

Notes on the *Hecuba* of Euripides

James Diggle

THE TEXTUAL TRADITION of *Hecuba* has been surveyed fully by K. Matthiessen.¹ In this paper I cite manuscript readings from the collations of his own which Dr Matthiessen, with very great generosity, has allowed me to use.²

1. *Hecuba* 414–22

(Po.)	ὦ μήτερ, ὦ τεκοῦσ', ἄπειμι δὴ κάτω.	
HE.	ὦ θύγατερ, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν φάει δουλεύσομεν.	415
PO.	ἄνυμφος ἀνυμέναιος ὦν μ' ἐχρήν τυχεῖν.	
HE.	οἰκτρὰ σύ, τέκνον, ἀθλία δ' ἐγὼ γυνή.	
PO.	ἐκεῖ δ' ἐν Ἄιδου κείσομαι χωρὶς σέθεν.	
HE.	οἴμοι· τί δράσω; ποῖ τελευτήσω βίον;	
PO.	δούλη θανοῦμαι, πατρὸς οὖσ' ἐλευθέρου.	420
HE.	ἡμεῖς δὲ πεντήκοντά γ' ἄμμοροι τέκνων.	
PO.	τί σοι πρὸς Ἔκτορ' ἢ γέροντ' εἶπω πόσιν;	

The sequence of exchanges between Polyxena and Hecuba has caused no offence to editors.³ At certain points, however, it proceeds without the close logical or syntactical connections which we should expect to find.

¹ *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides* (Heidelberg 1974). To his list of papyri (108) add *P.Oxy.* XLV 3215 fr.2 (lines 223–28). But one papyrus should be subtracted from the list: Fitzwilliam Museum inv. 2 (Pack² 1571), identified by F. M. Heichelheim (*AJP* 61 [1940] 209–10) as the scanty remains of lines 20–21 and 503–04, as well as of *IA* 790–91 and *Soph. Ant.* 689–90, has been identified as Coptic not Greek by R. V. Nicholls, Senior Keeper in the Fitzwilliam Museum, and J. M. Plumley, Emeritus Professor of Egyptology in the University of Cambridge. Mr P. J. Parsons, who was kind enough to inspect the papyrus at my request, endorses their identification.

² I refer to the following editions: R. Porson (ed. 2, London 1802), G. Schaefer (ed. 2, Leipzig 1803), A. Matthiae (Leipzig 1813 [text], 1821 [commentary]), G. Hermann (ed. 2, Leipzig 1831), F. H. Bothe (ed. 2, Leipzig 1837), W. Dindorf (Oxford 1839), F. A. Paley (ed. 2, London 1874), H. Weil (ed. 2, Paris 1879), W. S. Hadley (Cambridge 1894), N. Wecklein (Leipzig 1902), G. Murray (Oxford 1902), L. Méridier (Paris 1927), M. Tierney (Dublin 1946), S. G. Daitz (Leipzig 1973).

³ With two exceptions. J. King (Cambridge 1726) transposed 415 with 416 and deleted 417 (“mira vel audacia vel negligentia,” Musgrave). This is not reported by Wecklein. And A. Jenni deleted 419–21 (presumably in his *Kritische Mittheilungen zu Euripides I* [Frauenfeld 1865], which I have not seen), and this deletion is adopted by Wecklein.

415: Hecuba, in reply to Polyxena's valediction, says that she will live the life of a slave on earth. J. D. Denniston⁴ has some difficulty in classifying the δέ. Citing LSJ s.v. II.4, he observes that δέ is normally postponed after a vocative "when the speaker turns from one person to another," and he is obliged to admit this passage as an exception, together with Soph. *OC* 1459. But in that passage δέ introduces a question, and in such circumstances δέ is regularly postposed (see Denniston 174). Denniston, however, is unduly restrictive. There is no question of the speaker turning from one person to another at [Aesch.] *PV* 3 "Ἡφαισ τε, σοὶ δέ κτλ., or Soph. *OC* 592 ὦ μῶρε, θυμὸς δ' ἐν κακοῖς οὐ ξύμφορον ("δέ sometimes corrects or objects," Jebb pertinently observes), or Hdt. 1.115.2 ὦ δέσποτα, ἐγὼ δέ (again, a correction or objection). In fact, as is noted by Kühner/Gerth I 51, such postponement also occurs "beim Übergang zu einem neuen Gedanken," and "von der Erzählung zu einem Anrufe." An essential difference between our passage and the majority of the passages cited by Denniston and Kühner/Gerth is that (whether or not the speaker turns to a new person or a new point) in those passages the δέ-clause contains remarks applicable to the addressee, which our δέ-clause does not. We shall have to take the δέ as introducing a contrast with the preceding statement ("I shall go below the earth"—"But I shall live a life of slavery"), which seems acceptable, even if no exact parallel exists.

