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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.
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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.

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

Δόλωνα δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἤχειαν ὑπακούσαντα ἐκπέμπεσθαι τόπον εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀφορίσεν αὐτῷ†
6 ἀφορίσεν VQ : ἀφορίσας Αο 5-6 ἐξέπεμψε θηρὸς τρόπον εἰς τὴν π-
<μισθὸν> ἀφορίσας αὐτῷ 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 ἁφικόμενον ἀπεδέξατο> τόπον εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀφορίσας αὐτῷ3, ‘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 χρειαν. 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

παραγενηθέντος δὲ Ἐκτόρος ἵνα ἀυτόττης τῶν πεπραγμένων γένηται πετρωμένος ὁ τῶν Ῥήσου πόλων ἐπιμελητὴς διὰ τοῦ Ἕκτορος τὸν φόνον ἐνηργῆσθαι ἐπι-νοεῖι

‘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 ἐνηργῆσαι 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 γεγενῆσαι as opposed to the choicer ἐνηργῆσαι. At any rate, in both versions, διὰ τοῦ Ἐκτορὸς (pap.) or δι’ αὐτοῦ ... Ἐκτορὸς (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} Ἐκτορὸς <ἐπινοήσαντος> τὸν φόνον <φησὶ> ἐνηργῆσαι⁶, note that φησὶ’ seems to be the only verb this author allows, for reasons unclear, to appear in the historic present; cf. Hyp. (a) 21-2 Diggle oид’ Ἀχιλλέα φησὶν ἀδάκρυτον ἔσεθαι. Still, one may attempt to emend such presents away; here, one might envisage, for instance, {διὰ τοῦ} Ἐκτορὸς<ἐπινοήσαντος> ἔφησε τὸν φόνον ἐνηργῆσαι⁷.

3. Rh. 16-19

[Xo. θάρσει. Ἐκ. θαρσῶ.]
†μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν; Χo. οὐκ ἔστι. Ἐκ. τί σὺ γὰρ†
φυλακὰς προλιπὼν κινεῖσι στρατιάν;]
eἰ μὴ τιν’ ἔχων νυκτιπορίαν;
16-18 del. Diggle (post 15 fort. lac. indicanda est propter hiatum) 1 7


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

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

⁷ For the clausula — ίιι — — — (the commonest Ciceronian clausula, cretic + spondee) see J. Diggle, “Rhythmic prose” (supra, n. 3) 29-30 (no. 1). For ἔφησε (as opposed to ἔφη) as this author’s favourite form cf. W. Luppe, Anagenessis 3, 1983, 198; idem, Philologus 127, 1983, 136; both cited by J. Diggle, “Rhythmic 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 561, but is otherwise paralleled only twice in tragedy: S. Tr. 977, 991, and [E.] IA 2-3 στείχε—στείχω ... σπεύδε—σπεύδω. The IA, which is especially akin to our passage, is interpolated. Diggle excises lines 16-18, but as he is aware this leaves us with an unlikely hiatus between θορύβῳ in 15 and ei in 19. Although 18 reappears almost verbatim as 37b-38a, it is surely (pace Diggle) the latter passage that is interpolated (thus Dobree): 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. Ἑκ. {θαρσῶ·} μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν; | Χο. οὔτις. Ἑκ. 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 σο φάρ κτλ. in 17 —surely a retort to something the chorus has said— seem incoherent. More promising is Jackson’s οὐκ ἔσθ’, <Ἕκτορ>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

---

15 G. Dindorf (ed.), Euripidis tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta, Oxford 1840, 3, on Rh. 18.
17 See J. Jackson, Marginalia Scaenica, Oxford 1955, 12.
18 See O. Taplin, PCPhS n.s. 23, 1977, 126.
the Trachiniae passage mentioned above (the author of Rhesus is generally prone to such quirks of style).

In line 19, Kovacs suggested εἰ μή τιν’ ἐρεῖς νυκτηρεσίαν (‘unless you have some nocturnal activity to report’) for the transmitted εἰ μή τιν’ ἔχων νυκτηροίαν. This is ingenious: νυκτηρεσία / νυκτεγεσία (‘waking by night’) is elsewhere used with reference to the Doloneia’s nocturnal action; cf. Accius, Nyctegresia, frs. 127-37 Dangel; P.Oxy. 2176 frs. 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 νυκτηροίαν in the first place. It is retained, for instance, in Nauck’s τί σὺ γὰρ φυλακὰς προλιπῶν κινεῖς | στρατιάν; τίν’ ἐχων νυκτηροίαν;20.

4. Rh. 53-5

ἀνδρεῖς γὰρ ἐκ γῆς τῆσδε νυκτέρῳ πλάτη
λαθόντες οἷμα τοιμὸν ἀρείσθαι φυγὴν
μέλλουσι

53 ἀνδρεῖς Elmsley : ά- Ω : α- pap. 54 ἀρείσθαι Nauck : αἱρείσθαι pap. :
αἱρείσθαι Ω φυγὴν Stephanus : φυγή(ι) OLQ: φυγη V (ras.): φυγη[ 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. αἱρείσθαι has received some support from ΑΙΡΕΙΣΘΑΙ in P.Achm. 421. The future stem may express, with μέλλω, 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 μέλλειν.22

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

19 Euripidea Tertia (supra, n. 11) 147.
21 = P.Par. inv. BN, Suppl. gr. 1099.2 (no. 427 Mertens-Pack); ed. pr. U. Wilcken, SBAW-Berlin, 1887, 815-16; cf. also P. Collart, BIFAO 31, 1931, 52-5, here 54-5.
23 Barrett, Papers (supra, n. 4) 258 n. 69.
24 For the idiom see also A. Pers. 481 αἱροῦνται φυγήν (Elmsley : αἱροῦνται φ- mss.). It is perhaps an extended usage from such phrases as ἵστια αἱρεῖσθαι ‘to hoist sail’; or, in the active, E. Hec. 1141 ἁρείαν στόλον, IT 117 νόστον ἁροῦμεν πάλιν, Th. 1.52 τὰς ναὶς 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: ‘αἴρεσθαι φυγῇ is a perfectly proper “put to sea in flight” that calls for no change’; in this case, the transmitted αἴρεσθα (passive) is paralleled by A. Su. 2, Hdt. 1.165.3, 170.2. For the dative cf. E. Med. 938 ἀπαροῦμεν (Elmsley : ἀπαίρομεν mss.) φυγῇ.

5. Rh. 59-62

εἰ γὰρ φαεννοὶ μὴ ἔνεσχον ἡλίου λαμπτῆρες, οὐτὰν ἔσχον εὐτυχοῦν δόρυν, πρὶν ναῦς πυρῶσαι καὶ διὰ σκηνῶν μολεῖν κτεῖνων Ἀχαιοὺς τῇ δε 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, ἔνεσχον has so far resisted emendation. The ms. reading should require μή 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’ is impossible. What is more, ἔνεσχον seems to be an error by anticipation of ὑπάνεσχον in the following line; it must have ousted a word meaning something like ‘be put out’ or ‘be extinguished’. Heimsoeth’s ζανέσχων, 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’s (μή) ’φθόνησαν is elegant, but fails to account for the initial ἔνυ-. Wecklein’s ἐλείπον 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 reason; for the durative verbal aspect used of a specific occurrence in the past cf. Il. 2.106-7 (alternation of ἔλιπεν and λεῖπε in the same context). 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.
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 | λαμπτῆρας 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 *uvox propria* to signify ‘refrain from shooting a weapon’ (Magnelli fails to adduce any evidence whatsoever). The *crux* seems intractable, despite Wecklein’s brilliant emendation.


καίτοι περάσας κοῖλον αὐλώνων βάθος,  
εἰ μὴ κυρήσεις πολεμίων ἀπὸ χθονὸς  
φεῦγοντας ἀλλὰ σὸν βλέποντας ἐς δόρυ,  
νικώμενος μὲν οὐτὶ μὴ μόλης πάλιν.  
115  
115 οὔτι μὴ Cobet: τὴν’ οὐ μὴ L: τὴνδε μὴ VaQ et cod. L a Triclinio tertia emendatio: τὴνδ’ ἐμὴ O: τὴνδε μὴ ν Schaefer (seruato πόλιν)π α 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 (τὴνδ’ οὐ μὴ μόλης πόλιν) or ungrammatical (τὴνδε μὴ μόλης πόλιν). Cobet suggested οὔτι μὴ31, Reiske μόλης πάλιν32. Of interest is Schaefer’s τὴνδε 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, τὴνδε πόλιν, ‘this city here’, would be acceptable, since οὐδὲ 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 τὴδε … πόλει. However, there seems to be little point in Aeneas’ foregrounding the city

---

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 πάλιν.

7. Rh. 131

τάδε δοκεῖ, τάδε μεταθέμενος νόει
dókei Dawe μεταθέμενος Ἰν, coni. 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 responson with this line’s antistrophic pair (195). As is her wont, Pace36 tries to defend the majority reading μετατιθέμενος, assuming Responsionsfreiheit, i.e. ΩΩΩ— ΩΩΩΩΩΩ— Ω— in 131, corresponding to 2 dochmiacs in 195. However, the whole idea of Responsionsfreiheit 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 ΩΩΩ — — ΩΩ is exceedingly rare39.

As for Dawe’s δοκεῖ, 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 οἳ πάρεισιν ἐν λόγῳ
θέλει κατόπτης ναύς ἐπ’ Ἀργείων μολεῖν;
149 λόγω(ι) OVαQ : λόχω Λ 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?’

39 Cf. N. C. Conomis, “The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama”, Hermes 92, 1964, 23-50, here 28, 36. The inappropriateness of Responsionsfreiheit 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 Responsionsfreiheit ‘più che plausibile’.
The variant ἐν λόχῳ is found in L and Q (the latter supra lineam ante correctionem); moreover, as pointed out by Morstadt, 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 οἳ πάρεισιν ἐν λόχῳ = ‘those present at this announcement’, i.e. ‘all of the present company’, cf. Ar. Av. 30, Ach. 513 (with Dunbar, Olson ad ill.). 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 ύποσχόμενος τελέσει | δώρῳ ἐπι μεγάλῳ; (303-4).

9. Rh. 165

τάξαι 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 τυραννίδα 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: πολιοῦχου 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 λόχῳ 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 πολυόχος is doubtless a iotaistic error; cf. 381 πολύφρον (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 πολύ- as first component and a verbal second component are always resolvable into ὁ ἔχων πολλ- + a noun corresponding to the verbal component, e.g. πολυμέριμνος = ὁ πολλὰς μερίμνας ἔχων. This is impossible with πολυόχος.

