



## Sophocles Philoctetes 1019<sup>1</sup>

Makoto Anzai,  
Hokkaido University

### Abstract and Introduction

The purposes of this short textual note on the verse Sophocles Philoctetes 1019 are: to make a rather detailed report on the text of this line which was almost unanimously transmitted by four mediaeval manuscripts of Sophocles (manuscripts A,U,Y, and Z<sub>o</sub><sup>2</sup>), to show that this reading of the line is, though it has been completely neglected by all the modern editors of Sophocles since the *editio princeps* by Aldus Manutius, grammatically sound, to show that the line as transmitted by the four manuscripts can be sound and meaningful also in terms of theatrical performance. As a sort of finale to the paper, I will attach an appendix which will show that this neglected text can work as an effective part within the whole tragedy. Numbers inserted above in this paragraph correspond to the numbers of the sections of this paper.

The most convenient way for us, the reader and the author of the article, to share the information about what happened concerning the transmission of the line is to cite the text by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson first and the *ap. cr.* by Dawe (in the third edition).<sup>3</sup> A few lines without *ap. cr.* are prefixed for the sake of later comments (I consider that the underlined parts should be modified. I will show the modified form in Section 2.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Philological and interpretative observations included in this paper are a revised English version of what I published in Japanese; Anzai, M., “Sophocles Philoctetes 1019,” *Philologica XIII*, Tokyo, 2018, pp. 31-40.

<sup>2</sup> A : Parisinus Graecus 2712. Y : Codex Vindobonensis philosophicus philologicus Graecus 48. I made sure of the readings of these manuscripts through the Internet. U : Venetus Marcianus Graecus 467=coll. 764 : Z<sub>o</sub> : Florentinus C. S. 172 + Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 287. The latter two manuscripts were checked by the help of two respective microfilms sent to me by the arrangements of the honorable libraries where they are kept. I here sincerely express my thanks to the librarians of the four libraries who helped me in many ways. Z<sub>o</sub> (the part of this manuscript where tragedies of Euripides are transmitted is called by the initial of P) belongs to the contaminated class, and therefore is not a direct child of π (see below in this note), the father of *gemelli* AU Y. For basic assessments around Paris Class (π) of Sophocles manuscripts, see Turyn 173-83.

<sup>3</sup> In his third edition Dawe changed the text at the point which I am going to discuss from the vulgate reading (ὄλοιο· καί σοι...) and followed (in other words “persuaded by”) the change taken by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, (ὄλοιο· καί τοι...). Therefore, though the expression may be a little strange, the hybrid composition of citations here which was preferred in this article would be historically more correct suitable. The *apparatus criticus* by Dawe is more useful and kind than that of Lloyd-Jones and Wilson.

καὶ νῦν ἔμ', ὦ δύστηνε, συνδήσας νοεῖς  
 ἄγειν ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τῆσδ', ἐν ἧ με προυβάλου  
 ἄφιλον ἔρημον ἄπολιν, ἐν ζῶσιν νεκρόν. 1018  
 φεῦ.  
 ὄλοιο· καίτοι πολλάκις τόδ' ἠϋξάμην. 1019

1019 φεῦ om. KS | καίτοι Wakefield : καὶ σὺ AUYZ<sub>o</sub> | καὶ σοι rell. et γρ. AUY |  
 ἠϋξάμην LKQ εὐξ- L s.l., rell.

[And now, O! Wretched one, you have a plan of dragging me in bondage  
 from this shore where once you deserted me, as a lonely and friendless  
 existence without polis-society, a mere corpse in the eyes of living human beings]

I would not like to give a translation of the line 1019 itself and φεῦ (extra metrum). It is simply because I think that the line (1019), neither in the form as printed above (with καίτοι) nor in the form as has been printed in numerous Sophoclean editions within the Sophoclean vulgate tradition (with a sentence beginning with καὶ σοι), is translatable. Until the last decade of 20th century, editors of Sophocles have almost unanimously printed καὶ σοι, which is the majority reading in the mediaeval Sophoclean manuscripts. But in their new edition of Sophocles of 1990, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson gave up printing the reading here of traditional Sophoclean editions and decided to print instead the conjecture suggested by Wakefield in late 18th century. An edition by Pucci and others followed the lead of new OCT Sophocles and (the third edition of) Dawe, but without any meaningful positive comments.<sup>4</sup>

