452f. THE FIRST STASIMON

Metrical Analysis

452-491: Aeolo-choriambic, admitting of anapaests (457, 470): 467 is a major textual problem.

---

Polyschematist

Choriambic heptasyllable

Pherecratean

Polyschematist

Choriambic heptasyllable

Paroemiac

Reizianum, resolved base

Polyschematist

Reizianum, resolved base

Telesillean

Telesillean

Glyconic, double resolution

Reizianum

Polyschematist

Glyconic with resolved base corresponding to polyschematist

Loc. desp., see note ad loc.

Telesillean, resolved base

---

1See n. 2 ad l. 122.

2Reading πότνα at 457 - see note ad loc.

3Reading μεσομφαλος at 462.
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Analysis

In the epode, the aeolo-choriambic measures are interlarded with dochmiacs, iambics and anapaests; it concludes with a dactylic pnigos worthy of the name. There is room for disagreement on colometry, notably at 503 and 505 - fin. Biehl (p. 117ff.) subjoins to his analysis a further distillation of the epode into five symmetrical phrases, counted off by the number of metra they contain and adding up to thirty-four metra. The flow of the sense does not seem to benefit from this treatment.
Ithyphallic

Dochmius

Glyconic, dactyl base

Anapaestic monometer

Reizianum

Dochmius

Choriambic iambic dimeter with brevis in longo at period end

Dactylic \textit{pnigos} (cf. n. ad loc.)

\begin{itemize}
  \item Or reizianum, with Hartung’s τοῖς σοῖσιν.
  \item Keeping Φοῖβω in the MS position, with Diggle, against Murray.
  \item If the MS ὁ μελέα is retained; Badham deleted ὁ (= normal glyconic). Biehl prefers a curious hemiepes with an extra anceps - Dx (the spectre of hypercatalexis?), followed by a spondaic dochmius, the latter of which goes violently against the natural phrasing, and against the laws of metre: παρθένος ὁ μελέα βρέφος would have to end with anceps (i.e. βρε-) and a dochmius begins with anceps. \textit{Anceps iuxta anceps} is only permitted in the case of verse end - on this arrangement, however, we would have synartesis (βρέ-φος).
  \item Reading ἐξώρισε. Murray’s ἐξώρισεν is accommodated by its author and Diggle, who follows him, with different colometries. I adopt:
    \begin{itemize}
      \item παρθένος, ὁ μελέα, βρέφος
      \item Φοῖβω παρθένος
      \item ἐξώρισε̣ τὸ βιβλίον
      \item θηροῖ τῇ φοινίκῃ
      \item δαίδαλον, παρθένον γάμων ὅβροιν
    \end{itemize}
    oūτ... fin.
  \item Here editors differ on colometry and most prefer the epode to conclude with a run of anapaests. However (see commentary) this wrecks the integrity of this impressive \textit{pnigos} which must obviously begin with oūτε not ὅβροιν and must therefore be dactylic, a conclusion merely confirmed by the poignant Homeric allusions in the vicinity. I therefore propose the colometry set out above. (A. Ag. 106 is surely proof, in its context, that an allusion to Epic usage is not an illusion).
\end{itemize}
THE FIRST STASIMON

452f. Ion retires and the stage empties: the chorus come on to sing the first great formal ode of the play.

In the strophe they invoke Athena and Artemis as δύο θεσί δύο παρθένοι (466). A direct appeal to Apollo is pointedly left out - we have seen that Creusa (410f.) also directs her prayer to Leto rather than to the author of her misery. It is a sensitive touch.

In the antistrophe the theme changes to the desirability of children in itself. There is perhaps a certain playful irony in 485f.: the handmaidens who are slaves reject the life of wealth and kingly palaces for τροφοκρ κήδειοι. The former are in their case unlikely: the latter, legitimate marriage, by Athenian law in Euripides' day, unattainable.

Finally in the epode they turn their attention to the predicament of Creusa's "friend" which they have heard of in 336f. and movingly apostrophize the heights of the Acropolis, the haunt of Pan, where the outrage occurred. Who is to say whether we are to think that they have gleaned that τεκούσα τας is no other than their mistress? The juxtaposition of ideas in this chorus invites us to speculate at least.

The latter part of the chorus (503f.) is rich in echoes of the opening words of the Iliad (see ad loc.). This is Euripides at his very best: for the contrast in subject matter there and here is poignant in the extreme. See notes on 505f.

The ode is characterised throughout by highly wrought syntax and innovative language.

452-44: ο ε ταν ωδεων λοχιαν
άνειλεσιοιασ, εμαν
'Αθάναν, ικετεύω,


dveeleifima occurs nowhere else in extant Greek literature and is a formation of some considerable interest in that we have the proper name of a deity used adjectivally with the privative prefix. (L reads eileifimav: doubtless owing to extreme unfamiliarity).

The word is correctly kept in the text: any attempt at emendation is ruled out by the secondary tradition - in this case the the Suda and the glossographers: Photius 130 16 Reitzenstein and Hesychius all gloss the word with reference to this passage, and Eustathius (ad Od. p. 1861 42) ἐκ δὲ τῆς κατὰ γέννησιν ἀλληγορουμένης εἰλειθύιας, ὁ Ἐὐριπίδης παραφέρεται τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνειλειθύιαν εἰπὼν τὴν μὴ γεννήσασαν is evidently referring to it. Pollux III xv gives a slightly more extended notice ἃ γὰρ ἄτοκος κοινῶν πρὸς τὴν μηκέτι τάκτουσαν. The reference in Eust. is to Od. XIX 188 δὲ τε σπέος εἰλειθύιας, where Odysseus took his rest. Eustathius observes: ἢ μὴ τοκοῦσαν ἢ καὶ ἀνειλειθύιαν φίλον τοῖς ποιηταῖς κολεῖν which might be taken to imply that more than one poet employed the term: however τοῖς ποιηταῖς could well be a vague reference to Ion in the same way that οἱ περὶ + acc. with the name of a philosopher frequently is no more than a reference to the works of that particular philosopher. (ἀνηλειθύια (phonetic similarity) occasionally appears in the testimonia.)

Modern editors have differed as to whether the adjective should be understood as active (which is the unanimous testimony of the ancient scholars, or as passive ("born without the aid of Eileithyia"). Both clearly are appropriate to Athena. Grégoire favours the latter ("qui vis le jour sans l'aide d'Ilythie"): LSJ and Biehl both prefer the active sense and Owen suggests both applications ("Athena had no mother and had never been a mother"). In the sense "who had no truck with Eileithyia" this may be so; but a passive meaning seems

---


preferable, one that is elaborated upon in 455f. The word is of sufficient oddity to constitute a *griphos*, which is then explained, by a well known stylistic device in tragedy. As this is evidently a "gloss word" peculiar to Euripides, the testimony of ancient scholars may be set aside; see Breitenbach, 77f. on Euripides' propensity to invent α- privative adjectives, many of which are confined to him. See too Di Benedetto on *Or.* 162f. and, on the coinages ἀσοφία, ἀξινεσία (*Archelaus fr.* 257 N.) and συνασοφείν, Willink on *Or.* 491.

It is customary to adduce here *Or.* 621 ἔσσε ὑφήησε δῶμ' ἀνηφαίστω πυρί where the boldness is to some extent lessened by the use of Ἡφαίστος at an early date as a synonym for fire (equivalent to ἀπυρός) - cf. Dodds on *Ba.* 274-85, 625. It is also, as employed of Electra's "incendiary" behaviour in inciting Orestes to matricide, an example of "a fire that is no fire" (cf. Fehling, *Hermes* XCVI (1968), 142f., id. *Wiederholungsfiguren*, 286f.). Ἡφαίστος is so used as early as *II.* II 426 - often later, cf. *S. Ant.* 120f., 1007 etc. εὐλείθυια might be considered to be on the way towards this, especially in its usages in the plural (*II.* XI 270 (βέλος) τῷ τε προοίμῳ μογοοτάκοι Εὐλείθυια | Ἡρης θυγατέρες πικρᾶς ὀδίνας ἐχουσαι). The translation has certainly occurred in Oppian *Hal.* I 477 ("birth pangs"; at *IV* 505 it has the further extension of meaning "(fruit of) birth pangs" (θύννης δὲ βορύφρονος εὐλείθυια).


There are also a number of nouns, used as nouns, which have a most irregular privative prefix. It is possible that *Hes.* *OD* 355 δῶτι μὲν τις ἐδώκε, ἀδώτι δ' οὗ τις ἐδωκεν is a nonce-word, coined as the opposite number to δῶτις (though see Ernst Fraenkel, *NA* I, 118). However *Aeschylus' ἀτίτης* (*Ag.* 72, *Eum.* 256 - see Fraenkel ad loc. on the former) is not used in any context which would suggest this process - though *West* (*OD* loc.
cit.) speculates that it may have occurred in some lost play in such a context. A similar problem confronts ἀβοῦνης (OD 451, cf. E. Risch, Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache, (1974), 35) - it is difficult to see what the antithesis would be.

Our form may well also be assisted by the idea that forms in -ως were in origin participial adjectives (cf. ἔγυνα, ἔργυνα, αἰθωμα, ἔρπυκτα etc. - on this group cf. Chantraine Formation, 439f., id., Histoire du parfait grec, 45). Indeed, forms such as ἐπελευσετι, ἐπελεῦσας are known from the Gortyn inscription (Willet, Law Code index, p. 84) and a form ἐλευσαῖ is known to Ibycus (P. Oxy. 1790 = PMG 282 I. 18). This is also the ancient derivation as known from Eustathius, Il. 843 59 Ἐλευθερία παρὰ τὸ εἰς φῶς ἐλεύθερα τὰ ἐμβρύα. See other sources for this in Schulze, QE, 259f., 262 n. 3, Kalkmann, Pausanias der Perieget (1886), 214f. The oldest form is Ἐλευθερία/-έθως, as inscriptions show and the by-form Ἐλευθερίω suggests (AP VII 604 3, Call. h. Del. 276 (corr. Schneider)). On the orthography of the word see Nilsson, MMR, 519 n. 43, S. Pingiatoglou ΕΙΛΕΙΘΥΙΑ (1981) app. X, Threatte, GAI I, 342f. On the idea of Eileithyia "leading to light", it is possible that Il. XVI 187f. μονοστόκος Ἐλευθερία ἐξόγαγε πρὸ φωσὶν (cf. Pind. Nem. VII 1-5) refers to this idea; Ἐλευσις would also suggest this ("where one comes, the end of the journey"). Ἐλευσις is a Laconian by-form of Ἐλευθερία. (Further discussion of this philological connection and its implications in R. F. Willetts, "Cretan Eileithyia", CQ n.s. VIII (1958), 221f.). The name ereutya is known from Linear B (A. Heubeck, Kadmos II (1972), 87f.

455f. Προμηθεί Τιτάνι λοχευ-θεῖσαν κατ' ἀκροτάτας
κορυφᾶς Διὸς, ὥμάκαρατ Ἅλκα.

---

1 - ά only in later sources i.e. EM xiv 21.
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Various deities (see below) were traditionally present at the birth of Athena, and Euripides should not be understood as repudiating the presence of Eileithyia with ἀνελεύθυναν. In the earliest representation of this class (a seventh-century pithos from Tenos (*LIMC* III 1 s.v. Eileithyia (Olmos), A (a) 1), she stands behind Zeus’ throne bearing the knife symbolic of child-birth, while the fully armed Athena rises from Zeus’ head. This is not typical however - in other versions she is never in the role of the midwife, and her gestures in this scene are uncertain of interpretation. Her hands are generally raised - in *LIMC* A (b) 2 shield band (d) she seems to be uttering the *ololyge* at the birth, in (e) and (g) she holds Zeus’ head. As Cassimatis (*LIMC* I.c. p. 1022) suggests, she is certainly playing some role, probably that of comforter - the arm gesture may also signify honour paid to the goddess. Euripides will here be referring only to the unconventional manner of her birth.


Nor do we learn anything from the unknown Euripidean source contained in the composite "birth of Athena" commentary (P. Oxy. 2260 col. ii 11f.) which is the source of the two lyric fragments quoted above (Lobel deduces ἄκοντα συγκλαδια [τονυς εἰ]πήδησε κοῦψ ὧπο Δ[ιός]).

It has been remarked that in E.’s account here the fairly standard role of Hephaestus has been usurped by Prometheus. The only account that tallies with E. is Apollodorus’ composite (v. Kauer o.c., 44f.) account (I 3 6) ὦς δ’ ὁ τῆς γενέσεως ἐνέστη χρόνος,
Pindar seems to be the first author to include any deity in this role - Ol. VII 35f. ἄν' Ἀφαίστου ὑχναίων | χαλκελατω πελέκει πατέρος 'Αθαναία κορυφάν κατ' ἄκραν | ἀνορούσασο' ἀλάλαξεν ὑπερμάκει βοᾷ the wording of which might even be alluded to here. Cf. id. fr. 34 S.-M. ((Ζεὺς δὲ καὶ τυπεῖς οἵνυ πελέκει τέκετο ξανθάν 'Αθάναν). From the problematic Hesiodic account we learn only that Zeus inveigled Metis αἰμωλίου λόγουι to permit herself to be swallowed, after which he gave birth to Athena without the aid of Hera which is the point of the story. On the problems of the whole Hesiodic account, which is composite and confused in purpose, see West’s discussion (Theogony, p. 401f.) of its authenticity and composition and that of the Chrysippan fragment (fr. 343 = Chrysippus fr. 908 v. Arnim). We learn from the source of the latter (Galen de placitis III 8, 11f.) that it certainly belongs to Hesiod, though his phraseology, particularly where it concerns the Theogony account, leaves room for doubt. West is inclined to deduce
from the fact that Galen quotes it ἐν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα, after giving most of the Theogony account, that it came in a following poem - the Melampodia or Catalogues. But as these words are followed by πλεῖον διελθέτω ὤργα τοῦ, not the way one would refer to another work from that already cited, it is possible Galen knew of a text of Theog. that included it. In Theog. 886f. the birth of Athena is not included; it is mentioned briefly at 924f. and his wrath against Hera is there unexplained and unconnected - so the Chrysippian fragment, beginning as it does ἐκ ταύτης ἤρμος could well fit after 929 (contra, H. Erbse, Philologus CVIII (1964), 19-26). Kauer o.c. regards it as a fragment of an early Orphic theogony. Here too Metis is the prime mover: no one is present at h. Hom. Ap. 305-354 in this role.¹

There were reliefs depicting the birth at both Athens and Sparta (Paus. I 24 2, III 17 3) of which nothing is known. The first certain appearance of Hephaestus in his supposed role is in a series of shield band reliefs of the late seventh century from Olympia (illustrated in LIMC s.v. Athena no. 361), perhaps too in a relief pithos from Tenos (K. Schefold, Frühgriechische Sagenbilder (1964) fig. 13 = LIMC o.c. 360) of around 680 B.C. which has already assumed the distinctive type of the later black-figure Athenian version (from c. 570 B.C.) - see LIMC commentary 1022: in the Olympian shield bands he is unmistakably present, complete with his axe.


Some reason for the Euripidean innovation should be sought, but over-precision should be avoided: it is possible that an older Attic version which might in some sense be called the original existed on which Euripides is directly dependent: thus Wilamowitz (GWissGötter

¹Nor for that matter in Homer, though the allusive manner of his only reference (II. V 875f.) implies that the story was already well established.
But Wilamowitz' reference to the relief on the Parthenon does not help us, as we have already seen: a more cautious view is taken by Delcourt (Hephaistos ou la légende du magicien (1957), 140) who remarks that the Euripidean version "n'est peut-être pas une tradition ancienne mais simplement l'hommage d'un Athénien au Titan que sa ville était seule à honorer comme un dieu". A further reason will be the relation of Doppelgänger that exists between them. The glaring exception to their connection, confirmed at Athens by a joint cult, is the appearance of Hephaestus in the act of nailing his associate to the cliff at the start of the PV. Here Aeschylus innovates: in the version of Theog. 521 it was Zeus, which for obvious reasons would be dramatically undesirable. However it is also not unknown for two gods closely associated, or indeed two characters of myth, to be portrayed as polar opposites, in various ways - Apollo and Hyacinthus, for example, if we regard Hyacinthus as an earlier form of the deity as the etymology of the latter would suggest, almost certainly Cycnus, with his Apolline title, as portrayed in the pseudo-Hesiodic Scutum, Callisto, a by-form of Artemis Kalliste and metamorphosed into the very animal sacred to Artemis, although shot by her according to one version of the legend, Io the rival of Hera in myth but also her priestess and, again, changed into Hera's animal form, the cow. The relationship between Dionysus and Orpheus, as the gold-tablets above all indicate, is at best ambiguous. Whether in the battle between Xanthus and Melanaegis which forms the action legend for the Athenian Apaturia we are to see two forms of the same fertility god ("Year God") locked in conflict is uncertain.

The cult association is most obviously represented by the Athenian lampadephoria which began from the joint altar of Hephaestus and Prometheus in the Academy (Paus. I 30 2; cf. Harpocration s.v. λαμπάδας, schol. Ar. Ran. 131, 1087, 1093). The most important source for their association in general is the scholium on OC 56 -
χώρος μὲν ιερὸς πᾶς δὲν ἔστιν ἡ σεμερίδουν

ἐν δ’ ὁ πυρφόρος θεὸς Τιτάν Προμηθέας

- note the verbal parallel with E. here):

Scholiast: Περὶ τοῦ τὸν Προμηθέα περὶ τὴν 'Ἀκαδήμειαν καὶ τὸν Κολωνὸν ἱδρύσαται, 'Ἀπολλόδωρος γράφει σύντως ἐν τῇ περὶ θεῶν γ'.1 (FGrHist 244 F 147). συντιμάται [δὲ delevi] καὶ ἐν 'Ἀκαδήμεια τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ, καθάπερ ὁ Ἡφαῖστος, καὶ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ παλαιὸν ἱδρύμα καὶ βωμὸς ἐν τῷ τεμένει τῆς θεοῦ. δείκνυται [δὲ delevit Elmsley] καὶ βάσις ἀρχαία κατὰ τὴν ἔσοδον, ἐν ἦ τού τε Προμηθέας ἐστι τύπος καὶ τοῦ ὁ Ἡφαῖστου’ πεποίηται δὲ, ὡς καὶ Λυσιμαχίδης φησίν (FGrHist 366 F 4), ὁ μὲν Προμηθέας πρῶτος καὶ πρεσβύτερος, ἐν δεξιῷ σκήπτερον ἔχων, ὁ δὲ ὁ Ἡφαῖστος νέος καὶ δευτέρος, καὶ βωμὸς ἅμοιον κοινὸς ἔστιν ἐν τῇ βάσει ἀποτευτυπώμενος.

The curious legend making Prometheus the elder of Hephaestus is noteworthy (πρεσβύτερος) very possibly indicating a chance survival of folk memory in which Hephaestus, the pan-Hellenic god, in fact supplanted the local cult of the potter god. The source of the scholium quoted is unknown, but it clearly reflects a good authority doubtless used by Didymus. It is discussed by Wilamowitz, Aischylos Interpretationen, p. 142 and note 3.

Further afield, Prometheus is associated with the foundation legend of the Theban Kabeirion (Paus. IX 25 6); there is evidence for worship of him independently at Phocis (Paus. X 4 4)2 and of a μνήμα at Opus and Argos (Paus. II 19 8).

Cf. Eckhart RE o.c. 1 (A) 1, Delcourt, o.c. 192-3, Brommer, Hephaestos: Der

1<ἐν> Jacoby, reliquia C. Müller, Wilamowitz.

2the sacred stones said to be ‘surplus’ from the clay from which Π. formed mankind, and an ἄγαλμα of his own making.
Προμηθεύς Τιτάνων: Not, as Jebb remarks on OC 56, merely because he was seen as in opposition to Zeus and therefore as acting like one of the Titans, though this may have played some part: he is (Hes. Theog. 510) son of the Titan Iapetus.

κατ’ ἀκροτάτας κορυφὰς Διός: The usage of κατά is noteworthy, as against ἐκ (as in h. Hom. ΥΥΨΙV 4f.). We are invited to contemplate the very first moment of her appearance over the head of Zeus and the κατά will refer primarily to position, which would admittedly be easier if we read the accusative. Alternatively we should understand the preposition proleptically - the first action Athena takes after having been released from Zeus’ head is to leap down from it (ἐξανέπαλτο as in the Ibycus fragment (298 PMG) quoted above). L has κορυφὰς <acc. pl.>.

It may be best to read 

ἀκροτάτων κορυφῶν

(κεφαλή, κάρα and κεφάλαιον are similarly never found in the plural of a singular subject - κεφάλαιον only is distinguishable from singular in the metaphorical expression ἐν κεφάλαιοις vel sim. = in conclusion, or meaning ‘the principal points’.)

λοχευθεῖσσαν: The verb has a very wide semantic field. This appears to be the sole example of its application as "being born" in the sense of the child being delivered, as seen from the viewpoint of the child. It elsewhere means bear (+ acc.) of the mother, beget, or
bring forth (of the midwife). Hence the more usual employment of the passive to mean "to be brought to parturition" - Ba. 3 λοχευθεῖσα’ άστραστηφόρος πυρί (Semele at the birth of Dionysus), Tro. 602 etc.

The construction whereby the dative of agent appears solus after an aorist passive, as against a perfect or pluperfect is slightly unusual, though the indiscriminate usage of the dative in this way in later Greek should prevent us from limiting it to the category of "rarities" - cf. Jannaris, HGG, 1365, Menander Sententiae 751 Jaekel τάληθες ἀνθρώποισιν οὐχ εὑρίσκεται - it occurs with the present κτείνεσθαι as early as Homer (II. V 465) and the perfect/pluperfect τεθνῆκεν may be so used in S. Aj. 970, though Schneidewin suspected the preceding line, and the dative may be amenable to other explanations (ethic?). For the aorist passive compare e.g. II. III 429 ἀνδρὶ δαμεῖς κρατερῷ, XVIII 103 etc. The appearance of the imperfect at Thuc. I 51 τοῖς δὲ Κερκυραῖοις - ἐπέπλεον γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς - οὐχ ἐσωφάντο may be doubtful. Cf. K.-G. 1 p. 422 (c).

456-7: κορυψάς Διός, ὥ μάκαιρα Νίκα, μᾶλε Πύθιον οίκων, μάκαιρα codd.: πόνα τρ.

Νίκα: Athena bears the title that is particularly Athenian: cf. 1529; it is so common that it is alluded to in Hclld. 352 νυκωμένη γὰρ Πολλᾶς οὐκ ἀνέξεται.

The reference in S. Ph. 134 is more difficult: Νίκη τε’ Ἄθανα Πολλᾶς ἤ σφέξει μ’ ἀει. The problem is not so much the one that concerned Fraenkel so that he contemplated wholesale deletion (Due Seminari Romani, 46 f.), namely that the goddess could not be given two epithets, but with the syntax of τε. If the text is kept as it is we must assume a pause after Νίκη with Ἄθανα Πολλᾶς effectively a gloss on it. If the three words are to be taken together, the reading of a 15th century codex descriptus Harleianus BM 5743, Πολλᾶς, whether arrived at by an earlier corruption into πολλᾶς or by emendation, is worth

1Perhaps the dative is influenced by ἐπέπλεον following.
considering (also suggested by Burges); no one would be surprised to find Pallas Athena as one name, but with the addition of Polias which is a distinct function of the goddess different from Nike confusion arises, both religious and syntactic.\(^1\)

Cf. Aristides or. I 29 ὁυκ ἐπώνυμος τῆς Νῖκης ἐσταιν ἀλλ' ὄμωνυμος. A full account of the epithet is contributed by Ellendt-Genthe p. 469. In Ar. Lys. 317 the women invoke δέσποινα Νίκη, ξυγγενοῦ.\(^2\)

The line as it is transmitted fails to respond with 477: 457 is a perfectly regular enoplion

477 a no less regular paroemiac. Whereas irregularity in a kindred metre such as aeolochoriambics (cf. Page SA, 81, Barrett on Hipp. ad 552, 555-8, Diggle ad Phaethon l. 69 f. id. Dionysiaca, 174 = Euripidea, 195) is tolerable, and despite the frequent intermixture of anapaestic cola with aeolic, an example of this response has so far failed to appear. One or other must be changed. (For Euripidean examples of both cf. Diggle, PCPS XX (1974), 19: he adds a further parallel for the enoplion (IT 884) at Studies, 102.)

First among attentions to the antistrophe is the "radical reshuffle" (Diggle (1)) that Murray offers: λάμπωσι νεάνιδες θολάμως ἐνὶ ποτρίουσιν ἕβαι. On this see below - it is (Diggle (2)) ruled out of court by the fact that ἕβαι in tragedy always implies some part of the verb -ἐστα and cannot be used as a mere byform of the preposition. For other possibilities cf. Prinz-Wecklein.

Alteration of the strophe is by far the easier course and I shall argue that it is the only

---

\(^{1}\)The second objection of Fraenkel l.c. is more important "Perché s' inocherebbe Atena dopo Hermes!" However - Sophoclea, 181 - it is natural for Odysseus to invoke his personal protector with the trickster god.

\(^{2}\)At Ar. Eq. 581f. they are disjoined - ὁ πολυοέχε Πολλᾶς... δεῦρ' ἀφίκω λαβοῦσα τὴν... ἠμετέρων ξυνεργὸν Νίκην. Cf. the tailpiece attached to the end of the Dyscolus and possibly to other comedies ἢ δ' εὐπάθειρα φιλογέλως τε παρθένος Νῖκη μεθ' ἡμῶν εὖμενης ἔπουτ' αεί (cf. Gomme-Sandbach, Menander: A Commentary (1973), 288 for discussion. Νίκη is referred to allusively as Διὸς παῖς in Aristides or. I 322.
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path we should consider.

Wilamowitz removed the unwanted extra syllable in 457, at the expense of the received colometry, thus leaving the antistrophe’s wording intact

κορυφᾶς Διός, ὦ μάκαρ | Νίκα, μόλε Πόθιον οἶκον ~
πατρίουσι νεάνιδες | ήβαι, διαδέκτορα πλούτον

μάκαρ as the feminine is possible, and does occur in E.: Ba. 565, Hel. 375, IT 647.

Cf. too Ar. Av. 1722, μακαίρα (Cobet), Eubulus fr. 102 K.-A. and v. Leeuwen on Av. o.c.

It requires an almost inconceivable brevis in longo at νεάνιδες.

A reading, written in "an unusual hand" (Owen) in L has πότνα. This solves the problem with a minimum of tears and fuss, both the word and the metre are unexceptionable, and the author of the "unusual" handwriting is of course Triclinius (Tr.2). On the intriguing question of where he might have come by this learned conjecture, see below. It would appear not to have been surpassed, and that I think is what we should read in the text.1

I find it, with due respect, difficult to agree with Diggle on the text of the strophe. Following Page he wrote μόλε for μάκαμα producing κορυφᾶς Διός, ὦ μόλε Νίκα, μολε Πόθιον οἰκον responding to πατρίουσι νεάνιδες ήβαι | διαδέκτορα πλούτον (Diggle (1)).

There is indeed no shortage of examples of this double imperative, of the vocative interposed between them, and of ὦ with the imperative. However they differ in several respects from the tone of respectful entreaty addressed to the patron goddess of Athens that we might expect from the chorus here. It has invariably an imperative or even frantic tone. Consider the following: Hec. 1091 f. ὦ Ἀχιλέω, ὦ Ἀτρείδαι | βοῶν βοῶν αὐτῷ βοῶν,
| ὦ Ἰτε μολέτε πρὸς θεῶν Polymestor at this point in the play has little time for civilities.

1thus Dale, Metrical Analyses II, 121.
A ritual and ecstatic invocation. *Phaethon* fr. 773 69 N. = 112 Diggle ὃ ἔτε λαοὶ (the κηρύξ). This is a colloquial and standardized formula introduced into verse akin to ἔπειρο' ἔτε πάντες λέοφ as is shown by *Ar. Pax* 298, Plut. *Thes.* 25 1 etc.

A strange confusion has been made over *Hipp.* 1453 ὃ χαῖρέ καὶ σῦ, χαῖρέ πολλά μοι, πάτερ inasmuch as the passage in Barrett, following Wilamowitz,² appears in the order 1452, 1455, 1454, 1453, 1456. The principal grounds for this are the notion that (1) ὃ χαῖρε καὶ σῦ ought to be Hippolytus’ final leave-taking (despite the fact that we hear from him for another two lines which nobody has succeeded in wresting from him - 1457-8); (2) that 1456 μὴ νῦν προδοῦς με, τέκνον, ἀλλὰ καρπέρει comes more appropriately after 1453 ὃ χαῖρε καὶ σῦ, χαῖρε πολλά μοι, πάτερ than after 1455 τοιώνδε παιδῶν γνησίων εὐχοὺ τυχεῖν.

To answer these in reverse order: 1456 follows quite logically from 1455 in which Hippolytus mentions the nobility that Theseus might expect from his children: Theseus merely follows up the point νῦν (inferential: "since this is the case from what you have said") continue until the last in such conduct". And 1453, being as I have argued, a set expression, not an astonishingly original expression of emotion, accords very ill with its involuntary neighbours in Wilamowitz’ rearrangement - 1454 and 1456. There is moreover a positive reason for keeping ὃ χαῖρε etc. quite early in the final dialogue: Theseus in 1454 reacts to the greeting with admiration of Hippolytus’ good nature, less apposite after 1455. And the greeting is highly appropriate as a start to the moving reconciliation scene after Hippolytus has released Theseus from blood-guilt, less so at the very end. A further point is admirably made by Segal, *GRBS* XI (1970), 101f. "Theseus’ words in 1452 are, by the very nature of the situation, a pronouncement on the final act of his son’s life and are so understood by Hippolytus" (i.e. in the wording of 1453). Thus in his acknowledgements of his own absolution from blood guilt which only the dying man can pronounce, Theseus is effectively saying his own farewell and Hippolytus responds accordingly. If this point is taken, there is no cause to be concerned about καὶ σῦ in 1453. ὃ... καὶ σῦ does not, as Barrett suggests, require χαῖρε as an antecedent: that is effectively provided by ὃ φίλοτετε in 1452. The difficulty that both Barrett and Willink (*CQ* n.s. XVII (1968) 43) find in καὶ is illusory - it does not mean "farewell you too" which requires us to think of Artemis departing, but is adequately explained by Segal l.c. Willink’s suggestion that ὃ... καὶ σῦ answers ὃ φίλοτετε and should therefore be placed first followed by χαῖρε χαῖρε is both grammatically implausible (the ellipse) and introduces an element of comedy into this most serious scene that we could well do without (the double imperative).³

---

¹ Murray’s text: incerta multa - servato ὃ secundo, ad ἄμα... τοιάδ’obelosposuit Diggle.

² *An. Eur.*, 220f.

³ Indeed it merely exacerbates the problem: with σῦ dividing καὶ and χαῖρε we must take καὶ as copulative, not as focusing light on the one word χαῖρε. (The cheerful double χαῖρε in 64 suits the mood.) Naturalism rears its head when Willink informs us that "the
In Ag. 22 \(\omega\) χαίρε λαμπτήρ νυκτός we are in the language of both "common life" (Fraenkel ad loc.) and that of excited exclamation (little distinction in the MSS was made between the \(\omega\) of the vocative and the \(\omega\) of exclamation, little perhaps in usage, see below: see too Porson on Or. 476f. \(\omega\) πρέσβυ χαίρε... \(\omega\) χαίρε καὶ σού and on the expression χαίρε... \(\omega\) Giangrande, CO XVII (1968), 52f., especially his useful treatment of it as a hymnic formula\(^1\) \(\omega\) χαίρε 'Αδάνα χαίρε διογενείς τέκνον is pointed and ironic in the mouth of the crazed Ajax. Hel. 616 is slightly different again: \(\omega\) χαίρε Λήδας θόγατορ, ἐνθάδ' ἥσθ' ἄρα is the sarcastic, indeed deliberately impolite, mode of address that the messenger uses to Helen, when he is still under the impression that the supposedly fickle Helen has slipped his grasp.

The colloquial tone of it is demonstrated by: Ar. Ran. 269 \(\omega\) παῖς παῖς παράβαλον τῷ κωπίῳ Lys. 1269 \(\omega\) δεύρ' ἑτερ, δεύρ' \(\omega\) κυνηγε παρασένε 1304 εἰα... ἔμβη\| \(\omega\) εἶα κοὐφα πάλλων Ach. 971 εἴδες \(\ω\) εἴδες \(\omega\) πάσα πάλι τὸν φρόνιμον ἄνδρα κτλ. Ach. 1231 (\(\omega\) τήνελλα κολλενικος), Pax 1353f., Lys. 853, Menander Georgios I. 41 Sandbach, E. CycI. 52 ὑπαγ' \(\omega\) ὑπαγ' \(\omega\) κέραστα, Theocritus I 144 \(\omega\) χαίρετε πολλάκι Μόισσα. It is clear from these examples that the idiom of \(\omega\) with the imperative should find a place in Stevens’s most valuable collection of colloquial expressions in Euripides. It is no less clear that brachyology suits a dying man” as it does when Segal l.c. argues against Wilamowitz’ logic that a dying man may not know for certain the day and hour of his going. Characters in tragedy need not be judged so empirically.

Of Wilamowitz’ remaining arguments, the idea that the upshot of 1454-5 is that H. absurdly "ita laudatus paullulum reviviscit" may be refuted by the οὖν of 1454 - this expresses the grief of the survivor. That γενναῖος and γεννησίων should come in juxtaposition is manifestly wrong: γενναῖος refers to the pardon that H. has bestowed; how many other sons are in question from the point of view of being placed in this situation? γνήσιοι of course means "not νόθοι", a different point altogether and certainly not the counterbalance of γενναῖοι. The tone of 1455 is gently wistful, akin in tone to 1441.

\(^1\)to which add Blaydes on Aj. 91. On the accent see the important assemblage of information in Fraenkel ad Ag. l.c.
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because of its character it has no place here in the *Ion*. The repeated ξείδη of the
image/goddess in Call. *Lav. Pall.*, 33, 43, 55, 137 is quite in accord with the urgent tone of
the ‘cult’ hymn that was never performed.

On the question of ὅ (acute) and ὅ (circumflex) cf. Schulze, *Kl. Schr.*, 423, Fraenkel
l.c. LSJ s.v., iv, Seaford, *Cyclops*, p. 111 - the latter correctly rejects τυφέτω on *Cycl.* 659
τύφετ' ὅ καίετ' ὅ τὸν Ἀείνας μηλονόμον. Cf. the semi-satyr *Alc.* 234 βόσσον ὅ
στένοξον ὅ Φερσία χθών. *Hipp.* 64 is a typically ambiguous case χοιρε χοιρέ μου ὅ
κόρα... καλλίστα - is ὅ an expression of amazement and awe, in which case we should
probably place a raised stop after it, or the usual vocative? The distinction in all of these
cases is a fine one, but the ancient grammarians had rules on the matter of ὅ θεομαστικόν
and ὅ κλητικόν (*E.M.* p. 79 13, *Et. Gud.* 576 40 etc. - cf. Chandler, *GA*², p. 254) and it is
to be presumed that they were relying on ancient authority and actual usage, in some cases.

If we do not accept Diggle’s conjecture, we return to πότνα. It is a matter for
personal judgement whether πότνα would have been within Triclinius’ competence: the
shortened form occurs three times in the *Odyssey* (V 215, XIII 391, XX 61) which might
perhaps have suggested it to Triclinius:¹ it reappears in Hellenistic poetry - *AP* V 253, 285,
Theocr. II 69 in the repeated πότνα Ξελάντα formula. On the general question cf. Zuntz,

**Triclinian readings in Euripides**

Zuntz has shown in a number of cases in Triclinius’ dealings with the alphabetic plays
that the superior reading is (a) better than his usual standard (b) not such as could
immediately be deduced from the context, palaeographically or otherwise (c) demonstrably

¹as might his work on *Ba.* (’Ὁςα πότνα θεόν - 370). πότνα: δέσποινα, σεβαστή, ἐκτιμὸς might have been found in Hesychius. πότνα was rightly conjectured by Meineke
in fr. 453. 9 N. Wrongly in Q at *Tro.* 292, though metrical.
not the reading of his immediate archetype for L.1 (see p. 199)

As Diggle has taken Kannicht’s arguments (o.c.) against this situation, as seen in Hel. 74-5, as a sufficient basis for dismissing the lot, I will deal with that instance first and then mention some other particularly salient proofs of Zuntz’ contention that in these - admittedly rare - cases, Triclinius was not acting on his native wit but had before him an older exemplar as well - E in Z.’s notation, the "Eustathian" copy, as it is supposed to be.

L: θεοίς δοσον μίσημ’ ἔχεις; ’Ελένης, σ’ ἀποτύσασιν.

Triclinius’ corrections: θεοὶ σ’, δοσον μίμημ’ ἔχεις; ’Ελένης, ἀποτύσασιν.

This speaks for itself: μίμημα sharpens the insult - palaeography helps not at all and the metre is unaffected. ’Ελένης results from acute common sense and logical thought: unless Teucer is being abnormally and obscurely sarcastic, how can he call the woman he sees before him Helen, when he is still in complete ignorance. Kannicht’s arguments that all this is mere Triclinius are based on (a) the highly subjective one that if Brodaeus could hit on μίμημα or a version of it, so could Triclinius (b) the extremely weak one that as in 76 he glosses what must be the true text ἀπόλαυσιν (ἀπόλλαυσι’ L) εἰκοῖς with ἐνεκα which is in complete harmony with μίμημα in 74, he is therefore the author of the latter. This carries with it the implication that if Kannicht adopts an improvement made by, say, Porson, in his text of the Helen, he must be assumed to have done so without any perception of why it is better than the textus receptus and is certainly debarred from going on to explain the significance of his reading in the Commentary: only his own conjectures merit such treatment.

---

1 I am very grateful indeed to the late Professor Zuntz for his kindness in answering my enquiries at length on this point.

2 ἀπότυσασιν had to await L. Dindorf.

3 Reiske.
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El. 311 is particularly striking:

nova
dvavopottbe yupvdtg1060a napeévog.

5eYUde L:6?:wvuixotgTr2
yuvaixag again is certainly not a Deutung of a corrupt text, the sense is much the
same, and the metre is unaffected. The point is that, with δε already added as a line filler
before γυμνάς in L’s exemplar, it is likely that at this late stage (Tr²) Triclinius found his
change elsewhere.

Su. 840  ἔς τὰ σά μέθος, νῦν δ’ Ἀδραστον εἰσορῶ ἄν

As Zuntz points out (p. 76) the etacism that would have made his change seem a fairly light
one is not sufficient to rule out another authority: in the immediate area there are uncorrected
errors quite as easily put right.

Another important argument may be drawn from Triclinius’ occasional decision to
place what are known to be γρ readings in origin in the body of the text, such as Su. 183
τέρπειν δη ἀλλοὺς: τρέπειν L. γρ. τέρπειν - transp. Tr¹. A list of such occasions is
assembled by Zuntz, 131-2. If this was the case in the MSS he knew, and many of these
variants will be ancient, why should he not adopt the same policy of eclecticism with ancient
and reputable variants such as πότνως, if he found them in a source which was not the direct
’source’ of L?

Finally, it is surely important that Triclinius did practice just such a procedure of
searching for older and better copies in his work on other authors. Why in this, the final and

¹ For Page’s sensible dicta on this point cf. Dawe, Collation, 46 n.

² δε remains in Triclinius - finally deleted by Barnes. Here is an example to confute
Kannicht - for δε, possible with γυμνάς as introducing a new train of thought, is out of place
with γυναίκας - and yet Triclinius retains it with his discovery.
third stage of his labours on L - many of the relevant examples are to be assigned to Zuntz’ Tr³ by ink colour - should he not apply it to Euripides, all assuming that E was still in existence, or any other source of which we know not, though Occam’s razor can be applied with more than usual success here, as any thing resembling a plurality of archetypes would make L look a very different MS from what it is: the γράφεται would abound, as would notes and variants and the resemblance to the format of L in the plays of the triad would be very much closer. The standard and unquestionable proof that this was his practice is contained in the scholium on OT 472 (δευτοὶ δ’ ἀμ’ ἔπονται ἦταν ἀναστλάκητοι) - οὕτω χρή γράφεται... εὑρήσατε γὰρ ἐν τινὶ τῶν παλαιῶν οὕτω βιβλίων (ἀναστλάκητοι rec.). It is the reading of both Triclinian MSS, also, by chance (or as proof of Triclinius’ assertion) that of the mutually unrelated L, P and D.

The Triclinian branch of Hesiod is demonstrably contaminated with material from more than one source (see West, Theogony, p. 59). It is perhaps true of his work on the Mount Athos MS of Babrius - cf. Turyn, Tradition, 250 n. 236.

The above arguments convince me that πότνα is to be regarded with great respect, both as a reading in itself, and as being in all likelihood not a product of Triclinius’ imagination but a part of the paradosis or at very least a variant of considerably greater antiquity and value than Triclinius’ age or Triclinius’ philology.

