

An Interpolated Song in Euripides? *Helen* 229–52*

Euripides may not have been a darling of the ‘gallery’ during his lifetime,¹ but once he was dead he became a classic, to be read, performed—and imitated. Aristophanes’ half-serious attempts to show up the ‘depravity’ of Euripidean tragedy had no lasting effect: the many revivals of his plays from the fourth century onwards suggest that later audiences appreciated the purely sensuous appeal in Euripides’ verbal dexterity, his rhetorical flourishes, his distraught characters on the brink of madness and self-destruction, no less than the iridescent beauty of his lyric imagery. In particular, the far-fetched melodramatic outpourings in his solo arias must have had a special appeal, their kaleidoscopic rhythms and lush phraseology blending in with the Euripidean monodist’s stock in trade, self-pity. At the Athenian theatre of Dionysus, solo arias were felt to be so quintessentially ‘Euripidean’ that Aristophanes included monody in the ‘diet’ with which his ‘Euripides’ claims to have educated the audience’s taste (*Ran.* 944). We have no way of knowing if Athenian theatre-goers really became the sophisticated connoisseurs of fine poetry whom Aristophanes’ Euripides wished for. We may surmise, however, that by the early fourth century, as long as Helen and Iphigenia sang an aria which sounded loosely ‘Euripidean’, it did not matter that the said aria had not actually been written by Euripides.

For the posthumous popularity of Athens’ ‘most tragic’ poet did have its negative side. Actor-singers and producers felt free to ‘improve’ on the original by adding, altering (and probably suppressing) poetic material in order to make the revivals of Euripidean plays more palatable to the audience, as well as better ‘vehicles’ to show off their talents. As we leaf through our standard text of Euripides, James Diggle’s Oxford Classical Text, we cannot but notice that, in the case of some plays, the extent of these interpolations takes on rather alarming proportions. But, except for *Iphigenia at Aulis*, which is a problem in a unique category of its own, these interpolations consist primarily of iambic dialogue. Were later interpolators really so unmusical as never to feel the urge to try their hand at imitating Euripidean lyric too? The *prima facie* evidence (excluding *Iphigenia at Aulis*) is not promising. As we peruse the OCT, we do occasionally find a bracketed lyric line. This happens very seldom in the responding stanzas of choral stasima, for a reason which is easily understood: respension is in itself the best safeguard against tampering; and, in any case, the very ‘compactness’ of lyric expression in any given choral ode makes it difficult to add new material and expect it to pass unnoticed.² When it *does* happen, the best explanation seems to be: (a) the intrusion of a gloss, a carelessness that will sooner or later require tinkering in the

corresponding stanza in order to restore metre, e.g. *Hi.* 739 οἶδμα Barthold: οἶδμα πατρός codd. ~ 749 Ζηνός Barthold: Ζηνός μελάθρων codd., where the intrusion of πατρός (a gloss explaining the parentage of the κόραι) prompted the interpolation of μελάθρων;³ (b) the misguided attempt to clarify the sense (which might not even have been particularly unclear, as in the following examples) by inserting an extra line, as in, e.g., *Ba.* 537 οὔαν οὔαν ὄργαν⁴ and *Ph.* 800 (where λαβδακίδαις πολυμόχθοις looks like a gloss on βασιλευσιν in the previous line). Both intrusions are unmetrical, to the extent that, in Murray’s text, the second stasimon of *Bacchae* began with the putative loss of a line to accommodate 537, which Murray believed Euripides to have written.

Astrophic arias, on the other hand, lack the aforementioned metrical safeguard against interpolation (respension). Nevertheless, it is curious to note that they seem not to have invited major tampering. The number of suspected lines in monodies is hardly significant, as can be seen from the OCT’s deletions: *Hec.* 73–8, *Hel.* 236–7, 239 (the expression Πριαμίδαις), *Ph.* 345 (the expression ἐν γάμοις), *Or.* 998, 1384, 1430, 1451 (the expression ἄλλον ἄλλοσε), 1494 (the expression ἐκ θαλάμων).⁵ This careless and/or misguided adding of superfluous words or phrases is a phenomenon we may link up with the post-Alexandrian, probably Byzantine, phase in the transmission of Euripides’ text, because such trivial intrusions suit a ‘relationship’ with the text that makes more sense during a later period (post-Alexandrian to Byzantine), when the plays were taught and studied as *literature*, rather than acted and enjoyed as *theatre*, as they were before the Alexandrian ‘edition’.⁶

Now suppose that for an early fourth-century revival of *Helen*, a ‘fêted’ actor-singer had commissioned an extra aria in order to transform the parodos into an even more predominantly ‘monodic’ number than Euripides had intended, in which the said actor naturally had the lion’s share of the singing. Once it had intruded into the text, would this pastiche of a late Euripidean astrophic aria have later passed undetected in the Library at

Euripidean material (164–230) by grafting on a further couple of strophic pairs (231–76) + an epode of sorts (277–302); in the second case, a singularly drab epode (1080–97) was surprisingly deemed worthy to crown one of Eur.’s most exquisitely beautiful strophic pairs (1036–79).

³ Cf. Barrett’s excellent note on *Hi.* 738–41, especially p. 302; cf. also *Ion* 1058–1071, with Diggle’s note in *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford 1994) 19–20. Further examples of this kind of interpolation can be found at, e.g., *Alc.* 929, *Andr.* 483, 1223, *Su.* 1002, *El.* 1193, *Tr.* 206, 291a, 540, 554, 808, 1329, *Or.* 141–151.

⁴ Other than Dodds’ note *ad loc.*, see especially Diggle, *Euripidea* 460–1.

⁵ There is a good case for deleting two lines in Helen’s monody at 348–85: 366 ἄχεά τ’ ἄχεσι δάκρυα δάκρυσιν ἔλαβε πάθεα, a superfluous and incomprehensible excrement, that looks like a botched attempt at contriving an effect such as σύννοχα δάκρυα πάθεσι πάθεα, μέλεσι μέλεα (172–3); 379 δμματι λάβρωι σχῆμα λεαίνης†, deleted by Dingelstad (on the line’s many problems, cf. Dale and Kannicht *ad loc.*; Diggle, *Euripidea* 180).

⁶ We should nevertheless keep an open mind about *Hec.* 73–8, which might be pre-Alexandrian.

* It is a pleasure to thank Professor James Diggle and Dr Richard Hunter for encouragement and helpful comments.

¹ It seems significant that his fourth victory (with *Bacchae*, *Alcmaeon* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*) was posthumous.

