PROBLEMS IN EURIPIDES' *ORESTES*

These notes are intended as a critical supplement to my edition of the play,[1] the scale and style of which are not such as to allow extended discussion of textual questions. In some cases I have been able to offer new solutions that did not seem to need more than a brief note by way of explanation, or none at all, and these I shall not discuss further here.[2]

Author's afterthoughts

'Begin at the beginning, go on until you come to the end, and then stop.' Hardly any literary artist succeeds in composing substantial works in quite such a straightforward way, by uninterrupted linear progression from start to finish. As he composes, he has new ideas, and sometimes he goes back and changes what he has already written or makes insertions in it. If he is not very careful, this is liable to lead, if not to actual contradictions, at least to mild discontinuities and interruptions of the logical sequence of thought.

The occurrence of such discontinuities and interruptions in classical texts often provokes proposals for deletion or transposition. In some cases these are no doubt the correct answers. But it seems to me extraordinary how little use scholars have made of the concept of the author's afterthought — something that nearly all texts must contain, whether detectable or not – to account for irregularities of those kinds. In many instances what is recognizable as an insertion is at least as likely to be due to the author as to a second hand, unless one takes the *a priori* view (easily disprovable by experience) that an author will not fail to notice all the structural implications of an insertion in his own work. In certain instances we may recognize interpolations or rearrangements that cannot plausibly be ascribed to anyone but the author himself.[3]

The following passages of *Orestes* should, I submit, be considered from this point of view.

(a) The stichomythia between Orestes and Menelaos in 385–448

In stichomythia most lines connect closely with the ones preceding them, except where there is a definite advance to a new topic. Once a passage was written, therefore, it was difficult to insert anything without leaving signs of disturbance. Yet it must have been tempting, whenever Euripides thought of a new debating point or a new piece of repartee that suited a context already drafted, to try to incorporate it. There are

two places in the dialogue in question where natural connections are broken. In 395ff. Menelaos interrogates Orestes rather like a doctor.[4] 'What is the matter with you?' 'Intellect.' 'What do you mean?' 'Well, anguish.' 'Hm. May be curable.' 'And frenzy-fits.' 'And how long have you had this complaint?' 'Since the day I buried mother' (402). Of course the doctor needs to know next how long ago that was. But this essential supplementary question does not appear until 421, by which time the disease has been diagnosed (409/411). The thread has been broken by the introduction of another line of inquiry, leaving πόσον χρόνον δέ. . .; to be fitted in later.[5] The other discontinuity is the separation of 417,

ME. ἀμαθέστερός γ' ὢν (Apollo) τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς δίκης,

from 424,

OP. οὐ σοφός, ἀληθὴς δ' εἰς φίλους †ἔφυς κακός†,

which, however emended, makes no sense as a reply to 423 ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἷμα μητέρος θεαί. In BICS 28 (1981), 69 I have argued that the person whom Orestes calls 'not clever, but true to his friends' can only be Apollo, and I accordingly conjectured ἔφυ θεός for the end of the line. So far as I can see, this is the only interpretation which allows us to relate the line to anything in the whole context, and the connection is with 417. 424 was surely invented to answer 417. Then Euripides thought of a new riposte to Menelaos' comment on Apollo's ἀμαθία: 418 δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὅτι ποτ' εἰσὶν οἱ θεοί. He followed this with a question naturally arising from Orestes' reference to Apollo's instructions: 'Then isn't he providing any relief for your troubles?', which gave the opportunity for another philosophical bon mot: 420 μέλλει· τὸ θεῖον δ' ἐστὶ τοιοῦτον φύσει. The idea of time passing made a suitable point of attachment for the displaced question πόσον χρόνον δέ. . .; with the two lines that followed it. Then he continued with οὐ σοφός κτλ., quite failing to make a plausible logical sequence out of 423–4.[6]

There are further difficulties in the following dialogue. Menelaos' question at 427, τὰ πρὸς πόλιν δὲ πῶς ἔχεις δράσας τάδε; starts to lead towards his being told of the impending debate in Argos and being begged for help. Orestes' statements in 428/430 that no one will speak to him or admit him to their homes are hardly adequate to motivate Menelaos' question in 431, τίνες πολιτῶν δ' ἐξαμιλλῶνταί σε γῆς; Robert wished to delete 431–6 with its references to personal enemies of Orestes. Indeed 437ff. make a more natural sequel to 430:

OP. ἐκκλήιομαι γὰρ δωμάτων ὅπηι μόλω.   430
ME. Ἀγαμέμνονος δ' ⟨οὐ⟩ σκῆπτρ' ἐᾶι σ' ἔχειν πόλις;   437
OP. πῶς, οἵτινες ζῆν οὐκ ἐῶσ' ἡμᾶς ἔτι;

Oeax and the friends of Aegisthus (432–6) are in no way integral to the play. There

---

[4] The sort of citizens' doctor described in Pl. Leg. 720d, who τὰ τῶν ἐλευθέρων νοσήματα θεραπεύει τε καὶ ἐπισκοπεῖ, καὶ ταῦτα ἐξετάζων ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ κατὰ φύσιν . . . ἅμα μὲν αὐτὸς μανθάνει τι παρὰ τῶν νοσούντων, ἅμα δὲ καὶ καθ' ὅσον οἷός τέ ἐστιν διδάσκει τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα αὐτόν.

[5] Willink in his note on 421–3 says that after 402 'Menelaus saw no pressing need to pose the further question "how long ago was that?" Orestes' replies diverted him to other matters of interest'. But we are concerned not with Menelaos' mind but with Euripides': why did he not complete the questioning about the duration of Orestes' madness before going on to the 'other matters of interest'?

[6] Willink ingeniously emends 424 to οὐ σοφὸς ἀληθῶς ἐς φίλους ὁ φὺς κακός, but is still forced to assume a dislocation after 423. He suggests placing 412–13 here. 412 certainly goes quite well after 423, but I cannot see that 424 becomes any more relevant if preceded by 413. I speculate that Euripides' first draft may have contained the sequence 401–2, 421–3, 412–17, 424.

is a mention of the friends of Aegisthus in the report of the Argive debate (894), but neither they nor Oeax speak in the debate, and the city is represented, except in 889–97, as leaderless since the deaths of Clytaemestra and Aegisthus. I suspect that Euripides inserted 431–6 to recall his own *Palamedes* of seven years before, and to strengthen the bonds between his new story and its frame of existing mythology.[7]

(b) 591–9 ὁρᾷς δ' Ἀπόλλωνα κτλ.

