

Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III

Michael D. Reeve

THE EARLIER parts of this trilogy¹ 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,² three commended (two without discussion) by Jachmann;³ otherwise they are an independent collection, drawn largely from nineteenth-century editions.

The exiguous space allotted in Page's book to Sophocles⁴ 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

¹ GRBS 13 (1972) 247–65, 451–74.

² D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1934).

³ G. Jachmann, *Binneninterpolation* (*GöttNachr* 1 [1936] 123–44, 185–215).

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 *Trachiniai*, 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 deleter 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 *ὄν κακῶ μέτεi πάλιν* 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, *ἀλλά* 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 φίλους,
 [πατέρα γεραιάν θ' ἢ cf' ἔτικτε μητέρα,]
 οὐχ ἠῦρε πλὴν γυναικὸς ὅστις ἤθελε
 θανῶν πρὸ κείνου μηκέτ' εἰσορᾶν φάος.

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 ὤμωξα δ' οἶον ἔργον ἔστ' ἐργαστέον
 τοῦντεῦθεν ἡμῖν· τέκνα γὰρ κατακτενῶ
 τᾶμ'· οὐτις ἐστὶν ὅστις ἐξαιρήσεται.⁵
 δόμον τε πάντα συγχέας' Ἰάκονος
 ἔξειμι γαίαις, φιλτάτων παιδῶν φόνον
 φεύγουσα καὶ τλᾶς' ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον.
 οὐ γὰρ γελάσθαι τλητὸν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν, φίλαι.
 [ἴτω· τί μοι ζῆν κέρδος; οὔτε μοι πατρὶς
 οὔτ' οἰκός ἐστιν οὔτ' ἀποστροφὴ κακῶν.]
 ἡμάρτανον τόθ' ἡνίκ' ἐξελίμπανον
 δόμους πατρώους

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

⁵ Though there is no objection either to the asyndeton in this line (*cf.* *Hec.* 1194) or to the isolation of τᾶμ' (*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 τέκνα more explicit (for οὐτις ἐστὶν ὅστις ἐξαιρήσεται *cf.* *Alc.* 848, *Hclld.* 977). No such deletion, however, can safely be accepted without documentary support.

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 κείνται δὲ νεκροὶ παῖς τε καὶ γέρων πατήρ
[πέλας, ποθεινὴ δακρύοις συμφορᾷ].

ποθεινὴ δακρύοις συμφορᾷ 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 ἤμεῖς δ’ ἔτ’ ὀρθοὶ κοῦ γέροντες, ὡς δοκεῖς,
ἀλλ’ εἷς γε τοιόνδ’ ἄνδρ’ ἀποβλέψας μόνον
τροπαῖον αὐτοῦ στήσομαι, πρέσβυς περ ὦν.
[πολλῶν νέων γὰρ κᾶν γέρων εὐψυχος ἦ
κρείσων· τί γὰρ δεῖ δειλὸν ὄντ’ εὐσωματεῖν;]

“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 ὦν 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.”⁶ Nevertheless, πρέσβυς περ ὦν makes a more forceful and idiomatic end to the speech: cf. *Phoen.* 1624 οὐδέ περ πράσων κακῶς, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 453 καίπερ ὕστερος μολῶν, *Med.* 463–64 καὶ γὰρ εἰ κύ με στυγεῖς, | οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην σοὶ κακῶς φρονεῖν ποτε, *Andr.* 266–68 καὶ γὰρ εἰ περίξ ε’ ἔχοι | τηκτὸς μόλυβδος, ἔξαναστήσω ε’ ἐγὼ | πρὶν ᾧ πέποιθας παῖδ’ Ἀχιλλέως μολεῖν, *El.* 362–63 καὶ γὰρ εἰ πένης ἔφυν, | οὗτοι τό γ’ ἦθος δυσγενὲς παρέξομαι, *Soph.* *OC* 958–59 πρὸς δὲ τὰς πράξεις ὁμως | καὶ τηλικόσδ’ ὦν ἀντιδρᾶν πειράσομαι.⁷

⁶ “Malim καὶ γέρων εὐψυχος ὦν,” Wecklein; and indeed this κᾶν would be more at home in later Greek. The corruption of καί to κᾶν may have led to the corruption of ὦν 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 οὕτως ἀνόητος ἐγεγενήμην 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.).

- (5) *Supp.* 216 ἄλλ' ἢ φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ μείζον χθένειν
 ζητεῖ, τὸ γαῦρον δ' ἐν φρεσὶν κεκτημένοι
 δοκοῦμεν εἶναι δαιμόνων σοφώτεροι.
 ἦς καὶ σὺ φαίνη δεκάδος, οὐ σοφὸς γεγώς,
 ὅστις κόρας μὲν θεσφάτοις Φοίβου ζυγεῖς
 221 ξένοισιν ὡδ' ἔδωκας ὡς ζώντων θεῶν,
 229 ἐς δὲ στρατεῖαν πάντας Ἀργείους ἄγων
 231 βία παρελθὼν θεοὺς ἀπώλεσας πόλιν,
 νέοις παραχθείς, οἵτινες τιμώμενοι
 χαίρουσι πολέμους τ' αὐξάνουσ' ἄνευ δίκης,
 φθείροντες ἀστούς, ὁ μὲν ὅπως στρατηλατῆ,
 ὁ δ' ὡς ὑβρίζη δύναμιν ἐς χεῖρας λαβών,
 ἄλλος δὲ κέρδους οὐνεκ', οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶν
 237 τὸ πλῆθος εἴ τι βλάπτεται πάσχον τάδε.
 246 κᾶπειτ' ἐγὼ σοὶ σύμμαχος γενήσομαι;

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 παρελθὼν θεοῦς (231); and 238–45, an irrelevant piece of political analysis that deprives κᾶπειτ' in 246 of its function.⁸ The most damaging of the three is 222–28, which separates μὲν 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).

- (6) *Supp.* 504 ἢ νυν φρονεῖν ἄμεινον ἐξάσχει Διός,
 ἢ θεοὺς δικαίως τοὺς κακοὺς ἀπολλύναι.
 [φιλεῖν μὲν οὖν χρὴ τοὺς σοφοὺς πρῶτον τέκνα,
 ἔπειτα τοκέας πατρίδα θ', ἣν αὔξειν χρεῶν
 καὶ μὴ κατᾶσαι. σφαλερὸν ἡγεμῶν θρασύς,
 νεῶς τε ναύτης ἡκυχοῦς καιρῶ σοφός·
 510 καὶ τοῦτό μοι τάνδρειον, ἢ προμηθία.]
 [CHO. ἐξαρκέσας ἦν Ζεὺς ὁ τιμωρούμενος,
 ὑμᾶς δ' ὑβρίζειν οὐκ ἐχρῆν τοιάνδ' ὑβριν.]
 ADR. ὦ παγκάκιςτε—THE. σίγ', Ἄδραστ', ἔχε στόμα
 καὶ μὴ ἴπιπροσθεν τῶν ἐμῶν τοὺς σοὺς λόγους
 θῆς

⁸ Without 234–37 or 232–37 κᾶπειτ' would be even easier, but since these lines consist entirely of subordinate clauses, they do not sever the connexion between κᾶπειτ' and 231.

