86

SLEEP AFTER LABOUR IN EURIPIDES' *HERACLES*[1]

πόνος, in general a common word in Greek tragedy, is a cardinal theme in the *Heracles*.[2]

In the first half of the play the glorious saving Labours (πόνοι, μόχθοι, ἄθλοι, ἀγῶνες) of the warrior Hero with his bow, club and other weaponry are retrospectively evoked and further enacted. Repeated emphasis on this kind of 'noble toil' accords with the heroic definition of ἀρετή, which traditionally βαίνει διὰ μόχθων.[3] At 355–8 the first strophe of the long First Stasimon in honour of Heracles (presumed to be dead) ends with:

> ὑμνῆcαι cτεφάνωμα μό-   355
> χθων δι' εὐλογίας θέλω·
> γενναίων δ' ἀρεταὶ πόνων
> τοῖc θανοῦcιν ἄγαλμα.

Heracles *par excellence* merits the title ὁ πολύπονος, both for his μυρίοι πόνοι and for their individual greatness. πολυ- can mean either 'much-' or 'many-', so that it suffices for Amphitryon at 1190ff. to mention a single especially grand and godlike Labour:

> AM. ἐμὸς ἐμὸς ὅδε γόνος ὁ πολύπονος, ⟨ὃς⟩ ἐπὶ   1190
> δόρυ γιγαντοφόνον ἦλθεν cὺν θεοῖ-
> cι Φλεγραῖον ἐc πεδίον ἀcπιcτάc.

This we may call the 'epic' view of the hero and of the πόνοι performed by him cὺν θεοῖc. πόνος is normally martial in the *Iliad*.[4] Note also, however, that the terminal ἀcπιcτάc adds an allusion to the kind of martial ἀρετή most admired by 5th-century Athenians.

But there was a darker aspect of πόνος, especially prominent in tragedy, which is concerned with the *sufferings* of humanity. According to what we may call the 'tragic' view, 'toil' is the universal lot of man, in one form or another; and in many contexts πόνοι 'toils' can be translated as 'afflictions': e.g. at *Hipp.* 366–7, where the chorus exclaims ὦ τάλαινα τῶνδ' ἀλγέων | ὦ πόνοι τρέφοντεc βροτούc. The same is true of the words usable as synonyms: μόχθοι, ἄθλοι (cognate with ἄθλιος), ἀγῶνες. According to that view, the ἀρετή that βαίνει διὰ μόχθων typically takes the form of *endurance* in circumstances of δυcδαιμονία, rather than cὺν θεοῖc; and, in order fully to merit his title ὁ πολύπονος, the δυcδαιμονία of Heracles must be of a surpassing magnitude. So it is that the amoibaion between Amphitryon and Theseus continues:

[2] The Concordance of Allen–Italie s.v. πόνος lists *H.F.* 22, 89, 127, 357, 427, 575, 597, 729, 937, 1275, 1279, 1353, 1410; cf. 259, 388, 501 (πονεῖν), 581 (ἐκπονεῖν), 1190 (πολύπονος). Note the gap between 937 and 1190.

[3] *Hcld.* 625. My attention has been drawn also to Pindar, *Ol.* 11.4, *Nem.* 6.24, *Isth.* 1.42, etc., and to H. Parry's article in *AJPh* 86 (1965), 363ff. for the 'epinician' aspect of *H.F.*

[4] Cf. P. E. Easterling on S. *Tra.* 20–1.

ΘΗ. φεῦ φεῦ· τίς ἀνδρῶν ὧδε δυςδαίμων ἔφυ;   1195
ΑΜ. οὐ τᾶν εἰδείης ἕτερον
       πολυμοχθότερον πολυπλαγκτότερόν τε θνατῶν.⁵

πολυμοχθότερον obviously echoes ὁ πολύπονος in 1190, while developing it with a
shift of focus (sc. ἀθλιώτερον, cf. 1015); then πολυπλαγκτότερον is not simply an
isometric reinforcement, but alludes both to the affliction of πλάνη ('wandering',
sometimes mental) and to the sufferings (by implication, lesser sufferings) of
πολύτλας 'Οδυccεύς, who μάλα πολλά | πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίας ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον
ἔπερce (Od. 1.1–2).⁶

The direct juxtaposition in 1190–7 of these contrasting interpretations of the title
ὁ πολύπονος reflects the notoriously bipartite structure of the play as a whole. It is
precisely the ambivalence of 'toil' that provides the hinge linking the disparate
'halves' of the drama, in which the heroic stature and ἀρετή of Heracles ὁ πολύπονος
are explored and presented in terms first 'epic', then overridingly 'tragic'.

Everything that Heracles does, or contemplates doing, is by definition a πόνος; and
the culmination of his μυρίοι πόνοι is the mad killing of his recently saved wife and
children:
       τὸν λοίcθιον δὲ τόνδ' ἔτλην τάλας πόνον,
       παιδοκτονήcας δῶμα θριγκῶcαι κακοῖc.   1280

This is evidently a key sentence; climactic in its autobiographical context, and a
perfect couplet, characteristic of Greek tragic diction at its best. The cognate words
ἔτλην τάλας (both typical of tragedy) economically stress the δυcδαιμονία of the
(witting or unwitting) agent; the big 'coincident' aorist participle, the pungent
architectural metaphor and the terminal simplicity of κακοῖc for 'with disgrace and
ruin' defy translation; note also the alliterative assonances of λ, τ, π and κ. And all
this is support for the central, bitterly ironical word πόνον, to which τὸν
λοίcθιον...τόνδ', and all that Heracles has said so far, look forward.⁷

Our only witness L in fact reads φόνον in 1279, but Reiske's correction is rightly
accepted by editors. Confusion of πον- and φον- is a frequent error in tragic texts,
occurring usually (as one might expect) in contexts where the wrong word gives fair
sense.⁸ 'This culminating πόνος' is certainly the point needed here, following a list,
not of φόνοι (though it includes some 'killings'), but of the hero's famous Labours
(with echoes of the First Stasimon). The way to τὸν λοίcθιον...τόνδ' ἔτλην...πόνον has
been directly signposted with μόχθους οὓς ἔτλην in 1270 and μυρίων...ἄλλων πόνων
in 1275.

