

CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS



---

Critical Studies in the Cantica of Sophocles: III. Electra, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus

Author(s): C. W. Willink

Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 53, No. 1 (May, 2003), pp. 75-110

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3556482>

Accessed: 22/07/2009 16:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Cambridge University Press and The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE *CANTICA* OF SOPHOCLES: III. *ELECTRA*, *PHILOCTETES*, *OEDIPUS AT COLONUS*<sup>1</sup>

## *ELECTRA*<sup>2</sup>

121–4

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ὦ παῖ παῖ δυστανοτάτας  
'Ηλέκτρα ματρός, τίν' αἶ  
†τάκεις† ὦδ' ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγὰν  
τὸν . . . Ἀγαμέμνονα . . .

The third verse is indented in correspondence with 138–9 . . . πατέρ' ἀν-/στάσεις . . . Its metre (*gl sp*, ending a tricolon similar to *Ant.* 814–16/831–3) was discussed in *CQ* 47 (1997), 299–301, with a new proposal οὔτε γόοισιν οὔτ' ἄταις (for οὔτε λίταις) in 139.<sup>3</sup> There remains the controversial †τάκεις† in the strophe, where Schwerdt's λάσκες, previously accepted by LJ-W, is abandoned in their *Second Thoughts* in favour of Kvíčala's τάκει σ' ὦδ' ἀκόρεστος οἰμωγὰ (which also of course needs τίς for τίν'), still with a harsh construction for the following τὸν . . . Ἀγαμέμνονα . . .

I suggest τίν' αἶ γ' ἀχέις . . . *I/T* and *K/X* are frequent confusions, and the ancient text will have been divided as . . . *AEI* | *ΓAXEΙΣ* . . .<sup>4</sup> The γε is appropriate for the emphasis 'why *perpetually* . . . ?' (idiomatically with 'what' implying 'why').<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The first article (*CS* I: *CQ* 51 [2001], 65–89) was concerned in the first instance with the *cantica* of *Antigone*, but touched on a number of issues of wider relevance. *CS* II (*CQ* 52 [2002], 50–80) was on *Ajax*, *Trachiniae*, and *Oedipus Tyrannus*. On the chronology, especially the relative lateness of *Electra*, cf. *CS* II, n. 2. For *El.* and *Phil.* we have the Cambridge editions of J. Kells (1973) and T. B. L. Webster (1970) respectively, for *Phil.* also R. G. Ussher (Warminster, 1990), and for *O. C.* we look forward to Professor P. E. Easterling's edition in the Cambridge series. As in *CS* I and II, the siglum LJ-W embraces the Oxford Text of Lloyd-Jones/Wilson and their discussions in *Sophoclea* (Oxford, 1990); LJ-W<sup>2</sup> refers to their *Second Thoughts* (Göttingen, 1997). West, *GM* refers to M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), and West, *AT* to his *Aeschylus Tragoediae* (Teubner edn, 1990). References to Stinton are to T. C. W. Stinton, *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 "gl 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; also to correspondence with Professor Diggle, Dr Dawe, and Professor Easterling.

<sup>2</sup> There are references in *CS* I to *El.* 153/173 (n. 64), 154/174 (n. 55), 205/225 (n. 60), 225 (72), 472/489 (82–3, n. 49), 486–7/501–2 (76, n. 51), 504ff. (69), 511 (n. 89), 828ff./842ff. (n. 49), 832/845 (n. 38); in *CS* II to 125–6/141–2 (n. 77), 128/145 (69), 160–1/180–1 (69), 225 (79), 244 (79), 248 (59), 472/489 (n. 29), 487/503 (n. 58), 496 (67), 504–15 (56), 512 (n. 58), 828ff./842ff. (n. 29), 1066 (73), 1398ff./1422ff. (n. 90).

<sup>3</sup> An alternative οὔτ' ἀχαῖς was mentioned there (suggested by a reader). I now view it with more favour, while still preferring ἄταις.

<sup>4</sup> αἶ | γ' (divided thus), cf. G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), 232. For the common error κ for χ (as at *I. T.* 166 κεῖται), cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 227–8.

<sup>5</sup> Kells rightly explains 'What is this lamentation?' as a way of saying 'What is the meaning of



- 135–6 <ἐὰτ' > ἐὰτέ μ' ὦδ' ἀλύ-|ειν, αἰαῖ, ἰκνοῦμαι.  
 151–2 ἄτ' <αἰέν> ἐν τάφῳ πετραί-|ῳι, αἰαῖ, δακρύεις.

We thus obtain at once stronger sense and normal metre: *2ia* ∫ *ith*, like the *ia cr* ∫ *ith* clausula following dactyls at *Alc.* 465–6/475–6. *AIEN* drops out easily between *AT* and *EN*; and for the anadiplosis ἐὰτ' ἐὰτέ μ' . . ., cf. *Phil.* 135 τί χρῆ τί χρῆ με, 205 βάλλει βάλλει μ', 816 μέθες μέθες με (and other instances of this common initial doubling mentioned in n. 58 below).<sup>10</sup>

- 153–5 Χο. οὔτοι σοὶ μούναι,  
 τέκνον, ἄχος ἐφάνη βροτῶν†,  
 πρὸς ὃ τι σὺ τῶν . . . 155

- 173–5 Χο. θάρσει μοι θάρσει,  
 τέκνον· ἔτι μέγας ἐν οὐρανῳ  
 Ζεὺς, ὃς ἐφορᾷ . . . 175

174 ἔτι L<sup>ac</sup>: ἔστι cett.

The responsion-flaw in 154/174 is usually dealt with by omitting ἐν in 174 (with little or no discussion) on the negligible authority of a Livineian conjecture ('p').<sup>11</sup> There is then a choice of evils: (i) ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (so Dawe, as 'lekyth. '); (ii) ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ^ ~ ~ ( *ia cr* ); (iii) ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ( *gl* ). (i) is almost unique as a lekythion with split resolution of its third position.<sup>12</sup> (ii) has an earlier split, unusual in the verse *ia cr*, and (more seriously) resolution before syncopation which is without parallel in Sophocles;<sup>13</sup> (iii) resolves the first long of a choriamb.<sup>14</sup> ἐν is blameless in itself (ἐν οὐρανῳ, cf. *Hcl.* 910, *Hipp.* 456, *Su.* 1174, *Tro.* 985, *Bellerophon* 286.1 NK, etc.). So we should prefer a remedy that gives *2ia* in 154 as transmitted in 174. That can be obtained either by adding a short syllable (but <ἐπ>εφάνη seems unlikely, and nothing better suggests itself) or by a simple transposition τέκνον, ἐφάνη βροτῶν ἄχος. The iambic dimeter thus is of the type which I have called 'sub-dochmiac' (actually favouring split resolution), here following a dochmius.<sup>15</sup> It may be observed that a verse thus beginning × ~ ~ ~ ~ associates well with the following verse.

- 221–5 Ηλ. †ἐν δεινοῖς ἠναγκάσθην ἐν δεινοῖς†  
 ἕξοιδ', οὐ λάθει μ' ὀργά·

<sup>10</sup> For doubling of ἐὰτε in particular, cf. also (?) *Trac.* 1004–5 ἔ ἔ, †ἐὰτε μ' ἐὰτε μ' . . . † (a crux discussed, with a new proposal, in CS II, 70–2). On the propriety of postulating word-loss in both strophe and antistrophe (as by LJ-W at *Phil.* 678/693), cf. CS II, n. 34.

<sup>11</sup> That Livineian 'p' readings (as opposed to 'V') have no transmissional authority is conclusively shown by LJ-W in *Sophoclea* 271–5.

<sup>12</sup> So Dawe, after Wilamowitz and Schroeder (it does not help to call ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ here a 'cretic'). Parker<sup>2</sup> (27ff.) offers *Sept.* 235/241 as a parallel, but that differs as having no other resolution.

<sup>13</sup> There is no instance either in my colometry or in the (often rather different) verses as scanned and annotated in Dawe's *conspectus metrorum*.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. on *Ant.* 795–800 (CS I, 77 with n. 67). Here a resolved glyconic is otherwise unlikely.

<sup>15</sup> As in my commentary on *Orestes* (p. 113, cf. *Or.* 1253/1273, 1414), also *CQ* 19 (1999), 420 on *Hipp.* 877–8; cf. 1275 (p. 83 below), *Trac.* 1009/1030, *Eum.* 161/168, etc. In the light of Parker's discussion, the 'rhetorical pause' at the split may seem an obstacle; but it is similar to that at *Or.* 1273 ἄφοβος ἔχε· κενός, ὦ φίλα. Cf. also *Alc.* 272 τέκνα, τάδε . . . and *O.T.* 202 ὦ Ζεὺ πάτερ, ὑπὸ . . . (similarly with the split following a vocative).

ἀλλ' ἐν γὰρ δεινοῖς οὐ σχήσω  
ταύτας ἄτας,  
ὄφρα με βίος ἔχῃ.

222 ὀργαῖ L<sup>ac</sup>

221–2 corresponds with 201–2 ὦ πασᾶν κείνα πλέον ἄμέρα | ἐλθοῦσ' ἐχθίστα δὴ μοι (2an | paroem). ἐν δεινοῖς . . . ἐν δεινοῖς is evidently too long by two syllables. As to the sense, Electra must here be acknowledging the δεινότης of her conduct and/or her ὀργή, before proceeding in 223ff. to justify it by the δεινότης of her circumstances. Brunck's [ἐν] δεινοῖς . . . [ἐν] δεινοῖς . . . wrongly focuses premature attention on δεινά causes. Conjectures introducing δειν(ά) are better, as ἐν δεινοῖς δειν' ἤν- (Kaibel), δειν' ἤν- ἐν δεινοῖς (G. Wolff); but I suspect that we should integrate the following verse in the syntax, even as the corresponding verses 201–2 are bonded by the correption at ἀμῆρᾶ. It may well not be fortuitous that L<sup>ac</sup> attests the dative ὀργαῖ, which could be the conclusion of a sentence such as δεινᾶι 'ν δεινοῖς ἠναγκάσθην | (ἔξοιδ', οὐ λάθει μ') ὀργαῖ.<sup>16</sup> For truth surviving uniquely in L<sup>ac</sup>, cf. 174 above.

**243–4.** ἐκτίμους ἴσχουσα πτέρυνᾶς || ὀξύτόνων γόων. A clear instance of a breach of synapheia without sense-pause at change of metre, the change here being to dochmiac (cf. Stinton 336, 351). For the dochmius following anapaests, cf. CS II, 79.

**504–15.** The epode beginning ὦ Πέλοπος ἀ πρόσθεν | πολύπονος ἱππεία . . . mainly consists of dochmiac-related *ia sp* verses, extended at 506 ὡς ἔμολαι αἰανῆς : τᾶιδε γαῖ and 512–13 πρόρριζος ἐκριφθείς, : οὗ τί πω with an extra cretic colarion. At 510–11 there is a slight variation: παγχρύσων δίφρων (doubtless the same dochmiac pentasyllable as 153/173, etc.) | δυστάνοις ἀκείαις (*mol* : *mol*).<sup>17</sup> The penultimate verse (before - - - - - again, now as a clausula) is more open to question:

οὗ τί πω  
†ἔλειπεν ἐκ τοῦδ' οἴκου†  
πολύπονος ἀκεία.

515

514 ἔλιπεν CH (διέλιπεν <sup>i</sup>Σ<sup>L</sup>) οἴκους L<sup>ac</sup>V<sup>ac</sup>RT, ?C<sup>ac</sup>O<sup>ac</sup>G<sup>ac</sup>: οἴκου cett. (etiam T<sup>s</sup>); fort. οἴκοις

The cretic οὗ τί πω again ends a verse (followed as things stand by hiatus), optionally as a separate short verse (cf. 854/865 below). Then - - - - - or - - - - - may be possible; but to write λείπει, in line with ἐκλείπει Ag. 1186, προλείπει Or. 817, will at once eliminate the hiatus after πω and give, with 'κ following, another - - - - - verse like 510. The prodelision λείπει 'κ will have been a feature inviting corruption, first perhaps to λείπ' ἐκ. For the rest, against the usual view, corruption surely moved *towards* τοῦδ' οἴκου (with erasures of -ς). ἐκ τοῦδ' 'from this (time/event)' suits the

<sup>16</sup> There are other possibilities on similar lines, similarly with the sentence framed between agreeing adjective and noun, e.g. δεινᾶι δεινῶς (δεινῶς Meineke) ἠναγκάσθην | . . . ὀργαῖ, or δεινᾶι γ' ἠναγκάσθην δεινῶς | . . . ὀργαῖ. A reader is troubled by the 'isolation' thus of ὀργαῖ after the parenthesis; but its bonding with δεινᾶι . . . fully integrates it in the syntax.

<sup>17</sup> ἀκεί- (also 487 and 515), cf. CS II, 56. *mol* : *mol*, cf. CS I, n. 89. *mol cr* with ἀκείας is indeed as likely in itself, but consistent ἀκεί- is far likelier (*pace* Dawe). -ει- is surely needed, against Ellendt, for the scansion - - - .

compound (aetiological/temporal) point, in the temporal sense reinforcing οὐ τί πω, like ὅθεν . . . at *Or.* 816. But perhaps οἴκους was already an error for οἴκοις, very possibly read by whoever glossed the verb with διέλιπεν (intrans., ‘has intermitted’); cf. the dative construction at *Or.* 818 with Ἀτρεΐδαις.<sup>18</sup>

823–6                    ποῦ ποτε κεραυνοὶ Διὸς ἦ  
                              ποῦ φαέθων Ἄλιος, εἰ ταῦτ’ ἐφορῶντες                    825  
                              <νέμεσιν> κρύπτουσιν ἔκηλοι;

~836–9                    οἶδα γὰρ ἄνακτ’ Ἀμφιάρεω  
                              χρυσοδέτοις ἔρκεσι κρυφθέντα γυναικῶν  
                              ἀπάταις, καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ γαίης . . .

Schubert’s supplement <νέμεσιν> has been neglected (the lacuna indicated by Musgrave, who suggested <ἀτίτα>). The iono-choriambic sequence (either *ia* 5*ch* — — — — — or *pe* 5*io* — — — — —) begins like 1058/1070 below and ends with the same . . . : — — — — — as *Ant.* 140/154. Metre alone, indeed, cannot decide definitely between Brunck (del. ἀπάταις in ant.) and Musgrave. But ἀπάταις in 839 is too good to be an interpolation: χρυσοδέτοις ἔρκεσι . . . γυναικῶν ἀπάταις admirably defines what Amphiararus was ‘brought low’ by (and put underground): χρ- ἔρκ- (lit. ‘toils such that there is gold and fastening’) alluding to the famous necklace of Harmonia; γυν- ἀπ- alluding to (Eriphyle’s) ‘womanly/wifely deceit’. The generalizing gen. pl. γυναικῶν is much less happily governed by χρ- ἔρκ-, with its allusion to a unique piece of jewellery. LJ-W offer <μάκαρες> as a supplement in 826. But ἐφορῶντες guarantees that the subject of the ‘if’ clause is simply ‘they’, namely Zeus and the Sun. It is certainly as ‘all-seeing’ deities that Zeus (cf. 175) and the Sun are paired in the main clause. A new subject such as <μάκαρες> is thus out of place. It is rather the predicate κρύπτουσιν ἔκηλοι that invites expansion and clarification. As things stand, the object of κρύπτουσιν is ταῦτα; but things manifest to the chorus and explicitly ‘seen’ by divine powers cannot be said to be ‘hidden’ by the latter. κρύπτειν cannot mean ‘pretend not to see’ or ‘condone’ (vel sim.). Σ interprets as οὐκ ἄγουσιν εἰς φῶς, but ‘bringing into the light’ is not the function of all-seeing Zeus, with his thunderbolts, nor of the all-seeing Sun. Other proposed supplements, apart from other objections, do not confront this difficulty. What is ‘concealed’, as Schubert saw, is the ‘righteous anger’ to be expected (of gods, as 1467, *Phil.* 518, 602, *Or.* 1362). The Sun, indeed, does not wield thunderbolts; but he might have been expected to react wrathfully in some way (as in the Atrous myth; *E. El.* 737ff., etc.), rather than remaining apparently unmoved (ἔκηλος).

839–48                    . . . καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ γαίης . . .  
                              ~~Ηλ.~~ ἔ, ἰώ.                    840  
                              ~~Χο.~~ πάμψυχος ἀνάσσει.  
                              ~~Ηλ.~~ φεῦ. ~~Χο.~~ φεῦ δητ’, ὀλοὰ †γάρ† . . . ~~Ηλ.~~ ἐδάμη. ~~Χο.~~ ναί.  
                              ~~Ηλ.~~ οἶδ’ οἶδ’· ἐφάνη γὰρ μελέτωρ ἀμφὶ τὸν ἐν                    846  
  πένθει· ἐμοὶ δ’ οὔτις ἔτ’ ἔσθ’· ὅς γὰρ ἔτ’ ἦν  
  φροῦδος ἀναπασθεῖς.

<sup>18</sup> To the discussion of that passage in my commentary I should add that πόνωι πόνος there (codd. φόνωι φόνος) could well be an echo of πολύπονος here.

LJ-W rightly suspect the breach of synapheia at γάρ in 843. It is as a fragmented *ph<sup>c</sup>* = *3io* verse (cf. *Ant.* 787–8/797–8, 944/955, etc.) that the sequence makes metrical sense.<sup>19</sup> For the three speaker-changes within the verse (consistent with a late date for this play), cf. *O. C.* 539/546. LJ-W's δάμαρ ἦν for ἐδάμῃ repairs the metre at the cost of a most improbable emendation. It gives straightforward sense thus far (δλοά badly needs a noun to agree with); but not such as to make sense of the exchange as a whole, without further alteration of γάρ in 845 to an adversative ('but . . .'). τᾶρ' is better (LJ-W<sup>2</sup>), but still does not convince. We need a substantive, and I suggest κήρ. δλοή κήρ is epic (*Il.* 18.535). The chorus assent to Electra's φευ: 'Alas indeed: a murderous bane' (sc. ἦν). El. then makes the point that the murderous 'bane' was 'subdued' (by Eriphyle's death), to which the chorus give further assent. The wrong γάρ is easily accounted for as an interpolation ('Alas indeed: for . . .'; cf. Triclinius' γάρ after ἐδάμῃ), which in due course took the place of κήρ.

