

THE PARODOS OF EURIPIDES' *HELEN* (164–90)¹

The friendly expatriate ladies of the chorus in *Helen* enter having heard loud lamentation issuing from the palace, while engaged, like the φίλα of the chorus in *Hippolytus* 125ff., in spreading laundered crimson textiles to dry in the sun. The central theme of 'hearing cries', with the verb ἔκλυον and nouns of utterance (185–6), is reminiscent also of *Medea* 131ff., where the opening words of the Parodos ἔκλυον φωνάν, ἔκλυον δὲ βοάν...allude to Medea's loud utterances ἔσωθεν in 96ff. (ιώ...) and 111ff. (αἰαί...): here, as there, the Parodos exploits the familiar motif of βοηδρομία.²

Less orthodox, and indeed unique in extant tragedy, is the treatment of the choral entry-song here as an antistrophe, metrically corresponding with monody sung by the prologist;³ a highly artificial and very probably novel procedure, with an element of 'surprise' and a pleasantly whimsical piquancy in keeping with the overall tone and character of the play.⁴

Unhappily our text is marred by grave faults of responsion and other anomalies. The familiar problems in the solo strophe (167–78) and choral antistrophe (179–90) still merit further discussion, despite the detailed treatment in R. Kannicht's indispensable edition and commentary;⁵ and there are several other points of interest, both there and in the brief προωιδός (164–6a) preceding the strophe:

ΕΛ. ὦ μεγάλων ἀχέων καταβαλλομένα μέγαν οἶκτον, 165
 ποῖον ἀμιλλαθῶ γόον, ἢ τίνα μούσαν ἐπέλθω;
 [δάκρυειν ἢ θρήνοις πένθεσιν] 166a
 ἔξ·
 περοφόροι νεάνιδες...

164 οἶκτον supra lin. γρ. Tr¹: οἶκον L 166 versum delendum censeo 167 strophae initium notavit Triclinius

The 'pro-ode' has a double function:

¹ This article owes something to correspondence, many years ago, with Sir Denys Page, and much more to helpful comments from Dr J. Diggle. I am grateful also for the constructive criticisms of the *CQ* reader, whom I am permitted to identify as Professor M. L. West. For the metrical terms and notation used, mostly as in West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), see my *Euripides: Orestes* (Oxford, 1986), pp. xx–xxi. References to the latter are given below in the form 'comm. Or. p. ...' or 'comm. on Or. ...'. Cf. also my article 'The Reunion Duo in Euripides' *Helen*' in *CQ* 39 (1989), 45–69. I need not repeat here the same list of editions consulted ('Duo' n. 2). Here too references to Wilamowitz are to his *Griechische Verskunst* (1921, repr. 1975); to Zuntz, to his *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (1965); to Dale, *LM*², to her *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (2nd edn, 1968).

² The most explicit choral βοηδρομία is *Hcl.* 73ff. (with 121 βοηδρομήσας); cf. O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 218–20, who shows that the 'shout' motivating an entry is often a lament. Note that here, unlike *Med.* 131 ἔκλυον...βοάν, the root βοα- appears only in the simile at the very end of the antistrophe (190 ἀναβοάει), if with Badham (and as argued below) we excise ἀνεβόασεν in 184. The dramatic technique is much more sophisticated.

³ Compare, e.g., *El.* and *Or.*, in both of which the Parodos has exchanges with a soloist (Electra) in its first pair of stanzas, but is initiated as usual by the chorus; *I.T.*, where Iphigeneia goes to fetch the chorus before taking the lead in strophic lamentation; and *Andr.* and *Ion*, where the monody preceding the Entry is in a different metre. *Hypsipyle* (later than *Hel.*) is the nearest parallel, if the chorus enters there in the middle of the first strophe (Bond, pp. 61ff.; Taplin, p. 64).

⁴ The probability of innovation is enhanced by metrical novelty (n. 22 below). 'Unexpected entry', cf. comm. on *Or.* 71–125, 380–4, and Taplin, pp. 11–12. In effect, this chorus of human φίλαι arrives just in time to provide the proper 'antiphonal' element in the dirge (cf. *I.T.* 179ff., etc.; comm. on *Or.* 960–1012) in place of the wished-for *otherworldly* chorus. For the timing and stagecraft of their entry, see further in nn. 7 and 11 below.

⁵ Heidelberg, 1969; text: i.139–41; commentary: ii.59–94.

(a) *Dramatic*. Helen's long-standing and recent griefs naturally prompt the question 'Oh, how can I do justice to the magnitude of my sorrows?' and a further cry or cries of woe, as a preface to 'If only my lament might have the assistance of the Sirens...!'; an exotic wish very possibly, though not necessarily, prompted by a visible representation of sirens on the Tomb of Proteus.⁶ The 'woe-cry' must be loudly articulated, like other utterances heard at a distance, since this is the βοή-'cue', preceding the strophe during which the Chorus enter, to which they will allude in 186 (αἰάγμασι στένουσα).⁷

(b) *Formal*. The whole of 164–79 is patterned threnody, beginning with a προοίμιον. μεγάλων ἀχέων...μέγαν οἶκτον announces the theme,⁸ and the big participle καταβαλλομένα adds a flavour of solemn 'song-inception' to the opening hexameter.⁹ Then comes a 'deliberation' of a standard inceptive type ('how, in what words, form etc., am I to do justice to my theme?').¹⁰ And even the 'Alas!' is formally inceptive as well as dramatic: cf. *Or.* 316f. αἰαῖ· |δρομάδες ὦ πτεροφόροι...(where, in the absence of a προωιδός, the exclamation is part of the strophe).

Euripides is playing a sophisticated game here with poetic conventions. Helen 'begins' and poses the question 'What kind of lament...?' in the solemn antique mode of dactylic hexameters. Her θρήνος will then proceed in a contrasting and unconventional mode: a new, late-Euripidean μούσα of partly syncopated iambotrochaic (more trochaic than iambic), to which the Chorus 'responsively' enters in a non-threnodic dance, with contrastingly 'bright' motifs (see below). The issue of 'threnodic form' thus highlighted at once draws attention to, and artificially justifies, the formal innovation.¹¹

ποιῶν...ἢ τίνα...; a favourite kind of question with alternatives making nearly equivalent or complementary points. This one has several points of contact with *Ph.* 1498ff. (text and metre uncertain) τίνα προσωιδὸν ἢ τίνα μουσopόλον στοναχὰν ἐπὶ δάκρυσι...ἀγκαλέσσωμαι; and *Hypsipyle* I.iv.5–9 (Bond, pp. 29, 76–8) τὰ δ' ἐμὰ πάθεα

⁶ Dale's plausible suggestion. Sirens, a fortiori Sirens with instruments, may have been a new theme in tragedy. For the new sepulchral motif of 'Grabsirenen', variously portraying these otherworldly creatures as musicians and/or mourners (foreshadowing Baroque putti and angels), see G. Weicker, *Der Seelenvogel in der alten Litteratur und Kunst* (Leipzig, 1902), pp. 171ff., and further below.

⁷ To avoid too long a hiatus before the Chorus start singing, they must at least come into view during the strophe (see further in n. 11 below). Helen, however, only becomes aware of their entry during the antistrophe (her attention having been focused on the Tomb of Proteus?); and they do not see *her* (they continue to speculate about what they have *heard*) until she addresses them at 191.

⁸ For the stylish paregmenon, see W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart, 1934; repr. 1967), pp. 221ff.; for the correction οἶκ(τ)ον, see Zuntz, p. 42, and further below.

⁹ Kannicht compares the epic and Pindaric (ἀνα)βάλλεσθαι, but see also LSJ s.v. καταβάλλω II.7 'lay down as a foundation'. The sense 'begin (a song)', perhaps neologistic here with κατα- in Callimachus fr. 392 Pf.), may owe something to analogy with κατάρχεσθαι (cf. comm. on *Or.* 960 κατάρχομαι στεναγμόν κτλ.).

¹⁰ Such interrogative hesitation is especially appropriate to formal threnody: cf. M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 161ff.

¹¹ On the 'new metre' see further below (with n. 22). For Eur.'s penchant for 'highlighting' artificialities (of various kinds), cf. comm. on *Or.* 1214–15, and R. P. Winnington-Ingram, 'Euripides: ποιητὴς σοφός', *Arethusa* 2 (1969), 132. The whimsically artificial effect here will have been the more pronounced if the Chorus begin to enter silently *quite early* during the strophe, fitting their processional steps to the rhythm of Helen's lament (as accompanied by the αὐλητής?), but not yet seeing the singer (n. 7 above). Cf. my discussion of the unusual 'hushed', 'tiptoeing' Parodos in *Or.* (comm. p. 104). On the instrumental accompaniment, an interesting issue in this context, see further in n. 44.

| τίς ἂν ἡ γόος ἡ μέλος ἡ κιθάρας | ἐπὶ δάκρυσι μούς' ἀνοδυρομένα | μετὰ Καλλιόπας
| ἐπὶ πόνους ἂν ἔλθοι; apart from the more diffuse style of monody in those passages. Here we have balanced phrases in a single verse which both expresses the immediate point ('What kind of lament...?') and also looks forward to the wishful appeal to otherworldly *μουσεῖα* (174).

ποῖον ἀμιλλαθῶ γόον : the *ἀγών*-metaphor (cf. *Supp.* 71 *ἀγών* ὅδ' ἄλλος... γόων) conveys an idea of physical exertion (cf. *Or.* 456 *δεῦρ' ἀμιλλᾶται ποδί*, etc.); and the verb is consistent also with ideas of 'concerted performance' and 'projection'.¹² Helen would welcome fellow-mourners (like those in *Supp.* and *I.T.*); and projection of some kind is necessary if human utterance is to be heard in Hades (*Or.* 1241, etc.).

τίνα μουσαν ἐπέλθω : a *μούσα* can be either a musical νόμος ('song-mode'), as in *I.T.* 181ff. *τὰν ἐν | θρήνοις μουσαν νέκυιν μέλεον | τὰν ἐν μολπαῖς Ἀῖδας ὕμνῃ | δίχα παϊάνων*, or a more personal source of poetic assistance (not necessarily 'Muse'; for semi-personified 'Music', cf. Bond on *Hyps.* loc. cit.). *ἐπελθεῖν* (lit. 'go to') can be used either of 'consulting' a person, as in *Supp.* 155 (*μάντεις*), or of 'appealing, having recourse to' a non-personal exemplar, as in *Or.* 495 *οὐδ' ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν κοινὸν Ἑλλήνων νόμον*. 'What music (Music)?' is the appropriately ambivalent interpretation here. Kannicht prints *Μούσαν* and argues for 'Muse'; but the chthonian musicians whom Helen proceeds to address are surely thought of as *μουσικώταται*, not as 'Muses' (notwithstanding *Alcm.* 30 Page, where the Muse is *ἡ λίγη Σηρήν*).

To this well-shaped sentence and couplet the words *δάκρυιν ἡ θρήνοις ἡ πένθεσιν* are a metrically and otherwise redundant appendage. The point 'for threnody appropriate to my great griefs' is already implicit; and, in effect, Helen is made to ask 'What sort of *lament* shall I indite with tears or *laments*?' She might properly have deliberated: '(With) what tears or (with what) laments...?' But the appended disjunction is inconsistent with the commitment to 'threnody' enunciated in 164–5. The further disjunction *ἡ πένθεσιν* is a further confusion of thought, since the plural of *πένθος* naturally includes 'tears' and 'lamentation'.

As to the metre, it is customary to treat *δάκρυιν...*; *ἔ ἔ* (or *αἰαῖ*) as a 5*da* verse.¹³ But the 5*da* length is surprising, following the two hexameters; and this is no place for a merely appended 'alas!'.¹⁴ A strong pause before *ἔ ἔ* (s.v.l.) is appropriate here both for reflection after the deliberative question and for the drawing of breath before a loud *αἰαγμα* (or *αἰάγματα*). And indeed we can infer with some confidence that the ancestral Alexandrian text had verse-end before the exclamation(s).¹⁵ If the preceding

¹² For *ἀμιλ*- in contexts of 'projection', cf. 1471–2 *ἑξαμιλληγάμενος ἱτροχῶι τέρμονι δίσκουφ*, and *Hyps.* fr. 764 *ἑξαμίλλησαι κόρας*; for the construction with acc., cf. also 546, 1386–7, *Andr.* 336–7, *Hec.* 271, *Or.* 38 (comm. p. 89).

¹³ *αἰαῖ* Hermann, Murray. Hermann's alternative *αἰαῖ αἰαῖ* is plausible as an interpretation of *ἔ ἔ* (cf. *Ph.* 1284) and as a pair of *αἰάγματα* (cf. 186), but unappealing as an expedient for padding out a third hexameter. Colometric 'transposition' of *ἔ ἔ* is wrongly ascribed by editors to Triclinius. It is clear from a photograph of L that Tr. was merely concerned to indicate (with the siglum *στ* [sic] and an enlarged initial letter) the beginning of the strophe at *περοφόροι*. He therefore erased what stood before *περ*- in the right-hand column and rewrote *ἔ ἔ*: (sic) after, but separated by a substantial space from, *πένθεσιν*: (sic) in the left-hand column. There is no reason to doubt that what Tr. erased before *περοφόροι* was *ἔ ἔ*: (sic). The size of the erasure is exactly the same as that occupied by *ἔ ἔ*: (sic) in L's presentation of *Hel.* 661 and 662 (in each case, as here, before a *π*; 'Duo' p. 62).

