

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 Aeschylus

W. Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 05 / June 1904, pp 241 - 243

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990139, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990139

How to cite this article:

W. Headlam (1904). Notes on Aeschylus. The Classical Review, 18, pp 241-243 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990139

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

accordingly is composed. In it Aphrodite, not Apollo, rescues Aeneas, and Diomedes voluntarily abandons his human prey to fly at the divine quarry. He attacks the goddess, wounds her, and drives her from the field, and Apollo is utilized to rescue him in a cloud from the other Danaoi. This version contains 310-431. This new version is now 'vorbereitet' by ll. 129-132, and completed by the insertion of 817-821. Further the author of the new episode, thinking of the mistake Diomedes had been under with regard to Apollo in the older version, inserts 127, 8: the *πρίν* in ἢ *πρίν* ἐπῆεν is in the older version. The writer forgets that with his own version there is no longer any *πρίν*; but he is thinking of the Diomedes known up to his time without any miraculous power of discrimination.

(Cf. the ποτε of © 108, referring to what in our *Iliad* has taken place only the day

before, but is to the author of this line one of the data of the story.)

The old version and the new are now fused—perhaps by the same poet. Lines 433-5 are an attempt to do away with the contradiction between the blind attack on Apollo and Athene's promise that he should be able to recognize a god, and to give some appearance of truth to Diomedes' later assurance to the goddess: but they are only a clumsy attempt, and the contradiction with 435 remains.

This theory seems to explain two difficulties by the one hypothesis. It gives an explanation of l. 127 and furnishes a solution of the contradiction between Diomedes' acts and his words which has not yet been forthcoming.

R. M. HENRY.

BELFAST, January 21, 1904.

NOTES ON AESCHYLUS.

Pers. 638 Dealing with this passage in a paper on Ghost-raising in *C.R.* 1902, p. 56, I quoted among many similar descriptions of magic incantations Lucian i. 465 ἐπίτροχόν τι καὶ ἀσαφὲς ἐφθέγγετο . . . παραμυγνὺς ἅμα καὶ βαρβαρικά τινα καὶ ἀσημα ὀνόματα καὶ πολυσύλλαβα, and yet omitted to make the correction βάρβαρ' ἀσαφηνῇ for βάρβαρα σαφηνῇ. For ἡ παντάλαν' ἄχη διαβοάσω; add Ben Jonson *Masque of Queens* and Goethe *Faust* I scene 3.

893 schol. 'Ἰκάριον κλύδωνα' as ἥκιον κλύδωνα *O.T.* 197.

1005 schol. γρ. καὶ ἀκρόται· ἐξ οὗ ἔσται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄκρον. Read γρ. καὶ ἀκρόται· ἐξουσιασταί, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄκρον. The word is used by schol. rec. on οἰακοστρόφος *P.V.* 515 and δεσπότης *Theb.* 27.

1053 (ἀμ)μεμίξετ' οἶμοι for μεμίξεταί μοι?

P.V. 445 αἰὲν ὅς οὐράνιον πόλον. For Ἄτλαντος cf. *Orph. hymn.* i. 28.

580 πείθων may be an interpolation: cf. *Apoll. Rhod.* i. 977, ii. 239.

738 γύπδοσ in *M* possibly through glosses τύπους and πόδας on ἴχνος or ἴχνη, as in schol. *Hecub.* 1059, *Hesych.*

Theb. 55 schol. ἐτάξαντο?

109 δοχμολόφων κύμα γὰρ καχλάζει | περὶ πόλιν would correspond.

151 τλήμονες, συναιχμάλωτον?

299 schol.: read Ἀργείους.

473 schol.: read τῇ Αἰγυπτίων φωνῇ: this, not Αἰγυπτία, is regular.

547 ἡ ἔωθεν . . . μέμψεται: cf. *Ar. Nub.* 1433 μὴ τύπτ'· εἰ δὲ μὴ, σαντόν ποτ' αἰτιάσει. *Eubulus* 14 μὴ παρατίθει . . . ἡ σεαντὴν αἰτιῶ.