After 'toil' comes 'sleep'; a universally familiar association of ideas, but with a
particular irony and dramatic point in this play, whose 'sleep-scene' immediately

⁵ 1196 οὐ τᾶν Paley, οὐκ ἄν L; an easy correction, not mentioned by Diggle or Bond, which
at once enhances the dialogue and removes a metrical anomaly. – – – – – ∪∪– | ...is consistent with
the 'enoplian dochmiac' context (here dactylic); by contrast, –∪– – – –∪∪– is inescapably an
inappropriate chor. dim. Ion 1478 ΚΡ. ἴcτω Γοργοφόνα...ΙΩ. τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; should not be
cited as a parallel instance of aeolic (phalaecian) in a similar context. Better lineation there treats
τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; ΚΡ. ἆ cκοπελοῖc ἐπ' ἐμοῖc as an iambelegus, following a contracted 'D'; but
there are issues in that context which need to be pursued elsewhere.
⁶ Cf. πολυπλανής (of Menelaus) at Hel. 203 and πολυπλάνητος (of human life in general) at
Hipp. 1110. The overtone of mental 'wandering' in the case of Heracles seems inescapable (cf.
Hipp. 240), but it is only an overtone.
⁷ ἔτλην τάλας, cf. comm. Or. p. 86 on τλήμων 'Ορέcτης. λοίcθιον 'last and worst', cf. Page
on Med. 1105. For the θριγκός-metaphor Bond compares A. Ag. 1283.
⁸ Bond, after Dawe and Diggle, mentions Cyc. 471, I.T. 1046, S. Aj. 61, O.C. 542; see also
J. H. Kells, CQ n.s. 16 (1966), 51, on E. El. 100, who adds Or. 1544, and further in my comm.
on Or. 816–18.

follows Heracles' appalling, culminatingly ruinous 'labour'. Normally, of course,
'sleep after toil' is a (god-given) *boon* to suffering mortals, as from Athena to
Odysseus, when she

> ὕπνον ἐπ' ὄμμασι χεῦ', ἵνα μιν παύσειε τάχιστα
> δυσπονέος καμάτοιο, φίλα βλέφαρ' ἀμφικαλύψας.   (*Od.* 5.492–3)

or when Night is addressed as ὑπνοδότειρα τῶν πολυπόνων βροτῶν (*Or.* 175; cf. ibid.
159 ὕπνου γλυκυτάταν χάριν). Sleep may itself be directly invoked in prayer as a Lord
of Healing, as in S. *Phil.* 827ff.:

> Ὕπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαής, Ὕπνε δ' ἀλγέων,
> εὐαὲς ἡμῖν ἔλθοις,
> εὐαίων εὐαίων, ὦναξ· (κτλ.)[9]

In the ordinary way the πολύπονος mortal who 'sleeps after toil' is *ipso facto*
εὐδαίμων, like the mariner home from stormy seas (*Ba.* 902ff. εὐδαίμων μὲν ὃς ἐκ
θαλάccac | ἔφυγε χεῖμα λιμένα δ' ἔκιχεν· | εὐδαίμων δ' ὃς ὕπερθε μόχθων | ἐγένεθ'...).
It is surely against the background of that standard view of 'sleep' that we are to
understand the point of the closing lines of the Exangelos' speech at 1013ff.:

> εὕδει δ' ὁ τλήμων ὕπνον οὐκ εὐδαίμονα,
> παῖδας φονεύσας καὶ δάμαρθ'· ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν
> οὐκ οἶδα θνητῶν ὅστις ἀθλιώτερος.   1015

In the particular case of Heracles the antecedent action of children- and wife-killing
is such as to cancel the normal εὐδαιμονία of 'sleep after toil' (and the beneficence
of Athena in causing *this* sleep), and to justify the conclusion that he is 'the most
ἄθλιος (wretched, pitiable, unfortunate) of (all) human beings' (cf. 1196–7 above).

  Now of course this explanation of 1013–15 clearly presupposes our recognition of
Heracles' murderous action as a calamitous 'labour'. The attentive reader will have
spotted that 1013–15 comes before, not after, 1190–7 and 1279–80. He will already
have formulated the question 'has Euripides in fact identified the children- and wife-
killing as a πόνος through the mouth of his Exangelos?'; and, if sympathetic towards
the argument so far, he will be reaching for his Murray, Diggle or Bond in search of
πον- (or μοχθ-) words in the ῥῆσις. He will soon come to 936–7, where Heracles is
reported as saying:

> Πάτερ, τί θύω πρὶν κτανεῖν Εὐρυσθέα
> καθάρσιον πῦρ καὶ πόνους διπλοῦς ἔχω;

This is the right kind of proleptic touch, implying that the presently envisaged
'sacrifice' (a favourite kind of sinister irony)[10] and the future killing of Eurystheus are
both πόνοι in Heracles' deranged mind. But no πον- or μοχθ- words appear in the
detailed narrative that follows; and 937 is clearly both too subtly suggestive and too
distant from 1013 for the postulated connection of thought.

  That seems disappointing: Euripides has apparently neglected to bring together
explicitly the ideas of 'toil' and 'sleep', despite the centrality of the πόνος-theme in
this play, despite the natural implication of 1013–15 and despite his juxtaposition of
ὑπνοδότειρα and πολυπόνων at *Or.* 175 in a context with many echoes of the *Heracles*
sleep-scene.[11] But all is not lost. There may be no πον- word where we need it in the
vulgate text. But there are two φον- words in 1001–6, of which the second, though
blameless in itself, may well be erroneous:

---

[9] Text and lineation as Dale (*Lyric Metres*², 118) and Webster, not Dawe.
[10] Cf. Denniston on *El.* 1141.
[11] See Bond, p. 332, and *comm. Or.* p. 104; note also *Or.* 161 φεῦ, μόχθων.

κἀνθένδε πρὸς γέροντος ἱππεύει φόνον·
ἀλλ' ἦλθεν εἰκών, ὡς ὁρᾶν ἐφαίνετο
Παλλάς, κραδαίνουσ' ἔγχος †ἐπὶ λόφῳ κέαρ†,
κάρριψε πέτρον στέρνον εἰς Ἡρακλέους
ὅς νιν φόνου μαργῶντος ἔσχε κἀς ὕπνον   1005
καθῆκε· πίτνει δ' ἐς πέδον πρὸς κίονα...

There can, I think, be little doubt that, if φόνου and πόνου had been transmitted as variant readings in 1005, most editors would have favoured the latter, developing arguments of the kind that I have outlined. Note especially that

(a) this is the first appearance of the 'sleep'-theme, and the appropriate place therefore for the collocation 'from πόνος...to ὕπνος' (within the verse).

(b) The agent is Athena, and Euripides may well have had *Od.* 5.492–3 in mind (see above); πόνου μαργῶντος is then a reflection of the Homeric δυσπονέος καμάτοιο.

