

also be helpful to have the sequence of events indicated, as it is in the scholium. I should supply at the end of 17 <σὺν δέ οἱ>, comparing for the expression *Ol.* 13.87 σὺν δὲ κείνῳ καὶ ποτ'. The pronoun in this place could in theory be taken to refer to Eriphyle rather than to Amphiaras, but I am not troubled by this: as W. J. Slater says (*Lexicon to Pindar* [Berlin, 1969], s. v. ε' 2), 'the reference of οἱ must always be deduced from sense alone'. Slater adds that 'οἱ does not follow prepositions', but it is found after ἐπί at *Pyth.* 1.7–8 κελαινῶπιν δ' ἐπί οἱ νεφέλαν | ἀγκύλῳ κρατὶ . . . κατέχευας: joining ἐπί with κρατὶ alone (so Slater s.v. ε' 2.b) would produce an improbably harsh construction. The phrase σὺν δέ οἱ appears to be attested first in Herodotus (6.90, 7.58.1).

Oxford

W. B. HENRY

w_b_henry@yahoo.co.uk

doi: 10.1017/S0009838806000280

TWO CONJECTURES ON THE *SUPPLICES* OF EURIPIDES

295

ἀλλ' εἰς ὄκνον μοι μῦθος ὃν κεύθω φέρει

Soph. *OT* 991, τι δ' ἔστ' ἐκείνης ὑμῖν ἐς φόβον φέρον; , is cited by Collard in support of μοι here (a *dativus commodi*, allegedly).¹ However, the construction there is different: ὑμῖν can be taken with ἔστι. Here there is nothing but ὄκνον for μοι to latch onto. It cannot go with μῦθος because μοι as an enclitic will tend to cohere with what precedes it.

Professor Diggle observes, *per litteras*, that μοι here gains some support from Soph. *OT* 519–20, οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἀπλοῦν / ἢ ζημία μοι τοῦ λόγου τούτου φέρει, and that the stress on self seems appropriate. But in that Sophoclean example μοι seems to be a possessive dative making the punishment personal to Creon, whereas μοι is superfluous to ὄκνον here.² In my view there is no need for Aethra to stress that her concealed μῦθος leads to hesitation *for her*. The fact that she is concealing it rather presupposes that the hesitation is hers.

I am inclined to write ἀλλ' εἰς ὄκνον τοι κτλ., thereby removing the need to explain the unusual μοι, giving the ordinary absolute usage of φέρω,³ and throwing a natural emphasis on the hesitation Aethra's unspoken word engenders.⁴

¹ C. Collard, *Euripides' Supplices* (Gröningen, 1975).

² None of the other examples cited by Bruhn, *Anhang* (Berlin, 1899), §247.26, is quite equivalent.

³ Cf. LSJ s.v. VII.1. *CQ's* anonymous reader cites Hdt. 6.42.1 and 4.90.1 as possible examples of ἐς + accusative and φέρειν standing near datives which depend on them, but the first example is much like Soph. *OT* 991 in that the dative may go with ἐγένετο (note the chiasmus ἐγένετο . . . ἴωσι, . . . τοῖσι ἴωσι ἐγένετο, which further suggests that ἴωσι should not be taken with ἐς νεῖκος). Although the anonymous reader accepts that Hdt. 4.90.1, ὃ δὲ Τέαρρος λέγεται . . . εἶναι ποταμῶν ἄριστος τὰ τε ἄλλα τὰ ἐς ἄκεσιν φέροντα καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ ἵπποισι ψώρηγν ἀκέσασθαι, is 'less certain still', I do not think the datives ἀνδράσι and ἵπποισι can depend on τὰ ἐς ἄκεσιν φέροντα because the point of καὶ δὴ καὶ is to distinguish the river's other healing qualities from its particular excellence in curing scurvy for men and horses.

⁴ See examples of ἀλλὰ . . . τοι at Denniston, *Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954²), 549.

339–41

πολλὰ γὰρ δράσας καλὰ
 ἔθος τόδ' εἰς Ἑλλήνας ἐξεδειξάμην,
 ἀεὶ κολαστῆς τῶν κακῶν καθεστάναι.

340 ἐξεδειξάμην Hermann: ἐξελεξάμην L

The meaning of ἔθος is essentially 'custom' or 'habit'.⁵ That observation should give rise to some doubt about ἔθος here.

