this meaning of ἀρμονία from that of 'musical mode' (e.g. N. 4, 46), or (more probably) to express human modesty with regard to the god's desired behaviour: cf. Ο. 9, 25 σὺν τινι μοιριδίῳ παλάμαξ.

I do not agree with Hubbard (n. 17) that 'if vv. 67-9 referred to Apollo, we would expect a causal connective like γὰρ' at 70. The asyndeton has explanatory (specifying) force (cf. my note on I. 2, 37 αἰδευόντας, Mnen. IV 35, 1982, 27): 70-2 is the thought to which Apollo is asked to give his approval. In that context Δίκα is 'encomiastic propriety' (Hubbard, 291), but not in the sense of appropriate composition (Bundy I, 61 n. 69): it simply refers to the fact that the song of praise is the victor's due (see my remarks in Mnen. IV 14, 1961, 45-6). The next sentence then forms a suitable contrast, if we take διπτ in the sense of 'respect', 'reverence' (LSJ II 1) and read άριθμον: a success, even if it is deserved, should not tempt a man to expect that he now will be master of his future, but he should never cease to revere the gods (who may at any moment cause a reversal in his fortune).
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1) The reading άριθμον has been adopted by Fennell, Gildersleeve, Farnell, Puech, Tury; so W. Burkert, MH 38 (1981), 203, is wrong in calling it a 'allgemein verworfene Variante'. He seems to agree with LSJ in taking θεών διπτ in our passage as 'the care or favour of the gods', but this is unparalleled. For the meaning 'respect' with an objective genitive there are parallels in Pindar himself (Ο. 2, 6 οὐ... έχειν) and in Herodotus (IX 76, 2 τούς οὔτε δαμαλώνων οὔτε θεών οὔτω έχοντας; similarly VIII 143, 2). Burkert (201) writes: 'Herodot hat praktisch ὑπεξηθεὶς zerlegt in οὖν έχειν und damit eine neue Verwendung von διπτ geschaffen', but this usage may be much older: cf. Tyrt. 6-7 D. = 10 W., 12 οὔτ' οὗτι οὔτ' έλεος (Bergk's emendation, defended by me in Mnen. IV 22, 1969, 344) and Oed. 14, 82 οὖν δίπται φρονίστων ἔνι φρεσκο στάχται (where an ellipse of θεών is much harder to accept than at 88, where θεώς and ζου precede). Burkert's explanation of I. 5, 58 άριθμον... διπτ as 'der Hoffnungen aufmerksame Sorge', scil. 'wann endlich die Früchte reifen' (203) seems to me impossible: 'attentive care' can be a special case of 'respect', but not if 'attention' refers to a look-out (Burkert: 'indenman ... Ausschau hält'). I am inclined to prefer the interpretation proposed by D. Korzeniewski, Gymn. 78 (1971), 140-1 (similarly G. A. Privitera, Pindaro, Le Isthmiche, Milan 1982, 200-1): 'respect paid to hopes' is equivalent to 'those who fervently hope' (scil. for success). For hope as a divine power cf. fr. 214.

SOPHOCLES, TRACHINIAE 1264-78

Besides the minor difficulties at 1266 (τε/δε), 1270 (ἐφορᾷ/ἀφορᾷ) and 1275 (ἀπ’/ἐπ’), the attribution of 1275-8 is a major problem. The lines are well-suited to the youthful Hyllos (cp. 1264-9), and σὺ
παρθένε will then be addressed to the Coryphaeus; it might even be felt unfitting for a chorus of maidens to finish so dramatic a scene. But they have commented already at 1044 and 1112 on very masculine passages, and it is quite unparalleled for a play by one of the four great dramatists to end without words from the chorus (except for the first or second of a tetralogy: in Eumenides the Propompoi form a substitute chorus). A modern playwright might have the chorus file out in silence to underline his attack on the gods, but not a Greek.

If on the other hand the chorus speak 1275-8, σὺ παρθένε must refer to Iole. But apart from the unlikely use of a silent Iole (not hinted at elsewhere in the scene) and the absurdity of a sympathetic reference to so minor a character (linked with the Erinyes 895, cp. 1233 ff.) to end the play, we must explain ἄπτ' ἀπ' οἴκων. Where is Iole told to go? She cannot return to Oikhalia (which has been destroyed), nor go with Herakles to Oita (cp. 1194), while 'into the house' would entail an unexampled use of ἀπό = 'outside'. This objection also refutes the view that 1275-8 (together with πάθη in 1269) is a 4th-Century interpolation to go with the introduction of a silent Iole: in any case it is grotesque to suggest that the supposed interpolator referred to Iole only in the last 4 lines. On any account of the passage, the only available reference of σὺ is the Coryphaeus. (If the Coryphaeus addressed 1275-8 to the rest of the chorus, σὺ παρθένε would have to be plural.)

I believe Sophocles ended the Trachiniae in the following way: 1264-9, 1275-8 (Hyllos), 1270-4 (Chorus). Hyllos' speech is now a well-balanced unity: the first half is addressed to the henchmen, the second to the Coryphaeus, both halves explicitly upbraid Zeus (πατέρες 1269, Ζεὺς 1278), and the whole thing bristles with jingles and alliterations (1264-7, 1276-7) which are absent from 1270-4. Having dismissed the ὅπαθοι, Hyllos returns our attention to the chorus after their long silence, and telling them to go home (ἄπτ' οἴκων with the best mss.: for ἀπό = 'absent from' cp. Thuc. I 99 etc) goes out railing against Zeus. The Coryphaeus (on behalf of the chorus) then closes the drama with 5 lines of non-committal platitude, hinting at Herakles' coming deification (1270, the only reference in the play). Even άισχρά, though a criticism of the gods, is tempered by τὰ νῦν ἐστώτ' ἐκείνως refers to the gods, mentioned in the person of Zeus three lines above, the timid circumlocution of the girl contrasting sharply with Hyllos' outspoken vigor. The play concludes, not with a piece of un-Sophoclean blasphemy (in the traditional text 1266-9 + 1275-8 landing finally on the word.