

(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

AESCHYLUS PROMETHEUS VINCTUS

425-435

†μόνον δὴ πρόσθεν ἄλλον ἐν πόνοις δαμέντ' ἀκαμαντοδέτοις Τιτᾶνα λύμαις εἰσιδόμεν, θεὸν Ἄτλανθ', ὃς αἰὲν ὑπέροχον σθένος κραταῖον ... οὐράνιον τε πόλον νώτοις ὑποστενάζει.†	425 430
βοᾷ δὲ πόντιος κλύδων ξυμπίνων, στένει βυθός, κελαινός [δ ³] Ἄιδος ὑποβρέμει μυχὸς γᾶς, παγαί θ' ἄγροῦτων ποταμῶν στένουσιν ἄλγος οἰκτρόν.	435

425 δὴ] δ^η O^c, fort. O^{ac} fuit δεῖ ἄλλον] ita MCO^{ac}P²o ἄλλον QKBH
ΔYaN 426 ἀκαμαντοδέτοις] ἀδαμαντοδέτοις CI^{ac}, corr. I² 428 ὑπέροχον]
ita HB ὑπέροχον fere codd. 430 ὑποστενάζει] ita B^{ac} et rell. ὑποστενάζει
B^{1pc} 432 βυθός] βαθός MH βόθός V 433 δ³ seclisit 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 Dawe¹⁾ 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 stasimon²⁾. 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 $\beta\alpha\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ with MH and remove the comma after $\xi\nu\mu\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\nu$ ('the wave of the sea falling in answer to the cry groans from its depths') and accept Lachmann's excision of δ^3 , we then have a metrical scheme, mostly iambic, with one line which may best be described as aeolic with 'dactylic expansion' of the choriambic nucleus³⁾, by which to guide our approach to vv. 425-30. Thus

431	υ - υ - υ - υ -	iambic dimeter
432	- υ - υ - υ -	lekythion
433	υ - υ υ υ υ υ υ - υ - -	iambic trimeter catalectic
434	- - - υ υ - -	aeolic
435	υ - υ - υ - -	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 $\delta\eta$ to $\delta\epsilon$ and by cutting $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ as an unnecessary explanatory gloss⁴⁾. The reading in O^{ac} may possibly have been $\delta\epsilon$ (not $\delta\epsilon\iota$); and the gloss in B (quoted by Wilamowitz in his apparatus), $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\ \eta\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$, may be the origin of the mss. readings $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu/\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$.

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.

4) So Platnauer *Humanitas* 1952, p. 2. Cf. also Hoernle *Notes on the Text of Aeschylus*, Oxford, 1921, p. 15 and Terzaghi *Bolletino di Filologia Classica* 1916, p. 176.

- (ii) 426-7: if we accept Heimsoeth's excision of ἀκαμαντοδέτοις Τιτᾶνα λύμαις as an intrusion from v. 148, with θεόν glossed Τιτᾶνα⁵), 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 dimeter corresponding to a lekythion (i.e. a syncopated iambic dimeter), for which cf. *Septem* 330~342⁶)

δ' ἐκκενουμένα πόλις - - - - -
 ~ δὲ χραίνεται πόλισι⁷ ἅπαν - - - - -

- (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. Longman⁷) cites Hermann in support of his view that 'a reference to Atlas supporting the earth was to be expected in the context, and would explain the τε after οὐράνιον', and quotes *Od.* i 53-54

ἔχει δὲ τε κίονας αὐτὸς
 μακράς, αἱ γαῖαν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι.

and *PV* 349-50

ἔστηκε κίον' οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθονός
 ὤμοις ἐρείδων.

Longman is led to suggest

Ἄτλαντος ὑπέροχον σθένος
 δς καὶ γαῖον οὐράνιον τε πόλον
 νώτοις ὑποστεγάζει.

and claims that 'indeed γαῖον οὐράνιον τε πόλον is equivalent to κίον' οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθονός'. But is γαῖον οὐράνιον τε πόλον ὑποστεγάζειν the same as κίον' οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθονός ἐρείδειν? 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 ἀκαμαντοδέτοις/ἀδαμαντοδέτοις must go, since Atlas 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' ἀλκτοπεδῆσι Προμηθεά).

6) There is no mss. justification of Brunck's deletion of δέ (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 πόνον*, 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 pillar⁹) 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 *Ἀτλανθ'* as a gloss): –

428 ὃς αἰὲν ὑπεροχῶν σθένος κραταιός

429 <κίονά τ'> οὐράνιον τε πόνον

430 νότοις ὑποστενάζει

'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 *Ἀτλανθ'* 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) *ὑπεροχῶν*: the participle – which has the virtue of giving significance to *αἰὲν* – of this apparently rare verb could very

8) In Hesiod *Theog.* 517 Atlas actually *is* the pillar. See M.L. West's recent edition of the *Theog.* (Oxford, 1966) ad loc. for the various versions of Atlas's function.

9) Havet *RPh* 1923, p. 82 was on the right track when he suggested *κίον' αἴας* in place of *κραταιόν*.

10) Sophocles' usage of *ὑποστενάζειν* (*Aj.* 322, 1001) and of *ὑποστένειν* (*El.* 79) might suggest that *ὑποστενάζει* here means 'groans softly/in a low tone', a meaning which is in no way inappropriate in this passage. But *Il.* ii. 781 *γαῖα δ' ὑποστενάχιζε* is sufficient support for the interpretation of *ὑπο* as 'under'.

easily have been altered (accidentally¹¹) or, perhaps, deliberately) to the common adjective *ὑπέροχον*. Although *ὑπεροχεῖν* is instanced elsewhere only at Hipp. *Fract.* 18 (τοῦ γὰρ μηροῦ ἢ κεφαλῆ ὑπεροχεῖ τὸ ὑπερθεῖν τοῦ σώματος), it has there exactly the meaning we want in the passage under consideration.

- (iii) *κροταιός*: again this was probably deliberately altered to agree with *σθένος*, the resultant accusative reinforcing, or itself being reinforced by, the false reading *ὑπέροχον*.
- (iv) *κίονά τ'*: Whatever the *ratio corruptelae* here, if *τε* is to be retained and if we accept the principle of metrical responsion, there must be a lacuna in 429. In filling this lacuna with *κίονά τ'*, *τ'* provides a simple and obvious coordination; 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 κίονα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσι οἱ ἐπιχώριοι εἶναι*. Cf. also Pindar *P.* i. 9: *κίων δ' οὐρανία*.
Metrically, *κίονά τ'* will give a responsion of - ∪ ∪ to - -, a perfectly acceptable resolution of a long to double-short in the so-called 'aeolic base'¹².
- (v) apart from the fact that *ὑποστεγάζει* would be a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, whereas *ὑποστενάζειν*, *ὑποστένειν* and *ὑποστεναχίζειν* all appear elsewhere, I am convinced that *ὑποστενάζει* must be retained for the same reason as Thomson¹³, who saw that the idea of 'groaning' is the keynote of the whole ode (*στένω* 397; *στονόεν* 407; *στένουσι* 409; *μεγαλοστόνοισι* 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 *o* 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 *Atlas*¹⁴). 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 πάροσ;*; 409-10 *τὰν σὰν ξυνομαίμωνων τε τιμάν*). 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.