The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Sophoclea

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 03 / April 1899, pp 147 - 148
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042748, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042748

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1899). Sophoclea. The Classical Review, 13, pp 147-148 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042748

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SOPHOCLEA.

Ant. 213.

νόμῳ δὲ χρῆσθαι παντί πού γ' ἔνεστί σοι.

Such is Erfurd's generally accepted conjecture, ποντ' L, which the other MSS. divide into πού τ'. Well might Linwood say: 'Sed certe γ' otiosum sonat.' Besides I do not know in what language one says παντί πού γε; in Greek one says παντί γέ πον. Dindorf's πάρεστι is both sense and Greek, but that is all that can be said for it. I am surprised not to find τοῦτ' suggested, 'to enforce every law, that is in thy power.' For compare 466: ἀλλ' ἂν εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς | μητρὸς θανόντ' ἄθαπτον ἡνσχόμην νέκυν | κείνοις ἂν ἤλγουν. *O.C.* 639: εἰ δ' ἐμοῦ στεῖχειν μέτα | τόδ' ἡδύ. *Trach.* 458: τὸ μὴ πυθέσθαι, τοῦτό μ' ἀλγύνειν ἂν.

Electra 374.

εἰ μὴ κακὸν μέγιστον εἰς αὐτὴν ἰὼν
ἦκουσ' ὃ ταύτην τῶν μακρῶν σχήσει γόων.

It needs surely a poor opinion of Sophocles to believe that he could write ταύτην after αὐτὴν in this way. From Bacchylides v. 110 I propose εἰσάντην ἰὼν. That εἰσάντην would probably be corrupted may be judged from the fact that it was actually corrupted in the first edition of Bacchylides. For the sense compare *Ant.* 10: πρὸς τοὺς φίλους στείχοντα τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακά. For the tone of the phrase *O. T.* 324: τὸ σὸν φῶνημ' ἰὼν | πρὸς καιρόν. Homer often says ἄντα ἰέναι τινός and uses ἄντην ἔρχεσθαι for 'to advance' without a case after it; it is easy here to supply a genitive as in the only other place where the word has survived. Sophocles uses ἔναντα (*Ant.* 1298) in a lyrical passage however; but see Tyrrell on *Electra* 21 (p. xxii. of his edition).

Talking of Bacchylides I should like to make a belated suggestion on xi. 85:

τὸν δ' εἶλεν ἄχος κραδίαν ξείνα τέ νιν πλᾶξεν
μέριμνα.

Here ξείνα is unintelligible and Herwerden's δαινά was not likely to be changed to it; the poet wrote perhaps κραδίαν δαεία τ' ἢ πλᾶξεν μέριμνα. The form ἢν is familiar to us as a dative in *Pyth.* iv. 36, and as τιν is both dative and accusative in Doric, so ἢν has as good a right to the one case as the other, if indeed there ever was such a word. It was sure to be corrupted to νιν, as it was

in Pindar. Then as δαεία would not scan it got changed to ξείνα. Or we might start at the other end; in the papyrus an ο is sometimes hardly more than a mere dot; in some previous copy with a similar writing δαεία might thus easily lose the first letter and ξείνα would then be naturally changed to ξείνα, carrying the rest with it.

Compare then *Nem.* i. 53. δαείαις ἀνίσαι τυπεῖς. But dear me, all this is very speculative.

Ajax 774.

ἄνασσα, τοῖς ἄλλοισιν Ἀργείων πέλας
ἴστω, καθ' ἡμᾶς δ' οὔποτ' ἐκρήξει μάχη.

No one can explain ἐκρήξει, but the sense required is plain. Help others if you like, but the battle will never break where I stand, i.e. οὔποτε ῥήξει. For μάχη 'used in a concrete sense, as in old English, of the embattled hosts' (Leaf) see *Iliad* A 216, and the phrase στησάμενοι δ' ἐμάχοντο μάχην where στησασθαι μάχην must mean the same thing. I remember a sentence of Mr. Ruskin's somewhere: 'And all their battle broke before him into flight.' The intransitive use of ῥήγνυμι is rare but Sophoclean; see the lexicon. For the lengthening of the syllable before it compare *O. T.* 847 εἰς ἐμὲ ῥέπον, *frag.* 870, *Ant.* 318, etc. And how likely the lengthening was to cause corruption may be seen from the change of ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπαὶ ῥντήρος at *O. C.* 900 by Triclinius.

Since this was in type I find 'qu. οὔποτε ῥήξει' in Blaydes (1875). But it does not seem to have been considered so much as it deserves.

O.C. 547.

καὶ γὰρ ἄλλους ἐφόνευσα καὶ ἀπώλεσα.

The metre being four dactyls, καὶ ὤλεσα is generally read and ἄλλους variously emended. That ὤλεσα is right seems pretty clear, the last foot being a pure dactyl as every one assumes and the next line beginning with a consonant; therefore this line must end with a vowel. For synaphea in such cases exists with the next line. (So also if a verse ends with a first paeon in cretics.) It is indeed objected that ὤλεσα is weak after ἐφόνευσα, but surely repetitions of this sort are the commonest thing possible, especially in lyrics. Euripides says, διὰ μ' ἐφθέρως κατὰ δ' ἔκτεινας (*Hipp.* 1357).

