NOTES ON GREEK TRAGEDY, II

Sophocles, *Ajax, Electra, Philoctetes:* Euripides.[1]

S. *Ajax* 404–9

> ποῖ μολὼν μενῶ;
> εἰ τὰ μὲν φθίνει,
> φίλοι, τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ πέλας,
> μώραις δ' ἄγραις προσκείμεθα,
> πᾶς δὲ στρατὸς διπαλτὸς ἄν
> με χειρὶ φονεύοι.

= 423–7

> . . . ἔπος
> ἐξερῶ μέγ' οἷ-
> ον οὔτινα Τροία στρατοῦ
> δέρχθη χθονὸς μολόντ' ἀπὸ
> 'Ελλανίδος· τανῦν δ' ἄτι-
> μος ὧδε πρόκειμαι.

So Pearson. The strange series of hypodochmiacs here and at *O.T.* 1207 ff. (*cf.* E. *Or.* 982–4), with brevis in longo without pause at *Aj.* 421 and *O.T.* 1208 (possibly also 1217), seems metrically self-contained,[2] despite their syntactical interdependence (esp. *Aj.* 421–2 οὐκέτ' ἄνδρα μὴ | τόνδ' ἴδητ', so that the word-overlap of οἶον into iambics in Pearson's text is unlikely. ἐξερῶ μέγα should therefore be written *plena scriptura*. Then οἶον οὔτιν' ἁ Τροί|α στρατοῦ . . . is possible, but the ithyphallic with word-overlap, sometimes found in the syncopated iambics of Aeschylus, is foreign to Sophocles.[3] Divide ἐξερῶ μέγα, | οἶον οὔτινα | Τροία . . .[4] Then φίλοι τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ = οἶον οὔτινα, i.e. δ = hyp., which is not certainly found,[5] and the antistrophe has two syllables extra.

Dain's solution is to divide the hypodochmiacs throughout into pairs in synaphea, like dochmiacs, giving at 405–6 = 423–4:

> εἰ τὰ μὲν φθίνει, φίλοι, τοῖσ⟨ιν⟩ ὁμοῦ   hyp. + δ
> = ἐξερῶ μέγ', οἶον οὔτινα Τροία

But (1) ∪ – ∪ ∪ – – (reiz.), *pace* Conomis, *o.c.* (n. 6) 27, is not found as a form of δ and cannot correspond with ∪ – – (∪) ∪ – (the correption of Τροία cannot be assumed, as Stanford asserts, presumably on the model of τοιοῦτος, ποιῶ, etc.[6]). (2) The synaphea involves lengthening πατρὶ in mid-verse in *O T.* 1208.[7] This colometry must therefore be rejected.

The sense in the strophe is also obscure. εἰ τὰ μὲν φθίνει can be understood to mean 'if my glory is perishing', but 'together with these slaughtered animals' is hard to get out of a simple demonstrative. Jebb's τοιοῖσδ' does not help. ὁμοῦ, πέλας is in any case tautologous (we cannot construe ὁμοῦ τοῖς πέλας), and πέλας looks like a gloss. τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ, φίλοι

---

[2] *Cf.* Dale, *LMGD* 115.

[3] See M. Griffith, *The authenticity of 'Prometheus Bound'* (1977); *cf.* L. E. Parker, 'Catalexis', *CQ* 26 (1976) 20.

[4] So Wilamowitz, *GV* 508–9; Dale, *BICS Suppl.* 21.1 (1971) 18–19.

[5] *Cf.* Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 840. It occurs in mss.

at E. *Andr.* 834 = 838, but is easily emended there (see ad loc. below, p. 143); in A. *P.V.* 576/95 there is certainly some corruption.

[6] In E. *Hec.* 912 = 921, Τροίαν corresponds with τάλαιν'; but divide – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – | ⁔ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – , with normal licence. In any case the responsion ⁔∪ is impossible, as is ∪ –⁔⁔ ⁔⁔ –, while ∪ – ∪∪ ∪∪ – is unexampled as a form of dochmiac. (N.C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 [1964] 35, cites E. *Or.* 1247 = 1267, but this is best taken as iambic tripody; see di Benedetto *ad loc.*)

[πέλας] (after Wilamowitz, *GV* 508) then gives hyp., but four syllables less than the antistrophe.[8] Wilamowitz, following Nauck, reduced the antistrophe by excising στρατοῦ (as a variant on χθονὸς) and ἀπό (as a gloss) to give Τροία χθονὸς δέρχθη μολόνθ' | 'Ελλανίδος. But the elision corresponding with the brevis in longo in προσκείμεθα is impossible; nor is there anything wrong with the idiomatic part. gen. στρατοῦ, or even with ἀπό (on the break between ἀπό and 'Ελλανίδος eased by the preceding χθονὸς, see *JHS* xcvi [1976] on *Trach.* 97–9, p. 125–7). Since τοῖσδ' in the strophe needs a clearer reference, it is better to give it one by adding four syllables there,[9] e.g. τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ ⟨φόνοις | θηρῶν⟩, φίλοι.[10]

In 408–9 ἄν is misplaced[11] and the sense is better without it: Ajax *wants* to die (360, 394 ff.). ἄμμε could be right, but introduces a doubtful form (only in A. *Sept.* 156 in tragedy). ὤν, though unnecessary, seems the best alternative. δέ, if correct, is either apodotic, which is confusing with two other clauses in the protasis introduced by δέ; or it continues the protasis (Campbell), whose apodosis is then, in effect, ποῖ μολὼν μενῶ; This is very difficult with ἄν, and impossible without it. Read πᾶς δὴ στρατός. The strophe now reads:

> εἰ τὰ μὲν φθίνει
> τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ ⟨φόνοις
> θηρῶν⟩, φίλοι,
>
> μώραις δ' ἄγραις προσκείμεθα,
> πᾶς δὴ στρατὸς δίπαλτος ὤν
> με χειρὶ φονεύοι.

El. 122–3   . . . τίν' ἀεὶ
τάκεις ὧδ' ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγάν . . .;

= 138–9   (ἀλλ' οὔτοι) . . . πατέρ' ἀν-
στάσεις οὔτε γόοις οὔτε λιταῖσιν.

γόοις οὔτε λιταῖσιν (-αις) codd.; γόοισιν οὐ λιταῖς Tricl.: γόοισιν οὔτ' ἄνταις Hermann.

The paradosis does not correspond. The strophe is clearly sound, and – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – – is well attested (*Ant.* 816, 947; E. *Med.* 194, *Ion* 1073). – – – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – cannot correspond with this, since pendant close never corresponds with blunt; such examples in codd. as *Hipp.* 552 φονίοις θ' ὑμεναίοις = 562 φονίῳ κατηύνασεν are certainly to be emended. Kaibel gets correspondence by a division into 'ionic metra':

> – – – | ∪ ∪ – ∪ | – – –
>
> – – – | ∪ ∪ – – | ∪ ∪ – –

This kind of mechanical analysis by factitious metra has now long since been discarded (*cf.* on *Phil.* 209 below).

Corruption is isolated in οὔτε λιταῖσιν. Hermann's οὔτ' ἄνταις, based on Hesych. ἀντήσει (i.e. ἄντησι)· λιτανείαις, ἀντήσεσι, may well be right: it is neat, gives the right sense,

---

[7] Dain's supplement in *O.T.* 1217 εἴθε σ' εἴθ' ⟨ἐγώ⟩ is clearly wrong, but a supplement giving a long to suit his analysis could readily be found.

[8] Lobeck's φίλοι, τίσις δ' ὁμοῦ πέλας (with οἷ|ον οὔτινα) is on the wrong lines: it is dishonour, not vengeance, that Ajax dreads.

[9] So Dale, *l.c.* (n. 4).

[10] Wilamowitz also omits δέ after μώραις, and divides τοῖς δ', which he takes with προσκείμεθα. But 'I am involved with imbecile plunderings together with these,' sc. slaughtered beasts, gives an odd sense to ὁμοῦ. We then need προκείμεθα, cf. 427 ἄτιμος ὧδε πρόκειμαι and the Homeric κεῖται

ὁμοῦ νεκύεσσι. This might even be right, but the further changes are the last straws to break the back of the camel's credulity, if it is not broken already.

[11] Fraenkel was careful to point out ('Kolon u. Satz, II', *NGG* [1933] 319–20 = *Kl. Beitr.* i 93–4) that the rules governing the position of ἄν in classical prose do not necessarily apply to other genres. In practice they generally seem to hold for verse, and the few exceptions should probably be emended (e.g. *H.F.* 235 φεύγειν ὁρῶν ἄν, leg. ὁρῶν φυγεῖν ἄν: *ib.* 665–6 καὶ τῶδ' ἦν τούς τε κακοὺς ἄν | γνῶναι καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθούς, transpose ἦν, ἄν [Hermann]), or explained as a means of emphasis (see on *Phil.* 702, p. 135 below).

and explains its own corruption. However, the word ἄνταις, though well-formed and not completely unattested, is not wholly convincing. There is certainly not much room for manoeuvre here, as a negative disjunction of more or less determined sense is required. But Triclinius' οὔτε γόοισιν, οὐ λιταῖς, though pretty certainly a conjecture, deserves more attention than it gets. – ꞈ – in the close of a glyconic is well attested (e.g. *Phil.* 1128–51, *cf.* Barrett, *Hippolytus*, p. 299), also at the close of enoplians of various lengths (e.g. *Alc.* 252 = 259, *Andr.* 460 = 487). It occurs in – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ꞈ – at *Med.* 159 = 183, where εὐνέταν = ὁρμᾶται (Tyrwhitt's εὐνάταν is easy and could be right, but the form does not actually occur, while εὐνέταν does); and probably at *Phil.* 209 = 219 (see below *ad loc.*).

But is οὔτε γόοισιν οὐ λιταῖς possible Greek? There are several examples of οὔτε . . . οὐ, mostly, as Denniston points out, in serious poetry (*GP* 510). *P.V.* 450–1 κοὔτε πλινθυφεῖς | δόμους προσείλους ἦσαν, οὐ ξυλουργίαν is typical of the examples he lists from tragedy (*Cho.* 291, S. *Ant.* 249, *O.C.* 972, E. *Med.* 1348): several words intervene, making the asyndeton easier; the author has time, so to speak, to change his mind. But in Hom. *H. Cer.* 236 'the interval between οὔτε and οὐ is particularly short: οὔτ' οὖν σῖτον ἔδων, οὐ θησάμενος γάλα μητρός, which is in favour of Wilamowitz' conjecture in *Ag.* 496 ὡς οὔτ' ἄναυδος οὗτος, οὐ δαίων φλόγα . . .' (Dover, rightly, in *GP²*, p. 588). In these examples one should perhaps not speak of a 'change of mind', but of -τε being understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. If this seems strange it is no stranger than e.g. ἔχουσιν, οἱ δ' οὔ, sc. οἱ μὲν, or βροτοῖς οὔτε νεκροῖσιν, sc. οὔτε, which are not unusual ellipses in Greek. It is very difficult to determine, in a case of this kind, what was felt to be possible in the artificial language of poetry, and what was not. I argue below that at E. *Suppl.* 969 οὔτ' ἐν ⟨τοῖς⟩ φθιμένοις, | οὐ ζωοῖς ἀριθμουμένη (after Paley) is the right reading. οὔτε γόοισιν, οὐ λιταῖς, with no intervening word and no contrast, would be the extreme case; but it might be right, and it has much to recommend it. The change is marginal, the corruption obviously easy (*cf. Aj.* 1199 οὐ στεφάνων οὔτε . . . , where Hermann's οὐ for οὔτε is clearly right). Given the metrical rarity as well, I should hesitate to put this conjecture of Triclinius in the text; but its merits should not be ignored just because it is his.

El. **129–30**   ὦ γενέθλα γενναίων,
                            ἥκετ' ἐμῶν καμάτων παραμύθιον·

= **145–6**   νήπιος ὃς τῶν οἰκτρῶς
                            οἰχομένων γονέων ἐπιλάθεται.

129 γενναίων Monk: γενναίων πατέρων ΓΦΑ
145 οἰκτρῶς] οἰκτρῶς αἰκῶς τ' Porson

Responsion can be cured in either place. At first sight Porson's αἰκῶς τ' is attractive, since the metre is satisfactory (2 anapp.; the lack of diaeresis is no objection in lyric anapaests, cf. 238), and E. *Cycl.* 41–2 παῖ γενναίων μὲν πατέρων, | γενναίων τ' ἐκ τοκάδων could be a parody. However, πατέρων is far more likely to be intrusive; the scholiast in his first note seems not to have read it (ὦ παῖδες τῶν εὐγενῶν Μυκηναίων), while the gloss γενναίων. πατέρων shows how easily it could have been inserted. But what is the metre?

Not dactylic. Dactyls follow, but they are tetrameters with rapid movement, as are 177, 182 (Dale's B-type dactyls, *LMGD* 36 ff.), while – ∪ ∪ – – – – would be a trimeter with heavy movement (Dale's A-type). It is true that as Dale points out (*o.c.* 37–8) the two types are sometimes combined; but as she also points out, the B-type are especially characteristic of Sophocles, and they prevail in this passage, which she chooses to illustrate the point. An isolated heavy A-type trimeter would be most unlikely.[12] Not choriambic: – ∪ ∪ – – – and – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – – are found, but not – ∪ ∪ – – – –.[13] At *O.C.* 1247

                            αἱ δ' ἀνὰ μέσσαν ἀκτῖν(α),
                            αἱ δ' ἐννυχίων ἀπὸ 'Ριπᾶν,

[12] Dale reads πατέρων and scans as anapaests (*LMGD* 138).

[13] Page has pointed out that even – ∪ ∪ – – – ∪ – is in fact extremely rare, though it seems a straightforward variation of – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – (see n. 29 on S. *Phil.* 683–6 below).

ἀκτῖνα can be read with *plena scriptura* (brevis in longo and hiatus with pause), giving
– ∪ ∪ – – – – –. This is also rare (*cf.* E. *Hipp.* 70, with pherecratean in synaphea, i.e. a
form of priapeum), but is prepared for by the heavy spondaic endings of the two preceding
verses. It might however be dactylic, as is presumably 1248 αἱ μὲν ἀπ᾽ ἀελίου δυσμᾶν.
The final blunt enoplian – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – – at 1248 gives no clue.[14] Not anapaests, a
resolved form of the hexasyllable (e.g. *Ion* 925); these are always clausular to lyric anapaests
of the Klaganapäste type (see below on *Cycl.* 77), whereas this strophe is choriambic,
dactylic and iambic. The only possible hexasyllable of this type with resolution is in the
extraordinary lyric outburst in trimeters at *Trach.* 1085–6:

> ὦναξ ᾽Αΐδη, δέξαι μ(ε),
> ὦ Διὸς ἀκτίς, παῖσον.

These might be choriambic, but the comparable lyric verse in trimeters at S. *El.* 77 looks
like a spondaic paroemiac; so perhaps *Trach.* 1086 is dragged paroemiac (with opening da., *cf.*
I.T. 132), followed by its catalectic form as clausula. – ∪ ∪ – – – – occurs after two
dochmiacs at *O.C.* 1456 ἔκτυπεν αἰθήρ, ὦ Ζεῦ = 1471 ὦ μέγας αἰθήρ, ὦ Ζεῦ. This is probably
to be regarded as a 'long dochmiac', *cf.* the dragged dochmiac, also clausular after two
dochmiacs, at 1485 Ζεῦ ἄνα, σοὶ φωνῶ = 1499 σπεῦσον ἄισσ,᾽ ὦναξ.[15] This might indeed be
the right interpretation of *Trach.* 1085 (elided), 1086 (*cf.* 1081 αἰαῖ, ὦ τάλας, presumably
dochmiac). We could also compare S. *El.* 514 ἔλιπεν ἐκ τοῦδ᾽ οἴκου (though ἔλειπεν might
be right there). ὦ γενέθλα γενναίων might therefore just conceivably be given a dochmiac
interpretation. But – ∪ ∪ – – – – as a form of 'long dochmiac'—if it is one—is certainly
very rare.

