

NOTES ON *RHESUS*¹

VAYOS LIAPIS
Open University of Cyprus
vayos.liapis@ouc.ac.cy

SUMMARY

This is a set of philological notes on the text of [Euripides'] *Rhesus*. They are intended as a companion to my forthcoming commentary on the play (Oxford University Press, 2012). They are concerned mainly with textual problems: they discuss manuscript variants and offer, where possible, new emendations. They also include some metrical discussions.

RESUMEN

En este artículo se presenta una serie de notas filológicas al texto de [Eurípides] *Rhesus*. Se trata de un *addendum* a mi próximo comentario de esta obra (Oxford University press, 2012). Son fundamentalmente notas sobre problemas textuales: se discuten variantes textuales y se ofrece, cuando es posible, nuevas conjeturas. También se incluyen algunas discusiones sobre métrica.

KEYWORDS

Textual criticism; Greek metre; Greek tragedy; Pseudo-Euripides, *Rhesus*.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Crítica textual; métrica griega; tragedia griega; Pseudo-Eurípides, *Rhesus*.

Fecha de recepción: 15/11/2010

Fecha de aceptación y versión final: 26/03/2011

The following notes are complementary to my forthcoming commentary on *Rhesus* (Oxford University Press, 2012), to which they are meant to serve as a companion. They are concerned mainly with textual problems, offering discussions thereof and, occasionally, new emendations. To an extent, they also aim to correct recent misconceptions of textual and metrical matters.

Text and apparatus (the latter sometimes slightly modified) are reproduced from James Diggle's excellent OCT².

¹ I am deeply grateful to Professors James Diggle and David Kovacs, and to three anonymous referees for *Exemplaria Classica*, all of whom offered suggestions that improved the paper on a number of points. Naturally, none of these scholars can be held responsible for the use I have made of their advice, or for any errors of fact or judgement contained in this paper.

² J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis Fabulae*, Oxford 1994, 3, 427-79.

1. *Rh.*, Hypothesis (a) 4-6

Δόλωνα δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἵ⁵χρείαν ὑπακούσαντα †ἐκπέμπεσθαι τόπον
 εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἰ⁶ἀφώρισεν αὐτῶ†
 6 ἀφώρισεν VQ : ἀφορίσας Aο 5-6 ἐξέπεμψε θηρὸς τρόπον εἰς τὴν π-
 <μισθόν> ἀφορίσας αὐτῶ e.g. Diggle

‘Dolon, who responded to (Hector’s) request, was sent off ... while a
 space in the encampment was set apart for him (=Rhesus?)’

Diggle’s *exempli gratia* suggestion is brilliant: ‘(Hector) sent (Dolon) off to the (enemy) encampment disguised as a beast, having set a reward for him.’ It has, however, the drawback of making Dolon’s disguise part of Hector’s orders, when it is in fact Dolon’s own idea (cf. *Rh.* 201-15). More importantly, it says nothing about Rhesus’ subsequent arrival, an important and spectacular scene.

I propose (again *exempli gratia*, inevitably): ἐκπέμψας <Ῥῆσον μετ’ ὀλίγον ἀφικόμενον ἀπεδέξατο> τόπον εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀφορίσας αὐτῶ³, ‘after he had sent off (Dolon), Hector admitted to his presence Rhesus, who arrived shortly afterwards, and demarcated a space in the (Trojan) encampment especially for him (i.e. Rhesus)’; cf. *Rh.* 518-20, where Hector promises to show Rhesus a ‘space away from the marshalled troops’; the detail is important for the plot, since Rhesus’ cut-off bivouac will facilitate his murder. The resulting hiatus (ὑπακούσαντα ἐκπέμψας) can be easily avoided by reading Δόλωνα δὲ ὑπακούσαντα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν. For ἀποδέχομαι = ‘admit to one’s presence’ cf. Polyb. 21.35.5. My supplement glosses over Hector’s initial reluctance to accept Rhesus as a belated ally (319-32), but the omission would be acceptable in a summary.

2. *Rh.*, Hypothesis (a) 15-18

παραγενθέντος δὲ Ἑκτορος ἵνα ἰ¹⁶αὐτόπτης τῶν πεπραγμένων
 γένηται τετραμένος ὁ τῶν Ῥήσου ἰ¹⁷πῶλων ἐπιμελητῆς διὰ τοῦ
 Ἑκτορος τὸν φόνον ἐνηργῆσθαι †ἐπι-ἰ¹⁸νοεῖ†
 15 παραγενθε[ν]τος papyrus: παραγενομένου Ω τοῦ ἕκτορος Aο 16
 αυτοπτης τ[ῶν] πεπραγμε[ν]ων γενηται par: αὐτὸς περιγένηται (-γίνηται
 V) τῶν πεπραγμένων Ω 17-18 δια τ[οῦ] Ἑκ[τορος] τον φ[όνο]ν ἐνηργηθα[ι
 ἐ]πινοεῖ par: δι’ αὐτοῦ φησὶν (φησὶν Aο : φασὶν Q : om. spat. uac. relicto V)
 ἕκτορος τὸν (τὸν om. V) φόνον γεγενῆσθαι Ω

³ For the clausula 000 — | — in Hypotheses see J. Diggle, “Rhythmical prose in the Euripidean hypotheses”, in G. Bastianini & A. Casanova (eds.), *Euripide e i papiri: Atti del convegno ... Firenze 10-11 giugno 2004*, Florence 2005, 27-67 (here 31).

‘When Hector came along to see for himself what had happened, the wounded keeper of Rhesus’ horses claimed (?) that the murder was committed by the agency of Hector.’

In 17-18, ἐπινοεῖ is the reading of *PSI* XII 1286 col. i 17; but ‘contrives’ or ‘devises’ is hardly appropriate as a description of the charioteer’s accusations (*Rh.* 835-55). Moreover, not only is the hiatus ἐνηργῆσθαι ἐπινοεῖ inadmissible⁴, the tense is also undesirable, since this author seems to avoid the historic present.⁵ The medieval mss give ‘he says that the murder was committed through the agency of Hector himself’ — an inferior version altogether, cf. especially the banalizing γεγενῆσθαι as opposed to the choicer ἐνηργῆσθαι. At any rate, in both versions, διὰ τοῦ Ἑκτορος (pap.) or δι’ αὐτοῦ ... Ἑκτορος (mss.) are factually inaccurate: the charioteer does not accuse Hector of actually being the agent of Rhesus’ murder, but only of having masterminded it. Relics of the original *uox propria* may be preserved in ἐπινοεῖ: e.g. {διὰ τοῦ} Ἑκτορος <ἐπινοήσαντος> τὸν φόνον <φησὶν> ἐνηργῆσθαι⁶, note that φησί seems to be the only verb this author allows, for reasons unclear, to appear in the historic present; cf. Hyp. (a) 21-2 Diggle οὐδ’ Ἀχιλλεῖα φησὶν ἀδάκρυτον ἔσεσθαι. Still, one may attempt to emend such presents away; here, one might envisage, for instance, {διὰ τοῦ} Ἑκτορος<ἐπινοήσαντος ἔφησε> τὸν φόνον ἐνηργῆσθαι⁷.

3. *Rh.* 16-19

[Χο. θάρσει. Εκ. θαρσῶ.

† μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν; Χο. οὐκ ἔστι. Εκ. τί σὺ γὰρ†
φυλακὰς προλιπὼν κινεῖς στρατιάν,]

εἰ μὴ τιν’ ἔχων νυκτηγορίαν;

16-18 del. Diggle (post 15 fort. lac. indicanda est propter hiatus) 1 7

οὐκ ἔστι LQ : οὐκέτι OV 17ⁿ (ante τί) Ἑκ. O: paragr. L: om. VQ [Χο. οὐκ ἔστι. Εκ.] τί Dindorf, Χο. οὐκ ἔσθ’, <Ἑκτορ>. Εκ. τί Jackson

⁴ On the tendency to avoid hiatus, except after prepositives, where it is venial, see W. S. Barrett, *CQ* 15, 1965, 62 n. 1 = W. S. Barrett, *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers*, ed. M. L. West, Oxford 2007, 442 n. 4; *contra* W. Luppe, *Philologus* 120, 1976, 15, and 127, 1983, 139 n. 19; the latter is criticised by J. Diggle, *Euripidea: Collected Essays*, Oxford 1994, 332 n. 19.

⁵ See W. S. Barrett, *CQ* 15, 1965, 61 n. 2 = Barrett, *Papers* (*supra*, n. 4) 441 n. 3.

⁶ For the clausula — UU ——— in Hypotheses see J. Diggle, “Rhythmical prose” (*supra*, n. 3) 37 (no. 5).

⁷ For the clausula — U ——— (the commonest Ciceronian clausula, cretic + spondee) see J. Diggle, “Rhythmical prose” (*supra*, n. 3) 29-30 (no. 1). For ἔφησε (as opposed to ἔφη) as this author’s favourite form cf. W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 3, 1983, 198; *idem*, *Philologus* 127, 1983, 136; both cited by J. Diggle, “Rhythmical prose” (*supra*, n. 3) 55 n. 60.

‘(CHORUS) Have courage! —(HECTOR) I do have courage! Has there been a night ambush? —(CH.) No. —(HE.) Why then have you abandoned your watch-post and are stirring up the army unless you have some night-report to make?’

Division of an anapaestic metron between two speakers (θάρσει—θαρσῶ) occurs again at 17 and, perhaps, at 561⁸, but is otherwise paralleled only twice in tragedy: S. *Tr.* 977, 991⁹, and [E.] *IA* 2-3 στεῖχε—στείχω ... σπεῦδε—σπεύδω. The *IA*, which is especially akin to our passage, is interpolated¹⁰. Diggle excises lines 16-18, but as he is aware this leaves us with an unlikely hiatus between θορύβῳ in 15 and εἰ in 19¹¹. Although 18 reappears almost verbatim as 37b-38a, it is surely (*pace* Diggle) the latter passage that is interpolated (thus Dobree¹²): 18 makes perfect sense in a context in which Hector berates the guards for abandoning their posts (cf. 20-2); less so in 37-8 where Hector is merely trying to make sense of the chorus’ utterances. What is more, θάρσει in 16 is indispensable in view of τὰ δὲ θαρσύνεις in 35.

An undeservedly forgotten solution is Badham’s Χο. θάρσει. Ἐκ. {θαρσῶ} μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν; | Χο. οὔτις. Ἐκ. τί σὺ γὰρ κτλ.¹³, which also eliminates the anomalous lack of diaeresis between metra in 17 (λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν)¹⁴. There are less invasive remedies available: delete *OV*’s οὐκέτι¹⁵ or *LQ*’s οὐκ ἔστι¹⁶. However, such deletions, as well as producing a caesura-less anapaestic metron, make τί σὺ γὰρ in 17 —surely a retort to something the chorus has said— seem incoherent. More promising is Jackson’s οὐκ ἔσθ’, <Ἐκτορ>¹⁷, which was more recently backed up by Taplin¹⁸. However this may be, the fact remains that the division of speakers within the anapaestic metron seems to be an irreducible anomaly, despite Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra*, n.8) 290-1. Perhaps it ought to be attributed to conscious imitation of

⁸ See W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*, Cambridge 1964, 289, 292.

⁹ Cf. Davies *ad S. Tr.* 977; C.W. Willink, ‘Studies in the cantica of Euripides’ *Rhesus*, *ICLS* 27/28, 2002/3, 21-43, here 22 n. 5 = *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*, ed. W. B. Henry, Leiden 2010, 560-82, here 561 n. 5.

¹⁰ Cf. A.D. Fitton-Brown, *PACA* 7, 1964, 70-2, here 71; E. Fraenkel, *Gnomon* 37, 1965, 228-41, here 234.

¹¹ Cf. D. Kovacs, *Euripidea Tertia*, Leiden 2003, 146.

¹² P. P. Dobree, *Adversaria* ..., ed. J. Scholefield, Cambridge 1843, 87.

¹³ C. Badham, “Miscellanea critica”. *Philologus* 10, 1855, 336-40, here 336.

¹⁴ On the lack of diaeresis see M. Griffith, *The Authenticity of ‘Prometheus Bound’*, Cambridge 1977, 70-1.

¹⁵ G. Dindorf (ed.), *Euripidis tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*, Oxford 1840, 3, on *Rh.* 18.

¹⁶ Fitton-Brown (*supra*, n. 10) 71-2; D. Kovacs (ed.), *Euripides, Vol. VI: Bacchae, Iphigenia at Aulis, Rhesus* (Loeb Classical Library 495), Cambridge, Mass., 2002.

¹⁷ See J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica*, Oxford 1955, 12.

¹⁸ See O. Taplin, *PCPhS* n.s. 23, 1977, 126.

the *Trachiniai* passage mentioned above (the author of *Rhesus* is generally prone to such quirks of style).

In line 19, Kovacs¹⁹ suggested εἰ μὴ τιν' ἐρεῖς νυκτηγροσίαν ('unless you have some nocturnal activity to report') for the transmitted εἰ μὴ τιν' ἔχων νυκτηγορίαν. This is ingenious: νυκτηγροσία / νυκτεγροσία ('waking by night') is elsewhere used with reference to the *Doloneia*'s nocturnal action; cf. Accius, *Nyctegresia*, fr. 127-37 Dangel; *P.Oxy.* 2176 fr. 3-5, line 6 (Addendum on p. 184); Strab. 9.5.18 (439C., III.142 Radt). But there seems to be no good reason to reject νυκτηγορίαν in the first place. It is retained, for instance, in Nauck's τί σὺ γὰρ φυλακὰς προλιπὼν κινεῖς | στρατιάν; τίν' ἔχων νυκτηγορίαν;²⁰

4. *Rh.* 53-5

ἄνδρες γὰρ ἐκ γῆς τῆσδε νυκτέρῳ πλάτη
λαθόντες ὄμμα τοῦμὸν ἀρεῖσθαι φυγὴν
μέλλουσι

53 ἄνδρες Elmsley : ἄ- Ω : α- pap. 54 ἀρεῖσθαι Nauck : αἰρεῖσθαι pap. : αἶρεσθαι Ω φυγὴν Stephanus : φυγῆ(ι) OLQ: φ*υγῆ V (ras.): φυγῆ[pap.

'For these people are about to flee this land by nocturnal ship-voyage without being observed by me.'

Nauck's emendation of the ms. αἶρεσθαι has received some support from ΑΙΠΕΙΣΘΑΙ in *P.Achm.* 4²¹. The future stem may express, with μέλλει, an imminent futurity; however, a notion of urgent imminence can also be conveyed by μέλλω + present stem, the continuative aspect laying emphasis on the action's duration; cf. 110 στρατὸν μέλλεις ἄγειν²².

There is a further reason why αἶρεσθαι ought to be kept. As pointed out by Barrett²³, Stephanus' φυγὴν (also in 126, where the mss. again have φυγῆ)²⁴ would be more apposite if the activity undertaken were burdensome

¹⁹ *Euripidea Tertia* (*supra*, n. 11) 147.

²⁰ A. Nauck, "Euripideische Studien: Zweiter Theil", *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St-Petersbourg*, VIIe série, tome V, no. 6, 1862, 1-191, here 168.

²¹ = *P.Par.* inv. BN, Suppl. gr. 1099.2 (no. 427 Mertens-Pack³); ed. pr. U. Wilcken, *SBAW-Berlin*, 1887, 815-16; cf. also P. Collart, *BIFAO* 31, 1931, 52-5, here 54-5.

²² See further R. Kühner & B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, ii: *Satzlehre*, vols I-II (Hannover & Leipzig, ³1898-1904), 1, 177-9 (Anm. 4); J. Humbert, *Syn-taxe grecque*, Paris³1960, §280; L. Basset, *Les emplois périphrastiques du verbe grec μέλλειν*, Lyon 1979, 135, 141; G. Pace, "Note critico-testuali al *Reso*", in *Scritti in onore di Italo Gallo*, ed. L. Torraca, Naples 2002, 453-61, here 453-4; M. Fantuzzi, *CPh* 100, 2005, 268 n. 2.

²³ Barrett, *Papers* (*supra*, n. 4) 258 n. 69.

²⁴ For the idiom see also A. *Pers.* 481 αἶρονται φυγὴν (Elmsley : αἰροῦνται φ- mss.). It is perhaps an extended usage from such phrases as ἰστία αἶρεσθαι 'to hoist sail'; or, in the active, E. *Hec.* 1141 ἄρειαν στόλον, *IT* 117 νόστον ἀροῦμεν πάλιν, Th. 1.52 τὰς ναῦς ἄραντες; cf.

or troublesome; however, the requisite meaning here should be no more than ‘take to flight’, since ‘Hektor is concerned with rumoured evacuation solely from his own point of view and not the Greeks’. Thus, the transmitted reading is to be preferred: ἀΐρεσθαι φυγῆ is a perfectly proper “put to sea in flight” that calls for no change²⁵; in this case, the transmitted ἀΐρεσθαι (passive) is paralleled by A. *Su.* 2, Hdt. 1.165.3, 170.2. For the dative cf. E. *Med.* 938 ἀπαροῦμεν (Elmsley : ἀπαίρομεν mss.) φυγῆ²⁶.

5. *Rh.* 59-62

εἰ γὰρ φαεννοὶ μὴ ἴξυνέσχοντ' ἡλίου
λαμπτήρες, οὐτὰν ἔσχον εὐτυχοῦν δόρου,
πρὶν ναῦς πυρῶσαι καὶ διὰ σκηνῶν μολεῖν
κτείνων Ἀχαιοὺς τῆδε πολυφόνῳ χερί.

‘For if the sun’s gleaming lamp had not been extinguished, I would by no means have stayed my successful spear before setting fire to the ships and going through the tents killing Achaeans with this hand of mine, slayer of many.’

In line 59, ξυνέσχον has so far resisted emendation. The ms. reading should require με to be mentally supplied as object, but the resulting sense (‘had the gleaming sun not restrained me’) would be odd. C. E. Palmer’s translation ‘had not the bright rays of the sun withdrawn themselves’²⁷ is impossible. What is more, ΞΥΝΕΣΧΟΝ seems to be an error by anticipation of ΟΥΤΑΝΕΣΧΟΝ in the following line; it must have ousted a word meaning something like ‘be put out’ or ‘be extinguished’. Heimsoeth’s Ξανεῖσαν, accepted by Kovacs in his Loeb edition (*supra*, n. 16), goes some way towards restoring sense, but the sun cannot properly be said to have ‘let go of Hector. Van Herwerden’s²⁸ (μὴ) ῥθόνησαν is elegant, but fails to account for the initial ξυv-. Wecklein’s Ξέλειπον neatly conveys the idea of the sun’s ‘failing’ Hector (ἐκλείπω is also the *uox propria* for the sun’s eclipse), and is accepted by Jouan with good reason²⁹; for the durative verbal aspect used of a specific occurrence in the past cf. *Il.* 2.106-7 (alternation of ἔλιπεν and λείπε in the same context)³⁰. For a list

Mastronarde on E. *Med.* 938.

²⁵ Both quotations from Barrett, *l.c.* (n. 23).

²⁶ Cf. Pace, “Note” (*supra*, n. 22) 454-5.

²⁷ *CR* 4, 1890, 228.

²⁸ H. van Herwerden, “Novae lectiones Euripidae”, *RPh* 2, 1878, 19-57, here 31-2.

²⁹ See N. Wecklein (ed.), *Euripidis Rhesus*, Leipzig 1902, in app. crit. *ad l.*; F. Jouan (ed.), *Euripide Tragédies*, vol. VII.2: *Rhésos*, Paris 2004.

³⁰ See also J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Basel 1926², 1, 182-3 = *Lectures on Syntax*, ed. D. Langslow, Oxford 2009, 235-6.

of emendations and further discussion see E. Magnelli, “Miscellanea critica”, *Eikasmos* 10, 1999, 101-17, here 101-4. His own proposal εἰ γὰρ φαεννοὺς μὴ ξυνέσχεν ἥλιος | λαμπτήρας κτλ., ‘for if the sun had not held back his gleaming lamps’, makes for unlikely Greek, even though the light emitted by celestial bodies is, indeed, often compared to long-range missiles, such as lances and arrows, which one can ‘hold back’ (Magnelli, “Miscellanea critica”, 102-3). No such comparison is in evidence in the present passage, however, and even if it were I doubt that συνέχειν would be the *uox propria* to signify ‘refrain from shooting a weapon’ (Magnelli fails to adduce any evidence whatsoever). The *crux* seems intractable, despite Wecklein’s brilliant emendation.

6. *Rh.* 112-15

καίτοι περάσας κοῖλον αὐλώνων βάθος,
εἰ μὴ κυρήσεις πολεμίους ἀπὸ χθονὸς
φεύγοντας ἀλλὰ σὸν βλέποντας ἐς δόρυ,
νικῶμενος μὲν οὔτι μὴ μόλης πάλιν. 115
115 οὔτι μὴ Cobet: τήνδ’ οὐ μὴ L: τήνδε μὴ VaQ et cod. L a Triclinio tertia
emendatio: τήνδ’ ἐμὴ O: τήνδε μὴ οὐ Schaefer (seruato πόλιν) π ἄ λ ι ν
Reiske: πόλιν Ω

‘Yet should you find, once you have crossed the deep and hollow moat, that the enemies are not fleeing this land but are facing your army instead, there is no way you will come back if you are defeated.’

The mss readings are either unmetrical (τήνδ’ οὐ μὴ μόλης πόλιν) or ungrammatical (τήνδε μὴ μόλης πόλιν). Cobet suggested οὔτι μὴ³¹, Reiske μόλης πάλιν³². Of interest is Schaefer’s τήνδε μὴ οὐ μόλης πόλιν, with μὴ οὐ in synecphonesis³³, producing an independent clause expressing fear that something may not prove true³⁴. Although Troy cannot be visible in the darkness, τήνδε πόλιν, ‘this city here’, would be acceptable, since ὄδε can refer with some vividness to absent persons or things that have just been spoken of, and are thus present to the speaker’s mind³⁵; cf. 655 τῆδε ... πόλει. However, there seems to be little point in Aeneas’ foregrounding the *city*

³¹ C. G. Cobet, *Variae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores graecos*, Leiden 1873², 583.

³² J. J. Reiske, *Ad Euripidam [sic] et Aristophanem animadversiones*, Leipzig 1754, 86-7.

³³ See J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique*, Macon 1931, 32.

³⁴ See W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, Boston 1889, §264; Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n.8) 181.

³⁵ See H. Lloyd-Jones, *CR* 15, 1965, 241-2; Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 49 n. 2; Handley *ad Men. Dysc.* 185, 234ff.; Hutchinson *ad A. Sept.* 408; O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, Oxford 1977, 150-1.

of Troy as Hector's potential place of refuge rather than bringing up the distinct possibility that he may never come back into the Trojan camp *at all* — an idea neatly conveyed by Reiske's *πάλλιν*.

7. *Rh.* 131

τάδε δοκεῖ, τάδε μεταθέμενος νόει
 δόκει Dawe μεταθέμενος **Hn**, conl. Musgrave : μετατιθέμενος **Ω**

'This is what we think (too), this opinion you must adopt, changing your mind'

Found only in Hauniensis 417 (an apograph of Pal. Gr. 98), *μεταθέμενος* restores respension with this line's antistrophic pair (195). As is her wont, Pace³⁶ tries to defend the majority reading *μετατιθέμενος*, assuming *Responionsfreiheit*, i.e. $\text{UUU} - \text{UUUUUUU} - \text{U} -$ in 131, corresponding to 2 dochmiacs in 195. However, the whole idea of *Responionsfreiheit* is highly dubious, because it relies largely on textually suspect passages³⁷, or is otherwise limited to very specific metrical variants³⁸. But apart from the dubiety of such an assumption, the parallels adduced by Pace for resolved second anceps followed by resolved longum in dochmiacs can be easily emended, as she is aware; even the scheme $\text{UUU} - - \text{UU}$ is exceedingly rare³⁹.

As for Dawe's *δόκει*, it is presumably meant to balance *νόει*. It is, however, unnecessary. *δοκεῖ* presents the chorus' opinion as a *fait accompli* which Hector is expected to take seriously under consideration — as indeed he does (cf. 137).

8. *Rh.* 149-50

τίς δῆτα Τρώων οἱ πάρεισιν ἐν λόγῳ
 θέλει κατόπτῃς ναῦς ἐπ' Ἀργείων μολεῖν;
 149 λόγω(ι) **OVaQ** : λόγῳ **L** et **Q**(s.l., a.c.)

'Well then, which one of the Trojans here present wants to go to the Argives' ships as a spy?'

³⁶ G. Pace, *Euripide Reso: I canti*, Rome 2001, 25.

³⁷ See further P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, trsl. H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1962, 29.

³⁸ See A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, Cambridge² 1968, 112, 135, 153, 188.

