Classical Quarterly 56.2 404–413 (2006) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000413

EURIPIDES, *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS* 392–455[1]

In the first stasimon of *IT* – in several places controversial as to text and/or metre – the Chorus speculate about the identity and motivation of the Greeks whose arrival and arrest have been reported. They begin by apostrophizing in mythical terms the 'Bosporos' through which these Greeks have presumably passed on their way to the Taurian land. That sundering strait between Europe and Asia, variously 'cyan, dark' and with associated 'clashing rocks', is a recurrent theme in this play.[2]

392–7 κυάνεαι κυανέας σύνοδοι θαλάσσας, [στρ.
ἵν' οἶστρος †ὁ πετόμενος† Ἀργόθεν
Ἄξενον ἐπ' οἶδμα διεπέρασ'
Ἀσιήτιδα γαῖαν Εὐρώπας διαμείψας· 395

392 κυάνεαι κυανέας Willink: -αι -αι L 394 ἵν' Hermann: ἣν L ποτώμενος Tr[2] 395 Ἄξενον Markland (ἄξ–): εὔξεινον P L διεπέρασ'] -ασεν L (-ασεν <ποτε> Tr)

The opening verse is ambivalently iono–choriambic (*ch* ⋮ *ch* ⋮ ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –) and enoplian (*d* ⋮ *D ba*).[3] κυάνεαι κυανέας . . .: the correction, accepted by Kovacs, gives (with paregmenon) a disposition of epithets similar to that in the antistrophe (ἢ ῥοθίοις εἰλατίνας δικρότοισι κώπας). For the identifying epithet 'cyan, dark' applied to these σύνοδοι ('comings together') θαλάσσας, cf. Soph. *Ant*. 966–7 παρὰ δὲ κυανέωι πελάγει διδύμας ἁλός (referring to Salmydessus as adjacent to the Thracian Bosporus).[4] The epithet is proper to the deep sea-water in a strait (cf. 7 κυανέαν ἅλα of the Euripus), and so to this strait *par excellence*. Its attachment to the associated πέτραι (241, 746, 889; *Med*. 2, 1263) and ἀκταί (*Andr*. 863–4) is probably a secondary development.

The second verse is metrically unsatisfactory both in itself and on grounds of responsion with ἔπλευσαν ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα | νάιον ὄχημα . . . The latter (though ἔπλευσαν is suspect) is acceptably ∪ – ∪ ∪∪ ⋮ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ | × ∪∪ ∪ – ∪ . . . (*ia* ⋮ *2da*

[1] Short references are used for my commentary on *Orestes* (Oxford, 1986, 1989) and for sundry articles in *CQ* 38 (1988), 88–97; 39 (1989), 45–69; 41 (1991), 525–9; 42 (1992), 41–5; 51 (2001), 65–89; 53 (2003), 75–110; *Mnemosyne* 51 (1998), 715–18; 56 (2003), 30–2; 58 (2005), 499–509; *Quaderni Urbinati* 71 (2004), 43–54; *Philologus* 148 (2004), 197–221; 149 (2005), 187–208; also for J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981) and *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1994).

[2] Cf. 123–5, 241, 260, 422, 746, 889–90.

[3] Cf. *Hipp*. 732/742 – ∪ ∪ – ⋮ ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – ‖ , at once *ch* ⋮ *2io* and *D d* – . For the most part my metrical terms and notations are in line with M. L.West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), xi–xii, but see also my comm. on *Or.* xx–xxi and *CQ* 51 (2001), 65, n. 3, especially for 'enoplian'. For the commonly ambivalent cadence . . . ⋮ ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – ‖ cf. *Ag*. 204/217 etc. (*Quad. Urb*. [2004], 50 n. 24). [Verse-end after θαλάσσας (~ -σι κώπας) should not be controversial. Murray's perverse divisions at οἶ-/στρος (~ ἔπλευ-/σαν) and ἄ-/ξενον (~ νά-/ιον) should not have been accepted by Platnauer as a datum. Wilamowitz (*GV* 566) had incredibly analysed σύνοδοι . . . 'Αργόθεν (~ δικρότοισι . . . κύματα) as four iambic metra.]

[4] For the readings in both places, see *CQ* (2001), 82–3 with n. 75. For the characteristic paregmenon, cf. W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik* (Hildesheim, 1967), 222–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

| *ia* ∪ . . .).[5] So prima facie we need an emendation of ὁ πετόμενος to correspond with ἐπὶ πόντια.[6] Triclinius duly wrote ὁ ποτώμενος, which many editors (including Cropp) have accepted; but ὁ + *present* participle cannot be right.[7]

ἵν' οἶστρος . . . the strait might have been identified as that famously gone through by the Argo (*Med*. 1–2, etc.).[8] But the myth of bovine Io's migration from Europe to Asia was scarcely less familiar,[9] as putatively echoed in the name 'Bosporos' (to which 394–7 alludes with a focus on the famous 'gadfly'). Then, rather than ὁ ποτώμενος, I propose ὅ ποτ' ὄρμενος. ποτε is sheer gain,[10] and for this poetical aorist participle used of migratory winged flight, cf. Soph. *OT* 174ff. ἅπερ εὔπτερος ὄρνις . . . ὄρμενον | ἀκτὰν πρὸς Ἑσπέρου θεοῦ.[11] The responsion is then exact (∪ – ∪ ⁝ ∪∪ ⁝ – ∪ ∪ ⁝ – ∪ ∪ with *all* the dactyls now self-contained.

