Classical Quarterly (2004) **54.2** 441–450
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh050

TEXTUAL NOTES ON SOPHOCLES, *PHILOCTETES* 1–675*

As the four readily available texts of Sophocles reveal, the text is far from settled. These notes have involved no examination of the MSS themselves, but it is hoped that however unfashionable—particularly at a time when textual criticism has fallen into disrepute[1]—they might be of interest to editors and students. These notes contain one argument in favour of an alternative MS reading, four attempts to justify the paradosis, three justifications of other scholars' conjectures, and some of my own of which the last are offered more as provocation than proclamation, since I do not profess to know the language and metre of Sophocles better than other scholars.[2]

72–3 σὺ μὲν πέπλευκας οὔτ' ἔνορκος οὐδενὶ
οὔτ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης οὔτε τοῦ πρώτου στόλου

post 73 ἀνὴρ γὰρ ἄνδρα καὶ πόλις σῴζει πόλιν exhibet **Q**
lacunam statuit Dawe

Because of the unusual partitive genitive πέπλευκας . . . / . . . τοῦ πρώτου στόλου ('[nor] did you sail as a member of the first expedition') and Q's interpolation of an extraneous line, Dawe has suggested that a line is missing after 73 which would have contained a word making sense of the genitive.[3] Upbraiding Dawe for making 'heavy weather' of the partitive genitive, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson cite F 555.1 (Radt) and Eur. *Ion* 1395 in support of the MS reading. But the text of F 555.1 (Radt) is uncertain. Indeed, in the Loeb Lloyd-Jones prints his own conjectures ἢ ποντοναύτας (-ναῦται codd.) τῶν ταλαιπώρων νέμω (βροτῶν codd.). As to the Euripidean passage, it is not clear why Lloyd-Jones and Wilson think φάσμα (which they misquote as θαῦμα) τῶν ἀνελπίστων ὁρῶ is like πέπλευκας . . . τοῦ πρώτου στόλου. This example represents an ordinary genitive, an 'apparition of things unhoped for'. A possibility, it strikes me, is that the genitive could be temporal, somewhat like Aesch. *Cho.* 711, μακρᾶς κελεύθου: see Garvie ad loc. I would retain the MS reading

* These notes adopt the sigla of the Teubner edition. References to ancient authors and standard publications are as cited in *OCD*[3]. The following modern works are referred to in abbreviated form by author's name and page number and, where appropriate, the abbreviation: L. Campbell, *Paralipomena Sophoclea* (London, 1907) = *PS*; A. Dain and P. Mazon, *Sophocle* (rev. J. Irigoin, Paris, 1999[5]) = Irigoin; R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1973–8) = *Studies*, and *Sophoclis Philoctetes* (Stuttgart/Leipzig, 1996[3]) = Teubner; J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954[2]); E. Fraenkel, *Due seminari romani di Eduard Fraenkel* (ed. L. E. Rossi, Rome, 1977); J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955); H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford, 1990) = OCT, *Sophoclea* (Oxford, 1990) = *Sophoclea*, and *Sophocles: Second Thoughts* (Göttingen, 1997) = *Second Thoughts*.

[1] M. McCall, in a review of J. Diggle, *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994), in *JHS* 122 (2002), 163–4, has drawn attention to the tendency of textual critics to arbitrary dismissiveness and absolute dicta. While there are dangers inherent in attempting to make general criticisms of the sort McCall has made in the context of short reviews of specific works, McCall's is a valid complaint about textual criticism.

[2] Warm thanks are due to Roger Dawe, Neil Hopkinson, and Chris Kopff, who have helped me in different ways. The *CQ*'s anonymous reader also succinctly identified some deficiencies at a later stage.

[3] Dawe, *Studies*, 3.123.

Classical Quarterly 54.2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on this ground and translate: 'nor [did you sail] during the time of the first expedition'.

146–9

ὁπόταν δὲ μόλῃ
δεινὸς ὁδίτης τῶνδ' ἐκ μελάθρων
πρὸς ἐμὴν αἰεὶ χεῖρα προχωρῶν
πειρῶ τὸ παρὸν θεραπεύειν.

