

CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE *CANTICA* OF  
SOPHOCLES: II. *AJAX*, *TRACHINIAE*,  
*OEDIPUS TYRANNUS*

*Ajax* and *Trachiniae*, with *Antigone*, are probably the earliest extant plays of Sophocles, followed by *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Lyric passages in *Antigone* were considered in a previous article, with some general prolegomena and touching on some issues in the other six plays.<sup>1</sup>

*AJAX*<sup>2</sup>

172–181 (~182–191)	<p>ἡ ῥά σε Ταυροπόλα Διὸς Ἄρτεμις, ὦ μεγάλα Φάτις ὦ μᾶτερ αἰσχύνας ἐμᾶς, ᾤρμασε πανδάμους ἐπὶ βοῦς ἀγελαίας, ἡ ποῦ τινος νίκας ἀκαρπώ- του χάριν (ἡ ῥα κλύτων ἐνάρων ψευσθεῖς' ἀδώροις εἴτ' ἐλαφαβολίαις) ἡ χαλκοθώραξ σοί τιν' Ἐννάλιος μομφὰν ἔχων ξυνοῦ δορός ἐννουχίους μηχαναῖς ἐτείσατο λώβαν·</p>	175       180
-----------------------	--	------------------------------------

I have discussed elsewhere the rhetorical structure of this strophe, defending ἡ ῥα 'either' in 177 against Hermann's ἡρα (accepted by LJ-W).<sup>3</sup> I abstained there from colometric discussion, but I take this opportunity of affirming, against L and most edd., my lineation of 176–8 as above (~186–8 καὶ Ζεὺς κακὰν καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀργεῖ-λων

<sup>1</sup> C. W. Willink, *CQ* 51 (2001), 65–89 (hereafter *CS* I). 'The vulgate' for *Aj.*, *Trac.*, and *O.T.* includes the editions with commentary of A. Garvie (*Aj.*), P. E. Easterling (*Trac.*), M. Davies (*Trac.*), and R. D. Dawe (*O.T.*); also O. Longo, *Commento linguistico alle Trachinie di Sofocle* (Padua, 1968). Newly relevant for *Ajax* is A. Pardini, 'Note alla colometria antica dell' Aiace di Sofocle', in B. Gentili and F. Perusino (edd.), *La colometria dei testi poetici greci* (Pisa and Roma, 1999), 95–120. On the chronological issue, see especially Easterling, 19–23. If *Antigone* is assigned to 442–1 (so Griffith), I incline to the sequence *Aj.* – *Ant.* – *Trac.* – *O.T.* rather than *Aj.* – *Trac.* – *Ant.* – *O.T.* (*a fortiori* *Trac.* – *Aj.* – *Ant.* – *O.T.*), finding the lyrics of *Trac.* closest of the three in metric on the one hand to *O.T.*, on the other to Eur.'s early plays (*Alc.* to *Hipp.*). For convenience I repeat some bibliographica from *CS* I. The siglum LJ-W embraces the Oxford Text of Lloyd-Jones/Wilson and their discussions in *Sophoclea* (1990); LJ-W<sup>2</sup> refers to their *Second Thoughts* (Göttingen, 1997). West, *GM* refers to his *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982), and West, *AT* to his *Aeschylus Tragoediae* (edn Teubner, 1990). References to Stinton are to his *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990). Parker<sup>1</sup> = *CQ* 16 (1966), 1–26, and Parker<sup>2</sup> = *CQ* 18 (1968), 241–69. As in my commentary on *Orestes* (Oxford, 1986, 1989), to West's metrical symbols I add *ba* (baccheus), *sp* (spondee), *T* (-----), *A* (-----) and *:* (diaeresis), and for his 'g' and 'gl' I prefer respectively *ch ia* and *wil* (wilamowitzianus). 'Enoplian' is used in an adjectival sense (*comm. Or.* xx, cf. *CS* I, n. 13). I am again indebted to Professor C. Collard and the anonymous *CQ* referee for their criticisms and corrections.

<sup>2</sup> There are references in *CS* I to *Aj.* 199–200 (85), 348–9/356–7 (n. 93), 596/609 (73), 599–603/612–16 (78), 603–4/614–15 (80), 607/620 (n. 55), 622–5/634–7 (78), 629/640 (n. 49), 631 (82, and n. 25), 694/707 (n. 60), 704/717 (85), 1185/1192 (67), 1197 (89, and n. 9), 1202/1214 (n. 38).

<sup>3</sup> *Mnemosyne* 51 (1998), 716.

φάτιν· εἰ δ' ὑποβαλλόμενοι | κλέπτουσι μύθους οἱ μεγάλοι βασιλῆς): i.e. as – e – e – D<sup>2</sup> (with symmetrical word-overlap), not the vulgate – e – e – e || D.<sup>4</sup> There is indeed a symmetry here between 177 . . . χάριν and 187 . . . φάτιν; and one might compare the certain period-end at Medea 416–17 ἔρχεται τιμὰ γυναικείῳ γένει· || οὐκέτι . . . But two considerations favour the run-on here: the rhetorical unity (as argued) of 176–8, and the unusual absence of penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura when 176/186 is lineated as an iambic trimeter.<sup>5</sup>

The concluding verse 181 (~191, see below), following two iambelegi (– e – D), is not 'alien' (Dale, Pohlsander), but still enoplian (e – d –), the stanza ending like *O. T.* 895–6 εἰ γὰρ αἱ τοιαῖδε πράξεις : τίμιαι, : τί δέι με χορεύειν ~910–11 κοῦδαμοῦ τιμαῖς Ἀπόλλων : ἐμφανής, : ἔρρει δὲ τὰ θεῖα (e – e – : e : – d –); cf. also *Aj.* 408–9/426–7 and *Hipp.* 564 (~554) μέλισσα δ' οἶά τις πεπόταται.<sup>6</sup> Terminal – – – – often invites recognition as the catalectic correlate of – – – – – (D), and the colon × – – – – is variously rz, th, and × D<sub>h</sub>. It is irrelevant that – × – × – – – might, in a different context, be better taken as an aeolic hipponactean (West's *hi*). The choice is close between μαχ- and μηχ- in 181.<sup>7</sup>

190–1                    †μῆ μῆ μ'†, ἄναξ, ἔθ' ὦδ' ἐφάλοισ κλισίαις                    190  
                             ὄμμ' ἔχων κακὰν φάτιν ἄρηι.

190 μῆ semel OVG (teste Dawe)

The vulgate μῆ μῆ, ἄναξ (Wilamowitz) introduces an improbable hiatus. There is little supporting evidence elsewhere in tragedy of residual digamma. LJ-W appeal to *O. C.* 1485 Ζεῦ ἄνα, σοὶ φωνῶ, but that is a dochmius doubtless to be scanned with a correction like Ζεῦ ἀλεξήτορ in anapaests at *O. C.* 143.<sup>8</sup> After Kvičala I suggest μῆ μ<άν>, ἄναξ (αν easily dropping out before αν-). μῆ μάν + subjunctive in a strong prohibition will be akin at once to μῆν with imperative (rare in tragedy, and epic-toned) and to emphatic οὐ μῆν in statements (*GP* 330–2). Of the variants, μῆ μ' (not reported by LJ-W) may be older than μῆ μῆ μ' (cett.), the second μῆ coming in as a correction of the unintelligible μ'. μῆ μῆ . . . might indeed seem to be supported by *O. C.* 210 μῆ μῆ μ' ἀνέρηι τίς εἰμί (cited by Jebb); but that could well be a similar corruption of μῆ μ<άν> ἀνέρηι . . .<sup>9</sup>

192–200                    ἀλλ' ἄνα ἔξ ἐδράνων,  
                             ὅπου μακραίωνι

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Andr.* 789–91 πείθομαι καὶ σὺν Λαπίθαισί σε Κενταύ-λοισ : ὀμιλῆσαι δορὶ κλεινοτάται (e – D – e – D), where the vulgate division after δορὶ with *brevis in longo* is more obviously incorrect.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 475, n. 158.

<sup>6</sup> *Sic* (not οἶα); I have discussed *Hipp.* 563–4 (~553–4) in *CQ* 49 (1999), 413.

<sup>7</sup> *μηχαναῖς* H (conj. G. Wolff; 'fortasse recte', Dawe); cf. Björck, *Das Alpha impurum* 178. All MSS have *μηχαναῖς* at *Ant.* 349 (μαχ- Bergk, Erfurdt); cf. *Ant.* 363 ἀμηχάνων, 365 μηχανόεν. *μηχαν-* is similarly the norm, if we believe the MSS, in Euripidean lyric, as a hybrid like *φήμα*, etc. (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 155–8). The position is similar in Aeschylus, with *μαχαν-* attested only at *Septem* 134, against *Persae* 113, etc.

<sup>8</sup> On correction in dochmiacs (especially Sophoclean), see n. 18 below.

<sup>9</sup> I am indebted to Dr Dawe for knowledge of Kvičala's proposal μῆ μῆν in *ZOEG* 13 (1862), 402. He has also persuaded me that the MSS' ὄμμ' ἔχων is right in 191 (no need for Reiske's ἐμμένων), comparing the use of ὄμμα in 140 and 167 (especially τὸ σὸν ὄμμα in the latter).

στηρίζῃ ποτὲ ταῖδ' ἀγωνίῳ σχολαί,  
 ἄταν οὐρανίαν φλέγων. 195  
 ἐχθρῶν δ' ὕβρις ὦδ' ἀτάρβητα  
 ὀρμάται ἐν εὐανέμοις βάσσαις,  
 πάντων †βακχαζόντων† γλώσσαις  
 βαρυνάλητα.  
 ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος ἔστακεν. 200

194 ποτὲ] ποτὶ Zc (Ritschl): πόδα Morstadt 197 ὀρμάτ' codd., corr. Tr 198  
 βακχαζόντων L<sup>ac</sup>GQR(-χεζ-): καγχ- fere cett. (βαγχ- L<sup>pc</sup>); καχ- Livineius ('p')  
 199 βαρυνάλητα Aug. b (Lobeck): -ητ' codd.

**192–3.** Two verses (so most edd. since Pearson), though only one in L. The short verses are in Sophocles' manner, and *ia sp* is particularly characteristic (cf. *Trac.* 827–8/837–8, 847/858, *O.T.* 1097/1109, 1333/1353, *El.* 512, etc.); whereas *D × e sp* lacks parallel as a single verse. For presumable neglect in L of an archetypal division, cf. in this play 180 (Pardini 97, n. 11), 199–200 (see below), 606.

**194–5.** *gl ia* (with pause) and *gl*, both beginning – – – – – (the spondaic base perhaps preferred in this context as akin to – – – – – . . .). *gl ia* is rarer than some other compounds (K. Itsumi, *CQ* 34 [1984], 78–80), but viewable as the non-catalectic correlate of *gl ba* (the 'phalaecian hendecasyllable'), and related also to the frequent *gl sp* (Itsumi, *ibid.*; cf. my note on S. *El.* 137–9 in *CQ* 47 [1997], 299–301). *ποτέ* is commonly emended, but defended by Garvie, comparing ἀεί ποτε.

**196–200.** The MSS divide 196–8 as above, but treat 199–200 as a single verse (with βαρυνάλητ'. ἐμοὶ . . .). Since – – – – – does not make metrical sense, it is likely that here too, as in 192–3, two shorter verses have been combined. The ancestral lineator will presumably have analysed 199 as a monometer ending a run of five anapaestic metra.

The concluding . . . || – – – – – ||| has been recognized by most editors since Lobeck, but not hitherto in conjunction with the transmitted division after γλώσσαις. The favoured redivision before γλώσσαις βαρυνάλητα. gives 'twin' clausulae . . . | × – – – – – || × – – – – – ||| (approved by Dale, *Collected Papers* 7), but there is no clear warrant for that.<sup>10</sup>

There are other uncertainties in 196–8. The *brevis in longo* without sense-pause at ἀτάρβητα is surprising (unlike that at βαρυνάλητα.); the more so since with ἀτάρ-| βηθ' . . . we should have an overlapping colon like *Ant.* 864 (~845) κοιμήματά τ' αὐτογέν-|νητ' . . . (there followed by . . . f *gl sp*; cf. 596–7/608–9 and 602–3/615–16 in this play). (ii) Correction of ὀρμάτ' to ὀρμάται is sufficiently certain;<sup>11</sup> but the

<sup>10</sup> Division after γλώσσαις βαρυνάλητ' (as LJ-W) impossibly gives elision at 'pendent close before anceps', i.e. at a period-end according to Stinton's rule (326). Division after γλώσσαις βαρυνάλ- (already an unusual overlap) would give a 'dragged glyconic' in 200, against which in Sophocles see CS I, n. 8. On the 'full close' effect of . . . – – – – –, cf. *CQ* 49 (1999), 409, and CS I, n. 7. The verse × – – – – – (occurring elsewhere at 704/717, *Ant.* 1122/1133, *Trac.* 848/859, *Med.* 851/861, *I.T.* 1127/1142, *I.A.* 799, *Cyc.* 656, *Hypsipyle* 61D) may be a dragged telesilleian, but I prefer to take it as a hypercatalectic extension of × – – – – – (rz –).

