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](#)

Notes on Sophocles's *Oedipus Tyrannus*

Mortimer Lamson Earle

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 07 / October 1899, pp 339 - 342

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00078938, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00078938

How to cite this article:

Mortimer Lamson Earle (1899). Notes on Sophocles's *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The Classical Review, 13, pp 339-342 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00078938

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

X

- I. 2 cases (vv. 251, 315).
 In both the MSS. are with the *κοινή*.
 II.a 14 cases (vv. 42, 48, 69, 73, 83, 85, 118, 122, 198, 202, 416, 431, 475, 491).
 In 9 cases MSS. agree with *κοινή*.
 In 1 MSS. are divided.
 In 4 MSS. are against the *κοινή*.

Ψ

- I. 3 cases (vv. 374, 548, 622).
 In 2 MSS. are with the *κοινή*.
 In 1 MSS. are against it.
 II.a. 16 cases (vv. 18, 39, 48, 117, 120, 137, 287, 332, 361, 420, 422, 464, 483, 504, 635, 640).
 In 7 MSS. agree with *κοινή*.
 In 4 MSS. are divided.
 In 5 MSS. are against *κοινή*.

Ω

- I. 1 case (v. 67).
 Here the MSS. agree with the *κοινή*.
 II.a. 22 cases (vv. 20, 28, 38, 53, 148, 198, 200, 215, 241, 341, 347, 373, 418, 473, 518, 546, 636, 663, 701, 706, 764.)
 In 12 MSS. agree with *κοινή*.
 In 5 MSS. are divided.
 In 5 MSS. are against *κοινή*.

Total: I. 72 cases.

- In 47 MSS. agree with the *κοινή*.
 In 17 MSS. are divided.
 In 8 MSS. are against the *κοινή*.

IIa. 430 cases.

- In 256 MSS. agree with the *κοινή*.
 In 99 MSS. are divided.
 In 75 MSS. are against the *κοινή*.

Grand total of both classes:

- Cases 502.
 In 303 MSS. agree with *κοινή* = 60 p.c.
 In 116 MSS. are divided = 24 p.c.
 In 83 MSS. are against the *κοινή* = 16 p.c.

If we compare these percentages with those obtained from the direct quotations of the *κοινή*, we find that the agreements of our MSS. with the *κοινή* were there 57 p.c. as against 60 p.c. here. This is substantially the same proportion, and the nearness of the results may perhaps confirm the method on which I have endeavoured to ascertain the reading of the *κοινή* where it is not named.

In the other results there is some variation; the proportions in which our MSS. show a divided text and are unanimous in rejecting the *κοινή* appear to have changed places. Perhaps it will be right to prefer the second result, as based on a much wider field.

We may say then that the modern or MS. vulgate is the same as the ancient vulgate to the extent of 60 per cent.; to the extent of 16 per cent. other readings have established themselves to the exclusion of the ancient vulgate; in 24 per cent. of passages the ancient vulgate and the new element are in warfare.

What is this new element, and by what means has it to this extent established itself in our text?

T. W. ALLEN.

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES'S *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS*.

Vv. 2-5.

τίνας ποθ' ἔδρας τάδε μοι θαύζετε
 ἱκτηρίους κλάδουσιν ἐξεσπεμμένοι·
 πόλις δ' ὁμοῦ μὲν θυμιαμάτων γέμει,
 ὁμοῦ δὲ παιάνων τε καὶ στεναγμάτων;

