Readings in Aeschylus' Byzantine Triad

Douglas Young

In a recent issue of this journal (GRBS 12 [1971] 303–30) I suggested a number of interpretations or conservative emendations of the received text of Aeschylus' Choephoroe and Eumenides. In sequel I now propose several equally conservative emendations to the paradosis of Persae, Septem contra Thebas and Prometheus Vinctus, the so-called Byzantine triad.1

I. Persae

At 97–100 the manuscript paradosis in the astrophic mesode is thoroughly intelligible, and may be acceptable metrically if colometricized thus:

\[
\text{φιλόφρων γὰρ} \quad \text{古典: α } \quad \text{古典: α } \\
\text{καίνουσα τὸ πρῶτον παράγει βροτὸν ἔις} \quad \text{古典: α } \quad \text{古典: α } \\
\text{ἀρκύστατα, τόθεν οὐκ ἐξῆν ὑπὲρ θνα-} \quad \text{古典: α } \quad \text{古典: α } \\
\text{τόν ἄλυσαντα φυγεῖν.} \quad \text{古典: α } \quad \text{古典: α }
\]

The subject is the δολόμητις Ἀπάτα θεοῦ named at the start of the mesode in 93. "For with a friendly attitude fawning at first she leads a mortal aside into places beset with nets, from which it is impossible that a human should flee by escaping over."

Metrically we have a hexachronous rhythm of ionic a minore varied by ionic a maiore and a choriamb. Line 97 is an ionic monometer, 98 and 99 polyschematist ionic trimeters, and 100 an ionic dimeter cata-

lectric. But one can hardly colometrise rigorously what is to be seen rather as an ionic πνύγος with no true κῶλα. If in threnodic anapaests the Greek lyric tongue could cope with four short syllables on end when an anapaest follows a dactyl, it would find no trouble in 99, where an ionicus a maiore is followed by an ionicus a minore. We have too few swatches of ionics in extant verse to formulate any 'law' in terms of which this analysis could be denounced as illicit. Bothe printed the transmitted text, with no explanation, but divided the lines after πρῶτον and ἀρκύστατα, which destroys the ionic basis of the rhythm. The mesode should be retained where the mss have it, after 92, as by Hermann, Mazon, Paley and Wellauer. The rhythm of the ionic πνύγος conveys well the feeling of the irresistible onset of the Ἀπάτα θεός.

Lines 280–83 and the antistrophe 286–89 can be conservatively colometrized as mainly bacchio-paeono-cretic, with some molossi as equivalents, as allowed by A. M. Dale, p.101:

280 ἐκ τοῦ ἀποτυγματικοῦ ὁδοῦ
δυσκαγγισμένη Πέρσας,
δεισε γάρ πάντα παγκάκκως
ἐθεκαν. αἰαί, στρατοῦ φθάρεντος.

286 συνήγα γ' Ἀθάνας δεῖχος.
μειμελθέσας τοι πάροι,
ὡς πολλὰς Περσίδων μάτας
ἐκτίσων εὐνίδας ἢδ' ἀνάνδρους.

At 286 there is internal correpson in δεῖχος. At 289 the initial choriamb is, in this context, a molossus with its second long resolved. Of course 283 and 289 can both be termed syncopated iambic trimeters, it being allowed that a trimeter can have a choriambic anaclasis in the first metron, cf. Cho. 1049, φαοχέτωνες καὶ πεπλεκτανσίς. But maybe Aeschylus wrote θέκατα (283), κτίσων (289), making initial cetics. At 289 Italie follows Fraenkel in rejecting Wilamowitz's defence of the long iota in εὐνίδας. Also the accent is dubious. Maybe we should resolve the initial diphthong and print the paradosis as ἐκτίσων
At 329 MSS generally offer τοιώνδ' ἀρχόντων ὑπεμνήσθην πέρι, which lacks a short syllable to scan as a trimeter. Perhaps the easiest solution is to assume a loss by haplography from τοιών δ' ἄρα ἀρχόντων ὑπεμνήσθην πέρι, “Such then are the commanders I recall to mind.” The δ' ἄρα would be as in 568, τοι δ' ἄρα πρωτόμοροι, φεύ, λειφθ'έντες πρὸς ἀνάγκας, ἥ... Lack of caesura is found relatively more often in this play than in the later ones, cf. Broadhead’s edition, p.299.

In 370 the epicism νηυείν occurs in M, and in N a second hand writes η above ναιείν. At 448 also νηυείν is presented by \textbf{M ABC ΔΗΚ Νd O ante corr. P linea Q Y} and \textbf{Ya}, as I infer from Dr Dawe’s data, p.316. These occurrences are both in messenger’s speeches, which tend to be hospitable to epicisms, so that they may as well be left in and relished for their epic flavour.

At 375 all Dr Dawe’s MSS offer in the first metron of the iambic trimeter a choriambic anaclasis, δειπνον ἐπορεύοντο, which is in reciprocal support with the generally accepted φαιοχίτωνες at Cho. 1049. Triclinius, no lover of anomalies in metre, added a τ' that is both needless and rather awkward.

At 433 ἔρρωται is offered by M on the line, after an erasure, probably from an original ἔρρωσται, and as a γράφεται variant in the variorum codex P and the Iviron codex I, which seems to be the second best MS so far adduced for the triad. If the line runs αἰαί, κακῶν δὴ πέλαγος ἔρρωται μέγα | Πέρας... , the sense would be, “Alas, a great sea of evils rages strongly against the Persians...” The perfect passive of ὄωννυμι, with present sense, can mean simply ‘be strong’, as at Eur. Heracl. 636, γέροντές ἦμεν κοῦδαμῶς ἐρρώμεθα. But it also in the fifth century may have a more interesting and relevant figurative sense, implying emotional energy, ‘to be eager, enthusiastic’, cf. \textit{LSJ} s.v. Π.2. Thuc. 2.8.4, ἔρρωτο τε πᾶς καὶ ἰδιώτης καὶ πόλες εἰ τι δύνατο καὶ λόγω καὶ ἔργω γενετιλαμβάνεις αὐτοῖς. Lys. 13.31, οὕτω σφόδρα ἔρρωτο ἢ βουλή κακὸν τι ἐργάζεσθαι. Plato at Symp. 176b plays with the two senses: καὶ ἐτὶ ἐνός δέομαι ὑμῶν ἄκοιδα πῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὸ ἐρροῦσαι πίνεις, Ἡγάθωνος.—οὐδαμῶς, φάναι, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἔρρωμαι. In later Greek the sense ‘to be healthy’ prevailed and caused the other senses to be forgotten by copyists, as I surmise, so that the \textit{lectio difficilior} of the better MSS, ἔρρωται, was replaced by the more conventional verb for a marine context, ἐρρωγεῖν, from
ρήγνυμι, meaning 'a great sea of evils has burst'. In this substitution something may have been due to two common errors, the graphical confusion of tau and gamma, and the ear-mistake of mixing α and ε.

At 474 the singular form ἀπήρκεσσε(ν) is offered, in the phrase κούκ ἀπήρκεσσεν | ρώς πρόθε Μαραθῶν βαρβάρων ἀπώλεσσεν, by M A I K supra N Nd OP linea V Y and Ya. It is a schema Pindaricum, like 49 ἔτειται δ' ἱερῷ Τμῶλον πελάται, which is kept by Kirchhoff and Mazon. ἀπήρκεσσεν seems to have been disfavoured by editors since Robortello.

At 528 the learned have been embarrassed to find an adequate interpretation of the reading πιστοίς, found in IKPQ, and implied by the unmetrical πιστοίς of most mss, in the lines

υμᾶς δὲ χρῆ 'πι τοῖς τοῖς πεπραγμένοις πιστοίς πιστὰ ξυμφέρειν βουλεύματα.

Perhaps the best interpretation might be, “For you must, in view of these accomplished facts, bring together loyal counsels with loyal counsels,” that is, “each contribute his loyal counsel to your joint formulation of loyal counsel.” But it may be suggestive that the ms Ya has the reading πιστοίς, which it glosses διδακτικῶς, presumably by error for διδακτικῶς. LSJ know the adjective πιστός only from the Etymologicum Magnum and Eustathius. πιστοίς in 528 would give the sense, “For you must, in view of the ascertainment of these accomplished facts, contribute, bring together, your loyal counsels.” At Sept. 54 the true reading πύςτις has been corrupted to the more familiar, and for a Byzantine ear homophonous, πίςτις, in I supra K ante corr. O ante corr. Q post corr., and in Stobaeus. Lydia Massa Positano, Demetrii Triclinii in Aeschyli Persas Scholia [Naples 1963] p.47, records the grapplings of Triclinius with the passage in his scholia, and at p.102 his gloss, which attaches πιστοίς to his reading υμῶν, probably his own conjecture for the υμᾶς or ἡμᾶς of the paradox. His discussion may incorporate some older views. It begins: 'πιστῶς' ὁφείλειν εἶπεν ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα ἐπήρχαγε 'πιστῶς'. νοεῖται δὲ διπλῶς, ἡ ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις πιστῶς', ἦτοι τοῖς φανερῶς καὶ βεβαιῶς γεγενημένοις τῷ εὐρήματι, ἡ ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις πιστῶς', ἦτοι τοῖς πρότερον υφ' υμῶν γεγενημένοις πιστῶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐργοῖς· ὁ καὶ κρείττων... It seems possible that the phrase τοῖς φανερῶς καὶ βεβαιῶς γεγενημένοις represents an interpretation of the expression I am postulating, τοῖς πεπραγμένοις πιστοίς. Likewise Ya’s reading πιστοίς and gloss διδακτικῶς would not be individual efforts of Ya’s scribe,
but derive from older marginal or interlinear variant and gloss material.

In 532, where most mss lack the long syllable that would make the line an anapaestic dimeter, O and Y offer δ ᾶτομον Περσῶν. Many mss have the τῶν as a gloss, and Wilamowitz thought Q might have had τῶν in the erasure of three letters before Περσῶν. Elmsley at one time proposed to read νῦν τῶν Περσῶν, and very probably that was genuine paradossus. Though scribes often insert articles suum Marte, they equally often omit them pingui Minerva.