As to the reading in the MS itself: πότνα is clearly written above μάκωμα in L with the high tau that seems to be a feature of Triclinius’ style. μάκωμα is partially erased with a lack of concern for the aesthetic appearance of the MS that is not at all characteristic of the scribe himself: the offending word is encased in an oblong box with a line through the middle: the same method is employed to correct the metre at 677 and to remove an intrusive gloss at 886.
Olfimov... θαλάμων is an ablative genitive of 'motion-from', which in prose would require a preposition. This is a usage particularly associated with Sophocles. Cf. OT 151 τίς ποτε ταῦς πολυχρόσου | Πυθώνος ἀγλαὸς ἔβας | Θήβας OC 572 γῆς ὅποιας ἦλθον εἰρηκώς OT 142 βάθρων ιστασθε (see Jebb ad loc.), fr. 491 2 Radt ὑπὸν... στάζοντα τομῆς (seeping from the wood).¹ In E. cf. Med. 70 τοῦσθε παιδὸς γῆς ἐλαν Κορινθίας | σύν μπερί μέλλου. Dobree's 'κ χρυσέων is therefore redundant and stylistically unlikely.


πταμένα πρὸς ἀγυλάς: ἄγυλα refers to a collection of streets and therefore comes to mean effectively the city itself. Cf. Pind. Pyth. VIII 53f. τοῦχθεὶν | ἀφίξεται λαὸς σὺν ἁβλαβεῖ | Ἄβαντος ἐδυρχόρους ἀγυλὰς ibid. II 58f. (of Hieron) πρῶταν κῦρια πολλὰν μὲν εὐστεφάνων ἄγυλαν καὶ στρατοῦ. The singular is apparently so used at Nem. VII 92 νατειν... προγόνων εὐκτήμονα ξαθεῖν ἄγυλαν: the scholia oddly gloss θείαν ὁδὸν i.e. a reference to the way of life. At Ol. IX 34 the ἄγυλα θυρσάκων is indeed Hades but is more likely to be referring to it from the point of view of the "descensus". Neither ὠδὸς nor κέλευθος is used in this way.

πταμένα: Flying is a divine attribute (see on 377) so there is no need to insist on

¹Likewise Ant. 417, Ph. 630 νεῶς δαγοντα etc.

461-464: Φοιβήμος ἐνθα γὰς

μεσόδμφαλος ἔστια

παρὰ χορευομένῳ τρίποδι

μαντεύματα κραίνει,

Φοιβήμος: The lengthened form used occasionally for -εις in Euripidean lyric; *IA* 756.

The ἔστια is personified as the source of oracular wisdom. *OT* 964 approaches to this turn of phrase: τί δῆτ’ ἃν ὃ γύναι σκοποῖτο τις | τὴν πυθόμαντιν ἔστιαν, ἥ τοὺς ἄνω | κλάζοντας ὑρνεῖς where the ἔστια symbolizes the whole apparatus of seeking an oracle. It is common enough as a general way of referring to the place (*OC* 413 ἀνδρῶν θεωρῶν Δελφικῆς ἀφ’ ἔστιας etc.).


We here of an area called the μεσομφάλος (Hesychius: ἡ μέσος τῶν Δελφῶν πόλεως). On the ὁμφάλος see the discussion on 223f: Fraenkel on *Ag*. 1056.

¹*Or*. 331 ἵνα μεσόμφαλοι λέγονται μυχοῖ, *A. Septem* 747 μεσομφάλοις Πυθικοῖς χρηστηρίοις
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The MSS have μεσόμφαλος with single sigma. Nauck establishes exact respon
dy writing μεσόμφαλος. The formation is not elsewhere found though it would be perfectly
legitimate in another dialect in view of the large number of μεσο- compounds with the
Homeric double consonant. However it is wholly unnecessary as the correspondence within
the Aeolic base is free, in all poets at all periods provided both syllables are not short.\(^1\)
Murray should not have been tempted by this unnecessary and dialectically dubious
alteration.\(^2\)

γάς μεσόμφαλος ἐστία: How is one to explain the genitive? Owen, comparing OT
480 τὰ μεσόμοφαλα γάς ἀπονοσφίζων | μαντεία (τὰ ἀπὸ μέσου ὁμφαλοῦ γάς Jebb),
suggests that the γάς is not solely to be explained by the presence of μεσο - but could have
tones of a possessive genitive, which he feels might be facilitated by the legend of the rule
of Ge at Delphi before Apollo. However this last point may be, it is certainly true to say that
in an adjective such as μεσόμφαλος used with a genitive, the case is felt to go with both
parts of the compound independently.\(^3\) γάς ὁμφαλός is indeed a title for the Delphic
omphalos: another example is Pind. Nem. VII 33 παρὰ μέγαν ὁμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου μόλεν
χθονός cf. Pyth. IV 74 παρὰ μέγαν ὁμφαλὸν εὐδένδρῳ ῥηθέν... ματέρος (Γαία) Livy
XXXVIII 48:\(^4\) "Delphos, umbilicum orbis terrarum". Likewise, for example, δωμάτων
ὑπόστεγοι (S. El. 1386) which effectively means ὑπὸ στέγη δωμάτων. This is the best
explanation for the genitives in such phrases as ὑπέγγυος θεανότου Hdt. V 71 "under an

\(^1\)The original function of the pre-cadential part of the verse - West, GM, 30.

\(^2\)The same invention appealed to Wilamowicz in Aristonous’ hymnus ad Hestiam l. 3 p.
164, fr. 2 Powell - μιχδὸν γαίας μεσόμφαλον ('quod displicet' Powell).

\(^3\)An "amphisbaena" word might be a suitable appellation. ("Which is the head and which
the back?". Housman’s amusing poem of the same title pinpoints the issue precisely.)

\(^4\)Cf. XLI, 23.
that consists of θάνατος": et al. It is a telescoping of the syntax that cannot be
precisely conveyed in English and there is no technical phrase for it (I suggest one above).
Nonetheless, as a logical category it is distinguishable, and should not be confused with the
type of phrase discussed in the section on ἄνελεθων above in which the second part of the
compound adjective either duplicates or exactly negates the content of the noun in the
genitive following.

παρὰ χορευομένῳ τρίτοδι: The phrase is possibly echoed in Aristonous’ Delphic
hymn to Hestia (Powell C.A. p. 165 fr. ii 16f = Fouilles de Delphes II 217 - see further
below): ἑπιμαρτυροντον ἀδήπι σάν θυμέλαν χορεύειν. Cf. Pho. 234f. on χοροῖ at Delphi
εἰλισσόν Ἄρτεμιδος θεοῦ | χορός γενομένων ἄφοβος | παρὰ μεσόμφαλο γύσαλα Φοῖβος.
I venture to include in the text what I believe to be my own Ἄρτεμιδος. The MSS offer
either ἄθανάτος or ἄθανάτου, the latter rarer (see Mastronarde-Bremer, The Textual
Tradition of Euripides’ Phoenissae (1982), 132). In addition a gloss Ἀπόλλωνος seems to
derive from the masculine form. As M.-B. suggest, this form is probably a simplification of
the rarer ἄθανάτος not an attempt to “correct” the scholia vetera and the text, who both
paraphrase τῆς θεοῦ ἄθανάτος (the former who should not however be cited by Murray as
if it were a reading derived from them) and continue in the next note by beginning τῆς
Ἁρτεμιδος and proceeding to discuss the κοινά μουστήρια of Apollo and Artemis. It is
very possible from the format of this second note that [τῆς] Ἁρτεμιδος is in fact a lemma,
not a gloss, and therefore evidence from the tradition for my proposed text.
The difficulty is that ἄθανάτος might be considered too vague in a Delphic context.
This has led a number of scholars to replace Apollo here - Poiron simply adopted the
masculine reading of a small number of codd. - ἄθανάτος τῆς χοροῦ (Wecklein)
ἄθανατον τῆν (Kinkel). Seyfert subsumes both into ἄθανάτος τῆς θεοῦ. However a
mention of Artemis is apposite. In the context the Delphic deities are invoked in turn
-Dionysus in 228 and Phoebus is named in 237 by way of conclusion. Much better therefore
here is reference to another deity and one most important to Delphi, rather than two closely
juxtaposed ones to Apollo, the first less specific.

How did the error arise? A combination of phonetic similarity with the expected
adjective with θεος might be the solution.

The phrase χορευομένῳ τρίτοδι is more likely to mean “the tripod in the vicinity of
which χοροῖ take place” - it is hard to imagine a formal chorus taking place in the μυχοῖ:
what the maidservants have in mind are performances of the type that Aristonous catered for,

1And was, by the ancient grammarians: the scholiast glosses A. Cho. 932 (πολλῶν
αὐτῶν ἐπήκρισε) where the verb is used in a way analogous to here with ἐπ’ ἄκρον ἦλθε
and that is the way it should be taken: Orestes was ἐπάκριος κομιδῶν.
or the formal paeans of Pindar. The passive χορευομένης is explicable in the light of the internal accusatives of: S. Ant. 1153 αἳ σεν...πάννυχοι χορεῦουσιν E. Ion 1084 (middle) χορευόμεναι | τὰν χρυσεοστέφανον κόραν | καὶ ματέρα σεμνάν Cf. Pind. Isthm. 1 7f. τὸν ἀκείρεκδιμαν Φοίβον χορεῦον etc.1 At HF 871 σ’ ἔγω μᾶλλον χορεῦώσω has more sinister connotation "I will lead you in the dance of madness". The passive appears again in the difficult OT 1090f. οὐ τὸν "Ολυμπον ἀπετέρων, ὁ Κιθαρίων, οὐκ ἔσῃ τὰν αἴριον | πανσέληνον, μή οὐ σὲ γε καὶ πατριώταν Οἰλίτου καὶ προφόν καὶ ματέρ’ αὐδεῖν, | καὶ χορεύοσθαι πρὸς ἡμῶν | ὡς ἐπήρα φέρωντα. If Οἰλίτου (Voelcker, Gleditsch) is right,2 the construction must change - Oedipus is to honour Cithaeron as the place of his nurture, but the mountain itself become the subject of the passive χορεύοσθαι - it will be the subject of choric song from this chorus.3

The MSS have the vox nihil παραχορευομένη by false division, which is easily

---

1 The citation of Pind. Pyth. III 14 in Philostratus ep. XVI may guarantee the form ἀκείρ- here; in the latter the MSS of Pindar vary as Philostratus does not, in the Isthmian citation ἀκείρο- is due to Schroeder.

2 Not accepted by the OCT. However this seems inevitable, as does Campbell's explanation of τὴν αἴριον πανσέληνον "midnight festivities". καὶ πατριώταν remains a problem - cf. Sophoclea p. 104. καὶ preceding πατριώταν was emended to τὸν by Wilamowitz (KL Schr. VI, 227 f). He understood the subject of συλέτων to be τὸν αἴριον πανσέληνον but how can the festival be said to honour Oedipus in parallel with τροφός and μήτρῃ when it is in the latter relation that the last two stand to Oedipus, hence their mention. Οἰλίτου is adopted by the OCT (making Cithaeron the πατριώταν - simple, but an impossible usage (presumably by analogy with γετένων πόλεως) ο’ ἐμε (Blaydes). The accusative is Oedipus, if the unwanted first καὶ is emended. It is claimed (Sophoclea I.c.) that it is against the word order that Oedipus should govern σὲ γε, τροφόν and ματέρα. This is much alleviated by changing καὶ to σὸν rather than τὸν, thereby producing a telling disjunction with σὲ. It is easier for a mountain to have a πατριώτας than vice versa if one considers that Cithaeron might be taken as representative of Thebes and Boeotia, as the Acropolis of Athens, or Parnassus in allusive language.

The great discovery that the chorus wish to emphasize is that Oedipus has been shown - in all likelihood - to be a true Boeotian: all they have so far established is that he is not the son of Polybus.

3 See Dawe here and at 896.
rectified. There is however a passage of Himerius that appears to owe something to this passage of *Ion* (quoted by Photius),¹ Δειλωθα...λατρεύουσι μὲν ἀεὶ τῷ θεῷ καὶ περιχορεύουσι μετὰ παιάνων τὸν τρίτοδα. Musgrave accordingly wrote περιχορευομένῳ which is accepted by Biehl. The verb occurs in E. Pho. 316 ἐκεῖσε καὶ τὸ δεύρῳ περιχορεύουσα and it is applicable to the context (on religious application cf. Lucian de salt. 24).² However the syntax and the mixed metaphor are unthinkable. It is already a stretch of the imagination to understand ἐστία as in some way representing the whole "system" of Apollo's prophecy: if we are now to believe that the hearth is to be considered as doing so "by means of" the tripod itself on which the Pythia sits to discharge her duties, an attack of mental indigestion seems imminent, and locative would only confuse.

μοντεύματα κραίνει: cf. 569f. ἦς μὲν σὴν ἀνεύρεσιν θεός | ὄρθως ἐκρανε In connection with prophecy cf. trag. adesp. fr. 414 N., (αἰκραντα) which may well be from the initial prophecy scene in Euripides' *Alexandros*, (a scene now confirmed as part of that play by the papyrus hypothesis (see Coles, *The Hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros* (BICS supplement XXXII (1974))l. 28), and to be fr. 42b in Kannicht's forthcoming *editio maior* of the fragments of Euripides): ἀκραντα γὰρ μ' ἔθηκε θεοπροφετεῖν θεος. The idea in Ag. 249 τέχναι δὲ Κάλκσοντος οὐκ ἀκραντοι is similar, in that κραίνειν is regarded as a potential latent within Calchas’ words that will affect the ensuing events. Dreams that bring prophecies for the future are referred to in a fashion closely parallel to Ion here: *Od. XIX* 565f. οἱ τ᾽ ἐλεφαίροντοι ἔπε’ ἀκράντα φέροντες... οἱ ρ’ ἔτυμα κραίνουσι. (A further explanation of this passage is offered by Amory, *YCS XX*, 26-7 who prefers to explain in terms of κραίνω = "have power" like *Od. VIII* 390f. δώδεκα γὰρ κατὰ δῆμον ἄριστεπεῖς βασιλῆς

---

¹ = *or. XII* 28 Colonna.
²with accusative, as at *D. Mort.* 15 3.
It would be nice to have the context of the Aeschylean gloss συντοκράτον (fr. 295 Radt) explained by the writer of Anecd. Bekker 467 in precisely the terms we require here: λόγον τὸν ἕξ ἐκείνου τὸ τέλος ἐπιφέροντα, ὄντως Αἰσχύλος (cf. Hesychius, E.M. 173. 34). Dindorf suggests συντοκρατον. The root may be κρατίον; see Radt ad loc.

The idea behind this usage of the verb is certainly to be distinguished from the interesting conglomerate of meanings that it more usually represents "ordain" sliding into "actually bring about" ("no sooner said than done" in the way that Aristotle occasionally speaks of syllogisms in language that seems to imply that they exercise some actual control over their conclusions, bringing them about). But it is clearly closely connected: a prophecy divinely inspired carries within itself from the moment that it is uttered the seeds of its outcome.

On the etymology (probably from κάρα) cf. Chantraine DE s.v.; see too Fraenkel on Ag. 369.

It is striking and of considerable interest that in this passage Euripides should "personify" the Delphic hestia as a general term to cover the mantic process. In this connection it should be borne in mind that ἐστία was more than an especially sacred part of the temple, located in the μύχας (cf. 229). The associations of Hestia, both a goddess and an "object" of veneration, were of great importance at Delphi. It is of the essence of a hearth to be central and to represent the idea of centrality, an idea that was not born with the Paris structuralist school (cf. in primis Vernant, "Hestia and Hermes" in Myth and Thought amongst the Greeks (Eng. 1983)), 127f. but goes back to the allegorisation of the Neo-Platonists. As

---

1 I am grateful to Robert Parker for a discussion of this section.

such the *hestia* at Delphi occupies a unique role as associated (μεσόμψαλος) with the *omphalos* in the temple, the centre of the world.

Hestia was worshipped at Delphi, and there is little doubt that this facilitated Euripides’ use of κρατεῖν here which alludes to the practice while not naming her outright - a capital epsilon is ruled out by the oddity of the formation thereby produced with Φοιβήτος.

Our evidence for this cult is largely literary, and it remains uncertain whether we should be thinking in terms of an actual cult subordinate to that of Apollo or of a related concept.

465-471: Λατυγχής: The form next occurs as such in an "alphabetic" and probably Orphic poem in AP IX 525 l. 12 to augment the number of epithets beginning with *lambda*.

The feminine Λατυγένεα occurs in A. Septem 148.

466: For the anaphora of the numeral cf. S. Ant. 141f. and Jebb ad loc. for parallels.

---

1The best known evidence for this is of course Aristonous’ hymn to Hestia which accompanies his paean to Apollo, both inscribed at Delphi (cippus IX in Colin, *Fouilles de Delphes* II, p. 217 no 170 = Powell CA p. 164 fr. ii. (It is possible that her name should be replaced in the list of standard Delphic deities in the oath quoted by Aeschines in *Ctes*. 111. She was represented on the north facade of the treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi (LMC V 2 "Hestia" no. 9.) near the treasure house of the Athenians (Cf. in primis Wilamowitz GV 496-7. Audiat BCH LVI (1932) 299 f., other bibliography in Powell o.c.). Its language is reminiscent of these verses (cf. l. 3 γαῖας μεσόμψαλον (κύκλον?)... κατέχουσα l. 5 ναὸν ἐν ὑπόστηλον Φοιβοῦ χορεύεις l. xii δίδον... ἡμᾶς... ἄμφι σάν θυμέλαν χορεύειν. cf. h. hom. Hest. l. 1-2 Ἄστιῃ Ἠ ἔν τε ἄνακτος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτωτο | Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγαθεὶ ἱερὸν δόμον ἄμφιπολεῖς. Little else is known of her cult at Delphi. SIG 826 col. II l. 14 = F. de D. III 278 col. B includes her in the Amphictyonic oath with Apollo, Leto and Artemis (Roman). At Delos (cf. Roussel "Hestia à l'omphalos", Rev. Arch. (1911, II), 86f. an inventory from the second period of Athenian occupation) mentions a representation ἐν' ᾧ ὁμφαλῷ καθημένην, of some interest here. No votive offerings in her name are known at Delphi: she is formally honoured by the *stephanephoroί* at Delos (BCH XXXIV (1910), p. 392). SEG XIX 515 l. 3 (Inscriptions de Délos p. 38) has a votive of the third century BC, SEG XXXI 728, 9 two from the second. Cults are known in honour of both at various parts of the Greek world, doubtless offshoots of Delphi.

468: The idea of these not undistinguished deities "supplicating" may seem strange. Actually, vase paintings show innumerable scenes of gods and goddesses in positions of prayer, and arrangements on Olympus were in any case hierarchical. A well known literary example is the actions of Thetis in *Il. I* 500 f. It is well known in oriental art too.¹

469: πολλαίον: Obviously not a revision of the ancestry already given, and Owen need not have raised the question. Like Latin *antiqus* it can perfectly well express a tone of admiration with no implications as to time. Cf. *Il. VI* 215 ξένος S. *Tr. 263* ξένον πολλαίον δόντα (Eurytus) E. *Alc. 212* σὺ δ’ εἶ πολλαίοις δεσπόταις ἐμοὶς φίλος (the θεράπαινα to the *choregos* (presumably), on the arrival of the chorus).

470: εὔτεκνία. Apparently a Euripidean invention. The passage resembles Phaethon 1. 115. Diggle = fr. 773 70f. N.:

κηρύσσων δ’ ὁσίων βασιλήιονν, | αὐτῷ δ’ αὐθὸν δ’
εὔτεκνίαν τε γόμοις, ὃν ἓξοδος | ἄδ’ ἐνεχ’ ἦκει,  
παιδὸς πατρὸς τε τῆδ’ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ λέχη  
κράναι θελόντων ἀλλὰ οὐγ’ ἐστώ λέως.

whatever else may be wrong with the text at this point: cf. too E. *Su. 66*  

ὦστ’ εὔτεκνία δυστυχίαν τὸν παρ’ ἐμοὶ καθελεῖν, cf. 955.

¹This is a possible interpretation: it requires ἰκετέω to bear the unexampled sense of "intercede" (thus Grégoire). κόρη is a respectable title for a goddess, and in specific circumstances groups of goddesses are so termed in poetry: Phorcidês, *PV 794*, Furies, *Eum. 68*, Nereids, A. fr. 174 Radt ap. schol. Ar. *Ach. 883*, E. *Tro. 561* of Pallas etc. But these are specific groups - the action of ἰκετέα one might feel is the one that the chorus should undertake. For iconographic examples of Artemis apparently involved in a sort of cultic ἰκετέα (the "opfernde Götter" so common a motif in oriental art), see *LIMC* "Artemis" 966-1011, for Athena *LIMC* "Athena" 574f. most notably 582 if correctly interpreted; the great Athena in Promachos guise stands bowed with her helmet in her hand before a small altar.
The emendation to the difficult corruption in Phaethon are collected by Diggle: the main point of agreement is that the basic sense of Festugière’s αίτείν δ’ αὐτήν ἐσθλοῦν δὲν φῦναι γῶνον. is the one required.

470-1: χρονίσου καθαροῖς μαντεύμασι κύροσι. χρονίσου will mean "long delayed" as Owen points out (cf. Ion 1615). Thus Od. XVII 112 ἐλθόντα χρόνιον S. Ph. 1446 χρόνιος τε φανείς (see Jebb ad loc.) and on OC 441 ἥλαυνε μ’ ἕκ γῆς χρόνιον "after all that time", etc.

καθαροῖς: Not so much "morally pure" here though doubtless that tone is present: rather "free from falsehood". Cf. E. Rhes. 34f. τὰ μὲν ἄργελλεις δείμωτοι ἄκουονην, τὰ δὲ θαρσύνεις, κούδὲν καθαρῶς... πολλὰ γὰρ εἰπὼν ὦ οὐδὲν τρανῶς ἀπέδειξας.


The direct, impassioned prayer of the chorus for the fortunes of their mistress is now finished: in the antistrope they pass on to general reflections, and the mood alters.¹

¹Cf. Kranz, Stasimon, 248f., 251. His admirable observations on the "progress of thought" technique - from specific to general - are perhaps a little vitiated by the insistence that this is a feature of "das neue Lied", for which, apparently, we have Euripides to thank, in his later period. This type of theory, ever unsafe in itself, is particularly unreliable in the case of Euripides. His birth is generally placed circa 481, we know that his first victory was in 455, and his first extant tragedy, Alcestis, dates from 438. Thus he is hardly in his first youth by his next known dated work, Medea (431) where "das neue Lied" and other great sophistications are fully in evidence. Unless reasonably generous finds of, for example, Peliades, Cressae, Alcmaeon through Psophis or Telephus are forthcoming, there is little point speculating about Euripides’ earlier dramatic technique and how he might have refined upon it.
472f. Introduction

The servants praise the joy of having children and therewith a source of security and family continuity. In so doing, it has been observed, they express desires of their own that could not in Athenian law be realised. There is much pathos in 485f. (ἐμοὶ μὲν πλοῦτου τε πάρος | βασιλικῶν τ’ εἶνεν θαλάμων | τροφαί κήδειοι) and in the last words (490f. μετὰ δὲ κτενῶν μετρίων βιοτάς | εὐπαιδός ἔχομαι). There is no hope of βασιλικοὶ θάλαμοι and κτένα μέτρια is the highest good fortune they could aspire to, not a concession on their part. πλοῦτος (478), is out of the question and slaves could not inherit according to family law, so διωδέκτωρ is inappropriate.

There is a certain irony in the reference to βασιλικοὶ θάλαμοι inasmuch as the chorus, being δορῆληπτοι, are in a sense partakers in such institutions. However the general background to this disclaimer will be that of Archilochus (fr. 19 West) οὐ τὴν ἔργω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει, | οὐδ' εἶλε πώ με ἔμοι ἁγίομαι | θεῶν ἔργα, μεγάλης δ' οὐκ ἐρέω τυροννίδος and doubtless many other gnomic utterances lost to us. This, we are told, was also put in the mouth of a τέκτων, and is therefore impossible in a rather similar way.

The question must dog the commentator: is Euripides thinking along lines such as these, or is her merely letting the chorus step out of character in a relatively uninteresting way? In 585f. Ion seems to do this, as has been noted, in his discussion of the way of life metics enjoy at Athens ("a discussion of Athenian politics little in keeping with his years or the fact that he did not know Athens" (Owen)). The Supplices is a rich hoard of such rhetorical anachronism. The famous observation of Aristotle (Poet. 1456a 25 καὶ τὸν χορὸν δὲ ἐνα δει υπολαβεῖν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν καὶ μορίαν εἶναι τοῦ δόλου καὶ συναγωνιζεσθαι) might be borne in mind in this connection, and his strictures on Euripides' transgressions of this rule, of which this might be a case in point.
Commentary

ὑπερβόλειν: The verb, here and elsewhere is used as an intransitive adjectival participle, though it usually has a pejorative sense ("excessive"). Thus Pers. 291 for the indicative thus used ὑπερβόλει γὰρ ἤδε συμφορά, E. Ba. 785 (Pentheus of the conduct of the women) οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ὑπερβόλει τάδε | εἰ πρὸς γυναικῶν πεισόμεθα', Thuc. VII 67 κοκών etc.1 Its usage in Ar. EN 1108 b 17, though classed as "abs." by LSJ, is rather comparative, as πρὸς τὰς ἠλεείψεις shows. From Plut. Mor. 616D we learn of a composition by Thrasymachus known as Ὑπερβόλελλοντες Δόγοι (= 78 B 7 D.-K.). This, as Plutarch l.c. indicates, was a set of sophisms designed to defeat (ὑπερβόλειν) all comers, so inapplicable - the proper analogy will be the Κατοβόλελλοντες Δόγοι of Protagoras (= 80 B 1 D.-K.).

The two Euripidean exx. that do seem to provide a parallel for the abs. use in the favourable sense that we find here are both in different ways problematic. At Alc. 153f.

τι χρὴ γενέσθαι τὴν ὑπερβεβλημένην γυναῖκας; πῶς δ' ἄν μᾶλλον ἐνδεικτό τις πόσιν προτιμώσῃ ή θέλουσῃ ὑπερθονεῖν;

the meaning has been called into question: what compliment is the servant paying Alcestis? If the ὑπερβεβλημένη γυνὴ is Alcestis herself, it becomes difficult to translate τι χρὴ γενέσθαι (though this is how LSJ take it). The alternative is something along the lines of "what must the woman do who excels Alcestr's in virtue?".2 Even so, the first three words remain difficult. It is of little help to refer to Pl. Rep. 558b ως εἰ μὴ τὴν ὑπερβεβλημένην φύσιν ἔχουσιν, οὐπότε' ἄν γένοιτο ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός because of the difficulty mentioned and because of the oddity of the Platonic text itself: the middle and the choice of verb in prose and in this context are perplexing: possibly ὑπὲρ τὸ βέβηλον. This would accord with the usage of this adjective at Symp. 218 b 10 οὐ τε οἰκέται καὶ εἰ τὰς ἄλλας έστιν βέβηλος τε καὶ ἀγρουκός. Attention to the first three words seems requisite (such as Broadhead’s λέγεσθαι, adopted by Diggle).3 τὸ μή οὐ (Lenting) or τὸ μὴ (Dawe) produces an unnatural

1Unless we read αὐτοῖς for αὐτοῖς, which is curious.

2which is obtained by τίς χρὴ. However the context indicate that Alcestis is the specific instance.

3that is: "what ought the surpassing woman (Alcestis) be called?" (Conacher).
word order. We might consider ταύτην for τί χρή uniting this with the preceding clause i.e. ἐναντιώσεται, and clarifying who is the subject. τὴνδ' (Dale) is intended to provide this specification but the word order prevents it from being a predicative phrase with ὑπερβεβλημένην.

The second passage, HF 696f., though there is textual uncertainty, is evidently to the point.

Δίδος ὁ παῖς· τὰς δ' εὐγενίας
πλέον ὑπερβάλλει ἀρετὴν ἐν εὐγενίᾳ: Heracles excels even more in ἀρετή than in birth". It is true that ἀρετή is an exact parallel to εὐγενία and one can tolerate the vague πλέον with the genitive ("even more than his nobility i.e. the fact that he was noble"). However it is a curious thing to say: blasphemous one might think. How can he be said to surpass his divine origin by a mere mortal characteristic? And is there in the Greek view a valid distinction between εὐγενία and ἀρετή? I should like to suggest instead a supplement along the lines of <θεόθεν> with the sense "rising above the very peak that would be expected of his noble birth". So taken, the εὐγενία is the central focus and the disrespectful contrast is very much palliated.

There is no difficulty with Plato Lg. 945 C 1: ῥῴδιον μὲν οὕδαμος εὐρεῖν τῶν ἀρχόντων ἄρχοντα ὑπερβάλλοντα πρὸς ἀρετήν, ὅμως δὲ πειρατέον εὐθυντάς τινας ἀνευρίσκειν θέλουσ. In Lg 719 d the company of ἔλλειπουσα, μετρία indicates that the sense is comparative.

474: ἀκτήνητον ἀφορμᾶν. Financial imagery, odd in a certain sense, in that the metaphor is shortly to be converted to reality (διαδεκτορά κτλ.) On this technique - revealing what is in the character’s mind before it emerges - cf. S. Barlow, The Imagery of Euripides (1986), 51f. ἀφορμή: Cf. LSJ IV. Xen. Mem. II 7 12 uses the word in the literal sense of a banker’s capital: for a more general application cf. Lys. XXIV 24 ἄλλα· οὐ ταῖς τοιοῦταις ἀφορμαῖς τοῦ βίου... τυχάνων χρώμενον ("resources"). It is tempting to associate ἀκτήνητος with its meaning in property law ("reality"), though we must wait until Olympiodorus (FHG IV p. 458 D.) for an example in literature. However, the simple verb is so used in Classical Greek: Thuc. II 24 (of the Acropolis fund) ἦν δὲ τὰς εὗρη ἡ ἐπιτηψίου κινεῖν τὰ χρήματα ταῦτα

---

1in that τήν.. γυναῖκα remains a generality.
But this is not, as we now know, an especially good example: the change of idea from the antecedent to the relative is extremely difficult and in itself suggests a lacuna after 164. However we also have the "assistance" of the very fragmentary P. Hibeh 179 which offers a text with alarming divergencies from L at this point, suggesting that much may be wrong with our text: in the immediate vicinity (after 157) there may have been two lines unknown to us: 2

157 ἐδοξάσαν ως[θεν δίχας
]οςας πεδά

and if the reconstruction of the order is correct (R. Kannicht, ZPE XXI (1976), 117f.) and fr. ii col. ii continues with something approximating to 197f. of this speech, there is fresh cause for alarm as it consists of parts of five lines wholly unknown to us. Kannicht suggests that what we may have is an alternative version of Amphitryon's speech about archery: an alternative possibility is that it, or whatever stood after 157, stood after 164 and filled in the sense of a passage that seems on its own merits more than likely to have suffered loss. 3

A clearer example is Hel. 271f. κοι τότο μεῦσον τής ἀληθείας κακῶν | ὅσως τὰ

1 An παρεπέμψαντο?

2 L. 3 is probably a version of 159 with simplified word order. It is conceivable that l. 2 could be l. 160 (Ἄλθε οἶδας τὸ θὸς) misplaced. This, with the dots indicated, is the version of the ed. princ. (Turner): Kannicht l.c. is inclined to normalize towards L.

3 Other bibliography on this papyrus in Diggle, ZPE XXIV (1977), 294.
μὴ προσόντα κέκτηται κακά where an infinitive might have been expected in the second line. Pho. 509 ἀνανδρία γαρ, τὸ πλέον δοτις ἀπολέσας | τοῦλπασον ἔλαβε. Cf. K.-G. 2 p. 441 (d). The idea goes back to Homer (II. XIV 81 βέλτερον δς φεύγων προφύγη κακὸν ἥ ἄλωσι cf. Hes. OD 327 ἵσον δις θ’ ἱκέτην, δς το ξεῖνον κακὸν ἔρξῃ. A comic example is Ar. Thesm. 177: σοφοῦ πρὸς ἄνδρος, δοτις ἐν βραχεὶ | πολλοῦς καλῶς οἶδες 
tε συντέμνειν λόγους

Other Euripidean examples are: IT 606f., Tro. 1166, Hel. 267, Andr. 184f., Hel. 942-3 (a long example), Su. 312f. (with δοτιν), Tro. 648f., Phaethon fr. 783 Nauck = 160-2 Diggle ἐν τοῖς μώροις τούτ’ ἐγὼ κρίνω βροτῶν | δοτις † τῶν παστέρων † παιοὶ μη θρονούσιν εὖ |... παραδίδωσι

ποτρίσια l. 162 Diggle, nisi τα τοκεών legere vis, articulum quaerens.1

Fr. 1056 2 συμφορα δ’ δς ἐν τῷ χη | κακῆς γυναικῆς, εὐτυχεῖ δ’ ἐσθλῆς τυχῶν.

It is in common with prose: cf. Thuc. VI 16 οὐκ ἰχθυστος ἤδ’ ἡ ἀνοία, δς ἄν... 
tήν πόλιν ὀφελη cf. VI 14, Xen. Hell. II 3 51 etc.

See Bond on the HF quotation first quoted: Diggle on Phaethon loc cit.

καρποτρόφοι: This adjective in this application has caused considerable difficulty.

It might be thought that the parents are the ones who were to be seen as the nurturers at this point in the argument: hence Badham altered it to καρποτρόφοις, as did Dobree with the further change to καρποφόροις or κουρσότροφοις: Musgrave used the latter in the nominative - and in fine Diggle places Dobree’s καρποφόροι in the nominative plural. Wilamowitz gives effectively the same explanation as Owen. It might be supposed that the review of three generations, which troubled Badham, could also be averted by understanding

1Diggle - p. 130 - compares for the omission Tro. 1192 πατρίων οὐ λαχῶν ἔξεις κτλ. Menander fr. 577. This is convincing, as the words are "associative" in context and do not require the further specification of the article.
καρπότροφος so accented in two parts "children (reared) as children". However an example of this where the first element is a noun and expressing an idea not immediately to be deduced, in the face of the many standard combinations in existence, is wanting - e.g. λευκότροφος "white" (Ar. Av. 1100) χλοερότροφος ("green")¹ E. Pho. 826, καλότροφος, όμότροφος, αγρότροφος etc.

There seems no difficulty in the logic; it merely requires a moment's thought. In a fashion familiar from Aeschylus, Euripides goes on to clarify his conceit in ἐτέρους ἐπὶ τέκνους and that in itself should be sufficient to guarantee the nominative here with ἔξοντες.

The Diggle version καρποφόροι is a small but subtle improvement on the paradosis: τρόφου tends to make one think of the actual process of nurture, not the potentiality. καρποφόρος has no more claim than καρποτρόφος to be used regularly of people, though in both cases one feels that the metaphor requires little pondering, any more than "fruitful" so used would in English. καρποφόρος is used of Demeter (Ar. Ran. 384), for obvious reasons.

In explaining καρποτρόφοι in both its elements, the most important point is not the suffix, but the fact that children can be referred to as καρποί in Greek.

The disputed passage Ion 921 describing the birth of Apollo on Delos must obviously be discussed in conjunction with our passage:

ἔνθα λοχεύματα σέμν᾽ ἐλοχέυσατο

λατώ Δίου σε καρποῖς.

Finding καρποῖς ("the fact of having children" = "children") unduly obscure, Kirchhoff conjectured κάποις. In defence of this change might be cited S. fr. 320 Radt ἐν Δίῳς κήποις

¹Probably to be accented thus.
However this is as likely to refer to the Garden of the Hesperides (so Pearson). Here, if read, it would refer to the miraculous garden that Zeus caused to grow up to shelter Leto from the sun (cf. Call. h. Del. 260).

However this is not necessary. If one can say ἄλλης γυναικὸς παῖδας ἐκκαρποῦμενος (Ion 815) the transference is perfectly possible. Owen quite correctly defends the transmitted text: "the process rather than the result is thought of". It would almost be sufficient to cite as a parallel for the phrase AP X 16 1f., a beautiful spring time poem by Theaetetus Scholasticus, writing in the mid sixth century ("the golden flowering of Greek poetry which illuminates the age of Justinian"):

"Ἡνὴ καλλωπέτηλον ἐπ’ εὐκάρποισι λοχείαις
λήτων ἐκ ροδῶν ἄνθοφορεῖ καλύκων:"

(On this poet, whose name appears in an academic context in the scholia to Theocritus and as author of some grammatical treatises, see A. and A. Cameron, "The Cycle of Agathias", JHS LXXXVI (1966), 6f.

eὐκαρπία is known in this context as early as h. Hom. XXX 5: ἐκ σεό δ’ εὐπαιδές τε καὶ εὐκαρποὶ τελέθουσι. The analogy is obvious: the 'ancient' ritual hymn quoted by Pausanias X 12 10 from Dodona has Γά καρποῦς ἀνίειδιο κληζέτητε Ματέρα γαῖαν. A

1 As is the text. εὐδαίμονας (acc.) might be considered, as the subject of the infinitive.

2 ἐπὶ = 'in the process/business of'.

3 The poem is written in a fine style and Homeric allusions abound. The usual spectre of date arises: is it Hellenistic? The hapax ἡθὴμεθλος and the probable reading in l. 14 φερεσανθέσεν together with the borrowings from the Hymn to Demeter, so popular in the Hellenistic Age (cf. Richardson, The Homeric Hymn to Demeter (1973), p. 69 n. 1) and a 'romanticism' of tone may suggest it to some.

4 Ταίον ἄνθοτρόφον, Powell CA p. 163 21.
gloss in Hesychius καρπεῖν: πλημύττειν if we derive the verb from πλήμων = πλείων may add another instance of the meaning "be productive". Apollo, in his capacity as patron of the ephebes presumably, is called καρπογόνος in a long anonymous "alphabetic" hymn at AP IX 525. E. fr. 571 3 N. uses the figure of speech to produce an oxymoron: ἀπαύδια καρποῦσθαι βίον. An exact parallel for parents being καρποτρόφοι is provided by the expression, common in tragedy, φυτουργὸς πατήρ (A. Su. 592, OT 1482, and even ὁ φυτουργὸς on its own as in E. Tro. 481). φυτὸν is used metaphorically of a person (Χαρίτων). Theoec. XXVIII 7.

For actual formation, καρπολόχος, which is a certa coniectura for ΚΑΡΠΟΔΟΧΟΣ in an epigram to Demeter (AP XII 225. 3), is an exact parallel, matching κουροτρόφος and καρποτρόφος of the goddess. One might add the following: Simonides fr. 508 PMG παιδοτρόφος Page (the ὦρα that prompts the halcyon to nest), S. OC 701 γλαυκός παιδοτρόφος φόλλον ἐλαίας. There seems to be no difficulty in the textus receptus, as far as the choice of adjective is concerned (see next note).

λάμπωσι νεάνιδες ἦβαλ: λάμπειν is a natural way of expressing the bloom of youth. Closely similar is E. fr. 282 l. 10 f. N. (the speech on athletes from Autolycus satyricus): λαμπρόι δ' ἐν ἠβη καὶ πόλεως ὁγάλματα | φωτώσι; Thuc. VI 54 refers to Harmodius ὦρα ἠλίκτος λαμπροῦ. Cf. S. Tr. 379 (Deianeira of Iole) ἦ κάρτα λαμπρά καὶ κατ' ἀμμα καὶ φύσιν. Orestes is λαμπρός at the races (S. El. 685): likewise Electra laments δόμων δὲ σ' ὡ πολ', λαμπρόν ἐξέπεμψ' ἐγὼ at 1130.

νεάνιδες ἦβαλ: Here a serious difficulty arises: how can we account for this extraordinary locution with ἦβαλ in the plural? It occurs only here in Greek literature and in its abstract, often collective sense does not seem to fall into the category of nouns that can take a "distributive" plural LSJ II 3 might be a better place to put it than where it is now as
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presumably we shall have to explain it, if we do, as in some way approximating to the
collective sense, like A. Pers. 512 φιλτάτην ἣβην χθονός. But it is not quite the same, nor
appropriate.

Not surprisingly, similar instances of plural nouns in -μα abound (and -εῖα (S. Ant.
568 νυμφεῖα) likewise). But it is very closely confined to the established poetic trope of
referring periphrastically to one person with a neuter formation of the thing they would really
be if the correct gender was used. This point is amply illustrated by the list in Breitenbach,
178.1

But there is no singular sense of ἥβη to which we can appeal. The well known
Homer locution of "instances of" certain forms of conduct (μεθημοσύνης τε λαόν II. XIII
108) is hardly comparable ("instances of youth" is nonsense). Cf. K.-G. 1 16f. τὸ νεόξων
is used in a figurative sense in S. Tr. 144 where Deianira is speaking of herself: ἥδονατ (147)
implies that if φυτῶν were intended to be understood, the floral conceit in which it is placed
has been temporarily forgotten. However the use of the neuter singular in this way is familiar
from prose too.

One expects a collective meaning from a feminine abstract noun used concretely. This
is the main problem. ἀκμῇ is always collective when used of persons (cf. S. OC 1066 δεινά
δὲ Θησείδαν ἀκμᾶ). ἥλικτα is also collective. ὧρα is indeed personified in Pind. Nem.
VIII 1 no doubt assisted by the better known personification of the goddess Hebe not to
mention the real existence of the ὧρα. The best poetic parallel seems to be the use of
γενεά to mean both generation and one member of that generation i.e. off-spring. Thus Il.

