A TRANSPOSITION OF STANZAS IN THE
PARODOS OF *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS*?

In 1858 Friedrich Haase argued that the final strophe (190–202) and antistrophe
(203–15) of the parodos (150–215) should be transposed. Few have noticed Haase's
suggestion and fewer still have taken it seriously. R.D. Dawe mentioned it in
the *apparatus criticus* of his third Teubner edition of *Oedipus Rex* (1996).[1] In a
subsequent article (1999) Dawe wrote that in that 1996 Teubner edition he came
very close to putting Haase's proposed transposition into his text; in his recent
'Green and Yellow' Cambridge commentary on *Oedipus Rex* (2006), a substantial
revision of his 1982 edition, he actually does so.[2] Were it not for Dawe's deserved
standing as one of the world's pre-eminent textual critics of Sophocles and for the
widespread use of his 'Green and Yellow' edition and for the possibility that this
radical textual alteration might make its way into a future Teubner edition of all the
plays (the second Teubner edition of Dawe's *Sophoclis Tragoediae* was published in
1984), refutation of Haase's proposal might be unnecessary. It has been neglected
for 150 years and with good reason.[3] Nevertheless, given the three aforementioned
reasons, it is worth refuting Dawe's resurrection of Haase's proposal.[4] In order to

---

[1] R.D. Dawe, *Sophoclis Oedipus Rex* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1996): '190–215: stropham
et antistropham inter se permutavit Haase.' Dawe writes that Haase's proposal first appeared
in a Programme of the Breslau Academy in 1858. The *CQ* referee very kindly pointed out
to me the more precise reference, namely Henr. Aenoth. Frid. Haase, *Miscellaneorum
Philologicorum Liber II* (Vratislaviae, 1858), 3–6, which he/she found at the British
Library. I was able to obtain a microfilm copy of Haase's article ('In parodo Soph. Oed.
R. antistropham III ante stropham III ponendam esse') from the University of Cincinnati
Dissertations, Programmschriften, and Pamphlets in Classical Studies, No. 3329, pt. 2.
In addition to expressing my thanks to the *CQ* referee for a very informative reader's report and
to Judith Mossman, the *CQ* editor, for her encouragement and kindness along the way, I should
also like to express deep appreciation to Wolfgang Haase, my friend and learned colleague at
Boston University, for making numerous helpful suggestions and corrections on my final draft.
Any remaining errors are, of course, my own responsibility.

[2] R.D. Dawe, 'Strophic displacement in Greek tragedy', *Eranos* 97 (1999), 24–44, at 24.
Dawe's 'Green and Yellow' commentaries are, respectively, *Sophocles: Oedipus Rex* (Cambridge,
1982) and *Sophocles: Oedipus Rex*, revised edition (Cambridge, 2006). For his other recent
observations on editing Sophocles see 'EI KAI TRIT' ESTI …editing Sophocles for the third
time', in G. Most (ed.), *Editing Texts = Texte edieren* (Göttingen, 1998), 111–22 and 'On editing
Sophocles, Oxford style', *ICS* 27–8 (2002–3), 1–19.

[3] Dawe (n. 2, 1999), 25 notes that Haase's transposition is 'one which all editors have passed
over in silence, appalled perhaps by its apparent audacity'. It is not true that all editors have
passed over it. I have found at least two who did not. M. Schmidt, *Sophoclis Oedipus Tyrannus
in usum scholarum* (Jena, 1871), ad loc. notes Haase's proposal but does not adopt it. A. Nauck
in his 'Kritischer Anhang' to Schneidewin and Nauck, *Sophokles: Oedipus Tyrannos* [8] (Berlin,
1881) 162 apparently agrees with Haase's suggestion: '189–202 und 203–215 scheinen, wie Fr.
Haase erkannt hat, die Stelle getauscht zu haben.'

[4] V. Citti, 'Soph. *OT* 151–215', *Eikasmos* 14 (2003), 37–62, at 59 contains the only comment
I have seen thus far on Dawe's transposition: 'Tra queste considerazioni, mi tentano soprattuttto
quelle che riguardano i due riferimenti ad Ares, in cui il secondo fungerebbe da glossa del primo,
e la conclusione forte che la *parodos* acquisirebbe con l'invocazione a Zeus. Mi salva dalla ten-

do so I will gather together relevant insights from previous commentators, as well as making some new observations of my own.

To begin, I present the last three stanzas of the parodos, following Dawe's text, but without his transposition of the final strophe and antistrophe. I put in bold lettering several words which are especially pertinent to the issue at hand.

