

τεύχη φέρονται κενά, βορᾶς κεχρημένοι,
κρωσσούς θ' ὕδρηλους.

*LSJ*⁹ defines ὕδρηλος as “damp, moist” and so it would seem difficult to defend the received reading here. To be sure, one might think that we are supposed to imagine jugs so empty that they are no more than damp on their inside bottoms. But how could Silenus, catching sight of the Greek strangers from some distance, ascertain their inner condition? An easy and obvious improvement would be ὕδρηροῦς (= ὕδατηροῦς): Silenus observes that they are carrying jars or jugs for fetching water.

If this emendation is so simple and yields such good sense, why has it not been proposed? The answer appears when we turn to Aeschylus, fr. 44 Mette (96 Nauck²) of *Kabeiroi*, which presents a collocation consciously or unconsciously imitated by Euripides:

a.) Pollux VI 23: ...καὶ “οἶνηρός” ...καὶ Αἰσχύλος. “μήποτε κρωσσούς / μητ' οἶνηρούς / μηθ' ὕδατηρούς¹) / λ(ε)ῖπεν ἀφνεοῖσι δόμοισιν”

b.) Antiatt. [Phrynichus] p. 115, 3 Bekker “ὕδρηλούς” πῖθους καὶ “οἶνηρούς” Αἰσχύλος Κα<β>εῖροις.

Fr. 44 b seems to suggest that something is wrong with the lexicon. Since the fragment is obviously describing jars for water and jars for wine, this notice appears to establish that ὕδρηλος can mean “for water” (and consequently that the received reading of *Cyc.* 89 is sound). However Mette fails to acknowledge that ὕδρηρός is in fact the ms. reading reported by Bekker and that ὕδρηλος is Nauck's emendation. Nauck gave no reason for this emendation but *faute de mieux* I would suppose he offered it under the influence of *Cyc.* 89. The reasoning is not compelling since ὕδρηλος is evidently not elsewhere encountered as a synonym for ὕδατηρός. On the whole it would appear more judicious to leave the Aeschylean fragment as found and emend *Cyc.* 89.

The University of California (Irvine)

Dana Ferrin Sutton

1) Mette prints this word in daggers but it might be preferable to acknowledge it as a v. l.