---

1'Poetic' plurals and 'simple' plurals (δόματα, χρήματα) are of course in different
categories: we are concerned with the former here.
XXII 191 Διὸς γενεὴ of Achilles speaking of himself.\(^1\) In Pind. Pyth. IV 136: τῶν δ’ ἀκούσας αὖτὸς ὑπαινίασαν | Τυροῦς ἐρασιλοκάμου γενεὰ = Peleas (note the constructio ad sensum with αὖτὸς) Isthm. VIII 67 τὸν μὲν οὖ κατελέγχει κρυτοῦ γενεὰ | πατραδελφεὺ (Nicocles, cousin of Cleander), (Phylacides) etc. Various attempts have been made on Aj. 187f. κλεπτουσι μόθουσ οἱ μεγάλοι βασιλῆς | ἣ τὰς ἄχρωνον Σινοῦβδὰν γενεὰς† The editors of the Oxford text adopt Morstadt’s χῶ for ἣ to avoid the hanging genitive: other possibilities include Σινοῦβδας (Hartung) and ἡ παῖς Johnson (Reiske). The γρ. in the scholia Σινοῦβδα would be of the same camp - but is obvious nonsense as Anticleia is in question. What is required in primis in an article, and Morstadt is surely right. Odysseus is (as the post-Homeric tradition has it) οὐκαπολητὸς Σινοῦβου Λαερτίῳ S. Ph. 417. E. Or. 1233 certainly has Pylades addressing Agamemnon as σὺγγενής - in 733 the same word = σὺγγενενεῖς. One might argue (a) that this is a logical derivative from the usage of γενεὰ just reviewed, in its own turn derivative on γένος (b) that a family term is more readily understood in this dual application ("seed" in English) (c) that γενεὰ is well attested thus, as ἢβη is not.

In IA 285 Φιλέως λόχευμα = παῖς; it takes its flavour from the more familiar use of ὀδὸς. Other uses of the poetic plural are irrelevant. They all boil down to references in the plural to abstracts that either are, or could be, divided into particular instances at particular times. (μεθημὸσυνα, τεκτὸσυνα, φόβοι, ἐρωτες etc.) ἢβη in the logic of any language is a continuum: the "distributive" use is simply not thinkable.

It is clear that there is no adequate parallel for ἢβαι here.

I suggest we restore the collective singular, which is evidently what the sense requires, as follows:

\(^1\)And of others, admittedly.
The plural verb and following participle will of course be κοιτά σύνεσων. For such interlacing of number in word order cf. Ag., quoted below, and for parallel for both verb and adjective being so taken with a collective noun cf. A. Ag. 577 Τροίων ἔλοντες δὴ πότ' Ἀργείων στόλος... ἑπασσάλευσον κτλ. What is important in this is the restoration of the singular ἣβα. If the latter is 'concrete' i.e. refers to specific people, like the ἥβη χθονὸς of A. Pers. 512 then it must by all analogy be collective, leading, with the transmitted plural, to a collectivity of collectives, hardly what we desire when a reference to a group of young people is all that is needed (as in Pers.). If it is abstract we are faced with a translation "specimens of youth" - which is sense neither in English, Greek or common logic. There I rest my case. I do not for a moment pretend that the rest of my proposal is, with any certainty, Euripides' ipsissima verba. Paul Maas often spoke of a "diagnostic conjecture" - and all I pretend to have done here is point up a difficulty which I believe calls for treatment.

The ἐτὶ will imply only continuity: very similar is Od. XIV 325 καὶ νῦ κεν ἐς δεκάτην γενεὰν ἐτερὸν γ' ἐτὶ βόσκοι where one generation is seen as following on one from another over a long period of time (the king of Thesprotia in Odysseus' μόθος to Eumaeus about Odysseus' alleged wealth).

478-90: διαδέκτορα πλούτον

ως ἔξοντες ἐκ πατέρων

ἐτέρως ἐπὶ τέκνως.

διαδέκτορα: The wealth is said to inherit those who inherit it. The inversion of thought is
quite in accord with poetical diction, and LSJ are in error to take this instance, its only appearance as an adjective, as passive, a possibility that the formation of the word renders impossible. For the inversion cf. Hipp. 151 ʰί πόσον | ... πομαίνει τις ἐν οἴκους | κρυπτεῖ κοῦτα. At IT 1116 βωμοί are described as μηλοθύται. Tro. 263 πόλος etc. The common quasi personification of πλοῦτος, like Τώξη or πάλος, renders this even easier: the former is seen often as something present and constantly accompanying one in an active sense, rather like one's own αἰών.¹ This is all of the same camp.

-τωρ terminations are in all cases confined to what were originally nomina actionis (cf. in primis Schwyzer GG I 530f., Ernst Fraenkel, NA I, 77 n. 1).

Thus the only other usage of the word is as a noun meaning "inheritor", also in a metaphorical sense (Manetho Astrologus iv 223). Cf. Eum. 204 καίπειθ' ὑπέστης αἴματος δέκτωρ νέου (the Erinyes to Apollo - "you then took upon yourself the stain of new blood") - obviously of action. "Apollon bestätigt dies, indem er die Art und Weise (durch das Imperfekt) näher angibt" (Blass ad loc.). The cognate δεκτήρ (found in inscriptions: - "the receiver") and the hapax δεκτης (Od. IV 248) are active in sense. Likewise the compound ἐκδέκτωρ as in A. fr. 189a R. δους ἀντίδουλα καὶ πόνων ἐκδεκτορα which is a parallel - if one were needed in the face of the common διάδοχος + gen. - for the genitive here. The same applies to the late Greek compounds in ἐπι-, ἐπι, οἴκο-. It should not be necessary to point all this out were it not for the erroneous entry in the dictionary.

The close relationship with Latin -or terminations is obvious. Certain nouns in -ηρ (i.e. κρυπτήρ) lose a precise active sense by fossilization: I am not aware of any nouns in -ωρ which could bear other than an active meaning. Hesychius ἀθάκτορας: ἀνεπάθος παρθένους might seem to offer one (Ἰὸν Εὐρυτίδος) from Ion of Chios fr. 53 von Blumenthal. Bentley restored grammar and metre with ἀθάκτος κροας (dochmius).

¹A. Ag. 107 cf. S. fr. 950 Radt νοῦς however we take θεῖα at the start of l 2) Pearson on the latter passage. Fraenkel on the former.

The simple δέχομαι may be used of places, and this may be a remnant of a popular parlance, to judge by the conjunction of Pl. *Lg.* 747E τόποι τοὺς ἀεὶ κατοικουμένους ἕλει δεχόμενοι with the same expression in SIG 344 10. Cf. Hdt. VII 176, Pind. *Pyth.* iv 70: τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας | τίς δὲ κινδύνους κρατεροῖς ἀδέσμαντος δῆσεν ἄλοις.

With ἐκδέχομαι cf. Hdt. IV 1 τοὺς Σκύθας... ἐξεδέχετο σύν ἔλάσσων πόνος. The intransitive usage is also relevant for the metaphor: *Il.* xix 290 δέχεται κακὸν ἐκ κακοῦ αἰτεῖ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς. B 115 12 D.-K. ἄλλος ἐξ ἄλλου δέχεται (of places of exile for the exiled daemons).

διαδέχομαι is used of the *inheritor* in Luc. *D. Mort.* 11 3.

ἐπεροῦς ἐπὶ τέκνους: The use of the preposition is of interest - one feels that the root meaning is "on the basis/condition of" i.e. regarding wealth as a type of insurance for the state of affairs of having other children. The financial metaphor that we have already commented on at the start may be relevant: cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* ix 1 δανεὶζεν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι ΛΣΙ III 4.

481-4: ἀλκά τε γὰρ ἐν κακοῖς

σὺν τ’ εὐτυχίας φίλον

dορὶ τε γὰρ πατρίλι φέρει

σωτήριον ἀλκάν.

The appearance of ἀλκά at beginning and end of this sequence is curious and has prompted much emendation. Owen defends the transmitted text with the argument "as heir creates heir, so ἀλκή creates ἀλκή". This is specious: an heir creates other heirs apart from himself - ἀλκή here is that of the same group of people being applied to a different end. There is no question of generation.

Nor does there seem to be any other recognisable point in the anaphora. War is presumably numbered among κακά (481) so there is no contrast such as there would be for example if good fortune and εὐτυχία were being contrasted with evil fortune. Instead we
have: ill fortune -> good fortune -> an instance of the former.

Attention has mostly concentrated on the latter example of ἀλχή in 484. I shall go on to show that this is mistaken.

Wilamowitz speaks of "eine volle Tautologie" and, comparing HF 436 εἰ δ’ ἐγὼ σθένος ἦβων | δόρυ τ’ ἐπαλλον ἐν αἰχμῇ, suggests αἰχμᾶν in 484 - "Dennoch trifft die Änderung zu, αἰχμῆ ist hier die Lanzenspitze, δόρυ der Schaft, was es ja eigentlich ist, und οὐσήμον ἀἰχμᾶν periphrasiert σωτηριακ with jener Abundanz der im allgemeinen zu Syonymen gewordenen Worte, für die zum Herakles schon Hec. 102 λόγχης αἰχμῆ δοριθηροτος angeführt war". This is of course perfectly true. Ahrens (Philologus Supplementband I (1860), 530f.) went as far as to suggest that in αἰχμῆ (in the sense that Wilamowitz desiderates) we have two separate words: contra Fraenkel on Ag. 483 ("The transition is a simple one from the designation of the weapon to the meaning 'rule', especially in elevated style"). This is borne out by such usages as E. Hipp. 975 μῆτ’ εἰς δόρους γῆς ἢς ἐμὸν κρατεῖ δόρυ where δόρυ stands for "rule". Of the suggested emendations to 484 Wilamowitz’ is far the best.

Herwerden and Grégoire wish to continue the imagery of λάμπωσι, the former suggesting ἁγλασν, the latter ἁγγᾶν. This draws support form the common Epic turn of φῶς representing "salvation" (and biblical "a light to lighten the Gentiles", Luke ch. II v. 32. φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δύναν λαοῦ σοῦ Ισραήλ. Cf. trag. adesp. fr. 9 N. (Σκύριοι) the rebuke administered by Odysseus to Achilles in disguise: σο δ’, ὦ τὸ λαμπτρὸν φῶς ἀποσβεννὸς γένους | ξοίνειςἀριστου πατρὸς ’Ελλήνων γεγός (E. fr. 683a in Kannicht’s forthcoming volume of TGF), E. Hec. 841 ὦ δέσποτ’, ὦ μεγιστον Ἠλλήνου φάος, S. El. 1224, and the rather remarkable parallel to the biblical usage in S. El. 65f. δός κεμ’ ἐπανχώ.
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Neither of the suggested emendations which accord with palaeography are used metaphorically in quite this sense. It seems to have occurred to no one that if ἀλκάν in 484 is a result of accidental repetition, the emender has freedom to put in whatever metrical word he pleases with no thought for the appearance of the letters. And this is obviously a more likely explanation of such a corruption: is it plausible that the scribe, having just read ἀλκά in 481 would be tempted not to repeat it mechanically, (which is what one expects), but to alter a word that looks vaguely similar? Verrall’s ἀκμάν maintains the "volle Tautologie".

But σωτήριος ἀλκά must stand. Cf. the following: (taking instances of δόρυ, ἀλκά and σωτήριος together). A. Eum. 776f. πάλαιομα... σωτηρίων τε καὶ δορὸς νυκτήρον E. fr. 298 2 N. όδ' ἄν ἐκ μυθρός κακῆς | ἐσθολοὶ γένοντο παίδες εἰς ἀλκήν δορός, Held. 759 πόλιν ὡς Μυκήνας | εὐδαίμονα καὶ δορός | πολυαινετὸν ἀλκᾶ, Held. 815 ἐλθεῖν ἐκόλομητο' ἐγγὺς ἀλκίμου δορός (cf. fr. 243 N.), Pho. 1098, Pho. 1363 μονομάχου τ' ἀλκήν δορός, HF 194, S. Ph. 1151 τάν πρόσθεν βελέων ἀλκάν. A. Cho. 236 ὧ... δακρυτὸς ἑλπίς στέρματος σωτηρίου | ἀλκή πεποιθῶς δῶμ' ἀνακτήσει πατρός, Ar. Nu. 1158 οἷος ἐμοὶ τρέφεται | τοῖσιν' ἐν δάμασι παίζ' ἀμφήκει γλώττῃ λάμπων | πρόβολος ἐμὸς, σωτήρ δῶμοις, ἐχθροῖς βλάβη, | λυσονίας πατρίφων μεγάλων κακῶν.2

Thus attention must be turned to 481. What I believe to be the truth has been suggested privily by Dawe and Willink - Diggle is quite right to adopt it:

ἀλκάρ τε γὰρ ἐν κακοίς

---

1 The allusion to the baneful Σείριος is doubtless relevant - further confirmed by the remarkable phraseology of Timotheus Persae l. 179: (Xerxes) ἰώ κοσσακαφεῖ δόμων | σείριαι τε ναῖς Ἑλλανίδες.

2 E. Peleus is mentioned inter alia by the Σ. "The words are highly tragic" (Dover). Ion, if we had a date, would be no less relevant.
σὺν τ᾽ εὐτυχίας φίλον

αλκαρ has good credentials. Relevant is h. Hom. Ap. 193 θανάτου τ᾽ ἄκος καὶ γήρας
αλκαρ - (unable to be found in the state of mortality): E. Tro. 588 - βοῷς τὸν παρ᾽ Αἴδα
παῖδ᾽ ἐμὸν ὧ μελέα - σὰς δόμαρτος ἀλκαρ.

It recurs in a somewhat different context in a fragment of Heliodorus of Athens (= SH
472 5ff.), a poem possibly entitled Ἰταλικὰ Θεάματα and concerning the medicinal
properties of the lake on the mountain Leucogaeus near Naples: κεῖνο πολυστάφυλοι
περινεάται ἀνέρες ὄδωρ | δοσων ἀλκαρ ἔχουσιν (it should appear in the next edition of
LSJ). It is known (often with the genitive) from Callimachus fr. 186 l. 29, A.R. II 1074 and
Opp. Hal. I 46 and from Homer (II. V 644 etc.) and the lyric poets (Pind. Pyth. X 52 etc.).
Note too Call. fr. 304 2 P = Hecale fr. 46 Hollis with gen. of a petasos: other examples of
this periphrasis in Hollis ad loc.

The advantages of reading this relatively rare word in 481 go without saying: with
ἄλκα the phrase with the change of gender ("strength in adversity and a good thing in
prosperity") is alarming. With the neuter noun proposed these difficulties vanish. φίλον
agrees with ἀλκαρ in emphatic predicative position at the end of its clause.

Biehl evidently has National Service on his mind to judge by his parallels: he cites,
from the Erechtheus, fr. 360 14f. Ν. ἔπειτα τέκνα τοῦθ᾽ ἔκατε τίκτομεν | ὡς θεῶν τε
βωμοὺς ποτρίδα τε ὑφώμεθα and Catullus LXI 71f.

Nulla quit sine domus / liberos dare, nec parentes / stirpe nitier; at potest / te volente. Quis
huic deo / compararier ausit?

Quae tuis careat sacrīs / non queat dare praesides / terra finibus; at queat / te volente. Quis
huic deo / compararier ausit?".

The former citation is not especially apt, as it forms part of the chain of reasoning
whereby Praxitheajustifies her decision to immolate her daughter, hardly what Euripides’ chorus have in mind at this moment. The second would seem to refer to the regular “spell in the army” expected of Romans of high birth, rather than the emergencies that the chorus are contemplating.

However parallels can certainly be found in Euripides for the general sense of security that the presence of νεκρων δευτεροχρονων certainly brings. It is worth noting that the fact that we have more such statements about children from Euripides than the other tragedians is in this instance not to be explained by the imbalance in the amount of work we have from them. Euripides has a genuine feeling for children, as this ode, especially the epode, and indeed the whole play, goes to show. It is difficult not to see in the sensitive treatment of Creusa in respect of her terrible loss, and indeed in the portrayal of Ion himself, something approaching the “poet’s voice” - it is an aspect that, while entirely comprehensible no doubt to the other two poets, perhaps would not have interested them so much as dramatic material. This is not to offer an explanation in terms of mere temporal succession, which would be a false case of “Geistesgeschichte” - they had Homer to draw on, had they wanted to infuse pathos in this way. It is merely to point out a difference of interest and sensibility.

Thus: IT 57 στολοι γὰρ οἶκων εἰςι παιδεῖς ἄρσενες (a reference to the allegorical dream Iphigeneia has had): fr. 316 5f. N. (the famous fragment from the Danae:)

άλλα’ οὐδὲν οὕτω λαμπρὸν οὐδ’ ἰδεῖν καλόν

ὡς τοῖς ἀπαισι καὶ πόθῳ δεδημένοις

παιδών νεογνῶν ἐν δόμοις ἰδεῖν φάσος.

---

1 See R. Kassel, Quomodo apud veteres scriptores infantes inducantur (Meisenheim am Glam, 1954) 57f. = KLschr. 52 and n. 198.

2 Thus L: παιδεῖς εἰςιν is the reading of the majority of the secondary tradition, adopted by Diggle.
In view of λόγος in Ion 476 and the parallels there assembled, the conjecture of F.W. Schmidt, θάλος for φάος is ruled out of court. (Nauck unfortunately adopts it in the text.).

Andr. 419 πᾶσι δ’ ἀνθρώποις ἂρ’ ἦν | ψυχῆ τέκνα. The fragment from the Oenomaus (571 N.) I quote in full:

άμαθαν δ’ ἐγώνε κοῦκ ἔχω μαθεῖν,
ἐκ’ οὖν ἀμεινόν ἔστι γίνεσθαι τέκνα
θάντοισιν εἰτ’ ἀπαίδα καρποῦσθαι βίον.

καὶ γὰρ κακοὶ γεγώτες ἐχθήστη νόσος,
καὶ καὶ ῥέουσα τοῦτός τινὸς ἐρωτόμενος.

The same problem is broached at greater length at Med. 1090f. note 1098f. οἰον δὲ τέκνων ἐστιν ἐν οἷκοις | γλυκερὸν βλάστημα’, ἐσορῷ μελέτη | κατατρυχομένους τὸν ἀπαντᾷ χρόνον etc.

Aeschylus only offers us some 'heroic' reflections in the Choephoroi - 505f παῖδες γὰρ
We hear from Sophocles (Phaedra fr. 685 Radt) ἄλλ' εἰσὶ μητρὶ παιδεῖς ἄγκυρα βίου. Going to Latin, there is the parallel line of thought already quoted from Catullus; cf. Cic. Pro. Cael. 79 "qui hoc unico filio nititur", Prop. IV 11. 69 "serie fulcite genus", Sen. Contr. II 1. 7. etc. The ἁκάνητος ἀφορμή represents an idea of stability that is recurrent here.

485-7: ἔμοι μὲν πλοῦτου τε πάρος

βασιλικῶν τ' εἶνεν θαλάμων

† τροφαῖ κήδειοι κεδνών γε τέκνων †.

πάρος: Here used in the sense of preference, a metaphorical application confined to verse. Cf. S. OC 418 πάρος τούμου πόθου προσθεντο τὴν τυραννίδα; E. Hcd. 536 ἀδελφῶν ἢ πάρος θανεῖν θέλει, Ion 448 τὰς ηδονὰς γὰρ τῆς προμηθίας πάρος | σπεύδοντες. It is a highly likely emendation of Reiske for the missing two syllables at Hcd. 200 ὁ γὰρ αἰσχύνη <πάρος> τοῦ ζῆν παρ' ἐσθλοῖς… νομίζονται. S. Tr. 724 τὴν δ' ἐλιτώ' οὐ χρὴ τῆς τύχης κρίνειν πάρος might be an example and is so recorded by Ellendt-Genthe - if however we allow κρίνειν the sense of "judge (to be correct)" then the temporal sense seems the more appropriate.

βασιλικοὶ θέλαμοι: The usual Euripidean periphrasis - cf. Hel. 459 βασιλικοὶ δόμοι, id. El. 306, El. 947, Or. 1366, Pho. 1326. Hence τὸ βασιλικὸν (δῶμα) in later Greek, basilica etc.

1κληδόνος Sylburg, Schütz for -ες (M) is an incontrovertible improvement and generally adopted. Clement, it should be noted, ascribes 505-7 to Sophocles, prompting Ludwig to deletion.
Here an ogre looms up to bar our way. The MSS have the text as given above. The metre is hard to identify and it fails to correspond to 467 καοῦνται σεμναί Φοίβου. Modern attempts to amend matters have of necessity been Draconian: none absolutely convince.

Wilamowitz is dubious, both in his edition ("Sein Versmass nicht, [verständlich], Responson ist nicht vorhanden, in der Strophe auf die einzelnen Wörter kein unbedingter Verlass") and in GV (p. 569: he analyzes the antistrophe, including the γς, as two dochmiacs, which in the context is unconvincing, and then goes on, correctly, to note that "γς kann entbehrt werden").

Diggle leaves both in obeli, suggesting in the app. crit. καοῦνται σεμνόταται (following Fritzsche). Nauck deleted Φοίβου. To weld the antistrophe into the choriambic dimeters so created τροφαὶ κηδεὶς γς τεκέων (Diggle/Fritzsche, with minor variations) is suggested.¹

It is a long way from what is transmitted. Let us firstly consider what can be made of the decidedly irregular metres that are before us. Two analyses have been proposed. In the antistrophe Wilamowitz finds two dochmiacs: it would be more accurate to say dochmiac followed by iambic penthemimer if we keep the γς. This would be no surprise: cf. e.g. Ion 763 ὑμοι θάνοντα[, || θύχαρτερ τό τόλαιν' i.e penth. + dochmiac cf. West, GM, 111. In the strophe the sole definite pronouncement is that of Dale (Metrical Analyses II p. 121) who interprets the unemended text as an "enoplian" as follows: καοῦνται σεμναί Φοίβου

West has already warned us of the danger of using this term as a blanket designation for a large number of cola that have little in common except a rising start.

¹The epic form does occur in lyrics in E. cf. HF 439, Hec. 475.
When we turn to the text itself the situation is no less perplexing. In the strophe τοῦ is written before Φοῖβου s.l.:¹ in the antistrophe Tr² was responsible for deleting the γε though the deletion mark is much too large to deal with γε - the same goes for the large space around the deletion mark. I suggest this arises for this reason: a word of about four or five letters originally stood in this position: Triclinus on his first revision found it unpleasing for whatever reason and erased it as he often does with a substance akin to fuller’s chalk. A well meaning assistant later occupied the blank space with a shorter word - γε is a scribal standby - and the master when he returned to his labours promptly deleted it.

γε is in itself suspicious. The scribal tendency to add particles is doubtless the explanation, and in this case this will have been aided and abetted by the misunderstanding that the required meaning was "children... provided that they be worthy". κθίνον however probably bears its Homeric sense of "beloved" cf. II. XVII 28 (LSJ II) εὐφρήνων δολοχῶν τε φιλην κεδνούς τε τοκῆς. A striking parallel is afforded by Od. X 225 δς μοι κήδιστος ἐτάρων ἣν κεδνότατος τε. That the meaning of κηδειοι is quasi-active is no cause for surprise. Both the care is loving and the children are loved (κεννοι and κηδειοι were doubtless etymologically connected in the poet’s mind, rightly so). This is one consideration that militates against any attempt to remove either adjective. For κηδειος = beloved cf. (perhaps - cf. p. 335) II. XIX 294 (κοσμηντους). An interesting textual variant at II. IX 586 which is perhaps ancient confirms the etymological suggestion just made - οὶ οἱ κεδνότατοι καὶ φίλοτοι ἡσαν ἄπαντων (v.l. κήδιστοι). Cf. Od. X 225 for both combined.

Biehl attempts to reduce the lines by violent transposition both in the strophe and the antistrophe:

¹Murray thinks this to be the same hand responsible for the famous <πόνος> in 457, an editor in himself sub judice (see ad loc.). I would hazard no judgement: superfluous articles are omnipresent in all MSS.
Φοιβου κασόγηται σεμναί
κεδνῶν γε {τέκνων} τροφαί κηδειοι.

This is misguided. γε which is in any case doubtful is kept at the expense of the rest of the line: there is no evidence to believe that κεδνῶν τροφαί on its own can mean "well beloved children".

The simplest emendation is also the earliest; it is much to be lamented that we do not know what Triclinius deleted on his first attack on the antistrophe, but if we are right in ascribing the addition of the definite article before Φοιβου supra lineam in the strophe to the second stage of correction, the γε falls with it. With these attentions we do indeed attain responsion: κασόγηται σεμναί | τοῦ Φοιβου ~ τροφαί κηδειοι κεδνῶν τέκνων which one might analyze as a dragged kaibelianus dochmiac divided as above followed by a molossus i.e. a syncopated iambic metron.1

However none of this has independent authority: it is typical of the way Triclinius works, namely minor tinkering to achieve the desired result. And in all this morass, there is one piece of solid ground whereon to plant our feet. When Triclinius was engaged on his first correction of the MS he had occasion to delete in 487 a longer word - hence the unusual gap in the text. This he was doubtless inspired to do because he observed that what remains of the strophe was too short. We are not however under any obligation to agree with these Procrustean measures. To obtain the text he had before him originally, the solution may be to expand in both cases, not to abbreviate after the fashion of Biehl, Diggle and others.

Exempli gratia:

κασόγηται σεμναί <σεμναί> Φοιβου.

τροφαί κηδειοι | <κηδειοι> τέκνων.

1which is better than dochmiac (notional) with drag and an unusual spondaic dimeter.
We thus obtain the sequence dochmius \( \times 2 \) - double drag in second metron in strophe and antistrophe.\(^1\)

A point of interest in κηδειος is its connotations. Little is known about it until tragedy: it occurs once in Homer (II. XIX 293) where its meaning is uncertain κασαγνήτους, τούς μοι μιὰ γεῖνατο μήτηρ | κηδειος (beloved? connected by relationship? The tautology is no worse than δ φύσος ποτήρ). The usage in Ion is unparalleled (though this is hardly an excuse for LSJ II to attribute to it the power of taking a genitive "caring for" - the genitive goes naturally with τροφαί).

It is above all connected with duties of burial. Thus Cho. 226 κηδειου τριχὸς 87, 538, χοσι, IT 147 οικτοι, II. XXIII 159f. οῖοι κηδεῖς ἔστι νέκυς. It is the sole meaning of the compound ἐπικηδειος (cf. E. Tro. 514, Pl. Lg. 800E etc. and the fragment from Alexander (16 12 (Hermes Einzelschrift V, (1937) Snell) ἐπικηδείους πόνοις. It would also seem likely that the words κηδειοι (πόνοι?) should be restored in P. Ant. 24 fr. 2 (a) verso l. 4

(from the Ba. it would seem, possibly from the lacuna after 1329. The restoration is based on Chr. Pat. 147f. These fragments are conveniently set out and discussed in Dodds ed. appendix p. 243f.). It is of course frequent in the noun κηδος of burial (cf. Pind. Pyth. IV 112, N. 1 54 etc). A. Cho. 469 is so classified by LSJ - but δύστον' δφερτα κηδη seems to refer to the δληη in the next line and have that sense.

488-491: τὸν ἄπαιδα δ' ἀποστυγώ
βιον, ϕ τε δοκεῖ ψέγω'
μετὰ δὲ κτεάνων μετρίων βιστᾶς
εὐπαιδος ἔχοίμαν.

ἀποστυγώ codd.: ἀπέστυγον conieci.

ἀποστυγεῖν: an emphatic word, used in Sophocles (only here in Euripides and in lyric

\(^1\)The type of repetition - also an obvious source of scribal error - is much to be found in E. cf. Breitenbach, 230 f.
only in S.), in the Hellenistic poets, and in Herodotus. "Abhor".

Let us review its usage:

S. OC 691f. οὐδὲ Μουσάν χοροὶ νῦν ἀπεστύγησαν οὐδ’ αὖθ’ | ἀ χρυσάνιος’ Ἀφροδίτα (Colonus)

The aorist here is obviously used with a present sense, akin to the instantaneous aorist of the type of ἀπέπτυσα.

The perfect is used in precisely the same way at Hdt. II 47 (the Egyptian way of making sacrifice) δε’ ὅτι δε τούς ὡς ἐν μὲν τῆς ἄλλης ὥσπερ ἀπεστυγήκασι, ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ θάυμα, ἔστι μὲν λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ ὑπ’ Αἰγυπτίων λεγόμενος, ἔμοι μέντοι ἐπιστομένῳ σὺς εὐπρεπέστερος ἐστι λέγεσθαι (note equivalence in tenses) cf. ἀπεστυγήκασι and θάνατοι.

Call. h. Del. 223 is a useful example (of the islands that would not receive Leto in her wanderings): ἀλλὰ μὲν πᾶσα μὲν ἀπέστυγαν οὐδ’ ἐδέχοντο. Here the combination of the instantaneous ‘aorist’ and the imperfect brings out the point neatly - at one moment they took the decision that they were too horrified at Leto to wish to receive her. Exactly the same point emerges from Parthenius fab. XXXVI 2 (Arganthon e) αὕτη τῆς μὲν κατ’ οἷς διάαν... ἀπέστυγεν, ἀθροισμένῃ δὲ κύνας πολλοῦς ἐθῆρενεν etc. Nothing could prove the point better than Oppian’s use of the sigmatic aorist at Hal. IV 368f. (of how to delude fish into thinking that the bait of a goat’s foot is other than what it is): εἶ γὰρ τὸς ἀλλαται ἔργα δόλοιο |... φεύγουσι δ’ ἀποστῦξαν τε ομαρτῇ | καὶ μορφῆν καὶ δαίτα καὶ αὐτῆς ἐνδίᾳ πέτρης.

Parthenius may indeed supply us with another verse example (SH 633 = Et. Gen. AB, 1

---

1 as one would expect though cf. K.-G. 1, p. 148 para. 384. (4) on the proximity of the idioms - i.e. ἔθεσμοσα /τεθεσμικα.
from the Heracles) ἀύτροσχάδα βότρυν Ἰκαριώνης† where Meineke plausibly suggested ἢδ’ ἀύτροσχάδα βότρυν ἀπέστυγεν Ἰκαριώνη - a Nebenform no doubt of Ἡρμιώνη daughter of Icarius, the patron of the Aiora festival of Athens, who could well be said to have formed a revulsion for the works of Dionysus. At Call. fr. 178 11 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἑρμιωνὴ μὲν ἀπέστυγεν χανδὸν δμοστὶν | οἴνοποτεῖν (the Icus story) instantaneous aorist of a decision previously arrived at appears again. It is conceivable that the text of Hdt. VI 129 ἀποστυγέων γαμβρὸν ἀν οἱ ἐξὶ γενέσθαι Ἰπποκλείδεα (of Cleisthenes reaction to Hippocrates dancing on the table) should, both because of logic and because of the idiom discussed above, be changed to ἀποστυγών though the strong aorist is not known before Hellenistic poetry. The instantaneous aorist is of course, by the nature of the genre, more suited to conversation than non-conversational prose and more readily identifiable. One might add to prose examples the only one adduced by K.-G. - Lucian DDeor. XVI 2 ἐγέλασε. And of course with a participle one cannot be entirely sure.

Nicander (Alex. 406) provides a further example:

αινυσσο... ἵππεια λειριόεν τε κάρη το τ’ ἀπέστυγεν Ἀφρό (For the instantaneous aorist combined with the present, as above, cf. E. Hel. 673 κατεδάκρυσα καὶ βλέφαρον ύγραίνω | δάκρυσαν with Kannicht ad loc. On the use of the aorist of "der momentane Gefühlsausbruch" cf. K.-G. 1 164).

I suggest therefore that we read ἀπέστυγον in 488, restoring the idiom that has been established. With the evidence we have we simply cannot be certain that the strong aor. of ἀποστυγέω is impossible at this date: with the simple verb it is known from Homer and the sigmatic version is "later".

κτεύνων μετρίων: κτέανα is properly a word of Epic and Lyric used by Aeschylus and Euripides, perhaps Sophocles fr. 242 R. 1.2. See Davies EGF p. 27 for the problems of
Elsewhere E. fr. 791 3 N. in the Homeric heteroclite dative plural κτεύθεσθαι and in a problematic passage in the Andr. (1035) where Diggle, doubtless rightly, rejects the use of ἄδρτων as an adjective and eliminates this instance, reading ἔκταν' ὄν.\(^1\) It appears as might be expected in a mock-Epic (?) line (Eubulus fr. 137 K.-A.) indicating its connotations.

βιοστάς εὔπαυδὸς ἔχομαν: Owen in a somewhat literal minded fashion finds it difficult to understand how it can be that the chorus may speak of "maintaining" a life style that they do not possess and cannot aspire to. Therefore he approves Wecklein's βιοστάν εὔπαυδα δεχομαν. But this is a deterioration: firstly the chorus, as we said in the introduction to the antistrophe, are, in any event, speaking out of character, for reasons which may or may not be an example of literary imagination, secondly ἔχομαι can perfectly well mean "cling to the hope (of something absent), lay claim to".

Cf. E. fr. 409 N. μὴ τ' εὔτυχοῦσα πάσαν Ἰῆναν χάλα,] κακῶς τε πράσσον [ἐλπίδος κεδνής ἔχου which means precisely this. S. OC 423f. τῆς μάχης πέρι,] ἣς νόν ἔχοντα κάταναζήτονται δόρυ κτλ. - reference to the war that Eteocles and Polyneices have in mind: Xen. An. VI 3 17 τῶνδε σωθέντων πάντας εἰς ταύταν ἐλθόντας... σωτηρίας ἔχοντα, in an appeal to the troops patently means "cling to the hope of safety, aim for it." The idea of desire is present in two fragments of Sophocles (Aethiopes fr. 28R. l. 2 σῦ δ' αὐτὸς ὀδυπερ οἱ σοφοὶ τὰ μὲν | δίκαι' ἐπαίνει τοῦ δὲ κερδίανειν ἔχου, cf. Creusa fr. 354 l. 3f.). Ag. 1657 f. presents a notorious problem:  
† στείχετε δ' οἱ γέροντες πρὸς δόμους πεπραξένους τοῦδε † πρὶν παθεῖν ἔξαντα † καιρὸν χρήν † τάδ' ὡς ἐπράξαμεν εἰ δὲ τοῦ μόχθων γένοιτο τῶνδ' † οἷς γ' ἔχομεθ' ἀν.

It is possible that ἔχομεθ' ἀν if correct might mean "that is the prospect to which we would cling". Hermann's δεχομεθ' ἀν is "almost universally accepted" - Fraenkel - and yields a

\(^1\)Thus Burges, Seidler
similar sense. (ἐλοιμεθ' ἄν Blaydes). But the real problem lies in the previous line - see West Studies in Aeschylus (1990), 227 for a new approach.
Once again the mood of the chorus changes. In this moving and beautiful invocation of the tutelary deities of the site of Creusa’s terrible misfortune, they change from the rational reflections of the antistrophe about "family life" to a stark and emotional verbal portrait. The sympathy of the maidservants for the young girl who has lost her child is real: naturally they are unaware that their mistress is that person. Euripides' marvellous gift for depicting a scene in such a way that it comes before the eyes as one reads, is here very much in evidence: one does not need to have seen even the Acropolis to visualise the green-sward on the hill, haunt of the Aglauroides, and the shady caves sacred to Pan: all this beauty is in striking contrast to the event which has taken place there and the desolate grief of the young mother. Who will still maintain that the Greeks had little sense of the beauties of nature?  

492-494: ὦ Πανὸς θακῆματα καὶ  
παραυλίξουσα πέτρα  
μυχώδεσι Μακραῖς,  

θακῆμα: The formation is confined to Sophocles and Euripides. E. uses it only here and only here does it bear the sense of "seat, abode": in its two appearances in Sophocles -  

OC 1160, 1179 - it is a form of nomen actionis referring to the positions of suppliants. (Cf. Breitenbach, 23f., 25.)

---

1 On the epode, consisting of a direct invocation to a god (or man) contrasting in the present way with the str. and antistr., cf. Ion 714f., IA 573f. (Kranz, Stasimon, 250). In the latter case, as here, the invocation to Paris serves to sharpen and concentrate the more general consideration preceding.

2 Pan is invoked with ὦ here and in 500. There is no need in 503 to remove ὦ with Badham, there are numerous internal echoes in this polished and beautifully constructed ode.
παραυλίζουσα πέτρα: A surprising but effective metaphor, drawn in all probability from rustic life and hence indirectly appropriate to Pan. It is a Euripidean invention apparently: on this field of metaphor cf. Breitenbach p. 143f. The active is unusual as the simple verb is otherwise deponent, as in Athenaeus. 189 E. with the different sense of οἱ δορυφόροι being literally "housed" in the vicinity of the palace. The adjective παραυλίζως is found three times in Sophocles however.

A place is, as it were, personified in a similar though far more supernatural way at ΙΤ 1243: <συμ> βακχεύουσαν Διονύσων Παρνάσιον κορυφάν.

οἶκετίν is frequently used of the position of cities, and with this passage cf. especially Xen. Vect. I 5 πολλῶν γούν πόλεων παρουκουσών.

μυχόδεσι Μακραίς: The Ms has μυχόθι δαυσὶ and Tyrwhitt’s μυχόδεσι has been generally accepted, rightly.¹

μυχόδης will be a hapax. Euripides however is fond of such adjectival formations. Breitenbach records ten such inventions as against one in Aeschylus and five in Sophocles. Most of these do not recur until later Greek. (On this tendency see Schmid, Der Atticismus IV, 698-9).

It is quite the right word for the cavernous Μακραί, on which see above on 283.²


In the expression Πανὸς θακήμωτα καὶ παραυλίζουσα πέτρα we have what is effectively a hendiadys: the θακήμωτα are the πέτρα and Parmentier is correct to omit the καὶ in his translation.

The second element is more explicit, a feature which may cautiously be paralleled

¹μυχόλεοι Reiske: μυχάται Matthiae - horrible!
from elsewhere: *Hel. 673 κατεδάκτυλος και βλέψαρον ύγραίνω δάκτυλοι* (Kannicht *ad loc.* adds "der Aorist bezeichnet den momentanen... das Praesens ihren fortdauernden Vollzug").

Thus perhaps *Su. 1004 f.* (Page's rearrangement, as adopted by Diggle is compelling)

εἰμοσχέων καταλύσοντος

ές "Αιδαν

βίοτον αἰώνος τε πόνους

*Pho. 304 τὸ τέκνον, χρόνος σὸν δῆμα μυρίας ῥ' ἐν ἀμέραις | προσείδον.* Kannicht is right to class this type of expression as parataxis, rather than pleonasm (Breitenbach, 196 (b)).

In *παραυλίζουσα* the meaning, as Paley saw, is simply that the grotto whence Pan piped to the maidens is "close to" the Makrai, the significance of which to the play is self-explanatory.

This is to be preferred - despite Κέκροπος πέτρα in *Ion* 936 and several other examples of πέτρα in tragedy referring to mountains - to taking *παραυλίζουσα πέτρα* as a reference to the Acropolis itself (thus Badham). It is extremely odd to speak of the whole Acropolis as "being near" the Makrai which are one constituent part of it. And the geography of this little vignette suffers: στάδια χλοερά suggest a grassy terrace on a small scale, such as one would expect from the environs of the Makrai, not the top of the Acropolis. Pan is piping to the girls from his cave by the western end of the Makrai, not broadcasting to them on the Acropolis from below. We expect them to be near their own cave, by general association, the shrine of Aglaurus described in Hdt. VIII 53. And I find no difficulty in understanding it so described as being πρὸ Ποιλόδος νοῶν in the sense that the great

---

1*Cf. Mastronarde, TTP, 35, 220.*

344
temples of the Acropolis proper overlook the Makrai.\footnote{In the same sense as πρὸ θυρῶν, δωμάτων Pind. *Pyth.* II 18, S. *El.* 109 etc (Electra has ‘come out’ of the front door).} There is therefore no need to assume with Owen that they must be dancing in the Pandroseion immediately before the Erechtheum.\footnote{The whole passage is comparable with *h. Hom. Pan* - note especially XIX 4 (νύμφαι)... αἱ τε κατ’ στείλετος πέτρας στείβουσι κάρηνα, 10: ἅλλοτε δ’ αὖ πέτρησιν ἐν ἡλιβράτους διοιξεῖ, 19 σὸν δὲ οὖν τὸτε νύμφαι ὀρεστίδες λυγυμολοποῦ | φαινόσαι πυκνὰ ποσοῖν ἐπὶ κρήνη μελανύδρῳ | μέλλονται, κορυφὴν δὲ περιστενέι σοῦρεσι ἤχῳ, 22 etc.}  

495-498: ἵνα χοροῦς στείβουσι ποδοῦν
'Αγραύλου κόραι τρίγωνοι
στάδια χλοερά πρὸ Πάλλαδος
ναών

χοροῦς L: χοροῖς Reiske

(στείβουσι P)

χοροῦς στείβουσι... στάδια χλοερά: If the text of this and the following lines is correct, Euripides gives us a double accusative of a striking kind. χοροῦς στείβουσι is then expected to govern στάδια χλοερά as if the presence of the internal accusative χοροῦς was sufficient to turn the whole compound expression into a verb meaning the equivalent of "dance upon".

Not all the alleged examples of this idiom are certain or homogeneous. At *S. El.* 556 εἰ δὲ μ’ ὦδ’ ἄξις λήγουσ | ἐξήρχομε, οὔκ ἕν ήσθα λυπηρά κλύειν the accusative is necessary but preserved only in *L.a.c.* and its gemellus. (See Dawe, *Studies I*, 181). The accusative may find a parallel in *Tro.* 146f. though here the length of the construction may facilitate the asyndeton. The text is also corrupt.

