

# Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, II

*Michael D. Reeve*

THE FIRST PART of this trilogy (GRBS 13, 247–65) was a review of the only systematic attempt yet made to discredit deletion in the textual criticism of tragedy, J. Baumert's dissertation *ENIOI AΘETOYZIN*. When he comes to Baumert's *Lebenslauf*, the reader discovers that behind Baumert there looms a more venerable figure: "Die vorliegende Arbeit regte Herr Professor Erbse an und betreute sie." The tenor of Baumert's dissertation is not unlike that of Erbse's articles on the *Midiana*<sup>1</sup> and *Iliad* 20<sup>2</sup> and above all on Euripides' *Phoenissae*;<sup>3</sup> for out of 181 lines in *Phoenissae* whose authenticity he examines, Erbse acquits 180.<sup>4</sup>

Now that Baumert has shown how unconvincing the prosecution can be, Erbse's arguments will be used to show that they are matched step for step by the defence. For their true example, however, the following pages are indebted not to Baumert but to the scholar whose work Erbse is bent on undoing, Eduard Fraenkel. Fraenkel brought to the study of Greek tragedy four virtues without which scholars might as well not study it at all: a logical mind, a respect for the idiom of each author, an awareness both of rhetorical structure and of dramatic convention, and the ability to discriminate between poetry on the one hand and doggerel and rant on the other. Nowhere are these virtues exercised with happier results than in his article on *Phoenissae*.<sup>5</sup> It would be regrettable if Erbse's mere authority, unsupported by compelling argument, were allowed to reverse such an advance in Euripidean scholarship.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Hermes* 84 (1956) 135–51.

<sup>2</sup> *RhM* 110 (1967) 1–25. He has curious views on how magic horses cross the sea (pp.14–15).

<sup>3</sup> *Philologus* 110 (1966) 1–34.

<sup>4</sup> His arguments against the 181st (1634) are in fact unsounder than some of his arguments in favour of the other 180 (see *infra* n.19). 180 might have been 150 if he had disclosed what he really thinks about 1737–66.

<sup>5</sup> *SBMünchen* 1963, Heft 1, 3–120.

<sup>6</sup> The approval of Erbse's article expressed by Elizabeth Rawson, GRBS 11 (1970) 109 n.2, is only one symptom of her indifference to critical problems, the main blemish in an unambitious but level-headed essay on the theme of the play. Diller's reply to Fraenkel in *Gnomon* 36 (1964) 641–50 is altogether more discriminating than Erbse's.

References are confined to the articles of Fraenkel and Erbse, which give access to the other literature.

- 435 ἄλλ' ἐς σὲ τείνει τῶνδε διάλυσις κακῶν,  
 μήτηρ, διαλλάξασαν ὁμογενεῖς φίλου  
 παῦσαι πόνων με καί σε καὶ πᾶσαν πόλιν.
- 438 πάλαι μὲν οὖν ὑμνηθέν, ἄλλ' ὅμως ἐρῶ·  
 τὰ χρήματ' ἀνθρώποισι τιμιώτατα  
 δύναμίν τε πλείστην τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἔχει.  
 ἄγῶ μεθήκω δεῦρο μυρίαν ἄγων  
 λόγῃ· πένης γὰρ οὐδὲν εὐγενὴς ἀνήρ.

Fraenkel (pp.25–27) gave three reasons for deleting 438–42: (1) Polynices is not concerned with money; (2) *διαλλάξασαν* in 436 is picked up by *διαλλαγὰς* in the first line spoken by the chorus after his speech (443), and *διαλλακτῆς* also comes at the end of Iocaste's next speech (468); (3) *παῦσαι πόνων με καί σε καὶ πᾶσαν πόλιν* makes a suitable end to the speech, not least because Eteocles' final speech ends *τῆ δ' Εὐλαβείᾳ . . . προσευχόμεσθα τήνδε διασωσάμενοι πόλιν* (782–83). "Mitangeregt sein mag die Interpolation von 438–442 dadurch, dass Polynikes in dem Zwiegespräch mit seiner Mutter auf ihre Fragen, *also in ganz anderem Zusammenhange*, geantwortet hat (403) *εὖ πράσσει· τὰ φίλων δ' οὐδέν, ἢν τις δυστυχῆ* und (405) *κακὸν τὸ μὴ ἔχειν· τὸ γένος οὐκ ἔβοσκε μέ*" (italics editorial here and hereafter).

Erbse (pp.3–4) contests (1), the decisive argument,<sup>7</sup> by trying to show, in opposition to the italicized words in the last sentence, "dass der erste Teil der Stichomythie (383–407) die Voraussetzung für die Aussage 438–42 bildet" (p.4 n.3). "In dem Gespräch, das er mit seiner Mutter über die Nöte der Verbannung führt (383–407), geht es ihm nicht um Sentimentalitäten, sondern um sehr materielle Dinge. Das Leben draussen, so hören wir, enthält Armut und obendrein Unfreiheit, da man auf fremde Unterstützung angewiesen ist. Der Zuschauer erkennt leicht, dass die nackte Not hinter dem Unternehmen des vertriebenen Königssohnes steht" (p.3). Erbse might in fairness go back beyond 383–407 to 358, where Polynices speaks the following words:

- 358 ἀναγκαίως ἔχει  
 πατρίδος ἐρᾶν ἅπαντας· ὅς δ' ἄλλως λέγει  
 λόγοισι χαίρει, τὸν δὲ νοῦν ἐκεῖς' ἔχει.

<sup>7</sup> (2) and (3) may not be decisive, but they are welcome confirmation. Erbse calls (2) "ein psychologisches Argument" (p.4).

366

πολύδακρυς δ' ἀφικόμην,  
 χρόνιος ἰδὼν μέλαθρα καὶ βωμοὺς θεῶν  
 γυμνάσιά θ' οἷσιν ἐνετράφην Δίρκης θ' ὕδωρ·  
 ὦν οὐδ' ἀπελαθεὶς ξένην πόλιν  
 ναίω, δι' ὅσων νᾶμ' ἔχων δακρύρροον.

Is this not the Polynices who says

430

πολλοὶ δὲ Δαναῶν καὶ Μυκηναίων ἄκροι  
 πάρεισι, λυπρὰν χάριν, ἀναγκαίαν δέ μοι  
 διδόντες· ἐπὶ γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν στρατεύομαι  
 πόλιν. θεοὺς δ' ἐπώμος' ὡς ἀκουσίως  
 τοῖς φιλτάτοις ἔκοῦσιν ἡράμην δόρυ

and who ends his plea before Iocaste with the words

491

μάρτυρας δὲ τῶνδε δαίμονας καλῶ  
 ὡς πάντα πράσσων σὺν δίκη δίκης ἄτερ  
 ἀποστεροῦμαι πατρίδος ἀνοσιώτατα?

In elevating 383–407 to the stature of a ‘Voraussetzung’ for 438–42, Erbse not only fails to see that they are an incidental element in the structure of the whole scene but also misjudges the function they fulfil in themselves, which is not to make the audience think “dass die nackte Not hinter dem Unternehmen des vertriebenen Königssohnes steht” but simply to create sympathy for him (418 Io. τίς οὗτος; ὡς ἄρ' ἄθλιος ἀκεῖνος ἦν; cf. 86–87, 163–67, and 301–54, especially 317–21).<sup>8</sup> Once this latter point is recognized (and how many people are there who have not recognized it?), the fate of 438–42 is sealed; for their effect on the audience could hardly have differed much from the effect attributed by Seneca (*Ep.* 115.14–15) to a more famous passage on the same theme (*pecunia, ingens generis humani bonum*, etc. = Nauck fr.324): *cum hi novissimi versus in tragoedia Euripidis pronuntiatu essent, totus populus ad eiciendum et actorem et carmen consurrexit uno impetu.*

753

ἀλλ' εἶμ', ὅπως ἂν μὴ καταργῶμεν χέρα·  
 καί μοι γένοιτ' ἀδελφὸν ἀντήρη λαβεῖν  
 καὶ ξυσταθέντα διὰ μάχης ἔλεῖν δορὶ  
 κτανεῖν θ', ὅς ἦλθε πατρίδα πορθήσων ἐμὴν.

<sup>8</sup> In addition, as Mr Barrett points out, Erbse forgets that Polynices only went in need πρὶν γάμοις εὐρεῖν βίον (400).