¹⁴ Not to be supported by *Supp.* 77/85, as I hope to show in a forthcoming article, to be published in the next issue of *CQ*, on a number of controversial issues in *Supp.* 71–86. There are several other points of contact, meriting cross-reference: see below, nn. 30, 48, 55, 57–8.

¹⁵ For the transmissional significance of L's colometric indications, either verse-end in the left- or right-hand column or the 'divider': (sic), or both, see Zuntz, p. 212, and further in n. 17 below.

words δάκρυιν...πένθεσιν featured in the lineator's text, they will have done so as a separate verse, anomalous whether taken as open-ended dactyls or as dochmius + *ia*.

With suspicion thus aroused, it is not difficult to conjecture that the verse in question derives from an explanatory scholion, offering alternative glosses ('*sc.* δάκρυι or θρήνοις or πένθεσι'). There is, indeed, no obvious call for such a scholion on 164–5; but we shall find in 169–72 a difficult text that could have anciently prompted just such a marginal annotation. Its coincidentally dactylic form will then have caused it to be appended to the nearby hexameters, where it appeared to make sense of a sort.

167–90. Both stanzas are controversial, and it is convenient to begin with a synoptic presentation of the paradosis, stripped of punctuation:¹⁶

(ΕΛ.)		ΧΟΡΟΣ
περοφόροι νεάνιδες	167 ~ 179	κυανοειδές ἀμφ' ὕδωρ
παρθένοι χθονός κόραι	168 ~ 180	ἐτυχον ἑλικά τ' ἀνά χλόαν
σειρήνες εἴθ' ἐμοῖς γόοις	169 ~ 181	φοίνικας ἀλίω(ι) πέπλους
μόλοιτ' ἔχουσαι λίβυν	170 ~ 182	χρυσέαισιν αὐγαῖς
λωτὸν ἢ κυρίγγας ἦ	171 ~ 183	θάλλους' ἀμφὶ δόνακος ἔρνεσιν
φόρμιγγας αἰλίνους κακοῖς	171a ~ 184	ἐνθεν οἰκτρὸν ἀνεβόασεν
τοῖς ἐμοῖσι κύνοχα δάκρυα	172 ~ 185	ῥμαδὸν ἔκλυον ἄλυρον ἔλεγον
πάθει πάθεα μέλεσι μέλεα	173 ~ 185a	ὁ τι ποτ' ἔλακεν
μουσεῖα θρηγήμασι ξυνωιδὰ	174 ~ 186	αἰάγμασι στένουσα
πέμψιε φερσέφασσα φόνια	175 ~ 187	νύμφη τις οἶα ναῖς
χάριτας ἦν' ἐπὶ δάκρυι παρ' ἐμέ	176 ~ 188	ῥρεσι φυγάδα γάμων ἰεῖσα
θ' ὑπὸ μέλαθρα νύχια παι-	177 ~ 189	γοερὸν ὑπὸ δὲ πέτρῃνα μύχαλα γύαλα
ἄνα νέκυιν ὀλομένους λάβη(ι)	178 ~ 190	κλαγγὰς πανὸς ἀναβοά(ι) γάμων

171a αἰλίνους κακοῖς in marg. γρ. L¹: αἶ ἀνους κακοῖς <L>P 185 ἔλεγον supra lin. γρ. Tr¹: θρήνον L 189 μύχαλα] μύαλα L^{ac}

The responsion obviously breaks down in 170 ~ 182, and is problematic thereafter almost to the end of the stanza. It is common ground that order cannot be restored unless we are prepared to make more than superficial alterations to the wording, and to revise the lineation accordingly. At the same time we must recognize that the lineation attested by L is likely, on both general and particular grounds, to reflect that of an Alexandrian ancestor.¹⁷ It can scarcely be fortuitous that L attests an

¹⁶ We can properly modify L in respect of the 'γρ' readings in 171a and 185 (see Zuntz, p. 43, and further below): αἶ ἀνους entered the text as a misreading of ΑΙΛΙΝΟΙΣ, and θρήνον as a gloss that extruded ἔλεγον. Other Tricliniana will be considered in due course. I adhere for convenience to the familiar Barnesian line-numeration, with the addition of '171a' and '185a' (Kannicht does not explain why he prefers to call 184 '183a', 185 '184' and ὁ τι ποτ' ἔλακεν '185'). Earlier printed editions from Portus onwards had thirteen-line stanzas numbered 166–78 and 179–91, following the sub-Triclinian lineation of P and the Aldine.

¹⁷ 'The division of cola in lyric passages is as much a part of the tradition as its wording, and although these divisions – being due to the Alexandrian editor and not to the poet – are not binding on the modern critic, they are always deserving of attention and may occasionally assume crucial importance' (Zuntz, p. 212). That needs some qualification as to 'the Alexandrian editor': Zuntz's study of *Hel.* 625–97 in the light of P. Oxy. 2336 established that the amount of colometric agreement virtually guarantees that Π and L have a common ancestor, presumably the Alexandrian text as lineated by Aristophanes of Byzantium c. 200 B.C.; but he should have focused more attention on the visible colometric divergences in 634–5 and 650–1 ('Duo' pp. 51, 59). These, and other features in L's text of 625–97 ('Duo' n. 56), suggest that we must visualize a 'sub-Aristophanic' ancestor of L with a fair number of deviant, yet still rational, verse-divisions. Caution is the more necessary in a text convicted of corruption. My 'ancestral lineator' is not necessarily Aristophanes in respect of every single verse-division; but in principle the erroneous iambic interpretation of our passage probably does go back to 200 B.C. (at least).

inheritance of thirteen, for the most part rational, verses in each stanza; and the word-split at *παι-λάνα* in 177-8 is unlikely to have been invented by a mediaeval scribe. It is probable, therefore, that our text reflects a makeshift colometric interpretation of a paradosis already seriously corrupt in antiquity. That there is deeply rooted and compound corruption, at least partly ancient, is confirmed by consideration of the sense and further consideration of the metre, beginning with the strophe.

167–78. Kannicht's text (with a reduced apparatus) is as follows:

πτεροφόροι νεάνιδες,
 παρθένοι Χθονὸς κόραι,
 Σειρήνες, εἴθ' ἐμοῖς γόοις
 μολοῖτ' ἔχουσαι Λίβυν
 λωτὸν ἢ κύριγγας ἢ φόρ-
 μιγγας, αἰλίνους [κακοῖς τοῖς] ἐμοῖσι
 κύνοχα δάκρυα, πάθει πάθεα,
 μέλεσι μέλεα· μουσεῖα
 θρηνήμασι ξυνωιδὰ
 πέμψειε Φερεέφασσα
 φόνια, χάριτας ἴν' ἐπὶ δάκρυσι
 παρ' ἐμέθ' (εν) ὑπὸ μέλαθρα νύχια
 παιᾶνα νέκυσις ὀλομένους λάβηι.

171-2 κακοῖς del. Hartung; αἰλίνοις τ' ἐμοῖσι Wilamowitz 177 ἐμέθεν Seidler

Seidler's $\rho\alpha\rho' \epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta(\epsilon\nu)$ in 177 is rightly accepted by all editors.¹⁸ Right also, at least in principle, is the colometric reinterpretation which recognizes the syncopated trochaic value of the rhythm $--\cup$ in the words *μουσειά, θρηνημα(σι), πέμψειε* and *παιάνα*, in line with similar rhythms in the second pair of stanzas.¹⁹ We can provisionally account for the erroneous ancient verse-division at *παι-|ἀνα*: the lineator mistook *πεμψείε φερσεφάνα...παι-|* as an iambic sequence (presumably *δια*),²⁰ beginning with $\bar{x}-\cup-$, in line with the verses *σειρηνῆς εἶθ' ἔμοις γόοις* and *μοῦσεϊά θρη-|νημάσι ξυνωιδά* (the latter probably misinterpreted thus as *ia + ith*, a form of catalectic trimeter common in lyric iambic contexts). This left $-\alpha\bar{\nu}\acute{\alpha}...λα\beta\eta\iota$ as an anomalous residue ($-\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup-$); but $\bar{x}-\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup-$ would have been no better.²¹ The lineator's failure to recognize $--\cup$... as trochaic is understandable, since these are the first lyrics in the play, and even Aristophanes of Byzantium may have been relatively unfamiliar with this syncopated trochaic genre.²²

¹⁸ But L's reading is often misreported as the *vox nihili* $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\theta'$, without mention of the verse-division. $\pi\alpha\rho' \epsilon\mu\epsilon' \theta'$ is a possible phrase in itself (it evidently satisfied Triclinius), and could be a quite ancient error; for the normality of elided $\tau\epsilon$ at the beginning of a verse, cf. Zuntz, p. 232. But the chances are that the lineator correctly read $\epsilon\mu\epsilon-|\theta\epsilon\nu$, overlapping thus in accordance with a misinterpretation which treated $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\nu\pi\omicron$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha'-\theta\rho\alpha$ $\nu\chi\iota\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\iota-$ as a symmetrical iambic dimeter ($\cup; \cup \cup \cup - \cup; \cup \cup \cup -$); cf. n. 20 below.

¹⁹ e.g. 194 ναύτας Ἀχαιῶν τις ~ 213 αἰὼν δυαίῳν τις, cf. 193 ~ 213, 200 ~ 219, 242, 352, 355. The notation 'pa' is convenient, though - \wedge - \sim is really only a syncopated form of *tr*; cf. West, p. 103, Dale, *LM*², p. 93.

²⁰ As suggested below, the lineator's text of 175–7 may have run *πεμψει φερσεφασσα φονι(α)|χαριτ(α) ιν επι δακρυσι παρ εμε-θεν κτλ.* (n. 18 above). That is consistent with the present hypothesis, while accounting for *χαριτας* and the hypermetric verse *π- Φ- φονια*.

²¹ It is unlikely that he edited *παῖδαν* (anticipating Triclinius), with *-ανας* in response to *...κλαγγα(ι)ς* or *-γαιιν*; the sing. *παῖδαν* is so obviously superior (*pace* Dale). Other anomalies suggest that he interpreted the *parados* separately for each stanza, despairing of proper response. For the compound problem at *...μύχαλα γύαλα|κλαγγάς...*, see n. 73 and pp. 95ff.

²² West (*GM 102*) rightly draws attention to the novelty of the genre here: 'But in *Helen* we suddenly get this' (followed by citation of 167–78). Apart from its special prominence in *Hel.*,

So far so good; but many disturbing features remain.

(a) The phrase αἰλίνους...μέλεα has no intelligible construction. The three items δάκρυα...πάθηα...μέλεα cannot be added to the alternative musical instruments as further objects of ἔχουσαι ('A or B or C plus D E F'); nor can the 'tears' etc. be an appositive accusative of the kind that defines the operation of the verb.²³

(b) There is still no adequate parallel for αἰλίνους (now as a noun); see further below.

(c) The asyndeton between the two optative clauses following εἴθε is unendurably harsh. Wilamowitz had at least introduced a τε after αἰλίνους.²⁴

(d) Helen is apparently wishing that Persephone might send the Sirens to her, bringing with them 'tears, pains (πάθηα) and tunes' congruent with Helen's, in order that she (Persephone) may receive a 'paean' in the Other World. That can hardly be right: the 'tears' etc. are going in the wrong direction; and, if the 'paean' is to be heard in Hades, a more sensible wish would have the underworld μουσεῖα performing it *in situ*. Odder still, as argued further below, is μουσεῖα as the object of 'send'.

(e) φόνια is an oddly appended epithet describing the μουσεῖα ξυνωιδά, the more so with the syntactical break after it falling in the middle of a metron.

(f) The distant apposition χάριτας...παιάνα is more awkward than in the parallel cited (A. Ch. 320–2 χάριτες δ' ὁμοίως | κέκληνται γόος εὐκλεῆς | †προσθοδόμοις† Ἀτρεΐδαις). The point is also obscure: if we lean on that parallel, we must take it that the 'paean' is 'gratifications due to the dead', and indeed Kannicht appears to take νέκυειν ὀλομένοις 190 as dependent on χάριτας; but he also approves Heath's interpretation 'ut vicissim pro mercede...accipiat', the χάριτες thus being a 'quid pro quo' payment to Persephone.

