

## THE POETIC TECHNIQUE OF [EURIPIDES]: THE CASE OF *RHESUS* 118\*

Massimo Magnani recently redirected our attention to a vexed expression in *Rhesus*, which from Late Antique school texts, presumably, had found its way into the lexica of Cyril / Hesychius and the *Suda*.<sup>1</sup> The aim of this study is to explain its genesis more accurately in the light of the playwright's compositional style.

At *Rhes.* 116–18 Aeneas warns Hector of the dangers, should his intended night attack meet with Achaean opposition:

πῶς γὰρ περάσει σκόλοπας ἐν τροπῇ στρατός;  
πῶς δ' αὖ γεφύρας διαβαλοῦσ' ἱππηλάται,  
ἦν ἄρα μὴ θραύσαντες ἀντύγων χνόας;<sup>2</sup>

The difficulty lies with 118 ἀντύγων χνόας. In order to make sense of that phrase, one must take the Homeric ἀντυξ, 'rail round front of chariot' (LSJ s.v. I 2), metonymically of the entire vehicle, which is the interpretation of choice in *Rhes.* 237 Φθιάδων δ' ἱππων ποτ' ἐπ' ἀντυγα βαίῃ and Callim. *Hymn* 3, 140–1 καὶ ἀντυγες, αἶ τε σε ρεῖα | θηγητὴν φορέουσιν ὅτ' ἐς Διὸς οἶκον ἐλαύνεις and still preferable at Eur. *Hipp.* 1231 σιγῇ πελάζων ἀντυγι ξυνείπετο, *Phoen.* 1193 ἔθρωσκον ἐξέπιπτον ἀντύγων ἄπο and Theoc. *Id.* 2.166 ἀστέρες, εὐκάλοιο κατ' ἀντυγα Νυκτὸς ὀπαδοί.<sup>3</sup> The χνόαι could then regularly refer to the wheels' axle boxes or naves (LSJ s.v. χνόη 1).

But as Magnani (108–10) has observed, it is surprising to find normally distinct parts of a chariot (cf. Eur. *IA* 229–30 παρ' ἀντυγα | καὶ σύριγγας ἀρματείους) combined to denote a part of the whole;<sup>4</sup> and 'nothing authorizes us to regard

\* I am grateful to Patrick Finglass and Martin West for their help and encouragement, and to CQ's anonymous referee for pointing out places where my argument needed clarification. Gregory Klyve kindly allowed me to cite his unpublished Oxford dissertation (nn. 18, 25).

<sup>1</sup> M. Magnani, "'Mozzi di parapetti'?" (*Suda* α 2660 A. ~ [Eur.] *Rhes.* 118), *Paideia* 56 (2001), 107–11. The high number of *Rhesus* glosses in Hesychius (cf. J. Diggle, *Euripidea. Collected Essays* [Oxford, 1994], 517 n. 27 for the letter α) suggests that, contrary to its relative absence from other indirect sources, the play was as relevant to the ancient curricula as the rest of the Euripidean 'Selection'.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Polydamas in Hom. *Il.* 12.71–4 and the actual disaster, *Il.* 16.368–71 (Hector) λείπε δὲ λαόν | Τρωϊκόν, οὓς ἀέκοντας ὀρυκτὴ τάφρος ἔρυκεν | πολλοὶ δ' ἐν τάφρῳ ἐρυσάρματες ὠκέες ἵπποι | ἄξαντ' ἐν πρώτῳ ῥυμῷ λίπον ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων.

All Euripidean quotations, including *Rhesus*, are from J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis Fabulae*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1981–94).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. II 1, Gow on Theoc. *Id.* 2.166 and W.H. Porter (ed.), *The Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1916<sup>1</sup>, 1929<sup>2</sup>), on 118, who notes that in all of LSJ's passages for the meaning 'chariot' (Soph. *El.* 746, Eur. *Phoen.* 1193, Theoc. *Id.* 2.166 [+ Eur. *Hipp.* 1231]) 'the notion "chariot-rail" is to be traced'.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., by implication, Porter (n. 3), on 118. J. Jouan (ed.), *Euripide. Tragédies. Tome VII, 2<sup>e</sup> partie. Rhésos* (Paris, 2004), 61 n. 30 just says 'périphrase bizarre'.