The concluding part of Orestes' speech of self-justification before Tyndareos is variously problematic. We find consecutively:

588–90. Orestes points to Penelope as a contrast with Clytaemestra: she has remained faithful to her husband, and Telemachus has accordingly not killed her.

591–9. The Apollo argument. Apollo told Orestes to kill his mother. Was he wrong to obey the god?

600–1. Conclusion: the deed was well done, but turned out badly for the doer, Orestes.

[602–4] Irrelevant gnome about marriage, generally agreed to be an interpolation.

605–6. Choral comment: women always bring disagreeable complications into men's lives.

The first of these sections, 588–90, was condemned by Dindorf, whom a number of scholars have followed. The arguments against it, however, are not compelling,[8] and its presence seems to be presupposed by the ὁρᾷς δ' in 591, which takes up ὁρᾷς in 588.[9]

The second section, 591–9, was condemned by J. Oeri. 593 must be excised (Nauck), but otherwise the passage reads well. There are two linguistic abnormalities: the form Ἀπόλλωνα instead of Ἀπόλλω in 591,[10] and the synizesis μὴ ὁ in 599.[11] The first can be avoided by emendation.[12] But neither is of such a nature as to cast serious doubt on the authenticity of the lines. A graver consideration is that with 602–4 deleted, as they surely must be, we have to look back to 585–90 for remarks about women to which the chorus-leader's comment at 605–6 can be related. The chorus-leader disregards 591–9. Yet if 591–9 were a post-Euripidean interpolation, we should be faced with the extraordinary circumstance that Orestes fails to mention his strongest argument, the fact that the matricide was enjoined upon him by Apollo.[13]

[7] According to one version (Dictys 6.2, Hyg. *Fab.* 117) it was Oeax who prompted Clytaemestra to murder Agamemnon, and Paus. 1.22.6 describes a fifth-century painting on the Acropolis which showed Pylades killing 'the sons of Nauplius' as they came to Aegisthus' aid.

[8] See Willink, 178f.

[9] I see no necessity for the transposition of 585–90 to follow 578 (Willink, following a suggestion from J. Diggle so to transpose 585–7 with deletion of 588–90). The thought of Clytaemestra's wickedness is there throughout 572–84, even if less central in 579–84, and 585 follows well enough. The renewed address to Tyndareos in 585 (σύ τοι . . . ὦ γέρον) leads on to 588 ὁρᾷς; . . . 591 ὁρᾷς δ'.

[10] Otherwise in drama only at Soph. *Tr.* 210, and there not guaranteed by metre. See T. C. W. Stinton, *BICS* 22 (1975), 90.

[11] No real parallel in tragedy. Cf. however Pind. *Isth.* 7.8–9 ἤ ὅτ' (dub.), Bacchyl. 3.22 ἀγλαϊζέτω· ὁ.

[12] Porson read ὁρᾷς; Ἀπόλλων (*nominativus pendens*; the δ' is omitted by some manuscripts), and Hermann ὁρᾷς Ἀπόλλω δ'. Another possibility is ὁρᾷς δ' Ἀπόλλω γ'. δέ . . . γε is suitable (after 588 ὁρᾷς, Ὀδυσσέως ἄλοχον κτλ. – if 588–90 are accepted as genuine), as the appeal to Apollo's authority is the climax of Orestes' argument. Denniston's reservations about continuative δέ γε in tragedy (*Greek Particles*[2], 155) seem excessive, and he has not noted all the instances: add at least *Or.* 111.

[13] Its absence from the very abbreviated report of his speech to the assembly in 932–42 is not significant; the arguments he uses to Tyndareos in 551–6 and 572–84 are also omitted there.

Again, the best solution seems to be that the lines are Euripidean, but that they were added after 605–6 had been composed as the sequel to 544–90 + 600–1.

(c) The invocations of Agamemnon, Zeus and Dike in 1225–45

The passage is conceived on the models of *Cho.* 479–509 and Eur. *El.* 671–84. There is no reason to think that Euripides himself did not write it (except for the interpolation 1227–30). It makes an effective climax to the plotting scene. But in Euripides' first draft the scene may have ended at 1223, seeing that 1216–23 make a typical programmatic conclusion: 'You then, Electra, stay in front of the house to watch for Hermione . . . while we go in and arm ourselves for the final struggle.' On hearing that we expect to see Orestes and Pylades going in at once. Electra's lyric dialogue with the chorus (1246ff.) could well follow immediately. 1225–45 seem to have been an afterthought.

(d) Apollo's announcements *ex machina*, 1625–65

Willink rightly emphasizes the peculiarity of the unsignalled change of addressee from Orestes to Menelaos at 1638. His solution is to transpose 1638–42 to follow 1663, bringing together the two mentions of Menelaos' wife and the trouble she has caused. That is certainly an improvement, though the assumed dislocation is hard to account for. Willink speaks unconvincingly of 'some reviser' who 'thought it appropriate that the sundered parts of τὰ καθ' Ἑλένην should be brought together'.

I submit that the only reviser who ever shifted sections of Euripidean speeches about was Euripides himself, and that once again the solution to problems of faulty continuity is to be sought in the process of composition. I think it is clear that Apollo's speech, as originally conceived, did not contain the passage about Orestes' exile to Arcadia and trial on the Areopagus (1643–52), as other parts of the speech are composed with a simpler story in view. Orestes is to marry Hermione, with no suggestion of any delay, and the implication is that they will live happily ever after, like Pylades and Electra (1653–9); he is to rule in Argos forthwith (1660), and Apollo will put things right between him and the city (1664–5). The structure of the speech in this first version was, I suppose, as follows:

(A) Menelaos, cease your anger, and you too, Orestes.   = 1625–8
(B) Your desire (Orestes) to kill Helen is in vain.
     I am taking her to heaven.   = 1629–37
(C) Menelaos, leave Orestes alone, go back to Sparta, and forget about Helen. I will
     settle things with the Argives.   = 1660–3, 1638–42, 1664–5
(D) As for Hermione, Orestes, you are to marry her; and give Electra to Pylades.
                                                                          = 1653–9.

Note that in this version:

(i) The initial order to stop quarrelling (A) is methodically followed up. Apollo speaks to Orestes and Menelaos in turn (B, C) and explains that their designs on Helen are both alike futile. Finally (D) the other persons visible, Hermione and Pylades, are dealt with, and their future and Orestes' ordained.

