K. W. Krüger in his *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen* (§ 69, 32, 15) drew attention to the fact that καὶ used in the sense of 'also' sometimes does not refer to the next word but to a whole clause. His only example was the use of ὅ δὲ καὶ, e.g. in Xen. An. I 3, 13 ἀνίσταντο οἱ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτομάτου . . . οἱ δὲ καὶ ὑπ’ ἐκεῖνου ἐγκέλεστοι (cf. Denniston, *GP*, 305). We may compare ἂ καὶ 'or, what is another possibility' (e.g. Hom. α 175 [Ameis-Hentze wrongly 'schon'], 268, β 327 [Ameis-Hentze wrongly 'gar'; similarly Stanford 'even'], γ 217, η 263, θ 206 [Ameis-Hentze wrongly: "womit er für sich das Bedenkliche des Wettlaufs andeutet"], Thuc. VI 80, 5 and Steup *ad loc.*, Pl. Prot. 313 b 2, 316 b 3, Io 535 b 6, Phd. 94 b 7, Phdr. 235 c 4 and de Vries *ad loc.*, Ar. Poet. 1448 a 5, 1450 a 7; see further Denniston, 306), εἶτα καὶ (e.g. Hom. γ 91, Aesch. *Suppl.* 186; see further Denniston, 305, and my note on Pl. Meno 71 b 6, Mnemos. 1957, 289), and εἶ καὶ (cf. Denniston, 304-5, who wrongly thinks, however, that καὶ is "often approximating in sense to ὅ"; cf. Hom. σ 371 εἶ δ’ ὅ καὶ; see also my note on Men. *Epir*. 326, Mnemos. 1974, 31).

Some more examples of καὶ 'also' belonging to a whole clause are Hom. φ 29 (Ameis-Hentze wrongly 'sogar ihn selbst'), Pind. P. 1, 35, Hdt. I 201 (εἶτα δὲ οἵτινες καὶ), Thuc. I 81, 3, Pl. *Meno* 71 c 1 (cf. my note in Mnemos. 1957, 290).

The same applies to καὶ used in the sense of 'actually'. Among the examples of transposition listed by Denniston (326-7) there are some cases in which it is more natural to take καὶ to refer to the whole clause, e.g. Soph. Ant. 280 (Jebb wrongly thinks that καὶ "belongs solely to μεστῶσι") (cf. my note in Mnemos. 1957, 290).

The reading δοσίς σὺν γυναικὶ πέλεται at v. 100 is unacceptable because of the unmetrical πέλεται. I would like to accept Meineke’s emendation: δοσίσων γυναικὶ πείθεται. He presumably thought the corruption began with δοσίσων (= δοσῖσων). At the only other place
this pronoun occurs in the poem, v. 49, all our manuscripts give δυνατόν. A scribe may have read the δυτικόν at v. 100 of the manuscript he was copying as δυτικός σύν, which then caused πέλετα to be changed to πέλετα, since δυτικός σύν γνωστό πέλετα makes no sense. Verdenius objects that 'die Unzuverlässigkeit der Frau kommt erst 108 ff. zur Sprache' 2). I think, however, that the unreliability of wives is already implied at v. 94, where women are said to exist μηχανή Διός, and at vv. 97 f., where what wives seem to be is contrasted with what they actually are.

We can translate vv. 103-7 as follows: ‘Whenever a man thinks he is especially happy at home by divine fate or human favor, she (his wife) finding an occasion for blame arms herself for battle, for (γάρ) where there is a wife, they (husbands) may not gladly welcome a guest into their homes’. What troubles us here is the sequence of thought and the meaning of the γάρ-clause. How do vv. 106 f., which are introduced by an explanatory γάρ, explain vv. 103-05? And why should husbands hesitate to invite guests into their homes? In answer to the last question, Verdenius plausibly suggests that wives may prove to be sexually promiscuous and start to flirt with guests 3). The charge of adultery, which Wilhelm convincingly argues is leveled against wives at vv. 108-11 4), seems to be already anticipated at vv. 106 f. This is easy to believe, since adultery must have often entailed a breach of friendship between husband and guest, there being little opportunity for wives to meet men out of the home.

But how does the fact that the wife is likely to be promiscuous explain vv. 103-05? What does it mean to say: Whenever a man thinks he is especially happy at home, his wife finding an occasion for blame arms herself for battle, for a wife is likely to be promiscuous? There is something wrong here, and this, I suggest, is the translation of εὔροσεα μόμον as ‘she finding an occasion for blame’. I think the correct translation is ‘she getting blame’, which gives us a much clearer sequence of thought: She getting blame arms herself for battle, for a wife is likely to be promiscuous. The charge of adultery, and vv. 106 f., along with vv. 108-11, explain that she is being blamed for adultery. The battle imagery of v. 105 is appropriate in the description of an adulterous woman, whether we think of a murderous adulteress like Clytemnestra or of one like Chaucer’s Wife of Bath who merely squabbles with her husband to prevent him from suspecting the truth.

We can cite the following parallels in support of the proposed interpretation of εὔροσεα μόμον as ‘she getting blame’: ἀνδρα... ἄρετάν ἐὔροντα, Pind. Ol. 7, 89; τάν ἄπειρονα δύξαν εὔρεϊν, Pind. Pyth.