416: Polyxena ignores Hecuba's statement and adds an appositive clause to her own preceding statement.

417: Hecuba remarks upon her daughter's pitiful state and her own misery, aptly enough.

418: ἐκεῖ δ' is a mildly surprising beginning, for ἐκεῖ provides a link not with Polyxena's immediately preceding line but with her last but one (414 ἄπειμι δὴ κάτω). While it may be held that 414, 416, 418 form a reasonable continuous discourse, the direct point of reference for ἐκεῖ is a long way back.

419: Hecuba's expression of helplessness and her wish to die are a satisfactory continuation. "This line is in answer to the preceding one, in which Polyxena lamented her impending separation from her mother. Hecuba replies with a wish, expressed in question form, that she too might find death" (Hadley).⁵

⁴ *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 189.

⁵ ποῖ τελευτήσω βίον; is faultless: "ad quem exitum vitam perducam?" (Matthiae), "vers quelle fin précipiter ma vie?" (Weil), "whither shall I take my life and end it?" (Hadley). There is no need for πῆ, attributed by editors to A. Nauck (*Euripideische Studien* I [Mémoires-St-Petersb 7.1 (1859)] 9) but already reported by Hermann from 'Aug.

420: Polyxena's "I shall die a slave" also follows well enough.

421: "And I (shall die) bereft of fifty children." We cannot help supplying the verb *θανούμεθα*, but it is not the verb that we should most wish to supply. "I shall live bereft of fifty children" would excite pity, but "I shall die bereft of fifty children" seems a muddled thing to say.

422: "What am I to say to Hector or Priam?" is an acceptable continuation.

Now see what we gain if lines 415–16 are placed after 420:

(PO.)	ὦ μήτερ, ὦ τεκοῦσ', ἄπειμι δὴ κάτω.	414
HE.	οἰκτρὰ σύ, τέκνον, ἀθλία δ' ἐγὼ γυνή.	417
PO.	ἐκεῖ δ' ἐν Ἴδου κείσομαι χωρὶς σέθεν.	418
HE.	οἴμοι· τί δράσω; ποῖ τελευτήσω βίον;	419
PO.	δούλη θανούμαι, πατρός οὔσ' ἐλευθέρου.	420
HE.	ὦ θύγατερ, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν φάει δουλεύσομεν.	415
PO.	ἄνυμφος ἀνυμέναιος ὦν μ' ἐχρήν τυχεῖν.	416
HE.	ἡμεῖς δὲ πεντήκοντά γ' ἄμμοροι τέκνων.	421

A minor gain is that Polyxena's statement in 418 is now the immediate continuation of her statement in 414, with *ἐκεῖ δ'* picking up *κάτω*. The greatest gain is at 420–15, where Polyxena's *δούλη θανούμαι* could hardly be better answered than it is by Hecuba's *ὦ θύγατερ, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν φάει δουλεύσομεν*. The *δέ* is now as natural as could be, for Hecuba is providing a precise verbal antithesis to the statement that precedes. Polyxena's next line (416 *ἄνυμφος ἀνυμέναιος ὦν μ' ἐχρήν τυχεῖν*) is a much better continuation of *δούλη θανούμαι, πατρός οὔσ' ἐλευθέρον* than it was of *ἄπειμι δὴ κάτω*, for it continues the syntax of the appositional phrase *πατρός οὔσ' ἐλευθέρον* by adding a second, parallel expression in apposition. And this lament by Polyxena for the marriage of which she will be deprived is now most aptly followed by Hecuba's lament for her own greatest

