Aesop's butcher charge more for the meat of sacrificial victims than for that of non-sacrificial animals?

It is, of course, the case that customs varied from place to place and from one period of time to another. If one could state with some degree of certainty what the *archetypus vulgaris* actually read, one could

proceed with greater confidence. As the case stands, however, the problem of the sale of sacrificial meats still awaits its proper solution.

M. ISENBERG

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SENECA *MEDEA* 556–57

Medea vermag nicht, Jason zur gemeinsamen Flucht zu überreden. Er versucht vielmehr, sie abzuschieben und bietet ihr jedes gewünschte *solamen* zu ihrer Flucht an (539). Als Medea darauf ihre Kinder fordert und Jason gerade dies ausdrücklich verweigert, erkennt sie, wo er zu treffen ist, und kann nun einen versöhnlicheren Ton vortäuschen:

> MED.   . . . voce iam extrema peto,
> ne, si qua noster dubius effudit dolor,
> 555   maneant in animo verba: melioris tibi
> memoria nostri sedeat; haec irae data
> oblitterentur. IAS. Omnia ex animo expuli
> precorque et ipse, fervidam ut mentem regas
> placideque tractes: miserias lenit quies.
> 560   MED. Discessit. itane est? vadis oblitus mei
> et tot meorum facinorum? excidimus tibi?
> numquam excidemus . . .

Er soll also ihre durch den Schmerz verzerrten Reden vergessen und ein besseres Anden-

ken an sie bewahren. Mit "haec irae data [*sc.* verba] oblitterentur" wiese Medea über ihre Person auf ihre Worte zurück, was erstens ein *illa* fordern würde, da ihre Worte ja vergessen sein sollen und daher als weit zurückliegend gekennzeichnet werden müssen (vgl. *si qua . . . verba*, "wenn jemals"), während *haec* auf die Medea weist, die gerade von sich selbst spricht; zweitens würde das Verständnis von *haec irae data* als "vom Zorn eingegebene Worte"[1] einen im Lateinischen unbekannten *dativus causae* fordern. Der Änderung von *irae* in *ira* (was neben *data* fast Kakophonie wäre) ist die von *oblitterentur* in *oblitteretur* [*sc. Medea*] nicht nur aus den gennanten Gründen vorzuziehen, sondern auch, weil Medea selbst den Erfolg ihrer Bitten mit einem verhalten triumphierenden *oblitus mei* quittiert.

HERMANN FUNKE

UNIVERSITÄT MANNHEIM

1. So die *communis opinio* der Übersetzer: z.B. F. J. Miller (London, 1917), L. Herrmann (Paris, 1924), T. Thomann (Zürich, 1961). Die Übersetzung "dies sei meinem Zorn zugut gerechnet" (M. Schmitt-Hartlieb, Tübingen, 1929) würde eine sonst im Lateinischen nicht belegte Übertragung der Junktur "aliquid precibus, famae, consanguinitati, etc.

dare" ("zuliebe tun") auf Appellativa der Gemütsbewegung fordern, was mit Ausdrücken wie (*con*)*donare*, *concedere*, (*at*)*tribuere* wiedergegeben wird. Im übrigen verbiete sich jene Auffassung, weil *verba dare* zu Senecas Zeit auf die Bedeutung "leere Worte machen, täuschen" festgelegt ist (*TLL*, *s.v. do*, 1675. 11 ff.); so z.B. Sen. *Thyest.* 1056 f.

A NOTE ON HELLENISTIC ORTHOGRAPHY

I. Ποιέω in *IG* II². 774

For most texts, scholars are not able to consult originals but must depend on editors. An instance where editors can be shown to have erred and the Athenian scribe can be shown to have been consistent is therefore worth recording.

IG II². 774 is an Athenian decree, non-stoikhedon, and certainly of *s. III a.* It has

been dated 253/52 B.C. most recently by W. K. Pritchett–B. D. Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), pages xxi and 99. For the present study, however, the precise year is immaterial and details of the orthography are the sole concern.

