

Greek literature in connection with the αἵμακουρία to Patroclus's soul in *Iliad* xxiii, and with the ghosts in *Odyssey* xi.<sup>18</sup> Thereafter it appears particularly in association with the Erinyes.<sup>19</sup> It is arguable that to the audience of tragedy Oedipus's apostrophe of the cross-roads would have suggested that they were being treated as symbolic Erinyes, for it is they whom we would expect to witness the parricide, as at Pind. O. 2.41.<sup>20</sup> The language is at any rate sufficient to indicate that in Oedipus's own memory the killing of Laius has taken on the status of an act committed at a place which embodied the presence of chthonic forces. In thus dramatising the fallen King's sense of the tragic event, Sophocles is drawing out, in a particularly intense form, the significance which had been implicit in the references to the τρίοδος earlier in the play.

In directing attention to the forking road in the *OT*, it is not my purpose to pretend that this detail carries a simple, determinate religious meaning. But to concede this much does not entail, where we are dealing with so ironic and subtle a text, the rejection of *any* religious interpretation of this element in the story. Only those who regard Sophocles as more of a theologian than a dramatist will expect him to deal consistently in doctrinal assertion or conclusive demonstration of divine agency. In fact, much that is relevant to the understanding of religion in the surviving plays comes in the form of deliberately obscure, riddling or shifting hints and glimpses of a complex divine involvement in the events of the heroic world.<sup>21</sup> Religious *suggestiveness*, not necessarily resolvable into certain and stable comprehension, is a major means of dramatic significance in Sophocles. It is in these terms that the cross-roads in the *OT* need to be viewed, and that is why I have made some attempt to indicate how Sophocles could exploit the associations which this detail had for his audience.

That specific references to Furies, a family curse and kindred matters have largely been eliminated from the *OT* is not in doubt.<sup>22</sup> This divergence from Aeschylean and Pindaric precedent may well be the negative

counterpart of an attempt to increase the Apollonian dimension of the story. But Sophocles' handling of the myth, even where Apollo is concerned, is characteristically ironic and oblique. Does Apollo merely foresee or does he also bring about? Is Apollo the only divine force behind Oedipus's sufferings, or are there others? At more than one point there is ambiguity. It is consistent with this that Sophocles, while reducing the ostensible involvement of chthonic powers in the myth, has not removed all traces of them. The occurrence of Oedipus's parricide at a τρίοδος sacred to a dangerous deity, and one perhaps related to Apollo himself,<sup>23</sup> leaves open the possibility that forces other than the god of Delphi might be discerned behind Laius's and Oedipus's destinies. Nor is it enough to treat the branching road as a purely traditional part of the myth: however old it may have been, Sophocles' use of it—marking it with a moment of chilling emphasis in the scene with Jocasta, and allowing it to recur with intensified significance in the great rhesis of the blinded Oedipus—should leave us in no doubt that he meant his audience to notice it, and ponder it, afresh.

STEPHEN HALLIWELL

University of Birmingham

<sup>23</sup> On Hekate's relation to Apollo and Artemis (for Artemis and cross-roads cf. Plut. *Mor.* 170b) see Heckenbach (n. 3) 2769–71, Kraus (n. 3) 11–23. It would be wrong to press too hard the Olympian-chthonic distinction (*locus classicus* Isoc. 5.117) between deities such as Apollo and Hekate: see A. D. Nock, *Essays on religion and the ancient world* ii (Oxford 1972) 591–2, 599–601.

### *Prometheus Desmotes* 354

Prometheus, having lamented the burden of his brother Atlas, speaks of earthborn Typhos and his punishment by Zeus. The text and apparatus of lines 351 to 357 are given in Sir Denys Page's edition thus:<sup>1</sup>

τὸν γηγεῖν τε Κιλικίων οἰκῆτορα  
 ἀντρῶν ἰδῶν ὠικτιρα, δάιον τέρας,  
 ἑκατογκάρανον πρὸς βίαν χειρούμενον,  
 Τυφῶνα θυῶρον· ἴπᾱσιν ὄσῃ ἀντέστη θεοῖς  
 μερδναῖσι γαμφηλαῖσι κυρίζων φόβον, 355  
 ἔξ ὀμμάτων δ' ἤστραπτε γοργωπὸν κέλας,  
 ὡς τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδ' ἐκπέτρων βίαι.

