The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Sophoclea: III. Antigone

Arthur Platt

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 4 / Issue 04 / October 1910, pp 247 - 256

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800019091, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800019091

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1910). Sophoclea: III. Antigone. The Classical Quarterly, 4, pp 247-256

doi:10.1017/S0009838800019091

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SOPHOCLEA.

III.

ANTIGONE.

351. ἵππον ὀχμάζεται ἀμφὶ λόφον ζυγῶ.

This (Schöne's) must be the right reading, not ζυγῶν, for the next line begins with a vowel, and by Headlam's canon the final dactyl must be pure. Compare also 291: οὐδ' ὑπὸ ζυγῶ | λόφον δικαίως εἶχον.

376. ἐς δαιμόνιον τέρας ἀμφίνοῶ
τόδε πῶς εἰδῶς ἀντιλογήσω
τήνδ' οὐκ εἶναι παῖδ' Ἀντιγόνην;

If we take τόδε with τέρας there is no proper connexion of thought, for it is absurd to say: 'I am in doubt about this supernatural event, how I am to deny that yonder is Antigone.' If we put a colon after τόδε, we offend against the rhythm, and get a violent asyndeton; who believes that Sophocles would say: 'I don't know about the portent; how can I deny, etc.'? If we stop after ἀμφίνοῶ, the rhythm may be better, but nothing else is.

All required is to read:

ἐς δαιμόνιον τέρας ἀμφίνοῶ,
τὸ δὲ πῶς εἰδῶς ἀντιλογήσω
τήνδ' οὐκ εἶναι παῖδ' Ἀντιγόνην;

The Chorus cannot make up their mind what to think about an event apparently supernatural (on the meaning of which see the paper of Professor Drachmann, translated in *Class. Rev.*, Nov., 1909), but there is one thing that is plain; yonder is Antigone brought in prisoner.

Cf. *Phil.* 863, where the Chorus first express doubt about what Neoptolemus may wish to do, and continue

τὸ δ' ἀλώσιμον ἐμᾶ φροντίδι, παῖ,
πόνος ὁ μὴ φοβῶν κράτιστος.

Here also AL read τόδ'.

474.

καὶ τὸν ἐγκρατέστατον
 σίδηρον ὀπτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς περισκελῇ
 θραυσθέντα καὶ ῥαγέντα πλείστ' ἂν εἰσίδοις.

This passage has been discussed by Pähler, *Die Löschung des Stahles bei den Alten*, p. 17, and by Blümner, *Technologie*, vol. iv., p. 348. Pähler thinks that the reference is to the process of hammering the heated steel; if the metal has been raised to too high a temperature, it is apt to fly in pieces under the hammer. To this Blümner objects that we cannot expect such knowledge of technical detail in Sophocles. But there is no saying what he did not know, and I am inclined to echo the words of Psichari: 'il faut surtout tenir compte de la vaste curiosité qui caractérise l'esprit de Sophocle.' It is quite probable that he knew this, and yet I agree with Blümner in rejecting the view of Pähler. For Sophocles always writes as a poet, not as a smith, and nobody who has any feeling for poetry can believe that he refers here to the shivering of steel except as a poet would refer to it,

'Where the lord of fought fields
 Breaketh spear-shaft from spear,'

διακναιομένης ἐν προτελείῳ κάμακος. It is the sword that shivers on the helmet that he is thinking of.

But Blümner proceeds to accuse Sophocles of ignorance; he thinks he means wrongly that steel becomes brittle through its treatment in the fire. As if Sophocles did not know what everybody knows, that heat softens steel, and what hardens it is the plunge in cold water! Already Homer knew that. Even if we fall back on the hammer theory, it is the hammering, not the heating, which gives the steel its temper.

What, then, did the poet really mean? It is incredible to me that he can have meant any but one thing, *steel hardened by dipping after being over-heated in the fire*. That such steel is brittle must have been known to every smith, probably to every soldier, in Athens. But Sophocles, with his allusive and elusive way of referring to things generally known, or for that matter to things hardly known save to professional men, has only spoken definitely of one half of the process, leaving the rest to be filled up. He might have said, had he been as prosaic as some people, ὀπτὸν ἐν τῷ πυρὶ καὶ βαφέντα περισκελῇ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός. But he has turned the words about in his mind until they have got into a form which is logically incorrect, and which puzzles readers who are unacquainted with what to his audience was perfectly familiar.