146 ὁδίτης codd. ἑδρίτης Danielsson ἱδρυτὴς Dawe
147 ἐκ codd. οὐκ Linwood τώνδε μελάθρων Dawe

ὁδίτης, as Dawe has shown,[4] is an unlikely word to describe Philoctetes. Danielsson's ἑδρίτης occurs only in the Byzantine lexica. Dawe himself proposes ἱδρυτὴς, meaning 'settler'. But that noun is not attested elsewhere. Moreover, the iota in ἱδρύω-cognates is treated by Sophocles as a long syllable at *Trach.* 68 (ἱδρῦσθαι) and is anceps at *Aj.* 809 (ἱδρυτέον). LSJ, s.v. ἱδρύω, states that the iota is short by nature but frequently lengthened by position. However, in Tragedy, of the examples I have found of ἵδρυμα, ἱδρυτέον, and ἱδρύω, there are fifteen where the iota is anceps,[5] nine where it is long,[6] and three where it is short.[7] The three Euripidean examples of καθιδρύω all have long iota.[8] Euripides alone treats the iota as short, and even then only three times out of eighteen (twenty-one including the καθιδρύω examples), whereas he treats the iota as long in six places (nine with καθιδρύω examples). In Aeschylus and Sophocles the iota is never demonstrably short and it is long in three of the nine examples. If Sophocles had used Dawe's ἱδρυτὴς he would have treated the iota as long and he would not have used it here, where a short syllable is required.

I suggest ἀλήτης for ὁδίτης. The corruption could have arisen from scribal confusion of *ΟΔ* and *ΑΛ*. Sophocles uses this word six times elsewhere, and the meaning 'exile' suits the context where 'wayfarer' does not. A seeming objection might be that ἀλήτης implies movement from place to place, but Denniston has shown that it need not.[9] Accepting Linwood's οὐκ overcomes the objection that otherwise Philoctetes is pictured emerging from the cave when it has already been established that he is not there: 'whenever he comes, the fearful exile from this dwelling, etc.'

188–90

ἁ δ' ἀθυρόστομος
Ἀχὼ τηλεφανὴς πικρᾶς
οἰμωγᾶς ὑπόκειται.

189–90 πικρᾶς οἰμωγᾶς codd. πικρὰς οἰμωγὰς Pflugk
πικραῖς οἰμωγαῖς Ast
190 ὑπόκειται codd. ὑποχεῖται Musgrave ὕπο χεῖται Erfurdt
ὕπ' ὀχεῖται Hermann
ὑπακούει Dorat ὑποτάκει Jackson ὑποκλαίει Pflugk

[4] Dawe, *Studies*, 3.124.
[5] Aesch. *Ag.* 339 and 527 (unless Salzmann's deletion is accepted), *Cho.* 1036, *Pers.* 811, *Supp.* 413, Soph. *Aj.* 809, Eur. *Bacch.* 951, *Hel.* 46 and 820, *Heracl.* 19 and 786, *HF* 49, *Ion* 1134 and 1573, and *Phoen.* 1008.
[6] Aesch. *Eum.* 862, *Pers.* 231, Soph. *Trach.* 68, Eur. *Alc.* 841, *El.* 1130, *Hipp.* 33 and 639, *IT* 1453, and F 669 (Nauck).
[7] Eur. *Heracl.* 397, *Supp.* 632, and *Bacch.* 1070.
[8] *Bacch.* 1339, *Cyc.* 318 (not tragic), and *IT* 1481.
[9] See his note on Eur. *El.* 202–4.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The difficulty lies in ὑπόκειται.[10] Jackson conjectured ὑποτάκει on the basis of the apparent parallel with the MS reading at *El.* 122–3, τίν' ἀεὶ τάκεις ὧδ' ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγὰν, which was emended to λάσκεις by Schwerdt (accepted by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, but not by Dawe). As Lloyd-Jones and Wilson point out, that parallel gives a 'difficult locution'.[11] Accordingly, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson accept Dorat's ὑπακούει in conjunction with Ast's πικραῖς οἰμωγαῖς. But Jackson, who accepted that this is a good conjecture, must have been right to object that it is 'quite far enough from the tradition to make it worth while to look at the one practicable alternative'.[12] Three changes in succession is a drastic remedy, but Jackson was wrong to think that the only practicable alternative is his own ὑποτάκει.

