

Some of these variations may, as we should expect, be reduced to syllabic regularity by such expedients as the insertion of τε or γε¹. But others cannot. Not the least objection, except that grounded on metre, lies against οἴκοις τοῖσδε (the common dative of relation) in *v.* 1482. In *v.* 414 the supposed metrical difficulty has led to criticisms and proposals, which without it would not have been entertained for a moment. In the order of the words ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λογχίμους τε (*i.e.* κλόνους ἀσπίστορας λογχίμους τε *din of shield and spear*) there is nothing irregular: τε follows according to rule the word (λογχίμους) which it serves to couple on: and where adjectives are thus coupled by τε some other word constantly stands between them, *e.g.* in Eur. *Hec.* 267 αἰχμάλωτον χρῆ τιν' ἔκκριτον θανεῖν κάλλει θ' ὑπερφέρουσαν (*i.e.* ἔκκριτον... κάλλει θ' ὑπερφέρουσαν). On the other hand the double change proposed for the sake of syllabic respension (ἀσπίστορας κλόνους τε καὶ λογχίμους ναυβάτας θ' ὀπλισμούς) makes an arrangement not only improper but unconstruable. The first τε, however it be taken, is both useless and out of its place².

§ 2. – = ∪ in the unaccented part of the foot.

This (the 'unnatural' long syllable of H. Schmidt's terminology) is found in almost all poets and in every kind of metre. It occurs in the *strophæ* of the *Agamemnon* with moderate frequency.

{ 192. χαρ | ις βι | αιως | σελμα
{ 200. εχ | ων παλ | ιρρο | θοις εν

{ 207. τριβ | ω κατ | εξ – | αινον | ανθος | Αργει | ων.
{ 220. ρεεθ | ροις πατ | ρω – | ους χερ | ας βω | μου πελ | ας.

Here, as is not uncommonly the case, the feet interchange. All the feet are equal, most of them true³ trochees, the second in each set (not counting the anacrusis) a 'syncopated' trochee, while the trochaic – – appears in the fifth foot of the first set, and in the fourth foot of the second. So also in the first feet of *vv.* 392, 3, 4 compared with *vv.* 409, 10, 11 and in the last foot of *v.* 393 compared with that of *v.* 410. So in *vv.* 426, 27, 28. So in *v.* 1105 γένει by 1119 τεύχει: see Soph.

¹ Not that these insertions are justified by the usage of the poet. Both in 205 and in 401 the inserted τε is perfectly otiose and offensive. Aeschylus is not in the habit of using τε καί as a mere equi-

valent for τε or καί.

² According to the MS. there would be a 'syncopated' foot in *v.* 441 ουσ· | μεν γαρ ε | πεμψεν: but see note there.