

citizens,⁶ and were also used when the *εὐθνοὶ* deemed it necessary to refer charges to another authority.⁷ Finally, Hades resembles an *εὐθυνος* in that he scrutinizes everything, *πάντ' ἐπωπαῖ* (275). And at Athens, magistrates were held accountable for all their actions while in office, both public and private.

Creighton University, Omaha

GEOFFREY W. BAKEWELL

⁶ *Ath. Pol.* 48.4: *κἂν τις βούληται τινὶ τῶν τὰς εὐθύνas ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ δεδωκότων ἐντὸς γ' ἡ[μερῶν ἀφ'] ἧς ἔδωκε τὰς εὐθύνas εὐθυναν ἂν τ' ἰδίαν ἂν τε δημοσίαν ἐμβάλεσθαι, γράψας εἰς πινάκιον λελευκωμένον τοῦνομα τό [θ' αὐτοῦ] καὶ τὸ τοῦ φεύγοντος καὶ τὸ ἀδίκῃμ' ὃ τι ἂν ἐγκαλῇ, καὶ τίμημα ἐπιγραφάμενος ὃ τι ἂν δοκῇ δίδωσιν τῷ εὐθύνῳ.*

⁷ A. Boegehold, 'Andocides and the Decree of Patrokleides', *Historia* 39 (1990), 149–62.

SOPHOCLES, *ELECTRA* 137–9¹

Χο. ἀλλ' οὐτοὶ τόν γ' ἐξ Αἰδα
παγκοίνου λίμνας πατέρ' ἀν-
στάσεις οὔτε γόοισιν οὔτε λιταῖσιν.

The familiar crux in line 139, as obelized by Dawe,² disappears in the new Oxford Text,³ whose editors accept the Triclinian reading *οὐ λιταῖς*. Their short critical note⁴ touches only on the metrical issue, citing discussions by Stinton⁵ and Diggle,⁶ in both of which acceptance of *οὐ λιταῖς* here is cautiously linked with recognition of the same responson — — — — — — — — — — at *Philoctetes* 209/218⁷ and Euripides, *Medea* 159/183⁸. The note concludes with a reference (credited to Miss Parker) to p. 75 of an article by K. Itsumi.⁹

The editors' acceptance of *οὐ λιταῖς*, thus argued, is inconsistent with their treatment of *Phil.* 209/218;¹⁰ and the reference to Itsumi is seriously misleading. So far from supporting the responson — — — — — — — — — —, the article cited concludes that

¹ I am grateful to Prof. Diggle for encouragement and helpful comments.

² R. D. Dawe (ed.), *Sophocles Tragoediae* i (Teubn., 1975, 1984). The relevant apparatus, after Dawe, is: *οὔτε λιταῖσιν* LFHGR, -αῖσι C²Zc, -ῆσι NPV, -οῖσιν O, -αῖς ADXrXsZr, *οὐ λιταῖς* T; *οὐτ' ἄνταις* Hermann, *οὐτ' εὐχαῖς* Erfurdt. The corresponding verses (the opening of the Parodos) are: *ὦ παῖ παῖ δυστανότατας | Ἥλέκτρα ματρός, τίν' αἰεῖ | τάκεις ὦδ' ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγάν* | . . . (121–3). An alternative colometry *wil | wil sp* | — — — — — (uncommon, but cf. n. 18 below) is theoretically possible; but *wil | wil* | . . . is plainly superior, with the longer third verse presumably completing a period. For the two-syllable overlap, cf. *Ant.* 332f. *δεινὰ κούδεν ἀν-|θρώπου δεινότερον πέλει*, etc.

³ H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson (edd.), *Sophocles Fabulae* (Oxford, 1990). They also accept Schwerdt's unappealing *λάσκεις* in 123, a verb which seems nowhere to be used of *lamenting* utterance. In support of *τάκεις* (codd.), cf. J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), 206f. (on *Phil.* 190).

⁴ *Sophoclea* (Oxford, 1990), 46.

⁵ T. C. W. Stinton, *JHS* 97 (1977) 128–9, 132 = *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 273–4, 278–9.

⁶ J. Diggle, *CR* 33 (1983), 346–8 = *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 258–60.

⁷ *Phil.* 208–9 . . . *αὐδὰ | τρυγάνωρ· διάστημα γὰρ θροεῖ (θρηνεῖ Dindorf) ~ 217–18 . . . αὐγά-|ζων ὄρμον· προβοᾷ τι γὰρ (Wunder, for γὰρ τι) δεινόν*; see further below.

⁸ *Med.* 159 *μὴ λίαν· τάκου δυρομένα cὸν εὐνέταν* (v.1. -άταν) ~ 183 *τοὺς ἔσω· : πένθος γὰρ μεγάλως τόδ' ὀρμάται*; see further below.

⁹ K. Itsumi, 'The glyconic in tragedy', *CQ* 34 (1984), 66–82.

