

humanitas

Vol. IV

IMPrensa DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA
COIMBRA UNIVERSITY PRESS

FACULDADE DE LETRAS DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA
INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS CLÁSSICOS

HUMANITAS

VOL. IV (NOVA SÉRIE, VOL. I)



COIMBRA
MCMLII

TWO NOTES ON AESCHYLUS, *PROM. VINCT.*

I

11. 425-35

f μόνον δε πρόσθεν άλλον εν πόνοις 425
δαμέντ³ [άδαμαντοδέτοις
Τιτάνα λνμιας] είσιδόμαν θεόν,
Ἄτλανθ³ δς [alèn] νπέροχον σθένοσ κραταιόν,
... ουράνιόν τε πόλον
νώτοις ύποσχενάξει. f 430

βοα δε πόντιοσ κλνδων
ζνμπίτων, στένει βνθοσ,
κελαινόσ [<S>] Ἄιδοσ νποζρέμει μνχόσ γασ,
παγαί Οἰγνορύτων ποταμών
στένουσιν άλγιοσ οίκτρον. 435

This passage occurs after two regular antistrophic odes at the end of the first stasimon of the play. I have transcribed it as it appears in Murray's text. Wilamowitz, more or less following Badham, excises *μόνον...νώτοις*; puts a full stop before *νποσθενάξει*, and takes that verb with the next sentence, expelling *βοα*, presumably as a gloss.

In the first part of the stasimon the chorus expresses its sympathy with the sufferings of Prometheus (397-405), and then (406-24) enumerates other *human* sympathizers throughout the world. In 431-5 it seems to describe the sympathy of *nature*. Why does it, from 425-30, turn aside to consider the case of Atlas? Further, what about the metrical aspect of the passage? «425-30 num vv. 431-435 respondere debeant dubium» says Murray in his critical note. If they do *not* correspond, then we must regard the passage as *asepodic*. Epodes are not commonly used by Aeschylus, though three seem to occur in the

Persae and we apparently have one in the next passage which will be considered (901-7). But 428-30 and 433-5 are metrically so alike that we are almost driven to believe that corresponsion was intended.

This was the view of Hermann who arranged the text of the first six lines thus:

μόνον δε πρόσθεν [ἄλλον] ἐν πόνοις
 δαμέντ⁵ ἄδαμαντοδέτοις Τιτάνα λνμ -
 αἰς εσειδόμαν θεών
⁵Ἀτλαντος [αἶεν] νπέροχον σθένος κραταῖόν,
 <δς γαν> ουράνιόν τε πόλον
 νότοῖζ νποστεγάζει.

This gives good sense and, if we accept the excision of δ⁵ in 433, perfect corresponsion; but it involves us in postulating, with Hermann, a now lost line in the antistrophe between 431 and 432 to correspond to 1. 426. It cannot be said that this is impossible, but it seems unlikely. Further, the metre of his 1. 426 is in itself very odd; and, again, ἄδαμαντοδέτοις λνμαις looks like an echo of the same phrase in 1. 149, and *Τπανα* is surely, as Murray suggests, a gloss on *θεόν*. (Hermann's *θεών* is the reading of Φ). If we excise these three redundant words and make a transposition we get:

μόνον δε πρόσθεν ἐν πόνοις
 θεόν εσειδόμαν δαμέντ|
⁵Ἀτλαντος νπέροχον, κ. τ. λ.

In 1. 425 δέ is, according to Sidgwick (there is nothing about it in the apparatus of either Murray or Wilamowitz), the reading of the *recentiores*; ἄλλον is regarded by Wilamowitz as a gloss, and *θεόν* [*nisi leg. θεών* (= *θεων*, by synizesis)] will — unless it, too, is to be regarded as a case of synizesis — give us an opening tribrach, *θεόν έσ-*, = the trochee ζνμίτν-. As to the form *εσειδόμαν*, it is to be preferred to *είσιδόμαν*, for Aeschylus, though he writes *είσοραν*, etc., uses *εσ-* in compounds of the aorist, e.g. 1. 141 *είδεσθ* (*). It is true that the aorist *indicative* is not found in any of his plays, but *έσειδον* occurs at Soph., *El.* 1264.