Lucretius, of whom Munro ironically remarks that 'among his poetical merits is not included that of leaving his reader to guess which of many possible meanings was the one he intended to convey,' puts the fact very plainly (vi. 968):

umor aquae porro ferrum condurat ab igni.

This *ab igni* seems to me much the same as *ἐκ πυρός*, whether the meaning be *after* or *from* the fire. Munro says that in Lucretius it is *after*, in Sophocles I think it is *from*. The steel is taken *out of* the fire, and hardened by the dipping.

To sum up, when the poet says 'burnt hard from the fire' it is a brachylogy for 'hardened by being taken from the fire and plunged in water.' A similar brachylogy is really existent in that other phrase, *Ajax* 650:

ὅς τὰ δεῖν' ἐκαρτέρουν τότε,
βαφῇ σίδηρος ὥς.

For to say 'as steel *endures* in the dipping' is ridiculous, and yet tense and sense of *ἐκαρτέρουν* both demand that translation. Here also Sophocles puts briefly what might be more clearly expressed by writing *ἐκαρτέρουν στομωθείς ὥς σίδηρος ἐν τῇ βαφῇ*.

θραυσθέντα and *ράγέντα* appear to be gnomic aorists. The meaning cannot be 'you may see it after it has shivered,' but 'see it shiver.' This use is not quite so rare in the participle as has been supposed; Goodwin (*Moods and Tenses*, § 30, note 5) only gives one instance from Thucydides, and one from *Ant.* 479, in the same sentence as that here under discussion, *οἶδα ἵππους καταρτυθέντας*. Another is Hesiod *Opp.* 267, *πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ πάντα νοήσας*, and in Thuc. ii. 60, 61, I believe that *ὁ γὰρ γνούς καὶ μὴ σαφῶς διδάξας* and *ὁ φυγὼν τὸν κίνδυνον* are gnomic also.

599.

νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὕπερ
ρίζας ἐτέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις·
κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν
νερτέρων ἀμᾶ κοπῖς,
λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἑρινύς.

ἐτέτατο seems to me right beyond all question; the defences set up for *ὁ τέτατο* may be ingenious, but alas! ingenuity is the mother of mischief; had Sophocles written comic opera, he might have cut down a light over a root with bloody knife or dust, but he was writing nothing of the sort. The only real objection to *ἐτέτατο* is the alleged asyndeton at *κατ' αὖ νιν*. But there is no asyndeton; *αὖ* is used by Homer over and over again as a connecting particle; take for a specimen *Iliad* xi. 104, 109, where twice in six lines *αὖ* is used for *δὲ* to answer *μέν*; and Sophocles is full of all kinds of reminiscences of Homer. I wish, however, that I could get a better example from him himself than *Ant.* 229, but even there *αὖ* is used in a way not unlike this; and at 167 *τοῦτ' αὖθις* answers *τοῦτο μέν*. Yet admit that *αὖ* could not be used as a connecting particle in tragedy; what then? Are asyndeta unknown? This would be a mere gnat to the asyndeton people swallow at 376.

Then what can be said—or rather what has *not* been said—in defence of *ἀμᾶ κόνις*? 'Cover' forsooth is the meaning of *ἀμᾶ*, and so dust has to cover a light! Or the dust is that which Antigone scattered on the body, and so means a sort of funeral, and nothing is more natural and poetical than for a

funeral to cut down a light. This sort of thing reminds one of Harriet Smith's endeavour to guess a charade in *Emma*, chap. ix., 'Mermaids and sharks! Nonsense! My dear Harriet, what are you thinking of?' Anything is better, it seems, than to allow a man to talk like a human being and say that what cuts is something with an edge to it.

But as common sense is a feather in the balance against grammatical rules and parallel passages, here are two parallels from the same poet: *Ajax* 1178, γένους ἅπαντος ῥίζαν ἐξημημένος, *frag.* 489, ῥιζῶν κρύπτουσι τομὰς | ἄς ἡδὲ βοῶσ' ἀλαλαζομένη | γυμνὴ χαλκείοις ἡμα δρεπάνοις. Evidently to Sophocles ῥίζαν ἀμᾶν was a familiar phrase; let someone produce φάος ἀμᾶν from him or from anyone else. It is plain as daylight that what ἀμᾶ has here to govern is not φάος, but ῥίζαν. And it is equally plain that what cuts, nor can the verb here mean anything else, must be something that can cut. You can say that the defeat of Austerlitz cut Pitt to the heart; Austerlitz may be compared to a dagger, well and good; you cannot say that the star of Napoleon or his grey overcoat cut Pitt to the heart, unless you want to get yourself laughed at. So a poet might say that the madness of Antigone or the death of Polynices cut down the last hope, but in no speech of mortal man, not even of an Irishman, could he say that the dust cast on the one by the other cut down a root or a light or a mermaid or anything else. And the MSS. do not even say that, nor anything like it, but only 'the dust of the lower gods.'

Jebb in his first edition called κοπίς a 'certain correction,' but afterwards became doubtful about it. The Schneidewin-Nauck-Bruhn edition says it cannot be right in a tragic chorus, because it only means a 'zum Hauen verwandte Schlacht- und Küchenmesser und ein von Barbaren getragener Säbel.' But *frag.* 808:

ὀργῇ γέροντος ὥστε μαλθακὴ κοπίς,

makes it clear that Sophocles used the word in a general way for a 'cutter' of any kind. It is as appropriate as δρέπανον. Jebb finds a difficulty in the 'want of unison with λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν ἐρινύς.' If these words be an explanation of either κοπίς or κόνις, Sophocles is so bad a poet that it were waste of time to linger over him. But if τε means 'and,' I think that *Oed. Col.* 371 shews the 'want of unison' to be no objection at all; Ismene then says that her brothers have quarrelled ἐκ θεοῦ του κάλιτηρίου φρενός. So here the last hope is destroyed by the gods and by the rash heart of Antigone (λόγου by the way must here be 'reason,' not 'speech').

Yet as the words stand, it does look at first sight as if τε—καὶ meant 'both—and.' I have sometimes thought it would be better if we had θεῶν τε νεπτέρων. Not only would the connection be plainer, but also we shall be rid of what has always seemed to me a curious piece of versification. I have printed the lines as given by the MSS., and that is the only possible arrangement; Schmidt's makes Sophocles end a strophe with an iambic tetrameter catalectic, which might be all very well in Aristophanes, but in tragedy!—one

might as well insert such a line in an ode of Shelley's.¹ But then *θεῶν τῶν* at the end of a line is to me disagreeable, though of course a foreigner can scarcely venture to judge on such a question, and *θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων* comes in 749, and *τὸν* ends 409. And *τε* coming between *θεῶν* and *νερτέρων* would so easily be corrupted.

However that may be, on the general meaning of the passage I would fight to the last drop of my ink. On the one view the greatest of Athenian poets is guilty of saying that 'the light which shone on the last root of the house of Oedipus is cut down by blood-stained dust and madness of heart,' on the other he says that 'the root on which the light shone is cut down by the knife of God and madness of heart.' *Vtri creditis, Quirites?*

750. KP. *ταύτην ποτ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὥς ἔτι ζῶσαν γαμεῖς.*

AI. *ἦδ' οὖν θανεῖται καὶ θανούσ' ὀλεῖ τινά.*

The contrast between *ταύτην* and *ἦδε* is quite grotesque. Jebb's objection to *ἦ δ' οὖν* is that 'that phrase is properly used with the imperative, and has a defiant or scornful tone.' Precisely; is not Haemon defiant and scornful here? And the sense is just the same as would be given by the imperative, 'well then, let her die.' *ἦδε* would only be satisfactory after *ταύτην* if it meant *here*.

797. *τῶν μεγάλων πάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς.*

Considering this notorious line in itself (luckily there is no need to prove it corrupt) I should say the best correction would be *παρ γέρας ἀρχαῖον*. This certainly gives exactly the meaning wanted, and the letters are almost the same, especially when we reflect that *L* has *ργ* originally for *δρ* in *παρεδρος*.

But if this be right, it follows that a syllable is missing from the corresponding words *ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὐδεῖς*. It is easy to suggest *ἔστ'* before *οὐδεῖς*, and if it now seems sacrilegious to touch a syllable of this ode (as seem it must), yet if *ἔστ'* had been there from the beginning it would have seemed equal sacrilege to turn it out. There is nothing unlyrical about *ἔστιν*, see e.g. *O. T.* 503, 1339, *O. C.* 694, 1556, etc.

Either the traditional metre of the line, or that which I now advocate, is possible; both types are alike to be found in the Chorus beginning at 944. In either case I feel convinced that the verses from *νικᾷ δ' ἐναργῆς* to *ἀρχαῖς* or *ἀρχαῖον* are Ionic (a possibility hinted by Schröder). For the diiambus at the start cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 707. In an ode on this subject of Love it is almost certain that there will be some Ionic versification.

955. *ζεύχθη δ' ὀξύχολος παῖς ὁ Δρύαντος*
Ἥδωνῶν βασιλεύς, κερτομίους
ὀργαῖς, ἐκ Διούσου

¹ The same monstrosity has been imported into *El.* 1420, 1440.

πετρῶδει κατάφαρκτος ἐν δεσμῶ.
οὕτω τὰς μανίας δεινὸν ἀποστάζει
ἀνθηρόν τε μένος. κεί νος ἐπέγνω μανίαις
ψαύων τὸν θεὸν ἐν κερτομίοις γλώσσαις.

I print these lines as divided by the MSS., not in Schmidt's pestilential rearrangement, which ruins them. How anybody can suppose them to be anything but pure Ionic (as they are rightly called in the Schneidewin-Nauck edition) passes my comprehension; consider too the appropriateness of Ionic to the subject, remembering the riot of Ionics which revels in the *Bacchae*.

The language is tinged with medical colouring, and failure to observe this has led to strange alterations of the text and serious mistakes in interpretation.

ὀξύχολος does not mean 'swift to wrath' here whatever it does in Solon 13, 26, γίγνεται ὀξύχολος, and even in Solon how could Zeus 'become swift to wrath'? He either *is* such or *becomes* hot-tempered. Yet certainly Solon is there speaking of the gods not being in a hurry to punish the wicked, and may have used γίγνεται somewhat incorrectly. But, in the best Greek, compounds of ὀξύς very seldom mean 'quick,' and most of the words so translated will not bear much inspection. Thus ὀξύθυμος is 'hot-tempered,' but as a hot temper can in English be called 'quick,' and as indeed it comes to the same thing, the equivocation is easy. It is obvious for instance that ὀξυθυμηθεῖσα in Aristoph. *Wasps* 501 has nothing to do with 'swiftness,' and no more has ὀξυθυμῆς at Eur. *Andr.* 689. And here anyhow ὀξύχολος is carefully chosen to give the medical flavour of which Sophocles is so fond; χολή is the cause of anger, but not only that; it is also the cause for madness, and the madness of Lycurgus is here the important point; what has his temper to do with it? But the first half of the compound is medical too. φθινοπώρου δ' ἡ ὀξεῖα (χολή), says Galen (vol. xvii. A, p. 31), and ὀξὺς is perpetually used of fevers. We learn from Aristotle *de Partibus* IV. ii. 6 that in the opinion of Anaxagoras χολή was the cause τῶν ὀξέων νοσημάτων, and Sophocles must have known Anaxagoras. At *Phil.* 808 the attack ὀξεῖα φοιτᾷ καὶ ταχεῖ' ἀπέρχεται 'comes on *acutely* (not quickly) and goes off quickly.' (At *Ant.* 1238 φυνσιῶν ὀξεῖαν ἐκβάλλει ῥοήν has also been mistranslated; φυνσιῶν makes it obvious that ὀξεῖαν ῥοήν signifies 'sharp spurts of blood'; Haemon had driven the sword into his lungs and consequently gasped out blood from his mouth at every pant of his breath. Jebb's 'swift stream of the oozing blood' is really quite absurd. Compare Aesch. *Ag.* 1389 where ψακάδι makes it plain that the poet is thinking of a breath charged with fine drops of blood.)

ὀξύχολος then here may have seemed to the more ignorant among the audience to mean nothing but 'hot-tempered,' but for anyone capable of understanding the delicacies of language it suggested a fevered state and madness. To translate it is impossible.

Then ἀποστάζει in medical language does not mean 'flows away' or 'passes off'; it means simply 'drip.' Hippocrates, vol. i., p. 167, uses the

word in a sadly undignified context, *μυκτῆρ ἐν τουτέοισιν ἀποστάζων ὀλέθριον*, and see other references in Stephanus under *ἀποστάζω* and *ἀπόσταξις*.

Again *ἀνθηρὸν* is often used in various senses by the medical writers. Galen (vol. xvii. A, p. 329), commenting on Hippocrates, says: *ὑπανθηρὸν δὲ λέγει τὸ ὕφαιμον καὶ ὑπέρυθρον, καθάπερ καὶ ἀνθηρὰ πτύσματα καλεῖται τὰ ἐρυθρὰ καὶ ὕφαιμα καὶ πρόσωπον ἀνθηρὸν καὶ ἐρύθημα ὑπέρυθρον σημαίνει κ.τ.λ.* Hippocrates, vol. i., p. 602, *ἔπτυσεν ἀφρώδεα, ἀρχομένη δὲ ἀνθηρά.*

But it would be a great mistake to press the language of Sophocles unduly. Lest any unpoetical soul should argue that the particular kind of madness which is attended by foaming at the mouth is epilepsy, that epilepsy is *ἰερὴ νοῦσος* and Lycurgus was afflicted with madness from a god, that *ἀποστάζει ἀνθηρὸν μένος* refers to the dripping of froth in this disease (Hipp. vol. i., pp. 585, 600; Galen, vol. xvii. B, p. 544), that the case of Lycurgus was connected with the Bacchic worship, and epilepsy comes of over-indulgence in wine (Galen, vol. i., p. 661), and so on, I will observe that the medical theory ascribed epilepsy not to *χολή* but to *φλέγμα* (Hipp. vol. i., p. 595), and consequently the epithet *ὀξύχολος* will not suit the diagnosis. No, the poet allows his language to be coloured with medical terms, but he writes with the vagueness proper to poetry in such a case.

The meaning of *ἀποστάζει* however is of great importance in its bearing upon the interpretation of the passage. If it only means 'drip,' then the view that the *οὔτω* clause refers to the gradual recovery of Lycurgus is wrong. And there are two other grave objections to that view. First, the historic present; it is notorious that this is never used by Pindar, and it is hardly used by Sophocles in lyrical passages; there is something about it which is alien to the lyrical spirit, unless in very exceptional contexts, such as *Phil.* 728. Secondly, the *κείνος* of the next clause. If the *οὔτω* clause is a general reflexion—'so terrible is madness'—*κείνος* is correct. If the *οὔτω* clause referred already to Lycurgus, *κείνος* would be inexplicable. Those therefore are right who take the words to mean: 'so dread is the frothing violence of madness.'

But the misinterpretation of these lines draws another mistake in its train. *ζεύχθη* cannot mean 'was tamed'; when and where does this verb mean anything of the sort? The notion that there is any difference of sense required here because of the simple *ζεύχθη* after the compound *κατεζεύχθη* in 946 is merely due to ignorance of the poetical figure by which a simple word may echo its compound. I confine myself here to giving the following illustrations from the single play of *Philoctetes*, omitting any cases when any reasonable difference in meaning might be suggested; 329. *ἐξερῶ μόλις δ' ἐρῶ*, 663. *εἰσορᾶν—ἰδεῖν*, 911. *ἐκλιπὼν—λιπὼν*, 1382. *καταισχύνει—αἰσχύνοιτο*. The opposite device is also common enough, e.g. *Ph.* 216, *βοᾷ—προβοᾷ*, 1241. *κωλύσει—ἐπικωλύσων*.

