

EURIPIDES, *SUPPLICES* 71–86 AND THE CHORUS OF ‘ATTENDANTS’

The first choral ode of Euripides’ *Supplices*, or the Parodos if that term can be used for an ode which is not an ‘entry’, ends with two stanzas of lyric-iambic threnody, following four stanzas of supplication in ionic metre (42–70).¹

As Collard comments, this structure is broadly similar to, and very possibly modelled upon, A. *Pers.* 65–114, 115–39.² But there is an important difference here: prima facie, the ‘further/different concerted lament’ in 71ff. is sung and performed by the *πρόσπολοι* mentioned in 72, ‘taking over’ in a kind of antiphon to the Seven Mothers’ lamenting *ίκεσία*.³

ἀγών ὁδ’ ἄλλος ἔρχεται ἰγόνων γόνων
διάδοχος, ἀχούσι προσπόλων† χέρες.

The continuation (73–4) confirms the idea of *supportive* mourning:

ἴτ’ ὦ ξυνωιδοὶ κακοῖς
ἴτ’ ὦ ξυναλγηδόνας...

συνωιδός is the standard word for singers who ‘join in’ supportively: *H.F.* 786 βᾶτε ... *συναοιδοὶ νύμφαι* (sc. ἡμῖν), *Hel.* 174 *μουσεῖα θρηγνήμασι* (sc. ἐμοῖς) *ξυνωιδά*,⁴ *Ph.* 1518 (ὄρνις) ἐμοῖς ἄχεσι *συνωιδός*, *Or.* 132–3 τοῖς ἐμοῖς *θρηγνήμασι* / φίλαι *συνωιδοί*. *κακοῖς* naturally, as in *Hel.* 171, alludes to the already described ‘woes’ (here the *πάθη* of the Seven Mothers) with which the ‘co-singers’ are sympathizing;⁵ and the fine abstract-for-personal *ξυναλγηδόνας* repeats the idea of ‘sym-pathy’. The sense is evidently ‘Go (i.e. dance) as fellow-mourners...’, followed by *χορόν τὸν Ἀἰδάς ἐβεί* (see further on pp. 345f. below). The ‘fellow-mourners’ must be the

¹ This article fulfils, in part, a hope expressed in my commentary on *Or.* 961–2, where I offered a different tentative conjecture for *Supp.* 77; but it is also complementary to my discussion earlier this year of a stanza-pair in the Parodos of *Helen* (*CQ* 40 (1990), 77ff.), referred to below as ‘above, p. ...’, the numerous points of contact having forced me to a reappraisal. To the works cited there (p. 77 n. 1), add C. Collard, *Euripides Supplices* (Groningen, 1975; see also his Teubner edn., 1984). I am gratefully indebted to the helpful criticisms and suggestions of the *CQ* referee, none other than Dr J. Diggle, whom I have hitherto always consulted at an earlier stage.

² Collard, ii.116. *Pers.* 115ff. is essentially trochaic (beginning *lk lk ... lk |||*, like *Hel.* 167–78/179–90; cf. p. 84 with n. 34), whereas here we have *2ia 2ia ... ith |||*. But all three patterns have partly syncopated rhythm with no long acipitia (p. 83), and the corresponding exclamations in the middle of the stanza are a particular feature consistent with imitation (see below with n. 19).

³ *διάδοχος*: cf. *Andr.* 1201, where Peleus responds to the Chorus. Threnodic antiphons more typically respond to a single *ἐξαρχος* (as *I.T.* 179ff., etc.; comm. on *Or.* 960–1012, cf. Broadhead, *Persae*, pp. 310ff.). For Collard, the *πρόσπολοι* are mere ‘stage-extras’ and there is no ‘taking over’; a view surely inconsistent, if not directly with the Greek, at least with the conventions of choral lyric. The actively-lamenting persons thus prominently identified must be the performers of the lament.

⁴ For *μουσεῖα* (‘halls of song’) there metonymic for ‘musicians’, see above, p. 89 with n. 56.

⁵ Diggle rightly rejects *κόποι* (Nicklin, Collard) and *κτύποι* (Wilamowitz) in his *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981), 4–5, but is ‘driven back’ to *κακοῖς* (apogr. Par.; L. *κακοῖ*) with ἐμοῖς understood. ‘My’ is expressed in the parallels cited; and here it is not required, if the singers are the *πρόσπολοι*.

πρόσπολοι; and they must also (following 71–2) be the singers. For the choric imperative thus self-exhorting (unlike βάτε in *H.F.* loc. cit.), cf. *Ba.* 83 ἵτε Βάκχαι bis, *Ph.* 1350, *Or.* 141, 1353, etc.⁶

Who these πρόσπολοι are, and the implications of that for the constitution of the chorus, are controversial matters to which I shall come later, after discussing some points of textual, metrical and interpretative detail in these two stanzas.

Beginning as above, the strophe enunciates the themes of 'further concerted lamentation' and 'resounding hands', i.e. κομμός (71–2), of 'community in grieving' (73–4), of 'Death-choros' (75) and facial disfigurement, i.e. σπαραγμός (76–7), paradoxically ending with the word κόσμος 'adornment' (78). The first part of the antistrophe then develops the themes of χάρις and πόνος with a familiar 'waterfall' simile alluding to tears (79–82); and the concluding verses summatively explain the energetic dirge as a whole (83–6; text as L, not Diggle, Collard):

τὸ γὰρ θανόντων τέκνων
ἐπίπονόν τι κατὰ γυναῖ-
κας ἐς γόους πέφυκε πάθος.
ἔ. ἔ.
θανοῦσα τῶνδ' ἀλγέων λαθοίμαν.

