

# 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 Vincetus*, the so-called Byzantine triad.<sup>1</sup>

## I. *Persae*

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

	φιλόφρων γὰρ	υυ--
	καίνουσα τὸ πρῶτον παράγει βροτὸν εἰς	--υυ --υυ --υυ-
	ἄρκύστατα, τόθεν οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπὲρ θνα-	--υυ υυ-- υυ--
100	τὸν ἀλύξαντα φυγεῖν.	υυ-- υυ-

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 *ionici a minore* varied by *ionici a maiore* and a choriamb. Line 97 is an ionic monometer, 98 and 99 polyschematist ionic trimeters, and 100 an ionic dimeter cata-

<sup>1</sup> Editions of the plays are cited by the name of the editor of each. Other works of frequent reference are cited as follows: DALE: A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*<sup>2</sup> (London 1968). DAWE: R. D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1964). DENNISTON: J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1954). ITALIE: G. Italie, *Index Aeschyleus*<sup>2</sup> (Leiden 1964). ROSE: H. J. Rose, *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam 1957–58). SMYTH, GG: H. Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. G. M. Messing (Cambridge [Mass.] 1963). TURYN: A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York 1943). WECKLEIN: N. Wecklein ed., *Aeschyli Fabulae*, II: *Appendix coniecturas virorum doctorum minus certas continens* (Berlin 1885).

lectic. But one can hardly colometrize rigorously what is to be seen rather as an ionic *πνίγος* 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 *πνίγος* conveys well the feeling of the irresistible onset of the Ἐπάτα θεοῦ.

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	ἴωζ' ἄποτμον βοῶν	υ-υ- -υ-	<i>sync. iambic dimeter</i>
	δυσαιανῆ Πέρσαις,	υ-- ---	<i>bacchius+ molossus</i>
	δάοις ὡς πάντα παγκάκως	--- -υ-υ-	<i>molossus+ hypo-</i> <i>dochmius</i>
	ἔθεσαν. αἰαῖ, στρατοῦ φθαρέντος.	υυυ- -υ- υ--	<i>4th paeon+ cretic</i> <i>+ bacchius</i>
~ 286	ετυγναί γ' Ἀθῆναι δᾶοις·	--υ- -υ-	<i>sync. iambic dimeter</i>
	μῆμνησθαί τοι πάρα.	υ-- υ-	<i>bacchius+ cretic</i>
	ὡς πολλάς Περσίδων μάταν	--- -υ-υ-	<i>molossus+ hypo-</i> <i>dochmius</i>
	ἔκτισαν εὐνίδαο ἠδ' ἀνάνδρους.	-υυ- -υ- υ--	<i>resolved molossus+</i> <i>cretic+ bacchius</i>

At 286 there is internal correption in δᾶοις. 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 anacalasis in the first metron, cf. *Cho.* 1049, *φαιοχίτωνες καὶ πεπλεκτανημένοι*. But maybe Aeschylus wrote *θέσσαν* (283), *κτίσσαν* (289), making initial cretics. At 289 *Italie* follows Fraenkel in rejecting Wilamowitz's defence of the long *iota* in *εὐνίδαο*. Also the accent is dubious. Maybe we should resolve the initial diphthong and print the paradosis as ἔκτισαν

ἐϋνῖδας ἢ δ' ἀνάνδρους, -υυυ|υυυ-|υ- -, first paeon+ fourth paeon+ bacchius.

At 329 mss generally offer τοιῶνδ' 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 τοίων δ' <ἄρ' > ἀρχόντων ὑπεμνήσθην πέρι, "Such then are the commanders I recall to mind." The δ' ἄρα would be as in 568, τοὶ δ' ἄρα πρωτόμοροι, φεῦ, λειφθέντες πρὸς ἀνάγκαν, ἠέ, . . . 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 νηυσὶν occurs in **M**, and in **N** a second hand writes η above ναυσὶ. At 448 also νηυσὶν is presented by **M A B C Δ H K Nd O ante corr. P linea Q Y** and **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 anacalasis, δεῖπνον 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 αἰαῖ, κακῶν δὴ πέλαγος ἔρρωται μέγα | Πέρσαις . . ., the sense would be, "Alas, a great sea of evils rages strongly against the Persians . . ." The perfect passive of ῥώννυμι, with present sense, can mean simply 'be strong', as at Eur. *Heracl.* 636, γέροντές ἐσμεν 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. *LSJ* s.v. II.2. Thuc. 2.8.4, ἔρρωτό τε πᾶς καὶ ἰδιώτης καὶ πόλις εἴ τι δύναιτο καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ ξυνεπιλαμβάνειν αὐτοῖς. Lys. 13.31, οὕτω σφόδρα ἔρρωτο ἢ βουλή κακόν τι ἐργάζεσθαι. Plato at *Symp.* 176b plays with the two senses: καὶ ἔτι ἐνὸς δέομαι ὑμῶν ἀκοῦσαι πῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὸ ἐρρώσθαι πίνειν, Ἀγάθωνος. — 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 *lectio difficilior* of the better mss, ἔρρωται, was replaced by the more conventional verb for a marine context, ἔρρωγεν, from

ῥήγνυμι, 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 *αι* and *ε*.

At 474 the singular form ἀπήρκεε(ν) is offered, in the phrase κοῦκ ἀπήρκεεν | οὐς πρόσθε Μαραθῶν βαρβάρων ἀπώλεσεν, by **M A I K supra N Nd O P line a V Y** and **Ya**. It is a *schema Pindaricum*, like 49 στεῦται δ' ἱεροῦ Τμώλου πελάται, which is kept by Kirchhoff and Mazon. ἀπήρκεεν seems to have been disfavoured by editors since Robortello.

At 528 the learned have been embarrassed to find an adequate interpretation of the reading πιστοῖσι, found in **I K P Q**, and implied by the unmetrical πιστοῖς of most MSS, in the lines

ὕμας δὲ χρῆ 'πὶ τοῖσδε τοῖς πεπραγμένοις  
πιστοῖσι πιστὰ ξυμφέρειν βουλευματα.

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 *πυστοῖς*, which it glosses *διδασκτικοῖς*, presumably by error for *διδασκτοῖς*. *LSJ* know the adjective *πυστός* only from the *Etymologicum Magnum* and Eustathius. *πυστοῖσι* 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*<sup>2</sup> [Naples 1963] p.47, records the grapplings of Triclinius with the passage in his scholia, and at p.102 his gloss, which attaches *πυστοῖσι* to his reading *ὕμῖν*, probably his own conjecture for the *ὕμας* or *ἡμας* of the paradoxis. His discussion may incorporate some older views. It begins: 'πιστῶς' ὤφειλεν εἰπεῖν ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα ἐπήγαγε 'πιστοῖς'. νοεῖται δὲ διπλῶς, ἢ 'ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις πιστοῖς', ἢτοι τοῖς φανερώς καὶ βεβαίως γεγενημένοις τῷ στρατῷ ἀτυχήμασιν, ἢ 'ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις πιστοῖς', ἢτοι τοῖς πρότερον ὑφ' ὕμῶν γεγενημένοις πιστῶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔργους· ὁ καὶ κρεῖττον . . . It seems possible that the phrase *τοῖς φανερώς καὶ βεβαίως γεγενημένοις* represents an interpretation of the expression I am postulating, *τοῖς πεπραγμένοις πυστοῖσι*. Likewise **Ya**'s reading *πυστοῖς* and gloss *διδασκτικοῖς* 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 ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, νῦν τῶν 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 paradosis. Though scribes often insert articles *suo Marte*, they equally often omit them *pingui Minerva*.

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

650 Ἄιδωνεύς δ' ἀναπομπὸς ἄν εἴη,  
Ἄιδωνεύς,  
οἶον ἄνακτα Δαρείαν. ἦέ.

