

The Text of the Recognition Duet in Euripides' *Helena*

Douglas C. C. Young†

A MORE CONSERVATIVE attitude to the colometry of manuscripts ought to have received a substantial impetus from the publication in 1954 of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2236, with its stimulating fragments from the recognition duet of Helen and Menelaos in the ever puzzling *Helena* of Euripides. This papyrus is assigned to the late first century B.C., age of the chalcidic Didymus, and the sole independent witness for the play among the Byzantine mss is L, *Laurentianus* 32.2, dated by its watermarks and otherwise to the second decade of the fourteenth century. Yet there is almost complete agreement on colometry between the two documents, written some fourteen centuries apart. This was first seen by Professor Günther Zuntz,¹ and the general conclusion is well expressed by Professor A. M. Dale in her edition of the play in 1967 (p.170):

It has long been held that one of the chief arguments for the descent of all our medieval mss. from an authoritative Alexandrian edition, the work of Aristophanes of Byzantium, is their general agreement in lyric colometry; in such a daunting complexity of material, the key to which was for so long completely lost, the influence of this first great systematic ordering must have been paramount. **LP** show little more divergence from *II* [the *Helena* papyrus] in this respect than they do (when Triclinius's alterations are removed) from **MABV** in the Select Plays; that is to say, colometry is, on the whole, the same, with a few minor discrepancies.²

† Professor Young died suddenly at Chapel Hill on 24 October 1973. This final essay has been seen through press by his admiring friends, the editors.

¹ Professor Günther Zuntz appears to have been the first to observe publicly that the cola-divisions in papyri and mediaeval mss of Euripides are, by and large, identical, and that this must go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium. He did so in a lecture at the University of London Institute of Classical Studies in November 1960, in the presence of Professor A. M. Dale and Dr W. S. Barrett.

² A. M. Dale, *Euripides: Helen* (Oxford 1967), App. I p.170. This edition is later quoted as DALE, by page number. Reference is made to her *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*² (Cambridge 1968), as *LMGD*. My excerpt from Dale conveniently summarizes pp.31–34 of

Unfortunately for her readers, Professor Dale edited as if she understood Greek metre better than Aristophanes of Byzantium had done, and in her edition of the recognition duet, at pp.104–06, she needlessly abandons the colometry of the paradosis in some 21 cola. She also needlessly accepts changes in more than a score of words. She thus shows greater fidelity to the tradition of Gilbert Murray, her beloved preceptor, and mine, than to the paradosis of Euripides. Professors Günther Zuntz and Richard Kannicht are a good deal less hospitable to innovations than Dale, but by no means so conservative as the facts warrant.³

In this paper an attempt is made to interpret the text and colometry of **L** and of the papyrus, denoted by *Π*, with the minimum of changes. Another and longer paper could prove that the colometry of **L** is as valid for the rest of the lyrics in the play, and in the other 'alphabetic' plays for which it is the sole source, except in so far as its apograph **P** may here and there preserve a reading which has been removed from **L** by later alteration, usually by Demetrius Triclinius. Experience having suggested that the recognition duet is more assimilable if presented in smallish gobbets, like *hors d'oeuvre variés*, rather than served up whole as a *pièce de résistance*, I break up the text and sauce each portion with some exegetical trimming.⁴

The recognition duet may be held to start at 622, when Menelaos

Zuntz's *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965), referred to as *Inquiry*.

³ Richard Kannicht, *Euripides Helena* (Heidelberg 1969), hereafter KANNICHT.

⁴ By the wisdom of my neighbours at Duke University's having acquired a substantial *Nachlass* of the late J. A. Spranger, I was able to study his excellent facsimile of **L**, a book which I had examined in Florence only in regard to its Aeschylean contents and its watermarks. The three bouts of arbitrary alteration undertaken in *Helena* by Demetrius Triclinius have been admirably illustrated by Zuntz in his *Inquiry* as regards the recognition duo. He and Kannicht, in his excellent commentary, have adduced most of the material needed to form a judgement on matters of language and metre, following, of course, Dale, Prinz-Wecklein, and the long series of learned editors. My presentation, with a working version, aims at succinctness. I am indebted to Professor Bernard Knox, Director of the Center for Hellenic Studies at Washington, D.C., and the learned Fellows in residence in 1972–73, for their prolonged and helpful discussion of my views as presented in a seminar there on 16 February 1973. I am obliged also, for valuable comments on a draft of this article, to my colleagues Professors Henry Immerwahr, Brooks Otis, Kenneth Reckford, David Sider and Philip Stadter, and to Dr Thomas J. Fleming, to Professors Kenneth Dover of St Andrews, George M. Paul and William J. Slater of McMaster, Eric Turner of London, and Professor Zuntz himself, whose salutary observations might best be described as *glycypicric*. Inevitably, not all of them endorsed all my preferences of reading and interpretation.

grasps the fact that Helen's explanation of the phantom, at 582–88, had been confirmed by the man who reported the heavenward departure of the phantom from the cave.

- MEN. τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνο. ξυμβεβάσιν οἱ λόγοι
οἱ τῆσδ' ἀληθεῖς. ὦ ποθεινὸς ἡμέρα,
ὡς εἰς ἐμάς <ς'> ἔδωκεν ὠλένας λαβεῖν.
- 625 HEL. ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν Μενέλεως, ὁ μὲν χρόνος
παλαιός, ἡ δὲ τέρψις ἀρτίως πάρα.
ἔλαβον ἀμμένα πόσιν ἐμόν, φίλαι, 2 dochmii
περιπετάσασα χέρα φίλιον ἐν μακρᾷ 2 dochmii
φλογὶ φαεσφόρῳι. dochmius
- 630 <MEN.> καὶ γὰρ σέ. πολλοὺς δ' ἐν μέσῳι λόγους ἔχων
οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποῖου πρῶτον ἄρξωμαι τὰ νῦν.
624 <ς'> supplet Pearson. 631 ἄρξομαι L, corr. Hermann.

