

Graeci that Page favoured the same view; nor is any other view supportable. Now in Sophocles or Euripides it is legitimate to speak of aeolic cola in the context of dactylo-epitrite (cf. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 2nd ed., pp. 178 ff.); in Pindar or Bacchylides it is not, and although the evidence for Simonides is less abundant, there is nothing in it to justify an analysis which would dissociate him from Pindar and from his own nephew and group him with the younger tragedians.

The force of my argument from style must depend on individual sensibilities. In trying to give my feeling an objective basis, I picked on the articulated participle with the sandwiched prepositional phrase as the prosaic feature. I now think that it is in part the flat phrase *ἐν Θερμοπύλαις* itself; surely anyone will be able to appreciate the difference between *τῇ ἐν Πλαταιῇσι μάχῃ* (Hdt. 7. 231) and *τῶν πρὸ Κιθαιρώων μαχῶν* (Pind. *P.* 1. 77).

The strongest argument against a mention of Thermopylae in line 1 still seems to me to be the words *μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Λεωνίδας* in line 7, which suggest that those who fell at Thermopylae are brought into the poem as a notable illustration of general truths which came to mind in some other connection. Page thinks it sufficient answer to refer to Bowra's theory (*Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., p. 349) that the poem was sung at a shrine at Sparta dedicated to the fallen of Thermopylae, and that Leonidas is mentioned separately because he had a shrine of his own near by. But the fact that Leonidas is identified (after being named) as *Σπάρτας βασιλεὺς* does not particularly suggest performance at Sparta. And if *ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σηκὸς οἰκέταν εὐδοξίαν Ἑλλάδος εἴλετο* is a particular statement about a certain precinct, what is it that Leonidas bears witness to? I do not believe that the altar in line 3 can be a literal altar dedicated to the fallen of Thermopylae at Sparta or anywhere else, because such an altar—the existence of which is unattested—could not have been called their tomb, or (what Simonides does not say) a substitute for their tomb. I take the sense to be that men who die for their country have the status of heroes; their tomb has the status of an altar, because people approach it with reverence and bring offerings to it.

Bedford College, London

M. L. WEST

SOPHOCLES, ELECTRA 610–11¹

ὄρῳ μένος πνέουσιν—εἰ δὲ σὺν δίκῃ
ξύνεστι, τοῦδε φροντίδ' οὐκέτ' εἰσορῶ.

THAT both parts of the sentence refer to the same person is now generally agreed; it is not so much that a change of subject would be, as the commentators are wont to say, 'un-Sophoclean', but simply that it would be awkward and clumsy. But to whom do the lines refer?

D. B. Gregor (*C.R.* lxiv [1950], 87–8) argues for Clytaemnestra, but despite the apparent force of some of his arguments (e.g. that the *ξύνεστι*-clause refers

¹ I am grateful to Professor H. Lloyd-Jones, Mr. N. G. Wilson, and Dr. M. Winterbottom, whose comments and criti-

cism have spurred me to greater research into this idea.

to Clytaemnestra because it is she who picks up *φροντίδ'*, as Electra, in 616, picks up Clytaemnestra's *αἰσχύνῃς* of 615; but *φροντίδ'* could still be Electra's) I cannot agree. He adds too that the reference to *δίκη* echoes the motif of Electra's speech, but it is just as much the motif of Clytaemnestra's speech, in fact more so.¹ Finally, the first part of the sentence, it is true, could be asserted by the chorus on the strength of some such gesture as the heaving of the bosom, but I cannot see how they could then deduce that Clytaemnestra 'no longer cares whether justice is on her side'.

Now, another of Gregor's points is that since the reference is to loss of temper confirmation can come only from seeing which of the two does in fact lose her temper. He overlooks the possibility that it could be confirmed also by one of them *already having lost* their temper, cf. 611, *οὐκέτ' εἰσορῶ*. It seems to me that this occurs at 595, for it is here that Electra abandons argument—

ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ οὐδὲ νουθετεῖν ἔξεστί σε

—and henceforward utters naught but abuse and reproach, cf. Clytaemnestra's *ὑβρισεῖν* of 613. In 597–8 Clytaemnestra is more a mistress than a mother to her, in 599 it is Clytaemnestra who is responsible for her *βίος μοχθηρός*, and all culminates in 604–5 where she assures Clytaemnestra that, were she able, she would have been only too willing to rear Orestes as avenger of the crime. The final *coup de bec* comes when she adds sneeringly that, if she is *ἀναιδής*, then like mother like daughter. If Electra isn't *μένος πνέουσα, τί πνεῖ*;

