ON THE *ORESTES* OF EURIPIDES*

I cite manuscripts from my own collations. Information about most of these manuscripts, and explanation of the symbols by which I designate them, may be found in A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, 1953), K. Matthiessen, *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Euripideischen Hekabe* (Heidelberg, 1974), and D. J. Mastronarde and J. M. Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai* (Berkeley, 1982).[1] I shall discuss the affiliations and the relative value of these manuscripts on a later occasion. For the present no knowledge of these matters is needed. I refer to modern editions by the names of their editors: Wecklein = N. Wecklein (Leipzig, 1890), Wecklein (1906) = N. Wecklein (Leipzig and Berlin, 1906), Di Benedetto = V. Di Benedetto (Florence, 1965), Biehl = W. Biehl (Leipzig, Teubner, 1975), Willink = C. W. Willink (Oxford, 1986, 1989² [with Addendis Addenda]), West = M. L. West (Warminster, Aris and Phillips, 1987). *Studies* refers to my *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981).

304–5

> εἰ γὰρ προλείψεις μ’ ἢ προσεδρίαι νόσον
> κτήσηι τιν’, οἰχόμεσθα.

Orestes has urged Electra to attend to her personal welfare, by taking sleep, food, and a bath. 'For, if you desert me or fall sick, I am done for.' 'Impossible,' replies Electra (307 οὐκ ἔστι). 'I shall choose to live and die with you.'

Paley (followed by Wecklein, Murray and Biehl) was right to delete μ’. He compared *Hec.* 438 οἲ ’γώ, προλείπω, λύεται δέ μου μέλη. Di Benedetto, Willink, and West disagree. Willink argues that μ’ is required by 'the logic of El.'s reply' – 'οὐκ ἔστι: sc. ὅπως προλείψω σε ... El. cannot guarantee that she will not "sicken" (or "faint"); but she can and does assert her will to live ....' But, if οὐκ ἔστι alludes to the εἰ-clause, it cannot allude only to the first of the two verbs in it (as Willink's 'sc. ὅπως προλείψω σε' implies that it does). It must refer to both parts of the clause: so that Electra will still be denying that she will fall sick. Further, προλείψεις μ’ would not naturally mean 'abandon me by dying', but rather 'abandon me by departing' (West's 'give out on me' equally postulates an unparalleled sense for the transitive verb). No support for Willink's or West's interpretation is afforded by *Alc.* 386 ἀπωλόμην ἄρ’, εἴ με δὴ λείψεις, γύναι, since both characters have already spoken of their imminent physical separation, which will occur when Alcestis departs for the underworld. Similarly, *IA* 1466 μή με προλίπηις refers to physical separation. Finally, the natural sequel to Orestes' insistence that Electra should take sleep, food, and a bath is an expression of concern that otherwise she may collapse.

If we look more closely at Electra's reply (307ff.), we find a more satisfactory explanation of her initial οὐκ ἔστι. These words allude not (or, not only) to the εἰ-clause but to Orestes' earlier proposals for her welfare (301ff.), proposals whose motive is given in the εἰ-clause. οὐκ ἔστι is followed, in explanatory asyndeton, by a

---

[1] Many of these manuscripts are listed, and their symbols explained, at the head of my text of *Hecuba* (OCT i.334–5).

statement that her choice is to live or die with Orestes (cùν coì καὶ θανεῖν αἱρήcομαι|καὶ ζῆν). The alternatives amount to the same thing (ἔχει γὰρ ταὐτόν), since life without Orestes is no life (ἢν cὺ κατθάνηιc, |γυνὴ τί δράcω; πῶc μόνη cωθήcομαι, |ἀνάδελφοc ἀπάτωρ ἄφιλοc;). The first alternative (to die, if Orestes dies) provides a motive for her rejection of his proposals for her welfare (301ff.). The second (to live, if Orestes lives) provides a motive for accepting them. She solves the conflict by deferring to his authority (310–11 εἰ δὲ coì δοκεῖ, |δρᾶν χρὴ τάδ᾽).

Willink himself quotes the best parallel for the interpolated μ᾽: *Alc.* 391 προλείπειc L: προλείπειc μ᾽ BOVP. Here are other examples of interpolated pronouns in the manuscripts of *Orestes*: 153 μετάδοc ⟨μ᾽⟩ ZTp, μ- ⟨μοι⟩ Zc; 169 ⟨νιν⟩ ἔδοξα B²ᵐB³AdAnAt⟨K?⟩MsXXaXb (~ Kᶜ); 227 ὅταν ⟨μ᾽⟩ codd.; 262 μεθήcω ⟨cε⟩ Aa; 337 τίc ⟨c᾽⟩ Pr; 449 πράccουcιν ⟨ἡμῖν⟩ Aa(Mn)Pr²RfRwSZmZu (ᵍ¹B²/³GK¹R² XaXbZʳZcT); 507 δέ ⟨cε⟩ Cr (~Crᶜ); 719 κάκιcτε ⟨cύ⟩ H; 768 τάλαc ⟨ἐγώ⟩ F; 802 φίλοc ⟨coι⟩ MnS; 1072 ζῆν ⟨με⟩ FSagB; 1193 χρή ⟨cε⟩ MnMsRS; 1245 θανεῖν ⟨c᾽⟩ Pr?; 1248 ⟨cὺ⟩ πότνια JT; 1607 ⟨μ᾽⟩ ἀνδάνουcιν AaMnPRfSZZcZmT, ἀνδάνουcί ⟨μ᾽⟩ G, -cιν ⟨μ᾽⟩ M².

409–10

> Με. οἶδ᾽ ἃc ἔλεξαc, ὀνομάcαι δ᾽ οὐ βούλομαι.
> Ορ. cεμναὶ γάρ· εὐπαίδευτα δ᾽ ἀποτρέπου λέγειν.

The imperative ἀποτρέπου is impossible, although it is accepted by Wecklein, Biehl, and West ('Turn to politer matters'). Musgrave's ἀποτρέπηι was accepted by Porson and others, and might be held to derive support from (a) Σᵐᵇᶜ 142.14–15 εὐπαιδεύτωc δὲ ποιεῖc ὀνομάζειν αὐτὰc 'Ερινύαc παραιτούμενοc ('You act sensibly in declining ...') and from (b) ἀποτρέπει, which is reported from a few late manuscripts.[2] But I doubt if we should repose much confidence in the scholiast's paraphrase (Σᵐᵇᵛᶜ 142.16 interprets ἀποτρέπου), and I repose none at all in the integrity of those late manuscripts. Hermann's ἀπετρέπου is accepted by Di Benedetto and by Willink. But West justifiably objects that an aorist, not an imperfect, would be needed.

Musgrave's present tense may be right. But a past is preferable, and so, taking the lead from West, I propose ἀπετράπου. For the aorist, in the sense in which it is used here, see Thuc. 1.76.2 τοῦ μὴ πλέον ἔχειν ἀπετράπετο, Pl. *Euth.* 14b–c ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐ πρόθυμόc με εἶ διδάξαι – δῆλοc εἶ. καὶ γὰρ νῦν ἐπειδὴ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶι ἦcθα ἀπετράπου.

544–57

> Ορ. ὦ γέρον, ἐγώ τοι πρὸc cὲ δειμαίνω λέγειν,
> ὅπου cε μέλλω cήν τε λυπήcειν φρένα.   545
> ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἀνόcιόc εἰμι μητέρα κτανών,
> ὅcιοc δέ γ᾽ ἕτερον ὄνομα, τιμωρῶν πατρί.
> ἀπελθέτω δὴ τοῖc λόγοιcιν ἐκποδὼν
> τὸ γῆραc ἡμῖν τὸ cόν, ὅ μ᾽ ἐκπλήccει λόγου,
> καὶ καθ᾽ ὁδὸν εἶμι· νῦν δὲ cὴν ταρβῶ τρίχα.   550
> τί χρῆν με δρᾶcαι; δύο γὰρ ἀντίθεc δυοῖν·
> πατὴρ μὲν ἐφύτευcέν με, cὴ δ᾽ ἔτικτε παῖc,
> τὸ cπέρμ᾽ ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦc᾽ ἄλλου πάρα·
> ἄνευ δὲ πατρὸc τέκνον οὐκ εἴη ποτ᾽ ἄν.
> ἐλογιcάμην οὖν τῶι γένουc ἀρχηγέτηι   555
> μᾶλλόν μ᾽ ἀμῦναι τῆc ὑποcτάcηc τροφάc.
> ἡ cὴ δὲ θυγάτηρ – μητέρ᾽ αἰδοῦμαι λέγειν – κτλ.

[2] It is reported by Wecklein and Biehl from the lost Thessalonicensis (16th cent.), on which see P. N. Pappageorgiou, 'Αθήναιον 10 (1881), 286–309, Turyn 151–2, Mastronarde–Bremer 172–3. It was also probably the original reading (later corrected) of J (Cambridge, University Library, Nn 3. 13 [15th cent.]), on which see Turyn 206–8, Matthiessen 50.

Orestes says that he is afraid of speaking to Tyndareos, lest he annoy him (544–5). He begins to justify his past conduct (546–7), but stops abruptly and expresses the wish that respect for Tyndareos' old age may not inhibit him from speaking (548–50). He returns abruptly to his self-justification (551ff.). There are two features here which disturb us: (a) two different reasons are offered why Orestes may be inhibited from speaking, and (b) the second reason interrupts the argument.

Removal of 548–50 (Orestes' second reason), once proposed and the proposal later disowned by Nauck, would rid us of both disturbing features. But, so far as concerns sense and diction, the lines are faultless. Not without fault, however, is 545 (Orestes' first reason), with its vacuous collocation $c\epsilon$ ... $c\dot{\eta}\nu$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\phi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$. Musgrave proposed (and some, including Willink, have accepted) $\gamma\epsilon$ for $c\epsilon$ and $\tau\iota$ for $\tau\epsilon$ (for $\tau\iota$ see *Ph.* 383 $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\tau\iota$ $c\dot{\eta}\nu$ $\delta\dot{\alpha}\kappa\omega$ $\phi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$). In fact, $\gamma\epsilon$ is the reading of AtMn[uv]Pr[yp]S[yp]ZZc ($\sim$ Mn[c]) and of some manuscripts of the *Lexicon Vindobonense*,[3] and Sa has $\gamma\epsilon$ $c\dot{\epsilon}$. If the line is to stay, these changes must be accepted.[4] Paley deleted the line, suggesting that the interpolator had borrowed from the rejoinder of Tyndareos in 608 ($o\ddot{\upsilon}\tau\omega$ δ' $\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\dot{\iota}\beta\eta\iota$ μ' $\ddot{\omega}c\tau\epsilon$ μ' $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\dot{\eta}c\alpha\iota$ $\phi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$). Deletion has the merit of removing a superfluous reason for Orestes' inhibition. But it leaves the interruption untouched.

The interruption was eliminated by Hartung (1849) and independently by Kirchhoff (1855), who placed 548–50 before 546. This transposition is accepted by Paley, Wecklein, West, and others. It incidentally relieves us of the need for Hermann's $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}\iota\delta$' in 546, since $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}$ δ' may appropriately open the speech of self-justification (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, pp. 170–1; add *Med.* 526).

But a further problem now looms. Orestes continues 'What was I to do? Oppose two things against two others' (551). What are these two pairs of opposites? A first pair appears readily to present itself: the fatherhood of Agamemnon and the motherhood of Clytemnestra, conveniently opposed by $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ (552). The second pair is harder to find.

According to West, 'the first thing is the father's claim on his son's loyalty; it is set against the mother's, and found to be superior. The second point is Clytaemestra's adultery, which lessened her claims further, and this is set against the unholiness of matricide'. Adultery is mentioned, and so is the unholiness of matricide. But I do not see where, or how, the one is 'set against' the other. According to Di Benedetto (whose answer, though formulated differently, is similar to West's), the opposition is between two facts and the two responses of Orestes to these facts. The facts are (i) that Clytemnestra's part in procreation was the lesser, as the mere receptacle of the father's seed (553) and (ii) that Clytemnestra committed adultery (557ff.); and Orestes' responses are that, in consequence, (i) he has favoured his father (555–6) and (ii) he has killed his mother (562). We may wonder why, after the formality of $\delta\dot{\upsilon}o$ $\gamma\dot{\alpha}\rho$ $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}\theta\epsilon c$ $\delta\upsilon o\hat{\iota}\nu$, Euripides did not oppose facts and responses with more formal precision. According to Paley, Orestes sets two arguments, (i) that Clytemnestra 'was

---

[3] This Lexicon, compiled *c.* 1300 (Mastronarde–Bremer 72), was edited by Nauck from Vind. 169. But it exists in at least two other manuscripts, Vat. 12 and Vat. 22 (F. Benedetti, *BPENC* 14 [1966], 85–92, A. Colonna, ibid. 19 [1971], 13–16). Vind. 169 and Vat. 12 have $\gamma\epsilon$, Vat. 22 has $c\dot{\epsilon}$.

[4] It would not be sufficient to accept only $\tau\iota$ for $\tau\epsilon$, leaving $c\epsilon$ ... $c\dot{\eta}\nu$ $\phi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ as an example of the $\kappa\alpha\theta$' $\ddot{o}\lambda o\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}$ $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\rho o c$ construction (for which see Kühner–Gerth 1.289–90, Schwyzer 2.81, E. A. Hahn, *TAPA* 85 [1954], 219–36, R. Renehan, *Studies in Greek Texts* [1976], p. 60, my note on *Phaethon* 90ff., Barrett on *Hi.* 571–4, Bond on *Herc.* 162, Friis Johansen and Whittle on A. *Su.* 379, 515), since $c\dot{\eta}\nu$ after $c\epsilon$ would be otiose (contrast Hom. *Il.* 1.362 = 18.73, 3.442, 6.355, *Od.* 18.331 = 391, A. *Su.* 379, *Eum.* 88, S. *El.* 147, *Ant.* 319, E. *Tr.* 408, *Or.* 608).

not a parent in the same sense as the father' and (ii) that 'she was a faithless wife', in opposition to two arguments already used by Tyndareos, that Orestes slew (i) 'a mother' and (ii) 'a daughter of his'. In which case, the first opposition will be implied in 553, the second in 557ff. Again, this leaves too much work for the listener to do. If Orestes says 'oppose two things against two others', we expect to be told clearly what the two sets of opposites are and not invited to infer one of these sets from a statement (a none too clear one at that) of what the other set is. According to Willink, 'on one side of the "double antithesis" is the *father* who has *sown the seed*; on the other, the *mother* ... who has *received it like a sown field*'.[5] This has the virtue of simplicity. But we may wonder whether there really are two sets of opposites here, or rather a single set of opposites in 552, which are elaborated in 553. Finally, Wilamowitz[6] finds the first pair of opposites in 546–7 ('das eine hat er vorher genannt, er ist Muttermörder und Rächer des Vaters'), the second in 552ff. ('das andere ist, der Vater steht ihm näher (physiologisch, wie es bei Aischylos stand), die Mutter war eine Ehebrecherin'). But it is, in the full sense of the word, preposterous, that δύο γὰρ ἀντίθες δυοῖν should be preceded by the first set of opposites and followed by the second. It is small wonder that Nauck[7] flatly denied that two sets of opposites are to be found here at all, and altered δυοῖν to λόγω, a conjecture accepted by Wecklein.