At 649 there is an unusual imperatival employment of the potential optative with ἀν. The best text would probably run thus:

650

'Αἰδωνεύς δ' ἀναπομπός ἀν εἶη,
'Αἰδωνεύς,
οἷον ἄνακτα Δαρείαν. ἕ.

"Aidoneus (= Hades) might be upsender, Aidoneus, of the sole lord Dareias. Eh-eh!"

ἀν εἰη is the reading clearly intended by M's accentuation, and appears as a γράφεται variant among the scholia of the second best ms, I, and in P and Q. Smyth, GG §1830, remarks: "The potential optative with ἀν may be used, in a sense akin to that of the imperative, to express a command, exhortation, or request." Pindar has an instance in the third person, at Isthm. 8.49, where Themis says of Thetis λόι καὶ ἀλπόν ὕπ' ἤρωι παρθενιᾶς. ἀναπομπός, formed from the verb ἀναπέμπω, has the power to govern the accusative phrase at 651, οἷον ἄνακτα Δαρείαν. Cf. Cho. 23 χοάς προσομπός. ἀν εἰη was apparently approved or conjectured by G. C. W. Schneider, to judge by an entry in Wecklein's Appendix. Triclinius also knew the reading, to judge by a scholion of his, published by Positano p.54, which runs in part: εἰη τά διὰ μέσου ἐρείκ τό "ὁ 'Αἰδωνεύς δέ, ὁ 'Αἰδωνεύς εἶην ἂν ἀναπομπός," ἀντί τοῦ "εἰη" ἂντικος. The rather indirect type of petition is closer to the expression of wish, εἰη ἀναπέμποι, than to the direct petition, ἀνάπεμψοι. In framing an appeal to Hades, of all gods, a certain gingerly indirection is appropriate.

The text of 651 can be established only after consideration also of the antistrophic verse 656, and a little adjustment is needed in both. At 651 the paradossus offers δαρείων οἷον (or οἷον) ἄνακτα δαρείαν (variously accented). ἕ. Editors commonly reject the initial δαρείων
as a gloss or marginal variant on the form of the king’s name later in the line. Glosses have undoubtedly been intruded at some points into the text of Aeschylus, even into the relatively sincere M. I pointed out some in *GRBS* 5 (1964) 94f. At 651 it might be correct to print οἶον ἀνακτα Δαρείαν ἥ. Accenting Δαρείαν as from a nominative Δαρείας, like Αἴειας, and taking ἥ as an ululation *extra metrum*, one could analyse the metre as Adonean+ molossus, -ωυ-τ-χ-,-, or choriamb if the ei diphthong be opened up. At 656 the paradoxes presents ἐκκεν ἐπεὶ στρατὸν unanimously, then ὑπεδόκει Μ ante corr. εὔ ὑποδόκει Μ post corr. and the majority, with ὑπεδόκει in O post corr. Y Ya, and ὑποδόκει in K, which is probably the truth or the next thing to it. *LSJ* s.v. ποδόκεω attest the form ποδόκεω, doubtless psilotic because Ionic, as a nautical term meaning ‘guide a ship by means of the sheet’, which is one of the lower corners of the sail or a rope attached to it. With a simple prodelision we arrive at εὔ ’ποδόκει. Perhaps, indeed, Aeschylus never augmented his imperfect to begin with, *cf. GRBS* 12 (1971) 316f. The sense would be, “since he used to guide the host well.” For the metre, εὔ ’ποδόκει would be a choriamb answering the molossus or choriamb 651 Δαρείαν. But ἐκκεν, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν, -υυ-υυ, could only respond correctly to 651 οἶον ἀνακτα if one accepts that the final anecps of an Adonean could be resolved.

Now let us reflect that in this play, at 729, we find the word στρατὸς as an intruded gloss upon a true reading λαὸς. For the majority there have λαὸς πᾶς, but the variant πᾶς στρατὸς appears in the text of V N Nd P, on the line. But P elsewhere restores the truth as a γράφεται variant. Then let us turn to Pers. 279, where all ms have in their texts the reading στρατὸς δαμασιεῖς . . . but a second hand in Q has written λεῶς over στρατὸς as a γρ(άφεται) variant. Which word would be used to gloss the other? Clearly, once one thinks about it, the common prose word στρατὸς is an intruded gloss, and ought to be replaced by Q’s variant λεῶς, in 279. Here at 656 I would read ἐκκεν, ἐπεὶ λεῶς εὔ ’ποδόκει. η. ἥ. -υυ-τ-χ-,-υυ-τ-χ-,-, Adonean+ choriamb, with the ululation added *extra metrum*. Italie, s.v. λαὸς (λεῶς) rightly gives its first meaning in Aeschylus as ‘exercitus, copiae’, as also in the *Iliad*, *cf. LSJ* s.v. I.1. I assume synizesis in λεῶς.

The epode at 672–80 can make good sense and metre with much less alteration of the paradox than the current texts exhibit. The most conservative text and a plausible colometry might be as follows:
The literal sense is: “Alas! Alas! O much lamented by your friends at your death, how are these things possible, possible, in regard to your (land), twofold? [i.e. disasters by sea and land]. Because of a pollution and by means of an error three-thole-pinned ships have drained off all this land, (ships) that are no ships, no ships [i.e. are wrecks].”

At 675 the corruption of ουναρά to ουνάτα would be caused partly by the common interchange of τ and στ in minuscules and partly by the latent notion that the deceased Dareios being addressed had been a ουνάττις. For the ellipse of γαρ with τά σα cf. Smyth, GG § 1027 b. Bothe’s redivision could yield the sense, “How are these twofold impossibilities possible . . . ?” At 677 it must be postulated that a round sigma had fallen out in the uncial sequence ΔΙΑΓΟΣΕΝΔΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΙ between other round letters, Ο and Ε, and through the copyist’s familiarity with the verb διώγμα. The Chorus’ references to a pollution and an error would have been prompted by the messenger’s remarks at 354 and 361 on the alas tor and the trick of the Hellene. The εν here is instrumental. At 679Α εξήφυντοι Young, εζέφυντόi ai M linea, εζέφυντόi ai M supra, εζέφθωθοι ai deteriores plerique.

On metrical matters, one may compare the transitional spondees at 672, 678, 679Α to those at 930, αἰνώς αἰνώς ἐπὶ γόνυ κέκλυται. There they help to form a spondeo-dochmiac clausula for an anapaestic swatch,
on which Miss Dale comments (p.54), terming it an “ambiguous transition.” Later, at p.116 she appears to class the double-spondee colon as a form of dochmiac. It is possible that at 678 one should print what M apparently had at first, πάσαν γὰν τάνδε, unelided, to make a dochmius, - - - - x. In the astrophic epode it seems desirable to have the metrical cola coinciding so far as possible with the phrases of the speech natural to the emotional situation. On the foregoing constitution of the text the only changes from the best paradosis are addition of a sigma in 677 and reinterpretation of epsilon as eta in 679A.

At 704, where the other MSS present Dareios addressing his spouse as τῶν ἐμῶν λέκτην γεραιά ξύνομ’, ἐνγενεῖς γύναι, we find the variant δάμαρ in the Iviron codex, I, which is the next best source for the text after M, even though longe secundus. But here I has the better reading. Which word could be used to gloss the other? Clearly γύναι is an instance of gloss substitution, and I’s δάμαρ ought to be placed in the text.

At 730 Atossa says, according to M, after an erasure, πρὸς τάδ’ ὡς Σοῦσων μὲν ἀκτυ πὰν κενανδρία* στένει... Most of Dawe’s MSS have κενανδρίαν; but consider κενανδρία I Y, κενανδρίαις A, obviously through dittography of sigma before στένει. Blomfield, on κενανδρία in some recentiores, astutely noted “nempe pro κενανδρίᾳ”; and this dative of cause should probably be printed: cf. 295, ... κεῖ στένεις κακοῖς ὀμοι.

At 806 the reading ... πεδίον Ἀκωπός ῥοαῖς | ἄρδει φίλος, πίακμα Βοιωτῶν χθονι has superior manuscript support, from M I yp. A H Q Y B ante corr. O linea P linea ante corr. et supra. The nominative, stressing the kindliness of the rivergod Asopos, seems preferable to the neuter variant φίλον, which could be taken either with πεδίον or with πίακμα.

At 819 Dareios prophesies about Plataia, according to the usual text: βίνεις νεκρῶν δὲ καὶ τριτοπτόρῳ γένει | ἀφωνα σημανοῦσιν ὅμασιν βροτῶν. M and Δ have σημανοῦσιν, properispomenon, and very likely we should print a prophetic present, proparoxytone, σημαίνοντων.

At 852–57 ~ 858–63 there are some difficult choices both for variants and for colometry. Most conservative might be the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δ ἡμῶν, ἦ μεγάλας ἀγαθὰς τε πο-</td>
<td>dactylic tetrameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λισσονόμου βιοτάς ἐπεκύρσαμεν,</td>
<td>dactylic tetrameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὖθετ ο γεραιάς</td>
<td>Adonean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sense seems to be: “O popoi! Truly a great and good life of civic government we obtained when the venerable, omnicompetent, unharmful, unfightable king equal to a god, Dareios, ruled the land. Firstly we display as proofs glorious expeditions; and towered law-codes sped over all things. For returns from wars brought men without toil and without suffering, in prosperity, to their homes.”

At 854 γεραιός is better attested than γηραιός, for what little the manuscript evidence is worth on such a point, involving the mere interpretation of an original letter Ε, which, apart from context, might mean ε, η, or ει. The main reason for preferring γεραιός is metrical, that it makes an Adonean, a colon suited to the dactylic context, whereas εδόθ' ο γηραιός makes the awkward sequence —ο— designated by Broadhead, p.293, as an ‘ithyphallic syncopated’, monstrum horrendum informe.

At 860 an Adonean is made with ἐπέθυνον, which I take to be third-plural imperfect from *ἐπι-θύνω- a compound of Homer’s θύνω, cf. Il. 2.446 βασιλῆς | θύνον κρίνοντες. At 856 Murray made ἱκόθεος trisyllabic by synizesis. At 862 I scan the manuscripts’ εδ as εδ, more Homerico, in a generally dactylic stanza, to make a choriamb transitional to the non-dactylic clausula.

