

NOTES ON EURIPIDES' *HERAKLES*¹

215 f. βίαν δὲ δράσης μηδὲν, ἣ πείσῃ λίαν
 ὅταν θεοῦ σοι πνεῦμα μεταβαλὼν τύχῃ.

Professor M. L. West has challenged the accepted reading βία . . . βίαν (Reiske) and proposed λίαν . . . βίαν (*Philologus* 117 (1973), 145). This makes for a disappointing antithesis, and Paley seems to have been right in pointing out that βίαν would be surprising as an object to πάσχειν; tragic diction, at least, seems to use only pronouns, adjectives, or nouns which stand as *internal* accusatives (πάθος, ἄλγος etc.; fr. adesp. 310N², with βλάβην, is from the *Menandri Monostichoi*). This tells also against βία . . . βίαν, which (in addition to West's objection) involves two corrections. λίαν . . . λίαν (Lenting: I have not seen his argument) seems preferable: compare *I.T.* 721–2 . . . ἣ λίαν δυσπραξία λίαν διδοῦσα μεταβολάς, ὅταν τύχῃ. λίαν δὲ δράσης μηδὲν, 'don't get carried away' (cf. μηδὲν ἄγαν), coheres naturally with a warning that fortune changes, though in the context it is not surprising that a reference to βία has intruded. As for ἣ πείσῃ λίαν, West points out that an explicit object for πάσχειν would normally be required. But λίαν πάσχειν has some affinity with κακῶς (or εὖ) πάσχειν, and an object is in any case not required when a contrast is being made between 'doing' and 'suffering': cf. Denniston on *E. El.* 1045 and, e.g., *Andr.* 438, *Ba.* 801, *Rhesos* 483; so also, to an aggressor turned victim through retribution, *E. fr.* 1090 N² ἀνέχου πάσχω· δρῶν γὰρ ἔχαιρες.

301 ῥᾶον γὰρ αἰδοῦς ὑπολαβὼν φίλ' ἂν τέμοις.
 In marg. γράφεται φίλ' ἂν τελοῖς

This defies translation (Parmentier's 'en touchant le sentiment d'honneur' assumes an unparalleled meaning for ὑπολαβὼν). But the general sense required is clearly that a well-bred enemy can be prevailed on to show mercy: cf. *Hklid.* 458–60, *E. El.* 294–6 (see Denniston ad loc.), *Auge* fr. 270N², *S. fr.* 924P=838N². φίλ' ἂν τέμοις recalls the Homeric φιλότῃτα . . . ταμεῖν, as does *E. Suppl.* 375, and no alternative to τέμοις is required. Bruck's ὑποβαλὼν was followed by Wilamowitz, who interpreted αἰδοῦς as a partitive genitive in the light of Euboulos fr. 90 Kock; but this seems desperate. On the other hand, Euripides does once use ὑποβάλλειν reflexively as 'to submit oneself to' or 'throw oneself on the mercy of'—in line 1384 of this same play, ἐχθροῖς ἐμαυτὸν ὑποβαλὼν αἰσχροῦς θάνω; (*LSJ* compares Aischines 3.90). This suggests a simple cure for 301:

ῥᾶον γὰρ αἰδοῖ σ' ὑποβαλὼν φίλ' ἂν τέμοις.

460–1 Φεῦ·| ἣ πολὺ με δόξης ἐξέπαισαν ἐλπίδες
 ἦν πατρός ὑμῶν ἐκ λόγων ποτ' ἤλπισα.

¹ I cite the readings of L, normalized in punctuation, orthography, and accentuation. Lines 460, 543, and 557 were previously discussed in my *Stylistic and Analytical Commentary on Euripides' Herakles* 1–814 (Diss. Toronto, 1975). I gratefully acknowl-

edge the help and encouragement of Professor D. J. Conacher, my supervisor, of Mr. T. C. W. Stinton, who commented both on the dissertation and on a draft of this article, and of Mr. G. W. Bond, who also commented helpfully on the same draft.

