Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, I

Michael D. Reeve

IT IS not always possible to read a classical text without feeling from time to time that more than one mind has played a part in its creation. In Homer the feeling is familiar, but lesser authors can arouse it in forms even more acute. If not all scholars share it, those who act upon it and excise what strikes them as alien are liable to be accused of arbitrariness by others who have been brought up on the author from the cradle and never seen reason to doubt the received text. In no branch of literature has the issue engaged more attention than in tragedy.[1]

As of many other things, the great age of arbitrariness in the textual criticism of tragedy was the second half of the nineteenth century. Many scholars of that age who shortened the extant plays have left no name to posterity outside bibliographical compilations,[2] and no two scholars of the present century will agree on a second practitioner of the craft; but the first is invariably August Nauck, whose range alone guarantees him notoriety.[3]

The present century has seen two works concerned with interpolation in tragedy, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* by D. L. Page (Oxford 1934) and *Binneninterpolation* by G. Jachmann (*GöttNachr* 1 [1936] 123–44, 185–215, of which all but 123–33 deal with tragedy). Where Page places the responsibility for most interpolations is evident from the title of his book. Jachmann, on the other hand, is convinced

---

[1] This article is in three parts, which for reasons of space will appear separately. Professor William M. Calder III was kind enough to suggest the idea for the first, and all three owe many improvements, visible and invisible, to the acumen and careful scholarship of Mr W. S. Barrett.

[2] For Sophocles see the exemplary *Index Commentationum Sophoclearum* by H. Genthe (Berlin 1874). For Euripides, Prinz and Wecklein (Leipzig 1878–1902) endeavour to record all conjectures, and the sources can usually be located by recourse to the relevant sections of Engelmann-Preuss, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum* I (Leipzig 1880), and the continuation to 1896 by Klussmann (Leipzig 1909–11).

[3] To mention nothing else, he edited the whole of Euripides (ed. 1 Leipzig 1854, ed. 3 1869–71) and revised all Schneidewin's commentaries on Sophocles (Berlin 1856–60 and several later editions, for which see ed. 9 of *Ajax*, 1888, p. iii n.**).

that most interpolations in tragedy are of the same nature as inter-
polations in other literary works and date from the period of purely
literary transmission, which lasted much longer than the period of
performances. Both Page and Jachmann lean heavily on the labours
of nineteenth-century scholars, though Jachmann's respect for them,
especially for Nauck, is greater by as much as he is the readier of the
two to delete.[4]

How is the student of tragedy to make up his mind about the extent
and the origin of interpolation? "It would be possible to collect all
the passages which have ever been suspected or expunged," says
Page (p.55), "and then to make two inquiries. First, whether the
grounds for suspicion or deletion are strong enough; second, if they
are strong enough, whether the interpolation is histrionic or not.
This would seem to be the proper method. But nobody could study
even fifty passages chosen at random without beginning to under-
stand the feeling which lay behind Jebb's acrimonious strictures (pp.li,
lii of the Introduction to his edition of OK). It soon appears that careful
scrutiny of a very great number of suspected passages is a waste of
time, and that animadversions on the deletors' methods and reasons
must be ineffably tedious." A German scholar has recently attempted,
however, to circumvent the ineffable tediousness of the operation. In
a dissertation entitled *ENIOI AΘETOYΣIN* (Tübingen 1968), J. Bau-
mert has collected and examined all the deletions ever proposed in
Alcestis and *Medea*, not so much for the sake of *Alcestis* and *Medea* as
because the deletions proposed in them raise all the questions that
ever arise about the propriety of deletion. If it could be proved that
certain kinds of argument for deletion are invalid, much of the work
that Page had no stomach for would have been done. Deletors and
defenders alike must be grateful to Baumert for undertaking the
proof; deletors cannot afford to ignore, and defenders certainly will
not ignore, an investigation so fundamental.

Baumert distinguishes two kinds of evidence for interpolation, ex-
ternal and internal. The external evidence, however, presents nothing

---

[4] For all its aggressiveness, Jachmann's article is on the whole more instructive than
Page's book, partly because his arguments on individual passages are more incisive, partly
because he is better informed about scholarship in antiquity, partly because he exposes
many of the prejudices that deletors have to contend with. It must not be forgotten, how-
ever, that Page's book was his first publication.

more than a choice of variants, and such choices can be made only on internal grounds. Not until they have been made can the reliability of the external evidence be assessed. Stobaeus, for instance, attributes *Andr.* 330–31 to Menander. Who is right, Stobaeus or the scribes of *Andromache*? There is a simple conflict of evidence, and it can be resolved only by an examination of the context in *Andromache*. If the context is incomplete without the lines, Stobaeus is wrong; if they do not belong to the context,[5] Stobaeus may still be wrong but has some chance of being right.

Baumert divides the external evidence into three categories according to the nature of its source: the mediaeval manuscripts, citations, and the scholia. A division according to the nature of the evidence itself might have been more helpful: direct evidence, indirect evidence, and editorial comment. There is no difference in principle between a mediaeval manuscript that visibly gives one reading and an ancient scholion that explicitly attests another; but there is a difference between transmitting a text and compiling an anthology, and there is also a difference between transmitting a text and passing judgement on it. Baumert's conclusions about these three kinds of evidence are as follows: (1) direct evidence indicates omissions rather than interpolations; (2) indirect evidence is altogether unreliable because the sources go their own way; (3) editorial comment, which includes much that has been mistaken for direct evidence,[6] is of no evidential value. His argument for (1) is completely invalid, and though he is more right than wrong about (2) and (3), he fails to formulate his points sharply and to discriminate between one case and another.

To take (3) first, what does it mean if a scholiast remarks that a line is περιccóc?[7] Noticing that the term is often used in grammatical

[5] In fact they do not. See most recently O. Zwierlein, *GGA* 222 (1970) 204 n.9.

[6] *E.g.*, the greater part of what the scholia say about actors.

[7] One of the scholia Baumert discusses in this connexion is irrelevant, Σ *Phoen.* 1692 πῶc γὰρ θάψει Πολυνείκην Ἀντιγόνη cυμφεύγουca τῷ πατρί; πλεονάζει δὲ τῷ τοιούτῳ εἴδει ὁ Εὐριπίδηc. Baumert says (p.63) "für den Scholiasten ... liegt in der Verbindung von Bestattungs- und Begleitungsmotiv einfach ein Pleonasmus des Euripides," and again (p.65) "im Schol. Phoen. 1692 werden zwei Motive, die sich nicht glatt zueinander fügen, mit dem Vermerk πλεονάζει dem Euripides zuerkannt." The comment of course means "Euripides is full of such things."

