

CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE *CANTICA* OF  
SOPHOCLES: I. *ANTIGONE*<sup>1</sup>

By ‘the vulgate’ in this first of three articles I mean ‘at least a majority of the general Sophocles editions of Jebb, Pearson, Dawe, Kamerbeek, and Lloyd Jones/Wilson, and also A. Brown and M. Griffith for *Antigone* in particular’.<sup>2</sup> Metrical terms and notational symbols used are mostly as defined by M. L. West in his *Greek Metre*;<sup>3</sup> and for orthographica etc., unless otherwise stated, I follow West’s preface to his *Aeschylus Tragoediae*.<sup>4</sup> Short references are used also for the studies (especially metrical) of A. M. Dale, T. C. W. Stinton, L. P. E. Parker, H. A. Pohlsander, K. Itsumi, and J. A. J. M. Buijs.<sup>5</sup> Indentation is used for lines of verse either synartete with the preceding (following either a hyphen or elision) or otherwise continuative as the second or later limb of a dicolon or tricolon (a status not always objectively determinable); illumination of structure is always the primary consideration.

100–9

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ἀκτῖς ἀελίου, τὸ κάλ-  
λιστον ἑπταπύλῳ φανέν  
Θήβαι τῶν προτέρων φάος,  
ἐφάνθησ ποτ’, ὦ χρυσέας  
ἀμέρας βλέφαρον,  
Διρκαίων ὑπὲρ ῥέεθρων μολοῦσα,  
τὸν λεύκασπιν <Ἴν>αχόθεν  
φῶτα βάντα πανσαγίαι  
φυγάδα πρόδρομον ὀξυπόρῳ  
κινήσασα χαλίνῳ.

105

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Prof. C. Collard and the anonymous *CQ* referee for their criticisms and corrections; also to Dr R. D. Dawe for perceptive comments; and to Prof. J. M. Bremer for arranging for my inspection of Dr L. van Passen’s repertory of Sophocles conjectures at Amsterdam.

<sup>2</sup> A. Brown (Warminster, 1987), with notes also in *CQ* 41 (1991), 325–39; M. Griffith (Cambridge, 1999). The new *OCT* of Sophocles is referred to as LJ-W, a siglum embracing also the editors’ contemporary *Sophoclea* (Oxford, 1990); LJ-W<sup>2</sup> refers to their *Sophocles: Second Thoughts* (Göttingen, 1997).

<sup>3</sup> Oxford, 1982; hereafter West, *GM*. As in my commentary on *Orestes* (Oxford, 1986, 1989), I add *ba* (baccheus), *sp* (spondee), *T* (— — — — —), *A* (— — — — —) and *:* (diaeresis). For West’s ‘*gl*’ and ‘*g*’ I prefer respectively *ch ia* and *wil* (wilamowitzianus). ‘Enoplian’ is used in an adjectival sense (*Orestes* p. xx, see further in n. 13 below).

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Teubn. 1990; hereafter West, *AT*.

<sup>5</sup> Dale, *LM* = *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1968); Dale, *CP* = *Collected Papers* (Cambridge, 1969). Stinton, *CPGT* = *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990). Parker<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> = 1. ‘Porson’s Law extended’, *CQ* 16 (1966), 1–26; 2. ‘Split-resolution in dramatic lyric’, *CQ* 18 (1968), 241–69; 3. ‘Catalexis’, *CQ* 26 (1976), 14–28; 4. ‘Trochee to iamb, iamb to trochee’, in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens* (Oxford, 1990), 331–48. Pohlsander, *MSLS* = *Metrical Studies in the Lyrics of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1964). Itsumi<sup>1,2,3</sup> = 1. ‘The choriambic dimeter of Euripides’, *CQ* 32 (1982), 59–74; 2. ‘The glyconic in tragedy’, *CQ* 34 (1984), 66–82; 3. ‘Enoplian in tragedy’, *BICS* 38 (1991–3), 243–61. Buijs<sup>1,2</sup> = ‘Studies in the lyric metres of Greek tragedy’, *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985), 62–92 and 39 (1986), 42–73.

~117–26	<p>στὰς δ' ὑπὲρ μελάθρων, φονώ-          σαισιν ἀμφιχανῶν κύκλωι          λόγχαις ἐπτάπυλον στόμα,          ἔβα, πρὶν ποθ' ἀμετέρων          αἱμάτων ἱγένυσιν          πλησθῆναί(τε)† καὶ στεφάνωμα πύργων          πευκάενθ' Ἑφαιστον ἐλεῖν          τοῖος ἀμφὶ νῶτ' ἐτάθη          πάταγος Ἄρεος, ἀντιπάλωι          δυσχείρωμα δράκοντος.</p>	120
		125

106 Ἰναχόθεν Mekler: Ἀργόθεν codd. 108 ὀξυπόρωι S (Musgrave): -τόρωι pler.,  
 -τέρωι K<sup>s</sup>Σ<sup>L</sup>RV+ 122 τε Tr, om. cett. 125 ἀντιπάλου L<sup>s</sup>A<sup>s</sup>U<sup>s</sup>Y<sup>s</sup> δράκοντος V et  
 A<sup>s</sup>U<sup>s</sup>Y<sup>s</sup>: δράκοντι cett.

**100–9/117–26.** The entering Chorus begin with three glyconics. Then the break at *φάος* ~ *στόμα* (with *brevis in longo* and hiatus in ant.) is reinforced by anacalasis in the beginning of 103/120,<sup>6</sup> and a metrical shift from glyconics to wilamowitzian (and *wil*-related) verses: \**wil* | *dod'* (Λ*wil*) | *wil ba* (||) *wil* | *wil* | *wil* (*ia ch*) | *ph* (*dod'* –). The vulgate wrongly divides 104–5/121–2 as *gl* | *f* | *hi* with an anomalous overlap following . . .  
 --- (βλέφαρον, Διρκαί-λων ~ γένυσιν πλησθῆ-λναι);<sup>7</sup> further questionable in that *gl* with long penult. is at best very rare in Sophocles.<sup>8</sup> Brunck, followed by Dindorf, rightly divided as above, in line with the comma after βλέφαρον. The short colon *dod'* (Λ*wil*) soon recurs at 136/150; and for the verse *wil ba* (naturally followed by period-end), cf. 1145/1152, E. *Hipp.* 547/557, *El.* 432/442, *Or.* 810/822, etc.; akin to the sapphic, as *gl ba* to the phalaecian, and associable here with the praxilleans in the next stanza pair (--- × --- plus *ba* looking forward to --- plus *ba*). (Jebb followed L in printing 104–5/121–2 *uno versu* [an improbable 17-syll. length]; there is a stronger case for taking 104/121 closely with 103/120.)

**106/123.** It is virtually certain, against LJ-W (and LJ-W<sup>2</sup>), (i) that 106 needs emendation to correspond with 123, not vice versa (*mol ia* is unlikely in itself, the more so with the responsion --- ζ --- given by Hermann's 'Ἑφαιστον πευκάενθ' ἐλεῖν); (ii) that we need an emendation giving another *wil*, not *gl* in responsion with

<sup>6</sup> On such anacalasis at the beginning of a period see Buijs<sup>1</sup> 65, 74ff. The notations \**gl* and \**wil* are convenient.

<sup>7</sup> The colometric rule that word end must accompany 'dragged close' (a commonly terminal rhythmic feature) was adumbrated in *CQ* 49 (1999), 409 (on *Hipp.* 70–1). There is no instance of . . . --- / ζ . . . with word overlap in West's Aeschylus. The only other instance in LJ-W's Sophocles (*Ant.* 1132) is evanescent (see below). Of the few instances in Diggle's Euripides, *El.* 740 . . . ἔδραν ἀλλά-λξαντα is otherwise open to suspicion for the long penultimate syllable corresponding with short in 730 (Dindorf's ἀμεί-λξαντα effects a double cure). There remains only *Ba.* 865–7/885–7, where re-division as contemplated by Itsumi<sup>2</sup> (74–5) gives --- ζ --- | --- ζ --- | . . . (similar to Brunck's colometry here); there is then a different, but no more insoluble, problem at the end of *Ba.* 867/887. A similar restriction operates in dochmiacs (*CQ* *ibid.* 425 with n. 48), where forms ending with --- are almost always followed by full word-end.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Itsumi<sup>2</sup> 75. *O.T.* 1197 τοξεύσας ἐκράτησας τοῦ is certainly corrupt (otherwise suspect both for the unequal penults and for the word division after long penult.). There remains only *Phil.* 1151 τὰν πρόσθεν βελέων ἀλκάν, likewise suspect for the unequal penults. Hermann proposed ἀκμάν for ἀλκάν, but ἀλκάν is the more appropriate word and unlikely to be false. Better is to write ἀλκάν τὰν πρόσθεν βελέων, giving another *gl* ~ *wil* responsion like 1082/1102 and 1124/1147 nearby (I prefer this word-transposition to that proposed by Diggle in *Euripidea* 472).

*wil*. *gl* ~ *wil* is frequent in later Euripides from *Electra* onwards (Diggle, *Euripidea* 195), and occurs at least twice in *Phil.* (a late play with other 'Euripidean' features), but is alien to Sophocles' earlier style.<sup>9</sup> The pattern of this stanza clearly favours a run of *wil* verses (also a pair of identical verses, cf. 334–5/344–5, 353–4/365–6, 357–8/368–9, ?586–7/597–8, 590–1/601–2, *Trac.* 116–17/126–7, etc.). Of many conjectures with the right scansion, Mekler's <Ιν>αχόθεν, commended by Jebb, but oddly neglected by recent editors, is palmary.<sup>10</sup> Allusion to the Argive river to identify Argos (cf. *E. El.* 1, etc.) follows perfectly after 'Dirke's streams' for 'Thebes'. (*Pace* Griffith, the sentence runs much better with βάντα as 'having come [from]' than as 'departing'.)

**108/125.** . . . : . . . : – . . . – is ambivalently *wil* and *ia ch* (cf. *Aj.* 1185/1192); infrequent as a form of *wil* before later Euripides (Itsumi<sup>1</sup> 63).

In 108 δξυπόρωι (neglected by Griffith) would merit acceptance even without attestation. *Π* corrupts easily to *T*, with -τέρωι then as a natural 'improvement' (δξυτόρωι ineptly, *pace* LJ-W and LJ-W<sup>2</sup>, compares the bit to a drilling implement). δξύπορος, perhaps a new coinage, formed like and nearly synonymous with ταχύπορος (cf. *LSJ* δξύς IV), nicely adds a sufficient overtone of the bit's sharpness (we do not want 'sharper').<sup>11</sup>

**121–2.** Brown justly questions the unduly late τε added by Triclinius, and commends πληρωθῆναι (Semitelos) as a way of gaining the necessary extra syllable (Jebb should not have demanded a short syllable at this point). Better would be . . . <τε> γένυς ἐμπλησθῆναι . . . (<ἐμ>πλ- Boeckh), easily corrupted to γενουσιμ (*sic*) πλησθῆναι in a tradition with the lineation attested in *L. TE*, omitted before *TE*-, may perhaps have survived in the margin, to be seen and restored in the wrong place by Triclinius. For the new position of τε after the second of agreeing words, cf. *A. Su.* 282 etc. (*GP* 517);<sup>12</sup> for ἐμπιμπλάναι of filling with food, cf. *Od.* 7.221, 17.503, etc. (also *Il.* 16.348 with 'blood'). Acc. pl. γένυς (contracted like Ἐρινύς; *Od.* 2.135, etc.), as subject of the infinitive, is otherwise an improvement upon the rather odd dative γένουσι (variously explained as locative or instrumental).

**125–6.** Lloyd-Jones: 'hard for the dragon's adversary to vanquish'. Griffith (also against Jebb and Dawe) reads ἀντιπάλου . . . δράκοντος with δυσχείρωμα as 'hard-won victory'.

**134–40**                    ἀντιτύπαι δ' ἐπὶ γαῖ πέσε τανταλωθεῖς  
                                  πυρφόρος ὃς τότε μαινομένοι ξὺν ὀρμαῖ                    135  
                                  βακχεύων ἐπέπνει  
                                  ρίπαῖς ἐχθίστων ἀνέμων·  
                                  εἶχε δ' ἄλλαι τὰ μέν,

<sup>9</sup> *Aj.* 1190/1197 is very doubtful (as Garvie concedes): even if 1190 was rightly restored as a *wil* by Wilamowitz, ὦ πόνοι πρόγονοι πόνων in ant. yields to an easy transposition juxtaposing the πόν- words (or perhaps μόχθοι μόχθων, after Blaydes).

<sup>10</sup> Jebb also mentioned (apart from his own Ἀργόθεν <ἐκ>-/βάντα φῶτα) Ἀργεῖον, Ἀργογενή, Ἀργολικόν (implausibly accepted by Griffith), Ἀπιόθεν, Ἰναχίδαν, Ἰνάχιον.

<sup>11</sup> A reader defends δξυτέρωι ('the Argive army returned more quickly than it came'); but χαλίνωι does not mean 'spur'.

<sup>12</sup> Friis Johansen and Whittle there question several of the *prima facie* exx., but even they concede one certain instance in tragedy (*Tro.* 1063–4). One should indeed in general hesitate to introduce a rarity by conjecture; but here we already have a more certainly anomalous late τε, and the conjecture can fairly claim to offer a more acceptable text.

ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλους ἐπενώ-  
μα στυφελίζων μέγας Ἄρης  
δεξιόσειρος. 140

~148-54 ἄλλα γὰρ ἁ μεγαλώνυμος ἦλθε Νίκα,  
ταῖ πολυαρμάτῳ ἀντιχαρεῖσα Θήβαι,  
ἐκ μὲν δὴ πολέμων 150  
τῶν νῦν θέσθαι λησμοσύναν·  
θεῶν δὲ ναοὺς χοροῖς  
παννυχίοις πάντας ἐπέλ-  
θωμεν, ὁ Θήβας δ' ἐλελίχθων  
Βάκχιος ἄρχοι.

