

been repeated many times.<sup>5</sup> In fact, however, as I demonstrated in 1974,<sup>6</sup> Eustathius comments on *Od.* 10.477 at 1664.42–6, so his text must have included the passage 475–9.

In reality, the passage is omitted only by Allen's H3 (saec. xiii);<sup>7</sup> by W (Vrat. 28, saec. xv),<sup>8</sup> which is a member of Allen's family f, and by one or more of the three remaining members of this same family (all saec. xv);<sup>9</sup> and by Allen's V2 (Vindobonensis philol. gr. 50, saec. xv).<sup>10</sup> Thus, at the most, six omitting MSS. are known – all but two of them from a single family, and all but one of them very late – only a tiny fraction of the 68 extant MSS. containing this part of the text. This small total of omitting MSS. is fully compatible with the hypothesis of accidental omission,<sup>11</sup> and there are homoiographa in the text to provide a plausible explanation for such a copyist's slip.<sup>12</sup>

Thus the manuscript evidence against the lines is reduced from a mountain to a mole-hill, and it becomes easy to reconcile the external evidence with the very strong internal evidence in favour of the lines.

University of Queensland

M. J. APTHORP

<sup>5</sup> In 1974 ('Textual Problems' [above, n. 2], 26 n. 56) I listed six places where this error is to be found. I can now add that it is also to be found in the editions of H. Hayman (ii, London, 1873), J. U. Faesi–G. Hinrichs (ii<sup>8</sup>, Berlin, 1884) and J. van Leeuwen–M. B. Mendes da Costa (<sup>3</sup>, Leiden, 1908), and also in Beck (above, n. 3) and H. van Thiel, *Odyssees* (Basle, 1988), p. 142.

<sup>6</sup> 'Textual Problems' (above, n. 2), 26–7.

<sup>7</sup> T. W. Allen (ed.), O.C.T. *Od.*<sup>2</sup> (1917–19), *ad loc.*; but the lines have been added in the margin – see e.g. A. Ludwich's edition (Leipzig, 1889–91), *ad loc.*

<sup>8</sup> Not stated explicitly by Allen but reported by Ludwich (above, n. 7).

<sup>9</sup> Given Allen's procedure in citing his families we are still unable to be more precise than this: see e.g. *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 2), p. xxiv.

<sup>10</sup> This fact is not stated by Allen, although he implies that he has collated the MS. (*PBSR* 5 [1910], 16; *Od.*<sup>2</sup> [above, n. 7], i. iii, xii); but Professor Otto Mazal of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, who has kindly inspected the MS. for me, confirms the statement of some earlier editors that it omits the lines.

<sup>11</sup> For parallels see 'Textual Problems' (above, n. 2), 30–1; also my discussions of *Il.* 3.235, *Od.* 17.432 and *Od.* 16.50 at *ZPE* 82 (1990), 18–24.

<sup>12</sup> See 'Textual Problems' (above, n. 2), 28–30.

### EURIPIDES, *ORESTES* 895–7\*

Orestes has arrived at the Argive assembly to undergo trial for killing his mother:

ἐπεὶ δὲ πλήρης ἐγένετ' Ἀργείων ὄχλος,  
κῆρυξ ἀναστὰς εἶπε· Τίς χρήζει λέγειν, 885  
πότερον Ὀρέστην καταθάνειν ἢ μὴ χρεών,  
μητροκτονούντα;  
καπὶ τῷδ' ἀνίσταται  
Ταλθύβιος, ὃς σῶ πατρὶ συνεπόρθει Φρύγας.  
ἔλεξε δ' ὑπὸ τοῖς δυναμένοισιν ὧν αἰεὶ,  
διχόμυθα, πατέρα μὲν σὸν ἐκπαγλούμενος, 890  
σὸν δ' οὐκ ἐπαινῶν σύγγονον, καλοῦς κακοῦς  
λόγους ἐλίσσων, ὅτι καθισταίῃ νόμος  
ἐς τοὺς τεκόντας οὐ καλοῦς· τὸ δ' ὅμμ' αἰεὶ  
φαιδρωπὸν ἐδίδον τοῖσιν Αἰγίσθου φίλοις.  
τὸ γὰρ γένος τοιοῦτον· ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχῇ 895  
πηδῶσ' αἰεὶ κήρυκες· ὅδε δ' αὐτοῖς φίλος,  
ὃς ἂν δύνηται πόλεος ἐν τ' ἀρχαῖσιν ᾗ.

