

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

32.2014

ADOLF M. HAKKERT EDITORE

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

SOMMARIO

ARTICOLI

Liana Lomiento, <i>Ricordo di Bruno Gentili (Valmontone 20 novembre 1915 – Roma 7 gennaio 2014)</i>	1
Marina Caputo, <i>Osservazioni sul trattamento dei carmi di ‘Anthologia Latina’ per lo sviluppo dell’applicazione ‘Memorata Poetis’</i>	9
Emily Allen-Hornblower, <i>Gods in Pain: Walking the Line Between Divine and Mortal in ‘Iliad’ 5</i>	27
Paolo Cipolla, <i>Spigolature stesicoree</i>	58
Pär Sandin, <i>The Emblems of Excellence in Pindar’s First and Third ‘Olympian Odes’ and Bacchylides’ Third ‘Epinician’</i>	90
Alexander Garvie, <i>Eschilo nel ventunesimo secolo</i>	114
Antonella Candio, <i>Pregare e maledire: Aesch. ‘Ch.’ 145 s.</i>	119
Letizia Poli Palladini, <i>Aesch. ‘Sept.’ 778-87</i>	126
Guido Avezzù, <i>‘Lexis’ drammatica e critica del testo</i>	143
Patrick J. Finglass, <i>Il Sofocle di Jebb</i>	162
Luigi Battezzato, <i>La data della caduta di Troia nell’‘Ecuba’ di Euripide e nel ciclo epico: le Pleiadi, Sirio, Orione e la storiografia greca</i>	183
Stefano Novelli, <i>Lo stile disadorno: l’εἰκῆ λέγειν nel trimetro euripideo</i>	196
Andrea Taddei, <i>Le Panatenee nel terzo stasimo degli ‘Eraclidi’ (Eur. ‘Heraccl.’ 748-83). Rammemorazione rituale e identità corale</i>	213
Michela Curti, <i>Anomalie responsive nei giambi lirici</i>	229
Simonetta Nannini, <i>Il ‘Menesseno’ di Platone?</i>	248
Tristano Gargiulo, <i>Μεταμινθάνειν in Aristotele ‘Pol.’ 4.1289a 4 s.</i>	278
Maria Jennifer Falcone, <i>Due note esegetiche al ‘Dulorestes’ di Pacuvio (frr. 21.143-5 e 18.139 R.³)</i>	282
Enrico Corti, <i>Nube di guerra: percorsi di un’immagine poetica</i>	290
Paola Gagliardi, <i>Alberi e amore nell’‘ecl.’ 10 di Virgilio</i>	302
Silvia Mattiacci, <i>Prometeo ebbro e i suoi ‘monstra’ (a proposito di Mart. 14.182 e Phaedr. 4.16)</i>	315
Francesca Mestre, <i>Aspectos de la dramaturgia del diálogo en Luciano</i>	331
Tiziana Drago, <i>Una lepre quasi invisibile: Ael. ‘ep.’ 11 e 12</i>	356
Lucia Pasetti, <i>L’avarizia del padre Dite (Apul. ‘met.’ 6.18.6)</i>	368
Stefano Vecchiato, <i>Una congettura al testo della ‘Vita Maximini duo’ (2.5)</i>	374
Giovanna Pace, <i>Sul valore di προφδικός / ἐπφδικός / μεσφδικός in Demetrio Triclinio</i>	376
Matteo Tauffer, <i>Considerazioni sulle possibili fonti di Robortello e del Bodl. Auct. T.6.5 (Oa) relativamente al ‘Prometheus Vincetus’</i>	393
Miquel Edo, <i>La fealdad de Safo en la literatura moderna: historia de un eufemismo</i>	398
Francesco Citti, <i>Un frammento ‘primitivo’ delle ‘Eee’ pascoliane e il poemetto ‘Leucothoe’</i>	411

Pau Gilabert Barberà, <i>Classical References and Their Significance in 'The Magic Mountain' by Thomas Mann</i>	422
Mattia De Poli, <i>The Land of Teucer</i>	445

RECENSIONI

Dieter Bremer – Hellmut Flashar – Georg Rechenauer (hrsg. von), <i>Frühgriechische Philosophie</i> , Erster und zweiter Halbband der <i>Philosophie der Antike, Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie</i> (G. Ugolini)	453
Omero, <i>Odissea</i> , introduzione, commento e cura di Vincenzo Di Benedetto, traduzione di Vincenzo Di Benedetto e Pierangelo Fabrini (F. Ferrari)	454
Marco Ercoles, <i>Stesicoro: le testimonianze antiche</i> (M. Catrambone)	460
Sophocles, <i>Philoctetes</i> , edited by Seth L. Schein (F. Lupi)	469
<i>Nicofonte. Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento</i> , a c. di Matteo Pellegrino (S. Novelli)	475
<i>Aristoteles Romanus. La réception de la science aristotélicienne dans l'Empire gréco-romain</i> , Textes réunis et édités par Yves Lehmann (S. Maso)	478
<i>Alexandre le Grand. Les risques du pouvoir. Textes philosophiques et rhétoriques</i> , trad. et comm. par Laurent Pernot (C. Franco)	480
Virginia Fabrizi, <i>'Mores veteresque novosque': rappresentazioni del passato e del presente di Roma negli 'Annales' di Ennio</i> (A. Borgna)	483
Stefania Santelia, <i>La 'miranda fabula' dei 'pii fratres' in 'Aetna' 603-645</i> , con una nota di Pierfrancesco Dellino (G. Scarpa)	486
Stefano Costa, <i>'Quod olim fuerat'. La rappresentazione del passato in Seneca prosatore</i> (P. Mastandrea)	488
M. Valerii Martialis <i>Epigrammaton liber quintus</i> , introd., ed. crit., trad. e comm. a c. di Alberto Canobbio (G. Scarpa)	491
Jean-Luc Vix, <i>L'enseignement de la rhétorique au IIe siècle ap. J.-C. à travers les discours 30-34 d'Ælius Aristide. ἐν λόγοις καὶ μαθήμασιν καὶ ἐπαίνοις τραφεῖς; Johann Goeken, Aelius Aristide et la rhétorique de l' 'hymne' en prose</i> (C. Franco)	495
Iulius Africanus, <i>Cesti. The Extant Fragments</i> , edited by Martin Wallraff – Carlo Scardino – Laura Mecella – Christophe Guignard, translated by William Adler (T. Braccini)	497
Gesine Manuwald, <i>Nero in Opera. Librettos as Transformations of Ancient Sources</i> (C. Franco)	501
Kurt Sier – Eva Wöckener-Gade (hrsg. von), <i>Gottfried Hermann (1772-1848)</i> , Internationales Symposium in Leipzig, 11.-13. Oktober 2007 (G. Mancuso)	502
Angelo Giavatto – Federico Santangelo (a c. di), <i>La Retorica e la Scienza dell'Antico. Lo stile dei classicisti italiani nel ventesimo secolo / Between Rhetoric and Classical Scholarship. The Style of Italian Classicists in the Twentieth Century</i> (A. Balbo)	514
Giovanni Salanitro, <i>Scritti di filologia greca e latina</i> (A. Franzoi)	518

Direzione

VITTORIO CITTI
PAOLO MASTANDREA
ENRICO MEDDA

Redazione

STEFANO AMENDOLA, GUIDO AVEZZÙ, FEDERICO BOSCHETTI, CLAUDIA CASALI, LIA DE FINIS, CARLO FRANCO, ALESSANDRO FRANZOI, MASSIMO MANCA, STEFANO MASO, LUCA MONDIN, GABRIELLA MORETTI, MARIA ANTONIETTA NENCINI, PIETRO NOVELLI, STEFANO NOVELLI, GIOVANNA PACE, ANTONIO PISTELLATO, RENATA RACCANELLI, ANDREA RODIGHIERO, GIANCARLO SCARPA, PAOLO SCATTOLIN, LINDA SPINAZZÈ, MATTEO TAUFER

Comitato scientifico

MARIA GRAZIA BONANNO, ANGELO CASANOVA, ALBERTO CAVARZERE, GENNARO D'IPPOLITO, LOWELL EDMUNDS, PAOLO FEDELI, ENRICO FLORES, PAOLO GATTI, MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO, GIAN FRANCO GIANOTTI, PIERRE JUDET DE LA COMBE, MARIE MADELEINE MACTOUX, GIUSEPPE MASTROMARCO, GIANCARLO MAZZOLI, CARLES MIRALLES, GIAN FRANCO NIEDDU, CARLO ODO PAVESE, WOLFGANG RÖSLER, PAOLO VALESIO, MARIO VEGETTI, BERNHARD ZIMMERMANN

LEXIS – Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

<http://www.lexisonline.eu/>
info@lexisonline.eu, infolexisonline@gmail.com

Direzione e Redazione:

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Palazzo Malcanton Marcorà – Dorsoduro 3484/D
I-30123 Venezia

Vittorio Citti vittorio.citti@gmail.it

Paolo Mastandrea mast@unive.it

Enrico Medda e.medda@flcl.unipi.it

Pubblicato con il contributo del
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Copyright by Vittorio Citti
ISSN 2210-8823
ISBN

Lexis, in accordo ai principi internazionali di trasparenza in sede di pubblicazioni di carattere scientifico, sottopone tutti i testi che giungono in redazione a un processo di doppia lettura anonima (*double-blind peer review*, ovvero *refereeing*) affidato a specialisti di Università o altri Enti italiani ed esteri. Circa l'80% dei revisori è esterno alla redazione della rivista. Ogni due anni la lista dei revisori che hanno collaborato con la rivista è pubblicata sia online sia in calce a questa pagina.

