

## ON THE ALCESTIS AND ANDROMACHE OF EURIPIDES

JAMES DIGGLE

*Alcestis* 122-26<sup>1)</sup> μόνος δ' ἄν, εἰ φῶς τόδ' ἦν  
 ὄμμασιν δεδορκῶς  
 φοίβου παῖς, προλιποῦσ'  
 ἦλθεν ἔδρας σκοτίους 125  
 Ἄϊδα τε πύλας.  
 124 προλιπῶν ΒΟ 125 σκοτίας V

If we ignore μόνος, the sense is 'If the son of Phoebus (Asclepius) were alive, she (Alcestis) would have been restored to life.' Commentators explain μόνος by pleading anacoluthon: the speaker begins as if he intended to say 'he alone would have brought her back from Hades' and ends by saying not 'would have brought her back' but 'she would have come back.' This is anacoluthon of a violent and unpalatable kind, for which commentators have produced no analogy. Indeed Hayley found it so 'incredible' that he was driven to say that 'The thought is clear... but... expressed a trifle loosely: "if the son of Phoebus, and he alone, were now alive, Alcestis would return to the upper world",' which is nonsensical.

<sup>1</sup>*Dedi μούνωσ, pro μόνος, ob strophēn et sensum postulantes*, wrote Wakefield. Responision does not require a long syllable, μούνωσ is not a Euripidean form, and μόνωσ and μούνωσ are not adverbs used by the tragic poets. Hermann's<sup>2)</sup> μόνον is no better, for an adverb scarcely suits the sense of the passage. Read μόνα: 'She would have been uniquely privileged to come back from Hades.' This is rhetorical exaggeration (for, as the chorus go on to say in 127 ff., Asclepius was in the habit of bringing the dead back to life); but the exaggeration is much the same as in *S. OT* 298 f. τὸν θεῖον ἤδη μάντιν ὄδ' ἄγουσιν, ὦτι / τάληθές ἐμπέφυκεν ἀνθρώπων μόνωι ('above all other men'

Jebb, who compares *OC* 261); *Ant.* 821 f. αὐτόνομος ζῶσα μόνη δὴ / θνητῶν 'Αἴδην καταβήσῃ; *E. Phaeth.* 242-44 μόνος ἀθανάτων / γαμβρός δι' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν / θνατός ὑμνήσῃ; *Theoc.* 18.18 μῶνος ἐν ἡμιθέοις Κρονίδαν Δία πενθερόν ἐξεῖς. For an analogous use of μόνος see Barrett on *Hi.* 1282. Observe how often the adjective μόνη is attached to Alcestis: 180 (hardly to be changed to μόνον), 368, 434, 460, 825.

In 125 Monk's ἦλθ' ἄν for ἦλθεν should be accepted.<sup>3)</sup> There is no justification for the prejudice which editors show against elision of aorist -ε before ἄν: see *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974) 16 n.5 and *Studies* 100. Indeed, there is another passage in this play where we should possibly restore the same elision: 360-62 ...κατηῆλθον ἄν, καί μ' οὐθ' ὁ Πλούτωνος κύων / οὐθ' οὐπι κώπη ψυχοπομπός ἄν Χάρων / ἔσχον (ἔσχ' ἄν Lenting), πρὶν ἐς φῶς σὸν καταστῆσαι βίον. In support of ἔσχον Dale repeats Porson's comment on *Hec.* 86 [88]: '*Recte... infertur verbum plurale, sive duo singularia nomina conjunguntur sive disjunguntur*' (he quotes this passage in illustration). The passage of *Hecuba* reads as follows: 87-89 ποῦ ποτε θείαν 'Ελένου ψυχὰν / ἦ ( *V et G*<sup>2</sup>: καὶ *cett.*) Κασσάνδραν ἐσίδω, Τρωιάδες, / ὧς μοι κρίνωσιν ὄνειρους; If ἦ is right, we should hearken to Matthiae, who offers a helpful modification to Porson's statement:

'falsissimum est, plurale verbum sequi posse, ubi duo nomina singularia vere disiunguntur... et ineptissimus sit, qui dicere velit, *honesta mors, aut turpissima servitus subeundae sunt*. Sed saepenumero duo nomina singularia particula ἦ ita coniunguntur, ut significetur non alterutri actionem tribui, sed utrumque facere aliquid posse, ut h.l. non hoc dicit Hecuba, aut Helenum, omissa Casandra, aut Casandram, spreto Heleno, somnia interpretaturam esse, sed velle se sive uni, sive alteri, sive utrique hoc committere.'

Those who accept ἦ (and Matthiae's explanation) are entitled to accept ἔσχον at *Alc.* 362. But ἦ is very poorly attested, and I see no good reason to prefer it in place of καὶ. And if καὶ is accepted, we must ask whether any other parallels exist for the use of a plural verb in a disjunction. Only two are offered from classical Greek by Kühner-Gerth I.81, whose explanation for the plural is that in such cases the subjects are treated as a unity ('als eine Vielheit'). The two passages are: (I) *Isae.* 5.5 εἰ... περὶ τούτων ἐμελλον ἀπολογήσεσθαι μόνον Λεωχάρης ἦ Δικαιογένης, where Dobree proposed καὶ for ἦ, and this is accepted by Wyse, who gives plentiful illustration of the confusion

of these two words;<sup>4)</sup> (II) Dem. 27.12 ἀ μὲν οὖν Δημοφῶν ἢ Θηριππίδης ἔχουσι τῶν ἐμῶν (καὶ for ἢ F). The alleged parallels, then, are far from certain parallels. Even if they were certain and Kühner-Gerth's explanation were to be accepted, we should still be entitled to ask whether the same explanation is applicable to *Alc.* 362. Such an explanation is, in fact, offered by Paley, who claims that 'the plural is used, because the idea is, "both Charon and Cerberus together would have been unable to stop me".' But, while it is true that Charon and Cerberus, as two horrors of the underworld, make a natural pair, the form of the disjunction ('neither Charon nor Cerberus would have...') invites us to treat them as two separate barriers and not as the unified barrier implied by Paley's paraphrase. As a parallel for the plural Paley quotes A. *Su.* 727 f. ἴσως γὰρ ἄν (Burgess : ἢ M) κῆρῶς τις ἢ πρέσβυς (Turnebus : πρέσβη M) μόλοι / ἄγειν θέλοντες. But it is not at all certain that Turnebus' conjecture is right. - In *Alc.* 362 Earle proposed ἔσχεν, and so did Blaydes (*Adversaria critica in Euripidem* [1901] 90), and the same conjecture is ascribed by Wecklein to Lenting. Lenting in fact proposed ἔσχ' ἄν,<sup>5)</sup> and I think that this may well be right.

*Alc.* 218-20 δεινὰ μὲν, φίλοι, δεινὰ γ', ἀλλ' ὁμως  
θεοῖσιν εὐχόμεσθα· θεῶν  
γὰρ δύναμις μεγίστα.  
~ 230-32 τὰν γὰρ οὐ φίλαν ἀλλὰ φιλιτάταν  
γυναῖκα κατθανοῦσαν ἐν  
ἄματι τῶιδ' ἐπόψηι.