³⁹ Cf. N. C. Conomis, "The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama", *Hermes* 92, 1964, 23-50, here 28, 36. The inappropriateness of *Responionsfreiheit* here is seen even by S. Delle Donne ("In margine ad una edizione "colometrica" dei cantica del Reso di Euripide", *Rudiae* 16-17, 2004/5, 171-208, here 202-3), who had nonetheless earlier in the same article (p. 177) pronounced such *Responionsfreiheit* 'più che plausibile'.

The variant ἐν λόχῳ is found in L and Q (the latter *supra lineam ante correctionem*); moreover, as pointed out by Morstadt⁴⁰, ἐν λόχῳ must have been in the model of *Chr. Pat.* 1933 τίς δῆτα φίλων, αἱ πάρεισιν ἐνθάδε; — otherwise, there would have been no reason to change ἐν λόγῳ, which (unlike ἐν λόχῳ) suits the *Chr. Pat.* context.

Should one prefer ἐν λόχῳ over ἐν λόγῳ then? The answer is probably no. While it is true that tragic choruses are sometimes referred to, figuratively, as λόχος (e.g. A. *Sept.* 111, *Eum.* 46, 1026), the addressees of Hector's proclamation are not the chorus, who cannot be expected to spy upon the Greeks while on guard duty, but the Trojan warriors already present on stage (2-4; cf. 154ff.). For οἱ πάρεισιν ἐν λόγῳ = 'those present at this announcement', i.e. 'all of the present company'⁴¹, cf. Ar. *Au.* 30, *Ach.* 513 (with Dunbar, Olson *ad ll.*). In *Il.* 10.299-312 Hector makes a similar proclamation, likewise prefacing his speech with a question addressed to all those present: τίς κέν μοι τόδε ἔργον ὑποσχόμενος τελέσειε | δῶρῳ ἔπι μεγάλῳ; (303-4)⁴².

9. *Rh.* 165

τάξει δὲ μισθόν, πλὴν ἐμῆς τυραννίδος
ἐμὴν τυραννίδα Nauck, cl. 173

'So, name your reward [= ask for any reward you like], except for my kingship.'

Nauck's πλὴν ἐμὴν τυραννίδα⁴³ brings the syntax into line with 173 πλὴν στρατηλάτας νεῶν, where the accusative is in accord with the implied object of αἴτει. But while the accusative in 173 serves to avoid the repetition of two successive genitives (πλὴν στρατηλατῶν νεῶν), there is no reason to tamper with the normal construction of prepositional πλὴν + genitive here. Nauck's emendation probably does not even deserve a place in the apparatus.

10. *Rh.* 166

οὐ σῆς ἐρῶμεν πολιόχου τυραννίδος
πολιόχου OQ: πολιούχου V: πολυόχου L

'We have no desire for your city-guarding kingship'

⁴⁰ R. Morstadt, *Beitrag zur Kritik der dem Euripides zugeschriebenen Tragödie Rhesos*, Heidelberg 1827, 8 n. 1.

⁴¹ Not 'those who are within hearing of my words', despite Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 115.

⁴² For a defence of ἐν λόγῳ see also A. Meschini, in *Scritti in onore di Carlo Diano*, Bologna 1975, 217-26, here 217.

⁴³ Nauck, "Studien" (*supra*, n. 20) 170.

L's πολυόχου is doubtless a iotacist error; cf. 381 πολύαρχον (OV) < πολί- (LQ). It may have been understood as meaning 'ruling over many' (πολύς + ἔχω). Such a meaning, however, would be an impossibility. In classical Greek, dependent determinative compounds⁴⁴ with πολυ- as first component and a verbal second component are always resolvable into ὁ ἔχων πολλ- + a noun corresponding to the verbal component, e.g. πολυμέριμος = ὁ πολλὰς μερίμνας ἔχων. This is impossible with πολυόχος.

11. *Rh.* 169

χρυσὸς πάρεστιν, εἰ τόδ' αἰτήσεις γέρας
πάρεστιν OV : γάρ ἐστιν LQ αἰτήση V

'There is gold, if this is the prize you mean to ask for'

For V's predilection for middle verbal forms cf. 175 (ἔξαιτεῖς: -τῆ V), and 181 (αἰτήσεις LQ and *Chr. Pat.* 1972 : -ση O; -σει V). There would have been little point in arguing for the active or the middle, since they are practically equivalent here, were it not for two unambiguous cases where the active is used (αἴτει 173, ἀπαιτῶ 174). For pairs of active-middle verbal forms with no discernible semantic distinction see R. J. Allan, *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek*, Amsterdam 2003, 206-10.

12. *Rh.* 204

ἐπεὶ τίν' ἄλλην ἀντὶ τῆσδ' ἔξεις στολήν;
ἐπεὶ τίν' OV et Q^{lc} : ἐπεὶ τὴν τίν' Q : εἶπ' ἢ τιν' L

'Why, what new gear will you change into?'

L's reading deserves some attention: 'say, will you then change into some new gear?' For the combination of imperative (εἰπέ) and direct question cf. 207 λέξον, τίς ἔσται...; However, interrogative ἦ usually *introduces* questions, and is not preceded by another word, except a vocative or ἀλλά (see LSJ s.v. ἦ, II.1) — certainly not by an imperative, which might itself introduce an *indirect* εἰ-question. Thus, on the basis of the L reading, Pierson proposed εἶπ' εἰ τίν' ἄλλην ἀντὶ τῆσδε κτλ, 'tell me whether you will change into some new gear instead of this one'⁴⁵. This, however, is exceedingly feeble: the

⁴⁴ Cf. H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. ed. by G. Messing, Cambridge, Mass, 1956, § 897(2).

⁴⁵ J. Pierson, *Verisimilium libri duo*, Leiden 1752, 81-2. Pierson was followed by: A. Matthiae (ed.), *Euripidis tragoediae et fragmenta*, vol. VIII, Leipzig 1824, *ad l.*; F. Vater (ed.), *Euripidis Rhesus cum scholiis antiquis*, Berlin 1837, *ad l.*; and Dindorf, *Euripidis*

chorus have already been told that Dolon *will* change into a different attire (202); what they need to know is *what kind* of attire (τίν' ... στολήν) this is going to be. Moreover, Pierson's text would probably require an affirmative γε in Dolon's reply (πρέπουσάν <γ'>), but there is no room for such an addition. Pierson adduces E. *Herc.* 1118 as a parallel (εἴπ' εἶ τι καινὸν ὑπογράφη τῶμῳ βίῳ); but the situation there is quite different: a baffled Herakles is gradually becoming aware of the enormity of his acts, and his question to Theseus ('tell me whether you are revealing my life in a strange new light', cf. Bond *ad l.*) reflects his complete ignorance of the facts. More to the point is Herwerden's εἴφ' ἦντιν' ἄλλην κτλ., 'tell us what other gear you will put on'⁴⁶. But both Herwerden's and Pierson's emendations introduce an exceedingly harsh asyndeton which would be hard to justify in this context. It should not go without saying that ἐπεὶ is perfectly good and idiomatic⁴⁷.

13. *Rh.* 206

σοφοῦ παρ' ἀνδρὸς χρὴ σοφὸν τι μανθάνειν

'One must learn cleverness from clever men'

A 12th-century gnomologium, Athous Vatopedii 36, has σοφοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς, a perfectly plausible alternative, cf. e.g. S. *OC* 12-13 μανθάνειν ... πρὸς ἀστῶν. True, the rest of the tradition (in its gnomological ramifications too: Orion *Flor.* 1.7 p. 78 Haffner, Men. *Mon.* 718 Pernigotti), and *Chr. Pat.* 1766 unanimously provide παρ' ἀν-, but πρὸς ἀν- is surely *lectio difficilior*.

14. *Rh.* 208

λύκειον ἀμφὶ νῶτ' ἐνάψομαι δοράν
νῶτ' ἐνάψομαι Cobet : νῶτον ἄψομαι OV : νῶτα θήσομαι LQ

'On my back I shall fasten a wolf's hide.'

Cobet's⁴⁸ emendation has been generally accepted, and with good reason (although not by the hyper-conservative Zanetto, who prints the **OV**

tragoediae (*supra*, n. 15), *adll.*

⁴⁶ H. van Herwerden, "Studia critica in poetas scenicos Graecorum", *Verhandelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen (Afdeling Letterkunde)* 7, 1872, 1-100 + vi, here 17.

⁴⁷ See J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides*, Oxford 1981, 61.

⁴⁸ See C.G. Cobet, *Variae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores graecos*, Leiden 1873², 583.

reading)⁴⁹. Cobet was surely right: it is ἐνάπτεσθαι (middle rather than passive, despite LSJ⁹ s.v.)⁵⁰ that is commonly used to signify ‘fit’ to one’s body, ‘wear’; cf. Hdt. 7.69.1 λεοντέας ἐναμμένοι; E. *Herc.* 549 τὰδ’ ἤδη περιβόλαι ἐνήμμεθα; Ar. *Nu.* 72 διφθέραν ἐνημμένος, *Ec.* 80, *Av.* 1250, *Ra.* 430; fr. 264 KA ὁ χορὸς ... ἐναψάμενος δάπιδας. I see no difficulty in the fact that Cobet’s text gives an elision after the third princeps, which otherwise occurs in *Rh.* only in 986⁵¹. Such lines are far from unparalleled in tragedy⁵².

15. *Rh.* 219-20

σωθήσομαί τοι καὶ κτανὼν Ὀδυσσέως
 οὔσω κάρᾳ σοι 220
 219 τοι Diggle : τε VLQ et ΣV: δέ O : γε Wilamowitz

‘I shall return safe, I’m telling you, and having killed Odysseus I shall bring you his head’

As Diggle has shown⁵³, neither τε nor δέ can stand: τε would be exceedingly feeble as a correlative with καί, while δέ would be inappropriate either as adversative or as continuative. Diggle’s τοι gives highly idiomatic style, for it is regularly used in answer to a command or wish⁵⁴; and ‘the corruption of τοι to τε is especially easy when καί follows’⁵⁵. There are, however, alternatives worth considering, e.g. Wilamowitz’s γε, in its common usage as response-intensifier⁵⁶: it is a neat and elegant emendation, the more so since it nicely accounts, palaeographically, for τε: ‘yes, I shall return safely’ is an apposite reply to the chorus-leader’s ‘all you need now is luck’. I should also suggest δῆ as another possibility: often corrupted into δέ (O), δῆ is often used by the tragedians to emphasize verbs, sometimes with emotional force⁵⁷; thus, σωθήσομαι δῆ = ‘I shall, indeed, return safely.’

16. *Rh.* 227-30

ἰκοῦ ἐννύχιος
 καὶ γενοῦ σωτήριος ἀνέρι πομπᾶς
 ἀγεμῶν καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις 230

⁴⁹ G. Zanetto (ed.), *Euripides Rhesus*, Stuttgart & Leipzig 1993.

⁵⁰ See E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1950, 2, 231.

⁵¹ See Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 285-6.

⁵² See Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n.4), 473 with n. 151.

⁵³ Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 513-15.

⁵⁴ Cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. rev. by K. J. Dover, Oxford 1950, 541.

⁵⁵ Quotation from Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 513.

⁵⁶ Cf. Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 130-1.

⁵⁷ Cf. Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 214-16.

227 ἴκου L. Dindorf: ἴκου fere Ω (ἦκ- Q) 228-30 καὶ γενοῦ ...
 ἀγεμῶν Dindorf: ἀγεμῶν (ἀ- cod. L a Triclinio secunda emendatio: ἦ-
 <L>P)... καὶ γενοῦ Ω

‘(O Apollo,) do appear in the night, and be a safe guide on this
 man’s mission, and aid Dardanus’ descendants’.

W. Dindorf’s⁵⁸ transposition of the mss word-order (ἴκου ἐννύχιοις | ἀγεμῶν
 σωτήριος ἀνέρι πομπᾶς | καὶ γενοῦ καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις) has won
 almost universal approval. Zanetto (cf. *supra*, n. 49) predictably keeps the
 paradosis, but emends καὶ γενοῦ into καὶ πόνου (governed, together with
 πομπᾶς, by ἀγεμῶν). However, ἀγεμῶν πόνου is odd: we should expect
 e.g. ξυλλήπτωρ, as in E. *Med.* 946, oddly invoked elsewhere by Zanetto
 in support of his emendation⁵⁹. Moreover, it would be pointless to have a
 feebly vague πόνου supplement an appositely specific πομπᾶς. The attempt
 by several scholars⁶⁰ to defend the paradosis as an instance of the σχῆμα
 ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, i.e. γενοῦ καὶ ξύλλαβε = ξυγγενοῦ καὶ ξύλλ- will carry little
 conviction.

17. *Rh.* 231-2

ὦ παγκρατές, ὦ Τροΐας
 τείχη παλαιὰ δειμάς
 Τροΐας Lachmann : τροΐας Ω

‘O, all-mighty one, you who built Troy’s ancient walls.’

For Τροΐας, which is metrically necessary, see K. Lachmann, *De choricis
 systematis tragicorum graecorum libri quattuor*, Berlin 1819, 154 n.
 For the form cf. also *Rh.* 262 (emend. Dindorf), 360 (emend. Murray) and,
 probably, S. *Aj.* 1190 (emend. Wilamowitz). According to Aristarchus and
 Herodian, Homeric usage requires that trisyllabic Τροΐη be used only as
 epithet of πόλις (‘Trojan town’; by contrast, disyllabic Τροΐη = ‘Troy’ as
 substantive)⁶¹. Whether this is Aristarchus’ own conjecture or it represents
 genuine tradition⁶², the presumed rule is observed neither here nor in 360
 (although it is followed, albeit loosely, in 262). This may well mean that

⁵⁸ See Dindorf, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 15), ad 224-263 (p. 597).

⁵⁹ See G. Zanetto (ed., trsl.) *Euripide: Ciclope, Reso*, Milan 1998, 143.

⁶⁰ e.g. G. Hermann, in *Opuscula*, Leipzig 1828; repr. Hildesheim 1970, 3, 262-310, here
 302; F. Lindemann, in *Ad annum lustrationem Gymnasii Zittaviensis etc.*, Zittau 1834,
 1-16, here 8; G. Kiefner, *Die Versparung*, Wiesbaden 1964, 103-4.

⁶¹ Cf. *Il.* 1.129 with ΣA ad l. (129c, I.47.13ff. Erbse); *Od.* 5.39, 11.510 with Σ ad ll. (I 244.24-
 6, II 517.6 Dindorf); Hdn. *Il. pros.* 1.129 (*Gr. Gr.* III.2.2.1, p. 23.36ff. Lentz).

⁶² Cf. C. G. Cobet, *Miscellanea critica*, Leiden 1876, 253.

the Homeric edition known to the author of *Rhesus* made no distinction between disyllabic and trisyllabic forms; perhaps the distinction had even vanished from live performances of Homer, despite the fact that these probably did preserve elements of archaic accentuation, which influenced the Alexandrian editors' (including Aristarchus') decisions on matters of Homeric accentuation⁶³. If so, Aristarchus' thesis is somewhat weakened. In 262, Dindorf's Τροῖταν is an epithet, and thus conformant with Aristarchus' standards of Homeric usage.

18. *Rh.* 245-9

ἦ σπάνις αἰεὶ 245
 τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὅταν ἦ δυσάλιον ἐν πελάγει
 καὶ σαλεύῃ
 πόλις
 245 σπάνις αἰεὶ Wilamowitz: σπανία O: σπανία V² et Σ^V: πανία V: σπάνις
 LQ: σπάνις ἐστί Ritchie

‘Indeed, there is a dearth of good men when a sunless sky is upon
 the sea, and the city is tempest-tossed.’

Wilamowitz's neat σπάνις αἰεὶ (ἀεὶ) was first aired *ap.* Murray's OCT (in app. crit.)⁶⁴. The mss. readings are all one syllable shorter than the corresponding 256. It may be of some significance that σπανία (V *post corr.*, Σ^V) is reported as a synonym for σπάνις (LQ, obviously an emendation) by Hesych. σ 1402 Hansen, Phot. *Lex.* 529.12 Porson. Another possibility is Ritchie's⁶⁵ σπάνις ἐστί, which is however feebler than Wilamowitz's emendation. Willink's⁶⁶ conjecture, ἦ σπάνι' οἶα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, 'rare indeed [are λήματα] such as [are those] of οἱ ἀγαθοί', makes for contorted phrasing, not least because the implied change of number from singular (λήματος) to plural is quite jarring. Alternatively, one might consider emending 256 instead; indeed, Dindorf⁶⁷ suggested reading ἐπὶ γᾶς / γᾶ / γᾶν there⁶⁸; however, as Ritchie (*l.c.*) points out γαῖα-forms are unanimously transmitted in 256.

⁶³ See on this matter P. Probert, *Ancient Greek Accentuation: Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory*, Oxford 2006, 34-44. The evidence of the papyri in this regard is scant and often inconsistent; see J. Moor-Blunt, "Problems of Accentuation in Greek Papyri", *QUCC* 29, 1978, 137-63; A. Nodar, "Ancient Homeric Scholarship and the Medieval Tradition: Evidence from the Diacritics in the Papyri", in: B. Palme (ed.), *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Wien, 22.-28. Juli 2001*, Vienna 2007, 469-81.

⁶⁴ G. Murray (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae*, vol. III, Oxford 1909 (corr. repr. 1913).

⁶⁵ Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 301.

⁶⁶ Willink, "Cantica" (*supra*, n. 9) 29 = *Collected Papers* 568.

⁶⁷ *Euripidis tragoediae*, *supra*, n. 15 ad 256.

⁶⁸ So also Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921, 584 n. 1.

19. *Rh.* 253-7

τίν' ἄνδρ' Ἀχαιῶν ὁ πεδοστιβῆς σφαγεὺς
 οὐτάσει ἐν κλισίαις, τετράπουν 255
 μῖμον ἔχων ἐπὶ γαίας
 θηρός;
 256 γαίας LQ: γαίαι O: γαῖαν V

‘Which of the Achaeans will the crawling slaughterer slay in their huts, mimicking a beast’s four-footed trail on the ground?’ (lit., ‘putting on a four-footed mimicry of a beast’).

Pace Diggle and Kovacs, who print ἐπὶ γαίας, one should probably prefer either the O or the V reading; so Zanetto, Feickert, Jouan (ἐπὶ γᾶν, after Dindorf, cf. item 18 above). With the O reading, the sense of motion would merge with that of support (Dolon will be *crawling over* the land), cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐπί, B.I.2.a, and e.g. *Il.* 4.443 ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει. With the V reading, the sense of *extension over* a space would prevail (LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐπί, C.I.5): Dolon will pursue his mission *over* a large stretch of land. Murray’s ἐπιγαίου is superfluous, despite *Pl. Resp.* 546a ἐπιγείοις ζώοις.

20. *Rh.* 285-6

νυκτὸς γὰρ οὔτι φαῦλον ἐσβαλεῖν στρατόν, 285
 κλύοντα πλήρη πεδιά πολεμίας χερός.
 ἐσβαλεῖν Diggle: ἐμβ- Ω: cf. Chr. Pat. 2096, 2452 μορφή γὰρ οὔτι φαῦλον
 εἰσβαλεῖν τινα (εἰσβαλεῖν ἔφην 2452)

‘You see, it is no slight matter to come upon an army at night, having heard the flatlands full of enemy soldiers.’

With Diggle’s ἐσβαλεῖν⁶⁹, the implied subject of the infinitive must be τινά; as for στρατόν, it will be an accusative after a verb of motion, for which Diggle invokes as a parallel *E. Cyc.* 99 Βρομίῳ πόλιν ἔοιγμεν ἐσβαλεῖν. Consequently, γὰρ in 285 will explain not why Rhesus chose the rugged glades of Mt Ida over the level and broad roads (which is what Hector has asked in 282-3), but rather why the shepherd has no information on the Thracian’s reasons for doing so (284 οὐκ οἶδ’ ἀκριβῶς): he became frightened by the great din produced by Rhesus’ advancing army (287, 290-1, 308), thought that the approaching troops were Greeks (294-5, hence πολεμίας χερός in 286), and ran away to protect Hector’s flocks from the enemy (291-5).

⁶⁹ See Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 515.

Diggle's conjecture stumbles upon three difficulties:

(i) If the γάρ-clause explains οὐκ οἶδ' ἀκριβῶς rather than εἰκάσαι γε μὴν πάρα (284), the antithesis introduced by the latter is oddly interrupted, since we never learn exactly what the shepherd's 'conjecture' (εἰκάσαι) consisted of.

(ii) Moreover, with Diggle's conjecture, the γάρ-clause will not really explain the shepherd's lack of information: even if he had remained in his usual position, he would still be no better informed as to the reasons for Rhesus' choice of route; after all, he did eventually have the opportunity to converse with the Thracian advance scouts (296-7) but is apparently none the wiser for it. By contrast, with the *lectio tradita* ἐμβαλεῖν the rationale behind the shepherd's conjecture becomes transparent: the oddly inconvenient route taken by Rhesus was, presumably (εἰκάσαι), due to his wish to avoid leading his army upon (ἐμβαλεῖν) the enemy soldiers with which the Trojan plain was infested (286).

(iii) Most importantly perhaps, intransitive εἰσβάλλω is normally followed by an accusative denoting the *place* or *area* entered — as, indeed, it does in all the passages cited by Diggle in support of his emendation⁷⁰: *E. Hipp.* 1198, *Cyc.* 99, *Andr.* 968, *Ba.* 1045, *Phaeth.* fr. 779.1 K. But στρατόν cannot really fulfil this function.

When all is said and done, I would rather keep the *lectio tradita* ἐμβαλεῖν, with στρατόν as object: 'it is no slight matter to bring in an army'; cf. *A. Sept.* 583, 1019 (where 1019, probably an interpolation, seems merely a rehash of 583). It is true that transitive εἰσβάλλω with στρατιάν *uel sim.* as its object is an established usage (LSJ *s.v.* εἰσβάλλω I, II); and both ἐμβάλλω and εἰσβάλλω are used alternatively in *Hdt.* 4.125.4, and appear as mss. variants in *Hdt.* 5.15.2 and 9.13.2. But this is all the more reason not to depart from the *lectio tradita*.

Diggle's objections⁷¹ to the *lectio tradita* do not carry much conviction. Firstly, it is simply not true that 'Rhesus, when he appears, is brim-full of insouciance, and has borne the troubles of a night-time arrival with a very light heart'. For aside from the fact that Rhesus does complain of the extreme difficulties he has had to face on his way to Troy (426-42), the shepherd cannot possibly be aware of Rhesus' supposed 'insouciance', since he has never seen him. Secondly, to claim that 'Rhesus did not hear the land full of enemy troops, for the Greeks were cooped up by their ships and had every reason to keep quiet' (Diggle *l.c.*) is to disregard the advance information Rhesus turns out (quite plausibly) to have had as to the troubles the Greek army has been causing Hector for ten whole years (444-6). Finally, we have already shown —see (ii) above— that γάρ (285) explains not the shepherd's lack of 'precise information [...] about the route which Rhesus has taken',

⁷⁰ *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 163.

⁷¹ *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 515.

but rather the rationale behind his conjecture about the possible reason why Rhesus has chosen a patently troublesome route through Mt Ida's glades.

21. *Rh.* 296-7

στείων δ' ἀνακτος προξερευνητὰς ὁδοῦ
ἀνιστόρησα Θρηκίους προσφθέγμασιν
296 ὁδοῦ V: στρατοῦ OLQ

'So, I went and questioned the king's advance scouts, addressing them in the Thracian tongue.'

ἀνακτος has given pause to some editors: the shepherd could not have known at the time that a king was on his way to Troy. But none of the several emendations proposed so far is wholly satisfactory⁷². It seems best to assume that the shepherd is merely speaking with hindsight (cf. also 290 Θρηκίος ... στρατός, 299 σύμμαχος).

As for ὁδοῦ, it is preferable to στρατοῦ both because the latter is a redundancy (the προξερευνηταί can only be part of an army, even though they function separately from it) and because of the syntactical awkwardness resulting from the presence of two possessive genitives, namely ἀνακτος and στρατοῦ⁷³.

22. *Rh.* 333-41

Εκ. μισῶ φίλοισιν ὕστερον βοηδρομεῖν.	333
ὁ δ' οὖν, ἐπεὶπερ ἦλθε, σύμμαχος μὲν οὐ,	336
ξένος δὲ πρὸς τράπεζαν ἠκέτω ξένων·	
χάρις γὰρ αὐτῷ Πριαμίδων διώλετο.	338
Χο. ἀνάξ, ἀπωθεῖν συμμαχους ἐπίφθονον.	334
Αγ. φόβος γένοιτ' ἂν πολεμίους ὀφθεις μόνον.	335
Εκ. σύ τ' εὐ παραινεις, καὶ σύ καιρίως σκοπεῖς.	339
ὁ χρυσοτευχῆς δ' οὐνεκ' ἀγγέλου λόγων	340
Ῥῆσος παρέστω τῆδε σύμμαχος χθονί.	