Lexis figura tra le riviste di carattere scientifico a cui è riconosciuta la classe A nella lista di valutazione pubblicata dall'**ANVUR** (*Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca*). È inoltre censita dalla banca dati internazionale **Scopus-Elsevier**, mentre è in corso la procedura di valutazione da parte della banca dati internazionale **Web of Science-ISI**.

Informazioni per i contributori: gli articoli e le recensioni proposti alla rivista vanno inviati all'indirizzo di posta elettronica **infolexisonline@gmail.com**. Essi debbono rispettare scrupolosamente le norme editoriali della rivista, scaricabili dal sito **www.lexisonline.eu** (si richiede, in particolare, l'utilizzo esclusivo di un font greco di tipo unicode). Qualsiasi contributo che non rispetti tali norme non sarà preso in considerazione da parte della redazione.

Si raccomanda di inviare due files separati del proprio lavoro, uno dei quali reso compiutamente anonimo. Il file anonimo dovrà essere accompagnato da una pagina contenente nome, cognome e recapiti dell'autore (tale pagina sarà poi eliminata dalla copia inviata ai referees).

Aesch. Sept. 778-87*

The aim of this article is to resume discussion of a difficult passage of *Seven against Thebes* with regard to both issues of dramatization, content, mentality, and of textual criticism. The passage belongs to the second stasimon, sung by the chorus after Eteocles has departed to meet his brother in duel against their better advice. After expressing fear about the Erinys, recalling a mysterious Chalybian, i.e. personified Iron, appalled at the idea of fratricide (it is unclear if mutual), the chorus recapitulates sins and woes in the previous two generations of Theban kings: what Laius, what Oedipus did, the latter providing a link, by means of his curse, to the brothers' strife, whose outcome as the Erinys' work is feared. Let us start from the text of the last pair of stanzas in the song according to Page's edition with apparatus¹:

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀρτίφρων
ἐγένετο μέλεος ἀθλίων
γάμων, ἐπ' ἄλγει δυσφορῶν
μαινομένα κραδία
δίδυμα κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν
πατροφόνωι χειρὶ † τῶν
κρεισσοτέκνων δ' ὀμμάτων † ἐπλάγχθη.

στο. ε
780

τέκνοις δ' ἀρχαίας
ἐφῆμεν ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς,
αἰαῖ, πικρογλώσσους ἀράς,
καί σφε σιδαρονόμοι
διὰ χειρὶ ποτε λαχεῖν
κτήματα. νῦν δὲ τρέω
μὴ τελέσῃ καμψίπους Ἑρινύς.

ἀντ. ε
786

781 κραδία Tr: κραδίη O, καρδία rel. 784 κρεισσοτέκνων M^sΔΙΙcPKQTr, κρείσσω τέκνων MABHVNYaDWLhF, κρείσσων τέκνων XC, κρεισσόνων τέκνων OYG δ' ὀμμάτων HaQTr (qui etiam δ' omittit): δ' ἀπ' ὀμμ. rel.; δομάτων Hoernle 785 ἀρχαίας Wilamowitz coll. schol. S. OC 1375: ἀραίας codd.; ἀργίας Francken 786 ἐπίκοτος Heath: -κότους codd. τροφᾶς XWDABCP⁷⁰: -φᾶς rel. (utrumque B) 788 καί suspectum; ἦ Heimsoeth (ἦ Δ) 789 διὰ χειρὶ Porson: διαχειρία HaTr, -χειρία(i) rel.

At first the chorus deals clearly with Oedipus' discovery of his incest: «When he became aware, miserable one, of his wretched marriage, out of pain vexed in his maddened heart he carried out (or finished off) twin (i.e. two connected) evils with his parricidal hand»; but then we have problems up to the end of the stanza, and beyond, as the antistrophe may be tightly connected to 782-4. Actually, the majority of editors are content with reading τῶν κρεισσοτέκνων ὀμμάτων ἐπλάγχθη at the end of strophe 5, and only a few surmise corruption behind κρεισσοτέκνων and propose

* English version of a paper presented at the Aeschylus Seminar, held in Gela, 7th-10th April 2014. Many thanks to those present for their useful criticism.

¹ Page 1972. This edition offers in our case a more convenient working text than West 1998.

emendation: Stanley (φραιοστέκνων), Donaldson (κραιοσσοτεχνῶν), Hermann (κραιοστέκνων), Hartung (μὲν κραιοσσοτύπων), an anonymous scholar followed by Tucker (μιοστέκνων, although Tucker himself would read τρὶς στυγερῶν), and all of these leave ὁμιάτων, whereas some emend more heavily: Verrall (τῶν / χραιοστέκνων πωμάτων), West (τῶν κραιοσσοτέρων / γνωμάτων). Mere corruption without attempt at emending is signalled with a single *obelos* placed before κραιοσσοτέκνων by Paley²; with *obeloi* by Murray, from κραιοσσοτέκνων to ἐπλάγχθη, and with the warning, in the apparatus, that κραιοσσοτέκνων is a non-existent word, which cannot be really supported by the alleged parallels ἰσόθεος and ἀξιόλογος³. Also Groeneboom⁴ regards the compound as corrupt; and Page, as we have seen at the very outset of our discussion, signals corruption (but spares ἐπλάγχθη). Those who accept the reading κραιοσσοτέκνων ὁμιάτων interpret the whole sentence as either «he departed from his eyes, which are better than one's children», i.e. «he blinded himself»⁵; or «he was removed/departed from the sight of his children, more powerful (than he was)»⁶. Both groups utterly disregard the difficulty posed by κραιοσσοτέκνων, whether it is taken as a condensed comparative phrase (= κρείσσων/-ον τῶν τέκνων, *melior/-ius liberis*) or as a juxtaposed compound, i.e. comparative adjective + noun (= τῶν κραιοσσόνων τέκνων). No real parallel is provided for such a compound, and obviously enough since, to the best of my knowledge, nothing of this sort exists in ancient Greek.⁷ Secondly, the verb πλάζομαι is supposed by them to be bent from 'wandering' to 'moving', and the latter as either 'removing oneself/being removed' or 'depriving oneself'. Although no one can determine exactly how daring Aeschylus' language was, nonetheless such suppositions may fail to persuade.

I therefore stand by those who have recognized a corruption of some sort at the end of strophe 5. The existence of variant readings such as κρείσσω τέκνων or κραιοσσών τέκνων or κραιοσσόνων τέκνων in my view shows that the genuine reading got replaced by a corrupt form of it with subsequent adjustments. Both the 'M' and the 'A' scholia⁸ interpret the «twin evils» as Oedipus' putting his *two* eyes out and what follows as «he departed from his sons (who were) better than his own eyes»:

778-784a. [...] **δίδυμα** δὲ **κακὰ** ἔφη τὸ τῶν δύο ὀφθαλμῶν στερηθῆναι: ἔν γὰρ κακὸν τὸ ἑνὸς στερηθῆναι, δύο δὲ τὸ ἀμφοτέρων. ἢ τὸν Ἐτεοκλέα καὶ Πολυνείκη γεννήσας

² Paley 1879, *ad* 781: «The Greeks often speak of children, &c. being 'dearer than the very eyes,' cf. *supra* 525, but the converse seems absurd, to say nothing of the strangeness of the compound».

³ Murray 1955; see also Sevieri 2003.

⁴ Groeneboom 1966 (thus in the text; however, in his commentary his explanation resorts to the idea of «separating from his eyes, dearer than his own sons»).

⁵ Sidgwick 1903, *ad* 784, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1914a, in appar. *ad* 784 («quamvis invitis concedendum nobis esse videtur Aeschylum ad ἰσότεκνος sim. hoc κίβδηλον cudisse, ad sensum vero eximium cf. 530 Choeph. 934»), Mazon 1921, *I ad l.* The compound is suspected to mean, referred to 'eyes', 'able to provide the sight of one's sons' by Centanni 1995, *ad* 784.

⁶ Schütz 1782-97b, I 359, *ad* 780-93.

⁷ See e.g. Schwyzer 1953, I 425-55.

⁸ Smith 1982, *ad l.*

οἱ ἦσαν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν κρείσσονες: **ὀμμάτων δ' ἐπλάγχθη** ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔστερήθη τῶν κρειπτόνων ὀμμάτων, λέγει δὲ τῶν περὶ Ἐτεοκλέα καὶ Πολυνείκη. I¹M

778-784b. [...] **ἐτέλεσε** καὶ ἔπραξε **δίδυμα κακά**, ἦτοι τοὺς δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐτύφλωσε, τῇ χειρὶ τῇ καὶ τὸν πατέρα Λάιον φονευσάση, **ἐπλάγχθη** δὲ καὶ ἐχωρίσθη τῶν τέκνων τῶν κρειπτόνων τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν· τὰ γὰρ τέκνα τοῖς γονεῦσι κρείττω τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν νομίζονται. [...] ABHP¹PdSjWXaYYaYb

This seems to illustrate κρεισσόνων τέκνων (an improbable reading, though, due to the awkward sequence of separation and comparison genitive) rather than κρεισσοτέκνων, and means that the archetype (or the multiple archetypal tradition on which our manuscripts depend, if we reject the notion of a single archetype for Aeschylus' transmission)⁹ was already corrupt.

Once we agree on the corruption of 783 f., we need not rush to tamper with them, not until we make sure we understand what the chorus is meaning, i.e. the occasion and timing of Oedipus' cursing, surely a pivotal event in the Labdacid myth, and in many reconstructions of the second play of Aeschylus' Theban trilogy¹⁰. In fact, it is far from certain that Oedipus' curse belonged to the namesake tragedy, as it may have been omitted and then presupposed by the action of *Septem* and merely hinted at *a posteriori*. Leaving aside this insoluble problem, we have to understand whether in our play, within the chorus' retrospective recapitulation about the Labdacids (second stasimon), that curse is conceived as following closely on the disclosure, as a horrified impulsive reaction on a par with self-blinding, or as taking place some time after, as parental retaliation on insulting sons.

