

NOTES ON GREEK TRAGEDY, I

Aeschylus: Sophocles, *Trachiniae*.¹

A. *Suppl.* 524–8

ἄναξ ἀνάκτων, μακάρων
μακάρτατε καὶ τελέων
τελειότατον κράτος, ὄλβιε Ζεῦ,
πείθου τε καὶ γενέσθω·
ἄλευσον ἀνδρῶν ὕβριν εὔ στυγῆσας.

527 πείθου] πιθοῦ Stanley γενέσθω] γένει σφ̄ Schütz.

PELASGUS goes off to summon his people, bidding the chorus pray for their desires to be fulfilled. They appeal to Zeus to ward off the lust of men, and in the antistrophe claim his support as the ancestor of Epaphus. M's γενέσθω in 527 must mean *fiat*, an impossible sense with no closer analogue than LXX γένοιτο γένοιτο. Schütz' γένει σφ̄, adopted by most modern editors, gives good sense with little change, but removes the sense-pause at period-end (here marked by hiatus and the sequence ◡ -- | ◡ --). Period-end without pause is sufficiently infrequent in Aeschylus (about 10%) to deter us from introducing it by emendation, and especially infrequent when marked by hiatus (about 6%).² Moreover, πείθου or πιθοῦ is not a word used by mortals to gods in prayer (though Pindar so addresses his Muse, *P.* 1, 59).

A clue is given by Pelasgus' final words (523–4):

ἐγὼ δὲ ταῦτα πορουνῶν ἐλεύσομαι·
πειθὼ δ' ἔποιτο καὶ τύχα πρακτῆριος.

It is not unusual for a chorus to take their cue from the last words of the preceding dialogue, sometimes a prayer which they elaborate, e.g. *S. O.T.* 149–50:

Φοῖβος δ' ὄ πέμψας τάσσε μαντείας ἄμα
σωτήρ θ' ἔκοιτο καὶ νόσου πανστήριος,

followed by a κλητικὸς ὕμνος appealing to Apollo and other gods for help against the plague. Sometimes the actual words are repeated, e.g. *A. Cho.* 781–5:

Τρ. ἀλλ' εἶμι καὶ σοῖς ταῦτα πείσομαι λόγοις.
γένειτο δ' ὡς ἄριστα σὺν θεῶν δόσει.
Χο. νῦν παραιτουμένα μοι, πάτερ
Ζεὺς θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων
δὸς τύχας τυχεῖν . . .

Pers. 621–4

Βα. γαπότους δ' ἐγὼ
τιμὰς προπέμψω τάσδε νερτέροις θεοῖς.
Χο. βασιλεία γύναι, πρέσβος Πέρσαις,
σύ τε πέμπε χροάς . . .

S. Phil. 825–7

Νε. ἀλλ' ἐάσωμεν, φίλοι,
ἔκηλον αὐτὸν, ὡς ἂν εἰς ὕπνον πέσῃ.
Χο. Ὕπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαῆς . . .

and in particular *A. Suppl.* 417–8

Βα. μῶν οὐ δοκεῖ δεῖν φροντίδος σωτηρίου;
Χο. φρόντισον . . .

with 437–8

Χο. τάδε φράσαι . . . Βα. καὶ δὴ πέφρασμαί.

Comparable, though rather different, is *P.V.* 127–8:

Πρ. πᾶν μοι φοβερόν τὸ πρόσερπον.
Χο. μηδὲν φοβηθῆς . . .

¹ I am indebted throughout to Professor H. Lloyd-Jones, and in the *Trachiniae* passages to Mrs P. E. Easterling and Mr M. D. Reeve, for valuable advice and criticism. Part II of this article

will appear in the 1977 *Journal*.

² See 'Pause and Period in the lyrics of Greek tragedy,' *C.Q.* 27, 1977.

So here *πειθῶ* is the key to the situation, and the Danaids might well pray for her success. Schütz (in his note) suggested *πειθῶ τύχα θ' ἐπέσθω*, exactly echoing 524 (*cf. Men. Sam. 737 εὐμενῆς ἔποιτο Νίκη, κτλ*). The same result is given with less change by *πειθοῖ τύχα γενέσθω*, 'may Success attend Persuasion'. For the phrase, *cf. Theogn. 130 μῦνον δ' ἀνδρὶ γένοιτο τύχα*.

Suppl. 762

ὡς καὶ ματαίων ἀνοσίων τε κνωδάλων
ἔχοντες† ὄργας χρῆ φυλάσσεσθαι κράτος.

καὶ ματαίων] αἵματηρῶν Page ἔχοντες] -τας Turnebus, -τος Bothe.

There are three difficulties: (1) *καὶ*, (2) *ἔχοντες*, (3) *κράτος*. The chorus have been expressing their horror of the approaching Aegyptioi, while Danaus reassures them. They have no respect for altars or gods, they are lutsful, impious, and have the boldness of dogs (*κνωθρασεῖς*). Danaus counters: 'But it is said wolves are superior to dogs; papyrus does not beat corn'. The wolf is a symbol of cunning (e.g. *P. P. 2, 84*); Greeks are more than a match for Egyptians (as Helen and Menelaus were for Theoclymenus, Iphigenia and Orestes for the barbarian Thoas). Then the sense required is: 'They are also wild beasts, who must be warded off by force'. This will accommodate *καὶ* = 'also', 'even'. *ματαίων* = 'unruly', and in a sexual context, as here, 'lewd', *cf. S. Trach. 565 ψαύει ματαίαις χερσίν, E. El. 1064, μάται in A. Cho. 918* (of Agamemnon's infidelity); so also in *Suppl. 229* (*οὐ μὴ*) *φύγη ματαίων αἰτίας*, 820 *μάταισι πολυθρόοις*, which strongly supports *ματαίων* here. With *ἔχοντας, κράτος* was taken by Weil and Murray to mean 'by force', *cl. the adverbial τάχος*; but the analogy is scarcely adequate. With *ἔχοντος* (Bothe, read by Page, Friis Johansen), the sense is: 'we must ward off their might as of one with the spirit of wild beasts'. This gives a construction to *κράτος*, but the reply lacks point; and the singular, though possible, is surprising, since the sons of Aegyptus have been referred to throughout this exchange in the plural (*ἔχόντων* has also been conjectured). To give the required sense *κράτει* is needed (with *ἔχοντας*):

ὡς καὶ ματαίων ἀνοσίων τε κνωδάλων
ἔχοντας ὄργας χρῆ φυλάσσεσθαι κράτει,

'we must ward them off by force, as having also the spirit of lewd, wicked beasts'. Danaus suggests cunning as the means to victory, his daughters advise brute strength; so in the contrary sense Themis-Gaia at *P.V. 211-2*:

ὡς οὐ κατ' ἰσχὺν οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ καρτερὸν
χρείη, δόλω δέ, τοὺς ὑπερσχόντας κρατεῖν.

For this sense of *κράτει* the model is *Il. 7.142*:

τὸν Λυκόοργος ἔπεφνε δόλω, οὗ τι κράτει γε.

Eum. 502-7

πέυσεται δ' ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν, προφω-
νῶν τὰ τῶν πέλας κακά,
λήξιν ὑπόδοσίν τε μόχθων,
ἄκεα δ' οὐ μάταια τλά-
μων μάταν παρηγορεῖ.

ὑπόδοσίν M: ὑπόδοσίν G Tr.: ὑπόδησίν F

Page obelises τὰ τῶν, remarking: 'qui aegritudinum levationem quaerit, sua non propinquorum mala promulgat: ἀ (Blass, = 'sua'), τοῖς (Dawe) expectasses'. This is a fair point, if *πέυσεται* means 'one will learn from another the (means to the) cessation and lessening of his own sufferings'. But what the words most naturally mean is 'one man will learn from another about the cessation of sufferings'. This does not make very good sense; why should there be a cessation of sufferings when the Furies are on the war-path?³ Lloyd-Jones renders: 'one shall ask of another . . . as he proclaims his neighbour's ills, when shall tribulation subside and cease', which does not imply that the cessation is actually taking place.⁴ But *πυνθάνομαι* seems not to be used in this way (with accusative) of 'enquiry about'

³ Wilamowitz (ed.) took *μόχθων* to be the Furies' exertions. This is in itself unlikely and does not help

with the main difficulty.

⁴ So also Mazon, Weir-Smyth.

a state of affairs which does not obtain. It is true that abstract verbal nouns are favoured by choral lyric where other writers would use clauses,⁵ and it would be rash to claim that Aeschylus could not have written *πυιθάνεσθαι λήξιν μόχθων* for *πυιθάνεσθαι εἰ λήγρουσι μόχθοι*. But it is certainly stretching the normal usage of *πυιθάνομαι*.

The model is surely that of a plague or epidemic. Each man seeks rumours of the progress of the disease, while he spreads rumours of what he has heard. *ὑπόδοσιν* does not otherwise occur, nor does *ὑποδιδόναι* in classical Greek; it is found first in Aristotle meaning 'give way', the nearest sense to that required being 'decay', of power, in later writers (Aristides, Philostratus). Again, it would be rash to deny that Aeschylus could have coined the word *ὑπόδοσις* = 'abatement'; but a simple change gives normal Greek. Read *ἐπίδοσιν*, 'increase', a technical medical term, such as Aeschylus tends to favour in his later plays.⁶ *λήξιν ἐπίδοσιν τε*, 'abatement and increase', is then a polar expression for 'progress' (in the neutral sense), of the type *τὸ θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν* = 'temperature', *τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον* = 'degree':⁷ 'one man will learn from another, as he proclaims his neighbour's ills, the progress of the troubles, and, poor wretch, consoles with unreliable remedies'. He proclaims his neighbour's ills,⁸ since the plague-stricken are not in a position to proclaim their own; he is *τλάμων*, because these ills are soon to be his, and he will be as little able to help himself with his feeble remedies as he can now help others.⁹

P.V. 901-5

ἐμοὶ δ' ὅτε μὲν ὄμαλος ὁ γάμος,
ἄφοβος, οὐ δέδια,
μηδὲ κρεισσόνων θεῶν
ἔρωσ ἄφυκτον ὄμμα προσδράκοι με.
ἀπόλεμος ὅδε γ' ὁ πόλεμος, ἄπορα πόριμος, οὐδ'
ἔχω τίς ἄν γενοίμαν.

ὅτε Arnaldus] ὅτι οὐ δέδια μηδὲ] ὄν δὲ δέδια, μὴ Headlam: ἔφν, δέδια δὲ μὴ Page θεῶν del. Musgrave, ἔρωσ del. Schütz: ἔρω μ' . . . προσδράκοι Page

Apart from *ὅτι*, which Arnaldus corrected, fault is found with the paradosis in 901-2 as follows: (1) tautology and (2) asyndeton of *ἄφοβος, οὐ δέδια*; (3) *μηδὲ* adversative after a negative (*GP* 193). We may add (4) the successive syncopated bicipitia *ὄμαλος ὁ γάμος, ἄφοβος, οὐ* υ υ υ υ | υ υ -, normal in dochmiac or cretic-paeonic metres but avoided in iambics.¹⁰ In 902-3, (a) any intelligible colometry in 902 seems to give too many syllables in 903; (b) the internal accusative *ὄμμα* is surprising: the syntax in itself is acceptable, but *ὄμμα*, unlike the similar formations *βλέμμα, δέγγραμμα*, is not used to mean 'glance', the verbal action.¹¹

Tautology in asyndetic pairs is not in itself remarkable in Aeschylus, though this unsym-

⁵ Cf. F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, 1921; 86.

⁶ W. B. Stanford, *Aeschylus in his Style*, 1942, 55.

⁷ This use of polar opposites to denote the range of possibilities in between is akin to the type in *S. Ant.* 1109 ἴτ' ἴτ', ὀπάονες, οἱ τ' ὄντες οἱ τ' ἀπόντες, i.e. 'everyone', examined by Wilamowitz on *H.F.* 1106.

⁸ For *τὰ τῶν πέλας κακά* as opposed to *τὰ οἰκεῖα κακά*, others' troubles as opposed to one's own, cf. Hdt. 7.152, 2 *ἐπίσταμαι δὲ τοσοῦτον ὅτι εἰ πάντες ἄνθρωποι τὰ οἰκία κακά ἐς μέσον συνενεῖκαιεν ἀλλάξασθαι βουλόμενοι τοῖσι πλησίοσι, ἐγκύβαντες ἄν ἐς τὰ τῶν πέλας κακά ἀσπασίως ἕκαστοι αὐτῶν ἀποφεροῖατο ὀπίσω τὰ εἰσηρέικαντο*; E. fr. 322 N².

⁹ F. Wieseler, *Coniectanea in Aeschyli Eumenides*, 1839, 108, also read *ἐπίδοσιν*, which he thought was implied by the scholion *ἀεὶ τὰ ἀλλήλων ἀκούσονται καὶ οὐ γίνεται κακῶν ἀνάπανσις*, and would account for the alternative explanation *διαδοχήν*. He renders 'accessio, incrementum', derives *λήξιν* from *λαγχάνω*, and paraphrases: 'audient . . . initium et successionem laborum'. I find this very hard.

Hermann read *ὑποδύσιν, effugium*. But if this goes with *πέυσεται* (as in his text), the sense 'will ask about' is again required; if with *παρηγορῶν* (as he suggests in his note: *finem effugiumque laborum . . . frustra pro solatio adhibens*), the sense *effugium* does not quite fit.

¹⁰ A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*², 1968, 73 (= *LMGD*).

¹¹ Such usages as *κατ' ὄμμα, ἐν ὄμμασιν* are irrelevant, as can be seen from e.g. *Pers.* 81 *κνάνεον δ' ὄμμασι λεύσσων φονίου δέγγραμμα δράκοντος*, E. *Or.* 1020-1 *ὣς σ' ἰδοῦσ' ἐν ὄμμασιν | πανσπάτην πρόσσωπιν*. In *Pho.* 293 *γονυπετεῖς ἔδρας προσπίτνω σ', ἀναξ*, cited with our passage in K.-G. i 321, *προσπίτνω* governs *ἔδρας* in the first place, cf. *Hel.* 947. E. Forberg (*Abhandlung über πόδα βαινειν und ähnliche Strukturen im Griechischen*, Coburg, 1850, 9) explained *ὄμμα* here on the analogy of *πόδα βαινειν* and other expressions with *πόδα*, which has no verbal force either; but this peculiar idiom with *πόδα* is quite common, and its extension unwarranted.

metrical pair is surprising. However, neither looks like a gloss: ἄφοβος is clearly not a glossator's word, and δέδια is not a standard gloss, though it occurs (*Σ Pers.* 702); we should expect οὐ φοβοῦμαι if anything.¹² Adversative μηδὲ after the negative is more serious. A comparable example occurs at *S. El.* 131–3,

οἰδὰ τε καὶ ξυνίημι τὰδ', οὐ τί με
φυγγάνει, οὐδ' ἐθέλω προλιπεῖν τάδε,

where οὐδὲ must be adversative. The sequence is similar to *P.V.* 901–2, in that οὐδὲ can be regarded as contrasting with a preceding positive statement (οἰδα) rather than its negative restatement (οὐ τί με φυγγάνει), which is not quite so difficult¹³. But οὐδὲ there means 'and yet', 'and still', cf. *E. Bacch.* 758 πῦρ ἔφερον, οὐδ' ἔκαιεν. Adversative οὐδὲ answering μὲν is not found outside Homer, and μηδὲ, an adversative prohibition after a μὲν clause, would be harder still.

The metrical problem, which most remedies ignore, is equally intractable. Biceps before syncopation in iambs can be ruled out.¹⁴ ἄφοβος οὐ δέδια cannot plausibly be taken as dochmiac; isolated dochmiacs do occur (e.g. *S. Phil.* 1113), but very rarely. Nor is δ + ^{uu} cr [—], δ any more likely.¹⁵ In any case, we should not expect to find dochmiacs in the epode to a strophe in d.-e. ἐμοὶ δ' ὅτε cannot be a resolved bacchius; this only occurs when bacchiac metre is strongly indicated, e.g. *Trach.* 218, *E. Tro.* 564 (*LMGD* 74).

