

SHORTER NOTES

SOPHOCLES, *OEDIPUS COLONEUS* 174–5

These lines seem to violate the rules concerning word-end in recited anapaests:

∞ -- ∩ |
-- ∩ ∪ ∪ -- ∩ |¹

(a) The mss. offer:

ὦ ξείνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ
σοὶ πιστεύσας καὶ μεταναστὰς
ὦ ξείνοι AUYT: ὦ ξένοι rell. | σοὶ: ὑμῖν ZnZo
---| - ∩ ∪ ∪ ---|
---| - ∪ ∪ ∪ ---|

The word-end after ὦ ξείνοι is suspect, and so is the absence of normal diaeresis.² The absence of catalexis, moreover, is intolerable.

(b) The OCT reads

ξείνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ σοὶ
πιστεύσας καὶ μεταναστὰς
---- ∩ ∪ ∪ ---| -|
---| - ∪ ∪ ∪ ∩ |||

which breaks both rules, for σοὶ cannot be enclitic.

(c) The Budé edition (Dain–Mazon) analyses 176 f. as recited anapaests with catalexis, and makes 178 the beginning of the second strophe:

OI. ---| - ∩ ∪ ∪ ---|
----| - ∪ ∪ ∪ ---|
XO. --- ∪ ∪ | --- ∪ ∪ ---|
--- ∪ ∪ | --- ∪ ∪ ∪ ∩ |||

This produces at 190 ff.:

(OI.) ----| ∪ ∪ ∪ ∩ ||
XO. --- ∪ ∪ | --- ∪ ∪ ---|
--- ∪ ∪ ---| ∪ ∪ ∪ ∩ |||

A clever solution, but, as Raven remarks, 177 f. and 192 f. are better taken as belonging to the lyrics, for

- (i) there is exact responsion
- (ii) the first metron of the Chorus has a strange rhythm
- (iii) the 2an_Λ (177, 192) has an un-Sophoclean form.

In addition it may be remarked that the other anapaestic systems of this parodos have catalexis only in the final dimeter, like the parodoi of S. *Ph.*, *Ant.*,³ and A. *Pr.* In the

¹ On these rules cf. D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik* (Darmstadt, 1968), p. 91; E. Lefèvre, *WS* 72 (1959), 108–12; L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 8 (1958), 82–9; D. S. Raven, *AJPh* 86 (1965), 234–6; B. Snell, *Griechische Metrik* (Göttingen, 1962), p. 25; A. Wifstrand, *Hermes* 69 (1934), 210–14. The metrical notation of this paper follows Maas and Snell, but

| indicates full word-end,
∩ imperfect word-end,
∩ the last element before actual or assumed pause,
an anapaestic metron
2an_Λ catalectic dimeter, the so-called ‘anapaestic paroemiac’.

² But cf. καὶ before the break, A. *Pers.* 47; οὐδ S. *Tr.* 991, *Ph.* 196, E. *HF* 449; ὁπως S. *El.* 98; ὥς S. *Ph.* 162.

³ S. *Ant.* 113 the catalexis in some editions is due to conjecture.

Budé arrangement 190 is exceptional. Furthermore the structure of the passage seems to be

- str. 1, followed by anapaests of Oedipus and the Chorus,
- ant. 1, followed by anapaests of Oedipus and Antigone,
- str./ant. 2, separated by anapaests of Oedipus.

Raven's own solution avoids these difficulties, but involves others. He assumes that the ambiguous opening of str. 2 follows without a break on the acatalectic anapaests. The device is not repeated at the beginning of ant. 2.

There is nothing comparable: at A. *Pers.* 930 (2an || before a lyric strophe) sung anapaests are concerned, separated from their recited predecessors by 2an \wedge (921) and showing their lyric nature by 'doric α ' and the very fact that they are acatalectic. Change of speaker in recited anapaests is in Aeschylus always preceded by catalexis. In Sophocles and Euripides more persons may share a single system: S. *Ant.* 929–43; *Ph.* 159–68, 1445–51; *OC* 138–48, 170–5, 1754–67, 1768–76; E. *Med.* 96–110, 160–70, 1389–1414; *Hipp.* 198–207, 208–38; *El.* 1292–1307, 1308–30, 1331–56; *Ba.* 1377–87; *IA* 1–11, 12–27.

At change of speaker synaphea is sometimes broken by hiatus or brevis in longo without catalexis:⁴ S. *Ant.* 932, 936; *OC* 139, 143, 170, 1757; E. *Med.* 1396; *El.* 1333; cf. also Dale on *Alc.* 78.⁵ The same phenomenon occurs in dactylic, S. *Ph.* 1205.⁶

In all these cases the acatalectic anapaests do not close a system.

Dawe's Teubner edition tries to escape by printing two catalectic dimeters, probably assuming a patch of lyric anapaests, since a double paroemiac is impossible in recitative:

ξείνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ	2an \wedge
πιστεύσας καὶ μεταναστᾶς	2an \wedge

The rules for recited anapaests are not valid for sung anapaests, so that this solution seems unimpeachable. But it breaks the usual alternation of lyrics and recitative.⁷

We may, on the whole, safely conclude that it is impossible to force 174 into a correct dimeter. It is equally impossible to make a decent catalectic dimeter out of 175. The only acceptable solution to all problems is, I suggest, simple transposition:

σοὶ πιστεύσας καὶ μεταναστᾶς,
ξείνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ.

