8

Notes on the *Electra* of Euripides[1]

JAMES DIGGLE

409   (Ἠλ.) ἔλθ' ὡς παλαιὸν τροφὸν ἐμὸν φίλου πατρός.

"Go to my aged tutor of a dear father." This lopsided sentence admits of two easy corrections, between which editors have found that the choice is not easy. In Victorius' τροφὸν ἐμοῦ φίλου πατρός either ἐμοῦ or φίλου is otiose. *HF* 1281–1282 οὔτ' ἐμαῖс φίλαις/ Θήβαις ἐνοικεῖν ὅсιον lends no support, for in Heracles' complaint that "it is not lawful for me to live in my beloved Thebes" each epithet adds its separate stab of pain; nor is any more support afforded by the words imputed to the dying Agamemnon at 1151–1152 below, φονεύсεις φίλαν/ πατρίδα ... ἐλθόντ' ἐμάν;. In Camper's τροφὸν ἐμοῦ φίλον πατρός the word-order (noun A, adj. B, adj. A, noun B) is not unexampled: 489 πρόсβαсιν τῶνδ' (τῆνδ' Musgrave, perhaps rightly) ὀρθίαν οἴκων, *Hec.* 44 ἀδελφὴν τῶιδ' ἐμὴν ἐν ἤματι (v.l. τὴν ἐμὴν τῆιδ' ἡμέραι), *Tr.* 498–499 γάμον μιᾶς ἔνα/ γυναικός, *Hel.* 571 γυναικῶν ... εἰс δυοῖν ... πόсιс, S. *Ai.* 859 γῆс ἱερὸν οἰκείαс πέδον, *El.* 730 ναυαγίων Κριсαῖον ἱππικῶν πέδον, *OT* 52 ὄρνιθι ... τὴν τότ' αἰсίωι τύχην, 109 ἴχνοс παλαιᾶс δυστέκμαρτον αἰτίαс, *Tr.* 613 θυτῆρα καινῶι καινὸν ἐν πεπλώματι, and from lyrics *Tr.* 151–152 πλαγαῖс Φρυγίουс (Wilamowitz, -ίαιс codd.) εὐκόμποιс ... θεούς, *IT* 408 ῥοθίοιс εἰλατίναс δικρότοιсι κώπας (Reiske, ῥ- ἐλατίνοιс δ- κώπαιс L), S. *Ai.* 357 γένοс ναίαс ἀρωγὸν τέχναс, *Tr.* 994–995 ἱερῶν οἵαν οἵων ... χάριν. But while it would be going too far to say that in these passages the word-order was positively stylish, it would be fair to say that, in comparison with these, the style of τροφὸν ἐμοῦ φίλον πατρός, where "the interlaced hyperbaton ... throws a great deal of weight on two not very weighty adjectives" (Denniston), is positively graceless. The style of the phrase is not enhanced by the prior attachment to τροφὸν of the adjective παλαιόν.

There is a further complication: the Old Man was Agamemnon's τροφεύс, not his τροφός. When Amphitryon at *HF* 45 describes himself as

τροφὸν τέκνων οἰκουρόν, it is unnecessary for Elmsley[2] to re-name him
τροφέα, because, as Wilamowitz says, "hier zeigt die Verbindung mit
οἰκουρόν, dass der Ausdruck mit Absicht gewählt ist, weil Amph. nicht
mehr ἐν ἀνδράcιν ist, denn auch das οἰκουρεῖν ist spezifisch Weibersache."
But in our passage Elmsley's τροφέα is indispensable; and it opens the way
for a further change which removes all difficulties: ἔλθ' ὡς παλαιὸν τροφέα
μοι φίλου πατρός, "do me the favour of going. . . ." The role of the dative
may be illustrated by *Su.* 36–37 οἴχεται δέ μοι/ κῆρυξ πρὸς ἄcτυ and S.
OC 1475–1476 ὡς τάχιcτά μοι μολὼν/ ἄνακτα χώρας τῆcδέ τιc πορευcάτω:
see also Kühner–Gerth i.423. A parallel, if one is needed, for the dative's
position between noun and dependent genitive is provided by A. *Ch.*
193–194 εἶναι τόδ' ἀγλάιcμά μοι τοῦ φιλτάτου/ βροτῶν 'Ορέcτου.

432–436   Χο. κλεινaὶ νᾶεc, αἴ ποτ' ἔβατε Τροίαν
                           τοῖc ἀμετρήτοιc ἐρετμοῖc
                           πέμπουcαι χοροὺc μετὰ Νηρήιδων,
       435   ἵν' ὁ φίλαυλοc ἔπαλλε δελ-
                           φίc . . .

"Famous ships, which went to Troy with oars beyond number, *escorting
the dances with the Nereids*, where the flute-loving dolphin gambolled. . . ."
If the words which I have translated "escorting the dances with the
Nereids" could mean, as Paley would have it, "escorting the Nereids in
their dances," then all would be well. But they cannot. He translates
πέμπουcαι χοροὺc Νηρήιδων and ignores μετὰ. This preposition indicates
that someone is dancing with the Nereids. "Probably Euripides thought
of ship, Nereids, and dolphins as all dancing in concert," says Denniston,
citing *Hel.* 1451–1455 Φοίνιccα Cιδωνιὰc ὦ ταχεῖα κώπα . . . χορaγὲ τῶν
καλλιχόρων δελφίνων and S. *OC* 716–719 ἁ δ' εὐήρετμοc . . . πλάτα θρώιcκει,
τῶν ἑκατομπόδων Νηρήιδων ἀκόλουθοc. Weil is more expansive: "Avec leurs
rames innombrables, qui sont comme autant de pieds, les vaisseaux
dansent sur les flots, et les flots, agités par le mouvement des rames,
bondissent autour des vaisseaux, semblent s'associer à leur danse. Tradui-
sez ces faites en langage poétique et mythologique, vous verrez les choeurs
des Néréides accompagner la danse des vaisseaux."

---

[1] I am indebted to Sir Denys Page for invaluable criticism. The following editions are
referred to: P. Victorius (Rome, 1545), A. Seidler (Leipzig, 1813), F. H. Bothe (Leipzig,
1826), P. Camper (Leiden, 1831), C. A. Walberg (Leipzig, 1869), F. A. Paley (London,
1874[2]), C. H. Keene (London, 1893), N. Wecklein (Leipzig, 1898), H. Weil (Paris,
1903[3]), N. Wecklein (Leipzig, 1906), G. Murray (Oxford, 1913[3]), L. Parmentier (ed.
Budé, Paris, 1925), J. D. Denniston (Oxford, 1939).

[2] *Qu. Rev.* 14 (1812), 447. He compares the corruption of τροφεύc to τροφόc in some
manuscripts at S. *Ph.* 344.

But even if we could countenance those dancing vessels of Weil, using their innumerable oars for feet, like a convoy of waltzing centipedes, how are we to reconcile the expression πέμπουσαι χορούς with the preposition μετά? It is no help to compare, as Keene and Denniston do, the phrase πομπὴν πέμπειν. Because this means "take part in a procession," it does not follow that πέμπειν χορούς means "take part in a dance." The words πέμπουσαι χορούς ought to mean not that the ships participate in the dance but that they accompany or escort the dancers on their way: like the pair of eagles which Ἀχαιῶν δίθρονον κράτος . . . πέμπει ξὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι . . . Τευκρίδ' ἐπ' αἶαν (A. Ag. 109–113), or like the sons of Hephaestus who escorted Apollo to Delphi (πέμπουσι A. Eum. 12), or like Nessus who ferried Deianeira across the Evenus (S. Tr. 570–571 ὀνήσῃ τῶν ἐμῶν . . . πορθμῶν, ὁθούνεχ' ὑστάτην σ' ἔπεμψ' ἐγώ).

In short we do not want the preposition μετά. Without it we have an expression (χορούς Νηρηΐδων) which is found at Andr. 1267 (sing. χορός), Tr. 2, IT 274 (χορός), 428. And so perhaps Euripides wrote not χορούς μετά but χορεύματα, a noun of which he is fond: 875, HF 891, Ion 1474, Ph. 655, Ba. 132, Erechtheus fr. 65.80 Austin; also A. P.Oxy 2245.I.iii.3, Pratinas, PMG 708.1 (= Snell, TGF i, p. 82), Ar. Av. 746.

479–486

	τοιῶνδ' ἄνακτα δοριπόνων
480/1	ἔκανεν ἀνδρῶν, Τυνδαρί,
481/2	σὰ λέχεα, κακόφρον κόρα.
	τοιγάρ σέ ποτ' οὐρανίδαι
	πέμψουσι †θανάτοισι· κἂν†
485	ἔτ' ἔτι φόνιον ὑπὸ δέρας
	ὄψομαι αἷμα χυθὲν σιδάρωι.

481 Τυνδαρί, σὰ λέχεα Seidler, τυνδαρὶς ἀλέχεα L   482 κακόφρον Radermacher, -φρων L   κόρα Dindorf, κούρα L   485 ἔτ' ἔτι Seidler, ἔτι ἔτι L   δέρας Wecklein, -αν L   486 ὄψομαι Erfurdt, ὄψομ' L

For the moment let us accept πέμψουσι⟨ν⟩ θανάτοισι(ι), which all editors print, and ignore κἂν, which they emend in different ways. "Such were the spearmen whose leader was killed by your adulterous bed, daughter of Tyndareus, malignant woman.³ Therefore the gods will send you to

³ I have preferred Seidler's Τυνδαρί, with brevis in longo, to Murray's Τυνδαρίς. Nominative is occasionally used for vocative in tragedy (for a recent discussion see V. Schmidt, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas [Berlin, 1968], pp. 89–95), but seldom is ὦ absent. When it is absent, in passages like Med. 1133 μὴ σπέρχου, φίλος, and Ph. 629 κἂν τί σοι, πόλις, γένηται, a preceding second-person form precludes the confusion which is present in El. 480, where a third-person verb ἔκανεν precedes. On the infringement of Porson's law in this line see L. P. E. Parker, CQ n.s. 16 (1966), 16.

your death. Soon I shall see beneath your neck the bloody gore shed by steel."

"The gods will send you to your death": Clytemnestra may be sent to her death in English, but may she in Greek? And why the plural θανά-τοις(ι)? Is it any more possible in Greek than in English to send a person to his deaths?

"For the dative," says Denniston, "cf. *IT* 159 Ἀΐδαι πέμψας, and Hom. *Il.* 1.3 Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν." But Hades is a place, death is not. Camper compares Pi. *Ol.* 2.82 Κύκνόν τε θανάτωι πόρεν. But πόρεν is not ἔπεμψεν: Pindar has reversed the normal construction of this verb (*Pyth.* 4.297 μήτ᾽ ὦν τινι πῆμα πορών) by analogy with the alternative construction of δίδωμι (*Pyth.* 5.60–61 ἔδωκ᾽ Ἀπόλλων θῆρας αἰνῶι φόβωι).

Now consider the plural. "Pluralem θάνατοι saepius noster usurpat, ubi de violenta, sive, quod fere eodem redit, de praematura morte, sermo est," says Seidler; and Wecklein agrees—"Plural von gewaltsamen Tode." Maybe; but what we need to know is whether the plural is used of the death, violent or not, of a single person. "Some of the cases," says Denniston, "where θάνατοι appears to be used of the death of an individual are illusory . . . But cf. A. *Ch.* 53, S. *El.* 206 (Jebb), *Tr.* 1276, *OT* 497." I transcribe the passages: A. *Ch.* 51–53 ἀνήλιοι βροτοστυγεῖς/ δνόφοι καλύπτουσι δόμους/ δεσποτᾶν θανάτοισι, S. *El.* 206 θανάτους αἰκεῖς διδύμαιν χεροῖν, *Tr.* 1276–1277 μεγάλους μὲν ἰδοῦσα νέους θανάτους,/ πολλὰ δὲ πήματα ‹καὶ› καινοπαγῆ, *OT* 496–497 Λαβδακίδαις/ ἐπίκουρος ἀδήλων θανάτων. These passages have two features in common. First, the word for death is not the only plural in the sentence. In two of the passages the victim is also named in the plural. In the other two passages plurals of a different kind are linked to θάνατοι: in *El.* 206 θανάτους αἰκεῖς διδύμαιν χεροῖν means "attempts on his life by two pairs of hands"; in *Tr.* 1276, even if the "great new deaths" refer only to the death of Deianeira and not also (which I think more probable) to the imminent death of Heracles, the allusive generalizing plural matches the following generalized reference to πολλὰ πήματα.

Second, these deaths are the deaths of persons much lamented. The plural is apt, for the reason given by "Longinus" 23.3: χυθεὶς εἰς τὰ πληθυντικὰ ὁ ἀριθμὸς συνεπλήθυσε καὶ τὰς ἀτυχίας, as he remarks after quoting S. *OT* 1403 ff. ὦ γάμοι γάμοι,/ ἐφύσαθ᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ φυτεύσαντες πάλιν/ ἀνεῖτε ταὐτὸν σπέρμα κἀπεδείξατε/ πατέρας ἀδελφοὺς παῖδας κτλ. He adds a caution: οὐ μέντοι δεῖ ποιεῖν αὐτὸ ἐπ᾽ ἄλλων, εἰ μὴ ἐφ᾽ ὧν δέχεται τὰ ὑποκείμενα αὔξησιν ἢ πληθὺν ἢ ὑπερβολὴν ἢ πάθος, ἔν τι τούτων ἢ πλείονα, ἐπεί τοι τὸ πανταχοῦ κώδωνας ἐξῆφθαι λίαν σοφιστικόν. I see no justification for

referring to the death of Clytemnestra, who will be lamented by nobody, in the honorific plural.[4]

But even if the words τοιγάρ ϲέ ποτ' οὐρανίδαι πέμψουϲι⟨ν⟩ θανάτοιϲ(ι) were acceptable, there would still remain the difficulty of what to do with κἄν. And what editors do with κἄν is far from satisfying.[5] Murray, following Weil and Keene, prints K. Schenkl's θανάτοιϲ· ἦ cἀν.[6] The chief merit of this conjecture is its palaeographical simplicity (HC ∼ IK), since ἦ ("Affirmative, mostly with adjectives and adverbs," Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 280) is not especially appropriate here, and the sentence would begin much better with ἔτ' ἔτι.[7] No more attractive are Nauck's θανάτοιϲ· ἦ μὰν or L. Dindorf's θανάτοιϲι· cἀν δ'. Parmentier's defence of κἄν I pass over in silence.

Murray proposed ϲοί ποτ' ... θανάτοιϲ ⟨ἴϲαν δ⟩ίκαν, which he appears to have interpreted as "the gods will send you an equivalent punishment for (his) death."[8] The dative θανάτοιϲ, now referring to Agamemnon, is unsatisfactory. Grammatically it is sound enough: compare 148–149 χέρα τε κρᾶτ' ἐπὶ κούριμον/ τιθεμένα θανάτωι ϲῶι ("beating my shaven head for your death"), *Med.* 1286–1287 πίτνει δ' ἁ τάλαιν' ἐc ἄλμαν φόνωι/ τέκνων δυccεβεῖ, A. *Ch.* 53 (quoted above). Nor would it be right to object to the superfluity of such an explanatory dative after the explanatory τοιγάρ ("therefore [because of his death] the gods will send you punishment for his death"), for this is an idiomatic superfluity: *Su.* 191–192 οὗ χρείαι πόλειϲ/ πολλαὶ διώλοντ' ἐνδεεῖϲ ϲτρατηλάτου, Wilamowitz on *HF* 842. What disqualifies θανάτοιϲ is its plural number. The plural, unaided by any other plural noun in the context, fails one of the tests which I have prescribed for the plural of this noun.

Nevertheless, Murray's approach is a profitable one. The words ϲοι ... πέμψουϲι ... δίκαν would give good sense, if the troublesome plural θανάτοιϲ(ι) could be disposed of. I suggest that we accept Murray's ϲοι, elicit δίκαν from the letters -ϲι καν, and alter θανατοι- to θανάτου:

τοιγάρ ϲοί ποτ' οὐρανίδαι
πέμψουϲιν θανάτου δίκαν.

[4] Denniston quotes three further passages where other plurals are used to denote death: 137 αἱμάτων ('bloodshed', a regular use of this plural), S. *Ant.* 1313 μόρων (irrelevant, since two deaths are referred to), and more pertinently S. *El.* 779 φόνους πατρώιους (the murder of Agamemnon). For the "honorific" plural, in general, see Kühner-Gerth i.18.

[5] Metre offers no guidance, since the passage is not in responsion. For analysis of the metre see Denniston, p. 220.   [6] *ZöG* 25 (1874), 90–91.

[7] If Wecklein's δέραϲ (1906 ed.) is accepted, as it almost certainly should be, we shall have to read ἦ cᾶϲ (see Denniston, who also suggests θανάτοιϲι· cᾶϲ).

[8] This is the interpretation implied by his verse-translation: "Therefore the tribes of Heaven one day/ for these thy dead shall send on thee/ an iron death."

"Therefore the gods will send you punishment for his death." The expression θανάτου δίκαν may be compared with 977 φόνου . . . δίκας, IT 339 δίκας . . . σφαγῆς, Or. 500 αἵματος δίκην. The metre is choriambic dimeter and glyconic. For the verb πέμπειν used of the dealings of gods with men compare Antiope 97 Page θεοῦ πέμψαντος οἷα βούλεται, fr. 916.6–7 Διόθεν/ θανάτου πεμφθεῖσα τελευτή. For δίκην as the object compare S. Ph. 1265–1266 μῶν τί μοι μέγα/ πάρεστε πρὸς κακοῖσι πέμποντες κακόν;. Even closer, if the text is sound, will be A. Eum. 203 ἔχρησα ποινὰς τοῦ πατρὸς πέμψαι ("impose punishment for his father's murder"): see R. D. Dawe, The collation and investigation of manuscripts of Aeschylus (Cambridge, 1964), p. 100. Also comparable is 1169 νέμει τοι δίκαν θεός.

503–506   'Ηλ. τί δ', ὦ γεραιέ, διάβροχον τόδ' ὄμμ' ἔχεις;
                       μῶν τἀμὰ διὰ χρόνου σ' ἀνέμνησαν κακά;
        505   ἦ τὰς 'Ορέστου τλήμονας φυγὰς στένεις
                       καὶ πατέρα τὸν ἐμόν . . .;

These are Electra's first words to the Old Man. "Why are you weeping? Have they reminded you of my troubles after so long a time?" The plural ἀνέμνησαν is indefensible, since no plural subject is available. "The subject can only be οἱ ξένοι, supplied from 500," writes Denniston. ". . . But 500 is somewhat far away, and it is not very natural to say that the strangers have 'reminded' the Old Man of anything." No, it is not at all natural.

Denniston, together with Paley, Keene, Wecklein, and Parmentier, accepts Dobree's ἀνέμνησεν. "Can it be that my present misfortunes have reminded you after so long a time?" is Paley's translation. Reminded of what? Of "domus nostrae mala," Dobree; "of past events, the murder of Agamemnon, etc.," Paley; "δακρύων, suggested by διάβροχον in the preceding line," Keene; "le souvenir des tiens [maux]," Parmentier. It appears that we are free to supplement the sense in whatever way we wish, since the sense refuses to disclose what supplement is wanted. Denniston has a different approach. "The verb is used absolutely, 'stirred your recollection.'" But there is no satisfactory parallel for such a use, as Denniston himself admits. Weil alone has rejected these subterfuges. His conjectures, an unhappy pair, are σ' ἐκίνησ' αὖ κακά and σ' ἀνεκίνησε διὰ χρόνου κακά.

Sense and Euripidean usage are restored by accepting ἀνέμνησεν and changing κακά to the genitive: μῶν τἀμὰ διὰ χρόνου σ' ἀνέμνησεν κακῶν;, "has the sight of my condition after so long reminded you of your troubles?" For the construction see Alc. 1045 μή μ' ἀναμνήσῃς (LP, μή με μιμνήσῃς vel μιμνήσκεις cett.) κακῶν, Ion 284 ὥς μ' ἀνέμνησάς τινος. Also comparable, both for κακῶν and for the sentiment, is Or. 1032 ἐς

δάκρυα πορθμεύουϲ' ὑπομνήϲει (Musgrave, -μνηϲιν codd.) κακῶν ("bringing me to tears by reminding me of our troubles"). No qualification is needed by κακῶν in any of these passages, since the context makes its reference clear. The Old Man, cast out of the city by Aegisthus, has his own share of the troubles of Agamemnon's household, and Electra asks whether it is these that the sight of her has awakened, or whether he weeps rather for the exiled Orestes and the murdered Agamemnon.

567–568   Πρ. βλέψον νυν ἐϲ τόνδ', ὦ τέκνον, τὸν φίλτατον.
             Ἠλ. πάλαι δέδορκα, μὴ ϲύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῇϲ.

Everyone used to accept Victorius' δέδοικα, which removes the solecism of δέδορκα μὴ φρονῇϲ—a solecism because, as Jackson says simply, "δέδορκα is no synonym of ϲκοπῶ."[9] But recently four attempts have been made to reinstate δέδορκα. I do not think that any of these attempts succeeds, although I believe that δέδορκα is indeed correct. The fault in δέδοικα is twofold. First, "the child's reply . . . is . . . an impertinence," Jackson. Second, "in stichomythia we pass from point to point, and here the command βλέψον cannot be overlooked: I *have* been looking for some time," H. D. Broadhead.[10]

Denniston saw in δέδορκα a play on words: "'I have long been looking—to see whether you have gone mad.' Electra means the Old Man to take δέδορκα in the physical sense at first, answering his βλέψον, until she rounds on him with μὴ ϲύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῇϲ." The equivocation is frigid and hardly removes the solecism.

Jackson changed φρονῇϲ to φρονεῖϲ and punctuated πάλαι δέδορκα.— μὴ ϲύ γ'· οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖϲ. "As the old man makes a motion to lead her to her brother, she ejaculates, like a well-brought-up young woman, 'Don't! Have you gone out of your senses?'" But, as Broadhead says, "the assumption of the by-play is quite gratuitous and unsupported by anything in the context. What makes Electra think the old man may be 'out of his senses' is clearly his reference to the stranger as τὸν φίλτατον."

The former objection was also made by P. T. Stevens,[11] who proposed to print a colon after δέδορκα and to take μὴ . . . φρονῇϲ as an independent clause. This is unappealing, for a reason which he himself gives: "There is perhaps no exact parallel in Euripides to this use of μή with the present subjunctive to indicate that something may prove to be true, i.e., to make a cautious statement about the present."

[9] *CQ* 35 (1941), 182 = *Marginalia scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), p. 173.
[10] *Tragica* (Christchurch, 1968), p. 127.
[11] *CR* 60 (1946), 101–102.

Broadhead accepted Jackson's φρονεῖϲ and proposed the further change of AMH to ΑΛΛΗ: πάλαι δέδορκ'· ἀλλ' ἦ ϲύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖϲ;. He compared S. *El.* 879 ἀλλ' ἦ μέμηναϲ;. The sense is satisfactory,[12] but the further change was needless, since the adversative conjunction is not, as he insists, "indispensable." The same sense is given by πάλαι δέδορκα· μὴ ϲύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖϲ;, "I *have* been looking for a long time. Have you gone mad?" For μή introducing a question see *Hi.* 799, *Tr.* 178, *IA* 1536, A. *Pe.* 344, *Su.* 295, *Ag.* 683, *PV* 247, 959, S. *Tr.* 316, *OC* 1502.[13] Such a question does not demand a negative answer: see Fraenkel on *Ag.* 683.

Now L has been collated many times, but it can still yield novelties in unexpected places. And here is a place where it has been reported wrongly. It is clear to me, from Spranger's facsimile, that L originally had φρονεῖϲ, which has been corrected (very neatly) to φρονῆϲ. The form of ει is clearly visible. But the decisive evidence is the circumflex accent. The circumflex is a continuation of the right vertical of η (ει), and it rises in a loop to the right of that vertical. This is the almost invariable way in which the scribe of L adds the circumflex to ει. He never represents the circumflex on η in this way. P has φρονῆϲ, so that the alteration was made either by the original scribe of L or by Triclinius during his first stage of correction.

According to A. Olivieri, *RFIC* 24 (1896), 471, φρονεῖϲ was also written by the scribe of Riccardianus 77. This manuscript is a very careless copy of L, made at the end of the fifteenth century: see A. Turyn, *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, 1957), pp. 366–367.

893–896   ('Ορ.) ἥκω γὰρ οὐ λόγοιϲιν ἀλλ' ἔργοιϲ κτανὼν
                    Αἴγιϲθον· ὡϲ δὲ τῶι ϲάφ' εἰδέναι τάδε
     895   προϲθῶμεν, αὐτὸν τὸν θανόντα ϲοι φέρω,
                    ὃν εἴτε χρήιζειϲ θηρϲὶν ἁρπαγὴν πρόθεϲ . . .

"I come as Aegisthus' murderer not in word but in deed." What follows I give in Paley's paraphrase: "but, that I may add this ocular proof (τάδε τεκμήρια) to the certain knowledge you already have from my words, I bring you this head of Aegisthus." Denniston accepts this interpretation, though he toys with Heath's τόδε for τάδε. But the sense is preposterous. What poet, when he could make Orestes say "I have killed Aegisthus—here is his head to prove it," would allow him to say, in effect, "I assure you that I have killed Aegisthus—I know that you

---

[12] But the stop after the second foot is very uncommon in Euripides: see Denniston, *CQ* 30 (1936), 77–78.

[13] Murray creates another instance at *Ion* 1523; wrongly, as the commentators will explain.

are quite certain that I have killed him, but here is his head too"? As
Bothe puts it, "incerta confirmanda sunt, non certa" (in allusion to
Heath's translation "ut vero ad certam huius rei scientiam confirmandam
aliquid addamus"). Denniston's "But one can 'make assurance double
sure,'" is hardly to the point.

From the time of Barnes to the time of Paley and even beyond, the
ineptitude of the transmitted text was recognized, and in its place was
printed Barnes's conjecture ὡc δέ τωι . . . προθῶμεν, translated by Barnes
as "ut autem cuivis clare haec proponamus, i.e., ut haec certo scias." The
fatal objection to this was made by Paley: "Euripides would hardly have
said, 'that *one* may know it, I bring *you* the dead body.'" A second objec-
tion of his must be discounted: "πρόθεc is rather awkwardly repeated in
a somewhat different sense in the very next verse." The repetition is no
more objectionable than such instances as 44–45 ἤιcχυνεν ("dishonour")
. . . αἰcχύνομαι ("am ashamed"), S. *Ph.* 1300–1301 μὴ . . . μεθῆιc βέλοc./
—μέθεc με . . . χεῖρα.[14]

I suggest that we read as follows:

> ἥκω γὰρ οὐ λόγοιcιν ἀλλ' ἔργοιc κτανὼν
> Αἴγιcθον· [ὡc δὲ τῶι cάφ' εἰδέναι τάδε
> προcθῶμεν] αὐτὸν τὸν θανόντα cοι φέρω . . .

The asyndeton is vigorous and was itself the cause of interpolation.
Furthermore, the phrase οὐ λόγοιcιν ἀλλ' ἔργοιc finds a new resonance.
According to Denniston, "it comes to nothing more than 'in very truth.'"
And, indeed, with the transmitted text, that is all it can come to. In the
less charitable opinion of Herwerden,[15] the expression "non inutile
tantum sed ridiculum est verborum pondus." That goes too far, as *Ion* 1298
ὅπλοιcιν αὐτὴν οὐ λόγοιc ἐρρύcατο (cited by Denniston) shows. But see
how well the words are adapted to their new sequel: "I come not in
word but in deed as the murderer of Aegisthus—I bring you his body."
His word he has already given; his deed is confirmed by the bringing of
the corpse.

For the interpolation not of a single complete line but of parts of two
consecutive lines see *Alc.* 795b–796a (del. Herwerden), *Hel.* 9b–10a (del.
Nauck), 388b–389a (del. Nauck), and possibly *Su.* 842b–843a (del.
Hermann; see M. D. Reeve, *GRBS* 14 [1973], 149).

[14] See also the references in my note on *Phaethon* 56 (Cambridge, 1970), to which may
be added Page, *Actors' interpolations in Greek tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 123–124, and
Verdenius, *Mnemosyne*, ser. iv 11 (1958), 203. Anyone who is intent on accepting Barnes's
conjecture and avoiding the repetition may write πρόεc (Herwerden, *RPh* 2 [1878], 29).
But πρόθεc is supported by H. *Il.* 24.409 and S. *El.* 1487.

[15] *Mnemosyne* 28 (1899), 232.

962   Ὀρ. ἐπίσχες· ἐμβάλωμεν εἰς ἄλλον λόγον.

Denniston writes: "Intransitive ἐμβάλλειν has several well-defined physical senses: among others, 'invade,' of an army (metaphorical at Pl. *Tht.* 165D), 'flow into a sea or lake,' of a river (e.g., Pl. *Phd.* 113C), 'lay on with oars.' None of these are suitable here." He proposes ἐκβάλλομεν: "ἐκβάλλω is used at Pl. *Phd.* 113A of a river branching off, and Thucydides (1.97.2) uses ἐκβολὴ λόγου for 'digression.'" The parallels are insufficiently exact. And the tragedians do not use ἐκβάλλειν intransitively—for at 96 Denniston himself rightly accepts Dobree's ἐκβάλω πόδα for ἐκβάλω (ἐμ-Lγρ) ποδί. Indeed, he has forgotten what he wrote on 96: "The intransitive use of ἐκβάλλειν cannot be justified by ἐκβάλλειν of rivers, intransitive εἰσβάλλειν, βάλλ᾽ ἐς κόρακας, and Verrall's defence of βαλῶ at A. *Ag.* 1172."[16]

The compound of βάλλω which Euripides does use intransitively (in the sense "enter"), and whose noun is used in precisely the connection exhibited by 962, is ἐσβάλλω. For the verb see *Hi.* 1198 χῶρον εἰσεβάλλομεν, *Cycl.* 99, *Andr.* 968, *Ba.* 1045, *Phaethon* 168 (= fr. 779.1),[17] for the noun ("entering upon a thing, beginning," LSJ) see *Su.* 92 καινὰς ἐσβολὰς . . . λόγων, *Ion* 677 στεναγμάτων (Musgrave, στεναγμῶν L) τ᾽ ἐσβολάς, Ar. *Ran.* 1104 ἐσβολαὶ . . . σοφισμάτων.

1013–1017   (Κλ.) λέξω δέ· καίτοι δόξ᾽ ὅταν λάβηι κακὴ
                       γυναῖκα, γλώσσηι πικρότης ἔνεστί τις·
          1015   ὡς μὲν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν, οὐ καλῶς· τὸ πρᾶγμα δὲ
                       μαθόντας, ἢν μὲν ἀξίως μισεῖν ἔχηι,
                       στυγεῖν δίκαιον· εἰ δὲ μή, τί δεῖ στυγεῖν;

1016   μαθόντας Reiske, -όντα c᾽ L   ἔχηι Seidler, ἔχης L

"Hunc locum nemo intellexit," said Seidler. "Alii aliter vertunt, sed inepte omnes." His complaint still holds good. First, here is the conventional translation.[18] "I shall explain.—And yet, when a woman gets a bad reputation, there is a certain bitterness in her tongue. *In my opinion, not fairly.* But when people have learned the facts, if these facts justify hatred, then it is right to hate; if not, why hate?"

---

[16] See Fraenkel on this passage for a demolition of the alleged instances of the intransitive use of βάλλω and some of its compounds.

[17] In these passages a simple accusative is used after the verb; but εἰς is commonly added by other writers when the verb is used intransitively (see LSJ s.v. II, who actually cite ἐσβάλλειν ἐς λόγον from Olympiodorus), and it is added by Euripides when he uses the verb transitively at 79 βοῦς εἰς ἀρούρας ἐσβαλών.

[18] The reasons for accepting Reiske's and Seidler's emendations in 1016, and a defence of the anomalous prosody γυναῖκά γλώσσηι, are given by Denniston.

The words ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν, οὐ καλῶς, "in my opinion, not fairly," do not fit their surroundings. Clytemnestra is excusing the sharpness of her tongue. She says that women whose reputations have been wronged may be expected to adopt a bitter tone. She is just such a woman. But if she says that such women are acting οὐ καλῶς, she is condemned out of her own mouth. Denniston remarks that "the sequence of thought, though not expressed with formal exactitude, is perfectly intelligible." His paraphrase runs: "I will tell you what I think of Agamemnon. But a maligned woman has a sharp edge to her tongue. In my opinion such bitterness is to be deplored. But she should not be condemned out of hand on account of it: she should be judged on the facts alone." This paraphrase misses the direction in which the reader is pointed by the μὲν and δὲ of 1015. These particles suggest that two opinions or attitudes are to be balanced. "My opinion is that such bitterness is to be deplored. Others, when they have learned the facts, but not before then, are entitled to their own opinion." This, so far, is unexceptionable. But we do not now expect "and they may find that their hatred is justified," which is to imply "and they may come to the same opinion as me." The structure of the sentence demands "and, after learning the facts, they are entitled to come to a different opinion—but not before then." Furthermore, this is a most unexpected concession which Denniston imputes to Clytemnestra. It is as if she were saying "I am going to speak sharply. It is wrong to do so. Please ignore my asperity and judge the facts alone." This is no way to ingratiate yourself or win over your opponent.[19]

Denniston betrayed his own uneasiness over this interpretation when he considered an alternative rendering, first proposed by Seidler,[20] of the words γλώσσηι πικρότης ἔνεστί τις: "orationi eius invisi quid inest (i.e., eius orationem inviti audiunt, neque aequa lance pendunt) . . . πικρότης igitur est idem quod πικρόν τι, invisi, molesti quid." As Denniston puts it, "Dislike, invidia, attaches to her words, which are πικροί, 'repellent,' to the hearer." "This," he says with truth, "gives a smoother connection." With equal truth he adds "But ἔνεστι strongly suggests that πικρότης is a quality residing in the tongue." This is not so much strongly suggested as certain.[21]

---

[19] Weil comes to the same conclusion: "Clytemnestre ne doit pas faire une telle restriction." He condemns ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν as corrupt.

[20] And adopted by Paley, Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 18 [1883], 223), Wecklein (1906 ed.), and Parmentier. Paley and Parmentier go on to mistranslate ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν as "in my case." What these words mean is shown by *Med.* 763, *Hcld.* 881, *Ba.* 401, S. *Tr.* 589. Wilamowitz proposed γὰρ for δὲ in 1015.

[21] And for that reason Matthiae took γλῶσσα to be the tongue of the woman's detractor, which is impossible.

