Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III

Michael D. Reeve

The earlier parts of this trilogy were concerned with the legitimacy of deletion in the textual criticism first of tragedy in general and then of Euripides' Phoenissae in particular. In this final part arguments are offered for a number of deletions that are not accepted by recent editors and commentators. One is discussed inconclusively and another partially by Page, three commended (two without discussion) by Jachmann; otherwise they are an independent collection, drawn largely from nineteenth-century editions.

The exiguous space allotted in Page's book to Sophocles may seem to be explained by the taste of the fourth century, when Euripides was more popular and therefore more exposed to interference. A better explanation is the influence of Jebb's edition; for older scholars had no qualms about deleting lines in Sophocles, and their reasons are often of a kind that would be approved in Euripides. Two things

---

2 D. L. Page, Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy (Oxford 1934).
4 "In general, there are very few histrionic interpolations in Sophokles. Perhaps none at all in Aias, Elektra, OT; in Antigone, probably 904-20; in Trachiniae, 84 and perhaps 88-89, 362-4; in Philoktetes possibly 1365-7; in OK 769a" (p.91). It may be that in Electra "the levity of the delector has been truly wonderful" (p.86), but 428-30 are a most unhappy illustration of it. The difficulty of giving these lines to Chrysothemis has been brought out again by H. Heubner, RhM 104 (1961) 152-56, but his arguments for giving them to Electra do nothing to overcome Jebb's objection that ἐν κακῷ μέτει πάθω cannot be fitly uttered by Electra, and his explanation of ἀλλ' in 431 will not hold water (in the three passages he cites in n.10, ἄλλα marks a transition from statement to command, and 428-30 are just as much of a command as 431-38). Incidentally, n.2 of Heubner's article would drive Jachmann to distraction (cf. op.cit. [supra n.3] 138+n.2, 204), and with good cause: "Gegen eine Athetese... hat Kaibel (zu 428) mit Recht eingewendet, dass die sprachliche Formulierung eine solche nicht rechtfertige und zudem nicht einzusehen wäre, warum überhaupt jemand hier etwas eingefügt haben sollte. Ebenso T. v. Wilamowitz (Dramatische Technik des Sophokles 177 Anm. 1), der darauf hinweist, dass die Verse, gerade weil sie weder mit dem Vorhergehenden noch mit Elektras Antwort in Zusammenhang zu bringen seien, unmöglich als interpoliert angesehen werden könnten." All three objections would have equal or even greater force if the lines transmitted as 428-30 were OC 607-09. The third of them must be the most perverse principle of textual criticism ever enunciated—though its author was not ashamed to confess that he could make nothing of the lines.
alone counsel greater caution: far less of Sophocles is preserved, and his language is far more flexible. Nevertheless, many of the deletions proposed here are certain by any standard, and until modern scholars shake themselves out of their lethargy and regain the ground won by Wunder and Nauck, there will be no presentable edition of Sophocles.

(1) Alc. 15 
πάντας δ’ ἐλέγξας καὶ διεξελθὼν φίλοις, 
[πατέρα γεραιῶν θ’ ἡ σφ’ ἐτικτε μητέρα.] 
oὐχ ἦδρε πλὴν γνωσικὸς ὅσιος ἦθελε 
θανὼν πρὸ κείνου μηκέτ’ εἰσορᾶν φῶς.

Del. Dindorf. “Having sounded all, A and B, he found only C who was willing” is not a “characteristic Greek ellipse” (Dale) but nonsense. Conjectures that give “having sounded all his φίλοι, and his father and mother . . .” exclude the father and mother unaccountably from the φίλοι.

(2) Med. 791 
ὦμωξά δ’ οἶον ἔργον ἔστ’ ἐργαστέον 
τούτευθεν ἡμῖν· τέκνα γὰρ κατακτένω 
τὰμ’, οὕτως ἔστιν ὅσιες ἐξαράγηται. 
δόμον τε πάντα συγχέας’ Ἰάσονος 
ἐξειμι γαῖας, φιλτάτων παῖδων φόνον 
φεύγουσα καὶ τλαζ’ ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον. 
oὐ γὰρ γελάσθαι τλητῶν ἔξ ἐξθρῶν, φιλαί. 
[Ἰών· τί μοι ἐζήν κέρδος; οὕτε μοι πατρίς 
οὕτ’ οἶκός ἐστιν οὕτ’ ἀποστροφή κακῶν.] 
ἡμάρτανον τόθ’ ἡνίκ’ ἐξελίμπανον 
dόμους πατρίως

798–99 del. F. Leo, Hermes 15 (1880) 320 (798–810 deleverat H. Hirzel). If κακῶν (799) means the trouble likely to be caused by the murder of the children, a refuge from it has been provided earlier in the scene by Aegeus; if it means the unhappiness of Medea’s present situation, an escape from it has been devised in the last 20 lines by Medea herself; if it means the calamity of murdering the children, the power to avert it lies in Medea’s own hands. In any case, her arrangement with

Though there is no objection either to the asyndeton in this line (cf. Hec. 1194) or to the isolation of τὰμ’ (cf. Andr. 35, HF 966, and Denniston, CQ 30 [1936] 76, against Wilamowitz, Hermes 15 [1880] 495 n.2= Kleine Schriften I [Berlin 1935, repr. 1971] 31 n.2), it may have been interpolated for the sake of making τέωνα more explicit (for οὕτως ἔστιν ὅσιες ἐξαράγηται cf. Alc. 848, Hcd. 977). No such deletion, however, can safely be accepted without documentary support.

6
Aegeus has shown that she has neither the need nor the inclination to renounce life. "Der misskannte Zusammenhang 'zwar sündige ich, aber nicht erst jetzt: damals sündigte ich u.s.w.' hat auch die Interpolation herbeigeführt" (Leo).

(3) Med. 1220 κενται δὲ νεκροὶ παῖς τε καὶ γέρων πατὴρ
[pέλας, ποθεινὴ διακρόιοις συμφορᾶ].

ποθεινὴ διακρόιοις συμφορᾶ has resisted all attempts at explanation or emendation. Did Euripides write something that was corrupted to it, or did an interpolator think it meant something (something of the kind that Page resigns himself to)?

(4) Andr. 761 ἡμεῖς δ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ὀρθοὶ κοῦ γέροντες, ὡς δοκεῖ, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς γε τοιοῦδ᾽ ἀνδρ᾽ ἀποπλήσας μόνον τροπαίων αὐτοῦ ετήσιοι, πρέσβυς περ ὄν.
[pολλῶν νέων γάρ καὶ γέρων εὐφυχος ἢ κρείςσων· τί γάρ δεὶ δειλὸν ὄντ᾽ εὐσώματεῖν;]

"Suspecti," Wecklein. The sense is "for even if he is an old man of spirit, he is superior to a host of young men." Kirchhoff's ὅν for ἦ (764) gives what is required: "for even an old man, if he is a man of spirit, is superior to a host of young men." Nevertheless, πρέσβυς περ ὄν makes a more forceful and idiomatic end to the speech: cf. Phoen. 1624 ὀδὸς περ πράξσσων κακῶς, [Eur.] Rhes. 453 καὶ πέτρος μολὼν, Med. 463–64 καὶ γὰρ εἰ εἰ με στυγεῖς, οὐκ ἄν δυναίμην σοι κακῶς φρονεῖν ποτε, Andr. 266–68 καὶ γὰρ εἰ πέρικε εἰ ἐχοὶ | τηκτός μολυβδός, ἐξαναστήσεις εἰ ἐγὼ | πρὶν μὲ πέτοιον παιδό 'Αχιλλέως μολέων, El. 362–63 καὶ γὰρ εἰ πένης ἐφύν, οὕτω τὸ γ' ἡδος δυσενεῖς παρέξομαι, Soph. OC 958–59 πρὸς δὲ τὰς πράξεις ὅμως | καὶ τηλικόςδ᾽ ὄν ἀντιδραν πειράσομαι.7

6 "Malim καὶ γέρων εὐφυχος ὅν," Wecklein; and indeed this κᾰ̀ν would be more at home in later Greek. The corruption of καὶ to κἂν may have led to the corruption of ὅν to ἦ.

7 "Quaere: distinction here between γέρων and πρέσβυς? In 761 he denies that he is γέρων, in 763 he calls himself πρέσβυς: does he use γέρων with a connotation of decrepitude which is absent from πρέσβυς? If so, can γέρων have abandoned the connotation in 764?" (Barrett). It was partly doubt about the distinction that led Wecklein to accept Czwalina's deletion of 761 ("auch kann Peleus nicht in Abrede stellen, dass er ein Greis ist, wie er es 763–764 zugesteht"); but that γέρων has a connotation of decrepitude in 761 is evident from the phrase ἔτ᾽ ὀρθοὶ κοῦ γέροντες (cf. also, of intellectual decrepitude, 678 γέρων γέρων εἰ and Ar. Eq. 1349 ὅστις ἁπάθης ἐγκενήμης καὶ γέρων;), and there is no reason beyond a certain implausibility in the resulting statement why it should not keep this connotation in 764 ("for even a γέρων of spirit—sc. how much more a πρέσβυς of spirit!—" etc.).
Three interpolations have been removed from this passage: 222–28 (del. Lueders), in which Theseus so far forgets his own premises as to rebuke Adrastus for arranging a bad match; 230 (del. Wilamowitz), which competes for the attention demanded by the vital words βία παρελθών θεούς (231); and 238–45, an irrelevant piece of political analysis that deprives κάπετι' in 246 of its function. The most damaging of the three is 222–28, which separates μέν in 220 so far from δέ in 229 that the structure of the argument is completely obscured; not only that, but it throws the audience off the scent altogether by supplying another δέ (222).

