

ON THE MANUSCRIPTS AND TEXT OF EURIPIDES, *MEDEA*: II. THE TEXT¹

11–13

ἀνδάνουσα μὲν
φυγῇ πολιτῶν ὧν ἀφίκετο χθόνα,
αὐτῇ τε πάντα ξυμφέρουσι Ἰάκωνι.

12 πολιτῶν Π¹ codd. et Σ^{bv}: πολίταις V³, sicut con. Barnes χθονος Π¹ 13 τε codd. et gE: δὲ Stob. 4. 22. 30

The two Sophoclean passages by which Page supports his plea that 'πολιτῶν stands for πολίταις . . . , being attracted by the following ὧν into the genitive case' do not inspire much confidence, since both (as he acknowledges) are capable of being explained differently.² Further, as a recent writer has remarked, 'on cherche en vain la raison qui aurait pu inciter Euripide . . . à écrire πολιτῶν à la place de πολίταις. Le vers n'aurait rien gagné à cette substitution, sinon une obscurité inutile' (G. Roux, *REG* 85 [1972], 40).

Proposed substitutes for φυγῇ, designed to give a construction for πολιτῶν, are rightly dismissed as unsatisfactory by Page. No good comes of the proposal to construct φυγῇ with πολιτῶν, in the sense 'by avoiding the citizens' (so, most recently, Roux, loc. cit., R. G. Ussher, *Eranos* 59 [1961], 1–2, who even places line 12 after line 30; the proposal is as old as Nauck).³ Even if it were appropriate, which it scarcely is, for Medea to be described as gaining favour by living in seclusion, the words φυγῇ πολιτῶν, 'by flight from the citizens', are not the right words to describe this behaviour.⁴

What objection is there to πολίταις?⁵ 'error ortus est e scripturae compendiis' said Porson; 'but these compendia were not invented in the time of our Scholia's sources, which undoubtedly read πολιτῶν' objected Page. But although Porson's explanation is invalid, it does not follow that πολίταις is wrong. πολιτῶν ὧν for πολίταις ὧν may be explained as an error of assimilation. True, it is much commoner for the ending of the following word to be assimilated to that of a word which precedes. But it is not unexampled for the ending of the word which precedes to be assimilated to that

¹ For part I ('The Manuscripts') see *CQ* n.s. 33 (1983), 339–57. I refer to the following editions: R. Porson (1812), P. Elmsley (1818), J. Lenting (1819), A. Matthiae (1821), F. H. Bothe (1838), F. G. Schöne (1853), A. Kirchhoff (1855), F. A. Paley (ed. 2, 1872), J. A. Hartung (ed. 2, 1878), H. Weil (ed. 2, 1879), A. W. Verrall (1881), H. von Arnim (ed. 2, 1886), C. E. S. Headlam (1897), R. Prinz and N. Wecklein (1899), G. Murray (1902), M. L. Earle (1904), E. Diehl (1911), N. Wecklein (ed. min., ed. 3, 1891, ed. 5, 1909), L. Méridier (1926), D. L. Page (1938), E. Valgiglio (n.d., post 1955). In addition I refer to P. Elmsley, 'Annotatio in Euripidis Medeam' (1815) (= *Museum Criticum* 2 [1826], 1–44), and G. Hermann, 'Adnotationes ad Medeam ab Elmsleio editam', *Cl. Journal* 19 (1819), 267–89, 21 (1820), 338–57, 22 (1820), 402–28 (reprinted, with a fourth part, in the Leipzig ed. of Elmsley in 1822 and the Oxford ed. in 1828 and in Hermann's *Opuscula* 3 [1828], 143–261).

² In *S. El.* 653 Benedict proposed τέκνοις for τέκνων, and this has now some slight manuscript support: see Dawe, *Studies* i. 182, and the apparatus criticus to his Teubner edition (1975).

³ loc. cit. (part i, p. 357 n. 73), 107–8.

⁴ Roux's 'en fuyant la société des citoyens' and Ussher's 'in avoidance of the townsfolk' do not do justice to the meaning of the word φυγή.

⁵ πολίταις (V³) is not necessarily a genuine variant or even conjecture but may owe its origin to the scholium in V (τὸ δὲ πολιτῶν ἀντὶ δοτικῆς, τοῖς πολίταις); cf. B⁸¹ τοῖς πολίταις.

of a word which follows: so 1330 ὅτ' ἐκ δόμων (δόμου LP) *ce* βαρβάρου τ' ἀπὸ χθονός, *Alc.* 23 μελάθρων τῶνδε φιλάτην στέγην (τῶνδε φιλάτην Σⁿ *Hi.* 1437: τήνδε φιλάτην LP: τῶνδε φιλάτων BOV et Σ^b *Hi.*), *Andr.* 43 δόμων πάροικον (δόμων MBLV³: δόμον AVP), *Herc.* 456–7 ὦ μοῖρα δυστάλαιν' ἐμῇ (Kirchhoff: ἐμῶν L) *τε καὶ τέκνων/τῶνδ'* (apogr. Par.: τοῦδ' L) οὐς κτλ., 1156 φιλάτῳ (Reiske: -των L) *ξένων ἐμῶν*, *A. Ag.* 1299 χρόνον πλέω (Hermann: χρόνῳ πλέω codd. (πλέω Tr)), and so probably the papyrus at *Med.* 1188 πέπλοι δὲ λεπτοί, *ῶν τέκνων δωρήματα* (π(λ)επλων δε λ[*Π*⁹).

The real objection to *φυγῇ πολίταις* lies elsewhere, and it is an objection which applies equally to *φυγῇ πολιτῶν* (as interpreted by Page). With which verb (*ἀνδάνουσα* or *ἀφίκετο*) is *φυγῇ* to be constructed? 'Pleasing to the citizens by her flight' is the obvious construction (so Σ^b *ἀρεσκομένη τῷ πρὸς τοὺς Κορινθίους πεφευγέναι*). 'Equidem non uideo quo sensu Medea dicatur Corinthiis *φυγῇ* ἀδεῖν' objected Naber (*Mnem.* 10 [1882], 8), with good reason. It was not so much by her flight as by her later conduct (by stopping a famine, as another scholium says) that Medea pleased the Corinthians. Wecklein speaks of 'die gegensätzliche Beziehung zwischen *φυγῇ* und *πολιτῶν*... "Sie gefällt denen, in deren Land sie gekommen ist, obwohl sie der Bürgerschaft als eine fremde, landesflüchtige Person gegenübersteht"' (i.e. 'although only an exile', 'obwohl sie nur eine Fremde... ist'). 'But' (as Verrall objects) 'why is this simple thought obscured by the instrumental *φυγῇ*?' The alternative, to construct *φυγῇ* with *ἀφίκετο* (so Schöne, Hartung, Weil, Paley, von Arnim, Méridier, Valgiglio), gives unexceptionable sense but a most unwelcome hyperbaton. The truth, I think, is still to seek.

Modern editors pass over *αὐτῇ* in 13 without comment. And yet what point can there be in saying that Medea 'herself' complied in all respects with Jason? 'prorsus inutile', 'beziehungslös und ungerechtfertigt', 'pointless', are terms with which the last century found it appropriate to describe the word.⁶ Replacements have been offered: *πάντη* Nauck, *τέως* Ritschl.⁷ Embarrassed explanations were devised by Schöne and Wecklein. I have heard it suggested that *αὐτῇ* has the meaning illustrated by Page on 729 (ἐκ τῆςδε δ' αὐτῇ γῆς ἀπαλλάσσει πόδα, 'by yourself, of your own accord'; cf. 727). But *αὐτός* is so used only in combination with a verb of motion: to Page's examples add others cited by K–G i. 653 (c), LSJ s.u. i. 2, Gow on Theoc. 11. 12. The problem is admirably formulated by M. L. Earle: 'The word *αὐτῇ*, as it stands, marks a contrast between two actions of the same subject, between the action expressed by *ἀνδάνουσα*... and that expressed by *ξυμφέρουσα*. Medea is thus represented as "pleasing" somebody and "herself in accord with Jason". But it is obvious that the function of a form of *αὐτός* in the second half of a balanced compound clause should be the intensification of the latter of two contrasted terms – here (we should expect) Jason as opposed to the citizens of Corinth.'⁸ Earle's *αὐτῷ* is surely right. It was proposed again in the same year by Herwerden, *RPh* 18 (1894), 72 (to whom alone Wecklein attributes it), but it had been anticipated (as Earle acknowledged in *CR* 9 [1895], 395–6) by G. M. Sakorraphos (1891 ed.).⁹ The conjecture gained the qualified approval of Verrall, *CR* 19 (1905), 361.