Baumert is not at his happiest interpreting scholia: at *Or.* 640, where the scholiast says ἔνιοι ἀθετοῦcι τοῦτον καὶ τὸν ἑξῆc cτίχον· οὐκ ἔχουcι γὰρ τὸν Εὐριπίδειον χαρακτῆρα, he regards as "erwägenswert" (p.51 n.1) Biehl's suggestion that the subject of ἔχουcι is the same as the.

elucidation when a word fulfils no obvious function, Baumert argues that it is never more than an editorial judgement. Some of the most interesting cases bear him out. At *Or.* 249, for instance, the scholiast rightly takes exception to the article in ἐc τὸν ψόγον, but there is no reason to think that he knew of any other text; and at *Phoen.* 428 anyone could easily feel that cύγγαμoc γάρ ἐcτ' ἐμόc is περιccόν after 408–25. Nevertheless, editorial judgment may not be the whole story.

Phoen. 973   λέξει γὰρ ἀρχαῖc καὶ cτρατηλάταιc τάδε,
πύλαc ἐφ' ἑπτὰ καὶ λοχαγέταc μολών

ἥρκει οὗτοc· ὁ γὰρ ἐπιφερόμενοc . . . περιττόc ἐcτιν. Σ 973

Why is 974 περιττόc? On the strength of Homeric scholia such as that on *Iliad* 8.528 ἀθετεῖται ὅτι περιccόc, Fraenkel suggested[8] that περιccόc is a remnant of an Alexandrian athetesis. Though in this particular case he could well be wrong, since the scholiast may have disliked λοχαγέταc in 974 after cτρατηλάταιc in 973, the idea itself is perfectly plausible, especially in the abbreviated state of the extant scholia. The problem of περιccόc then gives way to the thornier problem of Alexandrian atheteses; but if in one single case an Alexandrian athetesis can be shown to have rested on documentary evidence, the possibility must always be reckoned with that περιccόc has documentary authority behind it. One such case is *Iliad* 23.92: ἀθετεῖται ὅτι . . . Σ *A*, ἐν πάcαιc δὲ οὐκ ἦν ὁ cτίχοc Σ *T*. Two others have been pointed out by Jachmann:[9] *Iliad* 4.88 Ζηνόδοτοc τούτου μὲν τὸ ἀκροτελεύτιον οὕτωc γράφει 'εὗρε δὲ τόνδε', τὸν δὲ δεύτερον οὐδὲ γράφει, δοκῶν ἀνθρώπινον τὸ ζητεῖν εἶναι, *cum Zenodoto consentit P.Hib.* 20;[10] *Iliad* 21.290 ἀθετεῖται ὅτι . . . Σ *A, om. Κρητική secundum P.Oxy.* 221 col. xv 26–27. In general, then, Baumert is right that editorial comment is of no evidential value; but the Homeric scholia show that it may occasionally reflect a documentary divergence.

Then (2). Baumert discusses a number of excerpts in Stobaeus and

---

subject of ἀθετοῦcι. To say nothing of the strain this imposes on ἔχουcι, a refutation is provided by *hypoth. Rhesus*: τοῦτο τὸ δρᾶμα ἔνιοι νόθον ὑπενόηcαν ὡc οὐκ ὂν Εὐριπίδου· τὸν γὰρ Σοφόκλειον μᾶλλον ὑποφαίνει χαρακτῆρα.

[8] *SBMünchen* 1963, Heft 1 p.46.
[9] *Klio* 33 (1940) 240–41; *GöttNachr* 4 (1942) 343 n.1. *Cf.* also *op.cit.* (p.247) 141 n.1.
[10] *Cf.* S. R. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of the Iliad* (Cologne 1967) 27, 68–69.

Christus Patiens without properly illustrating the elementary point (p.18) that not every word of the original always suited the purpose of the excerptor. He mentions, for instance, that Stobaeus cites *Eur. El.* 369–70 without the rest of the sentence (p.19), but he does not mention that the rest of the sentence was irrelevant to the heading under which the citation comes, namely ὅτι οὐκ ἀεὶ τοῖς εὐγενέσι καὶ χρηστοῖς τῶν πατέρων ἔοικε τὰ τέκνα. Similarly, Stobaeus cites *HF* 101–06 (Baumert p.26) without 103 οἵ τ' εὐτυχοῦντες διὰ τέλους οὐκ εὐτυχεῖς, which may have seemed unsuitable for a section περὶ ἐλπίδος. Such omissions clearly reveal nothing about the original. On the other hand, the omission of a line that would not have conflicted with the purpose of the excerptor may well reveal something more interesting than the mere selectiveness of the excerptor, as it does at *Bacch.* 314–18:

cod. **L**	οὐχ ὁ Διόνυσος σωφρονεῖν ἀναγκάσει
	γυναῖκας ἐς τὴν Κύπριν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει
	τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἔνεστιν εἰς τὰ πάντ' ἀεί.
	τοῦτο σκοπεῖν χρή· καὶ γὰρ ἐν βακχεύμασιν
	οὐδ' ἥ γε σώφρων οὐ διαφθαρήσεται.

Stob. *Flor.* 5.15	οὐχ ὁ Διόνυσος μὴ σωφρονεῖν ἀναγκάσει
(= 3.5.1 W.-H.)	γυναῖκας εἰς τὴν Κύπριν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει
	τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἔνεστιν εἰς τὰ πάντ' ἀεί.

Stob. *Flor.* 74.8	οὐχ ὁ Διόνυσος μὴ σωφρονεῖν ἀναγκάσει
(= 4.23.8 W.-H.)	γυναῖκας εἰς τὴν Κύπριν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν φύσιν
	τοῦτο σκοπεῖν χρή· καὶ γὰρ ἐν βακχεύμασιν
	οὐδ' ἥ γε σώφρων οὐ διαφθαρήσεται.

Here for once Baumert does try to show why the citations differ (p.26): the longer version, he thinks, was suitable for the section περὶ σωφρο-σύνης but would not have made a good γαμικὸν παράγγελμα. Unfortunately it is by no means clear why he takes this view.[11] Since 316 is undoubtedly an interpolation,[12] it is perverse to deny that the shorter version derives from an uninterpolated text.

[11] "Die verkürzte Fassung ist eine Ermahnung für Hochzeiter. Für mangelnde Keusch-heit entschuldigt Dionysos nicht: ... ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν φύσιν τοῦτο σκοπεῖν χρή, '. . . sondern auf die Anlage muss, wer auf Brautschau geht, in dieser Hinsicht prüfend sehen'."

[12] See Dodds on 314–18, and W. S. Barrett, *Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) 175. Baumert ignores Dodds' observation that ἔνεστιν nowhere else means 'depends on' (for which the Greek is ἔστιν ἐν: see *LSJ* ἐν A.I.6).

