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I

42 ἱκετεῖω σε, γεραιά,
42/43 γεραιῶν ἐκ στομάτων, πρὸς
γόνυ πίπτουσα τὸ σῶν;
44 ἕκασυ τέκνα λόκαι
44/45 φθιμένων νεκών οἱ
καταλείπουσι μέλη
46/47 θανάτῳ λυσιμελεῖ θηρείων ὅρείωι βορᾶν.

Commentators and emendators, with few exceptions, find the antecedent of the relative οἱ in νεκῶν in line 44/45: “. . . corpses which leave behind their limbs as a prey to beasts.” The gibering ψυχή, knocking in vain at the gates of Hell, may have left its limbs behind as carrion. A corpse on the battlefield has abdicated control over its limbs: it does not enjoy the privilege of bequeathing them to anybody. The conjectures of the interpreters in line 44 are not such as to redeem the improbability of their interpretation: ἀνὰ μοι τέκνα λόκαι φθιμένων νεκών ed. Brubachiana and the early editors, rendered as “ut redimas mihi filiorum extinctorum cadauera” or “ut eximas meos liberos ex cadaueribus defunctorum,” and modified by Brodaeus and Markland to ἀνὰ μοι κτλ., “surge mihi, redime filios meos, etc.”; ἀνὰ λείψανα λόκαι Kirchhoff, ἀνὰ μοι στίχα λόκαι Musgrave, ἀπὸ κάμπατα λόκαι Wecklein,¹ ἀνὸμι αἰχέξα λόκαι Bruhn apud Murray.

A few have tried a different path. Reiske and Markland find the antecedent of οἱ in τέκνα, and Markland offers a choice of three constructions for the phrase φθιμένων νεκών: (i) “ex cadaueribus defunc-

¹ Ed. maior (Leipzig 1898) and small annotated edition (Leipzig 1912). The conjecture is accepted by the latest editor, G. Italie (Groningen 1951), who also changes φθιμένων νεκών to νεκῶν φθιμένων. His laconic reason for this change (“zie antistr.” is all he says) I take to mean that φθιμένων in the strophe now occupies the same position as φθιμένων in the antistrope. Such correspondences occasionally occur in Euripidean lyrics, but they are not to be introduced by this sort of περιπτώσια.
torum,"”2 (ii) genitive absolute, “cadaueribus tabescentibus,” (iii) dependent on μέλη (so Reiske). “Haece nobis incerta sunt, quia ea proununciata non audiuimus: unde nescimus ueram distinctionem”; but it will take more than punctuation and pronunciation to turn Markland’s text into intelligible Greek. Grégoire3 writes ἀνα μοι τέκνα λύσαι, φθιμένων νεκύων μη καταλείπουσα μέλη κτλ., which Professor Page once called—perhaps a trifle indulgently—“pretty, though . . . unconvincing.”4 Murray produced a text of fits and starts, or, as he called it, of “clamores confusos precantium”: ἀνομοι . . . —τέκνα λύσαι. —φθιμένων κτλ., “Impii Thebani” . . . “Reddere filios!” . . . “qui mortuos feris relinquunt.” This division of speakers was exploded by Page, who himself conjectured ἀνα μοι νεκρά λύσαι φθιμένων τεκόνων.6
But Murray has spotted what seems to me to be an obvious truth: that the only party which may be described as leaving limbs as a prey to beasts are the Thebans, who are refusing burial to the corpses.7 And this view seems to be shared by the author of the most recent conjecture known to me: A. Y. Campbell8 conjectures, without explanation, ἀνομοι κατάληψαι, “put a stop to the lawless men who . . . ,” in which the sense is more plausible than the alleged corruption.

In listing the conjectures which take νεκύων as the antecedent of οἱ, I omitted to record two conjectures which are simpler and better than the rest. O. Ribbeck9 proposed ἀπό μοι for ἀνομοι, with the construction ἀπό μοι τέκνα λύσαι φθιμένων νεκύων, “release for us our children from the dead corpses.” Tmesis is common in Euripides’ lyrics;10 tmesis of the same verb, in a similar construction, occurs at Hom. Od.

8 Defenders of this construction quote no parallel, so I offer them Aesch. Ag. 1023 τῶν φθιμένων ἀνέγειν (“bring up from the dead”).
9 Budé ed. (Paris 1923).
10 CQ 31 (1937) 96.
"Redime" in fact, since ἕκδοσα in 48 shows that λύσαι is middle imperative and not aorist infinitive. But that would make Murray’s text even less coherent.
11 loc.cit. (supra n.4).
12 For καταλείψαι used of leaving corpses on a battlefield see II. 12.226–27 πολλοίς γὰρ Τρῶων καταλείψαντες, ὅσι κεν Ἄχαιοι | χαλκῷ δηύοσαν. Before Murray the only note of disquiet I can find is A. Matthiae, Observationes criticæ (Göttingen 1789) 14: “καταλείπσαι μὲν ἐν moriente uix bene dictur; et hoc loco esse saltem debet et κατέλειψαι.” I will not repeat his conjecture, which he withdrew in his edition (text 1814, commentary 1823).
13 In his edition of Helen (Liverpool 1950) 123.
14 RKM n.f. 31 (1876) 614.
15 Kühner-Gerth I 534–35, W. Breitenbach, Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euriptideischen Lyrik (Stuttgart 1934) 266.
12.420–21 ἀπὸ τοίχους | λύσε κλύδων τρόπιος ("the wave removed the sides from the keel"). But I doubt if ἀπὸ is the preposition we want in this context; ἐκ is what we should expect, and ἐκ was neatly supplied by a second conjecture of Professor Page, published but reduced to unintelligibility by misprinting in A. S. Owen’s edition of Ion (Oxford 1939) p.117: ἂνα μοι τέκνα λύσει ἐκ φθιμένων. For the preposition see 346 νεκροὺς ἐκλύσσομαι, and for μοι see 168 εὐκοι νεκροὺς μοι.

"There are no certain cases of prodelision after αι in tragedy," says Platnauer. But he is wrong: there is at least one. At Soph. OC 1608 πεσοῦσα τῇ οἴνοι (Heath, κλαίον codd.) the manuscript reading is not to be defended by the plea that the syllabic augment may be omitted in messenger speeches: for the conditions under which such omissions are permitted see Page on Med. 1141. Of the four remaining possible instances, I have already shown that Platnauer’s doubts about two of them are justified, but two instances which are probably to be accepted are Hel. 953 αἴρῃσομαι γώ (Porson, αἴρησομαι τό L), and IA 1396 γενήσομαι γώ (Reiske, γενήσομι ἐγώ L). Platnauer has shown that there are seven instances of the prodelision —μοι γώ in Aristophanes.

There is only one drawback to accepting this conjecture: the antecedent of οἱ is still νεκρῶν. But change the case of the relative and all will be well:


"arise, and release for us our children from the corpses whose limbs

11 The same construction (as ἀπολύσεις τί τινος) is used with the uncompounded verb at 470 λύσατα σεμα στεμμάτων μυστήρια, "release the μυστήρια (Demeter’s temple: cf. 173) from the suppliants’ garlands." So the passage is rightly explained by B. Lavagnini, AJP 68 (1947) 84–86. Commentators join στεμμάτων μυστήρια or, since that is an impossible phrase, accept Nauck’s ἰστήρια. And there is one more place in the play where the verb ἀπολύειν ought probably to be restored. At 638–39 the messenger, announcing victory, declares to the chorus λύσαν δέ εἰ μακροί ἄποστασις, which, one would suppose, means “I shall stop you from making a long speech,” than which no remark could be less apposite. H. van Herwerden, Mnemosyne n.s. 5 (1877) 36, conjectured ἀπολύειν, “I shall relieve you of a long speech” (i.e. I shall speak briefly). Compare Hec. 918, where Murray very plausibly conjectures καταπάλει for καταπαύει.

12 CQ n.s. 10 (1960) 141.

13 Heracl. 999, IA 1435: see CQ n.s. 22 (1972) 244.

14 And let me add another instance for consideration: Blaydes’ φανέρας ἑκ τεῶν at Aesch. Pers. 604, which is accepted by Page (OCT, Oxford 1972).
they are leaving for the beasts.” ἀνα is an invitation to Aithra to leave the altar and approach her son on the chorus’ behalf (cf. Alc. 276 ἄλλ’ ἀνα τόλμα, Tro. 98–99 ἀνα, δύσκαιμον, πεδόθεν κεφαλήν (P, κεφαλά V), ἐπάειρε δέρνην,¹⁵ Soph. Aj. 192 ἄλλ’ ἀνα ἐξ ἐδραίνων). The subject of καταλείπουσι is left unexpressed, as well it may be: the identity of the subject is not in doubt, for this reprehensible behaviour of the Thebans in refusing burial was described only a few lines earlier. For the idea ‘release from the corpses’ (i.e. ‘from the corpse-strewn battlefield’) see 762 θέραπες ἦγον ἐκ φόνου, “the servants brought (the corpses) out of the carnage.” The corruption of ὄν to οἶ is easy enough: either ὄν was lost by haplography after νεκύων and οἶ was supplied as a subject for καταλείπουσι, or, more likely, ὄν was simply assimilated to the case of the subject of the following verb. The repetition of the same sound in the adjacent syllables—ὄν ὄν causes no offence: see the passages I have cited in ProcCambPhilSoc 194 (1969) 59.

II

346 δράσω τάδ’. εἶμι καὶ νεκροὺς ἐκλύσομαι
λόγοι πείδων· εἰ δὲ μῆ, βίς δορός
ἡδη τόδ’ ἐσται κοὐξ” εὖν φθόνῳ θεών.

346 δράσω Kirchhoff, δράσων L. 347 πείδων Nauck, πείσων L.

“I shall do this. I shall go and redeem the corpses by using persuasion; failing that, it will be done ἡδη by armed force and without divine displeasure.”

