Myrtia, n° 15, 2000, pp. 51-67

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF EURIPIDES

HEATHER WHITE

Classics Research Centre, Londres*

Summary: The present work consists of several notes on the text of Euripides: *Suppl.* 24-8; 58-9; 60-2; 321-3; 584-7; 971-6; 1152-7; *El.* 1072-3; 1233-5; 1329-30; *HF* 117-8; *Tro.* 538-41; 542ff.; 694-5; 817-8; 1100-4; 1173-7; *IT* 186-8; 691-2; 1348-53; *Ion* 84-5;927-31; 936-8; 1410.

I

Supplices 24-28:

ός μ' ἐξοτρύνει παῖδ' ἑμὸν πεῖσαι λιταῖς νεκρῶν κομιστὴν ἢ λόγοισιν ἢ δορὸς ῥώμῃ γενέσθαι καὶ τάφου μεταίτιον, μόνον τόδ' ἔργον προστιθεὶς ἐμῷ τέκνῷ πόλει τ' ᾿ Αθηνῶν.

Translation by P. Vellacott (*Euripides*, Penguin edition, London, 1972, p. 193):

"He urges me to entreat my son to undertake – Whether by negotiation or by force of arms – The rescue of those bodies, and to bear his part In burying them. Upon my son alone he lays This task, and on the city of Athens."

Diggle¹ commented as follows on this passage (*op. cit.*, p. 1): "Adrastus (says Aethra) urges her to persuade her son to recover and bury the corpses".

^{*} Dirección para correspondencia: Heather White. 30C, Bethune Road, London N 16 5BD (England).

¹ Cf. J. Diggle, Studies on the Text of Euripides, Oxford 1981.

Diggle was puzzled by the word $\mu \dot{\rho} \nu \rho \nu$, in line 27. I would like to point out that Paley has defended the mss. reading $\mu \dot{\rho} \nu \rho \nu \tau \dot{\rho} \dot{\delta}^{2}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \rho \nu$ in a persuasive manner. He commented as follows: "this duty and nothing beyond it, i.e. to demand leave to bury the dead, but not to interfere further in the political relations between Argos and Thebes". The conjecture $\mu \dot{\rho} \nu \phi$, which was suggested by Reiske and others, also gives good sense: Aethra wishes to stress that Theseus is her "only" son. However, this conjecture is not necessary because it is possible that the poet has made use of adjectival *enallage*, referring $\mu \dot{\rho} \nu \rho \nu$ rather than to $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \phi$. I need hardly add that adjectival *enallage* is very common in Euripides: *cf. MPhL* vol. 10, p. 47.

Supplices 58-59:

```
μέτα νυν δὸς ἑμοὶ σᾶς διανοίας,
μετάδος δ', ὅσσον ἐπαλγῶ μελέα τῶν φθιμένων οὑς
ἕτεκον<sup>.</sup>
58
ὅσον] ὅσσον Tr², οἶον Stinton
```

Paley² translated as follows:

"Share then with me the sentiments you feel towards your own son, and share them, in proportion as I an unhappy mother grieve for the slain whom I bore".

In his discussion of these lines, Diggle (*op. cit.*, p. 2) noted that "Stinton's arguments (*JHS* 97, 1977, p. 145) are not quite strong enough to show that his conjecture is preferable to that of Triclinius". The reader will note that, according to Diggle, the reading $\delta\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu$ is a conjecture made by Triclinius. There is, however, no reason why we should assume that $\delta\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu$ is a conjecture. It is more likely that we are faced here with an example of the correct reading having been preserved for us by *Tr*. For other cases where Triclinius has preserved the correct reading, *cf. CL* 3, pp. 11 and 13.

From van Looy's edition of Euripides' *Medea* (*cf.* e.g. his apparatus on lines 1087, 1103) it appears that certain variants accepted by Triclinius are already attested in papyri.

² Cf. F.A. Paley, Euripides, London, 1857, vol. 1.

Supplices 60-62:

παράπεισον δὲ σὸν, ὃν λισσόμεθ', ἑλθεῖν τέκνον 'Ισμηνὸν, ἑμάν τ' ἐς χέρα θεῖναι νεκύων θαλερῶν σώματα †λάϊνον τάφον.

Translation by P. Vellacott (*Euripides*, Penguin edition, London, 1972, p. 194):

"Persuade your son, we entreat you, To march to Ismenus, and bring Those lost, unburied bodies Home to our arms, the dead to the living".