(*) *είαιδονσα* is found at *Prom. Vinc.* 695 in a metrically puzzling bit of chorus,

A word may perhaps be added on two further points: (1) *σθένοσ*. To read, as Wecklein does, *σθένοσ κραταιόν <γαίας> ουράνιον τε πόλον* and translate it «the mighty weight of the earth and the heaven above» is impossible, for the simple reason that *σθένοσ* cannot mean *weight*. Hermann's <δς γχν> is as near certain as anything in this vexed passage can be. (2) *ύποστεγάζει*. Surely this, a conjecture of Hermann's confirmed by a correction in the Laurentian MS., B, is right against the vulgate *νποστενάζει*. *νποστενάζειν*, found in tragedy only at Soph., *Aj.* 322 and 1001 means «to groan gently». There is, of course, no intrinsic reason why it should not mean «to groan beneath»; but if it did so it should govern not an accusative but a dative — cf. such a verb as *νποστεναχίζειν*; *γαία δ'νπεστενάχιζε Διί* (B. 781). Even supposing *νποστενάζειν* could be followed by an accusative, the word *νότοις* would have no construction. The argument against *ύποστεγάζει* is that the uncompounded verb *στεγάζειν* and its parent, *στέγειν*, meant in fifth century Greek «to cover», not «to support» — a meaning never acquired by *στεγάζειν* and by *στέγειν* only towards the end of the fourth century. This argument seems to me countered by an appeal to Aesch. *fr.* 312, where (it emanates from Athenaeus 11. 491 A) we read that the children of Atlas lamented their father's *αθλον ουρανοστεγη*, «his heaven-supporting ordeal». Wilamowitz, who was nothing if not thorough, and who adheres in the *Prometheus* passage to *νποστενάζει*, «emended» this citation of Athenaeus to *ουρανου στέγι*, a reading which he doubtless could, though I can not, translate.

However, even if these suggestions are accepted, we are still left with the problem: why is the reference to Atlas inserted here by the chorus who then return to the subject of Prometheus? «Diseases desperate grown, By desperate appliance are relieved, Or not at all»; and I believe that here what I shall call *στροφή γ* and *αντίστροφη γ* have got positionally interchanged, and that we should take *βοα δε πόντιοσ κλνδων*, κ. τ. λ. as the *στροφή* and *μόνον οδ πρόσθεν*, κ. τ. λ. as the *άντιστροφή*.

II

11. * 901-7

Murray prints the text thus:

<i>εμοι δ'δτε μεν ομαλός ο γάμος,</i>	[επωδ. 901
<i>αμοζος* δν δε δέδια, μή</i>	
<i>κρεισσόνων θεών ερωσ</i>	
<i>αφνκτον δμμα προσδράκοι με.</i>	904
<i>απόλεμος δδε γ'ο πόλεμος, άπορα πόριμος" οὐδ⁵ 904 A</i>	
<i>εχω τις αν γενοίμαν</i>	905
<i>τάν Α ιός γάρ ονχ όρώ</i>	
<i>μήτιν δπα φνγοιμαν.</i>	

902 δν δε δέδια μή Headlam: *ον δέδια μηδε* codd.

