

restores resposion with πόλεος in 215. Heimsoeth's *πυριγενέται χαλινοί* provides a subject for ἄπνον.² It seems that χαλινοί here = 'bridle and bit' (cf. Herodotus 3.118.2, 4.64.2; *IG* i³ 476.174–5), hence the distinction from the στόμα (for which see also Herodotus 1.215.2, 4.72.4). The reference is to the clinking noise produced by the metal bridles (*πυριγενέται*, lit. 'born in fire', means 'forged by fire', cf. Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1223 στόμα πυριγενῆ) as they strike against the metal bridle-bits; the noise is thus transmitted 'through' (διά) the bits.

It might be possible to keep the transmitted *πυριγενετᾶν χαλινῶν* by emending ἄπνων into ἀονά, 'cry' (αῶ): 'and the cry of equestrian rudders (sounded, ἐκλαγξεν) through the bits of the fire-born bridles'. *AYON-* will have been corrupted into *AYIN-*, and the ending changed under the influence of ἱππικῶν . . . πηδαλίων. With this arrangement, στόμα . . . χαλινῶν would be an accurate description of the bit being part of a bridle.³ Admittedly, however, ἀονή in this sense occurs only in Semonides, fr. 7.20 West (of a dog's yapping).

II. 211–13

ΧΟ. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δαιμόνων πρόδρομος ἦλθον ἀρ-
χαῖα βρέτη, θεοῖσι πίσυννος, λιθάδος
ὄτ' ὀλοῶς νειφομένας βρόμος ἐν πύλαις·

212 θεοῖσι πίσυννος Blomfield, Seidler : πίσυννος θεοῖς Ω λιθάδος Naber (cf. 159) :
νιφάδος Ω

In 213, the paradosis (ὄτ' . . . βρόμος ἐν πύλαις) involves a harsh ellipsis of the imperfect tense of the copula in a subordinate clause, for which I can find no adequate parallels.⁴ It is impossible to supply the copula without major rearrangement of the word order, e.g. Schmidt's ὄτ' ὀλοῶς | νιφομέ-

2. F. Heimsoeth, *Die Wiederherstellung der Dramen des Aeschylus*, Bonn 1861, 259.

3. X. *Eq.* 6.7–8, 10.6–10; J. K. Anderson, *Ancient Greek Horsemanship*, Berkeley 1961, 50–2.

4. Cf. R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, ii: *Satzlehre*, vol. 1, Hannover and Leipzig ³1898, 41. Note also Italic's remark: 'De weglating van ἦν is zeer ongewoon' (G. Italic, *Aeschylus' Zeven tegen Theben*, Leiden 1950, ad 212). For the (rare) omission of ἦν in principal clauses cf. E. *Ba.* 436 ὁ θῆρ' ὄδ' ἡμῖν προῖος; Pl. *R.* 503b ὄκνος γάρ, ἔφην, ὃ φίλε, ἐγὼ εἶπεῖν τὰ νῦν ἀποτετολμημένα (with M. Schanz, *Novae commentationes Platonicae*, Würzburg 1871, 33). The one example known to me where ἦν needs to be understood in a subordinate clause is A. *Ag.* 445–6 εἶ λέγοντες ἄν-|δρα τὸν μὲν ὡς μάχας ἴδρις.

νας νιφάδος (*lege* λιθάδος) <ἦν> βρόμος, largely accepted by Page in his OCT.⁵ As a tentative solution I suggest ἦν πύλαις,⁶ with πύλαις as locative dative.⁷

III. 219–22

ΧΟ. μήποτ' ἔμὸν κατ' αἰῶνα λίποι θεῶν
 ἄδε πανάγυρις, μηδ' ἐπίδοιμι τάνδ' 220
 ἄστυδρομουμένην πόλιν καὶ στρατὸν
 τυφόμενον πυρὶ δαίῳι.

221–2 καὶ στρατὸν | τυφόμενον π. δ. Meineke : καὶ στρατεύμ' | ἀπτόμενον (τυφόμενον
 Μ^{γρ} Υ^{στ}) π. δ. Ω : καὶ στρατοῦ | δαπτομένην πυρὶ δαίῳν Prie (unde καὶ στρατοῦ . . .
 δαίῳι Hutchinson)