As to the points touched by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson's *Sophoclea* on this problem<sup>5</sup>, I would like to make the following criticism : If an editor of an ancient book thinks that he should remove at a place in the book a popular reading transmitted in the majority of mediaeval manuscripts, what he should do next is, obviously, to check the possibility of accepting the minority reading. If the decision made after the rejection of the popular reading is to print a conjecture by a modern philologist, and not the minority reading, and if this decision meant his negative evaluation of minority reading in the form of 'rejection in silence' of the editor, I must say I am against the editor.

What follows is the report of my inspection of *Philoctetes* 1019 in four 14<sup>th</sup>-century manuscripts.

I think the most honest and obedient way to express the commands given us by the written letters and punctuations in the four manuscripts (and the father {π}, of the *gemelli* A, U,

<sup>4</sup> For example, Pucci and others *ad loc.* : καίτοι: 'è congettura di Wakefield accolta da Lloyd-Jones e Dawe. I manoscritti leggono καὶ σοι ο καὶ σὺ.' This is not a comment from a committed commentator. No linguistic or contextual explanation is written. Even the positive evaluation for the decision by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson is absent here.

<sup>5</sup> H.Lloyd-Jones and N.G.Wilson. *Sophoclea; Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, Oxford 1990, 204-5.

and Y) will be, if we express them according to the forms of modern conventions;

φεῦ.

ὄλοιο καὶ σύ· πολλάκις τόδ' ἠῤῥάμην.

[Ah, the destruction take you too!<sup>6</sup> Oft times I prayed this pray.]

I handed a color-copy of the page concerned in Codex Y to the audience at my paper-reading of the article reported in footnote 1). The points in the photocopy of Codex Y were : 1. σύ is with grave accent (unanimous in four manuscripts); 2) the punctuation after σὺ can be interpreted as a full-stop or a half-stop heavier than a comma,<sup>7</sup> 3) a space between σὺ and πολλάκις is clear to identify. The space is visibly a little wider than the other spaces elsewhere between the words written in the line (at least in Y).

I conclusion was that the form of Greek words printed above would be an obvious conclusion from the inquiry into the four manuscripts in accordance with the contemporary conventions concerning the accentuations and punctuations of Ancient Greek Language. And I think this form of the line deserves a serious evaluation. The part before the Caesura of the line contains the curse from Philoctetes to 'a specific' Odysseus (see the theatrical reconstruction discussed in details in the following section) in the form of Oratio Recta.<sup>8</sup> The latter half of the line is a statement of the historical fact that the curse uttered by Philoctetes has been repeatedly put against the specific Odysseus. And the more important fact is that this statement is being given not to the 'specific' Odysseus, but to a 'real' Odysseus, who is now on the *proskene* together with the speaker Philoctetes before the presence of the audience.

A little complicated rebuilding of the scene will be the theme of coming section. Before passing to the next stage of exegesis, however, I think I should make comments on the linguistic problems potentially involved in the line above. It is about the grammatical term *asyndeton*. Though there are two short sentences in the line shown above, we cannot see any connecting particles, which usually are considered to be necessary for Greek sentences when they are connected into some context. The number of connecting particles which would be necessary here in this line would be, in maximum, two (one for the sentence ὄλοιο καὶ σύ·, another for πολλάκις τόδ' ἠῤῥάμην.) The lack of a connecting particle in the former sentence (ὄλοιο καὶ σύ·) is easy to accept. The sentence is after an emotionally charged interjection (φεῦ), and in such cases the sentence following the interjection needs, in a usual case, no connecting particle in Greek.<sup>9</sup> As for the lack in the

---

<sup>6</sup> 'you too' should be taken to mean 'you as well as me'. This interpretation is an obvious one to me. See the discussion in sections 2, 3, and 4.