(ii) Ὀρέστα in 1653 signals a change of addressee, as it does not in the transmitted text. The superfluous vocative ought to worry us no less than the absence of one at 1638.

(iii) The last person addressed is Orestes. It is he who responds at 1666.

All in excellent order. But then Euripides decided to take account of the traditional legends about Orestes' exile and trial. Where was all that to be fitted in? Clearly it

had to precede (D); and it would naturally come after Orestes and Menelaos had both been told to end their feud and forget about Helen (B, C). τὰ μὲν καθ' Ἑλένην ὧδ' ἔχει is how the passage is actually introduced (1643). But then Euripides realized that the references in (C) to Orestes ruling in Argos and the Argives accepting him as purified of blood-guilt could not precede the exile and trial, and he transferred 1660–3 and 1664–5 to their present position, overlooking the inconcinnity that resulted at 1638.

I anticipate two kinds of adverse reaction to all these hypotheses of Euripidean afterthoughts. One is to say that it is all empty speculation, because we have no evidence for prior drafts and never will have. Of course there is no documentary evidence. The position is not much better for other sorts of textual criticism: in exceptional cases a new papyrus may confirm a conjecture, but in the vast majority of cases there is not going to be a new papyrus. That does not mean that in the absence of manuscript variation it is pointless to try to identify corruptions. The evidence is internal, in the coherence or otherwise of the text. It is the same with authorial revisions. There is evidence of that kind, whatever conclusions one ventures to draw from it.

The other possible objection is that our concern should be with the text as the author finally intended it to be, and that it is not our business to pry into the stages by which he arrived at it. I disagree. The creative process is a legitimate object of scholarly interest, and especially when it holds the key to difficulties that the finished text poses.

But it is time to move on to problems of other kinds.

490–2 ΜΕ. ὀργὴ γὰρ ἅμα σου καὶ τὸ γῆρας οὐ σοφόν.
  ΤΥ. πρὸς τόνδ' ἀγών τις †σοφίας ἥκει πέρι,
    εἰ τὰ καλὰ πᾶσι φανερὰ καὶ τὰ μὴ καλά;

Schol. οἷον· ἡ περὶ τὸν Ὀρέστην μητροκτονία οὐ δεῖται ἀγῶνος σοφίας . . . οὐ καιρὸς ἡμᾶς περὶ σοφίας ἀγωνίζεσθαι, and again τίς χρεία ὅλως σοφίας, ὅπου γε προφανὲς τοῦ Ὀρέστου τὸ πλημμέλημα;

The scholiasts' interpretation is exactly right. Tyndareos answers the charge that he is wanting in σοφία by saying that in regard to Orestes σοφία is neither here nor there: the issues are as plain as daylight, and no special σοφία is called for. Orestes himself has not shown any: 493 τούτου τίς ἀνδρῶν ἐγένετ' ἀσυνετώτερος;

How is metre to be restored in 491? Bothe's ἀσοφίας has had a number of adherents, including Paley, Winnington-Ingram (*BICS* 16 [1969], 53f.), and now Willink. It is an easy change, but it produces problematic sense. 'With regard to Orestes it is a sort of competition in being οὐ σοφός': this connects with 493, but leaves the conditional clause in 492 without point (whichever line it is taken with), and in any case it is a curious response to the accusation of not being σοφός. Or, reading ἀγὼν τίς with Murray, 'In a case like Orestes' why dispute about silliness?' But again the logic of the next two lines is left somewhat obscure. And to accuse one's interlocutor of deficiency in σοφία is surely to speak as if it were an ἀγὼν περὶ σοφίας, not an ἀγὼν περὶ ἀσοφίας.

Alternative conjectures retain σοφίας, but the metrical awkwardness of the anapaestic word then imposes more radical alteration of the line:

πρὸς τόνδε σοφίας τίς ἂν ἀγὼν ἥκοι πέρι;	(Porson)
πρὸς τόνδ' ἀγὼν ἂν τί σοφίας εἴη πέρι;	(Nauck)[14]
πρὸς τόνδ' ἀγῶνα τί σοφίας ἥκεις πέρι;	(Di Benedetto)

Of these only Porson's is stylistically plausible, and the change it involves is drastic.

[14] Not ἂν τι as reported in Prinz–Wecklein.

I propose leaving πρὸς τόνδ᾽ ἀγὼν τίς . . . ἧκει πέρι; as transmitted, and simply replacing σοφίας by τοῦ σοφοῦ γ᾽. For the neuter expression cf. e.g. 417 τοῦ καλοῦ, and Ar. *Eccl.* 895 οὐ γὰρ ἐν νέαις τὸ σοφὸν ἔνεστιν. The γε is very much in place. τῶν σοφῶν would also be possible, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 431 πῶς δή; δίδαξον· τῶν σοφῶν γὰρ οὐ πένηι, Soph. fr. 950.1 (?), Eur. fr. 492.3 (*Melanippe Desmotis* fr. 4 Arnim), Diog. Sinop. *TrGF* 88 F 6.3. διδάσκαλος γὰρ ηὐτέλεια τῶν σοφῶν in the last passage is paraphrased by Philostratus *Vit. Ap.* 6.10 as εὐτέλεια γὰρ διδάσκαλος μὲν σοφίας. The scholiast on *Or.* 491 naturally speaks of σοφία, and τοῦ σοφοῦ or τῶν σοφῶν might easily have given way to σοφίας in the text.

807–13   ὁ μέγας ὄλβος ἅ τ᾽ ἀρετά
μέγα φρονοῦσ᾽ ἀν᾽ Ἑλλάδα καὶ
  παρὰ Σιμουντίοις ὀχετοῖς
πάλιν ἀνῆλθ᾽ ἐξ εὐτυχίας Ἀτρείδαις
παλαιπαλαιᾶς ἀπὸ συμφορᾶς δόμων,
ὁπότε χρυσέας ἔρις ἀρ-
  νὸς ἦλυθε Τανταλίδαις κτλ.

I have combined πάλαι παλαιᾶς into one word, translating 'the old old misfortune'. This is not a new interpretation,[15] but it requires reassertion, and the note in my edition is too brief.