853–9	Χο. ἰδομέναι θροεῖς. Ηλ. μή με νῦν μηκέτι παραγάγῃς ἔν' οὐ . . . Χο. τί φής; Ηλ. πάρεισιν ἐλπίδων ἔτι κοινοτόκων εὐπατριδᾶν ἀρωγαί.	855
~864–70	Χο. ἄσκοπος ἂ λώβα. Ηλ. πῶς γὰρ οὐκ; εἰ ξένος ἄτερ ἐμᾶν χερῶν . . . Χο. παπαί. Ηλ. κέκευθεν, οὔτε του τάφου ἀντίσας οὔτε γόνων παρ' ἡμῶν.	865    870

I accept (with Dawe, ed. 3) Diggle's ἰδομέναι in 853 for the dubious εἴδομεν *ā θρ.*<sup>20</sup>

The metre of these exchanges is 'enoplian dochmiac': δ : *cr* : δ (or δ~δ : δ) | ~ - :: ~ - :: ~ *e* - *D* (*iambel*) | *ar*.<sup>21</sup> The cretic colarion in 854/865 can be lineated as such, but is really part of a longer verse: cf. on 513 (οὐ τί πω) above, also the apparent δ : *mol* : δ at *Phil.* 830–1/846–7 (p. 90 below). The vulgate lineation here as δ | 2*cr* || ~2*ia* | . . . has a most unwelcome breach of synapheia in both stanzas (and open *brevis in longo* in str.), after *μηκέτι ~ εἰ ξένος*.

The divided iambic metron ~ - :: ~ - can likewise be treated either as a separate colarion or as part of a longer verse (~ *E* - *D*) with two speaker-changes (late style: cf. 829–31/842–5 above). The verse-overlap at ἐμᾶν | χερῶν followed by interjection is similar to, and perhaps a model for, *Or.* 148/161.

<sup>19</sup> For the favourite *ph<sup>c</sup>*, equivalent to *3io*, cf. *CS* I, n. 49; here followed by iono-choriambic beginning – ~ ~ . . . ('a maiore'), cf. *O. T.* 490ff., *Trac.* 849–50, etc.

<sup>20</sup> Diggle, *Euripidea* 149, n. 5 and 472, n. 147 (also 318 and *Studies* 86); for the responsion ~ ~ - . . . add *O. T.* 657/686. I also remove the τ' before ἀρωγαί in 859, consistently with LJ-W's discussion in *Sophoclea*, though not with their text.

<sup>21</sup> δ~δ, cf. on *Ant.* 1261–9/1284–92 (esp. 1267–8/1290–1), *CS* I, 87 with n. 98; and further below on 1232/1253, *Phil.* 830/846, *O. C.* 117/149, 1561/1572.

1058–69  
(~1070–81)

τί τοὺς ἄνωθεν φρονιμωτάτους οἶω-  
νοὺς ἑσπορώμενοι τροφαῖς  
κηδομένους ἀφ' ὧν τε βλά- 1060  
στωσιν ἀφ' ὧν τ' ὄνασιν εὖ-  
ρωσι τάδ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἵσας τελοῦμεν;  
ἀλλ' οὐ τὰν Διὸς ἀστραπὰν  
καὶ τὰν οὐρανίαν Θέμιν  
δαρὸν οὐκ ἀπόνητοι· 1065  
ὦ χθονία βροτοῖσι Φήμα,  
κατά μοι βόασον οἰκτρὰν  
ὅπα τοῖς ἔνερθ' Ἀτρεΐδαις,  
ἀχόρευτα φέρουσ' ὀνειδίη·

1059 τροφαῖς] -fās codd. 1061 ὄνασιν Brunck: ὄνησιν codd.

1066 Φήμα Dawe: φήμη O<sup>ac</sup>D<sup>ac</sup>, φάμα cett.

Iono-choriambic sequences here frame a *gl | gl | ph* tricolon (1063–5/1075–7, see below). Such sequences almost by definition admit alternative lineations; and there is no reason why we should not have ionic and choriambic colometries in the same stanza.

The opening *ia ch ia* ∫ *ch ia* (as above) is equally *pe : anacr* (cf. *P. V.* 128/144, 133/149, 397–8/406–7) : *io-ia = anacr* (cf. *Pers.* 107).<sup>22</sup> Then 1060–2/1072–4 is naturally *ch ia* ∫ *ch ia* ∫ *D ba* (so Dawe). LJ-W lineate 1058–62/1070–4 as *pe + anacr | anacr* ∫ *anacr* ∫ *anacr* ∫ – – – – – – – – – –, but anacreontics do not normally overlap, whereas – – – – – / – – : – – is a common type of ‘dovetailing’ (as at *Ant.* 153, 816). For the concluding *D ba* (aeolic decasyllable) in iono-choriambic context, cf. *Pers.* 651/656, *Sept.* 726/733, *P. V.* 132/148.

At 1059 there is an overlooked point in the text: *κήδεσθαι* + gen. rei is uncommon, and it is somewhat awkward to understand *ἀφ' ὧν τε . . .* (‘both their parents and their offspring’, see Kells) as governed by *τροφᾶς* (‘take care of the nurture <of those> from whom . . .’). The construction is much less clumsy with a modal dat. *τροφαῖς*. There is also a further benefit: the ‘caring’ is *mutual*, with *κηδομένους* at once middle and passive in force. Pl. *τροφαί* (cf. *O. C.* 446, 1265, *E. Su.* 1137, *Hec.* 20, 599, *Ion* 487, etc.), also suits the mutual ‘nurtures’. In 1061 I accept Brunck’s *ὄνασιν*, cf. *Ant.* 616 (CS II, 73–4), *Hipp.* 757.

The sequence in 1066–9 (~1078–81 *οὔτε τι τοῦ θανεῖν προμηθῆς : τό τε μὴ βλέπειν ἐτοίμα, : διδύμαν ἐλοῦσ' Ἐρινύν, : τίς ἂν εὐπατρὶς ὦδε βλάστοι*;) can be similarly overlapped, as by Dawe, as *ch ia* ∫ *ch ia* ∫ *ch ia* ∫ *D ba*; but here lineation in ionic (especially anacreontic) cola obviates repeated hyphenation at line-end. The pattern – – – – – / – – : – – – – – (twice) : – – – – – – – – – – is like *Ag.* 447–51/466–70 and *Phil.* 687–90/703–6, differing only in the fourth colon (there simply – – – – –), and reminiscent of Anacreon’s archetypal strophe (fr. 1), with West’s indentations:

– – – – – / – – : – – – – –  
– – – – – / – – : – – – – –  
– – – – – / – – : – – – – –

<sup>22</sup> *οἰωνούς* here needs to be added to the exx. of internal correption in West, *GM* 11. Add also *δείλαϊος Ant.* 1310 and ?*E. Su.* 279 (not only ‘often in comedy’); also *τοῖόςδε* (alongside *τοῖούτος*).





perhaps ὦν καὶ σὺ, sc. τῶν ἀγαθῶν, be considered an improvement). Then κοινόν is evidently wrong. Kells defends it as an epithet in general proper to mourning (sc. σὺν τοῖς φίλοις). But the essence of Electra's πάγκλαυτος αἰών is its *abnormality*. She has explicitly been *alone* (μόνα) in her constant and extravagant lamentation. The favoured κλεινόν (Madvig and Sirks) spoils the argument by anticipating the conclusion (1089). We shall not understand the next verse unless we recognize that the πάγκλαυτος αἰών is *in itself* οὐ καλόν, though (paradoxically) a means of achieving εὐκλεία. Froehlich's κείνον, consistent with disparagement (like Latin *iste*), is at once what the argument requires and a smaller change (overlooked by Stinton).

1087 has been much emended,<sup>26</sup> but is rightly defended by Stinton: 'taking as equipment/armament what is not καλόν, (so as) to achieve . . .'. Metaphors of 'weaponry' are common in moral contexts. Unusual, indeed, is the use of active καθοπλίσασα with the sense καθοπλισμένη; but there are sufficient parallels for that (cf. Kühner–Gerth i.110).

1232–4            ἰὼ γοναί,  
γοναί σωμάτων ἐμοὶ φιλάτων,  
ἐμόλετ' ἀρτίως, . . .

~1253–5            ὁ πᾶς ἐμοί,  
ὁ πᾶς ἄν πρέποι παρὼν ἐννέπειν  
τάδε δίκαι χρόνος·

1255

Thus the vulgate. Suspicion is aroused by the period-end (hiatus in the antistrophe) splitting the anadiplosis γοναί γοναί (the comma is a subterfuge); and further by recognition that 1253–5 in itself scans naturally as – – – – – : – – – (δ cr or δλλδ) followed by two dochmiacs, like *Ion* 675–6 (~695–6) ὀρῶ δάκρυα καὶ πενθίμους | ἀλαλαγὰς στεναγμάτων τ' ἐσβολάς.<sup>27</sup> Only part of the tradition, not including L, in fact has γοναί twice in 1232, and it may be that false repetition has displaced something different. I suggest either ἰὼ <ἰὼ> γοναί σωμάτων or preferably (with exact symmetry) ἰὼ γοναί <ἰὼ> σωμάτων.<sup>28</sup>

1273–7            Ηλ. ὦ χρόνῳ μακρῷ  
                         φιλάταν ὁδὸν  
                         ἐπαξιώσας ὥδέ μοι φανῆναι,  
                         μὴ τί με, πολύπονον ὥδ' ἰδὼν . . .            1275  
                         Χο. τί μὴ ποιήσω;  
                         Ηλ.                    μὴ μ' ἀποστερήσης  
                         τῶν σῶν προσώπων ἥδοναν μεθέσθαι.

The vulgate colometry ἰὼ (codd.) χρόνῳ | μακρῷ φιλάταν ὁδὸν ἐπαξιῶ-/σᾶς ὥδέ μοι φανῆναι (ia | 2δ f 2ia) has anomalous word-end after overlapped long anceps.<sup>29</sup> ἐπαξιώσας : ὥδέ μοι φανῆναι is surely another catalectic trimeter like 1276

<sup>26</sup> Lloyd-Jones's ἄκος for τὸ μὴ, improbably postulating a gloss τομήν and otherwise misconceived, is justly condemned by Bremer and Kip in *Mnemos.* 47 (1994), 241–2.

<sup>27</sup> δλλδ, cf. n. 21 above.

<sup>28</sup> For the correction (not abnormal in Sophocles' dochmiacs), cf. on *Aj.* 348–9 in CS II, 55, n. 18; particularly easy with (ἐ)μοῖ, cf. also *Hec.* 1067.

<sup>29</sup> Even a short syllable overlap from dochmiacs into iambs would be a rarity (CS II, nn. 33,

and 1277 (cf. *O.C.* 541). Before that we easily obtain a characteristic pair of hypodochmiacs (cf. 246–7, *Aj.* 401–2/418–19, 403–4/421–2, *O.T.* 1208–9/1217–18, (?) *Phil.* 1214) by a routine correction of  $\acute{\iota}\omega$  to  $\acute{\omega}$ .<sup>30</sup> Blass proposed  $\acute{\iota}\omega <\acute{\iota}\acute{\omega}>$ , but  $h\delta | h\delta$  is likelier than  $2ia | h\delta$ . The breach of synapheia at  $\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu$  is unremarkable, at change of metre (cf. 243), and at the end of a  $h\delta$  (cf. *Aj.* 401–2  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \mu' \acute{\alpha} \Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \parallel \acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \parallel$  . . ., also (?) *Aj.* 422–3, *O.T.* 1209, 1217).

### PHILOCTETES<sup>31</sup>

188–90

$\acute{\alpha} \delta' \acute{\alpha}\theta\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$   
 $\acute{\chi}\acute{\alpha}\omega \tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\phi\alpha\eta\acute{\varsigma} \pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   
 $\omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota.$

190

189–90  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  Irigoin, praeunte Musgrave:  $-\acute{\alpha}\varsigma -\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   
 $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\omicron}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  codd.; alii alia

On the breach of synapheia at  $\acute{\alpha} \delta' \acute{\alpha}\theta\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma \parallel \acute{\chi}\acute{\alpha}\omega \tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\phi\alpha\eta\acute{\varsigma}$  . . . (explained as ‘the Babbler, distant Echo’ with a virtual comma), cf. Stinton, 317.

189–90. Thus Dain-Mazon (but without mentioning Musgrave, who glossed his  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  as *subvehit*). Echo ‘responsively gives forth bitter woe-cries’:  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron-$  as in  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\phi\omega\eta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ , etc.;  $-\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  middle, as in *Ar. Vesp.* 1020  $\kappa\omega\mu\omega\iota\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha} \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \chi\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  (of ventriloquial jokes; LSJ  $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  III.1);  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  as *Aj.* 317  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \lambda\upsilon\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ .<sup>32</sup>

205–9

$\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota \beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota \mu' \acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$   
 $\phi\theta\omicron\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\tau' \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma-$   
 $\kappa\alpha\nu \acute{\epsilon}\rho\pi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma, \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon} \mu\epsilon \lambda\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\iota$

205

53). As Parker has shown, word-end after long anceps is in general uncommon except at penthemimeral caesura. Colometry that gives it following overlap at the beginning of a verse is always to be rejected; cf. *CQ* 49 (1999), 409, n. 10.

<sup>30</sup> To redivide while keeping  $\acute{\iota}\omega$  would give an anomalous trimeter *ia ba ia* (unacceptable with the sequence – – – – within the verse, see Stinton 127). On the common corruption of  $\acute{\omega}$  to  $\acute{\iota}\omega$ , see *CS* I, n. 92.

<sup>31</sup> Add references in *CS* I to *Phil.* 203/212 (n. 49), 709 (78), 710/721 (n. 49), 711/722 (n. 65), 1090/1111 (n. 60), 1151 (n. 8); in *CS* II to 140/155 (55), 184 (n. 20), 203/212 (n. 29), 677–8/692–3 (n. 77), 710/721 (n. 29), 835–6/851–2 (68), 839–42 (71), 840 (n. 66), 1111 (69), 1139 (68).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the wrong  $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  for  $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  at *I.T.* 166 (p. 75, n. 4 above). Two other conjectures have changed only  $\kappa$  to  $\chi$ :  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\pi' \acute{\omicron}\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  (Hermann) and  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  (Erfurdt; so Pearson and Webster, but we surely need a verb with ‘active’ force with this quasi-personal subject). Many other conjectures, variously with  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  (Musgrave) or  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma(\nu)$  ( $-\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$  Brunck), have changed the verb arbitrarily, without explaining the corruption:  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota$  (Auratus; so Jebb and LJ-W),  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  (Emperius, approved by Kamerbeek),  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\epsilon\iota$  (Hartung, Purgold),  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota$  (Pflugk),  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\iota$  (Rauchenstein),  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$  (E. Viketos, *LCM* 12 [1987], 35). Jackson’s  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\iota$  depends on the insupportable  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  at *El.* 123 (q.v.). Dawe has been content to obelize. In *CQ* 49 (1999), 421, I commended  $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\pi\alpha \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  (Blaydes). This, if we also write  $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\phi\alpha\eta\acute{\varsigma}$ , gives an object-phrase like  $\tau\eta\lambda\omega\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\iota}\omega\acute{\alpha}\nu$  216; for  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\alpha$  of a lamenting ‘voice, utterance’, cf. *El.* 1067 ( $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ), *A. Su.* 60 ( $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\omicron}\chi\omicron\nu$ ); for  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\alpha$  with both epithet and genitive of content, cf. *Hipp.* 602  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\eta\tau\omicron\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}$  ‘ $\acute{\omicron}\pi\alpha$ . But if  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$  can be understood as ‘responsively pours forth’, there is no need to look further, as Professor Collard has persuaded me.

βαρεία τηλόθεν αὐδα  
τρυσάνωρ διάσημα †γὰρ θροεῖ†.

~214–18

ὡς ποιμὴν ἀγροβάτας,  
ἀλλ' ἣ που πταίων ὑπ' ἀνάγ-  
κας βοᾷ τηλωπόν ἰωάν,  
ἧ ναὸς ἄξενον αὐγά-  
ζων ὄρμον· προβοᾷ τι γὰρ δεινόν.

215

214 ἀγροβάτας RAU+; αἰγοβότας Burges 218 τι γὰρ Wunder: γάρ τι codd.

The stanza surely ends with the common (commonly clausular), sequence (–) – – – – – – – – – –, as argued in *CQ* 47 (1997), 299ff. with reference also to *El.* 123/139. As mentioned there, more is at issue here in the colometry of the preceding verses. These run comfortably only as above with period-end after . . . με λάθει and . . . ἰωάν (at a comma in ant.). The verse ο ο – × – – – – – is rare (West's *hī*); in effect a hypermetric *wil* –); but we may compare the sequence *ia ch* | *ia ch* – || (followed by *hag* : *hag*) at *Ant.* 781–2/791–2. Then 208–9/217–18 is a dicolon *tl*' × *gl sp* akin on the one hand to *tl* *f gl sp* (as (?) *Aj.* 196–7, *Ant.* 845–6/864–5, etc.), on the other to sequences with a link-anceps like *El.* 486–7 ἄ νιν κατέπεφνεν αἰσχί-/σταις ἐν αἰκείαις ~ 502–3 εἰ μὴ τόδε φάσμα νυκτὸς | εὖ κατασχήσει (also *O.T.* 1096–7/1108–9, cf. *Ant.* 789–90/799–800; *CS* II, 76 with n. 50); here *tl*' – (·*wil* –) rather than *tl* – (·*gl* –) in line with the preceding ·*wil* | *wil* *f wil* *f* . . .

The usual colometry ·*wil* | *wil* *f wil* *f* . . . gives unacceptable word-end after overlapped long anceps at αὐ-/δα . . . (cf. n. 29 above), and a concluding verse – – – – – – – – – – doubtfully supported by *O.C.* 520/533 and 1248 (qq.v.). Bergk's favoured transposition ὄρμον is unnecessary with the colometry as above (*El.* 486–7/502–3 affording a parallel for the word-overlap in only one stanza).