Although *τυφόμενον* has scant MSS support, it seems to be the correct reading (with Meineke's *στρατόν* for *στράτευμ'* in 221):⁸ the 'population' (*στρατόν*, cf. 184, 302) of a city set on fire by its captors is 'smoked out' of it, as wasps or bees might be smoked out of their nests;⁹ hence the image of frenzied flight evoked by *ἄστυδρομουμένην*. The *paradosis καὶ στρατεύμ' | ἀπτόμενον* entails the grotesque notion of setting the entire population on fire, rather than e.g. killing them or taking them as slaves. No further tampering with the *paradosis* is advisable. Prie's *καὶ στρατοῦ | δαπτομένην* (sc. *πόλιν*) *πυρὶ δαίῳν* is awkward,¹⁰ even though *δαπτομένην* is idiomatic,¹¹ and *στρατοῦ . . . δαίῳν* is paralleled in 147: the separation of *δαίῳν* from *στρατοῦ*, further aggravated by the intervening *δαπτομένην* looking back to *πόλιν*, makes for impossibly tortuous phraseology; and the bare genitive *στρατοῦ* is inelegant. Hutchinson's *καὶ στρατοῦ δαπτομένην πυρὶ δαίῳι* does remove the inelegance, but parallels suggest that in similar contexts 'fire' is the *subject* of *δάπτειν* (cf. n. 11).¹²

-
5. M. Schmidt, "Zur Kritik der Sieben gegen Theben", *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 16 (1865) 553–85, at 570.
 6. The conjecture is attributed to Voss by N. Wecklein (*Aeschylī Fabulae*, vol. 2, Berlin 1885, 63), but not to be found in H. Voss, *Curarum Aeschylearum specimen I*, Heidelberg 1812.
 7. Cf. e.g. S. OT 20 ἀγοραῖσι θακεῖ, *El.* 313 ἀγοῖσι τυγχάνει (Kühner and Gerth [n. 4], 441–2).
 8. A. Meineke, 'Bemerkungen zu Aeschylus', *Philologus* 20 (1863) 51–75, at 55.
 9. Wasps: Ar. V. 457 τῦφε πολλῶι τῶι καπνῶι. Bees: A.R. 2.134 καπνῶι τυφόμεναι.
 10. C. Prie, [Review of G. Hermann, *Aeschylī tragoediae*, 2nd edn., vol. i/2, Berlin 1852], *RhM* 9 (1854) 217–40, 392–421 (at 235–6 with n.*)
 11. Cf. *Il.* 23.183 πυρὶ δαπτέμεν; ?A. PV 368 ποταμοὶ πυρὸς δάπτοντες.
 12. See G. O. Hutchinson, *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas*, Oxford 1985, ad 221f.

IV. 223–5

ET. μή μοι θεοὺς καλοῦσα βουλεύου κακῶς·
 Πειθαρχία γάρ ἐστι τῆς Εὐπραξίας
 μήτηρ, †γυνή† σωτήρος· ὦδ' ἔχει λόγος. 225

225 γύναι GF^{pc} Tr

In 225, *σωτήρος* is commonly taken to refer to *Ζεὺς Σωτήρ*, and Sommerstein adduces a 4th-century inscription (*IG* ii² 4627) mentioning another personified abstraction (Good Fortune) as Zeus' wife.¹³ But Hutchinson offers two decisive objections to the *communis opinio*:¹⁴ (i) '(δ) Σωτήρ does not seem to be used alone of Zeus save in the proverb τὸ τρίτον τῶι Σωτήρι and expressions derived from it'; (ii) for Eteocles to bring in the supreme god here would spoil the chorus' counter-argument *θεοῦ δ'* in 226, as well as (we may add) vitiating the overall antithesis between the polis-centred Eteocles and the prayerful chorus.

It seems best to take *σωτήρος* as a qualification of *Εὐπραξία* (cf. Σ 224c τῆς σωτήρος εὐπραξίας, 225g τῆς σωστικῆς).¹⁵ As a result, *γυνή* can no longer stand, nor can the vocative *γύναι* at this position, esp. in view of the fact that Eteocles never uses the vocative to address the chorus, except disparagingly (cf. 182). Hermann's *γονῆς σωτήρος* ('offspring of a deliverer') clumsily introduces two genitives in succession.¹⁶ Read perhaps *ξυνῆς σωτήρος*, '(Welfare,) assurer of common safety': **YNHΣΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ* with the first letter erased would be almost inevitably supplemented as <Γ>*YNHΣΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ*, hence *γυνή σωτήρος*. For *κοινὸς σωτήρ* cf. Strabo 17.2.3 (C822) *κοινὸς ἀπάντων σωτήρας*, and the catchphrase *κοινή σωτηρία* in inscriptions and the orators.¹⁷

13. A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus: Persians, Seven against Thebes, Suppliants, Prometheus Bound*, Loeb Classical Library 145, Cambridge, MA, 2008, 174–5 n. 27.

