Classical Quarterly (2004) **54.2** 424–440
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh049

FURTHER CRITICAL NOTES ON EURIPIDES' *ORESTES*

My edition of Orestes followed on the heels of editions by Di Benedetto and Biehl,[1] and has been followed in turn by the editions of M. L. West,[2] J. Diggle[3] and D. Kovacs.[4] It would be laborious to detail all instances of (partial) agreement and disagreement with these successors (with all of whom I have enjoyed personal contact), and others who have recently addressed textual issues in this play.[5] Suffice it to say that, while I am gratified by the acceptance of many of my textual proposals in the new Oxford Text, or at least their mention in the apparatus,[6] I remain unrepentant about some which have not found favour.[7] At the same time, on some issues my thinking has changed, partly influenced by Diggle and West[8] and partly as a consequence of recent correspondence and direct discussions with Kovacs, some of the results of which are apparent in his Loeb edition;[9] and some further thoughts are offered in the following notes.

67–8 *βλέπω δὲ πᾶσαν ἐς ὁδὸν <ἦι> ποτ' ὄψομαι*
Μενέλαον ἥκονθ'·

[1] C.W.W., commentary on Murray's text (Oxford 1986, 1989), with corrections and *Addendis Addenda*; V. Di Benedetto (Florence, 1965); W. Biehl (Teubner, 1975), and previously *Euripides Orestes erklärt* (Berlin, 1965).

[2] M.L.W., with translation and commentary (Warminster, 1987); nearly contemporary with my edition, but he had seen a draft of my commentary. See also his article 'Problems in Euripides' *Orestes*', *CQ* 37 (1987), 281–93.

[3] J.D., *Euripidis fabulae iii* (Oxford, 1994). See also his notes on *Orestes* in *CQ* 50 (1990), 100–23 = *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1994), 362–99, and his monograph *The Textual Tradition of Euripides'* Orestes (Oxford, 1991); cf. my review in *CR* 41 (1992), 265–6.

[4] D.K., *Euripides v* (Harvard, 2002).

[5] Reviewers include D. Sansone, *CPh* 85 (1990), 64–7; P. G. Mason, *JHS* 109 (1989), 220–2; C. Collard, *CR* 39 (1989), 13–15; J. C. Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* 42 (1989), 531–9; E. Medda, *SIFC* 117 (1989), 98–124; also (reviewing Diggle's vol. iii) most notably R. Renehan, *CPh* 93 (1998), 249–60. See also the critical notes of A. and B. Manuwald, *WJA* 20 (1994–5), 91–3, on the Finale, and those of J. Hohlzhausen, *Hermes* 123 (1995), 270–80.

[6] There is more to be said (see below) about some of these: 412–13, 823, 847–8, 960–81, 966b, 1501–2, 1612, 1663.

[7] Here and in nn. 8–9 an asterisk signifies 'see further below'. 81–2 (I should now press the case for *αἷς* more strongly), 155 (commended by Collard), 189*, 218 (*-ίζω*), 536–7 (Brunck), 545* (Musgrave), 564 *ἀπειλείθ*, 579–84 (after 585–90), 588–90 (defend), 644–5, 677, 694–5, 932–42, 933, 1003–4* (prob. Kamerbeek), 1032 (nil mutandum), 1196 (defend), 1395 (Kirchhoff), [1579–84], 1638–42. Further proposals not mentioned by Diggle but accepted or mentioned by Kovacs are at 249, 345*, 390–89–88, 424, 431, 714–16, 1106, 1402b.

[8] I accept Diggle's proposals at 225, 410, 1041 (*Euripidea* 416–20, 364, 372) and his arguments at 212, 304, 555–6*, 811, 1039 (*Euripidea* 403, 362–3, 367–9, 370, 372); also (after Sansone) at 50, 110–11, 788. At 1184 I should now follow Sansone (against West, Diggle and Kovacs). At 1315, where Sansone has defended *ἐσπεσοῦσα* and Kovacs has followed him, I now incline with West to accept Wecklein's *ἐσπαίσουσα* as sufficiently supported by *Rhesus* 560 (also with Diggle, though he comes close to excising this verse and the next).

[9] Recent exchanges with Kovacs have generated further proposals: accepted in his text at 140–3/153–6*, 825*, 827, 1431, 1493*, 1533; mentioned in his apparatus at 960–81*, 1007.

Classical Quarterly 54.2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

67 ἐς ὁδὸν <εἴ> ποτ' Markland: εἴσοδον (εἰς ὁδὸν Musgrave) πότ' codd.

The construction βλέπω . . . πότ' ὄψομαι . . . has been questioned, but usually tolerated.[10] Markland's ἐς ὁδὸν <εἴ> ποτ' eases the syntax, and correction of εἴσοδον to εἰς/ἐς ὁδὸν is otherwise likely;[11] there is nothing wrong, pace Kovacs, with the 'looking in every direction'.[12] But there is a neglected issue concerning the subordinate clause. We scarcely want 'I am looking in every direction, *in case* I may see Menelaus having come', since it is certain that Menelaus will in due course come to rejoin his wife. ᾖ(ι) (*H* before *Π*) is at least as easy a supplement, and gives better sense: 'every way by which I may see . . .'.[13]

131, 156. I should now write ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγώ and ὦ τάλας (non-allocutory).[14]

140–6

(*Hλ.*) σῖγα σῖγα· λεπτὸν ἴχνος ἀρβύλας
τίθετε· μὴ κτυπεῖτ'·
ἀποπρὸ βᾶτ' ἐκεῖσ' ἀποπρό μοι κοίτας.
ΧΟΡΟΣ [στρ.
ἰδοῦ, πείθομαι.
Hλ. ἆ ἆ· σύριγγος ὅπως πνοὰ 145
λεπτοῦ δόνακος, ὦ φίλα, φώνει μοι.

Further consideration has persuaded me, and also Kovacs, that Di Benedetto was right in continuing σῖγα σῖγα . . . to Electra, against the MSS but in line with ancient *testimonia*. Some new considerations are involved in this recantation. (i) No one, I think, has previously identified the strophe as beginning at 144 (~156), rather than at 140 (~152). This at once eliminates the problem of defective symmetry between 140–3 and 152–4.[15] The Parodos of *Heraclidae*, in similar iambo-dochmiac dialogue, affords

[10] Diggle accepts εἰς ὁδόν and reports Markland in his apparatus. West keeps εἴσοδον, without mention of Musgrave or comment on βλέπω . . . πότε . . .

[11] Despite West's concurrence, I no longer think 'every εἴσοδος' appropriate in artificial reference to the two *eisodoi* in the theatre. It is also dramatically more effective for Electra to be looking literally 'every way, in every direction' (including across the orchestra), neglecting only the direction by which Helen is about to make her surprise entrance from the (so far unidentified) stage building.

[12] Kovacs obelizes βλέπω †δὲ πᾶσαν εἴσοδον†, on the ground that 'only one of the eisodoi leads to the harbor', and suggests βλέπω δ' ἐπ' ἀκτάς, εἰς ὁδὸν . . . without explaining how εἰς ὁδόν is then to be construed with ποτ' ὄψομαι κτλ. Against the notion that Menelaus' arrival can be looked for only by a particular *eisodos* that lies in the 'harbour' direction: (i) the palace in this play is consistently thought of as *surrounded by the town*, not as lying in some way between 'town' and 'harbour'; (ii) the play begins and continues with a scenically imprecise setting, associated with Orestes' 'sick bed' (in some courtyard? but we are offered no clues as to that); and (iii) Electra has in any case no reason for assuming that Menelaus will come (when he comes) directly from Nauplia. Some hours have passed since his arrival there (the night during which Helen has been sent on ahead), and he may well not have spent all these hours in the harbour. His very delay may suggest the possibility of business elsewhere. For the greater effectiveness of 'looking in *every* direction', see also n. 11 above.

[13] For the force 'qua videam' rather than 'qua videbo', cf. K-G i.173, ii.422.

[14] For this distinction between ὤ (ὦ) and ὦ, cf. *CQ* 49 (1999), 412, n. 17.

