

THE REUNION DUO IN EURIPIDES' *HELEN*¹

ME. ὦ ποθινὸς ἡμέρα,
 ὥς <ς> εἰς ἐμὰς ἔδωκεν ὠλένας λαβεῖν.
 EL. ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν Μενέλεως, ὁ μὲν χρόνος 625
 παλαιός, ἡ δὲ τέρψις ἀρτίως πάρα·
 ἔλαβον ἀσμένια πόσιν ἐμόν, φίλαι,
 περί τ' ἐπέτασα χέρα φίλιον ἐν μακρᾷ
 φλογὶ φαεσφόρῳι.

So begins one of the most engaging, and variously controversial, musical scenes in Euripides.² The Messenger's narrative of the Phantom Helen's disappearance has proved to Menelaus that the Helen standing before him is the *real* Helen, altogether innocent of elopement to Troy, from whom he has been sundered for seventeen laborious years. The ensuing embrace is developed in a duet (*Hel.* 625–59) which is followed without a break by the so-called 'Interrogation' (660–97), the two together constituting the so-called 'Recognition Duo'.

There was a vogue in the years around 412 B.C. for musical scenes following an ἀναγνώρισις. The plots of *Ion* and *Hypsipyle* feature recognitions between mother and son(s); and there are brother–sister recognitions in *Iphigenia in Tauris* and Sophocles' *Electra*.³ All these are followed by partly sung sequences which afford important parallels. At the same time we should not be surprised to find some special features in this scene. Here alone is the reunion conjugal, following an ἀναγνώρισις of persons separated as adults; and the *personae*, an untraditionally chaste Helen and her famously uxorious husband, are anything but 'typical'.

A favourite technique in such *amoibaia* gives all the singing to one performer, while the other's utterances are either trimeters (usually single trimeters) or such fragments of divided lyric verses as could equally feature in spoken ἀντιλαβή. This is a common pattern in late fifth-century tragedy, and may be conveniently termed 'punctuated monody', defined as follows: the musical passage, as a short or extended unit of composition, begins and ends with the opening and concluding lyrics of the monodist,

¹ I am much indebted to Dr J. Diggle, both for positive suggestions and for criticisms which have prompted some changes of view and several reformulations of arguments.

² Numerous conjectures are reported in the Prinz–Wecklein edition (Bd. I 6 ed. N. Wecklein, 1898). More recent editions are: A. C. Pearson (Cambridge, 1903), N. Wecklein (Leipzig/Berlin, 1907), G. Murray (OCT vol. iii, 1909, 1913), G. Italie (Groningen, 1949), A. Y. Campbell (Liverpool, 1950), H. Grégoire (Paris, 1950), K. Alt (Teubner edn, 1964), A. M. Dale (Oxford, 1967), R. Kannicht (Heidelberg, 1969). Other studies referred to by author's name only are: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921), pp. 561–6; G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 211–48; H. Lloyd-Jones, review of Zuntz in *CR* 16 (1966), 158; R. Schmiel, 'The Recognition Duo in Euripides *Helen*', *Hermes* 100 (1972), 274–94; D. C. C. Young, 'The Text of the Recognition Duet in Euripides' *Helena*', *GRBS* 15 (1974), 39–56; J. Diggle, 'On the *Helen* of Euripides' in *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies...presented to Sir Denys Page...* (Cambridge, 1978), 159–77. W. Biehl explores the Duo's metrical patterns in *Helikon* 20–21 (1980–1 [1983]), 257–92, but his metric is as unconvincing as his textual decisions.

³ For the points of contact, see K. Matthiessen, *Elektra, Taurische Iphigenie und Helena* (Göttingen, 1964), pp. 134–8. For the late dating of Sophocles' *Electra* (after E. *El.* and not long before S. *Phil.*), cf. my commentary on *Orestes* (hereafter referred to as 'comm. Or. p....' or 'comm. on Or....'), Introd. p. lvi n. 91.

whose utterances in it are *entirely sung* – framed between, as well as punctuated by, the contrasting spoken utterances of another actor or the chorus-leader.⁴

This pattern needs to be sharply distinguished from that of passages involving two singing actors or singing actor(s) and singing chorus (which may include spoken lines).⁵ There are few extant instances of true ‘duets’ for two actors; but it is evident, *prima facie*, that *Hel.* 625–59 (the ‘Embrace’) is differently structured, as well as different in tone, from 660–97 (the ‘Interrogation’). The latter obeys in every particular the rules enunciated above for ‘punctuated monody’. The former breaks them by giving spoken, as well as sung, utterance to Helen; by giving sung, as well as spoken, utterance to Menelaus; and in the use of *mixed* utterance, moving from speech to song without speaker-change.

There is a precedent for this in the opening lines of the *I.T.* ‘Reunion Duo’ (827ff.), if we accept the transmitted speaker-assignments there:

- IΦ.* ὦ φίλτατ', οὐδὲν ἄλλο, φίλτατος γὰρ εἶ,
 ἔχω σ', Ὀρέστα,†τηλύγετον χθονὸς ἀπὸ πατρίδος
 Ἀργόθεν, ὦ φίλος†. 830
- OP.* κἀγὼ σέ, τὴν θανούσαν ὡς δοξάζεται·
 κατὰ δὲ δάκρυ(α), κατὰ δὲ γόος ἅμα χαρᾷ
 τὸ σὸν νοτίζει βλέφαρον, ὡσαύτως δ' ἔμῳν.
- IΦ.* †τὸ δέ τι† βρέφος ἔλιπον...

Like Helen, Iphigenia begins with a spoken address (ὦ φίλτατ'...), before breaking into song.⁶ Orestes responds in the ‘Embrace’ with a verse like *Hel.* 658,⁷ and continues with another appropriately responsive sentence: ‘... and I, like you, am weeping with joy’. Then Iphigenia takes over with an aria (834–99), punctuated five times in its earlier part by Orestes’ single trimeters. 832–3 are sometimes transferred to Iphigenia, in order that she may do all the singing;⁸ but that somewhat spoils the sequence of thought (the connection, across Orestes’ intervention, between 829–30 and 834ff.);⁹ and, though it may normalize Orestes’ part by reducing it to single trimeters, it does not bring Iphigenia’s into line with the normal pattern of ‘punctuated monody’ – changing, as it does, from speech to song, and back from

⁴ Cf. also *Alc.* 244–72 (Alcestis, Admetus), *Andr.* 825–65 (Hermione, Nurse), *Tro.* 235–92 (Hecuba, Talthybius), *H.F.* 1178–1201 (Amphitryon, Theseus), *Ph.* 103–92 (Antigone, Paedagogus). The list can be greatly extended with exx. where the interlocutor is the chorus-leader, the longest being the Phrygian’s aria in *Or.* (1369–1502).

⁵ Two singing actors: *Hec.* 177–215 (Polyxena, Hecuba), *El.* 1177–1232 (a trio with chorus, on the model of *A. Ch.* 315–465). The exx. are too few for the formulation of rules; but there are a number of analogies if we include duets for actor and chorus (e.g. *Or.* 1246–86, which has speech and song for both parties).

⁶ Diggle...τηλύγετον <σύμενον>|χθονὸς ἀπο<πρὸ> πατρίδος Ἀργόθεν, ὦ φίλος (28). But I include 830 within the obeli, suspecting that the terminal φίλος, anticlimactic after ὦ φίλτατ'...φίλτατος, may conceal ΦΑΟΣ, cf. *Ion* 1439, *S. El.* 1224, etc. (see below). τηλύγετον (‘latest-born’) πατρίδος φάος would be a plausible phrase; but it is hard to know what other words to add or subtract.

⁷ Against Diggle, I accent σέ here (‘et ego te’), as also in *Hel.* 630 and 658; and I put the comma before, not after, τὴν θανούσαν.

⁸ Bauer; so Diggle. D. J. Mastronarde (*Contact and Discontinuity* [Berkeley, 1978], p. 56) prefers the transfer of 832 only (Lohmann, Maas); but all his parallels have syntax split between two singers. Monodists never (so far as I am aware) leave their syntax to be completed by a speaking interlocutor, though their sentences may be variously broken into or supplemented. He seems to have overlooked *Hel.* 659 in objecting to ‘the anomaly of a lyric line in the male role in the duet’ (also a dochmiac dimeter, and similarly in an embrace).

⁹ Coordination with a relative pronoun is conjectural in 834, but rightly regarded as probable by Diggle, who proposes δὲν ἔτι (after Bergk τὸν ἔτι).

song to speech, in mid sentence. No other argument commends the transfer, and we may properly take the view that Orestes is as entitled to his brief moment of emotional dochmiac utterance here as the otherwise silent Pylades is to his moment of speech at *A. Ch.* 900–2. Orestes is by no means a stolid person; and an embrace with bilateral ‘tears’ and ‘joy’ is a particular kind of action that invites – however briefly – a certain formal symmetry.

Like Orestes in *I.T.*, Menelaus in *Helen* is ‘not elsewhere in the play a singing character’ (Dale). But that certainly does not debar *him* from having a partly sung role in the ‘Embrace’ that precedes the ‘Interrogation’. The first half of the Duo ends with symmetrical antiphony (656–9):¹⁰

ΕΛ. τί φῶ; τίς ἂν τὰδ' ἤλπισεν βροτῶν ποτε;
 ἀδόκητον ἔχω σε πρὸς στέρνοισ.
ΜΕ. κάγω σέ, τὴν δοκοῦσαν Ἰδαίαν πόλιν
 μολεῖν Ἰλίου τε μελέους πύργου.

The ‘Interrogation’, with its different distribution of speech and song, then begins at 660:

ΕΛ. πρὸς θεῶν, δόμων πῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ἀπεστάλης; 660
 ἔξ· πικρὰς ἐς ἀρχὰς βαίνει·
 ἔξ· πικρὰν δ' ἐρευνᾷς φάτιν.
ΜΕ. λέγ', ὡς ἀκουστὰ πάντα δῶρα δαιμόνων.

There is a striking similarity, unlikely to be fortuitous, between 658–60 and *I.T.* 831–3; but note the rather different function of 660 as a self-contained question between the much longer Embrace-duet and Helen’s ‘punctuated monody’.

Having established that this Duo is bipartite with contrasting and differently structured sections, I defer further consideration of the ‘Interrogation’, in which there are interesting problems of detail, but no major structural issues. The speaker-assignments in 660–97 are, or should be, uncontroversial: Helen has all the lyric verses there (except for brief interventions in *ἀντιλαβή*); Menelaus has all the spoken (single-line) verses.¹¹

What now of the ‘Embrace’ duet (625–59)? This far surpasses all other tragic embraces in length: the lovers are still explicitly interlocked at 657–8, and the moment for separation is evidently at 660. I repeat that it is also unique in its happy *conjugal* sentiment and in the atypical characters who express it. The usual tendency of recent editors has been to deny Menelaus song whenever they can; but the arguments for that approach are fallacious – leaning on ‘parallels’ that are not parallel, and on the irrelevant consideration that Menelaus does not sing elsewhere in the play.¹² Rather, given that Menelaus unquestionably has a partly singing role in this duet (no one denies him lyric verses at 637 and 659), it is reasonable to look for some kind of antiphonal balance throughout the ‘Embrace’ (both performers having some spoken, some sung verses); though we shall not be surprised if we find some qualitative differences in Helen’s lyrics and sentiments.

¹⁰ The pattern is spoilt, *pace* Kannicht and Lloyd-Jones, by Kretschmar’s transfer of 656 to Men. (in conjunction with Lachmann’s wrong assignment of 654–5 to Helen). L’s assignments are correct here, as argued further below.

¹¹ Diggle rightly defends the assignment of 692–3 to Helen (see below); but his statement ‘Menelaus does not sing lyrics in this duet’ needed more exact formulation (either ‘in 660–97’ or ‘enoplian verses’).

¹² Zuntz refers no less irrelevantly to Men.’s ‘deuteragonist’ role. Many tragic persons sing in one scene only, including ‘second actor’ male persons (e.g. Theseus in *Hipp.*), and the second actor does all the solo singing in *Or.* (Electra, the Phrygian). Conversely, Ion does not sing in the *Ion* duo, though he *is* a singing character elsewhere.

At 623–4 Menelaus hails the day as *ποθεινός* for having given Helen into his arms. His happy exclamation mirrors Helen's lamenting cry *ὦ μέλεος ἀμέρα* at 335.¹³ As at *Or.* 1045 and 1082 (*ὦ ποθεινόν...*), the sense is not, or not simply, '*desiderata*'. Menelaus has not in fact been 'longing for' this second reunion. *πόθος* can be simply 'love'; but it is essentially that part of 'love' or 'desire' that manifests itself in tears and a lump in the throat (cf. the reference to *δάκρυα* and *γόος ἄμα χαρᾷ* at *I.T.* 832). It is present *πόθος* with which Menelaus is mainly concerned, though he is also alluding to the long separation. 624 then explains the exclamation¹⁴ and leads into the 'Embrace'.

Earlier Helen had attempted to embrace Menelaus, but was rebuffed (566–7): *ΕΛ.* *ὦ χρόνιος ἐλθὼν κῆς δάμαρτος ἐς χέρας.* | *ΜΕ.* *ποίας δάμαρτος; μὴ θίγῃς ἐμῶν πέπλων.* 623–4 reflects 566 (in reverse), but does not imply that Menelaus immediately clasps Helen; rather, that he here turns towards her (in 622–3a she is still *τῆρδε*), in preparation for a stylized action which is extended over several lines of speech and song.