As for the clausulae, prima facie we have at 857 an iambic dimer catalectic, like the same colon in the epode at 906, and this is answered at 863 by a Pherecratean, if we keep the paradosis. It is the sort of irregular or anaclastic responsion that Sappho admits when making a glyconic equivalent to a choriambic dimer. Cf. P. Maas, Greek Metre,
tr. H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford 1962) p.27. Now at 863 Dawe reports that in M the sigma of €c is almost erased, and Porson in fact deleted €c. Perhaps we might transpose it to make 863 run thus: -cov tae €c€γον €δίκον, a choriambic dimeter catalectic, or Aristophanean. Then, if in 857 we make the licit internal correction of the ei of Δαρείος, we see that Δαρείος Δρυχε χώρας, scanned -υυ-|υ-υ-, could be another Aristophanean.

At 935–40 ~ 944–47 there are problems of responsion, perhaps solvable by a new metrical analysis, which naturally must be made in relation to the colometry of the whole stanza. Square brackets signify deletions required to be made from the paradosis.

Σε. ὀδ' ἔγων, οἰοί, αἰακτός, anapaestic dim. catalectic
μέλεος γέννα γὰ τε πατρώα anapaestic dimeter
κακὸν ἀρ' ἐγενόμαν. dochmius ωωωωω-

935 Χο. πρὸ φθόγγου σοι νόετον [τὰν] double molossus
κακοφάτιδα βοᾶν, κακομέλετον ἰάν, 2 doch. ωωωωω-|ωωωωω-
Μαριανδύνοι θρηνητηρῶς πέμψω
[πέμψω] πολιδακρων ἰαχάν.

940 [πέμψω] πολιδακρων ἰαχάν.

~ Σε. ἵετ' αλανή [καὶ] πάνδυρτον anapaestic dim. catalectic
δύσθρον αὐθάν. αὐθῶν γὰρ ὃδ' αὖ dochmius ωωωωω-
μετάτροπος ἐπ' ἐμοί.

Χο. ἡσώ τοι [καὶ] πάνδυρτον, double molossus

945 λασπαθῆ τε σεβίζων ἀλήτυπά τε βάρη dochmiac dimeter -ωω-|ωωω-
πόλεως γέννας πενθητηρῶς. κλάγξω dochmiac dimeter ωωωωω-

8' αὖ γόνον ἀρίδακρυν.

dochmius ωωωωωω-

935 πρὸ φθόγγου Ι Α Β Ρ Ο Υ Ν Ω, πρὸσφθόγγου Μ Νδ, πρὸσφθόγγου ΚΡΩ. σοι νόετον τὰν codices fere, τὰν delet Wilamowitz. 940 πέμψω semel Υα bis ceteri, hoc loco semel Wilamowitz. 941 καὶ delet Passow. πάνδυρτον Blomfield, πανόδυρτον codices. 944 καὶ delet Hartung. πάνδυρτον Blomfield, πανόδυρτον codices.

The literal sense is: "XERXES: Here am I, Oioi!, lamentable, wretched, to my ancestral folk and land I became an evil truly. CHORUS: Instead of a speech to you for your return I shall send forth an evil-reporting shout, an evil-meditating cry, a Mariandynian mourner's many-teared yell. XERXES: Utter a prolonged all-lamenting ill-sounding cry. For Fortune here in turn has shifted against me. CHORUS: I shall utter
indeed an all-lamenting (cry), paying my tribute (of mourning) for
the folk-suffered and sea-smitten burdens of the city, mourner of the
nation. And I shall scream out in turn a very tearful wailing.”

The kommos having begun with anapaests, Xerxes starts his first
strophe with an anapaestic dimeter catalectic, followed by a full ana-
paestic dimeter, and then a subtly calculated transitional colon,
933, which may be taken either as a resolved anapaestic monometer
(i.e. procelemusmatic+ anapaest) or as a dochmius. Miss Dale (p.54)
appreciated this “ambiguous transition.” My approach to the Chorus’
concluding parts of this strophe and antistrophe is that the transition
to dochmiacs was exploited by Aeschylus, whereas the learned have
generally sought to make more anapaestic cola by sundry alterations.
In 935 Wilamowitz deleted τὰν, denouncing the placing of a prepositive
at the end of a colon in catalexis. It could well be a glossing interlinear
article that has been copied down into the line. That leaves 935 as a
colon of two molossi, for which one may compare Soph. Trach. 653~
661. Molossi, like variants of the cretic, often occur in dochmiac con-
texts. To make a molossus at 944 one has to accept Blomfield’s change
from the manuscripts’ πανόδυρτον to πάνδυρτον. This ties up with the
same change at 941. Normally one must be suspicious of parallel
changes in two lines, but here there is a plausible explanation. In 941
Passow deleted the καὶ in the sequence αἰαὴ καὶ πανόδυρτον δύσβροον
αἰδᾶν. If the adjectives are all three attributive, as they seem to be, it
would be quite against Greek idiom to connect the first and second but
not the second and third. Supposing that at 941 and 944 Aeschylus had
written the form πάνδυρτον, a reader might well make a marginal
note referring to the commoner form of the adjective, thus: καὶ
πανόδυρτον. A copyist taking this for a correction could well incorpo-
rate it in the text at both the nearby places.

Line 936 can easily be analysed as anapaestic, with procelemusmatics;
but much plastic surgery is needed to adapt the paradosis at 945
to anapaests, whereas it is straightway intelligible as a dochmiac
dimeter, thus: λασπαθῇ τε σεβιζων ἀλιτυπά τε βάρη, -ῶ-ῶ-|-
-ῶ-ῶ-ῶ-. To make anapaests of the rest the nineteenth-century
metricians had to add an extra κλάγξω at 947 and alter δ’ αὖ to δὲ; but
the lines are intelligible as dochmiac if one merely ejects the repeated
πέμψω at 940, having in this some manuscript support. Miss Dale
(p.104) suggested that “Possibly Aeschylus himself was the creator of
dochmiac lyric.” The rhythmical unit is likely to have been far older
than Aeschylus; but he certainly exploited its multiformity with great freedom. On the matter of responsion Miss Dale remarks (p.112) that “in all its diversity the dochmiac is a single type with variants.” She refers also to the thirty-two species counted in “the Protean diversity of forms shown by this colarion” (p.105). Especially in a kommos it is grossly inept to seek for strict syllabic responsion, and indeed the extravagant lack of strict responsion ought to be duly relished. In contrast to Xerxes’s anapaests the Chorus’s dochmiacs are meant to sound frantic.

At 961 M offers ταύβάτανα λιπών, and most of the rest τακβάτανα λιπών, which may be scanned as a resolved hypodochmius, ——, to which responds 973, τάδε ε’ ἐπανερομαι, ——. For the resolved hypodochmius cf. Dale p.105.

At 967 the paradosis is οἰωνὶ, τὸν δὲ κοι Φαρνοῦχος; except that O offers oI four times and P supra has δή. The corresponding verse is 955, οἰωνὶ, βόα καὶ πάντ’ ἐκποιήσει. Murray tailors 955 to 967 by taking βόα as a monosyllable, which is improbable. Better would be to print 967 as οἴοτ οἰωνὶ, τὸν δὲ κοι Φαρνοῦχος; Thus both lines emerge as dochmiac dimeters.

At 974-75~ 988-89 the majority of the mss support this presentation of the text:

974 ἰὸ ἰὸ μοι                                      iambic penthemimer
975 μοι τὰς ἄγυμιοις κατιδόντες                  anapaestic dimeter
~988 ἀγαθῶν ἐπάρων ὑπομυμήσκεις.

Concerning the manuscripts’ ὑπομυμήσκεις Wilamowitsch remarks “vocem a tragoedia alienam,” and Murray terms it “vocem non tragicam.” Yet at 329 they both print ὑπεμυμήσθην. Among those keeping ὑπομυμήσκεις are Mazon, Broadhead, Chambry, Wecklein, Kirchhoff, Paley, Blomfield, Bothe, Wellauer and Pauw. At 975 the initial enclitic μοι is in reciprocal support with the same initial enclitic at 1053. Böckh defended Pindar’s practice of allowing an enclitic to start a new colon, at Nem. 4.64; Isth. 8.11. Cf. GRBS 7 (1966) 12.

At 994 the paradosis has Ξάνθην, ἄρειων τ’ Ἀγχάρην, which can be scanned as the required anapaestic dimeter catalectic if one shortens by internal corretion the εί of ἄρειων, ‘martial’.
At 1000f the paradosis can be acceptably punctuated thus:

\[\text{\'etaphon \'etaphon. ouk \'amphi skenaic} \]
\[\text{trophilaicew, otiphe \deltap hi epomein.} \]

1001 otiphe \deltepsilon A, otiphein O Y, otiphein \deltedelta ceteri.

"I am astonished, astonished. (They are) not around (your) wheel-driven tents [= tented waggons], but following behind." Line 1000 is iambico-dochmiae, \(\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\n
the same metrical structure, a phenomenon not uncommon in classical verse, even when not formally strophic . . ."

Once the passage is conceded to be astrophic, a revised colometry can accommodate paradosis readings, impeccable for sense, that have long been exiled *metricalae theoriae gratia*. Thus at 114 the manuscripts’ γὰρ stays if we colometrize thus:

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{kȳma γὰρ peri | πτόλυν δοξυλόφων} & \text{hypodochmius + dochmius} \\
&\text{άνδρῶν καχλάξει | πνεικὸς "Ἀρεος} & - - - - | \text{οὐ - ύ - ζ} \\
&\text{ὀρόμενον. ἀλλ', ὥ Zev, | πάτερ παντελές,} & \text{οὐο - -} | \text{οὐ - ύ - ζ} \\
&\text{πάντως ἄρηξον δαίων ἀλωκεi.} & \text{iambic trimeter catalectic}
\end{align*} \]

At 120 the δὲ of M’s first hand, which is the lectio difficilior, would give a Hipponactean, as at 148: 'Ἀργεῖοι δὲ πόλειμα Κάδμου. If we prefer what may be an intruded gloss, the γὰρ of M² and most mss, then we can scan 'Ἀργεῖοι γὰρ πόλειμα Κάδμου, with internal corretion of the et in 'Ἀργεῖοι, as -ο- | -ο- | -ο-, a creticobacchiac trimeter.