506–10 (*del.* Schenkl) are irrelevant here or anywhere in the speech (*post* 493 Wilamowitz⁹), 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 *δαιμόνων* in the last line of Theseus's rejoinder (563) is not likely to be an accident.¹⁰

(7) *Supp.* 841 *πόθεν ποθ' οἶδε διαπρεπεῖς εὐψυχία
θνητῶν ἔφυσαν; εἰπέ [γ' ὡς σοφώτερος
νέοισιν ἄστῶν τῶνδ']· ἐπιστήμων 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.* 398E *τίνας οὖν θρηνώδεις ἁρμονίαι; λέγε μοι· σὺ γὰρ μουσικός.*

(8) *Supp.* 1169 *ὑμᾶς δὲ τῶνδε χρὴ χάριν μεμνημένους
[σώζειν, ὀρῶντας ὦν ἐκύρατε ἐξ ἑμοῦ,
παῖσιν θ' ὑπεῖπον τούδε τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους,]
τιμῶν πόλιν τήνδ', ἐκ τέκνων ἀεὶ τέκνοισι
μνήμην παραγγέλλοντας ὦν ἐκύρατε*
1171 *παῖσιν θ' ὑπειπεῖν* Reiske.

1170–71 are either a generalizing addition or (with Reiske's conjecture) a poor alternative to 1172–73. *χάριν* is already governed by one verb, and *ὦν ἐκύρατε* does not bear such close repetition.

(9) *HF* 190 *ἀνὴρ ὀπλίτης δοῦλός ἐστι τῶν ὀπλων
[καὶ τοῖσι συνταχθεῖσιν οὐδὲ μὴ ἀγαθοῖς
αὐτὸς τέθνηκε δειλία τῇ τῶν πέλας,]
θραύσας τε λόγῃ οὐκ ἔχει τῷ σώματι
θάνατον ἀμῦναι, μίαν ἔχων ἀλκὴν 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

⁹ Transposition of a self-contained and dispensable passage is never preferable to deletion unless some palaeographical cause can be found for the error. *Cf.* below on *HF* 191–92 (no.9).

¹⁰ *Cf.* Fraenkel, *Eranos* 44 (1946) 86 = *Kleine Beiträge* I (Rome 1964) 419. Other examples occur at *Ajax* 524, where *εὐγενής* answers *εὐγενῆ* in 480, and *Phoen.* 525, where *τᾶλλα δ' εὐ-
σεβεῖν χρεῶν* answers 493 *ἀποστεροῦμαι πατρίδος ἀνοσιώτατα* (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. ὦ μακαρίων μοι φασμάτων ἦδ' ἡμέρα.
 PR. λαβῶν νυν αὐτὰ τὴν τεκοῦσαν ἐκπόνει.
 πᾶσαν δ' ἐπελθὼν Ἀσιάδ' Εὐρώπης θ' ὄρου
 γνώσῃ τάδ' αὐτός. τοῦ θεοῦ δ' ἕκατί ce
 ἔθρῆψά τ', ὦ παῖ, καὶ τάδ' ἀποδίδωμί σοι,
 ἃ κείνος ἀκέλευστόν μ' ἐβουλήθη λαβεῖν
 1360 σῶσαί θ'· ὄτου δ' ἔβούλεθ' οὔνεκ' οὐκ ἔχω
λέγειν†.¹³
 ἦδει δὲ θνητῶν οὔτις ἀνθρώπων τάδε
 ἔχοντας ἡμᾶς, οὐδ' ἴν' ἦν κεκρυμμένα.
 καὶ χαῖρ'· ἴσον γάρ σ' ὡς τεκοῦς ἀσπάζομαι.
 [ἄρξαι δ' ὄθεν σὴν μητέρα ζητεῖν ce χρή·
 1365 πρῶτον μὲν εἴ τις Δελφίδων τεκοῦσά ce
ἐς τούδε ναοὺς ἐξέθηκε παρθένος,
ἔπειτα δ' εἴ τις Ἑλλάς. ἐξ ἡμῶν δ' ἔχει
ἅπαντα Φοίβου θ', ὃς μέτεσχε τῆς τύχης]
 1356 IO. πᾶσάν γ' ἐπελθὼν Ἀσιάδ' Εὐρώπης θ' ὄρου.
 PR. γνώσῃ τάδ' αὐτός Kirchhoff.

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

¹¹ Unless the author wrote *σὺν τοῖς τε συνταχθεῖσιν* (considered by Paley and better than Madvig's illogical *κἂν*), he had no better reason for using the dative than that the genitive would not scan. Nothing in Kühner-Gerth § 425.7 suggests that *τοῖς συνταχθεῖσι τέθνηκε* 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 οὐκ ἔχω [λέγειν] Wilamowitz, but ἔχειν is far from being a simple equivalent of εἰδέναι: it usually occurs in contexts of giving and receiving information or of suggesting and grasping ideas (e.g. *Phoen.* 953, *Or.* 1120), so that οὐκ ἔχω 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 *εἰ δὲ λέκτρα διέφυγες, τόδ' οὐκ ἔχω*).

καὶ χαῖρ', the priestess cannot give directions to Ion after 1363: cf. 1604, Alc. 1149, Hcl. 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 γνώση τὰδ' 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 Ἑλλάς 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 Ἐκάβη, πυκνὰς γὰρ οἰσθά μ' ἐς Τροίαν ὁδοῦς
 ἐλθόντα κήρυκ' ἐξ Ἀχαιοκοῦ στρατοῦ,
 [ἐγνωσμένος δὲ καὶ πάροιθέ σοι, γυναί,]
 Ταλθύβιος ἦκω καινὸν ἀγγελῶν λόγον

Del. Dobree. The syntax is indefensible.

- (12) El. 367 φεῦ·
 οὐκ ἔστ' ἀκριβὲς οὐδὲν εἰς εὐανδρίαν·
 380 οὗτος γὰρ ἀνὴρ οὗτ' ἐν Ἀργείοις μέγας
 οὗτ' αὖ δοκῆσει δωμάτων ὠγκωμένος,
 ἐν τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς ὦν, ἄριστος ἠύρέθη.
 οὐ μὴ φρονήσῃ, οἱ κενῶν δοξασμάτων
 πλήρεις πλανᾶσθε, τῇ δ' ὀμιλίᾳ βροτοῦς
 κρινεῖτε καὶ τοῖς ἦθεσιν τοὺς εὐγενεῖς;
 391 ἀλλ'—ἄξιός γὰρ ὁ τε παρὼν ὁ τ' οὐ παρὼν
 Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖς, οὐπερ οὐνεχ' ἦκομεν—
 δεξώμεθ' οἴκων καταλύσεις. χωρεῖν χρεῶν,
 δμῶες, δόμων τῶνδ' ἐντός· ὡς ἐμοὶ πένης
 εἶη πρόθυμος πλουσίου 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 Ἑλληνίς (*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),¹⁶ 383–85 (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 γάρ in 380, which makes no sense anywhere except after 367.¹⁸ It cannot give a reason for 379, because 379 is the conclusion of another train of argument; and it cannot give a reason for 368–72, because Orestes’ present experience of the αὐτουργός does not account for his past experience of similar people (369 ἤδη 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 κρείττων ἢ φίλος καφής,
οὐ πλοῦτος, οὐ τυραννίς· ἀλόγιστον δέ τι
τὸ πλήθος ἀντάλλαγμα γενναίου φίλου.