8 Without 234–37 or 232–37 κάπετι’ would be even easier, but since these lines consist entirely of subordinate clauses, they do not sever the connexion between κάπετι’ and 231.
506–10 (del. Schenkl) are irrelevant here or anywhere in the speech (post 493 Wilamowitz⁸), and they were unknown to the man who weakened the force of Adrastus’ outburst by adding 511–12. Furthermore, 504–05 justify the outburst, but hardly 506–10. Finally, the occurrence of θεούς in 505 and δαμόνων in the last line of Theseus’s rejoinder (563) is not likely to be an accident.¹⁰

(7) Supp. 841  

Πόθεν ποθ’ ο’δε διαπρεπεῖς εὐφυχία
θητῶν ἐφυκαν; εἰπέ [γ’ ως σοφότερος
νέοις ν’ ἀντών τῶν’] ἐπικτῆμον γὰρ εἶ

Del. Hermann, followed without reasons by Jachmann, op.cit. (supra n.3) 214. The γε is meaningless, and σοφία is not required for giving information so straightforward. For the form of what remains cf. Pl. Resp. 398ε τίνες οὖν θηρινάδες ἄρμονία; λέγε μοι· σδ γὰρ μουσικός.

(8) Supp. 1169  

ομας δε τώνδε χρη χάρυν μεμημένους
[cωζειν, ὁράντας διόν ἐκύρετα εξ εμοῦ,
pαςιν Θ’ ὑπείπον τούδε τούς αὐτούς λόγους,]
tιμὰν πόλν τήνθ’ ἐκ τέκνων ἀεὶ τέκνως
μυῆν παραγγέλλοντας διόν ἐκύρεστε

1171 παςιν Θ’ ὑπείπεστι Reiske.

1170–71 are either a generalizing addition or (with Reiske’s conjecture) a poor alternative to 1172–73. χάρυν is already governed by one verb, and διόν ἐκύρεστε does not bear such close repetition.

(9) HF 190  

ανήρ ὀπλίτης δοῦλός ἐστι τῶν ὅπλων
[kαλ τοῖς εὐναχείσιν οὔτε μὴ ἀγαθοῖς
αὐτῶς τῆθηκε δειλὰ τῇ τῶν πέλας,]
θραίσας τε λόγχην οὐκ ἤχει τῷ εἴσατι
θάνατον ἀμῦναι, μίαν ἐχών ἀλκῆν μόνον

Since the remarks about weapons must go together, Wilamowitz transposed 191–92 after 194, while Wecklein deleted them. Wilamowitz may have been right, inasmuch as whoever added them intended

¹⁰ Cf. Fraenkel, Eranos 44 (1946) 86= Kleine Beiträge I (Rome 1964) 419. Other examples occur at Ajax 524, where εὐγενής answers εὐγενής in 480, and Phoen. 525, where τάλα δ’ ἐβεβεβίων χρεών answers 493 ἀποστεροῦμαι πατρίδος ἀνοικῶτα (not the last words of the speech, but the last words of Polynices’ case).
them to follow 194, but Wecklein was right inasmuch as they were not added by Euripides. They say the same thing twice, the first time in questionable syntax,"11 and they kill off the hoplite yet again when his death has already been caused by a broken spear.

Even if 191–92 made acceptable sense after 194, transposition would not be a sounder remedy than deletion. Dispensable lines that form a syntactical unit will very seldom have been displaced by accident. In this passage there is nothing to cause such an accident,"12 and deliberate transposition would have been entirely pointless.

(10) Ion 1354 Io. ὃ μακαρίων μοι φασμάτων ἦδ' ἡμέρᾳ.
Pr. λαβὼν ὑπάντα τὴν τεκόδειαν ἐκπόνει. ἐπελθὼν Ἀκιάδ' Ἐυρώπης θ' ὀροῦς γνώσῃ τάδ' αὐτός. τοῦ θεοῦ δ' ἐκάτι τε ἐθερψά τ', ὅ ποι, καὶ τάδ' ἀποδίωμι σοι, ἅ γενός ἀκέλευστον μ' ἐδοξήθη λαβεῖν 1360

1356 Io. πᾶσαν γ' ἐπελθὼν Ἀκιάδ' Ἐυρώπης θ' ὀροῦς.
Pr. γνώσῃ τάδ' αὐτός Kirchhoff.

Del. H. Hirzel, reported by Dindorf, Philologus 21 (1864) 148. In view of

11 Unless the author wrote τῶν τοῦτο τῇ συναγαθεῖα (considered by Paley and better than Madvig's illogical κάτω), he had no better reason for using the dative than that the genitive would not scan. Nothing in Kühner-Gerth § 425.7 suggests that τοῦτο συναγαθεῖα τῆλον is a legitimate way of saying "his comrades in arms are the cause of his death."

12 If Wilamowitz was right about where 191–92 were intended to go, a careless insertion from the margin would account for their displacement, but nothing, if they were genuine, would account for their being in the margin.

13 ovp ξει [λέγει] Wilamowitz, but ξει is far from being a simple equivalent of eiδεια: it usually occurs in contexts of giving and receiving information or of suggesting and grasping ideas (e.g. Phoen. 953, Or. 1120), so that ovp ξει amounts to a request for further enlightenment (e.g. Or. 1120, Hel. 701, 794). The construction too is doubtful (see A. M. Dale on Hel. 1147–50 and 794—where read ei δὲ λέκτρα διέφυγες, τὸδ' ovp ξει).
καὶ χαῖρ’, the priestess cannot give directions to Ion after 1363: cf. 1604, Alc. 1149, Hcll. 600, Hipp. 1437, IT 708, Hel. 1686, Phoen. 1453, Or. 1068, Erechtheus fr.362.33, Hyps. fr.64.67 Bond. Indeed, if Kirchhoff’s restoration of 1355–57 is right,14 she cannot give him directions after γνώφη τάδ’ αὐτός in 1357. In detail too the lines betray themselves: 1364 gives either impossible sense (“begin from the place where you must seek your mother”) or impossible grammar (“as for the place from which you must begin to seek your mother, first of all whether any Delphian girl exposed you”), and Ἐλλάς in 1367, whether or not παρθένος is to be understood with it, lacks a parallel.15

1364–68 are not the only interpolated lines in the passage, but the others require a lengthier exposition.

(11) Tro. 235 ‘Εκάβη, πυκνάς γὰρ οἰκία μ’ ἐς Τροίαν ὄδους ἐλθόντα κήρυκ’ ἐξ Ἀχαικοῦ στρατοῦ, [ἐγνωκένος δὲ καὶ πάροιθε οὐ, γίναι,] Ταλθύμιος ἦκω καὶνὸν ἀγγελῶν λόγον

Del. Dobree. The syntax is indefensible.

(12) El. 367 φεῦ·

οὐκ ἔστ’ ἀκριβές οὐδέν εἰς εὐανδρίαν·

380 οὕτως γὰρ ἄνήρ οὕτ’ ἐν Ἀργείοις μέγας οὔτ’ αὖ δοκήσει δωμάτων ὁγκωμένος, ἐν τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς ὄν, ἄριστος ἱρέθη. οὐ μὴ φρονίσεθ’, οἱ κενῶν δοξασμάτων πλύρεις πλανάσθε, τῇ δ’ ὀμιλίᾳ βροτοῦς κρυνεῖτε καὶ τοῖς ἰθεῖν τούς εὐγενεῖς;

391 ἀλλ’—ξιος γὰρ ὅ τε παρῶν ὅ π’ οὗ παρῶν Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖς, ὀὕπερ οὖν ἔκομεν—

Dezoweb’ οίκων καταλύσεις. χωρεῖν χρεών, δμώες, δόμων τῶν ἐντός· ὄς ἐμοὶ πένης εἰς πρόθυμος πλουσίον μᾶλλον ξένος.

At 358 Orestes and Pylades are invited into the cottage, but it is not until 393 that Orestes accepts the invitation. Fortunately the delay is caused largely by 17 or perhaps 20 interpolated lines, which fall into

14 It surely is (see A. S. Owen, ed. Euripides, Ion [Oxford 1939] ad loc).
15 Euripides’ word is Ἐλλάς (Med. 1339, Tro. 477, El. 1076, IT 64, 1154, 1468, Hel. 193, 561, 562).
four blocks: 368–72 (369–72 del. Vitelli), 373–79 (del. Wilamowitz),
383–85 (383–90 “suspecti,” Murray), and 386–90 (del. Wilamowitz).
386–90, a reflexion on the superiority of moral to physical strength,
are irrelevant, and no more words need be wasted on them.17 The
key to the interpretation of the rest is the γὰρ in 380, which makes no
sense anywhere except after 367.18 It cannot give a reason for 379, be­
cause 379 is the conclusion of another train of argument; and it can­
not give a reason for 368–72, because Orestes’ present experience of
the αὐτουργίας does not account for his past experience of similar
people (369 ἡδη γὰρ εἶδον).

380–82 are not so much an illustration of 367 as the evidence for it, just
as in Orestes the services of Pylades are Orestes’ evidence for the value
of friendship:

1155

φεῦ:
οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρεῖσσον ἡ φιλος σαφῆς,
οὐ πλοῦτος, οὐ τυραννίς: ἀλόγιστον δὲ τί
tο πλῆθος ἀντάλλαγμα γενναίου φιλου.