If μηδὲ is impossible, the adversative must belong to δέδια, and οὐ is also wrong. Of the remedies suggested, Hermann's ἄφοβος, ἀλλὰ δέδια, μὴ (with subj.) gives good sense, but does nothing to explain the corruption; Headlam's ὃν δὲ δέδια, μὴ (with opt.) is neat, but the inverted relative, with ἔρωσ as antecedent, is rather artificial. Neither of these in itself deals with the metrical problem. Page's ἄφοβος ἔφν, δέδια δὲ μὴ (with opt.; subj. seems desirable) alone¹⁶ solves all the difficulties. We might also go back to the corrupt ὅτι and write ἐμοὶ δ' ὅπου¹⁷ (misread as ὅτιου, then οὐ displaced, causing trouble in the next line), followed by e.g. ἄφοβος ὅδε, δέδια δὲ μὴ. There are then various possibilities; but Page's solution is the most elegant so far proposed.

There is now, however, a problem in 902–3. If προσδράκοι με is written *plena scriptura*, there are two extra syllables. We can dispense (1) with ἔρωσ, which has the apparent advantage of eliminating the internal accusative ὄμμα; but this difficulty is not a real one, as ἄφυκτον ὄμμα can stand in apposition to ἔρωσ; or (2) with θεῶν, cf. *P. O.* 10, 39–40 νεῖκος δὲ κρεσσόνων ἀποθέσθ' ἄπορον, *N.* 10, 72 χαλεπά δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώποις ὀμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων, both in a strikingly similar context (ἀπόλεμος ὄδ' γ' ὁ πόλεμος). Or we can remove the syllable at the end, by moving με (μὴ με Platnauer; ἔρω μ' Page) or by simply eliding προσδράκοι μ'; the unhandy period of 9 metra¹⁸ could perhaps be divided at ἔρωσ | ἄφυκτον, with sense-pause (on my interpretation) given by the apposition.¹⁹ On balance I prefer to excise θεῶν, which impairs the universality of the chorus' fears;²⁰ but again there are various possibilities.

S. *Trach.* 86–93

Γλ. ἀλλ' εἴμι, μῆτερ· εἰ δὲ θεσφάτων ἐγὼ
βάξιν κατήδη τῶνδε, κἂν πάλαι παρῆ.

¹² The omission of δέδια, not οὐ δέδια, in H does not seem significant; see R. D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*, 1964, 139.

¹³ J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*², 1954, 191 (= GP).

¹⁴ Possible instances can be scanned in other ways, e.g. *Cho.* 152–3 ἴετε δάκρυ καταχές ὀλόμενον ὀλομένω δεσπότη, giving $\cup\cup$ | $\cup\cup$ if ι is long in ἴετε; but it is probably short, so that the rhythm is trochaic (so Wilamowitz, Schroeder, Kraus); *E. Bacch.* 578 τίς ὅδε, τίς πόθεν ὁ κέλαδος | ἀνὰ μ' ἐκάλεσεν εὐίου, possibly $\cup\cup\cup$ – $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ | $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ – \cup –, but better interpreted as $\cup\cup\cup$ – $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ | $\cup\cup$, trochees (so Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, 1921, 580 [= GV]).

¹⁵ *E. Bacch.* 1170 is best taken as 2 ia.; so Dodds, Schroeder.

¹⁶ οὐ φόβος (Dawe) still leaves biceps followed by syncopated long.

¹⁷ Hermann suggested ἐμοὶ δὲ γ' ὅτε, a most unlikely combination of particles, cf. *GP* 155.

¹⁸ 8 metra is the longest period found in Pindar (*P. Mass, Greek Metre* [tr. Lloyd-Jones], 1962, para. 65 [= *GM*]), which gives a reasonable guide for tragedy.

¹⁹ See *C.Q.* 27, 1977.

²⁰ Cf. the opening stanza, and Pindar *Il.cc.*; though the opposition mortals/gods is certainly meant here, despite the Oceanids' status, as it is in *N.* 10, 72. Wilamowitz is right to insist (in his edition) that they are thought of as girls not goddesses, but wrong to infer that θεῶν need signify irrelevant gradations of divine rank.

*νῦν δ' ὁ ξυνήθης πότμος οὐκ ἔα πατρὸς
 ἡμᾶς προταρβεῖν οὐδὲ δειμαίνειν ἄγαν.
 νῦν δ' ὡς ξυνήμ', οὐδὲν ἑλλείψω τὸ μὴ
 πᾶσαν πυθέσθαι τῶνδ' ἀλήθειαν πέρι.
 Δη. χώρει νυν, ὦ παῖ· καὶ γὰρ ὑστέρω, τὸ γ' εὖ
 πράσσειν ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο, κέρδος ἐμπολᾷ.*

88–9 secl. Hermann: post 91 traiecit Brunck, *νῦν δ'* in *ἀλλ'* mutato *νῦν*: *πρὶν* Wakefield *ἔα*: *εἶα* Vauvilliers.

The paradosis, though accepted by Longo,²¹ cannot stand. *νῦν δὲ . . . οὐκ ἔα* cannot mean 'but as it was (before I knew these facts) . . .'; it must mean 'but as it is (in the present circumstances), his characteristic fortune does not allow us to fear for him', which makes no sense in the context. We must therefore transpose, excise or emend 88–9.

(1) Transposition fails, because (a) Hyllus then ends on a note of consolation, which is out of key at the end of this scene of mounting anxiety; (b) if 88–9 follows 90–1, with *νῦν δ'* changed to *ἀλλ'* (Brunck), Deianeira's reply *χώρει νυν, ὦ παῖ* no longer picks up his last words. (2) 88–9 should not be excised, since the phrase *ὁ ξυνήθης πότμος* is not only striking in itself but thematically important. It recurs in the parodos as part of the chorus' consolation: despite Heracles' sea of troubles, some god always keeps him afloat (112–21). This objection does not indeed go home against Hermann and Kamerbeek, who think that 88–9 and 90–1 are examples of the author-variants they see elsewhere in this play: Sophocles first made Hyllus end with 88–9, then substituted 90–1. But apart from the general implausibility of this view Sophocles is unlikely to have made Hyllus end with 89, since although *χώρει νυν, ὦ παῖ* might then perhaps look back to *ἀλλ' εἰμι, μῆτερ* in 81, he will again end on the wrong note, with a consolation. (3) Vauvillier's *εἶα* is easy and necessary (I do not know why Longo should think the imperfect weak and pedestrian): *νῦν δ'* . . . *οὐκ εἶα* then does mean 'as it was' (before I knew these facts). But can *νῦν δὲ* 'but now' (in the present situation) follow immediately afterwards?

It is not enough to distinguish between the dialectical and temporal uses of *νῦν δὲ* (Jebb, Radermacher, Longo), or to point to other repetitions of *νῦν δὲ* or *καὶ νῦν*. The closest parallel, cited by Jebb, is *El.* 1334–5, where the Paedagogos says: 'If I had not been keeping guard, your plans would have been known in the palace before you entered it yourselves; but as it was (*νῦν δὲ*) I took precautions. And now (*καὶ νῦν*) . . . go inside'. The essential difference here is that *νῦν δὲ*, though doubtless dialectical, refers to the same actual, present situation as *καὶ νῦν*; whereas in our passage the second *νῦν δὲ* refers to the situation which actually obtains, the first to a situation which no longer obtains, a sequence impossibly hard to understand if the same phrase is used to introduce both. Other examples quoted by Longo are of equally little use. The first *νῦν δὲ* must therefore be emended. Wakefield considered *ἀλλὰ*, but rightly preferred *πρὶν δὲ*: it is more precise, and accounts better for the corruption. Wakefield himself wrote *πρὶν δ'* . . . *οὐκ ἔα*, which is not good enough; the combination of the two conjectures to give

*πρὶν δ' ὁ ξυνήθης πότμος οὐκ εἶα πατρὸς
 ἡμᾶς προταρβεῖν οὐδὲ δειμαίνειν ἄγαν*

is due to Campbell, who never emended without good reason.

Trach. 97–9

*τοῦτο καρῶξαι τὸν Ἀλκμή-
 νας, πόθι μοι πόθι μοι παῖς
 ναίει ποτ' . . .*

= 106–8

*οὔποτ' εὐνάζειν ἀδακρύ-
 τῶν βλεφάρων πόθον, ἀλλὰ
 εὔμναστον . . .*

πόθι μοι παῖς] *πόθι παῖς* Tricl.: *πόθι μοι Wunder.*

²¹ O. Longo, *Commento linguistico alle Trachinie di Sofocle*, 1968.

I summarise briefly the reasons why ἀλλὰ should not be written *plena scriptura* as in Pearson's text.

(1) Brevis in longo or hiatus, or both together, normally²² indicate period-end in lyric verse. Periods so determined, being metrical units, are the same for all repetitions of the metrical scheme. Period-end always coincides with word-break, and elision, which implies synaphea, is not permitted.

(2) In the lyrics of tragedy, period-end coincides with pause. 'Pause' in this restricted sense means that the break cannot be preceded by a prepositive (e.g. the article, some conjunctions such as καί, ὡς, etc.) or followed by a postpositive (enclitics, semi-enclitics).²³ Some words not strictly in these categories may be so reckoned for this purpose, as they seem to be treated in the same way, e.g. ἀλλὰ, οὐδέ.²⁴

(3) In Pindar, who is in general less strict than the dramatists about the coincidence of period-end and sense-pause (in the wider use of the term), there are a few exceptions to (2).²⁵ In the lyrics of tragedy there are very few such exceptions, and some of those can be justified or are suspect on other grounds. They are:

A. *Suppl.* 781–2 ἄιστος (or αἰδνός) ὡς | κόνις . . . ὀλοίμαν = 790–1 χριμφθῆναι χροῖ· | πρόπαρ . . . A *prima facie* instance. ὡς and χροῖ are both due to conjecture (αι δοσως, χροῖν M), but seem inevitable. The sense-break at χροῖ makes lengthening ῖ before πρ- most improbable (see Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 760).

S. *O.T.* 1218–20 (ὀ)δύρομαι γὰρ ὡς | περιᾶλλ' ἰακχέων ἐκ στομάτων (δύρομαι Seidler), giving no pause at ὡς to match brevis in longo at 1208, is shown to be correct by the sense. περιᾶλλα is sound (Oedipus' grief is 'preeminent'), but ἰακχέων ἐκ στομάτων is not Greek, and Burges' ἰὰν χέων is necessary; then ὡς is exclamatory and must come first. Read therefore ὡς ὀδύρομαι | περιᾶλλ' ἰὰν χέων ἐκ στομάτων, as proposed by Lloyd-Jones (*JHS* 85, 1965, 168), who points out that Burges' conjecture derives fresh support from the papyrus reading in *Hipp.* 584 (Pap. Oxy. 2224).

Trach. 510–12 Ἄχελῶος ἄπ' Οἰνιαδᾶν, ὁ δὲ Βακχίας ἄπο |
ἦλθε παλίντονα Θήβας
τόξα . . . τινάσσων.

The phrase Ἄχελῶος ἄπ' Οἰνιαδᾶν shows that ἄπο does not go closely with ἦλθε. Heracles has not just come from Thebes, any more than Achelous has come from Oeniadae; it is his home town, regularly mentioned in the announcement of contestants by the herald, cf. *S. El.* 693–4. The break between ἄπο and Θήβας is made easier by the preceding epithet.²⁶ So too in *Phil.* 184–5 στικτῶν ἢ λασίων μετὰ | θηρῶν, and cf. *Aj.* 425 χθονὸς μολόντ' ἄπο | Ἑλλανίδος (see *ad loc.* in Part II).

O.C. 684–5 ὄ τῃ | χρυσαυγῆς κρόκος. Here lengthening before χρ- is perhaps made possible by the close coherence of the word-group (cf. Barrett, *l.c.*). So too in

E. Or. 839–40 ὄ τῃ | χρυσοεπηγήτων φαρέων (the lengthening is required if the verse ends with a choriambus, as is probable; see *GV* 212).

O.C. 692–3 οὐδ(ἐ) | ἄ χρυσάνιος Ἀφροδίτα (Φ), is the only metrical reading offered by codd. (οὐδ' αὖ χρυσάνιος L, οὐδὲ χρυσάνιος A); but read οὐδ' αὖ | ἄ χρυσάνιος (so Pearson, Dain).²⁷

²² There are a few apparent instances of brevis in longo in mid-verse in Pindar (see Snell³, ii, 173). Hiatus at interjections and in *correptio Attica* are of course irrelevant.

²³ For further definition and illustration of these terms see Maas, *GM* para. 135.

²⁴ There is some inevitable circularity in the argument here. Fraenkel, arguing from the displacement of ἄν from its normal position as second in the sentence in e.g. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄν, has suggested that some conjunctions function as 'Kurzcola' and stand outside the sentence they introduce ('Kolon und Satz, II', *NGG Phil.-Hist.* 1933, 341 n. = *Kl. Beitr.* i 117 n 1, 120 n.5; 'Nachträge zu "Kolon und Satz, II"', *Kl. Beitr.* 135); but this is not meant, in its context, to

imply that there is any kind of sense-pause after such 'Kurzcola'. A less artificial approach, perhaps, is that of A. C. Moorhouse (*Studies in the Greek Negative*, 1959, 85), who says of such combinations as ἀλλὰ μὴ, where μὴ is displaced from its normal position of first in the sentence, that since ἀλλὰ must always come first, μὴ comes as early as possible and can therefore be regarded as having its normal position.

²⁵ Listed in Snell, *l.c.* n. 1, Maas, *l.c.* n. 2.

²⁶ 'A preposition placed between adjective and substantive loses something of its prepositional character', Maas, *l.c.*

²⁷ Not οὐδ' ἄ | χρυσάνιος, with Elmsley's *θεαῖς* for *θεῖαις* in 680, which gives successive ancipitia.

E. *Alc.* 218 θεῶν | γὰρ = 232 ἐν | ἄματι. The sense is sound but the rule infringed in both places, which is scarcely credible; see Dale ad loc.

Andr. 833-4 δῆλα καὶ | ἀμφιφανῆ = 837-8 ἂν ἔρεξ'. | ᾧ (ά). Undoubtedly corrupt, since the elision infringes rule (1). (See ad loc. in Part II).

Suppl. 992 αἰθέρᾱ, | ? = 1015 (τύχα δέ μοι ξυνάπτει ποδός·) ἀλλὰ τᾶς | εὐκλείας. τύχα . . . ποδός is not Greek; read ποδός ἀλλαγᾶς· (cf. Collard's note, and see ad loc. in Part II).

Hec. 469 ἐν | δαιδαλείαισι = 478 δορίκτητος | Ἀργεῖων. A different colometry is possible (see ad loc. in Part II).

Tro. 1305-6 καὶ | χερσί = 1320-1 αἰθέρα | ᾄστον. A *prima facie* instance, but easily mended (see ad loc. in Part II).

Or. 989-90 τεθριπποβάμωνι στόλω Πέλοψ ὅτε | πελάγεσι διεδίφρευσε. The lyric character of the trimeter is marked by lack of caesura, but an ordinary dialogue trimeter follows. In dialogue, enjambement of some conjunctions is not uncommon (cf. Maas, *GM* para. 136), and the same licence may apply here. Otherwise ὅτ' ἐν is an easy change (ὅποτε Tricl.).

Rhes. 461 πῶς μοι | Ἀχιλλεύς = 827 μή μοι | κότον . . . θῆς. As in *Alc.* 218/232, the sense is sound but the rule infringed in both places. Wilamowitz (*GV* 587) reads πῶς μοι τὸ σὸν ἔγχοσ Ἀχιλλεύς, perhaps rightly; 'synaphea in hoc carmine mire neglecta', Murray.

