

ποθ' ἢ διάνοια τῶν Ἀθηναίων τῶν τότε ταῦτα ποιοῦντων, ἢ τί τὸ ἀξίωμα; 'What was the intention of those Athenians when they did this, what was the purpose?' In view of this the most natural way to understand *Ba.* 877–8 is to take *τί τὸ σοφόν* and *ἢ τί τὸ κάλλιον* as repeated constituents with *παρὰ θεῶν γέρας ἐν βροτοῖς* shared by both. The lines then mean: 'What is the wise, what is the better gift of the gods among men?' When *σοφόν* is taken as an adjective with *γέρας*, its normal meaning in the play, 'wise' when used by the chorus, is preserved. Furthermore, *τὸ σοφόν* without a noun then everywhere in the play has the meaning 'cleverness'.

In line 879 a different problem arises. As has been repeatedly observed, the clause *ἢ χεῖρ' ὑπὲρ κορυφᾶς τῶν ἐχθρῶν κρείσσω κατέχειν* cannot be construed with *τὸ κάλλιον . . . γέρας*. The sequence article, comparative adjective, noun does not occur in Greek with a comparative construction, either a genitive or an ἢ clause. By far the best remedy here is to read ἢ with Blake and Roux. This makes 879–80 an independent question: 'Is it to hold a stronger hand over the heads of enemies?' The correction is minimal. Substitution of ἢ for ἦ is common in the manuscripts and the correction of ἦ to ἢ is routinely accepted elsewhere in Euripides.¹⁶ Dodds' metrical argument in favor of deleting the second τὸ¹⁷ has been convincingly refuted by Winnington-Ingram.¹⁸ The deletion is furthermore unacceptable because it destroys the parallelism of the alternative questions.

Line 881 implicitly answers the question of 879–80 in the negative. Power over one's enemies is not *τὸ καλόν*. To find out what is meant by *τὸ κάλλιον γέρας* and *τὸ καλόν* we must look elsewhere in the play. An explanation is given in two places. The first statement is made at 1007–10. The chorus has just rejected *τὸ σοφόν* in 1005 and claims to be striving for *τὰ καλά* in 1007. The *καλά* are explained in 1007–10: *βίον ἡμαρὲς νύκτα τ' εὐαγοῦντ' εὐσεβεῖν, τὰ τ' ἔξω νόμιμα δίκας ἐκβαλόντα τιμᾶν θεούς*, 'Leading a pure life night and day show respect and rejecting practices outside of justice honour the gods'. An even more explicit statement, which verbally echoes both the *σοφόν* and *κάλλιον* of 877, is made at 1150–2: *τὸ σωφρονεῖν δὲ καὶ σέβειν τὰ τῶν θεῶν κάλλιστον· οἶμαι δ' αὐτὸ καὶ σοφώτατον θνητοῖσιν εἶναι χρῆμα τοῖσι χρωμένοις*, 'Restraint and respect for the affairs of the gods is best. This, I believe, is the wisest thing for those who use it.' These sentiments are both quite traditional and quite non-aggressive. An accurate rendition of lines 877–81 = 897–901 then is: 'What is the wise, what is the better gift of the gods among men? Is it to hold a stronger hand over the heads of enemies? What is good is always dear.'

VALDIS LEINIEKS

University of Nebraska,
Lincoln, Nebraska

¹⁶ J. T. Allen and G. Italie, *A Concordance to Euripides* (Groningen 1970) 271–2.

¹⁷ Dodds (n. 4) 188.

¹⁸ Winnington-Ingram (n. 10) 34–5.

