

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

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

*AJAX*<sup>2</sup>

172–181  
(~182–191)

ἦ ῥά σε Ταυροπόλα Διὸς Ἄρτεμις,  
ὦ μεγάλη Φάτις ὦ  
μᾶτερ αἰσχύνας ἐμᾶς,  
ὄρμασε πανδάμους ἐπὶ βουῖς ἀγελαίας, 175  
ἦ πού τινος νίκας ἀκαρπώ-  
του χάριν (ἦ ῥα κλύτων ἐνάρων  
ψευσθεῖς ἀδώροις εἴτ' ἐλαφαβολίαις)  
ἦ χαλκοθώραξ σοί τιν' Ἐννάλιος  
μομφᾶν ἔχων ξυνοῦ δορὸς ἐννυχίους 180  
μηχαναῖς ἐτείσατο λώβαν·

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

190 μῆ semel OVG (teste Dawe)

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

192–200                    ἀλλ' ἄνα ξξ ἐδράνων,  
                                 ὄπου μακραίωνι

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

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

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

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

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

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

στηρίξει ποτέ τὰιδ' ἀγωνίῳ σχολᾷ,  
 ἄταν οὐρανίαν φλέγων 195  
 ἐχθρῶν δ' ὕβρις ὠδὸν ἀτάρβητα  
 ὀρμάται ἐν εὐανέμοις βάσσαις,  
 πάντων †βακχαζόντων† γλώσσαις  
 βαρυνάλητα·  
 ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος ἔστακεν. 200

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

221–32	οἶαν ἐδήλωσας ἀνδρὸς αἴθρονος ἀγγελίαν ἄτλατον οὐδὲ φευκτάν, τῶν μεγάλων Δαναῶν ὕπο κληιζομένην, τὰν ὁ μέγας μῦθος ἀέξει· ὦμοι, φοβοῦμαι τὸ προσέρπον· περίφαντος ἀνήρ θανεῖται, παραπλάκτωι χερὶ συγκατάκτας κελαινοῖς ξίφεσιν βοτὰ καὶ βοτήρας ἱππονώμας.	221–2  224–5      230
~245–56	ᾧρα ᾽στὶν ἤδη κἀρα καλύμμασι κρυψάμενον ποδοῖν κλοπὰν ἀρέσθαι, ἢ θοὸν εἰρεσίας ζυγὸν ἐζόμενον ποντοπόρωι ναῖ μεθεῖναι· τοίας ἐρέσσουσιν ἀπειλὰς δικρατεῖς Ἄτρεΐδαι καθ' ἡμῶν πεφόβημαι λιθόλευστον Ἄρη ξυναλαγεῖν μετὰ τοῦδε τυπεῖς, τὸν αἰσ' ἄπλατος ἴσχει.	245–6  248–9 250     255

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

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







ἐγὼ δ' ὁ τλάμων  
 παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος 600  
 Ἴδαία μίμνων  
 λειμώνι' ἔπαυλα μηνῶν  
 ἀνήριθμος αἰὲν εὐνώμαι,  
 χρόνῳ τρυχόμενος,  
 κακὰν ἐλπίδ' ἔχων 605  
 ἔτι μέ ποθ' ἀνύσειν  
 τὸν ἀπὸτροπον ἀΐδηλον Αἴδαν.

~609–21

καί μοι δυσθεράπευτος Αἴας  
 ξύνεστιν ἔφεδρος, ὦμοι μοι, 610  
 θεΐαι μανίαι ξύναυλος·  
 ὄν ξεξέμψω  
 πρὶν δὴ ποτε θουρίῳ  
 κρατοῦντ' ἐν Ἄρει·  
 νῦν δ' αὖ φρενὸς οἰοβώτας 615  
 φίλοις μέγα πένθος ἠϋρῆται,  
 τὰ πρὶν δ' ἔργα χερῶν  
 μεγίστας ἀρετᾶς  
 ἀφιλα παρ' ἀφίλοις  
 ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε μελέοις Ἀτρείδαις. 620