μάτηρ δ’ ὡσεὶ πτανοίς κλαγγάν

\[\text{In the same sense as πρὸ θυρῶν, δωμάτων Pind. *Pyth.* II 18, S. *El.* 109 etc (Electra has ‘come out’ of the front door).}\]
Obelos posuit Diggle: omnia sana putat Biehl, fortasse recte: inutilis quidem coniectura Jacksoni μολατάν... <ἄχαν>, at utilis διερειδομένου (Herwerden): nam οὐκ εἰπέρχει δελτα ἀφάντο ποιήσας Φρενίας

OCT 1119f. ὦ ἔλεεν, μὴ δαῦμαζε, πρὸς τὸ λυπαρές ἠ τέκν' εἰ φανέντ' ἐξελέτα μηκύνω λόγον "If I prolong my words to my children" - Jebb, who rightly explains it as in sense the equivalent of διὰ μακρῶν προσηγορῶ. Matters are very much less clear at the notorious S. El. 121f. ὁ παῖς παῖς δυστανοτάτας ἑλέκτρα ματρός, τίν' ἄει ἔκακος ὕδ' ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγάν | τὸν πάλαι ἐκ δολερᾶς ἀθεώτατα | ματρός ἄλλον' ἀσάτας Ἀγαμέμνονα | κάκα τε χειρὶ πρόδοσον; If the text is kept and the idea of "melting a lament" is not found indigestible, we have a partial parallel, though it is not exactly of a feather, inasmuch as Agamemnon could be said to be in apposition to οἰμωγάν as its subject matter, which is not true of στάδια here or θεοῦς. Kvičala rearranges the whole construction τίς ἔκακος σ' ὕδ' ἀκόρεστος οἰμωγά which is ingenious but leaves the construction of the following accusative uncertain: it would have to be taken as an unusual accusative of respect. It is nonetheless of interest that it is present in K a.c. (that is, τάκεις), and is preferable to the ugly λάσκεις of Schwerdt. See note for a defence of textus receptus. Another possible example from Sophocles should perhaps be introduced by emendation at OCT 1150f λόγον (λόγος MSS) δ' δ' ἐμπέπτωκεν ὅρτως ἐμοί | στείχοντι δεύορο, συμβαλοῦ γνώμην. With Brunck's λόγον, wherein the Aldine precedes him, all three words would come to mean "subject the logos to joint deliberation". Similarity of termination make it very tempting, though it is possible that we should explain the nominative in terms of the speaker "losing his way" in the construction, appropriate perhaps to the puzzled Theseus, discussing two matters at once. (Not I think "inverse attraction", Jebb, comparing Pho. 940 which is a simple (ἐκείνος) δ' case.)

These distinct usages in which the cognate accusative with one verb stands in for another verb which normally would take a direct accusative itself (προσαγορεύω vel. sim.) should not be confused with the simple acc. of respect as in OCT 223 δέος ἱσχετε μηδὲν δο'
σύνδω (incorrectly adduced by Jebb; likewise 583, with τὰ δ’ ἐν μέσῳ). The pronoun makes the difference in these cases.

χοροῦς στείβειν undoubtedly means "to dance" in the abstract sense of χορός which seems to have prevailed since Homer (for concrete "dancing place" which could have meant "tread the ring" as Paley would have it⁴ and be taken in direct apposition with στάδιο (cf. II. XVIII 590f. etc.) It is not used as such in Attic though the older meaning seems to have remained in εὐρύχορος (ἀγνίς Pind. Pyth. VIII 55, E. Ba. 87 (lyr)), along with the suggested later etymology of the latter from εὐρός χώρος, as applied to places ("Ἀργος Bacch. 9 31, 'Ασια Pind. Ol. VII 18 etc.).² καλλίχορος is both used of places and in the abstract in Classical verse: cf. 'Αθήνα E. Held. 359.

It does in fact seem clear by analogy with the usages we have reviewed of a verb implying an accusative such as προσαγορεύω being paraphrased in this way that χοροῦς στείβομαι... στάδια χλωερά is an understandable extension of this idiom. For the idea of "dancing a place" with cognate simple verbs cf.: the passive usage exemplified in Powell CA p. 198 (Lyr. adesp. Alex. 36 l. 17f., a hymn to Isis attributed by Wilamowitz to Mesomedes and if so hardly within the scope of Powell's edition):

Δασεὰ διψηλάτῳ
πάντα δ’ ἄνακτόρων
Ἰσώδι χορεύεται.

The oddity of Δασεα being the subject of a verb meaning "danced in" is unnecessarily avoided by Wilamowitz with Δασεα: the paeanic metre is thereby impaired and δ’ ἄνακτόρων given at the least a bizarre sense, as Powell points out. This particular usage is

¹Most relevantly Od. VIII 264 of the Phaeacian nobles - πέπληγον δὲ χορὸν θείον ποσι.

²εὐρυχωρία occurs as early as adesp. iamb. I West; cf. Hdt. IV 71 4.
safeguarded by *Ion* 463 πορὰ χορευομένης τρίποδοι which is sufficiently alike. Nonnus D. XIII 95 uses the verbal adj. χοροτύπως of an ἀλος in the passive sense: the verb itself, which is precisely the value of χοροῦς στείβω actually occurs twice in Oppian *Hal.* I 472, *Cyn.* IV 342 (cf. *Hom.* II. XXIV 261). The close sense connection of χορού and στάδια is indicated by such compounds as χοροστάδες (Call. fr. 66 a.) along with the commoner χοροεστάσις. Cf. the passive usage in a fragment of Euphorion (Pollux IV 95, corrected by Pierson: 'Ορχόμενον Χαρίτεσσιν ἄφορτίσιν ὀρχηθέντα = Powell CA fr. 87 p. 46).

In the light of this discussion we may feel confident in rejecting emendation of this line - neither Reiske’s χοροῖς or Musgrave’s χοροοῦ (which uses χορός in the wrong sense - see above) is called for.

'Αγλαύρων: ἄγραυλον is the reading of the MSS, altered by Scaliger and favoured by Wil. on etymological grounds. For a discussion of this problem, see on 23.

Wilamowitz raises an unnecessary difficulty at this point. Aglaurus by position, he argues, must be the father of the three daughters because the correct title of the daughters of Cecrops who are here being referred to is not 'Αγλαύρων κόραι but 'Αγρούλλης (l. 23). No male Aglaurus is known in any event until a deviant version in Hyginus *fab.* 253 ("eine nichtsnutzige späte Fabelei"). Therefore to preserve the reference ἄγραυλοι must be written.

There are several objections to this. Aglaurus is first specifically named as the mother of the well-known Aglaurus of the cult on the Acropolis by Apollodorus (III 14 2): to Pausanias I 2 5 she is only "the daughter of Actaeus". Cf. Suda s.v. Φοίνικης γράμματα.

---

1"χόρος στείβων wird als ein Begriff gefasst und kann daher den Akkusativ regieren." (Wilamowitz). See too the discussion by Diggle (*Phaethon* ad 69f. and Page (*Medea* 205f.): *Su.* 977, *Med.* loc. cit. Dem. XIX 81 is a prose example (δοτε... τῆς κοίτας τῷ φόβῳ Θηβαίοις). For the construction of ποδοῖν with χοροῦς see n. on 506-8.

2στάδιον sharing the common ιστήμα root with both.
However the practice of duplicating names in the king list to fill in gaps or to prop up one or other version of a chronology is too common to require comment: the name of the daughter was transferred up one generation, likely enough with the eldest daughter. There is no possible objection to the form of naming them. Owen rightly asks why if all the other deities in the immediate vicinity are given names, the Aglaurides should remain a general allusion. It is not at all clear that Wilamowitz is right to claim for his conjecture an etymological contention by Euripides, nor why this should be especially appropriate as a description: it could perfectly well allude to any set of Nymphs, even as it is used of Pan in AP VI 179. And the reason why they are called 'Αγλαύρον κόραι is because their cult title was 'Αγλαύριδες not Κεκροπίδες.

The sanctuary to which the scene alludes is that on the west side of the Acropolis whereby the Persians ascended into it (Hdt. VIII 53 τὸ ἱέρον τῆς Κέκροπος θυγατρὸς 'Αγλαύρου) and is mentioned as a τέμενος by Pausanias I 18 2. There is a tradition first mentioned in Plutarch (vit. Alc. xv) that it was here that the ephobes took an oath of loyalty to the state. It is mentioned in the context of quotation from Alcibiades: Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς γῆς συνεβούλευεν ἀντέχεσθαι τοῖς 'Αθηναίοις καὶ τὸν ἐν 'Αγραύλου προβάλλομενον ἀεὶ τοῖς ἐφήβοις δρκον ἔργα βεβαιοῦν. οἷς οὖν οὐδὲν γὰρ δροις χρῆσασθαι τῆς Ἀττικῆς πυροῖς, κριθαῖς, ἁμέλειοι, ἔλαταις, οἴκειαν ποιεῖσθαι διδακτόμενον τὴν ἡμερον καὶ κορποφόρον.1 Cf. Pollux VIII 105, anonymous source ap. Stob. Flor. XLIII 48.

Cf. Frazer, Pausanias, l.c.; Wachsmuth RE I col. 829.

κόραι τρίθονοι: Owen remarks "the two parts of the compound are taken separately". That is to say, "born as three". At Hipp. 559 (Cypris) βροντὺ... ἄμφιτυρῳ τοκάδα τὸν δυνόνου Βάκχου νυμφευσάμενα the adjective has its full verbal force - born twice in the sense that after Semele’s destruction Dionysus was sewn into the thigh of Zeus and born thence. It is imitated in h. Orph. XXX 2 τρίθονος (Dionysus) - referring in addition, presumably, to the myth of the dismemberment by the Titans. Here the verbal sense is

1Obvious and interesting evidence in addition to the festival itself of her continuous association with fertility.
present but somewhat more muted as at HF 1022 τέκνα τρίγωνα... τεκμένος where, as Bond points out, the second part of the compound reinforces the accompanying τεκμένος. Breitenbach, 190 assembles a large collection of adjectives with -γονοι along with διπτυχος, διώνυμος, τρίγωνος, τετραβόμον, δωδεκάστολος etc. as "Komposita die mit Zahlworten zusammengesetzt sind, dem Sinn nach als Simplicia verwendet" - but they all have differing connotations.

The problem is sharpened by considering E. El. 1179 ἔργα φόνια μυσαρά δίγωνα σώματι ἐν χθόνι τέ κέϕενον (Orestes of Aegisthus and Clytaemestra). It appears to be a mere doublet of δίδυμα and it is possible that Wecklein was right to restore the latter here: it is very difficult to see what sense the verbal element has referring to the corpses whose only connection in birth is the uninteresting one that both were born. But it is a long way from the paradosis. The text in the immediate region is extremely corrupt - the following line is unmetrical and Seidler rightly placed a lacuna after 1181. Here it is possibly correct to posit a slightly different "notional" etymology which is well attested in the lexicographers à propos of Sophocles fr. 129 R: actually quoted only in E.M. 272. 5

διόν δὲ φόνιν
μάσθητα δίγονον.

See Radt p. 158 and ad fr. 125 N. for all the lexicographical evidence, from Hes., Phot. Sabb. and E.M. For a discussion of the noun see too Eva-Maria Hamm, Glotta XXXII (1953), 43f. Both Hes. and E.M. offer in explanation δυστυλος and more surprisingly (δ) δυοι χρώμασι κεχρημένος with the latter of which ὑπόδημα φοινικοῦ (Hes. 331 Latte) seems to be connected, possibly via Sappho 39 L.-P. πόδας δὲ | ποδίλος μάθης ἐκλύσεις Λόδυ | στάλον ἔργον (in which case we may consider restoring ποιμελον in Hes. by transposition of letters and further misreading). Herwerden conjectured δτενον in Sophocles and δτεμος is in the lemma that Hes. 333 offers on Sophocles. It seems likely that 1. δτενος 2. δίγονος 3. δτεμος, all palaeographically comparable, have become inextricably confused in the tradition. 1. and 3. may be appropriate to Sophocles, 2. is appropriate to neither and may be false in both, presumably by the δτεμος corruption, to which we come.

There is a possibility that the general drive of what they have to say is correct, namely that δίγονος could have a very general meaning "of two types" - though the degree of uncertainty is perturbing. It is also possible however that there could be a closer connection. The phrase ἡ δυοι χρώμασι κεχρημένος argues for a second and completely different definition and leads the way to Herwerden's δτενος in Sophocles. One would account for the lexicographical evidence which might seem to guarantee the MS as follows: uncial corruption between ΔΤΕΝΟΣ and ΔΤΕΜΟΣ occurred at an early stage in the tradition and

---

1See Diggle, ICS II (1977), 123-4 = Euripidea, 168. The synapheia is fatal to Walberg's attempt to restore responson (χθονι <τάδε> πλαγία κείμενα): much better is Diggle's χθονι κεχρημένα πλαγία <δυπλί> which also solves the very problem we are attempting to address.
the gloss *appropriate to each* became conflated.  

Turning back to the oddity in the text of Electra, further aid may perhaps be sought from the lexicographers. In two of our sources ἀπάλως is appealed to as a gloss. It is also the otherwise unattested translation offered in Hesychius for δίπολος: δίπλα. Αἰσχύλος Προσομοιοῦστ (in the codex the words are arranged: 3, 2, 1, 4).

The word is otherwise known (from Proclus ad Hes. *OD.* 460) in the sense of "twice ploughed" (πολεύων). But the derivation from πέλομαί is quite possible and we need not assume that γύςα went with it. The meeting point of this material may be δύονος here. ΔΙΠΟΛΟΙ is palaeographically probable for ΔΙΓΩΝΩΙ and gives the sense and the fact that they share a gloss may well have influenced the corruption - it is possible that all three stood in the margin at some point. δύολος is therefore possible in *E. El.* l.c.

στάδια χλοερά: Here used in its precise etymological sense though doubtless a metaphor from the usual sporting sense is present and dancing in Greek thought, as the world of Alcman indicates so charmingly, is a competitive activity.

πρὸ Πολλάδος ναῶν: As said above there is no need to specify a particular temple - obviously the tradition of the worship of Athena on the Acropolis was early (Paus. I 26 11, Hdt. VIII 55 if parallels required). However it is possible that nonetheless we are to imagine some single proto-Parthenon dominating the background in this peaceful glimpse of a mythic past that Euripides offers us. (Our author would be little concerned about anachronism.) The plural and singular of this word are regularly interchangeable in this play and the fashion of referring to the same building in different ‘numbers’ in close proximity seems to have caused no problem: cf. 79 (sing.), 111, 115 (pl.), 140 (sing.), 157 (pl.), 219 (sing.) etc. Likewise at *IT* 129, 1215, 1227 a single building is in question. On the usage cf. K.-G. 1 p. 18 Anm. 2.

498-502: συρήγγων

υπ’ αἰόλος ἰσχάς

---

1 Conceivably the reference to two works of Sophocles is the sign of this (Σύνδεσμων and 'Ανδρόμεδα) in Hesychius 333. Our quotation may derive from the latter.

2 As Hermann ingeniously did to unify the meaning. If it is a ‘ghost-word’ the original in Hes. in the *lemma* is more likely to have been ΔΙΠΟΛΟΙ in the Ionic lengthened form.
ύμαλων ὅταν αὐλίοις
συρίζης, ὥ Πάν,
τοίοι σοὶς ἐν ἄντροις,

Locus a multis nimia sedulitate temptatus.

ύπ' αἰώλας ἴαχας: For αἰώλος of varied sound, such as that of the pipes Page compares the papyrus fragment of S. Inachus (P. Tebt III 1 no. 692 = Radt 269 (c) l. 32)

[Χο.1] ψιθυράν μᾶλ' αἰολάν.
-
πάντα μηχανεῖ τὸ Δίον ὡς]
-
ἡ ὡ τάχα Διός αὖ,
-
Διὸς δρα λότρις ὅδε;

An obvious reference to the "cleverness" of Hermes as immortalized in the Ichneutae where it is of interest that the same word is used of the instrument, l. 319 αἰώλισμα τῆς λύρας.
The σύριγξ is also described as αἰολόμαλλον in Nonnus XL 223: Oppian Hal. I 728 uses αἰολόφωνος of the nightingale.

ίαχας: Cf. S. Tr. 642 ὁ καλλιβίδας τὰχ' ύμαν αὐλίδος σύκ ἀναρτοίαν | ιάχων κανοχάν ἐπάνεισον.

Though a long second syllable for ἴαχη is much the most probable scansion for ἴαχη in tragedy - cf. Page on Med. 149 - here, as P. acknowledges, a syncopated choriambic dimeter is a more probable analysis than iambics. The verb ἴαχεω may have a long or short alpha in tragedy, though corruption with corresponding parts of ἄχη, ἄχεω is frequent. See Ellendt-Genthe p. 332 on the relevance of the spelling ἴαχη- when long, and Allen-Italics. s.v. nomm. on the ease of the corruption mentioned.

The articulation and text of the next few lines are problematic. The text of L is as

I have presented it with the exception that Triclinius' correction of the MSS to τοῖς σοῖς in 502 has been adopted to produce the ithyphallic "a contextu non alienus" (Diggle: see his

1Diggle reports L as illegible for these words: Murray reports Diggle's Tr as the MS reading.
apparatus for parallels in E.) (τοῖς σοίσιν (Hartung) makes a Reizianum: τοῖς<ν> (Fritzsche, Hartung) a pherecratean.

The objections to it are as follows: I. If ὄμνον is taken to be a genitive dependent directly on ἰεράς then the double genitive it will form with συρῆνων is awkward. Badham (also Reiske) feeling that a "natural and ordinary sentence" is thereby vitiated changes to ὄμνον agreeing with Pan. Wilamowitz takes the further step of writing σύμπων' a neuter plural adverb - Pan is playing in tune to the dance adding the further common-sense objection "wer die Syrinx bläst, kann nicht singen". (Hardly in itself to be rated an objection: obviously ὄμνος takes in both the musical and vocal sides of the operation). II. Some doubt as to the meaning and role in the sentence of αὐλλοις. Thus most have taken it to be an adjective "rustic". Verrall invented a new noun αὐλλόν as a diminutive of αὐλός ("pipe") despite the prior existence of αὐλλοκος. It has not been common to defend αὐλλόν = cave because of the existence of τοῖς σοίς ἐν ἀντροις; I propose to defend this apposition. Feeling (rightly as we will see) that the credentials of αὐλλος as an adjective in this sense here were not the strongest, Herwerden suggested ἀναλλος ("sunless") which is approved by Owen and adopted by Diggle. It has a certain attractiveness in the context as appropriate and is a respectable Euripidean usage - A. 437, Andr. 534. Nor is the disappearance of ἐν an objection or a reason to change the subjunctive to συρῆςις with the author of this conjecture: this is a reasonably well known licence in verse and to a limited sense in prose, of the type of ΟC 1225 τὸ δ', ἐπεὶ φανής, βῇναι κεῖθεν δὴν περ ἴκειν πολὺ δεύτερον ὡς τάχιστα A. Septem 338, S. Ant. 1025, etc. It is rare in Attic prose of the classical period, though

---

1Musgrave imports an orchestra with συρωτῶν, a word not found before Theocritus. Stephanus wrote ὄμνον, amazingly.

2"The frequency of αὐλλόν should be no objection, where the sense is clear" - hardly apposite in this passage.
attested in Herodotus: if the text is sound there are examples in Plato and Thucydides—though Thuc. IV 17 is generally thought to be part of a iambic quotation. Similar is the situation with ἤςης etc.: again Ionic allows the omission and there are some five examples in Thucydides. The latter becomes common by inscriptions of the second century, the former seems to retain a poetic and slightly generalizing flavour. It would seem that πρὶν ἀν was regarded as more of an indissoluble unit. Cf. Goodwin, GMT, para 540, 620: K.-G. 2 449 Anm. 4.

However the difficulty with both αὐλιος (- rustic) and ἀναλιος if read is the position of the adjective. Placed well before noun and article one is driven to take it if not as predicative or even temporal (the singing depending upon the rusticity or shadiness of the caves) certainly as putting a considerable stress on whatever meaning we choose. This objection is the strongest to either reading.1

One is not greatly enthused by the credentials of αὐλιος used in this sense: it seems quite unlikely that it could be used to mean "rustic" in the generalized sense envisaged by editors. It is a certain restoration in the papyrus of Callimachus fr. 177 P. = fr. 259. 5 SH.

ἀστήρ δ’ ἐντ’ ἐμελλε βοῶν ἀπο μέσσαθα[ λύσειν

αὐλιος] [δ’ δυθμη]ν εἰσιν ὑπ’ ἡμέρου
(from the "Mousetrap" poem: restoration by Blomfield; on its position in the Aetia cf. Parsons, ZPE XXV (1977), 1 f.)

A,R. IV 1629f., when the restoration, is a clear imitation: ἤμος δ’ ἡμέρος μὲν ἐδυ, ἀνὰ δ’ ἡλυθεν ἀστήρ | αὐλιος, δ’ τ’ ἀνέκαυσεν οἰκυρουός ἀροτήρας The expression is obviously derived from αὐλή in the sense of "steading" for cattle as in II. V 138 ὁν ῥα τε

---

1 On which Verrall is right to insist.

2 Note too Björck’s remarks on the validity of ἀναλιος, Das Alpha Impurum, 246.
πομήν... χραύσῃ μὲν τ’ αὐλῆς ὑπεράλμενον οὐδὲ δομᾶσῃ and has a very specific range: it is the star that bids the weary herdsman return his cattle to the fold. The scholiast ad A.R. offers αὐλοῖς: ὁ ἔσπερος. ἢ παρὰ τὸ αὐλῷζεσθαι, ὃ ἐστὶ κομιδᾶσθαι, ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἐν αὐλαις διστρέβειν καθ’ ἐκεῖνην τὴν ὁραν, ὅτε ὁ ἔσπερος ἀνατέλλει.

Its sense along the same lines was widened by conjecture in Bentley’s attentions to Menander fr. 592 K.-Th., quite wrongly. The fragment has to be quoted in full to show why: τοὺς τῆς γαμητῆς δροὺς ὑπερβαίνεις γύναι
† διὰ τὴν αὐλὴν λίων †πέρος γὰρ αὐλεῖος θύρα ἐλευθέρα γυναικείον ἑνόμοσ‘ οἰκίας,
τὸ δ’ ἐπιδιόκειν εἰς τὴν ὀδόν τρέχειν ἔτι λοισορουμένην κυνὸς ἐστ’ ἔργον, Ὄδη.
I. 2: δ’ αὐλὴν Bentley

ἔτι λοισορουμένην requires a parallel earlier, quite apart from the oddity of having two forms of the adjective in one line (αὐλοῖς in Stobaeus here is in fact the reading of SM at this point, only. A having the correct epsilon-iota). Nauck’s διὰ τὴν λαλῶν (I. 2) is palmary: the "emendation" should not appear in LSJ s.v. αὐλοῖς. The gloss αὐλία θύρα: πυλῶν in Hesychius is in all likelihood corrupt as the two sounds by etacism were identical in his time. ἡ σύλεια θύρα which is what Hesychius intended to write is a common expression which first occurs in Od. XI 239, Pind., Hdt. etc. and that is the only application of that adjective - ἡ σύλεια is an abbreviation.1

An objection to Herwerden’s ἀναλίοις is that 493f. ὁ Πανὸς θακήμεατα καὶ παρααὐλίζουσα πέτρα has already prepared us to hear of the same place described as σῶλον (noun: a cave) which is what I suggest we have here. No change in the text is needed as it is precisely the word we want for the cave of Pan. Its appropriateness is demonstrated by the following dedicatory epigram of Leonidas (AP VI 334).

1Biehl conjectures ἡμονυς δτ’ ἐναλίους explaining the τοῖς σῶλον ἐν ἄντρως as abundantia verborum, and apparently with some thought of the cave known as the σῶλόν ἄντρον in A.R. II 910 (cf. Amm. Marc. XXII viii 23) in which Dionysus took his repose. The etymology is present in A.R. (ἡμίλιξτο 908, the correct text which is to be restored from the explanation given in E.M. 170 40.). Frankel (Die Argonautica des Apollonios (1968), 612) correctly relates both examples from Apollonius to the discussion of which we learnt from the scholia to II. XI 62 on the text of that line; some there read σῶλος ἄστρικρι of σῶλος - ἐστι γὰρ † οὐλύπιος † καὶ εἰς ἀνάσπουσιν ἄγων τὰ ξύλα. σῶλον is certainly right in Homer, the baneful Sirius, and A.R. is amusing himself by alluding to an ongoing scholarly dispute at the Library. On the textual problems of the scholia cf. Fraenkel ad i.c. and Erbse’s comments ad loc. (σῶλοις coni. Frankel, scitissime). Biehl’s suggested ἐναλίους is non-Classical too, and is never used as an adjective in the sense he requires.
Aφίλσι καὶ Νυμφέων ἱερὸς πάγος, αἳ θ’ ὑπὸ πέτρῃ
πίθακες, ἢ θ’ ὤδαισιν γειτονέουσα πίτυς,
kατε ἑπταγλώξιν, μηλοοσόε, Μαυάδος Ἐρμᾶ,
δὲ τε τὸν αἰγοβότην, Πάν, κατέχεις σκόπελον
ὦλαι τὰ ψοιστὰ τὸ τε σκύφος ἐμπλεον οὐησ
δέξασθ’, Αἰακίδεω δῶρα Νεοπτολέμου.

It is also what the cave was known as to an Athenian audience - cf. Lys. 721 of the acropolis ἢ τοῦ Πανός ἔστι σαῦλιον, Lucian (bis acc. ch. ix) call it τὸ ύπὸ τῇ ἀκροπόλει σπήλαιον.

In tragedy it is used of Philoctetes’ cave (S. Ph. 16f. σκοπεῖν δ᾽ ὅπου στε ἐνταύθα διοτόμος πέτρα | τοῖ ἐν ὑπέρ μὲν ἡλίου δυτή | πάρεσται ἐνθάκης, ἐν θέρει δ᾽ ὕπνον | δι’ ἀμφιτρήτος σαῦλιον πέμπετε πνοή cf. 954); the Cyclops speaks thus of his own (E. Cycl. 345, likewise Odysseus at 593).

The dative will in its first instance be locative (cf. K.-G. 1 442 para 426) subsequently clarified by τοῖσοι σοίς ἐν ἄντροις to which it stands in apposition.

The articulation of this phrase now becomes clearer. For returning to the problem initially broached, that of ὑμνῶν and the supposed over-determined genitives, a parallel emerges. The hyperbaton of a participle standing outside its clause which is occasioned by Badham’s ὑμνῶν is unattractive though not entirely without parallel (for this sort of oddity through unusual placing of temporal pronouns see Breitenbach, 262f.). But it is disruptive because the whole clause connects as follows:

σπάργγων ὑπ’ αἰόλας ἰαχάς followed by ὑμνῶν in apposition (the product of the

1As unattractive as Page’s attempt: <θ’> to follow σπάργγων and ὑμνοῦσ’ We obviously do not want two separate activities catalogued, and since when have the Aglaurides become a choir?
σόρως) leads to αὐλίας followed by τοῖς σοῖς ἐν ἄντροις in the same relation. Cf. [Hes.] Scut. 278 ὑπὸ λυγυρῶν συρῆγγων ἰέσαν αὐδὴν. See note 2 for an alternative possibility.  

503-506: ἴνα τεκοῦσά τις
παρθένος, ὦ μελέα, βρέφος
Φοίβῳ πτανοῖς ἐξόρισεν
θοίναν θηροὶ τε φοινίαν
δαίτα, πικρῶν γάμων ὃμισυ.

ἐξόρισέν: ὧριζω and its compounds are used in Euripides in a variety of metaphorical applications, often meaning little more than motion. The sense of "boundary" is latent in Ion 46 ὑπὲρ τε θυμέλας διορίσαι πρόθυμος ἣν (the priestess finding Ion). Hel. 393f.

5 The first part of this line is signalled by Diggle with [L], meaning that the MS is no longer legible - τοῖς σοῖς is assigned to Triclinius. What seems to occur at this point is a gap enough possibly for two letters after σοῖς - whether this is natural or caused by loss of the contents through wear cannot be told from a facsimile. What is curious is that whereas σοῖς fully written out would fit inter alia (3 letters - or at any rate, both sigmas, written with less than the usual clarity, so perhaps there has been a correction) the -οις termination instead appears in the abbreviated form:

It is not clear whether this is the work of Triclinius as the scribe is totally inconsistent on this abbreviation (the same or very similar after λόγον). P reads σοῖς with admirable clarity. Editors, starting with P and ending with Biehl, have possibly assumed that the curious sign to the right of the abbreviation is the circumflex accent. However it is an unusual shape and one would expect it over the abbreviation (though accents are sometimes placed to the right, for reasons of spacing, cf. cases on the same page.) Unless it is a chance flaw in the MS - which again it does not resemble - it seems quite possible that it is the trace of the letter (s) that occupied the gap. It is of the height indicated in my sketch and it is difficult to think of any letter reaching to that height other than the more theatrical of the two ways L has of writing ταῦ. If this is so, we should contemplate τοῖς σοῖς τῷ ἐν ἄντροις
αὐλίας and ἄντρα are the same. We thereby have a precise parallel for θεακῆμενα καὶ παρουλίζουσα πέτρα (see above) and the principle there argued for - that the second is generally more specific in such phrases, is confirmed. On misreading of L's minuscule in P which this is cf. Wecklein, *Sitz Münch. phil. kl.* (1899) II, 397f. and other works in Turyn, *Tradition*, 266.
πλείστον γὰρ οὕτως... στράτευμα κώπη διορίσται Τροίαν ἐπὶ presumably means little more than "cross" and in 828 it seems to have taken on the function of ὀπαλλάσσειν: πελοσάντε δ’ ἐκ γῆς διορίζομαι ἔν πόλε; What is "crossed" here is simply the notional boundary between the mother's care and presence and the infant itself - an echo of the phrase recurs at Ion 1458f. τέκνον, σὺκ ὀδάκρυτος ἐκλοχένη, ἵσος δὲ ματρὸς ἐκ χερῶν ὀρίζη. Similarly at Hel. 128 χειμῶν δ’ ἄλλος ἄλλον ὀρίζεν they were separated in the sense that boundaries were put between them, the root meaning.

There follow two problematic instances of the verb: Hipp. 1379f. μασθόνον τι σύγγονον παλαιῶν προγεννη-
tόρων ἐξορίζεται κακόν σοῦδέ μενει, ἐμοιλὲ τ’ ἐπ’ ἐμὲ -

The neuter singulars in l. 1379 are almost certainly right against the clumsy genitive plurals offered by four MSS. Barrett's paraphrase well brings out the fluid nature of the image: "The taint should work only against the guilty themselves, and this its proper sphere is circumscribed by a boundary, a ὄρος; now it is no longer staying within the boundary, but is crossing it to operate outside its proper sphere". Hippolytus is imagining himself as a Pelopid via Aethra (pace Barrett: the "corruption locus" is too strong to allow us merely to assume that Hippolytus is advancing a speculation about some unknown antecedent (which would be "who can it have been among my ancestors who displeased the gods in this way...?") The family histories are much more closely linked in the eyes of a Greek audience than they are for us, whence it is possible to make allusions of this kind to both past history and the future, a point brought out by H. Lloyd-Jones in JZ ch. V on Sophocles.1 We might say "it has broken bonds".

Ar. Eccl. 202f. has caused doubt: σωπτρία παρέκκυψεν, ἀλλ’ ὀρίζεται ὥρασιβουλος σῶτος σώχ’ παρακαλούμενος.

ὀρίζεται is, in effect, the reading of the Ravenna, with the negligible phonetic error -ει- (iotaism) and omission of breathing (the iota was restored by the Aldine, also in Λ (= Peruginus H 56). However it should be mentioned (as it is not in the OCT) that R also has faulty word division which might conceivably point to an illusion of οὐκ δ’ ἐξεταί. The passive in the sense "banish from the borders" occurs in Aeschines (in Ctes. 253: εἰ δὲ μᾶς φήμος μετέπεσεν, ὑπερήφανον’ ἐν). This is not the point here and another must be sought. Hermann, feeling that the Women's reply ὡς ξυνετός ἄνηρ also required an answering mental attitude preceding wrote ὀρίζεται: Meineke wrote ὀρίζεται ("give himself airs") which also 'accounts' for the misspelling in the Ravennas but unnecessarily, as the two

1Ch. V, 110f. and n. 32, with reference to the work of G. Perrotta.
sounds were identical for the scribe.\footnote{1}

From the examples above I think it is possible to defend the \textit{textus receptus}. Thrasybulus has, as it were, had a boundary put between himself and the proceedings that might have lead to \textit{σωτηρία}: that is, he is 'distanced' from such proceedings. Our \textit{Hel} example in itself seems to justify such a translation - the storm \textit{divided} one ship from another in the sense of placing a boundary between each (cf. the scholiast on S. Ph. 636: \textit{ὀρίζεται: διώστησιν}).

Finally, a very interesting \textit{varia lectio} in the prologue to the \textit{Phrixus} of Euripides is worth recalling = fr. 819 N. Our primary source for this fragment is Tzetzes (for 1-6: the remainder is supplied by the scholiast to \textit{Pho.} l. 6). In the former the opening lines run

\begin{quote}
\textsc{Σωδόνινον ποτ' ἄστυ Κάδμως ἐκλυτών,}\\
\textquoteleft Ἀγήγορος παῖς, ἥλθε Θηβαῖαν χθόνα\\
Φιόνιξ περικός, ἐκ δ' ὀρίζεται γένος\\
'Ελληνικόν, Διορκαῖόν οἴκησας πέδον'\\
\textquoteleft δ' ἥλθ' ἀνάγκη πεδία Φοινίκης λιπών\\
λέγομ' ἄν...\\
\end{quote}

However in a citation made by Plutarch without credit or context l. 3 concludes \textit{ἐκ δ'} \textit{ὀρίζεται} \textit{γένος} | Ἐλληνικόν. It is seriously worth considering whether this might be the true reading. It is undoubtedly the difficult \textit{lectio} and hard to explain by a lapse of memory, to put it mildly. \textit{ὀρίζομαι} in the sense purveyed by Tzetzes is very regular: an untimely reminiscence of Solon's elegy "that most moved the Athenians" (D.L. I. 47) might be the source:

\begin{quote}
\textquoteleft ἀντὶ γ' Ἀθηναῖου πατρίδ' ὀρίζομαινος (= fr. 2 2 West)\footnote{2} - more likely a gloss on the curiosity. The sense would be "he was transferred across the boundary from being Phoenician to becoming a Greek". A boundary is conceived between being of one nationality or the other and it is this that he has been caused to cross - the notion of real \textit{ὁποί} existing between countries makes this easily comprehensible and a close parallel is afforded by E. Hcld. 15f. \textit{φεύγουσι} δ' \textit{ἀλώμενοι} | \textit{ἄλλην ἀπ' ἄλλης ἐξορίζοντες πόλιν} in an only slightly more literal sense. \textit{ἐξορίζοντων} (Diggle) is probably right - cf.
\end{quote}
The whole sentence down to ὅβριν is an interesting example of how apposition can work. There are three nouns in "apposition" to the sentence, but the first two (θοίνον, δαίτα) are apposed to an object already singled out, namely the βρέφος who became the dinner for wild animals in the imagination of the chorus, while the final one (ὅβριν) is, to use Barrett’s useful distinction (ad Hipp. 752-7) "non-integral" that is, "in apposition to the action of the sentence" (Barrett’s further objection that the usual form of this phrase is unhelpful as "it disguises the fact that this accusative is only one application of the internal accusative and it suggests that the accusative is a non-integral comment added to a sentence already complete without it" is undoubtedly correct: contrast our passage where the sentence is syntactically complete without ὅβριν with one where the word-order indicates that we are not to think of it in this way - Hel. 77 ἀπόλοξουσιν εἶκοις ἔθοανς ἄν Διὸς κόρης "your death would have been your reward for resembling Helen"). A close parallel to the idea and construction in ὅβριν here is El. 1260f. Ἀλλρόθιον δὲ ἐκταν' ἐμφέφρων Ἀρης, μῆνιν θυγατρὸς ἄνωσίν νυμφευμέτων (μῆνιν is an answer to the whole sentence: "in wrath for..."). Cf. Or. 1105 Ἐλένην κτάνουσαν, Μενέλαῳ λύπην πικρᾶν. The construction is part of the fabric of Greek: it can be discerned already in Homer (II. XXIV 734f.-Andromache portending the death of Astyanax Ἡ τῆς Ἀχαίῶν | βῆμεθι χειρὸς ἐλῶν ἀπὸ πούργου, λυγρὸν διέθρον. The shorter expression so common in Homer τὸ δ’ ἰκάνω e.g. XXIV 172 in its abbreviated, colloquial form shows that it was no poetic innovation but a

Likewise in general apposition to the action of a verb Erechtheus fr. 65 l. 89 f. Austin εἴργεῖν δὲ μὴ τις πολεμῶν θύσῃ λαθὼν | νίκην μὲν σῶτοις γῇ δὲ τῆδε πημονήν. Thus OC 92-3 (κέρδη... ἔτην) etc.
generally accepted mode of thought).¹ English, and more particularly German, would add the idea of the accusative so apposed to the verb making a longer compound: thus if the Greek followed the English idiom an Aristophanic-type creation would appear here περιγραμματιζειν (if the irreverence may be forgiven) and for an English noun carrying with it the idea of "evil" - "he malversated the funds" the Greek would probably say "he took the funds, a malversation". Ag. 226 ἔτοι δ' οὖν θυτήρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός, γυναικοποιώννον πολέμου ἀρωγήν καὶ προτέλεια ναῶν is a true example ("he brought himself to become the slayer of his daughter, in aid of a war for avenging the loss of a woman and as a preliminary rite on behalf of the fleet" Fraenkel's version: he refers (n. ad 47) to Matthiae, Grießliche Grammatik, 970f. who correctly explains the construction in a longer discussion) and shows how, as here in Ion, there can be two accusative "outcomes" to the sentence viewed slightly differently in meaning and syntax (ibid. 46 στόλον Αργείων... ἡμιν, στρατιώτων ἀρωγήν is, pace Fraenkel, not an example: the army is itself an ἀρωγή and in order to make the personification perfectly clear Aeschylus has placed στρατιώτων with the noun: thus the accusative stands in primary apposition to the preceding noun - it is like the στόλον στρατιώθεν of 132f., a "bit formed into the shape of an army").

Some more curious examples are: HF 57f.

τοιούτον ἀνθρώπουσιν ἡ δυσπραξία,

ἡς μήποθ' ὀστίς καὶ μέσως εὔνους ἐμοὶ

tύχοι, φίλων ἔλεγχον ἄψευδέστατον.

Here one might almost speak of anacoluthon in combination with the construction as the accusative ἔλεγχον shows how distinctly the idea of the dromenon of the sentence and the

¹at least a possible explanation for τὸ δ' ἔπει φανή κτλ., in OC 1225 - in apposition to the action of ἑγεῖν. It might be considered at Or. 1348 ἡμᾶν γὰρ ἢκεις, οὐχὶ σοι, σωτηρίαν if genuine - see Willink ad loc.
verb after which we expect a genitive have become separated. There is no question of corruption.¹

_Held._ 70f.

ικέται δ’ ὅντες ἀγοραστον Διός

βιαζόμεσθα καὶ στέφη μυαλνται,

πόλει τ’ ὑνείδος καὶ θεών ἁτμία.

is problematic. Diggle in his discussion in _Dionysiaca_, 171f. = _Euripidea_, 191f., following England, emends to the accusative. Neither nominative nor accusative is especially attractive as the text stands.² With the former the last line simply hangs in space with no construction. The accusative after a passive, especially with καὶ στέφη μυαλνται intervening, seems to be putting too much strain even on this wide construction. Much preferable in my opinion is a lacuna after 72 before we come to the chorus’ interjection and stasimon. e.g.

πόλει <τ’> ὑνείδος καὶ θεών ἁτμία

<καθίκετ’ ἐκ τοῦδ’ ἔργατος κλεινῇ ποτέ>.³

In addition to the editors and works cited above cf._ (in primis) Wilamowitz on _HF_ 59 (cf. too _Ba._ 9, _Pho._ 211f., _Alc._ 7 etc.), K.-G. I 284 para 6, Schwyzuer II 617. Diggle has considerably advanced our understanding of this idiom, despite the doubt that some, including myself, entertain about some instances where he has restored the accusative in question. See too _PCPS_ XXVIII (1982), 59f. (= _Euripidea_, 223f.) - where, however, στάσων in _Andr._ 475 is especially dubious. The most recent innovation - σωτηρίαν for σωτηρίαν (cf. _Held._ 402) is to be commended at _Pho._ 1092.

¹Thus in _Ag._ 225 the ἀρωγάν etc. is no _actually_ what is "endured", it is the result of the process.

²See also G.L. Koniaris, _AJP_ CII (1981) 104f.

³For καθικείσθοι thus, cf. Lucian _Toxaris_ xlvi (ὄβρις).
In prose it makes regular appearances but largely in the form of the so called schema etymologicum (I add the caution as it has connotations of learned Callimachean word-play where none is intended and does not embrace the wide category of phrases where the accusative is cognate to the verb of the sentence only in meaning.). The reason for this is obvious: clarity and the desire to avoid floating accusatives that allow of explanation in the context of the sentence in different ways.