(g) As to the stanza as a whole in relation to the antistrophe, Kannicht has in one respect made matters worse. By transposing and emending so as to make 170–2 μόλοιτ'...έμοίσι correspond with θάλλουσα χρυσεῖαις ἐν αὐ-|γαῖιν ἀμφὶ δόνακος ἔρνε'. | ἐνθεν οἰκτρὸν ἀνεβόαεν in 182–4, he commits himself to a period of at least twenty-one metra, and settles for an amorphous 'πνίγος' of twenty-three metra (as indented).²⁵ A πνίγος can indeed extend the normal maximum of a lyric period; but it ought in compensation to have a clear, regular structure of some kind.²⁶ This is the more to be expected at the beginning of an antiphonal sequence whose second stanza-pair will exhibit notably taut and accurately responsive metrical patterns.

In sum, if this is the best that can be done with the stanza, we must obelize the greater part of it.²⁷ Elmsley's φόνι' ἀχάριτά θ' merits further consideration in 175–6, but (at best) leaves other problems unresolved.

the examples cited (cf. also Wilamowitz, pp. 269ff., and Dale, *LM*², pp. 92–3) are in Euripidean plays later both chronologically and alphabetically.

²³ For the 'non-integral' (appositive) use of the internal accusative, cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 752–7, Diggle in *Dionysiaca...studies...presented to Sir Denys Page...* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 171–2. 'Congruent tears' cannot define the action μόλοιτε.

²⁴ Wilamowitz appears to have begun a new clause at αἰλίνους τ', with only a comma after μέλεα. But he did not elucidate that, so as to explain why Helen should wish Persephone to send 'congruent δάκρυα...μέλεα', or how μουσεῖα...could be added to that object-phrase.

²⁵ Wilamowitz had treated παρθένου...Λίβυν || λωτόν...λάβημι as two periods of six and nineteen metra (the latter already overweight), with an unnatural period-end in mid phrase.

²⁶ West defines πνίγος as 'a very long period in uniform rhythm'. The longest πνίγη occur in comedy, e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 266–79 (Dale, *LM*², p. 198), which runs to thirty-three iambic metra (following a three-dimeter period with catalexis). Note that it not only has the proper rhythmical uniformity – it also falls into sections, demarcated by syntax-breaks at verse-end, of only ten, fourteen and nine metra.

²⁷ Dale desperately (one supposes) offered the plea that 'this is an operatic aria whose words

There is, however, a further metrical anomaly in the text which has attracted surprisingly little comment. We have only to notice it to find ourselves impelled along a new and more promising path.

As we have seen, the *paradosis* has an incorrect, though not irrational, colometry which features several iambic metra of the form $\bar{x}-\cup-$, beginning with long anceps; and we have seen how most of these disappear when the sequence $--\cup$ is re-interpreted as trochaic (palimbacchiac).

All modern editors have accepted the long ancipitia in 169 ($\Sigma\epsilon\iota-$), 171 ($c\acute{\upsilon}-$) and 181 ($\phi\omicron\iota-$),²⁸ whatever steps they have taken, usually involving further long ancipitia, to make 182ff. correspond with 170ff. They have evidently taken the view, like Triclinius before them, that the length of anceps syllables is (by definition) a matter of indifference; and so it is in many metrical contexts. They have, however, overlooked the complete absence of long ancipitia from 167–8 ~ 179–80, 191–251 and 330–74;²⁹ and now also from 172–8 ~ 184–90, given the re-interpretation as syncopated trochaic.

The only remaining long ancipitia in these extended lyric passages are in 169–71a and 181 (not in 182–3 as transmitted), just where the responsion begins to break down. Everywhere else, the metron-forms employed, allowing plenty of variety, are: $\cup\cup\cup$ (*cr*) and $--$ (*sp*), $\cup\cup\cup\cup$ (*tr*) and $--\cup$ (*pa*), and less frequently, subject to iambo-trochaic continuity, $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ (*ia*) and $\cup--$ (*ba*). Everywhere else, adjacent long syllables within the verse are to be read as true longa, with syncopation. One is surely entitled to expect the whole of the opening sentences of the first stanza-pair, not merely their first two dimeters, to obey the rules rigorously observed thereafter; the more so, if the poet was creating in this play a new kind of iambo-trochaic metre (cf. n. 22). In this distinctive metrical genre long ancipitia are as out of place as they would be in Catullus 4 (*Phaselus ille...*).³⁰

The way forward lies along a path signposted by Triclinius' much-impugned excision of ἡ φόρμιγγας in 171. The case for rejecting 'or lyres' will be argued further below. For the moment I am concerned only to demonstrate the *metrical* virtue of this excision (which, so far as the metre is concerned, could equally well be of the isometric

must not be expected to bear too close a scrutiny of their meaning'. Formally, this is the opening of the *Parodos*; and in any case Eur. was not Timotheos. I hope to show that every single word pulls its weight.

²⁸ It is immaterial whether the long ancipitia feature in an iambic metron ($\bar{x}-\cup-$) or a trochaic ($-\cup-\bar{x}$). I might have added 171a ($\phi\omicron\rho-$); but West contrives to scan $c\acute{\upsilon}ρ\iota\gamma\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ ἡ $\phi\omicron\rho\mu\iota\gamma\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ as *ia pa*, removing any vestige of isometric balance in the isometric phrases (cf. n. 32 below).

²⁹ There is uncertainty at 191 ~ 210, but we do not have to follow Triclinius and Murray in writing $\alpha\iota\alpha\iota$ $\langle\alpha\iota\alpha\iota:\dot{\omega}\rangle$ $\delta\alpha\dot{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$ to correspond with $\dot{\iota}\omega$ $\dot{\iota}\omega$ $\dot{\iota}\omega$ $|\theta\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha\mu\alpha$ $\beta\alpha\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\nu$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\varsigma$. Kannicht accepts Wilamowitz's reduction of $\dot{\iota}\omega$ $\dot{\iota}\omega$ to $\acute{\omega}$ in 191, giving a syncopated trimeter (*sp lk*). $\dot{\iota}\omega$ [$\dot{\iota}\acute{\omega}$] $\theta\acute{\eta}-$ ~ $\alpha\iota\alpha\iota:$ $\langle\acute{\omega}\rangle$ is a possibly better alternative (*ba lk*, cf. *Or.* 965/76 with $\dot{\iota}\omega$ $\acute{\omega}$); $\dot{\iota}\omega$ is appropriate to this address (cf. n. 7 above). There are some long ancipitia in the conjectures considered by Kannicht at 358–9 $\tau\acute{\omega}\iota$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\dagger\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\rho\alpha\gamma\gamma'$ $\acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}$ $\Pi\rho\iota\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\iota$ $\pi\omicron\tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\iota$ $\beta\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma$; but that is enough to condemn them. Accepting $c\acute{\upsilon}ρ\iota\gamma\gamma-$ (Musgrave) and Hermann's $\epsilon\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\langle\tau\iota\rangle$ ($\tau\iota$ omitted before π), I see nothing wrong with $\tau\acute{\omega}\iota$ $\tau\epsilon$ $c\acute{\upsilon}ρ\iota\gamma\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ (pl., see n. 44 below) $\dagger\iota\delta\alpha\iota$ (local dat.) $\epsilon\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ $\Pi\rho\iota\alpha-\mu\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\tau\lambda$. (much the same overlapping cretic pattern as *Tro.* 1091f./1110f.); for Paris' devotion to 'piping' on Ida, cf. *I.A.* 573–8; for the ironical use of $\epsilon\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\nu$, cf. *Med.* 155 (= *colere*, not *venerari*, cf. Fraenkel on *A. Ag.* 1612).

³⁰ *Supp.* 71–86 (n. 14 above) and *A. Pers.* 115–25 are earlier exx. of *ia-tr* with only short ancipitia; *Or.* 960–81 is another such stanza-pair. Bacchyl. 19 (Wilamowitz, 393) shows a similar principle operating in a distinctive enoplian genre with almost all the link-ancipitia short. There is further work to be done on theoretically anceps positions which are consistently treated as short, whether in particular places in the verse (esp. before diaeresis) or more extensively (esp. in conjunction with resolution and/or syncopation); cf. *comm. Or.* pp. 113, 288.

phrase ἡ κύριγγας) – a virtue understood neither by Triclinius himself (see below), nor by any subsequent metrical analyst.³¹ This single step, a stylistic improvement *prima facie*,³² directly makes possible a more convincing colometric interpretation of the entire stanza, which in turn points to a better understanding of its syntactical structure and meaning:

	πτεροφόροι νεάνιδες	1.	υ υ υ υ υ υ
	παρθένοι Χθονὸς κόραι	2.	υ υ υ υ υ υ
	Σειρήνες, εἴθ' ἐμοῖς	3.	υ υ υ υ υ υ
170	† γόοις μόλοιτ' ἔχουσαι·	4.	υ υ (υ) υ υ υ
	Λίβυν λωτὸν ἡ κύ-	5.	υ υ υ υ υ υ
	ριγγας [ἡ φόρμιγγας] αἰλίνους κακοῖς†·	6.	υ υ υ υ υ υ
	τοῖς <δ'> ἐμοῖσι κύνοχα δάκρυα,	7.	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ
	πάθεσι πάθεα, μέλεσι μέλεα,	8.	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ
	μουσεῖα θρηνήμα-	9.	υ υ υ υ υ υ
	σι ξυνωιδὰ †πέμψειε	10.	υ υ υ υ υ υ
175	Φερσέφασσα φόνια χάριτας†	11.	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ
	ἴν' ἐπὶ δάκρυσι παρ' ἐμέθ<εν> ὑπὸ	12.	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ
	μέλαθρα Νύχια παιᾶνα	13.	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ
	νέκυιν ὀλομένοις λάβηι.	14.	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ

171–1a ἡ φόρμιγγας del. Tr² 172 δ' addidi

A crisp pattern of fourteen dimeters emerges, like but even stricter than the pattern of the second stanza-pair (191–209 ~ 210–28).³³ All the metra are of the forms described above, with no long ancipitia.

The stanza begins with two lekythia, firmly establishing the dominant and recurrently cadential rhythm.³⁴ The rest falls into three patterned quatrains (3–6, 7–10, 11–14). 3–6 and 11–14 end blunt (with a *lk*), whereas 7–10 ends pendent; the overall pattern is thus six dimeters (1 + 1 + 4), then eight (4 + 4).³⁵ Note that 3–6 and 7–10 both have enjambment bonding their third and fourth verses; and there is internal resposion between 7–8 and 11–12.

3 is the same verse (– ^ υ υ υ υ, a once-syncopated lekythion)³⁶ as 192 Ἑλλανίδες κόραι ~ 211 μοῖρας τε κάς, γύναι, 199 Λήδα δ' ἐν ἀγχόναϊς ~ 218 μάτηρ μὲν οἷχεται,

³¹ Dale nodded uncharacteristically when she wrote: 'No one could think λωτὸν ἡ κύριγγας αἰλίνους in resposion to θάλλουσ' ἀμφὶ δόνακος ἔρνεσιν very satisfactory'. Somehow losing sight of κακοῖς, she failed to see that ἡ κύ- [ἡ φόρ-]...κακοῖς corresponds perfectly with θάλλουσ'...ἔρνεσιν.

³² We should be happy to be spared the repetition ἡ -ιγγας ἡ -ιγγας. Isometric jingles are, indeed, a familiar feature of E.'s lyric style; but υ υ υ υ is not a metrical unit. Contrast the properly balanced units in 348 σὲ γὰρ ἐκάλεσα, | σὲ δὲ κατόμοσα, Or. 170 οὐκ ἀφ' ἡμῶν | οὐκ ἀπ' οἴκων, Hec. 1099 ποῖ τράπωμαι; | ποῖ πορευθῶ; and many similar examples cited by Diggle on *Phaethon* 99.

³³ Trimeters and/or monometers first appear in 191/210 (n. 29 above) and 195/214 (υ υ υ υ υ υ | *lk*). Further variations appear in 229ff. and 330ff. Cf. the looser texture of the second stanza-pair in Or. 140–207 (comm. pp. 106, 112).

³⁴ cf. A. Pers. 115f./120f., Ag. 974f./988f. For the cadential (catalectic) effect of the lekythion in trochaic contexts, cf. L. P. E. Parker, 'Catalexis', *CQ* 26 (1976), 21ff.

³⁵ 7–14 is a single period, all the verses ending with υ υ except for the final *lk*. It does not follow that we need to indent the whole of 8–14. Indentation is best used only when the colon (or dicolon etc.) is not coterminous with the verse; a practice which, applied to this patterned sequence of eight dimeters, shows better the symmetrical treatment of verse- and colon-end in str. and ant. 'Cola' are by definition delimited by word-end (comm. Or. p. xx). The word-end can be after a prepositive or before a postpositive ('weak diaeresis'); but elision counts as word-overlap, as at 181 θάλλου-|ς' ἀμφί.

³⁶ Dale (*LM*², p. 93) called it 'a sort of inverted ithyphallic'. It is more to the point to think of the ithyphallic in connection with the unusual verse υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ (tr pa) in 10 and 13, which at once hints at and cheats expectation of a clausula ('not yet').