² Consider the parodos of *IA* or the same play’s third stasimon: in the first case, the later poet(s) padded out the existing

Alexandria? This is a difficult question to answer. On the one hand, we know that, in regard to Antigone's aria in *Oedipus at Colonus* (237–57), 'erant inter antiquos criticos qui hos uersus spurios esse docerent', as Dawe elegantly puts it (see the apparatus of Dawe's Teubner and that of the OCT). On the other, it has been rightly stated that *very early* interpolations planned as constructive 'enrichments' of a given drama might conceivably have evaded detection by later Alexandrian scholarship, particularly as in the first half of the fourth century 'there were plenty of writers for the stage capable of composing verse-dialogue, and even lyrics, in a close approximation to the familiar Euripidean style'.⁷ That these writers were past masters at escaping detection is a statement which a considerable portion of *Iphigenia at Aulis* aptly confirms. As far as we can tell, Alexandrian (and for that matter Byzantine) scholars had little inkling of the patchwork lurking beneath the surface of this fascinating play (in fact, Musgrave and Porson in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries appear to have been the first scholars to sense that *IA* contains non-Euripidean material). And even if Alexandrian scholars had known which parts of the play were thought to be spurious, it is unlikely that the subsequent textual tradition would inform us of their suspicions, for reasons presented by Zuntz in a masterly paragraph of his *Inquiry* which it would be helpful to quote in full:⁸

The Alexandrian edition comprised τὰ σωζόμενα πάντα, arranged alphabetically. Aristophanes used the accumulated materials and results of his predecessors; the surviving text as well as the report about the Athenian state exemplar secured for the library—and no doubt used by him—are evidence of the method and quality of his work. Differently from his modern colleagues he would not expel faulty readings and interpolations if they were well attested; his text aimed to preserve what was transmitted, with marginal readings and critical signs designed to inform and warn the reader. In the later course of the tradition the variant readings might penetrate into the text—or they were lost. In the average current copies, the critical signs were also lost, together with those signs which served to draw attention to particular features—recurrent verses (e.g. *Med.* 693), the poet's use of proverbs. etc.—or, finally, to clarify the structure of lyrical passages (the latter were introduced by Triclinius). So interpolations were preserved, with no warning, like the iambic prologue of *IA.*, the spurious endings of *Phoen.* (and *Sept.*), and *Suppl.* 275 f. and 903 ff., and so the presence of faulty readings in the very archetype of our manuscripts has to be reckoned with, in addition to faults of more recent origin.

That *Iphigenia at Aulis* and *Phoenissae* contain many more interpolations than those mentioned by Zuntz is a fact generally accepted by most scholars. It is therefore not very surprising that these happen to be the two Euripidean tragedies where the suspicion of 'wholesale' interpolation in regard to a monody has arisen. In the new OCT, *Iphigenia's* arias at *IA* 1279–1335 and 1475–99 are '<uu.> fortasse non Euripidei'. We learn from Diggle's appendix on p. 424 that suspicion of 1279–1335 as a whole was first voiced by Harberton in 1903, though individual lines had already been considered spurious by the following impressive list of scholars: Bothe, Hartung, Monk, Conington, Hermann, Hennig, Paley, Herwerden and Wecklein. Harberton also paved the way for the athetesis of 1475–99 by damning 1474–8, 1480–6 and 1498.

On the other hand, Antigone's high-flown lyric outburst at *Ph.* 1485–1538 is not such a clear cut problem. The parts of Antigone and Oedipus in *Phoenissae* were considered by Verrall to be a later addition to the play: Antigone symbolized Euripides' poetry and Oedipus was the poet himself, forced by the crassness of all around him to leave his city.⁹ Although Verrall specifically objected to the 'teichoscopia' and to the lyric duet between father and daughter in the final scene, he passed Antigone's monody in silence. But since Verrall had such a peculiar axe to grind, modern scholars are apt to dismiss his ideas without further ado: in regard to the possible spuriousness of Antigone's monody, it would appear that Verrall has succeeded only in convincing Dihle, who feels no qualms in writing off 1485–1766 as non-Euripidean.¹⁰ Dihle's objections, however, have proved themselves too flimsy to withstand the onslaught of Mastrorarde's bludgeonings (comm. *Ph.* pp. 554–5). The text of Antigone's aria is uncertain in several places; indeed, on the whole sequence 1485–1581 Diggle's apparatus warns 'lectio permultis in locis incerta est'. But it is doubtful whether the textual problems are enough to justify the belief that the monody may be spurious. On the whole, I would not be inclined to consider this monody post-Euripidean.

A view not hitherto voiced in Euripidean scholarship is that *Helen* 229–52 may be a later addition to the play Euripides presented at Athens in 412. Although there are several reasons for suspecting this, as I will argue below, 'Stilgefühl' is ultimately (and perhaps necessarily) what really clinches each scholar's individual decision as to whether a given passage is interpolated or genuine—despite the universally acknowledged fact that 'Stilgefühl' is a notoriously difficult criterion to translate into a watertight methodology. In spite of these slippery problems, the question of interpolated song in Euripides has a fascinating appeal, not least because it opens a window (albeit a tiny one) on to a tantalisingly elusive chapter in Greek poetry—early fourth-century composition of 'Euripidean lyric pastiche' for the stage.

⁷ Cf. C. W. Willink, *PCPS* n.s. 36 (1990) 182.

⁸ G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965) 251–2. I do not quote footnotes.

⁹ *Euripides the Rationalist* (Cambridge 1895) 231–60.

¹⁰ A. Dihle, *Der Prolog der Bacchen und die antike Überlieferungsphase des Euripides-Textes* (Heidelberg 1981) 92–7.

Helen 229–52: text

Here is Diggle's text with a simplified apparatus:

Ελ. φεῦ φεῦ, τίς ἦ Φρυγῶν
 ἢ τίς Ἑλλαντίας ἀπὸ χθονὸς 230
 ἔτεμε τὰν δακρυόεσσαν
 Ἰλίῳ πεύκαν;
 ἔνθεν ὀλόμενον σκάφος
 συναρμόσας ὁ Πριαμίδας
 ἔπλευσε βαρβάρῳ πλάται
 τὰν ἐμὴν ἐφ' ἐστίαν 235
 [ἐπὶ τὸ δυστυχέστατον
 κάλλος ὡς ἔλοι γάμων ἐμῶν]
 ἄ τε δόλιος ἂ πολυκτόνος Κύπρις
 Δαναΐδαις ἄγουσα θάνατον [Πριαμίδαις]:
 ὦ τάλαινα συμφορᾶς. 240
 ἂ δὲ χρυσέοις θρόνοισι
 Διὸς ὑπαγκάλισμα σεμνὸν
 Ἦρα τὸν ὠκύπου
 ἔπεμψε Μαιάδος γόνον·
 ὅς με χλοερὰ δρεπομέναν ἔσω πέπλων
 ῥόδεα πέταλα Χαλκίοικον 245
 ὡς Ἀθάναν μόλοιμ'
 ἀναρπάσας δι' αἰθέρος
 τάνδε γαῖαν εἰς ἀνολβον
 ἔριν ἔριν τάλαιναν ἔθετο
 Πριαμίδαισιν Ἑλλάδος.
 τὸ δ' ἐμὸν ὄνομα παρὰ Σιμουντίοις ῥοαῖσι 250
 μαψίδιον ἔχει φάτιν.