<sup>7</sup> A period or a colon or a semicolon (unfortunately, it is usual that we cannot decide on the kinds in mediaeval manuscripts) is clearly put with space rather decidedly wider than usual in A and Y. As to the line in U and Z<sub>o</sub>, I should say that they are not with a clearly visible punctuation. I explained some of these comments showing a color-copy of the page which contains *Philoctetes* 1019 of manuscript Y, when I read my paper, *Sophocles Philoctetes 1019*, at Seijo University October 2017, which was eventually published in the article form in *Philologica* XIII (see note 1).

<sup>8</sup> I sincerely request the reader of this article to take my exegesis of the line as only a trial of the interpretation of this line.

<sup>9</sup> For example, φεῦ· (extra metrum) ἧ δεινὸν ᾧ δοκῆι γε καὶ ψευδῆ δοκεῖν. *Ant.* 323. Here ἧ is an adverbial particle qualifying the statement by a guard. Therefore the sentence beginning with ἧ lacks a

latter sentence, we need a much clearer and a fairly detailed explanation.

A rebuilding (or refinding) of *Philoctetes* 1019 above according to what was written in AUYZ<sub>o</sub> certainly produces the lack of connecting particle for the sentence in the latter half of the verse (πολλάκις τόδ' ἠϋξάμην.). This kind of asyndetic connection in Greek, however, is usual. When two sentences, one expressing that there was a speech by someone and the other reporting the speech itself in Oratio Recta, are connected, in many cases, with the help of demonstrative pronouns, they seldom need the help of connecting particle. These innumerable instances of asyndetic combinations of sentences, not with the help of connecting particles, but with the help of demonstratives are, in a more general way, formulated by Denniston-Dover (xliv-iv)<sup>10</sup> in the following way:

(i) The preceding context makes the connexion obvious, and no particle is required to point it. This is the case where a writer or speaker directly or indirectly announces his theme in advance, and where a forward-pointing pronoun or demonstrative adverb, or some other word or phrase, supplies the link (underlined by Anzai).<sup>11</sup>

The formulation does not directly explain the asyndeton we are facing. Our case is explained by the second formulation:

(ii) To a less degree, a backward-pointing pronoun or demonstrative adverb, usually at or near the opening of the sentence, similarly diminished the necessity for a connecting particle (underlined by Anzai).<sup>12</sup>

Our case in *Philoctetes* 1019 just accords with this latter formulation, and the helping demonstrative here in *Philoctetes* 1019 is τόδ'. In spite of the authoritative frequency judgment by Denniston-Dover that the second type is employed 'to a lesser degree,' we can find a close parallel easily in a place very near to our verse:

ἐγώ, σάφ' ἴσθ', οὐκ ἄλλος· ὁμολογῶ τάδε.  
[Certainly I did it. Not someone else. I confess this]  
*Philoctetes* 980

To sum up, a trouble around the transmission of the verse *Philoctetes* 1019 has been caused by our inaccurate knowledge of the asyndetic connection of Greek sentences. On the surface, the error might have been caused in the small change from συ (AUYZ<sub>o</sub>) to σοι (*rell.*).<sup>13</sup> But it has involved the change of punctuation, and inevitably the change in

---

connecting particle (asyndetic connection).

<sup>10</sup> Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles*. Revised by K. J. Dover. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Oxford UP 1950, xliv-iv.

<sup>11</sup> Since Deniston-Dover cites only a few examples, I add the following : ὁ (=Ξέρξης) δὲ Περσέων συναλίσας τοὺς (=οὓς in Attic) καὶ πρότερον συνέλεξε, ἔλεξε σφι τάδε. ἄνδρες Πέρσαι, συγγνώμη μοι ἔχετε ὅτι ... Hdt. 7. 13. 1.

<sup>12</sup> *ib.* xliv.