624 ἀτμαστήρ' ὡς ἀνδρὸν ἀτμήν· or at least banish him, φωνῇ γοῦν τίσασθαι: cf. 1006, *O.C.* 1306, *Nonn. D.* 40, 68.

788 schol. written on νεόκροτον? The same on νεόκτιστον in *Hesych.*

Supp. 121 The construction may be ζωσα γόοις με τιμῶ, ἠπλέμοισιν ἐμπρεπῇ: cf. *Soph. El.* 1187, *Cho.* 11, 17.

171 γαμετᾶν οὐλιονεικῶν? cf. 302. Νεῖκος οὐλόμενον was the epithet used by *Empedocles*.

249 'In this point only will the theory of a Greek land for your origin harmonise': *Callim. Ep.* 18' ὡς τῶργ' τοῦνομα συμφέρεται.

327 δοκεῖτ' ἐμοὶ <μὲν> So *Eur. Ion* 644 εἶη δ' ἐμοὶ <μὲν>

568 λειμῶνα χιονόβοσκον, οὗ τ' ἐπέρχεται Τυφῶ μένος ἵδωρ τὸ Νεῖλον νόσοις ἄβικτον 'where the diseaseless water of the Nile proceeds against the power of drought and pestilence': see *Plut. de Is. et Osir.* p. 363 D—364 B, 366 B—367 B, 371 A, 376 F. ὅν τ' ἐπέρχεται Τυφῶ μένος would be no

commendation of the country, and ἔδωρ τὸ Νεῖλου is Aeschylean.

592 τὸδ' ἤ?

680 ὑπερτάταν?

790 αἰσθ' ὅπως would do, but αἰσδος ὡς is probably an Egyptian error.

901 Μᾶ Γᾶ, Μᾶ Γᾶ, βόαν φοβερὸν ἀπότερε. Instead of βοᾶν 'requiritur nomen substantivum quo referatur φοβερὸν, id genus qualia sunt ὄναρ, ἀραχνος, ὄφεις, ἐχιδνα' Weil. Why not βόαν, the Latin *boam* or *bouam* (Plin. viii. 36 sqq., Paul. ex Fest. p. 30 Mueller), the *boa constrictor*?

1012 κηρύσσει Κύπρις | εἰς μῶρ' ἄκω-
λύτους ἀνεφωμέν' ἱμέρῳ? cf. Eur. *Tro.* 983.
κωλύουσ' is exactly contrary to the sense.

Agam. 71 παραθέλει without τις is strange: παραθέλεις?

219 πατρώους παρθενοσφάγουσιν |
χέρας μαιῶν βοαῖς πέλας βωμοῦ: the text
arising through τὸ ἐξῆς with βέεθροις sub-
stituted for βοαῖς.

653 πῶς κενά τοι κακοῖσι συμμίξω?
It is a proverb, Eur. *Ion* 1023.

1181 If πῆμα is the subject (cf.
Hom. *Ψ* 61), perhaps κλύσειν may be right.

1418 Ὁρηκίων γ' ἀημάτων?

Cho. 154 Punctuate πρὸς ἔρυμα τὸδε κακῶν
κεδνῶν τ' ἀπότερον, 'this offering to avert evils
(from Clytemnestra's point of view, v. 42)
and blessings (from ours)': or perhaps καλῶν
κεδνῶν τ' 'to avert (what are not evils, but)
blessings.'

245 Ζεῦ Ζεῦ θεωρὸς τῶνδε πρηγμάτων
γενοῦ. The singular πρηγμάτων was caused,
I suspect, in this way: Archilochus *fragm.*
88 ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, κτέ. continued thus: καὶ
νῦν θεωρὸς τῶνδε πρηγμάτων γενεῦ (cf. Hes.
Op. 267 πάντα ἰδὼν sqq.), and this the scribe
remembered.

284 ὀρῶντα λαμπρόν, ἐν σκότῳ νωμῶντ'
ὀφρῶν is, I think, an illustrative quotation
on the following line, τὸ γὰρ σκοτεινὸν . . .

