

Some Interpolations in Sophocles

Michael D. Reeve

I

DEIANIRA's opening speech in *Trachiniae* ends, according to the tradition, as follows (36–48):¹

νῦν δ' ἤνικ' ἄθλων τῶνδ' ὑπερτελής ἔφυ,
ἐνταῦθα δὴ μάλιτα ταρβήσας ἔχω.
ἐξ οὗ γὰρ ἔκτα κείνος Ἰφίτου βίαν,
ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐν Τραχίνοι τῆδ' ἀνάστατοι
ξένω παρ' ἀνδρὶ ναίομεν, κείνος δ' ὅπου
βέβηκεν οὐδεὶς οἶδε· πλὴν ἐμοὶ πικρὰς
ὠδῖνας αὐτοῦ προσβαλὼν ἀποίχεται.
σχεδὸν δ' ἐπίσταμαί τι πῆμ' ἔχοντά νιν·
44 χρόνον γὰρ οὐχὶ βαιὸν ἀλλ' ἤδη δέκα
μῆνας προσ ἄλλοις πέντ' ἀκήρυκτος μένει.
κᾶστιν τι δεινὸν πῆμα· τοιαύτην ἐμοὶ
δέλτον λιπὼν ἔστειχε, τὴν ἐγὼ θαμὰ
θεοῖς ἀρώμαι πημονῆς ἄτερ λαβεῖν.

But lines 44–48 were condemned by Wunder² for the following

¹ The following commentaries will be cited by the author's name: on *Ajax*, A. NAUCK (Schneidewin⁹, Berlin 1888), R. JEBB (Cambridge 1896); on *Trachiniae*, E. WUNDER (Gotha 1841), F. W. SCHNEIDEWIN (Leipzig 1854), NAUCK (Schneidewin⁵, Berlin 1880), JEBB (Cambridge 1892); on *Oedipus Tyrannus*, WUNDER² (Gotha 1840), SCHNEIDEWIN (Leipzig 1851), JEBB³ (Cambridge 1893), E. BRUHN (Schneidewin¹⁰, Berlin 1897); on *Oedipus Coloneus*, P. ELMSLEY (Oxford 1823), L. CAMPBELL² (Oxford 1879), N. WECKLEIN (Munich 1880), JEBB³ (Cambridge 1900). All these commentaries except Jebb's have been consulted in the earliest edition accessible. Two other exceptions: the first edition of Wunder's *OT* (Gotha 1832) does not contain the relevant matter, and Wecklein's *OC* (=Wunder⁵?) was not accessible at all (his views are reported by Jebb).

² E. Wunder, *Emendationes in Sophoclis Trachinias* (Grimma 1841) 167–70. The preface to this work is an interesting exercise in diplomacy. Originally a loyal pupil of Gottfried Hermann, Wunder had incurred his displeasure by a review of the second edition of Lobeck's *Ajax*. Cordiality was restored when they happened to meet on holiday, and in the following year he took the opportunity of dedicating to Hermann a work that would otherwise

reasons: (1) the δέλτος of 47 and 157 contains a report of the oracle; but whereas in 164–68 the period of fifteen months is critical, in 44–48 it is merely long; (2) if 46–48 are removed, 44–45 repeat the gist of 38–41; (3) 44–48 anticipate 155–74; (4) κάστιν τι δεινὸν πῆμα in 46 repeats 43; (5) 46–47 τοιαύτην . . . ἔστειχε repeats 41–42 πλήν . . . ἀποίχεται; (6) τῆν . . . λαβεῖν in 47–48 is inappropriate, because the δέλτος cannot harm Deianira.

Jebb in the appendix to his edition disposes of (5), reasonably ignores (2) and (6), but gives incompatible answers to (1) and (4): “Deianira is alarmed not merely because the absence of Heracles has been long, but because, as she says, it has now lasted precisely 15 months, thus completing the term fixed by the oracle. Verse 43 expresses a surmise; verse 46 is stronger, and expresses certainty.” If surmise in 43 changes to certainty in 46, then the fifteen months, which give rise to the former, cannot be connected with the δέλτος, which gives rise to the latter.