⁷² Cf. ἔναντα Morstadt, *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 20 n. 2, adopted by Kovacs, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 16): 'marching right up [to the advance scouts]'; ἔναγχος Reiske, *Animadversiones* (*supra*, n. 32) 88, 'moving up close [to the scouts]'; ἀν' αὐτούς N. Wecklein, *SBAWMünchen*, philos.-philol.-histor. Classe, 1897, 494; cf. further F. H. M. Blaydes, *Adversaria critica in Euripidem*, Halle 1901, 4.

⁷³ The clumsiness is well brought out by Vater's paraphrase (*Euripidis Rhesus*, *supra*, n. 45) ad 285: 'Admodum enim ieiunum est: *interrogavi antecursores eius, qui praefuit exercitui, cum expectaveris: antecursores exercitus*'.

333, 336-8, 334-5, 339-41 hoc ordine Nauck correcta personarum dispositione: 334-8 nuntio 339-41 choro trib. **OV**, 334-5 choro 336-8 Hectori 339-41 choro **L** (praescriptis paragr.), 334-8 choro 339-41 Hectori **Q** aut 336-8 aut 339-41 del. West

‘(HECTOR) I hate it when one is late in assisting friends. But anyway, since he is now here, let him come — not as an ally but as a guest-friend at his hosts’ table; for the favour of Priam’s family toward him has vanished. (CHORUS) My lord, it is invidious to push away one’s allies. (MESSENGER) He would strike terror in the enemy merely by being seen⁷⁴. (HECTOR) ‘(*To the coryphaeus*) Your advice is good. (*To the messenger*) And your considerations are timely. Let then gold-armoured Rhesus, as this messenger’s report has it, come as an ally to this land.’

There are a number of issues here, including the attribution of speaking parts, the correct order of lines, and the question whether deletion of lines is to be practised.

(1) As far as attribution of parts is concerned, none of the arrangements in the mss. is satisfactory. **OV** give 334-8 to the shepherd, and 339-41 to the chorus, but the chorus of soldiers cannot have the last word in the matter of accepting Rhesus as an ally. Moreover, there can be no doubt that only Hector has the authority to speak 336-8, and **L** is right in giving him these lines⁷⁵. But then 339-41 cannot be part of the same speech by Hector (thus **Q**, although all other mss give these lines to the chorus), because if 340-1 (‘let Rhesus come as an ally’) follow shortly after 336-8 (‘let Rhesus come, but not as an ally’), the result is an irreducible contradiction⁷⁶. Moreover, 339 is problematic: it clearly addresses two speakers⁷⁷, although for the last twenty lines Hector has only been conversing with the coryphaeus. Taplin, who wants the messenger to depart after 316, envisages ‘some textual trouble, or even an author’s incompetence, in lines 333-41, especially 339-41’⁷⁸. But this is unhelpfully vague, and at any rate Taplin himself shows that not all tragic messengers depart after they have delivered their report⁷⁹ — certainly not in this play, where the second messenger (Rhesus’ charioteer) indubitably stays on even after he has delivered his messenger speech (833ff.).

(2) Clearly, no satisfactory attribution of speaking parts is possible unless the lines are rearranged, or excision resorted to. Should one opt for the

⁷⁴ On the Greek text here see item 24 below.

⁷⁵ Cf. E. Dettori, *L’interlocuzione difficile*, Pisa 1992, 134.

⁷⁶ The point is ignored by Dettori, *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 75).

⁷⁷ Despite Herwerden, “*Novae lectiones*” (*supra*, n. 28) 32.

⁷⁸ See Taplin, *Stagecraft* (*supra*, n. 35) 90 n. 4.

⁷⁹ Taplin, *Stagecraft* (*supra*, n. 35) 89.

former, Nauck's⁸⁰ brilliant transposition of lines (336-8 after 333, and 334-5 before 339) is one's best bet, and it has been accepted with good reason by Murray, Diggle, Kovacs, and Jouan. With Nauck's rearrangement, 336-8 and 340-1 will be spoken by the only person in authority to make such decisions, namely Hector. As for 334 and 335, the former will have to be spoken by the chorus, who thus add a concluding argument to their appeal against rejecting Rhesus (327-8, 330, 332), while the latter with its emphasis on φόβος surely belongs to the shepherd, who has already emphasized Rhesus' power to frighten the enemy (287-9, 306-8). Attribution of 334-5 to two different speakers can hardly be bettered as a means of making sense of the double address in the immediately following 339, and has rightly been accepted by all recent editors. It is true that with this rearrangement Hector in 339-41 may appear to be yielding to the chorus' and the shepherd's arguments all too easily, an attitude which, according to Rosivach, would make the commander-in-chief to 'look like a fickle ninny'⁸¹. But Hector has already shown himself prone to bow to public opinion (137), and I do not see why his present *volte-face* is any more jarring than the one in 137. At any rate, it will be seen that Hector's change of mind is less abrupt than one may perhaps realize (below, after (4)).

(3) Another solution, offered by M. L. West⁸², is to assume that 336-8 and 339-41 are 'alternative endings for the same scene which have coalesced.' On this hypothesis, Hector's unconditional acceptance of Rhesus as a fully-fledged ally in 339-41 could only have come after an expostulation, now lost, which would have preceded 339. Indeed, Rosivach⁸³ had already suggested placing a lacuna between 338 and 339 — one in which the chorus and perhaps also the shepherd would have expatiated on such arguments as are raised in 332, 334, 335. In a similar vein, Klyve⁸⁴ envisages a lacuna between 334 and 335. But it is undesirable to use a lacuna as a *passe-partout* textual remedy when more cautious measures may lie to hand. Alternatively, on West's hypothesis, one may choose to excise 339-41 and interpret 336-8 as indicating that Hector accepts Rhesus 'only as a guest, postponing a final acceptance until he has had a chance to call him to account'⁸⁵. However, having the debate end on 338 would create an inconsistency with the following scene, where Hector, despite taking Rhesus to task for his belatedness, never as much as insinuates

⁸⁰ Nauck, "Studien" (*supra*, n. 20) 171-3.

⁸¹ V. J. Rosivach, "Hector in the Rhesus", *Hermes* 106, 1978, 54-73, here 58 n. 12. Cf. also C. D. Beck, *Exercitatio critica de Rhese suppositio Euripidis dramate*, Leipzig 1780, 23; H. D. F. Kitto, 'The Rhesus and related matters', *Ycls* 25, 1977, 317-50, here 336; G. E. Klyve, *A Commentary on Rhesus 1-526 with an Introduction*, DPhil thesis, Oxford 1995, 224-6.

⁸² *ap.* Klyve, *Commentary* (*supra*, n. 81) p. 225.

⁸³ "Hector" (*supra*, n. 81) 58 with n. 12.

⁸⁴ *Commentary* (*supra*, n. 81) p. 225-6.

⁸⁵ Quotation from Klyve, *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 84).

that the latter would be welcome only as a guest-friend, not as an ally, as 336-8 seem to imply.

(4) There is, finally, a third possibility, which however carries very little conviction. This is Zanetto's (cf. *Euripides Rhesus* [*supra*, n. 49]) transposition of 336-8 to follow 328, and of 339-41 to follow 335. Line 338 is now given to the chorus and takes the form of a surprised and incredulous question⁸⁶: χάρις ... διώλετο; 'what! Are the Priamids no longer grateful to Rhesus?' This is highly unlikely. First of all, 'we have sufficient men to defend Ilium' (329) does not follow very well after 338 — one should rather expect a comment on Rhesus' having fallen from grace. On the other hand, Hector's proud retort in 329 is very much apposite after the chorus' pointing out that an ally should always be welcome (328). Secondly, Hector's capitulation in 336-7 ('fine, let Rhesus sit as a guest at our table') would come as a complete surprise after only two lines of argumentation by the chorus (327-8), whereas it is more at home after the brief altercation in 329-32.

On balance, it seems best to keep the text as rearranged by Nauck. It is true that 336-8 and 339-41 may seem at first sight to be 'alternative endings which have coalesced', to repeat West's phrase (see (3) above). However, this is a false impression. The process of convincing Hector to accept Rhesus as an ally is both longer and smoother than has perhaps been realized, and the Trojan prince's attitude cannot be dismissed as 'fatuous', despite e.g. Pearson⁸⁷. Hector starts off by dismissing Rhesus' professed friendship and loyalty as mere sham (319-26); nine lines later, however, he concedes that Rhesus may come as a guest-friend, although he is certainly unwilling to have him as an ally (336-8); finally, after the chorus and the messenger put in their final arguments (334-5), Hector agrees to have Rhesus fight as a fully-fledged Trojan ally (339-41). For this gradual process to be delineated (passably, though by no means adequately), both 336-8 and 339-41 are indispensable.

23. *Rh.* 336-8

For the text see item 22 above. As pointed out by Beck⁸⁸, line 338 seems to be cited in Eustathius (*Comm. Iliad.* p. 822.5-6, III.123.25-6 van der Valk): συντέθνηκε κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἢ ἐκ τῶν Τρώων χάρις τῷ Ῥήσῳ, 'as the proverb has it, the Trojan's gratitude has died together with Rhesus.' The situation envisaged in the Eust. passage appears to be one in which the Trojans refuse to pursue Rhesus' murderers because they feel they are no longer indebted to him. This is most certainly not how matters stand in *Rhesus*, and so Morstadt⁸⁹ imagined that Eust. can only be referring to a

⁸⁶ Cf. Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 77-8.

⁸⁷ Cf. A.C. Pearson, "The *Rhesus*", *CR* 35, 1921, 52-61, here 59.

⁸⁸ *Exercitatio* (*supra*, n. 81) 27 n. 2.

⁸⁹ *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 74-6.

different *Rhesus* — presumably the genuine Euripidean play. However, Eustathius' referring to the passage as a *παροιμία* strongly suggests that he is quoting from a gnomologium, and therefore out of context; this surely accounts for the inaccuracy pointed out by Morstadt.

As for *διώλετο* (OVQ) *vs.* *ἀπόλετο* (L), it seems, *pace* Diggle, that the latter is to be preferred. As a rule, *διόλλυμαι* emphasizes the role of an external agency in effecting the perishing or coming to nought⁹⁰; by contrast, *ἀπόλλυμαι* (or the simplex *ἄλλυμαι*) can mean merely 'to cease to exist, to fail', and is apparently the *uox propria* to be used with regard to loss of *χάρις*; cf. E. *Held.* 438 οὔτοι σοί γ' ἀπόλλυται χάρις; fr. 736.5-6 Kannicht ἢ δ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς χάρις | ἀπόλωλ';⁹¹ S. fr. 920 Radt ἀμνήμονος γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ἄλλυται χάρις.

24. *Rh.* 335

For the Greek text see item 22 above. Evidently, *φόβος* here is used in the sense 'object or cause of fear'; cf. LSJ⁹ *s.v.*, II.2; S. *OT* 917 ἦν φόβους λέγει; *OC* 1651-2 ὡς δεινοῦ τινος | φόβου φανέντος⁹². Alternatively, one might capitalize: *Φόβος γένειτ' ἂν πολεμίοις*, 'Rhesus would become Phobos (= as terrifying as Ph.) for the enemy.' The reference would then be to Phobos, Ares' son or attendant⁹³, a personification of the terror that puts warriors to flight⁹⁴. For a redoubtable warrior being assimilated to Phobos cf. A. *Sept.* 500, where Hippomedon 'boasts of being Phobos at the gates'⁹⁵; cf. *Sept.* 574 for Tydeus as *πρόσπολον Φόβου* (*v.l.* *φόνου*). A key passage in this connection is *Il.* 13.298-300 (see Janko *ad l.*), where Meriones is likened to Ares, and Idomeneus (implicitly) to Phobos. Note that Rhesus is compared to Ares himself in *Rhesus* 385-7. For the use of divine names in predicate function, whereby one 'is' or 'becomes' this or that divinity, cf. e.g. E. *Tr.*

⁹⁰ Examples from tragedy include: A. *Pers.* 483-4 στρατὸς ... | διόλλυθ'; S. *Tr.* 1052 ὑφαντὸν ἀμφιβληστρον, ᾧ διόλλυμαι; *El.* 141 αἰεὶ στενάχουσα διόλλυσαι ('you're ruining yourself'); *OT* 225 ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τίνος διώλετο; E. fr. 757.848 Κν. διὰ σέ γὰρ διόλλυμαι (whereas in the same fragment's line 845, when there was no emphasis on a third party's agency, Hypsipyle had said merely ὡς ἀπόλλυμαι κακῶς); *Hipp.* 909 τῷ τρόπῳ διόλλυται; (Hippolytus is seeking to ascertain the *agent* of Phaedra's death); 1061 ὑφ' ὑμῶν ... διόλλυμαι; 1305 τροφοῦ διώλετ' οὐχ ἔκοῦσα μηχαναῖς; *Andr.* 158 νηδὺς δ' ἀκύμων διὰ σέ μοι διόλλυται; *Tro.* 629 ὡς κακῶς διόλλυσαι (of the slaughtered Polyxena); *Su.* 191-2 οὐ χρεῖα πόλεις | πολλὰ διώλοντ'; *Or.* 1512 ἢ Τυνδάρειος ... παῖς διώλλυτο.

⁹¹ See Vater, *Euripides Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) p. x with n.

⁹² Cf. further A. Feickert (ed.), *Euripidis Rhesus: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Frankfurt a. M. 2005, *ad* 52. For a similar usage in early modern English cf. e.g. Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* 5.1.21 'in the night, imagining some fear'; Milton, *Paradise Lost* 9.285 'His fraud is then thy fear.'

⁹³ Hom. *Il.* 15.119; Hes. *Sc.* 195.

⁹⁴ Cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.440, 15.119; A. *Sept.* 45 (with Tucker, Hutchinson *ad l.*), 574.

⁹⁵ As Rose *ad l.* argues, *Φόβος γὰρ ἤδη πρὸς πύλαις κομπάζεται* means that Hippomedon, who is 'inspired by Ares' (497 *ἔνθεος δ' Ἄρει*) and 'with a horrifying look in his eyes' (498 *φόβον βλέπων*), is assimilated with Phobos. *Contra*, however, Hutchinson.

988-9 ὁ σὸς ... νοῦς ἐποιήθη Κύπρις· τὰ μῶρα γὰρ πάντ' ἐστὶν Ἀφροδίτη βροτοῖς; S. *Tr.* 1278 κοῦδὲν τούτων ὅτι μὴ Ζεὺς⁹⁶; A. fr. 70 Radt Ζεὺς ἐστὶν αἰθήρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ etc.

25. *Rh.* 339-41

For the Greek text see item 22 above. Herwerden⁹⁷ thought that the two σύ refer to the same person (an impossibility), and went on to emend into σύ γ' εὔ παραινεῖς καὶ τὸ καίριον σκοπεῖς. However, the use of σὺ ... σύ with reference to two different interlocutors is an established usage. As tragic instances, Nauck⁹⁸ cites S. *OT* 637 οὐκ εἶ σύ τ' (i.e. Oedipus) οἴκους σύ τε, Κρέον, κατὰ στέγας...; *Ant.* 724-5 ἀνάξ, σέ τ' εἰκός, εἶ τι καίριον λέγει, | μαθεῖν, σέ τ' (i.e. Haemon) αὖ τοῦδ'; 1340-1 ᾧ παῖ, σέ τ' οὐχ ἔκων κατέκανον | σέ τ' αὖ τάνδ' (i.e. Eurydice); E. *IT* 657 σὲ (i.e. Orestes) πάρος ἢ σ' (i.e. Pylades) ἀναστενάξω γόοις; 1069 σὲ καὶ σ' ἰκνοῦμαι, σὲ δὲ φίλης παρηίδος (i.e. several members of the chorus); *IT* 1079 σὸν ἔργον ἤδη καὶ σὸν ἐσβαίνειν δόμους (ditto); *Ph.* 568 σοὶ μὲν (i.e. Eteocles) τάδ' αὐδῶ· σοὶ δέ, Πολύνεικες, λέγω.

With regard to οὐνεκ' ἀγγέλου λόγων, Pearson claimed that the paradosis cannot 'be merely the equivalent of "if we may believe the messenger" — with or without innuendo'⁹⁹. He thus went on to emend into οὐκ ἐν ἀγγέλου λόγῳ, 'Rhesus in his golden armour shall come before us, no longer through the medium of a messenger's tale.' But it would be otiose to point out that Rhesus will appear in person rather than through a messenger's report — unless one should want to have Hector suddenly all aflutter and anxious to see Rhesus face to face, which would be starkly inconsistent with his attitude so far.

26. *Rh.* 360-4

ἄρα ποτ' αἴθις ἅ παλαιὰ Τροῖα	360
τοὺς προπτότας παναμερεύ-	
σει θιάσους ἐρώτων	
φαλμοῖσι καὶ κυλίκων οἰνοπλανήτοις	
ἐπιδεξίσις ἀμίλλαις ... ;	
363 φαλμοῖσι Canter: ψάλμασι Ω 364 ἐπιδεξίσις L. Dindorf (-αις iam Musgrave): ὑποδεξίσις O, -αις VLQ et 'Σ ^V	

⁹⁶ Notwithstanding the scepticism of M. L. West, *BICS* 26, 1979, 112 with n. 18.

⁹⁷ (*supra*, n. 28) 32.

⁹⁸ Nauck, "Studien" (*supra*, n. 20) 172 n. 1.

⁹⁹ A. C. Pearson, "Some Passages of Greek Tragedy", *CQ* 11, 1917, 57-68, here 60; cf. *idem*, *CQ* 12, 1918, 79.

‘Will Troy of old ever again hold celebrations all day long with bands of toasting revellers, accompanied by love songs and the contest of wine cups wandering ever to the right...?’

Canter’s indispensable emendation of mss. ψάλμασι (a transcription error going back to a minuscule original: οἱ > α) restores responsion with 373. Pace¹⁰⁰, endorsed by Delle Donne,¹⁰¹ keeps the tradition, assuming ‘free responsion’ between a choriamb (ψάλμασι καί) and an iamb (σχιστὰν παρ’ ἄντ-); but the parallels she adduces are all easily emendable¹⁰²; on the dubiety of the *Responsionsfreiheit* device see item 7 above.

With regard to ἐπιδέξιος, L. Dindorf’s¹⁰³ emendation seems unassailable, even though ἐπιδέξιος is unattested in tragedy¹⁰⁴. For the sympotic custom indicated by ἐπιδέξιος cf. Crit. fr. 6.6 West προπόσεις ὀρέγειν ἐπιδέξια; Eup. fr. 354 Kassel–Austin ὅταν ... πίνωσι τὴν ἐπιδέξια; *idem* fr. 395.1 Kassel–Austin δεξάμενος δὲ Σωκράτης τὴν ἐπιδέξι’ with K–A in app. crit. *ad l.* Dindorf’s emendation has been contested by Pace¹⁰⁵, who reverts to the *lectio tradita* ὑποδεξίας (VLQ and Σ^v *ad* 364) or -ξίους (O), for which she posits an otherwise unattested meaning ‘welcoming, hospitable’ (‘che riceve, che accoglie, che ospita’).

27. Rh. 370–4

ἐλθὲ φάνηθι, τὰν ζάχρυσον προβαλοῦ 370
 Πηλεΐδα κατ’ ὄμμα πέλ-
 ταν δοχμίαν πεδαίρων
 σχιστὰν παρ’ ἄντυγα, πώλους ἐρεθίζων
 διβολόν τ’ ἄκοντα πάλλων.

‘Come, appear, hold before you your solid-gold *peltē* as you face Peleus’ son, raising it aslant over the bifurcating chariot-rail, goading your mares and flourishing your two-pronged spear.’

My translation follows Diggle’s punctuation at 373 (comma after ἄντυγα). Alternatively, one could punctuate after πεδαίρων in 372, and take σχιστὰν

¹⁰⁰ *Reso* (*supra*, n. 36) 39–40.

¹⁰¹ “In margine” (*supra*, n. 39) 199.

¹⁰² A. *Sept.* 736 γαῖα Dindorf alii alia (χθονία mss.); S. *Phil.* 1100 λωῖτος Bothe alii alia (τοῦ λῶπος mss.); 1138 mss. ἀνατέλ-(λονθ’) could be emended into ἐπανατέλ-; in E. *Held.* 915 read ἐρατὸν Par. gr. 287, Ald. (ἐραστόν L), in 924 ἔσχεν δ’ ὕβριν (Heath: ἔσχε δ’ ὕβρεις mss.); in *Hel.* 1340 read ἐνέπει (Heath: ἐνν- L).

¹⁰³ In *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* vol. 3 s.v. ἐπιδέξιος, col. 1568.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. J. C. Rolfe, “The Tragedy Rhesus”, *HSCPh* 4, 1893, 61–97, here 74.

¹⁰⁵ “Note” (*supra*, n. 22) 455–8.

... ἐρεθίζων to mean 'goaded your mares *past*, or *beyond*, i.e. *over the edge of*, the split chariot-rail' (Rhesus' whip or reins would naturally pass over the rail); for this use of παρά see LSJ⁹ s.v., C.III.1; cf. especially Ar. *Av.* 390-1 παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν χύτραν ἄκραν ὀρώντας, with Dunbar *ad l.*

28. *Rh.* 385-7

θεός, ὦ Τροία, θεός, αὐτὸς Ἄρης 385
ὁ Στρυμόνιος πῶλος ἀοιδοῦ
Μούσης ἤκων καταπνεῖ σε.

'A god, O Troy, a god, Ares himself — the colt born of Strymon and Muse the singer has arrived and breathes upon you.'

An accusative governed by καταπνέω denotes that which comes out with one's breath, not that which is breathed upon or over (except in late Greek, e.g. Heliod. 3.2.1 τὸν τόπον εὐωδία κατέπνεον); in E. *Med.* 838-40 one now generally reads τὰν Κύπριν κλήζουσιν ... χώρας (Reiske : χώραν mss.) καταπνεῦσαι ... ἀνέμων ... αὔρας. It follows that καταπνεῖ σε cannot mean 'breathes upon you'. Such a meaning could only be obtained if the object of καταπνεῖ were either in the genitive (governed by κατα-, cf. E. *Med.* 838-40 above, and Ar. *Lys.* 552 ἕμερον ἡμῶν κατὰ τῶν κόλπων ... καταπνεύση, unless ἡμῶν is possessive genitive) or in the dative, as in Pl. *Com.* fr. 189.15 Kassel-Austin μή σοι νέμεσις θεόθεν καταπνεύση, or in the closely parallel Archestr. *SH* 146.3-4 = fr. 16.3-4 Olson / Sens μή σοι νέμεσις καταπνεύση | ... ἀπ' ἀθανάτων with Olson / Sens *ad l.* As the genitive seems to be used only in conjunction with an accusative object (καταπνεῖν τί τινος), we should probably change σε into σοι here; so also Feickert, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 92) *ad* 387.

29. *Rh.* 388-9

χαῖρ', ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλοῦ παῖ, τύραννε τῆσδε γῆς,
Ἴκτορ; παλαιᾶ σ' ἡμέρα προσεννέπω
388 ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλοῦ παῖ Q et Chr. Pat. 2098, 2538: ἐ- ἐ- παῖς L: ἐσθλοῦ παῖ
V: ἐσθλοῦ πατρὸς παῖ O u. delere paene malit Diggle (uide Willink *ad Or.*
71-2)

'Hail, noble son of a noble father, monarch of this land, Hector; it is after a long time that I greet you.'

The readings of **O** and **V** are obviously unmetrical, but the **L** could be right¹⁰⁶, although the vocative **παῖ** coupled with the nominative **ἔσθλός** (which is not attested in the vocative, at least in tragedy¹⁰⁷) makes for a *lectio difficilior*¹⁰⁸. Addresses extending over more than one line often come under suspicion (see Willink *ad E. Or.* 71-2), and Diggle (app. crit. *ad l.*) was tempted to delete line 388. But the addresses cited by Willink *l.c.* as probably interpolated follow a set pattern, namely **ῶ** + vocative; *Rh.* 388 deviates from it in having **χαῖρε** open the line, and in lacking **ῶ**. This may or may not be sufficient reason to keep the line, but surely one cannot lump the present passage together with the group of interpolated addresses discussed by Willink.

30. *Rh.* 422-3

τοιούτος εἰμι καὐτός, εὐθειᾶν λόγων
τέμνων κέλευθον, κοῦ διπλοῦς πέφυκ' ἀνῆρ,
423 τέμνω (uel τέμνειν) Nauck, cl. Cycl. 524, Or. 895, fr. 196

'I am myself such a man too, following a straight path in my speech, and am not duplicitous.'