[15] Di Benedetto has defended the responsion with asymmetrical assignations, but they certainly break a rule with (at best) very rare exceptions. There is also the unequal number of dochmiacs if the shorter text is accepted in 141, as attested by Dionysius. Some violence will be needed to save τίθετε, μὴ κτυπεῖτε μηδ' ἔστω κτύπος (prima facie incorporating an intrusion from 137) as two acceptable dochmiacs; conversely, there is nothing to be said, pace Diggle, for

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a precedent for the structure proem–strophe–mesode (in related metre)–antistrophe.[16] The lack of speaker-change at 140 is somewhat unusual (and as such a credible cause of the MSS' misattribution to the entering chorus); but cf. Andromache's passage from trimeters to elegiacs at *Andr*. 103.[17] (ii) It is a marked gain with this assignation that the first choral utterance hushed by Electra (as opposed to foot-noise) is the chorus's (or chorus-leader's) first utterance.

As to the metre, τίθετε . . . κοίτας is a three-dochmiac sequence (a common length) like *Hcld*. 75–6, equally divisible as *2δ* ⁝ δ; and 145 (~157) I now recognize as a 'long dochmiac' (δ^^δ), rather than *ba* (or *ba/mol*) + δ; see further on 189 below. The sequence δ^^δ | *2δ* (like *Ion* 676–7/695–6) recurs at 1465–6.

189 οὐδέ <τι> γὰρ πόθον ἔχει βορᾶς.

This corresponds with 168 θωΰξασ' ἔλασας (codd. ἔβαλες) ἐξ ὕπνου. The verse – ⏑ – ⁝ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – has generally been accepted as comprising a dochmius abnormally preceded by – ⏑ –. These apparent compounds of a dochmius with a preceding or following bacchius, cretic or molossus typically both begin and end with a dochmius (often with the pattern ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ – ⏑ –, like 157 ὀλεῖς, εἰ βλέφαρα κινήσεις), and are thus better annotated as δ^^δ.[18] On that basis, my previous tentative suggestion merits stronger advocacy. As well as bringing the metre into line as δ^^δ (patterned like *Hipp*. 1276 χρυσοφαής ⁝ φύσιν ⁝ ὀρεσκόων), the supplement <τι> is at once technically easy and sense-enhancing ('not *at all*'; LSJ τις A.11.c; οὔτις I.2).

329–31
τρίποδος ἄπο φάτιν, ἂν ὁ Φοῖ-
βος [ἔλακεν] ἔλακε, δεξ- 330
άμενος ἀνὰ δάπεδον,
ἵνα μεσόμφαλοι λέγονται μυχοί [γᾶς].

~345–7
τίνα γὰρ ἔτι πάρος οἶκον ἄλ- 345
λον ἕτερον ἢ
τὸν ἀπὸ θεογόνων [γάμων],
τὸν ἀπὸ Ταντάλου, σέβεσθαί με χρή;

In the vulgate we have an anomalous sequence ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏒⏒ | ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏒⏒ between the exactly responsive sequences ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⁝ – ⏑ – (*2ia*) and ⏑ ⏑⏑ – ⏑ – ⁝ ⏑ – – ⏑ – (*2δ*) that begin and end this stanza-concluding iambo-dochmiac period.[19] The apparent

excising a dochmius in 153 (see my commentary). His evasion of the metrical objection by writing τίθει, μὴ κτύπει in 141 is most unconvincing.

[16] See *CQ* 41 (1991), 525–9; the structure identified there has been accepted by Kovacs.

[17] A reader objects that 'Andromache's lyrics are hardly a parallel'; but they are indeed parallel in the essential feature (transition from prologue to Parodos; for this as a function of *Andr*. 103–16, see *Mnemosyne* 54 [2001], 724–30). There may well have been other parallels known to the reputable scholars in antiquity who continued σῖγα σῖγα . . . to Electra.

[18] Cf. *CQ* 49 (1999), 425–6 (on *Hipp*. 1276), also *CQ* 51 (2001), 87 with nn. 97–8 (with mention also of Pindar, *Ol*. 1.9), and further on 1415 (⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ – – –) and 1465 (– ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ – – –) below. As the dochmius (δ) is ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ (with some limitations in practice), so δ^^δ is ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ (with some limitations). For other instances of δ^^δ (as well as *Hipp*. 1276) beginning with an apparent choriamb, cf. *Med*. 1256–7/1266–7, *Rhesus* 699–700/717–18, A. *Eum*. 270–1.

[19] An alternative metrical interpretation as *2ia cr* is no better, giving not only 'resolution before syncopation' at θἔ̆ὄγὄ-ˈνω̄ν γἄμω̆ν, but also adjacent resolutions at δἔ̄ξἄμἔνὸς ἄνἄ (admissible

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dochmius kaibelianus ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏓ is not perhaps impossible in itself, but the free responsion does nothing to commend it here. I no longer, however, favour my previous notion of reducing ἔλακεν ἔλακε to ἔλακ' ἔλακε, with ἀλλότριον in place of ἄλλον ἕτερον in 345 (thus obtaining *2ia* ∫ *2δ* | *2δ*).[20] Rather, with Murray and others, I should now begin by accepting the single ἔλακε attested in part of the tradition,[21] thus obtaining *3ia* followed by *3δ*. Editors favouring that have hitherto omitted either ἄλλον or ἕτερον in the antistrophe (likewise with some manuscript support). But the pleonasm ἄλλον ἕτερον is likely to be authentic;[22] and I now believe that γάμων is the intrusive word (like γᾶς in 331, rightly excised by Triclinius). Without γάμων we have *3ia* plus δ followed by *2δ*, with only one inequality (⏑⏑), and there is also an improvement of sense. The relevant divine ancestry of the Tantalid royal house is simply the status of Tantalus as Διὸς πεφυκώς, as enunciated in the prologue (5). τὸν ἀπὸ θεογόνων, followed epexegetically by τὸν ἀπὸ Ταντάλου, is straightforwardly in line with that. By contrast, the phrase ἀπὸ θεογόνων γάμων irrelevantly invites speculation concerning the distaff side of the lineage. The coinage θεογόνος (here only) suits a substantival at least as naturally as an adjectival use, especially in the plural (cf. ἐπίγονοι, ἀπόγονοι). For the idiomatic indefinite plural used thus in 'generalizing' reference to an individual, cf. 97, 819, etc. (K-G i.18 Anm. 2). It could be that the addition of γάμων following -γόνων derives from a superscribed variant -γάμων. τὸν ἀπὸ θεογάμων could well have been an ancient alternative. [I previously questioned the logic of τίνα γὰρ ἔτι . . . , and suggested τίνα δὲ τί<να>. But there will be no need for that if ἔτι can be understood as 'hereafter'.]

338–44 (~322–8). See my further discussion of the 'musical papyrus' (against E. Marino) in *Quaderni Urbinati* 68 (2001), 125–33.

423–4. West implausibly postulates ill-digested revision by Euripides himself. Kovacs prefers to invent two verses between 423 and 424.

491–3. In 491 I no longer favour Bothe's conjecture *Tυ.* πρὸς τόνδ' ἀγὼν τις <ἀ>σοφίας ἥκει πέρι·, which has now been accepted also by Kovacs (despite Renehan's further objections). ἀγὼν τις ἀσοφίας πέρι is a phrase at once too 'clever' (as an inversion, possibly with a new coinage, of the normal ἀγὼν . . . σοφίας), and too tentative (with the indefinite τις) for the forthright character of the elderly Spartan king. West proposes πρὸς τόνδ' ἀγὼν τίς τοῦ σοφοῦ γ' ἥκει πέρι;, which would be more acceptable if it did not involve *both* the substitution of τοῦ σοφοῦ for σοφίας *and* the addition of γ' to avoid hiatus. Diggle reasonably prefers to obelize, while favouring Porson's reshuffle πρὸς τόνδε σοφίας τίς ἂν ἀγὼν ἥκει πέρι; (or something on similar lines).

Di Benedetto's πρὸς τόνδ' ἀγῶν<α> τί[ς] σοφίας ἥκει<ς> πέρι; merits more attention than it has received. Prima facie, τἄ σὄφἴᾶς is the most inviting correction of

only within a dochmius), unless we write ἄν (for ἀνὰ) δάπεδον. West divides differently, beginning the period with an even more anomalous tripody ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ – / . . .

[20] Against anadiploses of the form ἔλακ' ἔλακε (with elision) see my discussion of S. *Aj.* 620 in *CQ* 52 (2002), 58 with nn. 26–8, and further in n. 46 below.

