κάλπισι πα | γὰν ῥυτὰν προιεῖσα κρημνῶν | τόθι μοί τις ἦν φίλα | πορφύρεα φάρεα ποταμία δρόσω | τέγγουσα . . . Then the adjective 'dewy' appears in Phaidra's expression of longing, 208, soon after her first entrance, πῶς ἄν δροσερᾶς ἀπὸ κρηνῖδος | καθαρῶν ὑδάτων πῶμ' ἀρυσαίμαν and in the Nurse's answering remonstrance, 226, πάρα γὰρ δροσερὰ πύργοις συνεχὴς | κλειτύς, ὅθεν σοι πῶμα γένοιτ' ἄν. Literally, of course, the women of the chorus refer to the local laundrette, Phaidra to a distant spring, and the Nurse to the palace water supply; but this does not negate the sous-entendre in the Leitmotiv.

That Euripides was fond of punning and wordplay is well-known; and that this tendency extends to the language of sex, in plays where sex is a dominant theme, need not surprise us. How far could such boldness go? In Cyclops,  $\delta\rho\chi\eta\sigma\tau\dot{v}s$  is probably a pun on  $\delta\rho\chi\epsilon\iota s$  (Cy. 171; see MM 27). In these passages in Hippolytos, where  $\delta\rho\dot{\sigma}\sigma s$  has sexual overtones,  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\dot{v}s$ , lit. 'slope', 'hillside', may be intended as a reminiscence of  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau o\rho\dot{t}s$  (cf. Poll. 2.174 and Ruf. Onom. 111) and  $\kappa\rho\dot{\eta}\mu\nu\sigma\iota$ , lit. 'bank', as a reminiscence of its other sense, as a medical technical term, of the vaginal labia (Poll. 2.174 and Ruf. Onom. 112; also Hipp. Loc. Hom. 47, cf. 29). What is certain is that aidos first occurs in a passage of dense erotic imagery; and that other words of this passage are later deployed in a way which capitalizes on this associative introduction. A link between aidos and eros is established long before Phaidra's rhesis; and we may note that Eros is the subject of the ensuing lyric, 525ff.

I conclude with a brief word on Furley's own interpretation. Much of what he says about aidos in general is unexceptional; most of what he says about aidos in Hippolytos, from the starting point of Theognidea 1063–8, is unoriginal. Aidos (glossed at 88 'decency', 'courteousness', 'impeccable manners') is at 89 'a fastidious sense of honour which can ruin oneself and others'. But much had already been written on Phaidra's time, eukleia, and social status, on prideful pleasure in attention to conventions, and on the ways in which virtue can become a vice if taken to excess. If, as Furley suggests, treatment of this passage may be likened to 'such ancient rites as singing the skolion, where every member of the symposium was supposed to give his variant of a given theme', it is time for the symposiarch to intervene: οδτos, δ'Ερυξίμαχε, δ' ἐμὸς λόγος ἐστὶ περὶ 'Έρωτος.

Kyoto University, Japan

E. M. CRAIK

<sup>6</sup> Furley's stance does not differ substantially from that of Barrett, Dodds, Segal and others; see discussion and bibliography in my article. Reciprocity is noted throughout D. L. Cairns, *Aidos* (Oxford, 1993); see e.g. pp. 3–4, 458–9, 184–5.

## A NOTE ON EURIPIDES, HECUBA 1054F.

άλλ' ἐκποδὼν ἄπειμι κἀποστήσομαι θυμῷ ζέοντι Θρηκὶ δυσμαχωτάτῳ.

