complex and even systematic that technique may be—is devoid of much interest. Speculative claims as to which ‘effects’ a poet may have ‘intended’ grossly devalue and misrepresent the essence of poetic composition, as linguistic poetics has made abundantly clear. For the *Batrachomyomachia*, I hope to have shown that the crude compositional ‘grab bag’ technique generally imputed to the poem requires serious qualification, leading to a new appreciation not of the poem’s stylistic ‘merits’, but of the intricacy and nature of its composition.

NEW HAVEN, Yale University  
B. VINE


2) Ludwich omits, for some reason, reference to the additional line-final occurrence of ἀχθος ἀροὺρης # at Od. 20.379. (In accordance with linguistic practice, as well as some recent work on Greek poetry, I used the symbol ‘#’ to designate the line-initial or line-final verse boundary.)

3) The variant reading ἐν πτέρυγοι, although hardly compelling, has at least some Homeric support; still less likely is the variant ἐν γαίη, which according to Ludwich’s plausible explanation (ad loc.) is ‘aus einer Glosse eingedrungen’, cf. Hesych. διαπέδου, ἔδαφος, γη.


5) Here one may note that the line-final δισπρωμὸν ἀνδρα # at Batr. 282 (the only other occurrence of δισπρωμὸς in the poem) constitutes, in effect, a morphological and semantic conflation of these two subtypes. (Ludwich ad loc. (op. cit. 413) merely cites one of the instances of δισπρωμὸς ἐκτωρ, without further comment.)

6) Thus Lawrence J. Bliquez, *Frogs and Mice and Athens*, TAPA 107 (1977), 12.

7) *Untersuchungen zur Batrachomyomachie* (Mcisenheim am Glen 1978).

8) Thus, in one of the rare reviews of Wölke’s monograph, Ken Dowden, in *CR* 30 (1980), 136, describes the poem as one of ‘irredeemable mediocrity’. In a similar vein, note Jasper Griffin’s slighting stylistic comments on the ‘banality, inexactness, and repetition’ characteristic of the Epic Cycle in general, *JHS* 97 (1977), 48-52.

9) See e.g. Bliquez (op. cit. n. 6), 12 and 24.

10) For a comprehensive overview of the dating problem, see Wölke (op. cit. n. 7), 46 ff., with detailed analysis of essentially equivocal metrical criteria, 70-84.

PHAIODRA’S RISKY HORSEMANSHIP:  
EURIPIDES’ *HIPPOLYTOS* 232-238

In his commentary, *Euripides. Hippolytос* (Oxford 1964), lines 232-238, W. S. Barrett is puzzled by the use of the words ἀναστράφην and παρακόπησ-τευ in the nurse’s speech. Phaidra has just revealed an insane passion for...
hunting and horses before the nurse uses the metaphor which troubles Barrett:

\[\text{Τρ. \ η \ τόδιν \ αὖ \ παράφρων \ ἀρρυσάς \ ἑποκ;}
\[\text{νῦν \ δὴ \ μὲν \ ὅρος \ βάε' \ ἐπὶ \ θῆρας}
\[\text{πόθουν \ ἐκτέλει, \ νῦν \ δ' \ αὖ \ φαμάθοις}
\[\text{ἐπ' \ ἀκυμάντοις \ πώλων \ ἐρακαί.}
\[\text{τάδε \ μαντεῖας \ ἁξία \ πολλῆς,}
\[\text{ὅτεν \ εἰ \ θεῶν \ ἄνακεράζει}
\[\text{kai \ παρακόπτει \ ἠφέναι, \ ὧν \ παῖ.}
\]

The major problem he finds is in the scholia treating \textit{ἀνακεράζειν} as drawing up on the reins so as to upset the chariot, i.e. Phaidra’s mind, while \textit{σειρά}, which normally means a cord, in association with horses means not the rein but the trace pulled by the tracehorse (\textit{σειραφόρος})\textsuperscript{1}. In view then of the scholia, the god would seize the reins and pull back violently, upsetting the chariot.

But there is a strong possibility that Euripides meant \textit{παρακόπτειν} to be literally ‘pulling’ the trace ‘up’ or ‘back’. The examples of the word given by Barrett have to do with drawing up or checking with a line, though later authors used the word to mean reining in horses. In Apollonios of Rhodes 1.391, one of Barrett’s examples, it refers to a ship being checked by a cable, after it has been launched. In Barrett’s second example, Aristophanes, fr. 561, the word would seem to refer to pulling up a flame on a wick:

\[\text{εἰσιβηθ \ θ' \ ἐκάτα ὑκτα \ μοι \ φλόγα' \ ἄνακεράζεις \ ἐπὶ \ τῷ \ λυχνίῳ: \ a \ probable}
\[\text{conjecture \ for \ the \ φλογάνας \ ἥραζες \ or \ φλόγα \ ἥξες \ of \ the \ mss.} (εἰσιβηθ
\[\text{is \ a \ cheap \ form \ of \ lamp).}

Barrett finds less difficulty with \textit{παρακόπτειν} which he takes to mean ‘sends off the track’. Here the verb is quite strong and might better be translated as ‘knocks off the track’.

Verbs with \textit{ἀνά} vary between ‘up’ and ‘back’, e.g. \textit{ἀνέλκω}, \textit{ἀνασπάω \ ἀναδίδωμι}. ‘Up’ may be more suitable here, even if ‘back’ is appropriate. Euripides may very well have intended to suggest an action as mysterious and supernatural as possible. This would be the case if, while the driver were controlling the reins, an unexpected force suddenly pulled up, or a little less preferably, back, on the trace, thus overturning the trace horse. Hesychios glosses \textit{ἀνακεράζουσιν} with \textit{ἀνθέλκουσι} —‘check, draw back’, and \textit{ἀνακόπτουσι} ‘drive back, push back’. The latter seems somewhat out of place and may result from confusion between the use of this verb with \textit{ὁχήσα} from \textit{ὁχεύει} (\textit{Od}. 21.47), ‘holdings, bolts, bars’ of the doors—close to \textit{ὁχος} and \textit{ὁχημα}, ‘chariot’. The \textit{ἀνακόπτειν} might also have been influenced by \textit{παρακόπτειν} in the Euripides passage. More relevant may be Hesychios’ gloss on \textit{ἀνακεράζει}: \textit{D} 70 \textit{ἀνακεράζει}: \textit{ἀνορὼειν ποιεῖ}, \textit{ἀνερθίζει}. Εὐριπίδης \textit{Ἰππολίτως} ετεφανηφόρω (237) \textsuperscript{2}.}