<sup>11</sup> On such false elisions of -αι due to 'the habitual failure of scribes to recognise correction', see especially Diggle, *Studies* 3 (on E. *Su.* 60–2) and *Euripidea* 313 (against West's toleration of elided -αι 'in later tragedy'). ὀρματ' should not have been accepted here without comment by

abnormal scansion εὐάνεμοις is doubtfully supported by *Laocoon* fr. 342 γλαυκάς εὐανέμου λίμνας in unknown metrical context. (iii) The phrasing is strange: the metaphor is doubtfully made intelligible by the gloss <ὡς πῦρ>, and the εὐ- epithet sits oddly in the supposed comparison with a forest fire. (iv) Dispute continues concerning the participle in 198. LJ-W mention only the choice between καγχ- and βακχ-, without reference to the metre, and favour βακχ- on the ground that 'running riot' goes better with γλώσσαις than 'laughing'. Garvie sufficiently counters that: 'jeering naturally combines laughter and speech . . . it is a pity to eliminate the laughter that is so regularly associated with ὕβρις in this play'. γλώσσαις is evidently equivalent to the longer phrase ἐν κερτομοίσις γλώσσαις at *Ant.* 962. Cf. also Σ γελώντων. καχαζόντων (accepted by Dawe) is doubtless conjectural (see LJ-W, *Sophoclea* 271), but not necessarily wrong for that reason; πάντων καχαζόντων plausibly gives another *ia sp* verse. A different conjecture βαζόντων (cf. Hes. *Op.* 186, A. *Sept.* 571, etc.), with the same division, would give a characteristic pentasyllable — — — — like *Ant.* 844/63, 1121/32, 1137/96, etc. (CS I, 80).<sup>12</sup>

221–32	οἶαν ἐδήλωσας ἀνδρὸς αἰθονος ἀγγελίαν ἄτλατον οὐδὲ φευκτάν, τῶν μεγάλων Δαναῶν ὕπο κληιζομέναν, τὰν ὁ μέγας μῦθος ἀέξει· ᾧμοι, φοβοῦμαι τὸ προσέρπον· περίφαντος ἀνὴρ θανεῖται, παραπλάκτωι χερὶ συγκατάκτας κελαινοῖς ξίφεσιν βοτὰ καὶ βοτῆρας ἵππονώμας.	221–2   224–5      230
~245–56	ᾧρα 'στὶν ἦδη κára καλύμμασι κρυψάμενον ποδοῖν κλοπὰν ἀρέσθαι, ἧ θοὸν εἰρεσίας ζυγὸν ἐζόμενον ποντοπόρωι ναῖ μεθεῖναι· τοίας ἐρέσσουσιν ἀπειλὰς δικρατεῖς Ἀτρεΐδαι καθ' ἡμῶν· πεφόβημαι λιθόλευστον Ἄρη ξυναλγεῖν μετὰ τοῦδε τυπείς, τὸν αἴσ' ἄπλατος ἴσχει.	245–6   248–9 250     255

Pardini (after Dain, Pohlsander, and others). Not all such false elisions have the same cause: e.g. *Herc.* 418 σώιζετ' ἐν (σώιζεται Pflugk). Cf. also *O.C.* 219, where LJ-W justly regard their μέλλεται for μέλλετ' at *O.C.* 219 as a matter simply of 'interpretation'.

<sup>12</sup> Everyone since Pearson has reported L as attesting βακχ- (and βαγχ- after correction), despite Jebb's explicit contradiction of that (blaming Campbell for the 'inadvertent' report). No one, however, has discussed this contradiction: one might have expected comment either in Dawe's *Studies* 1.134 (where there is a textual note on the status of 196 ἀταρβήτως), or in LJ-W's *Sophoclea* or *Second Thoughts*. But Dr Dawe assures me, after another look at the facsimile of L, that (though β and κ are very similar in appearance), the relevant letter is indeed β in his opinion. Jebb's apparatus prima facie commands respect, with its careful reports of L's lineation (otherwise neglected until Pardini's recent study), giving also the transmissional evidence for the elisions ἀτάρβηθ' and βαρυνάληγτ' (treated by LJ-W as conjectures of Lobeck and Nauck respectively; not mentioned by Pearson and Dawe).

245 'στὶν Bergk: τιν' codd. ἦδη HNVA: ἦδη τοι pler. κάρα Tr: κρατα codd.

A variously controversial stanza,<sup>13</sup> presumably of five periods, L divides as above, except in 221–2 (ἀνδρὸς | αἰθονος) ~ 245–6 (κα-|λύμμασι).

**221–3/245–7.** Dawe (after Wilamowitz, Jebb, Dale, Dain, Kraus, Pohlsander) divides with a pauseless breach of synapheia at οἶαν ἐδήλωσās || ἀνέρος (Hermann) αἰθονος . . . (and ἦδη τοι | κρατα in ant.). LJ-W (after Pearson) divide with a different breach of synapheia at ἀνδρὸς αἰθονος ~ (κά)ρα καλύμμασι (v), i.e. as *ia lk* || *ch 2ia*. Given *κάρα* (Tricl.), the words invite analysis rather as above, as an opening sequence – *e e* ∙ *D* ∶ ∙ *ith* similar to *O.T.* 1093–5/1105–7 (*e – e – D × ith*) and *Troades* 820–2/840–2 (∙ *ee* ∙ *D × ∶ D*). The sequence . . . ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∶ ∙ *ith* (cf. the 'Archilochian dicolon') recurs at the end of the stanza. (Of the further emendations 'στὶν [Bergk] and ἀρμοῖ [LJ-W, for ἦδη] the former merits acceptance, the latter is at best unnecessary.<sup>14</sup> The superfluous τοι in some MSS may derive from an intrusive τό with κρᾶτα, or perhaps from a superscribed τα in a tradition with *καρα* and *κρατα* as variants.)

In favour of οἶαν ἐδήλωσās || . . . it must be allowed that Sophocles was fond of the colon *ia sp* (cf. on 192–3 above) and that ἀνέρος for ἀνδρὸς is a slightly smaller change than *κάρα* for κρᾶτα. Prima facie, moreover, ἀνέρος | . . . for ἀνδρὸς | . . . directly restores repansion with L's κρᾶτα κα-| . . ., and is accepted for that reason by Pardini. Against that, however, it is incredible that the ancestral lineator, *ex hypothesi* a competent metricalian, would have divided irrationally after ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ | . . . (the irrationality aggravated by lack of word-end in the antistrophe). At the same time the division κα-|λύμμασι is unlikely to be a mere scribal aberration; a consideration telling both against division before κρᾶτα καλύμμασι (as Wilamowitz) and against division after *κάρα καλύμμασι* (as Pearson). More probably the ancestral division at κα-|λύμμασι was rational in a text as above, admitting division of the long compound opening verse with equal legitimacy either before or after the anceps link-syllable (in either case in the middle of a word). In such a case it is understandable that the word-division after -δρος in the strophe prevailed. If the lineator had read *ανερος* ~ *κρατα κα-*, as Pardini would have us believe, he would undoubtedly (like Wilamowitz) have divided between words *before* this dactyl.

**224–6/248–50** modulates from dactylic/enoplian metre into iono-choriambic.<sup>15</sup> The verses *D*<sup>3</sup> and ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ (the latter either *2ch* – or – *2io*, cf. 1201/1213, *O.T.* 483/498, *Pers.* 647/652, etc.; Dale's 'chor enneasyll') might indeed be taken as self-contained; but indentation of the second colon is in line with an equally legitimate interpretation of the sequence as a whole as *D ∶ 4io* (*io* ∙ *3io*). *D*<sup>3</sup> commonly has the pattern *D ∶ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙* (*Pers.* 855–6, *Ag.* 113–14, *Eum.* 529–30, *Alc.* 115–16, *Pho.* 830–1, etc.), and in this modulation the colarion ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ may be said to do double duty, serving also as the beginning of an ionic run.

**227–8/251–2** is an orthodox iono-choriambic sequence, overlappable as *ia ch f ar*, but no less correctly taken as *pe ∶ io ∶ io* ∙ *ba* (for the colon × ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙, cf. *Ant.* 782/792; ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ ∙ is a common ionic clausula). As elsewhere, indentation (if the

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Stinton, 140–1.

<sup>14</sup> As LJ-W<sup>2</sup> now concede.

<sup>15</sup> 'Iono-choriambic': cf. CS I, n. 15.

229–30/253–4 is the same without the first two syllables: *ba 3io* = <sup>+</sup>*dod*<sup>+</sup> ∫ *ar* (again preferably with indentation rather than overlap). Ionic beginning  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  is generally regarded as a late fifth-century development (cf. West, *GM* 125), but we need not hesitate to regard  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  here (as at *Alc.* 456/468) as at least akin to ionic.

348 ἰὼ φίλοι ναυβάται μόνοι ἐμῶν φίλων . . .  
~356 ἰὼ γένος ναῖας ἄρωγόν τέχνας . . .

394-5 [ὡ] σκότος ἐμὸν φάος,  
ἐρεβος ᾧ φαεινότατον ὡς ἐμοί, . . . 395

412 ὦ πόροι GQR (ὶὼ Brunck, edd.)

<sup>18</sup> According to Conomis (*Hermes* 92 [1964], 40) 'Epic corruption is rare in the lyrics of tragedy; less rare in dactylic metres than in others. There are very few examples in dochmiacs. Corruption of exclamations is in fact frequent in the dochmiacs of all three tragedians, especially (with split resolution) in δs beginning with *ὦ*, *ὅμοι*, *αἰαῖ*. Otherwise indeed rare in the dochmiacs of Aeschylus and Euripides (if we discount virtual exclamations such as *ὄρα ὄρα* . . .), but there are enough certain instances in Sophocles (also *Ant.* 1331, *O.T.* 663, 686, *Phil.* 854) to justify ready acceptance of others created by easy conjecture, as at *Ant.* 1310, *El.* 1239; and in this passage Hermann's certain *μόνοι ἔτ'* for *μόνοι τ'*.

If 394/412 is taken as *ia cr* (with *ἰὼ σκότος* and *ἰὼ πόροι*), we have not only split resolution before syncopation,<sup>19</sup> but also anomalous correption (*π ροῖ ἄλ-*) in an iambic metron. So here too (against L) the exclamation is customarily taken as extra-metric, after Wilamowitz (cf. Parker<sup>2</sup> 259). Since only a few MSS, and not the best, have the *ῶ* in 412, the chances are that the exclamations are false in both places. *ἰὼ* in 394 will have come in under the influence of 348/356 and 379; and *ῶ* is very often intrusive, as at *Ant.* 1121, 1289, *O.T.* 1339, *Or.* 160, 161, 186, etc.

L directly gives three dochmiacs in 412–13 (divided as 2δ | δ), and correspondingly divides 394–5 at *φαεν-νότατον* (Pardini 114). That may well imply that the ancestral lineator admitted lengthened *φαός* at the end of a dochmius within the verse; but we shall do well to prefer redivision as δ || 2δ, comparing *Eum.* 149 *ἰὼ παῖ Διὸς* || and *Or.* 1537 *ἰὼ ἰὼ τύχα* || for the exclamatory single-dochmiac opening.

401–3                    ἀλλά μ' ἄ Διὸς  
                         ἀλκίμα θεὸς  
                         ὀλέθριον αἰκίζει

~418–20                ῶ Σκαμάνδριοι  
                         γείτονες ῥοαὶ  
                         †εὐφρονες† Ἀργείους

420

L does not divide 401–2/418–19, the lineator having apparently scanned with another lengthened *-ōs* within the verse. Then, following the hypodochmiacs, either × – – – – – (again) or × ~ – – – – (as *Trac.* 846–7/857–8, etc.) is as likely as a dochmius; cf. *O.T.* 1208ff./1217ff. where hypodochmiacs are followed by ~ – – – – –, also the pattern of mixed short verses in *El.* 504ff. (there mostly *ia sp*). Since *εὐφρονες* is otherwise suspect, there is no case for emending *ὀλέθριον* to correspond with it; still less for Renehan's acceptance (now seemingly favoured by LJ-W) of ~ – – – – as a triply anomalous dochmius: not merely initial ~ . . . but unparalleled initial ~ . . . and unparalleled ~ ~ . . . If the sense of *εὐφρονες* is accepted, we need look no further than Hermann's *ἐὐφρονες* (giving ~ – – – – –), accepted by Dawe in his third edition. For the more probable sense 'unfriendly' (irony seems unlikely), <οὐκ> *εὐφρονες* is a less arbitrary correction than LJ-W's *κακό-* for *εὐ-*. For the scansion *ὀλεθρι-*, cf. *O.C.* 1683 and probably *O.T.* 1343 (Erfurdt). I write *αἰκίζει* (for *αἰκ-*): cf. West, *AT* xlv.

425–6                    δέρχθη χθονὸς μολόντ' ἀπὸ  
                         'Ελλανίδος' . . .

A remarkable *brevis in longo* without pause (in responsion with 408 . . . *προσκέμεθα*, but there is a comma there). If we accept the text (Nauck made excisions) we should probably write *ἄπο*, at least getting rid of the prepositive at period-end.<sup>20</sup>

596–608                ῶ κλεινὰ Σαλαμῖς, σὺ μέν που  
                         ναίεις ἀλίπλακτος εὐδαίμων,  
                         πᾶσιν περίφαντος αἰεὶ

<sup>19</sup> Nowhere certain in Sophocles: see Diggle, *Studies* 18–21.

<sup>20</sup> On this and similar disyllabic prepositions at verse-end (period-end), also *Trac.* 510 and *Phil.* 184, cf. Stinton, 205.

	ἐγὼ δ' ὁ τλάμων παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος 'Ιδαία μίμνων λειμώνι' ἔπαυλα μηνῶν ἀνήριθμος αἰὲν εὐνώμαι, χρόνῳ τρυχόμενος, κακὰν ἐλπίδ' ἔχων ἔτι μέ ποθ' ἀνύσειν τὸν ἀπότροπον αἰδῆλον Αἰδαν.	600
~609–21	καί μοι δυσθεράπευτος Αἴας ξύνεστιν ἔφεδρος, ὦμοι μοι, θείαι μανίαι ξύναυλος· ὄν ἐξεπέμφω πρὶν δὴ ποτε θουρίῳ κρατοῦντ' ἐν Ἀρεῖ· νῦν δ' αὖ φρενὸς οἰοβώτας φίλοις μέγα πένθος ἡŷρηται, τὰ πρὶν δ' ἔργα χεροῖν μεγίστας ἀρετὰς ἄφιλα παρ' ἀφίλοις ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε μελέοις Ἀτρεΐδαις.	610 615 620

602 λειμώνι' ἔπαυλα Lobeck: λειμωννίαι ποίαι (vel πόαι) codd. μηνῶν  
Hermann: μηλῶν codd. 610 ὦμοι μοι Tr: ἰώ μοι μοι (μοι ter LAX<sup>s</sup>) codd.

**596–603/609–616** takes rational shape with the proposals of Lobeck and Hermann (accepted by Jebb and now by Pardini), though opinions may differ as to whether the opening dicolon *hi : tl sp* (*hag–*) needs to be overlapped as *gl f gl sp*, and similarly *pe : hag : tl sp* (*hag–*) as *ia gl f gl sp*. Here too (cf. on 227–8/248–50 above) there is much to be said for colometry displaying the cola (as in L) as delimited by word-end without unnecessary hyphens; always provided, however, that indentation is available to show metrical continuity. For the combination *pe : tl* (= *ia gl*), cf. 624/635, 625/636, 1188/1195, *Trac.* 845/856, *?El.* 479/495 (Itsumi, *CQ* 34 [1984], 79). Word-end after × – – – : . . . is normal in this and many similar sequences.