But Wilamowitz was, after all, half right. Lines 546–7 do give a ready-made pair of opposites. We have seen that, where they stand, they are out of place. And the place for them is not after 550 (Hartung and Kirchhoff) but after 553. 'What was I to do?' asks Orestes. And he invites Tyndareos to 'set two things against two others'. The first opposition is between father and mother, his joint parents, who shared in the act of procreation (552–3). The second is between the unholiness of killing a mother and the holiness of avenging a father (546–7). Commentators have gone astray because they have supposed that Orestes, in saying δύο γὰρ ἀντίθες δυοῖν, is intent on claiming for himself two superior arguments with which to counter two inferior ones. On the contrary, what he expresses here is a dilemma (τί χρῆν με δρᾶσαι;). And he faced this dilemma because (γάρ) the claims of father and mother were evenly balanced, and the holiness of vengeance was finely poised against the unholiness of matricide.

Lines 554–6 will appear to tell against this interpretation. And so they do, if they are genuine. But they are not. Nauck deleted 554, and his deletion is commended by Paley, Wecklein, Reeve,[8] and Willink, and it ought not to be controversial.[9] Lines 555–6 harbour a problem which has not been solved by emendation, the unsupportable construction ἐλογισάμην ... (μ') ἀμῦναι (μ' is omitted by MAd AnFJLPXXaXb). Willink reviews the emendations and offers one of his own, which I find unconvincing. Three further difficulties, one of metre, two of language, have received less attention than they deserve.

(i) 'The metre of a verse commencing with ἐλογισάμην is unusual' (Paley).[10] More precisely, the word-shape ◡◡◡◡– in the first metron is used by Euripides only to

---

[5] The same explanation is offered by Weil: 'Si la leçon est bonne, chacune des deux phrases qui suivent est divisée par le poëte en deux idées, le sujet et l'attribut: πατήρ et ἐφύτευσέν με, σὴ παῖς et ἔτικτε.' Possibly something like this was in the mind of the scholiast (Σ^{mvc} δύο πράγματα δύο πράγμασιν ἀντίθες, τῶι πατρὶ τὸ σπέρμα, τῆι μητρὶ τὴν ἄρουραν).

[6] *Hermes* 59 (1924), 257 = *Kl. Schr.* 4 (1962), p. 351.

.[7] *Mém. Acad. Impér. des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg*, sér. vii. 1.12 (1859), 44.

[8] *GRBS* 14 (1973), 155–6.

[9] Some credit should go to I. F. Facius (1778), who, according to Beck (I have not seen Facius' edition), 'monet, hunc versum glossematis speciem habere, eiici tamen non vult'. Biehl's defence (*Textprobleme in Euripides Orestes* [1955], p. 31 and commentary [1965] *ad loc.*) is ineffectual.

[10] See also D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (1934), p. 53.

accommodate proper names.[11] There is, indeed, a parallel at *IA* 1408 τὸ θεομαχεῖν, which is followed immediately by a line beginning ἐξελογίcω (also unique, except in proper names),[12] but neither line is Euripidean.[13] The unusual metre is, in itself, no sufficient argument against authenticity. But, if other anomalies exist, it may be thrown into the balance.

(ii) 'It is hard to defend ὑποcτῆναι τροφάc, "to supply nurture"' (Paley).[14] Willink claims that the verb has here 'a force intermediate between active and passive', and compares *Su.* 188–9 πόλιc δὲ cὴ|μόνη δύναιτ' ἂν τόνδ' ὑποcτῆναι πόνον. But there is no reason to give that verb anything other than its usual 'passive' force. Athens would be unable to 'support/endure' (not 'undertake') the labour imposed on it, a direct response to 185 πῶc ταῖc 'Αθήναιc τόνδε προcτάccειc πόνον;. The expression ὑποcτῆναι τροφάc would properly be used of a person subjected to force-feeding. I find no comfort in Di Benedetto's notion that Orestes uses this expression in order to highlight 'la cattiva disposizione della madre'.

(iii) The second linguistic anomaly, unnoticed by Paley, is γένουc ἀρχηγέτηι. Di Benedetto is alert to the nuances of these words. 'In tragedia di solito ... con ἀρχηγέτηc si indica il re di una città. Qui Euripide sembra innovare l'uso della parola, poiché, in nesso con γένουc, ἀρχηγέτηc è qui il fondatore di una famiglia.' West translates 'the author of my birth', Willink 'the initiator of (my) γένοc', and then interprets γένοc as 'birth'. But the words mean what Di Benedetto said they mean, 'the founder of a/my family'; and that, in this context, is persiflage.

Paley deleted 555–6 (as well as 554, already deleted by Nauck). The passage now runs as follows:

<div align="center">

Ορ.   ὦ γέρον, ἐγώ τοι πρὸc cὲ δειμαίνω λέγειν

[ὅπου cε μέλλω cήν τε λυπήcειν φρένα].   545

ἀπελθέτω δὲ τοῖc λόγοιcιν ἐκποδὼν   548

τὸ γῆραc ἡμῖν τὸ cόν, ὅ μ' ἐκπλήccει λόγου,   549

καὶ καθ' ὁδὸν εἶμι· νῦν δὲ cὴν ταρβῶ τρίχα.   550

τί χρῆν με δρᾶcαι; δύο γὰρ ἀντίθεc δυοῖν·

πατὴρ μὲν ἐφύτευcέν με, cὴ δ' ἔτικτε παῖc,

τὸ cπέρμ' ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦc' ἄλλου πάρα.

[ἄνευ δὲ πατρὸc τέκνον οὐκ εἴη ποτ' ἄν.

ἐλογιcάμην οὖν τῶι γένουc ἀρχηγέτηι   555

μᾶλλόν μ' ἀμῦναι τῆc ὑποcτάcηc τροφάc.]   556

ἐγὼ δ' ἀνόcιόc εἰμι μητέρα κτανών,   546

ὅcιοc δέ γ' ἕτερον ὄνομα, τιμωρῶν πατρί.   547

ἡ cὴ δὲ θυγάτηρ – μητέρ' αἰδοῦμαι λέγειν – κτλ.   557

</div>

The argument is now logical and complete. (Prooemium) Orestes fears to address Tyndareos (544). If respect for Tyndareos' old age does not inhibit him, he will proceed (548–550a). But the fact is that he stands in awe of Tyndareos' grey hair (550b).[15] (Speech proper) What was he to do? (551a). The scales were evenly poised, with two counterbalanced claims (551b). On the one side was a father, on the other a mother, on the one side the unholiness of matricide, on the other the holiness of vengeance (552–3, 546–7).

---

[11] See M. Cropp and G. Fick, *BICS* Suppl. 43 (1985), 34. There is only one parallel in Aeschylus (*ScT* 272 πεδιονόμοιc), if we discount [A.] *PV* 817 ἐπαναδίπλαζε (ἐπανδ- Dindorf). And S. fr. 725.2 Radt ἀνυμεναιοῦντεc must be considered dubious.   [12] Cropp and Fick 35.

[13] See Page, op. cit. 188. Willink cites 597 ἦ οὐκ ἀξιόχρεὼc as another anomalous line-beginning. There are, in fact, parallels for this (*IT* 1284, *Hel.* 493, *Archel.* fr. 257.2 [fr. 31.2 Austin]; Cropp and Fick 42). But we might treat it as ἀξιόχρεῶc (for the synizesis see *Studies* 93, 120).   [14] Hence Blaydes' παραcχούcηc (*Adversaria critica in Eur.* [1901], p. 398).

[15] Observe how νῦν δὲ cὴν ταρβῶ τρίχα rounds off the prooemium with an appropriate recapitulation of δειμαίνω in 544. In 548 I have accepted Paley's δὲ for δή: see Willink.

What tipped the scales was not the Aeschylean notion that the father is the only true parent ([554–6]), but the adultery of Clytemnestra, which (once 554–6 are deleted) is mentioned next. By her adultery Clytemnestra forfeited the claim to which her motherhood entitled her. Orestes in 557 pointedly calls her 'your daughter' and expressly disdains to call her 'mother'.

The interpolator distorted the argument. Line 552 expresses the reciprocal rôle of father and mother in procreation, even if line 553 may imply that the mother's rôle is secondary to the father's. Line 553 suggested to the interpolator the more radical notion, which he remembered from A. *Eum.* 658–61, that the father is the only true parent. The interpolated 554 (ἄνευ δὲ πατρὸς τέκνον οὐκ εἴη ποτ' ἄν) is modelled on *Eum.* 663 (πατὴρ μὲν ἂν γείναιτ' [Wieseler: γένοιτ' codd.] ἄνευ μητρός), just as τροφάς in 556 may have been suggested by τροφός in *Eum.* 659. Lines 554–6 were designed to develop the imagined implications of 553, and were written to follow directly after 553. Lines 546–7, which originally followed 553, were extruded, then became inserted before 548, so breaking the connection between 544 and 548–50, which explain 544. And so 544 received a new explanation in the shape of 545.

807–12

> Xo.   ὁ μέγας ὄλβος ἅ τ' ἀρετὰ
> μέγα φρονοῦς' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ
> παρὰ Σιμουντίοις ὀχετοῖς
> πάλιν ἀνῆλθ' ἐξ εὐτυχίας 'Ατρείδαις   810
> πάλαι παλαιᾶς ἀπὸ συμφορᾶς δόμων,
> ὁπότε κτλ.

Willink's defence of πάλαι (811) is rightly impugned by West,[16] whose παλαιπαλαιᾶς is a compound for which tragedy provides no parallel. Sense and Euripidean style are well served by Hartung's πάλιν. It offers a species of anadiplosis or epanalepsis, in which a word, standing at the beginning of a colon, is repeated for rhetorical emphasis at the beginning of a new colon: as *Med.* 978–9 δέξεται νύμφα χρυσέων ἀναδεσμᾶν|δέξεται δύςτανος ἄταν, *Hec.* 1095–6 γυναῖκες ὤλεσάν με, |γυναῖκες αἰχμαλωτίδες, *Su.* 271–2 βᾶθι, τάλαιν', ἱερῶν δαπέδων ἄπο Περσεφονείας, |βᾶθι ..., 623 εἰδείης ἂν φίλων|εἰδείης ἂν τύχας, 1138–9 βεβᾶσιν, οὐκέτ' εἰσίν· οἴμοι πάτερ·|βεβᾶσιν, *Tr.* 201–2 νέατον τοκέων δώματα λεύσσω, |νέατον, *Ph.* 1060–1 γενοίμεθ' ὧδε ματέρες|γενοίμεθ' εὔτεκνοι, *Or.* 1545 τέλος ἔχει δαίμων βροτοῖς|τέλος ὅπαι θέληι, *Ba.* 534–6 ἔτι ναὶ τὰν βοτρυώδη|Διονύσου χάριν οἴνας|ἔτι ςοι τοῦ Βρομίου μελήςει.

1039–41

> Ορ.   ἅλις τὸ μητρὸς αἷμ' ἔχω· ςὲ δ' οὐ κτενῶ,
> ἀλλ' αὐτόχειρι θνῆιςχ' ὅτωι βούληι τρόπωι.
> Ηλ.   ἔςται τάδ'· οὐδὲν ςοῦ ξίφους λελείψομαι.

1039 αἷμ'· ἐγὼ ςὲ δ' XXaXbXcXdXeXhAdTh, αἷμ'· ἐγὼ δέ c' XfXgDrJMs   1041 ςοῦ (uel ςου)] ςοι FSa (~F²ˢ), ςοὶ Aa (~Aa³)   ξίφος VMnRRf (~V²Rf¹ᶜ)   λελήψομαι V (~V²)

The variants in 1039 are confined to the so-called 'Moschopoulean' manuscripts. The most familiar of these are XXaXb on which Turyn based his reconstruction of a supposed edition by Moschopoulos. The symbols of some of the others will be familiar to those who are familiar with the works of Matthiessen and Mastronarde–Bremer.[17] The remaining symbols need explanation. Xc is Cantabrigiensis,

Corpus Christi College 403,[18] Xd is Par. Coislin. 169,[19] XeXfXgXh are Par. gr. 2795, 2801, 2802, 2803,[20] Th is the lost Thessalonicensis,[21] and Dr is a lost manuscript from Dresden.[22] What relationships exist among these manuscripts and between them and Moschopoulos, and what is the probability that they may offer a true reading by inheritance rather than by conjecture, are questions to which I defer an answer until a later occasion. For the present it suffices to have given some indication of the diffusion of these variants.

Few have taken the variants seriously. Porson and Willink are among those few. Even though ἅλις τὸ μητρὸς αἷμ' ἔχω is acceptable (*Su.* 818 ἔχεις ἔχεις :: πημάτων γ' ἅλις βάρος, *El.* 73–4 ἅλις δ' ἔχεις|τἄξωθεν ἔργα, but not *Or.* 240, where τοῦ not τὸ is right), ἅλις τὸ μητρὸς αἷμ' is commended not only by *IT* 1007–8 οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην coῦ τε καὶ μητρὸς φονεύς·|ἅλις τὸ κείνης αἷμα (cited by Porson and Willink) but also by the recurrence of the same structure (ἅλις followed by nominative subject, with ellipse of ἐcτι) at *Alc.* 673, *Med.* 558, *Hec.* 394, [*Herc.*] 1339, *Ion* 1508, *Rh.* 870, S. *Tr.* 332. Whether the 'Moschopoulean' ἐγώ is a happy accident or a genuine inheritance, I leave undecided for now, secure at all events in the belief, which I shall support with arguments elsewhere, that it is not a Byzantine conjecture.[23] Between the variants ἐγὼ cὲ δ' and ἐγὼ δέ c' we must choose the latter. Willink prefers a modification by F. W. Schmidt,[24] ἐγὼ cέ γ' ('cε strongly emphasized, opp. μητρός'). Yet the opposition which we want is not between cέ and μητρός but between ἐγώ and (in the next line) 'you': 'The pollution incurred by the shedding of my mother's blood is enough (for me): *I* shall not kill you – you must die by your own hand.' The δέ is not adversative but connective and most nearly resembles the instances cited by Denniston where 'the writer is content with merely adding one idea to another, without stressing the logical connexion between the two, which he leaves to be supplied'.[25]

Line 1041 harbours a problem which has generally eluded editors. '"I shall not at all be *left behind* by your sword" ... the point is probably both temporal and qualitative' (Willink). But cοῦ ξίφους rings oddly.[26] Contrast the more straightforward 1085 ἦ πολὺ λέλειψαι τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων. 'Probably not "your sword" but a double genitive. "I shall not be left behind by you, fall short of you, in connexion with the sword"' (West). This is the sense required, but such a 'double genitive' is impossible. The variant ξίφος could be taken as accusative of respect (see LSJ, s.u. λείπω B.II.3, quoting Thuc. 6.72.2 ξύνεσιν οὐδενὸς λειπόμενος), but it is more likely a slip, associated with the error λελήψομαι (the scribe thinking, consciously or not, of ξίφος λήψομαι). The more natural way to restore the sense postulated by West is to write ξίφει, a conjecture of Wecklein (1906), overlooked by later editors, which gives the same construction as *Su.* 904 γνώμηι δ' ἀδελφοῦ Μελεάγρου λελειμμένος, Hdt. 7.86.2 καμήλους ταχυτῆτι (*u.l.* ταχυτῆτα) οὐ λειπομένας ἵππων. For the dative alone see *Hi.* 1243–4 ὑστέρωι ποδὶ|ἐλειπόμεσθα, *Tr.* 672 τῆι φύcει τε λείπεται, fr. 1066.1 τοῖς ἐν οἴκωι χρήμασιν λελείμμεθα.