Ἄξενον ἐπ' ('over') οἶδμα διεπέρασ' ('crossed').[12] If αὔραις is deleted in 410 (see below), no further emendation is needed in 395–7, other than Markland's certain ἄξενον for εὔξεινον and orthographic correction of διεπέρασεν to διεπέρασ'. Editors have hitherto always sought to add something after διεπέρασεν for correspondence with λινοπόροισ<ιν> (or -οις <σὺν> or -οισί<τ'>) αὔραις, but the proposed supplements are variously otiose.[13] As above (with διεπέρασ'), the metre is *2ia*

[5] Such juxtaposition of iambic and dactylic metra is uncommon, but cf. especially the nearly contemporary sequence at *Ion* 212–13 (~ 230–2) τί γάρ; κεραυνὸν ἀμφίπυρον ⁝ ὅβριμον ἐν Διὸς ⁝ ἑκηβόλοισι χερσίν, with *2da* (– ∪ ∪ ⁝ – ∪ ∪) similarly following ∪ – ∪ ∪∪ and in turn followed by iambics; also (conversely) the verse *2da* ⁝ *ia* at *Hipp*. 1108/1117. It is as though two dactyls can be treated as equivalent to an iambic metron and vice versa; but there is an apparent need for a word-division at the point of contact between the iambic and dactylic elements.

[6] Not vice versa: ∪ – ∪ ⁝ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ⁝ – ∪ – with ἐπὶ νότια (Bergk, England) does not make metrical sense. [Diggle obscurely looks for a trimeter (see n.13 below).]

[7] 'The one that *flies*'; moreover ποτᾶσθαι is typically 'to flit *habitually*' or '*to and fro*' (see *LSJ*), both senses inappropriate to this single unidirectional flight.

[8] See further in n.12 below for the allusions in *Andromache*.

[9] Already in lyric at Aesch. *Supp*. 540 ff. (ἔνθεν Ἰὼ | οἴστρωι ἐρεθομένα . . .); cf. Griffith on *PV* 561–886 (in which play the Bosporus crossed is the Cimmerian).

[10] Primarily for the sense ('of old'), in line with Triclinius' addition of ποτε after διεπέρασεν (did he perhaps find something to the point in L's archetype?); but also as giving a word-division between ∪ – ∪ ∪∪ (*ia*) and the following dactyls.

[11] Tragic lyric used both ὄρμενος and ὀρόμενος, the former naturally favourite (though not attested elsewhere in Euripides) for dactylic scansion, ὀρόμενος for the value ∪∪ ∪ – or ∪ ∪∪ ∪ (as at *Phoen*. 1569 and *IA* 186, both, incidentally, corrupted).

[12] 'Over' (cf. ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα: *LSJ* ἐπί I.5), not 'to' (the destination being 'Asia', not the Black Sea). That the οἶστρος crossing the Bosporus 'from Europe to Asia' flew 'over the Black Sea' implies that that sea is thought of as beginning at the Bosporus. διεπέρασε is certainly 'crossed' here, not 'went through (the strait)'; for that sense cf. also *HF 387 (Philologus* 2004, 204–5). διὰ . . . ἐπέρασεν is similarly to be understood as 'crossed' (not 'passed through') at *Andr*. 863–4 (the object there being the associated κυάνεαι ἀκταί; and likewise at *Andr*. 795 ἑκπερᾶσαι ποντιᾶν Ξυμπληγάδων should be taken as 'passed beyond' (rather than 'through') the Clashing Rocks (thought of as a kind of frontier).

[13] διεπέρασεν <Ἰοῦς> (Erfurdt) is the most favoured supplement (Hermann, Monk, Badham, Köchly, England, Jerram), but the added name is at once superfluous and weakly appended (too far from what it loosely depends on). The gadfly's place in the myth was well enough known for allusive treatment in Euripides' sophisticated manner. διεπέρασε <πόντου> (Schoene, Kovacs) is no better. Conjectures changing διεπέρασεν to διεπόρευσε(ν), variously with <πόρτιν> (Bergk), <τὰν βοῦν> (Wecklein), <Ἰώ> (Diggle), after Kirchhoff), have even less merit. Diggle's other suggestion ἵν' οἶστρος <Ἰοῦς> ὁ πετόμενος <ἀπ'> Ἀργόθεν (*Euripidea* 193, n. 30) is metrically clumsy (with long anceps before ∪ ⁝ ∪ ∪ ∪∪ in the presumable trimeter), and offered with no corresponding suggestion for the antistrophe; and the present participle remains inappropriate.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(symmetrically beginning with another – ∪ ∪ word),[14] closely followed by *Ἀσιήτιδα γαῖαν Εὐρώπας διαμείψας* as another enoplian verse $T \times d -$.[15] For *T* thus following *2ia* with synartesis (elision in str.), cf. *HF* 1036–7 *ἐρείσμαθ' Ἡράκλειον ἀμφὶ δέμας τάδε λαΐνοις* | . . . (for the colometry there, see *CQ* [1988], 94–5).

398–406 The Chorus proceed to ask 'Who on earth can have come (from Sparta? or from Thebes?) to this horrid land with its human sacrifices?'[16]

τίνες ποτ' ἄρα, τὸν εὔυδρον δονακόχλοον
λιπόντες Εὐρώταν ἢ ῥεύματα σεμνὰ Δίρκας, 400–1
ἔβασαν ἔβασαν ἄμεικτον αἶαν, ἔνθα κούραι
Δίαι τέγγει
βωμοὺς καὶ περικίονας 405
ναοὺς αἷμα βρότειον;

399 *δονακόχλοον* Elmsley : -*χλο** L, -*χλοα* Tr[1] 403 *ἄμικτον* L, corr. Murray 404–6 *ἔνθα κούρα διατέγγει . . . περὶ κίονας ναοῦ* L, corr. Elmsley

