

## APPENDIX II.

### *On the correspondence of Strophe and Antistrophe.*

On this subject, which is happily not very important to the play before us, I shall be as brief as possible, referring the reader to my edition of the *Seven against Thebes*, *Appendix I.*, the conclusions of which I shall here assume. "Upon the whole review, we see that three types of variation from strict syllabic correspondence are common in the *Seven against Thebes*—for we are not justified in assuming that an equal strictness must be found in all the works even of the same poet.—(1) a 'syncopated' foot answering to a complete foot<sup>1</sup>; (2) the trochaic or 'cyclic' dactyl answering to a trochee proper; (3) a long syllable in 'thesis' answering to a short syllable". I have reason to believe that the evidence offered for this has been found satisfactory, and as to (1), the only part of the statement likely to cause surprise, I may now cite the express agreement of Dr Fennell<sup>2</sup>.

The case of the *Agamemnon* is different. The evidence proves indeed not a few departures from syllabic correspondence. They are of exactly the same kind as those which are common in the *Septem* and, taken in connexion with them, are not open to reasonable suspicion. But they are exceptional; and in general this play exhibits a much nearer approach than the *Septem* to that strict treatment which seems to have been approved by Sophocles. 'This fact, we may observe, so far from diminishing the strength of the evidence for these variations, increases it very greatly. If Aeschylus had always used the stricter system, and if the departures from it in the ms. text were the result of erroneous copying, we should expect to find them on the average

<sup>1</sup> — = — ♪, in musical notation



<sup>2</sup> *The Parodos of Aeschylus' Septem etc.* Cambridge, Univ. Press, 1889.