¹⁰ Their partly new triple emendation *διάστημα [γὰρ] θρηνεῖ ~ προβοᾷ [γὰρ] τι δεινόν* (after Dindorf and Hartung) is advocated in *Sophoclea*, 183–4, now *against* Stinton and Diggle, and with no mention of *El.* 123/139. The double excision of *γὰρ* is no improvement on Wunder's easy *τι γὰρ* for *γὰρ τι* (regarded by Stinton as 'certain'). As to *θρηνεῖ*, I should prefer *θρυλεῖ*

preferring a different emendation of οὔτε λιταῖς(ιν).

(i) Stinton rightly recognized that, if Sophocles wrote οὔτε γόοισιν οὐ λιταῖς, this is an 'extreme case', with no exact parallel, of οὔτε . . . οὐ separated by only one word; and it was partly for that reason that he expressly hesitated to put it into the text.¹⁹

(ii) Editors have in general been content with the sense ' . . . nor with prayers', with or without emendation (Kells accepting Erfurdt's οὔτ' εὐχαῖς, others favouring Hermann's οὔτ' ἄνταις).²⁰ No one seems to have questioned that sense. The chorus are not otherwise concerned to protest against useless *praying*. The whole thrust of their argument, from 121–3 onwards, has been, and will continue to be, directed against Electra's unremitting, insatiate (ἀκόρεστον) *lamentation* as at once unprofitable and 'ruinous' (141 διόλλυται, etc.).

I propose that we should read οὔτε γόοισιν οὔτ' ἄταις. A little-noticed use of ἄτη in later fifth-century tragic lyric, in close conjunction with words such as γόος, ἔλεος, θρήνος, στεναγμός, alludes to the 'hurt' bloodily self-inflicted (especially by women) in lamentations for the dead. Cf. especially E. *Or.* 960–2 κατάρχομαι στεναγμόν . . . τιθεία . . . αἱματηρόν ἄταν,²¹ but also *Tro.* 121 ἄτας κελαδεῖν ἀχορεύτους (following 119 ἐπιούς' αἰεὶ δακρύων ἔλεος), and *I.T.* 148–9 †αἴτ' μοι συμβαίνουσ' ἄται | κύγγονον ἄμον κατακλαιομέναι (following 146 ἀλύροις ἔλεος). In our Parodos, ἄται (pl.) is thematic, and perhaps archetypal in the relevant sense,²² in direct or indirect reference to Electra's 'self-hurtful' behaviour: 215–16 οἰκείας εἰς ἄτας | ἐμπίπτουσ' οὕτως αἰκῶς, 223–5 ἀλλ' ἐν γὰρ δεινοῖς οὐ χήρῃς | ταύτας ἄτας, | ὄφρα με βίος ἔχῃ, 235 μὴ τίττειν σ' ἄταν ἄταις (with an obvious play on two senses). The pairing οὔτε γόοισιν οὔτ' ἄταις (now more nearly synonymous) is like the Euripidean Electra's στοναχαίς τε καὶ γόοις at *Or.* 204. For an explanation of the corruption we need look no further than misreading of . . . ΑΤΑΙC as . . . ΑΙΤΑΙC (at sentence-end) in a context where 'prayers' gives acceptable sense.²³

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK

¹⁹ My attention has been drawn to Dawe's latest thought οὐ λοιβαῖς (Teubner Einzelausgaben, 1995), which is open to the same (not in itself fatal) objection.

²⁰ ἄντ- for λιτ- is technically plausible, but ἄντη lacks sufficient attestation: only Hsch. ἄντησι (codd. ἀντήσει)· λιτανείαις, ἀντήσει. ἄντησι also is known only from Hesychius.

²¹ See my commentary (1989, with Addendis Addenda), pp. 141–2, 365; I am now more inclined to read (with Diggle) τιθεία λευκᾶν ὄνυχι διὰ παρηίδων αἰμ- ἄτ-.

²² A date for S. *El.* shortly before E. *Tro.* and *I.T.* would be consistent with other indications (cf. my commentary on *Or.* p. lvi n. 91), reinforced by further metrical studies which I hope to publish in due course.

²³ A reader objects that 'no one sought to raise dead fathers by ἄταις', and another suggests οὔτ' ἀχαῖς 'if one is to go down this avenue'. The objection is misconceived: the argument is simply 'No amount of lamenting will bring your dead father back from Hades', as a self-evident ἀδύνατον; a rhetorical point similar to δοκεῖς τοῖσι σοῖς δακρύοις . . . κρατῆρσιν ἐχθρῶν in the Parodos of Euripides' *Electra* (193–5). No one sought to gain the upper hand over their foes by δάκρυα. As to the suggested ἀχαῖς, 'loud utterance(s)' is relatively weak sense, and ἀχ- typically corrupts to ἰαχ-. More seriously, ἡχῇ, like ἡχώ, is a word used only in the singular.

THE MEANING OF *REPUBLIC* 606a3–b5

Εἰ ἐνθυμοῖο ὅτι τὸ βίᾳ κατεχόμενον τότε ἐν ταῖς οἰκείαις
συμφοραῖς καὶ πεπεινηκὸς τοῦ δακρύσαι τε καὶ ἀποδύρασθαι
ικανῶς καὶ ἀποπλησθῆναι, φύσει ὃν τοιοῦτον οἶον τούτων ἐπι-

606a3

5