72-3

ὁ μέντοι μῦθος εἰ καφῆς ὄδε
οὐκ οἶδα βουλοίμην δ' ἂν οὐκ εἶναι τόδε.

⁶ Elmsley (*Annotatio*, p. 4), Kvičala (*Denkschriften der Kais. Akad. der Wiss. Wien*, Phil.-Hist. Cl. 29 [1879], 238), Verrall.

⁷ *RhM* 21 (1866), 148–9 = *Opusc.* 1 (1866), 749–50.

⁸ In *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (1894), p. 11.

⁹ Known to me only from *Bursian* (1892), 256.

A desire to eliminate asyndeton will have caused the corruption (for the interpolation of connecting particles see Barrett on *Hi.* 40; there is a notable instance at *Med.* 1094, discussed in part I, p. 357). But why was ἀπ' lost? Perhaps because δ' began life above the line and was then taken as a correction for ἀπ'. Note that the interpolated ξξ in O<L>P is written above the line in V.¹³ Apparently easier changes are ἀρχαῖς (Schneidewin, and tentatively Weil) and ἀρχήν (Sakorraphos,¹⁴ Michelangeli¹⁵). But I can find no parallel for ἀρχαῖς so used; and ἀρχήν, though used in prose in the sense of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (see LSJ s.u. I. c),¹⁶ is used in tragedy only with negatives, in the sense 'at all' (*S. El.* 439, *Ant.* 92, *Ph.* 1239).

ἀνάξει, which has found much favour,¹⁷ is certainly wrong. Page observes that the metaphor of ἀνάψει νέφος 'is perhaps derived from lightning breaking through a cloud'. Rather, what lies behind the image is the idea that thunder is caused by the effect of fire on a cloud – the sound of thunder, not the flash of lightning, is the image which is relevant to Medea's οἰμωγή. The idea is found in Anaxagoras (DK A 84; see Guthrie, *History of Greek Philosophy* 2 [1965], p. 312) and the fifth-century atomists (Guthrie, p. 425), and it gains memorable expression in Lucr. 6. 145–51 *fit quoque, ubi e nubi in nubem uis incidit ardens/fulminis; haec multo si forte umore recepit/ignem, continuo magno clamore trucidat... aridior porro si nubes accipit ignem,/urit ingenti sonitu succensa repente* (see Bailey *ad loc.*, pp. 1575–6).¹⁸ Euripides is often called the μαθητής of Anaxagoras: see Diggle, *Studies*, 94.

131-8	Χο. ἔκλυον φωνάν, ἔκλυον δὲ βοὰν	131
	τὰς δυστάνου Κολχίδος· οὐδέπεω	
	ἦπιος; ἀλλ', ὦ γεραία, λέξον·	133
	ἀμφιπύλου γὰρ ἔσω μελάθρου γόον	134-5
	ἔκλυον, οὐδὲ συνήδομαι, ὦ γύναι,	
	ἄλγεσι δώματος,	
	ἐπεὶ μοι φιλία κέκραται.	

133 interrogationis notam post ἦπιος habent BDA: om. HOCEVLP γηραιά V 134-5 ἀμφιπύλου Weil: ἐπ' ἀμφ- codd. et Σ^{hbov} γόον Elmsley: βοὰν BODEALP: βοήν HCV 138 μοι μὴ V²Tr (~ <V>V³) φιλία κέκραται Porson: φίλον κέκραται OE: φίλον κέκρανται H^{uv}BCDAVLP (φίλως V⁸) et ¹Σ^{hb}: φίλα κέκραται Tr

Text and metre are in doubt. I have printed the version which I prefer. Analysis of the metre will depend upon the view which we take of the text of 134-5, given

¹³ We could retain the δ' by reading δηλαδ' ἀπ', as Dr Dawe suggests to me. For the neuter plural see e.g. Barrett on *Hi.* 269, Bond on *Herc.* 1058. But the asyndeton is not only natural; it is, I think, preferable. For a very similar asyndeton see 119.

¹⁴ See above, n. 9.

¹⁵ L. A. Michelangeli, *Saggio di note critiche al testo della Medea* (1878), known to me only from Wecklein, *BPhW* 21 (1901), 1284 ('ein unnützes Wort') and A. Levi, *Boll. di Fil. Cl.* 5 (1898-9), 211 ('felice e prudente').

¹⁶ Note also Theogn. 425 (*u.l.*), Sol. fr. 13. 14 (cj., cited above, n. 10).

¹⁷ It is accepted by Hartung, Wecklein, Méridier, von Arnim, and Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 15 [1880], 506 = *Kleine Schriften* 1 [1971], pp. 41-2, and on *Herc.* 1140); and Paley and Weil have a good word for it. For the confusion ἀνάψει/ἀνάξει see *Or.* 609, *A. Ch.* 131; similarly *Med.* 1382 προσάφομεν (*uel -ομαι*) codd.: -άζομεν Choerob. epim. p. 112, *Et. Ma.* p. 750. 44.

¹⁸ The Lucretian passage is cited by O. Regenbogen, *Erano* 48 (1950), 24, who, however, derives the idea from Anaximander (DK A 23), Empedocles (DK A 63), and Heraclitus (DK A 14). But the two former explain thunder in terms of the effect of wind, not fire, on a cloud; and Heraclitus is explaining lightning, not thunder. Anaximander's theory is reproduced in *Ar. Nub.* 404-7; cf. C. H. Kahn, *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology* (1960), pp. 100-2, 108-9.

by the manuscripts as ἐπ' ἀμφιπύλου γὰρ ἔσω μελάθρου βοᾶν (-ῆν).¹⁹ Some editors divide λέξον· ἐπ' ἀμφιπύλου γὰρ ἔσω μελάθρου βοᾶν/ἔκλυον, οὐδὲ συνήδομαι, ὦ γύναι, ἄλγεσι(ν) (so Hartung, Murray, Diehl, Page, also Fraenkel).²⁰ But ————, whether interpreted as 'aeolic dactyls' or as a form of prosodiac, is unparalleled in tragedy.²¹ This division makes it necessary to divide the preceding lines either as (i) τὰς δυστάνου Κολχίδος, οὐδέ πω/ῆπιος· ἄλλ', ὦ γηραιά (γηραιά V; so Murray, Page, Valgiglio), which entails a paroemiac with objectionable word-division,²² or as (ii) Κολχίδος, οὐδέ πω ῆπιος· ἀλλά, γηραιά (ὦ del. Hermann; so many editors, and Wilamowitz), a dactylic pentameter with spondaic ending, perfectly acceptable (cf. *Tr.* 837 ~ 857, *Hel.* 166, *Ph.* 792 ~ 808), but gained at the cost of deleting ὦ. Dale²³ prefers to write ἄλλ', ὦ γραιά; but this gives a pentameter which ends in two spondees, for which there is no parallel in Euripides. She adds: 'Hermann saw that the anapaests must end with the monometer τὰς δυστάνου... leaving the correction οὐδέ πω ῆπιος for dactyls'. There is no reason why the anapaests must end at that place, for interlinear correction in anapaests is legitimate (see *El.* 1331, *Ion* 221, both at change of speaker).²⁴

There is a linguistic problem in 134–5. If ἀμφιπύλου (which appears only here) is taken as an adjective, with μελάθρου, then ἐπί becomes unintelligible.²⁵ Some, following the scholia, take ἀμφιπύλου as a noun, meaning 'doorway': "[standing] at my doorway" – which is where she might naturally be standing when she heard the cry' (Page, following Wecklein).²⁶ For this use of ἐπί they quote *Hdt.* 5. 92γ. 4 ἐστεῶτες ἐπὶ τῶν θυρέων.²⁷ But the notion that the members of the chorus were standing each by their own individual doorways when they heard Medea's cry is irrelevant or worse. If we can tolerate the omission of a verb meaning 'standing', we should more naturally take the meaning to be 'standing at her doorway'. This would have to refer to some door other than the front door, since the front door is in view of the audience, which can see that the chorus has not been standing there. But why ever should the chorus have been standing at one of Medea's doors?

We should expect ἀμφιπύλου to be an adjective, synonymous with ἀμφίθυρος, as used at *S. Ph.* 159 οἶκον... ἀμφίθυρον (Philoctetes' cave, with front and rear entrance)

¹⁹ Statements that A has μολὼν for βοᾶν (-ῆν) are false.