229 ἢ Dindorf: ἦ ν L 236–7 del. Dindorf (237 iam Hartung [1837]) ut e 27–30 confictos 238 ἄ τε Matthiae: ἂ δέ L 239 Πριαμίδαις del. Nauck lac. post h. u. indic. Wilamowitz 241 α' Dindorf: εἰ L: ἦ Tr³ θρόνοισι Kannicht: οἰς L 245 πέταλα Tr²: πέταλα L

Commentary

In spite of deficient responson and a few perplexing anacolutha in the first strophic pair,¹¹ the parodos of *Helen* may be said to constitute a deeply satisfying exemplar of late Euripidean lyric. The epode, however, jars with its inapposite imagery and woolly phraseology. Lyric ingredients which Euripides used to good effect elsewhere are put to uses that are demonstrably not Euripidean. Furthermore, it is not illicit to ask whether the poet of this epode knew the extant lyrics of *Iphigenia at Aulis* (most of which Euripides could only have written *post mortem*). Who was he then? My guess is that he may have been commissioned to compose an extra aria for a performance of *Helen* sometime in the fourth century, before 'free' renderings of the great fifth-century tragedies were outlawed, a period during which 'the plays of Euripides were still regularly acted; and in producing ancient plays for modern audiences the actors did not scruple to adapt them to modern taste'.¹² I believe the whole epode to be, like *Iphigenia's* aria at *IA* 1283–1335, a fascinating pastiche of late Euripidean iambo-trochaic monody ('a type of lyric which could easily degenerate into a somewhat

empty *coloratura* performance'¹³), such as we encounter in *Electra's* song in *Orestes* (982–1012).

Wilhelm Dindorf in his critical notes on *Helen* (vol. III of his Euripidean edition, Oxford 1840) appears to have been the first scholar to see that there is reason to suspect interpolation in the astrophic monody which constitutes the parodos' epode, deleting 236–7 ('unmetrical' Dale on 233 ff.) and 245–6 (Χαλκίοικον ὡς Ἀθάναν μόλοιμι). A. Nauck (3rd ed. Leipzig 1871, vol. II) deleted Πριαμίδαις at 239 (probably a gloss, in view of Δαναΐδαις in the same line). Wilamowitz thought this still did not clarify the sense of the epode's problematic middle section and was led to posit a lacuna between 239 and 240. The solution, however, does not lie in piecemeal deletions: once we have excised the demonstrably unacceptable lines, the whole poetic framework crumbles and nothing worth salvaging is left among the debris.

Metrically, we have a song in syncopated iambo-trochaic, which blends in pleasingly with both the parodos' strophic pairs. Viewed as an exemplar of late Euripidean monody, this song is noteworthy in that it eschews the usual medley of rhythms, i.e. dochmiacs and dactylic and/or anapaestic sequences, such as we find in the songs of *Jocasta* (*Ph.* 301–54), *Antigone* (*Ph.* 1485–1538), *Electra* (*Or.* 982–1012) and (most conspicuously) the Phrygian slave (*Or.* 1369–1502). The result is that the epode blends in all the more imperceptibly, not only with the parodos, but also with *Helen's* later lyric sequence starting at 348, which is once again 'rein monodisch' as well as 'wieder in der Weise der Sirenenklage', as Kannicht remarks (II.104). This later monody, crowned as it is (in true 'late' Euripidean fashion) by an exquisite dactylic stanza (375–85), brings us back full circle to ὦ μεγάλων ἀχέων καταβαλλομένα μέγαν οἴκτον..., the rhythm in which *Helen* had started singing at 164. We may ask whether Euripides would have wanted the 'Weise der Sirenenklage' to go on in a monody immediately attached to the parodos if he was planning to use it again in *another monody* a scant hundred lines later, particularly since (as I shall endeavour to argue below) the parodos' monodic epode is an otiose rehash of *Helen's* prologue speech garnished with a few catchphrases snatched from the First Stasimon. (The only new element is the information that *Helen* was picking flowers when she was abducted by *Hermes*, a motif which is out of place in this context—see below.)

229–32 φεῦ φεῦ, τίς ἦ Φρυγῶν | ἢ τίς Ἑλλαντίας ἀπὸ χθονὸς | ἔτεμε τὰν δακρυόεσσαν | Ἰλίῳ πεύκαν; 'A Greek hand cutting down the pine for Paris' ship seems an unlikely thought; this is an extreme instance of "polar expression" for "Who, of all men, was it...?" (Dale). From Kannicht (II.81) we learn that Hermann and Paley also balked at this extraordinary idea. In spite of *Hec.* 629–34 (ἐμοὶ χρῆν συμφορᾶν, | ἐμοὶ χρῆν πημονὰν γενέσθαι, | Ἰδαίαν ὅτε πρῶτον ὕλαν | Ἀλέξανδρος εἰλατίναν | ἐτάμεθ'...),

¹¹ On which see Willink, *CQ* 40 (1990) 77–99.

¹² Barrett, ed. *Hi.* p. 46.

¹³ A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (2nd ed., Cambridge 1968) 93.

which he quotes, Kannicht thinks that ‘es handelt sich ja hier nicht um eine echte Alternative, sondern... um den bekannten Typus polar-disjunktiver Umschreibung abstrakter Begriffe wie “jeder/keiner”, “alles/nichts”’. Yes, but if a polar expression is to be endowed with poise rather than bathos, it ought not to contain a term that is patently absurd (e.g. ‘Which angel or demon made the bows that won the battle of Agincourt?’ is a pleasantly whimsical way of asking ‘who on earth made the bows...?’; on the other hand, ‘Which Englishman or Frenchman made the bows...?’ would strike one as very unsatisfactory phraseology not saying much for the discernment of its author). With *Hel.* 229–32 contrast *Ph.* 1509–13, where Antigone sings τῖς Ἑλλάδος ἢ βάρβαρος ἢ | τῶν προπάρουθ’ εὐγενετᾶν | ἕτερος ἔτλα κακῶν τοσῶνδ’ | αἵματος ἀμερίου | τοιάδ’ ἄχρα φανερά...; here the ‘polar expression’ and the ‘who on earth ever...’ idea is both stylish and meaningful; furthermore, the ‘Greek/barbarian’ disjunction is not immediately controverted by what follows, as it is with ἔνθεν ὀλόμενον σκάφος | συναρμόσας ὁ Πριαμίδας...

Stinton¹⁴ sees nothing wrong with the *brevis in longo* at the end of line 230, in spite of the fact that it is justified neither by a break in the sense nor the end of a syntactical period; and he actually formulates a rule to accommodate it, which I will quote in full:

when two semantically distinct elements in a sentence have a third element in common, this element is ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. If these two distinct elements are contrasted, and the common element has some rhetorical and semantic weight, there may be pause between the contrasted elements and the common element, as well as, or instead of, between the two contrasted elements. This is occasionally recognized in the *Iliad* scholia, and makes good sense. So in *E. Hel.* 230 τῖς ἢ Φρυγῶν | ἢ τῖς Ἑλλαντίας ἀπὸ χθονὸς | ἔτεμε τᾶν... πύκταν, the members of the disjunction are contrasted, while the common element has sufficient weight to stand by itself, and cannot readily be anticipated. Contrast *A. Eu.* 527...; cf. *S. OT* 489..., *E. Andr.* 299..., *Hclid.* 608...

