

other evidence suggests. Regarding Hesychius, Guyet's emendation θέλυμνον must be on the right track, and θελεμνον is certainly a *vox nihili*. According to the D-scholium on Hom. *Il.* 10. 15, θέλυμνα are θεμέλιοι, "foundations" (the latter term is glossed ῥίζαι in Hesychius). Such a sense is supported by the Homeric compound προθέλυμνος, which is formed in the same way as πρόρριζος and is glossed πρόρριζος by schol. AD on *Il.* 9. 541, D on 10. 12, and schol. on Ar. *Peace* 1209 (the meaning "overlapping," "one upon another" at *Il.* 13. 130 is apparently a secondary development).<sup>3</sup> M. Schmidt tentatively proposed emending θελεμνον to <ἐκ> θεμέθλων;<sup>4</sup> but, to remain closer to the paradosis, I propose <προ>θέλυμνον or <ἐκ> θελύμων.<sup>5</sup>

R. JANKO  
Columbia University

3. I follow H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1960–72), s.v. θέλυμνος. Τετραθέλυμνος is a further evolution, as Frisk argues; the account of P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1968–80), s.v. -θέλυμνος, is erroneous. See my note on *Il.* 13. 130 in *The "Iliad": A Commentary*, vol. 4 (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

4. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (Jena, 1858–64), s.v. (Θ 215).

5. I wish to thank the Editor, an anonymous referee, and J. E. Wills, who kindly helped me to consult the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database at Harvard University.

#### HELEN'S FAMOUS HUSBAND AND EURIPIDES *HELEN* 1399

Θε.	χωρεῖτ' ἐφεξῆς, ὥς ἔταξεν ὁ ξένος, δμῶες, φέροντες ἐνάλια κτερίσματα. Ἑλένη, σὺ δ', ἦν σοι μὴ κακῶς δόξω λέγειν, πεῖθου, μέν' αὐτοῦ· ταῦτά γάρ παροῦσά τε πράξεις τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν σὸν ἦν τε μὴ παρῆς. δέδοικα γάρ σε μὴ τις ἐμπεσῶν πόθοις πέισῃ μεθεῖναι σῶμ' ἐς οἶδμα πόντιον τοῦ πρόσθεν ἀνδρὸς χάρισιν ἐκπεπληγμένην· ἄγαν γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ παρόνθ' ὅμως στένεις.	1390
Ελ.	ὦ καινὸς ἡμῖν πόσις, ἀναγκαίως ἔχει τὰ πρῶτα λέκτρα νυμφικὰς θ' ὁμιλίας τιμᾶν· ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ τὸ μὲν στέργειν πόσιν καὶ ξυνθάνοιμ' ἄν· ἀλλὰ τίς κείνῳ χάρις ξὺν κατθανόντι κατθανεῖν; ἔα δέ με αὐτὴν μολοῦσαν ἐντάφια δοῦναι νεκρῷ.	1395      1400

There is universal agreement among modern editors and commentators that in line 1399 of Euripides' *Helen* the traditional reading κλεινός is an error for καινός, a conjecture first proposed by Beck.<sup>1</sup> The scribes have only themselves to blame for this, since the confusion of κλεινός with καινός is a common error in

1. Καινός is printed by Murray, whose text is given here (OCT<sup>2</sup>, 1913), Pearson (Cambridge, 1903), Grégoire (Budé, 1950), Campbell (Liverpool, 1950), Alt (Teubner, 1964), and Kannicht (Heidelberg, 1969). A. M. Dale (Oxford, 1967) gives tacit approval to Murray's text.

the text of Euripides' alphabetic plays.<sup>2</sup> Other arguments in favor of the conjecture, regarded, it seems, as self-evidently correct, are hard to find. F. A. Paley thought that καινός was confirmed by the reference to τὰ πρῶτα λέκτρα in the next line,<sup>3</sup> and A. Y. Campbell (ad loc.) simply says: "'O husband new to me' does not err on the side of warmth; indeed it is excellent."

In this article I want to fight a rearguard action in defense of κλεινός and to show that, while καινός produces unobjectionable if rather flat sense, κλεινός is the far better reading: its meaning coheres well not only with the tenor of the speech and dialogue which it introduces, but also with Euripides' use of the adjective elsewhere and with one of the important themes of the play as a whole. Before I set out the arguments in favor of κλεινός, I must first discuss the staging of the scene in question, since it is important to establish, insofar as the indications in the text allow, the movements of the characters involved.