Vahlen's reference to Plato, *Phaidros* 228 ε ἐκκέκρουκας με ἐλπίδος . . . ἣν εἶχον . . . (*Opuscula Academica* ii.225; cf. E. Kroeker, *Der Herakles des E.* (Munich, 1938) p.37 n.1) should secure ἐξέπαισαν or some adjacent form of ἐκπαίειν against Hirzel's ἡ πολὺ γε δόξης ἐξέπεσον εὐέλπιδος. Cf. also S. *O. T.* 1432 ἐλπίδος μ' ἀπέσπασας, and for the use of πολὺ E. *Or.* 1085 ἡ πολὺ λέλειψαι τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων, S. *Aj.* 1382 καὶ μ' ἔψευσας ἐλπίδος πολὺ. But no compilation of phrases illustrating that hopes or expectations can be said to deceive, disappoint, etc., can justify the sheer nonsense of 'my hopes have knocked me out of my expectation'. The subject of ἐξέπαισαν (or whatever is the true form) must surely be events or their agents, as in the passages cited above. This is correctly sensed by emendators who have read ἐλπίδος and replaced δόξης with a subject for the verb (Musgrave πράξεις, Hartung δαίμων) or replaced ἐλπίδες with a subject such as αἱ τύχαι (Nauck) or οἱ θεοί (Usener).

But perhaps a subject for the verb need not be stated at all. Kirchoff's ἐξέπαισας, addressed to Μοῖρα (456), seems too contrived, but there are cases where, in the emotional lamentation of shattered hopes, a speaker 'blames' those who are not really the perpetrators of the situation but its victims:

S. *El.* 809 ἀποσπάσας γὰρ τῆς ἐμῆς οἴχει φρενὸς
αἱ μοι μόναι παρήσαν ἐλπίδων ἔτι.

E. *Tro.* 1181 ὄλωλας, ἐψεύσω με . . .

And Megara does address the children in the lines immediately preceding and following. I therefore suggest that the true reading includes ἐξεπαῖσατ (ε).

The rest remains problematic. δόξης ἐξεπαῖσατ' ἐλπίδος would be the simplest, but 'hope consisting of expectation', while not strictly subject to Fraenkel's objections to taking φόβου . . . ἐλπίς together at *Ag.* 1434 (where a *noun* is interposed), still leaves an ambiguity (which genitive is dependent on which?) as well as a rather flat pleonasm. On the other hand 'hope of glory' (as a mother of glorious children) tends to blur the impression that Megara's maternal hopes are centred on the children, not herself. If this is rejected, either δόξης or ἐλπίδες has displaced a completely different word. It is hard to see what could have led to the intrusion of δόξης, but ἐλπίδος might have been a marginal explanation of δόξης which intruded into the text and caused the further adjustment to ἐξέπαισαν ἐλπίδες. (That the different shades of meaning of δόξα demanded explanation is shown by the Scholia on, e.g., *Med.* 1010, *Hipp.* 1414, *Hek.* 370, 489, S. *Ph.* 1463; none of these actually uses ἐλπίς, though Σ. S. *Ph.* 1463 has τῆς οἰησέως· ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδέποτε τοῦτο οἰηθέντες οὐδὲ ἐλπίσαντες τελεῖσθαι ὥστε ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Τροίαν.) As for the lost word, the strongest possibility is that it was an adjective qualifying δόξης. A possibility (no more) would be εὐτέκνον (cf. *Ion* 423–4 εὐτέκνους χρησμούς; similarly *Med.* 1010 δόξης εὐαγγέλου, derived from A. *Ag.* 262 εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν).

543

— στάσει τὸ Κάδμου γ' ἐπτάπυλον ἔχει κράτος.

Dobree's στάσει τὸ Κάδμου δ' . . . has been almost universally accepted, although there is a lonely protest by Klotz in his preface to Pflugk's edition. Klotz's suggestion that γε can be understood as limitative is unconvincing, but he rightly points out that in Dobree's reading τὸ Κάδμου . . . κράτος is otiose (Megara having already indicated in 541 that Lykos now controls Thebes).

Otiose statements in stichomythia need not be multiplied by conjecture. Two reasons can be offered for *emphatic* γε here, and perhaps both have contributed something to its appearance:

(1) It may be 'exclamatory' in the sense identified by Denniston, *The Greek Particles*², pp.126–8. It then expresses Megara's surprise or indignation that the great city of Kadmos should have suffered subversion (For τὸ Κάδμου γε rather than τὸ γε Κάδμου see Denniston, *ibid.*, p.147 (b)).

