

two-line interloquia in this part of the play (1042f., 1047f., 1085f., 1107f.). In 1042f. and 1047f. they clearly regard Polymestor as a dangerous person. They also style him in 1036 as ἀνδρὸς Θρηκὸς and in 1047 as Θρηῆκα; to this corresponds Θρηκὶ in 1055. Considering the uncertainty in the transmission concerning the change of speaker in Attic drama,² we have therefore good reason to attribute the lines 1054f. to the chorus instead of Hecuba. Of course this is not to say that the chorus should here leave the stage, where they are still present at 1085. Taking a few steps back will be completely sufficient. Hecuba, in comparison, could ostentatiously stay where she is, which would result in an effective contrast between her and her fellow captives.

Universität Innsbruck

MARTIN KORENJAK

² S. J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique* (Paris, 1954), pp. 215–8.

EURIPIDES, *PHOENISSAE* 1567–1578

δάκρυα γοερά
φανερὰ πᾶσι τιθεμένα
τέκεσι μαστὸν ἔφευγον ἔφευγον
ικέτις ικέτιν ὀρομένα.
[ἡδὺρ δ' ἐν Ἡλέκτραισι πύλαις τέκνα
λωτοτρόφον κατὰ λείμακα λόγχαις
κοινὸν ἐννάλιον
μάτηρ, ὥστε λέοντας ἐναύλους,
μαρναμένους ἐπὶ τραύμασιν, αἵματος
ἤδη ψυχρὰν λοιβὰν φονίαν,
ἂν ἔλαχ' Αἰδας, ὥπασε δ' Ἄρης.]
χαλκόκροτον δὲ λαβοῦσα νεκρῶν πάρα φάσανον εἴσω
σαρκὸς ἔβαψεν, ἅχει δὲ τέκνων ἔπες' ἀμφὶ νεκροῖσιν.

I give the text as printed by James Diggle in his new Oxford Classical Text. His deletion of 1570–6 is rejected by Donald Mastronarde in his recent commentary.¹ Apart from this, Mastronarde's text differs from Diggle's on only a couple of minor points which are immaterial to the main problems.²

Diggle argued for the deletion of 1570–6 as follows:³ 'I say nothing of their linguistic oddities, which have provoked much emendation. The lines interrupt the progress of the narrative. Jocasta offered her breast to her sons in supplication (1567–9). *She found them fighting* (1570–6). She took the sword from the corpses and killed herself (1577–8). First there is ὕστερον πρότερον: Jocasta cannot have bared her breast to her sons before she found them. Second, there is a logical

¹ *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1994). Mastronarde retains the text printed in his Teubner edition (1988). I follow both editors in treating 1485–1581 as substantially authentic though rich in textual difficulties (cf. Diggle's apparatus ad loc.) of the kind expected in an astrophic monody and amoibaion. I have commented briefly on the severe doubts that surround what follows (1582–1766) in *BMCR* 6 (1995), 431–2.

I would like to thank James Diggle, Donald Mastronarde and *CQ*'s anonymous referee for their helpful comments on drafts of this note.

² 1575 φόνιον with *IT*²; 1578 τέκνοισι with the main tradition but allowing the plausibility of Eldik's νεκροῖσιν (νεκροῖς Markland). Diggle and Mastronarde provide further textual information which need not be repeated here.

³ *SIFC* 7 (1989), 205–6 = *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994), 351–2.

inconcinnity: Jocasta found her sons alive, but (in a closely co-ordinated clause) took the sword from their corpses. If, in evasion of this second objection, it should be claimed (as some have claimed) that 1575–6 (which, if sound, are too inept to be Euripidean; if Euripidean, must be emended) mean that they are dead or dying, the inconcinnity is not eliminated, its location is merely shifted: for the sons cannot be described, within the same sentence, as “fighting” (1574), and a moment later, in an appositional phrase, as “now dead (or dying)” (1575–6). Further, the lines contradict the messenger, who said that Jocasta did not arrive until the fighting was over (1428ff.). The weeping and breast-baring happened over the dying bodies (1431ff.).’

