



Sophocles' Trachiniae: Discussions of Some Textual Problems

A. Y. Campbell

The Classical Quarterly, New Series, Vol. 8, No. 1/2. (May, 1958), pp. 18-24.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%28195805%292%3A8%3A1%2F2%3C18%3ASTDOST%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M>

The Classical Quarterly is currently published by The Classical Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/classical.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOPHOCLES' *TRACHINIAE*: DISCUSSIONS OF SOME TEXTUAL PROBLEMS

136-8

ἄ καὶ σὲ τὰν ἀνασσαν ἐλπίσιν λέγω
τάδε' αἰὲν ἴσχειν ἐπεὶ τίς κτλ.

That *τάδε* after that *ἄ* is just too ghastly. Jebb's citations are no parallels; the difference is that *ἄ* ('as to which things'—J.) and *τάδε* ('that prospect'—J.) have both precisely the same reference. Read *παλαι'* *ἐνίσχειν* 'which reflections . . . time-honoured as they are'. In this well-known construction a term (often substantive, sometimes adjective) which logically belongs to the antecedent is deferred and inserted¹ in the relative clause—'for emphasis' (M. Tierney, rightly, on E. *Hec.* 771). Cf. E. *Or.* 854 *λόγους ἀκουσον οὓς σοι δυστυχεῖς ἤκω φέρων*. Neuter plurals, it so happens, are not common, but cf. in this play 494 *ἄ τ' ἀντι δώρων δῶρα χρῆ προσαρμόσαι, καὶ ταῦτ' ἄγης. παλαιά* will here be used in the sense of *ἀρχαῖος* (*λόγος*) in line 1; cf. Pind. *Ol.* 7. 54 *ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ ῥήσιες*; and so with *λόγος* Pl. *Gorg.* 499 c, *παροιμία Ref.* 329 a. *ἐνίσχειν* itself is an improvement upon *ἴσχειν*, cf. *Ani.* 897 *ἐν ἐλπίσιν τρέφω*. For a somewhat similar sense—or should I say situation?—cf. Aesch. *P.V.* 317 *ἀρχαί' ἴσως σοι φαίνομαι λέγειν τάδε*.

322-8

ΑΙ. οὐ τᾶρα τῶ γε πρόσθεν οὐδὲν ἐξ ἴσου
χρόνῳ διήσει γλώσσαν, ἥτις οὐδαμὰ
προύφηγεν οὔτε μείζον' οὔτ' ἐλάσσονα,
ἀλλ' αἰὲν ὠδίνουσα συμφορᾶς βάρος
δακρυρροεῖ δύστηνος, ἐξ ὅτου πάτραν
327 διήνεμον λέλοιπεν ἢ δέ τοι τύχη
κακῇ μὲν αὐτῇ γ', ἀλλὰ συγγνώμην ἔχει.

328 *αὐτῇ γ' ἀλλὰ* Ven b; *αὐτῇ γ' ἀλλὰ* LA rec; *αὐτῇ γ' ἀλλὰ* Lb; *ἀλλ' αὐτῇ γε* Platt.

So Pearson's text and apparatus. The vulgate, however, is not this, but L's and A's *αὐτῇ γ'*, accepted by (e.g.) Dindorf-Mekler (Teubner), Jebb, Masqueray (Budé 1924), Dain (Budé 1955). And other emendations relevant to the general issue are—*αὐτῇ*, *τᾶλλα* Reiske; *αὐτῇ 'στ'* Hartung; *αὐτῇ 'στ'* Heimsoeth; *ἔκλινεν αὐτήν' ἀλλὰ συγγνώμην ἔχει* Hilberg; *αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ* Wecklein.

Although they had not hitherto been introduced to one another, there are actually two problems here: a minor (A) of expression, a major (B) of sense. B has been mooted, by some few faced honestly, and finally (as so often) ignored; yet it remains true that 'to make any sense' of the traditional text is, as Platt said (*C.Q.* iv. 162) 'impossible'. A as such, i.e. in relation to this passage, has not been noticed.

(A) Denniston, who rightly treats (*Greek Particles*, p. 159) *μὲν γε* and *μὲν . . . γε* as in effect the same, says (in ed. 2 as in ed. 1) that apart from the suspected 'Eur. *Fr.*' 909. 4 there would seem to be no example at all in Tragedy. He had overlooked this. On the other hand, the one editor (Blaydes) whose printed

¹ Generally rather late, as here; but sometimes in the forefront of (yet syntactically within) the rel. clause, as at *Tr.* 283; and this is the simple explanation of Virgil's

(*Aen.* 1. 573) *urbem quam statuo, uestra est*; add it therefore to Jebb's parallels for *O.T.* 449.

text, and the five critics (see above) whose conjectures, involve the suppression here of $\gamma\epsilon$, were not aware of any such general embargo. If we should find that both sides independently guessed better than they knew, it will obviously be significant.