A working version might run thus:

- MEN. (So) this is (what) that (was)! [So Miss Dale] Her utterances coincide (with his as being) true. O yearned-for day, because it gave you to my arms to take.
Menelaos incontinently embraces Helen.
- HEL. O dearest of men, Menelaos, the (interval of) time (has been) long, but the joy is newly present.
As she embraces him, she plays to the gallery of the Chorus by bursting into dochmiacs.⁵
I gladly received my husband, friends, stretching around a loving arm in a long light-bringing flame [= after a long succession of sunrises].
- <MEN.> And I (gladly received) you. But, having many topics for speech in between, I do not know which to start upon first now.

In ascribing verses to speakers L uses abbreviated forms of names at 622 and 625, but merely a *paragraphos* thereafter till 646. Usually it is plain who says what, but I put in hooked brackets the abbreviated names not specifically given as such by L. The authority of a *paradosis* is at its weakest in this matter of ascriptions of speakers, but *ratio et res ipsa* coincide far more often than not with L's *paragraphoi*.

At 624 Kannicht defends the *paradosis* ὡς in the sense 'because'. At

⁵ It is not clear whether Helen's dochmiacs here represent an aria or a recitative. Kannicht has no doubt, II.176 n.9: "παρακαταλογάδην, also als melodramatisches Rezitativ ausgeführt . . ."

628 he defends περιπετάσασα χέρα as being $\cup \cup \cup - \cup \cup$, a resolved iambic tripod, Dale's 'long dochmiac', *LMGD* p.216. Others may think it a rare form of the normal dochmius, $\times - - \times -$, with resolution of the initial *anceps*, a resolution accepted by Dale, *LMGD* p.105, and by W. J. W. Koster.⁶ In this connection it should be noted that the musical setting of the dochmiac dimeter at *Orestes* 344, in Vienna Papyrus G 2315, shows two vocal notes over the syllable ἐν in the phrase λάβροις ὀλεθρίοι-|σιν ἐ-εν κύμασιν, so that the second dochmius scans $\cup - - \cup -$, with resolved initial *anceps*. This is what one would expect if those are right who surmise that a dochmius started life as a syncopated iambic tripod, because iambic metra show frequent resolution of initial *anceps*.⁷

In the initial exchanges the dithyrambic extravagance of Helen's lyrical phraseology contrasts with the comparatively laconic and matter-of-fact tone of the less sharp-witted Menelaos' bewildered reactions; and she continues dithyrambically at 632–36.

<p><HEL.> 635</p>	<p>γέγηθα, κρατὶ δ' ὀρθίου ἐθείρας ἀνεπτέρωκα καὶ δάκρυ σταλάσσω. περὶ δὲ γυῖα χέρας ἔβαλον, ἡδονὰν <τύχα>ς ὡς λάβω, ᾧ πόσις, ᾧ φιλτάτα πρόσοψις.</p>	<p><i>iambic trimeter catalectic</i> <i>iambic trimeter catalectic</i> <i>2 dochmii</i> <i>dochmius</i> <i>syncopated iambic trimeter</i> <i>with initial choriamb</i></p>
	<p>633 ανεπτέρωσα Π. 634 χείρας L, ηδονη Π. 635 <τύχα> papyrus supplet Zuntz. 636 φιλτάτη L.</p>	

⁶ W. J. W. Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque suivie d'un précis de métrique latine* (Leiden 1953) 276–77. Referred to as KOSTER.

⁷ The most authoritative opponent of the resolved initial *anceps* in dochmiacs is Dr W. S. Barrett in his learned edition of *Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964) at p.434, Addenda on 670. He explains away or arbitrarily alters all the apparent occurrences of resolved initial *anceps* then known to him. Thus, at 1277, for the paradosis *σκυλάκων πελαγίων*, scanning $\cup \cup - \cup \cup -$, he champions Wilamowitz' *σκύμωνων* as "required by the sense" (p.393). He asserts (p.394): "the *σκυλάκων* of the mss. is not merely dubious metre (see above) but impossible sense: *σκύλακες* are puppies, the young of the dog; *σκύμοι* are the young of any wild animal (or at least of carnivores)." This pontification is undermined by LSJ s.v. *σκύλαξ* 1.2, where we find that *σκύλακες* can be the offspring not only of dogs but also of bears, weasels, dolphins and even, figuratively, of grammarians. Dr Barrett's erroneous special pleading merely strengthens the case for accepting the multiple evidence of the mss for the resolved initial *anceps* which he labours to outlaw. He himself accepts the resolution of the second *anceps* (p.434 n.1), and deems the iambic hexasyllable to be admissible among dochmii (p.268), and opines that an iambus may be a syncopated dochmius (p.267). Moreover, he recognizes dochmiacs to be "the wildest of lyric metres" (p.266). Scholars should not seek to tame their wildness by removal of the resolutions of initial *anceps* through what they imagine to be emendations.

<HEL.> I am rejoicing, but on my head I have fluffed up my hair (to be) upright [= I am excited], and I am shedding a tear. But around your limbs I put my arms, that I might take pleasure in the event, O husband, O dearest sight to see.

Helen and Menelaos relax their embraces, and gaze at each other long and carefully.