85

'For the πάθος when offspring die' is by nature an ἐπίπονον thing among women with regard to lamentation – eeh! eeh! – may I die so as to become unconscious of these griefs!' The concluding theme of 'death-wishing grief' is hyperbolic (the more so, if the wish is vicarious); but it was a traditional function of ritual lamentation, with real or mimed self-mutilation, to afford a controlled outlet for the extravagant and potentially suicidal grief of bereaved Greek women.⁸

Collard misinterprets 83–5, as Diggle has pointed out:⁹ it is not the πάθος (death) of the τέκνα, but the πάθος of bereavement, reflecting that of the Mothers as described in the Prologue (cf. 11 πάθος παθοῦσαι δεινόν), which is ἐπίπονον in this sentence. πάθος and πένθος are related words (see Barrett on *Hipp.* 139–40). One might have expected the former to denote especially the 'passive' aspect of grief (παθ- as in παθεῖν); but it is by no means limited to that, and there is a characteristic element of paradox here in the definition of the πάθος as at once passive and active.¹⁰ The compound sense of πάθος is reflected in the double sense of ἐπίπονον, even as

⁶ This use of the 2nd pl. imperative may derive from exhortations sung by an ἔξαρχος; but not all the exx. can be given to the Chorus-leader (cf. *comm. Or.* pp. 105, 302). If the 'self-address' in unison is artificial, it is no more so than Electra's lamenting use of the 2nd pers. sing. at *El.* 112f. and 127f. σύντειν' ... ὦ ἔμβα ἔμβα κατακλαίονσα, 125 ἴθι, τὸν αὐτὸν ἔγειρε γόνον, 140 (lect. dub.), 150 δρύπτει κάρα (for which see Dennison, who cites Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, 215–16).

⁷ Or 'caused by dead offspring'. The gen. phrase can be understood as 'absolute'; but for the causal gen. in contexts of grief, denoting also the object of the grief, cf. *comm.* on *Or.* 456–8.

⁸ Cf. M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, 1974), 28. The ritualized violence could alternatively give an outlet to desires for vendetta-killing (ibid. 22). For the σπαραγμός-topos, cf. also above, p. 89 with n. 55. We do not know how far the hyperbolically 'mortal' self-mutilation was curbed by Solon's legislation. In real life it may have become largely symbolic; but tragedy is not real life.

⁹ In *Dionysiaca ... studies ... presented to Sir Denys Page ...* (Cambridge, 1978), 175 n. 11. My interpretation here differs from Diggle's only in clarifying the force of ἐπίπονον, which he renders 'wearisome', and in giving a corresponding ambivalence to ἐς: 'with regard to' as well as 'so as to cause', cf. *El.* 37 λαμπροὶ ... ἐς γένος, *Cyc.* 522 μέγιστος ... ἐς τέρψιν βίου, *Ba.* 1162 ἐς γόνον ἐς δάκρυα (s.v.l.), etc.

¹⁰ Cf. *El.* 1226 δεινότατον παθέων ἔρεξα (*comm.* on *Or.* 3), also the similarly active threnodic πάθεα in *Hel.* 173 (above, pp. 88–9 with n. 55). 'Weeping', like other modes of grieving, can be 'actively' performed in rhythmical πίτυλοι (*Hipp.* 1464, *Tro.* 1235–6).

πόνουι 'toils', like 'pains', can be either active 'labours' or passive 'afflictions'.¹¹ The sentiment is otherwise neatly phrased: *κατὰ γυναῖκας...πέφυκε* accurately implies the *φύσις* of the female sex in general (cf. *Andr.* 93–5); and the whole complement *ἐπίπονόν τι...ἐς γόους* is inserted in a sentence so framed by *τὸ γὰρ...πάθος* as to throw full weight on the keyword *πάθος* at the end.¹² Then the *πάθος* is culminatingly defined as 'death-wishing', with the same juxtaposition of *παθ-* and *θαν-* as in *Hipp.* loc. cit. *κρυπτῶι πάθει* (*πένθει* codd.) *θανάτου* θέλουσαν / κέλσαι ποτὶ τέρμα δυστάνου.¹³

We should be reluctant to spoil the pattern by the 'simple transposition' *πάθος πέφυκε* (ν), with *ἐ ἐ* (or *αἰαί*) weakly appended as the clausula of a catalectic trimeter.¹⁴ The transposition in effect misplaces the copula;¹⁵ and the metre is perfect here, with no need for transposition, if we give to the exclamation(s) transmitted as *ἐ ἐ* the value ∪–∪–. What we then have is a characteristically Euripidean run of partly syncopated dimeters, ending with a 'one-plus-three' pattern of the last four metra.¹⁶ The pyrrhic word *πάθος* ends a dimeter, with a resolution that signals 'no period-end yet';¹⁷ at the same time the exclamatory metron belongs as closely with what follows as with what precedes.¹⁸ As shown below, it is the corresponding passage in the strophe that needs, and readily admits, emendation.