El. 514 occurs in a stanza consisting mainly of the colon ∪̄ ∪̄∪ ∪ – – –. This has
been interpreted as syncopated iambics (so presumably 479 ὕπεστί μοι θάρσος), or as a long
form of dochmiac. The dochmiac interpretation, favoured by Kaibel (*Electra*, p. 147, cf.
Dale, *LMDG* 59 f., 103), is preferable: the colon is found in conjunction with dochmiacs
at *Trach.* 827–9, E. *Ion* 148–50, 894–6, 827–9,[16] and the short penultimate in *Trach.* 826
ἦ που ὀλοὰ στένει (= 857 ἃ τότε θοὰν νύμφαν) precludes iambic interpretation there
(see *LMGD* 101, Kaibel, *l.c.*). This colon, though also rare, is sufficiently well attested,
and seems to have been favoured by Sophocles in this play. Besides 504 ff., it occurs
shortly after our passage at 159–60 = 180–1, and probably at 154 = 173 (divide 153–4
οὖτοι σοὶ μούνᾳ, τέκνον (paroem.), | ἄχος ἐφάνη βροτῶν: so Kaibel). It also occurs at 129
ὦ γένεθλα γενναίων, if γένεθλα is taken as neuter plural rather than feminine singular.
Both forms are found in Sophocles, and the neuter is not excluded here by the feminine at
226 below. This needs a slight change in the antistrophe: νήπιος ὃς ὦν οἰκτρῶς | οἰχομένων
πατέρων ἐπιλάθεται, 'foolish is one who forgets his own pitiably departed parents'. ὦν =
suorum is rare but Sophoclean (e.g. *O.C.* 1640 ψαύσας ἀμαυραῖς χερσὶν ὦν παίδων, *Trach.* 525
ἦστο τὸν ὃν προσμένουσ᾽ ἀκοίταν), and the pathetic emphasis is appropriate, as in the passages
cited. This gives a colon which, though rare in general, is favoured in this play, rather
than one which is very difficult to explain. To alter the paradosis in both strophe and
antistrophe may seem an error in method; but the error is to retain πατέρων on the specious
ground of economy.

El. 448–52   ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν μέθες· σὺ δὲ
                  τεμοῦσα κρατὸς βοστρύχων ἄκρας φόβας
                  κἀμοῦ ταλαίνης, σμικρὰ μὲν τάδ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως
                  ἄχω, δὸς αὐτῷ, τήνδε λιπαρῆ τρίχα
                  καὶ ζῶμα τοὐμὸν οὐ χλιδαῖς ἠσκημένον.

---

[14] In *Phil.* 828 εὐαὲς ἡμῖν ἔλθοις, text and colometry
are quite uncertain.

[15] See Dale, 'Lyrical Clausulae in Sophocles', in
Greek Poetry and Life (essays presented to Gilbert
Murray) (1935), 195 = *Collected Papers* (1969) 13.

[16] Probably also S. *Phil.* 832–3 = 848–9, 835–6 =
851–2. 838 ⟨πολύ τι⟩ πολὺ παρὰ πόδα κράτος

ἄρνυται = 854 μάλα τοι ἄπορα πυκινοῖς ἐνιδεῖν πάθη
can hardly be other than 2δ (on the correption, see
BICS 22 [1975] 106 n. 22); ἐκτέταται νύχιος is
certainly dochmiac, and so I suspect is 830 = 846
– ∪ ∪ – – – (possibly followed by – – – – ∪ ∪ – – –
mol. = δ). *Cf.* Dale, *LMGD*² 117 f. See also
Kaibel, *Electra* 147; L. E. Parker, *CQ* 18 (1968) 258 f.

(ἀ)λιπαρῆ should mean 'filthy, greasy' (the scholiast and Hesychius gloss ἀλιπαρῆ by αὐχμηρὰν); but the root is λιπ-, and this sense could only be got by assuming an unwarranted *abusio*. λίπαρῆ, 'suppliant' hair (ἵκετιν τρίχα Σ), *cf.* λιπαρεῖ χειρί, 'suppliant hand' in 1378, gives possible sense, but far better stylistically is Bayfield's τήνδε ⟨τ'⟩ ἀλίπαρον, since this gives a chiastic balance with ζῶμα . . . οὐ χλιδαῖς ἠσκημένον (as Jebb, who obelizes but favours this reading, remarks).[16a] Kaibel, however, pointed out that adjectives formed with the suffix -ρος do not take ἀ- privative, and modern editors have been guided by him. But the ancients did not know as much grammar as we do, and such rules are sometimes broken, as this one is in Eupolis, *fr.* 69 (*CAF* i p. 274): ὅτι οὐκ ἀτρύφερος οὐδ' ἄωρός ἐστ' ἀνήρ. This might be a comic formation, but it might not; the philosopher Teles took it seriously. At least it seems good enough to protect the superior reading from Kaibel's veto. (*Cf.* 'More rare verse-forms', *BICS* 22 [1975] n. 15.)

El. 466–7   δράσω· τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οὐκ ἔχει λόγον
                    δυοῖν ἐρίζειν, ἀλλ' ἐπισπεύδειν τὸ δρᾶν.

'As to what is right, it is not sensible for two people to wrangle, but they should make all speed to do it'. As often in Sophocles, the general sense is clear, the syntax hard to see. Kaibel, followed by LSJ, took τὸ δίκαιον as subject of ἔχει: 'the just course does not give two people grounds for dispute'. But ἔχει λόγον cannot mean this; it means 'make sense, be reasonable'. ἐμπειρία οὐκ ἔχει λόγον οὐδένα ὧν προσφέρει (Plat. *Gorg.* 465a) is clearly different: it means that experience cannot give reasons, as knowledge can. But nor can ἐρίζειν be the subject of ἔχει since this needs δύο not δυοῖν. The analogy is πρέπει: ἔχει λόγον is impersonal, and δυοῖν ἐρίζειν depends on it as in οὐ πρέπει δυοῖν ἐρίζειν.

τὸ δίκαιον, then, is not the subject of ἔχει; nor again can it be the object of ἐρίζειν. 'To vie in respect of justice', i.e. each take a 'holier-than-thou' stance, is just conceivable on the model of *Il.* ix 389 Ἀφροδίτῃ κάλλος ἐρίζειν, but makes no sense here—Electra and Chrysothemis have not quite been doing this, though Electra and Clytemnestra will do so presently.

What then is the construction of τὸ δίκαιον? Jebb took it as an 'anticipatory accusative', not strictly in regimen with anything, *cl. O.T.* 216, 278, 1134, *O.C.* 766, *fr.* 681 P. None of these is very like: the relative at *O.T.* 216 and the infinitive at *fr.* 681 are much easier, 1134 is so harsh as to be suspect; nearest is *O.T.* 278 τὸ δὲ ζήτημα τοῦ πέμψαντος ἦν | Φοῖβον τόδ' εἰπεῖν ὅστις εἴργασταί ποτε. Dawe, after Eggert (*PCPS* n.s. 14 [1968] 14), cuts the knot by punctuating δράσω, τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον· οὐκ ἔχει λόγον, etc., with some mss.; he would then read οὐδ' for οὐκ. This certainly gives straightforward Greek, but it weakens the point. It is not any action, but *just* action, that one should get on with and not dispute about.

What is peculiar in *El.* 466–7 is that τὸ δίκαιον may construe with δρᾶν (though δρᾶν makes sense without it) but cannot with ἐρίζειν. It is in fact, as Wunder saw, an example of the διὰ μέσου pattern. Wunder himself compared S. *Ant.* 1279–80:

            τὰ μὲν πρὸ χειρῶν τάδε φέρων, τὰ δ' ἐν δόμοις
            ἔοικας ἥκειν καὶ τάχ' ὄψεσθαι κακά.

But this is a special case, when the two verbs go closely together; *cf.* Ter. *Adelph.* 917 tu illas abi et traduce (cit. Wunder ad *Ant. l.c.*); Plaut. *Aul.* 270 vascula intus propera atque abstulisse dicite, 959 mortarium . . . fures venisse atque abstulisse dicito; Thuc. iii 68.1 αὖθις τὸ αὐτὸ ἕνα ἕκαστον παραγαγόντες καὶ ἐρωτῶντες. The typical case is a contrasted pair of terms, one of which is in regimen with a third term while the other, which separates them, is not: e.g. Plat. *Legg.* 934e διδασκέτω καὶ μανθανέτω τὸν ἀμφισβητοῦντα, *Phaed.* 94d τὰ μὲν ἀπειλοῦσα τὰ δὲ νουθετοῦσα ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ὀργαῖς, Isocr. *Paneg.* 149c θαυμάζοντες καὶ ὁμιλοῦντες τοὺς ἐν τούτοις πρωτεύοντας. Normally the verb comes first, the noun governed

---

[16a] *Cf.* E. *Cycl.* 501 λιπαρὸν βόστρυχον. λιπαρῶ (Kells) is too strong for the context. In any case λιπαρῶ, 'importune', is not the same as λίσσομαι, and   would not be so used in the first person (contrast A. *P.V.* 1002–3).

by it last, as in the preceding passages. But the reverse order is sometimes found, e.g. Thuc. vi 88.3 ἐξ ἧς κρατεῖν δεῖ ἢ μὴ ῥᾳδίως ἀποχωρεῖν, Xen. *Hell.* vii 3.7 ὑμεῖς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἀρχίαν . . . οὐ ψῆφον ἀνεμείνατε ἀλλ' ὅποτε πρῶτον ἐδυνάσθητε ἐτιμωρήσασθε, *Anth. Pal.* vii 664 Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ στῆθι καὶ εἴσιδε (= Page-Gow, Theocritus xiv, p. 522).

These examples suffice to explain the complex pattern of *El.* 466–7[17]. Jebb's 'anticipatory accusative' may not, however, be irrelevant, since Sophocles sometimes does project to the head of the sentence an accusative whose construction only later emerges, e.g. *Trach.* 545 τὸ δ' αὖ ξυνοικεῖν τῆδ' ὁμοῦ τίς ἂν γυνὴ | δύναιτο . . .;

Phil. 208-9   . . . βαρεῖα τηλόθεν αὐδὰ
τρυσάνωρ· διάσημα γὰρ θροεῖ.

= 218-9   . . . ἢ ναὸς ἄξενον αὐγά-
ζων ὅρμον· προβοᾷ γάρ τι δεινόν.

209 γὰρ θροεῖ] θροεῖ γάρ Tricl.   219 γάρ τι δεινόν] τι γὰρ δεινόν Wunder.

The paradosis does not correspond, since blunt close cannot correspond with pendant (*cf.* on *El.* 122–3 above). Triclinius' transposition θροεῖ γάρ fails (1) because it requires the lengthening διάσημᾱ θροεῖ (that one of the very rare examples is ἃ θροεῖς at *El.* 853 is a coincidence)[18]; (2) because the resulting sequence (–) – – – ∪ ∪ –˘– ∪ – – (it makes no difference for this purpose where we divide) is very unusual: cf. *Phil.* 1181 ναὸς ἵν' ἡμῖν τέτακται; E. *Suppl.* 1027 δικαίων ὑμεναίων ἐν Ἄργει (after bacchii: possibly corrupt, see ad loc.); possibly *Aj.* 1205 . . . τέρψιν ἰαύειν· ἐρώτων | . . . (colometry uncertain).[19] Wunder's equally simple transposition τι γὰρ δεινόν, on the other hand, gives a well-established colon – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪˘ – – – –; the responsion – ˘ – in the close having an exact parallel in *Med.* 159 = 183 and analogues in other aeolic metres (see above on *El.* 122–3).[20] For the resulting order *cf.* A. *Andr.* 770 εἴ τι γὰρ . . . *Suppl.* 99 προσδοκῶ τι γὰρ νέον; a straightforward case of Wackernagel's law. Wunder's conjecture seems to me certain.

Phil. 676-9   λόγῳ μὲν ἐξήκουσ', ὄπωπα δ' οὐ μάλα,
τὸν πελάταν λέκτρων ποτὲ †Διὸς
Ἰξίονα κατ' ἄμπυκα δὴ δρομάδα δέσμιον ὡς ἔλαβ' ὁ†
παγκρατὴς Κρόνου παῖς.

Διὸς] τῶν Διὸς Porson   ἔλαβ' ὁ] ἔβαλεν ὁ Palatinus 287 (Turyn's Zo): ἔλαβεν Vater

677 is a syllable short and is probably pure dactyls, though the ending – ∪ – is conceivable.[21] Most editors accept Porson's ⟨τῶν⟩, but it may be that Διὸς is intrusive: since Zeus is the subject of the sentence, the reference of λέκτρων is clear without it. In 678 either Ἰξίονα or δέσμιον must go. Schneidewin, followed by Jebb, Pearson and Dain, chose Ἰξίονα, reading κατὰ δρομάδ' ἄμπυκα δέσμιον. The name is certainly dispensable; the omission of names in unambiguous mythical contexts is not peculiar to Sophocles, cf. *Ag.* 1022, another exemplum of divine punishment (Asclepius). But it is also a normal feature of Greek

---

[17] For the slight zeugma (with ἐπισπεύδειν sc. δεῖ, not ἔχει λόγον) cf. 649, *O.T.* 241, 818, *O.C.* 1402-4.

[18] On the rarity of the lengthening before mute and liquid see Barrett, *Hippolytus* pp. 310, 435.

[19] Other examples are given by Dale, who holds that all such irregular clausulae are explained by the metrical context ('Lyrical clausulae in Sophocles', in *Greek Poetry and Life* (*Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*) [1935] 200 f. = *Collected Papers* [1969] 19 f.). *Cf.* 'More rare verse-forms', *BICS* 22 (1975) 101–3.

[20] According to Dale (*o.c.* 199 = 18), this responsion 'can be dismissed at once; Sophocles could never

have set a regular to match a "limping" iambic at the close of a stanza'. Her assertion is ill-founded. The licence is not frequent enough in Sophocles for any inference to be drawn from its absence at stanza-end. It is not frequent in Euripides either, and *Hipp.* 741/751 – – – ∪ ∪ – ˘ –, with the exact parallel, noted above (p. 129), offered by mss. at *Med.* 159/183 – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ˘ – , is perfectly good evidence for Sophocles' practice, despite her denial (*ib.* n. 2).

[21] At *Phil.* 827 = 845, however, the metre is unclear.

poetry from Homer on that a descriptive phrase is picked up by a name at the beginning of the next line.[22] δέσμιον is also dispensable, but being a poetical word it is most unlikely to have intruded from the scholion κατὰ τὸν τροχὸν δεδεμένον, as Jebb suggests. In fact it fits the gap left after ποτέ if Διός is cut out. κατ' is now unmetrical. ἀν' is seductively neat,[23] but makes no sense with ἔλαβε;[24] δέσμιον . . . ἔλαβε makes sense but not with any preposition which takes the accusative. ἔβαλε, doubtless a Thoman conjecture, is the slightest of changes. ἀν' might then just do, 'threw him up onto a wheel'; but the right preposition is ἐπί, which could have fallen out almost as easily as ἀνά, in the sequence -ον . . . ἀμ-.[25] There is nothing wrong with δή: it emphasises the severity of Ixion's punishment, cf. E. Hec. 907–8 τοῖον 'Ελλάνων νέφος ἀμφί σε κρύπτει | δορὶ δὴ δορὶ πέρσαν. For its late position in the sentence, which Hermann condemned, cf. Phil. 877–8, Trach. 460–1, O.C. 1215–6. One more minimal adjustment is ἔβαλεν for ἔβαλ'ό (ἔβαλεν ὁ Palatinus 287: ἔλαβεν Vater). The text now runs:

<div style="text-align:center">

. . . τὸν πελάταν λέκτρων ποτὲ δέσμιον
'Ιξίον' ἐπ' ἄμπυκα δὴ δρομάδ' ὡς ἔβαλεν
παγκράτης Κρόνου παῖς.

</div>

' . . . the attempter of the bed, how bound he cast him, Ixion, onto a spinning wheel, did the son of Kronos'. The complex word order cannot be properly rendered into English, but it is quite possible in the lyrics of Sophocles.[26]

Phil. 683–6   . . . ὃς οὔτ' ἔρξας τιν' οὔτι νοσφίσας
ἀλλ' ἴσος ὢν ἴσοις ἀνήρ,
ὤλλυθ' ὧδ' ἀναξίως.
τόδε ⟨τοι⟩ θαῦμα μ' ἔχει . . .