ἀντύγων χνόαι as a technical expression'.<sup>5</sup> The ancient and mediaeval lexica offer little help here. Cyril / Hesychius (α 5546 Latte \*ἀντύγων χνόαι αἱ περιφέρειαι τοῦ ἄρματος, οἱ τροχοί) merely begins with what became the standard explanation for ἀντυξ = 'chariot rail',<sup>6</sup> whereas οἱ τροχοί (sc. τοῦ ἄρματος) seems to regard both elements of the juncture as *pars pro toto*. The latter recurs in the garbled *Suda* α 2660 Adler Ἀντιγόχνοιαι (ἀντυγ- M<sup>ec</sup>): οἱ τροχοὶ τοῦ ἄρματος.

The entries do, however, push our reading back to at least the fifth century A.D. and show its early need of elucidation. In a modern attempt to regularize it, Blaydes proposed ἀξόνων χνόας on the analogy of Aesch. *Sept.* 153 ἐλακον ἀξόνων βριθομένων χνόαι and Soph. *El.* 745–6 ἔθραυσε δ' ἄξονος μέσας χνόας, | καὶ ἀντύγων ὤλισθε.<sup>7</sup> Despite Magnani (109), the comparison may very well hint at the source of the alleged error. For while ἀντύγων must indeed be called an implausible gloss on ἀξόνων ('axles'), the word could have entered the text by scribal recollection of that celebrated 'fake' messenger speech in Sophocles' *Electra* (680–763).<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, the early fourth-century poet of *Rhesus* would himself have been likely to remember such a climactic passage, and that this is what happened is suggested by several locutions in the play of an apparently similar type and pedigree.

The greatest stylistic difference between *Rhesus* and the rest of surviving tragedy lies in the manner and degree to which it relies on other drama, epic and lyric poetry, ranging from more or less obvious adaptations of entire scenes<sup>9</sup> to scattered echoes of unusual words and phrases. Fraenkel<sup>10</sup> in particular observed the poet's

<sup>5</sup> Magnani, 109: '... nulla autorizza a ritenere ἀντύγων χνόαι un'espressione tecnica'. Contrast e.g. Emped. fr. 46 DK ἄρματος ὡς πέρι χνοίη ἐλίσσεται (Panzerbieter) ἥ τε παρ' ἄκρην (Diels) ... (~ Plut. *De fac.* 925B ἄρματος ὥσπερ ἵχνος ἀνελίσσεται ... ἥ τε περὶ ἄκραν \*\*\*), Hom. *Il.* 23.339–40 πλήμνη ... | κύκλου ποιητοῖο, Nonnus, *Dion.* 37.212 πλήμνη ἐλίσσομένου σθένος ἄρματος, Eur. *Hipp.* 1234–5 σύριγγές τ'... | τροχῶν (with Barrett on 1234–7) and, as a genuine metaphor, Aesch. *Sept.* 371 πομπίμους χνόας ποδῶν (~ Aesch. \*\* F 451m, 35.1 *TrGF* | δα[ ]ε χνόαι π. [ ?]).

<sup>6</sup> Also e.g. Hsch. α 5545 Latte \*ἀντυγος· περιφερείας τοῦ ἄρματος, α 5549 Latte \*ἀντυξ· ἄρματος περιφέρεια, ε 3575 Latte \*ἐξ ἀντύγων· ἐκ τῶν περιφερειῶν τοῦ ἄρματος (which may or may not refer to *Rhes.* 567), Phot. α 2146 + 2147 Theodoridis (= *Synag.* α 687 + 688 Cunningham), *Suda* α 2769 Adler Ἀντυγες· περιφέρειαι τῶν ἀρμάτων (quoting Soph. *Aj.* 1029–31), *Et. Gen.* 934 (II 82.10–11 Lasserre–Livadaras) ἐξ ἀντυγος ἡνία τεῖνας, οἰονεῖ ἐξάψας τὰς ἡνίας τῆς τοῦ ἄρματος περιφερείας.

<sup>7</sup> *Adversaria Critica in Euripidem* (Halle, 1901), 2. As in *Analecta Tragica Graeca* (Halle, 1906), 128, he also cites Ar. *Nub.* 1264–5 ὦ τύχαι θραυσάντνες | ἵππων ἐμῶν (~ Xenocl. 33 F 2 *TrGF*, with T 1).

