SHORTER NOTES

THE END OF EURIPIDES' *ANDROMACHE**

ὦ πότνι᾽, ὦ γενναῖα συγκοιμήματα,
Νηρέως γένεθλον, χαῖρε· ταῦτα δ᾽ ἀξίως
σαυτῆς τε ποιεῖς καὶ τέκνων τῶν ἐκ σέθεν.   1275
παύω δὲ λύπην σοῦ κελευούσης, θεά,
καὶ τόνδε θάψας εἶμι Πηλίου πτυχάς,
οὗπερ σὸν εἷλον χερσὶ κάλλιστον δέμας.
κᾆτ᾽ οὐ γαμεῖν δῆτ᾽ ἔκ τε γενναίων χρεὼν
δοῦναί τ᾽ ἐς ἐσθλούς, ὅστις εὖ βουλεύεται,   1280
κακῶν δὲ λέκτρων μὴ ᾽πιθυμίαν ἔχειν,
μηδ᾽ εἰ ζαπλούτους οἴσεται φερνὰς δόμοις;
{οὐ γάρ ποτ᾽ ἂν πράξειαν ἐκ θεῶν κακῶς.}

1279–82 (quos citat Stobaeus 4.22.120) del. Stevens   1279 κᾆτ᾽ οὐ] ἀλλ᾽ εἰ gnomologium Vatopedianum: εἰ χρὴ Stob.   δῆτ᾽] δεῖ τ᾽ gnom. Vatop.: apud Stobaeum δῆτα cod. S, δὴ τὰ M, δεῖ τὰ M², χρὴ τὰ A   χρεὼν] γαμεῖν Stob.   1282 ζαχρύσους Stob.   1283 hunc v. ex *Antiopa* ut videtur (post Eur. fr. 215) citat Stob. 4.22.100: hic del. Hartung   ἐκ θεῶν] ἐς τέλος Stob.

Diggle[1] has followed Stevens[2] in rejecting 1279–82. Stevens' objections to these lines were that they 'should [*sc.* directly] follow a striking demonstration that birth is more important than wealth in marrying and giving in marriage', and that the lines do not form an apt comment on the fates of Peleus and Neoptolemos. The cogency of these objections will be examined presently; but first a counter-objection will be presented against the hypothesis of interpolation.

If 1279–82 are genuine, they are the last spoken lines of *Andromache*;[3] and as such they would bring the play into conformity with a pattern that is found in three of the five other Euripidean plays that survive complete from the period 431–21. In *Medea*, in *Hippolytos* and in *Suppliants* the last line or lines spoken by a character (ignoring, that is, the choral tailpiece) echo the opening words of the play.[4] *Medea* begins with

* I am indebted to an anonymous *CQ* referee for some invaluable criticisms and suggestions.
[1] J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae: Tomus I* (Oxford, 1984).
[2] P. T. Stevens, *Euripides: Andromache* (Oxford, 1971).
[3] 1283 : certainly spurious. It could make sense here only if it were taken to refer back to 1279–80 (1281–2 being regarded as a semi-parenthesis) and if the subject of πράξειαν were taken to be 'men who follow this advice'; but that notion was expressed in the singular in 1280 (ὅστις εὖ βουλεύεται), and if this were the meaning of 1283 it would have been far more intelligible with a singular verb (πράξειεν or πράξειας). The line makes excellent sense, on the other hand, after the sentence that precedes it in Stobaios' citation from *Antiope* (Eur. fr. 215): πᾶσι δ᾽ ἀγγέλλω βροτοῖς | ἐσθλῶν ἀπ᾽ ἀλόχων εὐγενῆ σπείρειν τέκνα. The subject of πράξειαν is then easily understood as 'those whom I am addressing' (= πάντες βροτοί), and the meaning of the whole passage will be in effect 'If you take a wife from a good family, you will never be disappointed in your children'. Recent discussions of the line (H. Friis Johansen, *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis* [Copenhagen, 1959], p. 155 n. :4; J. Kambitsis, *L'Antiope d'Euripide* [Athens, 1972], pp. 14, 97) take it as genuine in *Andromache* and not in *Antiope*, but they offer no real evidence; Méridier on *Andr.* 1283, to whom both refer, ignores the person and number of the verb. On the choral tailpiece 1284–8 see Barrett on *Hipp.* 1462–6 (condemning) and D. H. Roberts, *CQ* 37 (1987), 51–64 (accepting). The question whether 1279–82 is a possible final sentence of a play (with or without a tailpiece to follow) will be discussed below.
[4] In *Hekabe* we find what seems to be a variant of the same pattern: the first words of the *chorus* (98–9 Ἑκάβη, σπουδῇ πρὸς σ᾽ ἐλιάσθην τὰς δεσποσύνας σκηνὰς προλιποῦσ᾽) are echoed by its last (1293–5 ἴτε πρὸς λιμένας σκηνάς τε...τῶν δεσποσύνων πειρασόμεναι μόχθων); the adjective δεσπόσυνος occurs nowhere else in the play (and only twice in other surviving Euripidean texts: *IT* 439, *Phaethon* 88 Diggle). The other extant Euripidean play assignable to this decade, *Herakleidai*, is generally held to be mutilated at the end.