In **398–401** (413–16) we have a lyric iambic trimeter with free responsion (uncertain in detail in both stanzas),[17] followed by ∪ *e* × *D ba* as another enoplian compound with symmetrical word-overlap (. . . ⁝ – × – ⁝ . . .).[18]

In **399** Elmsley's *δονακόχλοον* removes both a questionable form and an unwelcome *brevis in longo*. *δονακόχλοα* with the scansion ∪ ∪∪ ∪ ∩ is indeed unlikely.[19] *δονακόχλοα* with the scansion ∪∪ ∪ ∪∪ would be acceptably analogous to

[14] For the pattern . . . – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ | × ∪∪ ∪ – . . . in this dactylic-to-iambic modulation, cf. *Med*. 136–7 (*Mnemosyne* [2003], 30–2) and Soph. *El*. 152–3 (~ 183–4) *δέξεται εὐπατρίδαν, Διὸς εὔφρονι* | *βήματι μολόντα τάνδε γᾶν Ὀρέσταν*.

[15] The traditional division as ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ | – – – ∪ ∪ – – misrepresents the enoplian compound beginning with ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – (*T*). For the bonding pattern . . . ⁝ – – – ⁝ . . . (symmetrically in both stanzas), see further in n. 18 below. The particular sequence ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ⁝ – – – ⁝ . . . recurs at *IA* 178–9 *ἐπὶ τὰν Ἑλέναν ἀπ' Εὐρώτα δονακοτρόφου* (*T* × *dod*), also at *Ion* 458–9 (~ 478–9) *μόλε Πύθιον οἶκον, Οὐλύμπου χρυσέων θαλάμων* | . . . (*T* × *D*), with the easy correction of *Ὀλύμπου* to *Οὐλ-* (cf. *HF* 872, etc.), perhaps also with addition of <*'κ*> before *χρυσέων*.

[16] Sparta and Thebes are not, of course, thought of as likely ship-launching places. They are chosen rather for their *positive* features, by contrast with the *ἄμεικτος* Taurian land (a contrast enhancing the Chorus' surprise); also as *wrong* guesses (for which, by a Chorus, cf. *Mnemosyne* [1998], 715–18 on *Hipp*. 145–50).

[17] Platnauer's recognition of ∪ – | ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ – | ∪ – | ∪ ∪ ⏑ | ∪ ∪ (sic) as an iambic trimeter is strangely equivocal as to the quantity of the third syllable of *δονακόχλοα* (or -*χλοον*). *δονακ̆ό-* is certain here (unlike *δονακ̄οτρόφου* at *IA* 179 in a different metrical context), whatever we make of the rest. The trimeter lacks a normal caesura in str. (on which as exceptional in lyric trimeters cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 475, n. 158); but the weak diaeresis after *ποτ' ἄρα τὸν* may be recognized here as sufficient, in line with the weak diaereses in 394 and 409 after *ὅ ποτ'* and *ἐπὶ*.

[18] Here too (cf. n. 15 above, and K. Itsumi, *BICS* 38 [1991–3], 260) the traditional division after ∪ – ∪ – – – | . . . is erroneous. *ia sp* is alien to the context (and in general rare in Euripides). For the enoplian pattern × – ∪ ⁝ – × – ⁝ . . . (similarly with symmetrical diaereses), cf. *Andr*. 1009 (~ 1018) *ὦ Φοῖβε, πυργώσας* (κτλ.), 1027/1037, etc. For the particular sequence × *e* × *D ba* (here with a contraction), cf. *Ion* 1049/1062 (following *D* | . . .), etc.

[19] Lyric trimeters can end with pauseless hiatus and/or *brevis in longo* (e.g. *Bacch*. 1161); but a lyric trimeter ending with ∪ ∪∪ ∪ ∩ would be unique, and metrical continuity is otherwise probable here, in line with the sense.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the nearly contemporary ἁπαλόχροα at *Hel.* 373;[20] but that would require εὐυδροῦντα (or some equivalent) in place of εὔυδρον.[21]

The stanza ends in **402–6** (~ 417–21) with two standard dicola (Archilochian, priapean),[22] flanking two spondees.[23] For the symmetrically long ancipites in 405–6/ 420–1 (in line with the spondees), cf. those in the similar stanza-ending *wil* + *ph* dicola at *Andr.* 800–1, *El.* 188–9/ 211–12, *Ion* 1242–3, *Bacch.* 574–5.[24]

407–21 The antistrophe (with some further cruces) is similarly bipartite: first a speculative question ('Can it be that they have *crossed the sea in an oared ship in pursuit of wealth*?), then moralizing explanation of that conjecture.

407–12 ἦ ῥοθίοις εἰλατίνας δικρότοισι κώπας [ἀντ.
†ἔπλευσαν† ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα
νάϊον ὄχημα, λινοπόροις [αὔραις] 410
φιλόπλουτον ἅμιλλαν αὔξοντες μελάθροισιν;

407 ἦ Barnes: ἢ L 407 εἰλατίνας . . . κώπας Reiske: ἐλατίνοις (εἰλ- Tr[1]) . . . κώπαις L