(B) Jebb, who renders $\kappa. \mu. \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta \gamma\epsilon$ 'grievous for herself', explains (and so previously Wunder) 'ἡ τύχη, not the doom of captivity, but rather her present condition of mute and inconsolable grief'. But however was anybody, Greek or modern, to know that? All others, from the scholiast down to the Budé of 1955, have taken $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ in its only possible sense, as precisely Iole's 'doom of captivity'; Platt, l.c., in explicit protest against Jebb. Yet that does not work. Obviously we should then require in place of the 'but' an 'and'; as witness, for example, *O.C.* 1014–15 $\delta \xi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma, \acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\xi, \chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma. \alpha\acute{\iota} \delta\acute{\epsilon} \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omicron\rho\alpha\iota | \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma, \acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\alpha\iota \delta' \acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\nu\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$.¹ The fatal word for this sense of $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ is just $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$. And those who have tried to circumvent this fact have failed. Hilberg's $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ is entirely idiomatic; but what precedes it is no more idiomatic than neat. Reiske's $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$ is too vague.

What is, in fact, quite intolerable at this point in this play and this speech is the statement (even if there were no fatuous $\tau\omicron\iota\iota$ to enforce the obvious²) that Iole's is an unhappy fate. After what Deianira has said as far back as 243, and again at 298–313, and after what Lichas himself has said at 284, both stage and auditorium have grasped this fact. And Lichas is naturally referring to what he himself has just described.

Jebb, sensitive to drama, realized (after Wunder) the impossibility of such a comment, and they are clearly right about the sense required; but Iole's grief is not a $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$. What her not unkindly guard thinks reprehensible in this captive princess 'and yet understandable' is her fastidiousness, delicacy, inability to face the inevitable and endure rough treatment. The word he will have used³ is $\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\acute{\eta}$. That is how a male Greek would see it; witness—*mutatis mutandis*, naturally—the comment attributed to Aeschines in *Dem. F.L.* 196–7, where after her city's capture a well-bred and decent Olynthian woman, forced by him into a men's drinking party, is terrified by their demands and reduced to great distress ($\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\sigma\eta\varsigma$): $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota . . . \alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\tau\omicron\nu \omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu \tau\rho\upsilon\phi\acute{\eta}\nu$.

The best way to complete this sentence now would (in my view) be the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tau\eta$ of Ven. b plus the 'στ' of Hartung; though Wecklein's unemphatic $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ is also possible. I see no chance for $\gamma\epsilon$; with $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tau\eta$ it would be meaningless, with $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tau\acute{\eta}$ ('bad in itself') too analytical for this speaker (*Ant.* 319 and 323 come from an eccentric). Thus Denniston's embargo would appear to be confirmed.

I have even three other reasons for my confidence in $\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\acute{\eta}$. (i) That this is how Sophocles would present such a series of ideas can be seen from *El.* 254–7 $\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\upsilon\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu, \acute{\omega} \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\varsigma, \epsilon\acute{\iota} \delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\omega} | \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota \theta\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\upsilon\sigma\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\nu |$

¹ Denniston, *op. cit.*, p. 162, under $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, says that the sense 'and' preponderates where no $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ precedes, and in such cases there is no essential difference between $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$. Jebb's 'but' here has to be buttressed, in his note by an English supplement 'but (all the more)', in his translation by the misleading 'accurst' for $\pi\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

² Its primary function is to bring home

to the comprehension of the person addressed a truth of which he is ignorant, or temporarily oblivious' (Denniston, *op. cit.*, p. 537).

³ Only two critics have seen that $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ is the source of the trouble, Blaydes (*Addenda*) and Herwerden; the latter (where?) proposed $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\eta$; but $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\eta$ denotes feeling, not behaviour; and I do not believe that $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\eta$ could ever be 'κακή' in this sense.

ἀλλ' ἢ βία γὰρ ταύτ' ἀναγκάζει με δρᾶν, σύγγνωτε. (ii) This comment of a herald upon the difference between Iole's reaction to captivity and that of the other women makes a foil, with typically Sophoclean subtlety, to that of a mature and sensitive woman at 312-13—where Jebb has a finely perceptive note. (iii) Knowing what he does know and intends to conceal from Deianira, Lichas will naturally not say anything to suggest that Iole's *fate* is in itself more distressful than that of the other captive women; and just as naturally, he will attribute the evident difference in behaviour to her character or her previous rank.

