

τοῦ εἰκῶς). But why Aeschylus omitted the *o*, or whether he usually did so, were questions beyond his scope. Aeschylus did many strange things. And therefore if Aeschylus wrote ὄμως, where the sense pointed to ὄπως, the inference was that for some reason he preferred the word with a *μ* instead of a *π*. Accordingly 'some one' commented upon τοκεῦσι δ' ὄμως τελεῖται thus:—ἵνα. τὸ ὄμοιον καὶ ἴσον τῷ πῖ μῦ φυλάχθῃ—i.e. "ὄμως is a conjunction, signifying ἵνα that [like ὄπως, but] the *μ*, which is similar to *π* [phonetically] and equivalent to it, should be retained" and not altered to *π*, as had apparently been proposed by some less robust philologist. This may surprise us: but we are not at the bottom yet. What are we to say of another 'some one', who, because in the text Orestes is speaking about his father, read and copied the note, expanding supposed contractions, thus—ἵνα τὸ ὄμοιον καὶ ἴσον τῷ πατρί μου φυλάχθῃ, *in order that similarity and equality may be preserved to my father*,—and left this nonsense to puzzle generations too well informed to see through it?

Style, accident, syntax, everything was conceived in the same empiric and lawless fashion. An awkward negative is dismissed as "redundant": πλεονάζει ἢ οὐ (v. 661). *Do not forget* (μηδαμῶς λάθῃ) is turned, in spite of the plainest possible context, into "Let it not be unknown to me": and to get this inappropriate meaning, *μ*ε is, without any warrant, supplied (v. 678). Such are the daily remedies; those for great occasions are more heroic. Thus ῥυθμὸν δάπεδον (v. 793) is translated by εὐτακτον καὶ μὴ τραχείαν πορείαν, *a regular and smooth progress*, without regard to the trifling fact that both words are substantives. If τίς ἂν ἰδεῖν; is suspected to mean *Who could see?*, grammar is satisfied by the remark that "ἰδεῖν is for ἴδοι" (v. 794). If κτάμενον *slain* (v. 802) must, to suit the commentator, be future in tense, it is so interpreted (ἀναιρεθησόμενον) without more ado. Nothing prevents λυτήριος (*liberative* or *liberating*) from taking the sense of ἐλεύθερος (*free*), if it seems convenient (v. 816). Because Aeschylus writes φρένες δύσαρκτοι (v. 1022), the expositor writes δυσχερῶς ἀρχόμενοι καὶ πειθόμενοι, quite ready to suppose that this time Aeschylus might have made φρήν masculine.

Such blighted ears may be gleaned, sometimes in handfuls, from almost every page; and the rest is mostly straw. Here and there is a grain to pick up, and very rarely a jewel. The utmost gratitude is due to the compilers. They did what they could, and they saved Aeschylus. But it is needful to weigh well their notions and methods, before we proceed to deal with the poet's text upon theories which assume, without