At 633 the perfect found in **L** is slightly preferable, because an uncial *kappa* is more likely to have been misread as the *sigma* of *Π* than *vice versa*, and it goes well with *γέγηθα*, a perfect with present meaning. In 634 **L**'s *χείρας* would give in the second half of the dimeter a dochmius with resolved initial *anceps*, as at 628. *Π*'s *ἠδονη* shows loss of terminal *nu*, perhaps represented by an overstroke on the vowel, and the inconsistency between *eta* and lyric *alpha* probably endemic from the author's holograph right on. At 636 **L** has *φιλάτη*, but Dale may be right in giving Helen lyric *alphas* and allowing the less lyrical Menelaos to pronounce more prosy *etas*. In 634–35 **L**'s loss of Zuntz's <τύχα>ϵ or the like has led to the colometry, on **L**'s two-column layout:

περὶ δὲ γυῖα χεῖρας ἔβαλον 4th paeon+ dochmius (or doch.+ 4th paeon)
ἠδονὰν ὡς λάβω. 2 cretics (or syncopated iambic dimeter)

After the long-separated couple have gazed sufficiently at each other, Menelaos comments, with **L** and the papyrus concurring in the colometry and most of the text, from 636b to 645:

<MEN.>	οὐκ ἐμέμφθην.	trochaic monometer (epitrite)
	ἔχω τὰ τοῦ Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε.	iambic tripod+ dragged hypodochmius
	ἂν ὑπὸ λαμπάδων κόροι λεύκιπποι ξυνομαίμονες	choriambo-iambic dimeter glyconic
640	ᾠλβισαν, ᾠλβισαν ἐμὲ σέ τε, μάταν,	dochmius+ 4th paeon
641A	τὸ πρόσθεν. ἐκ δόμων	iambic tripod
641B	δ' ἐνόσφισαν θεοί σ' ἐμοῦ. πρὸς ἄλλαν δ' ἐλαύνει θεὸς κυμ- φορὰν τᾶσδε κρείσσω.	iambic dimeter bacchiac pentapody
	τὸ κακὸν δ' ἀγαθόν.	anapaestic monometer

645 *κέ τε κάμῃ συνάγαγεν, πόσιν* *anapaesto-iambic dimeter*
χρόνιον, ἀλλ' ὄμωσ. ὀναίμαν τύχας. *dochmiac dimeter*

640 *ἐμὲ σέ τε μάταν non praebet L.* 641B *ὄμοῦ L, corr. Portus.*
 642 *γ' Π.* 644 *συνάγαγε L. ποσει Π.*

Murray, a true man of the theatre, and Grégoire are among the editors who saw no reason to depart from L's ascription of 636B–45 to a single speaker. One may imagine Menelaos' expression of his train of thought being punctuated by actors' business, and the hiatus at pause after 637 confirms the probability of prolonged actors' business at that point. The sense is:

"I found no fault. [= She is perfect, and therefore the true Helen.] I have the (fruit of the) bed of Zeus and Leda. *Prolonged actors' business.* Her whom, to the accompaniment of torches, whitehorsed youths sharing her blood [= Castor and Pollux] declared happy, declared happy me and you, to no purpose, in the past. For from my home the gods separated you from me. But to another upshot the god is driving, better than this. And the evil (was) good. It brought together you and me, a husband belated, but nonetheless. May I be blessed in my fortune!"

At 636B, *οὐκ ἐμέμφθην*, compare Helen's remark at 1424, while cajoling Theoklymenos, *οὐδὲν γὰρ μεμπτός*, "You are not at all to be found fault with (*i.e.* You are absolutely perfect)." For the monometer *cf.* Koster p.124. In the context of 637 *λέκτρα* is proved to mean 'offspring' by Zuntz (237–38), following Passow and LSJ *s.v.* The same rare metonymy of the common word had been used by Euripides in *Medea* 594, *λέκτρα βασιλέως ἃ νῦν ἔχω*, "the king's offspring whom I now have (to wife)." Psychologically, it is not unnatural that Menelaos should next think back to his marriage, at least eighteen years before, and then revert to the divinely engineered separation and the eventual reunion. In 640 L has lost the (admittedly dispensable) accusative pronouns, and is left with a dochmius in the form $-\overline{\cup}-\cup x$. The longer line in *Π* may be scanned as $-\overline{\cup}-\overline{\cup\cup\cup}$, dochmius, $+\cup\cup\cup-$, fourth paeon. Another analysis would be $-\overline{\cup}-\cup\overline{\cup}$, dochmius, $+\cup\overline{\cup}\cup-$, iambus. In 641A and 641B the papyrus has on each line only one letter now surviving, the final *nus* of *πρόσθεν* and of *ἐνόσφισαν*. L divided after *δόμων* with his double dot that signifies colon-end; but Triclinius, according to Zuntz (214), deleted L's double dot by thickening the *delta* of *δ' ἐνόσφισαν*. The reconciliation of L and *Π* seen

above was suggested by Dale (173), but in her preferred text at p.105 she followed Wilamowitz in deleting the final iamb, to make an iambic trimeter of τὸ πρόσθεν . . . θεοί. L's ὄμοῦ might be defensible if taken with θεοί: "the gods all together removed you." But Portus' correction is supported by the fact that in 1447 we find ἐμοῦ corrupted to ὄμοῦ, by uncial confusion of round letters; and at *Andromacha* 1257 the paradosis is split between the two readings.