The word ἡδη harbours a problem generally ignored. “Failing that, it will be done ἡδη by armed force.” While ἡδη commonly refers to what is to happen in the immediate future (‘now at once’), it is not clear that it may legitimately be used in the apodosis of a conditional sentence to refer to an event which, so far from being immediate, is

¹⁵ I have seen no convincing treatment of these lines. Some, with no warrant, give ἀνα the force of a transitive verb: “ἀνα construendum uidetur cum κεφαλήν, i.e. ἄνειχε κεφαλήν” (Hermann), “ἀνα for ἄναφερε, as John Milton (ap. Barnes) rightly took it” (Paley); Murray prints κεφαλή, with an impossible change of addressee to follow; Parmentier punctuates κεφαλήν | ἐπάειρε, δέρνη, which is abominable style; only Musgrave’s addition of τε after δέρν does deserve consideration (κεφαλήν | ἐπάειρε δέρν τ’). But I wonder whether πεδόθεν κεφαλήν, ἐπάειρε δέρν does not belong to that species of the ἄπο κοινοῦ construction illustrated by Soph. El. 105–06 ἐτ’ ἂν πομφειγεῖκα ἄστρων | ριπάς, λεύκου δὲ τοδ’ ἤμαρ, Hor. Carm. 1.30.5–6 solutis | Gratiae ζonis properentique Nymphae, though in these and all other instances known to me there is a copula and not asyndeton.
contingent upon a future event of uncertain time. Or, to formulate
the problem bluntly, can η δη mean τότε? No evidence has been
shown that it can.

Nauck\(^{16}\) deleted 348 and left ει δε μη, βις δορός effective enough in
its abruptness; and unless it can be bettered by conjecture, the dele-
tion deserves serious consideration.\(^{17}\) Such a conjecture is not Wila-
mowitz’s και δη, for it gives to the line a frigid aimlessness which, had
the manuscript presented this reading, would probably have been
despatched by Nauck with the same remedy. That Beck conjectured
η δη I mention only because it is creditable to make even a bad con-
jecture when others are asleep.

If the text is unsound, then perhaps the replacement of τοδ’ by τότ’
will mend it:

\[
ei \text{ δε μη}, \betaις \text{ δορός}
\]
\[
ηδη \text{ τότ’} \text{ εσται κοβχι} \epsilonυν \text{ φθόνω θεων}.
\]

Similarly Pl. Prt. 351ε εαν μεν προς λόγον δοκηι εϊναι . . . ευνωρησόμεθα.
ei δε μη, τοτε ηδη ομφεσητησουμεν. See also Aesch. PV 910–11 (Zeus will
be overthrown) πατρός δ’ αρα | Κρόνου τοτ’ ηδη παντελωσ κραιθεται,
Ag. 970–71 οταν δε τευχη Ζευς απ’ ομφακος πυκρας | οινων, τοτ’ ηδη ψυχος
εν δομωις πελει, Cho. 819 και τοτ’ ηδη (Blomfield, τοτε δη Μ) . . . μεθη-
σουμεν, Soph. OC 437–41 χρονω δ’ οτ’ ηδη πας ς μωχθος ην πεπων . . . το
την’ ηδη τουτο μεν πολις βια | ηλαυνε μ’ εκ γης. See also Thuc. 7.59.1,
Ar. Pax 341, Plut. 694, Pl. Resp. 417b, Lys. 1.19, 12.66, 25.22, Isoc. 12.25,
Isae. 11.22, 33, Dem. 16.27, 18.193.

I have retained the dative βις, though others may prefer to write
βια. The dative phrase gives a better balance with the following ευν
φθονω θεων; and the combination of ειναι, its impersonal subject unex-
pressed, with an adverb or equivalent phrase is illustrated by Aesch.
Sept. 683–84 ειπερ κακον φεροι τις, αισχυνης ατερ | εστω, Ag. 217 εδ γαρ
εη, Cho. 868 εη δ’ επι νεκρη, Eur. Med. 89 εδ γαρ εσται, HF 1292–93 δ’ δι
αει κακως | εστ’, Hel. 1273, Or. 1106.

III

365 Cho. ἵπποβοτον Ἄργος, ὁ πάτριον ἐμὸν πέδον,
ἐκλύετε τάδ’, ἐκλύετε
ἀνακτος δεια περὶ θεώς

\(^{16}\) BullAcImpSt.Petersburg 22 (1877) 92.
\(^{17}\) It is accepted by Wecklein in 1898 but not in 1912.
I have transcribed the first strophe in order to present it with a question-mark at the end. All the editors I have seen, with the exception only of Italie, make the sentence a statement: “Argos, you heard this good news from king Theseus.” If Argos heard it, fifty miles away, then Athens is ruled by king Stentor. I translate the remainder. “May he, in going as far as the ending of my miseries and still further, remove the bloody άγαλμα of a mother and make the land of Inachus friendly to himself by doing it service. Labour undertaken in a pious cause is a fine άγαλμα for cities and wins everlasting gratitude.” The “bloody άγαλμα of a mother” is taken to mean the bloody corpses of their fallen sons, and there is no reason why the words ματέρος άγαλμα φόνον should not have that meaning: see 631–32 τό σών άγαλμα, τό σών ίδρυμα | πόλεος (“the glory, the stay, of your city,” meaning these same dead heroes), 1163–64 οὕκετι φιλον | φίλας άγαλμα οἴσομαι σε ματρός (“no longer shall I see you, dearly beloved delight of a loving mother”), IT 273, Aesch. Ag. 208, Soph. Ant. 1115, tr. fr. adesp. 126.3. And for the adjective φόνον see 812 σώμαθ’ αἰματοταχῇ. But there are two difficulties. First, the recurrence of άγαλμα only eleven words later and with a different connotation betrays clumsiness to a high degree. Negligent repetition within a short space of common and colourless words is a well-known feature of tragic style: the word άγαλμα is neither colourless nor common. Second, the failure to define the verb ‘remove’ is troublesome: contrast the precision of 571 θάψω νεκρῶν γῆς εξελών ’Ακουπίας (similarly 38 ὃς ἦ το τούτων λυπρὸν εξέλη χθονός).
I will add that φόνον in this context is not apposite, although I am well aware that others will find it a choice epithet.

In place of ἀγολίμα I suggest ἀμυμαία: “may he put an end to a mother’s bloody cheek-tearing.” This clause defines τέρμα τῶν ἐμῶν κακῶν in the same way that τὸ πλέον ἐτὶ is defined by γὰν ... ὀνῆς. The noun appears at Andr. 826–27 ὀνύχων τε διὰ ἀμύματα θήσομαι, Soph. Αjeta. 634 πολλὰς ἀμυμαία χαίτας, and its cognates at Eur. fr.925a Snell γενύων τ’ ἀμυχάς, Aesch. Cho. 24 πρέπει παρήξ φοίνικ’ ἀμυμοῖς (text doubtful, παρήξ φοίνικ’ ἀμυμοῖς Stanley, παρήξ φοίνικ’ ἀμυμοῖς Conington). ‘Bloody’ is the epithet which this activity warrants: 76–77 διὰ παρήξοκ ὄνυχι λευκὸν | ἀιματοῦτε χρώτα φόνον· <e e>,19 Hec. 655–56, Hel. 373–74, 1089, Or. 961–62. For the verb ἔξαιρεῖ in the sense ‘put an end to’, with an inanimate object, see Phoen. 991 πατρός ἔξειλον φόβον, Med. 904 νείκος πατρός ἔξαιρομενήν, Pl. Resp. 387δ καὶ τοὺς ὀδύρμους ἀρα ἔξαιρήσουμαι καὶ τοὺς οἴκτους τῶν ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, 387ε, Isoc. 12.165 ἔξαιρεῖ ... τὰς διαφορὰς, LSJ s.υ. iii init.20 Comparable to the whole expression is Plut. Sol. 21.6 ἀμυχάς δ’ κοπτομένων ... ἀφεῖλεν (Solon “put an end to the cheek-tearing of mourners”).

IV

476 εκέφαι δέ, καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἐμοῖς θυμοῦμενος λόγοις, ὦς δὴ πόλιν ἑλευθέραν ἡχοῖν, εὐφαγωντ’ ἀμείψῃ μύθον ἐκ βραχιόνων. ἐλπὶς γὰρ ἐτ’ ἀπίστον, ἡ πολλὰς πόλεις συνήψ’, ἀγουςα θυμόν εἰς ὑπερβολάς.21

19 For the text of these and the corresponding lines in the antistrophe see G. Zuntz, An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides (Cambridge 1965) 65–67; A. M. Dale, The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama (Cambridge 1968) 75 n.1. I have two points to add: (i) the expression λευκὸν | ἀιματοῦτε χρώτα φόνον, where χρώτα is qualified by two epithets, the one descriptive, the other proleptic (“bloody the white flesh gory”), is so insipid that one of the adjectives must be altered. Since φόνοι (“with gory nail”: so Hec. 657 δίαμον ἄνυξα, Hel. 1089 ὀνύχα φόνον) requires an improbable corroboration (Zuntz’s objection to “the separation, excessively wide, of noun and adjective” is unwarranted: see Breitenbach, op.cit. [supra n.10] 243ff), perhaps we should consider λευκάς (Page): see Med. 923, 1148, El. 1023; (ii) the credit for first adding <e e> in the strophe should be assigned to Wilamowitz, Griechische Tragedien, III: Euripides, Der Mütter Bittgang (Berlin 1899). The textual notes were not added until the fourth edition (1904), but this reading is presupposed by the 1899 version, as are most of the other prescribed readings. But Wilamowitz ignores the conjecture in Griechische Verskunst (Berlin 1921) 267 n.2.