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

ἄν εἴη 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 ἄν 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 *λύοι κεν χαλινὸν ὑφ' ἥρωϊ παρθενίας. ἀναπομπός*, formed from the verb *ἀναπέμπω*, has the power to govern the accusative phrase at 651, *οἶον ἄνακτα Δαρείαν*. Cf. *Cho.* 23 *χοὰς προπομπός. ἄν εἴη* 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: *εἶτα διὰ μέσου ἐρεῖς τὸ “ὁ Ἄιδωνεύς δέ, ὁ Ἄιδωνεύς εἴην ἄν ἀναπομπός,” ἀντὶ τοῦ “εἴη” Ἀττικῶς*. The rather indirect type of petition is closer to the expression of wish, *εἴθε ἀναπέμποι*, than to the direct petition, *ἀνάπεμψον*. 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 paradosis offers *δαρείον οἶον* (or *οἶον*) *ἄνακτα δαρείαν* (variously accented). ἦέ. Editors commonly reject the initial *δαρείον*

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 *ολον ἄνακτα Δαρείαν. ἦέ*. Accenting *Δαρείαν* as from a nominative *Δαρείας*, like *Αἰνείας*, and taking *ἦέ* as an ululation *extra metrum*, one could analyse the metre as Adonean+ molossus,  $-uu-x|---$ , or choriamb if the *ει* diphthong be opened up. At 656 the *paradosis* presents *ἔσκειν ἐπεὶ στρατὸν* unanimously, then *ὑπεδώκει* **M** *ante corr.* *εὖ ἐποδώκει* **M** *post corr.* and the majority, with *ἐπεδώκει* in **O** *post corr.* **Y Ya**, and *ἐποδόκει* in **K**, which is probably the truth or the next thing to it. *LSJ s.v. ποδοχέω* attest the form *ποδοκέω*, 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 *εὖ '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, *εὖ 'ποδόκει* would be a choriamb answering the molossus or choriamb 651 *Δαρείαν*. But *ἔσκειν, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν*,  $-uu-uu$ , could only respond correctly to 651 *ολον ἄνακτα* if one accepts that the final anceps 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 *λαός*. For the majority there have *λαός 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 mss have in their texts the reading *στρατὸς δαμασθεῖς . . .* but a second hand in **Q** has written *λεώς* over *στρατὸς* as a *γράφεται* 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 *λεώς*, in 279. Here at 656 I would read *ἔσκειν, ἐπεὶ λεῶν εὖ 'ποδόκει. ἦέ*.  $-uu-|uu-|---$ , Adonean+ choriamb, with the ululation added *extra metrum*. *Italie, s.v. λαός (λεώς)* 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 *λεῶν*.

The epode at 672–80 can make good sense and metre with much less alteration of the *paradosis* than the current texts exhibit. The most conservative text and a plausible colometry might be as follows:

	αἰαῖ αἰαῖ·	transitional spondees
	ὦ πολὺκλαυτε φίλοισι θανών,	dactylic tetrameter catalectic
675	τί τάδε δυνατὰ δυνατὰ	dochmius
	περὶ τᾶ cᾶ δίδυμα;	dochmius
	δι' ἄγο<c> ἐν δ' ἄμαρτία	syncopated iambic dimeter
	πάσαν γᾶν τάνδ'	transitional spondees
679A	ἐξήφυνται	transitional spondees
679B	τρίσκαλμοι νᾶες	dochmius
680	ἄναες ἄναες.	dochmius (in Reizianum form)

675 δυνατὰ δυνατὰ Blomfield, *δυνάτα δυνάτα* **M N<sup>2</sup>** *post corr.* *δυνάστα δυνάστα vulgo deteriores, δυνάτ' ἀδύνατα* Bothe. 676 τᾶ cᾶ Schütz *alii, τᾶ cᾶ vel τὰ cὰ codices fere.* 677 δι' ἄγος Tucker, ἐν δ' Young, *διαγόεν* **M** *ante corr.* *διαγόεν δ' M post corr.* *διάγοιεν δ' codices plerique, διὰ γόεν θ' I γρ.* 678 πάσαν γᾶν τάνδε *ut vid. M ante corr., πάσαι γᾶι τᾶιδε M post corr., πάσαι γᾶι τᾶδε codd. pler.* 679A ἐξήφυνται Young, *ἐξέφυντ' αἰ M linea, ἐξέφουντ' αἰ M supra, ἐξέφθινθ' αἰ deteriores plerique.*

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 *δυνατὰ* to *δυνάστα* would be caused partly by the common interchange of τ and cτ in minuscules and partly by the latent notion that the deceased Dareios being addressed had been a *δυνάστης*. For the ellipse of γᾶ with τᾶ cᾶ *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 ΔΙΑΓΟCΕΝΔΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΙ between other round letters, O and E, and through the copyist's familiarity with the verb *διάγω*. The Chorus' references to a pollution and an error would have been prompted by the messenger's remarks at 354 and 361 on the *alastor* and the trick of the Hellene. The ἐν here is instrumental. At 679A ἐξήφυνται is the third plural perfect middle from ἐξαφύω, *cf.* *Od.* 14.95, and Hesychius: ἐξαφύουσιν· ἐξαντλήουσιν.

On metrical matters, one may compare the transitional spondees at 672, 678, 679A to those at 930, *αἰνῶς αἰνῶς ἐπὶ γόνυ κέκλιται*. 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 λέκτρων γεραιὰ ξύννομι', ἐυγενὲς 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 τὰδ' ὡς Σούσων μὲν ἄστῦ πᾶν κενανδρία\* στένει* . . . Most of Dawe's mss have *κενανδρίαν*; but consider *κενανδρία* **I Y**, *κενανδρίαίς* **A**, obviously through dittography of *sigma* before *στένει*. Blomfield, on *κενανδρία* in some *recentiores*, astutely noted “*nempe pro κενανδρία*”; and this dative of cause should probably be printed: cf. 295, . . . *κεῖ στένεις κακοῖς ὄμωσ*.

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

At 819 Dareios prophesies about Plataia, according to the usual text: *θῖνες νεκρῶν δὲ καὶ τριτοσπόρω γένει | ἄφωνα σημανοῦσιν ὄμμασιν βροτῶν*. **M** and **Δ** have *σημαινοῦσιν*, properispomenon, and very likely we should print a prophetic present, proparoxytone, *σημαίνουσιν*.

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

<i>ὦ πόποι, ἦ μεγάλας ἀγαθᾶς τε πο-</i>	<i>dactylic tetrameter</i>
<i>λιςσονόμου βιοτᾶς ἐπεκύραμεν,</i>	<i>dactylic tetrameter</i>
<i>εὖθ' ὁ γεραιὸς</i>	<i>Adonean</i>



855	πανταρκῆς ἀκάκας ἄμαχος βασι- λεὺς ἰσόθεος Δαρείος ἄρχε χώρας.	dactylic tetrameter choriamb catalectic iambic dimeter
~	πρῶτα μὲν εὐδοκίμους στρατιάς ἀπό- φαινόμεθ', ἠδὲ νομίσματα πύργινα	dactylic tetrameter dactylic tetrameter
860	πάντ' ἐπέθνον. νόστοι δ' ἐκ πολέμων ἀπόνους ἀπα- θεῖς ἐὺ πράσ- κοντας ἄγον ἐς οἴκους.	Adonean dactylic tetrameter choriamb Pherecratean

854 γεραιὸς **M I A B O P V Δ**, γηραιὸς **C K Nd Q Y Ya**. 858 ἀποφαινόμεθ' **M I** linea **A B C V Y Ya** (ἀπο- etiam alii), ἀπεφαινόμεθ' **I supra O<sup>2</sup> post corr.** **P γρ. Δ.** 860 ἐπέθνον, **M post corr. K Q<sup>2</sup> ante corr.** ἐπέθνον **M ante corr. Q<sup>2</sup> γρ. reliqui fere.**

The sense seems to be: "Ο ποροί! 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 γεραιὸς is better attested than γηραιὸς, for what little the manuscript evidence is worth on such a point, involving the mere interpretation of an original letter E, which, apart from context, might mean ε, η, or ει. The main reason for preferring γεραιὸς is metrical, that it makes an Adonean, a colon suited to the dactylic context, whereas εἶθ' ὁ γηραιὸς makes the awkward sequence -υ--- designated by Broadhead, p.293, as an 'ithyphallic syncopated',—*monstrum horrendum informe*.

