

of ecstatic frenzy, which ends with lines 31–34 (quoted above). Thus, at the end of this first movement, the poet includes a simile borrowed largely from erotic poetry; it suggests the interpretation that Attis is shunning the yoke of sexual experience. This focuses our attention once again on the terrible mutilation which began this first act of the tragedy of Attis. He is abandoning forever the yoke of and capacity for sexual love, and, as the audience already suspects, he unwittingly takes upon himself

Cybele's cruel yoke of madness and slavery. The simile vividly reflects Attis' own experience of his castration—a vision blinded by delirium, in which he has no more capacity for reason or foresight than the dumb animal to which he is compared—a masterful stroke which in no small way contributes to the final, crushing *peripeteia*.

JUSTIN GLENN

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

### SOPHOCLES *PHILOCTETES* 849–54

ἀλλ' ὃ τι δύνῃ μάκιστον,  
κείνο <δῆ> μοι, κείνο <μοι> λαθραίως 850  
ἐξιδού ὅπως πράξεις.  
οἶσθα γὰρ ὃν αὐδῶμαι,  
εἰ ταῦτ' αὐτῷ γινώμην ἴσχεις,  
μᾶλα τοι ἄπορα πυκνοῖς ἐνδεῖν πάθη.

852 ὃν L<sup>a</sup> A rec: ὦν L rec 853 εἰ ταῦτ' Dobree: εἰ ταῦτ' (ταυτ' A Ven c: ταῖτ' Ven Γ: τὴν αὐτ' Ven b) L A rec: εἴτ' αὐτ' B.

I here print Pearson's OCT and make no comment on 850 save to say that Miss Dale's suggestion<sup>1</sup> to omit δέ both times at 834 and read κείνο μοι, κείνο δὲ λάθρᾳ in the antistrophe is perhaps metrically preferable. The sense is not materially affected by either reading.

My concern here is solely with the readings and interpretation of 851–52; and my contention is that previous editors have been unable to explain this passage satisfactorily because it has always<sup>2</sup> been assumed that the reference to the (apparently) parenthetical οἶσθα ὃν αὐδῶμαι is forward rather than backward. I would maintain that a more natural sequence is for γὰρ to link, in an explanatory capacity, 852 to what *precedes*. I would thus punctuate with a semicolon at πράξεις and a full stop at αὐδῶμαι. 853 then begins with a

strongly marked adversative asyndeton; cf. *Antigone* 1334–35: μέλλοντα ταῦτα. τῶν προκειμένων τι χρὴ πράσσειν; and *Ajax* 470–71: οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα. πείρᾳ τις ζητητέα τοιάδ' κτλ.

This punctuation accepted, there remain two points. (1) At 852 the MSS vary between ὃν and ὦν. Dain reads ὃν, punctuating with full stops after both πράξεις and αὐδῶμαι. Mazon translates: "Tu sais de qui je parle." But what is the point of this oblique reference to the sleeping Philoctetes? The chorus are certainly at pains to insure that Philoctetes does not hear what they propose to do with him, but at no point do they (or Neoptolemus) attempt to conceal the fact that Philoctetes is the subject of their discussion.

My choice, therefore, would be for ὦν,<sup>3</sup> interpreted as a genitive of connection (cf. 439, ἀναξίου μὲν φωτὸς ἐξερήσομαι),<sup>4</sup> referring back to the vague κείνο of 850. In the strophe the chorus have implicitly recommended seizing the moment and making off with the bow while Philoctetes is asleep, a recommendation bluntly rejected by Neoptolemus (839–42), who there maintains that the meaning of the oracle is that it is useless to sail without Philoctetes himself.<sup>5</sup> In the antistrophe the chorus suggest that God will decide whether

1. A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 117–18.

2. A. Dain in his Budé edition is an exception to this generalization.

3. With this reading we must retain the MSS text μενούμεν at 836. The scansion of 836 and 852 is then — — — — —, choriamb plus molossus, a quite acceptable rhythm in this passage: see Dale, *loc. cit.*

4. For the genitive of connection see also R. C. Jebb on Soph. *OC* 307 and W. Rennie on Ar. *Ach.* 306.

5. I deliberately use the word "maintains" to avoid any suggestion that Neoptolemus' words are a literal quotation of the oracle. D. B. Robinson in his excellent article on *Philoctetes* (*CQ*, N.S. XIX [1969], 34–56) makes it quite clear (p. 48) that by this stage of the play Neoptolemus' "human feelings for Philoctetes are already sufficient to make him refuse to abandon him."