If 753 goes, so do 754–56, but the converse does not hold. About 753 Fraenkel argues as follows (pp.29–30): “Wenn in einer Tragödie eine Person ἀλλ’ εἶμι sagt, so verlässt sie nach wenigen Versen die Bühne. [Footnote: “Ich habe hier nur den Gebrauch von absolutem ἀλλ’ εἶμι, ‘aber ich gehe’, im Auge, also nicht die Fälle, in denen jemand sagt ‘aber ich will da und da hingehen’, wie . . .”] Das gilt für Euripides und ebenso für Aeschylus und Sophokles. Zwei scheinbare Ausnahmen bestätigen in Wahrheit die Regel . . . In beiden Fällen würde es nach dem ἀλλ’ εἶμι zu einem sofortigen Abgang des Sprechenden kommen, wenn das nicht von einer anderen Person verhindert würde. Hingegen findet in der Phoenissenszene kein Dazwischentreten statt; ohne dass eine andere Person eingreift, redet Eteokles noch eine lange Zeit weiter, als hätte er garnicht gesagt ἀλλ’ εἶμι.” Erbse ignores the footnote and appeals to four irrelevant passages<sup>9</sup> along with two relevant ones cited by Fraenkel, *El.* 1132 and *IT* 636. He speaks throughout as though the distance of ἀλλ’ εἶμι from the end of the speech were what mattered and not rather the content of the intervening passage. A mere glance at *El.* 1132 suffices to show that it is no exception to Fraenkel’s rule:

1132            ἀλλ’ εἶμι, παιδὸς ἀριθμὸν ὡς τελεσφόρον  
 θύσω θεοῖσι· σοὶ δ’ ὅταν πράξω χάριν  
 τήνδ’, εἶμ’ ἐπ’ ἀγρόν οὐ πόσις θυηπολεῖ  
 Νύμφαισιν. ἀλλὰ τοῦδ’ ὄχουσι, ὀπάονες,  
 φάτναις ἄγοντες πρόσθεθ’· ἡνίκ’ ἂν δέ με  
 δοκῆτε θυσιάσθαι τῆσδ’ ἀπηλλάχθαι θεοῖς,  
 πάρεστε· δεῖ γὰρ καὶ πόσει δοῦναι χάριν.

*IT* 636 is not so straightforward, and Erbse could have made his objection more convincing if he had confined himself to this one passage:

636            ἀλλ’ εἶμι δέλτον τ’ ἐκ θεᾶς ἀνακτόρων  
 οἷσιν· τὸ μέντοι δυσμενὲς μὴ ἴμου λάβησθ’.  
 φυλάσσειτ’ αὐτούς, πρόσπολοι, δεσμῶν ἄτερ.  
 ἴσως ἄελπτα τῶν ἐμῶν φίλων τινὶ  
 πέμψω πρὸς Ἄργος, ὃν μάλιστ’ ἐγὼ φιλῶ,  
 καὶ δέλτος αὐτῷ ζῶντας οὐκ δοκεῖ θανεῖν  
 λέγουσ’ ἀπίστους ἠδονὰς ἀπαγγελεῖ.

<sup>9</sup> “Natürlich denkt man auch an *Med.* 1067 (ἀλλ’ εἶμι γὰρ δὴ πλημονεστάτην ὁδόν) . . .”  
 Does one also think of the syntax?

As Iphigenia turns towards the temple, she orders the attendants to keep Orestes and Pylades under guard; the order is made necessary by her departure. Likewise at *Phoen.* 753–83, Erbse might have argued, Eteocles' instructions about his family are made necessary by his departure, and he naturally completes them, regardless of their length, before he leaves the stage altogether.

This defence, however, has an unfortunate consequence: the longer a passage is, the less plausible it sounds as an afterthought. Furthermore, the dispositions Eteocles makes in 757–65 are no afterthought but have been in his mind since the beginning of the scene:

690                    *χώρει cὺ καὶ κόμιζε τὸν Μενοικέως*  
                          *Κρέοντ', ἀδελφὸν μητρὸς Ἰοκάστης ἐμῆς,*  
                          *λέγων τάδ', ὡς οἰκεῖα καὶ κοινὰ χθονὸς*  
                          *θέλω πρὸς αὐτὸν συμβαλεῖν βουλευμάτα,*  
                          *πρὶν ἐς μάχην τε καὶ δορὸς τάξιν μολεῖν.*

At that point Creon arrives, and they thrash out between them the *κοινὰ βουλευμάτα*. That Eteocles should then turn on his heel before broaching the *οἰκεῖα βουλευμάτα* is at the very least surprising. Again, however, a defence is available: in view of Creon's report *ὅπλοις ἐλίξειν αὐτίκ' Ἀργείων στρατόν* (711), Eteocles is taking the military preparations in hand with due urgency (753 *ὅπως ἂν μὴ καταργῶμεν χέρα*), so that the *οἰκεῖα βουλευμάτα* become secondary.

It could be, then, that 753 is genuine. What about 754–56?<sup>10</sup> Paley felt that they were out of place in a speech so businesslike. Furthermore, Eteocles has already expressed the same wish:

621 POL. *ποῦ ποτε στήρη πρὸ πύργων;* ET. *ὡς τί μ' ἱστορεῖς τόδε;*  
                          POL. *ἀντιτάξομαι κτενῶν σε.* ET. *κάμὲ τοῦδ' ἔρωσ ἔχει.*

Finally, Iocaste's reaction of horror there (623–24) is the same as the messenger's later (1219–22) and the chorus's at a similar point in *Septem* (677–719); Creon ought therefore to be horrified by the prayer in 754–56, but he lets it pass. Which, then, is likelier, that the lines

<sup>10</sup> On 756 (= 1376) Erbse derides Valckenaer's observation that "suam ipsius patriam vastaturus" would have been more to the point (p.6 n.1) but nevertheless says (p.6) "es kann . . . kaum belanglos sein, dass der Zug gegen die Heimat als Grund für die gewünschte Tötung genannt wird." To quote Erbse's criticism of Valckenaer, "der Sinn dessen, was überliefert ist, bleibt . . . ganz unbeachtet."

were written by the poet or by the man who elsewhere anticipates the 'Wechselmord' ?<sup>11</sup>

- 766                    *ἔν δ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἄργόν, εἴ τι θέσφατον*  
*οἰωνόμαντις Τειρεσίας ἔχει φράσαι,*  
*τοῦδ' ἐκπυθέσθαι ταῦτ' . . .*
- 774                    *πόλει δὲ καὶ σοὶ ταῦτ' ἐπισκῆπτω, Κρέον·*  
*ἤνπερ κρατήσῃ τὰμά, Πολυνείκουσ νέκυν*  
*μήποτε ταφῆναι τῆδε Θηβαίᾳ χθονί,*  
*θῆσκειν δὲ τὸν θάψαντα, κἄν φίλων τις ᾗ.*

“Was sollte denn den Dichter zu der eindeutigen Formulierung *ἔν δ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἄργόν* veranlassen, wenn er den Sprecher hinterher doch noch zu einer völlig unerwarteten und überaus gewichtigen Mitteilung übergehen lassen wollte?” (Fraenkel p.35). Erbse rightly points out (pp.7–8) that *ἔν δ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἄργόν* is not the same as *ἔν οὐ λέλεκται τῶν ἐμῶν* (*Hipp.* 1021) but means ‘there is one thing I have not done’; yet why should the one thing that Eteocles has not done be sandwiched between his other instructions? and why should the one part of his speech that looks forward to the next scene be buried away in the middle?

Another argument of Erbse’s (p.8) is that 774–77 are the *κοινὰ βουλευματα* referred to in 692, as 757–65 are the *οἰκειῖα*; “die Aufforderung, den Seher anzuhören (766–73), steht folgerichtig in der Mitte, da

<sup>11</sup> 765, 880, 1263, 1269. Erbse cannot see why it should not be anticipated (p.12): “Der von der Sage gebotene, bereits von Aischylos behandelte Wechselmord enthielt für den athenischen Zuschauer überhaupt kein Spannungsmoment. Ihn interessierten nur die Voraussetzungen (wie es dazu kam) und die Wirkungen (das Leid, das der grauenhaften Tat folgte).” In other words, anything traditional can be mentioned at any point in the play, and the characters are allowed to know everything the audience knows. The application of this dramaturgically ruinous doctrine to *Phoenissae* had been forestalled by Fraenkel (p.42, on 880): “Wie vertraut auch immer das athenische Publikum mit der Geschichte vom Ende der beiden Brüder gewesen sein mag, der Dramatiker, in dessen Plan die spannungsreichen Botenberichte 1219ff. und 1356ff. liegen, wird sich seine Wirkung nicht von vornherein dadurch verderben, dass er den Tod beider Brüder nebenher in Reden erwähnen lässt, deren Aufbau und wahren Gehalt eine solche Erwähnung gänzlich widerstrebt.”