Willink, like most commentators, takes πάλαι separately as a qualification of ἀνῆλθε, 'declaring the antiquity both of the "reversal" and of its cause (cf. A. *Ag.* 1377–8)'. Antiquity is relative. Compared with Atreus' golden lamb, the reversal of the house's prosperity (since the conquest of Troy) is recent history. Why should the chorus call it ancient? Certainly seven years can be πάλαι if the context is suitable; so can seven seconds. But here the chorus has no reason to emphasize how long ago the reversal happened. Looking at the ode as a whole, we see that they are not even thinking of the murder of Agamemnon years ago, but of the *present* condition of the Atreid house in contrast to its glory when Agamemnon and Menelaos led the Achaeans against Troy. If ἀνῆλθε were to be provided with a temporal adverb, therefore, it would be νῦν, not πάλαι. The πάλαι is only a reinforcement of παλαιᾶς. (And in the *Agamemnon* passage that Willink cites, although πάλαι . . . παλαιᾶς are separated and syntactically independent, in sense the adjectival phrase reinforces and explains the adverb.)

Reduplication is the most primitive form of intensification. Just as we say 'long, long ago', a Greek could say πάλαι πάλαι δή.[16] παλαιπαλαιός is the corresponding

[15] H. Weil, *Sept tragédies d' Euripide* (3rd edn, 1905), 745, 'une espèce de superlatif'; N. Wecklein, *Eur. Orestes mit erklärenden Anmerkungen* (1906), 63; L. Méridier in the Budé translation (1959); and apparently V. Di Benedetto, *Euripides Orestes* (1965), 160. Cf. Verrall on Aesch. *Eum.* 394 (his 397): 'πάλαι παλαιόν Wieseler, perhaps rather παλαιπαλαιόν'.

[16] Ar. *Av.* 921. This example sounds paratragic, and anadiplosis is a familiar device in tragic, especially Euripidean lyric. Other material, however, suggests that it was at home in colloquial speech: Ar. *Equ.* 1155 (τρίπαλαι . . . δεκάπαλαι . . . δωδεκάπαλαι καὶ χιλιόπαλαι) καὶ προπαλαιπαλαιπαλαί; *Nub.* 1288 πλέον πλέον 'more and more', *Ran.* 1001 μᾶλλον μᾶλλον (so also Eur. *IT* 1406); Soph. *Phil.* 1197 οὐδέποτ᾽ οὐδέποτ᾽ and *OC* 210 μὴ μή are urgent rather than elevated. Cf. also Homeric πάμπαν, later παντάπασιν; *Anacreontea* 58.4 ἀεὶ δ᾽ ἀεί με φεύγει, 9.3 θέλω θέλω μανῆναι, Mod. Gk. λίγα λίγα, etc.; F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (1981), ii.159, on the phrase θεοῦ μεγάλου μεγάλου; and more generally K. Brugmann, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogerm. Sprachen* (1902), 287, 638f.; L. Radermacher, *Indog. Forsch.* 31, 1912/13, Anzeiger 8f.; E. Hofmann, *Ausdrucksverstärkung* (*Zeitschr. f. vgl. Sprachforschung*, Ergänzungsheft 9, 1930), 12–48, 'Die Doppelung'; E. Schwyzer and A. Debrunner, *Griech. Grammatik*, ii (1950), 700.

adjective. There is something of a formal analogy in Aristophanes' πονωπονηρός (*Vesp.* 466, *Lys.* 350), though this is not formed so directly from an adverbial phrase.[17] In the χελ(ε)ιχελώνη of the children's game[18] the aim is not to intensify the idea 'tortoise', I suppose, only playfully to embroider it, but the end product is similar in shape.

954–6   ηὐγένεια δὲ
                 οὐδέν σ' ἐπωφέλησεν, οὐδ' ὁ Πύθιον
                 τρίποδα καθίζων Φοῖβος, ἀλλ' ἀπώλεσεν.

Πύθιον scripsi pro -ος. There is nothing wrong with ὁ Πύθιος . . . Φοῖβος in itself (e.g. *Alc.* 570), but τρίποδα seems to call for an adjective. Cf. *El.* 980 (ἀλάστωρ) ἱερὸν καθίζων τρίποδα, *Ion* 51 θάσσει δὲ γυνὴ τρίποδα ζάθεον Δελφίς, 366 εἴπερ καθίζει τρίποδα κοινὸν Ἑλλάδος, *IT* 1253 τρίποδί τ' ἐν χρυσέωι θάσσεις.

1001–6   ὅθεν Ἔρις τό τε πτερωτὸν
                 ἀλίου μετέβαλεν ἅρμα
                 τὰν πρὸς ἑσπέραν κέλευθον
                 οὐρανοῦ †προσαρμόσας
                 μονόπωλον ἐς Ἀῶ†
                 ἑπταπόρου τε δράμημα Πελειάδος   1005
                 εἰς ὁδὸν ἄλλαν. {Ζεὺς μεταβάλλει}

1001 τε τὸ Blaydes   1004 προσαρμόσασα V², quo recepto ἐς μονόπωλον Paley, οἰόπωλον ἐς Weil, ⟨—⟩ μονόπωλον ἐς Willink   1006 Ζεὺς del. Weil, μεταβάλλει del. Biehl.

Ἔρις stands out at the front of the sentence as subject, governing the two coordinated phrases τό τε πτερωτὸν ἀλίου μετέβαλεν ἅρμα and ἑπταπόρου τε δράμημα Πελειάδος εἰς ὁδὸν ἄλλαν. Strife, because of the golden lamb, reversed the movements of (*a*) the sun and (*b*) the stars. (Cf. schol., i.199.7–10 Schwartz.) The words Ζεὺς μεταβάλλει have no place in this structure. (See Willink on 1005–6.) They may have been added by someone who had lost the thread of the sentence, perhaps remembering *El.* 727–30 τότε δὴ τότε φαεννὰς ἄστρων μετέβασ' (μεταβάλλει ⟨L⟩P) ὁδοὺς Ζεὺς καὶ φέγγος ἀελίου λευκόν τε πρόσωπον Ἀοῦς. The mythographical material in the scholia may also have been a factor in the intrusion of Zeus: i.198.22 Schw. τινὲς δέ φασι τὸν Δία πρὸς χάριν Ἀτρέως ποιῆσαι τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὰς Πλειάδας ἐκ δύσεως ἀνατεῖλαι μεταστρέψαντα τὴν τάξιν ἐν μιᾶι ἡμέραι.