Diggle (op. cit., p. 3) placed the words $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \ddot{\nu} \nu \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \nu$, in line 62, between cruces. The transmitted text is, however, capable of being explained. The chorus ask Aethra to persuade Theseus to bring the bodies of their sons to them "for a stony burial". For similar uses of the accusative in Euripides, cf. Kühner-Gerth, vol. I, p. 284. Cf. also Iliad 24, 735, where the words $\lambda \nu \gamma \rho \dot{\nu} \nu \dot{\delta} \lambda \epsilon \theta \rho \nu$ constitute another appositional accusative. The accusative $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \ddot{\nu} \nu \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \nu denotes here "eine Absicht" (cf. Kühner-Gerth, loc. cit.) and means "for the purpose of creating a stony burial".$

In conclusion, the text is perfectly sound: what Diggle obelizes is, of all things, a stylistic feature typical of Euripides (Kühner-Gerth, *loc. cit.*: "häufig bei Euripides"). Euripides has cleverly utilized, in an elegant *Neuwendung*, the phrase $\lambda \dot{\alpha} i \nu o \zeta \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi o \zeta$ which occurs in Soph., *Oed. Col.* 1596, where it means "a stone tomb". Here, in Euripides' line, the accusative $\lambda \dot{\alpha} i \nu o \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi o \nu$ is employed in the syntactical function described in Kühner-Gerth, *loc. cit.*, and means "so as to achieve a stony burial": the word $\tau \dot{\alpha} \phi o \nu$ is, accordingly, an abstract ("burial", not "tomb"), and the adjective $\lambda \dot{\alpha} i \nu o \nu$ means "stony", in the sense that the burial will be effected in a stone tomb. For such metaphors, *cf.* e.g. $\lambda i \theta i \nu o \zeta \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau o \zeta$, Pind., *Pyth.* 10, 48.

Euripides, as is well known, likes *Selbstvariation*: accordingly, elsewhere he uses the adjective $\lambda \dot{\alpha} i \nu o \zeta$ in its literal meaning "made of stone" (e.g. *El.* 328, *Troad.* 5), whereas here he has employed it in its metaphorical sense "stony": *cf. Habis* 30, 1999, p. 77 f., where G. Giangrande has shown that $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \delta o \nu$, which

elsewhere in Euripides means "soil", "territory", has been used by the poet in its metaphorical sense "home", "abode", at *Med.* 1359.

Supplices 321-323:

όρας, άβουλος ώς κεκερτομημένη τοῖς κερτομοῦσι γοργὸν ὡς ἀναβλέπει σἡ πατρίς; ἐν γὰρ τοῖς πόνοισιν αὕξεται.

Diggle (op. cit., p. 12) placed the words $\gamma \circ \rho \gamma \circ \nu \omega \varsigma$ between cruces and suggested that we should accept the alteration $\gamma \circ \rho \gamma \circ \nu \omega \mu'$. It is, however, possible to retain the transmitted text. As Paley has already explained in his note ad loc., this passage makes perfect sense and should be translated as follows:

"Do you see, how your country, when reproached as wanting in deliberation, looks sternly at those who assail her? (And she does this,) for she grows great in the midst of toils".

Supplices 584-587:

όρμασθαι χρεών πάντ' άνδρ' όπλίτην άρμάτων τ' ἑπεμβάτην, μοναμπύκων τε φάλαρα κινεῖσθαι στόμα άφρῷ καταστάζοντα Καδμείαν χθόνα.

Diggle translated these lines as follows (op. cit., p. 15 f.):

"Forward must go every hoplite and charioteer, and the singlehorses' cheek-pieces, making the mouth drip with foam ('dripping at the mouth with foam' Collard), must be set in motion to the Cadmean land".

Diggle was puzzled by the text of lines 586-7. He noted that $\sigma\tau \delta\mu\alpha$, in line 586, is particularly difficult to explain. I would like to point out that the transmitted text is sound.

As is clear from Diggle's translation, the verb $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \zeta \circ \nu \tau \alpha$ has been used in a causative³ sense and thus means "causing the mouth to drip with foam".