243 Ἥρα τὸν ὠκύπουν, 355 λαიმορρύτου φαγάς, *Ph.* 677 Ἰοῦς ποτ' ἔκγονον, etc.; and the first syncope in the ode now falls on the first syllable of Σειρήνες, which thus comes into its own as a palimbaccheus paving the way for μουεῖα, πέμψειε (s.v.l.), παιάνα etc. The corresponding verse at 181 is φῶνικᾶς ἀλιῶι (see below).

There are problems to be discussed below in the wording of 4–6. 2ia | 2ba | ... is provisionally acceptable;³⁷ but the antistrophe has πέπλους χρυσέαις... at this point, and a run of four bacchei would not be unwelcome.³⁸

5–6 ends with ... ἡ τῷ-|ριγγᾶς αἰλινῶς κακοῖς (s.v.l.), which is elsewhere a clausular sequence: 200–1 αἰσχῷ-|ναῖ ἑμαῖ ὑπ' ἀλγέων ~ 219–20 οὐκ εὔ-|δαῖμόνῃ τέκεα φίλά, 208–9 Εὐρω-|τα, νῆανῖαν πόνον ~ 227–8 καὶ τᾶν | Χαλκιοῖκόν ὀλβίεις. Since the antistrophe has a transmitted period-end following virtually the same sequence, and corresponding with a syntactical break, at ... θαλποῦς ἄμφι δὸνᾶκος ἐρνέειν || ἐνθὲν οἰκτρόν..., this intermediate pause, so far from meriting elimination (as, with transpositions, by Murray, Dale, Kannicht and others), should be regarded as a cornerstone of the structure.³⁹

What now of the syntactical structure?

(a) As pointed out above, the asyndeton of the two optative clauses introduced by εἴθε is not to be endured. The right place for an intermediate clause-end, followed by a fresh clause with a connective particle, is now revealed by the metrical pattern; and it is easy to add one in 172. δ' could easily have dropped out here in an unpunctuated tradition – perhaps very anciently – partly because the omission left αἰλινῶς κακοῖς τοῖς ἑμοῖσι as an apparently coherent phrase, and partly because the first of the three nouns with which τοῖς ἑμοῖσι agrees is understood: 'δάκρυα congruent with my (δάκρυα), πάθεα with (my) πάθεα, μέλεα with (my) μέλεα' – a crisply economical triple paregmenon, neatly filling two dimeters.⁴⁰ For the idiomatic anticipatory ellipse of δάκρυσι with τοῖς ἑμοῖσι, cf. Kühner–Gerth i.597 Anm. 8. [The interpolated verse δάκρυσι ἢ θρήνοισι ἢ πένθεσιν at 166 (see above) could well have originated here as an explanation of τοῖς ἑμοῖσι κύνοχα; but, as we shall see, this is not the only place that could have prompted the gloss.]

(b) We can at once reappraise the general sense of 172–8:

*'and (I wish) that (as) μουεῖα in concert with my lamentation
(you) might emit/transmit δάκρυα πάθεα μέλεα congruent with mine,
so that (also where) Persephone ... may tearfully receive from me
a paean to the dead in the halls of Night.'*

That seems promising (note that the syntactical break before Φερσέφας again falls at the end of a quatrain). It is also radically different from any previous interpretation, in that no one seems hitherto to have taken μουεῖα as nominative.⁴¹ But I pursue the detail of 172ff. no further for the moment. The time has come to make a fresh attack on the stanza from the beginning.

³⁷ For ...--|υ--... within a period in late Eur., cf. comm. on *Or.* 985–7 and 1377–9. But cf. also *Or.* 167/188 (comm. p. 112), where I prefer an emendation that gives 2ba rather than 2ia.

³⁸ For 4ba runs, cf. comm. on *Or.* 1294–5. This one could, of course, be analysed as palimbacchiac with word-overlaps; but Eur. often has iambic cola in the middle of mainly trochaic sequences and vice versa, and there is no good reason for not lineating them as such; cf. comm. on *Or.* 982–4, 1369–74, etc.

³⁹ Kannicht's ... ἐρνε' | ἐνθεν... is otherwise unacceptable: there is no other elision of this type (–υ(–)) at verse-end in 167–251 or 330–74, and the elision is particularly unwelcome where a pause is appropriate. For vindication of the transmitted ἐρνέειν, see further below.

⁴⁰ Paregmenon, cf. n. 9 above; for the favourite δακρυ- δακρυ-, cf. 195, 365, *Or.* 335, 1308, *Tr.* 605; Breitenbach, pp. 222–4.

⁴¹ Those who have given πέμψειε a subject other than Φερσέφας have also emended

167–9. πτεροφόροι νεάνιδες | παρθένοι Χθονὸς κόραι | Σειρήνες... for the run of attributes preceding the name, cf. *Or.* 317ff. *δρομάδες ὦ πτεροφόροι | ποτνιαδες θεαί... Εὐμενίδες.*⁴² ‘Winged’ here comes first, as appropriate at once to chthonian *δαίμονες* (as in *Or.* 317) and to ‘bird-like’ singers of threnody; *νεάνιδες* ‘youthfully feminine’ suits the imagined role of the Sirens as a chorus sympathetic to Helen (for choral *νεάνιδες*, cf. *Ph.* 302, *Or.* 375, *I.A.* 1467); ‘virgin’ (cf. *Ph.* 48, of the Sphinx) and ‘daughters of Earth’ are more august attributes. The address as a whole is honorific, while describing the Sirens as they might be portrayed on a tomb.⁴³

169–71a. I suggest:

Σειρήνες, εἴθ' ἐμοῖς [γόοις]	--- --
ὀμιλοῖτ' ἔχουσαι	- - - - -
Λίβυν λωτὸν ἢ κύ-	- - - - -
ριγγας †αἰλίνους† κακοῖς.	- - ∞ - - - -

169 γόοις om. ed. Aldina, alii 170 ὀμιλοῖτ' scripsi: μόλοιτ' L 171 ἢ κύριγγας Tr²: ἢ κύριγγας ἢ φόρμιγγας L

‘Oh that, with African *aulos* or cane-pipes, you might participate with (me in) my piteous woes!’ The chthonian musicians are appealed to for a purpose to be explained in 172–8: they are to perform in the Underworld, where Persephone may receive it ‘in the halls of Night’, a dirge corresponding point by point (as to *δάκρυα*, *πάθεα* and *μέλεα*) with Helen’s. Since they are otherworldly, they can simultaneously be thought of as directly ‘singing with’ Helen, *ξυνωιδοί* like a supporting chorus; and the concerted dirge is to have the appropriate threnodic accompaniment of a *wind* instrument (or instruments).⁴⁴

As to the emendations accepted or proposed:

(i) Excision of γόοις leaves ἐμοῖς...κακοῖς as agreeing words framing the first ‘wish’-clause; a type of wide separation with several parallels in late-Euripidean lyric.⁴⁵ It is easy to see why γόοις was added: sooner or later the intrusion of ἢ φόρμιγγας (see below) increased the distance between ἐμοῖς and κακοῖς; and in texts

μουσεῖα, e.g. Hermann, who accepted Fix’s *μοῦς*’ *ἰεῖα* and wrote *Φερσεφάτται* (cf. n. 59 below); other proposals only merit oblivion. The collocation of acc. and nom. n. pls. may be unusual, but so too is the new metrical genre with its need for short pendent syllables. See further below, where *μουσεῖα* (nom.) is more fully interpreted, in conjunction with the proposal *ἐμψαίτε*.

⁴² The metrical pattern might seem to favour two self-contained phrases; but I slightly prefer Wilamowitz’s punctuation (no commas before the one after *Σειρήνες*), which more poetically treats *νεάνιδες* as adjectival.

⁴³ For Dale’s suggestion, cf. n. 6. As in *Or.* 317ff. there is *ad hoc* ‘myth-determination’ in the attributes. Homer’s Sirens had been feminine and two in number (*Od.* 12.39, 52, etc.), and in Alc. 30 Page the Muse is *ἡ λίγη Σηρήν*; but for male Sirens, cf. Weicker, figs. 19 (Orpheus-like) and 72, also Simonides 607 Page. In art sirens occur often in pairs or groups of three (Weicker, 162). The number here is naturally indefinite: cf. *Or.* 317ff., where the Eumenides are similarly indefinite in number as a ‘*thiasos*’, though in *Or.* 408 and 1650 they are a triad (see comm.). Sirens are properly ‘chthonian’, but they were not canonically ‘daughters of Earth’ (‘honorific’: cf. *Διὸς* in *Hipp.* 534, *Or.* 5); in S. fr. 861 Radt they are *Φόρκου κόραι*. For ‘avian’ threnody, cf. 1107ff., *El.* 151ff., *Tro.* 146ff., *Ph.* 1515ff., etc.

⁴⁴ Plural ‘pipes’ can, of course, be played by a single instrumentalist (cf. *Ion* 498), whether as ‘twin pipes’ or ‘Pan-pipes’. I assume, but cannot prove, that Helen’s *ἄλυρος ἔλεγχος* was accompanied in performance by the *αὐλητής* (the instrumental accompaniment perhaps beginning at 167; cf. n. 11, also comm. on *Or.* 145–6). If that is right, it may well be deliberate that the phrasing here is consistent *both* with a wish for an appropriate instrumental accompaniment to Helen’s lament (highlighting the artificiality?) *and* with a wish for ‘congruent’ wind-accompaniment for the dirge as performed by the Sirens in the other world.

⁴⁵ cf. *Ph.* 190–2, 808–10, 1579–80, *Ba.* 421, *I.A.* 1036–9; Breitenbach, p. 246. The ‘framing’ effect here is like *Ba.* 526–7 *ἴθι, Διθύραμβ', ἐμὲν ἄρσενα τάνδε βᾶθι νηδύν* and 547–8 *τὸν ἐμὸν δ' ἐντὸς ἔχει δώματος ἥδη θιασώταν*.

reading ... *κακοῖς* | *τοῖς ἐμοῖσι* ... there will have been nothing for *ἐμοῖς* 169 to agree with.⁴⁶

(ii) *ὀμιλοῖτ'* then gives us at once the baccheus that we probably need (see above, and further on 179–83 below) and a clearer construction for the dative plural phrase.⁴⁷ Moreover the sense 'participate, consort with' suits the present interpretation better than 'come', if the Sirens are to make their music in the Underworld.⁴⁸ *ὀμιλεῖν* can govern either a personal or a non-personal dative (*Held.* 872, etc.; *Andr.* 792. *Or.* 354); and for the idiom with *ἐμοῖς κακοῖς*, equivalent to *ἐμοὶ ἐν κακοῖς οὔσῃ*, cf. *Or.* 419 *καίτ' οὐκ ἀμύνει Λοξίας τοῖς σοῖς κακοῖς*; and *ibid.* 683 *καὶ ξυμπονῆσαι σοῖς κακοῖσι βούλομαι*. The similar-looking *μολοῖτ* for *ομιλοῖτ* was a very natural error for anyone who mistook Helen's purpose as an ordinary 'invocation'; it will also have seemed metrically satisfactory for an iambic verse, with or without *γόοις* (either *γδοῖς μολοῖτ' ἔχουσαι* as *2ia* _Λ or *μολοῖτ' ἔχουσαι Λιβν* as *ia cr*).

(iii) *ἡ κύριγγας* [*ἡ φόρμιγγας*]: the strophe has an excess of syllables hereabouts; and interpolation of a variant is an obvious possibility, *prima facie*, in the case of an isometric and otherwise similar word, the more so in combination with 'or'. Consideration of the sense shows that *φόρμιγγας* is the intruder here: Helen's lament is explicitly an *ἄλυρος ἔλεγος* (185), in line with the standard association of wind-music with threnody, and conversely of lyre-music with joyful song;⁴⁹ and the same should apply to the Sirens' accompanying and 'congruent' music (*κύνοχα... μέλεα*). Without *ἡ φόρμιγγας*, the point of the instrumental specification is precisely to exclude the instrument normally used to accompany paeans and sometimes played by sirens. The 'blasphemous paradox' in the use of the word *παιᾶνα* at 178 (see below) really requires the 'lyreless' point here, not only in the antistrophe, as part of the oxymoron. [For metrical and stylistic arguments against *λωτὸν ἡ κύριγγας ἡ φόρμιγγας*, see above with n. 32. There is also a further argument, less cogent in itself. Given the three instruments, the third should be *φόρμιγγα*, not *φόρμιγγας*; cf. the combination of *λωτός, κύριγγες* (n. 44) and *κιθάρα*, envisaged for the music of the Muses, in *I.A.* 1036ff. Lyre-players did not play in consort with other lyre-players in fifth-century music, and 'lyre'-words occur elsewhere in Euripides only in the singular.]

Missing the point, Dale defended *φόρμιγγας* as 'the normal instrument of the Sirens' (on vases). It is true that lyre-playing sirens occur quite often on vases;

⁴⁶ Others may have supplied *δάκρυσι* or *θρήνοισι* or *πένθεσι* here, see above. The omission of *γόοις* in the Aldine, and thereafter in all the earlier printed editions, is interesting, but presumably accidental.