Mastronarde argues for the defence in his notes on 1570–6 and 1574. With regard to the linguistic problems, he suggests that the ‘remarkable style’ of 1570–6 is due to the heightened emotional tone of the passage; Euripides is evoking pathos, and while 1574–5 are admittedly problematic they may perhaps be understood by taking *λοιβάν* in apposition to the preceding clause: ‘(fighting) to add wound upon wound, and their fighting was an act of libation, already cold, deadly, of blood <not of wine>’. As to the placing of 1570–6 between the descriptions of supplication and suicide, he suggests that this is similarly intended for pathetic effect; the lines are ‘a build-up to a climax rather than an interruption’. And as to the discrepancy between the narrative implied here and the Messenger’s narrative, this may in Mastronarde’s view be something that Euripides allowed himself for the sake of the particular effects he was seeking in each passage: ‘here there is supplication before the catastrophe . . . , and Jocasta witnesses the ferocious strife; earlier maximum effect is obtained by separate concentration on the duel in 1377–1424 and on too-late arrival, lamentation and suicide in 1427–59’.

In what follows I shall suggest that the difficulties concerning the order of events, which Diggle finds damning and Mastronarde real but acceptable, can be eliminated. On the other hand the syntax in 1573–5 is both hard to accept and hard to emend conclusively, but there is a strong reason for retaining the passage as a whole. Without it, the account of Jocasta’s death which Antigone is giving in response to Oedipus’s request (1565–6) becomes very abrupt and incomplete, amounting to nothing more than ‘She approached her sons with bared breasts and killed herself over their bodies’. Something carrying more verbal and emotional weight than 1567–9 *plus* 1577–8 is surely needed; and Oedipus surely needs more if his question is to be properly answered. It is easier, then, to suppose that what we have is a somewhat corrupt version of what Euripides supplied than that it is a linguistically inept and/or corrupt replacement of it.

In the matter of the order of events, much depends on the sense of 1567–9. Diggle takes these lines to be referring to events *after* the fatal moment in the duel as described by the Messenger in 1431–6, and he argues that they should not be followed by a description of Jocasta’s arrival at the combat-scene. For Mastronarde, on the other hand, they describe events *before* the fatal moment but again out of narrative order (though in his view acceptably so). But what do these lines actually say? ‘Putting forth wailing tears (so as for them to be) evident to all, she roused herself (*ὀρομένη*) and bore, bore as a suppliant her suppliant breast to her sons.’ *ἔφερεν* here has been taken to mean ‘offer’, ‘hold out’, or ‘show’, but no normal usage of *φέρω* justifies this and none has ever been cited with reference to this passage.⁴ So far as the offering of breasts in supplication is concerned, we find e.g. *μαζὸν ἀνέσχε* Hom. *Il.* 22.80, *ἔξω πέπλων ἔβαλεν*, *ἔδειξε μαστόν* Eur. *El.* 1206–7, *ἔξέβαλλε μαστόν* Eur. *Or.* 527, while

for suckling we find e.g. *μαζόν ἐπέσχον* Hom. *Il.* 22.83 (cf. Stes. S 13.5 [suppl. Barrett], Eur. *Andr.* 224, *Ion* 1372 [ἐπ- Dobree: ὑπ- L]), *προσέσχε μαζόν* Aesch. *Cho.* 531. *ἔφερεν* ought to mean 'she was bearing' or 'she was bringing', and this suggests that 1567–9 are a description of Jocasta *going* to suplicate her sons, as indeed some commentators and translators have supposed.⁵ The imperfect tense is more appropriate for this than for the act of supplication; it would not be impossible for the latter ('she stood/knelt there offering') but the aorist would be more likely as in all the examples above except *Or.* 527, where the imperfect is due to its context.⁶ On the other hand, it is quite appropriate if 1567–9 are setting the scene with a picture of Jocasta's distress as she made her way towards the place of combat. 'I roused myself . . .' (*ὀρομένα*) suits this assumption also, implying that she rushed forth urgently. The phrasing is closely comparable, even in rhythm, with *I.A.* 185–6 δι' ἄλλος Ἀρτέμιδος ἦλυθον *ὀρομένα*, 'I have roused myself and come through the grove of Artemis' (to view the Achaean forces).⁷ 'Evident to all' also gains in point, recalling Antigone's feeling of *aidos* when called on to make her way *publicly* to the combat-scene (1274–6: cf. again *I.A.* 187–8). If one asks why attention is drawn at this point to Jocasta's 'bearing her suppliant breast', the answer may be that the phrase implies her *purpose* in running to the battlefield—that is, to beg her sons to refrain from fighting, like Hecuba supplicating Hector in *Iliad* 22.79ff. In this overwrought context it might even suggest that her breast was already uncovered as she went.