The only escape from (1) is to concede (4) and punctuate lightly after 45, so that the δέλτος can serve to explain why the fifteen months disquiet her.

have widened the distance between them. In the circumstances the preface strikes a nice balance between candour and generosity.

Ten years later the public heard more. In the third edition of his *Trachiniae* (Leipzig 1851) pp. xiv–xvi, Hermann felt impelled to explain why he had scarcely referred to Wunder’s work: “est enim Wunderus vir . . . singulari naturae proprietate ita semper mentem atque oculos in uno tantum puncto defixos habens, ut, quemadmodum qui aliquid per tubum telescopii contemplantur, illud unum cernat acutissime, a ceteris rebus omnibus, etiam proximis et quae bene cognita habet, plane interclusus.” To sum up, “vellem ego quidem vir optimus quid et recte et Graece diceretur sibi ab Sophocle, non Sophocli ab se discendum putaret.”

For all the fairness of Hermann’s strictures (and they are not unmixed with praise), Wunder remains one of the most independent and least cloudy of Sophoclean commentators. As the present article shows, he was not afraid to delete, and even inert editors agree with him from time to time (e.g. at *Trach.* 684); but it is by no means his only method. Others are employed, for instance, at *Trach.* 941–42, where he makes an unassailable case for Wakefield’s conjecture βίον, and at 810, where his suggestion ἔριν for θέμιν is far more penetrating than the usual preoccupation with προύλαβες/προύβαλες.

Though most of his endeavour was devoted to Sophocles, at least two other contributions are worth recalling, both to be found in *Neue Jahrbücher* 99 (1869): *über zwei stellen in Horatius oden*, 134–44, and *über zwei oden des Horatius*, 849–55. In the first he argues with care and clarity for *visis* in place of *linquis* at 1.35.24; in the second he offers interpretations of 1.22 and 30 that are altogether more helpful and perceptive than anything written before and many things written since.

1869 was the year of his death, and a brief obituary is appended to the second of these articles.

Jebb parries (3) as follows: "An allusion to the *δέλτος*, without further explanation, is natural here, where she communes aloud with her own thoughts, heard only by the Nurse. It is also dramatically effective, as bespeaking the interest of the spectators for the explanation given in 155ff." That the function of the passage is to create suspense had already been stated by Schneidewin.

Nauck apparently agrees with what he takes to be Wunder's view, that 46–48 are interpolated. He makes three points: (1) the *δέλτος* is ignored in the immediate sequel; (2) Deianira's distress is greater in 46 than in 43, but for no obvious reason;³ (3) the same as Wunder's (6).

Tycho von Wilamowitz, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophocles* (Berlin 1917) 122–25, takes up these three points and launches a vigorous attack on the idea that Sophocles or any of the tragedians might have wished to create suspense of the kind that appealed to Jebb. Like Nauck, however, he fails to notice that by deleting only 46–48 he exposes himself to the full force of Wunder's (1) and (2).

Recent editions and commentaries⁴ give the impression that the matter is closed; but it has no right to be until the arguments of Wunder, Nauck and Tycho von Wilamowitz have been confuted. Can they be confuted? On the contrary, Wunder's case against 44–48 is corroborated by a small but significant detail, and it can even be maintained that he did not go quite far enough.

In dialogue the tragedians appear to have used *τὸν κ.τ.λ.* for *ὄν κ.τ.λ.* only under metrical constraint. The manuscripts offer no exception in Aeschylus,⁵ three in Euripides,⁶ and in Sophocles perhaps only *ἔστειχε, τὴν ἐγὼ θαμὰ* in line 47 of the present passage.⁷ As it happens,

³ He does not make it clear whether the *Steigerung* lies in *δεινὸν πῆμα* compared with *πῆμα* or in *ἔστιν* compared with *χερδὸν ἐπίσταμαι*; but he is right in either case, because it is pointless, as Wunder saw, to distinguish between *πῆμα* and *δεινὸν πῆμα*, and the other distinction is the one unwisely drawn by Jebb (see above in the text).