At 639 it is notable that Π and L concur in presenting a glyconic, which implies that Aristophanes of Byzantium approved of that colometry. Miss Dale, however, opines (170) that "glyconics are utterly alien to the metrical style," which she considers (106) to consist of "trimeters and 'associable' metres . . . of the types which could easily pass into a half-spoken delivery: chiefly dochmiacs, bacchiacs, cretics, enoplians, hemiepe. Aeolo-choriambic and ionic are rigidly excluded." Maybe, however, they were not so rigidly excluded by Euripides. Maybe, on the contrary, it is precisely a startling mixture of metrical units that he is offering in this strange *amoibaion*, a metrical cocktail not easily surpassable by comic parodists of late fifth-century *bravura* pieces. When Aeschylus in the *Frogs* parodies the later operatic Euripides he introduces glyconics and resolved glyconics rather noticeably, as at 1311, 1317, 1318, 1322, 1323. With all due respect to the gracious lady whose books are so helpful to other earnest seekers, what reason have we to suppose that any modern student, lacking the ancient music, can understand the colometrical notions of an ancient tragedian better than Aristophanes of Byzantium understood them?

Line 642 is divided by both Π and L after θεός, but the bacchiac intention throughout seems most probable. Apparently Π cannot have had room for L's *συμφορὰν*, but may have had *τύχαν*, probably as an intrusive gloss. An original *τύχαν* would, in this context, hardly have been glossed by L's *συμφορὰν*. The division of a long colon between two lines is not unusual. For δ' Π has γ', by a common confusion of these particles. One may quote Kannicht's verdict (II.186): "aber Π ist in Kleinigkeiten auch sonst ziemlich unzuverlässig (633 -κα, statt -κα, 634 ηδονη<ν>, 642 γ' statt δ' und (?) τυχαν statt συμφορὰν)."

At 643 it may assume too bold an oxymoron to interpret "the bad good" as subject, and Professor Bernard Knox suggested putting a period at the colon-end. We then have an explanatory asyndeton, cf. 654f. In 645 the punctuation is Kannicht's. In 644 Zuntz thought he

could read an *omega* before *ποσει* in *II*; but C. H. Roberts and E. G. Turner could see no *omega*. Thus the papyrus does not support Hermann's vocative *πόσι* or W. Dindorf's *ὦ πόσι*. The accusative *πόσιν* could have been corrupted to *ποσει* by loss of terminal *nu* accompanied by itacism, helped by a scribe's inclination to expect a dative after the *συν-* in *συνάγαγεν*.

At 646 *L* has an ascription to Helen, who utters as follows:

HEL.	ὄναιο δῆτα. ταῦτα δὲ ξυνεύχομαι.	<i>iambic trimeter</i>
	δυοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιιν οὐχ ὁ μὲν τλήμων, ὁ δ' οὐ.	<i>iambic trimeter</i>
	φίλαι, φίλαι,	<i>iambic monometer</i>
	τὰ πάρος οὐκέτι στένομεν οὐδ' ἄλγῳ.	<i>dochmiac dimeter</i>
650	πόσιν ἔμὸν ἔχομεν. ἔχομεν ὃν ἔμενον.	<i>dochmiac dimeter</i>
	ἔμενον ἐκ Τροίας πολυετῆ μολεῖν.	<i>dochmiac dimeter</i>

646 δῆ *L*. 647 δυεῖν *L*.

Helen's speech may be translated thus: "May you be blessed indeed. For I join in making that prayer. For when there are two persons it cannot be that one is wretched and the other not [*i.e.* Our happiness is inseparable]. Again Helen plays to the gallery with a lyrical outburst. Friends, friends, the former events we no longer bewail; nor am I pained. My husband we have. We have him for whom I was waiting. I was waiting for him to arrive from Troyland after many years."

In 646 *L*'s δῆ can be a mere slip for *II*'s δε. In the 'fat blob' style around 1300 one finds forms of *epsilon* that are easily misread as an *eta*. In 647 the Hellenistic δυεῖν is, according to Zuntz (p.130), "confined, in *L*, to the alphabetic plays." Atticist grammarians of the Roman period must have restored the correct form in the commented selection. In 650 one might make two dochmii, each ending with a *brevis in longo* at a pause. *L*'s colometry divides after the second ἔχομεν, to make $\cup\cup\cup \cup\cup\cup \cup\cup\cup \times$, iambic dimeter catalectic, and after *Τροίας*, to make $\cup\cup\cup \cup\cup\cup \cup-\cup-$, iambic dimeter, with internal correction of the diphthong in *Τροίας*. *L* ends 651, as does *II*, with a dochmius. *L*'s two-column layout, or a similar layout in a minuscule ancestor, may have contributed to the misdivision of the lines.

From 652 the wording permits or encourages us to imagine some actors' business involving reciprocal huggings by the rediscovered spouses.

- <MEN.> ἔχεις, ἐγὼ τέ ε'. ἡλίους δὲ μυρίουσ
 μόγις διελθὼν ἡισθόμην τὰ τῆς θεοῦ.
 ἐμὰ δὲ δάκρυα χαρμονά· πλέον ἔχει 2 dochmii
 655 χάριτος ἢ λύπας. dochmius
 Ante v.656 lacunam vv.2 vel 3 statuit Zuntz (p.248).
- HEL. τί φῶ; τίς ἂν τάδ' ἤλπισεν βροτῶν ποτε;
 ἀδόκητον ἔχω σε πρὸς στέρνοισ. dochmius+
 molossus
- <MEN.> κἀγὼ σέ, τὴν δοκοῦσαν Ἰδαίαν πόλιν
 μολεῖν Ἰλίου τε μελέουσ πύργουσ. 2 dochmii
 660 πρὸς θεῶν, δόμων πῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ἀπεστάλης;
- <MEN.> You have (me) and I (have) you. And after traversing with
 difficulty countless suns [= days] I have perceived [= I now
 understand] the deeds of the goddess. *He bursts into song or
 recitative.* But my tears are joy. They have more of delight
 than of grief.
- HEL. What am I to say? Who among mortals would ever have
 expected these things? I hold you unexpectedly to my
 breast.
- <MEN.> And I hold you, her that seemed to have gone to the city of
 Ida and the miserable ramparts of Troy. In the name of the
 gods, how were you conveyed away from my palace?
 [Alternatively: Why in Heaven's name did you depart from
 my home?]