Philoctetes comes or not, and then urge Neoptolemus to speak quietly, lest the fevered sleeper perceive what they are planning. Thus, when for a second time they press their argument that Neoptolemus should steal the bow then and there, they use the deliberately vague *κεῖνο* ("that suggestion I made before"), adding, equally cryptically, "you know what I am talking about." They avoid all explicit mention of what the "stealthy accomplishment" is to be.

(2) At 853 the MSS variations all point to a reading *ταύταν*, sharply contrasted, as Jebb saw long ago, with *κεῖνο*. This contrast is even more pointed with the asyndeton: "[But] if you have *this* purpose in relation to this man..." "This man" is clearly Philoctetes,

6. So T. B. L. Webster, "Sophocles *Philoctetes*" (Cambridge, 1970).

and not Odysseus, as some of the editors would wish it.<sup>6</sup> Odysseus is nowhere mentioned in this *kommós*, the audience's attention being wholly directed to Neoptolemus, the chorus, and the figure of the sleeping Philoctetes.

The resolve (*γνώμην*) in question is Neoptolemus' desire to wait until Philoctetes awakes and take both him and his bow to Troy. And the *ἄπορα πάθη*, which the chorus warn are inevitable if this plan is pursued, are the problems both medical and emotional of shanghaiing Philoctetes.

ALAN S. HENRY

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND,  
ARMIDALE, NEW SOUTH WALES

#### THE NUMBER OF SLAVE ROLES IN PLAUTUS' *AULULARIA*

A minor, yet vexing, problem in the structure of the *Aulularia* is the question of how many slave roles there are in the play. Among the *personae* in the Oxford text, W. M. Lindsay lists three slaves in order of appearance: Strobilus, Pythodicus, and servus Lyconidis.

The problem is as follows: in Act II, Scene 2, after Megadorus has completed making the wedding plans with Euclio, he calls to his slave, who must have been on stage during the scene, "heus, Strobile, sequere propere me ad macellum strenue" (264). Scenes 4-6 of Act II establish firmly that Strobilus belongs to Megadorus as he supervises the preparations for his master's wedding to Euclio's daughter and engages in witty repartee about Euclio's meanness with the cooks whom he has hired for the occasion. Scene 7 of Act II, however, bears the superscription Pythodicus, and a slave presumably of that name delivers a monologue, lines 363-70, whose content is such that it should have been delivered by Strobilus as he continued to supervise the cooks. No slave then appears until Act IV,

Scene 1, in which there is a nameless slave (servus Lyconidis) who calls Lyconides *erui meus* (603) and refers to Megadorus as *huic Megadoro* (604). This slave is not certain of Euclio's identity when he first sees him: "atque hic pater est, ut ego opinor, huius erus quam amat <meus>" (619). When Euclio foils this slave's attempt to steal the treasure from the shrine of Fides (Act IV, Scene 4), there is no indication that he knows him, although Euclio certainly would have recognized Strobilus. Additional confusion is added to the problem in lines 697 and 804, in which Lyconides calls his slave by a name which has been emended to †Strobilum† in 697 and †Strolum† in 804.

Various solutions to the question of the number of slaves have been offered, dating from the Beroaldus edition of the *Aulularia* in 1500 to the present time. (1) All three slaves are the same.<sup>1</sup> (2) Megadorus and Lyconides each have a slave. The one belonging to Megadorus in Act II should really be called Pythodicus, notwithstanding the fact that the name Strobilus clearly appears in the text at

1. Some supporters of this theory are T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*<sup>2</sup> (Manchester, 1960), p. 123; E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), p. 235; and B.

Krysiniel-Josefowicz, "Once More about Plautus' *Aulularia*," *Eos*, XLVI (1952-53), 128-29.