Supplices 971-976:

ύπολελειμμένα μοι δάκρυα: μέλεα παιδὸς ἐν οἶκοις κεῖται μνήματα, πένθιμοι κουραὶ καὶ στέφανοι κόμας, λοιβαί τε νεκύων φθιμένων, ἀοιδαί θ' ὡς χρυσοκόμας ᾿Απόλλων οὐκ ἐνδέχεται·

Translation by Vellacott (Euripides, Penguin edition, p. 224):

"All that is left to me is tears. At home there are pitiful reminders of my son, Locks cut for mourning, garlands for the head, Offerings of wine for lifeless souls, Songs that golden Apollo will not accept".

In his discussion of this passage, Diggle argued (op. cit., p. 24) that we should accept Markland's alteration κἀστέφανοι κόμαι for καὶ στέφανοι κόμας in line 974. He noted that "Mourners do not wear garlands". Collard, on the other hand, thought that there is "a reference to the practice of decorating the corpse's head with a garland". He added, however, that "in Argos there would be only ashes, not corpses to be garlanded". I would like to suggest a different solution. It is well known that "coronati bibebant veteres" (Euripidis Opera Omnia, ed. A. et J.M. Duncan, vol. IX, p. 689, with material), i.e. that the ancients wore garlands not only when they were banqueting, but also when they drank on the occasion of libations being poured: here, evidently, the garlands mentioned in line 974 are those which had been worn on the occasion of the $\lambda olβα'$ mentioned in line 975.

The remains of the dead were "mit Wein begossen, dann begraben" (Beckby, Anthol. Gr., IV, p. 603). The multifarious uses of garlands in funerary

³ For other examples of the employment of verbs in a causative sense, *cf.* H. White, *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander*, Amsterdam, 1987, p. 34.

connections (*cf.* Beckby, *op. cit.*, *s.v.* Kranz) are most usefully analyzed, with the relevant bibliography (notably Deubner, Klein, and Köchly) by M. Blech⁴.

Supplices 1152-1157:

ΠΑ. ἕτ' εἰσορῶν σε, πάτερ, ἐπ' ὀμμάτων δοκῶ.	ΠА.	ěτ	είσοραν	σε,	πάτερ,	'nз	ομμάτων	δοκῶ	
--	-----	----	---------	-----	--------	-----	---------	------	--

- ΧΟ. φίλον φίλημα παρά γένυν τιθέντα σόν.
- ΠΑ. όγων δὲ παρακέλευσμα σῶν ἀέρι φερόμενον οἴχεται.
- XO. δυοίν δ' ἄχη, ματέρι τ' ἕλιπε, σέ τ' οὐποτ' ἄλγη πατρῷα λείψει.

Diggle translated these lines as follows (op. cit., p. 30):

(Sons)	'I seem still to see you, father, before my eyes'
(Chorus)	'placing your loving kiss on the cheek'.
(Sons)	'And the encouragement of your speech is carried away on the
	breeze'.
(Chorus)	'And for two of us he has left lamentation, for me his mother –
	and grief for a father will never leave you'.

Diggle stated that $\phi i \lambda o \nu \phi i \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ "is a feeble tautology" and suggested that we should print $\phi i \lambda \alpha \nu ... \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \upsilon \nu ... \sigma \dot{\alpha} \nu$. It should be pointed out, however, that the words $\phi i \lambda o \nu \phi i \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ constitute an example of the repetition of the same *Wortstamm: cf. MPhL* 9, p. 54 γοεροίο γόοια *Cf.* Duncan, *op. cit., s.v. Repetitio* and *Repetitiones*; Lehrs, *De Arist. Stud. Homer.*, p. 475; Campbell, *Sophocles*, vol. I, p. 82-84. The repetition $\phi i \lambda o \nu \phi i \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ is not only, in itself, at home in the tragic genre: it is, in the specific instance, the opposite of "feeble", as Diggle asserts. Euripides, as everybody knows, is fond of *enallage adjectivi (cf.* lastly G. Giangrande, *Habis* 30, 1999, p. 428 f.): here, he wants, by *enallage*, to underline that the kissing was done by a loving mouth (*cf. Medea* 1399)⁵.

⁴ Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen, Berlin, 1982, RGVV 38.

⁵ Cf. moreover, W. Breitenbach, Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik, Hildesheim, 1967 (repr.), p. 230.

γυνὴ δ' ἀπόντος ἀνδρὸς ἥτις ἐκ δόμων ἐς κάλλος ἀσκεῖ, διάγραφ' ὡς οὖσαν κακήν.

