EURIPIDES, *ION* 247–8

ὦ ξένε, τὸ μὲν σὸν οὐκ ἀπαιδεύτως ἔχει
ἐς θαύματ' ἐλθεῖν δακρύων ἐμῶν πέρι.

The second of these lines seems to be the result of an interpolation designed to spell out the implicit sense of the first. In 241–6 Ion has expressed amazement that Creusa should be weeping at the sight of Apollo's sanctuary, a sight which brings other visitors joy. She prefaces her explanation of this with an assurance which in its transmitted form is elegantly translated by Grégoire: 'Il n'est point discourtois de ta part, étranger, de marquer ta surprise au sujet de mes pleurs.' But there are reasons for doubting the authenticity of line 248:

(1) Line 247 is self-sufficient, as is shown by *IA* 1402: τὸ μὲν σόν, ὦ νεᾶνι, γενναίως ἔχει. This also gives the closest parallel for the use of τὸ σόν in reference to the attitude which a previous speaker's words have just expressed. Other instances of τὸ σόν, *tout court*, are helpfully grouped in Allen and Italie's *Concordance to Euripides*, s.v. σός. τὸ σόν...[adverbial phrase] ἔχει occurs also in *Hek.* 1195 and *Med.* 312; cf. *HF* 165, *Hel.* 893, *Pho.* 995 with τοὐμόν. These make it unlikely that τὸ σόν in our passage is to be taken adverbially, as perhaps Grégoire intended with 'de ta part', rather than as subject of ἔχει. *Tro.* 82 might be adduced for the alternative (A. *Ag.* 550 is a different idiom), but there is no reason for Creusa to be saying emphatically 'as far as *you* are concerned'.

(2) Line 248 actually produces a syntactic confusion, noticed by several commentators (Badham, Bayfield, Owen), who proceed to offer laborious explanations of how to make sense of the passage. But the fact is that while τὸ σὸν οὐκ ἀπαιδεύτως ἔχει makes sense in isolation ('Your question is not discourteous'), and οὐκ ἀπαιδεύτως ἔχει ἐς θαύματ' ἐλθεῖν also makes sense in isolation ('it is not discourteous to wonder...'), the two combined do not quite make sense at all.

(3) To clinch the case, the use of the plural θαύματα to mean 'surprise' is a solecism. In classical Greek literature the singular θαῦμα means either 'object of wonder' or (more rarely, but not abnormally) the state of 'wonderment'. The plural θαύματα meaning 'objects of wonder' is again natural though rarely attested down to Euripides' time. (To the instances in LSJ⁹ s.v. θαῦμα I. pl. add Hes. *Theog.* 834 [West compares only *Batrachom.* 58 in epic], Hdt. 1.93.1, Eur. *IT* 839, *Ba.* 449, *IA* 844; but at Aesch. *Ag.* 1166, θραύματα is accepted by Fraenkel and Page. The specialised sense 1.2 does not need notice here.) But I have found no certain instance of θαύματα = 'instances of wondering' except at Plato *Laws* 967a7, where the speaker is clearly referring to the speculations of a series of thinkers. There is no such reason for the use of the plural rather than the singular at Eur. *Ion* 248, nor at *Ba.* 716, which is mentioned with the Plato passage by LSJ⁹ s.v. θαῦμα II. pl. but is clearly an inauthentic adaptation of *Ba.* 667, where θαυμάτων means 'objects of wonder'. (The suggestion of Dodds that Euripides might originally have written θαυμάτων ἐπάξια in 667 seems, in the light of this discussion, implausible.)

Attempts to emend have been unimpressive. Scaliger's ἐλθόν, to say the least, does not meet objection (3). Reiske's ἔχεις εἰς θαῦμα γ' ἐλθών or ἔχει εἰς θαῦμα σ' ἐλθεῖν do not satisfactorily meet objection (2). Better to conclude that Euripides' line 247 was just inexplicit enough to invite the amplification so helpfully but clumsily offered by the author of line 248.

The University of Calgary   M. J. CROPP