Classical Quarterly 62.1 184–188 (2012) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838811000711

PROBLEMATICAL CONFLATIONS IN SCHOL. VET. SOPH. *EL.* 87*

Ἠλ. ὦ φάος ἀγνὸν
καὶ γῆς ἰσόμοιρ' ἀήρ, ὥς μοι
πολλὰς μὲν θρήνων ᾠδάς,
πολλὰς δ' ἀντήρεις ἤσθου
στέρνων πλαγὰς αἱμασσομένων, 90
ὁπόταν δνοφερὰ νὺξ ὑπολειφθῇ· Soph. *El.* 86–91[1]

P. Papageorgiou printed the ancient scholion to the above lines as follows:[2]

schol. *El.* 87

ὥς μοι | πολλὰς μὲν θρήνων: ὦ φάος ἀγνόν, ὅσα μοι σύνοιδας θρηνούσῃ καὶ κοπτομένῃ· τὸ δὲ κατάλληλον οὕτως, ὡς πολλὰς μὲν ᾠδὰς <τῶν θρήνων> ἤσθου πολλὰς δὲ πληγὰς αἱμασσομένων τῶν στέρνων, πληγὰς ἀντήρεις· τραγικώτερον δέ πως ἀπήγγελται ὥστε τὴν διάλυσιν αὐτῶν μὴ πάνυ πολιτικὴν εἶναι· μετῆκται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρεσσόντων οἷον πληγὰς κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν στέρνων ἐλαυνομένας.

Papageorgiou followed the paradosis[3] in keeping the above text as a single entity. But in this way the section τραγικώτερον (3) – εἶναι (4) should have to refer to the whole sentence τὸ δὲ κατάλληλον (2) – ἀντήρεις (3). In such a case the specialized dictionary by Bécares Botas might lead one to take διάλυσιν αὐτῶν (4) as the separation of those words in 87–90 that under 'normal' circumstances would belong together; namely, the hyperbata contained therein: ἀντήρεις from πλαγάς,

* I thank Nigel Wilson, the anonymous reader and especially George Christodoulou for their observations on this paper.

[1] I follow the OCT text by H. Lloyd-Jones and N.G. Wilson, *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford, 1990).

[2] The scholia vetera to the *Electra* and the *Oedipus Tyrannus* are quoted from P. Papageorgiou, *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias vetera* (Leipzig, 1888), whereas those to the *Ajax* are from G. Christodoulou, *Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους. Κριτικὴ ἔκδοσις* (Athens, 1977). For a discussion of the critical editions of the Sophoclean scholia vetera, see G. Xenis, *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis Electram* (Berlin and New York, 2010), 82–100 and G. Xenis, *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis Trachinias* (Berlin and New York, 2010), 43–9.

[3] Since the time of Papageorgiou's edition, which was founded mainly on Laurentianus 32.9 (L), V. de Marco has drawn the attention of editors to three more manuscripts: Laurentianus conv. soppr. 152 (G), Mutinensis α. T. 9.4 (M) and Vaticanus gr. 2291 (R); see V. de Marco, 'Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii sofoclei', *SIFC* NS 13 (1936), 3–44. I have consulted all three of them, but the picture of the note(s) in question remains unaltered in the respects discussed here. I have checked many other manuscripts too, but they have nothing of value to offer or do not contain the scholion in question: Ambrosianus E 103 sup. (Wa), Lugdunensis Bibl. Publ. Gr. 60 A (Λ), Laurentianus 28.25 (F), Laurentianus 31.10 (K), Laurentianus 32.40 (H), Laurentianus conv. soppr. 41 (Δ), Laurentianus conv. soppr. 142 (Lf), Lugdunensis Voss. Gr. Q 6 (O), Marcianus gr. 468 (V), Matritensis 4677 (N), Parisinus gr. 2799 (Lp).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000711 Published online by Cambridge University Press