If this is so, what 1567–9 describe is certainly not the same moment as the moment described by the Messenger, as Diggle assumed. Moreover, the act described by the Messenger was not an act of supplication, as he also assumed.⁸ In 1431–6 there was no breast-baring, and when Jocasta lamented the wasted labour of her breasts (1434) and moaned 'O nurturers of your mother's old age' (1436) these were not cries of supplication but lamenting complaints about her sons' abandonment of their duties to her, the latter paired with Antigone's 'O brothers who have betrayed my marriage' (1436–7).

The argument so far is sufficient, I think, to dispose of the contextual objections to 1570–6. The main sequence of events is the same in 1567–78 as it was earlier:

Jocasta (with Antigone) sets out to suplicate her sons	1270–83	1567–9
She finds her sons already wounded and dying	1428–31	1570, 1574–6
She laments and converses with them until they expire	1432–53	———

⁴ The seeds of the misinterpretation lie in the Scholia, which begin from a false reading *αἰρομένα* 'lifting', explain this as meaning that Jocasta lifted and displayed her breast to her duelling sons, and then offer the (correct) variant *ὀρομένα* with an equivalent (false) explanation (*γυράφεται δὲ καὶ ὀρομένα, ὃ ἐστὶν ὀρούουσα καὶ προτείνουσα τὸν μαστόν*).

⁵ E.g. Paley ('she set out to carry her suppliant breast to her sons'), Méridier ('elle s'élançait, suppliante, pour présenter à ses fils un sein suppliant'), Buschor ('Eilte sie, eilte sie hin, | flehend den Söhnen zu zeigen | flehende Brust ihrer Mutter'). Cf. *Pho.* 1530–2 (*λεῖπε σοὺς | δόμους, ἀλαδὸν ὄμμα φέρων*), *πάτερ γεραίε*, 'Leave your house, bearing your sightless eye(s), old father...') and such phrases as *Tro.* 334 *ποδῶν φέρουσα φιλάταν βάσιν*, *Tro.* 1332 *πρόφερε πόδα σόν*, *Soph. Trach.* 967 *ἄσφορον φέρει βάσιν*.

⁶ 'What were you feeling when your mother was holding out her breast to supplicate you?' (*τίν' εἶχες, ὦ τάλας, ψυχὴν τότε | στ' ἐξέβαλλε μαστόν ἱκετεύουσα σε | μήτηρ*).

⁷ See Stockert ad loc. and cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.590, *Soph. OT* 176.

⁸ Diggle 205–6 (= *Euripidea* 352): 'The tenor of Jocasta's supplication (1568–9) may be inferred from the apostrophe at 1436 'ὦ γηροβοσκῷ μητρός, implying "Do not abandon your mother to a childless old age".' Diggle's apparatus to lines 1429 and 1433 in the Oxford Text perhaps allows for a reading which does not involve supplication.

She seizes a sword and kills herself

1455–9 1577–8

And the summary of events now given by Antigone in answer to Oedipus's question is reasonably substantial and complete. It is not surprising that she does not repeat the content of 1432–53. On the other hand, some problems of syntax and sense do remain within 1570–6, and these are not easily solved. I discuss them in order.