²⁰ Fraenkel, *RhM* 72 (1918), 177 = *Kleine Beiträge* 1 (1964), pp. 181–2. Similarly Valgiglio, following Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, p. 538, but with ἄλγεσι δώματος, which gives a pure dactylic hexameter for the second line (on this line see below, n. 33). Wilamowitz had earlier suggested μελάθροιο (*Hermes* 15 [1880], 510–11 = *Kleine Schriften* 1 (1971), pp. 46–7), on which see Page.

²¹ See Dale, *Lyric Metres*, pp. 29–30, 117, 167.

²² See L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 8 (1958), 86.

²³ *WS* 77 (1964), 26–7 = *Collected Papers* (1969), pp. 198–9.

²⁴ Page's note illustrating correction in non-lyric anapaests is strangely irrelevant, since these anapaests are lyric. His discussion is supplemented by Barrett on *Hi.* 246 (Addenda, pp. 432–3).

²⁵ I doubt whether ἐπὶ μελάθρου can mean 'in the house' (phrases like ἐπ' οἰκήματος καθῆσθαι, 'work in a brothel', cited by LSJ s.u. ἐπί A. i. 1, are of a specialized kind). Even if it could, it would have to be referred to Medea, which would give no sense; her cry could not be described as being ἐπὶ μελάθρου. It certainly cannot mean 'at (near) the house' and so be referred to the chorus.

²⁶ Page's statement that the scholia take it as an adjective is mistaken. They offer three different explanations: (i) Σ^{h_{bv}} τὸ ἔχον δύο πύλας καὶ εἰσόδους, μίαν μὲν τὴν αὐθεντικὴν, ἑτέραν δέ, ἣν Ὀμηρος (*Od.* 22. 126, 132, 333) λέγει ὀρθοθύρην (i.e. a house or room with two doors), (ii) Σ^{h_{bv}} ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφιπύλου... τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τοῦ πυλῶνος (i.e. doorway), (iii) Σ^{h_{bv}} ὁ περὶ τὰς θύρας τόπος (i.e. the area around the doors). For Σ^h see S. G. Daitz, *The Scholia in the Jerusalem Palimpsest of Euripides* (1979), p. 96.

²⁷ The prepositional phrase ἔσω μελάθρου then depends on βοᾶν, 'a cry within the house'. Wecklein and Page compare *Hi.* 234–5; see also Diggle, *Studies*, pp. 28–9, 69.

and elsewhere.²⁸ ἀμφιθύρω is apparently used as a noun at Theoc. 14. 42, but its meaning remains in doubt ('porch' Gow). Against taking ἀμφιπύλου as an adjective, Page says that 'there seems no point whatever in saying that the hall had a door at each end', and he finds 'most unconvincing' Elmsley's explanation that 'duo ostia habere fingit poeta quo facilius clamores eius ad aures vicinarum perveniant'. But I think that this explanation is on the right lines. As Dale says, 'The chorus had heard her through the back door and now comes to call at the front'.²⁹ Paley proposed ἄπ' for ἐπ' ('I heard a cry within from the house'). Page has a sympathetic word for this and Dale accepts it. But ἔσω is then uncomfortable; Vitelli and Dale change it to ἐγώ, a wholly unwanted pronoun. Schöne proposed ὑπ', comparing S. *Ant.* 1248–9 ὑπὸ στέγης ἔσω... πένθος οἰκεῖον στένειν, but there ὑπό suggests 'in the privacy of' (Jebb), which would be inappropriate here. Badham's ἔτ' calls imperatively for a participle.³⁰

At the end of the line βοὰν/ἔκλυον, besides interrupting the flow of dactyls, gives a feeble repetition of the preceding ἔκλυον δὲ βοὰν. Elmsley's γόον restores the flow. Elmsley divided λέξον... μελά-/θρου γόον ἔκλυον, οὐδὲ συνήδομαι, with unappealing word-division. Dale divides λέξον... γόον/ἔκλυον... ἄλγεσι, two dactylic pentameters; this, after Κολχίδος, οὐδέ πω ἦπιος· ἀλλ', ὦ γραῖα (or ἀλλά, γεραῖά), gives a sequence of three dactylic pentameters, for which there is no parallel in Euripides. Others divide λέξον... γόον ἔκλυον, οὐδὲ... δώματος (so Hermann, Schöne, Paley, Wecklein, C. E. S. Headlam), giving a dactylic hexameter and pentameter (they also, like Dale, make 133 a pentameter, so giving an equally unparallelled sequence).

Sense and style are restored, and the metrical difficulties are eliminated, if, in addition to accepting γόον, we delete ἐπ' (Weil, and independently Herwerden,³¹ followed by Méridier). 131, 132, 133 are anapaestic (for the *brevis in longo* in 133 see Diggle, *Studies*, pp. 96–7);³² 134–5 and 136 are two dactylic tetrameters, and 137 is a dimeter consisting of two pure dactyls (for precisely the same arrangement, two tetrameters followed by two dactyls, see S. *OT* 155–7 ~ 163–5; similarly E. *Ph.* 1502–5, three dactylic tetrameters and two dactyls, S. *OC* 234–5 dactylic tetrameter and two dactyls).³³

Two matters remain. First, I have returned to the old custom of printing οὐδέ πω ἦπιος; as a question. Modern editors³⁴ have followed Elmsley in printing οὐδέ πω ἦπιος as a statement. A question gives a better introduction to the request for information which follows. Furthermore, οὐδέ πω is rarely used in tragedy as a connective ('necdum'): only S. *OT* 731 ἡδᾶτο γὰρ ταῦτ' οὐδέ πω (ταῦτα κοῦδέ πω O)³⁵

²⁸ For references see Gow on Theoc. 14. 42. Dawe (*Studies* iii. 123–4) has not convinced me that Philoctetes' cave did not have a rear entrance. For other caves with two entrances see Kannicht and Snell on *TrGF* II 646a 21–2.

²⁹ loc. cit. (above, n. 23), p. 27 n. 20 = p. 199 n. 1.

³⁰ Proposed in his edition of Plato, *Philebus* (1855), p. 92; also proposed by F. D. Allen, *HSCP* 9 (1898), 42–3.

³¹ *Mnem.* n.s. 5 (1877), 23.

³² Verrall prints 133 as I do; Page's objection that this 'breaks the symmetry of the two lines of lyric dactyls which follow' is no longer valid, once ἐπ' is deleted and γόον accepted.

³³ Weil, von Arnim, and Méridier, like W. J. W. Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque* (ed. 2, 1953), p. 197, join 137 to 136 to form a hexameter of six dactyls. In view of the dactylic, rather than spondaic, end, it is more natural to keep the dimeter discrete. Line 133 Weil and Méridier print (remarkably) as a hexameter ending in two spondees (Κολχίδος, οὐδέ πω ἦπιος· ἀλλά, γεραῖα, λέξον).

³⁴ With the exception of Verrall and of F. D. Allen, loc. cit. (above, n. 30).

³⁵ This tempts one to suggest ἡδᾶτο [γὰρ] ταῦτα κοῦδέ πω, but the temptation should probably be resisted. For κοῦδέ πω see *Med.* 60, A. *Pe.* 814, Ar. *Equ.* 168, *Au.* 1227.

λήξαντ' ἔχει; with a word interposed, *Hi.* 919 οὐδ' ἐθρήσασθέ πω and (but with οὐδέ intensifying, not connecting) *Hec.* 1222 αὐτὸ δ' οὐδὲ νῦν πω. By contrast, οὐδέπω ('nondum') is found at *Med.* 60, *A. Pe.* 760, 814, *Ag.* 296,³⁶ [*A.*] *PV* 320, *S. OT* 16,³⁷ Moschion fr. 6. 6 (Nauck, Snell). Similarly Aristophanes has ten instances of non-connective οὐδέπω (*Equ.* 168, *Vesp.* 940, *Pax* 327, *Av.* 1227, *Lys.* 1158, *Thes.* 552, 555, 846, 867, *Plut.* 696), one of οὐδὲ . . . πω (*Thes.* 498), none of connective οὐδέ πω.