¹⁶ 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 authorship, unless 375–76 had been interpolated into *Auge* before 373–79 were transferred to *Electra*. J. Baumert points out (*ENIOI AΘETΟΥΣΙΝ* [Tübingen 1968] 34–35) that in the passage of Diogenes ἐν τῇ Αὔγῃ εἰπόντος is only an emendation (*Αὔγῃ* cod. n, of the XVI century: αὐτῇ B P, αὐτοῦ F); but ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ makes no sense in the context, and ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ is a poor attempt at restoring sense, because if Diogenes had not known or not cared about the precise play he would have contented himself with εἰπόντος (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 *Αὔγῃ* 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 εὐανδρία has no business to be entertained after 371; cf. K. Schenkl, *ZöstG* 25 (1874) 89: “Wenn . . . diese Verse [371–72] echt sind, so kann man nicht 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 ἐλήρουσιν ὅτι τύχοιμ’ οὐδ’ ἐμπεσῶν ἔφυρον (Euripides at *Ar. Ran.* 945).

¹⁸ 368 goes with 369–72, which provide better evidence of παραγμός in αἱ φύσεις βροτῶν than the single instance of the αὐτουργός would. Incidentally, it should not be forgotten that the order αἱ φύσεις βροτῶν is “really remarkable” (Ed. Fraenkel, *Agamemnon* II² (Oxford 1962) 317 n.1; at OC 1721 read not [ᾶ] with Wilamowitz but [τῶ]).

cὺ γὰρ τά τ' εἰς Αἴγιϑον ἐξῆϋρες κακὰ
 καὶ πλησίον παρήϑθα κινδύνων ἐμοί,
 νῦν τ' αὖ δίδως μοι πολεμίων τιμωρίαν
 κοῦκ ἐκποδῶν εἶ.

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 ξυναλλάσσοντος ὄρνιθος βροτοῖς
 δίκαιον ἄνδρα τοῖσι δυσσεβεστέροις.
 ἐν παντὶ πράγει δ' ἔϑ' ὀμιλίαις κακῆς
 600 κάκιον οὐδέν, καρπὸς οὐ κομιστέος . . .
 609 οὕτως δ' ὁ μάντις . . .

383–85 draw a reasonable moral from the present case, so long as ὀμιλία 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 ὡς 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 βροτῶν (Keene) and something other than φρονήσεθ', probably not ἴφρονήσεθ' (*Il.* 15.104, *AP* 10.66, Cebes 41). For κενῶν δοξασμάτων πλήρεις cf. *Isoc.* 8.75 ἐλπίδων κενῶν ὄντα μεστόν, *Timon* fr.11 ἄνθρωποι κενεῆς οἰήσιος ἔμπλεοι ἄσκοι.

²⁰ Mr Barrett raises the important question of the exits and entrances in 357–407: what does the αὐτουργός do, and what do the ὄπαδοί do? The αὐτουργός 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 ὄπαδοί 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 αὐτουργός give orders to the ὄπαδοί of Orestes? can he sandwich an imperative addressed to the ὄπαδοί between two coordinate imperatives addressed to Orestes and Pylades? The case against 360 is strong, and so is the point that the αὐτουργός should not be discussed in his presence. Could it be that at 363 the αὐτουργός retires to the back of the stage and busies himself with the door (cf. 357 οὐκ οὐκον πάλαι χρῆν τοῖς δ' ἀνεπτύχθαι πύλας;), so that Orestes has time for a brief conversation with Electra (the briefer the better) before the αὐτουργός rejoins the company round about 393?

²¹ Cf. Ed. Fraenkel, *SBMünchen* 1963, Heft 1, 66–67.

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 παρών in 391 must surely be the αὐτουργός. Orestes, were he present, would be a worthy host; he is not present, but the man who is, the αὐτουργός, is no less worthy. The point would come across more clearly if 396–98 were placed between

- (13) *IT* 1411 ἀλλ' ἔρπε, δεσμὰ καὶ βρόχους λαβὼν χεροῖν·
εἰ μὴ γὰρ οἶδμα νήνεμον γενήσεται,
οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς τοῖς ξένοις σωτηρίας.
[πόντου δ' ἀνάκτωρ Ἴλιόν τ' ἐπισκοπεῖ
σεμνὸς Ποσειδῶν, Πελοπίδαις δ' ἐναντίος,
καὶ νῦν παρέξει τὸν Ἀγαμέμνωνος γόνου
κοὶ καὶ πολίταις, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐν χεροῖν
λαβεῖν τ' ἀδελφήν, ἣ φόνον τὸν Αὐλίδι
ἀμνημόνευτον θεᾶ προδοῦς ἀλίσκεται.]

Del. England. After the urgency and confidence of 1411–13, which in any case bring the speech to a perfect conclusion, ὡς ἔοικεν (1417) is alone sufficient to condemn “these halting lines, with their superfluous and ill-timed piece of mythologizing.”

- (14) *Hel.* 988 οὐ γὰρ γαμῆι τήνδ' οὔτε κύγγονος κέθειν
οὔτ' ἄλλος οὐδεὶς, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σφ' ἀπάξομαι,
εἰ μὴ πρὸς οἴκους δυνάμεθ', ἀλλὰ πρὸς νεκρούς.
[τί ταῦτα; δακρύοις ἐς τὸ θῆλυ τρεπόμενος
ἐλεινὸς ἦν ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ δραστήριος.
κτεῖν', εἰ δοκεῖ σοι· δυσκλεῶς γὰρ οὐ κτενεῖς·
μᾶλλον γε μέντοι τοῖς ἐμοῖς πείθου λόγοις,
ἵν' ἦς δικαία καὶ δάμαρτ' ἐγὼ λάβω.]

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 κτεῖν', εἰ δοκεῖ σοι (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 οὖν 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 *νεκρούς*, 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 *νεκρώ* in 986, which has no perceptible effect on Menelaus' resolution.

- (15) *Phoen.* 518 ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν ἄλλως τήνδε γῆν οἰκεῖν θέλει,
ἔξεστ'· ἐκείνου δ' οὐχ ἐκὼν μεθήσομαι.
[ἄρχειν παρόν μοι, τῶδε δουλεύσω ποτέ;]

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

- (16) *Or.* 360 Ἄγαμέμνωνος μὲν γὰρ τύχας ἠπιστάμην
[καὶ θάνατον οἶω πρὸς δάμαρτος ὤλετο]
Μαλέα προσίχων πρῶραν

"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 *ὤλετο* makes *Μαλέα προσίχων πρῶραν* ambiguous.²³

- (17) *Or.* 552 πατήρ μὲν ἐφύτευσέν με, σὴ δ' ἔτικτε παῖς,
τὸ σπέρμ' ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦς' ἄλλου πάρα·
[ἄνευ δὲ πατρὸς τέκνον οὐκ εἶη ποτ' ἄν.]
ἐλογικάμην οὖν τῶ γένους ἀρχηγέτη
†μᾶλλον ἀμῦναι† τῆς ὑποστάσεως 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 beabsichtigt, die hier vorauszusetzen

²³ 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;²⁴ wie ist es denkbar, dass er in so platter Form redet . . . ?” (*Euripideische Studien I* [*MémAcStPetersbourg* 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 σὴ δὲ θυγάτηρ—μητέρ’ αἰδοῦμαι λέγειν—
 ἰδίοισιν ὑμεναίοισι κοῦχὶ σῶφροσιν
 ἐς ἀνδρὸς ἦει λέκτρ’ ἐμαντόν, ἦν λέγω
 κακῶς ἐκείνην, ἐξερῶ, λέξω δ’ ὄμωσ.
 [Αἴγισθος ἦν ὁ κρυπτός ἐν δόμοισι πόσις.]
 τοῦτον κατέκτειν’, ἐπὶ δ’ ἔθυσα μητέρα,
 ἀνόσια μὲν δρῶν, ἀλλὰ τιμωρῶν πατρί.