(1) Though ἔπλευσαν has the right scansion (~ ἵν' οἶστρος), it is surely corrupt. One cannot πλεῖν a ship. To write ἔπλευσεν (Kvíčala), with ὄχημα as the subject, would be unconvincing even if it did not also require αὐξόντων for αὔξοντες in 412, with syntactical awkwardness. Of numerous conjectures keeping -αν, Diggle mentions only ἔλυσαν (Jackson), Murray only ἔκελσαν (Stadtmueller), Platnauer only ἔπεμψαν (Rauchenstein, Jerram, England, and now Cropp) and πόρευσαν (Dindorf). Prinz-Wecklein's appendix adds ἤπειξαν (Musgrave), ἔστειλαν (also Rauchenstein), ὤπλισσαν (Goram), ἔσπευσαν (Tucker). None of these verbs is really appropriate.[25] ὄχημα is properly 'carriage, car'; for the combination with νάϊον, cf. Soph. *Trach.* 656 πολύκωπον ὄχημα ναός. To govern it in this sentence, in conjunction with the 'oars' and 'waves' phrases, we need a verb typically used of 'driving, propelling' *cars*, so almost inevitably ἐλαύνειν, of which ἔλασσαν will be an appropriate epic form of the aorist (cf. *Il.* 4. 299, 18. 564).[26]

(2) As adumbrated above, deletion of αὔραις is then the sovereign remedy for the responsion-flaw in 395/410. We can then appreciate the excellence of λινοπόροις . . . μελάθροισιν ('in/with sail-faring abodes/dwellings') as a bold, phrase-framing locution for the 'domicile' of such hypothetical merchant-mariners, whereby/wherein

[20] Heteroclite -χλοα for -χλοον could well have occurred in poetry, *metri gratia*, before Nicander's ἔγχλοα (*Ther.* 676 and 885), by analogy with heteroclite -χροα etc. for -χροον etc. (familiar in poetry from Homer onwards).

[21] εὐυδρέω is not attested before Strabo; but there is something to be said for the rhythmic pattern – ∪ – ∪ ⁝ ∪∪ ∪ ∪∪ ⁝ . . . before λιπόντες Εὐρώταν . . .

[22] For the Archilochian (∪ *D* ∪ ⁝ *ith*), cf. *Med.* 645–6/655–6, 990–1/996–7, etc. For the asymmetrical division of the priapean here, cf. *Ion* 188–9/199–200, also the similar asymmetry before the final *ph* at 438/455 below.

[23] For this linking colarion (– – ⁝ – –), here perhaps associable with the paired dactyls in 394/409, cf. Soph. *Phil.* 711/722, 716/727 (*CQ* [2003], 88).

[24] The cadence – – – ∪ ∪ – – is variously at home in enoplian contexts as *D* – and also in ionic context as a form of *2io*.

[25] Of those most favoured, ἔλυσαν refers only to launching, ἔκελσαν denotes 'brought to shore', ἔπεμψαν and πόρευσαν need a personal object.

[26] ἐλαύνειν ναῦν as *Od.* 12.109 (νῆα . . . ἐλάαν), etc. For the augmentless form, and also for the corruption to a different verb, cf. the probable ἔλασας (codd. ἔβαλες) at *Or.* 169. ἐπέλασαν might seem tempting as closer to the letters; but ἐπέλασε(ν) at *Hel.* 671, 682, with personal object and dative of destination, is certainly from πελάζω, not ἐπελαύνω (*CQ* [1989], 64).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

they energetically pursue their desire for wealth (*φιλόπλουτον ἅμιλλαν αὔξοντες*).[27] *αὔραις* is in itself a plausible word with *λινοπόροις*, completing a phrase construable with *ἔπλευσαν*, and offering thus an irresistible temptation to the interpolator.[28] But we scarcely want both 'with oars' and 'with breezes' with the same verb. Moreover *μελάθροισιν* ('for their houses') is weak as an unsupported appended dative.

413–21

φίλα γὰρ ἐλπὶς †γένετ' ἐπὶ πήμασι βροτῶν†
ἄπληστος ἀνθρώποις, ὄλβου βάρος οἳ φέρονται
πλάνητες ἐπ' οἶδμα πόλεις τε βαρβάρους περῶντες·
κοιναὶ δόξαι,
γνώμα δ' οἷς μὲν ἄκαιρος ὄλ-
βου, τοῖς δ' ἐς μέσον ἥκει·

413–14 *γ' ἔτ' ἐπὶ* Willink (*γ' ἐπί τε* Murray) *πήμασιν* P *βροτῶν*] fort. *ῥοπῶν* (vel potius *ῥοπᾶν*) 417 *τε* Tr[1]: om. L 419 *κοιναὶ* Bergk: *-ναὶ* L

Such merchant-mariners (if that is what these Greeks are) are habitually optimistic and insatiably venturesome, like the *ποντοναῦται* in Soph. *Scyrioi* fr. 555 who *λεπταῖς ἐπὶ ῥοπῆσιν ἐμπολὰς μακρὰς | ἀεὶ παραρρίπτοντες . . . | ἢ ἔσωσαν ἀκέρδαναν ἢ διώλεσαν* (alternatives similar to those in 420–1, but in reverse order).

In **413–14** (thus obelized by both Diggle and Kovacs) the metre limps at *γένετ' ἐπὶ* (where we need ⏑⏑ ∪ for the trimeter);[29] and *βροτῶν* is plainly incompatible (though accepted by Murray) with the following *ἀνθρώποις*.[30] I now incline to think that it should suffice, with *γ' ἔτ'* for *γένετ'*,[31] to emend *βροτῶν* to a more appropriate genitive plural, to be construed either with *ἐπὶ πήμασι(ν)* (in effect '*despite πήματα*') or with *ἄπληστος* (like *κακῶν* at *Hel.* 1102, etc.), or with both (*ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*). *πόνων* or *μόγων* ('toils') or *πόρων* ('journeys, voyages') would make sense,[32] and *-ι βροτῶν* might perhaps have been generated by *–ι(μ) πόρων*.[33] But a likelier corruption is of

[27] *ἅμιλλα* is a favourite word in contexts of 'striving', not necessarily denoting 'competition'; cf. *Hel.* 356 (of suicidal sword-thrusting). It should not be objected that *μέλαθρον* is not attested elsewhere as referring to a ship (or ships). The word is flexible in connotation, typically 'domicilium' (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.*), but with a sense variously defined by context and/or associated epithet; cf. *Hec.* 1101 (of the 'vault' of heaven, as defined by *οὐράνιον*) and *Hel.* 177 (of the underworld, as defined by *νύχια*). Caravans could properly be described as '*μέλαθρα* on wheels', cf. the *στέγαι* in which the Scythians *πεδάρσιοι ναίουσ' ἐπ' εὐκύκλοις ὀχοῖς* (*PV* 709–10). The root sense 'wooden beams' (cf. *τέραμνα*) is also consistent with the use here, as defined by *λινοπόροις*.