(2) It may be responsive (Denniston, *ibid.*, pp.130–8, especially p.133 (iv), where S. *Ph.* 1385, E. *Or.* 398, and S. *Tr.* 590 show γε noticeably delayed.) In this case it denotes Megara's choice of an answer ('by *stasis*') to Herakles' open question ('by force or by *stasis*?').

556–7 — κοῦκ ἔσχευ αἰδῶ τὸν γέροντ' ἀτιμάσαι;
 — αἰδῶς γ' ἀποκεῖ τῇσδε τῆς θεοῦ πρόσσω.

Supra τῆς θεοῦ scr. ἐστίας

Who is the goddess? Hardly Hestia, since it is not Herakles' home which lacks *aidōs* but Lykos and his supporters. Bia continues to be canvassed (e.g. Parmentier, *R Ph* (1920), 146; Kroeker, *op. cit.*, p.44 n.1; V. Langholf, *Die Gebete bei E. und die seitliche Folge der Tragödien* (Göttingen, *Hypomnemata* Heft 32, 1971), p.50). Murray implausibly offered τοῦ νῦν ἡμᾶς ἔχοντος δαίμονος (in his apparatus) or δυστυχία or μοῖρα θανάτου (in a note recorded in Blakeney's commentary). A reference derived from the adverbial βία two lines above is in itself harder than the comparable instances where Euripides turns a reference to an abstraction into a reference to a deity (conveniently collected by Langholf, *loc. cit.*). And surely in this context a reference to 'this (or that) goddess' which did *not* refer to αἰδῶς would be profoundly confusing; if anything, we need βία γ' ἀποκεῖ . . . But this is unlikely to have been corrupted, and I agree with those who reject the possibility of a reference to a second goddess.

557 must therefore be emended. One suggested course has been to take the first words of 557 as exclamatory, indignantly repeating Herakles' reference to Aidōs, so that ἀποκεῖ begins a new sentence and has Lykos understood as its subject. The punctuation is possible under certain conditions (see further below), but Aidōs is in any case the most likely subject for ἀποκεῖ: Hesiod's description of her retreat to Olympos (*Erga* 197 ff.) is also echoed by Euripides at *Med.* 439 f., with similar delimitation of the area of the earth which she has deserted. (Parmentier's claim that the relative domiciles of two *deities* must be in question needs no detailed refutation.) That being so, something must be wrong with τῇσδε τῆς θεοῦ. That THC should have arisen from ΓΗC (and entailed the genitive θεοῦ) is more than likely, and we may note that Herakles does proceed to discuss the behaviour not just of Lykos but of Thebes as a whole. Hartman suggested αὐτῇ γὰρ οἰκεῖ τῇσδε γῆς πρόσσω θεός, while Elmsley had suggested Αἰδῶς γ' ἀποκεῖ τῇσδε τῆς χθονός πρόσσω. Hartman was correct in principle in pointing out how easily the pronoun could have been replaced by the proper name, but all that is strictly needed is

αἰδῶς γ' ἀποκεῖ τῇσδε γῆς θεός πρόσσω.

'Aidōs, on the contrary, dwells apart from this land, a goddess, far away.'

(L's γ' could easily be wrong and P's δ' fortuitously right, giving a more forceful

contradiction according to Denniston, *The Greek Particles*², p.167. But the use of γε is exactly paralleled at S. *Pb.* 424—cf. *ibid.* 570—and it may be retained here.)

That perhaps is as far as the discussion needs, strictly, to be taken. But the possibility of punctuating before ἀποκεί in 557, and thus making Megara's riposte more lively, remains interesting. Pearson showed (*CR* 38 (1924), 13) that if the first word in 557 were an exclamatory repetition, it would have to be (a) without γε, and (b) in the same case as the word it repeats; thus only αἰδώς; (Badham) would fit (and not Scaliger's αἰδῶ γ'; which Wilamowitz and Prinz—Wecklein favoured), while ἔσχεν αἰδώς would be needed in 556. Although Pearson did not make this clear, the use of a verb of restraining without an object specified ('did not aidōs restrain [him/anyone] from dishonouring the old man?') would be quite idiomatic: e.g. *Iliad* 15.657 οὐδὲ κέδασθεν ἀνὰ στρατόν· ἴσχε γὰρ αἰδώς|καὶ δέος, A. *Eum.* 690—2 σέβας|ἀστών φόβος τε ξυγγενῆς τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖν|σχήσει . . .¹ And ἔσχεν αἰδώς would have the slight advantage of avoiding a minor awkwardness in understanding Lykos as the subject of ἔσχεν αἰδῶ, when Lykos has not been under discussion since line 547; (with κοῦκ ἔσχεν αἰδώς . . . the object remains vague).