11. Rh. 169

χρυσός 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 (ἐξαιτεῖς: -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’ ἀλλὴν ἀντὶ τῆς ἕξεις στολήν;
ἐπεὶ τίν’ OV et Qc : ἐπεὶ τῆν τίν’ Q : εἴπ’ η τίν’ 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 (εἴπε) 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 εἴπ’ εἰ τίν’ ἀλλὴν ἀντὶ τῆς δε κτλ, ‘tell me whether you will change into some new gear instead of this one’45. This, however, is exceedingly feeble: the


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 (πρέπουσαν <γ’>), but there is no room for such an addition. Pierson adduces E. Herc. 1118 as a parallel (εἴπ’ εἴ τι κανόν ύπογράφῃ τόμῳ 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’ ἥντιν’ 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’ ἄνδρός χρή σοφόν τι μανθάνειν

‘One must learn cleverness from clever men’

A 12th-century gnomologium, Athous Vatopedii 36, has σοφοῦ πρὸς ἄνδρός, 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’ ἄν-, but πρὸς ἄν- is surely lectio difficilior.

14. Rh. 208

λύκειον ἁμφὶ νῶτ’ ἐνάψομαι δοράν
νῶτ’ ἐνάψομαι Cobet : νῶτον ἁφομαι ΟV : νῶτα θῆσομαι 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 ΟV

---


48 See C.G. Cobet, Variae lectiones quibus continetur observationes criticae in scriptores graecos, Leiden 18732, 583.
reading). Cobet was surely right: it is ἐνάπτεσθαι (middle rather than passive, despite LSJ’s v.) that is commonly used to signify ‘fit’ to one’s body, ‘wear’; cf. Hdt. 7.69.1 λεοντέας ἐναμμένοι; E. Herc. 549 τάδ’ ἢδη περιβόλαι’ ἐνήμεθα; Ar. Nu. 72 διφθέραν ἐνημένον, Ec. 80, Av. 1250, Ra. 430; fr. 264 KA ό 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 986. Such lines are far from unparalleled in tragedy.

15. Rh. 219-20

σωθήσομαι τοι καὶ κτανὼν Ὀδυσσέως
οίσω κάρα σοι 220
219 τοι Diggle : τε VLQ et ΣV: δέ Ο : γε Wilamowitz

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

As Diggle has shown, 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 continuing. Diggle’s τοι gives highly idiomatic style, for it is regularly used in answer to a command or wish; and ‘the corruption of τοι to τε is especially easy when καί follows’. There are, however, alternatives worth considering, e.g. Wilamowitz’s γε, in its common usage as response-intensifier: 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 δή as another possibility: often corrupted into δέ (Ο), δή is often used by the tragedians to emphasize verbs, sometimes with emotional force; thus, σωθήσομαι δή = ‘I shall, indeed, return safely.’

16. Rh. 227-30

ικοῦ ἐννύχιος
καὶ γενού σωτήριος ἀνέρι πομᾶς
ἀγεμῶν καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις 230

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

W. Dindorf’s\textsuperscript{58} transposition of the mss word-order (ἵκοῦ ἐννύχιος | ἁγεμὼν σωτήριος ἀνέρι πομπᾶς | καὶ γενοῦ καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις) has won almost universal approval. Zanetto (cf. \textit{supra}, n. 49) predictably keeps the paradosis, but emends καὶ γενοῦ into καὶ πόνου (governed, together with πομπᾶς, by ἁγεμὼν). However, ἁγεμὼν πόνου is odd: we should expect e.g. ξυλλήπτωρ, as in E. \textit{Med.} 946, oddly invoked elsewhere by Zanetto in support of his emendation\textsuperscript{59}. Moreover, it would be pointless to have a feebly vague πόνου supplement an appositely specific πομπᾶς. The attempt by several scholars\textsuperscript{60} 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. \textit{Rh.} 231-2

ō παγκρατές, ὦ Τροίας
tείχη παλαιῶ ἀδέίμας
Τροίας Lachmann: τροίας \(\Omega\)

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

For Τροίας, which is metrically necessary, see K. Lachmann, \textit{De choricis systematis tragicorum graecorum libri quattuor}, Berlin 1819, 154 n. For the form cf. also \textit{Rh.} 262 (emend. Dindorf), 360 (emend. Murray) and, probably, S. \textit{Aj.} 1190 (emend. Wilamowitz). According to Aristarchus and Herodian, Homeric usage requires that trisyllabic Τροίη be used only as epithet of πόλις (‘Trojan town’; by contrast, disyllabic Τροίη = ‘Troy’ as substantive)\textsuperscript{61}. Whether this is Aristarchus’ own conjecture or it represents genuine tradition\textsuperscript{62}, the presumed rule is observed neither here nor in 360 (although it is followed, albeit loosely, in 262). This may well mean that

\textsuperscript{58} See Dindorf, \textit{Euripidis tragoediae (supra), n. 15), ad} 224-263 (p. 597).


\textsuperscript{61} Cf. \textit{Il.} 1.129 with ΣA \textit{ad l.} (129c, 1.47,13ff. Erbse); \textit{Od.} 5.39, 11.510 with Σ \textit{ad ll.} (1 244.24-6, 11 517.6 Dindorf); Hdn. \textit{Il. pros.} 1.129 (Gr. Gr. III.2.2.1, p. 23,36ff. Lentz).

\textsuperscript{62} Cf. C. G. Cobet, \textit{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 accentuation. If so, Aristarchus’ thesis is somewhat weakened. In 262, Dindorf’s Ἰρώνταν is an epithet, and thus conformant with Aristarchus’ standards of Homeric usage.

18. *Rh.* 245-9

\[\frac{\text{ἡ σπάνις αἰεί}}{245}\]

τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὅταν ἦν δυσάλιον ἐν πελάγει
cαι σαλεύῃ
πόλις
245 σπάνις αἰεὶ Wilamowitz: σπάνια Ο: σπάνια V² et ΣV: πανία V: σπάνις
LQ: σπάνις ἐστιν 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 (αἰεί) 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 (LQ, obviously an emendation) by Hesych. σ 1402 Hansen, Phot. Lex. 529.12 Porson. Another possibility is Ritchie’s\(^{65}\) σπάνις ἐστίν, which is however feebler than Wilamowitz’s emendation. Willink’s\(^{66}\) conjecture, ἦ σπάνι’ οἷα 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, Dindorf\(^{67}\) suggested reading ἐπὶ γᾶς / γὰ / γᾶν there\(^{68}\); however, as Ritchie (l.c.) points out γαῖα-forms are unanimously transmitted in 256.

---


\(^{65}\) Ritchie, *Authenticity* (supra n. 8) 301.

\(^{66}\) Willink, “Cantica” (supra, n. 9) 29 = *Collected Papers* 568.

\(^{67}\) *Euripidis tragödiae*, supra, n. 15 ad 256.

\(^{68}\) So also Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921, 584 n. 1.
19. Rh. 253-7

τίν’ ἄνδρ’ Ἀχαιῶν ὁ πεδοστιβής σφαγεύς
οὐτάσει ἐν κλισίαις, τετράπουν
μίμοι έχων ἐπὶ γαίας
θηρός;
256 γαίας LQ: γαίαι O: γαίαν 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 (ἐπί γὰν, 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. LSJ s.v. ἐπί, B.I.2.a, and e.g. Il. 4.443 ἐπὶ χθοὶ βαίνει. With the V reading, the sense of extension over a space would prevail (LSJ 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 ζῴοις.

20. Rh. 285-6

νυκτὸς γὰρ οὔτι φαῦλον ἐσβαλεῖν στρατόν,
κλυόντα πλήρη πεδία πολεμίας χερός.

ἐσβαλεῖν Diggle: ἐμβ- Ω: cf. Chr. Pat. 2096, 2452 μορφὴ 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 Βρομίου πόλιν ἔοιμεν 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 εἰκάσας μὴν πάρα (284), the antithesis introduced by the latter is oddly interrupted, since we never learn exactly what the shepherd’s ‘conjecture’ (εἰκάσας) 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 (εἰκάσας), 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

στείχων δ’ ἄνακτος προὐξερευνητὰς ὁδοῦ ἀνιστόρησα Θρήκιος προσφέγμασιν 296 ὁδοῦ V: στρατοῦ OLQ

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

ἄνακτος 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 satisfactory. It seems best to assume that the shepherd is merely speaking with hindsight (cf. also 290 Θρῆκιος … στρατός, 299 σύμμαχος).

As for ὁδοῦ, it is preferable to στρατοῦ both because the latter is a redundancy (the προὐξερευνηταῖ 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 ἄνακτος and στρατοῦ.

22. Rh. 333-41

Ἐκ. μισῶ φίλοισιν ὑστερον βοηδρομεῖν. 333
ὁ δ’ οὖν, ἐπείπερ ἦλθε, σύμμαχος μὲν οὔ, 336
ἐνδόν δὲ πρὸς τραπέζαν ἲκέτω ἐνδόν· 338
χάρις γὰρ αὐτῷ Πριαμίδων διώλετο. 338
Χο. ἄναξ, ἀπωθεῖν συμμάχους ἐπίθονον. 334
Ἀγ. φόβος γένοιτ’ ἂν πολεμίοις ὀφθεὶς μόνον. 335
Ἐκ. σὺ τ’ εὖ παραινεῖς, καὶ σὺ καιρίως σκοπεῖς. 339
ὁ χρυσοτευχὴς δ’ οὕνεκ’ ἀγγέλου λόγων 340
Ῥῆσος παρέστω τῇδε σύμμαχος χθονὶ.

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’ αὐτοῦ 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 exercitu, cum expectaveris: antecursores exercitus’.

‘(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. (MESSANGER) He would strike terror in the enemy merely by being seen’74. (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.
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.
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 question\(^{86}\): χάρις … διώλετο; ‘what! Are the Priamids no longer grateful to Rhesus?’ This is highly unlikely. First of all, ‘we have sufficient men to defend Ilion’ (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 opposite 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. Pearson\(^{87}\). 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 Beck\(^{88}\), 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 ἡ ἐκ τῶν Tρώων 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 Morstadt\(^{89}\) imagined that Eust. can only be referring to a

\(^{86}\) Cf. Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 77-8.


\(^{88}\) 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 *παρομια* 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. *ἀπώλετο* (*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 nought, by contrast, *ἀπόλλυμαι* (or the simplex *όλλυμαι*) can mean merely ‘to cease to exist, to fail’, and is apparently the *vox propria* to be used with regard to loss of χάρις; cf. E. *Held.* 438 οὔτοι σοί γ’ ἀπόλλυται χάρις; fr. 736.5-6 Kannicht ἦ δ’ ἐν ώρθολμοις χάρις | ἀπόλωλ’;81 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. LSJ7 s.v., II.2; S. *OT* 917 ἦν φόβους λέγη; *OC* 1651-2 ὃς δεινοῦ τινος | φόβου φανέντος. Alternatively, one might capitalize: *Φόβος* γένοντ’ ἐν πολεμίοις, ‘Rhesus would become Phobos (= as terrifying as Ph.) for the enemy.’ The reference would then be to Phobos, Ares’ son or attendant, a personification of the terror that puts warriors to flight. For a redoubtable warrior being assimilated to Phobos cf. A. *Sept.* 500, where Hippomedon ‘boasts of being Phobos at the gates’; 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.*

---

80 Examples from tragedy include: A. *Pers.* 483-4 στρατός ... | διώλυσε; S. *Tr.* 1052 ὕφαστον ἀμφιβλητρόν, ὃ διόλλυμαι; *El.* 141 αἱ στενάχουσα διόλλυσε (‘you’re ruining yourself’); *OT* 225 ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τινος διώλετο; E. fr. 757.848 Κн. διὰ σὲ γάρ διώλλυμαι (whereas in the same fragment’s line 845, when there was no emphasis on a third party’s agency, Hypsipyle had said merely ὃς ἀπόλλυμαι κακῶς); *Hipp.* 909 τὸ τρόπο διώλλυται; (Hippolytus is seeking to ascertain the agent of Phaedra’s death); 1061 ὅφ’ ὑμῶν ... διώλλυμαι; 1305 προφού διώλετ’ ὡς ἐκούσα μηχαναί; *Andr.* 158 νηδὺς δ’ ἀκύμων διὰ σὲ μοι διώλλυται; *Tro.* 629 ὡς κακῶς διόλλυσε (of the slaughtered Polyxena); *Su.* 191-2 οὗ χρείᾳ πόλεις | πολλαὶ διώλοντ’; *Or.* 1512 ἢ Τυνδάρειος ... παῖς διώλυτος.