1570–3 are for the most part unobjectionable in themselves, at least if we accept Mastronarde's view that the language here is purposefully strained for emotional effect, and even though translation of the Greek word-order and its full effect is impossible: 'And she, the mother, found her sons at the Electran Gates (. . . fighting? . . .) with spears in the lotus-rearing meadow⁹ a mutual battle like lions at a lair.' A difficulty must, however, be recognized in the extraordinary positioning of *μάτηρ* (1572) not in the main clause (with *ἡδρε*) but in the participle-clause which describes the sons' fighting.¹⁰

In 1574, *μαρναμένους* is again satisfactory in itself: 'She found her sons . . . fighting . . .' But as we have seen, this is inconsistent with both the Messenger's narrative and with what follows in (at least) 1577–8; these agree with each other that the sons were already fallen and dying when Jocasta reached them. We need, it seems, a different phrasing on the following lines: 'She found her sons who had been fighting a mutual battle . . .' Wilamowitz attempted to provide this by taking *μαρναμένους* as a 'timeless' (perhaps better called 'imperfect') participle, but this suggestion has rightly been rejected.¹¹

In the remainder of 1574–6 there are problems of sense and syntax in *ἐπὶ τραύμασιν* and in *αἵματος ἥδη ψυχρὰν λιβὰν φονίαν*. Diggle and Mastronarde both place a comma after *ἐπὶ τραύμασιν*, thus linking it with *μαρναμένους*, and Mastronarde takes the sense of *ἐπὶ* to be either 'in addition to' or 'for the purpose of'; he tentatively translates, '(fighting) to add wound upon wound'. As for *αἵματος ἥδη ψυχρὰν λιβὰν φονίαν*, Mastronarde takes this in apposition to the preceding participle-clause as characterizing the outcome of the duel,¹² so that *λιβὰν* must be the *act* of libation, even though *ψυχρὰν* seems more applicable to the libation's *content*. All of this puts the best available construction on the text as transmitted, but it is worth noting that *ἐπὶ τραύμασιν* might mean 'in circumstances of wounds' or 'in a wounded condition'¹³ if it were syntactically associated with the 'libation of blood', and that if the *λιβὰν*-phrase were not appositive it could describe the blood itself as a (metaphorically) chilly libation.

Taken all together these difficulties suggest that, while the entire passage 1570–6 is

⁹ 'Lotus-rearing meadow' means no more than 'flowery meadow', like *πεδία λωτοῦντα* (or *-ἔντα*), Hom. *Il.* 12.283. CQ's referee compares *I.A.* 1544 *λείμακας τ' ἀνθεσφόρους*, also the setting for a scene of death.

¹⁰ The jarring rhythm given by *μάτηρ* (self-contained contracted dactyl following blunt ending in the previous line) compounds the difficulty, though it is not, I think, indefensible in itself. (828 has a rather similar effect, though the punctuation makes a difference.)

¹¹ Wilamowitz, *KS* VI.359 = *SPAW* (1903), 600; rejected by e.g. Diggle 352 n. 31 and Mastronarde, Comm. on 1574. For the present participle as 'imperfect' participle cf. Kühner-Gerth I.200 n. 9 with such examples as Thuc. 2.58 *ὥστε καὶ τοὺς προτέρους στρατιώτας νοσῆσαι, ἐν τῷ πρὸ τοῦ χρόνου ὑγιαίνοντας*, 'so that the original troops also fell sick, though having previously been enjoying good health'. The phrasing in our passage gives no encouragement to such an interpretation.

¹² Similarly e.g. Wecklein: *αἵματος... φονίαν...* steht appositionell zum Inhalt des Satzes und bezeichnet den Erfolg des Kampfes.

