

κρατύνει) is often stressed.<sup>22</sup> There is a pleasing irony, then, to prefacing the account of how almighty Zeus himself was bamboozled and had the tables turned on him, with a statement of *Ate's power*. (A similar effect of humour obtains in the string of consolations which Dione addresses to Aphrodite at *Il.* 5.385ff., where one goddess consoles another with stories of how gods (as opposed to men) have suffered at the hands of men (as opposed to gods).<sup>23</sup> In another consolatory context, we find Zeus' power referred to thus: ὁ πάντα κραίνων . . . Κρονίδας (*Soph. Trach.* 127), where word-play between participle and patronymic has been suspected.<sup>24</sup> The effect of Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἄτη, ἥ πάντας ἁάται would be very similar.

*St John's College, Oxford*

MALCOLM DAVIES

Malcolm.davies@sjc.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0009838806000553

<sup>22</sup> See further M. Davies, *Sophocles: Trachiniae* (Oxford, 1991), on line 127. The phrasing in the description of *Ate's power* in *Iliad* 19 is remarkably similar to passages in Greek literature which describe *Zeus' power*: see W. Kiefner, *Der religiöse Allbegriff des Aischylos*, Spudasmata 5 (Olms, 1965), 44–5.

<sup>23</sup> See Kassel (n. 1), 71, n. 1: 'die Trostparänese vorausgesetzte Verhältnis Götter-Menschen geradezu umgekehrt'.

<sup>24</sup> See my commentary ad loc. (n. 22).

## 'TELEBOES' AND OTHERS: ON SOME MISTAKEN PROPER NAMES

In *HSCP* 95 (1993), 154 I noted that the wrong form *Τηλεβόες* (instead of the correct one, which obviously is *Τηλεβόαι*) is given as a supplement to Pind. fr. 52s.10 in the canonical edition of Pindar's *Fragmenta* by Snell and Maehler, firstly in the fourth revised reprint (Leipzig, 1975), 217, in the *Addenda ad apparatusum*, 'adde *Τηλεβόες ἀπ]ήλασαν* Sn., sc. *βόας*?' and then again in the fifth revised reprint, the first by Maehler alone (Leipzig, 1989), 62, in the apparatus itself. I wished to mention the mistake, not so much for the sake of hunting errors, although that aim is perhaps not unworthy as such, but rather in order to give an example to future editors of how an elementary mistake may remain unnoticed by all the numerous reviewers of the edition—all too numerous indeed—and even be expressly approved by some, as for instance by L. Lehnus, *Paideia* 31 (1976), 194, and at last may be inherited by other editors, as for instance by G. Bona, *Pindaro, i Peani* (Cuneo, 1988), 280.

As a result of my note, the mistake has finally been corrected by I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paean*s (Oxford, 2001), 424, app. 10 'Τηλεβόαι ἀπ]ήλασαν Snell (cf. Pavese (1993), 154; sc. *βόας*?)'. Nevertheless this obscures the facts in favour of Snell, since Snell's supplement is and remains *Τηλεβόες*, while *Τηλεβόαι* is my correction. The facts are better represented as 'Τηλεβόες (sic) ἀπ]ήλασαν Snell, *Τηλεβόαι* corr. Pavese'. I omit Snell's two other mistakes, which I pointed out in the same note.

I found the same remarkable mistake in the well-known edition of Vergil by R. Sabbadini, *Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 2, *Aeneis* (Rome, 1937<sup>2</sup>) 465, in the *Index nominum*: there *Teleboes* (instead of *Teleboae*) is given as the lemma of the genitive Verg. *Aen.* 7.735 *Teleboun*, thus confusing the first declension with the third.

Scholars as well as pupils, in my experience, sometimes fail to perceive that the patronymics of the first declension in -δᾱ- (i. e. -ιδᾱς, -ιάδᾱς, -άδᾱς, gen. -ιδᾱο, -ιάδᾱο, -άδᾱο, etc.) are masculine, while those of the third declension in -δ- (i. e. -ίς, -ιάς, gen. -ίδος, -ιάδος) are feminine, and yet this is a fundamental distinction in Hellenic grammar and mythology.