[28] The more tempting with wrong punctuation giving a sense-pause at this point; and cf. *αὔραις* recurring at 433 below. For the unconvincing supplements proposed for correspondence in the strophe, see n. 13 above.

[29] Free responsion is unexceptionable in this lyric trimeter (~ 398–9), and there is no benefit in the transposition *ἐγένετ' ἐλπὶς* (Monk, Wakefield), necessarily then with arbitrary changes of *†ἐπὶ πήμασι(ν) βροτών†* to scan ⏑⏑ ∪ ⏑⏑ ∪ – .

[30] Prinz–Wecklein list eleven conjectures in their appendix of 'minus probabiles'. Most (as Bergk, Hartung and others) arbitrarily delete rather than emend *βροτῶν* (too cavalierly dismissed by England as 'evidently put in to fill up').

[31] In a previous conjecture (reported by Kovacs) I suggested *φιλεῖ γὰρ ἐλπίς γ' ἔτ' ἐπὶ πήμασιν βρύειν* 'hope *is still wont to wax* insatiable . . .'). For the appropriately underlining *γε* as also in Murray's conjecture) cf. *Il.* 10.59 *τοῖσιν γὰρ ἐπετράπομέν γε μάλιστα*, Soph. *Trach.* 945, *OC* 78 etc. (Denniston, *GP* 116).

[32] *μόγους* (Headlam) should be preferred to *πόνους* (Murray) at *Andr.* 305, as argued in *Philologus* (2005), 190. For *πόροι* 'voyages' (*LSJ πόρος* III), cf. 116, 1388, etc.; in fr. 926 *πόρους* (Valck.) is a plausible emendation of *τόπους*.

[33] *μ* and *β* are confusible letters (cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 307), as also are *τ* and *π*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

-ι(μ) *ῥοπῶν* ('hazards').[34] The uncertainties, however, are such that the obeli must remain here.

422–55 In the second stanza-pair, the Chorus first speculate about the route taken across the Black Sea. Then in the antistrophe they wish that the arrivals might include the hated Helen, to be justly slain; but they would be happiest if a ship has come to repatriate them.

422–38

πῶς τὰς Συνδρομάδας πέτρας, [στρ.
πῶς Φινηΐδας αὖ πολύ-
πνους ἀκτὰς ἐπέρασαν ;
<ἦ> παρ' ἅλιον αἰγιαλὸν ἐπ' Ἀμφιτρί-
τας ῥοθίωι δραμόντες,
ὅπου πεντήκοντα κορᾶν
†Νηρηίδων < – ∪ > † χοροὶ
μέλπουσιν ἐγκυκλίοις ;
<ἦ> πλησιστίοισι πνοαῖς,
συριζόντων κατὰ πρύμ-
ναν †εὐναίων† πηδαλίων,
αὔραισιν νοτίαις
ἢ πνεύμασι Ζεφύρου,
τὰν πολυόρνιθον ἐπ' αἰ-
αν, Λευκὰν ἀκτάν, Ἀχιλῆ-
ος δρόμους καλλισταδίους,
Ἄξεινον κατὰ πόντον ;

423–4 *Φινεΐδας* Tr[1] *αὖ πολύπνους* Willink: *ἀύπνους* L; *λιγύπνους* Wilamowitz 425 <*ἦ*> Willink *παράλιον* L, corr. Seidler 426 *ῥόθιον* Wecklein 428 *Νηρήιδων* Musurus 430 <*ἢ*> Bergk (<*καὶ*>Tr) 433 *αὔραισιν* Heath: *αὔραις* L 435–6 *πολιόρνιθον* et *ἀχιλλῆος* L, corr. Musurus *ἐπ' αἶαν* suspectum, fort. *ἐπᾶιξαν*

422–4 The first verse (~ 438) is an instance of the frequent responsion of *gl* with *wil*.[35] Thereafter sound metre is restored, with *ph* completing a tricolon in harmony with the syntax,[36] by the corrections proposed in 423 (and 425 <*ἦ*>) and 440–1 (see below).[37]

425ff. The question 'how did they pass the windy Salmydessan coast?' is naturally followed by contemplation of alternatives. 'Was it by hugging the shore? Or did they sail due North across the open sea to the mouth of the Danube?' We certainly need

[34] *ῥοπαί* are properly 'turns of the scale', typically but not necessarily downwards, so variously 'swings of fortune' (as in the Sophoclean *λεπταὶ ῥοπαί* upon which the hazarded *μακραὶ ἐμπολαί* depend) and 'hazardous moments' (cf. Soph. *Trach*. 82 *ἐν οὖν ῥοπῆι τοιᾶιδε κειμένωι*, explained by *Σ* as *ἐν κινδύνωι καὶ ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς ἱσταμένωι*); cf. also metaphorical uses of the cognate *ῥέπειν* and compounds. The genitive plural should probably be *ῥοπᾶν* in a lyric trimeter, but *-ων* and *-αν* are likely enough to have been ancient variants.