696–702   οὐδ' ὃς θερμοτάταν αἱμάδα κηκιομέναν ἑλκέων
ἐνθήρου ποδὸς ἠπίοισι φύλλοις
κατευνάσειεν, εἴ τις ἐμπέσοι,
φορβάδος ἐκ γαίας ἑλών·
εἷρπε δ' ἄλλοτ' ἀλλ⟨αχ⟩ᾷ
τότ' ἂν εἰλυόμενος . . .

683 οὔτ' ἔρξας τιν' codd.: οὔτε τι ῥέξας Eustath. in *Il.* 193, 2: οὔτι ῥέξας οὔτιν' Jackson οὔτι Schneidewin: οὔτε codd. 684 ἴσος ὢν Schulz: ἴσως ἐν LP: ἴσος ἐν ΦΑ: ἴσος ἔν γ' Hermann 686 τόδε θαῦμ' ἔχει με codd. 700 ἐκ γαίας Dindorf: ἔκ τε γᾶς codd.: ἔκ τι γᾶς Page

The text is Pearson's. Jackson,[27] in his trenchant manner, rightly insists that the verbs in 683 need an indirect as well as a direct object, but pours scorn on Schneidewin's way of introducing it, οὔτι νοσφίσας, on the ground that τινά cannot be 'borrowed' from ἔρξας to go with νοσφίσας, nor, emphatically, can τι be borrowed from νοσφίσας to go with ἔρξας, since in ἔρδειν τί τινα the verb is ἔρδειν τι not ἔρδειν: ἔρξας 'can no more borrow τι . . , than it can borrow its ας from νοσφίσας'. He therefore wrote, with an eye to the indirect tradition οὔτε τι ῥέξας in Eustathius,

<div style="text-align:center">

ὃς οὔτι ῥέξας οὔτιν', οὔτι νοσφίσας,

</div>

---

[22] See Fraenkel on *Ag.* 7, 681 ff.; F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (1921) 107 ff.

[23] Dindorf, followed by J. Diggle, *CR* 16 (1966) 262.

[24] Nor with Diggle's ἔλασεν, cf. C. Austin and M. D. Reeve, *Maia* 22 (1970) 2–3.

[25] Or -αν . . . ἀν- if Musgrave's ἄντυγα is right, which it may well be. 'Rim' is nearer to wheel than 'frontlet', and the lexicographers' explanations, e.g. Hesych. ἄμπυκες . . . ἢ τροχοί· οὔτως Σ. ἐν Φιλοκτήτῃ, διὰ τὸ κυκλοτερές, could derive from this passage. However, ἄμπυξ does not really mean 'wheel' either,

so it is better to leave the text. I am not convinced by D. B. Robinson's explanation of ἄμπυξ in *C.Q.* 19 (1969) 42–3, that since it means (1) (gold) diadem, (2) horse's frontlet, (3) bridle, it suggests that Ixion's wheel is round, fiery and a curb on his passions.

[26] For the position of the predicative δέσμιον between τὸν πελάταν and 'Ιξίονα, cf. O.C. 716 ἁ δ' εὐήρετμος ἔκπαγλ' ἁλία χερσὶ †παραπτομένα† πλάτα θρῴσκει, where Jebb rightly takes ἁλία with θρῴσκει. (Cf. also *GRBS* 17 [1976] 327 ff.)

[27] *Marginalia Scaenica* (1955) 110 ff.

(. . . οὔτε νοσφίσας Bergk), giving ia. tr.[28]   Then in 699 κατευνασειεν leaves a gap which he filled by πόθος, subject of ἐμπέσοι and governing ἐλεῖν: 'if any longing came on him to take (them) from the bounteous earth'.   Page,[29] accepting Jackson's version of 683 = 699, observed that the choriambic diameter with long anceps – ∪ ∪ – – – ∪ – given by Dindorf's ἐκ γαίας was very rare, and suggested ἔκ τι γᾶς, remarking on the order: 'the intervention of the pronoun between preposition and noun is Sophoclean enough', cl. Aj. 155 κατὰ δ' ἄν τις ἐμοῦ, 906 ἐν γαρ οἱ χθονί.   This gives:

κατευνάσειεν, εἴ τις ἐμπέσοι πόθος,
φορβάδος ἔκ τι γᾶς ἐλεῖν.

There are two objections to this text:
(i) πόθος is unlikely to be right.   ἐμπίπτειν, as Long points out,[30] is a technical term in medicine for the onset of an acute attack of illness, used elsewhere by Sophocles himself (Trach. 1253 πρὶν ἐμπεσεῖν σπαραγμόν, cf. Hippocr. Aër. 7, Aph. 4.46, 4.80, Morb. Sacr. 20, with Thuc. ii 48, ib. 49, cited by Jebb).   This usage can of course be extended to any untoward happening, including emotions (οἶκτος, ζῆλος, φόβος).   But πόθος here would be an unsuitable subject: the 'onset' of a desire to gather healing herbs[31]—like a dog feeling an urge to eat grass—would be a sad anti-climax after the real attack, the agonising pain of Philoctetes' festered foot.
(ii) ἔκ τι γᾶς will not do, since the order is more remarkable than Page allows and is not warranted by his examples.   These are normal instances of Wackernagel's law, that enclitics tend to come to the head of the sentence or colon even at the cost of disrupting the regular order.[32]   This displacement therefore occurs in the first few words of the sentence; later in the sentence it is extremely rare.   Wackernagel (p. 368) cites e.g. Th. i 106, 1 καὶ αὐτῶν μέρος . . . ἐσέπεσεν ἐς τον χωρίον ἰδιώτου, and considers that hyperbata of this type are imitations of the natural growth exhibited by his law; similarly with ποτε: P.P. ii 33 ὅτι τε μεγαλοκευθέεσσιν ἔν ποτε θαλάμοις, Leonidas, Anth. Pal. ix 9 Ἴξαλος εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἀλώῃ (ib. p. 370).[33]   It is conceivable that Sophocles wrote φορβάδος ἔκ τι γᾶς ἐλεῖν, but it would be rash to introduce this hyperbaton by conjecture.
The second objection can easily be met.   The chor. dim. in 684 is in any case given by conjecture, ἴσος ὢν ἴσοις (Schulz) or, better, ἴσος ἔν γ' ἴσοις (Hermann).   L and the gemellus P have ἴσως ἐν ἴσοις, a mere slip for ἴσος ἐν ἴσοις (ΦΑ), the right reading, i.e. lekythion.   We can then read in 700 φορβάδος τι γᾶς ἐλεῖν, ἐκ being an intrusive gloss on the simple genitive.   A preposition would be normal, but a simple genitive is not unusual with persons, and φορβάδος has the effect of personifying γᾶς (cf. e.g. O.T. 1123 μηδαμῶς ταύτας γ' ἔλῃ μου, ib. 1022 δῶρόν ποτ', ἴσθι, τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν λαβών).   The snag is the objection to πόθος, since if αἷμάς is understood with ἐμπέσοι or e.g. νόσος supplied it becomes difficult or impossible to introduce a word to govern ἐλεῖν.   With ἑλών, the simplest change, τι no longer makes sense: it can hardly refer to φύλλα, and without πόθος . . . ἐλεῖν it cannot refer to anything else.

If Jackson's treatment of 683 = 699 is right, we might argue:

(1) ἄν is displaced from its regular position, viz. second or third in its sentence (colon), or

---

[28] Short before initial rho is very rare in tragedy (see R. D. Dawe, Studies on the text of Sophocles [1973] i 299 ff., and add E. Suppl. 380 πάντα ῥύη), but it is occasionally found before ῥέζειν; cf. also Solon fr. 23.20 D. = 34.8 W., where [ῥέζ]ειν seems the best supplement (so Diehl).

[29] PCPS n.s. 6 (1960) 52, cf. Sappho and Alcaeus, 81.

[30] A. A. Long, Language and thought in Sophocles (1968) 134 n. 73, cl. H. W. Miller, 'Medical Terms in Greek Tragedy', TAPA 75 (1944) 165.

[31] πόθος cannot here refer to more general desires such as hunger; that is reserved for the next stanza.

[32] 'Uber ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Sprache', IF i (1892) 333–446=Kl. Schr. i 1–104; cf. K. J. Dover, Greek Word Order, p. 14.

[33] Thuc. i 45. 3 ἐς τῶν ἐκείνων τι χωρίων and Hdt. i 85. 2 ἦιε γάρ τῶν τις Περσέων, cited by Classen ad loc., are slightly different, but they may be formed on the same model; cf. Hdt. viii 90.1 τῶν τινες Φοινίκων ἐλθόντες, also cited by Classen, where the order is regular because τινες is second word.   Wackernagel observes that the regular hyperbaton of enclitics is more frequent in the Ionic dialect, though not confined to it.

next to the verb,[34] which is here εἶρπε, not εἰλυόμενος;[35] i.e. the regular order would be εἴρπ' ἄν or εἶρπε δ' ἄν.

(2) τότ' εἰλυόμενος needs no special alteration in 686, since codd. τόδε θαῦμ' ἔχει με must be altered anyway, and it is as easy to get U – – U U – as U U – – U U –; e.g. τὸ δ' αὖ θαῦμά μ' ἔχει (Wecklein).

(3) εἶρπε (Bothe) is certain for codd.'s unmetrical ἔρπει (the tense is secured by 691 ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἦν πρόσουρος); δὲ not γάρ (codd.) is the right connective; and the rare iterative ἄν is surely authentic. But

(4) εἶρπε δ' ἄν (Blaydes) involves changing 685 ὤλλυθ' ὧδ' ἀναξίως, which seems sound: ἀνάξιος is a favourite word of Sophocles, and ὤλλυτ' ἀνάξι' ὧδε (Bergk, or οὕτως Burges) is quite unconvincing.[36] Therefore

(5) The connective comes earlier, viz. . . . κατευνάσειε, κεἴ τις ἐμπέσοι . . . We might expect δέ, but καί is logical enough: 'he was his own neighbour, having no friend to help in his attacks, and whenever one came upon him, he would go crawling about . . . as soon as it let up'.

(6) An iambic word is now needed, governing ἑλεῖν and going with what follows; i.e. θέλων or ποθῶν, either easily omitted (ἑλεῖν, -πέσοι). ποθῶν is slightly less obvious, but has the merit of picking up πόθος in 645, ποθεῖ in 675. The text then runs:

683–6
> ὃς οὔτι ῥέξας οὔτιν', οὔτι νοσφίσας,
> ἀλλ' ἴσος ἐν ἴσοις ἀνὴρ
> ὤλλυθ' ὧδ' ἀναξίως.
> τὸ δ' αὖ θαῦμά μ' ἔχει . . .

699–702
> . . . κατευνάσειε, κεἴ τις ἐμπέσοι, ποθῶν
> φορβάδος τι γᾶς ἑλεῖν,
> εἶρπ' ἂν ἄλλοτ' ἀλλαχᾷ
> τότ' εἰλυόμενος . . .

The foundations of this structure are however far from secure. The abnormal position of ἄν may perhaps be justified. There is one case noted by Wackernagel (p. 395) in which the usual rule does not seem to apply universally, viz. when the verb begins the sentence. He quotes three examples: S. O.C. 125 προσέβα γὰρ οὐκ ἄν ποτε . . . ., E. Suppl. 944 ὄλοιντ' ἰδοῦσαι τούσδ' ἂν ἠλλοιωμένους, D. xx 61 μάθοιτε δὲ τοῦτο μάλιστ' ἄν; we may add A. P.V. 979 εἴης φορητὸς οὐκ ἄν, εἰ πράσσοις καλῶς. These cases are very rare, but what they seem to have in common is that the word before ἄν receives a particular emphasis (cf. E. Ion 1299 ἐπίκουρος οἰκήτωρ γ' ἂν οὐκ εἴη χθονός)[36a]. So here τότε is emphatic: Philoctetes could not fend for himself when the fit was on him, 'but he would go crawling from place to place then . . . when the spasm let up'.

Moreover, Jackson's arguments are not quite so cogent as his lively presentation makes them appear. The 'unimaginable situation' created by the 'borrowing' of τινα from the first clause and τι from the second is not so extraordinary, nor is the separation of ἔρδειν (ῥέζειν) from its τι. We can perfectly well say in English, 'to no one did he do or deny anything'. We should not normally say 'to no one did he do or anything deny', but it might just pass as a line of bad verse. We should not after all say 'hobgoblin nor foul fiend', but Bunyan wrote it. So in Greek οὕτινα ῥέξας οὔτε νοσφίσας τι is straightforward: οὐ ῥέξας τιν', οὔτι νοσφίσας is slightly more difficult, but not much, when we remember e.g.

---

[34] Wackernagel, o.c. 393–402; cf. E. Fraenkel, 'Kolon u. Satz II', NGG Phil.-Hist. (1933) 319 = Kl. Beitr. i 93–4. See also on Aj. 408 (p. 128 n. 11), and below.

[35] So Jebb, rightly, since εἶρπε . . . εἰλυόμενος is not equivalent to ἕρπων . . . εἰλύετο.

[36] There is of course lack of responsion at the end of the line. This is neatly cured by Campbell's ἀλλ⟨αχ⟩ᾷ; ἀλλαχᾷ does not occur elsewhere in tragedy, but then neither does ἀλλαχοῦ—except in O.C. 64. But ἀλλαχοῦ is also a variant here in G and (καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ) Q (P. E. Easterling, CQ 19 [1969] 76). This can hardly be a metrical conjecture (though cf. Trach. 118 ὥσπερ A, and see PCPS n.s. 13 (1967) 51); it may simply be a gloss on ἄλλᾳ, but it could be an old reading.

[36a] Cf. also Ar. Ach. 640, Eq. 405 (verb first); Ach. 215, Eq. 707, 855; S. O.C. 1174.

P.V. 21 οὔτε φωνὴν οὔτε του μορφὴν βροτῶν. One distrusts Jackson's *Sprachegfühl* at one's peril, but given a language in which ἔχουσιν, οἳ δ' οὔ (*H.F.* 636) means 'some have possessions and others do not', or ἣ μὲν ὡς ἱ θάσσονα, | ἣ δ' ὡς ἱ τέτοκε παῖδα (S. fr. 471) 'one said that her son was faster, the other that hers was', to jib at οὐ ῥέξας τιν' οὔτι νοσφίσας is to strain at a gnat. The additional abnormality of οὔτε . . . οὐ (τι) (*cf.* on S. *El.* 122–3 above) which Jackson also found fault with is not necessary; if we accept Eustathius' οὔτε τι ῥέξας as representing the indirect tradition,[37]

                 ὃς οὐ ῥέξας τιν', οὔτι νοσφίσας

is just as good. οὔτε τι ῥέξας in Eustathius is just normalising syntax.

Then there is no gap in 699, and the problem is how to make 700 a lekythion meaning something like 'taking them (the herbs) from the bounteous earth'. Inadequate are: φορβάδος τι γᾶς ἑλεῖν (τι makes no sense); φορβάδος γαίας ἑλεῖν (the long anceps is relatively infrequent, though this is not a compelling objection); φορβάδος τε γᾶς ἕλοι (coordinate with κατευνάσειε: pointless hysteron-proteron); φορβάδος ἀπὸ γᾶς ἑλεῖν (makes sense and metre but does not account for ἔκ τε). But 684 = 700 might be chor. dim. after all, in which case there are many possibilities. The crux remains.

Phil. 1130–5

          ἦ που ἐλεινὸν ὁρᾷς, φρένας εἴ τινας
          ἔχεις, τὸν Ἡράκλειον
          ἄθλιον ὧδέ σοι
          οὐκέτι χρησόμενον τὸ μεθύστερον
          ἀλλ' ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ
          πολυμηχάνου ἀνδρὸς ἐρέσσῃ . . .

1155–8

          . . . ἕρπετε, νῦν καλὸν
          ἀντίφονον κορέσαι στόμα πρὸς χάριν
          ἐμᾶς σαρκὸς αἰόλας.