Hermann, attempting to make these lines an antistrophic system, gives us for the first six lines:

<i>εμοι δ<έ γ'> δτε μεν δμαλος ο γάμος,</i>	στρ. β' 901
<i>αφοζος, ον<δε> δέδια* μή δέ <τον με></i>	
<i>κρεισσόνων θεών ερωσ</i>	
<i>προσδράκοι ομμ' αφνκτον [με],</i>	904
<i>απόλεμος δδε γ'δ πόλεμος, άπορα</i>	άντ. β' 904 _A
<i>πόριμος" ονδ'εχω τις αν γενοίμαν</i>	905 "

It is not easy to see how these various corruptions occurred, but even supposing they did, what is the metrical result? Hermann's 1. 901 = 1. 904 A is, if there is such a thing, a hypermetric iambic dimeter, or a catalectic iambic pentapody; his 1. 902 = 1. 905 is a trochaic pentapody with, in the antistrophe, a fifth foot spondee. (This line could, in and for itself, be scanned as a syncopated catalectic trochaic trimeter, ending — -1 — · I — (-), but 1.902 could not). And in 1. 904 he is forced to the scansion *προσδράκοι δμμα*, a metrical rarity. Such violent methods and such metrically unsatisfying results surely force us back to

the view, maintained by Murray, that this bit of chorno is *not* anti-strophic — that it is in fact an epode.

Weil and Wecklein practically rewrite the passage. Setting aside their plastic surgery, what can be made of the sense and metre of these eight lines, or rather of the first four, for 11. 904 A-7 seem metrically and semantically unexceptionable?

Save for the last (choriambic) line we clearly have an iambotrochaic system, though 1. 902 is in the MSS. unmetrical, and 1. 904 hyper-metric — unless we can take it *προσδράκοί μ*[ε\;απόλεμος...* The sense is clear, except for the word *ερωζ*. To translate *μή ερωζ ομμα αφνκτον προσδράκοί με* as «may love not cast his inescapable eye on me» is, one would have thought, impossible; and if *ερωζ* is retained at all it should surely be retained in the form *ερω* «with love». So Bothe: «may the eye of... not view me amatorially».

To excise *ον δέδια*, as does Wecklein, seems arbitrary: *dédia* is no glossator's word. Worse still is Wilamowitz's ejection of *αφοζος*. What reader could require a gloss on *ον δέδια*? The *μεν* of 1. 901 demands a *δε*; but neither the MSS. *μηδέ* nor Hermann's *μή δε*, even if they were metrically possible, could stand grammatically. For *μεν...μή δε* (or *μηδέ*) I can find no parallel in Attic. Denniston (*Greek Particles*, p. 191) quotes *Ω* 25: *ενθ'αλλοις μεν πασιν εήδανεν, ούδέποθ' "Ηρη*. But this is epic. Headlam indeed supplies a grammatical *δε*; but can *ον* (— *γάμον*) *δε δέδια, μή ερωζ* — or even *μή ομμα* (if we excise *ερωζ*) — *προσδράκοί με* be translated? «But what <marriage> I fear <is> lest...»?

Good sense and metre could be got without much violence to the MSS. text by reading:

*εμοί δ'δτε μεν δμαλος δ γάμος,
αφοζος" ον δέδια" <δέδια> δέ
μή<με> κρεισσόνων θεών [ερωζ]
αφνκτον ομμα προσδράκη [με\.*

The second *δέδια* might well drop out by haplography; *δε μή* might become *μηδέ*; *ερωζ*, a gloss on *ομμα*, might intrude, *προσδράκη* might have become *προσδράκοί* by itacism; but it is more likely that the subjunctive was changed to the optative deliberately by some scribe who, after the second *δέδια* had fallen out, regarded the *μή* as introducing a wish and in consequence supplied what he (lightly, from his point

of view) regarded as the correct mood. It is clear that Headlam did not object to the false sequence *δέδια...μή... προσδράκοι*; but such few instances of this as survive have, probably rightly, been corrected: e.g. Soph. *Aj.* 278,9 *δέδοικα μή ⁵κ τον θεον\πληγή τις ήκοι*, where editors, following the *recentiores*, give *ήκει*. (Cf. Kiihner-Gerth, 11. ii, p. 394).

Brasenose College: Oxford.

MAURICE PLATNAUER

Vice-Principal of Brasenose College