625–9. Helen takes her cue from *ποθεινός ἡμέρα ... εἰς ... ὠλένας λαβεῖν*, addressing Menelaus with happy love and contrasting 'old time' with 'newly present delight'; then, addressing the Chorus,¹⁵ she breaks into dochmiac song (a run of 5δ), expressing her joy in the recovery of her husband and in the spreading of a loving arm (*χέρα*) about him 'at long last'. The sentence is bipartite (2δ + 3δ, like 676–8), but a unit in that the ideas 'joyfully' and 'at long last' are common (*ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*) to the two clauses. The neat correction *περί τ' ἐπέτασα* (Hermann, for *περιπετάσασα*) has been challenged as 'unnecessary', on the ground that *υυυυ-υυυ* is a possible dochmius (*kδ*).¹⁶ But it should be accepted, as normalizing the third dochmius in the run of five; as restoring syntactical, as well as metrical, symmetry with 638–9 *περί δὲ γυνία χέρας ἔβαλον...*; and as slightly enhancing the sense: the embrace is treated as a separately described action, not as a 'coincident' epexegetis of the statement *ἔλαβον ἀσμένε πόσιν ἐμόν. ἔλαβον*, with *ἀσμένε*, can then have the force *ἀνέλαβον* 'I have recovered'.¹⁷ The error could be merely transcriptional (*τε* omitted before *πε*, then *-αααα* written for *-αα*); but the participle gives good enough sense to have been transmitted from antiquity as a false iambicizing variant. This is a phenomenon with several exact parallels: an apparent '*kδ + δ*' verse which *may* have been interpreted thus in later antiquity, but which is more likely to have been understood as *2ia + cr*, or simply as a kind of iambic trimeter.¹⁸ *Hipp.* 593 *τὰ κρυπτά †γάρ† πέφηνε, διὰ δ'*

¹³ *Leg.* *ὦ μέλεος ἀμέρα*? *ὦ* for exclamatory *ὦ* is a frequent error (*comm. Or.* pp. 140, 244, 362); and *-υυυ|υ-* (cretic-paeonic) is likelier than either *υ-υυυ|υ-* or *υ-υυ|υ-υ-* (cf. T. C. W. Stinton, *BICS* 22 (1975), 88ff.).

¹⁴ *ὦς <ς>* Brodaeus (Porson's *ὦς εἰς ἐμάς <ς>*) is no better). Canter's *ῆς*, preferred by Murray and Dale, may seem more natural. But *ὦς* is likely to be right. Kannicht cites *Ba.* 130; but for close causal-exclamatory parallels cf. *Or.* 90 *ὦ μέλεος ἡ τεκούσα θ', ὥς ἀπώλετο*, and *ibid.* 130 *θεοὶ σε μισήσαν, ὥς μ' ἀπώλεσας* '...for having (thus) destroyed me' (with *comm.*).

¹⁵ A conventional feature, cf. *I.T.* 842, *S. El.* 1281. Young neglected the parallels ('she plays to the gallery of the chorus...').

¹⁶ So Kannicht (also Young), with appeals to Dale's *Lyric Metres* (2nd edn, pp. 115f.) and N. C. Conomis, 'The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama', *Hermes* 92 (1964), 23–50, at 28–30. Dale herself had no doubt here ('the syllables must all be short'). The time is ripe for a reassessment of the 'dochmius kaibelianus' in tragedy; cf. n. 19 below.

¹⁷ Cf. *comm.* on *Or.* 1502 *ἔλαβε τὸν Ἐλένα γάμον* (and *ibid.* 1565; Collard on *Su.* 536); for the combination with *ἀσμενος*, cf. *Or.* 776 (with *comm.*).

¹⁸ That hypothesis is consistent with L's erroneous verse-division here after *χέρα φίλιον*; see n. 56 below.

ὄλλυται is a typical case in point.¹⁹ There is good reason for believing that metrical misinterpretation (usually iambicizing) of dochmiacs had a damaging effect on the text in antiquity, even in some places before 200 B.C.; see further below on 634–5, 638–9, 650–1, 661–2, 666, 670–1, 689–90, 694–5.

ἐν μακρᾷ φλογί φραεσφόρῳι: a striking modification of the ordinary (ἐν) μακρῶι (or πολλῶι) χρόνῳι (S. *El.* 1272–3, etc.); not simply as ornate poeticism, but making a point of the 'light-bringing' quality of the 'day' to which Menelaus has alluded. 'Day' and 'time' (Helen has just used the word χρόνος) can be equated, e.g. *Rh.* 389, S. *Aj.* 622; likewise 'day' and 'sun' (cf. 652). The metaphorical point is guaranteed by passages such as *Ion* 1439 and S. *El.* 1224.²⁰ Greeks counted the night as belonging to the following day, and the idea of a single continuum ('former τύχη') leading up to the present 'happy dawn' will be developed by Helen in 638–41 and 643–5.

630–5. Menelaus responds, and the duet proceeds. From here onwards the evidence of L is supplemented, with tantalizing incompleteness, by that of a first-century B.C. papyrus (Π).²¹

<p>ME. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ πολλοὺς δ' ἐν μέσῳ λόγους ἔχων, οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποῖον πρῶτον ἄρξωμαι τὰ νῦν· [—] γέγηθα, κρατὶ δ' ὀρθίους ἐθείρας ἀνεπτέρῳσα καὶ δάκρυ σταλάσσω· περὶ δὲ γυνὴ χέρας ἔβαλον, ἥδονάν 〈⋮⋮⋮〉 ὥς λάβω.</p>	<p>630 635</p>
--	---

The speaker-assignments in L, mostly indicated by *paragraphoi*, are no more to be relied on here than in 638–47 below. I propose to continue 632–5 to Menelaus, for the following reasons. (a) 634–5 περὶ δὲ γυνὴ χέρας ἔβαλον... is then *antiphonal* to 628–9 περὶ τ' ἐπέτασα χέρα φίλιον..., not a mere repetition. As things stand, Helen does the same thing twice, using virtually the same words and rhythm. Now, more effectively, the performers symmetrically embrace each other; and the pattern of the opening exchange, with both performers breaking into song after a spoken distich, is similar to that of the concluding exchange of the 'Embrace' (see above). Note that the latter echoes the former also in the repetition of καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ (there *sc.* ἀδόκητον ἔχω πρὸς στέρνοις, here *sc.* ἔλαβον ἀσμενος). (b) There is then a speaker-change before Helen sings ὦ πόσις· ὦ φιλάτα πρόσοψις (636, see below), and we no longer have a lame appendage to the dochmiac period in 634–5. [There is little excuse, *pace* Dale, Lloyd-Jones and Kannicht, for adhering, against Zuntz, to Elmsley's transposition... ἥδονάν, | ὦ πόσις, ὥς λάβω. | ME. ὦ φιλάτα... It is virtually certain that Π, like L, had ω ποσις] ω φιλάτα προσοψις in 636, and virtually certain therefore that the dochmius in 635, as edited by Aristophanes of Byzantium, had something other than ω ποσις before ως λαβω.]

Resistance to the proposed transfer can be expected, since the singing of 632ff. by Helen has hitherto been regarded as a datum. The general assumption seems to have been that, with or without Elmsley's ὦ πόσις before ὥς λάβω, the content of 632–5 is uniquely suited to Helen, and that she naturally takes over when Menelaus declares that he does not know what to say. According to Zuntz's interpretation (*Inquiry*, p. 247) 'Helen's mind is at first all centred on the present, while Menelaus's remains fixed upon the past', and 'it would be impossible for him to plunge into unreserved acceptance of the perplexing present before he has mastered the past in its light'; 'his

¹⁹ See Barrett (who favours τὰ κρύπτ' ἐκ-). For other suspect instances (*Hec.* 1083–4, *H.F.* 1070, *Or.* 330/345, 1247/1267), see *comm. Or.* pp. 138, 288 and *CQ* 38 (1988), 96.

²⁰ Cf. D. Tarrant, 'Greek Metaphors of Light', *CQ* 10 (1960), 181–7.

²¹ P. Oxy. 2336, ed. C. H. Roberts in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 22 (1954), 107; see Zuntz, pp. 217ff. and pl. xvi.

first words in the present scene (vv. 630f.)...indicate that between him and the acceptance of this moment there stand “words”, pressing to be uttered; words that would clarify the past and thereby make the present attainable’. That, if right, would certainly exclude the singing of 632–5 by Menelaus. But it is plainly wrong. Such a ‘reserved’ Menelaus could never have initiated the ‘Embrace’ with the words ὦ ποθαινός ἡμέρα, | ὥς (or ἦ) εἴς ἐμὰς ἔδωκεν ὠλένας λαβεῖν (of which Zuntz and Schmiel nowhere take any account).²² As to the sense of 630–1 and 632–5, we must now analyse these lines more closely.

630–1. κἀγὼ cé: *sc.* ἔλαβον ἄσμενος ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ. πολλοὺς δ’...τὰ νῦν: the rhetorical idiom is reminiscent of *Med.* 376–7 πολλὰς δ’ ἔχονσα θανασίμους αὐτοῖς ὁδοῦς, | οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅποιαί πρῶτον ἐγγχειρῶ, φίλαι, which is *not* followed by a speaker-change.²³ The fact that Menelaus here ‘does not know what λόγος to begin with’ by no means commits him to silence.²⁴ The ‘many λόγοι’ certainly include *questions* (many of the thousand-and-one things that reunited lovers have to say to one another are of an interrogative nature); but they are *not* barriers between him and acceptance of what he has already accepted in 622–4. λόγοι are ἐν μέσῳ when they are available for, or currently under, discussion (see Pearson on 944; Zuntz leans in vain on *Or.* 16 and *Med.* 819 for his interpretation). With his mind fastened on the present (τὰ νῦν) and on the tangible presence of the real Helen, Menelaus *defers the posing of questions* until 660ff. (the ‘Interrogation’), and breaks instead into lyric utterance, describing first his non-rational emotions and then his action and immediate desire (‘to grasp pleasure’).

632–3. Pairs of catalectic trimeters are sung by Creusa at *Ion* 1463–4 and 1492–3 in a context of punctuated monody. The similar pair here is a bridge between Menelaus’ spoken distich and his antiphonal dochmiacs. His next utterances will be in a similar rhythm, moving into bacchiac (636a–7, 641a–2a, see below). With the perfect γέγηθα, expressing the dominant emotion of joy (γηθοσύνη), are associated two physical symptoms, φρίκη and δάκρυα. For the former, cf. Jebb on *S. Aj.* 693 ἔφριξ’ ἔρωτι, περιχαρὴς δ’ ἀνεπτάμαν (sung by the chorus of Salaminian sailors). The ‘erect hair’ motif is more normally associated with φόβος (*A. S.c.T.* 564, *S. O.C.* 1623–5, the latter in the presence of the supernatural). ἀνεπτέρωκα here is a vivid brachylogy, equivalent to ἔτρησα ἀναπτρωθεῖς (ἰστάναι as in the *S.c.T.* and *O.C.* passages; normally the emotion ἀναπτεροῖ the person). [There is little to choose between the readings -ωκα (**II**) and -ωκα (**L**); but *ceteris paribus* the more anciently attested reading is to be preferred. The aorist is certainly idiomatic (as in *S. Aj.* 693), and the combination of aorist and present (-κα καὶ...σταλάσσω) is a stylistic feature supported by the parallel in 673 (-κα καὶ...ὑγραίνω). L’s -ωκα is sufficiently accounted for as an error influenced by the preceding γέγηθα].²⁵

It should not be insisted that this emotional language is apter to Helen. There is ‘tearful joy’ and πόθος on both sides (as in *I.T.* 832–3); but it is Menelaus for whom the circumstances of the reunion have been such as to cause the greater *shock*, with

²² Schmiel in general follows Zuntz, but goes further: his Menelaus is denied any ‘terms of endearment’ (276), and at the end of the Duo ‘there has been no reconciliation’ (280); cf. n. 65 below.

²³ As argued in *CQ* 38 (1988), 314, *Med.* 377 should be followed, after a pause, by a *direct* question (πότερον ὑφάψω...).

²⁴ Cf. also the standard rhetorical hesitation ‘How shall I begin?’ (as old as Homer; Denniston on *El.* 907–8 cites *Od.* 9.14).

²⁵ It may be that corruption of κ to ε is commoner than the reverse; but that is a slight consideration. Lloyd-Jones censures Zuntz’s ‘bias in favour of the papyrus’; but bias in favour of L would be more reprehensible.

symptoms of 'awe' akin to those of terror. It is barely a dozen lines since he learnt of the supernatural disappearance of the Helen he had recovered at Troy, and there is still much that he (unlike Helen) does not understand. We cannot, or should not, expect the ordinary Greek conventions of masculine self-control *vis-à-vis* women to apply to Menelaus *vis-à-vis* Helen; a man traditionally open to the slur of 'unmanliness' for his uxorious susceptibility to Helen's charms.²⁶

Rather, we can now begin to appreciate how Euripides has dramatized in this duet the overmastering emotions appropriate to Menelaus' astonishing reunion, in untraditional circumstances, with the real – and blameless – 'daughter of Zeus and Leda', his beloved wife. His traditional *persona*, including his uxoriousness, is reinterpreted, not forgotten, in this play – not without some piquant irony implicit in the abnormal presentation of both Helen and Menelaus as 'good' characters. The emotional lyrics given to the latter are in line with that; at the same time the proprieties are observed, in that any 'eroticism' in the embrace is subordinate to sentiments of *φιλία* (καγὼ cé...in reply to ὦ φίλτατ'), tearful *πόθος* (cf. ποθεινός 623) and 'awe'.

