SHORTER NOTES

AESCHYLUS, *SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS* 17–20

ἡ γὰρ νέους ἔρποντας εὐμενεῖ πέδῳ,
ἅπαντα πανδοκοῦσα παιδείας ὅτλον,
ἐθρέψατ' οἰκιστῆρας ἀσπιδηφόρους
πιστοὺς ὅπως γένοισθε πρὸς χρέος τόδε.

19 οἰκητῆρας Rc οἰκηστῆρας IBaNdΔK οἰκιστῆρας rell.

20 πιστοὺς omnes codd. πιστοί θ' M. Schmidt πιστοί γ' Hutchinson
γένησθε KYa (cum οι supra η in P) στέλλοισθε Scheer
τελοῖσθε olim Tucker

Eteocles is trying to inspire the Thebans to pull together and resist the approaching Seven, but the paradosis has aroused the suspicion of some. This note considers the difficulties and proposes a new approach to their solution.

The problems with the text of 19 have not received much attention, so it is worth setting them out here. If the majority reading οἰκιστῆρας is retained, Eteocles must be understood to be calling the citizenry of Thebes 'founders'. Blomfield, who accepted the paradosis, objected to the variant οἰκητῆρας and thought that Aeschylus would have been more likely to use the word οἰκήτορας than οἰκητῆρας. Elsewhere Aeschylus does not use οἰκητήρ, but he uses οἰκήτωρ twice. Hermann said Blomfield had forgotten that Sophocles used οἰκητήρ, but the more important consideration is that Sophocles used both οἰκητήρ and οἰκήτωρ; there is no reason why Aeschylus should not have done so too. That none of the tragedians uses οἰκιστήρ elsewhere is a greater difficulty for those editors who want to retain it here. The objection to Rc's οἰκητῆρας is therefore groundless. Returning to the majority's οἰκιστῆρας, it poses problems. In the first place, one does not 'raise' people to be founders. One raises them to be citizens. In the second, why should Eteocles refer to his people as founders when the actual founder, Cadmus, has already been mentioned in 1 and alluded to in 9? Cadmus was a foreigner, so for Eteocles to refer shortly afterwards to indigenous founders makes little sense.

There is no point rehearsing the textual difficulties of 20 here because they have been succinctly identified and analysed by Hutchinson in his commentary,[1] but the number of questions raised above and by Hutchinson casts doubt on the paradosis of both lines. It might come as a surprise therefore that West, in his recent Teubner edition,[2] retains it.[3] He is not alone: many previous editors did so, but their justifications are diverse, and in some cases bizarre. Most bizarre of all perhaps is Tucker's, who, after proposing τελοῖσθε for γένοισθε initially, later, in his commentary, defended the manuscript reading and argued that it is a figure borrowed from the language of inn-keeping. Tucker's note does not give sufficient parallels to support his argument, nor does it explain why such a borrowing is in keeping here. West's punctuation of 19 (without a comma after ἀσπιδηφόρους) suggests he thinks πιστοὺς stands in asyndeton after οἰκιστῆρας ἀσπιδηφόρους and that the phrase ὅπως γένοισθε πρὸς χρέος τὸδε is self-contained (rather than that πιστοὺς has been attracted

[1] G. O. Hutchinson, *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas* (Oxford, 1985).
[2] M. L. West, *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Stuttgart, 1990).
[3] He does not allude to the problems of 20 in his apparatus.

Classical Quarterly 55.1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi021 Published online by Cambridge University Press

into the accusative case, but goes with γένοισθε). This gives us 'she [Mother Earth] brought up trusty, shield-bearing founders in order for you to be engaged in this task'. The resultant asyndeton, if awkward, is not without parallel,[4] but, as Hutchinson observes, ὅπως γενοισθε πρὸς χρέος τόδε makes a weak period end. He is also surely right to query whether the phrase γίγνεσθαι πρός τι (rather than τινι) ever occurred and whether it would have occurred prior to fourth-century prose writers. The answers both seem to be negative.

Sufficient objections have been raised to make emendation desirable. Page adopted M. Schmidt's conjecture in his OCT. Hutchinson rejects it because it produces an awkward connection. He could have gone further, because no connective is needed at all. Hutchinson's conjecture, which he admits into his own text, does, as he says, give emphasis to πιστοί. But Hutchinson's references to pages 138 and 140 of Denniston's *Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954[2]) do not seem to support his conjecture. Denniston's examples (as well as Hutchinson's supplementary one) are all of γε attaching itself to ὥστε or ἵνα and not to an adjective within a final clause. Hutchinson's conjecture is not impossible, but how probable is it?

It is true that a phrase rather similar to the one in 20 occurs at *Eum.* 670, ὅπως γένοιτο πιστὸς εἰς τὸ πᾶν χρόνου, and editors who change πιστοὺς here may have been influenced by that. But the fact that all the manuscripts have πιστοὺς weighs against altering it to make this line conform. The collations of Dawe, on the other hand, have revealed variants for γένοισθε in the manuscripts,[5] and this might suggest that γένοισθε and not πιστοὺς is corrupt. The conjectures of Scheer and Tucker recognized this possibility. Unfortunately Scheer's conjecture does not convince: τέλλομαι and στέλλομαι are sometimes confused, but γίγνομαι and στέλλομαι are not. It would be easier to see how Tucker's retracted τελοῖσθε could have come about, but its meaning would not have been obvious nor does it make the ending of the sentence any stronger than the paradosis.

For the reasons already given, it seems to me certain that Rc's οἰκητῆρας should be adopted in 19 (with Hutchinson). What then of 20? As Jackson observes, confusion of *ΛΕΓ-* and *ΓΕΝ-* is common.[6] Now, γένοιτο appears already in 5 and 9 and these instances could have lingered in the scribe's mind. The scribe saw a word beginning λεγ- and supplied γένοισθε from the earlier repeated γένοιτο above. If my diagnosis is right, I propose λέγοι σφε for γένοισθε (with a comma after ἀσπιδηφόρους in 19).[7] This would give us 'she [Mother Earth] brought up shield-bearing inhabitants in order to call them faithful in the face of this task'. Even if the notion of Mother Earth calling her sons faithful is a bold one, her bringing the Thebans up will not have been a wasted effort.

Little Venice, London NICHOLAS LANE
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi021

[4] See, for example, Denniston's note on Eur. *El.* 253.
[5] R. D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of the Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1964), 248.
[6] J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), 42.
[7] σφε (acc. pl.) also occurs in dialogue at *Supp.* 507, as well as in the other tragedians.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi021 Published online by Cambridge University Press