c.' (= *Monac.gr.* 501, on which see A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* [Urbana 1957] 135) and adopted by Schaefer. For *ποῖ* with *τελευτᾶν* (or the like) see Aesch. *Pers.* 735, 787–88, *Sept.* 157, 659, *Supp.* 603, *Cho.* 528, Eur. *Tro.* 1029, Pl. *Symp.* 181E, *Leg.* 630B, Kühner/Gerth I 545. (Contrast Soph. *OC* 476 τὸ δ' ἐνθεν ποῖ τελευτήσαι με χρή; where *πῆ* [Elmsley, Dawe] is probably right [it is impugned by M. L. West, *Gnomon* 53 (1981) 525]: as Dr Dawe points out to me, we must distinguish between 'end' and 'perform', and here the question is clearly 'how' the rite is to be performed, and the question is answered in those terms; the last elements of the rite come later.) Still less do we need Nauck's alternative proposal *τάδε* for *βίον* (accepted with the further change of *τελευτήσω* to *τελευτήσει* by A. Y. Campbell, *Hermes* 86 [1958] 175). Three further proposals (not noticed by Wecklein) may be found in J. Kvičala, *DenkschrWien* 30 (1880) 133.

loss (421 ἡμεῖς δὲ πεντήκοντά γ' ἄμμοροι τέκνων), which gives a perfect syntactical balance with Polyxena's preceding line, and in which the verb to be supplied is no longer θανούμεθα but 'I shall live' (supplied from ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν φάει δουλεύσομεν).

2. *Hecuba* 619–21

(HE.) ὦ σχήματ' οἴκων, ὦ ποτ' εὐτυχεῖς δόμοι,
ὦ πλείστ' ἔχων κάλλιστά τ', εὐτεκνώτατε
Πρίαμε, γεραία θ' ἦδ' ἐγὼ μήτηρ τέκνων . . .

620 κάλλιστά τ' FGPPaRZZcZmT¹ et B²K^{1c}V³: -τα κ' MBKVT²
et O^sA^{1c}: -τ(α) OALSXXaXb

“ . . . O you who had very many and very fine possessions, most blessed with children Priam.” Disquiet has often been felt over the banal ὦ πλείστ' ἔχων κάλλιστά τ'. In itself πλείστα . . . κάλλιστά τε is acceptable Greek: Ar. *Ran.* 1254–55 πολὺ πλείστα δὴ καὶ κάλλιστα μέλη, cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.8.3 *multa et pulchra minantem*. But while ὦ πλείστ' ἔχων κάλλιστά τε . . . Πρίαμε might be tolerable, the addition of a further epithet εὐτεκνώτατε makes the invocation very oddly expressed, though I have not seen this feature remarked on by editors. The oddity would be lessened if we could take εὐτεκνώτατε as exemplifying πλείστ' ἔχων κάλλιστά τε, as Weil, Hadley, and Méridier do. “I see no difficulty in understanding from εὐτεκνώτατε in this line and τέκνων in the next τέκνα as object of ἔχων: reference to the number and beauty of Priam's children is frequent and here appropriate” (Hadley). But this is very artificial.⁶ The variant κεῦτεκνώτατε,⁷ accepted by Kirchhoff and Wecklein, scarcely helps.

Porson, in his second edition, punctuated κάλλιστά τ' εὐτεκνώτατε, but there appears to be no parallel for καλῶς or κάλλιστα qualifying a superlative, although we find καλῶς qualifying an adjective at Aesch. fr.317 N. (628 M.) = Soph. fr.848 N. (934 Pearson and Radt) τὸν καλῶς εὐδαίμονα, an expression parodied by the comic poets (see Nauck and Radt *ad locc.*).