The worst problem in the passage is the text and interpretation of τὰν πρὸς ἑσπέραν κέλευθον οὐρανοῦ προσαρμόσας μονόπωλον ἐς Ἀῶ. What was the change in the sun's course? According to the last scholium quoted (cf. i.200.1–6), it was a temporary reversal of its usual westward movement, occurring on one day only. We know that there were various versions and interpretations of the myth in antiquity.[19] But the best guide to Euripides' meaning is *El.* 727ff., where it seems clear that he envisages a permanent change in the sun's and stars' courses, a change which brought the present arrangement into being for the first time.[20] Previously the luminaries had not risen

[17] See J. Wackernagel, *Kl. Schr.* (1953), ii.1098 n. 1, who argues that the πονω- is an old instrumental. This presupposes, of course, that πονωπονηρός is a prehistoric survival, not an Aristophanic invention. Some may query this.

[18] *PMG* 976(c); χελυχελώνη ci. Wilamowitz on Ar. *Lys.* 350.

[19] See especially A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* (1917), i.92f. and iii.5f.

[20] Cf. also *IT* 193, 816; Pl. *Polit.* 269a. J. S. Morrison, *PCPS* 16 (1970), 85–90, approved by Willink, interprets the Euripidean passages differently, of the tilting of the celestial pole from the zenith to its present position. He supposes dawn and evening to be mentioned as novel

in the east, culminated in the south, or set in the west. Presumably they had risen in the west and set in the east, but this is not spelt out.[21]

Assuming the general sense of the *Orestes* passage to be the same, we must infer that 1003 τὰν πρὸς ἑσπέραν κέλευθον οὐρανοῦ, 'the westward sky-path', relates to the result of the action μετέβαλεν ἄρμα. (Cf. *El.* 731f., τὰ δ᾽ ἕσπερα νῶτ᾽ ἐλαύνει θερμᾶι φλογὶ θεοπύρωι.) Syntactically we can take it as a resultative accusative after μετέβαλεν, 'changed it to the westward path', comparing *IA* 343 μεταβαλὼν ἄλλους τρόπους, 363 μεταβαλὼν ἄλλας γραφάς. It is true that in those examples μεταβαλών has no direct object in addition to the resultative accusatives, but the difference does not seem crucial. The only alternative would be to make κέλευθον the object of προσαρμόσασα, but I can see no sense in 'attaching the westward path', whether to the sun's chariot or to Dawn. If the idea were 'laying out a new path from Dawn to evening', this would surely have been expressed differently.[22]

προσαρμόσασα (V²) cannot be regarded as a transmitted reading,[23] but it is an unavoidable correction for προσαρμόσας. Eris fitted something on to something else. As we have ruled out κέλευθον, the two entities fitted together would appear to be ἁλίου ἄρμα and μονόπωλος Ἀώς. Does this make sense? Chariots certainly need to be fitted to horses, and Euripides may have meant that from now on Helios would use horses from Eos' stables in the east. Cf. *Phaethon* 1–5,

> Μέροπι τῆσδ᾽ ἄνακτι γῆς,
> ἣν ἐκ τεθρίππων ἁρμάτων πρώτην χθόνα
> Ἥλιος ἀνίσχων χρυσέαι βάλλει φλογί·
> καλοῦσι δ᾽ αὐτὴν γείτονες μελάμβροτοι
> Ἔω φαεννὰς Ἡλίου θ᾽ ἱπποστάσεις.

But 'attaching the chariot to Dawn' – or, as I prefer, deleting ἐς, 'attaching Dawn to it'[24] – would imply that Dawn herself draws the sun's chariot forth from the east, somehow merged with her mythical horses. That is not in itself a nonsensical combination.[25] It is unconventional; but conventionally poets speak either of Dawn's horses or of the Sun's and do not try to define the relationship between the two. I do not feel certain that this is the right interpretation, but it does seem the most promising way of extracting sense from the text.

Finally, why is the dawn, contrary to poetic and artistic convention, styled 'single-horsed'? The epithet is as lacking in ornamental appeal as in pointed relevance. The metre too is unsatisfactory: after the trochaic dimeter οὐρανοῦ προσαρμόσασα we expect a continuation in iambo-trochaic rhythm. I propose χιονόπωλον Ἀώ. For the whiteness of dawn cf. *El.* 102, 730 (quoted above), *Tro.* 847, *IA* 157; Aesch. *Pers.* 386 λευκόπωλος ἡμέρα; Soph. *Ai.* 673; Bacchyl. fr. 20c.22 λε[ύκι]ππος Ἀώς. It is

---

features, the sun having previously travelled round the edge of the sky. But can Euripides have thought there were no days and nights before Thyestes?

[21] Oenopides DK 41 A 10 had a theory that the Milky Way marks the sun's earlier course.

[22] The gloss in Hesychius/Photius/*Suda*/Bachmann's *Anecdota* (Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων), ἕσπερον κέλευθον· ἑσπέριον ἐπὶ δυσμὰς ὁδόν, perhaps suggests that some ancient commentators, expecting a preposition after the first accusative, understood τὰν πρός as if it were πρὸς τάν. They naturally had to read ἕσπερον (so also BOLC), which could be construed as an adjective.

[23] Di Benedetto and Biehl wrongly infer it as the lemma presupposed by the interlinear gloss in M (i.199.25 Schw.), ἀντὶ τοῦ προσαρμόσας, ὡς 'πληγέντε κεραυνῶι'. The Homeric phrase (*Il.* 8.455) is an example of a masculine participial form used for the feminine. What was intended, therefore, was (προσαρμόσας) ἀντὶ τοῦ προσαρμόσασα.

[24] One sets horses to chariots rather than vice versa. Cf. *Il.* 16.148 *al.* ὕπαγε ζυγὸν ὠκέας ἵππους, 24.14 ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν ὑφ᾽ ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους, *Rhes.* 27 ἁρμόσατε ψαλίοις ἵππους.

[25] Cf. perhaps Ov. *M.* 4.629f. *dum Lúcifer ignés | éuocet Auróræ, currús Auróra diurnós.*

snowy whiteness at least in later poetry: Mesomedes 2.7 χιονοβλεφάρου. . . Ἀοῦς, Nonn. *D.* 22.136 χιονόπεζα. . . Ἠώς, Pamprep. 3.24 ἀντολίης χιονώδεες ἔπρ[ε]π[ον . . .]αι. Euripides has the compound χιονόχρως of the snow-white swan that was Zeus (*Hel.* 215). Rhesus' horses are πῶλοι. . . χιόνος ἐξαυγέστεραι (*Rhes.* 304). There can therefore be no linguistic or stylistic objection to χιονόπωλος as an equivalent of Aeschylus' λευκόπωλος.