'Why in the world, pray, are you sitting thus with suppliants' branches, while (whereas) the city is filled with incense, is filled with paeans and groans?' πόλις δὲ implies ὑμεῖς μὲν in the first member of the period. That the contrast exists is reasonably certain. But the actions

described in the two members are not plainly contrasted, as the sentence now stands. The sitting of a delegation with suppliants' boughs somewhere is not in marked contrast with burning incense or singing paeans somewhere. It is the designation of the person to whom the supplication is addressed on the one hand, the incense-burning and paeon-singing on the other, that makes a contrast between the actions. One part of the citizens—a delegation—supplicate the king; the city at large supplicates the gods. 'Why should a

few supplicate the *king*, while most look to the *gods* for aid?' is roughly the question in Oedipus's mind. If πόλις δ' is contrasted by implication (as without doubt it is) with <ὑμεῖς μὲν>, and if what has just been said about a second contrast in the sentence is true; then, inasmuch as there is no word referring directly to the gods, but there is one referring directly to the king (μοι), we have, what appears very often elsewhere, a double contrast expressed half by half. The scheme of such contrast in the present passage will be thus:

<ὑμεῖς μὲν> — μοι
πόλις δὲ — <τοῖς θεοῖς>.

But if this double contrast exists and one part of it is an oblique case of a personal pronoun, such oblique case of a personal pronoun should have the antidiastolic form, not the enclitic. Therefore, τάσδε μοι should give place to τάσδ' ἐμοί. So Brunck read. So the Σχόλια Νεώτερα, thus: *τινὲς εἰσὶν αἱ καθέδραι αὐται, ἃς κάθησθε χάριν ἐμοῦ*. And again: *ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰκότως εἴρηκεν δι' αὐτὸν γὰρ ἐκάθηντο*. Bothe should not have objected to Brunck's text (*addenda et emendanda* to Leipsic edition of 1806): 'leg. τάσδε μοι: nam ὀρθοτονουμένῳ locus non est. Sic saepius novavit Brunckius, a me non ubique, ut par esset, retusus. quod semel moneo.' The priest answers Oedipus's implication in vs. 31 *sqq.* Those words are pointless and have nothing to rest on (the priest replies to Oedipus in chiasitic order), unless we read τάσδ' ἐμοί. (I shall take up the priest's words presently from another point of view.) ἃ in ἀγῶ has reference to the contrast, the inconsistency, which Oedipus has just noted, of which he now demands the reason in person. Of course, the interrogation extends, as I have indicated by my pointing, through στεναγμάτων.

It may be remarked here that modern

scholars do not always appreciate the fact that from the ancient Greek point of view both terms of a contrast do not need always to be expressed. Thus, for example, Nauck wrote (*Mél. iv. p. 216*) of Eur. *Hel.* 1047 *sq.* thus: "Das Schiff, das wir hatten, hat das Meer." Wollte Euripides in dieser Weise mit dem Verbum ἔχει spielen, so konnte er nur sagen ἦν γὰρ ἡμεῖς πρόσθεν εἰχομεν, τὰ νῦν ἔχει ἡ θάλασσα. Der überlieferte Ausdruck lehrt dass nicht der Dichter sondern ein Abschreiberversehen verantwortlich zu machen ist für das frostige Wortspiel. Man erwartet ἦ γὰρ ἡλθομεν θάλασσαν ἔχει.' But in Eur. *Alc.* 339 *sq.* we find λόγῳ γὰρ ἦσαν οὐκ ἔργῳ φίλοι, | σὺ δ' (as if a οὔτοι μὲν or οὔτοι had gone before) ἀντιδοῦσα τῆς ἐμῆς τὰ φίλτατα | ψυχῆς ἔσωσας. Still more striking is Hom. *Γ* 164 οὐ τί μοι αἰτὴ ἐσσί, θεοὶ νῦ μοι αἰτιοὶ εἰσιν, where no σὺ anticipates θεοί.

As I have just spoken of a matter of punctuation, I may add here that in vs. 11 στέρξαντες should be followed by, . . The question is not direct; therefore, the ; is not required. Besides this, the pointing with ; obscures the relation of ὡς θέλοντος ἂν κτέ. (vs. 11) to φράζ' (vs. 9).

It seems to me, as to others, reasonable to suppose that στέρξαντες was once οὐ στέρξαντες. I would explain the present state of our text thus: The οὐ before στέρξαντες was dropped out by some one in copying; then an attempt was made to restore it (by putting it in the margin first?); this succeeded so far that οὐ did indeed get back into the text but in the wrong synizesis—with μῆ in vs. 13, where it was not wanted, instead of with ῆ in vs. 11, where it was wanted.