**604–8/617–21** is more controversial; cf. Parker (<sup>2</sup> 242–3), who contemplated five different analyses. L attests an ancestral division after *κακὰν* ~ *μεγί-* (i.e. after a glyconic), followed by – – – – | – – – – – | – – – – | – – – – –; a colometry in which only the central dochmius – – – – – convinces).<sup>21</sup>

Wilamowitz redivided as *gl | ch ia f – : – – – – – – – –* (Λ3ia). Dawe gives 604–5/617–18 *uno versu* as 'glyc. + chor.', a virtually unique compound (see Itsumi, *ibid.*). Most, after Jebb, rightly recognize the pair of – – – – – cola, as above.<sup>22</sup> Such

<sup>21</sup> I aspirate *ποθ' ἀνύσειν*, cf. West, *AT* xxx.

<sup>22</sup> Pohlisander rightly dismisses Pearson's wildly different colometry, but does not explain why he regards Wilamowitz's divisions after *gl* and *ch ia* as 'much more reasonable' than repetition of the colon – – – – –. We are certainly not committed to acceptance of L's glyconic (on such false octosyllables in presumably ancient colometry, cf. *CQ* 39 [1989], 59, n. 56); and the overlap . . . : – – / – : . . . is alien to Sophocles (unlike Euripides).



repetition of short cola is in Sophocles' manner, and in this case has a clear precedent at *Sept.* 904–5 δι' ὧν αἰνομόροις, | δι' ὧν νείκος ἔβα (~891–2 <. . .> | αἰαῖ δαιμόνιοι). ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ is there dochmiac or quasi-dochmiac, between ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ and ~ ~ ~ ~ ~; not indeed recognized as dochmiac by West, nor yet the similar ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ at *Sept.* 935 ἔριδι μαινομένοι ~ 949 ὑπὸ δὲ σώματι γᾶς and *Eum.* 837 = 870 ἐμὲ παθεῖν τάδε, φεῦ. But West does recognize ἴδε με τὰν ἰκέτιν ~ σὺ δὲ παρ' ὀφιγόνου as a dochmius at *Su.* 350/361.

**606/619** is then another dochmiac colon, like *Sept.* 903 κτέανα δ' ἐπιγόνους. LJ-W here follow Parker, Nauck, and others in combining these seven and the following eleven syllables, to be read somehow as some kind of iambic or trochaic tetrameter; unappealing both *prima facie* and however analysed in detail. The analyses of Nauck (*ia cr ia ba*), Schröder (*cr ia ia ba*) and Kraus (*tr tr ith*, similarly Dawe) all have an uncomfortable number of split resolutions, as Parker observed. Her own preference (*ia cr ch ba*), without reducing the number of splits, incredibly has at once *ia cr* with resolution before syncopation (as also Nauck),<sup>23</sup> adjacent resolutions . . . ~ ~ ~ . . . other than within a dochmius, and a choriamb with its *first* long resolved (resolved, moreover, with a split).<sup>24</sup>

As the phrasing suggests *prima facie*, we must divide as above and look for a satisfactory metrical interpretation of the concluding ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ : ~ ~ ~ ~ ~. We might consider taking it as a hypercatalectic iambic dimeter (2*ia* –), analogous to the stanza-ending verse – *e* – *e* – at *Trac.* 102/111. But there is a more exact precedent, likewise in dochmiac context and ending a stanza, at *Sept.* 214–15 δὴ τότε ἤρθην φόβωι : πρὸς μακάρων λιτάς, : πόλεος ἔν' ὑπερέχοιεν ἀλκάν.<sup>25</sup> The vulgate analysis . . . : *ch ia* | 2*ia* there is questionable as the conclusion of a mainly dochmiac stanza. ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (dochmius kaibelianus) plus *ba* is likelier; and the same could be right here, unless perhaps Sophocles here thought of ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (ambivalently?) as a resolution of the preceding ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ cola.

Split resolutions are unremarkable in dochmiacs. But there is something more to be said about ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε in 620. As Jebb observed, word-doubling is unusual in Sophocles (citing nothing nearer than 1205 ἐρώτων δ' ἐρώτων . . . and fr. 686 βαρὺς ξύνοικος, ὦ ξένοι βαρὺς, both with strong predicative emphasis, and epanalepses such as *Phil.* 1462 λείπομεν ὑμᾶς λείπομεν ἤδη). There scarcely seems sufficient emphasis on ἔπεσε here, functioning as a copula with ἀφίλα predicative, to justify its doubling in the middle of the sentence. Note also that anadiplosis of third-person verbs probably occurs elsewhere in Greek tragedy only with the terminations –*ε* or –*εν*, never with with either word elided.<sup>26</sup> The only exceptions, both conjectural, are at *E. Or.* 1547 (Seidler)<sup>27</sup> and *Ba.* 986–7 (Elmsley).<sup>28</sup> Perhaps we should read ἀφίλα παρ' ἀφίλοις |

<sup>23</sup> Cf. n. 19 above.

<sup>24</sup> Inadmissible, cf. CS I, n. 55 on *Ant.* 798.

<sup>25</sup> ~206–7 ἱππικῶν τ' ἄπυν (Lachmann) | πηδάλων †διὰ στόμα† (διαστόμια Schütz) πυριγενετᾶν χαλινῶν. West rightly divides after the two cretics (unlike Murray and Page). But then ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (with phrase-end in ant.) is surely the completion of a standard 2*cr* + *δ* combination, not the beginning of an alien ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (*ch ia* with a terminal resolution unparalleled in Aeschylus) followed by 2*ia*. This is not the place to consider further the crux in 207.

<sup>26</sup> There are certainly no other exceptions in Aesch. or Soph. As to Euripides, who commonly doubles such verbs, see Diggle's detailed study in *Euripidea* 388ff.

<sup>27</sup> ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε is variously uncertain there (with sundry variants and alternative interpretations in the scholia), in an otherwise textually doubtful setting. The truth there could well be ἐπεσέπεσε (from ἐπεισιπύτω), as I hope to argue elsewhere.

<sup>28</sup> Read ἐμο-λεν ἐμολεν, [ὦ] βᾶκχαι, rather than ἐμολ' ἐμολεν . . . Interpolation of ὦ is very

ἔπε' ἔπεσε: the glorious deeds are now mere words (cf. ἔπεα μόνον *Herc.* 112) associated with enmity (ἄφιλα) on the part of the ἄφιλοι Atridae.

- 622–33** ἦ που παλαιᾷ  
 (~634–45) μὲν σύντροφος ἀμέραι  
 λευκῶι τε γήραι  
 μάτηρ νιν ὅταν νοσοῦντα 625  
 φρενοβόρως ἀκούσῃ,  
 αἴλινον αἴλινον  
 οὐδ' οἰκτρᾶς γόον ὄρνιθος ἀηδοῦς  
 ἦσει δύσμορος, ἀλλ'  
 ὀξυτόνους μὲν ᾠδὰς 630  
 θρήνησει, χερόπλακτοι δ'  
 ἐν στέρνοισι πεσοῦνται  
 δοῦποι καὶ πολιᾶς ἄμυγμα χαίτας.

626 φρενοβόρως Dindorf: -μόρως vel -μώρως codd. 631 χερόπλακτοι Erfurd: -πληκτοι codd.

The stanza begins with *pe : tl (ia gl)*, then *pe : tl - : ith*, like 599ff./612ff. in the previous stanza-pair, but shifting briefly into enoplian metre in the cadence . . . *tl - : ith*. For ----- behaving as an enoplian rather than aeolic measure, cf. 194–5 above, also *Trac.* 883, *El.* 248. Then the short verse ---- (self-contained, followed by a change of metre) is either *dod* or *δ*, followed by a run of differently ambivalent verses, best taken as iono-choriambic: *3io (= ph<sup>c</sup>) | 3io<sup>+</sup>ba (= dod<sup>+</sup> : ar) | 2io : 2io | io +2io (= gl ba)*.<sup>29</sup> Ionic analysis does better justice to the invariably long second position and to the elided postpositive δ' in 630–1 (cf. n. 53 below). But ----- : ----- is also *D - : D -* (cf. *Pers.* 584–90/591–7, *Med.* 629–30/638–9), in line with the nod towards enoplian metre in 625–6/637–8.

- 701–5** νῦν γὰρ ἐμοὶ μέλει χορεῦσαι·  
 Ἰκαρίων δ' ὑπὲρ πελαγίων <πόρων>  
 μολῶν ἀναξ Ἀπόλλων  
 ὁ Δάλιος εὐγνωστος  
 ἐμοὶ ξυνεῖη διὰ παντὸς εὐφρων· 705
- ~714–18** πάνθ' ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνει,  
 κούδεν ἀναύδατον φατίξαιμ' <ἔγωγ'> 715  
 ἄν, εὐτέ γ' ἐξ ἀέλπτων  
 Αἴας μετανεγνώσθη  
 θυμοῦ τ' Ἀτρείδαις μεγάλων τε νεικέων.

701 χορεῦσαι <- - -> Hermann, Lobeck 702 πελαγίων NVZc: -έων cett. <πόρων>, cf. 412 714 post μαραίνει add. τε καὶ φλέγει codd., om. Stob. 1.97.18,

common (cf. *CS* I, 85 with n. 84). For the placing thus of the anadiplosis, cf. *Hel.* 650, where I should now read πόσιν γ' ἄμὸν ἔχο-|μεν ἔχομεν, ὃν ἔμενον . . . (not as proposed in *CQ* 39 [1989], 59); there appears to be room for ποσιν γ' αμὸν ἐ|χομεν . . . in *P. Oxy.* 2336.

<sup>29</sup> On the favourite *ph<sup>c</sup>* (West, *GM* xii), also *Ant.* 787/797, 944/955, 970/981; *El.* 472/489, 828ff./842ff.; *Phil.* 203/212, 710/721; *O. C.* 701/714; cf. *CS* I, 49.

del. Livineius 715 ἀναύδατον Lobeck (cf. A. Sept. 897): -ητον codd. (-ακτον Hsch.) φατίσαιμ' Livineius <ἔγωγ>, cf. O.T. 504 718 θυμοῦ τ' Hermann: -μόν τ' A, -μών N<sup>s</sup> G<sup>yp</sup> F<sup>ac</sup>?, -μόν cett.

In 701/714 the verse - - - - - : - - - repeats both 698/711 and the cadence of 700/713; a multivalent verse, at once *dod* plus *ba*, *δ* plus *ba*, a form of hipponactean (West's '*hi*') and an iono-choriambic enneasyllable (akin to both *ch ia* and the anacreontic), cf. Ag. 448 (~467) ἀλλοτρίας διαὶ γυναικός, Pers. 659/666 (following 2δ), O.C. 130/161, etc. The longer version - - - - - : - - - - - (Hermann, Lobeck), with . . . τε καὶ φλέγει in ant. and a supplement in str., is metrically anomalous, *ba ia* scarcely if at all occurring in lyric iambs before late Euripides.<sup>30</sup>

In 702-3/715-16 - - - - - (with φατίσαιμ') is not perhaps incredible, if taken as *d × d* (followed by - *ith*), akin to *e × d* and *d × e* (as 399/416, Trac. 637/644, Ant. 1116-17/1127-8, Alc. 573/583).<sup>31</sup> But πελαγέων is otherwise under grave suspicion, as argued by Renehan (CPH 87 [1992], 347-9), not only as needing emendation of φατίξαιμ'.<sup>32</sup> LJ-W's κελεύθων for πελαγέων postulates an unlikely gloss, and is otherwise unacceptable (not only because 'over seas' is different from 'over paths', cf. the acc. κέλευθα at Od. 3.71, 177, etc.). Unless we redivide, we have not only the rare long anceps following choriamb in 715,<sup>33</sup> but also (at φατίξαιμ' | ἄν) impossible elision at pendent close before single short (i.e. at period-end); while redivision gives either - - - - - / : - - - - - || still with the abnormal long anceps after *ch*, and now also period-end following non-catalectic trochees, or - - - - - abnormally following 2δ.

The variant πελαγίων is a clue pointing rather to the loss of a noun such as <πόρων> completing a second dochmius (before or after πελαγίων), cf. 412 πόροι ἀλγίροθοι; and it is not difficult to find a corresponding supplement in the antistrophe, for preference φατίξαιμ' <ἔγωγ> ἄν (cf. O.T. 504-6 οὐποτ' ἔγωγ' ἄν . . . καταφαίην).<sup>34</sup>

704/717 is the same × - - - - - as 199 and 200 (qq.v.). Period-end at εὐγνώστως is acceptable (with little or no sense-pause); or did Sophocles perhaps intend εὐγνώστως?

879-90

τίς ἂν δῆτά μοι, τίς ἂν φιλοπόνων  
ἀλιαδᾶν ἔχων αὐπνοὺς ἄγρας,

880

<sup>30</sup> Stinton, 119ff.; cf. CS I, 80. μαραίνει [τε] καὶ φλέγει would give a likelier *ba cr*; or one might consider . . . | φλέγει τε καὶ μαραίνει, with the lacuna before χορεύσαι in 701, giving a cadence immediately repeated in 703/16. But there is no defect of sense to favour such a lacuna. A reader suggests that the context arguably requires 'the longer version' with τε καὶ φλέγει; so indeed may an interpolator have opined (first perhaps simply writing καὶ φλέγει as a marginal gloss).

<sup>31</sup> Garvie mentions I.A. 556 (~571); and Diggle mentions E. Su. 999/1022, Or. 840-1, Ba. 410, I.A. 547, 553, 574, 576, 764-5 (Euripidea, 506, n. 56).

<sup>32</sup> φατίσαιμ' is certainly a conjecture of Livineius. The only variant (negligible) is φατίξ-.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. CQ 49 (1999), 426-7 on Hipp. 1387-8.

<sup>34</sup> Alternatively φατίξαιμ' ἄν <ἔρ-lyon>. 2δ | 2ia. is quite normal; 2δ - : *ith* less so, but in line with . . . : *ith* in 625-6/637-8. For dochmiac thus synartete with following iambic, cf. Sept. 420, Ba. 1185. A reader is troubled by the postulate of 'lacunae in both strophe and antistrophe'; but words *do* drop out, and we can surely accept some coincidences of word loss. Much of course depends on the separate plausibility of the supplements.

ἤ τίς Ὀλυμπιάδων  
 θεῶν ἢ βντῶν  
 Βοσπορίων ποταμῶν τὸν ὠμόθυμον  
 εἴ ποθι πλαζόμενον λεύσσων 885  
 ἀπύοι; σχέτλια γὰρ  
 ἐμέ γε τὸν μακρῶν ἀλάταν πόνων οὐρίωι  
 μὴ πελάσαι δρόμωι,  
 ἀλλ' ἀμένηνον ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὄπου. 890

~925–36

ἔμελλες τάλας, ἔμελλες χρόνῳ  
 στερεόφρων ἄρ' ἐξανύσσειν κακὰν  
 μοῖραν ἀπειρεσίῳ  
 πόνων τοιά μοι 930  
 πάννυχαι καὶ φαέθοντ' ἀνεστέναζες  
 ὠμόφρον' ἐχθοδόπ' Ἀτρείδαις  
 οὐλίῳ σὺν πάθει·  
 μέγας ἄρ' ἦν ἐκείνος ἄρχων χρόνος πημάτων  
 ἦμος ἄριστόχειρ 935  
 <---> ὅπλων ἔκειτ' ἀγὼν πέρι.