At 654 Triclinius altered to *χαρμονᾶν* and Brodaeus to *χαρμονᾶν*,
 Hermann to *χαρμονᾶι*. For the oxymoronic statement at 654 and the
 asyndetic explanation at 655 compare 643f. At 657, for the combination
 dochmius+ molossus, compare 680f and the paeono-dochmiac colon
 at 655. Note the changed tone at 660, and Helen's embarrassed
 emotionalism thereafter.

- <HEL.> ἔ ε'. πικρὰν ἐς ἀρχὰν βαίνεις. iambic metron+
 dochmius
 662 ἔ ε'. πικρὰν δ' ἐρευνᾶις φάτιν. iambic metron+
 dochmius
- <MEN.> λέγ', ὡς ἀκουστὰ πάντα δῶρα δαιμόνων. iambic trimeter
 <HEL.> ἀπέπτυσα μὲν λόγον οἶον paroemiac

664B	οἶον ἐσοίκομαι.	<i>dochmius</i> (or <i>dodrans A</i>)
<MEN.>	ὄμωκ δὲ λέξον. ἡδύ τοι μόχθων κλύειν.	<i>iambic trimeter</i>
<HEL.>	οὐκ ἐπὶ λέκτρον βαρβάρου νεανία	2 <i>dochmii</i>
667	πετομένας κώπας, πετομένου δ' ἔρωτος ἀδίκων γάμων.	<i>dochmius</i> 2 <i>dochmii</i>

661 γρ. πικρὰς ἐς ἀρχὰς L in margine. 665 τι L, corr. Triclinius.
666 λέκτρον L fortasse, λέκτρον Aldina. 667 πετωμένας L, corr.
Triclinius.

At 661 L's marginal *γράφεται* variant could have been an early draft by Euripides, later rejected by himself for excess of sibilance, or by his friend Kephisophon or some producer or editor. For the spondaic scansion of ε̄ ε̄ cf. Dale, *LMGD* 108 n.3, on the same phenomenon in Aeschylus. At 664B the papyrus may have had *εσοικομεν*, which Lenting had conjectured. Interchange of the inflectional endings *-μεν* / *-μαι* seems to have been fairly common at all periods. Dale *ad loc.* defends the middle form, on the ground that "there are so many verbs that sooner or later drop into a rare middle, especially in the future." A. C. Pearson found it acceptable as a "subjective middle." Kannicht, however, rejects it as unidiomatic, and arising from negligent assimilation of number to that of the foregoing verb *απεπτυσα*. In 666 the Spranger facsimile suggests that L was as likely to have meant *λέκτρον* as *λέκτρον*. L's minuscules often confuse *nu* and *upsilon*, and in this word the final letter may have been retouched. If the *epsilon* of *νεανία* was not in synizesis, we have another iambic tripod, or 'long dochmius'; or else the whole line is an iambic trimeter with choriambic first metron.

- <HEL.> Alas! You are entering upon a cruel theme. Alas! You are searching into a cruel story.
- <MEN.> Tell it, for all gifts of the gods can be heard [= Whatever the gods send, men can bear to be told].
- <HEL.> I abominate the tale, such it is, such it is that I shall utter.
- <MEN.> But nonetheless tell (it). Truly it is pleasant to *hear* of woes.
- <HEL.> Not (pleasant to hear) of the oar flying towards the bed of the barbarian youth [= Paris], and the flying passion of an unrighteous marriage. [*Alternatively*: (I was) not (conveyed from your palace) to the accompaniment of an oar flying to

the bed of a barbarian youth, and of a passion flying towards an unrighteous marriage.]

Here, as later in the *amoibaion*, Euripides left ambiguities of interpretation, perhaps deliberately as part of his apparent preoccupation throughout this play to produce a ‘he-goat-song’ of unparalleled multivalency of interpretation. My alternative working version represents the explication favored by Kannicht, who thinks the οὐκ at 666 answers Menelaos’ question at 660, δόμων πῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ἀπεστάλης; I fully admit the possibility of his way of taking the phrases, as involving genitive absolutes. But it seems to me slightly easier to supply with the οὐκ at 666 a repetition of Menelaos’ phrase in the immediately foregoing line, 665 ἦδὺ . . . κλύειν. An οαρ, that is, a ship, had in fact *flown*, that is, rowed or sailed, towards the bed of Paris, conveying Paris and his phantom pseudo-Helen, and there had been, for Paris, a flying passion for an unrighteous marriage, at the same time as the true Helen had been conveyed to Egypt by Hermes. Paris’ voyage with his phantom was part of the same μόχθοι that Helen wishes Menelaos to leave undiscussed. Helen’s dithyrambically allusive phrasing may have been chosen to leave both interpretations open, and Euripides would have been supplying his audience with some more talking points.