Π

Diggle (op. cit., p. 40) translated as follows:

"A woman who, when her husband is away from home, adorns (herself) with a view to beauty, write her off as wicked".

This passage puzzled Diggle who argued that "perhaps a line has been lost after 1072 in which $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}$ was given its object". There is, however, no need to alter the transmitted text. As is obvious from Diggle's translation, the reflexive pronoun has to be understood from the context in line 1073. For the omission of the personal pronoun, *cf.* my note on *Iphigenia in Tauris* lines 186 ff. *Cf.* also LSJ *s.v.* $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\hat{\epsilon}\omega$ (2): $\dot{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\varsigma\varsigma$ $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}$, *E., El.* 1073. For the ellipse of the reflexive pronoun, *cf.* Gow on Theocritus, *Idyll* 15, line 78.*Cf.* especially J. Fritsch, *Der Sprachgebrauch des...Heliodor*, Prgr. Kaaden, 1901-02, Teil I, pp. 27 f.

Electra 1233-1235:

XO. ἀλλ' οίδε δόμων ὑπὲρ ἀκροτάτων φαίνουσι τινὲς δαίμονες, ἡ θεῶν τῶν οὑρανίων.

These lines refer to the Dioscuri. Diggle noted (*op. cit.*, p. 41) that in line 1234 Hartung proposed the alteration $\beta\alpha$ ivouot. This alteration is nevertheless unwarranted. Hartung failed to understand that the verb $\phi\alpha$ ivouot alludes to St. Elmo's Fire. For the connection of the Dioscuri with St. Elmo's Fire, *cf.* Gow's note on Theocritus, *Idyll* 22, line 19 and *Homeric Hymn* 33, line 12. *Cf.* also Horace, *Odes* I 12, 27.

Electra 1329-1330:

ἕνι γὰρ κἀμοὶ τοῖς τ' οὐρανίδαις οἶκτοι θνητῶν πολυμόχθων.

Translation by Vellacott (*Euripides*, Penguin edition, London, 1968, reprint, p. 150):

"For I too, and the greater gods of heaven, Feel pity for the suffering of mankind".

Diggle argued (op. cit., p. 46) that "oἶκτoι should be changed to oἶκτoς". He compared *El.* 294-5 and Or. 702 where ἕνεστι δ' oἶκτoς is found. Textual alteration is nevertheless not warranted. We are faced here with an example of *Selbstvariation: cf. Minerva* 1992, p. 97 and G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, vol. 4, Select Index s.v. It should moreover be noted that oἶκτoι is a poetic plural: cf. MPhL 10, p. 49. Selbstvariation is, of course, common in Euripides. Cf. G. Schiassi, *Euripide. Le Troiane*, Milano, 1973, p. 112, underlining "il solito plurale poetico". I need hardly add that Euripides uses indifferently the singular oἶκτoς and the plural oἶκτoι. To accomodate the plural oἶκτoι here in line 1330, he has used ἕνι instead of ἕνεστι, which latter he uses in the two passages quoted by Diggle.

III

Heracles 117-118:

ώ τέκεα πατρὸς ἀπάτορ', ὡ γεραιε, σύ τε, τάλαινα μᾶτερ, ἂ τὸν ᾿Αΐδα δόμοις πόσιν ἀναστενάζεις.

According to Diggle (op. cit., p. 47) "the expression τον 'Αΐδα δόμοις πόσιν for 'the husband in Hades' is incredible". Consequently he argued that "Hermann's τον <εν> 'Αίδα δόμοις is inescapable". Diggle's argument is not convincing. We are faced here with a locatival dative: cf. Ba. 68-9 τίς όδῶ; τίς μελάθροις;⁶.

⁶ Cf. H. White, Further Studies in Greek Poetry, Athens, 1992, p. 51. For the hyperbaton of the article, cf. H. Boldt, De Liberiore Linguae Graecae et Latinae Collocatione Verborum, Diss. Göttingen, 1884, p. 11 ff.

Troades 538-541:

κλωστοῦ δ' ἀμφιβόλοις λίνοισι, ναὸς ώσεὶ σκάφος κελαινὸν εἰς ἕδρανα λάϊνα δάπεδά τε φόνια πατρίδι Παλλάδος θέσαν θεᾶς.