⁴⁷ Kannicht gives alternative explanations of the dat. with *μολοῖτ'*: 'entweder (1) das Ziel (vgl. Cho. 935, Ant. 233–4, Io 846) oder (2) den Beweggrund (vgl. Phoen. 1043) des *μολεῖν*'. (1) leans on false parallels (personal datives with *μολεῖν* virtually 'come to pass'); (2) confuses the invocation to the Sirens with the threnody to be sung by the Sirens with Helen.

⁴⁸ *μολοῖτε* is in line, *prima facie*, with 1111f. *ἔλθ' <ὦ>... θρήνων ἐμοὶ ξυνεργός, Supp.* 73–4 *ἴτ' ὦ...* (n. 58 below), *Hyps.* I.iv.9 *ἔλθοι* (above); also *H.F.* 787f. *βάτε... συναοῖδοι νύμφαι*. But a conventional deity-invocation with 'come' is less appropriate here, since (a) the Sirens are to sing 'in the halls of Night'; (b) they can be benign creatures in that *milieu*, but one does not wish for close contact with them in this world. For a possibly analogous ancient corruption, cf. the responson-flaw at *ἡλυθε* in *Or.* 813.

⁴⁹ Passages illustrating that 'if you wish to play a mournful tune, you use the flute and not the lyre' are collected by Diggle in *PCPhS* 20 (1974), 11–12; cf. also J. A. Haldane, *JHS* 85 (1965), 40–1. A lyre could be used for a lament, as by Orpheus in *Hyps.* I.iii.9 and by Apollo in *H.F.* 348; but in both passages there is oxymoron in the atypical use of the instrument. In *Hyps.* I.iv.5ff. 'sweet-toned lyre-lament' is by implication inappropriate to express the singer's grief.

moreover from about the date of our play they became an enduring commonplace in funerary sculpture. But there were other 'instrument-playing' and 'plangent' types.⁵⁰ In earlier art, sirens had always been portrayed as human-headed birds, usually (and most traditionally) as *δοιδοί* relying only on their voice.⁵¹ The addition of an instrument (rather awkwardly, if charmingly, played with avian feet) was a quite ancient development, as a natural way of expressing the idea of 'enchanted music' in pictorial art; but the optional instrument could be a pipe – usually twin pipes, as played by a single siren on a red-figure lekythos in Athens by the Pan-painter (c. 450 B.C.).⁵² Dale's argument merely serves to illuminate the interpolator's motive, already favouring the substitution or addition of 'or lyres' in the fourth-third centuries.

(iv) †*αἰλίνους*† *κακοῖς*. Something like 'doleful woes' is the sense required, giving a phrase like *ἀθλίων κακῶν Tro.* 489, *κακοῖς ... χρητλίοις Andr.* 31, etc.; and *αἰλίνους κακοῖς* in that sense may well have been the accepted reading in later antiquity, in line with the adjectival use attested in a Roman epitaph (*βρέφος αἰλινον*, *IG* 14.1502 = *GV* 473 Peek). But that use, presumably leaning on the false analogy of other *-ινος* adjectives, is certainly a secondary, and probably only a late, development from the proper use of *αἰλινον*, often doubled, as an indeclinable exclamatory expression of grief.⁵³

Kannicht, after Hartung and Wilamowitz, excises *κακοῖς* (also *τοῖς*) in order to make *αἰλίνους* a noun. But *κακοῖς* is blameless in itself (as argued above, and cf. *Supp.* 73, cited below); and *αἰλίνους* remains suspect. Inflexion of *αἰλινον* is not securely attested before Call. *Ap.* 20 and Ps.-Mosch. 3.1.1–2, both with *αἰλίνα* apparently equivalent, in a sophisticated way, to the traditional doubled *αἰλινον*. That development scarcely authenticates a fully substantival dative plural in fifth-century tragic lyric. Note also that the words excised by Kannicht are metrically integral to the text as lineated in iambic diameters (presumably by the Alexandrian editor, see above).

Alt accepts Nauck's *αἰλινον*, but this late position in the sentence is no place for a parenthetic exclamation, especially for an exclamation that normally begins an utterance.

It is a striking coincidence that the very same problematic word *αἰλίνους* recurs, apparently as an adjective, at 1163–4 *ἐπὶ δὲ πάθεα πάθεσι φέρεις* | †*ἀθλίοις κυμφοραῖς αἰλίνους*†. Nauck's *ἐλεινοῖς* is approved there by Kannicht; and it must be worth considering a similar correction here. *ἐλεινοῖς* will not be *contra metrum* if we can justify the scansion *ἐλεῖν-οῖς κακ-οῖς* (in responsion, be it noted, with *δὸν-ακ-οῖς ἐρ-νέ-σ-ων*). The postulated *ἐλεῖνός* is not *ἐλεεινός* with a shortened third syllable, but rather a tetrasyllabic articulation of Attic *ἐλεῖνός*, by analogy with uncontracted words like *ὀστέινος*, *πτελείνιος*, and with such admissible diaereses as *Ἀτρείδας*, *Ἀργεῖος*, etc.⁵⁴

172–5. *δάκρυα* and *πάθεα* are the non-musical but potentially rhythmical components of the dirge (both Helen's, and correspondingly the Sirens'). *πάθος* often

⁵⁰ cf. n. 6 and n. 55 below. Pairs of sirens with pipe(s) and lyre (Weicker, 172) symbolize complementary musical genres (cf. *Alc.* 446–7). Weicker's earliest sepulchral example (Berlin no. 755) dates from the late fifth century.

⁵¹ Weicker, figs. 13, 83ff., etc.

⁵² Beazley, *ARV*² 557, 120, illustrated in his *Der Pan-Maler* (Berlin, 1931), pl. 6. Weicker illustrates a single piping siren of the later, less avian type in fig. 89.

⁵³ See Kannicht; but he surprisingly omits *AP* 6.348.1–2 *αἰλινον ὠκυμόρωι με λεχωίδι τοῦτο γεγράφθαι* | *τῆς Διοδώρειου γράμμα λέγει σοφίης*, which may suggest how the adjectival use was developed. It is still possible there to take the initial *αἰλινον* as conventionally exclamatory, but the phrasing *αἰλινον ... τοῦτο ... γράμμα* is at least on the way to meaning, or being understood as, 'this doleful inscription'.

⁵⁴ cf. Kühner–Blass i.251. The non-Attic *-εῖνός* is associable with the non-Attic neuter *ἐλεος* (ibid. ii.296). Since *ἐλεος* is masc. in Attic, the form *ἐλεῖνός* is not necessarily a contraction of

nearly = *πένθος*, and the plural here naturally alludes to such customary painful manifestations of grief as tearing the hair, beating the breast and scratching the cheeks.⁵⁵ *μέλεα* adds the 'music' in the appropriate mode and rhythm (keening may well be inarticulate). *κύνοχα*: both 'congruent with' and 'rhythmically accompanying', describing the object of the verb as in *Ba.* 160ff. *λωτὸς ὅταν ...παίγματα βρέμῃ κύνοχα|φοιτᾶν εἰς ὄρος*.

μουσεῖα ...πέμψειε (s.v.1.): unlike the preceding 'tears, pains and tunes', *μουσεῖα* are not things that can be 'sent' (*pace* Kannicht). 'Halls of song' may denote persons, by a standard kind of metonymy; but they can only function *in situ*.⁵⁶ That *μουσεῖα* is here nominative and 'active', as provisionally interpreted above, is further suggested by *θρηνήμασι ξυνωιδά* ('singing with'): cf. *Supp.* 73–4 (cited below), *Ph.* 1518 (*ὄρνις*) *ἐμοῖς ἄχεσι συνωιδός*, *Or.* 132f. *τοῖς ἐμοῖς θρηνήμασι φίλαι ξυνωιδοί*.

πέμπειν is the *mot juste* for the wished-for action of the Sirens, with the double sense 'emit' and 'transmit'; also as a standard verb of choral performance (cf. *πέμπειν χορούς*).⁵⁷ But the sentence would run much better if we wrote *πέμψαιτε* for *πέμψειε*. Both the optatives following *εἴθε* are then 2nd pers. plural, and we are spared the awkwardness of *πέμψειε* adjacent to *Φερσεφάσσα* with *Φ*- not the subject of *π*-. Moreover there is no need then to understand *ὑμέτερα* with *μουσεῖα* ('and may your halls of song transmit tears etc.'): rather, we have *μουσεῖα θρηνήμασι ξυνωιδά* in predicative apposition to the subject 'you', with poetic syntax similar to *Supp.* 73–5 *ἵτ' ὦ ξυνωιδοὶ κακοῖς|ἵτ' ὦ ξυναλγηδόνες|χορὸν τὸν "Αἰδας céβει*.⁵⁸

If that is right, we may judge that the erroneous *πεμψειε* for *πεμψαιτε*, with *πεμψειε* and *φερσεφάσσα* in the same verse, is a central feature of the ancient confusion of the passage, fundamentally affecting its sense.

175–8. *Φερσεφάσσα ...ἵνα ...λάβῃ*: 'Persephone' is (clearly, now) the subject only of the *ἵνα*-clause.⁵⁹ Rightly so, since her sole function is to *receive* the 'paeon'. For *ἐλε-εc-νός*; and, even if it is so in origin, it does not follow that it was so regarded by Eur. (especially in a metrically innovative context). One would, of course, welcome a parallel; but *ἐλεινός* occurs elsewhere in Attic poetry only at *Hel.* 992 *ἐλεινὸς ἦν ἂν μάλλον ἦν δραστήριος*, ?1164 (conj. Nauck), *S. Tra.* 528, *O.T.* 672, *Phil.* 870 (*-ῶς*) and 1130.

⁵⁵ *πάθεα* in 684 ('Duo' p. 67) is the appropriately chosen word for Leda's 'suicidal grief'. For *σπαραγμός*, cf. 374, 1089, *Hec.* 653–6, *Or.* 961–2 (with comm.); Collard on *Supp.* 48–51a, Denniston on *El.* 146–9, and further in my forthcoming article on *Supp.* 71–86 (n. 14 above). The 'blood'-motif, for the moment implicit, becomes explicit in 175 below. For the 'rhythm' of tears and *σπαραγμός*, cf. *Hipp.* 1464 *δακρύων πίτυλος* (comm. *Or.* p. 360) and *Tro.* 1235–6 *ἄραccε κράτα, πιτύλους διδοῦσα χειρός*. *κομμός* is more obviously rhythmical. For 'Klagende Grabsirenen' thus (variously) engaged, see Weicker, 173ff.; many analogous mourners can be seen on the monuments in Westminster Abbey.

⁵⁶ *Α μουσεῖον* is properly a place sacred to the Muses and/or devoted to musical performance (cf. *ᾠδεῖον*). For the plural, cf. 1107–8 where the nightingale is exquisitely 'sitting within perched halls of song (*μουσεῖα καὶ θάκουc ἐνίζουσιν*) beneath leafy coverts', and *Ar. Ran.* 93 *χελιδόνων μ*-, parodying the Euripidean *κιccός...ἀηδόνων μουσεῖον* (fr. 88; *ἀηδ*- Meineke, *χελιδ*- codd.), in a reference to twittering poets. For the 'personifying' use of the place-word Kannicht rightly compares *εὐνατήριον* (*Or.* 590, *Antiope* 48.101 Kambitsis) and *βουλευτήρια* (*Andr.* 446, *A. S.c.T.* 575), but fails to show that such metonymy can be used when the persons concerned are on the move. 'Monasteries' can denote monks, but not itinerant monks. The *μουσεῖον* of the Sirens is located in Hades (cf. *Pl. Crat.* 403d); and they cannot be referred to in the same breath as 'halls of song' and as 'sent' from Hades to Helen.

⁵⁷ cf. *A. Ag.* 283 etc. (of the fire-beacon), and comm. on *Or.* 617. For the 'choric' point, cf. *Supp.* 73–5 (next n.).

⁵⁸ 'Go (i.e. dance) as fellow-mourners the dance which ...' (to be discussed further, see n. 14). The similar predicative phrase *ξυνωιδοὶ κακοῖς...ξυναλγηδόνες* is metonymic there also (abstract 'grievings' for personal 'mourners').

⁵⁹ So Hermann and others (n. 41 above). But to write *Φερσεφάσσα* introduces an unacceptable long anceps at either *πεμ*- or *-σαι*.

the shift from optative to subjunctive, cf. *Or.* 982ff. *μόλοιμι...ἵνα...ἀναβοάσω*.⁶⁰ Here, as there, *ἵνα* probably has some local force: Helen wishes the dirge to be sung where Persephone may hear it.