Menelaos pursues his interrogation by demanding, at 669:

<MEN.> τίς σε δαίμων ἢ πότμος κυλαί πάτρας;

“What deity or doom pillages you from your fatherland?” L’s text is a syncopated iambic trimeter. It is possible that the papyrus had after the initial τίς some particle, such as Barnes’ γάρ, Wecklein’s καί, or Zuntz’s suggestions οὖν and δῆ.

In Helen’s reply at 670A–71 the paradosis of L sustained a small lipography, as Elmsley suspected and the papyrus has proved.

<HEL.>	ὁ Διός, ὁ Διός, ᾧ πόσι,	<i>syncopated iambic dimeter</i>
670B	Μ<αίας τε> παῖς	<i>iambic monometer</i>
	μ’ ἐπέλασε Νείλωι.	<i>iambic penthemimer</i>

Here the papyrus has now only the initial letters of three lines; but the significant point for colometry is that they are three lines, not two. The letters are:

670A ΟΔ[
670B Μ[
671 Μ[

<HEL.> The son of Zeus, the son of Zeus, O husband, and of Maia [= Hermes], brought me to (the) Nile.

Some uncial ancestor of L seems to have omitted the sequence MAIACTE before the letters ΠΑΙC. Then L, or an ancestor, lacking *Μαίας τε*, presented 670AB as a single colon, υυυυυυ –υυ–, which is intelligible as a wilamowitzian, or polyschematic choriambic dimeter, with its first metron resolved. Admittedly, since the only son of Zeus regularly sent on errands is Hermes, the paradosis in L is intelligible without the *Μαίας τε*.

At 672 Menelaos reacts by saying:

<MEN.> *θαυμαστά. τοῦ πέμψαντος; ὦ δεινοὶ λόγοι.*

<HEL.> *κατεδάκρυσα καὶ βλέφαρον ὑγραίνω* 2 dochmii

674 *δάκρυσιν. ἅ Διός μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν.* 2 dochmii

<MEN.> *Ἥρα; τί νῶιν χρήζουσα προσθεῖναι κακόν;*

673 *φλέφαρον* L, corr. Triclinius. 675 *τίνων* L, corr. Hermann.

<MEN.> Astonishing! Who was the sender? Oh, strange terrible tales!

<HEL.> I burst into tears, and I wet my eyes with tears. The wife of Zeus ruined me.

<MEN.> Hera? Why did she wish to inflict evil on us two?

At this point the *amoibaion* again becomes dithyrambically allusive and offers multiple choices for interpretation.

<HEL.> *ὦμοι ἐμῶν δεινῶν. λουτρῶν καὶ κρηνῶν,* 2 dochmii

677 *ἵνα θεαὶ μορφὰν ἐφαίδρυναν ἔν-* 2 dochmii

θεν ἔμολεν κρίσις. dochmius

<MEN.> *τὰ δ' εἰς κρίσιν σοὶ τῶνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κακόν;*

678 *ἔμολε* L, corr. edd. 679 *κακῶν* L, corr. Musgrave.

<HEL. > Alas for my terrible (experiences)! Oh! bathing places and fountains, where the goddesses [Hera, Athena, Aphrodite] brightened the beauty from which came the judgement [by Paris]!

<MEN.> And was it in regard to the matters concerning the judgement of these (goddesses) that Hera caused evil for you?

In 672 the punctuation is Matthiae's. In 676 Helen passes from a genitive of cause, after the plaintive exclamation, to a simple genitive of exclamation. The paradosis is kept by Murray, Grégoire, Nauck, Paley and others, though it seemed 'Unsinn' to Wilamowitz, *Verskunst* 565. He had printed his own conjecture ὦμοι τῶν Ἰδαί λουτρῶν καὶ κρηνῶν, but repented slightly two pages later with the admission: "Aber die Änderung ist eigentlich zu stark." The comment is applicable to all his large and small alterations to the paradosis here, undertaken, of course, without knowledge of the papyrus which can enrich our insight into ancient colometry. For the sense of 679 τὰ δ' εἰς κρίειν Kannicht well cites fr.493.4f: τὰ δ' εἰς γάμους οὐδὲν δοκοῦσιν ὑγιεὶς ἀνδράσιν φρονεῖν.

In Helen's answer to Menelaos' inquiry at 679 Euripides excels himself in calculated ambiguity, exploiting the possibilities of the verb ἀφαιρέομαι, which, from Homer down, may take two accusatives.

Lines 680 and 681 are both split between the spouses. In each line Helen starts with a dochmius and Menelaos responds with a molossus. The combination of dochmius and molossus is found at 657 here also. Euripides plays with two senses of the divine name 'Kypris', using it first to mean 'sexual pleasure', as at *Bacchae* 773, and then as the goddess Aphrodite herself. So we find exchanges that have tended to baffle the modern learned. For the sake of clarity I repeat verse 679 first, and then proceed.

⟨MEN.⟩ τὰ δ' εἰς κρίειν σοι τῶνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κακόν;
 HEL. Κύπριν ὡς ἀφέλοιτο . . . ⟨MEN.⟩ πῶς; αὐδα.
 HEL. Πάριν, ὦι μ' ἐπένευεν. ⟨MEN.⟩ ὦ τλήμον.

⟨MEN.⟩ And was it in regard to the matters concerning the judgement of these (goddesses) that Hera caused evil for you?
 HEL. That she [Hera] might deprive of Kypris [sexual pleasure] . . .
 ⟨MEN.⟩ How (do you mean)? State (it).
 HEL. . . . Paris, to whom she [Kypris as goddess of sex] had assigned me. ⟨MEN.⟩ O hard-hearted!