A demonstrative expanded on by a following participle (τέμνων) does not seem to be a common tragic usage. The closest parallel I was able to find is *A. Ag.* 312-13 τοιοῖδε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι, | ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι. As Fraenkel *ad l.* explains, 'The binding arrangements (νόμοι) which Clytemnestra has made for the torch-racers consist in their being ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι.'¹⁰⁹

Thus, there seem to be some grounds for turning to Nauck's¹¹⁰ τέμνω or τέμνειν; indeed, the case for his emendation(s) may be even stronger than Nauck himself perhaps realized. For the indicative following and explicating a demonstrative Nauck cites only *E. Cyc.* 524 τοιόσδ' ὁ δαίμων· οὐδένα βλάπτει βροτῶν, *Or.* 895 τὸ γὰρ γένος τοιοῦτον· ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχῆ | πηδῶσ' ἀεὶ κήρυκες (Dindorf's deletion of the passage is immaterial), and fr. 196.1-3 Kannicht. But one should also take into account *E. Andr.* 173ff., *Su.* 881ff.,

¹⁰⁶ Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 324 n. 10.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Diggle, *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 106).

¹⁰⁸ The coupling of vocative and nominative in addresses is ancient and well attested; e.g. *Hom. Il.* 4.189 φίλος ῶ Μενέλαε; *E. Andr.* 348 ὦ τλήμων ἄνερ (ἄνῆρ Dindorf); *S. Aj.* 923 ὦ δύσμορ' Αἴας (Αἴαν Suda); see further Kühner-Gerth (*supra*, n. 22) 1, 48; West *ad Hes. Theog.* 964; Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen* (*supra*, n. 30) 7, 306-7 = *Lectures* 14, 385; Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 324 n. 10.

¹⁰⁹ Less close is *A. Pers.* 236 καὶ στρατὸς τοιοῦτος, ἔρξας πολλὰ δὴ Μήδους κακά, where τοιοῦτος, ἔρξας is not the same as τοιοῦτος, ὥστε ἔρξαι, hence Bothe's ἔρξαι, 'such as to have caused'. See further A. F. Garvie (ed.), *Aeschylus: Persae*, Oxford 2009, *ad* 235-6.

¹¹⁰ "Studien" (*supra*, n. 20) 173-4.

fr. 322.1-3 Kannicht and, for the infinitive after τοιόσδε, *IA* 502-3 ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ τρόποι | τοιοῖδε, χρῆσθαι τοῖσι βελτίστοις ἀεί. The passage should then be translated: ‘I am myself such a man too: I follow a straight path’ etc., or (with the infinitive) ‘I am such a man as to follow’ etc. As David Kovacs points out to me (*per litteras*), the indicative seems slightly preferable, since it parallels πέφυκ’. The corruption into τέμνων could be explained from the fact that the following word and the two preceding words also end in -ν.

31. *Rh.* 438-42

οὐχ ὥς σὺ κομπεῖς τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας
οὐδ’ ἐν ζαχρύσοις δώμασιν κοιμώμενος,
ἀλλ’ οἶα πόντον Θρηῆκιον φυσήματα 440
κρυσταλλόπηκτα Παίονάς τ’ ἐπεξάρει
ξὺν τοῖσδ’ ἄυπνος οἶδα τλὰς πορπάμασιν.

‘Nothing to do with that “deep drinking” of mine you rant about, nor with my lying in all-gold chambers; but I know what ice-frozen winds vexed the Thracian sea and the Paeonians, for I have suffered them without sleep in this cloak of mine.’

These lines contain an exceptionally harsh anacoluthon. Rather than being a self-standing comparative clause, ὥς σὺ κομπεῖς (438) spills over into ἀμύστιδας, itself governed by κομπεῖς; on the other hand, κοιμώμενος (439), although connected with 438 by οὐδ’, is syntactically unrelated with it, for it continues the participial syntax of 436-7 (περάσας ... περῶν). A further anacoluthon occurs in 440 where ἀλλ’, instead of providing a link with the preceding participial clause, introduces a principal clause with οἶδα (442) as the main verb; for this kind of anacoluthon cf. e.g. *Thuc.* 1.67.2 φανερώς μὲν οὐ πρεσβευόμενοι ... κρύφα δὲ ... ἐνήγον (Kühner–Gerth [*supra*, n. 22] ii 100, 4). On the whole, the anacoluthon is only partly paralleled by *E. Ba.* 683-8 (adduced by Porter *ad l.*)¹¹¹, a passage in which, although the syntax is indeed abruptly transformed under the influence of a *verbum dicendi* (φῆς 686), the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (ὦνωμένας ... θηρᾶν ... ἠρημωμένας) is much more regular than the simple *accusativus objecti* (ἀμύστιδας) here (see further Jebb on *S. Tr.* 1238f.). Matthiae, followed by Klyve¹¹², assumes a zeugma: οὐδ’ (*sic*), ὥς σὺ κομπεῖς, ἀμύστιδας δεξιούμενος (cf. 419); but no stretch of syntactic goodwill will supply δεξιούμενος from κοιμώμενος in 439, to say nothing of the fact that an intransitive verb such as κοιμῶμαι

¹¹¹ See W. H. Porter (ed.), *The Rhesus of Euripides*, Cambridge 1929².

¹¹² Matthiae, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 45) *ad* 435; Klyve, *Commentary* (*supra*, n. 81) *ad* 435.

cannot be involved in this type of zeugma (cf. Kühner–Gerth [*supra*, n. 22] 2, 570-1). And it will not do to posit, as Vater hesitantly suggests¹¹³, a lacuna after 438: as a *quasi*-quotation of Hector’s sarcastic reference in 419, τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας must be governed by κομπεῖς. Herwerden’s rewriting of 438, οὐχ ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς <σπῶν πυκνὰς> ἀμύστιδας¹¹⁴, would remove the anacoluthon but is too far removed from the paradosis¹¹⁵. The anacoluthon, it seems, is authorial.

32. *Rh.* 443

ἀλλ’ ὕστερος μὲν ἦλθον, ἐν καιρῷ δ’ ὅμως
 ὕστερος Cobet: -ov ΩgV et Chr. Pat. 1728 εἰς καιρόν Chr. Pat.

‘Alright then, I may have come late, but my arrival is timely nonetheless.’

Contrary to the majority of the mss. and the consensus of editors, ἐς καιρόν is probably to be read here (cf. εἰς καιρόν *Chr. Pat.* 1728 : ἐν καιρῷ mss.). Tragic idiom seems to prefer ἐς καιρόν after verbs of motion¹¹⁶, although this of course can be no hard-and-fast rule¹¹⁷. Cf. also the instances of εἰς καλόν / ἐν καλῷ cited by P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial expressions in Euripides*, Wiesbaden 1976, 28 and by Dawe *ad S. OT* 78.

33. *Rh.* 451-3

ὕμῶν δὲ μή τις ἀσπίδ’ ἄρηται χερί·
 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἴξω τὸς μέγ’ ἀυχοῦντας δορί
 πέρσας Ἀχαιοῦς, καίπερ ὕστερος μολῶν.
 451 ἄρηται L. Dindorf: αἴρηται V: αἰρέτω Q, αἰ- L 452 ἔγωγ’
 ἀρήξω Kirchhoff 452-3 ἴξω...πέρσας Ω: ἦκω ... πέρσων Nauck, ἀρκῶ
 (Holzner) ... πορθεῖν uel ἐξαρκέσω γὰρ ... πέρσας Diggle hos uu. del.
 Herwerden

¹¹³ Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) *ad* 425.

¹¹⁴ H. van Herwerden, “Novae commentationes Euripideae”, *RPh* 18, 1894, 60-98, here 84.

¹¹⁵ For a recent discussion of anacoluthon (in Plato) see S. R. Slings, “Figures of Speech and their Lookalikes: Two Further Exercises in the Pragmatics of the Greek Sentence”, in: E. J. Bakker (ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, Leiden 1997, 169-214, here 192-213.

¹¹⁶ e.g. *Rh.* 52 ἐς καιρὸν ἦκεις, *E. Hel.* 1081 ἐς καιρὸν ἦλθε, *Hipp.* 899, *Hec.* 666, *Herc.* 701, *Ph.* 106, *Or.* 384; *S. Aj.* 1168.

¹¹⁷ Cf. E. fr. 727c.39 Kn. ἐν δέοντι δ’ ἦλθε, *Alc.* 817, *Or.* 212, as against ἐς δέον in *E. Alc.* 1101, *S. OT* 1416.

‘As for you, let no one take up a shield with his hand; for I will stay(?) the boastful Greeks, vanquishing them with my spear, much as I have arrived belatedly.’

In 451, ἄρηται is a suggestion by L. Dindorf¹¹⁸. Of the variants mentioned in Diggle’s app. crit.¹¹⁹, only the Q is linguistically possible, though inferior due to its durative verbal aspect: what Rhesus demands is that the Trojans give up war, once and for all¹²⁰.

Far greater difficulties are presented by ἐγὼ γὰρ †ἔξω†. The problem with ἔξω is that its meaning ‘successfully to sustain an attack’ (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 11.820, 12.166, 13.51, 20.27; figurative in Pi. fr. 232 Snell–Maehler) is incompatible with the fact that in this play the Greeks have been on the defensive (56–64), and it is Rhesus who will be the assailant. Indeed, ἔχω and κατέχω are elsewhere used by Hector with regard to his *vanquishing* of the Greeks, cf. *Rh.* 60 οὐτὰν ἔσχω ... δόρυ; 101 λόγχη κατέξω. Kirchhoff’s¹²¹ ἔγωγ’ ἀρήξω, ‘I shall aid <you>’, i.e. by vanquishing the boastful Greeks in battle, is neat and paleographically plausible¹²². However, in tragedy the object of ἀρήγω does not seem ever to be omitted, except in exhortations¹²³. Moreover, as Nauck intimates¹²⁴, ‘I shall aid’ the Trojans is no doubt too modest a promise from a man who has claimed to be able to vanquish the entire Greek army in a single day. Nauck’s (*l.c.*) alternative suggestion ἐγὼ γὰρ ἦκω ... πέρσων (‘for I have come in order to vanquish...’) is also simple and elegant, but it would be hard to imagine how and why it was corrupted into ἔξω ... πέρσας (the presumed change in the tense of the participle seems particularly puzzling).

Minimal change is involved in a suggestion that occurred independently to Diggle and to Kovacs¹²⁵, namely ἐγὼ γὰρ ἦξω κτλ, ‘I shall come back having plundered the boastful Achaeans’. But although this is admirably economical, it perhaps places undue emphasis on the idea of Rhesus’ *coming back* from his *aristeia*, when Rhesus has just stressed that he will immediately *go away*

¹¹⁸ Recorded *apud* Dindorf, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 15), ad 451.

¹¹⁹ For the variants cf. E. *Hel.* 1597 ἀρεῖται Elmsley: αἰρεῖται L, αἰ- P.

¹²⁰ On the distinction between durative and determined aspect in commands and prohibitions cf. Humbert, *supra*, n. 22. §298–305.

¹²¹ A. Kirchhoff (ed.), *Euripidis tragoediae*, Berlin 1855, 1, 556 (ad 441).

¹²² The asyndeton would be explanatory, cf. Kühner–Gerth (*supra*, n. 22) 2, 344. For the ‘coincident aorist’ (πέρσας) with future leading verb (ἀρήξω) see Barrett *ad* E. *Hipp.* 289–92 and Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 356.

¹²³ In A. *Eu.* 232 the object is τὸν ἰκέτην, to be taken also with ῥύσομαι; in A. fr. 168.26 Radt, σύμεναι μὲν ἀρήγειν is merely Latte’s *exempli gratia* supplement.

¹²⁴ Nauck, “Studien” (*supra*, n. 20) 174.

¹²⁵ Kovacs, *Euripidea Tertia* (*supra*, n. 11) 147. The attribution to Diggle is to be found in Jouan, *Euripide* (*supra*, n. 29) 29 in app. crit. Indeed, I am informed by Diggle (*per litteras*) that he proposed ἦξω to Jouan sometime before the latter’s edition, but refrained from publishing it because of doubts that he now feels are less strong.

(450) after defeating the Greeks. In support of ἤξω + aorist participle to describe performing a feat and returning to tell about it (with no particular emphasis on the returning) Kovacs in private correspondence points me to a number of alleged parallels: *E. Alc.* 488 κτανῶν ἄρ' ἤξεις ἢ θανῶν αὐτοῦ μενεΐς; *Hec.* 930-2 παῖδες Ἑλλάνων, πότε δὴ πότε τὰν | Ἰλιάδα σκοπιὰν | πέρσαντες ἤξετ' οἴκουσ; *Tro.* 460-1 ἤξω δ' ἐς νεκροὺς νικηφόρος | καὶ δόμους πέρσασ' Ἀτρειδῶν; *Rh.* 156-7 καὶ πάντ' Ἀχαιῶν ἐκμαθῶν βουλευύματα | ἤξω. However, in all these instances the idea of *returning* or of *arriving* is crucial to the passage's point: in *Hec.* ἤξετ' describes a goal of primary importance¹²⁶; in *Tro.* Cassandra envisages a triumphant arrival in Hades; in *Rh.* Dolon's coming back from his spying mission is an essential prerequisite for its success; and in *Alc.* ἤξεις is contrasted to μενεΐς, an eventuality which (as already noted) is to be excluded in *Rh.* 451-3. I can find no satisfactory parallel for the use of aorist participle + ἤκω (*vel sim.*) to emphasize primarily the act denoted by the participle rather than by ἤκω; the syntagm does not merely signify 'I'll get the job done and come back with the news' (i.e. 'I'll be my own messenger before going back home to Thrace'), as Kovacs maintains, but rather 'I *will* return after performing the task'.

Diggle's alternative suggestions ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀρκῶ (Holzner) ... πορθεῖν ('for I am strong enough to vanquish...') or ἐξαρκέσω γὰρ ... πέρσας ('for I shall succour <you> by vanquishing...'), cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἐξαρκέω III, although the ellipsis of object seems unidiomatic) are ingenious but too far removed from the tradition.

No satisfactory expedient lies in hand, unless one wants to consider a solution of despair: ἔξω could be after all what the author wrote, presumably under the mistaken impression that ἔχω in the Iliadic passages cited above means generally 'to vanquish' rather than 'to repel an attacker'; cf. especially *Od.* 22.171-2 μνηστῆρας ... σχήσομεν ἔντοσθε μεγάρων, which is particularly liable to such a misunderstanding, since the suitors there are not attackers, and σχήσομεν = 'we shall vanquish' seems (deceptively) plausible.

34. *Rh.* 458-60

τὸ δὲ νάιον Ἀργόθεν δόρυ
 οὔτε πρὶν τιν' οὔτε νῦν
 ἀνδρῶν ἐπόρευσε σέθεν κρείσσω. 460
 459 τιν' οὔτε νῦν Nauck: οὔτε νῦν τιν' Ω

'As for the ships from Argos, they have never —neither before nor now— brought [here] a man superior to you.'

¹²⁶ As J. Gregory points out (*Euripides: Hecuba*, Atlanta 1999, ad 932), the goals of sacking Troy and returning home are traditionally linked.

As Willink remarked¹²⁷, Nauck's easy transposition 'postulates only that $\tau\upsilon\nu$ was skipped after $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ and later restored in the wrong place.' More complicated is Ritchie's¹²⁸ οὔτε πρὶν <ποτ'> οὔτε νῦν $\tau\upsilon\nu$ ', since it requires $\xi\beta\rho\iota\zeta\alpha \mid \mu\acute{\alpha}$ in the antistrophe (825-6, with initial anceps in the enoplian at 826). Pace¹²⁹ keeps the ms. reading, divides after $\tau\upsilon\nu$ ἀνδρῶν, and scans the result as choriamb + penthemimer (i.e. the colarion $x - \cup - x$)¹³⁰. This poses several problems. First, it mars responsion with 825, which Pace scans as a lekythion — since she misguidedly denies that the two stanzas correspond in the first place¹³¹. Secondly, Pace's colometry leaves us with the ensuing colon $\cup\cup - \cup\cup - \text{---}$ (ἐπόρευσε σέθεν κρείσσω), which is hard to make sense of¹³².

35. *Rh.* 467-8

τοιαῦτα μὲν σοι τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας
 πρᾶξιαι παρέξω·

The intended meaning seems to be 'Such is the compensation I will allow you to exact for my long absence', looking back to Rhesus' pledge in 447-53¹³³. Kovacs¹³⁴ finds "I will allow you to exact such things" hard to make sense of, especially since in his immediately preceding lines 451-3 [Rhesus] forbids the Trojans to do anything to the Greeks and promises he will do it alone'; moreover, Kovacs complains, 'τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας has no obvious construction.' Therefore, he argues, something must have fallen out after 467, e. g. <ἢ δυσχεραίνεις, ἄξι' ὠφελήματα>, so that the run of the sentence may be 'I shall allow you to exact from me <a benefit that befits> my long absence, <at which you take offence>'. In Kovacs' restoration, *τοιαῦτα* <ὠφελήματα> would be pointing ahead to the attack against Greece that Rhesus proposes

¹²⁷ Willink, "Cantica" (*supra*, n. 9) 37 = *Collected Papers* 576.

¹²⁸ Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra*, n. 8) 311.

¹²⁹ *Reso* (*supra*, n. 36) 41-2.

¹³⁰ See M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982, 30, 198.

¹³¹ Cf. also G. Pace, "[E.] *Rh.* 454-466: 820-832", *QUCC* 65, 2000, 127-39; endorsed by Delle Donne, "In margine" (*supra*, n. 39) 180-1, 193-4. Pace's idiosyncratic colometry earned her some sharp criticisms from Willink, "Cantica" (*supra*, n. 9) 33-7 = *Collected Papers* 572-6 *passim*.

¹³² Pace unhelpfully calls it 'prosodiac'. One might choose to call it 'anapaest + spondee', but this would be to disregard the metrical context. To scan it as $\cup\cup - \cup\cup - \cup\cup -$ (cf. K. Itsumi, "Enoplian in Tragedy", *BICS* 38, 1991-1993, 243-61, here 253 with n. 29), assuming contraction of the last biceps, would be unadvisable for lack of parallels. To call it a 'dragged' glyconic would be impossible, for the 'aeolic base' never takes the form $\cup\cup$ in tragedy (Dale, *Lyric Metres* [*supra*, n. 38] 133-4; West, *Greek Metre* [*supra*, n. 130] 30).

¹³³ Thus Lindemann, *Ad annuam lustrationem* (*supra*, n. 60) 12; J. Wackernagel, *Glotta* 7, 1916, 161-319, here 194 n. 1.

¹³⁴ *Euripidea Tertia* (*supra*, n. 11) 147-8.

to undertake, over and above his promised defeat of the Greek aggressors, in 469-73.

Ingenious as it is, Kovacs' conjecture is open to objections. First, τοιαῦτα is probably recapitulatory (appositely so, after the eleven-line choral interlude in 454-66), with μέν (467) contrasting the feats that Rhesus has promised to perform on behalf of the Trojans *all by himself* (447-53) with the additional —ἐπεὶ δ' ἄν (469)— services he will offer, *in joined effort with Hector* (471 ξὺν σοί), once the war is over, namely the proposed expedition against Greece (469-73). Moreover, *pace* Kovacs, there is no real contradiction between 467-8 (Rhesus will allow Hector to benefit from his exceptional valour) and 451-3 (Rhesus' valour needs no support from the Trojans). But even if there were such a contradiction, it would still not be an insurmountable one, since it resurfaces a little later, at 469-70, where Rhesus' θῶμεν implies —contrary to his insistence, in 451, that no Trojan should interfere in his attack against the Greeks— that the liberation of Troy will be achieved by the joint effort of Hector and himself (a rhetorically expedient device, as it paves the way for Rhesus' proposal of a joint expedition against Greece in the following lines, 471-3). As for Kovacs' complaint that τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας has no obvious construction, it is hard to see why it cannot be genitive of exchange / price from πρᾶξιαι 'exact' (as tribute or fine) — 'an unusual but understandable syntax'¹³⁵. One may compare *Rh.* 192 δῶρον τῆς ἐμῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας; *E. Med.* 534-5 (adduced by Paley¹³⁶) μείζω γε μέντοι τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας | εἴληφας ἢ δέδωκας; *S. Tr.* 287-8¹³⁷ εὗτ' ἂν ἀγνὰ θύματα | ῥέξη πατρῶφ Ζηνὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως.

When all is said and done, there may well be some textual corruption lurking in πρᾶξιαι παρέξω (cf. Diggle in app. crit). If πρ- παρ- conceal a word or words meaning compensation or requital, then a complement in the genitive would be perfectly in order. An emendation in this direction is Musgrave's πρᾶξιν παρέξω¹³⁸, 'these things I shall offer you as a compensation for my long absence' or perhaps (though this is doubtful) 'as a positive outcome of my absence', i.e. 'I shall turn my absence into an advantage for you'; cf. LSJ *s.v.* πρᾶξις, I.2, VI.2, and *E. IA* 270-2 τᾶς φυγούσας μέλαθρα | ... | πρᾶξιν Ἑλλάς ὡς λάβοι (πρᾶξις = 'requital'); *Hom. Il.* 24.524 οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις πέλεται ... γόοιο, 'no good comes from weeping'. But τοιαῦτα ... πρᾶξιν seems odd; Musgrave's emendation might be improved by reading τοιάνδε... πρᾶξιν.

¹³⁵ Quotation from D. J. Mastrorarde, *Electronic Antiquity* 8.1, 2004, 15-30, here 21 (in a review of Kovacs, *Euripides* [*supra*, n. 16]).

¹³⁶ F. A. Paley (ed.), *Euripides*, London 1872², vol. 1, on *Rh.* 467.

¹³⁷ Adduced by Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 249.

¹³⁸ S. Musgrave, *Exercitationum in Euripidem libri duo*, Leiden 1762, 94; so also Kirchoff, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 121) 556 *ad* 457.

36. *Rh.* 481

οὐκουν κτανόντες τούσδε πάντ' εἰργάσμεθα;
 πάντ' εἰργάσμεθα Q: πᾶν εἰργ- OV: πάντ' εἰργάσμεθ' ἄν L: cf. Σ^v πάντα
 διεπραξάμεθα (διαπεπραξόμεθα Schwartz, διαπραξόμεθα Wilamowitz

'Well then, once we have killed these men, will we not have accomplished everything?'

We can summarily dispose of the L reading¹³⁹, because the notion of an unfulfilled condition it introduces is unacceptable here: Rhesus presents the eventuality of defeating the Greeks as a wholly realistic one. The Q is of course entirely in order (cf. e.g. E. *Alc.* 607, *El.* 610, 771, *Hel.* 53), but so is the OV: cf. E. *Andr.* 448-9 πᾶν περίξ | φρονοῦντες (πᾶν corrupted into πάντα in some mss!); *IA* 1540 πᾶν πεύση σαφῶς; fr. 800.2 Kannicht πᾶν τελοῦσι (Nauck : πάντ' ἔχωσι mss); fr. 918.2 Κη. πᾶν ἐπ' ἔμοι τεκταινέσθω (πᾶν Ar. *Ach.* 660, *Suda* π 40 Adler : πάντ' Cic. *Att.* 8.8.2). Perhaps πάντ' is slightly preferable in view of the following (482) neuter plurals τὰ πόρσω, τὰγγύθεν¹⁴⁰. But the question is a hard one to settle.

37. *Rh.* 496

τίς δὴ μετ' αὐτὸν ἄλλος εὐδοξεῖ στρατοῦ;
 τίς δὴ LQ: τίς δέ V: τί δαί O

'Well then, who else after him is held in high esteem in the army?'

There is something to be said for the O reading, which I take to stem from an original τίς<ς> δαί. Despite its colloquial tone¹⁴¹, δαί is transmitted eight times in the mss. of Euripides, in questions motivated by preceding enunciations, often (as here) after the rejection of an idea or in introducing a new point¹⁴²; cf. *Cyc.* 450, *Med.* 1012 (*v.l.* : δὴ, δ' αῖ are also transmitted), *Hel.* 1246, *IA* 1443 (δαί Triclinius : δὴ Gaisford), 1447 (δέ Gaisford, *prob.* Diggle), *El.* 244 (δ' αῖ Seidler, *prob.* Diggle), 1116 (δ' αῖ Nauck, *prob.* Diggle), *Ion* 275 (δὴ Elmsley, δ' αῖ Porson). For δαί in questions in tragedy cf. also A. *Cho.* 900 ποῦ δαί τὰ

¹³⁹ Defended by J. Hardion, "Corrections de quelques passages de la tragédie de Rhésus", *Histoire de l'Académie royale des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 5, 1741, 68-75, here 74 (a piece written in 1731). *Contra* Matthiae, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 45) ad 477.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 324 n. 11.

¹⁴¹ Cf. P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*, Wiesbaden 1976, 45-6, citing *inter alia* examples from comedy. On δαί as a comic colloquialism see also A. López Eire, *La lengua colloquial de la comedia aristofánica*, Murcia 1996, 211.

¹⁴² Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 263; cf. also Page ad E. *Med.* 339.

λοιπὰ Λοξίου μαντεύματα ...¹⁴³; In general, editors are wary of accepting δαί in tragedy unless they feel its colloquial tone is warranted by the situation; a characteristic example is Jebb (on *S. Ant.* 318, App. p. 250): ‘Each passage in which the mss. ascribe δαί to [Euripides] should be tested by our sense of the degree in which, there, he meant to reproduce the language of every-day life.’ However, Stevens (*supra*, n. 141) 45 has rightly cast doubt on ‘the validity of this very subjective criterion, and of the assumption that E.[uripides]’s use of colloquialisms was entirely regulated by some single principle.’