[35] Frequent from *Electra* onwards (also Soph. *Phil*. 1082/1102, 1124/1147, 1128/1151; *CQ* [2001], 66, n. 8); cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 195 (rightly, in n. 36, contesting Musgrave's transposition *πῶς πέτρας τὰς Συνδρομάδας*).

[36] . . . *τύχοι τὰν* ‖ *Τρωιάδα* . . . is plainly unacceptable with the prepositive article at period-end. But redivision as *τύχοι* | *τὰν* ~ *ἐπέρα-/σαν* (Diggle, Cropp) is still unsatisfactory, with the overlap where we expect period-end.

[37] *πῶς Φινῆιδας ἀύ-/πνους ἀκτὰς ἐπέρασαν* is possible in itself (as *dod¨ ∫ ph*), and consistent with a different reading in ant. But <*αὖ*> and *πολύπνους* (accepted by Kovacs) are otherwise an improvement.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bergk's <ἦ> in 430 introducing the latter alternative. But a metrically remedial <ἦ> (sic) will have dropped out as easily in 425 (another *H* before *Π*).[38]

425–6 The sequence – ∪ ∪∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪∪ ⋮ ∪ – ∪ – – ⋮ ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – ‖ is an iambo-choriambic pentameter combining a symmetrically resolved lekythion (*ˆ2ia*) with the common colon *ia ch ba* (with symmetrical division after ∪ – ∪ – – ; cf. *Med.* 431/ 439, etc.). To obtain this, we need the proposed <ἦ> in 425.[39]

427–9 Cropp accepts West's <ἁβρὰ>, with Heath's ἐγκύκλιοι; but '*pretty, delicate* μολπή' does not suit this context of perilous inshore surf. Parmentier's <ποσσὶ> has the merit of keeping ἐγκυκλίοις, and 'feet' is in line with *Tro.* 2–3; but the form lacks attestation in tragedy. Better, I suggest, would be *Νηρέως* (as *Hel.* 1585, *Cyc.* 264; disyllabic as at 217, *IA* 1056, etc.) δίναισι . . . ἐγκυκλίοις ('in/with circling whirls').[40] 'Circling' is a constant feature of this Nereid *topos*, sometimes doubly expressed, as at *IA* 1055 εἱλισσόμεναι κύκλια. At the same time δῖναι are also the milieu of the Nereids' dance (cf. *Hipp.* 150 δίναις ἐν νοτίαις ἅλμας). Cf. also *Ion* 1080–4 χορεύει δὲ σελάνα, | καὶ πεντήκοντα κόραι | †Νηρέος αἱ κατὰ πόντον | ἀενάων τε ποταμῶν† | δίνας χορευόμεναι . . . (thus obelized by Diggle, but with ἀεναῶν), where Kovacs reports my proposals *Νηρέος* ἑλικτὰ πόντον | ἀείνων (Fix) τ' ἄμ ποταμῶν | δίνας . . . (with Hartung's Διὸς οὐκ for ὁ Διὸς ἐκ in 1099).

430–2 Dovetailing rather than period-end is likely at 431–2 (~ 448–9), giving *ˆwil* ⌡ *wil* (as *Cyc.* 44–5/58–9; *Hipp.* 145–6/155–6, etc.) rather than *hag¨* ‖ *ˆwil*. If so, we must scan πρύμνᾱν (as from πρύμνη),[41] rather than the normal Attic πρύμνᾰν unless of course (which no one has suggested) εὐναίων conceals a word beginning with a consonant. εὐναίων can indeed scarcely be sound.[42] There have been many conjectures, but none at once linguistically acceptable and accounting for the letters.[43] With due diffidence I suggest that Euripides may have scanned εὐανίων (from εὐήνιος)[44] as a trisyllable

[38] ἦ . . . ; ἦ . . . ; cf. *Hec.* 449 ff., *Hel.* 1465 ff., S. *O.T.* 993, etc. (*Mnemosyne* 2005, 501 n. 7), also my correction of ἦ . . . ; to ἦ . . . ; at *Hcld.* 81 (*CQ* 1991, 526 n. 5).

[39] <ἦ> rather than Diggle's overlapped -σαν (n. 36 above). Without the extra initial syllable, παρ' ἅλιον αἰγιαλὸν (~ *Τρωιάδα λιποῦσα πόλιν*) constitutes an unacceptable tripody, unless (with Platnauer) we analyse 425–6/442–3 as a catalectic trimeter followed by a reizianum (∪ ∪ – ∪ – –). Against that, however, catalectic trimeters need either penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura (*CQ* [1989], 53, n. 38); and the catalexis without pause is also unwelcome.

[40] My previous suggestion *Νηρέως* <ὠιδαῖσι> has been accepted by Kovacs; but δῖναι are more to the point than ὠιδαί here. πεντήκοντα κορᾶν νηρέως δίναις χοροί will credibly have been reduced to the transmitted π- κ- νηρηίδων χοροί, influenced by πεντήκοντα *Νηρήιδων χορόν* in 274. As Cropp observes, μέλπειν without external or internal accusative is unusual in Euripides, but the absolute use (with an adverbial phrase) is paralleled at Aesch. *Ag.* 244.

[41] With -νᾰν overlapping, we have 'overlap in anaclasis' which is 'clearly avoided' (J. A. J. M. Buijs, *Mnemosyne* 37 [1985], 89). πρύμνη is epic (and acceptable as such), but also occurs doubtfully in tragedy at Soph. *Phil.* 482 (Elmsley).