634–5. Whereas L has *περὶ δὲ γυῖα χεῖρας ἔβαλον | ἡδονὰν ὥς λάβω*, Π has [*περὶ δὲ γυῖα χεῖρας ἐβ[αλ(λ)ον | ἡδονη[3–4]c ὡς λαβω*]. Both are evidently imperfect: L has an iambicized lineation (2*tr* | 2*cr*), with *χεῖρας* for *χέρας* and the loss of something after *ἡδονάν*; Π attests the correct dochmiac lineation, but appears to have suffered a similar iambicizing corruption in 634 (*εβαλλον* for *εβαλον*) and further corruption of *ἡδοναν* to *ἡδονη(ι)*. Zuntz rightly insists that we need *ἡδονάν* as the object of *λάβω*, comparing *I.T.* 842 and *Ion* 1449.

Zuntz considers a number of 4- and 5-letter words that might fit the space, none very convincing.²⁷ *ἡδονάν* | <τύχας> ὥς λάβω is perhaps the least implausible. But, as with all his suggestions, Π's *ἡδονη(ι)* is left unexplained. It hardly seems likely that this reflects a misinterpretation '...with pleasure that I may grasp the τύχαι', and we have to attribute the omission of *N* to irrational, uncorrected carelessness.

The proposed assignation to Menelaus opens new doors. The sentence now needs to end with a statement of action and purpose antiphonally appropriate to *him*, following the points made in 630–1 and 632–3. What is needed to complete the sense is something conveying, in one way or another, the point 'without reservations'; cf. *Or.* 1047–8, where Orestes surrenders to an emotional embrace, abandoning 'manly' αἰδώς, saying τί γὰρ ἔτ' αἰδοῦμαι τάλας; <πάντως> would make sense ('regardless of other considerations'), but neither fits the space nor accounts for *ἡδονη(ι)*. Adverbs, however, are not the only possibility. What about a participle? Several compounds of ἵημι have intransitive uses, with 'letting go' as the root idea; and [ανει]c, [εφει]c and [υφει]c are all just the right length. The false *ἡδονη(ι)* at once becomes credible as an ancient variant (even with hiatus at verse-end), in the light of expressions like ἔδρασαν πάντ' ἑφέντες ἡδονῇ (fr. 564).²⁸ My vote here would go to ἀνεῖc, which has the special merit of accounting for the skip in L between -αν and ὥς. For 'letting go (the reins)', cf. *S. El.* 721–2 δεξιὸν δ' ἀνεῖc χειραῖον ἵππον. The intrans. sense here would be close to, but more 'active' than, the standard ἀνεμῖμένος 'unconstrained'.

²⁶ The negative view of 'the famous husband', as developed in *Andr.* 456ff., 590ff., 629–31, surely has an ancient heritage (*Il.* 17.588 μαλθακός αἰχμητής, *Ilias Parva* fr. 17, Ibycus 296 Page), alongside more heroic views of Menelaus' martial prowess; cf. comm. on *Or.* 682–716, 742, 754.

²⁷ For criticisms of Zuntz's suggestions, see Dale, Lloyd-Jones and Kannicht.

²⁸ Cf. also *Ph.* 21 ἡδονῇ δούc (codd.; ὕδούc Markland), *Pl. Phaedr.* 250e ἡδονῇ παραδούc.

636–7. For what is now the second exchange of the duet **Π** appears, *prima facie*, to have had virtually the same text as **L**:

ω ποσις] ω φιλτάτα προσοψις	636
—	
οὐκ ἐμέ]μφοθην	636a
ἐχω τα τ]ου διος λείκτρα ληδας τε	637

Π and **L** attest the same, by no means automatic, lineation 636|636a|637, and there can be little doubt that their common ancestor gave 636 to Helen and 636a–7 to Menelaus (then 638ff. to Helen, see below). Speaker-change after *προσοψις*, dividing what would otherwise have been an indivisible iambic metron *πρὸς ὀψίς οὐκ*, is the only rational explanation of the short line in 636a. Alexandrian speaker-assignments could be wrong,²⁹ but they are likely to be right here. Helen's exclamations are in the same vein as *Ion* 1439 *KP*. ὦ τέκνον, ὦ φῶς μητρὶ κρείσσον ἡλίου and *S. El.* 1224 *HA*. ὦ φίλτατον φῶς (the latter in *ἀντιλαβή*). 'Oh husband!' repeats (cf. 628) the *conjugal* point (not previously taken up by Menelaus, but now echoed in his point about *λείκτρα*); then 'Oh dearest *πρόσοψις*!' makes a point like *S. El.* 1285–6 νῦν δ' ἔχω σε· φίλτάταν δὲ προυφάνης ἔχων πρόσοψιν (and *ibid.* 1224).

Our first step should be to relineate Helen's words:

⟨*EA*.⟩ ὦ πόσις·
ὦ φίλτάτα πρόσοψις.

The alien choriamb *ω̄ πδ̄ζς ω̄* disappears;³⁰ and ὦ φίλτάτα...ἐμέμφοθην becomes another catalectic trimeter, this time divided like *S. El.* 1276. *ἀντιλαβή* is similarly appropriate here, interlocking the utterances that follow the joining of the embrace. There can be no objection to ὦ πόσις as a short exclamatory-allocutary verse (cf. 648 *EA*. φίλαι φίλαι·...).³¹ A more staccato style suits this second, shorter exchange.

Menelaus' reply is more problematic. It is appropriate that he should express, antiphonally to ὦ πόσις..., his own joyful satisfaction with his marriage to the daughter of Zeus and Leda. But the bald οὐκ ἐμέμφοθην, seemingly 'I don't blame (you, or your words/actions)', has justly been regarded as 'an insufferable remark' (Dale). Nothing is gained by transferring ὦ φίλτάτα πρόσοψις to Menelaus; the absolute οὐκ ἐμέμφοθην remains unnatural. No adequate parallels are cited for renderings such as 'my heart is full' (Pearson).

If only οὐκ ἐμέμφοθην had an appropriate object – something like 'you as my wife' – the sense 'I find no fault with', as a litotes, would be in line with 1424 οὐδὲν cὺ μεμπτός (*sc.* as a potential husband), *Ph.* 425 οὐ μεμπτός ἡμῖν ὁ γάμος, *I.A.* 712 οὐ μεμπτός (*sc.* τοιόδε πόσις). That reflection suggests that we should write ἐγὼ for ἔχω,³² producing a single sentence: 'I for my part find no fault with being married to the daughter of Zeus and Leda'. ἔχω is appropriate enough in itself, but the theme ἔχω σε...καγὼ σε occurs twice later on (650–2, 657–8), and it cannot be said that we

²⁹ Cf. *comm. Or.* p. 105.

³⁰ Zuntz proposed: *EA*. ὦ πόσις, ὦ φίλτάτα πρόσοψις. | *ME*. <τὸ σόν, γύναι, πρόθυμον> οὐκ ἐμέμφοθην, but neither justified the choriambic verse nor accounted for the lacuna. Dale humorously commented: 'no unmanly tenderness there!'

³¹ A cretic, of course, not a dactyl: cf. *Ion* 1470 ὦ τέκνον, | τί φίς;... There is nothing wrong with metrical pause at such a comma (*a fortiori*, colon); cf. Stinton, 'Pause and Period...', *CQ* 27 (1977), 27–66, at 27ff., 36.

³² For this confusion, cf. *Or.* 1039 (with *comm.*), *S. O.T.* 1061; for the reverse corruption, cf. 652(?) below, *Andr.* 427, *El.* 870.

need a one-sided anticipation of that motif here.³³ Note that ἔχω is not confirmed by Π.

That gets us over the first hurdle. But then τοῦ Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε† means 'the marriage-bed (marital union) of Zeus and Leda'.³⁴ Interpretation of λέκτρα as 'offspring' may have satisfied actors and scribes, and quite possibly some Alexandrian scholars;³⁵ but it is in gross conflict with the usage of this word in tragedy. Anomalous metre confirms that something is amiss: *ia ba ba* is an unlikely verse;³⁶ and the elided τε is incompatible with catalectic period-end.³⁷ Kannicht's ἔχω καὶ τὰς Λήδας Διὸς τε λέκτρα (τῆς Schäfer, Λήδας Διὸς τε Wilamowitz, κά Campbell), contrives to overcome these difficulties; but the reshuffled verse is now metrically unacceptable for a different reason, as lacking a caesura after the fifth or the seventh syllable.³⁸

A more promising approach, with no reshuffling, may be to look for a sequence of bacchei (in line with 641a–2a, see below):

ME. οὐκ ἐμέμφθην
ἐγὼ τὰς Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε <γῆμας>.

τὰς Διὸς: in objecting to Schäfer's τῆς Διὸς, Zuntz overlooked *Ion* 1220 τῆς Ἐρεχθέως. The natural pairing of 'Zeus' and 'Leda', as of Διὸς...Μαίας τε in 670, justifies the mild hyperbaton in the position of Λήδας τε here. γῆμας was suggested by Campbell in place of Λήδας τε,³⁹ but it can just as well complete a fourth metron.⁴⁰ For bacchei following a catalectic trimeter, cf. *Ion* 1465.

638–47. L unendurably continues the whole of 638–45 to Menelaus, then gives 646–7 to Helen (continued in 648ff.).⁴¹ It must certainly be Helen who sings of her brothers the Dioscuri as ξυνομαίμονες, using enoplian metre (she has all the other

³³ Note also that λέκτρα ἔχειν + gen. *feminae* elsewhere simply means 'to have as wife' (*Ph.* 14, etc.), even as λέκτρα λαβεῖν (or γαμεῖν) + gen. *feminae* simply means 'to marry' ('obtain the hand-in-marriage of').

³⁴ It is vain to appeal to *Med.* 140 τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἔχει λέκτρα τυράννων and *ibid.* 594 γῆμαί με λέκτρα βασιλέων ἃ νῦν ἔχω (βασιλεῶν Π, Elmsley; -έως codd.); cf. *Sen. Med.* 56 *regum thalamos*. There too the gen. is the usual gen. *conjugis* (n. 33 above). A princess is 'royal persons' according to a standard Greek generalizing idiom, used when a single person is regarded as the representative of a type (Barrett on *Hipp.* 49).

³⁵ That is the most that Zuntz (followed by Young) establishes in his defence of the text. For the interpretation of Agathyllos ap. Dion. Hal. *Antiq. Rom.* 1.49.2, see also Lloyd-Jones and Kannicht. One wonders whether Agathyllos was influenced by corrupt texts of Euripides: the false reading βασιλέως in *Med.* 594 (n. 34 above) could well be of sufficient antiquity.

³⁶ No known ex. in Euripides, though cf. *A. Ag.* 223/233. As L. P. E. Parker observes in *CQ* 26 (1976), 21, 'most of the examples of mid-verse bacchiac are in Aeschylus'.

³⁷ On 'catalexis', 'pause' and 'period-end', see the cited articles by Stinton (n. 31), esp. 39f., and Parker (last n.). 'Elision at period-end' is a contradiction in terms.

³⁸ I am indebted to Dr Diggle for the following list of catalectic iambic trimeters in Euripides and Sophocles: *Alc.* 223/234, 272, *Hcl.* 892/901, *Andr.* 1032/1043, *Hec.* 634, 642, 656, *Ion* 1459, 1463, 1464, 1492, 1493, *Tro.* 1088/1106, 1290, 1292/1299, 1303/1318, 1316/1332, *El.* 1206/1215, *Hel.* 632, 633, 636, *Ph.* 1713/1738, *Phaethon* 86/94; *S. Tra.* 954/963, *Ant.* 592/603, *O.T.* 192/205, 202/215, 865/875, 889/903, 891/905, *El.* 163/184, 1276, 1277, *O.C.* 541/548, 1672/1699. *E. Tro.* 1296 has no caesura, but Diggle rightly obelizes the whole of 1295–7 (also 1289).

³⁹ Campbell's ἔχω τὰ τὰς Διὸς καὶ λέκτρα γῆμας was somewhat contorted; but for the characteristically Euripidean idiom λέκτρα (λέχος) τινὸς γαμεῖν, cf. *Med.* 594 (n. 34), *I.T.* 538, *Or.* 20–1, etc.

⁴⁰ Bacchei tend to come in multiples of two. For runs of four, cf. comm. on *Or.* 1294–5.

⁴¹ Only Young in recent decades has attempted to defend L's attributions here (and numerous other transmitted anomalies in the Duo, see below). I make no apology for passing over in silence most of his arguments and metrical interpretations (cf. Diggle, p. 175 n. 14).

enoplian verses). There is weight also in Zuntz's argument from the unelided presentation of *ληδας τε* at verse-end in **Π** (as in L). That does indeed strongly suggest that the Alexandrian editor marked a speaker-change after these words; but that argument falls short of proof, in view of the corrupt wording of 637. We cannot be sure what Aristophanes read (perhaps obelized?), or how he scanned the verse; and in any case he could have been wrong.