20 Phoen. 516 πῶς γὰρ ἔξαιρεῖ λόγον (“removes every obstacle” Pearson) also belongs here and not in the class which LSJ invents for it. Euripides makes similar use of ἀφαίρει: e.g. Med. 456, HP 99.

21 ἐτ’ ἀπίστον Fix, ἐτ’ κάκιστον L.
“Take careful thought, and do not, in your anger at my words and because you suppose that yours is a free city, deliver in reply a speech flushed with pride ἐκ βραχίων. For hope is not to be trusted: it has brought many cities into conflict, by tempting the spirit to excesses.”

A commentator’s first instinct is to suppose that βραχίων must be a comparative adjective. Then he finds the grammarians writing “βραχίων nur bei alten Grammatikern...sonst βραχύτερος.”22 And “βραχίων (nur als Subst., woraus lat. brachium) βραχύτερος.”23 And so he writes such notes as these: “Distinguendum opinor: ἐφικτητικόν ἀμέλητο μόνον ἐκ βραχίων | ἐλπίς γάρ ἐπὶ κάκις τόν, ἡ πολλάκις, &c. βραχίων Graecis, ut brachia et lacerti Latinis, robur et uires denotat; Fidens juventus horrida brachiis, Horat. III. Carm. iv. 50, et νέοι βραχίονι Noster Hecub. 15, hac fab. 748 [738] νέοι βραχίονι” (Markland); “uide ne efficias uerbis contumeliosis, ut urbs nostra tibi respondeat sermonem robustum e brachiis torosis” (Reiske); “ne lasciuiens mihi reddas responsum ex lacertis, id est, ad lacertos, uel ad uim, rem deducens” (Heath); “ex brachiis: interpretor ex uiuium fiducia” (Musgrave); “Poet. as a symbol of strength, ἐκ βραχίων by force of arm, E. Supp. 478” (LSJ s.u. βραχίων; but LSJ Suppl. is more cautious—“for ‘as a...478’ read ‘of strength of arm, νέοι βραχίονι, E. Supp. 738’”); “non voler...ricambiarmi d’una tumida risposta per effetto (della forza) del tuo braccio” (Ammendola);24 “vertrouwend op uw kracht (cf. 738 βραχίονι)” (Italie). And finally Grégoire: “me faire une réponse gonflée de ta force. βραχίονι est bien le génitif du mot βραχίων, ‘bras’, et non un prétendu comparatif de βραχύς, comme le veulent certains modernes (Wilamowitz, Wecklein). Euripide, ainsi que les autres tragiques, ignore absolument un tel comparatif; par contre, il emploie plus de vingt fois le substantif βραχίων.” And so there we are: Euripides uses the noun βραχίων “more than twenty times” (I count nineteen, even when this alleged instance is included)25 not only Euripides but also Aeschylus and Sophocles “absolutely ignore” the comparative adjective βραχίων. And, to show how absolute is their ignorance of this comparative, they make great play with the other comparative βραχύτερος—do they? Not a bit of it: not even once, not

22 Kühner-Blass I 555.
23 E. Schwytzer, Griechische Grammatik I (München 1953) 538.
24 G. Ammendola, ed. 2 (Turin 1956).
25 Allen–Italie, A Concordance to Euripides (Berkeley 1954), record this instance under the adjective βραχύς. Mr Collard in his Supplement to the Concordance (Groningen 1971) has restored it to the noun βραχίων.
even in one of the three dramatists, is there to be found a comparative βραχύτερος. So that when Grégoire says that they “absolutely ignore” the comparative βραχύων, he really means that they never find an occasion on which they need to use it. So much, then, for this interpretation. I should consider it to be an absurdity even if there were no alternative interpretation to offer. But with its absurdity I am less concerned than with the reasoning by which it was attained. It was, like Marvell’s love, begotten by despair upon impossibility.

And now what have Grégoire’s fractious moderns to say for themselves? “Sieh’ dich auch vor, auf meinen Antrag nicht | kurz angebunden ein entrüstet Nein | zu sagen” (Wilamowitz); “gib nicht als eben ‘einem freien Staate’ vorstehend eine zu kurz und hochfahrende Antwort” (Wecklein 1912). And not only “certains modernes”; for “certains anciens” had the same idea. Barnes gives the translation: “superbum reddas responsum, paucioribus prolatum.” But this will not do: the length or shortness of Theseus’ reply to the herald is a consideration of the profoundest irrelevance. The correct interpretation was given by Paley: “ἐκ βραχύων, like εξ ἄλπτων, Aesch. Suppl. 351 [357], from βραχύς, ‘on small grounds’, ‘from an inferior and weaker cause’.” And E. B. England, CR 15 (1901) 55, writes: “the words ἐκ βραχύων, which some editors have thought corrupt, seem to me sound, and to mean ‘though on the weaker side’. Cf. v.518f οὐκ οἶδ’ ἐγὼ Κρέοντα δεσπόζοντ’ ἐμὸν | οὐδὲ εὐδοντα μεῖζον.” Paley’s citation of Aesch. Suppl. 357 ἐξ ἄλπτων is less apposite than the following passages: Heracl. 148-49 κῶνυνων ξδέ ἀμηχάνων | βίπτοντες (“hazarding a risk in a desperate situation”), Soph. Trach. 1109 χειρὼσομαι κάκ τῶνδε (“I shall destroy her even in my present state of health”), Phil. 91-92 οὖ γὰρ ξδέ ἐνος ποδός | . . . χειρώσεται (“he will not defeat us with only one leg to stand on”); see also Eur. Med. 459 and Hipp. 705 κάκ τῶνδε, Aesch. Ag. 1423 ἐκ τῶν δμοίων, Soph. El. 455 εξ ὑπερτέρας χερός, OT 528 εξ ὀμμάτων ὀφθαλῶν δέ καὶ ὀφθής φρενός, Trach. 875 εξ ἀκινήτου ποδός, OC 807 εξ ἀπαντος. And very similar is Thuc. 5.103.1 ἐλπὶς . . . τούς μὲν ἀπὸ περιουσίας (“from a superabundance of resources,” “from

26 Nor a superlative βραχύτατος. Sophocles twice has βράχιτος, the form which presupposes a comparative βραχύων.

27 The citations by F. H. M. Blaydes, Spicilegium tragicum (Halle 1902) 242, of Hermippus fr.58 Kock φθέγξε . . . βραχύων, and by R. Goossens, RBPhil 16 (1937) 625-26, of Achaios fr.4 Nauck (4 Snell) βραχύωνε . . . φρεγάοντες (ται Bergk) have no relevance to the present question. I shall ignore the conjectures which have been offered in place of βραχύων.

28 Griech. Trag. III (supra n.19).
a strong position”) χρωμένους αὐτῆς, κἂν βλάψῃ, οὐ καθεῖλεν. The adjective has the same sense as at Heracl. 613 τὸν μὲν ἄφ᾽ ὑψηλῶν βραχὺν φίκες, Phoen. 738 εθνός βραχύ, Soph. OC 880 χῶ βραχύς νικῇ μέγαν.

V

Cho. — ὁ μέλεια μελέων ματέρες λοχαγῶν,
ὅς μοι ψ' ἤπατι χλωρὸν δεῖμα θάκει . . .
600 — τίν' αὐδᾶν τάνδε προσφέρεις νέαν;
— εὐφράστωμα πά Παλλάδος κριθήσεται.
— διὰ δορὸς ἔπιας ἢ λόγων ξυναλλαγαίς;
— γένοιτ' ἂν κέρδος· εἶ δ' ἀρείφατοι
φόνοι μάχας εὐφραστῶμει τ' ἀνὰ πτόλων
605/606 κτύποι φανήσονται, τάλανα, τίνα λόγον,
607 τίν' ἂν τάνδ' αἰτίαν λάβομι;
— ἀλλὰ τὸν εὐτυχία λαμπρὸν ἂν τίς αἱροί
μοῖρα πάλιν· τόδε μοι θράσος ἀμφιβαίνει.

599 θάκει Murray, ταράκεει L. 604 τ' ἀνὰ πτόλων Murray, γ' ἀνὰ τόπον πάλιν L, iam τ' ἀνὰ πτόλων πάλιν Markland. 606 τάλανα Hermann, ο τάλανα L. 608 εὐτυχία Markland, εὐτυχή L; αἱροί Matthiae, αἱρῆ L.

This, for the most part, is Murray’s text. I differ from him in two respects. First, I have followed Dale’s29 colometry in 605–07 ~ 615–17. And, second, I have restored αἰτίαν at 607, where almost all accept Hermann’s αἰτία, since I cannot believe that the iteration τίνα λόγον τίν’ has any but an enervating effect in this context.30 The meaning is “What word of reproach, what blame would I receive?” For λόγον λαβεῖν see Heracl. 165–66 κακὸν λόγον | κτήσῃ πρὸς ἄστων,31 and for αἰτίαν λαβεῖν see Thuc. 2.18.3 αἰτίαν τε οὐκ ἔλαχιστην Ἀρχιδαμος ἔλαβεν ἂν αἰτοῦ, 6.60.1. The two emendations of Murray himself, at 599 and 604, are admirable. At 599 ψ’ ἤπατι ... δεῖμα θάκει may be

29 “Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses,” BICS Suppl. 21 i (1971) 78.
30 αἰτίαν is also retained by W. Headlam, CR 15 (1901) 19, and by Grégoire, and approved by Zuntz, op.cit. (supra n.19) 73.
31 λόγος cannot by itself mean ‘word of reproach’, and it is no good supposing that such a meaning is possible at 565 πολλοὶς ὑπερφόγοις ἄν ἀρβρώσων λόγους, where ψόγους (first considered and rejected by Markland) is needed. It depends on what qualification is given to λόγος. Here τίνα λόγον ἄν λάβομι; means “what sort of λόγος [i.e. an unfavourable one] should I receive?,” and τίνα performs much the same function as the adjective in κακὸν λόγον κτήσῃ (Heracl. 165–66).
compared with Aesch. Ag. 982–83 θάρσος εὐπειθεῖες ἢ|ει (Scaliger, ἢει F Tr) φρενὸς φιλον θρόνον, Eum. 517–19 ἐθή ὑπὸ τὸ δείμαν ἐδ | καὶ
φρενὸν ἐπίσκοπον | δεῖ μένειν καθήμενον, Eur. Alc. 604 πρὸς ἐμὲ ἴππις θάρσος ἤτται. If ἄμμαιβαινε is the right reading at 609 (and there is no
good reason to doubt it), then I cannot see how correspondence be­
tween that word and the end of line 599 will be achieved more neatly
than it is by this conjecture; and I should hope that nobody will re­
turn to Markland’s θράσκει.32 Equally, in 604 ἀνά πτόλων very simply
restores correspondence with the antistrophe at a point where the
text of the antistrophe seems unimpeachable.

