega \omega^{\prime}(\gamma \epsilon \pi \omega$ codd.) Lect. Comm.


185. iкє $\hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$ (iкт $\hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$ codd.) Lect.

†ı98. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ( $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota$ codd.) Lect. Comm.

200. $\tau \hat{a} \nu$ (lacuna) Lect.
214. $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu a \chi o \nu$ (lacuna) Lect.

22 I. aúrós, (aủrb, cod. L. and some edd.) Lect. Comm.
229. $\dot{\alpha} \beta \lambda a \beta \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda r_{r} s^{\cdot}\right.$ cod. L. and some edd.) Lect.
240. $\chi \epsilon \rho \nu \imath \beta a s(\chi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \iota \beta$ os one cod. and some edd.) Lect. Comm.

2इ8. $\kappa v \rho \hat{\omega} \tau^{\prime}\left(\kappa v \rho \hat{\omega} \gamma^{\prime}\right.$ some edd.) Lect.
${ }^{2} 70$. $\gamma \hat{\eta} s(\gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$ most codd.) Lect.
293. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta^{\prime} i \delta \delta o ́ \nu \tau \prime$ ( $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \delta \bar{\epsilon} \delta \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \tau^{\prime}$ some edd.) Lect.
294. $\delta \epsilon i \mu a \pi o ́ s ~ \gamma '(\delta \epsilon i \mu a \tau o ́ s ~ \tau ’$ most codd. $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ some edd.) Lect.
305. $\epsilon i \kappa a i(\epsilon t i \tau \iota$ some edd.) Lect.
315. $\pi o ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ( $\pi o ́ \nu o s ~ s o m e ~ c o d d . ~ a n d ~ e d d.) ~ L e c t . ~$
317. $\lambda<́ \eta$ ( $\lambda$ ú́ $\iota$ some codd. and edd.) Lect. Comm.
322. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \iota \lambda \hat{\eta}$ ( $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \iota \lambda \grave{\epsilon}$ s some codd. and edd.) Lect.
355. $\pi o \hat{v}$ ( $\pi o v$ many edd.) Lect. Comm.
360. $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ( $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$ some edd.) Lect. Comm.
361. $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ \nu(\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau o ́ \nu$ codd. and most edd.) Lect.
405. Oioinov (Oiסimous some edd.) Lect.
434. $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma^{\prime}\left(\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} \gamma^{\prime}\right.$ Suid. and some edd.) Lect. Comm.

159 I have suggested, but not edited $\Delta \iota o ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̆ \kappa \gamma o v \epsilon, ~ \Pi a \lambda \lambda a ̀ s ~(f o r ~ v u l g . ~ \theta u ́ \gamma a \tau \epsilon \rho ~ \Delta i o ̀ s, ~$ $\left.\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \rho o \tau^{\prime}\right)$, also $\phi i \lambda i a s$ for $\chi \rho v \sigma \dot{\epsilon} a s$ in the previous line, r9r. I must now say, that the reading of Herm. $\alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \iota \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$ for $\alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau c^{\prime} \zeta \omega \nu$ (191) seems to me probable, not, as he meant it, in construction, but interposed between commas, I entreat. This would make a comma desirable after $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \alpha \nu$.

435．$\sigma o i \mu \bar{\epsilon} \nu$（ $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ $\sigma o i$ codd．and most edd．）Comm．
$\dagger+45$ ．$\pi a \rho \omega \dot{\nu} \tau \epsilon \mu^{\prime}\left(\pi a \rho \omega ̀ \nu \sigma \dot{v} \gamma^{\prime}\right.$ many edd．）Lect．
458．aúròs（aưtòs many edd．）Lect．Comm．
461．$\lambda \dot{a} \beta \eta \eta_{s}\left(\lambda a ́ \beta \eta s \mu^{\prime}\right.$ some codd．and edd．）Lect．Comm．
$\dagger_{4} \sigma_{4}$ ．$\epsilon i \delta \epsilon(\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$ most codd．and all edd．）Lect．Comm．
$-\sim$（ $\pi \epsilon \tau \rho a$ codd．and all edd．）Lect．Comm．
478．ióóravpos（ $\dot{\omega}$ s râ̂pos many codd．）Lect．Comm．
483．$\mu \in \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$（ $\mu \in \dot{\nu} \nu$ oú $\nu$ codd．and most edd．）Lect．Comm．
49 I．$\beta a \sigma \alpha \nu i \xi \omega \nu+\pi \iota \theta a \nu \omega \hat{s}(\beta a \sigma \alpha \dot{\nu} \varphi \varphi$ codd．）Lect．Comm．
＋510．$\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\rho}$＇（ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ codd．and edd．）Lect．Comm．

†519．форой̀тı（фє́ро⿱亠䒑九 codd．and edd．）Lect．
525．Toűtos $\delta^{\prime}$（ roû $\pi \rho o \grave{s} \delta^{\prime} \operatorname{cod}$ ．L．and most edd．）Comm．
537．${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \mu o \iota(\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ i$ codd．and some edd．）Lect．
538．$\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota i \hat{\mu \iota}$（ $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \sigma o \iota \mu \iota$ codd．and most edd．）Lect．
539．خ̈ ои̉к（койк codd．and most edd．）Lect．Comm．
$5+\mathrm{I}$ ．$\pi \lambda$ oútou（ $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ ous codd．and most edd．）Lect．Comm．


624．$\pi \rho o \delta \in i \xi \eta s \gamma^{\prime}$（ $\pi \rho 0 \delta \epsilon i \xi \eta s$ codd．and most edd．）Exc．vir．
$\dagger$－$\quad \tau \dot{a} \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon i ̀ \nu(\tau o ̀ ~ \phi \theta o \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ c o d d . ~ a n d ~ e d d) ~ E x. c . ~ V i f . ~$
$6_{37}$ ．K $\rho \epsilon^{\prime} \nu \nu$（ $\mathrm{K} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ codd．and many edd．）Lect．
$6_{+4}, 6_{5} 8$ ．$\nu \hat{\nu} \nu(\nu v \nu$ many edd．）Lect．Comm．

＋667．$\tau$ à $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon i$（каi $\tau a ́ \delta^{\prime} \epsilon i \operatorname{cod}$ ．L．）Lect．

692．тóvoוб兀（ $\pi o ́ \nu o \iota s ~ c o d d.) ~ L e c t . ~$

＋696．$\epsilon \hat{i}$ тó $\gamma^{\prime} \notin \nu \sigma o i ́$（codd．corrupt）Lect．Comm．
722．$\theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$（ $\pi a \theta \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ most codd．）Lect．Comm．
728．viro $\sigma \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i s(\dot{v} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i s ~ m o s t ~ c o d d . ~ a n d ~ e d d) ~ L e c. t . ~ C o m m . ~$
†74．$\epsilon \beta a \iota \nu ’$（ $\ddot{\beta} \beta \eta s$ codd．）Lect．Comm．


779．$\mu \epsilon \in \theta \eta$（ $\mu \epsilon \in \theta \eta$ many codd．and edd．）Lect．

815．$\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu\left(\nu \hat{v} \boldsymbol{v} \epsilon \sigma \tau^{\prime}\right.$ cod．L．）Lect．Comm．
817．$\epsilon i(\hat{\psi}$ codd．）Lect．Comm．

6́gr．Observe that $\pi \epsilon \phi a^{\prime} \nu \theta a \iota \mu^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu$ depends on $\epsilon i \pi o \nu$ ，not on $\boldsymbol{i} \sigma \theta$ ，which is paren－ thetic．A comma should stand after $\delta \epsilon$ ．Verbs of knowing do not take infin．Perhaps Soph．wrote $\mathrm{i}^{\prime} \sigma \theta^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota$ ．
817. $\tau \iota \nu \iota(\tau \iota \nu a \operatorname{codd}$ ) Lect. Comm.
818. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\epsilon}(\tau \iota \nu a$ codd.) Lect. Comm.
825. $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime}\left(\mu \eta^{\prime} \sigma \tau^{\prime}\right.$ cod. L. $\mu \eta^{\prime} \mu^{\prime}$ codd. pl.) Lect.
843. катактєivєlà (катактєivalєข cod. L.) Lect. Comm.
852. тóv $\gamma \epsilon$ ( $\sigma \delta \nu \gamma \epsilon$ some edd.) Comm.
870. $\mu \dot{\alpha} \nu$ ( $\mu \dot{\eta}$ some codd.).
+877. т $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho_{o ́ \tau а \tau о \nu ~(\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \alpha \nu) ~ L e c t . ~ C o m m . ~}^{\text {. }}$
+878. ó $\rho \in \hat{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ (lacuna) Lect. Comm.

+889. $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ( $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau$ ò codd.) Lect. Comm.
+890. $\mu \dot{\prime} r^{\prime}$ ô̂v ( $\kappa a i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ codd.) Lect. Comm.
†- $\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \xi_{\xi} \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota\left(\epsilon_{f} \xi_{\xi} \epsilon \tau a \iota\right.$ codd.) Lect. Comm.
+89r. каi (ï codd.) Lect. Comm.
+894. The words $\epsilon \tau \iota \pi 0 \tau^{\prime}$ are cast out: see 1084-5.

+ $\boldsymbol{\tau o c o i ̂ \sigma \delta ' ~ ( ~} \tau 0 \hat{\imath} \sigma \delta^{\prime}$ codd.) Lect. Comm.
$\beta \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu(\theta v \mu \hat{\varphi} \beta \epsilon \lambda \lambda \eta)$ Lect. Comm.

895. єi'sєтal ( ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \xi \in \tau \alpha \iota$ codd.) Lect. Comm.
+905. ä $\phi \theta a \rho \tau o \nu(\dot{a} \theta a ́ v a \tau o \nu$ codd.) Lect.
896. ma入aià (lacuna) Lect. Comm.
897. $\epsilon l . . . \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o l(\eta ̈ \nu \ldots \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \eta$ some codd.) Lect. Comm,
898. $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~(~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ m a n y ~ c o d d) ~ L e c t .$.
899. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi$ ’ à $\nu(\tau a ́ \chi a$ cod. L.) Lect. Comm.
900. $\dot{\omega} \gamma \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu$ (lacuna) Lect.
901. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega\left(\epsilon l \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \omega \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \in \dot{\gamma} \operatorname{cod}\right.$. L.) Lect.
902. $\sigma \eta \mu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \rho$ ( $\sigma \eta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu a s ~ c o d . ~ L . ~ p r . ~ m.) ~ L e c t . ~ C o m m . ~$
903. $\kappa \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ ( $\kappa \tau a \nu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ most codd.) Lect.
904. $\tau \alpha \rho \beta \hat{\omega} \nu(\tau \alpha \rho \beta \hat{\omega} \operatorname{cod}$. L.) Lect.
905. $\tau v \chi \omega \dot{\nu}$ ( $\tau \epsilon \kappa \omega ́ \nu$ codd.) Lect.
906. $\sigma 0 \hat{v} \delta^{\prime}\left(\sigma 0 \hat{v} \gamma^{\prime}\right.$ most codd.) Lect.
907. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ ( $\dot{\nu} \nu \kappa а к о i ̂ s ~ m o s t ~ c o d d . ~ a n d ~ e d d.) ~ L e c t . ~ C o m m . ~$
908. $\tau \delta \nu \delta^{\prime}\left(\tau \delta \nu \theta^{\prime}\right.$ some codd.) Lect. Comm.
909. $\dot{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\prime}\left({ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega \omega\right.$ all codd. but one) Lect. Comm.

910. Oioímouv (Oioímov codd.) Lect. Comm.
trog6. Goi $\delta^{\prime}$ oûv ( $\left.\sigma o i ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ c o d d.\right) ~ L e c t . ~$
ro98. корầ (ảpa codd.) Lect. Comm.
1 1о0. $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma^{\prime}(\pi \rho o \sigma \pi \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma '$ codd.) Lect. Comm.


8gr. I have suggested, without editing, aं $\pi e v \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ here as a desirable substitute for $\dot{d} \theta i \kappa \tau \omega \nu$, which word occurs in 898 . With this word ${ }^{\xi} \xi \in \tau a l$ is good.

```
†ıros. \(\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma^{\prime}\left(\epsilon^{i l} \theta^{\prime}\right.\) codd.) Comm.
```



```
    r 109. 'E入ıк
    irir. \(\pi \rho \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \beta \epsilon \epsilon\) ( \(\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta v\) some edd.) Lect.
    1130. \(\pi\) ov ( \(\pi \omega\) most codd.) Lect.
    1131. äтo (üँo codd. and most edd.) Lect.
```



```
    п138. \(\chi \epsilon \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} \alpha\) ( \(\chi \epsilon \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu} \iota\) some codd. and edd.) Lect. Comm.
    \(\dagger\) ェ203. a áós ( \(\bar{\epsilon} \mu\) ós codd.) Lect.
    1209. \(\pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon t\) ( \(\pi a \tau \rho \dot{i}\) codd.) Lect. Comm.
    1216. Aaï̆ıov (Aatétov codd.) Lect.
```



```
    1219. \(\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho\) ià \(\lambda \epsilon \mu o \nu \chi \epsilon \omega \nu\left(\omega^{\prime} s \pi \epsilon \rho i a \lambda \lambda^{\prime}\right.\) la \(\alpha \epsilon \omega \nu\) codd.) Lect. Comm.
    1244. \(\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \rho \rho a \dot{\xi} a \sigma^{\prime}\left(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \rho \rho \eta_{\xi} \xi a \sigma^{\prime}\right.\) codd.) Lect. Comm.
```



```
    †ı280. тápa (какá codd.) Lect. Comm.
    1286. \(\tau \nu \nu \nu\) ( tivl codd.) Lect. Comm. \(^{2}\)
```



```
    131 . öv (lacuna) Lect.
    1323. \(\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu(\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \dot{\omega} \omega \nu\) codd.) Lect.
```




```
    1350. עouád' (עouádos codd.) Lect. Comm.
```




```
    1365. \({ }^{\epsilon} \tau \iota(\notin \phi v\) codd.) Lect. Comm.
    1383. ăvayvov. (ăvayvov codd.) Latov (Aaitov. codd.) Comm.
    140I. \(\quad \underset{\tau}{ } \tau \iota(\) öt \(\iota\) codd.) Lect. Comm.
    1414. \(\pi i \theta \in \sigma \theta \epsilon(\pi \epsilon i \theta \in \sigma \theta \epsilon\) codd.) Lect.
    1440. \(\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \psi о \mu a \iota(\pi \rho о т \rho \epsilon \psi о \mu a \iota ~ c o d d) ~ L e c. t . ~ C o m m . ~\)
    1466. Taî̀ (aì most codd.) Lect.
```



```
    1505. \(\pi \epsilon p i t i o ̄ n s ~(\pi a \rho i \delta \partial \eta s ~ c o d d) ~ C o m m .\).
    1513. \(\mathfrak{e q a}\) (áci codd.) Lect. Comm.
    \(\dagger\) 1526. ひ̈s \(\tau \tau s\) (ör \(\tau \iota s\) codd.) Lect. Comm. Exc. Ix.
    t1528. ä \(\mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu(\) ėк \(\kappa \dot{L} \nu \eta \nu\) codd.) Lect. Comm.
    †I 529 . \(\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega^{\prime}\left(\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu^{\prime}\right.\) codd.) Lect. Comm.
```

1105．I do not regard $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ with strong confidence：but if ei $\theta$＇be kept，a colon，not period，must be placed after $\phi$ í $\lambda a \iota$ ，for cïre can only be carried on from $\vec{\eta}$ above．

On 1264－5 see Lect．and Comm．On 1271 see Comm．and p．165，where I suggest aï $\sigma \theta$ olvto or ö $\sigma \sigma 0 \iota \nu \tau 0$ for ö $\psi o \iota \nu \tau 0$ ．On 1279 see Lect．and Comm．On 1529 I suggest


It may be convenient here to express my personal feeling respecting some of these readings, and respecting some interpretations.
(i) I feel very strongly that the readings adopted in the following places (with the consequent interpretations) are correct: II, 72, 1257, ${ }^{1} 494-5,1526$.
(2) I think the readings adopted in the following places probable in so high a degree as to be little short of certainty : $155^{-6,194}, 198-9,62_{4}, 696$, 1258. I have almost an equal feeling towards the suggestions offered at 159, 127 I , which I have not placed in my text.
(3) I am convinced that $\epsilon \hat{i} \delta \epsilon$ (unless oîje) was written by Soph. in $4 \sigma_{4}$, though what he wrote instead of $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \rho \alpha$ is hopelessly lost, whether $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ or $\pi \rho^{\prime} \nu \pi o \tau$ ' or something else. Much observation has enabled me to note the 'assimilating' tendency of the scribes, as shewn here, and in ${ }^{159}, 517$


(4) As to my numerous corrections in Stasimon II. where corruption is so manifest and so persistent, I leave them to their chance, merely saying that they nowise affect the general sense. "A $\pi \frac{\rho o \nu}{}$ (with $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \kappa \alpha \nu$ 878 ) I think tolerably certain.
(5) As respects interpretations where reading is not in question, I have in Excursus ifi. and vi. copiously defended my views on 43-5, 328-9 ( (is $\left.\dot{a}^{\prime} \nu\right)$, and in the Commentary those on 1078 ( $\dot{\omega} s \gamma u \nu \dot{\eta}$ ), 1085 ( ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha s$ ), 1296 ( $\sigma \tau v \gamma 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$ ), $\mathrm{I} 380, \mathrm{I}_{3} 3_{3}, \mathrm{I}_{4} \sigma_{4}\left(\alpha^{3} \nu \in v\right)$. Those who may honour my translation with their notice, will find many other passages, of which the presentation differs essentially from that which elsewhere appears ${ }^{1}$. Such (a few out of many) are 19, 34, 74, 88, 132, 154, 172, 211, 217, 219-221, $233-4,26 \mathrm{r}, 276,284-5,298,320-1,325,344,350,35^{1}, 363,37 \mathrm{I}, 39 \mathrm{I}$,
 $68_{1}, 703,739,765,768,778,780,784,786,795,797,803,877,1097,1130$,
 $\mathrm{I}_{4} 3_{2}, 1438$, $1477,148 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}_{5} 19, \mathrm{I}_{5} 20 .{ }^{2}$

1 I take this opportunity to correct two oversights in my translation (Stud. Soph.
 is the answer? At 486 , ovँ $\tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta a^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \dot{o} \rho \omega \bar{\nu}$ ovĩ' $\dot{o} \pi i \sigma \omega$, with no clear viezw of the present or the future. I had really no other judgment concerning them, as the Comm. in this book will shew. Correct also 1494-5, according to the lection and interpretation above.
${ }^{2}$ Since this Exc. was printed, several new readings have been adopted, for which see Lection 171, 173, 179, 181-5, 187, 779, 1205-6, 1214-17, 1350 .

## EXCURSUS XIII.

## NOTES ON PROSODY.

Coalition of vowels (or Contraction) always forms a long syllable. Coalition within a word is called Synaeresis: as $\tau \epsilon i \chi \in a \quad \tau \epsilon i \chi \eta$, $\tau \iota \mu \alpha_{0} \rho \tau \iota$ $\tau \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$. Since it is taught in the declension of nouns and conjugation of verbs, it need not be pursued here.
I. Crasis is the metrical coalition of two words by contraction of vowels.

The examples of Crasis in tragedy are mainly :
(I) those of кai with a vowel or diphthong following.
(2) those of the vowel of the article with a vowel or diphthong following.
(3) rarely those of the relatives 0 , $a^{\wedge}$ with a vowel following.






 $=\chi \alpha i$.
(2) $\tau \dot{\alpha}-\dot{\alpha}$ and $\tau \dot{\alpha}-\epsilon$ form $\tau \alpha-$ : $\tau \dot{\alpha} \not{ }_{\alpha}^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \alpha=\tau \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a, \tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\alpha}=\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} .-\tau \grave{o}-\alpha \dot{\alpha}$

 — $\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\varphi}=\tau \dot{\omega} \mu \hat{\varphi}$. - But $\tau \grave{o} \quad \ddot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu=\theta \ddot{a} \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu .-\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a=\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a, \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \mu a v-$




These examples cover the usage of Soph. in Oed. T.
II. Synizesis is when within a word two or more vowels, not forming a diphthong, metrically count as one syllable: as $\mathrm{I}_{77}(\theta \epsilon 0 \hat{u}), 697(\theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu}), 640$
 ( $\mathrm{K} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ ).
III. Synecphonesis is when syllables of two words metrically coalesce
 times, 13, 221, 283, 1065, 1091, 1232 ; $\ddot{\eta}$ ои́к, $\ddot{\eta}$ oủzi 539, 555, 993. Codd. K. OE.
and most critics treat $\tau \grave{\partial} \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$, I 388 , as an instance of synecphonesis (see Ellendt): Ca. as of Crasis, J. as of Aphaeresis.
IV. Aphaeresis is where a vowel beginning a word is absorbed by a long vowel or diphthong before it. Seven instances occur of $\mu \grave{\eta}$ thus absorbing $\dot{\epsilon}, 262,296,402,432,985,1075,1457$, five of $\dot{\eta}, 112,360,500$, 820, 1479. Other instances are 232 ( $\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ ' $\gamma \omega$ ); 785 ( $\kappa a ̉ \gamma \omega$ 'такои́баs); 844

V. Sophocles takes the license of eliding a short vowel at the close of a verse before a vowel beginning the next: see $29,332,785,791,1184$, 1224. In each case the elided word is one of the particles $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, $\tau \epsilon$, except in $33^{2}$, where it is $\tau a \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$. A verse ( 1085 ) begins with the enclitic $\pi 0 \tau \epsilon$, ${ }^{\prime} \tau \iota$ ending the previous line.
VI. ${ }^{'} \mathrm{H} \mu i \nu, \dot{\nu} \mu i \nu$, are written for $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu, \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$, when the shortening of the second syllable is required : $39,42,86,103,242,765,92 \mathrm{I} ;-99 \mathrm{r}$, 1402, 1484 .

## VII. METRICAL CONSPECTUS OF THE LYRIC PARTS.

I. The abbreviations used are :

| tr. | trochee or trochaic |
| :--- | :--- |
| iamb. | iambic |
| sp. | spondee or spondaic |
| dact. | dactyl or dactylic |
| anap. | anapaestic |
| choriamb. | choriambic |
| ion. a min. | ionic a minore |
| dim. | dimeter. |
| trim. | trimeter. |
| tetram. | tetrameter. |
| hexam. | hexameter. |
| cat. | catalectic, one foot short. |
| trihem. | trihemimer $1 \frac{1}{2}$ feet |
| penth. | penthemimer $2 \frac{1}{2}$ feet |
| heph. | hephthemimer $3 \frac{1}{2}$ feet |
| dip. | dipodia 2 feet |
| trip. | tripodia 3 feet |

${ }^{1}$ Ionic a majore is --u . Antispast - - - - Paeon is long syll. with 3 short. Epitrite short syll. with 3 long. These are called $\mathbf{1}, 2,3,4$, according to the place of the
 trihem.
dochm．dochmiac．
dochm．dup．double dochmiac．
$\breve{a} \quad$ short anacrusis．
$\vec{\alpha} \quad$ long anacrusis．
$\omega \quad$ resolved anacrusis．
$b \quad$ base．
$c$ cum，with．
－long syll．resolved．
Anacrusis is a syllable，short or long，prefixed to a rhythm of which it is not a part．A base is a foot so prefixed．A spondee at the end of a line is treated as equivalent to a trochee in rhythms to which the latter foot properly belongs．

PARODOS， 151 － 215 ．
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} a^{\prime}, \mathrm{I}_{5} \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{I} 58 . \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . a^{\prime}, 159-166$.
I．－－－－－－－－－－v－－
2．－｜－v－v－－
3．－～－－－－－－- －- －
4．$-\mid-\cup \cup-\cup \cup-\simeq$
5．－－－－－－－－－v
6．－v－－－－－－－－－－－－v
7．－v－－－－－－v－－－－
I（3，7）．dact．hexam．cat．
2． $\bar{a}+$ tr．heph．
4． $\bar{a}+$ dact．trim．
5．dact．tetram．
6．dact．hexam．
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} \beta^{\prime}, 167-17 \mathrm{~S} . \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . \beta^{\prime}, 1 \% 9-183$.
I．$\quad$－$\quad$ し
2．$-|\Phi \cup-v-v|-v \cup-\cup \cup-\cup v-v$
3．－レ－－－－－－－し
4．$=\mid-\cup \cup-\cup \cup-\cup \cup-\simeq$
5．$-|-v|-\cup \cup-\cup \cup-\cup \cup-v$
6．$-|-\cup-|-\cup \cup-\cup \cup-\cup \cup \simeq$
7．－－－－－－－－－
8．－－－－－－－

I． $\bar{a}+t r$. heph．
2． $\bar{a}+$ tr．trip．$\dagger$ dact．tetram．cat．
3 （ 7 ）dact．tetram．
4．$\breve{a}+$ dact．tetram．cat．
5． $\bar{a}+$ tr．base + dact．tetram．cat．
6． $\bar{a}+$ tr．trihem．+ dact．tetram．cat．
8． $\bar{\alpha}+$ tr．trip．
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \gamma^{\prime}, 189-202 . \quad$ à $\nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . \gamma^{\prime}, 203-21$ у．

2．$\cup \mid-\cup \underline{\simeq} \cup \underline{\simeq} \cup-\cup-\cup$
3．$\smile-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-$
4．－$\circlearrowleft \cup--\cup-$
5．$\quad$ い－－－
6．－－－v－－v－খ
7．ーレ－－－
8．－－－－v－v－
9．ーレーレーレ－
Io．レーーーレー
II．－v－－－－
12．$-\mid-\cup ふ \cup-\cup-\cup-$
I．$\breve{a}+2$ tr．trihem．$\dagger$ tr．heph．
2．$\breve{a}+$ tr．pentap．
3．iamb．trim．（pure）．
4． $\bar{a}+2$ tr．trihem．
5 （7）tr．trip．
6． $\bar{\alpha}+$ dact．trim．cat．
8． $\bar{a}+$ tr．heph．
9 （II）tr．heph．
10．$\breve{\alpha} \dagger$ sp．base $\dagger$ tr．trihem．
12． $\bar{\alpha}+$ tr．pentap．
This Ode has the nature of a Paean，beginning in its first strophe and antistrophe with dactylo－trochaic strains in Dorian mood，probably sung during the march of the Chorus through the кoviotpa to their orchestral platform．When arranged there，they sing，semi－chorally，the remainder of the Ode．The metres undergo some change while the miseries of the plague are described in the second strophe and antistrophe：anacruses and trochees
become frequent，and resolved syllables appear，the tokens of grief and despondency．The third strophe and antistrophe are of a similar character， though with the expression of pain and abhorrence of their pestilent foe is mingled the voice of earnest prayer for succour from their tutelary deities．

STASIMON I．463－5II．
$\sigma \tau \rho о ф \grave{\eta} a^{\prime}, 4^{6} 3-47^{2}$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho \cdot a^{\prime}, 473-4^{82}$ 。
I．$\quad$ ：－v－｜－v－－－－－－－
2．$----\mid-\cup \cup-\cup-v-\cup-v$
3．－－－v－－－
4．$-\mid-v \cup-\cup-$
5．$-\mid-\cup \cup-\simeq$
6．レレー レレー v－－－
7．レレー ソレー レレー ※ー
8．－－－－－－

I．$\breve{a} \dagger t \mathrm{tr}$ ．trihem．$\dagger$ dact．$c$. tr．tetran．
2．sp．base（bis）+ dact．c．tr．tetrap．
3 （4） $\bar{\alpha}+$ dact．c．tr．trihem．
5．$\breve{a}+$ dact．dim．cat．
6 （7）anap．dim．
8． $\bar{\alpha}+$ dact．dim．cat．
9．tr．trip．
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \beta^{\prime}, 4^{8} 3$－497．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho .498-511$.
I．－レレー－- －－－- －-
2．－レレー－レレー－レレー ーレレー
3．レレーー レレーー レレーー レレー
4．レレー－－レレー

6．$\smile \cup-\mid \cup \cup--\cup \cup-ー ~ \cup \cup-$
7．$\cup \cup-\mid \cup \cup--\cup \cup--\cup \cup--\cup \cup-$
8．$\cup \cup-\cup \cup-ー \cup \cup-$

I（2）choriamb．tetram．
3．ion．a min．tetram．cat．
4．ion．a min．dim．cat．
5．sp．base $\dagger$ ion．a min．pentam．
6．anap．base $\dagger$ ion．a min．trim．cat．
7．anap．base $\dagger$ ion．a min．tetram．cat．
8．anap．base $\dagger$ ion．a min．dim．cat．
This noble Stasimon in its first strophe and antistrophe depicts the flight of the murderer from the relentless pursuit of Apollo and the Fates （or Furies）．The anapaestic lines and the trochees which follow are eminently picturesque．In its next syzygy are expressed in choriambic and ionic rhythm the anxious thoughts of the Chorus concerning the terrible accusations of Oedipus by the seer Teiresias．They refuse to believe these charges．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COMMATION, 649-697. } \\
& \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} a^{\prime}, 6_{49-659 . \quad \text { à } \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . ~} \alpha^{\prime}, 679-687 . \\
& \text { I. } \quad \text {-vー - }-ー-v ー-\cup ー \\
& \text { 2. } \cup-\cup-\simeq ー \cup- \\
& \text { 3. レーレーーレー } \\
& \text { 4. }-v-\mid-v-v-v- \\
& \text { 5. }- \text { - }----\cup-\cup-\cup- \\
& \text { 6. vレv-vー-vv-vー } \\
& \text { 7. } \simeq \cup \cup-\cup ー レ ー-レ ー \\
& \text { 8. テーレー-லレレーーーレー } \\
& \text { 9. }- \text { - }-\cup-\cup ー ー ー レ ー \\
& \text { 1. } \breve{a}+4 \text { tr. trihem. } \\
& \text { 2. iamb. dim. } \\
& \text { 3. } \breve{\alpha}+2 \text { tr. trihem. } \\
& \text { 4. tr. trihem. } \dagger \text { tr. heph. } \\
& 5(8,9) \text {. iamb. trim. } \\
& 6(7) \text {. dochm. dupl. } \\
& \text { бт } о о ф \grave{\eta} \beta^{\prime}, 662-668 . \quad \text { à } \nu \iota \sigma \tau \rho . \beta^{\prime}, 689-697 .
\end{aligned}
$$

> 3. $\cup-ー \cup-\cup ー ー レ-~$
> 4. $-\cup--\cup--v-v$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 5. }-|--|-u-v-u- \\
& \text { 6. } v--\mid-v-v-\simeq
\end{aligned}
$$

I． $\bar{a} \nmid$ sp．bas．$\uparrow$ tr．dip．c．dact．dim．
2．dochm．dupl．（syll．solut．）
3．dochm．dupl．
4． 2 tr．trihem．+ tr．dip．
5． $\bar{a} \dagger$ sp．bas．$\dagger$ troch．heph．
6．$\breve{a}+$ sp．bas．$\dagger$ tr．trip．
In this Commation the earnest anxiety of the Chorus is here and there shown by resolved syllables．

STASIMON II．863－910．

$$
\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} a^{\prime}, 863-873 . \quad \alpha \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . a^{\prime}, 874-884 .
$$

I．$-\mid-\cup--v-v$
2．－レーー－－－－－－
3．- －$-ー-\cup-\cup-\simeq$
4．－－- －－－－
5．$\cup-|\cup \cup \cup-|-\cup-\cup--$
6．$-\mid-v \cup-v-$
7．$-\mid-\cup \cup-\cup-$

9．レーー－－－－－－－
I． $\bar{a} \dagger$ tr．trihem．c．tr．dip．
2．tr．trim．cat．
3．iamb．trim．cat．
4．paeon．pr．+ chor．
5．iamb．bas．$\dagger$ tr．trihem．$\dagger$ tr．trip．
6．$\breve{a}+$ dact．$c$ ．tr．trihem．
7．$\quad \bar{a} \dagger$ dact．$c$ ．tr．trihem．
8．$\breve{a}+$ tr．dip．$\dagger$ anap．dim．
9．？
v． 9 ，as it stands，seems to want rhythm．If $\theta \epsilon \delta$ s were placed at the close（and so $\pi o \tau \epsilon$ in antistr．）we should get anap．monom．$\dagger$ tr．heph．
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} \beta^{\prime}, 884-897 . \quad \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . \beta^{\prime}, 898-910$.
1．－v
2．$\quad \cup-\cup \cup-\cup-\cup-v-\cup-\cup-$
3．च－vu－－－－－－－－－－
4．ーー レー－－レー ・ー－
5．－－$---\cup-$
6．－－レー－－v－レーー
7．$-\mid-v-v-v-v-$
8．$-\cup---\cup-\simeq$
9．－u－v－v－ー－－－
10．च｜－レレ－খ
I．tr．tetram．cat．
2 （3）$\breve{a}+$ dact．$c . \operatorname{tr} . \dagger$ tr．heph．
4 （6）iamb．trim．cat．
5．iamb．dim．
7．$\breve{a}+t r$ trip．$\dagger$ tr．trihem．
8．tr．dim．
9．tr．dim．$\dagger$ tr．trihem．
io．$\overline{\bar{a}}+$ dact．c．tr．
The shifting character of the metres，and the prevailing anacruses in this Ode exhibit the meditative anxiety which fills the minds of the Chorus．

## STASIMON III．1097－1109．

$\sigma \tau \rho 0 \phi \dot{\eta}, 1086$－1096．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho .$, 1097－1 109.
1．－vレー－v－レ｜－v－ーーv こ
2．－レv－－－－－－－
3．－v－－－－－－－
4．－uレ－－－－－－－
5．－v－－－－－
6．－v－－－v－－
7．－uv－vレ－－－－－－－
8．い｜－uv－vーー｜－vーー－
I．epichoriamb．dim．$\dagger$ troch．heph．
2．dact．trim．†tr．dip．
3．tr．heph．$\dagger$ tr．dip．

4．dact．trim．+ tr．trihem．
5 （6）．tr．tetrap．
7．dact．dim．$\dagger$ tr．tetrap．
8． $\bar{a}+$ dact．c．tr．dip．+ tr．penth．
The dactylo－trochaic metres of this hyporcheme express hope and joy．

STASIMON IV．ri86－I222．
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} \alpha^{\prime}, 1186-1196 . \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . \alpha^{\prime}, 1197-1203$.
I．$-\mid-\cup \cup-\cup-$
2．$--\mid-\cup \cup-\cup-i---\cup \cup-\simeq$
3．$-\mid-v \cup-v-$
4．- －$-\cup v-\cup-$
5．$-\simeq \mid-v \cup-v-$
6．$--\mid-\cup \cup-\simeq$
7．$--\mid-\cup \cup-\cup-$
8．$--1-\cup \cup-\cup--\simeq-\cup \cup-\cup-$
9．$-1-\cup \cup-\simeq$
I（3）． $\bar{a} \dagger$ dact．$c$ ．tr．trihem．
2．sp．bas．$\dagger$ dact．c．tr．trihem．$\dagger$ dact．trim．cat．
4 （7）．sp．bas．$\dagger$ dact．c．tr．trihem．
5．tr．or sp．bas．+ dact．$c$. tr．trihem．
6．sp．bas．$\dagger$ dact．c．tr．
8．（sp．bas．$\dagger$ dact．c．tr．trihem．）bis．
g． $\bar{a} \dagger$ dact．c．tr．
$\sigma \tau \rho 0 \phi \grave{\eta}^{\prime} \beta^{\prime} 1204-1212 . \dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho .1213-1222$.
1．$\quad \cup-v--\cup-\cup-v-$
2．$\cup-\mid-\cup \cup-\cup-\cup-$
3．$v \mid-v-v-v-$
4．－－－－－－－－
5．－－－
6．－v｜－vu－v－v｜－v－－－－－
7．－uv－v－v－ーレレーu－－－
8．$-\cup v-\mid-v-\cup-v$

## EXCURSUS XIII．

I．$\breve{a}+t r$. trihem．$\dagger$ tr．heph．
2．iamb．bas．$\dagger$ dact．$c$ ．tr．penth．
3．$\breve{a}+t r$ ．heph．
4．sp．bas．$\uparrow$ tr．heph．
5．tr．c．dact．
6．tr．bas．$\dagger$ dact．c．tr．dip．$\dagger$ dact．c．tr．trihem．
7．（dact．$\dagger$ tr．penth．）repeated．
8．choriambus $\dagger$ tr．trip．
The bases，anacruses and general tone of the metres in this Ode suit the deep despondency with which the minds of the Chorus are over－ whelmed．

Anapaests 1297－1311．Iamb．Trim． 1312. $\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} a^{\prime}, \mathrm{I}_{3} \mathrm{I}^{2}-\mathrm{I} 320$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho . a^{\prime} \mathrm{I} 32 \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{I} 328$.