Further notes on Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*

- P. 5: *Ἀμύντου* is the normal genitive of persons we normally call Amyntas.
- Vv. 9–10: the date and family placing of Hipponikos discussed, on a premise rightly denied by Page, J. K. Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 256.
- Pp. 20 ff.: P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* i 778–80; I confess to some doubt about Egyptian Chersonesos.
- P. 87: we might consider the *gentilicium* Satrius, though the reading habits of Satrius Secundus (*Tac. Ann.* iv 24) are hardly relevant.
- Vv. 476–9: if Peek 46 (now P. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* [Berlin 1983] ['CEG'] no. 12) is in point, so is CEG 11, very close in date to Aeschylus' death; I have gone through life thinking that the genitive *Γέλας* belonged with Kühner–Gerth § 419, 2 (a); for trees at Marathon, cf. *Nep. Milit.* 5.3.
- Vv. 494–7: if the inscription is relevant, and it surely is, Wilamowitz' interpretation is possible, but Page's alternative is not; no amount of landholding in Euonymon will turn an Athenian of another deme into an *Εὐωνυμεύς*.
- Vv. 508–9: now CEG 313.
- Vv. 522–5: CEG 312; long ago I saw another stone in the Acropolis Museum with the beginnings of 522–3, and it is surely not to be excluded that Leocrates scattered his herms round Attica, as Wilamowitz thought; the case for the authenticity of 524–5 is not much strengthened.
- Vv. 526–7: I find it mildly interesting that Telemachos, more firmly associated than Sophocles with the beginnings of the Asklepios cult, laid some emphasis, in similar language, on his priority in setting up altars and cults (*IG* ii² 4355, 4961); Sophocles' descendants going into competition?
- Vv. 566–9: there is a case (J. Pouilloux and F. Roux, *Énigmes à Delphes* [Paris 1963] 55–60; ML 95) for supposing that Ion of Samos belongs to the second half of the fourth century and made his epideictic additions to the Aegospotami monument then, so that an attribution to him would not be out of character, but his two surviving poems include his own name.
- V. 675: an unpublished fourth-century text from Mytilene has *Σαωνυμείω* as a patronymic adjective in the genitive.
- Vv. 684–7: CEG 430.
- Vv. 691–5: CEG 179; the point that *ἀχυνόεντι* is one letter too long for the fifth-century copy is concealed here, as is the modern tendency to backdate it a decade.
- P. 201: there can be no doubt about Adeimantos' son Aristeus, so prominent in *Thuc.* i.
- Vv. 720–4: CEG 131.
- P. 219 n. 1: the last sentence belongs to n. 2.
- Vv. 764–71: CEG 2; I only note that Page's restoration of 768, claimed as filling the space better, is in fact as long as the restoration it replaces: Page has forgotten the aspirate of *ὑπέρβιον*.
- Vv. 772–3: *Plut. Arist.* 5.6 is relevant to Persian gold at Marathon, but I have no confidence that the source is early; I am less happy than Page about the use of *Ἀθηναῖοι*.
- Vv. 790–1: CEG 305; the altar has now been splendidly reconstructed by W. B. Dinsmoor Jr.

