

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

GENERAL EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

Regius Professor Emeritus of Greek, University of Cambridge

PHILIP HARDIE

Senior Research Fellow, Trinity College, Cambridge

RICHARD HUNTER

Regius Professor of Greek, University of Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

Kennedy Professor Emeritus of Latin, University of Cambridge

EURIPIDES

HELEN

EDITED BY

WILLIAM ALLAN

*McConnell Laing Fellow and Tutor in Greek and Latin Languages and
Literature, University College, Oxford*



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo,
Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521545419

© Cambridge University Press 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2008

Reprinted with corrections 2010

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-83690-6 hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-54541-9 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

TO THE MEMORY OF
ALBERT ALLAN

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	page ix
<i>List of sigla and abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>Key to metrical symbols</i>	xiii
Introduction	i
1 Euripides and Athens	i
(a) Life and works	i
(b) <i>Helen</i> in its Athenian context	4
2 The figure of Helen in early Greek culture	10
(a) Myth	10
(b) Cult	14
3 Helen on stage	16
4 The 'new' Helen	18
(a) Stesichorus	18
(b) Herodotus	22
(c) Euripides	24
5 The production	29
(a) Setting and staging	29
(b) Structure and dramatic technique	34
(c) Speech, song, language	38
6 A tragedy of ideas	46
(a) Knowledge and reality	47
(b) Family, gender, authority	49
(c) Greeks and Egyptians	55
(d) The gods	61
7 Genre	66
8 Helen transformed	72
9 The text and its transmission	82
HELEN	91
<i>Commentary</i>	142
<i>Bibliography</i>	347
<i>Indexes</i>	365

PREFACE

Helen has often been misunderstood and undervalued because of its apparent refusal to follow the 'rules' of its genre, yet in fact it embodies the variety and dynamism of fifth-century Athenian tragedy perhaps more than any other surviving play. The story of an exemplary wife (not an adulteress) who went to Egypt (not to Troy), Euripides' 'new *Helen*' skilfully transforms and supplants earlier currents of literature and myth. Nevertheless, Euripides uses his unorthodox heroine and her phantom double to explore many of the central issues connected to her more traditional self: the role of the gods in human suffering, the limits of mortal knowledge, the importance of reputation, the consequences of overwhelming beauty and desire, among others. By turns playful and serious, *Helen* is an extraordinarily exuberant and inventive drama that deserves to be read (and performed) more widely. To that end, this edition of the play aims to discuss a broad spectrum of issues (intellectual context, stagecraft, language, style, reception, etc.) in an easily accessible manner. Like many other tragedies, *Helen* has suffered from being interpreted anachronistically: as a tragicomedy, for example, or as an indictment of war; the Introduction therefore seeks to reconstruct the original audience's core values and expectations as a more accurate guide to understanding the play. As a result, the Introduction is comparatively long for this series, but the many preconceptions about *Helen* (and Euripidean tragedy more generally) therein addressed are of such pervasive and continuing influence as to merit detailed analysis. Its wider discussion of Euripides' dramatic art is intended to complement and support the Commentary, whose goal, naturally, is a nuanced appreciation of *Helen* in its own right.

I am extremely grateful to Justina Gregory, Mark Griffith, Albert Henrichs, Gordon Howie, Gregory Hutchinson, Adrian Kelly, Brad Levett, Pantelis Michelakis, Robert Parker, Christopher Pelling, Richard Rutherford, the late Charles Segal, Laura Swift, Oliver Taplin, Martin West, Christian Wildberg, and Froma Zeitlin for much helpful discussion and advice. David Kovacs and Donald Mastronarde read an earlier draft of the Introduction, James Diggle an earlier draft of the Commentary: to this great trio of Euripideans go my heartfelt thanks. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to the editors, Pat Easterling and Richard Hunter, for inviting me to work on *Helen* in this series and for their detailed and salutary corrections thereafter, and

to Michael Sharp and Muriel Hall, for their patient and expert guidance throughout the process of publication.

W. R. A.

Oxford

December 2006

SIGLA AND ABBREVIATIONS

L	Laurentianus 32.2 (Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Florence), c. 1300–20
Tr ¹ , Tr ² , Tr ³	Corrections in L made at various times by Demetrius Triclinius, early 14th cent.
P	Laurentianus conv. soppr. 172, c. 1320–5
apogr. Par.	Parisinus gr. 2887 and 2817, late 15th to early 16th cent.
Π	P. Oxy. 2336, 1st cent. BC
Bernabè	A. Bernabè, ed. <i>Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta. Pars I.</i> (Stuttgart 1996)
Davies	M. Davies, ed. <i>Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (Göttingen 1988)
DK	H. Diels and W. Kranz, eds., <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> (6th edn., Zurich 1951–2)
FGHHist	F. Jacoby, ed. <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin and Leiden 1923–58)
FJW	H. Friis Johansen and E. W. Whittle, eds. <i>Aeschylus: The Suppliants</i> (Copenhagen 1980)
Goodwin	W. W. Goodwin, <i>Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb</i> (Boston 1890)
GP	J. D. Denniston, <i>The Greek Particles</i> (2nd edn., Oxford 1954)
K-A	R. Kassel and C. Austin, eds. <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> (Berlin 1983–)
K-G	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre</i> (Hanover 1898–1904)
LIMC	<i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> (Zurich 1981–97)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Stuart Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> (9th edn., Oxford 1940)
PMG	D. L. Page, ed. <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> (Oxford 1962)
PMGF	M. Davies, ed. <i>Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , vol. 1 (Oxford 1991)
RE	A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, <i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Stuttgart and Munich 1894–)
Schwyzer	E. Schwyzer and A. Debrunner, <i>Griechische Grammatik</i> (Munich 1938–50)
SH	H. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons, <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Berlin 1983)
Smyth	H. Weir Smyth, <i>Greek Grammar</i> (rev. G. M. Messing, Cambridge MA 1956)
TrGF	B. Snell, R. Kannicht, and S. L. Radt, eds. <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (Göttingen 1971–2004)