138 ἄλλους L<sup>ac</sup>KVRZfZoKv+: -οις cett. 140 δεξιόχειρος L<sup>ac</sup>R<sup>yp</sup> (prob. Brown)  
150 ἀκμὰ δὴ Brown 151 θέσθαι RSVTr: θέσθε cett. 153 παννυχίοις ZfZo: -χοις cett.

Two praxilleans, verses at once enoplian and expanded aeolic in character,<sup>13</sup> are followed by two more ambivalent verses, at once *dod* | *wil* (cf. 103-4/120-1 above) and *D* | *D*<sup>2</sup>; a frequent kind of ambivalence in verses beginning with --- (--) . . .<sup>14</sup> Then, after a strong sense-pause, a cretic dimeter is followed by iono-choriambic,<sup>15</sup> with further ambivalence. The length *4ch* - - - *4io* is characteristic of this genre (cf. *Ag.* 201-2 μάντις ἐκλαγξεν προφέρων Ἀρτεμιν ὥστε χθόνα βάκτροις : . . . etc.); but the added colarion - - - - (adoneus, = *ch* - - - *io*) here has the further effect of suggesting an epic cadence with a paroemiac colon . . . : - - - - - - - - ( - - *D* - ).

138-40. With Griffith I follow Jebb, after Erfurdt, except for ἄλλους in 139 (see below). Brown (1991) rightly disfavours LJ-W's ugly . . . ἄλλαι τὰδ', <ἀλλ' > ἄλλ' ἐπ' . . . but raises mistaken objections against Jebb. τὰ μὲν, || . . . gives an unexceptionable period end, with sense-pause in the stanza where synapheia is breached,<sup>16</sup> and also at change of metre; and there is nothing wrong with the logic of the double antithesis: τὰ μὲν (in effect, euphemistically, 'some deaths') is answered by ἄλλα δ', and the adverbial ἄλλαι is answered by an adverbial phrase with ἐπ' ἄλλ-. There is no need for Wecklein's τοῦδ', and (against Musgrave) V's δευνά is easily accounted for as a gloss. In 138 ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' (with παννυχίοις in ant.) properly locates the shift from cretic to iono-choriambic at a full word division. *cr ch* f . . ., keeping παννύχοις in ant., is much less likely.

The case for the neglected variant ἄλλους is twofold: (i) ἐπ' ἄλλοις following ἄλλα is tiresomely ambiguous between masculine or neuter (cf. expressions like πόνος ἐπὶ πόνῳ). We certainly want 'other persons', which the accusative will make clear. (ii)

<sup>13</sup> 'Enoplian' (adj.), as in my commentary on *Orestes* (p. xx), in general embraces sequences best annotated with the Maasian symbols *e* and *D* (and *d* and *D*<sup>2</sup>, also *ba* and *ith* = *e ba*), to which I have added *T* ( - - - - - ) and *A* ( - - - - - ). As an enoplian length the praxilleian is *D*<sup>2</sup> *ba*; as expanded aeolic it is *ar*<sup>2d</sup> (cf. West, *GM* 32).

<sup>14</sup> So e.g. at *Andr.* 800-1 in the clausula - - - - - | - - - - - to a *D/e* ode (*wil* | *ph* = *D*<sup>2</sup> | *D* - ) and in the dicolon - - - - - : - - - - - at *O. T.* 465-6/475-6.

<sup>15</sup> A genre not recognized by West, for whom ionic metre has the licence to begin with - - - - - (*GM* 125-6). There are many places where choriambic and ionic colometries are equally correct, for what was in any case intended to be heard, not seen on a page.

<sup>16</sup> A frequent situation (cf. Stinton, *CPGT* 338-9); e.g. *Hec.* 444-5/455-6 (cited in n. 30 below).

The force of ἐπί + dat. pers. is less clear than ἐπί + acc. pers., for which, preceding an ἐπι- compound, cf. *O.T.* 469 ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπενθρόωσκει.

150–1. Brown (1991) makes a good case for ἀκμά . . . with θέσθαι then no longer a jussive infinitive. Griffith compares μολεῖν 1143, but it is easy to understand a verb of supplication there; and the shift to -ωμεν is another feature making θέσθαι = θέσθε unlikely.

332–3                    πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κοῦδὲν ἀνθρώπου  
                             δεινότερον πέλει·

~342–3                κουφονόων τε φύλον ὀρνίθων  
                             ἀμφιβαλὼν ἀγρεῖ . . .

The first *stasimon* begins with another long verse in Jebb's text, as in L. The more usual division as – – – – – (ch ia) plus glyconic is unexceptionable; but is it uniquely correct? Two glyconics follow (without word overlap), but that is not probative as to what precedes them. One syllable overlap is very common, and . . . / – – : . . . is a frequent variation of that (sometimes in responsion as at 816/833); but overlap with two long syllables is relatively rare (though it occurs at 810–11), and the exact responsion of – – – words here is a striking feature (recurring at 789–90/799–800 below, q.v.). – – – – – is one of the commonest cola in Greek lyric verse (variously as *dod* and as a form of dochmius, sometimes ambivalent); and Sophocles had a penchant for *ia sp* cola (variously – – – – –; cf. especially *El.* 502ff.). For the colon *ch ia sp*, cf. *Rhesus* 466 χειρὸς ἄποιν' ἄροιο σᾶι λογχᾶι ~ 831 ζῶντα πόρευσον· οὐ παραιτοῦμαι (similar to *ia ch sp* at *Hipp.* 147/157).<sup>17</sup> So here too ambivalence is a possibility to be reckoned with, favouring (if the sequence is not lineated *uno versu*) indentation of the second colon, as above, to show continuity. In general it seems desirable, in the interests of elegance and readability, to avoid unnecessary line-end hyphens where there are legitimate alternative analyses; always provided that the useful resource of indentation is not eschewed.

After the glyconics the stanza continues with – – – – – (West's *hag* = × *ph*),<sup>18</sup> then an iambic tetrameter (= – – – : *ith*) transitional to dactyls (*4da* | *4da* | . . .), and ends with

341/352                ἵππειώι γενεῖ πολέων ~ οὔρειόν τ' ἀκμήτα ταῦρον.

This has been taken as × – – – – –; but Dale (*CP* 205–6) and Stinton (*CPGT* 119), while pointing out that this uncommon colon elsewhere begins with a short syllable,

<sup>17</sup> *Rh.* 466/831 is usually taken as a form of dochmiac dimeter (– – – – – | – – – – –), and associated with the similarly terminal verse λυσσάδι συγκατεργάσω μοίραι at *Herc.* 1024 (cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 107, but also 395, 516). In *Rh.* (I no longer suspect παραιτοῦμαι) the context is at most partly dochmiac, and *ch ia sp* is in line with – – – – – (ch 2ia) recently preceding in 464/829 (not as Diggle). By contrast, *ch ia sp* is quite out of place in *Herc.* 1021–4, and I should now (not as in *CQ* 48 [1988], 93–4) read . . . | σὺ δὲ τέκνα τρίγωνα τεκόμενος, || ὦ δάιε, λυσσάδι συγκατεργάσω μοίραι (emending only L's δαῖς, with Canter), scanned as 2ia (of a common 'sub-dochmiac' type) || – *D* – *e sp*. Cf. the terminal sequence . . . *D* – *e sp* at 896–7/908–9, and further in *CQ* 97 for the enoplian clausula . . . *e sp*.

<sup>18</sup> *gl* × *ph* is in fact unusual. *gl* in the form – – – – – sometimes behaves as an enoplian measure (e.g. at *Aj.* 194–5), and it would be reasonable to regard the link-anceps here as an enoplian feature.

overlooked some precedents which virtually guarantee the analysis *sp* plus *ith*: *A. Ag.* 166–7/174–5 (*4da* : *sp* : *lk*), *Cho.* 30–1/40–1 and 591–3/600–2 (*4da sp* | *lk*), *Eum.* 370–1/379–80 (*4da* : *sp lk*), all similarly at the end of stanzas. The present terminal sequence with . . . | *4da* | *4da* | *sp ith* recurs, very possibly with conscious imitation, at *I.A.* 225–30: *4da* | *4da* | *Πηλεΐδας σὺν ὄπλοισι παρ’ ἄντυγα | καὶ σύριγγας ἀρματείους*. Sequences in which runs of open dactyls (usually in *4da* lengths) are followed by × . . . (mostly catalectic iambic) are a characteristic feature of the latest three Sophoclean plays, *El.*, *Phil.*, and *O.C.*,<sup>19</sup> but otherwise occur in Sophocles only, and rather differently, at *O.T.* 171–2/183–4 (*4da* |  $\underline{D}^2$  –).

**354–64 ~ 365–75.** The second stanza pair further exemplifies enoplian metre (n. 13 above). 1–3 (× *D* | × *D* |  $\mp$  *D ba*) is analogous to × *e* : × *e* : × *e ba* (= *2ia* : *2ia*), apart from the biceps–anceps beginning the third colon, and modulates easily to single-short rhythm.<sup>20</sup> 4–10 (*ia cr* | *ia cr* | *ia* : *2ia* | *ia cr* | *lk* | *2ia* | – – –) is iambic with a twist in the tail, but can equally well be annotated as – *e e* | – *e e* | *e* – : – *E* | – *e e* | *E* | – *E* | *e* –, indeed more precisely as to the length of ancipites, here all short.<sup>21</sup> The concluding ‘epitrite’ is properly an enoplian feature (making a nod, we may say, towards ‘dactylo-epitritic’), though it can also be viewed as a trochaic metron.<sup>22</sup>

**582–6** 585  
 εὐδαίμονες οἷσι κακῶν ἄγευστος αἰῶν·  
 οἷς †γάρ† ἂν σεισθῇ θεόθεν δόμος, ἄτας  
 οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει, γενεᾶς ἐπὶ πλήθος ἔρπον·  
 †ῥμοιον ὥστε ποντίας ἁλὸς . . . †

**~593–7** 595  
 ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν οἰκῶν ὀρώμαι  
 πῆματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πῆμασι †πίπτοντ’†,  
 οὐδ’ ἀπαλλάσσει γενεὰν γένος, ἀλλ’ ἐρείπει  
 θεῶν τις οὐδ’ ἔχει λύσιν·

595 φθιτῶν Hermann: φθιμένων codd.

In so far as commentators explain the logic of γάρ in 583, they do so by treating κακῶν in 582 as synonymous with ἄτας in the following sentence,<sup>23</sup> an illegitimate

<sup>19</sup> Rightly taken by Dale (*CP* 207, n. 3) as affording strong evidence of *El.*’s relatively late date; cf. *Orestes*, p. lvi, n. 91. Though less characteristic of Euripides, in fact the earliest instance is probably *Alcestis* 462–6/472–6: . . . *4da* | *4da* | *ia cr* † *ith* (= – *e e e ba*).

<sup>20</sup> The colon × – – – – – has been called ‘an enoplian’ (Wilamowitz and others), but I prefer to call it ‘an enoplian unit, or measure’ (one of many in this multifarious genre). Biceps–anceps (cf. West, *GM* 192 etc.) occurs sparingly for normal anceps in enoplian metre, always adjacent to – – – –.

<sup>21</sup> My *E* is always – – – – – (unless resolution is indicated at the beginning or end). – – – – – (with long anceps) is shown as *e* – *e*.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Parker<sup>4</sup> 337ff., who observes that the sequence – – – – – in tragedy always has word-division, so preferably line-division, between the ‘iamb’ and the ‘trochee’. The other occurrence in early Sophocles is at *Trac.* 497–9/507–9 – – – – – : – – – – – | – – – – – (in my notation *A* : – *e* | *e* –); but cf. also the stanza-ending verse – *e* – *e* – at *Trac.* 102/111.

<sup>23</sup> So one reader, who suggests: ‘Happy only are those who *never* encounter trouble, for one cannot count happy anyone who *once* runs into trouble; for once trouble starts it is liable to continue for ever’. Whereas everyone experiences κακά sooner or later, not everyone experiences ‘trouble’ as in lines 2ff.; and there is nothing corresponding to ‘once . . . starts’ in the clause οἷς ἂν σεισθῇ θεόθεν δόμος. Another reader points out that ‘the antithesis is chiasmic’. That of course does not support γάρ against the suggested δέ.

equation. As Professor Easterling has observed,<sup>24</sup> the opening μακαρισμός is essentially a 'foil' for what follows. As such, it makes sense only as the first limb of a *polar antithesis*, moving from unalloyed εὐδαιμονία at one extreme (somewhat unreal, in that no human life is in fact ἀγευστος κακῶν) to the extreme δυσδαιμονία of 'total' ἄτη (οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει) afflicting a house ἐπὶ πλῆθος γενεάς (a phrase implying a plurality both of persons and of generations). 583ff. neither explains nor verifies the statement in 582. γάρ can be an error for δέ (e.g. *Sept.* 119), so the truth may be οἶσι δ' ἄν . . .

In the corresponding verses the elision at πίπτοντ' should have attracted more attention. There seems to be no parallel in tragedy for elision at the word division  $D - :$  . . ., whether at line end or otherwise (a distinction often hard to draw in this metre).<sup>25</sup> The anomaly is the more remarkable here as a denial of period end at a natural pause (comma) following the palindromic sequence  $- D \times e - | e \times D -$ ,<sup>26</sup> and followed by a verse in itself likely to constitute a self-contained period ( $e - D ba$ ). There is indeed sense-continuity after ἄτας at the corresponding place in the strophe; but one still expects a *full* diaeresis at this verse end, even as elision is eschewed with only the rarest exceptions at the end of the epic hexameter. Suspicion thus aroused is not allayed by Easterling's discussion of the sense of 594–5 ('There are three main ways of construing these verses'), and LJ-W's further discussion of their ambiguity; neither, however, voicing suspicion of the text, apart from the certainly erroneous φθιμένων.