Does Tyndareus really need to know that “her clandestine husband was Aegisthus”?²⁵ and does anything turn on his identity?

- (19) Or. 579 πρὸς θεῶν—ἐν οὐ καλῶ μὲν ἐμνήσθην θεῶν
 φόνον δικάζων· εἰ δὲ δὴ τὰ μητέρος
 σιγῶν ἐπήνουν, τί μ’ ἂν ἔδρασ’ ὁ καταθανών;
 οὐκ ἂν με μισῶν ἀνεχόρευ’ Ἐρινύσιν;
 ἦ μητρὶ μὲν πάρεισι σύμμαχοι θεαί,
 τῷ δ’ οὐ πάρεισι, μᾶλλον ἠδίκημένῳ;
 [σύ τοι φυτεύσας θυγατέρ’, ὦ γέρον, κακὴν
 ἀπώλεσας με· διὰ τὸ γὰρ κείνης θράσος
 πατρὸς στερηθεὶς ἐγενόμην μητροκτόνος.

²⁴ According to Eust. 1498.58–59, Euripides *περιεσυρίχθη* *θεατρικῶς* for the line, *ἀκούσας τὸ ἄδόκον τὸ ἄνευ δὲ μητρός, ὦ κάθαρμ’ Εὐριπίδη;*. Σ 554 is vaguer: *λέγεται τις αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι ἄνευ δὲ μητρός, ὦ κάθαρμ’ Εὐριπίδη;*. The story is presumably of the same vintage as e.g. Diog.Laert. 2.33, Plut. *Mor.* 19B, Sen. *Ep.* 115.15; “Dass die Komödie, die eine solche Tactlosigkeit des Euripides nicht ungerügt 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: *οἱ* 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 εἶχε πόσιν*” (*op.cit.* [on no.17] 45). Surely, however, *ὁ κρυπτός πόσις* is easily enough extracted from 557–59, for *ἴδιοι ὑμεναίοι κοῦχὶ σῶφρονες* 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.

588 ὄρᾱς; Ὀδυσσέως ἄλοχον οὐ κατέκτανε
 Τηλέμαχος· οὐ γὰρ ἐπεγάμει πόσει πόσιν,
 μένει δ' ἐν οἴκοις ὑγιὲς εὐνατήριον.]
 ὄρᾱς Ἀπόλλων', ὃς μεσομφάλους ἔδρα
 ναίων βροτοῖσι στόμα νέμει καφέστατον·
 τούτῳ πιθόμενος τὴν τεκοῦσαν ἔκτανον.
 ἐκεῖνον ἠγείεθ' ἀνόσιον καὶ κτείνετε·
 ἐκεῖνος ἤμαρτ', οὐκ ἐγώ.

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 another²⁶ and leads up in all seriousness to his strongest argument.

(20) Or. 682 Ὀρέστ', ἐγώ τοι σὸν καταιδούμαι κᾶρα
 καὶ ξυμπονήσαι σοῖς κακοῖσι βούλομαι·
 [καὶ χρῆ γὰρ οὕτω τῶν ὀμαιμόνων κακὰ
 ξυνεκκομίζειν, δύναμιν ἦν διδῶ θεός,
 θηήσκοντα καὶ κτείνοντα τοὺς ἐναντίους·]
 τὸ δ' αὖ δύνασθαι πρὸς θεῶν χρήζω τυχεῖν.

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 τὸ δ' αὖ δύνασθαι in 687, and the use of ὀμαιμόνες for ‘kinsmen’ (684) is as much a singularity as the use of ὀμαιμοί for ‘kinsmen’ in 806.²⁷

“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 *θεοί* were read for *θεαί* in 583.

²⁷ See part I (GRBS 13 [1972]) 260 n.38 and cf. *Eur. Supp.* 1035, *IT* 1402, Jebb on OC 330.

CQ 10 (1916) 80–81; 714 *Ἀργους γ' ἔνεκ' ἄν* Hermann; 714–16 *del.* Dindorf.

- (21) Or. 931 *κόος δ' ἐπῆλθε κύγγονος,*
ἔλεξε δ'· ὦ γῆν Ἰνάχου κεκτημένοι,
ὑμῖν ἀμύνων οὐδὲν ἦσσαν ἢ πατρὶ
ἔκτεινα μητέρ'· εἰ γὰρ ἀρσένων φόνος
ἔσται γυναιξίν ὄσιος, οὐ φθάνουσ' ἔτ' ἄν
θνήσκοντες, ἢ γυναιξὶ δουλεύειν χρεῶν.
938 [*τοῦναντίον δὲ δράσετ' ἢ δράσαι χρεῶν·*
νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἢ προδοῦσα λέκτρ' ἐμοῦ πατρὸς
τέθνηκεν· εἰ δὲ δὴ κατακτενεῖτέ με,
ὁ νόμος ἀνεῖται, κοὐ φθάνου θνήσκων 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 *κοὐ φθάνου θνήσκων τις ἄν* in 941. “Für *δράσετ' ἢ δράσαι* könnte man eher *πράξετ' ἢ πράξαι* erwarten” (Wecklein), and indeed *müsste man* if the implied condition is *γυναιξὶ δουλεύοντες*;²⁸ if, on the other hand, the implied condition is *ἐμὲ κατακτείναντες*, nothing in the preceding lines has paved the way for this implication (which is why Weil read *δὴ* for *δέ* and punctuated the line as a question). As for *κοὐ φθάνου θνήσκων 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, *Alc.* 662, *Tro.* 456, *IT* 245, *Hclid.* 721, *Ar. Plut.* 485, 874) that *οὐ φθάνουσ' ἔτ' ἄν θνήσκοντες, ἢ γυναιξὶ δουλεύειν χρεῶν* means “ihr dürftet 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 φθάνουσ' 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 *κοὐ φθάνου θνήσκων 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 *δραῖν* intrans.=*πράσσειν* 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. ὦ φίλτατ', ὦ ποθεινὸν ἠδιστόν τ' ἔχων
τῆς σῆς ἀδελφῆς ὄνομα καὶ ψυχὴν μίαν.³⁰
OR. ἔκ τοί με τήξεις· καί σ' ἀμείψασθαι θέλω
[φιλότητι χειρῶν· τί γὰρ ἔτ' αἰδοῦμαι τάλας;]·
ὦ στέρν' ἀδελφῆς, ὦ φίλον πρόσπτυγμ' ἐμόν.
[τάδ' ἀντὶ παίδων καὶ γαμηλίου λέχους
προσφθέγματ' ἀμφὶ 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 *φιλότητι χειρῶν* is an extraordinary mixture of mental and physical.³³

- (23) Or. 1191 'Ελένης θανούσης, ἦν τι Μενέλεώς σε δρᾶ
ἦ τόνδε κάμέ—πάν γὰρ ἐν φίλον τόδε—,
λέγ' ὡς φονεύσεις 'Ερμιόνην· ξίφος δὲ χρῆ
δέρη πρὸς αὐτῇ παρθένου σπάσαντ' ἔχειν.
κἂν μὲν σε σῶζῃ μὴ θανεῖν χρήζων κόρη
[Μενέλεως 'Ελένης πτώμ' ἰδὼν ἐν αἵματι],
μέθεσ πεπᾶσθαι πατρὶ παρθένου δέμας·
ἦν δ' ὄξυθύμου μὴ κρατῶν φρονήματος
κτείνῃ σε, καὶ σὺ σφάζε παρθένου δέρη.