<i>TrGFs</i>	J. Diggle, ed. <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta</i> (Oxford 1998)
V	E.-M. Voigt, ed. <i>Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta</i> (Amsterdam 1971)
W	M. L. West, ed. <i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci</i> (Oxford 1989–92)

The following editions of *Helen* are referred to by author's name only:

- Badham, C., London 1851
- Paley, F. A., London 1874
- Jerram, C. S., Oxford 1892
- Pearson, A. C., Cambridge 1903
- Murray, G., Oxford 1913
- Alt, K., Leipzig 1964
- Dale, A. M., Oxford 1967
- Kannicht, R., Heidelberg 1969
- Diggle, J., Oxford 1994
- Kovacs, D., Cambridge MA 2002

KEY TO METRICAL SYMBOLS

—	long (heavy) syllable
∪	short (light) syllable
×	anceps (position may be occupied by a long or short syllable)
∪∪	resolution (two short syllables taking the place of a long)
oo	two positions of which at least one must be long
	word-end coinciding with colon-division within a period
	period-end
	strophe-end

an	anapaest (∪∪—∪∪—)
ba	bacchiac (∪—)
chor	choriamb (—∪∪—)
chor dim	choriambic dimeter (× × × ×—∪∪—)
cr	cretic (—∪—)
da	dactyl (—∪∪)
doch	dochmiac (×—×—)
dod	dodrans A (—∪∪—∪—) and B (oo—∪∪—)
gl	glyconic (oo—∪∪—∪—)
ia	iamb (×—∪—)
ith	ithyphallic (—∪—∪—×)
lk	lektyhion (—∪—×—∪—)
ph	pherecratean (oo—∪∪—)
prax	praxillean (—∪∪—∪∪—∪∪—∪—)
pros	prosodiac (×—∪∪—∪∪—)
r	reizianum (×—∪∪—×)
sp	spondee (—)
tl	telesillean (×—∪∪—∪—)
tr	trochee (—∪—×)

D	—∪∪—∪∪— (in dactylo-epitrite)
D ²	—∪∪—∪∪—∪∪— (in dactylo-epitrite)
c	—∪— (in dactylo-epitrite)

In 2ia^Λ, 3tr^Λ, etc. the sign ^Λ (denoting catalexis) applies only to the last metron.

When one symbol is placed over another, the upper applies to the strophe, the lower to the antistrophe. Thus, ∪ indicates two short syllables in the strophe corresponding to a long in the antistrophe.

For further discussion of metrical terminology, see West (1982) xi–xii, 191–201.

INTRODUCTION

1. EURIPIDES AND ATHENS

(a) *Life and works*

Euripides appears to us as one of the most vivid and recognizable poets of the fifth century BC. Compared to Aeschylus and Sophocles, more than twice as many of his plays have survived complete, while the greater quantity both of quotations in ancient authors and of sizeable papyrus fragments of the lost plays (reflecting his popularity throughout antiquity) gives us a more detailed picture of his dramatic oeuvre.¹ In addition, we possess a variety of sources purporting to chronicle the life of the poet,² who even appears as a character in three of the surviving comedies of Aristophanes (*Acharnians*, *Women at the Thesmophoria*, *Frogs*). Yet the very abundance of ancient 'evidence' for Eur.'s life and character has had a paradoxically confusing impact on the interpretation of his works (on which more below). For with the exception of a few details securely based on the Athenian didascalic records, all the surviving evidence is of highly dubious reliability,³ and the bulk of it is little more than anecdote based on naive 'inference', whether from the plays themselves⁴ or from the absurd caricatures of Eur.'s art and life generated by Aristophanes and other comic poets.⁵

¹ For a complete collection of the fragments of Euripides (hereafter Eur.), see the edition by R. Kannicht, *TrGF* v (abbreviations are listed above); also Jouan and Van Looy (1998–2003) with translations and notes (in French). The more substantial fragments are edited by J. Diggle in *TrGF* S, and are translated with excellent introductions and commentaries by Collard, Cropp, and Lee (1995: *Telephus, Cretans, Sthenoboea, Bellerophon, Cresphontes, Erechtheus, Phaethon, Wise Melanippe, Capture Melanippe*) and Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004: *Philoctetes, Alexandros, Palamedes, Oedipus, Andromeda, Hypsipyle, Antiope, Archelaus*). A Loeb edition by C. Collard and M. Cropp is also forthcoming.

² The five major sources for the life of Eur. are edited by Kannicht, *TrGF* v (Testimonia 1–5); these are the *Γένος και βίος Εὐριπίδου* transmitted in some medieval manuscripts of the plays; a chapter (15.20) in Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights* (published c. AD 180); an entry s.v. Εὐριπίδης in the medieval encyclopedia known as the *Suda*; a sketch of the poet's life by Thomas Magister (thirteenth to fourteenth century); and papyrus fragments of a longer *Life of Euripides* in dialogue form by Satyrus, a grammarian of the third century BC. For these texts with English translation, see Kovacs (1994b) 2–29.