If this ‘rule’ is to be applied to *Hel.* 230, I have the following objections: (i) the fact that τῖς... τῖς is a formal disjunction does not make the individual elements semantically distinct: quite the contrary, they are semantically indivisible because their *meaning* (= τῖς βροτῶν; see Kannicht) only becomes clear if they are taken as a unit; (ii) semantically, as well as syntactically, the *kernel of the utterance* is ἔτεμε. It is disappointing that Stinton should have been unable to offer instances other than the *brevis* at *Hel.* 230 to illustrate his ‘rule’; and it is very confusing that the reader should be invited to ‘contrast’ *A. Eum.* 527 (μῆτ’ ἀναρκτον βίον | μῆτε δεσποτούμενον | αἰνέσης, Page’s colometry), *Andr.* 299 (τίν’ οὐκ

ἐπῆλθε, ποῖον οὐκ ἐλίσσετο | δαμογερόντων) and *Hclid.* 608 (οὔτινά φημι θεῶν ἄτερ ὄλβιον, οὐ βαρύποτμον | ἄνδρα γενέσθαι), instances which this reader agrees are not the same thing at all (note the position of the verbs at *Andr.* 299 and the fact that neither ἄνδρα nor γενέσθαι are vital semantic elements necessary to complete the sense of the previous line, since ἄνδρα picks up οὔτινα and γενέσθαι, like εἶναι, can be supplied). And why was the example from *Eumenides* indicated as *not* conforming to the rule, when it appears to be the only example Stinton offered that *does*?¹⁵ As for *S. OT* 489 ff., there is no hiatus justifying pause in the OCT of Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (τί γὰρ ἢ Λαβδακίδαις | ἢ τῷ Πολύβου νει- | κος ἔκειτ’ οὔτε πάροιθέν | ποτ’ ἔγωγ’ οὔτε τανῦν πως | ἔμαθον...), who have seen fit to change πω (codd.) to πως.

In a note on the colometry of *IA* 1284, Diggle¹⁶ accepts the (to me) abnormal instances of *brevis in longo* at *Ph.* 250 and 676. Lest these examples be used to undermine my reluctance in accepting the *brevis* at *Hel.* 230, I shall briefly state how I interpret them. In what follows, I leave *IA* 1284 out of the picture for two related reasons: (i) with Iphigenia’s monody we are in a context where ‘tum de uerbis tum de numeris saepius non constat’ (OCT); (ii) I cannot say with any confidence that Euripides composed *IA* 1283–1335. Turning now to the examples from *Phoenissae*, here is 250–1: ἀμφὶ δὲ πτόλιν νέφος | ἀσπίδων πυκνὸν φλέγει (~ νῦν δέ μοι πρὸ τειχέων | θούριος μολῶν Ἄρης | αἶμα δάιον φλέγει 239–41¹⁷) where period-end is easily removed by Heimsoeth’s transposition¹⁸ πυκνὸν ἀσπίδων. *Ph.* 676–9 is much more perplexing: καὶ σέ, τὸν προμάτορος Ἰοῦς ποτ’ ἔκγονον | Ἐπαφον, ᾧ Διὸς γένεθλον, | ἐκάλεσ’ ἐκάλεσα βαρβάρωι βοᾷ, | ἰώ, βαρβάροις λιταῖσϛ. On 676–7 (p. 334), Mastronarde says ‘the double appearance of *brevis in longo* coincides with possible semantic pause before appositive proper names’ (my italics). This is going too far in accepting the patently aberrant. In Euripidean ἄστροφα, syntax and metre always harmonise perfectly in a phrasing that is enhancing to both, so how can there ‘possibly’ be semantic pause between the genitive adjective προμάτορος and Ἰοῦς, the noun which it is qualifying?¹⁹ And what is the semantic status of an utterance that consists of καὶ σέ, τὸν προμάτορος ||? τὸν *who*? No, we cannot countenance

¹⁵ Note that *A. Eum.* 526 ff. corresponds with ἔς τὸ πάν σοι λέγω, | βωμόν αἶδεσαι Δίκας, | μηδέ νιν κέρδος ἰδὼν κτλ (538 ff.), whereas *Hel.* 230, as part of an ἄστροφον, does not have the excuse of corresponding with a line that ends with obvious sense pause.

¹⁶ *Euripidea* 424 n. 18.

¹⁷ Hermann’s interesting transposition of 240 and 241 would give νῦν δέ μοι πρὸ τειχέων | αἶμα δάιον φλέγει | θούριος μολῶν Ἄρης, thereby causing φλέγει to ‘echo’ at the end of the second line of each stanza.

¹⁸ Cf. Mastronarde, *comm. Ph.*, p. 214 n. 1.

¹⁹ Note the difference at *S. Trach.* 212–14, where there is change of metre (2 ia ||^B 6 da catalectic), and where the adjective separated from its noun is almost a noun in itself, referring back to Apollo in l. 209: βοάτε τᾶν ὀμόσπορον. ||^B Ἄρτεμιν Ὀρτυγίαν, ἐλαφαβόλον, ἀμφίπυρον κτλ.

¹⁴ T. C. W. Stinton ‘Pause and period in the lyrics of Greek tragedy’, *CQ* 27 (1977) 34 = *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1990) 319.

period-end here. Besides, the opening lines of the first stasimon's epode form a (surprisingly unfelicitous) 'oblique invocation', a lyric device used to beautiful effect by Sophocles in the parodos of *Oedipus Rex* (particularly in the first and third antistrophes) and by Euripides in later plays like *Ion* (452–4 σέ τᾶν ὠδίνων λοχιᾶν | ἀνειλείθειαν, ἐμὴν | Ἀθάναν, ἴκετεύω) and, most notably, *Helen* (348–50 σέ γὰρ ἐκάλεσα, σέ δὲ κατόμοσα | τὸν ὑδρόεντι δόνακι χλωρὸν | Εὐρώταν and 1107–10 σέ τᾶν ἐναύλους ὑπὸ δενδροκόμοις | μουσεῖα καὶ θάκους ἐνί- | ζουσάν ἀναβοάσων, | τᾶν ἀοιδοτάταν | ὄρνιθα μελωιδὸν | ἀηδόνα δακρυόεσσαν).²⁰ In these examples, the whole oblique invocation is contained within a metrical period, a phenomenon, as we have seen, which does not occur at *Ph.* 676 ff. This instance can therefore be termed anomalous (I should certainly obelize it) and need not be used as evidence for justifying the *brevis in longo* at *Hel.* 230.²¹ (Anyway the dingy lyric sequence at *Ph.* 676–89 is variously problematical, as we can see from Diggle's apparatus. The possibility of unwarranted tampering by a non-Euripidean hand cannot be ruled out.)

To return, then, to *Hel.* 230, the problem, as I see it, is that with the 'polar expression' at 229–39 we have neither the end of a syntactical period nor a break in the sense justifying a pause—indeed *semantically*, τίς ἢ Φρυγῶν ἢ τίς Ἑλλαντίας ἀπὸ χθονός is, as Kannicht has taught us, no different from τίς βροτῶν, and as a 'semantic unit' φεῦ φεῦ, τίς βροτῶν || prompts the question τίς βροτῶν *what?* We ought therefore not to turn a blind eye to the anomaly of the pause between τίς Φρυγῶν/ τίς Ἑ. δ. χ. (subject) and ἔτεμε (verb), any more than (albeit in an aeolo-choriambic context)²² between Δηλιάδες and ὕμνοῦσ' at *Herc.* 687–8, satisfactorily emmended by Diggle to παιᾶνα μὲν Δηλιάδες | <ναῶν ὕμνοῦσ' ἀμφὶ πύλας.²³

231a ἔτεμε τᾶν δακρυόεσσαν

(UUU-UUU-U) also presents a metrical problem: in extant tragedy, the colon 'cretic + trochaic metron' is only securely attested in *Iphigenia at Aulis* (233–244, 1288, 1304) and *Rhesus* (681). It should be noted that all four examples from *IA* are found in lyric sequences the Euripidean authorship of which has justifiably been called into doubt.²⁴

²⁰ Presumably examples such as these led Barrett to remark (on *Hi.* 752–7) 'this device of the apostrophe is one that in the lyrics of Eur.'s later plays becomes an overworked mannerism'.