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


83 See Hom. II. 15.119; *Hes. Sc.* 195.


85 As Rose *ad l.* argues, *Φόβος* γὰρ ὃς ἀνέκδοτο πῦλας κοπύττεται means that Hippomedon, who is ‘inspired by Ares’ (497 ἐνθεος δ’ Ἀρει) and ‘with a horrifying look in his eyes’ (498 φόβον βλέπων), is assimilated with Phobos. *Contra*, however, Hutchinson.
988-9 ὁ σὸς ... νοὺς ἐποιήθη Κύπρις· τὰ μῶρα γὰρ πάντ' ἐστὶν Ἀφροδίτη
βροτοῖς; S. Tr. 1278 κούδεν τοῦτον ὅτι μὴ Zeuς96; A. fr. 70 Radt Zeuς ἐστίν
αἰθήρ, Zeuς δὲ γη etc.

25. Rh. 339-41

For the Greek text see item 22 above. Herwerden97 thought that the
two σὺ refer to the same person (an impossibility), and went on to emend
into σὺ γ’ εὐ παραίνεις καὶ τὸ καίριον σκοπεῖς. However, the use of σὺ ... σὺ with reference to two different interlocutors is an established usage. As
tragic instances, Nauck98 cites S. OT 637 οὐκ εἰ σὺ τ’ (i.e. Oedipus) οἶκους
σὺ τὰ, Κρέον, κατὰ στέγας...; Ant. 724-5 ἀναξ, σὲ τ’ εἰκός, εἰ τι καίριον
λέγει, | μαθεῖν, σὲ τ’ (i.e. Haemon) αὐ τοῦ; 1340-1 ὁ παῖ, σὲ τ’ οὐχ ἐκὼν
κατέκανον | σὲ τ’ αὐ τάνῳ’ (i.e. Eurydice); E. IT’ 657 σὲ (i.e. Orestes) πάρος
ἡ σ’ (i.e. Pylades) ἀναστενάξω χόος; 1069 σὲ καὶ σ’ ἱκνοῦμαι, σὲ δὲ φιλής
παρηδοὺς (i.e. several members of the chorus); IT’ 1079 οὖν ἔρσων ἦδη καὶ σὸν
ἐξαίτειν δόμους (ditto); Ph. 568 σοὶ μὲν (i.e. Eteocles) τὰδ’ αὐδῶ’ σοὶ δὲ,
Πολύνεικες, λέγω.

With regard to οὖνεκ’ ἀγγέλου λόγων, Pearson claimed that the paradoxis
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

ἀρά ποτ’ αὖθις ἀ παλαιὰ Τροία
τοὺς προπότας παναμερεύ-
-σει θάσους ἐρωτών
ψαλμοῖς καὶ κυλίκων οἰνοπλανήτοις
ἐπιδεξίοις ἀμιλλαις ... ;
363 ψαλμοῖς Canter: ψάλμασι Ω 364 ἐπιδεξίοις L. Dindorf (-ας ιαm
Musgrave): ύποδεξίοις Ο, -ας VLQ et Σ

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: oι > α) restores responsion with 373. Pace\textsuperscript{100}, endorsed by Delle Donne,\textsuperscript{101} keeps the tradition, assuming ‘free responsion’ between a choriamb (ψάλμασι καὶ) and an iamb (χιστάν παρ’ άντ-); but the parallels she adduces are all easily emendable\textsuperscript{102}; on the dubiety of the \textit{Responsionsfreiheit} device see item 7 above.

With regard to ἐπιδεξίοις, L. Dindorf’s\textsuperscript{103} emendation seems unassailable, even though ἐπιδεξίος is unattested in tragedy\textsuperscript{104}. For the sympotic custom indicated by ἐπιδεξίος cf. Crit. fr. 6.6 West προσώπεις ὑγέιεν ἐπιδεξία; Eup. fr. 354 Kassel–Austin ὅταν ... πίνωσι τὴν ἐπιδεξία; \textit{idem} fr. 395.1 Kassel–Austin δεξιμενος δὲ Σωκράτις τὴν ἐπιδεξία with K–A in app. crit. \textit{ad l.} Dindorf’s emendation has been contested by Pace\textsuperscript{105}, who reverts to the \textit{lectio tradita} ὑποδεξίοις (\textit{VLQ} and \textit{Σv ad 364}) or -ξίοις (O), for which she posits an otherwise unattested meaning ‘welcoming, hospitable’ (‘che riceve, che accoglie, che ospita’).

27. \textit{Rh.} 370-4

\begin{verbatim}
ἐλθὲ φάνηθι, τὰν ζάχρυσον προβάλον
Πηλεῖδα κατ’ ὁμμα πέλ-
ταν δοχυίον πεδαίρων
χιστάν παρ’ ἄντυγα, πώλους ἐρεθίζων
δίβολόν τ’ ἀκοντα πάλλων.
\end{verbatim}

‘Come, appear, hold before you your solid-gold \textit{pellē} 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 χιστάν

\textsuperscript{100} Reso (\textit{supra}, n. 36) 39–40.

\textsuperscript{101} “In margine” (\textit{supra}, n. 39) 199.

\textsuperscript{102} A. Sept. 736 γάτα Dindorf alii alia (χιστονία mss.); S. Phil. 1100 λωίνον Bothe alii alia (τοῦ λώνον mss.); 1138 mss. ἀνατέλ- (λωίνθ') could be emended into ἐπανατέλ-; in E. \textit{Held.} 915 read ἐκαστὸν Par. gr. 287, Ald. (ἔκαστὸν L), in 924 ἔσχεν δ’ ὕβριν (Heath: ἔσχε δ’ ὕβρεις mss.); in Hel. 1340 read ἐνέπει (Heath: ἐνν- L).

\textsuperscript{103} In \textit{Thesaurus Graecae Linguae} vol. 3 s.v. ἐπιδεξίος, col. 1568.

\textsuperscript{104} Cf. J. C. Rolfe, “The Tragedy Rhesus”, \textit{HSCP}h 4, 1893, 61-97, here 74.

\textsuperscript{105} “Note” (\textit{supra}, n. 22) 455-8.
... ἐρεθίζων to mean 'goading 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 LSJ s.v., C.III.1; cf. especially Ar. Av. 390-1 παρ’ αὐτήν τὴν χύτραν ἅκραν ὀρῶντας, with Dunbar ad l.

28. Rh. 385-7

θεός, ὁ Τροία, θεός, αὐτὸς Ἄρης
ὁ Στρυμόνιος πῶλος ἁοὶδοῦ
Μούσης ἥκων καταπνεῖ se.

'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 καταπνεῖo denotes that which comes out with one's breath, not which is breathed upon or over (except in late Greek, e.g. Heliod. 3.2.1 τὸν τόπων εὐώδια κατέπνεον); in E. Med. 838-40 one now generally reads τὰν Κύπριν κλῆσαι ... χώρας (Reiske : χώραν mss.) καταπνεύσαι ... ἀνέμων ... αὐρᾶς. It follows that καταπνεῖ se 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. above, and Ar. Lys. 552 ὕμερον ἡμῶν κατά τῶν κόλπων ... καταπνεύση, unless ἡμῶν is possessive genitive) or in the dative, as in Pl. Com. fr. 189.15 Kassel-Austin μὴ σοι νέμεσις θεόθεν καταπνεύσῃ, or in the closely parallel Archestr. SH 146.3-4 = fr. 16.3-4 Olson / Sens μὴ σοι νέμεσις καταπνεύσῃ | ... ἀπ' ἀθανάτων with Olson / Sens ad l. As the genitive seems to be used only in conjunction with an accusative object (καταπνεύν τι τινος), we should probably change se into σοι here; so also Feickert, Rhesus (supra, n. 92) ad 387.

29. Rh. 388-9

χαῖρ', ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλοῦ παῖ, τύραννε τῆδε γῆς,
'Εκτορ; παλαιὰ σ’ ἡμέρα προσεννέτω
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 right\textsuperscript{106}, although the vocative παί coupled with the nominative ἐσθλός (which is not attested in the vocative, at least in tragedy\textsuperscript{107}) makes for a lectio difficilior\textsuperscript{108}. Addresses extending over more than one line often come under suspicion (see Willink \textit{ad E. Or. 71-2}), and Diggle (\textit{app. crit. ad l.}) was tempted to delete line 388. But the addresses cited by Willink \textit{l.c.} as probably interpolated follow a set pattern, namely ὦ + vocative; Rh. 388 deviates from it in having χαῖρε open the line, and in lacking ὦ. 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. \textit{Rh.} 422-3

\[ \text{τοιοῦτος εἴμι καύτος, εὐθείαν λόγον} \]
\[ \text{τέμνων κέλευθον, κοῦ διπλοῦς πέρυκ' ἄνὴρ,} \]
\[ 423 \text{τέμνω (uei τέμνειν) Nauck, cl. Cycl. 524, Or. 895, fr. 196} \]

'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 (τέμνονω) does not seem to be a common tragic usage. The closest parallel I was able to find is A. \textit{Ag.} 312-13 τοιοίδε τοι μοι λαμπαδηφόρον νόμοι, | ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληροῦμενοι. As Fraenkel \textit{ad l.} explains, 'The binding arrangements (νόμοι) which Clytemnestra has made for the torch-racers consist in their being ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληροῦμενοι.'\textsuperscript{109}

Thus, there seem to be some grounds for turning to Nauck's\textsuperscript{110} 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 \textit{E. Cyc.} 524 τοιοῦδ' ὁ δαίμων οὐδένα βλάπτει βροτῶν, \textit{Or.} 895 τὸ γὰρ γένος τοιοῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχὴ | πηδῶσ’ ἀεὶ κήρυκες (Dindorf's deletion of the passage is immaterial), and fr. 196-3 Kannicht. But one should also take into account \textit{E. Andr.} 173ff., \textit{Su.} 881ff.,

\textsuperscript{106} Diggle, \textit{Euripidea (supra, n. 4)} 324 n. 10.
\textsuperscript{107} Cf. Diggle, \textit{l.c. (supra, n. 106)}.\n\textsuperscript{108} The coupling of vocative and nominative in addresses is ancient and well attested; e.g. Hom. \textit{Il.} 4.189 φιλος ὁ Ἐνέδρα; \textit{E. Andr.} 348 ὁ τλήμων δὲν (ἀνήρ Dindorf); \textit{S. Aj.} 923 ὁ δύσμοι Ἀτας (Ἀταν Suda); see further Kühner–Gerth \textit{(supra, n. 22)} 1, 48; \textit{West ad Hes. Theog.} 964; Wackernagel, \textit{Vorlesungen (supra, n. 30)} 7, 306-7 = \textit{Lectures} 14, 385; Diggle, \textit{Euripidea (supra, n. 4)} 324 n. 10.
\textsuperscript{109} Less close is A. \textit{Pers.} 236 καὶ στρατός 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.), \textit{Aeschylus: Persae}, Oxford 2009, \textit{ad} 235-6.
\textsuperscript{110} "Studien" \textit{(supra, n. 20)} 173-4.
fr. 322.1-3 Kannicht and, for the infinitive after τοιόδε, *IA* 502-3 ἀνδρός οὐ κακοῦ τρόποι | τοιόδε, χρῆσθαι τοίς 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 ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας οὐδ’ ἐν ζαχρύσοις δόμασιν κοιμώμενος, ἀλλ’ οἷα πόντον θρῄκιον φυσήματα κρυσταλλόσπηκτα Παίονάς τ’ ἐπεξάρει ξῦν τοίοδ’ ἀμύστα νοῦσα τλάς πορτάμασιν.