Finally (1). Direct evidence is supplied mainly by the mediaeval MSS but also by the scholia they contain, which report the readings of ancient MSS, and divergences at both stages of the tradition are discussed by Baumert. About the mediaeval MSS he has this to say (pp.7–8): "Die mittelalterliche Überlieferung basiert aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach auf einer einzigen, vermutlich in der Photius-Zeit vorgenommenen Transliteration. Divergenzen unserer Handschriften können folglich, wenn überhaupt, ausschliesslich byzantinische Fälschungen und Übertragungen anzeigen." That no divergence in the mediaeval tradition can be older than Photius is a strange misapprehension, and Baumert would no doubt have avoided it if he had read more widely.[13] It invalidates completely the ingenious argument to which he proceeds.[14] His argument about ancient variants is more complex but equally invalid. If a scholiast says that a line was not ἐν τοῖϲ πολλοῖϲ, these πολλοί, unless descended from Aristophanes' edition, must have been either MSS used by him or MSS independent of him. The latter alternative is rejected by Baumert (p.46) on the ground that there is no evidence for the existence after Aristophanes of MSS independent of him;[15] but how can such evidence be recognized when so little is known about the form in which Aristophanes presented his results? and how likely is it that the Aristophanean edition drove all other texts out of circulation? As for the other alternative, that the πολλοί were MSS used by Aristophanes, Baumert argues as follows (pp.45–46): Aristophanes used the official Athenian copy (Galen 17.1.607 Kühn= in Hippocr.Epid. 3.2.4 [Corpus Med.Graec. V 10.2.1 p.79]), which was the mainstay of his edition; the scholia were written

---

[13] E.g. Barrett, op.cit. (supra n.12) 58–59; G. Zuntz, An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides (Cambridge 1965) 261–72. The unsoundness of Baumert's argument does not entail that the conclusion he wishes to establish is false. If later centuries shared Aristophanes' desire for completeness (cf. n.18), interpolations might be expected to have spread throughout the tradition by the time of Photius. Certainly the mediaeval MSS all contain, with two trivial exceptions (Phoen. 1282 om. OP; cf. Baumert p.11), every one of the 11 Euripidean passages that are known to have been unevenly attested in antiquity. Cf. Jachmann's remark, GöttNachr 4 (1942) 366–67, that "nahezu überall die interpolierten Rezensionen sich vorherrschend durchsetzen und den breiten Hauptstrom der Überlieferung bilden."

[14] Namely: Byzantine interpolations, if they were to have been written in Euripidean Greek, would have had to be derivative, say borrowed from an anthology; but of the 65 lines unevenly attested not one is in Stobaeus; therefore uneven attestation is a sign not of interpolation but of omission.

[15] In spite of holding that there were no such MSS to collate, Baumert considers it impermissible to restrict the practice of collation to Aristophanes (p.45).

to accompany the Aristophanean edition; therefore the πολλοί are of no authority. This argument depends on the reliability of the official Athenian copy, which for all anyone knows may have been heavily interpolated. The conclusion that Baumert draws after he has rejected both alternatives is that the πολλοί were vitiated by post-Aristophanean omissions (p.47). This conclusion does not follow, however, unless Aristophanes suppressed information about all his sources except the official Athenian copy, which is the last thing he is likely to have done.[16]

Baumert regards it as significant that the scholia record omissions in other MSS but never additions (pp.44–45).[17] An explanation readily suggests itself: Aristophanes drew up a text that included every line attested, so that the only symbol he needed to use was a symbol for omission.[18]

What does it mean, then, if a line was unevenly attested in the ancient MSS ? Once more, only an examination of the context in each case can give the answer.

  (1) *Alc.* 818–20 (?): 818–19 *del.* Wecklein, *recte.*[19]
  (2) *Hipp.* 871–73: *del.* Nauck, *recte* (see Barrett).
  (3) *Hipp.* 1050: *del.* Nauck, *recte* (see Barrett).
  (4) *Andr.* 1254: *del.* Kirchhoff, *recte.*[20]
  (5) *Phoen.* 375: *del.* Usener, *RhM* 23 (1868) 155, *recte.*
  (6) *Phoen.* 1069 (?): 1070 *del.* Bruhn, *Jahrb.f.cl.Phil.Supp.* 15 (1887) 271.[21]

---

[16] See Barrett, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 47.

[17] This is not actually true: *Σ Or.* 1229 ἐν τῷ ἀντιγράφῳ οὐ φέρονται οὗτοι οἱ δ' ἴαμβοι, [καὶ] ἐν ἄλλῳ δέ. Baumert does not discuss the passage, but if he thinks omissions in MSS other than the scholiast's *Hauptexemplar* have no authority, he must think the addition here has no authority.

[18] *Cf.* U. von Wilamowitz, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin 1895) 149: "Sein Bestreben war offenbar, möglichst wenig von dem Überlieferten umkommen zu lassen"; *Hermes* 44 (1909) 449: "Unser Text ist, wie so oft, von den Alexandrinern aus verschiedenen Exemplaren componiert, in der Absicht, möglichst wenig umkommen zu lassen."

[19] ταῦτα δὲ τὰ τρία ἔν τισιν οὐκ ἔγκειται *Σ* 820 in V, where 819 is written as two lines. Whichever lines the scholion originally referred to, 818–19 at least are interpolated (see Dale or Weber).

[20] The line separates ἀπαλλάξασα (1255) too awkwardly from σέ (1253).

[21] βραδέως μὲν ἐξέρχῃ, ὅμως δὲ ἔξελθε, ἄκουσον· ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀντιγράφοις οὐ γράφεται ὁ στίχος (*Σ* V 1069). Since 1071 cannot stand as it is without 1070, Bruhn altered λήξασ' to λήξεις and attached the line to 1069. Not the least objection to this procedure is that it does not account for the interpolation; for it would be a coincidence if a line was interpolated

    (7) *Phoen.* 1075: *del.* Kirchhoff, *recte.*[22]

    (8) *Phoen.* 1225: *del.* Kirchhoff.[23]

    (9) *Phoen.* 1282: *del.* Grotius, *recte.*

    (10) *Or.* 957–59: *del.* Kirchhoff, *recte.* [24]

---

after ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως when the construction was not elliptical. Elliptical it surely was: (enter messenger) ὠή, τίς ἐν πύλαισι δωμάτων κυρεῖ; ἀνοίγετ᾽, ἐκπορεύετ᾽ Ἰοκάστην δόμων (no response); ὠὴ μάλ᾽ αὖθις (pause, and then the bolts rattle); διὰ μακροῦ μέν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως (Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* [Oxford 1955] 173–74). Either, therefore, 1070 must be left alone, or 1071 must go with it; so that unless the original note has been badly garbled, it looks as though *Σ* V had wandered from 1075. Irrespective of *Σ* V 1069, a case can be made out against 1071, but too many other passages would have to be considered with it for a footnote to suffice.