Earlier editors and translators pay no attention to the occasion for Oedipus' curse up to Heath¹¹, who not only corrects ἐπικότους τροφᾶς /-ᾶς to ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς, but also reflects on the motivation of that act by bringing to bear on our passage a scholium on Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* (1375)¹². According to this external piece of evidence, this was the occasion for Oedipus' curse in the epic *Thebais*: on receiving from his sons a portion of meat worse than usual after a sacrifice (a hip-joint instead of a shoulder of beef), and consequently being enraged at the slight. The following quotation from the *Thebais* (F 3 Bernabé) is rounded off by the mention of a similar treatment by Aeschylus in *Septem* (τὰ δὲ παραπλήσια τῷ ἐποποιῶι καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν τοῖς Ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβαις) and by two other quotations: one of a dramatic, probably satyric, fragment (*TrGF* II, fr. adesp. 458), where almost the same story is narrated by one of the sons¹³; and a shorter one from Menander's *Nauclerus* (fr. 248 Kassel-Austin). The question is whether the sentence concerning Aeschylus' treatment of the myth comes from an ancient source, and whether it is

⁹ On this problem see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1914a, XXII-v; Turyn 1943, passim; Dawe 1964, 156-61; Page 1972, VII-X; West 1990, 321-54; West 1998, III-XIX.

¹⁰ Sidgwick 1903, XII f.; Robert 1915 I, 252-83; Schmid – Stählin 1934, 210 f.

¹¹ Heath 1762, 33.

¹² Text in de Marco 1952. I defend the value of this scholium in Poli Palladini 2000, 225-30, and Poli Palladini 2014.

¹³ For both fragments de Marco 1936, and de Marco 1937 has shown that, while L provides a very corrupt text, R has several genuine or less corrupt readings. He also believes (*ibid.*) that the dropped author of the second may well be recovered by Bergk's Πρατίαν αὐτὰ ἐκτίθεσθαι, given παρά τινα in R.

correct. Now, although caution is hardly ever excessive in attempting to separate strata in scholia, as I am advised by a leading authority¹⁴, I am strongly inclined to take the scholium as a reliable piece of evidence, thus agreeing on the one hand with editors of the Scholia on Sophocles about its being a *vetus* (possibly by Didymus); and on the other hand with a large number of scholars on Aeschylus' treatment of the story – i.e. similar to that in the *Thebais*: Oedipus cursed his sons when they wronged him on account of sacrificial meat, or food or maintenance in general¹⁵. The reference to *Septem* in the scholium does not necessarily imply that *Oedipus* did not deal with the curse at all: for the original note may have referred to both places, before being cut and adapted to the current knowledge of Aeschylean tragedy¹⁶. Remarkably enough, those who cast doubt on the validity of the scholium, are just those who oppose any such occasion for Oedipus' cursing in Aeschylus' treatment of the myth. I have dilated on the value of this external piece of evidence because it cannot be simply swept away as trivial and because my interpretation of 778-87, carried on independently from such scholium, will in fact agree with it.

To come back to Heath, his view that *Septem* presupposes a curse motivated by an insult about food is followed by no scholar in the eighteenth century, as far as I can see, and by only a few in the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first¹⁷. Indeed Schütz's rebuttal and alternative explanation (Oedipus cursed his sons in outrage at the idea of having brought them up rather than exposed)¹⁸ wins the day. While his text and commentary keep being published in further editions through the nineteenth century, many scholars adopt his view of our passage, at first without any shift of meaning (and also without any acknowledgment, as does Bothe)¹⁹. Then Schütz turns out to be the founder of a whole new school of thought, as most nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars interested in our passage share the conviction that it would be unworthy of Aeschylus' spirit to present Oedipus cursing his sons only on account of his τροφή. In their view, the scholiast on Soph. *OC* 1375 has misunderstood our passage and seen a similarity with the *Thebais* which they hold as impossible. Their Oedipus, a forerunner of idealistic romantic figures, is superior to food or maintenance; he does not regard it as a serious parental right and filial duty. On the other hand, his moral sense is so high, that he cannot bear the mere thought of having *begotten* incestuous sons: therefore he reacts, immediately after the discovery

¹⁴ Mr. N.G. Wilson in epistular communication.

¹⁵ See n. 17.

¹⁶ Apart from the question of the single school-teacher, it is clear that from the third century A.D. the majority of Aeschylus' readers were acquainted only with the most popular plays, i.e. the seven of the 'selection'.

¹⁷ Brunck 1779, 140, 363 adopts and defends Heath's ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς but says nothing on the circumstances of the curse. Then, Heath's followers are Haupt 1839, 290; Paley 1879, *ad l.*; Verrall 1887, xxx f.; Verrall – Bayfield 1888, 96; Tucker 1908, xxvii, *ad l.*; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1914a, in app. *ad l.*; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1914b, 80 n. 2, 96; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921, 203 f.; Italie 1950, *ad* 785 ff.; Rose 1957, *ad Sept.* 785; Patzer 1958, 101, 112; Cameron 1970; Dawson 1970, 99; Cameron 1971, 21; Winnington-Ingram 1977, 37 f.; West 1999, 40; Collard 2008, xxix, 55, 192. Novelli 2008 agrees with Heath's general reconstruction of the curse (for which he adds interesting comparative material) but does not emend ἐπίκοτους.

¹⁸ Schütz 1782-97a, I; Schütz 1782-97b, I 359-63. He takes up his views in further editions: e.g. in Schütz 1808-11, I *ad Sept.* 787 f.

¹⁹ Bothe 1805, 129. He interprets τροφᾶς as «ob educationem», but makes no case against Heath.

of parricide and incest at the end of *Oedipus*, by cursing (i.e. condemning to death) not the culprit, i.e. himself, but his innocent sons, because they are the embodiment of his own monstrous act²⁰. This sort of orthodoxy, however, departs from Schütz in as much as it bends τροφή to meaning ‘origin, conception’ instead of ‘rearing’ putting on the word an unwarranted strain, as we shall see.

Before turning to the textual aspect of this view, I wish to rebut this general claim that, however the curse was presented in a cyclic poem, Aeschylus nonetheless must have treated it differently, namely so as to imprint his (alleged) spiritual sublimity on it. First, that the curse should be uttered by a wronged father, comprehensibly angry, not by an appalled morally superior being, is what we must expect of Greek mentality, at least archaic and classical. Within Greek culture (i.e. in myth and belief), curses²¹ are conceived as a means of defending a wronged authority, either in society or in the family, since the Erinys – whether invoked in the curse or not – will readily bring them about. The link between curse and Erinys is so tight and nearly automatic, that the two can be identified, and the former alone can be regarded as an agent²². Especially in the case of parents, the occasion for their cursing can even appear petty and unjust to us, like, e.g., Amyntor’s fierce reaction against his son Phoenix for the sake of a concubine (*Il.* 9.454). Yet gods, Erinyes, Zeus himself (as ἀραῖος²³, ὁμόγνιος²⁴, γενέθλιος²⁵) will protect the wronged parental authority without considering the merits of each case. One of the most eloquent pieces of evidence about the solemnity of γονέων ἀραῖ is Pl. *Lg.* 930e-932d. Note especially 931b-c:

Οἰδίπους, φαμέν, ἀτιμασθεῖς ἐπηύξατο τοῖς αὐτοῦ τέκνοις ἃ δὴ καὶ πᾶς ὑμνεῖ τέλεα καὶ ἐπήγχοα γενέσθαι παρὰ θεῶν, Ἀμύντορά τε Φοίνικι τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπαρᾶσθαι παιδὶ θυμωθέντα καὶ Ἴππολύτῳ Θησέα καὶ ἐτέρους ἄλλοις μυρίους μυρίους, ὧν γέγονε σαφές ἐπηκόους εἶναι γονεῦσι πρὸς τέκνα θεοῦς κτλ.²⁶

In Greek literature a great number of curses are mentioned: they are always caused by a wrong²⁷, never by the mere existence of a person²⁸. Soph. *OC* 873 ἔργους

²⁰ *Oedipus* ended with the revelation followed upon by self-blinding and cursing according to Schütz 1808-11, *ad l.*; Hermann 1852, ad 766 f.; Weil 1862, XII; Fritzsche 1877, VII 204 f.; Baldry 1956, 30 f.; Manton 1961; Winnington-Ingram 1980, 260 (but contrast Winnington-Ingram 1977, 36-7); Hutchinson 1985, XXIV-VI (approved by Garvie 1986, Zimmermann 1986, Dawe 1988); March 1987, 140 f.; Roisman 1988; Centanni 1995, *ad l.*; Sommerstein 1996, 123; it ended with a curse, but without self-blinding according to Collard 2008, XXIX.

²¹ Parker 1983, 192 f., 196-8; West 1999, 30-6.

²² *Sept.* 70, 695-7 (cf. 700), 833; *Eu.* 416 f.; see Hutchinson 1985, *ad Sept.* 70 f.; Sommerstein 1989, 7, *ad Eu.* 417; Novelli 2005, 51-7; Amendola 2010, 27-33.

²³ Soph. *Ph.* 1181 πρὸς ἀραῖου Διός.

²⁴ Pl. *Lg.* 881d ὁ δὲ μὴ ἀμύνων ἀραῖ ἐνεχέσθω Διὸς ὁμογνίου καὶ πατρῷου κτλ.

²⁵ Plut. *Mor.* 766c γονέων ἀραῖς ὁ Γενέθλιος ... διώκει καὶ μέτεισι.

²⁶ Note that about *Oedipus* Plato (*Lg.* 931b-c) quotes the ‘dishonour-version’ as the traditional one, without questioning its righteousness. The alleged meanness of the story, which so much worries our idealistic critics, was not seen by Plato himself.