218 δεινὰ... δεινὰ Diggle<sup>6)</sup> : δῆλα... δῆλά codd. 219 εὐχόμεσθα  
B et Tr(iclinius) : εὐχόμεθα OL : ἐχόμεθα V : εὐχόμεθα P  
220 δύναμις V : ἄ δ- BOLD

219 ~ 231 give the following respension: ∪ \_ ∪ \_ / ∩ \_ ∪ ∩.  
That 219-20 ~ 231-32 are in synapheia is proved by the postpositive γὰρ at the beginning of 220 and the prepositive ἐν at the end of 231. But ἐν gives *brevis in longo*, and this is incompatible with synapheia. Therefore there is a fault either in the text or in the colometry.<sup>7)</sup>

A long syllable in place of ἐν would cure this fault. But neither Musgrave's ἔν <γ'> nor Dindorf's εἶν has any appeal:

the former because γ' (which Weber calls a 'glückliche Ergänzung') is meaningless, the latter because the credibility of the epic εἰν in tragedy is slight. It is transmitted at A. *Su.* 871 as part of an uncured corruption, and by some mss. at S. *Ant.* 1241 εἰν Ἄιδου δόμοις (εἰν KAUYT : ἐν *sett.*), where Heath's ἐν γ', accepted by Jebb and Dawe, is perfectly apt. The sole plausible instance is *Alc.* 436 χαίρουσά μοι εἰν Ἄϊδα δόμοισιν (εἰν BOV : ἐν LP; Ἄϊδα Lascaris : ἀϊδ<sup>α</sup>\* L : ἄδα P : ἀϊδαο BOV; δόμοισιν Lascaris : δόμοις codd. : -οισι Tr), which is reminiscent of *Iliad* 23.179 χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ Πάτροκλε, καὶ εἰν Ἄϊδαο δόμοισι. The reminiscence would be even closer if we accepted the reading of the majority of the mss. εἰν Ἄϊδαο δόμοις. But this would entail the scansion of ὀρείαν in the antistrophe at 446 as an anapaest. Such a scansion is commonly assumed at *Hé.* 1127 ὦ δρυμὸς ὄρεος, ὄθι κυνῶν, where Wilamowitz actually spelled the adjective ὄρεος, comparing τέλειος, which exists alongside τέλειος (see Barrett ad loc.). But I propose that we take ὄρεος not as an adjective but as a genitive, which gives an expression (δρυμὸς ὄρεος) like *Andr.* 849 ὕλαν ὀρέων. I am less troubled than is Dale by the 'singular redundancy of expression' in Ἄϊδα δόμοισιν / τὸν ἀνάλιον οἶκον and see no likelihood in her belief that the words εἰν Ἄϊδαο δόμοις are 'due to a parallel quotation in the margin,' although the same suspicion was felt by Hermann, who suggested κευθμῶσιν (~ 446 οὐρεῖαν), and by J. Schumacher, who replaced the whole phrase by ἐν χθονίοις μυχοῖσι.<sup>8)</sup> The epic εἰν is probably right, and it is justified by the Homeric reminiscence. And yet we could replace it by ἐν γ' (as in S. *Ant.* 1241, cited above), another unpublished proposal by Hermann.<sup>9)</sup> Even if εἰν is right, it does not justify εἰν at 231.

Dale reports a conjecture of P. Maas, ἐν <τ>ᾶματι. This entails a very doubtful crasis. Crasis of τῶι and short alpha is attested once in Euripides, in τάγαθῶι at *Hé.* 637, a line which as it happens is spurious (see Barrett), and several times in Sophocles, but always in the words τάνδρῶι (*Al.* 78; *Tr.* 60, 603, 748, 1175). I know of no instance of the crasis of τῶι and a long alpha, let alone a Doric alpha (i.e. η).

If then the text brooks no change, what of the colometry? O. Schroeder, *Euripidis cantica* (1910) 5, divided θεοῖσιν εὐχώμεσθα·

/ θεῶν κτλ. ~ γυναῖκα κατανοῦσαν / ἐν κτλ. (υ - υ - / υ - υ), and the same division (with a different metrical interpretation) was proposed by Wilamowitz in the notes to his verse translation.<sup>10)</sup> Rhetorical pause now coincides with the *brevis in longo*. A colon of the length υ - υ - υ - - (as now in 220 ~ 232) follows an iambic colon ending in a bacchius at *Med.* 848 f. ~ 858 f.; *Held.* 892 f. ~ 901 f.; *Ion* 190 f. ~ 201 f. And the second of these passages exemplifies the *brevis in longo*: ἐμοὶ χορὸς μὲν ἡδύς, εἰ λύγεια / λωτοῦ χάρις + ἐνι δαι+ ~ ἔχεις ὁδὸν τιν', ὦ πόλις, δίκαιον· / οὐ χρῆ ποτε τοῦδ' ἀφέσθαι (Herwerden : ἀφελέσθαι L), where the division which I have given is preferable to that of Murray, who prints the first line as a full trimeter (λύγεια λω- / τοῦ - δίκαιον· οὐ / χρῆ), against the natural rhetorical division of the words. In any case, *brevis in longo* is very common in final bacchiacs: *Hec.* 1094; *El.* 1207; *Herc.* 1025; 1036; *Tr.* 1235; 1296; *Hel.* 1113; *Ph.* 312; 1518; 1532; *Or.* 167 ~ 188; *IA* 1480; fr. 53.1.

Against Schroeder's colometry Dale (on 232) has raised this objection: 'I can find no parallel for a catalectic iambic dimeter with a long antepenultimate (υ - υ - υ - -).' And in *The lyric metres of Greek drama* (2nd ed., 1968) 101 f., she observes that a molossus is found in responsion with a bacchius only at the opening of a colon, never at the end. One might adduce, against the former objection, these three Sophoclean passages: *El.* 514 ἔλειπεν ἐκ τοῦδ' οἴκους (so Dawe prints;<sup>11)</sup> most editors prefer the variant ἔλιπεν); *Phil.* 833 ὦ τεκνὸν ὄρα / ποῦ σταῶσι - 849 ἀλλ' ὅτι δύναι μακίστων (cf. Dale, *Lyric metres* 117 f.). But the latter objection, at least, appears justified. Here are the instances which I have found of the correspondence of molossus and bacchius in iambic cola: *Su.* 622 ~ 630 υ - - / - υ - / υ - - / - υ -; *Ion* 190 ~ 201 υ - - / υ - -; *Ph.* 1026 ~ 1050 υ - - / - υ -; *S. El.* 485 ~ 501 υ - - / - υ -; *Phil.* 1134 ~ 1157 υ - - / υ - υ -; *OC* 513 ~ 524 υ - υ / υ - υ; 1670 ~ 1697 υ - - / - υ - / υ - -. Whether this responsion exists in Aeschylus is doubtful: *Pe.* 281 ~ 287 υ - - / - υ - (avoidable by scanning μέμν-, as advocated by Denniston and Page on *Ag.* 991); *Septem* 356 ~ 368 υ - - / - υ - / υ - υ - (but 356 is corrupt, and though a bacchius seems likely it is not inevitable);<sup>12)</sup>

Ag. 977 ~ 990 - υ - / υ - υ - / ζ - . . . This last, where the irregular correspondence in the last metron would give the parallel which we are looking for, may be avoided by scanning ὕμν- (Denniston and Page) or by emendation (Fraenkel). The evidence suggests that Dale was right to regard the alleged correspondence of molossus and bacchius in the last metron of a dimeter at *Alc.* 219 ~ 231 as very implausible.<sup>13)</sup>

The best way out of dilemma may be to accept Schroeder's colometry but also to restore a bacchius by replacing εὐχόμεσθα with εὐξόμεσθα (Hayley): θεοῖσιν εὐξόμεσθα· / θεῶν κτλ. ~ γυναῖκα καθανοῦσαν / ἐν κτλ. As Hayley says, the subjunctive would be an easy error after the preceding subjunctives τέμω and ἀμφιβαλώμεθ' in 215-18 (and for εὐξ- corrupted to εὐχ- see *Hi.* 116). At first sight a subjunctive 'Let us pray' may seem more natural than a future; but I find nothing amiss in the sentence 'It is dreadful, my friends, dreadful indeed, but we shall pray to the gods.'<sup>14)</sup> I am reminded of *Held.* 344 f. οὐκ ἂν λίποιμι βωμόν· ἐζόμεσθα δὴ / ἱκέται μένοντες ἐνθάδ' εὖ πράξει πόλιν. Here we need either a subjunctive (ἐζώμεσθα Elmsley) or a future (εὐξόμεσθα Cobet, with Kirchhoff's δὲ for δὴ).<sup>15)</sup> I think that εὐξόμεσθα gives a better balanced sentence.<sup>16)</sup>

*Alc.* 846-48            κἄνπερ λοχαίᾳς αὐτὸν ἐξ ἔδρας συθεῖς  
                               μάρψω, κύκλον δὲ περιβάλω χεροῦν ἐμαῦν,  
                               οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις αὐτὸν ἐξαιρήσεται...