At Sapph. 44.13 αὐτικ' Ἰλιάδαι σατίναι[ς] ὕπ' ἐντρούχοις ||, just to give an instance, B. Marzullo, *Studi di poesia eolica* (Florence, 1958), 156 takes the patronymic Ἰλιάδαι as 'le donne d'Ilio', referring to Verg. *Aen.* passim *Iliades* and *Iliadum*: the scholar apparently does not realize that Ἰλιάδες is a feminine patronymic and Ἰλιάδαι, or in Lesbic Ἰλίαδαι, is a masculine one (see E. M. Hamm, *Gramm. zu Sappho u. Alkaios* [Berlin 1958], 144d), meaning 'offspring of Ilus', who was father of Laomedon, father of Priam and of others. This is shown, if needed, by Eur. *Andr.* 1024 Ἰλιάδαι βασιλῆες, Antipater, *A. P.* 9.77,5, Antonius the Argive *A. P.* 9.102.2 and Ov. *Met.* 10.160 *Iliaden*, meaning Ganymede, who according to Homer was son of Tros son of Erichthonius, but according to *Il. Parva* 29 B. and Eur. *Tro.* 821, cf. Pind. *O.* 1.44, was son of Laomedon son of Ilus, and thus brother of Priam two generations later.

At Pind. *O.* 2.45 the readings Ἀδραστεῖδων A Ἀδραστείδαν BL<sup>1</sup>EGHND<sub>2</sub> -εῖδᾱν C -εῖδᾱν Ø -εῖδων L<sup>S</sup> (according to the app. of Turyn, the app. of Snell-Maehler is silent here), which are false both for metre and for morphology, have been corrected or rather corrupted by all the editors into Ἀδραστιδᾱν after Triklinios *metri causa*, as a plural genitive of the masculine patronymic Ἀδραστίδαι, a reading which is correct for metre and for morphology, but wrong for sense. Both metre and morphology as well as sense are saved by reading Ἀδραστίδων after my emendation, as a plural genitive of the feminine patronymic Ἀδραστίδες, a reading which is to be understood as a poetic plural for singular, meaning Argeia daughter of Adrastus, wife of Polynices and mother of Thersander, so that Ἀδραστίδων θάλος means none other than Thersander himself (as I have expounded in 'Pindarica 2', *Eikasmos* 1 [1990], 40–4). As a matter of fact, although Schol. (Vat.) 80ab and (Ambr.) 81c have in their lemma the reading Ἀδραστείδαν and Schol. (Ambr.) 81b the reading Ἀδραστε' ἰδών, they rightly gloss them with various forms of the feminine genitive patronymic. In particular Schol. (Vat.) 80a and (Ambr.) 81b expressly gloss them as a plural for singular, meaning Argeia. These glosses nevertheless are correct for sense, but wrong for metre and morphology. The feminine patronymic from Adrastus is attested in the form Ἀδρηστίνη at Hom. *E* 412, *Suda* s. v. (Aegialeia daughter of Adrastus and wife of Diomedes), while it is found in the form Ἀδραστίς, -ίδος not in Greek, by chance, I suppose, but only in poetry derived from Greek at Stat. *Theb.* 12.678 (Argeia daughter of Adrastus and wife of Polynices).

At Thales VS I 11 A 12 (p. 77, 9) ap. Arist. *Mete.* 983b30 Ὠκεανόν τε καὶ Τηθύν is translated by A. Lami, *I presocratici. Testimonianze e frammenti da Talete a Empedocle* (Milano 1991) 125 as 'Oceano e Tetide', thus confusing the Titanis Tethys, sister and wife of Oceanus, with the Nereis Thetis (Θέτις, -ίδος or -ιος), mother of Achilles: the confusion has been prompted no doubt by the fact that, while both Tethys and Thetis sound 'Teti' in Italian, Thetis may be called 'Tetide' too.

At Hom. *Ε* 319 Δανάης καλλισφύρου Ἀκρισιῶννης || is obviously a patronymic in -ίων, fem. -ιώνη, meaning 'daughter of Acrisius', but it is rendered in a well-known Italian translation of the *Iliad* (Venice, 1990), 605, ad loc., as *Danae dalle belle caviglie, la figlia di Acrisione*, apparently taking Ἀκρισιῶννης for the genitive of a

feminine anthroponymic substantive, depending on *Δανάης*, instead of as the genitive of a feminine patronymic adjective, agreeing with *Δανάης*.