³⁰ The couplet is corrupt (*cf.* J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* [Oxford 1955] 142).

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) *πρόσπτυγμα* indicates the inception of the embrace from which Electra breaks away with 1052 *φεῦ*; 1050–51 must not delay the embrace, but equally can't be uttered during it. In 1047–49 I think *Binneninterpolation*:

ἔκ τοι με τήξεις· [καί σ' ἀμείψασθαι θέλω
φιλότητι χειρῶν·] τί γὰρ ἔτ' αἰδοῦμαι τάλας;
ὦ στέρν' ἀδελφῆς, ὦ φίλον πρόσπτυγμ' ἐμόν. (They embrace.)

After the future *τήξεις* ("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 ἔπειτ' ἐμοὶ τὰ δειν' ἐπηπείλησ' ἔπη
εἰ μὴ φανοίην πᾶν τὸ συντυχὸν πάθος
[κἀνήρητ' ἐν τῷ πράγματος κυροῖ ποτε].
κἀγώ, φίλοι, δείσασα τοῦξειργασμένον
ἔλεξα πᾶν ὄσονπερ 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 τοιᾶδε κείμενος κακῇ τύχῃ
ἄσιτος ἀνήρ, ἄποτος, ἐν μέσοις βοτοῖς
σιδηροκμήσιν ἦσυχος θακεῖ πεσών,
καὶ δηλὸς ἐστὶν ὥς τι δρασείων κακόν.
[τοιαῦτα γὰρ πως καὶ λέγει κῶδύρεται.]

Del. Nauck. Ajax is ἦσυχος (325). The wording of the line derives in part from 383 ξὺν τῷ θεῷ πᾶς καὶ γελᾷ κῶδύρεται.

- (26) *Ajax* 961 οἱ δ' οὖν γελώντων κἀπιχαιρόντων κακοῖς
τοῖς τοῦδ'· ἴσως τοι, κεῖ βλέποντα μὴ ᾽πόθουν,
θανόντ' ἂν οἰμώξειαν ἐν χρεῖα δορός.
οἱ γὰρ κακοὶ γνώμαισι τᾶγαθὸν χεροῖν
ἔχοντες οὐκ ἴσασιν πρὶν τις ἐκβάλῃ.
966 [ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἢ κείνοισι γλυκύς,
αὐτῷ δὲ τερπνός· ὦν γὰρ ἠράσθη τυχεῖν
ἐκτήσαθ' αὐτῷ, θάνατον ὄνπερ ἠθελεν.
τί δήτα τοῦδ' ἐπεγγελάωεν ἂν κάτα;
θεοῖς τέθνηκεν οὗτος, οὐ κείνοισιν, οὔ.]
πρὸς ταῦτ' ᾽Οδυσσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὑβριζέτω·
Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν, 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 βούλομαι). Emendations of ἦ give either poor sense or impossible idiom (no use of ἦ, 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 τέθνηκα δὴ εἴθι θυγατρὶ) is “he has been killed by the gods, not them” (*cf.* 950–53 TE. οὐκ ἂν τάδ’ ἔστη τῆδε μὴ θεῶν μέτα . . . TE. τοιόνδε μέντοι Ζηῆτος ἢ δεινὴ θεὸς | Παλλὰς φυτεύει πῆμ’ Ὀδυσσεῶς χάριν); 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 κεί μὴ θεῶν τις τήνδε πείραν ἔσβεσεν,
 ἡμεῖς μὲν ἂν τήνδ’ ἦν ὄδ’ εἴληχεν τύχην
 θανόντες ἂν προκείμεθ’ αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ,
 οὗτος δ’ ἂν ἔζη· νῦν δ’ ἐνήλλαξεν θεός
 [τὴν τοῦδ’ ὕβριν πρὸς μῆλα καὶ ποίμνας πεσεῖν].

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 οὐ *cf.* OC 587 οὐ μικρός, οὐκ, ἀγὼν ὄδε, fr.846 Pearson οὐ κόσμος, οὐκ, ὦ πλήμον, ἀλλ’ ἀκοσμία, Ag.Rap. 1308 αὐτῆ ποθ’ ἢ Μοῦς οὐκ ἐλεσβίαζεν, οὐ, Ach. 421 οὐ Φοῖνικος, οὐ. It would therefore be uncharitable to suspect that the author’s inspiration ran out before the end of the line. The same applies to *ὄνπερ ἦθελεν* in 968, which may seem to be a mere stopgap after ὦν γὰρ ἠράσθη τυχεῖν but can be read as οἷον ἦθελεν (*cf.* OC 1704–06 ἔπραξεν οἷον ἦθελεν.—τὸ ποῖον,—ἄς ἔχρηζε γὰς ἐπὶ ξένας ἔθανε).

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 ἀνάσσειν ἦλθες, οὐχ ἡμῶν κρατῶν,
οὐδ' ἔσθ' ὅπου σοι τόνδε κοσμήσαι πλέον
ἀρχῆς ἔκειτο θεσμός ἢ καὶ τῶδε σέ·
[ὑπαρχος ἄλλων δεῦρ' ἔπλευσας, οὐχ ὄλων
στρατηγός, ὥστ' Αἴαντος ἠγεῖσθαι ποτε·]
ἀλλ' ὦνπερ ἄρχεις ἄρχε*

Del. Schneidewin, *Philologus* 4 (1849) 474. A glance at LSJ *ὅλος* I.5 is instructive; Jebb takes no account of the stylistic level at which this use originates.³⁸ Furthermore, the contention that Menelaus is *ὑπαρχος ἄλλων* breaks the connexion between *Σπάρτης ἀνάσσειν ἦλθες* (1102) and *ἀλλ' ὦνπερ ἄρχεις ἄρχε* (1107), and it is not a contention that squares very well with 1109 *ἄτερος στρατηγός* (this last was one of Radermacher's reasons for accepting the deletion of 1105–06, just as *τὸν στρατηγόν* in 1116 was one of his reasons for deleting 1111–17).