Erfurdt's ὕπο χεῖται (printed by Pearson in the OCT's predecessor) and Musgrave's ὑποχεῖται (printed by Irigoin as his own conjecture), both retaining the MSS' πικρᾶς οἰμωγᾶς, deserve consideration. The problem is that they both fail to convey the futility of Philoctetes' cries. With Musgrave's conjecture, another difficulty is that there is no similar attested usage of ὑποχέομαι. Pflugk's ὑποκλαίει seems unduly romantic. All these suggestions disclose what Jackson archly described as 'a fluidity of learned opinion as to relations obtaining between a lament and its echo'. What they do not disclose is close attention to the thrust of the Chorus' words. Unless Sophocles can be interpreted as using a personified Echo to represent futility,[13] the idea that Echo alone responds to Philoctetes' lament is inept because it leaves the Chorus ending on a bathetic note ('but it's OK, guys, because Echo responds to his lament'), where what we expect is hyperbole.

The Chorus is describing here Philoctetes *l'étranger*, a man rejected by his peers and by society, and the resonance of the unique epithet ἀθυρόστομος is reduced if Echo is allowed to answer Philoctetes. If, on the other hand, there were a suitable emendation of ὑπόκειται to throw ἀθυρόστομος into relief and produce the hyperbole that I think we should find here, then that would be the appropriate remedy. Hermann's ὕπ' ὀχεῖται goes some way to creating the sense of futility required and is very close to the *ductus litterarum*. But there may be a simpler way of achieving this. Emending to ἀπόκειται, which occurs in just such an abstract phrase elsewhere (Pind. *Nem.* 11.46) and which answers the epithet τηλεφανὴς, would do. The sense would then be: 'But Echo with her mouth that never shuts, who appears afar, is out of the reach of Philoctetes' bitter lament.'[14] If even Echo does not respond to him, then that confirms Philoctetes as μοῦνος (183), making the βάρη he endures truly ἀνήκεστα (184).

227–9

ἀλλ' οἰκτίσαντες ἄνδρα δύστηνον μόνον
ἐρῆμον ὧδε κἄφιλον καλούμενον
φωνήσατ' εἴπερ ὡς φίλοι προσήκετε.

[10] Jackson, 207: 'totally unknown in Greek tragedy, all but totally unknown in Greek poetry'. The suggestions of Pflugk and Ast do not alleviate this difficulty.

[11] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea*, 183.

[12] Jackson, 207.

[13] The word's only other appearance in Soph. is at *El.* 109, where it is no personification but a loud cry. Echo does appear personified in Pind. *Ol.* 14.21 (where she definitely does not represent futility, πατρὶ κλυτὰν φέροισ' ἀγγελίαν), Eur. F 118.2 (Nauck), Ar. *Thesm.* 1059, and Mosch. F 2 (as Pan's lover).

[14] If it is felt that the three epithets accorded to Echo create an imbalance between her and Philoctetes' cry, τηλεφανὴς could be emended to τηλεφανοῦς. However, the imbalance may be intentional here, as it echoes Echo's lack of response.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

228 καλώμενον **S** καλούμενον rell. κὠλούμενον Bergk
κακούμενον Morell γ' ἀλώμενον Toup
καὶ φίλων τητώμενον Seyffert

There is nothing syntactically wrong with the MS text. Following Hermann, Blaydes held that καλούμενον should be translated 'imploring you', notwithstanding Ellendt's caveat about the infrequent use of the middle, there being apparently only one other instance in Sophocles.[15] Blomfield had defended it on the basis that it means 'existing', but this does not address the real issue.[16] If it could be argued that in fact καλούμενον means 'calling myself', there might be a chance of explaining the paradosis. The sense would then be 'having taken pity on a [x, y, z] man, and one who calls himself friendless, speak if you really have come as friends'. But the verb does not seem to be used like this and most editors emend.

Campbell in his commentary thought Seyffert's conjecture most worthy of mention, despite the unlikelihood of τητώμενον. Toup's ἀλώμενον ('wandering'), which Heath thought possible[17] and which is adopted by Dawe, is perhaps inappropriate to a man with an affliction of the foot,[18] and καὶ . . . γέ seems a clumsy use of the *remedium Heathianum* after the asyndeton. Following Campbell and Jebb, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson adopt Morell's conjecture.[19] While there is palaeographic justification for this, logically one must ask whether a castaway, who describes himself as μόνον and ἐρῆμον in the same sentence, can be said to have anybody there, other than perhaps the wind and the rain, to mistreat him. One would have to accept that κακούμενον is being used rather broadly.