Second, we are left at the end of the passage with (δῶματος) ἐπεὶ μοι φίλον κέκρανται:³⁸ "The house is appointed, determined, my friend", i.e. I have decided to befriend the house' (Page). But the verb κραίνειν ('make valid, ratify', usually of gods and kings)³⁹ does not suit this context, and its use with a predicative adjective is remarkable.⁴⁰ It has been alleged that a predicative adjective is found with κραίνειν at fr. 52. 8 νόμῳ δὲ γαῦρον αὐτὸ κραίνει χρόνος. The fragment, as Verrall says, is only 'half intelligible'; and I can make no sense of this line in its context ('Time, by means of convention, appoints it (sc. τὸ εὐγενές) proud' is Page's translation). If the line is corrupt, the corruption lies probably not in κραίνει, for κραίνει χρόνος rings true (cf. *Phaethon* 99; Verrall proposed κρίνει or διακρίνει), but in γαῦρον (γαῦρον S: γαύρων M: γαυρῶν A¹), for which κῦρῶν might be suitable,⁴¹ with αὐτὸ changed to αὐτὰ (sc. τὸ τ' εὐγενές καὶ τὸ δυσγενές).⁴² Porson's φιλία κέκραται deserves to be revived.⁴³ In illustration Porson quoted *Hi.* 253–4 χρῆν γὰρ μετρίαις εἰς ἀλλήλους/φιτίας θνητοὺς ἀνακίρνασθαι, *A. Ch.* 344 νεοκράτα φίλον, *Hdt.* 4. 152. 5 Κυρηναίοις . . . ἐς Σαμίου . . . φιλίας μεγάλας συνεκρήθησαν, 7. 151 τὴν πρὸς Ξέρξην φιλίην συνεκράσαντο.

336

μὴ δῆτα τοῦτό γ', ἀλλὰ ε' αἰτοῦμαι, Κρέον.

αἰτεῖσθαι is not elsewhere used with accusative of the person asked unless the object asked for is also expressed. This object may be expressed in several ways: (i) by a simple accusative (*Ion* 28 κἄμ' . . . αἰτεῖται τάδε), (ii) by an accusative and infinitive (*Med.* 869–70 αἰτοῦμαί σε . . . συγγνώμον' εἶναι), (iii) by a command, in apposition (*Alc.* 308 μὴ δῆτα δράσῃς ταῦτά γ', αἰτοῦμαί ε' ἐγώ). If not expressed, the object may be

³⁶ Some editors print οὐδέ πω. We do not need a connective here, and I am not sure whether editors, by so printing, mean to imply that οὐδέ is connective (Denniston and Page show by their translation that they do not).

³⁷ But not *S. Ph.* 446.

³⁸ As for the metre, if δῶματος is taken with this line, we have iambus + cretic + bacchiac; if with what precedes, we have the colon — — — — —, discussed by T. C. W. Stinton, *BICS* 22 (1975), 84–8.

³⁹ See Fraenkel on *Ag.* 369. At *Hec.* 740 I am sorry that I can no longer agree with Dr Matthiessen (*GRBS* 10 [1969], 302), with whom I formerly agreed (*JHS* 95 [1975], 198), that κρανθέν should be preferred to πραχθέν. D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* (1977), p. 14 n. 1, has convinced me that the verb is less suitable.

⁴⁰ This point is made by G. F. Schoemann, *Opuscula Academica* 3 (1858), p. 193, and by Verrall.

⁴¹ Cf. the reading of C at *Hi.* 746: κυρῶν DLP et B²V⁷ρ; γαίων QVE; γυιών C. But possibly the answer here is κραίων (Wecklein): cf. *Hec.* 219 κρανθεῖσαν] κυρωθεῖσαν M⁸¹O⁸¹.

⁴² As Herwerden says (*RhM* 58 [1903], 143), 'αὐτὸ non habet quo referatur'. What precedes (μία δὲ γονὰ/τὸ τ' εὐγενές καὶ τὸ δυσγενές) makes no metrical sense. Wilamowitz (*De tragicorum graecorum fragmentis commentatio* [1893] = *Kleine Schriften* 1 (1971), p. 205; see also *Hermes* 62 [1927], 289) suggested τὸ τ' εὐγενές <πέφυκε> κτλ. (cf. Snell, *Hermes, Einzelschriften* 5 [1937], 14). Körte (ap. Luria, *Hermes* 64 [1929], 493 n. 2) suggested δυσγενές <πέλει>. I should prefer τὸ τ' εὐγενές καὶ [τὸ] δυσγενές, like τὰ τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα (*Ion* 7, *Hel.* 14, 923, *S. El.* 1498).

⁴³ I am glad to find that Stinton, loc. cit. (above, n. 38), 85, calls it 'attractive'; hardly anyone else has ever been attracted by it.

Because of this, A. Dihle, *Sitzb. Heid. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, Abh. 5 (1977), 50, proposed ἄλλα for ἀλλά, a suggestion which had already been made by F. Wieseler, *Nachrichten Göttingen* (1890), p. 68. But such an abrupt statement as 'I am asking you for other things' does not suit the train of thought. Medea is, indeed, proposing to ask Creon for something other than she has been asking him for up to now (see 338, 340 ff.); but that request is not appropriately adumbrated by ἄλλα c' αἰτοῦμαι in 336. And ἀλλά is defended by *Hel.* 939 μὴ δῆτα, παρθέν', ἀλλά c' ἵκετεύω τόδε, *S. Ph.* 763 μὴ δῆτα τοῦτο γ', ἀλλά κτλ., 1367 μὴ δῆτα, τέκνον, ἄλλ' κτλ.

373-4 τήνδ' ἀφῆκεν ἡμέραν
μείναι μ'...

Another place where the support of Herodotus is mistakenly invoked is 738–9

⁴⁸ For the confusion of ἐπι- and ἀπο- see p. 61.

καπικηρυκεύματα (Σ^{bv}: -μασι(ν) codd.)/οὐκ ἂν πίθοιο. Page quotes with approval Weil's defence, that 'Πείθεσθαι ἐπικηρυκεύματα est dit comme πείθεσθαι τὰ κελευόμενα... Πείθεσθαι ταῦτα est une locution usuelle', and he quotes in illustration Hdt. 8. 81 οὐκ ἐπείοντο τὰ ἐσαγγελθέντα. This is to conflate two separate usages, neither of which justifies such a usage as πείθεσθαι ἐπικηρυκεύματα, πείθεσθαι τὰ κελευόμενα. The first usage, illustrated by Hdt. 8. 81 (cited above), is 'believe in the truth of a report'. The only other Herodotean passage quoted for this use of the accusative by Powell (s.u. πείθω II. 1. b) is 3. 116. 2 πείθομαι δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦτο, ὅπως κτλ. LSJ s.u. B. II quote 2. 12. 1 τὰ περὶ Αἴγυπτον ὧν καὶ τοῖσι λέγουσι αὐτὰ πείθομαι καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτω κάρτα δοκέειναι, where the accusatives are governed (either partly or wholly) by λέγουσι. The second usage is illustrated by Hdt. 1. 98. 3 πειθομένων δὲ καὶ ταῦτα τῶν Μήδων (similarly 4. 116. 1, 7. 141. 2, cited by Powell II. 2. d). In these phrases ταῦτα is an accusative of respect, 'be obedient in respect of this' (K-G i. 310). The extension of such a usage to a phrase like πείθεσθαι ἐπικηρυκεύματα, 'be obedient to proclamations', is not justified.

1181-2 ἦδη δ' ἀνέλκων κῶλον ἔκπλεθρον δρόμον
ταχὺς βαδιστῆς τερμόνων ἀνθήπτετο.

1181 ἀνέλκων codd. et Σ^{bv}: ἂν ἔλκων Schaefer: ἀνελθῶν Lenting ἔκπλεθρον L: ἔκπλεθρον BODEAVP et ¹Σ^{beav}: ἦ Π^o: ἐκπλέθρου Reiske 1182 ἀνθήπτετο codd. et Σ^{bv}: ἂν ἤπτετο Musgrave

Page's discussion of this passage (which is based on that of J. U. Powell, *CR* 47 [1933], 210-11) has come under critical scrutiny from N. Levitt, *CR* n.s. 14 (1964), 1-2, J. A. Davison, *ibid.* 240-1, and L. Bergson, *ibid.* 18 (1968), 268-9.⁴⁹ The reader of these articles is likely to sigh, like Terence's Old Man, 'incertior sum multo quam dudum'. I shall indicate what progress I think they have made and why I think that they have not solved the problem.