- (29) *El.* 591 *πῶς ταῦτ' ἐπαινέσαιμ' ἄν; ἢ καὶ ταῦτ' ἐρεῖς
ὡς τῆς θυγατρὸς ἀντίποινα λαμβάνεις;
[αἰσχρῶς δ', ἐάνπερ καὶ λέγῃς· οὐ γὰρ καλὸν
ἐχθροῖς γαμεῖσθαι τῆς θυγατρὸς οὐνεκα·]
ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ οὐδὲ νουθετεῖν ἔξεστί σε . . .*

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 θυγατρὸς οὐνεκα* is impossibly vague in a general maxim.³⁹

- (30) *El.* 655 *ταῦτ', ὦ Λύκει' Ἀπολλον, ἴλεως κλυῶν
δοῦς πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ὥσπερ ἐξαιτούμεθα.
τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα καὶ σιωπῶσης ἐμοῦ
ἐπαξιῶ σε δαίμον' ὄντ' ἐξειδέναί.
[τοὺς ἐκ Διὸς γὰρ εἰκός ἐστι πάνθ' ὄραν·]*

³⁸ *ὅλος* = ‘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 *κρινεῖ τις αὐτὸν πῶποτ' ἀνθρώπων μέγαν, | ὃν ἐξαλείφει πρόφασις ἢ τυχοῦς ὄλον;* is wrongly ascribed to Euripides (Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 40 [1905] 134 = *Kleine Schriften* IV 188; add that Euripides can hardly have used *πῶποτ'* of the future).

³⁹ Perhaps that explains “*Qu. οὐ γὰρ σ' ἐχρῆν*” (Blaydes).

Del. Jahn. Logic demands not πάνθ' ὄρᾶν but πάντ' εἰδέναι, and though all δαίμονες are expected πάντ' εἰδέναι (657–58), not all δαίμονες are ἐκ Διός.

- (31) OT 68 ἦν δ' εὖ σκοπῶν ἠῦρῖσκον ἴασιν μόνην,
ταύτην ἔπραξα· παῖδα γὰρ Μενοικέως
Κρέοντ', ἑμαυτοῦ γαμβρόν, ἐς τὰ Πυθικὰ
ἔπεμψα Φοίβου δώμαθ', ὡς πύθοιθ' ὅτι
δρῶν ἢ τι φωνῶν τήνδε ῥυσαίμην πόλιν.
73 [καί μ' ἡμαρ ἤδη ξυμμετρούμενον χρόνῳ
λυπεῖ τί πράσσει· τοῦ γὰρ εἰκότος πέρα
ἄπεστι πλείω τοῦ καθήκοντος χρόνου.]
ὅταν δ' ἴκηται, τημικαῦτ' ἐγὼ κακὸς
μὴ δρῶν ἂν εἶην πάνθ' ὅς' ἂν δηλοῖ θεός.

Del. L. Dindorf, NJbb Abt.1, 24 (1878) 321. “Wenn Oed. Tyr. 73 Oedipus sagt . . ., so ist weder in den Worten ἡμαρ ξυμμετρούμενον χρόνῳ ein sinn noch die construction λυπεῖ τί πράσσει durch ähnliche wörter, welche eine besorgnis ausdrücken, da λυπεῖν nur ‘traurig machen’ bedeutet, gerechtfertigt, und das auf τοῦ εἰκότος πέρα folgende τοῦ καθήκοντος . . . eher eines in versnot sich befindenden Byzantiners⁴⁰ als des Sophokles würdig.”

- (32) OT 236 τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀπαυδῶ τοῦτον, ὅστις ἐστί, γῆς
τῆσδ' ἦς ἐγὼ κράτη τε καὶ θρόνους νέμω
μήτ' ἐσδέχεσθαι μήτε προσφωνεῖν τινά
μήτ' ἐν θεῶν εὐχαίαι μηδὲ θύμασιν
240 κοινὸν ποιεῖσθαι μήτε χέρνιβας νέμειν,
ὠθεῖν δ' ἀπ' οἴκων πάντας, ὡς μιάσματος
τοῦδ' ἡμῖν ὄντος, ὡς τὸ Πυθικὸν θεοῦ
μαντεῖον ἐξέφηεν ἀρτίως ἐμοί.
ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τοιόσδε τῷ τε δαίμονι
245 τῷ τ' ἀνδρὶ τῷ θανόντι κύμμαχος πέλω.
[κατεύχομαι δὲ τὸν δεδρακότ', εἴτε τις
εἷς ὧν λέληθεν εἴτε πλειόνων μέτα,
κακὸν κακῶς νιν ἄμορον ἐκτρῦψαι βίον.
ἐπεύχομαι δ', οἴκοισιν εἰ ξυνέστιος
250 ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ συνειδότης,

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

παθεῖν ἄπερ τοῖσδ' ἀρτίως ἡρακάμην.]
 ὑμῖν δὲ ταῦτα πάντα' ἐπισκῆπτω τελεῖν
 ὑπέρ τ' ἑμαυτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τε τῆσδέ τε
 γῆς ὧδ' ἀκάρπως καθέως ἐφθαρμένης.

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 ἐχθροδαίμων μᾶλλον ἂν γένοιτ' ἀνήρ,
 ὃν μὴ ξένων ἕξεσσι μηδ' ἀστῶν τινὶ
 δόμοις δέχεσθαι μηδὲ προσφωνεῖν τινά,
 ὠθεῖν δ' ἀπ' οἴκων; καὶ τάδ' οὔτις ἄλλος ἦν
 ἢ 'γὼ 'π' ἑμαυτῷ τάσδ' ἀρὰς ὁ προστιθείς

1381 αὐτὸς ἐννέπων
 ὠθεῖν ἅπαντας τὸν ἀσεβῆ, τὸν ἐκ θεῶν
 φανέντ' ἀναγνον καὶ †γένουσι τοῦ Λαίου†.⁴¹

ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν, he continues, τοιοῦδε τῷ τε δαίμονι | τῷ τ' ἀνδρὶ τῷ θανόντι κύμματος πέλω (244–45). What is to follow this ἐγὼ 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 ἐγὼ μὲν answered by ὑμῖν δέ (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 δρῶσιν 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 ὑμῖν δέ 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 wäre es sehr leicht, mit M. Schmidt τοῖσδ' 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 ANG. εὖ ἴσθ' ἐκείνον θανάσιμον βεβηκότα.
 OED. πότερα δόλοισιν ἢ νόσου ξυναλλαγῆ;
 ANG. *σμικρὰ παλαιὰ κόματ' εὐνάζει ῥοπή.*
 [OED. νόσοις ὁ τλήμων, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἔφθιτο.
 ANG. *καὶ τῷ μακρῷ γε συµμετρούµενος χρόνῳ.*]

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

- (34) OT 1375 ἄλλ' ἢ τέκνων δῆτ' ὄψις ἦν ἐφίμερος,
 βλαστοῦς' ὅπως ἔβλαστε, προσλεύσσειν ἐμοί;
 οὐ δῆτα τοῖς γ' ἐμοῖσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς ποτε·
 οὐδ' ἄστν γ' οὐδὲ πύργος οὐδὲ δαιμόνων
 ἀγάλαθ' ἱερά, τῶν ὁ παντλήμων ἐγὼ
 1380 [κάλλιστ' ἀνὴρ εἷς ἔν γε ταῖς Θήβαις τραφεῖς]
 ἀπεστέρησ' ἐμαυτόν, αὐτὸς ἐννέπων
 ὠθεῖν ἅπαντας τὸν ἀσεβῆ, τὸν ἐκ θεῶν
 φανέντ' ἀναγνον καὶ ἴγένους τοῦ Λαῖου†.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 ἄνδρα τοῦτον in 236 to mean the harbinger, 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.* Il. 6.408 ἄμμορον; elsewhere in tragedy ἄμορος, ἄμμορος and ἄμοιρος all mean *expers*. In proximity to κακὸν κακῶς the meaning of ἐκτρῦψαι βίον is presumably ἐκτριβῆναι (*cf.* 428) rather than τρίβειν βίον (*cf.* El. 602).