But Murray, while curing one fault of responsion in 599, has left
another fault in the line unmended. In 609 the third dactyl of the
praxillean (μοι θράσκει) cannot be answered by a spondee in 599
(χλωρόν). Further, the break between χλωρόν and δείμα presents “a
unique example of word-end after long biceps.”33 Most of the solu­
tions offered are either improbably violent (δείμα χολήν ταράκεει Camper, δείμα φρένας ταράκεει Hermann) or metrically unsafe (δείμα
χλερόν ταράκεει p ~ μοι <τό> [Musurus] or μοι <τι> [Musgrave] or τοι με
[Blaydes]34 θράσκεος ἄμμαιβαινε). The simplest solution yet proposed is
Hartung’s χλωρόν <τι> δείμα ~ μοι θέρσεος ἄμμαι-, giving a hemiepes and
ithyphallic, as in the previous line, but it inspires little confidence. In
Dale’s35 modification of this, χλωρόν <τό> δείμα, the article is stylistic­
ally abhorrent.

“Tutissima proinde corrigendi ratio est, uocularum, si opus est,
transpositio,” said Porson.36 And here, by shifting the position of
χλωρόν, and changing it in the process to χλερόν,37 we may achieve
the praxillean ὡς χλερόν μοι ὑφ’ ἰτατι δείμα ϑάκεει. The displacement
of an adjective so that it may occupy a position next to its noun, or of a

32 But the corruption may well have arisen by way of θράσκει: cf. Hesych. θράστεων ἄνοχ­
λειν, παράττειν; Suda θράστεων ταράκεειν.
33 L. P. E. Parker, CQ n.s. 16 (1966) 24.
34 Adversaria critica in Euripidem (Halle 1901) 539.
35 loc.cit. (super n.29).
36 Two leading advocates of this method of correction are in the habit of misquoting this
remark with uocabulorum for vocularum: Headlam, CR 16 (1902) 243; G. Thomson, CQ n.s.
37 The two words are confused at [Hom.] Batrach. 162, Philox. Leuc. PMG 836 (b) 17,
Theoc. 13.41. Since they are semantically akin, and since χλωρός is very much commoner
than χλερός, it can be of no consequence that only χλωρός is attested in application to such
nouns as δείμα, δέος. For discussion of the shades of meaning of χλωρός see Jebb on Bacchyl.
5.172 (Appendix 473–74), Page on Med. 906.
noun so that it may stand next to its adjective, is a common error, and illustration exists in abundance.\footnote{Headlam, op.cit. (supra n.36) 243–56; J. Jackson, Marginalia Scaenica (Oxford 1955) 228–231; E. W. Whittle, CLMed 29 (1972) 14.} The same type of error has also been detected at 274 οὐς ύπο τείχες Καδμείωσιν ἀπώλεσα κούρους, where Hermann ("in notis msscrpt." Wilamowitz, Analecta Euripidea) and independently Nauck restore the caesura and the rhythm by writing οὐς ύπο Καδμείωσιν ἀπώλεσα τείχες κούρους.\footnote{The same adjective has suffered transposition at Soph. Ant. 1115 Καδμείας ἀγαλμα νύμφας Nauck, Καδμείας νύμφας ἀγαλμα codd., and so too has the adjective χλωρός at Ar. Lys. 255 βάρος χλωράς φέρων ἐλάς Bentley, φέρων βάρος χλωράς ἐλάς codd.} This transposition must stand or fall with the decision on an equally anomalous hexameter in the same passage, 282 μήδε ἀτάφους τέκνον ἐν χθονὶ Κάδμου χάρματα θηρῶν, where Wilamowitz proposed ἐν Κάδμου χθονί. Dale\footnote{op.cit. (supra n.19) 29.} claims that these are "irregularities which should not be emended away," but does not explain why not. Fraenkel\footnote{Aeschylus, Agamemnon II (Oxford 1950) 57–58.} cites 274 in defence of Ag. 111 πεῖμπει ξύν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι θυρίως ὄρνες, where others will prefer the colometry of Murray and Page; he also cites Ag. 156 τοὐδὲ Κάλλας ξύν μεγάλους ἀγαθοὶς ἀπέκλασέν, where the strong caesura in the fourth foot makes all the difference, and the textually dubious Eum. 365 Ζεῦς [γὰρ] αἰμοτογεῖς (αἰματοτογεῖς codd.) ἀξιόμενον ἔθνος τόδε λέεις. As to 282, L. P. E. Parker\footnote{loc.cit. (supra n.33) 21.} shows, in favour of Wilamowitz's transposition, that word-end after the spondaic fourth foot is an equally grave anomaly. I therefore conclude that Hermann's and Nauck's transposition in 274 is to be accepted. And I shall soon be suggesting a further transposition for which a similar desire to simplify the word-order may be given as a cause: see on 699, infra p. 264.

VI

650 Mess. λαμπρὰ μὲν ἀκτίς ἀλήου, κανῶν εαφής, ἕβαλλε γαίαν· ἀμφὶ δὲ Ἡλέκτρας πύλας ἔστη κεατὴς πύργων εὐαγή λαβῶν, ὀρῶ δὲ φῦλα τρία τριῶν εὐτραπευμάτων· τευχεσφόρον μὲν λαον ἐκτείνοντ' ἄνω

655 Ἡμεῖσιν πρὸς ἥχθον, ὡς μὲν ἂν λόγος, αὐτῶν τ' ἄνακτα, ποιῶδα κλεινὸν Αἰγέως,
“Lectori etiam attentissimo multum et irritum negotium facesset subsequens narratio, ut nunc habet contextus,” writes Markland at line 650. Markland’s was the first serious discussion of this passage; the latest discussion is that of Mr Christopher Collard.43 Mr Collard provides a convenient synopsis of the views of earlier commentators, and he has disposed of many of their mistaken notions (in particular he has vindicated the order of verses against the popular expedient of transposition), and these earlier mistakes I shall ignore except where they are relevant to my argument. But I have grave doubts about Mr Collard’s own interpretation of these lines, and it is this which I wish chiefly to examine. 44

First, I shall set out the facts which may be taken as established. The Athenian army is drawn up before the walls of the Cadmea in three separate detachments, 653 φύλα τρία τριών στρατευμάτων, clearly distinguished as (i) 654 τευχεσφόρον μὲν λαόν, the infantry, (ii) 660 ἵπποτην δ’ ὀχλον, the cavalry, (iii) 662 ἀρμάτων δ’ ὀχήματα, the chariots. The infantry is divided into a right wing, led by Theseus (656–58),45

43 CQ n.s. 13 (1963) 178–82.
44 It is substantially the same as that of J. Mesk, WS 55 (1937) 48–54. The literary and archaeological evidence for Theban topography is collected by F. Schober, “Thebai (Boiotien),” RE 5A 2 (1934) 1423ff [hereafter cited Schober with column number]. Both Mesk and Mr Collard ascribe this article to L. Ziehen, who wrote only the section “Kulte.”
45 Murray ought not to have printed in 658 παλαιὰς Κεκροπίας <τ’> οἰκήτορας (“distinguuntur Thesei comites et indigenae Cecropii”), where the τε is anomalously placed: see J. D. Denniston, Greek Particles (Oxford 1954) 517, Fraenkel, op.cit. (supra n.41) 130–31.
and a left wing, possibly led by Paralos (659-60). This is quite clear: see Mr Collard, especially 179 n.3 and 181. The messenger, whose vantage-point is a tower near the Electran gate (651-52), defines the position of the three detachments by reference to three distinct landmarks. The right wing of the infantry stretches Ἀεήμηνον πρὸς ὄχθον (655), “towards the Ismenian hill,” whose location is at the southeast of the walls. The left wing is drawn up κρήνην παρ’ αὐτὴν “Ἀρεος (660), “alongside the fountain of Ares,” which is located at the southwest of the walls. The infantry, therefore, invests the whole southern circuit of the walls.