⁴ Pearson (OCT, Oxford 1928), Dain (Budé, Paris 1962); Kamerbeek (Leyden 1959), Longo (Padua 1968).

⁵ At *Supp.* 265, *κνωδάλων βροτοφθόρων | τὰ δὴ . . .* is an emendation (Turnebus: *τὰ δὲ cod.*); "notandum τὰ δὴ in initio trimetri positum sine metri necessitate pro ἄ δὴ, nisi hoc ipsum restituendum," Dindorf, *Lexicon Aeschyleum* (Leipzig 1873) s.v. ὄ § 5. It may be that in *πορθεῖν ἄ μὴ χρῆ* at *Ag.* 342 ἄ (FTr.) is an emendation of τὰ (V).

⁶ *Supp.* 858 *ἔπαινον τῶν ἔγωγε βούλομαι . . .* (*ὦν* Pierson, *τῶνδ' ἐγὼ τε* Nauck), *IT* 35 *νόμοις τοῖσιν ἦδεται θεά (-σιν οἶσιν Herwerden), Bacch.* 338 *τὸν Ἀκτέωνος ἄθλιον μόρον, | τὸν . . .* (*τὸν L, ὄν I*). Only the second of these instances is noticed by Kühner-Gerth § 460.3.

⁷ At *OC* 35, *τῶν ἄ δηλοῦμεν* used to be printed as *τῶν ἀδηλοῦμεν*, which according to Campbell and Dain is the original reading of L, until Elmsley pointed out that "τῶν neque . . . neque pro ὦν nisi post vocalem in hoc metro usurpari solet." Dindorf emended

the words τὴν ἐγὼ θαμὰ occur after a vowel in *El.* 1144, albeit not at the end of the line; and it may be that an actor has borrowed them from Electra's famous speech without noticing that he should have written ἔστειχεν, ἦν ἐγὼ θαμὰ.

When Wunder found too many faults in 44–48, it may seem surprising that at the same time he should have made the contrary mistake of not going far enough; but made it he has. By ending Deianira's speech at 43, he leaves the last line tagging along like an afterthought: it introduces a new point only to abandon it at once and leave it hanging in the air. Delete it, and the speech could not have a more fitting conclusion:

πλὴν ἐμοὶ πικρὰς
ὠδῖνας αὐτοῦ προσβαλὼν ἀποιίχεται.

It is with the same language that Tecmessa concludes her final speech (*Ajax* 971–73):

πρὸς ταῦτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὑβρίζετω·
Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται.⁸

II

One deletion proposed by Wunder exceeds all the others in importance and is indeed one of the most important ever proposed in tragedy.

What, asks Oedipus, is the reason for these supplications and the wailing all over the city? Rather than learn at second hand,

αὐτὸς ᾧδ' ἐλήλυθα,
ὁ πᾶσι κλεινὸς Οἰδίπου καλούμενος (*OT* 7–8),

and so the action starts.

Trach. 47 accordingly, but Jebb had already cited it in two editions of *OC* as an instance of metrical constraint before he came to edit *Trach.* and saw that it is not.

⁸ Schneidewin, *Philologus* 4 (1849) 473–74, was quite wrong to remove 969 and 972–73: what must go is 966–70 (Nauck). “The diversity of opinion among the critics as to which verses should be deleted curiously illustrates,” says Jebb in his appendix, “the arbitrary character of such processes”—or the unremarkable fact that some people have more wit than others.

In the circumstances it is a waste of time to tinker with ἦ in 966, especially if all that

Wunder deleted line 8: “neque enim umquam apud Sophoclem qui prologum orditur suum ipsius nomen ita profitetur, sed ab eo quicum colloquitur primum nomine appellatur. accedit quod numquam Sophocles, quo fuit sensu venusti et decori, Oedipum in ipso exordio τὸν πᾶσι κλεινὸν καλούμενον se dicentem introduxisset.”