³ The variety of anecdote and fiction in the lives is revealingly explored by Fairweather (1974); cf. also Leskowitz (1981) 88–104 and Kovacs (1994a) 1–4 on Eur. For a less distrustful view of the biographical tradition, cf. e.g. Matthiessen (2002) 14–17.

⁴ E.g. the notion (related in the *Γένος*: *TrGF* v τ 1.74–6) that Eur. wrote his first *Hippolytus* as a response to his wife's infidelity.

⁵ Thus the plot of Ar. *Thesm.* is treated as biography by both the *Γένος* and Satyrus, with each claiming that the women of Athens conspired to kill Eur. during the Thesmophoria (*TrGF* v τ 1.99–100, τ 110). For satirical treatment of Eur. by other comic poets, cf. Ar. *Wasps* 61 (from a list of tired gags the audience should not expect) οὐδ' αὐθις ἀνασελγαινόμενος Εὐριπίδης. Telecleides (whose first victory was c. 445) associated Eur. with Socrates (frs. 41–2 K-A), for example, which suggests that there were stock jokes about Eur. even before Aristophanes.

In fact we have very little reliable evidence for Eur.'s dramatic career and know almost nothing about his life. He was evidently dead by the time of the first production of Aristophanes' *Frogs* at the Lenaea (in early January) of 405, and the *Marmor Parium* (a marble stele from Paros inscribed c. 264/3 with various dates from Greek history) puts his death in 407/6 and his birth in 485/4, dates which are as reasonable as any preserved in the sources.⁶ Like his father Mnesarchides (or Mnesarchus), Eur. belonged to the Attic deme of Phlya (part of the Cecropid tribe and to the north of Mt Hymettus). The musical and poetic training necessary for Eur.'s career implies a wealthy background, and it is clear from the range of contemporary intellectual issues handled in his plays that Eur. was a man of great learning and curiosity. As usual the biographical tradition deduced from Eur.'s broad cultural interests that he must have been a pupil or friend of nearly every major philosopher, rhetorician, and sophist of his day (*TrGF* v τ 35–48), and the image of Eur. the radical, controversial, and even alienated intellectual has had a major (and often misleading) influence on the subsequent interpretation of his works (and equally, via Aristophanes' *Frogs*, those of the allegedly 'unphilosophical' Aeschylus).⁷

Using the public records of the City Dionysia at Athens, ancient scholars calculated that Eur. had competed 22 times (= 88 plays).⁸ It is possible that Eur. staged new plays elsewhere,⁹ including the large deme theatres of Attica, and he is said to have ended his life in Macedonia writing plays for king Archelaus.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the bulk of his work was intended for Athenian audiences at the City Dionysia, and it is their world-view we must try to reconstruct as we interpret the plays. Eur. won first prize at the Dionysia four times during his lifetime and once posthumously (when his son, also called Eur., produced a tetralogy that included *Iphigenia at Aulis* and *Bacchae*). Given the stereotype of the alienated poet, Eur.'s four victories (compared to Aeschylus' 13 and Sophocles' 18) have often been taken to show that the Athenians were uneasy with, or even hostile to, his plays, yet this is hardly plausible, since Eur. was chosen 22 times by the eponymous archon to be one of the three tragic competitors at the city's greatest dramatic festival, and a playwright under such a cloud would not be repeatedly selected to vie for first prize.¹¹

⁶ For the conflicting and suspiciously synchronizing dates of Eur.'s birth and death (including, for example, the tradition of his birth on the island of Salamis on the very day of the great battle in 480), see *TrGF* v τ 10a–17c.

⁷ See Allan (2005) 74–5.

⁸ Although 92 plays were catalogued by ancient scholars under Eur.'s name, some were deemed spurious: see *TrGF* v p. 80. For a sceptical view of the transmitted figures for Eur.'s productions, see Luppe (1997).

⁹ The *Andromache* was long thought to be such a play, but the available evidence suggests that the play was first produced in Athens, but written so as to appeal to audiences elsewhere (Allan (2000) 149–60).

¹⁰ For the surviving fragments of the *Archelaus* itself, see Harder (1985) 125–272. The play told how the king's mythical ancestor and namesake killed the double-crossing Cisseus of Thrace and founded the Macedonian city of Aegae. Eur.'s time in Macedonia is the subject of four of the five fictional letters composed in his name c. AD 100: see Gösswein (1975), Costa (2001) 171–4.

¹¹ Stevens (1956) refutes the notion of Eur.'s unpopularity with the Athenians. The poet's alleged lack of success was used in the biographical tradition to explain why he went to work for

Of Eur.'s 17 surviving tragedies (not including the probably spurious, fourth-century *Rhesus* or the satyr-play *Cyclops*) *Helen* is one of nine plays for which we have fairly secure production dates based on the information recorded in ancient hypotheses and scholia. The remaining plays can be dated relative to these on stylistic grounds, the most important criterion being the rate and type of resolution (i.e. substitution of two short syllables for a long) found in the iambic trimeters, since Eur.'s plays show a gradual increase over time in the rate and variety of resolved positions.¹² The cumulative evidence allows us to reconstruct Eur.'s theatrical career as follows (extant works are in bold):¹³