στέρνων from *αἱμασσομένων*, *ἤσθου* from its first object (*ᾠδάς*).[4] However, two difficulties arise. First, the meaning 'hyperbaton' is not attested for *διάλυσις*.[5] The passages that Bécares Botas cites do not support his claim that this term can bear such a meaning:[6] in Alex. *Fig.* 2.12 as well as Demetr. *Eloc.* 61[7] and 269, *διάλυσις* is used in the sense of asyndeton;[8] in Charisius (362.23–363.2 Barwick), the term does indeed denote one of the kinds of hyperbaton, but it does not correspond to what we normally understand by *ὑπερβατόν* in Greek,[9] and Charisius' strength as evidence for Greek usage is limited in any case. Moreover, no occurrence of *διάλυσις* in the *TLG* offers any evidence for the sense 'hyperbaton'.[10] In Greek texts generally and the Sophoclean scholia in particular this meaning is constantly expressed by *ὑπερβατόν*; see Papageorgiou's *Index Graecus* on p. 526 s.v. *ὑπερβατόν*.

But even if we could suppose this meaning to be a *hapax* in our passage, the term *πολιτικήν*, i.e. ordinary, simple, unpretentious (see below), would make the whole sentence absurd. The scholiast thought it necessary to place the words of 87–90 in their 'normal' order (*τὸ δὲ κατάλληλον οὕτως …*), precisely because he found the hyperbata in this passage to be bold and thus responsible for a complicated word order. So he cannot be supposed to be saying immediately afterwards that the aforementioned passage has been set to a rather more tragic mode of recitation,[11] so that its hyperbata are not at all[12] ordinary. Bold hyperbata and ordinary (simple) hyperbata are incompatible with each other.

[4] On this interpretation *αὐτῶν* would have to refer to the whole of the section which precedes, not only to *πληγὰς ἀντήρεις*.

[5] LSJ and *DGE* are right not to ascribe such a meaning to *διάλυσις*.

[6] V. Bécares Botas, *Diccionario de terminología gramatical griega* (Salamanca, 1985), 127 s.v. *διάλυσις* 5. E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford, 2007), 232 follows Bécares Botas in translating *διάλυσις* as 'hyperbaton'; see the introduction to her glossary on p. 219. She informed me *per litteras* that she intends to remove this translation from the meanings of *διάλυσις* in the next edition of her book.

[7] Bécares Botas (n. 6) writes 66 by mistake.

[8] LSJ (s.v. 6) and *DGE* (s.v. III.3) are right to cite *διάλυσις* in Alex. *Fig.* 2.12 as an example of the sense 'asyndeton'.

[9] See *DGE* s.v. III.3.

[10] I am thankful to George Christodoulou for letting me know the results of his investigation of the *TLG* corpus in respect of the meanings of *διάλυσις*.

[11] I take *τραγικώτερον ἀπήγγελται* to denote the mode in which the *actor* delivered the passage on the stage. For *ἀπαγγέλλω* used of an actor ('recite'), see schol. vet. Ar. *Vesp.* 1109a Koster cited by LSJ s.v. III (= *οἱ δ' ἐν Ὠιδείῳ· τόπος ἐστὶ θεατροειδής, ἐν ᾧ εἰώθασι τὰ ποιήματα ἀπαγγέλλειν, πρὶν τῆς εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀπαγγελίας*). There are many scholia in which the tone of the actors is deduced from the text, e.g. schol. Soph. *Aj.* 334a … *ἐμφαντικῶς δὲ τὸ θωῦσσει· καὶ γὰρ δεῖ τὸν ὑποκρινόμενον τὸ τοῦ Αἴαντος πρόσωπον ἀπηνεστέρῳ χρῆσθαι τῷ φθέγματι καὶ κυνικώτερον βαΰζειν. διὰ τοῦτο εἶπε θωῦσσειν*; schol. E. *Ph.* 550 … *μετὰ σχετλιασμοῦ τὸ ὑπέρφευ ἀναπεφώνηται*; see R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work* (Cambridge, 2009), 349–51 with further bibliography.

[12] I translate *οὐ πάνυ* as 'not at all' in accordance with LSJ s.v. *πάνυ* 3, since there are parallels for this meaning in the Sophoclean scholia; cf. e.g. schol. *El.* 31 … *ἔστι δὲ ἀγάσασθαι τὸν νεανίσκον ὅτι μὴ πάνυ αὐθέκαστος φαίνεται*. One would not normally admire somebody who is not very self-willed, but one would admire someone who is not at all self-willed!