The period-end (pendent close) at λάθει is likely then to correspond with a light sense-pause: not simply between verb and subject, but between verb and *extended subject-phrase*; a consideration that may have a bearing on the crux in 209. Dindorf proposed θρηνεῖ, but 'laments' is doubtfully appropriate. I would now suggest that γὰρ θροεῖ conceals γάρυει (ῥ as *P.V.* 78 γηρῦεται, v.l. γαρ-), cf. *Ich.* 249–50 . . . ἐν τόποις τοῖσδε τίς νέρθε γᾶς | ὦδ' ἐγήρυσε (or ἐγάρυσσε) θέσπιν αὐδάν.<sup>33</sup> γῆρυς and γηρύω (etc.) are frequent in contexts of clearly heard utterance (of various kinds), as at *Hipp.* 213, 1074, *El.* 754, 1327, *Tro.* 441, *Ba.* 178, *Rh.* 294, 609. frs. 369.6, 627; for Sophocles cf. also *O.T.* 186–7 παιῶν τε λάμπει στονόεσσά τε γῆρυς (Bothe γάρυς) ὄμαυλος.

But I should also, at no extra cost, write βαρεῖ' ἄ (n. pl.). The whole dicolon, not just its first part, constitutes the subject of οὐδέ με λάθει, in line with the metrical articulation: 'nor escape my notice : from afar the intelligible utterances of a βαρεία αὐδὰ τρυσάνωρ'.

678–9

κατ' ἄμπυκα δὴ δρομάδα <. . . >  
δέσμιον ὡς †ἔλαβ' ὀ†  
παγκρατὴς Κρόνου παῖς·

<sup>33</sup> ἐγάρυσσε Hunt, ἐγηρυσσε Siegmann, see R. Carden, *BICS* 18 (1971), 44. γηρυ- may be right everywhere in tragedy; but that does not exclude the possibility of γαρυ- in an archetypal MS, cf. the variant γαρύεται (*aQ<sup>2</sup>K*) at *P.V.* 78. Cf. also γῆρυς (γάρυς Bothe) at *O.T.* 187 (*CS* II, n. 81).

~693-5

παρ' ὧι στόνον ἀντίτυπον <\_>  
 - > βαρυβρώτ' ἀποκλαύ-  
 σειεν αἵματηρόν·

695

678 ἄντυγα Musgrave <ἄιδου> LJ-W ἔλαβεν Vater, ἔβαλεν Stinton, ἔλασεν Diggle 693 <νόσον> LJ-W

LJ-W's supplements mend both the metre (giving -  $D \times D$  before the ithyphallic) and the defective sense.<sup>34</sup> But <ἄιδου> would be better in 678, both as the preferred lyric form (cf. *Trac.* 121) and for the lipography reducing *δρομαδα(ι)δα* to *δρομαδα*; and in 693-4 <λύπαν> (cf. 1088, 1195) gives at once more exact respension and a likelier skip after -υπον.

680-6

ἄλλον δ' οὐτιν' ἔγωγ' οἶδα κλυὼν  
 οὐδ' ἐσιδὼν μοίραι  
 τοῦδ' ἐχθίονι συντυχόντα θνατῶν,  
 ὃς οὐ τι ρέξας <οὐ>τιν' οὔτε νοσφίσας,  
 ἀλλ' ἴσος ἦν ἴσοις† ἀνήρ  
 ὦλλυθ' ὦδ' ἀναξίως·  
 τόδε <δ' αὐ> θαυμά μ' ἔχει . . .

680

685

~696-702

οὐδ' ὃς [τὰν] θερμοτάταν αἱμάδα κη-  
 κιομέναν ἐλκέων  
 ἐνθήρου ποδὸς ἡπίοισι φύλλοις  
 κατευνάσειεν† εἴ τις ἐμπέσοι†  
 φορβάδος† ἔκ τε γὰρ† ἐλεῖν,  
 †ἔρπει γὰρ† ἄλλοτ' ἀλλαχᾶι  
 τότ' ἂν εἰλυμένος . . .

700

683 οὐ τι ρέξας <οὐ>τιν' Bergk: οὐτ' ἔρξας τιν' fere codd., οὔτε τι ρέξας τιν' Eustathius 686 <δ' αὐ> Wunder 696 τὰν del. Erfurdt θερμορούταν Blaydes 698 ἐμπήρου Vauvilliers 701 εἶρπε (Bothe) δ' Hermann, εἶρπ' ἂν Stinton

**683.** We certainly need the double accusative construction with both participles (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ), not ὃς οὐτ' ἔρξας τιν', οὐ τι νοσφίσας (as Jebb, Pearson, Webster). LJ-W accept ὃς οὔτε τῷ ρέξας τιν' . . ., but τῷ ρέξ- is doubtful prosody in lyric (see now Diggle, *Euripidea* 456-8).<sup>35</sup> οὐ τι . . . οὐ τι . . . is no improvement, *pace* Stinton (281) and Dawe. οὐ . . . οὔτε is stylish, especially with οὐ τι in the first limb (*GP* 509 with n. 2).

**684.** Respension is again flawed (also in 686/702, see below). *Prima facie*, better sense would be obtained here by writing ἀλλ' ἴσος ἐν <οὐκ> ἴσοις ἀνῆρ ('a just man among

<sup>34</sup> Their discussion in *Sophoclea* variously supersedes Stinton's (279-80); but some doubt remains over ἄμπυκα (ἄντυγα Musgrave) and δῆ (om. QT). The latter is defensible, but ἀεὶ would be more pointed. As to the verb, ἔλαβεν is surely wrong; for ἔλασεν, cf. *Or.* 168. For the word-end after long anceps in the sequence  $\times D \times : D$ , cf. on *O.T.* 196/209 (*CS* II, 76 with n. 82).

<sup>35</sup> The Eustathian v.l. may owe something to reminiscence of *Od.* 4.690 οὔτε τινὰ ρέξας ἐξαΐσιον οὔτε τι εἰπών. (The smaller correction ὃς οὐ τι ρέξας τιν' οὔτε νοσφίσας gives a possible verse [*ia lk*]; but an unsyncopated trimeter is likelier for respension with 699, q.v.)

*unjust*' (giving – – – – –, a very common form of iambic dimeter). There is then room for a more convincing emendation in 700 (see below).<sup>36</sup>

**696–9.** *θερμοτάταν* is perhaps not worse than questionable.<sup>37</sup> Worse problems follow. The syntax has run on at some length from the strophe with *ἔν' αὐτὸς ἦν πρόσσυρος, οὐκ ἔχων βάσιν . . . οὐδέ . . . οὐδ' ὅς . . .*, and we expect the sentence to end at *κατευνάσειεν*.<sup>38</sup> An appended 'if' clause, apparently quite elaborate, is otiose verbiage, whether its general sense is 'if ever he desired some relief' or 'if ever the disease afflicted him', as to which opinions have differed.<sup>39</sup> A supplement is evidently needed in 699 to complete a trimeter. For that, and at the same time for the defective sense and syntax, I suggest *κατευνάσειεν· εἰ <δ' ἄσα> τις ἐμπέσοι | . . .* (keeping *ἐλεῖν* in 700, with Stinton). *ἄσῃ/ἄσα* is a rare word with just the right connotation of 'intolerable craving' (cf. *Med.* 245, Sappho 1.3), and the corruption is credible: first perhaps as a skip giving *κατευνασεῖτις*, later expanded to *-άσ<ειν> εἴ τις*.<sup>40</sup> A new sentence now begins with: 'and/but if ever some intolerable craving fell upon him to get something (?) from the earth, he would . . .'.<sup>41</sup>

**700** (~684). As things stand, 684 *ἀλλ' ἴσος ἐν ἴσοις ἀνὴρ* is a lekythion of a form with split resolution paralleled only at *Sept.* 235/241 in sub-dochmiac context; and 700 can become a lekythion (unsymmetrical, unlike *Sept.* 235/241) only with Stinton's bald *τι* for *ἐκ τε*. Responsion will now be satisfied (see above) by writing *φορβάδος <ἄκος> τι Γᾶς ἐλεῖν*. *ακος* will have dropped out after *αδος*, and *ἐκ* will have come in, as Stinton suggested, as an explanation of the genitive, for which I write *Γᾶς* in line with his discussion.

**701–2** is now the apodosis of the 'if' clause in 699–70. Stinton convincingly argued the need for *εἶρπ' ἄν* or *εἶρπε δ' ἄν* (not *εἶρπε δ'* with delayed *ἄν*);<sup>42</sup> and he accommodated *εἶρπ' ἄν* by an earlier interpolation of 'and' (*κεῖ . . .*) in 699, where I have proposed *εἰ δ' . . .* In 702 Stinton then read *τότ' [ἄν] εἰλυόμενος*, in responsion with 686 *τὸ δ' αὖ (Wecklein) θαυμά μ' ἔχει*. He was very probably right to keep *τότ'* (for which Dawe accepts Seyffert's *πόδ'*); but Wunder's *τόδε <δ' αὖ>* in 686 enables

<sup>36</sup> *ἐν οὐκ . . .*, cf. *ἐν οὐ καλῶι Or.* 579, *ἐν οὐ καιρῶι Ba.* 1287. Others have looked for – – – – – (*chia*), with *ἐν <γ> ἴσοις* (Hermann) or *ὦν ἴσοις* (Schultz) in str. and Hartung's *ἐκ τι γᾶς* in ant. (rightly challenged by Stinton [282] on linguistic grounds). Dindorf's *ἐκ γαίης* gives a most improbable long after the choriamb (cf. on *Hipp.* 1387–8 in *CQ* 49 [1999], 427); it also leaves us without an object other than *φύλλα* understood—ineptly, since what is 'taken from the earth' might well be some *root* or *fungus*.

<sup>37</sup> *θερμοτάταν* is a surprising superlative in a context where *θερμο-* has to do with 'fever'. LJ-W do well to mention Blaydes's *θερμορύταν*, but *θερμορύτων* seems better (with *ἐλκέων*); cf. Wilamowitz's correction *ἀργυρορύτων* for *-ταν* at *Herc.* 387.

<sup>38</sup> For the single word (a verb) thus overlapping metrical period-end, cf. *Aj.* 229, *O.T.* 493, *El.* 1095, *Sept.* 121, *Ag.* 245.

<sup>39</sup> Jackson's *<πόθος>*, approved by Dawe, rejected by Stinton, is too weak a word for the context. LJ-W argue for *<σπασμός>* (or similar), in conjunction with Turnebus's *ἐλών* (for which the case is far from sufficient to justify its acceptance into the text).

<sup>40</sup> Less probably *κατευνάσει· εἰ <δ' ἄσα> τις ἐμπέσοι* would give a syncopated trimeter (cf. n. 35 above).

<sup>41</sup> The revised punctuation cuts across Stinton's discussion (281ff.), which nevertheless includes many valuable insights.

<sup>42</sup> On the legitimacy of elided *-ε* before *ἄν*, see Diggle, *Euripidea* 109 (with n. 61) and 197.

us to keep *τότ' ἄν εἰλνόμενος*.<sup>43</sup> ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ is at least as likely as ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ in a verse immediately followed by an iono-choriambic tetracolon like *El.* 1066–9/1078–81.

714–17                    ὅς μῃδ' οἶνοχύτου πώματος ἦσθη δεκέτει χρόνῳ                    715  
                               λεύσσων δ' εἴ που  
                               γνοίῃ στατὸν εἰς ὕδωρ,  
                               αἰεὶ προσενώμα·

~726–9                    Σπερχείου τε παρ' ὄχθας, ἔν' ὃ χάλκασις ἀνὴρ θεοῖς  
                               πλάθει παῖς <θεοῦ>  
                               θείῳ πυρὶ παμφαῆς,  
                               Οὔτας ὑπὲρ ὄχθων.

716 εἴ που Brunck: ὅπου codd. 717 αἰεὶ Tr: αἰεὶ codd. πόδ' ἐνώμα Wakefield  
 728 πλάθῃ QR (Bergk) παῖς <θεοῦ>] πᾶσι codd.

714–15/726–17 is the fourth of a run of 'asclepiad' verses beginning with (707–8)/718–19 νῦν δ' ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν παιδὸς ὑπαντάσας (sic: -ήσας codd., edd.).<sup>44</sup>

There have been many conjectures for πᾶσι in 728, but no one seems to have suggested παῖς <θεοῦ>: a natural aggrandizing designation of Heracles in this context of apotheosis. θεοῦ will have dropped out before the adjacent θείῳι. That gives us another 2*sp* colarion (– : – : –) like 711/722 (there followed by *anacr.* here by *tl* like *Ant.* 844/863).<sup>45</sup> It only remains to accept Brunck's λεύσσων δ' εἴ που (for δ' ὅπου) in 716.

**827–54.** A tensely dramatic pair of stanzas. The metre is predominantly dochmiac, with some characteristically Sophoclean features; notably a partiality for the cola – – – – – and *ia sp* (cf. *El.* 504–15). The responsion is compoundly flawed in 833–4/849–50, with some obscurities of sense; again in all probability as a consequence of lipography (cf. 678/693, 683–4/699–700), as it certainly is in 838 (~854).

The dramatic situation is that the chorus of sailors see no good reason for not seizing the opportunity of departing at once with the Bow while Philoctetes is asleep. Neoptolemus reminds them in a dactylic mesode that the Bow alone is of no value without Philoctetes.<sup>46</sup> But for the chorus the need for Philoctetes as well as his bow is

<sup>43</sup> A repeated ἄν (Kühner–Gerth i.246ff.) associates naturally enough with the correlative τότε 'in apodosis' and the participle εἰλνόμενος. LJ-W obscurely object to αὖ in 701 as 'not suitable'. The sense is 'And/but I am *further* amazed, (wondering) how . . .'. δ' αὖ is uncertain indeed (with uncertainty also in the corresponding place); but it gives unexceptionable sense. The emotion of the chorus, contemplating Phil.'s ἐχθίστη μοῖρα and scarcely credible mode of existence, is a combination of *pity* and *astonishment*. The former predominates in 676–85 (down to ὦλλονθ' ὦδ' ἀναξίως); but θαῦμα is already implicit in the evaluation 'surpassed only by Ixion's fate'. Those who still reject τόδε <δ' αὖ> may prefer Dindorf's τόδε <τοῖ>. LJ-W cite 'GP 331' for their unlikely τόδε <μάν>. Nothing sufficiently similar will be found there.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. 680–1/696–7, *Ant.* 944–7/955–8 (CS I, 81–2), etc. -αντάσας, cf. *Tro.* 212 ἀντάσω, and my correction ὀρμάσας at *Pho.* 1064.

<sup>45</sup> CS I, 80 with n. 65. In 710ff./721ff. LJ-W rightly divide after τόξων ~ πλῆθει (at the end of a *ph* verse), against Dawe (followed by West in *GM* 108). Dawe's word-division after long penult. and with overlap following . . . – – – cannot be right. But then – – : – – : ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ is better regarded as 2*sp* | *anacr.* than as a (nameless) long verse beginning × – × – . . .

<sup>46</sup> Arguably the chorus have heard of this double requirement only at 610–13 in the narrative of the 'Merchant'. But, though the 'Merchant' is a suspect witness on other matters, no one is

secondary (843 'Nay, the god will see to *this*'), by comparison with the primary task as repeatedly set forth by Odysseus in the prologue, the 'capturing' of the Bow without which Troy cannot be taken (68–9), explicitly by 'theft' of some kind (77–8).<sup>47</sup> So in the antistrophe the chorus again urge Neoptolemus to devote his best efforts to the fulfilment of *that* task (κεῖνο 850), and not to deviate dangerously in accordance with Philoctetes' wishes. Their utterance is *sotto voce* and allusive, for fear that Phil.'s apparent sleep may be ἄπνους. At 852, if ὄν is right, their allusiveness embraces Odysseus ('you know *whom* I mean'), who must not be named in Philoctetes' hearing.

827–9                    'Υπν' δόδυνας ἀδαής, 'Υπνε δ' ἀλγέων,  
εὐαῆς ἡμῖν ἔλθοις,  
εὐαίων εὐαίων ὦναξ·

~843–5                    ἀλλά, τέκνον, τάδε μὲν θεὸς ὄψεται·  
ὦν δ' ἂν <κ>ἀμείβημι μ' αὖθις,  
βαιάν μοι βαιάν, ὦ τέκνον . . .

845

Hermann's ἄλγεος seductively gives a *4da* opening verse (with correption then at ὄψεται, as at *El.* 141 across a comma).<sup>48</sup> But LJ-W are doubtless right in keeping ἀλγέων; also in their other textual decisions here (though their unsymmetrical colometry needs correction). *4da* followed by a shift to metre other than iambic would be unusual, and it is likely enough that Sophocles intended period-end after — — — — — here,<sup>49</sup> and likewise in 1091/1112 below (where a dochmius follows after a sense-pause in both stanzas). The appropriate notation for such an enoplian verse in dochmiac context will be  $D^2 \times -$ , analogous to  $D \times -$  which behaves virtually as an expansion of — — —  $\times -$ : cf. the opening ibycean — — — — — at *Cho.* 315/332 and the same (more clearly sub-dochmiac, and admitting unequal penult.) at *Sept.* 205/213, 222/229. A modification of *4da* towards dochmiac gives a not inappropriate start to these stanzas (followed in both places by a sense-pause).

828–9/844–5 are then phrased so as to divide most naturally as seven long syllables followed by eight; a pattern common in lyric anapaests (e.g. *El.* 193–4/213–14), which quite often associate with dochmiacs. At the same time it can scarcely be fortuitous that the fifteen syllables are also divisible as three — — — — — cola (a favourite, as we have seen). — — — : — — — — — is a possible form of the 'dochmiac compound' δ~δ.<sup>50</sup> — — — : — — — is similarly adjacent to dochmiac at *Trac.* 1007(?) / 1027 and *El.* 203/223.

intended to disbelieve his report of the oracle. Neoptolemus has taken it from the start that the mission to Lemnos has a compound target (cf. next note).

<sup>47</sup> Three times in the prologue Neoptolemus explicitly contemplates taking Philoctetes as well as the Bow to Troy (90–2, 102, 112); whereas Odysseus everywhere speaks as if the Bow is the sole target (68–9, 113, 115), with 'theft' as a prominent theme (55, 57, 77). The expression δόλωι λαβεῖν (101, 107) is ambiguous, as applied to Philoctetes. Those ambiguities are doubtless a calculated preparation for the dilemma in the present scene.