At 122, διὰ δὲ τοῦ γενὸς ἵππιων, we have a dochmius followed by an iambic monometer, υυυυ- - - - - - as at 143, if we scan upsilon long, as at Eur. El. 1214.

At 125 δορυςάως καγαίς of the paradosis can stay as an iambic hexasyllable, a form of Miss Dale’s ‘long dochmiac’. Aeschylus uses the epic form δορυςάως at Supp. 182 and 985. Another such hexasyllabic long dochmiac is offered by most mss at 129, ρυςόπολις γενοῦ. ρυςόπολις, found in a few weaker witnesses, makes an ordinary dochmius. In general, throughout Septem, the paradosis shows Aeschylus exploiting what Dale termed “the Protean diversity of form shown by this colarion.” She suggests that “Possibly Aeschylus himself was the creator of dochmiac lyric.” However that may be, respect should be had for the less usual types evidenced in the paradosis.

At 131 what exactly is the analysis of ἵχυβολῳ μαχαν Ἡσερίδαν? Compare 791, μὴ τελέσῃ καμβίτοις 'Ερινές, and 854, ἀλλὰ γών, ὁ φίλαι, κατ' οὐρον. Perhaps we have an Adonean, -οο- - -, followed by an iambic penta syllable, οοο- - - -. But maybe one should think of the cola as syncopated iam bic trimeters, with choriambic anaclasis in the first metron.

At 135 our best witness by far, M, offers ἐπώνυμον Κάδμου πόλιν φιλαξον, an iambic trimeter catalectic, like 117, πάντως ἄρηξον δαίων ἀλωκειν, except that 135 lacks caesura, as do quite many non-lyric
trimeters in Aeschylus. The following phrase κήδεσαι τ’ ἑναργώς would be an ithyphallic or a syncopated iambic dimer. The deteriores present the order Κάδμου ἐπώνυμον, which can be scanned as a dochmius, with epic correction of the -ου, -οῦ-ο-, or by prod elision to make Κάδμου ’πώνυμον, ---ο-. With that colometry one makes an iambic trimeter catalectic out of πόλιν φύλαξον κήδεσαι τ’ ἑναργώς.

In 141 the best and the majority of the mss omit γαρ, which is dispensable, with explanatory asyndeton; and the colometry of 140–44 should perhaps proceed as follows:

140 καὶ Κύπρις, ἀτε γένους προμάτωρ, ἀλευγον.  ---ο/-οο-ο-ο- dochmius
    κέθεν εὖ αἰματος
    γεγόναμεν. λυταῖς σε θεοκλύτοις
    ἄπονειν πελαζόμεσθα.

On this view 140 consists of palimbachius+ 4th paeon+ 2 bacchii.

At 145–46 one might read thus:

καὶ σὺ, Λύκειον ἀναξ, Λύκειος γενοῦ
στρατῳ δαῖῳ στόνῳ ἕν ὀusterity.

“And you, Lord of Wolves, show yourself wolfish to the hostile host amid the groaning of the battle-meele.” For my στόνῳ ἕν from the manuscripts’ στόνῳ cf. Agam. 431, Dobree’s δόμῳ ἕν for the tradition’s δόμων, with postposition and prod elision. Homer’s ὀusterity evolved to mean ‘battle’ for Pindar, Nem. 9.35, ἀν κῶνδυνον ὀξεῖαι ὀusterity, where Slater’s Lexicon renders it ‘rush of war’. The dochmiacs are concluded by what Miss Dale termed “the iambo-trochaic pentasyllable,” x-ο-ο-, which she conjectured to be, like the hypodochmius, an anaclastic form of dochmius.

The astrophic part of the Chorus ends with the following cola:

cύ τ’, ὡς Λατογένεια κοῦρα, \ Hipponactean
tόγον εὐτυκάζου, \ sync. iambic dimer (or ithyphallic)
"Ἀρτέμι φιλα. \ iambic monometer, with resolution

At 158 one should divide the paradosis’ ἐπαλξέων, with G. C. W. Schneider and Bothe, to read ἀκροβόλων δ’ ἐπ’ ὄλξεων λιθὰς ἐρχεται,
“the skirmishers’ stone-shower comes against the fortifications.” Hesychius probably drew from this place his entry ἀλξευν τειχευν.

At 161 the manuscripts’ καὶ διόθεν needs only proper division to make the passage intelligible, thus:

καὶ δι’ (= δια’), διθεν
πολεμόκρατον ἄγνων τέλος, ἐν μάχαι-
αι τε μάκαιρ' ἀνασσ’, Ὠγκα, πρὸ πόλεως
ἐπτάπυλον ἔδος ἐπιρρύνου.

“And, O divine lady, from whom (is) war-ending holy accomplishment, and in battles a blessed queen, Onka, in defence of the city rescue the seven-gated abode.” Onka was a Theban by-name of Athena, cf. Sept. 501, Ὠγκα Παλλᾶς, ἂ τ’ ἄγχυστολες πύλαις γειτῶν. Diomedes invokes Athena at Iliad 10.290 as δία θεά. The Chorus had already invoked Athena, as Pallas, at 130 in their astrophic outburst; and at 150 and 154 they have a double invocation also of Artemis, another virgin goddess, appropriately to the maidens in the Chorus. Line 161 scans --u--, responding to the resolved iambic metron at 154, Ἀρτεμι πίλα.

At 212, in proposing a new emendation, θεοίῳ for the θεοῖς of the paradosis, I have to take account of the whole colometry of 203–07 as well as of 211–15, of which Murray made the proverbial dog’s breakfast. From his text no Bentley or Housman could ever divine what Aeschylus wrote. The most conservative colometry seems to be as follows:

203 ὁ φίλον Ὀδίπου τέκος, ἔθεις’ ἀκού-
ssa τὸν ἄρματόκτυπον ὅτοβον ὅτοβον,

205 ὅτι τε εὐρυγγες ἐκλαχγαν ἐλίπροχοι.

“O dear offspring of Oedipus, I took fright when I heard the chariot-rattling clatter, clatter, and the shriek made by the wheel-whirling nave-holes. And oh! the equine sleepless rudders in the mouth, the fire-born bridle-bits!” Lines 206–07 are a somewhat dithyrambic example of the genitive of exclamation. Others take them as depending on 203–04, ἀκούσας ἀρματόκτυπον. In 205 we have two dochmiacs, of which the first has two resolutions, one of them in its last element, coming close to the form that Miss Dale (p.107) signalled as “curious,”
DOUGLAS YOUNG

Line 206 may be analysed as syncopated iambic dimeter, followed by choriambo-iambic dimeter; or as syncopated iambic tetrameter, with anaclasis in its third metron. Its initial cretic-bacchius correspond with two cretics at the start of 214. Line 207 is an Aristophanean with initial resolution.

211 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δαιμόνων πρόδρομος ἠλθον ἄρ-χαία βρέτη, πίενοις θεοίς <ν>, νυφόδος βρόμος ἐν πύλαις.

215 ἦν ὑπερέχοιεν ἀλκάν.

"But as a fugitive I ran to the ancient statues of the deities, trusting in the gods, when there was a roaring of a murderous snowstorm snowing on the gates. Then indeed I was excited by terror to supplications of the blessed ones, that they might extend their protection over the city." The assumed loss of -ν in θεοίς would be all the easier before the initial letters of νυφόδος. Exact syllabic responsion between strophe and antistrophe is not sought by Aeschylus in dochmiac movements, so that, for example, a dochmius in dodrans form, -υυ-υ-, may respond to one in hemiepes form, -υυ-υυ-. In cola of paired dochmii he frequently observes diaeresis, but often welds together the pair by overlap, as in 205 and 213. These freedoms were further developed by Euripides, cf. Dale p.111. It seems likely that the lack of diaeresis and lack of exact strophic responsion contribute to the sense of agitation in the dochmias used here by the Chorus.

In 239 M's reading makes a perfectly acceptable pair of dochmias by Aeschylean norms: ποσαίνων κλύουσα πάταγον ἄμμαγα. The second iota in ποσαίνων is consonantalized. At 288 Wilamowitz accepted a consonantalized iota in καρδίας of the paradosis, which he reaccented to κάρδιας. At 781 a dochmiac analysis is possible with καρδίας of most of the mss, the antistrophe at 788 having a dochmiac in hemiepes form. Broadhead, in a note on Pers. 1008 (at p.282), defends what he calls "synizesis" of iota in Aeschylus. In Sept. it seems possible also at 176 φιλοπόλεις, 481 ίδιο, 521 Δίος, 789 διαξερίχθηκεν, 826 εὐπηρίας 948 διοδότων, Some cases will be discussed in their sequence. The turning of iota into a glide does not depend on the quality of the vowel following, but is connected rather with the consonant preceding, and it seems specially common after delta. T. G. Tucker, in
Appendix A to his 1908 edition of the play, discusses “consonantizing of ν and ι,” and concludes (p.210): “When we consider the number of examples, and also the fact that such pronunciations as Τειρεσιᾶς, Ἀμφίρεσες, would often assist in normalizing metre, it seems highly probable that more account should be taken of such consonantizing when we are considering correspondence in lyrics.”

At 291–94 the colometry involving the least departure from the tradition seems to be as follows:

δράκοντα δ’ ὡς τις τέκνων ὑπερ, ο–ο–|–ο–ο– iambic metron+ hypodochmius
δέδοικα λεχέων ο–οοο– dochmius
δυνευνήτορας, dochmius
πάντρομος πελειάς.  ىthyphallic (or sync. iambic dimeter)

“And as one (fears) a snake in concern for (her) children, I fear (men that may be) ill bedfellows of (my) bed, (like) an all-trembling rock-dove.” The accentuation ὑπερ is found in the mss that Turyn denotes by Λδ and Λε. The first singular ending of (ὑπερ)δέδοικα is attested by Μάντες κορ. (υτ υτιδ.) ΚΥπ υπ ρα Κε συ πρα, and makes the expression of fear by the Chorus more immediate than the third singular, for which the scholiast supplies as subject καρδία from 288. Any mother is afraid of a snake near her offspring, and not merely mother-birds, so that there is no need to think that πάντρομος πελειάς in 294 belongs closely with ὡς τις in 291. Rather it is attached in apposition to the unexpressed subject of δέδοικα, without any such expression of comparison as ὑπερ. Cf. Θεογνις 347, ἐγὼ δὲ κύων ἐπέρηκα χαράδρην.