847 δὲ ] τε Nauck        περιβάλω Monk : -βαλῶ LP : -βαλὼν BOV  
 et Tr et Σ<sup>bv</sup>

'And if, darting out of ambush, I seize him and encircle him with my hands...'. With this text, as emended by Monk, Heracles appears to mean that he will first catch hold of his victim and then make his hold more secure by throwing his arms around him. It may be better to accept the well attested περιβαλὼν and change δὲ to γε (...μάρψω, κύκλον γε περιβαλὼν), thereby making Heracles catch his victim with a single action ('if I seize him, (by) encircling him with my hands').<sup>17)</sup> For γε in an epexegetic participial clause see Denniston, *G.P.* 139 (ii). Let me add a further example by conjecture to his list.

*Hec.* 1175 f. τοιάδε σπεύδων χάριν / πέπονδα τὴν σὴν πολέμιόν τε σὸν κτανών: 'This is what I have suffered for my efforts on your behalf and for having killed your enemy.' These efforts consisted in killing the enemy, and so the coordination of σπεύδων and κτανών is surprising. We can avoid that coordination by accepting L's τὸν for τε, and this was proposed by Nauck, apparently unaware of L's reading. But there is no other place in *Hecuba* where L alone preserves the truth.<sup>18)</sup> Read therefore πολέμιόν γε σὸν κτανών. The corruption and the exegetic γε may be illustrated by another passage in *Hec.*: 611-615 ... ὡς παῖδα λουτροῖς τοῖς πανυστάτοις ἐμήν, / νύμην τ' ἀνιμρον παρθένον τ' ἀπάρθενον, / λούσῃ προδοῦμαι θ'· ὡς μὲν ἄξια, πόθεν; / οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην· ὡς δ' ἔχω (τί γὰρ πῶδω;) / κόσμον τ' ἀγείρασ' αἰχμαλωτίδων πάρα κτλ. Here the τ' in 615 is taken as linking the two notions ὡς ἔχω and κόσμον ἀγείρασα ('with my own resources, so far as they go, and with whatever contributions my fellow-captives may be able to make,' as Hadley paraphrases it). I find this forced and unnatural (though not so unnatural as Porson's plea that τ' links ἀγείρασ' to βάψασ' in 610), and I prefer (like the most recent editor, S.G. Daitz) Wakefield's γ' ('by whatever means I can, by collecting garments').

Finally, as parallels for the corruption at *Alc.* 847 I cite *Held.* 794 μάλιστα, πράξας γ' (Elmsley : δ' L) ἐκ θεῶν κάλλιστα δή. *Ba.* 816 σάφ' ἴσθι, σιγήι γ' (Aldina : δ' L) ὑπ' ἐλάταις καθήμενος. Denniston ought not to have created a special category for these two passages (*G.P.* 164 (3)), nor am I persuaded by the different explanation offered for *Ba.* 816 by Dodds. And instead of referring to 'the more normal exegetic γε (see γε I.12.ii)' (i.e., p.139), Denniston ought to have referred to his list of passages on p.136, where γε 'adds detail to an assent already expressed,' where in fact he includes *Ba.* 816.

*Andromache* 120-25 ... εἴ τί σοι δυναίμαν 120  
 ἄκος τῶν δυσλύτων πόνων τεμεῖν,  
 οἷ σε καὶ Ἑρμιόναν ἔριδι στυγεραῖ συν-  
 ἐκληισαν  
 τλάμον' ἀμφὶ λέκτρων  
 διδύμων ἐπίκοινον ἐοῦσαν  
 ἀμφὶ+ παῖδ' Ἀχιλλέως. 125

123 τλάμον' P : τλάμονα HMBAV : τλάμων L : τλάμον Aldina

124 οὔσαν H

As Jackson says, 'Murray's obeli may be accepted without demur or demonstration' (*Marginalia scaenica* [1955] 29).<sup>19)</sup> ἀμφὶ is

corrupt either in 123 or in 125. ἐοῦσαν, 'empty of content and neolithic in form,' is at least suspicious, though there are more instances of uncontracted verbal forms in tragedy than commentators imply: I listed most of them in *CR* n.s.18 (1968) 3 and I now add *A. Ag.*146 καλέω; *Ch.*828 θροεούσαι; [A.] *PV* 542 τρομέων (and perhaps we should include μεδέων *Hi.* 167; *Or.*1690; fr.912.1).

Jackson proposed ... τλάμον' (dual) ἀμφιλέκτωι, / διδύμων επίκοινων εὐνάων / ἀμφὶ παῖδ' Ἀχιλλέως, 'they have involved you and Hermione in an odious quarrel, causing dispute, about the son of Achilles, who shares promiscuously in two beds.' There are several weaknesses here: individually not decisive, in combination they put the conjecture out of court. (i) ἐπίκοινος with genitive is unexampled in classical Greek. The normal use ('common to more than one person') is illustrated by *Hdt.* 4.104 ἐπίκοινων δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν τὴν μεῖξιν ποιεῦνται. 6.19 ἐπίκοινων χρηστήριον. For the construction with the genitive the only passage which has been adduced (by L. Radermacher, *Charisteria A. Rzach* [1930] 153-55) is from Vettius Valens (saec. II A.D.).<sup>20</sup> (ii) The curtailment of ἐοῦσαν to εὐνάων makes necessary the deletion of τί in the antistrophe at 133. There is no reason, beyond this metrical need, to suppose that τί is intrusive. (iii) ἔριδι... ἀμφὶ παῖδ' Ἀχιλλέως gives an unusual construction. Ἀμφί, in a context of dispute or rivalry, would normally be constructed with a genitive (as *A. Ag.*62 f. ἀμφὶ γυναικός...παλαίσματα, LSJ, s.v. A.I) or a dative (as *Hdt.* 6.129 ἔριν... ἀμφὶ μουσικῆι, LSJ, s.v. B.IV). (iv) ἀμφιλέκτωι, supported though it is by *Ph.*500 ἀμφίλεκτος... ἔρις, comes a little late and lamely in its clause. (v) ἀμφὶ παῖδ' Ἀχιλλέως, which coheres closely in sense with ἔριδι συγερᾶι συνέκληισαν... ἀμφιλέκτωι, is placed uncomfortably late, after the appositional phrase διδύμων επίκοινων εὐνάων.

'The latter ἀμφί looks invulnerable,' said Jackson. No: I had found a replacement for it before I saw that the same word had occurred to Herwerden, *Mnemosyne* 31 (1903) 261, as part of a conjecture proposed without argument and overlooked by later editors. Replacing ἀμφί by ἄνδρα he wrote: ...τλάμον' ἀμφὶ λέκτρων / διδύμων επίκοινων ἐχούσα / ἄνδρα, παῖδ' Ἀχιλλέως, '...involved you and Hermione, poor women, in a quarrel



about two beds, having a husband in common, the son of Achilles.' For the expression ἄνδρα ἔχειν see *Alc.* 285; *El.* 1081; *Tr.* 673. But ἐχούσα entails hiatus and therefore cannot be right. The passages cited by Radermacher (who wished to accept Krause's εἶουσα) are of a different nature. There is no instance in Euripides of a prosodiac or enoplian (such as is 124) ending with hiatus when it is followed by an ithyphallic. We can easily avoid the hiatus by writing ἐχούσας (Wecklein, with a different restoration of the surrounding words), and we can still keep τλάμων' as a dual, since juxtaposition of dual and plural forms is quite regular (see Kühner-Gerth I.70). But ἐχούσας entails correspondence of a long with a short at the end of the colon, and this would be no less anomalous, in this context, than hiatus, as I must now show.