θοιναν etc. Callimachus was later to follow Euripides` method here of alluding to a clear Homeric context and sharpening the context and the wording. θοινα, if any distinction can be drawn between it and δειλας, is a word that par excellence conjures up the idea of joyful and pious conviviality. It is the very antithesis of the cruel scene we are invited to contemplate (the same effect in (Hes.) Scut. 113f. λυλαιόμενοι πολέμοι | φυλόπιδα στήσειν, τά σφιν πολύ φιλτρα θοίνης. The θοινη later (Ion 1140) is the γενέθλια for Ion: ἐν θοινη λέγει τινὰ (Pl. Lg. 649A et al.) is proverbial for friendly relations with anyone. (On the wider significance of food symbolism and the ironic use to which it can be put cf. Jasper Griffin, Homer on Life and Death, 16f.). πτωνοίς ἄρθρωσθείς θοινα reappears in an echo, of this passage at Ion 903 in the midst of the most intensely tragic part of the play, Creusa’s speech against Apollo. θοινη is essentially a celebration (Theasis in the famous fragment of lamentation (A. fr. 350 Radt l. 7 f.) contrasts the actions of Apollo towards Achilles with his presence at her wedding ὅ δ’ αὐτὸς ψυμνὸν, αὐτὸς ἐν θοϊνη παρῳν (l. 7).)

All this combined with the clear reminiscence in θηροί τε φοιναν δοειτα to the opening lines of the Iliad but in such a different and pathetic context. In πιρῳν γάμων as in E.

---

1In itself a topos: cf. in Hec. 1075f. Polymestor’s lament (again by allusion giving it a different tone) τέκνα... κυσίν τε φοιναν δοειτ’ ἀνήμερον τ’ ὅρειον ἐκβολάν, HF 568, S. Ant. 29 and many examples collected by Collard on Su. l. 47.
Su. 832¹ we seem to hear Od. I 266 πάντες κ’ ὤκουμοριά τε γενολατο πικρόγομοι τε. The θοινη metaphor similarly "reversed": El. 638 πικρος συνθοινατωρ. The phrase πικρον γάμον ύβριν should not be explained as it is by Owen, Paley and Badham as referring to the child himself in the same way in which Ion in 325 refers to himself as an αδίκημα του γυναικος (where see ad loc.).² Wilamowitz saw the point ("Der Akkusativ ist ganz lose als Apposition an die actio verbi angeschlossen... Darin, dass sie ihr Kind aussetzte, lag, dass ihre Vergewaltigung ύβρις war."). Closely comparable is Ba. 6f. ὁρῷ δὲ μητέρας μνήμα τῆς κεραυνίας | τὸδ’ ἐγγὺς ὅλων καὶ δόμων ἐρείπια | τυφόμενα δίου πυρὸς ἔτο ξώσαν φλόγα, | ἀθάνατον "Ἡρας μητέρ’ εἰς ἐμῆν ύβριν where the ύβριν is only slightly more closely associated with the actual noun preceding in that the fire reminds the speaker by association with the action of ύβρις.³

It is not entirely certain how we should construe Euripides' Homeric quotation in this phrase. By the common poetic turn πικρὸς γάμος mean "γάμος that spelt ill for the partners" (Od. XVII 448 μη τέχα πικρῆν Αἰγυπτῶν καὶ Κύπρον ἵκη αἰ is a classic instance: cf. E. Med. 399 with our expression πικροδος δ’ ἑγὼ σφιν καὶ λυγρος θῆσω γάμους | πικρὸν δὲ κῆδος καὶ φυγάς ἐμὸς χθονὸς: cf. Hel. 296 δτον πόσις πικρος | ξυνή γυναικι καὶ τὸ σώμ’ ἐστίν πικρὸν, Hipp. 635 λέχος (if genuine, del. Barthold), HF 483f. ¹ πατῆρ δὲ πατρὸς ἔστιν γάμους δδε, | "Αὐδὴν νομίζων πενθερὸν κηδος πικρων with Reiske's πικρὸν for πιτρὸς. Su. 832f. which is quoted in n. 1 previous page (chorus to Adrastus) actually seems to be a reminiscence conscious or otherwise of the end of this

¹πικροδος ἐσειδες γάμους, πικρὸν δὲ Φοίβου φάτιν.
²"puerum per vim et contumeliam genitum" (Musgrave).
³Here too the apposition modulates from φλόγα presumably to be taken, with Dodds, as internal acc. with τυφόμενα but nonetheless what is actually seen, to ύβριν which summarizes the whole action.
chorus of Ion (πικρός, φότις) or the other way round cf. Med. 1388 πικράς τελευτάς τῶν ἔμων γόμων ἰδών. πικρός used with things that one expects to be pleasant is too common to require parallel: the reversal of the joy of γόμος seems to be something that especially appealed to Euripides’ imagination, as the usage of this phrase and the larger context of his work shows (on the theme see now R.A.S. Seaford, "The Tragic Wedding", JHS CVII (1987), 106f.). One feels that the wonderful modulation of marriage-hymn to dirge conveyed in the tonality of Wagner’s "Auftritt" in Lohengrin would have been much to his taste.

506-8: οὔτε ἐπὶ κερκίσιν οὔτε λόγοις

φότιν διον εὐτυχίας μετέχειν

θεόθεν τέκνα θνατοῖς.

The final πνιγός which as often concludes a Euripidean system of lyrics. It is remarkable that not only Murray but Dale (Metrical Analyses II p. 122) should impair it by reading the three lines as anapaestic and adding ὑβριν to the beginning of the following line in my colometry. ὑβριν certainly belongs with the rest of the striking phrase in which it is contained - the truth was seen by Wilamowitz ("starke Sinnpause" GV, 569-70). For the effect might be compared Held. 615-7 = 626-8 and Su. 277f. The same effect may be seen at length at Pho. 784f. = 801f. - see too id. 1577f.

On the sense of οὔτε ἐπὶ κερκίσιν cf. on 197 μυθεύσαι παρὰ πήναις: cf. IA 788 αἱ πολύχρυσοι | Λυθαὶ καὶ Φρυγῶν ἄλοχοι στήσουσι παρ’ ἱστοῖς | μυθεύσαι τάδε κ.τ.λ.1 The κερκίδες in question reappear at Ion 747 (where the chorus are addressed by Creusa as ἱστῶν τῶν ἔμων καὶ κερκίδος | δοὺλευμα πιστῶν). It scarcely requires parallel that the loom with the κερκίς is just the place one would expect to find women in Greek

1'μυθεύσαι 'suspectum' - Murray; - εὖσουσι Matthiae and Π².
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custom as in Roman ("lanam fecit"): thus it appears as an alarming reversal of normality in the Bacchae that the Bacchanals are (117) θηλυγενής δώρος | ἀρ' ἵπτον παρὰ κερκίδων τ' | οἰκυπηθεῖς Διονύσῳ cf. ibid. 1236. (Agae’s tragic boast, echoing the former joyous chorus) ἣ τάς παρ' ἱστοῖς ἐκλυτιοῦσα κερκίδας | ἐς μείζον' ἄκω.

Conversations confined to women (cf. Hipp. 384, Semonides fr. 7, 90f., in comedy Men. Dysc. 384f. etc) were generally considered to be a vehicle for fantastic, tendentious or improper communications.

λόγους φάτων: Thus L. The phrase has caused some perplexity and Diggle consents to Badham’s λόγον (ed. 1851).

Owen paraphrases "they heard the story when weaving or at recitations and plays" (my italics). It brings out the difficulty with assuming that the preposition is to be taken in some fashion with λόγους: this had already perturbed Wilamowitz who explains "Man mag sagen, es wäre eine Art Zeugma, dass nicht das Korrekte ἐν λόγους steht". Diggle (à propos of Su. 968-9: Studies p. 23-4) collects a number of examples of the type in which a preposition has to be understood with a second noun, but from the first clause, of a double phrase but regards this one as "an improbable expression" and certainly of the examples discussed there the preposition understood goes naturally with the second as well as the first noun - e.g. Pho. 1555 οὐδ' ἐπ' ὀνείδεσιν οὐδ' ἐπιχάρμασιν | ὃλλ' ὀδύναιοι λέγω (where the second noun is understandably but wrongly written as ἐπι χάρμασιν in two MSS), S. OT 239 μήτ' ἐν θεῶν εὐχαίστ. μήτε θύμασιν | κοινὸν πονεῖσθαι. Indeed most of them are close to being synonyms. <ἐπί> λόγους is certainly not the Greek for "in conversation" in any general sense - it would make the λόγους into a concerted activity such as the work at the loom which is far from its meaning (= rumour).
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However this interpretation, and the emendation that it would probably require, is not the right one. φόνος as rumour is conveyed by λόγοι, and we should take it as one phrase consisting of two words, bearing much the same relation to each other as an adjective to a noun.

This is at its most common with the dative with nouns in -μο (factitive). Thus S. OC 1026 τὰ γὰρ δολῶν τὸ μὴ δικαίω κτήματ’ οὐχὶ σφέτεται ("the instrumental dative with the noun as with the cognate participle" Jebb). Pl. Soph. 261 E τὸν τῇ φωνῇ περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν δηλωμέναν 1 ("a δήλωμα that is brought about by the use of the voice"), Pl. Lg. 633B is a rather striking example, which also shows clearly that a noun of non-factitive meaning can be amenable to this idiom: τὸ περὶ τοὺς καρτερήσεις τῶν ἀληθοῦν πολὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν γινόμενον, ἐν τῇ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοῖς ἄρσενοι μάχαις καὶ ἐν ἄρσαγας πάσι διὰ πολλῶν πληγῆν ἔκκαστερε γινομένων. 2 ("genitival dative of the instrument" rightly England ad loc.). Cratylus 433 B is exactly parallel to the Sophist passage quoted Kai.gr’ omélyu bfihrwa aullaflaig Kat ypduguacnnpéwu’cog fivopa elven Three instances of such usages of verbs with non-factitive sense should be adduced from Pindar: Isthm. III 15 ἰστε μᾶὸν Κλεωνόμου | δόξαν παλαιὸν ἀρμασιν ("the glory of old compassed by your chariots"). Similarly in Pyth. VI 15f. κοινὰν τε γενέξ | λόγοισι θυσών | εὔδοξον ἀρματι νίκαιον. In view of these two I would agree, with Bury, that Isthm. II 12f. is a further example οὐκ ἀγνώτ’ ἀείδω | 'Ισθμίαν ἦποιοι νίκαιον. (This could conceivably be an ethic dative however: on this use of the construction cf. Diggle, PCPS, X (1974) p. 13 = Euripidea, 105.)

We now come to some "examples" that tend to haunt the discussion of the idiom and

1περί here with acc. "directed to the matter of οὐσία".

2Ast introduces γινομένως rightly.
should take their leave. It is perhaps a fault in K.-G. 2 427f. that such examples appear as
S. Tr. 668 οὐ δῆ τι τῶν σῶν 'Ηρακλεῖ δωρημάτων and even more so Lysias XIX 22 πρὸς
tῶν μυθῶν τοῖς πελταστοῖς, as these are in origin ethic datives of advantage and therefore
not in the same camp, as translation into English clearly indicates. At Pl. Lg. 631 C κινήσεις
tῷ σώματι does not mean "movements of the body": the whole subject is ἀγαθὸ and the
third benefit accruing form the Cretan system is ῥόχας εἰς τὸν δρόμον καὶ εἰς τᾶς
ἄλλας πάσας κινήσεις τῷ σώματί. At Pl. Pol. 280d. τὰς βία πράξεις the dative is so
much an established adverb as to make this a poor example. Cf. Rp. 397b: καὶ ἔστω δὴ ἢ
τούτων λέξεις ἀπασα διὰ μμήσεως φωναῖς τε καὶ σχήμασιν, ἢ συμφρόν τι δηηήσεως
ἦσοσα (it is like ὁ πάλαι χρόνος). Lg. 717a βέλη δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ οὖν ἢ τοῖς βέλεσιν
ἔφεσι τὰ πού' ἄν λεγόμενα ὀρθότατ' ἄν φέροιτ' ἄν probably means "the correct way of
firing with regard to the βέλη", "suitable to", Lg. 813 D γυμνάσια γὰρ τίθεμεν καὶ τὰ περὶ
tὸν πόλεμον ἀπαντα τοῖς σώματι διαπονήματα is under the influence of τίθεμεν "this
is what we recommend for the body".1

ἄπαν. The verb in tragedy is almost entirely confined to lyric - common in Homer.
Cf. in Euripides Hipp. 362, Tro. 155, Hec. 173 and eight other examples. The only instance
in dialogue is OC 304.2

For ἄποι with an indirect clause as here cf. II. XV 248 οὐκ ἄποι δὲ νησοῦν ἐπι
πρόμνησιν 'Αχαιῶν | οὑς ἑτάρους ὀλέκοντα βοήν ἀγαθὸς βέλευν Αἰαῖς; φάττω is quasi-

1These considerations, the abundance of 'internal imitation' in the syntax and structure
of this ode, and the influence of Od. VIII 264 (πέπληγον δὲ χορὸν θεῖον ποσῖν) make it
highly likely that χορὸς ποδοῦν in 495 is a virtually identical expression in form, with
ποδοῦν as dative, not genitive.

2A locus dubius for several reasons. Wecklein deleted 299 - 307 acc. to OCT. I would
include 554 in this excision and hope to argue for this elsewhere. The problem is not
addressed by the OCT editors.
adverbial in parallel with the adverbial expression preceding it.

As Wilamowitz notes, the Homeric form θεόθεν is used as a genitive here, more specifically a genitive of origin. For this cf. Or. 160 μέλεος ἐχθίστων θεόθεν ἐρμιότων where, as here, the word could be replaced with an adjective, A. Ag. 131f. μὴ τις ἤγια θεόθεν κνεφάση προτυπὲν στόμαν μέγα Τροίας (not I think, pace Willink, Or. 974 where the verb ἔδει makes a good deal of difference).
The second epeisodion of the play is divided in two metrically: the first third, roughly speaking (510-65) is conducted in trochaic tetrameters, which from 517 to 529 alternate line by line between the two speakers and for the rest of the conversation pass into increasingly frantic antilabe: towards the conclusion one speaker more often than not interrupts the syntax of the other and completes it for him. Euripides thus brilliantly portrays both through his choice of metre, which is associated for obvious reasons of sound with urgent stage business, and through the increasingly staccato character of the language, the gathering momentum of the dialogue. His audience must have been "on the edge of their seats" while following the flow.

Euripides' use of the trochaic tetramer, of which he makes a much more varied and imaginative use in widely differing literary contexts than did his predecessors (to our knowledge) has been explored by: W. Krieg, "Der trochaeische Tetrameter bei Euripides" (Philologus XCI (1936), 42 ff.). M. Imhof "Tetrameterszenen in der Tragödie" (Mus. Helv. XIII (1956), 125 ff.). T. Drew-Bear "The Trochaic Tetramer in Greek Tragedy" (AJPhil LXXXIX (1968), 385 ff.)

Drew-Bear’s study is the most sensitive and the least inclined to utilize the phenomenon to "date" plays otherwise in doubt - if schol. Ar. Eq. 1302 is right, the Alcmeneon (438) contained them (= fr. 66 N.), though certainly IA with 210 lines and Orestes with 114 testify to an upsurge in these late works (the Ion, with 84, comes third, though as the Pho., with 63 (if all genuine) is fourth, there is no cause for dogma).

From ancient sources we learn little more than that it ὅψι ἄνεσιμονθη from its employment in satyr play (Ar. poet. 1449 a 21) and that it lent itself to lively forms of dance (cf. Ar. l.c., id. Rhet. 1404 a 30, Longinus de subl. 41 1, D.H. de comp. 106 - West, Greek
Music, 158). A scholiast on ΛΑ 317, the play’s first trochaic line, explains the metre through Agamemnon’s entering μετὰ δρόμου.

In fact E. seems to take pleasure in introducing it in noticeably unexpected contexts: these are to some extent reviewed by Imhof l.c.- it is sufficient to point out the astonishing modulation from iambics to trochaics in Cassandra’s prophecy-speech (Tro. 444-461) with its powerful tragic effect. In Ion here, the animation with which later tragedy understandably associated it-will be the explanation. Another, however, is excogitated by Biehl ("Zur Plänumsökonomie der Tetrameterszenen in Euripides’ Ion", Philol. CXXI (1977), 301f.). He notes that the trochees occurring later in the play (1250-60, 1606-1622) together amount to 28 lines, exactly half of the 56 lines we have here, and concludes that the significance intended by this 2:1 ratio is that in the later combination we are to recognize "die echte Wiedererkennung", in the earlier "die vermeintliche Wiedererkennung". Quite apart from the common sense objections to this type of hyper-ingenious numerology, 1250f. cannot be called a "Wiedererkennung" of any kind, and 1606f. is not so in the normal fashion.

The Text

Ion reenters, having completed his attentions to the water-stoups, and encounters once again the maids of Creusa who are gathered around the steps of the temple. There is no obvious motive for the question he immediately puts to them as to whether Xuthus has emerged from the adyton, but there is a psychological plausibility in it: his awakened interest in Creusa and her plight.

Nothing could surprise him more than the extraordinary change in attitude towards him from Xuthus when he appears from the direction of the temple moments afterwards: Xuthus greets him as his "son" and the audience are well aware from the prologue spoken by Hermes
what he has in mind. Ion of course does not; the very word τέκνον can also be a term of affection alone and he not unreasonably attributes Xuthus’ exaggerated expressions of affection to unspeakable motives. High comedy results. Gradually he is brought to accept Xuthus’ story, and it is characteristic of the pious votary of Apollo that this occurs as a result of his unwillingness to disbelieve the god (557), rather than from the force of Xuthus’ arguments.

His interest immediately turns to the rationale behind this, however, and among his questions - delivered in staccato and excited antilabe at this stage - foremost comes the establishment of his own free birth. It is a touching contrast to his endless affirmations that he is a slave to the god in his opening monody, in which he literally attempts to "make drudgery divine", as Owen aptly puts it.

The scene concludes on a joyous note of acceptance. Xuthus is evidently overjoyed at being a father (terms expressing paternity are littered through the dialogue). Ion’s initial joy at escaping orphanage and slavery (ἐκπεφυγόμεν τὸ δοῦλον: 556) turn to the gravest misgivings in the next scene.

510f. "Ιω. πρόσπολοι γυναικεῖς, αἱ τῶν ὀμφί κρηπίδας δόμων
θυσίδών φρούρημι ἔχουσαι δεσπότην φυλάσσετε,
ἐκλέλοιπ’ ἡδὴ τῶν ιερῶν τρίτοδα καὶ χρηστήριον
Σοῦθος, ἢ μίνει κατ’ οἶκον ἵσταρτον ἀπαίδιαν;
Χο. ἐν δόμωις ἔστ’, ὦ ἔζεν’. σύπω δὲμ’ ὑπερβαίνει τόδε.
ὡς δ’ ἐπ’ ἐξόδοιςιν ὄντος, τῶν ὦκούμεν πολὺν
δοῦλον, ἔξισάντα τ’ ἡδὴ δεσπότην ὁρῶν πάρα.
On κρηπίς see on 38. In 511 L has ἔχοντα. Stephanus’ ἔχουσαι - governing φρούρημα,
Or. 804 τοῦτο ἐκείνον κτάσθε ἐπάλφους μὴ τὸ συγγενὲς μόνον. Otherwise textually unimpeachable: emendation difficult, as ἐκτησθ’ is unattested and ἐκεῖν’ <ὁ> (Willink) inappropiate in a gnomic remark. Text accepted by West.

IA 1391: ἕτε ἐκιαίον τοῦτο ἂρ ἔχομεν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος ἕτε; Most corrupt. Hermann’s version, adopted by Murray, still wants a caesura let alone solving our problem. Weil solves both but at some cost: Nonetheless possible -

ἱ ἐκιαίον ἂρα τοῦτος ἔχομεν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος;

b) Does the presence of an appositive constitute an exception? If so, our examples join this category.


2. Containing division: IA 908, Ag. 1652.

Considering the first example in (a) and those in (b), Diggle was certainly right to practise restraint.¹

οὔτω δόμ’ ὑπερβαίνει τόδε: For the verb with the accusative cf. 220 where it patently means “cross (over)”. Here and at Med. 382 ἐὰν ληφθήσομαι | δόμους ὑπερβαίνουσα it is more problematic in sense. In the latter case Housman’s ὑπερβαίνουσα has found much favour: it is an ingenious coinage to depict a stealthy entry but is unknown to Greek literature. It is also unnecessary. Barrett has shown (ad Hipp. 782-3) that (a) the sense ‘enter’ is legitimate cf. Od. VIII 80 ὑπέρβη λάϊνον σύδον | χρησμενο| (b) that by analogy with περᾶν (enter, Hipp. 782, exit, Pho. 299) either is

¹More generally, one might ask: (1) is it proper to speak of “word end” before ἔορν’ i.e. does the Porson-Havet rule apply to monosyllables? On this opinions differ. (2) In any event, elision is generally felt to mitigate breaches of rules concerning word-ending. In the examples cited with ὅπτ’ we have, again, a “strong” postpositive with elision (i.e. a monosyllable-equivalent by elision) - which is thought-provoking.
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possible - the former must be the meaning in Med. l.c., the latter here. In Alc. 829 I suggest ύπερβαίνων for ύπερβαλλόν.

If doubt were entertained ύπερβαίνει is conceivable - ύπεξέρχομαι governs an accusative (Thuc. III 34 etc.) and there need not be a tone of furtiveness - the Homeric sense of ύπέκ leads to ύπεκπρολώ (Q. Smyrn.) ύπεκπεράω (Orph. Arg.)

ἐπ’ ἐξὸδους: For the phrase "on his way out" as we say in English, cf. Thuc. V 14 ξυνέβαινε... τὰς τριοκονταύτες σπονδὰς ἐπ’ ἐξόδῳ εἶναι ibid. 28 ἐπ’ ἐξόδῳ γὰρ πρὸς οὐτῶς ἀι σπονδαὶ ἤσον. For this type of ἐπ’, which could vaguely be called circumstantial though the subdivisions are kaleidoscopic cf. on 235: K.-G. 1 p. 501f.: LSJ B I 1 (i).

ὁντος cannot stand for τινος as Owen thinks, nor do we need to assume so: the chorus are answering Ion's question in its own context much as they do about Creusa in 237. Telling a character's approach by the θύρας δοῦπος is reminiscent of comedy, or at any rate of ordinary life - cf. Gomme-Sandbach, Menander: A Commentary (1973), 574.

517-520: Ξο. ὃ τέκνον, χαῦρ' ἢ γὰρ ἄρχη τοῦ λόγου πρέπουσα μοι.

---

1 ἐξοδὸς / ἐπέξοδος is possibly a sly reference to the type of martial language that Xuthus himself employe habitually - vide supra.

2 Of course unspoken definite people can be understood in one word genitive absolutes. For τινὸς understood OT 629 is adduced and so interpreted by Jebb and S.-N. The context however shows that σοῦ is understood, ἵμοι being understood with ἄρκτέον -

Κρ. εἰ δὲ ξυνήσης μηδέν; Οἶδ. ἄρκτόν γ’ ὀμος.
Κρ. σοῦτοι κακῶς γ’ ἄρχοντος. Οἰδ. ὃ πόλις πόλις.
Κρ. κάμοι πόλεως μέτεστιν, ὦγις σοι μόνω.

The examples cited by those editors are amenable to a similar explanation.

3 The founding discussion of this device is Eduard Fraenkel, De Media et Nova Comoedia Quaestiones (Gottingen 1912), 60-3: on Menander cf. Frost, Entrances and Exits p. 6 (B 2).
“Ἰω. χαίρομεν ὑπὸ δ’ εὖ φρόνει γε καὶ δὺ ὅντ’ εὖ πρᾶξομεν.

Ἐπο. δός χερὸς φιλημά μοι σῆς σῶματός τ’ ἀμφιπτυχάς.

“Ἰω. εὖ φρόνεις μέν; ἢ σ’ ἔμηνε θεοῦ τις, ὦ ἔνε, βλάβην;

ἡ γὰρ ἄρχῃ κτλ.: Cf. the close parallel in Med. 663 (Aegaeus on first meeting Medea) Μῆδεια, χαίρε· τοῦде γὰρ προοίμιον | κάλλιον σύνεις οἴδε προοφωνεῖν φίλους, El. 1060 (the start of Electra's long rhesis to her mother) λέγομεν’ ἂν’ ἄρχη δ’ ἢδε μοι προοίμιον etc. The inception of speech, as of sacrifice or indeed any undertaking, could be regarded as the source of an omen, often a bad one. Cf. Ion 753 “Ἰω. ἵω δαίμον Πρ. τὸ προοίμιον μὲν τῶν λόγων οὐκ εὐτυχές, HF 538 (Heracles and Megara after the former has heard the terrible plight of his family) Ἀπολλόν, οἶους φρομίους ἄρχῃ λόγου. On the use of the word φρομίου in tragedy cf. Fraenkel III, 558 n.1.

Badham’s ἢδε γ’ is tempting, as it is at El. 1060 for the δὲ, in a slightly different sense "to begin with...", "this is the first thing I have to say".

518: χαίρομεν κτλ.

Ion responds to Xuthus' exuberance with haughty reserve. On the use of the plural χαίρομεν which here surely conveys that impression see on 417. The tone of γε with the imperative here is hard to define. Denniston (GP, 125) is cautious about the usage, as the MSS frequently differ in the various examples. This however is liable to be due to the disunity in practice between elision and scriptio plena, and the obvious temptation to replace a particle not immediately comprehensible with δὲ, which should be well known to anyone who has studied an ancient MS. He concedes that the particle "sharpens the tone of the imperative". Perhaps we should not impose a dogmatic unity of connotation: here we may understand the γε as approximating to a protasis "and provided that you behave sensibly, we
shall both fare well", or, as Diggle (Studies, 22) suggests, referring to Denniston, GP, 153, to be taken with δὲ as an example of δὲ... γε "in retorts and lively rejoinders". For an approximation to my ‘modificatory’ version cf. Su. 842 εἰπε γ’ ὄς σοφότερος (δὲ Elmsley), possibly the difficult S. El. 345 ἐπειθ' ἐλοῦ γε θάντερ' ἡ... ἡ (though cf. Diggle i.c. n. 1, Lloyd-Jones, CR n.s. XXVIII (1978), 219, id. Sophoclea, 49). However I suggest that ἐπειθ', which has caused the main doubt (ἐπειθ' ἡσθοῦ γε Blaydes ἐπειθ γ' Page, Lloyd-Jones) should be translated "after this" and the infinitives after ἐλοῦ to be, as it were, the equivalent of the imperatives that Electra would have expressed, modified (thus we have γε in our "moderating" sense). Not I think emphatic (Jebb on El, Collard on Su i.c., rightly rejected by Diggle.

Wholesale deletion of γε with the imperative is neither desirable nor possible but in every case explanation is, and it emerges from Diggle i.c. that everywhere both MSS and meaning deny us a simple γε just with the imperative. Of the six examples adduced by Denniston from tragedy, two owe their existence to metri gratia interpolation of γε, one is shown to be wrong by the MSS, at Alc 1126-7 either Denniston’s or Diggle’s emendation may be right, at S. El. 411 ὄλλα νῶν makes a compound: S. El. 345. I have attempted to explain.

519: δὸς χερὸς φίλημα μοι.

What is a χερὸς φίλημα? Evidently not "kiss" as it is generally taken. χερὸς does not fit in, unless we are in the world of courtly love. Wilamowitz was undoubtedly right to appeal to the clasped hands we find in Attic grave reliefs. On this cf. now G. Neumann, Gesten und Gebärden bei den Griechen (1965), 290 ff. An example from an exceptionally fine stone lekythos in the Museum of Copenhagen is illustrated in Kurtz, AWL, no. 53. 2, cf.
...in E. Also prose.

συμμετέχεις τ’ ὁμιλητικός: ὁμιλητικός occurs here and here only, a Euripidean variant on περιμετέχεις, ὁμα-, δια- (all in E.) etc. The plural is quite understandable as an embrace does not involve one single motion: alternatively it could be generic i.e. "the right to embrace you". For φιλήματα in the normal sense and χέρας περιμετέχειν cf. Andr. 416.

520: εὗ φρονεῖς μέν; The effect of μέν in a question is to imply an apodosis, usually not expressed, implying the opposite. It is common in questions of the sense we have here, and is an idiom of doubtful reserve (ὕπατείς μέν; Ar. Av. 1214), or of downright contempt (Med. 1129, the herald to Medea, φρονεῖς μέν ὁρθά;). Here the δὲ clause is effectively supplied in Ion's next words.

ἡ ὁ ἔμνεν θεοῦ... βλάβη: Cf. Hipp. 511 ἐπὶ βλάβη φρενῶν S. Ant. 1051 δοκιμη... μὴ φρονεῖν πλείστη βλάβη, ibid. 1104 θεὼν ποιδωκείς... βλάβαι.

ἔμνεν: ἔμνεν Diggle. ἔμνεν has been suggested by Diggle (PCPS, XX (1974) p. 36 n. 1 = Euripidea, 136) in a concluding note to an account of the synizesis of θεός, θεά in iambic trimeters, referring to trochaics. In ia. trim. there is a tendency to avoid altogether a short syllable preceding this synizesis except in the second element of the third foot. For further conditions and an explanation see Diggle's discussion. In trochaics in E. this is the only example tout court. There is one in Sophocles - OT 1519 if genuine. I am not entirely certain whether Diggle (following a hint of Badham's) means by the "ambiguity" he invokes to explain this tendency; an ambiguity as to how the form might be scanned (and if so

These are indeed taken to be funerary farewells - but perhaps they were not meant to be so specifically, merely a gesture of friendship similar to those we find in graphic art.
rightly? wrongly?) or a temporary ambiguity to be solved as soon as we reach the next syllable. Presumably the Athenians did not hear or read verse by passing mechanically from one syllable to the next. There is no such ambiguity of the former sort in the trochaics. And why does it not apply in other forms of synizesis?

521: σωφρονῶ τὰ φίλατι θ᾽ εὐρόν εἰ φυγεῖν ἐφεμευήν;

The above is the MS reading. Tr² has written φιλεῖν over the original φυγεῖν which might be seen to imply that Jacobs' "Deutung" of the MS as οὐ φρονῶ may be right. The possibilities are numerous:

(a) The textus receptus, warts and all: "But (would you consider that) I am in my right mind, if I attempt to flee from my best beloved?"

(b) The text yielded by the version of Triclinius, which requires taking εἶ in a different sense: "But I am in my right mind, since I aim to embrace my best beloved". (For εἶ in this sense cf. on 343).

(c) Jacobs’ version 1. with φυγεῖν: "Well I certainly would not be in my right mind, if I attempted to do other than what I am doing and avoided my best beloved". 2. with φιλεῖν: This will have to be a question: "Do you mean to say that I am out of my mind, if I seek to embrace my beloved?"

(d) Murray’s version: M. kept σωφρονῶ followed by a raised stop and οὖ for εἶ: "But I am in my right mind (contrary to what you have just claimed): I am not anxious to avoid my beloved".¹

Other permutations are possible: these are the main lines of the problem. Ion’s reply

¹In favour of this perhaps one should note the brusqueness that characterises Xuthus: one word reply again σωφρονοῦ in next lines and elsewhere in the speech.
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would accord equally well with all five, Jacobs' οὐ φρονῶ has a close parallel in El. 568f. (the preliminaries to the recognition scene of Electra and Orestes) -

Electra: πάλαι δέδορκας, μή σοι γ' σώκετ' εὖ φρονεῖς;¹
Old Man: οὐκ εὖ φρονῶ γε οὖν κατάγνητον βλέπων;²

The meaning of 369 appears to resemble Jacobs (2): "Am I out of my mind, since I am looking at your own brother?". Denniston's interpretation, which dispenses with the transmitted question mark, is quite different and less convincing: "I cannot look upon your brother except with feelings of loving loyalty". His γάρ for 'γώ admittedly assists this rendition slightly and sharpens the irony of the remark, however taken "Quite right: I cannot see your brother without loyalty", in which the Old Man echoes Electra's words in a changed sense. But this is not compelling either. Cf. too Andr. 666 εἴτ' ἐγὼ μὲν οὐ φρονῶ μηδὲν τὰ μή δίκαια, σοὶ δ' ἐνεστή νοοῖς;

φιλεῖν and φυγεῖν could be uncial variants known to Triclinius. If not, the need for an emendation is not apparent, as both give good sense. The uncorrected version merely requires the addition of a question mark, which as punctuation in MSS has no authority is scarcely an emendation. Murray's version is somewhat blunt, and the MS with φιλεῖν is somewhat dull. Jacobs is probably right and Triclinius' φιλεῖν producing a rhetorical jingle with τὰ φύλαττα is perhaps to be preferred. φυγεῖν is a weak word for "to keep away from", especially with the strong ἐφέμεια.

τὰ φύλαττα: See on 187. Epic lengthening before ὃ in 522, as almost universally in tragedy.

¹Diggle's punctuation - raised stop (or dash with Denniston) after δέδορκα and question mark at end of 568 is certainly right.
²γε pro 'γώ scripsi: vide sequentia.
523: ἰψομαί κεύ ῥυσιάζω, τάμα δʼ εὐρίσκω φῦλά ῥυσιάζω is a charming choice of word for Xuthus, cf. 1406 (pass.) A. Su. 424 (pass.). For the phrase cf. A. Su. 412 καὶ μὴ τε δὴρις ῥυσίων ἐφαύηταν, id. fr. 258 Radt for the sense of remove by force: (Phineus of the Harpies) καὶ ψευδόδειπνα πολλὰ μαργώσης γνάθου ἔρρυσιάζον στόματος ἐν πρώτη χαρὰ. Ἡλ. 163 (in passive) ποία πεδί’ ἄφαιρεθείς ἔτι ρυσιασθείς, πόλεμον ’Αργείους ἔχειν is a brilliant emendation of Kirchhoff for MS Τηρυνθείους θῆς (i.e. θείς). Tiryns, as Wilkins l.c. points out, has nothing to do with the play as such and is nowhere else mentioned.

The point of its application here, as these examples indicate, is that it has a pronouncedly military flavour, that of taking "spoil". In all of these contexts that tone is present, literally or metaphorically. In later Greek it becomes the mot juste for sacking or pillaging a city (Diodorus etc.). For the militaristic Xuthus it is just the phrase he would apply to laying hold of Ion's sacred fillets.

524: οὐκ ἀπαλλάξῃ πρὶν εἶσω τόξα πλευμόνων λαβεῖν;

For the hyperbaton with εἰσω cf. Ἀλκ. 1097 δέχον νῦν εἶσω τὴν χρήμα χειναίων δόμων. Euripides shows no especial preference for placing it before or after the case it governs: in Homer it follows its case with three exceptions. On the usage of εἰσω in

---

1 Athenaeus reads ἔρρυσιάς οἶνον which nonsense may be emended to the active (Lobeck) or the passive (ἔρρυσιάσθη, Kaibel). Nauck may be right to refer the action to the Harpies with μαργώση γνάθω.

2 An τάμα γ’ εὐρίσκων potius legendum? elegantius nimiram sed Xuthi fracto sermoni fortasse alienum.

3 Half the MSS have the genitive pl. assimilated to δόμων, the other half γενναίων assimilated to τήνδε. Lenting's γενναίως, adopted by Diggle, is not only more elegant but more relevant.
Euripides see also on 551.

πλευμόνων κτλ.: For the phrase cf. Ion 766. διανταξός ἐπιπέν ὅδονα με
πλευμόνων τὸν δ' ἔσω.

The MS offers πνευμόνων as is commonly the case. This is also frequent as a variant - thus at S. Tr. 567 it appears in most manuscripts with lambda, in L nu appears supra lineam. Examples are multiplied in TLG VI p. 1261. In Euripides cf.: HF 1093, nu in L and the papyrus, lambda Tr², Or. 277, codd. unanimous for nu. Ion 766 is interesting, though puzzling and indicating disunity in Byzantine times: L is illegible but as Tr¹ wrote nu, presumably the original was lambda - in contradiction to his attentions to HF l.c. The lambda is finally restored by Nauck. At fr. 983 N. Macrobius offers lambda, Plutarch nu. In Aeschylus, West (Aeschylus tragœdiae, præf. (1990), 1) notes that the form with lambda has survived in M at Septem 61 and Cho. 639. The Suda s.v. πνεύμων quoted from Philoponus in de anima II the etymology from ἀναστυνέοντα prefixing this with λέγεται καὶ διὰ τὸ λ. Despite the similarity on the two letters in uncial, paleographical error is unlikely to contribute. The question of which was the "right" form was debated in antiquity; the scholiast at Ar. Pax 1069 tell us that lambda was the correct Attic form, doubtless drawing on the Atticist grammarians of the time (cf. Moeris p. 309 Pierson). Eustathius II. 483 10 ad II. IV 363 etc. and Photius (s.v. nom.) supplement this by prescribing it for Homer. It is uncertain whether etymology is as decisive as is claimed - √ πλέω may indeed by the root of the lambda form, but the alternative etymology from πνέω subscribed to by Philoponus (supra), Herodian pert ὑθ. p. 571 24 Lentz, EM 677 31 and Hes. s.v. πνεύμων seems equally logical. See Chantraine s.v. πλευμόνων and the discussion of Jebb ad Tr. l.c.

On the inconsistency cf. Bond on HF 1097.

525: ὡς τι δὴ φεύγεις με, σαυτοῦ γνωρίσας τὰ φίλτατα;

ἐμέ was corrected to με by Heath. For the colloquial ellipse ὡς τι δὴ... cf. Or. 796 ὁπ. καὶ με πρὸς τῷ βον πόρευσον πατρός Πυλ. ὡς τι δὴ τόδε; ("what's the point of that?"). The verb in each different case has to be supplied mentally; for an entire version cf. IT 557 ὡς τι δὴ θέλων; Alc. 537 ὡς δὴ τῷ δράσων τὸν δ' ὑπορράπτεις λόγον; E. is, as one would expect, alone in the tragedians in making use of this touch from common speech: cf. Denniston GP p. 211 (c): Stevens CE, 29.

γνωρίσας is the MS reading. How then should we understand the structure of the sentence? Taken as syntactically independent it must mean "for what reason (i.e. τι <θέλων>) do you flee from me, now that you have recognized him who is most dear to you".
This is the only sense which can be given to the aorist participle and it is manifestly misleading. Ion is standing over Xuthus with his arrow on the string instructing him in the plainest terms to leave him alone, and even Xuthus could scarcely regard that as a sign of joyful recognition.

Murray places a raised stop after με and explains the remainder of the sentence by means of one of his frequent aposiopeses: "Why do you flee me? Once you have come to recognize the one most dear to you (you will act otherwise vel. sim.)". That at least has the virtue of separating the participle from subordination to the tense of φεύγεις and, with a slightly greater mental effort, one could assume aposiopesis without the new punctuation. But it is very difficult: (cf. Housman's dictum CP I, 12, re IT, 35) and the convention that the character abruptly interrupted, as X. would be here on M.'s interpretation, should continue his remarks in the same construction as he originally intended, still stands.

Page suggested γνωρίσσω, which takes τὰ φιλότοtheta as accusative in apposition to με. But this is no improvement on Herrmann's γνώρισσον (requiring renewed punctuation.) Indeed it is worse: we have already observed that "amat haec persona abrupte loqui" (Murray). We should not therefore invent a more difficult construction merely in order to make Xuthus speak in the elegant style of Ion or Creusa.

With Hermann's emendation, γνωρίζω must mean not "recognize" but "bring yourself to recognize" - the process rather than the fact. For this analogies are not lacking.

Pl. Rep. 402 A: (a noble youth may instinctively avoid evil without being told the λόγος that dictates this: ἐλθόντας δὲ τοῦ λόγου ὀσπάζοντά δὲν αὐτόν γνωρίζων

Pol. 258 A: δεῖ δὴ τούς τε συγγενεῖς ἡμᾶς ἀκεῖ... διὰ λόγων ἀναγνωρίζειν (in the context of the Young Socrates who bears the name of the master, and Theaetetus who shares his simian appearance: Socrates argues before the discussion proper begins that one ought to
526: οὔ φιλῶ φρενοῦν ἀμούσους καὶ μεμηνότας ξένους.

Scaliger was obviously right to alter ὀφεῖλω to οὔ φιλῶ and it is surprising that it took as long as this for such a simple emendation to be made. It will have arisen owing to the virtual identity of the two vowel sounds in Byzantine Greek. Possibly it may be worth noting editorially that P has φρενῶν for φρενοῦν - if only because it makes sense, albeit of a very inferior kind. It is doubtless a palaeographical error.

527: κτείνε καὶ πίμπρη τοτρός γὰρ, ἥν κτάνης, ἐσθι φονεύς.

The hyperbole in κτείνε καὶ πίμπρη is designed for comic effect: cf. fr. 687 1 f. N. from the satyric Syleus: πίμπρη, κάταυθε σάρκας, ἐμπλησθήτι μου | πίναν κελαινῶν αἴμα. It recurs in a more serious context in Pho. 521 πρός ταύτ' ἵτω μὲν πῦρ, ἵτω δὲ φάσγανα. Other examples of "killing and burning" are assembled by Owen. The reference is not probably to the technique of making a burnt offering but to the normal procedure on sacking a city, applied metaphorically to one person: another military touch put in Xuthus' mouth.