1132 ἄθλιον] ἄρθμιον Erfurdt   1134 ἀλλ' ἐν] ἄλλου δ' ἐν Hermann   μεταλλαγᾷ] μετ' ἀγκάλαις Cavallin

Dain alone of modern editors rightly keeps ἄθλιον. He translates 'n'as tu pas pitié à penser que le pauvre héritier d'Héracle ne pourra pas de suite user de toi?' (A more literal rendering of the articulation is 'that the heir of Heracles will not, poor wretch, be able . . .') The gift of the bow is indeed enough to make Philoctetes 'Heracles' man', but he was Heracles' man before. It was with Heracles that he made his first visit to Chryse, when Heracles sacked Troy; that was why he knew the island, and why he was guiding the Greeks when the snake bit him.[38] The description looks forward to Heracles' appearance at the end of the play. For the phrase, *cf.* οἱ Βρασιδεῖοι, 'Brasidas' men', etc.

In 1134 ἀλλ' ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ does not correspond with ἐμᾶς σαρκὸς αἰόλας in 1157. Hermann's ἄλλου δ' ἐν is widely accepted, but – – – = ∪ – – is doubtful except at the beginning of a

---

[37] Eustathius' οὔτε τι ῥέξας might just be due to a recollection of *Od.* iv 690 οὔτε τινα ῥέξας ἐξαίσιον οὔτε τι εἰπὼν | ἐν δήμῳ. But as Jackson says Eustathius certainly did have access to an independent tradition, *cf.* ἀμφίσταμαι at *El.* 192.

[38] Σ *Phil.* 194 τὸν βωμὸν ζητῶν ἐν ᾧ ἔθυσεν Ἡρακλῆς ἡνίκα κατὰ Τροίας ἐστράτευσεν; Philostr. jun. (*Imag.* 17, 859 K): Philoctetes knew where the altar of Chryse was because he had been there before with Heracles; Euripides, *Philoctetes ap.* Dio Chrys. *Or.* 59, 9: Philoctetes *showed* the Greeks where the altar was, *cf.* S. *Phil.* hyp. 4–5. The coincidence of the later sources with Euripides is enough to show that this version is not a late invention. Moreover, a series of vase-paintings (the earliest c. 430) show Heracles with Philoctetes (named) and/or Iolaus or Lichas at an altar, most probably the altar of Chryse

(see E. M. Hooker, *JHS* 70 [1950] 35–42). Mrs Hooker plausibly suggests that these were inspired by Euripides' play (431), in which the incident may well have been mentioned, rather than a large painting of *c.* 440 as Schefold thought. This previous association of Philoctetes and Heracles may belong to an early form of the legend, as Wilamowitz and C. Robert held (*Herakles* II 80; *Gr. Heldensage* 599 n. 3); in any case it is earlier than Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. The mere fact of Philoctetes receiving the bow from Heracles would of course suffice to make him 'Heracles' man', τὸν Ἡράκλειον, and thus anticipate Heracles' entry in the play; but the phrase has more point if it implies the earlier association of the two. (*Cf.* Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 1717 Alcidae comes, with ib. 1603–6 umerisque tela / gestat et notas populis pharetras / Herculis heres.)

period,[39] which this is not, and no good sense can be got from the Greek. Jebb translates: 'thou hast found a new and wily master; by him art thou wielded', and explains: 'the gen. after μεταλλαγᾷ denotes the thing *to* which the change is made, *cf.* Thuc. vi 18.4 ἀπραγμοσύνης μεταβολῇ, a change *to* inactivity'. Others compare e.g. μεταβαλεῖν νέους τρόπους 'change to new ways'. But at E. *H.F.* 765 μεταλλαγαὶ δακρύων means a change *from* tears not *to* them, and πόλιν μὴ ἀπράγμονα . . . ἀπραγμοσύνης μεταβολῇ διαφθαρῆναι is obviously much easier: a.μ. is an elegant variation on τῇ τοῦ ἀπράγμονα εἶναι μ. ἄλλου δ' ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ ἀνδρός, on the other hand, cannot mean, of a possession, 'change to a new master'; this would need ἄλλου δεσπότου; and what meanwhile is the construction of ἐρέσσῃ? 'You are wielded in the change to a new master' cannot mean what Jebb says it means. We need a noun in the dative, depending on the verb and governing the genitive. Cavallin bravely wrote ἀλλ' αἰὲν μετ' ἀγκάλαις, but although the poet Lovelace might 'with a stronger faith embrace a sword, a horse, a shield', it is not the best way to use a bow. Besides, there is nothing wrong with ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ. The obvious word is χεροῖν, and Hartung duly supplied it with χεροῖν δ' ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ, giving exact responsion. But as the preceding verse is certainly pure dactyls, a further change is then needed to make it end with a vowel: and μεθύστερον being clearly sound, this is not only a false economy, but an impossible one. The alternative is ἀλλ' ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ ⟨χεροῖν⟩, with a change in the antistrophe. ἐμᾶς σαρκὸς αἰόλας seems sound enough, but possessive pronouns are often intrusive in mss.: ἐμᾶς has displaced x – ∪, e.g. ἐν δαιτί. We then have:

1134–5	ἀλλ' ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ ⟨χεροῖν⟩ πολυμηχάνου ἀνδρὸς ἐρέσσῃ,
1156–7	. . . ἀντίφονον κορέσαι στόμα πρὸς χάριν ⟨ἐν δαιτὶ⟩ σαρκὸς αἰόλας.[40]

This has the additional advantage of getting rid of the sequence ∪ – – | ∪ – ∪ –, which I argue elsewhere[41] is avoided by Aeschylus and Sophocles.

***Phil.* 1192–2**   τί ῥέξοντες; ἀλλοκότῳ
 γνώμᾳ τῶν πάρος ὧν προύφαινες.

προύφαινες] προφαίνεις Pearson

Codd. give no intelligible metre; Pearson's προφαίνεις gives a hipponacteum, which as Page says (*PCPS*, n.s. 6 [1960] 53) is 'at home in this context'. But as Page points out the past tense is essential, since the sense must be: 'your intention is different from what you declared before'. Page therefore writes:

τί ῥέξοντες; ἀλλόκοτος γνώμα τῶν πάρος ἂν προφαίνεις.

'the intention you reveal is different from before'. It is simpler to keep the imperfect and the rest as they are, and write ὧν ⟨σὺ⟩ προύφαινες, giving – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – –; Sophoclean (*cf.* on *El.* 122–3), and just as much at home in this context.

E. *Cycl.* 76–81   ἐγὼ δ' ὁ σὸς πρόπολος
 θητεύω Κύκλωπι
 τῷ μονοδέρκτᾳ δοῦλος ἀλαίνων
 σὺν τᾷδε τράγον χλαίνᾳ μελέᾳ
 σᾶς χωρὶς φιλίας.

[39] Cf. *LMGD* 73, 100.

[40] ἐν δαιτὶ will then mark another allusion in tragedy to the pre-Zenodotean version of *Il.* 1–5 οἰωνοῖσι τε δαῖτα, shown by Pfeiffer to have been current in the fifth century, *cl.* A. *Suppl.* 800, S. *Ant.* 29–30, E. *Ion* 504, *Hec.* 1078 (*History of Classical Scholarship* (1968) 112–3). I owe this point to Professor Lloyd-Jones.

θητεύω Κύκλωπι is accepted by Diggle (*CQ* n.s. 21[1971] 45) as a 'hexamakron', *cl*. Dale, *LMGD* 60–2, but he disallows the brevis in longo, and therefore transposes Κύκλωπι τῷ μονοδέρκτᾳ | θητεύω etc., giving enoplia. The brevis in longo is in order: brevis in longo without pause is in any case not so rare that it must be emended, and here a light pause is given by the apposition of τῷ μονοδέρκτᾳ. But the analysis as hexamakron is very questionable, since this verse is always clausular to Klaganapäste.[42] This passage might be a parody of such, but if so it is not a very obvious one. ‒ ‒ ‒ ∪ ‒ ‒ , mol. + bacch., like *Trach*. 523–4 ἁ δ' εὐῶπις ἁβρὰ τηλαυγεῖ παρ' ὄχθῳ, would be equally out of place here (and so would Page's suggestion Κύκλωπι θητεύω ia. + sp.[43]). Diggle's transposition is easy and gives satisfactory metre, but Κύκλωπι looks like a gloss, as Headlam thought. Cut it out, and there is no need to juggle the words around to make metre, as he did: θητεύω τῷ μονοδέρκτᾳ paroem., followed by 4 + 2 anapp. δοῦλος goes with ἀλαίνων, giving pause after the paroemiac.

Cycl. 262–66

μὰ τὸν Ποσειδῶ τὸν τεκόντα σ᾽, ὦ Κύκλωψ,
μὰ τὸν μέγαν Τρίτωνα καὶ τὸν Νηρέα,
μὰ τὴν Καλυψὼ τάς τε Νηρέως κόρας,
τὰ θ᾽ ἱερὰ κύματ᾽ ἰχθύων τε πᾶν γένος,
ἀπώμοσα . . .

265 τά θ᾽ Hermann: μά θ᾽ L

Hermann rightly objected to μά θ᾽: when μὰ is repeated in oaths it is always in asyndeton.[44] But τά θ᾽ will not do either, since the new category—sea and sea-creatures—again needs asyndeton.[45] μὰ κῦμά θ᾽ ἱερὸν, with corresponsive τε . . . τε is possible (Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* 54), but the change is considerable; so too with μὰ κύμαθ᾽ ἱερά τ᾽ (Blaydes), which introduces a rare postposition of corresponsive τε (cf. *GP* 517, Fraenkel on A. *Ag*. 229). κύματα could do with an article, like Poseidon, Triton and the rest. Wieseler wrote μὰ ⟨τά⟩ θ᾽ ἱερά; simpler, however, is μὰ θαιερά, with crasis.[46] For the form *cf*. Ar. *Vesp*. 408 θαἱμάτια (see K.-B. i 220 f.); for the second-foot anapaest, *cf*. 272, 562, 588, 647, here with comic effect in the solemn formula.

Cycl. 511–18

καλὸν ὄμμασιν δεδορκὼς
Καλὸς ἐκπερᾷ μελάθρων.
⟨∪ ∪ ‒⟩ φιλεῖ τίς ἡμᾶς;
λύχνα δ᾽ ἄμμενον †δαῖα σὸν
χρόα χὼς† τέρεινα νύμφα
δροσερῶν ἔσωθεν ἄντρων.
στεφάνων δ᾽ οὐ μία χροία
περὶ σὸν κρᾶτα τάχ᾽ ἐξομιλήσει.

514 ἄμμενον ut vid. L: ἀμμένει 1 P

Polyphemus emerges, drunken and lecherous, ready for his κῶμος. The satyrs rehearse the pleasures to come, hinting meanwhile at the fate in store for him. The defective line 513 makes the satyrs suggest either (with τις) that they may be the object of his desires, anticipating the joke at 585 ff., where he picks on Silenus as his Ganymede; or (with τίς) that

[41] *BICS* 22 (1975) 88–95.

[42] A more sceptical view of 'hexamakra' is now taken by Diggle in *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974) 22–4.

[43] Possibly ∪ ‒ ∪ ‒∪ ∪ ‒ ∪ (enopl.) + ‒ ∪ ‒ ‒ , but this is also rare in Euripides.

[44] For examples of repeated μὰ see Pfeiffer on Callim. *fr*. 194. 105–6, to which add Men. *Dysc*. 666–7 (these references, and that in n. 46 below, I owe to Dr Diggle).

[45] I am indebted to Mr R. A. S. Seaford for this point.

[46] So F. Franke, *Commentationum de Cyclope Euripidis criticarum et grammaticarum spec*. i (1829) 32 (θἱερά, vel potius θαιερά), with reasons and the parallels for form and metre. The conjecture seemed worth reviving in this note, since it is clearly better than others since.

nobody loves *them*, while Polyphemus has a νύμφη waiting for him. It is also possible that the line was spoken by Polyphemus.[47] Then comes the crux: (1) δαΐα is unmetrical and also inappropriate, since it states as plain fact what should be *sous-entendre;* (2) χώς is meaningless.

The following points may be made. (1) ἀμμένει is an early correction of Triclinius, and may therefore be due to his exemplar and not to conjecture.[48] (2) 'Lamps await your flesh' (with χρόα as the object of ἀμμένει, as Dindorf and others have supposed) cannot be right, since again it says in terms what must be said in hints: there is no ostensible meaning to suit the context, and dramatic irony is not effective if there is no irony. (3) τέρεινα νύμφα is certainly right; the 'slender bride' (nymph) may or may not allude to the stake which is to blind the Cyclops. (4) The meaningless χώς might well conceal some case of χρώς, giving a paregmenon found elsewhere in such contexts, cf. *Suppl.* 1021 χρῶτα χρωτὶ πέλας θεμένα (with Collard's note), Theocr. ii 140 καὶ τάχυ χρὼς ἐπὶ χρωτὶ πεπαίνετο. Kirchhoff, assuming ἀμμένει to be correct, accordingly read: λύχνα σ' ἀμμένει· πελᾷ σὸν | χρόα χρῷ τέρεινα νύμφα. πελᾷ is superficially attractive, since it is tolerably close in uncials to δαΐα, the word often has sexual overtones, and there is an exact parallel in *Suppl. l.c.* But (1) πελάσω is the only form of the future in Euripides; (2) the form χρῷ is found elsewhere only in the stereotyped phrase, 'in close contact'; (3) σῷ not σὸν is required.[49]

The close of the stanza is manifestly ironical, the pivot of the ambiguity being ἐξομιλήσει, since ὁμιλεῖν can be used of good or bad association (e.g. *Or.* 354 εὐτυχίαις αὐτὸς ὁμιλεῖς; *fr.,* 341.2 μήδ' ὁμιλοίην κακοῖς). Less obvious is δροσερῶν . . . ἄντρων. A cool cave is a good place for making love (Theocr. iii 6, Hor. *C.* i 5, 2; E. *Ion* 17, al.), but Polyphemus' cave is also δροσερός because it is spattered with the blood of his victims (cf. *I.T.* 443 δρόσον αἱματηράν). ἀμμένει is also ambiguous. ἀναμένειν is commonly used of pleasant things in store, as at *Ion* 578 οὗ σ' ὄλβιον μὲν σκῆπτρον ἀναμένει πατρός, but sometimes, perhaps with some irony, of the reverse, as in *Hec.* 1281 φόνια λουτρά σ' ἀμμένει.[50] There is therefore more point if the *sous-entendre* begins with ἀμμένει, to be sustained for the rest of the stanza. Conjectures such as λύχνα δ' ἀμμένειν ἔασον, | ῥόδα, φῶς, τέρεινα νύμφα (Diggle),[51] which simply refer to some normal feature of an erotic assignation, do not meet this requirement. E.g. λύχνα δ' ἀμμένει πάλαι σὸν | χρόα καὶ τέρεινα νύμφα[52] does meet it, but 'lamps await your flesh', as we have seen, gives the game away, and the Greek does not readily yield a secondary meaning. Moreover, as we have also seen, χρόα χώς strongly suggests, in an erotic context, some play on χρώς. I suggest:

$$\text{λύχνα δ' ἀμμένει σὸν ὄμμα,}$$
$$\text{χρόα χρώς, τέρεινα νύμφα.}$$

'Lamps await your eye, flesh your flesh, a slender bride (nymph)', two coordinate phrases, with τέρεινα νύμφα in apposition, in the first place to χρώς, more remotely (with *sous-entendre*) to λύχνα. The *sous-entendre* is then obvious, the surface meaning rather less so, since ὄμμα is not in general used, like βλέμμα, to denote the verbal action, 'glance', 'gaze' (cf. *JHS* xcvi [1976] 123). If the sense of ὄμμα is slightly strained, this is justified by the obvious *sous-entendre:* as often in dramatic irony, the allusion is more important than the ostensible meaning (*ib.* 138 f.). σὸν ὄμμα → δαΐα σὸν would be due to a combination of uncial corruption and *simplex ordo*. This is however highly speculative, and the passage must remain a crux.

[47] As Diggle suggests, *Maia* 24 (1972) 345.

[48] See Zuntz, *Inquiry* 38, *al.* That the alteration is early is shown by the agreement of P. (Mr R. A. S. Seaford tells me that the correction is *l²* or *l³*, but that this may be simply a clarification of an obscure compendium in L.)

[49] The first objection (which I owe to Dr Diggle), is decisive, and the second cannot easily be met: (σῷ) χροΐ χρώ will not do, since χρώ is not found either, though said to be Attic by Choeroboscus (*in Theod.* 1.248 H); (σῷ) χροὶ χρώς, with τέρεινα νύμφα in

apposition, is unlikely to be right since πελάζω in a sexual context is intransitive only at P.*N.* x 81.