To sum up: assuming that the subject of ἀποκεί is Aidōs and that there is no second goddess, τῇσδε τῆς θεοῦ must be corrected, most simply to τῇσδε γῆς θεός. It is tempting to make further changes of αἰδῶ to αἰδώς in 556 and of αἰδώς γ' to the more lively αἰδώς; in 557, but nothing actually necessitates these—nor incidentally, does the first of them entail the second, although the second is impossible without the first.

- 616—17 — οὐδ' οἶδεν Εὐρυσθεύς σε γῆς ἥκοντ' ἄνω;
 — οὐκ οἶδεν· ἐλθὼν τὰνθάδ' εἰδείην πάρος.

The reading in 617 is now generally rejected, but of several emendations the most plausible remain unsatisfactory. Matthiae's οὐκ οἶδ', ὦ ἐλθὼν . . . is not really paralleled by cases where there is an ellipse of the type '[I say this] in order that . . .' (so Kvičala, *Jahrbuch.* 119 (1879), 530 ff.), and it also presents an irregularity of tense-sequence (cf. Goodwin, *Syntax of Moods & Tenses*, §§322—3). Musgrave's οὐκ οἶδεν· ἦλθον τὰνθάδ' εἰδέναι πάρος is not necessarily wrong in using an infinitive of purpose, but one would expect 'I came to find out' rather than 'I came to know'. Jackson's οὐκ οἶδεν· ἐλθόντ' ἐνθάδ' εἰδείη πάρος (*Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), p.149) puts into Herakles' mouth a challenge to Eurystheus which is not really apposite to the context.² ἐλθόντ(α) might, however, be right as an explanatory participle in agreement with σε (616:

¹ I am grateful to Mr. Bond for drawing this point to my attention, with the suggestion that my τῇσδε γῆς θεός might best be combined with the alterations suggested by Badham and Pearson. For verbs of restraining without objects specified, cf. also Theognis 140 ἴσχει γὰρ χαλεπῆς πείρατ' ἀμηχανίης (rightly explained by Van Groningen with πείρατα as subject of ἴσχει); Thuc. 3.45.3 καὶ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος ὅστις ἀπέλξει τούτου, 3.45.4 ἢ τοίνυν δειωτέρων τι τούτου δέος εὐρετέον ἐστίν,

ἢ τότε γε οὐδὲν ἐπίσχει . . ., Plato *Soph.* 242 a 2 εἰ τοῦτό τις εἴργει δρᾶν ὄκνος. Examples can be multiplied (cf., e.g., *Iliad* 15.618, 17.747, Theognis 816, S.O.T. 129, E. *Suppl.* 18, LSJ s.v. κωλύω 5 and 6).

This is not, of course, to say that there is anything wrong about ἔσχεν αἰδῶ ('felt compunction') in itself; cf. *I.T.* 949, and infinitives frequently following αἰδεῖσθαι, as they do αἰδώς ἦν ἐμοί at A. *Ag.* 1203 (cf. *ibid.* 948).

² There is an obvious possibility that

from Herakles' point of view, *με*) following a comma (not colon) after *οὐκ οἶδεν*: cf. *Alk.* 378, where the explanatory *ἀπεστερημένοις* takes its case from *τέκνοις* in 377. Thus we might have

οὐκ οἶδεν, ἐλθόντ' ἐνθ' (α) . . .
or *οὐκ οἶδεν, ἐλθόντ' ἐνθάδ' . . .*

‘He knows not, since I came . . .’

τὰνθάδ' εἰδείην may mask an original *δεῖ* or *ἔδει*, for it fits well with the stress laid in this sense on Herakles' feelings of natural affection and duty that he should be explaining that he placed his obligation to his family above his obligation to Eurystheus. Perhaps the best possibility for the whole line is

οὐκ οἶδεν, ἐλθόντ' ἐνθα δεῖ μ' ἦκειν πάρος
‘He knows not, since I came whither it is my duty to have come first.’

