

There can be little doubt that, if *εὔροϊαν* (or *εὐροϊαν*)<sup>18</sup> had been the transmitted reading, it would have been accepted without question and explained as above. The emendation is sense-enriching as well as geographically remedial; and there are also two grammatical benefits. (i) We no longer have the ‘unique’ attachment of a descriptive genitive to a proper noun. (ii) All the objects of *ἐξαλλάξασα*, no longer clumsily constructed, are now associated with ‘of well-horsed Greece . . .’;<sup>19</sup> first the (urban) *πύργοι* and *τείχη*, then the (more rural) *εὔροια* of well-treed *χόρτοι*.<sup>20</sup> And the terminal phrase *πατρῴων οἴκων ἔδρας* (*ἔδρας* now genitive singular) is naturally understood as in apposition to the emphatic initiating phrase ‘*Ελλάδος ἐνίππου* . . .’.<sup>21</sup>

The Greek origin of the chorus-ladies is thus properly enunciated in their self-introduction.

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK

cwillink@blueyonder.co.uk  
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000675

<sup>18</sup> Euripides could perhaps have favoured the paroxytone form with long *a* as more ‘exquisite’; but evidence for a decision is lacking.

<sup>19</sup> For this use of *εὐίππος* (praising the land as a whole) cf. S. *O.C.* 668–9 *ἐνίππου*, *ξένε*, *τᾶσδε χῶ-ρας ἵκου* τὰ κράτιστα γᾶς ἔπαυλα.

<sup>20</sup> These *εὐδενδροὶ χόρτοι* are antithetical to the Taurian *δύσχορτοι οἴκοι* lamented by Iphigenia in 218–19, where I see no need for Köchly’s emendation of *δυ-* to *συ-* (accepted by Kovacs, as advocated in his *Euripidea Tertia*, *Mnemosyne* suppl. 240 [2003], 6); cf. n. 17 above.

<sup>21</sup> As things stand, *ἔδρας* has to be taken, much less well, as accusative plural, in apposition either to ‘Europe’ or to the whole of ‘*Ελλάδος* . . . *Εὐρώπην*’ (as to which editors who accept *Εὐρώταν* offer no guidance).

## EURIPIDES, *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS* 1391–7

Orestes makes his escape by sea from the Taurian land:

ναῦς δ’, ἔως μὲν ἐντὸς ἦν  
λιμένος, ἐχώρει στόμια, διαπερώσα δὲ  
λάβρωι κλύδωνι συμπεσοῦσ’ ἠπείγετο·  
δεινὸς γὰρ ἐλθὼν ἄνεμος ἐξαίφνης νεὼς  
ᾧθει ἠπάλιν πρυμνήσι· οἱ δ’ ἐκαρτέρουν  
πρὸς κύμα λακτίζοντες· ἐς δὲ γῆν πάλιν  
κλύδων παλίσρους ἦγε ναῦν.

1395

1392 *ἐχώρει*, *στόμια* etc. some edd. *ἐχώρει*, *διαπερώσα δὲ στόμια* Murray 1395 *ᾧθει* Kirchhoff *παλιμπρυμνηδόν* Hermann (with 1346 placed before 1395), Paley (with 1394 *σκάφος* for *νεὼς*) *παλίμπρυν*· *ἴστι*· Mekler

So, most recently, the text and apparatus of Cropp, the first editor to obelize 1395 *πάλιν πρυμνήσι*.<sup>1</sup>

According to the Taurian messenger, whose language is rich in the technical vocabulary of seafaring, the Greek ship rests with the stern on shore, prepared for a

<sup>1</sup> M. J. Cropp, *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris* (Warminster, 2000), 162. I would like to thank the anonymous referee for *CQ* and James Diggle for their helpful comments.

quick escape. Orestes and Pylades stand on the stern (1348–9 *τοὺς νεανίας . . . πρύμνηθεν ἐστῶτας νεώς*), as do archers (1377–8 *τοξόται πρύμνης ἐπὶ / σταθέντες*), who are shooting at the Taurians on the beach. When the anchor is raised at the bow, it is necessary to steady the ship's prow with poles (1350–1 *κοντοῖς δὲ πρῶραν εἶχον, οἱ δ' ἐπωτιδῶν / ἄγκυραν ἔξανήπτον*) because the ship is facing rough seas (1379–80 *δεινὸς γὰρ κλύδων ὠκέιλε ναῦν / πρὸς γῆν*<sup>2</sup>) even though it is still within the harbour (1391–2 *ἐντὸς ἦν / λιμένος*). Following bloody hand-to-hand fighting between the Greeks and the Taurians (1364–76), Orestes brings Iphigenia and the cult image of Artemis on board by means of a ladder lowered from the stern (1351–3, 1380–5).<sup>3</sup> The ship then leaves the Taurian harbour under oar (1391 *ἔπαισαν ἄλμην*, and see 1346–7, 1387, and 1405), not unusual when ‘the harbour was sheltered or its mouth difficult to pass under sail’.<sup>4</sup>