At 860 an Adonean is made with ἐπέθνον, which I take to be third-plural imperfect from \*ἐπι-θύνω- a compound of Homer's θύνω, cf. *Il.* 2.446 βασιλῆες | θύνον κρίνοντες. At 856 Murray made ἰσόθεος trisyllabic by synizesis. At 862 I scan the manuscripts' εἶδ as εἶδ, more *Homeric*, 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 dimeter 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 respension that Sappho admits when making a glyconic equivalent to a choriambic dimeter. Cf. P. Maas, *Greek Metre*,

tr. H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford 1962) p.27. Now at 863 Dawe reports that in **M** the *sigma* of ἐς is almost erased, and Porson in fact deleted ἐς. Perhaps we might transpose it to make 863 run thus: -*con*τας ἐςᾶγον οἴκους, a choriambic dimeter catalectic, or Aristophanean. Then, if in 857 we make the licit internal correption of the εἰ of Δαρείος, we see that Δαρείος ἄρχε χώρας, scanned -υυ-|υ-- , could be another Aristophanean.

At 935–40 ~ 944–47 there are problems of resposion, 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.

	Ξε. ὄδ' ἐγών, οιοῖ, αἰακτός, μέλεος γέννα γᾶ τε πατρώα κακὸν ἄρ' ἐγενόμαν.	<i>anapaestic dim. catalectic</i> <i>anapaestic dimeter</i> <i>dochmius</i> υυυυυ-
935	Χο. πρὸ φθόγγου κοι νόστου [τὰν] κακοφάτιδα βοάν, κακομέλετον ἰάν, Μαριανδυνοῦ θρηνητῆρος πέμψω	<i>double molossus</i> <i>2 doch.</i> υυυυυ- υυυυυ- <i>2 dochmii</i> υ----- -----
940	[πέμψω] πολύδακρυν ἰαχάν.	<i>dochmius</i> υυυυυ-
~	Ξε. ἴετ' αἰανῆ [καὶ] πάνδурτον δύσθροον αὐδάν. δαίμων γὰρ ὄδ' αὖ μετάτροπος ἐπ' ἐμοί.	<i>anapaestic dim. catalectic</i> <i>anapaestic dimeter</i> <i>dochmius</i> υυυυυ-
	Χο. ἦσω τοι [καὶ] πάνδурτον, λαοπαθῆ τε σεβίζων ἀλίτυπά τε βάρη	<i>double molossus</i> <i>dochmiac dimeter</i> -υ-υ-  -υυυυ-
945	πόλεως γέννας πενθητῆρος. κλάγξω δ' αὖ γόον ἀρίδακρυν.	<i>dochmiac dimeter</i> υ-----  ----- <i>dochmius</i> -υυυυx

935 πρὸ φθόγγου **I A B C O V<sup>1</sup> Y Δ Ya** *ex corr.*, προφθόγγου **M Nd**, πρόσφθογγον **K P Q**. κοι νόστου τὰν *codices fere*, τὰν *delet* Wilamowitz. 940 πέμψω *semel* **Ya bis ceteri, hoc loco semel** Wilamowitz. 941 καὶ *delet* Passow. πάνδурτον Blomfield, πανόδурτον *codices*. 944 καὶ *delet* Hartung. πάνδурτον Blomfield, πανόδурτον *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 anapaestic dimeter, and then a subtly calculated transitional colon, 933, which may be taken either as a resolved anapaestic monometer (i.e. proceleusmatic+ 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 contexts. 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 αἰανῆ καὶ πανόδυρτον δύεθρον αὐδάν. 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 incorporate it in the text at both the nearby places.

Line 936 can easily be analysed as anapaestic, with proceleusmatics; but much plastic surgery is needed to adapt the paradosis at 945 to anapaests, whereas it is straightway intelligible as a dochmiac dimeter, thus: λαοπαθῆ τε σεβίζων ἀλίτυπά τε βάρη, -⊖-⊖-| -⊖⊖⊖-. To make anapaests of the rest the nineteenth-century metricians had to add an extra κλάγξω at 947 and alter δ’ αὖ to δέ; 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 τὰ γβάτανα λιπών, and most of the rest τὰ κβάτανα λιπών, which may be scanned as a resolved hypodochmius, -ῡῡῡ-, to which responds 973, τὰ δε ε' ἐπανερόμαι, ῡ ῡ ῡ ῡ-. For the resolved hypodochmius cf. Dale p.105.

At 967 the paradosis is οἰοιοῖ, ποῦ δέ σοι Φαρνοῦχος; except that **O** offers οἴ four times and **P** *supra* has δῆ. The corresponding verse is 955, οἰοιοῖ, βόα καὶ πάντ' ἐκπεύθου. Murray tailors 955 to 967 by taking βόα as a monosyllable, which is improbable. Better would be to print 967 as οἰοῖ οἰοῖ, ποῦ δέ σοι 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	ἰὼ ἰὼ μοι	<i>iambic penthemimer</i>
975	μοι τὰς ὠγγύιους κατιδόντες	<i>anapaestic dimeter</i>
~988	ἔγγά μοι δῆτ'	
989	ἀγαθῶν ἐτάρων ὑπομμνήσκεις.	

Concerning the manuscripts' ὑπομμνήσκεις Wilamowitz remarks "vocem a tragoedia alienam," and Murray terms it "vocem non tragicam." Yet at 329 they both print ὑπεμνήσθην. Among those keeping ὑπομμνήσκεις 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 Ἐάνθη, ἄρειόν τ' Ἀγχάρην, which can be scanned as the required anapaestic dimeter catalectic if one shortens by internal correption the εἶ of ἄρειον, 'martial'.

At 1000f the paradosis can be acceptably punctuated thus:

ἔταφον ἔταφον. οὐκ ἀμφὶ κκηναῖς  
τροχηλάτοιςιν, ὅπισθε δ' ἐπόμενοι.

1001 ὅπισθε δ' **A**, ὅπισθεν **O** **Υ**, ὅπισθεν δ' *ceteri*.

“I am astonished, astonished. (They are) not around (your) wheel-driven tents [= tented waggons], but following behind.” Line 1000 is iambo-dochmiac,  $\cup\cup\cup|-----$ , responding to 985, which should be printed as ἔλιπες ἔλιπες; ὦ ὦ δαῖτων (trissyllabic). 1001 scans as  $\cup-\cup-\cup|\cup-\cup\cup-$ , iambic penthemimer+ dochmius, responding to 986, Πέρσαις ἀγαυοῖς κακὰ πρόκακα λέγων,  $---\cup---|\cup\cup\cup\cup-$ .

At 1052–53 there is no sufficient reason to reject the paradosis:

μέλαινα δ' ἀμμεμείζεται	<i>iambic dimeter</i>
μοι στονόεσσα πλαγά.	<i>Aristophanean</i>

The enclitic μοι at the start of a colon is supported by the paradosis at 975.