The antistrophe at 308–11 should be cited with its preceding line also:

307 ὑδὼρ τε Διήρκαιον, εὐ–syncopated iambic dimeter
τρεφέστατον πωμάτων δεών ο–ο–|–ο–ο– iamb. metron+ hypodochmius
ἐν Ποσει–ο–ο– dochmius
310 δὰν ὁ γαίαόχος –οοοο– dochmius (in dodrans form)
Τῆθνος τε παίδες; ىthyphallic (or sync. iambic dimeter)

At 307 the form with -τρεφ- is in ΜΙΚΟ and Triclinius, and Wellauer preferred it as “magis poeticum.” At 310 the αὶ of γαίαόχος is shortened by internal correction. For the ellipse of δέδοικα in the ὡς clause at 291, cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar (1963), §2464: “The verb of the com-
parative clause is commonly omitted if it is the same as the verb of the leading clause."

At 345ff I would print:

345A κορκορυγαϊ δ' ἀν' ἀστυ, −οο−|ο− x Aristophanean
345B ποτὶ πτόλιν δ', οο- iambic monometer
346 ὄρκανα πυργῶτις, −οοο− troch. dim. brachycalectic
347A πρὸς ἀνδρός δ' ἀνήρ οο−ο− dochmius
347B δορὶ κλίνεια. οο−ο− iambic monometer, resolved

The corresponding cola of the antistrophe at 357ff run thus:

357A παντοδαπός δὲ καρπός Aristophanean
357B χαμάδες πεκόν οο−ο− iambic monometer, resolved
358 ἀλγυνεὶ κυρήσαε, −οοο− troch. dim. brachycalectic
359A πυκρῶν δ' ὅμμα θα- οο−ο− dochmius
359B λαμηπάλων iambic monometer

“And tumults throughout the citadel, and against the city a net like a rampart; and man is laid low by man with the spear . . . And every sort of crop falling on the ground will cause grief as it occurs [i.e. the spoiling of stores will grieve the spectator as it meets the eye]; and embittered is the gaze of the maidservants.” At 346 the scholiast notes: ὄρκανη τὸ θηραστικὸν δικτυών, δ καὶ σαργάνη καλεῖται. LSJ and the Supplement do not note either noun in this sense. At 347B MSS have δορί, and κλίνεια is Μ’s reading on the line, found also in Turyn’s Σh on the line. At 358 the future form ἀλγυνεῖ, with short upsilon, is in B and Η.

At 481–83 and the antistrophic 521–23 the paradosis is fully intelligible metrically thus:

481A ἐπείχομαί δῇ οο−ο−
481B τάδε μὲν εὐτυχεῖν, ιψι, οο−ο−
482 πρόμαχ' ἐμῶν δόμων, τοῖς δὲ δυστυχεῖν. u−u−x
483 ὅς δ' ὑπέραυχα βαζοῦς' ἐπὶ πτόλει −οο−|ο−ο−
~ 521A πέποιθα τόν Δίδ οο−ο−|ο−ο−
521B ἀντίτυπον ἑχοῦσα οο−ο−|ο−ο−
522 ἄφιλον ἐν σάκει τοῦ χοβονίου δέμας −οο−|ο−ο−
523 δαίμονος, ἔχθρον εἰκάσμα βροτοίς τε καὶ οο−ο−|ο−ο−

The only change needed is Brunck’s δαίμονος at 523 for the manuscripts’ δαίμονων, and that is not metrically motivated. 481A and 521A
are examples of Miss Dale's 'iambotrochaic pentasyllable' (p.108). In 521a we have an example of consonantal iota after a delta; cf. the remarks on line 239. At 481b we have another consonantal iota, in ἱό, as at Cho. 466, where Hermann needlessly altered to δ. At 483 all MSS have the elided form βάζουει except for C Δ Q post corr. and Triclinius, which have unelided βάζουειά. In 523 all have βροτοίς, which would give a dochmius in hemiepes form responding to a hypodochmius, or anaclastic dochmius, in 483. Granted that scribes often switch between such forms as -οίς/-οίς and -ούς/-ούς, they still more often copy what they see in their antigraph, and the majority variants here may well go back to the poet, and reveal again his interest in ringing the changes on his dochmiacs in responsion.

The problem of just what spellings can go back to Aeschylus is raised by variants in the best MSS at 497–98, which suggest that the text might be εἰςθεος δ' Ἄρη | βάκχα . . . At 497 M has ἄρη, according to Vitelli-Wecklein, and that appears in Naples II F 31 bis, after correction. ἄρη is in the second best MS, I, and in A D Re O post. corr. X ante corr. Quite many have the accusative ἄρην, and the normal dative form ἄρει is in K Q Y N post corr. and a few more. An epic form like Ἄρη might be acceptable in a messenger's speech. Cf. Τροίην at Agam. 577, in the better witness there, F. Professor George P. Goold, in a paper on "Homer and the Alphabet" (TAPA 91 [1960] 286), argued that the use of the Ionic alphabet for Homer was responsible for its universal employment by other literary writers long before 403 B.C., when it was finally adopted by decree at Athens. I have usually assumed that a script of Aeschylus submitted to the Archon in applying for a chorus would use the pre-Euclidean Attic alphabet without an η. But if Goold is right the dative ἈΦΙ might have been the author's spelling.

At 498 the unaugmented imperfect βάκχα appears in M and on the line in I, where the present form, found in the rest, is a γράφεται variant. The unaugmented imperfect goes well in a messenger's speech; cf. GRBS 12 (1971) 316f for the limit of the use by tragedians of past tenses of the indicative without syllabic augment. Like the aorist ἐπηλάλαξεν at 497 it describes what the messenger saw of Hippomedon before he left to report. It is not suggested that Aeschylus applied an accent, but that he wrote ΒΑΚΧΑ and some copyist later added an iota and made the form present.
At 562 no letter of the majority need be changed if we write 560–62 thus, with Eteokles referring to the Sphinx on Parthenopaios’ shield:

τῷ φέροντι μέμφεται
πυκνὸς κροτησμὸς τυμχάνουσ’ ὑπὸ πτόλιν,
θεῶν θελόντων. Δάν, ἀληθεύσαμ’ ἐγώ.

“She [the Sphinx] will be angry with her bearer when she meets with a constant rattling close to the city, if the gods will. Zeus, may I prove to have spoken truly!” Copyists who interpreted as δ’ ἄν had not read LSJ s.vv. Ζεύς and Δάν.

At 695f the minimal emendation seems to be involved in reading

ϕίλου γὰρ αἰσχρά μοι πατρὸς τέλεος Ἀρὰ
ἐπροῖς ἀκλαύστοις ὀμμαῖς προςίζανει, ...

“For in its ugliness my own father’s accomplishing Curse sits beside me with dry unweeping eyes . . .” At Cho. 382 we find the two-termination feminine form τέλεια. Both τέλεος and τέλεος are exemplified in Italie’s Index. Here τέλεος could scan by internal correpion of εἰ. A scholiast aware of 832, ὁ μέλαινα καὶ τελεία γένεος Οἰδίπος τ’ Ἀρά, could have written in the gloss τελεία: then that had its final alpha illicitly elided, giving rise to the manuscripts’ τελεί’, variously accented; or copyists simply took in τελεία with some variation in its accent. αἰσχρά is offered by the best mss M and I and a dozen others, and is printed by Tucker, Verrall and Pauw. The more obvious and in the context hackneyed ἐξθρά’ is attested by K O Q and others. At 696 the paradoxos form ἀκλαύστοις, adding more sibilance than Butler’s ἀκλαύστοις, is kept by Hermann, Wellauer, Pauw, Paley, Tucker and Rose, and in another case by Murray at Eum. 565.

At 766–68 and the antistrophic 772–74 the colometry and punctuation of the paradoxos might be made thus:

766 τελεια γὰρ πολαβάτων ὁραί
βαρείας καταλλαγῆ. ὁς
τὰ δ’ ἄλοι πελομεν’ ὃν
παρέρχεται,

~ 772 τίνι ἄνδριν γὰρ τοσόνδ’
ἐθαύμασαν
θεοὶ καὶ ξυνέστιοι
πόλεως πολυβοτός τ’
αιὼν βροτῶν, . . .

sync. iamb. trim.
sync. iamb. dim.
dochmius + iambic monometer
"For curses of men famed of old are accomplished [or accomplishing]
with grievous merchandising; and the ruinous deeds that are happen­
ing are not going past." . . . "For whom among men did the gods so greatly admire, and the city's hearth-sharers, and the populous
generation of mortals? . . . "

At 766 παλαυφάτων is in Μ Ι Β ante corr., and ἀραί in all mss. In 767 I merely reaccent βαρεῖα καταλαγαί of the paradosis. In 768 M ante corr. and I have πελόμεν oû, retained by Hermann, Smyth, Tucker, Verrall and Paley. At 772-74 I reproduce the almost unanimous para­
dosis. In 776 the manuscripts' ἀναρπαξάνδραν is metrically acceptable as a dochmius and was kept by Wellauer and Pauw, meaning 'man­
upsnatching' .

At 778-92 the mss need less adjustment than editors have usually
bestowed on them, though some small points remain moot.

ἐπεί δ' ἀρτίφρων
ἐγένετο μέλεος ἀθλίων
780 γάμων, ἔπ' ἄλγει δυσφορῶν
μανομένας καρδίας
dίδυμα κακ' ἐτέλεσεν
πατροφόνω χερ. τῶν

κρεισσοτέκνων δ' ἀπ' ἀμμάτων
ἐπιλάγχη.

~ 785 τέκνοις δ' <ἀρίγ' ἀραιάς
ἔφηκεν ἐπικότους τροφᾶς,
αἰαί, πικρογλύκεσσα ἀράς,
καὶ εφε σιδαρονόμῳ
διαχερίσαι ποτέ λασχείν

790 κτήματα· νῦν δὲ τρέω
μὴ τελέσῃ καμψίπους Ἑρμός.

"But after the miserable man became fully conscious of his wretched
marriage, falling sick through distress, with maddened heart he
wrought twin evils with his father-slaying hand. For from his children­s surpassing eyes he went astray. And against his children indeed he
discharged bitter-tongued curses, alas!, enraged at scanty sustenance,
actually that they should some day be assigned possessions by a trans-
action apportioning with iron. And now I dread that the leg-bending Fury may accomplish (those curses)."