Now the second of these arguments may be intangible and leave room for dispute;⁹ but the first rests on an observation of the greatest simplicity and the greatest significance. When Sophocles begins a play, two concerns are in his mind: to furnish essential information, and to develop a realistic situation. It is not realistic¹⁰ for someone to announce his name to people who know it already, and so the audience must wait until the second speaker uses it unless they are familiar with the myth.¹¹ In *Oedipus Tyrannus* they wait only 14 lines; in *Philoctetes* it is 26 and in *Trachiniae* 49.¹²

emerges is an ugly sequence like τέθηκε κεί κείνοις (R. D. Dawe, *ProcCambPhilSoc* 194 [1968] 12–13). Among the examples of repeated syllables collected by Diggle, *ib.* 195 (1969) 59, there is none as bad as this.

⁹ Cf. Schneidewin and Jebb: “Oed. spricht diese Worte nicht im stolzen Selbstgefühl — erinnert er doch nur an die allgemeine Volksstimme —, sondern in tiefem Mitgefühl für die Leiden Thebens und in bitterm Bewusstsein, wie gross der Abstand sei zwischen seiner gepriesenen Herrlichkeit und dem, was er in der Noth zu thun vermöge. Wie es aber für die *ικέται* ein Trost sein muss, dass der gefeierte Fürst selbst sich ihrer annimmt, so ist es für den Zuschauer ein Zug tragischer Ironie, das Oed. gerade am Wendepunkte seiner κλεινότης an diese erinnert”; “the tone is Homeric . . . : Oedipus is a type, for the frank heroic age, of Arist.’s μεγαλόψυχος — ὁ μεγάλων αὐτὸν ἀξιών, ἄξιος ὤν.”

¹⁰ Admittedly, different people will draw the line between the realistic and the unrealistic in different places, so that it may be impossible to tell whether a particular scene is meant to be realistic. At the beginning of *Philoctetes*, for instance, it would probably strike most people as unrealistic that Odysseus tells Neoptolemus at length when they set foot on Lemnos a story that he is bound to have heard earlier in even greater detail; but would Sophocles have pleaded necessity, or did he see nothing unrealistic in it?

¹¹ The only true statement in Bruhn’s interesting note is the comment of Voltaire’s that he disagrees with: “Die Nennung des Namens ist notwendig, damit der Zuschauer weiss, wen er vor sich hat, aber zugleich psychologisch wohl begründet . . . ; so dass wir eher mit dem Scholiasten sagen werden πιθανῶς δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ προλογίζοντος ἐδήλωσεν als mit Voltaire (*Lettres à M. de Genonville* 3) einem Dichter unsere Bewunderung versagen, qui n’emploie d’autre artifice pour faire connaître ses personnages que de faire dire (le roi): Je m’appelle *Œdipe*, si vanté par tout le monde.”

¹² Aristophanes can be much less obliging: see Dover on *Clouds* 134 (Oxford 1968). In comedy, of course, nothing hinges on the name—though it is as well for modern readers to remember that the audience was not disposed in Dicaeopolis’ favour at the beginning of *Acharnians* by merely knowing his name.

The crudity of Euripides’ introductions can go without illustration, but there is a welcome exception in *Heraclidae*, where Iolaus uses his own name in an imaginary rebuke (line 30). Eteocles does much the same in *Septem* (line 6); cf. also *OC* 3.

Wunder's arguments seem not to have impressed the editors, who ignore his deletion; and one P. de Koning apparently failed to set Leyden alight in 1891 when he made the same proposal, whether independently or not, in his doctoral examination (*Quaestiones Atticae*, thesis V). It is hoped that the explanation here offered for the phenomenon observed by Wunder will acquit him of irresponsibility and encourage the editors to think again.

