EURIPIDES, *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS* 392–455[1]

In the first stasimon of *IT* – in several places controversial as to text and/or metre –
the Chorus speculate about the identity and motivation of the Greeks whose arrival
and arrest have been reported. They begin by apostrophizing in mythical terms the
'Bosporos' through which these Greeks have presumably passed on their way to the
Taurian land. That sundering strait between Europe and Asia, variously 'cyan, dark'
and with associated 'clashing rocks', is a recurrent theme in this play.[2]

392–7 κυάνεαι κυανέας σύνοδοι θαλάσσας,   [στρ.
ἵν' οἶστρος †ὁ πετόμενος† Ἀργόθεν
Ἄξενον ἐπ' οἶδμα διεπέρασ'   395
Ἀσιήτιδα γαῖαν Εὐρώπας διαμείψας·

392 κυάνεαι κυανέας Willink: -αι -αι L   394 ἵν' Hermann: ἦν L   ποτώμενος Tr²   395 Ἄξενον
Markland (ἄξ-): εὔξεινον   P L διεπέρασ'] -ασεν L (-ασεν <ποτε> Tr)

The opening verse is ambivalently iono–choriambic (*ch* : *ch* : ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –) and
enoplian (*d* : *D ba*).[3] κυάνεαι κυανέας . . .: the correction, accepted by Kovacs, gives
(with paregmenon) a disposition of epithets similar to that in the antistrophe (ἦ
ῥοθίοις εἰλατίνας δικρότοισι κώπας). For the identifying epithet 'cyan, dark'
applied to these σύνοδοι ('comings together') θαλάσσας, cf. Soph. *Ant.* 966–7 παρὰ
δὲ κυανέωι πελάγει διδύμας ἁλός (referring to Salmydessus as adjacent to the
Thracian Bosporus).[4] The epithet is proper to the deep sea-water in a strait (cf. 7
κυανέαν ἅλα of the Euripus), and so to this strait *par excellence*. Its attachment to the
associated πέτραι (241, 746, 889; *Med.* 2, 1263) and ἀκταί (*Andr.* 863–4) is probably a
secondary development.

The second verse is metrically unsatisfactory both in itself and on grounds of
responsion with ἔπλευσαν ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα | νάϊον ὄχημα . . . The latter (though
ἔπλευσαν is suspect) is acceptably ∪ – ∪ ∪∪ : – ∪ ∪ – ∪∪ | × ∪∪ ∪ – ∪ . . . (*ia* : *2da*

[1] Short references are used for my commentary on *Orestes* (Oxford, 1986, 1989) and for sundry
articles in *CQ* 38 (1988), 88–97; 39 (1989), 45–69; 41 (1991), 525–9; 42 (1992), 41–5; 51 (2001),
65–89; 53 (2003), 75–110; *Mnemosyne* 51 (1998), 715–18; 56 (2003), 30–2; 58 (2005), 499–509;
Quaderni Urbinati 71 (2004), 43–54; *Philologus* 148 (2004), 197–221; 149 (2005), 187–208; also for
J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981) and *Euripidea: Collected Essays*
(Oxford, 1994).

[2] Cf. 123–5, 241, 260, 422, 746, 889–90.

[3] Cf. *Hipp.* 732/742 – ∪ ∪ – : ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ‖ , at once *ch* : *2io* and *D d* – . For the most part
my metrical terms and notations are in line with M. L.West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), xi–xii,
but see also my comm. on *Or.* xx–xxi and *CQ* 51 (2001), 65, n. 3, especially for 'enoplian'. For the
commonly ambivalent cadence . . . : ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – ‖ cf. *Ag.* 204/217 etc. (*Quad. Urb.* [2004], 50 n.
24). [Verse-end after θαλάσσας (~ -σι κώπας) should not be controversial. Murray's perverse
divisions at οἶ-/στρος (~ ἔπλευ-/σαν) and ἄ-/ξενον (~ νά-/ιον) should not have been accepted by
Platnauer as a datum. Wilamowitz (*GV* 566) had incredibly analysed σύνοδοι . . . Ἀργόθεν
(~ δικρότοισι . . . κύματα) as four iambic metra.]

[4] For the readings in both places, see *CQ* (2001), 82–3 with n. 75. For the characteristic
paregmenon, cf. W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik*
(Hildesheim, 1967), 222–3.

| $ia \cup \ldots$).[5] So prima facie we need an emendation of ὁ πετόμενος to correspond with ἐπὶ πόντια.[6] Triclinius duly wrote ὁ ποτώμενος, which many editors (including Cropp) have accepted; but ὁ + *present* participle cannot be right.[7]

ἵν᾽ οἶστρος . . . the strait might have been identified as that famously gone through by the Argo (*Med.* 1–2, etc.).[8] But the myth of bovine Io's migration from Europe to Asia was scarcely less familiar,[9] as putatively echoed in the name 'Bosporos' (to which 394–7 alludes with a focus on the famous 'gadfly'). Then, rather than ὁ ποτώμενος, I propose ὅ ποτ᾽ ὅρμενος. ποτε is sheer gain,[10] and for this poetical aorist participle used of migratory winged flight, cf. Soph. *OT* 174ff. ἅπερ εὔπτερος ὄρνις . . . ὅρμενον | ἀκτὰν πρὸς Ἑσπέρου θεοῦ.[11] The responsion is then exact ($\cup - \cup \vdots \cup\cup \vdots - \cup\cup \vdots - \cup\cup$ with *all* the dactyls now self-contained.