At 1060 **M** should be followed in reading πέπλον δ' ἔρειδε κολπίαν ἀκμῇ χερῶν. Dawe reports: ἔρειδε **MP** *supra*, ἔρειδ' **O**, ἔρρειδ' **Υ**, ἔρεικε *ceteri*. *LSJ*, s.v. ἐρείδω I.3, attest the sense ‘press hard, attack’. Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 9.32, ἤρειδε Ποσειδᾶν, | ἤρειδεν δέ μιν . . . Φοῖβος. Translate: “And attack with the strength of your hands the folded robe on your chest.” The *deteriores*’ ἔρεικε probably comes from memory of 537ff: πολλὰ δ' ἀπαλαῖς χερσὶ καλύπτρας | κατερικόμεναι | διαμυδαλέοις δάκρυ-  
σι κόλπους | τέγγουσ' . . .

## II. *Septem contra Thebas*

Colometrical theories unknown to Aeschylus have caused many of the learned to depart unnecessarily from the paradosis at numerous passages in *Septem*. Murray, for example, though expressing in his apparatus doubt whether 127–50 respond to 109–26, forced the verses into the shapes of a strophe and antistrophe by sundry excisions, additions and alterations, although Wilamowitz had seen the whole passage to be astrophic, like the Chorus’ preceding effusion at 78–107. H. J. Rose, in his commentary on 78ff, remarks that the lines “do tend to fall into groups of about the same length and approximately

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 *metricae theoriae gratia*. Thus at 114 the manuscripts' γὰρ stays if we colometrize thus:

	κῦμα γὰρ περι   πτόλιν δοχμολόφων	<i>hypodochmius + dochmius</i>
115	ἀνδρῶν καχλάζει   πνοαῖς Ἄρεος	-----   υ--υ × 2 <i>dochmii</i>
	ὀρόμενον. ἀλλ', ὦ Ζεῦ,   πάτερ παντελής,	⊔⊔----   υ--υ × 2 <i>doch-</i>
		<i>mii</i>
	πάντως ἄρηξον δαίωv ἄλωσιν.	<i>iambic trimeter catalectic</i>

At 120 the δὲ of M's first hand, which is the *lectio difficilior*, would give a Hipponactean, as at 148: Ἄργεῖοι δὲ πόλιςμα Κάδμου. If we prefer what may be an intruded gloss, the γὰρ of M<sup>2</sup> and most mss, then we can scan Ἄργεῖοι γὰρ πόλιςμα Κάδμου, with internal correction of the εἰ in Ἄργεῖοι, as -υ-|-υ-|υ-- , a creticobacchiac trimeter.

At 122, διὰ δέ τοι γενύων ἱππίων, we have a dochmius followed by an iambic monometer, υ⊔-υ-|--υ-, as at 143, if we scan *upsilon* long, as at Eur. *El.* 1214.

At 125 *δορυσκόοις καγαῖς* of the paradosis can stay as an iambic hexasyllable, a form of Miss Dale's 'long dochmiac'. Aeschylus uses the epic form *δορυσκόος* at *Supp.* 182 and 985. Another such hexasyllabic long dochmiac is offered by most mss at 129, ῥυσίπολις γενοῦ. ῥυσίπολις, 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 ἰχθυβόλω μαχανᾷ Ποσειδάν? Compare 791, μὴ τελέσῃ καμψίπους Ἐρινύς, and 854, ἀλλὰ γόων, ὦ φίλοι, κατ' οὔρον. Perhaps we have an Adonean, -υυ-- , followed by an iambic pentasyllable, υ-υ-- . But maybe one should think of the cola as syncopated iambic trimeters, with choriambic anaclassis in the first metron.

At 135 our best witness by far, M, offers ἐπώνυμον Κάδμου πόλιν φύλαξον, an iambic trimeter catalectic, like 117, πάντως ἄρηξον δαίωv ἄλωσιν, except that 135 lacks caesura, as do quite many non-lyric

trimeters in Aeschylus. The following phrase κήδεσσι τ' ἐναργῶς would be an ithyphallic or a syncopated iambic dimeter. The *deteriores* present the order Κάδμου ἐπώνυμον, which can be scanned as a dochmius, with epic correction of the -ου, -ᾠ-υ-, or by prodelision to make Κάδμου ἑπώνυμον, ---υ-. With that colometry one makes an iambic trimeter catalectic out of πόλιν φύλαξον κήδεσσι τ' ἐναργῶς.

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

140	καὶ Κῦπρις, ἄτε γένους προμάτωρ, ἄλευσον.	--υ υυυ- υ-- υ--
	κέθεν ἐξ αἵματος	υυ--υ- dochmius
	γεγόναμεν. λιταῖς σε θεοκλύτοις	υᾠ-υ- υᾠυ- dochmius
		+ iambic metron
	ἀπύουσαι πελαζόμεσθα.	-υ- -υ- υ- x cretico-bac-
		chiac trimeter

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

At 145–46 one might read thus:

καὶ κύ, Λύκει' ἄναξ, Λύκειος γενοῦ  
στρατῶ δαίῳ στόνω ἔν' αὐτᾶς.

“And you, Lord of Wolves, show yourself wolfish to the hostile host amid the groaning of the battle-melee.” For my στόνω ἔν' from the manuscripts' στόνων cf. *Agam.* 431, Dobree's δόμω ἔν' for the tradition's δόμων, with postposition and prodelision. Homer's αὐτά evolved to mean ‘battle’ for Pindar, *Nem.* 9.35, ἄν κίνδυνον ὄξειᾶς αὐτᾶς, where Slater's *Lexicon* renders it ‘rush of war’. The dochmiacs are concluded by what Miss Dale termed “the iambo-trochaic pentasyllable,” x -υ- x, which she conjectured to be, like the hypodochmius, an anaclastic form of dochmius.

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

κύ τ', ᾧ Λατογένεια κούρα,	<i>Hipponactean</i>
τόξον εὐτυκάζου,	<i>sync. iambic dimeter (or ithyphallic)</i>
Ἄρτεμι φίλα.	<i>iambic monometer, with resolution</i>

At 158 one should divide the paradosis' ἐπαλξέων, with G. C. W. Schneider and Bothe, to read ἀκροβόλων δ' ἐπ' ἄλξεων λιθὰς ἔρχεται,

“the skirmishers’ stone-shower comes against the fortifications.” Hesychius probably drew from this place his entry *ἄλξεων· τειχέων*.

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

*καὶ δι’ (= δία), ὅθεν  
πολεμόκραντον ἀγνὸν τέλος, ἐν μάχαι-  
σί τε μάκαιρ’ ἄνασσ’, \*Ογκα, πρὸ πόλεως  
ἐπτάπυλον ἔδος ἐπιρρύου.*

“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, \*Ογκα Παλλάς, ἧ τ’ ἀγχίπτολις πύλαισι γειτών*. 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 --υ-- , responding to the resolved iambic metron at 154, \**Αρτεμι φίλα*.