The colon διδύμων ἐπίκοινον εἶουσαν ~ τὸ κρατοῦν δέ σ' ἔπεισι· τί μόχθον (— — — — —) is, in the terminology of Dale, *Lyric metres* 175, an 'enoplian paroemiac,' and such a colon is 'quite distinct from the *catalectic* anapaestic dimeter, where a shortening of the final syllable indicates pause. The final syllable here is in fact a true *anceps*.' I wish to argue, further, that whenever an enoplian paroemiac occurs in a context like ours (followed by an ithyphallic or comparable colon) the *anceps* may be expected to be short.

First I list the instances which I have found of an enoplian or prosodiac (of whatever length) ending with final short and followed by an ithyphallic: — — — — — + ithyphallic *Med.* 645 f. τὸν ἀμηχανίας ἔχουσα / δυσπέρατον αἰῶν' ~ 655 f. σὲ γὰρ οὐ πόλις οὐ φίλων τις / ὠικτισεν παιδοῦσαν. *Hi.* 755 f. ἐπόμευσας ἐμὴν ἄνασσαν / ὀλβίων ἐπ' οἴκων ~ 767 f. χαλεπαῖ δ' ὑπέραντλος οὔσα / συμφοραῖ τεράμων. (ii) — — — — — + ithyphallic: *Med.* 990 f. σὺ δ' ὦ τάλαν ὦ καιόνυμφε / κηδεμῶν τυράννων ~ 996 f. μεταστένομαι δὲ σὸν ἄλγος, / ὦ τάλαινα παίδων. *IT* 402 f. ἔβασαν ἔβασαν ἀμεικτον / αἶαν ἔνθα κοῦραι ~ 417 f. πλάνητες ἐπ' οἶδμα πόλεις τε / βαρβάρους περῶντες. *IA* 585 f. ἔρωτά τ' ἔδωκας ἔρωτι δ' / αὐτὸς ἐπταόσης. Here are further examples of the same colon, followed by a colon other than an ithyphallic: + ibycean, *Andr.* 826 f. ~ 830 f. (linked by word-overlap in 830 f.); *Herc.* 1029 f.; + ibycean with long penultimate syllable, *Herc.* 1032 f.; *Tr.* 266 f.; *Or.* 1256 f. ~ 1276 f.; + dactylic tetrameter, *Ph.* 350 f. And here are the instances of this colon when its last syllable is long: *Herc.* 1038 (end of stanza); *Hel.* 1478 ~ 1495 (followed by — — — — —);<sup>(21)</sup>

*Rh.* 898 ~ 909  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$  (*brevis in longo* and hiatus in 909, strong pause in both strophe and antistrophe, and so evidently period-end; followed by  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ ).

There is a clear affinity between the enoplian paroemiac  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$  and the two cola just illustrated. Both these cola end in a short syllable when followed by an ithyphallic.<sup>22)</sup> The second of the two sometimes ends in a long, but only in metrical contexts different from ours.

Here are the instances which I have found in Euripides of the enoplian paroemiac itself: (i) with final short, *Ph.* 146 f.  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\sigma\tau\rho\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma \delta\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\iota \gamma\omicron\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma / \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\nu \nu\epsilon\alpha\nu\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ . (ii) with final long, *Hi.* 1122 ~ 1134 (strong pause at 1134; + dactylic tetrameter);<sup>23)</sup> *Her.* 895 (change of speaker); *Tr.* 516 ~ 536 (strong pause at 536; + dactylo-epitrites); *Ion* 477 ( +  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ ; but the respension of 477 and 457 is inexact and so this instance is doubtful);<sup>24)</sup> *Ph.* 1547 f. (twice, + dactylic hexameter); *Rh.* 903 ~ 914 ( $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ ; end of stanza). Whether some of the passages listed here under (ii) deserve to be classed as enoplian paroemiacs may be questioned. What is important is that the metrical context of these passages is quite different from ours. The only enoplian paroemiac which appears in a metrical context comparable with ours is the single example quoted in (i), where the final syllable is short.

Here are the instances which I have found of long corresponding with short in the last syllable ( $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ ): *Rh.* 527 f.  $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma \bar{\alpha} \phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha; \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon\iota / \tau\bar{\alpha}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\mu\bar{\alpha}\nu \pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{\alpha} - 546$  f.  $\kappa\bar{\alpha}\iota \mu\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega \Sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma / \eta\mu\epsilon\nu\bar{\alpha} \kappa\omicron\iota\tau\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$  (the first line is hardly an enoplian paroemiac at all, but is part of a dactylo-epitrite colon);<sup>25)</sup> *Rh.* 903 ~ 914 (end of stanza); *S. OT* 170  $\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \omicron\acute{\upsilon}\delta' \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota \varphi\rho\nu\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma \sim 181$   $\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha} \kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\omega\varsigma$  (strong pause at 181; dactylic tetrameter follows; clearly period-end, so  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$  is not *anceps* but *brevis in longo*).

There is, finally, one passage where what is probably an enoplian paroemiac, ending in a long, is followed by an ithyphallic: fr. 893  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\epsilon\iota \mu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha \beta\iota\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\omicron\iota / \acute{\alpha}\lambda\phi\rho\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\eta\varsigma, / \tau\bar{\omicron} \delta' \acute{\delta}\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}/\lambda\omicron\nu \tau\epsilon \mu\eta \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\nu$ . The metre is likely to be  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$  + ithyphallic, twice. Page restored the metre in the third line with  $\tau\bar{\omicron} \delta' \acute{\delta}\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu <\tau\acute{\alpha} \theta' > \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}/\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\alpha \mu\eta \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\nu$  (an unpublished conjecture; cf. *Med.* 127 f.).<sup>26)</sup> Such an instance, where the ithyphallic is linked to the enoplian by word-overlap, is different in nature from the instances which I have listed above, where the cola remain discrete.<sup>27)</sup> It calls to mind passages like *Med.* 420  $\omicron\nu\eta\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota} \delta\upsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\varsigma \varphi\acute{\alpha}\mu\bar{\alpha} \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\iota - 430$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\bar{\alpha}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\bar{\alpha}\nu \tau\epsilon \mu\omicron\iota\rho\bar{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$ . *Her.* 653 f.  $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu \tau' \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} \kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$

μάτῃρ τεκνῶν θανόντων. Fr.118.2 f. ἄποπαῦσον ἔασσον Ἄχοι μὲ σὺν φιλαῖσιν,  
in all of which word-overlap links the ithyphallic to the preceding colon.

