## TWO PHILOLOGICAL NOTES

HEATHER WHITE
Classics Research Centre (London)[*]

Because of editorial interference beyond my control, two sentences not written by me crept into the printed text of my reviews published in *Sic. Gymn.* 2001, p. 527ff.

On p. 528, the interpolated sentence beginning with "Nevertheless" and ending "actual in Homer" must be disregarded, insofar as it is mistaken. The previous sentence, written by me, makes it clear that Matthews has unreservedly accepted Giangrande' s demonstration to the effect that the ancients, including Antimachus, believed Doric forms to be well attested in Homer: what modern glottologists[1] think is of course irrelevant to the issue dealt with by me.

On p.530, the sentence beginning with "Textual alteration is warranted", and ending with "in apparatus criticus" is spurious, and must be disregarded. What I wrote (and was arbitrarily altered without my permission) is "Textual alteration is **not** warranted", because Diggle's conjecture is metrically uncalled-for and, to boot, textwidrig. I take this opportunity of dilating upon the matter, in order to throw light on Euripides' versification and on Diggle's failure to understand it. The text of the fragment, which is περὶ πολιτείας according to Stobaeus, is as follows:

> ἐν τοῖσι μώροις τοῦτ᾽ ἐγὼ κρίνω βροτῶν,
> ὅστις τῶν πατέρων παισὶ μὴ φρονοῦσιν εὖ
> ἢ καὶ πολίταις παραδίδωσ᾽ ἐξουσίαν.
> (Nauck, fragm. 784)

As regards the metre, the text is sound. Every competently trained undergraduate knows that Euripides, in his versification, displays great metrical "freedom" in the use of "trisyllabic feet" (cf. A.E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, p. 373) and that his lines contain many metrical *unica* or rarities (cf. -I note at random - Paley *ad loc*. 105, *Iph. Taur.* 961, *Med.* 1396, etc.), amongst which the employment of a dactyl in the fifth foot (cf. J.W. White, *The Verse of*

---

[*] **Dirección para correspondencia:** Heather White. 30C, Bethune Road, London N 16 5BD (England).

[1] It is crucial to remember that (cf. Gow, *Theocr.*, vol. II, p. 51), whenever Hellenistic poets imitate Homer's diction, the question is less what Homer wrote according to modern scholars than what the Hellenistic poets in question believed him to have written.

*Greek Comedy*, London 1912, p.42, note 1). What anybody who, like Diggle, aspires to edit Euripides should know is that this poet employed a dactyl in the second position at fragm. Nauck 1110, 2:

καὶ τέλος αὐτὸς ἔχει

This fragment is ascribed to Euripides, as everybody knows, by the scholiast on Aristides. The dactyl in the first foot, of course, does not present any problem; however, solely[2] because of the dactyl in the second foot certain scholars (cf. Nauck' s apparatus *ad loc*., and van Looy-Jouan, *Euripides, Tragédies, Fragm. des drames non identifiés*, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2003, p.115) saw themselves compelled to gratuitously contradict the scholiast (cf. van Looy-Jouan *ad loc*.), whilst Hartung, who knew Euripides' style better than most, rightly perceived that Euripides could well, in the fragment in question, have used a dactyl in the second foot[3]. Hartung is -what Diggle and those who uncritically follow him have not comprehended - fully vindicated by the dactyl in the second foot attested in Nauck, fragm. 784, 2.

As regards the sense, the words τῶν πατέρων give an impeccable contextual meaning. The sense is: "I judge this amongst men's follies, if anybody who is a father[4] hands over political power (ἐξουσίαν) to his children who are not in their senses, or in any other of the further possible circumstances (ἢ καί) to the citizens". The conjecture by Diggle forces into the text the notion of πατρῷα, "patrimony", which has nothing to do with πολιτεία and political power. The particles ἢ καί cannot mean, because of the context, "or especially", as Diggle is constrained to surmise, and it is significant that van Looy-Jouan, who in their Budé edition accept Diggle's conjecture are consequently obliged to eliminate καί from their translation ("ou qui accorde les pleins pouvoirs...".

What Euripides means in the fragment is that, in the days of hereditary power, a tyrant who is a father is stupid in handing over political power

---

[2] Cf. e.g. White, *op.cit*., p. 469: "editors" are too "often disposed to emend merely for metrical reasons".

[3] The influence of Comedy (dactyl in the fifth foot at *Iph. Aul*. 1623, division - U / U in the second dactyl at Nauck, fr. 1110,2) is obvious: cf. White, *op. cit*. p. 42-43. An indisputable anapaest in the second position is attested, *comicorum more,* in Eurip. fr. 813,3 Nauck (Hense arbitrarily altered the anapaest into a tribrach); another anapaest in the second position (obliterated by Xylander: for such procedures cf. Nauck's apparatus *ad* Soph., fragm. 610) occurs in Eur., fr. 984 Nauck. Similarly, a spondee in the fourth position is found at least twice in Euripides (fr. 852,3 Nauck and fr. 1132, 31 Nauck). Such cardinal peculiarities attested in Euripides' versification (a complete list would be too long) are unknown to Diggle.

[4] Grotius got the sense right, by conjecturing πατὴρ ὤν.

(ἐξουσίαν) to his children if they are mad, or in any other of the further possible circumstances (ἢ καί: cf. Denniston, *Gr. Part.* p.306) to the citizens. In sum: what the speaker says is that the tyrant who is a father must not hand over power either to his children, if they are mad, or, in any other of the further possible circumstances (i.e. if his children are not mad, and are entitled as such to inherit his power, or if he becomes converted to democracy as opposed to hereditary power, etc.), to the citizens.