These lines describe the wooden horse. Translation by Vellacott (*Euripides*, Penguin edition, p. 100):

"Hauling on cables of flaxen twine Like a ship's dark hulk they drew it along And up the hill to the Temple rising white; And there, on the holy floor where the slaughter of Troy began, Gave their gift to the god they knew".

Diggle noted (op. cit., p. 63) that the critics have explained the words $\phi \delta \nu \iota \alpha$ $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \iota \delta \iota$ as referring to the coming destruction. The floors of the temple are soon to run with blood. Diggle was, however, not satisfied with this explanation and suggested that we should alter $\phi \delta \nu \iota \alpha$ into $\phi \circ \nu \epsilon \alpha$. Textual alteration is not warranted. Diggle has failed to note that Greek poets often allude to future events⁷.

Troades 542 ff.:

έν δὲ πόνω καὶ χαρậ νύχιον ἐπὶ κνέφας παρῆν, Λίβυς τε λωτὸς ἐκτύπει Φρύγιά τε μέλεα, παρθένοι δ' ἀέριον ἀνὰ κρότον ποδῶν βοάν τ' ἔμελπον εὕφρον'·

Translation by Vellacott (Euripides, Penguin edition, p. 100):

"Over their happy weariness fell the shadow of night. Then Libyan flutes rang out,

⁷ Cf. H. White, New Studies in Greek Poetry, Amsterdam, 1989, p. 62.

And the old tunes were played, And our hearts were joined in singing And in music of dancing feet".

Diggle (op. cit., p. 64) noted that the old editors translated line 546 f. as 'per plausum aereum pedum laetam cantionem canebant'. However, Diggle was troubled by the meaning of both $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$ and τ '. Consequently he suggested that "we change $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon\rho\nu\nu$ to $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon\rho\nu\nu$ and $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$ to $\ddot{\alpha}\mu\alpha$ ". Once again, though, textual alteration is not necessary. The preposition $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$ means here "during" (cf. LSJ s.v. $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$ C, II; "of Time, throughout", quoting Hdt. 8, 123 $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$ $\tau\dot{\nu}\nu$ $\pi\dot{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\nu\nu$): "fra le danze", Taccone, ad loc. The particle τ ' is either $\tau\epsilon$ or $\tau\dot{\alpha}i$ elided, with "asseverative force", and is used here by Euripides as one of his many epicisms: cf. Ruijgh, as quoted by me in Essays in Hellenistic Poetry, Amsterdam, 1980, p. 19. In the light of Ruijgh's research, the belief that "diphthongus in τot elidi non potest" (Euripidis Opera Omnia, cura A. et J.M. Duncan, vol. IX, London, 1821, p. 667) is no longer tenable.

Troades 694-695:

ούτω δὲ κἀγὼ, πόλλ' ἔχουσα πήματα, ἄφθογγός εἰμι καὶ παρεῖσ' ἐῶ στόμα.

Diggle (op. cit., p. 66) was puzzled by the words $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\omega}$ ortóµ α and suggested that we should alter $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\omega}$ into $\hat{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ (literally, "I hold my mouth"). The alteration is nevertheless not necessary.

We are faced here with an example of *metonymy*. Thus στόμα is used here instead of λόγος: *cf.* LSJ *s.v.* στόμα (2): "*speech, utterance*". Consequently the words εῶ στόμα mean "I let alone speech". On στόμα "*sermo*" in Euripides, *cf.* Duncan, *op. cit.*, IX, p. 662.

Troades 817-818:

δὶς δὲ δυοῖν πιτύλοιν τείχη περὶ Δαρδανίας φονία κατέλυσεν αἰχμά.

Translation by P. Vellacott (*Euripides*, Penguin edition, London, 1970, repr., p. 109):

61

"So twice the reeking sword has pierced the heart of Troy, Twice her towers have crashed in thunder".

In his discussion of this passage, Diggle (*op. cit.*, p. 68) suggested that we should "change the accent on $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{i}$ and add a letter to $\Delta\alpha\rho\delta\alpha\nu\dot{i}\alpha\zeta$ " and print these lines as follows:

δὶς δὲ δυοῖν πιτύλοιν τείχη πέρι Δαρδανί<δ>ας φονία κατέλυσεν αἰχμά.