J. N. Madvig's κεῦτεχνώτατα and F. W. Schmidt's κεῦτεχν' ὄργανα are absurd.⁸ Substitutes for κάλλιστά τ', like ἀγάλαματ' or κειμήλι' (Wecklein),⁹ ὀλβίσματ' or κάλλη ποτ' (Murray), have no

⁶ This interpretation is as old as the gloss in Gu (*Gudianus gr.* 15, on which see Turyn [*supra* n.5] 61–66, Matthiessen [*supra* n.1] 50, 94–95) κτήματα ἢ τέκνα (377 of W. Dindorf's edition of the scholia).

⁷ For the crasis see my *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford 1981) 70.

⁸ The former in *Adversaria* I (Copenhagen 1871) 109–10, the latter in *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern* II (Berlin 1886) 85–86.

⁹ The former in *JhrbClasPhil* 121 (1880) 392, the latter in *SitzMünchen* 1921, 8–9.

plausibility. Much the best solution is J. E. Harry's *μάλιστά τ' εὐτεκνώτατε*.¹⁰ See *Hipp.* 1421 *μάλιστα φίλτατος*, D. L. Page on *Med.* 1323, LSJ s.v. *μάλα* III.3, Kühner/Gerth I 27, O. Schwab, *Historische Syntax der griechischen Comparison* III (Würzburg 1895) 69–72. For the corruption see *Heracl.* 794 *μάλιστα, πράξας γ'* (Elmsley: δ' L)¹¹ *ἐκ θεῶν κάλλιστα* (*arogr. Par.*: *μάλιστα L*) *δή* (though here the corruption was influenced by the preceding *μάλιστα*), Soph. *OT* 1172 *κάλλιστ' plerique* (*κάλιστ' V*: *μάλιστ' HN^{ac}* [conj. Nauck]).¹² If *πλείστ' ἔχων* should seem a rather bare expression, compare Eur. fr.580.5 *ὅς δ' ἂν πλείστ' ἔχη* (though here we understand *χρήματα* from the preceding clause).¹³ For wealth coupled with children as the mark of a prosperous man see Eur. *HF* 64–67, Hom. *Od.* 14.206.

3. *Hecuba* 653–57

CH. *πολιόν τ' ἐπὶ κράτα μάτηρ τέκνων θανόντων
τίθεται χέρα δρύπτεται τε παρειάν,
δίαιμον ὄνυχα τιθεμένα σπαραγμοῖς.*

653 *πολιόν MBOAFGKPPaRSXXaXbT* et V²: *-άν LVZZcZm* et Σ^v

655 *τε AFGKPPaXXaXbZm* et Zc^{1c}: δὲ V: om. MBOLRSZZcT

656 *δίαιμον] δίδυμον B^{γρ}B^{3γρ}O^{2γρ}*

There is nothing demonstrably amiss with the language: “The mother of dead children lays her hand on her grey head,¹⁴ and scratches her cheek, making her nail bloody by tearing.” Objection has, indeed, been taken to the sequence *τίθεται . . . τιθεμένα*,¹⁵ but “repetition of the neutral word *τίθεσθαι* need not cause offence.”¹⁶ In fact there are many parallels for the occurrence of a participle and a verb of the same stem in the same sentence.¹⁷ The expression *ἐπὶ κράτα . . .*

¹⁰ *The Greek Tragic Poets* (Cincinnati 1914) 103.

¹¹ See ICS 6 (1981) 88.

¹² Cf. R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* I (Leiden 1973) 255.

¹³ Tierney's claim that “the real difficulty is in the tense of *ἔχων*, which seems to require some complement such as *ποτέ*” is misguided. *ἔχων* is an imperfect participle: see Kühner/Gerth I 200. Ignorance of this use probably accounts for the variants at 821 *οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὄντες* (MOGKLRSSZZcZm et Va^m: *τοσοῦτοι APPaXXaXb* et F²G^{1γρ}G²Va^{2γρ}T: *τοσοῖδε BFVa*) *παῖδες οὐκέτ' εἰσὶ μοι*, as it does for the conjectures of Nauck (*οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἦσαν*), Weil (*ποτ' ὄντες*), and B. Stumpo, *RivIndGrItal* 18 (1934) 45 (*παρόντες*).