455	Eur. competes for the first time at City Dionysia (plays included <i>Peliades</i>)
441	first victory
438	<i>Alcestis</i> (fourth play in tetralogy with <i>Cretan Women</i> , <i>Alcmaeon in Psophis</i> , <i>Telephus</i>); wins second prize
431	<i>Medea</i> (first play in tetralogy with <i>Philoctetes</i> , <i>Dictys</i> , and satyr-play <i>Theristae</i>); wins third prize
c. 430	<i>Children of Heracles</i>
428	<i>Hippolytus</i> ; wins first prize
c. 425	<i>Andromache</i>
c. 424	<i>Hecuba</i>
c. 423	<i>Suppliant Women</i>
c. 420	<i>Electra</i>
c. 416	<i>Heracles</i>
415	<i>Trojan Women</i> (third play in tetralogy with <i>Alexandros</i> , <i>Palamedes</i> , and satyr-play <i>Sisyphus</i>); wins second prize
c. 414	<i>Iphigenia in Tauris</i>
c. 413	<i>Ion</i>
412	<i>Helen</i> (other plays included <i>Andromeda</i>)
411-409	<i>Phoenician Women</i>
408	<i>Orestes</i>
408/7	<i>Archelaus</i> (performed in Macedonia)
407/6	Eur. dies in Macedonia
405-400	<i>Iphigenia in Aulis</i> , <i>Alcmaeon in Corinth</i> , and <i>Bacchae</i> , produced by Eur.'s son; wins posthumous first prize

Archelaus (*TrGF* v τ 1.44-50). However, Eur. was only one of many poets and artists who took up commissions at the court of a Hellenizing king, as Aeschylus had done many years before while a guest of Hieron, tyrant of Syracuse, writing a tragedy on the foundation of the city of Actna (frs. 6-11 Radt = *TrGF* III); cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 1.58-70.

¹² There are approximately 445 resolutions in 1253 iambic trimeters in *Helen*, the equivalent of (on average) one resolution every three lines (or more precisely 35.5%, compared to 6.7% for *Alcestis* in 438 and 49.3% for *Orestes* in 408).

¹³ For the metrical criteria used to date Eur.'s plays, both surviving and fragmentary, see Cropp and Fick (1985); also Devine and Stephens (1981), Stinton (1990) 349-50. The list omits both *Rhesus* and *Cyclops*, in the latter case because it is uncertain whether the stylistic features used to date the tragedies apply with equal force to satyr-plays.

Helen was produced in 412 along with *Andromeda*.¹⁴ The two plays resemble one another in both plot and theme, as the central couples (Helen and Menelaus, Andromeda and Perseus) escape to Greece from a foreign land (Egypt, Ethiopia) after overcoming the opposition of a barbarian king (Theoclymenus, Cepheus). Eur. rings the changes on the story-patterns of rescue and escape, and on the crisis faced by central characters who are in love but threatened with permanent separation. So, whereas Helen (hereafter H.) and Menelaus (M.) are already husband and wife, and must outwit Theoclymenus (Theoc.), H.'s aggressive suitor, to escape from Egypt, Andromeda must first be rescued from a sea monster by Perseus, who falls in love with her, and the young lovers must defy the Ethiopian king Cepheus, who is Andromeda's father. Given the surviving evidence for *Andromeda*,¹⁵ we have no way of knowing which play was performed first,¹⁶ or what the other plays in the tetralogy were.¹⁷

(b) *Helen in its Athenian context*

As with any other work of art, *Helen* is deeply embedded in its own time and place. It is therefore essential that we see (and endeavour to interpret) every Athenian tragedy in its historical and social context. In later sections of this Introduction we shall take into account the various backgrounds (of law, social structure, ethnicity, religion, philosophy, etc.) against which *Helen* is to be read.¹⁸ But it is important that we first consider the political and military climate at the time of the play's production, not because this is the most significant factor for the original audience's response, but because *Helen* has often been (and continues to be) read as an 'anti-war' play.¹⁹

The place and function of tragedy in Athens are subjects which in this context cannot receive the full attention that they deserve, but it is important to consider them.

¹⁴ Cf. scholia to Ar. *Frogs* 53 (*Andromeda* produced eight years before *Frogs*), *Thesm.* 1012 (*Andromeda* produced together with *Helen*), 850 (*Helen* produced one year before *Thesm.*).

¹⁵ Cf. Klimek-Winter (1993) 55–315; Collard, Cropp, and Gilbert (2001) 133–68; *TrGF* v pp. 233–7 and frs. 114–56 Kannicht. Sophocles wrote an *Andromeda*, also dealing with the story of her rescue by Perseus, who killed the sea monster with the head of the Gorgon Medusa (for frs. and commentary; see Klimek-Winter (1993) 23–54). Vase-painting suggests a production date c. 450, but such evidence must be used with caution.

¹⁶ For an allusive reference in *Helen* which may suggest that *Andromeda* preceded it, cf. 769n. Andromeda's opening monody begins with an invocation of 'holy Night' (Ἵμ νύξ ἱερά, fr. 114 Kannicht), but this is no guarantee that the play was performed in the early morning (pace Hourmouziades (1965) 44, who inferred from these opening words that *Androm.* was the first play of the tetralogy).

¹⁷ Wright (2005) 43–55 argues that the *IT* was part of the same production (cf. Steiger (1908) 232–7), thus forming a thematically connected 'escape trilogy'. This is, however, extremely unlikely on stylistic and metrical grounds: cf. Cropp and Fick (1985) 5, 60–1, Devine and Stephens (1981) 44, 48, 52. Similar objections apply to other proposed trilogies or tetralogies, such as *Androm.*, *Hel.*, *Ion* (so e.g. Fantuzzi (1990) 22, Zacharia (2003) 3–7), *Androm.*, *Hel.*, and *Cyclops* as satyr-play (Austin and Olson (2004) lxiii–lxiv), or even *Androm.*, *Hel.*, *IT*, and pro-satyr *Ion* (Hose (1995) 17, 69).