I agree with Levitt that, if κῶλον designates the leg of the race and not the leg of the runner, then ἔκπλεθρον and not ἐκπλέθρου is right. Six plethra make one στάδιον (about 200 yards, the length of the stadium at Olympia).⁵⁰ A κῶλον ἔκπλεθρον is therefore one stadium's length. A κῶλον ἐκπλέθρου δρόμου would be a κῶλον of half a stadium's length. Levitt rightly objects that there is no warrant for this application of the word. And the argument by which Page (following Powell) supports his preference for the shorter distance is rightly impugned by both Levitt and Bergson.

I also agree with Levitt that κῶλον is more likely to be the leg of the race. If it were the runner's leg, either we should have to allow that ἀνέλκων κῶλον is acceptable Greek for 'running' or we should have to emend the verb. The proposed emendations are worthless and I shall not catalogue them. The attempts which have been made to justify ἀνέλκων κῶλον (or ἂν ἔλκων κῶλον)⁵¹ fail for two reasons, of which

⁴⁹ To the articles referred to here and in what follows may be added H. Weil, *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* 13 (1867), 381-2, R. Rauchenstein, *ibid.* 21 (1875), 838-9, J. Kvičala, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 6), 274, E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897), 493-5, J. Harry, *The Greek Tragic Poets* (1914), pp. 217-21, O. Regenbogen, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 18), 49-50, G. Müller, *loc. cit.* (part I, n. 43), 81-2, C. W. Willink, *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966), 240 n. 3.

⁵⁰ Page's statement that 'the δρόμος at the stadium at Olympia is 210 yards' is a slip (it would be right if by δρόμος he meant στάδιον; but a moment before he used δρόμος for δίαυλος). On the length of Greek stadia see E. N. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (1930), p. 128.

⁵¹ The ἂν is indispensable, whether it is restored here or in the next line (so Davison and Bergson, against Levitt). Its position is perfectly natural in either conjecture: with ἔλκων it owes its position to its tendency, shared with enclitics, to be placed as early as possible in the sentence; with ἀνθήπτετο it owes its place to its tendency to stand next to the main verb (for its late

commentators are alert to only one. First, as Page admits, 'ἔλκειν is more suited to slow movement'; and his citation of *Ba.* 1066–7 τροχός... ἔλκει δρόμον does not disprove this, nor does that of ἔλκειν κόρδακα (*Ag. Nub.* 540; cf. *Pax* 328), 'where a swift circular movement seems to be described' (not necessarily swift: see Dover, cited below). Davison and Bergson, like Paley, cite *Theoc.* 7. 21 πᾶι... πόδας ἔλκεις;, where 'the expression denotes the effort expended, not necessarily the speed achieved, and can thus be used indifferently of decrepit hobbling or energetic dancing' (Dover *ad loc.*). But even if (ἀν)έλκων κῶλον could here mean 'energetically moving the leg', a second objection remains: the lack of any qualifying epithet for κῶλον. It is one thing to say 'moving a swift leg' (cf. *Ba.* 169 κῶλον ἄγει ταχύπουν), another to say 'energetically moving a leg'. How else does one run except by energetically moving a leg? The expression remains unconvincing in its baldness; claims that it is a colloquialism are wishful thinking.

Page expresses sympathy with Lenting's ἀνελθών, comparing *Call.* fr. 24. 4 Pf. νεῖδον ἀνερχομένωι, which, following LSJ, he translates as 'traversing'. This conjecture was advocated by H. J. Munro, *JPhil* 11 (1882), 277, and F. Wieseler, *Nachrichten Göttingen* (1890), p. 71, but they gave the verb a different sense: 'coming back (on the second leg of the δίαυλος)'. With this interpretation κῶλον is accusative of space traversed, as at e.g. *Hel.* 598 πᾶσαν πλανηθεὶς τήνδε βάρβαρον χθόνα, *Ba.* 748–9 χωροῦσι... πεδίων ὑποτάσεις, *S. Ai.* 30 πηδῶντα πεδία (see K–G i. 312–13, Schwyzer ii. 69, E. Bruhn, *Anhang zu Sophokles* §61).⁵² Against this interpretation it may be objected that in tragedy ἀνέρχομαι rarely – perhaps never – means 'return' unless πάλιν is added: *Or.* 810 πάλιν ἀνῆλθ' ἐξ εὐτυχίας ('went backwards from happiness'), *Ion* 933 and *Ph.* 1207 ἀνελθέ μοι πάλιν ('go back over the details'),⁵³ and it is probably with these last two passages (rather than with *Call.* loc. cit.) that we should connect the unique transitive use of the verb at *Hclld.* 209 πάλιν δὲ τῶνδ' ἀνειμί σοι γένος ('go back over the details of their ancestry').⁵⁴ At *Hec.* 802 ὅς (sc. νόμος) ἐς ε' ἀνελθών the verb seems to be synonymous with ἀνερχοίς, 'having been referred' (cf. *Su.* 562 εἰς ἔμ' ἐλθών, sc. νόμος). At *Herc.* 607 ἀνελθών ἐξ ἀνηλίων μυχῶν it means 'come up' not 'come back' (cf. *S. Ph.* 625). I am not sure that *Tr.* 61 ἐκεῖσε πρῶτ' ἀνελθεῖ is an exception. There, although the meaning we need is 'first return to that point', we may get that meaning by giving the verb the sense 'go up': we go up the page to revert to what has preceded, just as we go down the page to find what is yet to come. In short, I am not convinced that ἀνελθών κῶλον, without some further qualification, would naturally be interpreted as 'returning on the second leg' (contrast the fullness of *A. Ag.* 344 κάμψαι διαύλου θάτερον κῶλον πάλιν).

I suspect that the interpretation given above of νεῖδον ἀνερχομένωι (in which νεῖδον is taken as direct object of a transitive verb) is wrong. We may describe a person as 'going up and down a field', and we may imagine him as going up when he moves away from us and as going down when he comes back in our direction (and κατέρχομαι does actually mean 'come back'). I think it likely that νεῖδον is accusative

position, again with a participial clause preceding, see 190–1 σκαίους δὲ λέγων κοῦδέν τι σοφοῦς/τοὺς πρόσθε βροτοῦς οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοις. Cf. Page on 250, Barrett on *Hi.* 270 – I observe that no parallel has been adduced for the sense which must be ascribed here to the compound verb, 'reach, attain'; for the simple verb in this sense see LSJ s.u. iii. 6.

⁵² The accusatives in *Herc.* 662 διςσοὺς ἂν ἔβαν διαύλους, 1102 δίαυλον... μολών are perhaps better explained as internal (δίαυλος being treated as a *nomen actionis*), like ὁδόν (et sim.) ἐλθεῖν: cf. K–G i. 303–11, Schwyzer ii. 74–8.

⁵³ On these expressions see Mastronarde, *op. cit.* (above, n. 44), p. 67 n. 46.

⁵⁴ Cf. Moschion, *TrGF* 97 F 6 1–2 πρῶτον δ' ἀνειμι καὶ διαπτύξω λόγῳ/ἀρχὴν βροτείου καὶ κατάστασιν βίου.

of space traversed ('going up the field') and that ἀνελθὼν κῶλον has the same construction ('going up the 200 yard leg of the racecourse').

'I cannot see any reason why this [ἀνελθὼν] should have become ἀνέλκων' objects Bergson. The corruption is a simple error of anticipation: ἀνελθὼν κῶλον = ἀνέλκων ΚΩλον, like A. Su. 905 πρόμοι δάμναμαι = πρόΜΝοι δάΜΝαμαι, Ag. 119 ἐρικύμονα φέρματι = ἐρικύΜΑΤα φέρΜΑΤι (see Fraenkel *ad loc.*), 552 ἄν λέξειεν εὐπετῶς = ΕΥ λέξειεν ΕΥπετῶς, Ch. 30 πρόστερνοι στολμοί = πρόσ-CTεΛνοι CΤοΛμοί, E. Andr. 27 σωθέντος τέκνου = Τ]ΕΧθεντ[ος ΤΕΚνου Π, Hec. 424 μαστοί θ' οἷ = μασΘΟΙ Θ'ΟΙ MAR, 1206 τάληθῃ λέγειν = -θΕΙΝ λέγΕΙΝ A, El. 435 φίλαυλος...δελφίς = φιλάΔΕΛΦος ΔΕΛΦίς, Su. 162 ὤλεσε στρατηλάτας = ΗΛΑσε στρατΗΛΑτας, IT 1104 κύκλιον...κύκνος = ΚΥΚΝειον...ΚΥΚΝος, Ba. 276 ὄνομα δ' ὁπότερον L = ΟΠΟμα δ' ΟΠΟτερον P. See also Jackson, *Marg. Scaen.*, pp. 223–7.