To give the exclamation such a value here is in line with *A. Pers.* 115–19/120–5, whose pattern *lk lk || δᾶ | cr | ∪ cr cr ∪ cr cr lk |||* is the equivalent of six dimeters, if *δᾶ* is a metron rather than extra-metric.¹⁹

¹¹ Cf. my discussion of the ambivalent *πόνος*-theme in *H.F.* in *CQ* 38 (1988), 86ff. Here *ἐπίπονόν* follows on the heels of the oxymoron *χάρις...πολύπονός* in 80 (cf. *Ba.* 67 *κάματος ἐνκάματος*). Note that *χάρις*, a richer word than *ἡδονή* in *El.* 126, is appropriate to the vicarious *πόνος* here.

¹² The *τι* simply serves, *pace* Collard, to make the neuter adjective a substantival complement (cf. *I.A.* 568 *μέγα τι θηρεύειν ἀρετάν*, etc.); a favourite idiom (comm. on *Or.* 231–2), not otherwise clear when the subject is neuter (unless *χρῆμα* or *κτῆμα* is used with similar effect). For the 'inserted' complement, cf. *Or.* 981 *βροτῶν δ' ὁ πᾶς ἀστάθμητος αἰών*, where I compare *H.F.* 290 *οὐμός δ' ἀμαρτύρητος εὐκλεῆς πόσις*. For the disyllabic keyword at the end, cf. also *Or.* 10 *νόσον* (comm. p. 82).

¹³ For the idiomatic emphasis on the participle *θανούσα*, cf. comm. on *Or.* 1149–50.

¹⁴ The transposition was proposed by Zuntz (*Inquiry*, 65–7); Dale (*LM*² 75 n. 1) created the trimeter, as accepted by Collard and Diggle (the latter previously in *GRBS* 14 (1973), 247 n. 19). A similarly appended *αἰαί* for *ἐ ἐ* at *Hel.* 166a (clausular to dactyls), accepted by edd., is rejected on pp. 79f. above.

¹⁵ A fair test of that is to try the effect of writing *ἐςτί* at the end of *H.F.* 290 or *Or.* 981 (n. 12 above).

¹⁶ Cf. *Andr.* 281–2 *βοτήρᾳ τ' ἀμφὶ μονότροπον / νεανίαν | ἔρημόν | θ' ἐστιούχον αὐλάν ~ 291–2 πικρὰν δὲ σύγχυτον βίον / Φρυγῶν πόλει | ταλαῖναι | περγάμοις τε Τροίας* (not two trimeters, since 291 lacks diaeresis after the fifth or seventh position). *Or.* 842–3 is similar (comm. pp. 221f.), but with *ar* clausula: *σφάγιον ἔθετο | ματέρα, πατρῶν-ων παθέων ἀμοιβάν*. Cf. also *Andr.* 484–5 (next n.), and the recurrently clausular sequence ...:-- / ∪∪∪∪∪∪– || (with word-overlap) in *Hel.* 171/183, 201/220, 209/228 (above, p. 84).

¹⁷ For the metron ∪∪∪∪ at verse-end before punctuation, cf. *Ba.* 414 *ἐκεῖ δὲ πόθος*, *ibid.* 584, *Hipp.* 1144(?), *I.T.* 864, *Hel.* 1326, (L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* 18 (1968), 255); also *Ph.* 294, where I am grateful to Dr Diggle for advance notice of his proposal *σέβουσα νόμον* (for *νόμον σέβουσα*(a)). Terminal ∪ in the glyconic, as in *Ba.* 109 (*δρυός*) ~ 124 (*τόδε*), is similar in principle. Note that 84–5 are *4ia*, not *2tr* | *lk*. The pattern with trochaic cross-rhythm in an iambic context is like *Andr.* 483–5 (~ 491–3) *ένός ἄρ' ἀνν-ςις ἀνά τε μέλα-/θρα κατά τε πόλι-ας, ὅποταν εὐ-/ρεῖν θέλωσι καιρόν* (surely *4ia*+*ith*: *ὅποταν εὐ-* cannot be 'catalectic' (Stevens) or a resolved *ba* (Dale): anything else gives ∪ | ∪ somewhere).

¹⁸ For *ἐ ἐ* (s.v.l.) preceded and followed by other words within the period, cf. *A. Supp.* 142/152.

¹⁹ Perhaps we should write *δᾶ <δᾶ>*: cf. *ibid.* 977, where Broadhead writes *ἐῆ ἐῆ* (Page *ἐῆ ἐῆ*; *ἐ ἐ ἐ* fere codd.), and *S.c.T.* 327/39 *ἐ ἐ* (s.v.l.) | *ιθ* (327 *ἐ* ter vel quater plurimi), which is probably

ἐ ἐ (ἐ ἐ, ἐἐἐ, etc.) is in general something of a chameleon. Sometimes it is proper to write, or prefer a variant, αἰαἰ or αἰαἰ αἰαἰ (or αἰαἰαἰαἰ), since ε and αἰ are commonly confused, and exclamations are often otherwise inaccurately transmitted or omitted in our MSS.²⁰ But it seems clear that all three tragedians used both ἐ- (or ἐ-) and αἰ- exclamations with metrical value;²¹ and it is up to the editor to make sense of the tradition, including metrical sense, however subjectively. In αἰ- exclamations the basic diphthong is long, but optionally subject to correption before another αἰ or in combinations like αἰαἰ (αἰ αἰ?) ἰώ. In ἐ- exclamations, probably always twofold or fourfold, the basic syllabic value is short, but the last (oxytone) ε is always lengthened.²² For the standard value ∪ – some editors write ἐή (after Dindorf);²³ but it is a sufficient clarification to write ἐ ἐ or ἐἐ followed by punctuation, with ἐ ἐ ἐ or ἐἐἐ (sic) for a more hypothetical value ∪ ∪ ∪.²⁴