\* I am grateful to Dr J. Diggle and Professor M. D. Reeve for improving an earlier version of this note.

Students of the play have not appreciated the merits of W. Dindorf's proposal to delete lines 895–7:<sup>1</sup> his conjecture is not reported by most editors;<sup>2</sup> when reported it is not accepted;<sup>3</sup> and it has been taken seriously perhaps only in an *obiter dictum* of Wecklein.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, the arguments in its favour are even more powerful than Dindorf realised.

(i) Appended to the speech of Talthybius the criticism of heralds in these lines is confusing. For with the transmitted text we come first (lines 885–7) to the κῆρυξ opening the assembly, then (887–94) to the speech of Talthybius, and then to the general criticism of heralds. The position of this last item thus seems anomalous. One might object that Talthybius had been well known as a κῆρυξ from *Iliad* 1.320 onwards and that he had appeared in this role in our author's earlier *Hecuba* and *Troades*. Yet in this passage he seems to have assumed trappings of more importance, and he is not called a κῆρυξ. It would be surprising, moreover, if Euripides, having introduced a herald at 885, had within ten lines introduced a potentially confusing allusion to the former profession of Talthybius.

(ii) After ὑπὸ τοῖς δυναμένοισιν ὧν ἀεί (line 889) has characterised the time-serving Talthybius so elegantly and concisely, lines 895–7 are disappointing and repetitious in context.<sup>5</sup> In particular, when we have just learnt in lines 893–4 that Talthybius kept making supportive glances to the φίλοι of Aegisthus, it is banal to be told that a φίλος to a herald was the man who wielded power in the city. Iteration is very common even in the best Greek stylists; but were Euripides the author of these lines one would still be disappointed that after the employment of ἀεί in 889 and 893 he used the adverb a third time in 896.

(iii) The excitement of this messenger speech owes much to the quick succession in which one speaker follows another. Thus after the initial proclamation of the herald, Talthybius rises (887 καὶ τῷδ' ἀνίσταται); after Talthybius, Diomedes (898 ἐπὶ τῷδε); after Diomedes, the rabble-rouser (902 καὶ τῷδ' ἀνίσταται); and after the rabble-rouser, the honest rustic (917 ἀναστάς). When the messenger has given a brief précis of the speech of each (and sometimes commented equally briefly on its reception), he introduces the next speaker. Lines 895–7 may thus be seen as a grievous interruption of the flow of the passage: for nowhere else does Euripides dilate on the character of the speaker *after* he has finished describing the speech; and he had no need to do so when he had already provided a deft characterisation of the man in question.

(iv) The construction of πόλεος in 897 is difficult and has long been disputed. Scholars have adopted the following approaches to the problem:

(a) The most popular solution has been to take it with ἀρχαῖσιν; but Porson objected that there is no parallel for the resulting postponement of τε,<sup>6</sup> and his argument, though often ignored, remains unanswered.

(b) Matthiae tried to side-step Porson's objections by construing the line as ὃς ἄν

<sup>1</sup> First proposed in *Poetarum Scenicorum Graecorum ... fabulae superstites et perditarum fragmenta*<sup>5</sup> (London, 1869), Part III, p. 109.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. the editions of F. A. Paley (Cambridge and London, 1879), N. Wedd (Cambridge, 1895), H. Weil (Paris, 1904), N. Wecklein (Leipzig and Berlin, 1906), G. Murray<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1913), F. Chapoutier (Paris, 1959), V. Di Benedetto (Florence, 1965), and M. L. West (Warminster, 1987).