14. Hutchinson (n. 12), *ad* 225.

15. For *σωτήρ* in the feminine cf. A. Ag. 664 *Τύχη δὲ σωτήρ*, S. *OT* 80–1 *τύχη . . . | σωτήρι*; E. *El.* 993 *τιμὰς σωτήρας*. For *nomina agentis* qualifying feminine nouns without change of grammatical gender, esp. in tragedy, see Ernst Fraenkel, *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis* –τήρ, –τωρ, –της (–τ–), vol. 2, Strassburg 1912, 49.

16. G. Hermann, *Opuscula*, vol. IV, Leipzig 1831, 335.

17. e.g. *IG* ii² 680.13, 682.32–3; *Isoc.* 4.85, 8.39, *Lycurg.* 46, 88, 139; *Din.* 1.2.

V. 271–80

ἐγὼ δὲ χώρας τοῖς πολισσούχοις θεοῖς,
 πεδιονόμοις τε κἀγορᾶς ἐπισκόποις,
 Δίρκης τε πηγαῖς ὕδατί θ' Ἰσμηνοῦ λέγω,
 εἴ ξυντυχόντων καὶ πόλεως σεσωμένης
 μήλοισιν αἰμάσσοντας ἐστίας θεῶν 275
 { ταυροκτονοῦντας θεοῖσιν ὧδ' ἐπέχομαι }
 θήσειν τροπαῖα { πολεμίων δ' ἐσθήματα }
 λάφρα δάιων δουρίπληχθ' ἄγροῖς δόμοις. 278
 { στέψω πρὸ ναῶν πολεμίων δ' ἐσθήματα } 278a
 τοιαῦτ' ἐπέχον μὴ φιλοστόνωσ θεοῖς
 μηδ' ἐν ματαίοις κἀγροῖς ποιφύγμασιν 280

273 πηγαῖς] πηγῆς IY W V K alii ὕδατί τ' Geel : οὐδ' ἀπ' Ω (unde οὐδ' ἀπ' Ἰσμηρόν Abresch) Ἰσμ- Groeneboom : Ἰσμ- Ω 276 ταυροκτονοῦν τε I uersum del. Ritschl 277 θύσειν O δ'] τ' IRb : om. X ἐσθήματα codd. plur. et Σ^M277j : ἐσθήμασι M (in textu) et cognouerat Σ¹278o : ἐσθημάτων Y 278a habent M P^{ac} E^{ac} et cognouerat Σ¹278o : sola uerba στέψω πρὸ ναῶν praebent Q Δ^{pc} : om. rell. δ' M (in textu) : τ' M (supra lineam) : om. rell.

Lines 276–278a are heavily corrupt; I have indicated above the parts that seem to me most likely to be interpolated.¹⁸

Line 276 is almost certainly suppositious,¹⁹ and seems to have ousted a genuine line. Following hard upon μήλοισιν αἰμάσσοντας (275), ταυροκτονοῦντας seems idle, and is at any rate unacceptable without a connective (e.g. ταυροκτονοῦντάς τε; cf. the clumsy attempt in I to supply one): it was probably suggested by ταυροσφαγοῦντες . . . ταυρείου φόνου (43–4). Likewise, θεοῖσιν so shortly after θεῶν is offensive, while the pointless ὧδ' is probably a filler to make up the metre. Finally, ἐπέχομαι, which can only mean 'I boast that',²⁰ is inapposite in this context, and appears to have been concocted from 279 (ἐπέχον) with the purpose of supplying a verb to govern θήσειν (277). That such a verb was contained in the genuine line ousted by 276 is highly likely; I suggest, *exempli gratia*:

18. For a detailed account of earlier attempts to emend see S. Novelli, *Studi sul testo dei Sette contro Tebe*, Amsterdam 2005, 177–84.

19. See F. Ritschl, *Kleine philologische Schriften*, vol. 1, Leipzig 1866, 367–70.

20. Cf. A. Ag. 1262 with E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, vol. 3, Oxford 1950, *ad loc.*

καλόν τ' ἐπευφημοῦντας ὕμνον ἔλπομαι
θήσειν τροπαῖα

‘and intoning, in addition (ἐπ-), a beautiful hymn, I expect us to set up trophies

For καλός ὕμνος cf. Aeschylus, fr. **204b.9 Radt καλ[ὸ]ν δ' ὕμνον . . . μολ- /πάσειν [ἔ]ολ[π' ἐγ]ώ (suppl. Lobel); for ἐπευφημεῖν denoting the singing of hymns to accompany ritual offerings cf. *Persae* 619–20 χοαῖσι ταῖσδε νερτέρων / ὕμνους ἐπευφημεῖτε.