The first fragments to be published (by U. Koehler, *Hermes*, V [1871], 3–4) were the present Fragment *b*, lines 1–24, which comes from the left side; and Fragment *c*, lines

9–22, which comes from the right side. Koehler emphasizes the dimness of the letters, and, though he does not actually say so, doubtless his readings of the text were made from the stone itself. His edition contains three minor discrepancies, irrelevant here, between the majuscule copy and the minuscule transcription. Of more importance are the forms of the verb ποιέω, which occurs in lines 7, 12, 16, and 20. Koehler read:

	COPY	TRANSCRIPTION
line 7	ΠΟΙΗΣΑ	ποιήσα[σθαι]
line 12	ΠΟ	πο[ιούμενος]
line 16	ΠΟΙ·Σ·ΣΟΛ	ποιήσασθα[ι]
line 20	ΕΠ·Ι·ΣΑΤΟ	ἐπ[ο]ι·[ή]σατο

For the text in *IG* II. 161, Koehler evidently re-examined the inscription. Again he published a transcription-copy, which serves as a control for the majuscule text. From a squeeze or from the stone, Koehler corrected the three discrepancies of the *Hermes* edition. He read and restored the two forms of ποιέω in lines 7 and 12 as before, each containing iota. In lines 16 and 20, however, Koehler now read:

	COPY	TRANSCRIPTION
line 16	ΠΟΗΣ·ΣΟΛ	ποήσ[α]σθα[ι]
line 20	ΕΠ///Ι/ΣΑΤΟ	ἐπ[οή]σατο

Koehler does not mention any of these forms in the *variae lectiones:* without notice to the reader, he changed the text in both lines by omitting the iota.

The most recent (1912) edition is J. Kirchner, *IG* II². 774 (where Fragment *a* is added). Kirchner states that he had a squeeze. His text of Fragments *b* and *c* is not a copy of *IG* II: there are improvements, some substantial, in the readings of all the lines except 1, 3, 5, and 24. In lines 7 and 12, Kirchner accepted Koehler's text, i.e., he read and restored forms of ποιέω with iota. He also followed Koehler for the other two instances of ποιέω and omitted the iota:

line 16	ποήσασθα[ι]
line 20	ἐπ[ο]ήσατο

1. Professor S. Dow kindly gave me access to his squeezes with which I was able to compare (and contrast) the published readings.

K. Meisterhans–E. Schwyzer, *Grammatik*³, do not mention *IG* II². 774. W. Lademann, *De titulis Atticis* (Kirchhain, 1915), page 35, refers to Kirchner's readings in lines 16 and 20 as examples *med. s. III a.* of ποιέω without iota (he does not cite the forms in lines 7 and 12).

Thus the *textus receptus* contains two spellings of ποιέω, with iota in lines 7 and 12, and without iota in lines 16 and 20.

A better than adequate squeeze has been made available to me.[1] Though in many instances dim, most of the letters, including the ones relevant for this study, can be made out with certainty. The occurrences of ποιέω are as follows:

line 7	ποιήσα[σθαι]
line 12	πο[ιού]μενος
line 16	ποιήσασθα[ι]
line 20	ἐπ[ο]ι·[ή]σατο

The readings of ποιέω with iota in lines 7, 16, and 20 are positive. Spacing determines that the iota was inscribed in line 12, as well. Correct in his first edition, the usually reliable Koehler strayed into error. As for Kirchner, his mistakes were due to insufficient attention. Surely, better grammars of Attic inscriptions are needed, since all too often original texts were not checked and previous errors were copied.

II. Ποιέω in Third-Century Athenian Inscriptions

It has long been established in grammars of Attic inscriptions that the iota in ποιέω, a barely discernible glide, is movable before an *e*-sound, but never before an *o*-sound.[2] According to Meisterhans–Schwyzer, *Grammatik*³, page 57, this practice occurs most often in *s. IV a.* and disappears almost entirely by the Roman period. Lademann, *De titulis Atticis*, page 35, emphasizes that there was a *usus duplex* in the spelling of ποιέω until *init. s. II. a.* Excepting substantives derived from ποιέω, and excepting artists' signatures, he counted seventy-six

2. In the remainder of this note, therefore, only those instances of ποιέω are cited where the iota is movable.

instances in Attic inscriptions down to *circa* 100 B.C. where forms of the verb are spelled with iota and forty-nine instances where they are spelled without it.