There is, however, no need to alter the transmitted text since it makes perfect sense. The poet is obviously alluding to the destruction of the city of Troy. The spear is said to have destroyed "the walls round Troy". For this use of περί with the genitive *cf.* LSJ *s.v.* A. 1. Moreover, the verb καταλύω is used elsewhere to describe the destruction of a city. *Cf.* LSJ *s.v.* καταλύω: "*put down, destroy* πολλάων πολίων κατέλυσε κάρηνα *Il.* 2. 117, 9. 24; τείχη, πτόλιν, E., *Tr.* 819, 1080". *Cf.* moreover, Paley's note *ad loc.*, where it is pointed out that the participle ψκοδομημένα must be understood⁸.

Troades 1100-1104:

εἴθ' ἀκάτου Μενέλα μέσον πέλαγος ἰούσας, δίπαλτον ἱερὸν ἀνὰ μέσον πλατῶν πέσοι Αἰγαίου κεραυνοφαὲς πῦρ,

Diggle (op. cit., p. 71) printed the following translation of this passage:

"As the ship of Menelaus sails in mid-ocean, may there fall between its banks of oars the holy fire of the lightning flash hurled by the two hands of Zeus".

He then commented as follows: "This translation ignores Aiγaiou, which the order of words forbids to be constructed with $\pi i \lambda \alpha \gamma \circ \zeta$ and which a good many commentators forlornly construct with $\pi i \rho$ ('Aiγaiou $\pi i \rho =$ "lightning such as commonly occurs over the Aegean" ' Lee)". Diggle then lists the various

⁸ For such "partiziplose Konstruktionen", cf. H. White, Essays in Hellenistic Poetry, Amsterdam, 1980, p. 60.

alterations which have been proposed for Ai $\gamma\alpha$ iou I would like to point out that textual alteration is not necessary, since the transmitted text makes perfect sense. The poet is referring to the literary *topos* of shipwreck in the Aegean sea. *Cf.* Horace, *Odes* 3, 29, 62 ff.:

tum me biremis praesidio scaphae tutum per Aegaeos tumultus aura feret geminusque Pollux.

Translation by C.E. Bennett (*Horace*, Loeb edition, London, 1964, repr., p. 277):

"Then the breezes and Pollux with his brother shall bear me through the tempests of the Aegean main, safely protected in my two-oared skiff".

This fact has already been seen by Paley, who commented as follows: "we must ... suppose an ellipse of $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\gamma\circ\nu\varsigma$, and understand 'the lightning of the Aegean', viz. such as commonly occurs there".

Troades 1173-1177:

δύστηνε, κρατὸς ὥς σ' ἔκειρεν ἀθλίως τείχη πατρῷα, Λοξίου πυργώματα, ὃν πόλλ' ἐκήπευσ' ἡ τεκοῦσα βόστρυχον φιλήμασιν τ' ἔδωκεν, ἔνθεν ἐκγελῷ ὀστέων խαγέντων φόνος, ἵν' αἰσχρὰ μὴ λέγω.

Translation by P. Vellacott (*Euripides*, Penguin edition, London, 1970, repr., p. 119):

"Poor little head, your curls were a garden where your mother loved to plant her kisses – how roughly they were parted by your own city's bastions, built by the God of Foreknowledge! Now through the shattered skull the blood gleams, mocking. ... No more words, or I shall offend".

In this passage Hecuba laments for her dead child. Diggle noted (*op. cit.*, p. 73) that, according to Athenaeus (66A), Euripides wished to avoid "the visually repulsive" in this passage. Diggle argued, however, that Athenaeus was wrong.

Consequently he suggested that we should write $i\nu' \alpha i \sigma \chi p \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \omega$ in line 1177. This alteration is not warranted. It should be noted that Hecuba's description of her child's smashed skull is very brief. In other words, the poet avoids speaking at length about unpleasant matters. Athenaeus therefore says that he avoided "the visually repulsive". *Cf.* again Paley *ad loc.*, who explains Hecuba's words accurately.

V

Iphigenia in Tauris 186-188:

οίμοι, τών 'Ατρειδάν οίκων έρρει φώς σκήπτρων, οίμοι, πατρώων οίκων.