The anticipation in 880 is defensible from the lips of Tiresias, but it occurs in a spurious passage (see later on 834–1018). On 765, the anticipation that most jars, Erbse writes (p.7): “Der Vers 765 . . . nimmt zwar die Katastrophe der Brüder voraus . . . Aber man versteht nicht, inwiefern dieser Gedanke eine Athetese rechtfertigen soll; denn Eteokles geht ja in dem ganzen Abschnitt von der Möglichkeit aus, dass er nicht zurückkehren könne.” Apparently Erbse sees no difference between one death and two.

Eteokles den Inhalt seiner Sprüche nicht kennen kann.” Even if 706–52 do not constitute the *κοινὰ βουλευματα*, the consultation of Tiresias unquestionably falls into that category. Why after all does Eteocles want him consulted? Not because he may be able to offer some personal advice but for the reason given by Creon:

863                    ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπέσταλκ' ἐκμαθεῖν ἐθέεν πάρα  
                          τί δρῶντες ἄν μάλιστα ῥύσασθαι πόλιν.

On 775–77 Fraenkel repeated an observation made by Polle, that if Eteocles survives (775 ἤνπερ κρατήσῃ τὰμά) he can see to it himself that Polynices is not buried;<sup>12</sup> in a footnote he added references to three other places in Euripides where τὰμά means no more than ἐγώ. Erbse replies (p.7): “Die inhaltliche Nuance ist indessen auch in den von FRAENKEL genannten Beispielen sichtbar, in unserem Fall ist sie entscheidend: τὰμά bezeichnet die Partei, zu der ich gehöre.” Erbse cannot have it both ways: if the victory of τὰμά need not include the survival of ‘me’, the defeat of the enemy need not include the death of Polynices.

778                    κοὶ μὲν τὰδ' εἶπον· προσπόλοισ δ' ἐμοῖς λέγω·  
                          ἐκφέρετε τεύχη πάνοπλά τ' ἀμφιβλήματα.

“FRAENKEL möchte ihn [778] . . . tilgen, einer selbstgeschaffenen Regel folgend, wonach in dieser Formulierung nicht ‘irgendwelche untergeordnete Diener’ angesprochen werden dürften. Die vier sprachlich verwandten Verse scheinen ihm Recht zu geben . . . Aber es begegnen zahlreiche Beispiele dafür, dass sich ein Darsteller vom Partner ab und zu den Dienern hinwendet (vgl. Her. 722–5, Ion 661–7, auch Med. 819–23), und im vorliegenden Fall besitzt ja gerade die Aktion der Wappnung ein solches Gewicht, dass sie durch die feierliche Zäsur vom Vorangehenden abgehoben und dadurch in ihrer Bedeutung kenntlich gemacht werden darf” (Erbse p.8).

Two of Erbse’s passages are nice parallels for the text as Fraenkel restores it:

Her. 722            ἡμεῖς, ἐπειδὴ κοὶ τόδ' ἔστ' ἐνθύμιον,  
                          οἱ δειμάτων ἔξωθεν ἐκπορεύομεν  
                          κὺν μητρὶ παῖδας. δεῦρ' ἔπεσθε, πρόσπολοι,  
                          ὥς ἄν σχολὴν λύσωμεν ἄσμενοι πόνων.

<sup>12</sup> “Das gleiche Argument wurde schon 1890 von POLLE vorgebracht. FRAENKEL zitiert es a.O. 34, 4 und bezeichnet es als amüsant” (Erbse p.7 n.3). Erbse might accord Fraenkel the

Med. 819 ἴτω· περιεκοὶ πάντες οὖν μέσῳ λόγοι.  
 ἀλλ' εἶα χῶρει καὶ κόμιζ' Ἰάκωνα·  
 ἐς πάντα γὰρ δὴ σοὶ τὰ πιστὰ χρώμεθα.

In the third passage a simple experiment can be performed:

σοὶ μὲν τάδ' εἶπον· δμωΐειν δ' ἐμαῖς λέγω·  
 κυγᾶτ'· ὀλεΐσθε δ' ἦν ἐμῇ μάθῃ δάμαρ.  
 ὑμῖν δὲ κυγᾶν, δμωΐδες, λέγω τάδε,  
 ἢ θάνατον εἰπούσαισι πρὸς δάμαρτ' ἐμῆν.

Which pair of lines stands at *Ion* 666–67?

“Der Eteokles des Euripides gab seinen Dienern ohne pompöse Einleitung nur den Befehl ἐκφέρετε τεύχη πάνοπλά τ' ἀμφιβλήματα κτλ., offenbar in beabsichtigtem Anschluss an die Worte, mit denen der Eteokles des Aeschylus seine tragischste Rede schliesst (*Sept.* 675f.), φέρ' ὡς τάχος κνημίδας, αἰχμῆς καὶ πέτρων προβλήματα” (Fraenkel p.36). Erbse could have inferred from that whether a ‘feierliche Zäsur’ is required to confer ‘Gewicht’ on ἐκφέρετε τεύχη.

Of the Tiresias episode (834–1018), Erbse says (p.9): “Die entscheidende Partie der Szene ist die erste Teiresiasrede.” Unless Erbse attaches some private sense to the word ‘entscheidende’, this statement is flagrantly false: the whole scene revolves round 911–14:

ἄκουε δὴ νυν θεσφάτων ἐμῶν ὁδόν·  
 σφάξαι Μενοικέα τόνδε δεῖ σ' ὑπὲρ πάτρας  
 σὸν παῖδ', ἐπειδὴ τὴν τύχην αὐτὸς καλεῖς.

Everything before these lines leads up to them, and everything after them is consequent upon them. According to Erbse, however, “die Worte des Teiresias [865–95] sind . . . ein Bindeglied, eine etwas steife, aber sehr geschickte Gelenkkomposition, welche die beiden Hauptthemata des Dramas vereinigt, nämlich das Schicksal des Oidipus und seiner Söhne mit dem des Menoikeus. In der Konzeption des Dichters ist dieses die Voraussetzung von jenem. In seiner Darstellung aber wird das Opfer des Menoikeus nur erforderlich, weil es dem Seher nicht gelungen ist, die hadernden Labdakiden zu versöhnen.”

---

courtesy of reading him carefully and reporting him carefully: “Amüsant ist die Bemerkung von F. Polle . . . : ‘774ff. Diese Verse sind auffällig, denn wenn Eteokles siegt, kann er ja selbst dafür sorgen, dass Polyneikes unbegraben bleibt. Das ist ein Fehler des Dichters.’”



Why the sacrifice of Menoeceus is necessary the poet explains with perfect clarity, and his explanation differs from Erbse's:

931            δεῖ τόνδε θαλάμαις οὐδράκων ὁ γηγενῆς  
                  ἐγένετο Δίρκης ναμάτων ἐπίσκοπος  
                  σφαγέντα φόνιον αἷμα γῆ δοῦναι χοᾶς  
                  Κάδμου, παλαιῶν Ἄρεος ἐκ μηνιμάτων,  
                  ὅς γηγενεῖ δράκοντι τιμωρεῖ φόνον·  
                  καὶ ταῦτα δρώντες σύμμαχον κτήσεσθ' Ἄρη.  
                  χθῶν δ' ἀντὶ καρποῦ καρπὸν ἀντί θ' αἵματος  
                  αἶμ' ἂν λάβῃ βρότειον, ἕξετ' εὐμενῆ  
                  γῆν, ἣ ποθ' ἡμῖν χαλκοπήληκα στάχυν  
                  Σπαρτῶν ἀνήκεν. ἐκ γένους δὲ δεῖ θανεῖν  
                  τοῦδ' ὅς δράκοντος γέννος ἐκπέφυκε παῖς.  
                  σὺ δ' ἐνθάδ' ἡμῖν λοιπὸς εἰ Σπαρτῶν γένους  
                  ἀκέραιος, ἕκ τε μητρὸς ἀρρένων τ' ἄπο,  
                  οἱ κοί τε παῖδες. Αἴμονος μὲν οὖν γάμοι  
                  σφαγὰς ἀπείργουσ'· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἧθεος·  
                  οὗτος δὲ πῶλος τῆδ' ἀνειμένος πόλει  
                  θανῶν πατρῶαν γαῖαν ἐκκώσειεν ἄν.

For once, however, Erbse's error is understandable. The fact is that the text offers two conflicting explanations of why Menoeceus must be sacrificed, one in 865–95 and the other in 931–48. Fraenkel deleted the greater part of the first (869–80, 886–90), but not 868 *ἕξ οὐδ' τεκνώθη Λάιος βία θεῶν*, on which it hinges. His deletion of 869–80 is confirmed by a stylistic detail that he misses: *μέλεος* (869) is an intruder from lyric.<sup>13</sup> If 868 is deleted as well, one of the conflicting explanations has vanished and Tiresias' first speech has become a vague and sinister foretaste of his second. It is no accident that the same language recurs: *νοσεῖ . . . ἦδε γῆ πάλαι* (867), and Menoeceus must *σφαγέντα φόνιον αἷμα γῆ δοῦναι χοᾶς Κάδμου, παλαιῶν Ἄρεος ἐκ μηνιμάτων . . . χθῶν δ' . . ., ἕξετ' εὐμενῆ γῆν* (933–34, 937–39). The sins of Laius and his descendants are beside the point.