(c) As things stand, Heracles ἱππεύει to a particular φόνος (the killing of Amphitryon) and is stopped from (that) 'crazy φόνος'. With πόνου, it is more generally his crazy activity (for which πόνος is the right thematic word) that is terminated. The use of the participle μαργῶν with either φόνος or πόνος is linguistically bold, but certainly no harder with the latter. Cf. *Or.* 807–8 ὁ μέγας ὄλβος ἅ τ' ἀρετὰ | μέγα φρονοῦσ' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ | παρὰ Σιμουντίοις ὀχετοῖς... The πόνος of Heracles is an 'active' – here madly active – quality analogous to the μέγας ὄλβος and ἀρετή which characterize the Atreid House and can be said to μέγα φρονεῖν. It is also his μοῖρα, which the Chorus will describe as λυσσάς in 1024 (see p. 93f. below).

The editor of an Alphabetic Play has to do his best without the benefit of transmitted variants; though indeed the Select Plays are not free from universal, and presumably ancient, error. Technically, though not semantically, the correction of φόνου to πόνου is a trivial διόρθωσις. The same correction is generally accepted at 1279; and the cause of error here is evident, in the 'bloody' context as a whole and in the recent occurrence of φόνον in 1001.

I proceed to focus attention on a controversial passage in the lyric 'sleep-scene' itself; and, after that, on some points of interest in the surrounding context.

As forecast by the Exangelos in 1006ff., Heracles is revealed at 1028 lying asleep, tied to a pillar and horrifyingly surrounded by the arrow-pierced (or, in one case, clubbed) corpses of his wife and children. The Chorus react to the spectacle with horror, amazement and fear, their 'enoplian dochmiac' verses including the iambic trimeter (1034)

εὕδοντος ὕπνον δεινὸν ἐκ παίδων φόνου.

Amphitryon emerges and hushes the Chorus, anxious that they should not disturb the hero's 'calm repose'; but they persist in exclamatory lamentation (1042–52). Amphitryon demands '*hushed* threnody', fearful that Heracles may awake to further violent action (1053–7); but the Chorus 'cannot' comply (1058). Amphitryon then demands silence while he bends over the sleeper: 'Sh! let me test his breathing by applying my ear...'

AM.   σῖγα, πνοὰς μάθω· φέρε, πρὸς οὖς βάλω.   1060
XO.   εὕδει;
AM.   ναί, εὕδει,
        †ὕπνον ὕπνον ὀλόμενον† ὃς ἔκανεν ἄλο-
        χον, ἔκανε δὲ τέκεα τοξήρει ψαλμῶι [τοξεύσας].

The answer to the question εὕδει; evidently serves both to confirm that Heracles really is in a deep slumber (so that for the moment, at least, it is *safe* to cτενάζειν) and to restate the grievous circumstances (inviting the inference that it is *proper* to cτενάζειν). Amphitryon duly participates, in response to urging, in a brief antiphonal θρῆνοc (1064ff. XO. cτέναζέ νυν...), interrupted by a false alarm (1067–8). The old man is minded to take cover ὑπὸ μέλαθρον (1069–70); but the Chorus reassure him (1071), and the hero's awakening is deferred for a few more lines.

The textual problem in 1061–3 has been discussed at some length by Diggle[12] and further by Bond. It is common ground that something is wrong, both in style and metre, with the anadiplosis ὕπνον ὕπνον; that the otiose τοξεύcαc is an interpolation (del. Madvig);[13] and that the words between ναί, εὕδει and [τοξεύcαc] should be restored, if restoration is possible, as four dochmiacs (4δ). Murray followed Wilamowitz (after Dobree) in printing AM. ναί, εὕδει | ὕπνον ⟨γ᾽ ἄ⟩υπνον ὀλόμενον...ἀλο-|χον...[τοξεύcαc]. Diggle bluntly rejects the hiatus at εὕδει | ὕπνον as 'intolerable', i.e. as a 'hiatus without sense-pause', eschewed in Euripides' dochmiacs. Bond argues, in effect, that there may be a pause (and indeed Diggle should have mentioned Wilamowitz's comma after εὕδει, which Murray omitted); but he accepts that ὑπνο͞ν γ᾽ ἀ͞υπνο͞ν ὀλο͝- is a form of δ which 'has no parallel in Euripides'.[14] In the new Oxford Text Diggle prints:

> XO. εὕδει; AM. ναί, εὕδει ⟨γ᾽⟩ ὕπνον ἄυπνον ὀλόμε-
> νον ὃc ἔκανεν ἄλοχον, ἔκανε δὲ ψαλμῶι
> τέκεα τοξήρει.

Bond justly questions the position of Diggle's γε;[15] and he appears to disfavour also the terminal transposition, for his *ex. gr.* suggestion κᾰκο͞ν γ᾽ ῠπνο͞ν ὀλο͝- implies that he would follow Murray as to the rest.

There is a further grave difficulty, not mentioned by Diggle and unconvincingly treated by Bond, in the extraordinary description of the sleep as ὀλόμενοc.[16] The idea that this 'calm repose' (1050, see below) is 'ruin-*causing*' is patently absurd; but that is what ὀλόμενον ought to mean here, if we compare (as Bond does, after Biehl) *Or.* 1364 διὰ τὸν ὀλόμενον ὀλόμενον Ἰδαῖον | Πάριν, *Ph.* 1029 ὀλομέναν τ᾽ Ἐρινύν, and the archetypal μῆνιν...Ἀχιλῆος | οὐλομένην (*Il.* 1.1–2).

I make no apology for reverting to a familiar lineation, while obelizing ὕπνον ὕπνον

---

[12] *Studies* 54–7; as to the hiatus, see also his further observations in *Illinois Classical Studies* 6 (1981), 96.

[13] For the interpolation of an explanatory participle (as in *Med.* 981) Dr Diggle has drawn my attention also to the note of Friis Johansen–Whittle on A. *Su.* 568 (p. 453).

[14] Cf. N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 23ff. --◡◡◡◡ does not occur at all (Diggle justly obelizes *Ion* 782f. πῶc φήιc; ἄφατον ἄφατον ἀναύδητον, which cannot be scanned as 2δ; *IA* 1307 εὐναῖcι βαcιλίcιν (sic) is a syncopated iambo-trochaic dimeter). ◡-◡◡◡◡ is attested only at S. *Ant.* 1273 θεὸc τότ᾽ ἄρα τότε (read τότε θεὸc ἄρα τότε?). It is hard to see why ×-◡◡◡◡ was thus eschewed; but we cannot escape from the evidence.