παιᾶνα: cf. Bond on *H.F.* 348, Fraenkel on *A. Ag.* 645, Garvie on *Ch.* 151. The normal lyre-accompanied paean, most typically in honour of Apollo, was a joyful song. The 'blasphemous paradox' (Bond) of using *παιάν* in reference to a dirge is quite frequent in tragedy, but it was still a paradox of the kind that Euripides habitually developed with a 'negating' adjective, as in *Alc.* 424 *παιᾶνα τῶι κάτωθεν ἄσπονδον θεῶι* (*ἄσπονδον* ¹Σ⁹, Diggle; *ἄσπόνδωι* codd.); a favourite kind of oxymoron.⁶¹ For Euripidean threnodists, 'Death music' is properly unmelodious and joyless, as in *I.T.* 145ff. (*τὰς οὐκ εὐμούσου μολπὰς κτλ.*) and 181ff. (*μέλεον, δίχα παιάνων*); and it is surely that kind of 'paean', involving 'blood' and 'tears', that Helen wishes Persephone to receive in this context. Paradoxically (in Eur.) the *χάρις* due to, or pleasing to, *νέρτεροι θεοί* is *ἄχαρις*.

†**ΦΟΝΙΑ ΧΑΡΙΤΑΣ**†: Elmsley's *φόνι' ἀχάριτά θ'* is technically plausible (**ΦΟΝΙ(A)|(A)ΧΑΡΙΤΑΘ**: note that the elision accounts for the lineator's apparently hypermetric verse *πεμψιε φερσεφασσα φονια*); and 'bloody' and 'without *χάρις*' link well, up to a point, with the adjacent *ἐπὶ δάκρυσι*. But construed (as they now must be) within the *ἵνα*-clause, *φόνια* and *ἀχάριτα* are grammatical only if understood as adverbs. That is possible in theory, but very awkward after so many neuter plural nouns and adjectives; and, though one can receive music 'joylessly' and 'tearfully', one can scarcely do so 'bloodily'.

It is even harder to believe that Euripides wrote *φόνι' ἀχάριτά θ'* (or, a fortiori, *φόνια χάριτας*), when both style and sense call for **ΦΟΝΙΟΝ ἈΧΑΡΙΝ** as an asyndetic pair of tribrach adjectives agreeing with *παιᾶνα*.⁶² For *φόνιον* thus describing lamentation associated with bloodshed, cf. *El.* 752 *φ- οἰμωγὴν κλύω*; for *ἄχαριν* applied to 'music', cf. *Cyc.* 489 *ᾄ- κέλαδον μουσιζόμενος. ἐπὶ δάκρυσι* (cf. *Ph.* 1500, *Hyps.* I.iv.7) then adds a third element to the oxymoron, completing a chiasmic balance between the three 'joy-negating' elements in the *ἵνα*-clause and the three features of the 'paean' as Helen wishes it to be transmitted, i.e. *δάκρυα, πάθεα* ('bloody', cf. n. 56) and *μέλεα*.

The first, very ancient, error will have been substitution of *φονια αχαριτα* (*sic*) for *φονιον αχαριν*, associating the adjectives, seemingly placed in the main clause, with the preceding neuter plural nouns rather than the distant *παιᾶνα*.⁶³ *αχαριτα ἵνα*, written *scriptio plena*, will have invited a suprascribed *θ* (whether for *αχαριθ* or *αχαριτα θ*);⁶⁴ and it was then but a short step (as Elmsley saw) from *ΧΑΡΙΤΑΘ* to *χαριτας*.

ὑπὸ μέλαθρα Νύχια: 'Night' is commonly personified in funereal contexts,⁶⁵ and 'halls of Night' is the appropriate translation here.

⁶⁰ Surprisingly, no one seems to have proposed here the easy, but probably wrong, alteration of *λάβη(ι)* to *λάβοι*.

⁶¹ *H.F.* 1061, 1133 (*CQ* 38 [1988], 90–2), *Or.* 319, 621, etc.; Breitenbach, pp. 236–8.

⁶² cf. *φόνια μυσαρά El.* 1178, *ἄνομος ἄχαρις Andr.* 491, *ἄπολις ἄφιλος I.T.* 220, etc. For the advanced (so emphatic) position in the clause, before *ἵνα* and widely separated from the noun, cf. *Or.* 162ff. *ἀπό-|φονον* *ὅτ' ἐπὶ τρίποδι Θέμιδος ἄρ' ἐδίκασε | φόνον*.

⁶³ The separation here by eleven words is near the upper limit (cf. n. 45). For the corruption by false assimilation, cf. *Alc.* 424 (corr. Diggle).

⁶⁴ Note that, if the lineator read *πεμψιε φερσεφασσα φονια(a) | αχαριτ(a) ἵνα ἐπὶ δακρυσι παρ εμε | θεν...*, his verses in 175–7 were rational iambic dimeters (n. 20), but not if he read *αχαριτα θ ἵνα* with the same division after *εμε*.

⁶⁵ cf. comm. on *Or.* 174–8 and 1225–6 (*δῶμα Νυκτός*).

νέκυειν ὀλομένους: as Kannicht argues, the pleonasm is supported by *Alc.* 995, *Ph.* 1295, and *Od.* 11.491 *νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοιισιν*; but the dative no longer depends on *χάριτας*. For the construction with *παιάνα*, cf. *Alc.* 424 (where the dative governed by *ἀντηχῆσατε* is not *τῶι κάτωθεν θεῶι*, but rather an understood *ἐμοί*), *I.T.* 183 *μοῦσαν νέκυειν μέλεον*,⁶⁶ *ibid.* 387 *θέοισιν ἐστιάματα*, *Hec.* 529 *χοὰς θανόντι πατρί*, *Pl. Rep.* 607a *ὑμνοὺς θεοῖς καὶ ἐγκώμια τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς* (comm. on *Or.* 1187; Kühner–Gerth i.428). The force of the dative is ‘for (offered to)’ rather than ‘addressed to’, and is nearly equivalent here to the genitive in *A. Ch.* 151 (*τοῦ θαγόντος*).⁶⁷

179–90. There are several more problems in the antistrophe; but the metrical view taken of the strophe (see the analysis above) opens some new doors.

179–83. Much less alteration is now required than is usually seen in editions;

ΧΟΡΟΣ κυανοειδὲς ἄμφ' ὕδωρ
ἔτυχον ἑλικά τ' ἀνά χλόαν
φοίνικας ἀλίωι
πέπλους χρυσέαισιν
<τ' ἐν> αὐγαῖς(ι) θάλλου-
ς' ἄμφι δόνακος ἔρνεσιν

180

181 ἀλίου Tr², edd. 182 τ' ἐν hic supplevi [de Triclinio vide infra, pp. 98f.]

Explaining their unexpected entry, the Chorus begin by describing the ‘waterside’ activity they have come from.⁶⁸ The emphasis on colours (‘cyan-blue’, ‘green’, ‘crimson’, ‘gold’), in conjunction with the antithesis of ‘night’ (177) and ‘sun’ (181), gives a sharp contrast with the funereal tones of the strophe.⁶⁹ The vegetation described is at first simply ‘fresh, luxuriant greenery’,⁷⁰ with no suggestion of exotic plants (such as ‘lotus’, ‘papyrus’ and ‘palm-trees’). The only plant mentioned is one familiar in Greece.

ἄμφι δόνακος ἔρνεσιν: whereas the laundress in *Hipp.* 125ff. had spread her *πορφύρεα φάρεα* ‘on a warm sunny rock’, here the crimson *πέπλοι* were being warmed in the sun ‘on standing reeds’. The correct interpretation ‘on’ (cf. *Ph.* 1516 *ἄμφι κλάδοις ἐζομένα*, *H.F.* 108 *ἄμφι βάκτροις ἔρεισμα θέμενος*) surely requires the dative here, *pace* Kannicht, after the different force of *ἄμφι*+acc. in 179. The sequence *ἄμφι*+acc...*ἄμφι*+dat. (with different force) in the same sentence has a precedent in *H.F.* 1036–8 *ἐρείσμαθ' Ἡράκλειον ἄμ-|φι δέμας τάδε, λαῖνοις|ἀντημμένα κίοςιν ἄμφ' οἴκων* (*L. ἄμφι κίοςιν*).⁷¹ *δόναξ* is elsewhere especially an attribute of the

⁶⁶ Diggle rightly rejects Markland’s metrically questionable *νέκυσι μελομένην*; the sense ‘unhappy music for the dead’ is unexceptionable there. Neither is there any need here for *παιάνα νέκυσι μελόμενον*, after Lobeck (*παιάνας ν- μελομένους*) and others.

⁶⁷ I take the gen. there to be objective (‘paean honouring the dead Agamemnon’). For a somewhat similar equivalence of gen. and dat., cf. comm. on *Or.* 123.

⁶⁸ *ἔτυχον*, cf. *Or.* 1426 (like *ἐτύχχανον Or.* 866, *Ba.* 215). *ἄμφι* ‘near, by’, as in 359, *I.T.* 6, *Or.* 1310, etc. As in *Hipp.* 125ff. the *ὕδωρ* is presumably fresh water, though the epithet gives it a marine colour (cf. 1502, *I.T.* 7). We have been told in the Prologue both that the palace of Proetus is near the Nile (1–3), and that it is on the island of Pharos (5, del. Dinkelstad). We are not expected to refer to a map.

⁶⁹ A characteristic ‘chiaroscuro’, cf. comm. on *Or.* 821–2. Note also the more ‘tripping’ rhythm, with three resolutions in the second verse.

⁷⁰ *ἀνά*, cf. comm. on *Or.* 329–31 (‘environmental’). *ἑλιξ*, usually substantival, is applied in poetry to ‘curly’ *κόμαι*, tender and/or luxuriant in growth, of various kinds. The treatment of *ἑλιξ* in LSJ needs revision. The rendering ‘on the tangled grass’ (followed by Dale) is plainly wrong here; and *ἑλικά* does not = *βούιν* in *Ba.* 1170 (see Dodds). *ἑλιξ* (A) and *ἑλιξ* (B) are scarcely distinct words. For the variously adjectival and substantival use, cf. Eng. ‘spiral’.

⁷¹ Discussed in *CQ* 38 (1988), 94f., where I missed the *ἔρεισμα* point (‘supported on’) in

Eurotas (208, 349, *I.T.* 399, *I.A.* 179). It may well be relevant that it occurs often also, like *λωτός*, in contexts concerned with wind instruments (*Or.* 145–6, etc.); cf. on *ὄμαδον* in 184–5 below.

ἄλίωι... χρυσαίαιν <τ' ἐν> **αὐγαῖς**: a hendiadys patterned like *Ph.* 305 *χρόνωι... μυρίαίς τ' ἐν ἀμέραις*.⁷² The phrasing poeticizes what would be prosaic if baldly expressed as *ἐν ἡλίωι* ('in warm sunshine'; LSJ *ἥλιος* I 4). In poetry the sun's *αὐγαί* are commonly both 'bright radiance' and 'eye(s)' (cf. comm. on *Or.* 821–2 *μελάνδετον... ξίφος ἐς αὐγὰς ἀελίοιο δείξαι*). All editors hitherto have accepted, with little or no discussion, the Triclinian reading *άλίου* (for which see below). L's *ἄλίω(ι)* could, of course, be a careless slip; but they have not justified with a parallel the sandwiching of the genitive between an agreeing adjective and noun (*φοίνικας... πέπλους*) on which it does not depend.

We can now see that the primary error in this sentence was simply erroneous colometry, mistaking *φοῖνικᾶς ἀλίωι πέπλους* as an ordinary iambic dimeter (see above). The continuation (to... *ἐρνέειν* ||) will then very naturally have been interpreted as *--- αὐγαῖς (ith) | θαλπῶν* *---* *(sp lk)*, or perhaps *--- αὐγαῖς | θαλ- | πῶν* *---* *(ia cr | 2ia)*.⁷³ In either case we can imagine *χρυσαίαιν* and *χρυσαίς* (τ') ἐν as metrically equivalent variants (possibly with *άλίου* as an associated variant in 181).

184–7. As in the strophe, the rest falls, with the syntax, into two quatrains:

ἐνθεν οἰκτρὸν ὄμαδον ἔκλυον,
ἄλυρον ἔλεγον, ὅ τι ποτ' ἔλακεν
<---> αἰάγμα-
ci στένουσα νύμφα τις,
οἶα Ναιΐς...

185

184 *οἰκτρὸν* Badham: *οἰκτρὸν ἀνεβόαεν* L 185a lacunam indicavit Badham

184–5. *ἐνθεν... ἔκλυον*... follows straightforwardly from the emphasis on location in 179–82, like *ὅθεν* in *Hipp.* 125–30 (*τόθι... ὅθεν μοι | πρῶτα φάτις ἦλθε δεσποίνας*). As Badham saw, that commonsense interpretation, impossible as things stand, necessitates excision of *ἀνεβόαεν*, which is otherwise unintelligible as lacking a subject;⁷⁴ and, as a further bonus, the excision makes room for a responsion-restoring supplement in 186.⁷⁵ The interpolated verb is not too hard to account for. It could

defending *ἀμφί* against Elmsley's excision. For the word-order there, cf. *Andr.* 511 *μαστοῖς ματέρος ἀμφί cās*.

⁷² For the *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* preposition, cf. comm. on *Or.* 1449–51, Bruhn, *Anhang* §171 vi (also *ibid.* §237 for some phrases like 'the sun and his golden rays' = 'the sun's golden rays'), and G. Kiefner, *Die Versparung* (Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. 27ff. *χρυσαίαι | <ξὺ>ν αὐγαῖς* (instrumental) may be a possible alternative for those who still prefer the Triclinian *άλίου*.