These exceptions are so few as to confirm the rule and make any infringement suspect. ἀλλὰ must therefore be elided, and one syllable must go from the strophe: παῖς or the second μοι. Most editors follow Triclinius in retaining παῖς, as an instance of a rare but idiomatic type of relative attraction,²⁸ to which the closest parallels are: E. *HF* 840 γυνῶ μὲν τὸν Ἥρας οἶός ἐστ' αὐτῶ χόλος, *Phaethon* 62 (Diggle) τοὺς σοὺς ἐλέγξω, μῆτερ, εἰ σαφεῖς λόγοι, *fr.* 1039N ὄρας τὸν εὐτράπεζον ὡς ἡδὺς βίος. In all these the word attracted into the nominative which completes the antecedent comes at the end, so that a normal accusative would give a normal order with no interlacing. Similar, but with the antecedent complete and an attribute attracted, is *Ar. Ran.* 430-1 κάκλαε κάκεκράγει | Σεβῖνον ὅστις ἐστὶν ἀναφλύστιος, while S. *Phil.* 549-50 ἤκουσα τοὺς ναῦτας ὅτι | σοὶ πάντες εἶεν οἱ νευαστοληκότες (συννευαστοληκότες Dobree) comes close to the common οἰδᾶ σε ὅστις εἰ pattern. Interlacing occurs with a related but quite distinct type of hyperbaton, in which the word which completes the antecedent is attracted into the relative clause, but retains its original case despite the immediate grammatical context; e.g. *Rhes.* 848 μολόντων ὧν σὺ πολεμίων λέγεις, *Ion* 1307 τὴν σὴν ὅπου σοι μητέρ' ἐστι νουθέτει. Similar is D.36, 14 τρισχιλίας ἐγκαλέσας ἀργυρίου δραχμᾶς πρὸς αἰς ἔδωκεν ἐκείνη δισχιλίας τοῖς τούτου παιδίοις.

Trach. 97-8 καρῦξαι τὸν Ἀλκμήνης . . . πόθι παῖς ναίει is of the first type, but differs in its interlaced order, which is elsewhere found only in the second. Whether this difference is significant is hard to tell. All the examples are from iambics, and it might be that in lyrics a greater freedom was permitted.²⁹ Certainly the scholion λείπει τὸ παῖδα is not evidence for a text without παῖς, though it shows how easily παῖς could have intruded. It is true that, as Wunder pointed out,³⁰ πόθι μοι πόθι μοι is a type of repetition favoured by Sophocles. But it is also true that pronouns are sometimes wrongly repeated in Sophoclean mss.: e.g. *Phil.* 1178 φίλα μοι φίλα μοι ταῦτα G: φίλα μοι φίλα ταῦτα rell., *Phil.* 832 ἴθι μοι ἴθι μοι Q: ἴθι ἴθι μοι rell., *Phil.* 816 μέθες με μέθες με GRQ: μέθες μέθες με rell.; cf. *O.C.* 1099, *Trach.* 1023 (repeated ᾧ).³¹ So although the abnormal syntax gives some slight ground for rejecting παῖς here, palaeographical probability gives a stronger indication that μοι is the intruder.

Trach. 96-102

Ἄλιον, Ἄλιον αἰτῶ
τοῦτο καρῦξαι τὸν Ἀλκμη-
νας, πόθι μοι πόθι μοι
ναίει ποτ', ᾧ λαμπρᾶ στεροπαῖ φλεγέθων,
ἢ ποντίας ἀλῶνας, ἢ
δισσαῖσιν ἀπείροις κλιθεῖς,
εἰπ', ᾧ κρατιστεύων κατ' ὄμμα.

²⁸ For this and the following type of hyperbaton, see K.-G. ii 579, Anm. 4.

²⁹ I owe this point to Mr R. Mayne.

³⁰ Ad loc. and on *O.T.* 1216 (his 1192).

³¹ I owe these examples to Mrs P. E. Easterling.

Lloyd-Jones has shown³² that the *paradosis* cannot be just a variation of 'is he on sea or land?', since *κλιθείς* cannot mean 'situated', *δισσαῖσιν ἀπείροις* cannot mean 'within the two continents', and *ἀλλῶνας* must mean 'channels'. He sees an allusion to the Pillars of Heracles, on which their architect is leaning (*κλιθείς*), so that the sense is 'is he on the east (the channels of Pontus, i.e. the Bosphorus) or the west?', as the scholiast took it. This bold and attractive interpretation has been widely accepted, and is, as he says, the only sense the Greek as it stands can be made to yield.³³ It may be right. But the picture of a colossal Heracles bestriding the straits of Gibraltar, though far from 'grotesque',³⁴ does not fit the entirely human, if heroic, stature of Heracles in this play,³⁵ and seems to me out of place in an ode of consolation for the anxious wife.

The prototype of the standard³⁶ question 'where is he, on land or sea?', is *Od.* iii 88–90

οὐ γάρ τις δύναται σάφα εἰπέμεν ὅπποθ' ὄλωλεν,
εἴθ' ὅ γ' ἐπ' ἠπείρου δάμη ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν,
εἴτε καὶ ἐν πελάγει μετὰ κύμασιν Ἀμφιτρίτης.

Similarly in *A.R.* 4, 440 ff., of the angry Aeetes searching for Medea:

δεινὰ δὲ παντὶ παράσχεδον ἦπνε λαῶ,
εἰ μὴ οἱ κούρην αὐτάγρετον, ἣ ἀνὰ γαῖαν,
ἣ πλωτῆς εὐρόντες ἔτ' εἰν ἄλός οἴδμασι νῆα,
ἄξουσιν.

She must be found, wherever she is hiding, on land or sea. Hermann compared with this passage a fragment of Sophocles' *Scythians* (549P):

κρημνούς τε καὶ σήραγγας ἡδ' ἐπακτίας
ἀλλῶνας,

and suggested that it refers to the same situation: these are the places where Medea might

³² *C.Q.* 2 4, 1954, 91 ff. Professor Lloyd-Jones does not accept the following criticism of his interpretation, though he endorses the arguments in n. 33.

³³ P. Janni, in a survey of some uses of *κλίνομαι* in Homer and later poetry (*Quaderni Urbinati* 3, 1967, 7–25), claims that *κλιθείς* here can mean 'situated'. He shows that there are various models underlying the uses of *κλίνομαι*, and that the senses 'leaning on', 'resting on', 'lying on' which underlie the relevant examples of *κεκλιμένος* are sometimes so watered down that it means no more than *κείμενος*, situated in or on; e.g. *Od.* 4.608 αἶθ' ἄλι κεκλιῖται (of islands, cf. *Od.* 9.25 εἰν ἄλι κεῖται), *Theogn.* 1216 *κεκλιμένη πεδίω* (of a city), *Il.* 10.472 *χθονὶ κέκλιτο* (of weapons). *Il.* 5.709 *λίμνη κεκλιμένος* and *P. O.* 1, 92 *Ἀλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθείς* 'situated near' (of persons), which come closest to *κλιθείς* here as it is usually understood, are extensions of the 'weak' use, as Jebb saw. (In *Il.* 15.740 *πόντῳ κεκλιμένοι*, of the Greeks fighting on the shore, the military use of *κλίνομαι* 'give way' may be operative, cf. *Il.* 16.68). But Janni does not meet the main difficulty: that the sense 'resting on', 'leaning on' underlying these personal uses cannot, however much it is watered down, apply in *Trach.* 101, because *δισσαῖσιν ἀπείροις* denotes the area *within which* Heracles is to be found, not a particular place near which he is situated; and the analogy of islands αἶθ' ἄλι κεκλιῖται cannot be invoked to justify some such paraphrase as ἐν χέρσῳ κείμενος because Heracles, like Mr King's Regulus, was not a feature of the landscape. The same holds if with marginal change we read *δισσαῖς ἐν ἀπείροις*. Nor does it

help to take ἐν ἀπείροις with *ναίει*, since *κλιθείς* will then have a positive sense 'laid' or 'having reclined', which suits Phaedra (*E. Hipp.* 114) but not Heracles. In other words, the fact that *κεκλιμένος* sometimes means *κείμενος* is irrelevant to *Trach.* 101, because *κείμαι* is not normally used of persons except in special circumstances, e.g. if they are ill or dead. Lloyd-Jones's interpretation alone gives *κλιθείς* its proper force. Otherwise we must assume that Sophocles has completely misunderstood and misapplied the Homeric usage.

³⁴ A. Y. Campbell, *PCPS* 183, 1954–5, 12.

³⁵ So the exchange with Atlas is not mentioned as a feat of strength (its inclusion at *E. H.F.* 403–7 does not clash with Heracles' human stature in that play, because the ode is a set-piece encomium, with the canonical labours). The Gigantomachy is mentioned (1059), but then giants were often thought of simply as rather large warriors, as the vases show (cf. F. Vian, *La guerre des géants*, 1952, 16, 51–6; West on *Hes. Th.* 50); monsters like Enceladus were dealt with by gods. Heracles is not to be thought of as a god in the *Trachiniae*, least of all in this ode, where his safety depends on divine help.

³⁶ I do not mean that the question 'is he in the east or west?' is impossible, particularly after the reference to the sun's rising and setting at the beginning of the stanza, but merely that 'where is he, on land or sea?' is typical in such a context. With Heracles, there is a special point, as his labours involve both; cf. e.g. *Trach.* 1012, *E. H.F.* 225 f., *P. I.* 4.40.

be hiding. *αὐλῶνας* here means ‘creeks’, ‘inlets’. Now in Euripides’ *Peirithous* (GLP i, p. 124, 30–1)³⁷ Heracles says of the labour of Cerberus:

τοῖονδ’ ἰχνεύων πρᾶγος Εὐρώπης κύκλω
Ἀσίας τε πάσης ἐς μυχοὺς ἐλήλυθα.

Page translates ἐς μυχοὺς ‘to the farthest ends’ of Europe and all Asia.³⁸ The passage touches *Trach.* 100–1 at several points: the context of the labours; the all-embracing two continents; and *μυχοὶ* corresponding with *αὐλῶνες*. *κλιθεῖς* still defies translation.³⁹ But putting these passages together, we can see what it has displaced:

δισσαῖς ἐν ἀπείροις κρυφείς.

Heracles, in some corner of earth or sea, is hidden from the eyes of men, but not from the Sun, *κρατιστεύων κατ’ ὄμμα*. *κλιθεῖς* for *κρυφείς* is an easy phonetic error.

Trach. 116–21

οὕτω δὲ τὸν Καδμογενῆ
τρέφει, τὸ δ’ αὔξει βιότου
πολύπονον ὡσπερ πέλαγος
Κρήσιον. ἀλλὰ τις θεῶν
αἰὲν ἀναμπλάκητον Ἄι-
δα σφε δόμων ἐρύκει.

τρέφει] *στρέφει* Reiske

βιότου . . . *Κρήσιον* must be taken together, ‘as it were a Cretan sea of life’s troubles’; *βιότου* *πολύπονον* cannot of itself be substantival,⁴⁰ and the article cannot be taken in hyperbaton with *πολύπονον*. Then on the face of it τὸν Καδμογενῆ is the object, πέλαγος the subject of both verbs. What then is the construction of τὸ δέ, and what is the meaning of the verbs?

Since κύματα have been central in the preceding simile, it might appear that κύμα can be understood with τὸ δέ, sc. τὸ μὲν (κύμα) before τρέφει, with a common ellipse (e.g. E. *H.F.* 636 ἔχουσιν, οἱ δ’ οὐ; see *GP* 166). But such an ellipse of τὸ μὲν is only possible when there is a strong contrast between the verbs. It might be said that there is one here: τρέφει = ‘encompass’ (Campbell), i.e. to his detriment, cf. E. *Hipp.* 367 ὦ πόνοι τρέφοντες βροτούς, *fr.* 591N βόσκει δὲ τοὺς μὲν μοῖρα δυσμερίας, τοὺς δ’ ὄλβος ἡμῶν; αὔξει = ‘exalt’. But since τρέφειν and αὔζειν, though not strictly synonyms, are often found complementing each other (e.g. Plat. *Rep.* 565c, *Tim.* 82d), this contrast would hardly be intelligible. Others have taken τὸ δέ adverbially, ‘encompasses, while it exalts’ (Campbell), cf. e.g. Thuc. 1.107, 7.48. But again contrast is needed between the verbs. Moreover the following ἀλλά, ‘but some god always keeps him from stumbling’, implies that the previous sentence has been negative in content, so that τὸ δ’ αὔξει must be parenthetical, ‘while it exalts him’; but the adversative still follows rather awkwardly, and in any case it is Heracles’ safety, not his glory, that now interests Deianeira. These difficulties also make against Macro’s ingenious interpretation (see n. 40). τρέφει, he rightly insists, means ‘feeds’. The sense then is: trouble is Heracles’ daily bread, though it increases his stature; yet some god always saves him from death. This gives excellent sense to τρέφει. But τρέφει and αὔξει are too close in meaning to give

³⁷ *Greek Literary Papyri*, i, ed. D. L. Page (Loeb), 1942 = *Select Literary Papyri*, iii, 1950 = *Pap. Oxy.* 2078.

³⁸ Rightly, I think, though the sense is not certainly attested elsewhere. The meaning of E. *Cycl.* 291 γῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδος μυχοῖς is unclear. R. A. S. Seaford suggests (*C.Q.* 25, 1975, 204) that the *μυχοὶ* which Heracles visited are caves: he is looking for a way down to Hell. In E. *H.F.* 400 f., *ποντίας θ’ ἄλός μυχοὺς εἰσέβαινε, θνατοῖς γαλήνειαν τιθεῖς ἔρετμοῖς, μυχοὺς* could mean ‘depths’ (Wilamowitz, Parmentier), but might again mean ‘farthest recesses’, cf. *P. N.* 3, 23–5.

³⁹ In *Theognis* 855–6, 945–6 κλίνομαι is used metaphorically of a ship off course (= ‘deviate’), which might suggest ‘having turned aside’ for *κλιθεῖς* here, cf. ἀποκλίνω (intr.) at Xen. *Anab.* 11.2, 16, *Theocr.* 1.130. But the simple verb could hardly mean this without some more precise complement, as at *O.C.* 193 μηκέτι τοῦδε . . . βήματος ἔξω πόδα κλίνης.

⁴⁰ Anthony Macro, in a note on the passage (*AJP* 94, 1973, 1–3) cites examples of genitives with neuter plural adjectives used substantively without the article, e.g. *Ant.* 1209–10, but I doubt if these are enough to establish the singular use.

the required contrast for τὸ δέ: if αὔξει is positive in sense, so too must τρέφει be positive, and this makes the following ἀλλὰ even harder to understand.⁴¹

Masaracchia⁴² adduced several passages of Homer in which ἀέξειν and cognates of τρέφειν were used of waves 'built up' by wind or sea (*Il.* 11.307 τρόφι κῦμα; *Il.* 15.625 κῦμα ἀνεμοτρεφές; 15.618, *Od.* 3.290 κύματά τε τροφόντα; 10.93 ἀέξετο κῦμα), and suggested that Sophocles, relying on these passages, is here comparing Heracles to a wave. I find his conclusion far-fetched, and the lack of contrast is still a difficulty; but the line of argument is attractive. We might also compare *A. Sept.* 758–60:

κακῶν δ' ὥσπερ θάλασσα κῦμ' ἄγει,
τὸ μὲν πίτνον, ἄλλο δ' αἶρει,
τρίχαλον, ὃ καὶ περὶ πρύμναν πόλεως καχλάζει.

κῦμα could perhaps be introduced as the object of τρέφει, αὔξει by reading οὔτω δὲ τῷ Καδμογενεῖ (*sc.* τὸ μὲν κῦμα) τρέφει, etc. But again lack of contrast precludes the ellipse. There seems to be no solution along these lines.

Reiske's στρέφει 'whirls back', 'twists aside' has been widely adopted. This does give a contrast (Jebb introduced the same contrast by conjecture at *O.C.* 1454–5), though τὸ δ' αὔξει must still be a parenthetical reference to the glory of Heracles' exploits. But the sense required for στρέφει is not easy. In *E. fr.* 540N φεῦ, τὰ τῶν εὐδαιμονούντων ὡς τάχα στρέφει θεός, it means 'upset', 'overturn', which is not wholly appropriate here, though Hartung so understood it. Something like πάλιν στρέφει is really needed to give the sense required.

Is αὔξει rather than τρέφει the corrupt word? Kamerbeek suggested the noun αὔξη (or αὔξει), but this is a prosaic word, and can hardly be understood to mean 'with the effect of increasing him'; nor is ἀλλὰ then intelligible. The clue is perhaps given by the use of αὔξειν as a gloss on τρέφειν at *Σ* 28, *Σ E. Hec.* 232; αὔξει may be a gloss here which has replaced some other word. In such cases there is not much hope of retrieving the original, since it need not be graphically similar to what has displaced it. Something like τρέφει τὸδ' αἰεὶ βίотου πολύπονον . . . πέλαιος would make adequate sense and give ἀλλὰ its full force: 'as for Heracles, this perpetual sea of troubles is his daily bread; yet some god always keeps him alive'.⁴³ But this is merely a possibility, and the passage must be left as a crux.