393-7

- AI. τί χρή, γύναι, μολόντα μ' Ἡρακλεῖ λέγειν;
 δίδαξον, ὡς ἔρποντος, †εἰσορᾶς†, ἔμοῦ.
 ΔΗ. ὡς ἐκ ταχείας σὺν χρόνῳ βραδεῖ μολῶν
 ἄσσεις, πρὶν ἡμᾶς κἀννεώσασθαι λόγους.
 AI. ἀλλ' εἴ τι χρήζεις ἱστορεῖν, πάρεμι' ἐγώ.

Wakefield's ὡς ὄρᾶς became the *textus receptus* (L. Campbell, Schneidewin-Nauck, Jebb), and I agree that the parenthetic εἰσορᾶς (strangely¹ admitted by Pearson, as also by Masqueray and Dain) is impossibly harsh. Jebb quotes (from Blaydes) three examples of ὡς occurring twice within a single trimeter; but one ὡς-phrase enclosed by another is much more awkward, and of this no example is forthcoming. Neither εἰσορᾶς nor ὡς ὄρᾶς is quite respectful; Lichas is a menial; he very fully acknowledges this in 405-9, and elsewhere he addresses Deianira as δέσποινα (430, 434, 472, 481) and is always deferential; she is in a position to reprove him, 616-17. Either reading is theatrically flat, since if Deianira can see (and hear) the simple fact that Lichas is departing, the audience can observe for themselves that she not only hears but sees. How different by comparison is the natural but subtle use of ὡς ὄρᾶς at 365; and, in a different way, of τάσδε δ' ἄσπερ εἰσορᾶς at 283. The formula is, in fact, employed to draw attention to definitely striking facts; κερατὶς δ', ὡς ὄρᾶτ', Aesch. *P.V.* 674; at *Agam.* 1597 ὡς ὄρᾶς is said with reference to the dead body of A.; and see, for example, E. *Hclid.* 928, where ὄρᾶς μὲν, ἀλλ' ὄμως εἰρήσεται is explained by 930-1, or *I.A.* 913-14 where a lady appears among 'a licentious soldiery'. The emendation is unmethodical, because owing to the abruptness which they involve, the letters εἰσ constitute the odd part, the hard core, of the corruption, and should therefore be retained.

Surely what the dramatist wrote was εἰ σύ γ' ἔᾶς. For the synzesis cf. *Ant.* 95, *O.T.* 1451—see also *O.C.* 1192—Ar. *Lys.* 734, with *Iliad* 5. 256, etc.; and with σ following, *Od.* 21. 233, perhaps also *O.C.* 1192 (ed. Lond. i). This by contrast has point. L. intended merely a polite formula; he did not know that it was to be a tragic crisis, and that leave to depart would for the moment be withheld. Cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1217-18, where the ἄγγελος says to Jocasta τί μ' οὐκ εἴσας ἐξ εὐαγγέλου | φήμης ἀπελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ μνηῦσαι κακά (a similar situation, therefore). And at 329-30, and again at 344, of our own play, the verb is associated, at least, with permission to depart. For the polite formula, cf. (variously) *El.* 554, 632.

¹ One answer to his defence (*C.R.* xxxix (1925), 3) is that a parenthetic ὄρᾶς is not the same thing as a parenthetic εἰσορᾶς; *vous voyez* is not *vous regardez*. Another is that in

the passages quoted the parenthesis has real point; e.g. there is an object to be pointed out, or an object lesson to be enforced.

526-30

† ἐγὼ δὲ μάτηρ μὲν οἶα φράζω†
 τὸ δ' ἀμφινείκητον ὄμμα νύμφας
 ἐλεινὸν ἀμμένει·
 κἀπὸ ματρὸς ἄφαρ βέβαχ',
 ὥστε πόρτις ἐρήμα.

526 is an inorganic series of Greek words. To start by tinkering with *μάτηρ* is little use. The first necessity is to explore for the original construction, and that must involve experiment. Jebb alone has tackled this problem methodically; his second and (still more) third paragraphs are excellently reasoned, and make requirements which must certainly be met. But his *μαργᾶ* is too personal¹ for his *ἀγών*; his *οἶα φράζω* is flat; and since his *μὲν* belongs in fact to his *ἀγών*, what he is saying is really *ἀγών δὲ μὲν μαργᾶ*—a feature of the traditional text which I am still disposed to denounce, as follows.