Bergson argues in favour of the scholiast's interpretation of βαδιστής as 'horse'. This cannot be right: 200 yards is the length of the course run by athletes; horses ran much longer courses.⁵⁵

1222-3

καί μοι τὸ μὲν σὸν ἐκποδὼν ἔστω λόγου·
γνώσῃ γὰρ αὐτὴ ζημίας ἀποστροφὴν.

'And let *your* circumstances indeed be removed out of my consideration; for you will yourself have to decide upon the means of escape from punishment' (Paley's translation). It is odd that the messenger should disclaim responsibility for advising Medea on how to escape from punishment, because his opening words (1121–3) contained just such advice. That the messenger said something quite different is suggested by the scholia, whose renderings are incompatible with the text of 1223. They give three separate paraphrases, all of which amount to 'You will experience a turning round of punishment against you': Σ^{bv} (a) ζημίας δὲ ἀποστροφὴν τὴν ἀντανάκλασιν τῆς συμφορᾶς ἧς δέδρακας καταληψομένην σε, (b) τῇ πείρᾳ γνώσῃ ἐπαναστρεφόμενην εἰς σὲ τὴν ζημίαν καὶ συμφορὰν, (c) αὐτὴ γὰρ γνώσῃ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐκ τῆς εἰς σὲ ἀνακυκλουμένης (ἀκολουθοῦσης Σ^v) ζημίας. This gives a much better point: 'I forbear to speak about your predicament: for you will experience the penalty yourself'.⁵⁶ For γνώσῃ in this sense see Andr. 1006 γινώσεται δ' ἐχθρὰν ἐμήν, Rh. 667 γνώσῃ δὲ καὶ σὺ τὴν ἐμήν προθυμίαν.

Kirchhoff, who is followed by Schöne, Weil, and Méridier, proposed ἀντιστροφὴν, on the basis of Chr. Pat. 800 (αὐτὴ τε γνοίης ζημίας ἀντιστροφὴν), allegedly supported by the scholia's ἀντανάκλασιν. But, as Page says, 'The word ἀντιστροφή seems not to be used until its appearance as a technical term in Aristotle; nor was it ever used except in various technical senses by rhetoricians, grammarians, logicians, etc. It is doubtful whether the word existed in Euripides' time; and, if it did exist, whether he could have used it in poetry'.

Lenting proposed ἐπιστροφὴν. Nobody has appreciated the merits of this conjecture, which I think is probably right. The word will have the same sense as in two Sophoclean passages: (i) OC 536 μυρίων γ' ἐπιστροφαὶ κακῶν ('horrors untold sweep back upon my soul', translated Jebb, commenting that 'His troubles are likened to foemen who, when they seem to have been repulsed and to be vanishing in the distance, suddenly wheel about and renew their onset...Philopoemen made his

⁵⁵ On the length of the hippodrome at Olympia see Gardiner, *op. cit.* (above, n. 50), p. 225, H. A. Harris, *G&R* n.s. 15 (1968), 113–26.

⁵⁶ The connection of thought was apprehended by Σ^{bv} (c): τὸ κατὰ σὲ οὐκ ἐξεργάσομαι τῷ λόγῳ· αὐτὴ γὰρ γνώσῃ κτλ. Σ^{bv} (a) and (b) misunderstand 1222.

cavalry ὁξεῖς πρὸς τε τὰς κατ' οὐλαμὸν ἐπιστροφὰς καὶ περικασμοὺς (wheeling sharply in troops) καὶ τὰς καθ' ἵππον ἐπιστροφὰς καὶ κλίσεις (wheeling and changing direction singly), Plut. *Ph.* 7'); (ii) *OC* 1044–5 δαῖων ἀνδρῶν...ἐπιστροφαί ('the wheeling-about of Creon's guards...when overtaken by the Attic pursuers', Jebb). Note also Thuc. 3. 71. 2 ὅπως μή τις ἐπιστροφή γένηται ('lest some counter-action be taken', Gomme, remarking on 'the military use of ἐπιστροφή, of a force changing direction in a counter-manoeuve: cf. ii. 90. 5'). The scholia's ἐπαναστρεφόμενην supports this conjecture, for the verb has the same military connotation as ἐπιστροφή, 'turn back upon one, wheel round and return to the charge' (LSJ). For the confusion of ἐπι- and ἀπο- (that of ἐπ- and ἀπ- is very common)⁵⁷ see 835 ἐπὶ LPV³: ἀπό BOCDEAV: ἀπ[in ἐπ[corr. *Π*⁶; *Andr.* 246 ἀποβλ- MBVLP: ἐπιβλ- A; 402 ἐπισπασθεῖς M^{BAV}: ἀπο- LP (this offers strong support for Pierson's ἐπισπασας for ἀπο- at A. *Su.* 909); *El.* 148 ἐπὶ κούριμον Barnes: ἀποκ- L; and perhaps *Andr.* 1034 (ἀποβάς Wecklein: ἐπι- codd.). The corruption will have been helped by the occurrence of ἀποστροφή earlier in the play at 603, 799.

An alternative suggestion is G. H. Franssen's⁵⁸ ἀναστροφὴν ('turning back, return'): cf. fr. 301. 1 ἀέλπτους (Nauck: -ων codd.) μυρίων ἀναστροφάς, *S. Ant.* 226 κυκλῶν ἐμαυτὸν εἰς ἀναστροφὴν, *E. Ba.* 793 ἡ κοὶ πάλιν ἀναστρέψω δίκην; ('cause justice to turn back' Dodds). And I record, as a further possibility, ὑποστροφὴν. This noun occurs at *S. El.* 725 ἐκ δ' ὑποστροφῆς/τελοῦντες...δρόμον ('as they wheeled round', of chariots at the turning-point of the racecourse), the verb at *Alc.* 1019 ἤκω δεῦρ' ὑποστρέψας πάλιν, *Herc.* 736 πάλιν ὑποστρέφει βίοντα ἐξ Ἄϊδα (Wilamowitz: εἰς αἶδαν L), *IA* 363, fr. 495. 3.⁵⁹ But neither ἀναστροφὴν nor ὑποστροφὴν seems as suitable as ἐπιστροφὴν. For, while δίκη is sometimes said to 'come back' or 'turn back' (*El.* 1155 παλίσρρους...δίκη, *Herc.* 739 ἰὼ δίκη καὶ θεῶν παλίσρρους πότμος, *Ba.* 793 cited above), this is less naturally said of ζήμια, which is better suited by the image which ἐπιστροφὴν affords, of punishment which turns upon Medea in requital for her actions. For a similar image see *Andr.* 492–3 ἔτι σε, πότνια, μετατροπὰ/τῶνδ' ἔπεισιν ἔργων. The *Suda* (ii. 384 Adler) has the remarkable entry ἐπιστροφή, ἡ ἀντέκτισις ('retribution').

1255-7 ~ 1265-7	cās γὰρ ἀπὸ χρυσέας γονᾶς ἔβλαπτεν, θεοῦ δ' αἷμα πίτνειν φόβος ὑπ' ἀνέρων.	1255
	~ δειλαία, τί κοὶ φρενῶν βαρὺς χόλος προσπίτνει καὶ δυσμενῆς φόνος ἀμείβεται;	1265

1255 cf. Chr. Pat. 116 γονᾶς γὰρ ἀπὸ χρυσέας ἔβλαπτε μοι 1256 huius u. tantum]εἰς τετλα[...πίτνειν φοβ] in *Π*⁷ leg. Lewis, quam lectionem in dubium uocauit Snell; equidem nihil legere potui θεοῦ OEA^{VP}Tr: θεῶν DL[?] et B aut B^{1c}: [*Π*⁷] αἷμα ELPV²: αἷματι BODV et *Σ*^b: αἷμα τι A: [*Π*⁷]: cf. *Σ*^{bν} τὸ θεῖον αἷμα...πεσεῖν, Chr. Pat. 117 καὶ νὸν δὲ πίτνειν αἷμ' ὑπ' ἀνέρων Θεοῦ 1265 huius u. tantum]αδηταδοτ[...φρε]νων βαρυν in *Π*⁷ legi (]αδληταδετ[φρενων βαρυν leg. Lewis,]αδληταδοτ[ε]οι φρε]νων βαρυν Snell) δειλαία BDEAV³: δειλαία O: δειλέα V: δηλαία PTr: de *Π*⁷ uide supra 1266 χόλος πινει (τ super ν scr.) καὶ *Π*⁷ (fort. κ in δ uel δ in κ mut.) δυσμενης etiam *Π*⁷ (sed δαι super δυσ scr.) 1267 φόνος ἀμείβεται BODEAVL (-οῖβ- L^{uv}, ~ Tr):]ειβεται *Π*⁷: ἀ- φ- P(-εῖρ-)Tr

⁵⁷ See p. 57 for some instances of ἐφ- and ἀφ- confused. Note also 552 ἐφέλκων] ὑφ- O: ἀφ- A.