²⁷ E.g. (leaving aside public curses) *Il.* 1.35-42, 9.454, 567, *Od.* 2.134 f., Aesch. *Sept. passim*, *Ag.* 236, 1600 f., *Ch.* 145 f., 406, 692, 912, and *PV* 910-2 (if this play is Aeschylean; otherwise, one should take the passage merely as a tragic parallel), Hdt. 1.165.2, Soph. *Ant.* 427 f., *Tr.* 1202 f.,

πεπονθὼς ῥήμασιν σ' ἀμύνομαι well illustrates the basic conception. It has been remarked that, in theory at least, the presence of a wronged right distinguishes a curse from a binding spell, a just claim for revenge from a malignant imprecation of the sort represented by the *defixiones*²⁹. Take mythical examples: Myrtilus curses his slayer, Pelops, and his stock (Soph. *El.* 502-15, Eur. *Or.* 988-1000, Schol. ad Eur. *Or.* 990). Pelops curses his sons Atreus and Thyestes because he suspects them of the murder of their step-brother Chrysippus (Schol. ad Eur. *Or.* 4); or, in another version of the latter's death, Pelops curses Laius for his sexual crime, along with his descendants (Schol. ad Eur. *Ph.* 60). In another version of our case, the second wife Astymedusa urges Oedipus to curse her step-sons Eteocles and Polynices, as though she has been wronged by them (Schol. ad *Il.* 4.376 (A)). Althaea curses her son Meleager because he has killed her brother(s) (*Il.* 9.566-72, D. S. 4.34.5). See also Theseus' reaction against the supposed crime of Hippolytus (Eur. *Hipp.*). So, it is quite clear that a proper ἀρά needs to be based on justice – at least subjectively – to work as an independent agent.

Then, food or maintenance. It is well known that in Homer great importance is attached to food as a concrete expression of honour³⁰. As to the *Thebais*, it has been supposed that a sacral meaning might have been attached no less to the piece of meat (fr. 3 Bernabé) than to the heirlooms (fr. 2 Bern.)³¹. In the case of old parents, it is a sacrosanct duty of sons to support and tend them, thus repaying them of their nursing cares (γηροτροφία, γηροβοσμία and cognates)³². By Attic law this duty was compulsory³³. In Soph. *OC* τροφή is an important theme which defines the relationship between the protagonist and his children, opposing his caring daughters to his negligent sons³⁴. So, however it may sound to our ears, from an archaic and classical Greek viewpoint there is nothing mean or petty in an old father cursing his sons for not providing him with the due τροφή. This is what lines 785-7 mean, and it is wholly acceptable.

Next, madness³⁵. For our idealistic critics maintain that Aeschylus' Oedipus acted not only out of superior morality, but also in a fit of madness. In order to avoid link-

1239, *OT* 417 f., *El.* 114 f., *OC* 154 f., 864 f., 952 f., 1375 f., 1384, 1407 f., Eur. *Med.* 607 f., *Hipp.* 888, 890, 895 f., 1167, 1241, 1315, 1323 f., 1378, *Supp.* 150, *Tr.* 734, *IT* 778, *Ph.* 67-9, 334, 474, 876 f., 1052-4, 1355, 1426, 1610, *Or.* 995 f., *Pl. R.* 393a, etc. Among these examples, Eur. *Ph.* 63-9 and 876 f. are remarkable because they combine Oedipus' mental disturbance with his being dishonoured, which seems to result from a more modern outlook, though unable to suppress the traditional causation. See also Pheres' question (Eur. *Alc.* 715) ἀράι γονεῦσιν οὐδὲν ἔκδικον παθόν;

²⁸ This is not the case at *Ag.* 1602, Eur. *Med.* 112 ff. either (*pace* Hutchinson 1985, xxv).

²⁹ Parker 1983, 198.

³⁰ Griffin 1980, 14 f.

³¹ Mastronarde 1994, 23.

³² See in particular Eur. *Alc.* 663, 666-8, *Isae.* 2.10.

³³ See the 'law of Solon' in D. L. 1.55 ἐάν τις μὴ τρέφῃ τοὺς γονέας ἄτιμος ἔστω, and *Isae.* 1.39 ἡμεῖς ἂν διὰ τὴν ἀγχιστείαν καὶ τὸν πάππον γηροτροφεῖν ἠναγκαζόμεθα. Further indirect evidence is in the mention of exceptions to this law: *Aeschin.* 1.13, *Plut. Sol.* 22. See MacDowell 1978, 92.

³⁴ Easterling 1967, 3-5, 9; Winnington-Ingram 1980, 257.

³⁵ Oddly seen as a cause for the curse by Verrall 1887, xxx, who also accepts indignation in Oedipus at his τροφή.

ing the curse to a previous wrong, they welcome this odd combination, which they allegedly find in the text itself (781 μαινομέναι κραιδίαι, cf. 724-6 τὰς περιθύμους / κατάρως Οἰδιπόδα βλα/ψίφρονος³⁶). But again this is wrong. First, we should bear in mind that it is customary in Greek serious poetry to describe all sorts of misguided action, especially blasphemy and serious breaches of the laws of kinship, in terms of insanity³⁷. Then a curse, uttered in anger at some offence (as our text has it, 785-6), can be referred to as a madman's act (as here at 724-5, but note περιθύμους) just because it is an awful and dire act, with formidable consequences.

Secondly, one has to think what looks like madness in a Greek's eyes (before Socrates, of course³⁸): is it invoking just retribution on the offender, or self-injuring? No doubt, it is the latter³⁹. This is why Oedipus' self-blinding is often described as the effect of derangement in Soph. *OT*⁴⁰. The same in all likelihood happens also at 781 (see below). Therefore, it can be confidently concluded that the 'idealistic' conception of the occasion for Oedipus' curse is altogether alien from Greek mentality and improbable for our passage. Had Aeschylus devised anything of that sort for the sake of novelty, he should have been more explicit.

Now let us move on to the textual interpretation supposed by the 'idealistic' critics. Despite much variety, they all take the transmitted δίδυμα κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν (782) as meaning 'he fulfilled two evils', and these should be then explained in the following lines: one at 783 f., whatever it may be, and the other at 785-91, i.e. cursing the sons. The ancestor of this school of thought⁴¹ interprets 783 f. as 'he departed from the sight of his reigning sons' (784 f.), i.e. he regards voluntary exile as the first evil; he admits that the 'parricidal hand' (783 πατροφόνωι χειρί) has nothing to do with

³⁶ But note that referring the phrase at 781 to Oedipus' cursing, as these critics do, requires special pleading (see below).

³⁷ E.g. 483 f. (of the Argives' impiety) ὡς δ' ὑπέραυχα βάζουσιν ἐπὶ πτόλει / μαινομέναι φρενί, 756 f. παράνοια συνάγε / νυμφίους φρενώλης, *Pers.* 725 ὥστε μὴ φρονεῖν καλῶς, 750 f. πῶς τάδ' οὐ νόσος φρενῶν / εἶχε παῖδ' ἐμόν; *Ag.* 222 f. αἰσχρομίητις / τάλαινα παρακοπὰ πρωτοπήμων. *Pi.* *P.* 2.26 f. μαινομέναις φρασίν / Ἦρας ὄτ' ἐράσσατο (*sc.* Ixion), 3.13 f. ἅ δ' (*sc.* Coronis) ἀποφλαυρίζαισά μιν / ἀμπλακίαισι φρενῶν, / ἄλλον αἶνησεν γάμον, *Eur.* *Ph.* 1172 Καπανεύς ... ἐμαίνετο, etc.

³⁸ At [Pl.] *Alc. II* 138c the remark, about Oedipus, ἀλλὰ σύ, ὦ Σώκρατες, μαινόμενον ἄνθρωπον εἴρηκας: ἐπεὶ τίς ἄν σοι δοκεῖ τολμήσαι ὑγαίνων τοιαῦτ' εὐξασθαι; judges a story, which clearly did not made of the curse the consequence of madness, from a modern view-point, different from Plato's (*Lg.* 931 f.). The *Alc. II* passage seems to reflect a dramatic version of the curse, so that its wording (χαλκῶι διελέσθαι τὰ πατρῶια τοὺς υἱεῖς) has been included in *TrGF* II (fr. 346b), even though it may freely reecho the same play (satyric?) as *TrGF* II fr. 458, given the common mention of 'bronze'.

³⁹ See, e.g., Darius' supposing that Zopyrus has injured himself out of mental insanity (*Hdt.* 3.155.4); Hermes' view on Prometheus' self-injuring challenge (*PV* 1054-7).

⁴⁰ *Soph. OT* 1252 βοῶν, 1255 φοιτᾷ, 1258 λυσσῶντι δ' αὐτῶι δαμόνων ... τις, 1265 δεινὰ βρονχηθεῖς, 1299-302 τίς σ' ... / προσέβη μανία; τίς σ' ὁ πηδήσας / μείζονα δαίμων τῶν / μηρίστων / πρὸς σῆι δυσδαίμονι μοίραι; 1327 f. πῶς ἔτλης τοιαῦτα σὰς / ὄψεις μαρᾶναι; τίς σ' ἐπῆρε δαμόνων;

⁴¹ Schütz 1782-97a, I 359-63. His interpretation of the first evil is well refuted by Hutchinson 1985, xxv.

it, and must refer to the act of cursing⁴². Another view, now the most popular, less arbitrarily sees the two evils in Oedipus' self-blinding and cursing⁴³. This interpretation runs thus: 'When he became aware, miserable one, of his wretched marriage⁴⁴, out of pain vexed, with maddened heart he fulfilled two evils: with his parricidal hand [...] (*scil.* he blinded himself); and resentful at his sons' [...] *origin*, he laid on them, alas, bitter curses, etc.'