966. παρὰ δὲ Κυανεᾶν πελάγει διδύμας ἄλός
 ἀκταὶ Βοσπορίαι ἥδ' ὁ Θρηκῶν — —
 Σαλμυδησός, ἔν' ἀγχίπολις Ἄρης
 δισσοῖσι Φινεΐδαις
 εἶδεν ἀρατὸν ἔλκος κ.τ.λ.

κυανέων MSS. corr. Wieseler. *πελάγεων* MSS. corr. Jebb. The difficulties of the strophe are scarcely cleared up yet, nor perhaps is it possible to do much unless light shine upon us from Egypt. That a word is lost, that the hiatus after *Βοσπορίαι* is incredible, that both *ἥδ'* and *ἀγχίπολις Ἄρης* fail to correspond to the antistrophe, all this is obvious. But there are even more difficulties involved.

What is the construction of *Κυανεᾶν πελάγει διδύμας ἄλός*? Two genitives depending on one noun are common enough. But I believe, speaking under correction, that in all such instances the genitive, which is *more* intimately connected with the governing noun, is not itself qualified by an adjective, though the *less* intimately connected may be so qualified. Thus at *Ajax* 616 we have *ἔργα χεροῖν μεγίστας ἀρετᾶς*. Here *ἔργα χεροῖν* is equivalent to a compound, upon which compound again depends *μεγίστας ἀρετᾶς*. But could we say *ἔργα κρατεροῖν χεροῖν ἀρετᾶς*? I think it will be admitted that such a phrase is, to say the least, very strange, or at any rate that it could only be explained as meaning 'deeds of valour of mighty arms,' which would be altogether different. The nearest exception that I know is *Ant.* 929, *τῶν αὐτῶν ἀνέμων αὐταὶ ψυχῆς ῥιπαί*, but there *τῶν αὐτῶν* really agrees *in sense* with *ῥιπαί*, and is irrationally attracted into the genitive. Substitute *μεγάλων ἀνέμων ψυχῆς ῥιπαί*, and you at once see that it is impossible.

But if this be so, *Κυανεᾶν πελάγει διδύμας ἄλός* is no longer permissible. For if *Κυανεᾶν* depend on the compound phrase *πελάγει ἄλός*, then *διδύμας* cannot be added to *ἄλός*. If we fall back upon making *Κυανεᾶν* depend on *ἄλός* alone (as in 'deeds of valour of arms') we get a perfectly intolerable expression. Nor can we make *διδύμας ἄλός* depend on *Κυανεᾶν πελάγει*, which would be equally intolerable.

Then too it is pretty plain from the Scholia that *ἵνα* once stood in a different place, for the scholiast bids us take it with *ἀκταί*. Is not Blaydes right in proposing to read *ἔν'* for *ἥδ'*? especially if we adopt Jebb's *κλήζεται* after *Θρηκῶν*, which has always looked to me much the best supplement.

Moreover it strikes me as altogether unlike Sophocles to construct a sentence in such a manner as 'and by the waters of the Blue Rocks is the Thracian Salmydessus, where Ares saw the sons of Phineus blinded.' Why in the world should he have expressed in such a contorted way a plain statement? Simple he is not in many things, but this does not look like his handicraft to me at any rate.

Well, if in so desperate a business one may resort to a revel of licentious conjecture, I should guess that what he wrote was something like this:

παρὰ δὲ Κυανεᾶν πελάγει διδύμας θ' ἄλως
 ἀκταῖς Βοσπορίαις, ἔν' ὃ Θρηκῶν κληίζεται
 Σαλμυδησσός, Ἄρης ἀγχίπολις κ.τ.λ.

Or maybe ἀκτᾶ Βοσπορίας, which will account better for the corruption. The other changes involved are all of a familiar kind enough; words do get transposed in all sorts of ways.