Antistrophe 2 (179–89)

> Ὧν πόλις ἀνάριθμος ὄλλυται·
> νηλέα δὲ γένεθλα πρὸς πέδῳ
> θαναταφόρα κεῖται ἀνοίκτως·
> ἐν δ᾽ ἄλοχοι πολιαί τ᾽ ἔπι ματέρες
> ἀκτὰν παρὰ βώμιον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι
> λυγρῶν πόνων ἱκετῆρες ἐπιστενάχουσι.
> παιὼν δὲ λάμπει στονόεσσά τε γῆρυς ὅμαυλος·
> **ὧν ὕπερ, ὦ χρυσέα θύγατερ Διός,**
> **εὐῶπα πέμψον ἀλκάν**.

Strophe 3 (190–202)

> **Ἄρεά τε** τὸν μαλερόν, ὃς
> νῦν ἄχαλκος ἀσπίδων
> φλέγει με περιβόητος ἀντιάζων,
> παλίσσυτον δράμημα **νωτίσαι** πάτρας
> ἄπουρον, εἴτ᾽ ἐς μέγαν
> θάλαμον Ἀμφιτρίτας,
> εἴτ᾽ ἐς τὸν ἀπόξενον ὅρμων
> Θρήκιον κλύδωνα·
> τελεῖ γάρ, εἴ τι νὺξ ἀφῇ,
> τοῦτ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἦμαρ ἔρχεται·
> τόν, ὦ τᾶν πυρφόρων
> ἀστραπᾶν κράτη νέμων,
> ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, ὑπὸ σῷ φθίσον κεραυνῷ.

Antistrophe 3 (203–15)

> Λύκει᾽ ἄναξ, τά τε σὰ χρυ-
> σοστρόφων ἀπ᾽ ἀγκυλῶν
> βέλεα θέλοιμ᾽ ἂν ἀδάματ᾽ ἐνδατεῖσθαι
> ἀρωγὰ προσταθέντα, τάς τε πυρφόρους
> Ἀρτέμιδος αἴγλας, ξὺν αἷς
> Λύκι᾽ ὄρεα διᾴσσει·
> τὸν χρυσομίτραν τε **κικλήσκω**,
> τᾶσδ᾽ ἐπώνυμον γᾶς,
> οἰνῶπα Βάκχον εὔιον,

tazione proprio il te: non certo perché non sia possibile dire "e invoco Bacco ad avvicinarsi con la torcia al dio spregiato dagli dèi; *e* Ares il violento si getti …", ma perché in questo modo la struttura connettiva τε … τε … propria delle invocazioni di tipo litanico ad una serie di divinità, non assumerebbe qui una funzione allineante ma piuttosto consecutiva, il che sarebbe irrituale.' To which, however, Citti adds the following in footnote 81: 'L'obiezione che mi muove *per litteras* Dawe, "but the τε is not linking a series of invocations to different divinities here: it is proposing a course of action", ripara il problema che mi propongo di approfondire.'

Μαινάδων ὁμόστολον
πελασθῆναι φλέγοντ᾽
ἀγλαῶπι < - ᴗ - >
πεύκᾳ ᾽πὶ τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν.

Of the four alleged merits (listed below) for flip-flopping the final two stanzas, the first is Dawe's idea, the rest are Haase's, revived by Dawe.[5]

(a) τε in 190 of the received text is 'abnormal'; δέ would be expected.

(b) In the last line of the received text the allusion to the 'unhonoured god' (215) is 'obscure'. Transposition puts Ares' name immediately after ᾽πὶ τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν, thus eliminating a lack of clarity.

(c) The received text at 188–9 places the burden of routing Ares too heavily on Athena alone.

(d) Transposition of stanzas places Zeus, blasting Ares with his thunderbolts, at the song's end and thus provides a more decisive conclusion than that of the received text.

I. THE *TE* IN VERSE 190 OF THE RECEIVED TEXT IS 'ABNORMAL'

Dawe maintains that the transposition 'explains the otherwise abnormal τε in 190, where δέ would be the expected connective if there is no close link between the third strophe and the preceding second antistrophe'.[6] But the τε can be called 'abnormal' only if we assume, as Dawe apparently does, that there is no close link between the third strophe (190–202) and the preceding second antistrophe (179–89). The text, however, clearly indicates a close link: the accusative and infinitive construction Ἄρεά … νωτίσαι (190–3) in the final strophe is a natural continuation of the preceding antistrophe's petition to Athena (πέμψον ἀλκάν, 189). Virtually everyone agrees on this. For brevity's sake I cite three distinguished commentators. a) Schneidewin (1851): 'Aus πέμψον ἀλκάν ist zu νωτίσαι ein allgemeineres δός, ποίει zu denken, wie öfter in Gebeten, z. B. *Hymn. Ven*. 104 bittet Anchises die Aphrodite: ποίει δ᾽ εἰσοπίσω θαλερὸν γόνον, αὐτὰρ ἔμ᾽ αὐτὸν | δηρὸν ἔυ ζώειν.'[7]

---

[5] Dawe (n. 2, 1999), 24–5 and, more summarily, Dawe (n. 2, 2006) at 190–215.

[6] Dawe (n. 2, 1999), 24.