¹⁸ For a comprehensive and useful bibliography of recent secondary literature on the play (not limited to English-language discussions), see Knöbl (2005).

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. most recently Pallantza (2005) 275.

albeit briefly, since the various anachronisms at the heart of 'anti-war' interpretations of *Helen* have their roots in equally inappropriate models of what fifth-century Attic tragedy is doing and what it is for.²⁰ So let us start by considering what kind of views contemporary scholars take of tragedy's relationship to the political life of fifth-century Athens. There is of course a wide range of opinion, but it will be helpful to focus on two of the most influential, which also happen to be at opposite ends of the spectrum in the view they take of tragedy's social and political functions. At one end of the spectrum are those scholars who are reluctant to tie tragedy too closely to day-to-day political issues. They focus instead on tragedy's aesthetic qualities as poetry and drama, on the pathetic suffering of its characters, and on the moral dilemmas that it poses.²¹ At the other end of the spectrum are critics who see tragedy as fundamentally political – indeed, as fundamentally questioning and interrogatory, even subversive. For them tragedy exposes the core values of fifth-century Athens to glaring scrutiny, and finds them wanting.²² Neither school appreciates the affirmatory impact of tragedy – the former because they take too narrow a view of the political, the latter because they regard the best art as that which challenges or subverts. But did Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides intend to undermine their audience's sense of identity and core beliefs? Or did they want to appeal to as wide a swathe of the public as possible in the hope of winning first prize?²³

It is against this background that we must view the claim that *Helen* represents a critique of Athenian war policy. For the theme of war is central to many readings of the play, including that of Kannicht, whose commentary is a monument of scholarship.²⁴ Thus studies of the play abound with such comments as 'the *Helen* delivers an implicit

²⁰ I hope to analyse in greater detail elsewhere the ramifications of ahistorical literary interpretations of tragedy.

²¹ Cf. e.g. Griffin (1998). Such reluctance to recognize tragedy's political and social functions is often motivated by the idea that political (and affirmatory) literature can be little more than 'propaganda' and part of a state-sponsored conspiracy. Yet literature and other forms of art can be political without being propaganda – and it reveals a very anachronistic picture of art (developed after the Romantic era, certainly, but mostly in the wake of Hitler, Stalin, and Mao) to say that art which celebrates the community must be suspect. Have these critics looked at Athenian public art of the fifth century (e.g. sculptures and temple friezes)? It affirms Athenian state ideology quite unabashedly.

²² Cf. e.g. Goldhill (1990), (2000). There is, however, no ancient evidence that tragedy was seen to be subversive of core polis values: indeed, one could say it is precisely tragedy's lack of such criticism that makes Plato hate it so much. Plato after all certainly did want to challenge and change the Athens of his day, and if tragedy was so questioning of the standard values of the Athenian people, one would expect Plato to like it – but he categorically rejects it: e.g. *Gorgias* 502b–d (tragedy as specious mass rhetoric), *Laws* 817a–d (tragic poets as *rivals* of the philosophers who are to be ejected from the ideal city).

²³ To continue in Platonic terms, one might say that tragedy offers a rival (and, in political terms, positive) *dialectic*. In other words, rather than seeing tragedy as a series of questions that flummox and discomfort the audience, we should see it as a process of questions and answers in which more emphasis is put on the *answers*. Naturally, in arguing that Attic tragedy had an affirmatory function for the watching community, I do not mean to imply that it evades the really hard issues which are not capable of being solved: cf. esp. §§6(a) and (d) below.

²⁴ Cf. esp. Kannicht (1969) I.53–7.

evaluation of the Sicilian expedition'²⁵ or 'Despite its ostensibly comic aspect, the *Helen* is a far more vehement anti-war statement than *The Trojan Women*.'²⁶ But does *Helen* reflect the disillusionment of a war-wearied generation? A variety of factors suggest that such an approach is misguided.

Firstly, pity for the waste of war, especially the Trojan War, and sympathy for the defeated are traditional epic (and tragic) themes (cf. especially *Od.* 8.523–31, where Odysseus, weeping at Demodocus' song of the Trojan Horse and the fall of Troy, is compared to a woman grieving over the corpse of her dead husband as she is dragged off to captivity). Moreover, the specific sentiment expressed by the Chorus of *Helen* – that conflicts should be resolved by diplomacy and reciprocal justice instead of warfare (1151–60) – is itself a traditional idea (e.g. Hes. *WD* 225–9, Aesch. *Supp.* 701–3). To read a chorus or character's insistence on the foolishness of war (cf. 1151 ἄφρονες ὄσοι . . .) or their yearning for peace (e.g. Eur. *Supp.* 488–93, *Or.* 1682–3, *Bacch.* 419–20, fr. 369 Kannicht) as criticism of Athenian war policy would be exceptionally naïve and anachronistic (for reasons we will turn to in a moment). Those who desire to see *Helen* as a protest against war overlook the fact that M. still wins H. by violence and that the Trojan War is part of a divinely conceived plan for the end of the race of heroes. The notion of Eur. the proto-pacifist or anti-imperialist is no more plausible than the comic caricature of Eur. the immoralist, misogynist, or atheist.

Secondly, the idea that *Helen* is in part a response to alleged Athenian disillusionment with the Peloponnesian War betrays a misconception that lies at the heart of many contemporary readings of tragedy, which is to assume a more or less simple equation between the play world and the world of the audience. No one would now endorse the most simple-minded form of historicism, where events on stage are taken to refer directly to the here and now of the audience.²⁷ Instead it is generally agreed that 'in an important sense everything that happens on stage is metaphorical, and there is never a literal identification between the world of the drama and the world of the audience.'²⁸ Nevertheless, the full significance of the distance between the heroic world and the contemporary world is not always recognized, as critics map one onto another, thereby revealing (so they claim) the play's purpose, which is usually to point up some terrible deficiency in Athenian culture. Let us consider, for example, the Messenger's report of the Argive assembly in *Orestes* (866–956). The current scholarly consensus on this scene might be summed up as follows:²⁹ in depicting the warring voices and factions of the Argive assembly Euripides is covertly expressing his reservations about, and criticisms of, the deficiencies of the contemporary Athenian polis, where democratic debate is hijacked by unscrupulous demagogues and self-interested factions. In *Orestes*, and especially in the Assembly scene, it is often said, Euripides is questioning the ideals of debate and freedom of speech that formed the core of

²⁵ Hosc (1995) 77. ²⁶ E. Segal (1983) 248 n. 8.

²⁷ Cf. e.g. Drew (1930) for whom the ten-year Trojan War becomes the ten-year Archidamian War (431–21), and M.'s seven years of wandering are made to stand for the seven years of war from 419–13!

²⁸ Easterling (1995) 80. ²⁹ E.g. E. Hall (1993); cf. Porter (1994) 73–5.

democratic ideology. In other words, by having the Argive assembly, which is simultaneously a kind of law-court, be swayed by vociferous speakers, Euripides is pointing to the negative features of the assembly and popular courts of his day.

In arguing like this critics either explicitly or implicitly make use of what Pat Easterling has called 'heroic vagueness', that is, the peculiar idiom and setting of tragedy which 'enabled audiences to project themselves collectively into a shared imaginative world which was firmly linked with both past and present but strictly represented neither and could be constantly redefined.'³⁰ However, it would be more accurate to speak of *heroic inversion*, since in *Orestes*, as elsewhere in tragedy (and not only in Eur.), we are shown repeatedly how fifth-century Athenian norms do not work in a heroic setting – yet the point is *not* that Athens is a failure, but that the excessive and dangerous figures of heroic myth are the problem.³¹ So whether we talk of 'heroic vagueness' or follow Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood and use the cinematic metaphor of 'zooming',³² the aspects of tragedy that have a contemporary ring (popular assemblies and law-courts, for example) are not there to provoke the audience into thinking, 'They are acting just like we do; they get things wrong, so our system must be at fault', but rather the heroic *inversion* points the difference between the malfunctioning world of the heroes and the way such institutions functioned in the world of the fifth-century Athenian audience. In short, it is not fifth-century Athens or democracy that is at fault in *Orestes*, but it is the inability of the heroic world to accommodate Athenian norms which marks that world as doomed to conflict and ruin.³³

Thus when we interpret those aspects of tragedy which have a contemporary ring, we should consider not only the distance between the two worlds but also the pattern of inversion that marks their relationship.³⁴ In the case of *Helen* the principle of heroic distance applies as much to the issue of Sparta and Spartans as it does to war. There is no anti-Spartan polemic in the play and the references to Spartan cult and ritual (c.g. 228, 245, 1465–75) serve to underline H. and M.'s separation from

³⁰ Easterling (1997a) 24–5.

³¹ *Pace* e.g. Melzer (2006), fifth-century Attic tragedy does not embody nostalgia for an idealized heroic age, but explores current issues in an imaginary world of the past which is systematically unlike that of the audience, and does so in a way that confirms the validity of contemporary Athenian norms. However, this tragic pattern of heroic inversion does not constitute a simple *dichotomy* of then (all bad) versus now (all good), since many heroic figures are admirable in some respects (especially, it should be added, when their outlook comes closest to that of the fifth-century Athenian audience: e.g. Eur. *Supp.* 429–55). In other words, the heroic and contemporary worlds exist as part of a *continuum* rather than a dichotomy, so that the heroes can be presented as more, or less, removed and different from the watching community; nevertheless, the world of the audience emerges as in most respects better than that of the heroes (cf. nn. 259–60 below).

³² E.g. Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 25–40.

³³ The notion of Eur.'s 'disillusion' with Athenian politics is itself closely connected to exaggerated ideas of cultural 'crisis' in the last decades of the fifth century. Such assumptions have in turn contributed to a distorted view of tragedy's development as a genre in which the plays of 'late Euripides' are seen as a symptom of the genre's 'decline' (see §7 below).