⁴⁴ Can it seriously be doubted that these words are corrupt? Since the proclamation referred to is clearly 236–43 (1382 ὠθεῖν ἅπαντας = 241 ὠθεῖν . . . πάντας, 1382–83 ἀσεβῆ . . . ἀναγνον = 241 μιάσματος, 1382–83 ἐκ θεῶν φανέντ' . . . = 242–43 . . . θεοῦ . . . ἐξέφηγεν . . .), τὸν ἀσεβῆ *κτλ.* is not Oedipus but the murderer, to whom γένους τοῦ Λαῖου does not apply. Something like χθονὸς μιάστορα is required (*cf.* 353); Herwerden's γένους ἀλάστορα, which has palaeographical attractions (τοῦ Λαῖου a mistaken gloss on γένους), cannot quite bear this sense (at OC 773 the reference of γένος τὸ πᾶν is fixed by the whole phrase πόλιν τε . . . τήνδε καὶ γένος τὸ πᾶν).

⁴⁵ Where? Not in *Exercitationes Criticae* (The Hague 1862), where he merely offers *τραφεῖς* for *τραφεῖς* (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?⁴⁶

- (35) *Trach.* 246 DE. ἡ καπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει τὸν ἄσκοπον
 χρόνον βεβῶς ἦν ἡμερῶν ἀνήριθμον;
 LI. οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν πλείστον ἐν Λυδοῖς χρόνον
 κατείχεθ', ὡς φησ' αὐτός, οὐκ ἐλεύθερος
 ἀλλ' ἐμποληθείς· τοῦ λόγου δ' οὐ χρὴ φθόνον,
 γύνοι, προσεῖναι, Ζεὺς ὅτου πράκτωρ φανῆ·
 [κεῖνος δὲ πραθεὶς Ὀμφάλη τῇ βαρβάρῳ
 ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξέπλησεν, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγει,]
 χούτως ἐδήχθη τοῦτο τοῦνειδος λαβῶν
 ὡςθ' ὄρκον αὐτῷ προσβαλὼν διώμοσεν . . .

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

- (36) *Trach.* 332
- πρὸς δὲ δώματα
- χωρῶμεν ἤδη πάντες, ὡς κύθ' οἱ θέλει
 σπεύδης ἐγὼ τε τὰνδὸν ἐξαρκῆ τιθῶ.
- 335 ANG. αὐτοῦ γε πρῶτον βαιὸν ἀμμείνας', ὅπως
 [μάθης ἄνευ τῶνδ' οὐστυνας ἄγεις ἔσω]
 ὦν [τ'] οὐδὲν εἰσήκουσας ἐκμάθης ἂ δει.
 [τούτων ἔχω γὰρ πάντ' ἐπιστήμην ἐγώ.]
- DE. τί δ' ἐστὶ; τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάειν;
- 340 ANG. σταθεὶς ἄκουσον· καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ τὸν πάρος
 μῦθον μάτην ἤκουσας, οὐδὲ νῦν δοκῶ.
- DE. πότερον ἐκείνους δῆτα δεῦρ' αὖθις πάλιν
 καλῶμεν, ἢ μοι ταῖςδέ τ' ἐξιπεῖν θέλεις;
- ANG. σοὶ ταῖςδέ τ' οὐδὲν εἴργεται, τούτους δ' ἔα.

⁴⁶ Herwerden deleted the line "weil τραφεὶς besagen würde, dass Ödipus in Theben erzo-gen 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 ταγῶν ἀπάσης Ἀείδος μηλοτρόφου, if there is *tragische Konsequenz* in falling from a pinnacle you never occupied.

[336] and [τ'] O. Hense, *Studien zu Sophokles* (Leipzig 1880) 77–79, [338] Nauck (“the line is perhaps an interpolation,” Blaydes, *The Trachiniai of Sophocles* [London 1871]). *ἄνευ τῶνδ'* in 336 preempts Deianira's question in 342–43.⁴⁷ The impossible grammar and unusual order of 338 may also be put down to an interpolator, perhaps the same one.⁴⁸

(37) *Trach.* 441 *Ἔρωτι μὲν νῦν ὅστις ἀντανίσταται
πύκτης ὅπως ἐς χεῖρας οὐ καλῶς φρονεῖ·
οὗτος γὰρ ἄρχει καὶ θεῶν ὅπως θέλει
[κάμου γε· πῶς δ' οὐ χιτέρας οἶα γ' ἐμοῦ;]·
ὥστ' εἴ τι τῶμῳ γ' ἀνδρὶ τῆδε τῆ νόσῳ
ληφθέντι μεμπτός εἰμι, κάρτα μαίνομαι,
ἢ τῆδε τῆ γυναικί, τῆ μεταίτια
τοῦ μηδὲν αἰσχροῦ μηδ' ἐμοὶ κακοῦ τινος.*

Del. E. Wunder: “Faciunt enim et quae praecedunt verba, οὗτος ἄρχει καὶ θεῶν ὅπως θέλει, et quae ἐμοῦ pronomini addita γε particula 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 Iolene vim aliquam et potestatem esse Deianira diceret. Nam primum si mulier Graeca, viro nupta, succumbere se Amori deo ait, non possumus id aliter interpretari, quam sic, ut praeter maritum alius viri amore flagrare se fateatur . . . Item nullo verbo indicatum a Sophocle est, Iolene 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 *ἴθ', ὦ τέκνον· πατὴρ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ἐστὶ σοι·
κάλει τὸ πᾶν μοι σπέρμα σῶν ὁμαιμόνων,
κάλει δὲ τὴν τάλαιναν Ἀλκμήνην, Διὸς
μάτην ἄκοιτιν, ὡς τελευταίαν ἐμοῦ
1150 φήμην πύθησθε θεσφάτων ὅς' οἶδ' ἐγώ.
HYL. ἀλλ' οὔτε μήτηρ ἐνθάδ', ἀλλ' ἐπακτία*

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' ἄνευ τῶνδ' οὐστινάσ <σφ' > ἄγεισ' ἔσω*,” Barrett.

⁴⁸ Jackson (*op.cit.* [supra n.30] 130) mends both by writing *τούτων—ἔχω γὰρ πάντ'—ἐπιστήμων ἐγώ*, but at the cost of saying “I know, for I know.”

Τίρυνθι κυμβέβηκεν ὥστ' ἔχειν ἔδραν,
 παίδων δὲ τοὺς μὲν ξυλλαβοῦς' αὐτῇ τρέφει,
 τοὺς δ' ἂν τὸ Θήβης ἄστῳ ναίοντα μάθοις·
 1155 ἡμεῖς δέ σοι πάρεςμεν, εἴ τι χρή, πάτερ
 [πράττειν, κλυόντες ἐξυπηρητήσομεν].
 HER. κύ δ' οὖν ἄκουε τοῦργον.