Trach. 122–3

ὄν ἐπιμεμφομένης ἀ-
δεῖα μὲν, ἀντία δ' οἶσω.

There are three difficulties. (1) The μὲν-clause is elliptical; (2) ἦδὺς cannot apparently have its normal sense; (3) there is no real contrast such as μὲν . . . δὲ should indicate. Jebb comments: 'The difficulty of ἀδεῖα is not the construction, which, if harsh, is quite possible; "I will counsel in a pleasant vein" (the adj. used adverbially), "though the counsel is

⁴¹ Macro (*l.c.*) anticipates these objections (a) by distinguishing between the senses of τρέφειν and αὔξειν: 'Aristotle defines the function of τροφή as the maintenance of the "being" of a living creature, whereas the increasing of the bulk of whatever has "being" is the function of τὸ ἀξητικόν (growth-promotion)'. But τρέφειν and αὔξειν are in general complementary rather than contrasted; they are both aspects of *alere*. Certainly *h. Cer.* 233–5 ἀγλαὸν νιδὸν . . . ἔτρεφεν ἐν μεγάροις: ὃ δ' ἀέξετο δαίμονι ἴσος, which he quotes, does not support his contention. (b) He follows H. Schütz (*Sophokleische Studien*, 1890, 400 f.) in explaining ἀλλὰ by the negative idea implicit in the metaphor: 'the higher the surge raises him, the greater the depth of the abyss on the other side; the more labours he performs with success, the further would he fall—if he were to fall. Yet, so far, one of the gods has kept him from falling into the abyss of death'. But for ἀλλὰ to have its proper adversative force, the negative implication would have to be explicit.

⁴² *Stud. Urb.* 39, 1965, 125 ff.

⁴³ Mrs Easterling writes: 'I take the logic of the stanza to be: just as the waves of the sea "pass by" and "come on", to use Jebb's translation, *sc.* just like the regular up-and-down movement of the sea (as in *A. Sept.* 758–60), so Heracles' fortunes are now up, now down—his *πόννοι* follow a similar up-and-down pattern—but up to now he has been under divine protection. Something like "this perpetual sea of troubles is his daily bread" would remove the comparability (or so it seems to me) of βάντ' ἐπιόντα τ', a rhythmic pattern which is important in the whole *Parados*.' But βάντ' ἐπιόντα τε surely refers not to the 'regular up-and-down movement of the sea', and so to the rising and falling fortunes of the swimmer, but to the perpetual succession of waves. The notion of 'up-and-down' in this stanza depends entirely on αὔξει, which I argue may be corrupt; though of course the cyclic alternation of good and bad fortune is the central theme in the antistrophe and epode.

adverse". The objection is the sense. "In a pleasant vein" must mean, "suggesting thoughts of comfort": as in *O.T.* 82 ἡδύς, "pleasant", = "bringing good news". But, since ἀντία expresses remonstrance against her *despair*, there is then no proper antithesis with ἀδεῖα. He therefore reads Musgrave's αἰδοῖα, which he considers gives the requisite contrast, 'tempering opposition with deference'.

Lloyd-Jones (*YCS* 22, 1972, 263-4) rightly dismisses αἰδοῖα, though not I think for the best reasons.⁴⁴ He too sees no difficulty in the syntax, assuming an ellipse of εἰμί, which his examples justify. He insists, however, that a proper contrast can only be given if ἀδεῖα means 'well-disposed', a sense which he finds uniquely but adequately supported by *E. Pho.* 771. With this interpretation the *paradosis* can stand.

The main problem is certainly to find a sense of ἡδύς which gives an adequate contrast. Any contrast will be no more than a formal one, as Jebb saw, since the form the chorus' opposition takes is a *consolatio* which must be welcome to her. There cannot therefore be a real contrast, as at e.g. *Ar. Ach.* 501 ἐγὼ δὲ λέξω δεινὰ μὲν, δίκαια δέ (an apology for plain speaking), or *A. Sept.* 810 βαρέα δ' οὖν ὄμως φράσον. But a formal contrast is not, as Jebb assumed, necessarily pointless. I agree with Lloyd-Jones that the text can be defended, and that given his account of the syntax, the meaning 'well-disposed' for ἀδεῖα is necessary not only to give a contrast, but even to make sense. I shall argue, however, (1) that εἰμί is not the only possible ellipse; (2) that the sense for ἡδύς that he posits, though it does occur, is not necessarily the sense in *Pho.* 771; (3) that 'well-disposed' is not the sense which gives the most pointed contrast.

ἡδύς has various relevant (or near-relevant) senses.

(i) pleasant, agreeable, welcome (of things: the standard sense): *S. El.* 667 σοὶ φέρων ἦκω λόγους | ἡδεῖς, cf. *ib.* 56, 1360; *O.C.* 731.

(ii) agreeable, welcome (of persons): *O.T.* 82 ὡς εἰκάσαι μὲν, ἡδύς (*sc.* βαίνει), *El.* 929 ἡδύς οὐδὲ μητρὶ δυσχερῆς, *Phil.* 530 ὦ φίλτατον μὲν ἡμαρ, ἡδιστος δ' ἀνὴρ.

(iii) agreeable, sweet-tempered, courteous: *Isocr.* i.20 (the context shows that this is advice on how to *behave*); *E. Hipp.* 289 ἡδίων γενοῦ, *στρυγγὴν ὀφρὺν λύσσασα*; *Theocr.* 14, 61 εὐγνώμων, φιλόμουσος, ἐρωτικός, εἰς ἄκρον ἀδύς (of Ptolemy).

(iv) well-disposed: *D.* 5.15 πάντων ἡκιστα Θηβαίους (ἂν πολεμῆσαι οἴομαι) . . . οὐχ ὡς ἡδέως ἔχουσιν ἡμῖν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν χαρίζονται Φιλίππῳ, ἀλλ' ἴσασιν . . . εἰ γενήσεται πόλεμος, κακὰ πάνθ' ἔξουσιν αὐτοί.

(v) glad (as adverb only): *E. Bacch.* 814 ὄμως δ' ἴδοις ἂν ἡδέως ἃ σοὶ πικρά;

(ἀηδῆς has much the same range, though (iv) is lacking).

These senses may be roughly classified as follows: (i) and (ii) refer to the (agreeable) effect the thing or person so described has, or may be expected to have, on others, without specifying what gives rise to it; (iii) specifies a particular kind of overt behaviour, compatible with good or bad intentions ('whatever his feelings towards me, he is certainly courteous and agreeable'); (iv) specifies a disposition towards others in the person so described, referring to intentions rather than overt behaviour; (v), the adverbial use, is the reverse side of (i) and (ii)—it refers to the agreeable effect from the point of view of the person experiencing it.

The sense required for Lloyd-Jones' interpretation is (iv), since the contrast as he understands it is in apparent contradiction between the chorus' intentions (good) and their behaviour (opposition, normally bad, but here in fact not so). *D.* 5.15 is, so far as I can see, the only certain example of this sense. Other candidates are: *Hipp.* 589 ἡδίων γενοῦ, which means 'be more agreeable', 'behave more agreeably', i.e. (iii) not (iv). *D.* 23.64 ἡδίους ἔσεσθε ἀκούσαντες means 'more sweet-tempered', 'more amenable'; this verges on (iv), but as Lloyd-Jones himself points out, really belongs to (iii). Finally *Pho.* 771-3:

σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἡδύς ἐς λόγους ἀφίξεται,
ἐγὼ δὲ τέχνην μαντικὴν ἐμεμψάμην
ἤδη πρὸς αὐτόν, ὥστε μοι μομφὰς ἔχειν.

⁴⁴ 'I shall oppose you, though with all deference' does give some contrast, if not the right one, and the slight zeugma of αἰδοῖα (οἴσω), ἀντία οἴσω is easy

enough. The conjecture is bad because αἰδοῖος never has the sense required.

This *could* mean, as Lloyd-Jones and Pearson say it does, 'he will enter into discourse well-disposed to you'; but it can also mean, 'he will discourse agreeably with you', i.e. with courtesy, whereas, for the reason stated, Teiresias is not on speaking terms with Eteocles. This seems to me more natural; it is clearly possible. There is then no certain example of the sense 'well-disposed' in tragedy, and though D. 5.15 may be enough, its assumption in *Trach.* 122 should if possible be avoided.

The sense 'well-disposed' seems inevitable, so long as we assume an ellipse of *εἰμί*. We can say 'I am well-disposed, but I shall oppose you', but not 'I am welcome' or 'agreeable'. We can of course say 'you are welcome' or 'he is welcome to her' (*Phil.* 530, *El.* 929), but 'I am welcome' is ruled out by the logic of the word.⁴⁵ Again, we can say 'I shall be welcome'; but the ellipse of *ἔσομαι* is unexampled.⁴⁶ We can also say, 'I shall oppose you, though in a manner welcome (agreeable) to you'. This adverbial use requires not the copula, but e.g. *ἐρῶ* understood, as Longo has suggested.⁴⁷ At first sight this seems difficult, as *ἐρῶ* is not expressed and *οἶσω* would not make sense. It is, however, justified by the type of zeugma found at e.g. *O.T.* 116 οὐδ' ἄγγελός τις οὐδὲ συμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ | κατείδεν (with ἄγγελος sc. ἦλθε): the verb which should be common to both members of the conjunction in fact only fits the second. Another way of supplying the verb would be to understand *ἀντία οἶσω* itself with *ἀδεία*, on the model of *Pho.* 438 παλαί μὲν οὖν ὑμνηθὲν (sc. ἐρῶ), ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐρῶ. In either case what we have is a variant on *ἠδέως μὲν, ἐναντίως δὲ σοι ἐρῶ*. For the adverbial use of *ἠδύς*, cf. *Trag. adesp. fr.* 283 γύναι, τί μοι τραχεῖα κοῦκ εἰθισμένως | λαλεῖς; with *O.T.* 82 ἀλλ' εἰκάσαι μὲν, ἠδύς (sc. βαίνει from 81), and, as I take it, *Pho.* 771.

We can now translate, 'I shall oppose you, though in a manner agreeable to you'. This clearly has more point: the chorus do not insist that they are well-disposed to Deianeira—why should they not be?—but that what they are going to say is what she will want to hear. In fact, as sometimes happens, the emphasis is on the *μὲν*-clause rather than the *δὲ*-clause: 'although I shall oppose you, my words will be agreeable'.⁴⁸ In prose we might have: *πρὸς τὰ παρόντα ἀθυμοῦσιν ἐναντιώσομαι μὲν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠηδῶς γ' ἀκούσεσθε*.

Lloyd-Jones is therefore right in his conclusion that the text can stand, but not in the sense he gives to *ἠδέα*.

Trach. 196–7

τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν ἕκαστος ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων
οὐκ ἂν μεθεῖτο, πρὶν καθ' ἠδονὴν κλύειν.

Various impossible interpretations have been suggested.

- (1) *ποθοῦν* = *ποθούμενον* (Σ).
- (2) *τὸ ποθοῦν* = *οἱ ποθοῦντες*, with *ἕκαστος* in apposition (Hermann).
- (3) *τὸ ποθοῦν ἐκμαθεῖν* = *τὸν πόθον ἐκπληῖσαι μαθῶν* (so Mazon in *Rev. Phil.* 25 [1951], 8 f., after Campbell; but see Jebb's note).
- (4) *τὸ ποθοῦν* is 'accusative of reference', 'as to his curiosity' (Jebb, hesitantly).
- (5) *τὸ ποθοῦν* is governed by *μεθεῖτο* (Blaydes); but as Jebb points out (ed. p. 191), this would need a genitive. (In *Ar. Vesp.* 416 *ὡς τόνδ' ἐγὼ οὐ μεθήσομαι*, the sense of *μεθίεμαι* is different; see MacDowell ad loc.)
- (6) *τὸ ποθοῦν* is object of *θέλων* and subject of *ἐκμαθεῖν*, 'wishing the desiring part of himself to learn' (Denniston *C.Q.* 45 [1931], 7); this is scarcely Greek.

τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν must remain a crux. Conjectures are not convincing. *τὰ . . . ποθεῖν'* (Thomas) is not quite *τὰ ποθούμενα*. *τῶν . . . πόθων* (Pearson), governed by *μεθεῖτο*, fails (a) because the plural is out of place (*O.C.* 333, *E. I.A.* 555, *Tro.* 595, which he cites, are not strictly comparable); (b) because it is clearly Lichas, not the desire to learn, which the crowd would not let go. There might be deep corruption, such that *τὸ . . . ποθοῦν* has displaced a phrase meaning 'the facts'; so Nauck proposed *τὰ γὰρ παρόνθ' . . . ποθῶν* (for *θέλων*). But there is perhaps a simpler possibility:

⁴⁵ I owe the substance of this point to Mr C. J. Tuplin.

⁴⁶ So even with *ἔσται*: D. 4.29, the only case cited by K.-G. i (41, Anm. 2), is not a clear case.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.* (n. 21), ad. loc.

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. D. 18.125 *ὄρα μὴ τούτων ἐχθρὸς ἦς, ἐμοῖ δὲ προσποιεῖ*, 'while pretending to be mine' (*GP* 370).

τοῦ γὰρ ποθῶν ἕκαστος ἐκμαθεῖν, θέλων
οὐκ ἂν μεθεῖτο . . .

'Each man desiring to learn (from him), would not willingly let him go . . .', with τοῦ (demonstrative) governed by μεθεῖτο (and perhaps also by ἐκμαθεῖν), θέλων = ἐκῶν, as e.g. in *Phil.* 1343 συγχῶρει θέλων, fr. 684 (Ζεὺς) ὑπέικει καὶ θέλων ἐγκλίνεται (cf. Ellendt s.v. θέλω, 316 col. i). ἐκμαθεῖν then has no object, but it does not really need one. The corruption would be quite easy.

Trach. 262-9

ὃς αὐτὸν ἐλθόντ' ἐς δόμους ἐφέστιον,
ξένον παλαιὸν ὄντα, πολλὰ μὲν λόγοις
ἐπερρόθησε, πολλὰ δ' ἀτηρᾷ φρενί,
λέγων χεροῖν μὲν ὡς ἄφυκτ' ἔχων βέλη
τῶν ὦν τέκνων λείποιτο πρὸς τόξου κρίσιν,
φωνεῖ δὲ, δοῦλος ἀνδρὸς ὡς ἐλευθέρου
ραίοιτο· δείπνοις δ' ἦρικ' ἦν ὠνυμένους
ἔρριψεν ἐκτὸς αὐτόν.

There are three difficulties. (1) πολλὰ δ' ἀτηρᾷ φρενί gives no proper antithesis; (2) the finite verb φωνεῖ (δὲ) corresponds with the participle. λέγων (μὲν); (3) ραίοιτο needs some complement or qualification. (2) can, after a fashion, be met; *Il.* 5.144-7 ἐνθ' ἔλεν Ἀστύνοον καὶ Ὑπεύρονα . . . τὸν μὲν . . . βαλὼν, τὸν δ' ἕτερον . . . πλῆξε has a similar structure. The nearest examples in tragedy are: *El.* 190-2 . . . οἰκονομῶ θαλάμους πατρός, ὧδε μὲν | ἀεικεῖ σὺν στολᾷ, | κεναῖς δ' ἀμφίσταμαι τραπέζαις; *O.C.* 521-3 ἦνεγκ' ἀέκων μὲν . . . τούτων δ' αὐθαίρετον οὐδέν; *Trach.* 835-7. The last two, however, with their change of construction, are easier, and even in *El. l.c.* the verb in the μὲν-clause (e.g. ὦν) is not expressed, so the finite ἀμφίσταμαι is less abrupt. Here it is the exact symmetry of the verbs λέγων and φωνεῖ which seems harsh. The crucial objection, however, is (2). (i) ἐπερρόθησε cannot be understood with πολλὰ δ' ἀτηρᾷ φρενί, because then, as Jebb says, the anaphora πολλὰ μὲν . . . πολλὰ δὲ is out of place. Kamerbeek cites *Phil.* 1370 χούτω διπλῆν μὲν ἐξ ἐμοῦ κτήση χάριν, | διπλῆν δὲ πατρός and explains that there is a hendiadys λόγοις καὶ διανοία, etc., adopting Campbell's view that the anaphora adds emphasis. The example makes the point against him; obviously 'you will get many things from my father and many from me' makes sense, while 'he insulted him often (much) with words, often (much) with baleful heart' does not. Moreover, as Jebb says, an epithet would be needed with λόγοις (e.g. αἰσχροῖς).⁴⁹ But Jebb's own explanation, that there is a kind of zeugma whereby a more general verb like ὕβρισεν is understood in the δὲ-clause, will not do either. There are of course cases where a verb must be understood in one clause or an antithesis in a sense slightly different from that of the verb expressed in the other (cf. on 122). The trouble here is that the whole contrast depends on the verb to be understood, and this is straining the device of zeugma too far. There must, for the contrast to work, be an explicit reference to *action* in the δὲ-clause.