⁷³ The metrically identical verses *θάλπους' ἀμφί δόνακος ἔρνεειν* and *κλαγγὰς Πανὸς ἀναβοᾷ γάμους* probably reflect the lineator's colometric interpretation; this false internal responsion is unlikely to be fortuitous. But it is conceivable that the lineator intended *θαλ- | πον(α)* here and either *κλαγ- | γα(ι)ς* (similarly) or *κλαγ- | γα(ι)ς (~ παι- | ανα)* in 189f. We cannot be sure that all the lineator's verse-divisions, especially if in the middle of a word, have been correctly transmitted (cf. n. 17).

⁷⁴ Kannicht impossibly punctuates *ἐνθεν οἰκτρὸν ἀνεβόαεν* as a separate sentence. Helen did not shout either from the waterside or as a consequence of the 'chance' described (*ἐτυχον*); we cannot understand the unexpressed subject as 'she (Helen)'; and the following asyndeton is intolerable. Attempts to save *ἀνεβόαεν* by adding words have failed miserably. Murray's '<and of my mistress>, whence she shouted..., I heard... what she shouted...' is grotesquely clumsy, though Dale looked for the truth on similar lines.

⁷⁵ The legitimacy of *---* in responsion with *-----* is unpersuasively argued by West (*GM* 103f.). It needs to be emphasized that the attested lineation is evidence that *μουσεῖα* and *ὅ τι ποτ' ἔλακε* were not treated as corresponding metra in antiquity.

derive from a gloss ἀναβόηειν (cf. Sch. S. *O.T.* 80), explaining the adjacent ὄμαδον (a rare word, inviting just such a gloss; cf. also the nearby intrusion of θρήνον for ἔλεγον). Or it could have featured in a marginal explanation of the sentence (intelligently associating ἔλακεν etc. with 187–90 οἶα... ἀναβοᾷ). Or perhaps ἀνεβόαεν was anciently conjectured by someone to supplement the monometer ὁ τι ποτ' ἔλακεν.⁷⁶

οἰκτρὸν ὄμαδον... ἄλυρον ἔλεγον: the rare word ὄμαδος, here only in tragedy and elsewhere used of the confused or concerted sound of several voices, is likely to have been suggested by the association with wind instruments in *Il.* 10.13 αὐλῶν κυρίγγων τ' ἐνοπὴν ὄμαδόν τ' ἀνθρώπων. The 'lyreless elegy' (cf. *Alc.* 447, *I.T.* 146) heard as a 'concerted cry' by the Chorus was a lament pointedly mentioning λωτός (= αὐλός) and κύριγγες, and presumably accompanied in the theatre by the αὐλητής.⁷⁷

186–7. ὁ τι ποτ' ἔλακεν|<---> αἰάγμα-|ει στένουσα νύμφα τις,|...: Nothing in 164–79 identified the singer of the ὄμαδος|ἔλεγος that the Chorus have heard. They might simply have referred to her as 'a woman'. But there was an established poetic connection between νύμφαι and lamentation;⁷⁸ and in Euripidean lyric the word νύμφα is applied not only to 'brides' but to such maritally distressed ladies as Medea (*Med.* 150) and Andromache (*Andr.* 140). The assumption of 'a (distressed) νύμφη' here, justified in the event, is more immediately justified by the following simile 'like a fugitive Naiad (nymph) ...'. Euripides is wittily playing on different senses of νύμφη in a highly sophisticated comparison.

It follows that, contrary to the usual view, we do not need a noun-supplement to give ἔλακεν a subject.⁷⁹ νύμφα τις is the appropriately terminal subject (before οἶα Ναΐς...) of an appositive clause appropriately framed by indefinite terms. There is indeed no immediately obvious deficiency in the sense. But closer consideration suggests that this is where the Chorus ought to mention what at present they do *not* mention, namely, the place from which the βοή originated (as opposed to the place from which they heard it). They have come from the waterside to the source of the ὄμαδος (or whatever), expecting to find the screamer (whoever she may be) *in this house*. To express that point, an adequate supplement after ἔλακεν would be the demonstrative adverb ἐντεῦθεν 'shouted *from here*'. Much better, if we are prepared to coin a standard type of adverb, would be *αὐλάθεν (αὐλη-θεν), following ἔλακεν like ἔλακε μυχόθεν in *A. Ch.* 35,⁸⁰ and alluding to the royal and theatral 'hall' to

⁷⁶ In support of ἀνεβόαεν...οἶα...ἀναβοᾷ Kannicht compares *Il.* 3.2–8 (cited in n. 87 below). Such parallels can equally be invoked to show how ἀνεβόαεν could have entered the tradition falsely, perhaps by way of the margin.

⁷⁷ See nn. 11 and 44 above; for λακεῖν of pipe-accompanied song, cf. *Alc.* 346f. πρὸς Λίβυν λακεῖν αὐλόν.

⁷⁸ See R. A. Seaford, 'The Tragic Wedding', *JHS* 107 (1987), 106–30.

⁷⁹ Murray's interpolation of 'my mistress' (n. 74) was misconceived for a different reason, as Dale observed. After the ladies of the Chorus have entered, Helen recognizes and addresses them in 191–2 as 'Greek κόραι, victims of barbarian piracy', and laments her fate; they, on their side, are already familiar with Helen's famous story, and they address her respectfully as πότνια (224). It does not follow that they are Helen's servants (for the use of πότνια Dale might have compared *Or.* 1249). Rather, 'outsider'-status has already been suggested by entry from outside the palace with motifs reminiscent of the choral entries in *Med.* and *Hipp.* (for other female choruses of sympathetic 'outsiders', cf. *El.*, *Ph.*, *Or.*, *I.A.*); and it will be confirmed at 313, where they ask πῶς δ' εὐμενείας τοιςὶδ' ἐν δόμοις ἔχεις;

⁸⁰ μυχόθεν also *A. Ag.* 96; cf. οἰκοθεν, θύραθεν (first at *Andr.* 953), κλισίηθεν *Il.* 1.391, etc. (Kühner–Blass ii.308.4). For λακεῖν with an adverbial expression of place, cf. also *Hec.* 1110, *I.T.* 976, *Or.* 329. Note that ΑΥΛΑΘΕΝ could have dropped out quite easily after ΕΛΑΚΕΝ, either before or after the text was lineated. Could it also, perhaps, have played some part in generating ANEBOACEN?

which the Chorus have directed their steps.⁸¹ Note that such a local adverb here also provides another point of comparison for the cries heard *μυχόθεν* in the following simile.

187–90

οἷα Ναϊς ὄρεσι φυγάδα
†γάμων† ἰεῖσα γοερὸν, ὑπὸ δὲ
πέτρινα †μύχала γύαλα† κλαγγαῖσι
Πανὸς ἀναβοαῖ γάμους.

190

188 γάμων Tr², νόμον Matthiae, edd. 189 μύχала (μύαλα L⁸⁰) del. Dindorf, edd. 190 κλαγγὰς L, post Boissonade (-αῖς) et Hermann (-αῖσιν) corr. Murray

187–8. οἷα Ναϊς...: cf. *Hipp.* 550 *δρομάδα Ναῖδ' ὅπως τε βάκχαν*. *οἷα* can be purely adverbial (= ὡς, ὅπως), but the comparison here is naturally understood as 'such (*αἰάγματα*) as a Naiad (nymph utters)...'.

ὄρεσι φυγάδα †γάμων† (Tr. -ον) **ἰεῖσα|γοερὸν** (with the transmitted lineation). If Matthiae's generally accepted νόμον is right, we may also need Herwerden's *φύγδα*.⁸² since it is hard to justify the 'kühne Enallage' (Kannicht) of applying *φυγάς*, which virtually always describes a person (see LSJ), to νόμος *γοερός* ('threnodic song-mode');⁸³ the only likely extension is with nouns such as πούς or δρόμος.⁸⁴ But one expects 'fugitive in the mountains' to describe the Naiad directly in this topos, like 'running' in *Hipp.* 550. *φυγάδα δρόμον ἰεῖσα* is a possible phrase;⁸⁵ but I should prefer <ῥμαδον> ὄρεσι|φυγάς ἰεῖσα γοερὸν,⁸⁶ as more accurately laying the emphasis where it belongs.⁸⁷ There can be no certainty that the corruption here is confined to the impossible γάμων, so that it seems best to leave the text obelized, with conjectures in the apparatus.

189–90. ὑπὸ δέ...: the shift to a clause with finite verb is a standard feature of epic

⁸¹ For the multivalent 'hall/court' constituted by the stage-building and the acting-area immediately in front of it, cf. *comm. Or.* p. xl. Entering choruses allude to the αὐλή in *El.* 168 (ποτὶ τὰν ἀγρότειραν αὐλάν) and *I.T.* 128 (πρὸς τὰν αὐλάν); cf. also *Hec.* 171, *Ph.* 1536, *Or.* 1257, *Ba.* 630.

⁸² cf. *A. Eum.* 256. We may prefer the tribrach word for exact responsion, but we have no right to demand it in the light of the adjacent -εῖσα (~ δάκρυσι).

⁸³ In its musical sense (LSJ s.v. II) a νόμος is never simply a song, but rather a type of song, or 'song-mode' (in accordance with the root idea of 'custom'), nearly always with a defining epithet (ὄρθιος, Βοιωτικός, βακχεῖος, etc.), and with an expressed or implied definite article (cf. *A. S.c.T.* 952 ἀπηλάλαξαν Ἀραὶ τὸν ὄξυν νόμον).

⁸⁴ cf. *Or.* 1468 *φυγά(δ)ι δὲ ποδί* (s.v.l.), 1499 *δραπέταν...πόδα*, *Hel.* 1301 *δρομάδι κώλῳ*.

⁸⁵ cf. *Phaethon* 171 Diggle *ἔει δ' ἐφ' ἑπτά Πλειάδων ἔχων δρόμον*, *Rh.* 798 *ἔσαν φυγῇ πόδα*. With δρόμον γοερὸν we might then compare *Thuc.* 4.128 *ἐν φοβεραῖ ἀναχωρήσει*, but it would be more natural to write γοερός (fem., cf. *Ba.* 992 *Δίκα φανερός*, etc.; Kühner–Blass i.535–6). 'Running', however, is not the relevant point here; and no support should be looked for in the possibility that Triclinius found a transmitted ποδ' in the margin nearby (see below).

⁸⁶ Not ὄρεσι *φυγάς ῥμαδον*, since an overlap at δ-|μαδον would conflict with the pattern of articulated dimeters; but word-corruption and wrong word-order can go hand in hand. ῥμαδον could have been skipped before ὄρεσι and/or transposed within the verse (bringing ῥμ- nearer to γοερὸν); *φυγαδαγαμον* is then a garble of *φυγα...μαδον*, perhaps helped by illegible supscription.

⁸⁷ ῥμαδον...ἰεῖσα γοερὸν thus frames the phrase, with immediate repetition in the simile of the first of the paired nouns in the leading clause: cf. *Il.* 3.2–3 *Τρώες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ' ἐνοπῇ τ' ἴσαν ὄρνιθες ὥς, | ἥύτε περ κλαγγῇ γεράνων πέλει οὐρανόθι πρό* (cited by Kannicht as supporting *ἀνεβόαεν...οἷα...ἀναβοαῖ*).

similes. There is a strophic balance (ὅπο + acc. again) between the hidden scene of the fugitive Naiad's screaming and the μέλαθρα Νύχια where Persephone is to receive the 'paean'; but in the context of the antistrophe the effect of the simile is rather to compare these 'rocky caverns' in the mountains with the waterside δώματα from which Helen's pipe-accompanied lamentation has been heard (similarly πέτρινα, unlike the coverts from which the nightingale pipes her lament in 1107ff.; in 68 the palace-buildings were described as ἐρυμνά δώματα). As to 'Pan', cf. the extended association of that god with 'piping' (both αὐλοί and κύριγγες), 'maidens' and 'sunless rocky caverns' in *Ion* 492–502 ὦ Πανὸς θακήματα καὶ παραυλίζουσα πέτρα | μυχώδεσι Μακραίς | ἵνα... κυρίζεις... ἐν ἄντροις.