1039. τάφῳ δ' ἐκείνον οὐχὶ κρύψετε,
 οὐδ' εἰ θέλουσ' οἱ Ζηνὸς αἰετοὶ βορὰν
 φέρειν νιν ἀρπάζοντες ἐς Διὸς θρόνους.

οὐδ' εἰ A, οὐ δὴ L. The editors seem to feel no difficulty about κρύψετε οὐδ' εἰ θέλουσι, and yet is it not very strange? Of course a future in the apodosis may answer εἰ with a present indicative, and we should not see anything strange in such a sentence as: 'I will not go, even if you now wish it,' but no poet could say: 'you shall not bury him, even if the vultures are now willing to rend him, etc.' It is too absurdly feeble. Clearly we want such a protasis as οὐδ' ἢν θέλωσιν, and that is what the reading of L points to.

It may be suggested that we should regard θέλουσι φέρειν as in a sort of way equal to a future. Thus οὐ μὴ cannot take a present subjunctive, and yet Xenophon can say οὐ μὴ σοι δύνωνται ἀντέχειν (*Hiero.* xi. 15) apparently because it is somehow equal to οὐ μὴ σοι ἀνθέξουσιν. To my own feeling however θέλουσι φέρειν does not seem capable of bearing the strain. The whole question is perhaps largely one of poetical taste; but that the difficulty really exists may be seen from Jebb's translation: 'no, though the eagles of Zeus should bear.'

1232. πτύσας προσώπῳ κοῦδὲν ἀντιπῶν, ξίφος
 ἔλκει διπλοῦς κνώδοντας.

It has become fashionable of late to insist upon Haemon's spitting in his father's face. Without objecting to that conduct in itself, one may yet doubt whether Sophocles meant us so to understand the words. 'Spitting in his face and answering nothing' does look to me a quite ridiculous expression both in the Greek and in the English. Could a more frigid anticlimax be devised? And in the second place the psychology appears to be wrong. He who spits in the face of another expresses utter contempt, he shews by it that he does not consider his opponent as a man who deserves to be treated as an equal or one from whom any reprisals may be expected. Nor does he follow it up by an attempt to kill him in a moment of passion. The furious anger which shakes Haemon would never vent itself in that way. Such passion as makes a man draw his sword upon his father does not stop to think, not for a second, and spitting is the expression of a comparatively reflective state of mind. The mood of absolute contempt could not be at once succeeded by this flaming outburst. A man might draw his sword first and then think better of it and

subside into contempt, as does Achilles in his quarrel with Agamemnon, but not the other way about. Never has any poet shown himself a greater master of psychology than has Sophocles in his presentation of Haemon, and it is hard to believe that he could have ended it with such a blunder.

Nor does the previous line countenance this translation. Haemon 'glares at him with wild eyes.' Is this the description of a man about to spit? Try the experiment for yourself; glare at an enemy coming in through the door, and you will find that your lips (or at any rate your teeth) are at once pressed tight together, so that spitting is the last thing possible. Or again imagine yourself proposing to treat him in that undignified matter, and your eyes will assume a calm and amused expression at once.

I confess also that I am not satisfied that *προσώπῳ* could have the meaning required; the datives alleged as parallels are not so strong.

So though the scholiast's note on the passage as a whole is ridiculous, I yet think he was right in saying that *πτύσας* is here metaphorical.

The words *αὐτῷ χολωθείς* in 1235, if they have any bearing on the question at all, favour the scholiast. They shew that Haemon was ashamed and remorseful for a sudden gust of fury.

1320. ἐγώ, φάμ' ἔτυμον. ἰὼ πρόσπολοι.

This line ought to correspond to 1342, of which the right reading is almost certainly

πρὸς πότερον ἴδω, πᾶ κλιθῶ· πάντα γάρ.

The simplest way of making it do so is to read ἰὼ ἰώ. The first ἰὼ will be a monosyllable, and will lengthen the preceding short syllable. See Munro's *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus*, p. 136, and *Phil.* 759.

ARTHUR PLATT.