Disyllabic exclamations are very often doubled (cf. ἰώ, παπαῖ, etc.). ἐἐ· ἐἐ· (or an equivalent) is clearly right at A. *Pers.* 977 (~ 991 βοᾷ βοᾷ); and for the suggested interpretation (in dimeters)

ἐἐ· ἐἐ· θανοῦσα τῶν- 2ia
δ' ἀλγέων λαθοίμαν. ith

I lean especially on two Euripidean parallels in contexts of παραγμός. At *El.* 150, ἐἐ· ἐἐ· (L ἐ ἐ) δρύπτε κάρα yields an *ia-ch* dimeter (introducing glyconics); and at *Tro.* 278–80 an otherwise plausible colometric re-interpretation gives

ἐἐ· ἐἐ· ἄρασσε κρᾶ- 2ia
τα κούρμῳ, ἔλκ' ὀνύχεσσι ∪ : D ∪
δίπτυχον παρειάν. ith

a trimeter. But ὀά occurs nowhere else, and there is more than one way in which exclamatory ο (or ω) + α can be articulated as a full metron. Broadhead suggests 'extra-metric' interpretation, but that seems less likely in the middle of a patterned stanza.

²⁰ Cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 208, 591–5, and Mastronarde's apparatus at *Ph.* 1284.

²¹ The value may be indeterminate when an exclamation occupies a whole verse, but that may not make it 'extra-metric'; e.g. a verse αἰαἰ αἰαἰ in anapaestic contexts is naturally regarded as a monometer, and many whole-verse exclams. form part of a responsive pattern. Sometimes also the colometry needs reconsideration, e.g. at *Alc.* 872–6/888–92 (n. 26 below). I did not assign a value to the verse ἐ ἐ (sic L) at *Hel.* 166a (above, pp. 77ff.); nor can I now. It could well be indeterminate ('ad lib'); but either αἰαἰ *bis* or ἐἐ *bis* would yield an appropriately metrical pair of αἰάγματα between the dactylic hexameters and the trochaic strophe.

²² As to the first ε, if ἐ ἐ can have the value – (Diggle, *CR* 32 (1982), 130, Garvie, *Choephoroi* p. 362), that implies the interpretation ἐ· ἐ· (sic). That may be theoretically possible (cf. single αἰ); but we should probably always write αἰαἰ for that value. If ἐ- exclamations could begin with a long, we should expect to find more attestations in dactylic and anapaestic contexts. In fact such attestations are few, except as obviously inferior variants (as at *Ph.* 1284), and generally rejected by edd. (as by Garvie himself at *Ch.* 1009, 1019). (ii) As to the last ε, the value ∪ (a fortiori ∪ ∪ ∪) is nowhere, I think, required by the metre, even in combinations like ἐ ἐ, ἰώ (which Eur. seems to have eschewed). In *S. El.* 827/40 the natural value of ἐ ἐ, αἰαἰ and ἐ ἐ, ἰώ is ∪ ∪ ∪; at *Tro.* 1026 Dawe gives ἐ ἐ, ἰώ (recc.) δαῖμον as a dochmius, but the truth could well be ἐ ἐ· / ἰώ ἰώ, δαῖμον. At *A. Ag.* 1114/25 divide ἐ ἐ· / παπαῖ παπαῖ... and ᾄ ᾄ· / ἰδοῦ ἰδοῦ...

²³ So, e.g., Broadhead at *A. Pers.* 977 (n. 19 above) and Dawe at *S. O.C.* 149.

²⁴ A value ∪ ∪ ∪ is plausible at the beginning of dochmiac sentences, like αἰαἰαἰαἰ (s.v.l.) at *Hipp.* 830, but nowhere necessary. Modifying what I wrote about *Hel.* 661, 662 in *CQ* 39 (1989), 62, I should now say that the choice there lies between ἐἐ· (∪ ∪) and ἐἐἐ· (∪ ∪ ∪), and similarly in *Tro.* 1216, which may be ἐἐἐ· φρενῶν | δ | 2δ. *Supp.* 1074 may, but need not, be ἐἐἐ· χχέτλια δὴ παθῶν ('dochmiac compound', *cr* δ or δ *cr*; *comm. Or.* p. 106), followed by 2δ.

This is nearly the same enoplian tricolon as *H.F.* 896–8/907–8 (*2ia* ∪ : *D* ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪).²⁵ Cf. also *Tro.* 1235–6 ἄρασσ' ἄρασσε κράτα, πιτύ-/λους διδοῦσα χειρός (surely *2ia* ~ *ith*, with overlap; note the metron ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ here also).²⁶

There are two textual problems in the first part of the antistrophe (79–82):

ἄπλητος ἄδε μ' ἐξάγει
χάρις γόων πολύπονος, ὡς
†ἐξ ἀλιβάτου πέτρας†
ὕγρὰ ρέουσα σταγῶν
ἄπαυστος αἰεὶ †γόνων†.

80

After *2ia* | *ia* | *ia* (which I lineate as dimeters, in line with the rest of the stanza) we are impossibly offered a telesilleian ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ (unwelcome in itself in this context) in responsion with the lekythion -χουσῑ προσ̄πολῶν̄ χερ̄εσ̄. But Wilamowitz's ἀλιβλήτου will not do, not only because ἀλιβάτου is protected by Hes. *Th.* 785–7 ὕδωρ / ψυχρόν, ὃ τ' ἐκ πέτρης καταλείβεται ἡλιβάτοιο / ὑψηλῆς. 'Sea-beaten rocks' have no place in this 'waterfall' topos, and the length of the anceps is not a matter of indifference.²⁷ Since there may be a fault in both stanzas (see below), we should probably leave the text obelized, with conjectures reported only in the apparatus. Given ἀλιβᾶτου, we may judge that the antique epithet is most likely to have been accommodated in the iambic pattern as a choriambic metron;²⁸ and that may suggest a transposition, e.g. ἀλιβάτου <τις> ἐκ πέτρας.²⁹ The stanza then begins with the same *2ia* / *2ia* / *ch ia* sequence as *Alc.* 86–8/98–100.

For γόνων in 82 U. Hübner proposes χοῶν ('pourings').³⁰ That, or rather χοᾶν, could be right: as Collard says, after Wecklein and others, the simile derives from *Il.* 16.3–4 δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων ὥς τε κρήνη μελάνυδρος, / ἥ τε κατ' αἰγίλιπος πέτρης δοφερόν χέει ὕδωρ;³¹ and if χοᾶν also suggests 'libations', that is not inappropriate

²⁵ 'Enoplian tricolon', as usual with short ancipitia; cf. *comm. Or.* p. 113. This one combines the dicola *2ia* ∪ : *D* (as Bacchyl. 19.1–2) and ∪ *D* ∪ : *ith* (as Archil. 168.1–2 West). Here I would mention also *H.F.* 1025–7, which I suspect should be restored as ἐέ· ἐέ· (ἐς L., ἐξ Kirchhoff) τίνα στεναγ-/μὸν ἦ γόον ἦ φθιμένων (L φθιτών) / ὠιδὰν ἦ τίν' "Αἶδα χορόν ἀχέας; (*2ia* / ∪ : *D* / 2δ). For confusion of φθιτών and φθιμένων, cf. *Alc.* 100.

²⁶ πιτύλους, cf. *Hipp.* 1464 (n. 10 above). The usual division after κράτα gives both an unwelcome catalectic period-end, with *brevis in longo*, in the middle of the short sentence and an ionic verse ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ alien to the iambo-dochmiac context. For the 'resolution before syncopation', cf. Diggle, *Studies*, 18–21. Finally in this connection I would mention *Alc.* 873–4 ~ 889–90, which I analyse as three verses: Αδ. αἰαί· Χο. πέπονθας ἄξι' αἰαγμάτων· (*2ia cr*) / Αδ. ἐέ· ἐέ· Χο. δι' ὀδύνας (*ia cr*) / ἔβας, κάφ' οἶδα· Αδ. φεύ· φεύ· (*2ia* ∪), and similarly in ant.; for the ἀντιλαβή, cf. *H.F.* 1051f., 1064ff. (*CQ* 1988, 95–6).

²⁷ It is surprising that Diggle accepts ἀλιβλήτου in the new Oxford Text: his discussion in *Studies*, 4, left it at best doubtfully deserving a place in the apparatus. As to the long anceps, not mentioned by Diggle, this should certainly not be introduced by conjecture in a context with otherwise only short ancipitia (cf. nn. 2 and 42, and p. 83 above).

²⁸ Choriambic feature in otherwise iambic contexts at 604/14, 619/27, 836(?), 1126/33, 1130/37 (cf. Collard, ii. 265). It is conceivable, but much less likely, that the epithet was accommodated by corruption (e.g. ἀλιβάτου ἐκ πέτρας as 2cr, or ἀ-/λιβάτου ὡς <τις> ἐκ πέτρας); corruption is very rare in iambs, but cf. *S. Tra.* 846–7 (twice, in the verse ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪).

²⁹ For τις in the simile, cf. *Hec.* 20 ὡς τις πτόρθος, *El.* 151 οἶα δέ τις κύκνος ἀχέτας, etc. The corruption began, perhaps, with omission of τις ἐκ; then the preposition was restored in the wrong place (cf. Diggle, *CQ* 33 (1983), 352f.). The preferred suggestions here and in 72 I owe in part to Dr Diggle.

³⁰ *Philologus* 124 (1980), 179ff. Acheron's χοαί are 'streams' associated with loud γόοι in *S. fr.* 523 Radt; and cf. *O.C.* 1598–9 ῥυτῶν ὑδάτων ... λουτρὰ καὶ χοάς.

³¹ Cf. also Garvie on *A. Ch.* 449 χέουσα πολύδακρυν γόον.