The whole passage has long been regarded as problematic. The papyrus does not directly solve the problems, and indeed multiplies them. Nevertheless it is possible to make progress only by taking full account of the new evidence, and I venture to offer the following partly new reconstruction (cf. Zuntz, p. 223):

[α γ υπο λα]μπαδων κοροι	638
[λευκιππ]οι ξυνομαιμονες	639
[ωλβισαν ω]λβισαν εμε σε τε ματαν	640
[το προσθε]ν	641
—	
[υ - -]ν	641a
[προς αλλα]ν γ ελαυνει θεος	642
[τυχαν ταςδε] κρεισσω	642a
—	
[το κακον δ αγ]αθον	643
[σε τε καμε συν]αγαγεν ω ποσει	644
[χρονον αλλ ο]μωσ ονα[ιμ]αν τυχας	645
—	
[οναιο δητα ταυ]τα δε ξυνευχομα[ι]	646
[δυοιν γαρ οντοι]ν ουχ ο μεν τλημων [ο] δ ου	647

The most striking visible features of **Π** are the extra words in 640, where L has simply *ᾠλβισαν ᾠλβισαν*, and the two very short verses in 641–1a, both ending with *N*, where L has *τὸ πρόσθεν ἐκ δόμων : δ' ἐνόσφισαν θεοί σ' ὁμοῦ*.

For these short verses Zuntz proposed [*θεοι δομω*]ν / [*δ ενοςφισα*]ν, explaining L's version as a paraphrase of that. Dale justly objected to the unnatural word-order, and to the inexplicable lineation in monometers; the latter objection applies equally to Kannicht's [*ενοςφισα*]ν / [*θεοι δομω*]ν. Dale suggested [*το προσθε*]ν / [*δ ενοςφισα*]ν, postulating a tradition which had somehow lost the second half of both verses. But it does not seem likely that a *mutilated* model, damaged in such a way as to produce nonsense, would have been thus reproduced in a finely-written play-text of the first century B.C.

I proceed rather, as in 634–5, with the provisional assumption that **Π**'s text was at least *rational*. Ancient or recent error may well have caused deviations from the truth, but it is likely to have made sense of a sort.

We know that **Π** included indications of speaker-change (a short horizontal bar below the beginning of the last line of an utterance); and the rule appears to have been 'new speaker, new line' (cf. 636a). With that in mind I suggest that **Π** is likely to have had a speaker-change at 641a, and that the two short lines are to be read as a single verse divided in *ἀντιλαβή*. For the first, [*το προσθε*]ν fits well, and is the natural conclusion to the sentence about nuptial *μακαρισμός* (of which we shall have more to say in a moment); the more natural, following 'in vain'. Zuntz should not have dismissed L's *τὸ πρόσθεν* as 'prosaic', since it is also epic: *Il.* 23.583, *Od.* 4.688. Then another baccheus in 641a will complete the divided verse. Divided bacchiac dimeters occur frequently in comparable amoibaia: cf. *Or.* 173/194, *Ba.* 1177/1193, 1181–2/1197–8, *S. Tra.* 893, *S. El.* 1279–80.

If Menelaus comes in at 641a, there must be a speaker-change back to Helen at

either 642 or 643. My reasons for preferring the latter will appear below; but *prima facie* that gives the more balanced pattern.

It follows, *ex hypothesi*, that the clause ἐκ δόμων δ' ἐνόσφισαν θεοί c' ὁμοῦ (Portus ἐμοῦ) was *wholly* absent from **II**, and we shall have to consider the possibility that the whole of it is spurious, not merely the last two syllables (deleted by Reisig and others). The verb νοσφίζειν is, indeed, both appropriate and poetical; but ancient interpolators were capable of using poetical language, especially if they were drawing upon some parallel passage, and it is credible that the short line το προσθεν was spuriously expanded into a trimeter in some ancient texts (cf. *Or.* 478); especially if the addition seemed to improve the sense. It is to the sense of the lyric dialogue that we must now turn our attention.

In 637 Menelaus has referred both to his marital union with Helen (λέκτρα + gen.) and to her illustrious parentage, appropriately (according both to his *persona* and to normal Greek matrimonial values) combining these ideas. Picking up his happy sentiment with a relative pronoun (cf. *I.T.* 834?), Helen refers to the nuptial μακαρισμός pronounced by her illustrious brothers, the white-horsed Dioscuri. According to L, it was Helen (ἄν...) who was 'declared fortunate' by them; according to **II** it was both the bride and bridegroom (εμε σε τε), cf. *Alc.* 918–21 ...εἶπετο κῶμος | τήν τε θανούσαν κάμ' ὀλβίζων | ὥς εὐπατρίδαι κάπ' ἀμφοτέρων | ὄντες ἀριστέων κύζυγες εἶμεν). These are not the only possible objects of ὀλβισαν, *a priori*. The μακαρισμός pronounced by the Dioscuri could have been directed specifically at Menelaus: cf. *Andr.* 1218 μάτην δέ c' (sc. Peleus) ἐν γάμοισιν ὀλβισαν θεοί, and *Tro.* 311 μακάριος ὁ γαμέτας. Or it could have been directed ὑπὸ λαμπάδων at the marriage-bed or 'conjugal union' (λέκτρα). These considerations give us grounds, even without the evidence of **II**, for questioning the relative pronoun ἄν, as Campbell saw; and we are now in a position to infer with some confidence that a different reading was current in antiquity, since *an* is incompatible with εμε σε τε.⁴² Campbell's ἄς gives straightforward sense ('Whose brothers...felicitated me and you...'), following 'the daughter of Zeus and Leda', and could well have been changed to ἄν in a tradition without ἐμέ σε τε. But ἄ γ' seems better ('(λέκτρα) as to which...'),⁴³ with the particle pointing the speaker-change;⁴⁴ and it will, I think, prove to be decisively better.

There is still work to be done in 638–41, since (a) the lineation *gl* (or *lk*) | *gl* (with pause)... is clearly wrong (cf. Dale, p. 170); this is an 'enoplian dochmiac' context (see *comm. Or.* p. 112, etc.), and we must certainly divide at... λεύκιπποι (2δ) | ξυνομαίμονες... (b) The extra words ἐμέ σε τε μάταν are metrically problematic, both as transmitted in **II**,⁴⁵ and with the revised lineation following... | ξυνομαίμονες

⁴² Zuntz seems not to have considered the possibility that **II** had something other than *an* at the beginning of the sentence. His very different inference, namely that the clauses *an*... ὀλβισαν and ὀλβισαν εμε σε τε μάταν must have been split in **II** (or **II**'s archetype) between different singers, produced an intolerable arrangement as to style (see Dale, pp. 172–3), further refuted by the consideration that ὀλβισαν εμε σε τε μάταν would naturally have been written as a separate verse (*lk*), following the hypothetical speaker-change.

⁴³ For this double acc. construction with a neuter pronoun, cf. *S. Aj.* 552 καίτοι σε καὶ νῦν τοῦτο γε ζηλοῦν ἔχω, *Ar. Vesp.* 588 τουτί γάρ τοί σε μόνον (Reiske, for σεμνόν) τούτων ὧν εἶρηκας μακαρίζω.

⁴⁴ Cf. *S. El.* 164 *HA*. ὅν γ' ἐγώ... (Hermann, for ὅν ἐγώγ').

⁴⁵ Dale posed the question 'What kind of line is (ὀλβισαν ὀλβισαν εμε σε τε μάταν) meant for?' The best that can be made of it is *δ ia* with a horrid split resolution and overlap at the join. Split resolution of the third *longum* of a *δ* occurs only before another *δ* and is virtually limited to the pattern described on p. 59 below, apart from *Tro.* 253 παρθένον αἰ γέρας ὁ | χρυσοκόμας...

ὦλβικαν ὦλβικαν. υυ-υυ-υυ-υυ- is a possible verse (cf. *Ph.* 164), but the period-end without pause at ὦλβικαν || ἐμέ is unwelcome, even if ἐμέ *cé* τε μάταν is emended to make a dochmius.⁴⁶ There is a clumsiness, *prima facie*, in the pronouns ἐμέ *cé* τε at this late position in the sentence, the more so with *cé* τε *κάμέ* following in 644. We may well be minded to reject them (with Dale). On the other hand it seems unlikely that the significant word μάταν is an interpolation.

We seem to have reached an impasse. But it may yet be possible to reject ἐμέ *cé* τε while keeping μάταν.

Let us suppose that the text as edited by Aristophanes had a γ (*sic*) υπο λαμπαδων κοροι | λευκιπποι ξυνομαιμονες | ὦλβικαν ὦλβικαν ματαν | το προσθεν. The third octosyllable makes the metrical misinterpretation even more understandable.⁴⁷ But observe that this text leaves 'felicitated' without a personal object. It does not in fact need one, since one can ὀλβίζειν or μακαρίζειν a personal quality,⁴⁸ or 'ivy' (*Ph.* 651–4), and surely (*a fortiori*) the λέκτρα of a bride. But it is easy to imagine a 'clarifying' interpolation of ἐμέ *cé* τε (suggested perhaps by *Alc.* 919), giving us the version attested by Π. The other tradition, ancestral to L, will not have had these pronouns; instead, a personal object was provided by writing αν (or αν γ) υπο... That makes transmissional sense: the traditions will have diverged after the received wording of 638–40 was lineated by Aristophanes; and we can fully account for the divergence. L's other fault here, the loss of μάταν after ὦλβικαν, is easily explained as a lipography due to homoeoteleuton (-αν -αν).

Are we then to accept this hypothetical Aristophanic text without further ado (merely changing the lineation)? I think not, since both the sense and the metre would be improved by inserting <οὐ> before μάταν:

ΕΛ. ἃ γ' ὑπὸ λαμπαδων Κόροι λεύκιπποι
ξυνομαιμονες ὦλβικαν ὦλβικαν <οὐ> μάταν τὸ πρόσθεν. 640

The doubled ὦλβικαν strongly suggests that Helen is thinking of positive, not unfulfilled, felicity. This is the theme, already adumbrated in 628–9 (ἐν μακρᾷ φλογὶ φαεσφόρῳ), that Helen will proceed to develop in 643f. (τὸ κακὸν δ' ἀγαθόν...) and 648f. ('I no longer grieve for the past'). Her sentiment with οὐ μάταν is the diametric opposite, appropriate to this happy context, of the threnodic topos developed in *Alc.* 915ff. and *Andr.* 1218.

As to the metre, we now have a long enoplian verse with... υυ-υυ- clausula like *H.F.* 884 ὄφρων ἰαχῇμασί Λυσσᾷ μαρμαρῶπος and *Or.* 1456 ἅπερ ἑδράκων ἑδράκων ἐν δόμοις τυραννῶν.⁴⁹ The longer form here, identical with A. *P.V.* 545f./553f., might alternatively be analysed as υυ-υυ-υυ-υυ-υυ- (A×-, cf. 687)|ba in this context. Menelaus replies with bacchei, so that it is equally proper to treat this terminal ba as the beginning of a divided dimeter (as in Π). But I prefer the above lineation, since Menelaus' reply now falls neatly into two 3ba verses:

ΜΕ. <τὸ πρόσθεν> πρὸς ἄλλαν γ' ἐλαύνει
θεὸς συμφορὰν τάδε κρείσσει.

⁴⁶ Zuntz proposed ἐμέ <τε> *cé* τε μάταν. Kannicht's suggestion ἐμέ <δὲ> *cé* τε μάταν begins a new sentence, but μάταν (if authentic) must go with ὦλβικαν. At one time I considered ἐμέ *cé* τ' <οὐ> μάταν.

⁴⁷ For the false division now after a lk, cf. 670f. (and n. 56 below).

⁴⁸ Hdt. 1.31 ἐμακάριζον τῶν νεανιέων τὴν ῥώμην, cf. *Tro.* 229 εὐάνδρον ὀλβίζων γάν.

⁴⁹ Analysed in *comm. Or.* p. 321 as T² (υυ-υυ-υυ-υυ-)+ba.

A responsive iteration⁵⁰ of *τὸ πρόθεον* fits the space in **Π** well enough.⁵¹ Like Helen, Menelaus is happy; but he is not yet ready to accept Helen's 'not in vain' view as to 'the past', and prefers to stress the *difference* (*ἄλλαν*) between former and present *τύχη*, while 'thanking god' (cf. 654–5 below) for the *superiority* of the latter (*κρείεω*). The sentence is appropriately framed by the two predication; and **Π**'s *γε* comes into its own (though L's *δ*' is equally good). We must suppose that *τύχαν* (**Π**, *ut vid.*) was an ancient alternative to *κυμφοράν*, perhaps even better attested when the text was lineated by Aristophanes, since both L and **Π** divide after *θεός*;⁵² but there can be little doubt that *κυμφοράν* is the truth.

