the statement is only arguably similar. Euripides is normally meticulous in avoiding the repetition of names in the same case in similar statements. In the prologue to the *Electra*, where Aegisthus' name appears an unprecedented seven times (nominative × 3, genitive × 3, and dative × 1), all are in different capacities: as killer of Agamemnon (10), ruler of Mycenae (12), would-be killer of Orestes (17), jailer of Electra (24), would-be killer of Electra (28), plotter of death to Orestes and of Electra's marriage to a farmer (32),[1] and target of retribution (42). In the prologue of the *Troades* Euripides' studied variation can be seen at work again (even in the same case): Apollo is *Φοῖβος* ~ *Ἀπόλλων* (5 ~ 42), Athena is *Παλλάδος* ~ *Ἀθάνας* (10 ~ 24), and Zeus is *Ζηνός* ~ *Διός* (17 ~ 47). Were *Πρίαμος* to stand in our example, it would be a unique case in the prologues of Euripides' extant tragedies of a name appearing twice in the same case in substantially the same statement. If it is an interpolated gloss, what has it dislodged? It would have been a word meaning 'her husband', but not perhaps an obvious one. In 108 we find Hecuba herself referring to her *τέκνα καὶ πόσις*. But a clue to what might plausibly have been replaced comes from Hecuba's mouth in another play; at *Hec.* 160–1 she laments *φροῦδος πρέσβυς, φροῦδοι παῖδες*. Later in our play Helen describes Priam as *πρέσβυς* (921). I therefore propose reading *πρέσβυς* for *Πρίαμος* in 41, with *ἧι* (39) clarifying whose 'old man' is meant as an organic part of *ἧι παῖς μὲν … φροῦδος δὲ πρέσβυς*.

126–7

… συρίγγων τ'
εὐφθόγγων φωναῖι

For balance with *παιᾶνι στυγνῶι* I was going to suggest *εὐφθόγγωι* until it was drawn to my attention that this is the reading of the Aldine edition. In support of the Aldine text it is worth pointing out that it is anyway common Euripidean practice to use compound adjectives whose second components are synonymous with the nouns with which they agree. Examples abound, but see e.g. *Tro.* 125 *λιμένας … εὐόρμους*. The *CQ*'s anonymous referee adds that where a genitive noun depends on one in another case an adjective is more commonly attached to the latter.

Little Venice, London NICHOLAS LANE
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000286

[1] This may be thought to be, in at least its first component, similar to 17, but the case is different in these two examples.

ARISTOPHANES, *ACHARNIANS* 23–6

ἀλλ' ἀωρίαν
ἥκοντες, εἶτα δ' ὠστιοῦνται πῶς δοκεῖς
25 *ἐλθόντες ἀλλήλοισι περὶ πρώτου ξύλου*
ἀθρόοι καταρρέοντες.

24 *οἴδ' ὠστιοῦνται* Suda
εἶτα διωστιοῦνται Dobree
εἶθ' οἴδ' ὠστιοῦνται Baermann
εἶθ' ὧδ' ὠστιοῦνται Starkie

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

25 ἐλθόντες ἀλλήλοισι om. Suda
ἔρροντες Starkie
ἕλκοντες Bachmann

In 24 εἶτα δέ followed by the indicative after a simple participle is considered by some a syntactical oddity, hence the various conjectures. Olson in his recent commentary is probably right to dismiss the conjectures and print the paradosis, in part at least on the strength of the protection afforded by *Eq.* 375-81.[1] Olson goes on to describe 25 as a 'troubled verse', opining that the lack of a definite article before πρώτου ξύλου can be explained as defining the prize being competed for ('a seat in the very front') and that the real trouble lies with ἐλθόντες (which is pointless after ἥκοντες in 24). After explaining why the conjectures of Starkie and Bachmann do not persuade he concludes by obelizing ἐλθόντες.

I believe there is a word of which ἐλθόντες could well be a corruption and which fits the required sense: ἀθλοῦντες. The verb ἀθλέω does not occur elsewhere in Aristophanes, but it does in other Attic writers of prose and verse. Verbs of competing naturally take a dative like ἀλλήλοισι. Moreover, ἀθλοῦντες would add an appropriately mock-heroic tone here (perhaps signifying something more than merely 'contend' given its connection with ἆθλον, 'prize'), and the corruption would have been simple enough. The meaning will then be that the prytaneis 'will jostle as they compete with one another for the prize of a front row seat'.[2]

Little Venice, London NICHOLAS LANE
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000298

[1] S. Douglas Olson, *Aristophanes: Acharnians* (Oxford, 2002), 74. To Olson's reasoning against Dobree's conjecture might be added the fact that it would introduce a third foot anapaest with word divide after the princeps, which is a fairly uncommon resolution.

[2] I am grateful to Professor James Diggle for comments on a draft of this note.

PITY THE POOR TRAVELLER: A NEW COMIC TRIMETER (ARISTOPHANES?)

Strabo is explaining the reasons for the prosperity of Corinth.[1] The difficulty of rounding Cape Malea is a major factor. To illustrate this he quotes a proverb:

ἦν δ' ὥσπερ ὁ πορθμὸς οὐκ εὔπλους ὁ κατὰ τὴν Σικελίαν τὸ παλαιόν, οὕτω καὶ τὰ πελάγη, καὶ μάλιστα τὸ ὑπὲρ Μαλεῶν, διὰ τὰς ἀντιπνοιάς· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ παροιμιάζονται

Μαλέας δὲ κάμψας ἐπιλάθου τῶν οἴκαδε.

The codices[2] vary between Μαλέας (in MS E), the plural form which was used by Homer and by Strabo himself (probably to emphasize the continuity between Homeric Greece and his own time), and the singular Μαλέαν (in MSS Bv, Nicetas, *Chron. Hist.* p. 73, 19 Dieten, Pletho), which was more current in classical times. The verse is quoted with Μαλέαν as a 'proverb' by schol. Hom. *Od.* 9.80 (cf. Eustathius,

[1] *Geog.* 8.6.20.

[2] I cite the text and sigla of S. Radt, *Strabons Geographika* (Göttingen, 2002).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press