My own suggestion is, adopting Seyffert's καὶ φίλων, to read μονούμενον for καλούμενον (καὶ φίλων μονούμενον: 'and being deserted by his friends'), as a pleonasm after μόνον and ἐρῆμον. μ and κ are regularly confused.[20] μονόω does not occur elsewhere in Sophocles, but the same usage of μονόω does occur in Euripides.

236–7 τίς σ', ὦ τέκνον, προσέσχε, τίς προσήγαγεν
χρεία; τίς ὁρμή; τίς ἀνέμων ὁ φίλτατος;

236 προσέσχε codd. ποτ' ἔσχε Blaydes κατέσχε Lloyd-Jones and Wilson

In *Sophoclea* Lloyd-Jones and Wilson called Blaydes's ποτ' ἔσχε the least unconvincing of his suggestions (which included προὔπεμψε, προὔτρεψε, and σ' ἔπεμψε), but in the OCT they preferred their own κατέσχε, referring to *OC* 369–70 and LSJ s.v. κατέχω II.6 and suggesting that the scribe's eye had skipped forward to the προσ- of προσήγαγεν and imported it back to give προσέσχε, displacing their κατέσχε (cf. LSJ s.v. I.2 and Soph. *Phil.* 244). In *Second Thoughts* Lloyd-Jones and

[15] *OC* 1385, where Jebb comments that this usage is rare except as a legal term meaning 'to cite' in a legal action, although he thinks it appropriate in that place. Cf. LSJ s.v. I.4.b.

[16] Cf. LSJ s.v. II.2 for apparent examples of this usage. It seems to be most common in the perfect passive, as noted by LSJ. The status recognition inherent in the usage seems to depend upon the existence of a social milieu. Philoctetes' point is just the opposite: he has none. This is one reason against Blomfield's defence.

[17] B. Heath, *Notae sive lectiones ad Sophoclem* (Oxford, 1762), 83.

[18] At least coming from his own mouth. But see my conjecture at 146, where a similar word is put in the mouths of the Chorus.

[19] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea*, 184–5.

[20] See Jackson, 120, and J. Diggle, *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994), 178, n. 4.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wilson have taken the opportunity to revise their earlier view,[21] in light of Kirkwood's review of the OCT, where he cited Hdt. 9.99.1 in support of the paradosis.[22]

What is Philoctetes asking? The progression of thought is from need (did Neoptolemus need something? but what could he have needed?), to impulse (what impulse could have brought Neoptolemus here?), to chance (was it just a chance wind? well, if it was, I like that wind very much). Philoctetes' expression of joy betrays a growing doubt about the reason for Neoptolemus' arrival. If Lloyd-Jones and Wilson could have convinced us that the sense of *κατέσχε* is of bringing Neoptolemus in to land at Lemnos and that Philoctetes' questions are inspired by nautical usage, that would have added weight to their conjecture. However, *κατέχω* in its nautical usage is intransitive (cf. LSJ s.v. B.2), as is *προσέχω*, except apparently in Kirkwood's Herodotean example.

To avoid doubt over whether *προσέχω* can be used transitively in the sense required, my suggestion is to read *προσεῖλκε* for *προσέσχε*. The sense will then be 'what need drew you on?' An obvious objection is that *προσέλκω* is not a word used by Sophocles. It does, however, occur in the sense 'draw on' in the variant reading at Pind. *Ol.* 6.83 and at Aristaenet. 1.10.17–20.[23]

260 *ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ πατρὸς ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως*

οὑξ **ZgZoT** *ἐξ* rell.

ἐκ describes origin in the sense of parentage (see LSJ s.v. III.2) often enough in prose[24] and verse. But the *textus receptus* here is awkward (especially in a rather grand apostrophe), 'o son from father Achilles'. Jebb cites *Ant.* 193 in support of the majority MS reading, even though that example includes the definite article in the cognate usage of *ἀπό*. Jebb's reference to *Phil.* 910 is a typographical error. In my view the variant reading ('o son whose father is Achilles') should be adopted. In its support I refer the reader to *Phil.* 940 (to which Jebb intended to refer), *οἰ' ἔργ' ὁ παῖς μ' ἔδρασεν οὑξ Ἀχιλλέως*, and to *Aj.* 1289, *οὐκ τῆς βαρβάρου μητρὸς γεγώς*. For a nominative appositional phrase following the vocative, see e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 70, *Ἀρά τ' Ἐρινὺς πατρὸς ἡ μεγασθενής*.