the Nurse's exclamation εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος κτλ.; it ends with Jason protesting against his being denied the right to bury his children οὓς μήποτ' ἐγὼ φύσας ὄφελον πρὸς σοῦ φθιμένους ἐπιδέσθαι (1413–14). *Hippolytos* begins with Aphrodite identifying herself as πολλὴ μὲν ἐν βροτοῖσι κοὐκ ἀνώνυμος θεὰ...Κύπρις; it ends with Theseus lamenting the loss of Hippolytos and adding ὡς πολλά, Κύπρι, σῶν κακῶν μεμνήσομαι (1461). *Suppliants* begins with Aithra praying to Demeter to give prosperity to herself, Theseus and the πόλις of Athens (1–4); it ends with Theseus himself praying to Athena to 'keep me upright' (ἐς ὀρθὸν ἵστη) because on her goodwill depends the future security of the πόλις of Athens (1229–31). In *Andromache*, the first words of the play spoke of Andromache's marriage to Hector and the πολύχρυσος χλιδή (2) of the dowry she brought to the house of Priam; 1281–2 speak of a woman who (like Andromache) brings a rich dowry to her husband's house but who (unlike Andromache) comes from bad stock and will prove a bad wife.[5] Can we reasonably ascribe to an interpolator such learning and insight, or such good fortune, as to suppose that he *created* by his addition to the text a pattern in *Andromache* which is also found in a majority of the other surviving Euripidean plays which we now believe, on quite other grounds, to have been composed within five or six years of the same date, but (so far as our evidence goes) in none of the author's later works?[6]

But while there is thus a presumption in favour of the genuineness of 1279–82, it remains to be shown that the passage can be defended against the objections raised by Stevens. These objections, as already stated, relate partly to the content of the passage itself, and partly to its connection with the preceding lines.

(1) On 1279–80: 'Peleus himself certainly married someone of very high birth indeed, and as a result he is to become a θεός; but it would be rather absurd to base a general maxim on this peculiar experience.' So it might be, if the maxim were being presented as a startling novelty; but it is rather a piece of accepted wisdom which has often proved itself true and has now done so yet again. The principle, indeed, was enunciated twice over by Peleus himself (619–23, 639–41) long before he knew how spectacularly it would be vindicated in his own case.

(2) On 1281–2: 'It is also true that Neoptolemus married a wife with a large dowry and met with disaster; but Hermione was well-born as well as rich, and...it is hard to see how κακῶν λέκτρων ἐπιθυμία can be ascribed to N. In any case it was not the dowry, lineage, or character of his bride that led to his death, but the ill-will of the injured Orestes.' Hermione was 'well-born' only in the most narrowly genealogical sense: her father was a contemptible coward (cf. 456–7; 577–746 *passim*, esp. 616–18, 632–41, 703–5) and her mother a notorious adulteress (cf. 602–9, 621, 630). With such parentage it was utterly predictable that she would make a bad wife (κακὰ λέκτρα), and the play has shown that she is in fact of weak and unstable character. As to the cause of Neoptolemos' death, he would never have incurred 'the ill-will of the injured Orestes' had it not been for the tempting dowry offered him by Menelaos; and while Hermione was not herself in any way responsible for her husband's murder, she has done him the most grievous wrong in her power by deserting him and leaving his home in the company of another suitor whom she knew (cf. 993–1008) to be plotting his death. Even her mother never sank quite so low as that.