[7] F.W. Schneidewin, *Sophokles, Oedipus Tyrannos* (Leipzig, 1851) at 190. Friedrich Haase (n. 1, 1858), 5 responded to Schneidewin's interpretation in the following way: 'Sed concedamus tamen, quod nunc necesse est, imperativi qui est πέμψον, posse duo obiecta inaequalia intelligi ἀλκήν et Ἄρεα νωτίσαι, ut in altero membro pro eo quod est πέμψον cum Schneidewino δός vel ποίησον dictum putemus, structura sic continuata si ferenda est, certe laudabilis non erit; quae enim per se non exspectatur structurae appendix, ea durior etiam et molestior est propter inaequalitatem.' Haase's assessment that Schneidewin's interpretation is 'bearable but certainly not laudable' (due to the 'harshness' of the transition between the fourth and fifth stanzas) finds no support in the scholarship. The *CQ* referee commented as follows on my note here: 'What might be worth adding is who first came up with the idea of making νωτίσαι depend on πέμψον. The earliest scholar to do so that I can find is Samuel Musgrave, as cited by Erfurdt; Musgrave's edition was published in Oxford in 1800, after his death in 1780.' Musgrave is also the earliest modern scholar I can find to have made this connection. As cited in Karl Erfurdt, *Annotationes integrae in Sophoclis Tragoedias* (London, 1824), Musgrave wrote: 'νωτίσαι, terga dare, ut Eurip. *Androm*. 1141. regitur enim a πέμψον. Πέμψον ἀλκάν, πέμψον τε Ἄρεα – νωτίσαι.' (To Musgrave's note Erfurdt added 'i.e. ὥστε νωτίσαι'). As best I can tell Musgrave's comments go back to the Scholiast

b) Campbell (1871 and 1879): 'The infinitive [νωτίσαι] is governed by the general notion of causing in πέμψον …'[8] c) Jebb (1887 and 1912): 'The accusative and infinitive Ἄρεά … νωτίσαι depend on δός or the like, suggested by the preceding words.'[9] In sum, as Linwood (1878) put it succinctly, 'Supply δός from πέμψον.'[10] The implied δός, like πέμψον, has Athena as its subject. The resulting translation of 188–93 runs thus: 'For the relief of this woe, O golden daughter of Zeus, <u>send [us] fair-eyed aid</u>. And [you, Athena, *grant that*] Ares turn his back in retreat.' (Or, supplying ποίει instead of δός, translate '*cause* Ares to retreat'.) Dawe himself notes that it is natural in such prayers for δός to be supplied mentally. But, unlike the commentators cited above, he is silent about the connection of the implicit δός with the preceding πέμψον, a connection enhanced by the postpositive enclitic τε.[11] As Roussel observes, 'Le τε du vers 190 marque la suite des idées: "Fille de Zeus, viens à notre secours, – et mets en fuite"'.[12] Although extant Sophocles provides

who, commenting on Ἄρεα τε τὸν μαλερόν at 190, wrote 'ἀπὸ κοινοῦ δὲ τὸ πέμψον' (cited from P.N. Papageorgius [ed.], *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias vetera* [Lipsiae, 1888], 174–5). Other commentators who understand νωτίσαι as being governed by πέμψον include J. Brasse, *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles*[3] (London, 1838), F. Ritter, *Sophokles' König Oidipus* (Leipzig, 1870), G. Schiassi, *Sofocle, Edipo Re* (Bologna, 1967) and J.C. Kamerbeek, *The Plays of Sophocles: Part 4: Oedipus Tyrannus* (Leiden, 1967). The recent analysis of the parodos in W.D. Furley and J.M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period* (Tübingen, 2001), 2.283–9 does not comment on the syntax of 190 ff.

[8] L. Campbell, *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments*[1] (Oxford, 1871; 2nd edn. 1879), vol. 1 ad loc., followed by e.g. A.A. Long, *Language and Thought in Sophocles* (London, 1968), 94.

[9] R.C. Jebb, *Sophocles: Part I: Oedipus Tyrannus* (2nd edn. Cambridge, 1887; repr. Bristol, 2004); similarly Jebb in his fourth and last abridged edn. (Cambridge, 1912); likewise J. Bollack, *L'Oedipe roi de Sophocle: Le texte et ses interprétations: Commentaire* (Lille, 1990), 2.115–16, with further references.