‘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, ὡς 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 φανερῶς μὲν οὐ πρεσβευόμενοι … κρύφα δὲ … ἐνῆγον (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* (φῄς 686), the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (ἀμύστιδας) is much more regular than the simple *accusativus objecti* (ἀμύστιδας) here (see further Jebb on S. *Tr.* 1238f.). Matthiae, followed by Klyve[112], assumes a *zeugma*: οὐδ’ (sic), ὡς 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


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 suggests\textsuperscript{115}, a lacuna after 438: as a \textit{quasi}-quotation of Hector's sarcastic reference in 419, \textit{tὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας} must be governed by \textit{κομπεῖς}. Herwerden's rewriting of 438, \textit{οὐχ ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς <σπῶν πυκνῶς> ἀμύστιδας}\textsuperscript{114}, would remove the anacoluthon but is too far removed from the paradosis\textsuperscript{116}. The anacoluthon, it seems, is authorial.

32. \textit{Rh. 443}

\[\text{άλλ' ύστερος μὲν ἥλθον, ἐν καιρῷ δ' ὅμως ύστερος} \text{Cobet: -ον} \Omega g \text{V 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, \textit{ἐς καιρόν} is probably to be read here (cf. \textit{εἰς καιρόν} Chr. Pat. 1728 : ἐν καιρῷ mss.). Tragic idiom seems to prefer \textit{ἐς καιρόν} after verbs of motion\textsuperscript{116}, although this of course can be no hard-and-fast rule\textsuperscript{117}. Cf. also the instances of \textit{εἰς καλόν} / ἐν καλῷ cited by P. T. Stevens, \textit{Colloquial expressions in Euripides}, Wiesbaden 1976, 28 and by Dawe \textit{ad S. OT} 78.

33. \textit{Rh. 451-3}

\[\text{ὑμῶν δὲ μὴ τις ἀσπίδ' ἄρηται χερί· ἐγὼ γὰρ †ἕξω† τοὺς μέγ' αὐχοῦντας δορὶ πέρσας Ἀχαιούς, καίπερ ὕστερος μολὼν.} \text{451 ἄρηται l. dindorf: αἴρηται} \text{V: αἱρεῖται} \text{O: αἱρέτω} \text{Q, αἱ-} \text{L 452 ἔγωγ'} \text{Kirchhoff} \text{452-3 ἀρήξω} \text{Nauck, ἀρκῶ} \text{(Holzner) ... πορθεῖν uel ἐξαρκέσω γὰρ ... πέρσας Diggle hos uu. del. Herwerden}

\textsuperscript{113} Vater, \textit{Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 425.}
\textsuperscript{114} H. van Herwerden, “Novae commentationes Euripideae”, \textit{RPh} 18, 1894, 60-98, here 84.
\textsuperscript{117} Cf. E. fr. 727c.39 Kn. ἐν δέοντι δ' ἤλθες, \textit{Alc.} 817, \textit{Or.} 212, as against ἐς δέον in \textit{E. Alc.} 1101, \textit{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, ἀρηται is a suggestion by L. Dindorf. Of the variants mentioned in Diggle’s app. crit., 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 all.

Far greater difficulties are presented by ἐγὼ γὰρ †ἕξω†. The problem with ἐξεω 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, ἐχω and κατέχω are elsewhere used by Hector with regard to his vanquishing of the Greeks, cf. Rh. 60 οὐταν ἔσων … δόρυν. Kirchhoff’s ἔγωγ’ ἀρητα, ‘I shall aid σεω’, i.e. by vanquishing the boastful Greeks in battle, is neat and paleographically plausible. However, in tragedy the object of ἀρητα does not seem ever to be omitted, except in exhortations. Moreover, as Nauck intimates, ‘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 ἥκω … πέρσας (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 ἐξεω ... 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 Kovacs, namely ἐγὼ γὰρ ἥξω 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 ἀρητα Elmsley: ἀρεῖτα L, αι–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 (ἀρητα) see Barrett ad E. Hipp. 289-92 and Diggle, Euripidea (supra, n. 4) 356.
123 In A. Eu. 232 the object is τὸν ἵκετα, to be taken also with ῥύσομαι; in A. fr. 168.26 Radt, σύμεναι μ[ὲν ἀρητα] 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 ἀρητα 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 ἥξω + 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 κτανὼν ἢ ἥξεις ἢ θανὼν αὐτοῦ μενεῖς; Hec. 930-2 παιδες ἕξαι Ἑλλάνων, πότε δὴ πότε τὰν | Ἦλιον ἄκοψαι | πέρσαντες ἥξετ’ οὐκουσι; Tro. 460-1 ἥξω δ’ ἐς νεκροὺς νικηφόρος | καὶ δόμους πέρσας’ Ἀτρείδων; Rh. 156-7 καὶ πάντ’ Ἀχαιῶν ἐκμαθὼν βουλεύματα | ἥξω. However, in all these instances the idea of returning or of arriving is crucial to the passage’s point: in Hec. ἥξετ’ describes a goal of primary importance; 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. ἥξεις is contrasted to μενεῖς, 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 + ἥκω (vel sim.) to emphasize primarily the act denoted by the participle rather than by ἥκω; 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 ἐξαρκέω 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 to hand, unless one wants to consider a solution of despair: ἥξω could be after all what the author wrote, presumably under the mistaken impression that ἥξω 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

τιν’ οὔτε νῦν Nauck: οὔτε νῦν τιν’ Ω

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 remarked\textsuperscript{127}, Nauck’s easy transposition ‘postulates only that τίν was skipped after πρῶν and later restored in the wrong place.’ More complicated is Ritchie’s\textsuperscript{128} οὔτε πρίν <ποτ’> οὔτε νῦν τίν’, since it requires ἔβριξα | μά in the antistrophe (825-6, with initial anceps in the enoplian at 826). Pace\textsuperscript{129} keeps the ms. reading, divides after τίν άνδρῶν, and scans the result as choriamb + penthemimer (i.e. the colarion x —∪— x)\textsuperscript{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 place\textsuperscript{131}. Secondly, Pace’s colometry leaves us with the ensuing colon ∪∪—∪∪— (ἐπόρευσε σέθεν κρείσσω), which is hard to make sense of\textsuperscript{132}.

35. Rh. 467-8

τοιαῦτα μέν σοι τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας
πράξαι 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 447-53\textsuperscript{133}. Kovacs\textsuperscript{134} 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. <ὥ δυσχεραίνεις, ἄξι’ ὤφελήματα>, 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

\textsuperscript{127} Willink, “Cantica” (supra, n. 9) 37 = Collected Papers 576.

\textsuperscript{128} Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 311.

\textsuperscript{129} Reso (supra, n. 36) 41-2.

\textsuperscript{130} See M. L. West, Greek Metre, Oxford 1982, 30, 198.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 ∪∪—∪∪—∪∪— (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 ∪∪ in tragedy (Dale, Lyric Metres [supra, n. 38] 133–4; West, Greek Metre [supra, n. 130] 30).

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

\textsuperscript{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 μὲν (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 πρᾶξιν ‘exact’ (as tribute or fine) — ‘an unusual but understandable syntax’\textsuperscript{135}. One may compare Rh. 192 δῶρον τῆς ἐμῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας; E. Med. 534-5 (adduced by Paley\textsuperscript{136}) μείζω γε μέντοι τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας | εἰλήφας ἢ δέδωκας; S. Tr. 287-8\textsuperscript{137} εὔτ’ ἀν ἄγνα θύματα | ῥέξῃ πατρῷ | Ζηνὶ τῆς ἁλώσεως.

When all is said and done, there may well be some textual corruption lurking in πρᾶξιν 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 παρέξω\textsuperscript{138}, ‘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 τῶς φυγούσας μελαθρά | ... | πρᾶξιν Ἑλλὰς ὡς λάβοι (πρᾶξις = ‘requital’); Hom. II. 24.524 οὖ γάρ τις πρῆξις πέλεται ... γάρ, ‘no good comes from weeping’. But τοιαῦτα ... πρᾶξιν seems odd; Musgrave’s emendation might be improved by reading τοιάνδε... πρᾶξιν.

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

\textsuperscript{136} F. A. Paley (ed.), Euripides, London 1872\textsuperscript{2}, vol. 1, on Rh. 467.

\textsuperscript{137} Adduced by Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 249.

\textsuperscript{138} S. Musgrave, Exercitationum in Euripidem libri duo, Leiden 1762, 94; so also Kirchhoff, Euripidis tragoediae (supra, n. 121) 556 ad 457.
36. *Rh. 481*

οὐκοῦν κτανόντες τούσδε πάντες εἰργάσμεθα; ἡνίκα πάντες εἰργάσμεθα Ψ: τούσδε πάντες εἰργάσμεθα ἄν L: cf. Σ' 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 reading\(^{139}\), 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 πέριξ ὑμᾶς | ζυγοίντες (πᾶν corrupted into πάντα in some mss!): *IA* 1540 πᾶν πεύκη σαφῶς; fr. 800.2 Kannicht πᾶν τελοῦσα (Nauck : πάντα εἰργασμέθα); fr. 918.2 Kn. πᾶν έπε’ ἐμοὶ τεκτανέσθω (πᾶν Ar. *Ach.* 660, *Suda* π 40 Adler : πάντες Cic. *Att.* 8.8.2). Perhaps πάντες is slightly preferable in view of the following (482) neuter plurals τὰ πόρσω, τάγγυθεν\(^{140}\). But the question is a hard one to settle.