<sup>8</sup> The drama was popular in antiquity (R.C. Jebb [ed.], *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part VI. The Electra* [Cambridge, 1924], lviii, where add Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 737A–B and Gell. *NA* 6.5, and read Prop. 2.14.5–6), but pre-Byzantine references to the speech seem few and far between. I have found only Arist. *Poet.* 1460a30–2 ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐν τῷ δράματι (sc. ἀλογόν τι δεῖ εἶναι), ὥσπερ ἐν Ἠλέκτρα οἱ τὰ Πύθια ἀπαγγέλλοντες, Plut. *De curiositate* 521C (Soph. *El.* 724–5a) and Hsch. β 237 Latte Βαρκαίοις ὄχοις· Λιβυκοῖς (Soph. *El.* 727).

<sup>9</sup> Athena's epiphany (*Rhes.* 595–674) has long been recognized as an adaptation of the *Ajax* prologue (1–133), and the preceding entry of Odysseus and Diomedes (*Rhes.* 565–94) takes much from Eur. *IT* 67–122, Soph. *Phil.* 1–49 and, to a lesser degree, Polynices' stealthy return to Thebes at Eur. *Phoen.* 261–73 ~ 361–4. On the relationship between *Rhes.* 527–64 and Eur. *Phaethon* 63–86 Diggle (= Eur. F 773.19–42 *TrGF*) see G.H. Macurdy, 'The dawn songs in *Rhesus* (527–556) and in the parodos of *Phaethon*', *AJPh* 64 (1943), 408–16, W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1964), 255–6 and Diggle on Eur. *Phaethon* 63–101 (pp. 95–6).

<sup>10</sup> Review of Ritchie (n. 9), *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 228–41 (henceforth 'Rev.'). Most of its linguistic material stems from G. Hermann, 'De Rheso Tragoedia Dissertatio', in id., *Opuscula* III (Leipzig, 1828, repr. Hildesheim, 1970), 262–310.

ἀλλ' οἶα πόντον Θρήκιον φύσῃματα  
κρυσταλλόπηκτα Παϊονάς τ' ἐπεζάρει  
ξὺν τοῖσδ' ἄνπνος οἶδα τλὰς πορπάμασιν.

A subcategory of this pattern, and the one relevant to the question of *Rhes.* 118 ἀντύγων χνόας, concerns ‘noun + attribute’ phrases peculiar to *Rhesus*, where each term can independently be traced to a common source. Alternatively, a choice adjective may qualify a word that occurs nearby in its closest or indeed only extant parallel. The following (not necessarily exhaustive) list will procede from clearer to perhaps less convincing examples from both classes and thus partly disregard the original verse-order.

1. *Rhes.* 568–9                      ... καμέ τοι, πρὶν ἡσθόμην  
δεσμῶν ἀραγμὸν ἱππικῶν, ἔδν φόβος

I put this first because the expression involved, *δεσμῶν ἀραγμῶν ἱππικῶν*, is grammatically equivalent to *ἀντὶ τῶν χνόας* and has already been discussed by Fraenkel (*Rev.* 231). Both verbally and in terms of content, Diomedes' reassurance of Odysseus bears a striking similarity to Aesch. *Sept.* 245 καὶ μὴν ἀκούω γ' ἱππικῶν φρουραγμάτων, with the comparatively rare *ἀραγμαῖς*<sup>13</sup> four lines further

<sup>11</sup> Marginal note in his copies of the second *editio Hervagiana* (Εὐριπίδου τραγωδία δακτωκαίδεκα ... / Euripidis tragoediae octodecim ... <ed. Io. Oporinus> [Basel *apud* Io. Hervagium, 1544?]; now Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. S. 4.11) and Canter's Euripides (Εὐριπίδου τραγωδία ιθ' / Euripidis tragoediae XIX ... *opera Guilelmi Canteri* ... [Antwerp, 1571]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. S. 5.16 [missing since 2002]); cf. C. Collard, 'J.J. Scaliger's Euripidean marginalia', *CQ* n.s. 24 (1974), 242–9, at 249. The reading can be tested against V and Q's glosses ἐπεβάρει (II 338.23 Schwartz [V] ~ Hsch. ε 4304 Latte \*ἐπεβάρει· ἐπεβάρει. ἐπέκειντο AS. ἐπέκρατεϊ).

