


O. C. 1557 and 1568. So in the first syllable (anacrusis) of *v.* 1162 νεογνός compared with *v.* 1173 καὶ τίς σε.


One or two more cases are doubtful. In *v.* 1469 the correction ἐμπίτνεις is probable, in *v.* 1512 προβαίνων is not improbable. In *v.* 462 Orelli's conjecture ἔχθοντας would give an instance, but the ms. ἔχοντας is better.

§ 3. $- \cup \cup = - \cup$ ().

This, which in the *Septem* is scarcely less frequent than (1) and (2), is in the *Agamemnon* rare. Two certain examples are close together:

{	718.	ε θρεψ - εν δε λε οντος ι -
		νιν δομ οισ αγα λακτον οι -
		τας αν ηρ φιλο μαστον
		εν βιο του προτε λειοις etc.
{	728.	χρο νισ - θεις δ' απε δειξεν η -
		θος το προς τοκε ων χαρ ιν -
		γαρ τροφ ας α μειβων
		μηλοφον οισιν αταις etc.

Both the last lines have been variously emended, but the suggested changes in *v.* 730 (e. g. τροφᾶς ἀπαμείβων) are arbitrary and those in *v.* 731 (see note there) very unhappy. From the mere fact that the same peculiarity occurs in two successive lines, we may be sure that there is no error. Such variations are naturally often grouped together. See also *v.* 715, as given in § 1 above. In *v.* 412 we should perhaps retain κλοπαῖς, and in *v.* 458 προδίκοισιν: but these dative forms are always uncertain.

§ 4. $- = \cup \cup$ (.

This, the so-called 'resolution of a long syllable', is not unfrequent.

{	394.	λακτισ αντι μεγ αλα δικ ας -	
{	411.	ησχυ νε ξεινι αν τραπ εζ -	
{	417.	α τλητα τλασα πολυ δ αν εστε νον -	
{	433.	βε βακεν οψις ου μεθ υστερ ον -	
	{	1090.	εκας α ποστατ ει -
	{	1098.	χερος ο ρεγομεν α -

See also *v.* 422, 1110, 1162, 1454, and 1482. Some of these can be