Vs. 15–21. The μὲν after ὁρᾷς is, of course, contrasted with the δὲ in τὸ δ' ἄλλο φύλον (vs. 19). The structure of this whole passage may be clearly indicated thus:

ὁρᾷς μὲν ἡμᾶς ἡλίκοι κτέ.
↓
οἱ μὲν οὐδέπω κτέ. οἱ δὲ σὺν κτέ.
↓ ↘
ιερεὺς ἐγὼ μὲν Ζηνὸς οἶδε δ' ἡμέτερον λεκτοί
↓
τὸ δ' ἄλλο φύλον.

The emphasis on ἡλίκοι makes φύλον mean primarily 'those of other age than we' (the contrast of sex is not so distinctly—if at all—present to the mind). We must read οἶδε δ' ἡμέτερον in vs. 18; also ιερεὺς ἐγὼ μὲν at the beginning of the same verse. οἶδε δ' ἡμέτερον is the reading of Pal. 40 (see Professor Campbell's edition; cf. also Emil

Müller, *Beiträge zur Erklärung u. Kritik des Königs Oedipus des Sophokles*, I. und II., Leipsic, 1884, p. 5).

In the priest's answer to Oedipus the words ἀλλ', ὃ κρατύνων κτέ. answer to ἀλλ', ὃ γεραίέ, κτέ.; the word πόλις in vs. 22 introduces the reply to πόλις δ' κτέ. (vs. 4 *sq.*); and στεναγμοῖς καὶ γόοις in vs. 30

refers us back to vs. 5. What follows vs. 30 will, therefore, by a natural process of chiasmic elimination, answer to vss. 2-3. This brings us to the conclusion already drawn from the point of view of the earlier verses—that vss. 31-32 have reference to vss. 2-3 and that *ἐμοὶ* must be read in vs. 2. From vs. 142 M. Schmidt (*Philologus* 18, 229) inferred that in vs. 16 Sophocles had written not *βωμοῖσι τοῖς σοῖς* but *βάθροισι τοῖς σοῖς*. In vss. 31-34 the priest protests that he and the suppliants do not approach Oedipus as a god. Does not this, the turning point of the priest's answer, taken in connection with what has already been said about the relation of the speeches of Oedipus and the priest, make strongly against *βωμοῖσι* and for *βάθροισι*?

I may add here that in vs. 31 Mr. Blaydes's *ἴσον νέμων σ'* *ἐγὼ* seems to me very plausible.

In v. 35 *ὅς τ'*, which is supported, so far at least as MS. testimony is concerned, by the scholiast's *ὥστε*, is certainly right, as Wunder maintained. *ἐν τε συμφοραῖς βίον* and *ἐν τε δαιμόνων συναλλαγαῖς* are resumed in chiasmic order. *νῦν* (v. 40) is contrasted with the notion of pastness in *μολὼν = ὅτ' ἔμολες*. *μολὼν* is, therefore, not to be construed with *ἄστυ Καδμείον*. But if *ἄστυ Καδμείον* is to be construed with *ἐξέλευσας*, Professor van Herwerden's *σκληρὰς αἰδοῦ, δασμὸν ἧμιν παρείχομεν* in v. 36 seems fairly inevitable.

Lest I may not have been explicit enough about the chiasmus mentioned above and its bearing on *ὅς τ'*, I add a word here. *συμφοραῖς βίον* is commonly misinterpreted. *συμφοραῖς* has its normal sinister sense, and the phrase here = 'misfortunes, mischances, of life,' with special reference to the plague, which, though a divine visitation is here regarded especially from the human point of view; *δαιμόνων συναλλαγαῖς* (the *συν-* is supported, as against *ἐν-*, by the parallelism with *συμφοραῖς*) means 'dealings with higher (supernatural) beings,' with reference to the Sphinx. *πρῶτον ἐν δαιμόνων συναλλαγαῖς* is expanded in the form of a relative clause in vv. 35-39; while vv. 40-45 look back to *πρῶτον ἐν συμφοραῖς βίον*.