There are various ways of introducing such a reference. A line could have dropped out after 264 meaning 'maltreated him with shameful acts'. Or again πολλὰ δ' ἀτηρᾷ φρενί,

⁴⁹ Mrs Easterling also suggests that πολλὰ μὲν . . . , πολλὰ δὲ has an emphatic rather than a contrasting effect, and compares 229 ἀλλ' εὔ μὲν ἴγμεθ', εὔ δὲ προσφωνούμεθα; she understands ἀτηροῖς with λόγοις, and renders: 'loaded him often with abuse, evilly spoken and evilly intended'. She argues further that there should be no contrast between words and actions in Eurytus' repeated behaviour towards Heracles. 'The emphasis, surely, is on the ever more offensive nature of his insults: he claims that Heracles is an inferior archer, he taunts him with being a slave, and finally to crown all he throws him out *once and for all*—not "often".'

ἀτηρᾷ could no doubt be understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ as

she takes it. But the distinction emphasised by εὔ μὲν . . . εὔ δὲ in 229 ('as my news is good, so I have a warm welcome') is irrelevant in 263-4: there is no point in distinguishing between Eurytus' evil speech and his evil intentions, if they are both aspects of his insults. (Lloyd-Jones compares *Ant.* 603 λόγον τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἐρμῆς; but the effect of the conjunction is to emphasise not that speech and intention are distinct, but that folly in both, for the family of Oedipus, is retribution for past wrong.) I do not take the point about the repeated behaviour of Eurytus: Lichas gives two examples of insulting words, one of insulting actions—in fact, the culmination of them.

λέγων χεροῖν μὲν could be cut out (Bergk), so that πολλὰ μὲν is answered by δειπνοῖς δὲ in 268. Jachmann has shown⁵⁰ that interpolations of this kind within the line are not uncommon, and a good example occurs below at 360–4, where Hartung's deletion is certainly right. The sense is then satisfactory, and the motive for the insertion would be to give a clearer antithesis to πολλὰ μὲν than is otherwise given by 268 δειπνοῖς δὲ. The displacement of λέγων χεροῖν μὲν, though possible (cf. e.g. *Il.* 13.13 ἔνθεν γὰρ ἐφαίνετο πᾶσα μὲν ἤδη, | φαίνετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις, see *GP* 372), might be a sign of clumsy writing. This may well be right. Another solution, however, is to insert, e.g. ῥέζων: πολλὰ δ' ἄτηρᾶ φρενὶ | ῥέζων, λέγων μὲν (ῥέζων⁵¹ drops out and χεροῖν is inserted to fill up the trimeter). This does allow some verb like ὕβρισεν to be understood, the participial clause being parallel to the dative λόγοις. This does not indeed dispose of φωνεῖ δὲ, which was Bergk's main reason for deleting πολλὰ δὲ . . . χεροῖν; but φωνεῖ is suspect on other grounds besides its corresponsion with λέγω.

The verb φωνεῖν is adequate in itself, 'exclaim', 'call': *P. O.* 13, 67 φώνησε δ' 'εὔδεις, Αἰολίδα βασιλεῦ'; *A. Ag.* 1334 'μηκέτ' ἐσέλθης' τάδε φωνῶν; *Hdt.* 2. 2 'βέκκος' φωνεῖν: cf. *Aj.* 1047 οὗτος σὲ φωνῶ. It is normally followed by direct speech, but καλεῖν in *O. T.* 780 καλεῖ (με) παρ' οἴνω πλαστός ὡς εἶην πατρί is near enough. The trouble is ραίοιτο. Jebb translates: "Thou art a slave", he cried, "a free man's broken thrall". This glosses over the difficulty: ραίοιτο needs a complement or qualification. True, in *P. V.* 188–9 μαλακογνώμων ἔσται ποθ' ὅταν ταύτη ραίσθῃ the verb has no agent or instrument expressed, but ταύτη 'in this way' (i.e. by the secret) is enough, and the striking ραίσθῃ has been prepared by μαλακογνώμων: Zeus is to be pounded in a mortar till tender.⁵² Campbell argued in *Paralipomena* that ἀνδρὸς ἐλευθέρου could be the simple genitive of the agent; but this rare archaic construction is not found with finite verbs.⁵³ As the text stands the gen. must be possessive, as Jebb took it. Radermacher wrote ἀνδρὸς ἐξ ἐλευθέρου; but with ὡς gone some other change is needed anyway, and the required complement for ραίοιτο is more likely to be concealed in φωνεῖ. Radermacher in fact read φωνῆ δὲ δοῦλος, which does not help since he meant by it 'a slave by his speech,' cf. *E. Alc.* 760 ἄμουσ' ὑλακτῶν; i.e. Eurytus is mocking his guest's uncouth Doric. This needs no refutation. But Pearson also read φωνῆ, and interpreted much more plausibly 'that he was crushed as a slave by the voice of a free man', i.e. by Eurystheus' orders, cl. *P. O.* 3.28 ἀγγελίαις Εὐρυσθέος.⁵⁴ The change is minimal, but φωνῆ must then bear a strange sense, and the picture of Heracles crushed by his master's voice is not convincing. The right sense is given by πόνω, 'crushed by hard labour, as befits a free man's thrall' (cf. *P. V.* 954 ὡς θεῶν ὑπηρέτου); πόνος is after all what servitude to Eurystheus means for Heracles. The verbal insults are now introduced by λέγων μὲν, picking up λόγοις, the action by δειπνοῖς δὲ, picking up ῥέζων. The two verbal insults in fact cohere: Heracles is inferior to his sons in archery, Eurytus claims, despite his supernatural weapon; he is broken down by his hard labour in servitude to Eurystheus. ῥέζων is one out of many possibilities, and πόνω is perhaps not quite close enough to φωνεῖ to carry full conviction, but they will serve as diagnostic conjectures. It may be thought uneconomical to make two changes, but it is idle to pretend that the corruption can be cured by one.

⁵⁰ *Philol.* 90, 1935, 341 ff., esp. 342–3; *Rh. Mus.* 84, 1935, 207; 'Binneninterpolationen', *NGG* 1 (1936) 123–44, 185–215.

⁵¹ ῥέζων rather than ἔρδων, the normal form of the verb with this sense in trimeters, since Sophocles in this play avoids interlinear hiatus without pause (*E. Harrison, CR* 55, 1941, 22–3). Another part., or aorist part. or finite verb would also do, and since the syllabic augment can probably be omitted here; there are many possibilities. (*χειρῶν* would be neat, cf. *χειρώματα* in *O. T.* 560 = 'deed of violence', *Sept.* 1022 = 'work of the hands', both apparently from *χείρ*; but the *abusio* cannot be assumed here, and without it the contrast is insufficient: cf. *Plat. Soph.* 219c *χειρῶν λόγους*.)

⁵² Cf. Taillardat, *Les Images d'Aristophane*, para. 369.

⁵³ It is found with participles and verbal adjectives, at least some of which may be regarded as having substantival force (see W. Schulze, *Ph. W.* 16, 1896, 1332–3 [= *Kl. Schr.*, 1966, 648–9]; Ed. Schwyzer, 'Syntaktische Archaismen des Attischen', *Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1940, nr. 7, pp. 8–9 [cf. *ib.* 1942, nr. 10, p. 14 and *Gr. Gr.* ii 6⁵]), though not all can be so explained (see W. J. Koster, *Mnemosyne* ser. iv 5, 1952, 89 ff.). The simple genitive with *νικᾶσθαι*, *ἠττᾶσθαι* is gen. of comparison. It might be argued that the same held for *ραίοιτο*, i.e. *ραίεσθαι* + gen. = 'to be crushingly defeated by'; but there is no analogy for such an extension, and the phrase *δοῦλος ἀνδρὸς ἐλευθέρου ραίοιτο* would even so be very difficult.

⁵⁴ *C. Q.* 39, 1925, 3.

Trach. 327-8

ἡ δέ τοι τύχη
κακὴ μὲν αὐτῇ γ', ἀλλὰ συγγνώμην ἔχει.

αὐτῇ γ' ἀλλὰ LRA: αὐτῆ γ' ἀλλὰ Ven b: αὐτῆ γ' ἀλλὰ Lb: ἀλλ' αὐτῆ γε Platt.

Jebb translates: 'Such a state is grievous for herself, but claims our forbearance', and comments: 'ἡ . . . τύχη, not the doom of captivity, but rather her present condition of mute and inconsolable grief.—αὐτῇ γε is emphatic; sad for *her*, but to be condoned by *us*; γ' is therefore in place.' But:

- (1) αὐτῇ is unemphatic, and cannot be emphasised by γε.⁵⁵
- (2) τύχη must mean 'state of slavery', not 'state of silence'.
- (3) There is no real contrast in 'bad for *her*, but to be condoned by *us*'.

αὐτῆ Ven b (Turyn's Zr) 'this state', a Thoman reinterpretation, gives no better contrast. αὐτῆ γε Lb (Turyn's K) 'her state is bad in itself, but deserves sympathy', though an improvement, still gives no real contrast, unless we can understand 'bad in other respects, but merits sympathy' (a consolation); but this cannot be got out of the Greek.

A. Platt (*C.Q.* 4, 1910, 162), rightly insisting that τύχη must mean her state of slavery, took the general sense to be 'her condition is a bad one, but if she continues in obstinate silence we must make allowances for her'. He therefore read . . . κακὴ μὲν, ἀλλ' αὐτῆ γε . . . : 'her *state* is bad, but *she herself* deserves sympathy'. He compared *O.C.* 1014-5

ὁ ξείνος, ὦναξ, χρηστός· αἱ δὲ συμφοραὶ
αὐτοῦ πανώλεις, ἄξιοι δ' ἀμναθεῖν.

But the required contrast is still not there: 'we may disapprove of her *state*, but we should pity *her*' is nonsense; it is her state which deserves our pity. *O.C.* 1014-5 does not help; it means 'the stranger is good, and his misfortunes bad, and deserving of our sympathy'. The contrast, the core of the problem, is still to seek.

An apposite sense, suggested above, is: 'her state is bad in other respects, but (at least) it deserves our sympathy (a consolation)'. K's αὐτῆ γε cannot convey this: 'in other respects' must be made explicit. It can be, with two slight changes, one depending on the other:

ἡ δέ τοι τύχη
κακὴ μὲν αὐτῇ τᾶλλα, συγγνώμην <δ' > ἔχει.

Trach. 441-48

Ἔρωτι μὲν νυν ὅστις ἀντανίσταται
πύκτης ὅπως ἐς χεῖρας, οὐ καλῶς φρονεῖ.
οὗτος γὰρ ἄρχει καὶ θεῶν ὅπως θέλει,
κάμου γε· πῶς δ' οὐ χἀτέρας οἴας γ' ἐμοῦ;
ὥστ' εἶ τι τῶμῶ τ' ἀνδρὶ τηδε τῆ νόσω
ληφθέντι μεμπτός εἰμί, κάρτα μαίνομαι,
τηδε τῆ γυναικί, τῆ μεταίτια
τοῦ μηδὲν αἰσχροῦ μηδ' ἐμοὶ κάκου τινος.

Wunder,⁵⁶ followed recently by Reeve,⁵⁷ deleted 444: Deianeira's application of the *exemplum* to herself can only imply an illicit love, while there is no other indication that Iole is in love with Heracles—indeed, she appears rather as an innocent victim. There is some force in this argument. That Love has power even over gods is a commonplace;⁵⁸ the *exemplum* is taken up, rather differently, in the following ode (497 ff.), and seems here to be an excuse for irresistible passion, as in *E. Hipp.* 443 ff. But the person to be excused for irresistible passion

⁵⁵ Nor can γε emphasise κακὴ, as Mazon implies by his rendering: 'si son sort est cruel, il lui donne au moins le droit à quelque indulgence'. Such displacement, with γε following two closely connected words of which the first is more emphatic, is very rare (*GP* 150; the only tragic example Denniston considers sound, *E. Hel.* 837 ταῦτῳ ξίφει γε, is clearly much easier).

⁵⁶ *Emendationes in Sophoclis Trachinias*, 1841, 192-4.

⁵⁷ M. D. Reeve, 'Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III', *GRBS* 14, 1973, 167.

⁵⁸ Cf. *h. Ven.* 34-5, *S. Ant.* 787, *fr.* 684, 941.15, *E. Hipp.* 443 ff., *Ar. Nub.* 1079-82, *Men. Hero, fr.* 2 (*Sandbach*), *A.P.* 5.64, 4-5 (*Asclepiades*), *Theocr.* 3.46-8, *Mosch.* 2.76, *Ovid. Met.* 5.369-70.

is Heracles; Deianeira needs no excuse, and it is sufficient excuse for Iole that she is in Heracles' power.

I share Jebb's feeling, however, that the line is a fine one: 'instead of saying *καὶ βροτῶν*, she touchingly refers to her own experience'. Love controls Deianeira's destiny, not only in the sense that she is enmeshed in the situation created by Heracles, who is dominated by his passion, but because the pain of her own situation is due to the very intensity of her own love for Heracles. It is this that has caused her cruel anxiety over his absence, and is to cause the cruel pangs of jealousy which cloud her judgement and bring Heracles and herself to death. It is this exercise of love's power, no less than Heracles' passion for Iole, which is treated in the second strophic pair of the third stasimon (845 ff.), and justifies the conclusion: *Κύπρις ἀναυδος φανερά τῶνδ' ἐφάνη πράκτωρ*. This is perhaps what Sophocles means by her *δαίμων*, on which she calls before she kills herself (910): her *ἦθος*, her too great love for her husband. That she should here anticipate this insight is a fine touch, not to be rejected as an interpolation. As for Iole, her love for Heracles, or Deianeira's belief in it, is *prima facie* made plain at 461-5:

κοῦπω τις αὐτῶν ἔκ γ' ἐμοῦ λόγον κακὸν
ἠνέγκατ' οὐδ' ὄνειδος· ἦδε τ' οὐδ' ἂν εἶ
κάρτ' ἐντακείη τῷ φιλεῖν, ἐπεὶ σφ' ἐγὼ
ᾤκτιρα δὴ μάλιστα προσβλέψασ', ὅτι
τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς τὸν βίον διώλεσεν.

The subject of *ἐντακείη* is most naturally Iole. That it should be Heracles, though Iole is the subject of the preceding main clause and is referred to by the following *σφε*, is not impossible, but it is very difficult. This is in fact another delicate touch: Deianeira cannot believe that any woman could resist Heracles. This is Iole's excuse, though it sharpens Deianeira's pain.⁵⁹ V. 444 thus reveals a depth of psychological insight sometimes denied to the Greek tragedians; but it is not just elaboration of character for its own sake, for the full realisation of Deianeira as a passionate woman is central to the working of the play.⁶⁰

How then is v.444 to be reconciled with the poetical logic of the passage insisted on by Wunder? The sense is, I think, perfectly coherent if it is taken as a parenthesis: '... Love rules the gods as he will (and me also; and why not another such as I am?), so that I am mad indeed, if I blame my husband', etc. This saves both the logic and the subtlety.

Trach. 497

μέγα τι σθένος ἃ Κύπρις ἐκφέρεται νίκας αἰεί.