1183–4 *HΛ.*   Ἑλένης κάτοισθα θυγατέρ'; εἰδότ' ἠρόμην.
         OP.   οἶδ', ἣν ⟨γ'⟩ ἔθρεψεν Ἑρμιόνην μήτηρ ἐμή.

γε *addidi.* The particle is a positive improvement, because Orestes is not simply showing that he does indeed know what the question is about (as in Soph.*Tr.* 1219f. τὴν Εὐρυτείαν οἶσθα δῆτα παρθένον; :: Ἰόλην ἔλεξας, ὥς γ' ἐπεικάζειν ἐμέ, cf. Eur. *IT* 812f., *Ion* 936–8, 987f., *Ba.* 462f.) but also adding a reason why he certainly should know; cf. Soph. *Tr.* 1191f., οἶσθ' οὖν τὸν Οἴτηι Ζηνὸς ὕψιστον πάγον; | :: οἶδ', ὡς θυτήρ γε πολλὰ δὴ σταθεὶς ἄνω, *IT* 517f. Τροίαν ἴσως οἶσθ', ἧς ἁπανταχοῦ λόγος; | :: ὡς μήποτ' ὤφελόν γε μηδ' ἰδὼν ὄναρ. I am gratified to see that Kaibel with the same instinct added γε in Anaxandrides fr. 9 Kock, τὴν ἐκ Κορίνθου Λαΐδ' οἶσθα; :: πῶς γὰρ οὔ, | τὴν ἡμ⟨ετ⟩έρειόν ⟨γ'⟩;

1366–72   ἀλλὰ κτυπεῖ γὰρ κλῆιθρα βασιλείων δόμων,
         σιγήσατ'· ἔξω γάρ τις ἐκβαίνει Φρυγῶν,
         οὗ πευσόμεσθα τἀν δόμοις ὅπως ἔχει.
ΦΡΥΞ.   Ἀργεῖον ξίφος ἐκ θανάτου
         πέφευγα βαρβάροις ἐν εὐμάρισιν   1370
         κεδρωτὰ παστάδων
         ὑπὲρ τέραμνα Δωρικάς τε τριγλύφους.

Schol. 1366 ἐξιών τις ψοφεῖ, τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος, ταῖς θύραις. τούτους δὲ τοὺς τρεῖς στίχους οὐκ ἄν τις ἐξ ἑτοίμου συγχωρήσειεν Εὐριπίδου εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, οἵτινες, ἵνα μὴ κακοπαθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν βασιλείων δόμων καθαλλόμενοι, παρανοίξαντες ἐκπορεύονται, τὸ τοῦ Φρυγὸς ἔχοντες σχῆμα καὶ πρόσωπον. ὅπως οὖν διὰ τῆς θύρας εὐλόγως ἐξιόντες φαίνωνται, τούτους προσενέταξαν, ἐξ ὧν δὲ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν ἀντιμαρτυροῦσι τῇ διὰ τῶν θυρῶν ἐξόδῳ· φανερὸν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἑξῆς ὅτι ὑπερπεπήδηκεν.

This brilliant nugget of ancient scholarly reasoning probably comes from the commentary of Callistratus, and may be derived from his teacher Aristophanes of Byzantium.[26] Counter-arguments appear in schol. 1371: ταῦτα οὖν φησιν ὡς ὑπερπεπηδηκὼς τῶν ἔσω τινὰς οἴκων· παστάδων γὰρ τῶν θαλάμων. Αἰσχίνης δὲ τὴν ὑπὲρ ἀντὶ τῆς πρό φησιν, ἵν' ᾖ πρὸ τεράμνων. Some, in other words, argued that the Phrygian's climbing feat took place somewhere inside the palace, invisible to the audience, and that there was no inconsistency with the reference to his emergence on stage by way of the doors. One Aeschines[27] maintained that he did no climbing at all.

Both explanations reappear among the modern commentators: the first in Paley, Weil, Dale,[28] and Di Benedetto, the second in Hartung and Willink. Willink refers to examples of ὑπερβάλλω and ὑπερβαίνω meaning 'pass beyond' something marking a boundary, especially in *Alc.* 829, *Ion* 514, 1321, and also

---

[26] Wilamowitz, *Einl. in d. gr. Trag.*, 152–4. It may be noted in addition that the discreet tone of οὐκ ἄν τις ἐξ ἑτοίμου συγχωρήσειεν is matched in the verbatim quotation from Callistratus in schol. 434, ἐπιζητήσειεν ἄν τις πῶς διὰ τριῶν εἴρηκεν.

[27] Also cited at schol. 12; cf. Wilamowitz, 156 n.72. I have not traced him elsewhere; he is unknown to Pauly–Wissowa.   [28] *Collected Papers* (1969), 127.

to *Ion* 46 ὑπὲρ δὲ θυμέλας διορίσαι πρόθυμος ἦν. Now certainly if the Phrygian had said ὑπὲρ πύλας we should not need to interpret this as meaning 'over the top of the doors'. But when he speaks of triglyphs, our attention is directed to a higher level. As for τέραμνα, it is an imprecise word in Euripidean usage (sometimes just 'chambers'), but in two passages they are roof timbers or rafters to which a suicide fastens a rope (*Hipp.* 768; *Phoen.* 333 ὑπὲρ τέραμνα; see Barrett on *Hipp.* 418). The only natural way of taking ὑπὲρ τέραμνα Δωρικάς τε τριγλύφους, then, is 'by way of the roof-beams', as practically everyone has always taken it, and only special pleading can arrive at a different interpretation.[29] The Phrygian had, after all, good reason to adopt an unorthodox method of departure from his lady's chamber.

