that Polydorus has been hanging around for three days, could equally suggest an appearance at stage level, or even presence on stage at the play's start. In favour of an entrance via an *eisodos* will be its reflection of the ghost's lateral movement between seashore and Greek encampment. While an entrance from below cannot be dismissed, the general lack of evidence for such entrances and the internal indications tend to suggest that it is even less likely than it is for Aeschylus' ghosts. That said, the mere fact that we cannot rule out an entrance from below stage level may itself tell against the ghost's appearance at height because an appearance at height would almost certainly rule out a subterranean entrance.[23]

Little Venice, London NICHOLAS LANE
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000274

[23] Roger Dawe, James Diggle, Neil Hopkinson and David Kovacs all kindly read and commented on successive drafts of this article.

NOTES ON EURIPIDES' *TROADES*

28–9 πολλοῖς δὲ κωκυτοῖσιν αἰχμαλωτίδων
βοᾶι Σκάμανδρος δεσπότας κληρουμένων.

David Kovacs in the recent Loeb translates: 'The Scamander River rings with many shouts of captive women who are being assigned by lot to their masters.' Commentators take κληρουμένων as middle (as does *LSJ*). While possible, were it right we would be faced with the notion that the captive women are in a position to draw lots for their new masters themselves. While λελόγχατε (243) might be thought to support the middle here, the essential difference between κληρόομαι and λαγχάνω can readily be judged by looking at e.g. Ar. *Eccl.* 999 or Pl. *Plt.* 298E. The sense of λαγχάνω is more developed in terms of what one obtains when a matter is out of one's hands. In tragedy the passive κληρόομαι also occurs at *Tro.* 240 and at *Hec.* 100, and the middle at Aesch. *Sept.* 55. The verb does not occur in any voice in Sophocles or elsewhere in tragedy. It is a word of technical precision and its imprecise use here would be atypical. As with the Loeb translation, κληρουμένων should be taken as passive, but in addition I would read δεσπόταις for δεσπότας, κληρόω taking the dative of the person to whom something is allotted as at Pind. *Ol.* 8.15 and Thuc. 6.42. The mistake could easily have arisen because a scribe's eye glanced forward to line 30, saw καὶ τὰς μὲν Ἀρκάς, τὰς δὲ Θεσσαλὸς λεώς, and imported the repeated ending -ας in 30 to make δεσπότας in 29.

41 φροῦδος δὲ Πρίαμος καὶ τέκν'·

Poseidon has already told us that Priam is dead and named him in 17. Should we expect to see his name repeated here in the same case in substantially the same statement (P. is dead/P. is gone)? Of the numerous other examples in Euripides' prologues of names of gods and humans repeated in the same case, in only three that I have found do they appear performing a similar function (Πολυνείκη in *Phoen.* 72 ~ 76, Διός in *Bacch.* 1 ~ 27, and Κάδμου in *Bacch.* 2 ~ 37), but even in these examples

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the statement is only arguably similar. Euripides is normally meticulous in avoiding the repetition of names in the same case in similar statements. In the prologue to the *Electra*, where Aegisthus' name appears an unprecedented seven times (nominative × 3, genitive × 3, and dative × 1), all are in different capacities: as killer of Agamemnon (10), ruler of Mycenae (12), would-be killer of Orestes (17), jailer of Electra (24), would-be killer of Electra (28), plotter of death to Orestes and of Electra's marriage to a farmer (32),[1] and target of retribution (42). In the prologue of the *Troades* Euripides' studied variation can be seen at work again (even in the same case): Apollo is *Φοῖβος* ~ *Ἀπόλλων* (5 ~ 42), Athena is *Παλλάδος* ~ *Ἀθάνας* (10 ~ 24), and Zeus is *Ζηνός* ~ *Διός* (17 ~ 47). Were *Πρίαμος* to stand in our example, it would be a unique case in the prologues of Euripides' extant tragedies of a name appearing twice in the same case in substantially the same statement. If it is an interpolated gloss, what has it dislodged? It would have been a word meaning 'her husband', but not perhaps an obvious one. In 108 we find Hecuba herself referring to her *τέκνα καὶ πόσις*. But a clue to what might plausibly have been replaced comes from Hecuba's mouth in another play; at *Hec.* 160–1 she laments *φροῦδος πρέσβυς, φροῦδοι παῖδες*. Later in our play Helen describes Priam as *πρέσβυς* (921). I therefore propose reading *πρέσβυς* for *Πρίαμος* in 41, with *ἧι* (39) clarifying whose 'old man' is meant as an organic part of *ἧι παῖς μὲν … φροῦδος δὲ πρέσβυς*.

126–7

… συρίγγων τ'
εὐφθόγγων φωναῖι

For balance with *παιᾶνι στυγνῶι* I was going to suggest *εὐφθόγγωι* until it was drawn to my attention that this is the reading of the Aldine edition. In support of the Aldine text it is worth pointing out that it is anyway common Euripidean practice to use compound adjectives whose second components are synonymous with the nouns with which they agree. Examples abound, but see e.g. *Tro.* 125 *λιμένας … εὐόρμους*. The *CQ*'s anonymous referee adds that where a genitive noun depends on one in another case an adjective is more commonly attached to the latter.

Little Venice, London NICHOLAS LANE
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000286

[1] This may be thought to be, in at least its first component, similar to 17, but the case is different in these two examples.

ARISTOPHANES, *ACHARNIANS* 23–6

ἀλλ' ἀωρίαν
ἥκοντες, εἶτα δ' ὠστιοῦνται πῶς δοκεῖς
25 *ἐλθόντες ἀλλήλοισι περὶ πρώτου ξύλου*
ἀθρόοι καταρρέοντες.

24 *οἵδ' ὠστιοῦνται* Suda
εἶτα διωστιοῦνται Dobree
εἶθ' οἵδ' ὠστιοῦνται Baermann
εἶθ' ὧδ' ὠστιοῦνται Starkie

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press