[50] I owe this point to Mr Seaford.

[51] *o.c.* (n. 47). He compares (after L. E. Rossi) Alcaeus *fr.* 346.1 (L.-P.) πώνωμεν· τί τὰ λύχν' ὀμμένομεν; δάκτυλος ἁμέρα. The passage is certainly relevant, but does not show that λύχνα is object rather than subject in *Cycl.* 514. Nightfall as a time for love is an obvious topos.

[52] πάλαι is due to Dindorf, καὶ to Hartung, the combination to Seaford.

Cycl. **672–5**   Κυ. Οὖτίς μ' ἀπώλεσ'. Χο. οὐκ ἄρ' οὐδείς ⟨σ'⟩ ἠδίκει.
Κυ. Οὖτίς με τυφλοῖ βλέφαρον. Χο. οὐκ ἄρ' εἶ τυφλός.
Κυ. ὡς δὴ σύ— Χο. καὶ πῶς σ' οὖτις ἂν θείη τυφλόν;
Κυ. σκώπτεις. ὁ δ' Οὖτις ποῦ 'στιν; Χο. οὐδαμοῦ, Κύκλωψ.

οὐδείς ⟨σ'⟩ Battierius]] οὐδείς

The usual interpretations of ὡς δὴ σύ are rightly rejected by Diggle (*CQ* 21 [1971] 49–50). It cannot mean '(blind) as you are' or 'as *you* say', nor can it be interrupted and left unfinished, sc. e.g. ἀπόλοιο.[53] Diggle supposes that καὶ πῶς . . .; interrupts ὡς δὴ σύ . . . σκώπτεις 'how you jest'. There are several objections to this. (1) It is true that interruptions sometimes have no bearing on what the first speaker is saying. But when a speaker is interrupted, though his words may be grammatically incomplete, he has always said something significant, which he completes or expands after the interruption.[54] This is not so with 'how you do . . . jest'. (2) Why καὶ πῶς . . .;? (3) σκώπτεις is better by itself, as at Ar. *Plut.* 973 σκώπτεις, ἐγὼ δέ, Men. *Dysc.* 54 (rather similar are Men. *Phasma* 90 καὶ καταγελᾷς μου; *Ran.* 55 μὴ σκῶπτέ μ', *cf.* Austin on *Samia* 596). What we need is for the Cyclops to say, in answer to οὐκ ἄρ' εἶ τυφλός, 'How do you mean? Of course I'm blind', i.e. πῶς; or πῶς λέγεις; The joke is then explained—being slow-witted he has failed to understand it—and he says σκώπτεις. Read e.g. πῶς δῆτα; or πῶς φῂς σύ; (*cf.* e.g. E. *Su.* 756, *El.* 575, Ar. *Av.* 319, *Plut.* 268 τί φῄς; *Nub.* 1443 τί φῄς συ;):

—οὐκ ἄρ' εἶ τυφλός.
—πῶς φῂς σύ;—καὶ πῶς σ' οὖτις ἂν θείη τυφλόν;
— σκώπτεις, κτλ.

καί then has some point: it picks up πῶς, and answers the implication 'I *am* blind'. Corruption could occur in various ways, e.g. φῂς becomes δή, then πῶς is altered to give a feeble 'tu quoque' sense.

Med. **44–5**   δεινὴ γάρ· οὔτοι ῥᾳδίως γε συμβαλὼν
ἔχθραν τις αὐτῇ καλλίνικον οἴσεται.

οἴσεται] ᾄσεται Muretus

καλλίνικος refers primarily to the victor, as in τήνελλα κάλλινικος, *cf.* Archil. *fr.* 119 D (= 324 West); or to the song (ὕμνος, ᾠδά, μέλος), in which case the noun is sometimes omitted: P.*O.* ix 1–2 τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος | φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, | καλλίνικος ὁ τρίπλοος κεχλαδώς | ἄρκεσε . . . (s.c. ὕμνος), *cf.* E. *H.F.* 180 τὸν καλλίνικον . . . ἐκώμασεν; *ib.* 681 τὰν καλλίνικαν ἀείδω (s.c. ᾠδάν); P.*N.* iii 18 καματωδέων δὲ πλαγᾶν | ἄκος ὑγιηρὸν . . . τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει (sc. μέλος); it never qualifies the prize. οἴσεται in this context must mean 'win'; and since καλλίνικον cannot refer to the prize, the phrase could only mean 'he will not win the victory-song'. But this would need the article (P.*O.* ix 3 is clearly no exception). We must read ᾄσεται (Muretus), 'he will not sing "καλλίνικος"' (for the accusative, *cf.* A. *Ag.* 48 κλάζοντας Ἄρη, with Page's note). If it is objected that victors do not sing their own victory-songs, the answer is that Dicaeopolis does so at Ar. *Ach.* 1227;[55] *cf.* E. *H.F* 180 (quoted above), with P.*O.* ix 3–4.

---

[53] This is only possible when the word to supply can be inferred either from what the speaker has already said (see Diggle's own remarks on aposiopesis in *PCPS* n.s. 15 [1969] 57) or from the context; e.g. Men. *Epitr.* 442–3 πῶς ἂν οὖν, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, | πῶς ἂν ἱκετεύω—is explained by 435–6 ἀλλ' ἀποδῷ πάλιν . . . ; ἄτοπον.

[54] The point is made by an apparent exception at S. *O.C.* 209–11:

Οι. ὦ ξένοι, ἀπόπτολις, ἀλλὰ μή,
Χο. τί τόδ' ἀπεννέπεις, γέρον;
Οι. μὴ μὴ μή μ' ἀνέρῃ τίς εἰμ(ι).

The bare negative is enough to tell the chorus what *kind* of utterance is to follow. Slightly different is S. *El.* 854–7:

Ηλ. μή μέ νῦν μηκέτι
παραγάγῃς, ἵν' οὐ
Χο. τί φῂς; Ηλ. πάρεισιν ἐλπίδων
. . . ἀρωγαί.

Here the simple question τί φῂς; needs no such indication.

[55] This might be just a joke, like singing 'for I'm a jolly good fellow'. But though it is doubtless the

Hcld. **892-7**

> ἐμοὶ χορὸς μὲν ἡδύς, εἰ λίγεια λω-
> τοῦ χάρις †ενι δαι†
> εἴη δ' εὔχαρις Ἀφροδί-
> τα· τερπνὸν δέ τι καὶ φίλων
> ἄρ' εὐτυχίαν ἰδέσθαι
> τῶν πάρος οὐ δοκούντων.

ενι δαι has been variously emended. The latest suggestion, ἐνδέδαεν (J. Diggle, *PCPS* n.s. 15 [1969] 41) is ingenious and colourful, and could be right. Another possibility is ἐν δ' ἀοιδαί, 'when the lovely pipe rings clear, and there are songs besides', *cf.* 780 νέων ἀοιδαὶ χορῶν τε μολπαί. For ἐν δὲ in a similar context, *cf.* S. *Trach.* 207 ἐν δὲ κοινὸς ἀρσένων | ἴτω κλαγγά, P. *fr.* 70ᵇ, 8 ff. S ἐν δὲ κέχλαδεν κρόταλ' αἰθομένα τε δᾷς; for the ellipse cf. *O.C.* 55 ἐν δὲ Πυρφόρος θεός, P.O. xiii ἐν δὲ Μοῖσ' ἀδύπνοος.

Diggle is right to see a priamel here (*CQ* 22 [1972] 241-2), so that in 894 δέ is correct but not εἴη.[56] Madvig's ἡδεῖα δ', which he reads, may well be right also. But he is wrong to meet the objection that 'Aphrodite, when she is charming, is pleasant' is tautological[57] by comparing passages where moderate and excessive love are contrasted, e.g. *Med.* 627 ff., *Hipp.* 525 ff. (add *I.A.* 543 ff.). This qualification is irrelevant to the priamel and disrupts it. It would be out of place for the chorus to imply that there are some kinds of love they do not like, just as ἐμοὶ χορὸς μὲν ἡδύς, εἰ . . . should not be taken to imply that there are some kinds of dance they do not like (a point on which Diggle rightly insists).[58] εὔχαρις would not be attributive but ornamental, like e.g. εὔλεκτρος in *Trach.* 515. We could also write ἀεὶ δ' εὔχαρις Ἀφροδίτα, with εὔχαρις as the predicate (= *suavis*), giving a freer form of priamel;[59] though perhaps εὔχαρις is not a sufficiently general word of approval. ἐμοὶ may simply be a conventional way of introducing a judgment, like ἐγώ at *Alc.* 962, ἐμοὶ μὲν at *Ion* 485 or παρ' ἔμοιγε at *Bacch.* 40,[60] but it could have a special point here: it is the chorus speaking,[61] so the first term of their priamel is dancing.[62]

Hipp. **622-3**

> . . . παίδων πρίασθαι σπέρμα, τοῦ τιμήματος
> τῆς ἀξίας ἕκαστον.

Barrett translates, 'Each man for the amount appropriate to his estate'. τίμημα, he says, seems to be confined to two specific usages, (*a*) assessment for property-qualification, (*b*) the sum assessed as damages or a penalty in a law-court. There are two ways of taking the passage: (1) the price varies according to the child's value, i.e. τοῦ τιμήματος τῆς ἀξίας means 'the sum at which its value is assessed', τίμημα general; (2) the price varies according to the father's means: 'for the sum appropriate to his estate', ἡ ἀξία τοῦ τιμήματος. Barrett has no doubt that (2) is right: (i) word order puts the emphasis on τιμήματος not ἀξίας,

---

victor's friends who would strike up the καλλίνικος (*cf.* Σ P.O. ix 1), there is no reason to think the victor would feel inhibited from joining in.

[56] In *P.P.* x 21f. θεὸς εἴη | ἄπημον κέαρ· εὐδαίμων δὲ καὶ ὑμνητὸς οὗτος ἀνήρ, κτλ., εἴη is obviously quite different.

[57] C. Austin and M. D. Reeve, *Maia*, 22 (1970) 11–12.

[58] Austin and Reeve, with some justice, question whether the conditional εἰ can bear this non-restrictive meaning. My doubts are not wholly allayed by Diggle's paraphrase 'if the flautist strikes up a tune, I like to dance', as I do not know an exact parallel. *Bacch.* 135 ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν, ὅταν . . . πέσῃ πεδόσε is presumably a case in point, if it refers to the god. Possibly εἰ = *si quidem*, as e.g. in P.O. ix 25-7 ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν, εἰ . . . ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων νέομαι κᾶπον, where the εἰ clause is strictly causal. But perhaps ᾷ should be read.

[59] As e.g. at P.O. i 1 ff., B. iii 85 ff. (*cf.* F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* 1921, 96 ff.). Diggle's examples and his comments on them give the impression that the type ἡδὺ μὲν . . . ἡδὺ δὲ . . . τερπνὸν δὲ καὶ . . . (or ἥδιστον δὲ) is the only form of priamel, whereas its variety is manifold, as Elroy L. Bundy, in particular, has shown (*Studia Pindarica* i, Univ. of California Publ., 1962). Dr Diggle tells me that he does not intend to give any such impression.

[60] See *PCPS* n.s. 22 (1976) 74.

[61] Cf. *O.T.* 896 τί δεῖ με χορεύειν, though this too can also be interpreted *in persona* (see D. M. Bain, 'Audience address in Greek tragedy', *CQ* 25 [1975] 16 n.).

[62] This is not to say that the priamel here hinges on a contrast between the speaker and others, as so often, e.g. P.O. i 111-3 ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν Μοῖσα . . . ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται βασιλεῦσι.

which fits (2) not (1); (ii) 'an Athenian will tend, if the context allows, to take τίμημα in one of the specific senses normal in Attic'.

The property-qualification of the purchaser seems an unnecessary elaboration of Hippolytus' brave new world: the point is that children can be bought like any other goods. τίμημα means 'valuation' or 'assessment', and has various specific uses; two of them, namely the valuation of a man's whole estate, i.e. his property-qualification for census purposes, and the assessment of a fine or punishment, are particularly important uses and common in the literature. Besides this, it means 'valuation' of any piece of property, whether for tax purposes or not: Dittenberger 1216, 27 ἐὰν δέ τις εἰσφορὰ γίγνηται . . . εἰσφέρειν Εὐκράτην κατὰ τὸ τίμημα καθ᾽ ἑπτὰ μνᾶς (Piraeus, c. 350),[63] 'according to its valuation, viz. 7 minae'; 965 ἐὰν δέ τις εἰσφορὰ γίγνηται ἀπὸ τῶν χωρίων τοῦ τιμήματος τοὺς δημότας εἰσφέρειν (Piraeus, late C. iv); D. xxiv 11 ἐμήνυσεν Εὐκτήμων ἔχειν Ἀρχέβιον καὶ Λυσιθείδην χρήματα Ναυκρατιτικά, τίμημα τάλαντ᾽ ἐννέα καὶ τριάκοντα μνᾶς, 'to the value of'; also 'assessment', i.e. 'rate of tax', D. xxvii 9 πεντεκαίδεκα ταλάντων γὰρ τρία τάλαντα τίμημα· ταύτην ἠξίουν εἰσφέρειν τὴν εἰσφοράν. So the range of its technical uses is wider than Barrett says. But I doubt the argument in itself. Occam's razor is a useful instrument in the interpretation of ancient texts: we should not be too ready to give words special meanings without evidence. But it is carrying this principle too far to say that an Athenian, hearing the word τίμημα in a tragedy, would take it to mean a fine or a tax-assessment unless the context forbade it. A bizarre feature of Hippolytus' fantastic ἀδύνατον is that children can be valued; so Euripides uses the verb-noun τίμημα, rather than simply saying τῆς ἀξίας (τιμῆς). The emphasis is indeed on τιμήματος, though I should not attach much weight to the argument from word order. But the difficulties and ambiguities disappear if we take του to be enclitic:

παίδων πρίασθαι σπέρμα του τιμήματος,
τῆς ἀξίας ἕκαστον.

'buy children at a valuation, each for its proper price'.[64] Barrett says that the gen. after πρίασθαι must be the actual price paid, so that 'according to', 'nach', 'suivant' etc. are slipshod mistranslations. When the valuation actually is the price paid, this fine distinction between *aestimatio* and *pretium* becomes invisible.

Andr. 465–7

ουδέποτε δίδυμα λέκτρ᾽ ἐπαινέσω βρότων
ουδ᾽ ἀμφιμάτορας κόρους,
ἔριδας οἴκων δυσμενεῖς τε λύπας.

= 471–3

ουδέ γ᾽ ἐνὶ πόλεσι δίπτυχοι τυραννίδες
μιᾶς ἀμείνονες φέρειν,
ἄχθος ἐπ᾽ ἄχθει καὶ στάσις πολίταις.

471 ουδέ γ᾽ ἐνὶ Lenting: ουδὲ γὰρ ἐν codd. 473 ἄχθος ἐπ᾽ ἄχθει ALV: ἄχθος τ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἄχθει V² rell.

In 471 Lenting's conjecture for the unmetrical ουδὲ γὰρ ἐν will not do. ἐνὶ (ἔνι) occurs in tragedy, and that very rarely, only when it is (part of) a predicate, e.g. A. *Ag.* 78 Ἄρης δ᾽ οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρᾳ.[65] ουδὲ is certainly right: 'double rule is not better in cities either', cf. *GP* 194 f. Read ουδέ γ᾽ ἄρα πόλεσι ('for cities'); on γ᾽ ἄρα see J. C. Lowe, *Glotta* 51 (1972) 34–64.

In 475 neither ἄχθος ἐπ᾽ ἄχθει nor ἄχθος τ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἄχθει corresponds with ἔριδας οἴκων. There are several lines of emendation. Musurus' ἔριν μὲν (answered presumably by τε) does not convince. ἔριδας ἐν οἴκοις, ἔριδα κατ᾽ οἴκους are inferior to the simple genitive. ἄχθος [ἐπ᾽] ἄχθει might be defended by e.g. *Hel.* 365 ἄχεα τ᾽ ἄχεσι, δάκρυα δάκρυσιν ἔλαβε, but as Jebb remarks (on S. *O.T.* 175), in such phrases the simple dative is always assisted

---

[63] See Dittenberger's note.