Of course, δίδυμα κακά can amount to the same as διπλᾶ / δύο κακά (surely not the blinding of two eyes, as the scholia of both recensions maintain). Nevertheless, that expression is not necessarily a proleptic one⁴⁵, such as, say, τάδε; nor is there a clear correlation between 783 f. and 785-7, such as μέν [...] δέ (or an equivalent), to be clear that the 'two evils' are taken up and analysed⁴⁶. So the structure of the sentence has nothing in itself which might support the 'idealistic' interpretation of δίδυμα κακά⁴⁷. In fact, very often, both in melic poetry and in the songs of tragedy, a stanza (either strophe or antistrophe) begins with an early δέ, just to add a sequence in the story which is being sung. In most cases a considerable lapse of time is implied between the sequences narrated⁴⁸. So the occurrence of δέ at 785 does not prove that the curse was uttered at the same time as the events described earlier (probably self-blinding).

As for the vague phrase δίδυμα κακά itself, in this context it is natural to understand it as referring to Oedipus' notorious two wrong-doings, parricide and incest⁴⁹, referred to together as consequences of Laius' mistake at 751-6⁵⁰.

⁴² A gesture of the hand(s), however, cannot be postulated as a constant in cursing, beyond those passages where it is explicitly mentioned, such as *Il.* 9.566-72; in fact Soph. *OC* is full of curses without that gesture.

⁴³ Initiated by Hermann 1852, as appears from the punctuation adopted (comma) between fifth strophe and antistrophe; see also Fritzsche 1877, VII 204 f.

⁴⁴ Hutchinson's comma before μέλεος, and claim (Hutchinson 1985, *ad l.*) that ἀρτίφρων should be absolute, meaning 'sensible' instead of 'aware', are unconvincing. The main idea is «aware of his incest», not «poor man on account of his incest». I therefore consider indisputable the punctuation with comma after γάμων (adopted *e.g.* by Wilamowitz, Murray, Page, West).

⁴⁵ See, *e.g.*, Call. *Epigr.* 20 (= *AP* 7.517).4, where δίδυμον ... κακόν refers to what has been said in the previous lines.

⁴⁶ Note that μέν ... δέ are often found in Aeschylus' lyrics: *Pers.* 65-74, 550 f., 560 f., 694 f., 700 f., 858-61, *Sept.* 295-300, 481 f., 759, 911 f., *Supp.* 117 f., 129 f., 134-9, *Ag.* 126 f., 145, 206 f., 396 f., 427-31, 433 f., 446 f., 740 f., 759 f., 764-73, 774 f., 1008-18, 1158-60, *Ch.* 62 f., 372 f., 376 f., 412 f., 436 f., 453 f., 935-7, *Eu.* 171 f., 313-5, 534 f. Note also μέν ... τε at *Sept.* 923 f., and μέν ... ἀλλά at *Ch.* 585-94.

⁴⁷ *Pace* Hutchinson 1985, xxv.

⁴⁸ See especially Pind. *O.* 2.38-46, 6.30-72; Aesch. *Sept.* 758, 778 (in this same stasimon); *Pers.* 109, 133, 584, *Supp.* 531, 539, 547, 556, 565, *Ag.* 122, 192, 205, 218, 248, 385, 403, 420, 437, 456, 475, 700, 717, 727 (χρονισθεῖς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος), 737, etc. On 'continuative' δέ see Denniston 1954, 162 f.

⁴⁹ Thus also Tucker 1908, *ad l.*; West 1990, 116-8 similarly thinks of the 'twin evils' as parricide and incest, but reshapes the whole passage in a peculiar way (see below), and times the curse like the 'idealists'.

⁵⁰ Compare the reference to 'two evils' in Soph. *OT* 1319 f. καὶ θαῦμα γ' οὐδὲν ἐν τοσοῖοδε πῆμασιν / διπλᾶ σε πενθεῖν καὶ διπλᾶ θροεῖν κακά. They are briefly mentioned also in *Od.* 11.273 f. This interpretation is made likely also by the fact that in our passage we find the common contrast between Oedipus' unrivalled happiness (772-7) and utter misery (778-84), as in Soph. *OT* 1197-205, 1282-5, 1524-30, *Eur.* fr. 157 f. Kannicht (*Ant.*).

Next, I wish to object to the attempt to water down the phrase ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς (for which I accept Heath's emendation) to anything like 'upset about (their) origin' or 'growing up'. For ἐπίκοτος implies being angry at suffering some wrong, or finding fault with somebody's action, for which revenge or punishment is wished; so, here it must have a more specific cause than the mere existence of the sons⁵¹, in spite of scholarly effort to maintain this⁵². Resentment at suffering a specific wrong is naturally implied by the basic meaning of the family of words based on κότος⁵³. The idea of resenting an outrage rules out here for τροφή the otherwise possible acceptance of 'rearing' (first proposed by Schütz, as said above). On the other hand, it is most doubtful that τροφή might denote 'origin', much like γονή or γενεά. I cannot quote a single instance of the word in this alleged meaning⁵⁴. So, of all attested acceptations for τροφή, 'rearing' is ruled out, while 'means of life' and 'offspring' are quite out of context; this leaves us with 'food'. Finally, what is remarked in order to support 'origin' here⁵⁵, namely that τραφήναι and the like are equivalent to γενέσθαι, in fact confirms that the proper meaning of τρέφω and cognate words is always felt. For τραφήναι comes close to γενέσθαι thanks to the explicit mention of parents or family, but still means 'to be reared/grow up'⁵⁶. Moreover, in tragedy τροφή / -αί most often refer to 'bringing up/nursing cares' devoted by a mother, or nurse or equivalent figure, to a child (and there a pathetic touch can be perceived)⁵⁷: all this again takes advantage of the basic meaning of the τρέφω family.

Another interpretation is put forward by the latest editor of Aeschylus, West⁵⁸, who claims that the whole passage 780-4 is meant to give the background to the curse, and so here Oedipus' self-blinding would be hardly to the point. The text is arranged with the following changes at the end of the fifth strophe (778-84):

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀρτίφρων ἐγένετο
 μέλεος ἀθλίων γάμων,
 ἐπ' ἄλγαι δυσφορῶν
 μαινομένα καρδίαι
 δίδυμ' ἅ κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν
 πατροφόνωι χερσί, τῶν κρεισσοτέρων
 γνωμάτων ἐπλάγχθη,
 κτλ.

⁵¹ Compare Pind. fr. 109.4 Snell.-Maehler. στάσιν ... ἐπίκοτον, and especially PV 600 f. (Io's sung words) λαβρόσυτος ἦλθον <Ἡρας> (suppl. Hermann) / ἐπικότοισι μήδεσι δαμείσα.

⁵² Hutchinson 1985, xxiv f.; Roisman 1988, 80 f.

⁵³ See *DELG*, s.v. κότος.

⁵⁴ Soph. OC 330 ὃ δυσάθλια τροφαί means 'O wretched way of life / diet', with τροφαί in the same meaning as it so often has in this play (Jebb 1900b, *ad l.*); the double meaning proposed by Kamerbeek 1984, *ad l.* (the one given above and an allusion to the incest) is quite astray in the context of greetings and exclamations exchanged by Oedipus and Ismene.

⁵⁵ See, with examples, Hutchinson 1985, xxv; Roisman 1988, 81.

⁵⁶ Not to mention that, e.g., τραφεῖς can be handier than γενόμενος to fit in the line.

⁵⁷ Sept. 548, 665, *Supp.* 894, Ag. 1159; Soph. Ant. 918, El. 776, 1143; Eur. Hec. 20, 599, *Supp.* 1137, Ion 52, 1377, IT 847.

⁵⁸ West 1990, 116-8; West 1998. He is followed by Centanni 2003, 170 f.; Collard 2008, 55, 192 f.

The whole period would run thus: 'But when the unfortunate man became aware of his terrible marriage, unable to bear the pain in his crazed heart of the twin evils he had accomplished with his parricidal hand, he went astray from better judgment'⁵⁹. I am not convinced this is the right, or even a likely, solution. First, the stasimon starts with fear lest Oedipus' curse might be fulfilled, and then deals with all the momentous events and acts of the previous two generations of the ruling family (Laius, 742-57; Oedipus, 772-91, where 785-7 provide a link with the third generation). Each of the relevant stanzas is especially focussed on an individual stage in the story: ant. 2 on Apollo's oracle; str. 3 on Laius' fatal disobedience in fathering a son; ant. 4 on Oedipus' unsurpassed prosperity; str. 5 on his becoming aware of the truth and his immediate reaction; ant. 5 on his cursing his sons in outrage. I have already refuted the claim that ant. 5 should be tightly bound to str. 5. In the broader context of the ode, there would be nothing strange in having Oedipus' self-blinding mentioned at 783 f. If the playwright here had been exclusively concerned with the occasion of the curse, so as to leave out the self-blinding, it is hard to see why he should have mentioned the disclosure at all. But there is more. The transmitted ὀμμάτων (784), if corrupt, is likely to be somehow related to the original text, either by deriving from a gloss on it, or by trivializing it. Besides, what is topical is 'Oedipus discovered the truth and blinded himself', not 'he discovered the truth and cursed his sons'⁶⁰.

West's text itself is liable to several objections. (a) A transitive use of δυσφορέω is unparalleled, whereas there are plenty of occurrences for the intransitive one⁶¹. (b) If, on the other hand, it is intransitive, then that sort of *attractio inversa* is of a rare type and not quite paralleled⁶². (c) «The two evils he had accomplished with his parricidal hand» can denote only two nasty actions concretely accomplished by Oedi-

⁵⁹ West 1990, 117.