What now of L's extra clause, absent from **Π**, following ὤλβισαν|τὸ πρόσθεν? It seems likely that L's text of 641–la conceals an ancient trimeter (τὸ πρόσθεν ἐκ δόμων δ' ἐνόσφισαν θεοί), later extended by the addition of *c'* ὁμοῦ (or ἐμοῦ), and consequently lineated as two verses divided at δόμων|δ'. Such a trimeter would make sense as a continuation of Helen's sentence, given a tradition with ἄν in 638, with or without (οὐ) μάταν in 640; the *understood* object of ἐνόσφισαν in such a clause can only be Helen, and the point about her 'sundering from home' by '(the) gods' is in line with 670ff., 694ff. With the extra pronouns *c'* ἐμοῦ (Portus) it makes good sense (but not metrical sense) as an elaboration of Menelaus' response. But it is at best superfluous to my interpretation, and I have little hesitation in accepting the evidence of **Π** that it was either unknown to, or not recognized as authentic by, the Alexandrian editor. As to its incorporation, with the extra syllables and a lineation designed to accommodate them, in the late-classical tradition ancestral to L (already perhaps corrupt as to the assignation of speakers), I refrain from further hypothetical speculation.

643–7. The fourth exchange completes the first movement of the ‘Embrace’. The spoken distich has the effect of an intermediate clausula after closely sequential lyric exchanges. The metre has come full circle (for Helen also: note the chiasmic pattern of 638–40, 643–5); and the fifth exchange will begin with another address from Helen to the Chorus (648ff., see below).

ΕΛ. τὸ κακὸν δ' ἀγαθὸν ἐν τε καὶ μετὰ συνάγαγεν, πόσι·
χρόνιον, ἀλλ' ὅμως ὀνείμαν τύχας.
ΜΕ. ὄναιο δῆτα· ταῦτά δ' ἐξυνέχομαι·
δυσὸν γὰρ ὄντοι οὐχ ὁ μὲν πλὴμων ὁ δ' οὐ.

645

Helen's first (enoplian) sentence is at once a continuation of her happy sentiment in 638ff. and an answer to Menelaus' negative view of τὸ πρόϑεν. The thing that is both 'bad' and 'good' can only be τὸ πρόϑεν ('former τύχη'), simply but paradoxically conceived as the non-personal agency without whose operation they

⁵⁰ Menelaus reacts similarly with interrogative iteration to a surprising remark at 675 (*ME*. *Ἥρα*;...); cf. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (1981), pp. 50f. (but the emotion is often surprise, rather than indignation or incredulity). *Ba*. 1177 (*AG*. *Κιθαίωνν...ΧΟ*. [τῷ *Κιθαίωνν*]) is an instance of bacchiac iteration. Note that [προς ἀλλὰ]ν (*bis*) will not do, since τὰδε then has no referent.

⁵¹ The space before *N* in **Π**'s 641a is a little longer than the space before *N* in 641 (nearly the width of the letter *N*); but the same words written twice are not always exactly the same length. Or did **Π** perhaps have [τῖ το ποροθε]ν?

⁵² The lineation of 641–2a is rational if Aristophanes read *τύχαν*, with a plausible ‘dochmiac compound’ (*comm. Or.* p. 106) framed between *2ba* verses. Zuntz overlooked that, if Aristophanes had read *κυμφοράν*, he could scarcely have failed to divide after *ελαύνει* for the run of *bacchei*.

would not have been brought together as man and wife.⁵³ In 644 there is little to choose between *συνάγαγεν, πόσι* (Dindorf, Dale), *-γεν, ὦ πόσι* (Zuntz) and *-γ', ὦ πόσι* (suggested by Kannicht). With *-γεν, ὦ πόσι* the verse ends like *Ph.* 163–4 *ἀνεμῶκεός εἶθε δρομόν νεφέλας | πόσιν ἐξάνυμαι δι' αἰθέρος*. But *Ion* 1466 ὁ τὲ γηγενετᾶς δομός οὐκέτι νῦν κτὰ δερκετᾶι (cited by Dale) is identical (*A ia*), if we follow Dindorf; and *-γε(ν) ποσι* is the tradition most likely to have generated L's *-γε πόσιν*. [Even if *ω* were securely attested in **Π**, it could be false (cf. comm. on *Or.* 167). For **Π**'s spelling *ποσει* at verse-end (with pause), cf. on 670–1 below.]

As elsewhere (650, 657), Helen continues asyndetically. *χρόνιον* follows a metrical pause at *πόσι* (and change of metre), and introduces the sentiment 'Better late than never'; cf. 1232 *χρόνια μὲν ἤλθεν, ἀλλ' ὅμως αἰνῶ τάδε*. The usual punctuation (...*πόσι, χρόνιον*·) is incorrect, not only for metrical reasons. There is a formal balance between the antitheses *κακὸν ἀγαθόν* and *χρόνιον, ἀλλ'...*, and *ἀλλ' ὅμως* refers only to *χρόνιον*, not to the whole preceding sentence including the positive word *ἀγαθόν*. *ὀναίμην τύχας* is a wish, not simply for 'good fortune', but for 'fruit (at long last) of the (ultimately good) τύχη'.

646–7. Menelaus implies that Helen should have said *ὀναίμεθα*. In 646 *δέ (Π, ut vid.; L δῆ)* is suitably corrective-progressive; cf. on 652–5 below.⁵⁴ In 647 **Π** supports L's *οὐχ ὁ μὲν τλήμων ὁ δ' οὐ*, but the treatment of both persons as masculine is surely very strange. Passages like Phocyl. fr. 1 *Λέριοι κακοί, οὐχ ὁ μὲν ὅς δ' οὐ, πάντες* are different, as Pearson observed, in referring to an indefinite number of persons. I should have expected Euripides to exploit the neuter gender here, with *οὐ τὸ μὲν τλήμον τὸ δ' οὐ*: cf. *Or.* 1613 *τὰμὰ δ' οὐχὶ τλήμονα*; (in line with a standard use of *τὸ ἐμόν, τὸ σόν*, etc.) and *ibid.* 1192 *πάν γὰρ ἐν φίλον τόδε (sc. τὸ ἡμέτερον)*.

648–59. There are two more balanced exchanges before the Interrogation: Helen rapturously sings 648–51, turning again towards the Chorus. Menelaus responds with 652–5 – first with another spoken distich, then (as in 632ff.) with an echo of Helen's dochmiacs (his lyric impulse rekindled, as it were). Then in 656–7 and 658–9 both performers have a trimeter followed by a lyric verse. The sequence as a whole develops the theme *ἔχω σ' ἀέλπτως* (cf. *Alc.* 1134, *El.* 579), with *ἔχω σε... καὶ γὰρ σέ* (in effect) in both pairs of utterances, and *ἐλπίζειν/ἀδόκητος* explicitly in the second.

L's speaker-assignments are correct here, though commonly altered by editors. The pattern of the verses favours them; likewise the sense of the words. The natural meaning of 654–5 is that the tearfully joyful singer feels more *gratitude* (*χάρις*) than bitterness towards the goddess just mentioned, consistently with the mixed feelings (unlooked-for joy, abiding memory of long suffering) implicit in 652–3. Such gratitude towards a *θεός* comes much less appropriately from Helen (cf. 694ff.), especially if the *θεός* is Hera (674, but see further below).

The misconceived transfer of 654–5 to Helen requires either the further transfer of 656 to Menelaus, spoiling the balance of 656–9, or the arbitrary postulate of a lost utterance after 655. The main reason for the transfer, namely, the notion that the emotional dochmiacs belong (as such) to Helen, is nullified by Menelaus' dochmiac verse in 659. As to the lacuna-postulate, there is no substance in Zuntz's argument that **Π** had additional lines hereabouts. Nothing survives of lines 652–62 in the right-hand column of the papyrus; but the available space for about thirteen lines of text

⁵³ *τὸ κακὸν ἀγαθόν* is a juxtaposition of opposites superficially similar to *τὸ καλὸν οὐ καλόν* at *Or.* 819; note that in both passages it is incorrect to supply a copula. But *Or.* 819ff. is otherwise very different (see comm.).

⁵⁴ I agree with Kannicht in preferring *δέ*, against Lloyd-Jones (cf. n. 25 above). The position is similar to that in 642 (*γ' Π, δ' L*; see above).

matches the probable 13-line presentation of 652–62 in L's ancestor. Zuntz overlooked that 660–2 accounts for five, not three, lines of text, both 661 and 662 having the 'divider'-sign (:) after the exclamation εἴ (sic).⁵⁵

648–51. Helen's rapture is such that she 'no longer grieves for the past' – a position contrasting both with Menelaus' 'more χάρις than λύπη' (654–5) and with her own instantaneous lamenting in response to Menelaus' question at 660. Her mention of 'Troy', here first in the Duo, is another forward-looking feature.

ΕΛ. φίλαι, φίλαι·
τὰ πάρος οὐκέτι στένομεν οὐδ' ἀλγῶ·
†πόσιν ἐμὸν ἔχομεν ἔχομεν†, ὃν ἔμενον 650
ἔμενον ἐκ Τροίας πολυετὴ μολεῖν.

650 is metrically defective in L, and seems to have been so in Π also ([c. 10 letters]χομεν εχομεν ον εμενον|...μολειν).⁵⁶ Seidler's ἐμὸν <ἐμόν> adds the necessary syllables for a dochmiac dimeter, but has been considered to need Hermann's further transposition πόσιν ἔχομεν ἔχομεν|ἐμὸν ἐμόν... (so Diggle). The result is surely unappealing: placed thus, ἐμόν ἐμόν detracts from the balance between ἔχομεν *bis* and ἔμενον *bis*, and produces a bizarrely long assonant sequence (ομενεμονεμονονεμενονεμενον). There is no real parallel for the run of three anadiploses,⁵⁷ and, though ἐμός can certainly be doubled, it is not in Euripides' manner to double unemphatically placed adjectives.⁵⁸

A more stylish alternative has been overlooked, namely,

πόσιν ἐμὸν ἔχομεν, <ἐμόν> ἔχομεν...

with epanalepsis. An ἐμόν is just as likely to have dropped out anciently after ἔχομεν, leaving an apparently standard anadiplosis. Euripides quite often, especially in his later plays, broke resolved dochmiacs thus after seven short syllables; cf. *El.* 1170 *σχέτλια μὲν ἔπαθες, ἀ-|νόσια δ' εἰργάσω*, *Or.* 1364 *διὰ τὸν ὀλόμενον ὀ-|λόμενον Ἰδαῖον*, *Ba.* 995/1015 *τὸν ἄθεον ἄνομον ἄ-|δικον Ἐχίονος*, *H.F.* 1212, *I.T.* 871 (*S.O.C.* 1464, *Ar. Av.* 951).⁵⁹ Both the pattern of the verse and the ancient error are then

⁵⁵ A surprising oversight, since it was Zuntz who taught us to take account of such colometric indications. It is credible that the Editor scanned 661a and 662a as *ia* – *x* – (another iambicizing misinterpretation), following an indeterminate 'extra-metric' exclamation (cf. 166–7 *πένθεσιν*: εἴ: πετροφόροι).

⁵⁶ L here attests a doubly divergent lineation: *ποσ-ἐμ-ἐχ-ἐχ-|ὄν ἐμ-ἐμ-ἐκ Τρ-|πολ-μολ-*. The verse-end after *Τροίας* is likely to be ancient, though probably not Aristophanic. The other division at *ἔχομεν|ὄν* is not an isolated scribal aberration, *pace* Zuntz (p. 229), but of a piece with L's divisions in 628–9 (*φίλιον|ἐν μακράι*), 634–5 (*ἐβαλον|ἡδονάν*), 654–5 (*χαρμονὰ|πλέον*), 694–5 (*κακόποτμον|ἀραίαν*), 696–7 (*ἔλιπον|οὐ λιπούς*). Such consistently wrong treatment of dochmiacs, typically creating a false *ia-tr* dimeter or glyconic, must go back to erroneous colometry in antiquity. Π may have shared some of these lineation errors (cf. 638f., ?661f., 670f.), but certainly not all (cf. 634–5). Some misinterpretation and corruption of dochmiacs probably goes back to Aristophanes (and earlier still); but we must also recognize that the Editor's division of cola was by no means uniformly transmitted in the sub-Aristophanic tradition. Zuntz's reference to the division of cola attested in L as 'due to the Alexandrian editor' (p. 212) needed some qualification.

⁵⁷ None of Zuntz's parallels (p. 229 n. §) contains such a sequential trio. More pertinent is *Or.* 149 *κάταγε κάταγε, πρόσιθ' ἀτρέμας ἀτρέμας ἴθι*; but the *σχῆμα Εὐριπίδειον* obviously makes a difference there, also the *aabccb* pattern.

⁵⁸ As to ordinary adjectives, cf. *comm. Or.* p. 252. Doubled ἐμός occurs at *Hec.* 710 *ἐμός ἐμός ξένος Θορήκιος ἱππότας...*, *H.F.* 1190 *ἐμός ἐμός ὁδε γόνος ὁ πολύπονος...* and *El.* 1149 *ἔπεσεν ἐμός ἐμός ἀρχέτας*, in each case preceding the noun and as the *only* anadiplosis; so also, perhaps, *Ph.* 153 *ὅς ἐπ' ἐμὰν <ἐμὰν> πόλιν ἐβα πέτρων* (Diggle).

⁵⁹ Cf. Conomis, art. cit. 45, and L. P. E. Parker, 'Split Resolution...', *CQ* 18 (1968), 241–69, at 267–8. *Ph.* 1295 (with *ἀχίω* Elmsley) and *I.A.* 1285 (with *ἐβαλε(ν)*) may be further exx.

paralleled at *Hypsipyle* fr. 64.89 *τίνα πατέρι ποτέ, <τίνα> χάριν ἀθλίωι|τιθέμενος; (<τίνα> suppl. Murray).*

652–5. As Campbell observed, Menelaus responds first to Helen's second sentence, picking up the themes 'have/hold' and 'after many years'. Then in dochmiacs he makes a point about *his* joyful emotions (*ἐμὰ δέ...*), antiphonal to 649 ('I no longer lament the past'). But his response is not simply a chiasmic echo, since it includes a 'perception' about 'the goddess'; and, unlike Helen's, his thought moves (as in 630–5) in sentences connected by corrective-progressive *δέ*.