If, however, he is merely describing an internal route that brought him to the door, we might have expected these details, if anywhere, at 1498f., τὰ δ᾽ ὕστερ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽ οἶδα· δραπέτην γὰρ ἐξέκλεπτον ἐκ δόμων πόδα. 1370–2 naturally refer to what the audience is witnessing. The Doric triglyphs are visual detail; they are mentioned because we can see them, just as we can see the man's barbarian slippers. If there were Doric triglyphs anywhere in a theatrical palace, they were on the front façade, and if they were there, we cannot but take a reference to Doric triglyphs to be a reference to these visible ones. It is typical of Euripides in his later plays to refer to architectural and pictorial details of the stage building.[30]

It is difficult to assess the feasibility of a descent from skene roof to stage in the late fifth-century theatre. We may be fairly sure that the height of the skene later increased, as it became generally more elaborate; so that if such a descent was originally possible it would have become more difficult, or impossible, in the later productions that we know took place. There would have been good reason to change the manner of the Phrygian's entrance just as the ancient commentator says, and that would account for the apparent contradiction in our text. As regards the late fifth-century skene, we can infer from *IT* 96ff.,

τί δρῶμεν; ἀμφίβληστρα γὰρ τοίχων ὁρᾷς
ὑψηλά· πότερα κλιμάκων προσαμβάσεις
ἐμβησόμεσθα; πῶς ἂν οὖν λάθοιμεν ἄν;

that it looked too high to scale from below without a ladder. In *Clouds* 1486ff. a ladder is used to get to the roof of the Phrontisterion, and Strepsiades is afraid of breaking his neck if he falls (1501). In *Phoenissae* 89ff. there is reference to an upstairs room from which Antigone descends.[31] If we are to imagine a Doric frieze surmounting a two-storey building, it can hardly have been less than twelve feet above ground level. The idea that the actor leapt down from this height, or even that Euripides should have proposed it, is certainly implausible.

But the text says nothing of a leap.[32] A little later in the *Iphigeneia* scene, 113f.,

---

[29] Willink says that in *Ion* 1320–1 τρίποδα . . . λιποῦσα θριγκοὺς τούσδ᾽ ὑπερβάλλω ποδί the word θριγκοί denotes the 'lofty, architectural masonry' of the skene façade, as also in *Hel.* 430. 'The Phrygian has no more come "over the triglyphs" than the Priestess in *Ion* has come "over the cornice".' He ignores not only the textual uncertainties of the *Ion* passage (θριγκοῦ τοῦδ᾽ is transmitted), but the usual interpretation of it: 'a low kerb protecting the adytum from intrusion' (Owen, following Hermann, Paley, Wecklein; and so LSJ). It is probably something that the priestess steps through, not over, but not something high up on the building.

[30] *IT* 74, 113, 128f., 1159, *Ion* 156, 172, 184ff., 1321, *Hel.* 70, 430, *Or.* 1569f., 1620, *Hyps.* fr. 764 (p. 24 Bond), *Ba.* 591, 1214; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus at Athens* (1946), 125; N. C. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides* (1965), 29.

[31] Cf. *Wasps* 379ff.; K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (1972), 25.

[32] The only definitely indicated leap in tragedy is Euadne's suicide in Euripides' *Supplices*. It is from a high eminence, but her landing is concealed from the spectators, so it is no evidence

Pylades suggests a way in which they might be able to get into the temple:

> ὅρα †δέ γ' εἴσω† τριγλύφων ὅποι κενόν
> δέμας καθεῖναι.

The corruption has resisted satisfactory emendation, but this much is clear, that Pylades envisages them crawling through the open metopes between the triglyphs and then letting themselves down, whether by their arms or with the help of a rope.[33] The exercise is not actually carried out, but it must have looked possible. And what Euripides had imagined in *IT* as a possible means of ingress, he might presumably have used a few years later as the desperate Phrygian's actual means of egress. This gives special point to ὑπὲρ τέραμνα Δωρικάς τε τριγλύφους: not just 'over the roof' but 'past the roof-beams and beam-ends'.[34]

If this is what Euripides intended, then 1366–8 as they stand cannot be original, but reflect a later production. They cannot, of course, simply be regarded as an addition, as the ancient commentator thinks. Something is needed to mark off the Phrygian's song from the chorus' and to introduce him.[35] Perhaps it is sufficient to delete 1366, leaving σιγήσατ' as first word (cf. 1311f., *Hipp.* 565, *Cycl.* 82f., 624ff.). It may be felt that ἔξω γάρ τις ἐκβαίνει Φρυγῶν would be a surprisingly neutral way of adverting to a man arriving in such an unconventional manner as I have supposed. Entrance announcements, however, became very stylized,[36] and we should perhaps not expect the chorus to pre-empt the Phrygian's proem by saying 'Oh look! A Phrygian is coming down from the rafters!' But it may well be that 1367 has been rewritten. 1368 may be original. In 1359 the chorus already anticipated the possibility of learning news from a slave of Helen's.

1545–8   τέλος ἔχει δαίμων βροτοῖς, τέλος ὅπαι θέληι·
μεγάλα δέ τις ἁ δύναμις †δι' ἀλαστόρων·†
ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε μέλαθρα τάδε δι' αἱμάτων
διὰ τὸ Μυρτίλου πέσημ' ἐκ δίφρου.

of the height from which an actor might be required to jump. It is evidence, nevertheless, of Euripides' imaginative use of upper levels of the skene.

[33] In *Wasps* l.c. Philocleon lets himself down from the window by means of a rope. So the idea was available for Euripides' use.

[34] That the Phrygian got out between the triglyphs was the view of Paley, Weil, Wedd (all of whom, however, believed that this was in the inner courtyard, not visible to the audience), and Wecklein; so too England and Platnauer on *IT* 113; Pickard-Cambridge, op. cit. (n. 30), 53 n. 1. The hypothesis has been neglected by recent commentators.

A further possibility, which would make the actor's task less demanding, is that there was a Doric frieze with open metopes between the lower and upper storeys. But Dr J. J. Coulton, whom I consulted on the question, is of the opinion that this would not be expected, as in monumental architecture true two-storeyed façades do not appear before the fourth century. He remarks that there are no certain examples of open metopes in stone architecture, but that some representations on vases suggest that they may have existed in non-monumental buildings (cf. B. Dunkley, *BSA* 36 [1935/6], 166f., fig. 8 and nn.). 'I should think' he writes 'it would be hard for an actor to emerge from a metope opening unless the frieze was on quite a large scale (the fairly monumental Stoa of Zeus on the Athenian Agora has metopes two feet square), but I suppose it could be done.'

