

I know of no other treatment of the myth that says explicitly that Apollo and Cassandra were lovers, nor any that accuse her of infidelity or of depriving Apollo of the child he would naturally expect. But it is quite possible that a version known to Aeschylus and to his first audience has perished without a trace.<sup>24</sup> I have noted above that the version I have argued for would apparently be mythically unique in its sequel, and it may be thought that we have merely exchanged one mythical anomaly (a girl's successful resistance to the desire of a god) for another. But the exchange is much better than even, for it is not merely the regularities of myth but the text of the play that implies that Cassandra was ravished by Apollo, and the new version allows us to explain the text we have without recourse to the hypothesis that Aeschylus was merely being vague. Add that it vindicates the manuscript readings in 1207, readings usually rejected by editors on the grounds of sense but which offer no other indication of corruption, and the evidence in its favor is strong.

If the foregoing is correct, it will, of course, make some difference to the interpretation of the play. Cassandra is one of the play's most sympathetic characters, but she is a Priamid, like Paris. In its meditative stasima the chorus has repeatedly spoken of Trojan guilt and related it convincingly to the corrupting power of Trojan wealth. Now Cassandra's confession shows that she was not exempt from its effects; for if the suppletion offered *exempli gratia* at 1204a represents the sense of the original, as 1205 suggests, Cassandra's treatment of Apollo is shown to be the result of pride. Her initial rejection of the god is regarded, somewhat surprisingly, as the contempt of someone grown proud in prosperity. But presumably a similar attitude of carelessness where the gods are concerned, also born of wealth, lies behind the breaking of her word to Apollo, an act more obviously reprehensible and one that comes naturally to a descendant of Laomedon. More tentatively we may suggest that if Cassandra did away with her child by Apollo, the theme of children as victims of dynastic luxury and ambition, notably the sacrifice of Iphigenia and the murder of Thyestes' children, receives one further exemplification.<sup>25</sup>

DAVID KOVACS  
*University of Virginia*

---

*Sophocles: "Oedipus Rex"* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 6–24. In our passage, however, the contradiction seems gratuitous, since Aeschylus could easily have written, e.g.:

Χο. ἤδη τέχναισιν ἐνθέοις ἡρημένη;  
Κα. ἤδη τὰ μέλλοντ' ὥς παρόντ' εἶδον σαφῶς.

24. Cf. the nearly complete disappearance from extant myth of the figure of Pleisthenes, twice alluded to in the *Agamemnon*: see Fraenkel, "*Agamemnon*," 3:740.

25. I would like to thank J. S. Clay, H. Lloyd-Jones, and W. C. Scott for their helpful suggestions. Their agreement with my contentions is, of course, not to be assumed. I am also grateful to this journal's anonymous referees for salutary criticisms.

#### THE ODE AND ANTODE IN THE PARABASIS OF *CLOUDS*

K. J. Dover comments on the invocation with which, as in other Aristophanic parabases, the chorus of *Clouds* invites the gods to join its dance, that "it is notable that the Chorus resumes its role as clouds (Aither is 'our father,' 569),

and does not simply sing as a chorus of Athenians at a festival.”<sup>1</sup> G. M. Sifakis explains an apparent contradiction between the piety of the song and the acquiescence of the clouds in Socrates’ denial of the gods’ existence earlier by insisting that “these invocations are not made by the chorus in character but in its capacity as comic chorus. . . . There is, however, nothing to prevent the chorus from momentarily changing its point of view in order to invite also . . . ‘our glorious father, most holy Aether.’”<sup>2</sup> Sifakis stresses that in such songs the chorus invites the gods to the actual, present performance, a task it can perform only as “comic chorus,” though license may allow traces of dramatic identity. Yet divinities may invite other divinities to dance with them, and the identity of this chorus is somewhat more complex than has been recognized.

In the ode (563–74), the chorus invokes Zeus, Poseidon, Aether, and Helios: Zeus as ὑψιμέδοντα . . . θεῶν τύραννον, Poseidon as steward of the trident and μοχλευτήν of earth and sea, Aether as not only their father but as βιοθρέμμονα πάντων, and Helios as he who covers the land with his rays and is great among both gods and mortals. In the antode also (595–606) four gods are invoked, in precise correspondence to the ode.<sup>3</sup> Just where the ode presents ἡμέτερον πατέρ’, the antode shows ἡμετέρα θεός, Athena. If Aether can be “our father” only to clouds, Athena is “our goddess” only to Athenians. The rest of the antode shows another shift: Phoebus is invoked as lord of Delos, Artemis as the goddess of Ephesus, Athena as ἐπιχώριος and πολιοῦχος, and Dionysus is characterized by his connection with Parnassus and Delphi. The gods of the ode are gods of nature—Helios, Poseidon as god of earthquake, Aether—and are seen in relation to other gods—Zeus as king and Helios as honored by both gods and mortals. Those of the antode, on the other hand, are identified by cult-places and are associated with human worshippers, the κόραι Λυδῶν who honor Artemis and the Delphian maenads of Dionysus: the chorus of the ode sees the gods from a perspective appropriate to clouds, as cosmic forces, whereas that of the antode sees them from the point of view of human worshippers. The chorus is therefore not in character only “momentarily,” but throughout the ode. The antode, on the other hand, identifies the chorus firmly as Athenian singers, creating a clear distinction between the two choral personalities that seems to be unique in the Aristophanic corpus.

RUTH SCODEL

*The University of Michigan*

1. *Aristophanes: “Clouds”* (Oxford, 1968), p. 172.

2. *Parabases and Animal Choruses* (London, 1971), p. 57.

3. On the symmetries of the poem and its close relation to traditional cult-poetry, see E. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Rome, 1962), pp. 196–98.

### THE THIRD REGNAL YEAR OF EPARCHIUS AVITUS: A REPLY

In an earlier number of this journal Ralph W. Mathisen presented a wide-ranging discussion of the end of the reign and life of the emperor Avitus and a