*ME. ἔχεις, ἐγὼ τε σ' ἡλίου δὲ μυρίου
μόλις διελθὼν ἥισθόμην τὰ τῆς θεοῦ·
ἐμὰ δὲ χαρμοναὶ δάκρυα πλέον ἔχει
χάριτος ἢ λύπας.*

655

652–3. *ἔχεις <μ>* (Jacobs) and/or *ἔχω* for *ἐγὼ* (Hermann, Matthiae) could be right; but neither seems necessary.

ἡλίου... διελθὼν: with a metaphor, not altogether faded, of 'completing a long δρόμος', cf. 775–6 *πρὸς τοῖσιν ἐν Τροίαι δέκα|ἔτεσι διήλθον ἐπὶ τὰ περιδρομὰς ἐτών, H.F. 425–6 δρόμων τ' ἄλλων ἀγάματ' εὐτυχῇ|διήλθε.*

μόλις: the 'going through' has been long and arduous, but has culminated in unexpected *εὐτυχία*; cf., in similar contexts of finding or reunion, 597 *Μενέλαε, μαστεύων σε κιγχάνω μόλις*, 896–7 *μόλις ποτέ λαβοῦς*, *Ph.* 310–11 *ὡς ἰώ, μόλις φανείς|ἄελπτα κάδοκῆτα ματρός ὠλέναις*, *S. Phil.* 296–7, *O.C.* 324–6.

ἥισθόμην τὰ τῆς θεοῦ: commentators are agreed, no doubt rightly as things stand, that 'the goddess' can only be Hera. 'I perceive the (actions?) of Hera' is taken as alluding to the information communicated in 586 and 608–11, namely that Hera substituted a Phantom for the real Helen in order to frustrate Paris, and that it was therefore by Hera's *μηχαναί* that so many Greeks and Trojans perished at Troy. But how is this 'perception' related to the rest of Menelaus' sentence? He appears to be implying a 'recognition' that he has Hera to thank both for his long years of suffering and for the present unexpected reunion (hence the mixed emotions 'more *χάρις* than *λύπη*'); but any such sentiment with regard to Hera's conduct is surely premature. Menelaus has not yet come to terms with the aforesaid information, and 'perceptions' about the Olympian gods should be matters for the Interrogation. The way in which 'Hera' is introduced at 674–5 (... *ἃ Διός μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν*. | *ME. "Hρα; τί...;*) should exclude any previous mention of her in the Duo.

I strongly suspect that *τὰ τῆς* is a corruption of *τύχης*: 'I recognize the goddess Chance', or more exactly 'I recognize Chance (as) *θεός*'. This is the appropriately paradoxical quasi-religious 'perception', completing the sentence in place of something like *ἀέλπτως εὐτυχίας τυγχάνω*. Personified Chance (or Fortune or Luck), like *τὸ θεῖον* (*Ba.* 882), 'proceeds *μόλις*' towards a desired consummation: cf. *El.* 402–3 *ἵως γὰρ ἂν μόλις προβαίνουσ' ἡ Τύχη σταῖη καλῶς*.⁶⁰ Menelaus has succeeded (*εὐτύχησε*) in recovering Helen not, as he had thought, by his prolonged labours at Troy, but in a wholly unexpected and apparently *irrational* manner, time and place. Irrational events are naturally attributed, especially by enlightened persons in Euripidean drama, to the agency of *τύχη*; at the same time Euripides was fond of non-canonical deifications, and Menelaus' amazement includes the emotion of 'awe'

⁶⁰ Poetic personification of *τύχη* need not, of course, imply deification; see, for example, Barrett on *Hipp.* 818–21. But editors of Euripides could afford to give *Τύχη* a capital letter more often. See in general G. Busch, *Untersuchungen zum Wesen der τύχη in den Tragödien des Euripides* (Diss. Heidelberg, 1937).

(see above). *ἡισθόμην* + gen. is *vox propria* for a mortal apprehending the presence of a deity (cf. *Hipp.* 1391–2 καὶ γὰρ ἐν κακοῖς | ὧν ἡισθόμην σου κἀνεκουφίσθην δέμας, with Barrett's parallels), and more generally for 'recognizing, identifying' what cannot be directly seen (*Hec.* 1114–15 ἡισθόμην γὰρ... ἐθέεν φωνῆς ἀκούσας, cf. *Ba.* 178 ὡς σὴν γῆρυν ἡισθόμην κλύων). By an easy extension, the deity apprehended here is more metaphorically '*praesens*'.

The transcendency and/or divinity of *τύχη* is more often apprehended as the explanation of *δυστυχία*, cf. *Hipp.* 818, *I.A.* 864, 1135, *Cyc.* 606–7; but for a similar sentiment in an unexpected reversal to *good* fortune, cf. *Ion* 1512–14 ὦ μεταβαλοῦσα μυρίους ἤδη βροτῶν | καὶ δυστυχῆσαι καὶ θῆς αὖ πράξει καλῶς | Τύχῃ... (following *μηδεὶς δοκεῖτω... ἀελλπον...* in 1510–11). Mindful of past *δυστυχία*, Menelaus proceeds to explain why (paradoxically) his present tears (cf. 633) contain (*ἔχει*) a preponderance of gratitude towards this 'goddess'.

654–5. L's word-order ἐμὰ δὲ δάκρυα χαρμονὰ |..., corrected by Elmsley, is associable with the iambicizing lineation; cf. 634–5, 650–1, 666–7, 670–1. Hermann's *χαρμοναῖ* then gives the right sense ('*prae gaudio*'; cf. 632 γέγηθα). Kannicht objects that the causal dative 'ist ohne personales Subjekt unbefriedigend'; but ἐμὰ δὲ δάκρυα (χάριν) ἔχει is virtually equivalent to ἐγὼ δὲ καί περ δακρύων (χάριν) ἔχω. He cites *Ph.* 316–17 τέρψιν παλαιᾶν χαρμονᾶν in support of ἐμὰ δὲ δάκρυα χαρμονὰ <ν> (Brodaeus), but the gen. pl. (without epithet) depends much less naturally here on the gen. χάριτος (paired with λύπας), and both the sense and the word-order are inferior. [Murray adhered to *χαρμονά*, with a colon after *δάκρυα*; but the effect is jerky, splitting a natural unit into two asyndetic sentences; and, though the tears may be joyful, they are not 'joy'. If they were, they would contain no λύπη at all.]

656–60. The concluding exchange of the Embrace (see above) now falls perfectly into place.⁶¹ Helen explicitly develops, again with asyndetic sentences, the already implicit ἀέλπτως theme; and Menelaus again echoes the sentiment with *κἀγὼ σέ*, before developing the idea *ἀδόκητον* in terms of false *δόκησις* ('...believed to have gone to *Troy*');⁶² a reflection which impels him to initiate the Interrogation with the question now pressing for an answer: 'By the gods (I implore you, tell me) how (*sc.* if not in Paris' ship) were you conveyed away from my house?'⁶³

τί φῶ; cf. *I.T.* 839–40 τί φῶ; θανμάτων πέρα καὶ λόγου πρός τάδ' ἀπέβα (Reiske; L *ἐπέβα*), sung by Iphigenia. Here Helen is running out of new expressions of joy, and the time has come for Menelaus to take the lead. *ἀδόκητον ἔχω σέ πρός στέρνοις*: a crisply summative verse. The enoplian echo of 640 and 643–4 also looks forward to 680–1.⁶⁴ Note that only Helen sings in this more lyrical (more feminine?) double-short rhythm.

660–97. I have referred to this as 'the Interrogation'; but the term is not ideal, and

⁶¹ Dale observed that 656 'follows badly on the previous line'. She failed to make it clear that this is true only when the speaker-assignments are altered.

⁶² *δοκοῦσαν* may include the imperfect sense '(previously) believed (by me)'; but *I.T.* 831 shows that Menelaus might equally have said *μολοῦσαν ὡς δοξάζεται*.

⁶³ For *πρός θεῶν* followed by a question and introducing a new *λόγος*, cf. *Or.* 92 and 579.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Andr.* 857, 862, *Ion* 1480(?), 1494, *Hyps.* fr. 64.94; *H.F.* 1190 (...ὑδρα) and *Ion* 1487 (...κύκλω) have *anceps* penult.; for the related ~~~~~, cf. *El.* 586, 588, 590. It is a matter of opinion whether these verses are best regarded as compounded of *an* + ~~~~ or as prolongations of ~~~~~~x (both may be correct: cf. the 'sub-dochmiac' *2ia* verse ~~~~~~:~x~, *comm. Or.* p. 112; 'prolongation', *ibid.* p. 288). But we can certainly reject the frequent analysis *an* + irregular δ (~~~~), since 'only "iambic-types" of metres are combined internally with dochmiacs' (Conomis, *art. cit.* 48).

may give a false impression.⁶⁵ The thirteen exchanges are not simply questions and answers. Formally, the pattern of 661–97 is ‘punctuated monody’ (see above), such that there is a continuity in Helen’s woeful lyric sentences independent, except at 688–90, of Menelaus’ interventions.

661–5. Helen is lamentingly hesitant, with a proper feminine αἰδώς, to tell her painful story. Menelaus twice encourages her to proceed. The answer to 660 then begins at 666.

πρὸς θεῶν, δόμων πῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ἀπεστάλης; 660
 ΕΛ. ἔῃ· πικρὰς ἐς ἀρχὰς βαίνειν·
 ἔῃ· πικρὰν δ’ ἐρευνᾷς φάτιν.
 ΜΕ. λέγ’, ὥς ἀκουστὰ πάντα δῶρα δαιμόνων.
 ΕΛ. ἀπέπτυστα μὲν λόγον οἶον
 οἶον ἑκοίσομαι†.
 ΜΕ. ὅμως δὲ λέξον· ἥδ’ τοι μόχθων κλύειν. 665

661–2. The exclamations may be scanned ∪ ∪, giving *cr* δ verses; or they may represent αἰαῖ, giving *ia* δ (cf. *Hypsipyle* fr. 64.72 on p. 69 below) or αἰαῖ αἰαῖ, giving 2δ (cf. *Hipp.* 830). For the lineation, see above with n. 55. The correct -ὰς -ὰς in 661 is transmitted as a ‘γρ’ marginale (Zuntz, p. 131).

663. Recent defenders of the text treat it as two sentences. But λέγ’, ὥς ἀκουστὰ is an oddly terse ‘prompt’; πάντα δῶρα δαιμόνων is a surprising theological statement, not obviously relevant to the issue of ‘speaking’; and the asyndeton is unnatural, with the adjacent neuter plurals and absence of copula. ‘Tell (your story), for all gifts of the gods are *hearable*’. That is much more to the point, and there is nothing wrong with ἀκουστὰ: a sophisticated inversion of the standard use of οὐκ ἀκουστός (-ιμος) and ἀνήκουστος (‘auditu nefandus’) in reference to τύχαι, πάθηα, etc. too terrible or shocking to be heard *about*: *Andr.* 1084 ἀκούσαι δ’ οὐκ ἀκούσθ’ ὅμως θέλω, *Hipp.* 362 (πάθηα), fr. 334.4(?), *S. El.* 1407, *O.C.* 1312, Pearson on *S.* frs. 357, 745 (though he was wrong here). δῶρα δαιμόνων is a variation of the standard τύχαι (or *κυμφοραῖ*) δαιμόνων (or θεῶν): *Hipp.* 832, 1267, *H.F.* 309, fr. 37, etc.; for the idea of ‘troubles’ as ‘gifts of the gods’, cf. *Il.* 1.96, *Od.* 9.15, etc. Menelaus proceeds in 665 to argue that ‘hearing μόχθοι is ἥδ’ (cf. 634–5 ἥδοναν... ὥς λάβω).

664. ἐκοίσομεν Lenting, Zuntz, Kannicht, on the ground that λόγον εἰσφέρειν is the standard idiom. Dale defended -ομαι (‘there are so many verbs that sooner or later drop into a rare middle, especially in the future’); and the middle may have positive merit here, where the λόγος is autobiographical. I obelize for a different reason: there is no parallel for the clausula ... ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ to an enoplian dicolon.⁶⁶ The clausulae favoured by Euripides, especially in ‘enoplian dochmiac’ contexts, are ... ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, ... ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, and ... ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ×;⁶⁷ and that suggests that the choice here lies between εἰκοίσω and ἐκοίσομεθα. The former would be rhythmically in line with 657, 680, 681; the latter with 693 ... χαλκεόπλων Δαναῶν (the whole dicolon then like *H.F.* 1083–4 δῶκετε· φεύγετε μαργον· ἀνδρ’ ἐπεγειρομένον). [Some clear instances of alteration of 1st person plural to 1st person singular are cited by Diggle

⁶⁵ It has evidently misled Schmiel, who supports his argument for a cold, ‘unreconciled’ Menelaus (n. 22 above) by the very fact that he ‘interrogates’ his wife. Menelaus has warmly embraced and been embraced by Helen for thirty-five lines before seeking to satisfy his curiosity; it is then Helen who makes the running and has the last word.