In the well-known graffito inscribed in three lines on two sherds of a Rhodian LGII kotyle from Eretria (720–710 B.C.), published by A. W. Johnston and A. K. Andreiomenou, 'A geometric graffito from Eretria', *ABSA* 84 (1989), 217–20, which is surprisingly similar to that of Nestor from Pithecoussae, the first line, seemingly a trimeter analogous to *Νεστορος* ε[μι] ευποτ[ον] ποτεριον, has been supplemented (*ibid.* 200) as

]το θυμοκα[ρτο εμι ...]

The correct genitive of *Θυμοκράτης*, with consonantic metathesis *Θυμοκάρτης* (cf. *κράτος*, *κάρτος*), obviously is *Θυμοκράτεος*, *Θυμοκάρτεος* (i.e. -ους), since the anthroponym is a *σ*-stem, not *Θυμοκράτῳ*, *Θυμοκάρτῳ* (i.e. -ου), which presupposes a hypothetical *α*- or *ο*-stem, in Euboic indeed only a hypothetical *ο*-stem. Thus the hiatus is eliminated by the ending -εος and the trimeter becomes more plausible (as I have noticed in 'La iscrizione sulla kotyle di Nestor da Pithekoussai', *ZPE* 114 [1996], 14, n. 38).

In the *Rhetra* of the Spartan Lycurgus son of Eunomus, ap. Plut. 6.2, the theonym gen. *Ἀθηνᾶς* (codd.) has been corrected, or rather corrupted, by all editors into the *Ἀθανᾶς* of Valkenaer. The theonym nevertheless is in Laconic and in all the Doric dialects *Ἀθάνα* and *Ἀθαναία*, in Attic *Ἀθηναία* and *Ἀθηνᾶ*, recent Attic *Ἀθηνᾶ* (see K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* [Berlin, 1900<sup>3</sup>] 31, 157), in poetic language *Ἀθάνα* and *Ἀθαναία*, in Ion. epic *Ἀθήνη* and *Ἀθηναίη*, in Lesbian Alc. 325, 1 *Ἀθανᾶ*. Thus just \**Ἀθήνα* (presupposed in the common modern transcription *Athēna*) and \**Ἀθανᾶ* (presupposed in the «correction» of Valkenaer) do not exist among the various attested forms of the theonym, not even in the Doric koinè inscriptions. Therefore *Ἀθηνᾶς* (codd.) must be emended not into the vulgate *Ἀθανᾶς* of Valkenaer, but into the correct *Ἀθάνας* (see my 'La *Rhetra* di Licurgo', *Atti del V Convegno plutarcheo* [Naples, 1994], 318).

In the funerary epigram on the tomb of Hesiod in Orchomenus, Tzetzae *Vit. Hes.* 51.4–7 W = 45–8 S, *Certamen* 250–3 A = 42.25–8 W, *Anth. Pal.* 7.54 = *HE* 18 (by Mnasalkas of Sikyon), Paus. 9.38.4 (ib. 10 by Chersias of Orchomenus), cf. Thuc. 3.96.1, for a change it is not a modern scholar, but a Byzantine scholar or copyist, who is caught falling into a similar blunder: Tzetzes quotes v. 2f. as *ὁστέα πληξίππου γῆ Μινύης κατέχει* || *Ἡσιόδου* (cod. V[aticanus] 1409), 14th cent.). The same verse is correctly read in the *Anthologia Palatina* and in Pausanias *ὁστέα πληξίππων γῆ Μινυῶν κατέχει* || *Ἡσιόδου* 'the country of the equestrian Minyans has the bones of Hesiod'. In the *Certamen*, on the other hand, the verse is altered into *πληξίππων γῆ Μινυᾶς* 'the Minyan country of the equestrians has the bones of Hesiod' or worse 'the Minyan country has the bones of the equestrians, of Hesiod': this reading, though wrong for sense, is still morphologically correct, *Μινυᾶς* being a feminine adjective agreeing with *γῆ*. Tzetzes' quotation, on the contrary, shows the end of the corruption: he or his copyist read *πληξίππου γῆ Μινύης* 'the country of the equestrian Minyes has the bones of Hesiod', which is tolerable for sense, but wrong for morphology. Wishing perhaps to 'normalize' *Μινυᾶς*, taken to be *Μινύας*, into Ion. *Μινύης*, they apparently mistake the latter form, which is senseless as a genitive of a feminine *Μινύη*, for a genitive of the masculine heroic name *Μινύης* (neither Wilamowitz nor Solmsen, app. ad loc., nor anyone else, as far as I know, makes any remark on the point): they decline the masculine *Μινύης* as if it were a feminine