38. *Rh.* 527-30

τίνος ἄ φυλακά; τίς ἀμείβει τὰν ἐμάν; πρῶτα
 δύεται σημεῖα καὶ ἐπτάποροι
 Πλειάδες αἰθέριαι 530

‘Whose turn is it to do guard duty? Who is to relieve my shift? The first signs are setting, and the Pleiades are aloft along their sevenfold paths in the heavens.’

In the wake of Lachmann¹⁴⁴ and others, C. W. Willink¹⁴⁵ emended πρῶτα into πρῶτας, sc. φυλακᾶς, arguing that ‘the transmitted *brevis in longo* at . . . πρῶτα || δύεται is extraordinary (in mid-phrase).’ I fail to see anything extraordinary here: for *brevis in longo* (and subsequent period-end) ‘in mid-phrase’ cf. e.g. *E. Med.* 427 (~ 415). Aside from this, how can the chorus say that the stars corresponding to ‘the first watch’ (Willink’s πρῶτας [sc. φυλακᾶς] σημεῖα) are setting only now? That the ‘first watch’ of the night has long been over is shown by *Rh.* 538-41: in fact, the Trojans’ is the *fourth* watch, cf. 5 τετράμοιρον νυκτὸς φυλακῆν¹⁴⁶.

39. *Rh.* 546-50

Σιμόεντος ἡμένα κοίτας
 φοινίας ὕμνεϊ πολυχορδοτάτα
 γήρυϊ παιδολέτωρ
 μελοποιὸν ἀηδονὶς μέριμναν. 550
 548 φοινίας O: φον-VLQ θρηνεῖ ^ῥΣ^V -χορδοτάταν O? (~O^{1c}?) 550
 μελοποιὸν ... μέριμναν Dindorf (μέριμναν iam Reiske): -ὸς ... μέριμνα
 fere Ω (μελω- ... μερίμνα Q)

¹⁴³ See Garvie *ad l.*, who opts in the end for Auratus’ δῆ.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) 196.

¹⁴⁵ See *CQ* 21, 1971, 351 n. 4; cf. more explicitly Willink, ‘Cantica’ (*supra*, n. 9) 39 = *Collected Papers* 577-8.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. also Vater, *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 144).

‘Sitting at the bloodied river-bank of the Simois, the nightingale, slayer of her own son, with its many-toned voice puts into song its music-making cares.’

In 547, the mss. are virtually unanimous in transmitting ὕμνεϊ. However, the scholia *ad l*¹⁴⁷. give θρηνεῖ as a (very tempting) γρ- variant. The dilemma is a difficult one, and more complicated than the universal acceptance of ὕμνεϊ by modern editors may suggest. Both ὕμνεϊ and θρηνεῖ can govern μελοποιὸν μέριμναν; for θρηνεῖ with internal accusative cf. A. fr. 291 Radt θρηνεῖ δὲ γόον τὸν (τιν’?) ἀηδόνιον. The nightingale’s plaintive song can be thought of both as ὕμνος and as θρηνησ, cf. Ar. Av. 210-11 ὕμνων, | οὐς ... θρηνεῖς; for ὕμνεῖν θρήνοις cf. Rh. 976. Moreover, ὕμνεϊ with an object meaning ‘song’ is straightforward, θρηνεῖ less so, and thus the former might in principle be a banalization. On balance, however, ὕμνεϊ seems safer: θρηνεῖ may have been introduced by someone who took the verb’s object to be κοίτας φοινίας, so that in effect = ‘lamenting her bloodied wedding’; thus e.g. the scholiast *ad l*. (ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Σιμόεντος ἔξομένη θρηνεῖ τὰς φοινίας κοίτας)¹⁴⁸, and Vater (*luget cruentas nuptias luscinia*)¹⁴⁹,

As for μελοποιὸν ... μέριμναν, Dindorf’s emendation of the mss. μελοποιὸς ... μέριμνα or μερίμνα¹⁵⁰ (μέριμναν had already been proposed by Reiske¹⁵¹) is virtually unassailable. With μέριμνα one would have to take ἀηδονίς as an adjective¹⁵², an unparalleled usage. The slip from accusative to nominative would have been an easy one after the three nominatives ἡμένα, παιδολέτωρ, ἀηδονίς¹⁵³.

40. Rh. 552-3

νυκτιβρόμου
σύριγγος ἰάν κατακούω.
νυκτιβρόμου Pierson : νυκτιδρόμου OV: νυκτὶ δρ- LQ

‘I hear the sound of a pipe played by night.’

Defending the *lectio tradita* as against Pierson’s commonly accepted emendation, Pace¹⁵⁴ argues that νυκτιδρόμου σύριγγος ἰάν, supposedly an

¹⁴⁷ See E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem*, Berlin 1891, 2, 341.21.

¹⁴⁸ See Schwartz, *Scholia* (*supra*, n. 147) 341.22.

¹⁴⁹ Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) *ad* 532.

¹⁵⁰ Dindorf, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 15) *ad* 550.

¹⁵¹ Reiske, *Animadversiones* (*supra*, n. 32) 89. For earlier attempts to emend see Wecklein, *SBAWMünchen* (*supra*, n. 72) 495-6.

¹⁵² Cf. Hermann, *Opuscula* (*supra*, n. 60) 306.

¹⁵³ Thus Porter, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 111) *ad l*.

¹⁵⁴ “Note” (*supra*, n. 22) 458-9.

enallage for νυκτιδρόμον σ. ἰ., can mean ‘the flute’s sound that runs (=spreads) through the night.’ However, in Greek sound can ‘travel’ (ιέναι)¹⁵⁵ or ‘come out’ (ἐκβαίνειν)¹⁵⁶, but it never seems to ‘run’. For the confusion BPOM / ΔPOM cf. E. *Herc.* 1212 δρόμον Reiske : βρόμον L.

41. *Rh.* 560-1

—ἀλλ’ ἢ κρυπτὸν λόχον ἐσπαίσας 560
διόλωλε; †τάχ’ ἄν εἴη† φοβερὸν μοι.
560 εἰσπαίσας O: εἰσπεσῶν VaLQ

‘Could it be that he chanced on a hidden ambush and perished? This is what I fear.’

The unmetrical εἰσπεσῶν (VaLQ) in 560 may have started life as an interlinear gloss. This seems to be confirmed by the reading of O in 559 (ἄπεστιν ἐμπεσῶν), where the uncalled-for ἐμπεσῶν (from an original εἰσπεσῶν?) apparently intruded from the interlinear space below. While ἐσπαίσας is doubtless correct, it is ironically less accurate than εἰσπεσῶν: εἰσπαίω means ‘to burst in’ (cf. S. *OT* 1252), εἰσπίπτω ‘to fall in’ (by chance), and it is the latter sense that we need here. In E. *Or.* 1315, Wecklein’s στείχει γὰρ εἰσπαίσουσα (εἰσπεσοῦσα mss.) δικτύων βρόχους is based on the present passage, and thus offers no warranty for the validity of εἰσπαίειν here — the more so since *Or.* 1315-16 are probably interpolated (Willink *ad l.*), and at any rate εἰσπαίειν ‘is an unnaturally violent’ verb in that context (Willink *l.c.*, though I cannot accept his view that ‘the notion of “striking” is much more to the point in *Rh.* 560’).

Line 561 presents a much more difficult problem. Among the emendations proposed I single out Morstadt’s (διόλωλε;) τάδ’ ἄν φοβέρ’ εἴη¹⁵⁷, Hermann’s τάχ’ ἄν δ’ εἴη φανερόν {μοι}¹⁵⁸, and Herwerden’s (διόλωλε) τάλας; φοβερὸν μοι¹⁵⁹. Taking his cue from Hermann, Diggle proposed a neat rewriting:

τάχ’ ἄν δ’ εἴη <φανερόν.
— καὶ μὴν τόδε γ’ ἦν> φοβερὸν μοι.
<Choreut A> ‘it should soon become apparent’ (*viz.*, whether Dolon has met with foul play).
<Choreut B> ‘Well, this is exactly¹⁶⁰ what I’ve been fearing’.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. A. *Sept.* 964; S. *Tr.* 208; E. *Supp.* 89, *El.* 879.

¹⁵⁶ S. *Aj.* 892.

¹⁵⁷ Morstadt, (*supra*, n. 40) 23.

¹⁵⁸ Hermann, *Opuscula* (*supra*, n. 60) 306.

¹⁵⁹ Herwerden, “*Novae commentationes*” (*supra*, n. 114) 85.

¹⁶⁰ On καὶ μὴν ... γ’ see Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 353-5.

Omission of <φανερὸν ... ἦν> would be due to an error *ex homoeoteleuto* (φανερὸν—φοβερόν). However, the sole parallel for the change of speaker at the beginning of a paroemiac seems to be *S. Tr.* 977¹⁶¹. More radical, though pleasantly concise, is Headlam's τάχ' ἄν {εἶη φοβερόν μοι}¹⁶²: 'Do you think Dolon may have been ambushed?' — 'No doubt' (the excised words were presumably added to 'complete' the syntax, which was wrongly felt to be incomplete). For elliptical τάχ' ἄν in replies Feickert¹⁶³ *ad* 561 compares *Pl. Soph.* 255c, *Resp.* 369a. True, there seem to be no tragic examples of elliptical τάχ' ἄν used in responses. Still, *S. OC* 964–5 θεοῖς γὰρ ἦν οὕτω φίλον, | τάχ' ἄν τι μηνίουσιν εἰς γένος πάλαι shows that τάχ' ἄν *can* be used elliptically as a virtual synonym of 'perhaps': see Jebb *ad l.* and *App.* 283–6 for detailed discussion. In the end, Headlam's solution seems to be preferable, *qua* more economical.

42. *Rh.* 567–8

οὔκ, ἀλλὰ δεσμὰ πωλικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων
κλάζει σιδήρον·
568 σιδήρον Bothe (denuo Paley): σιδήρου Ω

'No, it is rather reins striking on chariot rails that produce a metallic noise.'

Bothe's emendation¹⁶⁴ introduces a bold cognate accusative (governed by κλάζει), for which cf. *A. Sept.* 386 κλάζουσι ... φόβον. Porter, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n.111) *ad l.* further compares *Sept.* 123 κινύρονται φόνον χαλινοί (see Hutchinson *ad l.*).

There is little to be said for the mss. reading, retained by Zanetto and Jouan. It would entail one of the following three interpretations:

(1) take κλάζει σιδήρου as a brachylogy for κλ- κλαγγῆν σιδήρου, 'they emit an iron sound' (with σιδήρου as genitive of quality); but I can find no satisfactory parallel for such a brachylogy;

(2) take κλάζει σιδήρου as the auditory equivalent of e.g. τρυγὸς ὄζειν, μύρου πνεῖν etc.;¹⁶⁵ but this again would be unparalleled;

(3) take δεσμὰ σιδήρου as = δεσμὰ σιδηρᾶ (i.e. with σιδήρου as genitive of material);¹⁶⁶ this would go perversely against the run of the sentence.

¹⁶¹ See Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 292.

¹⁶² W. Headlam, "Notes on Euripides.-II", *CR* 15, 1901, 98–108, here 103.

¹⁶³ *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 92) *ad* 561.

¹⁶⁴ F. H. Bothe, *Euripides' Werke verdeutscht von*—, Berlin & Stettin 1803, 5, 296.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) *ad* 551; P. Albert, *De Rheso tragoedia*, diss., Halle 1876, 37, Dindorf, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 15) *ad* 568 paraphrases *Aeris sonum reddit*. For the construction see Kühner–Gerth (*supra*, n.22) 1, 356–7.

¹⁶⁶ A solution put forth by Feickert, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 92) *ad* 568 but attributed by Vater *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 165) to Bothe (I have been unable to confirm this). Jouan, *Euripide* (*supra*, n.

43. *Rh.* 585-6

οὐκουν ἐπ' Αἰνέαν ἢ τὸν ἐχθιστον Φρυγῶν
 Πάριν μολόντε χρῆ κατατομεῖν ξίφει;
 586 χρῆ *ONa* : χρῆν *LQ*

'Why, shouldn't we attack Aeneas or Paris then, that most hateful of Trojans, and hack their heads off with a sword?'

Should we read *chrē* or *chrēn* in 586? A difficult choice. The imperfect of *chrē* is used to express the idea that something ought to be the case but is not. Thus, *chrēn* here would rather appositely suggest Diomedes' reluctance in the face of Odysseus' decision not to kill any more Trojans: 'but still, should we not be (now in the process of) going and cutting off Aeneas' and Paris' heads (as we are not at this moment)?'. On the other hand, *chrē* makes Diomedes a little more unrelenting, since he insists that a prominent Trojan *must* be slain at all costs; besides, 'shouldn't we go and cut off Aeneas and Paris' heads' is a more straightforward proposition.

44. *Rh.* 607

ἔσται γὰρ αὐτῷ θάνατος ἐξ ἄλλης χερός,
 ἔσται *OLQ* : ἦκει *Va* : ἦξει *Va*¹⁵

'For death will come to him from another man's hand.'

Va's ἦξει (in a supralinear note by the codex's first scribe) deserves greater attention. For death 'coming' to humans cf. e.g. *E. Alc.* 671 ἦν δ' ἐγγὺς ἔλθη θάνατος; *Hipp.* 1373 καί μοι θάνατος ... ἔλθοι; *Troad.* 1167 θάνατος ἦλθε. Admittedly, however, I cannot find any instances in which ἦκω (rather than ἔρχομαι) is used of the coming of death.

45. *Rh.* 613-15

ὄδ' ἐγγὺς ἦσται κού συνήθροισται στρατῶ,
 ἀλλ' ἐκτός αὐτὸν τάξεων κατηύνασεν
 Ἔκτωρ, ἕως ἂν νύκτ' ἀμείψηται φάος. 615
 615 νύκτ' Lenting : νύξ mss.

'He (sc. Rhesus) is encamped nearby and has not joined the (rest of the) army; rather, Hector stationed him apart from the ranks until the coming daybreak.'

29) 35 adopts it in his translation: 'ce sont les chaînes de fer des attelages qui grincent.'

Lenting's emendation is indispensable, for otherwise (with φάος in the accusative) the sense would be exactly the opposite: 'until daylight is succeeded by night.' Paley's (*Euripides, supra*, n. 136) idea that νύξ ἀμείψεται φάος is acceptable Greek for 'shall have taken light in exchange for itself', i.e. 'shall have given place to day' is untenable: ἀμείβομαι 'get in exchange for' requires a genitive (or ἀντί + genitive) indicating the thing exchanged, as well as an accusative indicating the thing got in exchange, e.g. *S. Tr.* 736-7 ἡ λώρους φρένας | τῶν νῦν παρουσῶν τῶνδ' ἀμείψασθαι ποθεν.

46. *Rh.* 635

τοῦτον δὲ πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς οὐ θέμις θανεῖν.
χειρὸς οὐ θέμις fere **OV** (θέμις post θανεῖν**O**): οὐ θ- χερὸς **LQ** θανεῖν **O** et
aut **L^{im}** aut **Tr^m**: κτανεῖν**VLQ**

'For it is forbidden that this one (=Alexander) should die at your hands.'

χειρὸς οὐ θέμις θανεῖν as such is found in no single ms. **O** has χειρὸς οὐ θανεῖν θέμις, in keeping with its characteristic penchant for the *uitium Byzantinum* (cf. e.g. *Rh.* 170, 218, 220, 426, 433, 503, 506, 606, 618, 635, 636). **V** has χειρὸς οὐ θέμις κτανεῖν; a marginal note in **L** (either by the first scribe or by Triclinius) has οὐ θέμις χειρὸς θανεῖν, whereas **Q** and **L post corr.** have οὐ θ- χ- κτανεῖν. While there can be no doubt that κτανεῖν (which is incompatible with πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς) is a mere corruption of θανεῖν¹⁶⁷, it is hard to decide on the right word order: πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς οὐ θέμις or πρὸς σῆς οὐ θέμις χε(ι)ρὸς? *Pace* Diggle, I should be inclined to opt for the latter: it is *lectio difficilior* because of the separation of noun and possessive, for which cf. e.g. *Hom. Il.* 6.368 ἤδη μ' ὑπὸ χερσὶ θεοὶ δαμώσιν Ἀχαιῶν; *S. El.* 1033 μητρὶ ταῦτα πάντ' ἔξειπε σῆ; Kühner–Gerth (*supra*, n. 22) 2, 600.

47. *Rh.* 636-7

ἀλλ' ὥπερ ἦκεις μορσίμους φέρων σφαγὰς
τάχυν'
636 ὥπερ **P²**: ὥσπερ **Ω**

'But make haste towards (the man) for whom you have arrived bringing fated slaughter.'

¹⁶⁷ For the corruption cf. *E. IT* 553 θανῶν **Tr²**: κτανῶν <**L**>**P**. For the inverse error cf. *IT* 484 κτανεῖν Seidler: θανεῖν **L** et *Stob.* 3.8.6.

While the majority reading ὥσπερ ἦκεις obviously makes little sense, ᾗπερ ἦκ- is not entirely accurate: the man whom Diomedes has ‘come’ (ἦκεις) to kill is not Rhesus, but Hector (575–6 ἐφ’ ᾗπερ). Adding to the confusion, the place to which Diomedes ‘has come’ (ἦκεις), i.e. the Trojan camp, is not the same as the place to which he is enjoined to ‘hasten’ (τάχυν), i.e. the ‘separate’ (cf. 520 δίχα) space assigned Rhesus for the night. It would be unlikely for Athena, of all characters, to be misrepresenting the facts, since it is thanks to her intervention (595–607) that the Greeks turned their murderous attentions, midway, from the unreachable Hector to the more vulnerable Rhesus. Kovacs’ οἷπερ ἤξεις¹⁶⁸ (‘but hasten whither you will arrive bringing fated slaughter’) does remove the inaccuracy, but only at the expense of introducing a redundancy: in Athena’s mouth, τάχυνε, ‘make haste’, surely implies that Diomedes will ‘arrive’, ἤξεις¹⁶⁹. Moreover, as Mastrorarde has pointed out¹⁷⁰, ᾗπερ here is supported by the antithesis with τοῦτον in the previous line (‘not Alexander but Rhesus’).

I suggest: ἀλλ’ ᾗ προσήκει μορσίμους φέρων σφαγὰς | τάχυν’, ‘but make haste as you bring fated slaughter to the man it beseems’ (sc. to bring slaughter)¹⁷¹. This is precisely the point one should expect Athena to make: since fate will not allow Diomedes to slay Alexander (635), Diomedes should rather ‘bring slaughter’ to a target whose death is not forbidden by fate (cf. μορσίμους), and may therefore be described as ‘befitting’ or ‘suitable’.

48. *Rh.* 640-1

καὶ ταῦτ’ ἐγὼ μὲν εἶπον· ὃν δὲ χρὴ παθεῖν 640
οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδ’ ἤκουσεν ἐγγὺς ὦν λόγου.

‘And although I have said these words, he (=Alexander) does not know nor has he heard who is the man who must suffer, though he be within earshot of my speech.’

¹⁶⁸ *Euripidea Tertia* (*supra*, n. 11) 148–9.

¹⁶⁹ Kovacs (*per litteras*) points out to me that the emphasis in the relative clause falls, as is often the case, not on the verb of motion (ἤξεις) but on the participle dependent on it (φέρων), cf. Goodwin, *Syntax* (*supra*, n. 34) § 895 so that the whole means ‘But make haste to the man to whom your coming will bring fated slaughter.’ This is true, but the (characteristically Euripidean) idiom ἦκω + participle is usually reserved for situations in which a character explains the purpose for which he has come or the circumstances in which he has come; cf. E. *Or.* 245–6, 688, 854, 1323, 1628; A. *Th.* 40, *Ag.* 258; S. *Ant.* 394–5, *El.* 666; Bond on E. *Hyps.* fr. 60.39 (p. 110); T. B. L. Webster, *CR* 47, 1933, 117–23, here 118. In other words, the idea of a person’s arrival remains central in such expressions, even though the leading idea is conveyed by the participle.

¹⁷⁰ Mastrorarde, in *Electronic Antiquity* (*supra*, n. 135) 21–2.

¹⁷¹ The corruption from ὦπρος- to ὦπερ may have been facilitated by the similarity between the minuscule abbreviations for πρὸς and for ἐρ.

Schmidt's¹⁷² ταῦτα σοί μὲν for the mss. ταῦτ' ἐγὼ μὲν is worth considering: ἐγὼ μὲν εἶπον, with its emphatically placed first-person pronoun, implies a false antithesis between Athena and another *speaking* person. But the true antithesis is between Diomedes, to whom Athena has been speaking, and Alexander, who is prevented from hearing what Athena has just said. For ταῦτα σοί μὲν εἶπον Schmidt compares E. *El.* 1276 σοί μὲν τάδ' εἶπον ('you' contrasted to the ensuing 'the citizens'), *Supp.* 1213 σοί μὲν τάδ' εἶπον (as opposed to παισὶ δ' Ἀργείων λέγω), *Hel.* 1662 σοί μὲν τάδ' αὐδῶ (followed by συγγόνω δ' ἐμῇ λέγω), *Ph.* 568 (an address to Eteocles concluded by σοί μὲν τάδ' αὐδῶ and followed by an address to Polynices, σοί δέ, Πολύνεικες, λέγω)¹⁷³.

It is true that in all of Schmidt's examples σοί is placed at the beginning of the sentence, in emphatic position. This, however, is no argument against his emendation. Initial σοί in the passages invoked by Schmidt brings into focus the antithesis between the preceding portion of the speaker's utterance, which was addressed to σοί, and the following portion, which is addressed to someone else. In the present passage, by contrast, the antithesis is not between two different addressees but rather between a character (σοί μὲν, 'you, Diomedes') who can hear the speaker and another character who cannot. Foregrounding ταῦτ' makes it clear that this antithesis is due to a calculated disparity between those aware of Athena's plan (ταῦτ', summarizing 636-9) and those still in the dark.

49. *Rh.* 686

(Χο.) ἦ σὺ δὴ Ῥῆσον κατέκτας; (Οδ.) <μῆ> ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα σέ
(ante ἦ) nullam notam O: ἦμιχ. VLQ (ante ἀλλὰ) Ὀδ. O: om. VLQ <μή>
Dindorf; cf. A. Ch. 918, Denniston, GP 4-5 κτενοῦντα LV: κταν- OQ

'(Chorus) So, was it you who killed Rhesus? (Odysseus) No; (I rather killed) the man who was going to kill you.'

The line seems irremediably absurd. The first hemistich may be spoken either by the chorus (thus VLQ) or by Odysseus¹⁷⁴ — in the latter case, presumably

¹⁷² See F. W. Schmidt, *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern*, Berlin 1886, 2, 378.

¹⁷³ Cf. also J. Diggle, "P.Petrie 1.1-2: Euripides, *Antiope*", *PCPhS* 42, 1996, 106-26, here 110-11.

¹⁷⁴ Thus Kovacs, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 16) 422, supported by Mastronarde, in *Electronic Antiquity* (*supra*, n. 135) 22. It has been argued by L. Battezzato ("Parola d'ordine e distribuzione delle battute in [Euripide], *Reso* 682-89", *Lexis* 22, 2004, 277-88, here 277-9, 280-4) that both Odysseus and Diomedes are in the orchestra, and that the first half of 686 is addressed by the chorus to Diomedes, while the second half is spoken by Odysseus, who quickly chimes in to prevent a mindless response by Diomedes. For arguments against the notion that Dio-

as a red herring to distract the Trojan guards. Either way, one fails to see why Rhesus' murder should be mentioned at all: the chorus have not yet been apprized of it, while Odysseus has no interest in revealing the fact¹⁷⁵. The same objection goes for Morstadt's otherwise interesting suggestion that κατέκτας refers to murderous intent rather than to actual murder (cf. S. *Aj.* 1126 with Jebb *ad l.*; E. *Ion* 1500)¹⁷⁶. As for the second hemistich, it makes little sense, however one looks at it. If spoken by the chorus, it must mean something like 'No, but (I rather killed) yourself (σέ) who meant to kill <him> (τὸν κτενοῦντα).' But how can the chorus surmise that Odysseus intended to kill Rhesus? If the second half-line is spoken by Odysseus (thus presumably O), his red herring is bound to prove ineffective, since he will be unable to produce the body of the mysterious potential murderer he claims to have slain. All in all, the line is best deleted, just like 685 (cf. Diggle *in app. crit.*).

Here are some representative attempts that have been made to extract some sense out of 686.

(1) Badham, followed by Schenkl and Paley, transposes 685/6 and introduces concomitant emendations¹⁷⁷: |⁶⁸⁶ Ὀδ. ἦ σὺ δὴ Ῥῆσον κατέκτας; Χο. ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα σέ |⁶⁸⁵ ἱστορῶ. Ὀδ. θάρσει, πέλας ἴθι. Χο. παῖε, παῖε, παῖε πᾶς. But this still leaves us with the unwanted mention of Rhesus, and ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα σέ ἱστορῶ is impossible Greek for 'nay, I am asking you about the person who came to kill us' (a point half-conceded by Paley). Moreover, one fails to see the connection of Odysseus' θάρσει, πέλας ἴθι with what precedes it.

(2) Wilamowitz¹⁷⁸ suggested recombining 680 and 685 into a trochaic verse (Χο. δεῦρο δεῦρο πᾶς ἴτω [ἴτω mss.] Ὀδ. θάρσει. Χο. πέλας ἴθι παῖε πᾶς), to be placed after 679. But the resulting trochaic tetrameter would lack, as Wilamowitz was aware, the requisite caesura after the second metron; presumed exceptions to this rule, namely A. *Pers.* 165 and S. *Phil.* 1402, are probably to be emended or deleted¹⁷⁹, and at any rate they are too

medes, as well as Odysseus, is present onstage see my forthcoming commentary on *Rhesus* (ad 681/678-9).

¹⁷⁵ This was already seen by S. Petit, *Miscellaneorum libri novem*, Paris 1630, 3, 196; cf. also L. C. Valckenaer, *Diatribes in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*, Leiden 1767, 108-9; Morstadt, *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 36-7; H. Grégoire, in *Mélanges offerts à M. Octave Navarre*, Toulouse 1935, 232-3; Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 73-4; Battezzato, "Parola" (*supra*, n. 174) 281.

¹⁷⁶ Morstadt, *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 37. For other, less likely explanations see e.g. Badham, "Miscellanea" (*supra*, n. 13) 337; D. Ebener (ed.), *Rhesos: Tragödie eines unbekanntes Dichters*, Berlin 1966, 17.

¹⁷⁷ See Badham, "Miscellanea" (*supra*, n. 13) 337; K. Schenkl, "Die Euripideische literatur von 1850-1862", *Philologus* 20, 1863, 485; Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 135) ad 686.

¹⁷⁸ *Hermes* 44, 1909, 445-76, here 451-2 = *Kleine Schriften* (ed. K. Latte), Berlin 1962, 4, 230-1.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. West, *Greek Metre* (*supra*, n. 130) 91; Garvie on A. *Pers.* 165.

few and far between to warrant Wilamowitz's solution. Moreover, θάρσει is hardly the response one should expect of a cornered Odysseus; significantly, Wilamowitz found himself obliged to pretend that θάρσει can mean, in effect, 'easy now' ('nur ruhig').

(3) H. Grégoire¹⁸⁰, emended 686 into (Ὀδ.) μὴ σὺ δειρήσῃς ὄν κατέκτας, ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντά σε, 'don't cudgel someone you've already killed, go rather for the one who is about to kill you.' The emendation makes for oddly contorted Greek, not least because it uses κατακτείνειν in both its figurative and its literal senses in the space of a single line.

(4) In the wake of a number of earlier scholars¹⁸¹, Ritchie advanced a preposterous hypothesis¹⁸²: (i) Odysseus, who has despoiled Rhesus, enters clad in the latter's armour; (ii) he is subsequently 'struck down by one of the blows accompanying the παῖε πᾶς of 685'; (iii) members of the chorus realize that the man they attacked bears the arms of Rhesus; the suspicion is formulated in the first half-line of 686, which is spoken by some of the choreuts: 'have you killed Rhesus?'; to which the rest of the choreuts reply (second half-line of 686) 'no, I only killed someone who was going to kill you.' At this juncture, Ritchie argues, Odysseus comes to and decides to play along by pretending that he actually is Rhesus; whereby he eventually manages to escape. This interpretation cannot hold water. Ritchie's point (i) is untenable since Odysseus cannot be allowed any accoutrements (such as Rhesus' armour) that might give him away; his point (ii) is weakened by the distinct possibility that 685 is extremely hard to make sense of, and perhaps interpolated; as for his point (iii), it falls together with point (i). Most importantly, the chorus are too familiar with Rhesus' outward aspect (they had nearly 150 lines in which to observe him, 380-526) to be fooled so easily by Odysseus' imposture¹⁸³. And if they *did* somehow take Odysseus to be Rhesus, they would surely not have made a point of asking him —the formidable leader of an allied army!— for the night's password (688), which they know has already been given him by Hector (521).

¹⁸⁰ (*supra*, n. 175) 233-6.

¹⁸¹ e.g. S. Musgrave, *Εὐριπίδου τὰ σφῆζόμενα: Euripidis quae extant omnia*, Oxford 1778, 2, 410 (on *Rh.* 688); Beck, *Exercitatio* (*supra*, n. 81) 11-12; Morstadt, *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 32.

¹⁸² Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 73-4; for the absurdity cf. J. A. Hartung, *Euripides restitutus sive scriptorum Euripidis ingeniique censura*, Hamburg 1843, 1, 32 n.**; C. B. Sneller, *De Rhese tragoedia*, diss. Utrecht, Amsterdam 1949, 21. Battezzato, "Parola" (*supra*, n. 174) 279-80 thinks that the author of *Rh.* follows here the Doloneia, where the two Greeks have no time to remove Rhesus' armour.

¹⁸³ Cf. Hartung *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 182): 'Non potuit se Ulysses Rhesum esse fingere, quia statim fraudis convinceretur ab iis, qui paullo ante Rhesum ipsum praesentem oculis suis intuiti erant.'

50. *Rh.* 687

(Ὀδ.) ἴσχε πᾶς τις. Χο. οὐ μὲν οὖν. Ὀδ. ἄ· φίλιον ἄνδρα μὴ θένης.
μὲν οὖν Reiske: μενοῦν O¹⁸⁴: μενῶ VLQ

(*Odysseus*) Desist, everyone! (*Chorus*) Most certainly not!
(*Odysseus*) Hey! Don't strike a man who's your friend!

For οὐ μὲν οὖν (*neutiquam*) see Reiske, *Animadversiones* (*supra*, n. 32) 90. The VLQ reading would have to mean 'I will not tarry', i.e. 'I will strike without further ado'; but μένω in this sense signifies 'to wait *until X happens*' or 'to be *left behind*' (cf. LSJ *s.v.* μένω, I.3). Pace adduces a number of tragic passages that purportedly support οὐ μενῶ = 'I will not linger' (*E. Med.* 389, *El.* 220, 226, *Hel.* 548, *Phoen.* 897, *IA* 855)¹⁸⁵. However, aside from the impossible hiatus thus created¹⁸⁶, in all of these passages μένειν means 'to stay, to refrain from departing', a sense obviously inapposite here. It would be just possible to interpret 'I will not tolerate this', but this is unlikely with μενῶ *tout court*: a complement would be required (cf. e.g. *E. Phoen.* 740 ἀπορίαν γὰρ οὐ μενῶ)¹⁸⁷.

51. *Rh.* 703

ποῖον ἐπεύχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεῶν;
ἐπεύχεται Hermann: εὔχ- Ω: δ' εὔχ- Porson, Bothe

'Which of the gods does he proclaim to be supreme?'

For ἐπεύχεται see Hermann, *Opuscula* (*supra*, n. 60) 307. ποῖον δ' εὔχεται was simultaneously hit upon by Porson and Bothe¹⁸⁸. Sticking to the *lectio tradita*, Pace¹⁸⁹ takes ποῖον εὔχεται as hypodochmiac (—U—U—) in *Responsionsfreiheit* with πρὶν ἐπὶ γᾶν Φρυγῶν in 721 (UUU—U—). But aside from the dubiety of the whole concept of *Responsionsfreiheit* (see item 7 above), Pace's alleged parallel, namely *IA* 235 = 246, comes from a probably interpolated portion *and* is a special case involving a proper name (Καπανέως) in 246.

¹⁸⁴ Pace, "Note" (*supra*, n. 22) 460 n. 29 claims that O reads οὐ μενῶ, like VLQ, but Diggle (*per litteras*) informs me that O's reading is as reported in his app. crit.

¹⁸⁵ See Pace, "Note" (*supra*, n. 22) 460.

¹⁸⁶ Pace imagines the hiatus is rendered tolerable by the antilabe and the exclamation, but Battezzato, "Parola" (*supra*, n. 174) 284-7 shows that this is simply untrue.

¹⁸⁷ On the semantic inappropriateness of μενῶ here see also Battezzato, "Parola" (n. 174) 287.

¹⁸⁸ Bothe, *Euripides' Werke* (*supra*, n. 164) 297. I was unable to trace Porson's conjecture.

¹⁸⁹ Pace, *Reso* (*supra*, n. 36) 53.

52. *Rh.* 708

—τίν' ἀλκὴν τίν' αἰνεῖς; —Ὀδυσσῆ
 τίν' ἀλ- OV : τίς ἀλ- LQ

(*One choreut*) Whose bravery are you praising? (*Another choreut*)
 Odysseus' own'.

In the LQ, τίς must be meant a self-standing question taking up θρασύς in 707: τίς; ἀλκὴν τίν' αἰνεῖς; 'Who (sc. is it that you call θρασύς)?' However, bacchiacs here and in 706-7, 724-6 are separated from each other by diaeresis, so as to form syntactically self-contained units; the effect is surely too striking to be fortuitous, and one ought not to disturb the balance.

53. *Rh.* 710-14

ἔβα καὶ πάρος 710
 κατὰ πόλιν ὑπαφρον ὄμμ' ἔχων,
 ῥακοδύτῳ στολᾷ
 πυκασθεῖς, ξιφῆρης
 κρύφιος ἐν πέπλοις.
 κρύφιος Bothe, denuo Morstadt: κρυφαῖος Ω

'In the past, too, he (sc. Odysseus) went into the city (of Troy), his face under cover, a ragged outfit around his body, a sword hidden inside his cloak'.

κρύφιος was first proposed by F. H. Bothe¹⁹⁰, then again independently by Morstadt¹⁹¹, thus restoring respension with 696. Pace's defence of mss. κρυφαῖος¹⁹² rests on the doubtful assumption¹⁹³ that τίνι π' ροσεικάσω is possible in 696¹⁹⁴. Even if lengthening before mute + liquid is admitted in a few cases in tragic lyric, this is no reason to accept it where it can be disposed of by so simple an emendation as κρυφαῖος > κρύφιος.

¹⁹⁰ See F. H. Bothe, *Euripides' Werke verdeutscht von—*, 1824, 3, 366.

¹⁹¹ Morstadt, *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 41.

¹⁹² Pace, *Reso* (*supra*, n. 36) 52-3.

¹⁹³ The assumption is endorsed by Delle Donne, "In margine" (*supra*, n. 39) 203.

¹⁹⁴ See Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 760 and Addenda (p. 435) with due warnings (although he does not exclude the possibility); Diggle, *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 344, 386.

54. *Rh.* 764-7

... οὐδ' ἐφρουρεῖτο στρατὸς
 φυλακαῖσι νυκτέροισιν οὐδ' ἐν τάξεσιν 765
 ἔκειτο τεύχη πλήκτρα τ' οὐκ ἐπὶ ζυγοῖς
 ἵππων καθήρμοσθ', ...

‘nor was the army guarded by night sentinels, nor were there any arms lying with the ranks(?), nor were goads fitted on the horses’ yokes’.

οὐδ' ἐν τάξεσιν | ἔκειτο τεύχη raises an elementary question: where were the Thracian arms if not with their owners? It is inconceivable that the Thracians left their arms anywhere else except ‘in their ranks’, i.e. where the rank and file slept. When the charioteer wakes up, he finds himself ‘without a spear at hand’ but can clearly see, and reach for, his weapon (792-3), which presumably lay somewhere beside him. This is the case also in *Il.* 10.471-3 εὔδον ... ἔντα δέ σφιν | καλὰ παρ' αὐτοῖσι χθονὶ κέκλιτο εὔ κατὰ κόσμον | τριστοιχεί; and even in the drunken disarray of the Rutulian sleepers in *Verg. A.* 9.318-19, the weapons lie close to hand, albeit mixed up with wine-cups. It is, on the other hand, entirely conceivable (if militarily unadvisable) that the Thracians would have taken their armour off before going to bed, a sense easily obtained by a simple transposition: οὐδ' ἐν τεύχεσιν | ἔκει<ν>το τάξεις, ‘nor did the ranks lie [=sleep] in their armour’ — as the Trojans, we recall, more prudently did (cf. 21-2). For the construction cf. *Th.* 2.61.2 καὶ τινα μίαν νύκτα καὶ κατέδαρθον ἐν Θησείῳ τῷ ἐν πόλει ἐν ὄπλοις.

55. *Rh.* 770-2

κἀγὼ μελούση καρδίᾳ λήξας ὕπνου 770
 πῶλοισι χόρτον, προσδοκῶν ἑωθινὴν
 ζεύξειν ἐς ἀλκὴν, ἀφθόνῳ μετρῶ χερί.
 ἐς ἀλκὴν V : πρὸς ἀλκὴν LQ

‘And I, abandoning my sleep with anxious heart, measure out fodder to the steeds with unstinting hand, expecting to yoke them for an early-morning confrontation.’

Both ἐς ἀλκὴν and πρὸς ἀλκὴν seem to be used interchangeably in *E. Su.* 678-9 ἔστρεφον | πῶλους ἐς ἀλκὴν and *Andr.* 1148-9 στρατὸν | στρέψας πρὸς ἀλκὴν. For what it is worth, εἰς ἀ- is a much commoner tragic idiom¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁵ Cf. also *E. fr.* 298.3, 754b.6 Kn., *Med.* 264, *Hel.* 42, 980, 1379, *Ph.* 421, 1363.

than πρὸς ἅ⁻¹⁹⁶. Besides, the LQ reading may be the result of interference from προσδοκῶν in the previous line.

56. *Rh.* 785-6

... αἱ δ' ἔρρεγκον ἐξ ἀρτηριῶν 785
 θυμὸν πνέουσαι κάνεχαιτίζον φόβῳ.
 786 φόβῳ Ω: φόβην Reiske

'...while the horses snorted as they breathed their fury through their wind-pipes and threw their manes back in panic'.

Reiske's φόβην¹⁹⁷ was presumably suggested by the fact that ἀναχαιτίζω elsewhere seems to demand an accusative (cf. *Sud.* α2133); cf. *Heliodor.* 2.35.1 τὴν κόμην ... ἀναχαιτίζων; *Philostr. Her.* 31.1 ἀναχαιτίζων τὴν κόμην. Indeed, φόβην is good tragic idiom for 'mane', cf. *E. Alc.* 429 ἀυχένων φόβην; *A. Cho.* 188; *S. El.* 449 βοστρύχων ... φόβας; *OC* 1465; fr. 707a.1 Radt; *E. fr.* 540.5 Kannicht. And φόβῳ here *could* be an error by anticipation of φόβος at 788. However, in *S. fr.* 179 ἀναχαιτίζω *seems* to be used intransitively, as it certainly is in *Plut. Mor.* 150a; *Philostr. Im.* 2.17.1; cf. *Hippiatrica Cantabrigiensia* 81.8¹⁹⁸; *Hsch.* α4677, 4683 Latte. Moreover, horses rear up when afraid, and so φόβῳ is apposite.

57. *Rh.* 787-8

ἐγὼ δ' ἀμύνων θήρας ἐξεγείρομαι
 πῶλοισιν· ἔννυχος γὰρ ἐξώρμα φόβος.

'As for me, I woke up fighting off the beasts from the horses; for the nocturnal fear urged me on.'

M. Platnauer¹⁹⁹ pointed out that ἐξορμάω, when transitive, is always followed by an accusative, and went on to emend into ἔνν- δέ μ' ἐξώρμα φ-, with δέ = γάρ²⁰⁰. Although it is true that active ἐξορμάω is always followed by an *accusatiuus objecti*, it is also true that in no other extant case is the object so easy to supply mentally as in the present passage. The *lectio tradita* may stand, therefore, although Platnauer's conjecture probably merits a place in an *apparatus criticus*.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. *E. Ph.* 862; *A. Sept.* 498 with Hutchinson *ad l.*

¹⁹⁷ Reiske, *Animadversiones* (*supra*, n. 32) 91.

¹⁹⁸ In *E. Oder & K. Hoppe* (eds.), *Corpus hippiatricorum Graecorum*, Leipzig 1927, 2, 224.

¹⁹⁹ *Erano*s 62, 1964, 73.

²⁰⁰ Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 169-70.

58. *Rh.* 790-1

θερμὸς δὲ κρουνὸς δεσπότητος παρὰ σφαγῆς 790
βάλλει με δυσθνήσκοντος αἵματος νέου.

σφαγῆς Musgrave: -αῖς Ω et Σ^v, quo seruato πάρα Hermann (παρὰ LQ, παρα- V et Σ^v), insolenti uerborum ordine (uide Denniston ad *El.* 574)

‘And I was splashed by a warm spring of fresh blood gushing out of my master’s wound as he writhed dying’.

For σφαγῆς see Musgrave, *Euripidis* (n. 181) 411. Hermann²⁰¹ read δεσπότητος πάρα σφαγαῖς, presumably taking σφαγαῖς (locative dative) with αἵματος in 791, as in *A. Ag.* 1389 αἵματος σφαγῆν, an odd phrase that is sometimes explained along the lines of ‘the blood gushing from the wound’ (LSJ *s.v.* σφαγή I.2)²⁰². However, the *Agamemnon* passage is probably corrupt, at least as far as σφαγή is concerned (see Fraenkel *ad l.*), and at any rate it is hard to see how the alleged parallel might help make sense of the *Rhesus* passage. In their comment on the *Ag.* passage, Denniston and Page²⁰³ invoke, after Headlam, *Rh.* 790-1 as ‘an exact parallel’ but they can offer only a very clumsy rendering of it²⁰⁴, which merely goes to prove that the *Rh.* passage as transmitted is impossible to be made sense of. Aside from the inadequacy of the Aeschylean ‘parallel’, the postposition of πάρα not in end-line would be highly unusual in tragic iambs: see Denniston on *E. El.* 574.

Musgrave’s emendation (with σφαγῆς having its usual meaning of ‘wound’) simply and neatly indicates the source of the gushing blood. True, παρὰ with *genitiuus personae* is much more common than it is with *genitiuus rei* (hence Hermann’s emendation); but παρὰ + *gen. rei* to designate provenance is a recognized poetic usage, cf. Kühner–Gerth (*supra*, n. 22) 1, 509. The ancient scholia²⁰⁵ and later editors (e.g. Paley) read δεσπότητος παρὰ σφαγαῖς, taking παρὰ + dative to indicate the charioteer’s proximity to his master when the latter was slaughtered. But this is not borne out by the Greek; besides, what we need to know is surely where the κρουνὸς came from, not where the charioteer was standing when it splashed him.

²⁰¹ Hermann, *Opuscula* (*supra*, n. 60) 308.

²⁰² Cf. Meschini, in *Scritti* (*supra*, n. 42) 224-5.

²⁰³ J. D. Denniston & D. Page (eds.), *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, Oxford 1957, *ad* 1387 [*sic*].

²⁰⁴ ‘A hot stream, issuing from my master, strikes me with woundings (or whatever σφαγαῖς does mean) of fresh blood, while he struggles against death.’

²⁰⁵ See Schwartz, *Scholia* (*supra*, n. 147) 342.8-9.

59. *Rh.* 811-12

κούτ' εἰσιόντας στρατόπεδ' ἐξαπώσατε
 οὐτ' ἐξιόντας;
 811 ἐξηπύσατε Naber

'And you thrust them away neither as they were entering nor as they were exiting the camp?'

ἐξαπώσατε is a *harax* in the whole of Greek literature, and a problematic form: normal Attic would require ἐξαπεώσατε, which could only be accepted with synizesis (cf. Paley's ἐξαπεῶσατε); but synizesis in the fifth 'foot' of the iambic trimeter is to be avoided²⁰⁶. Ritchie²⁰⁷ evoked Soph. fr. 479.1 Radt as a possible parallel, but Herwerden's ἔπαυσε (for Eustathius' ἀπῶσε) is now generally accepted there. It would be inadvisable to explain away the unaugmented form as a Homerism (thus Porter, *Rhesus* [*supra*, n. 111] *ad l.*): such forms generally occur only in messenger speeches, and then ordinarily at line-opening position only. As far as I can see, there is only one intractable exception to this rule, namely E. *Ba.* 1134, where however γυμνοῦντο, although not at beginning of line, occurs at least in a messenger speech. Of the other apparent exceptions mentioned by Dodds on E. *Ba.* 1133-6, six are easily emended²⁰⁸, while one (A. *Pers.* 313) may be spurious²⁰⁹ or otherwise emendable (ναὸς ἔπεσον ἐκ μιᾶς Porson), and at any rate occurs in a messenger speech²¹⁰. Mastronarde²¹¹ argues that, if *Rh.* is a fourth-century work, perhaps ἐξαπώσατε can stand for ἐξαπεώσατε; but there are no adequate parallels, either from the fourth or from any other century.

It is true that ἐξαπώσατε ... ἐξιόντας, although not strictly an absurdity as Naber thought²¹², involves a rather harsh zeugma, e.g. οὐτ' ἐξιόντας <εἴλετε> / <ἐξωγήσατε>; in a translation it might be preferable to render by 'you intercepted them' or the like. However harsh, the zeugma ('an effect of vehement utterance', Mastronarde *l.c.*, *supra* n. 211) is not much harsher than, say, S. *El.* 435-6 ἦ πνοαῖσιν ἦ βαθυσκαφεῖ κόνει | κρύψον νιν, where one is to understand παράδος or the like with πνοαῖσιν (see Jebb *ad l.*)²¹³.

²⁰⁶ See Descroix, *Trimètre* (*supra*, n. 33) 32-3.

²⁰⁷ Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 154, 178.

²⁰⁸ E. *Andr.* 1130 κάφυλάσσετ'; *Ion* 1205 αἰάζουσ' ἐθάμβησεν; *Alc.* 839 ἐγείνατ' Ἡλεκτρύωνος; S. *Ph.* 371 κυρεῖ; *OC* 1506 τῆσδ' ἔθηκε.

²⁰⁹ Thus Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136); but see Broadhead's supplementary notes on 311-13 and Garvie *ad* 310.

²¹⁰ See further Davies on S. *Tr.* 560, 767, 904.

²¹¹ Mastronarde, in *Electronic Antiquity* (*supra*, n. 135) 22.

²¹² S. A. Naber, *Mnemosyne* n.s. 9, 1881, 5-6.

²¹³ For other harsh zeugmata in tragedy, though none that is strictly comparable with this one, cf. Friis-Johansen and Whittle on A. *Su.* 1006-7, 681-3; Garvie on A. *Ch.* 360-2.

Naber (*l.c.*, supra n. 212) proposed ἐξηπύσατε, which does away with the zeugma and is consistent with this author's otherwise unparalleled use of ἀπύω in non-lyric contexts (cf. 776). But surely the guards would be expected to capture or drive away (ἐξαπώσατε) the foreign spies rather than merely raise a clamour (ἐξηπύσατε). As for J. I. Beare's ἐξοπώπατε²¹⁴, it is out of the question: ἐξορῶ means 'to catch sight of from a distance, to descry', which would be impossible in the darkness; what is more, the perfect tense seems to be unattested for this compound.

All in all, ἐξαπώσατε seems to give the right sense, but is a problematic form. No satisfactory emendation lies to hand, and a *crux* is recommended.

60. *Rh.* 821-3

†μέγας ἐμοὶ μέγας ὦ πολίοχον κράτος
 τότ' ἄρ' ἔμολον ὅτε σοι†
 ἄγγελος ἦλθον ἀμφὶ ναῦς πύρ' αἴθειν.

'†Great to me, o great city-guarding ruler, it was then that I came to you, when† I arrived to announce that fires were burning around the (Greek) ships'

In 821-2 the transmitted text is both ungrammatical and unmetrical; for a list and refutation of earlier attempts to emend see Ritchie, *Authenticity* (supra n. 8) 309. For the address cf. *E. Tr.* 1216-7 ὦ μέγας ἐμοὶ ποτ' ὦν | ἀνάκτωρ πόλεως²¹⁵. At least the *epanadiplosis* μέγας ... μέγας seems guaranteed by the correspondence with φίλα ... φίλος at 455. Nauck's²¹⁶ μέγα σύ μοι μέγ' ὦ is neat and economical: μέγ' ὦ could easily give way to the (false) *scriptio plena* μέγας ὦ, which in turn would retrospectively force μέγα σύ μοι into accordance with the following μέγας, thereby giving rise to the transmitted μέγας ἐμοί. As for πολίοχον (Vater *l.c.*, supra n. 215 : πολιοῦχον mss.), which restores the metre, it is supported by its earlier occurrence at 166. It is true that Πολίοχος seems to be attested elsewhere only as a proper name in Athens²¹⁷; but despite Pace²¹⁸ this is no argument against Vater's correction. A more difficult problem is presented by 822, which albeit metrical (a 'hexasyllable'²¹⁹) seems to yield no satisfactory sense. The transmitted text

²¹⁴ *Hermathena* 13, 1905, 70-86, here 79.

