

THREE NOTES ON *OEDIPUS REX*

ὄραϊς μὲν ἡμᾶς ἡλικίοι προσήμεθα 15
 βωμοῖσι τοῖς σοῖς, οἱ μὲν οὐδέπω μακρὰν
 πτέσθαι σθένοντες, οἱ δὲ σὺν γήραι βαρεῖς·
 ἰερεὺς ἐγὼ μὲν Ζηνός, οἶδε τ' ἡιθέων
 λεκτοί· τὸ δ' ἄλλο φύλον . . .

For ἐγὼ μὲν in v. 18 Herwerden conjectured ἐγὼ εἰμι. This gives a much better structure to the lines: ‘You see the ages of your suppliants, some scarcely more than fledglings, others (= me) weighed down with age. I am a priest of Zeus, and these are chosen from the young people; the others are in the square[s]’. What might make editors hesitate is the apparent violence of the alteration. But that violence is indeed only apparent: at Phil. 585, where the Oxford editors depart on what English lawyers call a frolic of their own, we have ἐγὼ εἰμ’ Ἀτρείδαις δυσμενής, and in that place εἰμ’ has become μεν in G and μὲν in QR, and the intermediate stage in the corruption appears as ’μ’ in L^{SPC}KSZgZoT. The Teubner text embodies a similar emendation, itself supported by 240sq., at v. 57 of the same play.

ἄλλ’ ᾧδ’ ἀτεγκτος ἀτελεύτητος φανῆι; 336

The Oxford editors on p. 87 of their “Sophoclea”, alluding to Nauck’s translation of ἀτελεύτητος as “mit dem man nicht zu Ende kommt” observe “ἀτελεύτητος applied to a person in this sense is indeed unusual, but perfectly understandable”. I still do not understand it, and consultation with eminent German speakers has not led to any elucidation of the word in this context. The probabilities that the word is corrupt are much increased by the frequency of its occurrence in the Christian fathers: see Lampe’s Patristic Greek Lexicon s.v. Another place where Christian preoccupations have influenced manuscript readings comes in this play at v. 1362: ὁ μονογενής in GDXs.

Sehrwald’s ἀπαραιτήτος gives a highly suitable sense; more cautious spirits should simply obelize.

βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῖος οὐκ ἔσται λιμήν; 420
 ποῖος Κιθαιρῶν οὐχὶ σύμφωνος τάχα . . . ;

It is indeed probable (Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Hypomnemata* 100 [1997] 51) that this was accepted as the authentic text in antiquity. But antiquity is a long time, and corruptions did not begin on its expiry. For the first word of the third Teubner edition one more, namely πάτριος: cf. 1391, and above all 1090 (Κιθαιρῶν . . . πατριώταν) and 1451sq. (ἔνθα κλήζεται οὐμὸς Κιθαιρῶν οὔτος). The alteration is much slighter than it looks: πάτριος would be written as ποῖος, not a long step from a ποῖος still in the scribal mind from the line before. Even when making overtly threatening predictions the prophet still adheres to the tradition of his profession,

by using a term which as yet Oedipus must find incomprehensible. Only later will he bitterly describe what he thought were his *πάτρια δώματα* as *πάτρια* only *λόγῳ* (1395).

Just below, in v. 425, a less pusillanimous editor would have put Nauck's admirable *σῶι τοκεῖ καὶ σοῖς* into the text.

Cambridge

Roger D. Dawe