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. the editions of A. Nauck<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1893), N. Wecklein (Leipzig, 1900), W. Biehl (Leipzig, 1975), and C. W. Willink (Oxford, 1986).

<sup>4</sup> *Bursian's Jahresberichte* 20 (1892), 238; but note Wecklein's practice in his editions.

<sup>5</sup> This point was made by Dindorf.

<sup>6</sup> R. Porson, *Euripidis Orestes* (London, 1798), p. 67.

δύνηται ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ ἐν ἀρχαῖσιν τῆς πόλεως ᾗ;<sup>7</sup> but this paraphrase bears only a distant kinship to what the *paradosis* offers, and leaves *τε* unexplained.

(c) West translated δύνηται πόλεος 'has influence over the community' and held that πόλεος is in the genitive as though it were following ἀρχῶ or κρατέω; but he adduced no parallel for such a use of δύναμαι.<sup>8</sup>

(d) Porson himself took the genitive as partitive after ὅς, glossed it with 'ἐκ subaudito', and cited Soph. *Aj.* 1175 τις στρατοῦ ('someone from the army'). This is the only realistic way to construe the *paradosis*, and in further support of it Willink cited *Andr.* 873–4 ἀλλ' ἀνδρὸς ἐσθλοῦ παιῖδα ... πόλεώς τ' οὐ μέσῳς εὐδαίμονος ('a child of a noble man and from a particularly prosperous city'), and Soph. *O.T.* 236–8 γῆς|τῇσδε ... τινα ('anyone from this land').<sup>9</sup> Yet, whilst in all these passages the genitive adds a pointed description of origin, in our passage there is very much less point in 'who, belonging to the city, is powerful': which powerful man would not have belonged to a πόλις?

(e) Given these difficulties, it is tempting to resort to conjectural emendation; but only δυνάστης (Nauck),<sup>10</sup> πλείστον (Schmidt),<sup>11</sup> and κρατύνῃ (Vitelli)<sup>12</sup> are on offer, and none even approximates to hitting the nail on the head.

If, however, we regard these three lines as interpolated, our difficulties may be circumvented: for interpolators often reveal themselves by employing Greek of a quality far below what one would expect to find in a play written by one of the extant tragedians.

Absolute certainty in these matters is not to be attained, but these lines impair their context and should probably be excised.<sup>13</sup> Their presence might be explained as an intrusion from another play: for though Willink found it 'hard to visualize a more appropriate context for them', criticism of heralds was something of a τόπος (see *Tro.* 424–6 and Collard on *Supp.* 426). Nevertheless, in view of the difficulties posed by πόλεος, it is better to argue that the lines are the invention of an actor who desired to gloss the speech of Talthybius with worthy and sententious reflection. Such interpolations are common enough in our MSS. of Euripides, as lines 904–13, 916, 933, and 938–42 of this very speech bear witness – verses long regarded by good judges as having no place in *Orestes*.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

S. P. OAKLEY

<sup>7</sup> A. Matthiae, *Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1813–29), vi 212–13.

<sup>8</sup> There is no instance in LSJ.

<sup>9</sup> See, however, the note *ad loc.* in R. D. Dawe's edition of the play (Cambridge, 1982) for the problems of this last passage.

<sup>10</sup> See A. Nauck, *Bull. Ac. Imp. St Pétersbourg* 22 (1877), 95.

<sup>11</sup> See F. W. Schmidt, *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatiken* (Berlin, 1886–7), ii.359–60.

<sup>12</sup> See G. Vitelli, *SIFC* 1 (1893), 24.

<sup>13</sup> In one respect, however, they are perhaps not entirely without merit: the expressive *πηδῶσι* in 896 puts one in mind of Q. Dellius, the *desultor bellorum ciuiliū* (Sen. *suas.* 1.7).