[22] Contrary to what Wecklein and Murray say, Valckenaer retained the line: "quae secundum scholiasten, si recte conicio, deerant in exemplaribus non paucis, τί μοί ποθ᾽ ἥκεις καινὸν ἀγγελῶν ἔπος, Euripidea tamen mea quidem opinione, non miror si nonnullis hac in sede displicuerint." As Pearson points out, the line interrupts the sequence of thought.

[23] For the interpolation of such lines see *e.g. Il.* 9.224a and Ed. Fraenkel, *Agamemnon* III (Oxford 1950) p.756 n.1. If *Phoen.* 1225 were unanimously transmitted, deletion would not be justified. Baumert's remarks on the scholion are confused and the italicized sentences irreconcilable (pp.49–50): "G. JACHMANN ... beurteilt dieses Scholion als urkundlichen Nachweis für eine nacharistophaneische Interpolation ... Möglicherweise deutet das Scholion auf eine Interpolation hin. *Den Anspruch einer Urkunde allerdings kann das Scholion nicht erheben.* Denn G. JACHMANN hätte vielleicht doch bedenken müssen, dass gerade die Sinnlosigkeit der Kombination beider Bemerkungen [(1) ἀπὸ τοῦ διηγηματικοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ μιμητικὸν μετέβη· λείπει οὖν τῷ λόγῳ τὸ ταῦτα λέγων,᾽(2) οὗτος δὲ οὐ φέρεται ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀντιγράφοις] auf byzantinische Zeit hinweisen kann, in der systematisch alles antike Material zusammengestellt wurde, um es vor dem Untergang zu bewahren. *So ist es durchaus denkbar, dass ein Scholion aus einem Exemplar, welches den Vers Phoen. 1225 nicht führte, in ein vollständigeres Manuskript übertragen wurde.*"

[24] 960–81 are rightly given to the chorus by Weil, *RevPhil* 18 (1894) 208–09, and G. Pasquali, *Athenaeum* 8 (1930) 72–76. The formal facts about Euripidean messengers' speeches are as follows: (1) they are invariably followed by some utterance from the chorus; (2) if no other character is on the stage, the chorus follow with lyrics (*HF.* 1016, *Ion* 1229, *Bacch.* 1153; *cf. Alc.* 212) or anapaests (*Andr.* 1166, *Phoen.* 1480); (3) if some other character is on stage, the chorus either (a) follow with trimeters and are followed by that character in trimeters (*Med.* 1231, *Hcld.* 867, *Hipp.* 1255, *Hec.* 583, *Supp.* 731, *IT* 340, 1420, *Phoen.* 1200, *Bacch.* 775; *cf. Hec.* 1183) or tetrameters (*Hel.* 1619), or (b) follow with lyrics and are followed by that character in trimeters (*El.* 858). Formal considerations, therefore, tell against two of the possibilities at *Or.* 949–1012: that the chorus both speak 957–59 and sing 960–81, and that Electra sings 960–81 immediately after 956. There is no strict parallel for either of the other possibilities, that the MSS are sound and that the chorus sing 960–81 immediately after 956; but since there is only one other passage (*El.* 858) where the chorus follow the messenger in lyrics while some other character is present, it can hardly be called anomalous if at *Or.* 982 they are followed by Electra in lyrics rather than trimeters. *El.* 854–72 is in fact closely parallel to Weil's arrangement: just as the chorus there start dancing when the messenger announces to Electra that Orestes is returning triumphant, so the chorus here start dancing when the messenger announces to Electra that Orestes is returning in distress.

    Formally, then, Weil's arrangement has more to commend it than the arrangement in

(11) *Or.* 1229–32 (?): 1227–30 *del.* Nauck.[25]
(12) *Or.* 1394: *del.* Kirchhoff, *recte.*[26]

Out of 12 omissions, then, nine are right, and one more (8) will be accepted by anyone who is not defending a theory like Baumert's; of the remaining two, (11) may be right if the scholion is misplaced, and (6) is almost certainly a misplaced version of (7). Jachmann therefore has every justification for the view that the omission of lines from some ancient MSS casts such suspicion on them that their genuineness and not their spuriousness must be proved (Baumert p.43).

Even Jachmann makes one mistake in dealing with omissions. Manuscripts occasionally omit lines accidentally, and if there are obvious palaeographical reasons for an omission it cannot be used in support of a deletion, however attractive the deletion may be on internal grounds. In an otherwise excellent article on Horace, *Odes* 4.8,[27] Jachmann castigates scholars who seize on a palaeographical

---

the MSS; but the crux of the matter is whether 960–81 are better suited to the chorus or Electra. Di Benedetto's summary does not do justice to Pasquali's arguments for giving them to the chorus, and he is unable to point to a single word that suits Electra better. His assertion that "da vv. 960–967 risulta che chi parla assolve alla funzione di ἐξάρχων del *treno* e questa era propria dell'attore" makes no allowance for 960 ὦ Πελαςγία and 965 ἰαχείτω δὲ γᾶ Κυκλωπία.

[25] ἐν τῷ ἀντιγράφῳ οὐ φέρονται οὗτοι οἱ δ' ἴαμβοι, [καὶ] ἐν ἄλλῳ δέ Σ 1229. If the ἀντίγραφον really omitted 1229–32, the omission can only have been an accident, because 1231–32 are indispensable. No other scholion, however, with the doubtful exception of Σ V *Phoen.* 1069 (see n.21), records an omission that can only have been an accident, and so Nauck deleted 1227–30 on the supposition that they were the four lines originally referred to by the scholion. The deletion has two advantages: it restores symmetry to the prayer (*cf. Cho.* 479–509), and it allows μολεῖν in 1226 to be echoed immediately by ἱκοῦ δῆτ' in 1231 (*cf. El.* 672–73, 675–76, *Hyps.* fr.64.69–70 Bond, Aesch. *Supp.* 215–16).

[26] If what Di Benedetto says were true, that the line makes sense and is immune to considerations of either attestation or symmetry, then there would be no case against it, certainly not that it is "una evidente dittografia del precedente," which it is not, even in the loose acceptation of 'dittography' that prevails in modern editions. As for the sense, the chorus ought to be saying 'for I did not understand what went before', but the line makes them say 'for what went before, which was not readily intelligible, I have worked out'; or does it mean 'I grasp not your previous story with any clearness as the result of conjecturing' (Wedd)? Weil pardonably goes no further than to quote Heath's translation and declare the line "assez obscur."