<sup>12</sup> Shortly before, *Rhes.* 430–1 ἐνθ' αἵματηρός πελανός ἐς γαῖαν Σκύθης | ἡντλείτο λόγχῃ  
Θρήξ τε συμμυγῆς φόνος transfers to Rhesus' Scythian war the horrors of Darius' proph-  
ecy of Plataea at Aesch. *Pers.* 816–17 τόσος γάρ ἔσται πελανός αἵματοσφαγῆς | πρὸς γῆ  
Πλαταιῶν Δωριῶδες λόγχης ὕπο, except that the cumbersome (and not universally transmitted)  
αἵματοσφαγῆς is replaced by αἵματηρός, found exactly thus in Eur. *Alc.* 850–1 ἦν δ' οὖν ...  
μὴ μόλη (Death) | πρὸς αἵματηρόν πελανόν (~ *IT* 300 ὥσθ' αἵματηρόν πέλαγος ξζανθεῖν  
ἀλός). In a rarer case of non-tragic reminiscence, *Rhes.* 72–3 ὥς ἂν τις αὐτῶν καὶ νεὼς  
θρώσκων ἔπι | νῶτον χαραχθεὶς κλίμακας ράνη φόνω shows influence not just from Hom.  
*Il.* 8.512–15 μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδεὶ γε νεῶν ἐπιβαίνει ἔκρηλοι, | ἀλλ' ὥς τις τούτων γε βέλους καὶ  
οἰκοθι πέσση, | βλήμενος ἦ ἰὼ ἦ ἔρχῃ δ' ἐξυόνει | νηὸς ἐπιθρώσκων, but also from Pind.  
*Pyth.* 1.28 στρωμνὰ δὲ χαρδίσσοισ' ἅπαν νῶτον ποτικεκλιμένον κεντεῖ (of Typhos' discom-  
fort under Mt. Etna) and *Isth.* 8.49–50 ὃ (Achilles) καὶ Μύσιον ἀμπελόεν | αἶμαξε Τηλέφου  
μέλανι ραίνων φόνω πεδίον.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. with *Supplement* (1996). For tragedy add Eur. F 631.1–2 *TrGF*.

down at *Sept.* 249 δέδοικ' ἀραγμὸς δ' ἐν πύλαις ὀφέλλεται. One may also see δέδοικ' reflected in our ἔδω φόβος (cf. *Sept.* 240 ταρβουσύνω φόβω) and hence something of the shy Theban chorus girls in the Achaeans' alarm at ultimately harmless enemy noises. Like Aeschylus' *Persians* (above, with n. 12), the war play *Seven against Thebes* was one of the *Rhesus* poet's major sources of inspiration.<sup>14</sup>

2. *Rhes.* 47–8                   ... οὐ γάρ πω πάρος ὦδ' ἐφοβήθη  
ναυσιπόρος στρατιά

Although Fraenkel (*Rev.* 235) thought it perhaps more widespread, ναυσιπόρος, 'seafaring', is paralleled only in Eur. *IA* 171–3 (ἔμολον ...) Ἀχαιῶν στρατιὰν ὡς ἐσιδοίμαν | Ἀχαιῶν τε πλάτας ναυσιπόρους ἤ- | μιθέων,<sup>15</sup> from where στρατιά(ν) could easily have joined the adjective to create ναυσιπόρος στρατιά (~ Aesch. *Ag.* 987 ναυβάτας στρατός) for the Greeks at Troy. The case for such (inadvertent) borrowing is strengthened by two other references in *Rhesus* to the parodos of *Iphigeneia in Aulis* (164–230) and an equally impressive string relating to its anapaestic prologue (*IA* 1–48 + 115–62).<sup>16</sup> Even if the latter did not belong to the original production,<sup>17</sup> it is far more likely that here, too, our poet exploited a continuous passage<sup>18</sup> than that the redactor of *Iphigeneia in Aulis* took notable phrases from all over *Rhesus*.