For the play with the word *Κύπρις* one may compare the handling of the word ἔρως at 666–68, where Paley comments: "As Eros was represented as winged (Hippol. 1275), there is an ingenious play on the preceding πετομένας (cf. Med. 1), as if the god flew along with the

ship across the Aegean sea to Troy . . . But "Ερωσ is not in fact personified, for the poet puts instead of the god 'the desire of an unrighteous marriage'."

In 681 Menelaos may be addressing Hera, and using the sense 'hard-hearted'; or else he is addressing Helen, and using the sense 'wretched'. But Helen takes him up in the sense 'hard-hearted'.

HEL.	τλάμων, τλάμων, ᾧδ' ἐπέλας' Αἰγύπτωι.	2 dochmii
<MEN.>	εἴτ' ἀντέδωκ' εἶδωλον, ὡς κέθεν κλύω.	iambic trimeter
HEL.	τὰ δὲ κατὰ μέλαθρα πάθεα πάθεα.	dochmius+ 4th paeon
685	μᾶτερ, οἱ ἐγώ. <MEN.> τί φήεις;	syncopated iambic di- meter
HEL.	οὐκ ἔστι μάτηρ, ἀγχόνιον δὲ βρόχον δι' ἐμέ κατεδήσατο δύσγαμος αἰσχύναι.	iambelegus 2 dochmii
MEN.	ᾧμοι. θυγατρὸς δ' Ἑρμιόνης ἔστιν βίος;	iambic trimeter
HEL.	ἄγαμος ἄτεκνος ἄτεκνος, ᾧ πόσις, καταστένει	dochmius+ lekythion
690	γάμον ἄγαμον αἰσχύναι.	syncopated iam- bic dimeter
MEN.	ᾧ πᾶν κατ' ἄκρας δῶμ' ἐμὸν πέρσας Πάρις.	iambic trimeter
HEL.	τάδε καὶ σὲ διώλεσε μυριάδας τε	procephalous dactylic tetrameter
	χαλκεόπλων Δαναῶν.	hemiepes (or dochmius)
	ἐμὲ δὲ πατρίδος ἄπο κακόποτμον	dochmius+ iam- bic metron
695A	ἀραίαν ἔβαλλε θεὸς	polyschematic choriambic dimeter
695B	ἀπὸ πόλεος ἀπό τε κέθεν	syncopated iam- bic dimeter
	ὄτι μέλαθρα λέχεά	dochmius
	τ' ἔλιπον, οὐ λιποῦς' ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς γάμοις.	2 dochmii

687 αἰσχύναν L, corr. Hermann. 688 ἔστι L, corr. Triclinius.
690 αἰσχύναι L, corr. Nauck. 691 σῶμ' L^{ac}, corr. L¹ vel Triclinius.
696 μέλεθρα L^{ac}, corr. Triclinius.

For the concluding section 682–97 a version might run:

- HEL. Hard-hearted, hard-hearted, thus she brought me to Egypt.
 <MEN.> Then she gave (to Paris) a phantom instead, as I hear from you.
 HEL. And the sufferings, sufferings, in the palace, mother, woe is me!
 <MEN.> What do you mean?
 HEL. My mother does not exist, for she tied on herself a strangling noose, on account of me, unhappy in her marriage, through shame.
 MEN. Woe is me! But does (our) daughter Hermione's life exist?
 HEL. Unmarried, childless, childless, O husband, she laments a marriage that was no marriage, through shame. [Helen means her own supposed marriage to Paris, which Hermione would believe to be real and shameful.]
 MEN. O Paris, you that ravaged my household utterly!
 HEL. These deeds destroyed both you and myriads of bronze-armored Danaans. And me from my fatherland, (a woman) evilly doomed, accursed, a deity was expelling, from the city and from you, on the ground that I left the palace and the bed, though I did not leave for a shameful marriage.

One may scan 684 as $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \times$, which makes a dochmius and fourth paeon; or as dochmius+ iamb, by dividing thus: $\cup \cup \cup \cup - \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \times$. At 685, instead of assuming correction in *oi*, one may suppose a *scriptio plena* for *oi'γώ*, with prodelision of *epsilon*; and this would equally produce a syncopated iambic dimeter. At 690 a dative, *αἰχχύναι*, seems the easiest interpretation of the paradosis; and the repetition of the concept 'through shame' is dramatically effective. At 696 Kannicht defends the paradosis *ὄτι*, with some difference of emphasis from my version; but Dobree's *ὄτε* would involve little change and may be what Euripides actually wrote. The problem involves Helen's actual guilt and her fluctuating sense of guilt. There is a refreshing examination of the characters of Helen and Menelaos by Robert Schmiel,⁸ where he quotes a shrewd insight of W. E. J. Kuiper in 1926.

In ipsa fabula nonnulla insunt, e quibus apparet, heroinam non omni culpa liberam esse idque ipsam quodammodo sentire. Non temere

⁸ Robert Schmiel, *Hermes* 100 (1972) 280.

enim poeta egisse mihi videtur cum Menelao roganti εἶτ' ἀντέδωκ' εἶδωλον, ὡς ἐβθεν κλύω (683) iam nihil amplius respondentem eam fecit, sed de matris morte nuper audita subito acres planctus subiungentem, quippe quae intellexeret in huius raptus historia diutius morari famae suae non multum expedire. Quam opinionem praecedentibus versibus (660–682) confirmari censeo.