I suggest that we should punctuate after ἀρχαῖα (predicative, sc. ὄντα) τὰ Λ- οἶκων ὀρώμαι πήματα. Then φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πήμασι πίπτει, || οὐδ' . . . will explain the sense in which the πήματα are seen to be ἀρχαῖα. Stylistically, the epexegetic asyndeton thus is like *Trac.* 497–8 μέγα τι σθένος ἃ Κύπρις· ἐκφέρεται νίκας ἀεὶ . . .<sup>27</sup> It should not be objected that such punctuation separates πήματα from ἐπὶ πήμασι, since we still have the idea of 'πήματα falling ἐπὶ πήμασι' (τὰ Λ- οἶ- πήματα being carried forward as the subject of the second sentence). As for the hiatus thus created at a period-end with sense-pause (comma), cf. the three period ends with hiatus in *Med.* 410–20.

## 586–92

† ὅμοιον ὥστε ποντίας ἄλως  
οἶδμα δυσπνόοις ὅταν†  
Θρήισσαισιν ἔρεβος ὕφαλον ἐπιδράμη πνοαῖς·  
κυλίνδει βυσσόθεν  
κελαινὰν θίνα καὶ  
δυσάνεμοι  
στονῶι βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλήγες ἀκταί·

590

<sup>24</sup> In *Dionysiaca, Nine Studies . . . Presented to Sir Denys Page* (Cambridge, 1978), 143.

<sup>25</sup> Parker<sup>1</sup> (9), not counting dicola like  $- D - : ith$  at *O.T.* 196–7/209–10, found 'in Sophocles' dactylo-epitrites, apart from iambelegi and kindred verses, (only) six examples of word-end after long anceps, all in *O.T.* 1086–1109'. She presumably overlooked this passage. Of her six, only *O.T.* 1100–1 Πανὸς ὀρεσαιβάτα πατρὸς πελασθεῖς; | ἥ σέ γ' ἐννάτειρά τις has elision at the relevant word end (cf. σεβίζουσ' at *Med.* 643; both these follow the rhythm  $\times - - - -$ ). *Aj.* 631–2 θρηγήσει, χερόπλακτοι δ' : ἐν στέρνοισι πεσοῦνται is probably  $2io : 2io$ , if not  $ph | ph$ , rather than  $D - : D -$  (cf. on 944–7/955–8 below), and in any case articulates alternatively before the elided postpositive. Elision after  $D -$  seems to have been eschewed also by Pindar and Bacchylides.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. the clear period-end following  $- D - e - | e - D$  at *Med.* 410–11/421–2, and the similar  $- D - e | e - D -$  (stop) at *Med.* 976–7/982–3.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Stinton, *CPGT* 221. It would not be an improvement to write πήμαθ', ἃ . . . or πήμαθ', ὥς . . .

~597–603

θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν·  
 νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὅπερ  
 ῥίζας <ἐ>τέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις,  
 κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία  
 θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων  
 ἅμῃ κοπίς,  
 λόγου γ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν ἐρινύς.

600

In 586 Seidler's excision of ὅμοιον (ὁμοῖον)<sup>28</sup> is accepted by LJ-W. Prima facie the alternative excision of ἄλως (Elmsley), necessarily then with πόντιον for ποντίας (Schneidewin, Pearson, Griffith),<sup>29</sup> is less economical, and *lk* (before *lk*) is at least as likely as *2ia*.<sup>30</sup> But the 'gloss' explanation (not supported by a parallel) takes no account of the fact that ὅμοιον ὥστε . . . is at once uncommon and poetical; cf. Shakespeare's 'Like as the waves . . .' in *Sonnet* lx). Either way we are left with a surprising breach of synapheia (*brevis in longo*) at ἄλως || οἶδμα or πόντιον || οἶδμα, unwelcome (unlike ἄλως 967, q.v.) in the middle of a standard phrase and without change of metre, notwithstanding the punctuation at the corresponding place in the antistrophe.<sup>31</sup>

We might consider a transposition δυσπνόοισιν οἶδμ' ὅταν . . . with more interlaced word-order (note that the v.l. ποντίας, hard to account for with ἄλως οἶδμα following, becomes more explicable with δυσπνόοισιν) thus in closer proximity). But I suggest that we should go further and consider writing ὅμοιον ὥστε ποντίας | δυσπνόοις ὅτ' οἶδμ' ἄλως κτλ., keeping all the words, but with ὅτε for ὅταν; another poeticism, cf. 1025 (ἐπεῖ), *Aj.* 554, 1183 (ἔως, ἔστ'), *El.* 225 (ὄφρα), *Phil.* 764 (ἔως), *O.C.* 1225 (ἐπεῖ).<sup>32</sup>

It is then worth considering whether we should write a comma (edd.) or colon after πνοαῖς. In favour of the latter, (i) similes with ὥστε introducing a finite verb are very rare in tragedy;<sup>33</sup> and (ii) epic similes often break and continue with a new main clause. There is certainly a full period-end with rhetorical pause at this point (and similarly in ant.) between iambic sequences of seven and nine metra.

In 590–2/601–3 the usual lineation *ba cr* | *ba lk* | *3ia* is unexceptionable. But a different lineation may yet better reflect the ambivalent symmetrical pattern of the

<sup>28</sup> Jebb and Dawe report the MSS reading as ὅμοιον, Pearson and LJ-W as ὁμοῖον.

<sup>29</sup> Scarcely with ποντίας (L<sup>pc</sup> and Σ<sup>h</sup>), as Jebb. This epithet must go with either ἄλως or οἶδμα (cf. *Sept.* 210, *P.V.* 89, 430, *Hel.* 400, 1396, *I.A.* 704, etc.), not with πνοαῖς; the more so if ἄλως is deleted, leaving οἶδμα unqualified whereas the winds already have two epithets.

<sup>30</sup> *lk* | *lk* will constitute another characteristic pair of identical cola (cf. on 106 above), the more so if synapheia can be restored. θεῶν τις . . . also gives a smoother rhythm in ant. than θεῶν τῖς, following ἀλλ' ἐρεῖπε | . . . (for such rhythmic continuity despite breached synapheia in the corresponding place, cf. *Hec.* 444 αὔρα, πόντιος αὔρα, || ἄτε . . . ~ 455 ἡ νάσων ἀλιήρει | κῶπαι . . .).

<sup>31</sup> Stinton surveyed the incidence of 'period-end without pause', but might have distinguished more clearly between (i) places where the pauseless period-end is directly accompanied by hiatus or *brevis in longo*, and (ii) places where the hiatus or *brevis in longo* occurs only (with sense-pause) in a corresponding strophe. Instances of (i) are much rarer than instances of (ii), e.g. *Hec.* 444–5/455–6 (n. 16 above). Some unexpected breaches of synapheia in Sophocles may indeed be sound; but suspicion is often merited. See further on 812, 1116/1127, 1119/1130, 1133. [Strictly speaking 'brevis in longo' is applicable only to open short syllables at period end, closed syllables at period end being long by definition (West, *GM* 9); but the established terminology may be accepted.]

<sup>32</sup> Kühner-Gerth 2.449 Anm. 4.

<sup>33</sup> See Diggle, *Euripidea* 322–3 (who, however, accepts this as an instance).



cola. The repetition of *ba cr* is characteristic (cf. on 106/123 above). Then the following iambic metron does not simply complete a trimeter—it also initiates another catalectic tetrameter like 337–8 (~347–8) *περὼν ἐπ’ οἷδμασιν, θεῶν τε : τὰν ὑπερτάταν γὰν*.

The possible readings in 599–600 (*ὄπερ* K<sup>s</sup> [conj. Hermann], *ὑπὲρ* cett.; <ἐ>*τέτατο* Brunnck, Pearson, LJ-W, <ὄ> *τέτατο* Hermann, Jebb, Dawe) are well discussed by Griffith, whom I follow with no great confidence. Whatever is read, *νιν* refers to the metaphorical complex of hopeful ‘light’ that ‘had been spread in the house’ and ultimate vegetable growth. It is this which is now ‘cut down’ (*κατά*, emphasized by the tmesis), as a *further* affliction of the Labdakid house by *ἄτη* (the theme word, cf. 584–5).<sup>34</sup>

The ruinous *ἄτη* typically takes the form of *λόγου ἄνοια* and *φρενῶν ἐρινύς*—terms applicable not only to the latest calamity (to which the minds of both Antigone and Creon have contributed), but equally to the tragedies of Oedipus and his sons. Most recent editors rightly accept Jortin’s *κοπῆς*.<sup>35</sup> *φοινία* is an epithet applicable both to the ‘cutting’ implement and to *ἄτη* (as constantly associated with ‘blood’). But the coordination ‘A and B and C’ is decidedly odd for the disparate nouns *κοπῆς*, *ἄνοια*, and *ἐρινύς*. Apposition of the second and third phrases (‘both B and C’) to *κοπῆς* is better; but *epexegetic* apposition (GP 138–9) is surely what we want, with *γ’* rather than the ambiguous *τ’*.<sup>36</sup>

604–5                      *τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν  
                                 ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι;*

605

~615–16                *ἂ γὰρ δὴ πολὺπλαγκτος ἐλπίς  
                                 πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνασις ἀνδρῶν, . . .*

The stanza-opening 9-syll. colon is like *Aj.* 596/609, *O.C.* 668/681, surely here, as there, the beginning of a dicolon, not a self-contained short period. Such dicola are usually printed with word-overlap (in this case as \**gl f hi*). But there is no real need for such hyphenated division, given indentation understood as showing continuity. *gl* and *hi* are indeed constituent measures; but so too are the cola  $\underline{\quad} - - - \underline{\quad} - - -$  (\**hi*, recurring at 609/620 below) and  $\underline{\quad} - - - \underline{\quad} - - -$  (*hag*). The reader is at least as well served by a lineation doing justice to the symmetrical phrasing, so long as it does not violate metrical theory.<sup>37</sup> The anaphora *πολλοῖς μὲν . . . πολλοῖς δ’* . . . in ant. favours recognition of the rhetorical cola here, in a stanza with no other overlaps; and there is a further consideration, that the cola here also have an ionic flavour, with an

<sup>34</sup> LJ-W<sup>2</sup> do not say why *νιν* ‘must surely refer to *ρίζας*’. As Jebb observed, roots are extirpated, not cut down. *αὔ* is variously taken and may be ambivalent (at once ‘down again’ and ‘further’). There may also be a suggestion of *νῦν* <μὲν> *γάρ* . . . *κατὰ* <δ’> *αὔ* . . . with epic flavour (cf. LSJ *αὔ* II.1).

<sup>35</sup> I had been persuaded by Easterling’s defence of *κόνις* (doubtfully accepted also by Griffith); but Dr Dawe in a letter has satisfied me that she was mistaken. Mixed metaphors are all very well; but we must have a *cutting/chopping* implement, not *κόνις*, as the immediate subject of (*κατὰ*) *αμῆν* (to which the other nominative phrases are then added).

<sup>36</sup> On some corruptions of epexegetic *γὰρ* to *τε*, cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 203, 461.

<sup>37</sup> There is indeed a violation of Stinton’s rule (CPGT 326) that ‘pendant (*sic*) close followed by short or anceps is always a mark of period-end, if it is followed by a short or anceps’; a rule depending on the assumption that ‘pendant close’ ends with an anceps position. There is no obvious reason why poets should not have been at liberty to treat any long syllable at colon-end as ‘true long’, by analogy with the last syllable of a bacchiac or ionic metron. Indentation will serve to show that there is in fact no ‘close’.

ambivalence disguised by the hyphenation after *gl*. The first colon is akin to (if not actually a form of) *3io*, and the second (cf. 783–4/793–4, *Med.* 152–3/176–7, 435–6/442–3, etc.) is akin to the anacreontic – – – – –, which duly puts in an appearance at 611/622. In 616 I accept Brunck's *δνασις* (for *δνησις*); cf. *Hipp.* 757.

## 606–10

τὰν οὐθ' ὕπνος αἰρεῖ ποθ' ὁ παντογῆρως  
 †οὔτ' ἀκάματοι [τε] θεῶν†  
 μῆνες, ἀγῆρως δὲ χρόνῳι  
 δυνάστας κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου  
 μαρμαρόεσσαν αἶγλαν·

610

607 οὐτ'] οὐδ' AKV+, del. Tr τε del. Tr οὔτε θεῶν (οὔτ' ἐτέων Schneidewin)  
 ἀκματοι Hermann

606 (~ 617 πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων) is the same as 614/625 below; a self-contained verse, more clearly iono-choriambic in character.<sup>38</sup>

There are several textual issues here:

(i) The vulgate οὐθ' . . . οὔτ' (v.l. οὐδ') is insecurely transmitted. The truth could well be οὐχ . . . οὔτ', at once stylish in poetry (*GP* 509) and vulnerable to normalization (as either οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . or οὐχ . . . οὐδὲ . . .), thus accounting well for οὐθ' in 606 and the conflicting οὐδ' in 607.

(ii) Those who rightly question the sense of ὕπνος . . . ὁ παντογῆρως aim their emendations, all more or less violent, at παντογῆρως, on the unconvincing supposition that -ογῆρως has somehow intruded from ἀγῆρως 608 (so also Griffith). A different approach will give τὰν οὐ χρόνος αἰρεῖ ποθ' ὁ παντογῆρως. Cf. *Eum.* 286 χρόνος καθαιρεῖ πάντα γηράσκων ὁμοῦ (a clear pointer, if we need one, to the sense of παντογῆρως here).<sup>39</sup> οὐχρονος will then have been corrupted to οὐθ' ὕπνος by way of οὐχυπνος.<sup>40</sup> There is no reason, a priori, why the whole emphasis of the passage should not originally have been on the agelessness of the power of Zeus, as utterly *unaffected by the passage of time*. That affects the sequel, but first there is another crux in 607/618.