<sup>14</sup> The tragedies are mentioned together at Ar. *Ran.* 1021–30, and *Seven against Thebes* at least may have been revived towards the end of the fifth century B.C. See also Ar. *Ach.* 964–5 ~ Aesch. *Sept.* 384–5, *Lys.* 188–239 ~ *Sept.* 42–8, *Lys.* 406 ~ *Sept.* 594, Eup. fr. 207 *PCG* ~ *Pers.* 65–6, Eup. fr. 231 *PCG* ~ *Sept.* 39 and n. 18.

<sup>15</sup> LSJ s.v. ναυσίπορος II (parox.) here unnecessarily assume a secondary meaning, 'causing a ship to pass' = 'ship-speeding'. πλάτας, as often, metonymically designates an oared vessel.

<sup>16</sup> Parodos: *Rhes.* 261–3 (Agamemnon) ὃς ἐπὶ πόλιν, ὃς ἐπὶ | γὰν Τροίαν χιλιόναυον | ἦλυθ' ἔχων στρατεῖαν ~ Eur. *IA* 173–7 (Ἀχαιῶν ... ἤ- | μιθέων), οὓς ἐπὶ Τροίαν | ἐλάταις χιλιόναυσιν | τὸν ξανθὸν Μενελάον <θ'> | ... | ἐνέπουσ' Ἀγαμέμνονά τ' ... στέλλειν, *Rhes.* 356 ἥκει διφρεῶν βαλιδαῖσι πώλοις ~ *IA* 220–2 πώλους κέντρω θεινομένους, | ... | λευκοστίκτω τριχὶ βαλιούς (not elsewhere of horses, except for Achilles' immortal Βαλῖος [Hom. *Il.* 16.149, 19.400]). Prologue: *Rhes.* 16 (Χο.) θάρσει. (Εκ.) θαρσῶ ~ *IA* 2–3 (Αγ.) στείχε. (Πρ.) στείχω ... | ... (Αγ.) σπεύδε. (Πρ.) σπεύδω (sharing the very rare phenomenon of inner-metric ἀντιλαβή), *Rhes.* 274 μάχας πρὸ χειρῶν καὶ δόρη βαστάζομεν ~ *IA* 36 (δέλτον ...) τήνδ' ἦν πρὸ χειρῶν ἔτι βαστάξεις, *Rhes.* 529–31 καὶ ἐπτάποροι | Πηλεΐδες αἰθέριαι· | μέσα δ' αἰετὸς οὐρανοῦ ποτάται ~ *IA* 6–8 τίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀστήρ ὅδε πορθμεύει | σείριος ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐπτάπορου | Πηλεΐδος ἄσσων ἔτι μεσσήρης; Add *Rhes.* 467–8 τοιαῦτα μὲν σοι τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας | πρᾶξι παρέξω ~ *IA* 651 μακρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἡ 'πιούσ' ἀπουσία, 1172 κάκει γενήσῃ διὰ μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας (1170, 1171b–2a del. Conington, 1172 Nauck) and perhaps adjectival βασιλῖς at *Rhes.* 717–18 τὰν | βασιλῖδ' ἐστὶν Ἀτρεΐδαν and *IA* 1305–6 Ἥρα δὲ Διὸς ἄνακτος | εὐναῖσι βασιλίσω (sc. τρυφῶσα).

<sup>17</sup> On this question see most recently D. Kovacs, 'Toward a reconstruction of *Iphigenia Aulidensis*', *JHS* 123 (2003), 77–103, at 80–3 and 101–2.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. n. 9. In the same way, *Rhesus* makes several scattered allusions to the prologue of *Seven against Thebes* (1–77): *Rhes.* 19 νυκτηγορίαν, 89 νυκτηγοροῦσι ~ *Sept.* 29 νυκτηγορεῖσθαι, *Rhes.* 20–2 οὐκ οἶσθα δορὸς πέλας Ἀργείου | νυχίαν ἡμᾶς | κοίτην πανόπλους κατέχοντας ~ *Sept.* 59–60 ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἤδη πάνοπλος Ἀργείων στρατός | χωρεῖ (where the essential point of comparison – both Troy and Thebes have been under siege for a while, and the commander-in-chief has dispatched a scout – is clearest), *Rhes.* 514 πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοισιν ... ~ *Sept.* 33 ... καὶ πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις, 58 πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις ..., *Rhes.* 632 κατόπτας ... στρατοῦ ~ *Sept.* 36 κατοπτήρας στρατοῦ, 41 κατόπτης ... τῶν πραγμάτων (+ 369 ὃ τοι κατόπτης ... στρατοῦ), *Rhes.* 932–3 φιλαϊμάτους | ἄλκας ~ *Sept.* 45 φιλαϊμάτων Φόβον (G.E. Klyve, 'A Commentary on *Rhesus* 1–526, with an Introduction' [Diss., Oxford, 1995], 41–2).