[10] W. Linwood, *The Theban Trilogy of Sophocles*[4] (London, 1878) at 190. Cf. J.C. Hogan, *A Commentary on the Plays of Sophocles* (Carbondale, IL, 1991), 31: 'The preceding invocation leads naturally to a prayer ("grant that").' J. Rusten, *Sophocles: Oedipus Tyrannos* (Bryn Mawr, PA, 1990), at 190–3 offers a slightly different explanation: 'The accusative and infinitive represents a wish (Smyth #2014): "and would that Ares retreat …".' Even in this case, however, as Smyth notes, there is usually an unconscious ellipsis of a word like δός or εὔχομαι. Similarly A.C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1982), 244 (under the heading 'Infinitive in prayer and wish'). W. Ax, 'Die Parodos des *Oedipus Tyrannos*', *Hermes* 67 (1932), 413–37, at 420, n. 1, offers a variation on this: 'Die Konstruktion (Ἄρεα … νωτίσαι) ist ein imperativischer Acc. c. inf., der in archaischen Inschriften ebenso häufig ist wie in Gebeten und Wünschen von Homer an (Brugmann–Thumb, *Gr. Gr.*[4], #585).' On the infinitive used as imperative see H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. G. Messing (Cambridge, MA, 1956) #2013; W.W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (Boston, 1889) #784; D.B. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2] (Oxford, 1891) #241. E. Wunder, *Sophoclis tragoediae. Vol. I. Sect. II Oedipus Rex*[4] (Gothae et Erfordiae, 1856), takes the infinitive νωτίσαι (193) as an imperative, with Zeus at 202 as the subject (rather than Ares at 190); but delaying the subject for so long (i.e. until the strophe's conclusion) is not credible.

[11] Dawe (n.2, 1982) at 190 had recognized the connection of an implied δός with πέμψον although he postulated another possible interpretation: 'This [third] strophe is linked to its predecessor by τε not δέ. It may well be that Sophocles is continuing the construction of πέμψον, while giving it a different sense: send him on his way so that he turns tail.' In other words, Dawe understood the link as that of a result clause: πέμψον ἀλκάν … [ὥστε] νωτίσαι. This was first suggested by the Scholiast at 193 (πέμψον ἀλκὴν ὥστε παλινόρμητον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τὰ νῶτα δόντα τῇ πόλει) and reasserted by Musgrave (see n. 7 above). In his revised 2006 edition Dawe retains the explanation of an implied δός but is silent about τε as ὥστε. (On consequential τε, i.e. τε used to denote a consequence of what precedes ['and thus', 'and therefore', 'and as a result'], see Smyth [n. 10 above] #2968.)

[12] L. Roussel, *Sophocle Oedipe: Texte, traduction, commentaire* (Paris, 1940) at 193; similarly Kamerbeek (n. 7) on τε as connective. Failure to appreciate the connective force of τε in 190

no other examples of a stanza-connecting $\tau\epsilon$, he does employ a similar sentence-connecting $\tau\epsilon$ (as opposed to a clause-connecting $\tau\epsilon$) seven or eight times; so it would be more accurate, given the paucity of our evidence, to label this usage at 190 as 'uncommon' rather than 'abnormal'.[13] In any case, Dawe must not consider the stanza-connecting $\tau\epsilon$ that abnormal since he retains it in his 2006 'Green and Yellow' edition where, even after transposing the third strophe and antistrophe, he reads Ἀρεά τε τὸν μαλερόν …

In sum, the argument of this section is that the widely recognized stanzaic link between πέμψον ἀλκάν (189) and Ἀρεά τε … νωτίσαι (190–4) speaks against Dawe's argument that $\tau\epsilon$ in 190 of the received text is abnormal and that δέ would be expected.

II. THE ALLUSION IN VERSE 215 OF THE RECEIVED TEXT IS 'OBSCURE'

Dawe follows Haase in arguing that transposition has the advantage of bringing Ares 'directly next to the unhonoured god, the plain name resolving the more obscure allusion, a favourite technique of the tragedians.'[14] But ᾿πὶ τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν is not 'obscure'. Just as Sophocles ended the second antistrophe with an unnamed but clearly identifiable goddess (ὦ χρυσέα θύγατερ Διός at

---

(as well as the overall structure of the parodos) leads E. Stehle, 'Choral prayer in Greek tragedy: euphemia or aischrologia?', in P. Murray and P. Wilson (edd.), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford and New York, 2004), 121–55, at 144–8 to speak of a 'syntactic break' between the fourth and fifth stanzas. Furthermore she calls the opening of the third strophe 'a travesty of prayer' and speaks of the third antistrophe's 'faltering language' and 'sustained failure of euphemia' and of the final prayer to Bacchus (209–15) as 'chaotic' in its effect. This all seems to me, as intimated above and as I hope to argue more fully elsewhere, way off the mark. R.W.B. Burton, *The Chorus of Sophocles* (Oxford, 1980), 147 gives a much more accurate assessment: 'After its introductory strophe, the whole ode presents a remarkable unity of character. The language is direct and vivid …'