285 *ὁ μὲν χρόνος οὖν διὰ χρόνου προὔβαινέ μοι*

δὴ **AUY** (adopted by Schneidewin and Pearson, *inter alios*) *οὖν* rell.
νυν Wecklein and Blaydes
χρόνου codd. *πόνου* Nauck

The majority MS reading is unmetrical. Irigoin accepts the reading of AUY, despite the usual appearance of *μὲν δή* together rather than in isolation.[25] The triumvirate of

[21] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Second Thoughts*, 105–6.
[22] G. M. Kirkwood, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2.1 (1993), 22–31, at 29.
[23] For the combination of *ἕλκω* and *ἄγω*, see Soph. *OC* 924–8 (Theseus) *οὔκουν ἔγωγ' ἂν σῆς ἐπεμβαίνων χθονός,/. . ./ ἄνευ γε τοῦ κραίνοντος, ὅστις ἦν, χθονὸς/ οὔθ' εἷλκον οὔτ' ἂν ἦγον . . .*
[24] See J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge, 1938), s.v. II.3 (56 examples), and e.g. Andoc. 1.109, *ἀγαθοὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν*, translated by MacDowell ad loc. 'fine sons of fine fathers'.
[25] See the numerous examples cited by Denniston, 391–5.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lloyd-Jones and Wilson and Dawe agree in adopting the conjecture of Wecklein and Blaydes to restore sense and metre.

Lloyd-Jones and Wilson retain the MSS' χρόνου. Dawe, on the other hand, adopts Nauck's conjecture. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson think that Eur. *Andr.* 1247–8 is a parallel supporting the MS reading here. The text will then mean 'one period of time after another went by for me' (as Lloyd-Jones translates in the Loeb). But the Euripidean passage is not analogous: the definite article is absent and it is unlikely that χρόνος can mean 'a period of time', despite the examples cited by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson in support of that meaning.[26] With that in mind, the text should be emended. Nauck's πόνου, adopted by Dawe, makes good sense, but it is not the only possibility and the preference of Sophocles (*Phil.* 761) and Euripides (F 826 Nauck) for the plural διὰ πόνων elsewhere tells against it here. I prefer τρόμου, *T* and *X* being confused along with *M* and *N*: 'I spent my time trembling'.

451–2 ποῦ χρὴ τίθεσθαι ταῦτα, ποῦ δ' αἰνεῖν, ὅταν
τὰ θεῖ' ἐπαινῶν τοὺς θεοὺς εὕρω κακούς;

452 ἐρευνῶν Hartung (accepted by Nauck) ἐπαθρῶν Postgate

Critics have been concerned by ἐπαινῶν because finding out that something is bad in the course of praising it seems illogical. Erfurdt and Hermann tried to explain this by saying τὰ θεῖ' ἐπαινῶν means *quum uolo laudare diuina*. Most subsequent editors have accepted the MS reading, with varying degrees of diffidence. However, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson adopt Postgate's ἐπαθρῶν in the OCT. They reject the paradosis because in their opinion (i) it is unlikely that anyone would discover that the gods are evil in the course of seeking to praise them, and (ii) 'the word must have been corrupted because of the presence of αἰνεῖν in the line before'.[27] These objections require a response. As to the first, Sophocles' language here, while difficult, is a paradox more natural to Greek than even English.[28] It is quite in character with a declaration about divine inscrutability from a man with a heroic, anti-Odyssean belief system who feels the injustice of his abandonment, and who struggles with piety. αἰνεῖν need not in any event mean 'praise'.[29] Nor do we need to import an unattested meaning here for ἐπαινῶν. If, then, it means 'praise', are there similar examples in Sophocles of persons discovering things to be bad while praising them? No. However, at Soph. *OT* 441 Oedipus indignantly responds τοιαῦτ' ὀνείδιζ' οἷς ἔμ' εὑρήσεις μέγαν to Teiresias' enquiry about his prowess at answering riddles.