After the stasimon Helen enters from the *skene* in line 1369 to inform the chorus of Theonoe's complicity and to describe the preparations for the fictitious funeral rites to be conducted for the sake of her "dead" husband. She must enter alone. Dale is uncertain about this (cf. her note on 1369) and thinks that nothing precludes her entering with Menelaus. But, as Kannicht says in his note on 1374, the description of Menelaus' accoutrement and appearance in 1375–84 makes sense only as preparation for his entrance; also, as president of the procession, he should naturally enter with it after 1390. We could add two further points. The very deliberate reference to the entrance of Theoclymenus in 1385–87 would seem strange if Helen had entered fifteen lines earlier with a central character whose presence remains unnoticed until much later. Theoclymenus' reference to Menelaus in 1390 with the words ὡς ἔταξεν ὁ ξένος makes it unlikely that he has been on stage since 1369; contrast the way in which he is mentioned in 1406, when Helen makes his presence clear in the words τῷ ξένῳ τῷδε.

At what point, then, does Menelaus enter? I suggest that he enters after Theoclymenus and the line of attendants carrying the ἐνάλια κτερίσματα. These servants file off while Theoclymenus speaks 1390–98, and then Menelaus appears at the end of the procession, the bearer of the most significant offerings, the armor and the weapons.<sup>4</sup> Such a staging is not absolutely demanded by the text, but it makes excellent theatrical sense and is supported by two textual considerations. First, the reference to Menelaus as ὁ ξένος in 1390 makes it improbable that he enters then in company with Theoclymenus. If he does not come in ahead of the procession he must wait until its end, since his entrance is meant to be striking and its effect would be lost if he came out of the *skene* simply as one of a group. Second, the irony of οὐ παρόνθ' in 1398 is made much more pointed if the verbal

2. Cf. *HF* 38, 541, 768, *Supp.* 593, *IA* 1263. Elmsley thought the same error was to be found in *Soph. OC* 379. Cf. also Nauck's text of *Soph. Trach.* 613.

3. *Euripides*, vol. 2 (London, 1858), p. 201. One could also point out that καινός takes up Theoclymenus' τοῦ πρόσθεν ἀνδρός in 1397.

4. This staging agrees basically with that proposed by D. Bain in *Masters, Servants and Orders in Greek Tragedy* (Manchester, 1981), pp. 30–31. Bain shows that Kannicht's view that the servants carrying the offerings do not leave until 1450 is not required by the text. In the recent translation of J. Michie and C. Leach (Oxford, 1981), Menelaus is said to enter at 1379. The only grounds for this are the words "So here he comes," gratuitously inserted at this point.

effect is highlighted by the visual:<sup>5</sup> Menelaus enters just as Theoclymenus utters the words which reveal his complete failure to grasp the truth of the situation.<sup>6</sup>

It is immediately after Menelaus appears, then, that Helen begins her speech with the words in question. In the vulgate text, ὦ καινὸς ἡμῖν πόσις . . . , they constitute a straightforwardly ingratiating address to Theoclymenus. But with the MS reading, ὦ κλεινός . . . , the words are ambiguous. They are interpreted by Theoclymenus as a heartwarming address, taking up the tone of ὦ δέσποτ' in 1193 and marking, with the use of the deferential adjective κλεινός,<sup>7</sup> a welcome change from Helen's earlier attitude, which we can infer from statements like μετ' ἀνδρὸς οἰκεῖν βαρβάρου and πόσις πικρὸς in 295–96. At the same time the words are meant as an expression of admiration for Menelaus and function more as an exclamation than a true vocative.<sup>8</sup> Whereas before Helen could speak of Menelaus as ἄγριος δέ τις μορφήν (544–45) and flee from his approach, she now greets his public appearance as the Menelaus of old, clad and equipped in heroic fashion. Κλεινός is, then, an ironic reference to both Helen's "husbands" which skillfully picks up the unconscious irony of Theoclymenus' οὐ παρόνθ'. These two different yet complementary modes of speech are an appropriate introduction to the ironies which pervade the rest of Helen's speech and the stichomythia which follows.

There remains a further consideration in favor of the reading κλεινός and the ambiguous reference of the word here: the Euripidean use of the adjective. In the discussion printed after J. C. Kamerbeek's paper in the Fondation Hardt *Entretiens*, R. P. Winnington-Ingram has this to say in connection with the *Phoenissae*: "I have often wondered whether the epithet κλεινός, which occurs with some frequency in these later plays, does not really indicate something like 'belonging to the epic.'"<sup>9</sup> The remark that Euripides favors κλεινός in his later plays is not entirely justified,<sup>10</sup> but the observation on the connotations of the word is shown to be true by the following facts.