(cf. *Or.* 1239 *δακρύοις κατασπένδω* *ce*). But the sentence will then run more stylishly if we make a further easy correction: *ὑγρά<ν> ρέονσα σταγών / ἄπαιστος αἰεὶ χοᾶν*. The gen. *ὑγράν* ... *χοᾶν*, framing the phrase, is then dependent upon *σταγών* (see LSJ s.v.), and *χοᾶν* is not superfluously appended.³²

Reverting to the strophe, we may re-appraise the opening lines (now in dimeters):

ἀγών ὃδ' ἄλλος ἔρχεται
γόνων γόοις διάδοχος, †ἀ-
χοῦσι προσπόλων† χέρες·

71 γόνων *bis* L, corr. Valckenaer (γόοις γόνων Fritzsche) 72 ἀχοῦσιν προσπόλων Heath

Attention should now focus on the asyndeton at ἀχοῦσι, which seems surprising, though scarcely impossible, with the change of subject. Since ‘hands’ were mentioned in 51 (*καταδρύμματα χειρῶν*), one might have expected *διάδοχα δ' ἀχοῦσι* (*διάδοχα*, cf. *Andr.* 1200, *Tro.* 1307); adverbial n. pls. were vulnerable to corruption, and we may not need *διάδοχος* to govern γόοις (cf. *Hel.* 195, *Or.* 336, 817, etc.). But ... γόνων γόοις διάδοχος (balanced by ... *χάρις γόνων πολύπονος*) is commended by the similar *διάδοχος κακῶν κακοῖς* at *Hec.* 588. So perhaps we should consider writing ἀ-/χοῦσι <δὲ> *προσπόλων χέρες*, which also gives a choriamb for *ἀλιβάτου* to correspond with.³³

73–8
ἴτ' ὦ ξυνωιδοὶ κακοῖς
ἴτ' ὦ ξυναλγηδόνες
χορόν τὸν Ἄϊδας ἐβει·
διὰ παρῆιδος ὄνυχι λευ-
κὸν αἵματουτε χρῶτα φόν[ι]ον·
<ἔε· ἔε·> τὰ γὰρ φθιτῶν
τοῖς ὀρώσι κόσμος.

75

73 κακοῖς *apogr.* Par.: κακοί L 77 ἔ ἔ (sic) suppl. Wilamowitz

73–5. 73 and 74 are not simply a balanced pair of self-contained commands. The repeated ἴτ' ὦ is epanalepsis rather than anaphora;³⁴ and, as elements in a developing sentence, the adjectival *ξυνωιδοὶ κακοῖς* and the substantival *ξυναλγηδόνες* combine as a predicative phrase (nom., not voc.), in which we can take the dative as governed (*ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*) by both *ξυν-* words.³⁵

‘The *χορός* which Death ἐβει’ is a ritual funerary group-performance with music and movement (cf. *H.F.* 1027 Ἄϊδα χορόν; ἐβει ‘solemnly practises’, see Collard).

³² *ὑγρά<ν>* meets Dr Diggle’s objections to *χοῶν* (which he also pointed out should be *χοᾶν*). As he says, *ἄπαιστος* + gen. is not attested, and *ἄπαιστος* ... *χοᾶν* ‘is an odd adjunct for *σταγών*’. His own preference is (or was) for <λιβάς>, cf. *Andr.* 118, 533–6, *I.T.* 1106; and it is indeed possible that γόνων 82 came in from the line above (as the verses are set out in L). But see further in n. 34 below.

³³ See above with nn. 28–9.

³⁴ The three-verse pattern here is like *Hec.* 59–60 ἄγετ' ὦ παῖδες τὴν γραῦν πρὸ δόμων / ἄγετ' ὀρθοῦσαι τὴν ὁμόδουλον, / Τρωιάδες, ὑμῖν πρόσθε δ' ἄνακσαν (punctuation can often be lightened with advantage). Such epanalepsis (especially common in isometric units: comm. on *Or.* 142–3, etc.) is intermediate between anadiplosis and anaphora. We no more need completely symmetrical syntax here (*pace* Collard) than we do at *Or.* 142–3 ἀποπρὸ βᾶτ' ἐκεῖς | ἀποπρὸ μοι κοίτας; nor (see n. 32) do we need *ὑγρά* ... *σταγών* / *ἄπαιστος* ... <λιβάς> as correspondingly balanced phrases in 81–2.

³⁵ See also on pp. 77–6 above, with nn. 4–6. For ὦ with the imperative, add *Hel.* 1111 ἔλθ' ὦ ... *ξυνεργός* (clearly predicative nom., not voc.), *Alc.* 234, *Tro.* 335, ὦ ἴτε *Hec.* 1093, etc. (Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 22).

As governed by ἵτε, χορόν should certainly be understood here, not as an acc. of destination, but as following as though after χορεύετε.³⁶ 75 defines the performance, which is then further defined in the asyndetic continuation.

76–8. The cheek-scratching prescribed is at once a ritual due to the dead and a paradoxical ‘adornment for the living’; and the ‘blood’ in the ritual is at once red, contrasting with the white complexion of the mourners (a familiar topos), and hyperbolically ‘mortal bloodshed’ (φόνος), in accordance both with Ἰδακ 75 and with the quasi-suicidal, ‘death-wishing’ grief expressed in 85–6.³⁷

76–7. The framing words διὰ παρήιδος...φόνον in the first instance define the action ὄνυχι λευκὸν αἵματουτε χρώτα,³⁸ but with neat syntax they also balance and define the preceding ἵτ(ε)...χορόν τὸν Ἰδακ ἐβεί (both sentences ending with an action-defining expression).³⁹ For the use of φόνον thus (int. acc., ‘(effecting) mortal bloodshed’), cf. 1205 (cfάγια) τρώσῃ φόνον (similarly at verse-end, almost = φόνω), and S. *Aj.* 55 ἔκειρε...φόνον.