Ἄξενον ἐπ᾽ ('over') οἶδμα διεπέρασ᾽ ('crossed').[12] If αὔραις is deleted in 410 (see below), no further emendation is needed in 395–7, other than Markland's certain ἄξενον for εὔξεινον and orthographic correction of διεπέρασεν to διεπέρασ᾽. Editors have hitherto always sought to add something after διεπέρασεν for correspondence with λινοπόροιο<ιν> (or -οις <σὺν> or -οισί<τ᾽>) αὔραις, but the proposed supplements are variously otiose.[13] As above (with διεπέρασ᾽), the metre is 2ia

---

[5] Such juxtaposition of iambic and dactylic metra is uncommon, but cf. especially the nearly contemporary sequence at *Ion* 212–13 (~ 230–2) τί γάρ; κεραυνὸν ἀμφίπυρον ⁝ ὄβριμον ἐν Διὸς ⁝ ἐκηβόλοισι χερσίν, with 2da ($- \cup\cup \vdots - \cup\cup$) similarly following $\cup - \cup \cup\cup$ and in turn followed by iambics; also (conversely) the verse 2da : ia at *Hipp.* 1108/1117. It is as though two dactyls can be treated as equivalent to an iambic metron and vice versa; but there is an apparent need for a word-division at the point of contact between the iambic and dactylic elements.

[6] Not vice versa: $\cup - \cup \vdots \cup\cup\cup\cup\cup \vdots - \cup - $ with ἐπὶ νότια (Bergk, England) does not make metrical sense. [Diggle obscurely looks for a trimeter (see n.13 below).]

[7] 'The one that *flies*'; moreover ποτᾶσθαι is typically 'to flit *habitually*' or 'to *and fro*' (see *LSJ*), both senses inappropriate to this single unidirectional flight.

[8] See further in n.12 below for the allusions in *Andromache*.

[9] Already in lyric at Aesch. *Supp.* 540 ff. (ἔνθεν Ἰὼ | οἴστρωι ἐρεθομένα . . .); cf. Griffith on *PV* 561–886 (in which play the Bosporus crossed is the Cimmerian).

[10] Primarily for the sense ('of old'), in line with Triclinius' addition of ποτε after διεπέρασεν (did he perhaps find something to the point in L's archetype?); but also as giving a word-division between $\cup - \cup \cup\cup$ (*ia*) and the following dactyls.

[11] Tragic lyric used both ὅρμενος and ὀρόμενος, the former naturally favourite (though not attested elsewhere in Euripides) for dactylic scansion, ὀρόμενος for the value $\cup\cup \cup - $ or $\cup \cup\cup \cup$ (as at *Phoen.* 1569 and *IA* 186, both, incidentally, corrupted).

[12] 'Over' (cf. ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα: *LSJ* ἐπί I.5), not 'to' (the destination being 'Asia', not the Black Sea). That the οἶστρος crossing the Bosporus 'from Europe to Asia' flew 'over the Black Sea' implies that that sea is thought of as beginning at the Bosporus. διεπέρασε is certainly 'crossed' here, not 'went through (the strait)'; for that sense cf. also *HF* 387 (*Philologus* 2004, 204–5). διὰ . . . ἐπέρασεν is similarly to be understood as 'crossed' (not 'passed through') at *Andr.* 863–4 (the object there being the associated κυάνεαι ἀκταί; and likewise at *Andr.* 795 ἐκπερᾶσαι ποντιᾶν Ξυμπληγάδων should be taken as 'passed beyond' (rather than 'through') the Clashing Rocks (thought of as a kind of frontier).

[13] διεπέρασεν <Ἰοῦς> (Erfurdt) is the most favoured supplement (Hermann, Monk, Badham, Köchly, England, Jerram), but the added name is at once superfluous and weakly appended (too far from what it loosely depends on). The gadfly's place in the myth was well enough known for allusive treatment in Euripides' sophisticated manner. διεπέρασε <πόντου> (Schoene, Kovacs) is no better. Conjectures changing διεπέρασεν to διεπόρευσε(ν), variously with <πόρτιν> (Bergk), <τὰν βοῦν> (Wecklein), <Ἰώ> (Diggle), after Kirchhoff), have even less merit. Diggle's other suggestion ἵν᾽ οἶστρος <Ἰοῦς> ὁ πετόμενος <ἀπ᾽> Ἀργόθεν (*Euripidea* 193, n. 30) is metrically clumsy (with long anceps before $\cup \vdots \cup \ \cup \ \cup\cup$ in the presumable trimeter), and offered with no corresponding suggestion for the antistrophe; and the present participle remains inappropriate.

(symmetrically beginning with another $- \cup \cup$ word),[14] closely followed by Ἀσιήτιδα γαῖαν Εὐρώπας διαμείψας as another enoplian verse $T \times d - .$[15] For T thus following *2ia* with synartesis (elision in str.), cf. *HF* 1036–7 ἐρείσμαθ' Ἡράκλειον ἀμφὶ δέμας τάδε λαΐνοις | ... (for the colometry there, see *CQ* [1988], 94–5).

398–406 The Chorus proceed to ask 'Who on earth can have come (from Sparta? or from Thebes?) to this horrid land with its human sacrifices?'[16]

> τίνες ποτ' ἄρα, τὸν εὔυδρον δονακόχλοον
> λιπόντες Εὐρώταν ἢ ῥεύματα σεμνὰ Δίρκας,   400–1
> ἔβασαν ἔβασαν ἄμεικτον αἶαν, ἔνθα κοῦραι
> Δίαι τέγγει
> βωμοὺς καὶ περικίονας   405
>   ναοὺς αἷμα βρότειον;

399 δονακόχλοον Elmsley : -χλο* L, -χλοα Tr¹   403 ἄμικτον L, corr. Murray   404–6 ἔνθα κούρα διατέγγει ... περὶ κίονας ναοῦ L, corr. Elmsley

In **398–401** (413–16) we have a lyric iambic trimeter with free response (uncertain in detail in both stanzas),[17] followed by $\cup e \times \underline{D}\ ba$ as another enoplian compound with symmetrical word-overlap (... $\vdots - \times - \vdots$ ...).[18]

In **399** Elmsley's δονακόχλοον removes both a questionable form and an unwelcome *brevis in longo*. δονακόχλοα with the scansion $\cup \cup\cup \cup \cap$ is indeed unlikely.[19] δονακόχλοα with the scansion $\cup\cup \cup \cup\cup$ would be acceptably analogous to

---

[14] For the pattern ... $- \cup \cup - \cup \cup | \times \cup\cup \cup - $ ... in this dactylic-to-iambic modulation, cf. *Med.* 136–7 (*Mnemosyne* [2003], 30–2) and Soph. *El.* 152–3 (~ 183–4) δέξεται εὐπατρίδαν, Διὸς εὔφρονι | βήματι μολόντα τάνδε γᾶν Ὀρέσταν.

[15] The traditional division as $\cup \cup - \cup \cup - \cup | - - - \cup \cup - -$ misrepresents the enoplian compound beginning with $\cup \cup - \cup \cup - \cup - $ (*T*). For the bonding pattern ... $\vdots - - - \vdots$ ... (symmetrically in both stanzas), see further in n. 18 below. The particular sequence $\cup \cup - \cup \cup - \cup \vdots - - - \vdots$ ... recurs at *IA* 178–9 ἐπὶ τὰν Ἑλέναν ἀπ' Εὐρώτα δονακοτρόφου (*T* × *dod*), also at *Ion* 458–9 (~ 478–9) μόλε Πύθιον οἶκον, Οὐλύμπου χρυσέων θαλάμων | ... (*T* × *D*), with the easy correction of Ὀλύμπου to Οὐλ- (cf. *HF* 872, etc.), perhaps also with addition of <'κ> before χρυσέων.

[16] Sparta and Thebes are not, of course, thought of as likely ship-launching places. They are chosen rather for their *positive* features, by contrast with the ἄμεικτος Taurian land (a contrast enhancing the Chorus' surprise); also as *wrong* guesses (for which, by a Chorus, cf. *Mnemosyne* [1998], 715–18 on *Hipp.* 145–50).

[17] Platnauer's recognition of $\cup - | \cup \cup \cup | \cup - | \cup - | \cup \cup \underline{\cup} | \cup \cup$ (sic) as an iambic trimeter is strangely equivocal as to the quantity of the third syllable of δονακόχλοα (or -χλοον). δονακŏ- is certain here (unlike δονακŏτρόφου at *IA* 179 in a different metrical context), whatever we make of the rest. The trimeter lacks a normal caesura in str. (on which as exceptional in lyric trimeters cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 475, n. 158); but the weak diaeresis after ποτ' ἄρα τὸν may be recognized here as sufficient, in line with the weak diaereses in 394 and 409 after ὅ ποτ' and ἐπὶ.

[18] Here too (cf. n. 15 above, and K. Itsumi, *BICS* 38 [1991–3], 260) the traditional division after $\cup - \cup - - - | $ ... is erroneous. *ia sp* is alien to the context (and in general rare in Euripides). For the enoplian pattern $\times - \cup \vdots - \times - \vdots$ ... (similarly with symmetrical diaereses), cf. *Andr.* 1009 (~ 1018) ὦ Φοῖβε, πυργώσας (κτλ.), 1027/1037, etc. For the particular sequence $\times e \times D\ ba$ (here with a contraction), cf. *Ion* 1049/1062 (following $D | $ ...), etc.

[19] Lyric trimeters can end with pauseless hiatus and/or *brevis in longo* (e.g. *Bacch.* 1161); but a lyric trimeter ending with $\cup \cup\cup \cup \cap$ would be unique, and metrical continuity is otherwise probable here, in line with the sense.

the nearly contemporary ἁπαλόχροα at *Hel.* 373;[20] but that would require εὐυδροῦντα (or some equivalent) in place of εὔυδρον.[21]

The stanza ends in **402–6** (~ 417–21) with two standard dicola (Archilochian, priapean),[22] flanking two spondees.[23] For the symmetrically long ancipites in 405–6/ 420–1 (in line with the spondees), cf. those in the similar stanza-ending *wil* + *ph* dicola at *Andr.* 800–1, *El.* 188–9/ 211–12, *Ion* 1242–3, *Bacch.* 574–5.[24]

407–21 The antistrophe (with some further cruces) is similarly bipartite: first a speculative question ('Can it be that they have *crossed the sea in an oared ship in pursuit of wealth*?'), then moralizing explanation of that conjecture.

407–12   ἦ ῥοθίοις εἰλατίνας δικρότοισι κώπας   [ἀντ.
          †ἔπλευσαν† ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα
          νάϊον ὄχημα, λινοπόροις [αὔραις]   410
          φιλόπλουτον ἅμιλλαν αὔξοντες μελάθροισιν;

407 ἦ Barnes: ἦ L   407 εἰλατίνας . . . κώπας Reiske: ἐλατίνοις (εἰλ- Tr¹) . . . κώπαις L

(1) Though ἔπλευσαν has the right scansion (~ ἵν᾽ οἶστρος), it is surely corrupt. One cannot πλεῖν a ship. To write ἔπλευσεν (Kvíčala), with ὄχημα as the subject, would be unconvincing even if it did not also require αὐξόντων for αὔξοντες in 412, with syntactical awkwardness. Of numerous conjectures keeping -αν, Diggle mentions only ἔλυσαν (Jackson), Murray only ἔκελσαν (Stadtmueller), Platnauer only ἔπεμψαν (Rauchenstein, Jerram, England, and now Cropp) and πόρευσαν (Dindorf). Prinz-Wecklein's appendix adds ἤπειξαν (Musgrave), ἔστειλαν (also Rauchenstein), ὅπλισσαν (Goram), ἔσπευσαν (Tucker). None of these verbs is really appropriate.[25] ὄχημα is properly 'carriage, car'; for the combination with νάϊον, cf. Soph. *Trach.* 656 πολύκωπον ὄχημα ναός. To govern it in this sentence, in conjunction with the 'oars' and 'waves' phrases, we need a verb typically used of 'driving, propelling' *cars*, so almost inevitably ἐλαύνειν, of which ἔλασσαν will be an appropriate epic form of the aorist (cf. *Il.* 4. 299, 18. 564).[26]

(2) As adumbrated above, deletion of αὔραις is then the sovereign remedy for the response-flaw in 395/410. We can then appreciate the excellence of λινοπόροις . . . μελάθροισιν ('in/with sail-faring abodes/dwellings') as a bold, phrase-framing locution for the 'domicile' of such hypothetical merchant-mariners, whereby/wherein

---

[20] Heteroclite -χλοα for -χλοον could well have occurred in poetry, *metri gratia*, before Nicander's ἔγχλοα (*Ther.* 676 and 885), by analogy with heteroclite -χροα etc. for -χροον etc. (familiar in poetry from Homer onwards).

[21] εὐυδρέω is not attested before Strabo; but there is something to be said for the rhythmic pattern – ∪ – ∪ ⋮ ∪∪ ∪ ∪∪ ⋮ . . . before λιπόντες Εὐρώταν . . .

[22] For the Archilochian (∪ *D* ∪ ⋮ *ith*), cf. *Med.* 645–6/655–6, 990–1/996–7, etc. For the asymmetrical division of the priapean here, cf. *Ion* 188–9/199–200, also the similar asymmetry before the final *ph* at 438/455 below.

[23] For this linking colarion (– – ⋮ – –), here perhaps associable with the paired dactyls in 394/409, cf. Soph. *Phil.* 711/722, 716/727 (*CQ* [2003], 88).

[24] The cadence – – – ∪ ∪ – – is variously at home in enoplian contexts as *D* – and also in ionic context as a form of *2io*.

[25] Of those most favoured, ἔλυσαν refers only to launching, ἔκελσαν denotes 'brought to shore', ἔπεμψαν and πόρευσαν need a personal object.

[26] ἐλαύνειν ναῦν as *Od.* 12.109 (νῆα . . . ἐλάαν), etc. For the augmentless form, and also for the corruption to a different verb, cf. the probable ἔλασας (codd. ἔβαλες) at *Or.* 169. ἐπέλασαν might seem tempting as closer to the letters; but ἐπέλασε(ν) at *Hel.* 671, 682, with personal object and dative of destination, is certainly from πελάζω, not ἐπελαύνω (*CQ* [1989], 64).

they energetically pursue their desire for wealth (φιλόπλουτον ἄμιλλαν αὔξοντες).[27]
αὔραις is in itself a plausible word with λινοπόροις, completing a phrase construable
with ἔπλευσαν, and offering thus an irresistible temptation to the interpolator.[28] But
we scarcely want both 'with oars' and 'with breezes' with the same verb. Moreover
μελάθροισιν ('for their houses') is weak as an unsupported appended dative.

413–21 φίλα γὰρ ἐλπὶς †γένετ᾽ ἐπὶ πήμασι βροτῶν†
ἄπληστος ἀνθρώποις, ὄλβου βάρος οἳ φέρονται   415
πλάνητες ἐπ᾽ οἶδμα πόλεις τε βαρβάρους περῶντες·
κοινᾶι δόξαι,
γνώμα δ᾽ οἷς μὲν ἄκαιρος ὄλ-   420
βου, τοῖς δ᾽ ἐς μέσον ἥκει·

413–14 γ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἐπὶ Willink (γ᾽ ἐπί τε Murray) πήμασιν P   βροτῶν] fort. ῥοπῶν (vel potius
ῥοπᾶν)   417 τε Tr¹: om. L   419 κοινᾶι Bergk: -ναὶ L

Such merchant-mariners (if that is what these Greeks are) are habitually optimistic
and insatiably venturesome, like the ποντοναῦται in Soph. *Scyrioi* fr. 555 who λεπταῖς
ἐπὶ ῥοπῆσιν ἐμπολὰς μακρὰς | ἀεὶ παραρρίπτοντες . . . | ἢ ἔσωσαν ἀκέρδαναν ἢ
διώλεσαν (alternatives similar to those in 420–1, but in reverse order).

In **413–14** (thus obelized by both Diggle and Kovacs) the metre limps at γένετ᾽ ἐπὶ
(where we need ⏑⏑ ⏑ for the trimeter);[29] and βροτῶν is plainly incompatible (though
accepted by Murray) with the following ἀνθρώποις.[30] I now incline to think that it
should suffice, with γ᾽ ἔτ᾽ for γένετ᾽,[31] to emend βροτῶν to a more appropriate
genitive plural, to be construed either with ἐπὶ πήμασι(ν) (in effect 'despite πήματα')
or with ἄπληστος (like κακῶν at *Hel.* 1102, etc.), or with both (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ). πόνων or
μόγων ('toils') or πόρων ('journeys, voyages') would make sense,[32] and -ι βροτῶν
might perhaps have been generated by –ι(μ) πόρων.[33] But a likelier corruption is of

_____

[27] ἄμιλλα is a favourite word in contexts of 'striving', not necessarily denoting 'competition';
cf. *Hel.* 356 (of suicidal sword-thrusting). It should not be objected that μέλαθρον is not attested
elsewhere as referring to a ship (or ships). The word is flexible in connotation, typically
'domicilium' (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.*), but with a sense variously defined by context and/or
associated epithet; cf. *Hec.* 1101 (of the 'vault' of heaven, as defined by οὐράνιον) and *Hel.* 177
(of the underworld, as defined by νύχια). Caravans could properly be described as 'μέλαθρα on
wheels', cf. the στέγαι in which the Scythians πεδάρσιοι ναίουσ᾽ ἐπ᾽ εὐκύκλοις ὀχοῖς (*PV*
709–10). The root sense 'wooden beams' (cf. τέραμνα) is also consistent with the use here, as
defined by λινοπόροις.

[28] The more tempting with wrong punctuation giving a sense-pause at this point; and cf.
αὔραις recurring at 433 below. For the unconvincing supplements proposed for correspondence
in the strophe, see n. 13 above.

[29] Free response is unexceptionable in this lyric trimeter (~ 398–9), and there is no benefit in
the transposition ἐγένετ᾽ ἐλπὶς (Monk, Wakefield), necessarily then with arbitrary changes of
†ἐπὶ πήμασι(ν) βροτῶν† to scan ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ – .

[30] Prinz–Wecklein list eleven conjectures in their appendix of 'minus probabiles'. Most (as
Bergk, Hartung and others) arbitrarily delete rather than emend βροτῶν (too cavalierly
dismissed by England as 'evidently put in to fill up').

[31] In a previous conjecture (reported by Kovacs) I suggested φιλεῖ γὰρ ἐλπὶς γ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἐπὶ
πήμασιν βρύειν 'hope *is still wont to wax* insatiable . . .'). For the appropriately underlining γε as
also in Murray's conjecture) cf. *Il.* 10.59 τοῖσιν γὰρ ἐπετράπομέν γε μάλιστα, Soph. *Trach.* 945,
OC 78 etc. (Denniston, *GP* 116).

[32] μόγους (Headlam) should be preferred to πόνους (Murray) at *Andr.* 305, as argued in
Philologus (2005), 190. For πόροι 'voyages' (*LSJ* πόρος III), cf. 116, 1388, etc.; in fr. 926 πόρους
(Valck.) is a plausible emendation of τόπους.

[33] μ and β are confusible letters (cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 307), as also are τ and π.

-ι(μ) ῥοπῶν ('hazards').[34] The uncertainties, however, are such that the obeli must remain here.

422–55 In the second stanza-pair, the Chorus first speculate about the route taken across the Black Sea. Then in the antistrophe they wish that the arrivals might include the hated Helen, to be justly slain; but they would be happiest if a ship has come to repatriate them.

422–38   πῶς τὰς Συνδρομάδας πέτρας,   [στρ.
                 πῶς Φινηΐδας αὖ πολύ-
                    πνους ἀκτὰς ἐπέρασαν ;
                 <ἦ> παρ' ἅλιον αἰγιαλὸν ἐπ' Ἀμφιτρί-   425
                    τας ῥοθίωι δραμόντες,
                 ὅπου πεντήκοντα κορᾶν
                    †Νηρηΐδων < – ∪ > † χοροὶ
                    μέλπουσιν ἐγκυκλίοις ;
                 <ἦ> πλησιστίοισι πνοαῖς,   430
                    συριζόντων κατὰ πρύμ-
                    ναν †εὐναίων† πηδαλίων,
                 αὔραισιν νοτίαις
                    ἢ πνεύμασι Ζεφύρου,
                 τὰν πολυόρνιθον ἐπ' αἶ-   435
                    αν, Λευκὰν ἀκτάν, Ἀχιλῆ-
                 ος δρόμους καλλισταδίους,
                    Ἄξεινον κατὰ πόντον ;

423–4 Φινεΐδας Tr[1]   αὖ πολύπνους Willink: ἄϋπνους L; λιγύπνους Wilamowitz   425 <ἦ> Willink   παράλιον L, corr. Seidler   426 ῥόθιον Wecklein   428 Νηρηΐδων Musurus   430 <ἦ> Bergk (<καὶ>Tr)   433 αὔραισιν Heath: αὔραις L   435–6 πολιόρνιθον et ἀχιλλῆος L, corr. Musurus   ἐπ' αἶαν suspectum, fort. ἐπᾶιξαν

422–4 The first verse (~ 438) is an instance of the frequent responsion of *gl* with *wil*.[35] Thereafter sound metre is restored, with *ph* completing a tricolon in harmony with the syntax,[36] by the corrections proposed in 423 (and 425 <ἦ>) and 440–1 (see below).[37]

425ff. The question 'how did they pass the windy Salmydessan coast?' is naturally followed by contemplation of alternatives. 'Was it by hugging the shore? Or did they sail due North across the open sea to the mouth of the Danube?' We certainly need

---

[34] ῥοπαί are properly 'turns of the scale', typically but not necessarily downwards, so variously 'swings of fortune' (as in the Sophoclean λεπταὶ ῥοπαί upon which the hazarded μακραὶ ἐμπολαί depend) and 'hazardous moments' (cf. Soph. *Trach.* 82 ἐν οὖν ῥοπῆι τοιᾶιδε κειμένωι, explained by Σ as ἐν κινδύνωι καὶ ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς ἱσταμένωι); cf. also metaphorical uses of the cognate ῥέπειν and compounds. The genitive plural should probably be ῥοπᾶν in a lyric trimeter, but -ων and -αν are likely enough to have been ancient variants.

[35] Frequent from *Electra* onwards (also Soph. *Phil.* 1082/1102, 1124/1147, 1128/1151; *CQ* [2001], 66, n. 8); cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 195 (rightly, in n. 36, contesting Musgrave's transposition πῶς πέτρας τὰς Συνδρομάδας).

[36] . . . τύχοι τὰν ‖ Τρωιάδα . . . is plainly unacceptable with the prepositive article at period-end. But redivision as τύχοι | τὰν ~ ἑπέρα-/σαν (Diggle, Cropp) is still unsatisfactory, with the overlap where we expect period-end.

[37] πῶς Φινῆιδας αὐ-/πνους ἀκτὰς ἐπέρασαν is possible in itself (as *dod" ∫ ph*), and consistent with a different reading in ant. But <αὖ> and πολύπνους (accepted by Kovacs) are otherwise an improvement.

Bergk's <ἤ> in 430 introducing the latter alternative. But a metrically remedial <ἤ> (sic) will have dropped out as easily in 425 (another H before Π).[38]

425–6 The sequence – ∪ ∪∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪∪ : ∪ – ∪ – – : ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – ‖ is an iambo-choriambic pentameter combining a symmetrically resolved lekythion (ₓ2ia) with the common colon *ia ch ba* (with symmetrical division after ∪ – ∪ – – ; cf. *Med.* 431/ 439, etc.). To obtain this, we need the proposed <ἤ> in 425.[39]

427–9 Cropp accepts West's <ἀβρὰ>, with Heath's ἐγκύκλιοι; but *'pretty, delicate μολπή'* does not suit this context of perilous inshore surf. Parmentier's <ποσσί> has the merit of keeping ἐγκυκλίοις, and 'feet' is in line with *Tro.* 2–3; but the form lacks attestation in tragedy. Better, I suggest, would be Νηρέως (as *Hel.* 1585, *Cyc.* 264; disyllabic as at 217, *IA* 1056, etc.) δίναισι . . . ἐγκυκλίοις ('in/with circling whirls').[40] 'Circling' is a constant feature of this Nereid *topos*, sometimes doubly expressed, as at *IA* 1055 εἰλισσόμεναι κύκλια. At the same time δῖναι are also the milieu of the Nereids' dance (cf. *Hipp.* 150 δίναις ἐν νοτίαις ἅλμας). Cf. also *Ion* 1080–4 χορεύει δὲ σελάνα, | καὶ πεντήκοντα κόραι | †Νηρέος αἱ κατὰ πόντον | ἀενάων τε ποταμῶν† | δίνας χορευόμεναι . . . (thus obelized by Diggle, but with ἀεναῶν), where Kovacs reports my proposals Νηρέος ἑλικτὰ πόντον | ἀείνων (Fix) τ' ἀμ ποταμῶν | δίνας . . . (with Hartung's Διὸς οὐκ for ὁ Διὸς ἐκ in 1099).

430–2 Dovetailing rather than period-end is likely at 431–2 (~ 448–9), giving ₓwil ∫ wil (as *Cyc.* 44–5/58–9; *Hipp.* 145–6/155–6, etc.) rather than *hag¨* ‖ ₓwil. If so, we must scan πρύμνᾶν (as from πρύμνη),[41] rather than the normal Attic πρύμνᾰν unless of course (which no one has suggested) εὐναίων conceals a word beginning with a consonant. εὐναίων can indeed scarcely be sound.[42] There have been many conjectures, but none at once linguistically acceptable and accounting for the letters.[43] With due diffidence I suggest that Euripides may have scanned εὐανίων (from εὐήνιος)[44] as a trisyllable

---

[38] ἤ . . . ; ἤ . . . ; cf. *Hec.* 449 ff., *Hel.* 1465 ff., S. *O.T.* 993, etc. (*Mnemosyne* 2005, 501 n. 7), also my correction of ἤ . . . ; to ἤ . . . ; at *Hcld.* 81 (*CQ* 1991, 526 n. 5).

[39] <ἤ> rather than Diggle's overlapped -σαν (n. 36 above). Without the extra initial syllable, παρ' ἄλιον αἰγιαλὸν (~ Τρωιάδα λιποῦσα πόλιν) constitutes an unacceptable tripody, unless (with Platnauer) we analyse 425–6/442–3 as a catalectic trimeter followed by a reizianum (∪ ∪ – ∪ – –). Against that, however, catalectic trimeters need either penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura (*CQ* [1989], 53, n. 38); and the catalexis without pause is also unwelcome.

[40] My previous suggestion Νηρέως <ὠιδαῖσι> has been accepted by Kovacs; but δῖναι are more to the point than ὠιδαί here. πεντήκοντα κορᾶν νηρέως δίναις χοροί will credibly have been reduced to the transmitted π- κ- νηρηίδων χοροί, influenced by πεντήκοντα Νηρήιδων χορόν in 274. As Cropp observes, μέλπειν without external or internal accusative is unusual in Euripides, but the absolute use (with an adverbial phrase) is paralleled at Aesch. *Ag.* 244.

[41] With -νᾶν overlapping, we have 'overlap in anaclasis' which is 'clearly avoided' (J. A. J. M. Buijs, *Mnemosyne* 37 [1985], 89). πρύμνη is epic (and acceptable as such), but also occurs doubtfully in tragedy at Soph. *Phil.* 482 (Elmsley).

[42] Defensive commentators have wavered between something like 'couched' (in effect 'permanently mounted', unlike the other oars) and some association with εὐνή II (εὐναί pl., as stones used as anchors), whence *LSJ* derive the far-fetched interpretation 'steadying, guiding a ship' (such εὐναί were thrown out from the prow, not κατὰ πρύμναν, and there is no question of anchoring in this context).