(iii) 607 needs at least some correction; but mere excision of τε does not bring it into line with 618, where we have no reason to doubt the soundness of εἰδóτι δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει: at once perfect sense, and rhythmically appropriate in a context repeatedly featuring the cadence . . . – – – – –.<sup>41</sup> Despite Renihan's support, few will feel able to accept with LJ-W a telesilleian (or reizianum with monosyllabic θεῶν) in responsion with an aristophanean. We must surely begin by following Hermann, thus far doing little more than changing ἀκ- θ- to θ- ἀκ- (whereas changes proposed for 618 are all violent). But then, faced with οὔτε θεῶν ἀκματοι, we should be prepared with Griffith

<sup>38</sup> For the cadence . . . (–) – – – – –, cf. *Aj.* 1186, *Sept.* 918–21, *Ag.* 201–4, *Ba.* 384–5 etc.; for iono-choriambic beginning – – – – – ('a maiore'), cf. *Aj.* 1202/1214, *Trac.* 849/860, *O.T.* 490/504, *El.* 832/845. West's *hag*<sup>c</sup> is a convenient notation, like his *ph*<sup>c</sup> (n. 49 below), but it can mislead.

<sup>39</sup> 'Such that there is universal aging' (or ' . . . that everything ages/becomes aged'); a good instance of how compound adjectives work in Greek, often with a range of sense from 'active' through neutral to 'passive' (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 677–9).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *Herc.* 1061, where ὕπνος seems to be an error for πόνον (*CQ* 48 [1988], 91–2). A reader does not see why οὐχρονος should have become οὐχυπνος. One can but reply that our tradition is full of variants indicating that such errors occurred quite frequently. Perhaps the proximity of ἀκάματοι here suggested an association with 'sleep'. That the months are 'tireless' has of course no relevance for whether or not Zeus sleeps.

<sup>41</sup> For *ar* thus in iono-choriambic context, cf. *Ag.* 199, 200, etc.

to go further and accept Schneidewin's change of -ε θεῶν to ἐτέων. Confusion of θ and τ, as of φ and π, is a common error, and there is not much (if any) point, *pace* LJ-W, in attaching θεῶν to μῆνες. It is not as though all months were named after gods; nor does such a point about the months' names enhance the sense, whereas 'time' words (so ἐτέων) are of the essence.

(iv) ἀγήρως δὲ χρόνῳ . . . now (following my emendation in 606) falls rather flat, as merely repetitive.<sup>42</sup> I have wondered whether Sophocles in fact wrote ἀγήρως δ' ἄχρονος κτλ. Such a pairing of epithets would have many precedents (cf. *Il.* 12.323 ἀγήρῳ τ' ἀθανάτῳ τε, Hes. *Th.* 949 ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήρως, Pi. fr. 143 ἄνοσοι καὶ ἀγήρῳι) and parallels in tragedy (*Ag.* 979 ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος etc.). It would also be a bold locution, with a use of ἄχρονος 'timeless' anticipating by several centuries the attested occurrences.

611–14           τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον  
καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει  
νόμος ὅδ'· οὐδὲν ἔρπει  
θνατῶν βίῳτῳ †πάμπολις† ἐκτὸς ἄτας·

613 οὐδὲν' Ald. ἔρπειν Heath   614 πάμπολύ γ' Heath (-υν Zo<sup>ac</sup>, -ιν Zo<sup>pc</sup>; -υς Musgrave)

Given that πάμπολις is certainly corrupt (presumably for some part of πάμπολυς), and that other adjustment(s) may be needed, there are several possible formulations of the law, whether as a main clause or as acc. and inf. with ἔρπειν. Heath's οὐδὲν ἔρπει . . . πάμπολύ γ' ἐκτὸς ἄτας has the virtue of economy, but the γε is improbably late.<sup>43</sup> LJ-W print οὐδὲν' ἔρπει | θνατῶν βίῳτῳ πάμπολυς (as proposed by Lloyd-Jones in *CQ* 7 [1957], 20–1); but ἔρπειν does not elsewhere govern an acc. pers.<sup>44</sup> Better, if πάμπολυς is to agree with 'life', would be οὐδὲν' ἔρπειν | θνατῶν βίῳτῳ πάμπολυν: 'that no life of mortals proceeds πάμπολυς . . .'. But it may be better still to make 'no mortal' the subject of ἔρπειν. To write οὐδὲν' ἔρπειν | θνατῶν βίῳτῳ πάμπολυν ἐκτὸς ἄτας will have the merit of keeping βίῳτῳι. For βίῳτῳι πάμπολυς describing a person, cf. expressions like πλούτῳι τε κἀνδρείαι μέγαν (*Trö.* 674) and my commentary on *Or.* 348–51 (πολὺς ἀβροσύνη).

781–90           Ἔρως ἀνίκατε μάχαν,  
Ἔρως ὃς †ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις†,  
ὃς ἐν μαλακαῖς παρειαῖς

<sup>42</sup> The v.l. ἀγήρῳ (L<sup>ac</sup>AUYZc, Σ<sup>l</sup>) is negligible, presumably for ἀγήρῳι to agree with the adjacent χρόνῳι (a common type of corruption). 'With ageless time' makes no sense.

<sup>43</sup> *GP* 120 offers at best only partial support (whether πάμπολυ is taken as adjectival or adverbial; a reader favours the latter, but πάμπολυ can surely not be understood as 'wholly, absolutely'). LJ-W object rather to the 'heavy strain' on βίῳτῳι if taken as 'in life'; but ἔρπει θνατῶν βίῳτῳι could perhaps be taken rather as 'proceeds to/for human life' (cf. εἰδότει δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει, sc. ἄτα in 618). If the late γε were the only stumbling block one might consider writing κἀκτὸς rather than γ' ἐκτὸς (the κ incidentally accounting well for the wrong ις): '(at once) πάμπολυ and free from ἄτη'; ἐκτός + gen. can be adjectival, at least when predicative (*Cho.* 1031, etc.). But I have grave reservations about the expression 'nothing goes πάμπολυν'.

<sup>44</sup> The accusative pronouns με and σε with βαίνει (*Hipp.* 1371, cf. also *Ar. Nub.* 30) and ἐλήλυθε (*Phil.* 141) scarcely justify οὐδένα θνατῶν with ἔρπει, even if βίῳτῳι πάμπολυς (a phrase questioned by Griffith) is sufficiently similar to πᾶν κράτος in *Phil.* ἔρπειν has a more restricted range of idiom, which does not include accusative of destination.

νεάνιδος ἐννυχεύεις·  
 φοιταῖς δ' ὑπερπόντιος ἐν τ'  
 ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαῖς,  
 καί σ' οὐτ' ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὐδείς,  
 οὐθ' ἀμερίων σέ γ' ἀνθρώπων,  
 ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμνηεν·

785  
790

~791–800

σὺ καὶ δικαίων ἀδίκους  
 φρένας παρασπᾶις ἐπὶ λῶβαι,  
 σὺ καὶ τόδε νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν  
 ξύναιμον ἔχεις ταραξᾶς·  
 νικᾷ δ' ἐναργῆς βλεφάρων  
 ἥμερος εὐλέκτρου  
 νύμφας, τῶν μεγάλων †πάρεδρος† ἐν ἀρχαῖς  
 θεσμῶν· ἄμαχος γὰρ ἐμπαίζει  
 θεὸς Ἀφροδίτα.

795  
800

The opening colon is a dimeter (*ia ch*), not a form of *wil*.<sup>45</sup> The second adds – – – – (cf. 140/154) to the repeated (anaphoric) – – – . . . , the combination making a nod towards iono-choriambic.<sup>46</sup> Then 783–4/793–4 should be recognized as a dicolon like *Med.* 151–2 (~176–7) *τίς σοί ποτε τὰς ἀπλάτου : κοίτας ἔρος, ὦ ματαῖα*; not as two self-contained short periods; printed therefore either with an overlap at *παρεῖ-αῖς* (*tl f hi*) or with indentation as above to show the continuity.<sup>47</sup> 785–6/795–6 similarly need to be taken together, this time adding – – – – – (an extension of – – – – –) to another *ia ch* colon.<sup>48</sup> 787–8/797–8 is considered further below; at least in the strophe it adds – – – – – (again) to the colon – – – – – (akin to the preceding – – – – –).<sup>49</sup> Finally – – – – – : – – – : – – – – – is variously divisible,<sup>50</sup> and might be best written *uno versu* like *El.* 486–7 *ἄ νιν κατέπεφεν : αἰσχίσταις : ἐν*

<sup>45</sup> The distinction is clearly established by Itsumi<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. n. 15 above. *ia ch* – is unusual, but cf. the initial *pe 2io* (or *ia 2ch* –) at *P.V.* 140–1/154–5 and the ambivalent – – – – – at *O.T.* 483 etc.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. also *Med.* 435–6/442–3. Orthodox doctrine might prefer the overlap (so presumably Stinton, who does not list these passages as instances of 'period-end without pause'), as at *Hcl.* 915–16 *Ἥβας δ' ἐρατὸν χοῖτ-ίζει : λέχος χρυσέαν κατ' αὐλάν (~ ἔσχεν δ' ὕβριν ἀνδρὸς ὦι | θυμὸς ἦν πρὸ δίκας βίαιος)*, where hyphenation is unavoidable; but there is no need for it here, given the availability of indentation to show continuity; cf. on 604–5/615–16 above.

<sup>48</sup> Or we may say that × – – – – (again) is this time extended with . . . – – – – : – – – – – (cf. 948, 951 etc.). Either way we have a single *στίχος*, needing indentation if not printed *uno versu*.

<sup>49</sup> The verse – – – – – (West's *ph<sup>c</sup>*, *GM* 32 etc.) is a Sophoclean favourite, also at 944/955, 970/981 (q.v.), *Aj.* 629/640, *El.* 472/489, 828ff./842ff., *Phil.* 203/212, 710/722, *O.C.* 701/714; Eur. only at *Alc.* 986/997. The extensions *ph<sup>2c</sup>* and *ph<sup>3c</sup>* in *O.C.* are similarly stereotyped. The notations *ph<sup>c</sup>* etc., though convenient, are open to the objection that (at least in Sophocles) these verses always begin with three long syllables, with no evidence of 'aeolic base'; and their occurrence is in contexts where – – – | – – – | – – – is plausibly taken as *3io* (and similarly *ph<sup>2c</sup>*, *ph<sup>3c</sup>* as *4io*, *5io*).

<sup>50</sup> The usual lineation as *hag f ar* runs counter to the general rule that pendent-ending aeolic lengths do not overlap; cf. Parker<sup>3</sup> 22. The pattern here seems to be a special case, with a precedent at *Ag.* 1483–4 (~ 1507–8) *φεῦ φεῦ· κακὸν αἶνον, : ἀτηρᾶς : τύχας ἀκόρεστον*. The bonding . . . : – – – : . . . word is akin to that common in enoplian sequences (e.g. *Andr.* 1009–10 *ὦ Φοῖβε, : πυργώσας : τὸν ἐν Ἰλῶι : εὐτειχῇ : πάγον*). An appropriate notation here might be *tl f ar* (cf. n. 51 below).

δικείαις.<sup>51</sup> But in itself × - - - - - is a frequent colon;<sup>52</sup> and - - - - - is a very common clausula, akin to the reizianum × - - - - .<sup>53</sup> Here too indentation following colon-end is favoured in preference to the usual overlap.

As to the text, in 782 Dawe justly obelizes ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις (commenting ‘nulla emendatio arridet’): ‘who faltest on possessions’ is a sentiment at once off-key, baldly expressed and associating ill with ὅς . . . ἐννυχεύεις.<sup>54</sup> The short and longer relative clauses, the latter following asyndetically, should have some connection of thought (so that Brunck’s κτήνεσι does not help). Since the opening of the strophe is echoed at the end of the antistrophe (ἀνίκατε μάχαν . . . ἄμαχος), there is merit in Blaydes’s παίζεις here echoed at ἐμπαίζει 800 (the latter rightly defended by LJ-W). It is less clear that we want a reference to ‘eyes’ or ‘glances’ in place of κτήμασι, as in many proposals including Blaydes’s ἐν ὄμμασι παίζεις (or -σιν ἴζεις). A more general point about Love’s sportive *thievishness* would suit the overall structure better; so perhaps ἐν κλέμμασι παίζεις. Love’s victories in ‘battle’ (or not in battle) are paradoxically achieved by subtle means such as the soft cheeks of a girl, not by weaponry.

In 797 πάρεδρος is doubly suspect, as Jebb argued. - - - - in a choriamb (as also - - - in a dactyl) is at best very rare in tragedy;<sup>55</sup> and the point here should not be that Desire *shares sovereignty* with ‘the great θεσμοί’. Griffith perhaps goes too far in saying that Desire is rather a destroyer of the θεσμοί; but he too rightly stresses the connection between this sentence and 801–2 νῦν δ’ ἤδη γὰρ καὶ τὸς θεσμῶν | ἔξω φέρομαι . . . —a continuation which makes no sense unless Desire has been more or less explicitly defined as operating *in conflict with, at a distance from, the θεσμοί*. It is useless therefore merely to normalize the metre with something like Arndt’s σύνθρονος ἀρχαῖς (and ἐν ἀρχαῖς is otherwise likely to be the truth, cf. *Andr.* 699 and *Or.* 897). Jebb too violently proposed <ῶστε> πέρα δρᾶν (deleting ἐν ἀρχαῖς). Simpler would be to substitute ἐκτός for πάρεδρος (or an equivalent, if there is one). τῶν μεγάλων ἐκτός ἐν ἀρχαῖς | θεσμῶν, while keeping ἐν ἀρχαῖς, will have the merit of giving θεσμῶν a construction other than dependence on ἐν ἀρχαῖς (which does not govern a genitive in the parallels cited). Such an emendation is indeed somewhat violent; but it

<sup>51</sup> δικ- as *P.V.* 176 etc. (West, after Porson). The sequence *tl × e sp* at *El.* 486–7/501–2 (also *O.T.* 1096–7/1108–9) is more clearly enoplian in character.