[18] Turyn 123.   [19] Turyn 148–9, Mastronarde–Bremer 172.
[20] Turyn 141–3 and (for Xf) Mastronarde–Bremer 171.   [21] See n. 2 above.
[22] Turyn 124.
[23] Similarly G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (1965), p. 158, who however regards it as an unhappy accident. For the confusion of ἐγώ and ἔχω see Willink, *CQ* n.s. 39 (1989), 52 n. 32.
[24] *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern*, ii (1886), pp. 361–2.
[25] *Greek Particles*, p. 169.
[26] So, evidently, thought Herwerden, who proposed cοῦ θράcους (*Exercitationes criticae* [1862], p. 131), and H. Stadtmüller (as reported in Bursian, 1910, 332), who proposed οὐδ' εὐψυχίας.

1385–90

βαρβάρωι βοᾶι †διὰ τὸ τᾶς ὀρνιθόγονον   1385
ὄμμα κυκνόπτερον καλλοσύνας† Λῆδας
cκύμνον Δυcελέναν Δυcελέναν
ξεcτῶν περγάμων
Ἀπολλωνίων Ἐρινύν.
ὀττοτοῖ ...   1390

1385 διὰ τὸ τᾶc] δι' Porson   1387 cκύμνου RXXaXb (∼ R^{1s})   Δυcελέναν bis Kirchhoff, semel Rw: δυcελένας bis plurimi, semel AbAdFGJKMnPrRSSaXXaXbZb^cZvTp

On the text of 1385–6 I venture nothing. In 1387–8 I have given the text and colometry of Willink and West (the accusatives in 1387 appear to be inescapable). 1387–9 are dochmiac + cretic; dochmiac; dochmiac + bacchiac.[27] What form the exclamation in 1390 should take (the manuscripts offer a variety of forms), and how the text should continue thereafter, are questions which I shall not discuss here. My interest is in the second Δυcελέναν in 1387. Not only Willink and West but also Murray, Di Benedetto, Biehl, and Dale,[28] acquiesce in this solitary cretic. 'Non ha nulla di eccezionale l'inserzione di un cretico in una serie docmiaca', says Di Benedetto. Aeschylus and Sophocles have a few examples of a solitary cretic sandwiched between dochmiacs (A. *Eum.* 270, [A.] *PV* 575 ∼ 594, 582–3 ∼ 601–2, S. *Ai.* 889 ∼ 935, *OC* 1450 ∼ 1465). Whether Euripides has any is not certain. What is certainly unexampled is the anadiplosis which this cretic brings with it. Metre and style conspire to cast doubt on the cretic. I shall examine the metrical anomaly first, and then the anadiplosis.

Cretics are sometimes prefixed to dochmiacs at the beginning of a metrical period. So also are iambic metra; less commonly a bacchiac or molossus.[29] In what follows, the symbol ‖ indicates beginning or end of period.

(i) Cretics prefixed: *Hi.* 362 ∼ 668 ‖∪∪∪–⋮∪∪∪–⋮ + 7 do; 366–7 ∼ 673–4 ‖ –∪–⋮∪– –∪– ‖ –∪–⋮∪– –∪– ‖; *Herc.* 742 ∼ 757 ‖ �∪–⋮�∪–⋮∪∪∪–∪– ‖ (for the continuation see under (v) below); 875 ‖∪∪∪∪∪⋮–∪–⋮ + 7 do (but Hermann's conjecture, restoring a dochmiac, should be accepted); 895 ‖ –∪–⋮∪∪∪– – – ‖; 915 ‖ –∪–⋮∪∪∪–∪– ‖; 1203 ‖ –∪– + 3 do; *IT* 834 ‖∪∪∪∪∪ + 3 do (but corrupt); 881 ‖∪∪∪∪∪ + 2 do (but perhaps corrupt); *Ion* 1470 ‖ –∪– + 2 do; *Hel.* 661–2 ‖∪∪∪–⋮∪– –×– bis ‖ (or – – –∪–⋮, if ἒ ἒ is scanned as spondaic; see also Willink, *CQ* n.s. 39 [1989], 62); *Ph.* 153 ‖∪∪∪–⋮∪∪∪– – – ‖ (but it is worth considering ἐμὰν ⟨ἐμάν⟩, to restore a dochmiac; for the anadiplosis see below, under (d)); 296 ‖∪∪∪–⋮∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪⋮ (but P. Berol. 21169 had a different beginning, perhaps another dochmiac);[30] *Or.* 168 ∼ 189 ‖ –�–⋮∪∪∪–∪– ‖; 179 ∼ 200 ‖∪∪∪�⋮∪∪∪∪∪∪ ∧ ‖ (although dochmiacs precede, the *breuis in longo* at 199 shows that a new period begins at 179 ∼ 200; for the theoretical alternative ‖∪∪∪�∪∪∪⋮∪∪∪ ∧ ‖ see (iv) below); 317–18 ∼ 333–4 ‖∪∪∪–⋮∪∪∪–⋮∪∪∪–∪– ‖.

(ii) Iambic metron prefixed: *Alc.* 873 ∼ 890 ‖∪–∪–⋮∪– –∪– ‖; *Hcld.* 91 ‖ – –∪– + 2 do (for the text see under (v) below); *Hi.* 866 ‖ – –∪– + at least 8 do; *Hec.* 1092 ‖∪–∪–⋮∪– –∪– ‖; *Su.* 1077 ‖∪–∪– + 4 do; *Tr.* 247–8 ‖ – –∪– + 2 do; *Hel.* 648 ‖∪–∪– + at least 5 do; *Hyps.* fr. 64.72 (p. 47 Bond) ‖ – –∪– + 5 do. More doubtful

---

[27] For the dochmiac + bacchiac clausula see T. C. W. Stinton, *BICS* 22 (1975), 84–8, Willink, p. 253, and below, p. 121. Willink prefers to join 1388–9 as a single colon.

[28] *BICS* Suppl. 21.3 (1983), 124.

[29] N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 46–8 and A. M. Dale, *BICS* Suppl. 21 (1971–83), especially the section on dochmiacs (Suppl. 21.3, 21–152), may be consulted. But I have ignored some of the passages which they cite, based as they are on an unreliable text.

[30] See below, p. 110.

is *Hyps.* fr. 64.99 (p. 48 Bond) ‖ τῐνᾰ πᾰτέρῐ πό|τέ χᾰρῐν ᾱθλῐ͡ωῐ| +2 ia ‖. This is Bond's analysis. But the two divided resolutions in the iambic metron are as unwelcome as the solitary dochmia͡c interposed between iambics. Preferable, but not ideal, would be to analyse as τῐνᾰ πᾱτέρῐ͡ πό͡τέ χᾱ|ρῐν ᾱθλῐ͡ωῐ.[31] Murray's proposal τῐνᾰ πᾱτέρῐ πότέ ⟨τῐ|νᾰ⟩ χᾱρῐν ᾱθλῐ͡ωῐ| introduces a pattern of anadiplosis unusual in dochmiacs (see below).

(iii) Bacchiac prefixed: *Or.* 145 ∼ 158 ‖ ∪ − − +3 do (possibly − − − at 145).

There are few certain examples of cretics appended to dochmiacs at the end of a period. Alternative analyses are often possible or probable:

(iv) *Herc.* 1020 2 do + ∪∪∪∪∪∪∪|−∪−‖ (the theoretical alternative ∪∪∪∪| ∪∪∪−∪−, which accords better with the word-division, gives a cretic sandwiched between dochmiacs; we could gain a second dochmiac by writing τάλανι ⟨τάλανι⟩; for the anadiplosis see below, under (d));[32] *Ion* 1502 ‖ ∪ − − − −|∪∪∪−‖ (∪ − −|− − ∪∪∪ − is theoretically possible; but I accept the supplements of Hermann and Matthiae, which restore a second dochmiac; see below, under (b)); *Ph.* 169 2 do + − ∪ − ‖ (with Hermann's ἁλίου for ἀελίου [ἠλίου L], or, less plausibly, with synizesis ᾀελίου; but Wecklein was almost certainly right to delete the word as a gloss);[33] 189 3 do + ∪∪∪ − ‖ (186–9 harbour uncured corruptions); 300 3 do + − ∪ − ‖ (Murray's text; but read θιγεῖν τ' ὠλέναιςι τέκνου);[34] *Or.* 179 ∼ 200 ‖ ∪∪∪ ͡∞ ∪∪∪|∪∪∪⌒‖ (alternatively ‖ ∪∪∪ ͡∞|∪∪∪∪∪⌒‖: see (i) above); *Ba.* 1153–4 ∪∪∪ − − −|−∪−‖∪∪∪ − − −|−∪−‖ (it is impossible to decide between this and ∪∪∪−|−−−∪−‖ bis). Finally a doubtful instance of dochmiac + molossus: *Or.* 1414–15 2 ia + ∪∪∪∪∪∪∪|−−−‖ (Willink contemplates both this and ∪∪∪∪∪|∪∪∪ − − −; but possibly corrupt).[35] For dochmiac + bacchiac see n. 27.

I now come to instances which may be alleged to show a cretic interposed in the middle of a dochmiac period:

(v) *Med.* 1251 ∼ 1261 ‖ ∪ − − ∪ −|− ∪ −|+6 do (but this can be analysed as ‖ ∪ − −|∪ − − ∪ −|, ba + do, as *Or.* 158 [(iii) above]); 1255 ∼ 1265 ‖ − − − ∪ −|∪∪∪ −| +3 do (but this can be analysed as ‖ − − −|∪ − ∪∪∪ −|);[36] *Hcld.* 91–2 ‖ − ∪∪ − ∪ −|− ∪ −|∪∪∪ − ∪ − ‖ (read χειρὶ [Tr²], to give ia + 2 do [see (ii) above]); *El.* 593 2 do + − ∪ − +3 do (Matthiae's λιτὰς ⟨λιτάς⟩ restores a dochmiac; for the anadiplosis see below); *Herc.* 742–3 ∼ 757–8 ͡∞ ∪ −|͡∞ ∪ −|ͅ∪ ͡∾ − ∪ −|∪∪∪∪∪| +3 do (possibly corrupt [see my app. crit. and Bond]; but there is sense-pause after the first dochmiac, and so perhaps period-end should be marked before ∪∪∪∪, if the cretic is sound); *Ion* 676 ∼ 695 ‖ ∪ − ∪∪∪ −|− ∪ − ͅ|+5 do (but this can be analysed as ‖ ∪ − ∪∪|+6 do);[37] 776 ‖ ∪∪∪ − ∪∪|∪∪∪∪| +do (Seidler's ἔλακες ⟨ἔλακες⟩ restores a dochmiac; for the anadiplosis see below, under (d)); *Ph.* 346 3 do + − ∪ −|−∪∪∪∪ − ‖ (the cretic ὡς πρέπει was deleted by Nauck; but this leaves the following dochmiac μᾱτέρι μᾱκαρίᾱι to go with νόμιμον, which is a little strained, and so it would be preferable to delete the whole line, which is omitted by Plut. *Mor.* 606f; yet it may be even better to delete the preceding cretic ἐν γάμοις, omitted by Σ Ap. Rh. 4.808–9).[38]

---

[31] For the divided resolution in the last element of the dochmiac see n. 53 below.

[32] An alternative remedy is suggested by Willink, *CQ* n.s. 38 (1988), 93.

[33] The transmitted choriamb calls to mind *Hi.* 1275, where an anomalous choriamb is interposed among dochmiacs. See Barrett *ad loc.*, and my app. crit. The theoretical alternative at *Ph.* 169 is ba + 2 do (see (iii) above).   [34] See Stinton, *BICS* 22 (1975), 85.

[35] See below, pp. 109 and 120. *Ph.* 178 (− − ∪∪∪ −|− − −) is corrupt. So too is the spondee at *Tr.* 260–1 (2 do + sp).   [36] On these two passages in *Med.* see *CQ* n.s. 34 (1984), 62.

[37] See *CQ* n.s. 33 (1983), 347 n. 33, and for the resolved bacchiac see *Tr.* 564 (*Studies* 19–20, Dale, *Lyric Metres*, p. 74).   [38] On *Ph.* 1350–1 see n. 90 below.

I draw the following conclusions. A cretic (or iambic metron or bacchiac or molossus) is securely attested at the beginning of a metrical period, when dochmiacs follow. A cretic at the end of a metrical period, when dochmiacs precede, is very much rarer, and few, if any, of the apparent examples can be regarded as beyond all doubt. A cretic is nowhere securely attested in the middle of a period of dochmiacs: in all of the passages where the phenomenon may be alleged to exist ((v) above), an alternative analysis is possible or preferable, or there is reason for doubting the text, or a slight change (sometimes the restoration of anadiplosis in a form well attested in dochmiacs) will eliminate the alleged instance. I therefore judge that the analysis of *Or.* 1387 as (hypod. + 3 do?) + − − ∪∪∪ −|∪∪∪ −| + do should be treated with caution.

I turn to style. Repetition of words in dochmiacs is common, and follows certain patterns.

(a) At the beginning of successive dochmiacs: e.g. *Or.* 142 ἀποπρὸ βᾶτ' ἐκεῖc' ἀποπρό μοι κοίτας, 323 τινύμεναι δίκαν τινύμεναι φόνου,[39] 1353 κτύπον ἐγείρετε κτύπον καὶ βοάν, 1537 ἕτερον εἰς ἀγῶν' ἕτερον αὖ δόμος, 1541 ἴδε πρὸ δωμάτων ἴδε προκηρύccει.[40] In *Or.* there are two instances of the repeated word occupying successive dochmiacs: 324 καθικετεύομαι bis (semel Cr^c), 339 κατολοφύρομαι bis.