[26] The examples they give are Soph. *OT* 561, where χρόνοι cannot mean what they say because the point Creon is making is that Oedipus would have to go back a long way in time to find the time when Laius was murdered, a point made clear by Dawe's paraphrase in his commentary ad loc.; *OT* 1137, where the sense of period is lent by the adjective ἑκμήνους; and Eur. *Supp.* 1118, where if χρόνου could mean a 'period of time', Musgrave's μέτρα would be effete (Diggle and Kovacs adopt it; it does not satisfy Collard, who obelizes the text).

[27] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea*, 189.

[28] Cf. Shakespeare, *Antony & Cleopatra*, 2.6.53–7, 'Though I lose/ The praise of it by telling, you must know,/ When Cæsar and your brother were at blows,/ Your mother came to Sicily and did find/ Her welcome friendly.'

[29] Cf. LSJ s.v. II, 'be content with, acquiesce in' c. acc. rei, with examples (the references to Pindar do not mean what LSJ say they mean). Sommerstein on Aesch. *Eum.* 469 says 'the verb [sc. αἰνεῖν] need not imply enthusiasm', referring to Aesch. *Supp.* 903–4; and Eur. *Alc.* 2 (where Dale refers to Eur. *Hipp.* 37, ἔκδημον αἰνέσας φυγήν, which Barrett in his commentary ad loc. translates 'consenting to' without explanation).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Discovering that something is great in the course of censuring it is almost the opposite of discovering that something is bad in the course of praising it, and this should encourage editors inclined to retain the MS reading here. In response to Lloyd-Jones and Wilson's second objection, their reasoning is circular and cannot of itself justify altering the text. Repetition, if indeed the compound form in 452 allows this to be so categorized, is not of itself indicative of corruption. There is no reason, in a rhetorical question such as this, why a word should not be repeated in a compound form when it is asked why something should not be done and the question is then answered.

So, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson fail to establish that the MS reading is indefensible. As to their adoption of Postgate's conjecture, there are actually two good reasons against it (where they dismiss Hartung's *ἐρευνῶν*, which does not suffer from either), the second of which is, in my view, fatal. First, *ἐπαθρεῖν* occurs nowhere else in Tragedy. It occurs just once, at Bacchyl. 13.227, as they admit, prior to the third century B.C., making it a very rare word, to be inserted, one would have thought, only with circumspection. Second, the alpha in *ἀθρεῖν* is treated by Sophocles as short in those of the seven examples referred to by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson where its quantity is determinate. We must ask therefore why Lloyd-Jones and Wilson believe that in compound it should be treated differently, as it would have to be here.

500–3

νῦν δ', εἰς σὲ γὰρ πομπόν τε καὐτὸν ἄγγελον
ἥκω, σὺ σῶσον, σύ μ' ἐλέησον, εἰσορῶν
ὡς πάντα δεινὰ κἀπικινδύνως βροτοῖς
κεῖται, παθεῖν μὲν εὖ, παθεῖν δὲ θάτερα.

502 *πάντα δεινὰ* codd. *πάντ' ἄδηλα* Wakefield
503 *θἀτέρᾳ* Blaydes

Dawe admits Wakefield's conjecture. On 502 Lloyd-Jones and Wilson say that Wakefield's conjecture 'gives a sense better suited to the context than the reading of the manuscripts',[30] although they accepted the MS reading in the OCT. But is the paradosis unjustifiable and does the change really suit the context better? Dealing with the last first: *δεινὰ κἀπικινδύνως* is a perfectly natural combination;[31] *δεινός* with the infinitive is common in Sophocles where *ἄδηλος* does not occur in that construction;[32] and if we accept Wakefield's change, how can one stand outside evils and look out for them, as Philoctetes suggests one should in 504?[33] These points

[30] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Second Thoughts*, 107.

[31] See e.g. Pl. *Leg.* 736c and Xen. *Mem.* 4.6.10.

[32] But see Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of The Greek Verb* (London, 1889[2]), para. 763: 'Any adjective may take an infinitive to limit its meaning to a particular action.' The infinitives in 503 are more easily explicable if the thought can allow them to be epexegetic of what precedes.