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000711 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The idea of a conflation of two distinct scholia guided the steps of Lascaris, Brunck, Jahn[13] and Kruytbosch.[14] The idea itself was correct,[15] but the dividing line was drawn at the wrong point: all these critics put a full stop after *στέρνων* (3)[16] and handled the section *ὦ φάος* (1) – *στέρνων* (3) as a separate scholion. They then considered the phrase *πληγὰς ἀντήρεις* (3) as the lemma of a second scholion that comprised the rest of the text. However, *πληγὰς ἀντήρεις* will not do for a lemma, simply because these two words do not occupy consecutive places in the poetic text,[17] and also cannot be reconciled with the section *τραγικώτερον* (3) – *εἶναι* (4) for the reasons explained above. In fact, there is no problem in giving *πληγὰς ἀντήρεις* to the scholion which precedes.

We may now proceed to the section *τραγικώτερον* (3) – *εἶναι* (4). In order to discover the correct lemma of these words, it is necessary to clarify the meanings of *διάλυσιν* and *πολιτικήν*. The available evidence favours the following interpretation of the two terms:

(i) *διάλυσις*: schol. Soph. *OT* 2 *θοάζετε· κατὰ διάλυσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ θάσσετε*. There are closer parallels to our case: Soph. *OT* 316–17. *Τειρ. φεῦ φεῦ, φρονεῖν ὡς δεινὸν ἔνθα μὴ τέλη | λύῃ φρονοῦντι*. The relevant part of the corresponding ancient scholion is: … *διαλελυμένως δὲ εἶπεν τέλη λύῃ ἀντὶ λυσιτελεῖν*. Schol. Aesch. *Supp*. 618b Smith <*ξενικὸν ἀστικόν θ'*>] *ὃ εἶπεν ἄνω ἀστόξενον, τοῦτο διαλελυμένως εἶπεν*. On the basis of this evidence, we should understand *διάλυσις* in our passage as referring to the resolution of a compound word into its constituent parts.[18]

(ii) *πολιτικός* in our passage is a literary term and is no doubt related to LSJ s.v. V.[19] As a description of style, the term has many shades of meaning, the precise one being dependent on the context. Phryn. 32 and 294 F show that poetic words

[13] I. Lascaris, *Commentarii in septem tragedias* (sic) *Sophoclis quae ex aliis eius compluribus iniuria temporum amissis, solae superfuerunt* (Rome, 1518); R.F.Ph. Brunck, *Sophoclis quae extant omnia cum veterum grammaticorum scholiis*, II: continens Ajacem, Philoctetam et Electram (Strasbourg, 1786); O. Jahn, *Sophoclis Electra* (Bonn, 1861). P. Elmsley, *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias septem* (Oxford, 1825) is essentially in accord with the above editors.

[14] B. Kruytbosch, *Annotationes ad scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias septem* (Leiden, 1882), 74: '*πληγὰς ἀντήρεις:* pro integro lemmate accipienda sunt, ad quod sequentia, ut scholium, pertinent'.

[15] De Marco (n. 3), 22–9 proved that Laurentianus 32.9, the main source of the Sophoclean scholia vetera, is full of conflations.

[16] The paradosis has no punctuation mark after *στέρνων* (3).

[17] One should not suppose that the scholiast intended the words *πληγὰς ἀντήρεις* to be the beginning and the end of a lemma respectively, since the practice of omitting the intermediate words in lemmata is not attested.

[18] Comparable cases are schol. Hom. *Il*. 6.257 <*ἄκρης πόλιος·*> *ὅτι διαλελυμένως ἄκρην πόλιν εἶπε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν*; ibid. 7.345b etc. For *διάλυσις* in this sense, see *DGE* s.v. III.2, Bécares Botas (n. 6), 127 s.v. 1 and Dickey (n. 6), 214, 231–2.