In 781 καρδία of the paradosis is kept by Verrall, making a dochmius with consonantal iota; cf. 288. In 784 we have a hapax compound from the verb κρεισσών + τέκνον. For the sense cf. 530 μάλλον θεοῦ σέβειν πεποιθώς ὁμμάτων θ' ὑπέρτερον, and Catullus 3.5 quem plus illa oculis suis amabat. For compound adjectives having as their first part a verb-stem cf. Smyth, GG §880. Aeschylean examples include ἀμαρτίνοος, ἀρχέλεος, ἐρευφίτοιχος, ἐχενής, πειερβοτος, ῥυσίβωμος, στυγάνωρ, τελεσίψφων, φέρατις, φθειρεγενής, ὠλεισίοκος. For the metre of 784, perhaps it is to be interpreted as an anaclastic iambic trimeter catalectic, with the anaclasis in its first metron; cf. 131 and my remarks on it. Then 791 is a version of the same syncopated in its second metron as well as catalectic in its third.

At 785 the paradosis is τέκνοις δ' ἀραιάς, and G. C. W. Schneider reaccented to ἀραίας. Aeschylus is punning on the two adjectives ἀραιός, ‘thin, scanty’, and ἀραιός, ‘accursed’. Some might feel that metrically no change is needed, and the dochmius at 778 could be equivalently responded to by τέκνοις δ' ἀραιάς, an iambo-trochaic penta syllable that could be reckoned an anaclastic type of dochmius. If this be not so, one might produce an indubitable dochmius at 785 by a slight supplement, e.g. τέκνοις δ' ἀραιάς, where the loss would have been by haplography, or τέκνοις δ' ἀραιάς, where the loss would occur through inflectional interchange of a type perhaps commoner than haplography.

At 788, for καὶ in the sense ‘actually’ cf. Denniston p.321. At 789 most manuscripts have διαχείρια, but some have the final iota lacking or subscript. Triclinius may have hit the mark with his διαχείρια, scanned with its two iotas consonantalized, to make a dochmius of 789, as in the strophe at 782. The word would be a hapax legomenon, like its adjective εἰδορονύμω, but consider the fifth-century διαχειρίμως, διαχειρίμως, ἐγχειρία, ἐγχειρία, πολυχειρία. At 786 ἐπικότους of most mss and of the scholia is kept by Hermann, Smyth, Tucker, Verrall, Wecklein, Wellauer and Pauw.

Lines 803-21 have been much messed up by editors, among them Wilamowitz and Murray, in support of the theory that the end of Septem in our mss was added for a revival after the poet’s death, and that there are other evidences in the paradosis of double recension. If one keeps as closely as possible to the best manuscript tradition this
is how the verses appear (the original sequence of lines being retained, with numbering to suit, where Murray’s numeration is sadly perplexing):

803 ΧΟΡ. τί δ’ ἐστὶ πράγμα νεόκοτον πόλει πλέον;
804 ΑΓΓ. πόλεις εἴσωσται. βασιλέως δ’ ὀμόσποροι
805 ἀνδρες τεθνάσιν ἐκ χερῶν αὐτοκτόνων.
806 ΧΟΡ. τίνες; τί δ’ εἴπας; παραφρονῶ φόβῳ λόγου.
807 ΑΓΓ. φρονοῦσα νῦν ἄκουσον. Οἰδίπος τόκος —
808 ΧΟΡ. οἳ γά τάλανα, μάντις εἰμί τῶν κακῶν.
809 ΑΓΓ. οὐδ’ ἀμφιλέκτως μὴν κατεποδημένοι —
810 ΧΟΡ. ἐκείθι κεῖσθον; βαρέα δ’ οὖν ὄμως φράσων.
811 ΑΓΓ. οὕτως ἀδελφαὶ χέριν ἱναίρων’ ἄγαν.
812 ΧΟΡ. οὕτως δ’ δαίμων κοινὸκ ἵν ἀμφοῖν ἀμα;
813 ΑΓΓ. αὐτὸς δ’ ἀναλοί δήτα δύσποτομον γένος.
814 τοιαύτα χαίρειν καὶ διακρύεσθαι πάρα,
815 πόλιν μὲν εὗ πρᾶσσουσαι, οἳ δ’ ἑπιστάται,
816 δικσώ στρατηγῶ, διέλαξον εὐφρενλάτῳ
817 Σκιθῆ εἰδήρῳ κτημάτων παμπησίαι.
818 ἔξουσί δ’ ἵν λάβως εἰν ταφῇ χθονός,
819 πατρός κατ’ εὐχὰς δυσπότομος φορούμενοι.
820 πόλεις εἴσωσται. βασιλεῶς δ’ ὀμοστόροιν
821 πέπωκεν αἶμα γαί’ ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων φόνῳ.

A literal version might run thus:

“CHORUS. What novel matter is there for the city besides?
MESSENGER. The city has been kept safe. But a king’s joint-sown males have died by self-slaying hands.
CHOR. Who? What did you say? I am out of my wits through fear of your message.
MESS. Keep your wits about you now and listen. Oedipus’ offspring—
CHOR. Oh, how wretched I am! I am a prophetess of evils.
MES. Not disputably indeed reduced to the dust—
CHOR. Are they lying (dead) yonder? Grievous,—yet tell it.
MES. Thus they were destroyed, with hands too brotherly.
CHOR. Thus was the deity common to both at once?
MES. Yes, and in person he is squandering the ill-fated family. Such are the happenings that one has to rejoice at and weep over—the city indeed faring well, but the rulers, the twain army—
leaders, have shared out with hammer-forged Scythian iron full ownership of possessions. And they shall have whatever share of land they get in burial, borne away in accordance with their father's ill-destined prayers. The city has been kept safe. But earth has drunk the blood of the joint-sown pair of kings, amid reciprocal slaughter."

It is apparent that we have to do with 'Ringcomposition' by Aeschylus, and not with any theoretical double recension by some fourth-century producer of a revival of the play under the influence of Sophocles’ Antigone.

To consider some individual readings: at 803 πρᾶγμα is in MIKO and P on the line, and is kept by Smyth, Tucker, Verrall, Wellauer and Pauw, in preference to the majority reading πρᾶγος in most of the deteriores. πρᾶγος is the more poetic form, and occurs in 2 and 861 of this play, whence some copyist may have taken it. In studying scribal errors in Pindar I noted (GRBS 6 [1965] 258) that "The scribes' tendency to normalize or trivialize is not uniform, and sometimes they slip in a more poetic or dialectally recondite form."

At 804 βασιλέως appears in M on the line, A, P and O post corr. and is retained by Tucker. The riddling phrase "a king's joint-sown males" (cf. LSJ s.v. ἄνήρ I) is typical of the roundabout approach to bad news often manifested by messengers in tragedy and accounts for the questions in 805 by the initially baffled Chorusleader. Likewise, at 807, the Messenger chooses a word of some initial ambiguity in τὸκος, M's original reading on the line, which is kept by Mazon, Verrall and Rose. In 809 the Messenger's word κατεκτοδημένοι has more than one level of meaning, including obscene or at least vulgar associations, as Wilamowitz noted in his Aischyllos Interpretationen (Berlin 1914) p.86 n.5. It found favour with Smyth, Mazon, Groeneboom, Tucker, Paley, Wecklein, Verrall and Wellauer to leave 809 with the Messenger, as the paradosis has it.

At 810 again we are indebted to our best witness, M, on the line, for the dual κεισθον, kept by Smyth, Mazon, Groeneboom, Wecklein and Verrall. At 811 the manuscripts' phrase ἀδελφαῖς ... ἡγαν was endorsed by Hermann, Mazon, Wellauer and Pauw, and recalls Aeschylus' way of thinking at 871, with the presumed coinage δυσαδελφότατη. At 821 δυσπότμους of the majority has not been universally endorsed, and Headlam's δυσπότμως has found some favour.
I note that it occurs in the *deteriores* Ya, Le on the line, and probably Lh interlinear. If the strict meaning of the adjective be pressed, it is Oedipus who was ‘ill-destined’ and not the prayers he voluntarily chose to utter, so that if any change is to be made it might well be to δυσπότημον, which would have been altered by the common assimilation of endings. I notice the three-termination form δυσπότημας in Ld ante. corr. and Le. At 804 and 821 the mss offer the form εὔευςταῖα, which is kept by Hermann, Smyth, Mazon, Verrall, Paley and Pauw, and by LSJ.

Much dissension has arisen about the interpretation of the Chorus’ question at 827f: ἢ τοὺς μογεροὺς καὶ δυσδαίμονας | ἡτέκνους κλαύσω πολεμάρχους; The interpretation of the letters ΑΤΕΚΝΟΥΣ as ‘childless’ is most unlikely, since most people in the fifth century would know very well that Polyneikes’ son Thersandros became king of Thebes when the Epigonoi took the city—and his descendants included Theron, an eminent patron of poets,—while Laodamas, son of Eteokles, withdrew to Illyria. Professor Lloyd-Jones once suggested reading ἐκνοῦς, and one might consider ἕτ’ (Doric, = ἡτε) ἐκνοῦς, taken as nominative singular, with the sense: “Or am I, as one demented, to bewail the distressful and ill-fated war-leaders?” On this redivision and interpretation verse 828 is an acatalectic dimeter. Alternatively, recalling the use of *alpha*-ἀθροιστικόν in compound adjectives such as ἀπλός and ἀθρός, one wonders whether Aeschylus did not play with the formation ἡτέκνους, perhaps considering the brothers twins, as Verrall suggested in his edition (p. x n. 7), noting the “curious expression” at 890, ὁμοσπλάγχων τε πλευρωμάτων. More cogently relevant might be the phrases at 804f and 820, βασιλέως ἡ ὁμόσπορος ἄνδρες and βασιλέως ἡ ὁμοσπόρους; but they do not unambiguously mean the same as δίδυμογενής, ‘twin’. Most relevant probably is the utterance of the Chorus at 849, though requiring some adjustment of the paradox. 848–50 might best be presented in this form:

```latex
\begin{align*}
\text{τάδ’ αὐτόδηλα, προὔπτος} \\
\text{ἀγγέλου λόγος.} & \quad \text{iambic trimeter} \\
\text{διπλαῖν μερίμναιν δίδυμ’} & \quad \text{ιαμβικός μετρόν + δοχμίους} \\
\text{ἄνόρεα.} \quad \text{ιαμβικός τίμιος κομματικός} \\
\text{kάκ’ αὐτοφόνα δίμοιρα} & \quad \text{two dochmii} \\
\text{τέλεια τὰ πάθη.} \\
\end{align*}
```
"These things (are) self-evident; the messenger's report (was) foreseen [or is manifest]. Twin (were) the manly acts of my twofold objects of concern. Evil, kin-slaying, doubly-shared, complete (are) the calamities."