528: ποῦ δὲ μοι πιστὴρ σύ; ταύτ' οὖν σύ γέλως κλύειν ἐμοί;

L reads ἐμοῦ: the diorthotes corrects this to the more idiomatic dative. Murray nonetheless defends the genitive via a dubious paraphrase: "ludibrium mei". Dubious, because γέλως does not mean "laughter/mockery at someone" (which would justify the objective genitive), but "laughter by another person directed at someone else" (Od. XVII 350: γέλων δ' ἐτάροισιν ἔτευχε etc.). In short, it does not mean "mockery" per se but the effect that
another's laughable conduct induces, as with Ion here. Moreover κλέειν becomes difficult to explain. ποῦ has a satirical tone and is sharper than πῶς. Cf. A. Su. 505 ποῦ θράσος νέμεις ἔμοι; ("what do you mean by..."); S. Aj. 1100 (Teucer to Menelaus of Ajax) ποῦ σο εὑρείης τοῦδε; OT 390 ποῦ σο μάντις εἰ καφῆς, Ph. 451 ποῦ χρῆ τίθεσθαι ταῦτα, ποῦ δ' αἰνεῖν... IA 406 δεῖξις δὲ ποῦ μοι πατρὸς ἐκ ταὐτοῦ γεγός; (Ag.) The cynical ἄλλα ποῦ τόδε; Or. 1179, is linked with this. Cf. Hcld. 369, 510 ποῦ τάδ' ἐν χρηστοῖς ἑρέιει; ("how could this possibly be regarded as a decent action?").

On the "associative dative" in the first μοι cf. on 260. West has recently reminded us that κλέειν, κλέων may be either present or aorist depending on accent. Unfortunately the discrepancy goes back to the ancient sources on accents, though for the wrong reason, namely that they thought some IInd aorist infinitives to be present - as they often were in Byzantine times, θίγω for θυγγάνω etc., and thus passed into Modern Greek. It is quite possible that our passage would benefit from the resurrection of κλεεῖν, effected by West (BICS XXXI (1984) 172 f., 179 on this instance) "is this not a ridiculous thing for me to have heard?"

520: "Ἰω. οὐ τρέχων ὃ μύθος ἐν σοι τάμας σημηνεύειν ἐν.

οὗ solum: another colloquial brevity quite suited to Xuthus - cf. K.-G. 2 541. τρέχων ὃ μύθος: "in the course of what I am going to tell you". Cf. S. Aj. 731 λήγει δ' ἐρις δρομόφορα τοῦ προσωπάτων ("the strife when it had run well-nigh to the furthest" - Jebb).1

Ba. 268 εὐτροφοχος γλώσσα, quoted by Owen, has nothing whatever to do with this idiom:

1The genitive is difficult and may be influenced by those in the next line (note especially the final λόγου with the variant προσωπάτων in many MSS). Possibly τὴν προσωπάτην (like τὴν ταχιστήν): the ἐρις had gone as far as it could (when it came to drawing swords), indicating that the genitive is not governed by λήγει (which would make δρομόφορα strange anyway). Cf. in general Wil. ad HF 681.
the speaker is accusing Dionysus of having a "facile" tongue.

531: "Ἰω. τίς λέγει τάδ', Ἱσό. δει κτρεψεν δντα Λοξίας έμδν.

Note the hyperbaton in Xuthus' reply, designed for emphasis.

532: "Ἰω. μαρτυρεῖς σαυτῷ. Ἱσό. τά τοῦ θεου γ' ἐκμαθῶν χρηστήρια.

The sense of μαρτυρεῖν here is not exactly "produce witnesses to support your claim" but rather "to give me some good reason for doing/thinking that what you are saying is true". Cf. Orestes' answer to the Erinyes at Eum. 593f. Ἱσό. πρὸς τοῦ δ' ἐπείσοδης καὶ τίνος βουλεύμασιν, Ὀρ. τοῖς τούδε θεοφατοις μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι, A. Su. 796 βοθό πτώμα μαρτυροϋθά μοι ("making it quite certain that I shall have a βοθό πτώμα"), Pind. Ol. VI 21 etc.

There is however a problem in the translation of μαρτυρεῖς. The present tense in the second person cannot be used in Greek as a substitute for an imperative mood. It may verge towards this in the first person, and the "instantaneous present" ("I am going down to the library" when one is still sitting at the breakfast table) is as well known in Greek as it is in English. It is correctly delimited by K.-G. 1 140: "ohne Rücksicht auf den wirklichen Abschluss... wo der Abschluss gar nicht oder erst später erfolgt ist, das Deutsche oft Umschreibungen mit versuchen, wollen, nahe daran sein, und ähnlichen Wendungen zu Hilfe nehmen". (Cf. too Jannaris, HG, para 1841).

However this pattern of thought cannot be transferred to the actions of another and no example is forthcoming. Thus we must translate in the slightly more subtle sense of "you have only yourself as witness (Fact). Owen's citation with other editors from the Gospel of John V 31 is thus very apt ἐὰν ἔγω μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἔμαυτοῦ, ἢ μαρτυρία μου σοκ ἔστην
imam, despite the special theological connotations.

έκμαθὼν χρηστήρια: L has an impossible hiatus before ἐκμαθῶν and Triclinius mends this with his usual γέ. Cf. in the same context OT 1428 εἰ μὴ τού θεοῦ | πρῶτον' ἔχρηζον ἐκμαθεῖν τί δραστέον, 285 (Teiresias) παρ' οὖ τις ἃν | σκοπῶν τάδ'... ἐκμάθων σαφέστατα. Though he has indeed not got the point, he is characteristically determined that he is right and that no other interpretation is possible.

533: 'Ἰω. ἐσφάλης αἰνησι' ἀκούσας. Ξο. σῦκ ἄρ' ὃθ' ἀκούσμεν.

Even the pious Ion is aware that Delphic oracles tend to be misleading (δυσμαθὴ δ' ἀκως) in the words of the chorus of Ag. 1255 (πυθόκραντα)

The tone of ἀρα is close to our "so now you are saying that..." used indignantly when we wish to cast an opponent's words back in his teeth. Cf. for example HF 759 (in reply to a blasphemous suggestion) ἄφρονα λόγον... ὃς ἄρ' οὐ οἴκουσιν θεοῖ. Denniston, GP, 38f. has further examples of the sarcastic use of the inferential particle (a question mark at the end of the sentence is also possible, with the same implication).

534-5: 'Ἰω. ὃ δὲ λόγος τίς ἐστι Φοίβου. Ξο. τὸν συνάντησαντά μοι....

"Ἰω. τίνα συνάντησιν;

How is the accusative συνάντησιν to be explained? Probably as "accusative in apposition to the sentence". A parallel is afforded by Thuc. I 3 4: (of the Greeks making war on Troy) ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην τὴν στρατεύειν θαλάσσῃ ἢδη πλέω χρώμενον ἱενεξήλθον.

A problem of tenses now arises, which requires consideration of the following line as well.
Professor West (BICS XXVIII (1981), 64) has argued for συμφόρας in 534. Diggle mentions this in his app. crit. with the observation that if (presumably meaning "only if") this is adopted, Nauck’s κυρήσεων for κυρήσαι in 436 "requiritur".

West’s alteration, which was intended to reflect more faithfully the tense and wording of the actual oracle, seems to me unnecessary. The meeting logically precedes the συμφόρας and good sense is just as well served by the MS reading, if not better. The only difference in sense attained is one that may not be especially welcome: with the future participle Apollo is being slightly more specific "the man whom you are are going to meet". With the vaguer aorist participle all he is saying is that paternity will be consequent upon meeting the first man - whoever he may be - on leaving the shrine. Which is better, and in fact achieves West’s aim better? as he points out, δὲ ἔν + subj. is the norm in Delphic statements of this character and only Parke-Wormell DO II, 381, preceded by ἐστιν τις, has the future.

However the choice of tense in 534 has no bearing whatever on that used in 536, which is where the real problem lies. It is now nearly a century since the debate on whether aorist infinitives could stand for the future tense in oratio obliqua was laid to rest. This was achieved not by laborious cataloguing of what MSS actually offer us in these circumstances but by A.E. Housman’s common sense. It is of course a frequent source of variants. But it is only so with those verbs in which the change of spelling affects only one or two largely similar letters - as with δέξασθαι / δέξεσθαι. No canon of style works this way: as Housman pointed out so many years ago, one instance of λαβεῖν standing for λήψεσθαι would be one hundred times the worth of the quantity of sigmatic aorist infinitives that his predecessors had unthinkingly piled up. Nauck’s κυρήσεων should of course be adopted in
See A.E. Housman, CP (Diggle - Goodyear) III, 1067 f. Other discussion: Madvig, Adversaria I, bk. I ch. IV (cited by Housman. The more complicated argument based on 'historical' philology offered by K.-G. l p. 197 seems to me to founder on the same rock.)

συμφορά: As often, with no unfavourable connotations. In verse this is exemplified by OT 33 ἀνδρῶν δὲ πρῶτον ἐν τε συμφοραῖς βλου | κρίνοντες, ἐν τε δαμάνων συναλλαγαῖς where συναλλαγαῖ gives the sense. Hdt. I. 32. 4 πάν ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος συμφορή (what "falls out", good or bad). Who after reviewing the variatio in genders here will doubt the correctness of Nestle's theories about sophistic traits in Herodotus?

παιδ' ἐμὸν πεφυκέναι: Intrinsically ambiguous. It could mean that Ion is by birth (φύσες) the son of Xuthus, or that, in the more attenuated sense of the verb especially common in tragedy in the perfect tense, that Ion was "a son for him". Hermes has already given us notice of this divine subterfuge (70f. δόσει... ζοῦθω τὸν αὐτοῦ παιδα καὶ πεφυκέναι | κείνου σφέ φήσει: see ad loc.).

537: "Ἰω. σὸν γεγοντ' ἡ δῶρον ἄλλως; Ἐο. δῶρον ὄντα δ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ.

ἄλλως L: ἄλλων Dobree.

Dobree's conjecture has enjoyed a certain amount of unjustified popularity and it is perturbing to see that Diggle not only argues for it (Studies, 102) but even includes it in the text. In this he relies on Shilleto's proof - which nobody would gainsay - on Dem. de fals. leg. 24 to the effect that disparagement or deprecation are essential to the meaning of ἄλλως in all its applications. Why though is this "false to the tone of the passage?". What Ion means is "your natural son, or a 'son' given as a gift", continuing the ambiguity which he has noticed in 536 (see last note). Xuthus is effectively spiking Ion's guns "Yes, it is a token of
the god's generosity - but you are also my own son*. The whole logic (and subtlety) of his reply is lost if ἀλλὰς is read because the antithesis of δῶρον and σῶν γεγοτα fails: with Dobree's conjecture Xuthus simply fails to answer Ion's question. With ἀλλὰς however the idea is left open that Ion could be both a δῶρον and Xuthus' own son, which is the very point that Xuthus proceeds to take advantage of in his reply. And whoever are these ἄλλοι that suddenly spring into action from nowhere to provide Xuthus with offspring moments after he has left the mantic session which was concerned with that?. Dobree actually argued that ἦς ἐμοῦ necessitated his "emendation", which is over-exact and mistakes the true contrast Euripides has in mind. Owen's contention that δῶρον refers specifically to Apollo surrendering his own minister, on the other hand, rather overloads it. Diggle finally adduces OT 1162f. Οὐ πόθεν λαβών; οῖκειον ἦ 'ἐς ἄλλου τυνός; Θε. ἐμὸν μὲν σῶκ ἐγὼν' ἐδεξάμην δὲ τοῦ. But there the point is quite obviously Oedipus' passionate anxiety to discover the identity of the child in question for very good reasons. It assist the matter not at all and the conjecture should be rejected.¹

538: "Ἰω. πρῶτα δήτ' ἐμοὶ ξυνάπτεις πόδα σῶν; Ξο. σῶκ ἄλλῳ τέκνον.

ἐμοὶ ξυνάπτεις πόδα: A typical Euripidean periphrasis and a favourite verb. Cf. Ion 792 τῷ ξυνήψει ξυγος ποδος | πόσις ταλαίνης. Pho. 37 ξυνάπτετον πόδα ἐς ταύτων...

όδου Hel. 543f. σῶκ ως δρομαία πόλος ἢ Βακχη θεοῦ | τάφῳ ξυνάψῳ κώλων; (Helen),

¹Musgrave's δὲ sharpens the contrast, though L a.c. τε is equally possible. Triclinius' (?) σε is a gloss (pace Murray ad loc.) ("ο ex τ fortasse factum in L" is dubious).

ἀλλὰς frequently accompanies a substantive alone; cf. Tro. 476 σῶκ ἀριθμον ἀλλὰς ἕλλ. ὑπερθαύτους Φρυγάν (= a mere total, though there is a play on Homer's σοτ' ἐν λόγῳ σοτ' ἐν ὀρθῷ cf. Ar. Nu. 1203). S. Ph. 947 εἰδώλον ἀλλὰς "a mere figment" E. Hec. 489 ἢ δόξαιν ἀλλὰς τήνδε κεκτήσατα μάτιν "Illusory". The MSS continue with πεσθῇ, δικοῦντοι διαιμένων ἐλνα γένος. It took until Nauck to delete this, an interesting example of how the interpolator misunderstood the "Delphic" acc. and inf. construction of 488 (with ἄνθρωπος as subject), thereby leading him to this unfortunate composition.
Su. 1014 is a remarkable double periphrasis: τόχλα δὲ μοι ξυνάπτου ποδὸς ἀλλαγάς. This is attained by T.C.W. Stinton’s brilliant conjecture ἀλλαγάς for L’s ἀλλὰ τὸς which improves the whole structure of this part of Evadne’s devoutio speech (commended to Collard verbatim). The asyndeton which this gives to Evadne in the following line whatever else we read is entirely appropriate to her disturbed frame of mind: we hardly require an inferential particle. (ἀλλαγάς is easier. Hermann’s ἀλματί, adopted by Diggle, achieves the same result at perhaps greater cost.)
539: “Ιω. ἡ τύχη πόθεν πόθ’ ἤκει; Ξο. δύο μίαν θαυμάζομεν.

“However does this come about?”

This usage of πόθεν is a colloquialism rare in the tragedians and in the elliptical form seems to be confined to Euripides, Aristophanes and prose. El. 656 is an example, Ἡλ. ἢξει κληοῦσα λόχι’ ἐμοῦ νοσήματα Πρ. πόθεν; τί δ’ αὐτῇ σοφοὶ μέλειν δοκεῖς τέκνον; κληοῦσα is better here, as pointed out by West BICS XXXI (1984) p. 176. I respectfully venture to doubt whether even doubt, let alone obelisk accrue to τί δ’ in 657. Diggle conjectures τουκτή (clearly the answer required is not "from Argos" but a statement of what makes Electra so certain that Clytaemnestra will in fact come to see her). Thus Vesp. 1145 πόθεν ὧγάθ’ (What! ?), Ran. 1455 with Rogers’ note.

The tone is of amazement and frequently as the above examples demonstrate of unbelief as well (Ba. 648, Alc. 781 etc) – quite relevant to Ion’s state of mind at this moment. (El. l.c. should be added to the list in LSJ 1 4). A. Cho. 515 πόθεν χορὸς ἐπεμψεν; ἐκ τίνος λόγου; certainly means "why?" but the ellipse is not found in the other tragedians.

ἀπο λόγου: With τύχην understood from what Ion has said. This rough syntactical connection may well be suited to Xuthus’ style: the possibility of μίαν (adverbial) should not be forgotten however. Cf. Wilamowitz on HF 681.

540: “Ιω. ἔς τίνος δὲ σοι πέφυκα μητρὸς; Ξο. οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι.

Canter’s transposition of μητρὸς πέφυκα is metrically necessary.

Both suggested the simple emendation ἐκ and this is adopted by Diggle and favoured by Owen. This appears to be based on the assumption that if it is left unchanged the word can only mean "leave me alone": Owen envisages unannounced stage business: Xuthus once again attempts to embrace Ion. This is clearly not the moment juste for doing so and if that
were indeed the sense of ἐκα here, it should be changed.

The other possible sense is "let us abandon this subject" (cf. A. PV 332 (Prometheus to Oceanus) καὶ νῦν ἔκασσων μηδὲ σοι μελησότω, II. ΧΧΙ 221 ὄλλα' ὡς δὴ καὶ ἔκασσων etc.). That is no better, as it is the subject that has just been raised that Ion goes on to pursue.

The question that commentators have consistently begged is whether ἐκα in fact was felt to have anything whatever to do with the verb ἔκα. Prima facie there is no good reason to suppose so: it is used frequently in Euripides (in particular) to draw attention to any new or remarkable sight, sound or thought and may have no more to do with the verb than ἐκ does with ἀκα. If this explanation is permitted (it is authorized by LSJ inter alia), we must presumably explain it as "Leave off your present thoughts: for now look at this...". It is tortuous and unnecessary.

ἐκα, τι χρημάτα is a standard expression1 with ἐκα governing nothing (A. PV 298 is decisive here - λευσσω etc. can hardly be understood, as Oceanus has already appeared and delivered a speech of twelve lines. The punctuation is correctly restored by Willink at Or. 277, see n.: previous editors had taken τι χρημα' ἀλλ'ωτοgether as an accusative of respect. At S. OC 1477f.: ἐκα ἐκα - ἢδοι μάλ' αὐθίς' ἐμφιστάσαται διαπρύσσων ὅτος κτλ. a connection with the verb would exactly negate the intended meaning.

The set phrase ἐκα τι λευσσω occurs twenty times in E. alone. Cf. too Hel. 1177 ἐκα' ὄλλα' ώς ἐδικε πάντα διαπεπαγμένα ηῦρηκα (Theoclymenus) and Or. i.c. for the exclamation as introducing a new consideration.

If Ion is representing the new path of inquiry to himself almost like a vision, there is little difficulty in understanding ἐκα in the fashion described above, and no need to change the

---

1 cf. Stevens, CE, 33.
541: "Iw. οὖδὲ Φοίβος εἶπε; Ἐω. τερφθεὶς τοῦτο, κεῖν' οὐκ ἰρόμην.

Owen is right to compare Helen 536-7 (so pleased was Helen to hear from Theonoe that Menelaus was alive that she failed to ask whether he would be safe on Egyptian soil):

εὖ δ' ἀπέστη τοῦτ’ ἐρωτήσαι σαφῶς, | ἠσθείον’ ἐπει νῦν εἶπέ μοι σεσωσμένον.

542: "Iw. γῆς ἄρ’ ἐκπέφυκα μητρός; Ἐω. ο’ πέδον τίκτει τέκνα.

ἄρα used in a disbelieving question: it is of course fraught with irony in Ion’s case as the audience has just been reminded of his true ancestry and his curious origins in the preceding scene. Euripides is at his most witty. Needless to say Xuthus cannot bring himself to imagine anything so fantastic as the mode of birth of Creusa’s grandfather. The variant in P πατόων is obvious nonsense and a curious example of scribal psychology.

543: "Iw. πῶς ἀν οὖν εἶχην σός; Ἐω. ο’κ οἶδ‘, ἀναφέρω δ’ εἰς τὸν θεόν.

"I leave the exposition of the problem to the god" is what Xuthus means to say, though the underlying irony of this passage may activate a more severe sense of ἐωρόπω, namely "pass the blame on to the god", which fits the situation better (cf. 827, Or. 76 ἐς

---

1ἐά by synizesis, obviously: OT 1451, Ant. 95; Ar. Nu. 932 is metrically indeterminate (" possible, cf. Dover’s note) and should not appear in LSJ as an example. See Fraenkel (Agamemnon ad 1256 n. 4) for a full discussion of the idioms with the interjection.

2"not being itself an interrogation, like ἄρα, but expressing the anxiety of the questioner" LSJ B III Ion is here questioning (cf. preceding lines, and a question mark is here required). It should not be interpreted as a disclamatory inferential ἄρα (i.e. HF 739 ἄφονα λόγον... ὡς ἄρ’ ο’ὐ σθένουσι σθέοι, Denniston, GP, 38-9), as presumably Murray does. Biehl has the correct punctuation. All Ion’s remarks from 534 have been questions and 542 is no exception.
It is possible that Plato may have had this passage in mind at Apol. 20 E f. (Socrates decries his own capacity for knowledge and refers instead to the god at Delphi: οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸν ἑρώ τὸν λόγον, δὲν ἰὰν λέγω, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀξιόχρεον ὑμᾶν τὸν λέγοντα ἁνοίξω.) On the legal connotations of this verb cf. on 253.

544: "Ἰω. φέρε, λόγων ἀφόμεθ' ἄλλων. Ἑο. τοῦτ’ ἐμείνον, ὡ τέκνον: Cf. Andr. 662 ἀφαιρεῖ θα γὰρ οὐκ ἀἰσχρόν λόγον "the subject is not too disgraceful to approach" S. Ant. 179 δςίς... μὴ τῶν ἀριστῶν ἀπετείχε καυλειμάτων, and often. This should be distinguished from the more hostile sense best translated as "batten on to", Pl. Phaedo 86D etc.

tοῦτ’ ἐμείνον: L reads ταῦτα, which Herwerden emended to the singular, adopted by Diggle. Murray went in the other direction and secured concord with ἐμείνονα (elided). Wilamowitz argues "nur im Singular kann Xuthus dem neuen Vorschlage zustimmen". Exactly the opposite change (from ἐμείνον to ἐμείνονα (elided)) occurs at PV 1035 and Eum. 632 in M. The corruption here may well therefore have arisen in two stages, if the singular ἐμείνον at some earlier stage in transmission were corrupted to the plural. The singular certainly seems better, for the reason Wilamowitz offers.

545: "Ἰω. ἡλθες εἰς νόθον τι λέκτρον; Ἑο. μωρίς γε τοῦ νέου.

νόθον τι λέκτρον: Not necessarily as offensive a question as it appears to us.

μωρίς γε τοῦ νέου: An eccentric variant λόγου for what must be the right reading τοῦ νέου occurs in P - see below for the possible significance of this.

---

1 On MSS here cf. Dawe Collation p. 244.
toû νέου is generally understood as an abstract term and was so understood by an annotator in L: toû νέου: τῆς νεότητος. For this we may compare Andr. 184 κακὸν γε θυντοῦσι τὸ νέον ἐν τῇ νέφῳ τοῦ μὴ δίκαιον δότις ἀνθρώπων ἔχει (δὲ Stobaeus, et al.)

Mus. 75 τῶν νέφων δὲ ἐσπαλμένων ἢ σητοῦσα τοῦ τεκόντα, OC 1229 ἐντὶ ἢν τὸ νέον παρῆ (see Jebb on the sense). But Xuthus is not a man to deal in abstract terms - all these are quite clearly such and used in a quasi-philosophical context - and is it not easier to take it in the very common sense of "in the foolishness that one could expect from a young man"? Xuthus refers to himself in a generality.

The variant of P cannot be satisfactorily explained on palaeographical ground: the downstroke of the μ and the upstroke of the λ rule this out for minuscule and the capital Π does so for uncial. In the palmy days before Zuntz showed beyond any great doubt the dependence of P on L, some attempt was made to find sense in it: Murray argued that the scribe of P had his mind on τοῦ ἀλόγου that is to say (ἀλόγου) μέρους τῆς ψυχῆς which would presumably lead to τόλογου in the text. One may doubt whether Xuthus had read very much Plato, but fr. 650 N. was laid under contribution.

πᾶλλʼ ἐξείδες ψεύδουσιν ταῖς δόλοις πλατέοφοις
καὶ δόλοις Stobaeus MSS: καὶ λόγοι Dindorf: -οὖν-ν> ἀλόγοι Matthiae.

Dindorf's conjecture is somewhat weak.

ἐξείδε can indeed be a gilded bait but it is manufactured from within. λόγοι can back it up from without if they incite your hopes to rise yet higher, but that is not in the Greek,

1The first sentiment is singularly strange but should be understood as almost a hendiadys with the second. δότις.. ἔχει however is highly curious and ὄντων' is a simple palaeographical correction, making τὸ δίκαιον the subject. It is a probably emendation of Kirchhoff at E. Su. 164 and of F. G. Schmidt at fr. 408 N.; it should probably be considered at S. Aj. 475 and at E. Andr. 184f. κακὸν γε θυντοῦσι τὸ νέον ἐν τῇ νέφῳ τοῦ μὴ δίκαιον δότις ἀνθρώπων ἔχει (where the remarks of Diggle, PCPS XV (1969), 41-2 = Euripidea, 13f. are relevant).
which also allows of simple fraudulence on any matter. I suggest τάλαγαυον, which unifies the subject matter and improves on Matthiae’s ugly effort. "Hope tends to deceive mortals, even when they are manifestly turned towards the unthinkable”.

The error will have arisen from scriptio plena\(^1\) and we are entitled to divorce this from consideration of Ion 545. However a more important point arises. It is quite possible that the mistake in P simply arose from an untimely recollection of λόγων in the previous line. But if P had had before him the clarifying note we find in L in the margin would he have been so obtuse?

The aberrations of scribes and scholiasts are per se no reason to challenge Zuntz’s impressive arguments for derivation. We may, however, take this as one indication that P used L before the annotations that we find against the alphabetic plays were put in place. Another such indication at 300 († εἱ στρεφει † etc., see ad loc.) where the conditions despite an (incidentally valuable) note in L both MSS give the wrong reading and in different ways.\(^2\)

546: “Ἰω. πρὶν κόρην λαβεῖν Ἅραμ Ερεχθεως Ἴον. οὐ γὰρ ὅστερον γέ πω.

λαβεῖν: "Take" of marriage, as in seventeenth century English (in LXX cf. Ruth 4 13).\(^3\) Cf. on 293, Xen. Hell. IV 1 14, Hdt. I 199 etc. οὐ γὰρ ὅστερον γέ πω: The tone is amusingly indignant - "well it certainly was not after I married her!”. There is no activated

\(^1\)see Collard I, 42: Kannicht, 106).

\(^2\)That the L annotations are physically absent from P is an unsafe argument: given the character of P (Zuntz, 135f.) this was to be expected. This scribe would not have soiled his margin with notes, even if he knew of them. On the significance of the L annotations in general, see endnote.

\(^3\)Genesis 6: 2, 8: 9, 12: 5, 21: 21, 24: 3, Exodus 2: 1, 6: 25, Lev. 18: 17, Deut. 7: 3, Judges 3: 6, Jeremiah 16: 2, Hosea 1: 2 etc.
temporal sense in πω and the phrase seems to be mildly colloquial. Cf. Hec. 1278 μήπω μανεῖ Τυνδαρίς τοσόνδε ποίς ("yet" obviously irrelevant), S. El. 403 μήπω νοῦ τοσόνδε εὖν κενή, OT 105 οὖ γὰρ εἰςείδον γέ πω ("never": absurd). The combination appears in Aristophanes (Ach. 580) οὐκ οἴδα πω. ποῦ is used in a very similar way in Euripides: El. 235 οὖ που σπανίζων τοῦ καθ’ ἰμεραν βίου (I hope not...”), Ion 1113 σομοι, τι λέξεις; σοτι που λεξήμμεθα, Hel. 95, HF 966. ποῦ in effect emphasises - inference is in the background. Comic parallels for this are gathered by Stevens CE, 24. The above examples show that Cobet’s γ'ετα refuted by Dawe, Collation, 122-3 is awkward and unnecessary. It is already in Homer: II. XII 270 ἐπεὶ οὖ πω πάντες ὁμοίω | ἄνερες ἐν πολέμῳ; on πω cf. Janko on II. XV 426. At E. Or. 291 the variant μήπω is probably wrong - cf. Diggle, Orestes, 29 and 116.¹

547E: Owen introduces a strange confusion into the logic of the discussion at this point. Ion now turns to the exact details of his birth and Owen concludes from Ion’s continued puzzlement at how he came to Delphi in the first place (548 and 555) that "there must have been another incident" (in addition to the one at Delphi). The basis for this is presumably that in answer to Ion’s διὰ μακρός ἐλθόν κελεύθου (549) while Ion is still unaware that the incident in question occurred at Delphi rather than Athens, Xuthus appears to acknowledge a problem and profess uncertainty (τοῦτο κόμ' ἀπαιωλό). By the time we reach 555 the problem Ion has in mind is partially solved, in that he learns that Xuthus was at Delphi and he therefore restates the problem of 548 in a slightly modified form - how did he get from Mt. Parnassus to this temple when newborn. Xuthus offers a tentative suggestion.

¹ Eustathius (904 37 ad II. XII 270) absurdly explains its ἄστειώτης in the temporal sense.
But it is an answer to the same question that he, unbeknownst to Ion who was as yet unaware of the precise details - which Xuthus could hardly be expected to reveal all at one go - was debating with himself in 548. By 555 they are both engaged on the same problem. The assumption of another incident is totally unnecessary, and it goes outside the plot in the fashion of which Verrall would have warmly approved.

547: "Ἰω. δρα ὅτε ἐκεῖ ἐφυσάς; Ἐσο. τῷ χρόνῳ γε συντρέχει.

συντρέχει: "That would accord with the length of the intervening time". Cf. Hdt. I 116 1 ὀ τε χρόνος... τῷ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ ποιήσει ἔδοκες συμβαίνειν

Α. 362 1 f. Radiē ἀλλ' οὐτε πολλὰ τραύματ' ἐν στέρνουσι λαβών | θνῆσκει τις, εἰ μὴ τέρμα συντρέχοι βίου "it he does not die (fact)" E. Or. 1215 (O. of Hermione's expected arrival) τοῦ γὰρ χρόνου τὸ μῆκος σύντο συντρέχει (σύντο L: σύντο Z, T*: εἰς σύντο G: εἰς gl., nonnulli - cf. Diggle, Orestes, 85. The time phrase can either be the subject or in the dative in this kind of expression. See Willink ad Or. l.c. Fränkel, Ag. II, 63.

Some more difficult examples of a mode of expression which obviously appealed to the tragedians:

S. Tr. 293 f.

πῶς δ' οὐκ ἔγω χαίρομαι δευ, ἀνδρὸς εὐτυχῆ κλεισίσα πράξεών τήνει πανδέκῳ φρενί; πολλή στ' ἀνάγκη τῇδε τούτο συντρέχειν.

Jebb and Dindorf report ἀνάγκη as the reading of L, which is discarded by Dawe and the OCT. A gloss συμφέρειν appears over συντρέχειν in the Roman family, prompting Hartung to take the former in the sense intended ("that I should share this feeling with him") and as representing συμφέρειν which he proceeded to write in the text with τῆδε totally changing, and weakening, the meaning.

Jebb is surely correct to interpret τῆδε as going with an understood πράξεως: others had taken τῆδε as an adverb which requires συντρέχειν to approximate to συμβαίνειν "that's the way you would expect this (?) to turn out". But, as my query indicates, what can τῆδε (adverb) really refer to? The sense is "to such a πράξεως my joy (τούτο) must precisely

1It is the contrast between 'actuality' and 'subjective opinion' that gives point to σύντο (Willink), referring to δοκῶ in the previous line: the tone is somewhat mathematical, indicating the metaphor in question. Schwyzer II 211 2 helps not at all, as correctly pointed out by Willink ad loc. "Without the addition of any special information" (Paley), "the actual time lapse (Willink), "the length of time agrees in itself" (West).
correspond" where πράξις refers to the verb συντρέχειν.

Dindorf deleted the whole passage, following Wunder.

*OC* 157 f. μη προσπέχεις νάσει | ποιάνεται, κάθισίρις σοι | κρατήρ μελικών ποτών | θέμεται συντρέχει,

This is not a mere vague statement that both offerings are made in the sacred grove let alone that they coincide. *OC* 478f. (the first two offerings of water and then the third of water and honey) are the best commentary on what Sophocles has in mind here. συντρέχει is therefore not literal but like our own: the two offerings follow, complement and correspond to one another in the due order. *Cf.* Burkert, *GR*, 72.

E. fr. 580.1f. N. "Αγάμεμνον, άνθρώπου|ν πάσιν αι τύχαι| μορφήν ἔχουσι, συντρέχει δ' εἰς ἐν τόδε:" Here it is apparently used of two states of affairs which run in parallel. However the difficulties of this fragment are formidable indeed and "it all adds up to one point (as follows)...") seems to be the general sense.

LSJ should not include under (5) such examples as ὁ καρδίς καὶ τὸ συμφέρον συνδεδρόμηκε (Dem. XVII 9) as there is no sense of implicit chronology and mutual order as in the above examples: it is rather a chance coincidence exploited for rhetorical effect.

548: "Ἰω. κεῖτα πῶς ἄφικόμεσθα δεύρο; Ἑο. τοῦτ' ἀμηχανώ." "Ἀμηχανεῖν + acc. *Cf.* Ag. 1177 τέρμα δ' ἀμηχανώ The point of τοῦτο as against τοῦτο in the following line is the sequence of events which Xuthus is mulling over. ἀμηχανεῖν occurs also with dative, (ἐπαργάμουσι θεσφάτοις Ag. 1113) infinitive and indirect question. The accusative, as S. Tr. 1243 ὡς ἐς πολλὰ τάπορεῖν ἔχω suggests, was probably understood as one of respect, a fact which is further borne out by its predominant appearance with relative and demonstrative pronouns on their own: E. Held. 492 τοῦτ' οὖν ἀμηχανοῦμεν, Pl. Prot. 348C & αὐτὸς ὁ πορῶ ἐκάστοτε, Ar. Eccl. 664 τοῦτο γὰρ οἷμαι ο' ἀπορήσειν ("I have posed you, I think" Rogers).

On this question of grammar see on 245.¹

549: "Ἰω. διὰ μακρᾶς ἐλθὼν κελεῦθον; Ἑο. τοῦτο κἀ' ἀσιαλή." The slightly unusual use of διὰ is worth noticing: one would expect it to mean "through" in the sense of "through" a large area (A. Su. 1026 ποταμοῦς δ' οὖ διὰ χώρας |

¹Hermann’s τοῦτο for L’s τοῦτα is more logical, but not essential.
Itch/Jetxeroaw, cf. ibid. 254, or 'through' in the sense of entering some boundary, gate etc. and coming out on the other side. If we are to understand it here as purely denoting distance, parallel is afforded by Hdt. IV 39 παρῆκε διὰ τῆς διάξοσης ἢ ἀκτῆς, where the idea is that the shore follows the line of the sea. But there are shades of a different use of διὰ: that of undergoing a process, in which κελεύου σε means not merely the road travelled along, but the whole process of travelling.

The alpha was restored by Musgrave. L has -ολεί. Musgrave restores the correct Attic form. Cf. Moeris p. 47 Pierson ἀπαιολάξ: Ἀττικοῖς ἀπαιολάξαν Ελλήνες Hesychius s.v. ἀπαιολάξ: παραλογίζεσθαι. The passive occurs in Hippocrates (de morb. mul. II 174, and there it is explained by Galen (gloss. Hipp. 72 10 K. - σαλάκοθαι: τὸ οίλον πλατεύσασθαι καὶ πλαγάοςθαι καὶ ἐροτεῖν. At Babrius XCV 99 κερδῶ δ' ἀπαιολάξατα τῆς ἀληθείας, Rutherford ad loc. notes that it may well be intransitive (the genitive going with the prefix), as it seems to be in some of the glossographers quoted.

From the evidence of L here and of the scholiast at Ar. Nu. 1150 (see below - παρὰ τὸ ἀπαιολαξών καὶ κυνεῖν καὶ στερεῖν) it would seem that a later form in -(ε)ω existed.

As the root (σαλάξος) would suggest the basic meaning of the related compounds is much that of ποικιλός, namely unfavourable, and redolent of deception and fraud. Thus Ar. Nu. 1150 εὖς γαρ παμφοίσασθαι 'Απαιολάξ (an invocation to the daemon that makes the worse cause seem the better): ibid. 728 ἔξερετεῖς γαρ νοῦς ἀποστερτικὸς | καταιολάξα. The noun occurs in tragedy: A. fr. 186 Radl τῆς ἀλήθειας ἀττικῷ ἐπιφέρεται. The abstract ἀπαιολάξα is much that of uōuλογ, namely unfavourable, and redolent of deception and fraud. Thus Ar. Nu. 1150 a5 7' ἀτατόν ἔμβολον | ἐνεκέρεισθαι | καταιολάξα. The noun occurs in tragedy: A. fr. 136 Radt ἐφεξῆς ἐρετεῖται γαρ τοῦ ἀττικοῦ | καταιολάξα. The abstract ἀπαιολάξα may have been an Aeschylean invention, ἔξων ἀπαιολάξα. Cho. 1002 (of the φιλήτρας ἀνήρ: ἀπάτης schol.).

Here confusion in the glossographers arises. Hesychius and Photius both ascribe ἀπαιολάξα to Sophocles (fr. 1018 Radt) and ascribe to it three meanings - ἀπάτης, ἀτοκάθαρμα and ἀπαιολάξα. The first and third are obvious synonyms for deception and the middle term will be a term of abuse. However Eustathius (352 36) ad II. II 816 deduces these with an etymology of ἄλημα, the vox Sophoclea cast by Ajax at Odysseus (Aj. 381, 389). This is patently incorrect as both ancient and modern philology has shown: ἄλημα is not from σιδόλος but from ἀλεῖν ("finely ground meal" hence "a subtle knave"): thus Hes. s.v. ἄλημα: λεπτὸν ἀλειρον. The very same definition of the cognate πάλημα (πάλη) is quoted from Aelius Dionysius (p. 134 Erbse) by Eustathius 898 9 ad II. XII 168. Lobeck (Ajax p. 202) united the testimonies and restored order. At Aj. 381 the schol. gloss with τρίμμα ("chaff" possibly the right interpretation of the etymology). The notorious Ant. 320 arises: L has ἄλημα, the schol., even if the lemma is detachable, knew ἄλημα and offered the same gloss as at Aj. 1.1. The only other "personalized" ἄλημα is Andr. 936f. κληνοῦσσα τούσθε Σεμήρνων λόγους | σοφν πανορθόναι πουκλων λαλήματων | ἐξηνιμαθήν μωρία. These were deleted by Dindorf: one takes μωρία with ποικλῶν λαλήματων with comma before the former word: the sense (= words) is at least possible and the analogy gone.

---

"comica vox, quam in satyrica fabula positam fuisse credibile" Ellendt, _LS_.
The objection is that the literal sense of λάλημα is not found before the C4th (Eubulus). However logic suggests that this may only be accidental: literal before metaphor is more probable, though modern English shows that this is not an absolute truth. However Jebb's objection that this implies that Creon is taking the slave too seriously applies: though the preceding line is comically sophist. The slave before Creon is not Ajax' profoundly hated Odysseus and λάλημα must be read.

The connotation of αιδλο- compounds is "petty crime". The bluff Xuthus is being satirized - "that oracle foxes me" - typical bathos for the subject.

550: "Ἰο. Πυθίαν δ' ἰδεῖς πέτραν πρῶν; Ξο. ἐς φανᾶς γε θαυρᾶν.

The standard feature of Delphi from Homer onwards: Il. II 519 etc. Given the nature of the occasion Ion is referring to, the reference may be more specifically to the cliffs known as the Phaedriades.

φανάς: The torch-lit procession up Mount Parnassus (nothing known from Classical times: cf. Paus. X iv 3, Strabo IV 422 f. on later procedure) is derived, obviously, from the root of φανω and as such must have a short first syllable. The noun φανάς (cf. on 195) derives long α from φα(ω)-3 Cf. the adjective φαναίος E. Rhes. 355. Cf. too Rhes. 943 μαστιρίων τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων φαναζ, Ion 714 f.
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1So one would deduce from fr. 108 2 K.-A. = 109 Hunter λοπᾶς παφλάξει βαρβάρω λαλήματι (virtually the same is attributed by Eustathius to Pherecrates, probably wrongly). Hunter however notes a general resemblance to E. Hipp. 1211) and IA 74, to which Andr. l.c. should be added. He suggests this may be an unconscious reminiscence - paratragedy is more probable, which assists somewhat with the transference of meaning.

In Andr. loc. cit., though the Aeschylean sonority of the line should quell any doubts as to its authenticity, one may still hesitate about the first two adjectives in sequence - if the original were οὐρφανός it would be a very attentive scribe who would not be tempted by the genitive plural in this company.


3Cf. Aeol. φανω.
Ivor Bducxtog Mucupovg dwéxuw henna; laupnpdt113166:wmméloug firm 013vBéucxcug.l

Cf. Parke FA, 106. The Delphic Thyiades - the Athenian deputation - are charmingly described by Plutarch Mor. 953 D. The technical term was λαμπαδωτας, as emerges from Dittenburger SIG 671 A 10. Ar. Av. 1694 is nothing to the point, despite the marginal note in L - the obvious pun is the harbour of Chios, Phanae, or possibly a stream on the Acropolis (Clepsydra according to the scholiast and text), the operative derivation being φαίνειν (συκοφαντεῖν).

551-2: "Ιω. προξένων δ' ἐν τού (τῷ MSS) κατέσχες; Ξό. δ' με Δελφίνων κόραις...

"Ιω. ἐθιάσευσε', ἥ πῶς τάδ' αύδας; Ξό. μαινόσαν γε Βαγχίου.

κατέσχες: A metaphor originally drawn from docking a ship (with ναύν understood).² S. Ph. 220 τίνες ποτ' ἐς γὴν τήνδε κάκ' ποίας πάτρας | κατέσχετ' σύκ' ἐθόμμον is close to literal: E. El. 1033f. is similar to its application here: καὶ νόμφα δύο ἐν τούσειν αὐτῶς δῶμασον κατείχ' ὀμοῦ. Cf. Hcld. 81 f. (chorus to Iolaus) ἥ πέραθεν ἀλίω πλάτα κατέχετ' ἐκλειπόντες Εὔβοιδ' ἀκτάν Hel. 1206, S. Ph. 270.