In Greek you cannot say² *ἐγὼ δὲ μὲν* (you may say *ἐγὼ δὲ*, or *ἐγὼ μὲν*, or *καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν*) *ταῦτα λέγω ὡς μήτηρ*. Hyperbaton of such a *μὲν* will not give it a function. Of course you can say *ἐγὼ δὲ ταῦτα μὲν λέγω ὡς μήτηρ, τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὡς θυγάτηρ*, but that is quite different; all three particles are in true relation to their context; but that is not at all the case here. Twenty-five years ago I suggested that the solecism could be eliminated from this example by reading *ἐγῶδα, μάτηρ μὲν οἶ' ἔφριξεν*. But about that I have since developed three qualms, each I hope worth stating. (i) Mention of the mother here seems to me to weaken the sudden climax, *κἀπὸ ματρὸς ἄφαρ βέβαχ'*; and one has no warrant for the mother's presence, since *ἀπὸ ματρὸς* probably means³ from the mother's tutelage—*tandem desinit matrem*. Indeed *μάτηρ*, so much suspected, might very well be just a scribal repetition of the familiar type. (ii) I am not too happy, even now, about the *μὲν-δέ* antithesis, the mother shuddering, the maiden pathetic;⁴ it seems pointless. (iii) In tragedy the *crisis ἐγῶδα* appears to be confined to the trimeters: Soph. *O.C.* 452, Fr. 566. 4, 649. 44; Eur. *Med.* 39, *I.T.* 544, *Ph.* 716, perhaps *Or.* 546 (Hermann). I had relied on *I.T.* 852, but there it is a metrical supplement, and (? *ἔγωγ' ἄ*, or) Monk's <οἶδ',> οἶδ' may be right.

μάτηρ being wrong, what (alone) then comes into the picture is Zielinski's *θατήρ*, a most appropriate word (cf. Bacchyl. ix. (x.) 23) which both Radermacher and Masqueray promoted to the text. But in the absence of further change this obviously meets neither my main objection nor Jebb's (more important) requirements. Moreover, the sense ('I, however, tell the tale as a spectator', i.e. *as if* I had been, for they demonstrably were not) would be frigid, without parallel, and intrusive—if it were in the Greek. But it is not even there. *οἶα φράζω* construes itself, inevitably; cf. *El.* 334, *O.T.* 701, *Ant.* 693, *Tr.* 535, 897 (1203-6 exclam., and so *Phil.* 928-9), *O.C.* 881, 1428. *οἶα*, used as at 105, is never thus postponed; and *ὡς*, which is (*El.* 234, *Ichn.* 155;

¹ He cites Eur. *H.F.* 1005 *φόνου μαργῶντος ἔσχε*; but corr. Nauck (-ῶντ' ἐπέσχε).

² I dealt with this briefly in a paper (Oxford Philol. Soc., 1931) summarized in *Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.* clx (1935), 5; but I hope to discuss the point more thoroughly later. A neat case is Thuc. 6. 25. 2 *ὁ δὲ ἄκων*

μὲν εἶπεν; but read, with Krueger, *ἄκων μὲν, εἶπε δ'*.

³ So Jebb; similarly Cat. 61. 58-59 is not literal.

⁴ Witness footnote 2 on page 82 of my 1953 ed. of Horace, *Odes*.

Eur. *Phoen.* 835), never has a word¹ thus intervening between itself and its noun. What a tissue of anomalies!

At line 503 the audience will begin to understand, and so also should readers, that they are now to be given the fulfilment of a promise already implicitly made by the poet: 21–23, Deianira speaking, *καὶ τρόπον μὲν ἂν πόνων | οὐκ ἂν διείποιμ'· οὐ γὰρ οἶδ'· ἀλλ' ὅστις ἦν | θακῶν ἀταρβῆς τῆς θέας, ὅδ' ἂν λέγοι.* Sophocles, who in this play has many careful consistencies, was not so scatterbrained as, after writing that, to make these maidens—who are a good deal younger than Deianira, see 141–50—report the bullfight in picturesque detail, and with one striking technicality (520–1), upon their own maidenly authority. If he should now make them describe the terrifying effect upon the *spectators*—the effect of the entire situation 507–25—that would (i) reinforce their whole account with a climax, (ii) obviate any apparent claim to have spoken as eyewitnesses, and (iii) hint nicely at the source of their information.