In 849 M's original reading was the genitive dual, διπλαὶ μερίμναι, kept by Wilamowitz, Mazon, Groeneboom, Verrall and Italie. It was later corrupted to the reading of the deteriores, διπλαὶ μέριμναι. The mss mostly agree in the letter-sequence δίδυμανορέα, with or without division and variously accented. Of those known to me only Nb post corr. seems to have the accentuation I prefer, δίδυμ' ἀνόρεα = δίδυμα ἄνδρεια, 'twin acts of manhood', such as the heroic age reckoned personal slaying of an enemy. For μέριμνα in the sense 'object of concern' cf. LSJ s.v. 2, citing Homer's Hymn to Hermes 160, μεγάλην σε πατήρ ἐφύτευε μέριμνα | θυρτοὺς ἄνθρωποι τε καὶ ἀθανάτουι θεοῖς.

At 866ff some minutiae involve iotas, where I would write:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{δημας} & \; \text{δε} \; \text{δικη} \; \text{προτερον} \; \text{φημης} \\
& \text{τον} \; \text{δυκελαδον} \; \theta \; \text{υμνον} \; \text{Ερινυς} \\
& \text{iαχειν} \; \text{Αιδα} \; \tau \\
& \text{εχθρον} \; \text{παιαν} \; \text{επιμελετεων}.
\end{align*}
\]

"But it is proper for us first with our songs both to sound forth the ill-sounding hymn of the Fury and to chant an odious paean to Hades."

At 866, for the manuscripts' φημης Hartung already proposed the dative plural φημαις, but Aeschylus may have had the epicism φημης, from which the paradosis has dropped the iota. At 868 an adscript iota in αίδαε appears in A and K, two of the better independent witnesses in the category inferior to M and I, where it may be from continuous tradition, and is unlikely to arise by scribal effort in their own period. The dative 'Αιδα is preferred by Paley, Wellauer, Victorius and Pauw. Also at 868 the manuscripts' iαχει is kept by Hermann, Wilamowitz, Smyth, Mazon, Groeneboom and others.

At 895ff a plausible colometry of the paradosis is attained thus, if one restores the words deleted by Elmsley and deletes those added by Murray:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{διανταιαν} & \; \text{λεγεις} \; \text{υ}-\text{υ}-\text{υ}- \text{syncopated iambic dimeter} \\
\text{πλωγαν} & \; \text{δομωι και εωμαεων} \; \text{υ}-\text{υ}-\text{υ}- \text{iambic metron + dochmius}
\end{align*}
\]
“You tell of a penetrating blow against families and persons. Smitten I declare them by unutterable and accursed force proceeding from their father, through a discordant destiny.” The plural δόμων is relevant because both Eteokles and Polyneikes left children.

At 915 the problem of responsion is solvable by a transposition. The antistrophic colon at 926 consists of two dochmii, the second in Reizianum form: δυσδαιμών εφιν ἀ τεκοῦσα πρὸ πασῶν, ----|--|--|--. In 915 I would read δόμων τοὺς μᾶλ' ἀχάεσσα προφέμπτει, --|--|--|. The subject is Antigone, who has just spoken 911-14. Then 916f may be construed thus: δαίκτηρ (ἐκτιν ἀντής) γόος, αὐτοκτόνος, αὐτοπήμων . . . “Heart-rending (is her) lamentation, self-bemoaning, for her own woes . . .” The order of words from which I make the transposition in 915 is that of M, which offers δόμων μᾶλ' ἀχάεσσα τοὺς προφέμπτει. Nearest is I, on the line, with ἀχαίες τοὺς, and an η over the second α. A marginal variant in I has not proved legible. The deteriores get increasingly wilder with ἀχω/ἡχω/ἀχα/ἀλων ἐπ’/ἐκ/εἰκ αὐτοὺς. But these efforts are tame compared with the wilderness of the deterrimi manifested in Wecklein’s Appendix and Dawe’s Repertory.

The maximum conservatism is achieved at 933f and 947f by this colometry:

933 ὁμόςποροι δῆτα καὶ πανώλεθροι --|--|--|--| sync. iambic trimeter
dιστομαῖς οὐ φιλαῖς; . . .|--|--| dochmius

~ 947 ἐχουεὶ μοῖραν λαχόντες μέλει. --|--|--|--|--|--| sync. iambic trimeter
dιοιστόων ἀχέων. --|--|--|--| hypodochmius

“Joint-sown truly and wholly destroyed by unfriendly cuttings up.” . . . “They have obtained and possess, poor wretches, a share of heaven-sent griefs.”

The only departure from the general tradition is that at 947 I go
with M in leaving out the .vote or δ of the deteriores, which is doubtless derived from the interlinear exclamation often put in by glossing hands to mark a vocative, or what is thought to be such. Lines 933 and 947 will be syncopated iambic trimeters, the first singly syncopated, the second doubly. We see consonantal iotas in 934 διατομαις and 948 διοικοδότων, and synizesis in 947 μέλει and 948 ἄχεων.

Colometrical notes may be in order for 973f and 984f, which seem to make sense thus:

973 ἄχεων τ' ὁλων ἁδ' ἐγγύθεν.  ὅ htons of the ivalm  iambic dimerter
πέλας δ' αἰδίδ ἀδέλφαι ἀδέλφειων.  ὅ- | ὅ-  ὅ-  ὅ-  ὅ-  bacchius+ dochmius

~984 δύστανα κηδε' ὄφωνμα.  ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ-  iambic dimerter
δίγγρα τριπαλτων πημάτων.  ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ-  2nd paean+ dochmius

"And to griefs alone is the situation near."—"And here are sisters beside brothers." . . . "Unhappy the word that means both kindred and mourning."—"Tear-sodden because of thrice-brandished woes."

At 973 I propose what seems to be a novel division of the paradosis τοιῶν. For the general sense perhaps the nearest parallel is Soph. Ant. 933, θανάτου τοῦτ' ἐγγυτάτω τοῦτος ἄφικτα. Next nearest perhaps is Soph.OC 1217, πολλὰ μὲν αἱ μακραὶ ἀμέρους κατέβατο δῆ λύπας ἐγγυτέρω. In 973 we would have to allow shortening by internal correption of οι in ολων. In 974 we have synizesis in ἀδέλφειων and epic correption at the end of ἀδέλφαι, for which compare, also in a dochmiac context, 971, correption of -ou in πρὸς φίλου εφθικο. Miss Dale (p.114) cites an example from Aristophanes, Thesm. 915, the -ω of κύω in the resolved dochmiac pair φέρε σε κύω. ἀπαγέ μ' ἀπαγ' ἀπαγ' ἀπαγέ με, which of course parodies Euripides.

At 984 we have a lyric iambic dimerter with an anapaest in the third foot. For the δύστανα of Stephanus and Francken we have now manuscript support, or nearly so, with δύστανα in I Nd F linea Tr. Cf. 998, ἠ' ἠ', δυστάνων κακῶν ἀναξ . . . (M K O P linea Q γρ.) ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ-  dochmius+ hypodochmius. In 985 those who do not believe in the existence of second paesons will prefer to call the first element a resolved bacchius.

At 982 the paradosis has ἀπώλεσε δῆτα, defensible as a dochmius, ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- , answering to 971, πρὸς φίλου ἐφθικο, ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- ὅ- , each ending with a brevis in longo.
III. Prometheus Vinctus

Conservative colometry is called for at several places in PV where editors have transposed or deleted or otherwise altered. Thus at 116 all Dr Dawe’s MSS give us *θεόσκυτος* except for *Y*, and this form, with double *σίγμα*, fits best with the preceding and following cola, thus:

\[ \text{'Ea 'Ea.} \]

115 τίς ἄχω, τίς ὀδύμα προσέπτα μ’ ἀφεγγής, \(\text{υ—'|υ—'|υ—'|υ—'|υ—'}\) 4 bacchii θεόσκυτος, ἡ βρότειος, ἡ κέκραμένη; \(\text{υ—'|υ—'|υ—'|υ—'|υ—'}\) ἵκετο τερμόνυν ἐπὶ πάγον; \(\text{υυυ—'|υυυυυ—'}\) πόνων ἐμῶν θεωρός, ἡ τί δὴ θέλων;

Line 116 then appears as 2nd paeon + cretic + bacchius + cretic, and 117 as a 4th paeon (with the initial *ιοτά* short as an unaugmented aorist form), followed by a resolved dochmius. This closes the agitated rhythm of Prometheus’ initial utterance, and after a pause he goes on with 118, an iambic trimeter of dialogue type.

The question of Homerisms and Ionisms is raised by the majority reading at 138, where all Dawe’s manuscripts except KPΔ offer τ’ *ἐλεκσυμένον*. Here the *tau* preceding guarantees the psilotic form. At 1085 and 1092 the paradosis offers, unmetrically, *ἐλέκσυς* . . . *ἐλέκσυς*, which should be amended to forms in *ἐλ*- rather than the editors’ *ειλ*-.*LSJ* s.v. *ἐλέκσυς* note that MSS of Hippocrates offer psilotic compound forms, *κατ*-ἐλέκσυς, *κατ*-ειλέκσυς. At PV 882 one finds ὁμοίατ’ ἐλίγδην in M I Y O ante corr. *Tr.*, and it may be that this should be printed. For a general discussion see Broadhead on *Pers*. pp.250–53. In PV Ionicisms include 122 *ἐλεοθυγείων*, 831 *θῦκος*, 677 Λέρνης ἀκρήν τε ‘the height or promontory of Lerna’, unjustly altered, with Canter, to Λέρνης τε κρήνην, the more so that Lerna has many κρήναι.