The manuscripts attribute these lines with 1049–53 to Hecuba. This is accepted by all editors. But the fear of Polymestor as revealed in the sentence does not fit the death wishes Hecuba expresses e.g. in 167f., 231–3, 383–7, 391–3, 396; nor is it consistent with her scornful description of the blind king as  $\tau \nu \phi \lambda \hat{o} \nu \tau \nu \phi \lambda \hat{\phi}$   $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \chi o \nu \tau a \pi a \rho a \phi \delta \rho \phi \pi o \delta i$  in 1050. On the other hand, the chorus have many

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The text follows J. Diggle, Euripidis Fabulae I (Oxford, 1984).

two-line interloquia in this part of the play (1042f., 1047f., 1085f., 1107f.). In 1042f. and 1047f. they clearly regard Polymestor as a dangerous person. They also style him in 1036 as  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\delta s$   $\Theta\rho\eta\kappa\delta s$  and in 1047 as  $\Theta\rho\eta\kappa a$ ; to this corresponds  $\Theta\rho\eta\kappa i$  in 1055. Considering the uncertainty in the transmission concerning the change of speaker in Attic drama,<sup>2</sup> we have therefore good reason to attribute the lines 1054f. to the chorus instead of Hecuba. Of course this is not to say that the chorus should here leave the stage, where they are still present at 1085. Taking a few steps back will be completely sufficient. Hecuba, in comparison, could ostentatiously stay where she is, which would result in an effective contrast between her and her fellow captives.

Universität Innsbruck

MARTIN KORENJAK

<sup>2</sup> S. J. Andrieu, Le dialogue antique (Paris, 1954), pp. 215-8.

## EURIPIDES, PHOENISSAE 1567-1578

δάκρυα γοερὰ φανερὰ πᾶσι τιθεμένα τέκεσι μαστὸν ἔφερεν ἔφερεν ἱκέτις ἱκέτιν ὀρομένα.

[ηὖρε δ' ἐν Ἡλέκτραισι πύλαις τέκνα 1570 λωτοτρόφον κατὰ λείμακα λόγχαις κοινὸν ἐνυάλιον μάτηρ, ὥστε λέοντας ἐναύλους, μαρναμένους ἐπὶ τραύμασιν, αἵματος ἤδη ψυχρὰν λοιβὰν φονίαν, 1575 ἄν ἔλαχ Ἅιδας, ὤπασε δ' Ἅρης.] χαλκόκροτον δὲ λαβοῦσα νεκρῶν πάρα φάσγανον εἴσω σαρκὸς ἔβαψεν, ἄχει δὲ τέκνων ἔπεσ' ἀμφὶ νεκροῦσιν.

I give the text as printed by James Diggle in his new Oxford Classical Text. His deletion of 1570–6 is rejected by Donald Mastronarde in his recent commentary. Apart from this, Mastronarde's text differs from Diggle's on only a couple of minor points which are immaterial to the main problems.<sup>2</sup>

Diggle argued for the deletion of 1570-6 as follows:<sup>3</sup> 'I say nothing of their linguistic oddities, which have provoked much emendation. The lines interrupt the progress of the narrative. Jocasta offered her breast to her sons in supplication (1567-9). She found them fighting (1570-6). She took the sword from the corpses and killed herself (1577-8). First there is  $\hat{v}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\rho\nu$   $\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\nu\nu$ : Jocasta cannot have bared her breast to her sons before she found them. Second, there is a logical

I would like to thank James Diggle, Donald Mastronarde and CQ's anonymous referee for their helpful comments on drafts of this note.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Euripides: Phoenissae (Cambridge, 1994). Mastronarde retains the text printed in his Teubner edition (1988). I follow both editors in treating 1485–1581 as substantially authentic though rich in textual difficulties (cf. Diggle's apparatus ad loc.) of the kind expected in an astrophic monody and amoibaion. I have commented briefly on the severe doubts that surround what follows (1582–1766) in BMCR 6 (1995), 431–2.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  1575 φόνιον with  $\Pi^5$ ; 1578 τέκνοισι with the main tradition but allowing the plausibility of Eldik's νεκροίσιν (νεκροίς Markland). Diggle and Mastronarde provide further textual information which need not be repeated here.

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  SIFC 7 (1989), 205-6 = Euripidea (Oxford, 1994), 351-2.