[21] For the false doubling, cf. L's wrong ἔτυπεν ἔτυπεν at *Ion* 787 and ἄτεκνος ἄτεκνος at *Hel.* 689, a fault 'commoner than may generally be supposed' (Diggle, *Euripidea* 381, mentioning 328, 834, ?999, ?1387, 1449, 1454, 1470 in this play alone); here perhaps as a false echo of ἔλακεν ἔλακεν in 163.

[22] Cf. Collard on *Su.* 573, and Diggle, *Studies* 14–15.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the unmetrical *τῖς σὄφῖᾶς*. But his two further changes *ἀγὼν*<*α*> and *ἥκει*<*ς*> are less appealing. It is more economical, and otherwise better, to write simply:

Tυ. *πρὸς τόνδε* <*δ'*> *ἀγὼν τί σοφίας ἥκει πέρι . . .;*

'But against Orestes here' (riposting to Menelaus' thrust against Tyndareus' 'unwise old age') 'what has the *ἀγὼν* to do with *σοφία . . .*?'[23] *ἀγών* for *ἀγών*, as in 861, *Hcld*. 116, 722, *Su*. 754, *Herc*. 1191, *Hel*. 1090, *Pho*. 588, like *ἀνὴρ* for *ἀνήρ*, scarcely counts as an emendation. There are then other ways of gaining a short syllable (*aliter* *τόνδε* <*γ'*> or *τόνδ'* <*ἄρ'*> or *τοῦτον*), but none, I think, better than *τόνδε* <*δ'*>, with an appropriate adversative particle.

I should then, with West ('What has an intelligence-contest to do with this fellow, if seemly and unseemly are obvious to everyone?') take 492 (*εἰ τὰ καλὰ πᾶσι φανερὰ καὶ τὰ μὴ καλά*) with 491, not as a protasis to which 493 (*τούτου τίς ἀνδρῶν ἐγένετ' ἀσυνετώτερος;*) is the apodosis. The illogicality of the latter is evident in Kovacs' rendering: 'if good and bad are manifest to all, what man has ever shown himself more foolish than he has . . .?'. The surpassing lack of *σύνεσις* cannot be conditional upon the universal manifestness of *τὰ καλὰ* and *τὰ μὴ καλά*. For 491ff. thus beginning with a longer (not single-line) sentence following stichomythia, cf. *Hel*. 605, *Pho*. 427, 748, 931(?), 1217, *Ba*. 509.[24]

544–57(–63). Diggle's discussion in *Euripidea* 364–70 variously invites a riposte, partly in defence of line 545 (first deleted by Paley, and now also by Kovacs), partly in opposition to his newly-proposed transposition of 546–7 to precede 557. At the same time parts of his discussion are persuasive, and have prompted some changes of view (in 551ff.; not, as it happens, in 544–50).

544–50

Op. *ὦ γέρον, ἐγώ τοι πρὸς δὲ δειμαίνω λέγειν,*
ὅπου γε μέλλω σήν τι λυπήσειν φρένα· 545
ἐγῶιδ', ἀνόσιός εἰμι, μητέρα κτανών
(ὅσιος δέ γ' ἕτερον ὄνομα, τιμωρῶν πατρί)·
ἀπελθέτω δὲ τοῖς λόγοισιν ἐκποδὼν
τὸ γῆρας ἡμῖν τὸ σόν, ὅ μ' ἐκπλήσσει λόγου,
καὶ καθ' ὁδὸν εἶμι· νῦν δὲ σὴν ταρβῶ τρίχα. 550

545 *γε* (AtZ+) . . . *τι* Musgrave: *σε* (pler.) . . . *τε* codd. *λυπῆσαι* VMn+
546 *ἐγῶιδ'* Hermann: *ἐγὼ δ'* codd. 548 *δὲ* Paley: *δὴ* codd.

There is little amiss in this deprecatory *προοίμιον* (developing a standard rhetorical procedure). Note the tripartite pattern (distich–distich–tristich), and the ring structure with the opening theme echoed in the third section. There is no reason why the 'inhibition' expressed and overcome in such a *προοίμιον* should not be compoundly motivated.

The vulgate phrasing of 545 with *ὅπου σε . . . σήν τε φρένα* is indeed unsatisfactory (though tolerated by West without comment); but the variant reading *ὅπου γε . . .*

[23] Lit. 'what (coming) has it come?'; cf. K-G i.310.6.

[24] A scholion agrees with this punctuation: *ἐπειδὴ ὁ Μενέλαος εἶπεν, "Καὶ τὸ γῆρας οὐ σοφόν", φησὶν ὁ Τυνδάρεως, ὅτι "Τίς χρεία ἐστὶ σοφίας, ὅπου γε προφανὲς τοῦ Ὀρέστου τὸ πλημμέλημα;"* [Or does his *ὅπου* suggest perhaps that he read *ἦι* or *οὗ* rather than *εἰ*?]

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

merits respect.[25] Corruption of σε to γε in conjunction with σήν τε φρένα is incredible, unlike the converse. But if ὅπου γε . . . is an ancient reading, it presupposes . . . μέλλω σήν τι (not τε) λυπήσειν φρένα in the rest of the verse, and this is likely to be the truth. The indefinite τι ('somewhat') is a nice touch. The corruption will have begun with the erroneous τε for τι, necessitating ὅπου σε . . . before it, except in a minority of texts which somehow preserved γε. Given the excellent verse as restored by Musgrave, the case for excising it (Paley, Diggle, Kovacs) is evanescent. The phrasing is obviously not (as Paley suggested, echoed by Diggle) derived from 608 οὕτω δ' ἀμείβηι μ' ὥστε μ' ἀλγῦναι φρένα, but protected, rather, by the thematic connection of thought. All we are left with is Diggle's statement that 'deletion has the merit of removing a superfluous reason for Orestes' inhibition'. On the contrary: 545 very properly (on the lips of a grandson addressing his grandfather) makes explicit a reason for the initial expression of 'fear' (δειμαίνω, a strong verb) that otherwise has to be inferred.

There is nothing wrong with 546–7 *in situ* (given Hermann's ἐγῶιδ' for ἐγὼ δ'), provided that 547 ὅσιος δέ γ' . . . is recognized as a *parenthetic qualification* of the preceding statement: 'I am well aware that I am polluted as a matricide (*though holy indeed as a father-avenger*)'.[26] Understood thus, 546–7 sits very acceptably within the proem, as another preliminary expression of 'proper (inhibiting) sentiment', framed between the aforementioned ring-structured sentences. To justify the transposition 548–49–50–46–47 (favoured by Paley, Wecklein, West, and others, after Hartung and Kirchhoff), we need more than the observation that ἐγὼ δ' can then be kept (unconvincingly, in effect). Diggle's relocation of 546–7 before 557 is more plainly wrong, as it puts . . . ἀνόσιος . . . | ὅσιος . . . τιμωρῶν πατρί too close to 563 ἀνόσια μὲν δρῶν, ἀλλὰ τιμωρῶν πατρί, with only five trimeters intervening.

ἀπελθέτω δὲ . . . ('But . . .') is then a necessary correction in 548. The wrong δή (mildly colloquial, with the force ἄγε δή), though acceptable in itself, is associable with misinterpretation of 547 as having already effected a shift from 'inhibition' to 'confidence'.

551–8

τί χρῆν με δρᾶσαι; δύο γὰρ ἀντίθες δυοῖν·
πατὴρ μὲν ἐφύτευσέν με, σὴ δ' ἔτικτε παῖς·
[τὸ σπέρμ' ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦσ' ἄλλου πάρα·]
[ἄνευ δὲ πατρὸς τέκνον οὐκ εἴη ποτ' ἄν·]
[ἐλογισάμην οὖν τῶι γένους ἀρχηγέτηι 555
†μᾶλλον (μ')† ἀμῦναι τῆς ὑποστάσης τροφάς·]
ἢ σὴ δὲ θυγάτηρ (μητέρ' αἰδοῦμαι λέγειν)
ἰδίοισιν ὑμεναίοισι . . .

The argumentation (following the προοίμιον) begins with two self-contained verses enunciating the dilemma confronting Orestes as a dutiful son. 'Two against two' (with a 'mathematical' flavour, the terms indifferent in gender) in the first instance implies equality in the items thus antithetically 'balanced'. The 'duality' is then quite straightforwardly explained by the antithetically balanced phrases in 552, each

[25] Diggle (in *Euripidea*) reports ὅπου γε as the reading of AtMn^{uv}(~Mn^{c})Pr^{γp}SgrZZc and some MSS of the *Lexicon Vindobonense*; also S as reading ὅπου γε σὲ (*sic*).

[26] For the force of δέ γε here (cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles* 155), the best parallel is the parenthesis at *I.A.* 392–3 ὤμοσαν τὸν Τυνδάρειον ὅρκον οἱ κακόφρονες | φιλόγαμοι μνηστῆρες (ἡ δέ γ' ἐλπίς, οἶμαι μέν, θεός, | κἀξέπραξεν αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἢ σὺ καὶ τὸ σὸν σθένος), | οὓς λαβὼν στράτευ'· ἕτοιμοι δ' εἰσὶ μωρίαι φρενῶν.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

compounded of subject and predicate.[27] In the abstract, the male parent who φυτεύει and the female who τίκτει can be considered as on a par. But (557ff.) in this instance the mother (undeserving of that title) behaved in such a way as to forfeit her status. Note the effective collocation thus of 'your daughter' in 552 and 'But your daughter . . .' (again) in 557, now *explicitly* eschewing the designation 'mother'.[28]

In between 552 and 557 we have four verses, of which three (553, 555–6) elaborate a traditional argument for the *genetic primacy* of the father, and one (554, a weaker verse prima facie) inconsistently asserts the *genetic indispensability* of the father, a quite different idea. Diggle excises 554 (del. Nauck) and also 555–6 (del. Paley), which I previously defended; but he needed to take out 553 as well. He rightly identifies the content of 555–6, not only the faults of metre and language impugned by Paley, as affording grounds for excision, seeing that the 'genetic primacy' argument is a 'distortion' in this context introduced by an interpolator ('remembered from A. *Eum.* 658–6'). But 553 is surely a feature of the same distortion, likewise *genetically* downgrading the mother.

It seems likely that line 554, asserting the genetic indispensability of the father, was composed for a version of the passage which did not include lines 553 and 555–6 (with which 554 is inconsistent); and conversely, that 553 and 555–6 were composed for a version of the passage without 554. 553 and 555–6 can of course be taken sequentially (as in Nauck's text), and are not so stylistically different as to require the postulate of different authors.[29]

What we have, in effect, is alternative interpolations, differently elaborating the crisply enunciated antithesis of 'father who φυτεύει' and 'mother who τίκτει'. One interpolator merely thought it necessary to counter any 'imbalance' in favour of the mother ('your daughter'), his single-line composition thus ranking simply as an intelligent 'clarification'.[30] The other interpolator saw this as a moment for actually improving the speech (in his judgement) by adding the genetic argument famously developed (in Orestean context) by Aeschylus.

651 ἓν μὲν τόδ' ἡμῖν ἀνθ' ἑνὸς δοῦναί σε χρή.

[27] Though straightforward, this differs both from my own previous interpretation and from all the interpretations considered by Diggle (*Euripidea* 366–7). The difference lies essentially in the fact that no one hitherto has gone straight from 552 to 557.

[28] At once rhetorically effective and in line with the plot: for the latter, the overall effect of Or.'s eristic *apologia* has to be to exacerbate Tyndareus' anger.

[29] I previously accepted both 553 and 555–6 as Euripidean. I now see the style of both as close to that of Euripides, but flawed by a certain ineptness. As to 555–6 Diggle allows that the metrical 'unusualness' of ἐλογισάμην is 'no sufficient argument against authenticity'; and he should not have rejected *Su.* 189 ὑποστῆναι πόνον (rightly taken by Kovacs as 'to undertake this labor') as sufficient support for the expression ὑποστῆναι τροφάς ('to undertake nurture'); the expression τῶι γένους ἀρχηγέτηι is grandiloquent as applied to one's father rather than to the distant ancestor of one's clan, but not for that reason out of place, given the speaker's concern to emphasize the 'genetic primacy' of the father; and, as I have shown, the unmetrical μᾶλλον ἀμῦναι is at once certainly corrupt and emendable so as to give syntax harmonious with the rest of the sentence. As to 553, more closely considered, παραλαβοῦσ' ἄλλου πάρα is somewhat inelegant; and ἄλλου πάρα is more appropriate to a general statement concerning the source of the seed received by the mother than to the particular case in which the source of the seed has already been identified.

[30] Note that 554 following 552 is less immediately open to censure (now objectionable only as upsettting by elaboration the crisply balanced 'two against two'. Line 561 (del. Reeve, followed by Diggle) is another inorganic 'clarifying' single verse credibly attributable to the same author.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Diggle, followed by Kovacs, surprisingly accepts Paley's arbitrary transposition of this verse to precede 658. As things stand, ἓν ἀντὶ ἑνός plainly and properly refers to the first item (namely, 'ἀδικία for ἀδικία') in the compound claim for repayment, before the second item, namely 'πόνος (of one day) in return for πόνος (of many days)'. There is too much in 646–57 to be referred to as 'one thing'.[31]

704–5 ἐλθὼν δὲ Τυνδάρεών τέ σοι (σοι τὲ L) πειράσομαι . . .

It is hard to account for this metrically clumsy verse as a corruption of the minority reading ἐλθὼν δ' ἐγώ σοι Τυνδάρεων πειράσομαι (γρMC), previously favoured by me and accepted by Diggle. More credibly, the latter is an 'improvement', at once normalising the metre and incorporating both ἐγώ and σοι (τέ σοι and τ' ἐγώ could well have been transmitted as metrically equivalent variants), at the expense of the unnecessary τε. I suspect that we have here another instance of 'proper-name interpolation'.[32] If the original verse was

ἐλθὼν δὲ τὸν γέροντ' ἐγώ πειράσομαι . . .

τυνδάρεων, written over τονγερον, will all too easily have been mistaken as a correction, and the letters τεγω will then have readily generated the hypothetical variants τ(ε) εγω and τε σοι. L's deviant σοι τὲ for τέ σοι rather suggests an error due to superscription (whether of σοι or τε), and consequent insertion in the wrong place.

In 705 I no longer resist the easy correction πείσας (Hermann) for πεῖσαι, obviously vulnerable to corruption after πειράσομαι. The phrase τῶι λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς refers more aptly (with cryptic ambivalence) to the policy which Menelaus will attempt to pursue.

Uncertainties may remain, but I see no case for Kovacs's bracketing of 704–5 (as well as 702–3).[33]

812–15
ὅποτε χρυσέας ἔριν ἀρνὸς
†ἦλυθε† Ταναλίδαις
οἰκτρότατα θοινάματα καὶ
σφάγια γενναίων τεκέων· 815

~824–7
κακοφρόνων τ' ἄνδρῶν παράνοια·
†θανάτου γὰρ† ἀμφὶ φόβωι 825
Τυνδαρὶς ἰάχησε τάλαιν'·
Ἆ τέκνον, οὐ τολμᾶις ὅσια . . .

[31] A reader opines that '651 disrupts the syntactical coherence of 650 and 652'. Properly understood, the 'disruption' (such as it is) is not objectionable. A further argument that the answer to ἓν μὲν . . . must be the δέ in 658, not that in 652, has no force. It is at 652 that the second claim begins (πόνος for πόνος).

[32] Cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 459, n. 79 (but for '*Or*. 967' read '*Or*. 964'). There is, I think, yet another instance in this play at 1478 (see below).

[33] Kovacs rejects 704–5 partly as conflicting with his assignation of the exits of Tyndareus and Menelaus to different *eisodoi*, whereas I have assigned them (and would still assign them) to the same *eisodos*, opposite to that by which Pylades will shortly enter. If there is some uncertainty as to exactly what Menelaus means by τῶι λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς, that is not inappropriate to his suspect motivation.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

West mentions my proposal *ἐτεθάλει* for *ἤλυθε* in his apparatus. The responsion thus of *-νὸς ἔτεθᾱλ-* with *-ἄ· θἄνἄτου* seemed perfect; but further study has revealed that initial ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ . . . in the glyconic and wilamowitzian occurs only after a full diaeresis, with the sole exception of *Ἀρ-/τέμιδος* at *I.A.* 185–6 (a proper name, and in any case with the three shorts within a word). Previously I cited 826–7 . . . *τάλαι-/νᾰ· Τἔκνὄν* . . . in support. But it is easy and otherwise plausible there to write *τάλαιν'· | Ἀ τέκνον*. . .[34] Kovacs has accepted that, and also a later suggestion for 813/825, namely, *-νὸς ἦλθε Ταντἄλίδαις* in responsion with *Ἄιδα γὰρ ἀμφὶ φόβωι* (*wil* | ∧*wil*). The choice now seems to be between that and four different ways of obtaining *wil* | *wil* again: either . . . *ἔρις ἀρ-|νὸς τεθάλει Ταντἄλίδαις* or . . . *ἔρις <ἀμφ'> | ἀρνὸς ἦλθε Ταντἄλίδαις* with either *Ἄΐδα γὰρ ἀμφὶ φόβωι* or *ἀμφὶ γὰρ φόβωι θανάτου*. For the suggested *τεθάλει*, cf. Fraenkel on *βεβάκει* (Keck) at *Ag.* 407 (similarly with epic precedent); *Ἄΐδᾱc*, cf. *El.* 122, etc. (Diggle, *Studies* 21, 119).

819–24

τὸ "καλόν" οὐ καλόν, τοκέων
πυριγενεῖ τέμνειν παλάμαι 820
χρόα μελάνδετόν τε φόνωι
ξίφος ἐς αὐγὰς Ἀελίοιο δεῖξαι·
τὸ δ' "εὖ" κακουργῶν ἀσέβεια ποικίλα . . .

The chorus are contesting as 'not *καλόν*' and 'impious' the kind of positive approbation of matricide expressed on one side of the debate in the Assembly-trial. They are not accusing Orestes of *ἀσέβεια ποικίλη*.[35] For him they retain sympathy as one suffering from a terrible *νόσος* (831ff.). On two points of detail, (i) if the present infinitive *τέμνειν* is changed to aorist (Porson; so Diggle, West, and Kovacs), despite the 'generalising' plural *τοκέων* and the metrical acceptability of ⏑⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ . . . , then *ταμ-* should probably be written (cf. *Hec.* 634. A. *Ag.* 1410); (ii) the Sun merits a personifying, indeed deifying, capital letter in this kind of 'pious' sentiment.

846–8

Χο. ἥκιστα· πρὸς δ' Ἀργεῖον οἴχεται λεών,
ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα τὸν προκείμενον †πέρι
δώσων†, ἐν ὧι ζῆν ἢ θανεῖν ὑμᾶς χρεών.

Electra, knowing nothing of what has passed since she went within to rest at line 315, has re-entered to find Orestes unexpectedly absent. To her question 'Has Orestes left this house under the influence of god-sent madness?' (a natural conjecture, in the light of his recurrent *λυσσήματα*), the Chorus-leader replies: 'By no means (*ἥκιστα*): he has gone to the Argive people . . .'. The expression of 847–8 is unsatisfactory, and my previous excision of both lines (848 *iam* Kirchhoff) has been accepted by Diggle and Kovacs; but I now think it wrong. 846 alone is an incomplete answer to Electra's two-line question, and the incompleteness is not made good in the following exchange ('Alas, what has he done? Who persuaded him?' 'Pylades; but here comes someone who will tell you about your brother's doings there'). It is not in the manner of tragic dialogue for questions to be left imperfectly answered; in this case leaving

[34] For the responsion ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ . . . ., cf. *I.T.* 1092/1109, 1129/1144, *Hel.* 1347/1363, *Pho.* 208/220, *Ba.* 410/425, *I.A.* 553/568, 753/764, 754/765 (some, but not all, doubtful).

[35] Cf. my review of J. R. Porter, *Studies in Euripides'* Orestes (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 128), *JHS* 116 (1996), 195–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Electra to infer a motive other than madness for Orestes' departure *πρὸς Ἀργεῖον λεών*. In any case, until *δώσων* has been plausibly explained, we cannot properly proceed beyond obelization of †*πέρι* | *δώσων*†. We might yet consider bracketing 848 only (after Kirchhoff); but that still leaves the hypothetical interpolator's *δώσων* unexplained; and there is also a question-mark hanging over *πέρι*. Di Benedetto may well have been right in arguing that the word-pattern is against taking *πέρι* with *ψυχῆς*; at the same time, his interpretation *οἴχεται περὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα . . .* cannot be what Euripides intended.

No emendation of *δώσων* has proved acceptable; but what if *πέρι* is false and *δώσων* sound? Intrusion of *πέρι* for something different is not unlikely here, whether simply to explain the construction of *ψυχῆς* or from 851 nearby, or both; variants tend to proliferate at the ends of lines. Orestes has set off (with Pylades) to speak at the Assembly-trial, rather than passively awaiting its outcome. That will at least offer a chance of survival: cf. 778ff. (especially 779–80 *Πυ. μολόντι δ' ἐλπίς ἐστι σωθῆναι κακῶν*; *Ορ. εἰ τύχοι γένοιτ' ἄν*). So the truth here could well be *τύχῃ δώσων*, cf. *Pho*. 1653 *ἔδωκε τῆι τύχηι τὸν δαίμονα*, and *Alexandros* 618.4 K (II.4 D) *τύχηι δί[δωμι] πά[ντα]* (*δίδωμι* Cronert, *πά[ντα]* Aefke).

960–81. The MSS give the whole strophe and antistrophe to Electra. My division giving 960–4/971–5 to Electra and 965–70/976–81 to the Chorus has not found favour, principally on the ground that there is nothing confirming the changes of speaker; and Diggle, West, and Kovacs all accept Weil's transfer of the whole to the Chorus, despite my arguments against that (the rightful role of Electra as *ἔξαρχος* in this lament, and the oddity of her long silence following the Messenger-speech, broken suddenly at 982 *μόλοιμι κτλ.*). I should now prefer a modification which might also be accepted as a compromise, giving the whole of 960–81 to 'Electra and Chorus'.[36] A similar rubric (*ΗΛ.ΧΟ.*) has been proposed with good reasons by Di Benedetto at 1302, and accepted there by both Diggle and West; and the 'tutte' thus will be in line with the threnodic *συνωιδία* forecast in the prologue at 132–3: *αἴδ' αὖ πάρεισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς θρηνήμασιν* | *φίλαι συνωιδοί*.

1003–4

τὰν πρὸς Ἕσπερον κέλευθον (v.l. *ἑσπέραν*)
οὐρανοῦ προσαρμόσασα (*προσαρμόσας* pler.)
<ταῖι> μονόπωλον ἐς Ἀῶ . . .

'Combining the (sun's) Westward celestial course with that towards the East'. As previously argued, the two courses combined are the diurnal (from East to West) and the zodiacal. Since the latter (annual) course is strictly 'to the East' (regressively, in relation to the stars), not 'towards the sunrise', an epithet here serves to dissociate 'Eos' from the four-horsed chariot of solar dawn (as *Ion* 82, etc.). *μονόπωλον* 'with single horse' is to be understood as alluding to the Eastern (or Dawn) Star (*ἑῶιος ἀστήρ*, *Ἑωσφόρος*, later *Φωσφόρος*), in a phrase balancing *πρὸς Ἕσπερον* 'towards the Western (or Evening) Star'. On these two 'stars' (both, of course, the planet Venus), see West on Hes. *Th*. 381; for their combination in an antithesis, cf. *AP* 7.670

[36] This proposal is mentioned in Kovacs's apparatus. I have argued for a similar rubric *ΙΠΠΟΛΥΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΩΜΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΠΟΛΩΝ* at *Hipp*. 58 (not, as Barrett, at line 61) in *CQ* 49 (1999), 410 with n. 13.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Plato). As argued, *προσαρμόσασα* is the *mot juste* in a context of *ἅρμα* and *ἁρμονία* (or 'disharmony'), as thus additively effected by Eris.

The argument for this interpretation and the associated technically simple restoration of the text has been enthusiastically commended by Kamerbeek, but otherwise neglected in favour of West's deplorable conjecture *χιονόπωλον* [*ἐς*] *Ἀῶ* (with clumsier syntax and duller sense, and taking no account of the well-attested *difficilior lectio ἕσπερον*). It merits further advocacy against what is in danger of becoming the vulgate. But I have made one small adjustment, now reading *τὰν . . . <ταῖι> . . .* (an even easier correction), whereas I previously proposed *ταῖι . . . <τὰν> . . .*

1011–12. In support of the re-division . . . *ἦλθε* (Porson, Brunck) *δόμων | πολυπόνοις*, Diggle refers to his apparatus on *Pho.* 1581, where (more relevantly) he cites *Hel.* 384–5 . . . | *ὤλεσεν ὤλεσε πέργαμα Δαρδανίας | ὀλόμενους τ' Ἀχαιούς*. This similarly follows an open-ended *4da* verse, and there is another probable instance of the same – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – | ⏑⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – ‖‖ at *I.T.* 1135–7/1150–2 (text as Kovacs). If we keep . . . *ἦλυθε | δόμων* . . . we have *4da | 4da* (so far so good), but an improbable conclusion ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – –.[37]

1244–5

†*τρισσοῖς φίλοις γὰρ εἷς ἀγών, δίκη μία·*
ἢ ζῆν ἅπασιν ἢ θανεῖν ὀφείλεται.† 1245

Diggle and Kovacs accept Nauck's excision of 1245; but 'we must all either live or die' is too vacuous to be convincingly accounted for as an interpolation; contrast the familiar gnomic sentiment *βροτοῖς ἅπασι κατθανεῖν ὀφείλεται* (*Alc.* 419, 782, *Andr.* 1272, fr. 10.). Pylades' episode-concluding speech properly ends with a resonant distich mentioning 'life or death'; cf. *I.T.* 1065–6 *ὁρᾶτε δ' ὡς τρεῖς μία τύχη τοὺς φιλτάτους, | ἢ γῆς πατρώιας ἢ θανεῖν, ἔχει* (in turn reminiscent of *Il.* 10.173–4). I previously suggested writing *τρισσοῖς . . . εἷς ἀγών· δίκηι* (or *τύχηι*?) *μιᾶι . . . ἅπασιν . . . ὀφείλεται* (with a chiastic pattern).[38] West's translation supports such revised punctuation (though his text remains conservative): 'for this trio of allies faces a single trial, a single settlement: *one sentence* for all of us, either life or death!' (my italics). This evidently requires something like *μιᾶι δίκηι* with *ἅπασιν*. But I am now less inclined to dismiss as 'feeble' Paley's simpler emendation (accepted by Longman): . . . *δίκη μία, | ἦι ζῆν* . . .

1305–6

†(*τὰν*) *λιποπάτορα λιπόγαμον,†* ἃ *πλείστους* 1305
ἔκανεν Ἑλλάνων . . .

Diggle and Kovacs accept West's *λιπογάμ<ετ>ον*, which I too previously commended. Renehan justly contests the coinage. *ἀγάμετος* (S. fr. 970) by no means verifies *-γάμετος* as the second limb of a *λιπο-* compound. *ἀγάμετος* is associable

[37] S. *Ant.* 339–41/352–4 (*4da | 4da* | – – – ⏑ – ⏑ – – ‖‖) should not be looked to for support of the paradosis here. The clausula there is certainly *sp ith*, not × – – ⏑ – ⏑ – –; see *CQ* 51 (2001), 69–70 with n. 19, which includes some relevant observations about *4da* ⁝ × – . . . sequences. Euripides could doubtless have imitated the late-Sophoclean penchant for such patterns, but he is unlikely to have done so with the rare colon ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – (unparalleled in such a metrical context) rather than a more straightforward catalectic iambic verse.

[38] For confusion of *δικ-* and *τυχ-* cf. also *Hcld.* 460 (Ald.) and *Pho.* 1654 (W).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the large class of ἀ- . . . -τος adjectives (as ἄπρακτος, ἀκοινώνητος, etc.).[39] λιπο- compounds are quite differently generated: typically with a substantival second element (as λιπόναυς 'ship-leaving', λιπότεκνος, 'childless') or as a related verb in -έω (as λιποψυχέω 'swoon') or abstract noun in -ία (as λιπανδρία, λιποθυμία). λιπόγαμον is impeccable, and we must fall back on the other possibilities considered in my note. Hermann's λιπόγαμόν <θ'> still merits a place in the apparatus; but, given Herwerden's probable -πάτριδα for -πάτορα, I should now be content with τᾱ̀ν λῐ̆πŏπᾱ̆τρῐ̆δᾰ̆ λῐ̆-|πŏγᾰ́μŏν . . . There are sufficient (if not many) parallels in Euripides' dochmiacs for the lengthened -πᾱ̀τρ-,[40] and for split resolution of the third longum of a dochmius.[41] But, in view of the uncertain status of τὰν, it may be worth mentioning again my other suggestion <κῠ̆νᾰ̆> λῐ̆πŏπᾰ̆τρῐ̆δᾰ̆ λῐ̆-|πŏγᾰ́μŏν . . .

1344–9

Ερ. ἰδού, διώκω τὸν ἐμὸν ἐς δόμους πόδα·
σώθηθ' ὅσον γε τοὐπ' ἐμέ. 1345
Ηλ. ὦ κατὰ στέγας
φίλοι ξιφήρεις, οὐχὶ συλλήψεσθ' ἄγραν;
Ερ. οἵ 'γώ, τίνας τούσδ' εἰσορῶ;
Ηλ. σιγᾶν χρεών.
[ἡμῖν γὰρ ἥκεις, οὐχὶ σοί, σωτηρία]
ἔχεσθ' ἔχεσθε . . .

My previous excision of 1347–8 has been accepted by Diggle, but not by West or Kovacs. I now incline to delete 1348 only, the 'silliness' of 1348 in relation to 1345 σώθηθ' . . . being the only real fault in the text, once the incorrectness of the transmitted assignation of 1347b–8 to Orestes has been recognized (as by Lachmann and most subsequent editors). The divided trimeter at 1345, unusual on its own (with 1347 deleted) as a mid-verse exit, is associable with a dramatic 'coup', as West observes, and likely enough to have been associated with further *antilabe* (cf. S. *Phil*. 974, 981, 985).

Immediately after Hermione has irrevocably crossed the threshold after 1344–5a, Electra calls to the fellow-conspirators within to seize the prey. 1347, beginning with a loud exclamation, is heard from within, and 'shushed' by Electra (still outside). There is sufficient continuity thus between Electra's exhortations οὐχὶ συλλήψεσθ' ἄγραν; and ἔχεσθ' ἔχεσθε . . . addressed to the φίλοι ξιφήρεις, before her own scene-ending exit into the palace.

1366–8

Χο. [ἀλλὰ κτυπεῖ γὰρ κλῆιθρα βασιλείων δόμων]
σιγήσατ'· ἔξω γάρ τις ἐκβαίνει Φρυγῶν,
οὗ πευσόμεσθα τἀν δόμοις ὅπως ἔχει.

West plausibly suggests deleting only 1366, not all three verses (notoriously attributed

[39] On the range of meaning of such adjectives, as not inherently either 'active' or 'passive', but essentially 'such that there is no -ing', see Barrett on *Hipp*. 677–9.

[40] N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1962), 38–9, mentions *Herc*. 1045 κατὰ δὲ δᾱκρύοις and *Hel*. 673 βλέφαρον ῡγραίνω as the most certain instances (both, it may be noted, at the same point in the dochmius as τὰν λιποπᾱτριδα λι-).

[41] This split is indeed most frequently seen in the wholly resolved sequence ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ . . . (like 1364 διὰ τὸν ὀλόμενον ὀ-|λόμενον . . .); but I should have mentioned *Tro*. 263 παρθένον, ἃι γέρας ὁ | . . . and *Rhesus* 131 τάδε δοκεῖ, τάδε με-|ταθέμενος . . .

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by Σ to 'actors', and deleted by Diggle, postulating a substitution for genuine verses). It is only line 1366 that produces the contradiction between the phrasing of the choral approach-announcement (some such is certainly needed between 1353–65 and 1369ff.) and the Phrygian's immediately following description of his escape from death 'over the cedar timbers of the *παστάδες* (chambers) and Doric triglyphs'. Initial *σιγήσατ'* with a single *γάρ*-clause is a welcome simplification. But I disagree with West (and the scholiast) in inferring that the following sung verses must describe a visible escape by the Phrygian over the roof of the stage building (scarcely made more credible by suggestions of 'a rope' or 'clambering' or 'a wriggle through a gap between triglyphs', in conflict with 'over' in the sung verses).

Dangerous manoeuvres are not to be contemplated for an actor in Phrygian costume (including 'barbarian slippers') about to sing a long aria. It should not be overlooked that what the scholion actually attests is contemporary performance of the entry at ground level. The criticism of that practice comes from a too-literal-minded ancient critic (writing in a library), and is not evidential of a different stage practice in more ancient productions. We can surely (at least if we delete 1366, with its inappropriate focus on noisy door-fastenings) accept a 'charades-style' technique, in which a colourless announcement of 'emergence' (with all the emphasis on the command *σιγήσατε*) is followed by a colourful lyric narrative describing (doubtless with the aid of mime) what we are invited to imagine.