931 ὠμόφρον] ὠμόφρων codd. 936 <χρυσοδέτων> Musgrave; alii alia

After 2δ | 2δ | the sequence - - - - - : - - - - - : - - - - - : . . . suggests a convergence of *D* and δ, - - - - - in 881/928 standing for - - - - - × - in the same way as - - - - - at 604–5/617–18 (q.v.) seems to stand for - - - - - × -. At the same time the second - - - - - is synartete (elision in ant.) with - - - - -, thus constituting the beginning of an enoplian sequence (elegiambus, *D* - e - ).

In the vulgate, ὠμόφρων in 931 ends a period, in responsion with εἴ ποθι, but it may well be significant that L lineates 885–6 as τὸν ὠμόθυμον εἴ ποθι πλαζόμενον | λεύσσων . . . (dividing after an iambelegus). 2ia || δ is not indeed impossible (less probably 2ia | δ with ποθι lengthened before πλ-). But 2ia δ is a standard combination (*Ag.* 1156/1167, etc.), and one expects synapheia, if not synartesis (as at *Eum.* 158–9/165–6, *Med.* 1280/1291, etc.), in the absence of pause. ὠμόφρον' (paired with ἐχθοδόπ') is an easy correction (it is credible that the lineator here misinterpreted -φρον as -φρων). For the enoplian cadence . . . : - - - - - - - -, cf. *Hec.* 650, 1068, *Herc.* 1018, 1033, 1185–7, *Tro.* 267, *Ion* 718, *Pho.* 122, *Or.* 1256/1276.<sup>35</sup>

886/932 seems then to be a self-contained pair of cretics ( - - - : - - - , like *O. C.* 1685/1712) with a breach of synapheia in the strophe at γάρ. But σχῆτλιᾶ γάρ is perhaps a not impossible alternative scansion.<sup>36</sup> Although the elements here are cretics, the context is primarily dochmiac.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *comm. Or.* p. 288, and K. Itsumi, *BICS* 38 (1991–3), 245. The list could be extended with exx. with short penult. (e.g. *Andr.* 827) and/or a different word-division before the cadence, e.g. *Andr.* 831, *Pi. Ol.* 6.5, etc.). Sequences ending . . . - - - : - - - - - × - are vulnerable to misinterpretation (cf. *CQ* 38 [1988], 93 on *Herc.* 1016–20); likewise . . . - - - : - - - - - (as 177/187 above, *Trac.* 884–5, qq.v.).

<sup>36</sup> For such resolution before change of metre without sense-pause, cf. *Hec.* 1066–7 εἴθε μοι ὀμμάτων αἱματόεν βλ φᾶρ ν | ἀκέσαι' ἀκέσαιο τυφλόν, : Ἄλιε, φέγγος ἀπαλλάξας, also Diggle, *Euripidea* 398, n. 122 on *Pho.* 294.

**887–9/933–5** is then another member of the large class of dochmiac sequences that begin and end as dochmiac without comprising an integral number of  $\delta$ s.<sup>37</sup>  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  (as *Med.* 1251/1261, etc.) is  $\delta\alpha\delta$  in my notation. So here  $\delta : \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} : \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} : \delta$  is  $\delta\alpha\delta\delta$ ; virtually the same as *P.V.* 574–5/593–4, 582–3/601–2.

**890/936** is  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ , beginning with apparently dochmiac rhythm, but proceeding in such a way as to constitute a trimeter *ch 2ia*. The same trick is played (similarly ending an iambo-dochmiac stanza) at *Rhesus* 464–6/830–2:  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  (*ch 2ia*) |  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  ( $\delta$ ) |  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  (*ch ia sp*; not, as usually taken,  $2\delta$  with an irregular  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ ); cf. *CS* I, 69. A case might be made here and elsewhere for the notations  $\delta\alpha 2ia$  and  $2ia\alpha\delta$  for apparent instances of  $\times \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  ('kaibelianus') combined with a dochmius; cf. *CS* I, 89 (on *Ant.* 1275/1299).

**900–2** 900  
 ὦμοι ἐμῶν νόστων  
 ὦμοι, κατέπεφνες, ἄναξ,  
 τόνδε συνναύταν, τάλας.

**~946–8**  
 ὦμοι ἀναλήγων  
 δισσων ἐθρόησας ἄναυδ'  
 ἔργ' Ἀτρειδᾶν τῶιδ' ἄχει.

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} | \dots$  seems here to be at once a dochmius and a contracted *D* (cf. the choerilean  $D : \times D$ ). Then  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} : \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  ( $- D : e - e$ ) has in the antistrophe an instance of the rare cut  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} : \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ ; cf. *Ant.* 1129, *O.T.* 890/904 (651 and 1336 are rather different, see below), *O.C.* 1077; *Alc.* 227 (suspect, I think), *Med.* 634/643, *Hipp.* 1149.<sup>38</sup> Most instances are in enoplian (*D/e*) contexts,  $e - : e$  being akin to  $D - : e$  (as *O.T.* 1088, 1090).

**1190** † ἀνὰ τὰν εὐρώδην Τροίαν†  
**~1197** ὦ πόνοι πρόγονοι πόνων

1190 ἀν τὰν Ahrens Τροίαν Wilamowitz 1197 fort. ὦ πόνων πόνοι πρόγονοι

**1190** is variously problematic (justly obelized by Dawe). Emendation giving another 'chor. dim. B' (or *wil*), like 1187 τὰν ἄπανστον αἰὲν ἐμοὶ ~ 1194 κείνος ἀνὴρ ὅς στυγερῶν earlier in the stanza, is the most plausible line of attack. It may be fortuitous that ἀν (ἄμ) for ἀνά is not attested elsewhere in Sophocles.<sup>39</sup> The *hapax* εὐρώδην remains uncertain (including its sense), but Musgrave's εὐρυνεδῆ Τροίαν is doubtfully worth a place in the apparatus. ('Dragged glyconic' is everywhere doubtful in Sophocles [*CS* I, n. 8], and particularly unlikely with unequal responsion. Dawe's latest suggestion ἀν' [Hermann] εὐρώδεα Τρωϊάν improbably gives the responsion  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  [cf. Itsumi<sup>2</sup> 68].)

In the first instance this gives a responsion of *wil* and *gl*, probably not elsewhere in Sophocles before *Philoctetes* (*CS* I, n 9). Little violence, however, is needed to obtain

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *CS* I, 87 (on *Ant.* 1262–3/1285–6).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Parker<sup>1</sup> lff., who does not, however, mention all my exx. There is probably no instance in Aeschylus (West, *Studies in Aeschylus* 177).

<sup>39</sup> To the handful of certain or possible instances in Aeschylean and Euripidean lyric mentioned by Bond on *Herc.* 389 add ?*Pho.* 1516 (Diggle, *Euripidea* 348).

another *wil* ~ *wil* responsion like 1187/1194—merely a transposition postulating that *πόνων* was skipped before *πόνοι* and restored at the end of the verse; a transposition otherwise likely (or alternatively  $\tilde{\omega}$  *πόνοι* *πόνων* . . .), since the cognate words are normally juxtaposed in such paregmena, as at 866 *πόνος* *πόνον* *πόνωι* *φέρει*; cf. *Niobe* fr. 400.2 *πόνωι* *πόνον* *ἐκ* *νυκτὸς* *ἀλλάσσοι* (missed in my commentary on *Orestes* 816–18), Sept. 851 *τί* *δ'* *ἄλλο* *γ'* *ἢ* *πόνοι* *πόνων* *ἐφέστιοι*; etc.

I write  $\tilde{\omega}$  (not  $\tilde{\omega}$ ) in 1197, cf.  $\tilde{\omega}$  *πόνοι* Sept. 739,  $\tilde{\omega}$  *πόνος* Cho. 466 (West).<sup>40</sup>

TRACHINIAE<sup>41</sup>

94–102

ΧΟΡΟΣ

(~103–11)

ὄν αἰολὰ νύξ ἐναριζομένα  
 τίκτει κατευνάζει τε φλογιζόμενον, 95  
 Ἄλιον Ἄλιον αἰτῶ  
 τοῦτο, καρῦξαι τὸν Ἀλκμή-  
 νας πόθι μοι πόθι [μοι] παῖς  
 ναίει ποτ', ὦ λαμπρᾷ στεροπαῖ φλεγέθων,  
 ἦ ποντίους αὐλῶνας ἦ 100  
 δισσὰς ἀν' ἀπείρους κλιθείς·  
 εἴπ', ὦ κρατιστεύων κατ' ὄμμα·

98 μοι del Tr γὰς Schneidewin 100 ποντίους pler.: -ας L (~L<sup>15</sup>) 101 δισσὰς ἀν'  
 ἀπείρους Dawe: δισσαῖσιν ἀπείροισι(ν) codd. (-αῖς -οις Tr) κρυφείς Stinton

The metre is mostly straightforward enoplian (D/e). The opening  $\sim e D | \dots$  (like *Hel.* 1107, etc.) is analogous to  $\sim e e | \dots$ . Then iambelegi ( $- e - D$ ) frame the palindromic sequence  $D - | e - e - D$ . For the concluding run  $- e - e : - e - e | - e - e \sim$ , cf. *Hipp.* 759–63/771–5; here in effect with clausular  $e -$  (cf. 498/508) rather than clausular *ith.*  $\times e \times e -$  is analogous to  $\times D \times e -$  (the elegiambus).

In 98 Easterling rightly follows Triclinius (with Jebb, cf. Stinton, 204–7); not πόθι μοι [παῖς] (Wunder, LJ-W, Davies); but γὰς is plausible (Dawe; cf. Stinton, 448 n. 6).

Jebb was right also in 100–1 (followed by Stinton, Longo, Dawe, and Easterling) in taking the alternatives as essentially 'sea' and 'dry land'. *ποντίους αὐλῶνας* adds to 'sea' the idea of 'ramifications', reflecting the complex of sea-ways and much-indented coastline familiar to Greek navigators; '(the) two continents' elaborates 'dry land' in accordance with a common view of the world (sc. 'Europe and Asia'; LSJ s.v. *ἡπειρος* III, amplified by Longo). LJ-W (and still LJ-W<sup>2</sup>) perversely take the alternatives (reading *Ποντίας*) as 'In the channels of the Black Sea? Or leaning on the two continents?' (so Lloyd-Jones in the Loeb). Against this (i) *Ποντίας αὐλῶνας* (to be understood as 'the Bosphorus, the Propontis and the Hellespont') is a phrase at once obscure and too narrow for a specification of 'East', and also odd as objective

<sup>40</sup> For the recommended distinction between  $\tilde{\omega}$  and  $\tilde{\omega}$  (the former often exclamatory, but only in conjunction with an expressed or implied second-person address; the latter in 'non-allocutory' exclamations, often in self-pity), cf. on *Hipp.* 366 and 669 in *CQ* 49 (1999), 412 with n. 17 and 416 with n. 26.

<sup>41</sup> There are references in *CS I* to *Trac.* 102/111 (n. 22), 116–17/126–7 (67), 221 (n. 60), 497–8 (71), 497–9/507–9 (n. 22), 517 (79), 523–4 (n. 90), 848/859 (85), 849/860 (n. 38), 880 (n. 60), 1009/1030 (n. 86).

to *ναίει* (does one dwell in channels?). (ii) 'Leaning on (the) two continents' is even odder: supposedly referring to the Western 'pillars', but *ἡπειρος* does not mean 'pillar', and the image is grotesque. Why, in any case, should so precise a location be designated, when the Chorus have no idea where Heracles may be? It is surprising that Davies subscribes to this widely condemned interpretation (cf. also West, *CR* 41 [1991], 301).

*κλιθείς* is best taken as 'having made his resting-place', so with the implication 'not coming home'.<sup>42</sup> *Pi. Ol.* 1.92 *Ἀλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθείς* (of the hero Oenomaus) and *Il.* 5.709 *ναίεσκε* (like *ναίει* here) . . . *λίμνῃ κεκλίμενος Κηφισίδι* offer sufficient support.<sup>43</sup> Stinton's *κρυφείς* was clever;<sup>44</sup> but (as Easterling has pointed out) 'hidden' is doubtfully appropriate. Dawe's *συθείς* was more certainly misconceived (see Stinton), also his later *εἰ . . . σφ' ἄθρεῖς* (ed. 3); but I accept his neglected proposal *δισσᾶς ἂν' ἀπείρους*: we then have two accusative phrases both governed by the one 'environmental' preposition, according to an elegant *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* idiom,<sup>45</sup> and we no longer have *αὐλώνας* governed by *ναίει*.

I read *ποντίους* (a reading surprisingly not reported by Easterling) for the vulgate *ποντίας*. The latter is indeed attested in L, but only there and only in conjunction with *-ίους* suprascribed by the first hand. Either *αὐλών* is here masc. as at *P.V.* 731, or we have a stylish two-termination use as at *Alc.* 595 (cf. KB I.536–7, Diggle, *Euripidea* 167). Either way we have a more euphonious chiasmic sequence of accusative plural terminations.

112–21 (~122–131)	πολλά γὰρ ὥστ' ἀκάμαντος ἦ νότου ἢ βορέα τις κύματ' <έν> εὐρέϊ πόντῳ βάντ' ἐπιόντ' ἂν ἴδοι. οὕτω δὲ τὸν Καδμογενῆ τρέφει, τὸ δ' αὔξει, βιότου πολύπονον ὥσπερ πέλαγος Κρήσιον· ἀλλά τις θεῶν αἰὲν ἀναμπλάκητον Ἴαιδα σφε δόμων ἐρύκει.	115          120
----------------------	---	--

114 <έν> Erfurdt; <ᾶν> Porson, Wakefield 115 ἐπιόντ' ἂν] ἐπιόντα τ' codd.  
 117 στρέφει Reiske

The picture in 112–15, before *οὕτω* . . . 116ff., is simply of 'many' sequential waves ('following on') 'tirelessly' (i.e. unremittingly) driven by a north or south wind, as seen by a hypothetical observer 'in a wide sea'. There is no 'ebb-and-flow' or 'rise and fall' in this image (*pace* Easterling). The direction of flow may change with a change of wind (cf. the comparison of Oedipus with a *κυματοπλήξ ἀκτά* storm-buffed from four quarters in *O.C.* 1238–49), but that does not affect the essential point of comparison, namely the unremitting *πολυπονία* of the hero's life as an 'environment' akin

<sup>42</sup> Cf. M. L. West, *BICS* 26 (1979), 11 (with an unnecessary gloss 'reclining between his labours').