III

νῦν δ', ἐς σὲ γὰρ πομπὸν τε καὐτὸν ἄγγελον
 ἦκω, σὺ δὲ σῶσον, σὺ μὲν ἐλέησον, εἰσορῶν
 ὡς πάντα δεινά,¹³ κάπικινδύνως βροτοῖς
 κεῖται παθεῖν μὲν εὖ, παθεῖν δὲ θάτερα.
 χρὴ δ' ἐκτὸς ὄντα πημάτων τὰ δεινὰ ὄραν,
 χῶταν τις εὖ ζῆ, τημικαῦτα τὸν βίον
 σκοπεῖν μάλιστα μὴ διαφθαρεῖς λάθη.

These lines (*Phil.* 500–06) must be judged in the light of a Sophoclean mannerism. Since it may have passed unnoticed, here are sixteen examples:

- Ajax* 479–80 ἀλλ' ἢ καλῶς ζῆν ἢ καλῶς τεθνηκέναι
 τὸν εὐγενῆ χρὴ. πάντ' ἀκήκοας λόγον.
 691–92 τάχ' ἂν μὲν ἔσως
 πύθοικθε, κεῖ νῦν δυστυχῶ, σεσωσμένον.
 1314–15 βουλήσῃ ποτὲ
 καὶ δειλὸς εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ ἔμοι θρασύς.
El. 821–22 ὡς χάρις μὲν ἦν κτάνη,
 λύπη δ' ἐὰν ζῶ· τοῦ βίου δ' οὐδεὶς πόθος.
 1320–21 ἦ γὰρ ἂν καλῶς
 ἔσως ἐμαυτὴν ἢ καλῶς ἀπωλόμην·
OT 145–46 ἦ γὰρ εὐτυχεῖς
 σὺν τῷ θεῷ φανούμεθ' ἢ πεπτωκότες.
Ant. 37–38 δείξεις τάχα
 εἴτ' εὐγενῆς πέφυκας εἴτ' ἐσθλῶν κακή.
 209–10 θανῶν
 καὶ ζῶν ὁμοίως ἐξ ἐμοῦ τιμῆσεται.

¹³ ἄδηλα Wakefield, accepted by Diggle, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 37.

- 313–14 ἐκ τῶν γὰρ αἰσχροῶν λημμάτων τοῦς πλείονα
ἀτωμένους ἴδοις ἂν ἢ σεσωσμένους.
- 927–28 μὴ πλείω κακὰ
πάθοιεν ἢ καὶ δρωσιν ἐκδίκως ἐμέ.
- Trach. 468–69 σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ φράζω κακὸν
πρὸς ἄλλον εἶναι, πρὸς δ' ἐμ' ἀψευδεῖν αἰεί.
- 819–20 τὴν δὲ τέρψιν ἦν
τῶμῳ δίδωσι πατρί, τήνδ' αὐτὴ λάβοι.
- 1111 καὶ ζῶν κακούργους καὶ θανῶν ἐτεισάμην.
- Phil. 1043–44 ὡς ζῶ μὲν οἰκτρῶς, εἰ δ' ἴδοιμ' ὀλωλότα
τούτους, δοκοῖμ' ἂν τῆς νόσου πεφευγέναι.
- OC 459–60 τῆδε μὲν πόλει μέγαν
σωτήρ' ἀρεῖσθε, τοῖς δ' ἐμοῖς ἐχθροῖς πόνους.
- 1344–45 καὶ ταῦτα σοῦ μὲν ξυνηέλοντος ἔστι μοι
κομπεῖν, ἄνευ σοῦ δ' οὐδὲ σωθῆναι χθένω.

All these antithetical formulations occur at the end of long speeches; there are other examples at the end of shorter speeches (*Ajax* 132–33, *OT* 521–22, *Trach.* 83+85, *Phil.* 94–95), and also at heavy pauses in long speeches (*OC* 1306–07). It is therefore hard to repress the suspicion that Philoctetes' speech ended as follows:

ὡς πάντα δεινά, κάπικινδύνως βροτοῖς
κεῖται παθεῖν μὲν εὖ, παθεῖν δὲ θάτερα.

That 504–06 add nothing is insufficient to condemn them, and they are inoffensive in themselves; but *παθεῖν μὲν εὖ, παθεῖν δὲ θάτερα* accords with the poet's manner both formally and in another respect: it has the eloquence of economy and restraint.