<sup>48</sup> One might even be tempted then to begin the stanza with a hexameter. Hermann's εὐαῆς is easy enough. But ὦν δ' ἂν ἀμείβημι μ' then ends the hypothetical *hex* with an elided enclitic. εὐαῆς is likely to be sound, both in itself, and for the paronomastic assonance with εὐαίων εὐαίων. Hermann's alternative <κ>ἀμείβημι in ant. is palmary. Dawe's 2δ verse here beginning with — — — — — : — — — is impossible (cf. Parker<sup>1</sup> 12).

<sup>49</sup> Surprisingly Dale found that harder to accept than ἀλγ(ε)ῶν in responsion with ὄψεται at verse-end, for which there is no sort of parallel. A possible interpretation of *Or.* 1300 gives the same prosodiac length (see *comm.*; but I should no longer cite *Trac.* 1024 as a parallel).

<sup>50</sup> For the notation δ~δ, see n. 21 above and further in n. 52 below.



The metrical argument thus favours the majority reading ὤναξ in 829 (ἄναξ VTa, Wilamowitz). The position of ὦ between attributive epithet(s) and vocative is indeed unusual; probably a poeticism on the model of *Il.* 4.189 φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε.<sup>51</sup>

830–2                    ὄμμασι δ' ἀντέχοις τάνδ' αἶγλαν,                    830  
                              ᾧ τέταται τα νῦν·  
                              ἴθι ἴθι μοι, παιών·

~846–8                    πέμπε λόγων φήμαν, ὥς πάντων  
                              ἐν νόσωι εὐδρακῆς  
                              ὕπνος ἄϋπνος λεύσσειν·

A dochmiac sequence (followed by strong pause in both stanzas): δ~δ | δ | *ia sp* ||.<sup>52</sup> This seems preferable to the usual division – – – – – | – – – – – | . . ., in which the second verse is in danger of being mistaken as aeolic (× *gl*). For the sub-dochmiac *ia sp* verse with split resolution, cf. *Trac.* 846–7 (*CS* II, 68; ἴθι ἴθι, West, *GM* 15, n. 24).

833–6                    ὦ τέκνον, ὄρα †ποῦ στάση(ι),  
                              ποῖ δέ βᾶση(ι)· πῶς δέ μοι τάντεῦθεν†  
                              φροντίδος, ὀράϊς ἦδη·                    835  
                              πρὸς τί μένομεν πράσσειν;

~849–52                    ἀλλ' ὅ τι δύναι †μάκιστον  
                              κείνῳ μοι κείνο λάθρα(ι)†                    850  
                              ἐξιδού ὅπαι πράξεις·  
                              οἴσθα γὰρ ὃν αὐδῶμαι·

833–4 ποῦ] πῶς Q<sup>ac</sup> ποῖ] ποῦ KGQR 836 μένομεν Erfurdt; μενούμεν codd.  
849 δύναι LS: -αιο cett. 850 κείνο alterum om. A 850 λάθρ' ZgT 851 ὅπαι  
Schneidewin: ὅτι pler., ὅπως L<sup>s</sup>+ 852 ὃν pler.: ὦν LSV, ὦ K, ὦι s.l. AUy; ὅ γ'  
Dawe

There is plainly compound corruption in the words obelized between the cola – – – – – (*ia*, like 201 εὖστομ' ἔχε, παῖ ~ 210 ἀλλ' ἔχε, τέκνον) and – – – – – | – – – – – (*ia sp* twice). The most favoured procedure has been to expand 850 to correspond with 834. LJ-W print κείνο <δῆ> μοι, κείνῳ <μοι> λαθραίως (<δῆ> Hermann, <μοι> Kuiper, <-ως> Campbell); but this triply supplemented text is at best a makeshift. The metre thus (*ia* : *mol* then *2ia* : *mol*) inspires no confidence (including as it does the rare cut – – – – – : – – – – –). As to the language, no parallel is cited for the ellipse of <ἔχει> in the indirect question πῶς . . . φροντίδος in 834–5; and in 849–51 the sentence 'In the highest degree possible consider how you will secretly perform that (thing, action)' is

<sup>51</sup> LJ-W have too many commas here (. . . ἔλθοις, εὐαίων, εὐαίων, ὤναξ). We already have εὐαής as a predicative adjective with ἔλθοις. εὐαίων *bis* must then be part of the vocative address, as a laudatory epithet; not as in *Ion* 126/142, where the same anadiplosis is certainly predicative (to Apollo, with εἴης). It is natural for Ion to pray for 'good life'; less so for the chorus here. A reminiscence of *Ion* is indeed not unlikely, the association with παιών (*Παιών*) providing a further link.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. δδ~δ : δ (– – – – –) at *Aj.* 887–9/933–5 (*CS* II, 61); δ~δ (δ : *mol*) like *Ion* 695, *Or.* 158, etc.; for δ~δ beginning with – – – – – cf. *Hipp.* 1276, etc. (*CQ* 49 [1999], 425–6). ἀντίσχοις (Musgrave) or ἀμπίσχοις (Burges) could be right; but dochmiac – – – – – is acceptable here.

oddly expressed. Something seems to be missing, perhaps a participle <πονῶν> with ὅ τι δύναι μάκιστον ('labouring to the best of your ability').

In 833–4 we appear to have a reflection of a standard deliberative idiom ποῦ στῶ; ποῖ βῶ; (with variations, cf. *Alc.* 863, *Hec.* 1056, 1079, and similarly ποῖ τις οὖν φύγη; ποῖ μολῶν μένω; at *Aj.* 404). If we begin by changing the future verbs στάση(ι) . . . βάση(ι) to subjunctives σταῖς . . . βᾶις and adding <πονῶν> (ex. gr.) after μάκιστον, the passage begins to take shape with likelier verse units: ὦ τέκνον, ὄρα (ia) : ποῦ στᾶις, ποῖ δὲ βᾶις· (δ) | πῶς δέ μοι . . . ~ ἀλλ' ὅ τι δύναι : μάκιστον <πονῶν> | κείνό μοι . . .

We are then left with the seemingly intractable residue †τάντεῦθεν† ~ †κείνο λάθρα†. Here too the likeliest line of attack is supplementation.

(i) πῶς δέ μοι : τάντεῦθεν <φέρει> | φροντίδος. ὁρᾷς ἤδη turns the transmitted *cr mol* into a *cr* : δ colon following a dochmius (cf. *El.* 853–4/864–5, p. 80 above). φέρει might well have dropped out before φρ-. 'You already see the consequent *tenor* of my thinking' (LSJ φέρω VII.3b).

(ii) A clue to what is missing in 859 is afforded by the transmitted ὃν αὐδῶμαι in 851, lacking a satisfactory referent as things stand (and consequently altered to ὃ γ' αὐδῶμαι by Dawe). The reference can scarcely be to Philoctetes (straightforwardly identified by the demonstrative οὗτος in 853). 'You know whom I mean' should surely refer here to Odysseus, the author of the plan that Philoctetes will fail to execute at his peril, and who must not be named in Philoctetes' hearing. But for that we shall need something like κείνό μοι : <τὸ> κείνον (sc. Ὀδυσσεύς) λάθρα | ἐξιδού ὅπως πράξεις.

For the extra cretic in the verse 834/850 as thus speculatively reconstructed, cf. also *El.* 507, 513 (p. 78 above). The interlinear hiatus after λάθρα(ι) is acceptable (at change of metre) between δ and ia *sp.*

837–8                      Καίρός τοι πάντων  
                                 γνώμαν ἴσχων  
                                 πολὺ παρὰ πόδα <πυκνοῖς> κράτος ἄρνυται.

~853–4                    εἰ †ταῦταν† τούτῳ  
                                 γνώμαν ἴσχεις,  
                                 μάλα τοι ἄπορα πυκνοῖς ἐνιδεῖν πάθῃ.

838 <πυκνοῖς> J. F. Ch. Campe (Gy.-Pr. Greiffenberg, 1866, 17)

853 ταῦταν G 853a ἴσχεις L<sup>m</sup>SA+: ἔχεις pler. 854 πυκνοῖς Tr: πυκνοῖσ(ιν) pler.

The sequence ----- : -- : -- is like *Ant.* 844–5/863–4, 1121–2/1132–3 (*CS I*, 80, 85), and probably best lineated as two verses. The exact symmetry here, including repetition of γνώμαν ἴσχ-, favours similarly exact symmetry, very probably with another verbal echo, in the defective final verse. Campe's neglected <πυκνοῖς> is therefore preferred to Hermann's <πολύ τι> πολὺ . . . It is indeed especially for those intelligent enough to recognize it that Καίρός (cf. *El.* 75) 'there and then (παρὰ πόδα) wins much κράτος'.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Parker<sup>1</sup> (11) pointed out that 854, as things stand, is the only instance in Sophocles of the overlap . . . : . . . in dochmiacs, so common in Aeschylus and frequent also in Euripides. That is scarcely a ground for suspicion (I have added two other instances at *Ant.* 841/860 and *O. C.* 120/152). In general Sophocles has a higher proportion of non-overlapping dochmiacs; at the same time he was capable of exceptional overlaps, as (with exact responsion) at 399 ὅτε τὰ πάτρια τεύχεα παρεδίδοσαν ~ 515 μετατιθέμενος ἐν' ἑταίρῳ ἐπιμέμονεν earlier in this play.

In 853 there is a compelling need for an adversative ('If on the other hand . . .'), not asyndeton; and it costs little to write  $\epsilon\iota\delta'$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (τούτου, 'of Philoctetes', now antithetic to  $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ , 'of Odysseus'). 'To have, or adopt, the γνώμη of a person' is a natural enough way of saying 'to go along with the thinking, desire, etc.' of that person (akin to the common idiom  $\phi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ). The vulgate ταῦταί (Dobree) τούτῳι is otherwise doubtful, *pace* Diggle (*Studies* 7): γνώμην ταύτῃ τίθεμαι is doubtless right at *Phil.* 1448; but one could scarcely say πῇ (rather than τίνα or ποίαν) γνώμην  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ;

**839–42.** Neoptolemus' four hexameters, constituting a mesode, are surely lyric like *Trac.* 1010–14, 1018–22, 1031–40 (*CS* II, 71–2), and  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta'$  should be read for  $\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\delta'$  in 840.

**862–4**                    ὄρα, βλέπ' εἰ καίρια  
                              φθέγγῃ· τὸ δ' ἁλώσιμον ἄμῃ  
                              φροντίδι, παῖ, πόνος  
                              ὁ μὴ φοβῶν κράτιστος.

862 βλέπ' εἰ Hermann: βλέπει codd. 863 ἄμῃ Dindorf (ἄ-): ἐμῃ codd.

Dindorf's ἄμῃ for ἐμῃ merits further advocacy.<sup>54</sup> As things stand, between the iambic verses (*ia cr* . . . *2ia*) we have . . . | – – – – – || – – – – – || . . . as alien aeolic verses (*tl* and  $\bar{g}l$ ) with *two* pauseless breaches of *synapheia*.<sup>55</sup> The clausular sequence is surely . . . – – – – – | – – – – – (like 142–3/157–8, 1093–4/1114–15, 1097–8/1119–20, 1130–1/1154–5, *O.C.* 235–6 μῆ τι πέρα χρέος | ἐμῇ πόλει προσάψῃς, etc.).<sup>56</sup> Before that we clearly need . . . ὠσίμον ἄμῃ, completing the enoplian sequence  $\cdot e e : - D$  – like *Tro.* 820–1 (~840–1) μάταν ἄρ', ὦ χρυσέαις : ἐν οἶνοχόαις ἀβρὰ βαίνων | . . .<sup>57</sup>

**1095–8**                    σύ τοι σύ τοι κατηξίω-                    1095  
                              σας, ὦ βαρύποτμε·  
                              †οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἔχῃ τύχαι τᾶιδ'† ἀπὸ μείζονος  
                              εἰδτέ γε παρὸν φρονῆσαι . . .

**~1116–20**                    πότμος <πότμος> σε δαιμόνων  
                              τᾶδ', †οὐδὲ σέ γε† δόλος  
                              ἔσχ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς ἐμᾶς· στυγεράν ἔχε  
                              δύσποτμον ἄρ' ἔπ' ἄλλοις . . .                    1120

1095 σύ τοι semel KS 1096 κοῦκ SQ (Erfurdt) 1116 <πότμος> Erfurdt 1117  
γε om. SQV+

Parker's other argument for *πυκινά τ'* (Blaydes) is sufficiently met by LJ-W. It may not be in character for these sailors to assert their own cleverness. But they can properly appeal to intelligence as a presumed attribute of the person they are attempting to persuade. Moreover, though they may be 'simple sailors', they are undeniably capable of using sophisticated language. *πυκινά τ'* is otherwise questionable, even as one could not say *μάλα ἄπορα πολλά τε*.

<sup>54</sup> Preferably aspirate; West, *AT* xxx.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. *CS* I, 72, n. 31.

<sup>56</sup> *2da* | *2ia* is indeed less usual than *4da* | *2ia*, but cf. *Ion* 212–13 (~230–1) ὄβριμον ἐν Διὸς : ἐκῆβόλοισι χερσίν, also the verse – – – – – : – – – – – at *Hipp.* 1108/1127.

<sup>57</sup> Similar to *Aj.* 221–2/245–6 (*CS* II, 53–4); cf. also the probable *D* – : *D* | *ith* at 678–9/693–5 in this play.

LJ-W unsymmetrically print *σύ τοι σύ τοι κατηξίωσας, ὦ βαρύποτμε, κοῦκ* as a hypermetric verse (3ia -) in responsion with *πότμος σε δαιμόνων τάδ', οὐδὲ σέ γε δόλος* (3ia). If the doubled *πότμος* is not accepted, then we need single *σύ τοι* in 1095 (so Dawe). But the doubling is likely to be right;<sup>58</sup> in which case the verse will have been, not a trimeter, but the common 2ia + δ.<sup>59</sup> The verse-division at *κοῦκ* || *ἄλλοθεν* is otherwise unlikely, at the point where the metre shifts to the favourite 4da | 2ia- (contrast the strong pause before the same at 1130–1/1153–4, and note the clear period-end at *δόλος* | in the antistrophe).

It follows that we need to reduce *οὐδὲ σέ γε* in 1117 to three syllables (~ ὦ βαρυ-), preferably *οὐ[δέ] σέ γε*.<sup>60</sup> We shall also need a better emendation in 1097 than Dindorf's *ἀ τύχα ἄδ' ὀρχηί* *τύχαι τᾶιδ'*, accepted by LJ-W. *ἔχρη* is aptly reflected at *ἔσχ'* in 1118, and a most unlikely interpolation here. More probably the prosy and unmetrical phrase *τύχαι τᾶιδ'* is false, credibly introduced as an explanation of *ἔχρη*. I suggest

*ἄλλοθεν οὐκ ἔχρη [τύχαι τᾶιδ'] <οὐδ'> ἀπὸ μείζονος.*

For the hyperbaton thus of the negative, cf. *Aj.* 682 *αἰὲν οὐ μιν οὐκ ἔχρη*, *El.* 1211 *πρὸς δίκης γὰρ οὐ στένεις*. The intrusion of *τύχαι τᾶιδ'* will have extruded *οὐδ'*.

**1123–45/1146–68.** A strophic pair with several issues of responsion.

**1125.** *γελᾷ μου, χερὶ πάλλων* (~*ph* following *gl* | *gl*) stands in responsion with 1148 *χῶρος οὐρεσιβώτας*. Such inverted responsion (⌊ - . . .) in the aeolic base is extremely rare.<sup>61</sup> *μουγγελᾷ* = *μοι ἔγγελᾷ* is otherwise plausible here.<sup>62</sup>

**1126.** Conversely *τὰν ἑμὰν μελέου τροφάν* stands in responsion with 1149 *φυγαὶ μηκέτ' ἀπ' αὐλίων*. Here we might consider writing *ἀμὰν* for *ἑμὰν* (cf. 863 above; less probably *ἑμὰν τοῦ μελέου* since we need *τὰν* with *τροφάν*), giving ⌊ - - - - - .

**(1128)/1151.** Read *ἀλκὰν τὰν πρόσθεν βελέων* (CS I, 66, n. 8).

**1134–5/(1157–8).** *†ἀλλ' ἐν μεταλλαγαῖ† | πολυμηχάνου ἀνδρὸς ἐρέσση*. 1134 should doubtless be restored as an iambic dimeter (following 4da) with either LJ-W's *ἑμᾶς <γε> σαρκὸς αἰολᾶς* or something like Stinton's *<ἐν δαιτὶ> σαρκὸς αἰολᾶς* in 1157.<sup>63</sup> We also seem to need *<χεροῖν>* in 1134. But *ἐν μεταλλαγαῖ* remains oddly without point, as things stand. One looks for some allusion to the *other* 'change' (i.e.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. 135 *τί χρή, τί χρή με . . .* (*τί χρή* semel GQRS). Initial anadiplosis becomes very frequent in Sophocles' later plays (so, in the latter part of *Phil.*, also 1101, 1169, 1178, 1179, 1187, 1188, 1197, 1209, 1213).

<sup>59</sup> 2ia : δ is very common. For 2ia ∫ δ with this short-syllable overlap (already at *Eum.* 158–9/165–6), cf. *Med.* 1280–1/1291–2, etc. (CQ 49 [1999], 420 with n. 36).

<sup>60</sup> The pronoun is not needed, and *οὐδέ γε* is not impossible (GP 156); but *σέ γε* is likely to be genuine (cf. *Ant.* 790, *O.T.* 1101). *οὐδέ σε [γε]* might seem more obvious, not all MSS having the *γε*; but interpolation of this *γε* is less likely than careless omission. *οὐδέ* is more easily pruned: *οὐ* is more normal idiom here; at the same time it is credible that *οὐδε* was generated by misreading of *ου σε*.

<sup>61</sup> K. Itsumi, CQ 34 (1984), 68. It differs from some other inequalities in that - . . . forms are plausibly regarded as 'anaclastic', behaving in tragedy differently from - × . . . and - - - . . . forms as J. A. J. M. Buijs has shown (*Mnemos.* 38 [1985], 74ff.), and meriting the notations ~*gl* and ~*ph* (CS I, 66, n. 6).