Whilst discussing this passage, Diggle noted (*op. cit.*, p. 78) that Platnauer translated line 187 f. as "The sceptre-brilliance of (your) ancestral home". According to Diggle, "the addition of πατρώων οι κων" makes this expression "unbearable". It should be pointed out, however, that the use of two genitives one after the other is an orthodox Greek construction⁹. In other words, as Platnauer has correctly understood, in lines 187-8 the genitive σκήπτρων governs the genitive οι κων, the sense being "the light of the sceptre of your ancestral house" (here, οι κων means "royal family"; *cf.* Duncan, *op. cit.* IX, p. 642, on οι κος "*familia*"; *cf.* also Paley, *ad loc.*, "the woes of the house of Agamemnon").

Iphigenia in Tauris 691-692:

τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰς ἔμ' οὐ κακῶς ἔχει, πράσσονθ' ἂ πράσσω πρὸς θεῶν, λύειν βίον[.]

λήσειν L : λήγειν L s.l. :λύσειν P : λιπείν Badham, λύσαι

Schenkl

Diggle argued (op. cit., p. 84) that we should accept Schenkl's alteration $\lambda \hat{\upsilon} \sigma \alpha i$ $\beta \hat{\upsilon} \nu$. It should be noted, however, that good sense is provided by the reading $\lambda \hat{\eta} \gamma \epsilon i \nu \beta \hat{\iota} \nu$: cf. Maas, Textual Criticism, 1958, p. 27, who pointed out

⁹ Cf. CL 2, p. 170 and my New Studies in Greek Poetry, op. cit., p. 30. For the omission of the personal pronoun, cf. my New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry, Amsterdam, 1985, p. 83.

that "λήγειν transitive recurs at *Ion* 1404". For the transitive use of λήγω *cf.* also LSJ *s.v.* I: "stay, abate". It is difficult to disregard Maas' observation (*loc. cit.*) to the effect that "λήγειν deserves preference as the *lectio difficilior*".

Iphigenia in Tauris 1348-1353:

ἐκ δεσμῶν δὲ τοὺς νεανίας ἑλευθέρους πρύμνηθεν ἑστῶτας νεώς. κοντοῖς δὲ πρῷραν εἶχον, οἱ δ' ἐπωτίδων ἄγκυραν ἐξανῆπτον, οἱ δὲ κλίμακας σπεύδοντες ἦγον διὰ χερῶν πρυμνήσια, πόντῷ δὲ δόντες τοῖν ξένοιν καθίεσαν.

Diggle translated these lines as follows (op. cit., p. 92):

"And (we saw) the young men free from their bonds standing on the stern of the ship. (Some of the sailors) were holding the prow with poles, others were fastening the anchor to the catheads, others were carrying stern-cables in their hands while hurrying ladders ($\kappa \lambda i \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \varsigma \sigma \pi \epsilon i \delta \circ \tau \epsilon \varsigma$), and after putting them into the sea were letting them down for the foreign girl".

Diggle was puzzled by the meaning of lines 1351 ff. He argued that the aorist participle $\delta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ is out of place in this passage. There is, however, no need for us to alter the transmitted text. The aorist participle has been used here without any sense of anteriority¹⁰. Lines 1351-4 should therefore be translated thus:

"others were carrying stern-cables in their hands while procuring ladders, and placing them (i.e. the ladders) into the sea they let them down for the foreign girl".

VI

Ion 84-85:

ήλιος ήδη λάμπει κατὰ γήν, ἄστρα δὲ φεύγει πῦρ τόδ' ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἑς νύχθ' ἱεράν

¹⁰ Cf. H. White, Studies in Late Greek Epic Poetry, Amsterdam, 1987, p. 32.

Diggle translated these lines as follows (op. cit., p. 94):

"The stars are put to flight into the holy night by this fire of aether".

I would like to suggest that the verb $\phi \epsilon \dot{\nu} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ has been used here in a factitive sense. The subject of $\phi \epsilon \dot{\nu} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ is the sun, which is a fire ($\pi \hat{\nu} \rho \tau \delta \delta$) and which is said to cause the stars to flee into the holy night.

For another case of the employment of a verb of motion in a factitive sense in Euripides, *cf. MPhL* 10, p. 48. *Cf.* also my note on *Supplices* 584 ff. (above).

Ion 927-931:

κακῶν γὰρ ἄρτι κῦμ' ὑπεξαντλῶν φρενὶ, πρύμνηθεν αἴρει μ' ἄλλο σῶν λόγων ὕπο, οὓς ἐκβαλοῦσα τῶν παρεστώτων κακῶν μετῆλθες ἄλλων πημάτων κακὰς ὁδούς.