†**μύχαλα γύαλα**†: Dindorf's deletion of μύχαλα simultaneously removes three metrically superfluous syllables and a lexical problem. But μύχαλα merits greater respect than it has received, in the light of μυχαλα ταρταρα in a papyrus fragment attributed to Sophocles' *Niobe* (*PGrenf.* 2.6 fr. 1.7 = S. fr. 442.8 Radt). It is natural there to recognize μυχαλός (*sic*) as a synonym of μυχώδης (itself a hapax legomenon, restored by Tyrwhitt, in *Ion* loc.cit.), with the sense 'hidden and darkly cavernous'.⁸⁸ A μυχ- word is no less appropriate to this passage, both for the μυχόθεν point in the simile and for the balance with μέλαθρα Νύχια in the strophe. It is hard to believe (with Kannicht) that μύχαλα entered the text here merely through misinterpretation of a gloss μυχ(ός) written above γύαλα. γύαλα (usually 'dells' or 'fertile vales', when not specifically referring to the Pythian precinct)⁸⁹ are not elsewhere glossed as μυχοί,⁹⁰ and the same explanation will not account for μυχαλα in the papyrus. 'Dittography' (Dindorf) is even less tenable,⁹¹ and Canter's μύχατα is a mere red herring.⁹²

⁸⁸ cf. Hes. *Th.* 119 Τάρταρά τ' ἡρόοντα μυχῶι χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης (and *Supp.* 545, 926, *Tro.* 952, *H.F.* 37, *Ion* 1239, etc.). μυχαλός is acceptably in line with words like ἀπαλός, ὁμαλός, τροχαλός; for the accentuation of such adjs. (several of them rare), see Chandler, *Greek Accentuation*, §389. μύχια τάρταρα might have been understood similarly, but the Hesiodic sense of μύχιος is ἐν μυχῶι οἰκίας or ναοῦ (cf. West on *Op.* 523 and *Th.* 991). For virtually synonymous cognate adjs., cf. *πινάρος* (*El.* 184) and *πινώδης* (*Or.* 225).

⁸⁹ Presumably cognate with γύης (also usually pl.), cf. *Ba.* 13 and *A. Supp.* 550; *I.T.* 1235, *P.* *N.* 10.56, *Ar. Thesm.* 110, etc. 'Concave places', able to hold soil and water, afford the only cultivable ground in much of Greece. The archetypal 'Pythian' passage is Hes. *Th.* 499 Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγαθέη, γνάλοισι ὑπὸ Παρηγχοῖο, which follows the usual formulaic pattern if understood as ὑπὸ γ- Π- (so West; but there is no need to write ὕπο, cf. n. 71 above and comm. on *Or.* 94); likewise *h.Ap.* 396 γνάλων ὑπὸ Π- (cf. *h.Hom.* 26.5 Νύχης) and *P. Py.* 8.63 Πυθῶνος ἐν γνάλοισι. The characteristically Euripidean use of γύαλα as 'vox propria' in reference to the Pythian precinct, as in *Andr.* 1093 θεοῦ χρυσοῦ γέμοντα γύαλα, *Ion* 76, 220, 233, 245, *Ph.* 237 μεσόμφαλα γύαλα Φοῖβου, may reflect a misinterpretation of Hes. *Th.* 499 as 'holy Pytho, (the) γύαλα under Parnassos'. *I.A.* 1052 χρυσεόειν... ἐν κρατήρων γνάλοισι seems to combine the Homeric use of γ- to denote concavities in metalwork with the kind of gen. first seen in *S. Phil.* 1081 ὦ πέτρας κοίλας γύαλον. The sing. γύαλον is unusual there, and the true meaning of Phil.'s *envoi* to the cave may well be something like 'o my territorial dell (γύαλον = γύης) of hollow rock', the sense ἄντρον or μυχός being given by the phrase as a whole.

⁹⁰ Except perhaps by Eur. himself in *Or.* 331, where I now think that ἵνα μεσόμφαλοι λέγονται μυχοί combines the ideas μεσόμφαλος ἐστία (*Ion* 462) and μεσόμφαλα γύαλα (*Ph.* 223) in a new formulation, perhaps influenced, like so much in *Or.*, by *S. Phil.* (see last n.).

⁹¹ Dittography might account for μύαλα (*L*^{ac}) before γύαλα (though without explaining where the μ came from); but the transmitted status of μύχαλα is likely to have been confirmed by Triclinius (see below).

⁹² Widely accepted (cf. Jebb on *S. Phil.* 1081); but μύχατος is a late form (first in *Ap. Rhod.* and *Callim.*), and we certainly do not need a superlative here. Canter, of course, lacking contrary evidence, judged that μύχαλα was a *vox nihili*.

A likelier explanation of the interpolation here, as in 171, is that *μυχαλα* and *γυαλα* were ancient isometric, and otherwise similar, variants; and, if so, the former, as much the rarer word, could well be the truth. 'Hidden cavernous places' suits the context at least as well as vague 'concavities' (a fortiori, 'dells'); and we have no right to deny categorically the possibility of *μύχαλα* as a substantive (or substantival n. pl.) with that sense.⁹³ The suggestion that *γύαλα* may be the added word is consistent with its position after *μύχαλα*, like *ἡ φόρμιγγας* after *ἡ κύριγγας*, at the end of a hypermetric verse.⁹⁴

κλαγγαῖσι: a word with appropriate poetic overtones of high-pitched *bird-song*: cf. the similes in *Tro.* 146f. (the only other Euripidean occurrence) and *Il.* 3.2–3 (n. 87). The dative is surely right here (not only for the metre); for the modal dative of kindred meaning, often without epithet, cf. *αἰάγμασι* *στένουσα*, *Or.* 39 *σφαγαῖς* *θανοῦσα*, 56 *ἄλαισι* *πλαγχθεῖς*, etc.⁹⁵

Πανός...γάμουσ: cf. *Ion* 946 (*Ἀπόλλωνος*); poetical idiom, like *λέκτρα* + gen. *viri* (7, 666, etc.); also euphemistic, in reference to rape.

ἀναβοᾶι: cf. p. 77 n. 2. Here 'shouts for help against', unlike 1592 *ἀνεβόησε* *συμμάχους*;⁹⁶ but in both places there is a wish for *βοηδρομία*.

Tricliniana

When Triclinius first worked on the text, he was performing the proper function of a *διορθωτής*, carefully comparing the copy (L) with the manuscript being copied (Zuntz's 'A'), and remedying the scribe's errors and omissions.⁹⁷ It was at this stage that he wrote *γρ οἶκτον* above *οἶκον* in 164 and *γρ ἔλεγον* above *θρήνον* in 185, noncommittally recording transmitted variants or corrections which may have been either similar suprascriptions or marginalia in A.⁹⁸ Such Tr¹ readings, identifiable by blackness of ink, have the same transmissional authority as readings like *γρ αἰλίνους* *κακοῖς* (in marg.) recorded by the first hand. These are the only visible Tr¹ contributions to the text of this passage; but it is reasonable to assume that his *διόρθωσις* included visual confirmation of *μύχαλα* in 189, where the scribe had corrected his own *lapsus calami*.

Later he returned to the passage, probably more than once, motivated especially by a desire to make metrical sense of the lyrics, as the first Byzantine scholar to take an interest in this difficult field of study. His later contributions, collectively 'Tr²', have

⁹³ Many neuter nouns are adjectives used substantively, with a tendency then for them to retract their accent (Chandler, §§340, 346); indeed, it is plausible to derive *γύαλα* from a hypothetical *γυαλός* 'concave' (*γυαλός* in fact occurs, but apparently with a different sense, in a fragment of Callimachus).

⁹⁴ If I am right in postulating a variant by misquotation (like 'fields' for 'woods' in *Lycidas* line 193), the error may be very ancient indeed. We can already observe a convergence of *γυ-* and *μυχ-* in late Eur. and Soph. (nn. 89–90 above). As to the hypermetric verse, it remains possible, but not probable, that the lineator intended *γοερον...κλαγγ-* as a trimeter (cf. n. 73).

⁹⁵ Note that the dative also allows us to understand the force of *οἶα* (sc. *αἰάγματα*) as continuing to the end of the simile. But *κλαγγάς* (int. acc.) is good enough to be an ancient error; or the lineator may have read *κλαγγαῖς* (for inferences from the lineation, see n. 73). Professor West interestingly suggests *κλαγγαῖσι*; but see Barrett on *Hipp.* 101.

⁹⁶ 'Shout for', cf. *Ph.* 1155 *βοᾶι πῦρ καὶ δικέλλας*, *A. Ch.* 402 (see Garvie), *S. Tra.* 761; 'shout against', cf. the passive *ἀναβοᾶι* in *Or.* 103 (with comm.). Both, in different ways, express the idea 'shout aloud concerning'.

⁹⁷ cf. Zuntz, pp. 49f. (and *passim*).

⁹⁸ For the ambivalence of *γρ*, = *γράφεται* (καί) or *γραπτέον*, see Zuntz, pp. 42, 130ff.

a puzzlingly heterogeneous character, and merit careful appraisal in the light of Zuntz's conclusion (p. 198) that 'Triclinius occasionally drew upon older evidence even in the course of his final revision' – evidence found, not in Δ , but in Δ 's parent 'ε', the ancestral transcription into minuscule hypothetically made for Eustathius c. A.D. 1175.⁹⁹ It is on general grounds not unlikely that even some of Triclinius' metrical 'improvements' were prompted in part by discoveries of new evidence, or what he took to be new evidence.

(i) As mentioned above (n. 13), he rightly determined and indicated the beginning of the strophe at 167 *περοφόροι*.

(ii) He accepted the three 'γρ' readings *οἶκτον*, *αἰλίνοις* and *ἐλεγον*, and altered the text accordingly: *οἶκ(ον)* became *οἶκτ(ον)* by the addition of a τ; *θρήνον* was deleted with what looks like two pen strokes, but closer inspection reveals to be a flattened oval encirclement (Tr.'s usual method of deletion, as opposed to erasure); and *αἶ αἶνοις* became *αἰλίνοις* by the writing of λ in an erasure (he also deleted *γρ αἰλίνοις κακοῖς* in the margin). He needed no additional evidence to justify these alterations in what was, after all, his personal working copy of the text; but we cannot exclude the possibility that he had found some confirmation in ε.

(iii) He produced iambic dimeters in 170 (*μῶλοιτ' ἐχθρῶν- $\langle\tau\omega\rangle$ λιβῶν* and 182 (*αὐγαῖςιν $\langle\epsilon\nu\rangle$ ταῖς $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota\varsigma$*) by writing the added words above the line, by erasing and adding *ω* at the end of *χρυσαῖςιν* and *αὐγαῖς* respectively, and by a reverse-pointing arrow above the latter. There was merit in the addition of *ἐν*, and he could well have found *χρυσαῖς ἐν* transmitted as an alternative to *χρυσαῖςιν*. But the rest is most unlikely to have any transmissional authority, though many editors since Hermann have accepted the transposition *αὐγαῖςιν ἐν χρυσαῖς*. The conjectural status of these clumsy $\upsilon-\upsilon-\bar{x}-\upsilon-$ verses (with abnormal diaeresis after long anacp in 170) is betrayed by the characteristically Triclinian definite articles.¹⁰⁰

(iv) 185a–6 was brought into responsion with 174 by enlargement of the first letter of *αἰάγμασι* so as to obliterate the preceding divider (:) after *ἐλακεν*, and by the addition of *τε* after *μουσεῖα*, in responsion (now) with *ὁ τι ποτ' ἐλακεν*. Reduction of 185a–6 to a single verse will have seemed to Tr. the inevitable corollary of making a single verse out of 171–1a ~ 183 (see below); and the extra syllable duly produced an iambic metron of sorts ($\bar{x}-\upsilon-$ again, with *τε* improperly lengthened before *θρ-*). $\langle\tau\epsilon\rangle$ is another characteristically Triclinian expedient, so we are surely here in the realm of pure conjecture, at once rational and misconceived.

(v) He wrote *ου* above the *ω* of *ἀλίω* in 181, presumably because the genitive seemed necessary in conjunction with *αὐγαῖςιν ἐν ταῖς χρυσαῖς* (though there is little sign elsewhere that he devoted careful attention to the grammar or sense of these stanzas, cf. vi and vii below). It is not impossible that he had found attestation of *ἀλίου* in ε; but, if he had, he would probably have altered L's *ἀλίω* more decisively (cf. ii and vii).

(vi) He made 175 *πέμψειε φερσέφασσα φόνια* correspond with 187 *νύμφα τις οἶα ναῖς* by inserting a divider (:) after *φερσέφασσα*; and he went on to make three verses out of 176–7 (*φόνιᾶ $\langle\phi\omicron\nu\acute{\nu}\acute{\iota}\alpha\rangle$ χαρίτας | ἴν' ἐπὶ δᾶκρυῖς πᾶρ' ἐμέ | θ' ὑπὸ μέλαθρᾶ νύχιᾶ παῖ- $\langle\tau\alpha\nu\rangle$ α $\langle\tau\rangle$...*) and 188–9 (*ὀρεῖς φῦγάδᾳ γᾶμόν | $\langle\tau\rangle$ εῖς γῶερὸν ὑπὸ δὲ | πέτρινᾶ μῦχᾶλᾳ γῦᾶλᾳ | $\langle\kappa\rangle$ λαγγᾶς...*). These unappealing 'tripodies' are certainly his colo-

⁹⁹ Ibid. pp. 185ff., 192.

¹⁰⁰ cf. Zuntz, pp. 194f.

the line below, where a straightforward count of syllables already suggested that a supplement was needed.

These would not be the only places where the tradition has been affected by marginal readings, sometimes inserted in the wrong place.

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK