interpretation of the passage from *Wasps* is certainly incorrect; Aristophanes means 'the vertebrae', *sc*. of butchered animals.[3] Pherecrates has none the less been quoted in support of it, and not because he mentioned τραχήλια, as Meineke and Kassel–Austin assumed. The fragment might thus better be presented:

Schol. (VΓ) Ar. Vesp. 968 b (τὰς ἀκάνθας) τὰ κεφάλαια τῶν ἰχθύων, ὡς ἀκανθώδη. καὶ Φερεκράτης ἐν Ἐπιλήσμονι·

ὅστις παρέθηκε κρανία

κράνην VΓ: κρανί᾽ ἢ τραχήλια Meineke ed. min.: fort. κρανί᾽ ἀκανθώδη

ἀκανθώδη in the *scholium* must have come from somewhere, although not from Aristophanes. As κρανί᾽ ἀκανθώδη would scan, even if it does not fill out the line, one might alternatively – and more boldly – read:

Schol. (VΓ) Ar. Vesp. 968 b (τὰς ἀκάνθας) τὰ κεφάλαια τῶν ἰχθύων, ὡς ἀκανθώδη. καὶ Φερεκράτης ἐν Ἐπιλήσμονι·

ὅστις παρέθηκε κρανί᾽ ⟨ἀκανθώδη⟩ ⏑ –

κράνην VΓ: κρανί᾽ ἢ τραχήλια perperam Meineke ed. min.

University of Minnesota and University of Freiburg S. DOUGLAS OLSON
sdolson@umn.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838813000803

[3] For ἄκανθα meaning the 'backbone' of various animals and fish, LSJ s.v. 6. For the occasional use of the plural to refer to 'spiny parts of a fish's exterior', see Arnott on Alex. fr. 49.2–4.

EURIPIDES, *ORESTES* 1246*

Although the manuscript tradition of Euripides' *Orestes* is unanimous in preserving the reading Μυκηνίδες ὦ φίλαι at line 1246, recent editors have increasingly preferred the emendation Μυκηνίδες ὦ φίλ⟨ι⟩αι, first suggested by Gottfried Hermann in 1841.[1] Thanks to the recent publication of new Michigan papyri, that emendation can now be unreservedly accepted.[2]

At the time he proposed φίλ⟨ι⟩αι, Hermann did not offer much in the way of justification,[3] but Vincenzo Di Benedetto has elaborated on the basis of responsion with the

* I am grateful to Cassandra Borges and Mark Joyal for their advice in preparing this note. Any errors that remain are my own.

[1] G. Hermann (ed.), *Euripidis Orestes* (Leipzig, 1841), 123 on line 1239 (= 1246 Diggle). Of twentieth-century editors, the emendation is endorsed by V. Di Benedetto (ed.), *Euripidis Orestes* (Florence, 1965); F. Chapouthier (ed.), *Euripide: Oreste*, Tome VI[1], tr. L. Méridier (Paris, 1959); W. Biehl (ed.), *Euripides: Orestes* (Leipzig, 1975); M.L. West (ed.), *Euripides: Orestes* (Warminster, 1987); J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis Fabulae*, Tomus III (Oxford, 1994) and D. Kovacs (ed.), *Euripides V: Helen, Phoenician Women, Orestes* (Cambridge, MA, 2002). The transmitted text, by contrast, is retained by G. Murray (ed.), *Euripidis Fabulae*, Tomus III (Oxford, 1913). C. W. Willink, *Euripides: Orestes* (Oxford, 1986), prints Murray's text but endorses the emendation in his commentary (287–8) on 1246–65 = 1266–85.

[2] C. Borges and C.M. Sampson, *New Literary Papyri from the Michigan Collection: Mythographic Lyric and a Catalogue of Poetic First Lines* (Ann Arbor, 2012).