Lines 1391–3 contrast two types of movement: within the harbour the ship *ἐχώρει*, but once it hits open seas *ἡπείγετο*. Taking *στόμια* as a terminal accusative with *ἐχώρει*—‘went <straight for> the harbour mouth’ (Platnauer), ‘proceeded to its mouth’ (Kovacs), ‘made way as far as the mouth’ (Cropp)<sup>5</sup>—is somewhat flat, leaving the *ἔως* clause with little force. Further, ‘στόμιον is not elsewhere used of the mouth of a harbour’<sup>6</sup> in the way that *στόμα* regularly is; conceivably the diminutive further characterizes the harbour as having a narrow mouth. No easy improvement presents itself.<sup>7</sup> If *στόμια* is taken with *διαπερώσα* (placing a comma before *στόμια* instead of after it), then we are left with a postponed *δέ*, which is ‘awkward’.<sup>8</sup> Murray’s elegant remedy, *ἐχώρει, διαπερώσα δὲ στόμα*,<sup>9</sup> provides the sense required, but, while tempting, it is not easy to explain the corruption. Once it leaves the harbour, the ship is overpowered (*ἡπείγετο*, used absolutely), dashed by a huge wave.<sup>10</sup> The rowers are persistent, defiantly ‘kicking against the wave’ (1396 *πρὸς*

<sup>2</sup> The phrase *πρὸς γῆν* is perhaps redundant after *ὀκέλλω*, but it might also suggest that the ship is being pushed sidelong into the beach, further emphasizing the violence of the wave.

<sup>3</sup> For discussion of the text at 1348–53, see J. Diggle, *Studies in the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981), 92–3. G. Murray, *The Iphigenia in Tauris of Euripides* (London, 1910), 104, believes these are rope ladders, but this inference is not necessary.

<sup>4</sup> J. S. Morrison, ‘Euripides, *I.T.* 1390ff. and Pindar, *Pythians* iv. 202’, *CR* 64 (1950), 3–5, at 4, comparing *Odyssey* 9.180, 564, and 13.78.

<sup>5</sup> M. Platnauer, *Euripides, Iphigenia in Tauris* (Oxford, 1938), 173; D. Kovacs, *Euripides IV* (Cambridge, MA, 1999), 303; Cropp (n. 1), 163. Cropp 258 adduces *Ion* 174–6 and 1572 in support.

<sup>6</sup> Platnauer (n. 5), 173.

<sup>7</sup> Morrison (n. 4), 4, suggests, ‘The translation “was keeping the bit in its mouth” involves much commoner usages of both words; and the metaphorical use of equestrian words in connection with ships is quite regular (e.g. *χαλινός* for anchor, which occurs at line 1043 of the *I.T.* and in the naval lists). The expression would mean “moved steadily with a reserve of power” . . . .’ This might be plausible in other contexts, but no audience member would make that association for *στόμια* two words after *λιμένος*: the word must refer to the harbour mouth, despite the fact that it does mean ‘bit’ at 935.

<sup>8</sup> Cropp (n. 1), 258. The closest parallels in Euripides are either lyric or of dubious authorship: *Alc.* 469 *ὅν ἔτεκον δ’* (lyric), *IA* 1006 *ψευδὴ λέγων δέ* (*vix Euripidei*, says Diggle), and *Supp.* 783 *καλὸν θέαμα δ’* (lyric, but part of a *μὲν . . . δέ* construction). J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (1950), 187–89, provides other examples of postponed *δέ*.

<sup>9</sup> G. Murray, *Euripidis Fabulae*<sup>3</sup>, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1913), n.p.

