

Interea irato securus in æquore dormis,
 Nec curas vasto reboantes gurgite fluctus,
 Nec conjuratum cœli pelagique furorem :
 Dormis purpureo tectus velamine ; dormis
 Pulchra reclinatus materno in pectore colla :
 Ah ! si tantorum non esses ipse malorum
 Nescius, hunc forsan lenires, nate, dolorem ;
 Flensque simul, lacrymisque rigans puerilibus ora,
 Præberes miseræ solamina dulcia matri.
 At potius molli, proles carissima, somno
 Perge trui : pariter sopitis dormiat æquor
 Fluctibus, et teneant hostilia flamina venti.
 Tuque meæ genitor sobolis, tu Perseos auctor
 Jupiter, hos luctus, hoc lamentabile fatum
 Verte, precor : vel, si temeraria vota videntur,
 Ob natum insontem miserandæ ignosce parenti.” F. M.

Scholias in Plutum Aristophanis (vs. 1.) emendatur.

Ἀπαυδᾶ δὲ οὐ διὰ τὴν ΜΑΧΗΝ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἐπαχθὲς τῶν δεσποτῶν.]
 “Ante legebatur nullo sensu μάχην emendationem [τύχην] a L. Kustero comprobata adoptavi. Τύχην conditionem, sortem servilem vocat : ut ad γ. 21. οὐδὲ μὴν δούλοις ἐνειδίξουσα τὸ τῆς τύχης ὑποδείξ. Τύχαι παρ’ Ἑλλησιν, inquit Schol. Eurip. ad Hec. v. 865. καὶ αἱ ταπεινὰί τάξεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὑποπεταγμέναι, καὶ αἱ ὑψηλαὶ καὶ ἐπικρατούσαι ubi, quas dudum pro πράξεις reposueram, τάξεις clare confirmat Cod. D’O. Diosogenes apud Stob. Παντοδαποὶ βίοι καὶ τύχαι ἀνθρώπων Τύχην inter alia Suidas interpretatur ἐπιτήδευμα.”
 HEMSTERHUSIUS. Τύχην lectio, quam comprobavit Kusterus, est ex conjectura J. C. Pauwii, sensui potius quam ductui literarum morem gerentis. Lege, una tantum litera commutata, ΜΑΧΗΝ. Ceterum confusæ sunt voces τυχεῖν et λαχεῖν in Soph. Antig. 699. ubi vide Brunckium, ut et ad Electr. 364. In Antig. 387. δίκη impressorum est, codicum omnium τύχη. N. A.

Remarks on a Passage in Stobæus.

THE following passage in Stobæus Ecl. I. 52. p. 296. ed. Heeren, must be very obscure to readers unacquainted with the philosophy of Plato ; and the obscurity of it is greatly increased by the incorrectness of one word, the emendation of which will restore it to its true meaning.

Οἱ μὲν γὰρ εὐθὺς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶ τῶ σώματι τῶ ὀργανικῶ συνοικίζουσιν, ὥσπερ οἱ πλείστοι τῶν Πλατωνικῶν οἱ δὲ μεταξὺ τῆς τε ἀσωμάτου ψυχῆς, καὶ τῆς ἐγγυλιώδους αἰθέρια καὶ οὐράνια καὶ πνευματικά

περιβλήματα, περιεμπόχοντα τὴν νοερὰν ζωὴν, προβεβλήσθαι μὲν αὐτῆς φρουρᾶς ἕνεκεν [λέγουσι], ὑπηρετεῖν δὲ αὐτῇ καθάπερ ὅχηματα, συμμετρως ὃ αὐ καὶ πρὸς τὸ στερεὸν σῶμα συμβιβάζειν μέσοις τισὶ κοινοῖς συνδέσμοις αὐτὴν συνάπτοντα.

This passage in its present state is unintelligible, owing to the word ἀγγελιάδους; but if ὀστραδέους is substituted for it, the true meaning of the whole will be according to the following translation: "Some immediately conjoin the soul to the organic body, as most of the Platonists. But others say, that between the incorporeal soul, and the *testaceous* body, ethereal, celestial, and pneumatic garments circularly invest the intellectual life, and surround it as a guard. They add, that these vestments are subservient to the incorporeal soul as vehicles; and that they are commensurately adapted to the solid body, conjoining this soul to it, by certain middle common bonds."

The term ὀστραδέης is very frequently used by Platonic writers to denote the human body; and was originally derived by them from the Phædrus of Plato, where speaking of the felicity of the soul in a former life, when she was united to divinity, he says "that she was then liberated from this external body, to which we are now bound like an oyster to its shell." καὶ ἀσημαντοὶ τούτου ὁ νῦν δὲ σῶμα περιφέροντες διομάζομεν ὀστρίου τρόπον δεδεδεσμευμένοι.

By the *immortal soul* therefore in this passage, Porphyry means the rational and intellectual part of our soul; and this, according to the best of the Platonists, is united to the *testaceous* body by two media, an ethereal and a pneumatic vehicle, in the former of which the rational soul eternally resides, and in the latter she suffers the punishment of her guilt.

THOMAS TAYLOR.

Classical Criticism.

IT is observed by Mr. Blomfield (Gloss. Æsch. Theb. ad v. 965.) that *ἐν* is to be there rendered *simul*; and the same remark is made by Professor Monk in his notes on the Electra of Sophocles (v. 713.) Some have hence concluded that the particle *ἐν* may by some unaccountable transformation be changed, on occasion, into an adverb, and used as *ὀμοῦ* might be, entirely losing its nature as a preposition. If these critics had expressed what I apprehend to be their meaning with greater strictness and accuracy, that mistake, which introduces an anomaly into the regular structure of the Greek language, only to be paralleled by the antiptoses of the scholiasts and grammarians, would not have arisen.

Mr. Blomfield refers (evidently with approbation) to Mr. Elmsley's note on the 27th line of the *Cædipus Tyrannus* of