[27] *Philologus* 90 (1935) 331–51. When Jachmann has demonstrated once and for all the spuriousness of lines 15b–19a (*del.* Lachmann), it is a surprise to find G. W. Williams, *The Third Book of Horace's Odes* (Oxford 1969) 84, invoking *eius* at line 18 in defence of *eius* at 3.11.18.

explanation of correct omissions; but in method, if not in their con-
clusions, they are right and he is wrong.[28]

Now to internal evidence. Baumert divides arguments for deletion
into categories, so that if a variety of arguments have been brought
to bear on one passage, it has to be discussed separately under each
heading. Since many kinds of argument for deletion turn out to be
bad, any accumulation of such arguments is presumably bad.
Methodical as this approach seems, it is misguided and dangerous, as
an example will show.

Or. 1022   οὐ cῖγ' ἀφεῖcα τοὺc γυναικείουc γόουc
  cτέρξειc τὰ κρανθέντ'; οἰκτρὰ μὲν τάδ', ἀλλ' ὅμωc
  φέρειν c' ἀνάγκη τὰc παρεcτώcαc τύχαc.

Three arguments have been used for the deletion of 1024: (1) it was
unknown to the scholiast (λείπει τὸ δεῖ φέρειν); (2) it was obviously
put in to complete the sense of ἀλλ' ὅμωc; (3) it disturbs the sequence of
couplets (1022–46). Now it is true that each of these three arguments is
inadequate: (1) and (3) would go by the board if the line were vital
to the sense, and (2), as Baumert says (p.277), is just as likely to be an
explanation of why the poet put it in as why an interpolator put it in.
An inadequate argument, however, is not the same as a bad one:
three bad arguments do not make a good one, but three inadequate
arguments may make an adequate one. That is the case here, and it is
the case in many other passages.[29]

A relevant argument is bad only if its premises are false or its logic

---

[28] Jachmann's examples (p.341 and n.13) are Hes. *Scut.* 209b–11a ἴκελοc [. . . ἴκελοι], Ov.
Fasti 2.203–04 *omen habet* [. . . *omen habet*], 2.281–82 *erat* [. . . *erat*], 6.271–76 *onus* [. . . *onus*],
and Prop. 3.10.17–8 *caput* [. . . *caput*]. Cf. also Med. 304 τοῖc δ' . . . [τοῖc δ' . . .] *om.* **A**, *del.*
Pierson; *Hipp.* 691 ἐρεῖ . . . [ἐρεῖ . . .] *om.* **A**, *del.* Brunck; *Hec.* 756–58 [οὐ δῆτα . . .] οὐδέν *om.*
M B, *del.* Kirchhoff; Juv. 7.135 . . . *purpura* . . . [. . . *purpura* . . .] *om.* **U**, *del.* Knoche; 8.5–6
[*Corvinum/-i* . . .] *Corvinum/-i om.* **G**, *del.* C. F. Hermann; 159b–60a [*Syrophoenix* . . .] *Syro-
phoenix om.* **F**, *del.* C. F. Hermann; 160 . . . *Syrophoenix* . . . [. . . *Syrophoenix* . . .] *om.* **A**, *del.*
Jahn; Soph. *OC* 1321 ἀδμήτηc [. . . 'Αταλάντηc] *om.* **Φ**, *del.* Gratwick, *CR* 79 (1965) 243–46 (for
this omission *cf. Or.* 1393–94 ἕκαcτα [. . . εὔγνωcτα] *om.* **A**).

[29] It would be nice to know why Baumert regards *Med.* 468 as spurious (p.257 n.2). The
only objections that are advanced against it nowadays are that it recurs at 1324 and without
it the two speeches are of equal length; yet Baumert discountenances both kinds of argu-
ment. All credit to him if he agrees with Matthiae, *Euripidis tragoediae et fragmenta* VI
(Leipzig 1821) 469: "aptius ibi haec conferuntur in Medeam post Creusae et liberorum
caedem perpetratam, quam hic in Iasonem, nullo nisi uxoris desertae crimine laboran-
tem."

faulty. The three arguments above are bad only if their major premises are expressed in a way that renders them false: (1) no line unevenly attested in the ancient tradition is genuine (false for the sake of argument); (2) no line that completes what would otherwise be an elliptical construction is genuine; (3) no sequence in dialogue is irregular. Most scholars, however, would be content to express them as follows: (1) very few lines unevenly attested in the ancient tradition are genuine; (2) many spurious lines complete what would otherwise be an elliptical construction; (3) the regularity of sequences in dialogue is usually broken for some dramatic reason (this will do, but the matter is rather more complex).[30] The conclusions yielded by these premises all begin "probably," and the degrees of probability vary. To think that there is anything discreditable about that is to misunderstand the logic of textual criticism. In default of an autograph, no textual decision in Euripides or any other author can rise above probability. At *Alc.* 1037 all the MSS and the scholia as well offer οὖτοι σ᾽ ἀτιμάζων, but all editors since Scaliger have printed οὖτοι σ᾽ ἀτίζων. That Euripides intended ἀτιμάζων is overwhelmingly improbable, but it is not in any strict sense impossible. A tempting syllogism must be resisted: (1) Euripides always made his trimeters scan; (2) *Alc.* 1037 does not scan; (3) therefore Euripides did not write *Alc.* 1037 as it stands. What after all is the authority for (1)? To go no further, it founders on *Alc.* 1037. The notion that it holds good can only be entertained after a judgement of probability has been made, namely that a scribe is far likelier than Euripides to have written ἀτιμάζων instead of ἀτίζων.

It is unreasonably exacting, then, to demand that a transmitted reading should not be changed unless the poet cannot possibly have written it.[31] It should be changed if he is likelier not to have written it than to have written it. There are no rules for weighing probability in such matters,[32] and different critics will tilt the balance in different

---

[30] See Denniston on *El.* 651–52.

[31] Baumert's assertion (p.97) "Änderungen des überlieferten Textes können—will man nicht jeden methodischen Halt verlieren—ausschliesslich dann erlaubt werden, wenn zwingende Notwendigkeit vorliegt" is vacuous until "zwingende Notwendigkeit" is defined, and no definition is likely to meet the objection put forward above.

[32] To be more precise, general rules are too vague to be helpful in particular instances, and specific rules are too numerous to be worth drawing up. It is trivially true that anyone who gives a reason for making a change is setting up a rule, but the number of helpful rules to be extracted even from a large number of good reasons is usually very small.

ways; but an editor who prints a reading when he regards another as more probable is not doing his job, and an editor who fancies he can avoid arbitrary procedure by sticking to the transmitted text is making a judgement of probability just as arbitrary as if he were to change it.