Did not a celebrated critic of tragedy take exception to the opening of the *Choephori* on the same grounds? δις ταῦτόν ἡμῖν εἶπεν ὁ σοφὸς Αἰσχύλος.

None however of the corrections of ἄλλους are at all satisfactory. Is ἐμούς any better? M is easily written as ΛΑ, and ἔλλους would naturally become ἄλλους.¹ So Antigone speaks of her brother as τῶν ἐμῶν (*Ant.* 48). Cf. τοὺς ἐμούς at *O.C.* 832, and εἰς οὓς τ' ἔδρων said by Oedipus himself of his father, in exactly the same connexion as here, at 976.

Then consider the context, 'I was in a way justified,' says Oedipus, 'in killing my father (not simply in killing my opponent on the occasion) because I did not know who it was: αἰδρὶς ἐς τόδ' ἦλθον, and therefore I am νόμῳ καθαρός.' His argument is not that he killed him in self-defence; if it were, what is αἰδρὶς doing here? The sense appears to me to demand imperatively some such word as ἐμούς. And 975-978 back it up pretty strongly.

O.C. 1014.

ὁ ξείνος, ὦναξ, χρηστός· αἱ δὲ συμφοραὶ αὐτοῦ πανώλεις, ἀξίαι δ' ἀμναθεῖν.

'The speech,' say Campbell and Abbott truly, 'shows the vacillation of the Chorus, who are divided between fear of pollution by the presence of Oedipus and the desire to help him.' Exactly, *him* not *it*. What they are commenting on is really ἀξίος. It is impossible to make out that his συμφοραὶ are deserving of help; of pity they are deserving, but that is not what ἀμναθεῖν means. If the συμφοραὶ were the loss of his daughters ἀμναθεῖν would be all very well, but it is clear that they are his parricide and incest, which are past all help now. 'The stranger is a good man (though his calamities are

accursed) and deserving of help.' Read then ἀξίος, which was easily corrupted by the neighbourhood of συμφοραὶ, and either change the colon after χρηστός to a comma, or the comma after πανώλεις to a colon.

O.C. 1733.

ἄγε με καὶ τότ' ἐνάριζον.

So L.; the corresponding line is μέγ' ἄρα πέλαγος ἐλάχετόν τι, and the accepted correction of 1733 is Elmsley's καὶ τότ' ἐπενάριζον. Yet τότε is surely, if possible, still not the natural word; you would expect ἐπειτα or εἶτα; and you would expect the second foot to be a tribrach by preference rather than a trochee. Perhaps Sophocles wrote:

ἄγε μ' ἄγε με κατὰ τ' ἐνάριζον.

The first ἄγε μ' was easily dropped and ΚΑΤΑΤΕΝΑΠΙΞΟΝ and ΚΑΙΤΟΤΕΝΑΠΙΞΟΝ are hardly distinguishable. The shifting of the metrical ictus on the same word or words, in ἄγε μ' ἄγε με is a favourite ornament of Sophocles, e.g. *O.T.* 216, αἰτεῖς ἂ δ' αἰτεῖς, 261, κοινῶν τε παίδων κοινὸν ἄν, 1282, ὁ πρὶν παλαιὸς δ' ὄλβος ἦν πάροιθε μὲν | ὄλβος δικαίως, *Phil.* 1041, τείσασθε τείσασθ' ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ, and any number more in him and others.

The effect is heightened still further if a change of quantity goes along with the change of ictus, as at *Ant.* 1240, κείται δὲ νεκρὸς περὶ νεκρῷ. So with the beautiful regretful rhythm of Horace's *Postume* | *Postu* | *me* and *ibimus* | *ibi* | *mus*,¹ doubtless imitated from Alcaeus. And compare Milton's *Lycidas*, 'Yet once more O ye laurels and once more.' Swinburne's *Study of Shakespeare*, p. 219.

ARTHUR PLATT.

¹ For the opposite change cf. 1266 τᾶλλα MSS. τὰμὰ Reiske.

¹ — — — | — — — | — — —

NOTES ON GREEK COMIC FRAGMENTS.

A FRAGMENT of *Epicharmus* is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus *Strom.* 6, 2, 21 side by side with a saying of Chilon. Chilon said ἐγγύα, παρὰ δ' ἄτα: *Epicharmus* is reported to have written ἐγγύα ἄτας θυγάτηρ, ἐγγύα δὲ ζαμίας. Lorenz (*Epicharmos* p. 264) says this gives good sense and need not be changed, but, as the three last words

are evidently the end of a trochaic tetrameter, we shall rather agree with Ahrens (*De Graec. Ling. Dial.* 2, 461) who tries to throw the whole into metrical form thus—ἐγγύας ἄτα ὅτι θυγάτηρ, ἐγγύα δὲ ζαμίας. It is hard, however, to see what meaning he attached to these words. The sense obviously requires an inversion of the relations