At 212, in proposing a new emendation, *θεοῖσιν* 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 | <i>ὦ φίλον Οἰδίπου τέκος, ἔδειξ’ ἀκού-<br/>σασα τὸν ἀρματόκτυπον ὄτοβον ὄτοβον,</i>                           | - υ̅υ̅ - υ̅ -   υ̅υ̅ υ̅υ̅ υ̅υ̅ υ̅υ̅  |
| 205 | <i>ὅτι τε κύριγγες ἔκλαγξαν ἐλίτροχοι.<br/>ἵππικῶν τ’ ἀύπνων πηδαλίων διὰ στόμα,<br/>πυριγενετᾶν χαλινῶν.</i> | υ̅υ̅ - - υ̅υ̅   - υ̅υ̅ - υ̅ -<br>- υ̅ -   υ̅ - -    - υ̅υ̅ -   υ̅ - υ̅ x<br>υ̅υ̅ υ̅υ̅ - υ̅ - - |

“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, *ἀκούσασα . . . ὄτοβον*. 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,”



υ---∪. 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 ἦλθον ἀρ-  
 χαῖα βρέτη, πίευνος θεοῖς<ιν>, νιφάδος                     -∪∪-∪∪-|υ--υ∪∪  
 ὄτ' ὄλοα̃ς νειφομένας βρόμος ἐν πύλαις.                     υ∪∪--∪∪|-∪∪-υ--  
 δὴ τότε ἦρθην φόβω πρὸς μακάρων λιτάς,             -υ-|-υ-|-υυ-|υ-υ-  
 πόλεω̃ς  
 215 ἵν' 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 -ιν in θεοῖςιν would be all the easier before the initial letters of νιφάδος. 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 dochmiacs used here by the Chorus.

In 239 M's reading makes a perfectly acceptable pair of dochmiacs by Aeschylean norms: ποταίνιον κλύουσα πάταγον ἄμμιγα. υ--υ-|∪∪-υυ. The second *iota* in ποταίνιον is consonantalized. At 288 Wilamowitz accepted a consonantalized *iota* in καρδίας of the paradisis, which he reaccented to κάρδιας. At 781 a dochmiac analysis is possible with καρδία 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 “synzesis” of *iota* in Aeschylus. In *Sept.* it seems possible also at 176 φιλοπόλιες, 481 ἰώ, 521 Διὸς, 789 διαχερία, 826 σωτηρία, 948 διοσδότων. 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 *υ* and *ι*,” and concludes (p.210): “When we consider the number of examples, and also the fact that such pronunciations as *Τειρεξίας*, *Ἀμφιάρεως*, 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' ὥς τις τέκνων ὑπερ,	υ-υ-  -υ-υ- iambic metron+ hypo-
	dochmius
δέδοικα λεχέων	υ-υυ- dochmius
δυσευνήτορας,	dochmius
πάντρομος πελειάς.	ithyphallic (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 **Ld** and **Le**. The first singular ending of (*ὑπερ*)δέδοικα is attested by **Mante corr.** (ut vid.) **K YP supra Q<sup>2</sup> supra**, 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 *ὥς τις* in 291. Rather it is attached in apposition to the unexpressed subject of *δέδοικα*, without any such expression of comparison as *ὥσπερ*. Cf. Theognis 347, *ἐγὼ δὲ κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην*.

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

307 ὕδωρ τε Διρκαῖον, εὐ-	syncopated iambic dimeter
τρεφέστατον πωμάτων ὄσων	υ-υ-  -υ-υ- iamb. metron+ hypodochmius
ἴησιν Ποσει-	υ- -υ- dochmius
310 δὰν ὁ γαιαόχος	-υυ-υ- dochmius (in dodrans form)
Τηθύος τε παῖδες;	ithyphallic (or sync. iambic dimeter)

At 307 the form with *-τρεφ-* is in **MIKO** and Triclinius, and Wellauer preferred it as “*magis poeticum*.” At 310 the *αῖ* of *γαιαόχος* is shortened by internal correction. For the ellipse of *δέδοικε* in the *ὥς* 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	κορκορυγαὶ δ' ἀν' ἄστρῳ,	-υυ- υ-×	<i>Aristophanean</i>
345B	ποτὶ πτόλιν δ'	υ-υ-	<i>iambic monometer</i>
346	ὄρκάνα πυργῶτις,	-υ-----	<i>troch. dim. brachycatalectic</i>
347A	πρὸς ἀνδρὸς δ' ἀνήρ	υ--υ-	<i>dochmius</i>
347B	δορὶ κλίνεταιαι.	υυ-υ-	<i>iambic monometer, resolved</i>

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

357A	παντοδαπὸς δὲ καρπὸς		<i>Aristophanean</i>
357B	χαμάδις πεσῶν	υυ-υ-	<i>iambic monometer, resolved</i>
358	ἀλγυνεῖ κηρήσας,	-υ-υ--	<i>troch. dim. brachycatalectic</i>
359A	πικρὸν δ' ὄμμα θα-	υ--υ×	<i>dochmius</i>
359B	λαμηπόλων		<i>iambic monometer</i>

“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: ὄρκάνη τὸ θηρατικὸν δίκτυον, ὃ καὶ καργάνη καλεῖται. *LSJ* and the Supplement do not note either noun in this sense. At 347B mss have δορὶ, and κλίνεταιαι is *M*'s reading on the line, found also in Turyn's *Sh* on the line. At 358 the future form ἀλγυνεῖ, with short *upsilon*, is in *B* and *H*.

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

481A	ἐπέυχομαι δῆ	υ-υ--
481B	τάδε μὲν εὐτυχεῖν, ἰώ,	υυ-υ--
482	πρόμαχ' ἐμῶν δόμων, τοῖσι δὲ δυστυχεῖν.	
483	ὡς δ' ὑπέραυχα βάζουσ' ἐπὶ πτόλει	-υυ-υ- υ-υ-
~ 521A	πέποιθα τὸν Διὸς	υ-υ-×
521B	ἀντίτυπον ἔχοντα	-υυυ-×
522	ἄφιλον ἐν κάκει τοῦ χθονίου δέμας	
523	δαίμονος, ἐχθρὸν εἴκασμα βροτοῖσι τε καὶ	-υυ-υ- υυ-υ-

The only change needed is Brunck's δαίμονος at 523 for the manuscripts' δαίμοσιν, 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 *ἰώ*, as at *Cho.* 466, where Hermann needlessly altered to *ῶ*. At 483 all MSS have the elided form *βάζουε* except for **C Δ Q** *post corr.* and Triclinius, which have unelided *βάζουειν*. In 523 all have *βροτοῖσί*, 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 *-οῖε/-οῖσι* and *-ουε/-ουειν*, 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 respension.

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 *ἐνθεος δ' ἄρη | βάκχα . . .* At 497 **M** has *ἄρηι*, 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 R c 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 *eta*. But if Goold is right the dative **APHI** 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 **BAKXA** 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 μέμψεται  
 πυκνοῦ κροτησμοῦ τυγχάνουσ' ὑπὸ πτόλιν,  
 θεῶν θελόντων. Δάν, ἀληθεύσαιμ' 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 τέλος ἼΑρά  
 ξηροῖς ἀκλαύστοις ὄμμασιν προσιζάνει, . . .

"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 τέλειοι. Both τέλεος and τέλειος are exemplified in *Italie's Index*. Here τέλειος could scan by internal correption of *ει*. A scholiast aware of 832, ὦ μέλαινα καὶ τελεία γένεος Οἰδίπου τ' ἼΑρά, could have written in the gloss τελεία: then that had its final *alpha* illicitly elided, giving rise to the manuscripts' τελει', 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 ἐχθρά is attested by **K O Q** and others. At 696 the paradosis form ἀκλαύστοις, adding more sibilance than Butler's ἀκλαύτοις, 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 paradosis might be made thus:

766	τέλειαι γὰρ παλαιφάτων ἀραι βαρεῖα καταλλαγᾶ. τὰ δ' ὄλοα πελόμεν' ὄυ παρέρχεται,	υ-- υ- υ-υ-	<i>sync. iamb. trim.</i>
	τίν' ἀνδρῶν γὰρ τοσόνδ' ἐθαύμασαν θεοὶ καὶ ξυνέστιοι πόλεως πολύβοτός τ' αἰῶν βροτῶν, . . .	υ-- υ-υ- υυυυ- υ-υ- υ-υυ- --υ-	<i>sync. iamb. dim.</i> <i>dochmius+ iambic monom-</i> <i>eter</i>

“For curses of men famed of old are accomplished [*or accomplishing*] with grievous merchandising; and the ruinous deeds that are happening 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 *παλαιφάτων* is in **M I B** *ante corr.*, and *ἀραι* in all mss. In 767 I merely reaccent *βαρεῖαι καταλλαγαί* of the *paradosis*. In 768 **M** *ante corr.* and **I** have *πελόμεν’ οὐ*, retained by Hermann, Smyth, Tucker, Verrall and Paley. At 772–74 I reproduce the almost unanimous *paradosis*. 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.