(b) At the beginning of a dochmiac: *Hi.* 580 ἔνεπε δ' ἔνεπέ μοι, *Andr.* 854 ἔλιπες. ἔλιπες ὦ, *Hec.* 709 ἐμὸς ἐμὸς ξένος (ἐμὸς semel pars codd.), *El.* 585 ἔμολες ἔμολες ὦ, *Herc.* 1190 ἐμὸς ἐμὸς ὅδε γόνος, *Tr.* 325 ⟨ἄναγ'⟩ ἄναγε χορόν, 1216 ἔθιγες ἔθιγες ὦ, *Ion* 790 ἄτεκνον ἄτεκνον ἔλακ', 799 οἷον οἷον ἄλ|γος ... (hypodochmiac), 1445 ἰὼ ἰὼ λαμπρᾶς, 1454 ἰὼ ⟨ἰὼ⟩ γύναι,[41] 1502 ἰὼ ⟨ἰὼ⟩ δειναί, *Hel.* 670 ὁ Διὸς ὁ Διὸς ὦ, 684 πάθεα πάθεα μᾶ|τερ,[42] *Or.* 140 cῖγα cῖγα λεπ|τόν ... (hypodochmiac), 149 κάταγε κάταγε πρόciθ'|ἀτρέμας ἀτρέμας ἴθι, 162 ἔλακεν ἔλακεν ἀπό|φονον ... (ἔλακεν semel Rw), 174 πότνια πότνια Νύξ, 1353 ἰὼ ἰὼ φίλαι (ἰὼ semel Zb), 1414–15 ἔβαλον ἔβαλον Ἑλέ|νας ... (ἔβαλον semel FPrSa, metre doubtful),[43] 1537 ἰὼ ἰὼ τύχα (ἰὼ semel F), 1547 ἔπεc' ἔπεcε μέλαθρα (ἔπαιcε semel Ab),[44] *Ba.* 1182 μετ' ἐμὲ μετ' ἐμὲ τοῦδ', 1198 μεγάλα μεγάλα καί.

(c) At the beginning and end of a dochmiac, with a word interposed: *El.* 594 τύχαι coι τύχαι, *Ph.* 103 ὄρεγέ νυν ὄρεγε, *Antiope* 54 Page (fr. 223 Nauck, fr. xlviii.57 Kambitsis) δίκα τοι δίκα.

(d) At the end of a dochmiac: *Hec.* 684 and 694 ὦ τέκνον τέκνον (probably hypodochmiac; τέκνον semel pars codd. 684), *Herc.* 917 -κτὰν ἄταν ἄταν, 1020 κακὰ τάλανι ⟨τάλανι⟩,[45] *Ion* 776 ἄκρον ἔλακες ⟨ἔλακες⟩,[46] *Ph.* 153 ὃc ἐπ' ἐμὰν ⟨ἐμάν⟩,[47] *Or.* 1455 ἅπερ ἔδρακον ἔδρακον (ἔδρακον semel AaAtFZb),[48] *IA* 1290 -δαῖοc ἐλέγετ' ἐλέγετ'.

---

[39] φόνου BZu¹ˢ (accepted by Willink), rather than φόνον (cett.). The structure of the dochmiac dimeter is then the same as *Med.* 1273 ἀκούεις βοὰν ἀκούεις τέκνων, *Hec.* 1063 τάλαιναι κόραι τάλαιναι Φρυγῶν (Seidler: τ- τ- κ- Φ- codd.).

[40] And conceivably *Or.* 1500 πολύπονα δὲ πάθεα|πολύπονα (πολ- δὲ πολ- πάθεα codd.), for which see Willink. The conjecture which I have printed at *Hi.* 826 (τίνι λόγωι, τάλας, τίνι [τίνα λόγον ... τίνα codd.] τύχαν cέθεν) also conforms to this pattern. For further examples of the pattern see *CQ* n.s. 34 (1984), 65.

[41] With Page's ⟨ἰὼ⟩ and Hartung's πόθεν for πόθεν πόθεν. Alternatively, ὦ (Wilamowitz) γύναι, πόθεν|πόθεν ἔλαβες ἐμόν (hypodochmiac + dochmiac), which falls within category (e) below.

[42] But not *Hel.* 682 (see *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies ... presented to Sir Denys Page* [1978], p. 163, Willink, *CQ* n.s. 39 [1989], 66).   [43] See above, p. 108, below, p. 120.

[44] See n. 85 below.   [45] Only a possibility: see above (under (iv)).

[46] See above (under (v)).   [47] Only a possibility: see above (under (i)).

[48] But probably not dochmiac: see n. 65 below.

(e) At the end and beginning of successive dochmiacs: *Hi.* 586–7 διὰ πύλας ἔμολεν|ἔμολέ coι βοά, *El.* 592–3 λόγον, ἵει λιτάc|⟨λιτὰc⟩ ἐc θεούc,[49] *Or.* 177 Ἐρεβόθεν ἴθι μόλε|μόλε κατάπτεροc (μόλε semel AnThXa), *Phaethon* 282–3 (cφαγὰc|cφαγάc, but the surroundings are corrupt).[50]

Categories (b) and (c) are combined at *Hi.* 830 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ (αἰαῖ semel pars codd.) μέλεα|μέλεα τάδε πάθη ∼ 848 ⟨αἰαῖ αἰαῖ⟩ ἔλιπεc|ἔλιπεc, ὦ φίλα, *Ba.* 986–7 ἐc ὄρος ἐc ὄρος ἔμολ' (Elmsley: ἔμολεν P)|ἔμολεν, ὦ Βάκχαι, categories (b) and (c) are possibly combined at *Ph.* 296 ἰὼ ἰὼ πότνια|πότνια μό]λε πρόδρομος (P. Berol. 21169, suppl. Haslam, *CQ* n.s. 26 [1976], 6–7; the manuscripts have single πότνια),[51] and categories (d) (b) (e) are possibly all combined at *Hel.* 650–1 πόcιν ἔχομεν ἔχομεν|ἐμὸν ⟨ἐμὸν⟩ ὃν ἔμενον|ἔμενον ἐκ Τροίαc.[52]

I have found few instances which do not fall into one of these categories: *Andr.* 842 ἀπόδος ὦ φίλος (LP: φίλ' MBOAV) ἀ|πόδος ... (ἀπόδος ἀπόδος ὦ would regularise this),[53] *Herc.* 1042 -τεc οὐ cῖγα cῖ]γα ..., *IT* 835–6 -cι νεαρὸν τροφοῦ|νεαρὸν ἐν δόμοιc, *Ion* 1471 τί φῄc; οἷον οἷ]ον ..., *Or* 1364 διὰ τὸν ὀλόμενον ὀ]λόμενον ..., 1384 ἁρμάτειον ἁρ|μάτειον ... (hypodochmiac, but the verse may be spurious), *Ba.* 977 ἴτε θοαὶ Λύccαc κύνεc ἴτ' εἰc ὄρος (ἴτ' ἐc ὄρος κύνεc would regularise this), *IA* 1289–90 ὃc Ἰδαῖοc Ἰ]δαῖοc ....[54]

The repetition afforded by cκύμνον Δυcελέναν Δυcελέναν, where the first Δυcελέναν ends a dochmiac and the second Δυcελέναν is not part of another dochmiac but brings with it a cretic rhythm, is abnormal. Willink (p. 361) cites as an analogy 'for the anadiplosis in a "dochmiac compound"' 200 ὀλόμεθ' ἰcονέκνεc ὀλόμεθα.[55] But there the repetition is not in contiguous words, and we have period-end before and after the verse. If the repetition Δυcελέναν Δυcελέναν is genuine, I should expect the second Δυcελέναν to begin a second dochmiac (as in category (e)).

What we have been examining is the colometry of modern editors. It is time to examine the colometry of the manuscripts. The Alexandrian colometry is usually recoverable.[56] When our manuscripts agree in rational colometry, this colometry is presumably the ancient one.[57] For these lines we have the partial evidence of P. Oxy. 3717 (2nd cent. A.D.). The Alexandrian divisions were probably as follows:[58]

---

[49] See above (under (v)).

[50] Note also *IT* 869–70 τόλμαc· δείν' ἔτλαν|ἔτλαν δείν' (δείν' ἔτλαν L), ὤμοι (*PCPS* n.s. 22 [1976], 42–3). Willink suggests to me as an alternative ὤμοι, δείν' ἔτλαν.

[51] See above, p. 107.

[52] See *Dionysiaca* (n. 42 above), p. 166, Willink, *CQ* n.s. 39 (1989), 59.

[53] ἀπόδος, ὦ φίλος, ἀ|πόδος gives divided resolution in the last element, for which parallels are *El.* 1170, *Herc.* 1070, 1212, *Tr.* 244, 253, *IT* 871, *Ph.* 1295 (with Elmsley's ἀχήcω for ἰαχήcω: see n. 74 below), *Or.* 1364, *Ba.* 995 = 1015, *Rh.* 131, and possibly *Hyps.* fr. 64.99 (see above, under (ii)). See L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968), 267–8, Willink, p. 298 and *CQ* n.s. 39 (1989), 59. Normally such division follows after a run of shorts (∪∪∪∪∪∪|∪). The exceptions (to which *Andr.* 843 would have to be added) are *Herc.* 1070∪∪∪–∪∪|∪ (unless we follow Willink, *CQ* n.s. 38 [1988], 96), *Tr.* 253–∪∪–∪∪|∪, *Rh.* 131∪∪∪–∪∪|∪.

[54] *Rh.* 821 μέγαc ἐμοὶ μέγαc ὦ must be restored to dochmiac shape, but convincing restoration is hard to find (see W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* [1964], p. 309). Murray's conjecture at *Or.* 1483 (δὴ τότε διαπρεπεῖc|τότ' ...) is certainly wrong.

[55] See above (under (i) and (iv)).

[56] See Zuntz, *Inquiry*, pp. 27–35, and *Drei Kapitel zur griechischen Metrik (Sitzb. Öst. Akad. Wiss.*, phil.-hist. Kl., 443 [1984]), 50–8; Barrett, *Hippolytos*, pp. 84–90; Mastronarde–Bremer 151–66.

[57] It is not necessarily the right one. But, if we reject it, we must have good reason for doing so.

[58] Square brackets enclosing manuscript symbols indicate that this is the place at which these manuscripts divide the text. I have placed a vertical stroke at the end of each line, in order to indicate where I believe the Alexandrian division occurred. The manuscripts which follow in

1385a βαρβάρωι βοᾶι|[ΠHMBOVa+]
1385b διὰ τὸ τᾶς ὀρνιθόγονον ὄμμα|[ΠHMBO+]
1386a κυκνόπτερον|[MBOVa+]
1386b καλλοσύνας [ΠCr] Λῆδας|[HMRwZm]
1387a ϲκύμνον [AaGKXXaXbZcTp] Δυϲελέναϲ|[Π²MBOVa+]
1387b (Δυϲελέναϲ) (om. Π²AbFGKMnPrRRwSSaXXaXbZvTp) [Π²ZbZu] ξεϲτῶν|
          [HMBO+]
1388   περγάμων [ΠAaCrRf] ’Απολ|[MBA(C)GKMt(S)XXaXb]
1389a   -λωνίων [ZbZuTTp] ’Ερινύν|[ΠHVaAdFLPPrSaZZm]
1389b   ὀττ(οτοτ)οτοῖ|[HMBO+]

The corruption at the beginning of 1385b may be the cause of the surprising division (shared by the papyrus with HMBO+) at ὄμμα|. We expect ὄμμα κυκνόπτερον| to be a dochmiac. But at least the majority do divide correctly at κυκνόπτερον|, and so convict the papyrus of error (its κυκνόπτερον καλλοσύνας| is an unacceptable colon).[59] The ancient colometry evidently offered two dochmiacs καλλοσύνας Λῆδας ϲκύμνον Δυϲελέναϲ| (HMRwZm also divide after the first dochmiac καλλοσύνας Λῆδας|). The colometry of the papyrus here is uncertain, since we do not know whether it had Δυϲελέναϲ twice or (like a good many manuscripts) only once. If once, it offered Λῆδας ϲκύμνον Δυϲελέναϲ| (as Cr), if twice, Λῆδας ϲκύμνον Δυϲελέναϲ Δυϲελέναϲ| (as no other manuscript). The papyrus then offers ξεϲτων.. [ ]περγα[μων|(of the manuscripts which divide at περγάμων|), Aa offers Δυϲελέναϲ Δυϲελέναϲ ξεϲτῶν περγάμων|, CrRf offer Δυϲελέναϲ ξεϲτῶν περγάμων|). But the commonest division is at ξεϲτῶν|(HMBO+), and (with Δυϲελέναϲ written twice) this gives a further dochmiac Δυϲελέναϲ ξεϲτῶν|. There follows (in MBAGKMtXXaXb) a division in mid-word at περγάμων ’Απολ|λωνίων (slightly corrupted in C to ’Απολλω|νίων, in S to ’Απο|λλωνίων).

This mid-word division is very significant. Manuscripts regularly eliminate mid-word division. When they do divide in mid-word, and the division is right, or at least rational, it must be counted as evidence of the ancient colometry. Here are examples of correct mid-word division preserved by our manuscripts: 325 ἐκ|λαθέϲθαι P. Berol. 17051, HMOVACrFGKPPrRSaXXaXbZcT (ἐκλε|λαθέϲθαι Ab, ἐκλα|θέϲθαι BS); 326 φοιτα|λέου P. Berol., HMBOVACGKXXaXbZc;[60] 1269 ἀμ|φὶ MBOAKLX XaXbZbZmZu; 1434 ἀγάλ|ματα P. Oxy. 3718, HMBACGKMtPZ; 1472 ἔμελ|λεν HMBAMtP; 1498 ἐ|ξέκλεπτον HMBALMtPRwXXaXb (ἐξέ|κλεπτον SZ).[61]

And so the ancient colometry gave περγάμων ’Απολ- (hypodochmiac), followed presumably by -λωνίων ’Ερινύν|(ithyphallic). The papyrus and HVaAdFLPPr SaZZm divide at ’Ερινύν|, while most manuscripts append the exclamation in 1389b (variously corrupted) on the same line.[62]

The ancient colometry solves one problem, but creates another in its place. The problem solved is the isolated cretic Δυϲελέναϲ, which now comes at the beginning of a second dochmiac: ϲκύμνον Δυϲελέναϲ|Δυϲελέναϲ ξεϲτῶν. This dochmiac dimeter

square brackets are witnesses to this division. I have omitted a few aberrant divisions by single manuscripts or by a very few. A plus sign indicates that the division is found in the great majority of manuscripts in addition to those listed. I have printed each dochmiac (or hypodochmiac) as a separate line. Whether they were originally written singly or in pairs is of no consequence.   [59] There are no aeolo-choriambics hereabouts.
[60] The colometry of P. Berol. 17051 at 325 and 326 can be restored with certainty. The possibility of mid-word division was overlooked by J. Lenaerts, *Pap. litt. grecs* (Pap. Bruxell. 13 [1977]), 19–23, W. Luppe, *Archiv f. Pap.* 27 (1980), 241, and J. O'Callaghan, *Stud. Pap.* 20 (1981), 19–24.   [61] See below, p. 123.
[62] We must keep the exclamation separate (so Biehl, Willink, West). Di Benedetto and Dale (*BICS* Suppl. 21. 3 [1983], 134) print ’Ερινύν· ὀττοτοῖ, the former analysing as ba + cr, the latter as 'long doch'.

shows the pattern of anadiplosis illustrated above (under (e)). The problem created is the sequence περγάμων Ἀπολ|λωνίων Ἐρινύν (hypodochmiac + ithyphallic). Hypodochmiacs have appeared earlier at 1382 καλλίβωλον Ἴ-|, 1384 ἁρμάτειον ἁρ-|, 1385 βαρβάρωι βοᾶι, and possibly 1376 πᾶι φύγω ξέναι.[63] And ithyphallics are found at 1373, 1374, 1396(?), 1432,[64] 1456(?).[65] But hypodochmiacs are normally followed by dochmiacs (often in synapheia). Here the hypodochmiac is followed (in synapheia) by an ithyphallic. The sequence is unparalleled.