Before proceeding to the third landmark, I will speak of the text and interpretation of line 659, which I have marked as corrupt. Our chief uncertainty attaches to the noun Πάραλος: is this name intended to signify the hero Paralos, or the Paraloi, the inhabitants of the Paralia named after him? First, let me explain why this name is introduced here at all. In old king Cecrops’ day Attica was a conglomeration of towns: ἐπὶ γὰρ Κέκροπος καὶ τῶν πρώτων βασιλέων ἡ Ἄττικὴ ἐς Θησέα αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεις φίλειτο . . . καὶ ὅπως μὴ τε δείξων ὦ εὐνήσων βουλευόμενων ὡς τῶν βασιλεία ἄλλα ἀυτοί ἑκατοε ἐπολίτευον καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο . . . ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησέως ἐβασίλευε . . . (Thuc. 2.15). Cecrops lived in Athens. But there are texts which hint at an even more specific location for ‘Cecropia’: Ἰων 936-37 Κέκροπιας πέτρας | πρόσβορον ἄντρον (Acropolis); Mel.Soph. 10-11 θυγάτηρ Ἐρεβθέως Κέκροπιας ἐπ’ αὐχένι | Ἰων ἐτυκτεν (“on the side of the Acropolis,” unless the traditional site of Ion’s birthplace has been changed); and the Acropolis again looms large in Εἰ. 1289 ὄχθον (Valckenaer, ὀἶκον Ἐ) Κέκροπιας εὐδαιμονία. These are the only tragic passages specific enough to help in the location of ‘Cecropia’: they suggest that Cecrops was imagined as having his palace on the Acropolis. I do not say that Cecropia was felt to be synonymous with the Acropolis; but it does seem likely that Cecropia was felt to be limited to Athens, as centred on the Acropolis. Now, the Paralia is not a part of Athens. It is a part of Attica, and so it

46 See the plan in Schober, loc.cit. (supra n.44) 1426. In Mr Collard’s diagram (reproduced below) it has strayed a little too far north. Mr Collard rightly commends Murray’s interpretation of the words ὦς μὲν ἦν λόγος in 655; but the credit for this interpretation should go to P. P. Dobree, Adversaria II 81.

47 The evidence for this location, and against the location given by Pausanias, is decisive: Wilamowicz, Hermes 26 (1891) 241-42, Pindaros (Berlin 1922) 32 n.1; Schober, loc.cit. (supra n.44) 1426. In Mr Collard’s diagram it has strayed a little too far south.

48 Mr Collard’s diagram unaccountably shows the infantry investing only the southeast.
would not be under the direct control of Cecrops. Theseus unified Attica, and Theseus therefore would be (or so Euripides might reason) the first king who might appropriately be described as leading an Attic, as opposed to an Athenian, army. It is proper that Theseus himself should lead the “inhabitants of old Cecropia,” while someone else leads the outsiders. The epithet παλαιός reinforces the distinction between the past and present states of Athens-Attica.

At the beginning of 659 αὐτόν cannot be tolerated: it is one thing to say αὐτόν τ’ ἀνακτα, “the commander himself,” quite another to say αὐτόν δὲ Πάραλος, “Paralos himself,” when this is the first we have heard of him. Furthermore, αὐτόν τ’ ἀνακτα . . . αὐτόν δὲ Πάραλος . . . κρήνην παρ’ αὐτήν is very clumsy writing. It looks as if the second αὐτόν has intruded under the influence of αὐτόν overhead at 656 (for a similar intrusion from above see on 1090, infra p.266). We therefore have a free hand to replace αὐτόν with anything suitable. We might bring in the Paraloi simply enough by writing λαὸν δὲ Παράλον (λαὸν Jacobs, also Dobree, Adversaria II 81, Παράλον Kirchhoff). But what one would expect to be told, after hearing that Theseus and the Cecropids are on the right, is that Paralos and/or the Paraloi are on the left. Reiske’s λαὸν for αὐτόν, whether interpreted as masculine in agreement with Πάραλος or as neuter in agreement with the noun in the phrase κέρας πεταγμένον (mentally supplied), is unsatisfactory for the reasons given by Mr Collard, p.181. I can see no economical way of introducing a reference to the left-wing position of a plurality of Paraloi; but we may specify such a position for Paralos by writing λαῷ δὲ Πάραλον ἔστολους δορί, where δορί, as often, has a collective sense. Paralos may stand as eponymous part for the whole of the folk named after him. He was a sufficiently celebrated hero, with a portrait in the Propylaea and a shrine at Piraeus. Wilamowitz’s claim that Paralos would have been named only “wenn er in der Schlacht etwas thate” is unconvincing. Apart from the deliberate contrast which Euripides is exploiting between Cecropids and Paraloi and which alone would justify the introduction of the eponymous hero, the commander of the cavalry is later given a name (680 Phorbas), but for no conspicuous achievement.

A final point. I think that we must accept Murray’s τε in place of δέ, for these reasons: (i) δέ interrupts the essential triple division τευχε-
The first τέ does not join αὐτόν ἄνακτα to what precedes but rather looks forward to a correlative particle; a second τέ is needed to correspond to the first, so that the two wings may be seen to be coordinated as subdivisions of the τευχές-φόρος λαός. It may be argued in reply to (i) that the secondary contrast thus interposed is so straightforward that it does not confuse the picture, and to (ii) that examples of correlative τέ...δὲ are offered by Denniston, *Particles* 513 (the Euripidean instances are an unhappy and precarious collection). But we ought not to scruple to make a change which could be documented a thousand times over when the gain in lucidity is substantial.

We may now proceed to the third landmark, the “sacred monument of Amphion” (663), that is, the tomb of Amphion and Zethus. It is the location of this monument that I must make the beginning of my contention. Aeschylus at *Sept.* 527–28 (quoted by Mr Collard, 180 n.2) speaks of Parthenopaeus as προστασθέντα Βορραίας πύλας | τύμβον καὶ αὐτόν Διογένος Ἀμφίωνος. The Borraean gate can be situated nowhere except on the northern side of the city; Aeschylus says that Amphion’s tomb is situated near that gate. This is significant evidence. Archaeologists have attempted to identify this τύμβος or μνήμα with a hill directly north of the Cadmea. It has been replied that this hill is too large to permit such an identification, since Pausanias (9.17.4) describes the monument as χώμα οὗ μέγα. A further piece of evidence has been adduced: that Pausanias locates the tomb vaguely in the neighbourhood of the Proitidian gate, which is believed to have been situated in the northeast of the wall. But this evidence must be treated with caution. Pausanias locates his buildings and his sites by reference to three gates only: the Electran, the Neistan (believed to be in the northwest) and the Proitidian. The sites which he mentions as being near the Proitidian gate he locates in the vaguest terms, and they are probably scattered over a wide area. We need not therefore suppose that there is any contradiction between Aeschylus and Pausanias. The tomb of Amphion may safely be located in the north or northeast. But Mr Collard follows neither Aeschylus nor Pausanias. Instead he locates the tomb due east. Why he does so I do not know, since he is able to offer no evidence in support. He does, indeed, say that Euripides “seems to bring the tomb of Amphion a little nearer the gate of

—Mesk, *loc.cit.* (supra n.44), who does not give a plan, seems to require the same location.
Electra than its northeast location (confirmed by archaeological evidence) strictly requires.” I think that “a little nearer” is perhaps an understatement for what is a movement through forty-five degrees, from northeast to due east. But let that go. I ask only, what is the archaeological evidence which confirms the location of the tomb in the northeast? Mr Collard quotes none, and none is quoted by Schober 1446. The archaeological evidence which Schober does quote supports the location of the tomb due north of the walls. Furthermore, Euripides says that the chariots were disposed “beneath” the tomb. Mr Collard is obliged to dispose them between the tomb and the Ismenian hill. He says that “the chariots would seem to be below it (ἐνέρθη 663) to an observer looking northward from a tower at the gate of Electra.” If all else were in favour of Mr Collard’s interpretation, this further geographical imprecision might be overlooked. As it is, it must be accounted as another difficulty created by his interpretation.

And so the position which we have reached is this: Mr Collard, following unspecified archaeological evidence which locates the tomb in the northeast, locates it due east; I, following Aeschylus and the archaeological evidence presented by Schober 1446, which may or may not be relevant (for I have no competence to assess it), locate the tomb north of the Borraean gate. I shall therefore locate the chariots at the north of the city in order to see what effect this has on the remainder of the narrative.

I now come to the disposition of the cavalry: 660–62 ἵπποτην δ' ἐχλον | πρὸς κρασπεδοῖς στρατοπέδου τεταγμένον' | ἰεος ἀριθμόν. The old interpreters took these words to mean that the cavalry was disposed on the edges of the army in two detachments of equal number. Mr Collard (p.180) rejects this interpretation for the following reason: “In 680ff. the cavalry come to the immediate aid of the chariots, which began the battle (674ff.) and are stationed ἐνέρθη εσμιῶν μνημάτων Ἀμφύονος (663). The cavalry therefore was on one flank of the army only.”52 It all depends on where you place the chariots. If you place the chariots where Mr Collard places them, then the only way to make sense of the succeeding narrative is to place the cavalry where he places it. If you place the chariots elsewhere, then you can think again about the disposition of the cavalry. But, before we do think again, consider this. Euripides says that the cavalry was drawn up

52 Similarly Mesk, loc.cit. (supra n.44) 52.
It is essential to Mr Collard’s interpretation that this should refer to one edge only; so, for the moment, let us allow that κρασπέδωις refers to a single edge. Here will be the progress of the messenger’s description: (i) the infantry is disposed between the Isemian hill and the Fountain of Ares, (ii) the cavalry is disposed “on the edge of the στρατόπεδον.” Immediately the reader asks himself two questions: which edge, left or right? and whose edge, that of the infantry, or some other edge? To the first question—left or right?—the reader must answer “I cannot tell.” And if Mr Collard denies this by reminding us that “in 680ff. the cavalry come to the immediate aid of the chariots,” who according to his arrangement are on the right, I reply that 680ff are twenty lines away and that we cannot be kept waiting until the fighting is nearly over before we discover what position the combatants were occupying before the fighting began.63 To the second question—whose edge?—his reaction will, I think, go somewhat like this: “We are told that the cavalry is drawn up on the edge of the στρατόπεδον. It must therefore be contiguous with the infantry, for no other edge has been mentioned, nor do I know that any other edge is going to be mentioned. I cannot possibly retain an open mind about the identity of the edge, because I have no means of divining that in the next line but one the poet is going to mention the chariots and so create another edge or two.” No, it will not work: if you are to retain your reader’s comprehension, you cannot define the position of X by reference to Y, when Y does not yet exist. Moreover, if Mr Collard were correct in locating the cavalry on the right edge not of the infantry but of the combined forces of the infantry and the chariots, then Euripides has chosen a very odd way of defining the position of the chariots. Why did he locate them beneath that problematic monument, the tomb of Amphion, when he could have avoided all ambiguity and imprecision by simply telling us that they were located between the infantry and the cavalry?