353 ἑκατογκάρανον Blomfield: ἑκατοντακάρηνον vel -κάρανον fere codd. 354 πᾱσιν ὄσ M1ΔBCHWDLcLhPGTr: ὄσ πᾱσιν XHaVNNcOYYaKQF; ὄστις (deleto πᾱσιν tamquam gloss.) Gaisford, θεός ὄσ (deleto πᾱσιν) Headlam 355 γαμφηλαῖσι MΔIO<sup>4c</sup>W (ut vid.)KQG: -λήσι rell. φόβον M1ΔBH<sup>4c</sup>O<sup>2pc</sup> et sscr. XWF: φόνον I<sup>sscr</sup> rell. 357 ἐκπέτραι θέλων D, ἐκπέτραι etiam KQ<sup>1sscr</sup>, θέλων Q<sup>2yp</sup>, ἐκπέτραι θέλων βίαι W

Page did not believe that the correct emendation of line 354 had been found. The variety of conjectures, some of them wild, can be seen in Dawe's collection.<sup>2</sup> In emending the unmetrical πᾱσιν ὄσ scholars have not agreed where the corruption lies. Gaisford's ὄστις fails to explain the presence of πᾱσιν, and it was rejected by G. Hermann because it is syntactically awkward: . . . *ne recte quidem dictum est ὄστις, quod pronomen quum non sit definitivus, quam vim habet ὄσ, sed declarantis, referendum id*

*Eum.* 979 (for 980, and cf. *Cho.* 66, 400–02) alongside examples of the earth 'drinking' rain etc.: but the Aeschylean passages, like the Sophoclean, all involve killings between either kin or fellow citizens, and the language involved correspondingly carries the terrible implications of such spilt blood.

<sup>18</sup> *Il.* xxiii 29–34, *Od.* xi 36 ff., 95 ff. For αἵμακουρία cf. Pind. O. 1.90.

<sup>19</sup> Aesch. *Agam.* 1188 f., *Cho.* 577 f., *Eum.* 264–6, *Soph. Aj.* 843 f., *Trach.* 1054–6, *fr.* 743. At Hesiod *Theog.* 183 ff. the Erinyes are born from the blood of Uranos, caught by the Earth. For the drinking of blood by the dead cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 97, 164, *Soph. El.* 1417–21, *OC* 621–3 (or Oedipus as a Fury? cf. *Electra* at *El.* 784–6), *Eur. Hec.* 392 f., 534 ff. Hekate too is a drinker of blood, not surprisingly: Heckenbach (n. 3) 2776.

<sup>20</sup> For Erinyes and crimes against parents see, in addition to the *Oresteia*, *Hom. Il.* ix 453 f., 569–72, *Od.* ii 134–6. Erinyes are also relevant to Oedipus's incest: cf. *Hom. Od.* xi 280. A. L. Brown, *CQ* xxxiv (1984) 280, argues that Erinyes play no part in the *OT*, but he deals only with the explicit.

<sup>21</sup> Some obvious instances are Athena's uncertain involvement in Ajax's suicide (esp. *Aj.* 749–55); the background of the family curse in *Antigone*; the relation between the oracles and the end of *Trachiniai*; and the obscurities surrounding Helenus's oracle in *Philoctetes*.

<sup>22</sup> See R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Sophocles: an interpretation* (Cambridge 1980) 205 f., and for some considerations on the other side H. Lloyd-Jones, *The justice of Zeus* (Berkeley 1971) 121–3.

<sup>1</sup> Aeschylus O.C.T. (Oxford 1972) 302.

<sup>2</sup> *Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus* (Leiden 1965) 16.

esset ad θοῦρον, quo languida feret sententia.<sup>3</sup> Hermann, after considering the possibility of a lacuna of one verse between πᾶσιν ὅς and ἀντέττη, settled for πᾶσι δ' ἀντέττη θεοῖς. However, as Mark Griffith pointed out,<sup>4</sup> the relative ὅς would hardly have replaced the simple δέ. Griffith preferred the asyndeton πᾶσιν ἀντέττη θεοῖς, resulting from Wellauer's deletion of ὅς. The asyndeton was defended by Wilamowitz,<sup>5</sup> but it is harsh and it is not necessary, as we shall see. Murray kept ὅς and πᾶσιν:<sup>6</sup> θοῦρον Τυφῶν' ὅς πᾶσιν. But the prosody Τυφῶν' is doubtful. Headlam's θεός ὅς, described as 'a certain emendation' by George Thomson,<sup>7</sup> is neat—haplography of ΘCOC to OC; but it does not adequately explain the presence of πᾶσιν.

πᾶσιν is more suspect than ὅς, because if ὅς can be kept, asyndeton is eliminated. Another reason for doubting πᾶσιν is that Typhos did not fight all the gods; he fought Zeus and his allies. Metre is restored, and point is given, to line 354 by the palaeographically simple change of one letter—by the emendation of πᾶσιν to κάσιν.

In the emended line an unelided disyllabic word is confined to the sixth element. For such a word in the sixth element Aesch. *Supp.* 516 may be compared: ἀλλ' οὔτι δαρὸν χρόνον ἐρημώσει πατήρ. After κάσιν comes a pause; a stronger pause after a disyllabic word in the sixth element is to be seen, and heard, in Soph. *Ajax* 342–3:

ποῦ Τεῦκρος; ἢ τὸν εἰσαεῖ  
λεηλατήσῃ χρόνον; ἐγὼ δ' ἀπόλλυμαι;

Thus the rare metrical structure of the emended line is acceptable in a pre-Euripidean tragedy, whether or not *Prometheus Desmotes* is by Aeschylus. The conjecture κάσιν has been made long ago—by Wieseler, as a reader informs me. It deserves to be revived because it makes explicit the reason for the sympathy of Prometheus with the ferocious Typhos.