All of the difficulties which I have mentioned (metrical and stylistic) would be solved if we simply followed those manuscripts which offer Δυσελέvας not twice but once (Rw actually has the correct accusative Δυσελέναν once only). So, in effect, Weil proposed (but with the unnecessary inversion Δυσελέναν σκύμνον). And Wecklein (1906), like Hermann and Nauck before him, prints single Δυσελέvας. Dittography is a less common fault than haplography, but is commoner than may generally be supposed. The manuscripts of *Orestes* offer the following instances: 328 ὁ τάλας bis J; 834 οἷον bis MVAaAbMnRRfSSa; 1449 ἱππικοῖσι(ν) bis Va; 1454 Ἰδαῖα bis At; 1470 προβάς bis Aa; 1480 οἷος bis fere L; and possibly 999 ὀλοόν bis MnPrRRwS (though this could be right).

If single Δυσελέναν is right, the doubling must be a pre-Alexandrian error, for texts which had the word only once would have been divided next at περγάμων| (as in the papyrus), and not at Ἀπολ|λωνίων.

But it is more likely that double Δυσελέναν is right. Regular rhythm, and acceptable style, would be restored by περγάμων ⟨τῶν⟩ Ἀπολ|λωνίων Ἐρινύν (2 cr + ithyphallic [i.e. 3 cr + ba]). The article is frequently used with adjectives formed from proper names, sometimes when the adjective gives needed definition to the noun (as *Hi.* 736 τᾶς Ἀδριηνᾶς ἀκτᾶς, *Hec.* 641 τᾶι Σιμουντίδι γᾶι, *Herc.* 801 νύμφας τᾶς Περσηίδος, *Tr.* 841 τὰ Δαρδάνεια μέλαθρα, *Ion* 167 λίμνας ... τᾶς Δηλιάδος, 1089 ⟨ὁ⟩ Φοίβειος ἀλάτας, *Ph.* 824 τᾶς Ἀμφιονίας ... λύρας, *Or.* 179 τὸν Ἀγαμεμνόνιον ... δόμον, 1423 παῖδα τὰν Τυνδαρίδ᾽, *Rh.* 1 εὐνὰς τὰς Ἑκτορέους),[66] sometimes when the adjective (as here) merely adds elaboration (as *Alc.* 570 ὁ Πύθιος εὐλύρας Ἀπόλλων, *Or.* 1480 Ἕκτωρ ὁ Φρύγιος, *IA* 265 Μυκήνας ... τᾶς Κυκλωπίας, 1053 ὁ Φρύγιος Γανυμήδης). Similarly with adjectives not formed from proper names: *Med.* 440 and *Tr.* 1115 Ἑλλάδι τᾶι μεγάλαι, *Hi.* 229 γυμνασίων τῶν ἱπποκρότων, *Herc.* 368 Πηνειὸς ὁ καλλιδίνας, 784 Δίρκα ... ἁ καλλιρέεθρος, *Ba.* 556 Νύσας ... τᾶς θηροτρόφου, *IA* 548 Ἔρως ὁ χρυσοκόμας, *Rh.* 370–1 τὰν ζάχρυσον ... πέλταν. For the combination of name epithet and other epithet and articulated noun (as here) see *Alc.* 570 (quoted above), *Andr.* 489 τὰν τάλαιναν Ἰλιάδα κόραν, *Ba.* 409–10 ἁ καλλιστευομένα Πιερία μούσειος ἕδρα. And for the order epithet + noun + article + epithet (as here), see *Andr.* 277–8 τρίπωλον ἅρμα δαιμόνων ... τὸ καλλιζυγές, and, for the reverse order, *Cycl.* 620–1 τὸν φιλοκισσοφόρον Βρόμιον ποθεινόν. A further advantage of this proposal is that it leaves rational the attested division at Ἀπολ|λωνίων.

Now, the papyrus appears to have added something *before* περγάμων. The editor reports ξεστων . . [ ]περγα[μων ('Too much room for e.g. υπεργαμων, not enough for των. τοι (τρ[ι]) a long shot'). If τω[ν] were in fact possible, I should take this to be

---

[63] The manuscripts give this as a hypodochmiac, but other divisions are at least as plausible.

[64] See below, pp. 114–115.

[65] If we divide ἅπερ ἔδρακον ἔδρακον|ἐν δόμοις τυράννων (do + ith). But since there are no other dochmiacs hereabouts, Willink's analysis (⌣⌣–⌣⌣–⌣⌣–⌣–⌣––) may be preferable.

[66] We shall have another instance at *Or.* 838, if we follow West in writing Ἀγαμεμνόνιος (Ἀγ- codd.) παῖς. But the reizianum ⌣⌣–⌣⌣––is of a common shape (*Hcld.* 373, 750 ~ 761, 757 ~ 768, *El.* 700 ~ 714, *IT* 396 ~ 411, *Ion* 458 ~ 478, 460 ~ 480), and metre does not afford us the liberty to change *Andr.* 1034 Ἀγαμεμνόνιος κέλωρ.

an instance of a phenomenon which I have illustrated elsewhere: 'On numerous occasions, when words have been transposed from their proper place in some of the manuscripts, those words are omitted by others of the manuscripts.'[67] But, if τῳ[ν] is not possible, then we shall probably have to dismiss the papyrus' addition as a slip.[68]

An alternative solution has been suggested to me by Prof. West: the inversion of περγάμων and 'Απολλωνίων, to give 'Απολλωνίων|περγάμων 'Ερινύν, dochmiac + ithyphallic.

1408–13

οἱ δὲ πρὸc θρόνουc ἔcω
μολόντεc ἃc ἔγημ' ὁ το-
   ξότac Πάριc γυναικόc, ὄμ-   1410
   μα δακρύοιc πεφυρμένοι,
ταπείν' ἔζονθ', ὁ μὲν
τὸ κεῖθεν, ὁ δὲ τὸ κεῖθεν ἄλ-   1413a
λοc ἄλλοθεν δεδραγμένοι ...   1413b

1412 ταπείν' Willink: ταπεινοὶ codd.   1413b δεδραγμένοι Shilleto: πεφραγμένοι codd.

West tacitly rejects Willink's conjecture, and like previous editors divides ἔcω|...Πάριc|...δακρύοιc|...ταπεινοὶ|...ὁ δὲ|.[69] This gives hiatus at ταπεινοὶ| ἔζονθ'. Willink calls the hiatus 'unwelcome'. He is right.

The sequence ∪ − − ¦ − − ∪ − gives presumable period-end after the bacchiac, according to the rule formulated by T. C. W. Stinton.[70] And period-end is confirmed by the hiatus. Hiatus, like *breuis in longo*, often accompanies a bacchiac at period-end. The question at issue here is whether the rhetorical articulation of the passage is compatible with the assumption of period-end between words which belong so closely together as ταπεινοὶ ἔζονθ', especially when ἔζονθ' is followed by rhetorical pause. If (leaving aside theoretical considerations of period-end) we examine the instances of bacchiacs at the end of an iambic sequence accompanied by hiatus or *breuis in longo*, we find that either (i) there is a change of metre, or (ii) the first metron which follows is not a full iambic metron but a syncopated iambic metron (∪ − − or − ∪ − or − − −), or (iii) if the first metron is a full iambic metron, there is rhetorical pause after the bacchiac (as there often is in (i) and (ii) as well).

Here is the evidence:

(i) Hiatus or *breuis in longo* at change of metre: *Alc.* 219–20 θεοῖcιν εὐ-ξόμεcθά·|θεῶν γὰρ δύναμιc μεγίcτα ∼231–2 γυναῖκα κατθανοῦcἄν|ἐν ἅματι τῶιδ' ἐπόψηι,[71] *Hcld.* 892–3 ἐμοὶ χορὸc μὲν ἡδύc, εἰ λίγειἄ|λωτοῦ χάριc †ἐνὶ δαΐ† ∼901–2 ἔχειc ὁδόν τιν', ὦ πόλιc, δίκαιόν·|οὐ χρή ποτε τοῦδ' ἀφέcθαι (but λίγεια λω|τοῦ ∼231–2 δίκαιον· οὐ|may be preferable; or εἰ| ∼πόλιc|, as Willink suggests to me, comparing *Med.* 432 ∼439), *Andr.* 848–9 ποῦ δ' ἐκ πέτραc ἀερθῶ,|⟨ἢ⟩ κατὰ πόντον

---

[67] *CQ* n.s. 33 (1983), 352.

[68] I suppose that γε would give a semblance of sense, but it would not give acceptable metre, unless we adopted a colometry different from that which I postulate in 1387.

[69] This (for the most part) was probably the ancient colometry (see above, p. 110). P. Oxy. 3718 (5th cent.) divides at ἔcω|(with only AbPrRfSa; the majority divide at μολόντεc|) and Πάριc| (with the majority) and probably at δακρύοιc| and ταπεινοί| (with the majority). Thereafter the papyrus fails us. Only Sa (which divided at πεφυρμένοι|) divides at δὲ|. The remainder divide at κεῖθεν|ἄλλοc.

Incidentally, the gloss].τ..οc in the margin of P. Oxy. 3718 next to προνοίαc will be φρ]ον̣τίδοc. This word glosses πρόνοια in Hesychius, and in MV at *Ph.* 736 (Schwartz 326.20), and is found in the paraphrase on our line in Gudian. gr. 15 and Barocci 74 (as reported by Dindorf [schol. ii (1863), p. 307]), which I have found also in Zb.

[70] 'Pendant close is always a mark of period-end, if it is followed by a short or anceps' (*CQ* n.s. 27 [1977], 39).   [71] See *ICS* 6 (1981), 84–7.

ἢ καθ' ὕλαν ὀρέων, *Hec.* 630–1 ἐμοὶ χρῆν πημονὰν γενέσθαι, | Ἰδαίαν ὅτε πρῶτον ὕλαν
(∼ 639–40 κυκλοῦνται· | κοινὸν δ'), *Herc.* 1025–6 αἰαῖ, τίνα στεναγμὸν | ἢ γόον ἢ
φθιτῶν, 1036–7 ἐρείσμαθ' Ἡράκλειόν | ἀμφὶ δέμας τάδε λαΐνοις,[72] 1067–8 ὦ πρέσβυ
:: cîγα cîγά | παλίντροπος ἐξ⟨επ⟩εγειρόμενος στρέφεται· φέρε,[73] *Tr.* 1235–6 ἄρασσ'
ἄρασσε κρᾶτά | πιτύλους διδοῦσα χειρός, *Hel.* 1113–14 θρήνων ἐμοὶ ξυνεργός, | Ἑλένας
μελέας πόνους (∼ 1127–8 Ἀχαιῶν | μονόκωπος), 1486–7 ἐπιπετόμενος ἰαχεῖ. | Ὦ
πταναὶ δολιχαύχενες (∼ 1503–4 θαλάσσας, | ναύταις), *Ph.* 1293–5 τάλαιν' ἐγὼ τάλ-
αινά, | πότερον ἄρα νέκυν ὀλόμενον ἀχήσω; (Elmsley: ἰαχ- codd.) (∼ 1305–7
μέλλον· | πότμος [Dindorf: ἄποτμος codd.]),[74] 1518–19 ἐμοῖς ἄχεσι cυνωιδός, | αἴλινον
αἰάγμασιν ἅ, 1532–3 πάτερ γεραιέ, δεῖξόν, | Οἰδιπόδα, cὸν αἰῶνα μέλεον ὃς ἐπί, *Or.*
1399–1400 cιδαρέοιcιν Ἅιδα. | ἦλθον ἐς δόμους | (hypodochmiac, if we accept Willink's
division).

(ii) Hiatus or *breuis in longo* followed by a syncopated iambic metron: *El.* 1207–8
ἔβαλεν ἔδειξε μαστὸν ἐν φοναῖcιν, | ἰώ μοι, πρὸς πέδωι (∼ 1215–16 λιταίνω. |
παρήιδων), *Ph.* 313–17 καὶ χερcὶ καὶ λόγοιcι | πολυέλικτον ἁδονὰν | ἐκεῖce καὶ τὸ
δεῦρό | περιχορεύουσα τέρψιν παλαιὰν λάβω | χαρμονάν,[75] *Or.* 167–8 cὺ γάρ νιν, ὦ
(ὦ del. Willink) τάλαινά, | θωύξας' ἔλασας (Willink, praeeunte Longman:
ἐλάσαcα ᵞᴾMC: ἔβαλες codd.) ἐξ ὕπνου ∼ 188–9 θανεῖν ⟨θανεῖν⟩ (Lachmann; ⟨νιν⟩
Willink), τί δ' ἄλλο; | οὐδὲ γὰρ πόθον ἔχει βορᾶς, *IA* 1480–1 ἑλίccετ' ἀμφὶ ναὸν | ἀμφὶ
βωμὸν Ἄρτεμιν (s.u.l), fr. 53.1 οὐκ ἔcτιν ἐν κακοῖcιν εὐγένειά, | παρ' ἀγαθοῖcι δ'
ἀνδρῶν.

(iii) Hiatus or *breuis in longo* followed by iambic metron: *Hec.* 1095–6 γυναῖκες
ὤλεcάν μέ, | γυναῖκες αἰχμαλωτίδες, *Tr.* 521–2 -πλον ἐν πύλαις Ἀχαιοί· | ἀνὰ δ'
ἐβόαcεν λεώς (∼ 541–2 θεᾶς. | ἐπί). I assume that there is adequate sense-pause at
Andr. 1219–20 ἀμπτάμενα φροῦδα πάντ' ἐκεῖνά (Diggle: πάντα κεῖται codd.: πάντα
κεῖνα Dobree) | κόμπων μεταρcίων πρόcω, for the sense is potentially complete at
1219, and there is certainly sense-pause in the strophe 1205–6 ὦ φίλος, δόμον ἔλιπες
ἔρημον, | γέροντ' ἄπαιδα νοcφίcας. But I do not think that there is adequate sense-
pause at *Ph.* 312–13 τί φῶ cε; πῶc ἅπαντά | καὶ χερcὶ καὶ λόγοιcι, and I should accept
Wecklein's ἁπάνται, which eliminates not only the anomalous *breuis in longo* but also
the anomalous adverbial accusative.[76]

1431–2

> ἁ δὲ λίνον ἠλακάται
> δακτύλοιc ἕλιccεν ...

The majority of our manuscripts (including P. Oxy. 3718, 5th cent.) write these lines
as a single colon. Only T divides them at ἠλακάται |. The problem is to restore metre
in 1431. It is useless to analyse as – ∪∪ | – ∪∪ – (cretic and choriamb, Di Benedetto and

---

[72] For an alternative treatment of this passage see Willink, *CQ* n.s. 38 (1988), 94–5.

[73] For an alternative treatment see Willink, loc. cit. 96.