<sup>43</sup> Stinton objected that *δισσαῖσιν ἀπείροις* here 'denotes the area within which Heracles is to be found, not a particular place near which he is situated'. But with Dawe's emendation of that phrase the specification of 'particular place' is given rather by the initial *πόθι* . . . ;

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. 207–9. Note also the 'common' confusion of λ and ρ (Diggle, *Euripidea* 469–70).

<sup>45</sup> Bruhn, *Anhang* 97; *ἀνά* 'environmental' as *O.T.* 477–8, *O.C.* 1058, etc.

to the notoriously rough Cretan sea; *despite which* (ἀλλά . . .) some god always preserves him from death.

As to the text, we need ἄν with ὥστε . . . τις . . . ἴδοι. The vulgate κύματ' <ἄν> is defended by LJ-W, who say (without giving a parallel) that ἄν thus 'falls into place after the subject'; but a *belated* ἄν needs rather to be adjacent to the verb. That can easily be arranged: the participles in 115, in different tenses, do not need coordination with 'and'; without which, indeed, the 'following on' (not 'ebb and flow') is more clearly expressed.

Then in 116–17 (much discussed) τρέφει 116 was rightly taken by Campbell as 'encompasses' (cf. *Hipp.* 367 ὃ πόνοι τρέφοντες βροτούς), perhaps with a suggestion of 'daily bread' (Stinton, LJ-W). The popular στρέφει (Dawe, Easterling) does not suit the simile, in which there is no idea of turning, nor even of 'wracking' (a sense in any case not well supported by parallels). τὸ δ' αὔξει then alludes to the contrasting glorious aspect of the πολυπονία;<sup>46</sup> semi-parenthetically, since it is not this positive aspect which is countered by ἀλλά . . . Stinton was unhappy about the antithesis thus of τρέφει and αὔξει (and considered emending the latter), but the verbs, though often associated, are by no means necessarily nearly synonymous. The force of τρέφει is clear enough from the context as a whole; likewise the *contrasting* sense of αὔξει, as signalled by τὸ δ' . . . The subject of both verbs is then (as things stand) the whole phrase βίотου πολύπονον ὥσπερ πέλαγος Κρήσιον.<sup>47</sup>

For the lineation of 120–1 (~130–1) without word-split, cf. on *Aj.* 227–8/251–2 (pp. 54–5).

**138–40**                    ἃ καὶ σὲ τὰν ἄνασσαν ἐλπίσιν λέγω  
τάδ' αἰὲν ἴσχειν· ἐπεὶ  
τίς ὦδε τέκνοισ[ι] Ζῆν' ἄβουλον εἶδεν;                    140

The vulgate colometry *3ia | ia ith || ba ith* has an unwelcome *brevis in longo* without sense-pause at ὦδε. No one seems to have contemplated division as above, without the breach of synapheia and with the question τίς . . . εἶδεν; stylishly filling a complete verse (*3ia*). For ἐπεὶ at the end of a syncopated iambic dimeter, cf. *Ag.* 393. It costs little to write τέκνοις for -οῖσι. The wrong colometry may indeed be ancient, giving three trimeters.

**205–8**                    ἀνολολυξάτω δόμος ἐφεστίοις <σὺν> ἀλαλαῖς                    205  
ὁ μελλόνυμφος, ἐν δὲ κοινὸς ἀρσένων  
ἴτω κλαγγὰ τὸν εὐφάρετσαν . . .

ἀνολολυξάτω Burges: -ατε KZg: -ετε cett. δόμος Burges (cf. Σ<sup>L</sup> ὁ πᾶς οἶκος):  
δόμοις codd. 206 <σὺν> (cf. *Pho.* 335) ἐφεστίοισ<ιν> Blaydes, Radermacher  
ἀλαλαγαῖς ZgZo, fort. recte

I follow Stinton (417) in taking 205–6 as dochmiac (δδ *cr* = δδ~δ in my notation, cf. on *Aj.* 887–9/933–5 above). Others with the same or metrically equivalent wording divide after δόμῳς with a pauseless breach of synapheia. In 206 my σὺν offers an unconsidered further possibility, at once accepting ἀλαλαῖς (see also Mastronarde on

<sup>46</sup> For Heracles as πολύπονος in contrary senses, cf. *Herc.* 1190–6 etc. (*CQ* 38 [1988], 86ff.).

<sup>47</sup> The slight awkwardness of this would disappear if we wrote τὸ βίου (anagrammatically) for βίотου or βίотος πολύπονος (the latter suggested to me by Professor Diggle).



*Pho.* 335) and avoiding the split -σιν ἀλ-. But ἀλαλαγαῖς could yet be right (see LJ-W, *Sophoclea* 157).<sup>48</sup>

212–17                    βοᾶτε τὰν δόμοσπορον Ἀρτεμιν Ὀρτυγίαν  
                               ἐλαφαβόλον ἀμφίπυρον  
                               γείτονάς τε Νύμφας·                    215  
                               ἀείρομαι οὐδ' ἀπώσομαι  
                               τὸν αὐλόν, ὦ τύραννε τὰς ἐμὰς ἀρενός.

The vulgate divides as 2ia || 4da | ch ith. Better, without the breach of synapheia at δόμοσπορὸν ||, is to regard the sequence as an expansion of iambelegus (to phrase-end at ἀμφίπυρον) plus ithyphallic, dividing the former either as above (as - e - D<sup>2</sup> : - - D) or with an overlap at Ὀρ-/τυγίαν (as - e - D ∫ A ).<sup>49</sup>

In 216 there is no need for αἶρομαι (Lloyd-Jones), *pace* Davies, or for monosyllabic scansion of ἀεί- (Easterling); still less for αἶσομαι (Dawe, after Reiske's ἀείσομαι). × d × e is unexceptionable in enoplian context, cf. 637/644, *Aj.* 398/416, ?*A. Su.* 59/64 (and conversely × e × d, as *Ant.* 1142/1151, *O. T.* 870/880, *Alc.* 573/583). ἀείρ-, cf. *Ant.* 418. The false elision -ομ' for -ομαι in the MSS is unremarkable (cf. n. 11 above), whether simply scribal or favoured here as yielding an iambic dimeter.

517–22                    τότ<ε δ>' ἦν χερός, ἦν δὲ †τόξων† πάταγος  
                               ταυρείων τ' ἀνάμιγδα κεράτων,  
                               ἦν δ' ἀμφίπικτοι κλίμακες, ἦν δὲ μετώ-                    520  
                               πων †δόλονται†  
                               πλήγματα καὶ στόνος ἀμάοιν·

- - - - - occurs (in a very different context) at *Hipp.* 740 κόραι Φαέθοντος οἴκτωι δακρύων ~ 750 ἴν' ὀλβιόδωρος αὔξει ζαθέα (tl + ch). But here τόξων is surely corrupt. We cannot have archery by one party in the middle of a wrestling bout (so, rightly, Easterling against Jebb); but it makes even less sense to imagine noise generated during the contest by an *unused* bow and/or quiver. Musgrave's *ταρσῶν* (accepted by Dawe in his third edition) is not a suitable word (see LSJ), and the corruption remains unexplained. My guess would be that τόξων came in as a mistaken gloss on σπλῶν (*sic*), which should rather have been interpreted as 'of hooves'. For bovine ὄπλαί, cf. *h. Merc.* 77, *Hes. Op.* 489, and especially *Pi. Py.* 4.225–6 βόας, οἳ φλόγ' ἀπὸ ξανθᾶν γνάθων πνέον καιομένοιο πυρός, | χαλκείαις δ' ὄπλαῖς ἀράσσεσκον χθόν' ἀμειβόμενοι (of the fearsome male animals tamed by Jason). Substitution of δ' ὄπλᾶν for δὲ τόξων will give a barely possible verse - - - - - (× d × d) analogous to × d × e and × e × d (cf. on 216 above). I think that we should go further and write τότ<ε δ>' ἦν . . . giving another anapaestic verse like 504/514 (there following the same - - - - - as 522; cf. also the same - - - - - in enoplian context at 959/968). *Zan* (*A*) associates no less comfortably with the

<sup>48</sup> LJ-W appear to accept in *Sophoclea* that the metre is dochmiac, despite their adherence (still in *Second Thoughts*, 91) to the vulgate iambic lineation. ἀλαλαγή is probably better than a 'ghost word' (Mastrorade). As to the split resolution, dochmiac × - - - - - is in general rare in tragedy (*CQ* 49 [1999], 418–19), and would be unique here in Sophocles; though cf. the verse × - - - - - at *Pi. Ol.* 1.9 (etc.: 38, 78, 107).

<sup>49</sup> Stinton (338) does not mention this as an instance of 'period-end without pause', so presumably he too analysed without verse-end at δόμοσπορὸν. For the iambelegus running on, cf. 520ff. below, also *Herc.* 1067–8 (there - e - D - D; *CQ* 38 [1988], 96).

In 520–2 Headlam’s -πλικοι for -πλεκτοι is probably right, accepted by Dawe. But then obeli are merited by the metrical oddity of -πων ὀλόεντα (– : – – – ?) appended with overlap to an iambelegus (– e – D).<sup>50</sup> Lengthened -a before πλ- is unlikely, and *brevis in longo* (in mid phrase) intolerable. I suggest <ὀλόεντ’> ὀλόεντα, with rhetorically appropriate emphasis. The overlapping continuation of the iambelegus will then be a more normal D – : D –, like 112–13 πολλὰ γὰρ ὥστ’ ἀκάμαντος : ἡ νότου ἢ βορέα τις.

*tl* × : *E* is enoplian, and a short pendent syllable (~ . . . πετραῖα 633) is to be expected (though not perhaps as mandatory in Sophocles as it would be in Euripides; cf. below on *O.T.* 196–7/209–10). The correction ὕμιν here is credited by LJ-W and Davies to Itsumi, overlooking that Dawe had rightly attributed it to Triclinius. A similar correction of ῥῆμιν, neglected by LJ-W, appears without attribution in Dawe's text at *El.* 496 in the sequence *D* ~ : *E*.<sup>51</sup>

~836-40      δεινοτάτῳ μὲν ὕδρας προστετακὼς  
†φάσματι†, μελαγχαῖτα τ'  
ἄμμιγά νιν αἰκίζει  
†Νέσσου [θ]† ὕπο φόνια δολιόμυ-  
θα κέντρο' ἐπιζέσαντα.

840

**826/836** is usually (not by Jebb, who follows L; cf. also Stinton, 135–6) divided as *ar* || ~ ~ ~, with *brevis in longo* in the strophe. There is no sense-pause after *v̄δpas* in 836, and *dod* ~ : *e* – is akin to the verse *D* – : *e* – at *O.T.* 1088.<sup>52</sup>

After that we have the favourite short verse  $\times \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$  twice (cf. on 846–7/857–8 below), unusually with an elided postpositive at verse-end in 837 (or, if we prefer, at the beginning of the following verse).<sup>53</sup> As to the text, attempts to explain *φάσματι* are at

<sup>50</sup> Apparent — — — | . . . is similarly open to suspicion at *Ant.* 812 and 860 (*CS* I, 78–9).

<sup>51</sup> Dain claimed ἡμῖν there as his own correction, overlooking that he had been anticipated by Wunder.

<sup>52</sup> The multivalent  $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$  quite often behaves like  $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$  as an enoplion unit, even as  $t/$  ( $= \times \text{dod}$ ) may behave like  $\times D$  or  $T$  (as at 640, *O.T.* 1096, etc.).

<sup>53</sup> Full close is normal following . . . ~ ~ ~ (n. 10 above). The exception here is justified by the



The short penult. in 846 is uniquely anomalous. The colon — — — — occurs (also twice) at 827–8/837–8 above, *El.* 128/145, 160–1/180–1, *Phil.* 835–6/851–2; repeatedly in *El.* 504–15. For the same in Eur., cf. *Ion* 149–50, 896 (perhaps consciously ‘Sophoclean’). It is certainly × — — — — (Parker<sup>2</sup> 258). Whether the penult. also is anceps is much more doubtful, though accepted by Parker, after Dale, on the strength of . . . στένει here. Everywhere else (given ἀικ<ε>ίαις at *El.* 515), including the corresponding verse here, the colon ends with . . . — — —, and is naturally taken as *ia sp*; a form of iambic dimeter with dochmiac affinities indeed, but still strictly speaking iambic.<sup>58</sup>

Suspicion once aroused may well embrace the adjacent ὀλοά, taken by commentators as a rather strange adverbial neuter plural (Jebb ‘desperately’, Easterling ‘despairingly’, neither offering a parallel). Blaydes proposed ὀλό’ αἰάζει. But if στένει came in as a gloss, it is as likely to have come in as clarification of a verbless phrase. The structure ἦ που . . . | ἦ που . . . at the beginning of successive cola is consistent with epanalepsis like *Ba.* 534–6 ἔτι . . . | ἔτι . . . μελήσει. Ex. gr., something like ἦ που ὀλοᾶς ἄτας (causal gen.) would be stylish.

**882–8**                    *Χο.*    τίς θυμός, ἦ τίνες νόσοι,  
           τάνδ’ αἰχμᾷ βέλεος κακοῦ  
           ξυνεῖλε; πῶς ἐμήσατο πρὸς θανάτῳ θάνατον                    885  
           ἀνύσασα μόνα στονόεντος  
           ἐν τομᾷ σιδάρου;  
           ἐπείδες †ὦ ματαία† τάνδ’ ὕβριν;

886 ἀνύσασα] ἀν- codd. 888 ματαία L, -αία cett.; μαία Conington

**884–5** is usually taken as *2ia* || *D* (or *2ia* | *D* if -το is lengthened before πρ-; cf. *Aj.* 885, *Phil.* 1111, *O.C.* 684). Stinton accepted ‘period-end without pause’ here. But the whole constitutes an enoplian verse — *e* — *D*<sup>2</sup> (cf. — *e* — *e* — *D*<sup>2</sup> at *Aj.* 176–7/186–7, q.v., — *e* — *D*<sup>2</sup> at *Alc.* 903–4/926–7, etc.), following a glyconic of the form — — — — — (cf. on *Aj.* 626/637) and followed by a dicolon — *D* × : *ith* like *Andr.* 124–5/133–4 (cf. Archil. frs. 168–71 W.). The breach of synaphaea at θανάτῳ || ἀνύσασα (ἀν-, cf. *Aj.* 628) has more justification, at phrase-end between sequences of some length; cf. *Ant.* 967 ἀλῶς.