We now seem to be heading towards the position advocated by Jebb, viz., that the chorus are referring to Electra; but this too I find unacceptable in that I doubt whether it is the chorus which speaks these lines. Jebb sees this utterance as 'exactly parallel with that of the chorus in *Ant.* 471 f.' (after Antigone's defiant speech to Creon), and concludes that, since there it refers to the last speaker, so too must it here, i.e. Electra. But the parallelism is by no means exact: in that play the chorus is (at this stage in the play at any rate) against Antigone, as someone defying the authority of the state, and thus it is in character for them to say what they do. Here, however, the chorus is sympathetic towards Electra throughout the play—even the reproof of 213–20 is made *εὐνοία γ' . . . μάτηρ ὥσεί τις πιστά* (233–4)—and thus this accusation is thoroughly out of character and unexpected. Moreover it is not only *what* the chorus supposedly says that is unexpected, but *that* it says:² in *Ant.* the chorus' presence is felt throughout the scene (speaking at 386 beforehand, and 526, 574, 576 after), whereas here, after the *στάσιμον* 472–515, the chorus' next utterance is at 662, after the entry of the paedagogus, i.e. in the next scene of the *ἐπεισόδιον*. It might be argued that such two-line choral utterances are very familiar, and occur often after a long speech, especially in agons; but they are by no means necessary. Excellent examples are afforded by *Ant.* 988 f. (the altercation between Teiresias and Creon), and, most notably, *Phil.* 1222 f., where the chorus, having announced the approach of Odysseus and

¹ The root *δικ-* occurs 4 times in her speech (521, 528, 538, 551) as opposed to 3 in Electra's (560, 561, 583); and *v. infra*.

² I can find no other examples in Sophocles of a chorus making only one utterance in a scene, and giving no other indication of their presence or interest in the proceedings. The closest parallels would appear to be the

choral utterances at *O.T.* 404 and *Phil.* 317, but neither occurs in such a compact scene as this in Electra, and both have the chorus saying, at the transition from the previous scene, words to the effect of 'here comes so-and-so' (*O.T.* 297, *Phil.* 210), thus indicating that they will be listening in on what follows.

put off their own departure (thereby showing their interest in what ensues), do not speak at all in a scene of 250 lines, containing three long speeches. But let us suppose, with Jebb, that the chorus are here castigating Electra as in 213–20, surely it is more likely that they would have spoken *to* Electra, not *about* her? Sophocles could have written such had he wished, for *ὄρω σε* presents no metrical difficulties, and even if he were short of space he could have lost the syllable altogether with *ὄρω σ'*. Again, if these were two lines from the chorus referring to Electra, one would have expected her to reply immediately to such a charge, whereas it is Clytaemnestra who apparently takes up *φροντίδ'*. It could be said that Clytaemnestra mistakenly thinks *φροντίδ'* refers to her, but there seems no dramatic point for such an error.

As a solution to the complexity of contradictions in which we now find ourselves, I suggest that these lines should be taken away from the chorus and assigned to Clytaemnestra. In this way we can still have the lines referring to Electra, without automatically falling into the (I think) unacceptable position held by Jebb. As was hinted previously it is Clytaemnestra more than Electra who is concerned and convinced that *δίκη* is on her side: compare the confident 528, *ἡ γὰρ Δίκη νυν εἶλεν . . .*, with the lack of interest of 560, *εἴτ' οὐν δικάως εἴτε μή*. As Gregor says, 'Electra is only replying in kind to Clytaemnestra', and is in fact taking up the challenge thrown out by Clytaemnestra in 551, 'make sure your own judgement is just before blaming me'. (Note too the positions of these phrases in the speeches: Clytaemnestra ends her speech with the concern for justice shown in 551, Electra within three lines displays the comparative lack of concern exhibited in 560.) Thus it is not surprising to find that the second half of the sentence 610–11, *εἰ δὲ σὺν δίκῃ ξύνεσσι, τοῦδε φροντίδ' οὐκέτ' εἰσορώ*, echoes closely the thought of 529, [*Δίκη*] *ἡ χρῆν σ' ἀρήγειν, εἰ φρονοῦς' ἐτύγχανες*. 610–14 are now dramatically very effective: Clytaemnestra turns away in despair and appeals to the powers that be (or, more specifically, to those whose special concern is *ὑβρις*?) to witness Electra's conduct.¹

An interesting feature emerges if these lines are assigned to Clytaemnestra, for we would then have numerical parallelism in this short altercation: Clytaemnestra—6 lines, Electra—6, Clyt.—2, El.—2, Clyt.—2, El.—2, Clyt.—2, El.—2. Though by no means an *holländische Regel*, this feature has gone comparatively unnoticed, and yet I feel it occurs often enough elsewhere in Sophocles² to merit the description 'in the manner of Sophocles'.

Worcester College, Oxford

D. J. LILLEY

¹ Such quasi-soliloquies are especially common in Euripides, cf. *Hipp.* 616 f., part of which is 'addressed to empty air' (Barrett), and again 916 f., where Theseus, though conscious of Hippolytus' presence, nevertheless ignores him and 'utters his condemnation as though speaking to himself' (Barrett), esp. 943–5, where he refers to him explicitly in the third person, in language

similar to that of *El.* 613–14.

² I cite a small variety of examples to show the different patterns and formulations that are possible: *O.T.* 543 f., simple two line and one-line parallelisms; *O.T.* 726 f., variations of simple parallelism and definite 2–1 and 1–2 patterns; *O.T.* 1178 f., four-line parallelism; *Ant.* 726 f., two-line, one-line and four-line parallelisms.