ἐνθ' ἔδει is an obvious alternative. For *ἐνθα* ‘to the place whither’ cf. *I.T.* 1198, *S. El.* 1099, *S. Ph.* 1466. *ἦκειν* abbreviated as *ἦκ'* or similar in minuscules might account for *εἰδείην*.

(Also worth mentioning is *οὐκ οἶδεν, ἐλθόντ' ἐνθάδ' ἥ μ' ἔδει πάρος*, ‘. . . since I came here first, as was my duty’, since *ἥ* seems often to cause trouble—probably at *E. El.* 1301, *Ph.* 416, fr. 743N², and possibly at *Or.* 729, *I.A.* 1017, fr. 669N².)

1136–45 Herakles and Amphitryon:

- *τί φής; τί δράσας, ὦ κάκ' ἀγγέλλων πάτερ;*
- *μανεῖς· ἐρωτᾷς δ' ἄθλι' ἐρμηνεύματα.*
- *ἦ καὶ δάμαρτός εἰμ' ἐγὼ φονεὺς ἐμῆς;*
- *μῆς ἅπαντα χειρὸς ἔργα σῆς τάδε.*
- 1140 — *αἰαί· στεναγμῶν γάρ με περιβάλλει νέφος.*
- *τούτων ἕκατι σὰς καταστένω τύχας.*
- *ἦ γὰρ συνήραξ' οἶκον ἥ βάκχευσ' ἐμόν;*
- *οὐκ οἶδα πλὴν ἔν· πάντα δυστυχεῖ τὰ σά.*
- *ποῦ δ' οἴστρος ἡμᾶς ἔλαβε; ποῦ διώλεσεν;*
- 1145 — *ὅτ' ἀμφὶ βωμόν χειράς ἡγνίζου πυρί.*

That 1144–5 should come at the end of this sequence is incredible—as Wilamowitz saw (cf. *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin, 1875), pp.235–6)—despite W. H. Friedrich's invocation of ring-composition, (*Hermes* 69 (1934), 307 n.2), which is accepted by Kroeker, op. cit., p.81 n.1, and E. R. Schwinge, *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des E.* (Heidelberg, 1968), p.418 n.152. Wilamowitz and Wecklein transpose 1144–5 to precede 1142–3. But the proper place for 1144–5 is following 1136–7, so that Herakles' *ποῦ δ' οἴστρος* . . . (1144) is prompted by Amphitryon's *μανεῖς* (1137). Moreover, it seems that 1144–5 is not the only misplaced couplet, for the *γάρ* of 1142 should indicate that H.'s question is prompted by something implied in A.'s preceding answer, and this will be the case if 1142 follows 1139, where A. states

οὐκ οἶδεν, or at least *οἶδεν*, is an intrusive repetition from *οὐδ' οἶδεν* in the previous line. But the repetition is not in itself

unexpected: cf. *Hkld.* 670–1, *Ion* 952–3, 1326–7.

that *all* the destruction is H.'s doing. Whatever the solution to †*ἡ βάκχευσι*† in 1142, the sense of the line amounts to 'was my frenzy such as to make me capable of wrecking the house'—to which A. replies, in effect, 'that is beyond my power to explain.' If 1140–1 *follow* 1142–3, H.'s *στεναγμῶν νέφος* (1140) aptly reflects A.'s *πάντα δυστυχεῖ τὰ σά* (1143).

The order, then, is 1136–7, 1144–5, 1138–9, 1142–3, 1140–1. It will be noted that this is the chronological order—the circumstance of the onset of madness preceding the outcome in the killing of Megara and the wrecking of the house—and that this recapitulates the servant's narrative, 922 ff. (The necessary exception is that the leading fact of the children's death has been revealed to Herakles first, at 1131 ff. It likewise dominates the entire madness-sequence 815–921, to the exclusion of any mention of Megara's death: cf. 838–9, 865–6, 886, 896–903, 913, 917–21.) Thus the audience, having heard the narrative, now observes the effect of the same revelation on the unknowing Herakles. The same principle is evident in 539–61, where the events at Thebes expounded by Amphytrion in the prologue are recapitulated (with more recent details) in answer to Herakles' questions, and (for example) in *Hek.* 760–82 where Hekabe's stichomythic answers to Agamemnon recapitulate Polymestor's narrative (4–48).

University of Calgary

MARTIN CROPP