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

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

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

Wilamowitz redivided as *gl<sup>1</sup> ch ia f – : – – – – – – – – – (3ia)*. Dawe gives 604–5/617–18 *uno versus* as ‘glyc. + chor.’, a virtually unique compound (see Itsumi, *ibid.*). Most, after Jebb, rightly recognize the pair of – – – – – cola, as above.<sup>22</sup> Such

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>28</sup> Read ἔμο-λεν ἔμολεν, [ὦ] βάκχαι, rather than ἔμολ' ἔμολεν . . . Interpolation of ὦ is very

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

**622–33** ἧ που παλαιᾷ  
 (~634–45) μὲν σύντροφος ἀμέραι  
 λευκῶι τε γήραι  
 μάτηρ νιν ὅταν νοσοῦντα 625  
 φρενοβόρως ἀκούσῃ,  
 αἴλινον αἴλινον  
 οὐδ' οἰκτρὰς γόον ὄρνιθος ἀηδοῦς  
 ἧσει δὺσμορος, ἀλλ'  
 ὄξυτόνους μὲν ὠιδὰς 630  
 θρήνησει, χερόπλακτοι δ'  
 ἐν στέρνοισι πεσοῦνται  
 δοῦποι καὶ πολιᾶς ἄμυγμα χαίτας.

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

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

**701–5** νῦν γὰρ ἐμοὶ μέλει χορεῦσαι·  
 Ἰκαρίων δ' ὑπὲρ πελαγίων <πόρων>  
 μολῶν ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων  
 ὁ Δάλιος εὐγνωστος  
 ἐμοὶ ξυνεΐη διὰ παντὸς εὐφρων· 705

~**714–18** πάνθ' ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνει,  
 κούδὲν ἀναύδατον φατίξαιμ' <ἔγωγ'> 715  
 ἄν, εὐτέ γ' ἐξ ἀέλπτων  
 Αἴας μεταγεννώσθη  
 θυμοῦ τ' Ἀτρείδαις μεγάλων τε νεικέων.

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

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

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

del. Livineius 715 ἀναύδατον Lobeck (cf. A. *Sept.* 897): -ητον codd. (-ακτον Hsch.) φατίσαιμι' Livineius <ἐγγωγ>, cf. O.T. 504 718 θυμοῦ τ' Hermann: -μὼν τ' A, -μῶν N<sup>S</sup>G<sup>γ</sup>P<sup>ac</sup>?, -μὼν cett.

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

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

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

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

879-90 τὶς ἄν δῆτά μοι, τίς ἄν φιλοπόνων  
ἀλιαδᾶν ἔχων ἀϋπνοὺς ἄγρας,

880

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

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

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

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

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

ἢ τίς Ὀλυμπίδων  
 θεᾶν ἢ ῥυτῶν  
 Βοσπορίων ποταμῶν τὸν ὠμόθυμον  
 εἴ ποθι πλαζόμενον λεύσσων 885  
 ἄπυοι; σχέτλια γὰρ  
 ἐμέ γε τὸν μακρῶν ἀλάταν πόνων οὐρίω  
 μὴ πελάσαι δρόμωι,  
 ἀλλ' ἀμένηρον ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὄπου. 890

~925–36

ἔμελλες τάλας, ἔμελλες χρόνωι  
 στερεόφρων ἄρ' ἕξανύσσειν κακὰν  
 μοῖραν ἀπειρεσίῳν  
 πόνων τοιά μοι  
 πάννηχα καὶ φαέθοντ' ἀνεστέναζες 930  
 ὠμόφρον' ἐχθοδόπ' Ἀτρείδαις  
 οὐλίωι σὺν πάθει·  
 μέγας ἄρ' ἦν ἐκείνος ἄρχων χρόνος πημάτων  
 ἦμος ἀριστόχειρ 935  
 <- - - -> ὄπλων ἕκειτ' ἀγὼν πέρι.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**~946–8**  
 ὦμοι ἀναλγήτων  
 δισσῶν ἐθρόηςας ἀναυδ'  
 ἔργ' Ἄτρειδᾶν τῶιδ' ἄχει·