316 τύχοιμ' αὖ 'καθεν would account
for the MS.

491 πέδαις δ' ἀχαλκείοις γ'

835 Perhaps φόνιον ἄταν τίθης (or
τιθεῖς), τὸν αἴτιον δ' ἐξαπολλύεις

863 b <καὶ δώματ' ἀνὴρ> Mention
of the House is required, and a subject to
the verb: first comes the vague description
ἀνὴρ, then the proper name 'Ὀρέστης follows
in the second clause with telling emphasis, a
poetical device I have remarked before; e.g.
Supp. 542-9, *O.C.* 675-9, Pindar and
Bacchylides often.

ΔΝ

999 ΤΟΙΟΥΤΟΝΙΚΤΗC ΔΙΤΟ

would account for the MS., i.e. τοιοῦτον εἰ
κτῆσται with a mistaken Δν superscribed.

Eum. 213 καὶ παρ' οὐδὲν ἥρκε τις? cf. 849.

338 θνατῶν τοῖσιν (or θνατῶν γ' οἷσιν
cf. 350) αὐτουργίαι ξυμπαγῶσιν μάταιοι would
be the smallest change. But I cannot find
that συμπαγήναι was ever used to mean
agglutinated to something else; it always
means compact in itself, 'congealed,' 'coagu-
lated': and I do not think the meaning
could be *qui concretam labem habeant*.

484 πέμπειν ἀμηνίως τε.

485 φόνων δικαστάς, ὀρκίων αἰδου-
μένους <θέμιν as ὀρκίων θέμιν *Agam.* 1432, I
will select, and form> θεσμόν (a court or
institution), τὸν εἰς ἅπαντ' ἐγὼ θήσω χρόνον
which I will establish in perpetuity: cf. 617,
686. αἰδουμένους Prie: cf. 683, 713.

667 b e.g. <οὐ κοινολέκτροις ἐν
γάμοις ἐσταρμένῃ> as Coluthus 180 of
Athena: ἦν γάμος οὐκ ἔσπειρε καὶ οὐ μαιώσατο
μήτηρ.

941 φλοιγμός M probably through
φλοισμός. Cf. Heraclitus in Plut. *Mor.*
370 D.

947 If γόνος πλουτόχθων means
'earth-produce' generally (Πλούτων, *Ops*,
Δημήτηρ ὀμπνία, πλούτου μητέρα Δήμητρα
scolion, Hesych. πλούτος, εὐπλουτον κανοῖν,
etc.), γόνος <δὲ τὼς> πλουτόχθων would be
exactly like *Supp.* 699 and 678, a chorus
much resembling this. In each case τὼς, by
knitting the sentences together, avoids the
monotony of a mere catalogue, and Aeschylus
is studious of such variety (cf. *Supp.* 715,
Cho. 301). As in *Supp.* 699 he says 'May
the land yield her due of fruit with produce
in all seasons, and thus may their grazing
cattle prove prolific,' so here, instead of say-
ing 'and may there also be abundance of
treasure-trove,' he would imply it by saying
'and thus (i.e. by their crops and cattle
thriving) may there be plenteous produce of
the boon Earth to reward the God of Trover's
gift' with sacrifices.

There is no error, as has commonly been
thought, in *Eum.* 68, 688, *P.V.* 818: in all
these passages the construction is never
grammatically completed, but designedly
allowed to lapse forgotten after parenthetic
clauses introduced by relatives. This, too,
I take to be the explanation of the super-
fluous τε in *Agam.* 99 and *Supp.* 490: the
sentences begin as though another τε or καί
were to follow, but it never does, because
the clauses intervening are supposed to have

put it out of mind; a parenthesis usurps the place of the main sentence. It is studied carelessness, to resemble the irregularity of actual speech, like the 'nominativus pendens' which Aeschylus is so fond of using.

Frag. 258 καὶ ψευδόδειπνα . . . ἐρρυσιασ οἶον MS. ἐρρυσιάσθη Kaibel: ἐρρυσιάσθη as ἀφῆρέθη?