37. *Rh. 496*

τίς δή μετ’ αὐτὸν ἄλλος εὐδοξεῖ στρατοῦ; τίς δή 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 τί<ζ> δαί. Despite its colloquial tone\(^{141}\), 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 point\(^{142}\); cf. *Cyc.* 450, *Med.* 1012 (v. l.: δή, δ’ αὖ are also transmitted), *Hel.* 1246, *IA* 1443 (δαί Triclinius : δή Gaisford), 1447 (δέ Gaisford, prob. Diggle), *El.* 244 (δ’ αὖ Seidler, prob. Diggle), 1116 (δ’ αὖ Nauck, prob. Diggle), *Ion* 275 (δή Elmsley, δ’ αὖ Porson). For δαί in questions in tragedy cf. also A. *Cho.* 900 ποῦ δαί τὰ


\(^{140}\) Cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* (supra, n. 4) 324 n. 11.


\(^{142}\) Denniston, *Particles* (supra, n. 54) 263; cf. also Page ad *E. Med.* 339.
λοιπὰ Λοξίου μαντεύματα ... 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 ἡ φυλακά; τίς ἀμείβει τὰν ἐμάν; πρῶτα δύεται σημεία καὶ ἑπτάποροι Πλειάδες αἰθέριαι

‘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 πρώτας, sc. φυλακάς, 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. φυλακάς] σημεία) 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 φυλακήν146.

39. Rh. 546-50

Σιμόεντος ἡμένα κοίτας φοινίας ύμνει πολυχορδοτάτα
γῆριν παιδολέτωρ
μελωποίον ἀπόνις μέριμναν.

548 φοινίας ὁ: φον-VLQ θρηνεῖ ᾿ΙΣV -χορδοτάταν Θ? (~Θ) 550 μελωποίον ... μέριμνα Dindorf (μέριμνα iam Reiske): -δς ... μέριμνα fere Ω (μελο- ... μερίμνος Q)

143 See Garvie ad l., who opts in the end for Auratus’ δή.
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 ύμνεῖ. However, the scholia ad l\textsuperscript{47}, give θρηνεῖ as a (very tempting) γρ- variant. The dilemma is a difficult one, and more complicated than the universal acceptance of ύμνεῖ by modern editors may suggest. Both ύμνεῖ and θρηνεῖ can govern μελοποιὸν μέριμναν; for θρηνῶ with internal accusative cf. A. fr. 291 Radt θηρνεῖ δὲ γόον τὸν (τιν’?) ἀηδόνιον. The nightingale’s plaintive song can be thought of both as ύμνος and as θρῆνος, cf. Ar. \textit{Av} 210-11 οὐκὸν, | οὖς ... θρηνεῖς; for ύμνεῖν θρῆνος cf. \textit{Rh} 976. Moreover, ύμνεῖ with an object meaning ‘song’ is straightforward, θρηνεῖ less so, and thus the former might in principle be a banalization. On balance, however, ύμνεῖ 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 \textit{l}. (ὣς ἐπὶ τοῦ Σιμόεντος ἑζομένη θρηνεῖ τὰς φοινίας κοίτας)\textsuperscript{48}, and \textit{Vater} (\textit{lueget cruentas nuptias luscinia})\textsuperscript{49}.

As for μελοποιὸν ... μέριμναν, Dindorf’s emendation of the mss. μελοποίου ... μέριμνα or μερίμνα \textsuperscript{50} (μέριμνα had already been proposed by Reiske\textsuperscript{51}) is virtually unassailable. With μέριμνα one would have to take ἀηδονίς as an adjective\textsuperscript{52}, an unparalleled usage. The slip from accusative to nominative would have been an easy one after the three nominatives ἡμένα, παιδολέτωρ, ἀηδονίς\textsuperscript{53}.

40. \textit{Rh}. 552-3

υνκτιθρόμοι
σύριγγος ἰὰν κατακόω.

υνκτιθρόμοι \textit{Pierson}: υνκτιθρόμοι \textit{OV}: νυκτὶ δρ- \textit{LQ}

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

Defending the \textit{lectio tradita} as against Pierson’s commonly accepted emendation, Pace\textsuperscript{54} argues that υνκτιθρόμου σύριγγος ἰὰν, supposedly an


\textsuperscript{48} See Schwartz, \textit{Scholia} (supra, n. 147) 341.22.

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Vater}, \textit{Rhesus} (supra, n. 45) \textit{ad} 532.

\textsuperscript{50} Dindorf, \textit{Euripidis tragoediae} (supra, n. 15) \textit{ad} 550.

\textsuperscript{51} Reiske, \textit{Animadversiones} (supra, n. 32) 89. For earlier attempts to emend see \textit{Wecklein, SBAWMünchen} (supra, n. 72) 495-6.

\textsuperscript{52} Cf. Hermann, \textit{Opuscula} (supra, n. 60) 306.

\textsuperscript{53} Thus \textit{Porter}, \textit{Rhesus} (supra, n. 111) \textit{ad} l.

\textsuperscript{54} “Note” (supra, n. 22) 458-9.
enallage for νυκτιδρόμον s. i., can mean ‘the flute’s sound that runs (=spreads) through the night.’ However, in Greek sound can ‘travel’ (ἰέναι)\(^{155}\) 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

— ὀλλ’ ἡ κρυπτὸν λόχον ἐσπαίασας
διόλωλε; τάχ’ ἂν εἰήν ἰφοβερὸν μοι.
560 εἰσπαίασας 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 (ἀπεστιν ἐμπεσῶν), where the uncalled-for ἐμπεσῶν (from an original ἐπεσῶν?) apparently intruded from the interlinear space below. While ἐσπαίασας is doubtless correct, it is ironically less accurate than εἰσπεσῶν: εἰσπαίειν 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 εἰσπαίειν (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’ ἂν φοβερ’ εἴη\(^{157}\), Hermann’s τάχ’ ἂν δ’ εἰή φανερόν {μοι}\(^{158}\), and Herwerden’s (διόλωλε) τάλας; φοβερόν μοι\(^{159}\). Taking his cue from Hermann, Diggle proposed a neat rewriting:

τάχ’ ἂν δ’ εἰή καὶ μὴν τόδε γ’ ἦν φοβερόν μοι.

<Choreut A> ‘it should soon become apparent’ (viz., whether Dolon has met with foul play).

<Choreut B> ‘Well, this is exactly\(^{160}\) 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 "φανερόν ... ἦν" would be due to an error ex homoeoteleuto (φανερόν—φοβερόν). However, the sole parallel for the change of speaker at the beginning of a paroemiac seems to be S. Tr. 977. More radical, though pleasantly concise, is Headlam’s τάχ’ ἂν {εἴη φοβερόν μου}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’ ἂν in replies Feickert ad 561 compares Pl. Soph. 255c, Resp. 369a. True, there seem to be no tragic examples of elliptic τάχ’ ἂν used in responses. Still, S. OC 964-5 θεοὶ γὰρ ἦν οὕτω φίλον, τάχ’ ἂν τι μηνίουσιν εἰς γένος πόλει shows that τάχ’ ἂν 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, ἄλλα δεσμὰ πωλικῶν ἢν ἀντύγυρον
κλάζει σιδηρὸν
568 ιδηρὸν Bothe (denou Paley): ιδηρον 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 ιδηρον as a brachylogy for κλαγγην ιδηρον, ‘they emit an iron sound’ (with ιδηρον as genitive of quality); but I can find no satisfactory parallel for such a brachylogy;

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

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

161 See Ritchie, Authenticity (supra n. 8) 292.
163 Rhesus (supra, n. 92) ad 561.
165 Cf. Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 551; P. Albert, De Rheso tragœdia, diss., Halle 1876, 37, Dindorf, Euripidis tragœdiae (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

οὔκουν ἐπ’ Αἰνέαν ἢ τὸν ἔχθιστον Φρυγῶν
Πάριν μολόντε χρῆ καρατομεῖν ξίφει;
586 χρῆ OvA : 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 χρῆ or χρῆν in 586? A difficult choice. The imperfect of χρῆ is used to express the idea that something ought to be the case but is not. Thus, χρῆν 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, χρῆ 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 χερὸς,
ἔσται OLQ : ἥκει Va : ἥξει Va₁

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

Va’s ἥξει (in a supralinear note by the codex’s first scribe) deserves greater attention. For death ‘coming’ to humans cf. e.g. E. Alc. 671 ἢν δ’ ἐχθὴς ἔλθῃ θάνατος; Hipp. 1373 καὶ μοι θάνατος … ἔλθοι; Troad. 1167 θάνατος ἦλθε. Admittedly, however, I cannot find any instances in which ἥκω (rather than ἔρχομαι) is used of the coming of death.

45. Rh. 613-15

ὁδ’ ἐχθής ἢσται κοῦ συνήθροισται στρατῷ,
ἄλλ’ ἐκτὸς αὐτὸν τάξεων κατηύνασεν
’Εκτωρ, ἔως ἂν νύκτ’ ἀμείψηται φάος.
615 νύκτ’ Lenting : νυξ 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 φῶς in the accusative) the sense would be exactly the opposite: ‘until daylight is succeeded by night.’ Paley’s (Euripides, supra, n. 136) idea that νυξ ἀμείψηται φῶς 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 λύσους φρένας | τῶν νῦν παρουσῶν τῶνδ’ ἀμείψασθαι ποθεν.

46. Rh. 635

τοῦτον δὲ πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς οὐ θέμις θανεῖν.

χειρὸς οὐ θέμις fere O (θέμις post θανεῖνO): οὐ θ- χειρὸς LQ θανεῖν O et aut L1m aut Trm: κτανεῖνVLQ

‘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 χειρὸς? 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 ἡδη μ’ ὑπὸ χερός θεοὶ δαμόωσιν Ἀχαιῶν; S. El. 1033 μητρὶ ταῦτα πάντ’ ἔξειπε σῇ; Kühner–Gerth (supra, n. 22) 2, 600.

47. Rh. 636-7

ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἤκεισ μορσίμους φέρων σφαγάς
tάγυν;

636 ὥσπερ 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 Seidlter: θανεῖν L et Stob. 3.8.6.
While the majority reading ὥσπερ ἥκεις obviously makes little sense, ὥσπερ ἥκ- is not entirely accurate: the man whom Diomedes has ‘come’ (ἡκεις) to kill is not Rhesus, but Hector (575–6 ἐπ’ ὥσπερ). Adding to the confusion, the place to which Diomedes ‘has come’ (ἡκεις), 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 ἥξεις168 (‘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’, ἥξεις169. Moreover, as Mastronarde has pointed out170, ὥσπερ here is supported by the antithesis with τοῦτον in the previous line (‘not Alexander but Rhesus’).

I suggest: ἀλλ’ ὥ 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
οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδ’ ἤκουσεν ὡν λόγον.

‘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 (ἡκεις) 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 ἥκο + 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 Mastronarde, in Electronic Antiquity (supra, n. 135) 21–2.

171 The corruption from ὀπροσ- to ὥσπερ may have been facilitated by the similarity between the minuscule abbreviations for προς and for ἑπ.
Schmidt’s ταῦτα σοὶ 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 σοὶ μὲν εἶπον Schmidt compares E. El. 1276 σοὶ μὲν τάδ’ εἶπον (‘you’ contrasted to the ensuing ‘the citizens’), Supp. 1213 σοὶ μὲν τάδ’ εἶπον (as opposed to ταῖοι δ’ Αρχείων λέγω), Hel. 1662 σοὶ μὲν τάδ’ αὐδῶ (followed by συγγόνοι δ’ ἐμῆ λέγω), Ph. 568 (an address to Eteocles concluded by σοὶ μὲν τάδ’ αὐδῶ and followed by an address to Polynices, σοὶ δέ, Πολύνεικες, λέγω)173.