<sup>10</sup> Platnauer (n. 5), 173, adduces *Od.* 23.234–5 as an exact parallel: *Ποσειδάων ἐνεργέα νῆ’ ἐνὶ πόντῳ / ῥαίσῃ ἐπειγομένην ἀνέμῳ καὶ κύματι πηγῶ* ([‘as when] Poseidon wrecks a well-worked ship on the open sea, overpowering it with wind and with a big wave’).

κῦμα λακτίζοντες) as though it were a goad,<sup>11</sup> until the surf beats the ship back to land (1396–7).<sup>12</sup>

Within this context belongs the explanatory clause 1394–5. Murray, Diggle and Kovacs accept Kirchhoff's emendation of the verb from an unaugmented imperfect to a historic present,<sup>13</sup> though the larger context contains many imperfects and the change is not needed except to vivify the moment. Still, since the only certain examples of 'epic' omission of syllabic augment in Euripides are in *Bacchae* (767, 1066, 1084, 1134),<sup>14</sup> this is a reasonable improvement. The real problem lies with what the wind pushes.

A number of suggestions have been offered: the reading of L offers πρυμνήσι, 'stern-cables' normally, but perhaps merely 'things to do with the stern' and so 'the high terminal ornament of the stern'.<sup>15</sup> Though Sansone accepts this reading, Platnauer calls it 'nonsense' and Cropp says it 'hardly makes sense here'.<sup>16</sup> Mekler's proposal, παλίμπρυμν' ἴστι ('pushed the sail sternwards', using a word found in Hesychius' lexicon), is adopted by Murray, Diggle and Kovacs, perhaps believing with Platnauer that sails are used in synecdoche for the whole ship; Cropp calls it 'almost nonsense', and Morrison argues the literal reading 'is impossible. Sail was not raised except with a steady off-shore breeze'.<sup>17</sup> Hermann's παλιμπρυμνηδόν ('stern-foremost', also from Hesychius) leaves ὠθεῖ without an object, which has been supplied either by transposing 1346 or, with Paley, by changing νεὼς to σκάφος (a corruption which is difficult to explain, and which requires changing two non-adjacent words).<sup>18</sup> Morrison also suggests πρυμνήθεν (with Paley's σκάφος),<sup>19</sup> a proposal anticipated by Rauchenstein: the word is used in 1349, but the result has the wind somehow pushing the ship from its stern.

It seems to me that all of these suggestions treat the problem back to front. As the ship emerges from the shelter of the harbour, the first part to encounter the stronger wind is not the stern, but the prow. The wave that dashes the ship hits its prow, and behind that wave is the δεινὸς . . . ἄνεμος which comes upon the ship ἐξαίφνης. Indeed, so powerful is the onshore wind that εἰ μὴ γὰρ οἶδμα νήνεμον γενήσεται, / οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς τοῖς ξένοις σωτηρίας (1412–13, 'Unless the swells become calm, the foreigners have no hope of safe return'). I had thought ὠθεῖ πάλιν πρῶρηθεν

<sup>11</sup> For the proverbial associations of this, see E. R. Dodds, *Euripides: Bacchae*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1960), 173, and Cropp (n. 1), 258. Nauck, followed by Kirchhoff, even emended πρὸς κῦμα to πρὸς κέντρα, needlessly.

<sup>12</sup> Note however the metrical corrections of 1396 γῆν δὲ to δὲ γῆν, made by Peter Brubach in the sixteenth century, and Demetrius Triclinius' correction of 1397 παλλίρους to παλίρρους, which do not affect this discussion.

<sup>13</sup> Murray (n. 9), n.p.; J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae* (Oxford, 1981), 2.299; Kovacs (n. 5), 302.

<sup>14</sup> D. L. Page, *Euripides: Medea* (Oxford, 1938), 155–6, discussing MSS. κύνει at *Med.* 1141 and 1207.

<sup>15</sup> Morrison (n. 4), 4.

<sup>16</sup> D. Sansone, *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris* (Leipzig, 1981), 51; Platnauer (n. 5), 173; Cropp (n. 1), 258.

<sup>17</sup> Murray (n. 9), n.p.; Diggle (n. 14), 299; Kovacs (n. 5), 302; Platnauer (n. 5), 173; Cropp (n. 1), 258; Morrison (n. 4), 4.

<sup>18</sup> Euripides likes to put ships at the end of his iambic lines. This messenger has νεὼς at 1292, 1349, 1357 (and see 1379 and 1424), and he has σκάφος at 1345, 1406 (and see 108, 742, and 981). Indeed, every spoken use of σκάφος (and its forms) in Euripides is found at a line end, with the sole exception of *Trö.* 455 ποῦ σκάφος τὸ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ;

<sup>19</sup> Morrison (n. 4), 5.