18 The fact that Diog.Laert. 2.33 assigns 379 to Auge has always been thrown into the
balance, but the line could have been transferred on its own from Auge; at all events, the
clumsiness and incoherence of 374–76 (see Denniston on 375) tell against Euripidean author­
ship, unless 375–76 had been interpolated into Auge before 373–79 were transferred to
Electra. J. Baumert points out (ENIOI ΑΘΕΤΟΥΕΙΝ [Tübingen 1968] 34–35) that in the pas­
sage of Diogenes ἐν τῇ Ἀγης εἰσόντας is only an emendation (Ἀγης cod. n, of the XVI century:
αὐτῇ B P, αὐτῷ F); but ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ makes no sense in the context, because if Diogenes had not known or not cared about the pre­
cise play he would have contented himself with εἰσόντας (moreover, if the phrase is possible
Greek, it surely implies, since no one else’s Electra has been mentioned, that Euripides
wrote only one play). For the easy corruption of Ἀγης to αὐτῇ cf. Apollod. 3.9.1, where a
successful first appearance did not prevent her from being recast as αὐτῇ six words later. If
379 did not come from Auge, therefore, it is Diogenes who must be held to account, not his
editors. Whatever the truth about Auge, 373–79 certainly do not belong in their present
position, not only for the reason about to be given above but also because the notion of
employing wealth as a criterion of εὐαρεία has no business to be entertained after 371; cf.
begreifen, wie der Dichter v. 373f. nur davon sprechen kann Reichthum als Massstab
anzuwenden.”

17 “The outburst against athletes, who are no doubt intended, is quite out of place here.
But it does not follow with certainty that Euripides could not have put it in” (Denniston).
So much for οὐκ ἐλήφην ὅτι τύχως ὦδ᾿ ἐμπετῶς ἐφύρων (Euripides at Ar. Ran. 945).

18 368 goes with 369–72, which provide better evidence of ταραχμὸς in αἱ φύσεις βροτῶν
than the single instance of the αὐτουργίας would. Incidentally, it should not be forgotten
that the order αἱ φύσεις βροτῶν is “really remarkable” (Ed. Fraenkel, Agamennon II* (Ox­
ford 1962) 317 n.1; at OC 1721 read not [ὁ] with Wilamowitz but [ῥῶ]).
If 380–82 were to be an illustration of 367–79 or 367–72, the appropriate connexion would be not γάρ but καὶ γάρ or οὕτως. Cf. Septem 597–614:

φεῦ τοῦ εὐναλλάσσοντος ὄρνιθος βροτοῖς
dίκαιον ἄνδρα τοῖς δυσεβεστέροις.
ἐν παντὶ πράγμα δ’ εἴθ’ ὀμλύας κακῆς

κάκιον οὐδὲν, καρπὸς οὐ κομμεῖος . . .

οὕτως δ’ ὁ μάντες . . .

383–85 draw a reasonable moral from the present case, so long as ὀμλύας means “nach dem Verhalten im Umgang” (Wecklein) and not “by the company they keep” (Denniston). Whether they are genuine depends partly on how corrupt they are.19

396–400 are open to objections of a different kind. χωρεῖν χρεῶν (393)20 and the ὦ clause (394–95) suggest that the speech is at an end;21 and the oracle implied by 399–400, which apparently promises the return of Orestes, is ignored by Electra and nowhere else mentioned either in the play or outside it.22

---

19 Euripides would have written βροτοῖς (Keene) and something other than φρονίζειθ’, probably not ‘φρονίζειθ’ (Il. 15.104, AP 10.66, Cebes 41). For κενῶν δοξαμάτων πλήρεις cf. Isoc. 8.75 ἐπίδων κενῶν ὅτα μετεύχον, Timon fr.11 ἀνέρρωσα κενῆς οἶχος ἔμπλεοι ἄκολο. Mr Barrett raises the important question of the exits and entrances in 357–407: what does the αὐτουργὸς do, and what do the ῥαδοὶ do? The αὐτουργὸς can hardly be discussed in his presence, and yet there is no sign either that he leaves the stage at 363 or that he returns at 404. The ῥαδοὶ are ordered at 360 to take the gear inside, and yet they are still outside at 393–94 (awaiting an order from Orestes himself?). Two further difficulties about 360: can the αὐτουργὸς give orders to the ῥαδοὶ of Orestes? can he sandwich an imperative addressed to the ῥαδοὶ between two coordinate imperatives addressed to Orestes and Pylades? The case against 360 is strong, and so is the point that the αὐτουργὸς should not be discussed in his presence. Could it be that at 363 the αὐτουργὸς retires to the back of the stage and busies himself with the door (cf. 357 οὐκ οὖν πάλαι χρήν τοῦ ἀνεπτύχθαι πάλαι'), so that Orestes has time for a brief conversation with Electra (the briefer the better) before the αὐτουργὸς rejoins the company round about 393?


22 Wecklein was at least alive to the difficulty: “diese Worte, welche für Elektra noch nicht verständlich sind, spricht Orestes zu Pylades.” At what point, then, does Orestes turn from Electra to Pylades? and why should Pylades need oracular assurances about the return of Orestes? Incidentally, ὁ παρῶν in 391 must surely be the αὐτουργὸς. Orestes, were he present, would be a worthy host; he is not present, but the man who is, the αὐτουργὸς, is no less worthy. The point would come across more clearly if 396–98 were placed between
Del. England. After the urgency and confidence of 1411–13, which in any case bring the speech to a perfect conclusion, ώς ἐοικέν (1417) is alone sufficient to condemn “these halting lines, with their superfluous and ill-timed piece of mythologizing.”

Del. K. Schenkl, ZöstG 25 (1874) 451. Once again a perfect conclusion, this time one full of defiance, has been ruined by an interpolator. 991–992 can only bear one sense without violence to the Greek, namely “why (sc. have I been saying) this? (sc. because) if I had cried like a woman, I should have been pitiable rather than a man of action”; but to arouse pity in Theonoe was the sole purpose of his speech, and he has already explained to her why he will not resort to tears (947–53). The deletion of 991–92 leaves κτείων, εἰ δοκεῖσαν (993) altogether obscure: is it a gesture of defiance or submission? If of submission, why does he suddenly submit? If of defiance, what does it add to the speech but confusion? for after he has been saying “if you tell your brother and the pair of you try to kill me and take Helen, I shall kill both Helen and myself,” “go ahead and kill me” would only

382 and 391. These three lines cannot stand in their present position, but they could have been moved to it, rather than written for it, by the man who added 399–400. It is not clear whether this transposition would entail the deletion of 392.
be intelligible accompanied by ὁδὲ and followed by a summary of his reasons why the attempt is not worth making.

Only one method of rescuing the passage deserves to be considered, J. Jackson's deletion of 992 and substitution of τρεπόμεθα; for τρεπόμενος in 991. "When Menelaus, in the heat of his oratory, arrives at the chilling disyllable νεκροῦς, his voice falters a little, and, to brush away the involuntary tear, he lifts his hand . . . Then comes the recollection that he is the son of Atreus . . . and he rises to the typical bravado: 'kill, if kill thou wilt', followed by the typical relapse into the better part of valour: 'or preferably listen to reason.'" (Marginalia Scaenica [Oxford 1955] 37). This piece of melodrama sounds plausible enough until the eye lights upon the chilling disyllable νεκρῶ in 986, which has no perceptible effect on Menelaus' resolution.

(15) Phoen. 518 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἄλλως τήνδε γῆν οἰκεῖν θέλει, 
ἐξεετ'. ἐκεῖνον δ' οὐχ ἐκών μεθήσομαι. 
[ἀρχεῖν παρόν μοι, τῷδε δουλεύω ποτὲ.]

Del. Kirchhoff. The line adds nothing to ἐκεῖνον δ' οὐχ ἐκών μεθήσομαι and stands apart from the syntax of 503–19.

(16) Or. 360 Ἀγαμέμνονος μὲν γὰρ τύχας ἡπιπτάμην 
[καὶ θάνατον οἶον πρὸς δάμαρτος ὀλετο] 
Μαλέας προσίχων πρῴραν

"Der vor 367 überflüssige Vers wird von Dindorf getilgt," Wecklein. Since τύχας can only stand for θάνατον, the καὶ is indefensible, and the intervention of ὀλετο makes Μαλέας προσίχων πρῴραν ambiguous.83

(17) Or. 552 πατὴρ μὲν ἐφύτευκεν με, σή δ' ἔτυκτε παῖς, 
τὸ επέρμ' ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦσ' ἄλλου πάρα. 
[ἀνευ δὲ πατρὸς τέκνον οὐκ εἴη ποτ' ἄν.] 
ἐλογικάμην οὖν τῷ γένους ἀρχηγήτη 
踬ἄλλον ἀμώναιτ' τῆς ὑποστάσες τροφάς. 

Del. Nauck. "Wie ist es möglich, dass ein vernünftiger Dichter den Gedanken ausspricht 'ohne Vater gibt es kein Kind', wenn er nicht etwa eine komische Wirkung beabsichtigte, die hier vorauszusetzen

83 Di Benedetto repeats Hermann's argument that the ambiguity would have been resolved in delivery. How? If by pitching 361 on a different register, that in itself is a condemnation of the line, because τύχας and θάνατον go together in sense and syntax.
keinem einfallen wird; wie ist es denkbar, dass er in so platter Form redet . . . ?" (Euripideische Studien I [MémAcStPétersbourg ser. vii 1.12 (1859)] 44). The language of the line is not in itself impossibly platt, but the rest of the passage is much less direct, just as its argument is much less crass.

(18) Or. 557 ἡ σῇ δὲ Δυνάτη—μητέρ' αἰδούμαι λέγειν—идίοις τύμηνιοις κοῦχι εὔφροσιν ἐς ἀνδρός ᾦς λέκτρ'· ἐμαυτόν, ἢν λέγω κακῶς ἀκείνην, ἐξερώ, λέξω δ' ὅμως.