<sup>13</sup> In Euripidean lyrics it occurs something like 70 times. In trimeters it occurs four times in ὦ μέλεος (*Or.* 90, 447, 671, 1029) and once in an etymology of Meleager's name (fr.517). Mr Barrett draws attention to *Soph.* fr.443.5, where Pearson thought that “<μ>ελεαι indicates lyrics”; he himself reads the lines as trimeters and does not find the space too wide for *τελεαι*.

- 1009 ἄλλ' εἶμι καὶ στὰς ἐξ ἐπάλξεων ἄκρων  
 σφάξας ἑμαυτὸν σηκὸν ἐς μελαμβασθῆ  
 δράκοντος, ἔνθ' ὁ μάντις ἐξηγήσατο,  
 ἐλευθερώσω γαῖαν. εἴρηται λόγος.
- 1013 στείχω δὲ θανάτου δῶρον οὐκ αἰσχρὸν πόλει  
 δώσω, νόσου δὲ τήνδ' ἀπαλλάξω χθόνα.  
 εἰ γὰρ λαβὼν ἕκαστος ὅτι δύναίτο τις  
 χρηστὸν διέλθοι τοῦτο καὶ κοινὸν φέροι  
 πατρίδι, κακῶν ἂν αἱ πόλεις ἐλασσόνων  
 πειρώμεναι τὸ λοιπὸν εὐτυχοῖεν ἄν.

“Wenn jemand soeben (1009ff.) gesagt hat ἄλλ' εἶμι καὶ . . . σφάξας ἑμαυτὸν . . . ἐλευθερώσω γαῖαν und diesen Satz mit einem *dixi*, εἴρηται λόγος, abgeschlossen hat, so kann er wirklich nicht, jedenfalls nicht, wenn er das Geschöpf eines die Redetechnik beherrschenden Dichters ist, wieder ganz von neuem einsetzen . . .” (Fraenkel p.52). Erbse mentions two exceptions, *Med.* 355–56 (*del.* Nauck and Fraenkel amongst others) and *Soph. Phil.* 389–90:

λόγος λέλεκται πᾶς. ὁ δ' Ἀτρείδας στυγῶν  
 ἐμοί θ' ὁμοίως καὶ θεοῖς εἴη φίλος.

Anyone who has been listening since 341 can see that λόγος λέλεκται πᾶς in 389 means ‘my story is finished’:

- 341 PH. τοιγαροῦν τὸ σὸν φράσον  
 αὐθις πάλιν μοι πράγμ', ὅπως σ' ἐνύβρισαν.

That a brief imprecation should be appended to the story affords no support for *Phoen.* 1013–18, which are merely a sententious regurgitation of 997–1012.<sup>14</sup>

Erbse passes on to 1584, the beginning of the last episode:

- 1584 CR. οἴκτων μὲν ἤδη λήγεθ', ὡς ὄρα τάφου  
 μνήμην τίθεσθαι

Fraenkel (pp.74–76) deduced from a comparison of this opening with a number of similar ones that Creon has just entered the stage. “Aus der Fülle des von FRAENKEL nicht berücksichtigten Materials seien hier wenigstens zwei Stellen genannt, I.A. 496–7 (Menelaos gegen Ende

<sup>14</sup> Erbse is happy to translate 1015–17 ‘if everyone were to take what he has of value and go through it, and place it at the disposal of his country . . .’ (p.15).

*des Gespraches mit Agamemnon . . .) und Hipp. 473–4 (die Amme schliesst ihre Rede an Phaedra mahnend ab)“ (Erbse p.16). Ion 650, which Erbse relegates to a footnote, is more to his purpose: after a long speech by Ion and two lines from the chorus, Xuthus takes over with παῦσαι λόγων τῶνδ’. Nevertheless, since the majority of such openings occur when a character enters the stage, and many of them after a lyric ode, there must be a strong presumption at *Phoen.* 1584–85 that Creon too has just entered the stage. On its own this presumption would count for nothing, but in the presence of other anomalies it cannot be waved aside.*

The most important of the other anomalies here is that Creon remains on the stage in silence from 1356 to 1584, even though the news that the messenger brings (1356–1424, 1427–79) is addressed to him (1335–55). Erbse is not at a loss (p.17): “*Eine vollkommene Parallele zu dieser Anordnung befindet sich im letzten Epeisodion der ‘Andromache’: Peleus fragt den Boten, wie sein Enkel getötet wurde (1083–4), und dieser berichtet (1085 bis 1165). Sobald er geendet hat, setzen die Anapaste der Frauen ein (1166ff.: καὶ μὴν ὄδ’ ἀναξ ἤδη φοράδην | Δελφίδος ἐκ γῆς δῶμα πελάζει . . .), und erst danach beginnt die erschütternde Klage des Peleus. Die Szene der ‘Phoenissen’ wird allerdings anders fortgeführt: die Totenklage ist den nächsten Angehörigen des untergehenden Geschlechtes vorbehalten. Kreons Beteiligung würde die Wirkung der leidenschaftlichen Szene nur abschwächen und sein eigenes Verhalten ins Zwielficht rücken.*” As Erbse has been kind enough to demolish his own case, Di Benedetto’s arguments for removing Creon from 1307–55 (Fraenkel pp.71–74) need not be repeated.

One difficulty in Creon’s speech, however, does deserve mention.

1310 οἴμοι, τί δράσω; πότερ’ ἐμαυτὸν ἢ πόλιν  
 στένω δακρύσας, ἣν πέριξ ἔχει νέφος  
 τοσοῦτον ὥστε δι’ Ἀχέροντος ἰέναι;

Why does a cloud of doom surround the city after Menoeceus’ death? Since the moment when Tiresias declared that his death would save the city (834–959, especially 918, 947–52), no-one has doubted his words—not Creon (915–90), not Menoeceus himself (977–1012), not the chorus (1058–59), not the messenger (1092), not Iocaste (1206). According to Erbse (p.19), however, Creon “kennt doch am Beginn dieses Epeisodions den Ausgang des Kampfes noch nicht, weiss vor

allem nichts vom thebanischen Sieg! Er kann also auch den Tod des Sohnes noch nicht, wie Teiresias verheissen hatte, als Vorbedingung der Rettung ansehen . . . Erst am Ende des folgenden Botenberichtes wird ihm bestätigt, dass die Leiche des Menoikeus nicht Symbol des allgemeinen Unterganges, sondern ein Zeichen der Erlösung sei.”<sup>15</sup> Besides dreaming up this idea, Erbse deals with τε in 1313 (p.18) in a way that looks responsible enough but can only astound anyone who comes to him from Fraenkel (pp.78–79).

To return to 1584.

1585

τῶνδε δ', Οἰδίπου, λόγων  
 ἄκουσον· [ἀρχὰς τῆσδε γῆς ἔδωκέ μοι  
 Ἐτεοκλέης παῖς σός, γάμων φερνὰς διδοῦς  
 Αἴμονι κόρης τε λέκτρον Ἀντιγόνης σέθεν.  
 οὐκ οὖν σ' ἔάσω τήνδε γῆν οἰκεῖν ἔτι·  
 σαφῶς γὰρ] εἶπε Τειρεσίας οὐ μὴ ποτε  
 σοῦ τήνδε γῆν οἰκοῦντος εὖ πράξειν πόλιν.

“If the dowry was given to Haemon, how is it that Creon becomes sovereign?” (Pearson, cited by Fraenkel p.87 on behalf of the deletion indicated above). Erbse replies (p.20) that “Kreon Vormund (κύριος) Antigones wird” and “der zukünftige Gemahl das gesamte Vermögen der Erbtöchter (ἐπίκληρος), etwa gar das Königsamt, schon zu Lebzeiten Kreons erhält. Die Herrscherwürde geht damit also auf den gesetzlichen Vormund (Kreon) über . . . Bei Billigung dieser Überlegungen versteht man, weshalb Oidipus und Antigone Kreon als neuen Herrscher widerspruchlos anerkennen.” On the contrary, Creon is taking a liberty, because Eteocles merely confirmed τὴν δόσιν τὴν πρόσθε, which naturally did not include the kingdom:

757

γάμους δ' ἀδελφῆς Ἀντιγόνης παιδός τε σοῦ  
 Αἴμονος, εἴαν τι τῆς τύχης ἐγὼ σφαλῶ,  
 σοὶ χρὴ μέλεσθαι· τὴν δόσιν δ' ἐχέγγυον  
 τὴν πρόσθε ποιῶ νῦν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις ἐμαῖς.