	<i>ἐπεὶ δ’ ἀρτίφρων</i>	υ – – υ –	<i>dochmius</i>
	<i>ἐγένετο μέλεος ἀθλίων</i>	υ ὠ υ ὠ   υ – υ –	<i>iambic dimeter</i>
780	<i>γάμων, ἐπ’ ἄλγει δυσφορῶν</i>	υ – υ –   – – υ –	<i>iambic dimeter</i>
	<i>μαινομένα καρδίᾳ</i>	– ὠ – – –	<i>dochmius</i>
	<i>δίδυμα κάκ’ ἐτέλεσεν</i>	ὠ ὠ ὠ ὠ υ –	<i>dochmius</i>
	<i>πατροφόνω χερί. τῶν</i>	– ὠ – ὠ –	<i>dochmius (in hemiepes form)</i>
	<i>κρεῖσσοτέκνων δ’ ἀπ’ ὀμμάτων</i>	– υ υ –   υ – υ –   υ – –	<i>anacletic iamb. trim.</i>
	<i>ἐπλάγχθη.</i>		<i>catalectic</i>
~ 785	<i>τέκνοις δ’ &lt;ἄρ’ &gt; ἀραιᾶς</i>	υ – ὠ – –	
	<i>ἐφήκεν ἐπικότους τροφᾶς,</i>	υ – υ ὠ   υ – υ –	
	<i>αἰαί, πικρογλώσσους ἀράς,</i>	– – υ –   – – υ –	
	<i>καί σφε σιδαρονόμω</i>	– ὠ – ὠ –	
	<i>διαχερίᾳ ποτὲ λαχεῖν</i>	ὠ ὠ – ὠ υ –	
790	<i>κτῆματα· νῦν δὲ τρέω</i>	– ὠ – ὠ –	
	<i>μὴ τελέσῃ καμψίπους Ἐρινύς.</i>	– υ υ –   – υ –   υ – –	

“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 children-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 *hapa*x compound from the verb *κρεισσόω*+*τέκνον*. For the sense cf. 530 *μᾶλλον θεοῦ cέβειν πεπορθὼς ὀμμάτων θ' ὑπέρτερον*, and Catullus 3.5 *quæ plus illa oculis suis amabat*. For compound adjectives having as their first part a verb-stem cf. Smyth, GG §880. Aeschylean examples include *ἀμαρτίνοος*, *ἀρχέλειος*, *ἐρευφίτοιχος*, *ἐχενῆς*, *πεισιβροτος*, *ῥυσίβωμος*, *στυγάνωρ*, *τελεσσίφρων*, *φέραςπις*, *φθερσιγενής*, *ὠλεσίοικος*. For the metre of 784, perhaps it is to be interpreted as an anaclastic iambic trimeter catalectic, with the anaclysis 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 *ἀραιᾶς*. 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' ἀραιᾶς*, an iambo-trochaic pentasyllable 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' <ᾶρ> ἀραιᾶς*, where the loss would have been by haplography, or *τέκνοις<ι> δ' ἀραιᾶς*, 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 *διαχειρίαι*, but some have the final *iota* lacking or subscript. Triclinius may have hit the mark with his *διαχειρία*, scanned with its two *iotas* consonantalized, to make a dochmius of 789, as in the strophe at 782. The word would be a *hapa*x *legomenon*, like its adjective *σιδαρονόμω*, but consider the fifth-century *διαχείρις*, *διαχειρισμός*, *ἐκεχειρία*, *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 πρᾶγμα νεόκοτον πόλει πλέον;  
 804 ΑΓΓ. πόλις κέεωσται. βασιλέως δ' ὁμόσποροι  
 805 ἄνδρες τεθνᾶσιν ἐκ χερῶν αὐτοκτόνων.  
 806 ΧΟΡ. τίνες; τί δ' εἶπας; παραφρονῶ φόβῳ λόγου.  
 807 ΑΓΓ. φρονοῦσα νῦν ἄκουσον. Οἰδίπου τόκος —  
 808 ΧΟΡ. οἷ' γὰρ τάλαινα, μάντις εἰμὶ τῶν κακῶν.  
 809 ΑΓΓ. οὐδ' ἀμφιλέκτως μὴν κατεσποδημένοι —  
 810 ΧΟΡ. ἐκεῖθι κείσθον; βαρέα δ' οὖν ὄμως φράσον.  
 811 ΑΓΓ. οὕτως ἀδελφαῖς χερσὶν ἠναίροντ' ἄγαν.  
 812 ΧΟΡ. οὕτως ὁ δαίμων κοινὸς ἦν ἀμφοῖν ἅμα;  
 813 ΑΓΓ. αὐτὸς δ' ἀναλοῖ δῆτα δύσποτμον γένος.  
 814 τοιαῦτα χαίρειν καὶ δακρύεσθαι πάρα,  
 815 πόλιν μὲν εὖ πράσσουσιν, οἱ δ' ἐπιστάται,  
 816 διςσὼ στρατηγῶ, διέλαχον σφυρηλάτῳ  
 817 Σκύθῃ σιδήρῳ κτημάτων παμπησίαν.  
 818 ἔξουσι δ' ἦν λάβωσιν ἐν ταφῇ χθονός,  
 819 πατρὸς κατ' εὐχὰς δυσπότημοι φορούμενοι.  
 820 πόλις κέεωσται. βασιλείῳ δ' ὁμοσπόροι  
 821 πέπωκεν αἶμα γὰρ 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.

MESS. Not disputably indeed reduced to the dust—

CHOR. Are they lying (dead) yonder? Grievous,—yet tell it.

MESS. Thus they were destroyed, with hands too brotherly.

CHOR. Thus was the deity common to both at once?

MESS. 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 **M I K O** 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. ἀνήρ* 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 *τόκος*, **M**'s original reading on the line, which is kept by Mazon, Verrall and Rose. In 809 the Messenger's word *κατεσποδημένοι* has more than one level of meaning, including obscene or at least vulgar associations, as Wilamowitz noted in his *Aischylos 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 *κεῖσθον*, kept by Smyth, Mazon, Groeneboom, Wecklein and Verrall. At 811 the manuscripts' phrase *ἀδελφαῖς . . . ἄγαν* was endorsed by Hermann, Mazon, Wellauer and Pauw, and recalls Aeschylus' way of thinking at 871, with the presumed coinage *δυσαδελφότητα*. At 821 *δυσπότημος* of the majority has not been universally endorsed, and Headlam's *δυσπότημωσ* has found some favour.

I note that it occurs in the *deteriores* **Ya, Lc** 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 *κέεωσται*, 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: ἦ τοὺς μογεροὺς καὶ δυσδαίμονας | †ἀτέκνους† 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 Epigonoι 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 ἔκνους, and one might consider ἀτ' (Doric, = ἦτε) ἔκνους, 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 *ἀπλόος* and *ἀθρόος*, one wonders whether Aeschylus did not play with the formation *ἀτέκνους*, perhaps considering the brothers twins, as Verrall suggested in his edition (p.x n.7), noting the "curious expression" at 890, *ὄμοσπλάγχων τε πλευρωμάτων*. More cogently relevant might be the phrases at 804f and 820, *βασιλέως δ' ὄμοσποροί | ἄνδρες* and *βασιλείοι δ' ὄμοσπόροι*; but they do not unambiguously mean the same as *διδυμογενής*, 'twin'. Most relevant probably is the utterance of the Chorus at 849, though requiring some adjustment of the paradosis. 848–50 might best be presented in this form:

τάδ' αὐτόδηλα, προὔπτος  
ἀγγέλου λόγος.