- Vv. 796–801: I should be sorry to lose this one, but can only agree about the *τις*; if *τόθ'* were preserved, 'rough' though it is, no one would have doubted it; as far as the underlying facts are concerned, we should have been told that Panaitios (*ap. Plut. Arist. 1.6*) knew of the victory; one ostrakon for Aristeides Xenophilou has been found in the Kerameikos (R. Thomsen, *The Origin of Ostracism* [Copenhagen 1972] 94); see also Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 52.
- V. 814: *οὐκ ἀδαής* of a fifth-century sculptor in *CEG* 316.
- Vv. 831–2: C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*² (Oxford 1961) 356–7, supplies a point.
- V. 860: for a relevant fifth-century Attic use of *κάδος*, cf. *IG* i³ 258.38.
- V. 886: in the Thasian list of *theoroi* (F. Salviat, *BCH* suppl. v [1979] between pp. 116 and 117) the patronymic appears as *Ἀγλωφώντος*.
- Vv. 908–9: Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 399 f.
- Vv. 940–3: it is hardly clear why the anomalies are more likely later; one would require a good deal of convincing that the source is not Demetrios of Magnesia, which raises the *terminus ante quem*; K. Schefold, *Phil. Woch.* 1937, 1279 n. 4, attributed the text to Delos, since *CEG* 407 has the same beginning, and his case is strengthened by *CEG* 406 from there which starts a line *ἀσκητὸς παλαί* (see Hansen *ibid.* on the conjecture *ἀσκητῶς*); the real trouble is the absence of a dedicator, which might lead one to the view that Arcesilaus was himself the dedicator, even to the possibility that the *μισθός* was for something else; that seems to be the direction in which A. Rumpf, *Bonner Jb* clxxxviii (1958) 759 f., was moving, and we can have no confidence that we have the full text or that *γάρ* is unsound; *μισθός* in an uncertain context, *CEG* 208; C. Robert's case for *Νάξιος* (*RE* ii [1896] 1168) is implausible, but it is only a matter of word-division and a Delian attribution would support it; for the coins, see *NC* 1926, 146–9.
- V. 1187: on Athens as the founder of Smyrna, see C. J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna* (Oxford 1938) 48.
- Vv. 1368–71: a mountain of misunderstanding; Dem. vii is by the Athenian Hegesippos and a genuine speech of 342; I cannot believe that the epigram is later; its geographical problems discussed by U. Kahrstedt, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Thrakischen Chersones* (Baden-Baden 1954) 10–20; Page's curiosity about the canal could have been partly satisfied by Dem. vi 30.
- Vv. 1372–9: there is a photograph in *BMI*; the reading in 1374 is clearly *δρόμος*, not *δρόμον*, with consequent change of punctuation in the previous line; the dating given in *BMI* (i BC/i AD) is not an epigraphic one (it seems a little late to me), but rests on Bücheler's identification (*RhM* xxxvi [1881] 338 f.) of the persons involved; that identification would place the dedicant here in a distinguished line, but is very speculative.
- Vv. 1480–1: Moretti, *Olympionikai* no. 141.
- Vv. 1482–3: see also *FGrH* 140 F 6.
- Vv. 1494–5: *FGrH* 328 F 40, with a note arguing the early fourth-century date; I incline to agree with Page, but he should have tackled the interrelation with v. 777 (in either version).
- Vv. 1496–7: if the new discus from Nemea weighing 8½ kilos (*Arch. Reports* 1982–3, 24) is anything to go by, 95 ft becomes an achievement, but I think Page should have studied the progress of the triple-jump record in this century before saying that 55 ft is reasonable for that; another fifty-foot jump, apparently, in *CEG* 403.
- Vv. 1524–5: a very comprehensive note by P. J. Rhodes on the *Ath. Pol.* passage (Oxford 1981) raises other problems.
- Vv. 1536–9: see also R. Stroud, *Hesp.* xl (1971) 281, for Theozotides' decree for the children of *ὀπόσοι Ἀθηναίω[ν] ἀπέθανον [β]ιαίωι θανάτω ἐν τῇ ὀλυ[αρχίαι β]ο[ηθ]όντ[ε]ς τῇ δημοκρατίαι*.
- P. 421: the Lysandreia at Samos are now epigraphically attested (C. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum*² [Munich 1970] 243–4).
- Vv. 1558–61: the tattered remains of the text on the Thessalian statue of Pelopidas at Delphi (*SEG* xxii 460) might have been cited.
- Vv. 1566–7: Page failed to take the point that authenticity is proved by the unusual signature *Λεωχάρους ἔργον*, which is part of the text; that signature seems to appear in *IG* ii² 4900.
- V. 1770: cf. *Tod* ii 130.7–8.
- V. 1829: Pausanias may well have thought that Sippe/Sipte was a place, but I started to wonder whether he was a person even before discovering Antipater's general Sippas in *D.S.* xviii 12.2; I do not assert identity.
- Vv. 1844–7: Page's grasp of agonistic language deserted him here: this is clearly a dithyrambic victory dedication, in which Bacchiadas both produced and joined the chorus; plenty of useful material in *FGrH* 387, and there may be a dating point, in that there seems to be no trace of dithyramb at the Mouseia after the late third-century reorganisation (M. Feyel, *Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne* [Le Puy 1942] 88–132); see further A. J. Podlecki in *Classical Contributions . . . McGregor* (Locust Valley 1981) 99–100, who tries to give Bacchiadas the fifth-century Athenian text *CEG* 270, but I am confident that that name ended in *]ρας* and Hansen will not allow it to be a name at all.
- Vv. 1856–9: disaster; the whole problem was cleared up by Wilamowitz, *Hermes* liv (1919) 71 = *Kl. Schr.* iv 309–10, who showed that the text was about Eurydice mother of Philip II and made appropriate restorations; since she now appears (*Arch. Reports* 1982–3, 44) as *Εὐρυδίκη Σύρρα*, we should probably prefer that to Wilamowitz' *Ἴρρα*; I am tempted to add that she anticipated Poseidippus by a hundred years in describing the Muses as her fellow-citizens (of Pella), but Page (p. 116) will not allow us that text.
- Vv. 2129–36: for Eros and Narcissus at Thespieae, see A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* i, *BICS* suppl. xxxviii (1981) 216–19, for further bibliography of this text, *ibid.* iv 56 (1828), particularly M. Guarducci, *Epigraphia Graeca* iii 87–9, who prints a photograph, showing *ἀκροθεΐνιον*; did Hadrian have views about the etymology, or did the local mason let him down?

D. M. LEWIS

Christ Church, Oxford