Since Creon appeals only to Eteocles' instructions, Attic law is irrelevant except in so far as they comply with it. If it were relevant beyond

<sup>15</sup> The passage quoted is actually part of his answer to a point of less consequence raised by the deletion of 1312 (which he rightly opposes), but it would obviously have been his answer to the important point if he had answered it.



Bedeutung 'abhängig sein' [here follows a string of references, every one to δουλεύειν in the usual sense 'be a slave to' or 'serve']. Gewiss ist Oidipus kein Sklave im gewöhnlichen Sinn, aber er war als Kind und Jüngling in seiner Korinther Zeit von seinem Pflegevater abhängig—die Verse 43–4 (καὶ λαβὼν ὀχρήματα | Πολύβῳ τροφῆι δίδωαι)<sup>16</sup> bringen zum Ausdruck, wie er seine Stellung angesehen hat—und empfindet, seit sich herausgestellt hat, dass Polybos nicht sein leiblicher Vater war, jenes Verhältnis als δουλεία" (Erbse p.23). Children dependent on their parents would be surprised to hear that they are the δοῦλοι of their parents and their τροφεία are a token of their δουλεία;<sup>16</sup> and as for the piece of psychology with which Erbse winds up his argument, it rests on a sense of the word δουλεία that he has just gone out of his way to dispose of.

1612 οὐ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἀκύνετος πέφυκ' ἐγὼ  
 †ὥστ' εἰς ἔμ'† ὄμματ' ἔς τ' ἐμῶν παίδων βίον  
 ἄνευ θεῶν του ταῦτ' ἐμηχανησάμην.

The daggers are Erbse's. "FRAENKEL (a.O. 91) hat im Anschluss an Paley . . . mit Recht an die bekannte Regel erinnert, dass ἐμά (im Gegensatz zu τὰμά) nicht elidiert werden darf. Der Wortlaut des Verses 1613 ist also verdorben, indessen (wenn ich recht sehe) nicht eindeutig heilbar. Das darf aber nicht zu der Folgerung verführen, der Satz 1612–4 könne nicht im 5. Jh. geschrieben worden sein (vgl. FRAENKEL a.O. 92)" (Erbse p.23 n.4). Whether the rule about ἐμά<sup>17</sup> was bekannt to Erbse or anyone else before Fraenkel drew attention to it is something that may fairly be doubted. What of Erbse's daggers? ὥστ'ε is necessary as a link between οὐ and 1614, and εἰς is necessary alongside ἔς τ' ἐμῶν παίδων βίον. Is it the embarrassing ἔμ', then, that is "nicht eindeutig heilbar"? Erbse might have taken the bull by the horns and proposed τὰδ'.

Back to dramatic technique. "Wäre diese Rede [1595–1614] nicht, dann würde Oidipus, sobald er die Ausweisung erfahren hat, FRAENKELS Wunsch gemäss nur fragen: 'Was soll ich nun tun . . . , wer wird mich führen . . . , wovon soll ich leben?' Der Zuschauer aber könnte kaum ein Mitleiden mit solchen Besorgnissen des Greises haben"

<sup>16</sup> Let Erbse make what he will of *Supp.* 361–62 τοῖς τεκοῦσι γὰρ | δύστηνος ὅστις μὴ ἀντιδουλεύει τέκνων.

<sup>17</sup> It applies equally to *cá* on its own, but *cá* after *τά* can be elided even if other words intervene (*Soph. El.* 1499, *Men. Epitr.* 43).

(Erbse p.24). Antigone might have had something to say about that.<sup>18</sup>

Fraenkel then tries to show that the question of Polynices' burial, first raised by Eteocles in 774–77 and argued out by Creon and Antigone in 1627–82, has been superimposed on the original under the influence of *Antigone*. Erbse is at pains to play down both the similarity of the situation and the significance of the verbal echoes.

- 1627 νεκρῶν δὲ τῶνδε τὸν μὲν ἐς δόμους χρεῶν  
ἤδη κομίζειν, τόνδε δ', ὅς περσων πόλιν  
πατρίδα σὺν ἄλλοις ἦλθε, Πολυνείκους νέκυν  
ἐκβάλετ' ἄθαπτον τῆσδ' ὄρων ἔξω χθονός.  
κηρύξεται δὲ πᾶσι Κασμείοις τάδε·  
ὅς ἂν νεκρὸν τόνδ' ἢ καταστέφων ἀλῶ  
ἢ γῆ καλύπτων θάνατον ἀνταλλάξεται.
- 1634 ἔαν δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, οἰωνοῖς βοράν.  
σὺ δ' ἐκλιποῦσα τριπτύχους θρήνους νεκρῶν

<sup>18</sup> Diller, *op.cit.* (n.6) 645–46, is of the opinion that if 1595–1614 are removed the resultant use of *εἰέν* in 1615 is unidiomatic: “Auch wenn das Wort eine Rede einleitet, hat der Sprechende vorher schon Wünsche oder Einwände zu der Lage vorgebracht, in der er sich befindet und zu der er nun, von einem neuen Standpunkt aus, sich wieder äussert”; “Immer wird in diesen mit *εἰέν* beginnenden Reden etwas registriert und beiseite gelegt, das, so lange es nicht gesagt war, den Sprechenden von dem nun folgenden Schritt im Handeln oder Reden zurückhielt.”

As regards the first statement, would it really have been unidiomatic for Iphigenia to begin her speech at *IT* 342 with *εἰέν* if Euripides had passed straight from 239 to 260 and omitted the intervening dialogue between Iphigenia and the messenger? To rephrase slightly Diller's second statement, the function of *εἰέν* in the passages he examines is to indicate acceptance, often resigned acceptance, of new information or a new situation, and at the same time to introduce a reflexion or decision occasioned by that new information or situation. It is just this function that it fulfils at *Phoen.* 1615 if 1595–1614 are removed. For a similar use in stichomythia cf. *El.* 618.

*Supp.* 1094, which Diller considers his strongest card, differs significantly from *Phoen.* 1615. The loss of his son moves Iphis to lament the irremediable mistake he made in begetting him. ‘If I had known what it is like for a father to lose his children, my present plight would never have befallen me’, ὅστις φυτεύσας καὶ νεανίαν τεκῶν | ἄριστον, εἴτα τοῦδε νῦν στερίσκομαι (1092–93). Having summed up his plight in these last three words, he proceeds *εἰέν* τί δὴ χρῆ τὸν ταλαίπωρόν με δρᾶν; (1094), where *δὴ* in effect means *τοῦδε στερικόμενον*. At *Phoen.* 1615, on the other hand, the one thing that Oedipus' recital of his woes does not include is a summary of his present plight, and yet he proceeds *εἰέν* τί δράσω δῆθ' ὁ δυσδαίμων ἐγώ; What then is the function of *δῆτα*?

Even if there were any substance in Diller's objection, it would not follow that Fraenkel was wrong to ascribe 1595–1614 to an interpolator. The interpolator might have substituted lines of his own for lines written by Euripides (or *εἰέν* for *αἰαῖ*, as Mr Barrett points out).

κόμιζε καυτήν, Ἀντιγόνη, δόμων ἔσω,  
καὶ παρθενεύου τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν  
μένους, ἐν ᾗ σε λέκτρον Αἴμονος μένει.

“Das Verbot gilt ab sofort. Es untersagt also symbolische Bestattungen, bevor der Tote (nach Abzug der Feinde) fortgetragen werden kann, es untersagt aber ebenso, dass er in die Heimat zurückgeholt und dann erst bestattet werde.<sup>19</sup> Wie man sieht, weichen die sachlichen Voraussetzungen von denen der ‘Antigone’ erheblich ab” (Erbse p.26). The only significant difference is the one intended by Euripides and ignored by Erbse, that the body has been brought into the city (1480–1581). Erbse also ignores Fraenkel’s observation (pp. 101–02) that νεκρῶν δὲ τῶνδε τὸν μὲν . . . , τόνδε δ’ . . . (1627–28) is incompatible with the presence on the stage of three bodies (1482, 1502, 1635, 1693–1702).