The proposed φόνον for φόνιον restores responsion with...πέφυκε πάθος; note that here, as there, the sentence ends with the keyword, a pyrrhic noun. The vigorous formulation is worthy of Euripides; at the same time it is easy enough to account for the banalizing corruption of φόνον to φόνιον. For the rest, I follow Wilamowitz, Zuntz, Collard and Diggle in supplying the same exclamation(s) as in the antistrophe; though here too, of course, my supplement has the value ∪-∪-. Note that there is no need now, if there ever was, for the conjecture λευκάς.⁴⁰ It is properly χρώτα (‘complexion’, embracing ‘skin’ and ‘colour’) that has the epithet ‘white’ here, not διὰ παρήιδος (‘cheekwise’);⁴¹ and the introduced long anceps is alien to a strict metrical pattern in which all the other ancipitia are short.⁴²

78. Collard rightly takes τὰ (γὰρ) φθιτῶν as the subject and τοῖς ὀρώσι κόσμος as the complement.⁴³ The former, naturally understood in this context as ‘the rituals

³⁶ Collard considers both interpretations, and cites *Od.* 18.194 εὐτ’ ἂν ἴη (sc. Κυθήρεια) Χαρίτων χορόν ἱμερόεντα in support of ‘to the dance’. But ‘to’ is less apposite here. Rather similar is *H.F.* 783ff. ἀναχορεύεσθε...βᾶτε κυναιοῖδοι...τὸν Ἡρακλέους καλλίνικον ἀγῶνα (the ἀγῶν there at once the ‘Labour’ and the choric victory-ritual celebrating it). For ἵτε equivalent to χορεύετε, cf. also *Tro.* 338 (where I should remove the comma between ἵτ’ and ὦ; cf. nn. 34–5)).

³⁷ For the topos and the colour-contrast, cf. comm. on *Or.* 961–2. For the φόνος as hyperbolically ‘mortal’, see above with n. 8. For the double point, cf. also *Or.* 992–4 (with comm.).

³⁸ Cf. the similarly hyperbolic and terminal phrase αἵματηρόν ἄταν in *Or.* 962 (see comm.); there, with διὰ παρήιδων, defining the action τιθεῖσα λευκὸν ὄνυχα.

³⁹ An int. acc. of the ‘integral’ rather than ‘non-integral’ (appositive) type; cf. the discussions by Barrett and Diggle cited on p. 82 above (n. 23).

⁴⁰ Correctly attributed to Blaydes in the new OCT; previously in *GRBS* art. cit. attributed to Page, and considered ‘attractive’ by Collard. Its sole virtue was to remove one of the epithets with χρώτα.

⁴¹ For the force of διὰ, see comm. on *Or.* 961–2. In all the relevant parallels the noun with διὰ is epithetless. Similar considerations, including metrical ones, exclude Hartung’s λευκῶν for λευκόν in *Or.* 961 (there with ὄνυχα). For λευκός with χρώς here, cf. λευκόχροα *Ph.* 322 (with κόμαν), χιονόχρως *Hel.* 215, κυανόχροα *ibid.* 1502, μέλαγχρωτες *Or.* 321, etc.

⁴² Cf. nn. 2 and 27 above. There are indeed remarkably few long ancipitia in the lyric iambs of this play. Caution is the more necessary in respect of long anceps followed by diaeresis.

⁴³ Not, as Diggle, ‘For that is the proper honour for the dead in the eyes of the living’ (*Studies*, 5–6). τοῖς ὀρώσι then has little if any point, as the adduced parallel τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων shows. He too cites *H.F.* 357–8, but without drawing the inference that...τοῖς ὀρώσι κόσμος ||| should be interpreted syntactically like...τοῖς θανούσιν ἀγαλμα |||. κόσμος is not, in fact, a natural word for the ‘honour’ done to the dead by ritual lamentation, except indirectly. Το κοσμεῖν a corpse (*Tro.* 1147) is to wash and dress it properly; to κοσμεῖν a tomb (*Or.* 611) is to ‘adorn’ it with the appropriate offerings. It is surely certain that the primary function of

belonging to, proper to the dead' (with particular reference to the ritual just described), is like *Hel.* 1421 τὰ τῶν θανόντων (there 'impiously' dismissed by Theoclymenus as wasted labour). For the latter, the conclusive parallel is surely *H.F.* 358 τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἄγαλμα (a similarly stanza-ending phrase). The predication 'adornment for the living' is here paradoxical, in that *unmutilated* cheeks are normally a κόσμος for women.⁴⁴

Who, now, are these πρόπολοι and what is the constitution of the chorus?

Taking the second question first, I need not rebut in detail the view of Boeckh, Hermann and others, which I agree with Collard (i.18) in rejecting: viz. that it comprises the Seven Mothers plus their attendants (somehow bringing the number up to the regular fifteen). Nor can we happily visualize a main chorus seven in number and a subsidiary chorus of attendants.

Collard applauds the 'natural solution to an unreal problem...propounded with typical bluntness by Wilamowitz', namely that the fifteen-strong chorus 'freely represents' the Seven Mothers throughout the play. But I cannot share his confidence that an Athenian audience would have 'readily accepted' that. Athenians could count, and the Comedians were quick to exploit potentially ludicrous features in tragedy. Opinions may differ as to 963ff. (ἐπτά μάτρες ἐπτά κού-/ρους ἐγεινάμεθ' κτλ.), as sung by fifteen χορευταί; but it really will not do to confront the seven sons of the famous Seven heroes, at the climax of the play, with fifteen persons purporting to be their seven grandmothers. The spectacle at 1122ff. absolutely requires a one-for-one correspondence of urn-bearing παῖδες and ματρές.