And now let us see what happens when the words πρὸς κρασπέδωις στρατόπεδον τεταγμένον are interpreted to mean “drawn up on the edges of the infantry.” Everything will be found to fall into place. The

63 In fact, the statement that “the cavalry come to the immediate aid of the chariots” is a misunderstanding of 680ff. Euripides says that when the Athenian and Theban cavalry saw that the chariots had begun fighting, they τετάμηκαν ἄλειψιν κάρατον ἥταν ἐκάμπτο τε (683). The words τετάμηκαν ἄλειψιν mean the same as τετάμηκαν μάχας “they joined battle (with each other),” not “they went to aid (the chariots).” The mistake goes back to Wilamowitz, Analecta Euripidea 106.
cavalry, in two detachments of equal number (ἰκονε ἄριθμον), invests the east and west;⁵⁴ the infantry invests the south; the chariots invest the north. The city is surrounded, as it was when the Septem attacked it. And now consider a consequence of that earlier investment. Since the Septem and their contingents attacked the complete circuit of the walls, the dead, whose bodies have not been moved from the places where they fell, must be assumed to be lying at intervals around the whole circuit. If the Athenians are to invest only the southeast, as Mr Collard wishes, then, since we are explicitly told that the Thebans stationed themselves directly opposite the Athenians contingent for contingent (666–67), Theseus must be severely faulted for his generalship if he failed to despatch Paralos or a handful of the Paraloi to collect at least those corpses which lay unguarded around the northern and western sides. Reason conspires with the indications of the text to suggest that, when the Thebans took their stand “in front of the corpses, for whose possession the battle was being fought” (665), they stood in front of them all, not half of them.

I give overleaf a sketch of Mr Collard’s battle plan and a sketch of my own. I have tried to reproduce Mr Collard’s plan as accurately as possible; my own sketch of the walls describes a circle, for reasons which will become clear later.

It remains to consider two possible objections to my arrangement. First, offence has been taken at the words ἰκονε ἄριθμον, placed in apposition to ὀξὺν. Mr Collard says on p.180 that they are “very difficult to explain and to substantiate grammatically,” and again on p.182 that they are “supposedly constructed ‘κατὰ σώνειν’ with ὀξὺν in 660, but they are unclear in meaning . . . nor does the account elsewhere state that they [the cavalry] were placed equally on both sides of the army; I doubt if the Greek will bear that sense.” If the words ἱππότην δ’ ὀξὺν | πρὸς κρασπέδους ετρατοπέδου τεταγμένων are understood, as I have argued that they are most naturally understood, to mean that the ἱππότης ὀξὺς was arranged on both edges of the infantry, then we already have a mental subdivision of the ὀξὺς into two parts. To append the phrase ἰκονε ἄριθμον to that now plural con-

⁵⁴ The two wings of the infantry were the regular station for the cavalry in fifth-century warfare: Thuc. 4.93.4, 99.1, 96.5 (Delium), 5.67.1–2, 73.1 (Mantinea); A. W. Gomme, Historical Commentary on Thucydides I (Oxford 1956) 15. For κράσπεδα used of the wings of an army see Xen. Hell. 3.2.16 τοὐς δὲ πελτατῶς ἐπὶ τὰ κράσπεδα ἐκατέρωθεν καθίστασαι καὶ τοὺς ἱππέας, quoted by Markland.
PLAN OF BATTLE ACCORDING TO COLLARD

PLAN OF BATTLE ACCORDING TO DIGGLE
cept creates no difficulty either logical or linguistic. Mr Collard's own solution is to emend line 662 as follows: ἰκων ἀριθμὸν ἀρμάτων [δ'] ὀχήματα, "the chariots, equal in number (to the cavalry)." I find ἰκων ἀριθμὸν a rather ponderous attribute to be borne by ἀρμάτων when this is dependent on ὀχήματα, and I should rather have expected that style would have dictated the attachment of such an attributive phrase not to the genitive but to the governing noun. "Es ist im Griechischen ein völlig zu Recht bestehender Sprachgebrauch, dass ein Adjektiv zu dem regierenden Substantiv tritt, auch wenn es dem Sinne nach eigentlich nur zu einem von jenem abhängigen Genetiv gehört," says Wilamowitz on HF 468; see also Jebb on Soph. Ant. 794 and Fraenkel on Ag. 504. I will quote only one example of such enallage: Soph. Trach. 656 πολύκωπτον ὀχήμα ναός. But it is not a necessary part of my case to invalidate Mr Collard's conjecture.

The second possible objection to my arrangement is that the messenger, immediately after describing how first the chariots and then the cavalry joined battle, proceeds: 684–88 λεύσσων δὲ ταῦτα κοῦ κλών (ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἦ | ἐνθ' ἀρματ' ἡγιωνίζεθ' οὗ τ' ἐπεμβάται) | τάκει παρόντα πολλὰ πήματα', οὐκ ἐκὼ | τί πρῶτον εἴπω, πάτερα τὴν ἐς οὐρανὸν | κόνων προκαντέλλουσαν, ὡς πολλὴ παρῆν, κτλ. The messenger was on a tower near the Electran gate, which, it is believed, was situated at the south-east of the wall. He now claims that he was on the spot where the ἀρματα and the ἐπεμβάται fought. There is a preliminary problem to be considered: are the ἐπεμβάται the charioteers or the cavalry? In spite of 585 πάντ' ἀνθρ' ὑπάρτου ἀρμάτων τ' ἐπεμβάτην, I think it more likely that they are the cavalry. There is no reason why ἐπεμβάτης should not mean a cavalryman (so Bacch. 782 ἵππων . . . ἐπεμβάτας), and the sequence of thought favours a mention of the cavalry. In 674–79 the messenger has described the clash of the chariots; in 680–83 he describes the engagement of the cavalry; when he proceeds λεύσσων δὲ ταῦτα κοῦ κλών—ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἦ | ἐνθ', we expect him to say not "where the chariots and the charioteers fought" but "where the

65 In the same way ἰκων is applied to two groups, equally distributed on right and left, at Hel. 1573 ἀλλοι δὲ τούχωσι δεξιῶσι λειοῦς τ' ἱκων.
66 Line 686 τάκει παρόντα πολλὰ πήματα', οὐκ ἐκὼ was deleted by Herwerden, Mnemosyne n.s. 5 (1877) 37, not without reason: "uide quam inuenust interpolator usus sit uocabulis παρόντα πολλά, sequente terto post uersu πολλὴ παρῆν, quamque ridicule is qui πολλὰ πήματα narraturus est, primo loco memoret puluerem. rem minime iucundam esse experti nouimus. sed quis tamen puluerem serio πῆμα uocauerit?" 67 Schober, loc.cit. (supra n.44) 1430. See also Wilamowitz, loc.cit. (supra n.47) 210–11; J. G. Frazer, Pausanias V (London 1898) 36.
chariots and the cavalry fought.” But let us leave the answer to that difficulty in suspense. The charioteers at least cannot be brought any closer to the Electran gate than northeast. Therefore, if the Electran gate is situated in the southeast, why does the messenger claim to have been on the actual spot where the chariot fight took place? Paley faces the question with blunt common sense: “the Athenian charioteers had advanced from below the tomb of Amphion (v.663), i.e. from near the πύλαι Προιτίδες, to the πύλαι ‘Ηλεκτραί (v.651).” Wilamowitz damned the messenger as a liar, who speaks “mit offenbarer Rückbeziehung.” Grégoire damned him as a braggart: “L’Argien un peu hâbleur exagère visiblement en décrivant cette mêlée homérique. En lui faisant développer la formule courante λεύσσων κοῦ κλύουν jusqu’à lui faire dire un mensonge évident pour quiconque connaissait un peu la ville de Thèbes, Euripide a voulu nous montrer que les récits de bataille des témoins civils n’étaient pas toujours plus sûrs que ceux des combattants.” But there is a simpler solution: imagine that the position of the Electran gate, for the purpose of this narrative, is higher up the eastern wall.

We must consider what sort of picture of Theban topography Euripides was trying to implant in his listener’s mind and what sort of picture an Athenian mind was capable of apprehending from such a verbal narration. βιβλίον τ’ ἐξὼν ἐκαστὸς μαθαίνει τὰ δεξιά: the βιβλίον with which Mr Collard must equip his spectator is, I fear, a publication by Bartholomew & Co. The picture at which Euripides was aiming was a picture of broad outlines: he could not aspire to anything more precise. His listeners had never seen a ground plan of Thebes. Few of them knew where the Electran gate lay, and the Ismenian hill, the fountain of Ares and the tomb of Amphion were no more than names to them. Euripides knew the location of those landmarks well enough; and he was bound to construct a narrative which was not inconsistent with that location. He chose to mention the Ismenian hill, the fountain of Ares and the tomb of Amphion because the names are decorative and contribute an air of precision and verisimilitude. He located the Athenian forces by reference to those landmarks, and he placed the Theban forces contingent for contingent

68 I exclude the possibility that the ἐπεμβάται are the παραβάται mentioned in 677 and 679.
69 loc. cit. ( supra n.47) 234.
60 Cf. Aesch. PV 266 καὶ μὴν παρὼν γε κοῦ λόγους ἄλλων κλύων, Soph. Trach. 747, Eur. IT 901. See also Theseus’ speech at 846–56.
facing the Athenians. That the Thebans, thus deployed, are able to
protect the corpses which lie around the circuit of the walls is the
strongest indication to the listener that the whole circuit of the walls
is invested. The listener does not need to know the precise location of
each individual landmark; for, even if he did know it, he would not
have time during the messenger’s narrative to piece together the
facts which might complete in his mind a consistent picture of the
topography and of the fighting. The plan of battle which I have
sketched is therefore the plan which I believe Euripides would have
sketched if he had been called upon to explain his narrative. He would
have claimed that he had envisaged the three landmarks as occupying
equidistant points around the circumference of the Cadmea and that
he had envisaged the Electran gate as located somewhere on the
eastern circuit of the walls. Not even Meton himself would have found
fault with such an explanation.