In *Soph. fr.* 234. 7 δέιλη δὲ πᾶσα τέμνεται βλαστομένη | καλῶς ὁπώρα no alteration of

βλαστομένη seems probable, unless it was κλαστομένη i.e. κλασταζομένη: see *Ar. Eq.* 166 schol. and κλάσις, Phot. κλᾶν ἀμπελόν: τὸ τέμνειν.

Soph. fr. 612 One may suspect that Sophocles said not πολύκουνον Ἀμφιτρίταν but πολυκύμον' Ἀμφιτρίταν, the epithet of the sea in Solon, Empedocles and a fragment in Suidas πολυκύμονος θαλάσσης: cf. *Hom.* γ 91, μ 60.

W. HEADLAM.

THE PARODOS OF SOPHOCLES' *ANTIGONE*.

THE choral passages of Sophocles particularly in the *Antigone* are distinguished by an elaborate harmonic arrangement of ideas and figures, which however delicately presented or suggested, betrays to careful inspection a highly conscious and almost artificial analysis. In marked contrast hereto, the current interpretations of the parodos of the *Antigone* yield a lack of balance in the ideas, a confusion of the imagery, and an absence of all unity of plan. The belief that all this is the fault of the interpretations and not of the parodos instigates the writing of this paper.

Leaving out of account the final anapaestic system, which heralds the appearance of Creon, the subject matter of the ode proper is set forth in seven stanzas, four strophes (or antistrophes) with three alternating anapaestic systems. The first stanza (i.e. the first strophe) welcomes the beams of the rising sun, dispelling the terrors of the night, bringing peace to the battle-leagured town, —'fairest light that e'er shone on Thebes of the seven gates, at last hast thou appeared. O lid of golden day.' The seventh stanza (i.e. the second antistrophe), brings the echo hereto in the personal embodiment of *Nike* who advances 'smiling to greet Thebe of the many chariots,' appointing men to forget the battle and strife. In the first, the beams of the sun are driving the white-shielded Argive foe 'a headlong fugitive, prodding him on with ever tightening bit.' In the last, *Nike* as counterpart and exponent of the glad some sun sends the folk of Thebes in festal procession to the temples of their gods. The ἦλθε Νίκη repeats the ἀκτὶς ἀελίου μολοῦσα, as the τῇ πολυαρμάτῃ ἀντιχαεῖσα Θήβα reflects τὸ κάλλιστον ἑπταπύλῳ φανέν Θήβα.

Framed between these two stanzas, which

reveal the spiritual attitude of the song and yield the atmosphere of the picture,—which voice the exceeding joy of light out of darkness and of victory out of impending defeat,—stands the body of the ode, the five central stanzas, which tell the story of the battle itself. The battle is presented in its three phases, the onslaught of the foe, the even-matched struggle, the sudden discomfiture and rout of the Argive at the moment when his triumph seemed sure. The story is not told, however, as a continuous narrative, but is fashioned rather as a thrice-told tale. Stanzas two and three tell it all,—onslaught, struggle, and rout,—under the figure of the conflict between the white-winged eagle and the serpent. Then stanzas four and five tell it again, onslaught, struggle, and rout, but under another figure, and introduce the second tale as an explanation or epexegetis of the first. Of this epexegetis the particle γάρ of line 127 is the symbol. Thereupon again stanza six begins the tale, this time without figure and in the directer language of fact: 'For seven captains at the seven gates arrayed, equals matched against equals,' but again introducing it as epexegetis of the preceding with the particle γάρ of line 141. Three times under three forms or figures the onslaught has been set forth, each time with use of an anapaestic system.

The third form of the statement, namely that of stanza six, which as we have seen, reaches at last the plain language of fact, lays its stress on the even matching of strength against strength, man against man; it is 'seven against seven,' 'equal against equal'; yea, with one of the pairs the contest is even matched to the extent of πατὴρ ἐνὸς μητρὸς τε μῖα, and therefrom arises no issue of victory; with them the battle remains drawn; forever evenly matched