*iambic trimeter*

διπλαῖν μερίμναιν δίδυμ' ὕ-ὕ-| -ᾠ-ᾠx  
ἀνόρεα.

*iambic metron + dochmius*

κάκ' αὐτοφόνα δέμοιρα ὕ-ᾠᾠ-|ᾠ-ᾠὕ- two dochmii  
τέλεια τὰ πάθη.

“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, διπλαῖν μερίμναι, kept by Wilamowitz, Mazon, Groeneboom, Verrall and Italic. It was later corrupted to the reading of the *deteriores*, διπλαῖ μερίμναι. The mss mostly agree in the letter-sequence διδυμανορεα, 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 ἀνδρεῖα, ‘twin acts of manhood’, such as the heroic age reckoned personal slaying of an enemy. For μερίμνα in the sense ‘object of concern’ cf. *LSJ s.v. 2*, citing Homer’s *Hymn to Hermes* 160, μεγάλην κε πατήρ ἐφύτευε μερίμναν | θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

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

ἡμᾶς δὲ δίκη πρότερον φήμης  
τὸν δυσκέλαδόν θ’ ὕμνον Ἐρινύος  
ἰαχεῖν Ἄϊδα τ’  
ἐχθρὸν παιᾶν’ ἐπιμέλπειν.

“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’ φήμης Hartung already proposed the dative plural φήμαις, but Aeschylus may have had the epicism φήμης, from which the paradosis has dropped the *iota*. At 868 an adscript *iota* in αἶδαι 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 Ἄϊδα is preferred by Paley, Wellauer, Victorius and Pauw. Also at 868 the manuscripts’ ἰαχεῖν 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:

διανταίαν λέγεις	υ-- --υ-	syncopated iambic di- meter
πλαγὰν δόμοισι καὶ κόμασιν.	--υ- υ--υ-	iambic metron + dochmius

πεπλαγμένους ἐνέπω	υ-υ- -υ-	<i>syncopated iambic dimeter</i>
ἀναυδάτω μένει	υ-- -υ-	<i>syncopated iambic dimeter</i>
ἀραίω τ' ἐκ πατρός,	υ-- -υ-	<i>syncopated iambic dimeter</i>
διχόφροني πότμω.	υ-∩--	<i>dochmius</i>

“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 *δόμοιαι* 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: *δυοδαίμων σφιν ἀτεκοῦσα πρὸ πασᾶν*, ---υ-|υ-∩-- . In 915 I would read *δόμων τοὺς μάλ' ἀχάεσσα προπέμπει*, υ--υ-|---∩-- . The subject is Antigone, who has just spoken 911–14. Then 916f may be construed thus: *δαϊκτῆρ (ἐστὶν αὐτῆς) γόος, αὐτοστόνος, 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 μάλ' ἀχάεσσα τοὺς προπέμπει*. Nearest is **I**, on the line, with *ἀχαιεὶς τοὺς*, and an η over the second α. A marginal variant in **I** has not proved legible. The *deteriores* get increasingly wilder with *ἀχῶ/ῆχῶ/ἀχά/άλων ἐπ' /ἐς/εἰς 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	ὀμόςποροι δῆτα καὶ πανώλεθροι	υ-υ- -υ- υ-υ-	<i>sync. iambic trimeter</i>
	διατομαῖς οὐ φίλαις; . . .	∩--υ-	<i>dochmius</i>
~ 947	ἔχουσι μοῖραν λαχόντες μέλει	υ-υ- -υ- -υ-	<i>sync. iambic trimeter</i>
	διοσδότων ἀχέων.	--υ-υ-	<i>hypodochmius</i>

“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  $\omega$  or  $\delta$  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 *διατομαίς* and 948 *διοςδότην*, and synizesis in 947 *μέλαιοι* and 948 *ἀχέων*.

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

973	ἀχέων τ' οἴων τάδ' ἐγγύθεν.	υυ-υ- υ-υ-	<i>iambic dimeter</i>
	πέλας δ' αἰδ' ἀδελφαὶ ἀδελφεῶν.	υ-- υ-υ-υ--	<i>bacchius+ dochmius</i>
~984	δύστανά κήδε' ὁμώνυμα.	--υ- υυ-υ×	<i>iambic dimeter</i>
	διῶγρᾶ τριπάλτων πημάτων.	υ-υυ ---υ-	<i>2nd paeon+ dochmius</i>

“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 τοίων*. For the general sense perhaps the nearest parallel is *Soph. Ant.* 933, *θανάτου τοῦτ' ἐγγυτάτω τοῦπος ἀφίικται*. Next nearest perhaps is *Soph. OC* 1217, *πολλὰ μὲν αἱ μακρὰὶ ἀμέραι κατέθεντο δὴ λύπας ἐγγυτέρω*. In 973 we would have to allow shortening by internal correption of *οι* in *οἴων*. In 974 we have synizesis in *ἀδελφεῶν* and epic correption at the end of *ἀδελφαί*, for which compare, also in a *dochmiac* context, 971, correption of *-ου* in *πρὸς φίλου ἔφθικο*. Miss Dale (p.114) cites an example from *Aristophanes, Thesm.* 915, the *-ω* of *κύσω* in the resolved *dochmiac* pair *φέρε σε κύσω. ἀπαγέ μ' ἀπαγ' ἀπαγ' ἀπαγέ με*, which of course parodies *Euripides*.

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

At 982 the *paradosis* has *ἀπώλεσε δῆτα*, defensible as a *dochmius*, υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-, answering to 971, *πρὸς φίλου ἔφθικο*, -υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-, each ending with a *brevis in longo*.

### III. *Prometheus Vincitus*

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 *θεόσσυτος* except for **Y**, and this form, with double *sigma*, fits best with the preceding and following cola, thus:

εἶ ἄ.	υυυ- 4th paeon (first α corrected)
115 τίς ἀχώ, τίς ὀδμὰ προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής,	υ-- υ-- υ-- υ-- 4 bacchii
θεόσσυτος, ἢ βρότειος, ἢ κῆκραμένη;	υ-υυ υ- υ-- υ-
ἵκετο τερμόνιον ἐπὶ πάγον;	υυυ- υυυυ-
πόνων ἐμῶν θεωρός, ἢ τί δὴ θέλων;	

Line 116 then appears as 2nd paeon+cretic+bacchius+cretic, and 117 as a 4th paeon (with the initial *iota* 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 **K P Δ** offer τ' εἰλιτσομένου. Here the *tau* preceding guarantees the psilotic form. At 1085 and 1092 the paradosis offers, unmetrically, ἐλίττουειν . . . ἐλίττων, which should be amended to forms in εἰλ- rather than the editors' εἰλ-. *LSJ s.v.* ἐλίττω note that mss of Hippocrates offer psilotic compound forms, κατ-ελίττειν, κατ-ελίτται. At *PV* 882 one finds ὄμματ' ἐλίττην in **MIYO** 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 εἰκοιχνεύειν, 831 θῶκος, 677 Λέρνης ἄκρην 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 τοιόδε. Most mss offer us τῷ τοι τοιαῖδε πημοναίσι κάμπτομαι. **M** has, on the line, τῷ ταῖς τοιαῖδε . . ., with τοι over ταῖς. Apart from the problem of euphony, in the succession τῷ τοι τοι-, the reading ταῖς τοιαῖδε seems more emphatic. There appears to be a gradation, from τοιόδε τις 'of some such sort', through τοιόδε simpliciter 'of such a sort', to ὁ τοιόδέ' of such a sort as this one here'.