To be a punisher of wrongdoing is not a custom or habit. To punish wrongdoing may be.⁶ An ἔθος (sing.) is generally not the property of an individual,⁷ but belongs to groups of people or a place.⁸ As the *Etymologicum Gudianum* states (s.v. ἔθος), explaining the connection between ἔθος and ἔθνος, ἐκάστῳ γὰρ ἔθνει ἴδιον ἔθος ἔπεται. Moreover, one does not 'display' customs or habits. Customs and habits are simply apparent, so it is rather unusual to find Theseus claiming to have displayed one here.⁹ Finally, ἔθος appears in only three other places in tragedy.¹⁰ In one it is almost certainly wrong.¹¹ In another it is uncertain.¹² And where it is not demonstrably wrong the word is suited to its context.

Bearing these difficulties in mind, I propose reading ἦθος here. ἦθος is more developed in sense than ἔθος.¹³ In addition to custom it can and regularly does mean the disposition or character of a thing or person that arises from ἔθος, and can even mean character that stems from simple φύσις.¹⁴ ἦθος is much more likely to belong to an individual than ἔθος.¹⁵ Being a punisher of wrongdoing can be a person's characteristic. ἦθος can even be a national characteristic.¹⁶ For a person to show character is as natural an expression in Greek as it is in English.¹⁷ Moreover, ἦθος is a relatively

⁵ So Hsch. (Latte): ἔθος· συνήθεια.

⁶ When the Greeks talk about a custom, it is often described with a verb of doing. Their customs do not generally involve states of being or moral stances. A simple illustration of this can be found in Critias fr. 6.1–2 West: καὶ τόδ' ἔθος Σπάρτη μελέτημά τε κείμενόν ἐστι· / πίνειν τὴν αὐτὴν οἰνοφόρον κύλικα . . .

⁷ Infrequently, however, a person's 'habits' (pl.) are described as their ἔθη, as at e.g. Dem. 59.50: ἀλλ' ἐζήτει [sc. Phano, Neaera's daughter] τὰ τῆς μητρὸς ἔθη.

⁸ For example Dem. Lept. 116, τοῖς προγόνους ὑμῶν ἔθος ἦν τοὺς χρηστοὺς τιμᾶν (belonging to a group of people), and the example from Critias quoted in n. 6 above together with Thuc. 2.64 ταῦτα γὰρ ἐν ἔθει τῇδε τῇ πόλει πρότερόν τε ἦν νῦν τε μὴ ἐν ὑμῖν κωλυθῇ (belonging to a place).

⁹ Suda (Adler) s.v. ἔθος: τὸ ἔθος οὐκ ἔστιν εὖρεμα ἀνθρώπων.

¹⁰ Aesch. Ag. 727, Soph. Phil. 894, and Eur. fr. 282.8 Nauck.

¹¹ Aesch. Ag. 727, where Conington corrected to ἦθος.

¹² At Soph. Phil. 894 MS Zo has for μέ πως the variant μέ πως (Blaydes had conjectured μέ που and Herwerden με παῖ, and it is worth noting that the apparatus of the OCT incorrectly suggests that Blaydes had conjectured Zo's reading) and is in any event helped by the adjective σύνθηες. Some indeed might see ἔθος there as superfluous given (i) that τό τοι σύνθηες is tautologous to ἔθος and (ii) the frequent usage by poets of the definite article with neuter adjective in place of the abstract. For discussion, see R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1978), 3.57.

¹³ For interesting discussion of ἦθος in archaic and classical Greek literature, see O. Thimme, *Φύσις τρόπος ἦθος* (diss. Göttingen, 1935). Thimme does not investigate the difference between ἦθος and ἔθος in his analysis of the present passage (83), but assumes their equivalence. I am grateful to Professor Diggle for this reference.

¹⁴ Hsch. (Latte): ἦθος· γνώριμος τρόπος, ἀναστροφή. Cf. also Arist. Eth. Nic. 1103a17–20. The distinction between ἔθος and ἦθος is well illustrated in Plato's jingle, κυριώτατον γὰρ οὐν ἐμφύεται πᾶσι τότε τὸ πᾶν ἦθος διὰ ἔθος (Leg. 792E).

¹⁵ For example Pind. Nem. 8.35, Soph. Aj. 595, and Dem. De cor. 109.

¹⁶ Demosthenes and other orators regularly mention τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἦθος.