⁵⁸ *Quaestionis de scholiorum Euripideorum in poetae verbis restituendis auctoritate et usu specimen* (1872), pp. 38–9. The same proposal was made by Stadtmüller, *Beiträge zur Texteskritik der Eur. Medea* (1876), p. 34 n. 1. Barthold's elaboration συμφορὰς ἀναστροφὴν, where συμφορὰς is taken from the scholia, is needless.

⁵⁹ On ὑποστρέφων at *S. Tr.* 221 see Dawe, *Studies* iii. 81–2, Bond on *Herc.* 736.

Page considers two methods of restoring correspondence between 1255 and 1265: (i) Seidler's <τᾱς> cāc in 1255;⁶⁰ (ii) Musgrave's χρυέας ἀπὸ γονᾶς in 1255 with Seidler's φρενοβαρής in 1265. The first method yields unsatisfactory metre and unsatisfactory style. The metre (---υυυ-|υ-υ-) gives an iambic metron sandwiched between dochmiacs (for iambs occurring with dochmiacs see N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 47–8; as he says, 'In most cases the iambs occur either at the opening or at the closing of dochmiac passages'). Further, as Hermann said of <τᾱς>, 'languet articulus'. And in 1265 φρενῶν...χόλος ('anger of mind') is intolerably flat. With the second method we get unexceptionable metre and excellent style. The metre is better taken as ---|υ-∞υ- (molossus + dochmiac, as at *Or.* 145, 168) than as ---υ-|∞υ- (dochmiac + cretic). Page takes it in the latter way, just as he takes the opening of the stanza (1251 ~ 1261) to be υ---υ-|υ-υ- rather than υ---|υ-υ-υ- (bacchiac + dochmiac, as at *Or.* 158). Like iambic metra, cretics normally come at the beginning or end of a series of dochmiacs not in the middle. φρενοβαρής, not elsewhere found, is analogous to γυιοβαρής (*A. Ag.* 63) and θυμοβαρής (*Ant. Sid.*, *AP* 7. 146. 2 = Gow-Page 209).⁶¹

Since ἐβλασεν θεοῦ δ'...φόβος ὑπ' ἀνέρων ~ χόλος προσπίτνει...φόνος ἀμείβεται are unmistakably dochmiac and are not obviously corrupt, it is likely that dochmiacs are concealed in αἷμα (αἵματι) πίτνειν ~ καὶ δυσμενής. In the strophe θεοῦ δ' αἷμα πίτνειν cannot be far from the truth (what alarms the chorus is the shedding of divine blood). In the antistrophe δυσμενής is not an apt epithet for φόνος⁶² and was plausibly replaced by Porson with ζαμενής, a word which it glosses in *Σ S. Ai.* 137.⁶³ We need not linger over Page's reconstruction, which reposes far too much faith in Lewis's speculative readings in the papyrus.⁶⁴ Sense, no less than metre, suggests that something has been lost in both places: for (a) we need to be told *where* the blood falls, (b) φόνος ἀμείβεται is meaningless without some addition, as Page notes, and the efforts of editors to explain it are vain.⁶⁵

The following supplements will mend both metre and sense: θεοῦ δ' αἷμα <χαμαί> πίτνειν/φόβος ὑπ' ἀνέρων ~ πίτνει καὶ ζαμενής <φόνου>/φόνος ἀμείβεται. Blood, when shed, does not simply fall, but falls on the ground:⁶⁶ *Phaethon* 219–20 σταλαγμὸν...εἴ ποῦ τίς ἐστιν αἵματος χαμαὶ πεσὼν, *Or.* 1491 φόνωι χαμαιπετεῖ, *A. Ag.* 1019–20 τὸ δ' ἐπὶ γᾶν πεσὼν...αἷμα, *Ch.* 48 πεσόντος αἵματος πέδωι (πέδοι Dindorf); similarly χαμαὶ πεσεῖν of a person at *Med.* 1170. The addition of χαμαί

⁶⁰ *De Versibus Dochmiacis* (1811–12), p. 291.

⁶¹ Scribes tend to resolve compounds into their component parts: e.g. *Cycl.* 610 ξενοδοιτυμόνος (ξένων δ-), *El.* 735 ἀπειρόδροσοι (ἄπειροι δρόσου), *Herc.* 883 ἑκατογκεφάλοις (ἐκατόν κεφαλαίς), *Tr.* 536 ἀμβροτοπώλου (ἀμβρότα π-), 603 ἐρημόπολις (ἐρημος π-), *IT* 405–6 περικίονας ναοῦς (περὶ κίονας ναοῦ). Cf. Fraenkel, *Ag.* ii. 376 n. 1, Friis Johansen and Whittle on *A. Su.* 198.

⁶² 'ein nichtssagendes Epitheton' Nauck, loc. cit. (part 1, n. 73), 135, 'épithète faible et insignifiante' Weil.

⁶³ p. 210 ed. Elmsley, ii. 48 Christodoulou.

⁶⁴ For references to Lewis and Snell, see below p. 63.

⁶⁵ 'φόνος ἀμείβεται sc. φόνωι, caedes caede permutatur, caedem caedes sequitur' Matthiae, 'Nescio an Anglice significet *to ensue*' Elmsley, 'Why, instead of love and duty, is murder adopted as a new and sudden impulse?' Paley, "'comes in the place of, succeeds"' (supply αὐτοῦ sc. χόλου) Verrall, 'Avec Arnim nous sous-entendons après ἀμείβεται quelque chose comme ἀντὶ τῆς πρόσθεν φιλίας' Méridier.

⁶⁶ *Σ^{bv}* pertinently observe that Medea calls upon 'Earth' in 1251 ὥς μέλλουσιν δέχεσθαι τῆς μαιφονίας τὸ αἷμα. – It would be just possible to take αἷμα as 'offspring', a sense inadequately illustrated by LSJ s.u. iii. 2: see *Pi. N.* 6. 35, thereafter not apparently before Hellenistic poetry (Pfeiffer on *Call. fr.* 67. 7, Gow on *Theoc.* 24. 73). But the verb πίτνειν makes such a sense unlikely here.

was proposed by Hermann; but he added it after *πίτνειν*. It would much more easily drop out after *αἷμα* (*ΑΙΜΑ ΧΑΜΑΙ*). Wecklein proposed *αἷμα* <πέδοι>, Allen *αἷμ* <ἐπὶ γὰρ> (better γὰρ, as Wecklein notes), but again the omissions are less easily accounted for.

<φόνου> φόνος ἀμείβεται means ‘murder is replaced by (succeeded by) murder’. Wecklein compared *Or.* 1007 ἀμείβει θανάτους θανάτων and *H. II.* 11. 547 γόνυ γονὸς ἀμείβων; very similar is *Hel.* 1533 ἔργου δ’ ἔργον ἐξημείβετο.⁶⁷ The verb ἀμείβειν tends to attract to itself pairs of words of the same stem: *Hi.* 1108 ἄλλα γὰρ ἄλλοθεν ἀμείβεται, *Or.* 816 φόνωι φόνος ἐξαμείβων δι’ αἵματος,⁶⁸ 979 ἕτερα δ’ ἕτερος (Porson: ἑτέροις codd.)⁶⁹ ἀμείβεται πήματ’, 1503 ἀμείβει καινὸν ἐκ καινῶν τόδε.

Hermann⁷⁰ had already suggested <φόνον>, which might be expected to mean ‘murder repays murder’ (cf. *El.* 1093 ἀμείψεται/φόνον δικάζων φόνος,⁷¹ *Ph.* 1727 ἀμείβεται (sc. Δίκη) βροτῶν ἀνενεσίας) or ‘murder gets murder in return’ (cf. *Cycl.* 312 κέρδη πονηρὰ ζημίαν ἡμείψατο). But these do not give a suitable sense, since the murder of the children is a sequel to, not a requital for, the murder of Glaucē. Hermann in fact translated ‘Glaucē necem excipit caedes ipsius Medēae liberorum’, and Dodds,⁷² accepting φόνον, translates ἀμείβεται as ‘is succeeded by’. But I doubt if there is a fully satisfactory parallel for such a neutral sense of the verb. At *Rh.* 615 ἕως ἂν νύξ ἀμείψῃται φάος (‘until night is succeeded by day’), which Dodds quotes, the verb expresses something of the reciprocal nature of the phenomenon (‘shall have taken light in exchange for itself’, Paley; cf. *Cycl.* 312). Any notion of reciprocity or exchange would be foreign to our passage.⁷³

1282 μίαν δὴ κλύω μίαν τῶν πάρος . . .