<sup>62</sup> Jebb proposed *ἔγγελᾷ*, but *μουγγελᾷ* has the merit of restoring synapheia in this *gl* | *ph* sequence. It also accounts for the abnormal *μου* (*μοι* Cavallin). For this crasis, cf. *Aj.* 1225, *Eum.* 913, *Ar. Ach.* 339, etc. (Kühner–Blass i.222–3).

<sup>63</sup> Stinton, 122, 285–6.

changed ownership) of weapons' in which this same πολυμήχανος ἀνὴρ has previously been involved (when Odysseus defeated Ajax for the Arms of Achilles), and I suspect that ἀλλ' may conceal ἄλλ- 'other'. Perhaps then ἄλλαι <δ' ὄπλω>ν μεταλλαγαῖ . . . ἐρέσση. For the combination with one noun of both subjective and objective genitives, cf. Kühner–Gerth i.337, Anm. 4. The presumed need for χεροῖν is questionable.

**1136–9/1159–62.** At 1136–9 we straightforwardly have *ia ch | ia ch |* – – – – – : – – – – – (4*ch ba*, but with a familiar kind of iono-choriambic word-division in the last two verses.<sup>64</sup> At 1159–62, after the same *ia ch | ia ch* the MSS' μηκέτι μηδένος κρατύνων : ὅσα πέμπει βιόδωρος αἶα gives *ch ia* – : . . . rather than *ch ch* – : . . . No parallel is in view for such 'free responsion' (Webster, after Dale) of *ch* and *ia* in the middle of such a standard sequence. μηδένος must surely be a corruption of μηδέν followed by either <γε> (Frederking) or <τι> (Wecklein); preferably the latter (cf. LSJ τ.14). Gen. μηδένος will have readily displaced μηδέν as seemingly more normal; but κρατύνειν + acc. is quite in order (LSJ s.v. II).

**1178–80.** φίλα μοι φίλα ταῦτα παρήγγει-λλας ἐκόντι τε πράσσειν. Presumably ionic (following an ionic trimeter and two anacreontics). But can ionics begin with – – – – – without becoming anapaests? Hartung deleted the second φίλα. Alternatively we might supply a syllable, e.g. φίλα μοι φίλα <δῆ> ταῦτα . . . (or <μοι> again).

Then ἴωμεν ἴωμεν (rz), || †ναὸς ἵν' ἡμῶν τέτακται†, in which the second verse is metrically 'unique' (Stinton 137).<sup>65</sup> The phrasing is not self-evidently sound, and may well be corrupt, perhaps for ναὺς ἡμῶν ἵνα τέτακται (2*ia*): 'where our ship is drawn up and ready for us'. *IN* drops out before *INA* and is restored (following suprascription) in the wrong place, before rather than after *HM*.

**1211.** Χο. ποί γὰς; Φι. εἰς Αἴδου (preferably Αἴδα, cf. 678 above). This is much more likely to be a divided dochmius (cf. *O.C.* 837/879, *Herc.* 1061, *Or.* 148/161; here another – – – – – verse) than a divided penthemimer (or 'sp. + ba.' as Dawe) with εἰς. And indeed εἰς is the older reading (ἐς only GRAUY).

**1214–17** πῶς ἂν εἰσίδουμί σ' ἄθλιός γ' ἀνὴρ,  
 ὅς γε σὰν λιπῶν ἱερὰν  
 λιβάδ' ἔβαν ἐχθροῖς Δαναοῖς  
 ἀρωγός; ἔτ' οὐδὲν εἰμί. 1215

1214 πῶς σ' ἂν εἰσίδουμί Wilamowitz 1216 ἔβαν ἐχθροῖς Buijs: ἐχ- ἔβ- codd.

LJ-W surprisingly accept Dindorf's πῶς ἂν εἰσίδουμί | ἄθλιός σ' ἀνὴρ.<sup>66</sup> For the purpose of obtaining two hypodochmiacs (plausible, cf. on *El.* 1273–7 above)

<sup>64</sup> The MSS have . . . ἔμυσσας 'Οδυσσεύς in 1139, but it is generally accepted that the name is an intrusive gloss. For the colon . . . : – – – – –, cf. *Sept.* 325/337, *Anacr.* fr. 1.3, etc. (p. 82 above with n. 23).

<sup>65</sup> I do not understand Dawe's notation 'chor. dim. A' (after Dale). Webster's gloss on that ('but in this context like an anaclastic anacreontic') likewise has little contact with reality.

<sup>66</sup> Inconsistently with their note on 1213–17 in *Sophoclea*, which implies acceptance of the paradosis here against metrical changes which disturb the transmitted combination of 'iambic, ionic and dactylic metre . . . typical of late S'.

Wilamowitz's transposition is simpler and otherwise better (*GV* 406, n. 2). But there is nothing certainly wrong with the transmitted  $\lambda ia$  verse (accepted by most editors), followed by *wil* | *wil* | *hag* |||. We do, however, need Buijs's transposition in 1216.<sup>67</sup> The vulgate *wil* beginning  $\sim \bar{x} - \sim \dots$  is of a form not recognized by Itsumi.<sup>68</sup>

OEDIPUS AT COLONUS<sup>69</sup>

117–20

ΧΟΡΟΣ

† ὄρα· † τίς ἄρ' ἦν; ποῦ ναίει;  
 ποῦ κυρεῖ ἐκτόπιος συθεῖς  
 ὁ πάντων ὁ πάντων ἀκορέστατος; 120

~149–52

Χο.

† εἴ· † ἀλαῶν ὀμμάτων 150  
 ἄρα καὶ ἦσθα φυτάλμιος;  
 δυσαίων μακραίων θ', ὅς' ἐπεικάσαι·

The metre of 117–18/149–50 is anomalous, whether taken as a single verse or as  $\sim -$  (exclam.) |  $\sim - - - \sim -$ .<sup>70</sup> At the same time  $\sim - : \sim - - : \sim - -$  is suggestively like the stanza-opening verse  $\sim - : \sim - - - : \sim - -$  at *Ion* 676 ὀρῶ δάκρυα καὶ πενθίμους ~ 695 φίλοι, πότερ' ἐμῷ δεσποῖναι (δ~δ, there followed by 2δ).<sup>71</sup> Suspicion is justified, the more so as εἴ· εἴ in 149 is variously uncertain, not only as a metrical chameleon. 149 follows the first intimation to the chorus that the alarming, intruding πρέσβυς is *blind*; and an exclamation expressing surprise and further superstitious aversion (cf. 143 Ζεῦ ἀλεξήτορ) would be more to the point than a grieving 'alas!'<sup>72</sup> εἴ· εἴ here (cf. *P.V.* 687 εἴ· εἴ, ἄπεχε φεῦ) would correspond nicely with a doubled ὄρα in 117, otherwise likely in line with *Eum.* 255 ὄρα ὄρα μάλ' αὖ· λεύσσε τό<πο>ν (West) πάνται. Haplography is common, especially of exclamations, and εἴ· would reduce easily to ε before ἀλαων.

We then have  $\sim - - - - -$ . Unusual, but cf. *Sept.* 935 ἔριδι μαινομένοι ~ 949 ὑπὸ δὲ σώμασι γᾶς, *Su.* 350 ἔδε με τὰν ἰκέτιν ~ 361 σὺ δὲ παρ' ὀφρυγόνου, *Eum.* 837 = 870 ἐμὲ παθεῖν τάδε, φεῦ, *Ar. Av.* 426–9 (and *CS* II, 57 on *Aj.* 604–8/617–20).

Be that as it may, this agitated choral entry is certainly in the first instance dochmiac in character, and 119–20/151–2 should be redivided as above.<sup>73</sup> The colon  $\sim - - - \sim - - \times -$ , rhythmically akin to  $\sim - - - \times -$ , is frequently associated with

<sup>67</sup> J. A. J. M. Buijs, *Mnemos.* 39 (1986), 68. Buijs would also, much less convincingly, write -οιμι τάλας in place of -οιμ' ἄθλιός γ' ἀνὴρ (thus obtaining another *wil*).

<sup>68</sup> K. Itsumi, *CQ* 32 (1982), 63ff. *I.T.* 1120 and *Hel.* 1314 are corrupt. In the former read σύντροφος ὦι (post Lenting, Madvig) | μεταβάλλει (for -βάλλει) δυσδαιμονία.

<sup>69</sup> Add references in *CS* I to *O.C.* 668/681 (73), 701/714 (n. 49), 1079 (n. 59), 1225 (72), 1559/1571 (n. 89), 1682/1709 (81); in *CS* II to 120/152 (55), 123/155 (55), 228–9 (n. 68), 510ff./521ff. (n. 90), 684 (69), 701/714 (n. 29), 1076/1087 (n. 58), 1077 (62), 1078 (80), 1239–48 (54), 1485 (51), 1683 (56), 1685/1712 (61).

<sup>70</sup>  $\sim - - - \sim -$  occurs thrice at *Inachus* fr. 269c. 27–9, but that scarcely affords a sufficient precedent for  $\sim - | \sim - - - \sim -$  here (without confirmation by repetition), at the beginning of a Parodos.

<sup>71</sup> For the notation δ~δ, cf. nn. 21 and 52 above.

<sup>72</sup> The question framed by ἀλαῶν ὀμμάτων . . . φυτάλμιος; is simply 'So are you also *blind*?' ἦσθα, like ἦν 118, is virtually equivalent to a present tense (cf. Kühner–Gerth i.146). 'To be φυτάλμιος (nurturing) of ἀλαὰ ὀμματα' is equivalent to ἀ· ὄ· τρέφειν (cf. *LSJ* τρέφω II.6), with no necessary implication of blindness *from birth*.

<sup>73</sup> Ancient lineators habitually divided before/after apparent iambic dimeters and glyconics: cf. *CS* I, n. 77, also *CQ* 39 (1989), 49 (etc.) on such errors in dochmiac context in the *Helen* Duo.

dochmiacs (already at *Sept.* 205/213, 222/229).<sup>74</sup> Then 120/152 is another instance of 2δ with the overlap . . . : ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, as *Phil.* 854, etc. (q.v.). There is indeed metrical ambivalence, but not such as to favour, even as an alternative, the traditional division after ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ giving a contextually less likely elegiambus and a misplaced period-end (pendent close before single short) without sense-pause in either stanza.<sup>75</sup> The ambivalence is rather in the verses as above: ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (recurring at 208, q.v.) is also a late-style glyconic (~gl);<sup>76</sup> and the same ~ ~ ~ : ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ recurs immediately and with similar patterning at 123–4 *πλανάτας πλανάτας τις ὁ πρέσβυς, οὐδ'* . . . and 130–1 *ἀδέρκτως, ἀφώνως, ἀλόγως τὸ τὰς* . . . (~155–6, 162–3), but in a different guise as *ba* : ~gl, like *Aj.* 1205–6 (~1216–17) *ἐρώτων δ' ἐρώτων ἀπέπασεν, ὦ-μοι* . . . All these are synartete with following glyconics (125–7/157–9, 132/163, *Aj.* 1207/1218); the second is also synartete (with elision in str.) with a preceding pair of ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ cola (128–9/160–1; another ambivalent feature).

121–2                    †λεύσ(σ)ατ' αὐτόν† προσδέρκου  
                              προσπεύθου πανταχᾶι·

~153–4                ἀλλ' οὐ μὰν ἔν γ' ἔμοι  
                              προσθήσεις τάσδ' ἀράς·

121 *λεύσατ'* pler. (-σατ' AUY), *λεύσσειτ'* ZnZoT *προσδέρκου*, *λεύσσε* δὴ Jebb  
122 *προσπεύθου*] *προσφθέγγου* AUY *πανταχᾶι* Dawe: -χήι codd. 153 *ἐν γ'*  
*ἡμῖν* Tr

Jebb rightly argued that 'the singular *λεύσσε* must be restored and placed *after* *προσδέρκου*', as a step towards obtaining --- : ~ ~ ~ | --- : ~ ~ ~ in both stanzas.<sup>77</sup> At the same time conjectures giving the sense 'Behold him!' cannot be right.<sup>78</sup> But the δὴ in Jebb's conjecture is weak. *προσδέρχου*, *λεύσσε* *πᾶς*· would pair better with *προσπεύθου* (v.l. *προσφθέγγου*) *πανταχᾶι*.<sup>79</sup> The general command is for *thorough* search using both *eyes* and *voice*. *προσφθέγγου* could well be an ancient variant, clarifying the 'voice' point.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>74</sup> 'Ibycean', cf. K. Itsumi, *BICS* 38 (1991–3), 251; a feature of 'enoplian dochmiacs', probably favoured in dochmiac context for its kinship with ~ ~ ~ × ~.

<sup>75</sup> It is a subterfuge to supply a pause by writing a comma after the first ὁ πάντων.

<sup>76</sup> ~gl, as *I.T.* 1092, *Pho.* 208, etc. (K. Itsumi, *CQ* 34 [1984], 71ff.). *Cho.* 315–23/332–9 already associates ibycean (n. 74 above) with glyconics. See further on 208 below.

<sup>77</sup> Less probably *mol* : *mol* twice, with ἔν γ' ἡμῖν (Tr) for ἔν γ' ἔμοι in 153. Such pairs of identical cola are common in Soph. (as *Phil.* 835–6/850–1), cf. *CS* I, 67. Either *mol* : *cr* or *mol* : *mol* will be 'sub-dochmiac'; cf. on 1560/1571 below with n. 126.

<sup>78</sup> As Meineke's *λεύσσει* αὐτόν, *προσδρακοῦ* (accepted by Dawe). Schneidewin's *προσδέρκου*, *λεύσσει* νιν (after Hermann) is better, keeping present-tense -δέρκου in line with -πεύθου, but still the wrong sense.

<sup>79</sup> For *πᾶς* thus with singular imperative, cf. *Rhes.* 685 *παῖε* πᾶς, *Ar. Th.* 372 ἄκουε πᾶς. For *λεύσσει* intrans. see LSJ s.v. 2. Confusion of τ and π could have played a part in corruption of *λεύσσει*α to *λεύσσει*ατε (whence *λεύσατε* <αὐτόν>), in a context where 'stone him!' is likely enough to have been favoured sense.

<sup>80</sup> The temptation to throw out †λεύσ(σ)ατ' αὐτόν† in order to accommodate all three *προσ-* verbs should be resisted. *λεύσσει* is much more likely to be authentic (cf. *Eum.* 255 again) than introduced by some process of glossation or interpolation. Corruption in the MSS is evidence of misunderstanding (very possibly in antiquity), not of interpolation. Metre is against three molossus-words, if not decisively; and *prima facie* -φθέγγου and -πεύθου have been transmitted as *variants*, with no significant difference of meaning in this context.

- 133–7            *ιέντες· τὰ δὲ νῦν τιν' ἤκειν*  
                   *λόγος οὐχ ἄζονθ', ὃν ἐγὼ λεύσσω* 135  
                   *περὶ πᾶν οὐπω δύναμαι τέμενος*  
                   *γνώναι ποῦ μοί ποτε ναίει.*
- 165–9            *κλύεις, ὦ πολύμοχθ' ἀλάτα;* 165  
                   *λόγον εἴ γ' οἴσεις πρὸς ἑμὲν λέσχαν,*  
                   *ἀβάτων ἀποβάς, ἵνα πᾶσι νόμος,*  
                   *φῶναι· πρόσθεν δ' ἀπερύκου.*

134 οὐχ Brunck: οὐδὲν codd. (quocum ἄγοντ' Tr) 166 γ'] τιν' codd.  
 οἴσεις L<sup>5</sup>QR: ἔχεις cett.

The long strophe ends with anapaests (2an | 2an | 2an<sup>+</sup>), recognizably lyric only in the Doric vocalization at 166, following the pendent close of a hipponactean (syntactically self-contained in ant.).<sup>81</sup> For this satisfactory colometry we need Brunck's neglected οὐχ for οὐδὲν in 134 (better than the Triclinian οὐδὲν ἄγοντ', accepted by Dawe, or Blaydes's οὐκ ἀλέγοντ'). Without such a change the anapaests begin later following an anomalous colon - - - - - (neither clausular, since ending with elision in str., nor following in synaphea, since preceded by *brevis in longo* in ant.).<sup>82</sup> The wrong οὐδὲν is doubtless due to a mistaken desire to give ἄζοντα an object—needed only if τα δὲ νῦν is taken as equivalent to (τα)νῦν δέ. There is no parallel for such splitting of τανῦν. Rather, the sense here is: 'but *these sanctities* (τὰ δέ) there is now a report that someone has come not honouring'.

τιν' οἴσεις in 166 will then have to give place to τιν' ἔχεις (so Dawe); unless, as I strongly suspect, ἔχεις came in as a consequence of corruption of εἴ γ' to εἴ τιν'. λόγον εἴ γ' οἴσεις corresponds exactly with λόγος οὐχ ἄζονθ'. For εἴ γε *si quidem*, cf. GP 142.

- 208–11            *Οι. ὦ ξέν', ἀπόπολις· ἀλλὰ μὴ . . .*  
                   *Χο. τί τόδ' ἀπενέπεις, γέρον;*  
                   *Οι. μὴ μ<αν> ἀνέρμι τίς εἰμί,* 210  
                   *μηδ' ἐξετάσης πέρα ματεύων.*

208 ξέν'] ξένοι codd. 210 μὴ μ<αν>] μὴ μ' QR, μὴ μὴ μ' cett.;  
 μὴ μὴ μ' Hartung

It is certainly to the Coryphaeus that the notation Χο. refers throughout the preceding *amoibaion* 176–87/192–206. He it is, with quasi-magisterial authority, who gives the promise in 176–7; and he it must be whom Oedipus continues here to address in ἀλλὰ μὴ . . . ἀνέρμι . . . ἐξετάσης κτλ. with singular verbs. Metrical considerations confirm the proposed (apparently new) correction of ξένοι to ξέν' in 208.<sup>83</sup> The MSS'

<sup>81</sup> The period-end before *ιέντες* is acceptable; but Meineke's *τιθέντες* could be right.

<sup>82</sup> The common use of the colon . . . : - - - - - is of course as an iono-choriambic clausula, as at 1723 *δυσάλωτος οὐδεὶς* |||, Ag. 204 *δάκρυ μὴ κατασχεῖν* ||| (etc.); often (optionally) lineated with word-overlap (. . . / - : - - - - -). So far as I am aware this is its *only* use as a colon in the lyrics of tragedy.