[15] Diggle leans on *Alc.* 201 κλαίει γ᾽ ἄκοιτιν...in reply to 199–200 ἦ που cτενάζει...; But the long (presumptive) question there is quite different from the one-word question εὕδει; and there is no ναί before κλαίει γ᾽...The reply 'Aye, he sleeps a bad sleep...', if that is the general sense, introduces a new point after the affirmative answer, a point not implied by the questioner and contrasting with what Amphitryon himself said in 1043–4 and 1048. For such a sequence of thought Bond rightly looks for a pattern like *Ba.* 794 θύcω, φόνον γε θῆλυν.

[16] 'He sleeps a ruined sleep' may be an intelligible hypallage in English, but no convincing Greek parallel has been cited, or for the rendering 'deathly' (Gray and Hutchinson). Wilamowitz explained this and other exx. as damnatory, implying the optative ὄλοιτο (cf. Eng. 'perishing', 'perisher'); but Amphitryon has no good reason for 'cursing' the oblivious sleep whΐch he wishes to continue. At least Wecklein was aware of the problem when he proposed ὀλόμενοc.

ὀλόμενον as a first step towards reconsidering the problem from a different starting-point. Prima facie there is nothing wrong with ...ὅς ἔκανεν ἀλό-|χον, ἔκανε δὲ τέκεα | τὸ ξῆρει ψαλμῶι. Short-syllable overlap is common in Euripides' dochmiacs, and the words here flow easily and naturally in a run of *brevia* up to the weighty dochmius τοξήρει ψαλμῶι. The terminal adjective + noun phrase (in that order) is a stylistic feature by no means *inviting* transposition; cf. especially *Ph.* 157 ... | πολυπόνωι μοίραι (likewise a modal dative).[17] It can scarcely be said that the two emendations at ⟨γ'⟩ ὕπνον ⟨ἄ⟩υπνον are so certain as to justify the further doubtful expedient.[18] [It certainly should not be assumed that the original articulation of the verses corresponded with the comma after ἄλοχον. Diggle has himself refuted the emendation ...ὅς ἔκανε ⟨μὲ⟩ν ἄλοχον... (an earlier suggestion of Wilamowitz), so that we cannot avoid overlaps altogether; and indeed successive overlaps are not unlikely, cf. 1042–4 Καδμεῖοι γέρον-|τες, οὐ cîγα cî-|γα τὸν ὕπνωι παρει-|μένον ἐάςετ' ἐκ-|λαθέςθαι κακῶν; (admittedly an extreme case).]

At the risk of being accused of an idée fixe, I venture to invite contemplation of the following preliminary conjecture:

> AM. ναί, εὕδει,
> πόνον ⟨...⟩ ὀλόμενον ὅς ἔκανεν ἄλο-
> χον, ἔκανε δὲ τέκεα τοξήρει ψαλμῶι.

It will be observed that

(*a*) the hiatus problem has disappeared, and we have a stronger sense-pause following the divided dochmius, as at *Or.* 148 ... | βοάν. ΗΛ. ναί, οὕτως· | κάταγε... (corresponding with 161 ... | τάλας. ΗΛ. φεῦ, μόχθων· | ἄδικος...). It is likely that Euripides had our passage in mind when he composed *Or.* 148ff. (the whole passage is full of echoes, divided δs are uncommon, and these are the only extant instances of hiatus after ναί). The parallel does not support Bond's view that we need γε; still less does it support the altered colometry of Diggle's ...ναί, εὕδει γ' ὕπνον ἄυπνον ὀλόμε-| νον...

(*b*) We have an even closer collocation of 'sleep' and πόνος than in 1005, and a more explicit statement of the irony as to 'sleep after toil' adumbrated in the concluding sentiment of the Exangelos (1013–15, see above). We still have, as in 1034 εὕδοντος ὕπνον δεινὸν ἐκ παίδων φόνου, the mention of 'children-killing' following the verb εὕδειν in the same sentence. We do not need ὕπνον for a further echo of that.

(*c*) We are spared the application of ὀλόμενος to ὕπνος. It is now properly the πόνος of Heracles, recently described as μαργῶν and analogous to the μῆνις of Achilles, that is described as '(damnably) ruin-causing'.

We can take encouragement from the smallness of the alteration made so far. πόνον could easily have been corrupted to ὕπνον following εὕδει in an unpunctuated and wrongly lineated tradition.[19] ὕπνον will have seemed automatic in the light of 1034

---

[17] Cf. also *Or.* 1374 βαρβάροιcι δραcμοῖc, *Ba.* 77 ὁcίοιc καθαρμοῖcιν (-μόc nouns like ψαλμόc), *Med.* 865 τλάμονι θυμῶι, *Hel.* 374 φονίαιcι πλαγαῖc, 629, 693, 697, *Ph.* 225, 346, 656, 832, *Or.* 1012 πολυπόνοιc ἀνάγκαιc, etc.

[18] As to ἄυπνον, that can be understood as implying οὐκ εὐδαίμονα (cf. 1013–14). But, apart from the metrical problem, it is not obviously appropriate in this context that Amphitryon should disparage by 'negation' the one feature of the situation which (as 'calm oblivion') he wishes to preserve, and which (in reply to εὕδει;) he is concerned to affirm. Bond allows that S. *Phil.* 848 is different, where the chronically ill sleeper is more literally 'sleepless' (and consequently εὐδρακήc). He should not have speculated here about 'nightmares', inconsistently with what Amphitryon has said in 1042 and 1049–50.

[19] The traditional line-numeration, reflecting the lineation of LP and the Aldine Edition, is 1061 εὕδει;... | 1062 ὅc... | 1063 τοξήρει...

εὔδοντος ὕπνον δεινόν; and the doubling of ὕπνον could be the indirect consequence of suprascription.

To proceed further is necessarily speculative; but we can outline some possibilities. It may be thought that we need something like τλᾶς (cf. 1270, 1279) to govern πόνον. But we already have acceptable syntax without such a participle, since πόνον can be taken as an internal accusative defining the action ἔκανεν ('who, *as* a calamitous πόνος, killed...').[20] For the advancement of the accusative phrase before the relative, we may compare *Or.* 338 μάτεροс αἷμα ϲᾶϲ ὅϲ ϲ' ἀναβακχεύει ('who torments you with madness as to your mother's blood') and ibid. 988ff. ποτανὸν μὲν δίωγμα πώλων...Πέλοψ ὅτ' ἐ⟨πὶ⟩ πελάγεϲι διεδίφρευϲε... ('when Pelops, driving winged horses, crossed the seas in a chariot').