If Herwerden's ἄνδρα is right, then metre conspires with palaeographical probability to suggest that ἐοῦσαν is a corruption of ἔχουσαν. A similar corruption has occurred at *Tr.* 695 (ἔχω Burges : ἐῶ codd.; see *Studies* 66 f.). ἔχουσαν should be taken with σε, in spite of the interposed καὶ Ἑρμιόνα. There is no difficulty in this: it is Andromache whom the chorus are addressing, and Ἑρμιόνα, though grammatically coordinate with σε, is logically subordinate to it (the sense amounts to '...have brought you into conflict with Hermione'). This is a variety of the διὰ μέσου construction, where very commonly a verb is interposed between noun and attribute. E.g. *Iliad* 11.738 f. ἔλον ἄνδρα, κόμισσα δὲ μώνυχας ἵππους, / Μούλιον. *Hes.* 919-21 πόσις... ἔκειτο, ξυτὸν δ' ἐπὶ πασσάλωι,... ὄρων. 1047 ἦ γὰρ καθεῖλες θορήικα καὶ κρατεῖς ξένον;<sup>28)</sup> Here the word interposed between noun and attribute is another noun: similarly *Hes.* 774-76 ὁ χρυσὸς ἅ τ' εὐτυχία... ἐφέλικον. *Cycl.* 604 αὐτὸν τε ναύτας τ' ἀπολέσητ' Ὀδυσσεά.<sup>29)</sup> *Hyps.* fr.60.13 f. ὦ πῶϊρα καὶ λευκαῖνον ἐξ ἄλλης ὕδαρ / Ἄργους. For further illustration see Kühner-Gerth I.80; West on *Hes.* *Op.* 406.

In 123 the vocative τλάμον seems more natural than an appositional accusative τλάμον'.<sup>30)</sup>

*Andr.* 479-85 πνοαὶ δ' ὅταν φέρωσι ναυτίλους θοαί,  
κατὰ πηδαλιῶν διδύμα πραπίδων γνώμα 480  
σοφῶν τε πληθὸς ἀθρόον ἀσθενέστερον  
φαυλοτέρας φρενὸς αὐτοκρατοῦς·  
+ἐνδὸς ἂ δύνασις+ ἀνά τε μέλαθρα  
κατὰ τε πόλιας, ὁπόταν εὐ-  
ρεῖν θέλωσι καιρόν. 485

480 διδύμα... γνώμα AVLP (δίδυμα L) : δίδυμαι... γνώμαι MB et V<sup>3</sup>  
481 σοφόν P 484 ἀ] ὁ P

In a storm (say the chorus in 479-82) divided counsel over the handling of the rudder, and a multitude of wise men, are not as effective as a lesser mind in absolute control. Alternative punctuations of these lines (they are discussed by Stevens) are to be rejected. In 480 conjecture is unnecessary;<sup>31)</sup> the singular διδύμα... γνώμα is more stylish than the plural

and better suits the predicate ἀσθενέστερον; and the use of κατὰ is exemplified by LSJ, s.v. A.7; Kühner-Gerth I.476; Barrett on *Hil.* 1051 f. Lines 483-85 give sense of a sort: 'Power belongs to (?) one man, when people wish to find the right mark.'<sup>32)</sup> Metre shows 483 to be faulty. The antistrophic verse 491 which corresponds with 483 is a fully resolved iambic dimeter. Some of the conjectures give uncouth and barely intelligible Greek: ...ἐνός, ὃ (or ᾶ) δύνασις Hermann (with no punctuation after αὐτοκρατοῦς), ἔν ὄσα δύνασις Lenting ('*quaecumque sunt potestas, ea (sunt ver erunt) unum, si bene consulatur*'),<sup>33)</sup> ἐνός, ὃ δύναται Blaydes (*Adversaria critica* 237). Less uncouth are Seidler's ἐν ἐνὶ δύνασις and Wilamowitz's ἐνὶ δὲ δύνασις (*Verskunst* 427 n.1), but they entail improbable changes.

For ἐνός ἂ δύνασις read ἐνός ἄρ' ἄνυσις, 'effective execution belongs to one man, when...'. Compare *Iliad* 2.347 ἄνυσις δ' οὐκ ἔσσεται αὐτῶν ('there will be no fulfilment on their part,' as Leaf translates; cf. E.-M. Voigt in *Lexicon des frühgriech. Epos*, I [1979] 959 f.), Alcman l.83 f. P. [σι]ῶν γὰρ ἄνα / καὶ τέλος. That the noun is not elsewhere found in tragedy can be an argument against its restoration here; ἄνω and ἀνύ(τ)ω are in regular use; and ἀνυστόν is found for the first time at *Heid.* 961 (unless Emperius' ἀνυστόν for ἀνεκτόν is right at *Theogn.* 1195) but never again in tragedy and rarely thereafter. Aeschylus has the much rarer ἄνη at *Septem* 713 (elsewhere only Alcman l.c. and Callim. *h.* 1.90).

*Andr.* 510 Ἄν. κείση δὴ, τέκνον ᾧ φίλος, ...  
 κείση δὴ Musgrave: κείσο ἦδη codd.: κείσο δὴ B<sup>Yp</sup> (κείσο etiam A<sup>g1</sup>)

Everyone now accepts Musgrave's conjecture. But it has not been observed that the conjecture is implied by the scholia, which have been inaccurately and incompletely reported. E. Schwartz, *Scholiam in Euripidem* II (1891) 287, reports from M and V (V is Schwartz's A) this comment on κείσο ἦδη:

διχῶς δύναται νοεῖσθαι κείσο δὴ καὶ κείσο ἦδη.  
 This he emends to κείσο ἦδη καὶ κείσοε ἦδη, so imputing to the scholiast the remark that κείσο may be interpreted as either κείσο or κείσοε. He has reported M correctly. But V has something different: διχῶς δύναται εἶναι τὸ πλήρες κείσο δὴ καὶ κείση διπλον.<sup>34)</sup> And N (*Neap.* II F 41), whose marginal scholia

Schwartz reports, has this interlinear scholion, which he has not reported: διχῶς δύναται νοεῖσθαι τὸ πλήρες κείσο δὴ καὶ κείσῃ δὴ. It is clear that what the scholiast is saying is that κείσ' ἤδη may be interpreted either as κείσο ἤδη (by *scriptio plena*, τὸ πλήρες) or as κείσῃ δὴ. Putting the three versions together we can restore the original form of the scholion:

διχῶς δύναται νοεῖσθαι (Σ<sup>mn</sup> : εἶναι Σ<sup>V</sup>)· τὸ πλήρες  
(Σ<sup>Vn</sup> : om. Σ<sup>m</sup>) κείσο ἤδη (Schwartz : κείσο δὴ Σ<sup>mvn</sup>)  
καὶ κείσῃ δὴ (Σ<sup>n</sup> : κείσ' ἤδη Σ<sup>m</sup> : κείσῃ Σ<sup>V</sup>).

There is another place in this play where a conjecture (this time one which has not gained general acceptance) is confirmed by a scholion which Schwartz does not report: 814 μέγ' ἀλγεῖ codd., μεταλγεῖ Nauck. 'In codice Vaticano qui adscripsit μετανοήσασα λυπεῖται, nonne legit μεταλγεῖ?' asks E. Bruhn, *Jahrb. f. klass. Philol., Suppl.* 15 (1887) 272. I do not know where Bruhn found this information. If he had looked at V itself, he would have found that it actually has, above the line, γρ. μεταλγεῖ, ἀντὶ τοῦ μετανοήσασα λυπεῖται. B (whose scholia Schwartz ignores completely in this play) and H (the Jerusalem palimpsest)<sup>35</sup> have the scholion μετανοεῖ ἐννοήσασα λυπεῖται. And the confirmation of this conjecture lends strong support, in its turn, to the similar conjecture which Nauck made at *Med.* 291 ὕστερον μέγα στένειν (μετα-στένειν Nauck). Page objected to the tautology of ὕστερον μετα-. R. Renehan, *Studies in Greek texts* (1976) 61 f., has shown that the tautology is highly idiomatic. What is more, μεταστένειν proves to be the reading of the *Gnomologium Escorialense*: see K. Matthiessen, *Hermes* 94 (1966) 398-410.