⁶⁰ See Soph. *Ant.* 49-52 πατήρ / ὡς νῶϊν ἀπεχθῆς δυσκλεῆς τ' ἀπόλετο, / πρὸς αὐτοφόρων ἀμπλακημάτων διπλᾶς / ὄψεις ἀράξας αὐτὸς αὐτουργῶι χειρί, where I follow Jebb 1900a in punctuating with comma at the end of 50, and interpreting 'how our father died hideous and disgraced, after having struck his eyes because of his crimes discovered by himself' (on causal πρὸς see Mastronarde 1994, ad Eur. *Ph.* 66 πρὸς τῆς τύχης νοσῶν, with parallels: Soph. *Ant.* 170, *OT* 1236, Eur. fr. 682.2 Kannicht). See also Eur. *Ph.* 59-61 μαθὼν δὲ τὰ μὰ λέκτρα μητροῦν γάμων / ὁ πάντ' ἀνατλάς Οἰδίπους παθήματα / εἰς ὄμμαθ' αὐτοῦ δεινὸν ἐμβάλλει φόνον, / κτλ. At Aristoph. *Ra.* 1188-95 the series of Oedipus' evils is made up by exposure, injured feet, incestuous marriage and finally self-blinding (1195 εἶτ' ἐξετύλωσεν αὐτόν). We can be fairly confident that Oedipus' self-blinding had been a traditional element of the story since at least the *Thebais*, and it did not come up first with Sophocles: for *TrGF* II fr. 458, a clear parody of the corresponding cursing scene in the epic, emphasizes the old man's blindness, and thus suggests that this belonged to that poem as well (here I agree with Robert 1915, 171, Mastronarde 1994, 22).

⁶¹ Aesch. *Supp.* 513 οὔτοί τι θαῦμα δυσφορεῖν φόβου φρενός, Soph. *El.* 254, fr. 314.337 Radt, Eur. *Andr.* 1235, *Rh.* 425, Aristoph. *Th.* 73, *Ra.* 922, Pherecr. fr. (dub.) 286.1, Xen. *Cyr.* 2.2.8, Hdt. 5.19.2, Arist. *De gen. anim.* 775a30, *Top.* 118a24, *De virt. et vit.* 1251b21, Men. fr. 862.7 Kassel-Austin, Plut. *Thes.* 20.4, 26.5, *Cor.* 20.8 f., *Comp. Alc. et Cor.* 5.1, *Timol.* 5.3, Arist. 18.1, *Pyrrh.* 23.5, *Mar.* 36.2, *Lys.* 29.1, *Cim.* 4.10, *Lucull.* 26.5, *Pomp.* 36.3, *Caes.* 14.2, *Ant.* 44.4, 57.4, *Brut.* 13.6, 43.9, *Mor.* 112b, 116a, 143e, 167f, 216f, 468d, 469d, 498e, 543b, 608c, 611b, fr. 178.55, Ael. *VH* 14.22, Aesop. 13.1.5, 180.1.12, 190.1.4, 2.4, 201.1.8, 3.8, 274.6, D.S. 4.11.1, 34.1, 47.4, 61.6, 11.11.4, 17.76.7, 101.1, 20.61.5, etc.

⁶² Schwyzer 1953, II 641 f. In none of the few instances of *attractio inversa* listed by Italic and Radt 1964, 219, s.v. ὅς I.2.b (cf. also Matino 1998, 197) do we find the order attribute + relative + antecedent (nor can this be found, independently of attraction, with ὅστις, ὅσπερ, ὅστε).

pus' hand, by no means incest beside parricide. A 'hand' has nothing to do with incestuous marriage and begetting⁶³. Furthermore, a qualified χειρί usually describes a concrete action literally: cf. *Pers.* 202 f. σύν θυηπόλωι χειρὶ / βωμὸν προσέστην, *Sept.* 788-90 σιδαρονόμωι / διὰ χειρὶ ποτε λαχεῖν / κτήματα, *Eu.* 592 ξιφουλκῶι χειρὶ πρὸς δέρον τεμών. Here πατροφόνωι χειρὶ cannot possibly be said metaphorically, just in order to emphasize Oedipus' responsibility, as occasionally αὐθέντης, αὐτουργός, αὐτόχειρ do. On the other hand it would be proper to describe in these words Oedipus' self-blinding: see the above-quoted *Soph. Ant.* 50 f. (d) It seems that Aeschylus is fond of making rather simple periods, when they begin by ἐπεὶ δέ, usually placing the main clause immediately after: compare *Pers.* 201-4, 377-9, 386-92, 500 f., *Ag.* 658-60 (all these examples from iambics); *Ag.* 218-21 (lyric)⁶⁴. (e) If the text went 'after he became aware [...] he made a bad decision⁶⁵, and (sc. i.e.) he cursed his sons', why should the cursing be motivated by ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς? (f) An error of judgement is so emphasized as fatal to Laius (750, 756 f.) that it is unlikely that it was resorted to also for the background of Oedipus' curse.

To sum up. I have already explained why the non-idealistic reconstruction is the only probable one: Oedipus cursed his sons not immediately after the disclosure, nor enraged by their mere existence, but some time after that and because he was wronged by them in respect of τροφή. As something due to Oedipus, τροφή here must be 'food/maintenance'⁶⁶: which exactly of the two, was possibly evident to the audience who had watched *Oedipus*. To me 'maintenance' appears to be more likely than a specific piece of food, as in *Thebais* fr. 3 Bernabé. In this case, his sons would have not complied with their duty of γηροτροφία, which would fit very well the existing theme (with related imagery) of Mother-Land, debt to earth, proper/improper behaviour towards 'her' (and one's next of kin)⁶⁷. Anyway, it is instructive that Wilamowitz, though accepting here a «treatment similar to that in the *Thebais*», never resorted to a unique explanation for it⁶⁸.

As to the textual difficulties, both at 783 f. and at 785, although it is obviously impossible to divine the original wording, the above discussion can help us fix a few points. (1) In the second stasimon every crucial stage and element in the doom of the Labdacids, and its effect on Thebes, are focussed upon in each stanza. Strophe 5 is devoted to Oedipus' terrible discovery of his two transgressions, parricide and incest, and to his consequent self-blinding. Antistrophe 5 conjures up his cursing his

⁶³ Miraculous begetting and birth are different: *Supp.* 313, 1066 (cf. *PV* 848 f.).

⁶⁴ The only complex instance comes from the parodos of *Ag.* (198-205), where periods are deliberately long and interlocked with anacoluthon.

⁶⁵ This is what «going astray from better judgement» is supposed to mean, as Dr. M.L. West kindly explained to me when I was under his supervision as a graduate student.

⁶⁶ Cf. fr. 47a.16(= *Dictyul.*)814 Ρατ τροφᾶς ἀνόσου, *Soph. Ai.* 499, 511, 563, *El.* 1059, 1183, *Ph.* 32, 953, 1126, *OC* 330, 338, 346, 352, 362, 446, 1265, 1614, 1687; *Eur. Supp.* 205, *Ion* 322, 1013, *Tr.* 1187, *Or.* 109, 556, *IA* 1230; etc. This is also the common meaning of the word, and that very frequent, in documentary Greek (as a search in the old PHI disc # 7 shows or in the website 'papyri.info').

⁶⁷ Cameron 1964; Cameron 1971, 85-95; Thalmann 1978, 42-50; etc.

⁶⁸ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1914b, 80-96 proposes either Oedipus' being deprived of a king's privilege in respect of 'food' (either from sacrifices or at banquets), or his being neglected in maintenance; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921, 204 favours 'sacrificial food', according to royal γέρας.

sons as he got enraged at their inadequate maintenance. Between the dénouement and the curse a considerable lapse of time may have occurred. (2) I have argued for seeing in δίδυμα κακά Oedipus' notorious and connected crimes, parricide and incest. (3) I am fairly confident that here τελέω should mean not 'fulfil' but 'finish off, complete', a well-attested acceptance⁶⁹ which would yield perfect sense here: δίδυμα κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν 'he finished off his twin evils', i.e. he added a further evil so as to crown them. (4) The rest of 783 and 784 must have referred to self-blinding carried out by Oedipus πατροφόνωι χειρί: the original verb, either indicative or participle, is hidden behind ἐπλάγχθη. Although the latter verb is well attested in the meaning of 'going astray' (from both a concrete and an abstract entity)⁷⁰, the above discussion has shown that we need self-blinding here instead of either 'getting mad' or 'making a bad decision' or 'going into exile'. (5) Oedipus' eyes are likely to have been qualified in such a way as to provide a ground for their maiming in relation to his offspring. From Soph. *OT* 1375-7⁷¹ one would think that Oedipus, who used to be so fond of looking at his own children, wanted to avoid their sight forever, once he had discovered the truth about them. An adjective like e.g. φιλότεκνα could be mistakenly paraphrased as 'as dear as one's children', and this could be turned into κρείσσω τέκνων due to the interference of the common notion 'dearer than one's eyes' (cf. 530). (6) In all probability the τροφᾶς was qualified negatively (784 f.), but I stand by those who have qualms about keeping the transmitted ἀρᾶίας, on grounds both of meaning (for 'enraged at his *accursed* food/maintenance, he laid bitter curses on his sons' sounds pointless) and of metre⁷².

The sense of the passage must therefore have been: 'When he became aware, miserable man, of his wretched marriage, out of pain vexed in his deranged heart, he finished off his own twin evils *by putting out/smiting* with his parricidal hand his eyes *fond of (seeing) his children*. On his sons, then, enraged at their *miserable* maintenance, he laid, alas, bitter curses, etc.' (guesses italicized).