A similar improvement can be made in a speech whose final lines are not so inoffensive (*OT* 51–57):

. . . ἀσφαλεία τήνδ' ἀνόρθωσον πόλιν.
ὄρνιθι γὰρ καὶ τὴν τότε αἰεὶ τύχη
παρέσχεε ἡμῖν, καὶ τανῦν ἴσος γενοῦ·
ὡς εἴπερ ἄρξεις τῆσδε γῆς, ὡςπερ κρατεῖς,
ξὺν ἀνδράσιν κάλλιον ἢ κενῆς κρατεῖν·
ὡς οὐδέν ἐστιν οὔτε πύργος οὔτε ναῦς
ἐρημος ἀνδρῶν μὴ ξυνοικούντων ἔσω.

Not to linger over the Boeotian navy, the military commonplace in

the last clause is infelicitously expressed: men do not 'dwell together' in ships, hardly even in embattled towers. In addition, though this appeal is littered with instances of *ὡς* (44, 47, 54, 56), the last two unlike the rest occur in the same sentence, one on top of the other—a piece of clumsiness that could easily have been avoided (*οὐδὲν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*).¹⁴

IV

Certain peculiarities of Polynices' appeal to his father at *Oedipus Coloneus* 1285–1345 have not been given sufficient attention.

(1) Eteocles won the city over and drove me out, says Polynices (1292–98);

*ὦν ἐγὼ μάλιστα μὲν
τὴν σὴν Ἐρινὺν αἰτίαν εἶναι λέγω·
ἔπειτα κατὰ μάντεων ταύτη κλύω (1298–1300).*

According to Jebb, “*ἔπειτα* is not opposed to *μὲν*, but introduces the fact which confirms his conjecture.” How likely that is may best be judged from the other passages in Sophocles where *ἔπειτα* follows *μάλιστα μὲν*:

*μάλιστα μὲν τόνδ' ὄρκον αἰδεσθεὶς θεῶν,
ἔπειτα καμὲ τούδε θ' οἱ πάρεισί σοι (OT 647–48).
μάλιστα μὲν δὴ τοῦ θανόντος ἡμέρω,
ὅπως ἴδοιμ' ἄθραπτον· οὐ γὰρ εἰδόμην·
ἔπειτα μέντοι χῶ λόγος καλὸς προσῆν (Phil. 350–52).
ὄλοισθ', Ἀτρεΐδαι μὲν μάλιστα', ἔπειτα δὲ
ὁ Λαρτίου παῖς καὶ σύ (Phil. 1285–86).*

Unless Polynices is misusing the language, therefore, he must mean “that your Curse was responsible is primarily my opinion, but I hear the same from seers as well”; yet that is surely not what he does mean, and even if it were he would have put his words in a different order.

(2) He goes on

*ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἦλθον Ἄργος ἐς τὸ Δωρικόν,
λαβὼν Ἄδραστον πενθερόν, ξυνωμότα
ἔστης' ἐμαυτῷ γῆς ὅσοιπερ Ἀπίας*

¹⁴ Alternatively, the second *ὡς* clause may have been designed to replace the first.

πρῶτοι καλοῦνται καὶ τετίμηνται δορί,
 ὅπως τὸν ἐπτάλογγον ἐς Θήβας στόλον
 ξὺν τοῖσδ' ἀγείρας ἢ θάνοιμι πανδίκως
 ἢ τοὺς τὰδ' ἐκπράξαντας ἐκβάλοιμι γῆς (1301–07).

Why γὰρ? Jebb, reduced to perplexity and reluctant to write δ' ἄρ', supposes "the hearers are left to understand that he found the seers among his new allies." δ' ἄρ' is certainly out of the question, but so is any other particle, because only δὲ and δ' οὖν are appropriate and neither scans.

(3) The vocabulary and expression of 1313–25, in which Polynices lists his allies, are in various ways unusual.