[43] εὐπειθέων (*olim* εὐθείαι) Rauchenstein, εὐαγῶν Weil, εὐπαγῶν or εὐπάκτων Herwerden, εὐηρέων or εὔδιον Bergk, εὐθύνων Wecklein. I do not understand the conjectures (as reported by Prinz–Wecklein) of Bothe (εὐναίαν vel potius εὐνάων (εὐνάων)) and Hartung (εὖ ναίων).

[44] Cf. εὐήνιος Emped. 4.5., φιλήνιος PV 475, χρυσήνιος -άνιος Homer and Pindar, δυσήνιος Menander, etc.

(– – –).[45] The epithet thus metaphorically compares the steering oars to 'reins', in line with the treatment of the ship as an ὄχημα ('car'); in line also with the participle συριζόντων, apt to a racing-chariot, cf. *IA* 230 σύριγγας ἁρματείους (*LSJ* σύριγξ II.2), as well as to 'swishing' πηδάλια.

433–4 (~ 450–1) A dicolon, *dod˘ ꞉ tl˘* (*dod˘ × dod˘*), like *Ion* 1050–1/1064–5. South or south-west winds are the sail-filling ones for the imagined northward (as opposed to coast-hugging) course, and the nouns in 433–4 are thus straightforwardly appositive to πλησιστίοισι πνοαῖς. For this apposition (against Platnauer) there is nothing wrong with 'another pure dative', with Kirchhoff's routine correction αὔραισιν, and no need for a preposition (αὔραις <σὺν> Wecklein, <ὑπ'> αὔραις Wilamowitz).

435–8 (~ 452–5) A dovetailed tetracolon: *2ch ∫ wil ∫ wil + ph ‖‖* .[46] The pile-up of appositions is awkward here, with 'land of many birds' first appositively defined as '(the) white shore', and then as 'Achilles' running-track'. The syntax would also be improved by a finite verb governing not only the 'destination' phrases but also the terminal phrase 'across the Inhospitable Sea'. Too much has passed since ἐπέρασαν in 424 (at which point we were concerned merely with passing the Salmydessan coast), and we need something like '<or> . . . *did they head directly* across . . . to . . . ?' We can at once provide a suitable verb and eliminate one of the appositions by changing ἐπ' αἶαν to ἐπᾶι<ξ>αν (from ἐπαίσσω);[47] though we may then need ἐπῆιξαν as a further correction.[48]

439–55

εἴθ' εὐχαῖσι δεσποσύνοις   [ἀντ.
Λήδας <τάνδ'> Ἑλένα φίλα   440
παῖς ἐλθοῦσα τύχοι γᾶν,
Τρωιάδα λιποῦσα πόλιν, ἵν' ἀμφὶ χαί-
ταν δρόσον αἱματηρὰν
ἑλιχθεῖσα λαιμοτόμωι
δεσποίνας χειρὶ θάνηι   445
ποινὰς δοῦσ' ἀντιπάλους·
ἡδίσταν δ' ἂν ἀγγελίαν
δεξαίμεθ', Ἑλλάδος ἐκ
γᾶς πλωτήρων εἴ τις ἔβα
δουλείας ἐμέθεν   450
δειλαίας παυσίπονος·
< – > γὰρ ὀνείροισι †συμβαί-
ην† δόμοις πόλει τε πατρώι-
αι τερπνῶν ὕμνων ἀπολαύ-
ειν, κοινὰν χάριν ὄλβου.   455

---

[45] The admissibility of 'consonantal ι' in tragedy, other than δια (including καρδία / κάρζα) in Aeschylean lyric, has been contested by Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 288. But 'consonantal ι' is akin to 'consonantal υ' (West, *GM* 14); and trisyllabic εὐανίων here will be similar in principle to the rare trisyllabic ἐρινύων, which occurs in tragedy only at 931, 970, 1456 in this play.

[46] *2ch ∫* . . . , cf. *HF* 637 (there followed by the usual *ch ba*). For the asymmetrical division (again) before the terminal *ph*, cf. n. 22 above.

[47] For ἀίσσειν of fast navigation (ships are commonly analogous to birds, with oars as wings), cf. Soph. *OC* 717 παραισσομένα (Meineke, Campbell for παραπτομένα; advocated in *CQ* [2003], 103–4).

[48] Doric ἀίξαν is attested at Bacchyl. 13. 111. According to the canon for tragedy enunciated by West (*Aesch. Trag.* xxvi), verbs beginning ἀ- αἰ- augment to ἠ- ἠι- except those with monosyllabic stems.

439 δεσποσύνοις Markland: -ας L   440–1 <τάνδ᾽> et γᾶν Willink: τὰν L   442 χαίταν
Musurus: -τα L   444 ἑλιχθεῖσα Tr²: εἰλ- L   445 χειρὶ Monk: χερὶ L   θάνοι Seidler   447
ἡδίσταν δ᾽ ἂν Musgrave (-την), Seidler (ἀδίσταν Dindorf): ἤδιστ᾽ ἂν τήνδ᾽ L   448 δεξαίμεσθ᾽
Tr²   452 ὀνείροισι Fritzsche: -ασι L   453 -η <᾽ν> δόμοις Markland   454–5 ἀπολαύειν Tr (in
ras.): ἀπόλαυσιν <L>P   ὄλβου Dupuy: ὄλβα L, -ω Tr²

439–41 It is hard to see why Heath's εὐχαῖσι<ν> is the unquestioned vulgate in 439.
Responsion does *not* require this added ν. For the responsion of − − − ∪ ∪ − ∪ − with
− − − ∪ − ∪ ∪ − (with three shorts and five longs in both places), cf. *Ion* 209/223a and
(as Diggle) *Hel.* 1302/1320.