[13] My calculations are based on the 597 instances of $\tau\epsilon$ recorded by M. Papathomopoulos, *Concordantia Sophoclea*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim, Zürich and New York, 2006), 2.838–47, who uses as his text H. Lloyd-Jones and N. Wilson, *Sophoclis fabulae* (Oxford, 1990). I have excluded from this figure of eight (or nine) sentence-connecting instances of $\tau\epsilon$ in Sophocles any examples of coordinating or correlative $\tau\epsilon$ (such as $\tau\epsilon$ … καί, $\tau\epsilon$ … $\tau\epsilon$, $\tau\epsilon$ … δέ, of which there are multitudes) since the $\tau\epsilon$ in *OT* 190 is not of that sort. (I have also excluded the possible example of *Trach.* 1019 where the text is uncertain.) Besides *OT* 190 the other seven (or eight) passages with a 'single' sentence-connecting $\tau\epsilon$ are *Trach.* 462, *El.* 421 and 907, *Phil.* 292 and 942, *OC* 772 and 1235; also, arguably *OT* 203. Other than *OT* 190 (and possibly 203) I believe that there are no other Sophoclean instances of $\tau\epsilon$ connecting two stanzas in a choral ode. It is worth remembering, however, that we have only 7 of some 123 plays. On the $\tau\epsilon$ in *OT* 203 M.L. Earle, *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles* (New York, 1901) writes: '$\tau\epsilon$ does double duty; it links the prayer to Apollo to what precedes and is also correlative to the $\tau\epsilon$ in τάς τε πυρφόρας [in 206].' Earle is certainly correct on his first point and, given the high frequency of linguistic response between the three strophes and antistrophes of the parodos, he may well be correct on his second point as well. In particular the metrical response of ἀνάριθμα (168) and ἀνάριθμος (179) in the respective first lines of the second strophe and antistrophe makes it reasonable to suspect a similar kind of response (functionally if not quite metrically) between $\tau\epsilon$ τὸν (190) and τά $\tau\epsilon$ (203) in the respective first lines of the third strophe and antistrophe – in each of which there are, perhaps not accidentally, three instances of $\tau\epsilon$ (190, 194, 196: $\tau\epsilon$ … εἴτ᾿ … εἴτ᾿ and 203, 206, 208: τά τε, τὰς τε, and τὸν … τε).

[14] Dawe (n. 2, 2006) at 190–215.

188 referring to Athena), so he ends the third antistrophe with an unnamed but clearly identifiable god. The chorus establishes an impressive martial momentum to make this identification clear. To wit, they name Ares at the outset of the third strophe, devote an entire stanza to him, line up his Olympian adversaries (Zeus, Apollo, Artemis and Bacchus), and conclude by returning to him. The result is an embracing ring composition: Ἀρεά (190) …᾿πὶ τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν (215). Otherwise stated, the presence of fire-bringing Ares is stretched across the breadth of the final pair of stanzas (190–215) just as the presence of the death-bringing plague had been stretched across the breadth of the central two stanzas (168–89). This structural design emphasizes the enormity of the task at hand and the high stakes of this cosmic theomachy between the forces of good and evil.

III. TRANSPOSITION MORE ADEQUATELY DISTRIBUTES TO SEVERAL GODS THE TASK OF ROUTING ARES

Dawe, following Haase, argues that the traditional text leaves the banishment of Ares to Athena alone whereas the proposed transposition would distribute the burden more widely. The basis of the argument is this: at the end of the fourth stanza the chorus addresses only Athena (ὦ χρυσέα θύγατερ Διός, πέμψον ἀλκάν, 188–9); immediately thereafter and for most of the following stanza (190–200) the Theban elders shift their attention to Ares. In Haase's transposition Athena and all her allies (Apollo, Artemis, and Bacchus) appear consecutively in the fourth and fifth stanzas rather than being separated by a stanza. This arrangement is persuasive only if one thinks that the logic of such a consecutive listing matters to the chorus. I suggest that such logic misunderstands their prayer's ritual intention and structural dynamics.

First, from the ritual perspective of the prayer's exorcizing power, transposition leaves the invocation of the gods and their weapons in Dawe's fifth stanza without any immediate target. I would suggest that immediate naming of the enemy, who has been identified by the chorus thus far only obliquely by being compared to a previous 'flame of woe' (φλόγα πήματος, 166), is ritually important; only after uttering the enemy's name – Ἀρεά is the final strophe's emphatic first word (190) – and then fully characterizing him (ὅς … φλέγει …, 190–2) can the chorus effectively proceed to their actual request for his expulsion. I cannot prove this suggestion about the necessity of immediate identification but I believe there are noteworthy analogues to support my claim. In the 'Hymn to Zeus' in the parodos of *Agamemnon* (160–84) the very first word of the prayer is 'Zeus'. As Fraenkel observes, 'To know the name of the daemon is to acquire power over him.'[15] One recalls, too, the blinding of the Cyclops where it is only after the hero, overly proud of his trick, reveals his true name and identity – 'Odysseus, sacker of cities, Laertes' son, whose home is in Ithaca' (9.504–5) – that Polyphemus can utter to Poseidon his infamous curse: δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον οἴκαδ᾽ ἱκέσθαι …

[15] E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1950), 2.100; cf. S. Pulleyn, 'The power of names in classical Greek religion', *CR* 44 (1994), 17–25. Hogan (n. 10), 41 writes on the same passage: 'In prayers, naming the god accurately, according to attribute and function, is necessary for procuring attention and aid. Cf. "I will protect him, because he knows my name" (Psalm 91.14).'