<sup>83</sup> Singular vocatives from actor to Χο. are 'exceptional' (M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the Light of the Person and Number Used* [Helsinki, 1970], 231), but certainly occur at 465 and 530 in this play, also O.T. 1321, all similarly on the lips of blind Oedipus; cf. also Oed.'s



ὦ ξένοι, ἀπόπολις . . . gives  $\overline{\times} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ , unlikely as  $\times gl$  and with impossible correption (admitted in aeolic verses only in the double-short part of the verse).<sup>84</sup> The vulgate ὦ ξένοι, ἀπόπολις . . . (Wilamowitz) gives an iambic dimeter, with the correption still unacceptable.<sup>85</sup> With the proposed ὦ ξέν', ἄποπτολῖς . . . we straightforwardly have  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  again (cf. on 119/151 above with nn. 74 and 76), here inceptive as at *Cho.* 315/332, *Alc.* 244/248, with no need even to consider altering the transmitted ἀπόπολις. ξένοι will be simply a misinterpretation of the elision ξέν(ε). It should not be argued that ὦ ξένοι is protected by Antigone's ὦ ξένοι at 237. That could indeed have played a part in the error. But, whereas it is appropriate for Antigone to address her appeal to a crowd, it is proper that here the blind Oedipus, in more personal contact with an individual, should specifically address the Chorus-leader with '(I am) stateless), *sir*' in reply to the latter's interrogation. It is no refutation that Oedipus explicitly addresses the whole chorus at 220 (ἴστε . . .) when he reluctantly begins to reveal his identity. Singular address is particular apt here for an *impassioned entreaty*,<sup>86</sup> possibly with the bodily contact of supplication. At the same time it must be conceded, in the light of 174–5 ὦ ξένοι, μὴ δῆθ' ἀδικηθῶ, | σοὶ πιστεύσας, μεταναστάς, that the shift of number is not impossible in itself.

For the proposed μὴ μ<άν> ἀνέρι in 210, rather than the vulgate μὴ μὴ μ' ἀνέρι (Hartung), cf. *CS* II, 51 on *Aj.* 190 (μὴ μ<άν>, ἄναξ . . .).

**216, 218, 220, 222.** As things stand, these are all  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  :  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ <sup>87</sup> except 220:

*Oi.* Λαῖον ἴστε τιν' ἀπόγονον;  
*Xo.* ὦ ὦ, ἰού.

LJ-W, like Hermann in his first edition, accept Reisig's excision of ἀπόγονον, with the exclamations then expanded to ὦ· ἰὸν ἰού (the doubled ἰού already Triclinian). Pearson changed ἀπό- to ἔκ- and threw out ὦ ὦ (losing the word-end after  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ ). Stinton (13) rightly pointed out that ἀπόγονον (recurring at 534) is not a glossator's word. Elmsley was the first (with <οῦν>) to propose gaining a long syllable between τιν' and ἀπόγονον.<sup>88</sup> Hermann in his second edition preferred *Xo.* <ὦ> *Oi.* ἀπόγονον.<sup>89</sup> Dawe accepts Dindorf's <ὄντ'> ἀπόγονον. Where ἀπόγονον is kept, the exclamations ὦ ὦ, ἰού (s.v.l.) will of course be a separate short verse or extra-metric (like *El.* 840). As a further refinement (after Hermann<sup>2</sup>), it may be observed that to write *Oi.* Λαῖον ἴστε τιν' . . . *Xo.* ἃ *Oi.* ἀπόγονον . . . would scarcely even count as an emendation; cf. my similar proposal (after Biehl) at *Or.* 182. For ἃ thus interrupting (with an elision), cf. also *Herc.* 1052.

ῥῆσις at 258ff. in which the 2nd pers. sing. is used from 282 onwards (then plural address at 296 and 299 in the following dialogue; Kaimio, 217, misstates that).

<sup>84</sup>  $\times gl$  occurs elsewhere in Sophocles only at *Phil.* 141/156 (without resolution). ὦ ξένοι, ἀπόπολις . . . would locate the correption in a choriamb, but  $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$  (– *chia*) is scarcely more likely.

<sup>85</sup> Sophocles has correption quite frequently in dochmiacs (*CS* II, n. 18) and occasionally in sub-dochmiac *ia sp* verses (*Trac.* 846–7, *Phil.* 851); not otherwise in lyric iambs (likewise Aesch. and Eur.), except for the exclamation ὦ πόποι at *O.T.* 167.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. *Phil.* 1181 (Kaimio [n. 83 above], 230)

<sup>87</sup> A verse questionably associated by Stinton (11ff.) with the verse 2da : *ia* at *Hipp.* 1108/1117 and elsewhere. The long seventh syllable can scarcely be an anceps here.

<sup>88</sup> Jebb should not simply have dismissed ἀπόγονον as 'against the metre'.

<sup>89</sup> Wecklein accepted this <ὦ>, but weakly continued it to Oedipus.

228-36 Χο. οὐδενὶ μοιριδίᾳ τίσις ἔρχεται  
 ὦν προπάθῃ τὸ τίνειν·  
 ἀπάτα δ' ἀπάταις 230  
 ἑτέραις ἑτέρα παραβαλλομένα  
 πόνον, οὐ χάριν, ἀντιδίδωσιν ἔχειν·  
 σὺ δὲ τῶνδ' ἐδράνων  
 <ἔμ>παλιν ἔκτοπος αὐθις ἄφορμος ἐ-  
 μᾶς χθονὸς ἔκθορε, μή τι πέρα χρέος 235  
 ἐμᾶι πόλει προσάψῃς.

The usual colometry imposes a dactylic strait-jacket, with  $\omega\tilde{\nu}$   $\pi\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\mu\iota$  . . .  $\epsilon\tilde{\chi}\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$  as an extraordinary run of four  $4da$  verses (framed between  $4da$  verses) with three consecutive word-overlaps, the sequence as a whole in conflict with the punctuation. This is particularly unacceptable in non-strophic verse, where metre and rhetoric should go hand in hand. Period-end at  $\epsilon\tilde{\chi}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  should be regarded as certain, following a sequence beginning with the common  $D : \text{---} : D$  (as *Aj.* 172–3/182–3, *O.T.* 155–6/163–4), already ambivalent ( $4da : D = D : A$ ) and with a clear shift to anapaestic cola as in *Pho.* 1489–50 (. . .  $D : an : A : A$ ) and *Hypsipyle* 68–74D.<sup>90</sup> We then need an extra syllable somewhere to obtain dactyls ( $4da + 4da$ ) running up to the standard  $2ia$  clausula.<sup>91</sup> The proposed  $\langle\epsilon\tilde{\mu}\rangle\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu$  (*El.* 647, etc.) is easy,  $\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\nu\omega\nu$   $\epsilon\mu\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu$  corrupting easily to  $\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\nu\omega\mu$  (*sic*)  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\iota\nu$  with apparent dactylic continuity.

237-40      *Αν.*    ὦ ξένοι αἰδοφρόνες,  
           †ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ γεραὸν ἀλαὸν πατέρα†  
           τόνδ' ἐμὸν οὐκ ἀνέτλατ' ἔργων  
           ἀκόντων αἰῶντες αὐδάν . . .

ἀλαόν in 238 is omitted by L<sup>ac</sup>AUY and commonly deleted. But the verse thus trimmed as — — — — — is a surprising glyconic in this enoplian context (between *D* and *D* — — | *D* *ba*),<sup>92</sup> the more so as Sophocles does not elsewhere resolve the last syllable of *gl. Prima facie*, ἀλαόν is too good to be attributed to an interpolator, the combination with γεραόν enhancing the appeal; and loss of ἀλαόν in part of the tradition is easily explained as a skip due to homoeoteleuton. If instead ἀλλ' is false (as often, e.g. *Phil.* 1203 [ἀλλ'] ὦ ξένοι codd., corr. Erfurdt),<sup>93</sup> it is easy to obtain a *2ia* verse: γεραόν ἀλαόν ἐπεί πατέρα,<sup>94</sup> with the adjectives appropriately brought forward for emphasis. For ἀκόντων (not ἀκ-) in 240, cf. West, *AT* xxx.

<sup>90</sup> The verses can indeed be variously divided and/or indented. The above colometry makes a feature of the shorter *an* cola that symmetrically follow the two sentence-divisions. The first metrical shift exploits the frequent *D* : ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (cf. *Aj.* 224-5/248-9; *CS* II, 54).

<sup>91</sup> The eight dactyls might equally well be divided as  $2da : 6da$  or  $6da : 2da$ , cf. the sequence  $6da (2da : 2da : 2da) \parallel 4da \parallel 2da$  at 1673–6 below (for the ending ...  $[2da] 2ia$ , thus, cf. on *Phil.* 862–4 above with n. 56; for  $6da$  before the iambs cf. *El.* 133–4/145–6). But we can accept one word-overlap, in order to end with the favourite  $4da : 2ia$ , like 676–7/689–90, 1675–6, *El.* 211–12/231–2, *Phil.* 142–3/157–8, 1093–4/1114–15, 1097–8/1119–20 (cf. also  $4da : 3ia$  at 252–3, 540–1/547–8, and 1671–2 below). For the penultimate  $8da$  run thus, cf. *Ba.* 163–5.

<sup>92</sup>  $-\cdot-\cdot-\cdot-\cdot-\cdot-$  may be either a contraction of  $D^2$  or a dragged form of  $-\cdot-\cdot-\cdot-\cdot-\cdot-$ .

<sup>93</sup> Cf. J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), 103. But *El.* 1239 is probably not an instance (n. 24 above).

<sup>94</sup> For the resolved *πατέρα* at verse-end before change of metre, cf. exactly *Tro.* 565–6 *νεανίδων στέφανον ἔφερεν* | *Ἑλλάδι κουροτρόφον* (and Diggle, *Euripidea* 398, n. 122).

**241–53.** 237–40 (above) are a prooimion to Antigone's appeal. From 241 onwards, with only three exceptions, all her verses are dactylic tetrameters, taking further the runs of such verses at *El.* 130ff./146ff. The first two exceptions are at 242 and 249, in both of which we are offered a surprising choriamb + cretic, with limping effect. (i) **241–2** ἀλλ' ἐμὲ τὰν μελέαν, ἰκετεύομεν, ὦ ξένοι, οἴκτειράθ'. ἀ | . . . easily becomes another *D* : - - - - : *D* (as 228–9) with Brunck's οἴκτις- for οἴκτ(ε)ίρ-.<sup>95</sup> (ii) At **248–9** κείμεθα τλάμονες· ἀλλ' ἴτε, νεύσατε ἰ τὰν ἀδόκητον χάριν we can obtain the same again by writing τάνδ' ἀδόκητα χάριν.<sup>96</sup> (iii) The conclusion **252–3** has an unacceptable hiatus:

οὐ γὰρ ἴδοις ἄν ἀθρῶν βροτὸν ὅστις ἄν  
εἰ θεὸς ἄγοι † ἐκφυγεῖν δύναιτο.

LJ-W attempt to evade that by lineating εἰ θεὸς ἄγοι as a separate short verse between commas. Triclinius *more suo* inserted a γε. Dawe, after Elmsley (<νιν>), supplies a pronoun (<σφ'>).<sup>97</sup> But the supplement we want is <κάκ'> (κακεκ easily reducing to κακ with εκ suprascribed). The sense is then similar to *El.* 696–7 ὅταν δέ τις θεῶν | βλάπτῃ, δύναιτ' ἄν οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχύων φυγεῖν and *Phaedra*, fr. 680.1–2 αἵσχη μέν, ὦ γυναῖκες, οὐδ' ἄν εἰς φύγοι | βροτῶν ποθ', ὦι καὶ Ζεὺς ἐφορμάσῃ κακά. For the unsynopated *3ia* verse thus following the dactyls, cf. 541/548 below; here – - - - . . . like *El.* 163/(183), etc.

Not mentioned so far is the corruption in **243** πατρὸς ὑπὲρ † τοῦ μόνου† ἄντομαι, where metre requires three dactyls. Dawe's τοῦμοῦ <- - - > does not lead anywhere, and gives too much weight to a variant (QR+) which is more likely to be a guess (or simply lipographic) than a survival of truth. Hense's τοῦ <τλά>μονος, accepted by LJ-W, is a makeshift, no more or less likely than τοῦ <δυσ>μόρου (Meineke) or τοῦ <δυσ>πόνου. All postulate the loss of three letters (for no obvious reason) and alteration of a fourth. τοῦ ἀμηχάνου ('helpless') would account better for τουμ- while keeping -νου.

**512** ὅμως δ' ἔραμαί <τι> πνθέσθαι . . .

~523 τούτων δ' αὐθαίρετον οὐδέν.

The irregular responson of - - - - - (hag) with - - - - - (hag" = *paroem*) is tolerated by LJ-W, with an appeal to West, *GM* 117. But there is no sufficient support there.<sup>98</sup> Meineke's easy <τι> πνθέσθαι should surely be accepted, restoring

<sup>95</sup> It should not be argued that present imperative is better. The aorist here on Antigone's lips is in line with 243–7 ἄντομαι . . . αἰδοῦς κύρσαι and 248 νεύσατ', and cf. *O.T.* 1508 ἀλλ' οἴκτισόν σφας. According to Speake's collations the MSS in fact have οἴκτειρ-, not οἴκτιρ- as implied by editors *ex silentio*; but that does not greatly affect the issue.

<sup>96</sup> τάνδ' is likely enough in itself (Δ lost before ΑΔ). For adverbial ἀδόκητα, cf. *Pho.* 311 (like ἀνόνητα, *Hec.* 766 etc.).

<sup>97</sup> Jebb's parallels cannot be said to confirm the personal object. At *Ant.* 623–4 the extra words φρένας . . . πρὸς ἅταν make a big difference.

<sup>98</sup> The alleged parallels in *GM* 117 are: *E. El.* 116/131 (irrelevant, as an instance rather of the frequent *gl ~ wil*; at 116 Diggle accepts Hermann's καὶ μ' ἔτικτε, but I venture to prefer καὶ τίκτει με); *E. Su.* 1000/1023 in a variously corrupt context; *Hel.* 1481/1498, where Diggle rightly accepts ὁμβρον χεμέριον λιπούσαι (Hermann) ~ λαμπρῶν ἀστέρων ὑπ' ἀέλλαις (Fritzsche); *Trac.* 960/969, where θανόντα in 969 has been emended to θάνατον by Bothe, to φθίμενον by Hermann (see Jebb). In any case none of these has hag in responson with - - - - -.

534-5 Χο. †σαι τ'† εἶς' ἄρ' ἀπόγονοί τε καί...  
Οι. κοιναί γε πατρὸς ἀδελφεαί.

<b>668-80</b> (~681-93)	εὐίππου, ξένε, τᾶσδε χώρας, ἴκου τὰ κράτιστα γᾶς ἔπαυλα, τὸν ἀργῆτα Κολωνόν, εὖθ'	670
	ἃ λίγεια μινύρεται θαμίζουσα μάλιστ' ἀηδὼν χλωραῖς ὑπὸ βάσσαις, τὸν οἰνωπὸν ἔχουσα κισσὸν	675
	καὶ τὰν ἄβατον θεοῦ φυλλάδα μυριόκαρπον ἀνήλιον ἀνήνεμόν τε πάντων χειμῶνων· ἵν' ὁ βακχιώτας	
	ἄει Διόνυσος ἐμβατεύει †θείαις† ἀμφιπολὼν τιθήναις·	680

This famous stanza is formed of six verse-pairs (dicola) and a further verse.<sup>101</sup> The four verse-pairs from 670 to 677 (~683–90) are  $\bar{g}l | g | l | l | \bar{g}l | ph (\bar{h}i : rz) | l | \bar{g}l | g | l | (\bar{h}i : t) | l | 4da : 2ia_-( | l |$ .<sup>102</sup> Then 678–9 (~691–2) is metrically the same as the opening 668–9 (~681–2);<sup>103</sup> a sequence overlappable indeed as  $gl | g | l | ba$ , but no less properly lineated in its natural cola (delimited by word-end) as  $hi$  (a recurrent

<sup>100</sup> Jebb was only at fault, *pace* LJ-W, in retaining  $\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau'$ . For the metre, there is no good reason for preferring  $\sigma\alpha\iota\ \gamma'\ \delta\rho'\ \dot{\alpha}\rho\acute{o}\gamma\omega\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau'\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota$  (or  $\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\rho'$  . . . as Bothe), which gives at once less exact responson and the ugly rhythm . . .  $\bar{x} : - -$  (combining long anceps following resolution with the cut . . .  $\bar{x} : - -$ ).

<sup>101</sup> The metrical scheme is discussed by L. P. E. Parker in *The Songs of Aristophanes* (Oxford, 1997), 25, with an analysis as four periods (2 cola + 4 + 4 + 3). 670–3/683–6 might indeed be better termed a tetracolon; at the same time the anacalasis in 672, as also in 670 and 674, suggests another metrical inception (cf. CS I, n. 6). The syntax overlap at 677–8 emphasizes *χειμώνων* (cf. CO 42 [1992], 43). Parker is surely wrong in her division of 679–80/692–3 (n. 103 below).

<sup>102</sup> Stinton (353) was doubtless right to scan  $\delta \tau \epsilon \iota$  |  $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  at 684–5, a lengthening reminiscent of Pindar's  $\delta \delta \epsilon \iota$  |  $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  in *Ol.* 1.1, similarly at the end of an anaclastic glyconic. The period-end with *brevis in longo* and hiatus at 688 ἀλλ' | αἰὲν ἐπ' ἄματι || ὀκνύτοκος is at a change of metre before the favourite *4da* : *2ia.* (nn. 7, 56, 91 above; a sequence whose frequency belies Parker's reference to it as 'in defiance of normal practice in Greek metre').