<sup>52</sup> *tl sp*, akin to *gl sp* (n. 66 below), e.g. *Aj.* 597/610, *Hipp.* 130/140; sometimes following with overlap as at 833 . . . ὁμοιοτάταν κατευνάζω.

<sup>53</sup> Like the reizianum, - - - - - commonly follows a word-overlap; but there is no reason why it should not stand on its own (as in West’s colometry at *Ag.* 455/470). It may indeed be a form of ionic dimeter. Eur.’s stanza-ending . . . | Ἔρως ὁ Διὸς παῖς at *Hipp.* 534 may be a conscious echo of . . . | θεὸς Ἀφροδίτα here.

<sup>54</sup> Ellendt (s.v. κτήμα) showed that some sort of sense can be extracted from the paradoxos. But if he had been satisfied by it, he would not have contemplated a transposition conjoining ἐν κτήμασι with ἐν ἀγρονομίῳ αὐλαῖς (in effect as ‘wealth’ and ‘rustic poverty’).

<sup>55</sup> - - - - - (as distinct from - - - -) seems not to occur in Aesch. or Eur. (for the latter see Diggle, *Euripidea* 470–1; the nearest parallel seems to be *Ba.* 397–8 ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ τίς ἂν μεγάλα διώκων | τὰ παροντ’ οὐχὶ φέροι; in ionic metre). In this play 970/981 is otherwise dubious, and -ἐθρὸν ἀγρίου at 1124 yields to plausible emendation (qq.v.). LJ-W, after Parker<sup>2</sup> 242–3, mention *Aj.* 607/620 and *El.* 154/174. In the former the clausular colon - - - - - following - - - - - (bis) | - - - - - | . . . may be either - - - - - or - - - - - plus *ba*, but the context is certainly dochmiac (cf. *Sept.* 891–4/902–5), with a neglected precedent at *Sept.* 215 (~ 207) πρὸς μακάρων λιτάς (δ), : πόλεος ἢν’ ὑπερέχοιεν ἀλκάν. *El.* 154 τέκνον, ἄχος ἐφάνη βροτῶν ~ 174 τέκνον· ἐτι (L+, ἐστὶ pler.) μέγας ἐν οὐρανῶι is evidently corrupt somewhere. 174 *prima facie* looks sound as an iambic dimeter of ‘sub-dochmiac’ type with split resolution (the vulgate excision of ἐν is Procrustean). 154 can most simply be brought into line with that by writing τέκνον, ἐφάνη βροτῶν ἄχος. Both these passages I hope to discuss in further studies of Sophoclean *cantica*.



(853–6), though ending with πατρῶιον δ' ἐκτίνεις τιν' ἄθλον, has been predominantly censorious, rather than 'pitying, lamenting'. As to τριπόλιστον, that should mean something like 'trite' (lit. 'thrice gone over', with a metaphor derived from ploughing); cf. Pindar's Ἀκούσατ' ἥ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας | ἄρουραν ἧ Χαρίτων | ἀναπολίζομεν . . . (Py. 6.1–3). As such it is applicable to the 'touching upon' a painful theme by the chorus, but less aptly to a doubtfully implied idea of 'pitying lamentation'.<sup>56</sup>

The thinly attested variant οἶτον is no better, and may be merely lipographic. Only on a superficial view does 'fate, doom' make sense (very awkwardly taken as objective to the idea ἀνέμνησας supposedly implied by ἔψαυσας . . . μερίμνας). LJ-W's τριπόλιστου οἶτου, to 'ease the syntax', is metrically impossible;<sup>57</sup> and in any case the epithet τριπόλιστος, as most naturally understood, makes even less sense with 'fate, doom' than with 'lament'.

The noun we want with τριπόλιστον, I would suggest, is οἶμον, lit. 'path, track', so metaphorically 'strain of song, theme'; *h. Merc.* 451, *Pi. Ol.* 9.47, *Py.* 2.96.<sup>58</sup>

The next verse, 841–2/860–1, is usually divided as – – – – ε || – – – – –; but the breach of synapheia at προπαντός is again intolerable (cf. on 817 above) in the middle (*a fortiori*, soon after the beginning) of a phrase. We might be able to accept the analysis 'choriamb + telesilleian' (cf. *tl + ch* at *Trac.* 517 τότε ἦν χερός, ἦν δὲ τόξων πάταγος, also *Hipp.* 740/750). But, as LJ-W observe, the phrasing at ἀμετέρου . . . Λαβδακίδαις in 861–2 is suspect. Griffith is content to say that ἀμετέρου is 'equivalent to ἡμῖν, a usage more common with the genitive', without offering any supporting evidence. Here too, as in 812/829 above, the fault may be due to the loss of a syllable. I propose that we should write τοῦ τε πρόπαντος ἀμ<ίν> ἐτέρου πότμου | κλεινοῖς Λαβδακίδαισι: '(concerning my father . . .) and (concerning) all the other fate of (lit. *what has fallen to*) us the famous *Labdakidai*' ('other', i.e. 'other than that of Oedipus').<sup>59</sup> There is then no difficulty in the datives governed by πότμου (cf. Kühner-Gerth i.426–30), and the metre is straightforwardly two dochmiacs with internal overlap like *Sept.* 698ff., etc).<sup>60</sup>

In 841–2 correspondence will then be obtained by writing <τ>ὼ πόλις . . . in line with ἰὼ . . . in 844 (likewise probably with long iota). I will have dropped out easily after N, the more easily with ὦ πόλεως . . . immediately following.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Dindorf's τριπόλητον has been commended by West in *Gnomon* 53 (1981), 526, but there is no reason to reject -πόλιστον in the light of Pindar's ἀναπολίζειν in an associable sense ('go over a theme again' with a metaphor of ploughing a field).

<sup>57</sup> Correction virtually occurs, in lyric as in epic, only when a short syllable either precedes or follows; West, *GM* 11. LJ-W<sup>2</sup>, though now less confident of their conjecture (which should never have been put into the text), still seem unaware of the rule which it violates.

<sup>58</sup> οἶμος aspirate, cf. West on Hes. *Op.* 290 (and *AT* xxx). The 'ploughing' metaphor for pursuing a 'theme' is clear in *Pi. Py.* 6.1–3 (ἄρουραν . . . ἀναπολίζομεν). For πολεύειν of 'going up and down' in ploughing, cf. 341; for πολεῖν = φοιτᾶν in conjunction with 'track, path', cf. also *Or.* 1270.

<sup>59</sup> ἄμιν or ἡμῖν? The plural of ἐγώ etc. is usually transmitted as ἡμ- in tragic lyric, as in dialogue. But at *Eum.* 348 we have ἄμιν, and at *Sept.* 156 ἄμμι (v.l. ἄμμιν), and these are enough to arouse a suspicion that Doric forms in line with ἀμέτερος (as ἄμιν at *Ar. Ach.* 821) may originally have been commoner, or even the norm, in tragic lyric. Or, if indeed ἄμιν here will be exceptional, it will be no more so than the form ὕμμι(ε) nearby at 846. The status of Doric ἄμαρ ἄματ- is similar: *Ant.* 1333 is the only place in tragedy where it is unanimously attested, and there are only three other attestations in part of the tradition (*O. C.* 1079, *Alc.* 105, *Pho.* 1579).

<sup>60</sup> Ambivalent indeed, since – – – – – is in itself also a dochmiac (a common ambivalence). Dochmiac pentasyllables follow in 844/863 and 850/869. For other more or less isolated dochmiacs verses in Sophocles, cf. ?*Aj.* 694/707, *Trac.* 7221, 880, *El.* 205/225, *Phil.* 1090/1111.

<sup>61</sup> ἰὼ with long iota is certain at *El.* 149 and quite often at least possible. LJ-W<sup>2</sup> on *O. T.* 159–66,

844-6                    ἰὼ Διρκαῖαι  
                          κρήναι Θήβας τ'  
                          εὐαρμάτου ἄλσος, ἔμ-  
                          πας ξυμμάρτυρας ὕμμ' ἐπικτῶμαι.                    845

863-5                    ἰὼ ματρῶναι  
                          λέκτρων ᾄται  
                          κοιμήματά τ' αὐτογέν-  
                          νητ' ἐμῶι πατρὶ δυσμόρου ματρός.                    865

The symmetrical ἰὼ --- colon is best taken as a dochmius, like 850/869 below.<sup>62</sup> Division three syllables later at Θή-/βας ~ ᾄ-/ται (Dawe, LJ-W, Griffith) gives a quite extraordinary overlap after eight long syllables (4sp).<sup>63</sup> Sophocles was in general fond of the colon -----,<sup>64</sup> and -- : -- can be a linking colarion.<sup>65</sup> ----- : -- : -- : ... recurs at 1121-2/1132-3 (see below) and *Phil.* 837/853. The ending (tl f gl sp) is like *Aj.* 614-15 (~603-4) νῦν δ' αὖ φρενὸς οἰοβώ-/τας φίλοις μέγα πένθος ἡῦρηται.<sup>66</sup>

850-2                    ἰὼ δύστανος,                    850  
                          [οὔτ' ἐν] βροτοῖς οὔτ' ἐν νεκροῖσιν, <οἴμοι>,  
                          μέτοικος, οὐ ζῶσιν οὐ θανοῦσιν.

~869-71                    ἰὼ δυσπότημων  
                          κασίγνητος γάμων κυρήσας,                    870  
                          θανὼν ἔτ' οὔσαν κατήναρές με.

851 οὔτ' ἐν del. Boeckh βροτοῖς Tr: -οῖσιν codd. οὔτ' ἐν] οὔτε S 870 κασίγνητος  
 Boeckh: -ητε codd.

Dain rightly divided after another ἰὼ . . . pentasyllable (presumably another dochmius, cf. 844/863), not after an anomalous *ba ia* dimeter; cf. Stinton, *CPGT* 121-2. Following that, given Boeckh's generally accepted excision of the first οὔτ' ἐν in 851, responsion in 851/870 is then restored by some supplement. *Prima facie* the verse might be either a hipponactean (with οὔτε rather than οὔτ' ἐν in str.) or *ba ith* with Boeckh's κασίγνητος in 870. The latter is metrically likelier in association with another syncopated iambic verse; moreover the isolated attestation of οὔτεν against οὔτενν is more likely to be lipographic than a survival of truth; and indeed ἐν can scarcely be dispensed with. For the supplement, Gleditsch's οὔτε <νεκρὸς> νεκροῖσιν is neat; but the paregmenon, though stylish in itself, is out of place as an expansion of just one of four balanced terms. Others add <- -> after νεκροῖσιν[υ]:

after S. Stelluto, correct the previously cited observation of Friis Johansen and Whittle on *A. Su.* 162. As to the proposed emendation, corruption of ᾠ (ῶ) to ἰὼ is far commoner (n. 92 below); but for the reverse corruption cf. *O.T.* 1186.

<sup>62</sup> So Stinton, *CPGT* 121-2. It is not clear how he took the rest. One hopes that he did not agree with Wilamowitz in taking the following -- : -- : -- as another dochmius, with unacceptable word-end after long penult. and unparalleled overlap from dochmiacs into a glyconic.

<sup>63</sup> Pearson's κρή-/ναι ~ λέ-/κτρων was no better. Both these splits combine word-end after long penult. (objectionable not only in dochmiacs) and overlap following . . . --- (cf. nn. 7-8 above).

<sup>64</sup> See further on 1137-9 below with n. 91, and add *El.* 153/173, 249 ἔρροι τᾶν (Martin) αἰδώς, 510.



<ἐνερθεν> Hermann, <κυρούσα> Boeckh. But an exclamation seems simplest and best (for which οἶμοι is not the only possibility). [Griffith still has the inferior colometry; more culpably he treats νεκρὸς νεκροῖσιν as the paradosis.]

876–82      *Αν. ἄκλαυτος ἄφιλος ἀνυμέναιος*  
                   ἃ ταλαίφρων ἄγομαι  
                   τάνδ' ἐτοίμαν ὁδὸν οὐκέτι μοι  
                   τόδε λαμπάδος ἱρὸν ὄμμα  
                   θέμις ὀρᾶν ταλαίνοι·  
                   τὸν δ' ἐμὸν πότμον ἀδάκρυτον οὐ-  
                   δεῖς φίλων στενάζει.  
 880

878 τὰν Dindorf    *πυμάταν* Reiske    879 ἱρὸν Dindorf: *ἱερὸν* codd.

878–82 is lineated in the vulgate, following the opening tetrameter (*3ia + ch*), as follows: τάνδ' (or τὰν)<sup>67</sup> . . . | οὐκέτι . . . | ὄμμα . . . | τὸν δ' . . . | οὐδεῖς . . . This is variously incorrect. Working backwards from the end: Brown has 881–2 right; LJ-W do not explain why they still 'prefer' the division after ἀδάκρυτον, with a non-catalectic trochaic dimeter followed without sense-pause by an iambic dimeter, and also with a split resolution at -μον ἃ-, to one which straightforwardly (with one easy resolution) gives *4cr + ba*, divisible either as *3cr f ith* or as *2cr f cr ith* (*3cr*, cf. *El.* 1249/1269, *O. C.* 1682/1709); *πῶτμ-* as at 1296. The syncopated five-metron sequence with overlaps is akin to *Pers.* 118–19 (~124–5) τοῦτο μὴ πόλις πύθη- | ται κέναν- | δρον μέγ' ἄστν *Κουσιδος* (for . . . *f cr f ith*, cf. also *Pers.* 574–5/582–3, *Andr.* 1016–17/1025–6 etc., and similarly . . . *f cr f ar* at *Pers.* 258–9/264–5 etc.). Before that, with division before τόδε, we have the standard dicolon *T - : ith* (cf. *Med.* 647–8/656–7, *Hipp.* 755–6/767–8), with the same resolution in the ithyphallic as at *Ion* 1078–9 (~1094–5) ὅτε καὶ Διὸς ἀστερωπὸς : ἀνεχόρευσεν αἰθῆρ.<sup>68</sup> I accept Dindorf's ἱρὸν in 879 for the scansion – .<sup>69</sup> That only leaves 878. τάνδ' ἐτοίμαν may be erroneous (τὰν *πυμάταν* would give a more orthodox dactylic verse, *D*<sup>2</sup>); but – – – – – (*e D*), though unusual without link anceps, is scarcely impossible.