Among the seventy-four definite instances of κλεινός in Euripides,<sup>11</sup> we find that in more than twenty places the word is used in connection with Troy and

5. I agree with Murray and Dale, against Kannicht, that there is no need for Baar's παροῦς' in 1398. Kannicht is persuaded by Baar's argument that παρόνθ', which must be concessive, yields no sense: Helen mourns Menelaus not although he is absent, but because he is absent. But this ignores the force of ἄγαν emphatically placed at the beginning of the sentence. In fact, the sequence of thought is quite coherent with παρόνθ'. Theoclymenus brings forward three reasons, each introduced by γάρ, to justify the advice to Helen in 1393. The third point in 1398, however, is subordinate to the second: Theoclymenus is worried that Helen will cast herself into the sea during the funeral rites because her grief for Menelaus, despite the absence of his body, is evidently (cf. the detail of 1186–90) excessive.

6. For similar visual irony, cf. Electra's anxious scurrying away at the approach of Orestes in Eur. *El.* 215–19, and Ion's greeting to the Pythia at her entrance as ὦ φίλη μοι μήτηρ, οὐ τεκοῦσά περ while his real mother sits threatened in front of him (*Ion* 1324).

7. For κλεινός as a regular title of royalty, see Denniston on Eur. *El.* 327 and Bond on *HF* 38.

8. Cf. J. Diggle on the tone of ὦ θύγατερ in some instances ("On the *Heracles* and *Ion* of Euripides," *PCPhS* 200 [1974]: 4), Dover on Ar. *Clouds* 216, and Page on Eur. *Med.* 61.

9. *Euripide*, *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 6 (Geneva, 1960), pp. 34–35.

10. Κλεινός is found, it is true, most frequently in *Phoen.* (9 instances), and it occurs 6 times in *IA*. On the other hand, it is found only once in *Or.* and *Bacch.*, while there are 6 occurrences in each of *IT*, *Tro.*, and *Ion*, and 5 in *Andr.*

11. There are only 3 instances in Aeschylus. Among the 22 instances in Sophocles the connection with the epic is far less marked than in Euripides. Aristophanes may be parodying Euripides' fondness for the word when he puts it into his mouth in *Thesm.* 29.

participants in the Trojan war. This is by far the largest of the categories into which the occurrences of κλεινός in Euripides can be divided. The word is also used frequently of Athens (notably in *Ion* and *Hipp.*) and of Thebes (in *Supp.* and *Phoen.*), when it is linked with the storied past of these places and the heroes associated with them.

In *Helen* 1399, then, the word is entirely appropriate for the “restored” Menelaus, whose appearance and aspirations at this juncture call quite naturally for the adjective which brings to mind his heroic past. The associations of the word are fresh in our minds, since it has been used several times in connection with the Trojan expedition in the earlier part of the play (cf. 105, 392, 453, 503). The choice of word here becomes even more significant when we remember that Menelaus, who comes out of the *skene* holding a spear (cf. 1377), is repeatedly given in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the epithet δουρικλειτός, used, with one exception, of him alone.<sup>12</sup>

But why, one may ask, remind us here of epic Menelaus? Up to the end of the preceding episode we have been confronted forcefully with the idea that the expedition to Troy and the ensuing war were futile in the most fundamental sense. The war itself is deprived of its *raison d'être*, and one of the chief combatants is presented as the reverse of a hero. His appearance, his demeanor, and his lack of initiative beside the resourcefulness of Helen all strip Menelaus of his traditional glory. The point is brought home by the fact that Menelaus himself believes firmly in the fame of the expedition both before and, more surprisingly, after he learns the truth. The shame he expresses in 415–17 is occasioned by the thought of former greatness, and when he is put in his place by the Portress, his only rejoinder is to yearn for the help of his renowned troops, which, κλεινά though they may be, make little impression on the irascible old woman (cf. 452–55). Even after the futility of the war has been made clear, Menelaus cannot quite believe it. In the discussion of the *mechane* which will lead to escape, he continues to use Troy and its honor as a yardstick by which to judge his present behavior (cf. 806, 808). Helen, of course, is all too aware of the emptiness of the Trojan enterprise and must impress on Menelaus that survival depends, not on reputation, but on their own wits and the cooperation of Theonoe.