<sup>13</sup> I believe that this is what has happened in the history of the Sophoclean manuscript tradition. Not the other way round. Evidently this happened long before the birth of Manuscript L of Sophocles.

the interpretation of the verse, particularly of the effect by the sentence-connecting particle. But I think I should rather say the change happened in the following way: the leading force in this direction towards the Sophoclean vulgate (ὄλοιο· καὶ σοι πολλάκις τόδ' ἠὺξάμην) both in its medieval transmission and printed editions might have been, not an accidental change in one letter or two, but a strong belief that Greek sentences need the help of connecting particles for them to be built into a proper context. It is possible that the first failure was of punctuation in order to 'restore' the meaning of καὶ to its seemingly proper function as a connecting particle. The change from σύ to σοι might have happened later following this change to 'restore' the meaning of καὶ.

Whatever has happened in the mediaeval manuscript transmission of the verse 1019 of *Philoctetes*, the belief in the necessary force of Greek connecting particles seems to be still alive. The belief has been strong not only for five hundred years since the creation of the Sophoclean vulgate, but also for a few decades, after editors had begun to give up printing καὶ σοι. The belief in the necessity of connecting particles in Classical Greek Language has been so forceful that even after the giving up of καὶ as a sentence-connecting particle in the Sophoclean vulgate, the editors thought they still needed help from a connecting particle here. What they have done is just to replace καὶ by another connecting particle, καίτοι.

To give a finishing form to the discussion in this section, I would like to show the text which I believe to be near the truth (the underlined parts are my responsibility). Just for the convenience of the reader of this article I add a set of quotation marks to make the understanding and explanation easier in the present and the next section.

καὶ νῦν ἔμ', ὃ δύστηνε, συνδήσας νοεῖς  
 ἄγειν ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τῆσδ', ἐν ἧ με προυβάλλου  
 ἄφιλον ἔρημον ἄπολιν, ἐν ζῶσιν νεκρόν. 1018  
 φεῦ.  
“ὄλοιο καὶ σύ·” πολλάκις τόδ' ἠὺξάμην.

[Ah, the destruction take you too! Ofttimes I prayed this prayer.]  
 1019 φεῦ om. KS | καὶ σὺ AUYZ<sub>o</sub> | καὶ σοι rell. et γρ. AUΥ | ἠὺξάμην LKQ εὐξ- L  
 s.l., rell.

Although the grammatical defence of the AUYZ<sub>o</sub> reading of *Philoctetes* 1019 seems to me to have been, I hope, properly and fully conveyed, there still remain awkward points for the defender of the recovered readings to explain, as long as he believes that AUYZ<sub>o</sub> represent the true transmission of the *Philoctetes* text here.

They, Philoctetes and Odysseus, are making here a conversation on the *proskene*. A grotto is painted on the *skene*, behind the two actors. In front of them a shore is imagined, and beyond the shore the Aegean Sea, of course, could be imagined. Who is speaking? To whom? From the line 1016 to the first part of 1017, the answer will be an easy one. Philoctetes is speaking to Odysseus who is just in front of his (=Philoctetes') mask. The finite verb (νοεῖς, 2sg. pres. indicative and active) describes a possible action, which will be surely acted by the 'real' Odysseus. The inference is being spoken, from another point

of view, in front of the audience and spectators. Philoctetes is making an inference, with anger and fear, that Odysseus is surely going to bind his arms and legs violently and is going to draw his body alive to the Trojan battlefield from this shore (ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τῆσδ'), which could be imagined to be before them and before the audience. The relative clause with ἀκτῆς as the antecedent of the relative changes the scene. The main verb of the clause (προυβάλου, 2sg. aor. indicative and middle), although the actor (=Odysseus) of the verb is certainly still before us (the audience and spectators and the readers of *Philoctetes*), the described action itself belongs to the past, ten years ago. It is the action of leaving the wounded Philoctetes alone without any colleagues, without any social relations, relations that are necessary for a man to be called as a member of fully equipped human beings, as one who can be said to be alive in this world (ἐν ζῶσιν ἀνθρώποις). This action of leaving Philoctetes on the shore was surely done, but the action of leaving is purely imaginary one, or, in other words, belongs to the past world, for us and for the actors, although the shore is certainly before us. And of course, the mask of Philoctetes continues to be fixed on the shore through this part of his speech, from the beginning of the latter part of 1017 to the last word of 1018 (νεκρόν).