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

**1190** †  
 †ἀνὰ τὰν εὐρώδη Τροίαν†  
**~1197** ὦ  
 ὦ πόννοι πρόγονοι πόνων

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRACHINIAE<sup>41</sup>

94–102  
(~103–11)

## ΧΟΡΟΣ

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

98 μοι del Tr γὰς Schneidewin 100 ποντίους pler.: -ας L (~L<sup>1s</sup>) 101 δισσὰς ἀν'  
ἀπείρους Dawe: δισσαῖων ἀπείροισιν(ν) codd. (-αῖς -οῖς Tr) κρυφείς Stinton

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

112–21 (~122–131)	<p><i>πολλὰ γὰρ ὄστ’ ἀκάμαντος</i>  <i>ἢ νότου ἢ βορέα τις</i>  <i>κύματ’ &lt;ἐν&gt; εὐρέϊ πόντῳ</i>  <i>βάντ’ ἐπιόντ’ ἀν’ ἴδοι·</i>  <i>οὕτω δὲ τὸν Καδμογενῆ</i>  <i>τρέφει, τὸ δ’ αὔξει, βιότου</i>  <i>πολύπονον ὥσπερ πέλαγος</i>  <i>Κρήσιον· ἀλλά τις θεῶν</i>  <i>αἰὲν ἀναμπλάκητον Ἄιδα</i>  <i>σφε δόμων ἐρύκει.</i></p>	115          120
----------------------	--	--

114 <ἐν> Erfurd; <ἀν> Porson, Wakefield 115 ἐπιόντ’ ἀν] ἐπιόντα τ’ codd.  
 117 στρέφει Reiske

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**205–8**                    ἀνολοιξάτω δόμος ἐφεστίοις <σὺν> ἀλαλαῖς                    205  
                                  ὁ μελλόνμφος, ἐν δὲ κοινὸς ἀρσένων  
                                  ἴτω κλαγγὰ τὸν εὐφάρετραν . . .

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

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

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

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







best implausibly forced.<sup>54</sup> Of numerous *-ατι* conjectures by far the best is Blaydes's neglected *βάμματι* 'tincture' (cf. *Ar. Ach.* 112, *Pax* 1176, etc.), both technically (*βά.μ-* corrupting to *φά.μ-*) and for the sense. There is a double point: the robe had been dipped in Nessus' blood (*ἔβαψα* 580); but the blood was also poisonous because of the Hydra's blood in which Heracles' arrows had been dipped (*ἔβαψεν* 574). Then *τ'* (following *μέν*, *GP* 374–6) is likely to be right here for an 'additive', not simply 'balancing', point. *ἀκίζει* (not *αἰκ-*), cf. *Aj.* 403. For the shift to finite construction, cf. *GP* 369, n. 1.

In 839–40 the usual procedure is to delete *Νέσσου θ'* after Erfurdt and Gleditsch (sometimes *ὑπο* as well, after Dindorf), with *μελαγχαίτα* in 837 then taken as substantival. That is scarcely possible. Longo compares the use of *κυανοχαίτης* in *Il.* 20.144 and *Od.* 9.536; but the 'titular' epithet (in the nominative) there ends a verse, preceded by the verb of which 'Poseidon' is already understood as the subject. The residue of 839 is then somehow taken as a dochmius in responson with 829 *ἔτι ποτ' ἔτ' ἐπίπονον*, followed as above by *2ia*.<sup>55</sup> But we cannot simply excise *Νέσσου θ'* or *Νέσσου θ' ὑπο* (though *θ'* is indeed unwanted). More probably we need a supplement in 829. We can then write *θηρός ὑπο . . .* in 839 (glossed by the proper name, cf. *ἡρακλέους* 854, *ὄδυσσεύς Phil.* 1139) as the appropriate noun with *μελαγχαίτα* and with the right metrical value for another iambic sequence, beginning *- ~ ~ ~ ~ : . . .* like 825/835.<sup>56</sup> For the supplement in the strophe <*ἄελιον*> then suggests itself (recurring at 835), or else <*ἔτι φάος*>.<sup>57</sup> As things stand we have to understand something like *φῶς* with *ὁ μὴ λεύσσων*, but no parallel is cited for that.