[19] One should proceed with caution here, as *πολιτικός qua* literary term has two different meanings; the one (LSJ s.v. IV) normally denotes a type of speech, and the other (LSJ s.v. V) is an adjective qualifying style. Meaning IV is connected with oratorical speeches and an example thereof is Hermog. *Id*. 2.10; see D. Russell and N. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford, 1981), 310–11 for further examples. It sometimes happens that the *πολιτικὸς λόγος* (IV) adopts elements which are also characteristic of the *πολιτικός* style (V); e.g. in schol. Dem. 24.104, 207a/b *πολιτικὸς λόγος*, in contrast to poetic diction, is said not to be characterized by bold expressions and in schol. Thuc. 1.86.3 it is implied that *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* or uncommon constructions should not be part of *πολιτικὸς λόγος*. This is however by no means the rule.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000711 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are untypical of πολιτικός style.[20] In Phryn. *PS* fr. *6[a] πολιτικός vocabulary is suggested to avoid γλῶσσαι whereas schol. Aeschin. 3.1.3 Dilts, which is especially relevant to our case, since it opposes πολιτικός to tragic diction, reveals that metaphors are normally not part of πολιτικός diction.[21] The above examples and those listed in LSJ s.v. V, especially Isoc. 9.10, Gal. 5.221 Kühn = 2.3.11 de Lacy, Gal. 18(1).415 and Arist. *Poet*. 1450b7, establish that the common denominator of the uses of πολιτικός denotes a type of diction which is ordinary, everyday, simple, plain, common, unpretentious. Such a kind of diction is clearly unsuitable for the dignified and lofty style thought to be characteristic of tragedy.

Now, *El*. 86–91 contains only one pair of words which readily fit in with the notion of διάλυσις as specified above. θρήνων ᾠδάς (88) could indeed be described as being used διαλελυμένως instead of θρηνῳδίας and are without doubt the lemma of τραγικώτερον – εἶναι. This sentence should clearly be considered a note of its own and be separated from its surrounding material. This of course requires us to delete δέ after τραγικώτερον. The sense of this note is as follows: the διαλελυμένη phrase θρήνων ᾠδάς in Sophocles' text has struck the Scholiast as more commonplace and unpretentious than the compound θρηνῳδίας and therefore as lacking in tragic dignity.[22] However, this imperfection is – according to him – eradicated by the actor's setting the phrase to a more tragic mode of recitation; i.e. he believes that the flaw in Sophocles' style is overcome at the level of acting.

We are now left with the last section μετῆκται (4) – ἐλαυνομένας, which obviously refers to *El*. 89–90 ἀντήρεις … πλαγάς.

In conclusion, we should divide the conflated entity of the paradosis into three distinct notes:[23]

schol. *El*. 86–90
(ὦ φάος –) ὥς μοι | πολλὰς μὲν θρήνων (–αἱμασσομένων): ὦ φάος ἁγνόν, ὅσα μοι

[20] Phryn. 32 Μεσονύκτιον ποιητικόν, οὐ πολιτικόν; id. 294 Χθιζὸν ἀποβλητέον ὅτι ποιητικόν, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ χθιζὸν ἐροῦμεν χθεσινόν, πρὸς τὸ πολιτικὸν ἀποτορνεύοντες τὸν λόγον, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (*Vesp*. 281 et *Ran*. 987).

[21] Phryn. *PS* fr. *6[a] … τό τε οὖν ἄγειν καὶ τὸ ἀγῆλαι Ἀττικά, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ἄγειν πολιτικόν, τὸ δὲ ἀγῆλαι κωμῳδικὸν καὶ ἐγγὺς γλώττης. φεύγειν μὲν οὖν χρὴ τὸ τῶν γλωττῶν; schol. Aeschin. 3.1.3 τὴν παράταξιν] ἀντὶ τοῦ 'σύνταξιν [καὶ] παρακλήτων καὶ συναγωνιστῶν σπουδήν'. δοκεῖ δὲ τραγικώτερον κεχρῆσθαι εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῇ μεταφορᾷ, πολιτικώτερον δὲ ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους εἰρῆσθαι τὸ αὐτὸ νόημα ἐν τῷ τῆς παραπρεσβείας εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἔχον οὕτως (Dem. 19.1)· «ὅση μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, σπουδὴ καὶ παραγγελία γέγονε» καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