The 2an \wedge now has a natural break, with elision, which is allowed even in acatalectic dimeters. The vocative is postponed, as in 214 f. Some comment is necessary on 175: plural (ξείνοι) and singular (σοὶ) at this close distance cannot be the result of mistake. Nor is there any reason to assume deliberate conjecture. In fact, it even provoked the trivial ὑμῖν of ZnZo. This makes emendations like ὦ ξένε (Nauck) or [σοὶ] (Brunck)

⁴ S. *OC* 188, hiatus without change of speaker, but with rhetorical pause, should not be emended. The same may be true of A. *Pers.* 18, but there is no justification for the phenomenon in S. *Aj.* 169. A. *Ag.* 794 f. has a lacuna. A. *Ag.* 1537 ἰὼ γὰ γὰ is exclamatory, therefore no example, since hiatus after exclamations is admissible everywhere. E. *Hipp.* 1377, *Hec.* 83, *Ion* 167, *IT* 125, 147, 231 are sung. Cf. this catalogue with Korzeniewski, p. 89. E. *Or.* 1302, Fr. 773. 68, and perhaps *Supp.* 277 are comparable dactylic examples.

⁵ S. *Ph.* 161 ἄπεστι QR is therefore metrically possible.

⁶ Fraenkel's reservation, *RhM* 72 (1917/18), 186 n. 1, seems not justified in view of the anapaestic parallels.

⁷ S. *El.* 88 f., 105 f., E. *Ion* 859–61 are by no means comparable, as those long anapaestic passages are not interrupted by lyrics.

improbable. On the other hand, [ὦ] ξείνοι (Reisig) implies a quite frequent type of corruption, interpolation of ὦ; cf. e.g. S. *OT* 1329, *Tr.* 1010 f.,⁸ E. *Hec.* 186.

The ms. text is the result of double corruption, trivialization of word-order and addition of ὦ.

Zeist

J. A. J. M. BUIJS

⁸ cf. Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, p. 348 n. 2.

NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES' *PEACE*

17–18:

B. οὐ γὰρ ἔθ' οἶός τ' εἴμ' ὑπερέχειν τῆς ἀντλίας.
A. αὐτὴν ἄρ' οἶσω συλλαβὼν τὴν ἀντλίαν.

These verses have occasionally been suspected, and generally misunderstood. Grounds for suspicion are (1) the termination of both lines with the same word, (2) the difficulty of making sense of ὑπερέχειν τῆς ἀντλίας 17. The first objection need not detain us long. The almost identical termination of two successive lines could be due to corruption; but it could result from careless writing (Greek and Roman poets are notoriously tolerant of repetition), or (as I believe) from the desire to point a joke. The real problem is the meaning of ὑπερέχειν τῆς ἀντλίας. Schol. R paraphrases ἀντέχειν καὶ περιγίνεσθαι τῆς ὁσμῆς. Platnauer¹ objects that ὑπερέχειν cannot be used for ἀντέχειν, and that ἀντλία means 'the hold of a ship where the bilge water was', not 'bilge water' (ἀντλος). The second claim is in fact erroneous; ἀντλία is used for ἀντλος at Arist. *HA* 534a, τῆς ἀντλίας ἐκχυθείσης (cf. Lucian, *Cat.* 1 ὅ τε γὰρ ἀντλος ἐκκέχυται, Zen. 1. 23 τὴν ἀντλίαν ἐπαναβῆναι συνέβη καὶ ἐκτῆξαι τοὺς ἄλλας). The first objection is entirely correct. Van Daele translates 'avoir le nez sur cette sentine'.² He is followed in essence by MacDowell,³ who translates: 'I can't stand over this dung-tub any longer'. However, although as MacDowell points out ὑπερέχειν may be used where only part of A is above B, the verb usually means 'emerge/project from' rather than simply 'be above', and almost invariably so where B is a liquid. The verb is so used in Thuc. 3. 23. 5 (cited by MacDowell), and would naturally be so used here with ἀντλίας (whether the word means 'bilge' or 'bilge water').

Once we recognize that ἀντλία may mean 'bilge water' as well as 'bilge', ὑπερέχειν falls neatly into place as part of a nautical metaphor. Bilge water is water which collects in the lowest part of the ship. When a ship leaks, founders or is swamped, the bilge water rises to fill the whole vessel. Cf. Alcaeus 326. 6 LP (metaphor), Aesch. *Sept.* 796 (metaphor), Eur. *Tro.* 686 (bailing during a storm), *Heracl.* 168, Luc. *Tim.* 4. 18, *Nav.* 16. The phrase τὴν ἀντλίαν φυλάξω in *Eq.* 434 refers to the danger of being swamped. οὐκέτι ὑπερέχει τοῦ ἀντλου / τῆς ἀντλίας might be said either of a ship being swamped or a sailor fighting a losing battle to bail. Either way, to indicate that his disgusting task is rapidly becoming unendurable, the slave uses a nautical metaphor. But bilge water, being stagnant, is also foul, as is excrement. So not surprisingly the other slave takes the metaphor literally, and announces that he will take away the tubful of dung instead of individual cakes as heretofore. It makes little difference whether we take ἀντλίαν in v. 18 to be the tub in which the excrement is kneaded or the excrement contained therein; αὐτὴν favours the former. Slave

¹ M. Platnauer, *Aristophanes Peace* (Oxford, 1964), p. 68.

² V. Coulon & H. Van Daele, *Aristophane II* (Paris, 1924), p. 100.

³ D. M. MacDowell, *CR* n.s. 15 (1965), 17.