---

[5] The echo becomes closer if we read, with Stobaios, ζαχρύσους for ζαπλούτους in 1282: ζάχρυσος is a Euripidean adjective (*Alk.* 498, *IT* 1111) attested in no other author till late Roman times, and it is a more vivid and evocative term than ζάπλουτος.

[6] We can say nothing about his *earlier* works, since no complete play of his earlier than *Medea* has survived except the prosatyric *Alkestis*.

(3) There remains the problem of the connection of 1279–82 with the preceding lines. This connection is marked in the text by κᾆτα...δῆτα[7] which, as Stevens points out,[8] indicates with considerable emphasis that what is said in 1279–82 follows logically from what has been said just before. And certainly at first sight it is hard to see how 1279–82 follows logically from the preceding sentence, in which Peleus merely says that he will cease from his grief, bury Neoptolemos and then go to Mount Pelion; in 1278, to be sure, he mentions that he there won Thetis for his bride, but he says nothing of her birth or character, only of her beauty.

It is curious that there is something which Peleus might have said here that would make a much better connection with 1279–82. The reason why he is to go to Mount Pelion has been explained shortly before by Thetis (1265–9): he is to dwell there (for an unspecified period) until Thetis comes from the sea, accompanied by the fifty Nereids, to convey him to her father's house where he will dwell with her for ever as a god (1257–8) and whence he will be able to visit Achilles on the island of Leuke (1259–62). Few if any human beings can ever have been offered translation from such a depth of misery to such a height of bliss; and Peleus has earned it solely for having married Thetis (cf. 1253 τῆς ἐμῆς εὐνῆς χάριν). If Peleus had said 'And after burying my son I will go to Pelion where I first took you in my arms ⟨and there wait for you to come again and take me to live as an immortal god⟩' he might very reasonably continue 'Now doesn't that show that it pays to go for birth and character in choosing a wife or a son-in-law?'. Perhaps that *was* originally the sequence of Peleus' speech. Perhaps what is wrong with 1279–82 is not that they are interpolated, but that two or three lines that once preceded them have dropped out of the text.[9]

One other problem has still to be disposed of. If, as here argued, 1279–82 are genuine and are the last spoken lines of *Andromache*, then the play will effectively end with a rhetorical question; and some may well agree with the young Denys Page[10] that this is *prima facie* unappealing. Such qualms, however, would be misplaced. Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* ends with a question (ποῖ δῆτα κρανεῖ, ποῖ καταλήξει μετακοιμισθὲν μένος ἄτης;) and so do several scenes within Euripidean plays, including two in *Andromache* itself (*Andr.* 765,[11] 1165; *Alk.* 961; *IA* 1035). In all the Euripidean parallels, as in the passage we are considering, the question has the force of a strong assertion or denial.[12] Peleus concludes this tragedy by reaffirming a maxim

---

[7] So the Euripidean MSS.; the variants in Stobaios and in the Vatopedi gnomology seem to be in part mere errors (originating from misdivision of δῆτα as in cod. M of Stobaios) and in part attempts to give the passage a declarative rather than interrogative form, as seemed more appropriate for a self-contained γνώμη. Stobaios' reading γαμεῖν at the end of 1279 may, however, be more significant; I reproduce a remark by the *CQ* referee: 'The word-order of 1279 [*sc.* as given by the Euripidean MSS.] is all but impossible – we expect something like κᾆτ' οὐ χρεὼν δῆτ' ἔκ τε γενναίων γαμεῖν (otherwise the τε is misplaced).'

[8] Referring to J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*[2] (Oxford, 1954), pp. 272–3; cf. also ib. pp. 269, 311. The *CQ* referee has been very helpful in enabling me to appreciate more clearly the point which Stevens was making here.

[9] Diggle posits two lacunae elsewhere in *Andr.*, before 334 and before 365.