846–8                    *ἦ που †ὄλοα στένει†,*  
                              *ἦ που ἀδινῶν χλωρὰν*  
                              *τέγγει δακρῶν ἄχραν·*

~857–9                   *ἂ τότε θοὰν νύμφαν*  
                              *ἄγαγες ἀπ' αἰπειῶς*  
                              *τάνδ' Οἰχαλίας αἰχμᾶν·*

'stichic' nature of the repeated cola (cf. the similarly unusual *. . . λεπτόν δ' | . . .* or *. . . λεπτόν | δ' . . .* at Sappho 31.9–10). In such cases I do not indent the following verse, even as one does not indent following elision at verse-end in non-lyric stichic metres. (*Aj.* 631–2 is different, at any rate if the sequence there is *2io : 2io*.)

<sup>54</sup> Easterling rightly rejects Lloyd-Jones's *δεινοτέρωι* (approved by West). Heracles is doomed (835), on the one hand (*μέν*) because the poison has a Hydra origin, and further because of its enhancement (with mingling, *ἄμμιγα*) by Nessus; a sequence of thought spoilt by 'more terrible than the Hydra' in the *μέν*-clause. But her defence of *φάσματι* does not convince: there is surely *real* (if indirect) contagion from both Hydra and Centaur, not an 'apparition' to be understood 'not literally'.

<sup>55</sup> *δ - : ith* is possible in itself, though such overlap from dochmius into following iambic is rare; cf. n. 34 above.

<sup>56</sup> With split resolution at *- ~ ~ ~ . . .* as *El.* 212, *Phil.* 201 (and in *ia sp* verses also at 846, 847, *El.* 508, *Phil.* 836/52); cf. Parker<sup>2</sup> 252. To retain *φοῖνια δολόμυθα* would give another split resolution. *φόνια δολόμυθα* is probably right, with a more normal pattern.

<sup>57</sup> <*ἔτι φάος*> was suggested to me by Professor Diggle (comparing *I.T.* 232–3 for the triple *ἔτι*). Gleditsch's <*πόνων*> after *-πονον*, though technically good, is painfully otiose, and *λεύσσων* does really need an object (<*φῶς*> Hartung, <*φάος*> Wunder).



type before an extended narrative), and with *μάταια* (pl.) supposedly referring to the same thing as ‘this *ῥβρις*’. Conington saw that *ω ματαια* is likely to conceal a vocative *μαῖα* (to the Nurse, cf. *Hipp.* 243, 311); an insight surprisingly not mentioned in LJ-W’s discussion. *ἐπείδεις, ὦ μαῖα, τάνδε <τάν> ῥβρω* will give a satisfactory syncopated trimeter (*ia lk*), as likely as *ζια* in lyric. But *ὦ μαῖα <μαῖα>* will obviate the need for the prosy *<τάν>*. For the doubled vocative, cf. *Ag.* 973 (etc.) *Ζεῦ Ζεῦ, 1490/1514 βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ, Phil.* 797 *ὦ Θάνατε Θάνατε, Andr.* 504 (etc.) *μᾶτερ ματερ, Ba.* 582–4 *δέσποτα δέσποτα . . . ὦ Βρόμει Βρόμει*.