The following interpretations have been offered:

(1) 'Kypris ever bears away great and mighty victory' (Jebb, Radermacher), i.e. *μέγα τι σθένος* . . . *νίκας* = *μεγασθενῆ τινα νίκαν*. But the word needed then is not *σθένος* but *κράτος*, which often means 'victory' from Homer on, and occurs in such phrases as *νίκη καὶ κράτη τῶνδ' ὀρωμένων* (S. *El.* 85, cf. A. *Suppl.* 981, Pl. *Legg.* 962a), *ἀέθλων κράτος* (P. *I.* 8, 4), etc. The equivalence only works if *Νίκη* is personified; but Nike personified cannot be won by Kypris.

(2) 'Kypris ever wins great strength from victory', i.e. (a) 'wins with much to spare' (Jebb), or (b) 'wins the strength victory confers' (Wunder), cf. S. *El.* 60 *ἐξενέγκωμαι κλέος*. Jebb's paraphrase (which he does not endorse) is impossible to understand from the Greek—the genitive is doing too much work; Wunder's interpretation is open to the same objection as (1): '*σθένος* is the *act* rather than the *result* of victory' (Campbell); contrast O.C. 1088 *ἐπινικεῖω σθένει* 'with conquering strength'.⁶¹

(3) 'Kypris ever advances unchecked in mighty conquering strength' (Hermann, Campbell), cf. Alc. 601 *ἐκφέρεται πρὸς αἰδῶ*, S. *El.* 628 *πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐκφέρη*, Thuc. 3. 84 *ἀπαιδευσία*

⁵⁹ Jebb makes a psychological error when he says in his note: 'Such a belief would mitigate, rather than increase, the wife's pain'. This might seem reasonable, but it is not the way the human heart works.

⁶⁰ Cf. the judicious remarks of P. E. Easterling on the kind of psychological realism to be looked for in

Greek Tragedy (*Greece and Rome* 20, 1973, 6-7).

⁶¹ Longo understands (1) and (2) at the same time, this being a case of the 'syntactical ambiguity' he often finds in Sophocles. There is ambiguity in Sophocles, but not of this particular kind.

ὄργης πλεῖστον ἐκφερόμενοι, with μέγα τι σθένος internal accusative. But ἐκφέρεσθαι means 'to be carried away' by feelings, usually undesirable impulses, like a chariot plunging off course (cf. *PV* 883); it cannot mean 'advance unchecked'. (αἰδώς in *Alc.* 601 is of course good, but not in the excess to which Admetus displays it: even a good quality can be bad in excess, like Niobe's pride in her children, cf. Arist. *NE* vii. 4.1148^a 33 ff.). The internal acc., μέγα τι σθένος, is also hard, and the position of νίκας awkward (in *Paralipomena* Campbell read νικῶσ' for this reason).

(4) '... exerts mighty victorious strength' (LSJ), cf. *Ion.* 1012 δύνασιν ἐκφέρει τίνα; (of the Gorgon's blood). But ἐκφέρει probably means 'exhibit' there rather than 'exert'.

(5) '... exhibits mighty victorious strength' (Hermann), cf. Lys. 19. 30 ἀλλ' οὐδ' οἱ πάλοι πλούσιοι δοκοῦντες εἶναι ἄξια λόγου ἔχοιεν ἂν ἐξενεγκεῖν, Pl. *Legg.* 788c δείγματα ἐξενεγκόντα εἰς φῶς, Xen. *Cyr.* 5.2.7. This is the most convincing interpretation so far, but in the context of victory it is difficult to understand ἐκφέρεσθαι in any other sense than 'win'.

(6) 'Invictum ubique est Veneris robur' (Brunck), i.e. μέγα τι σθένος in apposition to ἡ Κύπρις, νίκας acc. plural. This is a promising line, since it gets rid of the awkward genitive, makes σθένος a property of Kypris and gives the right sense to ἐκφέρεσθαι.⁶² Better still is:

(7) 'Mighty strength is Kypris; she ever bears away victories,' punctuating after Κύπρις (Wakefield). This explanation, mentioned by no modern commentator, is I believe correct. The ellipse of the copula is typical of such γνώμαι: *IA* 568 μέγα τι θηρεῦεν ἀρετάν, A. *P.V.* 536 ἡδύ τι θαρσαλέαις τὸν μακρὸν τείνει βίον ἐλπίσι (cf. *Andr.* 781), *Bacch.* 883 πιστόν τι τὸ θεῖον σθένος; and of this word: S. *El.* 174 ἔτι μέγας οὐρανῶ | Ζεὺς, *Rhes.* 821 μέγα σύ μοι, μέγ', ὦ, πολίοχον κράτος, *H.F.* 735 μέγας ὁ πρόσθ' ἀναξ,⁶³ Ar. *Ran.* 1199 μέγα τὸ πρᾶγμα, μέγα τὸ νεῖκος, ἀδρὸς ὁ πόλεμος ἔρχεται (possibly ἔρχεται with all three), *Acts* 19, 28 μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις τῶν Ἐφεσίων). The effect may seem somewhat staccato for dactylo-epitrites and the like, but cf. P. *O.* 6.72-4, 7.35, 13.47; P. 4.287, 12.30; N. 5.16, 9.33, 10.30, 79-80; I. 1.32, 2.12.

But can σθένος be a predicate? The normal expression would be ἔχει γὰρ ἡ Δίκη μέγα σθένος (E. *El.* 958, cf. *Bacch.* 883 τὸ θεῖον σθένος); Κύπρις ἐστὶ σθένος, with substantive as predicate, is eccentric in Greek with this kind of predicate.⁶⁴ Κύπρις ἐστὶ κράτος would be different. We can say 'Kypris is a power' (cf. *Rhes.* l. c. μέγα σύ μοι . . . κράτος), or address Zeus as a power (A. *Suppl.* 526 τελειότατον κράτος, ὄλβιε Ζεῦ), just as we can say 'old age is a burden' (*H.F.* 638 τὸ δὲ γῆρας ἄχθος) or 'death is a great joy' (*Ag.* 550 θανεῖν πολλή χάρις) or 'woman is a great bane' (*Hērph.* 627 γυνή κακὸν μέγα): all these are individuated. Xen. *Cyr.* 5.2, 7 τέλος (ἐκφέρων) τὴν θυγατέρα, δεινὸν τι κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος is an oddity: κάλλος 'a beauty' is even found in the plural (Luc. *Dial.* 18, 1 Λήδα καὶ Ἐλένη καὶ ὅλα τὰ ἀρχαῖα κάλλη), and μέγεθος is simply correlated with it (Pl. *Prot.* 356c μεγέθη = mathematical 'magnitudes' is a philosopher's usage; we might have (varying) 'strengths', but σθένη is not found). Misleadingly similar are statements of identity such as Ζεὺς ἐστὶν αἰθέρ (A. *fr.* 70, cf. E. *fr.* 877), a kind of persuasive redefinition whereby a god is identified with one of his attributes—a common form of theological proposition in later writers, cf. . . . μοῖρα τ' ἔφυς, βάσανος, ὀλέτις σύ, δίκη σύ (Abel, *Orphica*, 292),⁶⁵ 'God is Love', etc. Clearly irrelevant is e.g. *Hel.* 560 ὦ θεοί· θεὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ γινώσκειν φίλους, where θεός is predicate = θεῖόν τι⁶⁶ (and so with other abstracts equated with θεός—ἐλπίς, νοῦς, λήθη: see Dale, Kannicht ad loc.). Irrelevant also are definitions of abstracts with an abstract in the definiens: μέγα τι σθένος ἡ Κύπρις is not like ἔστιν . . . ἡ ἀπιστία ὑπόληψις τις ἀδικίας (Theophr. *Char.* 18.1).

More to the point are the Homeric periphrases with σθένος, βίη, ἴς, etc., e.g. σθένος Ἰδομενῆος, which give one context at least in which such words tolerate individuation. Nor

⁶² Longo also considers taking μέγα τι σθένος in apposition to ἡ Κύπρις, but thinks that ἐκφέρεται must then mean 'advance unchecked', making νίκας a genitive of space traversed, which is 'duro': I should say impossible.

⁶³ Punctuate after ἀναξ, followed by asyndeton. (This arrangement occurred independently to several members of the *Heracles* seminar given in

Oxford by Mr G. W. Bond and Professor H. Lloyd-Jones in 1972.)

⁶⁴ This objection was pointed out to me by Mr L. D. J. Henderson.

⁶⁵ See Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 172.

⁶⁶ For this 'predicative' use of θεός, see Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube d. Hellenen*, 1931-2, i 17.

is it irrelevant that the antistrophe begins (507) ὁ μὲν ἦν ποταμοῦ σθένος, a phrase evidently modelled on the Homeric pattern, and corresponding in structure with μέγα τι σθένος ἅ Κύπρις in 497. This is I think an adequate defence of Wakefield's punctuation, though the question remains open. The same problem arises if σθένος is taken in apposition to Κύπρις (6), which is less attractive in other ways. Wakefield's interpretation seems to me less difficult, at least, than any of the others.

Trach. 553-4

ἦ δ' ἔχω, φίλαι,
λυτήριον λύπημα, τῆδ' ἐγὼ φράσω.

ἔχω] ἔχει Wratlslaw λύπημα] λώφημα Jebb post λυτήριον, τῆδ' interpunct Hermann

λυτήριον λύπημα is a puzzle. Deianeira must be innocent, and cannot therefore know what effect the charm will in fact have. Hermann's punctuation . . . λυτήριον, λύπημα τῆδε . . . will not do; not so much for the reason given by Jebb and Kamerbeek, that it is out of character for her to want to cause Iole pain (it is, of course, but if Iole loves Heracles as she believes, cf. 444-5, 463, his loss will hurt Iole whether she wants it nor not); nor because λυτήριον could not, at a pinch, be a noun;⁶⁷ but because, since λυτήριος is in fact always an adjective, the sentence could not, without modern punctuation, be understood so that λυτήριον λύπημα do not go together and ἦδε . . . τῆδε are not correlative. Wratlslaw's ἔχει, read by Paley, 'how my pain has a cure', suffers from a similar defect. Jebb's λυτήριον λώφημα gives straightforward sense and is widely accepted.

A disadvantage common to all these answers is that they eliminate the striking oxymoron λυτήριον λύπημα (cf. 1021 λαθίπονον ὀδύναν, Cho. 539 ἄκος τομαῖον; see below on 1020-2), and with it a powerful piece of tragic irony. A quieter irony has already deepened Deianeira's words at the end of the previous episode (494-6):

. . . ἄ τ' ἀντὶ δῶρων δῶρα χρὴ προσαρμόσαι,
καὶ ταῦτ' ἄγης. κενὸν γὰρ οὐ δίκαιά σε
χωρεῖν προσελθόνθ' ὦδε σὺν πολλῶ στόλῳ.

There Deianeira is simply giving instructions to Lichas; she has not yet thought of the charm;⁶⁸ but her words are so chosen by the poet that the audience, knowing the story, will at once remember the robe which cleaves to him (767 ff., 833, 836). Here too λυτήριον λύπημα will at once remind the audience of the charm's disastrous consequences. But what is the ostensible meaning of 'a pain that brings release' that Deianeira intends and the chorus understands?

Quiet simply, I think, it is the pain of the dying Centaur, the blood of whose wounds has provided the charm, as she now goes on to relate. This may be thought far-fetched: Deianeira has no interest in Nessus' pain. Now tragic irony works rather like oracles or riddles: an oracle seems to mean one thing, e.g. that Heracles will find rest after his labours, or is to die by the hand of none of the living (i.e. is invulnerable), but is seen on its fulfilment to mean another: he is to die, and the agent of his death is the long-dead Centaur. Sometimes the fulfilment of the oracle seems to demand an artificial sense, e.g. the oracle of the bones of Orestes in Herodotus (1.68), but formally the terms of the oracle are fulfilled. The difference between oracles and tragic irony is this. The ostensible meaning of an oracle is the obvious one, while its true meaning, revealed on its fulfilment, is obscure; in tragic irony the true meaning must be obvious to the audience, while the ostensible meaning, what the words mean in the stage-situation, is less important. So here the ostensible meaning, the Centaur's death-agony, is less important, and it does not matter that it is somewhat artificial, if formally it fits the terms of the 'oracle', the riddle, the ambiguous phrase λυτήριον

⁶⁷ As σωτήριον, *El.* 925, possibly *A. Eum.* 701; *μειλικτήριον Pers.* 610; possibly *κηλητήριον Trach.* 575; cf. Hesych. *λυτήριον φυλακτήριον* (see Paley, *J. Phil.* 5, 1874, 89; but in *P. P.* 5, 106, which he

cites, *λυτήριον* is adj.).

⁶⁸ As Reinhardt and others interpret the scene, cf. K. Reinhardt, *Sophokles*,³ 1947, 55-6, 254-8.

λύπημα. It might also be said that this ostensible meaning spoils the oxymoron, since the pain and the cure no longer apply to the same person. Again, in the secondary meaning of a riddle this does not matter; but there is an analogy to this less pointed use of oxymoron: ἄκος τομαῖον, cure by surgery,⁶⁹ is applied in Aeschylus' *Supplikes* (268) to Apis' salvation of his country by destroying its monsters. Here it is the monster Nessus whose death furnishes the cure, so she thinks, for Deianeira's marriage. In the event, the cure is to destroy both its partners. (*Addendum*: Simpler still is to suppose that the charm is painful for her because its use is αἰσχρόν, cf. 597: it is shameful to have to win back a husband by such means. I now prefer this interpretation.)

Trach. 680–88

ἐγὼ γὰρ ὦν ὁ θήρ με Κένταυρος, πονῶν
πλευρὰν πικρᾶ γλωχίνι, προυδι δάξατο
παρήκα θεσμῶν οὐδέν', ἀλλ' ἐσωζόμην,
χαλκῆς ὅπως δύσνιπτον ἐκ δέλτου γραφήν,
καί μοι τάδ' ἦν πρόρρητα καὶ τοιαῦτ' ἔδρων·
τὸ φάρμακον τοῦτ' ἄπυρον ἀκτίνος τ' αἰεὶ
θερμῆς ἄθικτον ἐν μυχοῖς σῶζειν ἐμέ,
ἕως νιν ἀρτίχριστον ἀρμόσαιμί πον.
κάδρων τοιαῦτα.

Wunder,⁷⁰ followed by Pearson, excised 684 (1) because it interrupted the construction, in which σῶζειν is governed by προυδιδάξατο; (2) because of the repetition of καὶ τοιαῦτ' ἔδρων . . . κάδρων τοιαῦτα. As Jebb and others point out, σῶζειν can equally well depend on πρόρρητα, καὶ τοιαῦτ' ἔδρων being διὰ μέσου (cf. A. PV 664–5 σαφῶς ἐπισκήπτουσα καὶ μυθουμένη | ἕξω δόμων τε καὶ πάτρας ὠθεῖν ἐμέ). Both καί's could be connective, as Jebb took them: 'Now these were his instruction, and I obeyed them', or (better) corresponsive, as at S. *El.* 680 κάπεμπόμην πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ τὸ πᾶν φράσω, where (pace Denniston, *GP* 321) καὶ . . . καὶ means 'both . . . and . . .', or rather 'ut . . . ita . . .'. So Mazon renders: 'Voici ce qu'elle (l'inscription) m'ordonnait, ce qu'aussi bien j'ai fait'. As for the repetition, the emphasis it gives has point, and is marked by the chiasmus (cf. Men. *Pk.* 506–7 Γλυκέρα με καταλέλοιπε, καταλέλοιπέ με | Γλυκέρα, Πάταικε, to quote Eduard Fraenkel's favourite illustration of the figure). This is not unlike the insistence on detail in the performance of ritual that we find elsewhere in tragedy, as Lloyd-Jones points out to me; cf. Atossa's description of her offerings at A. *Pers.* 607 ff., or the chorus' detailed prescription for propitiating the Eumenides at *O.C.* 469 ff. But there is a special dramatic point here: not only is Deianeira concerned to justify her acts by emphasising how exactly she has followed her instructions, as Radermacher remarks, but there is a nice irony, in that her very exactness ensures that the Centaur's cunning has its full, deadly effect.

Trach. 807–12

τοιαῦτα, μήτηρ, πατρὶ βουλεύσασ' ἐμῶ
καὶ δρῶσ' ἐλήφθης, ὦν σε ποίνιμος Δίκη
τείσαιτ' Ἐρινύς τ'. εἰ θέμις δ', ἐπεύχομαι
θέμις δ', ἐπεὶ μοι τὴν θέμιν σὺ προῦβαλες,
πάντων ἄριστον ἄνδρα τῶν ἐπὶ χθονὶ
κτείνας', ὅποῖον ἄλλον οὐκ ὄψη ποτε.