¹³ Cf. LSJ *ἐπὶ*, B.I.i; also e.g. *Pho.* 786, 1499, *El.* 163, *Or.* 1491, *Bacch.* 1369.

not intrusive, there has been some corruption and/or disruption within it, possibly at an early stage of transmission when the text was not arranged colometrically. *ἡῦρε* . . . *μαρναμένους* would make good sense if *κοινὸν ἐννάλιον* were the object of an aorist participle such as *τελέσαντας*¹⁴ ('She found at the Elektran gates her sons <who had completed> their mutual warfare with spears in the lotus-rearing meadow, like lions fighting [or 'fighting like lions'] at a lair'). *μάτηρ* would then no longer be inside the participle-phrase and would stand more easily as, or in apposition to, the subject of *ἡῦρε* ('She, their mother, found . . .'), although its position would still be striking.¹⁵ Alternatively, *μάτηρ* itself might be a corruption of the needed participle. Either way, *ὥστε* . . . *μαρναμένους* would be a self-contained comparative clause. As for *ἐπὶ τραύμασιν* . . . *Ἄρης*, again the sense seems to require an additional participle:¹⁶ '(and?)¹⁷ <who had offered> now in their wounded state the chilly, gory libation of blood which Hades had been allotted and Ares had supplied.' This could be provided without disturbing the metre by deleting the pleonastic *αἵματος* (a gloss on *φονίαν*?) and inserting a participle such as *δόντας* (. . . *ἐπὶ τραύμασιν ἤδη | ψυχρὰν <δόντας> λοιβὰν φονίαν*).¹⁸ Or *μαρναμένους* (not essential to the *ὥστε*-clause) might be a corruption of such a participle.

These suggestions can hardly be conclusive, but they may at least be of diagnostic value and help to support the contention that the passage is essentially genuine rather than intrusive.

University of Calgary

MARTIN CROPP

¹⁴ *CQ*'s referee notes that similarity between a participle such as *τελέσαντας* and 1573 *ὥστε λέοντας* might have led to some textual disruption.

¹⁵ *μάτηρ* could be shifted, e.g. by placing it before *λωτοτρόφον* and putting *λόγχαις* where *μάτηρ* now is; but such a displacement would be hard to explain. Mastronarde (on 1570–6) thinks the placement between *ἐννάλιον* and *μαρναμένους* is intended for pathetic effect.

¹⁶ This was Paley's suggestion: 'Either some participle seems wanting... like *ἀποχευομένους* (cf. *Ion* 147), or we should read *ἐπὶ τραύμασί θ' αἵματος... λοιβὰν*, "a chilled (or congealed) outpouring of blood on their wounds". His second suggestion (anticipated by the reading *τραύμασι τ'* in ms. O) gives an unhappy zeugma: 'She found her sons fighting... and a chilled outpouring of blood on their wounds.' The Scholia also attempt to make the *λοιβὰν*-phrase a second object to *ἡῦρε*, but asynchronously: *κοινὸν τὸ εὔρε· ὁ δὲ λόγος ἀσύνδετος· ἐπὶ τοῖς τραύμασιν εὔρε ψυχρὰν σπονδὴν αἵματος...* Musgrave proposed *τραύμασι δ'*.

¹⁷ For suggestions to insert a connective (though to different effect) see previous note.

¹⁸ Cf. 933 where Menoeceus must 'give gory blood as a libation to the ground', *φόνιον αἶμα γῆι δοῦναι χοάς*. For *δοῦναι* of offering libations (*χοαί*) cf. also *I.T.* 61, *Or.* 125, *Soph. Ant.* 902.

ANTIIPHANES FR. 46 K-A AND THE PROBLEM OF SPARTAN MOUSTACHES

ἐν Λακεδαίμονι
γέγονας· ἐκείνων τῶν νόμων μεθεκτέον
ἐστίν. βάδιζ' ἐπὶ δείπνον εἰς τὰ φιδίτια,
ἀπόλαυε τοῦ ζωμοῦ, † φόρει τοὺς βύστακας.
μὴ καταφρόνει, μηδ' ἕτερ' ἐπιζήτει καλά,
ἐν τοῖς δ' ἐκείνων ἔθεσιν ἴσθ' ἀρχαϊκός

5

Lines 4–5 of Antiphanes fr. 46 K-A, an Athenian view of the stereotypical Spartan life, present several difficult, interrelated problems. The text as printed by Kassel–Austin is grammatically intelligible, although problematic, since *καταφρονέω* is used absolutely elsewhere in old or middle comedy only at *Amph.* fr. 1, where the