CrossMark

SHORTER NOTES

A NOTE ON EURIPIDES, *ALCESTIS* 106*

In the anapaestic sequences of Eur. *Alc.* 93–7 and 105–11, a fast-paced exchange takes place between two choreuts (or two groups of choreuts) eager to learn about Alcestis' fate. The two passages pose several metrical and textual problems.[1] The most serious is the presence at lines 94 and 106 of the ⏑ ⏑ – – sequence (a 'catalectic monometer'), which finds no parallel in anapaestic poetry from any age or literary genre.[2] The same sequence occurs at the beginning of the short anapaestic coda of lines 132–5, which, whether authentic or not,[3] from a metrical point of view presents certain affinities with the two previous sequences.

As regards lines 94 and 132, the attempts made to emend the transmitted text have yielded rather unconvincing results.[4] To this day, the most economical solution is the athetesis of the words νέκυς ἤδη at line 94 (Elmsley) and βασιλεῦσιν at line 132 (Haupt):[5]

* I am especially grateful to Luigi Battezzato, Marco Catrambone, Glenn W. Most and the anonymous *CQ* referee for their insightful comments.

[1] I will refer to the discussion in L. Parker, *Euripides* Alcestis (Oxford, 2007), 69–70 (on lines 77–135). For a different arrangement of the sequences, see C.W. Willink, 'Notes on the parodos-scene in Euripides' *Heraclidae*, 73–117', *CQ* 41 (1991), 525–9, at 528 n. 17 = id., *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (ed. W.B. Henry) (Leiden and Boston, 2010), 241–7, at 246 n. 17 (cf. 'Critical notes on the cantica of Euripides' *Alcestis*', in id., *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* [Leiden and Boston, 2010], 786–801, at 786–8), followed by D. Kovacs, *Euripides* (Cambridge, MA, 1994–2002), vol. 1. The present discussion sets out from the assumption of the lyrical character of lines 93–7 and 105–11.

[2] Cf. Parker (n. 1), 70 (on *Alc.* 77–135). In his discussion on lyrical anapaests, M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 121–4 usually refers to 'catalectic dimeters'. The hypothesis of a catalectic monometer, however, is not ruled out a priori: West (this note), 121 notes 'even a catalectic monometer at *Alc.* 93 [*sic*]'. Cf. M.L. West, 'Tragica I', *BICS* 24 (1977), 89–103, at 92 (on catalexis in recitative anapaests). The admissibility of the sequence, however, is far from being proved.

[3] The athetesis of lines 132–5 (Wheeler) is accepted, for example, by J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* (Oxford, 1981–94), vol. 1 and Kovacs (n. 1). Good arguments in support of the authenticity of the text are adduced by D.J. Conacher, *Euripides Alcestis* (Warminster, 1988), 162 and, especially, Parker (n. 1), 82 (on lines 132–5).

[4] See the Appendix in R. Prinz and N. Wecklein, *Euripidis fabulae*, vol. 1.2 (Leipzig, 1883–1902), 51. As regards line 94, Willink (n. 1 [1991], 528 n. 17 = [2010], 246 n. 17) proposes: οὐ γὰρ δή<που> | φροῦδός γ' {ἐξ} οἴκων (or γε δόμων: 'glossed as a slightly abnormal prepositionless genitive') νέκυς ἤδη. This suggestion, accepted by Kovacs (n. 1), has been persuasively rejected by Parker (n. 1), 70–1 (on *Alc.* 77–135): δήπου/δή που, attested in tragedy only at *PV* 1064, would introduce 'an unwanted touch of doubt' into the passage. To this we should add the fact that the syntagm 'φροῦδος + genitive' is not attested elsewhere: the adjective is used absolutely or with a preposition (see LSJ s.v.).

[5] The two deletions are combined in A. Garzya, *Euripides Alcestis* (Leipzig, 1983²). The deletion of νέκυς ἤδη (94) is taken into serious consideration by A.M. Dale, *Euripides Alcestis* (Oxford, 1954), 61 (on line 91) and recorded in Diggle's apparatus criticus (n. 3). As regards βασιλεῦσιν (132), Parker (n. 1), 70 (on *Alc.* 77–135) holds the word to be 'dispensable' and, at 81 (on lines 132–5), suspects that it may be an interpolation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