[Ἀγνώσθη χήν ὁ κρυπτός ἐν δόμοις πόσι.] τοῦτον κατέκειν' ἐπὶ δ' ἐθνον μητέρα, ἀνόσια μὲν δρῶν, ἀλλὰ τιμωρῶν πατρί.

Does Tyndareus really need to know that "her clandestine husband was Aegisthus"? and does anything turn on his identity?

(19) Or. 579 πρὸς θεόν—ἐν οὐ καλῷ μὲν ἐμνήσθην θεόν φῶνον δικάζων· εἴ δὲ δῇ τὰ μητέρος εἰγὼς ἐπήνουν, τί μʹ ἢ ἐδρακ' ὁ καθανῶν; οὐκ ἢν μὲ μικῶν ἄνεχόρευ!' Ἐρινών;

♂ μητρὶ μὲν πάρειει σύμμαχοι θεαί,

τῷ δʹ οὐ πάρειει, μᾶλλον ἥδυκημένιος;

[κύ τοι φυτεύσας δυνάτη', ὦ γέρον, κακήν ἀπώλεσας με· διὰ τὸ γὰρ κείνης θράσος πατρὸς εστερθεῖε ἐγενόμην μητροκτόνος.

---

24 According to Eust. 1498.58–59, Euripides περιευρήχηθη μεταρκῶς for the line, ἄκούσας τὸ φόδομεν τὸ ἅνευ δὲ μητρός, ὅ κάθαρυ 'Εὐρυπίδη'; Σ 554 is vaguer: λέγεταί τις αὐτοῦ εἰσόνος τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι ἅνευ δὲ μητρός, ὅ κάθαρυ 'Εὐρυπίδη'; The story is presumably of the same vintage as e.g. Diog.Laert. 2.33, Plut. Mor. 19β, Sen. Ep. 115.15; "Dass die Komodie, die eine solche 'Tactlosigkeit des Euripides nicht ungerührt gelassen hätte, den Vers gekannt habe, lässt sich nicht erweisen" (A. Nauck, op.cit. 45). Cf. Clem.Alex. Strom. 2.142.3.

25 Murray in his apparatus on 561 prints an impossible conjecture: οἷς Nauck (for δ), a word too archaic for Euripides (cf. Denniston on El. 924). Nauck's reason was this: "Der Artikel würde nur dann statthaft sein, wenn ein κρυπτός πόσις der Clytaemnestra bereits erwähnt wäre und nun gesagt werden sollte, dieser sei Aegisthus gewesen. Eine derartige Erwähnung ist nicht vorangegangen; vielmehr soll ausgedrückt werden Κλυταιμνήστρα κρυπτόν ἐξε ρός·" (op.cit. [on no.17] 45). Surely, however, δ κρυπτός πόσις is easily enough extracted from 557–59, for διὸν ὑμέναιοι κοῦχι εὔφροσιν will oftener than not be clandestine. It is tempting to wonder whether the interpolation was due to a mistaken belief that the future tenses in 560 needed something to refer forward to. In that case Nauck's conjecture would have more justification, unless the name of Aegisthus was supposed to be a rude word.
Dindorf’s deletion of 588–90 is now commonly accepted (see Di Benedetto), but it only serves to isolate 585–87 even further. If all six lines are deleted, Orestes passes from one divine ally to another and leads up in all seriousness to his strongest argument.

(20) Or. 682 'Oréct', 'γώ τοι σών καταδούμαι κάρα
και ξυμπονήσαί σοίς κακοίς βούλομαι.
[kai χρή γὰρ οὕτω τῶν ὁμαμόνων κακὰ
ξυνεκκομίζειν, δύναιμ ἦν διδῷ θεός,
θυήκοντα καὶ κτείνοντα τοὺς ἐναντίους;]  
tό δ' αὐ δύνασθαι πρὸς θεῶν χρήζω τυχείν.

686 del. Hermann, “neque enim continuo interfici inimicos necesse est, quo quis aliquem ab eorum saevitia defendat”; to which Wecklein adds, “wenn Menelaos seine Bereitwilligkeit zu sterben erklärte, würde er sich die folgende Ausrede abschneiden.” Pedantic objections, perhaps; but to 684–85 there are two others: the previous mention of δύναμις (685) takes the force out of τό δ' αὐ δύνασθαι in 687, and the use of ὁμαίμονες for ‘kinsmen’ (684) is as much a singularity as the use of ὁμαίμοι for ‘kinsmen’ in 806.

“Wer mit der Logik und ihrer Schere an die Rede geht, kann viel wegschneiden . . . Menelaos dreht sich ja im Kreise herum und sagt eigentlich alles zweimal,” Wilamowitz, Hermes 59 (1924) 261= Kleine Schriften IV 355. Unfortunately mere repetition is not the only thing wrong with the speech, and even editors who leave the text unchanged would do a service by printing a number of diagnostic conjectures in the apparatus, for instance 694–95 del. Weil, RevPhil 18 (1894) 208; 696 θυμός Nauck; 702–03 delebat Hartung; 706–07 del. Gow.

26 Mr Barrett points out that the transition would be even smoother if θειό were read for θειά in 583.

INTERPOLATION IN GREEK TRAGEDY, III

CQ 10 (1916) 80–81; 714 "Ἀργοῦς γ’ ἔνεκ’ ἄν Hermann; 714–16 del. Dindorff.

(21) Or. 931
cος δ’ ἐπήλθε σύγγνοις,
ἐλεξε δ’ Ἡ Ὑμῖν Ἰνάχου κεκτημένοι,
ἡμῖν ἀμύνων ουδέν ἰςκόν η πατρὶ
ἐκεῖνα μητέρ’ εἰ γὰρ ἀρεστῶν φόνω
ἐστιν γνωσεῖν ὀσιος, οὐ φθάνουτ’ ἔτ’ ἄν
θυλκοντες, ἡ γνωσεῖ κουλεύειν χρεῶν.

938 [τούναυτίον δὲ δράσετ’ ἡ δράσει χρεών:
νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἡ προδοσία λέκτρ’ ἐμοὶ πατρὸς
tεθηκεν εἰ δὲ δὴ κατακτείνατε με,
ο νόμος ἀνείτα, κοῦ φθάνοι θυλκὼν τις ἄν.
ὡς τῆς γε τόλμης οὐ σπάνις γενήσεται.]

Del. Wecklein (938 et 941 iam Schenkl mutato 942, 938–41 in suspicionem vocaverat Weil). The trouble is located in 938 and κοῦ φθάνοι θυλκὼν τις ἄν in 941. "Für δράσετ’ ἡ δράσει könnte man eher πράξετ’ ἡ πράξαι erwarten" (Wecklein), and indeed müsste man if the implied condition is γνωσεῖ δουλεύοντες;28 if, on the other hand, the implied condition is ἐμε’ κατακτείναντες, nothing in the preceding lines has paved the way for this implication (which is why Weil read δὴ for δὲ and punctuated the line as a question). As for κοῦ φθάνοι θυλκὼν τις ἄν, the reappearance of this idiom after only five lines is disquieting enough, but even more disquieting is the change of sense that it has undergone. Wecklein establishes with the aid of seven parallels (1551, Αλκ. 662, Τρ. 456, ΙΤ 245, Ηχλ. 721, Αρ. Πλ. 485, 874) that οὐ φθάνουτ’ ἔτ’ ἄν θυλκοντες, ἡ γνωσεῖ δουλεύειν χρεῶν means "ihr dürfet nicht mehr zu früh sterben (es ist hohe Zeit für euch zu sterben, d.i. seid nur gleich auf den Tod gefasst), wenn ihr euch nicht in die Knechtschaft der Frauen ergeben wollt," or in other words that οὐ φθάνουτ’ ἄν is equivalent to an imperative; but though he remarks that the idiom is more aptly used in 936 and 1551, he does not notice that 942 requires κοῦ φθάνοι θυλκὼν τις ἄν to be interpreted as a future indicative, i.e. "you will be murdered before you know where you are, because they will certainly have the nerve to do it."29 It is inconceivable that one poet could have used such a distinctive phrase twice in five lines in different senses, but

28 On δραν intrans.=πράκεεν intrans. see Fraenkel on Phoen. [376] (op.cit. [supra n.21]
22–24).
29 Some authors use the idiom in this way (LSJ φθάνω iv.2.b).
quite conceivable that an interpolator misunderstood Euripides’ use and did not realize his own was different.

(22) Or. 1045 El. ὃ φιλσατ’, ὃ ποθεινον ἡδιστὸν τ’ ἔχων τῆς εἰς ἀδελφῆς ὅνομα καὶ ὕψη ἄλαν.30
Or. ἐκ τοι με τῆς εις καὶ ε’ ἀμείψασθαι θέλω
[φιλστὶ τε φιλρῶν· τι γὰρ ἄτ’ αἰδοῖμαι τάλας;]
ὡς ἐτέρου ἀδελφῆς, ὃ φίλον πρόσπτυμ’ ἐμῶν.
[τάδ’ ἀντὶ παιδῶν καὶ γαμηλίου λέχους
προεβηγματ’ ἀμφι τοῖς ταλαιπώροις πάρα.]