[64] This suggestion was endorsed by Lloyd-Jones in his review of Barrett's edition (*JHS* 86 [1966] 164 f.).

[65] It makes no difference whether we write ἔνι = ἔνεστι (whence M. Gr. εἶναι) with Fraenkel and others, or ἐνὶ (*sc.* ἐστί) with Page; *cf.* Wackernagel, *Syntax* ii 166, cited by Page *ad loc.*

by a verb (so even in *Hel. l.c.*) and the rather different dative πολίταις is awkward. ἄχθος (τ') ἐπ' ἄχθει may well have intruded, via the margin, from 395–6 τί δέ με δεῖ τεκεῖν ἐχρῆν | ἄχθος τ' ἐπ' ἄχθει τῷδε προσθέσθαι διπλοῦν. There are then various possibilities. The words could have replaced a similar phrase with a different noun, e.g. ἄχε' ἐπ' ἄχεσι; but ἄχθος is the right word for the burden of divided rule. I suggest *exempli gratia* δίδυμον ἄχθος, cf. 386, 465, *Hipp.* 1345 οἷον ἐκράνθη δίδυμον μελάθροις πένθος.

Andr. **833–5**   τί δέ μέ δεῖ στέρνα
                    καλύπτειν πέπλοις; δῆλα καὶ
                    ἀμφιφανῆ καὶ ἄκρυπτα δε-
                    δράκαμεν πόσιν.

= **837–9**   κατὰ μὲν οὖν στένω
                    δαΐας τόλμας, ἂν ἔρεξ'·
                    ὦ κατάρατος ἐγὼ κατά-
                    ρατος ἀνθρώποις.

                    838 δαΐας] δὲ βιαίας B   839 ὦ MBLPΣ : ὅ V: ἤ A

The strophe seems sound; the brevis in longo without pause στέρνᾰ | καλύπτειν is not especially remarkable.[66] In the antistrophe, δαΐας τόλμας gives υ – – υ – – – υ – – –, δ = hyp., a responsion not certainly attested (see above, p. 127 and n. 5) δὲ βιαίας (B) might indicate βιαίας as the original reading, as Stevens suggests, but is more likely a mistake. τόλμας δαΐας is an easy change. δῆλα καὶ = ἂν ἔρεξ' gives an impossible responsion of hiatus (after a prepositive!) and elision. Maas, in his interleaved copy of Schroeder's *Euripidis Cantica*, now in my possession, divided:

                    δῆλα καὶ ἀμφιφανῆ καὶ ἄκρυπτα δε-
                    δράκαμεν πόσιν,

dactyls with shortened ithyphallic clausula, i.e. a long prosodiac compound; cf. the similar compound at S. *El.* 1414 μοῖρα καθαμερία φθίνει φθίνει, and the corresponding enoplians at *Trach.* 499, A. *P.V.* 545–6. Maas does not suggest a way of adjusting the antistrophe, but this is not far to seek:

                    ἂν ἔρξ' ἃ κατάρατος ἐγὼ κατά-
                    ρατος ἀνθρώποις.

The aorist ἔρξα is much rarer in the indicative than ἔρεξα (cf. A. *Sept.* 924, possibly *Ag.* 1529), though common enough in other moods; this would account for the corruption, which is in any case easy. The responsion – ῡῡ is not abnormal in the first dactyl, even in Dale's 'B'-type dactyls; cf. e.g. S. *O.T.* 153/161.

Hec. **466–74**   ἢ Παλλάδος ἐν πόλει
                    τὰς καλλιδίφρους†, 'Αθα-
                    ναίας ἐν κροκέῳ πέπλῳ
                    ζεύξομαι ἆρα† πώλους ἐν
                    δαιδαλέαισι ποικίλλουσ'
                    ἀνθοκρόκοισι πήναις, ἢ
                       Τιτάνων γενεὰν

---

[66] N. Conomis (*o.c.* [n. 6] 45) maintains that brevis in longo without pause is extremely rare in dochmiacs. I noted on S. *Trach.* 1008 ff. (*JHS* 96 [1976] 144 n. 87) that this appears to be true of Sophocles, but not of Aeschylus or Euripides (see *CQ* 27 [1977] 46 f.).

τὰν Ζεὺς ἀμφιπύρῳ κοιμί-
ζει φλογμῷ Κρονίδας.

καλλιδίφρους M: -ου rell.　ἆρα M (ἄρα) O: ἄρματα V: ἅρματι rell.

The chorus speculate on their destination: the Peloponnese? Thessaly? Delos? Or perhaps Athens, where they will ply the loom, the typical activity of captive women from Homer on (*Il.* vi 466). But their task there would be a peculiarly Athenian one, weaving the peplos to be carried in the panathenaic procession and placed on the *xoanon* of Athena. The peplos[67] was in fact woven afresh each year, not by captive slaves but by the *arrhephoroi*, free-born Athenian girls; a privilege of which the exiled Iphigeneia thinks with longing: (*I.T.* 222–5) οὐδ᾽ ἱστοῖς ἐν καλλιφθόγγοις | κερκίδι Παλλάδος ᾿Ατθίδος εἰκὼ | καὶ Τιτάνων ποικίλλουσα. The scenes depicted on it were of Athena and the other gods, Zeus and Poseidon, sometimes Dionysus, with their mortal helper Heracles, in their victory over the Giants; an episode which figures seldom in literature, but often in art,[68] as even the literary evidence testifies: *Ion* 206–18, where the visitors to Delphi point out familiar scenes on the temple; cf. *ib.* 1528–9 μὰ τὴν παρασπίζουσαν ἅρμασίν ποτε | Νίκην ᾿Αθηνᾶν Ζηνὶ γηγενεῖς ἔπι, 'by Athena Nike, bearing her shield for Zeus beside his chariot against the Earth-born ones':[69] a frequent black-figure type in which Athena fights by Zeus' chariot as *paraibates*. On the peplos Athena rode triumphant on her chariot, as is reflected in the black-figured type which begins about 530. This type virtually disappears after 500, and Euripides doubtless had the peplos itself in mind, rather than contemporary vase-paintings, when he here sets Athena on her chariot. He does in fact speak of Titans, not Giants, here and at *I.T. l.c.*, but he certainly means Giants: Athena has nothing to do with the Titanomachy— she was not even born at the time. This syncretism is found in other writers after Euripides, but is particularly odd in this context.[70] καλλίδιφρος refers of course to the goddess not her horses. The genitive has been introduced in various ways: καλλιδίφρου τ᾽ (clearly wrong); καλλιδίφροι᾽ (-οιο is never elided in tragedy); καλλιδίφροῦ Hermann, perhaps rightly; his rearrangement of the strophe to give exact responsion is not necessary. The usual colometry, however, gives 469 ἐν | δαιδαλέοισι = 478 δορίκτητός | ᾿Αργείων, prepositive corresponding with brevis in longo. I prefer therefore to introduce the genitive by dividing:

ἢ Παλλάδος ἐν πόλει
τᾶς καλλιδίφρου
᾿Αθηναίας ἐν κροκέῳ
πέπλῳ ξεύξομαι ἆρα† πω-
λους ἐν δαιδαλέαισι ποι-
κίλλουσ᾽ ἀνθροκρόκοισι πήναις,
ἢ Τιτάνων γενέαν . . .

The period-end marked by hiatus at 467 could then have slight pause, given by the apposition of ᾿Αθηναίας to Παλλάδος . . . τᾶς καλλιδίφρου. The incidence of word-overlap, which is favoured in this metre, is about the same with either division. For the metre of 467, cf. *Alc.* 116 = 126, *Hipp.* 63, *IA* 1040 = 1062. (In these places, as at *Hec.* 467, x – ∪ ∪ – need not be a separate Kurzvers—reiz. may well be the shortest—but is added to a blunt aeolic verse to make a longer compound.)

In 469 ἆρα is certainly wrong. Interrogative ἆρα (the questions start at 447 ποῖ . . .; and run right through) is never so late in the sentence.[71] ἅρματι, ἄρματα are unmetrical.

---

[67] See Francis Vian, *La Guerre des Géants* (1952) 251; also pp. 63–7, 200 f. The first part of this note is largely derived from Vian's book.

[68] Gigantomachies on vases begin, and are most common, in about the decade before the middle of the sixth century. This fits well enough with the traditional date for the foundation (or 'revival') of the Panathenaea by Pisistratus (566); see Beazley,

The development of Attic black-figure (1951) ch. viii; J. A. Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 27.

[69] For this interpretation see Vian, *o.c.* 200.

[70] Aristophanes, as Vian observes (184 f.), draws indifferently on both legends for his parody in the *Birds*. For references to Hellenistic and Roman writers see Vian, p. 173.

[71] Denniston indeed, after a list of examples in

The obvious reading is ἅρμα, the central feature of Athena's advance on the peplos, cf. Σ Aristid. *Panath*. 197, 8 ἐν τοῖς Παναθηναίοις ὕφαινον . . . πέπλον, ἐν ᾧ ἅρμα ἦν ἐντετυπωμένον. For the middle ζεύξομαι, cf. *Alc*. 428 τέθριππά θ' οἳ ζεύγνυσθε. Note the chiasmus.

Suppl. 58   μετάδος δ'ὅσσον ἐπαλγῶ μελέα ⟨'γώ⟩
                         φθιμένων οὓς ἔτεκον.

ὅσσον *lp*: ὅσον LP (see Zuntz, *Inquiry*, 65)

ὅσσον would be the 'causal' use, = ὅτι τοσοῦτον (see K.-G. ii 370-1), as in *Hel*. 74 θεοί σ', ὅσον μίμημ' ἔχεις | 'Ελένης, ἀποπτύσειαν. The epic form in -σσ- is not found in Euripides, and occurs in tragedy only at A. *Pers*. 864, where dactyls perhaps license the epicism, S. *Aj*. 184 (τόσσον), and in mss. at *Phil*. 509 ἀθλ' ὅσσα μηδεὶς τῶν ἐμῶν τύχοι φίλων, where it is easily emended (ἀθλ' οἷα [Porson], or ὅσ' ἆθλα); it is doubtful in A. *fr*. 17.56 M, certainly wrong in E. *Med*. 1292, and introduced wrongly by conjecture in *I.T*. 1265 (see below ad loc.). Blomfield's οἷσιν, 'give me a share in the dead I bore, for whom I grieve,' is not impossible, but the two relative clauses with the same antecedent are clumsy, and the inversion of the first inappropriate in this highly emotional style. ὡς ἄν would make sense, but in tragedy is otherwise confined to trimeters: this again does not fit the emotional intensity of this passage.

Rather commoner than ὅσος in the causal sense is οἷος, which verges on exclamatory οἷος: with *Hipp*. 878-9 ἀπὸ γὰρ ὀλόμενος ἔρχομαι | οἷον οἷον εἶδον γραφαῖς μέλος (causal; 'causal-exclamatory', Barrett) compare ib. 844-5 ὤμοι μοι . . . σέθεν, | μέλεος οἷον εἶδον ἄλγος δόμων (exclamatory). This suggests that the right reading here is οἷον, sc. ἄλγος.[72]

Suppl. 960-1   δυσαίων δ' ὁ βίος,
                         πλαγκτὰ δ' ὡσεί τις νεφέλα . . .

= 968-9   οὔτ' ἐν φθιμένοις
                         οὔτ' ἐν ζωοῖσιν ἀριθμουμένα

968 ἐν φθιμένοισιν LP: ἐν τοῖς φθιμένοις *p* (see Zuntz, *Inquiry*, 77)   οὔτ' ἐν ζωοῖσιν] οὔτ' ἐν ζῶσιν *p*: οὐ ζωοῖς Hermann

The paradosis does not correspond: (1) 961 ∪ − − ∪ ∪ − cannot be answered by 968 − − ∪ ∪ − − (see on S. *El*. 122-3 = 138-9 above); (2) 969 has too many syllables. Wilamowitz cured (1) by transposing: βίος δὲ δυσαίων = οὔτ' ἐν φθιμένοισι, reiz. With this transposition, we could get responsion without effectively altering the antistrophe, viz.:

                         οὔτ' ἐν φθιμένοις, οὔτ'
                         ἐν ζωοῖς ἀριθμουμένα

This gives normal choriambic displacement, and is technically possible since the elided pendant οὔτ' at the end of 968 is followed by a long, not short or anceps. But this division implies that βίος δὲ δυσαί|ων ∼ οὔτ' ἐν φθιμένοις | οὔτ . . . is also possible; just as S. *El*. 473-4

drama (*GP* 49), concludes: 'There are, then, not a few cases in the dramatists where interrogative ἆρα is placed late'. But in such a case as *Eum*. 745 ὦ Νὺξ μέλαινα μῆτερ, ἆρ' ὁρᾷς τόδε; the vocative forms a separate colon, ἆρα beginning a new one. If we exclude such cases, ἆρα never comes later than fourth word in tragedy (here, given an incision at 'Αθηναίας, it is sixth, otherwise twelfth). There is one case in comedy: Ar. *Ec*. 462 οὐδὲ στένειν τὸν ὄρθρον ἔτι πρᾶγμ' ἀρά μοι; Denniston compares *ib*. 462 οὐδ' ἐς δικαστήριον ἄρ' εἶμ' ἀλλ' ἢ γυνή; The

postponements in Plato, which Denniston says are much freer than in other prose writers, are often to be explained in the same way by a separate initial colon, e.g. *Phlb*. 27B τὴν δὲ μείξεως αἰτίαν καὶ γενέσεως τετάρτην λέγων ἆρα μὴ πλημμελοίην ἄν τι; cf. Fraenkel's demonstration that ἄν in prose always obeys Wackernagel's rule (see above, p. 128, n. 11).

[72] In this note and the following notes on the *Supplices* I had the early benefit of Professor Collard's commentary, which he kindly allowed me to see in typescript.

εἰ μὴ 'γὼ παράφρων μά τις ἔφυν καὶ
γνώμας λειπομένα σοφᾶς

implies the possibility of dividing

εἰ μὴ 'γὼ παράφρων μάντις ἔφυν
καὶ γνώμας λειπομένα σοφᾶς,

though how it is actually set out on the page is a matter of convention. Now x – ∪ ∪ – certainly occurs (see on *Hec.* 466 ff.), but it is rare, and not found at the beginning of a period as it would be here. – – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – is also rare, though it occurs (e.g. S. *El.* 474). So 968–9 as they stand break no rules, but give markedly abnormal metre. Moreover, 960 seems perfectly sound, and the inverted order slightly preferable.

In 969 doubt has been cast on ζωοῖς (non-tragic) and ἀριθμουμένη (prosaic: 'glossema', Murray). ζωός (ζοός) occurs in epic, lyric (Archilochus, Pindar, Aeschylus' elegiacs) and prose (Xenophon; cf. ζώς, Herodotus); and in contrasts between living and dead at *Od.* xvii 116 ζωοῦ οὐδὲ θανόντος, P.I. iv 10 φθιμένων ζωῶν τε φωτῶν, A. epigr. fr. 3.3 Bgk. (*PLG* ii 241) ζωὸν δὲ φθιμένων πέλεται κλέος. There is no reason why Euripides should not for once have used it here. ἀριθμεῖν is a favourite word of his, especially passive in the sense 'be numbered among' (*El.* 729, *Bacch.* 1317, *Hyps. fr.* 22, 10 B; *fr.* 787 N); there is no ground whatsoever for doubting it.

Wilamowitz wrote οὔτε ζῶσ' ἀριθμουμένα. It is true that a participle corresponding with a prepositional phrase is a common enough type of *variatio* (cf. *GV* 547 n. 3), but a more exact formal balance is here appropriate to the sense. οὔτ' ἐν ζῶσ' ἀριθμουμένη (after *p* οὔτ' ἐν ζῶσιν ἀ.) would give an impossible elision. The best way of securing responsion with plausible metre is to read (with Triclinius and Hermann):

οὔτ' ἐν ⟨τοῖς⟩ φθιμένοις,[73]
οὐ ζωοῖς ἀριθμουμένη.