<sup>103</sup> Parker surprisingly divides 679–80 at ἐμβατεύ-λει θεαῖς . . . (with οὐδ' | ἄ χρισ- in ant.), against the pattern of the stanza and offering no parallel for the penultimate length *gl* - - (no

length) : *tl ba*.<sup>104</sup> Whether 680/693 is a separate period may depend on what we read. Period-end is of course given by hiatus in ant. if οὐδ' αὖ || á is accepted there (see below). Period-end would also be given by 'anceps following pendent close' (Stinton 326), if *θείαις* were emended to monosyllabic *θεαῖς*, as by Elmsley (preferably then with L's οὐδ' αὖ || χρυσάνιος in 692–3, accepted by Dawe). Arguably period-end is to be expected after the compound *gl ba* (or *tl ba*), as at 669 where there is both *brevis in longo* and sense-pause. But there is no sense-pause after either 679 or 692, and cf. the terminal rhythm at *Alc.* 993–4 (~1004–5) γενναιοτάταν δὲ πασᾶν || ἐξεύξω κλισίαις ἄκοιτιν.

LJ-W are doubtless right, after Wilamowitz, in rejecting *θεαῖς* on grounds of sense,<sup>105</sup> and in accepting á χρυσάνιος Ἀφροδίτα in the corresponding verse (see further below). But it does not follow that, if *θεαῖς* is wrong, 'we must read *θείαις*'. *θείαις* too is questionable. As applied (exceptionally) to a person, *θεῖος* elevates him from his actual humanity to a kind of 'divinity', whether as herald, bard, or king (LSJ s.v. 2 and 3). It is not applied to persons who actually are divine or semi-divine (heroes, nymphs), nor do we find it used to describe the (temporary) elevated status of bacchanals. We might perhaps have to accept *θείαις* if nothing better were on offer; but the neglected conjecture *Θυῖαις* (or *θυῖαις*) is surely the truth: cf. *Ant.* 1149–52 προφάνηθ', || ὦναξ, σαῖς ἄμα περιπόλοις || Θυῖᾶσιν (s.v.l.), αἷ σε μαινόμεναι πάννυχον | χορεύουσι τὸν ταμίαν Ἰτακχον. If *θυῖαις* had been transmitted, it would have been accepted here without question, though at the same time calling for an explanation. As things stand we are left wondering what the Διωνύσοιο τιθῆναι are doing at Colonus rather than on Mount Nysa where they belong (*Il.* 6.133, etc.). With *Θυῖαις/θυῖαις* (the same dilemma as *Βάκχαις/βάκχαις*) an identity is wittily suggested between those archetypal companions of the god and the 'Thyiad' maenads familiar in Attic Dionysiac cult.<sup>106</sup>

### 691–3

(~678–80)

στερνούχου χθονός· οὐδὲ Μουσᾶν  
χοροί νιν ἀπεστύγησαν, οὐδ' †αὐ†  
á χρυσάνιος Ἀφροδίτα.

692–3 οὐδ' αὖ á Tr: οὐδ' á L, οὐδ' á KQR+, οὐδὲ AUΥ; fort. οὐδ' <οὐν> | á

οὐδ' αὖ || χρυσάνιος (as Dawe), οὐδ' á || χρυσ- (as Jebb) and οὐδὲ || χρυσ- all give period-end (pendent close before anceps), unacceptable both as unnatural period-divisions (especially that after á) and as requiring the improbable *θεαῖς* in 680 (see above). At the same time á χρυσάνιος Ἀφροδίτα gives a surely authentic concluding

secure parallel exists, cf. K. Itsumi, *CQ* 34 [1984], 78–9, and my discussion of S. *El.* 137–9 in *CQ* 47 [1997], 299–300; moreover *θεαῖς* is unlikely (n. 105 below).

<sup>104</sup> The symmetry is such that the first syllable of ἴκου in 669 is probably short, cf. ἰκόμαν at *Hypsipyle* 265D. On my lineation without dovetailing overlaps but with indentation to show continuity, cf. *CS* I, 73 with n. 37.

<sup>105</sup> Wilamowitz argued that these attendants of Dionysus are unlikely to have been called *θεαῖς*, since they needed Medea's arts to rejuvenate them. The *τίθηναι* in *Il.* 6.128–41 are doubtless thought of as Nymphs (as in *Hom. Hy.* 26.3), but are associated with, rather than included in, the θεοὶ ἐπουράνιοι with whom Lycurgus vied.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (London, 1960), 178. The form *Θυῖαι* = *Θυιάδες* is attested in Strabo (10.3.10) and certainly restorable at *Ant.* 1151, whether *Θυιάσιν* (codd.) is corrected to *Θυῖᾶσιν* (Holford-Strevens, LJ-W) or *Θυῖαισιν* (Boeckh).

hipponactean (now in responsion with *Θυίαις ἀμφιπολῶν τιθήναις*); for the definite article in such a phrase, cf. 706 *χὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθάνα*, *Trac.* 208–9 *τὸν εὐφάρετραν Ἀπόλλω*, *Phil.* 188–9 *ἃ δ' ἀθυρόστομος Ἀχῴ*, *I.A.* 548 *ὁ χρυσοκόμας Ἔρως*, etc.

Stinton (338, 353) felt able to accept *οὐδ' αὖ* || *ἃ* as a 'period-end without pause'. But the hiatus is obviously unwelcome, and *αὖ* otherwise doubtful.<sup>107</sup> LJ-W print their conjecture *αὖθ'* as 'the neatest way of avoiding' the period-end. But *αὖτε* is unlikely in itself,<sup>108</sup> and the elision at pendent verse-end insupportable.<sup>109</sup> Since *οὐδ' αὖ ἃ* is attested only by Triclinius, very possibly generated by conflation of the variants *οὐδ' ἃ* and *οὐδ' αὖ* (either of which could be the parent of AUY's *οὐδέ*), we might legitimately visualize an archetypal *οὐδ' <οὐν> | ἃ*, anciently telescoped by lipographic omission of *OYN* after *OYΔ*.<sup>110</sup> Both *οὐδ' οὐν* (*GP* 420 'nor in fact') and the similar *οὔτ' οὐν* (*GP* 510 'nor for that matter') are uncommon, but the force of the particle is appropriate here to this conjunction of *Μουσᾶν χοροί* and 'Aphrodite with her golden harness'. This is a place eschewed neither by *poets* nor (for that matter) by *courting couples*. There is thus rhetorical point, not without a delicate touch of humour, in the conclusion of both stanzas.

703–6                      *συνναίων ἀλιώσει χερὶ πέρσας,*  
                               †ὁ γὰρ εἰς† αἰὲν ὄρων κύκλος  
                               *λεύσει νιν Μορίου Διὸς*  
                               *χὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθάνα.*

705

~716–19                *ἃ δ' εὐήρετμος ἔκπαγλ' ἀλὶ χερσὸν*  
                               †*παραπτομένα† πλάτα*  
                               *θρώισκει τᾶν ἑκατομπόδων*  
                               *Νηρηίδων ἀκόλουθος.*

703 *συνναίων* Blaydes: *σημαίνων* codd. *χερὶ* Heath: *χειρὶ* codd. 704 *εἰς* del. Hermann, *ὁ δ' εἰς* Dawe *εἰσὼν* (om. *αἰέν*) AUY *λεύσει* LKQR 716 *ἀλὶ* (Page) *χερσὸν* Dawe: *ἀλία χερσὶ* codd.

(i) Against Stinton (491–2), *ἀλὶ χερσὸν*, symmetrical with 703 *χερὶ πέρσας*, neatly restores the *ph<sup>c</sup>* = 3*io* verse (n. 19 above), while accounting well for the transmitted *ἀλία χερσὶ*(ν) and giving point to the following *παρα-* ('alongside', not simply 'flies . . . along', as Lloyd-Jones). LJ-W's *ἔκπαγλα χοροῖσιν* also gives *ph<sup>c</sup>*, but otherwise lacks

<sup>107</sup> Jebb argued that *αὖ* 'is somewhat prosaic, and implies a contrast between the deities which is unfitting here'. A slight contrast ('nor on the other hand') is not in fact inappropriate.

<sup>108</sup> *ἃδ' αὖθ' ἔρπει* may be the truth in *Trac.* 1010 (Blaydes proposed *αὖ φέρπει*); but a dactylic hexameter more readily accommodates such an exceptional epicism.

<sup>109</sup> Brunck's *οὐδέ <γ> || ἃ* is no better. Cf. L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* 26 (1976), 23, who cites *Aj.* 632 and *Rhes.* 911 as the only instances in tragedy of elision at the end of a pendent-ending aeolo-choriambic colon. *Aj.* 632 (CS II, 59) in fact exemplifies elision following *D* – or 2*io* within a *D* – *D* – or 4*io* sequence. *Rhes.* 911 *Φρυγίων λεχέων ἔπλευσε πλαθείσ'* is 'enoplian' (*Tba*), not aeolo-choriambic, and the elision at *πλαθείσ'* is akin rather to that at *πίπτοντ'* in *Ant.* 594 (CS I 71). Both of these are open to grave suspicion (period-end being otherwise likely in both places). In *Rhes.* 911 we should, I think, read . . . *πλέουσ' ἐπλάθη*.

<sup>110</sup> The distinction between *οὔτ' οὐν* and *οὐδ' οὐν* is not clearcut, and some attestations of the former have been emended to the latter: *Il.* 2.1147 (Dindorf, La Roche), *S. Ach. Conv.* 17 (Wecklein, prob. Pearson). Under *οὐδ' οὐν* Denniston mentions *O.C.* 1134 *οὐκ ἔγωγέ σε (θέλω θιγέιν μου)*, *οὐδ' οὐν ἔάσω*, *Hdt.* 2.134, *Pl. R.* 492e. The occurrence of *οὐδ' οὐν* elsewhere in *O.C.* is an encouraging feature.

these merits.<sup>111</sup>

(ii) In 717 *παραιομένη* as a past participle (for which one might have expected *-πατήμενα*) is the wrong tense. Stinton's *παραιομένη* is differently the wrong tense. LJ-W write *παραιομένη*, again appealing to Parker for justification of the unacceptable resolution ~ ~ ~ ~ .<sup>112</sup> *παραιομένη* (Meineke, Campbell) is the neglected palmary remedy here: *ἔκπαγλα . . . θρώϊσκει* goes well with a participle emphasizing *speed*; and it is credible that *ις* should have been misread as *π*τ in a context where 'flying' makes sense.

(iii) *παραιομένη* might then correspond with *ὁ δ' αἰὲν ὀρών* or *ὁ δ' εἰς αἰὲν ὀρών*; but ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ is the likeliest scansion. Sophocles has only *ἄϊσσο* elsewhere in lyric (1499, *Trac.* 843); and only *Tro.* 156 and 1086 offer (very doubtful) support for *αἰσσω* in tragedy.<sup>113</sup> So the choice lies between *ὁ γὰρ αἰὲν* (Hermann) and *ὁ δ' ἐς αἰὲν*, giving ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (T) before the concluding *gl | ph*; preferably *ὁ δ' ἐς αἰὲν*, since wrong *γάρ* for *δέ* is likelier than interpolation of *εἰς* (*εἰς-*) before *αἰὲν*.<sup>114</sup>

1081–4                    εἴθ' ἀελλαία ταχύρρωστος πελειὰς  
αἰθερίας νεφέλας κύρσαιμ' †αὐτῶν δ' ἀγώνων†  
αἰωρήσασα τοῦμόν ὄμμα.

A D/e sequence (*e – e – e – | D – ith*), then a concluding syncopated trimeter (probably *ba ith* with the scansion *αἰω-*, cf. *El.* 1058 *οἰωνούς*). LJ-W accept Hermann's remedial but too arbitrary *ἄνωθ'* for *αὐτῶν δ'*. Jebb proposed *ἄνωθεν αὐτῶν*, an improvement in that *ἄνωθεν* is normal, *ἄνωθε* not elsewhere in tragedy. On similar lines *κύρσαιμ' τῶνδ' ἄνωθεν* will account better for *αὐτῶν δ'*. The primary cause of error will have been intrusion of *ἀγώνων* as a gloss.

1085–6                    †ὦ Ζεῦ πάνταρχε θεῶν παντόπτα πόροις†

~1074–5                    ἔρδουσιν ἦ μέλλουσιν; ὥς προμνᾶταί τί μοι

The antistrophe is evidently sound as *2ia + δ*, a common combination. In 1085–6 LJ-W accept Jebb's *ὦ θεῶν πάνταρχε παντόπτα Ζεῦ, πόροις*, after Brunck and Hermann. But Dawe was right in desiderating <πάτερ>, to give *θεῶν* something other than *πάνταρχε* to depend on.<sup>115</sup> It is as *πάνταρχε*, not as *πάνταρχε θεῶν*, that Zeus is invoked. So read

<sup>111</sup> It is also awkward to take *ἀκόλουθος* as governing *χοροῖσι . . . τᾶν . . . Νηρήιδων*, rather than the adjacent *Νηρήιδων*. LJ-W remarkably commend their conjecture as at once 'radical' and 'somewhat less expensive'.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. on *Ant.* 795–800 in CS I, 76 with n. 47. *Ant.* 1141/1150 (glyconic, with resolved antepenult.) should not have been mentioned here as an instance of ~ ~ ~ ~; nor are *Aj.* 606/619 (CS II, 58) or *Ant.* 970 (CS I, 83) convincing instances.

<sup>113</sup> *Tro.* 156 *φόβος αἰσσει* is in anapaests (*τάρβος nol.* Seidler). At *Tro.* 1086 *αἰσσω* (s.v.l.) *πετροῖσι πορεύσει* ~ 1104 *†αἰγαιού† κελαίνοφαές πῦρ*, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ is as likely as ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, perhaps with Schenkl's *Δίον*, or *αἰγλᾶν* (= *αἰγλάειν*). Diggle's *αἰθαλοῦν* is unconvincing, both as an emendation of *αἰγαιου* and for the responson with *αἰσσω*.

<sup>114</sup> As Stinton observed, *ἐς αἰὲν* (*ἐσαιέν*) is like the equally rare *ἐς αἰεῖ* (*ἐσαιεῖ*) at *Eum.* 836, and Hermann's *αἰὲν ὀρών* does not account for *εἰς*. ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (as *Hec.* 905, 910, etc.; cf. CS I, 81, CS II, 70 with n. 59) here follows smoothly after the ionic sequence . . . : ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (a possible contact *without period-end* not contemplated by Stinton).

<sup>115</sup> R. Dawe, *ICS* 19 (1994), 67.

ὦ θεῶν <πάτερ> πάνταρχε παντόπτα Ζεῦ, πόροις . . .

cf. *Cho.* 784 *πάτερ Ζεῦ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων. πάτερ (πρ)* drops out easily before *πα-*. For the routinely common corruption of initial *δ* to *ιώ*, cf. *CS* I, n. 92 and *CS* II, n. 17.

1224-5      μὴ φύναι †τὸν† ἅπαντα νι-  
                     καὶ λόγον, τὸ δ' ἐπεὶ φανῇ  
 βῆναι . . .      1225

Dawe would now accept  $\tau\iota\nu$  for  $\tau\omicron\nu$  in 1224 ( $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$  πάντα after Blaydes's  $\tau\iota\nu'$  ἀπαντα). But, as Professor Easterling has pointed out to me, the parallels by no means support  $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$  in this *topos*; what we want is rather  $\mu\eta$  φῦναι μὲν . . .<sup>116</sup> The indefinite subject of φανῆι can be understood (Kühner–Gerth i.35).

1239–44      ἐν ᾧ τλάμων ὄδ', οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος,  
                   πάντοθεν· βόρειος ὥς τις ἀκτὰ  
                   κυματοπλήξ χειμερία κλονεῖται,  
                   ὥς καὶ τόνδε κατ' ἄκρας  
                   δειναὶ κυματοαγεῖς  
                   ἄται κλονέουσιν αἰὲ ξυνοῦσαι, . . .

1240

The verses are mostly self-contained in this eopde (see further below); but 1242–3 are a pair of ambivalent — — — — — like *Aj.* 631–2/642–3 (*CS* II, 58), where the cola are certainly synartete in the strophe.<sup>117</sup> As to the sense (involving the punctuation), the vulgate treats the whole epode as a single sentence. But the syntax ‘this man *τλάμων* . . . even as . . . so also this man . . .’ plainly needs articulating with a colon somewhere. Logically, it is the opening predication *τλάμων ὅδε . . . πάντοθεν* (like *μέλεος . . . θεόθεν* at *Or.* 160) that is then elaborately developed (with epexegetic asyndeton) in the comparison with a perpetually storm-battered headland (1240–4), variously buffeted *from all four points of the compass* (1245–8, see below). The overlap at *πάντοθεν* stresses that word (cf. *χειμώνων* at 678).

1245-8 αἰ μὲν ἀπ' ἀελίου δυσμᾶν,  
αἰ δ' ἀνατέλλοντος,  
αἰ δ' ἀκτῖν' ἀνὰ μέσσαν,  
αἰ δ' ἐννυχίᾳ ἀπὸ 'Ριπᾶν.

The sequence  $D\ sp\ (D^2)\ ||\ d\ sp\ (D)$  is like – ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ | – ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ | ... at *Hec.* 165–6/207–8. In the penultimate verse (◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ – again) I have made what seems to me a necessary transposition, for the MSS' αἰ δ' ἀνὰ μέσσαν ἀκτὺν'. We cannot end a verse thus (*a fortiori* a period) with elision at pendent close.<sup>118</sup> But

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Thgn. 425–7 πάντων μὲν μὴ φύναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον, | μηδ' ἔσιδεν αὐγὰς ὀξέος ἡελίου, | φύντα δ' ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας Αἴδαο περῆσαι (and similarly *Cert. Hom. et Hes.* 78–9, beginning ἀρχὴν μὲν μὴ φύναι . . . and without the pentameter).

<sup>117</sup> Then – *D ba* like *Alc.* 436/446, *Hipp.* 163, etc.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. n. 109 above. — — — — — is otherwise unlikely (see further on 1456/1471 below, and cf. on *Hipp.* 70–1 in *CO* 49 [1999], 409).



neither – – – – – nor redivision as αἰ δ' ἀνὰ μέσσαν || ἀκτῖν' appeals.<sup>119</sup> The wrong word-order may well owe something to αἰ δ' ἀνα- in the preceding verse, while also putting the words in the *simplex ordo* preposition–adjective–noun. The terminal verse is probably a paroemiac like 523.<sup>120</sup>

**1456/1471.** ἔκτυπεν αἰθήρ· ὦ Ζεῦ ~ ὠμέγας αἰθήρ· ὦ Ζεῦ. A self-contained terminal verse (following two dochmiacs and pause in both stanzas). Choriamb + molossus is strange in itself and unparalleled as a clausula. To write ὦ Ζεῦ <Ζεῦ> (cf. E. *El.* 137) would give a possible paroemiac (2an.); to write ὦ Ζεῦ <ὦ Ζεῦ> (cf. Ag. 1073 ὦ πολλόν ὦ πολλόν) would give a non-catalectic anapaestic dimeter.