Wecklein[22] and later K. Schenkl[23] proposed ὑμῖν for ἡμῖν. "In *your* opinion, such bitterness is unjustifiable. But first examine the facts." This is only a specious improvement. Clytemnestra has said "When women are maligned, they speak bitterly." She can hardly continue with "*You* do not think that they should do so." Electra might very well think that maligned women in general (for Clytemnestra is speaking in general terms) have a right to speak bitterly, and to preempt Electra's opinion on the matter does nothing to help Clytemnestra's case.[24]

Clytemnestra must not weaken her case by admitting that her bitterness is unjustified. She ought to say that, in her view, such bitterness is reasonable, and that, although others may hold a different opinion, they should not reach that opinion until they have learned the facts. The phrase οὐ καλῶc is the opposite of what we want: what we want is οὐ κακῶc. "When a woman gets a bad reputation, there is a certain bitterness in her tongue: in my opinion, not improperly, ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν, οὐ κακῶc. But people should learn the facts before deciding. If the facts justify hatred, then it is right to hate; otherwise, why hate?" For the sense of κακῶc ("wrongly, improperly") compare *Su.* 297–298 οὔτοι cιωπῶc' εἶτα μέμψομαί ποτε/ τὴν νῦν cιωπὴν ὡς ἐcιγήθη κακῶc, fr. 199 τὸ δ' ἀcθενές μου καὶ τὸ θῆλυ cώματος/ κακῶc ἐμέμφθης.

1041–1046 (Κλ.) εἰ δ' ἐκ δόμων ἥρπαcτο Μενέλεως λάθραι,
              κτανεῖν μ' Ὀρέcτην χρῆν, καcιγνήτης πόcιν
              Μενέλαον ὡς cώcαιμι; còc δὲ πῶc πατὴρ
              ἠνέcχετ' ἂν ταῦτ'; εἶτα τὸν μὲν οὐ θανεῖν
1045   κτείνοντα χρῆν τἄμ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου παθεῖν;
              ἔκτειν', ἐτρέφθην ᾗπερ ἦν πορεύσιμον . . .

────────
1046 ᾗπερ Boissonade[25], ἥνπερ L

"If it had been Menelaus (and not Helen) who was abducted, ought I to have killed Orestes in order to save Menelaus, my sister's husband? How would your father have tolerated that? Then ought not he to have died for killing my child and I to have suffered at his hands? I killed him . . . ."

The absolute use of παθεῖν, in the sense of τι παθεῖν or θανεῖν, is open

[22] *Ars Sophoclis emendandi* (Würzburg, 1869), p. 185.

[23] *ZöG* 25 (1874), 95.

[24] Further discussion of this passage may be found in A. Schmidt, *RhMus.* 31 (1876), 565–566, S. Mekler, *Euripidea* (Vienna, 1879), p. 50, E. Holzner, *Studien zu Eur.* (Vienna, 1895), p. 111, G. Ammendola, *RFIC* 48 (1920), 393–394.

[25] Attributed to Boissonade by Wecklein (1906 ed.), also conjectured by Page *apud* Denniston.

to the gravest doubt, as Denniston and Jackson[26] have shown. Denniston's
θανεῖν for παθεῖν is not appealing. It gives, as he himself says, a "flat
repetition," and the change would have to be imputed, as Jackson says,
to "a reflective—and therefore improbable—copyist." Jackson's πόθεν;
(εἶτα τὸν μὲν οὐ θανεῖν/ κτείνοντα χρῆν τἄμ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου; πόθεν;,
"ought he to have escaped death and I to have died? Certainly not")
is quite out of court. Jackson has fallen into the trap into which Denniston
and others have fallen (and this is fatal in his case, though in Denniston's
it was not) of supposing that οὐ negatives θανεῖν and that the meaning is
"ought he not-to-die (i.e., to live) and I to die?" Not θανεῖν but χρῆν
is negatived by οὐ. If the infinitive alone is to be negatived, μή is needed:
Hcld. 969 χρῆν τόνδε μὴ ζῆν, and for both types of negation *Ion* 1314–1318
οὐχ ἵζειν ἐχρῆν/ ἀλλ' ἐξελαύνειν . . . καὶ μὴ 'πὶ ταὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἰόντ' ἔχειν ἴσον,
"he ought not to sit but (one ought) to drive him away . . . and (he
ought) not-to-have."[27] The question οὐ θανεῖν χρῆν; means "ought not
he to have died?" (equivalent to a statement "he ought to have died").
A similar question is *Rh.* 643 οὐκ ἐγείρεσθαί cε χρῆν; ("ought you not to
be awake?"), and another instance of an infinitive separating οὐ from the
verb it negatives is *IT* 659 οὐ λέγειν ἔχοντά με.

There is a further objection to the transmitted text: an essential part
of the antithesis is missing. Euripidean antitheses do not, as a rule, require
us to piece out their imperfections with our thoughts; contrasts are fully
and precisely expressed. Here is a supplement which provides an object
for παθεῖν, adds the missing thought in its entirety, and sets a trap for the
scribe:

> εἶτα τὸν μὲν οὐ θανεῖν
> κτείνοντα χρῆν τἄμ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου παθεῖν,
> ⟨κτείνουcαν αὐτοῦ παῖδας, οὐκ ἐλάccονα⟩;
> ἔκτειν' . . .

"Then ought not he to have died for killing my child and I to have
suffered no less at his hands for killing his child?" In other words, εἰ
γὰρ δίκαια τάδε, καὶ ἐκεῖνα ἔνδικα (see 1096). I have taken the language
from A. *Pe.* 813–814 κακῶς δράcαντεc οὐκ ἐλάccονα/ πάcχουcι.

---

[26] *Marg. scaen.* 170–172. Denniston might have made it clearer that the use of πάcχω,
without object, in the sense "be the sufferer," "be on the receiving end" (often, but not
always, in direct antithesis to a verb expressing action), is not uncommon (e.g., *Ba.* 801
οὔτε πάcχων οὔτε δρῶν), and this is the justification for *Rh.* 640. We may also be justified
in dispensing with Wilamowitz's ⟨τι⟩ (favored by Jackson) at *Lys.* 20.30; compare
12.100 ἀκηκόατε ἑοράκατε πεπόνθατε ἔχετε· δικάζετε. This use does not justify the equation
παθεῖν = θανεῖν.