809 θέμις δ'] θέμις γ' Brunck: θέμιστ' Wunder
810 προῦβαλες A: προῦλαβες LP

εἰ θέμις δ' is surely wrong. (1) δὲ makes no sense: it is obviously not adversative, nor can it be progressive. Jebb translates: 'Yes, if it is right, this is my prayer', glossing over the difficulty. If δὲ is progressive, ἐπεύχομαι must add something to the imprecation already uttered in ὦν σε ποίνιμος Δίκη τείσαιτο, 'and if it is right, I utter (this as) an imprecation'.

⁶⁹ It is possible that τομαῖον here means 'shredded' or 'tapped' (i.e. lot by incision), cf. Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 17 ἐντέμνειν ἄκος. But the metaphor has much

more point if it refers to surgery (cf. Tucker's note and see p. 57 n. 3 below, on *Trach.* 1121).

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.* (n. 56), 196–7.

It is true that performatory utterances such as 'I promise', 'I swear' do add something to a bare future statement of intention, in that they commit the speaker further. But *εὐχομαι*, *ἐπεύχομαι* adds nothing; the wish *is* the imprecation. Cf. *Phil.* 1286 ὄλοισθ', Ἀτρεΐδαι μὲν μάλιστ', ἔπειτα δὲ | ὁ Λαρτίου παῖς, καὶ σύ.—μὴ 'πεύξῃ πέρα.⁷¹ (2) The standard pattern in such expressions, as commentators point out, is: 'if it is right—and it *is* right, since . . .—then . . .' (or the injunction, statement, etc. qualified by 'if it is right' comes first). E.g. *E. HF* 140–3

τὸν Ἡράκλειον πατέρα καὶ ξυνάρον,
εἰ χρὴ μ', ἐρωτῶ· χρὴ δ', ἐπεὶ γε δεσπότης
ὑμῶν καθέστηχ', ἱστορεῖν ἂ βούλομαι·
τὴν ἔς χρόνον ζητεῖτε μηκύνειν βίον;

(see Wilamowitz' note); *S. fr.* 941, 14–5

εἴ μοι θέμις, θέμις δὲ τάλῃθῃ λέγειν,
Διὸς τυραννεῖ πλευμόνων (sc. Κύπρις).

E. El. 300–1

λέγοιμ' ἄν, εἰ χρὴ—χρὴ δὲ πρὸς φίλον λέγειν—
τύχας βαρείας τὰς ἐμὰς κάμου πατρός.

Men. fr. 223 (Koerte)

εἰ θεὸν καλεῖν σε δεῖ,

δεῖ δέ, τὸ κρατοῦν γὰρ νῦν νομίζεται θεός.

Hippocr. Art. 8

εἰ δὴ τε τοιοῦτο δεῖ ἐν ἱητρικῇ γράφαι· δεῖ δέ· καλῶς γὰρ Ὀμηρος
καταμεμαθήκει, κτλ;

But in *Trach.* 809 the pattern is interrupted by *εἰ θέμις δέ*.

Heath and Wakefield wanted *εἰ θέμις δὴ*, 'πεύχομαι, which breaks Porson's law. Brunck wrote . . . Ἐρινύς τ'. *εἰ θέμις γ'*, *ἐπεύχομαι*. This goes some way to meeting the first objection, but it leaves the second. Wunder's *εἰ θεμίστ' ἐπεύχομαι* meets both, and could be right. But the form *θεμιστός*, as opposed to the normal *θεμιτός*, is certain only once in tragedy, in lyrics (*A. Sept.* 694; cf. *ἀθέμιστος*, *S. fr.* 742), though Elmsley and others read it in *O.T.* 993, perhaps rightly, and Wunder would introduce it elsewhere (*Phil.* 812, *O.C.* 644; *E. Pho.* 612, *Or.* 97). Axt⁷² adopted Brunck's *γε* with different punctuation: Ἐρινύς τ', εἰ θέμις γ', ἐπεύχομαι· θέμις δέ. . . This also meets both objections, but *ἐπεύχομαι* can neither govern the optative nor follow as a parenthesis, like *ικετεύω*.

Taking a hint from both Wunder and Axt, I would punctuate:⁷³

ὦν σε ποίνιμος Δίκη
τείσαιτ' Ἐρινύς τ', εἰ θέμις γ' ἐπεύχομαι·

with *θέμις* indeclinable: see K.-B. i 459, Anm. 2.

In 809 LP have *προῦλαβες*, which would have to mean, 'you took the law into your own hands,' 'you preempted *θέμις*'. This gives some sort of sense: Hyllus would be reproaching Deianeira for exacting her own vengeance. But (1) *τοι* for *μοι* (Pretor) is then necessary; (2) the article *τὴν θέμιν* is wrong; (3) *θέμιν* has a different reference from that of *θέμις* in the same line, with punning effect. *προῦβαλες* (A) may be conjecture, but may be old—*λαβεῖν* for *βαλεῖν* (and vice versa) is a common slip in mss. Jebb and Kamerbeek take it to mean 'you spurned Themis'. The article is then possible (*θέμις* is almost personified), and *μοι* could just be an ethic dative. But the other objection, that *θέμιν* has a different reference,

⁷¹ In *Trach.* 1190 *εὐχομαι* is performatory; but that is different, as it does not endorse a prayer already uttered.

ἐπεύχομαι can mean *glorior* as well as *imprecor*, as at *A. Ag.* 1262 (see Fraenkel), 1394; so here *εἰ θέμις δ' ἐπεύχομαι* might mean, as Lloyd-Jones suggests to me, 'and if it is right, I exult in it', viz. her punishment. But the sense *imprecor* is favoured here both by the context, where an imprecation is actually uttered, and by the qualification: it is particularly in the utterance that the speaker must insure himself against impiety, cf. *S. El.* 126–7 ὡς ὁ τάδε πορῶν ὄλοιστ', εἴ μοι θέμις τόδ' ἀνδάν, *P. P.* 3, 1–2 ἤθελον Χίρωνά κε

Θιλυρίδαν, | εἰ χρεῶν τοῦθ' ἀμετέρας ἀπὸ γλώσσας κοινὸν ἐῴασθαι ἔπος, | ζῶειν . . . (it does not matter whether or not Pindar is actually uttering the wish for Cheiron's return), *Od.* 22.412 οὐχ ὁσίη καταμένοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάσθαι, (Odysseus restrains Eurycleia from uttering an exultant cry).

⁷² *Philol.* 4, 1849, 574. Wakefield has the reading so pointed in his text; in his note he attributes it to Brunck, and prefers *δὴ*.

⁷³ This punctuation seems not to have been considered by Wakefield or Musgrave, as is implied in Blaydes' note.

still stands. Far simpler is Hermann's interpretation: *quoniam tu mihi hoc fas obtulisti, Herculem necans: h.e. dedisti, ut hoc fas esset*. For the sense 'give up', 'give over' for *προβάλλειν* cf. Plat. *Phaedr.* 241c τῶν Νυμφῶν, αἷς σύ με προῦβαλες ἐκ προνοίας; S. *O. T.* 745 ἐμαυτὸν εἰς ἀρὰς | δεινὰς προβάλλων; 'make available', E. *Cret.* 6 εἰ μὲν ἀνδρὶ προῦβαλον δέμας | τοῦμόν. τὴν θέμιν = 'the right' is an unusual phrase: we should expect τὴν δίκην, and indeed θέμιν might be intrusive from the line above.⁷⁴ But the repetition is effective, and cf. A. *Ag.* 1431 καὶ τήνδ' ἀκούεις ὀρκίων ἐμῶν θέμιν, i.e. θεμιτὰ ὄρκια (see Page's note). So here the sense is: 'since you yourself have made this θεμιτόν, θέμις for me,' by killing his father and so sacrificing her own right to the filial piety which θέμις would normally enjoin.

Trach. 924-5

λύει τὸν αὐτῆς πέπλον, ἧ χρυσήλατος
 προῦκειτο μαστῶν περονίς.

ἧ Wakefield: ῶ codd.

'The peplos was fastened near the left shoulder by the περονίς, which is described as lying "in front of", i.e. "above" the (left) breast. It would not accord with Greek usage to imagine the brooch at the centre of the bosom' (Jebb, reading ἧ).

'It is impossible to understand, with Jebb, "'in front of", i.e. 'above' the (left) breast". But it is equally impossible to think that the fibula of the peplos was placed at the centre of the bosom and not near the (left) shoulder. It would then seem that the phrase ῶ . . . περονίς is a rather loose way (!) of saying: "which was held before her breasts by a gold-wrought brooch"' (Kamerbeek; my exclamation point).

'Pins, in the first place, serve to fasten the apoxygma of the robe on the right and the left shoulder: a triangular lappet is drawn over from the back and clasped on the front part with a pin, pointing up or down. That is the rule'. (Jacobsthal, *Greek Pins*, 1956, 109).⁷⁵ Pins are commonly shown on vases (first on the François vase) point upwards, which 'no doubt renders reality', since if the pin were point down in the ordinary activities of daily life it would prick the wearer, though 'all was well so long as she behaved like the maiden in the Panathenaic procession and did not dance or work' (ib. 114). Two pins were worn; when women are shown on vases with a pin on one shoulder only, 'it is simply a slip, and it was not the painter's intention to characterise them as ἐτερόπορπος' (ib. 109).⁷⁶

ἧ is necessary; Deianeira of course loosens her robe where it is fastened by the pin. She reaches up to her breast and pulls the left pin downward and out, so uncovering her heart. προῦκειτο μαστῶν means '(where the pin) projected from her breasts' ('was set in front of her breasts', LSJ). Such pins were usually from five to six inches long.⁷⁷ Sometimes they are shown with the points projecting above the shoulder, with the pin-head correspondingly high up on the body; sometimes with the point below the shoulder, and the head well down on the breast, as the Moirai and Atalanta are shown on the François vase (detail in Jacobsthal,

⁷⁴ If θέμιν is intrusive, there are many possibilities. Wunder suggested ἐπεὶ τοι τὴν ἔριν σὺ προῦβαλες 'since you provoked this strife' (between mother and son), *Il.* 11.529 ἔριδα προβαλόντες (*op. cit.* 58).

⁷⁵ περονή can also mean fibula (safety-pin or brooch), as in *Od.* 19.226-7 (*Od.* 18.293 is problematic; in *Il.* 10.131, *Il.* 14.180 a pin is probably meant; see E. Bielefeld, Heft 'Schmuck' in *Archaeologia Homerica*, 1968); but περονίς here is almost certainly a pin. Fibulae are not found in mainland Greece in the classical period, except in outlying parts such as Illyria, and hardly ever appear on vases (C. Blinkenberg, *Fibules grecques et orientales*, 1926, 32-33, notes only two examples, both of the mid-sixth century); whereas pins, and later also buttons or discs, are shown regularly on vases as fasteners of peploi.

⁷⁶ Cf. Pfeiffer on Callim. *fr.* 620^a.

⁷⁷ Sub-Mycenean and Geometric pins are sometimes very long (30 cm or more) and were worn

point downwards. Pins tend to become smaller; in the sub-Geometric period the longer pins average 13 cm; the smaller, from 5 cm to 10 cm, are not all likely to have been used to fasten peploi, as they would not be long enough to pass through the folds and hold them. Virtually no pins have been found which can be identified, by some divergence from the archaic type, as originating in the classical period. We must therefore assume that in classical times pins, when they were used, were of the archaic type: for peploi, that is, around 13 cm long. This agrees well enough with the size of pins shown on vases. (Herodotus comments on the very large pins used in Argos and Aegina [5.88]). Pins were inconvenient, and evidently went out of general use during the fifth century: 'It is hard to understand how long it took for the pin, an inheritance from the Bronze Age, to be gradually superseded by other, cleverer types of fasteners' (Jacobsthal, *op. cit.* 114; cf. 90, 110-11).

pll. 331–2).⁷⁸ Given a large pin so worn, the head might be described as ‘projecting in front of the breasts’, especially as the weight of material from over the shoulder would tend to pull the point back and the head forward.⁷⁹ *προύκειτο μαστῶν* therefore makes sense and should not be altered, though Jebb’s paraphrase is not quite right. It seems to me, however, that a more natural expression for such an arrangement would be given by the slight change *προύκειτο μαστῶ*, ‘where the pin was visible on her breast’; *μαστῶ* then corresponding exactly with *κατὰ στήθος* in *Il.* 14 180 *χρυσείης δ’ ἐνετήσι κατὰ στήθος περονᾶτο*.⁸⁰ For the dative, cf. *O.C.* 313 *κρατὶ δ’ ἡλιοστερῆς | κυνῆ πρόσωπα Θεσσαλὶς νιν ἀμπέχει*, ‘the sunhat on her head screens her face.’

Trach. 1003–6

ἔ ἔ,
 ἐᾶτέ μ’, ἐᾶτέ με
 δύσμορον εὐνάσαι
 ἐᾶτέ με δύστανον εὐνάσαι.

= **1024–5**

ὦ παῖ, ποῦ ποτ’ εἶ;
 τᾶδέ με τᾶδέ με
 πρόσλαβε κουφίσας.
 ἔ ἔ, ἰὼ δαῖμον.

1006 *ἐᾶτέ με δύστανον*] *ἐᾶθ’ ὕστατον* Hermann *εὐνάσα* L: *εὐνάσαι* A: *εὐνάσθαι* Ellendt

Since A. H. Coxon showed⁸¹ that the lyrics in this scene have normal strophic responson and not the complex interlocking pattern which Seidler postulated, Dain (in his edition) and Lloyd-Jones⁸² have followed him, with variations of their own on his text. In so defective a passage, it may seem a waste of time to suggest further variations; but there is one point where I believe progress can still be made.

ἐᾶτέ μ’ ἐᾶτέ με is similar in shape to, and so probably corresponds with, *τᾶδέ με τᾶδέ με* in 1024 (Coxon’s starting-point). So a dochmiac precedes it (what this was is anybody’s guess), and it is followed by 2 δ (or δ + hyp.). Guided by this, Coxon writes:

<δ>
 ἐᾶτέ μ’ ἐᾶτέ με
 δύσμορον εὐνάσαι [*ἐᾶτέ με δύστανον εὐνάσαι*]
 <ο ο̣ ο̣ ο̣ ο̣ ---->

Dain:

ἔ ἔ,
 ἐᾶτέ μ<ε>, – ο̣ –, ἐᾶτέ με δύσμορον
 ὕστατον εὐνάσαι, ἐᾶτέ με δύστανον

Lloyd-Jones:

<δ>
 ἐᾶτέ μ’ ἐᾶτέ με
 δύσμορον εὐνάσαι,
 ἐᾶτέ με δύστανον.

All three versions founder on two facts:

(1) *ἐᾶτέ με ἐᾶτέ με* clearly means not ‘allow me to . . .’ but ‘let me go’, ‘let me be’; cf. the agonised Hippolytus’ *μέθετέ με τάλανα* (*Hipp.* 1372),⁸³ in a scene whose similarity to this one is surely not accidental, and *Phil.* 816–7 *Φι. μέθες μέθες με. Νε. ποῖ μεθῶ; Φι. μέθες ποτέ. | Νε. οὐ φημ’ ἑάσειν*. It is true that Heracles at once tells them to take hold of him, but this

⁷⁸ The François vase is cited in illustration of *Trach.* 924–5 by F. Studniczka, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht*, 1886, 98–9.

⁷⁹ This point was made to me by Mr J. Boardman, to whose advice I am indebted in this note.

⁸⁰ Jacobsthal (93) quotes the passages together, and remarks on *Trach.* 924–5: ‘thus the peploi in the Kerameikos graves were fastened’. But the position

of pins in graves can rarely show how they were fastened, and as he later points out (109), ‘pins in tombs are found where they were placed at or after the prothesis: vases show how people wore them when alive’.

⁸¹ *CR* 67, 1947, 7–8.

⁸² *YCS* 22, 1972, 267 ff.

⁸³ For the reading see Barrett ad loc.

contrariness is a sign of his condition. So Philoctetes has asked for Neoptolemus' hand just before he cries 'let me go'.