“Die hinreissend schöne Herstellung dieses Passus stammt von Nauck . . . Das überlieferte ἡμεῖς δ' ὄσοι (1155) mit seinem echten Plural ist unmöglich . . . Vielmehr heisst ἡμεῖς ‘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' εἴ τι χρήσεις ἱστορεῖν, πάρεμι' ἐγώ.⁴⁹

(39) Phil. 300 φέρ', ὦ τέκνον, νυν καὶ τὸ τῆς νήσου μάθης.
 αὐτῇ πελάζει ναυβάτης οὐδεὶς ἐκῶν·
 οὐ γάρ τις ὄρμος ἐστὶν οὐδ' ὅποι πλέων
 ἐξεμπολήσει κέρδος ἢ ξενώσεται.
 [οὐκ ἐνθάδ' οἱ πλοῖ τοῖσι κώφροσιν βροτῶν.]
 τάχ' οὖν τις ἄκων ἔσχε.

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

(40) Phil. 382 τοιαῦτ' ἀκούσας κάξονειδικθεὶς κακὰ
 πλέω πρὸς οἴκους, τῶν ἐμῶν τητῶμενος
 πρὸς τοῦ κακίτου κακ κακῶν Ὀδυσσέως.
 385 [κοῦκ αἰτιῶμαι κείνον ὡς τοὺς ἐν τέλει·
 πόλις γάρ ἐστι πᾶσα τῶν ἡγουμένων
 στρατός τε σύμπας· οἱ δ' ἀκοσμοῦντες βροτῶν
 διδασκάλων λόγοισι γίνονται κακοί.]
 λόγος λέλεκται πᾶς· ὁ δ' Ἀτρείδας στρυγῶν
 ἐμοί θ' ὁμοίως καὶ θεοῖς εἴη φίλος.

⁴⁹ πράττειν was not necessarily the interpolator's form: cf. *El.* 998 ἐλαττον *codd.*, *Persae* 195 διασπαράττει *codd.*, *Andr.* 939 φυλάττειν *codd.* (Mr Barrett adds *Phil.* 1449 πράττειν *codd.*, *Ajax* 1396 ξύπραττε *codd.*).

ἀκομοῦντες (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 λόγος λέλεκται πᾶς), 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) *Phil.* 1440 τοῦτο δ’ ἐννοεῖσθ’, ὅταν
 πορθήτε γαῖαν, εὐσεβεῖν τὰ πρὸς θεούς·
 ὡς τᾶλλα πάντα δεύτερ’ ἠγείται πατήρ
 [Ζεὺς· ἢ γὰρ εὐσέβεια συνθνήσκει βροτοῖς·
 κἂν ζῶσι κἂν θάνωσιν, οὐκ ἀπόλλυται].

1443 οὐ γὰρ ἠσέβεια Dawes.

Del. Fr. Peters, *Theologoumena Sophoclea* (Münster 1845) 51, and F. W. Schneidewin, *Philologus* 4 (1849) 669–71. “Denn der gedanke: ‘seid fromm bei der zerstörung, weil Zeus die frömmigkeit am höchsten hält: denn die frömmigkeit besteht unabhängig von leben und sterben der menschen als ein unsterbliches fort’—leidet an unklarheit und gezwungenheit” (Schneidewin p.671).⁵¹

(42) *OC* 755 ἀλλ’, οὐ γὰρ ἔστι τὰμφανῆ κρύπτειν, κύ νυν
 πρὸς θεῶν πατρώων, Οἰδίπους, πεισθεῖς ἐμοὶ
 †κρύψον†, θελήσας ἄστν καὶ δόμους μολεῖν
 τοὺς σοὺς πατρώους, τήνδε τὴν πόλιν φίλωσ
 εἰπών· ἐπαξία γάρ· ἢ δ’ οἴκοι πλέον
 [δίκη κέβοιτ’ ἄν, οὔσα σὴ πάλαι τροφός].

Del. A. E. Housman, *AJP* 13 (1892) 153. κέβεσθαι as passive is unparalleled, and the motive for the interpolation is obvious.

⁵⁰ ἀκομεῖν of flouting authority: *Ant.* 730, *Lys.* 14.13, *Dem.* 24.92, 50.64, *Aen.Tact.* 38.5; of disorderliness: *IG* I³ 84.27, *Pl. Leg.* 764b, 784d, *Hyperides* fr.14, *SIG* 736 § ix, 1109.74, *Pollux* 8.112, 131; of one or other (or both): *Isoc.* 7.42, 46, *Ath.Pol.* 3.6. For ἀκομος and ἀκομία in similar senses cf. *Il.* 2.213, *Ant.* 660, *Hdt.* 7.220, *IA* 317, *Lys.* 3.45, *Pl. Gorg.* 508a, *Aeschin.* 1.189, 3.4. The passage that comes nearest to supporting the one under discussion is *Pl. Symp.* 188b ἐκ πλεονεξίας καὶ ἀκομίας περὶ ἄλληλα: Odysseus’ acquisition of Achilles’ armour could be regarded as a piece of πλεονεξία, a breach of the κόσμος that guarantees a father’s armour to his son. In the context of authority, however, it is hard to see how ἀκομεῖν 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 ἐσχάροι τε παντελεῖς
 πλήρεις ὑπ' οἰωνῶν τε καὶ κυνῶν βορᾶς
 τοῦ δυσμόρου πεπτῶτος Οἰδίπου γόνου.
 κᾶτ' οὐ δέχονται θυστάδας λιτὰς ἔτι
 θεοὶ παρ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲ μηρίων φλόγα,
 [οὐδ' ὄρνις εὐσήμεος ἀπορροιβδεῖ βοάς,]
 ἀνδροφθόρου βεβρῶτες 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 ἐκείνης τῆς νυκτὸς οὐδεὶς ἐκοιμήθη, οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀπολωλότας πενθοῦντες . . . Even so, it is strange that the removal of 1021 yields normal grammar and excellent sense.⁵²

- (44) *Ant.* 1074 τούτων σε λωβητῆρες ὑστεροφθόροι
 λοχῶσιν Ἄιδου καὶ θεῶν Ἐρινύες,
 ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς τοῖσδε ληφθῆναι κακοῖς.
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἄθρησον εἰ κατηγγυρωμένος
 λέγω· φανεῖ γὰρ οὐ μακροῦ χρόνου τριβῆ
 [ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν σοῖς δόμοις κωκύματα].

Reflexion shows that the object of *φανεῖ*, as of *ἄθρησον*, must be *εἰ κατηγγυρωμένος λέγω ταῦτα*, so that *κωκύματα* must be made the subject of *φανεῖ* and *οὐ μακροῦ χρόνου τριβῆ* 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 σοῖς δόμοις κωκύματα* was the subject or the object of *φανεῖ*. Which is likelier, that Sophocles wrote a sentence with a parenthetical 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 *βεβρῶτες* auf *θεοί* und *ὄρνις* gemeinsam zu beziehen ist? Man kennt aus dem Tantalosmythos den unerhörten Frevel, den Göttern 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 *γνώμαι* could at all plausibly have been incorporated into the text from the margin.⁵³ 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,⁵⁴ 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;⁵⁵ 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 *γνώμαι* 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?

⁵⁴ *Ajax*: Σ 864. *Orestes*: Σ 268, IG II² 2320 (reproduced in A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis [Oxford 1968] 109).

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.

FREL PLATE 2



ATTIC STELE OF MYNNIA IN THE J. PAUL GETTY MUSEUM
(A71·53, ht. 1.23 m)

PLATE 3 FREL



UNINScribed ATTIC STELE IN NEW YORK, *ca.* 390 B.C.

(*ht.* 75 cm, *w.* 33.5 cm)