VII

καὶ εὐμπατάξαντες μέσον πάντα στρατὸν
ἐκτείνον ἐκτείνοντο . . .

Of Euripidean lines which have been alleged to lack a caesura few
emerge from scrutiny with their claim unshorned: 303 εφαλῆς γὰρ ἐν
τούτῳ μόνῳ τᾶλλ’ εὗ φρονῶν is emended with certainty by Marchant;
Hec. 355 γυναιξὶ παρθένως ἀπόβλεπτος μέτα and El. 546 ἐκεῖραι: ἣ τῆς ἐκ
κοσμοῦ λαβῶν χθονὸς have other faults and are marked as corrupt by
Murray; Andr. 397 ἀτὰρ τί ταῦτ’ ὀδύρομαι τὰ δ’ ἐν ποιών requires little
ἀγχώνια to set right; Hel. 86 ἀταρ τίς εἶ πόθεν; τίνος δ’ αὐδᾶν εε χρῆ;
ought never to have been cited, since δ’ αὐδᾶν is merely a bad conjecture
for ἔξαιδᾶν; IA 630 καὶ δεῦρο δὴ πατέρα πρὸς εἰπεῖστε εὖν φίλον is probably
not by Euripides, but, if it is, it is easily emended. The only three
serious claimants are Hec. 1159 γένοιτο διαδοχαῖς ἀμείβουσα χερῶν,
fr.495.6 (=Page, GLP 13.31) ὀρθοστάδων λόγχαις ἐπείγουσας φόνον, and
perhaps Bacch. 1125 λαβώσα δ’ ὀλέναις (ὁλεν[α]ῖς Π) ἀριστερὰν χέρα,
though this verse is troublesome on other counts. Some would
create a caesura in all three places (the papyrus has already done so in
one) by writing -ac’ for aec. Dodds on Bacch. 1125 calls this “a rather

artificial device." Perhaps it is; but it is a well-nigh miraculous coincidence that the same three lines in which alone we have any justification for suspecting that Euripides may have dispensed with the caesura also happen to contain a word ending in -ate immediately before the division of the verse.

In 699 only two conjectures are known to me. The conjecture κυμπατάξαντ’ ἐσ is ascribed by editors to Blomfield, *Museum Criticum* I (1826) 184, but it should more correctly be assigned to Dobree, *Aduersaria* II (1831) 81, for Dobree died in 1825. The authors of this conjecture call it a nominative absolute ("i.e. κυμπατάξαντ’ τοῦ βασιλέου," "Creon sc. ac Theseus. Est nominativus, quod sindunt, pendens"), and the conjecture is accepted by almost everybody. To me it seems that the economy of this solution is an inadequate recompense for the hispidity of the construction and style. Murray's reshuffle επίτα τὸν δὲ πάντα κυμπατάξαντες μένον is a more hopeful approach, but his introduction of δὲ for καὶ lessens its probability. I think that transposition may well be the solution; and perhaps we have here another example of that scribal habit which I discussed on 599 (supra p.251), the habit of bringing closer together words in agreement with each other. If we alter the order of words and add one letter, we shall have

καὶ μένον ἄπαντα κυμπατάξαντες επτάτων.  

The meaning will be "they dashed together the whole of the centre of the army." The centre of the army will be the infantry; and perhaps this is a reasonable way of designating the infantry, since the conventional placing of the cavalry on the infantry's wings suggests that the infantry, led as it is by the commander-in-chief, may be looked upon as the army's centre. But perhaps a further improvement is desirable; for I fancy that, if the manuscript had presented the verse in the form in which I have given it, the verse would have attracted a further very slight change, that of καὶ for καὶ:

καὶ μένον ἄπαντα κυμπατάξαντες επτάτων.

The infantry is now designated by επτάτως, as it was by επετάωπεδον.


63 Supra n.54.
at 661. For ες μεκον used of combatants advancing to meet each other, see II. 23.814 ες μεκον ἀμφοτερω συνήτην μεμαωτε μακεσθαι, Soph. Trach. 513-14 (Heracles and Achelous) οι τῶν ἀκλεικ | ἵκαν ες μεκον, Eur. Phoen. 1361 ἔλθοντ' ες μεκον μετασκήμον. For word-end after initial dactyl see 93 μητέρα; it is found in plays produced before or about the same time as our play at Aesch. Ag. 7 ἀκτέας, Cho. 216 καὶ τῶν, 986 ἥλιος, Soph. Aj. 846 ἱμα, Eur. Alc. 802 οὐ βίος, Telephus (C. Austin, Nova fragmenta Euripidea [Berlin 1968] 102.10) μητέρα, Erectheus (65.56 Austin) πόντε.

VIII

811 προσάγετε < > δυσπότμων
cωμαθ' αἰματοσταγη.

προσάγετε < > δυσπότμων ~798 στεναγμόν ὁ ματέρας. Hermann’s προσάγετε <τῶν> restores responsion, but προσάγετ' ἄγετε does so more stylishly and shows why the loss occurred. Similarly Alc. 400 ὑπάκουσον ἄκοουσον, Hipp. 1374 προσαπόλλυτε μ' ὀλλυτε (προσαπόλλυτον ἀπόλλυτε Wilamowitz), Hec. 167 ἀπώλεσατ' ὀλλεσατ', Or. 181 δοιοχόμεβρ' οἰχόμεθα, Bacch. 1065 κατῆγεν ἥγεν ἧγεν. The same corruption is found at Med. 1252 κατὶδετ' ἢδετε OL, κατὶδετε AVBP, and at Or. 1465 ἀνάχεν ἰάχεν, where one manuscript has ἀνάχεν alone.64

IX

(ΙPHIS) ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄλλοις εἰςορῶν τεκνουμένους
παῖδων ἐραστῆς ὡς πόθω τ' ἀπωλυθῆν.
1090 ἥτοι δ' ἐς τόδ' ἦλθον κἀξεπειράθην τέκνων
οίον στέρεσαν πατέρα γίγνεται τέκνων,
οὐκ οὖν ποτ' ἐς τόδ' ἦλθον εἰς δ νῦν κακῶν·
διεικ φυτεύσας καὶ νεανιὰν τεκνῶν
ἀριστον εἶτα τοῦδε νῦν στερίκομαι.

This is the text of L and Murray; and Murray’s are the obeli. I paraphrase Iphis’ speech (1080-93). “Why is it not possible to become

64 On the habit of following a compound verb with a simple verb in which the force of the compound is maintained, see the works cited by Fraenkel, op.cit. (supra n.41) II 175 n.3; to which may be added C. Watkins, HSCP 71 (1966) 116-19; R. Renehan, Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader (Harvard 1969) 78-85; E. J. Kenney on Lucr. 3.261 (Cambridge 1971).
young again and live one's life afresh? In matters of domestic manage­ment if something goes wrong it can be set right by a change of plan. But mistakes concerning one's life cannot be set right in this life­time. And yet if we had our lives to live again we should avoid making the same mistakes twice. When I was young I wanted children. But if I had realised what it means for a father to lose his children, I should have had none, and so I should have avoided my present plight. For I fathered a fine son, and now I have lost him."

The words in italics represent the evident sense which must be borne by the obelized lines. The repeated τέκνων (1089–90) betrays corruption, and some have also found offence in the repetition of ἐκ τοῦ ἄλθου (1089, 1091). Canter proposed to replace τέκνων by τεκόν: "if I had come to this and had experienced, by having fathered a child, what it is for a father to lose his children..." Grégoire claims the conjecture as his own, which is surprising, since it had received the approval of Reiske, Heath, Markland, Musgrave, Porson, Hermann, Dindorf and Paley; and it is also accepted by the most recent editor, Italie. That is an impressive crowd of supporters; but now listen to Elmsley. "This is an emendation, of which we may say, in the language of Mr Wakefield, friget, vehementer friget. When two contiguous verses end with the same word, and there is reason to suspect that word to be erroneous in one instance, the critic may be allowed to take a greater latitude of conjectural emendation, than has been taken in the passage before us... In our passage the reader is at liberty to replace the first τέκνων by any word which appears to him to improve the sense." Availing himself of this liberty Elmsley conjectured πάρος and τότε. And the following disyllables have been

---

65 For ἐν δόμοις in 1082 Nauck, BullAcImpSt.Petersburg 9 (1866) 390–91, proposed ἐν νόμοις, which is perhaps an improvement, though not a necessary one.

66 And at 479 Grégoire claims for himself a conjecture by Musgrave which went out of fashion long ago. While I am defending Canter's conjecture against misappropriation, let me take from Canter a conjecture to which, through no fault of his own, his name has become wrongly attached. At 174 Markland writes: "Canterus uertit quas ipsas, quasi legisset ἀε αὐτάκη." The version to which Markland refers is by Portus, not Canter. "Insigni sane fraude Porti versionem, obscuri scilicet hominis, et cuius nomen libro praefixum parum gratiae conciliatum esset, sub illustriore Canteri nomine uendituit Paulus Stephanus," Elmsley, preface to Heracleidae (cf. Quarterly Review 7 [1812] 454–55). And yet the conjecture should not be ascribed to Portus either, for quas ipsas is already the rendering of Melanchthon, the second edition of whose translation (I have not seen the first) was published at Frankfurt in 1562. Indeed, Portus' version is merely a revision of Melanchthon's, just as later Latin versions are revisions of Portus'.