[74] Murray's colometry here is impossible. D. J. Mastronarde (Teubner, 1988), retaining (like
Murray) the transmitted text, analyses 1294–5 ∼ 1306–7 as hexasyllable dochmiac + dochmiac,
and notes that 'γόους, ὕμνους vel sim. ἠχεῖν dici potest, non potest νέκυν ἠχεῖν'. But νέκυν
ἰαχεῖν is no less unusual in itself, and is supported only by *Hel.* 1147 (Hermann: see below, p.
116). In fact, a personal object for either ἰαχεῖν or ἠχεῖν, though unusual, is not more surprising
than that which is attested for ὑμνεῖν (*IT* 1457) and χορεύειν (*Herc.* 871), or than expressions
like *IT* 367–8 αὐλεῖται ... μέλαθρον, *El.* 691 ὀλολύξεται ... δῶμα, and βοᾶcθαι passive in Hdt.
See also Willink on 103.

[75] But we could write λόγοιcι⟨ν⟩ (Fritzsche); and Murray's deletion of 315 (ἐκεῖce καὶ τὸ δεῦρο)
may be right.

[76] The defence of ἅπαντα by R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* (1969), pp.
107–12, does not touch on the metrical issue.

Biehl) or as $-\cup\cup\cup|-\cup\cup-$ ('chor heptasyll B', Dale),[77] since there is no trace of choriambs in this aria. Willink suggests βαρβάροιc νόμοιcιν· ά δ᾽[-ε λίνον]|ἠλάκατα δακτύλοιc ἕλιc|cε…, which brings an unwelcome sense-pause in the lekythion, removes the inoffensive λίνον, and retains 1430 βαρβάροιc (-οιcι all manuscripts except RwTTp) νόμοιcιν, words rightly deleted by Hartung, who is followed by Wilamowitz (as reported by Murray), Wecklein (1906), Biehl, and West. The repetition, offensive after 1426 Φρυγίοιc ἔτυχον Φρυγίοιcι νόμοιc, is not to be defended (as Willink defends it) by reference to 1374 βαρβάροιcι δραcμοῖc, inoffensive after 1370 βαρβάροιc ἐν εὐμάριcιν. Nor does the collocation of datives ἠλακάται δακτύλοιc, which offends Willink, offend any more than do those at *El.* 474 δρόμωι… χαλαῖc, *Hel.* 373–4 ὄνυχι…πλαγαῖc, A. *Ch.* 24–5 ἀμυγμοῖc ὄνυχοc ἄλοκι νεοτόμωι, S. *Ai.* 230–1 χερὶ…ξίφεcιν, 310 ὄνυξι…χερί.[78] West restores anapaests with ⟨χρυcέαι⟩ λίνον, which introduces a prosodic anomaly δὲ χρ-.[79]

Weil's λίν' (accepted by Wecklein [1906]) may be right. It gives a hemiepes followed by an ithyphallic, as *Alc.* 440–1 ∼450–1, *Su.* 598 ∼608,[80] *Hyps.* fr. I. ii. 13–14∼I. iii. 16–17 (pp. 26–8 Bond). But it is worth considering λίνον ⟨λίνον⟩, since anadiplosis is so common in this aria and is especially well suited in a description of the repetitive act of spinning (just as at 1427 the anadiplosis αὔραν αὔραν is well suited to the activity of fanning). In most of the instances of anadiplosis hereabouts a part of the manuscripts writes the word only once: 1373 γᾶ OAtCZuTp, 1387 δυcελένας AbFGKMnPrR(Rw)SSaXXaXbZvTp,[81] 1414 ἔβαλον FPrSa, 1416 ἔθορον FPrSaZb, 1427 αὔραν AtC, 1428 'Ελένας GRZbZvT, 1453 μᾶτερ HAtCCrGKLMnMt SZbZdZmZu, 1414 ὀβρίμα fere AtF, 1461 κατθανῆι Va, 1481 εἶδον AaAb(Cr)RZb.

The metre will then be dactylic tetrameter catalectic, as 831, 1381 [$-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$], and possibly 1369 (if we divide at θανάτου|), and elsewhere (*Cycl.* 617, *Andr.* 482∼490, *El.* 141∼158, *Ba.* 116∼131, *IA* 210, 588, 1041∼1063, *Rh.* 244∼255). This colon is followed by an ithyphallic at *IT* 1136-7∼1151–2 (despite corruption, the metre seems secure), just as a catalectic dactylic pentameter is followed by an ithyphallic at *El.* 452–3∼464–5 and *Hel.* 384–5.

1465

ά δ᾽ ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν· Ὤμοι μοι.

ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν BOVaAaAbAtCrFGKLMnPPr(R)RfSSaZT: ἀνίαχεν ἀνίαχεν HACJMtZb ZmZu: ἴαχεν ἴαχεν XXaXbZcZv et Mt^c: ἴαχεν γ᾽ ἴαχεν γ᾽ Tp: ἀνίαχεν M: ἀνίαχεν Rw: ἴαχεν Ad ἰώ μοι μοι AaAtFPrSaZb

Murray divides ά δ᾽ ἀνίαχεν ἴ-|αχεν· Ὤμοι μοι (it is not clear whether this was intended as $-\cup--\cup-|-\cup---$ or $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup|-\cup--$). Wilamowitz[82] and Dale[83] accept the solitary ἀνίαχεν of M (and Rw), and the former analyses as $-\cup\cup\cup|---$ (trochaic), the latter as $-\cup-|-\cup-|--$. Di Benedetto prints his own conjecture ά δ᾽ ἀνίαχ᾽ ἴαχεν· |Ὤμοι μοι and analyses as $-\cup-\cup-\cup\cap|---$ (lek + mol). Biehl analyses as $-\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup|---$ (do + mol). Willink accepts the variant ἰώ μοί μοι and analyses as $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$. The manuscripts, apart from a few with aberrant divisions, give 1465 as a single colon.

There are three factors to be considered: (i) the prosody of ιαχ-; (ii) Euripidean usage in respect of anadiplosis; (iii) Euripidean metrical usage.

---

[77] *BICS* Suppl. 21.3 (1983), 136.   [78] cf. Kühner–Gerth 1.441.
[79] See Barrett on *Hi.* 760. At *Or.* 839–40 ὅτε|χρ- (on which see Stinton, *JHS* 96 [1976], 126) read ὅτ᾽ ἐ⟨κ⟩ (Willink). At *Ph.* 166 βάλοιμῖ χρ- I propose βάλοιμεν (*SIFC* 1989).
[80] And possibly *Su.* 599∼609 (*GRBS* 14 [1973], 250–1).   [81] See above, p. 111.
[82] *Griechische Verskunst* (1921), p. 271.   [83] *BICS* Suppl. 21.3 (1983), 138.

Prosody

The epic prosody is ἰάχ- in the present tense (only the participle ἰάχων is found, apart from a single instance of ἰαχεῖ at *Hymn* 27.7), and in the noun ἰαχή. Epic prosody in the past tense ἴαχον is ῐᾰχ- (preceding vowel always elided; ἐπίαχον also found), but ἴᾱχον thrice in the *Iliad* (always Ϝῐᾰχον) and ἰάχηςα twice in the *Hymns* (Ϝῐᾰχ- at 28.11 and presumably at 2.20). Attic prosody is ῐᾰχ- in both verb and noun, but Euripides occasionally uses epic ῑᾱχ-: *El.* 707 certainly ῑᾱχ-, but uncertain whether ἰάχει (L) or ἰαχεῖ (Diggle) or ἴαχεν (Elmsley); *Herc.* 883 ἰᾱχήμαςι; *Hel.* 1147 ῑᾱχήθης (Hermann's certain conjecture); *Phaethon* 82 probably ⟨ῑ⟩ᾱχούςιν. In the past tense Euripides has the augment at *Hel.* 1147 (ῑᾱχήθης) and drops it at *Or.* 826 (ῑᾱχηςε) and at *El.* 707 if Elmsley's ἴαχεν is right; at *El.* 1150 either ῑᾱχηςε or ῑᾱχηςε (ῑ in the anceps position).

Ours is the only passage in tragedy where epic ἰάχω (as opposed to ἰαχέω) occurs, unless we accept either ἰάχει (L) or ἴαχεν (Elmsley) at *El.* 707 or write ⟨ῑ⟩ᾱχουςιν instead of ⟨ῑ⟩ᾱχοῦςιν at *Phaethon* 82.

Epic usage suggests the scansion ἀνῐᾱχεν and ἴᾱχεν or ἀνῐᾱχεν and ῑᾱχεν. But Attic usage in respect of ἰαχή, ἰάχημα, and ἰαχέω suggests that ἀνῑᾱχον and ῑᾱχον or ἀνῐᾱχον and ῐᾱχον are legitimate.

Anadiplosis

It is reasonable to assume that ἀνίαχ(εν) ἴαχ(εν), compound followed by simple verb, as in the majority of manuscripts, is correct,[84] and that the less well attested variants are incorrect. There are then four possible forms which the anadiplosis may take: (a) ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν, (b) ἀνίαχεν ἴαχ', (c) ἀνίαχ' ἴαχεν, (d) ἀνίαχ' ἴαχ'. The following observations are applicable to Euripidean usage:

(A) *Anadiplosis in verbs*:

  (i) third person endings in -ε(ν):
    (a) when the first verb is not elided, the second is not elided either:
      Hi. 586–7, *Hel.* 195, 1118 ἔμολεν ἔμολε; *Hel.* 214 ἔλαχεν ἔλαχεν, 384 ὤλεςεν ὤλεςε; *Ph.* 1568 ἔφερεν ἔφερεν; *Or.* 162 ἔλακεν ἔλακεν, 329 ἔλακεν ἔλακε (s.u.l.); 986 ἔτεκεν ἔτεκε, 1468 ἔφερεν ἔφερεν.
    (b) first verb elided, second not elided: *Or.* 1547 ἔπες' ἔπεςε (s.u.l.);[85] *Ba.* 986–7 ἔμολ' ἔμολεν (Elmsley: -εν -εν P), rather than ἔμολεν ἔμολ', for a reason which will become apparent.
  (ii) other verbal forms which admit elision:
    (a) when the first verb is not elided, the second is not elided either: *Alc.* 266, *Hi.* 64, *Hel.* 331, *Ph.* 681, *Or.* 148, 176, *Ba.* 107, 595, *Rh.* 675, 676. An exception is the non-Euripidean [*Ph.*] 1716 γενόμεθα γενόμεθ'.
    (b) when the first verb is elided, the second may be elided (*Hec.* 173–4 [s.u.l.], *Su.* 800 [Blaydes], *Ph.* 1054, *IA* 1289–90, *Erecth.* fr. 65.43 Austin) or not elided (*Hec.* 1067, *Herc.* 1072, 1186, *Tr.* 1235, *Ion* 705, 1229, *Ph.* 679 [s.u.l.], 1350 [s.u.l.], *Rh.* 720, fr. 588.1, *Hyps.* fr. 64.92 [p. 48 Bond]).[86]

---

[84] For this figure see *GRBS* 14 (1973), 265 and *Studies* 18.

[85] ἔπες' ἔπεςε Seidler: ἔπεςεν ἔπεςε(ν) uel ἔπαιςεν ἔπαιςε(ν) fere codd.: ἔπαις' ἔπαιςε(ν) FT.

[86] And possibly fr. 453.9 (*Cresph.* fr. 71.9 Austin) ⟨ἴθ'⟩ ἴθι μοι, πότνια, πόλιν (*Papyrologica Florentina* 7 [1980], 59). A. Harder, *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos* (1985), pp. 104–5, expresses reservations about a lekythion in an aeolic context (in addition to *Hi.* 67 and *El.* 153 which she cites see *Hi.* 530 ∼ 540, 531 ∼ 541; also K. Itsumi, *CQ* n.s. 34 [1984], 72–4) and about resolution of the penultimate long (which is found at *Hel.* 180, 199, 203, 373, *Ph.* 649 [s.u.l.], 652 ∼ 671 [s.u.l.], 1286, 1288 ∼ 1299, [*Ph.*] 1721).

(B) *Anadiplosis in other parts of speech which admit elision*:

(a) when the first word is not elided, the second is not elided either: *Hi*. 61, 830, *Hec*. 1097, *Herc*. 115, 1042, *Tr*. 1312, 1327, *IT* 881 (s.u.l.), 894 (s.u.l.), *Ion* 1231 (Dindorf), *Hel*. 684, *Ph*. 190, 1298, [*Ph*.] 1720, 1721, *Or*. 140, 174, 182–3, 1373, *Ba*. 412, 578 (Hermann, Wecklein), 582, 584, 1182, 1198, *IA* 1487, 1524, *Rh*. 680. There are few exceptions: *Alc*. 270 τέκνα τέκν᾿ (s.u.l.), *Ion* 1054 πότνια πότνι᾿, [*Ph*.] 1725 δεινὰ δείν᾿.

(b) when the first word is elided, the second may be elided (*Alc*. 414) or not elided (*El*. 485, *Herc*. 1058 [s.u.l.], *IT* 864).

From this evidence two general rules may be formulated: (i) when the first word is not elided, the second is not elided either (this rule is observed in up to 48 passages and is broken possibly twice [*Alc*. 270 (s.u.l.), *Ion* 1054] and twice more in the non-Euripidean [*Ph*.] 1716 and 1725); (ii) when the first word is elided, the second may be elided (up to 6 instances) but is more commonly not elided (up to 16 instances).

The manuscripts of Euripides offer five instances[87] of anadiplosis in compound + simple verbs, and two further instances have been restored by conjectures which could be right. All of these instances conform to the rules just formulated: (i) when the first verb is not elided, the second is not elided either: *Alc*. 400 ὑπάκουσον ἄκουσον, *Ba*. 1065 κατῆγεν ἦγεν ἦγεν (a unique instance of this figure outside lyrics); (ii) when the first verb is elided, the second may be elided (*Hec*. 167 ἀπωλέσατ᾿ ὠλέσατ᾿, *Or*. 181 διοιχόμεθ᾿ οἰχόμεθ᾿)[88] or not elided (*Med*. 1252 κατίδετ᾿ ἴδετε, *Su*. 811 προσάγετ᾿ ⟨ἄγετε⟩ [Diggle],[89] *Ph*. 1350 ἀνάγετ᾿ ἄγετε [Mastronarde: ἀνάγετ᾿ ἀνάγετε codd.]).[90] Note also *Hi*. 1374 προσαπόλλυτέ μ᾿ ὄλλυτε (προσαπόλλυτ᾿ ἀπόλλυτε Wilamowitz).

We may now examine our four candidates:

(a) ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν conforms to rule (i) and may be compared with *Alc*. 400 ὑπάκουσον ἄκουσον and *Ba*. 1065 κατῆγεν ἦγεν ἦγεν.

(b) ἀνίαχεν ἴαχ᾿ breaks rule (i).

(c) ἀνίαχ᾿ ἴαχεν conforms to rule (ii) and may be compared with *Med*. 1252 κατίδετ᾿ ἴδετε.

(d) ἀνίαχ᾿ ἴαχ᾿ conforms to rule (ii) and may be compared with *Hec*. 167 ἀπωλέσατ᾿ ὠλέσατ᾿, *Or*. 181 διοιχόμεθ᾿ οἰχόμεθ᾿.