944–7      *ἔτλα καὶ Δανάας οὐράνιον φῶς*  
                   ἀλλάξαι δέμας ἐν χαλκοδέτοις  
                   αὐλαῖς, κρυπτομένα δ' ἐν  
                   τυμβήρῃ θαλάμῳ κατεζεύχθη·  
 945

<sup>65</sup> Cf. *Phil.* 711/722 (πτανοῖς ἰοῖς ~ πολλῶν μνηῶν, followed by an anacreontic), *I. T.* 404/419 (*Δίαι τέγγει ~ κοινᾷ δόξαι*, between dicola).

<sup>66</sup> To the list of *gl sp* cadences in *CQ* 47 (1997), 300 n. 12, add *A. Su.* 48/57.

<sup>67</sup> Pearson, followed by LJ-W without comment, erroneously printed τὰν as the paradosis, with τάνδ' attributed to Triclinius. Jebb had explicitly reported L as reading τάνδ', in conjunction with his meritorious report of L's lineation. Dawe does not even mention τὰν.

<sup>68</sup> For *T* (– – – – –) following – – – – – (*D*), cf. *Med.* 433/441, *Andr.* 835/839, ?864, *Herc.* 1055, *Ion* 1480, *Or.* 183/204, *Rh.* 531/ 550, *Hypsipyle* 270 and 276 *D*.

<sup>69</sup> – – – – – does occur as a verse at *Hel.* 1119; but the resolution there (by analogy with the antepenult. of a glyconic) is an exceptional late-style licence in enoplian metre. Monosyllabic *ῖ(ε)ρ-* (as opposed to *ῖ(ε)ρ-*) is seldom provable, but often likely. Resolution is similarly unlikely, if not impossible, at *Sept.* 268 (*ἱρὸν* Pearson), *Tro.* 123 (*ἱρὰν* Lenting), 1065 (*ἱρὰν* Heath), *I. T.* 1101 (*ἱρὸν* Tr<sup>2</sup>). The spelling *ἱρ-* is well attested at *Pers.* 745 and *O. C.* 16. The vulgate colometry scans *ῖ(ε)ρδν*, for which there is no parallel known to me in tragedy (LSJ's mention of '*Th.* 268' is certainly erroneous).

- ~955-8 ζεύχθη δ' ὀξύχολος παῖς ὁ Δρύαντος, 955  
 'Ηδῶνων βασιλεύς, κερτομίους  
 ὀργαῖς ἐκ Διονύσου  
 πετρῶδαι κατάφαρκτος ἐν δεσμῶι.

Some, as Jebb and LJ-W, divide after αὐλαῖς/ὀργαῖς, followed by - - - - | . . . I prefer to divide, with Pearson, Dawe, and now Griffith, after *sp* 2*ch* (cf. the verse *sp* 3*ch* at 950-1/960-1), with no anticipation of the full close . . . - - - - || at 947/958. Then - - - - - , ending in str. with a prepositive, is like *Aj.* 631 θρηγῆσει, χερόπλακτοι δ' (n. 25 above) and *Alc.* 967; cf. also the prepositives ending a *ph<sup>c</sup>* verse at *El.* 472/489.

- 966-70 παρὰ δὲ †κυανέων πελαγέων [πετρῶν]† διδύμας ἄλῶς 970  
 †ἀκταὶ Βοσπόριαι . . . † ἡδ' ὁ Θρηϊκῶν  
 Καλμυδησός, ἔν' ἀγχιπτολος Ἄρης . . .

- ~977-81 κατὰ δὲ τακόμενοι μέλαιοι μέλεαν πάθαν 980  
 κλαῖον, ματρός ἔχοντες ἀνύμφευτον γονάν.  
 ἂ δὲ σπέρμα μὲν ἀρχαιογόνων <ῆν> . . .

In neither 977-8 nor 979-80 (both printed *uno versu* in the vulgate lineation as above) does the antistrophe invite suspicion, whereas there is certainly compound corruption in 966-9. 966-7 needs reduction to - - - - - : - - - - - (preferably divided as *dod* | *T*);<sup>70</sup> and 968-9 will need some expansion (a verb is to desiderated), and Herkenrath Θρηϊκῶν for Θρη(ι)κῶν,<sup>71</sup> for the scansion - - - - - × - - - (*D*<sup>2</sup> × *e*).<sup>72</sup>

In 966-7 Brunck's deletion of πετρῶν, accepted by Jebb and Dawe, is the necessary first step.<sup>73</sup> Jebb took a further step in the right direction by proposing πελάγει, rightly arguing the need for a dative after παρὰ in the sense 'adjacent to' (a need recognized long ago by whoever was responsible for K's supralinear κυανέοις πελάγεσι), and drawing attention to L's unique reading πελάγεων (*sic*). He might have added that singular 'sea' is better than 'seas' in conjunction with 'of twofold brine'.<sup>74</sup> He was then content to read Κυανεᾶν (Wieseler) πελάγει διδύμας ἄλῶς, with an awkward double genitive construction. It costs little (given πελάγει and [πετρῶν]) to write παρὰ δὲ κυανέωι πελάγει δ- ἂ- . . . The more natural phrasing is now merely allusive to the Cyan Rocks. κυάνεος (here only in Sophocles) was not only proper to the cliffs adjacent to the Bosphorus, also called the Symplegades (*Med.* 2.1263, *Andr.* 864, *I.T.* 241, 889),

<sup>70</sup> Initial *dod* as *Hipp.* 545/555, etc. (resolved as *Sept.* 935/949, etc.); - - - - - (*T*) is another common verse (cf. on 1115/1126 below, also *T* : . . . at 879 above), equally at home in aeolic and eoplian contexts (cf. *Hec.* 905/914, 910/919). The breach of synapheia at ἄλῶς is unremarkable at phrase-end following a long verse or colon. The position is different at 586 (q.v.).

<sup>71</sup> Θρηϊκ- seemingly not elsewhere in tragedy, but sufficiently supported by *Il.* 4.533, etc.

<sup>72</sup> In agreement thus far with LJ-W; cf. Lloyd-Jones (*CQ* 7 [1957], 23-4), as approved by Parker<sup>1</sup> (17). For *sp* *D* = *D*<sup>2</sup>, cf. *Alc.* 89/101, *Hipp.* 164, etc. *D* × *e* is common, *D*<sup>2</sup> × *e* much less so, but cf. *P.V.* 429-30/434-5 (*sp* : *D* | *e* *ba*), 533-5/542-4 (*D*<sup>2</sup> : *e* : - *ith*). For the symmetrical break after the spondee, cf. also *Pers.* 864/872, etc. Dale (*CP* 197) strangely mistook this spondee as 'aeolic base' prefixed to an elegiacus. [In the Loeb Lloyd-Jones prints ἀκταὶ Βοσπορίαὶ <τόπος ῆν> ὁ Θρηϊκῶν in 968-9. There is no mention of this unconvincing proposal in the *OCT*, or discussion of it in *Sophoclea* (merely a reference to *CQ* loc. cit.).]

<sup>73</sup> So also Griffith. Dale (*ibid.*) preferred to delete πελαγέων with Triclinius, but offered no parallel for disyllabic scansion of μέλαιοι (in responson with πετρῶν).

<sup>74</sup> For the pattern πελάγει διδύμας ἄλῶς cf. also *Tro.* 88 πέλαγος Αἰγαιάς ἄλῶς.

but also a possible epithet for sea water in a strait (as at *I.T.* 7 *κυανέαν ἄλα*, of the Euripus). At *I.T.* 392, similarly in an opening verse, the epithet is applied (doubly) to the Bosporian strait as a 'sea junction',<sup>75</sup> not directly to the Cyan Rocks, though indirect allusion to the latter is clear in the light of *I.T.* 241. Similar allusiveness is likely here, with *πετρῶν* intrusive from a gloss.<sup>76</sup> The further correction *κυανέωι* is scarcely an additional postulate, since intrusion of *πετρῶν* is likely enough to have brought a wrong *κυανέων* with it.

In 968–9 we expect a finite verb, and there was merit in Jebb's suggestion . . . ὁ *Θρηικῶν <κλήιζεται>*. But the poetical ἦδ' (elsewhere in Sophocles only in frs. 386, 549; frequent in Aesch., especially *Persae*; in Eur. at *Herc.* 30, *Hec.* 323, *I.A.* 812) is most unlikely to be an error for *καὶ* or *ἔν'* (alternative suggestions of Blaydes) or for the Triclinian *ἰδ'* (an epic 'and', eschewed by the tragedians, as also by Pindar and other lyric poets). The loss of something before ἦδ' is further suggested by the hiatus at this point (where also *L* ends a verse, so that the loss is at verse end). I suggest *ἀκτὰ Βοσπορί<ς> αἰδετ<αι> αἰ ἦδ'* . . ., giving at once appropriate sense and a plausible skip.<sup>77</sup> For *αἰδετ<αι>* is celebrated in song, cf. *Pi. Py.* 8.25. The feminine form \**Βοσπορίς* is not attested, but likely enough (as *Κυκλωπίς*, *hapax* at *I.T.* 845, equivalent to *Κυκλωπία*); cf. *ἀκτὴ τις ἔστ' Εὐβοίης* at *Trac.* 237 (also *Hclid.* 83).

970–2                      *Καλμυδησός, ἔν' ἀγχίπολις Ἄρης*                      970  
                                 *δισσοῖσι Φινείδαις*  
                                 *εἶδεν ἀρατὸν ἔλκος . . .*

~981–3                    *ἀ δὲ σπέρμα μὲν ἀρχαιογόνων <ἦν>*  
                                 *ἄνασσ' Ἐρεχθεῖδαν,*  
                                 *τηλεπόροις δ' ἐν ἄντροις . . .*

970 *ἀγχίπολις* *L*<sup>2</sup>RSZfZoT: -πολις cett. 981–2 <ἦν> *ἄνασσ'* Wilamowitz: *ἄντασ'* codd.

The next two verses are probably *ph<sup>c</sup>* (again) | *tl'* (*awil*), followed by another aristophanean like 605/616, 610/621 (then iambic verses: *ia ith* || *3ia* | *ba ith* || *ia ith*). With *ἀγχίπολις* in 970 and *ἄντασ'* in 982 we have — — — — — — — — — — | — — — — — — — — — —; *sp 2ch* | *awil (tl')* is credible, but the choriamb — — — — — is again open to grave suspicion (cf. on 797 above), the more so as the variant *ἀγχίπολις*, likely in itself, gives with spondaic *Ἄρης* another *ph<sup>c</sup>* verse; moreover *ἄντασ'* in 982 is barely intelligible, requiring us to postulate a nonce-sense and -construction.<sup>78</sup> LJ-W rightly accept Wilamowitz's excellent <ἦν> *ἄνασσ'*, but the division should be after *ἦν*, not before it with *Ἄ-/ρης* overlapped. For the monosyllable at the end of the *ph<sup>c</sup>* verse, cf. *El.* 472/489 (again). *ην* following -ων at verse-end will have dropped out easily, perhaps anciently with *ανασσ(ε)* then understood as a verb. Subsequently it will have been a short step from *ανασσ{ε}* to *αντασ(ε)*. The verse-end thus after 970/981 may, but need not, be a period end. The 'pendent close' is followed by a verse beginning

<sup>75</sup> *κυάνειαι κυάνειαι σύνοδοι θαλάσσης . . .* (*L*, edd.); but it seems likely that Eur. wrote *κυάνειαι κυανέας κτλ.*, with a favourite kind of paregmenon and interlaced phrasing in line with *ἡ ῥοθίους εἰλατίνας δικρότοις κώπας* at 407–8 in the antistrophe.

<sup>76</sup> If genuine, the gen. pl. of *πέτρα* should of course be *πετρῶν* in lyric (as at *Med.* 1264).

<sup>77</sup> *ἀκτὰ Βοσπορί<ς> αἰδετ<αι>* incidentally makes an apparent glyconic, and that may be relevant for the transmitted verse-division before ἦδ'.

<sup>78</sup> Those who accept *ἄντασ'*, or a metrical equivalent such as Blaydes's *αὔχησ'* (after Dindorf), need also to justify the inappropriate *aorist* tense.

with anceps, but the pendent syllable is a true long here, not long anceps, at the end of a verse equivalent to *3io* (n. 49 above).

975-8 ἀραχθέντων ὕφ' αἵματηραῖς  
χειρέσσι καὶ κερκίδων ἀκμαῖσιν. 975

~986-7 θεῶν παῖς· ἀλλὰ κάπ' ἐκείναι 985  
Μοῖραι μακραίωνες ἔσχον, ὦ παῖ.