καταστέφω (1632), which Fraenkel suspects of being borrowed inopportunely from *Ant.* 431 τὸν νέκυν στέφει, “heisst ‘nach ritueller Vorschrift schmücken’, wie aus Herakl. 124 und I.A. 905 besonders deutlich hervorgeht (vgl. auch PEARSON z.St.)” (Erbse p.26 n.2). Once more Fraenkel has disposed of this interpretation in advance (pp.102–103), but it would not have occurred to him that *Hcl.* 124 and *IA* 905 are relevant: in the former passage the object of the verb is an altar, in the latter Iphigenia. So long as Erbse understands the word, the propriety of the operation it denotes is apparently of no interest to him.

“In 1637 sind die Formen ἐπιούσαν und εἰσιούσαν, paläographisch gleichwertig, also beide überliefert. Dass ἐπιούσαν vermutlich nicht ‘unmetrisch’ . . . ist, hat C. PRATO . . . gezeigt” (Erbse p.26 n.2). Where metre is concerned some Italians can prove anything, but it is unusual to see their results acclaimed in Germany.

<sup>19</sup> Erbse’s reason (p.26) for suspecting 1634, where the syntax alone breaks down, is quite baffling: “Es mag zwar üblich sein, einer positiven Formulierung die negative folgen zu lassen; hier aber würde diese Aussage nur für die Zeit gelten, in welcher sich der Leichnam noch auf thebanischem Hoheitsgebiet befindet.” The argument seems to run as follows: the body is “noch auf thebanischem Hoheitsgebiet” (even the interpolator knows that it is on the stage); it must be neither symbolically buried where it is nor brought into the city for burial (a distinction not drawn in the text); only where it is can it be eaten by birds; therefore Creon cannot have added ‘it must be left where it is to be eaten by birds’. The falsity of the first premise, the fanciful nature of the second, and the sheer irrationality of the conclusion, leave the argument rather too weak to prove the line spurious.

In case anyone is bewildered by the passage, here is a paraphrase of it: the body of Poly-nices (which is now on the stage) is to be thrown outside Theban territory and neither crowned nor covered with earth but left unburied for the birds to eat.



In 1644, where Antigone asks a question that Creon does not answer, Erbse (p.26) commends “die leichte und wohl evidente Änderung” of  $\tau\acute{\iota}$  to  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ , which “befreit den Text von der ersten (scheinbaren) Frage (1644):  $\tau\acute{\iota}$  τόνδ’ ὑβρίζεις πατέρ’ ἀποστέλλων χθονός”; but he does not explain the force of this  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ , and it does not emerge from the translation he quotes: ‘Jagst frevelnd du den Vater aus dem Land, warum | Schaffst du, zum Hohn dem Toten, uns ein neu Gesetz?’

Fraenkel (pp.106–07) regards it as the most surprising feature of the passage that nothing comes of Antigone’s avowal  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$   $\sigma\phi\epsilon$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}\psi\omega$ ,  $\kappa\grave{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\pi\eta$   $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$  (1657), from which she gradually retreats until she is forced to change the subject (1673). Erbse replies (p.27): “Antigone reagiert eindeutig” to 1656, “wie es einer Antigone<sup>20</sup> zukommt:  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$   $\sigma\phi\epsilon$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}\psi\omega$  (1657). Aber sie muss . . . Schritt für Schritt zurückweichen: sie darf den Toten nicht waschen, darf seine Wunden nicht verbinden, ihm nicht einmal einen Abschiedskuss reichen. Der Dichter . . . lässt sie jedoch die Aussichtslosigkeit ihres Vorhabens nicht eingestehen: nirgends nimmt die das Versprechen des Verses 1657 ( $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$   $\sigma\phi\epsilon$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}\psi\omega$ ,  $\kappa\grave{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\pi\eta$   $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ ) zurück.” How do the two italicized assertions square with each other?<sup>21</sup>

How is Antigone to bury Polynices (1657) if she accompanies her father into exile (1679)? The difficulty was noticed by a scholiast:<sup>22</sup> οὐ τηρεῖ τὸ σύμφωνον, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ δράμα ὑποτίθεται· πῶς γὰρ θάψει Πολυνείκην Ἀντιγόνη συμφεύγουσα τῷ πατρί; According to Erbse (p.29), these sentences “sind . . . kein Produkt interpretatorischer Klugheit; denn sie setzen ganz naiv voraus, dass ein dramaturgisches Genie wie Euripides die Teile seines Werkes nicht habe aufeinander abstimmen können.” They setzen nothing whatever voraus: they merely state in an unexceptionably sober way that the text contains an inconsistency. It is Erbse himself who setzt something ganz naiv voraus, namely the third proposition in the following syllogism: Euripides was a genius; a genius is never guilty of an inconsistency; Euripides wrote this passage; therefore there is no inconsistency in this passage. Unlike some of Erbse’s others, this syllogism is at least valid; but a more alarming method of arriving at the conclusion can scarcely be imagined.

<sup>20</sup> The phrase ‘einer Antigone’ is a concise illustration of the preconceptions with which Erbse approaches this part of the play.

<sup>21</sup> The object of Erbse’s factitious distinction is presumably to deflect suspicion from 1743–46, where Antigone is still proposing to bury Polynices.

<sup>22</sup> Whether or not the author of such a comment was Byzantine is of purely historical interest.

- 1703 OED. νῦν χρησμός, ὦ παῖ, Λοξίου περαίνεται.  
 ANT. ὁ ποῖος; ἀλλ' ἦ πρὸς κακοῖς ἐρεῖς κακά;  
 OED. ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις καταθεῖν μ' ἀλώμενον.  
 ANT. ποῦ; τίς σε πύργος Ἀτθίδος προσδέξεται;  
 OED. ἱερὸς Κολωνός, δώμαθ' ἵππιου θεοῦ.

In his defence of these lines, an addition suggested by OC, Erbse makes light of 1687 and 1734–36, which are inconsistent with them:

- 1687 OED. πεσὼν ὅπου μοι μοῖρα κείσομαι πέδω.  
 1734 ANT. τάδε σ' ἐπέμενε μέλεα πάθεα  
 φυγάδα πατρίδος ἄπο γενόμενον,  
 ὦ πάτερ, θανεῖν που.

In his translation of the latter passage he misses out the very word that introduces the inconsistency, *που*. At no point does he acknowledge that a reception anywhere (1706 *προσδέξεται*), let alone in Athens, must be regarded as a mitigation of Oedipus' misery (1687 *πεσὼν*, 1690 *τῶν σῶν κακῶν*, 1710 *φυγὰν τάλαιναν*, 1723 *δυστυχεστάτας φυγάς*, 1734 *μέλεα πάθεα*).<sup>23</sup>

Whether or not Erbse thinks 1737–66 are interpolated is not clear (see p.30 n.2), but he treats them (p.32) in the same way as many passages that he defends: “Halten wir uns nur an den überlieferten Wortlaut, dann ergibt sich: Antigone versichert dem Vater in den Versen 1737–9 zum letztenmal, dass sie mit ihm in die Verbannung ziehen werde. Wenig später gibt sie die Absicht kund, den Bruder trotz Kreons Verbot zu bestatten. Wenn Oidipus sie daraufhin auffordert, bei den Freundinnen, bei den Heiligtümern oder im Gebirge Zuflucht zu suchen, kann er *doch wohl* nur an die Zeit nach Erfüllung

<sup>23</sup> Diller, *op.cit.* (n.6) 646, is unhappy about the function of ἀλλ' εἶα if 1703–07 are deleted: “Diese Interjektion steht gewöhnlich innerhalb einer Rede; sie besagt, dass der Sprechende einen Gedanken nunmehr in die Tat umsetzen will . . . Wenn wir Ph. 990 der von F. gebilligten Personenverteilung der Überlieferung folgen, steht dort ἀλλ' εἶα zwar bei Personenwechsel, aber innerhalb der bisherigen Handlungslinie. Dasselbe gilt für Hel. 1429. Wenn Oedipus 1708 Antigone mit ἀλλ' εἶα von der Leiche des Polyneikes wegrufen wollte, so wäre das nach dem Sprachgebrauch wohl einfach ungehörig.” Here too, however, the speaker wishes to translate an idea into action (Antigone's idea of accompanying him into exile, which he has implicitly accepted at 1693 *προσάγαγέ νυν με, μητρὸς ὡς ψαύσω εἶθεν*), and since the idea was discussed only 15 lines previously and the intervening passage is a preliminary to carrying it out, his ἀλλ' εἶα most definitely stands “innerhalb der bisherigen Handlungslinie.”

des ersten Auftrages, also an die Zeit nach seinem Tode, denken. *Diese überaus naheliegende Deutung . . .*”

Two years before he turned to *Phoenissae*, Erbse took issue<sup>24</sup> with an earlier article by Fraenkel on *Septem*.<sup>25</sup> Fortunately most of the interpolations he discusses are single lines of no significance outside their context, and his misinterpretation of the play<sup>26</sup> neither stands nor falls with them; but it may be as well to show that he has not undermined Fraenkel’s arguments at any point.