*Andr.* 778-84 κρεῖσσον δὲ νίκαν μὴ κακόδοξον ἔχειν  
ἢ εὖν φθόνωι σφάλλειν δυνάμει τε δίκαν. 780  
ἡδὺ μὲν γὰρ αὐτίκα τοῦτο βροτοῖσιν,  
ἐν δὲ χρόνωι τελέθει  
Ξηρόν καὶ ὀνειδέσιν +ἐγκείται δόμων+.

784 ὀνειδέσιν ἐγκείται HAVLP et B<sup>2</sup> et Gnomol. Barberinianum<sup>36</sup>) : ὀνειδέσι νείκη τε MB<sup>2</sup>O

'It is better not to have a victory that brings ill repute than to overthrow justice by the invidious exercise of force. For this brings momentary pleasure to mortals, but in time it withers away<sup>37</sup>) and (involves the house in disgrace).' The bracketed words give the sense which presumably lies behind

ὄνειδος ἐγκείται δόμων. 'Editors take the text as it stands to mean unjust victory "is included among reproaches against the house", ' says Stevens, adding that 'this sense is rather weak.' It is intolerable. Scarcely better is Norwood's 'This evil prosperity in time bears upon (the wicked prosperous man) with reproaches against his house.' The emendations are uniformly unappealing, indeed some are barely intelligible:

ὄνειδος ἀμείβεται δόμων Hartung ('receives in exchange a reproach against the house' Stevens, who wrongly ascribes the conjecture to Herwerden);  
 ὄνειδος αἰεῖ κείται δόμων Barthold; ὄνειδος εἵκει δαμοτῶν Kayser; ὄνειδος ἔνεγκεν δαμοτῶν Herwerden (*Mnemosyne* 31 [1903] 263); ὄνειδος νικᾶται δόμων Wilamowitz. Stevens suggests δόμω ('presses upon the house'), and so Blaydes had already suggested (*Adversaria critica* 242), but the collocation of the datives ὄνειδοσι... δόμω gives very poor style.

Write δόμος for δόμων: 'and the house is involved in disgrace.' Compare 91 f. οἷσπερ ἐγκείμεσθ' αἰεῖ / θρήνοισι; *IT* 144 f. θρήνοις ἐγκειμαι. *Ion* 181 οἷς δ' ἐγκειμαι μόχθοις. *Hel.* 269 συμφοραῖς ἐγκείμεθα. *S. Ph.* 1318 ἐκουσίοισιν ἐγκεινται βλάβαις. *Archil.* 193.1 West ἐγκειμαι πόθω. For δόμος as subject in a similar connection see 548 f. νοσεῖ / δόμος; *Hi.* 852; *Hel.* 478; *Or.* 1537 f.; *S. Ant.* 584.

*Andr.* 832-39 Τρ. τέκνον, κάλυπτε στέρνα, σύνδησαι πέπλους.

Ἐρ. τί δέ με δεῖ στέρνα [στρ. β  
 κάλυπτειν πέπλους; δῆλα καὶ  
 ἀμφιφανῆ καὶ ἄκρυπτα δε- 835a  
 δράκαμεν πόσιν. 835b

Τρ. ἀλγεῖς φόνον ράψασα συγγάμωι σέθεν;

Ἐρ. κατὰ μὲν οὖν στένω [ἀντ. β  
 δαΐας τόλμας, ἄν ἔρεξ'.  
 ὦ κατάρτος ἐγὼ κατάρ- 839a  
 ρατος ἀνθρώποις. 839b

832 σύνδησον Α πέπλους O, sicut conī. Reiske : πέπλους cett.

833 δεῖ om. Β 834 πέπλους O 838 δαΐας MAVLP : δικαίας  
 <B>O : δεμίς D : δεμίς vel δεβιαίας B<sup>2</sup> 839 ὦ MBLP et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>m</sup>  
 : ἄ V : ἦ A

This is Murray's text. My apparatus criticus records two mss. readings which are not reported by modern editors and one which has never been reported; all of them I believe to be right

In 832 editors accept (and in the last century some of them attributed to O) Reiske's πέπλους. They do not accept (but they used to report) σύνδησον, which Blaydes proposed as a conjecture (*Adversaria critica* 242); the middle is unexampled. The main problem is in 834 ~ 838, where a dochmiac καλύπτειν πέπλους is answered by δαΐας τόλμας (- υ - - -), and elision (ἔρεξ' / ὦ), which implies synapheia, answers hiatus (καὶ / ἀμφιφανῆ), which is incompatible with synapheia. A solution was proposed by T.C.W. Stinton, *JHS* 97 (1977) 143, who restored dochmiac respension by changing δαΐας τόλμας to τόλμας δαΐας and restored a run of dactyls by changing ἔρεξ' to ἐρεξ': 834 f. καλύπτειν πέπλους; / δῆλα καὶ ἀμφιφανῆ καὶ ἄκρυπτα δε-/δράκαμεν πόσιν ~ 838 f. τόλμας δαΐας, / ἄν ἐρεξ' ἄκατάρατος ἐγὼ κατάρατος ἀνθρώποις.

Simple though this is, I do not think that it is the whole truth. First, as Stinton admits, the aorist indicative ἐρεξα (from ἐρῶ) is very uncommon in tragedy (only *A. Septem* 923 and uncertain conjectures at *Ag.* 1529; *S. Ai.* 905; *adesp. tr.* 490).<sup>38)</sup> Since the form ἐρεξα (from ῥέζω) is better attested and Euripidean (*Med.* 1292; *El.* 1226; *S. OC* 539 *bis*)<sup>39)</sup> I prefer ῥέξ', with omission of the syllabic augment.<sup>40)</sup> Credit for this proposal (not reported by editors) must go to Burges (ed. *Tr.*, p. 163).

Second, Stinton has left a dochmiac with *brevis in longo* in 833 (τί δέ με δεῖ στέρνω). In *CQ* n.s. 27 (1977) 46 he has argued that *brevis in longo* and hiatus are allowed in dochmiacs even without pause or change of speaker. I am quite unconvinced. The Euripidean passages which he lists are a precarious collection: (i) *Alc.* 120 ~ 130: I do not regard this as an 'indubitable dochmiac.' If it is not taken in the way I suggested in *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974) 26, it may be better to emend it (several proposals exist); in any case the dochmiac would be isolated, not followed by another, as here. (ii) *Andr.* 833 (the present passage). (iii) *Ba.* 1002 (admitted to be 'undoubtedly corrupt'). (iv) 'I am less convinced that the *brevis* is due to corruption in *Pho.* 177.' See N.C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964) 24, 44. (v) *Her.* 1060 (hiatus): see *Studies* 54-56.

Conomis (art. cit. 44) suggested στέρνω. I suggest τί δέ με δεῖ στέρνοις / καλύπτειν πέπλους ~ κατὰ μὲν οὖν τόλμας / στένω δαΐας. This not only eliminates the *brevis*; it restores exact

syllabic correspondence between the dochmiacs τί δέ με δεῖ στέρνοις and κατὰ μὲν οὖν τόλμας. In the antistrophe my transposition (τόλμας στένω δαΐας for στένω δαΐας τόλμας) is even more easily justified than is Stinton's interchange of τόλμας with δαΐας: 'the displacement of an adjective so that it may occupy a position next to its noun, or of a noun so that it may stand next to its adjective, is a common error, and illustration exists in abundance.'<sup>41)</sup> In the strophe στέρνοις καλύπτειν πέπλους, with its inversion of the normal relationship of the two nouns, is an expression of the same stamp as *I T* 312 πέπλων τε προυκάλυπτεν εὐπήνουσ ὑφάσ. *Ion* 1522 περικαλύψαι τοῖσι πράγμασι σκότον. *Iliad* 5.315 πρόσθε δέ οἱ πέπλοιο φαεινοῦ πτύγμ' ἐκάλυψε. 21.321 τόσσην οἱ ἄσιν καθύπερθε καλύψω (cf. 8.331; 14.359; 17.132; 22.313; Plat. *Tim.* 34 b). A similar inversion has been introduced by conjecture at *Herc.* 640 f. (γῆρας) βλεφάρων / σκοτεινὸν φάρος ἐπικαλύψαν (βλεφάρωι... φάρος Reiske), but there I prefer βλεφάρων...φάρος (Stiblinus). Whether O's πέπλους is a genuine preservation or a lucky slip (here as in 832) I do not know. In this play O is either a copy or a twin of B.<sup>42)</sup>