3. *Rhes.* 605–6 ... τὰς δ' Ἑκτορος  
εὐνὰς ἔασον καὶ καρατόμους σφαγὰς

With one classical attestation each, both *καράτομος*, 'beheaded', and *καρατόμος*, 'beheading', are infrequent enough to command our attention. The latter (cf. Eur. F 228a.10 *TrGF* δς ἐλθὼν Γοργόνος *καρατόμος*, Lyc. 187) appears more likely here, but from the company it keeps, it may still be possible to identify its source as Eur. *Tro.* 562–6 σφαγαὶ δ' ἀμφιβώμιοι | Φρυγῶν ἐν τε δεμνίοις | *καράτομος* ἐρημία | νεανίδων στέφανον ἔφερεν | Ἑλλάδι *κουροτρόφον*,<sup>19</sup> the end of that poignant ode on Ilion's fall, *Tro.* 511–67. Note also the formal resemblance to Eur. *Andr.* 399–400 ἦτις σφαγὰς μὲν Ἑκτορος τροχηλάτους | κατείδον.

4. *Rhes.* 618 στίλβουσι δ' ὥστε ποταμίου κύκνου πτερόν

As in the previous item, two Euripidean passages seem to have contributed to this comparison of Rhesus' gleaming white mares and the shimmer of a swan's plumage. For while the image is not uncommon in drama,<sup>20</sup> the second verse-half looks very much like the metrically identical lecythion Eur. *Hel.* 215 *χιονόχρῳ* κύκνου πτερῷ. Instead of *χιονόχρως*, however, which would not scan in the genitive or accusative, *Rhesus* has *ποτάμιος*, a natural, but nevertheless unique epithet of κύκνος. If there is anything to the principle I am trying to establish, we cannot fail to observe Eur. *El.* 151–3 οἶα δέ τις κύκνος ἀχέτας | ποταμίους παρὰ χεύμασιν | πατέρα φίλτατον καλεῖ, where *ποτάμιος* occurs near to, though not in conjunction with, κύκνος.

5. *Rhes.* 715 βίον δ' ἐπαιτῶν εἶρ' ἀγύρτης τις λάτρης

This specimen is different in that it illustrates not so much literal recollection of related terms as probably deliberate juxtaposition of semantic ideas. The context of the line (*Rhes.* 710–21; cf. 501–7) recalls the *πτωχεία*, Odysseus' undercover mission to Troy from the *Little Iliad*<sup>21</sup> and Helen's account in Hom. *Od.* 4.242–64. As Fantuzzi has shown,<sup>22</sup> the latter especially might help to explain the genesis of *Rhes.* 715 ἀγύρτης τις λάτρης by the preparations Odysseus takes (*Od.* 4.244–9):

<sup>19</sup> I follow e.g. Diggle, Lee and Murray in reading *καράτομος* and *κουροτρόφον* (V) and joining *νεανίδων* to *στέφανον* ('and, in our beds, desolation wrought by the headsman's blade brought a victory garland of young women to Greece to bear them children' [Kovacs]). Others, notably Biehl, Parmentier and Wecklein, adopt *καρατόμος* and *κουροτρόφῳ* from PQ. *νεανίδων* then goes with *ἐρημία*, whereas *καρατόμος* is taken to bear the active sense corresponding to the passive in Soph. *El.* 52 *καρατόμοις* χλιδαῖς, 'cut from the head, shorn' (Parmentier 51 n. 4; cf. Biehl on 562 ff.). But one may doubt whether Euripides would have so twisted the meaning of the word, and both variants are easily attributed to scribal errors. Moreover, this would leave *στέφανον* without any epithet and greatly obscure the bitter sense of these lines.