At 237 there is a small point worth raising about the idiom of the article with *τοιότος*. Most MSS offer us τῷ τοιτοιαίδει σημειοἀεί κάμπτομαι. M has, on the line, τῷ ταῖς τοιαίδε ... , with τοι over ταῖς. Apart from the problem of euphony, in the succession τῷ τοι τοι-, the reading ταῖς τοιαίδε seems more emphatic. There appears to be a gradation, from *τοιότος* τις ‘of some such sort’, through *τοιότος* simpliciter ‘of such a sort’, to ὁ *τοιότος* of such a sort as this one here’.

At 425–32 the epode may be most conservatively analysed thus:
425 μόνον δή πρόσθ' ἐν'  u---|u-|u- u-  sync. iamb. trim.

ἀλλον ἐν πόνοις

δαμέντ' ἀκαμαντοδέτους  u--u-u u-  enoplian (prosodiac)

Τιτάνα λόμαις εἰκεδόμαν,  --|--|--|--|--  iambbelegus

θεῦν "Α—

tλαυθ', δὲ αἱ ὕπειροχον  -u|--|--|--|--  Glyconic

ἐθένος κραταιόν ὀφράνιν  u-u-|u-|u-u-u-  iambbelegus

tε πόλον

430 νότοις ὑποστενάξει.  --|--|--|--  iamb. dim. catalectic

βοᾷ δὲ πόντιος κλίδων  u-u-|--|--|--  iamb. dimeter

ξυμπίτινων στένει βαθύς,  --|--|--|--|--  sync. iamb. trim.

κελαινὸς δ᾽

"Αἰώς ὑποβρέμει μυχὸς  uuuuuu|--|--|--  2 dochmii

γὰς, παγαί θ'

ἀγνορύτων ποταμῶν  --|--|--|--  dochiomus (hemiepes)

435 στένουσιν ἄλγος οἰκτρόν.  u-u|--|--|--  iamb. dim. catalectic

A translation might run: “One other Titan alone did I see previously
in tribulations, subdued by indefatigably-binding outrages, the god
Atlas, who always groans under the excessive strong force and the
heavenly sphere on his back. And at the cry the marine billow, as it
falls together, groans deep down; and Hades’ dark recess of earth
rumbles below; and the springs of the pure-flowing rivers mourn the
pitiful suffering.”

Through taking 431 βοᾷ as a verb scribes seem to have arrived at the
noun βυθός in 432. Aeschylus leaves it vague whether the cry is that of
Atlas or that of Prometheus; and the same applies to 435 ἄλγος. In
429 τε is appositional or defining, as at Agam. 9 ἐκ Τροίας φάτων |
ἄλωσιμόν τε βάξων: one might translate it “namely.”

An alternative colometry of 433f might be:

"Αἰώς ὑποβρέμει μυχὸς γὰς:  uuuuu|--|--  trochaic dimeter

παγαί θ' ἀγνορύτων ποταμῶν --|--|--|--  dactylic tetram. catalectic

Cf. Eum. 1042, λαμπαδὶ τερπόμεναι καθ' ὅδον.

At 553 M’s προδοθὼς’ is defensible, meaning ‘seeing what is before
my eyes’. Cf. Thuc. 7.44.2, τὴν μὲν ὀλίγην τοῦ σώματος προοράν.

At 617 one can accept M’s πᾶν γὰρ ὁ δὲ πῦθοι μου, the more so in view
of 520, where τοῦτ’ οὐκ ἄν ὁ δὲ πῦθοι appears in M O P V Δ. Denniston,
in what has been called his “magnus de particulis liber” p.425, says that
"In A. Pr. 520 M's οὐκ ἂν οὖν can hardly be right." But at p.424 he gives some examples that show οὖν emphasizing the negative, as Xen. Cyr. 3.3.50 οὐκ ἂν οὖν τοξότας γε. At p.446 he notes that οὖν adds to γὰρ "the idea of importance or essentiality." At 520 Prometheus is saying "That you would not learn by asking." At 617 we have a potential optative without ἂν, which W. W. Goodwin (Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb2 [Boston 1897] §241) grudgingly admitted at Cho. 594, among other instances in Attic poets that he thought "mere anomalies, even if we admit that the text is sound."

At 629 we might repunctuate and accent the paradosis to make: μὴ μουτροκῦδουμᾶσσον. οὐκ ἐμοὶ γλυκῦ. "Do not take heed for me unduly far. Thus is my pleasure" (scil. to learn of my future wanderings). For ὑσ= οὕσως cf. Agam. 930, 1354, Pers. 565, Supp. 622.

At 667 the epithet πυρωτόν is applied to κεραυνόν by Μ, supported by O ante corr. and I supra γρ. It is used by the comic poet Antiphanes and means 'fiery', just as suitable a sense as the majority variant πυρωτόν, 'fiery-faced, fiery-looking', a commoner word in the surviving literature.

At 687–95 the astrophic lyric makes good sense and metre thus:

689A  ξένους μολείεθαι λόγους  u- | -  | -  |  sync. iamb. dimer
689B  ἐκ ἄκοιν ἐμάν,  u-u-  |  dochmius
690  οὖθ' ὦδε δυσθέατα  - - - - - |  iamb. metron + dochmius
       ὄπλωστα
       πῆματα λόματα δείματ'  - - - - - -  2 dochmii
       ἀμφηκεί κέν-
       τρω ψύχειν ψυχαν ἐμάν.  - - - - - - -  2 dochmii
       ἰὼ ἰὼ,
       Μοῖρα, Μοῖρα, πέφρυκ'  - - - -  2 dochmii
695  ἐκιδοῦσα πράξειν Ἰούς.  u-u- |  iamb. dim. catalectic
       ἔκιδοῦσα πράξειν Ἰούς.

The sense runs: "Oh! Oh! Keep off! Woe is me! Never, never did I think that such strange tales would come to my hearing, nor that such hideous intolerable miseries, pollutions, terrors, with two-pronged goad would chill my soul. Oh! Fate! Fate! I shiver when I see the condition of Io." We have correction of final long vowels in 687 ἐά  ἐά and 692, the first ἰώ. At 688 ηὐχόμην is attested by Μ and others, but is probably an intruded gloss. In 690 Μ I O ante corr.
**BC H** rightly omit the καὶ before δύσοιετα. At 695 ἐκιδωτέα is in the best mss M and I, and in others.

At 776 there is a rare particle combination in MBHC, namely with the phrase μηδὲ σαντῆς τ' ἐκμαθεῖν. Cf. Theognis 1031, and the combination οὐδὲ τε or οὐδὲ...τε listed by Denniston, who failed to collect μηδὲ...τε.

At 872 our best mss, M and I on the line, give us the dative plural κλεινοῖς, which makes good sense if one punctuates thus:

```
επορᾶς γε μήν ἐκ τής δια φύσεται θρασύς,
τόξους κλεινοῖς δε πάνων ἐκ τάνηδ' ἐμὲ
λύσει.
```

“From her seed at any rate there shall be born a bold man, who, with his famous bow, shall release me from these troubles.”

At 901-06 the best colometry seems to be as follows:

**901** ἐμοὶ δ', ὅτ' ἢμεν ὀμαλὸς ὡ  ὡ-\-

γάμος, ἀφοβος.

οὐ δέδομα. μη δὲ κρεισσόνων -\-\-

**903A** θεῶν ἐρως ἀφικτον  \-\-

**903B** ὄρμα προσδράκοι με.

ἀπόλεμος ὡδε γ' ὅ πόλε-

μος, ἀπορα πόριμος.

**905** οὐδ' ἤχο τίς ἀν γενομαιν.

τὸν Δίως γὰρ οὐχ ὄρω \-\-

μὴτιν ὡτα φύγοιμ' ἂν. \-\-

**901** ὅτ' ἢμεν Young, ὅτι μὲν codices. 903B προσδράκοι Salvinius, προσδάρκοι M προσδέρκοι plerique.

The sense is: “For me, when a marriage is on the same level for going on with, it is without terror. I am not alarmed. But may the passion of superior gods not look upon me with unescapable eye. This is a war that none can war against, source of resourceless evils. Nor can I tell what might become of me. For I do not see by what way I might escape the intention of Zeus.” In 901 my redivision may be acceptable. If not so, the easiest alteration is to Arnaldus’ ὅτε μὲν...LSJ, s.v. ὀμαλὸς ΙΙ, cite the adverb used with such verbs as βάινειν, προτέναι, κνεῖεινα, and marriage may be conceived as a side by side progress.

At 910 M should be supported in omitting τ' after θρόνων in the
phrase δε αντων ἐκ τυραννιδος | θρόνων αυτων ἐκβαλει, “(a marriage) that shall expel him from the throne of his sovereignty out of sight [in utter destruction].” The adjective is proleptic.

At 926 consideration should be given to the variant κακων offered by M on the line, K supra, Δ and P γρ., giving the verse πταίσας δε τῶδε πρὸς κακων μαθήσεται . . . “And after stumbling against him [the adversary described at 920ff] through sufferings he shall learn . . .”

At 933 M ante corr. offers the particle δαι, found also at Cho. 900. τι δαι φοβοίμην ὁ θανεῖν οὐ μόρειμον; would be an example of Dennis-ton’s category “Emphatic, in a lively or surprised question” (p.263). Five lines earlier in the stichomythia the Chorus-leader uses the sole Attic example of θην.

At 948 most MSS have ἄν τ’ ἐκείνος ἐκπίπτει, which is kept by Hermann, Wecklein, Paley, Mazon, Groeneboom and others. But it might be better to redivide it into ἄν τε κείνος ἐκπίπτει, for euphony, to avoid the succession of two words starting with ἐκ.-

At 992 the hapax word αἴθεροῦσσα appears in M supra γρ. and Y post corr., supported by the form αἴθεροῦσσα in I supra γρ. and Q2 γρ. Rose dubiously considers it may mean ‘sky-ranging’. Perhaps one could render it ‘heavenly, ethereal’. It is not noticed by Italie, nor by LSJ and the Supplement. The majority variant αἴθεροῦσσα is an epicism, and might be thought stale compared with an epithet stressing the non-earthly origin of the fire with which Prometheus expects to be assailed.
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