

APPENDIX.

Verses 2 f. ἄρ' οἴσθ' ὃ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν
ὅποιον οὐχὶ νῶν ἔτι ζῶσαιν τελεῖ;

The view taken in the commentary—that ὃ τι is subject to ἐστί understood—seems to have been first proposed by W. Schneider, then by Neue; it was advocated by Bonitz (*Beiträge* II. 17); and it is now received by Bellermann. What is new in my note, so far as I know, is the attempt to show how associations of colloquial idiom may have helped to soften the apparent harshness, and, more especially, to excuse the hyperbaton of Ζεὺς. Here, at any rate, we approach the root of the difficulty which these verses present. The ultimate question is,—how much irregularity would the spoken language of the day have tolerated in such a sentence? We do not know: we can but study the evidence of contemporary analogies.

At one time I inclined to the only theory which dispenses with the assumption of irregularity. This consists in taking τελεῖ with both clauses: ἄρ' οἴσθ' ὃ τι Ζεὺς τῶν...κακῶν (τελεῖ), ὅποιον οὐχὶ νῶν ἔτι ζῶσαιν τελεῖ; Then,—τελεῖ being, in this case, better regarded as *fut.*,—the sense would be, 'what will Zeus fulfil, which he will not fulfil *while we live?*'—that condition being emphasised by the form of the sentence. Grammatically, this is blameless. Cp. Plat. *Legg.* p. 710 D πάντα σχεδὸν ἀπείργασται τῷ θεῷ, ἅπερ (sc. ἀπεργάζεται) ὅταν βουλευθῆ διαφερόντως εὖ πράξαι τινα πόλιν: where the relative clause, expressing the condition, ὅταν βουλευθῆ...πόλιν, is parallel with our gen. absol., νῶν ἔτι ζῶσαιν. If the τελεῖ after ζῶσαιν stood after κακῶν, the parallelism of form would be complete: except, indeed, that the Platonic sentence is a little bolder, since it is natural to supply ἀπεργάζεται (or ἀπειργάσατο) rather than ἀπείργασται. Yet, admissible as this construction is, it is undoubtedly harsh. And that harshness—especially at the outset of the play—is a strong argument against it.

Two other interpretations have been suggested by those who take ὃ τι as a pronoun. (a) ὅποιον is resumptive of ὃ τι. 'Knowest thou *what* evil,—*what sort of* evil,—he does not fulfil?'—an emphatic pleonasm. The Scholiast seems to have acquiesced in this:—εἶπεν δὲ διττῶς: πρῶτον μὲν ὃ τι, ἔπειτα δὲ ὅποιον, ἀρκούντος θατέρου. But this