(2) *εὐνάω*, *εὐνάζω* and compounds are invariably transitive,⁸⁴ both in the literal sense and in the frequent metaphorical sense 'put to (easeful)⁸⁵ death'. (So too, except for Hdt. 8.134, is *κοιμάω*, etc., which has a similar semantic pattern, and is also used of death.) If the sense is 'let me sleep', *εὐνάσθαι* (Ellendt) is essential.

The clue to the right line is given by the end of the scene (1040-3):

ὦ γλυκὺς Ἄιδας,
ὦ Διὸς ἀθθαίμων, εὐνασον εὐνασόν μ'
ὠκυτάτῳ μόρῳ τὸν μέλεον φθίσας.

Heracles in his agony prays for the death which Hyllus has denied him, and in characteristic Greek fashion he prays to the god of death to put him to sleep. Cf. Ajax in his suicide speech (*Aj.* 831-3):

καλῶ δ' ἄμα
πομπᾶιον Ἑρμῆν χθόνιον εἶ με κοιμίσαι
ξὺν ἀσφαδάστῳ καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι . . .

and especially Hippolytus, who at the beginning of his lyric outburst prays for death to come (1371-3):

καὶ νῦν ὀδύνα μ' ὀδύνα βαίνει—
μέθετέ με τάλανα—
καί μοι θάνατος παιᾶν ἔλθοι,

asks for the means to kill himself:

ἀμφιτόμου λόγχας ἔραμαι,
διαμοιρᾶσαι
διὰ τ' εὐνάσαι τὸν ἐμὸν βίοτον,

and concludes (1386-8):

εἶθε με κοιμάσειε τὸν δυσδαίμον' Ἄι-
δον μέλαινα νύκτερός τ' ἀνάγκα.

It is generally agreed that, whatever the text in 1004 ff., Heracles is asking for death: 'let me sleep my last sleep', or something of the kind. That the *Hippolytus* scene owes something to the *Trachiniae* is clear enough;⁸⁶ perhaps the debt is even greater than it appears. Suppose Heracles, like Hippolytus, utters a prayer at the beginning, as he does at the end, so that *εὐνάσαι* is not infinitive but optative, like *Hipp.* 1373 (*θάνατος*) *ἔλθοι*, 1387 *κοιμάσειε*, and, like *κοιμάσειε*, 1377 *εὐνάσαι*, transitive; the subject of *εὐνάσαι* having been displaced by one of the intrusive elements offered by the mss. Then, taking the intrusion to be *ἔᾱτέ* (*με*) *δύστανον*, we could write:

ἔᾱτέ μ' ἔᾱτέ με
δύσμορον· εὐνάσαι <μ' >
εὐνάσαι <δαίμων>,

⁸⁴ There are of course many verbs in Greek which are normally transitive but have an intransitive, reflexive or absolute use (see K.-G. i 91-5). These are characteristically verbs expressing motion or change, as in other languages (*verto*, *muto*; *turn*, *move*; *changer*, *sortir*; *ziehen*), and are far more often compound than simple. This seems to be very rare with denominative verbs. Out of the many listed in K.-G. *l.c.*, I note only *κυκλείν*, which is probably absol. rather than intr. (*sc. πόδα*, cf. *ἔλισσω*), and *ἐναυλίξειν* (*Phil.* 33, *E. Hyps.*, *Hippocr.*), perhaps by analogy with *καταλύειν* (cf. *κατακοιμᾶν* in Hdt. 8.134). *εὐνάω* intr. might conceivably be justified by analogy with this last, or with *λωφᾶν*

(commoner intr.), or (*κατ' ἀντίφρασιν*, as it were) with *ἀνακνεῖν* if intr. at *Trach.* 1250 (probably trans. there as Jebb takes it, though the intr. use is found with *παρα-*, *ὑποκνεῖν*). The usage is not particularly Sophoclean (Campbell lists a few examples in his 'Essay on Language', ed. vol. i p. 99); it is fairly common in Herodotus. *εὐνάσαι* might therefore be intransitive, but the evidence tends to show that it is not.

⁸⁵ Not always easeful: cf. *Hipp.* 560 *πότμῳ φονίῳ κατηνάσεν*, of Althaea; *Hec.* 473 *ἀμφιπύρῳ κοιμίζει φλογμῶ*, of Zeus and the Titans (Giants).

⁸⁶ See E. R. Schwinge, *Die Stellung der Trachinierinnen im Werk des Sophokles*, 1962, 21-4.

δαίμων corresponding with δαῖμον in the antistrophe (*cf.* also *Ant.* 833 ἄ με δαίμων ὁμοιοτάταν κατευνάζει and *E. Andr.* 1182 εἴθε σ' ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ ἦναρε δαίμων).⁸⁷

With this reconstruction the correspondence with *Hipp.* 1371–88 becomes very close. Not only is the general structure similar, with opening and closing prayers for death around an urgent appeal for a death-dealing weapon, but the formal pattern of μέθετέ με τάλανα, καί μοι θάνατος παιᾶν ἔλθοι corresponds exactly with ἔατέ με δύσμορον· εὐνάσαι μ' εὐνάσαι δαίμων, as εἴθε με κοιμάσειε τὸν δυσδαίμονα . . . Ἄιδου . . . ἀνάγκα does with ᾧ γλυκὺς Ἄιδας, . . . εὐνασόν εὐνασόν με . . . τὸν μέλεον. Of course Euripides need not have followed Sophocles so closely; but if I am right about the sense of ἔατέ με and the usage of εὐνάω, it seems likely enough that he did so.

Trach. 1018–22

Πρ. ᾧ παῖ τοῦδ' ἀνδρός, τοῦργον τόδε μείζον ἀνήκει
ἢ κατ' ἐμὴν ῥώμαν· σὺ δὲ σύλλαβε· σοίτ' τε γὰρ ὄμμα
ἔμπλεον ἢ δι' ἐμοῦτ' σῶζειν. Γλ. ψαύω μὲν ἔγωγε,
λαθίπονον δ' ὀδύναν οὐτ' ἔνδοθεν οὔτε θύραθεν
ἔστι μοι ἕξανύσαι βίον· τοιαῦτα νέμει Ζεὺς.

1019 σοὶ γὰρ ἐτοίμα Jebb 1022 ὀδυνᾶν . . . βίον Musgrave

Jebb's ingenious σοὶ γὰρ ἐτοίμα (*sc.* ῥώμα) ἐς πλεόν (Meineke) . . . σῶζειν gives some sort of sense, but ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ cannot mean 'than mine' or 'than for me', nor can it readily be altered to mean this. *E.g.* ἢ γεραῖω would make sense, but does not account for ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ. Suppose we start with σοὶ γὰρ ἔθ' ὄρμα (μοι· τὸ γὰρ ὄρμα Meineke), which is as easy as Jebb's reading and as good. ἔμπλεον looks like ἔμπεδον (Hermann), a word it has in fact displaced in an Orphic fragment quoted by Tzetzes (*Orph. fr.* 261 K). The change from -ον to -ος would be inevitable when ὄρμα became ὄμμα. There is now no comparative in need of a complement, so the feeble repetition of ἢ κατ' ἐμὴν ῥώμαν can be eliminated. Suitable sense would be given by *e.g.* ἄ νεαρά 'your youthful spring', or even ἄ διερά, *cf.* *Od.* 9.43 διερῶ ποδὶ 'nimble foot' (an epic usage; διερός later means 'fluid', *cf.* ὑγρός), with *P. N.* 5.20 γονάτων ἐλαφρόν ὄρμάν.⁸⁸ We then have:

σοὶ γὰρ ἔθ' ὄρμα

ἔμπεδος ἄ διερά σῶζειν,

'your agile spring abides still to save'. This is of course pure speculation, and the passage must remain a crux.

⁸⁷ εὐνάσαι μ' εὐνάσαι here might account for the unmetrical εὐνασόν μ' εὐνασον in 1042. For the responson 1006 ----- (εὐνάσαι) = 1025 υ υ υ ---, *cf.* *Phil.* 395 πότιν' ἐπιηρώμαν = 510 ἔχθεις Ἀτρείδας, where the scansion Ατρ- need not be doubted (*cf.* N. Conomis, 'The dochmiacs of Greek drama', *Hermes* 92, 1964, 38). εὐνάσαι is also possible, though I know no actual instance of the responson υ υ --- x --- in hypodochmiacs (υ υ --- υ --- occurs in syncopated trochees at *E. IA* 235/46). ἔατέ μ' ἔατέ με = τᾶδέ με τᾶδέ με is in this context most naturally interpreted as dochmiac. But this gives brevis in longo without sense-pause in both places, which would be remarkable. (Conomis states [*op. cit.* 45] that brevis in longo and hiatus do not occur without sense-pause in the dochmiacs of tragedy. This does not hold for Aeschylus and Euripides, in whom this feature is no more rare in dochmiacs than in other metres, but it does seem to hold for Sophocles; see now *C.Q.* n.s. 26, 1976). Slight pause might perhaps be given by the exclamatory force of δύσμορον in the strophe, though this is doubtful; certainly not με πρ- with lengthening before mute and liquid in 1024, since this would imply synaphea (it is required, most improbably, by Seidler's arrangement of the scene if Erfurd's

εὐνασον εὐνασόν μ' is read in 1042). It seems better to interpret ἔατέ μ' ἔατέ με (with Coxon) as dactyls. An isolated pair of dactyls among dochmiacs is, however, anomalous; they should be regarded as forming a compound with the following --- υ υ ---, i.e. a long form of prosodiac, *cf.* the shorter ibycean at *Andr.* 826 δαί' ἀμύγματα θήσομαι, itself part of a longer enoplian compound; the longer dactylic movement of *Med.* 135 λέξον ἐπ' ἀμφιπύλον γὰρ ἔσω μελάθρον βοάν; and the corresponding enoplian at *Ion* 1466 ὃ τε γηγενέτας δόμος οὐκέτι νύκτα δέρκεται, followed by dochmiacs (on this type of colon and its incidence in dochmiacs, see *LMGD* 167; the ending --- υ --- is typical, *ib.* 159). Dale remarks on *S. Phil.* 827 Ὑπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαής, Ὑπνε δ' ἀλγέων, where the metre is ambiguous, that the verse --- υ υ --- υ υ --- is uncharacteristic of Sophocles (*op. cit.* 117–9), but it is presumably in place in the κομμός type of scene in which most of the Euripidean examples occur. (*On Phil.* 677 see Part II of this article.)

⁸⁸ As a devotee of R. B. Onians' *Origins of European Thought* (q.v. p. 149 f.), I had thought of ὄρμα . . . ἄ μυελοῦ, *cf.* *A. Ag.* 76–8 ὃ τε γὰρ νεαρός μυελός στέρνων | ἐντὸς ἐνανῶσων | ἰσόπρεσβυς, in a similar contrast between youth and old age; but the phrase is too bizarre to convince even myself.

All recent editors adopt Musgrave's *λαθίπονον δ' ὀδυνᾶν . . . βίωτου*: 'My hands are helping, but no resource, either in myself or in another, avails to make his life forget its anguish' (Jebb); lit. 'I cannot achieve a life which makes him forget the distress of his pains', i.e. I cannot cure him. The reading of *codd.*, however, not only makes sense but has more point. Heracles, in a frenzy of pain, has just begged (whatever the exact text may be)⁸⁹ that his head should be cut off. The old man asks Hyllus to help him; he replies, 'This I can do, but I cannot compass the pain which makes life forget its troubles' (or 'which will cause him to forget the troubles of his life'); 'such things are in the hands of Zeus to bestow'. Hyllus cannot bring himself to put Heracles out of his pain as he asks by giving the *coup de grâce*. The idea of a painful cure is familiar, e.g. in the metaphor *ἐντέμνειν ἄκος*⁹⁰ (*Ag.* 17, *cf. ib.* 846), *ἄκος τομαίων* (*Cho.* 539); the idea of death as a cure for life's troubles is implicit in Hippolytus' prayer *εἴ μοι θάνατος παιᾶν ἔλθοι* (*Hipp.* 1373), *cf. A. fr.* 255 N *ὦ Θάνατε Παιᾶν*, and esp. *P. fr.* 131^a S. *ὄλβιοι δ' ἅπαντες αἴσα λυσιπόνων τελετᾶν* (of death). The exact counterpart of *λαθίπονος ὀδύνα* is *λυτήριον λύπημα* at 554, which I believe to be sound (see above ad. loc.). It adds a fresh ironical twist that Deianeira's 'pain that brings release' does indeed bring such pain that it needs still more pain to cure it. And it is a central theme of the play that the release from labours which Heracles thinks he has been promised is in fact death.

Trach. 1151–56

ἀλλ' οὔτε μήτηρ ἐνθάδ', ἀλλ' ἐπακτία
 Τίρυνθι συμβέβηκεν ὥστ' ἔχειν ἔδραν,
 παίδων δὲ τοὺς μὲν ξυλλαβοῦσ' αὐτὴ τρέφει,
 τοὺς δ' ἂν τὸ Θήβης ἄστρῳ ναίοντος μάθοις·
 ἡμεῖς δ' ὅσοι πάρεσμεν, εἴ τι χρῆ, πάτερ,
 πρᾶσσειν, κλυόντες ἐξυπηρετήσομεν.

Nauck, followed by Jachmann⁹¹ and Reeve,⁹² changed to *ἡμεῖς δέ σοι* in 1155 and deleted 1156, on the ground that *ἡμεῖς δ' ὅσοι* must indicate a real not a courtesy plural, whereas Hyllus should refer to himself alone. Radermacher argued that any *βασιλικὸν πρόσωπον* on stage would have a retinue, and Hyllus is referring to these as well as himself. This is possible, but it is dramatically more effective, as Jachmann insists, if Hyllus is referring only to himself—he alone is dramatically important as the only son present, and it is to him that Heracles' last requests are to be addressed. But the rhetorical fullness of 1156 makes a better close to his speech than the rather abrupt 1155, and it is doubtful if *εἴ τι χρῆ* can stand alone = 'if anything is needed'.⁹³ We can get the best of both worlds, and secure a substantial improvement at little cost, by adopting Nauck's first change and punctuating:

ἡμεῖς δέ σοι πάρεσμεν· εἴ τι χρῆ, πάτερ,
 πρᾶσσειν, κλυόντες ἐξυπηρετήσομεν.

T. C. W. STINTON

Wadham College, Oxford

⁸⁹ The most convincing restoration is that of Lloyd-Jones (*JCS* 22, 1972, 269–70):

οὐδ' ἀπαράξαι μιν
 κρᾶτα βίον θέλει
 <—υ.υ.—> μολὼν τοῦ στυγεροῦ; φεῦ φεῦ.

His *ex gratia* supplement *πανσίπονος* (or *λυσιπόνος*) governing *βίον* = 'putting an end to the pains of life' fits exactly with the interpretation of *λαθίπονον ὀδύναν βίωτον* offered here.

If it is right to see a close correspondence between this whole passage and *E. Hipp.* 1371 ff. (see p. 144 top) above), *Hipp.* 1385–6 *πῶς ἀπαλλάξω βιωτᾶν ἐμὴν τοῦδ' ἀνάληπτον πάθος*; (for the text see Barrett) might be thought to support Musgrave's interpretation of *Trach.* 1021–2. But it would correspond equally well with *Trach.* 1015–8, as restored by Lloyd-Jones.

⁹⁰ It is possible that the metaphor there refers to the tapping of roots or the shredding of herbs, as *ἀντίτομα . . . ὀδυνᾶν* does at *P. P.* 4.221 or *φάρμακα . . . ἀντιτεμῶν* at *E. Alc.* 971 (*cf.* Fraenkel's note); but it has more point if it anticipates 846 in the sense 'cure by incision', i.e. surgery, as Page takes it, and so does *ἄκος τομαίων* in *Cho.* 539, *Suppl.* 268 (see n. 69 above on *Trach.* 554).

⁹¹ G. Jachmann, 'Binneninterpolationen', *NGG* 1, 1936, 190–1.

⁹² *Op. cit.* (n. 57), 167–8.

⁹³ I owe this point to Mr Reeve, who tells me that Mr W. S. Barrett made it to him. I have not found any examples of this usage. *E. Suppl.* 594 *ἐν δεῖ μόνον μοι* would be analogous, but *δεῖ* has other usages not shared by *χρῆ*.