¹⁴ *πολιόν* not *πολιάν*, which is preferred by several editors and by M. L. West, *BICS* 27 (1980) 12, who cites *Supp.* 50, where *πολιάν* should be taken not with *χειρῶν* but with *σαρκῶν*.

¹⁵ E.g. by Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921) 547 n.2 (“die Dublette unerträglich ist”), and West (*supra* n.14).

¹⁶ T. C. W. Stinton, *Euripides and the Judgement of Paris* (London 1965) 75.

¹⁷ See Diggle (*supra* n.7) 66–67, 120.

τίθεται χέρα is supported by *Andr.* 1210–11, *El.* 148–49, *Hel.* 372, all quoted below.

The problem is largely, perhaps entirely, a metrical one. In 655 the copula τε, which is attested by only half the tradition, ruins the metre.¹⁸ If τε is omitted, we have a form of enoplian (˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘) which is found at 927 ~ 937 and often elsewhere in Euripides.¹⁹ But can we dispense with the copula? Stinton believes that we can. I do not. The asyndeton is most unwelcome.

The solutions that have been offered entail considerable change.²⁰ Wilamowitz, combining excision with transposition, proposed πολίων τ' ἐπὶ κράτα μάτηρ / δίαιμον ὄνυχα τιθεμένα σπαραγμοῖς / τέκνων θανόντων δρύνπεται παρειάν. This is thoroughly bad in style and sense (“laying a bloody nail on her grey head, with tearing, she rends her cheek, her children being dead”). One does not rend the cheek while laying a bloody nail on the head; and τέκνων θανόντων is very awkwardly placed.

West (*supra* n.14) deletes δρύνπεται, changes ὄνυχα to ὄνυχι and τιθεμένα to τεμνομένα, and accepts the variant δίδυμον for δίαιμον. This gives τέκνων θανόντων τίθεται χέρα, παρειάν δίδυμον ὄνυχι τεμνομένα σπαραγμοῖς (to be interpreted as ˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘/˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘/˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘?). He quotes two passages in which “‘lay hands on her head’ is supplemented by another phrase involving ὄνυχι and an accusative specifying the part of the head being scratched (δέραν, γένυν).” They are *El.* 146–49 κατὰ μὲν φίλαν ὄνυχι τεμνομένα δέραν χέρα τε κράτ' ἔπι κούριμον (Barnes: ἀποκ- L) τιθεμένα, *Hel.* 372–74 ἐπὶ δὲ κρατὶ χέρας ἔθηκεν, ὄνυχι δ' ἀπαλόχροα γένυν δεῦσε φονίασι πλαγαῖς. He apparently takes ‘lay hands on the head’ to mean ‘tear the scalp’ (for which idea see *El.* 150 δρύνπτε κάρα). This interpretation is considered by J. D. Denniston²¹ and rejected by him, rightly, in favour of the interpretation ‘beat the head’, which gains strong support from *Andr.* 1210–11 οὐκ ἐμῶι 'πιθήσομαι (Murray: ἐπιθήσομαι ἐμῶι codd.) κάραι κτύπημα χειρὸς ὀλοόν;²² Head-beating and cheek-tearing are again juxtaposed at *Tro.* 279–80 ἄρασσε κράτα κούριμον, ἔλκ' ὀνύχεσσι δίπτυχον παρειάν, and *Or.* 961–63 τιθείσα

¹⁸ Editors who accept the copula divide ... μάτηρ / ... τίθεται / χέρα δρύνπεται τε παρειάν, but it is no good calling ˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘˘ a paroemiac (O. Schroeder, *Euripides Cantica*² [Leipzig 1928] 42) or an enoplian (Daitz).

¹⁹ See *PCPhS* n.s. 20 (1974) 19 and (*supra* n.7) 102.

²⁰ I record without comment two proposals which may otherwise pass unnoticed: τέκνων θανόντων del. R. Lohmann, *Nova Studia Euripidea* (Halle 1905) 38; ἀπαλὰν χερὶ for τίθεται χέρα C. B. Sneller, *De Rheso Tragoedia* (Amsterdam 1949) 123.

²¹ *Euripides Electra* (Oxford 1939) ad 146–49.