μίαν alterum om. A et (sec. Lewis et Snell) Π⁷

The claim of Lewis (*Études de Papyrologie* 3 [1936], 59) and Snell (*Hermes, Einzelschriften* 5 [1937], 71) that Π⁷ omitted μίαν is, I believe, wrong. Here are their transcriptions of lines 1275–85 (= col. III 21–3):

Lewis:

]ι μοι φον[ου]ς – ταλα[ινα ως αρα ηςθα πετρος η ciδαρος ατις τ]ε[κ]ν[ων]	21
]ν αυτοχειρι τ[ολ]μαι κτενες μ[ιαν δ]η κλυω τω[μ παρος γυναικ]ων	22
]ς χειρα βαλειν ως εκ θ[εω]ν οτ[ε η διος δαμαρ] εξε[πεμψε δωματ]ων αλαι	23

⁶⁷ The genitive is of the same type as in *IT* 397–8 Ἀσιήτιδα γαῖαν/Εὐρώπας διαμείψας, *Hel.* 1186–7 πέπλους μέλανας . . . λευκῶν ἀμείψας, *S. Tr.* 736–7 λῳιονες φρένας/τῶν νῦν παρουσῶν τῶνδ’ ἀμείψασθαι, *E. Med.* 967–8 τῶν δ’ ἐμῶν παίδων φυγὰς/ψυχῆς ἂν ἀλλαξαίμεθ’, οὐ χρυσοῦ μόνον, *Andr.* 1029 ἐναλλάξασα φόνον θανάτου (Stevens: θανάτῳ codd.). Cf. *K–G* i. 378, Schwyzler ii. 127.

⁶⁸ It is perhaps best to take φόνωι φόνος as an independent phrase (‘murder upon murder’, as in *Ph.* 1495 οὐκ ἔρις ἀλλὰ φόνωι φόνος: see *K–G* i. 444 Anm. 4, Schwyzler ii. 156, Kannicht on *Hel.* 366), and to take ἐξαμείβων with δι’ αἵματος (‘passing through bloodshed’, as at *Ph.* 1051–2 δι’ αἱμάτων δ’ ἀμείβει/μυκαρόν εἰς ἀγῶνα).

⁶⁹ ἕτερον (*M. L. West, BICS* 28 [1981], 69) should perhaps be preferred.

⁷⁰ So also Weil, *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* 13 (1867), 383 (‘φόνωι, oder vielmehr φόνον, ist vor φόνος ausgefallen’).

⁷¹ For a different interpretation see J. H. Kells, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 129–30.

⁷² *Humanitas* 4 (1952), 15–18. I cannot approve of Dodds’ other proposals in this passage: to place the question-mark after ζαμενής instead of after ἀμείβεται, and to read αἷμα <μάταν> in 1256.

⁷³ Similarly <φόνωι> would give the meaning ‘murder is repaid by murder’ (LSJ s.u. ἀμείβω B. 3).

If we take the Ω of $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\omega$ as our point of reference, we find that between $\mu[$ and Ω there are 12 letters. In the first line, Π stands directly above the Ω , and between $\alpha[$ and Π there are, again, 12 letters.⁷⁵ In the third line, N stands directly below the Ω , and between $\tau[$ and N there are 13 letters. In Lewis' version, we have 8 letters in the second line ($[\iota\alpha\nu\delta]\eta\kappa\lambda\upsilon$) occupying the same space as about 11 in the third line, and even then the figure of eleven is attained only after the arbitrary assumption has been made that the papyrus omitted $\nu\iota\nu$ in the third line. In Snell's version (where no such assumption is made) we have 8 letters in the second line occupying the same space as about 13 in the third line.

(b) $\pi\epsilon[\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma \quad]..[$
 $\omega\tau\omega[\mu\ \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa]\omega\nu[\]$
 $\nu\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\pi[\epsilon\mu\psi\epsilon\ \delta\omega\mu\alpha\tau]\omega\nu\ \alpha\lambda\alpha\iota$

I have aligned the initial letters as they are aligned in the papyrus. At the end of the second line, the Ω of $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa]\omega\nu$ stands directly above the N of $\delta\omega\mu\alpha\tau]\omega\nu$. From the initial ω to the Ω of $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa]\omega\nu$ there are 16 letters. From the initial ν to the N of $\delta\omega\mu\alpha\tau]\omega\nu$ there are, again, 16 letters. At the end of the first line, Lewis identified $\tau]\epsilon\kappa[\nu]\omega\nu$, Snell $\tau]\epsilon\kappa[\nu\alpha\nu$. I can see traces of (probably) two letters, which I cannot identify and cannot reconcile with any of the letters identified by Lewis and Snell.

If $\mu[\iota\alpha\nu\ \mu\iota\alpha\nu\ \delta\eta]$ is the correct restoration, the reading may instantly be dismissed as unmetrical. But I have not excluded the possibility that we should read $\mu[\iota\alpha\nu\ \delta\eta\ \mu\iota\alpha]\nu$, which preserves the dochmiac. The word order $\mu\iota\alpha\nu\ \delta\eta\ \mu\iota\alpha\nu$ is comparable to *Alc.* 222 $\pi\acute{o}\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\ \delta\eta\ \pi\acute{o}\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon$, *Hec.* 909 $\delta\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\ \delta\eta\ \delta\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}$, 930 $\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\ \delta\eta\ \pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$. And repetition of this same type is contained within a single dochmiac at *El.* 169 $\xi\mu\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \xi\mu\omicron\lambda\epsilon\nu$, 594 $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\alpha\iota\ \kappa\omicron\iota\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\alpha\iota$, *Ph.* 103 $\delta\omicron\rho\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\ \nu\upsilon\nu\ \delta\omicron\rho\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$, *Antiope* 54 Page (fr. xlviii. 57 Kambitsis, fr. 223 Nauck) $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\ \tau\omicron\iota\ \delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha$, *S. OT* 685 $\tilde{\alpha}\lambda\iota\varsigma\ \xi\mu\omicron\iota\gamma'\ \tilde{\alpha}\lambda\iota\varsigma$. But the corresponding line in the strophe, 1273 $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \beta\omicron\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omega\nu$, decisively confirms the order $\mu\iota\alpha\nu\ \delta\eta\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega\ \mu\iota\alpha\nu\ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$. Repetition of a word at the beginning of successive dochmiacs is common: *Hec.* 1064 $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \kappa\acute{o}\rho\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \Phi\rho\upsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$ (Seidler: $\tau\text{-}\tau\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\Phi\text{-}$ codd.), *Hi.* 836, *Or.* 142, 1353, 1537, 1541, *A. ScT* 134, 171, *S. Ai.* 349–50, 879, 925, *OC* 842, 885, 1480. Similarly when the repeated word stands in anaphora: *Ph.* 1291 $\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$, $\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\ \psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu$, *Hi.* 571, 826, *Hec.* 695–6, *IT* 847, *Hel.* 667–8, *Or.* 154, 180, 323. See also A. Tessier, *BIFG* 2 (1975), 130–43.

The inferences which have been made from the alleged agreement between A and the papyrus (Snell 74–5, endorsed by Page) are therefore invalid. But there is a possible connection between the papyrus' transposition and A's omission of the same word: I have observed (part I, p. 352) how often a word transposed in one manuscript may prove to be absent from another.

Queens' College, Cambridge

JAMES DIGGLE

⁷⁵ Assuming that $[\iota\nu\alpha\ \omega\varsigma$ and $\alpha\rho\alpha\ \eta\varsigma\theta]$ were not elided. The general practice of the papyrus (there are a few exceptions) is to elide before the same vowel (e.g. $\delta(\epsilon)\epsilon\kappa$) but not before a different vowel. In the third line we may compare $\omicron[\tau\epsilon\ \eta$ with 1102 $\tau\epsilon\ \omicron\pi\omicron\theta\epsilon\nu$.