1050–51 del. Oeri. 1047–51 break a sequence of couplets (1022–5931) at the point where a reciprocal action makes parallelism most desirable.32 1051 has been deleted by many editors since Nauck because of its resemblance to 1026, but 1050 cannot stand on its own. In 1048 the phrase φιλστι τε φιλρῶν is an extraordinary mixture of mental and physical.33

(23) Or. 1191 'Ελένης θανούσης, ἥν τι Μενέλεως σε δρά ἥ τόνδε κάμε—πάν γὰρ ἐν φίλον τόδε—,
λέγ’ ὡς φονεύεις 'Ερμιόνην: ξέφος δὲ χρὴ
dέρη πρὸς αὐτῆ παρθένου επάσαντ’ ἐχειν.
καὶ μὲν σε σώζῃ μὴ θανεὶν χρῆζων κόρην
[Μενέλεως 'Ελένης πτῶμ’ ἰδὼν ἐν αἰματί],
μέθες πεπάθαι πατρὶ παρθένου δέμας·
ἤν δ’ ἀξεύθυμοι μὴ κρατῶν φρονήματος
κτείνῃ σε, καὶ σὺ σφαίζε παρθένου δέρην.

31 On 1024 see part I (GRBS 13 [1972]) 256–57.
32 Deletions that break a sequence merit the same suspicion as transmitted lines that break a sequence. Hipp. 779 (del. West, Philologus 110 [1966] 155) is not so objectionable that the sequence of couplets need be broken.
33 Mr Barrett writes: "1050–51 must go; not because of the resemblance (fortuitous?) between 1026 and 1051, but because (a) Orestes and Electra have not been bent on incest; the lines surely belong to the farewell of lovers prevented (whether by death or otherwise) from marrying, and I suppose them to have been interpolated here from such a context in another play. In our context, marriage and children are wholly irrelevant. (b) πρόσπτυμα indicates the inception of the embrace from which Electra breaks away with 1052 φεβ; 1050–51 must not delay the embrace, but equally can’t be uttered during it. In 1047–49 I think Binneninterpolation:

ἐκ τοι με τῆς εις καὶ ε’ ἀμείψασθαι θέλω
φιλστι τε φιλρῶν· τι γὰρ ἄτ’ αἰδοῖμαι τάλας;
ὡς ἐτέρου ἀδελφῆς, ὃ φίλον πρόσπτυμ’ ἐμῶν. (They embrace.)

After the future τῆς εις ("I can’t hold myself in much longer") I should expect the giving way just to happen, not to be announced with an expression of intention (θέλω)."
Del. Nauck. Both names appear at the beginning of the speech (1191): the repetition of both is inartistic, of Menelaus' totally unnecessary. Since Menelaus' awareness of Helen's death is the premise that Electra sets out from, the phrase "seeing Helen's corpse in blood" can hardly be meant to add anything new.

(24) Ajax 312 ἐπειτ' ἐμοὶ τὰ δεῖν ἐπιπείδης ἐπη
e' μὴ φανοὶς πᾶν τὸ συντυχὸν πάθος
κανήρετ' ἐν τῷ πράγματος κυροὶ ποτε].
καγώ, φίλοι, δείκασα τοὺξεργασμένων
ἐλεξα πᾶν ὀυσιπτέρ ἐξηπιστάμην.

Del. Nauck. "... and he asked what situation he was in" adds nothing to 312-13 and is unutterably tame by comparison: Ajax is not asking but threatening, and it is his threats that terrify Tecmessa (315).34

(25) Ajax 323 νῦν δ' ἐν τούδε κείμενος κακῇ τύχῃ
ἀστος ἀνήρ, ἀποτοσ, ἐν μέεικο βοτοῖς
cιδηροκμῆςις ἥσυχος θακεί πεσών,
καὶ δηλός ἔστιν ὡς τι δρασείω κακόν.
[τοιαῦτα γάρ πως καὶ λέγει καϊδύρεται.]

Del. Nauck. Ajax is ἥσυχος (325). The wording of the line derives in part from 383 ἔν τῷ θεῷ πᾶς καὶ γελᾶς καϊδύρεται.

(26) Ajax 961 οἱ δ' οὖν γελώντων κατιγαρώντων κακοῖς
tοίς τοῦδ' ἵας τοι, κεί βλέποντα μη ἀπωθοῦν,
θανώντ' ἀν ὀμισόθεν ἐκ χρείας δορός.
οἱ γὰρ κακοὶ γνώμαις τάγαθον χερών
ἐχοντες οὐκ ἰσαὶ πρῶν τις ἐκβάλη.

966 [ἐμοὶ πικρός τεθνηκεν ἡ κεύοις γλυκάς,
αὐτῷ δὲ τερπνóς ἄν γάρ ἡράσθῃ τυχέουν
ἐκτίμησθ' αὐτῷ, θάνατον ὄντερ ἤθελεν.
τι δήτα τοῦδ' ἐπεγεγειρέν ἀν κάτα;
θεοίς τεθνηκεν οὖτος, οὐ κεύοις, οὐ.]
πρός ταῦτ' ὁδεσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὑβριζέτως
Ἀιας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται.

34 Here, at least, ποτε cannot be called an "interpolatorisches Flickwort": Ajax asked ποῦ ποτ' εἰμὶ πράγματος;
Del. Nauck (followed without reasons in GRBS 11 [1970] 286 n.8). The lines are open to five objections, two of them insurmountable and one of the two by itself decisive. (1) Since Tecmessa changes the subject in 966, the asyndeton is unjustifiable.35 (2) There is no parallel for the syntax of 966 (the two offered by Jebb both contain the verb βουλομαι). Emendations of η give either poor sense or impossible idiom (no use of η, for instance, is remotely like the one introduced by Schneidewin here). Both these objections can be evaded by supplying a suitable line before 966. (3) 969 is unmetrical. Remedies are available, but they are usually spurned. (4) 970 is just silly. “His death concerns the gods, not them” (Jebb) flatly contradicts 961-65 and 971-72. Another interpretation that the Greek perhaps allows (cf. Andr. 334 τεθνηκα δη η θυγατρι) is “he has been killed by the gods, not them” (cf. 950-53 Τε. ουκ ἐν ταύτῃ ἔστη τῇ δὲ ἐκ θεῶν μέτα... Τε. τοιόνυ ἐπέλθει Ζηνός ἡ δευτηθε θέος | Παλλάς φυτεύει τῆς’ 'Οδυσσέως χάρων); but the other Greeks are not laughing at Ajax because they imagine they have killed him themselves.36 (5) 971–72 are unambiguous: “let Odysseus bear that in mind when he indulges in empty mockery, because they no longer have Ajax.” Between 965 and 971 there is one position and one only where πρὸς ταῦτα, ἐν κενοῖς37 and γάρ, all fall into place: after 965.

Few interpolations are so unworthy of their surroundings.

(27) Ajax 1057 κεῖ μὴ θεῶν τις τήνδε πείραν ἐέβεσεν,
            ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐν τῇ ἔξω ἢν ὀδ' ἐξηκεν τύχην
            θανόντες ἐν προκειμέθ' αἰσχύστω μόρῳ,
            σοτος δ' ἐν ἐξήνυ νῦν δ' ἐνήλπαξεν θεὸς
            [τῇ τούθ' ὄβριν πρὸς μήλα καὶ ποίμνας πεεῖν].

Del. Nauck. “... and if some god had not frustrated his enterprise, we should have been dead as he now is and he would have been alive; but as it is the god changed it round,” i.e. we are alive and he is dead. The

35 To forestall a rhetorical rejoinder: except at the start of a speech, Greek does not mark a lack of connexion by a lack of connective.
36 For the repeated ο̣ν cf. OC 587 ο̣ν εἰκόνως, ο̣ν, ο̣γον ο̣δ, fr.846 Pearson ο̣ν κόσμος, ο̣ν, ο̣ς τήμων, ἀλλ' αἰκόσμε, Ar.Ran. 1308 αὐτὴ θοῦ' ἢ Μοῦ' ο̣ν εἴλεξαζεν, ο̣ν, Ach. 421 ο̣ν Φαίνεται, ο̣ν. It would therefore be uncharitable to suspect that the author's inspiration ran out before the end of the line. The same applies to ἐγερήσεν in 968, which may seem to be a mere stopgap after ἄν γὰρ ἥρασθ' τιχεῖν but can be read as οἴον ἥθελεν (cf. OC 1704-06 ἐξαξέν οἰον ἥθελεν.—το ποίων;—ἐκ ἔχρης γάς ἐπὶ ξένας θέων).
37 For an unusual interpretation of ἐν κενοῖς see CR 85 (1971) 344-45.
interpolator has ruined the sense by completing an elliptical expression that he either disliked or did not understand; in doing so he misused πρός (contrast 53, 184, 300, 374–75).

(28) Ajax 1102 Σπάρτης ἀνάσσων ἠλθες, οὐχ ἡμῶν κρατῶν, ύπαρχει εἰς τοὺς κομισταί πλέον ἀρχής ἐκείνο θεμικὸ ἕ καὶ τῶν τένει· [ὑπαρχος ἄλλων δεῦρ᾿ ἐπλευσα, οὐχ ὄλων εὐρετηγὸς, ὅτε Λάιαντως ἠγείτιαι ποτε;]

Del. Schneidewin, Philologus 4 (1849) 474. A glance at LSJ δόλος 1.5 is instructive; Jebb takes no account of the stylistic level at which this use originates. Furthermore, the contention that Menelaus is ὑπαρχος ἄλλων breaks the connexion between Σπάρτης ἀνάσσων ἠλθες (1102) and ἄλλ᾽ ὄντων ἀρχεῖς ἀρχὴ (1107), and it is not a contention that squares very well with 1109 ἄτερος εὐρετηγὸς (this last was one of Radermacher’s reasons for accepting the deletion of 1105–06, just as τὸν εὐρετηγὸν in 1116 was one of his reasons for deleting 1111–17).