²¹ The *brevis in longo* at *Ph.* 676 disappears with Willink's καὶ σέ, τὸν προμάτορος | <πόρτιός> ποτ' ἔκγονον. I am grateful to Sir Charles for communicating this conjecture in advance of publication.

²² This is probably immaterial, since whether the metrical context is aeolo-choriambic, iambo-trochaic or even dochmiac, *brevis in longo* and hiatus are permissible only at the end of a syntactical period or when a break in the sense justifies a pause. Stinton's attempt to exempt dochmiacs from this rule ('Pause and period' (n.14) 46 = *Collected Papers* 334–5) was exploded by Diggle (*Euripidea* 213).

²³ See *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford 1981) 52–4.

²⁴ Diggle's list of tragic examples of 'cr + tr' in *Euripidea* 424 n. 19 is questionable: *Hel.* †352† (corrupt text; neither Dale nor Kannicht divides so as to give 'cr + tr'); *Hel.* 358

234 ἔπλευσε βαρβάρῳ πλάται... *Prima facie* there is nothing objectionable about this expression. I transcribe part of a note from Diggle's *Euripidea* (499, n.29):

with πλάτη Euripides has the epithets ἄλιος (*Hcl.* 82), βάρβαρος (*Hel.* 192, 234, 1117), εἰλάτινος (*Hel.* 1461, *Hyps.* I.iii.14 (p. 27 Bond), ἐνάλιος (*Hec.* 39, *Tr.* 1095), ναυπόρος (*Tr.* 877), ναυσιπόρος (*IA* 172), ναυτίλος (fr. 846.2), νύκτερος (*Rh.* 53), ποντοπόρος (*Tr.* 811), πρωτόπλοος (*Andr.* 865), ῥόθιος (*IT* 1133?), ὠκυμποός (*IT* 1427).

It would appear that, with πλάτη, Euripides was loath to use the same epithet more than once and preferably not in the same play. This observation also applies to the use of epithets with κώπη and σκάφος. With ναῦς (a noun that occurs a total of 147 times in the extant Euripidean corpus; πλάτη occurs 31 times), the picture is in essence the same (asterisk indicates that there is reason to believe the line is not Euripidean):

(i) *iuncturae* consisting of epithet + ναῦς

Cycl. 85 ναὸς Ἑλλάδος, 467 νεὼς μελαίνης, *El.* 2 ναῖσι χιλίαις, 432 κλειναὶ νᾶες, *Tr.* 1017 ναῦς Ἀχαικάς, 1094 κυανέαν... ναῦν, *IT* 10 χιλίων ναῶν, 70 ναῦν ποντίαν, 1000 εὐπρύμνου νεώς, 1137 ναὸς ὠκυπόμου, 1292 Ἑλλάδος νεώς, 1328 ναῦς κρύφιος, 1345 Ἑλλάδος νεώς, 1357 εὐπρύμνου νεώς, 1383 εὐσέλμου (Pierston: εὐσήμου L) νεώς, 1424–5 νεώς Ἑλληνίδος, *Ion* 1160 εὐηρέτους ναῦς, *Hel.* 1412–13 ναῦν... Σιδωνίαν, 1531 Σιδωνίαν ναῦν, 1543–4 νεώς... Ἀχαιίδος, 1622–3 ἀλώσιμος ναῦς, *IA* 238* ναυσὶ θουρίαις, 242–3* ἰσηρέτμοι νᾶες, 247–8* Ἀθίδας... ναῦς, 263–4* Λοκράς... ναῦς, 277–8* δωδεκάστολοι νᾶες, 293* εὐστροφωτάταισι ναυσίν, 354–5 νεῶν χιλίων, 1319* ναῶν χαλκεμβολάδων, *Rh.* 97* εὐσέλμων νεῶν, *Fr.* 304.2 θοαῖσι... ναυσίν.

(ii) *iuncturae* consisting of epithet + κώπη

Cycl. 468 διπλαῖσι κώπαις, *Alc.* 459 ποταμίαι νερτέραι τε κώπαι, *Andr.* 855 ἐνάλου κώπας, *IT* 140 κλειναὶ κώπαι, 407 εἰλατίνας... κώπας (Reiske: ἐλατίνοις [εἰλ- Tr²]... κώπαις L), *Hel.* 1272 Φοίνισσα κώπη ταχύπορος, 1451–2 Φοίνισσα Σιδωνιάς... ταχεῖα κώπα.

(iii) *iuncturae* consisting of epithet + σκάφος

Alc. 252 δίκων... σκάφος, *Med.* 477 Ἀργῶιον σκάφος, 1335 καλλιπρωριον... σκάφος, *Andr.* 863 πευκάεν σκάφος, *Tr.* 539 σκάφος κελαινόν, 1085 πόντιον σκάφος, *IT* 981 πολυκώπῳ σκάφει, *Hel.* 233* ὀλόμενον σκάφος.

In the evidence presented above, we notice that instances of the same epithet being applied twice to the same noun in the same play are *IT* 1000+1357,

(introduced by Diggle's conjecture); *Ph.* 655b~674b (the diaeresis of αἰ in 655b is anomalous; a possible solution would be Musgrave's εὐείλοισι in 674b, giving 'cr + pa', as at *Hel.* 353a); *Ba.* 578 and 584 (better analysed as lecythia).

1292+1345 and *Hel.* 1412–13+1531. It should be noted, however, that these examples are not lyrical; moreover, the expression Ἑλλάς ναῦς, no less than Σιδωνία ναῦς, is really a technical term which describes a specific type of boat, so Ἑλλάς and Σιδωνία have a definite, rather than a ‘decorative’, function (to give a homely example, ‘Seville orange’ is a different thing from ‘orange’).²⁵ Also, at *Hel.* 1272, the expression Φοίνισσα κώπη ταχύπορος (spoken iambic) belongs to too different a category of poetic utterance from 1451–2 Φοίνισσα Σιδωνιάς ὦ ταχεῖα κώπα (aeolo-choriambic lyric) truly to count as an instance of Euripides using the same epithet with the same noun twice in the same play.²⁶ I hazard, then, that the threefold lyric use of βάρβαρος with πλάτη at *Hel.* 192, 234 and 1117 is not a repetition Euripides would have wished for and could well be deemed an element that points to the spuriousness of the epode. In writing lines 232–9, the composer of this aria might have drawn inspiration from 1117–21: ὄτ’ ἔδραμε ῥόθια πολιὰ βαρβάρωι πλάται | ὅς ἔμολεν ἔμολε μέλεα Πριαμίδαις ἄγων | Λακεδαίμονος ἄπο λέχεα | σέθεν, ὦ Ἐλένα, Πάρις αἰνόγαμος | πομπαῖσιν Ἀφροδίτας. Indeed, the expression πομπαῖσιν Ἀφροδίτας does to some extent clarify the reference to Cypris at 238, where we miss a verb (as Dale remarks [on 233 ff.], ‘the hyperbaton, with zeugma, is considerable; the meaning is, in effect, συνέπλευσε δὲ καὶ ἡ Κύπρις’).