470                   καὶ τῶδε φωτὶ πέμπε τὸν φερέγγυον  
                           πόλεως ἀπείργειν τῆσδε δούλιον ζυγόν.  
 ET. [πέμποιμ’ ἄν ἤδη τόνδε, σὺν τύχῃ δέ τῳ]  
                           καὶ δὴ πέπεμπται κόμπον ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων  
                           Μεγαρεύς

*Del. C.G.*,<sup>27</sup> Fraenkel. “Auch in der Tragödie finden sich Beispiele für Verwendung der Junktur *καὶ δὴ* im Satzinneren (vgl. Soph. O.C. 173; DENNISTON, Gr. Part. 251” (Erbse p.9). In the section that Erbse refers to, Denniston presents examples of *καὶ δὴ* ‘in response to a definite command, often with a word of the command echoed’, e.g. Alc. 1117–18 *τόλμα προτεῖναι χεῖρα . . . — καὶ δὴ προτείνω*, *Aves* 175 *βλέψον κάτω*. — *καὶ δὴ βλέπω*, and three of the five cited by Fraenkel from Aeschylus himself, *PV* 74–75 *σκέλη δὲ κίρκωσον βία*. — *καὶ δὴ πέπρακται τοῦργον*, *Supp.* 437–38 *τάδε φράσαι . . . — καὶ δὴ πέφρασμαί*, 506–07 *κλάδους μὲν αὐτοῦ λείπε . . . — καὶ δὴ σφε λείπω*. What is in dispute is not whether *καὶ δὴ* can come in the middle of a sentence<sup>28</sup> but whether it is a coincidence that the deletion of 472 brings the passage into line with all these others. A coincidence it might be if the transmitted text gave better sense than ‘I will now send this man, and rather fortunately he has already been sent’.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> *Hermes* 92 (1964) 1–22.

<sup>25</sup> *SBMünchen* 1957, Heft 3, 3–61 = *Kleine Beiträge I* (Rome 1964) 273–328.

<sup>26</sup> See *infra* n.29.

<sup>27</sup> See R. D. Dawe, *Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus* (Leyden 1965).

<sup>28</sup> OC 173 is the worst example Erbse could have chosen to prove that it can, because *ψαύω καὶ δὴ* behaves in all other respects as though it were *καὶ δὴ ψαύω*. The examples he wants are on p.252 of Denniston in section (iv), e.g. *Hdt.* 4.102.1 *τῶν δὲ καὶ δὴ οἱ βασιλέες συνελθόντες ἐβουλεύοντο*. It is in this section that Denniston ought to have put *Sept.* 472 if he trusted the text.

<sup>29</sup> That the seven commanders have already been sent to their several gates, ‘already’ meaning while the chorus were singing 287–368, is a theory to which Erbse devotes the first nine pages of his article. The history of the theory is reviewed by von Fritz, *Antike und*

- 451 λέγ' ἄλλον ἄλλαις ἐν πύλαις εἰληχότα.  
 457 ET. [καὶ μὴν τὸν ἐντεῦθεν λαχόντα πρὸς πύλαις]  
 λέξω· τρίτῳ γὰρ Ἐτεόκλῳ . . .

*Del.* H. Wolf. Fraenkel objects amongst other things to the vagueness of πρὸς πύλαις, but according to Erbse (p.11) it is “nicht unbestimmter als im Vers 376: ὡς τ' ἐν πύλαις ἕκαστος εἴληχεν πάλον.” Since ‘how at the gates’ quite plainly means ‘at which gate’, the resemblance between the two uses is purely superficial.

- 510 ξυνοίετον δὲ πολεμίους ἐπ' ἀσπίδων  
 θεούς· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Πύρπνοον Τυφῶν' ἔχει,  
 Ἵπερβίῳ δὲ Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος  
 σταδαῖος ἦσται, διὰ χερὸς βέλος φλέγων.  
 514 [κοῦπω τις εἶδε Ζῆνᾶ που νικώμενον.]  
 τοιάδε μέντοι προσφίλεια δαιμόνων·  
 πρὸς τῶν κρατούντων ἐσμέν, οἱ δ' ἠσσωμένων.  
 εἰκὸς δὲ πράξειν ἄνδρας ὧδ' ἀντιστάτας,  
 εἰ Ζεὺς γε Τυφῶ καρτερώτερος μάχη·  
 Ἵπερβίῳ τε πρὸς λόγον τοῦ σήματος  
 σωτὴρ γένοιτ' ἂν Ζεὺς ἐπ' ἀσπίδος τυχών.

Erbse accepts this order from Fraenkel but refuses to part with 514 (*del.* Hermann). His elaborate paraphrase of the passage, which leads to the predictable conclusion “dass der Gedanke des Verses 514 in dieser Deduktion nicht fehlen darf” (p.13), never comes into contact with Fraenkel’s argument: “ein solcher Gedanke könnte an sich sehr wohl den Abschluss des Vorhergehenden bilden, er darf sich aber nach den Regeln aeschyleischer Gedankenführung nicht zwischen 511–3 (ὁ μὲν γὰρ . . . Τυφῶν' ἔχει, Ἵπερβίῳ δὲ Ζεὺς . . . ἦσται . . . φλέγων) und 515 (τοιιάδε μέντοι κτλ.) eindrängen.”<sup>30</sup> It may be added that the invincibility of Zeus is less to the point than his victory over Typhon.

*moderne Tragödie* (Berlin 1962) 193–226, whose verdict Erbse is appealing against. Erbse’s only contribution is the argument that the future tenses in 408 and 621 do not refer beyond the speech (better, do not refer beyond themselves: cf. Eur. *Andr.* 323, Or. 560, Pind. *Ol.* 9.25, 10.79, and Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* I [U.Cal. Publ. in Cl.Phil. 18.1, 1962] 21–22), which is possible but leaves von Fritz’s case untouched (cf. Erbse p.5: “natürlich können diese Verbformen nicht eine der Vergangenheit angehörende Handlung bezeichnen”).

<sup>30</sup> Fraenkel “muss allerdings zugeben, dass die tadellosen Worte nicht von einem Interpolator verfertigt sein können” (Erbse p.12). Fraenkel merely says that the line “macht . . . gar nicht den Eindruck, als sei er das Flickwerk eines Bearbeiters.” The notion that interpolators cannot write presentable lines is an assumption of Erbse’s own similar to

553 ἔστιν δὲ καὶ τῶδ' ὃν λέγεις τὸν Ἀρκάδα  
 ἀνὴρ ἄκομπος, χεὶρ δ' ὄρα τὸ δράσιμον,  
 Ἄκτωρ, ἀδελφὸς τοῦ πάρος λελεγμένου  
 ὃς οὐκ ἔασει γλῶσσαν ἐργμάτων ἄτερ  
 εἴσω πυλῶν ρέουσιν ἀλδαίνειν κακά,  
 οὐδ' εἰσαμεῦμαι θηρὸς ἐχθίστου δάκος  
 559 [εἰκὼ φέροντα πολεμίας ἐπ' ἀσπίδος]  
 ἔξωθεν εἴσω. τῶ φέροντι μέμβεται  
 πυκνοῦ κροτησμοῦ τυγχάνουσ' ὑπὸ πτόλιν.  
 558 δάκος V: δάκουσ cett.

Weil emended δάκουσ to δάκος and deleted 559, but Wilamowitz, who adopted both changes, was the first editor to punctuate after εἴσω rather than after 559. Erbse makes the suggestion, entirely groundless, that Wilamowitz would never have accepted the deletion of 559 but for the mistaken punctuation that led Weil to it. Some other passage, therefore, will have to serve as a lesson about the persistence of error.<sup>31</sup>

others that he makes elsewhere, e.g. "schwerlich kann diese Beziehung von einem Interpolator geschaffen oder auch nur kenntlich gemacht worden sein" (p.6 of the other article, on *Phoen.* 1376=756 of all things), "ich würde diesen Kontrast als sehr wirkungsvoll bezeichnen. Könnte ihn ein Interpolator geschaffen . . . oder gar durch Zusätze in den Text gebracht haben?" (*ibid.* p.28, on *Phoen.* 1680).