1．$-\mid-\cup-$

3．$\checkmark \circlearrowleft-\cup-\mid \cup-ー レ ー$
4．－－
$5(6,7,8) . \quad--\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-$
I． $\bar{a} \dagger t$ tr．trihem．
2．？
3．dochm．dup．
4．spond．
$5(6,7,8)$ iamb．trim．
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} \beta^{\prime}, \mathrm{I} 329-\mathrm{I} 336 . \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \sigma \tau \rho . \beta^{\prime}, \mathrm{I} 349-\mathrm{I} 356$.
I．レーーレー－－－－
2．ソ $\circlearrowleft \circlearrowleft \cup-\cup \circlearrowleft \circlearrowleft \backsim-$
3．$-\mid-v-\cup-v-v-\cup---$
4．ひぃーレ－
6．v－vー v－v－v－v－
7．－ー レー ーー－－
I（2）．dochm．dupl．
3．$\breve{a} \dagger t$ tr．tetrap．$\dagger$ tr．penth．
4．tr．penth．
6．iamb．trim．（pure）．
7．iamb．dim．

I．$\cup \mid-\cup--\cup-$
2．－レーレーu－

4．ひぃー ひー ひ ひー－－
5．ふぃーレーーホーレー
6．ーレレー லー ひー－－－
7．－－－－－
8 （9）．－－v－ー－－－v－－－
1．$\breve{a}+2$ tr．trihem．
2．tr．heph．
3．iamb．trim．brach．
4．tr．trihem．$\dagger$ tr．heph．
5．dochm．dupl．
6．chor．$\dagger$ tr．heph．
7．dact．c．tr．trihem．
8 （9）．iamb．trim．
All the resolved short syllables and dochmiac rhythms in these lyrics spoken by Oedipus betoken woe and anguish．

On the Anapaests see Commentary．

Note．Since the date of the metrical treatises of Hermann，Linwood， \＆c．，Greek Metre，especially Lyric，has been largely investigated by German scholars，especially by Rossbach and Westphal，and by J．H．Heinrich Schmidt．The latter＇s Leitfaden on this subject have been translated by the two American professors，White and Riemenschneider，and a scheme of the choric metres in the Oed．T．（supplied by Schmidt）is printed as an appendix to Prof．White＇s edition of this drama．I shall not here exhibit or discuss Schmidt＇s theory，though I have had his Compositions－ Lelire on my shelves since its publication in 1869，and have studied it to some extent．I disclaim any right（having no scientific knowledge of music），to disparage this theory on the mere ground of scepticism con－ cerning it．Let classical students examine and appreciate it at some era in their educational career．But as a schoolmaster emeritus，I am bound to say that I would not overload and embarrass school－work of any grade with a metrical theory，applicable only to lyric poetry，requiring some musical
knowledge, with the mastery of a new and troublesome terminology, and a siglarium profuse and intricate. 'Non tanti est' for school teaching, is my clear and honest verdict. Whether the last new theory has superseded those of Westphal and others who have treated its subject, I leave for better judges than myself to decide. A sense of time, rhythm and harmonious language is an essential element of poetic faculty and poetic taste: but there is nothing in literary history leading me to think that scientific skill in music is equally essential. For my own part, I have enjoyed the lyric poetry of Pindar and the tragic writers, without knowing how it was sung: and, as this question lies outside my knowledge, I am unwilling to endorse a theory which I cannot appreciate. I have therefore been content to exhibit my conspectus of the choric metres in Oed. T. with the terminology to which I have been long accustomed.

## EXCURSUS XIV.

NOTES ON SYNTAX OF THE OEDIPUS TYRANNUS.

## I. Verbs.

A. The Verb Finite.
I. Voices.
(a) Active, used as Middle : ${ }_{153}(\pi \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu)$; 170 ( $\left.\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\prime} \chi o v \sigma \iota\right)$; 782 ( $\kappa a \tau \notin \sigma \chi o \nu)$; 968 ( $\kappa \in \dot{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota$ ).
(b) Middle sense of indirect agency: $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ ( $\left.\pi \rho 0 \sigma \eta \eta^{\prime} \gamma \tau \tau\right)$; $\mathbf{1 3 4}$
 ( $\dot{\rho} \hat{\sigma} \sigma \alpha)$; 358 ( $\pi \rho \sigma \hat{\tau} \tau \rho \hat{\epsilon} \psi \omega)$; $95^{\mathrm{I}}\left(\dot{\epsilon}_{5} \epsilon \pi \xi \mu \psi \omega\right)$. The more proper middle

 795 (е̇ккєтрои́иєขоs).
2. Moods.
(a) Optative.
(r) This mood, expressing a wish, as its name imports, may occur positively or negatively, without or with $\epsilon i, \epsilon i \gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho, \epsilon^{i} \theta \epsilon$.




Positive with particle: 8r ( $\epsilon i$ रà $\rho \ldots \beta a i \eta) ; 86_{3}$ ( $\left.\epsilon \check{\iota} \mu 0 \iota \xi \nu \nu \epsilon i \eta\right)$.

Negative with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and without particle: 644 ( $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ óvai $\mu \eta \nu$ ); $830(\mu \grave{\eta}$ $\left.\delta \hat{\eta} \tau^{\prime} . . . i^{\prime} \delta o c \mu \iota\right)$; 904 ( $\mu \grave{\eta} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \theta o \iota$ ).

Negative with particle and $\mu \dot{\eta}$ : 1068 ( $\epsilon^{*} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\eta} \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon \quad \gamma \nu 0 i \eta s$ ), but with indic. 1217 ( $\left.\epsilon \mathfrak{l} \theta \in \sigma \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \pi о \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \ell \delta o \nu\right)$.
(2) The Optative is used in oblique construction, after a principal verb of past time. (a) If the time referred to in the oblique clause is future, the Fut. Opt. is then used in immediate consecution, not otherwise.





 clauses after $\pi \rho$. $\lambda$. are in immediate consecution to it ( $\mu \epsilon े \nu \ldots \delta \epsilon . . . \delta \epsilon$ ); but the first ( $\chi \rho \epsilon i \eta$ ) relates to the then present time, because the necessity existed when the oracle was spoken; but the events $\delta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \iota \mu l, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ belong to time
 $I$ was flying to some place where I should never see). ( $\beta$ ) $8+3$ ("̈s $\nu \iota \nu$ кara-
 time, and rightly opt., but $1257 \kappa i \chi \eta$ must be read instead of кi$\chi 0 \iota$, the time being future.
 true reading at $7^{2}$ is $\dot{\rho} v \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ not $\dot{\rho} v \sigma a i \mu \eta \nu$. See Exc. IV.
(3) The opt. is used after a pres. construction to express indefinite generality. See $315,917,979$.
(4) It stands in dependence on Final particles (in order that) after a past tense 7 I ( $\dot{\omega} s \pi \dot{v} \theta o \iota \tau o$ ) ; 1006 (ö $\pi \omega \mathbf{s} \epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\xi} \alpha \iota \mu i \tau \iota$ ); 948 ( $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\kappa \tau \alpha ́ \nu о \iota)$. See 443 ( $\pi \rho i \nu$ í $\delta o \iota \mu \iota)$.
(5) With $\epsilon i$ it stands in the protasis of a condition habitually, when $\ddot{\partial} \nu$ with opt. or infin. is in the apodosis. See äv.
(b) Conjunctive. This mood is used (1) interrogatively: $3^{6} 4$ ( $\epsilon i \pi \omega \tau \iota \delta \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \kappa \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o ;$ ) ( 2 ) imperatively in ist pers. pl. : 47 ( $\mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} s \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \omega$ $\mu \epsilon \theta a$ ) ; (3) 147 after $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega, 650$ : (4) in 2nd pers. prohibitively with $\mu \dot{\eta}, 283$, 326, $3^{29}, 606,860, \& \mathrm{c}$. (see Imperative) : (5) after Final particles and verb pres. or fut.: $\dot{\omega} s 3^{25}$; önt ${ }^{2} 921$; i'va 364, 1454; $\mu \dot{\eta}$, lest, $329,747,767$,
 605; 748; 839; 1062; 1159; кӓу 341; 461; (7) with particles of Time

 (ro) with $\delta$ s ä́v 28i; 580 ; 725; (11) with relative only I23I. See Comm.

(c) Imperative. The positive uses of this mood are too frequent and familiar to need citation; ${ }^{a} \gamma \epsilon, a^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$, $\epsilon i \pi a \tau \epsilon$, ${ }^{\prime} \theta \iota, i^{i} \tau \epsilon$, $i^{\prime} \sigma \theta_{l}, \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon, \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ and others, are of frequent occurrence, and present no difficulty. But, negatively, it must be observed that $\mu \grave{\eta}$ is used with the 2nd pers. pres. imp. in this play eight times, $548,608,724,740,980,1147$, ${ }_{11} 65,1370$, 1522 , once with the 3 rd pers. pres. ${ }^{2}{ }^{1}$ I $(\mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \omega \omega \pi \alpha \tau \omega)$; once, exceptionally, with the 3 rd pers. of the aor. pass. $1449 \mu \dot{\eta} \pi o \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \xi \iota \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$. But never in this, rarely in any play, is it used with the aor. and pers. imp., its use being with aor. subjunctive and pers. in imperative sense. See note in Comm. on 1449 .

## B. The Infinitive.

As a general rule, the Greek Infinitive (Verb-noun) is in dependence on other Verbs (including Participles), or in a minor degree on Adjectives; other instances are idiomatic, and comparatively rare.

The dependence on Verbs may be either immediate ( $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu$ ) so that the Infin. is objective, or with an intervening case ( $\theta \epsilon \hat{\lambda} \lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon L \nu$, $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \sigma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon(\nu)$ so that either the case is subject of the Infin., and that case-with-Infin. is object of the principal verb $(\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega)$; or else so that the case, as well as the Infin., is object of the principal verb ( $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ ).
I. Immediate and objective dependence of Infin. on Verbs Active or Middle occurs about 60 times in Oed. Tyr., on Participles about seven times ( $12,17,266,347,400,588,616$ ), on Passive Verbs three times ( $39,29^{2}, \mathbf{1 4 5 0}$ ). In six of these examples the Infin. is future (272, $355,368,400,402,552$ ).
 $\mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon i \nu a \iota)$. Once $\tau \grave{\partial} \mu \dot{\eta}$ with infin. follows a negative: 1388 (oúк ä̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \dot{\partial} \mu \eta \nu$ $\tau \grave{\partial} \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ ). Twice $\tau \grave{\mu} \mu \dot{\eta}$ oú with infin. does so: 283 ( $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \hat{\eta} s \tau \grave{\partial} \mu \dot{\eta}$



If the princ. verb is an Impersonal or $\epsilon i \mu \ell$, the infin. connected with it is subject, not object, of that verb: 377 ( $\hat{\dot{\varphi}} \tau \alpha \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \pi \pi \rho \hat{\xi} \xi a \iota \mu^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ ); 1253 (oúк
 subj. may take $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. See 598,624, I 390 .
2. An Infinitive is dependent on Adjectives about 27 times in this play. See 55, 92, 316, 429, 440, \&cc. At 986 we find $\dot{\boldsymbol{\kappa} \nu \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\imath} \nu}$ depending on
 $641,837,912,1417,1441$, the Infinitives stand rather in apposition to various nouns than as grammatically dependent.
3. " $\Omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ takes an Infin. $361,595,1045$, I 131 ; $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \grave{\eta} 374,1085$, 1461. 狖 $(=\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon)$ 84. An epexegetic Infin. omitting $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ occurs twice:
 may be so regarded. Absolute Infinitives are found in 82 ( $\epsilon i \kappa \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma l)$ and 1220 ( $\left.\tau \delta \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \theta \partial \nu \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu\right)$. The following constructions are also specially


4. Finally an Infinitive is used for Imperative at 462 ( $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu)$, and $\mathrm{I}_{4} 66(\mu \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota)$.
(a) An Accusative-subject with Infin. depending on a verb is called an Indirect Statement (enuntiatio obliqua). Examples in O. T. are 123 ( $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau$ às $\kappa \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ), $205,248,256-8,270,314,349,351-2,3^{62}, 3^{66-7}$, \&c. \&c. Here too the clause will be subjective if the verb is impersonal
 stood. Cp. 314, 468.
(b) But the instances are numerous in which the case before Infin. is effectively governed by the principal Verb, so that the Infin. is virtually a second object. Cp. 98, 130, 213, 226, 252, \&c. In many of these the princ. verb is $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ (or for it $\chi \rho \epsilon \omega \nu$ ) or $\delta \epsilon \hat{l}$.
(c) In some Accus.-Infin. clauses the Infin. takes $\hat{\alpha} \nu$ without a protasis. See $375,385,1228,1456$. Two have $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ and $\epsilon i$ with opt. protasis, 88 ( $\tau \dot{\alpha}$
 $\ldots \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \mu \psi a i \mu \epsilon \theta a)$. Once $\not \vec{a} \nu$ with plup. infin. and $\epsilon i$ with Indic. protasis:

 The remarkable passage, $\mathbf{2 3}^{6-241}$, requires careful study. See Comm.

## C. The Participle.

The construction of Participles (which are both verbs and adjectives) is more various and complicated than that of the Infinitive, and if great attention be given to its varieties and to the best modes of representing them in English, students will find their trouble amply compensated by sound and rapid progress in knowledge of Greek.
I. When a Participle accompanies a Finite Verb, it is often equivalent to a Finite Verb and кai, and should be so rendered. Thus 28,

 217, 308, $386,396,43$ 1, $599,603,620,64 \mathrm{I}, 718,728$, $760,782,946,967$, 1025, 1069, 1121, 1270, 1276. So 86ı, $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi \omega$ тax'́va $\sigma \alpha$ may be rendered I will make haste and send, but more elegantly, I will send with speed: ${ }_{1074-5} \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu \nexists \xi \alpha \sigma a$, can be hath rushed off and gone; but more simply, hath rushed away; the whole stress being on $\notin \xi=a \sigma a$.

A few places occur in which the Participle seems better rendered as a
second Finite Verb．So 227 фoßєìqal $\dot{i} \pi \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \omega \dot{\omega}$ ，is frightened and hath hidden away，i．e．hath hidden away in fright． 143 \％vaб大є äpavтєs，arise
 quivas，consent and touch．In these examples the times of the verbs are so closely coincident that the poet may invert the usual order if it suits his verse to do so．

2．A Participle having the Article without a Substantive is usually equivalent to the Relative ös（or to $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \bar{i} \nu o s$ ös）with Finite Verb．Thus 8

 269，277，297，308，313，401，566，597，755，784，805，820，821，835，917， 1038 ，1104， $1114,1300,1330,1383,1476$ ．All these are similar to 139 or 293 ：but 735 oن́ $\xi \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta \dot{\omega} s$ refers to $\chi \rho o ́ \nu o s$, time： $1047 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \rho \in \sigma \tau \omega \dot{\omega} \tau \omega$ refers to $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu: 988 \tau \hat{\eta} s \zeta \dot{\omega} \sigma \eta s$ refers to $\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s$ understood．

The following are of the same class as 293，and may be said to refer to man understood：but might also be called＇equivalent to a substantive＇：


 $\phi u ́ \sigma \alpha s=\dot{o} \pi \alpha \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$, г $247 \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau i ́ \kappa \tau о v \sigma a \nu=\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \eta \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$.

Participles neuter with article are used as substantives：sing． 74 （ $\tau 0 \hat{u}$
 plur． 604 （ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi \chi \rho \eta \sigma \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha$ ）， 770 （ $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \nu \sigma \phi o ́ \rho \omega s$ 光 $\chi o \nu \tau \alpha$ ）， 1057 （ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\rho} \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha$ ）： 1237 （ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \chi \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau \omega \nu)$ ．

3．Participle with Article in conjunct agreement with substantive appears 75 （той каӨウ́коутоs $\chi$ ро́vov）．Ср．278，393，397，633， 78 1，793，879， $967,97 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}_{21} 3,1375, \mathrm{I} 386,1425,1477,1514$ ．Without Article it appears in conjunct agreement about 20 times：14，$\hat{\omega}$ крađúv $\omega \nu$ Oioimous， $300 \hat{\omega}$



Participle without Article in adjunct agreement（ecthesis）supplies the largest class．I have counted $8_{4}$ ，and this is probably below the total num－
 $\& c . \& c$ ．This Part．is introduced by $\dot{\omega} 97$（ $\dot{\omega} s \tau \epsilon \theta \rho \alpha \mu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \nu \nu$ ）， 353 （ $\dot{\omega} \delta \nu \nu \tau \iota$ ）． Cp．625，955，1095， $1219,1290,1423,1526$ ．In $955^{-6}$ we find the some－

 participles on account of context in 3IO（imperative），IIIO（condit．），I389 （ $\imath^{\prime} \hat{\eta}^{\eta} \ldots \kappa \lambda \dot{u} \omega \nu \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ）．

4．Some Participles have an Adjectival character， 317 ，申povoû̀tь $=\sigma 0 \phi \varphi, 454 \delta \epsilon \delta о \rho \kappa$ ó $\tau о s=$ oculati，616，875，1278．Some are Predicates
primary, $747,904,99 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I} 389$, \&c. tertiary or oblique, $31,206,213,356$, 368, 46 r \&c., $517,539,606,626,632,642,726,797,833,922$, 1031, 1140, 1188, 1215,1529 . More emphatically at 356 i $\sigma \chi \hat{v} 0 \nu$, and at $906 \phi \theta i \nu 0 \nu \tau a$ is proleptic.
5. In many instances an ecthetic Participle without Article is equivalent to a Conjunction and Finite Verb.
(a) temporal : containing when, while, after, \&c.
(b) conditional: containing if.
(c) causal : containing because, since, in that.
(d) admissive : containing although.

Under (a) come-when: 73, 114, 155, 295, 296, 306, 340, 539, 544, 600, 679, 746, 749, 773, 794, 824, 1058, ェ391, 1487: while: 778, 952, ч1о5, 1254, 1453; after: 726, 1192, 1268, 1402, 1404.

Under (b) $326,519,570,602,829,930$, 1469 : with $\mu \eta^{\prime} 77$, I 158, 1368: with $\mu \grave{\eta}^{\circ}$ ov̉ 13,221 .

Under (c) because: $50,5^{15}, 526,704,963$, 1000-1, 1011, 1178-9: with ov, 1150: since: 1084 .

Under (d): 37-8, 318, 330, 534, 1304.
Observe, however, that, in translating such clauses, great care must be taken to avoid inelegance: for it will wery often happen that a temporal or causal clause may be more elegantly rendered without using any of the English conjunctions cited above.

For instance: in 798 , $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \chi \omega \nu$, certainly temporal, is more elegantly rendered as I went, or on my way, than by using either when or while. In $399 \delta 0 \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$, certainly causal, is more neatly rendered expecting, than by using either because or since. In $330, \xi v v \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\omega}$ ov่ $\phi \rho a \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \epsilon$ is better expressed, you know, but will not tell us, than though you know you will not tell. Students may usefully apply these remarks to the translation of such passages as $357,399,523,933,947$, and others.

It may be observed that an aorist participle may often be more justly rendered by an Engl. present than past participle. For instance: 3ro,

 the mark; 1265, $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \beta \rho v \chi \eta \theta \epsilon i s$, with a dreadful yell-are better versions than any which attempt to retain the past sense of the aorist.
6. Sometimes a Participle is equivalent to a Dative Infin. with $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $=$ Latin gerund in $d o$, and may be so rendered. Thus $43 \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} о \dot{v} \sigma a s=\tau \dot{\varphi}$
 doing or saying what; 100-1 à $\nu \delta \rho \eta \lambda a \tau 0 \hat{\nu} \tau a s \hat{\eta} \lambda$ v́ov $\tau a s=\tau \hat{\varphi}$ à $\nu \delta \rho \eta \lambda a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \hat{\eta}$入úєเv, by banishing a man or expiating, \&c. Cp. 105, 119, 141, 286, 323, $348,387,403,450,688,705,1080,1150,1517$.
K. OE.
7. A Participle often stands absolutely with a Genitive Noun, twice with an Accus. in this play. Such a clause is usually a brachylogy for a Finite sentence of Time or Cause, the latter being generally accompanied with $\dot{\omega} s$, but not always. Thus genitives abs. of Time are gr $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon$ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \omega a$ Yóv $^{2} \omega \nu$, while these men are near (in presence of these men) ; 126 ^atou ò $\lambda \omega \lambda o ́ \tau o s$, zehen Laius was dead. Cp. 250, 257, 565, 636, 685, 772,
 with $\mu \epsilon \mu \phi \circ \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \omega \nu$ the mind supplies $\tau \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$, and this clause might be called Conditional ( $\left.=\epsilon l^{\prime} \tau \iota \nu \epsilon s \mu \epsilon \mu \phi о \iota \nu \tau o\right)$ on account of $\hat{a} \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \phi a i \eta \nu$, but evidently $\epsilon i$ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{o} \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon}$ are in effect alike here. The same may be said of 629, какиิs

 $\tau \iota \nu o ́ s$, where the substantive $=$ a participle $\dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma o v \mu \notin \nu o u$. So 966 , $\dot{\omega} \nu$
 causal. But the passage 848 , $\dot{\omega} s \phi^{\prime} \nu^{\prime} \nu \gamma \epsilon \tau o v ̃ \pi o s \hat{\omega}^{\delta} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma o$, is on a different footing. There is no causality here. The Part. (instead of Infin.) is determined by the verb of knowing $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma o$, and $\dot{\omega}$ is merely idiomatic

8. Instances of what is called a Nominative Absolute are two: 60
 which see Comm. on 159.
9. Participles, being Verbs as well as Adjectives, can govern cases of Nouns. Thus we find an Accusative governed by a Partic. 139 ( $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu o \nu$
 $\left.\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon \tau \tau \mu \omega \rho 0 \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \theta^{\prime} a^{\prime \prime} \mu \alpha\right)$, ср. $25-7$ : a Genitive 14 ( $\kappa \rho a \tau u ́ \nu \omega \nu \chi$ र́́pas $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\eta} s):$ cp. 932, 1104. On Infin. after Partic. see II. I. (1).
 stand for Finite Verbs. But we may observe that in each case the verse is alone, by one speaker, and conveys the idea of incompleteness, as at 325 , 558 , 1128 . At 1296 with $\sigma \tau v \gamma o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$ the mind supplies $\tau \iota \nu a$. 'The line 517 ending $\phi \epsilon \rho_{\rho} \nu \mathrm{I}$ have corrected, not believing that $\pi \epsilon \pi o \nu \theta \epsilon \in \nu \alpha \iota \phi \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \rho \nu$ for $\pi$. $\tau \iota$ $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho o \nu$ is a tenable construction. Those who have cited in its support Antig. 687 ка入ิิs $\notin \chi o \nu$ misunderstand the line they cite, which means 'it might however be quite proper ( $\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \ddot{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi o \nu$ ) for some one else (to gainsay you)'. No instance of a neuter Participle without Article being used as a Noun Subst. can be found in extant Greek. In $\mathrm{I}_{4} \mathrm{I} 6$ 's $\delta \epsilon_{o \nu}$, the Partic. is used adjectively, and $\epsilon_{s} \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\prime} \nu$, like $\epsilon^{\prime} s \dot{\partial} \rho \theta o \dot{\nu}$, is an adverbial phrase.
iI. We have now to enumerate classes of Verbs which take a Participle in construction after them and not an Infinitive. They are chiefly Verbs of knowledge, sight and appearance. Verbs of knowing show

 689 a comma should stand after $\delta \epsilon$, making ťđ $\theta \iota \delta \epsilon ̀$ parenthetic; for $\pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\nu} \nu \theta a \iota$ $\mu^{\prime} a^{a} \nu$ must depend on $\epsilon \tau \pi o \nu$, not on ' ' $\sigma \theta c$.)
 176, 324, 338, 465, 1264, 1506 . See Comm. 463.
 $\epsilon \dot{u} \rho \in \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \nu$, ср. 146, 457, 673, 790, 1008, і184-5, 1397, 1485.



12. Periphrasis. Sophocles is especially fond of periphrastic verbal phrases, for which he uses, with Participles, the copulative verbs ci $\mu i$, $\kappa \nu \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \tau v \gamma \chi^{a} \nu \omega, \phi \hat{\nu} \nu a l$, $\gamma^{i} \gamma \nu 0 \mu a \iota$, and, with past participles only, the verb ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$.

In Oed. T. the verb $\epsilon i \mu i$ is thus used 19 times, $90 \pi \rho o \delta \epsilon i \sigma a s \in i \mu i$,

 847, 991, 1045, 1285, 1369, 1393. Examples occur in his other plays, but in none so many.
$\kappa v \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ three times: 258- $50,594,9^{8} 5$. Examples occur in other plays.
 other plays; none in Philoctetes.
$\phi \hat{\nu}$ al, twice: 9, 587 , once in Antigone 501, once in Philoctetes 1052.
$\gamma^{i} \gamma^{\nu} o \mu a \iota$ is not used in Oed. T. with a Partic., unless the reading $\sigma \eta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu a s{ }_{\gamma} \epsilon \nu 0 \hat{u}$ is right at 95 r . It occurs once in Aj .588 , once in Phil. 773.

 found in all his other plays.

Note.-Before quitting the Verb we may observe, that the most frequent ellipse in tragedy is that of the copulative $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \boldsymbol{c} \\ i\end{gathered}$. As a sample, in the Prologos six instances may be cited: 55, 82, 84, 92, 99,111 ; in the first Epeisodion nine: 230, 291, 315, 316, 376, 378, 379, 408, 429 ; in the second nine: $518,545,609,61-, 628,754,769,834,838$; in the third twelve: $927,928,935,94 \mathrm{I}, 969,987,988,993,999$, 1019, 1050, 1061, \&c. \&c. $\chi \rho \epsilon \bar{\omega} \nu$, needful, proper, always omits $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i$. See $6_{33}, 1488,1502$.

## II. Adjectives and Adverbs.

Little need be said of these Parts of Speech. The construction of Adjectives as epithets and complements agreeing with substantives are elementary matter, familiar to all who have construed any Greek.
I. Adjectives neuter, singular or plural, by assuming the Article, become virtually Substantives. Instances in this play are $35^{6}$ rà $\eta \theta \notin \mathbf{s}, 722$
 $\tau \dot{a} \phi a \nu \hat{\eta}, 916 \tau \dot{a}$ kalvá. See 595. The Article can give the same force to an Adverb or Adverbial phrase, $13 \delta \tau$ à $\pi$ fòs $\pi o \sigma i, 668 \tau$ à $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$, Antig.
 Adv. of time or place $=$ Adjective, as $\mathrm{t} \tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \dot{a} \lambda a \iota(=\tau 0 \hat{\jmath} \pi a \lambda a \iota o \hat{v}), 5 \sigma_{4} \tau \hat{\psi}$

2. An Adj. can also serve for a Subst., if it agrees with a Sulst. manifestly understood: 3 II $\mu a \nu \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s$ agrees with $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$ s understood. Cp.

3. Neuter plural Adjectives can be used substantively without Article: $\phi \rho \delta \nu \iota \mu, 690$. They are often adverbial: 419 ( $\delta \rho \theta \dot{a}), 443$ ( $\mu \hat{\omega} \rho a$ ), 483 ( $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu a ́)$. Any Adj. may have adverbial force. See 618 ( $\tau \alpha \chi u ́ s$ ).
4. The predicative and semi-adverbial position of the Adj. (or Partic.) after Art. and Subst. is shown $356 \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \theta \dot{\epsilon} s i \sigma \chi \hat{v} o \nu, 526 \tau o v i s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o u s$

 Here it is not easy (on account of $\epsilon \pi \sigma \iota \kappa \tau \epsilon i \rho \cdot \nu)$ to say that $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \partial \nu=\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu \grave{\nu} \nu \epsilon \tau \nu a \iota$, for which reason I have suggested that the verb may perhaps (parenthetically) be confined to $\tau \grave{\partial} \tau 0 \hat{\nu} \delta \epsilon$ as object, leaving $\tau \grave{\partial} \sigma \delta \nu(\sigma \tau \dot{\partial} \mu a)$ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$. If not, it would seem that the only alternative is to give $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$ a participial force: I am moved to pity by thy voice, not by Creon's,
 same observations apply here. I have suggested that Soph. may have written $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \gamma a \mu \psi \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \chi \alpha{ }^{\mu} \mu_{0} \sigma_{\iota} \kappa \grave{a} \nu \pi \kappa \rho \theta \leqslant \nu o \nu$, which restores both grammar and metre. But, feeling no assurance that he did write so, I have not altered the text. And again I find my only resource in rendering $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \varphi$ סòv like a temporal participle ( $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \omega \delta o \hat{v} \sigma a \nu$ ) when she sang her riddle.
5. Comparatives and superlatives should be noted: 136 àm $\boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \rho \omega$
 $663 \pi \dot{u} \mu a \tau o s\left(\pi v \theta \mu \eta_{\nu}\right.$ ?). Homer has Od. $\delta^{\prime} 685$ v̈бтaгa каi $\pi \cup ́ \mu a \tau a$.

## III. Substantives.

A. Case.
I. Accusative. Its ordinary use as object of transitive verbs needs no exemplification. It is also used


(b) of respect, with verbs and adjectives: 153 ( $\phi \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \nu a) ; 216$


(c) of time: $75 ; 558 ; 78 \mathrm{I} ; 1090$.



(e) in apposition: $1 ; 197 ; 212 ; 806, \& c .:$ to sentence 603.
$(f)$ after a compound verb: 208; $\mathbf{1} 300$.
(g) attracted from dependent clause to former sentence: 15

(h) after oủ for oủ $\mu a ́ ; 660 ; 1087$.
(i) after $\delta \rho \hat{\alpha} \nu$ with adv.: $6_{43}$.
(k) double accus.: $340 ; 639 ; 644 ; 1518$.
( $l$ ) accus. as subject of infinitive, and as standing between verb and infinitive. See Verb (Infinitive) above.
( $m$ ) as absolute with ws. See Participle above, 7.
2. Dative :

The Dative as remoter object after Verbs and Adjectives, and the Dative (=Latin Abl.) of matter, manner, cause or instrument, are constructions of ordinary use; also the Dative 'commodi vel incommodi', for: 39; $42 ; 44 ; 86 ; 217 ; 261 ; 267 ; 269 ; 381 ; 701 ; 784$ \&c.

Add to these :
(a) the ethic Dative: the examples of which, are chiefly $\mu \circ$,
 735, тoîo $\delta \epsilon$.
(b) of place: 20,$422 ; 818 ; 900, \& \mathrm{c}$.
(c) of time: 156,782 .
(d) with compound verbs: $16 ; 113 ; 141 ; 175 ; 273$, \&c.
(e) with $\epsilon i \mu i: 103 ; 295,370, \& \mathrm{c}$.
$(f)$ with $\dot{o}$ aútós: 284,840 , \&c.; with $\dot{o} \mu 0 \hat{v}: 1007$; with $\epsilon \xi$ loov: ioig.
$(g)$ by attraction: $35 \mathrm{I}, 569$.
Observe $\mu$ á $\alpha \tau \sigma \rho \iota$, 353. Strictly this should be $\mu$ ıá $\sigma \tau o \rho a$, in apposition to $\sigma \epsilon$ in 350 ; but as $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}$ is nearer to it, the dative is used to avoid confusion, as if $\sigma \circ \iota$ had been written after $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$.
3. Genitive: ${ }^{1}$

Sophocles may be said to luxuriate in the use of the Genitive case, which he extends to a very wide circle of meanings.
(a) Genitive of Origin.
gen. of the place or point whence...

 ( $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \nu$ ) ; 894 ( $\psi \nu \chi \hat{\alpha} s$ ); 1035 ( $\sigma \pi \alpha \rho \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \nu$ ); 1063 ( $\mu \eta \tau \rho o ́ s$ ); 1082 ( $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ );

of comparison, excess, \&c.:
 (iँ $\pi \pi \omega \nu$ ) ; 593 ( $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s, \delta \nu \nu a \sigma \tau \epsilon i a s) ; 674(\theta v \mu o \hat{\imath}) ; 700(\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon) ; 76_{4}(\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta \epsilon)$;


of cause and price :
48 ( $\pi \rho 0 \theta v \mu i a s)$; 185 ( $\pi o ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ); 233-4 ( $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu$, aúroû); 698 ( $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \tau o s)$;
 1478 ( $\dot{\delta} \delta o \hat{u})$. In $\left.49^{6(\theta a \nu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu} \bar{\epsilon} \pi i \kappa o v \rho o s\right)$ the adj. $=\dot{\alpha} \rho \omega \gamma \dot{o} s$ avenger.
after verbs of hearing, learning, recciving:

 тov). After $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \nu \omega$, see 1004 ; 1012; 1022.
(b) Genitive of Possession (Subjective).
with Nouns (the most ordinary use, needing little exemplification)

after article elliptically: 224 ( $\tau \grave{\nu}$ Маßסáкоv); 488 ( $\tau \hat{\psi}$ По入ú $\beta o v$ ); 498
 ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ 人aitov).
after verbs of belonging, requiring, ruling:

 ă $\rho \chi \omega$ 14; 54-5; 409; 579; 1197 .
(c) Genitive of the Object.
with Nouns:
seven times after фoveús, 459, 534, 703, 721, 793, 1001, 1357. Also, $3^{8,45}$, 104, 116, 121, 150, 201, 218, 266, $303,518,535,565,60$, 603,
${ }^{1}$ Observe that the functions of the Latin Ablative are divided between the Dative and Genitive in Greek: the Dative expressing matter, manner (cause), instrument : the Genitive origin, comparison, cause, price.