εὕροι δ' ἐν πήματα οἴκῳ (9.530–5). The monster's vengeful imprecation reveals the almost magical power of the name. Polyphemus' curse immediately arouses his father's wrath and over time its impact plays out by extending Odysseus' wanderings, by proving fatal for his entire crew, and by forecasting the woes the hero will find in his house (cf. 1.68–75). Calling this curse 'the key to the action of the whole poem', Calvin Brown aptly observes that 'The rest of the *Odyssey* is devoted to the working out of this curse'.[16] In *Oedipus Tyrannus* the Theban curse against Ares (190–215), which serves as a prelude to the king's curse against Laius' murderer (216–75), will likewise end up exerting tremendous impact and in some sense the rest of the play is devoted to the working out of this choral curse: the plague (Ares) and its cause (Oedipus as a kind of 'double' of Ares) must be expelled but not before the hero uncovers the woes in his house, discovers his true identity, and blinds himself.

My second objection to this third point of Haase and Dawe is that from a structural perspective they do injustice to the invocation of Athena at 188–9 by isolating that specific appeal from its larger context. On the one hand, it is true that ὦ χρυσέα θύγατερ Διός, πέμψον ἀλκάν indicates Athena as its immediate addressee. While this choral petition might appear to impose upon her the sole burden of routing Ares, it must be viewed in the context of the entire prayer. It is significant that the petition begins by focusing on the theme of ἀλκή, 'defensive aid', against the plague. To wit, the second stanza petitioned Athena, Artemis, and Apollo to appear as 'defenders against death', <u>ἀλεξίμοροι</u> (164, a tragic hapax). The third stanza followed with the elders' extraordinary admission of human impotence against the plague: 'there is no spear of thought by which anyone <u>will defend himself</u>', <u>ἀλέξεται</u> (171). The fourth stanza concludes emphatically with πέμψον <u>ἀλκάν</u> (189). This impressive march of ἀλκή words, tabulated below, shows that Athena is indeed part of a larger assault against the enemy.

<u>ἀλεξίμοροι</u>	(164; first antistrophe)	… you three divine <u>defenders</u> against death, appear!
<u>ἀλέξεται</u>	(171; second strophe)	… human <u>defence</u>lessness against death
<u>ἀλκ</u>άν	(189; second antistrophe)	… Athena, send divine <u>defence</u> against death!

That assault, which began with one triad of gods (Athena, Artemis, Apollo) in the second stanza, culminates with a second triad of gods (Apollo, Artemis, and Bacchus) in the final stanza. So, in addition to the collective momentum behind the ἀλκή motif, the ring composition of these two triads of gods, conspicuously framing the boundaries of the ὕμνος κλητικός (summoning prayer), makes clear that Athena is not alone in the task of routing Ares.

---

[16] C.S. Brown, 'Odysseus and Polyphemus: the name and the curse', *Comparative Literature* 18 (1966), 193–202, at 195. On the same passage W.B. Stanford, *The Odyssey of Homer: Books I–XII* (London, 1965) writes: 'Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 2, 3, 1380 b22) says that Odysseus tells Polyphemus his name because the Greeks considered vengeance incomplete till the sufferer knows by whom and for what reason it was inflicted.'

IV. TRANSPOSITION BRINGS A 'MORE DECISIVE' ENDING

The final argument of Haase and Dawe maintains that transposition provides 'a more decisive conclusion, not with a pictorial description of Bacchus and his entourage: instead Zeus, king of the gods, is to blast Ares beneath his thunderbolt'.[17] I see two objections here. The first regards the song's overall structure. This choral petition exhibits, like many Greek prayers, a tripartite liturgical progression: an inquiry and initial appeal (151–67) which leads to the grounds for the appeal (168–89) which culminates in the appeal proper (190–215).[18] As mentioned above, the second and sixth stanzas form a natural pair that encompasses the hymn proper (159–215). The first words of the second stanza immediately announce the prayer's formal beginning: πρῶτα σὲ κεκλόμενος (159), 'first calling on you ...' The second stanza proceeds to invoke three Olympian gods (Athena, Artemis, Apollo) in their roles as civic protectors (γαιάοχον, 160; ἀγορᾶ, 161; πόλει, 165). In the sixth stanza the chorus petitions three Olympians, this time in a non-civic martial context, climaxing with an invocation of Bacchus (κικλήσκω, 208). So the two reduplicated verbs, κεκλόμενος (159) and κικλήσκω (208), employing what Burton calls 'the phraseology of ritual', frame the entire parodos.[19]