236–7 ἐπὶ τὸ δυστυχέστατον | κάλλος ὡς ἔλοι γάμων ἐμῶν†. Diggle rightly deletes these lines, following Dindorf, who considered them ‘scrambled together’ (Dale) out of 27–8. Echoes from the first stasimon are also likely (see above).

Two recent editors of *Phoenissae* (Craik and Mastrorade) have made much of ‘thematic’ features in arguing against interpolation. Even though I have doubts on the validity of concepts such as ‘overall thematic and dramatic coherence’ as used by Craik to defend the ‘fundamental integrity’ of *Ph.* 1582–1766,²⁷ I concede that, viewed from the ‘thematic’ standpoint, the expression δυστυχέστατον κάλλος is not without significance (cf. 27–9 [the probable origin of 236–7], 260–6, 304–5, 375–85). Nevertheless, it is difficult to escape the feeling that, whether we argue in favour of ‘thematic significance’ or, on the contrary, for ‘otiose redundancy’, we tread on equally thin ice; for when, at 22–3, Euripides causes his heroine to say ἄ δὲ πεπόνθαμεν κακὰ | λέγοιμ’ ἄν, he had something rather more far-reaching in mind than the forty-odd iambic lines that follow. In fact, right up to the First Stasimon (which, in this play, occurs surpris-

ingly late in the proceedings—compare *IT*), the principal ingredient in the play’s thematic texture is the astonishingly repetitive presentation of Helen’s chequered past and all its bizarre παθήματα, mainly by the heroine herself. In this context, there is little hope of drawing a clear distinction between elements that were included by Euripides for their special thematic relevance and those of which the apparent significance is perhaps unintentional. Thus, I do not think that ‘thematic’ arguments carry enough weight to squash the theory that 236–7 were put together from 27–30, as Dindorf suggested.

238–9 On the awkwardness of these lines, see Dale’s note on 233 ff. (p. 82).

241–4 ἄ δὲ χρυσέοις θρόνοισι | Διὸς ὑπαγκάλισμα σεμνὸν | Ἦρα τὸν ὠκύπουν | ἔπεμψε Μαιάδος γόνον. The disturbing element in these ungainly lines is the genitive Μαιάδος. Elsewhere in Euripides, Hermes’ mother is Μαῖα at *Med.* 759, *Andr.* 275, *El.* 463, *Ion* 3, *Antiope* fr. v. 69 *TrGFS* (= fr. 223.69 Nauck = xlvi.69 Kambitsis) and *Rh.* 216*. Μαιάς appears only three times in the extant Euripidean corpus: here, at 1670 and at *Or.* 997*, deleted by Diggle in the Oxford text. Lines 1670–5, part of a noticeably interpolated *deus ex machina* speech,²⁸ were deleted by Hartung, although they are retained in the OCT.²⁹

244–9 ὅς με χλοερά δρεπομέμαν ἔσω πέπλων | ῥόδαε πέταλα Χαλκίοικον | ὡς Ἀθάναν μόλοιμ’ | ἀναρπάσας δι’ αἰθέρος | τάνδε γαίαν εἰς ἀνολβον | ἔριν ἔριν τάλαιναν ἔθετο | Πριαμίδαισιν Ἑλλάδος. The syntax here is extraordinarily contrived (the position and construction of Ἑλλάδος is particularly perplexing): an epexegetic final clause with the aorist optative depending on an imperfect³⁰ participle in apposition to the object of a relative clause, the subject of which also governs a participial clause. Small wonder that Dindorf deleted the sequence Χαλκίοικον ὡς Ἀθάναν μόλοιμ’ (the possibility that the interpolator took Χαλκίοικον from line 228 is not unlikely). Euripides did not always avoid syntactical complexity in non-iambic contexts,³¹ but a parallel as overcooked as this is hard to come by. The idea of following the abduction-account with a ὡς + optative clause might have presented itself to the composer as he checked how Helen describes the abduction in her prologue-speech: 44–7 λαβὼν δέ μ’ Ἑρμῆς ἐν πτυχαῖσιν αἰθέρος | νεφέληι καλύψας - οὐ γὰρ ἡμέλησε

²⁸ Diggle deletes 1650–5 and 1667b–8a, following Willink and F. W. Schmidt respectively. Other deletions recorded in the OCT apparatus are: 1653 (Nauck), 1653–4 (Harberton), 1668b–9a (olim Herwerden), 1672 (suspectum habuit Wecklein), 1678–9 (del. Schenkl; 1679 iam Hartung).

²⁹ Professor Diggle observes that the play would finish neatly at 1669 with the expression Ζεὺς γὰρ ὦδε βούλεται: suspicions have been voiced against most of what follows and it would be no loss to have it all out.

³⁰ Cf. *Euripidea* 233, n. 13.

³¹ Cf. e.g. *Alc.* 79–85 ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ φίλων πέλας <ἔστ> οὐδεῖς, | ὅστις ἄν εἴποι πότερον φθιμένην | χρῆ βασιλείαν πενθεῖν ἢ ζῶσ’ | ἔτι φῶς λεύσσει Πελίου τόδε παῖς | Ἀλκηστis, ἐμοὶ πᾶσι τ’ ἀρίστη | δόξασα γυνῆ | πόσιον εἰς αὐτῆς γεγενησθαι.

²⁵ I cannot explain away εὐπρύμνου νεῶς at *IT* 1000 and 1357. However, Euripides uses the word ναῦς twenty-eight times in this play; he can be forgiven for the involuntary carelessness of applying the same epithet to the same noun twice. πλάτη appears seven times in *Helen*, three times, as we have noted, with the same epithet. The *aliquando dormitat* excuse is less plausible.

²⁶ That is to say, it is an instance, but may be said to count for less.

²⁷ Craik, comm. *Ph.*, pp. 245 ff.

μου | Ζεύς - τόνδ' ἐς οἶκον Πρωτέως ἰδρύσατο,
| πάντων προκρίνας σωφρονέστατον βροτῶν, |
ἀκέραιον ὡς σώσαιμι Μενέλεωι λέχος.

For the inapposite imagery of ...με χλοερά δρεπομέναν... ῥόδεα πέταλα, it is more instructive to recall *IA* 1296–9 (<uu.> fortasse non Euripidei' OCT) λειμών τ' ἔρνεσι θάλλων | χλωροῖς καὶ ῥοδόεντ' | ἄνθε' ὑακίνθινά τε θεαῖς δρέπειν than *Ion* 887–9 ἠλθές μοι χρυσῶι χαίταν | μαρμαίρων, εὖτ' ἐς κόλπους | κρόκεα πέταλα φάρεσιν ἔδρεπον, which might have been the model for both passages. Owen remarked that 'the words are more essential to their context in the *Ion* and seem more like a purple patch in the *Helena*'.³² Agreed. It is interesting that, if indeed the poets of Helen's and Iphigenia's arias borrowed from Creusa's monody, they overlooked the overall poetic context, in that the motif of flower-picking in a *locus amoenus* as an idyllic foil to subsequent rape³³ really makes sense in Creusa's monody, but seems out of place in the contexts described by Helen and Iphigenia, where violent eroticism is out of the question. Furthermore, Helen is inappropriately cast in this rôle, since traditionally 'it is maidens, not married women, who are snatched away while gathering flowers'.³⁴

The expression ἔσω πέπλων is surprising: Dale on 244 laconically explains 'δρεπομέναν ἔσω πέπλων = ἐς πέπλους'. In view of Creusa's ἐς κόλπους... ἔδρεπον, Euripides might have preferred ἐς πέπλους (cf. *Herc.* 972) with δρεπομέναν, trochaic metron + 2 cretics (instead of 2 trochaic metra + cretic).

247 Why should Egypt be termed ἀνολβος, a term implying abject poverty (cf. *Hes. Op.* 319 αἰδῶς τοι πρὸς ἀνολβίῃ, θάρσος δὲ πρὸς ὄλβωι)? Helen's first words in the prologue (1–2) allude directly to Egypt's fertility (and, by extension, wealth).³⁵ The adjective is not used often enough by the tragedians (at least in the extant plays) for us to dogmatize about the way it should be employed: in the Euripidean corpus we find it only at *IA* 354, a line Dindorf did not think Euripides wrote (it is nevertheless ensconced within a sequence of lines the OCT considers '<uu.> fortasse Euripidei').

248 It is interesting to note that the anadiplosis ἔριν ἔριν appears three times in the extant Euripidean corpus. That makes it, along with μάτερ μάτερ (see below), the only extant instance of Euripides using anadiplosis of the same noun thrice (other than here, at *IA* 183 and 587*). Can this fact have any significance? Here, with the help of Breitenbach's repertory³⁶ of

Euripidean anadiploses, is a survey of Euripides' use of anadiplosis with nouns:

Alc. 889 τύχα τύχα, *Med.* 650 θανάτωι θανάτωι, *Hi.* 61 πότνια πότνια, 525 Ἔρωσ Ἔρωσ, 1363 Ζεῦ Ζεῦ, 1371 ὀδύνα... ὀδύνα, *Andr.* 504 μάτερ μάτερ, 523 πόσις πόσις, 530–1 φίλος φίλος, 1031 θεοῦ θεοῦ, 1044 νόσον... νόσον, *Hec.* 177 μάτερ μάτερ, 186 τέκνον τέκνον, 444 αὔρα... αὔρα, 684 τέκνον τέκνον, 909 δορὶ... δορὶ, 1095–6 γυναικες... γυναικες, *El.* 137 Ζεῦ Ζεῦ, 594 τύχαι... τύχαι, 709 ἀγορὰν ἀγορὰν, 1185 τύχας ἴ... τύχαςῖ, *Herc.* 115 τέκνα τέκνα, 763 χοροὶ χοροί, 772 θεοὶ θεοί, 818 φυγῆι φυγῆι, 918 ἄταν ἄταν, 1081 φυγὰν φυγὰν, *Tr.* 173 Τροία Τροία, 806 Ἴλιον Ἴλιον, 840 Ἔρωσ Ἔρωσ, 1310 ἄλγος ἄλγος, 1312 Πρίαμε Πρίαμε, 1326 ἔνοσις... ἔνοσις, *Ion* 1054 πότνια πότνι, *Hel.* 248* ἔριν ἔριν, 370 βοῶν βοῶν, 648 φίλαι φίλαι, 684 πάθεα πάθεα, 1462 ναῦται ναῦται, *Ph.* 1298 πέσεα πέσεα, 1286 ἔλεος ἔλεος, *Or.* 174 πότνια πότνια (Νύξ),³⁷ 968 ἔλεος ἔλεος, 1358 κτύπον... κτύπον, 1381 Ἴλιον Ἴλιον, 1387 Δυσελέναν Δυσελέναν, 1395 αἴλιον αἴλιον, 1454a³⁸ μάτερ μάτερ, *Ba.* 412 Βρόμιε Βρόμιε, 582 δέσποτα δέσποτα, 584 Βρόμιε Βρόμιε, *IA* 183 ἔριν ἔριν, 587*³⁹ ἔριν ἔριν, 1487* πότνια πότνια (μάτερ).

We note that the use of the same anadiplosis more than once is limited to theonyms such as Ἔρωσ Ἔρωσ (*Hi.* 525, *Tr.* 840), Ζεῦ Ζεῦ (*Hi.* 1363, *El.* 137), Βρόμιε Βρόμιε (*Ba.* 412, 584), πότνια πότνια (*Hi.* 61, *Ion* 1054, *Or.* 174, *IA* 1487*—in these last two examples the classification as a noun might be queried); to μάτερ μάτερ (*Hec.* 177, *Andr.* 504, *Or.* 1454a),⁴⁰ τέκνον τέκνον (*Hec.* 186, 684) and the considerably more rarified instances offered by Ἴλιον Ἴλιον (*Tr.* 806, *Or.* 1381) and ἔλεος ἔλεος (*Ph.* 1286, *Or.* 968). The question, in view of this evidence, is whether it is reasonable to consider ἔριν ἔριν at *Hel.* 248 and *IA* 587 a 'pre-cooked formula' culled from *IA* 183. I do not think a definitive answer can be hoped for, but I trust it is not dogmatic to assume that the possibility is not unlikely. (The idea of using the word ἔριν might also have been suggested by *Hel.* 1134–6 γέρας οὐ γέρας ἀλλ' ἔριν | Δαναῶν Μενέλας ἐπὶ ναυσὶν ἄγων | εἶδωλον ἱερόν Ἡρας. Cf. also 1155, 1160.)

250–2 τὸ δ' ἐμὸν ὄνομα παρὰ Σιμουντίοις ῥοαῖσι | μαψίδιον ἔχει φάτιν. The use of Σιμουντίος is intriguing, particularly if, as I suggest, parts of *Iphigenia at Aulis* antedate the composition of this epode. Other than here, Euripides uses

³² A. S. Owen, comm. *Ion*, p. xxxix.

³³ Cf. *h. Cer.* 5–8, *Mosch. Eur.* 63–9.

³⁴ I owe this important point to an anonymous referee.

³⁵ M. McDonald's explanation is not particularly convincing: 'it is clear that Egypt is a wealthy land... so ἀνολβος must mean unhappy rather than unwealthy. The land is unhappy because it makes Helen, who has been seized from her native land, unhappy' (*Terms for Happiness in Euripides* (Göttingen 1978) 189).

³⁶ See W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart 1934) 218–20. I have changed Nauck's line numbers to Diggle's.

³⁷ One might legitimately ask here whether πότνια is not an adjective, rather than a noun.