Chiasmus is a prominent feature of this whole passage. We have a striking little instance of it in v. 42 sq., where *τον θεῶν* is followed by *ἀνδρὸς—του*. The reading *που* spoils this.

Vv. 44-45. 'For it is especially to experienced men that I see even misfortunes <?> of counsels.' What we want where *ζώσας* stands is a substantive that shall be

connected as predicate with *ξυμφορὰς* and shall have *τῶν βουλευμάτων*, depend upon it. The best suggestion that has been made here (to my knowledge) is Mekler's *ρίζας*. (Musgrave, if I am right in thinking some MS. notes on Sophocles in my possession to be his, felt the difficulty in the same way; but his conjectures were less satisfactory. I may have more to say of this at another time.) *ρίζας* with superscribed *οὔσας* (the latter merely to indicate the construction) might have got botched into *ζώσας*. At all events *ρίζας* indicates very well what is wanted here. *ζώσας* is pretty certainly wrong. 'For to the experienced (as you are) necessity is especially the mother of invention' is a sentiment that fits in here very fairly well indeed.

In vs. 47 I would read *ὥς σε νῦν μὲν κτέ*. There is no emphasis of contrast on the *σε*—no special emphasis at all, in fact: therefore, there is no reason why we should accent the word. *νῦν μὲν* demands a contrasted term in the *δε*-clause. This is to be found in *ὑστερον*, which does not belong to *πεσόντες*. *πεσόντες* needs no such adjunct. *στάντες τ' ἐς ὀρθὸν καὶ πεσόντες* is contrasted (chiasmically) with *ἀσφαλείαι (= ἀσφαλῶς, ὥστε μὴ πεσεῖν) ἀνόρθωσον* in v. 51.

In v. 48 Pal. 40 is again right. *προμηθείας* (a mere carelessness of spelling for *προμηθίας*) is sense; *προθυμίας* hardly.

In v. 55 I propose to read *ἐν ἀνδράσιν κάλλιον ἢ κενὴς βροτῶν*.

In v. 58 should we not construe the final word of the verse, *μοι*, with *προσῆλθε* at the beginning of v. 59, rather than with *γνωτὰ κοῦκ ἄγνωτα* in v. 58?

If vv. 80-1 are right as they stand, should we not construe thus: *εἰ γὰρ ἐν τύχῃ γέ τω σωτήρι βαίη <οὐτω> λαμπρός, ὥσπερ ὁμμάτι ('to the eye') <λαμπρὸς βαίνει>?* This = *οὕτω λαμπρῶς (= φανερώς) σωτήριος ἔλθοι, ὥσπερ λαμπρὸς (= φανερός) προσέρχεται*. Oedipus knows nothing about any bright expression on Creon's face. He has not even seen him yet—only heard that he is approaching. Nor is the news that Creon brings of a kind to put a smile on a man's face. Nor does the priest in his next words say anything about bright looks: he judges of the character of Creon's news merely from his chaplet (vv. 82-83).

In v. 99 I cannot but think that the reading of the MSS. *τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς ξυμφορὰς*; is adequately defended by Aristoph. *Av.* 94 *τίς ἢ πτέρωσις; τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς τριλοφίας*; In the reply of Creon (v. 100 sq.) *ποιῶι καθαρμῶι*; is answered first; *ὥς τάδ' (Hermann's certain and admirable*

correction of τὸδ' αἶμα χεϊμάζον πόλιν answers τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς ξυμφορᾶς;

In v. 116 *sq.* have we really what Sophocles wrote? Should we not rather read thus:

οὐδ' ἄγγελος τις ὧδε συμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ
κατῆλθ', ὅτου τις ἐκμαθὼν ἐχρήσατ' ἄν;

to be construed: οὐδέ τις συμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ ἄγγελος ὧδε κατῆλθε, κτέ. ? θνήσκουσι γάρ (*sc. οἱ συμπράκτορες ὁδοῦ πάντες*) in v. 118 looks as if συμπράκτωρ in v. 116 might have been the subject of the whole sentence.