[42] Defensive commentators have wavered between something like 'couched' (in effect 'permanently mounted', unlike the other oars) and some association with εὐνή II (εὐναί pl., as stones used as anchors), whence *LSJ* derive the far-fetched interpretation 'steadying, guiding a ship' (such εὐναί were thrown out from the prow, not κατὰ πρύμναν, and there is no question of anchoring in this context).

[43] εὐπειθέων (*olim* εὐθείαι) Rauchenstein, εὐαγῶν Weil, εὐπαγῶν or εὐπάκτων Herwerden, εὐηρέων or εὔδιον Bergk, εὐθύνων Wecklein. I do not understand the conjectures (as reported by Prinz–Wecklein) of Bothe (εὐναίαν vel potius εὐνᾴων (εὐνάων)) and Hartung (εὖ ναίων).

[44] Cf. εὐήνιος Emped. 4.5., φιλήνιος *PV* 475, χρυσήνιος -άνιος Homer and Pindar, δυσήνιος Menander, etc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(– – –).[45] The epithet thus metaphorically compares the steering oars to 'reins', in line with the treatment of the ship as an *ὄχημα* ('car'); in line also with the participle *συριζόντων*, apt to a racing-chariot, cf. *IA* 230 *σύριγγας ἁρματείους* (*LSJ* *σύριγξ* II.2), as well as to 'swishing' *πηδάλια*.

433–4 (~ 450–1) A dicolon, *dod¨* ⋮ *tl¨* (*dod¨* × *dod¨*), like *Ion* 1050–1/1064–5. South or south-west winds are the sail-filling ones for the imagined northward (as opposed to coast-hugging) course, and the nouns in 433–4 are thus straightforwardly appositive to *πλησιστίοισι πνοαῖς*. For this apposition (against Platnauer) there is nothing wrong with 'another pure dative', with Kirchhoff's routine correction *αὔραισιν*, and no need for a preposition (*αὔραις* <*σὺν*> Wecklein, <*ὑπ'*> *αὔραις* Wilamowitz).

435–8 (~ 452–5) A dovetailed tetracolon: *2ch* ⌠ *wil* ⌠ *wil* + *ph* ||| .[46] The pile-up of appositions is awkward here, with 'land of many birds' first appositively defined as '(the) white shore', and then as 'Achilles' running-track'. The syntax would also be improved by a finite verb governing not only the 'destination' phrases but also the terminal phrase 'across the Inhospitable Sea'. Too much has passed since *ἐπέρασαν* in 424 (at which point we were concerned merely with passing the Salmydessan coast), and we need something like '<or> . . . *did they head directly* across . . . to . . . ?' We can at once provide a suitable verb and eliminate one of the appositions by changing *ἐπ' αἶαν* to *ἐπᾶι<ξ>αν* (from *ἐπαίσσω*);[47] though we may then need *ἐπῆιξαν* as a further correction.[48]

439–55

εἴθ' εὐχαῖσι δεσποσύνοις [*ἀντ.*
Λήδας <τάνδ'> Ἑλένα φίλα 440
παῖς ἐλθοῦσα τύχοι γᾶν,
Τρωϊάδα λιποῦσα πόλιν, ἵν' ἀμφί χαί-
ταν δρόσον αἱματηρὰν
ἑλιχθεῖσα λαιμοτόμωι
δεσποίνας χειρὶ θάνηι 445
ποινὰς δοῦσ' ἀντιπάλους·
ἡδίσταν δ' ἂν ἀγγελίαν
δεξαίμεθ', Ἑλλάδος ἐκ
γᾶς πλωτήρων εἴ τις ἔβα
δουλείας ἐμέθεν 450
δειλαίας παυσίπονος·
< – > γὰρ ὀνείροισι †συμβαί-
ηνι† δόμοις πόλει τε πατρώι-
αι τερπνῶν ὕμνων ἀπολαύ-
ειν, κοινὰν χάριν ὄλβου. 455

[45] The admissibility of 'consonantal *ι*' in tragedy, other than *δια* (including *καρδία* / *κάρζα*) in Aeschylean lyric, has been contested by Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept*. 288. But 'consonantal *ι*' is akin to 'consonantal *υ*' (West, *GM* 14); and trisyllabic *εὐανίων* here will be similar in principle to the rare trisyllabic *ἐρινύων*, which occurs in tragedy only at 931, 970, 1456 in this play.

[46] *2ch* ⌠ . . . , cf. *HF* 637 (there followed by the usual *ch ba*). For the asymmetrical division (again) before the terminal *ph*, cf. n. 22 above.

[47] For *ἀίσσειν* of fast navigation (ships are commonly analogous to birds, with oars as wings), cf. Soph. *OC* 717 *παραισσομένα* (Meineke, Campbell for *παραπτομένα*; advocated in *CQ* [2003], 103–4).

[48] Doric *ἆιξαν* is attested at Bacchyl. 13. 111. According to the canon for tragedy enunciated by West (*Aesch. Trag.* xxvi), verbs beginning *ἀ-* *αἰ-* augment to *ἠ-* *ἠι-* except those with monosyllabic stems.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

439 δεσποσύνοις Markland: -ας L 440–1 <τάνδ'> et γᾶν Willink: τὰν L 442 χαίταν Musurus: -τα L 444 ἑλιχθεῖσα Tr2: εἶλ- L 445 χειρὶ Monk: χερὶ L θάνοι Seidler 447 ἡδίσταν δ' ἂν Musgrave (-την), Seidler (ἀδίσταν Dindorf): ἥδιστ' ἂν τήνδ' L 448 δεξαίμεσθ' Tr2 452 ὀνείροισι Fritzsche: -ασι L 453 -η <'ν> δόμοις Markland 454–5 ἀπολαύειν Tr (in ras.): ἀπόλαυσιν <L>P ὄλβου Dupuy: ὄλβα L, -ω Tr2

439–41 It is hard to see why Heath's εὐχαΐσι<ν> is the unquestioned vulgate in 439. Responsion does *not* require this added ν. For the responsion of – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – with – – – ∪ – ∪ ∪ – (with three shorts and five longs in both places), cf. *Ion* 209/223a and (as Diggle) *Hel.* 1302/1320.