Within the boundaries of these two kletic verbs (κεκλόμενος and κικλήσκω) one finds a sophisticated ring structure. As Burton puts it, 'Like the first stanza, the other five are thus composed together in circular form.'[20] That circular form to which Burton refers is worth outlining briefly because the conspicuous symmetry of stanzas strengthens the case against Haase's proposed transposition. The circular movement of the first strophe, framed by the invocation of the Delphic oracle at its beginning (ὦ … ἀδυεπὲς φάτις … πολυχρύσου, 151–2) and end (εἰπέ … ὦ χρυσέας … Φήμα, 157–8), marks off that initial stanza as a discrete unit and, one might say, announces the liturgical ring structure of the next five stanzas. Their symmetrical design can be seen most clearly by starting from the centre and moving out. The second strophe and antistrophe respond to one another with two strong verbal sequences that highlight the plague's devastating power, namely ἀνάριθμα (168) echoed by ἀνάριθμος (179, in exact metrical response) and ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλα … ἀκτὰν (175–8) echoed by ἀκτὰν … ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι (184). On each side of the central pair of stanzas are the 'fires' that have ravaged Thebes in the past and present, namely φλόγα … νῦν (166–7, i.e. the Sphinx) echoed by νῦν … φλέγει (191–2, i.e. the plague). Surrounding all this and binding the kletic hymn into one coherent whole are κεκλόμενος (159) and κικλήσκω (208), each invoking a triad of protective deities.[21] Transposition of the fifth and sixth stanzas

---

[17] Dawe (n. 2, 2006) at 190–215.

[18] W. Ax (n. 10), 421–3 describes these three parts of the kletic hymn as 'die Anrufung', 'die Begründung der Bitte' and 'das eigentliche Gebet'; similarly W. Kranz, *Stasimon: Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie* (Berlin, 1933), 185: 'ein Rufhymnus an die Götter', 'ein Stück begründender Beschreibung' and 'ein neues, andersgeartetes Gebet'; and T.B.L. Webster, *An Introduction to Sophocles* [2] (London, 1969), 127 and 135: 'invocation', 'grounding' and 'prayer'. Chryses' appeal to Apollo at *Iliad* 1.37–42 provides a simple example of this pattern.

[19] Burton (n.12), 144.

[20] Burton (n.12), 144.

[21] The ring structure of the *OT* parodos is noted by Burton (n. 12), 144 and given fuller treatment by Webster (n. 18), 129–30. I have elaborated on this matter because the *CQ* referee disagreed with my structural analysis (and implicitly with the assessments of Burton and Webster):

would destroy the chiastic architecture outlined here and along with it the hymn's structural and ritual symmetry.[22]

My second objection to this final argument of Haase and Dawe (i.e. that strophic transposition brings about a more decisive conclusion) regards content and, more specifically, the appropriateness of Bacchus and Ares at the close of the final stanza. The passionate first-person κικλήσκω has as its direct object 'the god of the golden headband … wine-faced Bacchus, comrade of the Maenads, blazing with his gleaming-eyed pine torch, ἀγλαῶπι … πεύκαι (208–12). Given that the chorus had begun their song with a reference to 'gleaming Thebes', ἀγλαὰς … Θήβας (153–4), it is appropriate that they conclude by summoning that city's divine benefactor. In an analogous fashion the chorus in *Antigone* sing their sixth and final ode (1115–54) as a kletic hymn to Bacchus: 'And now, since the entire polis is gripped by a violent sickness (πάνδαμος πόλις ἐπὶ νόσου, *Ant.* 1141; cf. νοσεῖ … πρόπας στόλος, *OT* 169), come with a purifying foot (καθαρσίῳ ποδί, 1144) over the ridge of Parnassus or the groaning waters of the [Euboean] strait.'[23] In each of these passages the Theban chorus is emphasizing Bacchus' close connection with his mother city (ἐπώνυμον, *OT* 209; ματρόπολιν, *Ant.* 1122). Bacchus had a major sanctuary on Thebes' acropolis called the Cadmeia whose focal point was the tomb of his mother, Semele (cf. *Bacch.* 6–12).[24] But this is not the only reason the chorus has replaced Athena as the third member of the divine triad (210–15; cf. 160). As Erp Taalman Kip observes, 'the gods here almost seem to have become violent elemental forces and in this context Bacchus fits better than

'This is the sort of word game which could be applied to any random collection of lyric lines.' Respectfully I disagree. Sophocles was a master of ring composition in both narrative and lyrics; he used the technique economically but when he did use it, he did so with real purpose. The parodos of *OT*, the longest of his odes, is one of those instances: it has the most conspicuous circular design of any song in the dramatist's surviving plays, although for a close competitor see S. Esposito, 'The third stasimon of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*', *CW* 91.1 (1997), 21–38. For a comprehensive treatment of lyric response in Sophocles see Alois Rzach, 'Über antistrophische Wort- und Gedankenresponsion in den Chorliedern der sophokleischen Dramen', *Programm* (Prag, 1874), 1–47 (p. 16 on the *OT* parodos).