Now see the value of experiment; indeed, of mistakes. We try first *ἐγὼ δὲ θατήρ<ας> οἴ<δ>α φρίζαι.* No; the emphasis which in any case must fall upon *ἐγὼ* from its position (and its addition to a verb) remains quite unjustified. When a Chorus begins a sentence with *ἐγὼ δὲ* (*Ai.* 600, Eur. *H.F.* 352) or otherwise uses an emphatic *ἐγὼ* (*Phil.* 511, 680; *O.C.* 694; Eur. *Alc.* 962), it expresses a definitely personal view. Between 517 and 530 any *ἐγὼ* is intrusive, and Jebb was right in scenting corruption just here. Our problem can now be solved: <λ>έγοι δὲ θατήρ² ἂν οἴ³ ἐφρίζεν.³ As Deianira had already said, 22–23, *ὅστις ἦν | θακῶν ἀταρβῆς τῆς θέας, ὅδ' ἂν λέγοι*; which shows that there were spectators, and implies that few if any were *ἀταρβῆς*. Moreover, this is how Sophocles writes; cf. *O.T.* 95 *λέγοιμ' ἂν οἴ³ ἤκουσα*; also, in their various degrees, *El.* 334 *δηλώσαιμ' ἂν οἴ³ αὐτοῖς φρονῶ*, and *O.T.* 700–1, *Tr.* 535. Apart from the (typical) substitution of common *μάτηρ* for rare *θατήρ*, the entire corruption was clearly conditioned by the loss of that initial λ; *εγοι* had to be taken for either *ἐμοί* or *ἐγώ*; to fit *ἐγώ*, *φρίζεν* had to be converted into a 1st pers. finite verb. Without its optative, *ἂν* must go; and I still⁴ point to that functionless *μὲν* at *Agam.* 568 as evidence that this supposedly harmless particle was in use as an interpolator's stopgap;⁵ but now for two most peculiar examples of the same device, this time in prose, see a shrewd and learned note by D. E. Eichholz in *C.R.*, n.s. ii. 144 f. *φρίσσω* is a strong word, compare, e.g., *O.T.* 1303–6; and for its use to describe the horror produced by the sight of *bovine monsters* cf. Aesch. *P.V.* 695 (lyr.), Eur. *Hipp.* 1202 with 1214–16. It belongs to the vocabulary of Sophocles, and in particular of this play, 1044 *ἐφρίζα*.

I suggest that what I have now restored lasted at least as long as the age of Ovid. In *Met.* 9, between lines 8 and 280, there are, naturally, numerous and obvious reminiscences of our play; even in detail, e.g. cf. Ovid's 11–12 with *Tr.* 10, he asked her father; and it is most remarkable that the only ancient description which we possess of the *ἀμφίπλευτοι κλίμακες* of this stasimon is Ovid's in 52–61. Corresponding to *Tr.* 517–22 we have 44–45; and then the

¹ Except, naturally, *δέ*; *μάτηρ δ' ὡσεὶ τις*, Eur. *Tro.* 146.

² Or *θατήρ γ' ἂν*?

³ Or *οἶα φρίζεν*? Augments are omitted at 499, 515, 516.

⁴ As in the summary referred to (p. 21 n. 2).

⁵ P.S. I have just noticed that Blaydes in his *Addenda* wrote: 'The *μὲν* is evidently not required here.'

counterpart to *Tr.* 523–5 follows in 46–49. Our metamorphoser has, indeed, elected to transform this into a simile; but I am hardly the less inclined to point with some confidence to the two words emphasized in the following extract. 'Non aliter uidi fortes concurrere tauros, cum pretium pugnae toto nitidissima saltu expetitur coniunx; *spectant* armenta *pauentque*, nescia quem maneat tanti uictoria regni.' Even if our words had already been corrupted, that represents the sort of rational thing that most ancient poets would have written.

555

ἦν μοι παλαιὸν δῶρον ἀρχαίου ποτέ | θηρός.

παλαιόν, ἀρχαίου, ποτέ: some padding! The sentimentality which Jebb's note attributes to Deianira would be irrelevant here; she is not 'sad' but worried, and in 554–87 is concerned to state all material facts. The feeblest word is ποτέ, which cannot go with ἦν, and must therefore go with ἀρχαίου; but surely, once an ancient monster, always an ancient monster. Jebb records three conjectures for ἀρχαίου. Has nobody yet seen that what it overlaid was ἀνταίου?—'a monster once a foe'. Cf. *A. Cho.* 587 κνωδάλων ἀνταίων. The ominous undertone would not be lost on an Athenian audience; ἐχθρῶν ἄδωρα δῶρα κοῦκ ἀνήσιμα, that too is Sophocles.

