



Here, if the text is right, there is the same balance of variations which has been noticed elsewhere (see previous volumes): the  for  appears in both verses, but differently placed. By taking *δουρικμη̄τι* from Blomfield, and with the scansion *δορίτμητος*, we can have exact correspondence, thus:



Whether this is really preferable is a question on which a modern, as I think, cannot wisely give an opinion.

{ *v.* 381. Ζεῦ Ζεῦ, κάτωθεν ἀπέμπων.
v. 395. φεῦ φεῦ, κάρανα δαίξας.

Here it is upon any theory legitimate to doubt whether the text can be right. It is physically possible to obtain correspondence of bars by setting the lines thus:



And the more carefully we look into the evidence on this subject, in Greek and elsewhere, the less disposed we shall be to treat anything as *impossible*, which is not physically such. But the probability, that *δαίξας* was meant to be so sung, certainly seems less *prima facie* than that of Grotefend's correction *κάτωθ' ἀναπέμπων*, which gives to both verses the rhythm



{ *v.* 404—405. ποῖ ποῖ δῆ, νερτέρων τυραννίδες;
 ἴδετε, πολυκρατεῖς ἀραὶ φθιμένων.
v. 417—418. τί δ' ἂν φάντες τύχοιμεν ἄν; ἢ τάπερ
 πάθομεν ἄχρα πρὸς γε τῶν τεκομένων;

that is,



answers to



V. Æ. CH.

14