The next step, i.e. emending these difficult lines, cannot help being merely tentative, not only because my own proposal may fail to convince, but also on account of the more general difficulty which arises from the uncertainty in the colometry and metrical analysis of most tragic songs, and the consequent risk of circularity in either emending so as to obtain a certain metrical arrangement or inferring metrical liberties from the transmitted text, as long as its sense is held to be satisfactory. Here is my own *exempli gratia* proposal, which stands by West's colometry and metrical analysis⁷³, with my conjectural emendations underscored:

⁶⁹ Cf. *Il.* 23.373 πύματον τέλεον δρόμον ὠκέες ἵπποι, 768, *Od.* 5.262, 23.199 f. λέχος ἔξεον ὄφρ' ἐτέλεσσα / δαιδάλλων χρυσῶι κτλ., Hes. *Th.* 951 (cf. 994, 997), *Op.* 554, Sol. 27.3 West ὄτε δὴ τελέσῃ θεὸς ἔπτ' ἐνιαυτούς, Pind. *N.* 9.6 τετελεσμένον ἐσλόν, Aesch. *Sept.* 35 (if an object is understood), *Ag.* 751 τελεσθέντα ... ὄλβον, 806, Soph. *Tr.* 825 ἀναδοχὰν τελεῖν πόνων, 917, Eur. *Or.* 1670, *Ba.* 99 f., Hdt. 1.206, 7.187.2, Thuc. 3.2.2, etc.

⁷⁰ *LSJ*⁹ s.v. πλάζω defines it a «poetic verb» and gives examples from Homer, Pindar, tragedy, etc.

⁷¹ A similar reasoning is put forward by Manton 1961, 82, but for thinking of e.g. τερψιτέκνων (which makes it harder to imagine a cause for corruption).

⁷² E.g. Prien 1856, 38 (ἀθλίας), Schmidt 1864, 630 (ἀργίας), Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1914a (ἀρχαίας), West 1998 (obelized).

⁷³ West 1998 (with metrical appendix). The only differences consist in admitting responsion of a long to a short syllable in anepic position at 778 ~ 785 (cf. e.g. *Sept.* 356 ~ 368, and see below);

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀρτίφρων ἐγένετο μέλεος ἀθλίων γάμων, ἐπ' ἄλγעי δυσφορῶν μαιομέναι κραδίαι δίδυμα κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν πατροφόνωι χειρὶ <u>κρατὸς φιλότεκν'</u> <u>ὄμματ' ἐκπαταχθεὶς.</u>	str. 5 780	kl al ky k r kl kl kl kl kl kkl kkl kr kr kl kkl kkl kkl kl kl	ia^ 3ia ia^ ^ia D kδ D ch ith
τέκνοις δ' <u>αἰακτᾶς</u> ἐφῆκεν ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς, αἰαῖ, πικρογλώσσους ἀράς, καί σφε σιδαρονόμοι διὰ χειρὶ ποτε λαχεῖν κτήματα. νῦν δὲ τρέω μὴ τελέση καμφίπους Ἑρινύς.	ant.5 790		

to be translated thus: 'When he became aware, miserable man, of his wretched marriage, out of pain vexed in his deranged heart, he finished off his own twin evils by striking out of his head, with his parricidal hand, his eyes fond of (seeing) his children' (literally 'being smitten in his eyes [...] out of his head by his [...] hand'). 'Then, resentful at his lamentable maintenance, he laid, alas, bitter curses on his sons, etc.' I suppose that a participle, and that a coincident aorist⁷⁴, is likely (as *difficilior*) to have been replaced by the indicative; on the other hand, if the period 778-84 has the meaning I have argued for, a participle would yield better syntax than another indicative, co-ordinated to ἐτέλεσεν through asyndeton. Admittedly, ἐκπατάξας is far removed from ἐπλάγχθη, and the only way to support it is to suppose that 783 f. were utterly misunderstood and words from a scholium about Oedipus' miserable old age, including perhaps 'he wandered as an exile' or a quotation of a *locus similis*, crept into the text. Those who wish to defend ἐπλάγχθη should reflect that a metaphor of the sort 'going astray from sight/eyes' for 'blinding oneself' sounds odd with the very concrete πατροφόνωι χειρὶ⁷⁵. The use of a -θη- aorist with an accusative of respect could be puzzling⁷⁶. Marginal and interlinear glosses must have played a great role in the corruption. For ἐκπατάσσω see *Od.* 18.327 φρένας

responsion of a long to a resolved fourth longum at 778 ~ 785 (cf. e.g. *Sept.* 481 ~ 521); giving up word-end between the dactylic colon and the choriamb at 783 (cf. e.g. *Supp.* 526 ~ 533, 846 ~ 857/858, *Ag.* 143, 1007 ~ 1024).

⁷⁴ See Aesch. *Supp.* 52 (with Johansen and Whittle 1980, *ad l.*), *Ch.* 604, 832, etc.

⁷⁵ Eur. *HF* 1189 μαιομένωι πιτύλωι πλαγχθεὶς is not comparable, since both the verb and the instrument are metaphorical and consistent. Note that Hutchinson 1985 adopts ἐβλάφθη by Oberdick (*non uidi*).

⁷⁶ Cf. with textual disruption *Pers.* 595-7 αἰμαχθεῖσα δ' ἄρουρα<v> (Porson) / Αἴαντος ... / νᾶσος ἔχει τὰ Περσᾶν, *Pl. R.* 361e ἐκκαυθήσεται (AFD, cf. *Hdt.* 7.18 θερμοῖσι σιδηρίοισι ἐκκαίειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, *Pl. Grg.* 473c ἐάν ... τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς ἐκκάηται): ἐκκοφθήσεται M: ἐκκοπήσεται Clemens, Eusebius, Theodoretus) τῶφθαλμῶ. (See also *PV* 245 ἠλγύνθη κέαρ, 390 μὴ ποτ' ἀχθεσθῆι κέαρ.) This usage could be somehow encouraged by the rare one of the same sort of aorist as a transitive middle: Archil. fr. 9.10 f. West εἰ κείνου κεφαλήν καὶ χαρίεντα μέλα / Ἥφαιστος καθαροῖσιν ἐν εἵμασιν ἀμφεπονήθη, fr. 173 West ὄρκον δ' ἐνοσφίσθης μέγαν / ἄλας τε καὶ τράπεζαν, *h. Hom.* 2.92 νοσφισθεῖσα θεῶν ἀγορῆν καὶ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον: see Prévot 1935, 22 f., 109-12, 136-43, 158-65.

ἐκπεπαταγμένος, AP 9.309.2, Hsch. ε 3721 Latte ἐξεπατάχθη· ἐξεπλάγη (*locus classicus* unidentified): given these occurrences, the fact that ἐκπατάσσω does not turn up in extant tragedy may be due to the accidents of transmission. Also, a verb compound with ἐκ- seems particularly apt for 'putting out eyes' (see the examples from Plato and Herodotus, n. 76). As said above, I take κρείσσω τέκνων as previous to all other nonsensical readings, though no better, in the course of corruption. Supposing κροατός was in the original, it is easy to imagine a shift to κρόατος and another one to a form of κρείσσω. At 785 I favour emending to τέκνοις δ' αἰακτᾶς, with an attractive etymological play with αἰαῖ (786). The adjective (cf. 846/847, *Pers.* 931, 1068) would have been assimilated to the following ἄραός. A long in the antistrophe corresponding to a short syllable in anceps position in the strophe is paralleled in Aeschylus' lyric iambs: see e.g. *Sept.* 834~842, *Supp.* 138/139~148/149, *ib.* 559/560~568/569, *ib.* 580~588, *ib.* 781/782~789/790, *ib.* 809~818, *ib.* 812~821, *Ag.* 1102~1109, *Ch.* 423~444/445, *ib.* 425~447, *Eum.* 144~150, *ib.* 169~174. The same text of 785 would, however, be possible also with the manuscript colometry⁷⁷ (778 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀρτίφρων κ | | κ | |, basic dochmiac, ~ 785 τέκνοις δ' αἰακτᾶς κ | | | |, 'drag-out' dochmiac⁷⁸). Again, it may be objected that it is unlikely that a scribe may have erred so greatly. I admit that palaeographically, Prien's ἀθλίαις would be the most satisfactory emendation⁷⁹, were it not for the occurrence of the adjective a little earlier, at 779 (ἀθλίων γάμων).

Associate Fellow
Dep. of Classical Studies – Dickinson College

Letizia Poli Palladini
palladil@dickinson.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Amendola 2010 = S. Amendola, *La preghiera del re: il linguaggio religioso dei sovrani nelle tragedie superstiti di Eschilo* (*Ag.* 810-854, *Sept.* 69-77), in Goeken 2010, 19-33.
- Andreatta 2012 = L. Andreatta, *Contesti dochmiaci in Eschilo*, San Donà di Piave 2012.
- Baldry 1956 = H.C. Baldry, *The Dramatization of the Theban Legend*, G&R 3, 1956, 24-37.
- Bothe 1805 = F.H. Bothe, *Aeschyli dramata quae supersunt et deperditorum fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1805.
- Brunck 1779 = R.F.P. Brunck, *Aeschyli tragoediae 'Prometheus', 'Persae' et 'Septem ad Thebas'; Sophoclis 'Antigone'; Euripidis 'Medea'*, Argentorati 1779.
- Cameron 1964 = H.D. Cameron, *The Debt to Earth in the 'Seven against Thebes'*, TAPhA 95, 1964, 1-8.

⁷⁷ The manuscript colometry of 778-80 = 785-7 (doch., 2 ia., 2 ia.) is retained by Page 1972; Dale 1983, 308; but rejected by Parker 1966, 18, who favours instead 4 ia., bacch., cret. The gist of her suggestion is taken over by Hutchinson 1985, 162 f. and West 1998, 471. The aim of the change is to get rid of a word-end at a long anceps (780 ἄλγει) which seems to break the «extended Porson's law». It is not for me to discuss whether this law is one of the strictest; yet note that Parker's study itself is cautious in drawing this conclusion for tragic lyric metres. Information of the actual colometry of this passage in several Aeschylean manuscripts can be found in Andreatta 2012, 62 f.; see also Galvani *et Al.* 2008.