In 277, πολεμίων δ' ἐσθήματα (or the minority readings ἐσθήμασι / ἐσθημάτων) will not do: even if it could mean ‘enemy armour’ (thus Σ 277j, 277ο, ρ), it would be otiose before λάφυρα δαίων (278). Its repetition in 278a (in a few MSS) bespeaks the interpolator’s hand in one of the two passages, or even in both. The only parallel I could find for this peculiar use of ἐσθήματα (which elsewhere means only ‘garments’) is in the 4th-century orator Demades, a notorious practitioner of linguistic affectation (‘a word-hunting sophist’, Athenaeus 99ε), who is credited, inter alia, with the recherché metaphor ἐσθῆς τῆς πόλεως, ‘raiment of the city’, meaning ‘the city walls’ (Athenaeus 99d). It is conceivable, then, that πολεμίων δ' ἐσθήματα started life as an overeager, ‘word-hunting’ interpolator’s expansion of λάφυρα δαίων.

Line 278a is, again, almost certainly interpolated; it is found only in three MSS, and its first half-line alone in two more. Hutchinson (n. 12, ad 275–8a) plausibly argues that στέψω πρὸ ναῶν was misguidedly devised to supply 278 with a verb, and that πολεμίων δ' ἐσθήματα was then pilfered from 277 to make up the line. In particular, πρὸ ναῶν looks like a scholiastic banalization of ἀγνοῖς δόμοις (278), and the rough-and-ready στέψω, prompted no doubt by the lack of a verb to govern λάφυρα in 278, was devised apparently on the basis of μνημεῖά . . . | . . . ἔστεφον (49–50); cf. Sophocles, *Ajax* 93 στέψω λαφύροις; Euripides, *Troades* 574–6 σκύλοις τε Φρυγῶν δοριθηράτοις | . . . | στέψει ναούς. A standard term for dedicating spoils to temples is πασσαλεύω,²¹ and the text may be emended accordingly as follows:

θήσειν τροπαῖα καὶ λάφυρα δαίων 277
<προσπασσαλεύσειν> δουρίπληχθ' ἀγνοῖς δόμοις 278

21. Cf. A. Ag. 579 θεοῖς λάφυρα . . . / δόμοις ἐπασσάλευσαν; [E.] Rh. 180 θεοῖσιν αὐτὰ πασσάλευε πρὸς δόμοις.

‘(I hope) to set up trophies and peg up spoils won from the enemy with the spear’s stroke (as dedications) to the holy temples’ (of the gods, cf. 275 θεῶν).

For προσπασσαλεύω + dative cf. *Prometheus Bound* 20 προσπασσαλεύσω (sc. σε) τῶιδ’ ἀπανθρώπῳ πάγῳ; Herodotus 9.120.4 σανίδι (Scaliger : σανίδα(ς) codd.) προσπασσαλεύσαντες (cf. 1.144.3).

VI. 282–4

ἐγὼ δέ γ’ ἄνδρας ἔξ ἐμοὶ ξὺν ἐβδόμῳι
ἀντηρέτας ἐχθροῖσι † τὸν μέγαν τρόπον †
εἰς ἑπτατειχεῖς ἐξόδους τάξω μολῶν

282 δέ γ’ anon. in editionis Aldinae exemplari Cantabrigiensi : δ’ ἐπ’ Ω ξὺν
Brunck : σὺν Ω 283 τὸν μέγαν τρόπον glossema sapiunt 284 ἑπτατείχους Q^{pc}
P^{ve} λ

In 283, τὸν μέγαν τρόπον, ‘in the grand manner’, makes no sense in this context, and the article is particularly offensive. Hutchinson (n. 12, *ad loc.*) posits a lacuna after 283, which would have contained a dative plural participle qualifying ἐχθροῖσι, with τὸν μ- τρ- meaning ‘in that proud manner of theirs’. However, μέγας *tout court* is not ‘proud’, nor have we witnessed, as yet, examples of the attackers’ insolence. A more promising line of argument would be to take τὸν μ- τρ- as a corruption of, e.g., οὐ μικρῶι τρόπῳι (cf. 465 ἐσχημάτισται δ’ ἄσπις οὐ μικρῶι τρόπῳι) or οὐ φάλλῳι τρόπῳι (cf. [Euripides] *Rhesus* 599 μολόντα Ῥῆσον οὐ φάλλῳι τρόπῳι).²² The modal datives would then attach to ἀντηρέτας: ‘opponents in no negligible fashion’.

OPEN UNIVERSITY OF CYPRUS

vayos.liapis@ouc.ac.cy

22. See V. Liapis, *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides*, Oxford 2012, *ad* 598–9.