It is true that in all of Schmidt’s examples σοὶ is placed at the beginning of the sentence, in emphatic position. This, however, is no argument against his emendation. Initial σοὶ in the passages invoked by Schmidt brings into focus the antithesis between the preceding portion of the speaker’s utterance, which was addressed to σοὶ, 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 (σοὶ 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

(Xo.) ἦ σὺ δὴ Ψῆσον κατέκτας; (Οδ. <μὴ> ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα σὲ (ante ἦ) nullam notam O: ἡμῖν. VLQ (ante ἀλλὰ) Ὀδ. O: om. VLQ <μὴ> 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

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 fact. 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). 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 Ὀ), 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 emendations: Ὀδ. ἦ σὺ δὴ Ρῆσον κατέκτας; Χο. ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα σὲ 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 σὲ 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. Wilamowitz suggested recombining 680 and 685 into a trochaic verse (Χο. δεῦρο δεῦρο πᾶς ἴτω [ἴστω 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 deleted, and at any rate they are too

---

175 This was already seen by S. Petit, Miscellaneorum libri novem, Paris 1630, 3, 196; cf. also L. C. Valckenaer, Diatribe 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 unbekannten Dichters, Berlin 1966, 17.


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. Grégoire, emended 686 into (Ὅδ.) μη σὺ δείρῃς ὃν κατέκτας, ἀλλὰ τὸν κτενοῦντα 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 scholars, Ritchie advanced a preposterous hypothesis: (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 παιε 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’ imposture. 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 σῳζόμενα: 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 ingenique censura, Hamburg 1843, 1, 32 n.**; C. B. Sneller, De Rheso tragedia, 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 ipsis, qui paullo ante Rhesum ipsum praesentem oculos suis intuivi erant.’
50. Rh. 687

(‘Ὀδ.) ἰδίχε πᾶς τις. Χο. οὖ μὲν οὖν. Ὀδ. ἀδίκοιον ἄνδρα μὴ θένησ. μὲν οὖν Reiske: μενοῦ O\textsuperscript{184}: 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, l.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)\textsuperscript{185}. However, aside from the impossible hiatus thus created\textsuperscript{186}, 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 ἀποριάν γὰρ οὐ μενῶ)\textsuperscript{187}.

51. Rh. 703

ποῖον ἔπευχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεῶν;
ἔπευχεται Hermann: εὔχ- Ω: δ’ εὔχ- Porson, Bothe

‘Which of the gods does he proclaim to be supreme?’

For ἔπευχεται see Hermann, Opuscula (supra, n. 60) 307. ποῖον δ’ εὐχεταί was simultaneously hit upon by Porson and Bothe\textsuperscript{188}. Sticking to the lectio tradita, Pace\textsuperscript{189} takes ποῖον εὔχεται as hypodochmiac (—∪—∪—) in Responsionsfreiheit with πρὶν ἐπὶ γὰν Φρυγῶι in 721 (∪∪∪∪—∪—). 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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{185} See Pace, “Note” (supra, n. 22) 460.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{187} On the semantic inappropriateness of μενῶ here see also Battezzato, “Parola” (n. 174) 287.

\textsuperscript{188} Bothe, Euripides’ Werke (supra, n. 164) 297. I was unable to trace Porson’s conjecture.

\textsuperscript{189} Pace, Reso (supra, n. 36) 53.
52. Rh. 708

—τίν’ ἀλκὴν τίν’ αἶνεῖς; —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’ αἶνεῖς; ‘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 στολά
πυκασθείς, ξιφήρης
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 responson with 696. Pace’s defence of mss.
kρυφαῖος192 rests on the doubtful assumption193 that τίνὶ 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.

191 Morstadt, Beiträg (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.
... oúd' èferou reitó stratós
φυλακαίσι νυκτέροισιν oúd' én táxeisn
έκειτο τεύχη πλήκτρα τ' oúk épi ξυγοΐς
ιππων καθήμοσθ',...

'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'.

οúd' én táxeisn | ékeito teúχη 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 Ii. 10.471-3 εὐδον ... ἐντεά δέ φιν | καλὰ παρ' αὐτοῖσι χθονὶ κέκλιτο εὗ καθὰ κόσμον | τρίστοιχεi; 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: οúd' én τεύχεσιν | ἐκεῖνοτο τάξες, '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 ὀπλαῖς.

κάδω μελούση καρδίας λήξας ύπνου
πώλοισι χόρτον, προσδοκῶν ἑωθινήν
ζεύξειν ἐς ἀλκην, ἀφθόνοις μετρῶ χερί.
ἐς ἀλκην V : πρὸς ἀλκην 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 ἀλκην and πρὸς ἀλκην seem to be used interchangeably in E. Su. 678-9 ἔστρεφον | πώλους ἐς ἀλκην and Andr. 1148-9 στρατόν | στρέφας πρὸς ἀλκην. For what it is worth, εἰς ἀ- is a much commoner tragic idiom.195

195 Cf. also E. fr. 298.3, 754b.6 Kn., Med. 264, Hel. 42, 980, 1379, Ph. 421, 1363.
than πρὸς ἀναχαιτίζων. Besides, the LQ reading may be the result of interference from προσδοκῶν in the previous line.

56. Rh. 785-6

... αἱ δ’ ἔρρεγκον ἐξ ἀρτηρίων θυμὸν πνέουσαι κἀνεχαίτιζον 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 φόβην 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 αὐχένων 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 81.8; Hsch. α4677, 4683 Latte. Moreover, horses rear up when afraid, and so φόβῳ is apposite.

57. Rh. 787-8

ἐγὼ δ’ ἀμύνων θῆρας ἐξεγείρομαι πώλοισιν· 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. Platnauer pointed out that ἐξορμάω, when transitive, is always followed by an accusative, and went on to emend into ἐνν- δέ μ’ ἐξώρμα φ-, with δέ = γάρ. Although it is true that active ἐξορμάω is always followed by an accusativus 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.
199 Eranos 62, 1964, 73.
200 Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 169-70.
58. Rh. 790-1

\[ \text{θερμός δὲ κρουνός δεσπότου παρὰ σφαγής} \]
\[ \text{βάλλει με δυσθνῄσκοντος αἵματος νέου.} \]

σφαγής Musgrave: -αῖς Ω et ΣV, quo seruato πάρα Hermann (παρὰ LQ, παρὰ- V et ΣV), 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 σφαγής see Musgrave, Euripidis (n. 181) 411. Hermann\(^{201}\) read δεσπότου πάρα σφαγαῖς, presumably taking σφαγαῖς (locative dative) with αἵματος in 791, as in A. Ag. 1389 αἵματος σφαγήν, 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 Page\(^{203}\) invoke, after Headlam, Rh. 790-1 as ‘an exact parallel’ but they can offer only a very clumsy rendering of it\(^{204}\), 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 iambics: see Denniston on E. El. 574.

Musgrave’s emendation (with σφαγής having its usual meaning of ‘wound’) simply and neatly indicates the source of the gushing blood. True, παρὰ with genitus personae is much more common than it is with genitus 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 scholia\(^{205}\) and later editors (e.g. Paley) read δεσπότου 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 κρουνός 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’ ἐξιόντας στρατόπεδ’ ἐξαπώσατε
οὔτ’ ἐξιόντας;
811 ἐξαπώσατε Naber

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

ἐξαπώσατε is a *hapax* 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 ἐξαπεώσατε); 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 ἐπαυσε (for Eustathius’ ἀπώσε) is now generally accepted there. It would be unadvisable 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 (νοῶς ἐπεσον 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. οὔτ’ ἐξιόντας <εἵλετε> / <ἐζωγρήσατε>; 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 ἢ πνοαῖσιν ἢ βαθυσκαφεὶ κόνει | κρύψον νυν, where one is to understand παράδος or the like with πνοαῖσιν (see Jebb *ad l.*213).

207 Ritchie, *Authenticity* (*supra* n. 8) 154, 178.
208 E. *Andr.* 1130 καφυλάσσετ’; *Ion* 1205 σιάξωνοι ἐθάμβησεν; *Alc.* 839 ἐγείνατ’ Ἡλεκτρώνος; *S. Ph.* 371 κυρεῖ; *OC* 1506 τήρο ἐθήκε.
209 Thus Paley, *Euripides* (*supra*, n. 136); but see Broadhead’s supplementary notes on 311-13 and Garvie *ad l.*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 ἐξοπώπατε, 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
tót ἀρ ἐμολον ὧτε σοι†
άγγελος ἦλθον ἄμφι ναὸς 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’ ὤν | ἀνάκτωρ πόλεως. At least the epanadiplosis μέγας … μέγας seems guaranteed by the correspondence with φίλα … φίλος at 455. Nauck’s μέγα σὺ 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 σὺ μοι into accordance with the following μέγας, thereby giving rise to the transmitted μέγας ἐμοὶ. 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 Athens; but despite Pace this is no argument against Vater’s correction. A more difficult problem is presented by 822, which albeit metrical (a ‘hexasyllable’) 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.
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 ἔμοι is likely to be interpreted as first person singular in view of the following ἦλθον220; moreover, as Willink points out221, ἀρα ‘does not mean “surely”’.

An emendation worth considering is that proposed by Willink222: μέγα σέ μοι | μέγα σε πολίοχον | κράτος τότ’ ἀρ’ ἐμολον 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 ἐπεί: 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’ ἀρα μέλον ἔτ’ ἐμοι | οὐδὲν ἀρ’ ἐμοὶ μέλον 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 ἐγέλων ... θεόμενοι, | οὐδέν ἄρ’ ἐμοὶ μέλον223). 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 ἐπεί-sentence at 824ff. further elaborates on that thought: ‘my guard duty was always on my mind; for (ἐπεί) i didn’t get a wink of sleep this night’. For ἀρα ‘expressing a lively feeling of interest’ see Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 33-5 (but the usage admittedly has ‘a precarious footing in tragedy’).

---

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

tίς ἂν ύπερβαλὼν λόχους
Τρώον ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἠθεν, ὡστε καὶ λαθεῖν; 845
844 ἄν Nauck: δ’ Ω, quo seruato 845 ἠθ’ 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’ ύπερβαλὼν) 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 ἠθ’ 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

tίς οὖν τέτρωται, τίς τέθνηκε †συμμάχων†
tῶν σῶν, μολόντων ὃν σὺ πολεμίων λέγεις;
848 ὄν Bothe: ως Ω

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

reading μολ– ως 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– ως λέγεις σὺ πολεμίων (Blaydes229); it would be unusual
to have the first short of the fifth-‘foot’ tribrach so strongly divorced (σὖ |
πόλε) from the other two. Morstadt took τῶν σῶν μολόντων ὡν σὺ πολεμιων λέγεις to mean ‘when those foes of yours came, those you’re talking about’ (cf. 866 οὐκ οἶδα τοὺς σοὺς οὐς λέγεις ‘Οδυσσέας). 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 . . . σὺ seems redundant.