If there were rules for weighing probability in such matters, they would not include, as *Alc.* 1037 shows, the rule that a transmitted reading is the likeliest reading simply because it is transmitted. A transmitted reading is never more than part of the evidence for what the author wrote. Another example will make the point clearer and take it further. At *Hipp.* 1228, where **L** has πρὸc πέτρας, editors rightly print πρὸc πέτραιc; but at *Hel.* 409, where **L** again has πρὸc πέτρας, editors all retain it. In neither passage is πέτρας impossible (*cf. Od.* 12.71). Why then the discrepancy? Because at *Hipp.* 1228 several other mss have πρὸc πέτραιc, whereas at *Hel.* 409 **L** is the sole authority. Can it really be maintained in these circumstances that πρὸc πέτρας at *Hel.* 409 is protected by the mere fact of being possible?

The deletion of a line does not differ in principle from the addition or alteration of one letter, and the text may be no more affected by it. At *IA* 1032, for instance, Wilamowitz deleted a line that makes no difference to the sense:

μηδὲ πατρῷον δόμον
αἴcχυν'· ὁ γάρ τοι Τυνδάρεωc οὐκ ἄξιοc
[κακῶc ἀκούειν· ἐν γὰρ Ἕλληcιν μέγαc].

Many editors who might bring themselves to add an *iota* or alter a letter would balk at deleting a whole line, and yet by deleting *IA* 1032 they would run no graver risk of misrepresenting what the poet meant. By altering a letter, indeed, they might run the gravest possible risk, the risk of reversing the sense completely (Soph. *El.* 1320 καλῶc *codd.*, κακῶc Nauck; 1466 οὐ *codd.*, εὖ Tyrwhitt; *OT* 376 με . . . γε coῦ *codd.*, cε . . . γ' ἐμοῦ Brunck; Eur. fr.1035.2 κακοῖc *codd.*, καλοῖc Grotius). The best that can be said for the reverence some scholars display towards transmitted lines is that they are following Alexandrian precedent; but the Alexandrian editors possessed an equivalent of square brackets and were not afraid to use it.

Broadly, the difference between emending and deleting is that the one corrects an accidental change in the text, the other a deliberate

change. Some changes made by scribes were deliberate, but their object was to restore what the author wrote, not to improve on it. That actors in antiquity often tried to improve on the text of the tragedians is shown by the notorious measure of Lycurgus ([Plut.] *Mor.* 841F), and only a devout believer in the purity of the copy sanctioned by Lycurgus can suppose that their efforts have left no mark on the tradition.

If the deletion of a line is being considered, therefore, the question to be asked is which is more likely, that the line was written by the poet or by an interpolator. It is a more difficult question than which is more likely, that a word was written by the poet or by a scribe. Scribes often wrote δέξεcθαι when they should have written δέξαcθαι, but they were not given to writing φεῦ when they should have written παραcκευαcθηcομένην. About the mental processes of interpolators, however, nothing useful is known beyond what can be inferred from their work. In comparison with what survives of Euripides, what survives of their work is very little, and there is no reason to think they all shared the same mental processes. It is futile, therefore, to demand that before a line is deleted some explanation should be forthcoming of why it was put in. Futility is not all: are doctors forbidden to treat a patient for pneumonia unless they know how he contracted it? Not but what the motives of some interpolators are perfectly clear; and if it turns out that interpolators often put lines in for the same reason, say to complete an elliptical construction, then something useful is known about them, and anyone who refuses to contemplate the possibility that less offensive lines elsewhere were interpolated for the same reason is turning a blind eye to part of the evidence.

Enough on the metaphysics of interpolation. It remains to say a word about Baumert's views on internal arguments. With one exception, his categories do not lend themselves to general comment, because it is not so much the value of certain arguments that he disputes as their applicability to particular passages: editors have been too intolerant of grammatical anomalies,[33] too strict in

---

[33] "Es ist letzten Endes eine Frage des Ermessens, bis zu welchem Grade syntaktische Schwierigkeiten zu billigen sind. Aber der Spielraum sollte nicht zu eng bemessen sein" (p.116). The second sentence, incidentally, is tautological and therefore completely unhelpful.

their logical requirements,[34] too quick to diagnose obscurity,[35] and so on.

The one exception concerns words that occur nowhere else or nowhere else in the same sense, a motley collection about which no comprehensive statement can be made; for along with κόρευμα (Alc. 178; ἅπαξ λεγόμενον) and βαδιστής (Med. 1182; ἅπαξ in classical Greek) come πόμπιμος (Med. 848; ἅπαξ in the sense 'hospitable') and πέπρακται (Med. 1064; ἅπαξ in the sense 'it is settled'). No ἅπαξ λεγόμενον is automatically suspect: in the messenger's speech in Orestes, for instance, there are at least five words beginning with alpha alone that appear nowhere else in Euripides (866 ἀγρόθεν, 874 ἄθροισμα, 903 ἀθυρόγλωccoc, 920 αὐτουργός, 922 ἀνεπίπληκτος), but it would not occur to anyone to suspect either the whole speech or the lines in which they appear. In trimeters suspicion falls on words of the following classes: (1) words common at the time but otherwise absent from poetry;[36] (2) words otherwise found only in epic or lyric;[37] (3) words common elsewhere in the poet in a different sense;[38] (4) words common in later Greek but otherwise absent from the language of the time; (5) words not found elsewhere in the poet but common in the other tragedians. None of the five words from the messenger's speech in Orestes belongs in any of these five classes; nor does κόρευμα or βαδιστής.

[34] "Mit einem Urteil, das ein Missverhältnis eines Verses oder einer Versgruppe zum Kontext feststellt, erhebt man einen schwerwiegenden Einwand gegen die Echtheit der Überlieferung . . . Auf die sich zwangsläufig ergebende Frage, wann wir von einer Verletzung der gedanklichen Gestaltung eines Abschnittes sprechen dürfen, kann freilich keine umfassende Antwort erteilt werden. Eine Entscheidung ist von Fall zu Fall zu treffen" (p.198); "Für uns ergibt sich die Aufgabe zu überprüfen, ob die Widersprüche an den verdächtigten Stellen immer richtig 'diagnostiziert' sind" (p.209).

[35] "Diese Stelle kann ein Beispiel für die Neigung einiger Kritiker sein, bei schwierigen Perikopen, denen man fehlende Klarheit und Mängel im Ornatus nachsagt, gar zu schnell zum Mittel der Athetese zu greifen" (p.136).

[36] E.g. οἰκία, read by A V B at Med. 1130 and introduced by Pearson at Trach. 911, and λόγιον at Hcld. 405 (cf. Wilamowitz, Hermes 17 [1882] 352 n.1=Kleine Schriften I p.97 n.1).