⁶⁶ Period-end at οἶον|οἶον is out of the question, and οἶον ἐκοίσομαι cannot therefore be a dochmius, whose *anceps* first syllable (*pace* Dale) can only follow a *longum* or *biceps*. The telesilleian × ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ occurs exceptionally in the rising part of enoplian dicola (*Hipp.* 1269, *S. O.T.* 1096/1108), but not in the close.

⁶⁷ For these clausulae, variously following *P* × (∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪), *T* × (∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪) or *A* × (∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪), see *comm. Or.* pp. xxi, 113, 288.

in *CQ* 33 (1983), 350. *Rh.* 832 *παραιτούμαι* may be a similar error (*leg.* *παραιτούμεθα*; *CQ* 1988, 94). A possible cause of confusion here is the preceding *ἀπεπύσαμεν* (cf. *Or.* 1165 *ἴν' ἀνταναλώσω μὲν*...).

666–71. First emphasizing that she was neither physically involved in the notorious elopement in Paris' ship nor guilty of adulterous *ἔρωσ*, Helen reveals that it was Hermes who brought her to Egypt. Menelaus' intervening question does not disrupt the syntax, since the answer to 669 is also the completion of Helen's sentence; a favourite, elegant device in dialogue.⁶⁸

ΕΛ. οὐκ ἐπὶ βαρβάρου λέκτρα νεανία
πετομένας κώπας †πετομένου δ'† ἔρω-
τος ἀδίκων γάμων...
ΜΕ. τίς <ῆ> σε δαίμων ἢ πότμος κυλαί πάτρας;
ΕΛ. ὁ Διὸς ὁ Διός, ὦ πόσι, με παῖς Μαίας
τ' ἐπέλασεν Νείλωι.

670

666. *λέκτρον βαρβάρου* L, corr. Kluge, after L. Dindorf; so Diggle. The false word-order with (at first) *λέκτρα βαρβάρου νεανία* could be another ancient iambicizing error; cf. 634–5, 654–5, 670–1 (below), 689.

667–8. Kannicht defends the text, and it is true that *πετομένας... | πετομένου...* is in itself a type of iteration very common in dochmiacs. But (a) the function of such iteration is to emphasize, and the emphasis is here evidently misplaced: '(It was) not in a (metaphorically) *flying* mode... (that) Hermes brought me to Egypt'. (b) 'Flying oar' and 'flying *ἔρωσ*' are an oddly disparate pair.⁶⁹ (c) The sentence runs very awkwardly with ill-balanced genitive absolutes, both to be understood as negated by *οὐκ*. No parallel is cited for *οὐ*..., ...*δέ* equivalent to *οὐ*...*μὲν*...*δέ*, and the natural coordination here would be *οὐκ*...*οὐδέ* (or *οὔτε*...*οὔτε*).

Reiske seems likely to have been right, therefore, in proposing <...> *οὐδ'* for *πετομενουδ'*; the scribe's eye could well have taken *πετομένον* from the line above (L attests verse-end after *κώπας*). But we are not then committed to looking for a finite verb (*κέλομεν* Reiske, *ἔμεν* Campbell, *εἰπόμεθ'* Dale), with further alteration of *ἔρωτος* to *ἔρώντες*. We can at once preserve the unity of the sentence and improve its structure by writing: *οὐκ*...*κώπας* <ἔποχον>, *οὐδ' ἔρωτος*... (the predicative adj. picked up both by *σε* in 669 and by *με* in 670). One can be *ἔποχος* 'borne upon' either a ship (*ναῶν* A. *Pers.* 54) or an emotion (*μανίας* *Hipp.* 214).

669. *τίς <γάρ>* (Barnes) needs a parallel before it can be considered for the type of intervening question that precedes subject and predicate. *τίς <δῆ>* (Zuntz) is more suitable. But Rappold's neglected <ῆ> deserves to be right, enhancing the disjunction *δαίμων ἢ πότμος*. For the omission, cf. *Andr.* 848–9 *ποῦ... ἀερθῶ, | <ῆ> κατὰ πόντον ἢ καθ' ὕλαν ὀρέων*...; (suppl. Seidler). There is a mild hyperbaton in the position of the first ῆ, exactly as in *Hipp.* 670 *τίν' ἢ νῦν τέχνην ἔχομεν ἢ λόγον*...; (*τίν' ἢ νῦν* Page, Conomis, Diggle; cf. *Σ* *τίνα νῦν ἢ τέχνην ἢ... λόγον*...); 'Either' has a licence to wander somewhat in this type of alternative question.⁷⁰ In this case the inserted position of the enclitic pronoun may owe something also to the ancient type of phrase-pattern illustrated by Barrett on *Hipp.* 10 *ὁ γάρ με Θησέως παῖς*...

670–1. Elmsley's ...*πόσι, <Μαίας τε> παῖς | μ'*... can claim the support of Π's line-

⁶⁸ Classified by Mastronarde (*Contact and Discontinuity*, pp. 56ff.) as 'suspended syntax with intervention encouraging completion (lyric and iambic)'.

⁶⁹ As to the latter, it is the person, not the emotion, that *πέτεται* in the passages cited by Kannicht as parallels.

⁷⁰ 'Either' may also be deferred; cf. *Med.* 846ff. *πῶς οὖν ἱερῶν ποταμῶν | ἢ πόλις ἢ φῖλων | πόμπιμος σε χώρα*...; (where Elmsley compared *Ar. Av.* 420).

openings (ο δ[ιος...|μ[αιας...|μ[ε...]). Dale rightly preferred the metre of Hermann's με παῖς Μαίας τ',⁷¹ but hesitated to accept it in the light of Π ('now it postulates a tangled little process of corruption'). All we have to believe, however, is that the same iambicizing tendency which treated ο διος...ποσι as a lekythion had already in the 4th–3rd centuries iambicized the words με παῖς μαίας τε (giving also easier word-order) in accordance with that metrical interpretation. L may descend from a tradition with ο διος...μαίας τε παῖς *uno versu*, unlike Π; this is just the kind of situation in which sub-Aristophanic texts could diverge as to lineation (cf. 634–5 and 650–1; p. 59 n. 56). Note that Π has the common misspelling ποσει at verse-end in 644, and may well have had it here also.

ἐπέλασεν: from πελάζω, a favourite verb; not from ἐπελαύνω, a compound not attested elsewhere in Euripides;⁷² cf. *Med.* 759–60 ἀλλά ε' ὁ Μαΐας πελάσειε δόμοις. [The articulation τε πέλασεν is equally good here, and also ὦδε πέλας' in 682. Omission of the syllabic augment is common in Euripides' lyrics, and he was fond of short-syllable overlap in dochmiacs (cf. 659, 668, 678, 685, 694–5).]

672–8. 672 and 675 are both expressions of 'wonderment', parenthetically articulating a lyric narrative which has its own momentum, while *indirectly* conveying the desired information. The explanation of the statement ἄ Διός μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν will not be completed until 682(–3), after a further intervening question; and even then Helen will have further points to make.

ME. θαυμαστά· τοῦ πέμψαντος; ὦ δεινοὶ λόγοι.

EA. †κατεδάκρυσα† καὶ βλέφαρον ὑγραίνω
δάκρυςιν ἄ Διός μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν.

ME. Ἥρα; τί νῶν χρήζουσα προσθεῖναι κακόν;

675

EA. ὦ μοι ἐγὼ κείνων λουτρῶν καὶ κρηνῶν,
ἵνα θεαὶ μορφὰν ἐφαΐδρυναν, ἐν-
θεν ἔμολεν κρίσις.

673–4. The text is tautologous, but lamentation often includes repetitive phrasing. The objection is rather to the deployment of cognate words in a pleonastic pairing of the type that requires *variatio*. One can say 'I weep and my eyes are wet with tears', but not 'I am *tearful* and my eyes are wet with tears'. The initial emphasis on δάκρυα (with a κατά compound) and the verse-end at ὑγραίνω make the appending of δάκρυςιν even more jejune.

What we want, surely, is κατὰ δ' ἔκλαυσα..., looking back to 663 ἀπέπτυσα μέν... and forward to 676 ὦ μοι..., while giving an appropriate verb of 'lamenting' (intrans., cf. *El.* 113, 128; tmesis as *Or.* 196, etc.). The scribe's eye catches δάκρυςιν in the line below (cf. 667–8, 690).

675. προσθεῖναι: simply 'to inflict' (not 'add', which would require ἄλλο). τί νῶν (Hermann, for τίνων)...κακόν; Probably 'What hurt...?' (not 'Why...?'), though χρήζουσα implies an interest in Hera's motive. Hitherto he has been thinking of a vague θεός directing τύχη (642f.) or Τύχη θεός (653?), without 'desires'. νῶν: Menelaus assumes that affliction aimed at his wife is aimed also at himself (cf. 647). Helen in her continuation disregards the dual pronoun, and egotistically repeats the first person singular.

676. ὦ μοι ἐμῶν δεινῶν L, corr. Badham (ἐγὼ), Stinton and Dale (κείνων); so Diggle (cf. also *Or.* 671). No one seems hitherto to have corrected L's atticized spelling κρηνῶν.

⁷¹ On supposed dochmiacs with two shorts for initial *anceps*, see Barrett, *Hippolytos*, p. 434, and Diggle, *Ill. Cl. Stud.* 2 (1977), 123, and *Studies* 54.

⁷² Both LSJ and Allen-Italie cite these passages under ἐπελαύνω; and the silence of Dale and Kannicht seems to imply acquiescence. Dr Diggle drew my attention to the truth.

677–8. '...whence came (the) judging.' κρίσις can scarcely be personified like Justice (*Ion* 846) or Death (*A. Ch.* 935). For the abstract subject with μολεῖν, the nearest parallel seems to be *Ion* 1558 μὴ τῶν πάροιθε μέμψις ἐς μέσον μόλῃ. But 'to go εἰς κρίσιν' is standard Attic forensic idiom, and one might have expected ἐνθ' ἔμολον ἐς κρίσιν, cf. *I.A.* 1298ff. ἐνθα ποτὲ | Παλλὰς ἔμολε καὶ δολιόφρων Κύπρις | Ἥρα θ'... | κρίσιν ἐπὶ στυγνὰν ἔριν τε | καλλονᾶς; or in this case, where the focus is on Hera, ἐνθ' ἔμολεν ἐς κρίσιν.

679–83. After a much-discussed intervening question, Helen continues and Menelaus intelligently supplements the explanation of the statement ἁ Διός μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν (674).

ME.	†τὰ δ' εἰς κρίσιν σοι τῶνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κακῶν†;	
ΕΛ.	Πάριν ὡς ἀφέλοιτο...	
ME.	πῶς; αὖδα.	680
ΕΛ.	Κύπρις ὦι μ' ἐπένευεν...	
ME.	ὦ †τλήμον.	
ΕΛ.	τλάμων τλάμων† ὦδ' ἐπέλας Αἰγύπτωι.	
ME.	εἴτ' ἀντέδωκ' εἶδωλον, ὡς ἐθεν κλύω.	

679. Menelaus can be assumed to know about the ruin-causing events on Mt Ida as ἀρχή of the Trojan War and so of his own troubles. The issue now, to which lines 680ff. are addressed, is the connection between those events and Hera's ruination of Helen in particular (674 μ'...ὤλεσεν, and ἐγώ 675).

Diggle has discussed and disposed of most of the published conjectures for 679. Of those considered, Kayser's τί δ' (Musgrave) ἐς κρίσιν σοι τήνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κότον; is indeed the best; and Diggle's τόνδ' is arguably an improvement on τήνδ'. But there is still a weakness, in that we need a stronger emphasis on the second person pronoun: 'but why...you...?'

I suspect that Campbell may have been on the right lines in proposing ἔκκριτον (adv., with an idea of 'singling out', cf. *Tro.* 1241 Τροία τε πόλειω ἔκκριτον στυγουμένη, sc. by the gods).⁷³ We can then keep τῶνδ' as a straightforward causal genitive 'on account of these (events on Ida)':

ME. τί δ' ἔκκριτον σοὶ τῶνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κότον;

εἰς (sic L) κρίσιν for ἔκκριτον will then be an error influenced by the preceding verse (in more than one possible way, see above). But the line must remain obelized. κότος occurs in Aeschylus, but is not certainly a word used by either Sophocles or Euripides (only *Rhesus*). The corruption is certainly compound, and every word in the line has been altered at one time or another.

680. Reiske's Πάριν...|Κύπρις... (for κύπριν...|πάριν...) is almost universally accepted.⁷⁴ Bothe's ὡς <μ> ἀφέλοιτο is plausible (clearer, and also balancing ὦι μ' ἐπένευεν). Helen hesitates αἰδοίως before mentioning Aphrodite, and Menelaus prompts her to proceed (cf. 661ff.; for the elliptical use of πῶς; sc. φήις or εἶπας, cf. 95, 1523, *Ph.* 1648, *I.A.* 513, 874, etc.). He may also be momentarily puzzled, and perhaps disturbed, since ἀφέλοιτο 'take away from' might imply that Helen had after all been with Paris.