Having now corrected the two iota-less readings that Kirchner printed in *IG* II². 774, I was curious to see how many, if any, published Athenian decrees from *s. III a.* (the century of *IG* II². 774) reveal occurrences of ποιέω without iota. Of the fourteen spellings of ποιέω that I found in the decrees (excluding restorations and substantives derived from the verb, but including the readings in lines 7, 16, and 20 of *IG* II². 774), twelve

were with iota and significantly only two were without iota.

IG II². 774, therefore, like most published Athenian decrees from *s. III. a.*, maintains a scribal consistency in the spelling of forms of ποιέω. The large majority of Athenian inscriptions in this category constitutes an important exception to the *usus duplex* that Lademann detected in his over-all survey of Attic inscriptions and their spellings of ποιέω.

BLAISE NAGY

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, BOSTON

AESCHYLUS *AGAMEMNON* 513-14

τούς τ᾽ ἀγωνίους θεούς | πάντας προσαυδῶ

None of the interpretations offered of the expression ἀγώνιοι θεοί in this passage is wholly satisfactory. Denniston and Page[1] list three interpretations and object to all of them. They finally decide in favor of "gods of the Assembly" (ἀγών occurs with its Homeric sense in line 845), though they admit Fraenkel's objection that passages in the *Supplices*[2] make this meaning most improbable. Fraenkel himself[3] adopts the meaning "gods *in* assembly," i.e., the assembled gods. This fits the *Supplices* passages, since there the gods' images are assembled on the πάγος. In the *Agamemnon*, however, they are not assembled in view, nor are we supposed to imagine their images present.[4] With Fraenkel's interpretation, then, we should apparently have to take "assembled" as meaning "if they were assembled," or simply "all" the gods. But this would then make πάντας redundant—and the fact that this is poetry does not really excuse the pleonasm.

There is, however, another possible meaning, which may have been dismissed too

hastily. In the passages elsewhere in which the meaning of ἀγώνιος is quite certain, it can only mean "concerned with the ἀγῶνες," in the sense of "games" or "contests." Thus Pindar describes Hermes as ἀγώνιος in this context,[5] and when the adjective does not refer to a god it refers to prizes in the games.[6] The same meaning is clear in Plato *Laws* 783A, as it is in Sophocles *Trachiniae* 26. This is why most ancient commentators explained our passage as "the gods presiding over the games." But the word ἀγών, like our "contest," was ambiguous in another respect: it could mean "contest," but it could also be used as a metaphor for "battle." There is one example of this use in classical tragedy. In Sophocles *Trachiniae* 26, Ζεὺς ἀγώνιος decides the outcome of the contest between Acheloüs and Heracles, but this is an ἀγὼν μάχης (*Trach.* 20). The metaphor is common elsewhere.[7] This secondary meaning of ἀγών has been generally overlooked by commentators,[8] but that is not surprising, as there was at least one occasion in ancient times when it was similarly overlooked.

1. *Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1957), p. 119.
2. Especially *Supp.* 189.
3. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, II (Oxford, 1950), 260–63.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 262.
5. *Isthm.* 1. 60.
6. *Isthm.* 4. 7; cf. also *Ol.* 10. 63.
7. For other battle ἀγῶνες see Hdt. 8. 3. 2, 142. 2, *et al.;* Thuc. 2. 89. 8, *et al.*

8. One exception is Fraenkel, who describes this interpretation as "obviously arbitrary" and attributes it to Hermann. But Hermann says "Dii ἀγώνιοι proprie sunt gubernatores certaminum . . . ideo potissimum invocantur, ut victoriam praebeant"—the meaning as in, e.g., *Trach.* 26.