Aeschylus, Prometheus 680

Page writes ταυρφίνιδος, and Griffith commenting on 680 also seems dissatisfied with the reading of the codd.: “The MSS give ἄπροοδόχητος δ' αὐτὸν ταυρφίνιδος μόρος, with impossible metre and the awkward doublet of adjectives without connective. Porson’s transposition is a simple correction (αὐρφίνιδος αὐτὸν, giving – – – – | – – – – | – – – – –); so is the adverbial ἄπροοδόχητος, avoiding the doubled adjectives. Of alternatives, Elmsley’s ἄφιδιος gives an unattested form (though cf. ἄφρων and Hesychius s.v. ἄφρων) and resolution in weak position (ἀφρ-, cf. 2n.). Better would be Headlam’s ἄπτηρος (from Hesych. s.v. ἄπτηρος—προσηνής, ταχύς, αὐρφίνιδος; see Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 276).” In his text appears ‘Porson’s transposition’ along with his own ἄπροοδόχητος.

It is true that the position of ἄφρων (2) creates a fifth-foot anapaest unparalleled in tragedy (3); Elmsley’s ἄφρων would in this case offer an instant remedy, yielding a τυμβραχύς in the fourth foot, but – as also Griffith points out – it would give an unattested form. Headlam’s ἄπτηρος restores the metre and gives appropriate sense, however it is a very rare word in this meaning (5) (cf. LSJ s.v. iii).

Porson’s transposition may not be considered as ‘a simple correction’ only, especially if it is accompanied by an additional ‘simple’ correction, namely Griffith’s transformation of ἄπροοδόχητος into an adverb. But (I) ἄπροοδόχητος is not stylistically better than the adjective, which occurs another three times in tragedy (A. Supp. 712, S. El. 1017, E. IA 1610), whereas the adverb otherwise first appears in Thucydides (4. 29.3, 7. 21.4); (II) since ἄπροοδόχητος appears in the codd. one is hardly justified in interfering with it, especially since, in other respects, there is nothing wrong with the adjective. The problem remains with ἄφρων.

For all corrections above, which for some reason or other either lack credibility or evidence I would prefer ἔξαιφνης in the place of ἄφρων. ἔξαιφνης may

1) M. Griffith, Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge Univ. Press 1983.

2) αὐρφίνιδος does not occur elsewhere before Thucydides (twelve times in all as adj.); it is worth mentioning, however, that the first time it appears in Thucydides it is coupled with ἄπροοδόχητος (2. 61.3).

3) Seven times in Sophocles and twenty four in Euripides that an anapaest in the fifth foot occurs – cf. M. L. West, Greek Metre, Oxford 1982, p. 82 – it is restricted to proper names.

4) On disputes about ἄπτηρος and its meanings see CQ 30 (1936) 3, 105, 151.

be better than ἄπτερος, perhaps easier than the transposition\(^6\), and better supported by evidence than ἄφρινιδος (though this last would otherwise be the lightest change palaeographically). With ἔξαίψνης the metre runs quite normally: ἀπροσδόκητος δ' αὐτόν ἔξαίψνης μόρος.

This adverb occurs in Pr. 1077 (anap.), and in a lyric line of S. Aj. 170. All other times that ἔξαίψνης occurs in tragedy, six in Sophocles (Ant. 417, Tr. 912, Ph. 751, OC 1610, 1623, 1625), and four in Euripides (Hipp. 434, IT 1394, Ph. 1144, 1469) it always stands in one and the same metrical position within the trimeter, viz. followed by a two-syllable word to close the (metric) line. On this account ἔξαίψνης might offer a good solution to the metrical problem in Pr. 680.

Athen Nikolaos Georgantzoglou

1902, p. 68), but in his Analecta Tragica (Hal. Sax. 1906, p. 27) Blaydes prefers Porson’s αὐφρινίδος αὐτόν. Unaware of all this E. Braun (Lesefrüchte iv, MVPhW \(9\) [1932] 104–5) proposed ἔξαίψνης against Wilamowitz’s ἐκ Δίως (for αὐφρινίδος).

His point is that “eine manus corrigens in Analogie zum Adjektivum ἀπροσδόκητος auch das Adverbium ἔξαίψνης in adjektivischer Form ohne Wissen um die metrische Anstößigkeit eingesetzt hat” (p. 105).

6) C. Prato, L’anapesto nel trimetro tragico, SIFC 32 (1961) 110: “Il Porson aveva tentato, con scarso successo, la transposizione αὐφρινίδος αὐτόν.” Prato (ibid.) actually defends αὐφρινίδος on the account of Thucydidès’ use of the same combination, φρόνημα τὸ αὐφρινίδων καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον (2. 61.3); to this add the late αὐφρινίδος γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπροσδόκητος φόβος ἐπεχύθη (v.l. ἐπηλθέν), LXX Sap. Salom. 17.14.

\textbf{DENTES MORTUI IMITARI}

In dem Teil von \textit{De arte grammatica}, der von der Aussprache der einzelnen Buchstaben des Alphabets, von Lautphysiologie, handelt, überliefert Martianus Capella (III 261) folgende Auffassung des berühmten altromischen Zensors, Konstius und Redners Appius Claudius Caecus: "z' vero idcirco Appius Claudius deter-\textit{statur quod dentes mortui dum exprimitur imitatur}.

"Die Zähne eines Toten nachahmen": Das schien bedeutendsten Altertumswissenschaftlern unverständlich zu sein. In seiner 1861 erstveröffentlichten Abhandlung „Die patricischen Claudier“ vermutete Mommsen, es sei "vielleicht dentis morsus zu schreiben\(^1\). 5 Jahre später nahm F. Eyssenhart diese Konjektur Mommsens in den Apparat seiner Teubner-Ausgabe des Martianus Capella auf, behielt aber den überlieferten Text, ohne ihn durch Crux-Setzung in Frage zu stellen, bei\(^2\). 35 Jahre nach Mommsen diskutierten Norden und Buecheler (dem

1) Th. Mommsen, Römische Forschungen I, Berlin 1864, 304 Anm. 36.