Thus at 198f Helen states that Troy was burned

δι' ἐμὲ τὰν πολυκτόνον,
δι' ἐμόν ὄνομα πολύπονον,

“because of me, the ‘woman who slew many’, because of my name [*i.e.* the so-called ‘Helen’], that caused many troubles.” As Dale comments *ad loc.*, “199 as it were corrects 198.” Similarly at 280f Helen says:

μήτηρ δ' ὄλωλε, καὶ φονεὺς αὐτῆς ἐγώ,
ἀδίκως μὲν, ἀλλὰ τᾶδίκον τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐμόν.

Euripides and his characters are expert in equivocations, akin to the cult of *δικσοὶ λόγοι*.⁹ Thus at 138f Teukros says about the Dioskouroi

τεθνᾶσι καὶ οὐ τεθνᾶσι. δύο δ' ἐστὸν λόγῳ.

and Helen replies: *πότερος ὁ κρείσσων*; With such expertise in what may be termed *dittologistics* one can appreciate why Euripides ends this recurrently ambiguous *amoiibaion* by giving Helen a pointedly dittological last word, *ἔλιπον οὐ λιποῦς' ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς γάμοις*. Many in the Athenian audience of 412 must have thought, with the canny Kuiper, “Methinks the lady doth protest too much.” No doubt, through the power of Aphrodite, Helen had committed adultery in her heart by consenting to elope with the handsome Paris, and it was only Hera’s spite that frustrated the consummation of their amours. As Helen says at 31ff, Hera turned her intercourse with Paris into thin air.

Ἥρα δὲ μεμφθεῖς' οὐνεκ' οὐ νικᾶι θεάς,
ἐξηνέμωσε τᾶμ' Ἀλεξάνδρωι λέχη,
δίδωσι δ' οὐκ ἔμ', ἀλλ' ὁμοιώσας' ἐμοὶ

⁹ Paley, in his introduction to *Helena* (p.113), remarks: “There is much of that sort of irony which rejoices in clever equivocations . . .” He also notes that “Helen is too prompt in the arts of deception to suit our ideas of a thoroughly sincere woman . . .” Grégoire, in his *Notice* (Budé ed., V p.38), suggests that “l’ironie, plus comique que tragique, mérite le nom de parodie.” He also finds elements of self-parody by the poet: “Dans l’*Hélène*, une sorte de persiflage d’Euripide par Euripide me paraît certain.”

εἶδωλον ἔμπνου, οὐρανοῦ ξυνθειεῖς ἄπο,
 Πριάμου τυράννου παιδί. καὶ δοκεῖ μὲ ἔχειν, —
 κενὴν δόκησιν, οὐκ ἔχων.

At 689 it is curious how editors still follow Musurus in corrupting Helen's ὦ πόσις to the vocative, especially in view of her ὦ πόσις at 636 and another nominative for vocative at 1399, addressed to Theoklymenos, ὦ καινός ἡμῖν πόσις (if indeed Reiske's καινός be correct for L's κλεινός). At 1399 Kannicht rightly notes: "die Anrede im Nominativ ist, ihrer betörenden Absicht entsprechend, von gesuchter Solennität: vgl. Svennung, Anredeform, Uppsala 1958, 207." Presumably there is a nuance of propitiatory ceremoniousness in Helen's use of the nominative at 689 also. Here we have an example of the *vis inertiae* of printed texts. Because Musurus in the Aldine *editio princeps* of 1504, perhaps casually, 'normalized' the text, even careful editors today take it for granted that the normalization was correct. Now every unnecessary departure from paradosis is *eo ipso* a corruption, and papyrologists sedulously eschew such corruptions when interpreting papyri. For texts primarily dependent on Byzantine manuscripts it is a task of this generation to go through printed editions in the light of up-to-date codicological research and weed out the thousands of *Verschlimmbesserungen* foisted upon the ancients since the invention of printing.

Reviewing L's performance in the recognition duet in the light of the foregoing, one sees that L, or its ancestry, had lost some lines, phrases, words and letters: two or three lines before 656, if Zuntz is right in his suspicion; ἐμὲ σέ τε μάταν 641; Μαίαια τε 670; τύχαια 635; a *sigma* by haplography at 624; ephelestic *nus* at 644 and 688; adscript *iotas* at 675 and 690. L confused *omicron* and *omega* at 631, 667, 679; had an itacism at 665, and an *eta* for a lyric *alpha* at 636. Otherwise L's errors in the duet seem to be only these—putting the true reading first: 634 χείρας — χέρας; 641B ἐμοῦ — ὁμοῦ; 646 δὲ — δῆ; 647 δυοῖν — δυεῖν; 673 βλέφαρον — φλέφαρον; 687 αἰσχύναι — αἰσχύναν; 691 δωμ' — σωμ'; 696 μέλαθρα — μέλεθρα. Further, L may have misdivided cola at 650. This is a small number of errors by L in some eighty lines—a far smaller number, and of errors less grave, than those perpetrated by learned conjecturers of the past two centuries. L's errors mainly affect single letters, and are readily corrigible by attentive readers. The corruptions by the learned include sweeping transpositions and

deletions, which would make recovery of Euripides' text impossible if we had to depend only on modern printed versions.

Zuntz, in his *Inquiry*, has a statement, at p.35: "Now that it is realized that the verse division in the medieval manuscripts derives from the authoritative Alexandrian edition, that is, from Aristophanes of Byzantium, its neglect by editors and students in general would seem to be hard to maintain." In a later article I hope to discuss just what Aristophanes may have done to make an authoritative colometry, and the relevance to the problem of the Vienna papyrus G 2315, dated to the lifetime of Aristophanes, with its fragment of what recent scholarship believes to be the original music of Euripides to his *Orestes*.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
September, 1973