⁷³ Campbell gilded the lily (*more suo*) by writing σε τῶνδ' ἔθηκε φάρμακον for σοι τῶνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κακῶν, without thinking it necessary to offer a parallel for the sense 'scapegoat' (see LSJ). Perhaps that is why Diggle's survey did not include the plausible conjecture ἔκκριτον.

⁷⁴ Young is too conservative, as elsewhere: 'That she [Hera] might deprive of Kypris [sexual pleasure]...Paris, to whom she [Kypris as goddess of sex] had assigned me...'. No one could be expected to understand that.

681. '... to whom Cypris (had) assigned (lit. nodded) me ...'. Menelaus now follows Helen's drift and expresses pitying sympathy with ὦ τλάμων (Ald.) or ὦ τλάμων (Hermann). [Surely τλαμ- (so Kannicht): juxtaposition of Attic τλημ- and Doric τλαμ- is an improbable incongruity. Having sung in the recent duet, Menelaus can be allowed the Doric alpha in what is, after all, part of a lyric verse.]

It is often hard to distinguish between nom. and voc. in such expressions, and either will do for the extremely common pitying sense; but the voc. seems slightly more natural here, since Helen was the object, not the subject, of the preceding sentence, and Menelaus' previous and following utterances are addressed to Helen, not 'asides'.⁷⁵

The alternative interpretations 'Oh, cruel (Hera)!' (Dale, after Wilamowitz) and 'Oh, cruel (Cypris)!' (Schmiel) introduce a vexatious ambiguity, surely not intended. (a) From Menelaus' point of view Hera merits gratitude for dispossessing Paris. (b) τλήμων does not strictly mean 'cruel'. The pejorative force of τλήμων and τάλας, in appropriate contexts, is rather 'How could you bring yourself, or what afflicted you so as, to do such a thing?', and there are few parallels for reproaching a god in such terms.⁷⁶ The right point here must be the straightforward one, with the adjective used in the same sense as at 647.

682. Hermann τλάμων<α> τλάμων', Wilamowitz τλάμων τλάμων'. Both are metrical improvements, removing 'the abnormality of word-division after the second long anceps of the dochmiac'.⁷⁷ τλάμων τλάμων', accepted by Dale, Kannicht and Diggle, is superficially attractive, since paregmenon is a favourite figure; cf. *Su.* 598 ὦ μέλαι μελέων ματέρες λοχαγῶν.⁷⁸ But when an adjective is applied in different cases to different persons, the sense of the adjective cannot well change, the function of the figure being to *associate* the persons. This is no place for clever 'word-play', associating both Hera and Helen as τλήμονες. All we want is husbandly commiseration from Menelaus and concurring self-pity from Helen. So we must either follow Hermann, or (an overlooked resource) write:

ME.	ὦ τλάμων,
	τλάμων.
EA.	τλάμων' ὦδ' ἐπέλας' Αἰγύνπτωι.

The 'pitying' repetition is at least as appropriate to Menelaus, who then contributes a portion, consisting only of long syllables, to all three lyric verses; and his successive utterances in 680, 681–2 and 683 increase in length. For the dochmiac thus divided, cf. 685, *H.F.* 1051–2 (*CQ* 1988, 95), *Or.* 148/161, *S. O.C.* 836/879.

683. Menelaus intelligently adds the corollary, rephrasing what Helen told him at

⁷⁵ Metre guarantees ὦ τλήμων at *Hec.* 775 and ὦ τλάμων ὑμεναίων at *Hipp.* 554 (both obviously pitying). In exx. of exclam. nom. (cf. comm. on *Or.* 90, 160, 1527, 1537–8, and Stevens on *Andr.* 71) it is normally easy to supply the appropriate name or pronoun in the nominative case.

⁷⁶ In all senses τλήμων and τάλας are characteristically applied in tragedy to human beings, whose 'audacious' conduct may be due to divine affliction (cf. τλήμων Ὀρέστης; cf. also ταλαίπωρος, μέλεος, δύστηνος. Dale needed better support than *Alc.* 1, where Apollo uses the verb ἔτλην for his *ungodlike* 'submission' to servile status. Dr Diggle draws my attention to *Ion* 905, where (in his text) Creusa reproaches Apollo as τλάμων; that is doubtless right (after the precedent of *Med.* 990 cὺ δ', ὦ τάλαν, ὦ κακόννυμφε), but it is likely that the use of τλάμων addressed to Apollo was as bold a novelty as Orestes' rhetorical hyperbole ἐκείνον ἡγείσθ' ἀνόσιον καὶ κτείνετε at *Or.* 595.

⁷⁷ So Diggle, citing Parker, *CQ* 16 (1966), 12.

⁷⁸ Cf. W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart, 1934), pp. 221–5. Paregmenon of 'pitying' words is especially frequent.

684–90. The *πάθη* of Leda and Hermione are further features of ‘my ruin’.

684. <cá> Hermann; a certain correction (*pace* Young).

688. *ἔστιν* (Triclinius) remedies only the metrical fault. We seem to need *τίς* ...; but Badham's *τίς μοι* for *ὦ μοι* removes a necessary expression of grief in response to the report of Leda's suicide, and the *δέ* is unnaturally late. Better would be *ὦ μοι· θυγατὶς Ἑρμιόνης δὲ τίς βίος*; But Dr Diggle (pers. comm.) questions the genitive case, comparing the dative in *S. Ant.* 548 *καὶ τίς βίος μοι σοῦ λελειμμένη*; As he says, we really want *λόγος* (Campbell), not *βίος*, as in the similar question at *I.T.* 563 *τί δέ; σφαγείσθαι θυγατὶς ἔστι τι λόγος*; There is no need then for an interrogative *τίς*, but ... *δέ τίς* ... could still be right.

⁸⁰ For the pejorative-negative use of $\acute{\alpha}$ - and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ - words, see in general D. Fehling, *Hermes* 96 (1968), 142ff., and comm. on *Or.* 162–5.

691–7. The Duo ends with a well-characterized exchange:

ME. ὦ πᾶν κατ' ἄκρας δῶμ' ἐμόν πέρσας Πάρις.
 ΕΛ. τᾶδε καὶ σὲ διώλεσε μυριάδας τε
 χαλκεόπλων Δαναῶν·
 ἐμὲ δὲ πατρίδος ἀπο(πρὸ) κακόποτμον ἀραι-
 ὸν ἔβαλε θεὸς ἀπὸ πόλεος ἀπὸ τε σέθεν,
 ὅτι μέλαθρα λέχεά τ' ἔλιπον οὐ λιποῦ-
 σ' ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς γάμοις.

695

691. Diggle rightly rejects Triclinius' continuation of 692–3 to Menelaus. The single-trimeter utterance is right here, as elsewhere in this 'punctuated monody', economically saying all that Menelaus needs to say about the utter ruin of 'my house', with an air of finality in the alliterative phrasing ὦ πᾶν...πέρσας Πάρις and an appropriately paradoxical metaphor (Menelaus having sacked Paris' house). δῶμ' ἐμόν reflects 660 δόμων...τῶν ἐμῶν.

692–7. Helen concludes with an extended dochmiac period preceded by an enoplian dicolon; a characteristic pattern,⁸¹ here chastically reflecting the beginning of her agitated aria (661–2, 664), and also articulating the antithesis between (a) the 'ruin' of Menelaus and countless Greek warriors, (b) the no less lamentable ill-fortune (and ruin, 674) of Helen herself. Whereas Menelaus has attributed the ruin to 'Paris', Helen first refers imprecisely to a plural τᾶδε, but ends by attributing her own misfortune to θεός (= δαίμων), to be understood in the same sense '(generalized) divine power' as in 642; a turn of language which enhances her own δυσδαιμονία.

692–3. The sentence-opening is *ambivalent*: (a) τᾶδε has two direct referents, 'Paris' and 'my γάμος ἄγαμος', and may also refer to the events on Ida (cf. 676–9); (b) καὶ may be taken either with τᾶδε ('It was *even* these things that ruined...'; so Diggle) or with σέ ('...ruined *you also*, husband,...'). We are not faced with a choice between incompatible alternatives. With neat syntax 692ff. is at once an assentient reply to 691 and a lamenting continuation of 689–90, thus concluding an 'aria' which, as we have seen, has its independent momentum. διώλεσε: another appropriate ambivalence (for the bracketing of Menelaus and 'countless bronze-armoured Danaans'). As Diggle rightly argues, the hyperbole in respect of Menelaus is unexceptionable (in the same vein as ὤλεσεν in respect of Helen in 674; cf. also *H.F.* 1065–6 τέκνων ὀλεθρον...σέθεν τε παιδός); the point is also comprehensive, embracing Greek warriors like Teucer who have been 'ruined' rather than killed.⁸²

694–7. The concluding single period of seven much-resolved dochmiacs is a metrical and syntactical *tour de force* like *Or.* 149–52/162–5; there is no pause at σέθεν, and the singer needs a long breath. Diggle's corrections ἀπο(πρὸ) and ἀραιὸν convincingly mend the metre of 694–5.⁸³ Note that the overlapping word ἀραι-|ον now stands out as containing the only *longum* in the first forty-two syllables of the sentence; a feature consonant with the rhetorical importance of this word. Severance from one's πατρίς is a bad enough πότμος (cf. *Med.* 34–5); but Helen's special δυσδαιμονία is to have been supernaturally exiled from her πόλις (πόλεος as often = πολιτῶν) and husband *falsely execrated as an adulteress*; cf. 53–5 ἡ δὲ πάντα τλᾶς' ἐγὼ|κατάρατος εἰμι καὶ δοκῶ προδοῦς' ἐμόν|πόσιν συνάψαι πόλεμον. The 'causing of war' counts for less, in this conjugal reunion, than the 'adultery' allegation.

⁸¹ Cf. *H.F.* 883–5, 1082–6, 1205–13, *Tro.* 886–92, *I.T.* 895–9, *Ion* 1494–6, *Or.* 181–6/202–7, 1256–65/1276–85, 1363–5/1546–8. There is no excuse for attempts to make dochmiacs out of 692–3 – an unexceptionable dicolon as transmitted, like *Med.* 992–3/999–1000.

⁸² Euripides exploited the imprecision of διώλετο and διολέαντας rather differently at *Or.* 1512 and 1566; see comm., also *CQ* 1988, 96 on *H.F.* 1021–4.

⁸³ L has ...ἀπὸ κακόποτμον|ἀραίαν ἔβαλε θεός|...; see n. 56 above.

ὅτι...: 'for the offence that, on the (unjust) ground that ...';⁸⁴ cf. *Hyps.* fr. 64.72–4 (Bond, p. 47) αἰαί, φυγὰς ἐμέθεν ἄς ἐφύγον, | ὧ τέκνον, εἰ μάθοις, Λήμνου ποντίας, | πολὺν ὅτι πατέρος οὐκ ἔτεμον κάρα. The paradoxical piquancy of that passage lies in the *truth* of the unjust ἔγκλημα, i.e. in the identity of ἔργον and λόγος. The force of ὅτι is the same here (following ἀραῖον and the idea of 'exile'); but the λόγος and the ἔργον are in conflict.

μέλαθρα λέχεά τ' ἔλιπον...ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς γάμοις: the traditional 'adultery' charge is formulated with a pejorative use of λιπ- in line with *Il.* 3.174–5, Sappho fr. 16.7–11 L.–P., Alcaeus fr. 283.6–8 L.–P. (cited by Kannicht), and Stesichorus fr. 223 Page; cf. also *Or.* 1305 (with two λιπο- words, see comm.).

The 'negating' insertion of οὐ λιποῦς is the same species of positive–negative juxtaposition as 611 δοκοῦντες Ἑλένην οὐκ ἔχοντ' ἔχειν Πάριν. Logically, the negative phrase is a *parenthetic* contradiction of the false δόκησις; but it is treated as integral for the sake of the rhetorical figure.⁸⁵ There is also brachylogy, in that the λόγος negated is not simply ἔλιπον or μέλαθρα...ἔλιπον (Helen did in fact 'leave home and husband'), but μέλαθρα λέχεά τ' ἔλιπον ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς γάμοις. Both the object phrase and the adverbial phrase are ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, as the object Ἑλένην is ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in the simpler precedent at 611 (whose intelligibility depends in turn upon 35–6 δοκεῖ μ' ἔχειν, | κενὴν δόκησιν, οὐκ ἔχων). There is no real problem here: we know what Helen means,⁸⁶ and Euripides could instruct his singer in the articulation of the words.

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK

⁸⁴ Kannicht rightly rejects the vulgate ὅτε (Dobree). 'When I left home...' feebly ends the Duo with a less relevant temporal point. and (more seriously) loses the echo of the traditional accusation in μέλαθρα...ἔλιπον.

⁸⁵ Pearson was wrong in principle ("I left and did not leave...", i.e. I seemed to do so'), though followed by Dale ('when I left-without-leaving...') and cited approvingly by Kannicht. 611 does not mean 'thinking that Paris seems-to-have Helen'. In most of these positive–negative quibbles (there are several species) there is an implicit λόγῳ/ἔργῳ antithesis, e.g. (λόγῳ μὲν) μήτηρ (ἔργῳ δὲ) ἀμήτωρ. In 138 τεθνᾶσι κοῦ τεθνᾶσι (obviously not 'they seem to be dead') there are explicitly 'two λόγοι'.

⁸⁶ Cf. *H.F.* 1072–8, where 'the double-edged use of (οὐ) φεύγω complicates the thought, but the point is clear enough' (CQ 1988, 97).