† ἐν τῷ κατέσχες †

Obelos posui ego, nullo, ut opinor, praeunente.

This phrase poses the gravest difficulties. The MS has τῶ, which makes little sense and was

¹ἀμα σοῦν is indeed surprising. Dobree's ἀμα συμβάλλων at least merits a mention - cf. Tro. 500. At Ba. 1254 though ἐν and ἀμα govern the same object they are at some distance and have somewhat different nuances. The first two words (δτ' ἐν) are obelized by Diggle - Wecklein's δπος or Jackson's δπότε eliminate ἐν, though this may not be necessary. At S. Ichneutae, 70 the reading is dubious (σοῦνμα Hunt, a word not found before Theocritus).

²So Paley, LSJ etc. But possibly it may have been thought of as intransitive in Euripides' day already.
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altered to του by Ludwig Dindorf and τοῦ (interrogative) by Madvig. Wilamowitz supports the latter with the argument - in itself perfectly admissible - that Ion "verlangt der Namen, der ja zur entdeckung der Mutter führen könnte". If this is so, of course, Xuthus does not answer the question straight on, unless we assume a Murrayesque aposiopesis - why should Xuthus assume that, from his private recollections about what the πρόξενος did for him, Ion is likely to get the right name.

But both emendations miss the point at issue. πρόξενον ἐν τοῦ / τοῦ / κατέσχες is difficult. The idiom whereby "staying with" a person is expressed by using the genitive of the host with oἰκε vel sim understood is easy and comprehensible when a proper name accompanies the expression (ἐν Ἀιδόου etc.). No parallel can be produced for the harshness of ἐν τοῦ (solum) κατέσχεν. The noun is at some distance, not that this makes any difference to the general proposition.

What Euripides wrote, I suggest, was:

ΠΡΟΞΕΝΩΝ ΕἸΣΩ ΚΑΤΕΣΧΕΣ;

Apart from the ease and the palaeographical similarity to what L actually offers of this reading, it is much assisted by Ion 1039 f.

Πρ. σὺ μὲν νῦν ΕἸΣΩ ΠΡΟΞΕΝΩΝ μέθες πόδα.

ημεῖς δ' ἐφ' ὁ τετάμεθα, ἐκκονησομεν' "keep yourself inside the houses of the πρόξενον".

For εἰσω meaning not "in, inside" but "among" in a static sense cf. too Xen. An. III 3 7 οἱ τε γὰρ Κρήτες... ψυλοὶ δὲνες εἰσω τῶν δῷλων κατεκέκλειντο - "were cooped up among the armed ranks" (εἰσω here clearly means "among the armed troops").

The basic advantage of the accented τοῦ is thus retained and the oddity of the interrogative, which logically requires Ion to have prior knowledge of the incident to have his question answered, is avoided.
It is a finer point whether, if εἰσω is accepted, Xuthus' ὅς μὲ Δελφίδες κόρας in the singular becomes any more difficult to understand than it would have been with interrogative το. In the latter case Xuthus begins to speak in the specified sense about someone who Ion has naturally introduced as specific but unspecified: in the former he makes only a slightly greater jump - from a group of unspecified persons he goes straight to the specific and specified individual. In dialogue moving as urgently as this is, I feel we are allowed to supply obvious intermediate stages in this way.

A rather charming exchange. E. Genner, whose premature death in 1930 left Owen the task of completing the Oxford commentary, sensitively observes that Xuthus seems to pause in a certain embarrassment and Ion eagerly supplies him with the technical religious term for initiation, which is probably not quite what Xuthus had meant. έθιασευσί': Musgrave's correction of the MS έθιασε σι' is obviously correct. The usual ligature of ε and υ will have led to the loss of the latter. θυσιασω + dat. is readily explicable by analogy with verbs such as συνάσπω which can mean "attach" of persons. It is peculiar to Euripides cf. Ba. 378 (Dionysus) δς ταδ' ἔχει | θυσιάσων τε χοροῖς κτλ.

We may be certain about Musgrave's γε for τε in Xuthus' reply. τε is clearly out of place: we do not wish to introduce a second group of Maenads and they have just been referred to. There is particular point to γε here. The Δελφίδες κόρας are generally

1τε MS: γε Musgrave, quem secuti sunt editores plerique.

2generally inverted. It is like μουείσθαι γάμῳ Alciphron I 4. The latter example shows that, pace Dale, Monk's δόμους for σο δ' αὐτῶς αὐτήν εἰσαγ’, εἰ βουλεί, δόμους at E. Alc. 1112 (boxet: the MSS are equally divided and there is not a penny to choose between them) is not 'a necessary correction'. δόμου are here regarded as a relationship. δόμος seems already to have been excogitated by a Renaissance emender in an apograph of B (Marc. gr. IX 10).
designated. Ion correctly deduces that - from 550 - Maenads are in question. Xuthus however replies with a significant tone in his voice - if one were acting his part, the reply might be spoken through clenched teeth. This is (Denniston GP 130 11) the γε which imparts a tone of "liveliness or interest or intensity" to the opening of an answer.

553: "Ἰω. ἔμφρον' ἢ κάτοινον δντα; Ξο. Βασίσου πρὸς ἱδοναίς.
κάτοινον ed. Herv.² κάτοικον L; γρ. etiam -όχον Ricc. 32.
"In what state of mind were you?"
κάτοινος is an adjective of some interest. It joins καταβόστρυχος (Pho. 146) and κατάκομος (Ba. 1187) as a hapax in Classical Greek. IT 1374 κάθαιμα... τραχύματα (with HF 384, κάθαιμα γένυσι σίτα, where L has the false division καθ' αἷμα and order was restored by Brodaeus) is also confined to Euripides.

In its later history it seems to have veered between the sense of κότα- implying an excessive tendency and the simple meaning "drunk" as here. The former (the only other instance recorded by LSJ) is predominant in Diodorus V 26, of the interest of the Gauls in strong liquor, a commodity of which they are deprived in winter when traders do not reach the country - κάτοινοι δ' ὄντες καθ' υπερβολὴν τὸν εἰσαγόμενον... ἄκρατον ἐμφυροῦνται οἶνον (obviously they are not under the influence of drink at the time of making the transaction). This sense of "tendency" reappears in e.g. κοτάγαστρος, κατάγυνος, κατάδηξ ("excessively timid") κατάγλυττος κατάθεος ("godly" for Philo, "superstitious" for Photius, significantly) and κατάχολος.

However Phrynichus (epit. p. 78 9 de Borries) has κάτοινος: ὁ μεθύων and a fragment of D.H. recorded in the Suda s.v. ηθιάνας and ἀρτιστομος reads ὁ δ' ἣδε τοὺς παιὰνας οὖκ εὐτραπέλη τῇ γλώσσῃ ουδ' ἐφεμενη ὡσπερ οὖν κάτοινος ἣδη. Plut.
The argument that it is post-Classical need not concern us. Euripides seems to have led the way in the extension of κατα- compounds, which was taken further in later Greek - as witness the inventions mentioned above. One perhaps should not compare the Homeric κατάσκιος where κατα- may have its local sense, or indeed κατάπτερος (PV 798), approximating to "under wings" in the sense of our "under arms". However OC 158 κάθοδρος... κρατήρ (όδοτος πληρὴς schol. L) means what the scholiast says and no more (cf. schol. ad Pho. I.c. τὸ γάρ κατὰ κλήθους ἐμφανιζόντων), and from that example we may answer the other objection that might spring to mind, namely that in the other Euripidean exx. and indeed in the greater number of post-Classical creations (κατάσκιορος (LXX, actual) κατάσκιοσ, κατασκελής, κατάσκυγνος - etc.) we are referring to a factual state of affairs, not the mildly metaphorical human description which κάτωνος suggests and in which sense Diodorus uses it. There is furthermore the perfectly Classical πάροινος for which this could well be formed as a synonym. κατ᾽ οἶνον and πάροινον were both suggested by Blaydes at Ion here; the difficulty seems to be illusory.

Note: κατασκυφέλος.

This (= "very rocky") is reported by LSJ from Hes. Theog. 806 and h. Hom. Herm. 124. It seems oddly in anticipation of the simple use of κατα- compounds to mean simply "very", that we expect from later Greek. On inspection it proves to be a "ghost word" in this context. In the former ὅδωρ... τὸ θ’ ἵππο κατασκεφέλου διὰ χώρου van Lennep had alreay seen

---

1The context in Plutarch certainly seems to indicate that drunkenness is the point (πάνυ πόρρω μέθης οὖσιν... προσέπεσε).

2Note too κατοίνομαι, factitive (καταφγωμένος Pl. Lg. 815 c).
that the κατα- element was to be taken separately with the preceding ἦς referring to direction; in the latter ῥυνοῦς δ' ἐξετάνυσε καταστυφέλω ἐνὶ πέτρῃ the same seems to be true, and in both cases it would perhaps be advisable to write them as such.

See Mastronarde ad Pho. 146.

Βασιλέα πρὸς ἡδοναῖς: The sense of πρὸς is not far from Phaedo 84 C κοι αὐτὸς τὸ πρὸς τῷ εἰρημένῳ λόγῳ ἦν ὁ Σωκράτης "was absorbed in the foregoing discourse".1

Βασιλεία: The form is employed metri gratia for βάσιλείας in verse, though never in Aeschylus. Cf. S. Ant. 154, E. Ba. 225, Cycl. 9. Examples are collected by Hermann on Ba. 67.

554: "Ἰω. τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν' ἦν' ἐσπάρη<ν> μὲν, ὡς ὁ πότμως ἐξηδρεῖν, τέκνων.

(A) τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο - "that's the answer". Closely parallel is Helen 622 τοῦτ' ἐστ' ἐκεῖνο (Menelaus replying to the ἐγγελος on the disappearing phantom of which he has just heard and which enables him to fit together the jigsaw of evidence). Cf. too S. El. 1178 τὸδ' ἐστ' ἐκεῖνο. It is an independent elliptical expression as is further borne out by Tro. 624 (in apposition to a sentence, though closely connected) and Med. 98 τὸδ' ἐκεῖνο, φιλοι παῖδες a reaction to a previous observation now confirmed by Medea's outburst, "that's how it is...". Owing to its sense it cannot obviously govern ἦν' ἐσπαρη<ν> μὲν in the fashion of an indirect question: Dobree and Badham were right to place a raised stop after ἐκεῖνο and Diggle right to adopt it. Xuthus completes the syntax.

To the discussion of τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο should be added a disputed passage of S. El. (1115 f.)

οὐ γὰρ τάλαινα τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν', ἦδη σοφές'

---

1Cf. Rep. 500 B, Aeschines III 32 (πρὸς ἐτέρῳ τινὶ τὴν γνώμην ἐχουσίν, etc.) translation is Archer-Hind's.
The parallels we have seen here seem to indicate that of the three possible articulations available - (a) no punctuation either within the last phrase of the first line or after (making it equivalent to σοφός πρόσεχειν διχθος (b) raised stop after σοφές making σοφές agree with τοῦτο and robbing the latter of its independence, which we have seen to be desirable (c) raised stop after έκείνῳ and σοφές "that is it: I now see clearly: grief is at hand" - the third is preferable. Jebb's objection that the expression is too "homely" for Sophocles may not be an objection given the extreme agitation of Electra's manner here. See discussion by Stevens, CE, 32 Kamerbeek ad loc. and, Sophoclea, 65, the latter in agreement with Kamerbeek.

Cf. also: E. Or. 804,¹ Ar. Av. 354 τοῦτ' έκείνῳ ποιήσας; ("çela y est - ou fuir, malheureux?").²

(B) Strong approval should be accorded to Willink's incidental conjecture here (at Or. 804) έκπάρηπν μέν. In this way by the introduction of μέν... δέ a clever forethought of the problem of 555 is introduced "that is the problem of my conception solved... but..."

This, quite apart from the metrical point at issue, confirms Scaliger's deletion of the σε which L offers after πότμος. It was mistakenly re-introduced by Wakefield at the start of Xuthus' reply. Owen notes that the word-order is misleading: this is true but it is not the real problem which is the total irrelevance of the remark to the context. Ion goes back to the question concerning the circumstances of his birth in the next line: an observation "Fate has found you out my son!" would have to be an ecstatic interjection which is not in the style of

¹ Willink rightly corrects Murray's punctuation.

² Pl. Phaedr. 241 D; τοῦτ' έκείνῳ, ὦ Φαίδρε, οὐκέτ' ἀν τὸ πέρα ἀκοῦσας ἐμοῦ λέγοντος is a striking example, illustrating the independence of the expression and coming as a shock at the end of an elevated speech ("that's all there is").
this type of fast and excited antilabe. 1422 τὸς ἡμῶς ἐκκυνηγεῖτει πότμος is highly relevant however.

The σε was probably added by a scribe who was unfamiliar and hostile to the elliptical syntax of antilabe. Corruption of antilabe thus motivated appears at Su. 818-19 (faulty unification Ἀδικτείς (Χο. τοῖς τεκούσι δ' οὐ λέγεις; Ba. 1195f. Or. 161-2 is a prima facie example, though it took until Seidler for the point to be seen (the desire to unify the split dochmiac was too much for the scribe). The chaos in the attributions at Tro. 585f. is an extreme example, in the course of which VPQ succeed in giving Hector as a son to Andromache. At Su. 1144f. both omitted and extra attributions combine. Cf. V. di Benedetto "Responsione strofica e distribuzione delle battute in Euripide", Hermes LXXXIX (1961), 307f., Ritchie, Authenticity, 295f.

555: "Ἰω. πάς δ' ἀφικόμεθα ναοῦς; Ἐο. ἐκβόλον κόρης ἱσως."

ἐκβολον is a vox Euripidea for the prose word ἐκβόλμος. Cf. Ion 964 σοι δ' ἐς τι δόξις τεσσαλοῦν ἐκβολεῖν τέκνον; Pho. 804 has the extended phrase βρέφος ἐκβολον οἶκων (of Oedipus) - cf. Hec. 1078 (of Polymestor's children), δοῦτ' ἀνήμερον τ' ὀρειον ἐκβολάν. In Ba. 91, νηδόδος ἐκβολον refers specifically to the circumstances of Dionysus' birth. With the neuter we understand τέκνον (see Pho. supra). Xuthus assumes with flippant impiety that this sort of deposit at the temple was the norm - contrast the attitude of the Pythia at 43f.

556: "Ἰω. ἐκπεφύγαμεν τὸ δοῦλον. Ἐο. πατέρα νυν δέχον, τέκνον."

τὸ δοῦλον: At 983 ἐπίστημον ὁ φῶνος καὶ το δοῦλον ἀσθενές the sense is "the whole slave body", the more usual sense of the neuter of δοῦλος. Here it means "the state

---

1 where οἱ λέγεις (no question mark) has more point than the uninteresting paradox on which Collard comments.
of slavery".

Owen rightly points out that, as Maenads were free-born (cf. Paus. X 4 3), and he now
deems himself to have been born from one of them, he had indeed escaped τῶ δοῦλον which
Creusa refers to in 310 and which he himself has attempted to glorify as best he could in his
opening monody.¹

557: "Io. τῷ θεῷ γοῦν οὐκ ἀπιστεῖν εἰκός. Ξο. εὖ φρονεῖς ἀρα.

For the usage of γοῦν here Owen rightly compares Pl. Rep. 557 Ε ίσως γοῦν, ἐφι, οὐκ ἄν ἀποροί παραδειγμάτων. The example of Lg. 666 D is not quite so relevant as there
γοῦν does not stand in place of ὀφίκουν as it might be said to do here, but operates upon the
opening sentence: the οὖν is connective and effectively separated from the γε which has
emphatic connotations.

Denniston (452) in discussing this passage draws a somewhat doubtful distinction
between the use of γοῦν to introduce a "part-proof" and a usage he finds especially prevalent
in Euripides, namely "in the sphere of action to introduce a pro tanto reason for following
a suggested course, i.e. IT 1193f.:

'Iφ. θάλασσα κλῦζει πάντα τάνθρωπον κακά.

Θε. ὀσιώτερον γοῦν τῇ θεῷ πέσοιεν ἄν.

Diggle prefers Tournier's ὀσιώτεροι, which in the context (Ξενοί 1188) is an improvement.
"so, going on what you have said, the victims would be sacrificed in a more clean condition".
But surely Ion's decision here verges on the intellectual?

558-9: "Io.: καὶ τῇ βουλώμεσθα γ' άλλο Ξο. γοῦν ὀφίς κ' χρῆ σ' ὄραν.

¹For the preoccupation cf. the less confident 1382 f., and Alc. 638 f. where Admetus calls
his father by suggesting himself a bastard son δούλιον τ' ἄφ' ἀμαστός.
"Ἰα.: ἦ Διὸς παῖδος γενέσθαι παῖς; Ξό. δι σοί γε γίγνεται.

βουλόμεσθα Lac -όμεσθα Lpc: 559 ἦ Lpc ἦ Lac

Only the corrected version is visible from the facsimile

There is evident irony in this exchange, however we decide to treat the textus receptus. In acknowledging Ion's claim to be the son of a son of Zeus, Xuthus is thinking of his own lineage and using παῖς in a wide sense (technically, according to his light, Ion would be great grandson of Zeus (see on l. 63)). Little does he know that in point of fact Ion has stated the precise truth unwittingly: as son of Apollo, he is indeed Διὸς παῖδος παῖς.

The indicative βουλόμεσθα is a conjecture by an anonymous diorthotes of L for the original deliberative subjunctive. Why he sought to alter a perfectly metrical text in this way is not clear: possibly he failed to understand the construction. An increased tendency in late antiquity for the "instantaneous" present to replace the subjunctive may be the explanation.¹

The original text, contra Murray, may be the one we want. If the indicative is read, two undesirable consequences emerge: when Xuthus replies νῦν ὄρας & χρῆ σ' ὀρᾶν, he has either some inexplicable foresight as to what the (on this reading) interrupted observation of Ion will be and is applauding it, or he is simply repeating what he has just said in εὖ φρονεῖς ὄρα in the previous line to no point at all, in which case we must assume that he is paying no attention to what Ion is now going on to say and is simply enhancing his own delight by self-repetition.²

However difficulties are not yet at an end. Deliberative subjunctive, if subjunctive, it must be, but how to classify it? Whether we have aposiopesis after it or not, Ion's question is not a deliberation but a statement "what could we want more?" implying that nothing could


²The phrase recurs at Pho. 713 μῶν νεός οὖχ ὄρας & χρῆ σ' ὀρᾶν;
be better. And that is the role of the potential optative.

It is well known that in some usages the d.s. approaches the future, or more correctly envisages a prospect, a usage particularly associated with τι πάθω and τι γένωμαι (A. Su. 777 τι πεισόμεθα; ποι ψύγωμεν;). However I think it is possible to understand how the d.s. and p.o. might merge into one another on occasion. Hdt. IV 118 τι γι'ρ πάθωμεν, μη βουλομένων ύμέων τιμορείνω; might be understood as standing for the apodosis of a remote condition. Thuc. II 52 οὖκ ἔχοντες δ τι γένώνται, ες ὀλιγορχίαν ἐπαράπνοντο is a clearer example (= δ τι δν γένοντα, the sense of "would" impresses itself, though encapsuled in the syntax is the original thought τι γενώμεθα). With that in mind, let us consider the crux at HF 1417 where the MS reads: Ἡρ.: πῶς οὖν ἓν ἔσπερ δ ἡ συνέσταλμα κακοῖς. Words three and four have been obelized and variously emended - L. Dindorf perceived the required meaning and wrote δν εἰποις which is superior to emendations which introduce a present or past tense. However the case for the subjunctive is the same as I suggest for the Thuc. quote, namely that two points of view are being expressed in one, the original 'aporetic' subjunctive of the subject and the narrator's objective p.o. In HF likewise, Heracles is asking the objective 'what would you do', and combining with it his own total uncertainty as to the reply. I think if this formulation is accepted, we may explain our subjunctive in Ion's mouth as follows: he is combining the direct self-question which would require a reply from Xuthus with his own opinion - p.o. - that the answer is in the negative. In his next and more tendentious question, he reverts to the true deliberative.

Thus I consider the further change

καὶ τι βουλομέσθ' <δν> ἄλλο;

unnecessary. Cf. K.-G. I, 222 Anm. 3; Schwzymer II p. 311 2.

The problem is of course linked with the first word of 559. Rather oddly the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{εμ' εἰπας (Paley) μ'ἐνύπτεις (Hermann)}\]
"corrector" of L now proceeds to introduce the circumflex ı which entirely conflicts with his suggested indicative in the previous line, and all modern editors while reading the latter have returned to the original reading for ı disjunctive.

However it is the later hand that we must follow, as ἀλλο must look backwards.¹ Xuthus understands Ion's statement as independent and self-sufficient which, as his answer shows - he is not waiting for a disjunctive, and this offers a difficulty, and a range of choices, depending on whether we take ı in its interrogative or affirmative sense. In the first case Ion slightly abandons his train of thought and extrapolates from what Xuthus says that he "ought to see" - "Do you mean to say being the grandson of Zeus?". In the second the train of thought will be the same and the infinitive will be expegetic, "that is, in truth to be the grandson of Zeus". That accords better with Xuthus' ὅ σοι γε γίγνεται than a straight question.

ıt however still presents difficulties. Both 'guesses' that he makes are very strange and inelegant. Xuthus' νῦν ὅρας ὧ χρη σ' ὅραν reads naturally not as an interrupted remark - all of Xuthus' replies in this dialogue have been brief self-contained 'caps' to Ion's excited "feed" for them, to borrow from stage-language, and this is appropriate to his rather military abruptness (see on 417). He means "now you are coming to your senses"² and that translation conveys why we do not require an epexegetic infinitive to follow it. Nor is that what Ion has primarily in his mind in κατ' τί βουλῶμεσθ' ἅ' ἄλλο, which is likewise independent, and refers back to 556. The dialogue set out would require us to think of Ion as answering with

¹ıt runs into the unavoidable difficulty that βουλῶμεσθ' ἄλλο cannot look both forward and backwards as we would be requiring it to do: Unless we are to allow in a very loose syntactical and logical connection, a feature which has not been over-noticeable in this highly compact piece of antilabe, the deliberative subjunctive, to make sense, must look back to something previously said.

²In fact is simply repeats εὖ φρονεῖς ἅρα.
"What could we both want better!"

"Now you are coming to your senses!"

(Pause)

"Do you mean by that that the purport of my last exclamation for you was that I shall become the grandson of Zeus!"

A break in the sense after 558 would be a definite gain.

I suggest tentatively the transposition of lines 559 and 560, to make the passage read thus:

558: "Iω. καὶ τί βουλόμεσθά γ' ἄλλο; Ξο. νῦν ὤρας ἀ χρῆ σ’ ὀρᾶν..

560: "Ἰω. ἦ θέγω δὴθ’ ο’ν μ’ ἐφυσον; Ξο. πιθόμενός γε τῷ θεῷ.

559: "Ἰω. ἦ Διὸς παιδὸς γενέσθαι παῖς. Ξο. δ’ σοὶ γε γίγνεται.

As ἦ begins both lines, a saut du même au même on the part of the scribe could be all too easy. Now the infinitive becomes quite straightforward as prolative depending on πιθόμενός which is what it needed. ἦ is now the ἦ of ἦ μὴν - absolute truth. There is no ambiguity. It has the further advantage of bringing Xuthus' confirmatory πιθόμενός γε closer to Ion's τῷ θεῷ γὰρ σύκ ὀπιστεῦν εἰκός and gives it more point, as an answer to Ion's suggestion "Yes, well since you have just advocated putting trust in the god, do embrace your father".1

560: "Ἰω. ἦ θέγω δὴθ’ ο’ν μ’ ἐφυσον; Ξο. πιθόμενός γε τῷ θεῷ.

Thus L. Page, perturbed by the plural number simplified to ὁς μ’ ἐφυσάς. Whereas it is true that if Page's conjecture were in fact the reading of L we would not be tempted to alter it to what the MS actually has, I hope that the following discussion will show that his

---

1The latter consideration is in favour of an alternative transposition suggested to me by Mr N.G. Wilson, namely transposing 557 to before 560. However I find Ion’s ἦ θέγω premature at that point in the argument.
attentions to the text here are indeed a simplification, not a correction.

In various circumstances in Greek tragedy, the names of single relations - usually parents, as here - are placed in the plural: the tone is difficult to gauge. Possibly not to be unified; a tone of respect might be relevant here, and Professor Lloyd-Jones has suggested that oracular language may play a part. A propos of -μα terms, one might have welcomed a discussion by Long, *Language and Thought in Sophocles*. Cf. Moorhouse, *Syntax*, p. 7 (c).

A possible misunderstanding should first be cleared away. The plural cannot be explained simply by assuming that Ion is including in the same breath both his mother and father. If any thought of his mother were present to his mind, θυγώ would be in the (more remote) future, not in the deliberative subjunctive which demands advice on what he should do in the immediate future. Furthermore, Ion is aware from 555 and indeed from the whole narrative that Xuthus is unaware of the true identity of the mother and that therefore such a meeting is unlikely. And the wording of καὶ σῶν δεισαμ δέμας in 563 seems to imply that the possibility as imminent has only at that point dawned on Ion (though the desire was evident earlier in the conversation with Creusa).

The following examples seem to be parallel:

S. *OT* 1176 (the herdsman quotes the words of the oracle on Oedipus (unaware of the real subject thereof): θε. θεοφάτων γ’ δικυφ κακόν. | Οι. ποιών; θε. κτενείν νιν τούς τεκόντας ήν λόγος. But we have been aware from 393 τού ψυτέως σωτος πατρός that the oracle was couched in the singular: presumably the herdsman knew of the oracle by rumour, and so we need not assume that he is merely resorting to a vague plural to disguise it - nor has he any needs to at this stage in the play.

E. *Hec.* 403: χάλα τοκεύσει ελκέτως θυμομένος (Polyxena enjoins Odysseus: this is probably to be taken as an example of the idiom in question, not as a general statement as the request is hardly gnomic).
OT 1184 f. is in a sense a parallel only for itself: ὅ τις τεφασαμαι Φός τ' ὦψ' ὄν οὖ ἄρην, ἤν ὄς τ' ὧν ἄρην ὄμιλὼν, οὗς τέ μ' οὔκ ἔδει κτεινών, but may provide a parallel for the use of the plural relative as we have it here. The idea of these plurals being generic is manifestly absurd: there is scarcely a class of people who commonly find themselves in the position in which Oedipus is. (Jebb’s translation cuts the knot: “accursed in birth, accursed in wedlock, accursed in the shedding of blood”).

S. El. 1232: ιὼ γονατί γονατί σωμάτων ἐμοὶ ϕιλτότων (Electra to Orestes). Probably an example though not quite of the same camp: here we are in the high and almost distorted Greek that characterises the lyrics of Electra and the usage of σωμάτων ϕιλτότων (= Agamemnon) verges on the common Sophoclean device of referring to concrete things with abstract nouns in -μα.

That such an idiom is no illusion is confirmed by its appearance in (mildly archaic) Latin. It is remarked upon by Aulus Gellius (NA II xiii) - liberos in multitudinis numero etiam unum filium filiamve veteres dixisse. It is well discussed by Wackernagel (Vorlesungen II, 95) whose explanation I quote: "In allen diesen Fällen handelt es sich eigentlich um Pluralia tantum und kommt es nicht auf die Zahl der gemeinten Personen an, sondern auf die Stellung, die sie zum Sprechenden einnehmen". The author rightly singles out Euripides for special attention in this respect. Wackernagel wrongly adduces the testimony of Charisius (gramm. Lat. 102 27 Keil) that parentes could also so be used; all Charisius means there is that Gracchus included his mother within the masculine plural. It should be rigorously distinguished from the use of the plural for a single intended but (definitely unspecified) person; here the point of the plural is deliberate rhetorical allusiveness (οἱ λέγοντες in the orators etc.)

---

1 Each plural refers to a singular person in the order Laius - Jocasta - Laius.

2 Note too τέκνα of Iphigenia (IA 1015)
I now attempt to purge the relevant section of K.-G. (I, 18. Anm. 2) of some "examples" which are in reality nothing of the sort.

(a) OT 1007 ἀλλ' οὖσαν' ἐμὲ τοὺς φιλέσωσον γ' ὁμοίους is nothing to the point, as 1012 and especially 1015 indicate: this is pluralis tantum.¹ This would be taking dramatic irony and ambiguity too far!

(b) Ant. 9. 1 ἦ σε λανθάνει | πρὸς τοὺς φίλους στείχοντα τῶν ἐξιθρῶν κακά;
Difficult of interpretation in any case: τοὺς φίλους does indeed come to mean Polyneices but not of itself: what Antigone is doing is drawing Ismene's attention to the horror of the general situation. Though cf. τῶν ἐμὸν (48).

(c) OT 366: λεληθέναι σε φημᾶ σων τοὺς φιλτάτους | ἀληθινόθ᾽ ὁμολογοντ᾽,
Teiresias to Oedipus. Prophetic mystery and irony apart, the point of the sinister hint derives from the common use of τὰ φιλτάτα to refer to any object of love, animate or inanimate. On this cf. on 287.

(d) OK 813-4 Κρ. μαρτύρομαι τοῦσδ᾽, οὐ γε, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς φίλους
οἳ ἀντιμείβῃ ρῆματ᾽.
This is quite clearly a reference by Creon addressing Oedipus to himself, Eteocles and Polyneices, all of whom have just had the benefit of Oedipus' ρήματα.

(e) Hipp. 11: Ἰππόλυτος, ἀγνοῦ Πιτθεὺς παυδεύματα.²
This should not join the list because it (like Electra quoted above) replaces a concrete person or thing with an abstract plural noun, wherein lies the difference.

¹Oedipus, as 988f. indicates, is here worried about both Polybus and Merope in different respects: he is simply refusing to go near Corinth. The idiom is unlikely to be continued in dialogue in this way - note that the messenger uses it in the two quotations mentioned, and that O. is content with the singular at 1001 and 1019.

²Pace Barrett, ἀγνός should probably be read in the text here. B. objects that Aphrodite cannot say this as his ἄγνεσα consists in rejecting her, though he admits that the description of Pittheus is pointless. May not Aphrodite be sarcastic and bitter?
The examples given by Jebb on *OC* 832 (τοὺς ἔμοις) should probably be added to the list. It is clear from the foregoing that Page's conjecture may be relegated to the *apparatus criticus*.

560: πυθόμενος. Heath made the obvious metrical correction to the aorist participle: the error will have arisen owing to the identity of the two sounds in the Byzantine period.

561: Ἰω. χαίρε μοι, πάτερ. Ξο. φίλον γε φθέγμ' ἐδεξάμην τόδε.

χαίρε: This is almost a formula for recognition scenes, of which this is an unusual variety. Cf. in Menander *Mis.* 213, *Epitr.* 860 Sandbach - hence "salve" in Latin adaptations - Plautus *Rudens* 1172, *Poenulus* 1259 etc.

Owen explains that the aorist ἐδεξάμην is one of instantaneous recognition. It is difficult to see why it should be explained in any other way than by the well-known precision in the Greek use of tenses, which our language possesses to a lesser extent. Nor are his examples for δέχομαι so used relevant. At *Hel.* 330 (Helen to the chorus who have just advised her to consult Theonoe about the fate of Menelaus) φίλοι, λόγους ἐδεξάμαιν is more likely to mean "Friends, I agree with what you say". At S. *El.* 668 Clytemnestra's ἐδεξάμην τὸ ῥήθεν is a polite and formal reply to δι' χαίρ' ἀνασοσα (as the messenger has just addressed her).

There should be no confusion with the so-called "simultaneous" aorist exemplified by ἀπέπνυσα (Abscheulich! Pfui!" is the colourful translation of K.-G. 1. 164 (b) which truly represents a thing as "over before it has begun".
562: "Io. ἡμέρα θ’ ἡ νῦν παροῦσα.\(^1\) ἔσο. μακάριον γ’ ἔθηκε με.

Wilamowitz, noting the effect of the γε in 561, argues that 562 would be better given as a unity to Xuthus, deleting the attribution to Ion and writing τέθηκε for γ’ ἔθηκε, a probable change by Nauck in Rhes. 160f. and a probable reading at El. 6f. despite Haupt’s ἔθηκε. "Gerade das Perfekt schliesst erst gut ab; der Zustand der Erfüllung ist erreicht".

However this is wrong, and Diggle and Owen are right to follow the MS here. Wilamowitz seems to combine with his desire to give Xuthus an impressive "final" statement a failure to see that Ion’s ἡμέρα θ’ ἡ νῦν παροῦσα is a natural continuation of the sentence he has begun in 561, in which the greeting to Xuthus continues with a greeting of the day itself. This is part of the same formula we noted at the previous line, in effect the same as the address to the sun so well known in arrival scenes combined with one to the land arrived at or returned to, and here used in the context of recognition. Thus Ἰλίου φῶς in Ag. 508, the arrival scene that seems certain in A. fr. 451 k 1f. Radt, cf. Ar. Plut. 771f. καὶ προσκυνῶ γε πρῶτα μὲν τὸν Ἰλίου, ἔπειτα σεμνῆς Παλλάδος κλεινῶν πέδων ἐκρόν σε πάσαν Κέκροπος ἦ μ’ ἔδέσσατο. Diggle’s full stop after παροῦσα is quite correct.

563: ὁ φίλη μήτερ, πότ’ ἄρα καὶ σὸν δρομαὶ δέμας;

πότ’ ἄρα: There are a number of parallels in E. for this combination of ἄρα with another interrogative pronoun. Tro. 247 (τίς ἄρα) likewise 293, IT 472, fr. 403 1 N.: τί IA 1228. Also in the other tragedians e.g. S. Aj. 905 τίνος πότ’ ἄρ’ ἐπραξε χειρὶ δύσμορος; Cf. Denniston GP p. 45 (3) 30 and on the position Barrett addendum, Hipp. 1012. Similarly ἄρα with interrogatives is common in E.: Ba. 556 (ποθί), Pho. 1288 (πότερος), Ba. 639, Or. 1269, Pho. 1515, IA 6, 790, 1036 (τίς). Note here II. VII 415 ποτέ δέμενοι ὅπατ’ ἄρ

\(^1\)Cf. 537, 546, 559 (however we transpose). Another consideration is Housman’s sensible rule (cf. p. 385) that an aposiopesis should bear within itself the germs of its resolution.
εἰλθόν | Κόντος. This quasi-interrogative use of both particles shows us a middle line between their two usages. ἄρα (ἵ ποι according to Apollonius) may in origin have been separate, and it is only in Attic verse to our certainty that it duplicates ἄρα (inferential) metri gratia, suggesting a licence. But there too it remains true to one of the senses of the ancient derivation: which is earlier is wholly unknown.

564: νῦν ποθό σε μᾶλλον ἡ πρὶν ἡτας εἰ ποτ' εἰσοδέειν.

On the expression ἡτας εἰ ποτε cf. on 324 with Diggle Studies, 99. Here the construction is that of "I know thee, who thou art".

565: ἄλλη ἵσως τέθνηκας ἡμείς δ' οὐδ' ὄνομα δυνατόμεθα' ἄν.

The line in L and P reads: οὐδέν ἄρ δυνατόμεθα. The reading in P used (extraordinarily, as a glance will show) to be read as ἄν (thus Kirchhoff).

For this obvious nonsense Canter suggested the simplest alteration which has been most generally adopted (Murray included) οὐδέν ἄν δυνατόμεθα.¹ It is at any event singularly weak, particularly as the concluding line of an exciting episode.

Another popular conjecture has been ὄνομαθα which in its latest and best form belongs to Matthiae: οὐδέν ἄρ ὄνομαθ' ἄν²

¹The ascription to Canter has been kindly pointed out to me by Dr. Diggle (it is ignored by all, including the latest text to print it (Biehl)). This probably gives us the earliest date for it - 1571. It is also a conjecture (presumably) in the famous Paris apograph Par. gr. 2887 - C16 (Turyn) - and though Barnes (1694) certainly proposed it independently, the two earliest sources should have priority in an app. crit., if quote it we must.

It is unlikely to be the correct reading. The sense would be "but perhaps I would profit not at all from such an undertaking", or "then I would not benefit from her presence". It is a common turn of phrase in the poets: often used with the genitive, it occurs as an absolute verb in Euripides at Hipp. 517, 718. It is of some interest that an identical and virtually certain correction was made by Wecklein at IA 1344 KL. ἀλλὰ μὴν ὡς σεμνὸς ἔργον ἦν ὄνωμεθα where LP have δυνώμεθα, making precious little sense taken on its own: to Iphigenia's protest that she is ashamed to meet Achilles because of the unfortunate circumstances of their wedding arrangements Clytaemestra should reply "this is no moment for delicacy if advantage will accrue to us from this meeting".

Wakefield acutely compares Admetus' words at Alc. 334 f. ἄλις δὲ παιδων τοῦ ὄνου εὐχόμαι | θεοὶς γενέσθαι· σοφ γὰρ οὐκ ὄνημεθα, with a view to improving the logic of the tenses with τέθνηκας, and proceeds to accommodate the ductus litterarum with ἄντωνήμεθα. As ἀντονήμημα next surfaces as a disputed reading in Libanius Or. 53 this must nonetheless be treated with some caution.

However, what is far superior to these suggestions invoking ὄννημα is Parmentier's highly ingenious οὐδ' ὄναρ δυναίμεθ' ἄν. In its favour, in addition to the notable palaeographic simplicity, is the noteworthy popularity of this expression in the negative in Euripides, and indeed elsewhere. It is of course employed metaphorically - colloquial English might substitute "not in a month of Sundays" (Owen's "objection" that "why, if Ion had dreamt about his mother, should he cease to do so, if she is dead?" merely betrays a misunderstanding of this idiom).

Cf. IT 518 (Orestes in answer to Iphigeneia's questions about his knowledge of Troy)

ψῷ μὴτος ὧφελὸν γε μηδ' ἤδον ὄναρ. The mysterious fragment 107 offers a slightly extended version of the phrase:

πλήσας δὲ νηδὸν οὔδ' ὄναρ κατ' εὐφρόνην
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It is demonstrably a colloquialism and should be added to Stevens’ list, as I shall go on to show. Menander Perikeiromene 359f. Sandbach has another variant: κακοδαίμον’ οὔτω δεσπότην οὐδ’ ἐνύπνιον ἵδων γὰρ οἶδα. Herodas I 11 has a pleasant example of its application (Metrice to the go-between Gyllis)

μὴνες

ἐξ οὖν σε Γύλλις οὐδ’ ὄναρ, μὰ τὰς Μολρας,

πρὸς τὴν θύρην ἐλθοῦσαν εἰδέ τις ταύτην.

(the point being presumably that, before Metrique’s widowhood, Gyllis’ visits during the daytime had not been infrequent). The negative is not in the position in the sentence where English would place it: it is exactly similar to the function of pronominal phrases such as οἶδα σε οὐδε ὁπλοῦν. ("I love thee, nay not at all" would be familiar to sixteenth century writers).

That it had semi-proverbial status is interestingly proved by its appearance as a "tag" in Cicero ad Att. I 18 6: "sed interea πολιτικός αὐτήρ οὐδ’ ὄναρ inveniri potest" (I add the prefix "semi-" as I would like to suggest that this allusion, hitherto unidentified by commentators, is partly a reference to the famous culmination of the Cave and Line simile at Plato Rep. 520 D καὶ οὔτω ὕπαρ ἠμέν καὶ ἦμαν ἡ πόλις οἰκήσεται, ἀλλ’ οὕκ ὄναρ, ὥς νῦν αἱ πολλαὶ ὑπὸ σκιαμαχοῦστων τε πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ στασιαζόντων περὶ τοῦ ἄρχειν οἰκοῦνται).

οὔδ’/μηδ’ ὄναρ: is common in prose - cf. Pl. Apol. 40D with μηδ’ ὄναρ μηδὲν ὅρε and μηδ’ ἵδεῖν ὄναρ in short space. Theaet. 173 D ταῦτ’ οὔδ’ ὄναρ πράττειν παρέσταται αὐτοῖς (contrasting the activities of the pleasure seeking man of politics and the philosopher: another possible source for the Cicero quotation as this is a famous purple passage, but perhaps less likely than the one proposed above), Dem. XIX 275 19 ἢ μηδ’ ὄναρ ἥλπισαν,
and so forth.

Later examples are assembled by Headlam on Herodas l.c.

 MANUAL in the positive sense has the same metaphorical connotations in tragedy and elsewhere.

It is introduced into HF 495 by a brilliant conjecture of Wilamowitz, and the usage so produced bears considerable similarity to oúd' MANUAL, if read here in Ion: (Megara apostrophizing Heracles shortly before his triumphant return) MANUAL γὰρ ἔλθον καν MANUAL γένοιτο σῦ. (iκανὸν ην MSS). The extreme oddity of this neuter adjective prompted Herwerden to expunge the lines and Reiske, more profitably, to write MANUAL for MANUAL. There are however two exceptionally cogent reasons why Wilamowitz should be followed: it is as he points out "ganz undenkbar" that MANUAL and iκανὸν should duplicate one another: moreover (Wil. ad HF 496) σκιᾶ in the preceding line goes well with MANUAL (the passage he has in mind is Pindar Pyth. VIII 95 τι δέ τις; τί δ' οὗτος; σκιᾶς MANUAL ἀνθρωπος - there are others, going back to Homer.) Wilamowitz' emendation postulates the erroneous insertion of iota before the kappa (a duplication of the upstroke at the end of nu) and the simple confusion of nu and rho at the end of the word.