The syncopated iambic sequence *ba cr ba || ia cr ba* gives a characteristic effect of double clausula.<sup>79</sup> Period-end is presumable (though without breach of *synapheia*), not so much as an instance of 'pendent close before anceps' (since *ba* certainly ends with a true long), but rather because the sequence *ba ia* is eschewed within a period before late Euripides.<sup>80</sup>

1115-20 πολύννυμε Καδμείας 1115  
νύμφας ἄγαλμα καὶ Διὸς βαρυβρεμέτα  
γένος, κλυτὰν δὲ ἀμφέπει  
'Ιταλίαν, μέδεις δὲ παγ-  
κοίνοις 'Ελευσινίας... 1120

~1126-31 σέ δ' ὑπὲρ διλόφου πέτρας  
στέροψ ὅπως λιγνύς, ἔνθα Κωρυκίαι  
στείχουσι νύμφαι Βακχίδες,  
Κασταλίας τε νῆμα, καί 1130  
σε Νυσαίων ὀρέων...

L divides symmetrically after the first eight syllables as above; then less symmetrically (νύμφας... | βαρυβρεμέτα... | κλυτὰν... ~ στέροψ... ἔν-θα... | στείχουσι...), but symmetrically again for 1119-20/1130-1 (with the overlap παγ-/κοίνοις as above). Dawe, after Hermann and Nauck, prints πολύννυμε Καδμείας ἄγαλμα νύμφας as a 13-syllable verse explained as *an* + *2ia*; an unusual compound, and with an unappealing *brevis in longo* at ὅπως in ant.; similarly Griffith, but with the even less credible analysis - - *ch 2ia*. LJ-W divide both before and after νύμφας ἄγαλμα ~ στέροψ ὅπως, the penthemimer again (presumably) ending with *brevis in longo*. There is nothing certainly wrong with - - - - - | ... as transmitted in L, but as an opening verse it is at best unusual.<sup>81</sup> The problem, such as it is, lies simply in the long seventh syllable in the strophe—not confirmed in ant., where *πέτρας* is, in itself, as likely as *πῆτρας*.

I propose that we should write Καδμίας (giving - - - - -).<sup>82</sup> The form Κάδμιος is not attested elsewhere, but -*ιος* and -*ειος* were available alternatives in many comparable adjectives, e.g. Δαρδαν-, Ἀγαμεμνον-, Κυκλωπ-, Βακχ-; and -*ιος* forms

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Dale, CP 7.

<sup>80</sup> Stinton, CPGT 113, 119ff. (cf. on 850/869 above). Elsewhere (338) Stinton mentions 'O.T. 975/986' as an instance of 'period-end without pause' (in the strophe), doubtless as an error for Ant. 975/986.

<sup>81</sup> Dale (LM<sup>2</sup> 191) somewhat desperately explained it as a contraction of - - - - - (as a form of - - D? Surely not an anapaestic tripody?).

<sup>82</sup> For - - - - - (T) as an initial colon, cf. Hec. 905/14, Pi. Ol. 9.1, Nem. 10.1, etc. The penult. of this common unit is always short elsewhere.

are routinely corrupted to *-ειος* (as *Βάκχιος* at 154). Since the syllable after *Καδμ-* is often in anapest position, the form *Καδμι-* (analogous to *Βακχι-*) may in fact have been quite frequent.

There is then no need for Hermann's transposition *ἄγαλμα νύμφας. ε - ε . . .* is at least as likely as *ε - ε . . .* in the three-element second verse (akin to *ε - d e* at 1142/51 in the next stanza-pair). Cf. also the stanza-opening *D : D e - ε - d | . . .* at *A. Su.* 40ff./49ff., and the verse *ε - d* at *O. T.* 870/880 and *Alc.* 572/582.

1119–20/1130–1 are usually divided as *ar || wil*, with *brevis in longo* in both places and no pause in the strophe. L's symmetrical division here with the word-overlap is surely ancient and should be preferred.<sup>83</sup>

1121–5  
 Δηοῦς ἐν κόλποις,  
 [ὦ] Βακχεῦ, Βακχᾶν  
 <ὁ> ματρόπολιν Θήβαν  
 ναιετῶν παρ' ὕγροῖς  
 Ἰσμηνοῦ ρείθροις ἀγρίου τ'  
 ἐπὶ σπορᾷ δράκοντος.  
 1121a  
 1125

1121a ὦ del. Tr 1122 <ὁ> add. Musgrave *μητρο-* codd., corr. Dindorf

1123–4 ναιετῶν Dindorf: ναίων codd. ὕγροῖς (Hartung) . . . ρείθροις (Blaydes)

Pearson: ὕγρον . . . ρέεθρον fere codd. (-ὶων . . . -ων Tr)

With the easy corrections of Triclinius and Musgrave,<sup>84</sup> 1121–2 corresponds exactly with 1132–3 *κισσήρεις ὄχθαι | χλωρά τ' ἀκτὰ | πολυστάφυλος πέμπει || . . .* beginning with the same ----- : -- : -- : . . . as 844–5/863–4 (see above), then - - - - - || like *Aj.* 199, 200, 704/717, *Trac.* 848/859, etc.<sup>85</sup> In 1123–5, corresponding with 1134–6 *ἀμβρότων ἐπέτᾶν | εὐαζόντων, Θηβαῖας | ἐπισκοποῦντ' ἀγνιάς (D<sup>2</sup> | -ith? cf. n. 14 above), Pearson dealt convincingly with the problematic . . . παρ' ὕγρον || Ἰσμηνοῦ ρέεθρον . . .* (left obelized by Dawe; accepted with misgivings by LJ-W).<sup>86</sup> For the dative plural in this phrase after *παρά*, cf. 712 *παρὰ ρείθροισι χεϊμάρροισι*. It is credible that *-οις* was corrupted before *ισ-*; and for the correction of *ρέεθρ-* to

<sup>83</sup> For *x - x - - -* thus following in synartesis (so, in effect, *dod'* preceded by link-anapest), cf. *Ion* 456 (certainly), *Pho.* 231 (probably, as Mastronarde, not as Diggle). There are more exceptions than Buijs' (71) recognized to his rule that 'acephalous cola are preceded by non-appositive full word boundary'. It cannot be assumed that the notations *gl* and *wil* (implying acephaly) are always proper for the heptasyllables *tl* and *tl'* (West), which may indeed sometimes be best regarded as anapest + dodrans (*dod* or *dod'*).

<sup>84</sup> Both, accepted as 'certainly right' by Jebb, have been neglected by subsequent editors. ὦ is often interpolated (as at 1289; cf. *Or.* 160, 161, 186, etc.). For the article with participle following a vocative, cf. *Hipp.* 525–6 *Ἐρως Ἐρως, ὁ . . . στάζων* (Paley, for *ὁ . . . στάζεις*; contested by S. R. Slings, *Mnemosyne* 88 [1996], 53–5), for which this passage provides a welcome parallel, overlooked by Barrett.

<sup>85</sup> Period-end commonly follows . . . - - - - -; cf. nn. 7, 17, 48, 66 above.

<sup>86</sup> The breach of synapheia in mid-phrase at *ὕγρον* is suspicious (removed by Dain with a misplaced τ); still more so the virtually unique resolution *-εθρον ἄγριοῦ*; cf. on 797 above, with n. 55. Surprisingly, LJ-W here appeal, not (as at 797) to parallels cited by Parker, but now to Dale (*Metrical Analyses* 2.33); to no better effect, since *O. T.* 883/897 is simply - - - - - : . . . , and *Trac.* 1009/1030 is likewise completely irrelevant (not 'hardly relevant'), if scanned as iambic. - - - - - is indeed a frequent form of dimeter, as *A. Su.* 113/124; often with split resolutions when 'sub-dochmiac', as *Or.* 1414, etc.

ῥειθρ-, cf. Triclinius' emendation at *Ag.* 210. Griffith has it right, but without mentioning Pearson. It only remains to aspirate the name of the river.<sup>87</sup>

- 1137-9 τὰν [ἐκ] πασᾶν τιμαῖς  
ὑπερτάταν πόλεων  
ματρὶ σὺν κεραυνίαι·
- ~1146-8 ὦ πῦρ πνειόντων  
χοράγ' ἄστρων, νυχίων  
φθεγγμάτων ἐπίσκοπε, ...

1146 ὦ] ἰὼ codd. πνειόντων Brunck: πνεόντων codd. 1147 χοράγ' ἄστρων Brunck: χοραγὲ ᾤ- καὶ codd.

Brunck's reduction of 1147 to χοράγ' ἄστρων, νυχίων is generally accepted (giving - - - - - , *tl'*, followed by *lk* ||), leaving only the problematic metre and responsion of 1137 τὰν ἐκ πασᾶν τιμαῖς ~ 1146 ἰὼ πῦρ πνειόντων. Brunck's πνειόντων is acceptable in 1146;<sup>88</sup> but the resultant 'hexamakron' is strange. *mol mol* occurs, but only as *mol* : *mol*.<sup>89</sup> - - - - - is possible, but is not easily obtained in the strophe.<sup>90</sup> Likeliest, given πνειόντων, is reduction as above to the favourite pentasyllable - - - - -. <sup>91</sup> That can be effected easily by excision of ἐκ in the strophe, and correction of ἰὼ to ὦ in the antistrophe (after Campbell, who proposed ὦ with a different treatment of the rest). ὦ (ῶ) is routinely corrupted to ἰὼ in such exclamations and exclamatory allocutions;<sup>92</sup> and ἐκ is at once otiose with the gen. governed by ὑπερτάταν (cf. 337-8, 684 πάντων . . . κτημάτων ὑπέρτατον, *Pers.* 155, *Tro.* 476, 1219, etc.) and a credible clarifying interpolation here, serving to show that πασᾶν (*sic*) is to be taken with πολέων, not with the adjacent τὰν.

- 1261-9 Κρ. ὦ φρενῶν δυσφρόνων ἀμαρτήματα  
στερεὰ θανατόεντ' ὦ κτανόντας τε καὶ  
θανόντας βλέποντες ἐμφυλίου·  
ὦμοι ἐμῶν ἀνολβα βουλευμάτων· 1265

<sup>87</sup> 'Ισμ- (also 'Ισμήνη): cf. West, *AT* xxx, citing Hutchinson on *Sept.* 273, Mastronarde on *Pho.* 101.

<sup>88</sup> Garvie (on *Cho.* 619-21) echoes Fraenkel's objection to epic πνει- in 'non-dactylic tragic lyrics' (*Agam.* 2.62 n. 4). Against that, West (*Studies in Aeschylus*, 176) reminds us of the particular collocation πῦρ πνειούσα ([Hes.] fr. 43a.87, cf. *Il.* 6.182).

<sup>89</sup> *Trac.* 653/661, *El.* 511, *O.C.* 1559/1571, *Ion* 141-3 (- - - - - is surely impossible, but the first syllable of ἰὼ can be long; n. 61 above).

<sup>90</sup> For - - - - - (akin to 2ba), cf. *Trac.* 523-4, *Alc.* 92/104, *Ion* 201 (~ 190). But one would need something like τὰν [ἐκ] πασᾶν <σὺ> τιμαῖς (or <προ>τιμαῖς) or Dindorf's τὰν ἔκπαγλα τιμαῖς | ὑπὲρ πασᾶν πόλεων. Griffith implausibly takes the verse as a contraction of × - - - - - (*wil*). This would be credible only in a context inviting choriambic interpretation (e.g. with *wil* preceding), as perhaps at *I.T.* 1126/1141 if we do not emend there.

<sup>91</sup> In *Ant.* it occurs elsewhere at 844/863 (presumably dochmiac like 850/869) and 1121/1132; cf. n. 64 above. - - - - - is indeed inherently ambiguous, variously a form of dochmius, a once-contracted dodrans and a twice-contracted hemiepes (*D*). For the combination with × - - - - -, cf. *Hel.* 1452-3 ὦ ναῦται ναῦται | πέμποντες εὐλιμένους | . . .

<sup>92</sup> A large number of certain and probable instances of erroneous ἰὼ for ὦ (ῶ) are listed in *CQ* 49 (1999), 417, n. 29 (whereas the reverse error is surprisingly rare). For the distinction between ὦ (often exclamatory, but only in conjunction with an expressed or implied second person address) and ὦ ('non-allocutory' exclamations, often in self-pity), cf. *ibid.* 412, n. 17.

ἰὼ παῖ, νέος νέωι ξὺν μόρωι,  
 αἰαῖαιαῖ, ἔθανες, ἀπελύθης,  
 ἐμαῖς οὐδὲ σαῖσι δυσβουλίαις.