[37] E.g. OC 304 ἀίων (cf. GRBS 11 [1970] 293 n.21).

[38] E.g. Or. 806 ὅμαιμος, which elsewhere means 'brother' or 'sister' (674, Hipp. 339, IT 1361, Hel. 890—where in the words of Hermann "mirum si elidere vocalem, quam ὅμαιμον scribere maluisset Euripides," Phoen. 319, fr.515.5; the same applies to Sophocles). Together with the unemendable metrical anomaly in 804 (P. Maas, Greek Metre, transl. H. Lloyd-Jones [Oxford 1962] § 118), this suffices to condemn 804–06. 803, incidentally, is corrupt, because ἐπαρκεῖν elsewhere takes the dative, a point that did not escape Weil and Wecklein but failed to worry them; read perhaps εὑρών for ὄντα (εἴ γε . . . ὄντι would be closer, but γε is unjustifiable).

πέπρακται at *Med.* 1064, if the objection is correctly formulated,[39] belongs in class (3), and of course πράccειν is so common in Euripides and everywhere else that the objection is a very serious one. In short, misuse of a word, whether in sense or stylistically, is what matters.

From Baumert's treatment of individual passages there is very little to be learnt. Under both 'external evidence' and 'internal evidence' he defends a large number of interpolations commonly recognized,[40] and even if he had always seen the force in his opponents' arguments, his own too often defy probability and strain language. Two illustrations will suffice.

Andr. 5   ζηλωτὸc ἔν γε τῷ πρὶν Ἀνδρομάχη χρόνῳ,

                      νῦν δ', εἴ τιc ἄλλη, δυcτυχεcτάτη γυνή

                      [ἐμοῦ πέφυκεν ἢ γενήcεταί ποτε]

6 οὔτιc **V**. οἱ ὑποκριταὶ τὸν ἴαμβον προcέθηκαν ὑπονοήcαντεc εἶναι τὴν γραφὴν δὴ τίc *Σ* 7.

Baumert accepts οὔτιc from **V** and agrees with the scholiast's interpretation ἀντὶ τοῦ cυγκριτικοῦ τὸ δυcτυχεcτάτη. Why Euripides in this one place should have used the superlative for the comparative, and why δ' οὔτιc was ever corrupted to δ' εἴ τιc or δὴ τίc, he does not explain. There is no clearer case in Euripides of an interpolation designed to obviate an elliptical construction.[41]

Med. 1314   χαλᾶτε κλῇδαc ὡc τάχιcτα, πρόcπολοι,

                      ἐκλύεθ' ἁρμούc, ὡc ἴδω διπλοῦν κακόν,

                      τοὺc μὲν θανόνταc, τὴν δὲ τείcωμαι δίκην.

"Nach allgemeiner Auffassung wird das Objekt διπλοῦν κακόν des Finalsatzes durch zwei mit den Partikeln μέν und δέ abgesetzten Bestimmungen erläutert. Die Verbindung zweier Glieder, die trotz

---

[39] Another way of putting it is that the perfect is being made to do duty for the future. The whole of 1056–80 is interpolated, as G. Müller argued in *StItal* 25 (1951) 65–82; *cf.* now *CQ* 66 (1972) 51–61.

[40] E.g. *Hipp.* 1029, *Alc.* 795b–96a, 1094–95 (on which see Zwierlein, *op.cit.* [n.5] 205 n.10), *Med.* 87, 262, 785, *Phoen.* 912, *Hec.* 1087.

[41] But for Baumert's treatment of the passage, it would scarcely be necessary to add that the interpolator altered δυcτυχεcτάτη to δυcτυχεcτέρα, which must already have disappeared from the margin (or wherever Aristophanes put it) when the text came into the hands of the scholiast.

der Partikeln syntaktisch nicht parallel geordnet sind, noch sich inhaltlich unter den gemeinsamen Oberbegriff fügen, veranlasste einige Interpreten mit Recht zu Textänderungen. K. SCHENKL 1868[42] streicht den Vers Med. 1316 . . . Zweifelhaft jedoch ist der Ausgangs-punkt dieser Vorschläge . . ." (p.146); and he goes on to suggest that only the punctuation need be altered:

$$\text{ὡc ἴδω (διπλοῦν κακὸν)}$$
$$\text{τοὺc μὲν θανόντας, τὴν δὲ τείcωμαι δίκην.}$$

The words διπλοῦν κακόν constitute a "betont vorangestellte Appo-sition zu τοὺc μὲν θανόντας," the children being two in number, and "die Partikeln μέν und δέ, die an keine bestimmte Stelle des Verses gebunden sind, stellen dann völlig parallel die Objekte (τούc, τήν) der beiden Prädikate ἴδω und τείcωμαι gegenüber." In other words, the text is the nearest Euripides could get to ὡc τοὺc μὲν ἴδω θανόντας, διπλοῦν κακόν, τὴν δὲ τείcωμαι δίκην.

In most of the passages Baumert discusses, the pertinent arguments have already been used, and Baumert's reluctance to accept them is not reason enough for repeating them; but in two passages something can be added.

Med. 37   δέδοικα δ' αὐτὴν μή τι βουλεύcῃ νέον·
[βαρεῖα γὰρ φρήν, οὐδ' ἀνέξεται κακῶc
πάcχουc'· ἐγᾦδα τήνδε, δειμαίνω τέ νιν
μὴ θηκτὸν ὤcῃ φάcγανον δι' ἥπατος
cιγῇ δόμουc εἰcβᾶc', ἵν' ἔcτρωται λέχος,
ἢ καὶ τύραννον τόν τε γήμαντα κτάνῃ,
κἄπειτα μείζω cυμφορὰν λάβῃ τινά.]
δεινὴ γάρ· οὗτοι . . . .

No one seems to have noticed that δεινὴ γάρ in 44 very nicely picks up δέδοικα δ' αὐτήν in 37. Cf. Or. 102–03:

Ἐλ.   δέδοικα πατέρας τῶν ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ νεκρῶν.
Ἠλ.   δεινὸν γάρ,[43] Ἄργει τ' ἀναβοᾷ διὰ cτόμα.

---

[42] The article here referred to, ZöstG 19 (1868) 344–58, contains no mention of Med. 1316. Good luck to anyone who sets about tracing the conjecture to its true source.

[43] δεινοὶ γάρ?

Or. 1366   XO. ἀλλὰ κτυπεῖ γὰρ κλῇθρα βασιλείων δόμων,
            ϲιγήϲατ᾽· ἔξω γάρ τιϲ ἐκβαίνει Φρυγῶν,
            οὗ πευϲόμεϲθα τἀν δόμοιϲ ὅπωϲ ἔχει.