710,727 ( $\phi \rho \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ), 736 , $911,923,978$, 988, 1030, 1200 ( $\pi \dot{v} \rho \gamma \cos \theta a \nu a \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$ ), 1206, 1246, 1294, 1318, 1375, 1387, 1418, 1447, 1524. In 980, 987 ,
 are not of frequent use; and the Verbs which take them are mentioned under heads ( $b$ ) (e). Most of them can be resolved into $\epsilon \chi \omega$ with accus., as


The subjective and objective genitives may easily be distinguished by applying the test of construction with transitive verbs, in which the former will come out as a nominative, the latter as an accusative.


 $\mu$ iovs).
(d) Genitive of Description (Attributive).
with nouns only:
24 ( $\sigma \alpha ́ \lambda o v$ ); 25 ( $\chi$ Oovós); 27 ( $\gamma v \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \omega \hat{\nu}$ ); 33 ( $\beta i o v$ ); 34 ( $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu) ; 67$
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta \epsilon) ; 239(\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu) ; 480(\gamma \hat{\alpha}), 520,524,533,647,681,717,718,724,727$, $76 \mathrm{r}, 797,826,830,833,864-5,898$, and many more.

Such is the phrase in Thucyd. i. 140 ai $\xi v \mu \phi o \rho a l ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, which is discussed in Excursus iii.
(e) Genitive of Distribution.
after nouns and adjectives of multitude:


after superlatives: $33(\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu) ; 46$ ( $\beta \rho \circ \tau \hat{\iota} \nu) ; 3 \mathrm{I} 5(\pi o ́ \nu \omega \nu) ; 334$ ( $\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu)$;
 1223 ( $\gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ); 1230 ( $\pi \eta \mu \circ \nu \omega \hat{\nu}$ ); 1234 ( $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ ); 1237 ( $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho a \chi \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau \nu)$; 1298 ( $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu) ;{ }^{1} 346$ ( $\left.\beta \rho о \tau \hat{\omega} \nu\right)$; 1474 ( $\left.\epsilon \kappa \gamma o ́ \nu o \iota \nu\right)$.
after Pronominal and Numeral words:
tís interrog.: 437, 991, 1099, 1174, 1328, $1435,1496$.
ris enclitic: 42, 396, 645, 817, 1040, 1049, 1108, 1140, $1167,1258$.
 119, 373, 415, 427, 862, 975, 1195, 1259, 1437.
after words of sharing : 630,709 , 1465 . Of remembrance, regard, ignorance: 49, 219-20, 564, 724, 1060, 1226, 1401, 1462-6. Of touch or approach: 891, 1100, 1413, 1437. Of desire: 597, 891, 933. Of fulness and want: $4,5,57,83,394,405,448,1148,1292,1379,1396,1509$. This class includes compounds with a privative: 190 ( ${ }^{2} \chi a \lambda \kappa 0 s$ ); 789 (ă $\tau \mu \mu \mathrm{s}$ );

after Adverbs of place and manner: 108 ( $\pi 0 \hat{v} \gamma \hat{\eta} s ;$ ); 345 ( $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s} \dot{\delta} \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ ); 367

(f) Genitive with Compound words:

117, 178, 192, 229, 307, $309,385,43$ 1, $514,529,640,641,670,707$, 743, 762, 809, 812, $85 \mathrm{I}, 95 \mathrm{I}, 1003,143^{2}, \mathrm{I}_{438}$, 1499 , 1518 . In writing $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta a \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \downarrow$ $\pi a \tau \rho i \delta o s 8_{25}$, Soph. seems to have given that verb the sense and construction of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta a i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$.
(Obs.) The attracted Gen. $\dot{\omega}_{\nu} \nu$ appears at $119,148,645,788,862$; at 1464, ö $\sigma \omega \nu$.

Note. Cases after Prepositions and Prepositional words:
The prepositions of which Soph. makes largest use in Oed. T. are cis ( $\dot{\epsilon} \mathrm{s}), \dot{\epsilon} \kappa(\dot{\epsilon} \xi), \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, and especially $\pi \rho \delta \mathbf{s}$. Next come $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta, \dot{\epsilon} \pi l, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́, \sigma \dot{v} \nu$.
'Avá (acc.) is rare in Soph.; once in Oed. T., 477 ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha ́ \tau$ ' äv $\nu \rho a$ кal
 v̈ $\lambda \alpha \nu$, beneath wild forest. The fugitive wanderer seeks the darkness of woods and the inaccessible heights and caves of mountains.

Eis, és (acc.), to, 62, 70, \&c. \&c.; into, 744, 1527; on, 263; for, 1180 ; as to, 980 . Special uses and phrases : 78 ( $\epsilon$ is калóv, at a happy moment);
 to no simple issue, but to a most serious one); 700 (''s $\pi \lambda \epsilon \circ \nu=\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$ alone);
 ( $\epsilon$ is $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \grave{\rho} \dot{\rho} \epsilon \pi o \nu$, pertaining to me); 975 ( $\epsilon$ is $\theta \cup \mu \dot{\partial} \nu \beta a ́ \lambda \eta s$, fix your mind on, dwell on); 1351 ( $\epsilon i s \chi a ́ \rho \iota \nu$, to be thankful for); 1372 ( $\epsilon i s{ }^{\text {"A } A \iota \delta o v ~ i . e . ~ \delta o ́ \mu o v) ; ~}$ 1416 ('єs $\delta$ '́ov, for the needful purpose). The prep. $\dot{\text { s }}$ may be used for $\epsilon$ is when a person is the object: 1481 ( $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \dot{\alpha} s \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \dot{\alpha} s \ldots \chi \epsilon ́ \rho a s)$.
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \nu$ (dat.), in, 98, $110, \& \mathrm{c} . \& \mathrm{c}$. ; among, $215,75^{2}, \& c$. ; in respect of, 1112. Special uses: 80 ( $\epsilon \nu \tau u ́ x \eta \gamma \epsilon \tau \psi$, having some good luck); 287 ( $\epsilon \nu$
 $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \eta)$; 613 ( $\epsilon \nu \chi \rho o ́ \nu \varphi$, in process of time); 652 ( $\epsilon \nu \delta \rho \kappa \varphi \mu \epsilon \hat{\gamma} \alpha \nu$, see note);
 IIßI (èv $\tau \alpha ́ \chi \epsilon \iota$, quickly).
 $\left.\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \sigma o l, 697\right)$ compare also $\tau \dot{a} \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma o l, 805$, and Tr. 621 , oủ $\tau \iota \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{\omega}$


完 $\nu$ (dat.), with, occurs about twelve times in Oed. T. without any special peculiarities, $\mathbf{1 7}, 55, \& c$.
'A $\nu \tau l$ (gen.) occurs six times: $26_{4}$ ( ${ }^{2} \nu \theta$ ' $\omega \nu$, for which reasons); 455 ( $\pi \tau \omega \chi \grave{s} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \pi \lambda o v \sigma i o v$, a beggar instead of wealthy); 543 ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$, in reply to what you have said); 1021, II55 (dंvтi $\tau 0 \hat{0}$, what for? why?); 1418 ( $\dot{\nu} \tau i \dot{l} \sigma 0 \hat{u}$, in thy stead $)$; 1491, see note.

Пןó (gen.) occurs twice, meaning in behalf of; 1о, 124.
'A $\pi$ ó (gen.), from, frequent; without peculiarities. Note 758 (à $\phi$ ' ov , und. $\chi$ คóvov, from the time that). After its case, $712,1131$.
' $\mathrm{E} \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ (gen.), out of, often, 418, 632, \&c.; from, usually, 230, 359, \&c.; $b y, 225,854,1382$, 1454. Special examples, $\epsilon \xi$ toov 61 and often; $132(\dot{\epsilon} \xi$

 So in $528 \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ with the two genitives expresses the circumstances. See Aesch. Ag. 328 (oúк $\epsilon \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \xi \xi \in \epsilon \cup \theta \epsilon \in \rho 0 v \delta \epsilon \rho \eta s$, with neck no longer free).
$\Delta a^{\prime}$, through, occurs once with acc. 867 ( $\delta i$ ai $\theta \in \hat{\rho} \rho a$ ); four times with
 through such fortune); 822 ( $\delta i \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \pi \epsilon \rho$, through which).

Karà has two cases. It occurs in Oed. T. (r) seven times with acc.
 to your dwelling); 1086 (катд̀ $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu a \nu$ in respect of judgment); 1197 (ка日, $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \beta_{0} \alpha{ }^{\prime}$, in excess); 1447 ( $\kappa a \tau^{\prime}$ oikous, in the house); (2) once with gen. 228 ( $\kappa a \theta^{\prime}$ aúrov̂, against himself).
$\mathrm{M} \epsilon \tau \dot{a}$ has three cases, in Oed. T. gen. only, with, five times : thrice after its case, 247, 414, 990.
$\Pi_{\epsilon \rho l}$ has three cases: in Oed. T. gen. only, concerning, twice, after its case : 94, 743 .
' $\Upsilon \pi \epsilon \grave{\rho} \rho$ has two cases, only gen. in Oed. T., in behalf of, about, seven times: four times after its case, $165,187,987$, 1444. See 137.
${ }^{\prime} A \mu \phi i$ has three cases: but in Oed. T. dat. only, once, i 55 ( $\left.\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi i \sigma o l\right)$.
Hapà has three cases: ( I ) acc. 182, 983 ( $\pi a \rho$ ' oú $\delta \dot{\ell} \nu$, of no account); (2) gen. from, with person, $285,704,716,935,1039,1280 ;$ (3) dat. at, with, 382, 612, 780, 972 ( $\pi a \rho$ ' "Aı $\delta \eta$, in the realm of Orcus). It follows its case (gen.) thrice, $95,704,714 . \quad \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho a$ is for $\pi$ d $\rho \in \sigma \tau \iota$, 1238.
' $\Upsilon \pi \delta$ d has three cases: (1) acc. under 476 ; (2) gen. by, from, throush, 29, 37, 728, 949, 1073, 1448; (3) dat. 202. Twice after its case (gen.), 728, 949 .
' $\mathrm{E} \pi i$ has three cases: ( I ) acc. 199 ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime} \hat{\eta}^{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a} \rho$, during the day-time); to, $265,455,76 \mathrm{I}, 899$; against, $215,469,494$; for, 555,690 ; (2) gen. on, $1_{13}, 1049,1$ 109; (3) dat. on, at, against, \&c., 21, 569, 820, 829, 1029, 1457. 'E $\pi i$ is adverbial 182.

 376, 949, 1037, 1094; from, 429, 493, $516,668,835$; in the interest of, 1434; by the hands of, 292, 713, 722, 1488; $\pi \rho \dot{\rho} s=\varepsilon \omega \nu, I$ adjure you by, 697, 1037, 1060, 1153, 1165, 1410; (3) dat. at, close to, 130, 730, 1126, 1169 ; in addition to, 1333 ; for, to effect, 1302.

Prepositional words which take a gen. are :
(1) ả̉ $\downarrow \in v$, without, $54 \mathrm{I}, 590$; without direction of, $146_{4}$; (2) $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma\end{gathered}$, єl $\sigma \omega$, within, 678, 1241, 1515 ; (3) $\epsilon \xi \omega, 531$, 1390, 1410; (4) кáт $\omega$, beneath, 968 ; (5) $\lambda \dot{d} \theta \rho a$, without privity of, 787 ; (6) оїขєка ( $=$ єั עєка, on account of), 383 , 497, 858, 934, 997, 1о10; (7) $\pi \epsilon \in \lambda a s, ~ n e a r, ~ 782, ~ 803 ; ~(8) ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a, ~ b e y o n d, ~$ 74; (9) $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$, except, 14 I 5 (as conjunction 118-19); (10) $\chi$ d́ $\rho \nu \nu$, for the sake of, 147, 888; (11) $\chi \omega \rho i s$, apart, 1463 .
B. Number.

1. Plural used for singular. At 435 Teiresias says of himself $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s$

A word signifying 'a house' or 'dwelling' is often plural, $\delta \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \tau a, \delta \delta \mu о \iota$, otкоь, $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in$ ' $\alpha$. This seems to arise from the fact that Greek houses were regarded as having distinct apartments for the sexes, the domestics, \&c.

On the use of the masculine dual for women see Comm. on 1472.
(Obs.) The use of Abstract Noun for Concrete is seen I ( $\tau \rho 0 \phi \grave{\eta}$ for $\theta \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \mu a \tau a) ; 85$ ( $\kappa \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon \nu \mu a$ for $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \sigma \tau a ́) ; 128$ ( $\tau v \rho a \nu \nu(\delta o s$ for $\tau v \rho a ́ \nu \nu o v) ; 1248$ ( $\pi \alpha \iota \delta o v \rho \gamma i \alpha, \nu$ for $\pi \alpha \iota \delta o u \rho \gamma o ́ \nu$ ); and elsewhere. See 313, 1426.

## IV. Particles not Pronominal

(as used in the Oedipus Tyrannus) ${ }^{1}$.
A. The potential and conditional particle $\dot{a}^{\prime} \nu$.

Homer used two such particles, $\kappa \epsilon$ or $\kappa \epsilon \nu$, ă $\nu$. Attic and Ionic writers dispensed with $\kappa \epsilon$, using $\ddot{a}^{\nu} \nu$ only. When without a preceding particle (and before the time of Plato, who often uses it for $\eta^{\prime} \nu$ ), its function was to imply 'conditionality,' and to place words to which it was attached under that influence. Generally speaking, it belongs to the apodosis of a condition having a protasis either expressed by $\varepsilon i$, or conveyed in some other form, or implied and left for the mind to furnish. But this implication is often so faint, that (as in $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma\left(\mu \prime \not \alpha^{\prime} \nu\right)$ the verb with $\tilde{\alpha}^{\prime} \nu$ represents little more than a modest future: as Eng. I should say.
${ }^{1}$ This section must be taken as a small fragment of a very large subject. On such Particles as $\kappa \alpha i . . . \tau \epsilon, \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \ldots \delta \dot{\epsilon}$, and on the negatives $o \dot{v}, \mu \dot{\eta}$, with their compounds, I have not dwelt with any fulness, but only touched upon a few salient points affecting passages in Oed. T., the interpretation of which play, not the doctrine of Greek Particles, is my subject here. And I must frankly confess that in this doctrine there are some questions upon which, with all the pains I have taken, my opinion still remains unsettled. Such are the distinct uses of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ and $\nu v \nu$, oṽкov $\nu$ and oủkov̂ $\nu, \mu \eta{ }_{\eta}$ ov as compared with $\mu \dot{\eta}$. When Soph. writes in one place ( 1232 ) $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ où $\delta^{\prime} \hat{\alpha} \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \tau$ ò $\mu \grave{\eta}$ où $\beta a \rho v ́ \sigma \tau \sigma \nu^{\prime}$
 discern no such distinction between the two places as to make $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov requisite in the first, while $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is sufficient in the second. I am obliged to suppose the poet free to write one or the other form, as M advig does in his Greek Syntax.
I. "A $A$ can stand with opt. indic. or infin. of imperf., aor., or pluperf., never with fut. in any mood.
(a) With opt. it always refers to time fut. or present, and if its protasis has $\epsilon i$, the verb in prot. is opt. Of this form we have in Oed.
 and it is a remarkable fact that of this very normal form there is no second instance in the play. Most of the other instances of $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ with opt. have no
 $282,333,334,339,343,503,505,599,6$ г5, 8 г $6,845,857,862,925,96_{4}$, 977, 1004, 1032, 1053, 1058, 1065, 1172, 1182. Some have a participial
 Cp. 77, 446, $570,600,602,772,828,1084,1469$. In $216 \notin \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \theta \lambda \eta s$ is protasis of $\lambda \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta \circ \iota \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu$, and in $839, \ddot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \rho \epsilon \theta \hat{\eta}$ is protasis of $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon \cup \gamma \circ \circ \eta \nu$ : in

(b) With indic., $\grave{a} \nu$ always refers to time past, and its protasis is either $\epsilon i$ with indic. past, or a participle or clause expressed or under-

 432,573, 1438, 1512. The following show a participial or clausular pro-
 117, 1355, 1357, 1372, 1456. Reference to a suppressed clause must be assumed, 82 (o $\dot{v} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \hat{a} \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \rho \pi \epsilon$ ); 318, 434. Observe $969-70$, $\epsilon \grave{\iota} \tau \iota \mu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{\omega} \mu \hat{\psi}$


 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\nu} \hat{v}$ is the real apodosis. On ${ }_{5}{ }^{1} 3$ see Comm.
(c) "A $\nu$ with infin. has protasis with $\epsilon i$ and opt. twice in O. R.
 In four other places it has no protasis: 375, 584, 1227, 1455. At 691, äv with pluperf. inf. $\pi \epsilon \phi^{\prime} \nu \theta a \iota$ has for protasis $\epsilon l^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \nu 0 \sigma \phi \iota \zeta \dot{o} \mu \alpha \nu$, where see Comm. On ir ( $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda o \nu t o s a ̈ \nu)$ see Comm.
(d) The repetition of ${ }_{a} \nu$ in the same clause occurs eleven times in O. R., ten with Opt. $139,339,446,505,602,772,857,862,936$, 1053: once with Indic., 261. See Mr Steel's note on p. 1445, and Rost's Greek Grammar, Synt. Cap. $3 \S 120$ Anm. 4.
(e) On compounds of $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ and relatives with $a \partial y$ which govern subjunctive, see Verb, moods.
B. Strengthening and limiting Particles:
a. $\Gamma \epsilon$, as a limiting enclitic, lends force to the word which it follows. In O. R. it is so used with
(1) Substantives: $\ddot{v} \pi \nu \varphi \gamma \in 65$. Cp. 80, 257, 712, 778, 857 , 1015, 1030, 1175, 1292, 1319, 1357, 1378.
(2) Adjectives: $\sigma \grave{v} \delta^{\prime}$ ä $\theta \lambda$ ıós $\gamma \epsilon, 372,563,800,963,987$, 1035, 1159 .
(3) Pronouns, personal: $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma \epsilon, 335,565,840,103$ 1, 1046, ro92, 1169, 1446; possessive: 852; demonstrative: 383, 442 (aü $\tau \eta \gamma \in \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \tau o l$ ),

 Cp. 1455 (каітоц тобоиิтóv $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ' оіठа).

(5) The Article: 90 ( $\tau \hat{\varphi} \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{v} \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$ ), 290 ( $\kappa a l \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \tau a ́ \gamma$,

(6) Numerals: $845(\epsilon \hat{i} \rho \gamma)$.
(7) Verbs: 105, 345 ( $\kappa a i \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \pi a \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \gamma^{\prime}$ où $\delta \epsilon \nu$ ); $57 \mathrm{I}, 583,77 \mathrm{I}$ ( $\kappa<\dot{u} \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} s \gamma \epsilon$ ).
(8) Participles: 326, 680, 848, го०7, Іогі, 1158.


 (каì $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu \ldots \gamma \epsilon$ ), 290, 345, 836, 987, 1004, 1066.

In a short speech, $848-60, \gamma \epsilon$ appears six times.
It is used in answering questions yes or $n o$ : but not often in this play. See 562-3, 962-3, 993-4.
b. $\Gamma 0 \hat{\nu} \nu$ ( $\gamma \epsilon$ of $\nu$ ), at least, used thrice in Oed. T., 408, 626, 1425.
c. $\Pi_{\epsilon \rho}$ (from $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ), a slightly strengthening particle, joined to conjunctions of time, place, condition, and to rel. pronouns; $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho$, $\partial \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, oîbs $\pi \epsilon \rho$, ö $\theta \epsilon \nu \pi \epsilon \rho$. See 22, 54,369 , \& c. ; 25 I , 351, \&c.; 403, 498, \&c.

It is used with Participles and Adjectives as althoug $\kappa$, but only once in Soph., Phil. 1068.
d. $\Delta \dot{\eta}$, a strengthening particle, denotes exactness, occasionally

 1042.
e. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \tau a$ in Oed. T. enforces a question : $364(\epsilon \ell \pi \omega \tau \iota \delta \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha), 558$, 964 , IoI4, used confirmatively 445 ( коцц广 $\epsilon \tau \omega \delta \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha)$. In earnest prayer 830 ( $\left.\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha, \mu \grave{\eta} \delta \hat{\eta} \tau^{\prime}\right)$.
f. M ${ }_{\eta}^{\prime} \nu$, however, $y e t$, indeed, is a particle always combining with some other, which it modifies. In Oed. T. we find 810 oú $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, not however: 870 oú $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \alpha ́ \nu \pi o \tau \epsilon$, and never in sooth. In all other places кai $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ followed by $\gamma \epsilon$ after a word interposed: 290, 345, 836, 987, 1004, 1066.

Of these examples, the first and fifth would be rendered well!, the second nay then!, the third yes indeed!, the fourth and sixth and yet.
g. $8 \mu \omega \mathrm{~s}$, nevertheless, occurs 302, 628, 785, 859,998 , 1064, 1170, $1239,1326,1442$.
h. Tol, a slightly strengthening enclitic, which brings the matter home to the hearer: $442(\gamma \in \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ zol, yet this fortune, let me tell thee).
 393, 855, 1455 (кai $\tau \circ$, yet, thou must know), 629 (oй тol... $\gamma \epsilon$ ), 852 (ой тol
 occurs $1067, \mathrm{ri}_{7}$; well, let me tell thee. On $\nu \hat{v} \nu, \nu v \nu$, see note in Comm. on 644 .
$j$. ${ }^{\top} \mathrm{H}$, an earnest interrogative particle: 622, 943, 993, 1012. In the lines $1039-1045$, Oed. uses it four times during his examination of the Corinthian messenger: see also irio, 1168. $\hat{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ 1000, 1039, ${ }_{1173}$. In $429 \hat{\eta} \hat{\delta} \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha$ shows double indignation. $\hat{\eta}$ каl 348,757 , 1045 .
$k$. 'A $\rho a$, interrog. and intensive : $4^{15}$, 540, 822-3, 828, 924, 1395, r401. äpa, illative, 1444. $\dot{\rho}$ á do., 5 Io.
C. Divisional Particles:
a. 'A $\lambda \lambda a$, besides its use as but after negation, ( 1 ) opens a sentence in reply, remonstrance, interrogation, or transition, $14,78,82, \mathrm{I} 32$ and often. (2) before imperative, $9,5 \mathrm{I}, 66$, and elsewhere. (3) before conjunctive, 86I. (4) before opt., 929,1478 . (5) after voc., 1583 . (6) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ’ oú $\gamma{ }^{\alpha} \rho, 1409$.

 $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}^{\prime}, 5^{2} 3$. (13) $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oű $\tau \iota \ldots \gamma \epsilon, 363$.
b. Kai, and, in this its ordinary sense, as connecting words and sentences, is so frequent as to need no special exemplification. Again, its meanings also, even, are of frequent occurrence; 22, 44, 87, 94, 164, 234, $34 \mathrm{I}-2,409,575,682$ and many more. In some places the emphatic sense of $\kappa a l$ is more peculiar-in fact, particularly, especially. Such we see in 148, 582, 782, $85 \mathrm{I}, 989$, 1029. Combinations with кal are numerous: as $\kappa \alpha ̈ \nu$, which is sometimes for кai $\dot{a} \nu$, sometimes for кal ćáv. к $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ is for кai $\grave{\epsilon} \nu$. кai $\gamma$ áp, for indeed, 334, 1445, 1448, 1523 каi $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, well! well then, nay
 and $y e t, 313,1463$. See $\gamma \epsilon, \epsilon l, \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ above.
c. M $\epsilon \nu$. The general divisional use of the particles ${ }^{\circ} \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \epsilon$ is well known, and need not be exemplified. But the peculiar idiom of Sophocles in sometimes repeating the same word with each must be noted:


$\mu \grave{\nu} \ldots \kappa \alpha \kappa \dot{\partial} s \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ ), $1127(\hat{\eta} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \ldots \hat{\eta} \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon})$. In $647 \mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \hat{e} \nu$ is only answered
 $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ followed in 605 by $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau^{\prime} a ̈ \lambda \lambda o$.
d. Eita, next, then, 452, after a Participle 1402. кậ $\tau a$ for кai cita 544, $1023,1500$.
e. $\Pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$, except.
(1) As conjunction 118 ( $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon i s ~ \pi \iota)$ ), 370 ( $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma o i$ ).
(2) As preposition with gen. once 1415 ( $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{u}$ ).
f. "H (1) or, 100, 309, 659, \&c. $\ddot{\eta} \ldots{ }^{\prime}$, either...or, 145-6, \&c. The alternative is often one of emphatic contrast; in ( $\delta \epsilon i \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ), $378,536,538,555, \& c$. Sometimes it is alternative to $\pi \dot{o} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu, \pi \dot{\delta} \tau \epsilon \rho a$, 750,960 ; (2) than, after comparative words $55,94, \& c$., after ä入入os 59 , \&c. (3) after $\pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu 736,832$. So after $\pi \rho^{\prime} \nu$, but not in Oed. T.

## D. Conditional Particles :

$\mathbf{E} i$, if, particle belonging to the protasis of a condition, passim. It is used, commonly, with the indic. or opt. of verbs. The subjunctive usually has $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu$ or $\ddot{\eta} \nu$, but $\epsilon i$ is exceptionally used with it, as in this play $198(\epsilon \ell \tau \iota$ $\nu \dot{v} \xi \dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\eta}$ ), 874. See 1063.- $\epsilon i$ каí, even though, although, 283, 302 (see $\epsilon i$ каi $\mu \dot{\eta}$ 308), 408:-кєi, even if, although, 227, 669, 986, 1077:-єi $\mu \dot{\eta}$, if


 єїте, 42-3, 194-6, 246-7.

For $\hat{\eta}_{\nu}^{\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu} \overline{i f}$, see Verbs, Conjunctive.
E. Particles of Time and Place.
a. 'E $\tau \iota, \pi \omega$. Learners are apt to confuse the particles $\epsilon \tau \iota$ and $\pi \omega$, because each may sometimes be rendered by English yet, as ètı $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \in \iota$, he is staying yet; oün $\omega$ ơ $\chi \epsilon \tau a l$, he is not yet gone. This confusion may be avoided by noting two things: (1) é $\epsilon \iota$ points from present time forward, he is staying yet (and may stay on); $\pi \omega$ points from the present time backward, (some time has passed and) he is not yet gone. (2) è $\tau \iota$ can take
 longer. But $\pi \omega$ must take a negative, for $\pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \pi \omega$ is nonsense-ou $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon v \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$, he has not yet fled; $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \omega$ ф'́yns, do not fly yet, are gram-matical.-"E $\tau \iota$ occurs twenty times in Oed. T. See oủќ่ $\tau \iota, \mu \eta \kappa \epsilon \in \tau \iota$, no longer,
 1370 ( $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon v^{\prime}$ '̈ $\tau \iota$, and counsel no more). "E $\tau \iota$ strengthens a compar. 272 (кä̃ı $\tau o \hat{\delta} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \in \theta$ iodl, and still more odious than this). For $\pi \omega$,

places and others in Soph. have a negative with $\pi \omega$; see oü $\pi \omega$, 594. Hence we have written $\pi 0 v$ for $\pi \omega$ in 1130 , where there is no negation.

 moods. The different uses of ov, objective, and $\mu \dot{\eta}$ subjective negative are well brought out in the places of this play where ${ }^{\xi} \nu \theta a$ is used with a

 ( $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \theta \alpha \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \pi o \tau^{\prime} \epsilon i \sigma \delta \psi \epsilon \sigma \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \tau \iota$ ), and in each instance $\mu \grave{\eta}$ shows that ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \theta \theta$ implies any place where, i.e. wherever. This applies to $\dot{\delta}$, ós and rel. particles, ov̀,
 be used with ov, while $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ( (conjunction) that, because, cannot be used with $\mu \dot{\eta}$.
c. "Iva has two uses: (I) as an adverb of place, where; (2) as a final conjunction, in order that.
(1) where: 360, 413 (iv' єi какой, in what evil plight thou art),



(2) in order that, with subjunctive after present or future principal verb; with opt. (as a rule) after a past verb. But Soph. has only one instance of $\ell_{\nu a}$ with opt., and none in this play. See subjunctive 1454. But he has an instance with $\ell_{\nu} \nu$ of that peculiar idiom by which a past indic. follows a past principal verb; and immediately afterwards another, where $\dot{\omega}$ has the same construction. See I386-I 393 ( $\nu_{\nu}$ ' $\hat{\eta}$... w's ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \in \iota(\xi \alpha)$.
d. Má入al, of old, long ago, for a long time: 289, 449, 949, 973, 997, 1043, 1067, 1112, 1161, 1214, 1245, 1477: with article 1, 268, 668, $916=$ талаıб́s.
e. Hilv as an adverb (formerly) occurs four times; 259, 652, and with article, 1024, 1282. As a conjunction (before) it takes infin. 104; opt. (after opt. negative), $\pi \rho i \nu \ell \delta o \iota \mu l 505 .-\pi \rho i \nu \ddot{a} \nu$ with subjunctive (after pres.
 1530. When time is def. and past, $\pi \rho \rho \nu$ takes aor. ind., 777.
F. Illative Particles :
a. Гáp, for, 87, 320, 333, \&c. (affirm.) yes: for, 328, 338, 341, 433, 582, 731, 1024, 1117, 1516. (neg.) no: for, 118, 324, 376, 626, 1 151. This word must be rendered as the place suggests; 346 to $\theta_{l}$ ráp, know then ; 358 ovं $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, certainly not, 939 тoı $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ خà $\rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a$, you zvere a shepherd,
then. Sometimes English idiom would omit it; 711, 779, 862, 994, 1039 (or, did you then), $1 \mathbf{7 3}$ (or, did she then), 1241, 1259, 1268, 1496 (or indecd). It is in several places referred to a clause mentally supplied: $\mathbf{1 2}$, 82, 228, 317-8, \&c. In the latter passage one $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ closely follows another. So 472-5.
b. 'Oû̀, therefore, then, in fact, \&c., 90 (oưT' oîv), 124, 568 ( $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$




Are we to receive oúkouv or oúkoû̀, or sometimes one sometimes the other of these accentuations where this compound appears? In other words, does oúk ever lose all its power in the word, or does it not? Since writing the note on 343 (which see) I have reconsidered the question, and having examined all the Sophoclean instances, I now lean strongly to Elmsley's and Dindorf's opinion, that Soph. has never used the word in such a way as to compel us to make oúk impotent: that is, there is no passage appearing to do this, which may not be regarded as interrogative. Assuming this view to be right, how does it affect accent? Must oűкouv always be written, or oúкoû̀ always, or the former when oúk is categorical, the latter when it is interrogative? My feeling is that oúкoûv (or oúk oviv) is probably the right form always. Oviк is atonic, whether categorical or not ; oû $\nu$ is nọt an enclitic, like $\pi \omega$, $\tau 0 \iota$. Why, then, should it resign its accent? Has it not an equal claim with ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau \iota$, which keeps its accent not only with the atonic ovं (ovंкध̇८), but also with $\mu \dot{\eta}(\mu \eta \kappa \dot{\xi} \tau \iota)$ ?

## G. The Negative Particles:

$\mathbf{O} \dot{v}, \mathrm{M} \dot{\eta}$. The distinctive uses of the two negative particles ov (objective and definite), $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (subjective and indefinite), involving those of their many
 $o \dot{o} \delta a \mu \omega \hat{s} \mu \eta \delta a \mu \hat{\omega} s$, and others, exhibit at once the subtlety of the Greek mind, and the exquisite refinement of the Greek language.

1. The objective negative ov, oúk, is of constant occurrence, 24, 31 , \&c. \&c. As oúxi, 137, 360, 421,567 . Observe 430 (ov̉к єis $\delta \lambda \epsilon \theta \rho o \nu$; oủxi
 881, 1377, 1456. ov่ $\delta \in$, nor, neither, 31, 38, 116, 312, 414; not even, 255 ,

 ойтє, 857-8. Ср. гого.

On the use of $\mu \grave{r}_{l}$ and its compounds: (1) with Opt., expressing a wish. (2) with Imperative and Conjunctive in prohibition: (3) as a Conjunction, lest, with Conjunctive and Optative: (4) with Relative Pronouns and

Particles governing a Subjunctive: (5) in Conditional Protases, conjunctional or participial: (6) with Infinitive: (7) $\mu \dot{\eta}$, ou with Infinitive and Participles:-examples will be found in the sections on the Verb and Parti-
 ( $o \dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \epsilon i \pi \omega$ ) is found 328-9, and also ovं... $\mu \grave{\eta}$, nonne, a strong remonstrance, with Fut. Indic. $637-8: \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \pi \omega s \mu \dot{\eta}$, after $\delta \epsilon \in \delta o \kappa \alpha$, with Fut. Indic. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \rho \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \xi \iota$
 unless for some terrible calamity, 1457: 裒 toov $\tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu i$, as good as nobody, 1019; î $\sigma a$ каi $\tau \grave{\prime} \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \ell \nu$, the same as nothing (= mere vanity): showing that robody and nothing, as abstract nouns, are in Greek $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon i s, \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$.

## V. Pronouns and Pronominal Particles.

These are important elements in Greek construction, and in the Greek of Sophocles they deserve special notice.

Pronouns are Nouns and Adjectives assignable to the following Categories :
A. Quiddity: asking and answering the question Who or What?
B. Quality: ," ,, Of What Kind?
(C. Quantity: ,, ,, ,, How Great?
(D. Quotity: ,, ,, ,, How Many?

Pronominal Particles are assignable to the following Categories:
E. Manner : asking and answering the question How?
F. Time: ,, ,, ,, , When?
G. Place: ,, ,, ,, ,, I. Where?
2. Whither? $\}$
3. Whence?
with others.
Pronouns are classed as:
$a$. Interrogative: $b$. Indefinite: c. Personal (with $d$. Possessive: e. Reflexive) : $f$. Demonstrative: $g$. Relative.