1414–15 *περὶ δὲ γόνυ χέρας ἱκεσίους*
ἔβαλον ἔβαλον Ἑλένας ἄμφω. 1415

The resolved *2ia* verse with split-resolution is of a standard sub-dochmiac type (like 171/192, 1253/1273, A. *Sept*. 157/165, S. *Tra*. 1009/1030, etc.; *CQ* 49 [1999], 420), followed by another form of the 'long-dochmiac' ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ (δ^^δ); cf. on 189 above. There is no good reason for regarding the metre of 1415 as 'doubtful' (Diggle, *Euripidea* 108).

1465 *ἁ δ' ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν· Ὤμοι μοι.* 1465

Not *ἄνῑ̆ᾱχε̆ν ῑ̆ᾱχε̆ν* as I previously took it, and towards which Diggle inclines after a long discussion (*Euripidea* 386–97), in the course of which he rejects as 'unappealing' (p. 394) the scansion – ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ – – – ('dochmius + molossus'). The strong aorist *ἴαχεν* properly has the epic scansion with short *α* (unlike *ἰᾱχησα* etc. from *ἰᾱχέω*);[42] cf. *El*. 707 (Elmsley) and the noun *ἴᾰχημα* (analogous to *πάθημα*). Given the probable *ῐᾰ̆χ-*, what we have is to be recognised as another instance of δ^^δ (again beginning and ending with a dochmius), this time – ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⁝ – – – in line with the typical diaeresis pattern described above (on 189); cf. also *Ion* 695 *φίλαι, πότερ'* ⁝ *ἐμᾶι* ⁝ *δεσποίναι* (similarly followed by *2δ*). There is then no case for preferring (with Diggle) the negligible variant *ἴω μοί μοι* (FPr et Aa), otherwise open to the objection that *ὤ/ὦ* commonly corrupts to *ἰώ*, whereas the converse is rare.[43]

[42] On *ἀχ-* and *ἰᾱχ-/ἰᾰ̆χ-*, see also my discussion in *Mnemosyne* 56 (2003), 45 n. 42. I do not, incidentally, accept Hermann's unique *ἴᾰχήθης* at *Hel*. 1147 as 'certain' (read *κακὰ δ' ἰᾱχῆι καθ' Ἑλλανίαν*). At *Phaethon* 82 read *ἀχοῦσιν* (Wilamowitz) as a correction of *Π*'s *αχεουσιν* (in responsion with – – – . . .), not *ἰαχοῦσιν* (Diggle).

[43] Cf. *CQ* 49 (1999), 417, n. 29; also *CQ* 51 (2001), 86–7, and *CQ* 52 (2002), 55.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1468–70 †φυγᾶι δὲ ποδὶ τὸ χρυσεοσάμβαλον (v.l. -σάνδαλον)
ἴχνος ἔφερεν ἔφερεν,†
ἐς κόμας δὲ δακτύλους 1470
δικὼν 'Ορέστας . . .

There are problems both of metre and phrasing. I agree with Diggle and Kovacs in dividing after δακτύλους, but now suspect that the words obelized conceal a run of three dochmiacs, for example:

φυγᾶι δὴ ποδοῖν χρυσεοσαμβάλων
ἴχνος ἔφερεν ἔφερεν, . . .

φυγᾶι δὴ . . ., cf. τότε δὴ . . . in 1485 below. ποδοῖν as *Ion* 495 (lyr.) etc., cf. χεροῖν 1493; but of course ποδῶν is scarcely less likely. A trace of genitive plural survives here in H, teste Diggle.[44] For the terminal resolution . . . ⏑ ⏑⏑ in a dochmius before change of metre, cf. *Hec*. 1065–6 (βλέφαρον | ἄκεσαῖσ). Alternatively (I now prefer) φυγᾶι <u>δ' ἀ<πὸ></u> . . . ἔφερεν (tmesis, cf. 340–1); πο drops out before ποδ, and reappears as τὸ.

1478–80 ἔναντα δ' ἦλθε †Πυλάδης† ?
ἄλαστος οἷος οἷος Ἕκ- *2ia* ∫
τωρ ὁ Φρύγιος ἢ τρικόρυθος Αἴας· ˄*3ia*˄

ἔναντα δ' ἦλθεν (OZ, Bothe, Hermann) Πυλάδας (Wilamowitz) ἀλίαστος | . . . (as Diggle) gives an enoplian verse (⏑ *e D* ⏑, akin to 'dactylo-epitritic') like *Phaethon* 272 ἀν' αἰθέρ' ἢ γᾶς ὑπὸ κεῦθος ἄφαντον. But that metrical genre appears nowhere else in this long aria. Moreover division thus, with . . . | οἷος οἷος Ἕκτωρ || . . . following as an ithyphallic, leaves us a syllable short in 1480, where Diggle prints ὁ Φρύγιος ἢ <καὶ> τρικόρυθος Αἴας as an unconvincing makeshift. More probably, Wilamowitz was right in correcting ἀλίαστος to ἄλαστος (as advocated in my commentary), with ἄλαστος . . . Αἴας then constituting a syncopated iambic period of five metra, without the 'period-end without pause' when Ἕκτωρ ends a verse. 1478 might then be *ia ch* (with ἦλθεν); but that too is contextually unlikely. I have suggested that Πυλάδης (*sic*) is another interpolated proper name (cf. n. 32 above). But I no longer favour simple excision ('there came against us as it were a Hector or Ajax . . .'), already disfavoured in my Addenda. Rather, this is likely to be another place where a name-gloss has displaced an allusive designation; for which I previously considered Ἄρης Ἄρης, but now more simply prefer

ἔναντα δ' ἦλθ' ὁ Φωκεύς, (*2ai*˄)
ἄλαστος οἷος κτλ.

ἄλαστος can be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, describing both Pylades and Hector (cf. *Il*. 22.261), with whom he is compared.

1484–5 τότε δὴ τότε διαπρεπεῖς
†ἐγένοντο Φρύγες ὅσον Ἄρεος ἀλκὰν†
(ὅσσον O, ἄρεως M<B>O+)

[44] χρύσεον ἀμβαλὼν H, -σάνδαλων H^{cuv}, *ον* [pro *ων* ut vid.] H^{1m}.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἥσσονες Ἑλλάδος ἐγενόμεθ' αἰχμᾶς·

Diggle obelizes thus, and suggests [*ἐγένοντο*] *Φρύγες ὅσον Ἄρεως* <*Ἄρεως*> *ἀλκὰν* (or *ἀλκὰν* <*ἀλκὰν*>, after West); Kovacs similarly deletes *ἐγένοντο* and prints *Φρύγες ὅσσον Ἄρεως ἀλκὰν* <*ἀλκὰν*> (with *Ἄρεως* disyllabic). Previously I suggested *ἐγένοντ' Ἄρεος Φρύγες ὅσον ἀλκάν*, but commented in my Addenda that *ἐγένοντο . . . ἐγένομεθα* 'remains hard to accept'. I would now add that, if *ἐγένοντο* is thrown out, we can supply the necessary syllables in a different way, thus:

<*ἦμεν*> *Φρύγες ὅσ(σ)ον Ἄρεως ἀλκὰν κτλ.*

1492–3 *ἄθυρσοι δ' οἷά νιν* [*δραμόντε*] (*-όντες* AGKL+)
βάκχαι σκύμνον ἐν χεροῖν
ὀρείαν ξυνήρπασαν·

Diggle obelizes †*δραμόντε . . . χεροῖν*† (previously tolerated by West and me) between *ba cr* and *ba ia* dimeters. Kovacs accepts my subsequently suggested deletion of the awkwardly placed *δραμόντε(ς)*, leaving *βάκχαι . . . χεροῖν* as *mol ia*. As a refinement of that, I should now excise *ἐν* as well, leaving

βᾱκχαῖ σκῡμνῶν χἔροῖν | ὄρεῖᾱν ξῦνῆρπᾰσᾶν·

as the same recurrent clausular sequence as 1407 *ἔρροι τᾶς ἡσύχου | προνοίας κακουργὸς ὤν* and 1472 *παίειν λαιμῶν ἔμελ-|λεν εἴσω μέλαν ξίφος* (cf. also 1379, 1447, 1464).