~1284-92	<i>Κρ. ἰὼ ἰὼ δυσκάρτος Ἄϊδα λιμήν,  τί μ' ἄρα τί μ' ὀλέκεις; ὦ κακὰγγελτά μοι  προπέμψας ἄχῃ, τίνα θροεῖς λόγον;  αἰαῖ, ὀλωλότ' ἄνδρ' ἐπεξηργάσω·  τί φῆς, παῖ, τίν' αὖ λέγεις μοι νέον,  αἰαιαῖ, σφάγιον ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ,  γυναικεῖον ἀμφικεῖσθαι μόρον;</i>	      1285     1290
----------	--	--

The vulgate division  $\iota\omega \mid \phi\rho\epsilon\nu\acute{\omega}\nu \dots$  gives a very odd split  $\iota\omega \mid \iota\omega \dots$  in the antistrophe. *ia cr* plus  $\delta$  is not impossible, though rare.<sup>93</sup> But *2cr*  $\delta$  is frequent,<sup>94</sup> and  $\tilde{\omega}$   $\phi\rho\epsilon\nu\acute{\omega}\nu \dots$  is likely to be the truth here, given the frequency with which  $\tilde{\omega}$  ( $\tilde{\omega}$ ) is corrupted to  $\iota\omega$  (as indeed in 1285, corrected there by Turnebus).<sup>95</sup> In the corresponding place,  $\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\omega}$   $\tilde{\omega}$  is likelier than  $\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\omega}$  in dochmiac context (as in *Ag.* 1136/1146, cited below).<sup>96</sup>

The second verse (as lined above) is prima facie a dochmius + two cretics ( $\delta$  2cr), but belongs in the category of verses that both begin and end with a dochmius without comprising an integral number of dochmiacs. The simplest type is - - - - - (e.g. *Med.* 1261–3 μάταν μόχθος ἔρρει τέκνων), variously taken as ba δ or δ cr, but best, I think, regarded as a compression of two dochmiacs, for which the notation δ~δ will be appropriate.<sup>97</sup> Three dochmiacs constitute another standard length, similarly ‘compressible’ to δ~δ~δ. Both δ~δ and δ~δ~δ will have ancipites and resolvable longa analogous to those in the simple dochmius. δ~δ~δ is thus theoretically ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ; but in practice, of course, resolutions and long ancipites will be subject to certain restrictions. Its most prominent occurrences elsewhere are in *Agamemnon*: 1118/1129 κατολολυξάτω θύματος λευσίμου ~ δολοφόνου λέβητος τύχαν σοι λέγω, 1136/1146 ἰὼ ἰὼ ταλαίνας κακόποτμοι τύχει ~ ἰὼ ἰὼ λιγείας μόρος ἀηδόνος, 1143–4/1153–4 ἀκόρετος βοᾶς, φεῦ, φιλοίκτοις φρεσίν ~ μελοτυπείς ὁμοῦ τ’ ὀρθίους ἐν νόμοις. All these can indeed be analysed as δ 2cr, but they should at least be written *uno versu*. The notation δ 2cr is less apt for 1136/1146, and 1143 articulates like *Ant.* 1262–3/1285–6 as δ : – : δ. The notation δ~δ~δ covers them all.<sup>98</sup>

1267-/1290-1 is usually written as two verses, or with the exclamation taken as

<sup>93</sup> *ia* *cr*  $\delta$  perhaps only at *Herc.* 739/753, since I should be inclined to make a similar correction of  $\iota\omega$  (twice) at *Aj.* 348–9/356–7  $\iota\omega$   $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\iota$   $\nu\alpha\upsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$  :  $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$   $\xi\mu\omega\acute{\nu}$   $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omega\acute{\nu}$  ~  $\iota\omega$   $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\varsigma$  :  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\gamma\omicron\acute{\nu}$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\alpha\varsigma$  (similarly stanza-opening).

<sup>94</sup> 2cr  $\delta$  as Ag. 1124/1125, *Eum.* 256, *Hipp.* 362–3/669–70, *Herc.* 743/757, etc.

<sup>95</sup> See n. 92 above; cf. also 1265 and 1276 in this same strophe. I should write  $\omega$  in both 1261 and 1263 in accordance with the distinction outlined.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. also *Sept.* 87, *P.V.* 576, *Hipp.* 811, *Ion* 1445, 1502, *Pho.* 296, *Or.* 1353/1537, *Ἰ.Α.* 1283 (ὡ ἰώ, υφροβόλων Φρυγῶν | . . . ); for 2cr δ beginning with ἰώ ἰώ, cf. *Rh.* 454–6 ἰώ ἰώ, : φίλα θροεῖς : φίλος Διόθεν εἰ : | μόνον φθόγον ἄμαχον ὕπατος | . . . ἔστω – ἰώ ἰώ : μέγα σύ μοι : | μέγ' ὦ (Nauack, for μέγας ἐμοὶ μέγας ὦ) πολλόχον | κράτος ἔστω ἄρ' ἔτμολον? (ἔμελες) ὅτε σοι | . . . This better colometry, with a sub-dochmiac *2ia* as the third verse, I hope to discuss elsewhere. ἰώ ἰώ . . . is indeed frequent in lyric iambic context, as *Ag.* 410, *Cho.* 429, *Pers.* 974 (etc.), *Sept.* 875/881, 969 etc. (also Eur., but seemingly not Soph.).

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Orestes*, p. 106 (on *Or.* 145/158). The same length, with resolutions, occurs already in Pindar's first Olympian (*Ol.* 1.9/20 etc. ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, followed by 2δ).

<sup>98</sup> This kind of analysis has implications which I hope to pursue elsewhere; but it should already be clear that the notation  $\delta \sim \delta$  will not only bring under one roof a great many forms of

extrametric (*αἰαῖ αἰαῖ* | . . .). It is as likely to be a single verse, either as *ia δ* (common, where the *ia* is exclamatory) or as another instance of ‘dochmiac compression’ ( $\delta\sim\delta = cr\delta = \delta cr$ ). I incline to favour the latter (writing *αἰαῖαἰαῖ* like Barrett at *Hipp.* 830/848):  $\sim\sim\sim : \sim\sim\sim : \sim\sim\sim -$  is a characteristic pattern for the ‘dochmiac compound’ that both begins and ends with a dochmius. There is a similar verse at 1306 *αἰαῖ αἰαῖ* (s.v.l.), *ἀνέπταν φόβωι* ~ 1328 *ἴτω ἴτω, φανήτω μόρων*, similarly best taken as  $\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim -$  ( $\delta\sim\delta$ ); cf. also *Pho.* 296 *ἰὼ ἰὼ : πότνια : μόλε πρόδομος. ἴτω ἴτω* recurs immediately, certainly as  $\sim\sim\sim -$ , at 1332 *ῥπατος ἴτω ἴτω* (~1310 *δεῖλαῖος ἔγω, αἰαῖ*).

In 1284 I write *Αἰδα* for the transmitted (and vulgate) *Αἰδου*, cf. *Hec.* 1105, etc.; and in 1288 *ἐπεξεργ-* for *ἐπεξεργ-*, cf. West, *AT* xlii.

1273 †θεὸς τότ’ ἄρα τότε μέγα βάρος (μ’) ἔχων† | ἔπαισεν . . .

~1296 τίς ἄρα τίς με πότμος ἔτι περιμένει;

1273 merits obeli, not only for the uncertain status of  $\mu'$  (om. SVZfZoT; *prima facie* in the wrong place), but also because  $\times - \sim\sim\sim$  is a form of dochmius that the tragedians seem to have eschewed.<sup>99</sup> In the corresponding verse *τίς ἄρα τίς . . .* seems likely to have been in responsion with *τότ’ ἄρα τότε . . .*<sup>100</sup> The right place for  $\mu\epsilon$  (which can hardly be dispensed with) is before *μέγα*, as Meineke saw; omitted there by lipography and later restored in the wrong place (first, perhaps, as a suprascription). With  $\mu\epsilon$  thus before *μέγα* and *τότ’ ἄρα τότε* beginning the verse, there are four possibilities: (A) *τότ’ ἄρα τότε θεὸς με μέγα βάρος ἔχων*; (B) *τότ’ ἄρα τότε με μέγα θεὸς βάρος ἔχων*; (C) *τότ’ ἄρα τότε με μέγα βάρος θεὸς ἔχων*; (D) *τότ’ ἄρα τότε με μέγα βάρος ἔχων θεὸς*. A gives the closest responsion, with only one unequal resolution ( $\sim\sim\sim\sim - | \sim\sim\sim\sim -$ ). B, C, and D have the merit of closer symmetry with *τίς ἄρα τίς με . . .*, but with three unequal resolutions ( $\sim\sim\sim\sim - | \sim\sim\sim\sim -$  or  $\sim\sim\sim\sim - | \sim\sim\sim\sim -$ ). B and C end with  $\sim\sim\sim - \sim\sim\sim -$ , a form of dochmius uncommon in Sophocles.<sup>101</sup> D breaches *synapheia* at *θεὸς || ἔπαισεν*. A must be favourite.

1275–6 οἱμοι, λακπάτητον ἀντρέπων χαράν· 1275  
φεῦ φεῦ· ὦ πόνοι βροτῶν δύσπονοι.

~1298–1300 τάλας, τὰν δ’ ἔναντα προσβλέπω νεκρόν·  
φεῦ φεῦ μάτερ ἄθλια, φεῦ τέκνον. 1300

1299 *τὰν δ’* Postgate, Dawe; *τὴνδ’* R, *τάδ’* LZf, *τόδ’* S, *τόνδ’* cett.

‘dochmiac compound’ (including such as *mol δ*,  $\sim - \sim \delta$ ,  $\delta mol$ ) but will also suggest criteria for deciding the admissibility of particular resolutions and inequalities of responsion, e.g. the unequal penults at *Ion* 676/695  $\sim\sim : \sim\sim\sim : \sim\sim -$  are perfectly in order if the verse is  $\delta\sim\delta$  (neither *ba δ* nor  $\delta cr$ ).

<sup>99</sup> Cf. my discussion of *Herc.* 1061–3 in *CQ* 48 (1988), 90 with n. 14.

<sup>100</sup> For the pattern *τότ’ ἄρα τότε*, cf. my commentary on *Or.* 1483 *τότε δὴ τότε*. No one seems to have suggested this here, though Erfurdt transposed *θεὸς (τότ’ ἄρα θεὸς τότε)* and Enger (followed by Nauck) proposed *τότε θεὸς τότ’ ἄρα (sic)*. In *CQ* (n. 99) I conjectured *τότε θεὸς ἄρα τότε*.

<sup>101</sup> Perhaps elsewhere only at *Aj.* 879b *τίς ἄν φιλοπόνων*, rightly accepted as ‘certain’ by Conomis (*Hermes* 92 [1964], 23). *Ant.* 1340b *ἐκὼν κατέκτανον* (W. Schneider, for *κατέκτανον*) is less certain (Musgrave *ἐκτανον*, Hermann *κάκτανον*).



1275–6/1298–9 seems to be a hybrid between the associated 2δ and 3ia verses; accepted by Stinton (CPGT 122) as dochmius plus – – – – – (kδ), rather than – – 2ia; possible parallels being *Hec.* 715, *Rh.* 463–4/829–3 (all – – – – – : – × – – – and arguably *ch* 2ia). Conversely kδ + δ may be recognized at *Hipp.* 594, ?*Hec.* 1084, *Or.* 329–30/346, 1247/1267. But not much would be needed here to obtain a more normal dochmius plus hypodochmius (as, e.g., *Alc.* 393/406). In 1275 adverbial λακπάτητ(α) could well have been corrupted to agree with χαράν;<sup>102</sup> and in 1299 the preverb προσ- might be deleted without loss. Triclinius' ὦμοι for ἰὼ μοι was certainly right in 1265, and we should accept also his correction of ἰὼ in 1277: cf. *Aj.* 1197 ὦ πόνοι . . . (n. 9 above), also *Hipp.* 367 ὦ πόνοι τρέφοντες βροτούς, and on 1261 above with n. 95.

## 1341–7

... ὦμοι μέλεος, οὐδ' ἔχω  
†[ὅπαι] πρὸς πότερον ἴδω, πᾶι κλιθῶ· πάντα γὰρ†  
λέχρια τὰν χεροῖν, τὰ δ' ἐπὶ κρατί μοι  
πότμος δυσκόμιστος εἰσήλατο. 1345

These verses—the end of the play apart from the choral anapaests 1347–53—contain a familiar crux (thus obelized by Dawe, but with the v.l. πρότερον in his text); thoroughly discussed by Jebb, but without a satisfactory solution emerging (though Griffith appears to be satisfied with the unobelized vulgate). It is indeed plausible, after Jebb, to eject ὅπαι (with Seidler) while retaining πάντα γὰρ (against Nauck and others).<sup>103</sup> Prima facie we then have what should be a two-dochmiac verse (in responsion with 1321 ἐγώ, φάμ' ἔτυμον· ἰὼ πρόσπολοι), preceded by 2δ | 2δ | 2δ and followed by 2δ | 2δ. But πρὸς πότερον ἴδω, πᾶι is doubly unacceptable as a dochmius. The break after long penult. is one anomaly.<sup>104</sup> At least as objectionable is the form of dochmius ending with . . . – – – – –<sup>105</sup>

A possible remedy is to hand if we write ποτί for πρὸς,<sup>106</sup> giving the same verse – – – – – : – – – – – as 1262/1285 above, i.e. a dochmius plus two cretics, or (preferably) δαδδδδ, like *Ag.* 1143–4, etc.<sup>107</sup> Though the corresponding verse 1321 is blameless in itself, it is easy there to write ἐγώ, φάμ' ἔτυμον· <ἰὼ> ἰὼ, πρόσπολοι (– – – – – : – – – – – : – – – – –);<sup>108</sup> the responsion – – – – – : – – – – – : – – – – – is then free as to resolutions, but has exactly matching diaereses and short ancipites.

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK

<sup>102</sup> Cf. my correction of ἀπόκρυφον to ἀπόκρυφα at *Herc.* 1069 (*CQ* 48 [1988], 96).

<sup>103</sup> Add that the interpolation of ὅπαι can be associated with the v.l. πρότερον (the latter seeming to require a preceding interrogative). But it could also owe something to misreading of the proposed ποτί.

<sup>104</sup> According to Parker<sup>1</sup> (12) there is 'no example in Sophocles'. Presumably she had discounted this passage as corrupt (cf. Parker<sup>2</sup> 266–7).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. *CQ* 49 (1999), 425 on *Hipp.* 1272, where I claim that δς with long penult. exist only in the forms ending with . . . – – – – –. Evidence for Conomis's forms (n. 101 above) 27–8 and 30–1(–2) is all fragile. West similarly regards the transmitted χθονός, ἴτ' ἵτε πάντες at *Sept.* 108 as 'unacceptable as a form of dochmius' (*Studies in Aeschylus* 104), the well supported v.l. ἴθ' ἵτε πάντες there lending credence to emendations such as ἴθ' ἀλέες (Headlam) and ἴθ' ἀθρόοι (Steusloff).

<sup>106</sup> ποτί rare but not unlikely: cf. *Ag.* 725, *Hipp.* 140, etc., also the much rarer ὕμμ' at 846.

<sup>107</sup> Jebb can be faulted here for demanding pure dochmiacs in line with the rest of the stanza. A stanza consisting only of twelve pure dochmiacs would indeed be exceptional.

<sup>108</sup> ἰὼ ἰὼ . . ., cf. on 1284 above with n. 96.