

SHORTER NOTES

SOPHOCLES, *O. T.* 230–2

In *CR* N. S. 10 (1960), 7, I supported L. Purgold's emendation of ἄλλον to ἄλλος in *O. T.* 230, accepted by Elmsley, wrongly discarded by all editors since, and now omitted even from the apparatus criticus of R. D. Dawe's recent Teubner edition of Sophocles. May I now add that the emendation was also defended, at greater length, by M. Furness in *CR* 13 (1899), 195–7? The 1899 editor of *CR* reproduced, at the end of Furness's article, the succinct and trenchant Latin in which, in the year 1802, Purgold defended his emendation. He called it Purgold's 'somewhat neglected' emendation. It is to be hoped that there will not be a further hundred years of neglect.

Attempts by J. C. Kamerbeek (in his 1967 edition) and others to defend ἄλλον fail to meet adequately the crucial point about the reward that is offered in lines 231–2. It seems absurd that a reward should be offered to a citizen who informs against a stranger, but not to one who informs against a fellow-citizen. We have here not Attic law, but law by king's proclamation; and Oedipus offers to the citizens not the carrot but the stick as their inducement. In line 226 he *orders* them to give him the information, as their patriotic duty, and in 236 ff. he threatens dire penalties if they do not. There is no need for him to offer a reward to a citizen, still less to single out as particularly reward-worthy a citizen who informs against a stranger. The only class of person to whom he might reasonably offer a reward is a foreigner who, not having a stake in the city himself, might well be unwilling to come forward unless it were made worth his while. Therefore we must read ἄλλος, not optionally but perforce.

Polytechnic of North London

N. B. BOOTH

PROPERTIUS 4.7.26 AGAIN

laesit et obiectum tegula curta caput.

In *CQ* N.S. 28 (1978), 242, Frances Muecke, quoting Beroaldus, rightly understood this line to refer to a funerary practice. In default of ancient parallels the author offered us a modern one from a novel *I vicerè* by Federico De Roberto, first published in 1894. But even before De Roberto's novel was published, Vincenzo Padula, in his curious work *Pauca Quae in Sexto Aurelio Propertio Vincentius Padula ab Acro Animadvertabat*¹ (Naples, 1871), had explained Prop. 4.7.26 by reference to popular custom:

Testa . . . capiti demortuae Cynthiae pro pulvillo subjecta, subjicitur adhuc iis, quum moriuntur, qui vitam agunt monasticam. Ex [quo] conficitur consuetudinem illam . . .

¹ Now reprinted in P. V. Tomaszuk, *A Vincenzo Padula* (Aquila, 1971).
Romantic Interpretation of Propertius: