

seems weak; and it is certainly jerky. (*b*) Two questions are combined in ὅτι ὅποῖον (as in τίς πόθεν εἶ;)—‘what, (*and*) of what kind?’ This view, proposed by Zehlicke (Greifsw. 1826), has been rightly rejected by A. Boeckh (*Ueber die Ant.* p. 175).—Wecklein’s comment is, ‘ὅτι ὅποῖον, *quid quale*, welches Leid, wie es immer heissen mag’: *i.e.*, ‘what woe,—of whatever sort it may be.’ I do not see how the words could yield this sense.

If we read ὅτι, the conjunction, then ὅποῖον is substituted for the direct ποῖον. ‘Knowest thou that Zeus fulfils—what not?’ In favour of this, we might, perhaps, suggest two points. (1) The double question, being somewhat awkward, may have made it easier to slide into the irregular relative construction with ὅποῖον. (2) The familiarity of the combination οἶδ’ ὅτι—strongly illustrated by its use as an adverbial parenthesis (275 n.)—may have made it easier to treat οἶσθ’ ὅτι, after some intervening words, as if ὅτι did not exist. On the other hand, the harshness of the construction is aggravated by the shortness of the sentence. We cannot compare *O. T.* 1401, where the MSS. give ἀρά μου μέμνησθ’ ὅτι | οἶ’ ἔργα δράσας ὑμῖν εἶτα δεῦρ’ ἰὼν | ὅποι’ ἔπρασσον αὐθις; For there—even if ὅτι is kept—it is obviously impossible that μέμνησθ’ ὅτι οἶα δράσας, etc., should be a fusion of μέμνησθ’ ὅτι τοιαῦτα δράσας with μέμνησθ’ οἶα δράσας: the alternative—to treat οἶα and ὅποῖα as exclamatory—though not (to my mind) tolerable, would be a less evil: but clearly ὅτι should there be τι. It has been suggested, indeed, that ὅποῖον is not substituted for ποῖον, but is itself a direct interrogative. This has been supported by the analogy of ὁπότερος in direct question. Plat. *Lysis* 212 C ναί· ὁπότερος οὖν αὐτῶν ποτέρον φίλος ἐστίν; Heindorf there cites *Euthyd.* 271 A ὁπότερον καὶ ἐρωτᾶς, ὦ Κρίτων; *Rep.* 348 B ὁποτέρως οὖν σοι...ἀρέσκει; Let it be assumed that the readings are sound in those places. Still, there is at least no similar instance of ὅποῖος: nor is ὅποῖον here the *first word* of a direct question.

The proposed emendations are all unsatisfactory. They are of three classes.

(1) Those which alter v. 2, leaving v. 3 untouched.—Bothe: ἀρ’ οἶσθά τι Ζεύς.—Meineke: ἀρ’ οἶσθα δὴ Ζεύς.

(2) Those which alter v. 3, leaving v. 2 untouched.—Dindorf: ἐλλείπον for ὅποῖον.—Paley: οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅποῖον οὐχὶ νῶν ζώσαιν τελεῖ (*Journ. Phil.* x. p. 16). He thinks that ἔτι was a gloss (due to the frequency of its combination elsewhere with ζῆν), and that, when ἔτι had crept into the text, οὐκ ἔσθ’ was erroneously omitted.—Blaydes: ἦ ποῖον, or τὸ λοιπὸν, for ὅποῖον.

(3) Those which change, or transpose, words in both verses.—Heimsoeth (*Krit. Stud.* 1. 211): ἀρ’ οἶσθά πού τι τῶν ἀπ’ Οἰδίπου κακῶν | ὅποῖον οὐ Ζεύς νῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ;—Nauck: ἀρ’ οἶσθ’ ὅτι Ζεύς νῶν ἔτι ζώσαιν τελεῖ | ὅποῖον οὐχὶ τῶν ἀπ’ Οἰδίπου κακῶν; As Moriz Schmidt says, this would naturally mean, ‘Knowest thou what Zeus fulfils for us, which does not belong to the woes from Oedipus?’—Moriz Schmidt (1880): ἀρ’ ἔσθ’ ὅτι Ζεύς τῶν ἀπ’ Οἰδίπου κακῶν | εἰκεν