Diggle noted (op. cit., p. 107) that Paley translated lines 927-8 as follows:

"I was just now getting rid of a wave of troubles in my mind, and now another wave at the stern (i.e. which was yet behind) heaves me up in consequence of your words".

Diggle then added that he was puzzled by lines 929-930 which he stated have "not yet received an acceptable explanation". It should be pointed out, however, that the sense of lines 929-930 has already been well explained by the critics, who understood that we are faced here with a genitive of separation. Hence these lines should be translated as follows:

"having poured out (these words) you have come from your present troubles to a wretched path of other woes".

For the genitive of separation, cf. Gow's note on Theocritus' *Idyll* 24, line 129. Cf. also Odyssey 20, 53 κακών δ' ὑποδύσεαι ("escape from misfortune")¹¹.

¹¹ Cf. moreover my Studies in Late Greek Epic Poetry, op. cit., p. 60 and Gow, Theocritus, vol. 2, p. 435.

Ion 936-938:

```
    ΚΡ. ἄκουε τοίνυν· οἶσθα Κεκροπίας πέτρας
    πρόσβορρον ἄντρον, ἁς Μακρὰς κικλήσκομεν;
    ΠΑ. οἶδ', ἔνθα Πανὸς ἄδυτα καὶ βωμοὶ πέλας.
```

Diggle noted (*op. cit.*, p. 109) that line 937 has been deleted by various scholars. He then added that the main objections to 937 are "(i) that the cave was not called 'the Long Rocks'; (ii) that $\hat{\alpha}_{\zeta}$ has no antecedent". He then suggested that we should accept the alteration Kekponiwv metpŵv and translate as follows: "Do you know the northern cave belonging to the Cecropian rocks, which we call the Makpaí?".

I would like to point out that textual alteration is not necessary. The critics have failed to understand that the noun $\pi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \varsigma$, in line 936, means "cave": cf. LSJ s.v. $\pi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha$ (2), quoting *Iliad* 2, 88 and Sophocles, *Ph.* 16. Thus we should translate as follows: "Do you know the Cecropian cave, a north-facing cave, which we call the Maxpai?".

For the Cecropian cave, cf. line 1400. It will be noted that $\pi \acute{\epsilon}\tau \rho \alpha \varsigma$ is a poetic plural: cf. MPhL 10, p. 49. The antecedent of $\mathring{\alpha}\varsigma$ is Kekponias $\pi \acute{\epsilon}\tau \rho \alpha \varsigma$. We are thus faced here with an example of the employment of synonyms: cf. MPhL 4, p. 200, note 2 and my Studies in Late Greek..., op. cit., p. 64.

Ion 1410:

ΙΩ. παῦσαι πλέκουσα. λήψομαί σ' ἐγὼ καλῶς.

Diggle translated as follows (op. cit., p. 115):

"Stop weaving: I shall catch you nicely".

He was, however, troubled by the "oddities" presented in this line and suggested printing it thus: $\pi\alpha\hat{\upsilon}\alpha\alpha$ $\pi\lambda\hat{\varepsilon}\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ - $\lambda\hat{\eta}\sigma\omega\alpha$ σ $\hat{\varepsilon}\gamma\omega$ - $\pi\lambda\sigma\kappa\dot{\alpha}\varsigma$.

Textual alteration is nevertheless not warranted. As previous critics have understood (*cf.* especially Paley, *ad loc.*), the adverb καλώς means here "effectually", "successfully", and the verb πλέκουσα is used absolutely, in the sense "plot". In line 826, Euripides uses πλέκω with the internal accusative (κάπλεκεν πλοκάς κτλ.): here, for the sake of *variatio*, he has omitted the internal accusative (*cf.* Kühner-Gerth II, p. 558, § 596, 4). The absolute construction of $\pi\lambda$ é $\kappa\omega$ ("plot") also occurs in late prose, *cf.* Lampe, *Patr. Lex.*, *s.v.*, 3.

Conclusion. The reader will have noticed that not even one of the conjectures proposed by Diggle is justified. My paper fully confirms what Prof. H. van Looy has recently written (AC 1986, p. 417 f.) about "certaines tendances qui se manifestent de façon plutôt inquiétante dans certaines éditions critiques". Cf. especially G. Giangrande, $\Pi\lambda \acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ 50, 1998, p. 262.