²² Cf. also R. Kannicht, *Euripides Helena* (Heidelberg 1969) ad 372–74.

λευκὸν ὄνυχα διὰ παρηίδων . . . κτύπον τε κρατός. If, then, ἐπὶ κράτα . . . τίθεται χέρα refers to head-beating, δρύνπεται, so far from making the language “sadly redundant,” is indispensable, for the participial clause δίαιμον ὄνυχα τιθεμένα σπαραγμοῖς describes what is meant by δρύνπεται, not what is meant by ἐπὶ κράτα . . . τίθεται χέρα.

West’s alternative proposal, τίθεται χέρα <διὰ> παρειᾶς / δίαιμον ὄνυχα τιθεμένα σπαραγμοῖς, is open to the same objection, and it entails a resolution in the enoplian (~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~) for which no parallel is quoted.

If, as I believe, the language of the passage as a whole is faultless, and we need the copula with δρύνπεται, then the most economical way of mending the metre may be to suppose that a word has been lost: e.g. τίθεται χέρα δρύνπεταιί τε <δίπτυχον> παρειάν. For δίπτυχον παρειάν see *Tro.* 280 (quoted above). And δίδυμον may have begun life as a gloss on δίπτυχον rather than as a corruption of δίαιμον. The colon ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ is the same as *Med.* 645–46 ~ 655–56, *Hipp.* 755–56 ~ 768–69. Alternatively, τ’ <ἀθλίαν> will give the same colon as the previous line: this colon is found again at *Eur.* fr.118.2–3.²³

4. *Hecuba* 828–30

(HE.) ποῦ τὰς φίλας δῆτ’ εὐφρόνας δείξεις, ἄναξ;
ἢ τῶν ἐν εὐνήι φιλτάτων ἀσπασμάτων
χάριν τίν’ ἔξει παῖς ἐμή, κείνης δ’ ἐγώ;

828 citat *Etym.Magn.* 137 Miller, 828–29 schol. *Soph. Aj.* 520

“In what way will you show your gratitude for those nights of love that you call (δῆτ’) so dear?” is Hadley’s translation of 828. But he confesses that “ποῦ δείξεις is an odd phrase: it may = ‘in what esteem (ποῦ) will you show that you hold?’” Perhaps he meant that we are to supply the participle οὔσας with ποῦ,²⁴ i.e. ποῦ (οὔσας) τὰς φίλας εὐφρόνας δείξεις; This is probably the best explanation available. But the expression remains unparalleled and unconvincing. Méridier’s translation “Comment montreras-tu . . . que ses nuits te sont chères?” and his note “On attendrait τὰς εὐφρόνας φίλας οὔσας. Mais ce complément de l’idée est impliqué dans φίλας. L’attribut se sous-entend parfois en pareil cas” are wishful thinking.²⁵

²³ See Diggle (*supra* n.11) 91–92.

²⁴ For its ellipse with the predicate see Kühner/Gerth II 66–67.

²⁵ Pl. *Meno* 89A οὐκ ἂν εἶεν φύσει οἱ ἀγαθοί (sc. ἀγαθοί), which he cites as a parallel, does not help (see the useful remarks of R. S. Bluck, *Plato’s Meno* [Cambridge 1961] *ad loc.*).

Attempts have been made to turn τὰς φίλας δῆτ' into a predicative expression: δὴ φίλας τὰς (or τὰσδ'),²⁶ προσφιλεῖς δῆτ' (Weil), μοι φίλας δῆτ' (H. van Herwerden), σοι φίλας δῆτ'.²⁷ The results are insipid. Better sense, but at an unacceptable cost, is given by G. M. Sakorraphos' ποῦ τοῖς φίλοις δῆτ' εὖ φρονῶν κτλ.²⁸ (cf. *Or.* 802 ποῦ γὰρ ὦν δείξω φίλος; *IA* 406 δείξεις δὲ ποῦ μοι πατρὸς ἐκ ταύτου γεγώς;).