        ΦΡ. Ἀργεῖον ξίφοϲ ἐκ θανάτου πέφευγα
            βαρβάροιϲ ἐν εὐμάρι-
            ϲιν κεδρωτὰ παϲτάδων ὑπὲρ τέραμνα
            Δωρικάϲ τε τριγλύφουϲ,
            φροῦδα φροῦδα, γᾶ γᾶ,
            βαρβάροιϲι δραϲμοῖϲ.

τούτουϲ δὲ τοὺϲ τρεῖϲ ϲτίχουϲ οὐκ ἄν τιϲ ἐξ ἑτοίμου ϲυγχωρήϲειεν Εὐριπίδου
εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, οἵτινεϲ, ἵνα μὴ κακοπαθῶϲιν ἀπὸ τῶν βαϲι-
λείων δόμων καθαλλόμενοι, παρανοίξαντεϲ ἐκπορεύονται τὸ τοῦ Φρυγὸϲ ἔχοντεϲ
ϲχῆμα καὶ πρόϲωπον. ὅπωϲ οὖν διὰ τῆϲ θύραϲ εὐλόγωϲ ἐξιόντεϲ φαίνωνται, τού-
τουϲ προ(ϲ)ενέταξαν. ἐξ ὧν δὲ αὐτοὶ λέγουϲιν ἀντιμαρτυροῦϲι τῇ διὰ τῶν θυρῶν
ἐξόδῳ· φανερὸν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἑξῆϲ ὅτι ὑπερπεπήδηκεν. Σ 1366

A familiar problem. As the scholiast observes, 1369–74 seem to indi-
cate that the Phrygian has just jumped off the roof; but defenders of
1366–68 put some other interpretation on them, such as that he
jumped off a roof somewhere in the palace before emerging through
the door (Σ1371, Baumert pp.78–79).

   That is as far as the argument can go if it is confined to 1366–74.[44]
In fact the structure of the whole scene must be taken into account.

        CHO. 1353–65 strophe
                 1366–68 three trimeters
        PHR. 1369–1502 monody, punctuated by single trim-
                         eters from the chorus (1380, 1393,
                         1425, 1452, 1473)
        CHO. 1503–05 three trimeters
        OR./PHR. 1506–36 dialogue in tetrameters
        CHO. 1537–48 antistrophe

Now in the strophe the chorus assume, naturally enough (cf. 1296–
1310), that Helen is dead, and only at the end of his long monody does

---

[44] One small point, however: if Δωρικαὶ τρίγλυφοι were represented on the ϲκηνή, would
it not be confusing for a slave who emerged through the door to speak of having escaped
over them?

the Phrygian reveal that she has escaped (1494–98). No sooner has he revealed it, however, than he is agreeing with Orestes that her death was fully deserved (1512–13), and Orestes goes on to say that he will not stop at one corpse (1536). This and other difficulties in 1503–36 led A. Grüninger[45] to delete 1506–36 and substitute 1503–05 for 1549–53 (with ’Ατρείδην for ’Ορέϲτην in 1505). Grüninger's proposal has recently been revived, albeit tentatively, by B. Gredley, who shows that none of the solutions so far offered is satisfactory.[46] Amongst other things, Gredley observes that without 1503–36 the structure of the scene is much more orderly; what he fails to observe is that it is more orderly still, in fact perfectly symmetrical, without 1366–68.[47]

[45] *De Euripidis Oreste ab histrionibus retractata* (Basel 1898).

[46] *GRBS* 9 (1968) 409–19. He deletes 1503–05 and leaves 1549–53, except that he suspects 1550 (414 n.11). If 1506–36 go, the remaining tetrameters in the vicinity inevitably come under suspicion. Their use just to announce an entry seems rather pointless (on *Phoen.* [1308–09] see Fraenkel, *op.cit.* [n.8] 83 and n.2), and the shouted γνώμη in 1552–53 is strange technique; the γνώμη itself makes only superficial sense, and Grüninger remarks (p.23) that εὐτυχῶν ἀνήρ "male cadit in Menelaum, praesertim si dicitur a choro, qui modo calamitatem vel iam ruinas domus Atridarum cecinerat" (*cf.* Di Benedetto: "Riesce strano che il Coro qualifichi Menelao εὐτυχῶν in una situazione simile. Si avrebbe l'impressione che Euripide faccia ripetere poco opportunamente al Coro una formulazione dei rapporti tra Menelao e Oreste, che andava bene per una fase precedente della tragedia," followed by the suggestion, ingenious but impossibly demanding on the audience, that εὐτυχῶν is meant to pull the wool over Menelaus' eyes).

On tetrameters in tragedy see J. Kanz, *De tetrametro trochaico* (diss. Giessen, Darmstadt 1913) 23–39; W. Krieg, *Philologus* 91 (1936) 42–51; M. Imhof, *MusHelv* 13 (1956) 125–43; T. Drew-Bear, *AJP* 89 (1968) 385–405. Of 1549–53 Imhof says (p.137): "Die Tetrameter von 1506ff. wirken hier noch nach."

This is as good a place as any for drawing attention to another proposal of Grüninger's that has recently been revived and elaborated on, the deletion of 1618–20. In *Hermes* 97 (1969) 8–22, an article that would do credit to the most methodical of detectives, G. Seeck finds cause for suspecting not only 1618–20 but every other mention of setting the palace on fire (1593–96, 1149–52, 1541–44+1357–60). This reference was kindly supplied by Professor W. G. Arnott.

[47] The inconsistency between the dialogue and the surrounding context is so glaring that even the interpolator can hardly have overlooked it. Was the dialogue written not to follow the monody but to replace it, at a time when monodies were either out of fashion or beyond the capacity of the actors? Without the monody the Phrygian does not contradict himself, and the disappearance of Helen is not forgotten but merely delayed (1579–86).

In this hypothetical version the arrival of the Phrygian must have been announced, and it is tempting to wonder whether 1366–68 might have announced it. As Mr Barrett points out, however, they are not quite suitable: 1368 aptly introduces the monody, in which the chorus do learn what has been happening inside the palace, but not the dialogue, in which the Phrygian is so intent on saving his skin that his entry must have been too precipitate to be greeted so calmly by the chorus.

So much for *ENIOI AΘETOYΣIN*, a catalogue of deletorial obliqui-
ties. As it happens, two recent articles on tragedy have furnished
ample material for a dissertation in the manner of Baumert entitled
ANAΓKAIOI ΔE EIΣIN; and though the second part of this trilogy
will not pretend to be anything so grand as a dissertation, it may at
least succeed in showing that the boot fits either foot.

EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD
May, 1972