As we have seen, there are objections *prima facie* to interpreting the lamenting πρόπολοι in 72 as mere 'stage-extras', with 71–86 still sung by the same 'Chorus of Mothers'; and a quite different solution to the problem appears to have been overlooked.

The fifteen choristers, I suggest, are *all* πρόπολοι, and as such identical with the ἀμφίπολοι who, prompted by their Leader, give physical support to the Mothers at 1115ff.⁴⁵ The Mothers, by contrast, are an impressive group of seven κωφὰ πρόσωπα *throughout the play* – particularly impressive as such in the climactic scene with the seven παῖδες bearing seven urns, in the presence of Theseus, before the appearance of Athena 'ex machina'.⁴⁶ Such stagecraft is the more appropriate in this play, since, though elsewhere famous as individuals, the Seven Mothers are here conspicuously denied any individuality. They have no names, and their πάθη are undifferentiated. Though centrally important in the action, they need only to be *seen* as a group of seven γράες, appropriately dressed and in mostly static attitudes; they do not also have to *dance*.

As to their singing, the Chorus can do that for them.⁴⁷ In the first four stanzas (42–70) the Mothers and the Chorus form a prostrate group of twenty-two ἰκετιδές (not counting Adrastus and the παῖδες), still in the same positions as in the opening

κόσμος here is to make a *paradoxical* point about 'adornment' in a context of 'facial disfigurement'. Note too that the associated πόνος of 'weeping' (79ff.) is a χάρις for the living in more than one sense (cf. n. 11) though also no doubt (indirectly) a χάρις for the dead.

⁴⁴ For the cheeks as the prime seat of beauty, cf. J. H. Kells, *CQ* 16 (1966), 53.

⁴⁵ Note that there are thus two ἀμφίπολοι available to support each γράς. It may be suggested that the Chorus-Leader could still be one of the Mothers; but that works less well at 71ff., and (I think) elsewhere.

⁴⁶ For Eur.'s use of κωφὰ πρόσωπα in general, see D. P. Stanley-Porter, *BICS* 20 (1973), 68–93. Important persons appear thus in *Or.* (comm. p. xxxv).

⁴⁷ By the same token they can also sing for the 'chorus of παῖδες' at 1122ff., since there are two masked χορευταί adjacent to each γράς (n. 45 above).

tableau. At this stage the spectators cannot see that the Mothers themselves, nearest to Aethra, are not singing; the performers are all, of course, masked. Then at 71 the Chorus, leaving the Mothers still prostrate, proceed to 'dance' the 'further *ἄγών*' in their *persona* as *πρόσπολοι*.⁴⁸ The total effect of 1–86 is to identify them with the Mothers' cause in such a way that they are able thereafter to 'impersonate' them in song and dance without incongruity,⁴⁹ since at any time the group of seven plus fifteen can be re-formed for that purpose; or they can revert to their role of 'supporters', as at 1115ff.⁵⁰

Meanwhile their Leader can have the additional function of *speaking* on the Mothers' behalf. Most of the Chorus-leader's spoken utterances are pleas, hopes, etc. in quite general terms. The only real audacity is her reference to 'my *τύχαι*' at 194 (covered by the standard choric use of 'my' for 'our'). More significant is her reference to the Mothers as 'them' at 266 (*αὐτάς*), with Musgrave's generally accepted assignation.

Are we then to infer that the *πρόσπολοι* are fifteen *domestic servants* who have come from Argos with the Seven Mothers? Surely not, for the role of the Coryphaeus would then be anomalous. Moreover we have, I think, been told otherwise by Euripides himself: the *πρόσπολοι* are none other than the *Eleusinian* 'acolytes' whom Aethra goes out of her way to address in the second line of the play:

Δήμητερ ἐστιοῦχ' Ἐλευσίνος χθονὸς
τῇςδ', οἷ (leg. αἷ?) τε ναοὺς ἔχετε πρόσπολοι θεᾶς...⁵¹

Sympathetic temple-acolytes provide choruses of women in *I.T.* and *Ph.*; and an Athenian audience will have seen nothing odd in the readiness of Eleusinian women to undertake at 71ff. and elsewhere a vicarious function similar to that performed in real life by either voluntary or professional female mourners.

The *χάρις* of, and for, *πόνος* on behalf of others is a central theme of the play;⁵² and its closing words in 1232–3 can appropriately refer to the women of the *πόλις*, as well as the men, who have deserved honour by their efforts:

ἄξια δ' ἡμῖν
προμεμοχθήκασι ἐβέεσθαι.

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK

⁴⁸ Note that *ἔρχεται* 71 thus comes into its own as a verb of motion.

⁴⁹ At the same time the 'highlighting' of the artificial stagecraft (notably at 963ff.) is characteristic of Eur.; cf. above, p. 78 n. 11.

⁵⁰ There are also many places where the sentiments expressed by the Chorus are ambivalent as to *persona*, no doubt deliberately; but there is no room here for a detailed study of that.

⁵¹ Note that the temple-*πρόσπολοι* are feminine in A. *Eum.* 1024 (cited by Collard). Here, as there, they are servants of a *goddess*.

⁵² See especially 373–4, 1176–9 (and n. 11 above).