<sup>20</sup> Usually of the white hair of age: Eur. *HF* 110–11, 692–4, *Bacch.* 1365, Ar. *Vesp.* 1064–5 and probably [Aesch.] *PV* 795, where the Graiae, who like Cycnus (Hes. fr. 237 M–W) were ἐκ γενετῆς πολιαί (Hes. *Theog.* 271), are called *κυκνόμορφοι*. Eur. *Or.* 1385–6 is too corrupt to make anything of the MSS' *κυκνόπτερον* (–πτέρου Scaliger) with reference to Helen's face.

<sup>21</sup> Procl. *Chrest.* 52.19–24 (+ fr. 8) Davies = 74–5.15–18 (+ fr. 6, 7) Bernabé = 122 (4) (+ fr. 8, 9) West.

<sup>22</sup> 'Odiseo mendicante a Troia e a Itaca: su [Eur.] "Rh." 498–507, 710–719 e Hom. "Od." 4, 244–258', *MD* 36 (1996), 175–85, at 183–5 ~ *Arachnion* 2.1 (1996), 1–8, at 5–6 and 7–8 (notes). The latter is accessible online under <<http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num4/fantuzzi.html>>.

αὐτόν μιν πλῆγῃσιν ἀεικέλῃσι δαμάσσας,  
 σπείρα κάκ' ἄμφ' ὤμοισι βαλὼν, οἰκῇ ἔοικώς, 245  
 ἀνδρῶν δυσμενέων κατέδυν πόλιν εὐρυάγνιαν.  
 ἄλλω δ' αὐτὸν φωτὶ κατακρύπτων ἦϊσκε  
 Δέκτη, ὃς οὐδὲν τοῖος ἔην ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν·  
 τῷ ἵκελος κατέδυν Τρώων πόλιν ...

Here 246 εὐρυάγνιαν ... 249 Τρώων πόλιν is likely to represent a doublet of 244 αὐτόν μιν ... 246 κατέδυν πόλιν.<sup>23</sup> In 248, moreover, Aristarchus glossed the otherwise unknown δέκτη with ἐπαίτη, whereas in the *Little Iliad*, we are told, it was a proper name (Σ<sup>HMQT</sup> *Od.* 4.248 [I 197.24 – 198.2 Dindorf] ~ *Il. Parv.* fr. 6 Bernabé = 9 West). Whatever the truth for the *Odyssey*, δέκτη, 'beggar', would be incompatible with 245 οἰκῇ, although this is precisely what is mirrored in *Rhesus*. It does not take much, therefore, to regard the playwright as a precursor of Aristarchus, who with lexical replacement<sup>24</sup> coined his 'begging vagabond menial' from a conflation of the Homeric *OIKHI* and *ΔΕΚTHI*.

6. *Rhes.* 276–7     ἀνὴρ γὰρ ἀλκῆς μυρίας στρατηλατῶν  
                            στείχει φίλος σοι σύμμαχος τε τῇδε γῇ

No unusual vocabulary embellishes the Shepherd's first announcement of Rhesus' arrival. Yet the lines share an astonishing number of words with Eur. *Or.* 688–90 (Menelaus speaking) ἦκω γὰρ ἀνδρῶν συμμάχων κενὸν δόρυ | ἔχων, πόνοισι μυρίοις ἀλώμενος, | σμικρᾷ σὺν ἀλκῇ τῶν λελειμμένων φίλων – and among them ἀλκή ('armed forces') and μυρίος, which stand together in *Rhes.* 276.<sup>25</sup> As an example of how a similar context alone can exert this influence, the couplet is worth recording.

By contrast to *Rhes.* 118 ἀντύγων χνόας, none of the passages discussed so far is linguistically strained or implies corruption. But 'the fact is that *Rhesus* shows no lack of puzzling expressions'.<sup>26</sup> Some of them may in turn be owed to unconscious reminiscence. Thus, for example, Fraenkel (*Rev.* 238) explained *Rhes.* 770 κἀγὼ μελούση καρδίᾳ λήξας ὕπνου ('and I awoke from sleep in heartfelt concern ...'), where personal μέλειν, 'care for', 'take an interest in' (LSJ s.v. B I), exceptionally acquires a non-personal subject, as a hasty reworking of Aesch. *Sept.* 287 μέλει, φόβῳ δ' οὐχ ὑπνώσσει κέαρ (with 288–9 γείτονες δὲ καρδίᾳ | μέριμναι). The chorus' answer to Eteocles' preceding request for prayers, μέλει, could all too easily have been taken with κέαρ, as a predicate parallel to οὐχ ὑπνώσσει.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup> L. Friedländer, 'Doppelte recensionen in Iliade und Odyssee', *Philologus* 4 (1849), 577–91, at 580–1. Cf. S.R. West on Hom. *Od.* 4.246–9.