It follows that what we need is merely some reinforcement of the phrase πόνον ὀλόμενον, starting with a vowel and preferably scanning ◡◡◡◡ (if only ◡◡◡, we shall have to make some further, unwanted adjustment). The run of short syllables is not, perhaps, certain, but it is so probable as to exclude anything else from consideration. For parallels for the overlapping pattern πο̆νο̆ν ⟨◡◡◡◡⟩ ο̆λο̆-|με̆νο̆ν we need look no further than 1056 ἄπο̆ δε̆ πᾰτε̆ρᾰ με̆λᾰ-|θρᾰ τε̆ κᾰτᾰρρη̄ξει and 1052... κε̆χῠ-|με̆νο̆ϲ...

Two possibilities then suggest themselves, one straightforward, the other much more speculative:

(*a*) ὀλόμενον is doubled at *Or.* 1364 (see above), and could have been similarly doubled here.

(*b*) In the parallel sleep-scene in *Orestes* Euripides twice used, and probably coined *ad hoc*, the adjective ἀπόφονοϲ as a pejorative-negative approximately equivalent to *δύϲφονοϲ (162–5 ἀπό-|φονον... | φόνον, 192 μέλεον ἀπόφονον αἷμα). The interpretation is not easy at *Or.* 162ff.,[21] the intelligibility of the sentence seeming to depend on closer precedents than any that editors have been able to cite; note especially the long separation of ἀπόφονον from the later φόνον that it 'negates'. If Euripides had previously used *ἀπόπονοϲ in the *Heracles* sleep-scene, pejoratively applied to 'calamitous labour', he had just the kind of precedent that the phrasing of the *Or.* passages seems to imply (note also the addition of μέλεον, answering to ὀλόμενον, in 192). It will not be denied that πόνον ἀπόπονον here would give us at once another reminiscence of the Homeric δυϲπονέοϲ καμάτοιο and the same favourite kind of ϲχῆμα as has been admired in Dobree's ὕπνον ἄυπνον, in line with what Amphitryon says at 1133:

> AM. ἀπόλεμον, ὦ παῖ, πόλεμον ἔϲπευϲαϲ τέκνοιϲ.

πόνοϲ can be expected to have some martial connotation in a sentence mentioning weapons (τοξήρει ψαλμῶι). Part of the irony of the situation lies in the perverted use, against his own φίλτατα τέκνα, of the famous Bow which had featured in Heracles' γενναῖοι πόνοι against πολέμιοι.[22]

[20] Cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 752–7, and Diggle in *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies...Presented to Sir Denys Page*...(Cambridge, 1978), pp. 171–2. A typical ex. of the 'integral' type of int. acc. phrase, as classified by Barrett and further illustrated by Diggle, is *Hel.* 77 ἀπόλαυϲιν εἰκοῦϲ ἔθανεϲ ἂν Διὸϲ κόρηϲ. Predicative advancement in the word-order is a natural feature of such idiom. For the *Or.* passages cited, see comm. *ad locc.*

[21] *Comm. Or.* p. 111, where sympathetic consideration is given to the alternative interpretation 'free from blood(-guilt)' (Hermann, Verrall). It is surprising that A. Dihle does not mention ἀπόφονοϲ, even in a footnote, in his survey of 'ἀπο- privatives' (*Glotta* 63 [1965], 137–9).

[22] The implicit antithesis of φίλοι (a fortiori φίλτατοι) and πολέμιοι/ἐχθροί seems to have been missed by commentators on 1133. Tragedy offers countless variations on this 'friend/foe', 'love/hate' dichotomy (e.g. *Med.* 16; cf. *comm. Or.* p. lxiv).

I append some miscellaneous notes on the other lyrics sung during Heracles' sleep.

1016–20.[23] The lament of the Chorus, following the departure of the Exangelos, begins reflectively with comparative mythology:

> XO.　ὁ φόνος ἦν ὃν Ἀργολὶς ἔχει πέτρα
> 　　　τότε μὲν περισαμότατος καὶ ἄπιστος
> 　　　Ἑλλάδι τῶν Δαναοῦ παίδων·
> 　　　†τάδ' ὑπερέβαλε παρέδραμε†
> 　　　τὰ τότε κακὰ τάλανι διογενεῖ κόρωι.　　　　　　　　1020

The vulgate lineation, treating τῶν Δαναοῦ παίδων as a dochmius, gives a premature period-end, with lengthened *breve*, at …Ἑλλάδι. As lineated above (so Wecklein), the opening sentence combines a 2δ verse with a favourite type of enoplian dicolon;[24] a dragged prolongation of the sequence ‿‿–‿‿–‿‿–‿‿–‿ : –‿‿–‿‿– (*Med.* 992–3/999–1000, *Hel.* 692–3). The clausular colon (‿) *D*–– recurs at 1030, 1033 and (probably) 1038, see below. For the whole sequence, cf. *Hec.* 1066–8 (2δ/ἄκε͞σαι' ἄκε͞σαι͝ὄ τυφλὸν, : Ἅλι͝ε͝, φε͞γγὸς ἄπαλλᾰξᾱς) and *Or.* 1257/1277 (2δ/‿D‿ : D––).

Of the remedies conjectured for 1019–20, the best, after Bothe, is surely τάδε δὲ [ὑπερέβαλε] παρέδραμεν (τάδε δ' Wunder), which at once gives us a straightforward 3δ sentence (like 1021–2) and gets rid of the anomaly of paired verbs with the longer one coming first.[25] At all periods ὑπερβάλλειν was standard Greek for 'to exceed'. παρατρέχειν is rare in that sense (LSJ s.v. 2), with a metaphor of 'overtaking' on the race-track (*Il.* 23.636). ὑπερέβαλε would be a very natural gloss on παρέδραμε(ν) here. For the interpolation, cf. τοξεύσας 1063.

1021–4. The Chorus continue:

> μονότεκνον Πρόκνης φόνον ἔχω λέξαι
> †θυόμενον† Μούcαιс·
> cὺ δὲ τέκνα τρίγον', ὦ δάϊε, τεκόμενος
> λυccάδι cυγκατειργάcω ⟨cοι⟩ μοῖραι.