³⁴ When the alterity of the heroic world is neglected, a misleading one-to-one mapping between it and the world of the audience is often the result.

their homeland and from one another.³⁵ The heroic distance is missed by critics who argue that 'Euripides' staging a story with a glamorized Spartan heroine who returns home to a gloriously portrayed Sparta must have had a shocking impact upon a late fifth-century Athenian audience.'³⁶ Such an approach is gravely misleading: Athens had been at war with Sparta for much of the fifth century, yet tragedy abounds with Spartan and Dorian figures throughout the century, and does so because these heroes stand at the core of the panhellenic tradition of divine and heroic myth. Part of the genius of Athenian tragedy is to draw these Dorian (and also non-Greek, e.g. Cretan and Egyptian) heroes into Attic myth, often showing (especially in those plays where Athens is strongly focalized: e.g. Aesch. *Eum.*, Soph. *OC*, Eur. *Held.*, *Supp.*) how non-Athenian communities lack the benefits of the Athenians. Yet this aspect of tragedy is not foregrounded in *Helen* (where Athens is never mentioned), and Eur. has chosen H. and M. not because they are Spartans (whom he can then use to make a topical point) but because they are central to the myth of the Trojan War which is the raw material of his work. The play itself displays the same patterns of heroic inversion and disaster that we find throughout tragedy, but it does so in a way that is not explicitly anti-Spartan.

Thirdly, and most tellingly perhaps, the interpretation of *Helen* as an anti-war play is profoundly anachronistic. Many tragedies portray the horrors of the Trojan War (among other mythical conflicts), but this does not mean they are criticizing Athenian policy (Athens was at war almost constantly throughout the fifth century).³⁷ Athens was not a militaristic society as Sparta most famously was, but the Athenians were immensely proud of their military skill.³⁸ The centrality of warfare to the Athenian state and the Athenians' lack of sentimentality about it are shown most clearly in the state's practice of presenting *suits of armour* to the sons of men killed in war.³⁹

³⁵ Cf. Taplin (1999) 50 'There is even a notable amount of favourable Spartan material in *Helen*, including the aetiology at 1666-9.'

³⁶ Zweig (1999a) 220.

³⁷ Perhaps the most common example of such misreading is the view that *Trojan Women*, produced in 415, is an indictment of Athenian action on the island of Melos in the winter of 416 (cf. Thuc. 5.84-116). Yet, as van Erp Taalman Kip (1987) has shown, there was too little time between the fall of Melos (around December) and the Dionysia of 415 for *Trojan Women* to be reacting to it. Moreover, this approach exaggerates the peculiarity and topicality of the play (the sack of Troy is a theme of tragedy throughout the fifth century), and disregards both its impact within the trilogy (for which we have substantial information: *TrGF* v pp. 174-204, 596-605, 657-9; cf. Kovacs (1997)) and the tradition of war poetry which it continues. *Trojan Women* is a profoundly Iliadic drama, which combines sympathy for the defeated with a wider framing of the enmities that underlie the war. For a Greek audience raised on Homer, it is self-evident that the *Iliad* poet presents the war as just and that Zeus himself approves of Troy's fall (see Allan (2006)), and these assumptions will have guided the Athenian audience's response to *Trojan Women* (cf. e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 524-37).

³⁸ Both these points are stressed by 'Thucydides' Pericles in his funeral oration for the Athenian war dead (2.39, 2.42; cf. also 2.64.3). Public honours for the war dead were a fundamental part of Athenian ideology: see Herrman (2004) esp. 1-9 for the idealized Athens of the surviving funeral orations.

³⁹ Cf. Pl. *Menex.* 248c6-249b2, ending 'After they reach manhood, it [the city] sends them off to their own responsibilities, after equipping them with full armor and reminding them of

Moreover, this was carried out each year as part of the pre-play ceremonies at the City Dionysia itself, and the orphaned sons were paraded in full armour in the theatre and given front-row seats.¹⁰ Just as no one doubted that war was horrific, so no one doubted that some wars were necessary and worthwhile, an idea embodied in Greek myth by the Trojan War itself, which was both part of a divine plan and beneficial to humans in some ways (cf. *Hel.* 36–41, 453n.). That the majority of Athenians felt the Peloponnesian War could be beneficial to them can only be doubted by critics who are sealed off from history in a literary bubble. For to portray *Helen* as Eur.'s reaction to a particularly bad patch in the war (the final failure of the Sicilian Expedition in the summer of 413),¹¹ as is often done, overlooks the fact that the majority of Athenians continued to vote for the war,¹² that they wanted to win it at all costs, and that they did so because each of them believed they had something to gain if they did win.¹³

Finally, a frequent alternative to the claim that *Helen* is about the futility of the Peloponnesian War is to present it as a 'lighthearted' or 'romantic' escape from the awful present.¹⁴ Yet this is no more convincing, since quite apart from the dubious assumptions about the tragic genre which underlie interpretations of the play as a 'romantic tragedy', 'tragicomedy', 'escapist melodrama' *vel sim.* (see esp. §7 below), there is no contradiction in a tragedy with an 'upward' movement, or positive outcome for the protagonists, also having serious political, ethical, and religious resonances for the Athens of its day.

their fathers' habits by giving them the tools of their paternal virtue. With good omens it sends them out, decorated in arms, to begin the strong rule of their father's home.' (Trans. Herrman (2004) 61.)

¹⁰ Isoc. *On the Peace* 82, *Against Cleisthenes* 153–5; cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 59, 67, Csapo and Slater (1995) 117–18.

¹¹ There is no reason to doubt the tradition that Eur. himself (who will have completed the requisite military training and service for an Athenian citizen of his class) wrote an epitaph in honour of the Athenians who died in Syracuse (Plut. *Nic.* 17.4 = *TrGF* v τ 92).