Possibly we should prefer the accusative τόλμαν... δαΐαν, as did Burges and Hermann (both believing that it was metre which called for δαΐαν τόλμαν). Wecklein described δαΐας τόλμας καταστένω as 'eine grammatische Unmöglichkeit' (*SBAM* 1897, 461). That is unjustified, since the genitive may be explained as the causal genitive commonly found with verbs of lamentation (Kühner-Gerth I.388 f.). Stevens quotes as an instance of στένω with this construction *IA* 370 Ἑλλάδος...στένω, but this is better not quoted, since 'στένω c. gen. of commiserated object is without parallel' (Page, *Actors' Interpolations* 149; see England ad loc.); and it does not help to quote, as Stevens also does, for a parallel to the absolute use of καταστένω, the anomalous and possibly non-Euripidean *IA* 470 ὑπὲρ τυράνων συμφορᾶς καταστένειν.

Finally, in 839 ἄ κατάρατος ἐγώ, following the first-person verb, is preferable to ὦ κτλ.<sup>43)</sup> (ὦ κατάρατος ἐγώ at Ar. *Thes.* 1048 [= E. fr.122] may or may not be an echo of this passage). This calls to mind *Andr.* 1200 f. ὅτι τοιοτοιοῦ, διάδοχα δ' ὦ τάλας ἐγώ / γέρων καὶ δυστυχῆς δακρύω (δ' ὦ A : om. M(V)LPO



et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>v</sup>). A's δ' ὦ mends the metre but cannot be right: (i) δ' after an exclamation is unparalleled (Denniston, *GP* 189);<sup>44</sup> (ii) ὦ τάλας ἐγὼ... δακρῶω is, to my knowledge, equally without parallel, for ἄν ῥέξ'· ὦ κτλ., even if it were right, would give a different order of words. Blaydes' διαδοχα <δ' αἶ> (*Adversaria critica* 248) answers the second objection but not the first. Wilamowitz's διαδόχά <σοι> answers both.

*Andr.* 1097 ἀρχαί τ' ἐπληροῦντ' εἰς τε βουλευτήρια...

In *PCPS* n.s. 15 (1969) 43 f. I proposed ἀρχαῖα τ' ἐπληροῦτο βουλευτήρια, and I need not repeat my arguments, except that I should add to the illustrations of the lengthening of the syllabic augment before mute and liquid in ἐπληροῦτο *S. Ichn.* 39 ἐπέκλυον; 224 κατέκλυον; *E. Cret.* 21 Page (fr. 82.21 Austin) ἐ[νέπλησεν κα]κῶν (though ἐ[πλήρωσεν or ἐ[μέστωσεν might be considered). I agree with Stevens (*Addenda*, p. 249) that the epithet ἀρχαῖα 'has no special point,' and I now prefer ἀρχαῖοι τ' κτλ., 'the council chambers began to be filled up with the Delphic authorities.' For ἀρχαί in this sense see *Ion* 1111 ἀρχαί... ἀπιχώριοι. For the dative see *Herc.* 372 f. πεύκαισιν... χέρας πληροῦντες; *A. Septem* 464 (φιμοί) πνεύμασιν πληρούμενοι; cf. also Kühner-Gerth I. 422; *S.* fr. 921 P.

Queens' College,  
Cambridge University

#### NOTES

1) I refer to the following commentaries: (a) *Alcestis*: G. Wakefield (London 1794), G. Hermann (Leipzig 1824), J.H. Monk (ed. 5, Cambridge 1837), F.A. Paley (ed. 2, London 1872), M.L. Earle (London 1894), W.S. Hadley (Cambridge 1896), H.W. Hayley (Boston 1898), L. Weber (Leipzig/Berlin 1930), A.M. Dale (Oxford 1954); (b) *Andromache*: J. Lenting (Zutphaniae 1829), G. Hermann (Leipzig 1838), F.A. Paley (ed. 2, London 1874), G. Norwood (London 1906), N. Wecklein (Leipzig/Berlin 1911), P.T. Stevens (Oxford 1971). *Studies* refers to my *Studies on the text of Euripides* (Oxford 1980).

I am indebted to Dr. Roger Dawe for several helpful comments and to Mr. Nigel Wilson for a service which is acknowledged in n.34.

2) Hermann's conjecture is to be found written in his own hand in his copy of the edition by C.T. Kuinoel (1789), now in the Cambridge University Library. It is not found in his own edition (1824). His annotations to Kuinoel were made after 1813, since he refers (on p.144) to Elmsley's review of his *Supplices* (*Cl. Journal* 16, 1813). Of his other manuscript conjectures a few more are worth reporting here, especially since some of them anticipate proposals made by later scholars: 153 χρηστήν... τήνδ' ὑπερβε-

βλημένως, 118 ἀπότομος (Blomfield *apud* Monk; Hermann in his 1824 edition claims priority), 347 μοι for μου (Earle, perhaps rightly), 717 σημειᾶ γ', ὃ κἀμιστε, σῆς ἀψυχίας (Bruhn, *Jahrb. f. kl. Philol. Suppl.* 15, 1887, 254 f.), 963 βᾶς μετάρσιος (for καὶ μ-). The last is clever, since it avoids both a zeugma ('We understand ἔβην from ἤϊξα, which strictly belongs only to μετάρσιος' Earle) and a slightly forced antithesis (καὶ διὰ μούσας καὶ μετάρσιος ἤϊξα, 'I have both ranged through literature and soared aloft in the speculations of science,' as Hadley translates: cf. Σ<sup>βν</sup> καὶ μετάρσιος ἤϊξα: καὶ περὶ μετεώρων ἐφρόντισα, οἷον ἡστρολόγησα). But the transmitted text is acceptable. I mention a further conjecture of Hermann's from this same source (at 436) in the note on *Ale.* 218 ff. (below).

3) For the doubling of ἄν see Wackernagel, *Kl. Schr.* I.60-70; Page on *Med.* 250; Barrett on *Hi.* 270.

4) For further illustration see *Studies* 27.

5) In *Nova acta lit. soc. Rheno-Traiect.* 1 (1821) 35, I have not seen his *Epistula critica in Eur. Alcestin* (1821).

6) *PCPS* n.s. 15 (1969) 36 f. To the instances of this confusion cited there I add, from R.D. Dawe's edition of Sophocles, *Ant.* 320 (Burges) and *OC* 383 (Dawe). See also Dawe's *Studies on the text of Sophocles III* (1978) 128 f.

7) Cf. T.C.W. Stinton, *JHS* 96 (1976) 127; *CQ* n.s. 27 (1977) 60.

8) *De praepositionum cum tribus casibus coniunctarum usu Euripideo* I (1884) 73. 9) See above, n.2.

10) *Griechische Tragödien* ed.2, IX (1920) 93. For a later view see *Griechische Verskunst* (1921) 534.

11) Cf. *Gnomon* 48 (1976) 232.

12) For two recent proposals (not however touching on the question of respension) see R.D. Dawe, *The collation and investigation of manuscripts of Aeschylus* (1964) 182; T.C.W. Stinton, *PCPS* n.s. 13 (1967) 49 f.