In 1022 Heath's θρεόμενον (attributed by Bond to Wunder) is too uncertain to be accepted. θρέομαι is attested only with an active sense (θρέω Hsch. is dubious support for a passive), always in contexts of lamentation. 'Lamented in poetry' is not inappropriate; but 'celebrated in poetry' would be at least as good, for which one might have expected κλεόμενον (cf. *Alc.* 447, *Od.* 1.338, Pi. *Isth.* 51(4).27, S. *Tra.* 639, etc.). I follow Diggle, after Canter and Wilamowitz, in 1023 (L τρίγονα τεκόμενος ὦ δαΐς).

In 1024 λυccάδι…μοῖραι is strongly supported by *Med.* 1281 αὐτοχειρὶ μοῖραι κτενεῖc (likewise of child-slaughter). According to the present argument, the μοῖρα of Heracles is πόνος (cf. πολυπόνωι μοῖραι Ph. 157 for this connection of ideas), and the striking phrase at once reflects and is explained by πόνου μαργῶντος in 1005.

[23] Here and elsewhere I pass over in silence some corrections of L adopted by Diggle and accepted with convincing arguments by Bond, as 1016 πέτρα (Bothe, for πάτρα) and 1017 ἄπιcτος (Reiske, for ἄριcτος).

[24] *Comm. Or.* p. 288. Though he mentions the alternative colometry in *PCPhS* n.s. 20 (1974), 13–16, Diggle follows Murray here, but not at *Hec.* 1067–8 in *Euripidis Fabulae* I.

[25] See Diggle, *PCPhS* art. cit., and comm. on *Or.* 1302 [φονεύετε] καίνετε (φονεύετε del. Hermann). Diggle is evidently on the defensive as to τάδε δ' ὑπερέβαλεν | παρέδραμεν | …in the light of his own evidence, and he goes on to propose a doubling of τάλανι (unwanted in this 'quiet' context). An alternative excision, of course, would be τάδε δ' ὑπερ[έβαλε παρ]έδραμεν.

The very abnormal clausular 'dochmius' ‿ – – –, however, must arouse misgivings;[26] and prima facie the most plausible procedure, after Kirchhoff, is to look for a monosyllabic supplement.[27] I venture to suggest ⟨coι⟩, to be understood (following cυν-) as cὺν cαυτῶι.[28] That at once fills the gap plausibly (after -cω), and gives extra point to the sentence and the big cυν- compound. Euripides was fond of this trope, associating persons literally and figuratively 'destroyed': cf. 1064–6 (p. 96 below), and *Hel.* 692–3 τάδε καὶ cὲ διώλεcε μυριάδας τε | χαλκεόπλων Δαναῶν. κατ-εργάζεcθαι (lit. 'do down'), like διολλύναι, is a verb at once strong and usefully imprecise. The reflexive use of coι is unexceptionable in principle, cf. Stevens on *An.* 256, and Kühner–Gerth i.559, Anm. 8. For λυccάδι μοίραι as a second dative (with coι), we may compare *Hec.* 202–4 οὐκέτι coι...γήραι δειλαίωι...cυνδουλεύcω (not, indeed, otherwise similar).

1035–8. The Chorus have exclaimed at the opening of the doors to reveal the child victims lying before their unfortunate father. The leading verb is still ἴδεcθε as they continue:

περὶ δὲ δεcμὰ καὶ πολύβροχ' ἁμμάτων   1035
ἐρείcμαθ' Ἡράκλειον ἀμ-
φὶ δέμας τάδε, λαΐνοιc
†ἀνημμέν' ἀμφὶ κίοcιν οἴκων†.

Elmsley's excision of ἀμφί in 1038 is by no means clearly right. The interpolation is hard to account for, this use of ἀμφί + dative (loosely 'on, in contact with') being poetical, cf. *Ph.* 1516 ἀμφὶ κλάδοιc ἐζομένα. Since also the dactylic clausula... – ‿ ‿ – – is at best rare in 'enoplian dochmiacs',[29] it seems better to write ἀνημμένα κίοcιν ἀμφ' οἴκων: 'difficult' word-order like *Andr.* 511 μαcτοῖc ματέροc ἀμφὶ cᾶc,[30] and the same clausular colon ‿ – ‿ ‿ – ‿ ‿ – × – as 1018, 1030 and 1033 (cf. also *An.* 827/831, 841, *Phaethon* 270–1 τάλαιν' ἐγὼ τάλαινα ποῖ | πόδα πτερόεντα καταcτάcω;). The combination of ἀμφί + acc. and ἀμφί + dat. (with a different sense) in the same sentence is paralleled at *Hel.* 179–83 κυανοειδὲc ἀμφ' ὕδωρ...ἕλικά τ' ἀνὰ χλόαν...ἀμφὶ δόνακοc ἔρνεcιν.[31] Both Sophocles and Euripides could be insensitive to casual repetitions of short words.[32] The fact that the first ἀμφί picks up the anticipatory περί does not really affect the issue.

[26] The only parallel (*Rh.* 832 παραιτοῦμαι) is vitiated by faulty responsion and doubtful Euripidean authorship; but in itself it is quite easily emendable to παραιτούμεθα (the same error, I believe, as at *Hel.* 664 ἐcοίcομαι for ἐcοιcόμεθα).

[27] ⟨cὰι⟩ μοίραι Kirchhoff; ⟨νιν⟩ Paley, ⟨δή⟩ J. H. H. Schmidt.

[28] It should not be objected that cυγκατεργάζεcθαί τινά τινι ought to mean 'to collaborate with A in destroying B', rather than 'to destroy B in conjunction with (destroying) A'. There may be a theoretical ambiguity, but cf. A. *Ag.* 1605–6 μ'...ἀθλίωι πατρὶ ξυνεξελαύνει (like Th. 6.88.8 ξυναπέcτελλον αὐτοῖc πρέcβειc), and cυνθάπτειν τινά τινι (*Alc.* 149, etc.).

[29] There is no instance in *Ion* or *Or.* As to H.F., 1078 is dealt with below. At 888 κακοῖcιν ἐκπετάcουcι ends a compoundly corrupt sentence. At 890 and 893 there is flawed responsion; the latter should be βοτρύων ἐπὶ χεύμαcι⟨ν⟩ λοιβᾶc (the same ‿ ‿ – ‿ ‿ – ‿ – × – verse as 1190, *An.* 857, 862, *El.* 586, 588, 590, *Ion* 1486, 1494, *Hel.* 657, 680, 681, *Hyps.* fr. 64. 94), and the notorious problem in the former (as I hope to argue elsewhere) can then be solved by writing [οὖ] Βρομίου κεχαριcμένων (for -μένα) θύρcωι.