[35] I cannot see any force in M. D. Reeve's argument (*GRBS* 13, 1972, 263f.) that with the removal of 1366–8 and 1503–36 (Grüninger, Gredley) the scene becomes 'perfectly symmetrical', *sc.* strophe – monody – antistrophe. We find no such 'symmetry' in the other tragic examples of separated strophe and antistrophe, unless we count those cases where only dialogue intervenes (Soph. *Phil.* 391–402 ∼ 507–18, *Rhes.* 131–6 ∼ 195–200; the others are *Hipp.* 362–72 ∼ 669–79 and *Rhes.* 454–66 ∼ 820–32). The monody itself is no marvel of symmetry.

[36] See Hourmouziades, op. cit., 142.

Schol. ἐὰν μὲν διὰ τοῦ ε̄ τὸ ἔπεσεν, οἱονεὶ ἐπλησίασέ τις τοῖς οἴκοις φονικὸς δαίμων, δι’ αἱμάτων τιμωρίαν ποιούμενος τοῦ πτώματος τοῦ Μυρτίλου· ἐὰν δὲ διὰ τῆς αῑ διφθόγγου [sc. ἔπαισεν], ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔκρουσεν.

The commentator finds a φονικὸς δαίμων in 1546, and takes this to be the subject of ἔπεσε, which he construes as 'has fallen upon'. That is clearly wrong: the subject of ἔπεσε is μέλαθρα. (ἔπαισε is excluded by the responsion with 1364 διὰ τὸν ὀλόμενον ὀλόμενον Ἰδαῖον.) Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1532–4 πίτνοντος οἴκου. . .ὄμβρου κτύπον δομοσφαλῆ τὸν αἱματηρόν, *Cho.* 263, *Eum.* 516; *Hipp.* 812 ἔπαθες εἰργάσω τοσοῦτον ὥστε τούσδε συγχέαι δόμους. μεγάλα – †δι’ ἀλαστόρων† is therefore an independent sentence, of similar form to Soph. *Ant.* 951 ἀλλ’ ἁ μοιριδία τις δύνασις (v.1. δύναμις) δεινά. The parallel confirms what we should guess in any case, that the word(s) following δύναμις served to define it. The basic meaning required is evidently 'great is the power of an avenging spirit'. δι’ ἀλαστόρων, hardly satisfactory as an expression of this idea, is proved corrupt by the metre, since this line responds with 1363,

δακρύοισι γὰρ Ἑλλάδ’ ἅπασαν ἔπλησεν,

where there is no ground for suspecting the text.[37] The corruption is no doubt due to δι’ αἱμάτων immediately below.

Seidler, who first observed the responsion between this strophe and 1353–65, wrote δι’ ἀλάστορ’. But there must be period-end between the ancipitia, so elision is excluded. It is hard to avoid the conviction that the verse must have ended [◡] ἀλάστωρ.[38] The scholiast's φονικὸς δαίμων points to this; cf. Phot. (*Suda*, etc.) ἀλάστωρ· φονικὸς δαίμων, τιμωρῶν καὶ ἀνεπίληστα ποιῶν. The δαίμων in 1545, however, is not to be identified with the ἀλάστωρ, but is the divine power that governs a man's or a house's fortunes in general, operating not according to any predictable law but ὅπαι θέληι. There is a contrast between him and the ἀλάστωρ, the One Who Never Forgets, who always demands further blood. 'God can make it turn out however he will' – in other words, we cannot absolutely rule out the possibility of a happy ending to the play – 'but on the other hand, great is the power represented by the ἀλάστωρ: murders have destroyed this house in consequence of Pelops' crime' (and it looks as if we are about to see the final disaster).

That is the sense; and the only acceptable way I can see to emend δι’ ἀλαστόρων is καὶ ἀλάστωρ. It may also be considered whether ἁ should be changed to αὖ, since δύναμις and ἀλάστωρ are related as predicate and subject (K-G i.591–3). But I think the article may be possible, as there is in effect a double layer of predication, a conflation of μεγάλα τις ἁ δύναμις ἁ ἀλάστορος with μέγα δύναται καὶ ἀλάστωρ.

1668–9   καίτοι μ’ ἐσῄει δεῖμα, μή τινος κλύων
           ἀλαστόρων δόξαιμι σὴν κλύειν ὄπα.

I conclude with a note on a grammatical rarity. ἐφοβούμην μή + optative would normally refer to a fear of something that was in the future. But here the meaning is 'I was beginning to be afraid that I *had thought* I had been hearing your voice when it was really that of some vengeance-demon'. This might have been expressed by an indicative, μὴ ἔδοξα; cf. K-G ii.394f. But the aorist optative has an exact parallel at

---

[37] Willink (303) thinks that a pendant close is less likely before a dochmiac period, and he assumes ἔπλησεν to be somehow corrupt for ◡–◡–. But see *IT* 889, *Hyps.* p. 47.86 Bond. It is risky to alter the strophe when it is the antistrophe that is obviously corrupt.

[38] So already Hartung and Weil, whose conjectures, however, are unacceptable: δύναμις, τὶς ἀλάστωρ Hartung; δύναμις· μάλ’ ἀλάστωρ ἐπέπεσεν ἔπεσε μέλαθρα τάδ’ αἱμάσσων Weil.

IT 1340f., ἐσῆλθεν ἡμᾶς μὴ λυθέντες οἱ ξένοι|κτάνοιεν αὐτὴν δραπέται τ' οἰχοίατο, 'it occurred to us (to be afraid) that the foreigners had got free, killed her, and escaped' (rightly interpreted by Paley and England, wrongly by Platnauer). Similarly with present optative *Od.* 21.394f., πειρώμενος . . . |μὴ κέρα ἶπες ἔδοιεν ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος, 'in case the worms had been eating'. Homer has also a few analogous examples where an aorist subjunctive in primary sequence represents something that has (it is feared) already happened: *Il.* 1.555f. νῦν δ' αἰνῶς δείδοικα κατὰ φρένα, μή σε παρείπηι|ἀργυρόπεζα Θέτις, 10.97–9, *Od.* 5.300 (v.l.). We must distinguish from this the less uncommon use of the present or perfect subjunctive for what (it is feared) is now the case: Soph. *Tr.* 663f. δέδοικα μὴ περαιτέρω|πεπραγμέν' ἦι μοι, *Ai.* 279 (v.l.), *OT* 747, 768, *Phil.* 494 (v.l.); cf. *Od.* 13.216 (v.l.), 24.491, Hdt. 7.103.2, Dem. 19.224. So in historic sequence with perfect optative, Xen. *Anab.* 5.7.26, *Cyr.* 1.3.10. Cf. K-G ii.391–3; A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles*, 291.

Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, London   M. L. WEST