Paley's further change, οὐ ζωοῖς ἐναρίθμ(ι)ος, is unnecessary. ἐν τοῖς is ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, as often when the preposition is in the second member of the conjunction (disjunction), *cf.* Wilamowitz on *H.F.* 239. The change is slight, the corruption to οὔτ' ἐν predictable. The only difficulty is οὔτε ... οὐ so close together. S. *Ant.* 850–1 βροτοῖς οὔτε ... νεκροῖσιν | μέτοικος, οὐ ζῶσιν, οὐ θανοῦσιν, the same topos, is only superficially similar in form. The relevant evidence, which I judge to be sufficient, is set out on S. *El.* 122–3 = 138–9 above. (Cf. D.21. 114 ἢ πρὸς φίλον ἢ ἐχθρόν, S. *El.* 991, P. *P.* 9.40; E. *Or.* 46–7 μήθ' ἡμᾶς στέγαις, | μὴ πυρί δέχεσθαι, μηδὲ προσφωνεῖν τινα.)

***Suppl.* 1012–6**   ὁρῶ δὴ τελευτάν,
         ἵν' ἔστακα· τύχα δέ μοι
         ξυνάπτει ποδός· ἀλλὰ τῆς
         εὐκλείας χάριν ἔνθεν ὁρ-
         μάσω τᾶσδ' ἀπὸ πέτρας

ξυνάπτει]-οι Paley   ἀλλὰ τῆς] ἅλματι Hermann, *cf.* 992:   ἀλλὰ τᾶς Scaliger

τύχα δέ μοι ξυνάπτει ποδός is rendered 'the fortune of my foot cooperates' or the like, which is nonsense. The idiom is either ξυνάπτω πόδα (or equivalent acc.) or ξυνάπτω absol. *sc.* πόδα (*cf.* ἑλίσσω *sc.* πόδα etc.). The adversative ἀλλά is moreover out of place, while τῆς, which is dispensable, gives a prepositive corresponding with the brevis in longo κατ' αἰθέρα in 992, which seems sound despite corruption in 993. Hermann wrote ποδὸς ἅλματι, which

---

[73] Equally plausible is Kirchhoff's οὔτ' ⟨οὖν⟩ ἐν φθιμένοις, as Dr Diggle points out to me, comparing *Andr.* 329, 731, *I.A.* 1437, and L's οὔτ' for οὔτ' οὖν in *Hec.* 1244. He also suggests οὐ ζώντων ἀριθμουμένα' cl. *Ba.* 1317, an interesting possibility.

is possible, cf. 992, El. 439; but ἀλλα τῆς (τᾶς) looks like some form of ἀλλαγή. ἀλλαγαῖς (Ellis) is scarcely adequate. ξυνάπτει' πόδ' ἐν ἀλλαγᾷ would be straightforward, cf. O.T. 1206 ἐν ἀλλαγᾷ βίου, Phil. 1134 ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ. But closer to codd. and in the style is: τύχα δέ μοι | ξυνάπτει ποδὸς ἀλλαγάς, 'fortune joins a change of her foot to mine', i.e. changing fortune cooperates with me. For the phrase cf. E. El. 112 σύντεινε ποδὸς ὁρμάν, for the sense, H.F. 762 μεταλλαγαὶ ξυντυχίας. The explanation follows in asyndeton: the pyre below gives her the opportunity to rejoin her husband. There is then no need to change ξυνάπτει to optative. (Collard, who endorses this conjecture, adds [ad loc.] that its effect is to advance 'the ruling idea εὐκλείας χάριν to the head of its clause.')

Suppl. **1002–3**   πυρᾶς φῶς τάφον τε
                        βατεύουσα τὸν αὐτόν

= **1025–6**   ἴτω φῶς γάμοι τε . . .
                        †εἴθ' αἵτινες εὐναὶ

1002 πυρᾶς Bothe: πυρὸς codd. τάφον τ' ἐμβατεύσουσα Kirchhoff: ματεύουσα Hermann

βατεύω does not exist. Hermann's ματεύουσα, '(I came) searching for', would make sense, but the word is a strange one: ματεύω is not quite ζητῶ. Exactly the sense required is given by Kirchhoff's conjecture, ἐμβατεύσουσα, 'to set foot on', confirmed by the gloss καθέξουσα (on the wrong sense of ἐμβατεύειν, 'occupy'); cf. also 989 τήνδ' ἐμβαίνουσα κέλευθον. It seems to be ruled out by the brevis in hiatu at 1025 ἴτω φῶς γάμοι τε, the word-pattern corresponding exactly with 1002 πυρᾶς φῶς τάφον τε. But there is a word missing in 1025–6, so that τε there may also have been elided, e.g.:

ἴτω φῶς γάμοι τ'· ⟨εὐ-
τυχο⟩ῖθ' αἵτινες εὐναὶ . . .

In terms still appropriate to the marriage procession (cf. *Ion* 567, *Med.* 688), Evadne takes leave of the living, more fortunate in wedlock than herself.

The antistrophe then becomes too corrupt for restoration,[74] but the context indicates the sense of Evadne's closing lines (1029–30), where the εὐναῖος γαμέτας is described as

συντηχθεὶς αὔραις ἀδόλοις
γενναίας ἀλόχοιο.

She may be anticipating in erotic terms her union with her husband on the pyre, as Collard supposes (cf. 1019 ff.), or, as I think, saluting the wedded life she has lost and will regain only, so to speak, in effigy. But in any case συντηχθεὶς 'fused with', 'melted together with', has erotic overtones; cf. S. *Trach.* 462–3 οὐδ' ἄν εἰ | κάρτ' ἐντακείη τῷ φιλεῖν, 'melted into love', Plat *Symp.* 192a συντακεὶς τῷ ἐρωμένῳ. αὔραις surely means 'breath', 'fragrance': 'fused with the chaste fragrance of his noble wife'. It is true that αὔρα means 'breeze' and that the metaphors it enters into are usually nautical; but a rendering such as 'cleaving to the reliable winds of his noble wife' is impossibly frigid. There is no good parallel for αὔρα in this sense; the nearest is θυμιαμάτων αὔραι 'steam of exhalations' from sacrifices (Ar. *Av.*

[74] . . . αἵτινες εὐναὶ | δικαίων ὑμεναίων ἐν Ἄργει | φανῶσιν τέκνοις, if correct, would mean: '(goodbye to) any legitimate marriage in Argos appearing for my children'. Evadne is then mourning her own children's blighted prospect of marriage, as tragic heroines do elsewhere (*Alc.* 165 ff., 318 ff.; *H.F.* 476 ff.; *Hel.* 282 f., 933. I am assuming some such supplement as εὐτυχοῖθ' : ἴτω does not mean 'goodbye to', see Diggle, *PCPS* n.s. 20 [1974] 8 n.). φανῶσιν however is very odd, and I believe corrupt. Diggle would restore the passage so that Evadne is still referring to her own children. But Evadne's children have no place in this incident: the whole monody concerns her love for her husband and the happiness in marriage they have lost. My tentative *ex. gratia* restoration would be: . . . θάλλωσιν τέκνοισιν, ὅσους | εὐναῖος ⟨τέκῃ⟩ γαμέτας, meaning any marriage of which the children are ἀμφιθαλεῖς, i.e. with both parents surviving, unlike Capaneus and herself.

1717); in Antiphanes *fr.* 217, 22 αὖραι refers to the savoury smell of fried fish. The relevance of αὔρη φιλοτησίη of a fish's powers of sexual attraction in Oppian (*H.* 4, 114) is unclear.[75] But *cf.* the sense of πνεῦμα in such passages as *Med.* 1074 ὦ γλυκεῖα προσβολή, | ᾧ μαλθακὸς χρὼς πνεῦμά θ᾽ ἥδιστον τέκνων, *Tro.* 757 ὦ νέον ὑπαγκάλισμα μητρὶ φίλτατον,|ὦ χρωτὸς ἡδὺ πνεῦμα. *Cf.* also Papadiamantopoulos' βρίσκω τὴν ἄδολη πνοή σου | στὸ θυμάρι τοῦ βουνοῦ 'I find your chaste breath in the mountain thyme'. This sustains the image of close embrace begun at 1019–21 σῶμα τ᾽ αἴθοπι φλογμῷ | πόσει συμμείξασα, φίλον χρῶτα χρωτὶ πέλας θεμένα. Evadne is re-enacting her wedding and bridal night, as in the *Troades* the mad Cassandra enacts the wedding she is never to have (*cf.* 1001 ἐκβακχευσαμένα).

Suppl. 1115–8   λάβετ᾽, ἀμφίπολοι,
γραίας ἀμενοῦς—οὐ γὰρ ἔνεστιν
ῥώμη παίδων ὑπὸ πένθους—
πολλοῦ †δὴ χρόνου† ζώσης μετὰ δὴ
καταλειβομένης τ᾽ ἄλγεσι πολλοῖς.

δή] τε Reiske   μετὰ] μέτρα Musgrave

With Reiske's τε the text is metrical and will construe. But the sense, despite Mme J. de Romilly's recent defence of codd. (*Time in Greek Tragedy* 45), is inadequate. There is nothing wrong with μέτα in anastrophe and hyperbaton, and 'the separation of δή from the word it emphasises (here πολλοῦ) is not rare (*cf.* 573, *Hec.* 480, *Hel.* 1171, etc.; *GP* 229), but the form of expression is counter to the regular concept of man's life in relation to time. Man does not live simply in the company of time but of others or conditions throughout it, e.g. *H.F.* 676 μὴ ζῴην μετ᾽ ἀμουσίας, *Phil.* 1022 ζῶ σὺν κακοις πολλοῖς (Bruhn, para. 257); alternatively, χρόνος, "absolute" time, and αἰών "relative" time or one's lifetime, keep *man* company, e.g. *O.C.* 7 χὠ χρόνος ξυνὼν μακρὸς, *Ag.* 106 σύμφυτος αἰών: see Fraenkel's note . . ., Wilamowitz on *H.F.* 669'; thus Collard, who obelizes ζώσης μετὰ δή.[76] Musgrave's μέτρα is commonly adopted,' a use of the word which it is argued elevates the simple notion of long life to emotional equivalence with καταλειβομένης ἄλγεσι πολλοῖς and justifies the attachment of the particle δή to μέτρα', Collard. πολλοῦ χρόνου μέτρα could certainly mean 'long span of time', cf. *O.T.* 561 μακροὶ παλαιοί τ᾽ ἂν μετρηθεῖεν χρόνοι, 963 καὶ τῷ μακρῷ γε συμμετρούμενος χρόνῳ; but I share Collard's doubt: the idea of old age is not in itself enough to balance the next line. Zuntz (*Inquiry*, 186) considers that the 'lame last two words' μέτα δή point to a metrical makeshift by Triclinius. It is not μέτα δή, however, that is lame, but χρόνου. Read πόνου, and the line makes perfect sense and gives an adequate balance. μετὰ is normally used of persons (*H.F. l.c.* is exceptional), but there is an ironical point: trouble is Hecuba's companion in life. It is this, rather than πολλοῦ, that is then emphasised by δή, and γε is better than Reiske's τε:

πολλοῦ γε πόνου ζώσης μέτα δή

The corruption would be assisted by γραίας in 116.

Tro. 1305–6   γεραία γ᾽ ἐς πέδον τιθεῖσα μέλεα καὶ
χερσὶ γαῖαν κτυποῦσα δισσαῖς.

= 1320–1   κόνις δ᾽ ἴσα καπνῷ πτέρυγι πρὸς αἰθερα
ᾆστον οἴκων ἐμῶν με θήσει.

So Murray. The sense in the antistrophe is: 'I shall not know my home; it will disappear in dust like smoke rising to the sky'. So at 1298–9:

---

[75] Presumably the 'attractive smell' is like that of Barine in Hor. *C.* 2.8. 23 f. *tua ne retardet aura maritos*, though this is hardly appropriate in our passage.

(I owe this example to Dr Diggle.)

[76] Professor Collard's note as published is slightly different, though not in substance.

πτέρυγι δὲ καπνὸς ὥς τις οὐ-
ρίᾳ πεσοῦσα δορὶ καταφθίνει γᾶ,

'the land, fallen by the spear, perishes as smoke on the wings of the wind' (οὐρίᾳ Wilamowitz for the unmetrical οὐρανίᾳ of codd.). Wilamowitz compared (and contrasted) A. *Ag.* 818

καπνῷ δ' ἁλοῦσα νῦν ἔτ' εὔσημος πόλις.

The metaphor also appears at A. *Suppl.* 781–2:

τὸ πᾶν ἄφαντος ἀμπετὴς ἄιστος ὡς
κόνις ἄτερθε πτερύγων ὀλοίμαν,

though here the dust which flies up into oblivion is 'wingless', and ἄιστος, if correct,[77] has its normal passive sense, rather than the active sense required at *Tro.* 1321 (*cf.* 1214). It is compressed into a brief phrase, perhaps proverbial, at *H.F.* 510:

καὶ μ' ἀφείλεθ' ἡ τύχη
ὥσπερ πτερὸν πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ.

Wilamowitz (*ad loc.*, cf. *GV* 166) explains that πρὸς αἰθέρα depends on the verbal force of πτερόν, as on πτέρυγι in *Tro.* 1320. But πτέρυγι here is bolder; it stands, he says, for ἀναπετομένη, i.e. with κόνις: 'dust, like smoke, on wing to the sky'. This is not the pall of dust and ash rising over the doomed city as high as the smoke that marks its capture in *Ag.* 818—like Lucan's sandstorm (*Phars.* ix 460):

non altius ignis
rapta vehit, quantumque libet consurgere fumo
et violare diem, tantus tenet aera pulvis.

The image is again one of evanescence, as at 1298–9 and A. *Suppl.* 781–2, though the dust and ashes are here real enough: Troy will be dissipated in dust and ashes upon the air like smoke, as the human mind is dissipated εἰς ἀθάνατον αἰθέρ' ἐμπεσιών (*Hel.* 1016), though with no such metaphysical hope of immortality. The dative πτέρυγι, so interpreted, is however difficult, and is made more so by the adjacent καπνῷ. It would perhaps be better to take it in apposition to καπνῷ as a subsidiary image: 'like smoke, a flight to the sky',[78] i.e. like smoke winging to the sky. The phrase will then be more closely analogous to ὥσπερ πτερὸν πρὸς αἰθέρα in *H.F.* 510 than Wilamowitz allows.

In the strophe the sense is satisfactory but the prepositive καὶ | (χερσὶ) cannot correspond with the hiatus αἰθέρα | ἄιστον. We need a monosyllable at the end of the trimeter[79] which coheres with what precedes, not with what follows, e.g. μέλε' ἐμά (Hermann, followed by Diehl and the Budé editors), or μέλεά μου. Then καὶ χερσὶν = ἄιστον (not [καὶ] χερσὶν = ἄστον: ἄστος for ἄιστος never occurs, ἀστῷ for ἀιστῷ only at S. *Aj.* 515).

I.T. **34–41**   ναοῖσι δ' ἐν τοῖσδ' ἱερέαν τίθησί με·
        ὅθεν νόμοισι τοῖσιν ἥδεται θεὰ   35
        Ἄρτεμις, ἑορτῆς, τοὔνομ' ἧς καλὸν μόνον—
        τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη—
        [θύω γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει
        ὃς ἂν κατέλθῃ τήνδε γῆν Ἕλλην ἀνήρ.]

---

[77] ἄιστος ὡς C. G. Haupt: -αις δόσως M: ἀιδνὸς ὡς Kirchhoff.

[78] It is impossible to translate πτέρυγι adequately, since no equivalent English word has the requisite verbal force. 'Plume' would suggest what smoke looks like rather than what it does. A more abstract use seems to be required at Callim. *Lav. Pall.* 124 ποίων οὐκ ἀγαθαὶ πτέρυγες, of omens, though this may be technical. K. J. McKay, *The Poet at Play* (1962) 48 n. 2 compares *penna* = 'omen' at e.g. Prop. 3.10, 11, with Butler's note.