(29) El. 591 πῶς ταῦτ᾿ ἐπανέεσας ἄν; ἦ καὶ ταῦτ᾽ ἐρείς ὡς τῆς θυγατρῶς ἀντίποινα λαμβάνεις; [αἰχρῶς δ᾽, ἄντων καὶ λέγεις οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἐχθρῶς γαμεῖται τῆς θυγατρῶς οὐνεκα.] ἄλλ᾽ οὐ γὰρ οὐδὲ νουθετῶν ἔστη τε . . .

Del. Wilamowitz, Hermes 18 (1883) 219 n.1 ("This verse is perhaps an interpolation, and also 593," F. H. M. Blaydes, The Electra of Sophocles [London 1873] on 594). There is nothing to add, except that τῆς θυγατρῶς οὐνεκα is impossibly vague in a general maxim.

(30) El. 655 ταῦτ᾽, ὡς Λύκειι ᾿Απολλον, ὀλεως κλων ὅς πᾶσιν ἠμῶν ὀμοπλήθεια. τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα πάντα καὶ εὐπώρως ἐμοῦ ἑπαξίω σε δαίμον ὅντ᾽ ἐξειδέναι.

[τοὺς ἐκ Δίων γὰρ εἰκός ἐχτὶ πάνθ᾽ ὄραν.]

38 δόλο = 'whole' occurs in Sophocles (OT 1136, Phil. 480, OC 479), but Euripides seems to avoid the word altogether outside Cyclops (217): Phoen. 1131 comes in an interpolated passage (1104–40), and fr.1041 κροῖει τις αὐτόν πᾶσσον ἀνθρώπων μέγας, τὶν ἐξαλλήιει πρόσωπος ἡ τυχωδὲς δόλων; is wrongly ascribed to Euripides (Wilamowitz, Hermes 40 [1905] 134 = Kleine Schriften IV 188; add that Euripides can hardly have used πᾶσσον of the future).

39 Perhaps that explains "Qu. οὐ γὰρ εἷς ἔχρη" (Blaydes).
Del. Jahn. Logic demands not πάνθ' ὅραν but πάντ' εἰδέναι, and though all δαίμονες are expected πάντ' εἰδέναι (657–58), not all δαίμονες are ἐκ Διός.

(31) OT 68 ὡς δ' εἰ δεκαύων νηρικον ἵκει μόνην, ταύτην ἔπραξα· παῖδα γὰρ Μενοκέως Κρέοτ', ἐμαυτοῦ γαμβρόν, ἐς τὰ Πυθικά ἔπεμψα Φοίβου δάμαθ', ὡς πῦθοιθ' ὅτι δρῶν ἢ τι φωνῶν θύρῳ ρυσαίμην πόλιν.

73 [καὶ μ' ἦμαρ ἦδη ἑυμμετρούμενον χρόνῳ λυπεῖ τί πράξει· τοῦ γὰρ εἰκότος πέρα ἀπετεῖ πλεῖον τοῦ καθ' ἱκτός τοῦ χρόνου.] ὅταν δ' ἵκηται, τηρικαῦτ' ἐγὼ κακός μη δρῶν ἢν εἰήν πάνθ' ὅτε ἢν δηλοὶ θεός.

Del. L. Dindorf, NJbb Abt.1, 24 (1878) 321. "Wenn Oed. Tyr. 73 Oedipus sagt . . . , so ist weder in den Worten ἦμαρ ἑυμμετρούμενον χρόνῳ ein sinn noch die construction λυπεῖ τί πράξει durch ähnliche wörter, welche eine besorgnis ausdrücken, da λυπεῖν nur 'traurig machen' bedeutet, gerechtfertigt, und das auf τοῦ εἰκότος πέρα folgende τοῦ καθ' ἱκτός . . . eher eines in versnot sich befindenden Byzantiners als des Sophokles würdig."

(32) OT 236 τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀπαυῶ τοῦτον, ὅστις ἔστι, γῆς τῆς ὅς ἐγὼ κράτη τη καὶ θρόνος νέμω μῆτ' ἐκδέχεσθαι μῆτε προσφοροῦν τινά μῆτ' ἐν θεόν εὐχαίτω μηδε θόμασίν

240 κοινὸν ποιεῖται μῆτε χερνβας νέμειν, ὁθεὶν δ' ἀπ' ὁικὼν πάντας, ὡς μᾶκρατος τοῦ δ' ἦμων ὄντος, ὡς τὸ Πυθικὸν θεοῦ μαντεῖον ἐξέθηνεν ἀρτίῳς ἔμοι.

245 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τοιάδε τῷ τε δαίμον

250 ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γένοιτ' ἐμοὶ κυνειδότος,

40 The time is now past when the Byzantines had to answer for interpolations. Cf. Jachmann, op.cit. (supra n.3) 134 n.1.
INTERPOLATION IN GREEK TRAGEDY, III

In 235–43 Oedipus commands that the murderer of Laius be cut off from society. As the play progresses, he twice recalls the terms of this command, treating it the first time as a curse on the murderer:

816 τίς ἔχθροδαίμων μᾶλλον ἂν γένοιτ' ἀνήρ, δὲν μὴ γένον εξετεὶ μὴ δ' ἀστών τινί δόμοι δέχεσθαι μὴ δ' προσφωνεῖν τινά, ὥθειν δ' ἄπ' οἴκων; καὶ τάδ' οὕτως ἀλλος ἦν ἦ γ' ἐκ π' ἐμαυτῷ τάκδ' ἁρὰς ὁ προστιθεὶς

1381 αὐτὸς ἐνέπτων ὥθειν ἀπαντας τὸν ἀσβη, τὸν ἐκ θεῶν φανέντ' ἀναγνων καὶ ἔγνους τοῦ Δαίον. 41

ἔγω μὲν οὖν, he continues, τοῦκε τῷ τε δαίμοιν | τῷ τ' ἄνδρι τῷ θανόντι σύμμαχος πέλω (244–45). What is to follow this ἔγω μὲν? Normal expectations are frustrated by the next six lines, in which, still using verbs in the first person, Oedipus pronounces a further curse on the murderer, whether alone or assisted by others, and goes on to pray that he himself, should he knowingly give hospitality to the murderer, may suffer the tribulations he has just called down on “these people”—which people? Only then is ἔγω μὲν answered by ὑμῶν δὲ (252).

These difficulties were first exposed by Ribbeck, RhM 13 (1858) 129–32. He tried to solve them by placing 246–51 before 273, where “these people” would refer to ταῦτα τοῖς μὴ δρᾶσιν in 269; 42 but in that place the lines are both belated and disruptive (see Jebb, Appendix on 246ff), and Ribbeck is wrong to think that he can account for the transposition by pointing to ὑμῶν δὲ at the beginning of both 273 and 252. A. Y. Campbell, CQ 42 (1948) 103, accounts for it by placing the lines before 244, so that the scribe’s eye could have jumped from one ἀρτίως (243) to another (251); but “these people” are no more identi-

41 See n.44.

42 “Nun ware es sehr leicht, mit M. Schmidt τοῖς' in τῷδ' zu verwandeln, aber dieses Mittel liegt eben zu flach auf der Hand, um das Richtige zu sein,” O. Ribbeck, Epikritische Bemerkungen zur Königsrede im Oedipus Tyrannos (Kiel 1870) 19. In these Epikritische Bemerkungen Ribbeck surveys all the literature that his original article provoked in the 1860s.
fiable here than where the manuscripts put them, and κατεύχομαι δὲ τὸν δεδρακότ’... (246) suggests a transition where there is none.

Interpolation therefore seems likely. Someone who regarded 236–243 as an interdict on the citizens rather than a curse on the murderer may have taken it upon himself to supply the missing curse.43

(33) OT 959  
\text{Ang.}  \text{εδ έεθ’ ἐκεῖνον θανάσιμον βεβηκότα.}
\text{Oed.}  \text{πότερα δόλοις ἢ νόσου ἐναλλαγῇ;}
\text{Ang.}  \text{ἐμικρὰ παλαία εὕματ’ εὐνάζει ῥοπῆ.}

\text{[Oed. νόσοις ἢ τλήμαν, ὡς έοικεν, ἐφθιτο.}
\text{Ang. καὶ τῷ μακρῷ γε εὐμετροῦμενος χρόνῳ.]}

Del. L. Dindorf, loc.cit. (on no.28) 322. νόσοις after νόσῳ is “offenbar nur des hiatus wegen für νόσῳ gesetzt, da er doch nur an der einen krankheit der altersschwäche gestorben war, und das ὡς ἐοικεν nach dem vorhergehenden ebenso überflüssig wie das ganze weitere gerede über seine todesart.”

(34) OT 1375  
\text{ἀλλ’ ἡ τέκνων δῆτ’ ὑμίς ἢν ἐφίμερος,}
\text{βλαστοῦδ' ὄπως ἐβλαστε, προσλεύσεσεν ἐμοί;}
\text{οὐ δῆτα τοῖς γ’ ἐμοίσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς ποτε·}
\text{οὐδ’ ἄστι γ’ οὐδε πύργος οὐδε δαιμόνων}
\text{ἀγάλμαθ’ ἵερα, τῶν ἐ παντλήμων ἐγὼ}

1380  
\text{[καλλιστ’ ἄνθρ εῖς ἐν γε ταῖς Θῆβαις τραφείς]}
\text{ἀπεστέρησ’ ἐμαυτόν, αὐτὸς ἐννέπινων}
\text{ὁδεῖν ἀπαντας τὸν ἀέβη, τὸν ἐκ θεῶν}
\text{φανεντ’ ἀναγγελν καὶ ἡγέουσι τὸν Λατοῦν’}44

Del. Herwerden.45 Even if it were true that Oedipus had been brought

43 The suggestion being made here is not necessarily that he took τὸν άνδρα τοῦτον in 236 to mean the harbourer, as some scholars in the 1860s did, but that he took 236–43 to be directed at the subject rather than the object of the infinitives in 238–41. For ἄμορον = δύσμορον in 248 cf. II. 6.408 ἄμορον; elsewhere in tragedy ἄμορος, ἄμορος and ἄμορος all mean expers. In proximity to κακόν κακοῦ the meaning of ἐκτρωμα βλεν is presumably ἐκτρῳβην (cf. 428) rather than τρ blockIdx βλεν (cf. El. 602).