[27] I have discussed the difficulties of this passage in *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974), 30–31.

1150–1154   (Xo.) ἰάχησε δὲ στέγα λάϊνοί
               τε θριγκοὶ δόμων, τάδ' ἐνέποντος· Ὦ
               σχετλία, τί με, γύναι, φονεύσεις φίλαν
               πατρίδα δεκέτεσιν
               σποραῖσιν ἐλθόντ' ἐμάν;

1150–1153 dochmiacs, 1154 syncopated iambics. But in 1152 the initial
anceps of the dochmiac σχέτλια τι με γυναι is resolved. Barrett has shown
that of the alleged instances of resolved initial anceps in tragic dochmiacs
only this instance and one other have resisted convincing emendation.[28]
Two emendations are offered: ὦ σχέτλια Seidler ("highly doubtful
Greek," Denniston) and σχέτλιος, ἤ Weil ("possible, for σχέτλιος has two
terminations at *IT* 651," Denniston). But why not simply σχέτλιε? For
the corruption see *IT* 858 and S. *Ai.* 358, cited in n. 28 above. Further
examples of Euripides' use of three-termination adjectives with two
terminations are given by Kühner–Blass i.535–537, Wackernagel, *Vorl.
über Syntax* ii.49–50, Dodds on *Ba.* 991–996, Kannicht on *Hel.* 335, and
W. Kastner, *Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf –ΟΣ* (Heidel-
berg, 1967). For the separation of noun and adjective in the vocative
case (σχέτλιε . . . γύναι) see *Hi.* 840–841 πόθεν θανάσιμος τύχα,/ γύναι, σὰν
ἔβα, τάλαινα, καρδίαν, *Tr.* 165–166 μέλεαι, μόχθων ἐπακουσόμεναι,/ Τρωιάδες,
ἐξορμίζεσθ' (Headlam, ἔξω κομίζεσθ' codd.) οἴκων. Similar is 167 Ἀγα-
μέμνονος ὦ κόρα, ἤλυθον, Ἠλέκτρα.

1177–1182   Ὀρ. ἰὼ Γᾶ καὶ Ζεῦ πανδερκέτα
                           βροτῶν, ἴδετε τάδ' ἔργα φόνι-
          1179 a   α μυσαρά, δίγονα σώματ' ἐν
               b   †χθονὶ κείμενα πλαγᾶι†
          1180 a   χερὸς ὕπ' ἐμᾶς, ἄποιν' ἐμῶν
               b   πημάτων . . .

1179b χθονὶ κείμενα πλαγᾶι is in responsion with the iambic dimeter 1193
λάχε' (Weil, λέχε' L) ἀπὸ γᾶς (l, γᾶς τᾶς L) Ἑλλανίδος (iambus + dochmiac
if γᾶς τᾶς is retained). The only conjecture worth mentioning[29] is Wal-
berg's χθονὶ ⟨τάδε⟩ πλαγᾶι κείμενα, and this is made unattractive by word-

---

[28] *Hippolytos*, p. 434. See also N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 35–38. The three other
"possible instances" mentioned by Barrett are certainly to be rejected: *HF* 878 μανίαισι⟨ν⟩
λύσσας (μανίασιν λύσσαις: see *PCPS* n.s. 20 [1974], 11), *IT* 858 δολίαν ὅτ' ἀγόμαν (δόλιον,
but also delete the unwanted ὅτ' with Hartung), S. *Ai.* 358 ἁλίαν (ἅλιον) ὃς ἐπέβας. It
remains unclear whether P.Oxy. 2336 justifies the attempts which have been made to
restore a further instance at *Hel.* 670. See G. Zuntz, *An inquiry into the transmission of the
plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), p. 230, and Kannicht *ad loc.*

[29] Wecklein's list may be supplemented by W. Headlam, *CR* 16 (1902), 251, K.
Busche, *Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, 1904, 451, G. Schiassi, *RFIC* 34 (1956), 261.

end after the long anceps in the second metron[30] and by neglect of synapheia. I suggest χθονὶ κεχυμένα πλαγᾶι ⟨διπλᾶι⟩, with the verb used as in *Hcld.* 75–76 ἴδετε τὸν γέροντ' ἀμαλὸν (γέροντα μᾶλλον L)[31] ἐπὶ πέδωι/ χύμενον (perfect part. at *HF* 1052, *Ba.* 456), H. *Od.* 22.386–389 οἱ δέ τε πάντες (sc. ἰχθύες . . .) ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι κέχυνται . . . ὡς τότ' ἄρα μνηςτῆρες ἐπ' ἀλλήλοιςι κέχυντο, the phrase πλαγᾶι διπλᾶι as at S. *El.* 1415 παῖςον . . . διπλῆν, and the iteration δίγονα . . . διπλᾶι much like *Or.* 633 διπλῆς μερίμνης διπτύχους ἰὼν ὁδούς, A. *ScT* 849 διπλᾶ μερίμναιν διδύμαιν ὁρᾶν κακά (Tucker, διπλαῖν . . . δίδυμ' ἀνορέα fere codd.), Pi. *N.* 1.44–45 διccαῖcι δοιοὺς . . . μάρψαις . . . χερςὶν ἑαῖς ὄφιας.

Queens' College, Cambridge

[30] See L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966), 14–16, 18 (1968), 247. But 480 provides a parallel (n. 3 above).

[31] Editors attribute the restoration of ἀμαλὸν to Hemsterhuys (in Hesychius, ed. Alberti, i [1746], s.v. ἀμαλός), but priority belongs to P. Wesseling, *Probabilia* (1731), p. 38. For a recent discussion of this passage see R. Renehan, *Greek textual criticism: a reader* (Harvard, 1969), pp. 113–114.