³⁸ This example is not listed by Breitenbach, working from Nauck's edition (μάτερ bis MBVaAFPPrR; XZT³: semel HCGKLS).

³⁹ Not listed by Breitenbach (ἔριν ἔριν Page: ἔρις ἔριν L).

⁴⁰ Three instances, but, as Breitenbach notes (216), Euripides uses the anadiplosis of nouns in the vocative almost four times as much as of nouns in the accusative (ten examples, three of which ἔριν ἔριν).

this adjective only at *Or.* 809 παρά Σιμουντίοις ὀχρετοῖς, an expression imitated by the composer of *Iphigenia at Aulis*' second stasimon at *IA* 767.⁴¹ I venture that the epode's interpolator was once again using Helen's prologue speech as prospecting ground for suitable themes and expressions. Reading ψυχὰὶ δὲ πολλὰ δι' ἔμ' ἐπὶ Σκαμανδρίοις | ῥοαῖσιν ἔθανον· ἢ δὲ πάντα τλᾶσ' ἐγὼ | κατάρατος εἶμι καὶ δοκῶ προδοῦσ' ἐμόν | πόσιν συνάσαι πόλεμον "Ἐλλησιν μέγαν (52–5), he may have opted for Σιμουντίοις instead of Σκαμανδρίοις with ῥοαῖσι not only because παρά Σκαμανδρίοις would be unmetrical but also because he was well acquainted with *Iphigenia at Aulis* (whence he had taken ἔριν ἔριν in the previous line). Perhaps κατάρατος εἶμι καὶ δοκῶ προδοῦσ' ἐμόν πόσιν prompted the infelicitous τὸ δ' ἐμόν ὄνομα... μαψίδιον ἔχει φάτιν. This staggeringly anti-climactic conclusion (a damp squib comparable to the one with which *Iphigenia* ends her monody: μεγάλα πάθεα, μεγάλα δ' ἄχρα, | Δαναΐδαις τιθείσα Τυνδαρίς κόρα *IA* 1354–5 (not Euripidean?))—one has only to compare the exuberant pyrotechnics with which the Phrygian finishes his aria) is in no way enhanced by the oddity of the adjective μαψίδιος which, although the adverb μαψιδίως appears in Homer, is quite unknown in classical Greek (in fact, other than here, we find it only in the Hellenistic poet Theocritus and the Byzantine historian-poet Agathias).⁴² In any case, the topography of Helen's terrible reputation is incorrectly placed παρά Σιμουντίοις ῥοαῖσι, i.e. Troy, now a smoking ruin so non-existent ὥστ' οὐδ' ἴχνος γε τειχέων εἶναι σαφές (108, cf. also 195–6). Elsewhere in the play (as in *Orestes*), Helen's name is 'mud' in Greece: 66, 81, 223–5, 1147–8. What Helen cares about is what the Greeks think of her (cf. 262–6); the hurtful, repeated 'cry' she refers to at 370–1 (βοᾶν βοᾶν δ' Ἐλλάς <αἶ' > | ἐκελάδησεν ἀνοτότυξεν) is probably 'adulteress!' For the motif of Helen hated in Greece and by the Greeks, cf. the overwhelming evidence provided by *Or.* 56–60, 98–103, 118–19, 249–50, 520–2, 1132–6, 1305–6, 1585. We may add that, traditionally, Priam's male relations and subjects always found a soft spot for Helen: cf. *Il.* 3. 154–8 οὐδ' ὡς οὖν εἶδουθ' Ἐλένην ἐπὶ πύργον ἰούσαν, | ἦκα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον· | Οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς | τοιῆδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν· | αἰνῶς ἀθανάτησι θεῆσι εἰς ὦπα ἔοικεν.

The conclusion I draw from the evidence presented is that the poet of *Helen* 229–52 may not have been Euripides. He knew the technique of lyric composition in syncopated trochaic which became fashionable at the end of the fifth century; but two metrical features invite suspicion: the unwarranted *brevis in longo* at 230; and

⁴¹ Cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 505.

⁴² Professor Diggle draws my attention to the following attestations provided by *TLG CD ROM*: Hesiod, *fr.* 10(a) 87; *AP* 7. 589.4; 7. 602.4; Nonnus 15.80, 33.204, 36.335; Oppian, *Hal.* 4. 626, 5.192; *Cyn.* 4.192; Greg. Naz., *Carm. mor.* p. 762.5, *Carm. de se ipso* p. 1314.15, *Carm... ad alios* p. 1553.4 (Migne); Qu. Smyrn. 1. 357, 1.385, 8.11, 14.78.

the colon 'cretic + trochaic metron' at 231a, for which the only parallels in extant tragedy are to be found in non-Euripidean sections of *Iphigenia at Aulis* and in *Rhesus*. He used suitably Euripidean ingredients from *Helen* itself as well as from *Ion* (Creusa's monody, from which he may have taken the 'abduction motif'), *Phoenissae* (the 'polar disjunction' from Antigone's aria) and *Iphigenia at Aulis*. But he was not consistently successful in his use of these ingredients, in that he misjudged the extent to which Euripides himself strove after ποικιλία by deliberately eschewing expressions made 'formulaic' by repeated use. This is particularly true of βαρβάρωι πλάται and ἔριν ἔριν. Two further expressions go against Euripidean usage by revealing some degree of insensitivity as to the difference between tragic and epic vocabulary: (i) Μαϊάδος, and (ii) μαψίδιος.

FREDERICO LOURENÇO
Centro de Estudos Clássicos,
Universidade de Lisboa

New Light on Thracian Thasos: A Reinterpretation of the 'Cave of Pan'*

This short article concentrates upon a very small part of the material culture of Thasos in an attempt to show how knowledge and discussion of the local archaeology can not only elucidate the study of Greek 'colonization', but also is vital to a clear understanding of the process. The Greek colonization of Thasos, and indeed of Thrace, is currently written from a wholly Hellenocentric and text-based perspective, behind which lies an unspoken and pervasive comparison with Western European colonialism. Behind my discussion lies the opposing conviction that Greek colonization must be considered at the local level, and in the context of an understanding of social developments within the area settled. This discussion of the cave of Pan thus indicates both how an archaeology that concentrates only upon Greek material culture can miss important features, and how an awareness of the archaeology of local populations can elucidate the processes of Greek 'colonization'.

The 'cave of Pan'

The cave of Pan is situated on the rock slope of the third and highest peak of the Thasian acropolis, just west-south-west of the Sanctuary of Athena (FIG. 1). Much attention was paid to it by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century travellers and scholars,¹ but relatively

* I am grateful to Diana Gergova and Alexei Gotsev for useful discussions on and around the subject matter of this article. I also thank Anthony Snodgrass, John Graham and Sofia Voutsaki for their insightful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

¹ For example, J. Baker-Penoyre, *JHS* 29 (1909) 215–18, fig. 7, pl. XX; W. Déonna, *RA* 13 (1909) 11ff.; A. Conze, *Reise auf den Inseln des Thrakischen Meeres* (Hannover 1860) 10, pl. VII, 2. For further bibliography, see P. Devambez, 'La "grotte de Pan" à Thasos', in *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne et d'archéologie offerts à Paul Collart* (Lausanne 1976) 117–23 at p. 117.