[10] *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), p. 66. Page rejected 1283 (partly on the mistaken ground that it is 'ignored by Σ', when in fact there is a scholion on the line explaining that the understood subject is οἱ ἐξ εὐγενῶν γαμοῦντες) but was of course writing before 1279–82 had come under suspicion; his solution to the problem of the rhetorical question was to suppose that the inserted line 1283 had 'replace[d] another closing sentence'.

[11] 764–5 are deleted by M. D. Reeve, *GRBS* 14 (1973), 147; but the typically Euripidean use of τί δεῖ in the sense 'what's the use of...?' (see Stevens *ad loc.*) should not be denied to the poet.

[12] Cf. also Aesch. *Supp.* 965 and, further afield, the end of the book of Jonah: 'And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, in which are more than a hundred and twenty thousand people who cannot tell their right hand from their left hand, and also many beasts?'

in which he has always believed and whose truth has been proved anew by his and his grandson's contrasting fates.

Department of Classical and Archaeological   ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN
Studies, University of Nottingham

WHOSE LAUGHTER DOES PENTHEUS FEAR? (EUR. *BA*. 842)

$$ΠΕ. \ πᾶν \ κρεῖσσον \ ὥστε \ μὴ \ 'γγελᾶν \ βάκχας \ ἐμοί$$

'γγελᾶν Pierson: γελᾶν P

Matt Neuburg, in *CQ* 37 (1987), 227–30, rightly objects that it does not make sense that Pentheus should be afraid of being laughed at by the Bacchants when he is disguised as a woman,[1] and proposes a new emendation. Apart from possible objections to this, I do not believe that any change is necessary if the line is properly interpreted. The main point is that ἐγγελᾶν does not refer to laughter at Pentheus' appearance by the Bacchants or by anybody else. There is also something to be said about the implication of πᾶν κρεῖσσον.

To take the second point first, when in dialogue somebody says 'anything would be better than *x*', he is normally referring to some distasteful proposal and indicating that anything, even that, would be better than *x*, i.e. something that must be prevented at all costs. It is hard to see why Dionysus' proposal in 841 ὁδοὺς ἐρήμους ἴμεν should be particularly repugnant, and it is more likely that Pentheus is not referring to the previous line, or at any rate not only to that line, but to the idea of being dressed as a woman and a Bacchant, the contemplation of which has occupied his mind since line 822. He has twice declared his opposition (828, 834), but in 838 μολεῖν χρὴ πρῶτον εἰς κατασκοπήν he sees, or pretends to see, the proposed expedition as a military reconnaissance. This, as πρῶτον indicates, he now represents to himself as a preliminary to further action; later (846), with characteristic inconsistency, he speaks of military action and Dionysus' proposal as alternatives.

What is it that Pentheus thinks must be prevented at all costs? We have already heard (785–6) what enraged him and provoked his call to arms:

$$οὐ \ γὰρ \ ἀλλ' \ ὑπερβάλλει \ τάδε$$
$$εἰ \ πρὸς \ γυναικῶν \ πεισόμεσθ' \ ἃ \ πάσχομεν,$$

and in answer to a proposal which he seems to suspect will amount to surrender, he exclaims sarcastically (803)

$$τί \ δρῶντα; \ δουλεύοντα \ δουλείαις \ ἐμαῖς;$$

What is not to be endured, then, is that the Bacchants should be allowed to triumph over him by continuing their wild orgies, and his description of these as ὕβρισμα in 779 anticipates the sense of ἐγγελᾶν.[2] For ἐγγελᾶν with a dative in the sense 'triumph over' see E. *Med*. 1354–5

$$σὺ \ δ' \ οὐκ \ ἔμελλες \ τἄμ' \ ἀτιμάσας \ λέχη$$
$$τερπνὸν \ διάξειν \ βίοτον \ ἐγγελῶν \ ἐμοί,$$

---

[1] Much the same point was made by Hans Oranje, *Euripides' Bacchae: the Play and its Audience* (Leiden, 1984), pp. 85–8: 'P. is after all apprehensive of the ridicule of the men in the city, not that of the women on the mountain'. Here, too, ἐγγελᾶν is taken to denote laughter at Pentheus' appearance.

[2] This last point was suggested by the anonymous referee.