In **888** both Davies and Easterling accept the inappropriately reproachful, if not gratuitously offensive, address ὦ ματαία (the context at *Med.* 152 is quite different), and Easterling implausibly deals with the metrical problem (an apparently defective iambic trimeter) by making two short verses (*2ia* | *cr*). The interpretation ὦ μάταια (Dawe), with Blaydes’s τάνδε <τάν> ὕβριν padding out a trimeter, is indeed not much better. LJ-W mention *Ag.* 1214 ἰὸν ἰού, ὦ ὦ κακά, but that is not parenthetic, and κακά is commonly substantival, unlike μάταια. The exclamation postulated here is quite different in tone and context: inserted in the middle of a question (of a common

<sup>58</sup> Irregular responsion . . . — — — is attested in the sub-dochmiac *2ia* verse — — — — — : — — — at *E. El.* 1149/1157 and *Or.* 152/171. But of the cola × — — — — and × — — — — here, only the latter is a form of iambic dimeter. A tripod surely cannot correspond with a dimeter. The associable × — — — — (*El.* 512) is certainly *ia sp* (× *e sp*), cf. *Aj.* 193, 198, 400/417, *O.T.* 1097/1109, 1333/1353, *El.* 487/503, *O.C.* 1076/1087. The ‘dochmiac affinities’ of this *ia sp* colon are seen partly in its association with δς, partly in the occurrence of correption (cf. n. 18 above) and greater tolerance of split resolution. But these affinities cannot include ‘optional drag’. It is one thing to lengthen a usually short penult., quite another to shorten the first syllable of a spondee.



θρώϊσκει δ' αὖ θρώϊσκει δειλαΐα  
 διολοῦς' ἡμᾶς  
 ἀποτίβατος ἄγρία νόσος·

1030

The antistrophe appears to be sound, though  $\mu'$  < $\omega$ > for  $\mu\epsilon$  seems a plausible improvement in 1024;<sup>62</sup> beginning with either  $3\delta$  |  $\delta$  or  $3\delta$  | *ia sp*, depending on the scansion of  $\epsilon' \epsilon'$  (*αἰαῖ*) *ἰω*.<sup>63</sup> Secure responsion returns in 1007–9/1028–30, with a shift to anapaests (with a transitional verse of eight longs) and a typical 'sub-dochmiac' iambic dimeter with symmetrical split resolution (– ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪).<sup>64</sup>

In 1004–6 there is probably compound corruption. Ellendt's *εὐνᾶσθαι* seems certainly necessary (for *-ᾶσαι*, v.l. *-άσαι*). A variant *ῥστατον* for *δύσμορον* is attested by a scholion in L. The truth could perhaps be something like this:

$\epsilon' \epsilon'$ · *ἐᾶτέ μ' ῥστατον*, *ἐᾶτέ μ' ὦ*  
*δύσμορον εὐνᾶσθαι*·  
 < $\epsilon' \epsilon'$ · *ἰὼ δαΐμον*>

1005

The lacuna usually, after Coxon, indicated after the initial  $\epsilon' \epsilon'$  is now located later, as a verse corresponding with, and very probably identical to, the exclamatory verse  $\epsilon' \epsilon'$ · *ἰὼ δαΐμον*· at 1026 (a responsion thus like *Aj.* 694/707, *Andr.* 1175/1188). The variant *ῥστατον* is taken as a survival of truth. *δύστανον* may have come in either as a corruption of that or as a synonym of *δύσμορον* (or both). *εατε με δυστανον ευνασ(θ)αι* and *εατε με δυσμορον ευνασ(θ)αι* will then have been transmitted as variants. The same corruption of  $\mu'$   $\omega$  to  $\mu\epsilon$  (as in the antistrophe) is postulated at the end of the first (28) verse. *ἐᾶτε* has the normal trisyllabic scansion, not with *ἐα*- monosyllabic as in some conjectures.

**1010–14/1031–5, 1018–22.** At *Phil.* 839–42 similar hexameters constitute a mesode. Here it is the *further* hexameters (divided between the Old Man and Hyllus) that constitute a mesode, with nothing corresponding after the antistrophe.<sup>65</sup> As usual in tragedy, the hexameters are 'enoplian' (*D* : ∪ ∪ *D* –, nearly all with strong caesura) and with Doric vocalization.<sup>66</sup>

In 1010–11 . . . *πόθεν ἔστ'*,  $\omega$  | *πάντων Ἑλλάνων ἀδικώτατοι ἄνδρες, οἷς δὴ* | . . . the text is suspect, since the point should not be that the persons addressed are 'the most unjust of all the Greeks', but rather (much more pointedly) that 'you Greeks are

<sup>62</sup> Neither *brevis in longo* nor lengthened  $\mu\epsilon$  before  $\pi\rho$ - seems as likely.  $\omega$  frequently precedes or follows an imperative (*Ag.* 22, *Herc.* 792 [Verrall], *Alc.* 234, *Tro.* 335, *Cho.* 942, etc.); at *E. El.* 112–13/127–8 *σύντειν'* . . .  $\omega$  | *ἔμβα* . . . it both follows and precedes. In general  $\omega$  very often ends a verse, and a similar emendation seems likely at *Hipp.* 1372 *μέθετε με τάλαν' ὦ*· (codd. *τάλανα*).

<sup>63</sup> For ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ . . . in dochmiac context, cf. on *ἰὼ ἰὼ* . . . in CS I, n. 96 (also n. 18 above).

<sup>64</sup> Verses of the pattern – – – ∪ – – ∪ – – – can be 'sub-dochmiac' (indeed admitting the annotation  $\delta\omega\delta$ ); cf. *El.* 203/223, *Phil.* 829/845. For the sub-dochmiac iambic dimeter, cf. *CQ* 49 (1999), 420. I observe *en passant* that . . . *ἀποτίβατος ἄγρία νόσος* || is like *Hipp.* 883 . . . *δυσεκπέρατον ὁλοὸν κακόν* || (*CQ* *ibid.*).

<sup>65</sup> A precedent (if *Trac.* precedes) for the questioned structure of *Hcld.* 73–117 (defended in *CQ* 41 [1991], 525–9).

<sup>66</sup> 1011 *Ἑλλάνων* (s.v.l.), 1013 *ὠλεκόμαν*, 1019 *ἐμὰν ῥώμαν*, 1021 *λαθίπονον δ' ὀδύναν*, 1035 *ἔμᾶς*, 1037 *σὰ μάτηρ* and *τὰν ὀνάσιμον* is likely in 1014 (cf. *ὄνασιν Hipp.* 756; CS I, 73), and *τάνδ'* should be written at *Phil.* 840.

the most unjust of all men'. It is his fellow countrymen in a *broad* sense that Heracles has benefited by his labours. LJ-W accept Koechly's 'Ἑλλανες πάντων. I should prefer πάντων 'Ελλανές <γ>' with no change of word-order and an appropriate additional emphasis.

# OEDIPUS TYRANNUS<sup>67</sup>

- 151-8      ὦ Διὸς ἄδυεπές Φάτι, τίς ποτε τᾶς πολυχρύσου  
Πυθῶνος ἀγλαῶς ἔβας  
Θήβας; ἐκτέταμαι φοβερὰν φρένα δείματι πάλλων,  
ἱήϊε Δάλιε Παιῶν,  
ἀμφὶ σοὶ ἀζόμενος· τί μοι ἦ νέον      155  
ἦ περιτελλομέναις  
ῶραις πάλιν ἐξανύσεις  
χρέος, εἰπέ μοι, ὦ χρυσέας  
τέκνον 'Ελπίδος, ἄμβροτε Φήμα·
- ~159-67      πρῶτα σὲ κεκλόμενος, θύγατερ Διὸς ἄμβροτ' Ἀθάνα,  
γαιάοχόν τ' ἀδελφεᾶν      160  
Ἄρτεμιν, ᾧ κυκλόεντ' ἀγορᾶς θρόνον εὐκλέα θάσσει,  
καὶ Φοῖβον ἐκαβόλον, ἱὼ ἰὼ†  
τρισσοὶ ἀλεξίμοροι προφάνητέ μοι,  
εἴ ποτε καὶ προτέρας  
ἄτας ὑπερ ὀρνυμένας      165  
πόλει ἡνύσατ' ἐκτοπίαν  
φλόγα πῆματος, ἔλθετε καὶ νῦν.

151 ἦδν- pler. (~ L) 154 Παιῶν (dubitanter) L-J/W: -άν codd. 158 φήμα P: φάμα cett. 159 κεκλομένω(ι) DA<sup>s</sup>+ 162 ἰὼ semel Heath; fort. ὦ ὦ 165 ὑπερορνυμένας Musgrave 166 ἡνύσατ' ἦν- codd.

The chorus begin with *6da* (||) *2ia* (||) *6da* (||) *paroem*, or in enoplian notation *D* : :: *D* - (||) - *E* (||) *D* : :: *D* - (||) - *D* -; the verses all self-contained but with no visible breach of synaphea.<sup>68</sup> The hexameters also, as usual, have diaeresis after the fourth dactyl, giving the pattern *D* : :: - - - : *D* (d -).<sup>69</sup> The rest of the stanza is a long dactylic run, with strikingly symmetrical word-divisions, usually lineated as *4da* | *6da* | *6da*. But with that lineation the *6da* verse - - - - - : - - : :: - - - : :: is

<sup>67</sup> There are references in *CS* I to *O.T.* 159-66 (n. 61), 171-2/183-4 (70), 465-6/475-6 (n. 14), 469 (69), 483 (n. 46), 490/504 (n. 38), 870/880 (88), 883/897 (n. 86), 1096-7/1108-9 (n. 51), 1186 (n. 61), 1197 (n. 8).

<sup>68</sup> For this hexameter-form (anciently termed 'enoplian'), cf. *Ag.* 104, *Hipp.* 1102, *Andr.* 103, etc. The alternation of double- and single-short cola has a heritage stemming from the epodes of Archilochus (frs. 168-71, 182-7 West, etc.). Cf. *Andr.* 117ff. as a more extended development (probably later in time), discussed in *Mnemosyne* 54 (2001), 724-30. The opening hexameter here can be viewed as a catalectic correlate of the opening sequence *D* : :: - - - : *D* at *Aj.* 172-3/182-3 (cf. *O.C.* 228-9, 241-2, *Tro.* 825-6/845-6, *Pho.* 351-2, 1555-6, *Phaethon* 84-5/92-3).

<sup>69</sup> *d* - and *2da* are alternative notations of the colarion - - - - - (*adoneus*, *ad*), which may also behave as the catalectic correlate of - - - - - (*D*). Opinions may differ as to whether - - at the end of a hexameter stands to - - - in a 'catalectic' relationship; but notations (as West) such as *4da*. for - - - - - (not for - - - - - , which is *D*') are convenient.

oddly amorphous. Colometry κατ' ἐνόπλιον is preferable here,<sup>70</sup> with indentations as above.<sup>71</sup> The sequence  $D : \sim \sim \sim \sim : D$  is already at once  $4da : D$  and  $D : A$ ; and the whole period, as an expansion of the basic ('enoplian') hexameter  $D : \sim D -$ , is at once  $16da$  and  $D^{11} : \sim D -$  (*paroem*).<sup>72</sup>

I write  $\Phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\upsilon$  (personified) in 151 in line with  $\Phi\eta\mu\alpha$  158 (cf. *Aj.* 173, *El.* 1066); for the rectifications  $\Pi\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$  in 154 and  $\eta\acute{\nu}\nu\sigma\alpha\tau'$  in 166, cf. West, *AT* xlix and xxx. In 162  $\iota\acute{\omega}$   $\iota\acute{\omega}$  needs correction, but there is no compelling reason to look further than Heath's single  $\iota\acute{\omega}$ , with long iota:<sup>73</sup> we might, however, perhaps consider writing  $\omega$   $\omega$ .<sup>74</sup>

168-78 ὦ πόποι, ἀνάρηθμα γὰρ φέρω  
 πῆματα· νοσεῖ δέ μοι πρόπας  
 στόλος, οὐδ' ἔνι φροντίδος ἔγχος 170  
 ὦι τις ἀλέξεται· οὔτε γὰρ ἔκγονα  
 κλυτὰς χθονὸς αὖξεται οὔτε τόκοισιν  
 ἰγίων καμάτων ἀνέχουσι γυναῖκες·  
 ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλωι προσίδοις ἅπερ εὐπτερον ὄρνιν 175  
 κρεῖσσον ἀμαιμακέτου πυρὸς ὄρμενον  
 ἀκτὰν πρὸς ἐσπέρου θεοῦ·

~179-89      ὦν πόλις ἀνάρθριμος ὄλλυται,  
νηλέα δὲ γένεθλα πρὸς πέδῳ      180  
                 θαναταφόρα κεῖται ἀνοίκτως·  
ἐν δ' ἄλοχοι πολυαῖ τ' ἐπὶ ματέρες  
                 ἄχ' ἀν παραβώμιον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι  
λυγρῶν πόνων ἱκετῆρες ἐπιστενάχουσιν·      185  
                 παιῶν δὲ λάμπει στονόσσά τε γῆρυς ὄμαυλος·

<sup>70</sup> It seems not unlikely that the alternatives *κατὰ δάκτυλον* and *κατ' ἐνόπλιον* in *Ar. Nub.* 650–1, defining *ῥυθμοί* of which the pupil is expected to have an understanding, in effect refer to alternative modes of what we should call colometric analysis. Many passages can be analysed in alternative ways, and simple counting of metra may well not be uniquely correct. Counting of metra is of course impossible in 'dactylo-epitritic'. For the colon δ (as part of a longer dactylic/enoplian sequence), cf. on *Trac.* 214 ἐλαφαβόλον ἀμφίπυρον (above, p. 66).

<sup>71</sup> Dawe similarly lineates 154–8/163–7 with indentations, but preserves purely dactylic cola: *4da* : *4da* (with a contraction) : *2da* : *4da* : . . . There is no unique virtue in that.

<sup>72</sup>  $D^4$  as a further extension of the sequence  $D, D^2, D^3$ , etc. *Hclad.* 615–18/626–9 (if earlier) may be viewed as a step towards this, with  $D^6$  ( $4da + D$ ) :  $\sim D$  – as an expansion of the opening enoplian hexameter ( $D$  :  $\sim D$  –) in 608/619. The ambivalence is such that the symmetrical pyrrhic words  $\chi\rho\epsilon\omicron\varsigma/\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota$  and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omicron\nu/\phi\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$  between  $-D$  and  $D$  – are at once double-short (dactylic) and anaps-biceps (enoplian; cf. n. 70 above).