94 οὐ γὰρ δὴ φροῦδός γ' ἐξ οἴκων {νέκυς ἥδη} – – – – – – – – {∪ ∪ – –} 2an

132 πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τετέλεσται {βασιλεῦσιν} – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – {∪ ∪ – –} $2an_{\wedge}$

The purpose of the interpolations would seem to be to aid the understanding of two sentences that might be perceived as being too elliptical. At line 94 ('for she is not out of the house') the word νέκυς makes the reference to the ἐκφορά explicit.[6] As regards line 132, the introduction of the dative of agency (or advantage)[7] clarifies that the sentence should not be taken to mean 'everything … is over' (that is to say, Alcestis is dead) but rather 'all the rites … have been accomplished'.[8]

Be that as it may, a completely different situation—and possibly a far more straightforward explanation—may be found at line 106. Diggle's text reads as follows:

105 – καὶ μὴν τόδε κύριον ἦμαρ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – – $2an_{\wedge}$

106 – † τί τόδ' αὐδᾷς; † ∪ ∪ – – ?

107 – ὦ χρή σφε μολεῖν κατὰ γαίας. – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – – $2an_{\wedge}$

An economical way of obtaining a coherent sequence at line 106 is to restore an anapaestic monometer.[9] Hermann thus emends αὐδᾷς to αὐδάσεις:[10]

– τί τόδ' αὐδάσ<εις>; ∪ ∪ – – <–> an

The Dorism may be justified by the co-presence, at lines 93–7 and 105–11, of Doric forms (93, 108) and Attic-Ionic ones (97, 105, 111).[11] The future is instead explained by Hermann in the light of the Euripidean use of τί λέξεις; to express 'a horrified "what do you mean to say?"';[12] yet this usage would seem to be confined to the verb λέγειν. The crux of the matter, however, is the demonstrative τόδ(ε), which can only refer to what has just been stated at line 105 ('What is this you are saying?'). The only parallel I was able to find in support of Hermann's conjecture is Aesch. *Supp.* 460 (λέξον τίν' αὐδὴν τήνδε γηρυθεῖσ' ἔσῃ), where a periphrasis with a 'timeless' aorist participle is employed.[13] Beside this passage, the combination τίς ὅδε (or ὅδε τίς) appears to require, in Euripides as well as in the other two tragedians, the present

[6] Schol. (AB) *Alc.* 94 (οὐ δὴ πρὸ τῶν οἴκων ἔλαθεν ἡμᾶς προκομισθεῖσα) would seem to ignore the word νέκυς: cf. schol. (MAB) *Phoen.* 1327 (νέκυν is rendered as τὸ νεκρὸν σῶμα) and 1489 (νεκύων rendered as νεκρῶν).

[7] See Parker (n. 1), 81 (on *Alc.* 132–5).

[8] Naturally, if lines 132–5 are inauthentic, the problematic metre could be due to the interpolator.

[9] The identification of the monometers depends on the criterion used to scan the anapaestic sequences: see e.g. West (n. 2 [1977]), 89–94. A monometer following a catalectic dimeter within a sequence of lyrical anapaests is certainly found at *Hec.* 83 (the *breuis in longo* proves the autonomy of line 83 from the dimeter at line 84): see the metrical analysis in L. Battezzato, *Euripides Hecuba* (Cambridge, 2018), 79–82 (on lines 59–97).

[10] G. Hermann (*Euripidis Alcestis cum delectis adnotationibus* I.H. Monkii; *accedunt emendationes* G. Hermanni [Leipzig, 1824], 16) traces the corrupted form back to the dropping of the abbreviation for -εις. The conjecture, printed by Garzya (n. 5) and Kovacs (n. 1), is recorded by Diggle (n. 3) in his apparatus criticus (cf. Willink [n. 1 (2010)], 788). *Contra*, Parker (n. 1), 71 (on *Alc.* 77–135).

[11] Hermann (n. 10), 16.

[12] D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1994), 503 (on line 1274). Cf. W.S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), 224 (on line 353), who also quotes *Med.* 1310; *Hel.* 779; *Hec.* 511, 712, 1124; and *Ion* 1113.