Metre

To the uncertainty over the prosody of ἰαχ- is added uncertainty over the exclamation which follows. The great majority of manuscripts has ὤμοι μοι, but a few have ἰώ μοι μοι. Although Biehl is wrong to say that C has ὤμοι, we had better consider this as a further alternative; likewise ἰώ μοι. All four forms of exclamation are found in Euripides.[91]

If we combine all four versions of the exclamation with all four versions of the anadiplosis, the number of theoretical combinations is 64.

---

[87] The variant cυνέπεc(εν) ἔπεcε at *Or*. 1309 is certainly wrong.

[88] We must follow Willink (and Biehl) in writing οἰχόμεθ᾿ ἅ for -μεθα.

[89] *GRBS* 14 (1973), 265, *Studies* 18–21, 119.

[90] The conjecture is neat, but it leaves a cretic (-κυτὸν ἐπί) interposed between dochmiacs (see above, pp. 107–109). If these lines are worth emending (I do not believe them to be Euripidean), we might accept the conjecture and follow it with ἐπὶ κάρα ⟨τίθε⟩τε, giving dochmiac and hypodochmiac twice. [91] See Willink *ad loc*., and his Addenda, p. 362.

(A) ἰᾱ̆

(a) ἁ δ' ἀνῐᾱχεν ἰᾱχεν
    1 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪∪–∪∪–∪–––(= 7)　　　unattested
    2 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪∪–∪∪–∪––(= 8)　　　alc. decas.
    3 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪∪–∪∪–∪∪––　　　da. pent. cat.
    4 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪∪–∪∪–∪∪––　　　da. tetr.

(b) ἁ δ' ἀνῐᾱχεν ἰᾱχ'
    5 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪∪–∪∪–––　　　da. tetr.
    6 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪∪–∪∪–––　　　da. tetr. cat.
    7 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪∪–∪∪–∪–––(= 1)　　unattested
    8 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪∪–∪∪–∪––(= 2)　　alc. decas.

(c) ἁ δ' ἀνῐᾱχ' ἰᾱχεν
    9 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪∪–∪–|∪–––(= 15)　　do +∪–––
   10 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪∪–∪–|∪––(= 16)　　do + ba
 [11 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪∪–∪–∪∪––　　　unacceptable]
 [12 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪∪–∪–∪∪––　　　unacceptable]

(d) ἁ δ' ἀνῐᾱχ' ἰᾱχ'
   13 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪∪–∪–|–––　　　do + mol
   14 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪∪–∪–|––　　　do + sp
   15 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪∪–∪–|∪–––(= 9)　　do +∪–––
   16 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪∪–∪–|∪––(= 10)　　do + ba

(B) ῑᾱ̆

(a) ἁ δ' ἀνῑᾱχεν ῑᾱχεν
   17 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪–|–∪–|–∪–|––(= 23)　　3 cr + sp
   18 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪–|–∪–|–∪––(= 24)　　2 cr + tro
   19 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪–|–∪–|–∪∪––　　　2 cr + do
 [20 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪–––∪––∪––　　　unacceptable]

(b) ἁ δ' ἀνῑᾱχεν ῑᾱχ'
 [21 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪–––∪–––　　　unacceptable]
   22 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪–|–∪–|–––　　　2 cr + mol
   23 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪–|–∪–|–∪–|––(= 17)　　3 cr + sp
   24 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪–|–∪–|–∪––(= 18)　　2 cr + tro

(c) ἁ δ' ἀνῑᾱχ' ῑᾱχεν
 [25 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪––––∪––(= 31)　　unacceptable]
   26 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪–|–––|∪––(= 32)　　cr + mol + ba
 [27 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪––––∪∪––　　　unacceptable]
 [28 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪––––∪∪––　　　unacceptable]

(d) ἁ δ' ἀνῑᾱχ' ῑᾱχ'
 [29 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪–––––––　　　unacceptable]
 [30 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪––––––　　　unacceptable]
 [31 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪––––∪––(= 25)　　unacceptable]
   32 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪–|–––|∪––(= 26)　　cr + mol + ba

(C) ἰᾱ̆

(a) ἁ δ' ἀνῐᾱ̆χεν ἀνῐᾱ̆χεν
   33 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪∪∪∪∪∪|–––(= 39, 43)　　do + mol
   34 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪∪∪∪∪∪|––(= 40, 44)　　do + sp[92]
   35 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪∪∪∪∪∪|∪–––(cf. 9, 15)
                                         do +∪–––
   36 Ἰώ μοι　　　–∪∪∪∪∪∪|∪––　　　do + ba

(b) ἁ δ' ἀνῐᾱ̆χεν ἰᾱ̆χ'
   37 Ὤμοι μοι　　　–∪∪∪|∪∪––(= 41, 47)　　cr + do
   38 Ὤμοι　　　　–∪∪∪∪|∪––(= 42, 48)　　ia + ba
   39 Ἰώ μοί μοι　　–∪∪∪∪∪∪|–––(= 33, 43)　　do + mol

***

[92] Or –∪∪∪∪|∪∪––2 tro.

40 Ἰώ μοι   –∪∪∪∪∪∪|––(= 34, 44) do+sp[92]

(c) ἁ δ' ἀνίαχ' ἴαχεν
   41 Ὤμοι μοι   –∪∪∪|∪∪∪–––(= 37, 47) cr+do
   42 Ὤμοι   –∪∪∪∪∪|∪––(= 38, 48) ia+ba
   43 Ἰώ μοί μοι   –∪∪∪∪∪∪|–––(= 33, 39) do+mol
   44 Ἰώ μοι   –∪∪∪∪∪∪|––(= 34, 40) do+sp[92]

(d) ἁ δ' ἀνίαχ' ἴαχ'
   45 Ὤμοι μοι   –∪∪∪∪–|–– do+sp
   46 Ὤμοι   –∪∪∪∪|–– ia+sp
   47 Ἰώ μοί μοι   –∪∪|∪∪∪–––(= 37, 41) cr+do
   48 Ἰώ μοι·   –∪∪∪∪|∪––(= 38, 42) ia+ba

(D) ῐᾰ

(a) ἁ δ' ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν
   [49 Ὤμοι μοι   –∪–∪∪–∪∪––– unacceptable]
   [50 Ὤμοι   –∪–∪∪–∪∪–– unacceptable]
   [51 Ἰώ μοί μοι   –∪–∪∪–∪∪∪––– unacceptable]
   [52 Ἰώ μοι   –∪–∪∪–∪∪–– unacceptable]

(b) ἁ δ' ἀνίαχεν ἴαχ'
   53 Ὤμοι μοι   –∪–∪∪–∪––– glyc+sp
   54 Ὤμοι   –∪–∪∪–∪–– hipponactean
   [55 Ἰώ μοί μοι   –∪–∪∪–∪∪––– unacceptable]
   [56 Ἰώ μοι   –∪–∪∪–∪∪–– unacceptable]

(c) ἁ δ' ἀνίαχ' ἴαχεν
   57 Ὤμοι μοι   –∪–∪–∪∪–––(= 63) ch dim+sp
   58 Ὤμοι   –∪–|∪–∪∪––(= 64) cr+do
   [59 Ἰώ μοί μοι   –∪–∪–∪∪∪––– unacceptable]
   [60 Ἰώ μοι   –∪–∪–∪∪–– unacceptable]

(d) ἁ δ' ἀνίαχ' ἴαχ'
   61 Ὤμοι μοι   –∪–|∪–∪–|–– cr+ia+sp
   62 Ὤμοι   –∪–∪|–∪–– 2 tro
   63 Ἰώ μοί μοι   –∪–∪–∪∪–––(= 57) ch dim+sp
   64 Ἰώ μοι   –∪–|∪–∪∪––(= 58) cr+do

Conclusions

ἁ δ' ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν· Ὤμοι μοι is much the best attested reading, and ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν accords with Euripidean style. I comment in turn on the three possible metrical analyses (1, 17, 33).

1 –∪∪–∪∪–∪–––. Such a colon is unattested. And it is not usual for –∪––– to follow directly on dactyls. There is a possible instance at *Andr.* 834–5 ~ 838–9 –∪∪–∪∪–∪∪|–∪–∪–.[93] As a clausular rhythm, –∪––– appears, after a linking anceps, in the sequence ... (∪∪)–∪∪–(∪–)×|–∪–––(*Herc.* 896–8, 908–9, ∪–∪–∪–∪–∪∪–∪∪–∪|–∪–––; perhaps *Herc.* 1077 –∪∪–∪∪–∪|–∪–––;[94] *Tr.* 282–3 ∪∪–∪∪–∪–∪|–∪–––; 286–7 ∪–∪∪–∪∪–∪|–∪–––; *Ion* 1508–9 ∪∪–∪∪–∪∪–∪∪–∪∪–∪|–∪–––; *Rh.* 527–8 ~ 546–7 ∪∪–∪∪–∪∪–∪|–∪–∪;[95] *Phaethon* 234–5 ~ 243–4 –∪∪∪∪––|–∪––; 272–3 ∪–∪––∪∪–∪∪–∪|–∪–––; fr. 911.3–4 –∪–––∪∪––|–∪––; S. *El.* 486–7 ~ 502–3 ––∪∪–∪–∪|–∪––; *OT* 1096–7 ~ 1108–9 ∪–∪∪–∪–∪|–∪–––).[96] A very partial analogy for the sequence

---

[93] See *ICS* 6 (1981), 95–8, *CQ* n.s. 33 (1983), 347, Stinton, *JHS* 97 (1977), 143.
[94] If we accept Willink's ϲυγγόνων for ϲύγγονον (*CQ* n.s. 38 [1988], 97).
[95] See *ICS* 6 (1981), 91 with n. 25.
[96] Note also (in a dactylo-epitrite context) *Tr.* 515 ~ 535 ––∪∪––|–∪–––. I should not accept the transmitted text of *Ph.* 309, where –∪–––appears as a clausula to (and in synapheia with) dochmiacs, but (like Murray) should accept Fritzsche's transposition.

‿‿–‿‿–‿––– is provided by the colon‿‿–‿‿–‿–––(*Andr.* 857, 862, *Ion* 1494, *Hel.* 657, 680, 681, *Hyps.* fr. 64.94 [p. 48 Bond]).[97]

17 –‿–|–‿–|–‿–|––. The cretics are well suited to the context. For the final spondee compare *Herc.* 131–2‿‿‿‿‿‿––|–‿–‿–‿–|–‿––– and *Hel.* 231‿‿‿–‿‿‿–‿|–‿–––, as well as ‿–‿–|––at *Alc.* 401~413, *Su.* 781~789, *IT* 400~415,[98] and –‿–|–‿–|–‿–|––– at *Ph.* 320–1. Willink (p. 362) objects to the 'unparalleled pattern of overlaps' (ᾱ δ' ἀνῑ|ᾱχεν ῑ|ᾱχεν ὡ|μοῖ μοῖ). It is true that cretics, when they come in series, often stay within the boundaries of the metron: so *Cycl.* 659 τύφετ' ὤ|καίετ' ὤ, *Hi.* 362 ἀιες ὤ|ἔκλυες ὤ ~ 669 τάλανες ὤ|κακοτυχεῖς, *Hec.* 1080 ναῦς ὅπως|ποντίοις|πείσμασιν|λινόκροκον, 1100 ἀμπτάμενος|οὐράν-ιον|ὑψιπετὲς|ἐς μέλαθρον, *Herc.* 135 Ἑλλὰς ὤ|ξυμμάχους, 742 χαρ-μοναὶ|δακρύων ~ 757 τίς ὁ θεοὺς|ἀνομίαι, *IT* 647 cὲ δὲ τύχας|μάκαρος ὤ|νεανία, 832 κατὰ δὲ δάκρυ|κατὰ δὲ γόος|ἅμα χαρᾶι,[99] *Or.* 316 δρομάδες ὤ|πτεροφόροι ~ 333 τίς ἔλεος|τίς ὅδ' ἀγών, *Rh.* 682 τίς ὁ λόχος;|πόθεν ἔβας;|ποδαπὸς εἶ;. But they also regularly overstep the metron: *Andr.* 275–6 ἐς νάπαν|ἦλθ' ὁ Μαίας τε καὶ Διὸς τόκος ~285–6 πιδάκων|νίψαν αἰ|γλᾶντα cώματα ῥοαῖς, *Herc.* 386 δυστράπε|ζοι πέραν ~399 ἕλικ' ἐφρού|ρει κτανών, *Tr.* 1091–2 Μᾶτερ ὤ|μοι μόναν|δή μ' Ἀχαιοὶ κομίζουςι cέθεν ἀπ' ὀμμάτων ~1110–11 μηδὲ γαῖάν ποτ' ἔλ|θοι Λάκαι|ναν πατρῶι|όν τε θάλαμον ἑστίας, *IT* 849 ἐξεθρέ|ψω φάος, *Ion* 1449 πόθεν ἐλάβο|μεν χαράν, *Ph.* 316 περιχορεύ|ουςα τέρ|ψιν παλαιὰν λάβω, 320 ἢ ποθει|νὸς φίλοις, 1524–5 τίν' ἀπὸ πρῶ|τον ἐπὶ χαι|τας cπαραγ|μοῖς ἀπαρ|χὰς βάλω, *Or.* 1377 πόντον Ὠ|κεανὸς ὄν, 1419 μή τις εἴ|η δόλος, 1421 τοῖς δ' ἐς ἀρ|κυςτάταν, 1424 ματροφόν|τας δράκων. In the anadiplosis ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν the syllables which are repeated occupy the same positions in successive metra (ῑ|ᾱχεν bis), which is crucial for the rhetorical balance.

33 –‿‿‿‿‿‿|–––. This is a rare form of dochmiac: almost certainly to be accepted at *Herc.* 1085, *IT* 870, *Or.* 1305, *IA* 1290, less certainly at *Ph.* 1533, and certainly not at *Tr.* 325.[100] A possible, but far from certain, parallel for dochmiac followed by molossus is 1414–15 ἔβαλον ἔβαλον Ἑλένας ἄμφω.[101]

Of these three candidates 33 does not appeal; 1 though unique cannot be entirely discounted; and 17 has some appeal. It remains to consider whether a change in the text will produce a yet more appealing candidate.

2 (= 8) –‿‿–‿‿–‿–– (alcaic decasyllable, as *Hec.* 952, *El.* 486, 1226 ~ 1232, *Ion* 1049 ~ 1062, *Rh.* 536–7 ~ 555–6[102]) is obtained (in 2) by dropping μοι[103] (parallels for the interpolation would be *Ph.* 1493 and 1551, where many or most of the manuscripts have ὤμοι μοι for ὤμοι).

3 –‿‿–‿‿–‿–––(dactylic pentameter catalectic, as *Cycl.* 620, *El.* 452 ~464, *Hel.* 384, *Ph.* 1491 and possibly 831–2[104]) has a clausular cadence not attested in this length

[97] See *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974), 15, Dale, *Lyric Metres*, p. 171.