13) Correspondence of molossus and cretic, on the other hand, is attested in the last metron at S. *OC* 1559 ~ 1571 ---/---/---. Cf. *Ion* 676 ~ 695 (dochmius + ---), Dale 102.

14) They go on to pray in the lines which follow. Matthiae proposed εὐχόμεθα, which Bothe argues for unconvinclingly ('*Servus, quamvis actum sit de Alcestide, tamen etiamnum familiam deos invocare dicit, ut qui nihil non possint, si velint*').

15) δῆ should be changed to δέ even if ἐζώμεθα is preferred. Denniston, *GP* 218, cites only one parallel for δῆ with a jussive subjunctive, S. *Phil.* 1469 χαράμεν δῆ (δῆ T<sup>91</sup> et coni. Hermann : υυυ T, recepti Dawe : ἦδη et ἰδοὺ cett.).

16) Cf. G. Zuntz, *The political plays of Euripides* (1955) 107.

17) A. Tuilier, *Étude comparée du texte et des scholies d'Euripide* (1972) 33, even finds it possible to accept δέ alongside περιβαλῶν: see my comments in *Gnomon* 76 (1974) 747.

18) 'L is rather disappointing in *Hecuba*,' K. Matthiessen, *GRBS* 10 (1969) 301. See further his *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides* (1974) 64, 119-21.

19) I need not discuss the proposals of Schumacher (cit. supra, n.8), p.15, C. Busche, *Jahrb. f. kl. Philol.* 137 (1888) 458 f., E. Holzner, *Euripi-deische Studien* (1895) 10 f.

20) Cf. W. Morel, *Bursian* 1938, 47.

21) For the text see *Studies* 52.

22) Perhaps it would be appropriate to add to this category *Alc.* 904 f.  $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$  γένει δὲ κάρως ἀξιόθρηνος / ὄλετ' ἐν δόμοισιν ~ 927 f. σοὶ πότμον ἦλθεν ἀπειροκώωνι τὸδ' / ἄλγος· ἄλλ' ἔσασσας. Dale ad loc. prefers ἀξιόθρη/νος and -κώωνι / τὸδ', adding that 'the exact point of division... is a matter of indifference.' At any rate, 904 ~ 927 in the former colometry must not be taken as a dactylic tetrameter, since the elision of τὸδε shows that the lines are in synapheia and that the final syllable is therefore a true short and not *brevis in longo*. Compare *Tr.* 838 f. ~ 858 f.

23) Murray's colometry. Barrett prints this as a segment of a longer colon. The same sequence is visible in other lines of this ode (see Barrett, p.370), and here again it is a matter of indifference where we divide.

24) See *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974) 19; *Studies* 102.

25) Cf. Dale, *Lyric metres* 181 f.; W. Ritchie, *The authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (1964) 314 f.

26) (τὸδ') ὑπερβάλλον τε Porson. In the second line read τραπέζας for -ζης.

27) An exception (quoted above) was *Andr.* 830 f. (— — — — — / — — — — —), linked by word-overlap.

28) See also Kühner-Gerth II.602; Bruhn, *Anhang zu Sophokles* § 173; Jebb on *S. Ant.* 1279 f.; Fraenkel on *A. Ag.* 318; West on *Hes. Theog.* 158; Stinton, *JHS* 97 (1977) 131 f.

29) A good parallel for αὐτόν τε ναύτας τ'... 'Ὀδυσσεΐα is *Sil.* 6.277 *ingenti... et iaculis et pondere conti*, which I take from Housman's *Addenda* to *Manil.* 4.534 (vol. V, p.158). Pierson's αὐτοῖσι ναύταις is not needed.

30) Cf. also Dindorf: 'praestat vocativus, ut vitetur ambiguitas quam accusativus τλάμονα haberet, qui et ad σέ et ad Ἐριμόναν referri posset.' Stevens, taking τλάμον' as dual, claims that 'if τλάμον' refers to Andromache it is odd that the Chorus should commiserate with her for having to share N. with his lawful wife.' I do not find it at all odd.

31) καὶά for κατὰ Verrall, *Essays on four plays of Euripides* (1905) 269; κατὰ πηδάλιον or παρὰ πηδάλιω Reiske.

32) On the senses of καιρός see Barrett on *Hi.* 386 f.; a close parallel to εἰρεῖν... καιρόν is *Med.* 128. Stevens' rewriting of 484 f. is uncalled for.

33) The same proposal ('wherever there is power, there is unity') was made by Verrall (cited in n.31 above).

34) I owe the identification of εἶναι in this line to Mr. Nigel Wilson, who kindly inspected the manuscript for me in Rome; my photograph was unclear. At the end of the line we have διπλ with what I took to be a compendium for αω with an accent. An abbreviation for διπλασίως? But this would duplicate διχῶς. Mr. Wilson (hesitantly) prefers διπλον ('But διπλον is a puzzle, as it gives no sense and introduces an unknown compendium. ...But elsewhere in the MS. the scribe uses the same curve stroke in this sense').

35) See S.G. Daitz, *The scholia in the Jerusalem Palimpsest of Euripides: a critical edition* (1979) 78.

36) Published by K. Matthiessen, *Hermes* 93 (1965) 148-58.

37) 'Super hunc versum scripsit ἀφανές V' Murray. No: it is above ἔπρον (in H as well as V), and I take it to be a gloss on this word (cf. Σ<sup>hmV</sup> τῶι μὲν χρόνῳ αὐτὸ μαραινέται). Murray presumably took it to be a comment on the obscurity of the verse, as did Matthiae; Lenting took it to indicate that a word had been lost ('*evanuisse aliquod vocabulum*'). In the alternative version of Σ<sup>mv</sup> ἡ... ἡδονὴ ἐπ' ὀλίγον χρόνον φθάνουσα κτλ., Holzner (*Studien zu Eur.* 32) plausibly conjectured ἀνθοῦσα, comparing *El.* 943 f. ὄλβος... σμικρὸν ἀνθήσας χρόνον.

38) Cf. O. Lautensach, *Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern und Komikern* (1911) 179.

39) Cf. Lautensach, *ibidem*.

40) For which see Lautensach, *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern: Augment und Reduplikation* (1899) 174-77. The manuscripts commonly restore the augment: e.g. 285 (νύψαν Hermann : νύψαντο LP : ἔνυψαν(τ') fere M<sup>BAV</sup>), *Alc.* 583 (χόρευσε Monk : ἔχ- codd.).

41) *GRBS* 14 (1973) 251 f. See also *Dionysiaca: nine studies in Greek poetry by former pupils presented to Sir Denys Page* (1978) 173 f.; *Studies* 49 f.

42) Cf. A. Turyn, *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides* (1957) 334, who believes it a copy. But the reservations of Barrett, *Hippolytos* p.65 n.2, and Matthiessen, *Studien* (supra, n.18) 25 n.24, are justified. I hope to discuss the question elsewhere. In 838 we can confidently assume that B (which is variously reported by editors) had the same reading as O; nothing should be built on this reading, an evident slip. D (both in *Alc.* and in *Andr.*) is certainly a copy of B (as Turyn argued, pp.336 f.), made after B had been corrected by B<sup>2</sup>.

43) Stinton also accepts ἀ, without argument. Cf. *Ba.* 1282 ὄρω μέγιστον ἄλγος ἢ τάλαιν' ἐγώ. *Med.* 510 f.; 1016; *Hec.* 232 f.; *Hel.* 833.

44) δὲ in a *question*, after an exclamation, is a different matter: see 535 f. ὦμοι μοι, τί δ' ἐγὼ κωῶν (M<sup>AV</sup> : κωῶν τί δ' ἐγὼ BLP) / μήχος ἐξανύσασμαι; Denniston, *GP* 174 f.