Diggle’s *cruces 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 nonsensical. 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.’

63. *Rh.* 875-6

63. *Rh.* 875-6

ὀλοιθ’ ὁ δράσας: οὐ γὰρ ἡμὶ σὲ τείνεται†

675 γλῶσσ’, ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς: ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται

ὀλοιθ’ ὁ δράσας: ἡ Δίκη δ’ ἐπίσταται ceteris omissis Chr. Pat. 276, haud male eĩc σὲ fere LQAf: εἰσέτι Β sensum requiro ‘numquam cohobebitur’

‘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 τὴν’d’ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐνδίκως τείνει φόνον) cf. especially *Pl. Phd.* 63a καὶ μοι δοκεὶ Κέβης εἰς σὲ τείνειν τὸν λόγον; *E. Hipp.* 797 οὐκ εἰς γέροντας ἥδε 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

---

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

‘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 conjecture\(^{235}\), which subsequently turned up in \(\text{Af}\) (otherwise of little value). It restores the metre as against \(\text{VL}\) (ἀγει) and \(\text{Q}\) (ἄγοι), both of which seem to be due to haplography (ΤΡΟΙΑΝΑΝΑΓΗΕΙ)\(^{236}\). 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. \(\text{Aj}\). 131–2 ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κανάγει πάλιν | ἄπαντα τάνθρωπεια. One wonders if the \(\text{Q}\) reading (ἄγοι) may not point to another, more promising solution, namely <ἂν> 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. \(\text{El}\). 1450 ποῦ δὴ ἂν εἶεν οἱ ξένοι; (Kühner–Gerth \([supra, n. 22]\), 1, 234-5; Goodwin, Syntax \([supra, n. 34]\) § 238).

65. \(\text{Rh}\). 886–8

τίς ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς θεός, οὐ βασιλεία,
τὸν νεόκμητον νεκρὸν ἐν χειρόιν
φοράδην πέμπει;
887 νεόκμητον \(\text{LQ}\) (νέοχμ- V) : νεόδμητον \(\text{Va}\) and \(\text{Chr. Pat.}\) 1456 (αἵρειν φοράδην τὸν νεόδμητον χρεών).

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

νεόκμητον is a \textit{hapax} in the sense ‘newly killed’; otherwise, νεόκμητος/νεοκμηίς 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 \(s.v. \kappaάμνω, II. 4\)), a usage common also in tragedy and prose. The ‘tautology’ νεόκμητον νεκρόν seems also to be Homeric in origin, cf. νεκροὺς κατατεθηντὰς and the like (\(\text{Il.}\) 16.526, 18.540, \(\text{Od.}\) 10.530); for tragic examples cf. S. \(\text{Ant.}\) 26 θανόντα . . . νέκυν, 515 οὐ καταθανόντω νέκυς; E. \(\text{Hel.}\) 1252 τοὺς θανόντας . . . νεκροὺς; \(\text{Su.}\) 45 (cf. 974) φθιμένων νεκύων, 107 νεκρὸν τῶν ὀλωλότων, 524, 558; also Collard on E. \(\text{Su.}\) 16b-17.

As for the variant νεόδμητον, it can stand only by assuming synecphonesis (νεόδμ-). The word should mean either (i) ‘newly tamed’, from δαμάω (cf.


\(^{236}\) For a comparable error from haplography cf. Men. fr. 842 Kassel–Austin οἰσχυνόμενος οἴσχυτα πενιάν ἄνει φέροις, on which see R. Porson, \textit{Adversaria}, Cambridge 1812, 278.
νεόδμητος)237; 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 = τεθνεότες cf. E. Tro. 175 with Biehl ad l.; IT 199, 230; Alc. 127. Taking into account that νεόδμητος = ‘recently killed’ is unparalleled in pre-Hellenistic literature (lycophr. 65 πρὸς νεόδμητον νέκυν; cf. Nonn. 47.213 νεοδήμητοι Koechly: νεοτμ- mss.), we may safely assume that νεόδμητον in Vα and Chr. Pat. reflects Hellenistic and later usage. Indeed, it appears that in later Greek νεόδμητος and νεόκμητος 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
ἐξοντι λύπης τὸν σὸν οἰκτίρω γόνον.

904 ὅσῃ (et 905 λύπη) Wecklein (~Chr. Pat. 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 ὅσῃ προσήκει ... λύπης: L already has λύπη, and ὅσῃ was hesitantly suggested by Wecklein240. But again it would be clumsy to separate ὅσῃ 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 | ἐξοντι λύπης κτλ.241, ‘as much as it becomes a non-relative it is with grief that I feel pity for your offspring’; but again λύπης would be redundant in view of οἰκτίρω242.

As a simpler remedy I suggest: ... μὴ γένει κοινωνίαν | ἐξοντα 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 (ἐξοντα) instead of the dative after an impersonal verb (προσήκει) cf. Kühner–Gerth (supra, n. 22) 2, 591.

239 Cf. Suid. ν 194 (III.450.14 Adler) and Phot. p. 294.22 Porson νεόκμητον· νεωστι κατεσκευασμένον.
242 Cf. further Nauck, “Studien” (supra, n. 20) 185.
67. Rh. 910-14

ἀ θ’ Ἑλλανα λιποῦσα δόμον
Φρυγίων λεχέον ἐπλευσε πλαθεῖσ’,
†ὑπ’ Ἡλίῳ ὀλεσε† μὲν σ’ ἐκατι Τροίας,
φίλτατε, μυριάδας τε πόλεις
ἀνδρῶν ἄγαθῶν ἐκένωσεν.

910 Ἑλλανα Badham: ἑλένα Ω 912 ἀ διώλεσε Jackson, ἀπὸ δ’ ὀλεσε Henning (ἀπό τ’ Wecklein), ὅπον ὀλεσε Wilamowitz σ’ ἐκατι 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 ἐπλευσε πλαθεῖσ’. As Kovacs points out\footnote{Kovacs, \textit{Euripidea Tertia} (supra, n. 11) 149-50.}, πλαθεῖσ’ is extremely awkward in its confused relation both to ἐπλευσε and to λιποῦσα. The awkwardness remains, at least in relation to λιποῦσα (does it precede or follow πλαθεῖσ’?), even if we assume, with Mastronarde\footnote{Mastronarde, \textit{Electronic Antiquity} (supra, n. 135) 21.}, 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., \textit{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 ‘pennant close’) is not a mark of period-end if followed by double short, as here\footnote{See T. C. W. Stinton, \textit{Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy}, Oxford 1990, 326 n. 41.}. The point is also made by Mastronarde, l.c. (\textit{supra}, n. 244) 21: ‘The metrical argument used by [Kovacs] applies properly topassages 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 †ὑπ’ Ἡλίῳ ὀλεσε† at 912. This unmetrical phrase has generally been obelized as corrupt, or emended away. Thus, Jackson suggested <ἀ> διώλεσε (with ἀ standing for λέχεω);\footnote{Marginalia (supra, n. 17) 66.} H. Henning
ἀπὸ δ’ ὤλεσε 247; and Wilamowitz ὅπου ὤλεσε 248. Were it certain that ὑπ’ Ἰλίῳ ὤλεσε is corrupt, then Wilamowitz’s emendation would be the obvious choice: the subordinate clause it introduces helps preserve the basic structure ὅλοιτο Χ, ὃς … initiated in 906-8 (with ὅλοιτο Ἐλένα understood as antecedent of the relative clause at 910ff.). Moreover, Wilamowitz’s emendation provides ‘an easy explanation of the paradox: 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 Τροΐᾶς in the same verse. One wonders whether the corruption may not lie rather in σὲ κατὰ Τροΐᾶς, ‘which is faulty both in sense and rhythm’ 250. True, E. Bruhn’s 251 σ’ ἐκατὲ Τροΐᾶς is satisfactory, but what if κατὰ Τροΐᾶς were a gloss on ὑπ’ Ἰλίῳ rather than vice-versa (thus e.g. Paley)? For ὑπ’ Ἰλίῳ in tragedy cf. A. Ag. 860, 882, 1439 (cf. also ὑπὸ Τροΐᾶς in 1457); Ch. 345; E. Andr. 1182; Hee. 764; El. 881; Or. 58, 102. If so, then one might consider reading, as an exempli gratia suggestion, ὑπό τ’ Ἰλιον ὤλεσεν σὲ βάντα (cf. already Hermann’s ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιῶ 252): for the triple τε (ἄ θ’ … ἐπέλευσε … ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιόν ὤλεσε … μυρίάδας τε πόλεις … ἐκένωσεν) see Denniston, Particles (supra, n. 54) 504-5; for ὑπὸ τ’ Ἰλιον … βάντα cf. II. 2.216, 673 ὑπὸ Ἰλιον ἠλθε. Noteworthy is also Paley’s ὑπὸ δ’ (malim ὑπό τ’) Ἰλιον ὤλεσεν σὲ πύργους 253.

The emendation suggested, exempli gratia, in the previous paragraph is compatible with the lectio tradita ἐπέλευσε πλαθεῖσ’ in 911, but not with Kovacs’ emendation πλέουσ’ ἐπιάθη, 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 μυρίάδας seems unparalleled: one should have expected either μυρίας πόλεις or μυρίάδας πόλεων. Despite

247 Teste Wecklein, Euripidis Rhesus (supra, n. 240) 55, who printed it in slightly modified form as ὑπὸ τ’ ὤλεσε.
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 ἄγαθῶν, 'and she emptied cities of myriads of good men'\textsuperscript{254}. However, (i) to take μυριάδας with ἀνδρῶν goes against the run of the sentence\textsuperscript{255}; and (ii) κενόω with double accusative is unparalleled, since in Pi. \textit{Pyth.} 3.97-8 τὸν μὲν ... θύγατρες ἐρήμωσαν ... | εὐφροσύνας μέρος αὐτη τρεῖς\textsuperscript{256}, it seems best (despite LSJ \textit{s.v.} ἐρημόω II.1) to take μέρος as accusative of respect rather than as object of ἐρημώσων: 'his three daughters, each one for her part, deprived him of his happiness'. As an alternative, Ritchie \textit{l.c.} (\textit{supra}, n. 254) suggested emending into μυριάδον or μυριάδας; but the resulting consecutive genitives (μυριάδων / μυριάδας ἀνδρῶν ἄγαθῶν) would be clumsy. The same goes for Reiske’s μυριάδων τε πόλεων\textsuperscript{257}: it is an obvious remedy\textsuperscript{258}, 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, \textit{faute de mieux}, is Wilamowitz’s suggestion that adjectival μυριάδας is a Boeoticism, apparently paralleled in Corinn. \textit{PMG} 654 (\textit{a}) col. i.34 Page εἰ μου[π]άδεσι λαύς (=ἐν μυρίασι λαοῖς)\textsuperscript{259}. For another Boeoticism in \textit{Rhesus} cf. 523 προταινὶ τάξιν: its Boeotian character, affirmed by Parmeniscus (thus the ancient scholiast, Schwartz, \textit{Scholia [supra}, n. 147] 340), has been confirmed by epigraphy: προταινὶ occurs at least 3 times in Boeotian inscriptions (\textit{IG} 7.1739.11, 14 Thespiae; restored by Dittenberger in \textit{IG} 7.2406.7 Thebes); a fourth instance may be lurking in \textit{BCH} 21 (1897) 554.2 / 557.2 (Thespiae, suppl. G. Colin) ὑπάρχι δὲ ἐν τῇ π[ροτ]ηπ[ορρ]εῖσε. 68. \textit{Rh.} 923–4

... μεγίστην εἰς ἔριν μελῳδίας κλεινῷ σοφιστῇ Θρηκί... κλεινῷ Dobree: κεῖνῳ(ι) Ω: δεινῷ Valckenaer

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

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

\textsuperscript{255} Cf. Paley, \textit{Euripides (supra, n. 136)} ad 914.