Prometheus pities Atlas, who is his brother (347–348); but he pities Typhos also, and Typhos is another brother, since Typhos is earthborn (351), and Themis, who is Earth (209–210), is the mother of Prometheus. The chorus also emphasizes the ties of kinship: ἐτένουσι τὰν εὐξυναιμόνων τε τιμάν (409–411). There are many words about kinship in the play because the strife between Zeus and Prometheus is all the more terrible for being an enmity of kin.<sup>8</sup> Typhos suffered too in the family war between Zeus and his enemies; accordingly, in line 354 Prometheus sorrows for his furious brother who withstood gods: Τυφῶνα, θοῦρον κάσιν, ὅς ἀντέττη θεοῖς.

GEORGE HUXLEY

*St Patrick's College, Maynooth*

<sup>3</sup> *Aeschyli Tragoediae* ii (Leipzig 1852) 79.

<sup>4</sup> *Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge 1983) 150.

<sup>5</sup> *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (1914, repr. Berlin 1958) 37.

<sup>6</sup> O.C.T.<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1955) 116, app. crit.

<sup>7</sup> *Aeschylus. The Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge 1932) 153.

<sup>8</sup> Concerning Zeus's divine victims as close relatives of Prometheus see now Griffith (n. 4) 14–15.

### The Diolkos

R. M. Cook has recently pointed out that the transport of warships across the Isthmus of Corinth was

not the normal use of the *diolkos* since there was no regular need for such transport. Rather, the *diolkos* from its inception served a commercial function and its use provided the Corinthian state with a source of revenue.<sup>1</sup>

Because information about its commercial use is lacking, Cook remains uncertain as to the success of the *diolkos* and its technical efficiency. He points out two possible drawbacks. Our knowledge of ancient merchant ships indicates that a ship could not be taken out of the water with cargo on board; thus, ship and cargo would have to be transported separately and then reloaded. Also, the movement of warships across the isthmus suggests that there may have been a relatively low limit to the weight of loads that could be transported on the *diolkos*. Drawing upon Thucydides and Polybius, Cook notes that in 412 triremes were transported across the isthmus whereas in 217 cataphracts, presumably *pentereis*, were not (unlike the *hemioliai* and undecked ships that were part of the same fleet). Because *pentereis* had dimensions similar to those of triremes but were somewhat heavier, weight may have been the criterion.<sup>2</sup>

Both suggestions are drawn, by necessity, from what is known about the occasional military use of the *diolkos* whereby warships were hauled across the track and assume the similar transport of merchant ships. In this regard, Cook acknowledges that neither point may be applicable if the *diolkos* was built to carry only cargo. He notes, 'It is, I suppose, possible that the original purpose and use of the *diolkos* was to transport cargoes and not ships and that that was why the Spartans had to construct ὄλκοι in 428 BC.'<sup>3</sup> Further analysis suggests that its regular commercial use involved the transport not of merchant ships but of cargo, and from this perspective we can better assess the success of the *diolkos*.<sup>4</sup>

The differences between merchant ships and warships make it unlikely that the *diolkos* was intended to

<sup>1</sup> R. M. Cook, *JHS* xcix (1979) 152–3. Others who have recently emphasized the commercial aspects of the *diolkos* include J. Wiseman, *The Land of the ancient Corinthians* (Göteborg 1978) 45–6; and J. B. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth: A history of the city to 338 BC* (Oxford 1984) 136–9. This was also the view of the excavator of the *diolkos* who suggested that commercial ships went over the *diolkos* empty while cargo was transported by wagon between Lechaion and Kenchreai; see N. Verdels, *ILN* ccxxxi (19 Oct. 1957) 650.

<sup>2</sup> Cook (n. 1) 152–3 n. 16, citing Thuc. viii 7–8 and Polyb. v 101.4. However, other explanations are also possible. Although the hulls of the *penteres* and the trireme were similar, the *penteres* was also supplied with an oar-box that, in addition to adding weight, may have made the warship more top heavy and consequently more awkward to move and handle on land; cf. J. Morrison and R. Williams, *Greek oared ships* (Cambridge 1968) 286, and L. Casson, *Ships and seamanship in the ancient world* (Princeton 1971) 102–3. Also the *penteres* may have carried more marines with their own gear or may have supported more rigging or armaments, practices that became common by the Hellenistic period. Of course, it is possible that Philip sent some of his ships around the Peloponnese simply for tactical reasons—to challenge Skerdilaidas, whose ships were committing acts of piracy off the cape of Malea (Polyb. v 95. 1, 101.1).

<sup>3</sup> Cook (n. 1) 153 n. 29, referring to Thuc. iii 15.1.

<sup>4</sup> Cook has now reached a similar conclusion and sees in the reference in Thucydides cited above an indication that before 428 only cargo was transported across the *diolkos*; see R. M. Cook, 'A further note on the *Diolkos*', in *Studies in honour of T. B. L. Webster*, i (Bristol 1986). I am grateful to Professor Cook for sending me a copy of his paper prior to publication.