²¹⁵ Cited by Vater, *Rhesus* (supra, n. 45) ad 808.

²¹⁶ A. Nauck, *Eὐριπίδης: Euripidis tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1854, 2, xxiii (cf. p. 336).

²¹⁷ Already in the 5th/4th century: see P. M. Fraser & E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford 1994, 2, 370.

²¹⁸ Pace, *Reso* (supra, n. 36) 57 with n. 93.

²¹⁹ On the 'hexasyllable', a sequence related to the dochmiac, see Barrett on *E. Hipp.* 565-

can only mean: ‘surely it was then they came (sc. οἱ κατάσκοποι) when I went to bring thee news that fires were blazing round the ships’ (Porter, *Rhesus* [*supra*, n. 111] *ad l.*). But omission of the crucial οἱ κατάσκοποι seems very awkward, especially since ἔμολον is likely to be interpreted as first person singular in view of the following ἦλθον²²⁰; moreover, as Willink points out²²¹, ἄρα ‘does not mean “surely”’.

An emendation worth considering is that proposed by Willink²²²: μέγα σέ μοι | μέγα σε πολίοχον | κράτος τότ’ ἄρ’ ἔμολον ὅτε σοι κτλ., ‘(it was) to you as a ruling power mighty in my eyes that I came on that occasion, when I came with the report that...’. As Willink explains, ‘the chorus know that they left their post only the once, for sufficiently exonerating reasons, and that they have not been otherwise remiss.’ But this would obscure the logical link with the following ἐπεὶ: having stated that they left their post only once, the chorus should then be expected to add ‘and I otherwise did not budge from my post’ or something of the sort, rather than point out that they never fell asleep on their duty.

An easy emendation would be τόδ’ ἄρα μέλον ἔτ’ ἐμοὶ | ἄγγελος ἦλθον κτλ. (in conjunction with Nauck’s emendation discussed in the previous paragraph): ‘it was still with that thing in mind that I came to announce’ etc. Here, τόδ’ would refer to the guard duty Hector accuses the chorus of having abandoned, and μέλον would be used as an accusative absolute, although its syntax is personal with τόδ’ as subject (cf. e.g. Pl. *Protag.* 314c δόξαν ἡμῖν ταῦτα ἐπορευόμεθα; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1287-8 ἐγγέλων ... θεώμενοι, | οὐδὲν ἄρ’ ἐμοῦ μέλον)²²³. The primary item in the chorus’ defence would be, then, that they never for one moment forgot about their assigned task, even when they had temporarily to abandon their posts in order to communicate important news to Hector. The ἐπεὶ-sentence at 824ff. further elaborates on that thought: ‘my guard duty was always on my mind; for (ἐπεὶ) I didn’t get a wink of sleep this night’. For ἄρα ‘expressing a lively feeling of interest’ see Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 33-5 (but the usage admittedly has ‘a precarious footing in tragedy’).

600, p. 267-8; Dale, *Lyric Metres* (*supra*, n. 38) 115-16; Conomis, “Dochmiacs” (*supra*, n. 39) 28-30; Diggle, *Studies* (*supra*, n. 47) 19.

²²⁰ So also Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 309.

²²¹ Willink, “Cantica” (*supra*, n. 9) 38 = *Collected Papers* 576.

²²² “Cantica” (*supra*, n. 9) 34, 38 = *Collected Papers* 572-3, 577.

²²³ See Goodwin, *Syntax* (*supra*, n. 34) § 854: “The accusative absolute used personally without ὡς or ὡσπερ is very rare. It occurs chiefly with neuter participles which are regularly impersonal.” See also Kühner–Gerth (*supra*, n.22) 2, 89-90; for μέλον as accusative absolute see LSJ *s.v.* μέλω, II.2.

61. *Rh.* 844-5

τίς ἄν ὑπερβαλὼν λόχους
 Τρώων ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἦλθεν, ὥστε καὶ λαθεῖν; 845
 844 ἄν Nauck: δ' Ω, quo seruato 845 ἦλθ' ἄν Beck (cf. *Studies* 100, 120)

'Who could have reached us passing through the Trojan companies [that lay in-between] so that he might remain unnoticed?'

For Nauck's emendation see his 'Studien' (*supra*, n. 20) 182-3. There can be no question that a 'potential' rather than a simple indicative (as in the mss. τίς δ' ὑπερβαλὼν) is required here to express past possibility²²⁴. An alternative solution would be to keep the mss reading at 844 —with δ' expressing indignation at the implicit suggestion contained in the question²²⁵— and to accept Beck's ἦλθ' ἄν at 845²²⁶. Against Beck's emendation Paley (*Euripides*, *supra*, n. 136) *ad* 845 invoked Elmsley's alleged 'rule' postulating that Attic poets avoid eliding 3rd-person -ε before ἄν²²⁷; but the validity of the 'rule' has been repeatedly assailed by Diggle²²⁸.

62. *Rh.* 847-8

τίς οὖν τέτρωται, τίς τέθνηκε ἴσσυμμάχων†
 τῶν σῶν, μολόντων ὧν σὺ πολεμίων λέγεις;
 848 ὧν Bothe: ὡς Ω

'Who has been wounded, then, among your allies? Who has died, if as you claim it was enemy soldiers who entered (the camp)?'

For μολ- ὧν σὺ see Bothe, *Euripides' Werke* (*supra*, n. 190) 366. The mss. reading μολ- ὡς σὺ πολεμίων λέγεις (impossible because of the word-order) probably originated in an effort to do away with the somewhat convoluted relative attraction. The problem cannot be solved by a mere re-shuffling of words, such as μολ- ὡς λέγεις σὺ πολεμίων (Blaydes²²⁹): it would be unusual to have the first short of the fifth-'foot' tribrach so strongly divorced (σὺ |

²²⁴ For past indicative + ἄν expressing past possibility, with no reference to any definite condition, unfulfilled or otherwise (here, 'who would have been likely to come?'), see Goodwin, *Syntax* (*supra*, n. 34) § 243-4.

²²⁵ Cf. Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 174.

²²⁶ See Beck, *Exercitatio* (*supra*, n. 81) 12 n. 3; cf. Blaydes, *Adversaria* (*supra*, n. 71) 10.

²²⁷ For the 'rule' see P. Elmsley, *Euripides Medea*, Leipzig 1822, 151-2 n. p.

²²⁸ *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 109 n. 61, 197; *Studies* (*supra*, n. 47) 100, 120.

²²⁹ Blaydes, *Adversaria* (*supra*, n. 72) 10.

πόλε) from the other two²³⁰. Morstadt²³¹ took τῶν σῶν μολόντων ὧν σὺ πολεμίῳν λέγεις to mean ‘when those foes of yours came, those you’re talking about’ (cf. 866 οὐκ οἶδα τοὺς σοὺς οὕς λέγεις Ὀδυσσεάς). But in such a case συμμάχων in 847 would lack a necessary qualification: the Trojans and their allies need to be distinguished from the Thracian newcomers. Moreover, τῶν σῶν ... σύ seems redundant.

Diggle’s *crucēs* around †συμμάχων† indicate an apparent illogicality: the murdered Thracians were all Trojan allies, and so it the charioteer’s claim that ‘none of your allies’ was harmed seems at first sight nonsensical²³². However, the Thracian newcomers are clearly distinguished from the Trojan / allied contingent both spatially (519–20) and because of their longer standing as fighting allies, and it would probably not be inapposite to refer to them as ‘Hector’s allies’ by a mild catachresis. A similar point has been made by L. Battezzato: ‘Lines 138–9 imply that the Trojans and the allies (before the arrival of Rhesus) are all in one location. The position of the allies is explicitly clear if we keep συμμάχων at line 847: the Thracian charioteer knows that the Trojans and their allies are all in the same location. The word συμμάχων here needs to mean “all who fight on your side”, i.e. Trojans and the allies other than the Thracians—who have just arrived, and whose allegiance has been repeatedly questioned.’²³³

63. *Rh.* 875–6

ὄλοιθ' ὁ δράσας· οὐ γὰρ †εἶς σὲ τείνεται† 875
 γλῶσσ', ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς· ἡ Δίκη δ' ἐπίσταται

ὄλοιθ' ὁ δράσας· ἡ Δίκη δ' ἐπίσταται ceteris omissis Chr. Pat. 276, haud male εἰς σὲ fere LQAf: εἰσέτι V sensum requiro ‘numquam cohibebitur’

‘May the doer perish — what I am saying is not meant for you, brag as you may; Justice is aware of it’.

A locus vexatus. In principle, οὐ γὰρ εἰς σὲ τείνεται | γλῶσσ' *could* mean ‘my tongue is not aimed at you’, i.e. ‘you are not the target of my virulent remarks’; for the figurative use of τείνειν (no doubt a metaphor from archery, e.g. *E. Hec.* 263 ἐς τήνδ' Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐνδίκως τείνει φόνον) cf. especially Pl. *Phd.* 63a καὶ μοι δοκεῖ Κέβης εἰς σὲ τείνειν τὸν λόγον; *E. Hipp.* 797 οὐκ εἰς γέροντας ἦδε σοι τείνει (‘concerns’) τύχη; see further LSJ s.v. τείνω, I.4 (*E. Ph.* 435 ἐς σὲ τείνει τῶνδε διάλυσις κακῶν is different: see Mastronarde

²³⁰ Cf. Descroix, *Trimètre* (*supra*, n. 33) 163.

²³¹ Morstadt, *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 44.

²³² See already Morstadt, *Beitrag* (*supra*, n. 40) 43–4.

²³³ L. Battezzato, “The Thracian camp and the fourth actor at *Rhesus* 565–691”, *CQ* 50, 2000, 367–73 (here 368 n. 9).

ad l.) For the tongue as a bow shooting words cf. e.g. A. *Su.* 446 with Friis-Johansen and Whittle *ad l.* Thus, the tenor of the passage *could* be, in effect, ‘how can you [i.e. Hector] be so arrogant (cf. ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς) as to think that my remarks are directed at you?’²³⁴.

However, the charioteer has so far been vehement in his denunciation of Hector’s supposedly criminal behaviour; a *volte-face* here would be both unexpected and inexplicable. To assume, with Mastronarde (*l.c.*, *supra*, n. 234), that ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται means ‘but Justice knows the truth’, viz. that the charioteer’s curse does properly fall upon Hector, even though the Thracian has just assured Hector that ‘the curse I utter is not directed at you’, is both to strain the Greek and to muddle the passage’s logic — especially if the force of γάρ is ‘(I feel free to utter my curse against the slayer in your very presence,) for on your own hypothesis it doesn’t apply to you’ (thus Mastronarde). Moreover, ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς seems to refer to a positive assertion of Hector’s prior to this; still, the only statement of Hector’s that could qualify as κόμπος is his claim, in 856–8, to have never received any complaints about his dealing with his allies, and this would be too far back for the charioteer to refer to it now.

Alternatively, one may attempt to restore, as Diggle suggests (*in app. crit.*), the sense ‘I will not hold my tongue’. Apart from everything else, this would also make much better sense of ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς, which would now look back to 874: Hector’s alleged ‘presumption’ consists in thinking that he could silence the inconvenient charioteer. But it is hard to think of a paleographically plausible way of obtaining the sense posited by Diggle: for instance, ὄλοιθ’ ὁ δράσας· καὶ γὰρ οὐ καθέξεται | γλῶσσ’ is perhaps easy enough to make up but scarcely follow from the transmitted text.

All in all, it may be best to delete οὐ γὰρ ... σὺ κομπεῖς as a *Binneninterpolation*, as Diggle implies *in app. crit.*: the words are, after all, omitted in the corresponding passage in *Chr. Pat.* 276. The omission yields acceptable sense: ὄλοιθ’ ὁ δράσας· ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται, ‘may the doers perish — and Justice is aware of who the doers are’ or ‘Justice is aware that what I am saying is true’.

64. *Rh.* 882–4

τί ποτ’ εὐτυχίας ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης
Τροίαν ἀνάγει πάλιν ἐς πένθη
δαίμων ἄλλος, τί φυτεύων;

‘Whatever is the reason that an adverse deity is carrying Troy from great success to mourning? What is he up to?’

²³⁴ Cf. Mastronarde, in *Electronic Antiquity* (*supra*, n. 135) 29.

In 883, ἀνάγει is B. Heath's conjecture²³⁵, which subsequently turned up in **Af** (otherwise of little value). It restores the metre as against **VL** (ἄγει) and **Q** (ἄγοι), both of which seem to be due to haplography (ΤΡΟΙΑΝΑΝΑΓΕΙ)²³⁶. Although ἀνάγει, 'brings back' (cf. πάλιν), is apposite ('a δαίμων is leading Troy back to her old misfortunes'), it does seem rather odd that in a context bemoaning a change from good to bad fortune the author should have chosen a verb that can also mean 'lift up', 'raise' 'elevate', as indeed it does in *S. Aj.* 131-2 ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν | ἅπαντα τάνθρώπεια. One wonders if the **Q** reading (ἄγοι) may not point to another, more promising solution, namely <ἄν> ἄγοι, 'why would an adverse deity be changing Troy's fortune?'; for the potential optative in questions, expressing 'what may hereafter prove to be true' cf. *S. El.* 1450 ποῦ δῆτ' ἄν εἶεν οἱ ξένοι; (Kühner–Gerth [*supra*, n. 22] 1, 234-5; Goodwin, *Syntax* [*supra*, n. 34] § 238).

65. *Rh.* 886-8

τίς ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς θεός, ὦ βασιλεῦ,
τὸν νεόκητον νεκρὸν ἐν χειροῖν
φοράδην πέμπει;
887 νεόκητον **LQ** (νεόχμ- **V**) : νεόδητον **Va** and *Chr. Pat.* 1456 (ἀφρην
φοράδην τὸν νεόδητον χρεῶν).

'Who is this god above our heads, O King, that escorts the man who died of late, bearing him in her arms?'

νεόκητον is a *hapax* in the sense 'newly killed'; otherwise, νεόκητος/νεοκμής are found only in late Greek, and only in the sense 'newly wrought' or 'fresh'. This is evidently a Homerizing usage, harking back to the well-known epic euphemism οἱ καμόντες = 'the dead' (LSJ *s.v.* κάμνω, II. 4), a usage common also in tragedy and prose. The 'tautology' νεόκητον νεκρὸν seems also to be Homeric in origin, cf. νεκρούς κατατεθνηῶτας and the like (*Il.* 16.526, 18.540, *Od.* 10.530); for tragic examples cf. *S. Ant.* 26 θανόντα . . . νέκυν, 515 ὁ κατθανὼν νέκυς; *E. Hel.* 1252 τοὺς θανόντας . . . νεκρούς; *Su.* 45 (cf. 974) φθιμένων νεκύων, 107 νεκρῶν τῶν ὀλωλότων, 524, 558; also Collard on *E. Su.* 16b-17.

As for the variant νεόδητον, it can stand only by assuming synecphonesis (νεόδη-). The word should mean either (*i*) 'newly tamed', from δαμάω (cf.

²³⁵ See B. Heath, *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschylī, Sophoclis, Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*, Oxford 1762, Euripidean section p. 97; cf. Valckenaer, *Diatribē* (*supra*, n. 175) 111-12 n. 12.

²³⁶ For a comparable error from haplography cf. *Men. fr.* 842 Kassel–Austin αἰσχυνόμενος αἰσχιστα πενίαν <ἄν> φέροις, on which see R. Porson, *Adversaria*, Cambridge 1812, 278.

νεοδηής²³⁷; or (ii) ‘recently constructed’, from root *δεμ-²³⁸. Only meaning (i) would be suitable in this context: cf. δαμάζω = ‘kill’, LSJ *s.v.*, III.2; for δμαθέντες = τεθνεώτες cf. E. *Tro.* 175 with Biehl *ad l.*; *IT* 199, 230; *Alc.* 127. Taking into account that νεόδητος = ‘recently killed’ is unparalleled in pre-Hellenistic literature (Lycophr. 65 πρὸς νεόδητον νέκυν; cf. Nonn. 47.213 νεοδηήτοιο Koechly : νεοτμ- mss.), we may safely assume that νεόδητον in *Va* and *Chr. Pat.* reflects Hellenistic and later usage. Indeed, it appears that in later Greek νεόδητος and νεόκητος came to be regarded as essentially synonymous²³⁹; this will no doubt have encouraged confusion in the manuscript tradition.

66. *Rh.* 904-5

ὅσον προσήκει μὴ γένους κοινωνίαν	
ἔχοντι λύπης τὸν σὸν οἰκτίρω γόνον.	905
904 ὄση (et 905 λύπη) Wecklein (~ <i>Chr. Pat.</i> 1159)	905
λύπης Kirchhoff: -η L: -ην VQ	

‘With as much grief as befits a non-relative I feel pity for your offspring.’

The transmitted text makes for awkward syntax: it requires us to take ὅσον προσήκει ... λύπης as cognate accusative with οἰκτίρω = ‘I feel as much pity (with λύπης as partitive genitive from ὅσον) as befits a non-relative’; but λύπης would be both redundant and too far removed from ὅσον for their syntactic relationship to be adequately apparent. One way out of the difficulty is to read ὄση προσήκει ... λύπη; L already has λύπη, and ὄση was hesitantly suggested by Wecklein²⁴⁰. But again it would be clumsy to separate ὄση and λύπη so widely; besides, *Chr. Pat.* 1159 ὅσον δέον γὰρ μὴ γένους κοινωνίαν shows that ὅσον is firmly ensconced in the tradition. Another possibility is Kirchhoff’s ... μὴ γένους κοινωνίαν | ἔχοντι λύπη κτλ.²⁴¹, ‘as much as it becomes a non-relative it is with grief that I feel pity for your offspring’; but again λύπη would be redundant in view of οἰκτίρω²⁴².

As a simpler remedy I suggest: ... μὴ γένει κοινωνίαν | ἔχοντα λύπης, ‘as far as it becomes someone who shares your grief though not *qua* relative’; for this use of γένει see LSJ *s.v.*, I.1; for the accusative (ἔχοντα) instead of the dative after an impersonal verb (προσήκει) cf. Kühner–Gerth (*supra*, n. 22) 2, 591.

²³⁷ See Phot. *Lex.* p. 294.15 Porson νεόδητον· νεοδάμαστον; E. *Med.* 623.

²³⁸ Cf. Pi. *I.* 3/4.80.

²³⁹ Cf. Suid. v 194 (III.450.14 Adler) and Phot. p. 294.22 Porson νεόκητον· νεωστὶ κατασκευασμένον.

²⁴⁰ N. Wecklein (ed.), *Euripidis Rhesus*, Leipzig 1902, in app. crit. *ad l.*

²⁴¹ A. Kirchhoff (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae*, Berlin 1868, 3, 341.

²⁴² Cf. further Nauck, “Studien” (*supra*, n. 20) 185.

67. *Rh.* 910-14

ἄ θ' Ἑλλάνα λιποῦσα δόμον 910
 Φρυγίων λεχέων ἔπλευσε πλαθεῖς,
 †ὕπ' Ἰλίῳ ὤλεσε† μὲν σ' ἕκατι Τροίας,
 φίλτατε, μυριάδας τε πόλεις
 ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐκένωσεν.

910 Ἑλλάνα Badham: ἐλένα Ω 912 ἄ διώλεσε Jackson, ἀπὸ δ' ὤλεσε Henning (ἀπὸ τ' Wecklein), ὅπου ὤλεσε Wilamowitz σ' ἕκατι Bruhn: σε κατὰ Ω 913 μυριάδος uel μυριάδων Ritchie πόλεων Reiske

'(May the woman perish) too, who abandoned her Greek home and sailed off to lie in a Phrygian bed; and she destroyed you, my dearest, for Troy's sake(?), and emptied myriads of cities of their good men'.

There seems to be some textual corruption at 911 ἔπλευσε πλαθεῖς'. As Kovacs points out²⁴³, πλαθεῖς' is extremely awkward in its confused relation both to ἔπλευσε and to λιποῦσα. The awkwardness remains, at least in relation to λιποῦσα (does it precede or follow πλαθεῖς?), even if we assume, with Mastronarde²⁴⁴, that "Phrygian bed" refers to a bed already shared with [the Phrygian] Paris, her new sexual partner, not to a bed in Phrygia she has yet to reach'. Kovacs (*l.c.*, *supra*, n. 243) proposes a simple emendation, namely πλέουσ' ἐπλάθη, which addresses both problems in tandem (the hiatus in ἐπλάθη | ὑπ' implies period-end, cf. below). Kovacs also advances a metrical argument in favour of his emendation: according to him, assuming period-end at 911 (since the concluding bacchiac, a catalectic metre, is followed by a *breve* in the next line) would be incompatible with the elision in πλαθεῖς'. However, catalexis (or 'pendant close') is not a mark of period-end if followed by double short, as here²⁴⁵. The point is also made by Mastronarde, *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 244) 21: 'The metrical argument used by [Kovacs] applies properly to passages of single-short rhythm and is misapplied in this passage containing double-short movement: the lack of period end in these enoplians is correctly accepted by Wilamowitz, Zanetto, and Dale.'

Another problem concerns †ὕπ' Ἰλίῳ ὤλεσε† at 912. This unmetrical phrase has generally been obelized as corrupt, or emended away. Thus, Jackson suggested <ᾗ> διώλεσε (with ᾗ standing for λέχεια);²⁴⁶; H. Henning

²⁴³ Kovacs, *Euripidea Tertia* (*supra*, n. 11) 149-50.

²⁴⁴ In *Electronic Antiquity* (*supra*, n. 135) 21.

²⁴⁵ See T. C. W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*, Oxford 1990, 326 n. 41.

²⁴⁶ *Marginalia* (*supra*, n. 17) 66.

ἀπό δ' ὤλεσε²⁴⁷; and Wilamowitz ὅπου ὤλεσε²⁴⁸. Were it certain that ὑπ' Ἰλίου ὤλεσε is corrupt, then Wilamowitz's emendation would be the obvious choice: the subordinate clause it introduces helps preserve the basic structure ὄλοιτο X, ὃς ... initiated in 906-8 (with ὄλοιτο Ἐλένα understood as antecedent of the relative clause at 910ff.). Moreover, Wilamowitz's emendation provides 'an easy explanation of the paradosis: ὅπου, referring to a Troy that had to be understood out of Φρυγίων, was difficult enough for someone that he added an explanatory note, which in time effaced ὅπου'²⁴⁹. However, it seems awkward to have a vague ὅπου = 'Troy' juxtaposed with an explicit Τροίας in the same verse. One wonders whether the corruption may not lie rather in σὲ κατὰ Τροίας, 'which is faulty both in sense and rhythm'²⁵⁰. True, E. Bruhn's²⁵¹ σ' ἕκατι Τροίας is satisfactory, but what if κατὰ Τροίας were a gloss on ὑπ' Ἰλίου rather than vice-versa (thus e.g. Paley)? For ὑπ' Ἰλίου in tragedy cf. A. *Ag.* 860, 882, 1439 (cf. also ὑπὸ Τροία in 1457); *Ch.* 345; E. *Andr.* 1182; *Hec.* 764; *El.* 881; *Or.* 58, 102. If so, then one might consider reading, as an *exempli gratia* suggestion, ὑπὸ τ' Ἰλιον ὤλεσέν σε βάντα (cf. already Hermann's ὑπὸ τ' Ἰλίου²⁵²): for the triple τε (ἅ θ' ... ἔπλευσε ... ὑπὸ τ' Ἰλιον ὤλεσε ... μυριάδας τε πόλεις ... ἐκένωσεν) see Denniston, *Particles* (*supra*, n. 54) 504-5; for ὑπὸ Ἰλιον ... βάντα cf. *Il.* 2.216, 673 ὑπὸ Ἰλιον ἦλθε. Noteworthy is also Paley's ὑπὸ δ' (*malim* ὑπὸ τ') Ἰλίου ὤλεσέν σε πύργους²⁵³.

The emendation suggested, *exempli gratia*, in the previous paragraph is compatible with the *lectio tradita* ἔπλευσε πλαθεῖς in 911, but not with Kovacs' emendation πλέουσ' ἐπλάθη, since a hiatus between 911 and 912 is precluded by the probable lack of period-end at 911 (see above). In other words, the problem of the temporal relation between πλαθεῖς and λιποῦσα remains. For want of a better solution, it may be advisable, at least for the time being, to accept that the problem is innate, a genuine fault of the author's style rather than the result of textual corruption. After all, it would not be the first time this author utilizes what is evidently meant to be precious tragic style but is in fact bad or contorted Greek: see my forthcoming commentary on *Rhesus*, notes to 8, 90-4, 109-11, 143-5a, 226-7, 355-6, 360-7, 414b-15, 424-5, 519-20, 523-5a, 619-21, 624-6, 633, 647-8, 710-14, 986-7.

