(and/or the coin) so represented him. Moreover, since senile blindness is usually irreversible, the tale of Stesichoros’ recovery cannot pertain to his senile blindness; it can pertain only to earlier attacks of (reversible) hysterical blindness. His permanent senile blindness was, for obvious reasons, not mentioned by the purveyors of edifying tales: it would have destroyed the hearer’s faith in the usefulness of “repentance”.

Antony (France)  George Devereux

AESCYLUS PROMETHEUS VINCTUS

425-435

†μόνον δὴ πρόσθεν ἄλλον ἐν πόνοις
damént' ákamantodétous
Τιτάνα λήμας εἰσιάδόμαν, θεόν
"Ἀτλανθ', δς αἰεὶν ὑπέροχον σθένος κραταίων
... οὐδόνιον τε πόλον
νότοις ὑποστενάζει;†

βοᾷ δὲ πόντιος κλόδων
ξυμπίτων, στένει βυθός,
κελαινός [δ'] "Αίδος ὑποβολεῖ μνηχός γᾶς,
παγαί δ’ ἀγνόυτων ποταμῶν
στένουσιν ἄλγος οἴκτρῶν.

425 δὴ] δὲ Ο, fort. Ο buit δεῖ ἄλλων] ita MCOabcPde ἄλλων ΟΚΒΗ
ΔYaΝ 426 ἀκαμαντοδέτους] ἀκαμαντοδέτους CIac, corr. Ι" 428 ὑπέροχον]
ita HB ὑπέροχον fere codd. 430 ὑποστενάζει] ita Babc et rell. ὑποστενάζει
B1pe 432 βυθός] βαθὺς MH βυθὸς V 433 δ’ seclusit Lachmann

The text given is that of Murray* (OCT 2nd. ed., 1955); the apparatus criticus is selected from the collation of Dawe (The Collation and Investigation of the Manuscripts of Aeschylus, CUP 1964, pp. 215–16), to whose work the reader is referred for a

*Although the author was unfortunately unable to make use of Page’s 1972 OCT, the reader will see that Page still describes vv. 425-430 as desperati.

complete apparatus and for an explanation of the symbols employed.

Many and varied have been the solutions offered of this vexed passage, including partial and wholesale excision. Those ‘solutions’ which have a direct bearing on my own interpretation will be noted below: for the others see Dawe and for the older material see Wecklein’s Appendix. The solution which I offer is based on the assumption that vv. 425–435 constitute strophe and antistrophe γ of this stasimon. This assumption seems at least probable in the light of the close metrical responson which can be established with relatively little tampering with the traditional text.

To begin with 431–435: if we read βαθύς with MH and remove the comma after ξύμπλητνων (‘the wave of the sea falling in answer to the cry groans from its depths’) and accept Lachmann’s excision of δ’, we then have a metrical scheme, mostly iambic, with one line which may best be described as aeolic with ‘dactylic expansion’ of the choriambic nucleus, by which to guide our approach to vv. 425–30. Thus

| 431 | - - - - - - | iambic dimeter |
| 432 | - - - - - - | lekythion |
| 433 | - - - - - - | iambic trimeter catalectic |
| 434 | - - - - - - | aeolic |
| 435 | - - - - - - | iambic dimeter catalectic. |

Let us now turn to vv. 425–30 and endeavour to establish strophic responson with as little textual disturbance as possible:

(i) 425: responson with 431 is obtained simply by altering δη to δέ and by cutting ἀλλων as an unnecessary explanatory gloss. The reading in Oαε may possibly have been δέ (not δει); and the gloss in B (quoted by Wilamowitz in his apparatus), σοῦ ἡ τῶν ἀλλων, may be the origin of the mss. readings ἀλλον/ἀλλων.

1) Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus, Leiden (E. J. Brill), 1965, p.17.
2) Hermann was the first to introduce strophic responson in this passage.
3) See D. S. Raven, Greek Metre (Faber and Faber), 1962, 143.
(ii) 426–7: if we accept Heimsoeth’s excision of ἄκαμαντοδέτος Τιτάνα λύμας as an intrusion from v. 148, with θεὸν glossed 
Τιτάνα,[5) the remaining δαμέντ’ εἰσιδόμαν gives a trochee in 
the second foot. But this can easily be repaired by reading 
ἐσειδόμαν (so Hermann). We then have a full iambic dimer 
corresponding to a lekythion (i.e. a syncopated iambic 
dimeter), for which cf. Septem 330 ~ 342[6])

δ’ ἐκκενονυμένα πόλις
~ δὲ χραίνεται πόλισμ’ ἀπαν

(iii) 428–30: here we have the crux of the matter. Apart from 
any problem of responsion, there is the obvious difficulty 
of the uncoordinated τε. Longman[7) cites Hermann in sup-
port of his view that ‘a reference to Atlas supporting the 
eth’ was to be expected in the context, and would explain 
the τε after οὐράνιον’, and quotes Od. i 53–54

ἐχει δὲ τε κίονας αὖτὸς 
μακρὰς, αἱ γαῖάν τε καὶ οὐρανον ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι.

and PV 349–50

ἐστηκε κίον’ οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθόνος 
ὦμος ἑρείδων.

Longman is led to suggest

Ἀτλαντὸς ὑπέροχον σθένος
δς καὶ γαῖων οὐρανίων τε πόλων
νώτοις ὑποστεγάζει.

and claims that ‘indeed γαῖων οὐρανίων τε πόλων is equivalent to 
κίον’ οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθόνος’. But is γαῖων οὐρανίων τε πόλων ὑποστε-
γάζειν the same as κίον’ οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθόνος ἑρείδειν? If it is, 
then presumably the picture is of Atlas supporting the pillar 
between heaven and earth. But there is some confusion here: 
for Longman has already stated and concurred with Hermann’s

5) At the very least ἄκαμαντοδέτος/ἄδαμαντοδέτος must go, since At-
las is nowhere represented as being bound: cf. Hesiod Theog. 517–522 where 
the lot of Atlas is contrasted with that of the bound Prometheus (δῆσε δ’ 
ἅλκαποεδήσα Προμηθέα).

6) There is no mss. justification of Brunck’s deletion of δἐ (cf. Dawe 
Collation and Investigation, p. 262). For further examples of responsion of 
syncopated and complete metra see J.D. Denniston ‘Lyric Iambics in Greek 
Drama’ in Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray, Oxford 1936, pp. 143–44.

7) CR n. s. ii (1952), pp. 1–2.
view that we should expect a reference to Atlas supporting the earth itself.

Many other editors have also attempted to introduce ‘earth’ into the text as the coordinate to οὐράνιον τε πόλον, but the absolutely crippling objection to their theories is the obvious criticism that nowhere is Atlas said to support the earth. Rather he supports the pillar which keeps earth and heaven apart (as in the two passages quoted) 8).

I am thus inclined to seek our solution in some reference to this pillar 9) rather than to the earth. I would maintain that the corruption here has stemmed from the earlier reference to Atlas in this play (vv. 347–350), and I would suggest the following text (cutting “Atlas” as a gloss) :

\[ \deltaσ \ αίεν \ ύπεροχῶν \ σθένος \ κραταιῶς \]

\[ \kappaινά \ τ’] \ οὐράνιον \ τε \ πόλον \]

\[ νότως \ ύποστενάζει \]

‘The only one I beheld before subdued in toils was the god who, mighty in strength, always supporting the pillar and the vault of heaven with his back groans beneath’ 10).

There are several points to notice here: –

(i) I cut “Atlas” rather than θεόν since the latter is more liable to be glossed by the former than vice versa. But either would fit the text.

(ii) ύπεροχῶν: the participle – which has the virtue of giving significance to αίεν – of this apparently rare verb could very

---

9) Havet RPh 1923, p. 82 was on the right track when he suggested κινα’ αιας in place of κραταιών.
10) Sophocles’ usage of ύποστενάζειν (Aj. 322, 1001) and of ύποστένειν (El. 79) might suggest that ύποστενάζει here means ‘groans softly/in a low tone’, a meaning which is in no way inappropriate in this passage. But II. ii. 781 γαία δ’ ύποστενάζεις is sufficient support for the interpretation of ύπος- as ‘under’.
easily have been altered (accidentally\(^ {11} \)) or, perhaps, deliberately) to the common adjective ύπεροχόν. Although ύπεροχέειν is instanced elsewhere only at Hipp. Fract. 18 \( (τοῦ \ γάρ \ μηρόν \ ἡ \ κεφαλή \ ύπεροχεῖ \ τὸ \ ύπερθέν \ τοῦ \ σώματος)\), it has there exactly the meaning we want in the passage under consideration.