In 440–1 we must have period-end after the opening tricolon (as in str.). γᾶν for τὰν
is easy, with which <τάνδ᾽> before ῾Ελένα (or perhaps Λήδας <τάνδε> [῾Ελένα]
φίλα) completes the remedy.[49]

442–6 ἀμφὶ χαίταν . . . ἑλιχθεῖσα . . . θάνηι, see Diggle, *Studies* 80–1. Seidler's
θάνοι (accepted by Kovacs) could be right; but primary sequence is not merely
admissible (as Diggle shows), but persuasively advocated by England: 'that she *may*
die' rather than 'might die'; cf. ἔβα (not βαίη) in 449.

447–51 ἡδίσταν (or ἀδίσταν) δ᾽ ἂν . . . is the likeliest correction, if 430/447 is *wil*
rather than ˏwil; though τὰν δ᾽ ἥδιστ᾽ ἂν . . . is another (more recherché) possibility.
Then in 448 Triclinius' δεξαίμεσθ᾽ gives more exact responsion; but for unequal
anceps before the choriamb cf. 427/444, 429/446, 434/451, 435/453, *HF.* 645/663, etc.
For the breach of synapheia (with pause) at παυσίπονος (if 452 begins with a vowel,
as suggested below), cf. *Cyc.* 51, 64, 72, *Alc.* 1001, *El.* 150, *HF* 350, 689, 793, *Hel.*
?1477, 1480.

452–5 The Chorus have made play with the blissful notion that some ship may have
arrived from Greece to liberate them from exile and slavery (447–51). Later we shall
learn that their city's walls and presumably their home have been destroyed (1108ff.);
but that will not prevent them in that later ode from wishing to fly home like
migrating birds and to join once more in the χοροί which they enjoyed as girls
(1138–52). So when they sing here of 'home' and 'dreams' and 'happiness', they must
surely be saying (or at least implying) that they *have* nostalgic dreams, not that they
wish to have such dreams. If the stasimon ends with a wish, following 447–51, it must
be a wish for *realization* of the dreams (by repatriation), not (weakly) for a contin-
uation of them.

Of many conjectures for this corrupt sentence, most fail the test on that ground
(including those accepting Hermann's ὕπνων for ὕμνων). Of those consistent with the
desire for actual dream-fulfilment, the best is Weil's <τὰν> γὰρ ὀνείροις ἀποβαίη . . .
or alternatively <τὰν> γὰρ ὀνείροισί μοι εἴη . . . ,[50] followed by ᾽ν δόμοις . . .
ἀπολαύειν, and then κοινὰν χάριν ὄλβου as a further appositional phrase.

But the phrasing seems clumsy (the more so in versions attempting to keep
ἀπόλαυσιν), and the corrupt συμβαίην (or -η ᾽ν) is not very convincingly accounted
for. I suspect that the universal search for a different optative verb has been
misdirected, and tentatively suggest restoration as an explanatory *statement*, rather
than a wish:

---

[49] For the shorter alternative (deleting ῾Ελένα) cf. n. 37 above. 'Obvious' proper names are
often interpolated (Diggle, *Euripidea* 459, n. 79).

[50] The latter after Hartung (who proposed καὶ γὰρ ὀνείροισί μοι εἴη . . .). Not συνείην
δόμοις (after Fritzsche, Kirchhoff): we cannot well put τὰν γὰρ ὀνείροισι before that; and, apart
from the awkward double apposition (συνείην . . . ἀπόλαυσιν . . . χάριν), συνεῖναι δόμοις is
abnormal language (unlike σ- φίλοις).

<ἦ> γὰρ ὀνείροισί μοι ἡ-
βᾶι 'ν δόμοις πόλει τε πατρώι-
αι τερπνῶν ὕμνων ἀπολαύ-
ειν, κοινὰν χάριν ὄλβου.   455

'For truly *it is still fresh for me* in dreams to enjoy . . . '; a construction like Aesch. *Ag.* 584 ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡβᾶι τοῖς γέρουσιν εὐμαθεῖν. With the infinitive thus as the subject of ἡβᾶι, there is no 'double apposition'; only the single point that such ἀπόλαυσις and memory of home kept fresh in/by dreams is a χάρις ὄλβου available to everyone (κοινή).[51] <ἦ> (again) is shorter than all the other proposed supplements before γὰρ, and for ἦ γὰρ . . . thus beginning the last sentence of an ode, cf. *Alc.* 474. ὀνείροισι needs no preposition, since 'dreams' are also the medium *by which* the memory of 'songs at home' has remained fresh. For the prodelision 'ν δόμοις following ἡβᾶι, cf. *Supp.* 69 ταλαίναι 'ν χερὶ θεῖναι.[52] The idiom with ἡβᾶι is uncommon enough for the letters σιμοιηβαιν to have puzzled the tradition (the more so with the corruptible correption)[53] in such a way as to generate συμβαίην as a makeshift.

Highgate, London   C. W. WILLINK

Addendum

IT 123ff. and 392ff. are discussed by M. E. Wright, *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies* (Oxford, 2005), 170–4. There is more to be said, and a further note on 123–36 will follow in due course.

---

[51] On this type of non-integral appositive accusative, see Barrett on *Hipp.* 752–7.
[52] *CQ* (1992), 42. For this prodelision after -αι, see Diggle, *Studies* 33.
[53] On 'the habitual failure of scribes to recognize correption', see Diggle, *Studies* 3.