[13] See H. Friis Johansen and E.W. Whittle, *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*, 3 vols. (Copenhagen, 1980), 2.364–5 (on line 460).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or the aorist.[14] In particular, an interrogative clause with τί τόδε followed by a *uerbum dicendi* in the present occurs, in a similar context to that of *Alc.* 105–7, at *Hec.* 186–9 (τέκνον τέκνον μελέας ματρός—: | τί τόδ' ἀγγέλλεις;: | σφάξαι σ' Ἀργείων κοινὰ | συντείνει … γνώμα),[15] *Or.* 790–1 (κεῖνό μοι μόνον πρόσαντες—: τί τόδε καινὸν αὖ λέγεις;: | μὴ θεαί μ' οἴστρῳ κατάσχωσ')[16] and Soph. *OC* 208–10 (ὦ ξένοι, ἀπόπολις· ἀλλὰ μή— : | τί τόδ' ἀπεννέπεις, γέρον;: | μὴ μή μ' ἀνέρῃ τίς εἰ|μι). In the light of what has been argued so far, Hermann's conjecture is at least questionable.

One way of restoring an anapaestic monometer at line 106 without changing the present tense would be to integrate a syllable not after but before αὐδᾷς:

– τί τόδ' <ἐξ>αυδᾷς; ∪ ∪ <–> – – an

The corruption would not appear to be due to graphic or phonetic factors. The dropping of the preverb ἐκ-/ἐξ- as a mere oversight can be observed, for instance, at *Heracl.* 129, *Cyc.* 456, *Alc.* 298 (MS V), *Med.* [361] (MS O) and *Andr.* 1040 (MSS MODAVLP). The error may partly have arisen because of the relative rarity of the compound form (nine occurrences in Euripides[17] against forty occurrences of αὐδᾶν[18]). The primary meaning of ἐξαυδᾶν would appear to be 'speak out' (LSJ s.v.), by contrast to an attitude of reticence: this is, for instance, the case at *Hec.* 183 (ἐξαύδα· μὴ κρύψῃς δαρόν). Nevertheless, ἐξαυδᾶν can be used as a generic *uerbum dicendi*, as at Eur. *Supp.* 143 (δύο γὰρ ἐξαυδᾷς ἅμα) and Soph. *Phil.* 1244 (σοφὸς πεφυκὼς οὐδὲν ἐξαυδᾷς σοφόν). Sometimes, especially in the context of public statements, the verb carries a nuance of solemnity,[19] which would agree with the almost oracular tone of lines 105 and 107. One can refer to Pind. *Nem.* 10.79–80 (Ζεὺς … | … τόδ' ἐξαύδασ' ἔπος) as well as Eur. *Phoen.* 1249 (λόγοις ἐθάρσυνόν τε κἀξηύδων τάδε) and, especially, fr. 223.7–10 K. (*Antiope*), which presents a situation very similar to that of the *Alcestis* passage:

μένου]σι δ' ἡμῖν εἰς τόδ' ἔρχεται τύχη
….] θανεῖν δεῖ τῷδ' ἐν ἡμέρας φάει
….] τροπαῖα πολεμίων στῆσαι χερί.
…..(.) μ]ὲν οὕτω, μῆτερ, ἐξαυδῶ τάδε.[20]

[14] e.g. Eur. *Tro.* 269 (τί τόδ' ἔλακες), *Phoen.* 1560 (τί τόδε καταστένεις), *Hipp.* 232; Aesch. *Pers.* 1021, *Ag.* 1162. I have checked all the instances collected in J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981), 42–3 (thirty-eight in Euripides alone; instances from comedy are also included).

[15] At *Hec.* 187 some manuscripts (MOFZc) read ἀγγέλεις [*sic*], which Hermann reinterpreted as a future (ἀγγελεῖς); hence the need for an integration *metri causa*: τί <δὲ> τόδ' ἀγγελεῖς; (another dochmiac occurs at line 185). This suggestion, recorded in Diggle's apparatus criticus (n. 3), should be rejected for the following reasons: i) all the other manuscripts transmit a text that is already metrically coherent as well as linguistically plausible; ii) the accentuation of ἀγγέλεις suggests a derivation from ἀγγέλλεις via degemination; iii) here we would expect a question in asyndeton, as in the examples previously quoted (we find no other examples in Attic drama of interrogative clauses introduced by the sequence τί δὲ τόδε).

[16] At *Or.* 790, only one manuscript (X) records the variant ἀγγελεῖς, which looks like a banalization of αὖ λέγεις; for the pleonastic αὖ, see Mastronarde (n. 12), 266 (on *Phoen.* 417).

[17] To the passages quoted below add *Hipp.* 590, 1239; *IT* 181, 1162; *Hel.* [86].

[18] See J.T. Allen and G. Italie, *A Concordance to Euripides* (Berkeley and London, 1954) and C. Collard, *Supplement to the Allen & Italie Concordance to Euripides* (Groningen, 1971) s.vv.