<sup>24</sup> ἀγύρτης (also *Rhes.* 503 ἀγύρτης πτωχικὴν ἔχων στολήν) normally denotes a mendicant priest or seer, but see Hom. *Od.* 19.284 χρήματ' ἀγυρτάζειν ('to collect guest gifts') and later Heliod. 2.19.1 ἐλευσόμεθα δ' οὖν ὁμῶς εἰς πτωχοὺς καὶ τοὺς διὰ τροφὴν ἀγύρτας ἑαυτοὺς μεταπλάσαντες.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Klyve (n. 18), on 276.

<sup>26</sup> Magnani, 111: 'Il fatto è che il *Reso* non difetta di espressioni sconcertanti'.

<sup>27</sup> This is still found in L–S<sup>5</sup> (1861) and all subsequent editions of the lexicon (s.v. μέλω B [I] 1), which must have inherited the slip either from the new Stephanus *Thesaurus* (Paris, 1831–65), vol. 5 (1842–6) s.v. μέλει col. 728 or, more likely, from the fifth, substantially revised, version of Passow's Greek–German dictionary (Leipzig, 1841–57), vol. 2.1 (1852) s.v.



Likewise, in *Rhes.* 389 παλαιᾷ σ' ἡμέρᾳ προσεννέπω ('It is an advanced [i.e. late] day that I am addressing you') the application of ἡμέρα to an unspecific 'period during which [Rhesus'] presence might have been expected'<sup>28</sup> is hard to justify, unless perhaps as an extension of the sense 'state or time of life' (LSJ s.v. ἡμέρα I 2), which appears with παλαιός at *Aj.* 624–5 ἡ που παλαιᾷ μὲν ἔντροφος (codd: σύν- Nauck) ἀμέρα, | λευκῷ (codd: -κά Schneidewin) τε γήρα μάτηρ.<sup>29</sup> In the absence of any comparable idiom,<sup>30</sup> it seems reasonable to suppose our poet took over the phrase ready-made from a tragedy that supplied him with plenty of other material for his own.

In conclusion, *Rhes.* 118 ἀντύγων χνόας should be kept not just because the reading is ancient and can somehow be excused by pointing out other linguistic anomalies in the play, but also (and especially) as an idiosyncratic type of reference to *Soph. El.* 745–6 ἔθραυσε δ' ἄξονος μέσας χνόας, | κάξ ἀντύγων ὤλισθε. On a more general level, I hope to have provided some deeper insights into the poetic technique of a man who I firmly believe was not Euripides, and who demands minute attention from critics of his style.

University College, Oxford

A. FRIES  
almut.fries@classics.ox.ac.uk

μέλω 2. On the use of both these works by Liddell and Scott see the 'Preface 1925' to LSJ<sup>9</sup> (1940), iv.

<sup>28</sup> Porter (n. 3), on 388 f.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. especially Eur. *Ion* 720 νέαν δ' ἀμέραν ἀπολιπὼν θάνοι. On the Greek concept of 'time as itself existing in time' see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 907–8, Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 625–9 and J. de Romilly, *Time in Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca, NY, 1968), 42–9.

<sup>30</sup> Jouan (n. 4), 66 n. 110 posits a colloquialism, and Kannicht (on Eur. *Hel.* 625–9 [pp. 183–4]) hesitantly relates it to *Hel.* 628–9 περί τ' ἐπέτασα χέρα φίλιον ἐν μακρᾷ | φλογὶ φαεσφόρῳ (where, however, φαεσφόρος 'suggests ... repeated dawns' [Allan on *Hel.* 627–9]). Whatever the origin of Diogenian. 4.38 (*CPG* I 237.19) διὰ παλαιᾶς ἡμέρας ὥσπερ διὰ χρόνου ~ Apostol. 6.30 (*CPG* II 370.3), it works on the normal 'day' and διὰ of an 'interval ... between two points of Time' (LSJ s.v. A II 2).