[98] And possibly *Cycl.* 77 (Fritzsche); but not *Or.* 1447, which is corrupt or lacunose. At *Or.* 1401–2, where it is difficult to make metrical sense of the transmitted text, I hazard λέοντες Ἕλλανες|δύο διδύμωι (MOMt: -ω cett.) ⟨ῥυθμῶι⟩ (‿–‿–|–– ‖ ‿‿‿‿–|––).

[99] For an alternative dochmiac interpretation (with Dindorf's δάκρυ⟨α⟩) see *Studies* 20, Willink, *CQ* n.s. 39 (1989), 46.

[100] See *Dionysiaca* (n. 42 above), p. 166, where I wrongly said that *IA* 1290 is iambic.

[101] See above, p. 108. For the position of the repeated element in the dochmiac see p. 109 (under (b)).   [102] See Dale, *Lyric Metres*, p. 181.

[103] Wilamowitz (*Verskunst*, p. 271 n. 1) appears to have contemplated the deletion of μοι, but his analysis would then have been –‿–|–‿–|–‿–– (as 18).

·[104] This assumes the division -ρας μεταμειβομένα πόλις ἅδ' ἐπ' ἄκροις|, which will then be followed in 833 by ἔστακ' Ἀργηΐοις στεφάνοισιν (––‿–‿‿‿––), an unwelcome length (but an acceptable colon can be restored by ἔστακ' Ἀρείοις στεφάνοισιν [fere Brunck ('Ἀρηΐοις)] or

but found in the commoner catalectic tetrameter (*Ion* 1484, *Ph.* 121, 192, *Or.* 1381 Ἴλιον Ἴλιον ὤμοι μοι) and in a catalectic hexameter at *Andr.* 274 ~ 284 (and possibly *Ph.* 831–2).[105] Willink suggests that the same colon might be restored at 1300 ἐλθ' ἐπίκουρος ἐμοῖσι φίλοισι (φίλοις Cr, as Willink had conjectured) πάντως. But I see no cause to remove the praxillean (for which see *Alc.* 568–9 ~ 578–9, possibly *Su.* 599 ~ 609,[106] *Tr.* 1070 ~ 1080, *Ion* 1075 ~ 1091, possibly *Or.* 1369).[107]

4 – ⌣⌣ – ⌣⌣ – ⌣⌣ – – is a straightforward dactylic tetrameter of common shape (*Hi.* 1124 ~ 1137, 1129 ~ 1140, *Andr.* 1174 ~ 1187, 1182 ~ 1195), but it requires ἰώ μοι [μοι].

5–8 may be ruled out of consideration, since ἀνίαχεν ἴαχ' gives an unattested pattern of anadiplosis.

9 – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ – | ⌣ – – – is attested at *Herc.* 1024 and *Rh.* 832 (~ †466†), where we have the choice of analysing as dochmiac + ⌣ – – – or as aeolo-choriambic.[108] In both places the colon is clausular to the stanza. It is not welcome here.

10 – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ – | ⌣ – – (do + ba) is, in theory, an acceptable combination.[109] But, when this combination occurs, the dochmiac nowhere takes the form – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ –. The most probable instances are *Alc.* 874 ~ 891 (⌣⌣⌣ – ⌣ – ⌣ – ⌢ [unless ⌣⌣⌣ – ⌣ – | – ⌣ – ⌣]), 877 ~ 894 (⌣ – – ⌣ – ⌣ – –), *Su.* 804 ~ 817 (⌣ – – ⌣ – ⌣ – –), *Ph.* 300 (⌣ – – – ⌣ – ⌣ – –), *Or.* 1012 (⌣ – ⌣⌣⌣ – ⌣ – –), fr. 117, 118, 119 (all ⌣ – – ⌣ – ⌣ – –).[110] See T. C. W. Stinton, *BICS* 22 (1975), 84–8, who observes (after Wilamowitz) that 'initial short appears to be characteristic of this verse'. In any case, – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ – ⌣ – – would naturally be taken as aeolo-choriambic (like S. *Ai.* 701 ~ 714, *OC* 130 ~ 161),[111] a rhythm alien to the context.

13 – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ – | – – – (do + mol) is not certainly attested (see on 33 above). Nor is 14 – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ – | – –.[112] For 15 and 16 see on 9 and 10.

18 – ⌣ – | – ⌣ – | – ⌣ – – has little to commend it.[113]

19 – ⌣ – | – ⌣ – | – ⌣⌣ – – – gives a sequence (2 cr + do) found at *Hi.* 362 ~ 668, *Herc.* 742 ~ 757, *Or.* 317–18 ~ 333–4.[114]

21–4 may be ruled out for the same reason as 5–8.

26 and **32** – ⌣ – | – – – | ⌣ – – interpose an unwelcome molossus. I know no parallel for a molossus in the middle of a trimeter (Murray's text of *Alc.* 595 ~ 604 is unacceptable).

34 if taken as – ⌣⌣ ⌣⌣ ⌣ ⌣⌣ | – – introduces a rare form of dochmiac (see on 33 above) and adds an unwelcome (and unparalleled) spondee;[115] the alternative trochaic analysis (– ⌣ ⌣⌣ ⌣ | ⌣⌣ – –) has little appeal.

ἕσταϰ' Ἄρεος στεφάνοισιν [Porson]). Alternatively, divide -ρας μεταμειβομένα πόλις ἄδ' ἐπ' ἄκροις ἕσταϰ'| Ἀρηίοις (or Ἀρείοις) στεφάνοισιν (for the catalectic hexameter see immediately below).   [105] See n. 104.   [106] See *GRBS* 14 (1973), 250–2.

[107] I see even less cause for ἐμοῖς (JMnRRwST), adopted by Murray, giving an encomiologus (– ⌣⌣ – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ – ⌣ – –), which belongs among dactylo-epitrites (as *Ion* 1504, fr. 901.1) and is less well suited as a continuation after the preceding dactylic tetrameter. In dactylic lengths the clausular – ⌣ – ⌣ – – does not abut directly onto dactyls ending in double short (hence *Rh.* 530 ~ 550 should be divided – ⌣⌣ – ⌣⌣ – | ⌣⌣ – ⌣⌣ – ⌣ – ⌣ – [see *Studies* 102, 121; W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (1964), pp. 314–15], and we must reject Murray's text of *IA* 1485–6), but may follow after catalexis (see above, p. 115). I add that ἐλθ' ἐπίκουρος ἐμοῖς φίλοις πάντως would provide a parallel for candidate 1; but I do not recommend it.

[108] See *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974), 15–16; Bond on *Herc.* 1024; West, *BICS* 28 (1981), 62, *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982), 285–6, *Greek Metre* (1982), pp. 100, 111. Willink (*CQ* n.s. 38 [1988], 94) introduces a second dochmiac in both *Herc.* 1024 and *Rh.* 832. I shall deal with the corruption in *Rh.* 466 (~ 832) elsewhere.   [109] See n. 27 above.

[110] On fr. 117 see M. Hose, *Mus. Crit.* 21–2 (1987), 143–4.

[111] See Dale, *Lyric Metres*, p. 140.   [112] For the alleged spondee see n. 35 above.

[113] See n. 103 above.   [114] See above, p. 107.   [115] See n. 35 above.

35–6, besides introducing the same rare dochmiac as 33 and 34, add the same unwelcome elements as 9 and 10.

37–40 may be ruled out for the same reason as 5–8.

41 $-\cup\cup\cup\,|\cup\cup--$ (cr + do) is an attested combination.[116]

42 $-\cup\cup\cup\cup\,|\cup--$ (ia + ba) is perfectly acceptable.

43 is the same rare dochmiac as 33, followed by molossus, as 13.

44 is subject to the same strictures as 34.

45 adds an unwelcome spondee after the dochmiac (see on 34).

46 adds an unwelcome spondee after the resolved iambic metron (in the examples of the sequence ia + sp given above on 17 the iambic metron is not resolved).

47 is like 41, **48** like 42.

53–4 would be acceptable if there were any trace of aeolo-choriambics hereabouts (53 like *Su.* 957 ∼ 965, *IT* 1093 ∼ 1110, *Ion* 1060 ∼ 1073),[117] but in any case are ruled out, as are 55–6, for the same reason as 5–8.

57–60 can be saved if (like Di Benedetto) we contemplate *breuis in longo* ($-\cup-\cup-\cup\frown$) and take the exclamation *extra metrum*, an unconvincing expedient, since the exclamation is not an isolated utterance by the Phrygian. Again, aeolo-choriambic interpretation of 57 (cf. *Hi.* 147 ∼ 157, *El.* 174 ∼ 197, 434 ∼ 444)[118] and 58 (cf. S. *Ai.* 181 ∼ 192) can be discounted. Treatment of 58 as cr + do (see on 41) does not appeal, since this shape of dochmiac ($\cup-\cup\cup--$) is probably unexampled.[119]

61 $-\cup-\,|\cup-\cup-\,|--$ is an unwelcome length, but 62 (2 tro) would be acceptable.

63 and **64** are the same as 57 and 58.

In conclusion: I see no merit in eliding the termination of one or both of ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν, since neither ἀνίαχ' ἴαχεν nor ἀνίαχ' ἴαχ' (the two versions entailing elision which accord with Euripidean usage) yields metre which is preferable to metre which is yielded by the unelided forms. I should not scruple to alter the exclamation Ὤμοι μοι, if alteration were to yield metre which is preferable. The variant Ἰώ μοί μοι could, indeed, be right, although ὤμοι is much more commonly corrupted to ἰώ μοι than is ἰώ μοι to ὤμοι.[120] If we accept the majority reading, I should not exclude the possibility that 1 $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup---$ is right (the exclamation may be held to account for the anomalous clausula), but it may be wise to prefer 17 $-\cup-\,|-\cup-\,|-\cup-\,|--$. If we accept the variant ἰώ μοί μοι, we should probably follow Willink and adopt 3 $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$. Of the other possibilities I have most sympathy for 2 $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup--$ and 4 $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup--$.

1488–90

> ὑπὸ ϲκότον δ' ἐφεύγομεν·
> νεκροὶ δ' ἔπιπτον, οἱ δ' ἔμελλον, οἱ δ' ἔκειντ'·
> ἔμολε δ' ἁ τάλαιν' Ἑρμιόνα δόμουϲ ...

Willink (Addenda, p. 363) records a proposal of mine to interchange 1488 and 1489: νεκροὶ δ' ἔπιπτον, οἱ δ' ἔμελλον, οἱ δ' ἔκεινθ'· | ὑπὸ ϲκότον δ' ἐφεύγομεν. | ἔμολε δ' κτλ. Here are my reasons. First, the sequence of thought is improved: 'Men began to fall dead, or were about to fall, or had fallen – and we (the survivors) ran for cover' is more logical than 'We ran for cover – and/but men began to fall dead...'[121] More

---

[116] See above, p. 107.   [117] See Dale, *Lyric Metres*, p. 155.

[118] See Dale, *Lyric Metres*, p. 140.

[119] Neither of the two instances alleged by N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 27, is to be counted as dochmiac.   [120] See Willink, p. 362.

[121] Since Wecklein (III. vi [1902], p. 90) attributes to Elmsley a proposal to delete οἱ δ' ἔκειντ', I had better say that what Elmsley proposed (on *Hcld.* 838) was πολλοί for νεκροί. Wecklein was misled by Blaydes (*Adversaria critica in Eur.* [1901], p. 418).

important, the transmitted sequence, iambic trimeter elided before dochmiacs at a strong sense-pause, is metrically intolerable.[122]

Contrast the following, where there is no pause between trimeter and dochmiacs and yet period-end is demonstrable (because of hiatus and/or *breuis in longo*): *Hec.* 699–700 ἔκβλητον ἢ πέσημα φοινίου δορός|ἐν ψαμάθωι λευρᾶι, *IT* 843–4 δέδοικα δ' ἐκ χερῶν με μὴ πρὸς αἰθέρᾰ|ἀμπτάμενος φύγηι, *Ion* 1452–3 μῶν οὐκ ἔχειν μ' ἔχουσα; :: τὰς γὰρ ἐλπίδᾱς|ἀπέβαλον πρόσω, *Ph.* 148–9 λοχαγός, ὡς ὄχλος νιν ὑστέρωι ποδῑ|πάνοπλος ἀμφέπει, 168–9 ὅπλοισι χρυσέοισιν ἐκπρεπής, γέρον,|ἑώιοις ὅμοια φλεγέθων βολαῖς [ἀελίου],[123] *Ba.* 1161–2 τὸν καλλίνικον κλεινὸν ἐξεπράξατε̆|ἐς στόνον ἐς δάκρυα, *Rh.* 697–8 ὅστις δι' ὄρφνης ἦλθ' ἀδειμάντωι ποδῑ|διά τε τάξεων καὶ φυλάκων ἕδρας.

An iambic trimeter so elided at sense-pause can be followed only by an iambic colon (compare *Su.* 923–4 ἐγὼ δὲ γηροβοσκὸν οὐκ ἔχω, τεκοῦς'|ἁ τάλαινα παῖδα, *El.* 1183–4 διὰ πυρὸς ἔμολον ἁ τάλαινα ματρὶ τᾷδ',|ἅ μ' ἔτικτε κούραν, the only other elided trimeters known to me). With 1489 before 1488 we have a period of five iambic metra, like 1481–2 ὃν εἶδον εἶδον ἐν πύλαις (Murray: πύλαισι codd.) Πριαμίσι· φας|γάνων δ' ἀκμὰς συνήψαμεν (alternatively divisible at πύλαις|)[124] and 1498–9 τὰ δ' ὕστερ' οὐκέτ' οἶδα· δραπέταν (Willink: -την codd.) γὰρ ἐξ|έκλεπτον ἐκ δόμων πόδα (alternatively divisible at δρα|πέταν).[125]

Queens' College, Cambridge   JAMES DIGGLE

---

[122] Murray's text of *Hel.* 637 presents a *catalectic* iambic trimeter elided, at sense-pause, before dochmiacs, an even greater anomaly, and generally recognised as impossible (see, most recently, Willink, *CQ* n.s. 39 [1989], 52–3). Nor should I accept Murray's text of *Ph.* 294–5 τὸν οἴκοθεν νόμον σέβους'|ἔβας ὦ χρόνωι γᾶν πατρώιαν. There is no parallel for elision of an iambic dimeter before an iambic line beginning with a bacchiac, and such elision at a strong sense-pause is unthinkable. To write σέβουσα (so Mastronarde and others) gives an unparalleled length. Write σέβουσα νόμον. Parallels for resolution in the last element of the dimeter, at sense-pause, are given by L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968), 255. A comparable phenomenon is resolution before change of metre, as in *Tr.* 565, *Ion* 212∼230, *Ba.* 1170∼1186.

[123] See above, p. 108.

[124] The manuscripts mostly divide at Πριαμίσι|(none at πύλαισι|). Murray's conjecture (accepted by Willink) is a small price to pay for avoidance of the metrical analyses offered by other editors.

[125] HMB and others divide at ἐ|ξέκλεπτον, and I take this to be the Alexandrian division (see above, p. 111). Most of the others divide at οἶδα|or γάρ|, none at δρα|πέτην.