[33] M. D. Reeve, 'Some interpolations in Sophocles', *GRBS* 11 (1970), 283–93, at 288, has argued for the deletion of 504–6, which would negate my third objection. The deletion, proposed on the bases that 504–6 add nothing and that such antithetical gnomic utterances as we find in 502–3 occur at the end of sixteen other long speeches in Sophocles, is accepted by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, but not by Dawe or Irigoin. Reeve himself couched his proposed deletion carefully: 'it is hard to repress the suspicion that Philoctetes' speech ended [with 503]'. Statistically he has a point, but I do not think that 504–6 add nothing. They contain a warning to Neoptolemus to watch out in case he comes to grief through not looking to his life, intimating that he has reason to want to get away from Lemnos too, which is not implicit in 501–3.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

should be enough to cast doubt on Lloyd-Jones and Wilson's view. Dealing with the MS reading: the sense must be that we know that everything is terrible and that, given that knowledge, it is sensible, when one is making hay, to be on the look out for catastrophes in case they take one by surprise. You can anticipate terrible events, but you cannot avoid them.[34] The MS reading, which Irigoin retains, allows this interpretation. I would therefore reject Wakefield's conjecture and compare further Pind. *Pyth.* 8.76–7.

The epexegetic phrase *παθεῖν μὲν εὖ, παθεῖν δὲ θάτερα* is also difficult to explain. Jebb's explanation 'that, *as* they have fared well, *so* they may fare ill' (original emphasis) does not help and does not do justice to the Greek. These words need a peg and the only peg for them is in what precedes. It means 'some of which [sc. *δεινὰ* (502)] to bear well, others badly'. Blaydes's *θἀτέρᾳ* should also be adopted because *θάτερα* is unparalleled in an adverbial sense and is clumsy in the context of an (otherwise inexplicable) epexegesis, whereas *θἀτέρᾳ* is regularly used in this way.[35]

628–30 *οὔκουν τάδ', ὦ παῖ, δεινά, τὸν Λαερτίου*
ἔμ' ἐλπίσαι ποτ' ἂν λόγοισι μαλθακοῖς
δεῖξαι νεὼς ἄγοντ' ἐν Ἀργείοις μέσοις;

630 *νεὼς* codd. *'κ νεὼς* Blaydes *λεὼς* Schubert

When analysed, the phraseology is a little strange. Blaydes lists a number of conjectures for 630 before concluding, as if in defiance of his reputation for radical emendation, that 'the common reading may be defended, and should not hastily be altered'. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, following Blaydes, retain the MS reading. Dawe adopts Schubert's conjecture, despite the word's absence in the plural in Tragedy.

If *νεὼς* meant 'from his ship' with *ἄγοντ'*, then one would expect *ἐς Ἀργείους μέσους* to follow. So there was some sense in Campbell's original attempt to make it dependent on *δεῖξαι*, despite his later retraction of this argument,[36] even if a separative genitive was even more unlikely with *δεῖξαι*. *νεὼς ἄγοντ'* is difficult for 'leading from his ship', but not impossible. But *νεὼς ἄγοντ' ἐν* is tortured and Blaydes's *'κ νεὼς* seems a certain correction.

Dr Dawe has expressed concern *per litteras* about *λόγοισι μαλθακοῖς*. With what, he asks, do the soft words go? This prompted me to suggest *εἶξαι* for *δεῖξαι* with Philoctetes as subject. Philoctetes is imagined yielding to Odysseus' words as the latter leads the former from his ship. However, this necessitates a further emendation of *ἄγοντ' ἐν* and I propose *ἄγουσί* (dative plural participle agreeing with *λόγοισι*) *μ'*. Having already accepted Blaydes's correction, we would have *ἔμ' ἐλπίσαι ποτ' ἂν λόγοισι μαλθακοῖς/ εἶξαι 'κ νεὼς ἄγουσί μ' Ἀργείοις μέσοις;* 'Is it not strange, my son, that Odysseus hopes that I would ever yield to his soft words leading me from his ship to the middle of the Argives?' This proposal has the benefit of giving *λόγοισι μαλθακοῖς* a purpose. I acknowledge that it is radical, but believe the text to be in need of a radical solution here.[37]

[34] For the thought, see e.g. Achilles Tatius 1.3.3.

[35] Cf. LSJ s.v. IV.1.c, and add to the examples given there Soph. F 434.3 (Pearson, but not Radt) *εὖ παθόντα θἀτέρᾳ θανεῖν*.