¹⁷ For example Aesch. Ag. 727 ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος, Eur. El. 363 ἦθος . . . παρέξομαι, and [Pl.] Ep. X 358C ἦθος . . . παρεχόμενον. Cf. also Demetr. Eloc. 171 and Philo. Rhet. 1.200 Sudhaus. Indeed,

common word in tragedy, occurring some twenty-five times.¹⁸ In addition to these arguments (which respond to my arguments against ἦθος), it suits the context for Theseus to refer to his ἦθος after saying that not to respond to Adrastus' plea, but instead to run away from a terrible situation, would not be in keeping with his ways, ὡς τοῖς ἐμοῖσιν οὐχὶ πρόσφορον τρόποις (338). A bare (as opposed to arthrous) infinitive stands in apposition to ἦθος elsewhere at Pl. *Resp.* 375E: οἴσθα γάρ που τῶν γενναίων κυνῶν, ὅτι τοῦτο φύσει αὐτῶν τὸ ἦθος, πρὸς μὲν τοὺς συνήθεις¹⁹ τε καὶ γνωρίμους ὡς οἶόν τε πρασιότους εἶναι, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀγνώτας τοῦναντίον.

In summary, the problem as I see it here is that what Theseus claims to have shown the Greeks is a personal quality, what we might even call his 'ethos'. ἦθος does not convey that, but ἦθος does.²⁰

Little Venice, London

NICHOLAS LANE

doi: 10.1017/S0009838806000292

one can also hide character, although not, according to Pindar, if it is inborn, because ἄμαχον δὲ κρύψαι τὸ συγγενὲς ἦθος (*Ol.* 13.13). Dr Dawe suggests a possible parallel with the Herodotean usage of ἀποδείκνυμαι with the nouns ἀρετάς, εὐεργεσίας, σοφίην, and δύναμιν.

¹⁸ Figures for particular writers are as follows Aesch. (4), Soph. (3), Eur. (15), Chaeremon (1), and *Trag. Adesp.* (2). Although the word is particularly common in Eur. (60 per cent of occurrences in tragedy), that may simply be down to the comparative bulk of his surviving corpus.

¹⁹ Another ethical wordplay from Plato.

²⁰ I am grateful to Dr Roger Dawe and Professor James Diggle for helpful comments and suggestions on a previous (longer) draft of these notes, but neither should be taken to approve the contents of this version. At a later stage the *CQ*'s anonymous reader made several useful observations which I have attempted to address.

THE PHANTOM STELAI OF LYSIAS, AGAINST NICOMACHUS 17

Probably in 399, Lysias composed a speech (*Corpus Lysiacum* 30) for an unknown client concerning the alleged malfeasance of a certain Nicomachus in his role as publisher in both phases of the re-edition of secular and sacred Athenian laws between 410 and 399.¹ Lysias at one point remarks of Nicomachus, according to the generally accepted text (17):²

¹ For a recent overview of this speech, see S. C. Todd, 'Lysias *Against Nikomakhos*: the fate of the expert in Athenian law', in L. Foxhall and A. D. E. Lewis (eds.), *Greek Law and Its Political Setting: Justifications not Justice* (Oxford, 1996), 101–31. The first phase of the re-edition lasted from 410 to 404 (Lys. 30.2–3, and see Thuc. 8.97.2 and Andoc. 1.81–82 for the election of law-givers after the fall of the Four Hundred in 411), during which time (in 409–408) Draco's law on homicide was re-edited (*IG* I³ 104; see now A. B. Gallia, 'The republication of Draco's law on homicide', *CQ* 54 [2004] 451–60), as well as many others (see *IG* I³ 105 and 236–41), and the second from 403 to 399 (Lys. 30.4, and see the controversial Teisamenus decree of 403 quoted in Andoc. 1.83–4, along with the remarks in *Schol. Aesch.* 1 *Tim.* 39 and Poll. 8.112). From the latter phase we have remains of the sacrificial laws written in Ionic letters on top of a mysteriously erased text (see F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques, supplément* [Paris, 1962], 27–31 [no. 10]), the exact date of which is much debated (see Todd [above] 116, n. 24). S. Dow ('The law codes of Athens', *PMHS* 71 [1953–57 (1959)], 3–36, at 11 and 'The Athenian calendar of sacrifices: the chronology of Nikomakhos' second term', *Historia* 9 [1960], 270–93, at 289) dated it to 400–399 (or, less likely, 402–401) by restoring the prescript (fr. A, line 30) on the