<sup>73</sup> So S. Stelluto, *RIFC* 120 (1992), 400 (who also defends ὑπερ, against ὑπερ-, in 165). For wrongly doubled ἰώ, cf. 1186, *Aj.* 891, *Ant.* 869, *Trac.* 1026 (the opposite fault at *Trac.* 1031, *E. Su.* 804, *Tro.* 1327, *Ion* 912, 150). LJ-W<sup>2</sup> now allow that ἰώ with long iota is 'not impossible' (cf. CS I, n. 61). The anacoluthon κεκλόμενος . . . προφάνηται μοι has been much discussed, and LJ-W commend without adopting Blaydes's conjectures κέκλομαι ὦ and αἰτῶ for ἰώ ἰώ. The first would be more appealing if we had reason for regarding the variant κεκλομένω(ι) as a reading older than κεκλόμενος; but that is evidently not the case. As to the second, 'I ask' is surely feeble in a context calling for an *impassioned* appeal. The anacoluthon is of a kind familiar enough in general, including epic poetry, if not elsewhere in tragic lyric; cf. KG 2.105–7. To the parallels cited by Jebb add *Il.* 5.135, 6.510 and Barrett on *Hipp.* 23. It is arguably made *less* 'harsh' by exclamation at the syntactical shift; perhaps also by the echo of ἀζόμενος . . . εἰπέ μοι in the strophe.

<sup>74</sup> Corruption of  $\hat{\omega}/\tilde{\omega}$  to  $\acute{\omega}$  is very common (CS I, n. 95). For allocutory/exclamatory  $\hat{\omega}$  with imperative (with or without a vocative as well), cf. n. 62 above.



τῶν ὕπερ, ὃ χρυσέα θύγατερ Διός,  
εὐῶπα πέμψον ἀλκάν·

183 ἀχάν παραβώμιον Nauck: ἀκτάν παρὰ β- codd. 182 ἐπὶ CFNPA+: ἐπι L<sup>ac</sup>,  
ἐπι pler. 184 ἰκετῆρες O: ἰκτ- cett. 185 παιῶν II et L<sup>ac</sup>Kt: παιάν cett. γάρυς  
Bothe 187 τῶν II (Kennedy): ὧν codd.

The second strophic pair again mixes single- and double-short cola, with some new developments. Period-ends are certain after the third, fifth, sixth, and seventh verses.<sup>75</sup> 168–70/179–81 is *2ia* | *2ia* | *paroem*, or in enoplian notation –<sup>–</sup>*E* | –<sup>–</sup>*E* | –<sup>–</sup>*D* – (cf. –<sup>–</sup>*E* in 152/160). Then in 171–2/182–3 we have *4da* (again) followed by –<sup>–</sup>*D*<sup>2</sup> – (reflecting –<sup>–</sup>*D* – in 154/62, also the paroemiac in 170/181). The sequence *4da* (open-ended) | × – . . . was to become a Sophoclean mannerism (recurring at once in 177–8/188–9).<sup>76</sup> Then in 173–5/184–6 the hybrid compounds *ia* : *paroem* and *pe* : *paroem* (= *ia* + *4da*) are obviously related (the latter with precedents at *Pers.* 970–1/988–9, *Ag.* 108–9/126–7, 116/134); both recur in *Hipp.* 1102–10/1111–19 (nearly contemporary?). The concluding *4da* : *2ia* is the first of many instances of this, or a closely related, combination in Sophocles.<sup>77</sup>

In 174 Dobree's ἀλλᾶι is widely accepted, but 'one after another' is the sense required.<sup>78</sup> In this sentence (unlike Th. 2.4, cited by Dawe) there is no place for variety of mode or destination, the image being of a constant progression like a migratory flight. At 183 ἀλλοθεν ἀλλᾶι, by contrast, both mode and location are relevant. We should not wish to anticipate that ἀλλᾶι here; nor is it easy to see why ἀλλᾶι(ι) should have been corrupted here but not in 183.

In 183 several considerations favour Nauck's ἀχάν for ἀκτάν. (i) The main emphasis should be on *loud lamentation*; by suppliants at altars, indeed, but presumably at various altars (ἀλλοθεν ἀλλᾶι). ἀκτάν παρὰ βώμιον puts too much stress on 'altar' (at the expense of 'lament'), and apparently on a particular altar. The reference can scarcely be to an altar in front of the palace, with the ἀλοχοι and ματέρες actually visible to the spectators. (ii) The genitive λυγρῶν πόνων has a better construction as governed by ἀχάν . . . ἐπιστενάχουσιν (at once objective and causal, cf. *Phil.* 751–2, *Andr.* 1037) than as governed only by ἐπιστενάχουσιν (a verb in itself apt to govern a dative, as at *Ag.* 790) or by ἰκ(ε)τῆρες (as Jebb takes it). (iii) παραβώμιον is in itself a plausible compound (cf. ἐπιβώμιος). (iv) The recent ἀκτάν at 178 is not in favour of a recurrence here in a quite different sense; but it may do something to explain the error.

More trivial differences from the OCT are: 168 ὦ πόποι, cf. on *Trac.* 852 above; 182 ἐπὶ (with Jebb);<sup>79</sup> 184 ἰκετῆρες (with Dawe);<sup>80</sup> γάρυς Bothe (added in the apparatus).<sup>81</sup>

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Dale (*Collected Papers*, 207) who similarly indents the third, fifth, and last verses.

<sup>76</sup> Here unlike nearly all the later exx., as not iambic following the dactyls; cf. next n.

<sup>77</sup> As *El.* 125–6/141–2, etc. Cf. Dale (*ibid.*) and West, *GM* 129–30. Not *Ant.* 340–1/351–2, which is *4da* : *sp ith* (*CS I*, 69). – – – – followed by × – . . . other than iambic occurs elsewhere only in *Phil.* (677–8/692–3, etc.).

<sup>78</sup> So Jebb; for the construction (sc. ἐπὶ), cf. *KG* 1.444 Anm.4 (but the adjacent *προσ-* here is scarcely relevant, since *πρός* cannot stand for *ἐπὶ* in such expressions).

<sup>79</sup> Not ἐπι (Pearson, Dawe, LJ-W, without comment). ἐπι = ἐπεστι makes no sense. Only Dawe, and only in his collations (*Studies* 2), reports the reading ἐπι (*sic*).

<sup>80</sup> *Exact* responson is obviously likely here.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Björck, *Das Alpha impurum* 173–4 γήρυς -ύω -υμα is naturally the (epic, Attic) spelling

190–202

Ἄρη τε τὸν μαλερόν, ὃς  
 νῦν ἄχαλκος ἀσπίδων  
 φλέγει με περιβόητος ἀντιάζων,  
 παλίσσουτον δράμημα νωτίσαι πάτρας  
 ἄπουρον, εἴτ' ἐς μέγαν  
 θάλαμον Ἀμφιτρίτας  
 εἴτ' ἐς τὸν ἀπόξενον ὄρμων  
 Θρήκιον κλύδωνα·  
 †τέλει γὰρ εἴ τι νῦξ ἀφῆι  
 τοῦτ' ἐπ' ἡμαρ ἔρχεται·†  
 τόν, ὦ τᾶν πυρφόρων  
 ἀστραπᾶν κράτη νέμων,  
 ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, ὑπὸ σῶι φθίσσον κεραυνῶι.  
  
 Λύκει' ἄναξ, τά τε σὰ χρυ-  
 σοστρόφων ἀπ' ἀγκυλᾶν  
 βέλεα θέλοιμ' ἂν ἀδάματ' ἐνδατεῖσθαι  
 ἄρωγὰ προσταθέντα, τὰς τε πυρφόρους  
 Ἀρτέμιδος αἷγλας, ξὺν αἷς  
 Λύκι' ὄρεα διάισσει·  
 τὸν χρυσομίτραν τε κικλήσκω  
 τᾶσδ' ἐπώνυμον γᾶς  
 οἰνώπα Βάκχον, εὐίων  
 μαινάδων ὁμόστολον,  
 πελασθῆναι φλέγοντ'  
 †ἀγλαῶπι – – †  
 πεύκαι 'πὶ τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν.

190 Ἄρη Elmsley: -εα codd. 192 περιβόατος Elmsley 194 ἄπουρον PV<sup>PC</sup>AC+ (-πορ- FG): ἔπ- pler. 196 ὄρμων Doederlein: -ον codd. 198–9 τέλος H. Müller ἄμαρ Dindorf 200 τόν ὦ τᾶν Hermann: τᾶν ὦ GR: τὸν ὦ cett. et II 204 ἀγκυλᾶν Elmsley: -ων vel -ῶν codd. 205 fort. βέλη 208 fort. ὄρη 211 εὐίων (εὐίων F<sup>AC</sup>) M. Schmidt: εὐιον codd. 212 ὁμόστολον L<sup>3</sup>PaXs: μονό- pler. 214 ἀγλαῶπι <σύμμαχον> G. Wolff, ἀγλαῶπα (Hartung) <δαΐαι> Arndt, <νυκτέρωι> J. H. H. Schmidt

Mostly straightforward lyric iambs (*ia cr | lk | 3ia<sup>+</sup> || 3ia | ia cr | ith || . . . || 2ia | lk | ia cr | lk | 3ia<sup>+</sup>*), but with an enoplian colon – *D* – | *ith* at 196–7/209–10.<sup>82</sup> The split resolution in the last verse is remarkable (more so, across a comma, in the strophe).<sup>83</sup>

In 190–7 the chorus pray (in the first instance to Athena, previously associated with Apollo and Artemis) for the banishment from Thebes of the unmartial 'Ares'

in trimeters and non-lyric anapaests: A. *Su.* 460, *Eum.* 569, *P.V.* 78 (v.l. γάρυεται); E. *Hipp.* 213, 1074, *El.* 754, 1327, *Tro.* 441, *Pho.* 960, *Ba.* 178, *Rh.* 294, 609, frs. 627. Doric γαρν- is likely in lyric, as transmitted at *Ichn.* 250 (*teste* Page; *contra* Lloyd-Jones, also Diggle). But the MSS offer only γῆρ- here, and likewise at *Alc.* 969, *Rh.* 549, E. fr. 369.6 (= *Erechtheus* 3.6D).

<sup>82</sup> An 'Archilochian colon' (cf. Archil. frs. 168–71 West), untypical (for tragedy) in its long anapitpes; contrast *Sept.* 756–7/764–5, *Med.* 990–1/996–7, *I.T.* 403–4/417–18 (all ~ *D* ~ : *ith*).

<sup>83</sup> Most split resolutions in lyric iambs are 'sub-dochmiac', as in *Trac.* 1009/1030 (p. 71 above). But cf. *Trac.* 657–8 πρὶν τάνδε πρὸς πόλιν ἀνύσειε νασιδῶτων ἐστὶν (Parker<sup>2</sup> 245).

currently afflicting the land. The stanza climaxes with a remarkable appeal to Zeus to destroy the abominated god with his thunderbolt. In between, 198–9 is unintelligible as transmitted, though the metre is well preserved. LJ-W accept Hermann's τελεῖν, mentioning also Kayser's τελεῖ and the latter's punctuation after γάρ. These do not satisfy, and most will subscribe to their further comment 'forsitan lateat gravior corruptela'. I propose two small changes:<sup>84</sup> τέλη for τέλει,<sup>85</sup> and τοῦδ' for τοῦτ'. The sense is then that, whereas other gods have either diurnal or nocturnal τέλη, at once 'rites' (cf. *Ba.* 485 τὰ δ' ἱερὰ νύκτωρ ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν τελεῖς; LSJ τέλος 6) and 'spheres of action' (τέλος 3), the τέλη of this abominated god, by implication funerary, are, with little remission, both diurnal and nocturnal. τοῦδ' in 199 also gives a clearer antecedent to the following τὸν . . . The τέλη at once 'proceed' and, as deaths, 'come'.<sup>86</sup>

In 190 the form Ἄρεα is generally accepted without comment. But this accusative is always Ἄρη elsewhere in tragedy (including lyric), except as corrupted to Ἄρην.<sup>87</sup> It is hard to see why Sophocles should have favoured an abnormal spelling and/or scansion here in responsion with 203 Λύκει' ἄναξ . . . It might be argued that it is no easier to account for corruption of normal Ἄρη to abnormal Ἄρεα. But the near equivalence (see further below) of -η and -εα in words like βέλη/βέλεα could have made copyists careless in the spelling of apparently analogous terminations (perhaps also influenced by accusatives like βασιλέα).

In 192 περιβόητος is 'such that there is βοή around' (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 677–9); debate as between 'active' and 'passive' is sterile. βοή as 'war-cry' is an attribute of Ares as war-god; and likewise, but as στόνος (as elaborated in 182–7 above), an attribute of this ἄχαλκος Ares. There is no need for Dindorf's -τον or Dawe's -φοβ-φλέγει (of Ares), cf. *Pho.* 251; here the 'fire' metaphor follows on the heels of 186 παιῶν . . . λάμπει. ἀντιάζων 'confronting (me)'. Not ἀντιάω (Hermann), necessarily with the sense 'and I entreat Ares . . .' (rather than further prayer to the θεοὶ ἀλεξίκακοι addressed in 159–67). The chorus cannot, in the same stanza, address one prayer to Ares ('please go away') and another to Zeus to 'destroy' Ares; moreover ἀντιάω (lit. 'confront', only by extension 'entreat') is not used of entreaties to gods.

In 194 Dawe rightly prefers ἄπουρον, which gives πάτρας a much clearer construction. The variant ἔπουρον will have been prompted by the following εἴτ' ἐς . . .

In 205 scan βέλ ἄ, if sound; and similarly ὄρ ἄ 208. But the truth could well be -η in both places.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>84</sup> But I also accept Erfurd's δμαρ (with Pearson; *contra*, Björck, 175), cf. CS I, n. 59.

<sup>85</sup> τέλη, rather than τέλεα, for the scansion × - - - - - (~211); cf. n. 88 below.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. LSJ ἔρχομαι V. On τέλος in tragedy, see F. M. J. Waanders in *Misc. Trag. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam, 1976), 475–82.

<sup>87</sup> Schwyzler (1.576) does not even mention Ἄρεα as a possible form of the accusative.