In 440–1 we must have period-end after the opening tricolon (as in str.). γᾶν for τὰν is easy, with which <τάνδ'> before Ἑλένα (or perhaps Λήδας <τάνδε> [Ἑλένα] φίλα) completes the remedy.[49]

442–6 ἀμφὶ χαίταν . . . ἑλιχθεῖσα . . . θάνηι, see Diggle, *Studies* 80–1. Seidler's θάνοι (accepted by Kovacs) could be right; but primary sequence is not merely admissible (as Diggle shows), but persuasively advocated by England: 'that she *may* die' rather than 'might die'; cf. ἔβα (not βαίη) in 449.

447–51 ἡδίσταν (or ἀδίσταν) δ' ἂν . . . is the likeliest correction, if 430/447 is *wil* rather than ⏑*wil*; though τὰν δ' ἥδιστ' ἂν . . . is another (more recherché) possibility. Then in 448 Triclinius' δεξαίμεσθ' gives more exact responsion; but for unequal anceps before the choriamb cf. 427/444, 429/446, 434/451, 435/453, *HF.* 645/663, etc. For the breach of synapheia (with pause) at παυσίπονος (if 452 begins with a vowel, as suggested below), cf. *Cyc.* 51, 64, 72, *Alc.* 1001, *El.* 150, *HF* 350, 689, 793, *Hel.* ?1477, 1480.

452–5 The Chorus have made play with the blissful notion that some ship may have arrived from Greece to liberate them from exile and slavery (447–51). Later we shall learn that their city's walls and presumably their home have been destroyed (1108ff.); but that will not prevent them in that later ode from wishing to fly home like migrating birds and to join once more in the χοροί which they enjoyed as girls (1138–52). So when they sing here of 'home' and 'dreams' and 'happiness', they must surely be saying (or at least implying) that they *have* nostalgic dreams, not that they *wish* to have such dreams. If the stasimon ends with a wish, following 447–51, it must be a wish for *realization* of the dreams (by repatriation), not (weakly) for a continuation of them.

Of many conjectures for this corrupt sentence, most fail the test on that ground (including those accepting Hermann's ὕπνων for ὕμνων). Of those consistent with the desire for actual dream-fulfilment, the best is Weil's <τἀν> γὰρ ὀνείροις ἀποβαίη . . . or alternatively <τἀν> γὰρ ὀνείροισί μοι εἴη . . . ,[50] followed by 'ν δόμοις . . . ἀπολαύειν, and then κοινὰν χάριν ὄλβου as a further appositional phrase.

But the phrasing seems clumsy (the more so in versions attempting to keep ἀπόλαυσιν), and the corrupt συμβαίην (or -η 'ν) is not very convincingly accounted for. I suspect that the universal search for a different optative verb has been misdirected, and tentatively suggest restoration as an explanatory *statement*, rather than a wish:

[49] For the shorter alternative (deleting 'Ελένα) cf. n. 37 above. 'Obvious' proper names are often interpolated (Diggle, *Euripidea* 459, n. 79).

[50] The latter after Hartung (who proposed καὶ γὰρ ὀνείροισί μοι εἴη . . .). Not συνείην δόμοις (after Fritzsche, Kirchhoff): we cannot well put τἀν γὰρ ὀνείροισι before that; and, apart from the awkward double apposition (συνείην . . . ἀπόλαυσιν . . . χάριν), συνεῖναι δόμοις is abnormal language (unlike σ- φίλοις).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press

<ἦ> γὰρ ὀνείροισί μοι ἡ-
βᾶι 'ν δόμοις πόλει τε πατρώι-
αι τερπνῶν ὕμνων ἀπολαύ-
ειν, κοινὰν χάριν ὅλβου. 455

'For truly *it is still fresh for me* in dreams to enjoy . . . '; a construction like Aesch. *Ag.* 584 ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡβᾶι τοῖς γέρουσιν εὐμαθεῖν. With the infinitive thus as the subject of ἡβᾶι, there is no 'double apposition'; only the single point that such ἀπόλαυσις and memory of home kept fresh in/by dreams is a χάρις ὅλβου available to everyone (κοινή).[51] <ἦ> (again) is shorter than all the other proposed supplements before γὰρ, and for ἦ γὰρ . . . thus beginning the last sentence of an ode, cf. *Alc.* 474. ὀνείροισι needs no preposition, since 'dreams' are also the medium *by which* the memory of 'songs at home' has remained fresh. For the prodelision 'ν δόμοις following ἡβᾶι, cf. *Supp.* 69 ταλαίναι 'ν χερὶ θεῖναι.[52] The idiom with ἡβᾶι is uncommon enough for the letters σιμοιηβαιν to have puzzled the tradition (the more so with the corruptible correption)[53] in such a way as to generate συμβαίην as a makeshift.

Highgate, London C. W. WILLINK

Addendum

IT 123ff. and 392ff. are discussed by M. E. Wright, *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies* (Oxford, 2005), 170–4. There is more to be said, and a further note on 123–36 will follow in due course.

[51] On this type of non-integral appositive accusative, see Barrett on *Hipp.* 752–7.
[52] *CQ* (1992), 42. For this prodelision after -αι, see Diggle, *Studies* 33.
[53] On 'the habitual failure of scribes to recognize correption', see Diggle, *Studies* 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000413 Published online by Cambridge University Press