[22] Compounds were thought to derive a certain grandeur from the very fact that they are compounds: cf. Demetr. *Eloc*. 92 Ἔξει μέντοι τὸ σύνθετον ὄνομα ὁμοῦ καὶ ποικιλίαν τινὰ ἐκ τῆς συνθέσεως καὶ μέγεθος, καὶ ἅμα καὶ συντομίαν τινά. ὄνομα γὰρ τεθήσεται ἀντὶ ὅλου τοῦ λόγου, οἷον ἂν τὴν τοῦ σίτου κομιδὴν σιτοπομπίαν λέγῃς. (Our Scholiast clearly does not share what Demetrius goes on to mention: τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ λυθέντος ὀνόματος εἰς λόγον ἕτερον τρόπον μεῖζον γένοιτο, οἷον σίτου πομπὴ ἀντὶ σιτοπομπίας). Compounds seem to have been taken as grandiose on account of their great length: cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp*. 22 μεγάλοις τε καὶ διαβεβηκόσιν εἰς πλάτος ὀνόμασιν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ μηκύνεσθαι φιλεῖ (*sc*. ἡ αὐστηρὰ ἁρμονία)· τὸ γὰρ εἰς βραχείας συλλαβὰς συνάγεσθαι πολέμιον αὐτῇ, πλὴν εἴ ποτε ἀνάγκη βιάζοιτο; cf. [Longinus], *Subl*. 41.3 ὁμοίως δὲ ἀμεγέθη καὶ τὰ λίαν συγκείμενα καὶ εἰς μικρὰ καὶ βραχυσύλλαβα συγκεκομμένα.

[23] The *apparatus criticus* printed here is highly selective. For detailed reports of the manuscripts' readings and an apparatus of parallels to the last of the three scholia, I refer the reader to my edition of the *Electra* scholia vetera (n. 2).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000711 Published online by Cambridge University Press

σύνοιδας θρηνούσῃ καὶ κοπτομένῃ. τὸ δὲ κατάλληλον οὕτως· ὡς πολλὰς μὲν ᾠδὰς[24] *ᾔσθου, πολλὰς δὲ πληγὰς αἱμασσομένων τῶν στέρνων, πληγὰς ἀντήρεις*. L **r**(GMR)

1 lm. L supplevi: deest in **r**; (*ἰσόμοιρος* s.) R 2 post *ᾠδὰς* add. *τῶν θρήνων* **r**

schol. *El*. 88
(*θρήνων ᾠδάς*): *τραγικώτερον* [*δέ*] *πως ἀπήγγελται, ὥστε τὴν διάλυσιν αὐτῶν μὴ πάνυ πολιτικὴν εἶναι*. L M **r**(GR)

1–2 haec a scholio priore separavi annotationem novam esse iudicans 1 lm. addidi *δὲ* delevi

schol. *El*. 89–90
(*ἀντήρεις … πλαγάς*): *μετῆκται* [*δὲ*] *ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρεσσόντων, οἷον πληγὰς κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν στέρνων ἐλαυνομένας*. L M **r**(GR)

1–2 haec a scholio priore separavi ut annotationem novam 1 lm. addidi *δὲ* delevi

University of Cyprus GEORGIOS A. XENIS
gxenis@ucy.ac.cy

[24] The phrase '*τῶν θρήνων*' is, as we see, given by GMR but absent from L. It is reasonable to suppose that it is a scribal interpolation rather than genuine material. In cases such as this, where the ancient Scholiast sought to clarify a hyperbaton and restore the 'normal' word order, he would frequently leave out from his rephrasing any words whose position in the sequence was easy to grasp. '*Τῶν θρήνων*' without doubt belongs to this category of words. On the other hand, the reviser who created the *διασκευή* contained in GMR did have a tendency to be explicit about ideas easily inferred from the context.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000711 Published online by Cambridge University Press