Others have altered δείξεις. E. Holzner's ποῦ σοὶ . . . τεύξεις is negligible.²⁹ E. B. England's τείσεις cannot give the meaning which he intended ("how will you repay?").³⁰ Much the most promising proposal is Herwerden's θήσεις ("quo numero habebis?" "how will you value?"),³¹ for which he compared *Andr.* 210 τὴν δὲ Σκῦρον οὐδαμοῦ τίθης, *Soph. Phil.* 451 ποῦ χρὴ τίθεσθαι ταῦτα, ποῦ δ' αἰνεῖν . . . ; The sense is perfect. But the corruption of θήσεις to δείξεις is inexplicable.

The same sense is given by a word with which δείξεις is readily confused: λέξεις. See *Med.* 741 ἔδειξας Sigonius: ἔλεξας codd.; *Supp.* 340 ἐξεδειξάμην Hermann: ἐξελεξάμην L; *Phoen.* 530 λέξαι: δείξαι Stob. 4.50.1; *Soph. Phil.* 426 ἔλεξας: -έδειξας L^{γρ}S^{γρ}.³² With ποῦ . . . λέξεις compare *Soph. Ant.* 183 τοῦτον οὐδαμοῦ λέγω.³³ The verb is used in similar connections (with the sense 'count', 'reckon') at 906 τῶν ἀπορθήτων πόλις οὐκέτι λέξει, *Alc.* 322 ἐν τοῖς οὐκέτ' οὔσι λέξομαι, *HF* 41 εἴ τι δὴ χρὴ κάμ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν λέγειν, [Aesch.] *PV* 973 καὶ σὲ δ' ἐν τούτοις λέγω, *Soph. Ant.* 462 κέρδος αὐτ' ἐγὼ λέγω. For ποῦ introducing a question of this type see *Supp.* 127 τὸ δ' Ἄργος ἡμῖν ποῦ ἔστιν; with C. Collard's note.

In 829–30 it is worth considering whether we should write ἦ . . . τιν' for ἦ . . . τίν'. It is the difference between "What value will you put on those nights of love? Or what gratitude will my daughter have for her favours?" and "What value will you put on those nights of love? Will my daughter have any gratitude . . ." The latter reads more naturally. In its support is the late position in the sentence

²⁶ H. Gloël, *WochKlasPhil* 1 (1884) 556.

²⁷ T. Halbertsma, *Adversaria Critica* (Leiden 1896) 44.

²⁸ *Mnemosyne* n.s. 21 (1893) 200.

²⁹ *Studien zu Euripides* (Vienna 1895) 48.

³⁰ *CR* 9 (1895) 171.

³¹ *RevPhil* n.s. 2 (1878) 24. "mallet θήση" Wecklein 63.

³² Note also Aesch. *Cho.* 566 δέξαιτ' Turnebus: λέξαιτ' M.

³³ For this use of οὐδαμοῦ see P. T. E. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides* (Wiesbaden 1976) 50; G. W. Bond, *Euripides Heracles* (Oxford 1981) ad 841. Add *Men. Aspis* 298.

which the interrogative $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu'$ would otherwise occupy. G. Thomson³⁴ includes this passage in the category which he defines thus: "When two questions are asked in succession, the second amplifying the first, the interrogative introducing the second question loses something of its force by reason of the fact that it has been anticipated, and therefore it is liable to be postponed." But there is no example on his list in which the interrogative is postponed to so late a position as it occupies here.

The enclitic $\tau\iota\nu'$ was silently printed by Porson, and after him by Matthiae and Hermann, a fact of which modern editors seem unaware.³⁵ But, with the enclitic, the disjunctive $\tilde{\eta}$ is less natural than the interrogative $\tilde{\eta}$.³⁶

QUEENS' COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
June, 1982

³⁴ "The Postponement of Interrogatives in Attic Drama," *CQ* 33 (1939) 148.

³⁵ Herwerden, recanting his earlier proposals, also restored the enclitic, but wished to delete 828 and replace $\tilde{\eta}$ by $\pi\omicron\upsilon$: *RevPhil* N.S. 7 (1893) 225. Bothe deleted 829, C. G. Cobet, *Variae Lectiones*² (Leiden 1873) 564, deleted 828–30.

³⁶ I am grateful to Dr R. D. Dawe for helpful comments.