"Die beliebte Annahme, ein 'Leser' habe die Worte aus einem anderen Drama des Aischylos herübergenommen ('an den Rand geschrieben' . . .), soll das Rätsel [of how the line got in] lösen" (p.12), with the footnote: "Die Annahme ist natürlich möglich, aber sie erklärt so lange nichts, als nicht bewiesen wird, dass die spätere Überlieferung notwendig ausschliesslich auf dieses interpolierte Exemplar zurückgeht. Wenigstens seit einem halben Jahrhundert (seit Bekanntwerden der Papyri) weiss man, dass ein solcher, für die Glaubwürdigkeit der oben referierten Annahme unabdingbarer Beweis nicht geführt werden kann." The argument of these two sentences seems to be: (1) before a line can be ascribed to an interpolator, it must be proved that all the mediaeval manuscripts go back to an interpolated copy; (2) the papyri show that in antiquity the tradition had several branches; therefore (3) even if someone interpolated a line in one copy, it would not spread through the tradition; but (4) 514 is found in all the mediaeval manuscripts; therefore (5) 514 is not an interpolation. This chain of argument prompts three questions: (1) could it be proved, except of course by the discovery of interpolations, that all the mediaeval manuscripts go back to an interpolated copy? (2) do the papyri show that no interpolation established itself before the tradition branched? (3) was the tradition free from contamination right up to the mediaeval period? An authority on *Überlieferungsgeschichte* like Erbse really ought to have worked out other answers to these questions than the ones implied by his argument.

<sup>31</sup> "Wer sich den Gang der Diskussion um diese Verse vor Augen hält, wird sich die Frage, weshalb wir den ganzen Rattenschwanz von Vorurteilen und übereilten Folgerungen nicht längst losgeworden sind, sicherlich selbst beantworten können" (p.15).

Erbse (p.15) would like to know how Fraenkel, who follows Wilamowitz, “vom neutralen Objekt δάκος zum femininen Subjekt des Verbs μέμψεται zu gelangen gedenkt.” Kühner-Gerth § 359.3 (a) will tell him.

Fraenkel’s observation that the Sphinx and not the εικών must be the subject of μέμψεται makes no impression on Erbse. A further observation may be offered, that γλώσσαν ἐργμάτων ἄτερ and θηρὸς ἐχθίστου δάκου εἰκὼ φέροντα<sup>32</sup> are unequal yokefellows.

617 ἄλλ’ οἶδεν ὧς σφε χρὴ τελευτῆσαι μάχη,  
εἰ καρπὸς ἔσται θεσφάτοισι Λοξίου.  
[φιλεῖ δὲ σιγᾶν ἢ λέγειν τὰ καίρια.]

Del. Pearson. Erbse (p.16) accuses Fraenkel of suppressing any reference to *Eum.* 614ff, a passage that proves nothing except what no one doubts, namely that Apollo’s prophecies come true. Erbse himself, in propounding for 618 the novel interpretation ‘if he will have fruit by means of Apollo’s oracles’,<sup>33</sup> suppresses any reference to another passage in *Eumenides* that Fraenkel does cite, 713–14 κάγωγε χρησμοὺς τοὺς ἐμούς τε καὶ Διὸς | ταρβεῖν κελεύω μηδ’ ἀκαρπώτους κτίσαι. If a line cannot be defended except by such means, Erbse’s ‘unprejudiced reader’ may be forgiven if he concludes that it is indefensible.

649 τοιαῦτ’ ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τᾶξευρήματα·  
[cὺ δ’ αὐτὸς ἤδη γινῶθι τίνα πέμπειν δοκεῖ.]  
ὧς οὔ ποτ’ ἀνδρὶ τῷδε κηρυκευμάτων  
μέμψη· σὺ δ’ αὐτὸς γινῶθι ναυκληρεῖν πόλιν.

Del. Paley. Erbse’s defence of the line (pp.17–19) is built on the hasty assertion, for which he cites Tucker’s note (“in κηρύκευμα lies the sense of conveying a message entrusted”), that κηρυκευμάτων (651) “nicht die vom Späher vorgetragene Berichte meinen könne. Man würde statt dessen ἀγγελμάτων erwarten . . .” Cf. *Trach.* 97–99 τοῦτο καρῦσαι τὸν Ἀλκμήνας, πόθι μοι πόθι μοι ναίει ποτ’, *IT* 527 νόστος δ’ Ἀχαιῶν ἐγένεθ’, ὧς κηρύσσεται;, probably *OT* 737 τοῦτ’ [the murder of

<sup>32</sup> Erbse reduces the clutter of genitives to order by punctuating round ἐχθίστου δάκου (p.13). Mr Barrett would delete 559 and read ἐχθίστον δάκος after the example of *Hipp.* 646–47 ἄφθογγα . . . δάκη θηρῶν (and see his note on *Hipp.* 333–35).

<sup>33</sup> ITALIE erkannte, dass zu καρπὸς ἔσται der Dativ des Profitierenden (αὐτῷ) ergänzt werden muss, während θεσφάτοισι Λοξίου ein Instrumentalis ist” (p.16), with the footnote “ITALIE bemerkt zur Stelle: ‘εἰ καρπὸς ἔσται i.e. εἰ μέλλει καρπὸν φέρειν.’” Italie, for what it is worth, surely means εἰ μέλλει καρπὸν φέρειν τὰ θέσφατα.

Laius] *ἐκηρύχθη πόλει* ('nuntius venit' Ellendt-Genthe, though Erbse could argue that Creon had the news proclaimed by a *κῆρυξ*).

Lastly, a word about 803–20, where Erbse thinks he can rescue the credit of the transmission by defending the position of 809 and treating 804 and 820–21 as author's variants designed to follow 810. His remarks about 809 are irrelevant unless he is saying that since *οὐδὲ μὴν* is not a mere negation of *καί*, it is not a negation of *καί* at all.<sup>34</sup> His speculation about author's variants is simply irresponsible, even if 804 and 820–21 were marked as alternatives in the Aristophanean text;<sup>35</sup> for what use are variants to the author of a play written for a single performance? He also ignores the difficulty of *μάντις εἰμί τῶν κακῶν* (808) when the messenger has already said *ἄνδρες τεθνᾶσιν ἐκ χερῶν αὐτοκτόνων* (805)<sup>36</sup> and the even greater difficulty of *βαρέα δ' οὖν ὄμωσ φράσον* (810) after both 805 and *οὐδ' ἀμφιλέκτως μὴν κατεσποδημένοι* (809). If this is a way of showing that the methodological possibilities have not been exhausted,<sup>37</sup> then they never will be.

That bad arguments are often put up in defence of suspected verses is not a startling or important discovery, and it no more reflects on good ones than the extravagances of deletors reflect on their successes; but it had to be demonstrated not only that there is nothing disreputable in principle about deletion but also that between deletors and defenders nature has not been unfair in her distribution of skills. The first demonstration was concluded in the first part of

<sup>34</sup> "Dass der Vers 809 an der richtigen Stelle steht, hat man seit G. HERMANN mehrmals bezweifelt, vielleicht deshalb, weil man *οὐδὲ μὴν* für eine bloße Negation der Kopula hielt. Das trifft nicht zu, wie die beiden anderen Belege bei Aischylos dartun; man vergleiche Eum. 471 . . . , Sept. 668 (Eteokles über das Schildzeichen des Bruders, *negierte Behauptungen gehen voran*) . . . Der Vers 809 besagt also, beide Helden seien so in den Staub geworfen worden, dass an ihren grässlichen Tod auch nicht der geringste Zweifel möglich ist" (p.21). It is not clear what the last sentence is supposed to contribute to Erbse's argument.

<sup>35</sup> If Aristophanes treated 804 as an acceptable variant, he must have been half asleep, because *βασιλεῖς* does not scan, *βασιλέες* is not admitted in trimeters, and *βασιλέως ὀμόσποροι* does not mean 'the king's sons'.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *Andr.* 1070–73 MESS. *ὦμοι μοι | οἷας ὁ πλήμων ἀγγελῶν ἤκω τύχας | κοί τ', ὦ γεραῖέ, καὶ φίλοις δεσπότης.* | PEL. *αἰαί· πρόμαντις θυμὸς ὡς τι προσδοκᾷ.* | MESS. *οὐκ ἔστι σοι παῖς παιδός . . .* The scholiast's interpretation of 808, followed by Tucker, has against it not only Schütz, Hermann and Weil, but also the tense of *εἰμί*.

<sup>37</sup> "Der nachfolgende neue Anordnungsvorschlag erhebt keinerlei Anspruch auf Überzeugungskraft, geschweige denn auf Evidenz. Ich trage ihn nur vor, um darzutun, dass man in der bisherigen Diskussion nicht alle methodischen Möglichkeiten erschöpft, sondern (von der Änderung einzelner Wörter abgesehen) immer nur Umstellungen und Athetesen befürwortet hat" (pp.19–20).

this trilogy, and the second part has been a contribution to the second. The third part, which will be given over to a number of deletions not accepted by recent editors and commentators, will make up for the absence from the first part of any but the broadest critical principles.

EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD

*June, 1972*