893–5 Χο. <ἔ ἔ> ἔτεκεν ἔτεκε  
 μεγάλην ἀνέορτος ἄδε νύμφα  
 δόμοισι τοῖσδ’ Ἐρινύν. 895

Easterling has the support of a scholion in preferring *ἀ νέορτος* to *ἀνέορτος*. But the definite article is otiose in conjunction with *ἄδε*, and LJ-W rightly approve the sense ‘this bride *without a (marriage) ceremony*’ (cf. *ἀνυμέναια κτλ.* at *Pho.* 346ff.). With *ἄν φῶτος* we can also divide as above, so as to end with . . . | *T ba* || *2ia*, with an effect of double clausula; *T ba* as 648/656, *Alc.* 437/447, etc.<sup>59</sup>

Before that, *ἔτεκεν ἔτεκε* (Tr; *-κεν -κεν* codd.) could be an iambic monometer, but seems more likely to be a defective dochmius, the context suggesting a need for an exclamation of grief at this point.<sup>60</sup> For the dochmius ending with resolution before change of metre, cf. *Hec.* 1066–7 (the same . . . δ | *T . . .*), cited in n. 36 above.<sup>61</sup>

The vulgate divides either after *μεγάλαν* or after *μεγάλαν ἄ*, always with a metrically unacceptable first verse. Dawe, dividing as Dale, annotates *ἔτεκεν ἔτεκε* *μεγάλαν ἄ* as ‘*ia. dim. cat.*’ (catalectic verses cannot end with a prepositive, and the two split resolutions are horrible). Davies, dividing a syllable earlier, annotates ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (sic) as a dochmius (impossibly, and also inconsistently with his commentary). The vulgate *ἔτεκεν ἔτεκε* (Schröder) is culpably treated as the paradosis by LJ-W (a misrepresentation not remedied by Davies). It is in fact an anadiplosis of most unusual form (see above on *Aj.* 620), and the elision should not be regarded (as by Dale) as a routinely ‘simple emendation’.

1004–9 †ἔέ, ἐᾶτέ μ’ ἐᾶτέ με  
 δύσμορον εὐνάσαι, 1005  
 ἐᾶτέ με δύστανον·†  
 πᾶι <πᾶι> μου ψαύεις; ποῖ κλίνεις;  
 ἀπολείς μ’ ἀπολείς·  
 ἀνατέτροφας ὅ τι καὶ μύσηι·

~1023–30 ὦ παῖ, ποῦ ποτ’ εἶ; τᾶιδέ με τᾶιδέ μ’ <ὦ>  
 πρόσλαβε κουφίσας· 1025  
 ἔ ἔ· ἰὼ δαίμον·

<sup>59</sup> *T ba* and *-e ba* are related verses, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ often behaving as an ‘enoplian expansion’ of ~ ~ ~ (comm. Or. xx). *T*, cf. also *Ant.* 879, 967/978, 1115/1126. *T sp*, frequent in Eur. (as *Andr.* 862, *Ion* 1482) occurs first at *Trac.* 646/655. For the ‘double clausula’, cf. on *Aj.* 196–200.

<sup>60</sup> <ἔ ἔ>, cf. 1004, 1026, etc., below. There are indeed other possibilities on similar lines: e.g. <φεῦ> ἔτεκεν ἔτεκεν. Or one might insert *ὦ* or *φεῦ* or *ἔ ἔ* or simply *δῆ* at the end of the verse.

<sup>61</sup> On anadiplosis in dochmiacs, see especially Diggle, *Euripidea* 376–8.

θρώισκει δ' αὖ θρώισκει δειλαία  
 διολοῦς' ἡμᾶς  
 ἀποτίβατος ἀγρία νόσος· 1030

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

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

ε̃ ε̃· ε̃ἀτέ μ' ὕστατον, ε̃ἀτέ μ' ὦ  
 δύσμορον εὐνᾶσθαι· 1005  
 <ε̃ ε̃· ἰὼ δαίμων>