[3] 'Scripsi φίλιαι pro vulgato φίλαι': Hermann (n. 1), 123 on 1239.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000815 Published online by Cambridge University Press

antistrophe. There (at 1266), the later text of Demetrius Triclinius (as well as several from the so-called second Thoman recension[4]) preserves the reading ἐλίσσετέ νυν βλέφαρα,[5] while the *veteres* have ἐλίσσετέ νυν βλέφαρον. In light of the transmitted text at 1246, the argument for reading βλέφαρα at 1266 is straightforward: the responding lines, which comprise the *incipits* of strophe and antistrophe, respectively, scan as telesillian (⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏓).[6] But as Di Benedetto argues, one should legitimately suspect βλέφαρα of being a Byzantine correction: Euripides inclines toward the singular βλέφαρον (for example, *Ion* 205, *El.* 1332, *Hel.* 673, etc.), and the enoplian produced by accepting this variant (⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –) corresponds to the *incipits* of other Euripidean stanzas (for example, *Alc.* 588 = 597, *Med.* 627–8 = 636–7).[7] Since forms of φίλος and φίλιος are both frequent in Euripides, the sole argument against emending to φίλ⟨ι⟩αι at line 1246 to produce a corresponding enoplian, in truth, was the unanimity of the manuscript tradition.

This objection can now be put to rest: on the recto of P.Mich. inv. 3250c (a second-century B.C.E. papyrus) we find the sequence μυκηνιδεσωφιλι, which its editor, Cassandra Borges, has restored as Μυκηνίδες ὦ φίλι̣αι̣ (= Eur. *Or.* 1246).[8] The larger context of the passage guarantees the identification: the papyrus belongs to a set consisting of *incipits* categorized under a variety of headings. The recto in question contains the label παρόδων ἀρχαί (indented and marked with a *paragraphos*), below which the *incipits* of a number of known Euripidean lyrics appear: *El.* 988 (on ii.7); *Or.* 1246 (on. ii.9); *Or.* 317 (on ii.11); *Bacch.* 519 (on iii.1); *Bacch.* 64 (on iii.2); and *Or.* 140 (on iii.4).[9] Most of these, curiously, do not derive from *parodoi* (at least as we understand the term), but the confluence of Euripidean passages and the trio of verses from *Orestes*, in particular, is decisive in spite of the misleading heading.

The hand's Ptolemaic-era date, which is early by any standard, provides the ancient witness which validates Hermann as well as the subsequent editors whose sensitivity to Euripidean style favoured emendation at 1246: since the *veteres* preserve both φίλαι and βλέφαρον, we may conclude that, at some early point in the tradition, the original φίλιαι lost an iota. Whether it was out of a concern for responsion (of the sort known to have been undertaken by Demetrius Triclinius) or, as Diggle would have it, simple trivialization, this loss resulted in the variant βλέφαρα creeping into the tradition.

University of Manitoba C. MICHAEL SAMPSON
mike.sampson@ad.umanitoba.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838813000815

[4] On the Thoman recensions, see A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, 1957), 165–87, and on the line in question, esp. 174; cf. the objections and corrections of J. Diggle, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Orestes* (Oxford, 1991), 81–7.

[5] Following L. Dindorf (ed.), *Euripides. Orestes* (Leipzig, 1825), editors more typically print enclitic νυν in place of the transmitted ἐλίσσετε νῦν βλέφαρα.

[6] As Di Benedetto (n. 1) notes regarding 1246, the resolution in the final syllable of 1266 in responsion to the diphthong -αι is supported by *Ion* 463 = 483, *IT* 1089 = 1106, and *Phoen.* 208 = 220 (p. 238). Diggle (n. 4), 85 is far less generous: of the fifty-one so-called Thoman interpolations listed by Turyn (n. 4), 172–5, this is one of two that he terms 'trivializing'; 'Evidence of rational thought is almost non-existent.'

[7] Di Benedetto (n. 1), 238 on 1246. Willink (n. 1), 287–8 on 1246–65 = 1266–85, agrees that the telesillian 'is contextually less likely' and argues that its 'resolution at verse end, before syntactical break and change of metre, is definitely anomalous'.

[8] See Borges and Sampson (n. 2) on P.Mich. inv. 3250c (recto) ii.8 (p. 19).

[9] See Borges and Sampson (n. 2) 19–20, 29–31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000815 Published online by Cambridge University Press