[30] See comm. on *Or.* 94 τάφον...πρὸc καcιγνήτηc μολεῖν.

[31] Kannicht's emendation ἔρνε' is wrong for the sense (there is no room here to elaborate other objections to his text): the laundered crimson πέπλοι were being spread 'on standing reeds' (lit. 'saplings of reed') as in *Hipp.* 128 they were spread on a warm sunny rock. ἀμφ' ὕδωρ makes a local point ('by, near', cf. *I.T.* 6; Diggle, *Studies* 80), and ἀνὰ χλόαν is also 'environmental' (comm. on *Or.* 329–31). By contrast, the concluding ἀμφί-phrase there goes closely with θάλπουcα, as κίοcιν ἀμφ' οἴκων here goes closely with ἀνημμένα.

[32] Cf. Diggle, *Studies* 66–7, and (for Sophocles) Easterling, *Hermes* 101 (1973), 14–34.

The preceding sequence is better taken as 2δ/2ia/◡◡–◡◡–◡– (T, cf. on 1056 below). When ἐρείϲμαθ᾽ Ἡράκλειον is taken as a catalectic dimeter, we have an unwelcome period-end in mid phrase.

1047–52. Not much is needed to restore rational metre (*4ia*, then *6δ*):

AM. ἑκαϲτέρω πρόβατε, μὴ
κτυπεῖτε, μὴ βοᾶτε, μὴ
τὸν †εὖ διαύοντα† ὑπνώδεά τ᾽ ἐγεί-   1050
ρετ᾽ εὐνᾶϲ.

XO.   οἴμοι, φόνος ὅϲοϲ ὅδε...

AM.   ἆ ἆ,
διά μ᾽ ὀλεῖτε.

XO.   κεχυμένοϲ ἐπαντέλλει.

1050–1 ἐγείρετ᾽ εὐνᾶϲ Conradt: εὐνᾶϲ ἐγείρετε L

τὸν εὖδι᾽ ἰαύονθ᾽ (Reiske) | ὑπνώδεά τ᾽ εὐνᾶϲ | ἐγείρετε – οἴμοι (Page ἰώ μοι) is usually analysed as three 'reiziana' (×–◡◡––). But the sequence ...◡––:×–... (a fortiori ...◡–×:×–...) implies period-end, inconsistently with the elision at ἰαύονθ᾽.[33] Further, there is no parallel for a divided reizianum; and in any case the reizianum is a verse-unit alien to this metrical genre. Conradt's neglected transposition ἐγείρετ᾽ εὐνᾶϲ at once removes the hiatus before οἴμοι and turns two of the 'reiziana' into δs; and it then only remains either to recognize τὸν εῦδῐ᾽ ῐαῠ῀ονθ᾽ as an isolated rare form of dochmius or to find a different correction of εὖ διαύοντα.[34] Perhaps εὖδιά τ᾽ ἄγονθ᾽ (LSJ ἄγω IV.2; εὖδια = εὐδίαν, as γαληνά = γαλήνην at *Or.* 279), which could have been corrupted first to εὖ διάγοντα.[35]

The neat pattern of *three* divided δs can now be appreciated. Note that Amphitryon's ἆ ἆ (×–, cf. *Or.* 145) balances οἴμοι, thus in a sense completing his own dochmius after the intervention; and the Chorus' sentence behaves similarly (φο῀νο῀ϲ ο῀ϲο῀ϲ (or ὅϲον?) ὅδε᾽...κε῀χῠ–|με῀νο῀ϲ ε῀πα῀ντε῀λλει).

1053–8. A different lineation again seems preferable:

AM. οὐκ ἀτρεμαῖα θρῆνον αἰάξετ᾽, ὦ
γέροντεϲ; ἢ δέϲμ᾽ ἀνεγειρόμενος
χαλάϲαϲ ἀπολεῖ πόλιν,   1055
ἀπὸ δὲ πατέρα μέλαθρά τε καταρρήξει.

XO. ἀδύνατ᾽ ἀδύνατά †μοι (×–)†.

1053–5 is usually treated as two catalectic iam. dims. (with an unwanted pause at θρῆνον), followed by ––◡◡–◡◡–◡◡–◡◡–◡–. Rather (as above) Amphitryon begins and ends with 2δ verses: ᾰτρε῀μαῐᾰ, not ᾱτρ-, cf. *Or.* 147 ῐδ᾽, ᾰτρε῀μαῐο῀ν ῶϲ | ... The

---

[33] See T. C. W. Stinton, 'Pause and Period in the Lyrics of Greek Tragedy', *CQ* n.s. 27 (1977), 27–66. To the rule enunciated on p. 40 ('pendant close followed by short or anceps can never coincide with word-overlap or elision') he admitted some exceptions, but none remotely supporting an exception here. The reizianum is rightly defined as ×–◡◡–× by M. L. West on pp. xii and 199 of his *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), though not on p. 30 (cf. my review in *JHS* 104 (1984), 227).

[34] Reiske's is not the only published emendation, but I refrain from giving fresh currency to the others listed by Prinz–Wecklein.

[35] The emphasis is on the paired n. pl. words, which together characterize Heracles' condition as 'calm' and 'sleep-like'. To govern them, the colourless verb ἄγειν is at least as suitable as ἰαύειν (properly 'pass the night'; *Ph.* 1538 is a more natural extension from that, *pace* Bond, than the supposed use here). Note that, with ἰαύονθ᾽, the n. pls are adverbial, not substantival. Is there a parallel for an -ώδης adjective used thus?

intervening enoplian sequence combines an *ia D* colon like *Phaethon* 272 (ἄν' αἰθέρ',
ἦ γᾶc ὑπὸ κεῦθοc ἀφᾱντόν : ...) with the unit ∪∪–∪∪–∪– (cf. 1037, 1080).[36]

In 1058 Diggle's οἴμοι for -ά μοι looks plausible, but *resolved* ithyphallics do not
seem to occur in 'enoplian dochmiac' contexts. ⟨ἰώ μοί⟩ μοι would be better. Either
that, or something simple like μοι ⟨λέγειc⟩ or more recherché like μ' ἀπύειc (as
Or. 1253), would give a *2ia* verse of the favourite pattern ∪ ∪∪ ∪ ∪∪ ∪ : ∪∪∪– (some-
times with the dragged cadence ... : –×–), as *Or.* 171/192, 1253/1273, etc.