[79] For this type of lyric trimeter without caesura cf. *Or.* 966, 989.

$$\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi o\mu\alpha\iota \ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu, \ \sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha \ \delta' \ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda o\iota\sigma\iota\nu \ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota \qquad 40$$
$$\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\eta\tau' \ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\theta\epsilon\nu \ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu\delta' \ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{o}\rho\omega\nu \ \theta\epsilon\hat{\alpha}\varsigma.$$

35 τοῖσιν P² et nunc L: τοῖσιδ' P et primitus L   38–9 secl. Murray

τοισίδ' in 35 makes no sense, as Hermann saw. τοῖσιν (Tricl.) can hardly be right,[80] but *prima facie* we need look no further than -ν οἷσιν (Herwerden, cf. *H.F.* 1300; corruption due to τοῖσδ' above), though deeper corruption cannot be ruled out. The lines still cannot stand as they are, for these reasons:

(1) νόμοισι has no construction.
(2) τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ cannot be immediately followed by θύω γὰρ ... ἀνήρ, or Iphigeneia will at once break her self-imposed silence. If 37 is transposed to follow 41 (Markland), she will have nothing significant left to be silent about. (The gory details of 76 ff., 402 ff. to which Markland refers 37 are of no dramatic importance.)
(3) Less importantly, κατάρχομαι μέν follows oddly in asyndeton on 38–9.

The most plausible lines of emendation proposed are:

(i) Give a construction to νόμοισι or ἑορτῆς by deleting 35 (Monk: ἱερέαν . . . ἑορτῆς) or emending: θύειν for ὅθεν, depending on 34 (Herwerden); χρώμεσθ' for the presumed gloss Ἄρτεμις (Weil); νόμοις ἵν' ὀθνείοισιν (Housman).
(ii) Delete 36–8, so that νόμοισι . . . ἑορτῆς depends on κατάρχομαι, which also governs ὅς ἂν κατέλθῃ . . . ἀνήρ, *sc.* τούτου (Wecklein); *cf.* 56 τέθνηχ' Ὀρέστης, οὗ κατηρξάμην ἐγώ.
(iii) Delete 38–41, with aposiopesis at 36 (Usener).
(iv) Delete 38–9, so that νόμοισι depends on κατάρχομαι, which also governs ἑορτῆς (Murray).

Of these remedies only the last three, which deal with all the difficulties, need be considered in the first place. (ii) is neat, but inferior, as it makes Iphigeneia reveal too much too soon: a veiled hint is more effective dramatically here than a plain statement of her priestly duties. Diggle also notes that κατέρχομαι is not used in classical Greek to mean simply 'arrive' except in the sense 'arrive back' of returning exiles.[81] Usener's deletion of 38–41 is at first sight attractive. τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη then ends this part of Iphigeneia's speech, as is natural; *cf.* A. *Ag.* 36 ff., where the watchman ends his speech with τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, κτλ. She then goes on at once to relate what *can* be said, in her report of the dream (42 ff.):

$$\ddot{\alpha} \ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\grave{\alpha} \ \delta' \ \ddot{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota \ \nu\grave{\upsilon}\xi \ \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho o\upsilon\sigma\alpha \ \phi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$$
$$\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega \ \pi\rho\grave{o}\varsigma \ \alpha\grave{\iota}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha, \ \kappa\tau\lambda.$$

Usener explains 38–9 and 40–1 as alternative and misguided attempts to give 'the rest' about which she is silent.[82] Two things, however, make against his deletion. Firstly, it is doubtful if the sense is complete enough at 36 for the speaker to break off there, though the following τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ might make this a special case.[83] Secondly, the line κατάρχομαι μέν, σφάγια δ' ἄλλοισιν μέλει clearly and effectively recalls another passage of the *Agamemnon* (1249–50):

Χο.   ἀλλὰ μὴ γένοιτό πως.
Κα.   σὺ μὲν κατεύχῃ, τοῖς δ' ἀποκτείνειν μέλει.

Murray's text (iv) has the advantage of retaining this allusion while dispensing with the over-explicit 38–9. Moreover, the slight clumsiness which results from the two relative

---

[80] As J. Diggle points out in his note on the passage (*PCPS*, n.s. 15 [1969] 57–9), the articular form of the relative pronoun is very rare when not required by metre (see also M. D. Reeve, *GRBS* 11 [1970] 285 f.).

[81] κατάγεσθαι is analogous and *Od.* xvi 472 νῆα . . . κατιοῦσαν is a sound example of the sense required, but the word is common enough for the argument *ex silentio* to be valid. The dominance of the special

usage can be seen from A. *Cho.* 3 ἥκω γὰρ ἐς γῆν τήνδε καὶ κατέρχομαι, and from Aeschylus' defence of the line against Euripides' charge of tautology (Ar. *Ran.* 1154–65).

[82] *Cf.* D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (1934) 76.

[83] *Cf.* on *Cycl.* 672–5 above, and see Diggle, *o.c.* (n. 80) 57.

clauses in 35–6 if ἑορτῆς qualifies νόμοισι disappears if ἑορτῆς depends on κατάρχομαι.[84] The genitive (for which *cf.* e.g. *Hec.* 685 κατάρχομαι γόων) is not quite the same as in the technical usage at 56 . . . Ὀρέστης, οὗ κατηρξάμην, where the genitive denotes the sacrifice (*cf.* e.g. *Pho.* 573 πῶς δ᾽ αὖ κατάρξῃ θυμάτων;); but ἑορτῆς κατάρχομαι prepares for v. 56, as Iphigeneia's sinister hints prepare for the dream without anticipating it exactly. That Aeschylus' κατεύχομαι has here become κατάρχομαι need not surprise us, since they are both technical terms for an early stage in sacrificial proceedings.[85] They are in fact both guaranteed by their context: κατεύχη by the preceding prayer, κατάρχομαι by the preceding genitive.[56] But v. 37, whether understood as a parenthesis as Murray prints it, or as a part of the relative clause,[87] separates ἑορτῆς rather awkwardly from the verb which governs it. It also remains true that τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα σιγῶ, κτλ. should follow not precede κατάρχομαι κτλ., and conclude this part of the speech; as Markland saw, it follows 41. It was presumably displaced *after* the interpolation of 38–9, which is evidently meant to explain not τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα, as Usener and Page suppose, but τοὔνομ᾽ ἧς καλὸν μόνον;[88] perhaps placed after 36 to give an antithesis to τοὔνομα . . . μόνον.

One further change is desirable, though not demonstrably right: the excision of 41 (so Wecklein, along with 40, after Stedefeldt). The line is strikingly similar to 65–6 εἴμ᾽ ἔσω δόμων | ἐν οἷσι ναίω τῶνδ᾽ ἀνακτόρων θεᾶς. This is not of course conclusive, but v. 66 makes a good ending to Iphigeneia's speech, which is seriously weakened if it is anticipated towards the close of the preceding section. More importantly,[89] the sense of 41 conflicts with that of 72, where the sacrificial altar is evidently outside. Moreover, the omission of 41 is in itself an improvement. The sinister tone has already been set by τοὔνομ᾽ ἧς καλὸν μόνον, and κατάρχομαι μέν, σφάγια δ᾽ ἄλλοισιν μέλει sustains this tone more effectively if, like its Aeschylean conterpart, it stands alone, than with the addition of ἄρρητ᾽ ἔσωθεν κτλ., more obviously driving the point home. It might be said that ἄρρητα more clearly motivates the following τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη: Iphigeneia breaks off for fear of revealing mysteries, a motive which otherwise the audience must be left to infer for themselves. But this is not after all a difficult inference, when the fear is so widespread. No doubt v. 41, if genuine, would recall the bloodthirsty rites of Tauric Artemis,[90] later in the play to be identified with Artemis Tauropolos (1456–7), when Athena prescribes the more humane version of those rites, with surrogate victim, to be brought by Orestes and Iphigeneia to Attica. But given that the audience knew of the rites, 34–40 would be enough to suggest all this to them, even in the allusive form for which I have argued. One cannot be sure that Euripides did not write v. 41, but the text is better without it. The passage then runs:

35   ὅθεν νόμοισιν οἷσιν ἥδεται θεὰ
       Ἄρτεμις, ἑορτῆς, τοὔνομ᾽ ἧς καλὸν μόνον,
       κατάρχομαι μέν, σφάγια δ᾽ ἄλλοισιν μέλει·
       τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη.
         ἃ καινὰ δ᾽ ἥκει νὺξ φέρουσα φάσματα,
       λέξω πρὸς αἰθέρα, κτλ.

[84] As Diggle observes, though he seems not to recognise that Murray construes ἑορτῆς in the same way as himself (*cf.* C. Austin and M. D. Reeve in *Maia* 22 [1970] 15).

[85] κατάρχομαι is used sometimes of the sprinkling, *cf. Od.* iii 445 χέρνιβά τ᾽ οὐλοχύτας τε κατήρχετο, sometimes of the stage after the sprinkling, *cf.* Ar. *Av.* 559 μὴ κατάρξῃ τοῦ τράγου, where the genitive denotes the offering, as in *I.T.* 56, 1154, *cf.* D.xxi 114 κατάρξασθαι τῶν ἱερῶν. For the technical sense of κατεύχομαι *cf.* S. *Trach.* 764, and see Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides* (1913) 152 n. 3.

[86] κατεύχομαι also occurs in a fourth-century inscription (*IG* vii 235, 25) with the genitive used of the offerings (τῶν ἱερῶν), like κατάρχομαι. But the use is not attested in literature, and the more general sense of κατάρχομαι is needed here (just as in *Ag.* 1450

the general sense of κατεύχομαι is needed to refer back to the chorus' prayer, while the technical sense gives the line its point).

[87] So Diggle, who puts brackets round the clause (τοὔνομ᾽ . . . φοβουμένη). The hyperbaton is in itself perfectly possible; but with Murray's pointing the parenthesis breaks up the run of the sentence, while with Diggle's the relative clauses impede it.

[88] So Diggle (*o.c.* 58), though he would now prefer, with Elmsley, to take the lines as an explanation of νόμοισί(ν).

[89] As Diggle, after Wecklein, points out (*o.c.* 57), though he retains the line in his final version.

[90] As Hermann remarked, cl. Hdt. iv 103. For the relation between Artemis Ταυρική and Ταυροπόλος, see L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (1896) ii 240 ff., 251–5.

I.T. 1239–40   φέρε νιν†
                  ἀπὸ δειράδος εἰναλίας

= 1264–5   οἳ μερόπων τά τε πρῶτα,
                τά τ' ἔπειτ', ὅσα† τ' ἔμελλε τυχεῖν,
                . . . ἔφραζον.

1239 νιν] δ' ἴνιν Kirchhoff: δ' αὐτά νιν Murray.
1265 ὅσα τ'] ὅσ' Burges: ὅσσα τ' Musgrave: ἅ τ' Seidler.

In 1265 codd. have the unmetrical ὅσα τε. Musgrave's ὅσσα τ', read by Murray, will not do, since (1) the form is non-tragic (*cf.* on E. *Suppl.* 58), (2) the metrical sequence given by Murray, φέρε δ' αὐτά | νιν ἀπὸ = τά τε πρῶτα, τά τ' | ἔπειθ', giving dactyls in synaphea with ŬŬ ū – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – is extraordinary, and with his supplement impossible, since only pure dactyls have alien close.[91] Burges wrote ὅσ' ἔμελλε τυχεῖν, meaning 'both the first things and the next which were to happen', i.e. both the immediate and the remoter future. But (1) the distinction seems irrelevant in prophecy; (2) τὰ πρῶτα = 'the first part of the future we come to' is difficult, even with the relative clause; Aristotle's πρώτη αἰτία as 'proximate cause' would be analogous, but hardly a convincing parallel; (3) in S. *Ant.* 611 τό τ' ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ μέλλον | καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει νόμος ὅδ', τό τ' ἔπειτα is contrasted with τὸ μέλλον as the present (or immediate future) with the (remoter) future, both being contrasted with the past. In prophetic contexts such as *I.T.* 1259 ff., of the Delphic oracle, three terms are in fact the norm: e.g. *Il.* 1.70 ὃς ᾔδη τά τ' ἐόντα, τά τ' ἐσσόμενα, πρό τ' ἐόντα, *cf.* Hes. *Th.* 38 (with West on ib. 32);[92] and S. *Ant. l.c.* shows that τὰ ἔπειτα is the middle one.[93] τὰ πρῶτα however, is not simply τὰ πρὶν.[94] 'The first things' means, I think, both 'first beginnings of things' (the other sense of Aristotle's πρώτη αἰτία, 'ultimate cause'), as in the song of Silenus (Virg. *Ecl.* vi 31 ff.),[95] or what Melanippe learned from her mother Hippe, daughter of Cheiron (E. *fr.* 484N),[96] and 'the first beginnings' of any particular event, as in P.P. 9. 46 ff. Apollo knows the number of the leaves in spring, the number of the sands, χὤ τι μέλλει, χὤποθεν | ἔσσεται, 'what is to be and whence it will come'. The Delphic oracle was in fact as often concerned to explain as to predict: 'Why do we have a plague?' 'Because one of you has committed murder'. Read therefore with Seidler ἅ τ' ἔμελλε τυχεῖν, with Kirchhoff's δ' ἴνιν in 1239, giving the normal three terms modified to suit the context.

Hel. 784–5   Με. ἦ γὰρ γαμεῖν τις τἀμ' ἐβουλήθη λέχη;
                  Ελ. ὕβριν θ' ὑβρίζειν εἰς ἔμ', ἣν ἔτλην ἐγώ.

785 in codd. means 'and to commit violence upon me, which I endured'; and in this context the violence could only be rape. Menelaus' undisturbed answer shows that Helen has not said this. F. W. Schmidt's εἰς ἐμὴν εὐνὴν ἔτλη gives good sense at the cost of some change, though we might still expect Menelaus to ask at once if Theoclymenus had succeeded, rather than eight lines later. Kannicht's εἰς ἔμ'—οἴ'ἔτλην ἐγώ (exclamatory) is neat, but fails because this again implies that Theoclymenus *has* succeeded; Menelaus could hardly understand that it was only the wish she had endured, not the act. What we need is:

ὕβριν θ' ὑβρίζειν εἰς με,[97] κἂν ἔτλην ἐγώ

---

[91] φέρε δ' ⟨αὐτίκα⟩ | νιν, read by the Budé editors, avoids this snag, but alien close to dactyls is normally iambic, so ∪ ūū – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – is an unlikely sequel.

[92] For some philosophical formulations see G. S. Kirk, *Heraclitus, the Cosmic Fragments* (1954) 310.

[93] Hermann, who makes this point, read ὅσ' ἔμελλε τυχεῖν θ', which he preferred to Seidler's ἅ τ'; but see *GP* 517.

[94] As Dr Diggle points out to me. He prefers Burges' ὅσα, with the explanation given above.

[95] In Virgil the point is rather more sophisticated; see M. Hubbard, *PCPS* n.s. 21 (1975) 53 ff., esp. 61.

[96] *Cf.* D. W. Lucas, *Aristotle's Poetics* (1968) 100 f. It was from the first two occupants of the Delphic oracle, combined in one (Gaia-Themis), that Prometheus learned to foretell the future and to validate his prophecies by his knowledge of the past (*cf.* A. *Eum.* 1–4, *P.V.* 209–11, 824–5).

[97] Better perhaps ἐς ἐμέ, an improvement suggested by Dr Diggle. The corruption would be just as easy.

'which I would have endured' (had you not turned up), *EICMEKAN* → *EICM[EIC]AN*;
cf. *Aj.* 44–5:

> *OΔ.* ἦ καὶ τὸ βούλευμ' ὡς ἐπ' Ἀργείοις τόδ' ἦν;
> *Aθ.* κἂν ἐξέπραξεν, εἰ κατημέλησ' ἐγώ,

where the condition is explicit, and *Ant.* 260–1:

> . . . φύλαξ ἐλέγχων φύλακα, κἂν ἐγίγνετο
> πληγὴ τελευτῶσ', οὐδ' ὁ κωλύσων παρῆν,

where it is not.   It is true that Menelaus presently needs reassurance (794–5):

> *Mε.* . . . εἰ δὲ λέκτρα διέφυγες τάδ' οὐκ ἔχω.
> *Eλ.* ἄθικτον εὐνὴν ἴσθι σοι σεσωμένην.

But κἂν ἔτλην ἐγώ still leaves room for doubt: it could also mean, 'and to take me by force, which I should have endured (if I had resisted)'.   In any case Menelaus' wish to be doubly sure is psychologically appropriate, and serves dramatically to introduce the exchange about her asylum and his danger.

<div align="right">T. C. W. Stinton</div>

Wadham College, Oxford

INDICES TO 'NOTES ON GREEK TRAGEDY', I and II
Page numbers alone refer to I (*JHS* xcvi [1976]).

Index of passages discussed
(Page references to passages discussed incidentally are numbered in italics.)

General Index