**1477–81**                    ἔα ἔα· ἰδοῦ, μάλ' αὔθις ἀμφίσταται  
                                  διαπρύσιος ὄτοβος·  
                                  ἴλαος, ὦ δαίμων, ἴλαος, εἴ τι γὰι  
                                  ματέρι τυγχάνεις ἀφεγγές φέρων. 1480

~1491–5 (sec. L)    †ἰὼ παῖ | βᾶθι βᾶθ'· εἴτ' ἄκραν  
                                  ἐπιγύαλον . . . (space of about eight letters) . . . ἐναλίωι  
                                  Ποσειδαωνίωι θεῶι† τυγχάνεις  
                                  βούθυτον ἐστίαν ἀγίζων, ἰκοῦ. 1495

The strophe is straightforwardly 2ia + δ | δ | 2δ | 2δ.<sup>121</sup> The initial 2ia + δ is indeed reducible to 2δ (ἔα [ἔα] Bothe, J. H. H. Schmidt), but there is no clear warrant for that. The antistrophe is a partly lacunose mess, though we are back in secure responsion at least for the last two dochmiacs. Triclinius was probably right in beginning 1491 symmetrically with <ἰοῦ ἰοῦ> ἰὼ . . ., following which Hermann's πρόβαθι βᾶθ', εἴτ' ἄκραν . . . neatly completes the opening 2ia f δ (with symmetrical overlap at μάλ' αὔθις ~ πρόβα-<sup>1</sup>θι, cf. n. 59 above).<sup>122</sup> Attempts to preserve παῖ do not yield satisfactory metre;<sup>123</sup> and indeed the bald vocative 'boy!' thus shouted to the offstage Theseus is very odd, to a King not elsewhere regarded as young in this play. It follows that ἐπὶ γύαλον . . . τυγχάνεις conceals three dochmiacs. To restore them, if we can, we must certainly begin by accepting Nauck's excision of Ποσειδαωνίωι.<sup>124</sup> There will then be room for something (in or near the place where L's gap suggests a lacuna) that will restore sense. Perhaps something like . . . βᾶθ'· εἰ <δὲ κα>-/πὶ γνάλων ἄκραν | <μολών> ἐναλίωι θεῶι τυγχάνεις κτλ. (μολών Kuiper, Pearson).

<sup>119</sup> Stinton (275) argued for the former; but – – – – – scarcely exists except as a form of paroemiac (2an-). To divide before ἀκτῖν' would give an improbable length (whether ending . . . – – – – or . . . – – – –); not supported by 520/533, which is *tl sp*, preceded by a divided pair of spondees (the frequent – – : – –, cf. on *Ant.* 844–6/863–5 [CS I, 80 with n. 65]).

<sup>120</sup> Usually taken as – – – – – (*tl sp*), terminal as *Aj.* 1191/1198, *Hipp.* 130/140. But, as Diggle has shown (*Euripidea* 458, n. 73, correcting West, *GM* 16 with n. 27), ἀπὸ ῥ- is normal, ἀπὸ ῥ- almost without parallel, in the lyrics of tragedy (cf. also on *Phil.* 683 above). Following enoplian verses, – D – || is no less appropriately clausular, with its 'epic' cadence.

<sup>121</sup> There is no advantage (though little harm) in analysing as *ia* (exclam.) | *ia* δ. I accent ἰδοῦ ('behold!' here of sound) for ἰδοῦ. Cf. my commentary on *Or.* 144 and 147–8.

<sup>122</sup> For the idiom (as *Med.* 1252 κατῖδετ' ἴδετε, etc.), cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 84.

<sup>123</sup> ἰὼ <ἰῶ>, παῖ, βᾶ- as a dochmius (so Jebb, with single ἔα in 1477) has unacceptable word-end after long penult. ἰὼ <ἰῶ>, παῖ, βᾶθι βᾶθ' as 2ia (so Pearson, Dawe, LJ-W, likewise with single ἔα in 1477) has the unlikely cut . . . : – – – in an iambic dimeter.

<sup>124</sup> 'Poseidonian god' is unparalleled for 'Poseidon'. Probably it was simply the name that was interpolated (as often). The ending -ίωι could have been generated later, in line with ἐναλίωι.

- 1556–61      εἰ θέμις ἐστί μοι τὰν ἀφανῆ θεὸν  
καὶ σὲ λίταις σέβειν, ἐννυχίων ἀναξ  
Ἀιδωνεὺ Ἀιδωνεὺ, λίσσομαι  
†μήτ' ἐπιπόνω† μήτ' ἐπὶ βαρυαχεῖ . . . 1560
- ~1568–72      ὦ χθόνιαι θεαὶ σῶμά τ' ἀνικάτου  
θηρός, ὃν ἐν πύλαις φασὶ πολύξενοις  
εὐνᾶσθαι κνυζεισθαί τ' ἐξ ἄντρων  
ἀδάματον φύλακα παρ' Αἴδαι . . . 1570

(i) With *σέβειν* (Heimsoeth) for *σεβίζειν*, and *πύλαις* (QR; -αισι *rell.*) in *ant.*, the stanza begins with a straightforward run of four dochmiacs (all – – – – – except for one long penult.). With *σεβίζειν* (~πύλαισι<ν>) we have 2δ followed by an aristo-phanean; unexceptionable in itself (though more characteristic of Aeschylus), but with an unwelcome period-end in the antistrophe before the enclitic *φασὶ* (defended below against Bergk's *ταῖσι*).<sup>125</sup> Active *σέβειν* is poetical (LSJ 'rare in prose'), and so liable to be replaced by the much commoner *σεβίζω*. *σεβίζων* is probably an error for *σέβων* (so Page, after Burney, Blomfield, Elmsley, Prieen) at *Pers.* 945.

(ii) The vulgate *Αἰδωνεὺ Αἰδωνεὺ* is Hermann's spelling (codd. *αἰδ- αἰδ-*). The contraction (here only) seems likely to have behaved on the analogy of *Αἰδης* and *Αἰδης*.

(iii) The responsion . . . – – at *λίσσομαι ~ ἐξ ἄντρων* has been questioned, but seems acceptable at the end of a sub-dochmiac verse.<sup>126</sup>

(iv) The usual procedure in 1561, after Seidler, is to delete the first *μήτ'* and then to make an appropriate adjustment of *ἐπιπόνω* (*sic* LV; *ἐπὶ πόνωι* Tr, *ἐπίποννα* *pler.*).<sup>127</sup> I should prefer to delete the first (ε)πι, leaving simply *μήτε πόνωι μήτ' ἐπὶ βαρυαχεῖ* | . . . *μόρωι κτλ.* with the preposition *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* as in *Ant.* 366 *ποτέ μὲν κακὸν ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἐσθλόν*, etc. (Bruhn, *Anhang* 97). That has the merits of giving clearer sense and of not introducing an interlinear hiatus.<sup>128</sup> The scansion is then – – – – : – – – – –, an acceptable form of the dochmiac length δωδ.<sup>129</sup>

(v) *βαρυαχεῖ* (not *-αχεῖ*, as Jebb): cf. *δυσαχές Eum.* 145, *βαρυάλλητα Aj.* 199. The sense must be 'grievous', not 'loud'; and a dochmius cannot end with . . . – – –.

(vi) Dawe was right to question the vulgate *ταῖσι* (Bergk) for *φασὶ* in 1570. It is hard to see why such an easy definite article should have been corrupted; and there is nothing wrong with the inserted position of *φασί*, cf. *Hec.* 451–3 *ἐνθα τὸν | καλλίστων ὑδάτων πατέρα | φασὶν Ἀπιδανὸν πεδία λιπαίνειν*.

<sup>125</sup> It should not be suggested that – – – – – × : – – – – – is a possible verse with link-anceps. Word-end after long anceps is in general rare, except at the caesura after penthemimer (Parker<sup>1</sup> 2ff.), and the clausular effect of – – – – – after – – – – – × – *bis* is unmistakable.

<sup>126</sup> Jebb's *νεύσόν μοι* for *λίσσομαι* does not appeal (better *λίσσοιμ' ἄν?*). If change be needed I should prefer one giving *mol : mol : cr* (with another *mol cr* following). It could be, perhaps, that *ἐξ ἄντρων* has glossed *ἐκ μυχόν*.

<sup>127</sup> For that, LJ-W's *ἐπιπόνως* is no better than Seidler's *ἐπὶ πόνωι* (after Triclinius); indeed inferior in the inelegant combination of *ἐπι-* and *ἐπὶ* . . .

<sup>128</sup> Dain's *μὴ πόνωι* is a slightly bigger change, but otherwise acceptable. Or the truth could well be *μὴ <τι> πόνωι (μὴ τι . . . μὴτε, GP 509 with n. 2, cf. on Phil. 683 above; <τι> π-, cf. on 512 above with n. 99).*

<sup>129</sup> – – – – : – – – – – (δωδ, n. 21 above), cf. CS I, 87.

1561–7

... μήτ' ἐπὶ βαρναχεῖ  
 ξένον ἐξανύσαι μόρωι  
 τὰν παγκευθεῖ κάτω  
 νεκρῶν πλάκα καὶ Στύγιον δόμον·  
 πολλῶν γὰρ ἴαν καὶ μάταν†  
 πημάτων ἰκνουμένων  
 πάλιν σφε δαίμων δίκαιος αὔξει·

1565

~1572–8

... φύλακα παρ' Αἴδαι·  
 λόγος ἱαῖεν ἀνέχει†· τόν, ὦ  
 Γᾶς παῖ καὶ Ταρτάρου,  
 κατεύχομαι ἐν καθαρῶι βῆναι  
 ὀρμωμένωι νερτέρας  
 τῶι ξένωι νεκρῶν πλάκας·  
 σέ τοι κικλήσκω τὸν αἰὲν ὕπνον.

1575

(i) 1562–4/1573–5 should be divided thus ( $T \mid mol \text{ cr} \mid \sim D \sim -$ ), not as an isolated anapaestic metron followed by  $\sim - - - - - \sim - - - - -$  (a weird verse)  $\parallel - - - - - \sim -$ . *μόρωι* naturally ends the phrase that began at μήτ(ε) . . . , and ὦ very often falls at the end of a verse. The division after κάτω ~ (*Ταρ*)τάρου is attested by L and rightly accepted by Jebb and Pearson. The cola  $\sim - - - - - \sim -$  (*T*) and  $(-) - - - - - \times -$  occur frequently in 'enoplian dochmiac' contexts.<sup>130</sup> *mol cr*, cf. 1559 (~1571) Αἰδωνεὺ λίσσεται.

(ii) LJ-W<sup>2</sup> give good arguments (citing Kassel) against Dawe's latest idea *λόχον* (Blaydes) αἰὲν ἔχειν (requiring also an additional τ' somewhere for coordination of the infinitives). But *λόγος αἰὲν ἔχει* (itself an emendation of ἀνέχει) remains open to objection, 'always' being frigid with *λόγος ἔχει*, and ἀνέχει (v.l. -οι) insufficiently accounted for. Progress will lie in keeping ὦν . . . φασὶ . . . παρ' Αἴδαι (a stylishly shaped clause, see above) and looking for a different emendation in 1573, in effect beginning a new sentence following the extended exclamatory address which has focused attention on mythical terrors. A minimal change gives *λόγος αἰν' ἀνέχει*: 'myth maintains/upholds (such) fearsome (notions of the Underworld)'. *αἰνός* is uncommon in tragedy, but cf. *Aj.* 706, *Pers.* (?)256 (Pauw), 930 (*αἰνώς*), and several *αἰνο-* compounds. For the sense 'maintain, uphold', cf. *Od.* 19.111 (*εὐδικίας*), *Ar. Th.* 948 (*ὄργια*); but it would cost little to write *αἰνά γ' ἔχει*.

(iii) Jebb convincingly condemned καὶ μάταν in 1565. The choice here lies between Bücheler's ἀνταλλαγαν (possibly then with Jebb's ἰκνουμένην 'due, fitting'; LSJ *ἰκνέομαι* III.2) and something like αὐτὰν ἀκμὰν (possibly with Jebb's other conjecture *ἰκνούμενον*, but the many *πήματα* may be said to be 'coming to their very acme'). For the γάρ then in a wish, without strong causal force, cf. *GP* 94–5 and Kannicht on *Hel.* 1201.

(iv) The ode ends with a prayer to 'eternal sleep' (Death), uncanonically invoked as 'son of Earth and Tartarus'. We expect something properly climactic at the end of this fine envoi, and the phrase ἐν καθαρῶι is surely thematic. The passing of the notoriously 'unclean' Oedipus is to involve not merely a painless end of *πήματα* (the theme of the strophe), but a terminal *catharsis*. And yet, as things stand, the prayer is apparently for *Cerberus* to βῆναι ἐν καθαρῶι for Oedipus as he sets forth on his last

<sup>130</sup> (-)  $D \times -$ : cf. *Andr.* 827, 831, *Herc.* 1030, 1033, *Tro.* 267, *Or.* 1257/1277, etc. (unequal penult. as *Sept.* 222/229); also 119/151 above (p. 95 with n. 74).

journey. It will not help to emend βῆναι (some also emend ἐν καθαρῶι), since no action/inaction by the mythical dog will constitute an appropriate terminal prayer, worthy of Sophocles as a serious poet. Dawe's latest suggestion, ἐν καθαρῶι μείναι, is technically clever but weak in sense. As many have seen, we need a subject of βῆναι other than Cerberus. Nauck's δός for τὸν allows us to take τῶι ξένωι as the subject, but comes too abruptly. Wecklein's ἔν' impossibly leaves us to infer a subject. Hartung's τόδ' (better τὸ δ' or τὰ δ'?) seems to require <'κ>βῆναι 'to turn out, result'. But perhaps no change at all is needed, given the change in what has gone before. The antecedent of τὸν . . . is now the λόγος with its traditionally frightening view of Death, including a notion of (punitive) χθόνιαι θεαί, and can thus almost stand for 'Death' (as represented in that λόγος). Where βαίνειν is used of things rather than persons (only in poetry), there is always an element of personification; and that the subject of βῆναι here is virtually Death is confirmed in the final verse σέ τοι κικλήσκω . . . (cf. *Aj.* 1226–8 σέ δὴ . . . | σέ τοι . . . λέγω).<sup>131</sup>

1670–6	<i>Av.</i> αἰαῖ, φεῦ· ἔστιν ἔστι νῶιν δῆ, οὐ τὸ μὲν ἄλλο δὲ μή, πατρὸς ἔμφυτον ἄλαστον αἶμα δυσμόρου στενάζειν, ᾧτινε τὸν πολὺν ἄλλοτε μὲν πόνον ἔμπεδον εἴχομεν, ἐν πυμάτῳ δ' ἀλόγιστα †παροίσομεν† ἰδόντε καὶ παθούσα.	1670      1675
--------	--	----------------------------------

The metre is straightforward, with a syncopated iambic verse (*ba : cr ba*) followed by *4da : 3ia* || *6da (4da : 2da) | 4da : 2ia* (for the combination of pure dactyls and catalectic iambs so frequent in later Sophocles, cf. nn. 7, 56, and 91 above). As to the text, (i) ᾧτινε (Badham and Wex) must be right in 1673. The MSS' ᾧτινι is a suspect form *prima facie* (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 903–4); and the explanation of ἔστιν ἔστι νῶιν δῆ (with the dual pronoun as it were underlined) . . . δυσμόρου στενάζειν logically proceeds with ᾧτινε 'us who . . .'. The explanation is twofold: there are grounds for στόνος in the πολὺς πόνος unremittingly experienced by Oedipus' daughters *before his death* (ἄλλοτε μὲν); and there are (now and henceforth) further grounds in what they have seen and experienced *at the end* (of Oed.'s life). (ii) παροίσομεν has been defended, but only with evident reluctance. παρεύρομεν (Hartung), κάχ' εὔρομεν (Blaydes), ἀπελαύσαμεν (Arndt) are indeed worthless conjectures. περάσομεν (Reiske) and ἐπέρασαμεν (Jebb) are little better, the latter ('we have gone through') weakly anticipating παθούσα, the former ('we shall go through') leaving the participles without an object. Better are the technically plausible conjectures ἀπορ' οἴσομεν and ἀπορήσομεν contemplated by Jebb and rejected somewhat obscurely as 'barred by the context'. What the sisters have recently seen and experienced is well described as ἀλόγιστα (καὶ) ἀπορα (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀπορος II.2); at the same time we need a future verb for the balance with ἄλλοτε μὲν . . . εἴχομεν). But I should prefer ἀπόρως ἔμεν (easily corrupted to -α παροίσομεν): the sisters' future 'course' will be ἀπορον for the reason given.

<sup>131</sup> At one time I thought it necessary to change τόν, ᾧ Γᾶς παῖ . . . to σέ δ', ᾧ Γᾶς παῖ . . . in line with that parallel. But such a change would be hard to justify.

1720–3

ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ὀλβίως σφ' ἔλυ-  
 σεν [τὸ] τέλος, ὦ φίλοι, βίου,  
 λήγετε τοῦδ' ἄχους· κακῶν  
 γὰρ δυσάλωτος οὐδεὶς.

1720

1720 σφ'] γ' codd. 1721 τὸ del. Bergk. ὦ om. Q<sup>ac</sup>

Jebb's 'he hath found a blessed end' gives an impossible sense to ἔλυσεν, and Lloyd-Jones's 'he has resolved the end . . .' still does not convince. 'The end of his life' should surely be the subject of 'has set him free'. This is the culminating theme of the play. σφ' for γ' is an easy correction (especially after -s); cf. Monk's ὅς σφε for ὅς γε at *I.A.* 70. In 1721 either τὸ or ὦ is intrusive; the metre is certainly *ch ia* | *ch ia* | *ch ia* : *ch ba* (= *ar*). [ὦ] φίλοι could be right (cf. *Ion* 764), but one might then have expected a different word-order.

*Highgate, London*

C. W. WILLINK  
 willink@classicfm.net