Their Particles are assignable to classes $a . b . f . g$. (not to $c . d . e$.$) .$
The following Tables exhibit classes $a . b . c . f . g$. under the several Categories: words with asterisk are not found in Oedipus Tyrannus:
A.
B.
C. D.
a. tis who? what?
a. moios of what kind, a. móvos how great? what? $\quad$ *tóroc how many?
b. Tis some, any
b. *$\pi$ olós of some kind $\quad$ b. **orós of some magni-

є่ $\gamma \dot{\omega} I$
oú thou
K. OE.
A.
f. $\dot{\mathrm{o}} \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{6}$ that, the
ö $\delta \varepsilon$ this
oû̃os ,, е̇кєivos that, he soc. кeìvos
g. ös who, which
ö $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$,, ," öбtis who, whoever, whatever
B.
f. Toîos of such kind, $f$.

| тоо́б $\delta \epsilon,,$, <br> тоцоิ̂тos |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

C. D.

тb́oos so great тобó $\sigma \delta$, , тобои̂тos ,, (pl. so many)

a. $\pi$ जिs how?
a. ${ }^{*} \pi \dot{t} \tau \epsilon$ when?
a. $\pi o \hat{v}$ where?
b. $\pi \omega s$ somehow
b. Tor'́ ever Evc.
b. mov anywhere
f. $\dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon$ so, thus oũtcus ,"
g. $\dot{\omega}$ how, as ö $\pi \omega$ s how, as
$\stackrel{\omega}{\sigma} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ as
$o ̈ \pi \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ so as
2.
f. $\tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$ then
f. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\sigma}$ here
$\tau \eta \nu \iota \kappa a \hat{\tau} \alpha a,, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \hat{\theta} \theta a$, ,
*тот ${ }^{*} \nu i к a$
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon i ̀ \imath ~ t h e r e ~$
g. örє when
g. oṽ where

| ıка | " | * 0 ĩ $\pi \epsilon \rho$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

$\dot{\eta} \mu o s$ ", öтou ",
モ̇ $\pi \epsilon i \quad$, $\quad$ ѐ $\nu \theta a \quad$,
cis, ö $\pi \omega s,, \quad{ }^{* \prime \prime} \nu \theta \alpha \pi \epsilon \rho,$,
 iva ,,
a. mô̂ whither?
3.
4.
b. **ol anywhither
a. $\pi \delta \theta \epsilon \nu$ whence?
a. $\pi \hat{\eta}$ which way?
f. $\hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon$ hither $\delta \epsilon \hat{v} \rho o$,"
*'єкєїбє thither
${ }^{*}$ кєî $\sigma \epsilon \quad$,
g. *oi whither
*oime $\rho$,
*öтои ,, *о́тó $\theta \in \nu$, ö $\pi о \iota \pi \epsilon \rho$ whithersoever $\quad \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \nu \quad$,

Other series are :
(1) Age or size: a. ${ }^{*} \pi \eta \lambda \iota \kappa о s ; ~ f . ~ \tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o ́ \sigma \delta \epsilon($ see 1463$),{ }^{*} \tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa о \hat{u}$. ros, of that age; g. $\dot{\eta} \lambda i ́ \kappa o s$, of what age. See 15.
(2) Dual Interrog., a. ${ }^{*} \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, which of two? Not in Oed. T. as Adj., but as Interrog. Adverb, $\pi \sigma_{o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu}^{715}, \pi \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho a 112,923$.
f. ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \mathrm{S}$, one or other of two, once in Oed. T. $747 \theta \dot{a} \tau \epsilon \in \rho a=\tau \hat{g}$

g. Rel. *ító $\tau \epsilon \rho o s$.
 $\pi \epsilon \rho, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta}$ since. "O $\tau \iota$, oưvєка oftener mean that oblique. See 59,500 , ${ }^{1133 ; 708 .}{ }^{\text {'O } O \text { Oóveка }}$ means that ten times in Soph. (twice in Oed. T. 572, 1271); seven times it means because (once in Oed. T. 1016). Oӥขєка is also used for $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \kappa \alpha$, as a preposition.
$\epsilon \epsilon \pi \epsilon i$, since, appears $9,258,3{ }^{16}, 370,376,390,43^{8}, 563,649,725,9^{8} 5$,


Obs. I. The strengthened Relatives ö $\sigma \tau \iota s, \dot{\delta} \pi o i o s, o ̈ \pi \sigma \sigma o s, o ̈ \pi \omega s, o ̈ \pi o u$, \&c. are used

 as indirect Interrogatives, in which sense direct Interrogatives also, and (occasionally) even simple Relatives are used: $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ö $\sigma \tau \iota s \epsilon_{l} \rho \gamma \alpha \sigma \tau a i \quad \pi 0 \tau \epsilon$


 after doing such things as $I$ did within your vicw, what kind of things $I$ went on doing afterwards, when I came hither? i \&or, where oia is rel. and $\dot{\delta} \pi o \hat{\imath} a$ indirect interrog. dependent on $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Hence these forms in Aristophanes echo questions, кai $\pi \hat{\omega}$; -ón $\boldsymbol{\prime} \omega \mathrm{s}$; (do you ask hozv?) Equ. 128 .

Obs. 2. A Relative, simple or strengthened, may become universal, by

 with ${ }_{\alpha} \nu$, as öт $\alpha \nu, \dot{\delta} \pi o ́ \tau \alpha \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu$ or $\ddot{\eta} \nu, \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta a ́ \nu$.

## A. Correlation of Quiddity (tis; who or what?)

a. The Interrogative Pronoun ris occurs in Oed. T. about 68 times, in eleven of which places its construction is indirect, as $\phi \rho \alpha{ }_{j} \epsilon \in \dot{\eta} \tau i$ $\phi$ in's 653. Tit five times means wihy? 634, 964, 1000 ; and 139 r , $i \omega$
 ( $=w h y$ ?), 1021, 1155. Twice, $\tau i$ is exclamatory, $\tau i \delta \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha ; 577: \tau i \delta \epsilon ;$; 94 I : how? zohat? The other examples are of direct interrogation; rồ for tivos again occurring 357, $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o \hat{v} \delta i \delta a \chi \theta \epsilon i s ;$ and $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ for $\tau i \nu \iota 772$.
b. The Indefinite Pronoun $\tau \iota s$ nccurs about 64 times; of which

 wiv ós $\epsilon$ i.

1457: oй $\tau \iota$ s occurs twice, 8 I9, 1333. In some places $\tau \iota$ has an adverbial character, at all: $3^{6} 3,410,433,73^{6,85}$ r, $969,1066$.

Personal Pronouns (with Possessive):
c. d. ' $\mathrm{E} \gamma \dot{\omega}, \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\rho} s$. The enclitic forms $\mu \epsilon, \mu o v, \mu o \iota$ are, co nomine, unemphatic, as compared with $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}, \dot{\epsilon} \mu o \hat{v}, \dot{\epsilon} \mu o i$, and in some places a deliberate choice of the stronger form is noticeable, as 374 ( $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta^{\prime} \tau^{\prime}$
 ${ }_{2}$ §o, $\mathbf{1 5 1 6}^{16}$. But the stronger forms are not everywhere used with great emphasis, but are often due to the convenience of position. One proof of this is that they obtain more decided emphasis by taking $\gamma \epsilon$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$, $\dot{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon,{ }_{\epsilon} \mu \circ<\gamma \epsilon$. The dual $\nu \stackrel{y}{\varphi}$ occurs 1504 .

The possessive $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{s}$ has no peculiarities: it forms frequent crasis with the article; оч́ $\dot{\prime} s, \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\eta}, \tau о \dot{\jmath} \mu o ́ \nu, \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha ́$ к.т. $\lambda$.
$\Sigma \dot{v}, \sigma o ́ s$. The oblique cases singular of $\sigma \dot{v}$ are enclitic or emphatic, as the sense requires; and also gain force by taking $\gamma \epsilon$. The dual forms $\sigma \phi \omega$, $\sigma \phi \hat{\varphi} \nu$ appear 1488,1495 : plural $\sigma \phi e ̀$ for aúrás, 1505 .

The Possessive oòs is freely used. Observe roîs бoĩoly aủzoû (= roîs $\sigma \alpha u t o u ̂) 416$. $\Sigma \epsilon \theta \epsilon \nu$ is an Attic form for $\sigma o v, 597,1221$.
[ $e$. Reflexive Pronouns:
The Pronoun $\sigma \phi \grave{\epsilon}$ ( $=$ Homeric $\hat{e}$ ), ồ, ô̂ (Lat. se, sui, sibi) occurs; accus.
 See aúrós. The Reflexive Pronoun Possessive čs (Lat. suus) is used by
 See $\sigma$ òs above.]

## f. Demonstratives in correlation with $\tau i s$, who, what?

1. The Definite Article $\dot{0}, \dot{\eta}, \tau 6$ (corresponding to Sanskrit $s a$ ) is the chief pronominal base, being in fact itself a demonstrative Pronoun. Italian speech did not acquire an article anciently; and this defect is among the chief causes which make the Latin language inferior to the Greek. Modern Italian, French and Spanish have supplied the want by forming an article (lo, le, la) from the second syllable of the pronoun ille.

[^18][The Definite Article stands:
(1) immediately before its noun, ó $\Lambda$ á̈os, $1169: \tau$ às $\xi v \mu \phi \circ \rho a ̀ s$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o u \lambda \epsilon v \mu a \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu, 144$ (which in prose might be $\tau \grave{\alpha} s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta . \xi$.).
(2) before epithet and noun, ó $\pi v \rho \phi o ́ \rho o s ~ \theta \epsilon o ́ s, 27$.
(3) before epithet following noun, $\beta \omega \mu 0 i \sigma \iota \tau o i ̂ s \sigma o i s$, or before both, $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha i ̄ s ~ \xi u \mu \phi o p \alpha i ̂ s ~ \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \nu u ̂ \nu, ~ 518$. If the order is article subst. adj. or adj. article subst. the adjective is not epithet, but predicate: as 525
$\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$ ó $\mu a ́ \nu \tau \iota s$ roùs $\lambda o ́ \gamma o u s ~ \psi \epsilon v \delta \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o t, ~$
where $\psi \in v \delta \epsilon i$ is has a predicative position, which would be equally such if it were $\psi \in v \delta \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o u s, ~ w h e r e a s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \psi \epsilon v \delta \epsilon i s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o u s ~ o r ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o u s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \psi \epsilon v \delta \epsilon i s ~$ or roùs Nó
(4) with many words between article and noun:
$$
\chi \circ i \pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s \in \hat{v} \text { گuvvî́v } \epsilon i \sigma \alpha \epsilon i \text { } \theta \epsilon o i .
$$
(5) before an adjective or a participle (without noun); either of which thus acquires the power of a substantive: $\tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \phi \sigma_{0}{ }^{2} 87, \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi a \nu \hat{\eta}$

 $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon \in \tau \sigma 604$.
(6) before an adverb, which is thus made adjectival: $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi$ ápos
 pos, 208; or if there is no noun, the phrase will form one: $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho o s, 1420$.
 or a case, $\tau \dot{a} \beta \rho o \tau \hat{\omega} \nu, 498$; $\tau \grave{a} \tau \hat{\eta} s \tau u ́ \chi \eta s, ~ 977 ; \tau a \nu \hat{v} \nu$ often occurs as a merely strengthened form of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ now .
(7) often as a demonstrative pronoun. So oi $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu$, oi $\delta \dot{́}$, somc,
 ò $\delta \hat{\epsilon}, 669$, 1264 ; $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ for $\tau a u ́ \tau \eta s, 1082$; $\tau a i ̂ \nu$ for $\tau a v i \tau a \iota \nu, ~ 1466 . ~ S o m e t i m e s ~$ it is for a relative: $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ for $\dot{\omega} \nu, \mathrm{I}_{3} 79$; $\tau \grave{o}$ for $\delta$, $\mathrm{I}_{427}$. In $1229 \tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$, others,
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \Pi_{0} \lambda \dot{u} \beta o v$ (und. vị̂) 489. The following places illustrate the power of the article: $37 \mathrm{I}, 497,668$.]
2. "O $0 \varepsilon$, ovitos, are of constant occurrence. Either may occur before article and noun, or after both: $\tau \delta \delta \epsilon \tau$ ò $\dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ or $\tau \grave{\rho} \dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu a$ $\tau$ ó $\delta \epsilon$, $\tau o \hat{v} \tau o ~ \tau o ̀ ~$
 and this too, 37; тoûto $\mu \hat{e} \nu$ in the first place, 603; followed by $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau$ ' á $\lambda \lambda \frac{1}{}$, 605.
3. 'Eкєivos or кeivos, that one yonder, that, he, \&oc. is derived from $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, there (bringing to mind our vulgarism 'that there'). It occurs about

12 times; and its shortened form кєivos as many. The adverb $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ twice,
 Of these $\kappa \epsilon \hat{\theta} \theta \epsilon \nu$ alone appears in this play, 758 ; but all are used by Sophocles.
[Obs. The Pronoun aútòs (=Lat. ipse) has a variety of sense and construction which makes it one of the most remarkable words in the Greek language; it is of all persons.

1. Its first meaning is Self, and this sense it can keep in all its cases: being (in this use) in apposition either to a pronoun personal or demonstrative, expressed or understood, or to a noun, with or without article, as:
aủzòs ( $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}) \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda v \theta a, I$ an come myself.
aúròs ( $\sigma \dot{v}$ ) $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda u \theta a s$, thou art come thyself.

( $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{i}$ ) avं oi $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{\prime} \theta a \mu \epsilon \nu$, we are come ourselves.
( $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ ) aủroi $\overline{\epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda u ́ \theta a \tau \epsilon, ~ y e ~ a r e ~ c o m e ~ y o u r s e l v e s . ~}$
 come.

So aùtòs $\dot{o}$ Фoîßos or $\dot{o}$ Фoîßos aútós, Phocbues himself, which may be
 Thebans themselves, which may be declined through all plural cases.


 574 ; aùtós $\mu_{0 \iota} \sigma \dot{v} \sigma \eta \mu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \rho \gamma \epsilon \nu 0 \hat{v}, 957,1039,1447$. Third Pers. aútòs $\delta$,

 aùrà, they will cone of themselves, 34 I . Other cases: aùtò $\epsilon i \pi a \tau ' ~ \epsilon i \kappa \alpha ं \tau \iota \sigma \theta$ ' öтov, tell me of himeself, if ye knove, where he is, 926 (кátıбтє is 2 d pers. pl. of кátoı $\delta a)$. See $547,54^{8}$; Фolßov $\gamma^{\prime}$ à $\pi^{\prime}$ aúrov̂, 712.
 $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\varphi} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. кӓ $\gamma \omega \gamma^{\prime}$ áкоч́ $\epsilon \iota \nu$, where the Infinitives depend on $\tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \nu \hat{\varphi}$, and after $\kappa a ̈ \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$ the mind supplies again $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi^{\prime}$ aí $\hat{\varphi}_{\hat{\varphi}} \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon i \mu i \tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\varphi}$.
2. The oblique cases of aúto's compounded with the Reflexive Pronoun $\boldsymbol{E}_{0}$ (Hom. $=0 \hat{v}$ ) form :

himself. herself.
So the plural cases become aúrou's -ás, aú $\omega \hat{\nu} \nu$, aúrois -aîs, themselves,

The singular cases again compounded with $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\epsilon}, \dot{\epsilon} \mu o \hat{v}, \dot{\epsilon} \mu o l, \sigma \epsilon, \sigma o v, \sigma o l$, form the pronominal words:



 (3) In correlation with aủrós; aủtòs кa日' aữov, 228; $\pi \alpha \iota \sigma i$ qoîs aúrồ
 aủròs au̇rồ we have an instance of aن் there is no example of aívô for $\sigma a v \tau 0 \hat{v}$, but this is equally feasible; as $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i} \boldsymbol{\delta}$,



 707. $\sigma \alpha u \tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ is not in Oed. T. See $\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ aî $\rho \in \sigma a v \tau \delta\langle\nu$, Phil. 886. $\epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \iota$


 tua ipsius, sua ipsius.
3. The oblique cases of aúròs (but not the nominative) are used as
 emphatic.

In Oed. T. aữóv, him, 297, 469, 703, 842, 989, 1421 ; aữ仑̂, to him, 1258; aं ${ }^{\prime}$ ' aù $\bar{\eta} s$, from her; 1269; au่тஸ̂̀, of them, 975 ; au่ $270, \& c . \& c$.

The accusative pronoun $\nu \iota \nu$ (usually singular, sometimes plural) is for aùтóv, 123, 248, 466, 642, 718, 763, 768, 843, 857, 889, 942, 1133, 1174,
 aủvás, 1505 , 1508. See above (Refl. Pr.).
4. Aúròs with the article before it means 'the same.'




In three places $\tau a \dot{\tau} \tau \dot{\alpha}$ is constructed with a dative: $\tau \alpha \dot{u} \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \Phi o i \beta \varphi$, the same things as Phoebus, 284; '̇кєív $\quad$ raúrá, the same as she does, 579; $\sigma o i$ ravía, the same that you do, 840].
g. I. The Relative ös is largely used, with the occasional variation ö $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, which occurs as Nom. S. 756 ; Acc. S. 1120 ; Dat. S. 351 ; Acc. Pl.
 $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho$ is for $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$. "Os $\gamma \epsilon$, 35. The universal form ôs $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ appears 580 , 749, as $a^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$, whatever things.
2. ${ }^{*} O \sigma \tau \iota s$ appears about 29 times : of these ${ }^{\circ} \tau i 7 \mathrm{I}, 485,664,934$,

 $\tau a ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau a$, as soon as possible, 1340 . See $\pi 0 \tau \epsilon$.
B. Correlation of Quality ( ooios; of what kind?).
a. The Interrogative $\pi 0$ ôos; of what kind? may generally be rendered what, and in tragic use, differs little from $\tau i s$; Like $\tau i s$, it is used in indirect as well as direct interrogation.

Hoîos, as direct Interrogative, is in Oed. T. 23 times: 89, 99, 102, 120
 Indirect: 137 I .
b. moò̀s indef. does not occur.
 twelve times, $13,244,295,3^{87}, 435, \& \mathrm{c} . ;$ totov̂ 0 os, thirteen, $140,339,406$, 44 I, \&c.


 w's); 803, 1224 (exclamation); 1395 (exclamation); 1488. In 303, 1272, 1402, it is indirect Interrog.

Note: oîos $\tau \epsilon$ (for $\tau 0 \hat{o} 0 \mathrm{~s} \omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ) able, $24,1415$.
${ }^{\circ}$ O $\pi$ ôos occurs, $554,1076,1272,1403$, but in the last place alone it is an indirect Interrog.; in the rest it is Relative. (See above Obs. r.) In 915 ómoía is adverbial.
C. D. Correlation of Quantity and Quotity ( $\pi$ ó $\sigma o s$; tó $\sigma o l$;).
a. Hóros; how great? interrog. occurs once, 533, nowhere else in Soph.
b. $\pi$ ooòs indef. does not occur.
f. Demonstratives:
 80I, 1146, 14 Io.
g. Relatives (which in plur. express quotity, i.e. number) :
"O $\sigma 0 s, 273$, 347 ( ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \sigma \circ \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i$ кalv $\omega \nu$, all but killing with the hands); 365 (ö $\sigma 0 \nu \gamma \epsilon$ ); 382 (exclam.); 1224 (exclam.); 1239 (ö $\sigma 0 \nu \gamma \epsilon$ ). Oblique

 ö $\sigma o s$ is used as indirect Interrog.

Pronominal Particles:
E. Correlation of Manner ( $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$; how ?).
a. $\quad \pi \bar{\omega} \mathrm{s}$; how? 391, and fifteen times more.
b. The Indefinite $\pi \omega s$, somehow, is often used by Soph. but not in Oed. T.
f. Demonstratives:
$\dot{\omega} \delta \boldsymbol{\delta}$, so, thues, 83 , and ten times besides. hither, $7,144,298$. oüt $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, oüt $\omega$, so; 129, and seven times more.
In $1444 \alpha^{\prime} \rho a$, then, proves that oür $\tau \omega$ s is not to be taken with $\dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda i o v$.
g. Relatives:
(a) $\omega$ (Lat. $u t$ ) is the chief Relative of Manner.

This particle is notable as exhibiting more varieties of meaning and use than any other in Greek. As many as fifteen can be noted in this play. We may class them in seven groups:
i. a's, Rel. particle of Comparison (as).
ii. ," ,, ,, of Manner (hozv).
iii. ," ,, ", in Oblique Construction (that).
iv. ,, ,, ,, in Final Construction (in order that).
v. ", ", of Time (when, from the time when).
vi. ,, ,, ,, of Cause (since).
vii. ", Preposition (to a person).
i. $\dot{\omega} s, a s$ :
(I) with nouns and pronouns: 60, 583 ( $\dot{\omega} \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\omega}$ ); 923, 1260, 1422.
(2) with finite verbs: $114,242,435,940,962,1160$.

(3) with Infin. 84 .
(4) with participles absolute or otherwise: $11,97,101$, 145, 241-2, 353, 625, 848, 956, 1178, 1290-1, 1423 .
(5) with particle 1174 ( $\dot{\omega} \pi$ soos $\tau i \quad \chi \rho e i a s ;$ ).
(6) as if with verb: 538 ( $\omega$ s ov $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \stackrel{\imath}{\imath} \mu l$ ).
(7) idiomatic with noun (as=considered as, for) 1078


(9) idiomatic with adv. pos. or sup. (wंs $\tau$ á $\chi$ os) 945,1154 ; (ís $\tau$ áxı $\sigma \tau \alpha$ ) 1429 , as soon as possible.
(10) $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho, a s, 22,54,8 \mathrm{I}, 276,715,1470 ; \mathrm{III}_{4}(\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ є $\gamma \nu \omega \kappa \alpha, I$ seem to recognise), 1218 .
(11) $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon i$, as if, 264.
ii. is, how:
(1) exclamatory: $316,319,439,1187,1348$.
(2) oblique: 547 , $117^{2}$. Note 543 (oi $\sigma \theta^{\prime}$ is $\pi o i \eta \sigma 0 \nu$ ); 329 ( $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{s}{ }^{\alpha} \nu$, howusoever). See Exc. vi.
iii. $\dot{\text { w }}$, that (oblique):
(1) with indic. 1369 .
(2) with opt. imperf. $555,780,791$; aor. $730,843,1167$;
fut. 713 .
iv. $\dot{\omega}$, final (in order that):
(1) with subjunctive: 325,359 .
(2) with opt.: 1143, II74.
(3) with indic. past: 1392.
v. ís, temporal:
(1) when ( $\dot{\omega} \dot{s} \dot{\delta} \hat{a}$ ), 807 .
(2) from the time when, ${ }_{11} 5$ ( $\dot{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ ).
vi. $\dot{\omega}$, since (causal), $44,47,54,56,365,445,922$, 1050.

Exc. III.


(b) ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$, the strengthened $\dot{\omega}$, has many of its uses: as (partially): how (oblique): that (oblique): in order that: when.
i. as: 979, 336 (ö $\pi \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ) ; öт $\omega \stackrel{s}{ } \tau \alpha ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau a$, 1410 .
ii. how: 406 , $125 \mathrm{I}, 1367$.
 $\sigma \omega \omega \pi \hat{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \sigma \delta^{\prime}$ àvappウ'今єє кака́, I fear lest evils will break forth from this silence).

 1265 (ö $\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega s \dot{o} \rho \hat{q} \nu \nu \nu\right)$.
(c) $\stackrel{\omega}{\sigma} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, so that, so as:
i. with Indic. pres. 65 ; fut. 135, $41^{11}$; aor. 534, 1036 .
ii. with Opt. aor. and ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \nu, 857$.
iii. with Infin. $3^{61}, 374,595$, 1045. ( $\left.\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \grave{\eta}\right) 1085,1460$.

Note. For $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ the art. $\tau \dot{\delta}$ is used with Infin. 283, 1388 . Cp. 1412, where $\tau \dot{o} . .$. is in apposition.
F. Correlation of Time ( $\pi \dot{d} t \epsilon$; when?).
${ }^{*} \pi \delta \tau \epsilon$, when? and correlates.
a. The Interrog. $\pi \delta \tau \epsilon$ is not in Oed. T.; only once in Soph. Aj., 1185 ( $\epsilon s \pi \dot{s} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$ ). The question when? was asked and answered by various uses of the word $\chi$ póvos, time.

As to time past, comp. 558, 56 r . See Aesch. Ag. 254, $\pi$,oiov $\chi$ рóvov


When? would be asked of the future by means of the prep. $\epsilon s$, as $\epsilon$ 's
 $\epsilon$ is êtos and the like. Note 199 ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu a \rho$, during the day).
b. The Indefinite $\pi 0 \tau \epsilon$, ever, formerly, hereafter, is in large use.
 428, 486; cuer: (1) strengthening Interrogatives: $\tau$ is, $2,15 \mathrm{I}, 803 ; \pi \hat{\omega}$, 1212; $\pi 0 \hat{v}, 1480$; (2) strengthening öवтıs, 224, 279, 703; (3) after oú or $\mu \dot{\eta}$, $335,375,573,602,852$, \&c.
c. ойтотє, never, 503, $5 \mathbf{1 1}, 1009$, \&.c.; $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi о т \epsilon, 329,1218,1392$.
f. Demonstratives, then:

g. Relatives, whicn, numerous:
 wikenever, öтav, 422, 618, $624, \& c$.

## G. Correlation of Place ( $\pi$ ồ ; where?).

(1) Place where: $\pi 0 \hat{v}$, and correlates.


b. Indefinite, $\pi \mathbf{\pi} \mathbf{0}$, somewhere, anywhere, perchance, 43, 769, ini6, $\mathrm{H}_{128,} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{I} 41 \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{I}_{4} \mathrm{SO}$.
f. Demonstratives:

there, $\overline{\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{l}, 776,940 .}$
g. Relatives: where.


 in Oed. T. it means arriving at a point, evil or unpleasant; and so elsewhere in Soph., but not always in evil sense.
wherever, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \theta^{\prime} a^{\prime} \nu, 667,146 \mathrm{I}$; and ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \theta a \mu \dot{\prime}, 3 \mathrm{I} 6,796,14 \mathrm{I} 2$.
It must be noticed that $i_{\nu} \alpha$ is also used as a final conjunction, in order that (to the point that) (1) with subjunc., 364,1454 ; (2) with past Indic.

2. Place whither, $\pi$ oî and correlates.
a. Interrog. $\pi 0 \hat{\imath}$ रâs ; 1309.
b. The Indefinite does not occur in Oed. T., and of the Relatives only ö $\pi o \kappa \pi \epsilon \rho$, $145^{8}$.
f. Demonstratives:
hither, $\hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon, 144,298 ; \delta \epsilon \hat{u} \rho 0,532,95 \mathrm{I}$, 1069 , г126, $\mathrm{I}_{4}$ So.
$g$. Rel. whither is not represented in Oed. T.
3. Place whence; $\pi o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$ and correlates.
a. Interrog. $\pi \delta^{\prime} \theta \in \nu ;$ пı 62.
b. Indef. does not occur.
f. Demonstratives:
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \epsilon \in \nu \delta \epsilon, \mathrm{I}_{2} 6_{7} ; \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu, \mathrm{I}_{5} 16$.
g. Relatives:
$\dot{o} \theta \epsilon \nu \pi \epsilon \rho, 1498 ;{ }^{\epsilon} \nu \theta \epsilon \nu, 1179,1286,1485,1490$.
4. Which way? $\pi \hat{\eta}$ and correlates.
a. Interrog. $\pi \hat{\eta}$; i3Io.
b. Indef. not in Soph.
f. Demonstr., $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon, 858,859,1128$.
g. Rel. none in Oed. T.

## INDEX OF WORDS.

In using this Index, observe: (I) 'See' before a numeral (verse) implies a reference to its place in the Commentary: before Exc. to one of the Excursus. (2) Conjunctions, Prepositions, Pronouns and Pronominal Particles are not included here: they will be found in Excursus xiv. (3) Matters not given here (genders, declensions, conjugations, forms, \&c.) must be sought in the Lexicon, when required. (4) Abbreviations used are: in Verbs: Voices, act. pass. m.; Moods, \&c.: ind. imp. subj. opt.-inf. part.; Tenses: imperf. fut. (future), f. I, f. 2, f. 3 (paulo-post fut.) ; aor. (aorist); a. I (first aorist); a. 2 (second aorist) ; perf. (perfect); pl-pf. (pluperfect).
"A, ha! I 147
*ABą, a town in Phocis. See 899
$\alpha$ áßaros, inaccessible, untrodden, 719
$\dot{\alpha} \beta \lambda a \beta \dot{\eta} s$, uninjured, 229
äßou入os, inconsiderate, 634
ä $\gamma \mathrm{a} \mu \mu \mathrm{a}$, image, statue, ${ }^{1} 379$
ä $\gamma$ auos, unmarried, 1 502. ä $\gamma \cdot \gamma$ д́ $\mu 0$,
unconnubial, i.e. impious, mar-
ruage. See 1214
ä $\gamma a \nu$, very, 439; very much, 2, 767 ( $\pi$ ód $^{\prime}$ 'ä $\gamma \alpha \nu$, too much $), 914$
ä $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ गos, messenger, iı6, 305. See $6, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$. -Hence $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda$ -
$\lambda \omega$, to announce, $60+955$, with

$\dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \lambda a \tau \epsilon ́ \omega$. See 402
' $\mathrm{A} \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \omega \rho$, father of Cadmus 268.
See I
aqvós, pure, 830.- $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \in i a$, purity, 864
à $\gamma \nu \dot{\prime} \dot{\prime}$, ignorant, $677,68_{1}$ (vagulue), 1123 (oblivious)
á ${ }^{\nu} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ тоs, unknown, 58
äyovos, unprolific, barren, 27
àoрá. See 20, гб!
ä yos, curse. See 1427, 931
$a^{\prime} \gamma \rho \iota o s$, wild, 477 ; ficrce, $3+4$; cruel, 1073, 1205 , 1349
àүúpr $\eta$ s. See $33^{8}$
ärरıбтos, nearest, 919
à $\chi$ óop $\eta$, strangling. See 1374,1365
ä $\gamma \omega$, lead, 298, 724 ; bring, ${ }_{106}$; convey, 756; hold, deem, 775. $\delta \nu \sigma \phi \circ \rho \omega \mathrm{s}$ ä $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$, see 784
ádáuavos, invincible, I3I5
$\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \epsilon \alpha^{\prime}(=\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \dot{\eta})$, sister, 160
äô $\eta \lambda o s$, unknown, concealed, 475, 497; unproven, see 608
aं $\epsilon$, always; the first syll. is doubtful. aiév, 60, 905. єiซaci, for ever, 275,1013
à $\epsilon \lambda \lambda a ́ s . ~ S e e ~ 466$

'A $\begin{aligned} \text { áva, the goddess Pallas. See } 159\end{aligned}$ $\tilde{a}^{\prime} \theta \epsilon o s$, godless, 662. - $\dot{\alpha} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ s. See $25+$ ä $\theta \lambda$ cos, wretched, 372,789 , $8+$ c.
$\dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \epsilon \in \omega$, view, observe, $130_{5}$
$\dot{\alpha} \theta \rho o i j \omega$, collect, 144
 747
$\alpha^{\prime} \gamma \lambda \eta$, splendour, 207.-Hence $\dot{a}^{\prime} \gamma$ $\lambda a o ́ s$, splendid, $\mathrm{I}_{52}$. - ${ }^{\gamma} \gamma \lambda a \omega \psi$, brilliant, 214
aī́éoual, revere, respect. See $\mathrm{I}_{426}$
 the reaim of Hades; 1372, eis"Aiסou (und. $\delta o ́ \mu o \nu$ )
ai $\theta \dot{\eta} \rho$, sky. See 866
 1153
aîua, blood, 1279, 1406; bloodshed, ior. See 1450
aìv $\gamma \mu a$, riddle, 393, 1525 .-aivıктós, riddling, 439. See Exc. VI.
aip $\epsilon \omega$, take, aor. $\epsilon i \lambda o \nu, 396$ ( $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ aîua, shed) $; 585$ ( $\dot{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a l$, choose) ;
 2 p., take away)
aì $\rho \omega$ ，lift，143，270， 914 （ì $\psi 0 \hat{v}$ aí $\rho \epsilon \iota$ ，
 Oos，conceive，feel）
aīӨávoual，perceive，aor．ท’ $\sigma \theta o \mu \eta \nu$. See 127 I
$\dot{\alpha} i \sigma \sigma \omega, \not \partial \alpha \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，aor．$\hat{\eta} \xi \bar{\xi}, r u s h, 1074$
al $\sigma \chi \downarrow \sigma \tau$ ，most foully，sup．of ai $\sigma$－ $\chi \rho \hat{\omega}$ ， 367
 be ashamed of，1079
aiт $\epsilon \in \omega$ ，ask，pray， 2 10́， 1518 ．midd．ai－ то̂̂́al，do．880．－ait $\eta \tau$ ós，sued for， $3^{8} 4$
aitia，cause，1236；crime，109；ac－ cusation， 656 （ $\beta a \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ airiqu）． —aitıáoмaц，accuse， 608
áкá入uттоs，unconcealed， 1427
$\dot{\alpha} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \omega s{ }_{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ s．See 254
$\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta}$ ，time of life．See 741．finger， $\dot{a} \mu \phi \iota \delta \epsilon \xi i o \iota s \quad \dot{a} \kappa \mu a i ̂ s . ~ S e e ~ 1243$ ． 1034 modoì àk $\mu$ ás（ankles or in－ steps？）
аंкои́ш，hear，7，43，\＆c．àкоибтє́os，to be heard．See 117о．áкоиатós，
 ply， 544
a̋кроs，sup．áкро́татоs，hig\％／zest，п поб， 876
áкт ${ }^{\prime}$, coast， $\mathrm{I}^{2} 7$
äк $\omega \nu$ ，unwilling， 1283 ；uninten－ tional， 1230
à $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \neq \mu a l$ ，wander， 1506
ä $\lambda$ yos，grief，pain，62，638，1031．－ $\dot{a} \lambda \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, grievous，${ }^{15} 30$ ；$\dot{a} \lambda \gamma \iota \sigma$－ тos，most painful，675，1 238．－à $\lambda$－ rúve，pain，annoy，332，446，1об7
$\dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \xi i \mu \mathrm{opos}$, death－averting．See 163
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} s$ ，true，299．$\tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \in$ ，the truth，299，356．à $\eta \eta$ 啲；ha really！350－－ả ${ }^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota a$, truth， 369
ä入cs，enough，685，ІобІ， 1515
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma к о \mu a l$ ，be taken， 542 ，fut．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma-$ $\mu a l$ ，576．－$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega t o s$, that may be caught
$\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \dot{\eta}$, help，succour，42，189， 218
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}, b u t$, well！\＆c．See Particles．
à $\lambda \lambda a \gamma \dot{\eta}$, change，reverse， 1206
${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ ．See $6.185\left({ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda 0 \theta \epsilon \nu{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha\right.$, some here，some there）；ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s} \tau \epsilon$ ， moreover， $\mathrm{I}_{4} \mathrm{I}_{4}$ ；ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，in vain， 333， 1151
ä ${ }^{*} 0 \xi$ ，furrow， 121 I
ä $\lambda$ oxos，wife（young）， 183
ä入voos，painless， 593
$\ddot{\alpha} \mu a$ ，together，at the same time， 140 ， 47I，I317
а̀ $\mu a ı \mu \dot{\alpha к є т о s, ~ i n v i n c i b l e, ~} 177$
$\dot{\alpha} \mu a \xi \iota \tau o ́ s$, carriage road， 716,730
$\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ ，err，fail，perf．－p．$\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \eta-$ $\mu a l, 621$

व $\mu \in i \nu \omega \nu$ ，better， $1443,1479,1528$
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \omega$ ，neglect， 1 I
ä $\mu$ opos，ill－fated，unhappy， $2_{4} 8$
äuiv $\omega$ ，zeard off， 894
$\alpha \mu, \phi \iota \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \xi$ ．See 417
＇А $\mu \phi$ ıт $і$ it $\eta$ ，zvife of Poseidon
$\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ ．See Particles and Verbs，Exc． xiv．
à $\alpha^{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ ，necessity，strait， $877,986$. －$\dot{\alpha} \alpha \gamma \kappa \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ ，compel， 280
ävaryos，impure， $823, \mathrm{I} 38$
$\dot{\alpha} \nu a \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, aor．2．m．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\partial} \mu \eta \nu, I$ re－ ceived， 1035
á $\nu а к \eta \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，proclaim aloud， 450 àขaкivךбıs，agitation，quaking，727

$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \mu \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，remind，fut．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \mu \nu \eta \sigma \omega$ ， 1133
ävaら．See 80，284，\＆c．
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu$ оs．See 167， 179
$\dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \eta \lambda a \tau \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ ，banish a man．See 100 $\ddot{u}^{\mu} \nu \in v$ ．See $1_{4} 6_{4}$ ，also $54 \mathrm{I}, 590$
à $\nu \dot{\iota} \chi \omega$ ．See 174
àv $\dot{\chi \kappa \epsilon \sigma \tau o s, ~ p a s t ~ c u r e . ~ S e e ~} 98$
à $\nu \dot{\eta} \rho$ ．See 43 （Exc．III）．$\tau 0 \hat{0} \dot{\delta} \epsilon$ тávópós（me），534，1018；so тoî̀＇ à $\nu$ óós， 1464 ．See 449
${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s, \operatorname{man}, 977$
àvinul，send forth，270，1277，140：
avíqт $\eta \mu$ ，ávaбтás，arising，（a．2）， 1200

[^19]àvıбторє́ $\omega$, ask, inquire, 573
à $\nu \mathbf{o i \kappa \tau} \omega \mathrm{s}$, without a mourner, 182
àop ${ }^{\circ} \dot{\omega} \omega$, uplift, re-establish, 46, 5 I
ă $\nu$ op $\mu$ os. See 422-3
àvórıos, impious, 353
à $\nu \tau \iota \dot{a} \zeta \omega$. See 192
$\dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \omega$, send back, 366
$\dot{\alpha} \nu v^{\prime} \omega$, bring to pass, cause. See 166, 720
$\dot{a} \nu \omega$, above, 965 (in the air). But
 (the earth) and on earth above. Cp. 968, кєv́ $\theta \epsilon \iota$ кáть $\delta \grave{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta} s$, is hidden now beneath earth, i.e.