⁷⁸ Dochmiac n. 25 in Conomis 1964, 23, 26 f. See also West 1982, 109.

⁷⁹ Adopted by Hutchinson 1985.

- Cameron 1970 = H.D. Cameron, *The Power of Words in the 'Seven against Thebes'*, TAPhA 101, 1970, 95-118.
- Cameron 1971 = H.D. Cameron, *Studies on the 'Seven against Thebes' of Aeschylus*, The Hague 1971.
- Centanni 1995 = M. Centanni, *Eschilo. 'I sette contro Tebe'*, Venezia 1995.
- Centanni 2003 = M. Centanni, *Eschilo. Le Tragedie*, Milano 2003.
- Collard 2008 = C. Collard, *Aeschylus, 'Persians' and Other Plays*, Oxford 2008.
- Conomis 1964 = H. Conomis, *The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama*, Hermes 92, 1964, 23-50.
- Dale 1983 = A.M. Dale, *Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses*, Fasc. 3, *Dochmiac-Iambic-Dactylic-Ionic*, London 1983.
- Dawe 1964 = R.D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*, Cambridge 1964.
- Dawe 1988 = R.D. Dawe, *Review of Hutchinson 1985*, CJ 83, 1988, 328-32.
- Dawson 1970 = C.M. Dawson, *Aeschylus: The Seven against Thebes*, Englewood Cliffs NJ 1970.
- de Marco 1936 = V. de Marco, *Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii sofoclei*, SIFC 13, 1936, 1-44.
- de Marco 1937 = V. de Marco, *De scholiis in Sophoclis tragoedias veteribus*, MAL 6, VI ser., 1937, 105-229.
- de Marco 1952 = V. de Marco, *Scholia in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum*, Romae 1952.
- Denniston 1954 = J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954².
- Easterling 1967 = P.E. Easterling, *Oedipus and Polynices*, PCPS 13, 1967, 1-13.
- Fritzsche 1877 = T. Fritzsche, *Godofredi Hermannii Opuscula*, Lipsiae 1877.
- Galvani et Al. 2008 = G. Galvani et Al., *Th. J. Fleming: The Colometry of Aeschylus*, Amsterdam 2008.
- Garvie 1986 = A.F. Garvie, *Review of Hutchinson 1985*, CR 36, 1986, 191 s.
- Goeken 2010 = J. Goeken, *La rhétorique de la prière dans l'antiquité grecque*, Turnhout 2010.
- Griffin 1980 = J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford 1980.
- Griffin 1999 = J. Griffin, *Sophocles Revisited: Essays Presented to Sir H. Lloyd-Jones*, Oxford 1999.
- Groeneboom 1966 = P. Groeneboom, *Aeschylus' Zeven Tegen Thebe*, Amsterdam 1966.
- Haupt 1839 = C.G. Haupt, *Aeschyli Septem contra Thebas: quaestionum Aeschylearum specimen, I ii*, Lipsiae 1839.
- Heath 1762 = B. Heath, *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque relliquias*, Oxonii 1762.
- Hermann 1852 = G. Hermann, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Lipsiae 1852.
- Hutchinson 1985 = G.O. Hutchinson, *Aeschylus. 'Septem contra Thebas'*, Oxford 1985.
- Italie 1950 = G. Italie, *Aeschylus, 'Zeven tegen Thebe'*, Leiden 1950
- Italie and Radt 1964 = G. Italie and S.L. Radt, *Index Aeschyleus*, Leiden 1964
- Jebb 1900a = R.C. Jebb, *Sophocles: The Antigone*, Cambridge 1900.
- Jebb 1900b = R.C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The 'Oedipus Coloneus'*, Cambridge 1900.
- Johansen – Whittle 1980 = H.F. Johansen – E.W. Whittle, *Aeschylus. The 'Suppliants'*, Copenhagen 1980.
- Kamerbeek 1984 = J.C. Kamerbeek, *The Plays of Sophocles, VII, The 'Oedipus Coloneus'*, Leiden 1984.
- MacDowell 1978 = D.M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*, Ithaca NY 1978.
- Manton 1961 = G.R. Manton, *The Second Stasimon of the 'Seven against Thebes'*, BICS 8, 1961, 77-84.

- March 1987 = J.R. March, *The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry*, London 1987.
- Mastronarde 1994 = D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides, 'Phoenissae'*, Cambridge 1994.
- Matino 1998 = G. Matino, *La sintassi di Eschilo*, Napoli 1998.
- Mazon 1921 = P. Mazon, *Eschyle*, Paris 1921.
- Murray 1955 = G. Murray, *Aeschylus septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, Oxonii 1955.
- Novelli 2008 = S. Novelli, *Autoaccecamento e amare maledizioni. Nota ad Aesch. 'Sept.' 778-792*, QUCC 89, 2008, 11-21.
- Page 1972 = D.L. Page, *Aeschylus septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, Oxonii 1972.
- Paley 1879 = F.A. Paley, *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*, London 1879.
- Parker 1966 = L.E.P. Parker, *Porson's Law Extended*, CQ 16, 1966, 1-26.
- Parker 1983 = R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford 1983.
- Patzer 1958 = H. Patzer, *Die dramatische Handlung der 'Sieben gegen Theben'*, HSCP 63, 1958, 97-119.
- Poli Palladini 2000 = L. Poli Palladini, *Studies on Aeschylus' 'Seven against Thebes'*, D. Phil. Thesis, Oxford 2000.
- Poli Palladini 2014 = L. Poli Palladini, *De scholio ad Sophoclis 'Oedipum Coloneum' 1375*, forthcoming.
- Prévot 1935 = A. Prévot, *L'aorist grec en -θην*, Paris 1935.
- Prien 1856 = C. Prien, *Beiträge zur Kritik von Aeschylus' 'Sieben vor Theben'*, Lübeck 1856.
- Robert 1915 = C. Robert, *Oedipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffes in Griechischen Altertum*, Berlin 1915.
- Roisman 1988 = H.M. Roisman, *Oedipus' Curse in Aeschylus' 'Septem'*, *Eranos* 86, 1988, 77-84.
- Rose 1957 = H.J. Rose, *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*, Amsterdam 1957.
- Schmid – Stählin 1934 = W. Schmid – O. Stählin, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*, erster Teil, *Die klassische Periode der Griechischen Literatur*, Bd. 2, *Die Griechische Literatur in der Zeit der attischen Hegemonie vor dem Eingreifen der Sophistik*, München 1934.
- Schmidt 1864 = M. Schmidt, *Zu Aeschylus' 'Septem'*, *RhM* 19, 1864, 627-31
- Schütz 1782-97a = C.G. Schütz, *Aeschylus septem quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta*, Halae 1782-97.
- Schütz 1782-97b = C.G. Schütz, *In Aeschylus septem quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta commentarius*, Halae 1782-97.
- Schütz 1808-11 = C.G. Schütz, *Aeschylus septem quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta*, Halae 1808-11.
- Schwyzler 1953 = E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1953.
- Sevieri 2003 = R. Sevieri, *Eschilo. 'Sette contro Tebe'*, Milano 2003.
- Sidgwick 1903 = A. Sidgwick, *Aeschylus, 'Septem contra Thebas'*, Oxford 1903.
- Smith 1982 = O.L. Smith, *Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae exstant omnia*, I i 2, *Scholia in 'Septem adversus Thebas' continens*, Leipzig 1982.
- Sommerstein 1989 = A.H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus, 'Eumenides'*, Cambridge 1989.
- Sommerstein 1996 = A.H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylean Tragedy*, Bari 1996.
- Thalman 1978 = W.G. Thalman, *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus' 'Seven against Thebes'*, New Haven CT 1978.
- Tucker 1908 = T.G. Tucker, *Aeschylus, The 'Seven against Thebes'*, Cambridge 1908.
- Turyn 1943 = A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus*, New York 1943.
- Verrall 1887 = A.W. Verrall, *Aeschylus 'Septem contra Thebas'*, London 1887.

- Verrall – Bayfield 1888 = A.W. Verrall – M.A. Bayfield, *Aeschylus, The ‘Seven against Thebes’*, London 1888.
- Weil 1862 = H. Weil, *Aeschyli quae supersunt tragoediae*, I i 1, *Septem contra Thebas*, Gissae 1862.
- West 1982 = M.L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982.
- West 1990 = M.L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart 1990.
- West 1998 = M.L. West, *Aeschylus: Tragoediae Cum Incerti Poetae Prometheo*, Stutgardiae 1998².
- West 1999 = M.L. West, *Ancestral Curses*, in Griffin 1999, 31-45.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1914a = U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aeschyli Tragoediae*, Berolini 1914.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1914b = U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aischylos: Interpretationen*, Berlin 1914.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921 = U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921.
- Winnington-Ingram 1977 = R.P. Winnington-Ingram, *Septem contra Thebas*, YCS 25, 1977, 1-45.
- Winnington-Ingram 1980 = R.P. Winnington-Ingram, *Sophocles: An Interpretation*, Cambridge 1980.
- Zimmermann 1986 = B. Zimmermann, *Review of Hutchinson 1985*, *Gymnasium* 93, 1986, 542-4.

Abstract: This article examines a notoriously difficult passage in the second stasimon of *Septem*. A thorough discussion of archaic and classical Greek mentality concerning parental curses, maintenance, insanity, and self-injuring, helps conclude that Oedipus’ curse is envisaged along the lines of the epic *Thebaid* (just as maintained by Schol. ad Soph. *OC* 1375), and that under the corruption of 783 f. self-blinding was mentioned. Finally, an emendation of these lines is provided *exempli gratia*.

Keywords: Aeschylus, *Seven against Thebes*, Oedipus, Parental curses, Textual criticism.