907–11. I am sorry to see Miss Dale advocating (*C.R.*, n.s. vi. 106) Wecklein's unmethodical and detrimental excision of these five lines, and saying that they 'are not to be improved by tinkering with a word or two'. ἄπαιδας οὐσίας is not Greek, and in any context would have to be improved. The fundamental fault is with the traditional and all editorial texts of the preceding context; 903 is fatuously inconsistent not *only* with 907–11 but with 904 (where then *were* the altars?) and, for that matter, with 905–6. And even apart from Deianira's movements, how can the Nurse herself say 903 when her own observations—even within 904–6—stultify it? Decades ago I placed 903, with ἐμαντήν for ἐαντήν, after 914—to find, of course, that the correction had been made already; by Hense, *Studien zu S.* (Leipzig 1880), pp. 209–12, three pages all worth reading. As for 911, what had Pearson (*C.R.* xxxix. 4–5, a series of—mostly—extraordinary statements) and Housman (*ibid.* 78) been thinking of when they read their Jebb at this point? Jebb's τῆς ἐπ' ἄλλοις removes the difficulty and makes perfect sense; and that it is the right solution is shown by his citation of Eur. *H.F.* 337–8 in his generally excellent note. (But it would have been better to say 'when the master was (not 'and mistress were') dead', since Deianira's prospective suicide is obviously her own secret.) ἐπ' ἄλλοις is consistent with γένονται ἔρημοι (905 Nauck's correction, rec. Jebb) which indicates an—of course, temporary—vacancy.

1018–19

ὦ παῖ τοῦδ' ἀνδρός, τοῦργον τόδε μείζον †ἀνήκει†
ἢ κατ' ἐμὴν ῥώμαν σὺ δὲ σύλλαβε, σοὶ †τε γὰρ ὄμμα
ἐμπλεον ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ σώζειν.†

Naturally, the latter of the two areas above enclosed in obeli has caused an immense amount of trouble; see Jebb's Appendix; add J. Jackson, *Marg. Scaen.*, pp. 205–6, a grotesque proposal;¹ and for the latest extraordinary

¹ In making the old man address to the young this breezy British exhortation, Jackson does not seem to have given a thought to

the reproachful and despairing tones of all three of the speaker's previous admonitions.

reconstruction and its perhaps still more extraordinary translation see the new (1955) Budé. Jebb's second paragraph on p. 150 is incontrovertible; it led him to the emendation σοὶ γὰρ ἐτοίμα, which he placed in the text, following it with Meineke's clear correction ἐς πλέον. Jebb's emendation is methodical, and salutary—so far as it goes; I could have made no progress at all without it.

The master-key to this complex has not hitherto been observed. μείζον ἀνήκει is itself unsatisfactory, and not less so after Jebb's defence. A scribe had confused the end of 1018 with that of 1019, causing the next scribe to transpose them. For the rest, σοὶ ἐς πλέον ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ is harsh, and unexampled; the proper construction, which is already here in words, can be implemented by reading (with a sense made possible by my reconstruction) ἤδη for ἢ δι'. All will now run smoothly and lucidly: τοῦργον τόδε μείζον ἔτ', οἶμαι, ἢ κατ' ἐμὴν ῥώμαν· σὺ δὲ σύλλαβε, σοὶ γὰρ ἀνήκει ἐς πλέον ἤδη ἐμοῦ σῶζειν, 'for it is now "up" to you [this is slang for us, but in sense exact] to do more for him than I can'. Cf. Hdt. 6. 109. 4 ἐς σὲ ἀνήκει 'it devolves upon you', corresponding to ἐν σοὶ νῦν ἐστὶ ibid. 3 and ἐς σὲ νῦν τείνει ibid. 6. (For my οἶμαι anyone who likes may read οἴμοι, but the former seems to me to suit the subdued tone.)

(P.S. 1046 †καὶ λόγῳ κακά†. In *Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.* clxxi. 26–27 I proposed καὶ λόγῃς ἀκμῆ. By inadvertence I omitted from my parallels 856–9 of this play itself, λόγχα . . . αἰχμᾶ.)

Cambridge

A. Y. CAMPBELL

[Readers of the *Classical Quarterly* will have heard with sorrow of the death of Professor Campbell. He corrected the proofs of the above article shortly before he died.]