With the scene under discussion there is a shift of focus. The closing part of the play reenacts, one might say, the Trojan conflict. Once again barbarian is pitted against Greek, and Helen is to be wrested from a suitor. In the seabattle described by the Messenger, she assumes the role of prize for which the parties contend,<sup>13</sup> urges on the Greeks, and reminds them, in words very reminiscent of Menelaus' *cri de coeur* before the Portress, of the glory of Troy (cf. 1602–4). In this conflict Menelaus plays a major role (cf. 1591–95, 1606–11), and Helen's admiring address or exclamation in 1399 anticipates the glory which she hopes will be his.

But the ending of the play is only overtly optimistic. In fact it shares many of the negative features of the futile Trojan expedition.<sup>14</sup> Wholesale slaughter, even of barbarians, is scarcely countenanced by Euripides, and the ill omen of the

12. Cf. *Il.* 5. 55, 578; 10. 230; 11. 333 (of Diomedes); 23. 355; *Od.* 15. 52; 17. 116, 147.

13. Cf. the description of her boarding of the boat and her position in it (1569–72).

14. On this aspect of the play, see most recently K. V. Hartigan, “Myth and the *Helen*,” *Eranos* 79 (1981): 30, and the earlier literature cited by her.

reluctant bull in 1555–59 gives a hint that all may not be well. Theoclymenus, melodramatic villain though he be, deserves less than total condemnation from the audience. His infatuation with Helen and his gullibility are too extreme not to provoke at least some sympathy. We feel that just as Menelaus had been deceived by appearances, so too the barbarian king is duped not more by Helen's cleverness than by his own somewhat pathetic hope that what she says is true, and by his own eagerness to please his wife-to-be.

The closing scenes of the play bring out the further point that the characters who have most of our sympathy have not learned the lesson of Troy. We are relieved to see the Greeks escape, but our pleasure is muted when we hear that the success of the venture depended on a too ready indulgence in violence and bloodshed, and on an acceptance of values which the Trojan debacle should have deprived of currency. To this idea Helen's statement in 1399 makes a small but significant contribution. When she speaks of Menelaus as κλεινός, she gives a clear indication that she too is prepared to believe in the renown of Troy and her husband's associated glory at a moment when she is eager for him to display it in her own interests and not for the sake of an *eidolon*.<sup>15</sup>

KEVIN H. LEE

*Center for Hellenic Studies*

15. I am grateful to B. Murnaghan and P. Bing for helpful comments and suggestions.

## THE POLITICAL CAREER OF ARISTOPHON

No fresh evidence for the political career of Aristophon of Azenia has come to light since J. E. Kirchner assembled his dossier for *Prosopographia Attica* number 2108; however, the most challenging contribution to our understanding of the nature of that career as a whole was made only a few years ago, in a short article in this journal by Stewart Irvin Oost.<sup>1</sup>

Oost addressed himself first to the datum which, as he observed, "even most undergraduate students of fourth-century Athenian history have learned," namely, Aeschines' claim in court in 330 that Aristophon had once boasted to an Athenian jury of his acquittal in a *graphe paranomon*, the public prosecution for an illegal proposal, on seventy-five occasions (Aeschin. 3. 194).<sup>2</sup> Some scholars, as Oost noted, repeat this claim as a simple fact;<sup>3</sup> more usually it is reproduced as a claim

1. "Two Notes on Aristophon of Azenia," *CP* 72 (1977): 238–42.

2. For the only attested instance of Aristophon's *conviction* under this procedure, see M. H. Hansen, *The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens and the Public Action against Unconstitutional Proposals*, Odense University Classical Studies, vol. 4 (Odense, 1974), p. 31 (no. 10); he retains παρανόμων in the source for this, schol. Aeschin. 1. 64, rather than Meier's emendation παρ' ὀλίγον, and thus rejects what would otherwise be a plausible identification of this case with Hyperides' known prosecution of Aristophon under the *eisangelia* procedure (Hyper. Eux. 28, with P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* [Oxford, 1972], p. 167 and n. 8).

3. Oost, "Two Notes," p. 239, n. 2, cites M. N. Tod, *GHI* 2:128, and G. L. Cawkwell, s.v. "Aristophon," *OCD*<sup>2</sup>, p. 114; add, e.g., Hansen, *Sovereignty*, p. 25, and more circumspectly in "The Number of *Rhetores* in the Athenian *Ecclesia*, 355–322 B.C.," *GRBS* 25 (1984): 152.