$a \mathfrak{a}$ cos, worthy, 93 I, 1004. With gen. 778, 972. With infin. 763, 769 , 777. See 92
ásió $\omega$, deem fit, require, 1449 ; consent, 944; deign, 1413
$\dot{\alpha} \pi a v \delta \dot{\alpha} \omega$, forbid. See 236. The negative with infin. after such verbs is a common Greek idiom
ä $\pi \epsilon \iota \mu$ ( $\epsilon$ โvaı), be absent, 75,1238 ,
 229, 431, 444, 447
àтєípw, unaware, 1088 (var. r. ä$\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \rho s)$
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon v \theta \dot{v} \nu \omega$, direct, rule, $\mathrm{IO}_{4}$
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$, mule-chaise. See 753
aं $\pi \lambda$ oûs, single, 606; simple. See 519
à $\pi о \delta є і к к v \mu \iota$, display, 1405
äтокоя. See $\mathrm{r}_{5} \mathrm{I} 8$. Hence $\dot{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi}$ $\kappa \in ́ \omega$. See 998 .
 Aal, to bewail mutually.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о к \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \omega$, to shut off, close up. See I387 ( $\tau \grave{\partial} \mu \grave{\eta}$ àток $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota)$
а̇токрі̀ш. See 640 (ăтокріраs, gizing choice of)
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \lambda \lambda \nu \mu l$, destroy, 144i. 1251 ( $\dot{\alpha}-$ $\pi \dot{o} \lambda \lambda u \tau \alpha \iota$, pres. hist. he perished). See 1454
${ }^{\prime} А \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \omega \nu, 80,8 c$.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{2} 0 \sigma \phi i \zeta \omega$. See 4 So
$\alpha \pi \dot{\xi} \epsilon \nu$ оs, stranger-shumning. See 196
 $\pi \tau 0 \lambda \iota s$; didst thou abandon that city?)
äтоттоs $\pi \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \tau o \nu$, very far out of sight of, $7 \mathrm{~F}_{2}$
äтороs, helpless. See 691, 877.Hence a $\pi$ тopé $\omega$, am at a loss, 486
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \dot{a} \nu \nu \cup \mu$, , disperse, dispel. Att. fut. $\alpha \pi \sigma \sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \hat{\omega}$, I 33
$\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} о \sigma к о \pi \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, look at steadfastly, 746
$\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, tear off, 1268 . See 1432
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$. See II5 ( $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda$ )
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, deprive, 138 r ; withhold. See 323
 $\dot{a} \pi о \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i s$ än $\pi \epsilon$; wilt thou not turn thee back and be gone?)
áто́тıцоs. See 215

$\dot{\alpha} \pi о ф \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$. See 485
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \phi \dot{\phi} \rho \omega$, carry azvay, f. $\dot{\alpha} \pi о i \sigma \omega$, І 179
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \theta \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, fut. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$, repulse, 234 ; drive out, $64 \mathrm{I}, 670$
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega$ (adv. from $\dot{\alpha} \pi o ́)$. See 137 ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi \omega \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \phi i \lambda \omega \nu$, more distant friends)
ä $\alpha \dot{\alpha}$, a curse, 295, 418 , \&c.-Hence àpaîos, under a curse. See 276, 1291.-ảpáouaı, utter a curse, curse. See 251, 291
á $\rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, to tear, 874
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma \omega \bar{s})$
"A $\rho \eta$ s, the war-god (Mars), put for the pestilence, 190
ä $\rho \theta \rho o v$, , joint, muscle, 713, 1032. See 1270 (ả, $\theta \rho a$, pupils of the eyes)
ápı $\theta$ ós, number. See 84
äрıбтos, best, 46, 257, \&c. äpıбта (adv.), best, 1046, $\mathrm{I}_{3}(9$
àкктє́os. See 628
'Арктойроs("Арктоv oűpos, bear-ward), the brightest star in Bootes, near the Bears ("Аркто九), II 37
д́ $\rho \mu o ́ \zeta \omega$. See 902
ä $\rho \rho \eta \tau о s$, unspoken, 301,465 (ä $\rho \rho \eta \tau$ ' áppít $\omega \nu$, most horrible)
à $\rho \tau \dot{a} \nu \eta$, halter, 1268
ä $\rho \tau \iota$, d’ $\rho \tau i \omega \mathrm{~s}$, newly, lately, 742; 78, 243, \&c.
äp $\alpha \omega$, to rule, $54, \& \mathrm{c} .-\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}$, rule, sway, 383, 593, \&c. beginning, 121, 385. -a $\rho \chi$ aios, ancient, 1033. - $\dot{a} \rho \chi \eta \gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \tau \eta$, chieftain, 75 I
dं $\omega$ 人ós, helper, avenger, 127. See 206 ( $\alpha \rho \omega \gamma \dot{\alpha}$ т $\pi \rho \sigma \tau a \theta \in ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ )
$\dot{a} \sigma a \phi \dot{n}$, unclear, obscure, 439. Exc. vi
$\ddot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \pi \tau$ os，impious， 890
a＇$\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \gamma \eta^{\prime} s$ ，disquicting，grievous， 229
ä $\sigma \tau v$ ，city，35，\＆c．－á $\sigma \tau o ́ s$ ，citizen， 222，\＆c．
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \dot{\eta} s$, safe．$\dot{a} \sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{\omega} s$, safely，6Із． －á $\phi$ a入єla，in strong securrity，5I $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，grieve， 937
áтєүктоs кáтє $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \tau \eta \tau o s, \quad u n s o f t e n e d$ and ever impracticable， 336
ä $\eta$ ，woe，mischief，ruin（from delu－ sion or guilt），164，1205，1284
$a ̈ \tau \iota \mu o s$ ，dishonoured， 657,670 ．On this word and $\dot{a} \tau \iota \mu \dot{a} \zeta \omega$ ，see 340 ， 789
äт $\lambda \eta \tau 0 s$ ，insufferable，792．Nowhere found actively，but that it might be so used seems proved by the verb $\dot{\alpha} \tau \lambda \eta \tau \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ ，be indignant， 515 ， and the analogy of $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \rho \alpha \kappa \tau о s, \alpha \dot{\alpha}$－ av $\sigma \tau o s, \& c$ ．
aủd＇̀，voice，1325．aủ $\mathbf{1 a ́}^{2} \omega$ ，speak，93， 527，731， 940
av̇əadia，self－zvill，obstinacy， 549
av̉日aipetos，of voluntary act， 123 I
$a \hat{i} \theta \iota s$ ，$a \hat{\vartheta}$ ，aggain，（often with $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \iota \nu$ but not in O．T．，）back，230，1373； $132,359,36 \mathrm{r}, \mathrm{I} 403 . \alpha \hat{u}$ is some－ times on the other hand； 233
aü $\omega$ ，exalt，Іо92．aü $\xi$ ouat，grow， 173
aưpos，of the morrow，10go
aíiкка，forthwith， $\mathbf{I} 229$
aủrós．See Pronouns，Exc．XIv． aür $\omega \mathrm{s}$ ，in like manner．See 93I． av่zov，at that point，688．－au่тoย่v－ $\tau \eta s=a \cup \cup \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \eta s$, murderer．See 107. －aủтó $\chi \iota \rho$（＝aủ兀òs $\tau \hat{\eta} \chi \in \iota \rho \grave{\imath} \delta \rho \alpha \dot{-}$ oas），perpetrator，266，I33I
$\alpha \dot{v} \omega$ ，shout， 1260
áфадтоs є́ $\rho \rho \epsilon \iota$ ，has disappeared．See 560
äфатоs，unuttcrable．See I3I4
à申inuı，dismiss， 320,599 ；omit， 198 ， 860；resign，II77；acquit，707． aor．á $\phi \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha, \dot{a} \phi \in s, a \dot{\alpha} \hat{\omega}, \alpha \phi \in i ́ s$
 áфєко́ $\mu \eta \nu$ ，perf．áфì $\gamma \mu \iota), 833,920$ ， 933，935，1005．See 265 （ $่ \pi i$ $\pi \alpha \dot{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \phi i \xi o \mu a \iota, I$ will resort to every expedient）
äфı入os，friendless， 662
áфо́ $\beta \eta \tau 0$ s，fearless， 885
$\dot{\alpha} \phi \rho о \nu \epsilon ́ \omega$ ．See 624．Exc．VII．
ä $\chi \alpha \lambda \kappa o s a \dot{a} \sigma \pi i \delta \omega \nu$ ．See I9I

ảzos，grief， 1355
ä $\psi a v \sigma \tau o s$ ．See 969
ä $\psi о \rho \rho$ оs．See $43^{\text {I }}$
Bá $\theta \rho o \nu$, stcp， 142
$\beta \alpha i \nu \omega$（stem $\beta a$ ），a．${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \eta \nu$ ，p．$\beta \epsilon \in \beta \eta \kappa \alpha$ ， p．part．$\beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa \omega$＇s or $\beta \epsilon \beta \omega \dot{s}$ ．go， 125，741，832，959，1073．－come， 81，148， 152,772
$\beta$ aıós．See 750
Ва́к $\chi$ оs， 2 II．Bак $\chi \epsilon$ Һ̂os， 1105
$\beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega$ ．See 657 （ $\epsilon$ $\nu$ aicíạ $\beta a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ ）， 975 （ $\epsilon$ s $\theta v \mu o ̀ \nu \beta a ́ \lambda \eta s$ ）
$\beta \dot{a} \xi \iota s$ ，saying，imputation， 509
ßapús．See i7，546，673．－ßaoúv $\omega$ ， weigh on；part．a．1．p．$\beta a \rho \nu \nu \theta \epsilon i$ ， indignant，781．－$\beta a \rho u ́ \sigma \tau o \nu o s, ~ l a-~$ mentable， 1233
$\beta \dot{a} \sigma \alpha \nu o s$, touchstone，test， $510 .-\beta a$－ $\sigma \alpha \nu i \zeta \omega$（also $\beta a \sigma \alpha \nu \epsilon u ́ \omega)$ ，prove，test， 493
ßaбı入єús，king， 257
$\beta \epsilon \in \lambda o s$, dart，arrow，205，893
Bia，force，670．$\pi$ pòs $\beta$ íav，perforce， 805．－$\beta \iota a ́ \zeta o \mu a \iota, ~ e n f o r c e, ~ p a r t . ~ a . ~ p . ~$ ßıaбөєís， 524
$\beta$ ios，life， 33 ，\＆c．mode of life， 1124 ． －$\beta i o \tau o s$, life，6I2．－$\beta \iota \hat{\omega \nu} a \iota$ ，to live， 1488
$\beta \lambda a ́ \pi \tau \omega$ ，harm，375．－$\beta \lambda \alpha \dot{\beta} \eta$ ．See 517
$\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\nu} \omega$ ，be born，aor．є $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau o \nu$ ． See 1376．－$\beta \lambda a ́ \sigma \tau \eta$ ，pl．－$\iota \iota$ ，birth， 717
$\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega$ ，see，302，\＆c．－$\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \phi a \rho o \nu$, eyelid， 1276
及oŋ̀，cry，420．－${ }^{2}$ oá $\omega$ ，shout，roar， 1252， 1287
$\beta о \rho a ́ . ~ S e e ~ 1463$
$\beta o ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，feed， 1425 ．－$\beta o \tau \eta \dot{\prime} \rho$ ，hords．
－man，837，1044，\＆c．
ßountúv，advise，1417；plan，plot （act．and m．），537，606，619，701， 1367．－$\beta$ oú $\lambda \epsilon v \mu a$ ．See 44，and Exc．III．
ßoú入oual，wish，choose，623， $\mathbf{I}^{22}$ ； resolve，1057，1077
ßoúvouos，of pastured kine， 26
$\beta \rho a \chi$ ús，small，mere， 121
$\beta \rho o \tau o ́ s, ~ m o r t a l, ~ 46, ~ \& c .-\beta \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon l o s$, of mortals， 709
$\beta \rho v \chi a ́ o \mu a l$ ，to roar，aor．part．$\beta \rho v \chi \eta$－ $\theta$ єis， $\mathrm{I}_{2} 6_{5}$

Büós，depth， 24
$\beta \omega \mu$ ós，altar，$\sigma$ ．$\beta \omega \dot{\omega} \mu \mathrm{os}$ ，of the altars， 184

「aîa，land，456－raıáoरos．See 160. －$\gamma \hat{\eta}$ ，land，country， 54, \＆c．，\＆c． （usually $\pi a \tau \rho i$ is or $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \alpha) .{ }^{113}$（ $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$ $\left.\dot{\epsilon} \pi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \eta \mathrm{~s}\right)$ ．- earth，108， 415,480 ， 898， 968 ，г 308
ráuos（often pl．），marriage， 825 ，\＆c． －$\gamma a \mu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, marry，f．$\gamma a \mu \hat{\omega}$, a．$\epsilon_{\gamma} \gamma \mu a$ （of the man）， 577, r 500 ．－$\gamma a \mu \beta$ pós， kinsman by marriage，brother－in－ law， 70
$\gamma \alpha \mu \psi \dot{\omega} v \underset{\xi}{ }$, crook－clazved， 1198
$\gamma \in \lambda a \sigma \tau \eta$＇s（lit．a laugher），insulting， 1422
$\gamma \epsilon \mu \omega$ ，be fraught．See 4
$\gamma \dot{\jmath} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \circ \nu$, beard，chin，chee．k， 1277
$\gamma^{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$ ，old man，402，\＆c．－$\gamma \in \rho a 1 o ́ s$, aged，9，990，1009．－$\gamma \hat{\eta} p a s$, old age．See 17，III3．－ $\boldsymbol{\eta \rho} \mathbf{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ， grow old， 872
$\gamma \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ ，rejoice，perf．part．$\gamma \epsilon \gamma \eta \theta$ 白s （＝$\alpha$ aip $\omega \nu$ ），with impunity， 368
$\gamma \hat{\eta} p u s$, voice，${ }^{1} 67$
 become，be，be born，f．$\gamma \in \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \iota$, a． є $\gamma \epsilon \nu о \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ ，pf．part．$\gamma \in \gamma \omega \dot{s}$ ．（r） 53 ， 250，600，697，721，816．（2）127， $845,930,957,1058$ ， 1408 ．（3） 714,1168 ，1181，1393．а．І．$\epsilon$－ रєєขá $\mu \eta$ ，begat，rozo，must be ascribed to the ancient form $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu 0-$ $\mu a$. A large tribe of words spring from this verb．First $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime}$－ vos，family，261，791，1070， 1383 ； descent，parentage，1059，1085；

 Hence the adjectives $\epsilon \gamma \gamma \in \nu \dot{\eta} s$ ， $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta$＇s．Connected are $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon a ́$, generation，ri86．$\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \theta \lambda o \nu$ ，do． ェ80．$\gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\nu} \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ ，son， 470 ．Next （from $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \nu a$ ）$\gamma \in \nu \nu a i ̂ o s, ~ n o b l e, ~ I 469$, $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu a^{\prime} \omega$ ，beget，whence，$\gamma є \frac{\epsilon}{}{ }^{\prime} \eta \mu a$ ， birth，one born， $116_{7}, \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} s$ ， parent， 1015 ．Finally，róvos，son （sing．only），$\gamma o \nu \dot{\eta}$, birth， 1469 ；off－ spring，I495，$\gamma \mathbf{y}$ cús，parent， 436. With numerous compounds．
$\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$（stem gna，gno），know， f．$\gamma^{\nu} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \mu a l$ ，а． $2 \underset{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \omega \nu, \gamma \nu \circ i \eta \nu$ ，
$\gamma \nu 0 u ́ s, ~ є ̌ ~ \gamma \nu \omega к а, ~ I ~ k n o w ; ~ 403, ~ 613, ~$ $615,1115-17,1274,1325,1477$. Hence $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$ ，judgment，opinion， purpose，398，524，6or，\＆c．525， （таîs Ł̇uais $\gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu a \iota s$, bymy influence．） －$\gamma \nu \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ós，known，58，351， 396
$\gamma \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$ ，eyeball， 1277
$\gamma \lambda$ ukús，sweet， 1390
$\gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \alpha$ ，tongue， 635
$\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \zeta \omega$ ，recognise，Att．fut．$\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota \omega$ ， 538
roos，wailing，tearful plaint， 30. —roáo $\mu a \iota$ ，bewail， 1249
roû̀．See Particles．Exc．XIV．
$\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega$ ，write，enroll，f．3．p．$\gamma \in \gamma \rho \alpha^{\prime}$－ $\psi$ сرal， 4 II
$\gamma v \nu \dot{\eta}$, woman，wife，lady：sometimes， queen，260，\＆c．See 1074 （ ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$子uví，for a woman）．
$\Delta \alpha^{i} \mu \omega \nu$ ，deity， 244 ；evil genius， 1 3ог ； fortune，fate， $823,1194,1311$ ， 1479；סaimoves，deities，higher powers，34，886，912，1258，1328， 1378．All $\theta \epsilon \circ$（gods）are $\delta a i \mu 0-$ ves（supernatural beings），but not every $\delta$ ai $\mu \omega \nu$ would be called $\theta$ és． Human beings have a $\delta a^{i} \mu \omega \nu$ attached to them（good or evil genius，angel，fate），whence the adjectives $\epsilon \dot{v} \delta a i \mu \omega \nu, \quad 1197$ ，$\delta \nu \sigma$－ $\delta a i \mu \omega \nu$ ，І 302
бакри́ш，weep，66，1486， 1515 －$\delta a-$ $\kappa \rho \cup \rho \rho \cdot \underset{\sigma}{ } \omega$ ，do． 1473
бáuaן，wife， 930
$\delta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$（lit．devour，rend），goad，sting， 682
$\delta a \sigma \mu o ' s$, tribute，${ }_{3} 6$
$\Delta a u \lambda i a$, or $\Delta a \hat{u} \lambda c s$, a town in Phocis $\delta \in i ̂(\tau \iota \nu a)$ ，it behoves（one），$\delta \in \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon, I$ must，with inf．，619，825，896， 958,976 ；with gen． 406 （ $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ í ou тоoót $\omega \nu$ ，$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \ldots \sigma к о \pi \epsilon і \nu$ ，we want not such things，but．．．to consider， \＆c．）imperf．$\epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota$ ， 1185 ， 1273 ；with gen． $39+$ ；part．$\delta \in \neq \nu, 1416$ ．－$\delta \in i \sigma$－ $\theta a t$ ，to require，with gen． 1148 ， 1293
 278，614，1294，\＆c．
$\delta \in i \pi v o \nu$ ，pl．－a，dinner，or supper， banquet， 779
$\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \circ$ ，Delphi in Phocis，with temple，\＆c．，734．$\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s$, fem． See 464，comm．
$\delta \epsilon ́ \mu a s$, body， 1388
ס́́os，fear，also $\delta \epsilon i \mu a, 294$ ．－$\delta \in i \hat{\sigma} \alpha \iota$, to fear， $11,234, \& c .$, p．$\delta є \delta о к к а, 767$, 1074．－$\delta \in \iota \nu$＇́s，dreadful，terrible （often，see 1169，1312）；sad， 3 16， 1035；wonderful，clever， 545. $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\partial} \nu, \delta \epsilon \iota \nu a ́$, adverbial， $1260 ; 483$ ， 1265．See 747 （ $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\omega} s \dot{a} \theta \nu \mu \hat{\omega})$ ．－ $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ \pi o u s . S e e 418$ ．－$\delta \epsilon \iota \lambda a ́ s, \delta \epsilon \iota \lambda i ́ a$, cowardice，536．סei入alos，weretched （from fear），I347
$\delta \epsilon ́ \rho к о \mu \alpha \iota$, see，pf．$\delta \epsilon є \delta о \rho к а, I$ see， $3^{89} 9$ ， 413， 454
$\delta \in \sigma \pi \dot{\tau} \neq \eta$ ，master，lord， 1132
$\delta \in \hat{\rho} \rho$ ，hither，this way！i48，\＆c．
סét $\epsilon \in \rho o s$, second，next－best， 282
бє́ $\chi$ оцаи，receive， 217
$\delta \dot{\eta}, \delta \bar{\eta} r a, \delta \dot{\eta} \pi \sigma o v, \& c$ ．See Particles， Exc．Xiv．
$\Delta \eta^{\prime} \lambda l o s$（Dor．$\Delta$ á $\lambda l o s$ ），of Delos， 154
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o s$, manifest，672，1008．－$\delta \eta \lambda \dot{\omega} \omega$ ， show，manifest， $77, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．See äd $\eta$－入os
סıá $\sigma \sigma \omega$ ，speed over，glide through， 208
סıáтopos，perforated，pierced， 1034
סıaфavض＇s，clear， 754
$\delta \iota a \phi \in ́ \rho \omega$ ，fut．$\delta \iota o i \sigma \omega$ ，carry through， perform， 321
$\delta \iota \alpha \phi \theta \in i \rho \omega$ ，destroy，438．－$\delta \iota a \phi \theta о \rho a ́$. See 573
$\delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，teach，564，fut．$\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \xi \omega, \& \mathrm{c}$ ． －$\delta \iota \delta \alpha \kappa \tau$ ós．See 300
$\delta i \delta \omega \mu \iota$ ，give，aor．є̀ $\delta \omega \kappa \alpha, \delta o i \eta \nu, \delta o u ́ s$, 583，\＆c．－$\delta 6 \sigma \iota s$, gift， 1518
$\delta$（єırềv（a．inf．），explain，distinctly state，394．See 854
$\delta \iota \epsilon \chi \omega$ ．See 717
סiк $\eta$ ，justice，274， 885 （ $\pi \rho$ оेs бiкทs， justly）， $55^{2}$（just penalty）．— $\delta i-$ каlos，just，280，609，614，\＆c．－ws， justly，675．See 853．－$\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o ́ \omega$, deem right，6；claim（as right）， 575， 640
סooi $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ ，open wide， 1295
סьó入入vмaı，perish，be undone；a．$\delta \iota \omega$－ $\lambda 6 \mu \eta \nu .225,1159$
$\delta \iota o i j \omega$ ，define，determine， 1083
סıاगлoûs，twofold，double，809，938， 1249，1257，1261，1320；two，288， 607，1135

Sis，twice， 363
$\delta_{0 \kappa \epsilon} \omega$ ，seem，346，401，402，405， 435，1191 ；seem right，seem true， 126，282；think，355，368，399， 584，729，IIII，1479，1470；agree， 484．Hence סóкๆбьs，fancy，68ı； סóそa，opinion，idea．See 91 I
סo入os，deceit，treachery，539， 960.
－$\delta^{\prime} \lambda$ ıos，cheating， 608
$\delta \delta \mu o s$, usually $\delta{ }^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{oc}$ ，house，dwelling ， $422, \& \mathrm{c} .-\delta \omega \mu a$ ，home，29．$\delta \omega$－ $\mu a \tau a, \delta o ́ \mu о \iota, 71$ ，\＆c．
Soû̀os，slave， $410, \mathbb{\& c}$ ．
боа́лпиа．See 193
$\delta \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \omega, d o, 77, \& c$ ．with two accus．
 acc．See 642．－ípaбt＇os，to be done， 1443
ס $\rho$ vós，glade，I 399
סúvauaı，am able，315，979， 1212. －$\delta v \nu a \sigma \tau \epsilon i a, ~ p o w e r, ~ 593$
Súo，two．See 640
סvad́入 $\gamma \eta$ тos，hard－hearted， 12
סvбүє̀єєa，lozv birth， 1079
$\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} s$ ，ill－affected， $5+6$
$\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \rho \rho o s$, ill－fated， 665 ．$\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi о \tau \mu$ оs， do．， 888, 1181
סvaov́ $\iota \sigma \tau$ os，wafting evil， 1316
סvará入as，unhappy， 1236
$\delta v \sigma \tau \epsilon \kappa \mu a \rho \tau o s$, hard to trace，dim， 109
$\delta \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \kappa \nu 0$ ．See 1248
סúvrqvos，unhappy，miserable，evil， 790，\＆c．
$\delta v \sigma \tau v \chi \notin \omega$ ，be unfortunate．See 262
סv́røороs．．．єủrvхєì．See 87， 783 （ $\delta v \sigma \phi o ́ \rho \omega s$ a $\gamma \epsilon \omega \nu$ ，to be sore dis－ pleased）， 770 （ $\tau \alpha \dot{\gamma} \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \sigma o \iota \delta v \sigma \phi o ́ \rho \omega s$ ${ }^{\prime}$＇Xovia，the grounds of thy distress， or，as J．well renders，what lies heavy on thy heart）．
$\Delta \omega p i s$（fem．），Dorian，i．e．Pelopon－ nesian， 775
$\delta \hat{\omega} \rho \rho \nu$ ，gift，1022．－$\delta \omega \rho \eta$ тós，given， 384
＇Еầ，allow，leave，256，676， 1070. $\notin a$（monosyll．） $1451, \epsilon^{\prime} \hat{a}$（do．） 1513
є่ $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \nu \eta$＇s，native， 452 ；of kin，kindred， I168，i430， 5506 ．－$\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，loyal－ $l y, 1225$
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \kappa \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ ，charge，impute．See 702
${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \kappa \alpha \rho \pi о$ ，fruit－inclosing，${ }^{2} 5$
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \eta^{\prime} s=\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon$ ，in power，ruling， 941
є́ $\gamma \chi \in i \rho \eta \mu \alpha$ ，attempt， 540
Ěर才os，sword，weapon，I70， 959
 image，886．ধ゙ $\delta \rho a$ ，є̈ $\delta \rho \alpha$ ．See 2， 13
$\dot{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ ，wish， 1203 ，а．І $\dot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda \eta \sigma a, 1348$
$\epsilon i \delta \in \nu a l$ ，to know，pf．pres．oida， I know（2 p．s．oi $\sigma \theta a, 3$ oí $\delta \epsilon$ ，pl．
 pl．－perf．$=$ imperf．$\eta ้ \delta \eta$ or $\eta ้ \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ （ $\ddot{\eta} \delta \eta \sigma \theta a, \quad \eta ँ \delta \epsilon \iota, \vec{\eta} \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ or $\hat{\eta} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ ， $\ddot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \eta \not \partial \epsilon \tau \tau \epsilon$ or $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \eta \geqslant \delta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu)$ ，
 $i \not \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ．Compounded with $\delta \iota a ́, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \xi$ ， $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́, \pi \rho o ́, \sigma o ́ v$
єіка́j๘，guess．See 82，404
$\epsilon i \kappa \kappa \omega$ ，yield， $6_{73}$ ．See $6_{5 \text { I }}(\epsilon i \kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega)$
$\epsilon i \mu i$ ，verb of being，Iam．See Gram－ mar，and Verbs in Exc．xiv．
$\epsilon i \mu \ell, g 0$ ，shall go，637，897；part．$i \omega \nu$ ， $324, \& c$ ．，imperat．$i^{\prime} \theta \iota,{ }^{\prime} \tau \omega \omega,{ }^{\prime} \omega \mu \mu \nu$ ， ${ }_{i} \tau \epsilon$, go，46，\＆c．
$\epsilon i \pi o \nu, \epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu, s a y$ ，aor．2．See Lex．

$\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \gamma \omega$ ．${ }^{\prime} \rho \gamma \omega \omega, \dot{\epsilon}_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega$（Homer），confine， restrain， 129 ；midd．refrain， 890
$\epsilon i \hat{s}$ ，$\mu i a, ~ \epsilon ้ \nu$ ，one，single，alone．See 62 ，І І $3,122,247,374$, \＆$c$ ．
єiбavaßaiv ，aor． 2 єiбav $\epsilon \beta \eta$ ，climb up to， 876
єiбסє $\chi о \mu a l$ ，entertain， 238
єi $\sigma \delta \dot{v} \omega$ ，aor． 2 єi $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\prime} \nu$ ，enter， 1317
$\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho о \mu a \iota$, aor． $2 \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$, pf．$\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon-$ $\lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta a, 3$ 19， 1244
єiбора́ $\omega$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma о \rho \alpha ́ \omega, 22, \& c$ ．，f．єíó－ $\psi о \mu a \iota$ or $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{\prime} \psi о \mu a \iota$ ，aor．$\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \delta o \nu$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \delta o \nu$, look on，behold， 1224 ， 1295，105，\＆c．；1263，I303
tionain，burst in， 1252
$\epsilon i \sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \mu \pi \omega$ ，send in， $70_{5}$
$\epsilon i \sigma \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ ，aor．$\epsilon l \sigma \epsilon \pi \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \alpha$ ，sail in， 423

$\epsilon \ddot{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ，$\notin \sigma \omega$ ．See Prepositions，Exc． xiv．
єita．See Particles，Exc．xiv．
єїтє，do．
є̇кßá入入入 $\omega$ ，expel，386，399；cast off， 61I；retract， 849
ékrovos，offspring，1474．See 159. product， $\mathrm{I}_{72}$
$\bar{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \eta \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, travel，be abroad， 124
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \iota \delta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \kappa \omega$ ，instruct，teach， $38,{ }^{2} 370$
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta i \delta \omega \mu$ ，give up，resign， 1040
е̇кєй，\＆c．，е̇кєі̀vos，\＆c．See Exc． xiv．
є́кпßó入os，far－darting， 162
є́ккалєє $\omega$ ．See 597

$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa v \lambda i \nu \delta \omega$, roll out， 8 r 2
є̇к入ข́ $\omega$ ，loose off，make quittance，35； release（midd．），1003．－$\epsilon \kappa \lambda v \sigma \iota s$ ，re－ lease，delivery，306．－宀ेєлити́pıos， tending to deliver， $39^{2}$
 1439：learn fully，286，835，1065， 1085．а．$\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi} \epsilon \mu \alpha \theta о \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \mu a \theta$－．
єєкиєт $є$ є́раи．See 795
єккцךขоя．See II ${ }^{\text {п }}$
$\dot{\epsilon}_{\kappa} \pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$ ，over－persuade，win over， 1024
є́клєєрáoнац．See 360，and Lex．
$\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \omega$ ．See 309
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，dismay，pf．p．$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma-$
$\mu a l, 922$
єєкпра́б $\sigma \omega$ ，achieve， 377
е̇крiтt $\omega$ ，fing forth，I4 12
$\epsilon \kappa \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，deck out，adorn，dress， I269
$\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \omega$ ．See 3， 19
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \omega$ ，rescue，save，443，756
є́ктєірш．See $\mathrm{I}_{5} 3$
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ ко＇тtos，from the region，166；from this place，I 340
̇̇ктós，out，forth， 676
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \pi \omega$ ，turn aside，thrust off，806；
midd．diverge， 851
दोкт $\rho \dot{\epsilon} \phi \omega$ ，rear， $8{ }_{27}, 1396$
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \rho i \beta \omega$ ，wear out， 248

329 ；f．m．є̇кфарой $\mu a \iota, 1063$
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \in \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ ，escape，ili．See 840
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi о \beta \dot{\epsilon} о \mu a \iota$（pass．），stand in fear， 989
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \dot{\prime} \omega$, beget，437，1017；а． $2 \underset{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \dot{\epsilon} \phi \nu$, sprang，1499．See 1084．perf． є́ктєфика．See 262
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \dot{\nu} \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \circ \dot{\prime} \sigma \iota o s$, voluntary．See 1230
 drive out， 98 ；ravage， 28
 question，333， 783
è $\lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ós，piteous．See 672
$\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \in \theta \epsilon \rho \frac{\partial}{\circ} \omega$ ，set free， 706
${ }^{`} \mathrm{E} \lambda \iota \kappa \omega \nu$ is（fem．），of mount Helicon