After an interjection in *extra metrum*, the words of curse from Philoctetes to 'you' are put (surely in the form of Oratio Recta). And the words of comments or explanation from the mouth of seemingly a 'real' Philoctetes are to give us a hint that will make us fully understand the first part of line of the 1019: "Many times I cried this curse, 'The destruction take you too.'"

But who is 'you' in ὄλοιο καὶ σύ exactly? I ask this question because this 'you' clearly does not indicate the same person as 'you' of νοεῖς. The latter 'you' is surely before Philoctetes on the stage, and he, Philoctetes, is speaking to this 'you,' at least as the subject of the verb, νοεῖς. But 'you' in ὄλοιο καὶ σύ is not the Odysseus himself before Philoctetes on the *proskene*. If it were so, ὄλοιο καὶ σύ would mean the wish by Philoctetes that the person before himself in the same way as he was ten years ago. We do not know whether Philoctetes is still hoping that physical and social destruction is upon him, 'the real Odysseus in front of himself'. It might be possible. But the context is not about the presence nor absence of hate, or anger. Philoctetes says "Ofttimes I prayed (aor.) this prayer." The words do not say clearly nor make sure that the hate or the curse is still in his mind. The first voice of the curse was thrown in the past. Philoctetes is not speaking about his hate and despair at the moment. He only says the fact that he repeated the curse to the Odysseus imagined on the beach or on the boat.

The preceding lines (the words after ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τῆσδ') depict the scene where, ten years ago, Odysseus and his colleagues deserted Philoctetes on the very shore where the two heroes are talking now. They, Odysseus and his colleagues, had left him on the shore. They had, I imagine, surely got on board a ship. The ship had left the shore. This is the best moment, it seems to me, for Philoctetes to utter for the first time the sentence of curse, ὄλοιο καὶ σύ. Just after the curse in Oratio Recta, Philoctetes says to Odysseus before him that he has repeated the curse many times.

Is this too much, too many, too complex, for the audience to accept? Just the opposite! If we give focus to the turns and movements of Philoctetes' mask, these complex

explanations by me are, I think, will become very easy to accept. First, Philoctetes speaks to Odysseus, who is really in front of him (voεῖς ‘You are now thinking ...’). Then, from the words ἀπ’ ἀκτῆς τῆσδ’ on, his mask leaves from the ‘real’ Odysseus and turns towards the shore, the place where the leaving alone of Philoctetes took place, which will be, in terms of the structure of the theater, the center of the edge-line of the *proskene*, the edge-line which separates the *proskene* from the *orchestra*. I imagine that the direction of the focus of the mask of Philoctetes’ moved, after the moment when Philoctetes had voiced the last word of 1018 (νεκρόν), towards further into the center of the rows of spectator’s seats, where, to my view, the back of leaving Odysseus is best imagined ten years ago. Then the curse to the person (Odysseus), who is to be imagined there (around the center of audience’s seats, in terms of the real buildings of Dionysus’ Theater), is thrown. Finally the mask turns back again towards the person, ‘the real Odysseus,’ who is present before him, and the comment (‘ofttimes the curse have been repeated by me.’) is spoken to the the ‘real Odysseus.’

The narrative movement of *Philoctetes* is simple. Ten years ago, there was a disastrous accident to the body of Philoctetes, and the Achaean army judged that the hero would be harmful to the completion of the army’s purpose. They decided that they should leave him alone on the island. Ten years later, Odysseus now has a knowledge that the Achaean army needs Philoctetes as a key fighter to realize their final goal and their return to their home country. Negative emotion (hate to Odysseus and the Achaean army) from the hero is an obstacle to this desirable movement from the hate of one hero (Philoctetes) against another (Odysseus) and the Achaean army to the cooperation. The movement is from the impasse to the restarting (χωρῶμεν 1469).