In v. 118 φόβωι is to be construed, I think, with οὐδὲν εἶχ' εἰδὼς φράσαι in v. 119. The participle φυνγὼν is then = ἐπεὶ (*postquam*) ἐφυγεν. For the emphasis on the participle thus placed cf. what I have said of μολὼν in v. 35.

In v. 122 *sq.* I venture to think that Sophocles may have written οὐ μῖᾱς (not *μῖαι*) ῥώμῃ κτανεῖν νιν, ἀλλὰ σὺν πλήθει χερῶν.

It may be questioned whether vv. 141–146 are always (or generally) rightly understood. ὡς πᾶν ἐμοῦ δράσοντος (*cf. v. 10 sq.*) belongs in thought to ἵστασθε. The suppliants are to go away now in the belief that Oedipus will do all that lies in his power for the relief of his people. The concluding words of Oedipus's speech are the promise referred to by the priest in the words (v. 147 *sq.*) τῶν δὲ χάριν ὧν ὁδ' ἐξαγγέλλεται (= ὑπωχνεῖται: I fail to see why commentators drag in 'of his own accord' in their interpretations). 'For we (*i.e.* I) will succeed—please God—or fall in the attempt' is what Oedipus means by his words. The words σὺν τῷ θεῷ need not refer to

Apollo—in fact, they probably do not. At all events φανούμεθα here has the proper force of the future: it is an expression of intention.

Are v. 421 *sq.* perhaps to be written:

ὅταν καταίσθῃ γ' ὃν ὑμέναιον ἐν δόμοις
ἄνορμον εἰσέπλευσας εὐπλοίας τυχών?

It is interesting to observe that G. Wolff's conjecture αὖ for οὐ in v. 430 is supported by the newly-discovered Oxyrhynchus fragment, in which αὖ stands in the text with: *ov*: written above by the second hand. The balance of opinion ought now, it seems to me, to turn in favour of αὖ, as against the feebler οὐ.

In v. 1369 *sq.*, the MSS. make Oedipus say to the Coryphaeus:

ὡς μὲν τάδ' οὐχ ὧδ' ἔστ' ἄριστ' εἰργασμένα,
μή μ' ἐκδιδασκε, μηδὲ συμβούλευ' ἔτι.

But the Coryphaeus had said (v. 1367):

οἶδ' ὅπως σε φῶ βεβουλεύσθαι καλῶς.

It thus seems that Sophocles wrote in v. 1369 not εἰργασμένα but ἐγνωσμένα. It may be noted that ἐγνωσμένα and εἰργασμένα are confused in Eur. *Med.* 779—at least the reading of the MSS. varies between ἐγνωσμένα and εἰργασμένα. In the present passage the corruption of ἐγνωσμένα to εἰργασμένα may be due—wholly or in part—to the occurrence of εἰργασμένα at the end of v. 1374.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Barnard College.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Conclusion).

OUR discussion has as yet taken no account of any external evidence that there may be, bearing on the genuineness of the disputed works. In point of fact it will be found that this evidence, although as far as it goes it is in favour of them all, possesses no very great intrinsic value. It is something that a work should by manuscript tradition be included in the writings of a given author. It is something that it should be definitely ascribed to him by later writers. But, when several centuries inter-

vene between the earliest of these later writers and the author in question, their ascription carries with it but little authority: and no greater weight attaches to the mere presence of the work in the collection of writings, when we are quite in the dark as to the circumstances under which that collection was formed and when we know well that into similar collections (Hippocrates, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle) works found their way which had no business there. As far as I know, the literature