[22] S. Esposito, 'The changing roles of the Sophoclean chorus', *Arion* 3rd series, 4.1 (1996), 85–114, at 95 points out that not only does the *OT* parodos have a chiastic ring structure but so too do all five choral odes when taken together as an ensemble:
   a) Song 1 (151–215) = an affirmation of the power of the gods
   b) Song 2 (463–511) = chorus as prophet (μάντις, 499)
   c) Song 3 (863–910) = crisis of faith: 'Why should I dance?' (896)
   b) Song 4 (1086–109) = chorus as prophet (μάντις, 1086)
   a) Song 5 (1186–222) = a lament on the powerlessness of mankind.

[23] On the importance of this *Antigone* passage and the notorious 'purifying foot' of Dionysus see M.R. Kitzinger, *The Choruses of Sophokles' Antigone and Philoktetes: A Dance of Words* (Leiden and Boston, 2008), 65–9; H. Cullyer, 'A wind that blows from Thrace: Dionysus in the fifth stasimon of *Antigone*', *CW* 99 (2005), 3–21; W.D. Furley and J.M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period* (Tübingen, 2001), 2.278; S. Scullion, 'Dionysos and katharsis in *Antigone*', *ClAnt* 17 (1998), 96–122; N. Loraux, *The Mourning Voice: An Essay on Greek Tragedy*, tr. E.T. Rawlings (Ithaca and London, 2002), 92–3; C. Segal, *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1981), 199–206.

[24] A. Schachter, 'Sophokles *Oidipus Tyrannos* 210', in J.-B. Caron, M. Fortin and G. Maloney (edd.), *Mélanges d'études anciennes offerts à Maurice Lebel* (Québec, 1980), 113–17, at 115.

Athene.'[25] Furthermore, as Calame points out, the invocation of the eponymous Bacchus 'leads us back to Thebes and to the site of the dramatic action.'[26]

I would add a second point, with respect to content, about the appropriateness of the final stanza of the received text. In the climactic last verse the enemy suddenly reappears in what Kamerbeek aptly calls a 'remarkable designation', namely τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν ('the god who is repelled from honour among the gods').[27] No name is needed, just as at the end of the second antistrophe no name was needed to identify 'the golden daughter of Zeus' (188). Ares was the emphatic first word of the third strophe; now in his new characterization as τὸν ἀπότιμον … θεόν he is the emphatic last word of the third antistrophe. The chorus calls him not just 'dishonoured' (ἄτιμος) but 'repelled from honour' (ἀπότιμος, a tragic hapax).[28] The Ares who began the third strophe as a voracious, scorching killer surrounded by the screams of his victims has been forced, at the very end, to retreat in dishonour to the outermost boundary of the song itself. It is a lovely irony that just as the Theban elders are pushing Ares off the edge of their lyric text (with the ritual banishment perhaps performed mimetically by their dancing in the orchestra) Oedipus should reappear on stage and, in response to their prayer (αἰτεῖς. ἃ δ᾿ αἰτεῖς), offer himself, 'stranger to the report and the deed' (of Laius' murder), as the source of ἀλκή against their sickness (216–20).

In sum, this section has argued that the final stanza of the received text is quite appropriate with regard to structure and content and that the appearance of Bacchus (Thebes' divine benefactor) and his antithesis Ares (most dishonoured of the gods) at the end provides a very effective conclusion.

V. CONCLUSION

Haase's transposition, restored by Dawe, has been adopted by hardly anyone since Haase first proposed it 150 years ago. As I hope to have shown, much is lost by this flip-flopping of stanzas and nothing gained.

Boston University   STEVE ESPOSITO
                                                       espo@bu.edu

[25] A.M. van Erp Taalman Kip, 'Some reflections on the chorus in Sopholces' *Oedipus Tyrannus'*, in J.M. Bremer, S.L. Radt and C.J. Ruijgh (edd.), *Miscellanea Tragica in Honorem J.C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam, 1976), 71–83, at 75; cf. S. Scully, 'Orchestra and stage in Sophocles: *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the Theater of Dionysus', *SyllClass* 10 (1999), 55–86, at 77.

[26] C. Calame, 'Performative aspects of the choral voice in Greek tragedy: civic identity in performance', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge, 1999), 125–53, at 134.

[27] Kamerbeek (n. 7) at 215.

[28] In tracking word frequency (such as the *hapax legomenon* here) I have found very helpful, not least because they are so user-friendly, the following books by G. Rigo: *Sophocle: Opera et fragmenta omnia: Index verborum, Listes de Fréquence* (Liège, 1996); *Eschyle: Opera et fragmenta omnia: Index verborum, Listes de Fréquence* (Liège, 1999); and *Euripide: Opera et fragmenta omnia: Index verborum, Listes de Fréquence*, 2 vols. (Liège, 2005).