1501–2 *aliter* *ἀνσχόμενος ἀπὸ Τροί-|ας ἀνόνατ' ἔλαβε*
τὸν Ἑλένας γάμον.

There is no need (though still something to be said) for the suggested [*ἀπὸ*] *Τροία-|θεν*.

1545–8 *τέλος ἔχει δαίμων βροτοῖς,* 1545
τέλος ὅπαι θέλει·
†*μεγάλα δέ τις ἁ δύναμις δι' ἀλαστόρων*
ἔπεσεν ἔπεσε† *μέλαθρα τάδε δι' αἱμάτων*
διὰ τὸ Μυρτίλου πέσημ' ἐκ δίφρου.

1547 aut *ἔπεσεν ἔπεσε*(*ν*) aut *ἔπαισεν ἔπαισε*(*ν*) fere codd. (utrumque *Σ*)

These are the last sung verses in the play, in responsion with 1361–5 (*διὰ δίκας ἔβα θεῶν : νέμεσις ἐς Ἑλέναν· || δακρύοισι γὰρ Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν ἔπλησε* <*γᾶν*>) | *διὰ τὸν ὀλόμενον ὀλόμενον Ἰδαῖον | Πάριν ὃς ἄγαγ' Ἑλλάδ' εἰς Ἴλιον* |||).

Diggle and Kovacs have accepted the text which I previously advocated: *μεγάλα δέ τις ἁ δύναμις καὶ ἀλαστόρων· | ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε μέλαθρα . . .*[45] I am now less ready to

[45] *καί* after West (*καὶ ἀλάστωρ*); *ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε* Seidler.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

countenance the stylistic abnormality of the vulgate 'correction' ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε;[46] (ii) the splitting into two sentences, with an uncomfortable asyndeton, of what should be a single sentence like the corresponding aetiological sentence in 1363–5, as a terminal expression of the 'curse'-αἴτιον. At the same time I no longer favour alteration of the blameless phrase δι' ἀλαστόρων: 'through (the medium of) ἀλαστόρες' is theologically accurate for the operation of the curse.[47] The triplication of διά-phrases (cf. LSJ διά A. III.a.1; A. III.c.; III.2) has been impugned; but this is not a feature alien to Euripides' lyric style,[48] here echoing with interest the prominent aetiological use of διά in the corresponding verses.

It should not be argued that ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε is metrically inescapable, since the same letters can properly be interpreted as ἐπεσέπεσε (from ἐπεισπίπτω); a verb appropriate with 'this house' now as the object, cf. Critias 6. 14 ἐπεισπίπτει δ' οἰκοτριβὴς δαπάνη (with analogously 'ruinous' effect), occurring elsewhere in Euripides at *Hec.* 1042 βούλεσθ' ἐπεσπέσωμεν (sc. 'into these οἶκοι') and *Herc.* 34 ἐπεσπεσὼν πόλιν (of the tyrant Lycus). We still have the aetiological word-play, with -πεσ- looking forward to διὰ τὸ Μυρτίλου πέσημα (indeed with διὰ . . . -πεσ- looking forward to διὰ . . . -πέσ-, if we keep δι' ἀλαστόρων).

It remains to determine what, exactly, 'fell (has fallen) upon/into' the Atreid House. We cannot extract an appropriate subject from 1546 as it stands. μεγάλα δέ τις ἃ δύναμις implies a copula (like S. *Ant.* 951 ἀλλ' ἃ μοιριδία τις δύνασις δεινά and *Tra.* 497 μέγα τι σθένος ἃ Κύπρις), and cannot directly serve as the subject of δι' ἀλαστόρων ἐπεσέπεσε μέλαθρα τάδε . . . Nor would it suffice to write μεγάλα δέ τις ἃ δύναμις . . . ('the power which . . .'). δύναμις is in any case an inappropriate subject, since it enables rather than acts.

We might perhaps consider writing μεγάλα δέ τις ἃι δυνάμει . . . (= ἃ δύναμις ἃι . . .).[49] The subject continued from 1545 would then be '(the) δαίμων'. But what 'fell upon the house through (the medium of) ἀλάστορες' is not so much the δαίμων himself, as the divinely wrought vengeance proceeding in bloody requital for the murder of Myrtilus. So I propose, as a scarcely more venturesome conjecture:

μεγάλᾱι δὲ τίσις δυνάμει δι' ἀλαστόρων
ἐπεσέπεσε μέλαθρα τάδε δι' αἱμάτων
διὰ τὸ Μυρτίλου πέσημ' ἐκ δίφρου.

[46] Seidler; cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 388. There are no transmitted exceptions in Euripides to the apparent rule for the anadiplosis of third person verbs ending in -ε(ν), namely that neither verb is elided. Both verbs retain their unelided length in line with the doubling. Thus we have ἔλακεν ἔλακεν at 162, (329, see above); ἔτεκεν ἔτεκεν at 987; ἔφερεν ἔφερεν at 1468 (see above), *Pho.* 1568; ἔμολεν ἔμολε(ν) at *Hipp.* 586–7, *Hel.* 195, 1118, *Ba.* 986–7 (Elmsley ἔμολ' ἔμολεν, but read ἔμο-]λεν ἔμολεν, [ὦ] βάκχαι, cf. . . . [ὦ] φίλαι at *Or.* 186); ἔλαχεν ἔλαχεν at *Hel.* 214; and similarly one instance of a dactylic verb, ὤλεσεν ὤλεσε at *Hel.* 384. I should now accept ἔπεσεν ἔπεσε at *Or.* 1309 (L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* 18 [1968], 256). Seidler's ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε here, if accepted, will be uniquely *contra stylum*. ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε is indeed attested at S. *Aj.* 620, but probably there, as I have suggested in *CQ* 52 (2002), 57–9, as a corruption of ἔπε' ἔπεσε. The anadiplosis there is otherwise alien to the style of Sophocles in his earlier plays (unlike the later: *CQ* 52 [2002], 497, n. 58).

[47] On this modal use, cf. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 590 φρυκτώρων διά (s.v.l.: -ωρῶν Abresch, διαί Sansone): 'διά with the genitive in the instrumental sense is found especially with ἑρμηνεύς, ἄγγελος (cf. Stevens, *CR* 1 [1936], 162).'

[48] Cf. *Herc.* 1035–8, discussed in *CQ* 38 (1988), 94, and *Hel.* 179–83, discussed in *CQ* 40 (1990), 91.

[49] For the attraction of the noun thus into the relative clause, cf. S. *El.* 160–4 ὄλβιος, ὃν . . . Ὀρέσταν (K-G ii.419).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The details then all fall into place. τίσις . . . ἐπεσέπεσε μέλαθρα is like ἐπεισπίπτει . . . δαπάνη in Critias loc. cit. The 'mighty power' with which the vengeance has proceeded (δυνάμει dative, cf. *Andr*. 780, *Ba*. 906)[50] is directly associable with the preceding statement about the universal τέλος of (the) δαίμων, of whom (the) τίσις is at once the agent and a kind of manifestation: cf. S. fr. 743 τίσις δ' ἄνωθεν εἶσιν αἱματορρόφος, also *O.C.* 228 (with ἔρχεται). There may be a conscious word-play in the sequence τέλος (emphasized by repetition) . . . τίσις. τίσις . . . δι' αἱμάτων is nearly equivalent to τίσις . . . αἱματορρόφος in the Sophoclean fragment, while accurately conveying the *plurality* of bloody incursions in the working-out of this curse.

The corruption, though compound, is easily enough accounted for: τις{ις} is a simple haplography; and it is then only a short step from μεγαλα(ι) δε τις δυναμει to μεγαλα δε τις <α> δυναμις (restoring double-short rhythm), the more easily taken since μεγάλα δέ τις ἁ δύναμις . . . gives in itself plausible idiom, in line, for example, with S. *Ant*. 951 (cited above).

Highgate, London C. W. WILLINK

[50] δύναμις (not δύνασις, conjectured by Herwerden and widely favoured) is correct with adjectives of degree, cf. *Alc*. 219 (μεγίστα), 1072 (τοσαύτην), *Hec*. 336 (μείζω), *Pho*. 440 (πλείστην). For δύνασις with other kinds of epithet, cf. *Herc*. 776 (ἄδικον), *I.A.* 1093 (ἄσεπτον).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh049 Published online by Cambridge University Press