[36] Campbell, *PS* 210.

[37] For the record, Dr Dawe does not approve it.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

645 ἀλλ', εἰ δοκεῖ, χωρῶμεν ἔνδοθεν λαβὼν

λαβὼν codd. λαβεῖν Page
λαβόνθ' Wyttenbach λάβ' οὖν Fröhlich

For examples of the singular participle with the plural verb, see Bond on Eur. *HF* 858.[38] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson print the MS reading. Their list of parallels[39] is badly ordered, and it does not deal with all the relevant examples.[40] Moreover, Jackson did not propose χωροῖς ἄν, as Lloyd-Jones and Wilson suggest, without more.[41] Jackson was complaining that the examples cited in support of the MS text involve a singular participle preceding the plural verb, and he suggested the possibility that the plural χωρῶμεν could have come about as 'a whim of the subconscious memory' of what appears in 526 and 635. Jackson, however, sounds a note of doubt by saying that if right, 'we should have to impute to Sophocles the banality ἀλλ', εἰ δοκεῖ, χωροῖς ἄν'.[42] Despite Jackson's self-confessed idiosyncrasy regarding word order,[43] there is something that sets this example apart: Neoptolemus and Philoctetes are both about to leave, whereas in other examples, where the text is not corrupt, the plural verb refers in reality to one person. That is not the case here and the text therefore requires correction. Neither Fröhlich's λάβ' οὖν nor Wyttenbach's λαβόνθ' is much help. οὖν is the wrong connective and λαβόνθ' is the wrong tense for the construction. Page's λαβεῖν, however, gives just the sense required and is an easy correction. Of modern editors only Dawe adopts it.[44]

650 . . . ὥστε πραΰνειν πάνυ.

πόνου $\mathbf{V}^{ac}$ πάνυ $\mathbf{V}^{pc}$ rell. πόνον Reiske
πόδα Wecklein πάλιν Nauck πολύ Hense ταχύ Meineke

Because the MSS' πάνυ is rare in Tragedy, and then occurs only in lyric and anapaestic passages, many changes have been suggested. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, however, retain the MS reading translating 'a good deal' rather than 'entirely'.[45] While they refer to five other instances of the word in Tragedy, none of their examples displays the meaning they give it here. Its occurrence in satyric drama at Soph. *Ichn.* 345 in such a mutilated area of the papyrus is inconclusive. The MS reading is unparalleled and unsuitable. There is not much to choose between the conjectures cited. Those of Hense and Nauck are rather dull. Meineke's has some plausibility on palaeographic grounds, but seems abrupt. Wecklein's is pedestrian, and it is the wound, not his foot, that Philoctetes wants to soothe. Dawe accepts the

[38] To his examples should be added Eur. *IT* 349. Hermann compared this line also with Soph. *OC* 1104. Page on Eur. *Med.* 565 suggested the MSS' singular optative might be kept against Elmsley's conjecture, although he was uncharacteristically indecisive on this. Diggle has now stepped into the breach and maintains the MS reading (approved by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea*, 194).

[39] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea*, 193–4. The closest parallel is Soph. *Trach.* 335, as Schneidewin realized.

[40] To their list can be added Eur. *HF* 1208–9, and *Ion* 548–9 and 1250.

[41] Referring to Jackson, 241–2.

[42] Jackson, 242.

[43] Contrary to what Fraenkel, 61, says, some examples do exhibit plural verb followed by singular participle, so consideration of the sequence is not decisive.

[44] Approved by Diggle also on Eur. *Phaëth.* 97 D.

[45] Not a meaning given by LSJ.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reading of V before correction (as Hartung had done), but this leaves us with an unlikely separative genitive.[46] Reiske's simple *πόνον* gives the best outcome of applying salve to the wound.

Little Venice, London NICHOLAS LANE

[46] The examples of such genitives given by Dawe, *Studies*, 3.55, involve a passive verb (Soph. *Phil.* 1334 and Eur. *Or.* 43) or a verb connoting taking respite from which ordinarily takes the genitive (Soph. *Aj.* 274). These are quite natural. Here, however, we have an active verb and a need to supply an object if *πόνου* is accepted.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh050 Published online by Cambridge University Press