67 Classical Journal 9 (1814) 60.
offered in emulation: cafoe Hartung, éwq Hirzel, kalwq Holzner, 68
μαθών Nauck, τορως Prinz, ἀπαξ Fritzsche and later Hartman, 69 πάλαι
Naber, 70 παθών Paley and later Blaydes. 71 Not one of these conjectures
amends the line, for there is still a fault to be found in the words ei δ’
ἐκ τὸδ’ ήλθον. “If I had come to this”—come to what? There is nothing
to which τόδε may refer. Editors appear to suppose that it refers
either to the acquisition of a second youth or to the fathering of
children in the first youth. But it can refer to nothing of the sort. No
good is therefore served by repunctuating with a comma after
κακόν and writing κακόν for τέκνων in 1091: τέκνων | oίνοι στέρεθαι
πατέρα γίγνεται κακόν. 72 And it is a desperate man who will consider
replacing ei δ’ ὑπὸ τὸδ’ ήλθον by any of the following proposals: ei δ’
eἰκόθων τὸδ’ Hartung, ei δ’ ἱεθομὴν τὸ κακεπειράθην τὸδε Heimsoeth, ei
δ’ εἰ τὸδ’ ἐγνών Hirzel, ei δ’ ἴχνω νῦν ἐξεπειράθην τύχη Schenkl, ei δ’
ἀυτὸς ἐμαθὼν κακεπειράθην τύχη Wecklein olim. 73 ei δ’ ἵν πρόδηλων
Holzner, ei δ’ αὐτὸς ἶδη Nauck, ei δ’ εἰ τὸδ’ ἶδη Haupt 74 (accepted by
Wilamowitz in 1875 and by Wecklein in 1912). I forbear to transcribe

The only fault in the words ei δ’ ὑπὸ τὸδ’ ήλθον is that τόδε has noth-
ing to refer to either before or after it; but if it is to be retained, it
must be made to refer one way or the other. In fact, the problems of
τόδε and τέκνων are not two but one. To prove that, I must set out the
evidence for the various uses of the locution ἐκ τὸδ’ ἔρχομαι and cognate
locutions. These uses may be distributed into four classes: (i) τόδε
refers back to a clear conception expressed immediately before:
Soph. Aj. 554–56 ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἤδιστος βλεύ . . . ὅταν δ’ ἢκη
πρὸς τοῦτο (i.e. τὸ φρονεῖν), OT 1157, OC 548, 981, 75 Eur. Ion 1411, TrO.
401, Bacch. 1380, Ion 1368; (ii) τόδε refers forward and is picked up by
an exegetical clause: Hipp. 1298–99 ἀλλ’ ἐκ τὸδ’ ήλθον, παιδός ἐκδειξαι
φρένα | τοῦ εὐθ δικαίων, HF 1356, Phoen. 1328, Antiope (Page, GLP 10) 7;
(iii) τόδε is qualified by a noun in the genitive, and this phrase refers

68 Studien zu Euripides (Vienna 1895) 83.
69 Mnemosyne n.s. 10 (1882) 313.
70 Mnemosyne n.s. 10 (1882) 155.
71 Paley in his school edition of Supp. (Cambridge 1888), a reference I owe to Mr Collard;
Blaydes, loc.cit. (supra n.34) 152.
72 Kaakon is Toup’s conjecture, the punctuation is Lennep’s.
73 JahrbClPh, Supplbd. 7 (1874) 331.
74 Hermes 8 (1874) 4=Opuscula III (1876) 606.
75 Editors punctuate as if τοδ’ agreed with ἄνοιας στόμα. They are corrected by Housman,
AJP 13 (1892) 156–57=Classical Papers 196, approved by Jackson, op.cit. (supra n.38) 194.
forwards and is picked up by an epexegetical clause: Med. 56–57 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔτος ἐκβεβηκ' ἄλγηδόνοις | ἄκτε, Hipp. 1332, Andr. 170, HF 1281, 1294, El. 918, Phoen. 963, Or. 566; (iv) τὸδὲ is qualified by a noun in the genitive, and this phrase refers backwards: Soph. OT 124-25 πῶς ... τὸῦ ἔβηκ; n. 264. It should be clear, then, that ἔτος ἣλθον, if sound, requires some qualification. And it is likely that this qualification will take the form of a noun in the genitive, whose place has been usurped by τέκνων. The choicest noun available is πάθους:

εἶ δ' ἐκ τὸῦ ἣλθον καξεπειράθην <πάθους>,
οὖν στέρεθαι πατέρα γίγνεται τέκνων,
οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἐκ τὸῦ ἣλθον εἰς ὅν γὰρ κακὸν.

The noun πάθους is governed jointly by both ἐκ τὸῦ ἣλθον and καξεπειράθην, and the expressions ἐκ τὸῦ ἣλθον πάθους and καξεπειράθην πάθους may be said to form in combination a single unit which paves the way for the epexegesis in the following line: “if I had come to such a length of suffering and had experienced it—what it is like for a father to lose his children—I should not have come into this my present misery.” For a similar turn of phrase see Med. 34–35 ἐγνωκε δ' ἦ τάλαινα εὐμφοράς ὦπο | οἶνον πατρίμας μὴ ἀπολείπεσθαι χθονός.

I have chosen the noun πάθους because of its similar application in the following passages: 11-13 ... πάθος παθοῦσας δεινῶν ἀμφὶ γὰρ πύλας | Κάδμου θανόντων ἐπτα γενναίων τέκνων | ἀπαιδές εἰςω, 83-85 τὸ γὰρ θανόντων τέκνων | ἐπίποννοι τι κατὰ γνωσικας | ἐκ γόους πάθος πέρεκεν,76 786-93 ἀγαμὸν μ' ἐτί δέαρ' ἄει | Χρόνος παλαιός πατήρ | ὁφελ' ἀμερᾶν (Porson, ἀμέρα L) κτίσσα. | τί γὰρ μ' ἐδεί (Markland, με δεῖ L) παῖδων; | τί (Nauck, τὸ L) μὲν γὰρ ἤλπιζον ἄν πεποιθέναι | πάθος περιεόν, εἰ γάμων ἀπεξύην; | νὸν δ' ὀργείς καθέκασαν | κακῶν, τέκνων φιλτάτων στερείς (Markland et fortasse L, στερείθαι l, στερεθαι Blomfield), 1120-22 τί γὰρ ἂν μείζον τοῦδ' ἐτί θνητοῖς | πάθος ἐξεύροις | ἦ τέκνα θανόντα ἐκείδεθαι;

No further change is needed. The variation εἶ δ' ἐκ τὸῦ ἣλθον πάθους ... οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἐκ τὸῦ ἣλθον εἰς ὅν γὰρ κακὸν, if it is not very imaginative, is not inept (“if I had [in a previous life] come to this length of suffering ... I should not have come to this my present plight”), and Toup’s κακοὶ for κακῶν, approved by Porson, Aduersaria 245, and by Hermann, but destroying the variation, is best avoided. The expression ἐκ τὸῦ ἣλθον πάθους ...
Finally, consider the two lines 1092–93 which are appended to the passage I have discussed: δοτικ φυτεύσας καὶ νεανίαν τεκὼν | ἀριστον εἶτα τοὺδε νῦν στερίκομαι. Iphísc now applies his general reflections to his own personal case: he had a son, and now he has lost him. Poor Evadne! What has become of your glorious suicide? Forgotten, after twenty lines. Your father’s heart is riven with grief, but not for you. At the moment of his daughter’s death he protests that it is grievous to lose his son. A son, moreover, whom he has not only procreated but also begotten (φυτεύσας καὶ . . . τεκὼν), and of whom he is being deprived at this very moment (νῦν στερίκομαι: the only appearance of this verb in tragedy, apart from Agathon fr.5 Nauck [5 Snell]). True, editors can rewrite the passage and bring back Evadne to share her brother’s limelight; but, had Dr Johnson been a student of Euripides and not of Shakespeare, he might have said without unfairness that “no amendment can be made to these lines but by a general blot.”
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77 The author of the ‘Danae’ fragment ([Eur.] fr.1132 N.) perhaps had our lines in mind when he wrote (line 65) ὅπερ ἧλθες ἐπὶ τὸ τόδε θράκους. Porson supplied εἰς τὸδ’ «εἰς δ νῦν» θράκους.

78 Wecklein suggested in 1898 a lacuna after φυτεύσας, which in 1912 he filled with <παιδα σωφρονετάτην | εἴδος τ’ ἀγητῆν>; Schenkl suggested a lacuna after 1093; W. Gilbert, Acta Soc Phil. 6 (1876) 337, proposed δοτικ φυτεύσας <τῆδε> καὶ νεανίαν [τεκὼν] | ἀριστον εἶτα τοῦδε (Bothe) νῦν ετ., οτ δοτικ φυτεύσας <τῆδε> καὶ νεανίαν | τεκὼν ἀριστον εἶτα [τοῦδε] νῦν ετ. | H. G. Viljoen, Acta Classica 5 (1962) 12-13, δοτικ θυγατέρα καὶ νεανίαν τεκὼν | ἀριστον εἶτα τοῦδε (Camper on El. 333 [Lugd. Bat. 1831], a reference I owe to Mr Collard) νῦν (οτ τῶν δυου) ετ. The tautology φυτεύσας καὶ . . . τεκὼν is defended by Wilamowitz on HE 1367, though he proposes to read φυτεύσας καὶ τεκὼν νεανίαν κτλ. The remarks directed against Wecklein’s and Gilbert’s proposals by G. Kiefner, Die Versparung (Wiesbaden 1964) 97, show that he had no inkling of the problem which they were tackling.

79 I am indebted to Professor Sir Denys Page for invaluable criticism and to Mr Christopher Collard for the loan of copies of Ammendola’s and Italie’s editions and for further helpful discussion.