44 Can it seriously be doubted that these words are corrupt? Since the proclamation referred to is clearly 236–43 (1382 ὡδεῖν ἀπαντας = 241 ὡδεῖν...πάντας, 1382–83 ἀέβη...ἀναγγελν = 241 μάεματος, 1382–83 ἐκ θεῶν ἀναεντ’... = 242–43...θεοῦ...ἐξεύρετο...), τὸν ἀέβη κτλ. is not Oedipus but the murderer, to whom γένους τοῦ Λατοῦ does not apply. Something like χθονὸς μάετορα is required (cf. 353); Herwerden’s γένους ἀλάστερα, which has palaeographical attractions (τοῦ Λατοῦ a mistaken gloss on γένους), cannot quite bear this sense (at OC 773 the reference of γένους τὸ πᾶν is fixed by the whole phrase πάντων τε...τίμδε καὶ γένους τὸ πᾶν).

45 Where? Not in Exercitationes Criticae (The Hague 1862), where he merely offers τρᾳφείς for τρᾳφείς (p.116); perhaps ad loc. in his edition of 1866, which I have not seen.
up in splendour at Thebes, what has that to do with his self-inflicted exclusion from the temples?\footnote{Herwerden deleted the line “weil τραβείς besagen würde, dass Ὀδίπυς in Theben erzogen worden sei; aber die tragische Konsequenz ist eine andere als die pragmatische,” K. Reinhardt, Sophokles 3 (Frankfurt 1947) 273. Tragische Konsequenz would no doubt be satisfied by ταγών ἀπάσες Ἀείδος μηλοτρόφου, if there is tragische Konsequenz in falling from a pinnacle you never occupied.}

(35) Trach. 246 De. ἢ κατὶ ταύτη τῇ πόλει τὸν ἀσκόπον χρόνον βεβαίως ἤν ἡμερῶν ἀνήριθμον;

Li. οὖκ, ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν πλεῖστον ἐν Λυδῷ ἄριστον κατείχεθ', ὡς φης' αὐτὸς, οὖκ ἐλεύθερος ἀλλ' ἐμπολυθείες τοῦ λόγου δ' οὐ χρή φθόνον, γύναι, προσεῖναι, Ζεῦς οὗτοι πράκτωρ φανή'/κείνος δὲ πραθείς ὁμάθη τῇ βαρβάρῳ ἐναυτὸν ἐξέπλησεν, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγει[,] χοῦτως εὐθύχθη τούτῳ τοῦνεδός λαβὼν ὥσθ' ὀρκὸν αὐτῷ προσβαλῶν διώμοσεν . . .

Del. Wunder. The lines are a more explicit version of 248–51; they probably began οὖκ, ἀλλὰ πραθείς κτλ, which was altered to κείνος δὲ πραθείς so that both versions could be accommodated. 248–51 are clearly the original version, for three reasons: (1) 260–61 μεταίτον μόνον βροτῶν requires a previous reference to a god; (2) an answer containing τὸν πλεῖστον χρόνον follows better on 246–47 than one containing a bald ἐναυτὸν; (3) an interpolator can hardly have wanted to make the passage less explicit.

(36) Trach. 332

πρὸς δὲ δῶματα

χωρῶμεν ἃδὴ πάντες, ὡς κυθ' οἱ κλέεις

335 Ang. αὐτοῦ γε πρώτον βαῖνον ἄμμενας', ὅπως

[μάθης ἀνευ τῶν' οὐστίνας ἄγεις ἄγεις ἔκω]

ἄν [τ''] οὐδὲν εἰςήκουσας ἐκμάθης ἄ δεί. [τοιῶν ἔχω γὰρ πάντ' ἐπιστῆμην ἔγω.]

De. τί δ' ἐστί; τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαί βάσιν;

340 Ang. σταθεῖς' ἄκουσαν· καὶ γάρ οὐδὲ τὸν πάρος μᾶθην ἤκουσας, οὐδὲ νῦν δοκῶ.

De. πότερον ἐκείνους δήτα δεύρ' ἀδύις πάλιν καλλομέν, ἢ μοι ταϊσδὲ τ' ἐξειπεῖν θέλεις;

Ang. σοὶ ταϊσδὲ τ' οὐδὲν εἰργεταί, τοιῶν δ' ἔα.
[336] and [7'] O. Hense, Studien zu Sophokles (Leipzig 1880) 77–79, [338] Nauck ("the line is perhaps an interpolation," Blaydes, The Trachiniae of Sophocles [London 1871]). Ænev tów'd' in 336 preempts Deianira's question in 342–43. The impossible grammar and unusual order of 338 may also be put down to an interpolator, perhaps the same one.

(37) Trach. 441 "Ερωτή μέν νυν ἀτανίσταται πῦκτης ὅπως ἐκ χειράς οὐ καλῶς φρονεῖ· οὗτος γὰρ ἀρχεῖ καὶ θεῶν ὅπως ἥελει [κάμῳ γε· πῶς δ' οὔ χατέρας οἴας γ' ἐμοῖ;]. ὥστ' εἰ τι τῶμώ γ' ἀνδρὶ τῇδε τῇ νόσῳ ληφθάντι μεμπτό εἴμι, κάρτα μαίνομαι, ἦ τῇδε τῇ γυναικι, τῇ μετατιάς τοῦ μηδὲν αἰσχροῦ μηδ' ἐμοὶ κακῷ τινος.

Del. E. Wunder: "Faciunt enim et quae praecedunt verba, οὗτος ἀρχεῖ καὶ θεῶν ὅπως ἥελει, et quae ἐμοῖ pronomini addita χε parti culæ est, ut sensus hic sit: Amor enim et dis imperat ad arbitrium et mihi adeo. Quod aliter accipi non licet, quam sic, ut hoc dicere Deianira statuatur, difficilius esse, se vinci ab Amore quam deos . . . Illud nemo dum advertit, omnino fieri non potuisse, ut Amoris in se Iolenque vim aliquid et potestatem esse Deianira diceret. Nam primum si mulier Graeca, viro nupta, succumbere se Amari deo ait, non possimus id aliter interpretari, quam sic, ut praeter maritum alius viri amore flagrare se fateatur . . . Item nullo verbo indicatum a Sophocle est, Iolen amore Herculis captam fuisse; immo ita de ea loquitur, ita eam se gerentem in scenam producit, ut invitissimam in domum eius, a quo misere amabatur, abductam esse appareat."

(38) Trach. 1146 ᾧ', ὡ τέκνον· πατήρ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ἐστὶ σοι· κάλει τὸ πᾶν μοι επέρμα εἰών ὁμαμόνων, κάλει δὲ τὴν τάλαιναι Ἀλκυλήνην, Διὸς μᾶτην ἁκοιτων, ὡς τελευτηγάν ἐμοῖ

1150 φήμην πυθηκέθη θεοφάτων δε' ὥδ' ἐγὼ. ἩΥΛ. ἀλλ' οὔτε μῆτηρ ἐνθάδ', ἀλλ' ἐπακτίς

47 "Since no man in his senses would insert 336 with these lines there, it must have been inserted in place of them. I'm not quite sure just what it replaced: 337–44? 337–48? And since it must have been metrical, and since γ' is no use to anybody, I wonder if it might have been μάθης ἀνευ τῶν' oὐστιάς <εφ' > ἄγεις ἐκος," Barrett.

48 Jackson (op.cit. [supra n.30] 130) mends both by writing τούτων—ἐχω γὰρ πάντ'—ἐπιστήμον ἐγώ, but at the cost of saying "I know, for I know."
"Die hinreissend schöne Herstellung dieses Passus stammt von Nauck ... Das überlieferte ἕμεις δ' ὅσι (1155) mit seinem echten Plural ist unmöglich ... Vielmehr heisst ἕμεις 'ich', Hyllos bietet sich statt aller anderen dar, das ist einzig angemessen, und seine Worte V. 1155 in Naucks Emendation enthalten bei aller Schlichtheit eine so recht sophokleische Innigkeit, die allein schon die Richtigkeit dieser Verbesserung des schlechten handschriftlichen Wortlauts gewährleistet" (Jachmann, op.cit. [supra n.3] 190–91). For the expression cf. 397 ἀλλ' εἰ τι χρήζεις ἔστορεῖν, πάρεμι' ἐγώ.⁴⁹

(39) Phil. 300 φέρ', ὥ τέκνον, νυν καὶ τὸ τῆς νήσου μάθης. 
ταῦτῃ πελάξει ναυβάτης οὐδεὶς ἐκών: 
οὐ γάρ τις ὁμοίως ἐστὶν οὔθ' ὅποι πλέων ἐξεμπολήσει κέρδος ἢ ἐξενύεται. 
[οὐκ ἐνθάδ' οἱ πλοῖ τοῖς κόφροις βροτῶν.] 
tάχ' οὖν τις ἄκων ἐχεῖ.

