

Euripides' *Heracles* 858–73

ELIZABETH FRANZINO

Three subsequent editors of Euripides' *Heracles* have accepted the suggestions of John Jackson at 858–73, the transposition of 860 to follow 870, alteration of ἐπιρροΐβδην θ' ὁμαρτεῖν to ἐπιρροΐβδεῖν ὁμαρτεῖν θ' in 860 and of ἀνακαλῶν to ἀνακαλῶ in 870.¹ Before this text becomes even more established as the modern vulgate, it is worth while to speak out in defense of the paradosis. I cite the reading of the Laurentianus with significant corrections noted below:

Ἥλιον μαρτυρόμεσθα δρῶσ' ἃ δρᾶν οὐ βούλομαι.
 εἰ δὲ δὴ μ' Ἦραι θ' ὑπουργεῖν σοί τ' ἀναγκαίως ἔχει
 τάχος ἐπιρροΐβδην θ' ὁμαρτεῖν ὡς κυνηγέτη κύννας, 860
 εἰμί γ' οὔτε πόντος οὔτω κύμασι στένων λάβρος
 οὔτε γῆς σεισμός κερανοῦ τ' οἴστρος ᾠδῖνας πνέων
 οἶ' ἐγὼ στάδια δραμοῦμαι στέρνων εἰς Ἡρακλέους·
 καὶ καταρρήξω μέλαθρα καὶ δόμους ἐπεμβαλῶ,
 τέκν' ἀποκτείνασα πρῶτον· ὁ δὲ κανὼν οὐκ εἴσεται 865
 παῖδας οὐς ἔτικτεν ἐναρών, πρὶν ἂν ἐμὰς λύσσας ἀφήι.
 ἦν ἰδοῦ· καὶ δὴ τινάσσει κρᾶτα βαλβίδων ἄπο
 καὶ διαστροφῶν ἐλίσσει σίγα γοργωποὺς κόρας,
 ἀμφοτέρω δ' οὐ σωφρονίζει, ταῦρος ὡς ἐς ἐμβολήν,
 δεινὰ μυκᾶται δὲ κῆρας ἀνακαλῶν τὰς Ταρτάρου. 870
 τάχα σ' ἐγὼ μᾶλλον χορεύσω καὶ καταυλήσω φόβωι.
 στείχ' ἐς Οὐλύμπον πεδαίρουσ', Ἴρι, γενναῖον πόδα·
 ἐς δόμους δ' ἡμεῖς ἄφαντοι δυσόμεσθ' Ἡρακλέους.

858 *λυ.* Musgrave: *Ip.* L || 861 λάβρος ed. Brubach.: -ως L || 866 ἔτικτεν ἐναρών Wilamowitz: ἔτικτ' ἐναίρ[ων] L^{fr}: ἔτικτεν αἰρῶν L || 870 δεινὰ Canter: -ὄς L

¹ J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford 1955) 13–17. The transposition was partially anticipated by Wecklein, who transposed 860 to follow 871. Subsequent editors who accept Jackson's transposition are J. Diggle (Oxford 1981), G. W. Bond (Oxford 1981), and K. H. Lee (Teubner 1988). One exception that has come to my attention is D. Ebener, *Euripides Tragödien* III (Berlin 1976). Jackson's second suggestion here (ἐπιρροΐβδην θ' ὁμαρτεῖν to ἐπιρροΐβδεῖν ὁμαρτεῖν θ') was first proposed by Kirchhoff.

Jackson's transposition, like any transposition, should be supported by arguments of two sorts: (a) that the line is awkward or clearly out of place where transmitted; and (b) that it fits well in its new surroundings, adding to rather than detracting from the coherence of the passage.

On the first score (a), Jackson confesses, with his customary dry wit, that the evidence is not all that clear (14):

¹ Since [my views] demand, in the *Hercules*, that 860 should go elsewhere, it would be agreeable to find that in decency it cannot stay where it is, but the evidence, though not to be ignored, might with advantage have been a little stronger. It is possible that τάχος ἐπιρροίβδην τε is not signally felicitous as a phrase, but it is at least better than ἐπιρροίβδην τάχος τε; it is possible that ὄμαρτεῖν is not the aptest of all infinitives, since Lyssa neither left the golden floor of Olympus nor entered the chamber of horrors at Thebes in company with Iris, but the word is just defensible; it is possible that a logician of the strictest sect would have preferred κύνα to κύνας, but on more than one occasion Euripides has shown himself less logical than Herwerden.