1064–71. 'Antiphonal lament' and 'false alarm':

XO.	cτέναζέ νυν...	
AM.	cτενάζω.	
XO.	τέκνων ὄλεθρον...	
AM.	οἴμοι.	1065
XO.	cέθεν τε παιδόc...	
AM.	αἰαῖ.	
XO.	ὦ πρέcβυ...	
AM.	cῖγα cῖγα, παλίντροποc ἐξε-	
	γειρόμενοc cτρέφεται·	
	φέρ', ἀπόκρυφα δέμαc ὑπὸ μέλαθρον κρύψω.	1070
XO.	θάρcει· νὺξ ἔχει βλέφαρα παιδὶ cῶι.	

1069 φέρ', ἀπόκρυφα scripsi: φέρ' ἀπόκρυφον L

There should be three (not, as in Diggle/Bond, four) catalectic iambic dimeters
divided between the Chorus and Amphitryon. Thrice Amphitryon adds a catalectic
close to the Chorus' open-ended phrase, but each time the Chorus continue their
sentence.[37] Then the pattern changes with the change of theme. There is no period-
end at cῖ γᾰ cῖ γᾰ (cf. 1042, *Or.* 140, 182), as the metre shifts into the enoplian
sequence ∪D∪D, after the pattern of the iambelegus (cf. 1082–3 δἰ ὦκέ τέ· φεῦγέ τέ
μᾱργὸν : ἀνδρ' ἐπέγειρόμενόν, and further below on 1072–8; note the overlap
...μηcέ-|ται...there). There is no need, then, for Diggle's ἐξ⟨επ⟩εγειρόμενοc.

1069–70. The vulgate...cτρέφέται· φέρε, ‖ ...(after Wilamowitz) unendurably
misplaces the period-end. 'Hortatory' and analogous uses of φέρε occur normally at
the beginning of a metrical unit – never at the end, and never with hiatus. The usual
comma is conventional, not indicative of pause; cf. *Tr.* 1282 φέρ' ἐc πυρὰν δράμωμεν,
Cyc. 152, 492, 557, 568, *Su.* 1159, *H.F.* 529, 1060, *Ph.* 276, *Or.* 1281, *Ba.* 1106,
etc.

Retaining ἀπόκρυφον, the verse ∪∪∪–∪∪∪∪∪––– might then be defended as
2ia + mol or *kδ δ* (a familiar issue, cf. *Or.* 1247/1267, *Hel.* 628);[38] but ἀπόκρυφα is
a very easy correction (of an error natural before δέμαc): adverbial n. pl. like *Ph.*
336 cκότια κρύπτεται. Note that -κρυφ- ...κρύψω is not objectionably tautologous.
The point of the cognate adverb, with intensive ἀπο-, is that the rest of the sentence
might merely be a way of saying 'Come, let me go within' (cf. *Or.* 1107).

---

[36] The favourite unit ∪∪–∪∪–∪– (related to the telesillean, but also behaving like ∪–∪–,
∪–∪∪–∪∪– and ∪∪–∪∪–∪∪–∪∪–) is *T* in my notation; see *comm. Or.* pp. xxi, 113, 288. 1080
Ταφίων περίκλυcτον ἄ-|cτυ πέρcαc is *T ba* (clausular), analogous to *A ba* at 1197
πολυμοχθότερον πολυπλαγκτότερόν τε θνατῶν.

[37] For the pattern of this exchange, D. J. Mastronarde in *Contact and Discontinuity*
(Berkeley, 1979), p. 61, compares *Alc.* 872–5/889–92 and *Tr.* 1229–30.

[38] *Comm. Or.* p. 288; cf. also *Hec.* 1084, and Barrett on *Hipp.* 593.

1072-8. Amphitryon justifies the apparent timidity of his desire for flight and concealment:

> AM. ὁρᾶθ᾽ ὁρᾶτε, τὸ φάος ἐκ-
> λιπεῖν μὲν ἐπὶ κακοῖσιν οὐ
> φεύγω τάλας,
> ἀλλ᾽ εἴ με κανεῖ πατέρ᾽ ὄντα,   1075
> πρὸς δὲ κακοῖς κακὰ μήσε-
> ται πρὸς Ἐρινύσι θ᾽ αἷμα
> ϲυγγόνων ἕξει.

1078 ϲυγγόνων scripsi: ϲύγγονον L

ὁρᾶθ᾽ ὁρᾶτε, a standard rhetorical idiom for drawing attention to a present 'truth', is exactly equivalent here to 'Look you'. The truth about which the Chorus are to make no mistake is: 'I am not afraid to *die* in these calamitous circumstances (though I am indeed running away), but (I *am* afraid) in case...'. The double-edged use of (οὐ) φεύγω complicates the thought, but the point is clear enough. I do not understand why Bond says: '"look out", "be careful", is the sense required for what follows'.

Rhetorically, the principal break in the long sentence is before ἀλλ᾽, and it is natural therefore to end a verse after the run of *5ia*. At the same time, however, there is metrical continuity in that the sentence as a whole is a compoundly expanded iambelegus (*ia×D*, cf. 1068), beginning with *5ia* and continued with a characteristic extended enoplian sequence $-D\cup : D\cup D\cup : -\cup--- $ (cf. $D\cup : D\cup :D$ at 1199–1201).

The clausula with ϲῠγγŏνŏν ē̆ξει (L, edd.) is as abnormal in 'enoplian dochmiacs' as the clausula with ϲῡγγŏνῶν ē̆ξει is typical: cf. 898 Λύϲϲα βακχεύϲει, 909 ἐϲ δόμουϲ πέμπειϲ, *Tr.* 283 φωτὶ δουλεύειν, 285-6 διπτύχωι γλώϲϲαι, *Ion* 1509 ἐκ κακῶν, ὦ παῖ, *Phaethon* 274 ἐξαμαυρωθῶ.

πρὸς Ἐρινύϲι αἱμ- ϲυγγ- is simply equivalent (as Bond argues, after Klotz) to 'further Erinyes', balancing πρὸς κακοῖϲ κακά ('further evils'). In effect, ἄλλο is to be understood with αἷμα, or ἄλλων with ϲυγγόνων. For the idiom with indefinite gen. pl., where Amphitryon might simply have said αἷμα πατρός, cf. *Or.* 97 πρὸς φίλων...τάφον ('to the tomb of a φίλος'), 819 τοκέων...τέμνειν...χρόα ('of a parent'), *Med.* 594 λέκτρα βαϲιλέων ('marriage with royalty'). ϲυγγόνων is also indefinite in that the ϲυγγένεια is not straightforwardly parental, if Heracles is (also) the son of Zeus.

Highgate, London   C. W. WILLINK