- 1313 οἶος: in this use, an echo from a bygone age (Hes. *Catal.*, Aesch. *Pers.* 21; cf. *Il.* 1.263; parodied in Timon's *Κίλλοι*¹⁵).
- 1313 δορυσσοῦς: Hesiod, Theognis, Aesch. *Supp.* 182 and 985 uncontracted, otherwise lyric (Aesch. *Sept.* 125, Eur. *Heraclid.* 774); clumsy, not to say superfluous, alongside τὰ πρῶτα μὲν δόρει κρατύνων.
- 1314 κρατύνων: elsewhere 'rule' or 'possess'; τὰ πρῶτα κρατύνων presumably to be interpreted along the lines of *Ajax* 1300 τὰ πρῶτ' ἀριστεύσας.
- 1318 εὔχεται . . . δηώσκειν: *LSJ* εὔχομαι III 'profess loudly, boast, vaunt . . . : mostly, not of empty boasting, but of something of which one has a right to be proud', and for that reason seldom if ever construed with the future infinitive, which is confined to religious vows (*LSJ* II).
- 1318–19 the datives κατασκαφῆ and πυρὶ (πυρὶ LΦ, τάχα A) sit uneasily together in the same phrase.
- 1319 δηώσκειν: in this sense, Solon, Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristophanes, "etc." (*LSJ*); not in tragedy at all.
- 1320 ὄρνυται, 1321 ἀδμήτης: epic and lyric.¹⁶
- 1322 λοχευθεῖς: nowhere else in Sophocles,¹⁷ seven times in Euripides.

¹⁵ References can be found under οἶος in Index II of Diels, *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta* (Berlin 1901).

¹⁶ ὄρνυται, however, has a much stronger flavour of epic and lyric than ἀδμήτης, partly no doubt because it is commoner, partly because more synonyms were in use.

¹⁷ A. S. Gratwick, *CR* 79 (1965) 243–46, takes exception to λοχευθεῖς in the colourless sense 'born', and for other reasons as well follows Φ in omitting χρόνω . . . Ἀταλάντης; but Φ probably omits the words because some scribe jumped from ἀδμήτης to Ἀταλάντης.

1322 *πιστός*, 1325 *ἄφοβον*: in the situation, empty swagger.¹⁸

(4) “. . . and I . . . am leading to Thebes the fearless army of Argos” (1323–25),

οἱ δ' ἄντι παίδων τῶνδε καὶ ψυχῆς, πάτερ,
ἰκετεύομεν ξύμπαντες . . . (1326–27).

Jebb again: “*ἄντι παίδων* . . . *ἰκετεύομεν* here=*πρὸς παίδων*, ‘by them’, i.e. ‘as you love them’, a very rare use of *ἄντι*, but one which comes easily from its ordinary sense, ‘in return for’, ‘as an equivalent for’.” Ludwig Dindorf wished to substitute *ἀμφὶ*, also “very rare,” if that is the phrase for singularities (Ap.Rhod. 2.216).

(5) . . . ἐξαιτούμενοι
μῆνιν βαρεῖαν εἰκαθεῖν ὀρμωμένῳ
τῶδ' ἀνδρὶ τοῦμοῦ πρὸς κακιστῆτος τίειν (1327–29)

“*μῆνιν* . . . *εἰκαθεῖν*, concede thy wrath to me, i.e. remit it: the same constr. (though not in the same application) as *Ph.* 464 *ὀπηνίκ' ἄν θεός | πλοῦν ἡμῖν εἴκη*, concede a voyage to us. This is better than to make *μῆνιν* acc. of respect,” Jebb.

It is hard to say how many of these peculiarities ought to excite suspicion. (5) and (4) may not seem beyond the range of *audax verborum novator Sophocles*;¹⁹ the loss of all but a few fifth-century tragedies will doubtless be said to account for most of (3); and Jebb's treatment of (2) and (1) may be thought satisfactory. Anyone who is prepared to swallow all five need read no further; others may like to consider the following suggestions for removing (1), (3) and (4).