*Μινύη*, according to the paradigm of the first declension feminine nouns, instead of that of the same declension masculine ones, of which the correct genitive of course is either the (here unmetrical) ancient form *Μινύαο* or the metrically possible recent forms Ion. *Μινύεω* and Att. *Μινύου*.

University of Venice

CARLO ODO PAVESE

doi:10.1017/S0009838806000565

## FOR ALL THAT A WOMAN: *MEDEA* 1250, *ΔΥΣΤΥΧΗΣ Δ' ΕΓΩ ΓΥΝΗ*

In a recent edition of this journal, Howard Jacobson complained that ‘these four words, coming as the end of so profoundly emotional a speech, seem remarkably flat’,<sup>1</sup> and suggested reading instead *γονή*: ‘Medea is ill-fated in her children (who must die and at her hands)’.

*De gustibus cum non sit disputandum*, there is no point in debating the alleged flatness of the words in question; nor can I argue with any certainty that Euripides’ taste would have been more like my own than like Prof. Jacobson’s. I will argue, however, that the word *γονή* in this position is well prepared for and well justified by what has gone before.<sup>2</sup>

More than any other character in Greek literature, Medea presents herself as an archetype of oppressed femininity.<sup>3</sup> After raging offstage with a passion appropriate to her situation, she appears onstage composed in demeanour and clear of speech; and what she has to say is her famous indictment of woman’s fate, *πάντων δ’ ὅσ’ ἔστ’ ἔμψυχα καὶ γνώμην ἔχει / γυναικές ἐσμεν ἀθλιώτατον φυτόν* (230–1). The ills of which she complains are the ills of womankind, and she explicitly includes the women of Corinth as her fellow-sufferers before she goes on to complain of her own exposed position.<sup>4</sup> Her words are undoubtedly self-interested, designed to secure the Chorus’ collaboration; but she does not take them back later. On the contrary, she demonstrates clearly, in her second interview with Jason, the submissiveness expected of a woman: ‘But we women are the sort of thing we are—I will not say, “something bad”—so you should not be like us in nature’ (889–90). Jason magnanimously accepts her submission, ‘for you have, even though it be after a while, recognized the better

<sup>1</sup> H. Jacobson, ‘*Medea* 1250: *δυστυχῆς δ’ ἐγὼ γονή*’, *CQ* 54, n.s. (2004), 274.

<sup>2</sup> Euripides is not above padding out a hexameter with an otherwise otiose disyllable, generally a vocative: see, e.g., *Med.* lines 89, 227, 281, 290, 292, 816, 818. Each of these, of course, could be defended, but in any event I agree with Prof. Jacobson that this climactic line is not the one to end with a throwaway word.

<sup>3</sup> I would not exclude from this generalization Aristophanes’ famous ‘feminists’, Lysistrata and Praxagora. Lysistrata does claim (*Ar. Lys.* 588) that women suffer ‘more than double’ from war, but she does not portray war the way Medea portrays marriage, as an institution wherein men prosper and women suffer. Praxagora in the *Ecclesiazusae* makes no claims at all of women’s oppression, but only that women could solve better the common problems of the state.

<sup>4</sup> When at 252 she says that their situation is not the same as hers, the *ἄλλ’* with which she begins the line indicates that everything she has said for the past twenty lines is as true for every woman as it is for her. In fact, as Page points out well in his commentary to 231, her generally phrased complaints are not entirely appropriate to her own history.