At 425-32 the epode may be most conservatively analysed thus:

425	μόνον δὴ πρόσθ' ἔν' ἄλλον ἐν πόνοις δαμέντ' ἀκαμαντοδέτοις Τιτᾶνα λύμαις εἰσιδόμαν, θεὸν Ἄ — τλανθ', ὃς αἰὲν ὑπείροχον κθένος κραταῖον οὐράνιον τε πόλον	υ-- υ- υ-υ- υ-υ-υ- --υ-- υ-υ-υ- -υ -υ-υ- υ- υ-υ-υ -υ-υ-υ-	sync. iamb. trim. enoplian (prosodiac) iambelegus Glyconic iambelegus
430	νώτοις ὑποστενάζει. βοᾶ δὲ πόντιος κλύδων ξυμπίτνων στένει βαθύς, κελαινὸς δ' Ἄιδος ὑποβρέμει μυχὸς γάς, παγαί θ' ἀγνωρύτων ποταμῶν	--υ- υ-- υ-υ- υ-υ- -υ- υ-υ- υ-- υυυυ- υ---- -υ-υ-	iamb. dim. catalectic iamb. dimeter sync. iamb. trim. 2 dochmii dochmius (hemiepes)
435	στένουσιν ἄλγος οἰκτρὸν.	υ-υ- υ--	iamb. dim. catalectic

425 πρόσθ' ἔν' Zakas, πρόσθεν codices. 432 βαθύς M H, βυθός ceteri.

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 βοᾶ 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.* 9f ἐκ Τροίας φάτιν | ἀλώσιμόν τε βάξιν: one might translate it "namely."

An alternative colometry of 433f might be:

Ἄιδος ὑποβρέμει μυχὸς γὰς· υυυυυ-|υ-- trochaic dimeter  
παγαί θ' ἀγνωρύτων ποταμῶν ---υυ-υυ- dactylic tetram. catalectic  
Cf. *Eum.* 1042, λαμπάδι τερπόμεναι καθ' ὁδόν.

At 553 M's προἰδοῦς' is defensible, meaning 'seeing what is before my eyes'. Cf. *Thuc.* 7.44.2, τὴν μὲν ὄψιν τοῦ σώματος προορᾶν.

At 617 one can accept M's πᾶν γὰρ οὖν πύθοιο μου, the more so in view of 520, where τοῦτ' οὐκ ἂν οὖν πύθοιο 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 ἄν 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 ἄν 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 ἄν, which W. W. Goodwin (*Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*<sup>2</sup> [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: μή μου προκήδου μάσσον. ὥς ἐμοὶ γλυκύ. "Do not take heed for me unduly far. Thus is my pleasure" (*scil.* to learn of my future wanderings). For ὥς= οὕτως cf. Agam. 930, 1354, Pers. 565, Supp. 622.

At 667 the epithet πυρωτὸν is applied to κεραυνόν by M, 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 πυρωπὸν, 'fiery-faced, fiery-looking', a commoner word in the surviving literature.

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

	ἔᾱ ἔᾱ, ἄπεχε, φεῦ.	⊔⊔⊔⊔-	<i>dochmius</i>
	οὔποτ' οὔποτ' ἠῦχουν	-⊔-⊔--	<i>ithyphallic</i>
689A	ξένους μολεῖσθαι λόγους	⊔-⊔- ⊔-	<i>sync. iamb. dimeter</i>
689B	ἐς ἀκοὰν ἐμάν,	⊔⊔-⊔-	<i>dochmius</i>
690	οὐδ' ὦδε δυσθέατα	--⊔- ⊔-⊔-×	<i>iamb. metron+ dochmius</i>
	δύσοιστα		
	πήματα λύματα δείματ'	-⊔-⊔- ⊔----	2 <i>dochmii</i>
	ἀμφήκει κέν-		
	τρῶ ψύχειν ψυχὰν ἐμάν.	----- ⊔-⊔⊔-	2 <i>dochmii</i>
	ἰὼ ἰώ,		
	Μοῖρα, Μοῖρα, πέφρικ'	-⊔-⊔--	<i>ithyphallic</i>
695	ἐσιδοῦσα πράξιν Ἴους.	⊔-⊔- ⊔--	<i>iamb. dim. catalectic</i>

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 ἔα ἔα and 692, the first ἰώ. At 688 ἠὺχόμεν is attested by M and others, but is probably an intruded gloss. In 690 M I O *ante corr.*



**B C H** rightly omit the *καὶ* before *δύοιστα*. At 695 *ἐσιδοῦσα* is in the best mss **M** and **I**, and in others.

At 776 there is a rare particle combination in **M B H C**, namely with the phrase *μηδὲ καυτῆς τ' ἐκμαθεῖν*. Cf. Theognis 1031, and the combination *οὐδέ 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:

*σπορᾶς γε μὴν ἐκ τῆσδε φύσεται θρασύς,  
τόξοις κλεινοῖς ὅς πόνων ἐκ τῶνδ' ἐμέ  
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' ἴμεν ὀμαλός ὁ γάμος, ἄφοβος. οὐ δέδια. μὴ δὲ κραισσόνων	υ-υυυυ υυυυυx	2 dochmii
		-υυ- υ-υ-	iamb. dimeter
903A	θεῶν ἔρωσ ἄφυκτον	υ-υ- υ-x	iamb. dim. catalectic
903B	ῥμμα προσδράκοι με. ἀπόλεμος ὅδε γ' ὁ πόλε-	-υ-υ-x υυυυυυυ	ithyphallic
	μος, ἄπορα πόριμος.	υυυυυx	2 dochmii
905	οὐδ' ἔχω τίς ἂν γενοίμαν. τὰν Διὸς γὰρ οὐχ ὀρώ μῆτιν ὅπα φύγοιμ' ἄν.	-υ-υ υ-- -υ-υ υ- -υυ- υ-x	troch. dimeter troch. dim. catalectic Aristophanean

901 ὅτ' ἴμεν 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. ὀμαλός II*, cite the adverb used with such verbs as *βαίνειν, προιέναι, κινεῖσθαι*, 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 *ὅς αὐτὸν ἐκ τυραννίδος | θρόνων ἄϊστον ἐκβαλεῖ*, "(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 *κακῶν* offered by **M** on the line, **K** *supra*, **Δ** and **P** *γρ.*, giving the verse *πταίσας δὲ τῶδε πρὸς κακῶν μαθήσεται . . .* "And after stumbling against him [the adversary described at 920ff] through sufferings he shall learn . . ."

At 933 **M** *ante corr.* offers the particle *δαὶ*, found also at *Cho.* 900. *τί δαὶ φοβοίμην ᾧ θανεῖν οὐ μόρσιμον;* would be an example of Denniston'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 *ὦν τ' ἐκεῖνος ἐκπίπτει*, which is kept by Hermann, Wecklein, Paley, Mazon, Groeneboom and others. But it might be better to redivide it into *ὦν τε κείνος ἐκπίπτει*, for euphony, to avoid the succession of two words starting with *ἐκ-*.

At 992 the *hapax* word *αἰθεροῦσσα* appears in **M** *supra γρ.* and **Υ** *post corr.*, supported by the form *αἰθεροῦσα* in **I** *supra γρ.* and **Q**<sup>2</sup> *γρ.* Rose dubiously considers it may mean 'sky-ranging'. Perhaps one could render it 'heavenly, ethereal'. It is not noticed by Italic, nor by *LSJ* and the Supplement. The majority variant *αἰθαλοῦσσα* 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.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL  
December, 1971