\textsuperscript{256} Adduced by Ritchie (\textit{supra n. 254}).

\textsuperscript{257} Reiske, \textit{Animadversiones (supra, n. 32)} 92.

\textsuperscript{258} Cf. also Blaydes, \textit{Adversaria (supra, n. 72)} 11; for the synizesis see Diggle, \textit{Studies (supra, n. 47)} 93, 1207

\textsuperscript{259} Wilamowitz, \textit{Verskunst (supra, n. 68)} 585 n. 1.
The mss reading is untenable: we should expect either σοφιστῇ κείνῳ or κείνῳ τῷ σοφιστῇ. One possibility is Dobree's κλεινῷ, but Valckenaer's δεινῷ may be slightly preferable in view of E. Hipp. 921 δεινὸν σοφιστήν; Su. 903 δεινὸς σοφιστῆς (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 τοῦ, Ἀθάνα, παντὸς αἰτία μόρου—
οὐδὲν δ’ Ὄδυσσεως οὐδ’ ὁ Τυδέως τόκος
ἔδρασε—δρώσα μὴ δόκει λεληθέναι.

940

938 καὶ: σὺ Kirchhoff 940 ἔδρασε—δρώσα Lenting: ἔδρασε δράσας Ω (cf. Chr. Pat. 1411 ἔδρασε δράσας κτλ.); ἔδρασ’—ἔδρασας Heath, quibus acceptis τοῦτ’ pro τοῦτ’ 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 emendation requires a parenthesis in 939–40 and an intransitive use of δρώσα. Paley, Euripides (supra, n. 136) ad 938–40 accepts Heath’s (οὐδὲν δ’ Ὄδ- ... ἔδρασ’) ἔδρασας, μὴ δ- λ- in 940; his further change of τοῦ into τοῦτ’ in 938 aims at furnishing ἔδρασας with an object. But surely the transmitted text can be defended. As Matthiae saw, οὐδὲν ... ἔδρασε, μὴ δὲ in 940; his further change of τοῦτ’ into τοῦτ’ in 938 aims at furnishing ἔδρασας with an object. 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, Diggle, Parker (ad E. Alc. 521), and Olson (adAr. Ach. 395–6). For such paradoxes one may further compare h. Merc. 92 και τε ἰδών μη ἱδών εἶναι και κωφὸς ἀκούσας; A. Ag. 1623 οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὁρῶν τάδε;

260 Dobree, Adversaria (supra, n. 12) 88.
261 L. C. Valckenaer, Εὐριπίδου Πτολύτου: Euripidis tragoedia Hippolytus, Lugduni 1822, 262.
262 Nova Acta Literaria Societatis Rheno-Trajectinae 1, 1821, 77.
263 For such parenthetic 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 Ul- ysses 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.
(apparently proverbial, see Fraenkel ad l. and cf. especially [Dem.] 25.89); _PV_ 447-8 ἑβλέπτονς ἑβλέπων μάτην, | κλύοντες οὐκ ἑκούον (with Griffith ad l.); _S. Aj._ 85 ἐγὼ σκοτώσω βλέφαρα καὶ δέδορκότα; _OT_ 413 σὺ καὶ δεδορκῶς οὐ (Reiske : δέδορκας κοὐ mss.) βλέπεις; for a late ex. cf. [Men.] _Mon._ 586 Pernigotti ο γράμματων ἄπειρος οὐ βλέπει [βλέπων].

The transmitted text would be improved with Kirchhoff’s σῦ for καὶ 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 μισθῶν παῖδ’ ἔχουσ’ ἐν ἄγκαλαις
θρῆνω· σοφιστήν 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 Philosophe269; 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 σοφιστάι 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 a liqueum adducere, arcessere’273. This is correct, but


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 tragœdœae_ (supra, n. 45) ad 946; Vater, _Rhesus_ (supra, n. 45) cxxvi; cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπάξω, II.1, 2, 4; Schwyzer, _Grammatik_ (supra, n. 50) 231.
no alternative interpretation carries any conviction. Thus, Musgrave\textsuperscript{274}, followed by Matthiae \textit{l.c.} (\textit{supra n. 273}), thought the phrase means ‘θρηνῶ, 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 \textit{E. Herc.} 911-12 μάντιν οὗχ | ἐτερον ἀξοματ (see further Bond \textit{ad l.}); cf. also \textit{Rh.} 952 οὐδὲν μάντεον ἔδει φράσαι, with Porter, \textit{Rhesus (supra, n. 111)} \textit{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 \textit{E. Herc.} 911-12, L. Dindorf\textsuperscript{275} and Vater\textsuperscript{276} argued that the phrase means ‘I have no need for a skilled exegete (\textit{veteratore} L. Dindorf) or a prophet (\textit{vate sive interprete} Vater) to reveal to me who the guilty party is’; but of course neither could adduce any evidence for σοφιστής = μάντις\textsuperscript{277}; the same goes for Burnett’s translation ‘diviner or adept’\textsuperscript{278}.

Defending the traditional interpretation, Fantuzzi\textsuperscript{279} has argued that the Muse’s affirmation is in reality a statement of poetics: she refuses to ‘bring over to her side’ (ἐπάξομαι) 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. \textit{E. Pho.} 1498-501, \textit{Hel.} 164-6, \textit{IT} 179-85; see further Fantuzzi, \textit{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 tradition\textsuperscript{280}. Moreover, this interpretation seems to have no use for ἀλλὸν in σοφιστήν … ἀλλὸν: 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

\textsuperscript{274} Musgrave, \textit{Eυριπίδου τὰ σῳζόμενα (supra, n. 181)} 412.
\textsuperscript{275} \textit{teste} Dindorf, \textit{Euripidis tragoediae (supra, n. 15)} \textit{ad} 949.
\textsuperscript{276} Vater, \textit{Rhesus (supra, n. 45)} cxxvii.
\textsuperscript{277} Despite Porter, \textit{Rhesus (supra, n. 111)} \textit{ad} 949, Melampous himself is not called σοφιστῆς in Hdt. 2.49.1.
\textsuperscript{280} In the \textit{Aethiopis} Thetis was joined in her lament for Achilles by \textit{the Muses} as well as by her own sisters the Nereids; \textit{Procl. Chrest.} 198-9 Severyns = \textit{PEG I} 69.20-1 Bernabé = \textit{EGF} 47.26-7 Davies: καὶ Θέτις ἀφικομένη σὺν Μούσαις καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς θρηνεῖ τὸν παῖδα. The detail is also mentioned in \textit{Od.} 24.60-2 and in \textit{Pi.} 1.8.57-60.
pleader to speak on my behalf. This is an improvement upon an untenable suggestion first put forward by Reiske, 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, Richards suggested that the Muse, considering that her association with the musician Thamyris 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 Athens. True, the middle ἐπάξομαι remains problematic, and it will not do to imagine, with Burnett, 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): 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). More importantly, the Rhesus author does use problematic middle forms elsewhere, or use active forms where one would

---

282 Reiske, Animadversiones (supra, n. 32) 93.
284 Cf. Jouan, Euripide (supra, n. 29) p. 78 n. 280(3).
285 Cf. in the last instance Fantuzzi, “La mousa” (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 Schwyzzer, Grammatik (supra, n. 50) 232-3, 234-5.
289 In 805, middle δυσοίζω is unique, and the sense problematic. Active δυσοίζω 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 middle\textsuperscript{290}, 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' ἀφηται (=μηκέτι τις); also, e.g., S. Ant. 91 οὖν δὴ μὴ σθένω, πεπαύσομαι (=ὑπὸν 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. Wilson\textsuperscript{291}, 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 audience\textsuperscript{292}.

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 attractive\textsuperscript{293}: the perfective mode seems in order because Rhesus is already ‘gone’; moreover, ἀποίχομαι seems to be a key term in Greek funerary discourse.\textsuperscript{294} Equally plausible is Nauck’s διοίχεται\textsuperscript{295}. cf. S. Aj. 972-3 ἐμοὶ | λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται. But either emendation would destroy the studied antithesis with ἐλθών: Rhesus is now leaving (ἀπέρχεται) Troy in very different circumstances from those surrounding his arrival (ἐλθὼν).

\textsuperscript{290}In 982, διοίχει (sc. βίων) is unusual, since it is the middle, not the active, that is used absolutely (LSJ s.v. διαφέρω, l.2; cf. S. Aj. 511); cf. 600 εἰ διοίχει νύκτα τὴν δ'.


\textsuperscript{293}Vater, Rhesus (supra, n. 45) ad 946.

\textsuperscript{294}Cf. P. A. Hansen (ed.), Carmina epigraphica Graecae saeculi IV a.Ch.n., Berlin 1989, no. 75.2; W. Peek, Griechische Vers-Inscriften, 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.

\textsuperscript{295}Nauck, “Studien” (supra, n. 20) 186.
72. *Rh.* 974-5

ῥᾷον δὲ πένθος τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ
οἴσω· θανεῖν γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἐκ κείνης χρεῶν.

974 ῥᾷον 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 ῥᾷον 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. Finglass. Musgrave, who actually got around to publishing the same emendation, hit upon it independently several years later than Valckenaer — a coincidence pointed out by Valckenaer himself: ‘mihi dudum id ipsum in mentem venisse’.

This neat emendation should have won universal approval; cf. especially *E. Hipp.* 205-6 ῥᾷον δὲ νόσον ... οἴσεις; ?Α. *PV* 104 αἴσαν φέρειν ὡς ῥάστα. However, βαιὸν is still printed by Zanetto and defended by Feickert as meaning ‘presently, after a short while’. But βαιός never has this meaning, and supposed parallels turn out to be illusory: in *S. OC* 1653 ἐπείτα μέντοι βαιὸν οὐδὲ σὺν χρόνῳ, construe βαιὸν ἐπείτα, ‘shortly afterwards’ (cf. *S. Phil.* 20 βαιὸν δ’ ἐνερθεν); and in *S. Trach.* 355 βαιὸν ἀμμείνα’ means ‘waiting for a short while’, not ‘after a short while’. Even if βαιὸν could mean ‘presently’, the resulting sense would still be absurd in the present context; for though a participant in the lamentations for Achilles, 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, ὦ παῖ τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ; and because, as pointed out by E. Harrison, 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
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.