(1) Delete 1300. At *OT* 1466 *μάλιστα μὲν* is not followed up, and Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954) 382, collects similar instances of *πρῶτον μὲν*. In this passage alternative speculations (if *μάλιστα μὲν* means ‘rather than anything else’) or attributions of secondary responsibility (if *μάλιστα μὲν* means ‘more than anything else’) are quite irrelevant, but a continuation may have been missed by some pedant.

¹⁸ The same applies to *πανάρχως* (codd.) at 1293. In a class on the play Ed. Fraenkel once proposed *πάναρχος*, which is surely right. It is published here without his knowledge, because he is now with Sophocles.

¹⁹ The phrase comes from Ellendt-Genthe, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Berlin 1872) s.v. *ἀριστεύω*. Cf. Haupt's remarks on *πρόθυμος* at *El.* 3, cited by C. Belger in *M. Haupt als akademischer Lehrer* (Berlin 1879) 220.

(3) Delete the list of allies (1313–25) and either or both of the relative clauses that frame it. Deletion of the second has the virtue of removing (4); the first is harmless enough in itself, but *κὺν ἑπτὰ . . . λόγχοι* repeats 1305 *ἑπτάλογχον*.²⁰ Read therefore

*εἶέν · τί δῆτα νῦν ἀφιγμένος κυρῶ;
κοὶ προστροπαίους, ὦ πάτερ, λιτὰς ἔχων*
1310 *αὐτός τ' ἑμαυτοῦ συμμάχων τε τῶν ἐμῶν*
1328 *μῆνιν βαρεῖαν εἰκαθεῖν ὀρμωμένῳ*
τῶδ' ἀνδρὶ τοῦμοῦ πρὸς κασιγνήτου τίειν.

The excision of a substantial passage from the play is not unprecedented (299–307 *del.* Wecklein²¹). Nor is the list any loss: it contributes nothing to the appeal and is devoid of any other merit.²²

As long as (5) has to be taken on trust, however, and (2) remains a grave problem (perhaps a sign of omission or dislocation),²³ it cannot be pretended that the difficulties of the speech have been cleared away.

EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD

October, 1970

²⁰ “The art. *τόν*” with *ἑπτάλογχον*, “because the expedition is no longer a project, but a fact (1312),” Jebb. Since 1312 comes seven lines after 1305, another possibility could be entertained: that *τόν* is addressed to a knowledgeable audience (so Campbell: “The article is probably used by an anachronism: i.e. ‘The well-known expedition of the seven chieftains’.”). In that case no more information about *τόν ἑπτάλογχον στόλον* ought to be forthcoming.

²¹ 301–04, in which the chorus say that the mention of Oedipus’ name will bring Theseus running to the spot, are a fussy elaboration of what they have just said (297–98), that the same *σκοπὸς* as brought them themselves on the scene has gone to fetch him. Though Sophocles could have been fussy for once, linguistic eccentricities point the other way: it may be an accident that *ἐντροπήν* (299) is attested only in Hellenistic prose (*ἐντρέπομαι Ajax* 90, *OT* 724, 1056, 1226, *El.* 519), but *αἰών* (304) is foreign to trimeters, and *βραδὺς εὔδει* (306–07) has always been an embarrassment.

²² Contrast the rhetorical force of *Trach.* 1089–1106, where Heracles lists six of his victims in suitably horrific language and then continues:

*ἄλλων τε μόχθων μυρίων ἔγευσάμην,
κοῦδεῖς τροπαί' ἔστησε τῶν ἐμῶν χερῶν·
νῦν δ' ὠδ' ἀναρθρὸς καὶ κατερρακωμένος
τυφλῆς ὑπ' ἄτης ἐκπεπόρθημαι τάλας,
ὁ τῆς ἀρίστης μητρὸς ὠνομασμένος,
ὁ τοῦ κατ' ἄστρα Ζηγὸς αὐδηθεὶς γόνος.*

²³ Unless, in the absence of 1300, the force of *γάρ* could be “I hold your Curse responsible, because the measures I proceeded to take will bring disaster on either me or him (and thereby fulfil your Curse).”