(‘pushed back . . . from the front’) could create the needed sense, but this entails adopting Paley’s σκάφος for νεώς.<sup>20</sup>

A better solution is Unger’s πάλιν προρήσι.<sup>21</sup> The word προρήσια is found at *Etymologicum Magnum* 177.47, where it is glossed κόρυμβα (‘high point [of the prow]’): ἄφλαστα μὲν λέγεται τὰ πρυμνήσια, κόρυμβα δὲ τὰ προρήσια. In nautical contexts, κόρυμβος refers to the stern at *Iliad* 9.241 and Apollonius 2.601, and it probably does at Aeschylus, *Persians* 411 (where a Greek ship rams the κόρυμβα of a Persian one<sup>22</sup>), but it need not do so at Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 258; Aristophanes fr. 222 shows there was ambiguity about the word’s meaning. The pairing at Lycophron 295 of ἄφλαστα καὶ κόρυμβα (echoed at *Etymologicum Magnum* 177.47) demonstrates κόρυμβος could equally refer to the bow. Further, προρήσια never came to be associated with mooring-cables at the bow, as πρυμνήσια did for stern-cables.<sup>23</sup>

It may be that beneath this passage lies much deeper corruption:<sup>24</sup> this would help explain the threefold πάλιν . . . πάλιν . . . παλίρρους (1395–7), which is inelegant.<sup>25</sup> Given what we have, though, the best solution for 1395 is that of Robert August Unger, which gives a clear sense to the passage as a whole:

ναὺς δ’, ἕως μὲν ἐντὸς ἦν  
 λιμένος, ἐχώρει στόμια, διαπερώσα δὲ  
 λάβρωι κλύδωνι συμπεσοῦσ’ ἠπείγετο·  
 δεινὸς γὰρ ἐλθὼν ἄνεμος ἐξαίφνης νεὼς  
 ὠθεῖ πάλιν προρήσι· οἱ δ’ ἐκατέρουν  
 πρὸς κύμα λακτίζοντες· ἐς δὲ γῆν πάλιν  
 κλύδων παλίρρους ἦγε ναῦν.

1395

While it was within the harbour, the ship proceeded to the narrow mouth, but, once it passed through, it collided with a violent wave and was overpowered. For a terrible wind came suddenly and pushed back the ship’s prow. They persevered, kicking against the surf, but a tossing wave drove the ship to land again.

*The University of British Columbia*

C. W. MARSHALL

toph@interchange.ubc.ca

doi:10.1017/S0009838807000687

<sup>20</sup> Translating Mekler’s emendation, Murray (n. 2), 85, nevertheless captures the sense of *πρόρηθεν*, when he writes, ‘Then sudden in her teeth a squall / Drove the sail belling back’ (my italics).

<sup>21</sup> R. Unger, ‘Zur taurischen Iphigenie des Euripides’, *Philologus* 20 (1863), 355–8, at 357–8. The proposal is mentioned at N. Wecklein, *Euripidis Iphigenia Taurica* (Leipzig, 1898), 87, but, as far as I can see, nowhere else.

<sup>22</sup> Bow-to-bow ramming seems not to have been practised as a deliberate tactic before 413 B.C.: Thuc. 7.34 describes the Corinthians’ innovation against the Athenian fleet at Naupactus, a development emulated by the Syracusans (7.36).

<sup>23</sup> It seems to me that anchor cables at the bow could be called χαλινωτήρια, and that *Hec.* 539–40 *λύσαι τε πρύμνας καὶ χαλινωτήρια* | *νεῶν δὸς ἡμῖν* should be understood not as prayerful hendiadys, but rather, ‘Grant that we may release our sterns and our ships’ cables.’

<sup>24</sup> This possibility is also suggested by P. Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides’ Iphigenia in Tauris* (Berlin, 2006), 440.

<sup>25</sup> I can see no obvious remedy for this, except perhaps ὠθεῖ τὸ καλλίπρωρόν, with either σκάφος (‘pushed the beautifully prowed ship’) or νεὼς (‘pushed the ship’s beautiful prow’), echoing *Med.* 1335 *τὸ καλλίπρωρον* . . . *Ἀργεὺς σκάφος*. In either case, the position of the verb remains intrusive.