The lacuna usually, after Coxon, indicated after the initial ε̃ ε̃ is now located later, as a verse corresponding with, and very probably identical to, the exclamatory verse ε̃ ε̃· ἰὼ δαίμων· at 1026 (a responsion thus like *Aj.* 694/707, *Andr.* 1175/1188). The variant ὕστατον is taken as a survival of truth. δύστανον may have come in either as a corruption of that or as a synonym of δύσμορον (or both). εατε με δυστανον ευνασ(θ)αι and εατε με δυσμορον ευνασ(θ)αι will then have been transmitted as variants. The same corruption of μ' ὦ to με (as in the antistrophe) is postulated at the end of the first (2δ) verse. ε̃ἀτε has the normal trisyllabic scansion, not with ε̃α- monosyllabic as in some conjectures.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OEDIPUS TYRANNUS<sup>67</sup>

151–8 ὦ Διὸς ἀδυεπέες Φάτι, τίς ποτε τὰς πολυχρόσου  
 Πυθῶνος ἀγλαῆς ἔβας  
 Θήβας; ἐκτέταμαι φοβερὰν φρένα δείματι πάλλων,  
 ἰήϊε Δάλιε Παιῶν,  
 ἀμφὶ σοὶ ἀζόμενος· τί μοι ἦ νέον 155  
 ἦ περιτελλομένας  
 ὦραις πάλιν ἐξανύσεις  
 χρέος, εἰπέ μοι, ὦ χρυσέας  
 τέκνον Ἑλπίδος, ἄμβροτε Φήμα·

~159–67 πρῶτα σέ κεκλόμενος, θύγατερ Διὸς ἄμβροτ' Ἀθάνα,  
 γαιάοχόν τ' ἀδελφεὰν 160  
 Ἄρτεμιν, ἃ κυκλόεντ' ἀγορᾶς θρόνον εὐκλέα θάσσει,  
 καὶ Φοῖβον ἑκαβόλον, †ἰὼ ἰὼ†  
 τρισσοὶ ἀλεξίμοροι προφάνητέ μοι,  
 εἴ ποτε καὶ προτέρας  
 ἄτας ὕπερ ὀρνημένας 165  
 πόλει ἠνύσατ' ἐκτοπίαν  
 φλόγα πήματος, ἔλθετε καὶ νῦν.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I write Φάτι (personified) in 151 in line with Φῆμα 158 (cf. *Aj.* 173, *El.* 1066); for the rectifications Παιών in 154 and ἡνύσατ' in 166, cf. West, *AT* xlix and xxx. In 162 ἰὼ ἰὼ needs correction, but there is no compelling reason to look further than Heath's single ἰώ, with long iota;<sup>73</sup> we might, however, perhaps consider writing ὦ ὦ.<sup>74</sup>

168–78	<p>ὦ πόποι, ἀνάριθμα γὰρ φέρω          πήματα νοσεῖ δέ μοι πρόπας          στόλος, οὐδ' ἔνι φροντίδος ἔγχος          ὦι τις ἀλέξεται οὔτε γὰρ ἔκγονα          κλυτὰς χθονὸς αὔξεται οὔτε τόκοισιν          ἰηίων καμάτων ἀνέχουσι γυναῖκες·          ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλωι προσίδοις ἄπερ εὔπτερον ὄρνυ          κρεῖσσον ἀμαιμακέτου πυρὸς ὄρμενον          ἀκτὰν πρὸς ἐσπέρου θεοῦ·</p>	170
~179–89	<p>ὦν πόλις ἀνάριθμος ὄλλυται,          νηλέα δὲ γένεθλα πρὸς πέδωι          θαναταφόρα κείται ἀνοίκτως·          ἐν δ' ἄλοχοι πολιαί τ' ἐπὶ ματέρες          ἀχὰν παραβώμιον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα          λυγρῶν πόνων ἰκετῆρες ἐπιστενάχουσιν·          παιῶν δὲ λάμπει στονόεσσα τε γῆρυσ ὄμαυλος·</p>	180     185

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

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

<sup>72</sup>  $D^{11}$  as a further extension of the sequence  $D, D^2, D^3$ , etc. *Hclid.* 615–18/626–9 (if earlier) may be viewed as a step towards this, with  $D^6 (4da + D) : \text{---} D -$  as an expansion of the opening enoplian hexameter ( $D : \text{---} D -$ ) in 608/619. The ambivalence is such that the symmetrical pyrrhic words χρέος/πόλει and τέκνον/φλόγα between  $- D$  and  $D -$  are at once double-short (dactylic) and anceps-biceps (enoplian; cf. n. 70 above).

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

<sup>74</sup> Corruption of ὦ/ῶ to ἰώ is very common (*CS I*, n. 95). For allocutory/exclamatory ὦ with imperative (with or without a vocative as well), cf. n. 62 above.



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

183 ἀχὰν παραβώμιον Nauck: ἀκτὰν παρὰ β- codd. 182 ἐπι CFNPA+: ἐπι L<sup>ac</sup>,  
ἐπι pler. 184 ἰκετῆρες O: ἰκτ- cett. 185 παιῶν Π et L<sup>ac</sup>Kt: παιῶν cett. γάρυς  
Bothe 187 τῶν Π (Kennedy): ὄν codd.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

190–202

Ἄρη τε τὸν μαλερόν, ὃς  
 νῦν ἄχαλκος ἀσπίδων  
 φλέγει με περιβόητος ἀντιάζων,  
 παλίσστυον δρᾶμημα κωτίσαι πάτρας  
 ἄπουρον, εἴτ' ἔς μέγαν  
 θάλαμον Ἀμφιτρίτας  
 εἴτ' ἔς τὸν ἀπόξενον ὄρμων  
 Θρήκιον κλύδωνα·  
 †τέλει γὰρ εἴ τι νύξ ἀφῆι  
 τοῦτ' ἐπ' ἡμαρ ἔρχεται·†  
 τόν, ὦ τᾶν πυρφόρων  
 ἀστραπᾶν κράτη νέμων,  
 ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, ὑπὸ σῶι φθίσσον κεραυνῶι.

Λύκει' ἀναξ, τά τε σὰ χρυ-  
 σοστρόφων ἀπ' ἀγκυλᾶν  
 βέλεα θέλομι' ἀν' ἀδάματ' ἐνδατεῖσθαι  
 ἄρωγὰ προσταθέντα, τὰς τε πυρφόρους  
 Ἄρτέμιδος αἴγλας, ξὺν αἰς  
 Λύκι' ὄρεα διαίισσει·  
 τὸν χρυσομίτραν τε κικλήσκω  
 τᾶσδ' ἐπώνυμον γᾶς  
 οἰνώπα Βάκχον, εὐίων  
 μαιάδων ὀμόστολον,  
 πελασθῆναι φλέγοντ'  
 †ἀγλαῶπι - - - †  
 πεύκαι 'πὶ τὸν ἀπότιμον ἐν θεοῖς θεόν.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

483 *με νοῦν* Nauck: *μὲν οὖν* codd.

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

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

651–7  
 Οι. τί σοι θέλεις δῆτ’ εἰκάθω;  
 Χο. τὸν οὔτε πρὶν  
 νήπιον νῦν τ’ ἐν ὄρ-  
 κωί μέγαν καταίδεσαι.  
 Οι. οἶσθ’ οὖν ἅ χρῆζέεις;  
 Χο. οἶδα.

655

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>91</sup> Cf. CS I, 66 with n. 8. <sup>92</sup> Cf. Parker<sup>1</sup> 12.



~1349–51

ὄλοιθ' ὄστις ἦν ὄς [ἀπ'] ἀγρίας πέδας  
 νομὰς ἐπιποδίας λῦσέ μ' ἀπό τε φονοῦ  
 ἔρρυτο . . .

1350

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

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

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

**1339/1359** ἔτ' ἔστ' ἀκούειν ἠδονᾶι, φίλοι ~ βροτοῖς ἐκλήθην ὦν ἔφυν ἀπο

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

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK  
 willink@classicfm.net

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