Bond does not object to the transmitted wording, though he accepts the transposition, albeit in less measured tones than Jackson (293): “ὄμαρτεῖν is inappropriate, for Lyssa does not accompany Iris (872 f.); the noble Iris will not in fact be a huntsman; and the plural κύνας is not particularly appropriate to describe Lyssa, who rather keeps hounds at *Ba.* 977.” Although scribes are hardly infallible and often have copied a line in the wrong place,² we must nevertheless question whether arguments like those of Jackson and Bond are really strong enough to convince us that there is probably or certainly something wrong with 858–61 in their transmitted order. I will attempt to prove that their arguments are insubstantial.

i) Although a reader may first suppose that the connectives in 859 serve to join Ἡραὶ and σοί, he soon realizes that the two infinitives are connected *apo koinou*. Ἀναγκάίως ἔχει thus governs (1) Ἡραὶ θ' ὑπουργεῖν and (2) σοί τε τάχος ἐπιρροίβδην θ' ὄμαρτεῖν ὡς κυνηγέτη κύνας. Not only is the transmitted reading grammatically possible, but it is also thematically sound. Hera is the prime mover whom *both* Lyssa and Iris assist: Iris says Ἡρα προσάψαι κοινὸν αἶμ' αὐτῶι θέλει / παῖδας κατακτείναντι, συνθέλω δ' ἐγώ (831–32). Lyssa serves Hera but accompanies Iris.

ii) Jackson never explains exactly why he considers τάχος ἐπιρροίβδην τε as infelicitous. Parallels for τάχος used adverbially for ταχέως are cited by Bond. Likewise, there is no grammatical reason to reject the adverb ἐπιρροίβδην and substitute the infinitive ἐπιρροίβδειν, as Bond also points

² Jackson's own conjecture seems a bit forced (16): He proposes that this line and an alleged second line (see below) were mistakenly relegated to the margin due to the similarity of line-beginning with 870, and then our line was incorrectly reinserted after 859 while the alleged second line was left aside.

out. Though the adverb is ἄπαξ εἰρημένον here, the verb apparently does not occur anywhere else in classical literature either. The joining of two adverbs by τε, though not common in poetry, does have precedent.³ The phrase provides little reason to doubt the soundness of the text.⁴

iii) It is simply not true that Lyssa does not accompany Iris. Rather, she left Olympus (or perhaps the Underworld) in Iris' company: They appear hovering above the stage, arriving together on the same *mechane*.⁵ In this sense ὁμαρτεῖν is appropriate. To be sure, Lyssa and Iris do not go together into the house of Heracles,⁶ but the transmitted text need not imply that they do. Ὅμαρτεῖν, though coordinate with ὑπουργεῖν, is easily taken as subordinate in thought: "It is necessary for me to serve Hera by accompanying you (to this place)." The notion of speed and whirring of wings (τάχος ἐπιρροΐβδην τε) refers most naturally to the aerial portion of their journey just completed on the *mechane*,⁷ and not to the remaining few downward steps into Heracles' house. The verb ὁμαρτεῖν describes Lyssa's attendance on Iris thus far, and this attendance is likened to the attendance of hunting dogs on a hunter as they approach the scene of the hunt.

iv) Lyssa thus compares her role in the proceedings to that of a hunting-hound in the service of a hunter. Like a hound, she must carry out the orders of her "masters," in this case Iris and Hera, regardless of her unwillingness, as line 858 indicates.⁸ As Wilamowitz has noted, the plural κύνας is entirely suitable in the metaphor, since in the world of hunting there is usually a pack of hounds; but to write κύνα for κύνας is a trifling change if this seems desirable.⁹

v) Given the frequency of hunting metaphors in Greek literature, it is surprising for Bond to say that "the noble Iris will not in fact be a huntsman." Surely Iris' nobility cannot be the objection to the use of a hunting metaphor. In fact, the expense involved in hunting suggests, if not "nobility," at least a certain level of wealth. Although it is true that Iris,

³ H. II. 1. 128 τριπλῆ τετραπλῆ τ', S. El. 101–02 σοῦ, πάτερ, οὕτως / αἰκῶς οἰκτρῶς τε θανόντος, 1263 ἀφράστως ἀέλπτως τε, E. IA 724 καλῶς ἀναγκαίως τε.

⁴ I agree with Bond (294) that even the transposition of 860 does not actually require this change: Τάχος ἐπιρροΐβδην ἑ' continues to make sense.

⁵ See 817, spoken by the Chorus: γέροντες, οἷον φάσμι ὑπὲρ δόμων ὄρω; Iris and Lyssa are therefore between earth and Olympus. On the staging here see D. Mastronarde, CA 9 (1990) 268–69.

⁶ See 872–73: στεῖχ' ἐς Οὐλύμπων πεδαίρουσ', Ἴρι, γενναῖον πόδα· / ἐς δόμους δ' ἡμεῖς ἄφαντοι δυσόμεσθ' Ἡρακλέους.

⁷ The arrival of the Oceanids on their *mechane* produces a similar whirring sound at A. PV 124–26: φεῦ φεῦ τί ποτ' αὐ κινάθισμα κλύω / πέλας οἰωνῶν; αἰθῆρ δ' ἐλαφραῖς / περύγων ῥιπαῖς ὑποσυρίζει. Bond also cites Eum. 404 and S. Ant. 1004, where the root ροιβδ- is used in connection with flying (in the former case, there may also be a reference to the *mechane*).

⁸ Note U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Euripides. Herakles II (Berlin 1895) 195: "860 war sie der hund des jägers, weil sie nicht aus eigener initiative handelte." Cf. LSJ s.v. κύων III, for "servants, agents or watchers of the gods."

⁹ See Wilamowitz' comments on 860 (p. 186).

unlike a real huntsman, soon leaves the scene, the use of a single metaphor does not commit the author to sustained allegory.

vi) Lyssa is indeed the possessor of hounds in one Euripidean play, the *Bacchae*. But a bell-krater of about 440 B.C., which Shapiro argues was inspired by an Aeschylean tragedy,¹⁰ provides evidence earlier than Euripides of a Lyssa with canine attributes who apparently is urged on by a goddess.¹¹ Our Lyssa is similar, therefore, to the depiction of her in the latter case. Furthermore, Orestes refers to the Erinyes as dogs at *Choephoroi* 1054, only a few lines after he had described them as women wreathed in snakes.¹² In comparison, Lyssa as a hound and as a hunter in two separate plays should not pose a problem.

Now I turn to the second criterion (b), the claim that 860 improves coherence in its new setting if transposed to follow 870, with the infinitive ἐπιρροϊβδεῖν for the adverb ἐπιρροϊβδην, ἀνακαλῶ for ἀνακαλῶν in 870, and a punctuation change. It may be true that the passage becomes more descriptive. But it cannot be said that one detects the lack of anything after 870, that the arrival of 860 there meets a pre-existing need. More importantly, I will show that the transposition creates several new problems.

i) The first new problem is that if we transpose 860 to follow 870, it fails to join up with 871 and we must assume a lacuna. Here is what Jackson says (15):

How then and by whom should [the Keres] be summoned up? Indirectly by the quarry? Or directly by the huntress? If by the huntress, and directly, it is certain without qualification that ἀνακαλῶ must be written for ἀνακαλῶν, and certain morally that after Ταρτάρου there exists a gap of one verse at least and quite possibly two.

Jackson thus deems it necessary to insert a line:

Personally I should call 860 from its leisured dignity, write it as Kirchhoff, too, suspected that it should be written, restore it to its birthplace, then fabricate a trochaic tetrameter for the more exacting, and shape the passage thus:

¹⁰ See H. A. Shapiro, *Personifications in Greek Art: The Representation of Abstract Concepts 600–400 B.C.* (Zurich 1993) 169: "Since . . . Lyssa was probably not personified before the fifth century, the immediate source of the dog's head is most likely the contemporary stage, where the character could have worn such a mask."

¹¹ Shapiro (previous note) 170 notes that, "for the vase-painter, Lyssa is the daemonic huntress who, as instrument of a divine huntress, destroys the hapless hunter." Cf. K. H. Lee, "The Iris–Lyssa Scene in Euripides' *Heraclēs*," *Antichthon* 16 (1982) 48; R. Padel, *In and Out of the Mind* (Princeton 1993) 163, who attempts to examine descriptions of a canine Lyssa on vases and in dramas and fragments; and R. Padel, *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness* (Princeton 1995) 18–20. Interestingly, Padel retains the manuscript position of 860 in her translation of Lyssa's speech (19).

¹² A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus. Choephoroi* (Oxford 1986) comments on 1054 that the two descriptions of the Erinyes "need not trouble us."

870	δεινὰ μυκᾶται δέ. Κῆρας ἀνακαλῶ τὰς Ταρτάρου
860	τάχος ἐπιρροιβδεῖν ὄμαρτεῖν θ' ὡς κυνηγέτη κύνας.
	(<i>Pauses a moment. Hercules dances. The hounds arrive.</i>)
(<i>ad canes</i>)	<ήκετ'; ἄρ' ἀκούετ' ἔνδον δάπεδον ὡς κρούει ποδοῖν;>
(<i>ad Herculem</i>)	τάχα σ' ἐγὼ μᾶλλον χορεύσω καὶ καταυλήσω φόβῳ.
(<i>ad Irim</i>)	στεῖχ' ἐς Οὐλύμπων πεδαιρούσ', Ἴρι, γενναῖον πόδα· ἐς δόμους δ' ἡμεῖς ἄφαντοι δυσόμεσθ' Ἑρακλέους.

A missing line must be assumed, Jackson sees, to explain τάχα σ' ἐγὼ μᾶλλον χορεύσω (871) if 860 precedes. Without 860 here, by contrast, the reference in μᾶλλον χορεύσω can be to the movements in 867–69, a reference made only slightly difficult by intervening 870. Transposed 860 with Jackson's requisite lacuna would focus emphasis on the Keres and thus sever the connection of 871 to 867–69. A dilemma arises for subsequent editors: None who adopt Jackson's transposition marks his lacuna. But, as we have seen, both scenarios (with and without lacuna) present difficulties.

ii) Jackson's transposition also involves changing L's ἀνακαλῶν in 870, with Heracles as the subject, to ἀνακαλῶ, with Lyssa as the subject, on the supposition that Lyssa would be the huntress in the following 860. But there are difficulties with this, as Bond, who accepts Jackson's transposition but retains the transmitted wording, states clearly:

Diggle follows Jackson in changing to ἀνακαλῶ and ἐπιρροιβδεῖν (with θ' after ὄμαρτεῖν): Lyssa then is the huntsman; she, not Heracles, should summon the dogs she keeps (*Ba.* 977) from Hell. This is attractive, but the Κῆρες are not explicitly Lyssa's hounds and L offers us a powerful picture, which should not lightly be altered, of the bellowing of Heracles which attracts them. . . ἐγὼ at 871 has more point if Lyssa has not been the subject of the preceding sentence.

I agree with Bond that the picture of Heracles calling up the Keres by his bellowing should not be altered, since it is appropriate for Heracles to call upon the Keres as he goes (in his madness) to take bloody vengeance upon Eurystheus.¹³ Bond is also correct that ἐγὼ loses all force if it does not indicate a subject change: Ἀνακαλῶν is necessary to produce a contrast between Heracles' mad symptoms and Lyssa's own activity in the matter, while it avoids the problem of an awkward instance of asyndeton.

But Bond wants 860 to follow unaltered 870. This means that Heracles is calling upon the Keres to “move quickly with a whirring sound and accompany him as hounds do a huntsman.” It seems unlikely that we are

¹³ D. Mastrorade, *EMC* 27 (1983) 109, objects that ἀνακαλέω “is used of deliberate, rational summoning, not of inadvertently attracting something.” One should note, however, that inanimate objects are described as acting on people in ways that, taken literally, imply a purpose, such as αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος at *H. Od.* 19. 13 or καὶ μὴν τύποι γε σφενδόνης . . . οἶδε προσαινοῦσί με at *Hipp.* 862–63. At any rate, this issue becomes moot once it is understood that Heracles thinks he is taking vengeance on Eurystheus.

meant to think of Heracles as actually saying such a thing, and as an interpretation of bellowing it seems rather overdone.

Finally we should note that the transposition requires ἀνακαλέω to be construed with an infinitive. This construction is found nowhere in Euripides, and LSJ cites no examples from any other author.¹⁴ A transposition that is poorly motivated at both ends of the journey and actually creates anomalies at the point of arrival can be regarded as at best unproved.

As an afterword, it is worth while to examine briefly some interpretive consequences of retaining the lines in their transmitted order. Lyssa's speech begins with an excuse, "I do not want to do this but I must" (858–59). Then she compares herself running into the breast of Heracles to a raging sea, an earthquake, and the sting¹⁵ of lightning (863–66):

οἶ' ἐγὼ στάδια δραμοῦμαι στέρνων εἰς Ἡρακλέους·
καὶ καταρρήξω μέλαθρα καὶ δόμους ἐπεμβάλω,
τέκν' ἀποκτείνασα πρώτων· ὁ δὲ κανὼν οὐκ εἴσεται
παίδας οὐς ἔτικτεν ἐναρών, πρὶν ἂν ἐμὰς λύσσας ἀφῆι.

Lyssa, therefore, will actually enter the body of Heracles. In 865, Lyssa first uses the feminine aorist participle ἀποκτείνασα; then the subject dramatically switches in the middle of the line and it is Heracles who is doing the killing (κανὼν). In every other place where the killing of the children is mentioned, a masculine participle or indicator is used.¹⁶ This gender switch refers to the moment when Lyssa will affect a change in Heracles.¹⁷ As Lee says (48): ". . . once Lyssa invades the person of Heracles his thoughts and actions are no longer independent of her and vice versa. This is also the reason for the two views taken of Lyssa: as acting herself (cf. 864) and at the same time as manipulating the behavior of Heracles (cf. 871)." I would take this one step further and say that Heracles appropriates the character of Lyssa—she is at once a character and an abstraction.

Lyssa's double role can also be seen in Iris' original instructions to her. Iris orders Lyssa to "set in motion"¹⁸ the madness on the hero at 837. But

¹⁴ The closest parallel can be found at *S. OC* 1376, where, however, the verb is in the middle voice.

¹⁵ See R. Renehan, *CP* 80 (1985) 169–70; Mastronarde (above, note 13); and Bond (290–91) on οἴστρος and Wakefield's conjecture οἰστός. I am convinced by Renehan's and Mastronarde's arguments that οἴστρος can mean "sting" instead of its primary meaning of "gadfly." We need not adopt οἰστός.

¹⁶ *HF* 829–30, 839, 886, 898, 915, 917–18, 1014, etc.

¹⁷ See Lee (above, note 11) 49: "Her decision to attack the hero is itself sufficient to set in motion the initial stages of his derangement." Padel, *Whom Gods Destroy* (above, note 11) 20, on the other hand, sees Lyssa as a wholly external force and never admits that, although Heracles' madness is externally instigated, it then becomes a part of Heracles himself.

¹⁸ See Bond (284) for his translation of ἔλαυνε, κίνει at line 837.

Heracles will commit the murder αὐθέντηι φόνωι (839), “by his own hand.” Once she instigates his madness, Heracles is possessed by Lyssa and she becomes at the same time both an autonomous character and an abstraction describing Heracles. Note, for instance, 866 πρὶν ὄν ἐμὰς λύσσας ἀφῆι, “until he lets go of my madness,” implying that Lyssa and her madness will have become part of Heracles. The next line (867) surely supports the opposite notion that Lyssa is at the same time outside of Heracles. The character Lyssa now refers to events in which she acts as an abstraction—she describes Herakles shaking his head and acting mad (now in the vivid present tense). Bond (292) notes that “μᾶλλον (871) indicates that Lyssa will intensify the madness when she enters the house at 874,” acknowledging that the madness has already become part of Heracles.

Thus Lyssa is the instigator, and Heracles “takes over,” so to speak, when he appropriates the character of madness and kills his children. Accordingly, Lyssa does not appear in an epiphany, as Athena does when she saves Amphitryon.¹⁹ To a certain extent, Athena’s action against Heracles parallels Lyssa’s: The phrase στέρνων εἰς Ἡρακλέους used of Athena at 1003 is identical to that used of Lyssa at 864. In further contrast to Athena, however, Lyssa descends into Heracles’ house ἄφαντοι, “unseen” (873).²⁰ She becomes one with Herakles: At 873 she goes into his house “unseen” because she is already part of him. Herakles even appropriates Lyssa’s racing imagery: Στάδια δραμοῦμαι at line 863 refers to Lyssa; in 867, βαλβίδων ἄπο now refers to Heracles. Finally, at 896–97, Heracles is the huntsman (κυναγετεῖ τέκνων διωγμόν), a metaphor which recalls and inverts Lyssa’s simile of 860 (ὡς κυνηγέτηι κύνας).

The manuscript’s ἀνακαλῶν thus fits well with the conception of madness visible in the whole speech and acknowledges poetry’s blendings of human and divine aspects. Conversely, Jackson’s prosaic transposition of 860 to follow 870 and its adoption by subsequent editors raises more problems than it solves.²¹

University of Virginia

¹⁹ See 906–08: ἦ ἦ· τί δρᾶις, ὦ Διὸς παῖ, μελάθρωι; / τάρραγμα ταρτάρειον ὡς ἐπ’ Ἐγκελάδωι ποτέ, Παλλάς, / ἐς δόμους πέμπεις and 1002–04: ἀλλ’ ἦλθεν εἰκῶν, ὡς ὄραν ἐφαίνετο / Παλλάς, κραδαίνουσ’ ἔγχος †ἐπὶ λόφω κέαρη, / κᾶρριψε πέτρον στέρνων εἰς Ἡρακλέους.

²⁰ Lyssa’s and Iris’ exiting stage directions in this passage are puzzling. For discussions see Wilamowitz (195) and Mastrorarde (above, note 5).

²¹ I am very grateful to David Kovacs for his helpful advice.