є̀ $\lambda \pi i s$, hope，I2I，I5S，835－6；ex－ pectation，1432；pl．487，77I
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau o u ̂ . ~ S e e ~ P r o n . ~ E x c . ~ X I V . ~ \dot{\epsilon} \mu o ́ s$, do．
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \alpha^{i} \nu \omega$, perf．part．$\epsilon \in \beta \epsilon \beta \omega$＇s，mount－ ed， 803
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta a \tau \epsilon \cup \cup \omega$ ，set foot on， 825
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$ ，abide by， $35 \mathbf{I}$
є $\mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho o s$, experienced， 44
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi i \pi \tau \omega$ ，rush into， $\mathbf{I} 262$
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \in \kappa \omega$ ，entwine， $\mathrm{I}_{2} 6_{4}$
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi о \delta \omega \nu$ ，in the way，I28．See 445
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi о \lambda a ́ \omega$, purchase， 1025
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi о \rho є \dot{v} о \mu a \iota$, travel， $45^{6}$
є́uфа⿱亠䒑𧰨s тıиais，visibly honoured，909． －$\omega \mathrm{s}$ ，manifestly，96， 534
${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \phi \rho \omega \nu$ ，rational， 436
є́uфú入cos，of one kin， 1406
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi \dot{\omega} \omega$ ，engender in，$\epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \phi \nu \kappa \epsilon$ ，is inborn， 299
є̇varท＇s，oath－bound，656
є̀vá入入oual，spring upon，1261
є่ $\nu a \rho \gamma \eta$ ク́s，manifest， 535
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu a \rho \iota \theta \mu \epsilon ́ \omega$ ，count，reckon，II88
$\epsilon \in \nu \delta a \tau \epsilon ์ о \mu a \iota$ ．See 205
＇̇vסıкоs，just，honest，true，553， 683. See II58．－$\omega \mathrm{s}$ ，with justice， 135
$\epsilon \nu \epsilon \iota \mu \iota$ ．oủk $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ，is impossible．
 not within reach，） 598 （＇่ $\nu \tau \alpha \hat{v} \theta^{\prime}$ ＇t $\nu$ ，depends on this），I 239
є่ єขє́ $\pi \omega$ ，mention，842，1033，1048； tell of，1150；bid，command，350， I381
 330．＇̇ $\nu \nu$ ous à $\nu \dot{\eta} \rho$, a man of good sense，916
èvvouos，lawful， 322
＇ン $\nu$ оскоs，inhabitant，I 524
${ }^{\prime} \nu \circ \pi \lambda \frac{1}{}$ ，armed， 469
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a, \not ้ \nu \theta a, \& c$ ．See Exc．XIV．
Є̇̀т $\rho \in ́ \pi о \mu a \iota, ~ p a y ~ r e g a r d, ~ 724, ~ 1056 ; ~ ;$ feel regard， 1226 a．I．p．є่ $\nu \epsilon \tau \rho a ́ \pi \eta \nu$
є̇そaүүє́入入оцаи，send notice， 148
$\epsilon \epsilon \xi a \iota \rho \epsilon \in \omega$ ．See 907 and aipé $\omega$
$\stackrel{\grave{\epsilon}}{ }{ }^{\prime} \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda o \mu a \iota$ ，spring forth．See I3II
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \nu \cup ́ \omega$, achieve．See 157 and Exc．V．
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i \rho \omega$ ，arouse， 65
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ ，say，tell，748．See $\epsilon \hat{i} \pi 0 \nu$
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi_{\xi} \in \lambda \epsilon \gamma \gamma \omega$ ，convict， 297
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \rho \epsilon v \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ，search out， 258
＇$\xi \epsilon \rho \chi о \mu a \iota$（see $\left.\epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \circ \mu a \iota\right)$ ，turn out，
prove，88，1011， 1084 ；elapse， 735 （no other sense in O．T．）
$\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi} \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}$ ，will speak out，shall speak， fut．See $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rho \hat{\omega}, 2$ I 9 ，\＆c．pf．pass． $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in i \rho \eta \mu a \iota, 98_{4}$
${ }^{*} \xi_{\xi} \in \sigma \tau \iota$ ，it is lawful．See 817
$\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi} \epsilon \in \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，find out，discover，304；
 vention， 378
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ ．See in 82， 15 I5 and Lex．
$\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \iota \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ ，beseech，aor．$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \bar{\xi} \kappa \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \nu \sigma a$ ， 760
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \iota \sigma b \omega$, make equal，level．̇̇ $\xi \iota \sigma \omega \tau \epsilon ́ o s$. See 408
 full（see єiઠ́́vaı），37，105，129
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \circ \rho i \xi \omega$ ．See 192 and Lex．
$\xi \xi \omega$ ．See Prepos．Exc．XIv．
єогка，perf．of $\epsilon і \kappa \omega$ ，seem， $9^{62}$ ， 1160 ． $\dot{\omega} s$ हैorкє，as it seems，seemingly；
 hood，74，）seemly，fitting， 256
є̀opт $̀$ ，festival， 1490
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi a i p \omega$ ，lift up，1276；instigate， 1328；midd．，arouse， 635
є̇ $\pi a \iota \sigma$ ávo $\mu a \iota$ ，perceive， 424
є่ $\pi \alpha \iota \sigma \chi$ úvo $\mu \alpha \iota$ ，be ashamed， 635
є่ $\pi \alpha \iota \tau \epsilon \in \omega$ ，request，require， 1416
є̇ $\pi a \iota \tau \iota \alpha ́ o \mu a \iota$, accuse， $6+5$
є̇такои́ $\omega$ ，listen to，hear，708， 794
є $\pi a \xi i \omega s$, right worthily，I33
є $\pi a v \lambda a$ ，pl．stalls，II $3^{8}$
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \ell, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho$ ，่̇ $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta}, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$ ．See Exc．XIV．
$\epsilon \in \epsilon \nu \theta \rho \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，bound，leap onzvard， 469
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \eta \mu o \iota$ ，befell me，a．of $\dot{\epsilon} \phi i \sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ ， 772
є́ $\pi \epsilon \cup \cup \chi o \mu a \iota, ~ i m p r e c a t e, ~ \pi a \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~ S e e ~$ 249
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ ．See $I_{5} 26$ and Exc．IX．
$\epsilon \epsilon \pi \iota \beta o v \lambda \epsilon u ́ \omega$ ，plot asainst， 618

 tos àvóos，the first comer
є̇тірра．See 1094
$\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \cup \mu \mathrm{a} \alpha \mathrm{a}$ ，incense－offering，913
є́ $\pi і к а \iota \rho о$ ，seasonable， 875
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i к \lambda \eta \mu a$ ，charge，accusation，227， 529
є́тікоироя．See 296
$\epsilon \pi \iota \pi \lambda o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s$, coming on，assailing； sync．part．of $\epsilon \pi \iota \pi \epsilon \in \lambda$ о $\mu \iota$ ．See I $3{ }^{1} 4$
є̇ $\pi \iota \pi$ ó $\delta \iota o s$, on the foot， 1350

є̇пimo入os．See 1322
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \rho \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ ．See 1242
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \pi \tau \omega$ ，urge upon，enjoin，252， $144^{6}$
є̀тьбколє́ $\omega$ ．See ${ }^{15} 5^{29}$
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau a \mu a \iota$, know，284，589， 848.

$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon \epsilon$ ，be in charge of， 1028
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，send order，enjoin， 106
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi$ àó $\omega$ ，enwreathe，fill with wreaths， 185
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$ ，attention， 134 （from $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \notin о \mu a \iota)$

$\epsilon \pi \%<\kappa \tau \epsilon i \rho \omega$ ，pity， $671,1473 . \quad \epsilon \pi о \kappa \kappa-$ $\tau i \zeta \omega$ ，do． $129^{6}$
ётода⿱，follow， 47 I
 see 504．тoútos，the answer， 89 ； the proposal，demand，234；the language，525，848；the tidings， 936；the question，1144．Pl． words，216，290，\＆c．

$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\omega} \nu \mathrm{v} \mu \mathrm{os}$, namesake， 210
$\dot{\epsilon} \rho a \sigma \tau \dot{\prime}$, lover， 60 I
 work，1124．Pl．deeds，517，\＆c．
 sense），279， 347 ；part．$\epsilon i p \gamma a \sigma \mu \epsilon$－ $\nu 0 s($ pass．）$\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i$, г $369,1374 .-\dot{\epsilon} \rho$－ रáт $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ s．See 859
є̈ $\rho \in \nu \nu a$ ，search，inquest， $56_{5}$－－$\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon v$－ ${ }^{\nu}{ }^{2} \omega$ ．See 725

${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \nu \mathrm{os}$ ，scion， 1216
 －$\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ，do．740，1119， 1122
$\epsilon \rho \pi \omega$ ，$\epsilon \bar{\tau} \rho \pi \sigma_{0}$. See 83 and Lex． （ $=$ L．repo，whence Eng．reptile）
${ }_{\epsilon}^{\text {ép }} \rho \omega$ ，be gone，be lost．See 560，910， and Lex．
 p． $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda v \theta a$ ．Its numerous com－ pounds have the same tense－ forms
$\dot{\epsilon} \rho \hat{\omega}$ ，will say，will speak，p．$\epsilon \ell \rho \eta \kappa a$ ， p．p．$\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \eta \mu a \iota$, part．$\epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu o s$, all frequent．See Lex．Compounds （ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}, \hat{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}, \& c$ ．）have the same forms．$\epsilon i \pi \% \nu$（root $\epsilon \pi$－）is the aor． in use
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \lambda \sigma s$, good， 61 II

є̇бкомi乡ん，convey in， 1429
ধ̈ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \frac{s}{} \theta \epsilon o ́ s$（Hades or Pluto．See

god，（god of the sunset，or of darkness）．
є̀ $\sigma \tau i a$ ．See 965

ぞィ兀．See Particles．Exc．xiv．
є゙тоноs．See 92
$\epsilon \hat{v}$ ，well，frequent with oija，$\phi \rho o \nu \epsilon \in$ ， \＆c．，\＆c．
$\epsilon \dot{u} a \gamma \dot{\eta}$ s．See 921
$\epsilon \dot{v} \delta a i \mu \omega \nu$ ，blessed， $1197 .-\epsilon \dot{d} \delta a \iota \mu 0 \nu i a$ ， happiness， 1190 ．See $\delta a i \mu \omega \nu$
$\epsilon \ddot{\delta} \omega$ ，sleep， 65,586
$\epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota a$ ．See 932
$\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v}$, adv．straight，1242；єن̉もús， forthwith， 1392
єứos．See 21I， 154
$\epsilon \dot{v} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \check{a}$ poet．for $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \hat{\alpha}$ ，gloriouts．
See ibr
єủ入aßto $\mu a \iota$ ，be cautious．See 47， 616
є่̀vท่，pl．єن̇vai，marriage－bed，mar－ riage－union，1249．－єїvíтєєpa．
See 1102．－$\epsilon \dot{\nu} \alpha \dot{S} \zeta \omega$ ，lull to sleep， 961
Gvipous，with kind feeling， 1003
є ن่ $\pi \lambda$ oia，fair voyage， $4^{25}$
єünouros，ably zeafting， 697
$\epsilon u ̈ \pi \tau \epsilon \rho \frac{s}{}$, fleet－winged， 176
єن́pi íк $\omega$ ，find，68，440，1397，f． $\epsilon \dot{\cup} \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, 44^{1}$ ，а．є $\dot{\nu} \mu \circ \nu, 42$, 1026， pf．$\epsilon \ddot{\sim} \rho \eta \kappa \alpha, 546$ ，pf．p．єӥ $\eta \mu a \iota$, Іо50，а．г р．єنेр $\hat{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, 839$ ，f．єنे－ $\rho \in \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \iota, 108$
$\epsilon \dot{\cup} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\omega} s \stackrel{\alpha}{\epsilon} \chi \in \iota$ ，it is a pious duty， 1431
$\epsilon \cup ̈ \sigma \epsilon \pi \tau 0 s$, holy， $86_{4}$
 be fortunate， 88,1478
єüхо⿱㇒⿻二亅⿱⿰㇒一乂七，pray，269， 1512 ；boast， 199，892．－$\epsilon \dot{\chi} \eta$ n，prayer， 239 （ $\epsilon \dot{\chi}$ al $\theta \epsilon \omega \nu$ ，prayers to the gods）
$\epsilon \dot{v} \hat{\omega} \pi a$ à $\lambda \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu$ ．See 189
$\bar{\epsilon} \phi i \epsilon \mu a \iota$（midd．from $\bar{\epsilon} \phi i \eta \mu \iota$ ），desire， 766 ，imperf． 1055
єфі $\mu \in p o s$, desirable， 1375
$\epsilon \phi v \mu \nu \epsilon \omega$ ，repeat．See 1275
$\dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho o ́ s, \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta i \omega \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \iota \sigma \tau o s(\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \sigma \tau a \tau o s)$ ， hostile，hateful，415，272，28，1519， 1345．$\epsilon \chi \theta \rho o \delta a i \mu \omega \nu$ ，hateful to deities，816
$\ddot{\epsilon} \chi \omega$ ，have， $221, \& c . \& c$. f．$\ddot{\epsilon} \xi \omega$ ，imp． єǐरov，hold，259，566，586，726， 759，942，1470，1477．be able，

119，277，1074．with gen．for $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \omega, 709$ ．With adverbs， 345

 （ $\dot{s} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \chi \in \iota$ ）．With past participles，


 xiv，Verbs．
$\epsilon_{\epsilon}^{\omega} \dot{\rho} \alpha$ ．See $\mathrm{I}_{2} \sigma_{4}$.
$\epsilon \omega \bar{\epsilon}$ ．See Exc．xiv，Particles．
 $\dot{u} \gamma \eta \nu, 826$
Zeús，200，498，g．Zquós， 18 ，or $\Delta$ tós，151，I59，188， 470
sh रos，emulation．See 1526 and Exc．IX．
乡クuia，damage， 520
$\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ ，to live，be alive，survive．See 45 and Exc．III．Also 482， 985 ， 988
$\zeta \eta \tau \epsilon \omega$ ，seek，266，\＆c．，pass．part． 110．－Sír $\eta \mu a$ ，thing sought，ques－ tion， 278
 Particles，Exc．Xiv．
$\ddot{\eta} \beta \eta$ ．See 741
$\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$, ruler， 103
 mayest perhaps find pleasure in
 See 82．$\dot{\eta} \delta v \epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} s$ ，sweet－spoken， 151．ท̇סúro入cs．See 510
$\eta^{\prime} \theta$ єos．See 18
ク̈ккьта，by no means，623．oủ $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \sigma \tau \alpha=\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$, best．See $10_{5} 3$
$\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ ，am come．See 687 （ $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu$ ， ＂$\nu$＇${ }^{\prime \prime} \kappa \in \iota$ к．т．$\lambda$. to what a pass the solemn oracles of the grod are come）； 1519．f．$\ddot{\eta} \xi \omega$ will come，341－2， II58，1489．See 713
$\dot{\eta} \lambda i к о s, 15$. See Pronouns，Exc． xiv．
$\eta{ }^{\eta} \lambda \iota o s$, Dor．ä ${ }^{\lambda} \lambda \cos$ ，the Sun，66r， 1426
$\dot{\eta} \mu a \rho$, day．See 73，199．$\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a$ ，do． 1283
in, spring， 137
$\dot{\eta} \sigma u \chi \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ ，stay quiet， 620 （ $\ddot{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma v \chi \alpha ́$－广 $\omega \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \mu \in \nu \omega$ ，if I shall await him quietly）

Өакє́ $\omega, 20$ ；$\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, 161$ ；$\theta 0 \alpha ́ \xi \omega, 2 ;$ sit．See 2
$\theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \mu o s$, chamber．See 195．－$\theta$ a $\lambda$ a－ $\mu \eta \pi \delta$ خos．See 1209
$\theta a \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota o s$, on the sea， 14 II
taî $\mu \mathrm{a}$ ，a wonder，1132，1319．— A av－ $\mu a ́ \xi \omega$ ，to wonder，777．See 289
$\theta \in ́ a \mu a$ ，spectacle，1295．$\theta \in \omega \rho i a$ ，do． 1491.
$\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ ，wish，be willing， $11, \& c$. \＆c． See 649， $6_{51}$ ， 1356
$\theta \epsilon \mu \iota \tau o ́ s$, laweful．See 993
$\theta \epsilon o ́ s, ~ a ~ g o d, ~ 27, ~ 77, ~ \& c . ~ \& c . ~ \theta \epsilon i o s, ~$ divine，298．See 960 ， $1235 . \theta \in \dot{\eta}^{-}$ גatos，heaven－sent，255， 992. $\theta \epsilon \sigma \pi \iota \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \iota a$ ，fem．heaven－inspired， prophetic．$\theta \dot{́} \sigma \pi \iota \sigma \mu a$ ，$\theta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \phi u \tau o \nu$, oracle， 97 I ， 1175 ．See 907．$\theta \in \omega$－ pós，on sacred mission，II 4 ．Exc．x．
$\theta \hat{\eta} \beta a \iota, ~ Ө \dot{\eta} \beta \eta$ ，Thebes．See $153,15^{2}+$
өทpá $\omega$ ，hunt for，seek， 542
rircia，hired service， $1029^{2}$
$\theta \iota \gamma \gamma \alpha^{\prime} \nu \omega$ ，touch，f．$\theta i \xi \circ \mu a \iota$ ，a．${ }^{*} \theta c \gamma o \nu$ ， $760,1413,1469$
$\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，die，f．$\theta a \nu o v \mu a l$, a． $\bar{\epsilon} \theta a \nu o \nu$, pf． $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$, ІІ， 106,3 гз，\＆с．$\theta \nu \eta$－ тós，mortal，868，1424，\＆c．$\theta$ áva－ тos，death，942，1284．Dávatol， violent death，497，І200．$\theta$ aváoı－ $\mu о \mathrm{~s}, 560$ ，959．өavá $\sigma \mu 0 \nu \quad \beta \epsilon \beta \eta$－ ко́та，is dead and gone．Өavatŋ－ фо́pos，death－dealing，I 8 I
 be bold，be cheery， 1062
ө $\epsilon \epsilon \mu \mu a$ ，nursling，offspring， $\mathrm{II}_{43}$
$\theta$ óvos，seat，throne， 161
өvरátท $\rho$ ，daughter，188．See 159
$\theta u \mu o ́ s$, mind， 914,975 ．anger， 674 ． －$\theta v \mu o \hat{\nu} \mu \mathrm{a}$ ，fret angrily， 344
$\theta v \rho \omega ̈ \nu$, vestibule， 1242
$\theta \dot{v} \omega$ ，to sacrifice：whence $\theta \hat{v} \mu a$ ，a sacrifice，239．－${ }^{2} \mu \mathrm{mia} \mathrm{\mu a}$ ，incense－ offering： 4
＇Iá入є
laбıs，cure， 68
＇do $\uparrow$ ¢s，skilful， 1086
iepós，sacred，holy，1379，1428．－ iєpeús，priest，i8（iєpク̂̀s Att．n．pl．）
ińıos．See 151，iog6
in $\mu \iota$ ，1242．ïєто（midd．），she hurried iкavós，suffficient， 377

 920 （fem．）．－ікєти́ $\rho$ or iктй $\rho$, sup－ pliant，143．－iкт ${ }^{\prime} \rho$ os，supplica－ tive，3．－iкєтєv＇$\omega$ ，supplicate， 4
iнєiры，59，587，iцєiролац，386，to desire
iva．See Particles．Exc．xiv
＇Іока́ $\sigma \tau \eta$ ，Focasta， $622 \& c$ ．
iov́，alas， 107 I
＇I $\sigma \mu \eta \nu_{o ́ s . ~ S e e ~}^{2 I}$
ívos，equal，409，544， 845 ；same as before，53，677；їбор каі，6ı1．－ ï $\sigma a \kappa \alpha i$, гı 87 ；$\epsilon \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ l $\sigma \omega \nu, 1498$. ioov，equally，1018，1347－－i／oov （ $\mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \sigma s$ ）579．－${ }^{\imath} \sigma \eta \nu(\tau i \sigma \nu \nu) 810$. ïбws，perhaps，1078，see 927．－ iob $\alpha$ avpos，like a bull，478．－lioów， make equal，deem equal，31， 58 r
ï $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$ ，place，station，make，\＆oc．f． $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ，a．I $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma \\ \\ \\ \sigma a \\ \text { ，part．} \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \mathrm{s}\end{gathered}$ （all trans．）．See $\sigma \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a s{ }^{\text {é }} \chi \epsilon \iota s, 699$ ， a． 2 ë $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$ ，part．$\sigma \tau \alpha ́ s, 50, \mathrm{pf}$ ．
 for $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, 1442$（these are intrans．），midd．í $\sigma \tau \alpha \mu a \iota$ ．See ${ }^{1}+3$ ， 147．Pass．a．І $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, 1463$
iбторє $\omega$ ，inquire，ask，1144， 1150 ， ${ }^{1156}$ ；know， 1484
＂I $\sigma$ Tpos，the river Danube， 1227
$i \sigma \chi \omega$（ $=\neq \chi \chi)$ ，882．See 1031
$i \sigma \chi$ 尚 $\omega$ ．See 356
＇$\chi$ र $\nu 0$ s，foot－print，trace，rog．Hence ixvéve，to track，search for，22I， 476
$i \omega$ ，a call；or an outcry of sympathy or woe，162，1186，1207，1216， I31I，I313，I32I，I391

Ká $\delta \mu \mathrm{os}$ ．See I．adj．Ka $\alpha \mu \epsilon i o s, 29$ ， 35，223，273，1288．Once $\theta_{\eta}$－ ßaîos， 453
каӨappós，purification，99， 1228
$\kappa а \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega \nu$ ，regular，required．See 75
$\kappa \alpha \theta \iota \kappa \nu \notin о \mu a \iota$ ，smite（lit．＇come down on＇）．See 809
 $\theta \epsilon \in \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon$ ，каӨєбтával，pf．See ıc， 703
$\kappa a l$ ，каiтоı，кằ，кєl，кєî̀єע，кєî̀os． See Exc．xiv
каıvós，new，9ı6
$\kappa \alpha i \nu \omega$ ，kill， $34^{8}$

каıрós，time，accasion，season， 1513 ， 1516．See 325 ，1050．Hence кaiplos，in season，opportune， 631
како́s，evil，bad．This，perhaps the most largely used adj．in Greek， must be rendered by various words，all conveying the same idea of evil，whether moral or casual．See 78， 521 （criminal or traitorous）\＆c．Adv．как $\omega$ s often joined with the adj．See 248. Compar．кокієь，sup．ка́кьбтоs． See 334，vilest of the vile．－ка－ коûpros，knavish， 705
$\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ ，call， 1245 ；invite， 432 ；twit， 780，pass．8，120I， 522 （ $\kappa$－ $\kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \iota)$ ； 1359 （ $\epsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu)$
$\kappa а ́ \lambda \lambda о$ ．See 1396
ка入ós，honourable，good，noble，595， 1409， 15 16．Comp．$\kappa a \lambda \lambda i \omega \nu \nu$ ，ка́入－入ıбтоs，55，315．See 78 （eis ка－入óv）．Adv．ка入ิิs，well， 317,616 ， 984， 986, г 367 ．See 600 ，кал $\omega$ s $\phi \rho о \nu \omega \nu$, right－minded， 1008 ，кал $\omega$ s $\epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ठ $\hat{\eta} \lambda o s$ oű $\epsilon i \delta \omega \dot{s}$ ，thou very covi－ dently knowest not
$\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \nu \xi, b u d, 25$
ка́латоs，pain，suffering．See 174
ка́pa，head，23，742，809．See 40， 1207， $1235 . ~ к \rho \hat{a} \tau \alpha$（neut．）is used for $\kappa \alpha^{\prime} \rho \alpha, 263$
катаıбӨávоцаı，discern， 422
катаıбхи́vонац，respect（from shame）， 1424
катакоцд＇$\omega$ ，lull to slumber，869， 1222
$\kappa а \tau а к \tau \epsilon \ell \nu \omega, k i l l$ ，а．у катєктєє $\nu a, ~ а . ~ 2 ~$ катє́кта⿱亠䒑⿱亠乂，826，856．See 843
$\kappa а \tau \alpha \mu \beta \lambda$ и́v． ．See 688
ката́ратоs，accursed，І 344
катабфа́乡ш，murder， 730
ката́фทцц．See 507
$\kappa а \tau а \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$ ，destroy， 33
$\kappa а \tau a \phi \theta i \omega$ ，waste away，970，катєф－ $\theta_{\iota} \tau$
ка́тєvүนa，votive offering．See 920
катє宀́хомаı，imprecate．See 246
катє $\chi \omega$ ．See 782
кат $\eta \gamma о \rho \epsilon \omega$ ，accuse，514， 529
$\kappa а \tau \iota \in i \nu$ ，discern，behold．See кат－ $\epsilon i ̂ \delta \epsilon$, II7， 338
ка́тоьঠa，know clearly，225，926， 104I，1048，II34
 See 13，Exc．II
$\kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ ．See Prepos．Exc．XIV
кє́ap．See 688
кєîนaı，lie， $182,972,1267$ ．є̀кєเто， was existing．See $49^{\circ}$
кєเขós．See 8
$\boldsymbol{\kappa є \kappa \lambda о ́ \mu є \nu о \text { ．See I } 5 9}$
$\kappa \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$ оs，road，801， 1398
$\kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v ่ \omega$ ，command， 226
кєขós，empty， 55 ，whence кєขó $\omega$ ，to empty， 29
кє́̀т pò，goad．See 809；point，13I8
кєраuдо́s，thunderbolt， 202
кє́ $\rho \delta о$ ，profit，gain，232，595．Hence $\kappa є \rho \delta \alpha i \nu \omega, 889$
кєv́v $\theta$ ，hide， 1229 ；lie hid， 968
 See I324（ $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu)$ ．Hence $\kappa \dot{\eta}$－ $\delta є v \mu$ ．See 85
$\kappa \eta \lambda i s$, stain， $833,138_{4}$
$\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon$ s．See $47^{2}$
кท̂pv乡，herald，753．－кпрv́ббн，pro－ claim，737．－кทю $\rho \gamma \mu a$ ，proclama－ tion， $35^{\circ}$
K \＆alp $\dot{\nu}$ ，Cithaeron，mountain－ range near Thebes， $42 \mathrm{I}, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．
$\kappa \iota \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$, call， 210
$\kappa \iota \nu \epsilon \omega$ ，stir，${ }_{3} 6$
$\kappa \iota \chi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ ，find，а． 2 єєкı$\chi о \nu, 1257$
$\kappa \lambda a ́ \delta o s$, a small branch or wand， 3
$\kappa \lambda a ́ \omega$ ，weep，mourn．－$\kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \nu$ ，to your cost，to your sorrow，401，1152．— $\kappa є \kappa \lambda a v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s$, in tears
$\kappa \lambda \dot{n} \zeta \omega$, call，48，733，1171，1451
$\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \rho a$ ．See 1262
$\boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega$ ．See 1262
$\kappa \lambda \cup ́ \delta \omega \nu$ ．See 197， 1527
$\kappa \lambda \dot{\omega} \omega$, hear，84，\＆c．－к $\lambda \cup \tau$ ós，famous， noble．See 172
коî入os，hollow．See 1262
коьขós，common，240，261．—коь $\hat{\eta}$ ， in concert， 606
ко入á乡 $\omega$ ，chide，II47．Hence кола－ $\sigma \tau \eta s$, a chider
коці广ш，convey，conduct，444－5，678． коціรоцає，reprieve， 580
ко́рŋ，maiden，Іо98
Kópıv日os，Corinth，936，\＆c．；adj． Kopiv日los，774，\＆c．
кратє́ $\omega$ ，rule，swvay，possess，54，409， 530，973，1197，1522－3；also кра－ тúvผ，14，903．－кра́тоs，pl．кра́т
power，крáтıбтos，most mighty， noblest
$\kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ ，stronger，superior．－крєî $\sigma-$ oov，adv．more strongly，177；є $\rho \gamma \alpha$ $\kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma o \nu a$ árरóvns，deeds too bad for hanging to expiate， 1374
крє $\mu a \sigma \tau$ о́s，suspended， $1263^{-6}$
 крì $\omega$ ，judge，34，544，829
$\kappa \rho v ́ \pi \tau \omega$ ，hide，кєкрv $\mu$ е́ข $о$ о， 1398
кта́о $\mu a \iota$ ，acquire， $1499 .-\kappa \tau \grave{\eta} \mu a$ ，ac－ quirement， 549
$\kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega, k i l l$, а．$\underset{\epsilon}{\kappa} \tau \alpha \nu \circ \nu, 123, \& c . \& \in$ ． $\kappa v \beta \epsilon \nu \eta \tau \eta \dot{s}$ ，steersman， 923
кикло́єєs，encircled．See 16I
ки́клоs，orbit，eye， 1270
кирє́ $\omega$ ，am， $362,594,985$ ；succeed， 398 ；obtain（with gen．） 1514 ． See Verbs．Exc．XIV
кúpios，proper，assigned， 1453
$\kappa \cup \cup \omega \nu$ ，hound，monster，391
$\kappa \omega \phi$ ós，dull，stupul，stale， 290
 496．－$\Lambda \alpha \beta \delta \alpha \kappa є і$ іैs， 267,1226
$\lambda a \gamma \chi a ́ \nu \omega$ ，receive as lot，a．є̌ $\lambda a \chi o \nu$ ． See 1366
入á $\theta \rho a$ ，secretly，without the know． ledge of．See 618，787
ムáios，father of Uedipus， $103, \& c$, always trisyll．$\Lambda$ aitelos，adj．of do．
$\lambda a \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, take，seize，catch，find， 1031，1494，f．$\lambda \dot{\eta} \psi о \mu a \iota, ~ p . ~ \epsilon \grave{\prime} \lambda \eta \phi a$ ， 643，а．$\epsilon \lambda a \beta o \nu$ ，part．$\lambda a \beta \omega \nu, 121$ ， 218，641，913，IOI2，\＆c．\＆c．
$\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \mu \pi \omega$ ，shine，sound clearly，187， 473．Hence $\lambda a \mu \pi \rho o ́ s$, bright， 81 ， 1483
$\lambda a \nu \theta a^{\prime} \nu \omega$ ，lurk，be hid，a．Є̀ $\lambda a \theta o \nu, p$. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta a$（used with partic．，see 247，366， 415 ），904．－$\lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \omega$ ，be hidden from， 1325
入aós，people， 144
$\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ ，speak，say（frequent），f．$\lambda \epsilon \xi \xi$ ， a．＇$\epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \xi a$ ，pass．$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o \mu a \iota$ ．See 39， p．$\lambda \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \epsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$ ，a．I $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \chi \theta \eta \nu$ ．Hence入óरos，word，speech，report：very frequent．See 219,657
$\lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega$ ，leave，a．${ }^{\prime} \lambda \iota \pi \frac{1}{}{ }^{\prime}$ ， $1247, \mathrm{pf}$ ． pass．$\lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu a \iota, 1418,1504$ ．See \ei $\pi \epsilon \ell$ ，intrans．for $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota$ ，is wanting，1232．Hence $\lambda$ oltós，

See Lex．тो $\lambda o \iota \pi o ́ v, ~ t h e r e a f t e r, ~$ 795，1273．т $\dot{\alpha}$ 入oı $\pi \alpha$ ，the residue， 1487
$\lambda$ 入́ктоя．See 19
$\lambda e ́ \kappa т \rho o \nu, \lambda \epsilon \in$ Хos，bed．The plurals $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \tau \rho a, \lambda \epsilon \in \chi \eta$ have the same sense． See 260，821， 1243
$\lambda \epsilon v \kappa a \nu \theta \dot{\eta}$ s．See 742
$\lambda \epsilon u ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，see， 1524
$\lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega$ ，cease，686，731，881
$\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \eta$ s，robber，422－4，535，\＆c．
$\lambda_{\iota} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ ，haven，428， 1208
$\lambda \iota \pi a \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ ，beseech， 1435
入i $\sigma \sigma o \mu a l$, pray， $6_{50}$
入oүiSomal，consider，reckon up，461
入o七нós，plague， 28
Mogias，Apollo＇s title as a deliverer of obscure（ $\lambda_{0} \xi \dot{a}$ ）oracles：used by Soph．in this play four times， 410，853，994，1102：in El．once， 82
入ó $\chi \in v \mu a, ~ n e w-b o r n ~ c h i l d, ~ 1107 ~$
入oxirns，trooper， 75 I
Aúкєlos，Lycean，epithet of Apollo． See 203．ムúкıos，Lycian， 208
$\lambda u ́ \pi \eta$ ，grief，915，1074．－$\lambda u \pi \epsilon \in \omega$ ， grieve，pain，74，1231
$\lambda u \sigma \sigma a ́ \omega$ ，rave， $125^{8}$
$\lambda u ́ \omega$ ，loose，release，1034， 1351 ；atone， expiate， 101 ；fulfil， 407 ；break uр，ипnerve，880．－$\lambda \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ тє́ $\lambda \eta$ $=\lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ้$ ，bring profit， 317 ． Hence $\lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma \iota s$, release， 921
$\lambda \varphi \omega \nu$ ，better， 1038 ， $15 \mathrm{I} 3 .-\lambda \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau \circ \mathrm{s}$ ， best，1066－7

Má ${ }^{2}$ s，conjuror， 387
Maıvás，a Bacchanal（ $\mu a \iota \nu o \mu \notin \nu \eta$ ， maddened）， 2 12
макаріјь，deem happy， 1295
$\mu а к \rho a i \omega \nu$ pios，aged life，length of days， 5 I3
макро́s，long，56r，\＆c．Hence макра́v，far，16，220， 998
$\mu a ́ \lambda \alpha, \mu \dot{d} \lambda^{\prime}$ av̂̀ts，again and again． $\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{}$ ，more，rather，better（fre－ quent），$\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ ，most（of all）， primarily，especially，exactly： never means most often
$\mu a \nu \theta a ́ v \omega$, learn，a．${ }^{\ell} \mu a \theta o \nu$（frequent） mavia，madness， 1300
$\mu a ́ v \tau \iota s$, seer，prophet．Hence $\mu a \nu \tau \iota-$ кós prophetic， $723 ; \mu a \nu \tau \iota \kappa \eta$（ $(\tau \epsilon \chi \chi \nu \eta)$ ，
the prophetic art，divination， 31 I ， 462，709．－$\mu$ аутєia，prophecy，I49， 394，857．－$\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon і \hat{i} \nu$ ，oracle，407， $4^{81}$ ，oracular shrine，243．－ цavtєîos，oracular．See 21．－ $\mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$ ，oracle，946，953， 992
$\mu a p a i v \omega$ ，corrupt，vaste，destroy，a． द̇ $\mu$ ápā̀ $\alpha$
$\mu \alpha \rho \tau u \rho \epsilon \omega$ ，testify， 1032
$\mu a \tau \not \subset \zeta \omega \nu$ ，in rash folly，891
$\mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{\omega} \omega$ ，seek，search out，1052，1061
$\mu a ́ \tau \eta \nu$ ，in vain，unwisely，365，609， 874，1057， 1520
$\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a s$, great， $44 \mathrm{I}, \& \mathrm{c} . \quad \mu \hat{\prime} \gamma \alpha$ ф $\rho о \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$, to be proud－minded，tall， 742. $\mu \epsilon \in \gamma a$ ，greatly，1023，I343．$\mu \epsilon i \zeta \omega \nu$, greater：see I301．$\mu \epsilon$ خıбтos，great－ est．$\mu \in ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a$ ，most greatly， 1223 ． ＇̇s $\mu \epsilon \in \gamma \iota \sigma \tau o \nu, \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a$ ，in the highest degree
$\mu \epsilon \theta \eta$ ，strong drink， 779
$\mu \in \theta i \eta \mu \ell$ ，dismiss，I 3 I，a．part．$\mu \in \theta \in i$ ， 784．$\tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \epsilon \theta \in \nu \tau \iota \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \lambda 6 \gamma 0 \nu$, him who let drop the word
$\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon$, 377．$\stackrel{\oplus}{*} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ ，whose care it is， 443．oü $\mu o \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$ ，I care not，mid． $\mu \hat{\text { ® }}$ 人oual，take care，with gen．See 1466.
$\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon$ єos，wretched， 479
$\mu \in \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，delay， 678 ；be fated， 96 ． $138_{5}$ ，${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda$ ov $\dot{\rho} \rho \hat{a} \nu$ ，was $I$ going to behold？
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \phi о \mu a \iota$, blame，337．See 506
$\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu, \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau o l, \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ oüv，$\mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \mu \dot{\eta} \&{ }^{c}$ c．\＆c． See Exc．XIV
Mevookeús，father of Creon．See 1503
$\mu^{\prime} \nu \omega$ ，remain，stay，295，437， 1291
$\mu \epsilon \in \iota \mu \nu a$ ，care，anxiety，723．Hence $\mu \in \rho \iota \mu \nu a \dot{\omega}$ ，have the care of， $\mathrm{II}_{2}$
$\mu \epsilon \in \rho o s$, part，portion，1294， $1509, \pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ ö oov $\tau \grave{\partial}$ бò̀ $\mu \notin \rho o s$, save what con－ cerns thee
$\mu \epsilon \sigma \delta \mu \phi а \lambda о$ ．See 430
$\mu \notin \sigma o s$, middle，$\mu \hat{\epsilon} \sigma o \nu$ кápa，full on the head，808，812
$\mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \iota \mu:$ к $\dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{o}$＇$\mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ ，I too have a share， 630
$\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \chi \omega$ ，partake， $146_{5}$
$\mu$ е́тоькоя．See 452，comm．
$\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \epsilon \omega$ ，measure．See 58 I
$\mu$ пंкьбтоя．See $\mathbf{I} 301$
$\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, month， 1083
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$\mu \hat{\eta} v i s$, wrath. See 699
$\mu \eta \nu \cup ̛ \omega$, indicate, show, 102. See 1384
$\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$, mother, 775, \&c., adj. $\mu \eta \tau \rho \hat{\varphi} о \mathrm{~S}, \mathrm{I} 256$
mia $\alpha \mu$, pollution, defilement, 97, 24I, 813, IOI 2
$\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \omega \rho$, polluter. See 353
$\mu i \gamma \nu \nu \mu \iota$, f. $\mu i \xi \omega$, p. p. $\mu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \mu a l$, a. і р. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu i \chi \theta \eta \nu$, a. 2 p. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu i \gamma \eta \nu$, ming $\bar{l}$, couple, 791, 995
$\mu \iota \kappa \frac{s}{}$, for $\sigma \mu \kappa \rho \sigma s$, small, 1083
 $\mu \eta \nu$, make mention, 564 ; p. $\mu \epsilon \mu$ $\nu \eta \mu a \iota$, remember, 1057 , 1401. Hence $\mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$, memory, 43 1, i239, 1246, 1328
$\mu о і$ ра, fate, $376,713,864, \& c$.
$\mu_{0} \lambda \epsilon i v$, а. 2 come, 35, 765, \&c.
$\mu o ́ \lambda l s$, hardly, 782
$\mu b \nu$ cuos, remaining, 1322
$\mu 6 \nu \mathrm{os}$, alone, only, 614, \&c.
$\mu v \delta \omega \nu$, clammy, $\mathbf{1}_{27} 8$
$\mu$ víos, pollution, 138
$\mu \omega p i a$, folly. See 586
$\mu \hat{\omega}$ pos, foolish, 433, 436, 540