(iii) κοσμαύος: again this was probably deliberately altered to agree with σθένος, the resultant accusative reinforcing, or itself being reinforced by, the false reading ύπεροχόν.

(iv) κλονά τ': Whatever the ratio corrupteae here, if τε is to be retained and if we accept the principle of metrical respon­
sion, there must be a lacuna in 429. In filling this lacuna with κλονά τ', τ' provides a simple and obvious coordina­
tion; and both the earlier description of Atlas in this play (vv. 348–9) and the Homeric passage quoted above confirm the intrinsic probability of a reference to the pillar(s) which the Titan holds. It is perhaps not without significance that Herodotus too (iv. 184.3) in his description of Mount Atlas uses the same word: τοῦτον τὸν κλονά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσι οἱ ἔπιχόρωι εἰναι. Cf. also Pindar P. i. 9: κλὸν δ' οὐρανία.

Metrically, κλονά τ' will give a respon­sion of − ο − to − −, a perfectly acceptable resolution of a long to double-short in the so-called ‘aeolic base’\(^ {12} \).

(v) apart from the fact that ύποστενάξει would be a ἄπαξ λεγό­

μενον, whereas ύποστενάξειν, ύποστενέαν and ύποστεναχίζειν all appear elsewhere, I am convinced that ύποστενάξει must be retained for the same reason as Thomson\(^ {13} \), who saw that the idea of ‘groaning’ is the keynote of the whole ode (στένω 397; στονδεν 407; στένωσι 409; μεγαλοστόνουσι 413; στένει 432; στένουσιν 435).

One final question remains to be asked: can vv. 425–30 be fitted satisfactorily into the sense of the stasimon where they stand? Many editors have felt that the mention of Atlas at this point makes an awkward interruption in the Chorus’s account of the widespread groaning lamentation for Prometheus’s fate, and that it would come better after v. 435. This would necessi-

\(^{11}\) Dawe, Collation and Investigation p. 45, notes that the confusion of ο and ω is a fault to which M ‘is most prone’.

\(^{12}\) See Raven, op. cit. §§ 132–133.

\(^{13}\) CQ xxiii (1929), p. 162.
tate assuming a further corruption in the mss, which has resulted in the transposition of what we now see to be strophe and anti-strophe γ.

One could sympathize with these critics of the position of vv. 425–30 if, and only if, vv. 431–35 refer once more to Prometheus. But there is nothing to prevent us taking vv. 431–35 as continuing to refer to Atlas14). The sense of the stasimon then is: Prometheus, I groan for you, as do the peoples of all the world. The only comparable divine suffering which I have seen is that of your brother Atlas; ‘in unison with his cry the wave of the sea as it falls groans from its depths, the black infernal realm of Hades rumbles beneath, and the springs of pure-flowing rivers groan for his piteous distress’.

I cannot see that this would be a total shift of interest and sympathy from Prometheus to Atlas, thus destroying the climax of the ode. Twice earlier in the stasimon there is a reference to the other Titans (404–5 θεοῖς τοῖς πάροις; 409–10 τὰν σὰν ἔγνωμαι-μένων τε τιμᾶν). The expanded description of the piteous fate of Atlas is intended to typify the cruel punishments allotted by Zeus to the Titans and thus increase indirectly our sympathy for Prometheus15).

Monash University, Australia Alan S. Henry

14) H. J. Rose, *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*, Amsterdam 1957, p. 274 remarks: ‘The mention of Atlas interrupts this simple line of thought quite unseasonably. If it belongs in this stasimon at all, it should conclude it’. And so it should, and does if vv. 431–35 also refer to Atlas.

15) Cf. the first stasimon in Euripides’ *Hipp.* where the chorus sing at length of two other instances of women (Iole and Semele) who have been ruined by Eros. The poet there introduces an account of their fate in order to direct the audience’s attention to the fate which awaits Phaedra.