Both last-mentioned emendations in Ion are worthy of consideration. I certainly favour the latter and Diggle places it in his text. It is of some note that neither Aeschylus or Sophocles use either the negative or positive metaphor of MANUAL.

The long and frenetic trochaic exchange ends on a wistful note. Ion is not fully satisfied, unlike the bluff and tactless Xuthus: he longs to see his mother. It is fitting that the Chorus should close the scene with a similarly qualified note of doubt, which the audience would perceive as ironic. It is the first sign of the passionate loyalty to their mistress which is evinced in the next ode and which emboldens them to risk contravening even Xuthus'
brutal threat of death in order to inform Creusa of what has occurred. It is not difficult to see why Creusa should inspire such loyalty and affection.

Wilamowitz observes of the opening of the next scene "Der Chor erhält den Zwischenspruch wesentlich, um den Übergang von den bewegten Trochaeen zu den ruhigen iambischen Reden zu machen. Daneben wird passend der Rückwirkung auf Kreusa präjudiert".

Imhof has a good observation at this point (Mus. Helv. XIII (1956) 134 n. 28): "das rasche Eingehen auf das Glück dem misstrauisch-bedenklichen Character Ions nicht gemäß ware: der hält sich gleich an das, was noch nicht μακάριον ist, an die Mutter, ihr Schicksal!".

Xuthus' brash acceptance of his apparent good fortune matches the simplicity of the man's character: that Creusa might have some personal interest in the matter only occurs to him at 657. But Ion is Creusa's son in more ways than one and possesses her sensitivity. As Wilamowitz notes, a shadow passes over the action, portending the coming storm.

Euripides was intrigued by the idea of sudden prosperity turning into the reverse: the most famous example is probably the HF - there so pronounced that some critics have felt that the play literally "falls apart" midway (See Bond's introduction, 21f., for a sensible view of this). But here we have no grim deities rising above the battlements of the castle to confound the chorus in their moment of joy: the reversal to come is integral to the action and the characters, and Euripides' delicate stroke of the brush in depicting the characters as they are is everywhere evident.

566-8: κονναι μὲν ἡμᾶν δωμάτων εὐπρεξίαν

δόμως δὲ καὶ δέσποιναν ἐς τέκν' εὐτυχεῖν

ἐβουλὸμαι ὃν τοὺς τῷ Ἐρεχθέως δόμους.

κονναὶ κτλ. "The good fortunes of the house are shared with us".
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ēς τέκνν' εὐπυρχέν: A common prepositional phrase in Euripides, also elsewhere. Cf. HF 63 ὅτε ἐς πατέρ' ἀστηλάθην τύχης ("as far as my father is concerned"), Orestes 540 μακάριος πέφυκ' ἀνήρ | πλήν ἐς θυγατέρας. It is also common of states of mind: HF 1416 εἰς τὸ λῆμα παντὸς ἦν ἥσσον ἀνήρ, Ἀ. Pers. 326 πρώτος εἰς εὐφυχίαν and of events: Ion 569 ἐς μὲν σὴν ἀνεύρεσιν... ὀρθῶς ἐκραυγε (Apollo) IT 850 has an illustrative parallelism γένει, μὲν εὐτυχούμεν, εἰς δὲ συμφορᾶς, ὡ σύγγον', ἡμῶν δυστυχῆς ἐπὶ βλογ. Plato Laws 774 b εἰς χρήματα... ζημιούσθαι may be a legal idiom. It appears too in short phrases with pronouns S. OT 706 τὸ γ' εἰς ἑαυτόν At S. Ichneutae 355] ν εἰς ᾿ευθέων ἐξων must be the word division and probably means "to have no concerns on my account".¹

Not quite in the same camp are expressions such as S. OC 1121 τὴν ἐς τάσσε μοι τέρψιν... πεφασκένην where τέρψει could be taken as an "active" emotion, resembling the transitive force of ἔρως ἐς which also occurs (Hipp. 1430). Love is something directed towards another thing and this colours the choice of the preposition.

Good notes on the subject by Owen and Wilamowitz on HF 63.

¹i.e. lest I should derive κέρδος from guarding Hermes (cf. l. 356).
ENDNOTE:

The Marginal annotations in L

Owen (Intro. xliii) lists "thirteen notes, mostly in the margin of L" and dignifies them with the title "scholia". There are in fact nineteen notes, they are all in L, marginal or interlinear, with no effect upon P (as one would expect), and the purpose of this note is to point out that the term "scholia" has misleading connotations.

To the list he offers should be added:

172 ψαλμοι: λαοχαι, κατα το 'νευρη μεγη Ιωχεν' (= II. IV 125)
175 λευτει κωλον
180 θεον: ἕγουν Ζηνός (L s.l.) λευτει κωλον (L in marg.)
212 κεραυνον: λεύσσεις (i.e. to be taken with 209).
283 Μακραι: δνωμα κυριον τοπου (cf. ad 494)
585 ταυτον: το αυτο (explaining the nu in the contracted neuter, not scriptio plena)
594 λευτει
1294 πανοις: γρ. δαλοις
1454 γναι: Πυθια

Owen's citations should be corrected in the following particulars:

172 should read λέγει δὲ τούς φωλεούς οί ὁς ἐπὶ <τὸ πλείστον> ἐκ καρφέων γίνονται (τὸ πλείστον etiam nunc leg. Ricc. 32; little sense unless we do likewise)
494 δνωμα <κυριον> τοπου (L)

At 1023 άρ': τὸ ἀρα...; it is of didascalic interest that both accents appear over αρα to aid the demonstration.
Some of the total, including almost all that could be termed vaguely informative, are
certainly in the hand of the scribe himself; the rest seem to a less tidy and legible form of
essentially the same Byzantine script, so probably his as well (in whose else interest would
they be?). The only certainly late addition, as form and content prove, is the note at the end
of pl. 124 of the facsimile, after 1423 κεκρασπέδωτα το δ' άφεσιν αὐτίδος τρόπον informing
us that dislocation of the folia has here taken place (as indeed it has: "evolso et male restituto
folio" 1424-1582 now make an appearance after IT 271, six pages intervening). This note
obviously does not concern us. I give a list of the notes I judge definitely to be in the script

The poverty of their contents is remarkable. They look like nothing more than the
notes made by one who is working his way through the text in a mechanical fashion
attempting to understand it as he goes along, and it is instructive to contemplate the degree
of difficulty that a scribe experienced with Classical Greek, even in what we are accustomed
to regard as the "best" period of Palaeologan scholarship (c. 1280-1330?). Already the
demotic was a dominant influence over the fossilized language of scholarship, which
nonetheless seems to flow so naturally from the pen of Eustathius.

Thus the note on 87 (τὴν προεῖθαν) is a straightforward howler and that on 1137
implies failure to understand the text. The note on ἄρκα at 1023 and on ννύν at 1026 are the
sort of thing that any student of elementary Greek at any age from then to now might jot into
his exercise book. The high probability that the only notes with any pretensions to learning
(εὐνάθας at 132, factual information at 494 and 550) came straight from a dictionary implies
a similar method of work.

τὴν προεῖθαν (87) emanates from ἡμερος: ὁ πρῶς (Suda, cf. Hesychius). On
εὐνάθας see ad loc. Hesychius is the principal source. At 525 ῥυσιόζω: πολέμω seems
largely a guess dictated by the need to find an absolute opposite to τόμα δε θυρίωκος Φίλας, as Biehl suggests; if a lexicon were consulted, as is probable, a citation such as φύσιον τῶν πολεμίων ἠγαν (Josephus BJ I 19 2) cited by the Suda s.v. μυστάζαν may have prompted this. φαναί (550) is glossed by Hes. and Sud. with ταξ ἐκλάμψεις (though probably in reference to Rhes. 943). The reference to Aristophanes (Av. 1694) is not provided by them, but may well have been in some similar compilation and, in any event, it indicates a total failure to understand Aristophanes' allusion here (= συκοφαντία). The note on the accentuation of νυν could have been borrowed from any of the sources listed and cited by Chandler, GA para 826. It is perhaps a fault in Owen's list that he failed to mention the one real γρ. variant in the play, δολοῖς at 1294, but even so, the evidence I adduce in my note on l. 195 shows that words of this root were the stuff of the lecture theatre.1 With έγώντον (sic) at 1137 the scribe admittedly had a corrupt text before him (έγωντον Elmsley) but his guess does not accord with the surrounding Greek. At 1421 the phrase ἕτρων πέπλον (ἕτρος is Musgrave's correction) is rendered εὕτρειον ἴματον which suggests that ἕτρων was taken to be an adjective. The note on the metaphor implicit in ψαλμοί (173) accompanied by an apposite parallel from Homer, is of a better class - but Homer was at the centre of the Byzantine curriculum of elementary studies, of course, and often the recipient of bizarre attentions (cf. N.G. Wilson, Scholars of Byzantium, (Duckworth 1983), pp. 148f, 196f etc.). The four metrical notes (thrice λέπει τὸ κώλον, at 176 οὐ καλῶς ἔχουσι τοῦτο) are undistinguished: 180 is wrong (synizesis unnoticed), 390 and 594 attest the ability to scan an iambic trimeter. At 176 Turyn (p. 249) thought that a (completely wrong) desire for responsion with 170f. was evinced, but it is not Triclinian and may well have the same

1 It is possible that even at this date the neglect of the distinction between γρ. and gloss (rightly rebuked by Dawe, Collation p. 9) had set in.

430
reference as the λεξιτετ attached to 175 which, again, may be an accurate remark on the
unusual hiatus 175-6 but is more likely to be connected with the appearance s.l. of ἐν before
διήνυσσ, deemed necessary for the sense in 174.

I have troubled to excavate this graveyard, partly to offer illustration of the mental
habits and abilities of a not ill-educated scribe at this period - which should always be borne
in mind - but also in the hope that future editors will refrain from calling such contemporary
scribal memoranda "scholia". The latter term should be reserved for the annotations such as
we possess for the non-alphabetic plays, which draw on a long tradition of formal academic
exegesis reaching back, in the far distance, to Alexandria, though constantly intermingled with
later material and inferior observations. These came into being ex nihilo c. 1320. Moreover,
the use of the term conjures up a tantalizing vision of precious scraps salvaged from a
complete Alexandrian commentary on Euripides' omnia opera. They are nothing of the sort
and indeed it now seems unlikely that there ever was such a work - the papyri we possess of
the plays not of the selection yield nothing more distinguished than these mediaeval apercus.
APPENDIX I

184f. The question of scenery

It will be helpful at this point to discuss the question of the physical background to the play to which the chorus now draw our attention closely. There are two questions: what are the chorus notionally commenting on, and what possibility is there that something similar was actually before the eyes of the audience at the time? The two points are sometimes confused: if it can be established, for example, that the chorus are accurately describing monuments that existed at Delphi in Euripides’ day and were presumably well known to the audience, it obviously does not follow that facsimiles of these adorned the Theatre of Dionysus; indeed, it is a possible reason to the contrary. (The otherwise interesting discussion of W. Miller, Daedalus and Thespis: The Contribution of the Ancient Dramatic Poets to our Knowledge of the Arts and Crafts in Greece (1931) falls into this trap: see vol. II 409f.; Amott SC, 67.)

Let us take these questions in order. At 189 mention is made of διδυμῶν προσώπων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς. I discuss other interpretations of this puzzling phrase ad loc.: it is sufficient to note here that it could refer, however vaguely, to two architectural portions of a building. Whether, as Wilamowitz considered, it was a colonnade, or whether these were pediments, acroteria or just walls of a temple remains an open question. But nothing should be based on a phrase of such uncertain meaning.

We are naturally led to think from the start of the play that we are in the vicinity of the main temple of Apollo at Delphi: one would not write a play describing a church and set in Canterbury without prompting thought of the Cathedral. And in Euripides’ day this was
the great temple of the Alcmaeonidae (built by 487-6). The anachronism is obvious: but Euripides could ‘play’ with this so we must not rule it out.

Of the earlier writers who took this ‘positive’ line, Carl Robert (Die Iliupersis des Polygnot, 36 n. 23) argued that the contents of the first strophic pair, Heracles with Iolaus fighting the Hydra, and Bellerophon on Pegasus, belonged on the acroteria, and the contents of the second, a Gigantomachia, on the metopes. E. Kinkel (Euripides und der bildende Kunst, 25) consigned the lot (except διδόμων προσώπων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς) to metopes. Discussion was slightly advanced and certainly intensified by the discovery in 1901 of a fragment of the West Pediment of that temple (see BCH (1901) 498f., Fouilles de Delphes IV 3 17-19 pl. 36 fig. 7, LIMC vol. II s.v. Athena no. 126). It shows Athena striking some foe who is already supine: naturally enough thoughts were turned to ll. 209f. of Ion, in which Athena is described as wielding her spear against Enceladus, who was well known as her particular adversary in the fifth century as literary references and iconography show (see note ad loc.). Is it then possible, as Miller (o.c. I, 531f.) and others have argued, that διδόμων προσώπων... φῶς refers to the two pediments of the Alcmaeonid temple, here being accurately described to the audience, in which a Gigantomachia occupied one side and the two heroic feats (Heracles - Hydra - Iolaus, balanced by Bellerophon - Chimera) of the first stanzas filled the second (East pediment)? Neither of the last two are yet attested at Delphi, though LIMC V (Heracles) 2022 accords Ion a mention.

Before discussing this and the theory lying behind it, mention should be made of G. Karo’s suggestion (BCH XXXIII (1909), 215n.) that διδόμων προσώπων etc. has nothing to do with pediments whatever: he argues that προσώπων is literal and, corresponding

1 The terminus post quem is the date of Pind. Pyth. VII (mentioned in ll. 10f.). This victory of Megacles probably took place in 487-6: cf. Pontano, Rh. Mus. L I (1896), 577.
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exactly with the ἀγωνίας comparison, refers to the Caryatids of the Athenian Erechtheum (the point of comparison) and those of the Treasury of the Cnidian or Siphnians (cf. Homolle, BCH XXIII (1899), 617) where we do possess the north frieze, which is a Gigantomachia figuring all of the three gods referred to. A distinct initial objection to this is the one earlier made about plays in Canterbury.

To the details of the former, more popular, theory the most cogent refutation may be achieved simply by attempting to visualise the two pediments in the state Miller suggests: a Gigantomachia involving at least three scenes and six opponents on the massive scale of the Athena we have on one half: Iolaus, Heracles, the Hydra and then the wholly unrelated feat of Bellerophon with Pegasus on the other - such an over-congested series would not only be an artistic disgrace but would be virtually impossible to sculpt.

To the theory that Euripides is really setting out to be a kind of Dolmetsch around the Delphi of his own day, I think that a number of objections should be made. It does not accord with the way anachronism is used in Greek tragedy. *Oblique allusion* to present-day circumstances and politics, descending to quite specific references (in this play possibly 60, *A. Eum.* 398f. etc.), and likewise references that can be read in such a way; thus *Andr.* 445f. (cf. Stevans intro. xv) would at least prompt thoughts of present views of Spartan politics, though perhaps only in the way that N. Horsfall (*PVS* XIII (1973-4), 1f.) has shown to be operative in Virgil's treatment of Carthage. *Id.* 699f., if genuine, seems to imply contemporary debate. The allusion to the Lycurgan festivals at 599, like the mixture of monarchy and Athenian political schemings at *Ion* 595f. (see M. Lloyd, *Antike und Abenland* XXXII, (1986), 38), belong to a different camp, that of the perfectly acceptable commingling of present institutes (which were in any case considered antique, as *A. Eum.* indicates) with the Heroic Age. But where do we find a prolonged, intricate description of objects or
happenings of the fifth century placed in the heroic age?

Moreover, had Euripides wished to be as fiercely specific as the French excavators of Delphi wish, would he have chosen *three of the commonest artistic themes in the whole corpus of Classical portraiture*? I discuss the specific iconography of the various figures mentioned as it arises in the text; on the Gigantomachia it is sufficient to refer to the two publications of F. Vian to see quite how universal the subject was in sculptured reliefs, metopes, pediments, etc. The feat of Heracles in question offers obvious artistic potential and certainly goes back to archaic art (see on 190f.), with or without the company of Iolaus: on its subsequent proliferation, see e.g. E. Kunze, *Olympische Forschungen II* (Berlin 1950), 103f. Paus. X 18 6 mentions the group without the company of Iolaus at a different point in his round trip of Delphi (in iron, the work of Tisagoras, near the statue of Gorgias and the bronze "procession" of the Sicyonians). There is no known Delphic representation of Bellerophon and Pegasus at Delphi; but the popularity of the topic in art is abundantly attested in practice and goes back to archaic seventh-century art, of course Oriental in origin.

If it is accepted that Euripides, as I have argued, is most unlikely to have described any specific main building of the Delphi of his day, there seem two possible conclusions. From the new information this century that the Alcmaeonid temple probably did contain some part of the Gigantomachy, and from the Pausanian notice concerning Heracles and the Hydra, it is perhaps possible for those who still insist on a modern Delphi in this passage to argue that Euripides has presented in words a sort of telescoped 'Delphic medley' of artistry which would be separately known to his audience but did not belong together in any one place and
could doubtless not be seen together.\textsuperscript{1} The alternative which I prefer is that Euripides has simply combined the commonest temple decorations known to him and put them together at random to produce a fictitious picture of what the Delphi of Ion’s day might have been like, for the benefit of the onlookers.

There is little point is speculating about what was actually before the audience in this scene, though two points might be made. If anything corresponding to what is stated to be there was present, it can presumably only be thought of in terms of σκηνογραφία; metopes and so forth for a performance that would be a "one off" are unthinkable. And our evidence for that is notoriously slight - see the collection of evidence in W. Beare, \textit{The Roman Stage} (London 1968), Appendix H, and discussion by P. Arnott (\textit{SC}, 91f.). Secondly, even this is unlikely to be relevant, for the obvious reason that detailed description is in fact presented by the chorus. Their words give generous cause for a vision of Delphi in the mind. The ancient theatre, unlike ours, has a natural backdrop, always unchanging, namely the part of town or countryside it occupies, usually from some height. It is not too much to imagine the audience relating another description of a city, with countryside in sight (as the in the prologue to S. \textit{El.}), to what is actually visible to them - "garden" productions depend for much of their effect on just such a faculty of transference. One cannot guess further.

\textsuperscript{1}Thus G. Roux and J. Pouilloux, \textit{Énigmes à Delphes} (Paris 1963), 109 n. 2: 'La diversité des interprétations que l'on donne du texte... montre que le poète cherchait à rendre un atmosphere plus qu'à décrire précisément comme eût fait un guide.'
APPENDIX II

On Alliterations ad l. 386

The ancient critics are remarkably unhelpful on giving a general view of the function of alliteration.

There is no doubt that lines such as Med. 476 caught the public fancy. The scholiast ad loc., having soberly informed us of the presence of the phenomenon goes on to quote two pieces of satirical verse. The first is specific and is also paraphrased in Eust. 1379. 56 ad Od. proem. εὖ γέ σοι <γένουθ> διὰ | ἑσφορὰς ἐκ τῶν σύμων τῶν Εὐριπίδου, Plato Comicus (Ἔορτα ὁ τ. 29 Κ.-Ἀ.). εὖ σοι γένοντο is a Euripidean tag (cf. Alc. 627). The second (Eubulus Διονύσιος, fr. 26 K.-A. and Hunter) is textually more difficult. The scholiast quotes it in the form:

Εὐριπίδου δ’ ἑσφορὰ σ’ ὡς ἵσασ’ δοσοι"
καὶ "παρθέν’ εἰ <σώσαι> σ’ ἤξεις μοι χάριν"
καὶ τοῖς ἔμοιοιν ἐγκλῆσαι ἠπῄμασι
τὰ σύμων συλλέξαντες, ὡς αὐτοὶ σοφοί.

The second quotation is Androm. fr. 129 N., with ἤξεις for ἔξω which aids another sibilant to the line. Schwartz (ad schol. Eur.) deleted the author reference in l. 1 as scholiastic, with the δε, and restored the original Euripidean verse, though, as Hunter notes, with sigmatism as the point, Ἐλλήνων is unwelcome. In lines two and three, assuming we have a series of quotations from Eubulus, καὶ might also be deleted. However this be, Hunter’s opinion that we have two fragments, 1-2 and 3-4 (his frs. 26 and 27) seems right; unless Schwartz’ treatment of l. 1 is adopted, by l. 3 Euripides himself seems to have begun speaking - with Εὐριπίδου δ’ we must assume, if we have one fragment, another poet, also prone to sigmatism, being bedevilled with Euripidean parallels and retorting to them. This is of little
point, and ὃς ψυχῷ σοφὸς reminds us that E. was deemed the σοφὸς poet (cf. bibl. in Hunter and in general P. van Lennep, Ποιητής Σοφός (1935). In l. 3 πήμασι has been doubted, irrespective of speaker, but Hunter is surely right to point to the paratragedy in both ἐγγελῶσι and πήμασι and the similarity to the sentiment of E. El. 68. Cf. also W. Elsperger, Reste und Spuren antiker Kritik gegen Euripides gesammelt aus den Euripidesscholien (Philol. su. XI 1 (Leipzig 1907), 85f.).

It is also very likely that Aristophanes parodies Euripidean alliteration in Ran. 826-8 where he envisages Euripides’ reply to Aeschylus:

ἐνθεν δὴ στοματουργὸς ἐπών βασανίστρια λίστη
gλῶσσα’ ἀνελισσομένη φθονεροῦς κινοῦσα χαλινοῦς,
ῥήματα δαιμόμενη καταλεπτολογήσει
πλευμὸν πολύν πόνον.

Related to all this merry-making is a notice of the Atticist Aelius Dionysius, cited by Eustathius (813 44 ad II. X 409: cf. ad II. XII 146) and including Plato com. l.c. in testimony: ἱστορεῖ τοὺς κομικοὺς μάλιστα ἐκκλίνειν πάν τὸ ἔχον σιγάν καὶ ἐξήχησιν καὶ ψόφον ἃ τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ ἄν ἀρμοττοῦ (Erbse, σ 15). This statement has been examined by, inter alios, J. Scott, AJP XXIX (1908), 69f. and O.J. Todd, CQ XXXVI (1942), 29f. (see other references in Hunter o.c. p. 120 n. 1), and found not to correspond to practice. Aelius statement is based on what the comic poets say, not what the tragedians of Euripides or the others do. Eust. 1170. 54 ad II. XIX 49 nonetheless refers to Euripides ὁ φιλόσωματος with a third reference to Pl. Com.

Do the comic statements reveal a genuine antipathy to what they clearly ‘perceived’ as a trend especially evident in Euripides? Only if one forgets that we are dealing with comedy and not computerized analysis or serious literary criticism. If a poet writes an
especially unusual, exaggerated or otherwise striking line, it will pass on its own into the
commun pool of knowledge that a comic poet seeks to plumb. We are not to assume that
from the line of Cicero’s poem on his consulship relentlessly pilloried in antiquity (and now)
that the author had invented a new form of double internal rhyme which the statistician would
encounter in high proportion in his work, if we had more of it. The comic poets hang their
jokes on a couple of lines, and the Atticist notice hangs exclusively on them.

However, there are indications of a different nature that sigma was sometimes avoided
by design and actually for literary effect, and it is these which we must now briefly examine,
if only to ascertain where any lively awareness of this was likely in Euripides’ time. Pindar
fr. 70 (b) S.-M. 1-3 πρὶν μὲν ἔρηκε σχοινοτένειά τ' ἀουδᾶ... [... καὶ τὸ σῶν κιβδηλὸν
ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπὸ στόματων has played a rather confused part in this debate; 1-2 or 3
appear in different contexts in Athenaeus (twice) and Dionysius, and 31 lines of this
dithyramb are preserved in P. Oxy. xiii 1604. The source for Strabo who also has 8-11 has
been conjectured to be Posidonius; the sources cited in Athenaeus are respectively Clearchus
fr. 88 Wehrli at 455 C and Aristoxenus fr. 87 Wehrli at 467 A. In Athenaeus this is
connected with the alleged asigmatism of Lasus of Hermione - see too id. 624 E-F. In the
case of Pindar it seems unlikely that ἡ ἀσιγματοποιήσα每一个 φόδη has anything to do with the
case, whatever his sources may have thought, though it is not yet known what phonetic
feature of san Pindar was objecting to. The Athenaean citations have been carefully studied
by G.A. Privitera (Riv. Cult. Class. e Med. VI (1964), 164f.) à propos of Lasus; it is worth
noting in Dionysius that the context: θηριώδους γὰρ καὶ ἀλόγου μᾶλλον ἡ λογικῆς
ἐφάπτεσθαι δοκεῖ φωνῆς ὁ συριμοῦ. τῶν γοῦν πολλῶν τινες σπανίως ἐξρώντο αὐτῷ
καὶ πεφυλαγμένως, εἰοί δ’ οἰ καὶ ἀσέχμους ὅλας φῶς ἐποιοῦν ἡμλοὶ δὲ τούτῳ καί
Πίνδορος ἐν οἷς φησι’ (Pind. l.c. follows.—D.H. de comp. verb. XIV) gives no suffrage to
the idea (a) that Pindar wrote wholly asigmatic φόξι (b) that his remarks have anything to
do with Lasus. But Athenaeus and Dionysius thought that Pindar was in some way
deprecating the use of sigma.¹ This is not difficult to disparage. No composition of Pindar
shows such a tendency; still less does this dithyramb, in which there is commended to us the
Παλλάδοσ αἰγίς which μυρίων φθοργάζεται κλαγγάζει δρακόντων (l. 16-17). It is difficult
not to accept the opinion of G. Huxley (Pindar’s Vision of the Past (Belfast 1975), 41) that
"the false san, which cannot be a true Greek san- or sigma-sound, calls to mind the sh- sound
found in some Anatolian languages". He suggests the strange speech of some early Eastern
practitioners of the dithyramb might be in Pindar’s mind. That is certainly possible; the
adjective σχοινυστενής seems to refer to something "long drawn-out" (cf. Hermogenes de inv.
IV 4), σόν is the Doric name for σήμα (Hdt. I 139), and it is perhaps worth mentioning, in
connection with some oddity in the fricative pronunciation Pindar is criticizing, the phonetic
background to the Attic ττ for dialect σσ (on the sampi (which might have been called san
as well) cf. Sidney Allen, Vox Graeca, 57f. - evidently it involved συρυμμός).

The phrase κιβδηλον ἀνθρώπουν has been translated in numerous strange ways
dictated by different interpretations of the fragment; "spurious" in the sense of "no proper
sound for a man to make" seems at least natural.

Moving to Lasus, we have three lines of his hymn to Demeter of Hermione, courtesy
of Heraclides Ponticus fr. 161 Wehrli quoted by Athenaeus (624 E) which do indeed omit
sigma (fr. 702 PMG). But, as the rest that is known of his work by titles was deemed
spurious in antiquity, the Dithyrambs by Aelian (n.a. VII 47) and the Centauri by Athenaeus
(455 C), the latter explicitly in connection with asigmatism, it is perhaps worth taking a step

¹What Aristoxenus actually said, quoting οἱ μονονοῖ, was that it was ‘harsh-sounding
and unfitted for the flute’ (467 A).
further and suggesting that the one fragment we have is either a later forgery or a later choice of a real piece of Lasus which, by coincidence, contained no sigmas for a small space. The reason for either possibility will be the later association of Lasus with asigmatism, perhaps based on a misunderstanding of the famous Pindar fragment which accompanies the idea in the tradition (it is unlikely that some of the sources would have known more of the dithyramb than the three lines they transmit). There might have been an attempt to identify a predecessor of Pindar who is here the object of his criticism - just the exercise attested for Pindar's "biographers" in many other cases (see Lefkowitz, Lives, ch. VI passim). It seems that, from another reference in Athenaeus (455 C) to the same statement of Heraclides the word ηςιμιας actually occurred in the third book of Heraclides de musica, which only indicates that he said something about sibilants in this connection - probably, given his context, the Aeolian mode, concerning their value in a score - and this led the Pindar commentators up the wrong road.¹

If Lasus, as I have argued, is unlikely to have indulged in what I regard as essentially a product of Hellenistic and later "book poetry" - and he seems to have made no effort to avoid consonants which include a sigma-sound, if the word βουλζόγης is correctly assigned to him by Heraclides Lembus (PMG 705) - then let us consider an example which certainly does, P. Bodmer xxviii (= TGF II fr. 655). This fragment of iambics from a play, involving the confrontation of Heracles and Atlas, does not include a sigma in some sixty lines preserved in whole or part. Significantly, perhaps, it does not of resolution either. What of date or provenance? In the ed. princ. (MH XXXIII (1976), 1 f.) E.G. Turner concludes (21f.) that it is likely to be a later re-working of a Classical text, pointing to the "metrical

¹ or more likely that Lasus was the founder of the dithyramb - Marm. Par. (FGrHist. 239 A. 46) with Jacoby ad loc., West, Greek Music 343 n. 62, with other sources, and that is what P. is commenting on.
monotony" contrasted with "the presence of a few phrases of startling expressiveness which shine like gem stones imprisoned in duller rocks". He also concludes from language and a tone that this is in origin a satyr play. This is not an especially economic thesis and two objections have been raised which serve to confirm a late date. D.A.F. Sutton (BASP XIV (1977) 251) sensibly notes that the absence of resolution as an additional factor militates against the "re-writing" thesis. West (ZPE XXII (1976),41f.) uses the same feature to find a more appropriate original late context - that of Hellenistic tragedy. Language is then no obstacle, and certainly there is nothing so hilarious in the contents as to necessitate satyr-play.

I would only add to this another consideration. The unknown author does not feel himself debarred from the use of letters involving sigmatic sounds. This piece of evidence works in the opposite direction from its application to Lasus in the sixth century B.C. - for, as sigma itself is rigorously excluded, this shows that it was the appearance, not the sound, that counted in *prima*: it was written to be read, not heard, "book poetry" *par excellence*.

How late, it cannot be said, though its colleagues known to us only by repute certainly imply the Roman period. If the Suda is to be believed, s.v. Νέοτωρ Αρομνήδης ἑκ Λυκίας, Nestor wrote an Ἰλίας λεωθοδραματος in which in book A there was no α, in B no β and so on, in the time of Septimius Severus, and Triphiodorus (third or fourth century) treated the Odyssey similarly. Eustathius 1379 55 ad *Od. proem* actually says this was asigmatic, Tryphiodorus having a lisp.

The notices from the rhetorical and grammatical writers are disappointingly slight. They are all Latin, and though it is clear from the terminology that they hark back to a discussion among earlier Greek grammarians, they present their views in an abbreviated and confused form.

The only technical term for alliteration in the general sense known to us is
homeoprophoron, which is only known from the Latin sources. (‘Adliteratio’ was coined by
the humanist Pontano, Dial. lib. IV (Actius) ed. Aldina 1519, fol. 127b). It is discussed most
fully by Martianus Capella = l. 178 para. 514 Willis (1983) (254.8 Dick-Préaux (Teubner)):
he contrasts it with dysprophoron, which seems to be a much more general category
embracing cacophony, and lists as examples polysigma, iotacismus, labdacismus, and
myotacismus. The second and third are referred to without definition by Quintilian (I.5.32)
as Greek oddities. Martianus regards all these as vitia, as does Quintilian, ‘vel cuiuslibet
litterae assiduitatem in odium repetitam, ut "sale saxa sonabant"’. He is joined by the Auctor
ad Herennium (IV xii 18): composition is improved ‘si vitabimus eiusdem litterae nimiam
adsiduitatem’, taking as his butt ‘Ennius’ line about Titus Tatius.\textsuperscript{1} In general this is the
pattern: rhetorical writers help themselves to ‘cautionary examples’ from the poets - who may
well have been using the device to produce a quite deliberate effect - and use them to
illustrate a possible rhetorical fault. Virgil’s alliterations appear as tags in many of the
grammarians for this reason: thus e.g. Servius on Aen. III 183 (‘casus Cassandra canebat’) is
totally deaf to the weighty effect produced, remarking merely that the line is ‘vitosus’ and
old-fashioned in sound (precisely the effect Virgil was aiming at!).

A further obstacle to our understanding of this comes when we examine the specific
terms Martianus and the grammarians use. Polysigma is self-explanatory. Labdacismus is
implicitly understood by Martianus to mean using too many ‘l’s, and Isidore (I 32 8 Lindsay)
agrees. However, Diomedes (I Keil 454) defines it as an excessive lingering on the letter, a
fault in pronunciation (which is its meaning in modern medicine, a form of lisp). Servius IV
455 takes it similarly, as failure to distinguish single and double ‘l’. The situation is exactly
the same with the other categories: it would be wearisome to go into the tortuosities the

\textsuperscript{1}fr. 104 Skutsch.
sources invent to explain *iotacismus*, which like the others was a term invented for another language and seems to have become wholly obscure by this date: it is sufficient to point out that Martianus' assumption that it means the use of too many 'i's is unlikely to the point of absurdity.


The conclusions to this survey fall into three divisions. The comedians should only be used as comedians, not as statisticians; but on the other hand there is no virtue in denying that the audience did detect a special effect in *Med.* 479. We are certainly entitled to look for noteworthy examples, and though the evidence from serious writers about sigma proved a treacherous path, that attention was paid to its nuances is not in doubt. Naturally letters and contexts can never be linked exactly and the true art of alliteration works otherwise, in building for the ear a pattern of sound attractive in itself. It adds "speed and force to the motion of verse" as A.E. Housman observes in his celebrated lecture on Swinburne when treating of his use and misuse of the device. No one will deny Virgil great praise for his interweaving of sounds and alliterative effects, and a commentator of the fine ear of R.G. Austin will remark of these, without attaching a precise intellectual flavour to them.

It belongs to the non-intellectual level of poetics to which Housman pointed in "The Name and Nature of Poetry" in 1933; unfortunately for us, he never bequeathed to us the "few pages more" on this and other artifices of versification that he there felt able to add to the precepts of Frederic Myers and Coventry Patmore. There is a sensitive account of its
various poetical and psychological uses in Greek verse by M.S. Silk (Interaction in Poetic Imagery (CUP 1974), 173f.) - at the start he notes "As usual, we cannot guarantee the accuracy of the intention... nor are we called upon to make the attempt. The point is simply that it is perceptibility (ear-catching) that is in question, and that recurrence of sound is not necessarily perceptible".

When we turned to asigmatic works in their own right, we found good reason to think that absolute asigmatism was a literary gimmick, very much part of Hellenistic and later "book poetry", and that though Lasos, through his Pythagorean (?) interests in harmony, no doubt, had some opinions on the difficulty of accommodating sigma to the lyre, it was a very different matter to what later sources impute to him. Stanford, The Sound of Greek (California 1967), 53, thinks that "most likely what they objected to - though this is not specifically stated - was the presence of the higher overtones, or partials, in the sibilant s, together with its unusual carrying power". He notes the practice of choirmasters over this consonant and the speech-defect known as *sigmaismus stridens*, which last, indeed approaches some of the descriptions we have of the process of pronunciation from ancient sources; cf. D.H. l.c. ("sigma is produced by bringing the entire tongue up to the palate and the breath being forced out between the two, emitting the hissing sound lightly and thickly around the teeth"), Pl. Theaet. 203 B. etc. Pericles worried about the facial expression produced, acc. to Eust. 813 45. *Ad. II. X 409.*

Doubtless there were refinements in the Hellenistic period to all forms of enharmonics and this was especially associated with Stoic linguistic theories. What we know of them has to be gleaned from later rhetorical writers in the main, with all their faults. Dionysius is of some practical interest in his treatment of the "double hemiphona" ibid. - of those which involve sigma throws more pleasantly upon the ear than the others, for ξ and ψ give the hiss
with κ and ι respectively (συνρυμός), both of which letters are smooth, whereas ζ is gently roughened by the breath and is the noblest of its class"). We have seen that these were not avoided in the examples we have examined.

Interest in the "s" sound continued, from different points of view; Cic. de Or. 161 aligns himself with the orators and warns against it; it would be interesting indeed to know of the contents of the "book" on the letter "s" indicted by the greater orator and patron of poetry, Valerius Messalla (Quintilian inst. or. 1 7 23). In a sense, Attic Greek evolved away from sigmatism of itself, with the transformations ρο to ρρ, and σσ to ττ, the proto aspirate (s) to the rough breathing etc. Lucian's purpose in his Αἰμισςάμονεν between sigma and tau is of course comic - he does however include the conquests of ρ and ζ.

Thus we have the comedians, the Hellenistic theorists, the book poets and the writers of oratorical handbooks, who had a naturally narrow didascalic purpose and merely regarded alliteration as tending to a vitium. Real Kuntsprosa and poetry was always a step ahead, as one would expect; the multiplied sigmas of Dem. de cor. 208 testify to its application and Hellenistic poetry remained as sensitive and more so - see Mineur's note on Call. hymn in Del. ll. 88, 118, McLennan on hymn. in Iov. l. 30 etc.
APPENDIX III

Plutarch de exilio 607 (B-C) (ad l. 504)

The variant ὄριζεται has been largely ignored because of uncertainty as to how to use Plutarch as a source here. It is worth examining the context. In ch. 17 Plutarch attacks the idea that exile is a suitable subject for reproach by offering numerous glamorous mythological precedents - Theseus, Eumolpus, Melanthus etc. but not until this point quoting verse. Euripides enters his prose at the last sentence of 607 B (Ἡρακλέους τοῦ καλλινίκου cf. HF 582 et al.) and it goes on:

καὶ ὁ τοῦ Διονύσου πάππος, ὡς ἔξεπέμψη τὴν Εὐρώπην ἀνευρεῖν, οὐδὲ σάτος ἐπανήλθε, Φοῖνιξ πεφυκὼς ἐκ ο' ὄριζεται γένος εἰς τὰς θήβας παραγενόμενος ἐνενὸν ὀραγύναικα

μαννομένας Διόνυσον

ἀνθέοντα τιμαῖς (adepota 1003 PMG)

The Loeb editor therefore takes only the first three and the last words in the quote as Euripides, and noting that ὄριζεται is being used transitively, explains ‘expatriated’ with γένος as ‘offspring’ (unnecessarily, probably acc. of respect), though not in Euripides’ sense.

This would be a very strange method for Plutarch to adopt. It is well known that he often and deliberately takes a quotation, in a different sense than that intended, out of context (the extreme example being the alarming literary criticism adumbrated in de audiendis poetis) and evidently he has done so here - But why ever should he impair the allusion by introducing instead in place of ὀμείβεται, intransigent for his purpose, not only a word of a different meaning but a word extremely rare in the meaning he bestows on it? (a difficulty acknowledged by Diggle à propos of Wecklein ἔξαμείβοντες in Hcld. 16 - PCPS XXVIII (1982) 57 = Euripidea, 221). The only parallel for the simple ὄριζω meaning ‘exile’ is
indeed from Euripides, Hec. 940 νοεῖς... μή αὐτὸ γᾶς ἰρισθεὶς Ἰλιάδος which is a type of tmesis. ὁρίζω is perfectly understandable as a synonym or alternative for ἀμετέρως but hardly Plutarch’s invention. Secondly why in the middle? Plutarch’s own meaning would be equally served with the active. Therefore this diff. lec. is probably part of the text he had before him.

Evidently the lyric fragment appended to the quotation must have a governing verb, and ὁρίζεται has been explained as an alteration to provided this - "consulto mutavit Plut., ut ad γένος subiungeret εὖ θνον κτλ." Bernhardy. Plutarch alone cites it - here, at q. conv. IV vi 1, and at de E ap. Delph. ix. Each version differs in text and order, though all require the subject and epithets to be in the accusative in context.

(καὶ εἰσῆγωγε) at the end of the quotation might well disappear before the καὶ of the next paragraph, if we must assume that Plut. also used ὁρίζεται in the exact meaning he found it in Euripides - i.e. intransitive. But there seems no need to do this. Plutarch has created a transitive meaning where an intransitive one existed in Euripides - but I suggest he has merely availed himself of an ambiguity inherent in the formation.
BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY

This is entirely selective and arbitrary, as might be expected from a list compiled at a preliminary stage in a longer project. My only object in offering it is to be of help, if possible, and to avoid any confusion. Thus I have included all titles referred to from the start in shortened form (apart from the most obvious - K.-G., Schwyzer, Schmid-Stählin etc. did not seem to merit amplification), and other compendia I have adopted.

This is purely designed for use with the work in hand. A list of previous editions is available in Diggle, Studies - opera omnia p. xi, Ion p. xiii; to the latter, for the sake of completeness I should like to add the edition of G. Ammendola (Florence 1951) though I have unfortunately only second-hand knowledge of it. In the thought that a scholarly translation may sometimes aid the critic, I mention that of E. Staiger (Bern 1947) and especially that of F. Lourenço (Lisbon 1994), the latter equipped with brief and useful notes on the text and a substantial introductory essay.

I have not included standard references to Classical texts, nor to periodicals, where I have mostly followed LSJ and L'Année Philologique respectively. The later Clarendon editions of Euripides contain more general bibliographies - I draw attention especially to those of G. W. Bond (HF 1981) and Sir Charles Willink (Orestes 1986). D. J. Mastronarde’s Phoenissae (C.U.P. 1994) is exemplary in this respect (p. 651f.) and the bibliographies S. Radt has prefixed to his two TGF volumes (III, IV) have been ever useful.
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