<sup>88</sup> Attic poets used both -η (commonly) and non-Attic -εα in the plural of neuter nouns in -ος, presumably, as Elmsley opined, with a consistent difference of scansion. It is hard to believe that they indifferently used -η and -εα in lyric in the same words with the same scansion. Transmitted -εα is usually - ἄ without ambiguity; invariably so, following a long syllable (e.g. ἄλγη/ἄλγ ἄ, πένθη/πένθ ἄ, τείχη/τείχ ἄ). The same is usually apparent also in nouns with short penult. as

In 211 εὐίων (*sic*) in F, corrected to -ον, may well be a mere slip (Dawe). But εὐίων μαινάδων ὁμόστολον is nonetheless likely to be the truth (ευίων easily corruptible to -ον following βακχον); cf. *Pho.* 656–7 παρθένοισι Θηβαῖταισι καὶ γυναιξὶν εὐίοις.

477–9                    φοιτᾷ γὰρ ὑπ' ἀγρίαν  
                         ὕλαν ἀνά τ' ἄντρα καὶ  
                         πέτρας †ὥς ταῦρος†, . . .

478 πέτρας] -αις FG+, -αῖος ?L<sup>ac</sup>KRV ὡς] ὁ ?L<sup>ac</sup> ταῦρος] καυρός (potius καῦρος cf. *EM* 493, 54) Bergk ex Photio καυρός· ὁ κακός, οὕτω Σοφοκλῆς (fr. 1059 Radt)

Dawe's uncertainty is more persuasive than LJ-W's confident acceptance of πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος. (i) ἄντρα καὶ πέτρας makes a natural pair (hendiadys); καὶ πετραῖος, by contrast, makes an odd third after ὑπ' ἀγρίαν ὕλαν ἀνά τ' ἄντρα (what are ἄντρα if not rocky?). (ii) ' . . . the bull', taken as 'like a bull', is an inept comparison at the end of this explanatory sentence, even if ταῦρος ἀν' ὕλαν was a proverbial phrase for a wanderer (text and interpretation of Theocr. 14.43 are in fact uncertain). The chance that Bergk was right gives a further ground for preferring obeli. If Photius read καυρός (καῦρος) here, ὁ κακός makes sense, but not the only possible sense; e.g. 'the polluted/accursed person' or 'the quarry' might have been a more accurate gloss. We might then consider writing ὁ <γε> καῦρος.

483–4                    δεινά με νοῦν δεινὰ παράσσει  
                         σοφὸς οἰωνοθέτας . . .

483 με νοῦν Nauck; μὲν οὖν codd.

A choriambic tetrameter, but also – 2io : 2io<sup>^</sup> (the same sequence is repeated, followed by a clear shift to ionics beginning - - - - . . .).<sup>89</sup>

Argument for and against Bergk's με νῦν has strangely neglected Nauck. It is the chorus's 'thinking' that is disturbed; με gives a peg for the following participles; and for the construction, cf. *KG* 1.289–90, Diggle, *Euripidea* 365, n. 4, etc.

651–7                    Οι.    τί σοι θέλεις δῆτ' εἰκάθω;  
                         Χο.            τὸν οὔτε πρὶν  
                                    νήπιον νῦν τ' ἐν ὄρ-  
                                    κωι μέγαν καταΐδεσαι.  
                         Οι.    οἶσθ' οὖν ἃ χρήζεις;  
                         Χο.            οἶδα.

655

ἄχη/ἄχεᾶ. There are scarcely any places in the whole of tragedy where the tradition offers -εα and disyllabic scansion is either impossible or very unlikely (as at *Hel.* 1119), and only a few, though there is a clutch of them here, where such scansion is possible but contrary to exact responson. The case for -η is enhanced by the nearby κράτη (201). Cf. *E. El.* 1228 μέλεα and 1231 φάρεα, with φάρη nearby (1221). That -εα spellings may be erroneous is further suggested by the abnormal Ἄρεα in 190 above.

<sup>89</sup> Iono-choriambic (for the colon - - - - - - - -, cf. *Pers.* 633–5/640–2), etc.; cf. *CS* I, n. 15. Ionics follow in 487ff. Lines 483–4/498–9 and 485–6/500–1 are thus better *not* overlapped as 2ch f 2ch, given the availability of indentation to show continuity.

Οι. φράζε δή· τί φήεις;  
 Χο. τὸν ἐναγὴ φίλον μήποτ' ἐν αἰτίαι  
 σὺν ἀφανεῖ †λόγωι ἄτιμον ἐκβαλεῖν†.

657 λόγωι] λόγον L, -ων K<sup>+</sup> βαλεῖν Tr et Suda

Two exchanges (651–4, 655–7), both beginning with a divided trimeter. The first divided trimeter is followed by two dimeters (or *3cr : ia*); the second (differently divided) by four dochmiacs. The corresponding dialogue in the antistrophe (678–96) is between *Io.* and *Χο.* Only the latter sings in these stanzas, in line with the rule that unsymmetrical assignation (to different personae) normally occurs only in the *spoken* verses of strophic amoibaia.<sup>90</sup> The utterance of *Οι./Io.* in 651/680 is usually shown as a dimeter (suggesting song, despite Jocasta's Attic vocalization *μαθοῦσά γ' ἥτις ἡ τύχη*). In what is properly taken as the first part of a divided trimeter, the cut . . . : – – is unremarkable, since it falls at the penthemimeral caesura. The same metrical trick is repeated at 1336–7/1356–7. For the apparently similar, but certainly sung, verse – *e* – : *e* at 890/904, cf. on *Aj.* 948 above. I indent *νήπιον* . . ., since the corresponding divided trimeter at 680 ends with word-overlap.

The corruption in 657 has been variously treated, but no one seems to have proposed the simple transposition *σὺν ἀφανεῖ βαλεῖν ἄτιμον λόγωι*. *λόγωι* will have moved next to *ἀφανεῖ*. The false *ἐκβαλεῖν* (*βαλεῖν* is clearly right with *ἐν αἰτίαι*) perhaps entered from the margin.

873–4                    ὕβριν φυτεύει τυραννίς· ὕβρις, εἰ  
                          πολλῶν ὑπερπλησθήι μάταν . . .

873 ὕβριν . . . τυραννίς Blaydes: ὕβρις . . . τύραννον codd.

Dawe's note, citing convincing parallels, remains persuasive against the latest defence of the *parados* by F. E. Romer in *Eranos* 98 (2000), 9–24 (which surprisingly fails even to mention Fraenkel's proposal *ὕβρις φυτεύει τύραννον ὕβριν· εἰ* . . ., despite its commendation by LJ-W and inclusion in their apparatus). We surely need *ὕβρις* as the thing initially 'begotten', which then *with a progression* becomes the subject of the calamitous 'rise and fall'. (Against Fraenkel, the pattern *ὕβρις-φυτ-τύρ-ὕβρις, εἰ* . . . is supported by the similar asyndetic pattern . . . *θεὸν αἰτοῦμαι | θεὸν οὐ λήξω* . . . at the end of the stanza.)

1197–9                    ὅστις καθ' ὑπερβολὰν  
                          τοξεύσας ἐκράτησας †τοῦ†  
                          πάντ' εὐδαίμονος ὄλβου, . . .

1197 is suspect not only for the long penult. (short in the corresponding place, and in itself a rarity in Sophocles),<sup>91</sup> but even more so for the word-end after long penult.<sup>92</sup> Reisig's *οὐ* for *τοῦ*, accepted by LJ-W, gives quite the wrong sense, as several reviewers

<sup>90</sup> Cf. *Aj.* 364–93, *Ant.* 1312–16/1334–8, *El.* 1398ff./1422ff. (the rule applicable also to Aesch. and Eur.); *O.C.* 510ff./521ff. is a rare exception.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. CS I, 66 with n. 8.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Parker<sup>1</sup> 12.

have pointed out. ἐς | πάντ' (olim Hermann, Blaydes) is better (ἐς dropping out after -as), cf. *Trac.* 489 εἰς ἅπανθ' ἥσων, *Pho.* 1642 εἰς ἅπαντα δυστυχής, *P.V.* 736 ἐς τὰ πάντα, etc. But, given ε(ι)s, it costs nothing to write εἰς, adding further emphasis to the 'superlative' statement; cf. *Aj.* 636 (Lloyd-Jones, for ἐκ), *Sept.* 6, etc. (LSJ εἰς 1b).

1201-3                    ἐξ οὗ καὶ †βασιλεὺς καλῇ  
                             ἐμὸς† καὶ τὰ μέγιστ' ἐτί-  
                             μάθης . . .

The hiatus in the middle of a phrase at the end of the first glyconic of a run is incredible. The choice lies between changing καλῇ to κλύεις (Heimsoeth, Dawe) and Elmsley's βασιλεὺς ἐμὸς | καλῇ. Not καλῇ <τ'> ἐμὸς (Blaydes), with the τε both otiose and questionably late. καλῇ βασιλεὺς | ἐμὸς would give *wil* in responsion with *gl*: not impossible, but doubtful before late Sophocles (cf. on *Aj.* 1190).

1307-11                    αἰαὶ αἰαί, δύστανος ἐγώ,  
                             ποῖ γὰς φέρομαι τλάμων; πᾶι μοι  
                             φθογγὰ διαπωτᾶται φοράδαν;                    1310  
                             †ἰὼ† δαῖμον, ἵν' ἐξήλου.

Jebb took the whole of 1307-11 as 'anapaests' (p. xciii); likewise (presumably) Dawe and Pohlsander, who exclude these verses from their analyses of the lyrics. 1307-10 are indeed anapaests, but lyric (with Doric vocalization); 1311, however, resists recognition as a paroemiac (2ia-).<sup>93</sup> The paroemiac never ends with . . . -- (a cadence proper rather to non-catalectic anapaests); and its fourth position is virtually never resolved, except (very rarely) in the pattern -- -- -- : -- -- (as *I.T.* 215 ψαμάθων Αὐλίδος ἐπέβασαν).<sup>94</sup> As an anapaestic verse, 1311 is further anomalous as having a split resolution other than in the second position of the first metron.<sup>95</sup> It follows that the cadence . . . : δαῖμον, ἵν' ἐξήλου should be recognized as dochmiac (with iambo-dochmiacs following in 1313-20/1321-8). For such a dochmiac clausula to non-catalectic lyric anapaests, cf. *S. El.* 225, 244, *E. Hec.* 180 (as Hermann), 182, etc. It may suffice then to take the ἰὼ as extra-metric. Or the truth could be ἰὼ <ἰὼ>;<sup>96</sup> or even ἰὼ <ἰὼ δαῖμον> δαῖμον, ἵν' ἐξήλου as two dochmiacs.<sup>97</sup>

1329-31                    Ἀπόλλων τὰδ' ἦν, Ἀπόλλων, φίλοι,  
                             ὁ κακὰ κακὰ τελῶν ἐμὰ τὰδ' ἐμὰ πάθη·                    1330  
                             ἔπαισε δ' . . .

<sup>93</sup> Jebb thought it necessary only to comment on a paroemiac ending with three long syllables (in itself unremarkable in lyric anapaests).

<sup>94</sup> Cf. West, *GM* 53-4, 121, 198. For . . . -- : -- -- || cf. also *I.A.* 123, but that yields to a plausible transposition (Herwerden, cf. Diggle, *Studies* 45).

<sup>95</sup> Diggle (*Euripidea*, 117, n. 81) seems to imply that split resolution does not occur at all in anapaests. Initial -- : -- -- . . . does indeed occur, e.g. *Tro.* 159 ὦ τέκν', Ἀχαιῶν . . ., *Ion* 921 ἐνθα λοχεύματα . . . Lyric anapaests did not fall within the purview of Parker's article on split resolution in *CQ* 18 (1968).

<sup>96</sup> Giving either *ia* δ or δωδ, cf. on *Ant.* 1267-8/1290-1 in *CS* I, 87. Similar doubling of ἰὼ is widely accepted at *Trac.* 1031 (Bergk), *E. Su.* 804 (Triclinius), *Ion* 912 (Paley), 1502 (Hermann), *Tro.* 1327 (Kirchhoff).

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *P.V.* 694 ἰὼ ἰὼ μοῖρα μοῖρα (lect. incert.).

~1349–51

ὅλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν ὅς [ἀπ'] ἀγρίας πέδας  
 νομάς ἐπιποδίας λῦσέ μ' ἀπό τε φονου  
 ἔρυτο . . .

1350

1329 ὦ φίλοι pler. (~L+) 1330 κακὰ semel L+ ἐμὰ τὰδ' τὰδ' L+ πάθη  
 Elmsley: -εα codd. 1349 ἀπ' (ἐπ' O) del. Tr 1350 νομάς Hartung: νομάδος  
 codd. (quocum ἐπὶ πόας Müller) λῦσέ μ' Bothe: ἔλυσέ μ' vel ἔλυσεν fere codd.  
 (ἐλαβέ μ' L<sup>acV</sup>, μ' Tr) 1351 ἔρρυτο pler.

In 1330 we should write *πάθη* (with Elmsley), as at *O.C.* 1078 (likewise verse-end), cf. *ἄχη Pers.* 573, 581, *Sept.* 78, etc.; *πάθ* ᾱ here (cf. n. 88 above) would be an impossible resolution at period-end before hiatus. (LJ-W<sup>2</sup> appear to commend an extraordinary scansion of ἐμὰ τὰδ' ἐμὰ πάθεα as ~ ~: ~ ~ ~: ~ ~ ~ ~ ['kaibelianus'] with two split resolutions and *brevis in longo*, rather than a normal dochmius ~ ~: ~ ~ ~ ~ -; it is scarcely an advantage that correspondence with this is given by the minority reading ἐλαβέ μ' in 1350.)

In 1350 other possibilities include *λάβε μ'* or *λάβεν/ἔλαβ'* with μ' transposed to follow ὅς, but Dawe rightly accepts Bothe's simple *λῦσέ μ'* (and attributes μ' ἔλαβ' to Linwood, not Kamerbeek). LJ-W should not have accepted Kennedy's otiose <μ'> following ἀπό τε φόνου, giving elision at verse-end in responsion with clear period-end (hiatus with syntactical pause). The hiatus without sense-pause in ant. is unremarkable *at change of metre*.

1339/1359 ἔτ' ἔστ' ἀκούειν ἡδονᾶι, φίλοι ~ βροτοῖς ἐκλήθην ὦν ἔφυν ἄπο

~ ~ ~ ~ ~: ~ ~ ~ ~ becomes a normal syncopated trimeter (*ia 2ia*) with Heimsoeth's plausible supplements <σύν> ἡδοναῖ and ἐκλήθην <ᾶν>; but precedents in *Pi. Ol.* 13.3/11 etc. and *Py.* 8.7/14 etc. may be added to the parallels cited by Stinton (15), after Wilamowitz and Dale.<sup>98</sup>

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK  
 willink@classicfm.net

<sup>98</sup> Stinton, 15–16; cf. also Parker<sup>1</sup> 15, and my discussion of *Hcl.* 81/102, 90 in *CQ* 41 (1991), 526–7.