Naixı, yes, $68_{4}$
$\nu a i \omega$, dwell, inhabit, 338, 414, 1105, 1451
vaós, shrine, $21,899,912$
$\nu a ́ \pi \eta$, dell; $\nu a \pi a i ̂ o s, ~ w o o d e d, ~ s y l v a n ~$
ขєîкоs, quarrel, 490, 633
$\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho o ́ s$, dead, $18 \mathbf{1}$, г 245
$\nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$, hold, 201, 237; distribute, 240, 579; esteem, Io8o
$\nu$ 臽, young, $1145 . N e w$, see 155 , Exc. v. modern, see I
$\nu \epsilon \in \theta \epsilon$, beneath, i.e. in Hades, 416, opposed to $\Delta \nu \omega$.
$\nu$ '́ $\phi$ os, cloud, 1313
$\nu \dot{\eta} \pi \iota o s$. See 652
$\nu i \xi \omega$ or $\nu i \pi \tau \omega$, wash, cleanse, 1228
$\nu \nu \nu$, him, $123, \& c$. , her, 397, 1265. See Pronouns, Exc. xiv
$\nu 0 \in \omega$, bear in mind. See 1054, midd. עoov̂ $\mu a \iota, 1487$
$\nu 0 \mu i \zeta \omega$, think, consider, esteem, 516 , 549, 551, 610, 859, pass. 39
ขb $\mu \mathrm{os}$, law, 855
$\nu$ ббоs, $\nu \dot{\sigma} \eta \mu a$, sickness, plague, 217 , \&c. $\nu o \sigma \epsilon \omega$, am sick. See 6o, \&c.
voбфiگoual, put from me, forsake. See 693
$\nu 0$ s.s, mind, $37 \mathrm{I}, 600$, 1347; under. standing, 550
Nú $\mu \phi \eta$, Nymph, iro8. $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \phi \eta$, bride, 1407; $\nu v \mu \phi ı 66 s, b r i d a l$, I242
$\nu v ́ \mu \phi \iota o s$, bridegroom, 1358 . vv́ $\mu$ $\phi \in \nu \mu a$, marriage, 980
$\nu \hat{\nu} \nu, \nu \nu \nu, 6_{44}$
$\nu \dot{\prime} \xi, n i g h t, 198,374, \& c$.
$\nu \omega \mu a ́ \omega$, ponder, contemplate, 300
$\nu \omega \tau i \zeta \omega$, turn back. See 193
$\Xi \epsilon \operatorname{los}$, stranger, foreigner. See 219, $45^{2}$
 and Particles. See Exc. xiv
òós, path, way, road, i16, 3 II, \&c. See 1473. Hence óoımópos, wayfarer, 292. ódolmopé $\omega$, travel, 801
jóv́popal, wail. See 1218
Oidimous. See 405, rogi. Oioııó$\delta \eta s, 495$
oikos, house, home, II5, \&c., also plur. 249, $320, \&$ c. Hence oiк $\epsilon \omega$, dwell, 414.-оiкєios, your own, II62.-оiкє́t $\eta s$, oiкєús, domestic servant, 756, iII4.-oiк $\quad$ т $\eta$ s, in-habitant.-oîкol, at home
oiктij $\omega$, pity, 1508.
oiкт $o$ ós, pitiable, 58, 1462
oipal, think, 1051, 1227
oivos, wine, 780
oiv'̈ $\psi$, wine-visaged, ruddy, 21 I
oió̧ $\ddagger$ vos, travelling alone, 846
oï $\sigma \rho \eta \mu a$, prick, sting, 1318
oi $\omega$ vós, bird, 310, 395, 398
óкขךрós, fearfull, 834
öкvos, dread, ІІ75. Hence $\delta \kappa \nu \notin \omega$, to dread, fear, 746, 749, 922, 976, 986, 1000
bi $\beta$ os, weal, prosperity, 1197, 1282. Hence ő $\lambda \beta$ ıos, blessed, 929
 adj. $\dot{\delta} \lambda \epsilon \theta \rho \iota o s$, I 343
ö $\lambda \lambda v \mu l$, destroy, Att. f. $\dot{\partial} \hat{\omega}, 448$, p. ó $\lambda \omega \lambda a$, am killed, am dead, 126 , \&c., pass. perish, 179,799, a. 2 $\dot{\omega} \grave{o ́}^{\mu} \eta \nu, 645,663,822,856,{ }_{5} 57$, ${ }^{1} 349$
ò $\lambda$ os, whole, entire, 1 I 36
'Oגv $\quad$ mia, Olympia in Elis, 900
＂Oגvuros，Olympus， 1088
öдас $\mu \mathrm{os}$, sister， 689
öpav入os，consonant，in unison， 187
${ }_{\circ}^{\circ} \mu \beta \rho o s$, shower， 1279,1428
$\dot{\delta} \mu \lambda \lambda \epsilon \omega$ ，associate，cohabit，367， 485.
Hence $\dot{\delta} \mu \mathrm{\lambda} \lambda\left(a\right.$ ，company， $\mathrm{I}_{4} 89$ oै $\mu \mu \alpha$ ，eуe，81，\＆c．

o $\mu \mathrm{ol}$ iws，in like manner， 563
о́ $\mu$ о́ $\sigma \pi$ ороя．See 260,460
ó $\mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda$ os，companion， 212
$\dot{\circ} \mu \mathrm{o} \hat{\text { ，}}$ ，at once，4，1276， 1278 ；alike，
1495；with，337， 1007
о́ «фалós，navel，centre， 893
ö $\mu \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，nevertheless，all the same，302， \＆c．
і́vaím ${ }^{\prime}$ ．See 644
övє $1 \delta o s$, reproach，scandal，disgrace， $5^{2} 3$ ，\＆c．Hence $\delta \nu \epsilon \delta \delta i j \omega$ ，cast reproach，twit，372，\＆c．
óveípara，dreams（from a disused nom．）， 981
óvo $\mu \dot{\jmath} \zeta \omega$ ，call（by name），mid．$\dot{\omega} \nu 0-$ $\mu a ́ \zeta \epsilon \tau o ́ ~ \mu \epsilon \pi a i ̂ \delta a$, called me his son， 1021，pass．1036， 1042
ȯ $\pi i \sigma \omega$ ．See 488
$\dot{\text { óá́ } \omega, ~ s e e, ~} 15$ ，\＆c．\＆c．，f．oै $\psi о \mu а \iota$, 135，776．See 1271，p．a．ö $\pi \omega \pi a$ ，
 $i \delta \epsilon i \nu-i \delta \omega \dot{\omega} \nu$（frequent）compounded with $\epsilon$ is（ $\dot{\epsilon} s$ ），$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i, \quad \pi \rho o ́ s, \pi \epsilon \rho i$, ，катá
d $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ ，anger，405．$\delta c^{\prime} \dot{\text { o }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \hat{\eta}$ s，in anger， 344,807 ．Hence $\delta \rho \gamma a i \nu \omega$ ， op $\rho \boldsymbol{i} \ddagger \omega, 524$ ，to anger，335，339， 364
optós，right，upright，stedfast，true． See 506， $528,853,1226,1385 . \kappa a \tau$＇ д $\rho \theta$ о́v，88，696．$\beta \lambda \epsilon \notin \pi о \nu \tau a$ д $\rho \theta \dot{a}$ ， 419．ö $\rho \theta$＇а́кои́єєs， 903 ．See 528. Hence $\dot{\delta} \rho \theta_{o}^{\prime} \omega$ ，upraise，39－b $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s$ ， rightly，550， 1448
ӧркоя，oath， 647,653
óp 0 os，anchorage，roadstead， 196
óp $\rho$ Ls，bird， 176 ；omen：see $5^{2}$
о́ $\rho \nu v \mu$ ，arouse，midd．ö $\rho \nu v \mu a \iota$ ，arise， rush on， 165 ，part．ópuevos，speed－ ing，${ }_{17} 6$
őpos，mountain，208，719，1106， 145 I ．Hence $\delta \rho \epsilon \cos$ ，of the moun－ tain， 1028
boov́ $\omega$ ，hasten，hurry， 877
On ou and its compounds see Exc． XIV
oúpávios，in heaven， 301,866
oúpl乡由，waft，carry with fair breeze， 695
oûs，$\uparrow \omega \tau$－，ear， $37 \mathrm{I}, 1387$
$\dot{\partial} \phi \epsilon i \lambda \omega$ ，a．$\ddot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu$ ．See 1157
óфөа $\lambda \mu$ о́s，cye， 1377 ．See 987
óф $\lambda \iota \sigma \kappa a ́ \nu \omega$ ，f．$\dot{\phi} \phi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ．See 512
$\dot{\sigma} \lambda \epsilon \omega$ ，trouble，annoy， 446
ö $\begin{gathered}\text { ıs，sight，eye，} 1328\end{gathered}$

Па́ $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ алтоs，berry－laden， 83
пacáv，paean，prayer－song，5，187
$\Pi a \iota a, \nu$ ，for $\Pi a \iota \omega \nu$, the healer（Apollo）， 154
mais，child，son，\＆c．，69，\＆c．$\pi$ al－ doupria．See 1248
$\pi a l \omega$ ，strike，807，1270， 1332
$\pi d$ dal，anciently，of old．See 1 ． Used of＇a short time since＇by an idiomatic exaggeration，1161， 1277
$\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \nu$, again，back．See 156 （Exc． v．），in return，100，619．$\pi a \lambda i \sigma$－ outos，retreating， 193
Ma入入ás＝the goddess Athene， 20. See 159
$\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，quiver．See $I_{52}$
$\pi a \nu \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \nu 0 s$, full moon， 1090
$\pi a \nu \tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ ，most miserable， 1379
$\pi a \rho a \beta \omega \dot{\mu} \boldsymbol{\circ} \mathrm{os}$ ，beside the altar， 184
тapá $\gamma \omega$ ，mislead， 974
$\pi а \rho \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a$ ，pattern， 1193
$\pi a \rho a \iota \nu \epsilon \omega$ ，advise，913， 1512
$\pi а \rho а \mu \epsilon i \beta \omega$ ，surpass， 504
$\pi a \rho a \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon \omega$ ，stand beside， 400
тapaбтєix $\omega$ ，walk beside， 808
тараф $о$ о̀ $\mu$ оs，insensate， 691
$\pi \alpha^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \iota \mu$ ，be present．$\pi$ á $\rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ ，it is possible， 766
$\pi a \rho \epsilon \bar{\rho} \chi о \mu a 1 . \pi a \rho \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ ，she entered， 124I
$\pi a \rho \in ́ \chi \omega, 36$ ，pay；53，procure； 567 ， hold（inquiry）；1306，cause
$\pi a \rho \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{os}$, virgin，maiden， 1199 ， 1462
$\pi a \rho \iota \eta \mu c$, omit；283，$\mu \grave{\eta} \pi a \rho \hat{\eta} s$ тò $\mu \grave{~ ф ~} \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma a l$ ．See 346，688，relax， unnerve
$\pi a \rho i \sigma \tau \eta \mu$, perf．part．$\pi a \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega \dot{s}$ ， present，standing by，633，1047， aor．I pass．$\pi a \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta$ ，presented itself， 911
$\pi \alpha ́ \rho o 九 \theta \epsilon, \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho o s$, formerly，491，856， 1282，1116；48，$\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi a ́ \rho o s ~ \pi \rho o-$ avpias，for thy former zeal；1421， тà $\pi$ ápos，in my former conduct
$\pi \hat{\alpha} s$（for $\pi \hat{\alpha} s \tau \iota s$ ），every one，596， 823 ． $\pi \hat{\alpha} s$ äparvos，wholly impure， 986. $\pi \hat{a} \sigma^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \nu a \dot{\gamma} \gamma \kappa \eta$ ，absolute necessity． $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\delta} \eta \lambda \hat{\omega} \theta \eta$ ，was made fully manifest，476．$\pi a ́ v \tau ’ ~ i \chi \nu \in \dot{\prime} \epsilon \nu \nu$ ， make all search for（adverbial）． The dat．pl．$\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ is ethic several times（＝in universal esteem），8， 40，596．$\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota ~ \chi a i \rho \omega$ ，all give me joy．$\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \tau a$ ，all things，frequently． $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \omega$ ，suffer， 1272 （stems $\pi \alpha \theta$－， $\pi \epsilon \nu \theta-)$ ；fut．$\pi \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota, 223$ ；perf． $\pi \epsilon \pi \pi \nu \theta a, 516$ ；aor．${ }^{\epsilon} \pi a \theta 0 \nu$（fre－ quent）， $325,403, \& \mathrm{c} . \pi \dot{\alpha} \theta o s$, calamity， 840, і33і．$\pi \alpha ́ \theta \eta \mu a$ ， injury， 554
$\pi a \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$, father，passim．Hence $\pi \alpha^{\prime}$－ т $\rho$ ，country，father－land，194， 1524．тaтpís，do．， 64 I ．$\pi \dot{a} \tau \rho \iota o s$, marpफ़os，of a father，996，1394， 1450．$\pi a \tau \rho \iota \dot{1} \tau \eta s$ ，of the same cozntry，IO91．тaтроктóvos，par－ ricide
$\pi a v ́ \omega$ ，put a stop to，put an end to， 397．Hence $\pi$ auot $\dot{p}$ oos，queller， stauncher
$\pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \eta$ ，fetter， 1340
$\pi \epsilon \in \delta o \nu$, ground， 181
$\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$ ，advise， 55 ；a．midd．$\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \dot{\sigma} \mu \eta \nu$ ， take advice， $321,649,1065$ ；а．I pass．$\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$ ，persuaded， $526 ; \pi \epsilon \iota$－ $\sigma \tau \epsilon_{o \nu}, I$ must obey， $\mathrm{I}_{1} 16$
$\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ \omega$ ，attempt， 399
$\pi \epsilon$＇$\lambda \alpha s$ ，near， $400,565,801,1047$. $\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ ，draw near；$\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ ， 213
$\pi \epsilon \lambda \omega$ ，anl， 245
$\pi \epsilon \epsilon \pi \omega$ ，send， 7 I ，\＆c．；midd．$\pi \epsilon \mu-$廿artai tiva，to have some one sent
$\pi \epsilon \nu$ Gos，sorrow，94， 1225 ．Hence $\pi \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \omega$ ，mourn， $\mathbf{I} 320$
$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho a$ ，beycnd，74．Hence $\pi \epsilon \rho a ́ \omega$ ， exceed， 674 ；pass， 1530
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota$ ßóntos．See 192

$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \omega$ ，walk about， 1254
$\pi \epsilon \rho / \sigma \sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ ．See 84 I and Lex．
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda о \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha, \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \rho a \iota s$ ．See 156
$\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\nu}_{\nu} \eta$, brooch， I 269
$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho o s$, a stone，334．$\pi \in \tau \rho a$ ，a rock， 478．See 464
$\pi \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta 0 \mu a \ell$ ，inquire，learn， 604 （also $\pi v \nu \theta a ́ v o \mu a \iota)$ ；fut．$\pi \epsilon \cup \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, I 442 ； aor．єं $\pi v \theta \dot{\circ} \mu \eta \nu, 7 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}_{3} 5$ ；perf．p． $\pi \epsilon \pi v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 513$
$\pi \epsilon$ ќк $\eta$ ，pine－torch， 214
$\pi \eta \mu o \nu \dot{\eta}$ ，injury，slander， $3^{6} 3$ ；woe， 1230
$\pi \iota \kappa \rho \dot{s}$, bitter， I 437
$\pi i \nu \omega$ ，drink，aor． $\begin{array}{ll}\pi \\ \pi & \circ \nu, 1401\end{array}$
$\pi i \pi \tau \omega$ ，fall，aor． $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma o \nu, ~ 50, ~ 129, ~\end{gathered}$ 376， 6 16；perf．$\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \kappa \alpha$ ， 146
$\pi \iota \sigma \pi b s$ ，faithfiul，trusted，385， 1118. $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$, faith， 1445 ；pledge of faith， 1420．$\pi / \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ ，believe， 625,646
$\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\nu} \circ \mathrm{s}, 67 .-\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\nu} \eta \mu a$ ，wandering， 727．－$\pi \lambda$ ávns，wanderer， 1029
$\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \xi$, tract， 1 IO3
$\pi \lambda a \sigma \tau$ ós．$\quad$ See 780
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau o ́ s$, corded， $\mathrm{I}_{2} 6_{4}$
$\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os．See $5+\mathrm{I}$
$\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \iota a ́ \zeta \omega$ ，be near， 1 I $\boldsymbol{3}^{\sigma}$
$\pi \lambda o \hat{v} \tau o s$, wealth $, 380,54 \mathrm{r} . — \pi \lambda$ oúolos， rich， 455 ， 1070
$\pi$ ó $\theta$ os，desire， 518 ；regret， 969
$\pi o \iota^{\prime} \omega$ ，do，537．See 543．Midd． тolov̂maı，make， 240 ．See 9I8，

$\pi о \iota \kappa \iota \lambda \varphi \delta \dot{s}$ ，riddling， 430
$\pi о \iota \not \eta^{\prime}$, shepherd，1029，1040．$\pi$ оí $\nu \eta$ ， $\pi$ оi $\mu \nu \iota o \nu$ ，flock， $76 \mathrm{I}, 1125$
то入ıós，hoary，io3
 citizen， 1 I64， 1526
$\pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \iota s$, many times，often， 1275
Пó̀vßos，400，\＆c．
$\pi o \lambda \dot{\jmath} \ddagger \eta \lambda o s$, of many rizalries， $3^{81}$
$\pi o \lambda$ és $^{\prime} \pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{n}$ ，mo入ú，much，many． Plur．$\pi o \lambda \lambda o i, m a n y ~(m e n) . ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha, ~$ many things， $120,591,98 \mathrm{I}, \& \mathrm{c}$. Adv．mo入ú，much，743， 786 ．Obs． $\pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda о \nu$, much more， 1 I 50. $\pi \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu, \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ ，more，75．Adv． $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ оу，more， 93 ，\＆c．$\pi \lambda \epsilon \bar{\sigma} \sigma \tau o s$, most．Adv．$\pi \lambda \in i \sigma \tau o \nu, 6 i 2$ ．$\dot{\omega}$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \hat{\sigma} \tau o \nu$ ，as much（far）as pos－ sible， 762 ．Obs． $1125, \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \tau a$ tô̂ $\beta i o v$, most of my life
$\pi 0 \lambda \cup \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \dot{n}_{s}$ ，richly crowned， 83
тодо́хрибоs．See 151
móvos，toil，suffering， 185 ，\＆ic．；la． bour， 3 I 5
$\boldsymbol{\pi}$ о́тоь. See 167
$\pi o p \epsilon i v$, provide, aor. of a disused present, $92 \mathrm{I}, 1255$
торєи́о $\mu \alpha$, go, 787
то́бts, husband, 459, 639, 934, 209
$\pi о \tau \epsilon ́, \pi \delta ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu, \pi o u, ~ \& c$. See Exc. XIV
$\pi \dot{\jmath} \tau \mu \circ \mathrm{s}$, fate, $27 \mathrm{I} . \quad \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi o \tau \mu o s$, illfated, 888, in 1
moús, foot, 468, \&c.
$\pi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, act, 1417; do, 862, 1353. Obs. 74, $\boldsymbol{\tau} i \quad \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota$, howe he fares (lit. what he is doing) ; 69, тaúr $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ ध̈ $\pi \rho a \xi a$, on this $I$ acted (i.e. I proceeded to effect $i t) . \epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho \dot{\xi} \xi a \iota \mu \hat{i} \tau \iota$, I might have some good fortune. Passive, $125, \epsilon \ell ้ \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \epsilon \epsilon \pi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau о$, if some intrigue were not going on. 621 , $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ тồ $\delta \epsilon \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ ' Ëoval, that man's schemes will have been effected. $11{ }^{4} 0, \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega \tau \iota \tau 0$ út $\omega \nu$ $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma^{\mu \epsilon \nu} \nu \nu$; is what I have been saying matter of fact? $\mathbf{1 2 3 7}, \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ $\pi \rho a \chi \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu$, the facts. See 220, $\tau c \hat{v} \pi \rho a \chi \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau o s$, the procedure, i.e. the inquest (on the murder of Laius). Hence $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$, thing, fact, 69, 255 ; business (where $\tau \boldsymbol{\delta}$ $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a=\tau \grave{o} \pi \rho a \chi \theta \in \dot{\nu} \nu$ in 220). $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha}-$ $\xi \iota s$, action, 895. трактєоs, proper to be done, 1430
$\pi \rho \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$. See 9
$\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta v \mathrm{~s}$, old man, 805, \&c. $\pi \rho \in \sigma$ -及útepos, graver, more serious, $\mathrm{I}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}$
$\pi \rho i \nu$. See Particles. Exc. xiv
$\pi \rho о \beta a \lambda \lambda \omega$. See 945
$\pi \rho о \delta є i к \nu \nu \mu$. See 456 and Excursus VII
$\pi \rho о \delta \epsilon i \sigma a s . \quad$ See 90
$\pi \rho o \delta i \delta \omega \mu$, betray, 33 r
$\pi \rho о є \iota \pi \epsilon i \nu$, address, proclaim, $35{ }^{1}$
$\pi \rho о \theta v \mu i a, z e a l, 48$; hopeful thought, see 838
$\pi \rho o i ́ \sigma \tau \eta \mu$. See 206
$\pi \rho о ́ к є \not \mu \alpha \iota$. See 865 ( $\pi \rho \delta \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, are set forth)
$\pi \rho 0 \lambda \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \omega$, foretell, 973
$\pi \rho o ́ v o c a$, fore-knozvledge, 978
$\pi \rho \circ \xi \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon$. See $\mathrm{I}_{4} 83$
$\pi \rho о \pi о \boldsymbol{\text { е́ }} \boldsymbol{\omega}$. See $68{ }_{5}$
$\pi \rho о \sigma a ́ \gamma o \mu a \iota$, force, $\mathbf{I} 3$ I
$\pi \rho \rho \sigma a ́ \pi \tau \omega$. See $66_{4}$
$\pi \rho о \sigma a \rho \kappa \epsilon ́ \omega$, help, assist. See 12, 141
$\pi \rho o \sigma a v \delta a ́ \omega$, address, 352
$\pi \rho o \sigma \beta a i \nu \omega$, come on, $\mathbf{1} 300$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \omega$, look upon, i183, 1486
$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \delta \epsilon \chi \neq \mu a l$, accept, entertain, 1428
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, address, 1072
$\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \rho \pi \omega$, steal on, 559
$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \in \rho о \mu a \iota$, approach, come; aor. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ \nu, 59$
$\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\eta} \gamma \mathrm{o} \rho o \mathrm{~s}$, addressing, or being addressed, 1437 (pass.)
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \hat{\eta} \mu a l$, sit beside, 15
$\pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta$, $\pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$, before, 268, 360, $\& \mathrm{c} . \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \ddot{\eta}$ (antequam) with indic., 736 ; infin., 832
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$, assistance, 38
$\pi \rho \dot{\sigma} к є \iota \mu a$, 232. тробкєібєтаl, shall be credited to him besides
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa v \nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, bow before, 327
$\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \rho \hat{\omega}$, meet with; aor. $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon$ кv $\sigma \sigma$, $\mathbf{I} 299$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega$, look upon, 1376
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega$, azvait, 620
$\pi \rho о \sigma о \rho \alpha ́ \omega$, look upon; aor. $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon i ̂ \delta o \nu$, I75, I 372
$\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\prime} \eta \mathrm{~s}$, patron, 41I; champion, 882
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau i \theta \eta \mu$, attach, 820. $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}$, do not undertake (aor. m.), 1460
$\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \in \pi о \mu a l$, supplicate, 1446. тро́ $\sigma$ тротоs, suppliant, 4 I
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \iota \lambda \dot{\prime} s$, friendly, 322
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \omega \nu \in i \nu$, address, 238,818
$\pi \rho о \sigma \chi \rho \eta \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$, require, ${ }^{1}{ }_{55} 5$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \omega \pi \pi \nu$, face, 448, 533
$\pi \rho о т р є ́ \pi т о \mu a l$, instigate, 358
$\pi \rho o u ́ \chi \omega(\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \chi \omega)$, have the vantage of, ini6
$\pi \rho о \phi$ аiр $\omega$. See 163, 395, 790 and Exc. vili
$\pi \rho \circ \phi \omega \nu \epsilon \omega$, proclaim, 223
$\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o s$, first, 33, 958 . Comp. $\pi \rho o ́-$ $\tau \in \rho o s$, former, r $_{4} ;$ sup. $\pi \rho \dot{\top} \tau \iota \sigma \tau o s$, first of all, 1439
$\pi \tau v \chi \dot{\eta}$, dell, Іо26
$\pi \tau \omega \chi$ ós, beggar, 455, 1506
$\pi v \theta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$. See I26I
$\Pi \nu \theta \dot{\omega} \nu, \Pi \nu \theta \dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon, \Pi \nu \theta_{\iota}{ }^{\prime} s, \Pi \nu \theta_{o}^{\prime} \mu \alpha \nu \tau \tau s$.
See 70, 152, 788, 965
$\pi \dot{u} \lambda \eta$, gate, door, 1244, 1261, 1294
ти́матоя. See 663
$\pi v \nu \theta a ́ v o \mu a \iota$. See $\pi \epsilon v v^{\theta} \theta \mu a \iota$
$\pi \hat{\nu}$, fire, 177,470
$\pi \nu \rho \phi o ́ \rho o s . ~ S e e ~ 27,200,206$
$\pi \hat{\omega}, \pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．See Exc．xiv
$\pi \omega \lambda \iota$ кós，drawn by colts（or ponies？）， 802．For Particles，Pronouns，\＆c．， see Exc．Xiv
${ }^{*}$ Pa．See Particles
 $\grave{\rho} \hat{\sigma} \sigma \tau, 320,983$
ја $\psi \omega \delta o s, s$, singing riddles，riddling， 391
$\dot{\rho} \in \pi \omega$ ，incline（of a balance）， 847 ． Hence $\dot{\rho} о \pi \dot{\eta}$ ，impulse，961
 $\rho \omega \gamma a, 1280$
p̀ $\eta$ ós，fit to be spoken，993．Hence äр $\rho \eta \tau о s, 466$ ．－$\dot{\eta} \mu \mu a$ ，word，speech， 355
$\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau \omega$ ，fing， 7 19，1290， 1436
р́v́о $а и$ ，rescue，72，312， $135^{2}$
$\dot{\rho} \omega \mu \eta$ ，strength（from $\dot{\rho} \omega \nu \nu v \mu), 123$ ， 1292

इá入os，surge，24．Hence $\sigma a \lambda \epsilon i \omega$ （of a vessel），rock，toss，23， 695
бavtov，$\sigma \epsilon a v \tau o u ̂ . ~ S e e ~ P r o n o u n s, ~$ Exc．xiv
бáфa，$\sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~s}$, clearly，truly，106，604， 702，846，958，1065，1117，1132， 1325．Sup．Adv．$\sigma a \phi \notin \sigma \tau a \tau a, 286$
$\sigma a \phi \dot{\eta}$ ，clear，true，390，973，ioir， 1182
$\sigma \epsilon \beta a s$, majesty， 830 ；from $\sigma \epsilon \beta \omega$ ，to worship，respect，700，886， 898. Hence $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu 0 s$ ，for $\sigma \epsilon \beta-\nu \circ \rho$ ，holy， reverend，953．See 556，$\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu$ о－ mavtเs，holy seer， 556
$\sigma \epsilon v^{\prime} \omega$ ，go forth，a．I pass．Є̇ $\sigma \sigma \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$ ， $\sigma v \theta \epsilon i s$, having departed， 446
$\sigma \eta \mu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \rho$, reporter， 957
$\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i 0 \nu, \operatorname{sign}, 7$ ІО，Іо59．$\sigma \eta \mu a i \nu \omega$ ， sive sign，declare，79，226，933， 1056
$\sigma \theta \in \dot{\nu} \omega$ ，be strons，be able， $17,1486$. $\sigma \theta \in \nu o s$, strength， 369 ．$\sigma \theta \in \nu a \rho o s$, strong， 468
$\sigma i \gamma a$ ，adv．in silence， $1212 .-\sigma \iota \gamma \dot{\eta}$ ， silence， 34 I －$-\sigma \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ，be silent， 569
$\sigma \iota \omega \pi \eta$ ，silence，1075．$\sigma \iota \omega \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ，be silent， 233
 （from $\sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \pi \tau \omega$ ），swooping
бкл $\eta \rho o ́ s$, hard，cruel， 36
бкот $\epsilon \omega$ ，regard，consider，68，\＆c．；
midd．observe，respect， 964 ；fut． $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \psi о \mu a \iota$ ，а．г $\epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \psi \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu, 584$
бофо́s，wise，484，509，563，568．－ бoфia，wisdom， 503
$\sigma \pi a ́ v i s$, want， 1461
$\sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma a \nu a$ ．See 1035
$\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a$, seed，origin， 1077,1405
$\sigma \pi o \delta o ́ s$, ash（for fire，altar）， 21
$\sigma \pi o v \delta \dot{\eta}$（from $\sigma \pi \epsilon v \dot{\delta} \omega$ ），serious care， 778
$\sigma \tau a \gamma \omega \prime v, d r o p$（from $\sigma \tau a ́ \xi \omega$ ）， 1278
$\sigma \tau a \theta \mu a ́$, stalls， 1 I 39
$\sigma \tau a \theta \mu \dot{a} \mu a l$, form a judgment，IIII
$\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \leq s \quad \gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \eta s$ ，insurrection of the tongue，i．e．altercation， 634
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \eta$ ，or plur．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma$ al，roof，dzvelling， apartment，533，637，1164，1228， 1262， 1515
$\sigma \tau \epsilon i \chi \omega, g o, 612,798,1521$
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，fetch，dispatch，860．See 198；midd．send for， 434
бтє́vaүна，groan，5．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu a \gamma \mu o ́ s$,
 groanful， 187
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \omega$ ，groan， $6_{4}$
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \omega \pi \frac{\prime}{s}$, narrow pass（ $\dot{\delta} \delta o ́ s$ ），glen， I 399
atép $\rho \omega$ ，love， 1023 ；be content，be resigned．See it and Exc．II． Hence $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \kappa \tau o ́ s$, loveable， 1338
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ ，deprive，aor．I p．$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ ， 771
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho 0 \pi \eta$ и́，lightning， 470
$\sigma \tau$ ó入os．See 169
бто́ма，mouth，specch，language，426， 671．See 706
$\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \in \phi \omega$ ，p．$\sigma \tau \rho \notin \phi о \mu a \iota$, aor．p．$\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha a_{-}$ $\phi \eta \nu, \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon i s$, tur ning aside， 728
$\sigma \tau v \gamma^{\epsilon} \omega$ ，hate， 672 ．See I296．Hence $\sigma \tau v \gamma \nu o ́ s$, usually hateful，but 673 ， full of hate，sullen
$\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \eta \prime s$, akin，kindred（adj．）， 55 I， 1082．See 814 $\tau \iota$ ovvरєข ${ }^{\prime}$ ，any kinship
$\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \beta_{0} \lambda o \nu$, sign，clue，221
бv́м $\mu a \chi o s$, ally，135，245， 274
$\sigma \dot{\prime} \mu \mu \in \tau \rho o s$, commensurate，agreeing， 11I3；within reach，84．$\sigma v \mu \mu \epsilon-$ $\tau \rho \epsilon$ є́є．See 73， 963
бvলлal乡 $\omega$ ，play with， 1 IO9
$\sigma v \mu \pi i \pi \tau \omega$ ．See II3
$\sigma \nu \mu \pi \rho \dot{\kappa} \kappa \tau \omega \rho$ óoô，fellow traveller： ${ }_{11} 6$
$\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \omega$ ，$\sigma \nu \mu \phi о \rho a ́$. See Lexicon， Note and Exc． $111{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$
$\sigma \dot{\mu} \phi \eta \mu$ ，agree， 553
бuलфитєن́ $\omega$ ，complot， 347
ov́ $\mu \phi \omega \nu 0$ ，concordant， 42 I
$\sigma v \nu \dot{d} \delta \omega$ ，conspire，agree，III3
$\sigma v \nu a \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，deal with， 11 IO， 1130. ovva入入arŋ́，intervention，visita－ tion，34， 960
oúvaunos，in unison with，II 26
Fivєє $\mu$, ，be with，consort with，attend， $275,457,863 . \quad \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu(\nu o ́ \sigma \varphi)$ ， is afficted with
$\sigma v \nu \in \pi о \mu a \iota$, accompany， 1523
бvขє́ $\rho \chi о \mu a l$, meet with， 572
$\sigma \cup \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \circ$（otкоьбь ），harboured in， 249
$\sigma \cup v \epsilon \tau o ́ s$, intelligent，all－knowins， 499
бvvєuvá §oual，sleep with， 982
ovvinuc，understand， 360,623 ；allow， 988；think， $34^{6}$
ouvvev́a，consent， 1510
बúvoioa，be azvare，be conscious，250； have knowledge，330， 704
бט́voıкоs，dwelling with，1206．ouv－ oukt $\omega$ ，dwell with， 57
бuvii日少し，concoct，scheme， 401
би́vто 0 s, brief， 7 IO ；adv．$\sigma \nu \nu \tau o ́ \mu \omega \mathrm{~s}$ ，
sharply，810
बvv $\tau v \chi \chi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ ，meet
${ }^{2} \Sigma \phi i \gamma \xi($ throttler，from $\sigma \phi i \gamma \gamma \omega)$
$\sigma \chi \in \delta o ́ v, j u s t$（adv．）
$\sigma \chi \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\eta}$ ȯoós，a cross road， 733
$\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \dot{\eta}$ ，leisure．See 434，I286
$\sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \omega$ ，save， 1180,1457
$\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ тоưцóv，my person， 643
$\sigma \omega \tau \dot{\rho} \rho$ ，saviour，48，150，304，1030；
saving（fem．），8 $\mathbf{r}$
$\sigma \omega \phi$ ро⿱ $\epsilon \in \omega$ ，be discreet， 589
Ta入ain $\omega \rho 0$ s，unhappy， 634 тá入as，do．，1211，i265， 1363,1373
${ }^{1}$ оуифора́．See 45， 99 and the notes in these places．In studying Greek writers generally，but especially in studying the dramatists，learners should beware of the not unnatural tendency to suppose that the prevalent use of a word is that which is necessa－ rily the true one in every place．Su $\mu \phi$ o $\alpha^{\prime}$ means calamity，misfortune，far oftener than anything else in Greek authors，but all scholars know that it does so only because it has the prior meaning＇event，＇＇occurrence＇（in which sense it is frequently used，and once or twice even of a joyful event，as Soph．El．1230），and because the Greek disposition to avoid ill－omened words led them to call a misfortune by the word occurrence．The Romans did the same in using＇casus，＇accident to signify calamity．A student should have in mind a clear conviction that a verbal substantive of the form $\phi \circ \rho \alpha^{\prime}, \sigma v \mu \phi \circ \rho \alpha^{\prime}$ ，is，a priori，capable of obtaining all the senses as a substantive，which its verb $\phi \in \rho \omega$ or $\phi \in \rho о \mu a l$ ， $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \dot{\rho} \rho \omega$ or $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \dot{\rho} \rho о \mu a \iota$ ，exhibits as a verb．Whether it does in extant Greek literature shew all（which is not probable），and which of them it shews in preference to others，are matters depending on various causes，and sometimes variant in different authors．If $\phi \dot{e} \rho \boldsymbol{\omega}$ （ $\phi$ ќроцає）and $\phi$ opó be thus compared in the Lexicon of Liddell and Scott，and in the Indices of different authors（as the Dramatists，the Orators，Plato and Thucydides）it will be found，for instance，that in Plato the prevalent meaning of фop $\alpha^{\prime}$ is that of motion－but that others sometimes occur，while in the Orators and Historians the senses of pay－ ment，produce，and others occur oftener than that of motion．Then let $\sigma v \mu \phi o \rho \alpha$ be compared with $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega, \sigma v \mu \phi \dot{\rho} \rho о \mu \alpha$ in the same way and it will be seen that while the literal sense＇bring together＇is the radical one，the active verb is far most often used in the sense of profiting，being expedient（see 875 ，Phil．I3I，627），while（as has been said） the prevailing use of the noun is that of＇misfortune．＇$\sum v \mu \phi$＇$\rho о \mu \alpha \iota$ usually means，to concur，agree，comply．Our inference in the two places before us is that which our notes declare．We have not the very slightest doubt that $\sigma v \mu \phi о \rho \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu \alpha, \tau \omega \nu$ is that （substantively）which $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$（in Aesch．）is as verb，－comparing counsels．
 $\tau \rho о$ поs тov̂ $\xi v \mu \phi \dot{\rho} \rho \in \sigma \theta a t$ ，what is the mode of compliance with the oracle？But we admit that the arguments for this interpretation are not so overwhelmingly conclusive as those which determine the meaning in 44－45．
${ }^{2}$ The Sphinx was a monstrous invention due to Assyrian and Aegyptian superstition． It was a huge colossal figure，having the body and claws of a lion，with a head and breast sometimes human（male or female），sometimes resembling a ram．These statues were placed before temples or palaces，and adored as guardian spirits．The Assyrian Sphinxes usually had wings．The Greeks became acquainted with them through Asia Minor，in which the coins of many cities represent this monster，and on a bas－relief of Tenos（see Overbeck，Heroische Bildw．）is shown a flying Sphinx carrying a youth in its claws．So the Sphinx which figures in the Oedipodean myth is called $\mu l \xi=\pi \alpha \rho \theta \dot{v} \nu o s$.