Lastly, in 913, the adjectival use of μυριάδας seems unparalleled: one should have expected either μυρίας πόλεις or μυριάδας πόλεων. Despite

²⁴⁷ *Teste* Wecklein, *Euripidis Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 240) 55, who printed it in slightly modified form as ἀπό τ' ὤλεσε.

²⁴⁸ *ap.* G. Murray, *Euripidis Fabulae*, Oxford 1909, in app. crit. *ad l.*

²⁴⁹ Quotation from Kovacs, *Euripidea Tertia* (*supra*, n. 11) 149.

²⁵⁰ Quotation from Porter, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 111) *ad* 910ff.

²⁵¹ *RhM* 48, 1893, 630.

²⁵² Hermann, *Opuscula* (*supra*, n. 60) 310.

²⁵³ Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136) *ad* 912.

various attempts to explain or emend it away, μυριάδας has remained an intractable *crux*. Thus, Vater and Ritchie wished to construe καὶ πόλεις ἐκένωσε μυριάδας ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν, ‘and she emptied cities of myriads of good men’²⁵⁴. However, (i) to take μυριάδας with ἀνδρῶν goes against the run of the sentence²⁵⁵; and (ii) κενόω with double accusative is unparalleled, since in Pi. *Pyth.* 3.97-8 τὸν μὲν ... θύγατρεις ἐρήμωσαν ... | εὐφροσύνας μέρος αἱ τρεῖς²⁵⁶, it seems best (despite LSJ *s.v.* ἐρημῶω II.1) to take μέρος as accusative of respect rather than as object of ἐρήμωσαν: ‘his three daughters, each one for her part, deprived him of his happiness’. As an alternative, Ritchie *l.c.* (*supra*, n. 254) suggested emending into μυριάδων or μυριάδος; but the resulting consecutive genitives (μυριάδων / μυριάδος ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν) would be clumsy. The same goes for Reiske’s μυριάδων τε πόλεων²⁵⁷: it is an obvious remedy²⁵⁸, but rather awkward in view of the following genitives; indeed, it is precisely those genitives that, one expects, should have protected πόλεων, had it been the original reading. The best way out of the conundrum, *faute de mieux*, is Wilamowitz’s suggestion that adjectival μυριάδας is a Boeoticism, apparently paralleled in Corinn. *PMG* 654 (a) col. i.34 Page ἐ]μ μου[ρι]άδεσσι λάυς (=ἐν μυριάσι λαοῖς)²⁵⁹. For another Boeoticism in *Rhesus* cf. 523 προταινὶ τάξεων: its Boeotian character, affirmed by Parmeniscus (thus the ancient scholiast, Schwartz, *Scholion* [*supra*, n. 147] 340), has been confirmed by epigraphy: προτηνὶ occurs at least 3 times in Boeotian inscriptions (*IG* 7.1739.11, 14 Thespieae; restored by Dittenberger in *IG* 7.2406.7 Thebes); a fourth instance may be lurking in *BCH* 21 (1897) 554.2 / 557.2 (Thespieae, suppl. G. Colin) ὑπάρχι δὲ ἐν τῇ π[ροτ]ηνὶ π[ρο]ρρεῖσει.

68. *Rh.* 923-4

... μεγίστην εἰς ἔριν μελωδίας
κλεινῶ σοφιστῆ Ἰθηκί...
κλεινῶ Dobree: κείνω(ι) Ω: δεινῶ Valckenaer

‘...a supreme contest of music against the renowned Thracian singer...’.

²⁵⁴ Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) ad 899; Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 177; cf. Jouan, *Euripide* (*supra*, n. 29) p. 53 n. 270.

²⁵⁵ Cf. Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136) ad 914.

²⁵⁶ Adduced by Ritchie (*supra* n. 254).

²⁵⁷ Reiske, *Animadversiones* (*supra*, n. 32) 92.

²⁵⁸ Cf. also Blaydes, *Adversaria* (*supra*, n. 72) 11; for the synzesis see Diggle, *Studies* (*supra*, n. 47) 93, 1207

²⁵⁹ Wilamowitz, *Verskunst* (*supra*, n. 68) 585 n. 1.

The mss reading is untenable: we should expect either σοφιστῆ κείνω or κείνω τῷ σοφιστῆ. One possibility is Dobree's κλεινῶ²⁶⁰, but Valckenaer's δεινῶ²⁶¹ may be slightly preferable in view of E. *Hipp.* 921 δεινὸν σοφιστήν; *Su.* 903 δεινὸς σοφιστής (del. Porson, *prob.* Diggle); *Trag. adesp.* fr. 323 Kannicht-Snell (perhaps a parody or an alternative version of E. *Su.* 903).

69. *Rh.* 938-40

καὶ τοῦδ', Ἀθήνα, παντὸς αἰτία μέρου—
οὐδὲν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς οὐδ' ὁ Τυδέωος τόκος
ἔδρασε—δρῶσα μὴ δόκει λεληθέναι. 940

938 καὶ: σὺ Kirchhoff 940 ἔδρασε—δρῶσα Lenting; ἔδρασε δράσας Ω (cf. Chr. Pat. 1411 ἔδρας ἔδρασας κτλ.); ἔδρας—ἔδρασας Heath, quibus acceptis τοῦτ' pro τοῦδ' 938 Paley

'And you, Athena, cause of all this massacre—for neither Odysseus nor Tydeus' son did anything—, do not think that your act has escaped notice.'

Lenting's emendation²⁶² requires a parenthesis in 939-40²⁶³ and an intransitive use of δρῶσα. Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136) *ad* 938-40 accepts Heath's (οὐδὲν δ' Ὀδ- ... ἔδρας) ἔδρασας, μὴ δ- λ- in 940²⁶⁴; his further change of τοῦδ' into τοῦτ' in 938 aims at furnishing ἔδρασας with an object.²⁶⁵ But surely the transmitted text can be defended. As Matthiae saw²⁶⁶, οὐδὲν δ' Ὀδ- οὐδ' ὁ Τ- τ- ἔδρασε δράσας is meant as a mild paradox: although Odysseus and Diomedes did of course slay Rhesus (δράσας), they were not really the perpetrators of the act (οὐδὲν ... ἔδρασε), since it was Athena who masterminded it (cf. 945 κατέκτεινας σύ). This is no doubt an attempt to reproduce a well-known Euripidean mannerism, which has been recently discussed by, *inter alios*, Diggle²⁶⁷, Parker (*ad* E. *Alc.* 521), and Olson (*ad* Ar. *Ach.* 395-6). For such paradoxes one may further compare *h. Merc.* 92 καὶ τε ἰδὼν μὴ ἰδὼν εἶναι καὶ κωφὸς ἀκούσας; A. *Ag.* 1623 οὐχ ὄραξ ὄρων τάδε;

²⁶⁰ Dobree, *Adversaria* (*supra*, n. 12) 88.

²⁶¹ L. C. Valckenaer, *Εὐριπίδου Ἰππόλυτος; Euripidis tragoedia Hippolytus*, Lugduni 1822, 262.

²⁶² *Nova Acta Literaria Societatis Rheno-Trajectinae* 1, 1821, 77.

²⁶³ For such parenthetical statements see Diggle, *Studies* (*supra*, n. 47) 115-16; *Euripidea* (*supra*, n. 4) 428-9 with n. 40.

²⁶⁴ See Heath, *Notae* (*supra*, n. 235), Euripidean section p. 98, notwithstanding his inept οὐ δόκει λ-.

²⁶⁵ Cf. his explanation: 'And this, O Athena, thou sole cause of his fate, —for neither Ulysses nor Diomed in fact was guilty, —*thou* hast done; think not it has escaped my notice.'

²⁶⁶ Matthiae, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 45) *ad* 937.

²⁶⁷ "Notes on fragments of Euripides", *CQ* 47, 1997, 98-108, here 106 with n. 46, citing *inter alia* *Hel.* 696 ἔλιπον οὐ λιπούσα, *Ba.* 332 φρονῶν οὐδὲν φρονεῖς.

(apparently proverbial, see Fraenkel *ad l.* and cf. especially [Dem.] 25.89); *PV* 447-8 βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην, | κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον (with Griffith *ad l.*); *S. Aj.* 85 ἐγὼ σκοτώσω βλέφαρα καὶ δεδορκότα; *OT* 413 σὺ καὶ δεδορκῶς οὐ (Reiske : δέδορκας κού mss.) βλέπεις; for a late ex. cf. [Men.] *Mon.* 586 Pernigotti ὁ γραμμάτων ἄπειρος οὐ βλέπει βλέπων.

The transmitted text would be improved with Kirchhoff's σύ for καί at 938: 'You, Athena, (are the) cause of all this massacre; neither Odysseus nor Tydeus' son did anything, even though they did act. Do not think that your act has escaped notice.'

70. *Rh.* 948-9

καὶ τῶνδε μισθὸν παῖδ' ἔχουσ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις
θηρῶν· σοφιστὴν δ' ἄλλον οὐκ ἐπάξομαι.

'And as my recompense for all these things, I now lament my son whom I hold in my arms; thus, I will never bring another skilled artist (into Athens).'

A much-debated phrase. Sense and context seem to require something along the lines already suggested by Hardion²⁶⁸: 'n'espérez pas que je forme jamais pour votre ville aucun autre Philosophe'²⁶⁹; cf. also Beck²⁷⁰: 'non inducam, non mittam Athenis [sic], non sinam e Thracia illuc venire, alium philosophum' — although, of course, σοφιστής here means 'poet / musician' rather than 'philosopher'²⁷¹.

Later editors, with few exceptions²⁷², have generally resisted this interpretation. The reason is that, if the Muse's point were that she will provide no more σοφισταί for Athens, then one should have expected ἐπάξω rather than ἐπάξομαι, which seems elsewhere to be reflexive, 'to procure or provide for oneself', 's i b i aliquem adducere, arcessere'²⁷³. This is correct, but

²⁶⁸ J. Hardion, "Dissertation sur la Tragédie de Rhésus", *Mémoires de littérature tirés des registres de l'Académie royale des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 14, 1741, 509-31 (written in 1731), here 527-9.

²⁶⁹ The quotation is from p. 527. There is no need to discuss Hardion's absurd idea that this is a covert reference to Socrates.

²⁷⁰ Beck, *Exercitatio* (*supra*, n. 81) 14 n. 8.

²⁷¹ For σοφός ('learned' or 'skilled') used of poets and musicians cf. LSJ *s.v.*, I.1. For σοφιστής in connection with musicians see M. Coray, *Wissen und Erkennen bei Sophokles*, Basel/Berlin 1993, 138.

²⁷² e.g. O. F. Gruppe, *Ariadne: die tragische Kunst der Griechen*, Berlin 1834, 327: 'ich werde dir keinen Weisen mehr hersenden'; Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136) *ad* 942: 'But I will take care not to bring into Athens any more teachers of religion and art'.

²⁷³ Thus e.g. Matthiae, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 45) *ad* 946; Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) cxxv; cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἐπάγω, II.1, 2, 4; Schwyzer, *Grammatik* (*supra*, n. 50) 231.

no alternative interpretation carries any conviction. Thus, Musgrave²⁷⁴, followed by Matthiae *l.c.* (*supra* n. 273), thought the phrase means ‘θρηνώ, and I need no other skilled artist to sing my dirge’ (*musicum alium naeniae canendae causa non adducam*), an interpretation that appears to be corroborated by the similarly phrased E. *Herc.* 911-12 μάντιν οὐχ ἕτερον ἄξιομαι (see further Bond *ad l.*); cf. also *Rh.* 952 οὐδὲν μάντεων ἔδει φράσαι, with Porter, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 111) *ad* 949. But as Matthiae himself suspected, it would be an irrelevance for the Muse to call attention upon the fact that she will not hire the services of a professional mourner to perform a dirge for her son; tragic lamentation is never performed by proxy.

Again on the basis of E. *Herc.* 911-12, L. Dindorf²⁷⁵ and Vater²⁷⁶ argued that the phrase means ‘I have no need for a skilled exegete (*veteratore* L. Dindorf) or a prophet (*vate sive interprete* Vater) to reveal to me who the guilty party is’; but of course neither could adduce any evidence for σοφιστής = μάντις²⁷⁷; the same goes for Burnett’s translation ‘diviner or adept’²⁷⁸.

Defending the traditional interpretation, Fantuzzi²⁷⁹ has argued that the Muse’s affirmation is in reality a statement of poetics: she refuses to ‘bring over to her side’ (ἐπάξιομαι) poets and singers (cf. σοφιστήν), who would be unwilling to perform what Greek poetry, especially tragedy, often brands as anomalous or unbecoming, namely a song on a funereal occasion, cf. e.g. E. *Pho.* 1498-501, *Hel.* 164-6, *IT* 179-85; see further Fantuzzi, *art. cit.* (*supra*, n. 279) 178-85. However, Fantuzzi’s reading is simply not borne out by the text: one would expect the Muse at least to hint at the supposedly anomalous nature of her song, the more so since her lament is legitimized (as Fantuzzi is aware) already in epic tradition²⁸⁰. Moreover, this interpretation seems to have no use for ἄλλον in σοφιστήν ... ἄλλον: if Fantuzzi were right, there would be no point in the statement that the Muse will bring in no ‘other’ artisans or (with a well-known idiomatic use of ἄλλος) ‘other people, artisans’.

In an alternative suggestion by Leaf, the phrase is taken to imply: ‘I am content with Musaios as my advocate, and need call in no other skilled

²⁷⁴ Musgrave, *Εὐριπίδου τὰ σφζόμενα* (*supra*, n. 181) 412.

²⁷⁵ *teste* Dindorf, *Euripidis tragoediae* (*supra*, n. 15) *ad* 949.

²⁷⁶ Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) cxxvii.

²⁷⁷ Despite Porter, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 111) *ad* 949, Melampous *himself* is not called σοφιστής in *Hdt.* 2.49.1.

²⁷⁸ A. P. Burnett, “*Rhesus*: Are smiles allowed?”, in P. Burian (ed.), *Directions in Euripidean criticism*, Durham 1985, 13-51, here 48.

²⁷⁹ M. Fantuzzi, “La *mousa* del lamento in Euripide, e il lamento della Musa nel *Reso* ascritto a Euripide”, *Eikasmos* 18, 2007, 173-99, here 188-90.

²⁸⁰ In the *Aethiopsis* Thetis was joined in her lament for Achilles by *the Muses* as well as by her own sisters the Nereids; Procl. *Chrest.* 198-9 Severyns = *PEG* I 69.20-1 Bernabé = *EGF* 47.26-7 Davies: καὶ Θέτις ἀφικομένη σὺν Μούσαις καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς θρηνεῖ τὸν παῖδα. The detail is also mentioned in *Od.* 24.60-2 and in *Pi. I.* 8.57-60.

pleader to speak on my behalf²⁸¹. This is an improvement upon an untenable suggestion first put forward by Reiske²⁸², namely ‘*doctorem & testem huius rei locupletem habeo filium meum, ut opus alio non habeam*’ (but a σοφιστής is not a *testis*, and at any rate Rhesus’ dead body could scarcely serve as proof of the murderer’s identity). Promising as Leaf’s suggestion may seem, it is unlikely: the intervening καὶ τῶνδε μισθὸν . . . θρηνῶ permanently shifts the focus from the Muses’ importance for Athenian culture to this particular Muse’s personal grief.

Finally, Richards²⁸³ suggested that the Muse, considering that her association with the musician Thamyras led to the ill-fated birth of Rhesus, and that the Muses’ generosity in offering the musicians Orpheus and Musaeus to Athens was basely rewarded by the death of Rhesus, resolves ‘never to bring down on [her] head another musician’. This is impossibly contorted.

All things considered, it appears that Hardion’s and Beck’s intuition, described in this note’s first paragraph, was right, and that σοφιστὴν ἄλλον δ’ οὐκ ἐπάξομαι is best taken as the Muse’s vengeful response to Athena’s ungrateful, perverted ‘recompense’ (948 μισθόν): as an act of retaliation, the Muse will retract the benefits she once bestowed on Athens²⁸⁴. True, the middle ἐπάξομαι remains problematic²⁸⁵, and it will not do to imagine, with Burnett²⁸⁶, that it merely stresses the Muse’s personal interest in Athens’ cultural excellence: the Muse cannot be speaking from an Athenian perspective — not in this context of express enmity against Athens. One solution might be to emend into ἐπάξομεν (Paley)²⁸⁷: the shift into the first-person ‘heroic plural’, however jarring, is adequately paralleled in Euripides (see Bond on *Herc.* 858). Still, the *pluralis maiestatis* is never used elsewhere by the Muse, presumably because she reserves the plural for references to herself and her sisters as a group (e.g. *Rh.* 891, 921-5, 941-2, 947, 976). Given the frequent lack, in Greek, of any appreciable difference between active and middle verbal forms, interchangeability or downright confusion were common, and not only among non-native speakers (as in Ar. *Thesm.* 1005, *Pax* 291)²⁸⁸. More importantly, the *Rhesus* author does use problematic middle forms elsewhere²⁸⁹, or use active forms where one would

²⁸¹ W. Leaf, “Rhesos of Thrace”, *JHS* 35, 1915, 1-11, here 4. Cf. also Feickert, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 92) ad 949.

²⁸² Reiske, *Animadversiones* (*supra*, n. 32) 93.

²⁸³ G. C. Richards, “The Problem of the *Rhesus*”, *CQ* 10, 1916, 192-7, here 196-7.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Joan, *Euripide* (*supra*, n. 29) p. 78 n. 280(3).

²⁸⁵ Cf. in the last instance Fantuzzi, “La *moussa*” (*supra*, n. 279) 189-90 n. 50.

²⁸⁶ Burnett, “*Rhesus*” (*supra*, n. 278) 187 n. 109.

²⁸⁷ Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136) ad 948.

²⁸⁸ See further Schwyzer, *Grammatik* (*supra*, n. 50) 232-3, 234-5.

²⁸⁹ In 805, middle δυσούζου is unique, and the sense problematic. Active δυσούζω probably means ‘to cry out in distress’ or ‘in indignation’, but ‘you should stop wailing because Rhesus was after all killed by enemies’ cannot possibly be the intended meaning here. One would

expect the middle²⁹⁰, and so it would not be unreasonable to infer a similar error in the present passage.

A final hurdle is οὐκ ἐπάξομαι where one might expect οὐκέτ' ἐπάξομαι; but there seem to be sufficient parallels for this omission of -έτι: *Rh.* 451 μή τις ἀσπίδ' ἄρηται (=μηκέτι τις); also, e.g., *S. Ant.* 91 ὅταν δὴ μὴ σθένω, πεπαύσομαι (=ὅταν δὴ μηκέτι σθ-).

The Muse's climactic threat, to the effect that she will henceforth withdraw her favour from Athens, has also been remarked upon by P. Wilson²⁹¹, who has pointed out that 'one *could* read it, perhaps a little facetiously, as a kind of *aition* for the end of Athens' poetic productivity [...] A Muse herself announces the end of Athens' musical privilege and poetic supremacy, and the departure of those deities from an ungrateful city.' In a similar vein, I have argued (with no awareness of Wilson's remarks) that the Muse's severe criticism of Athens is hard to reconcile with the assumption of Athenian authorship, whereas it is compatible with the hypothesis that *Rhesus* was written for a Macedonian audience²⁹².

71. *Rh.* 961

φίλος γὰρ ἐλθὼν δυστυχῶς ἀπέρχεται

'For though he came in friendship he is departing in misfortune'.

At first sight, Vater's ἀποίχεται seems attractive²⁹³: the perfective mode seems in order because Rhesus is already 'gone'; moreover, ἀποίχομαι seems to be a key term in Greek funerary discourse²⁹⁴. Equally plausible is Nauck's διοίχεται²⁹⁵. cf. *S. Aj.* 972-3 ἐμοὶ | λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται. But either emendation would destroy the studied antithesis with ἐλθὼν: Rhesus is now leaving (ἀπέρχεται) Troy in very different circumstances from those surrounding his arrival (ἐλθὼν).

require δυσσοίχομαι to mean 'to carp' ('stop cavilling, for this was all our enemies' doing'), but this is unattested.

²⁹⁰ In 982, διοίσει (sc. βίον) is unusual, since it is the middle, not the active, that is used absolutely (LSJ s.v. διαφέρω, I.2; cf. *S. Aj.* 511); cf. 600 εἰ διοίσει νύκτα τήνδ'.

²⁹¹ "Euripides' Tragic Muse", *ICLS* 24/25, 1999-2000, 427-49, here 427-8.

²⁹² See V. Liapis, "They Do It with Mirrors: The Mystery of the Two *Rhesus* plays", in D. I. Jacob & E. Papazoglou (eds), *Θυμέλη: Μελέτες χαρισμένες στον Καθηγητή Ν. Χ. Χουρμουζιάδη*, Heraklion 2004, 159-88, here 161; cf. also V. Liapis, "Rhesus Revisited: The Case for a Fourth-Century Macedonian Context", *JHS* 129, 2009, 71-88, here 83.

²⁹³ Vater, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 45) ad 946.

²⁹⁴ Cf. P. A. Hansen (ed.), *Carmina epigraphica Graeca saeculi IV a. Chr. n.*, Berlin 1989, no. 75.2; W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, Berlin 1955, nos. 210.1, 238.2, 647.6, 785.2, 844.7, 1121.6, 1237.6, 1438.7, 1474.4, 1892.4, 2089.2; Ar. *Ra.* 83 (a parody of funeral language); fr. 504.10 Kassel-Austin ὁ μακαρίτης οἴχεται.

²⁹⁵ Nauck, "Studien" (*supra*, n. 20) 186.

72. *Rh.* 974-5

ῥᾶον δὲ πένθος τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ
 οἶσω· θανεῖν γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἐκ κείνης χρεών. 975
 974 ῥᾶον Musgrave: βαιὸν Ω et Chr. Pat. 1777 θαλασσίου L

‘I will bear my grief more easily than the sea goddess will; for her own son must die too’.

The credit for ῥᾶον belongs really to Valckenaer, who proposed the emendation in a set of manuscript notes, which are dated 24 Febr. 1749, but were published only recently by P. J. Finglass²⁹⁶. Musgrave, who actually got around to publishing the same emendation²⁹⁷, hit upon it independently several years later than Valckenaer — a coincidence pointed out by Valckenaer himself: ‘mihi dudum id ipsum in mentem venisse’²⁹⁸.

This neat emendation should have won universal approval; cf. especially E. *Hipp.* 205-6 ῥᾶον δὲ νόσον ... οἴσεις; ?A. *PV* 104 αἴσαν φέρειν ὡς ῥᾶστα. However, βαιόν is still printed by Zanetto and defended by Feickert as meaning ‘presently, after a short while’²⁹⁹. But βαιός never has this meaning, and supposed parallels turn out to be illusory: in S. *OC* 1653 ἔπειτα μέντοι βαιὸν οὐδὲ σὺν χρόνῳ, construe βαιὸν ἔπειτα, ‘shortly afterwards’ (cf. S. *Phil.* 20 βαιὸν δ’ ἔνερθεν); and in S. *Trach.* 335 βαιὸν ἀμείνας means ‘waiting for a short while’, not ‘after a short while’. Even if βαιόν could mean ‘presently’, the resulting sense would still be absurd in the present context; for though a participant in the lamentations for Achilles (976-7), the Muse cannot properly be said to ‘bear’ a grief that really belongs to Thetis (cf. 977 Θέτιδος ἐν πένθει). Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136) *ad l.* explains: ‘though they will one day have to take part in the mourning of Thetis for her son [...], they will feel it but lightly [i.e. βαιόν] ... in comparison with the loss of Rhesus’. This is entirely off the mark, not least because ‘in comparison with the loss of Rhesus’ is not in the Greek.

The L reading θαλασσίου θεοῦ is unlikely both because of the phrasing in this passage’s model, namely E. fr. 885 Kannicht ἄληθες, ὃ παῖ τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ; and because, as pointed out by E. Harrison³⁰⁰, it is hard to parallel θεός preceded by feminine article with an intervening adjective in -ος. Harrison, apparently unaware of this passage’s Euripidean model, considers reading θαλασσίου θεᾶς, which would incidentally also eliminate interlinear hiatus. True, θαλασσίους is feminine in E. *IT* 236, but all the instances of feminine

²⁹⁶ See *GRBS* 49, 2009, 187-221, here 199-201.

²⁹⁷ Musgrave, *Exercitationum* (*supra*, n. 138) 96.

²⁹⁸ Valckenaer, *Diatribē* (*supra*, n. 175) 113 n. 15.

²⁹⁹ Zanetto, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 49); Feickert, *Rhesus* (*supra*, n. 92) *ad* 974.

³⁰⁰ “Interlinear Hiatus in Tragic Trimeters, II”, *CR* 57, 1943, 62-3.

article + adjective in -ος + feminine noun cited by Harrison (S. *OC* 39-40, 458; E. *Andr.* 978, *Su.* 260, *IT* 944, 1113-4) feature compound adjectives, which have no morphologically distinct feminine endings anyway, and thus cannot support his emendation.