[19] Cf. C. Collard, '*Antiope*', in id., M.J. Cropp and J. Gibert, *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 2004), 259–333, at 315 (on fr. 223.10) and J. Kambitsis, *L'Antiope d'Euripide* (Athens, 1972), 102–3 (on fr. 48.10).

[20] This is the text printed by R. Kannicht, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta* 5.1 (Göttingen, 2004). Possible integrations at lines 8 and 9 would be, respectively, ὥστ' ἢ (Ellis, Blass) and ἢ καὶ

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

With this solemn proclamation, Amphion envisages two possibilities: triumph over his and his loved ones' enemies, or death 'in this day's light' (compare τόδε κύριον ἦμαρ). In the case of *Alc.* 106, the meaning would be: 'what is this declaration you are making?'

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa RUGGIERO LIONETTI
ruggiero.lionetti@sns.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000415

ΔΙΑΚΡΙΤΙΚΗ AS A ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗ ΤΕΧΝΗ IN THE *SOPHIST*[1]

The διακριτικὴ τέχνη (the art of separating or discriminating), from which the sixth definition of the *Sophist* starts (226b1–231b9), is puzzling. *Prima facie* the art of separating does not fit the initial division of art between ποιητικὴ τέχνη (production) and κτητικὴ τέχνη (acquisition) at 219a8–c9.[2] Therefore, scholars generally agree that, although mutually exclusive, ποιητική and κτητική are not exhaustive and leave room for a third species of art, διακριτικὴ τέχνη, on a par with ποιητική and κτητική.[3] However, I argue that textual evidence suggests otherwise.

Later during the sixth division (at 226e8–227a1) we indeed learn that medicine (ἰατρική) is a species of purification (καθαρτική), which itself is a species of διακριτική. But medicine, whether it is conceived as removing evil from the body or helping the body to recover health, is certainly a form of *care* (θεραπεία) for the body (see, for instance, the expression τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν θεραπείας at Pl. *Prt.* 354a5).[4] Now, the art of caring is cited among the examples of production at the beginning of the *Sophist* (at 219a10–b2). Therefore, medicine, a part of διακριτική and a kind of care, seems productive. Moreover, another part of διακριτική, the art of carding (ξαντική), is clearly treated as productive in the *Statesman* (= *Plt.*) (the Stranger speaks of the ἔργα of carding at *Plt.* 282e4). Finally, at *Plt.* 282b1–c10, the Stranger uses the couple

(Wilamowitz), both printed by Collard (n. 19); at line 10 καὶ σοὶ μ]ὲν (Blass), πᾶσιν μ]ὲν (Diggle) or ἡμῖν μ]ὲν (Cropp). τάδε (10) refers to what has been stated at lines 7–9; in the following lines, Amphion turns to address Zeus: for the structure of the speech, cf. Eur. *Supp.* 1213 and *Hel.* 1662 (quoted by Collard [n. 19], on lines 11–13).

[1] I thank Sylvain Delcomminette, Pieter d'Hoine, Laura Brown and the anonymous referee for *CQ* for discussions and comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Finally, as a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO), I would like to thank my funding body for supporting financially the undertaking and completion of this research.

[2] I am quoting the Greek text from the new Oxford edition of *Platonis Opera*, vol. 1. See E.A. Duke, W.F. Hicken, W.S.M. Nicoll, D.B. Robinson, J.C.G. Strachan (edd.), *Platonis Opera, Tomus I, Tetralogias I–II continens* (Oxford, 1995).

[3] See, for instance, F.M. Cornford, *Plato's Theory of Knowledge* (London and New York, 1935), 171 and 177–8; L. Brown, 'Definition and division in the *Sophist*', in D. Charles (ed.), *Definition in Greek Philosophy* (Oxford, 2010), 151–71, at 159 n. 18; M.L. Gill, 'Division and definition in Plato's *Sophist* and *Statesman*', in D. Charles (ed.), *Definition in Greek Philosophy* (Oxford, 2010), 171–99, at 180–1 and 192 n. 38; M.L. Gill, *Philosophos: Plato's Missing Dialogue* (Oxford, 2012), 145–6.

[4] For the dialogues that do not belong to the first two tetralogies, I am using J. Burnet, *Platonis Opera* (Oxford, 1901–7).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000415 Published online by Cambridge University Press