"Suspectus mihi videtur," Bergk; del. H. van Herwerden, Exercitationes Criticae (The Hague 1862) 122. The line blurs the ἐκών ἄκων distinction and has not been integrated into the syntax.

(40) Phil. 382 τοιαῦτ' ἄκούσας κἀξονειδιθεὶς κακά 
πλέω πρὸς ὀίκους, τῶν ἐμῶν πητῶμενος 
πρὸς τοῦ κακίστου κὰκ κακῶν Ὀδυσσέως. 
385 [κοῦκ αἰτιῶμαι κεῖνον ὡς τοὺς ἐν τέλει· 
πόλεσ γάρ ἐστὶ πάσα τῶν ἡγούμενων ἐπιτάος τε σύμπας· οἱ δ' ἀκοσμοῦντες βροτῶν 
διδασκάλων λόγοις γίγνονται κακοί.] 
λόγος λέλεκται πάς· ο̣̃ δ' Ἀτρείδας εὐγών 
ἐμοὶ δ' ὀμοίως καὶ θεοὶ εὑ̣̄ φιλος.
\(\text{akocmo\dups}\) (387) means 'insubordinate',\(^{50}\) and yet Odysseus is being relieved of blame precisely because he was obeying orders. The interpolator wanted a transition from 384 to 389–90, but none is necessary: 382–84 conclude the story (389 \(\text{logos} \ \text{lektai} \ \text{pacs}\)), and the imprecation that follows is quite separate. The relevance of the imprecation is explained by 319–26: Neoptolemus tells the story to discredit the Atridae.

(41) \(\text{Phil. 1440}\) \(\text{toto d' enneicb}', \text{atan}\)
\(\text{porbhte gaia}, \text{eucbceiw} \ \text{ta} \ \text{pros} \ \text{theouc}\).
\(\text{ous} \ \text{talla} \ \text{panta} \ \text{deuter} \ \text{hgeitai} \ \text{patih}\)
\[\text{[Zeus: 'h gar eucebeia euvnhkcei bropoic}·
\text{kav zoes kav thanoic, oik apoollutai]}\].

\(1443\) \(\text{oju gar hucebeia}\) Dawes.


(42) \(\text{OC 755}\) \(\text{al}', \text{oju gar ekti tambhv} \ \text{kruptei}, \text{cui van}\)
\(\text{pros} \ \text{theouc} \ \text{patrhwou}, \text{Oidipous, eucbceic emoi}\)
\(\text{fkrupwou}', \text{belhscas aevi kai dmosouc molciv}\)
\(\text{tovc cwc} \ \text{patrhwouc, t} \ \text{ndve} \ \text{povc} \ \text{fivwuc}\)
\(\text{eipwv} \ \text{epaxia gar} \ \text{f} \ \text{ovkoi plevou}\)
\[\text{[bik} \ \text{ceboib' au, oxa} \ \text{c} \ \text{valai trofoc]}\].

Del. A. E. Housman, \textit{AJP} 13 (1892) 153. \textit{ecebcbai} as passive is unparalleled, and the motive for the interpolation is obvious.

\(^{50}\) \text{akocme} as flouting authority: \textit{Ant.} 730, \textit{Lys.} 14.13, Dem. 24.92, 50.64, Aen.Tact. 38.5; of disorderliness: \textit{IG} 1\(\text{b}\) 84.27, \textit{Pl. Leg.} 764\(\alpha\), 784\(\delta\), \textit{Hyperides fr.14}, \textit{SIG} 736 \text{§} 9, 1109.74, Pollux 8.112, 131; of one or other (or both): \textit{Ios.} 7.42, 46, \textit{Ath.Pol.} 3.6. For \text{akocme} and \text{akocmala} in similar senses cf. \textit{Il.} 2.213, \textit{Ant.} 660, \textit{Hdt.} 7.220, \textit{IA} 317, \textit{Lys.} 3.45, \textit{Pl. Gorg.} 508\(\alpha\), Aeschin. 1.189, 3.4. The passage that comes nearest to supporting the one under discussion is \textit{Pl. Symp.} 188\(\beta\) \(\epsilon\) \text{plcnezia kai akocmala peri dhlma}: Odysseus' acquisition of Achilles' armour could be regarded as a piece of \text{plcnezia}, a breach of the \text{kocmoc} that guarantees a father's armour to his son. In the context of authority, however, it is hard to see how \text{akocme} can bear any but its common meaning.

\(^{51}\) The deletion of 1442 as well (Dindorf) is totally unwarranted.
Finally two deletions that improve a defensible text:

(43) Ant. 1016  βωμοὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐσχάραι τε παντελεῖς
πλήρεις ὑπ’ οἰωνίων τε καὶ κυνῶν βοράς
τοῦ δυσμόρου πεπτῶτος Οἰδίπου γόνου.
καὶ οὗ δέχονται θυστάδας λιτὰς ἐτὶ
θεοὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν οὐδὲ μηρίων φλόγα,
[οὖθ᾽ ὅρμεν εὐσήμους ἀπορροιβδεῖ βοᾶς,]  
ἀνδροφθόρου βεβρωτέει αἵματος λίπος.

None of the passages yet cited in defence of the switch from singular to plural in 1021–22 is worth as much as one not yet cited, Xen. Hell. 2.2.3 ἔκεισθι τῆς νυκτὸς οὖθεὶς ἐκοιμήθη, οὗ μόνον τοῖς ἀπολωλότας πενθοῦντες... Even so, it is strange that the removal of 1021 yields normal grammar and excellent sense.52

(44) Ant. 1074  τούτων εἰς λαβητῆρες ὑστεροφθόροι
λοχῶν "Αἰδοῦ καὶ θεῶν Ἔρμνες,
ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τοιὸς ληφθήναι κακοῖς.
καὶ ταύτῃ ἄρρητον εἴ κατηγορωμένους
λέγω: φανεῖ γὰρ οὐ μακρὸν χρόνου τρίβῃ
[ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν οὐς δόμως κωκύματα].

Reflection shows that the object of φανεῖ, as of ἄρρητον, must be εἴ κατηγορωμένους λέγω ταῦτα, so that κωκύματα must be made the subject of φανεῖ and οὐ μακρὸν χρόνου τρίβῃ must form a parenthesis. The parenthesis could have been made clear to the audience in delivery, but they would still have had to work out whether ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν οὐς δόμως κωκύματα was the subject or the object of φανεῖ. Which is likelier, that Sophocles wrote a sentence with a parenthetic construction and a subject not obviously in the nominative, or that an interpolator wanted an explicit object for φανεῖ?

If there is any cogency in the arguments set out here, these 44 passages, and others discussed in the earlier parts of this series, go some way towards revealing the extent of interpolation in tragedy. About

52 "Ob nicht βεβρωτεῖ auf θεοῖ und ὅρμεν gemeinsam zu beziehen ist? Man kennt aus dem Tantosmythos den unerhörten Frevel, den Götttern Menschenfleisch vorzusetzen. Und dies ist es doch, was v. 1016–18 beschreiben," G. Müller, Sophokles: Antigone (Heidelberg 1967) on 1019–22. That incident, however, took place at a dinner and not at a sacrifice. No parallel comes to hand for the idea that the gods actually eat sacrificial meat, but it lends a peculiar horror to Tiresias' discomfiting speech.
its origin two points stand out. First, the great majority of the adventitious lines did not 'get' in: they were put in. Many even of the single lines were deliberately written for their present context (e.g. Med. 1220, Supp. 230, Or. 361, 1191, Ajax 1057, Trach. 336, 444, OC 755), and among the longer passages only the γνωματι could at all plausibly have been incorporated into the text from the margin. The second point is this: whereas almost any motive that can be ascribed to a reader or an editor can be ascribed equally well to an actor or producer, the converse does not hold. No reader or editor ever had occasion to add Supp. 571–72, Ion 1364–68, Or. 585–90, or Ajax 1105–06; but for two of these plays later performances are attested, and for the others they can be assumed. Furthermore, Jachmann's period of purely literary transmission, supposedly much longer than the period of performances, is effectively reduced whenever it can be shown that an interpolation was current before the end of it; and the shorter the distance from the period of performances, the less scope and therefore the less reason there is for blaming an editor rather than an actor or producer. Of course Jachmann would not dream of saying that all interpolations are editorial, any more than Page would dream of saying that they are all histrionic; but the considerations just advanced suggest that if they both swallowed their reservations Page would be nearer the truth than Jachmann.

Some readers may be inclined to dismiss this article as a return to the nineteenth century and the nonchalance of Nauck. They are welcome to do so, if they will put their hand on their heart and swear that they honestly believe Nauck was wrong about Ajax 966–70, Trach. 1156, or Or. 554. Then at least it will be clear what they expect of two poets whom the world has not ceased to hold in esteem.

Exeter College, Oxford
December, 1972

53 Even for γνωματι the theory is overworked, and Erbse could have found other arguments against it than an invalid one applicable to interpolations of all kinds (see part II [GRBS 13 (1972)] 471 n.30). Granted, for instance, that people were in the habit of noting down parallels in the margin, how often would these parallels look as though they were meant to be incorporated in the text?


55 e.g. Eur. El. 368–79 habet P.Hibeh 7 (ca. 250–210 B.C.); Or. 588–90 cit. Clem.Alex. Paedag. 3.41.4.
Attic Stele of Mynnia in the J. Paul Getty Museum
(A71-53, ht. 1.23 m)
Uninscribed Attic Stele in New York, ca. 390 B.C.
(ht. 75 cm, w. 33.5 cm)