тарá $\sigma \omega \omega$ ，disturb， 483
$\tau$ áp $\beta$ os，fear，296．тapßé $\omega$ ，to fear， 292
тav̂pos，bull，478
$\tau а ́ \phi o s$, tomb， 1453 ；sepulture， 1447
$\tau a ́ \chi a$ ，soon，84，\＆c．тá $\chi$ ä $\nu$ ，per－ haps，I39，523，936，III6．—тá $\chi$ os， speed．— $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \dot{a} \chi \in \iota, 765, ~ 1131 .-\dot{\omega} s$ тáरos，with all speed，II54．－тa－ $\chi \dot{v} \omega$ ，hasten，${ }^{86 \mathrm{I} .-\tau \alpha \chi u ́ s, ~ s w i f t, ~}$ 6I7－I8．$\theta \hat{a} \sigma \sigma o \nu$ ，faster（adv．）， 430，sup．adj．$\tau a ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau o s, 1234^{\circ}$ adv．тá $\not \iota \tau \tau \alpha$ ，$\dot{s} \tau a ́ \chi \iota \tau \alpha$ ，as quickly as possible， 142, I429．So
 1410；ö $\sigma o \nu \tau \alpha ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha, 143^{6}$
 ing， 1279
Telpe $\begin{gathered}\text { ias，} 235,300\end{gathered}$
$\tau \epsilon ́ \kappa \nu о \nu$, child， $158, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．－$\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu 6 \omega$ ．See I2I5
$\tau \in ́ \lambda o s$. тє́ $\lambda \eta$ $\lambda u ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，bring profit．－ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in$ ，complete，perform，fulful， 252，土 330， $1443,465,797 .-p a y$ ， 232．－iount，am enrolled，222．－ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau a i ̂ o s$, last， 1528
тєрабкотоs，seer， 605
тє́p $\mu a$ ，limit，goal，I 530
$\tau \epsilon \prime \rho \pi \omega$ ，to delight．See $78_{5}-\tau \epsilon \rho \psi \iota s$ ， delight，1477
тє́ $\chi \nu \eta$ ，art，skill，profession，357， 380，\＆c．
тiөŋ $\mu \iota$ ．In O．T．only midd．a． 2 $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \eta \nu$ ．${ }^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，ye have paid， 134 ； $\dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ，appointed，1453．$\theta 0 \hat{v}$ ， 1448．$\epsilon \hat{v} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，to settle
тiкт $\omega$ ，bear，bring forth， 173,869 ， 1048．－$\dot{\eta}$ тіктоvба，$\dot{\eta}$ тєкойба， mother，1247，985，1497．－oi $\tau \epsilon \kappa \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ ，parents，999， 1 I 76
$\tau \iota \mu \dot{\prime}$, honout ，909．－$\tau \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, to honour， $5_{5}^{6} 3$ ，1202， 1223 ．－$\tau^{i} \mu$ cos，honour－ able， 895
$\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \epsilon \in$ ，avenge（with dat．）， 107 ； wreak wrath on， 140
$\tau i \omega$（or $\tau i \nu \omega$ ），pay：see 8 ro
（ $\tau \lambda \eta \mu i)$ endure，aor．$\epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \nu, \tau \lambda a i \eta \nu$ ， 602，I327
то́коs，labour（of childbirth）， 26
$\tau \dot{\tau} \mu a$ ，audacity， 125,533
тómos，place，region，II27，II34
$\tau \rho a ́ \pi \epsilon \zeta a$ ，table．See $1_{4} 6_{4}$
$\tau \rho \in \hat{\imath} s$ ，three，т $\rho \iota \pi \lambda \frac{\hat{\sigma} s, ~ \tau \rho \iota \sigma \sigma b s, ~ d o . ~}{\text { d }}$
 1399；168．тpitos，third，283， 581，1062．тpíounos，threefold slave， 1063
$\tau \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \omega$ ，tremble，947，1014
т $є$ є́ $\omega$ ，feed，murture，maintain， train，\＆c．356，\＆c．See 374，f． $\theta \rho \epsilon ́ \psi \omega$ ，a．I $\epsilon^{\prime} \theta \rho \epsilon \psi a, 323 \mathrm{~m} . \dot{\epsilon} \theta \rho \epsilon-$ $\psi a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, II43，p．pass．$\tau \epsilon \theta \rho a \mu \mu \alpha \iota$ ， 97 ；aor． 2 ，p．є́ $\tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \eta \nu$, I 23 ， I380．－т $\rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta}$ ．See 1 ：т $\rho \circ$ оós， nurse，1092
$\tau \rho \iota \beta \dot{\eta}$ ，delay， $1 \times 6$
тро́тos，manner，99；mood，ro
$\tau \cup \gamma \chi a ́ \nu \omega$, obtain（with gen．），f．$\tau \epsilon$ и́ఢo－ $\mu a \ell$ ，1519，aor． 2 єٌ $\tau v \chi o \nu, 423$ ， 677, I 435，I 450,598 ．On its use with Participles see Verbs．Exc． XIV．$\tau \dot{\chi} \chi \eta$ ，fortune，80，\＆c． See ro8o
$\tau u ́ \pi \tau \omega$ ，strike，aor． 2 p．є่ $\dot{\prime} \pi \eta \nu$
тúpaplos，sovereign，tyrant，king， 5I4，799，873，925，939，I043；as adj．588．－тupapvis，monarchy， 121，380，535，592．－$\tau v \rho a \nu \nu \epsilon ́ \omega$ ， eign，be king， 408
$\tau \cup \phi$ 人ós，blind， $37 \mathrm{I}, 389,412,454$ ， 1324，1368，I389
On Pronouns and Pronominals $\tau i s$ ， tıs，tồos，\＆c．，see Exc．XIV
${ }^{*} \uparrow \beta \rho \iota s$ ．See 873
viós，son， 4.59
úpévacos，bridal－song，wedding， 422
 $13^{2}$
úneiк $\omega$ ，yield， 625
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \xi a \iota \epsilon \in \omega$ ，put azvay secretly，hide away；aor．ن́ $\pi \epsilon \xi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \lambda o \nu, 227$
vi $\pi \epsilon \rho \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ ，excess．See 1196
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \dot{\chi} \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha \iota$, fight for， 265
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \rho \pi \tau o s$, arrogant，insolent．i $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ． o $\pi \tau \alpha$（adverbial）， 883
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \pi i, \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$, fill to excess，aor．I p． $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 779,874$
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho ф \epsilon є \rho \omega$ ，surpass， 38 ェ
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \chi o \mu a \iota$ ，steal upon，aor．$\dot{v} \pi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ \nu$ ， $3^{86}$
v̇m $\eta \rho \epsilon ́ \tau \eta s$ ，minister，$\dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ ，minis． ter to，help to stem，217
ür vos，sleep， 65
vimo $\hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$ ，endure， 1323
v̀тounos，hiding a sore（or sores）， 1396
v̈rtios，supine，81I
v̈ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho 0 \mathrm{~s}$ ，later， $50, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．
$\dot{v} \phi \epsilon \in \pi \omega$ ．See 786
$\dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \eta \dot{\prime}$ ，suggester，$\hat{\omega} \nu \dot{v} \phi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ ， on whose suggestions， 966
$\dot{v} \phi i \eta \mu \iota$ ．See 387 ．ì $\phi i$ ，having sub－ orned
$\dot{y} \psi i \pi n o v s$, sublime， 865
$\dot{v} \psi o \hat{v}$ ，aloft；$\dot{v}$ ．aí $\rho \epsilon \iota$ ，to excite，agi－ tate
$\Phi a i \nu \omega$, shew，display，midd．appear， pass．be shown，displayed，fut．a． $\phi a \nu \hat{\omega}, \mathrm{~m} . \phi a \nu 0 \hat{v} \mu a \iota$, aor．a．है $\phi \eta \nu a$ ， perf．$\pi \epsilon \in \phi \nu \nu a$ ，perf．p．$\pi \epsilon \notin \alpha \sigma \mu a \iota$, aor．I $\grave{\epsilon} \phi a ́ \nu \theta \eta \nu$ ，a． 2 є́ $\phi a ́ \nu \eta \nu$ ，fut． фади́бомає．See r32，\＆c．582，686， $737,692,838$, ェ184，743，474， 848，1063，ェ231，1383，146，336， 1437，453，457．фа⿱㇒日бós，mani－ fest， 527
фа́бкю，say，ıIо，\＆c．462，фа́ $\sigma \kappa є \nu$ for $\phi$ áбкє
фátıs，speech：oracular speech，oracle， 151，310， 1440 （the information sought from Teiresias is so called 323）；public report，495， 715
$\phi \epsilon \nu \omega$ ，kill，aor． $2 \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \phi \nu 0 \nu, 1497$
$\phi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \omega$（a verb of wide use），bring，86，
1094：bear，suffer，93，168，675， 983， $1211,1293,1320,1415:$ gain， receive，590， 764 ， 1190 ， 501 （ $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{0} \nu$ $\phi \epsilon \rho \in \tau a l):$ tend， 5 17，520， 991
 ＇́s фó $\beta o \nu$ ）：maintain or exhibit，
 658．$\pi$ oî $\gamma \hat{a} \mathrm{~S} \phi \in \rho \rho \mu a l ;$ whither am I borne？ 1309 ．The imper．$\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon$ is used as Engl．come now，ф $\epsilon$ ， $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$ ， $536,{ }_{11} 4_{2}$ ：fut．oí $\sigma \omega$ ，aor．
 afar， 13 Io
$\phi \in \dot{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ ，fly，shutn，with infin．гого，
 perf．$\pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon v \gamma a, ~ 118,356$ ，be ba－ nished，623．Hence фurí，flight， 468，exile，659，фurás，an exile， 309
$\phi \dot{\eta}_{\mu}^{\prime} \mu$（Dor．$\phi \dot{\alpha} \mu a$ ），a divine voice， oracle， 158 ．Sce $43,7^{2} 3$
$\phi \dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{c}$ ，say，362，866，1471．Its
K．OE．
forms are $\phi \hat{n} s, \phi \eta \sigma i, \phi a \sigma i, \phi \hat{\omega}, \& c$ ． f．$\phi \eta \sigma \omega$ ，imperf．$\epsilon \phi \eta \nu, \& c$ ．$\phi a i \eta \nu$
$\phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$ ，waste，fut．m．$\phi \theta \epsilon \rho \circ \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota$, 272，aor． 2 p．$\epsilon \phi \theta \dot{a} \rho \eta{ }^{1} 502$
$\phi \theta i \nu \omega$ ，pine away，waste（intrans．）， 256，666， 906 ；from another form $\phi \theta i \omega$ ，destroy，aor．I a． ${ }^{\prime} \notin \theta \iota \sigma a, 202$, I 198 ；perf．p．${ }^{\xi} \phi \theta_{\iota}-$ mal，962
$\phi \theta$ óvos，envy，382．$\phi \theta o \nu \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ ，to envy， grudge， 3 10．See 624 and Exc． viI
фìos，adj．and subst．dear，agreeable， 862，IIO3，I329，I342，1472； friend，137，233，385，522，541， 582，611，фi入тaтos，dearest，950， $\tau \grave{\alpha} \phi \grave{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\tau} a \tau a$ ，1474．See Comm． on 366
$\phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ ，inflame（trans．），192．Hence $\phi \lambda o ́ \xi$, flame， $166, \mathbf{I}^{2} 5$
$\phi o ́ \beta o s$, fear， $118, \& \mathrm{c} ., \phi \circ \beta \epsilon \omega$ ，frighten， ${ }^{236}$ ，midd．фовoüraı，to fear，227， 977，980．фоßє $o ́ s$, timid， 153
Фоїßos，Phoebus， 7 r, \＆c．
фo七สáw，roam，walk up and down， 477， 1255
фoveús，slayer，murderer，362，\＆c．

$\phi o ́ v o s$, blood（from $\phi \epsilon \nu \omega$ ），murder， 100，113，266，450，852．death， 100，I351．blood， 1278 ．фoívios， bloody，red，deadly，24，466， 1276
фра ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$＇s，stoppage，means of closing， ${ }^{1} 387$
$\phi \rho a ́ \zeta \omega$ ，explain，tell，say．See Exc． II
$\phi \rho \dot{\eta} \nu$ ，heart， 153 ；mind（also фрévєs）， 5II，528， $5^{24}, \quad 727 . \phi \rho \in \nu \in s$ ， understanding， $\mathrm{I}_{5} \mathrm{II}$ ．Hence $\phi \rho 0-$ $\nu \epsilon \in \omega$ ，knozv，have knozeledge，302， 316，326，328，462，569，1038； purpose，403，1520；consider， judse，550，552，600，617， 626. €û dpoveî̀ has two senses（1）to judge well，be right－minded （ $=\dot{\delta} \rho \theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{S} \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu)$ as in the places cited：（2）to be loyal，affectionately minded，as in 570，ro66（though with ambiguity perhaps designed）， see Aj ．49I．фpoveiv $\mu \epsilon \in \gamma a$ ，to have a proud mind．See ro7s and Comm．－$\phi$ óviots，thougght，
puspose $(=\phi \rho о ́ \nu \eta \mu a), 66_{4}$ ．－фоо́vь－ pos，wise，rational，692．－фроутis， thought，67，170， 1390
фрі́кт，horror， 1306
ф $\rho$ ov $\rho \in \epsilon$ ，guard，I 479
$\phi \nu \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ ，guard，keep in store， 382. Hence фú $\lambda a \xi$ ，guardian，I 418
$\phi \hat{v} \lambda o \nu$ ．See 19
$\phi \dot{\omega} \omega$, engender，beget， $43^{6}, 43^{8}$ ，IOI 9 ， 1404．Aor．（from form in $\mu c$ ） $\epsilon \notin \phi \nu$ ．See 9 and Comm．435， $440,458,587,593,601,627,822$ ， IOI5，II84， $1359, ~ 1363, ~ 1365$. Hence $\phi \dot{\sigma} \iota s$ ，nature，335，674， 869 ；stature， 740 ．фvтєv́ $\omega$ ，en－ gender，793，873，1404， 1504 ． beget， 15 I4．oi $\phi \cup \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s, p a$－ rents，Ioō，roiz．－фutoupरós， who begat， $\mathrm{I}_{4} 82$ ，tô̂ фutovpүoû тat $\rho$ ós
$\Phi \omega \kappa i s$, Phocis，N．W．of Boeotia
$\phi \omega \nu \epsilon ́ \omega$ ，speak（aloud），10，72，II2I． фஸ́v $\quad \mu a$ ，speech， 324
$\phi \hat{\omega} s$（contr．fr．фáos），light， 375 ， II83，1229， 1428

Xaipu，rejoice，roђo．See ov̉ rı xai－ $\rho \omega \nu, 363 ; \nu \hat{v} \nu \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \chi \alpha i \rho \omega, 596$
$\chi$ á入aگa，hail．See 1279
$\chi$ ápıs，gratitude，grateful return， favour，232，764，1004．тןòs $\chi$ ápıv，graciously，to oblige，II52， єis $\chi$ á $\rho \iota \nu$ ，thankworthy．－$\chi$ á $\rho \iota \nu$, used as a prepos．with gen．for the sake of，147，888
$\chi \in \iota \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ ，afflict， ，о
$\chi \in \iota \mu \omega \dot{\nu}$ ，winter， $\operatorname{II} 88$
$\chi \in i \rho$ ，hand．$\chi \in t \rho i$ ，with the strong hand，ェо7．See 140，$\chi \in \rho$ í， 1510.
 $\chi \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu, 213 ; \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{\omega} \nu, 1022,1400$ ， $\chi \epsilon ́ \rho a s$, II54，1481，$\chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i, 348$ and five times more．－$\chi \in i \rho \omega \mu a$ ，act of violence， 560 ．$\chi є \iota \rho$ о́бєєктоs，finger－ pointed，901．$\chi$ є́ $\rho \nu \iota \psi$ ，lustral water， 240
$\chi$ є́ $\rho \sigma$ os，barren， 1502
$\chi \eta \rho \epsilon$ úe，wander alone，be solitary， 479
$\chi \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, earth，25，172．land，97，

230， $736,795,939,1178,1290$.
$\chi$ Өo $0 \sigma \tau \iota \beta$＇s，treading earth，earth－
$l y, 501$
$\chi \lambda \iota \delta \eta^{\prime}$ ，luxury，pride， 888
$\chi$ до́́ŋの．See 742
Хорєи́ш．See 896
$\chi \rho a i v \omega$ ，pollute， 822
$\chi \rho \dot{a} \omega$ ，prophesy．See 604，$\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi \rho \eta \sigma$－ $\theta$ évтa，the prophecies；$\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu o ́ s$, oracle，7II，797．хр $\quad \sigma \mu \varphi \delta$ ós， singing riddles，I 199
хрєía，need，desire， $725,1174,1435$ ， I 443
$\chi \rho$ є́os，object，thing， 157
$\chi \rho \in \omega \dot{\omega} \nu(=\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ in О．T．$), 633,1_{4} 88$ ， ${ }^{1502}$
$\chi \rho \eta^{\prime}$ ，it behoves（must），235，342，669， 823，IIIo．imperf．є $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu, \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ ， $\mathrm{II}_{4}$ ，opt．$\chi \rho \in i \eta, 555,791$ ，infin． хрทิขaย， 854,995
$\chi \rho \eta \dot{\jmath} \omega$ ，desire，require（as a needful thing），9r， $365,595,622,655$ ，
 who have need of thee， 1076 ，от ôa $\chi \rho \eta \eta \zeta \epsilon \iota$ ，whatsoever will（or must）
хрฑ̂ua，thing，business，II29，
$\chi \rho v ่ \sigma \epsilon o s$, golden，from $\chi \rho v \sigma o$ ós，gold， $\chi \rho v \sigma \dot{\eta} \lambda a \tau o s$, gold－zurought， 1268 ； $\chi \rho v \sigma o \mu i \tau \rho \eta s$ ，having golden tur－ ban．$\chi \rho v \sigma o ́ \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi$ os，gold－twisted， gold－spun， 203
$\chi \rho \hat{\omega} \mu a \iota(\chi \rho a ́ o \mu a \imath), u s e, 8_{73}(\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota)$ ，
 873．хрךбтós，serviceable，vir－ tuous，610
$\chi \omega \dot{\rho} \alpha$ ，land，14，97，911，1418
$\chi \omega \rho \epsilon \in \omega$ ，proceed，go，6i9， 750
$\chi \omega \rho i s$ ，without，apart，608， 1463
$\chi \hat{\omega} \rho o s$, spot，place，732，798，I 126
$\Psi a v i \omega$, touch， 1467 ，of＇taking to eat，＇$I_{4}{ }^{6} 5$
$\psi \epsilon \gamma \omega$ ，blame， $33^{8}$
$\psi \hat{\eta} \phi$ os，vote（lit．＇pebble＇）， 607
$\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$, soul，64，666，727；iife，94， 894
$\hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon, \dot{\omega} s, \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \& c$ ．See Pronomi－ nal Particles
${ }^{*} \Omega \rho a$ ，season， $1_{5} 6,467$


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In casual reading I light upon the following passage in Xen. Cyr. III.
     $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ठ $\tau \iota \gamma \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \circ$. Here are two constructions, the former exactly the same as that for which I argue in Oed. and El., fut. opt. ' $\rho$ oi $\eta$ after past verb and indirect question : the latter, imperf. opt. after the same antecedence: Cyrus was very eager to hear what Tigranes would say, and briskly bade him state what his opinion was. This is normal Greek, and

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ In his note on $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \gamma \epsilon$ \aîov $\phi \dot{b} \nu o \nu$ Prof. Jebb condemns both variations, $\sigma \dot{c} \nu \gamma \epsilon$ and $\tau o ́ \nu \delta \epsilon$. His statement of Jocasta's argument I need not cite, having little or no fault to find with it. He goes on: "This fine and subtle passage is (to my apprehension) utterly defaced by the conjecture $\sigma o{ }^{\prime} \nu$ $\gamma \epsilon$ Laîou фóvov (Bothe), it cannot be shown that your slaying of Laius fulfils the oracle. Herm. reads" (with $\Gamma$ ) "tóv $\delta \epsilon$, 'this slaying' (of which you think yourself guilty): but the $\gamma \epsilon$ is needed." I agree with Prof. Jebb in preferring $\tau o ́ \nu \gamma \epsilon$ as more refined than $\sigma o ́ \nu \gamma \epsilon$, but he does not convince me that $\tau^{\prime} \nu \delta \epsilon$ (such a death as you describe) is inadmissible, much less that it is 'nihili'. Why he says 'the $\gamma \epsilon$ is needed' I should have been glad to hear, my own feeling being quite opposite. In fact $\tau \dot{\prime} \nu \gamma \epsilon$ succeeded by $\ddot{o}^{\circ} \nu \gamma \epsilon$ (the latter manifestly needed, the former, to my apprehension, not at all) was always an offence to me. I now therefore incline to the diorthotic correction in $\Gamma$, endorsed by Hermann.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Briefly, the facts are: Cod. L has $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma$ ' written over an erasure, and also written by another hand in the margin, which proves that some reading was earlier in L than $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma^{\prime}$. And that this was $\tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime}$ appears certain from the fact that $\Gamma$, the most valuable copy of $L$, reads $\tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime}$ with $\sigma \dot{v}$ above $\tau \dot{\alpha} . \quad$ Par. B has $\tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime}$ only, and Par. E has $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ above $\sigma \dot{v}$ in $\sigma \dot{v} \gamma^{\prime}$. These facts ought in common justice to have been stated by Prof. Jebb.

[^3]:    214．$\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu a \chi o \nu$ abest a codicibus．Cf．Lect．221．Cod．L．aivíó．Cf．Lect．

[^4]:    248．Codd．ä uotpov． 270 ．Omnes fere codd．$\gamma \eta \nu$ ．

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ My note here ( 1 ) states that oi $\sigma \theta^{\prime}$ ws $\pi$ oingov is an idiomatic construction: (2) states the syntactic form out of which it grows: (3) states the equivalent English idiom: (4) gives various examples. This is all that can be done. Nobody can tell how a Greek who used this idiom felt about its component parts, any more than it can be told how a person saying 'please come back soon' feels about the construction of please, and its colloquial variations. English grammarians know and explain all such matters. The construc-
     oî $\sigma \theta^{\prime}$ ô $\delta \rho \hat{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \iota \beta o u ́ \lambda o \mu a \iota(S u p p l .932)$ are normally grammatical, and need no special explanation. See Kühner, Gr. Gr. II. 204. 6, who illustrates the idiom here from some forms in Alt- and Mittel-Hoch-Deutsch. Plautus, Rud. III. 5, I8. imitating Greek, has 'tange, sed scin quomodo,' indicating the syntactic analysis.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Of these choreutai, it is probable that half the total number, if not three-fourths, were youths fit to act female parts. For of the 33 tragic dramas extant (including the Satyric Cyclops and the spurious Rhesus), 21 have a female chorus, 12 only a male, namely, of Aesch. the Ag. and Pers.; of Soph. the Oed. T., Oed. C., Ant., Aj., Phil.; of Eurip. the Alc., Heracl., Herc. F., Rhes., Cycl. In the Eumen. a second (male) chorus expels the Furies at the close. This proves that the dancing of women was preferred to that of men in ancient days as much as it is in modern times. It may be here noted that the comic chorus was of 24 . In two plays of Aristoph. it is female, Thesmophor. and Eccles. In Lysistrata is a double chorus, one male, one female.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~K} . \mathrm{O}$. Müller (Eumen. $9 \mathbf{1}$ \&c. transl.) cites nine instances of the use of the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ $\kappa u ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ in extant tragedy. Among these he ranks the appearance of the blind and bleeding Oedipus at 1297. But there seems no reason to ascribe this to the use of machinery. It is enough to suppose that two attendants, summoned by his cries (1287), lead him forth through the central door to the $\lambda o \gamma \in i o \nu$, and stand near to protect him while he converses with the chorus.

[^8]:     $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i}$. This is perhaps superfluous refinement. *A $\nu$ with a past indic. always points to a protasis expressed or (as at $3^{18}$ ) understood. But with opt. infin. and part. I think it often conveys no more than that vague conditionality or doubttul shade which in English is implied by using should for shall and would for will. See note on 523 .

[^9]:    ${ }^{2}$ Let readers count the various senses and shades of meaning in which the word case is used, and say whether a play-gning Londoner would have any difficulty in recognising each when he heard it in the theatre.

[^10]:    ${ }^{3}$ My friend Shilleto declared his agreement with me as to the meaning of $\tau \dot{a}$ s $\xi \nu \mu \phi \quad \rho a ̀ s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta o u \lambda \epsilon \nu \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$. So far as he did notice this place, I cannot claim his support

[^11]:    'I take these two verses with the whole context from v. 35 , and not merely as a comment on the immediately preceding words, $\epsilon^{i \prime} \tau^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} \pi r^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ o i \sigma \theta \alpha^{\prime} \pi o v . '$

[^12]:    4 I regret that J . has not abstained from repeating so baseless an objection as thisthat 'the general spirit and tone of the speech appear adverse' to my view, because we cannot 'imagine the priest giving his peerless sovereign so strong a hint to consult other men.' If there be such a 'strong hint', surely it lies in the words $\epsilon \ddot{\boldsymbol{i} \tau}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{a}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ o i \sigma \theta \dot{\alpha}$ $\pi o v$, not in the laudatory apology which I find in 44,45 . And all that follows to the end of the speech mingles respectful admonition with entreaty: see 47-50, 54-57. But 'strong hint' is a misapplied phrase.

[^13]:     à $\nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ \epsilon i \delta o ́ \tau a$, there might have been some shade of reason for calling the second clause ' $a$ strong hint' to consult another man; but by writing oi $\sigma \theta a$, which supposes the knowledge already possessed, the skilful poet, avoiding this objection, enables Oed. to say that 'the divine voice' is already sought, and that, for the purpose of seeking it, he has already conferred with another man, viz. his kinsman Creon. Thus, as I have said, vv. 43-45 become an important link in the plot of the drama; otherwise they would have been superfluous and merely obstructive.

[^14]:     (not to call them thy) griefs. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\alpha}$ кака́, those same secrets in their import for Oedipus. We might render $\boldsymbol{\omega} \dot{s} \dot{a} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ eit $\pi \omega \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma^{\prime}$ either (i) as above, or (ii) "in order that I may not utter thy griefs." But (i) is preferable for these reasons: ( i ) the subjunct.
    
    

[^15]:    'Yet the fact that $\pi \rho o \phi a i v e c \nu$ was thus a vox sollennis for oracular utterance would not suffice to warrant the adoption of $\pi \rho \circ \stackrel{v}{ } \phi \eta \nu \in \nu$, if the $\pi \rho o i \phi a^{\prime} \nu \eta$ of the MSS. seemed defensible. $\pi \rho o u ́ \phi \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \eta \lambda \epsilon ́ y \omega \nu$ would mean "came into view telling". Cf. above, 395, and El.
     appearance of a beacon (cp. ò фрvктòs á $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu \pi \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota$, Ag. 30); but, in reference to the god speaking through the oracle, it could only mean by a strained metaphor, "flashed on $m e$ with the message", i.e. announced it with startling suddenness and clearness. The difficulty of conceiving Sophocles to have written thus is to me so great, that the special appropriateness of $\pi \rho \circ$ й $\phi \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$ turns the scale.'

[^16]:    'Lucian once uses the verb $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ with a dative, Astrol. 20 (where he is imitating an Ionic style), .. غ̇ $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \epsilon \psi a \nu$ (looked favourably upon); Plutarch (Caes. 2) has roís $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \circ \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \iota \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, "eyeing the money" (covetously), but that proves nothing for $\dot{e} \pi \iota \beta \lambda \dot{e} \pi \omega[?]$. è $\pi \iota \beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ usually takes either ( $a$ ) an accus. with preposition of an object
     Deinarch. Or. i. $\S_{i 2}$; or (b) a simple acc. of a thing which one mentally considers: as,
     warranted, then, in rendering, "Not looking jealously on the prosperity ( $\zeta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega$, or as Prof. Kennedy translates it, the aspiring hopes) and fortunes of the citizens'?'

[^17]:    1 I am strengthened in this view by the following words of Schiller in his Correspondence with Göthe, Vol. I. p. 385: 'I have been trying to-day to find a material for tragedy resembling that of the Oedipus Rex, and offering to a poet the same advantages. These are immense, even if confined to one only-that a long and complicated action, out of harmony with tragic form, may be made the foundation of a drama, because it is already past, and lies altogether outside of the drama itself.'

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ The pronominal forms $\dot{\epsilon}$, ovi, oi, $\mu(\nu, \nu \iota \nu)$-with those of the 2nd and 3 rd persons that begin with the letters $\sigma \phi$-cause great perplexity for these reasons: (I) the usages of Homer, Herodotus, and Attic writers differ in regard to them, and Attic authors differ from each other: (2) some of them have a twofold use, as reflexive, and as objectively personal. As yet we have nowhere found them thoroughly sifted. Confining ourselves here to the Reflexive forms in Soph., óv (for $\dot{\epsilon} a v \tau o \hat{v}$ ) appears only as above, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\phi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ (for éautóv) only twice, as above, and Trach. 166. Personally, it occurs in sing. sixteen times
     but, as it seems to us, wrongly. Homer has one instance of $\sigma \phi e$ plur. as reflexive: 11 . xix. 265.

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E} \tau \in \rho o s$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o s$ differ as their Latin cognates alter，alius：the former meaning， ＇one（or the other）of two，＇the latter＇another．＇But in Oed．T．＂́тєpos occurs once only＇
    
     cp． $63,375,589,704,1023, \& \mathrm{c} . ;$（2）in correlation with a second $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ os or some cognate，
    
    
    