We see here in my citation above, a clear picture of things which are taking place in the mind of the hero, Philoctetes, if we choose the AUYZ<sub>o</sub> reading of *Philoctetes* 1019 (ὄλοιο καὶ σύ· πολλάκις τόδ’ ἠὺξάμην.) He shows his recognition of what he must choose for the future of the Achaean army and of himself, although here it is still a primitive and somewhat negative feeling, the feeling of fear against going to Troy (ἔμ’ ... συνδήσας voεῖς ἄγειν). He shows that he recognizes the things which stand against the decision for him to go to Troy in the relative clause (ἐν ἣ με προυβάλου / ἄφιλον ἔρημιον ἄπολιν, ἐν ζῶσιν νεκρόν), the anger for what Odysseus and his colleague had done to him ten years before. Giving voice to the memory of this anger, he cries the cry which was going to be repeated for ten years after the first utterance: ὄλοιο καὶ σύ·. Just after a moment with Caesura, a sudden and violent (in a sense) change comes to his mind. The recollection and reevaluation of his own past action, what he has repeated for these ten years: “I often repeated this cry of anger and hate for the whole ten years!” The voice has been spoken to the actor of this very action or decision hateful to himself! Is this not a great and dramatic step towards the final solution and goal, reconciliation between the two heroes and a positive start towards what is desirable for everyone, the giving up of a negative oneself through the recognition (or confession?) by oneself, before the face of once hated existence. Is this not a great start for a mentally wounded person towards a very desirable cure by himself, through a recognition of one’s own unhappy past, through the confession to the very originator of the disaster, who is (to his own view) responsible for his own hate in the past? Is it not a form of cure, a form of communication (confession?) of one’s own negative past with others?

This paper's goal has been to establish the reading by the manuscripts of the four mediaeval manuscripts of the verse 1019 of the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles into its proper place. I think that the minimum that is necessary for the reappraisal and reestablishment of the reading in the direct context of the verse which I cited at the start of the paper (*Philoctetes* 1016-9) has been done. Therefore I would like to stop talking about the importance of the recovered truth in terms of the work *Philoctetes* as a theatrical narration.

I think that the minimum that is necessary for the reappraisal and reestablishment of the manuscript reading in A, U, Y, Z<sub>o</sub> of *Philoctetes* 1019, in the direct context of the verse which I cited at the start of the paper (*Philoctetes* 1016-9) has been done.

Aldus Manutius, who produced the *editio princeps* of Sophocles on the basis of Y,<sup>14</sup> must have been in a similar situation as I am. Before him there must have been many other witnesses of the majority reading (with ὄλοιο· καὶ σοι ...), which showed different reading from the Y-reading. Although his last choice was to print the majority reading, I imagine that he must have felt a certain amount of hesitation between the two options. It was unfortunate that a means to express the hesitation (such as, γρ. καὶ σο· AU<sub>Y</sub>) was not available for him because of the poorer capacity of printing in his *editio princeps*.

### Works Cited

- Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles*. Revised by K. J. Dover. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Oxford UP 1950.
- Sophoclea; Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, Lloyd-Jones, Hugh and Wilson, N.G. Oxford 1990.
- Sophocles. *Filottete*. Edited by Pietro Pucci, Guido Avezzi and Giovanni Cerri. Arnoldo Mondadori, 2003.
- . *Tragœdiarum Delectus*. Edited by Wakefield, G. 1794.
- . *Τραγωδίαί ἑπτὰ*. Edited by Manutius, A. Aldine Press 1502.
- Sophoclis Fabulae*. Edited by Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. and Wilson, N.G. Oxford UP, 1992.
- Sophoclis Tagoediae*, vol. 2. Edited by R. D. Dawe. Teubner, 1979.
- Sophoclis Tagoediae*, vol. 2. Edited by R. D. Dawe. Teubner, 1996.
- Turyn, Alexander. *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles*. U of Illinois P, 1952.

---

<sup>14</sup> Y was basically the basis of his *editio princeps* of Sophocles. See Turyn, 176 n2.





This article was published by  
*The East Asian Journal of Classical Studies*  
and is contained in Volume 1, 2022  
(ISBN: 979-8-9870802-0)  
and may be found at [www.teajcs.com](http://www.teajcs.com).