¹² The Athenians' determination to persevere (albeit with necessary economies) despite the Sicilian disaster is acknowledged by Thucydides (8.1.2–3; cf. 8.15.1, where in 412 they are forced to use the 1000 talents set aside at the start of the war). Though the Persians were supporting the Spartans from 412 onwards (cf. Cawkwell (2005) 139–46), the Athenian regime of 5000 voted in 411 to continue the war, unlike the much narrower (and less representative) regime of the 400, who had earlier in the same year sought peace terms with Sparta (cf. Thuc. 8.70.2, 90.2, 97.3).

¹³ Besides the literary bubble just mentioned there is the serious problem that many critics remain in thrall to the biased accounts of late fifth-century Athens offered by Thucydides and Plato. For example, the Athenians (*pace* Thucydides) were not simply hoodwinked into fighting by devious self-serving 'demagogues', and various groups had plenty to gain from maintaining and expanding the empire (the aristocrats could get more land, the poorest classes could get paid for rowing in the fleet, etc.). So we must not take these central (in part because they are extant) accounts at face value, and we should also beware of transferring these authors' anti-democratic bias onto others.

¹⁴ E.g. Post (1964) 118 'For Athenians in the terrible situation produced by the Sicilian disaster, the lighthearted *Helen* was just right.'

2. THE FIGURE OF HELEN IN EARLY GREEK CULTURE

(a) Myth

The story of H. is central to the myth of the Trojan War, one of the best known and most frequently handled in all Greek literature and art.⁴⁵ Since all myths are collective narratives, told by a variety of people for a variety of purposes, there can be no definitive version of any one myth, and the same principle (of purposive variation) applies to the central figures of myth like H. herself. Thus H. is presented in a variety of guises, ranging from the cosmic figure created by Zeus to destroy the race of heroes (cf. *Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabè/Davies, discussed below) to the goddess who confers beauty on girls at Sparta (Hdt. 6.61.2–5). Each manifestation purports to present an aspect of the ‘real’ H., yet each has been created to suit the mentality and objectives of a specific society. Nevertheless, even as the different versions of H. reflect the purposes of particular audiences, so they also share a basic story (H.’s role in the fall of Troy, the defining episode of her life) which it is the poet’s (or artist’s) task to recreate in as compelling a manner as s/he can.⁴⁶

The central themes of the Helen myth in the Greek literary tradition are already present in (and are crucially influenced by) Homer’s presentation of H. and her past. Whether she is presented by later poets as regretful and ashamed or as a calculating and vain adulteress, such characterizations have their roots in Homeric poetry, which presents a variety of perspectives and judgements on H.’s conduct.⁴⁷ The *Iliad* foregrounds her elopement with Paris as a catalyst of the war (e.g. 2.160–2, 354–6, 3.441–6, 9.337–9, 19.324–5), and her great shame and remorse as a result (3.173–6, 242, 410–12, 6.344–8, 24.764).⁴⁸ The principle of ‘double motivation’ means that

⁴⁵ The major poetic cycles (Trojan, Theban, Iolcan, Aetolian-Elcan-Pylian) and the connections between them are well discussed by West (1985) 137–8.

⁴⁶ For surveys and discussion of the various versions of H.’s story before Eur., see *RE*: 7.2824–35 s.v. Helene (É. Bethe), Roscher (1886–90) cols. 1928–78, Preller-Robert (1894–1926) 2.1077–89, Becker (1939), Lindsay (1974) 13–174, Clader (1976), Homeyer (1977), Prost (1977), Schmid (1982), Backès (1984), Guardini (1987) 24–69, Adams (1988), Suzuki (1989) esp. 18–91, Gantz (1993) 564–76, Austin (1994) 23–136, Fredricksmeyer (1996), Gumpert (2001) 3–98, Zajonz (2002) 11–19, Wright (2005) 56–157 esp. 67, 76–7, Pallantza (2005) esp. 34–43, 61–79, 98–123, 265–75. The iconographic tradition of H.’s myth is discussed in detail by L. Kahil, *LJMC* s.v. Helene (= vol. 14.1, pp. 498–563, with further bibliography on p. 501). As Kahil observes (p. 499), there is no evidence of the ‘new’ or Egyptian version of H.’s myth in archaic and classical art. Instead, the artistic tradition is dominated by a few key scenes from H.’s life: her unusual birth figures prominently (*LJMC* nos. 1–13), but the most popular scenes by far are those dealing with her abduction by Paris (nos. 70–185) and her reunion with M. after the war (nos. 210–372). In the latter scenario there is a particular focus on M.’s violent seizure of H., followed by the dropping of his sword (nos. 260–77, all but one of which date from 470–400 BC: cf. Eur. *Andr.* 628–31). For a possible allusion to a feature of Eur.’s new H. myth in fourth-century art, see n. 328 below.

⁴⁷ Cf. Reckford (1964), Groten (1968), Kakridis (1971), Clader (1976) 5–23, Worman (2001).

⁴⁸ H.’s regret, self-condemnation, and disgust at her own behaviour help create an intriguing character, with a vivid interiority. The harshness of her insults (esp. in calling herself a ‘bitch’: 3.180, 6.344, 356; also *Od.* 4.145) contrasts with the poem’s generally positive picture of her as both repentant and sorrowful (cf. Graver (1995)).

Aphrodite's role does not exonerate H.; it is typically Greek to focus on the ramifications of an individual's actions,⁴⁹ and there is no doubt that H.'s leaving Sparta had terrible consequences. The issue of *how* willing H.'s elopement was is closely linked to the extent to which she can be blamed, which in turn is open to rhetorical debate and negotiation by humans, since the precise extent of divine influence is always unknowable.⁵⁰ Thus when Priam tells H. οὐ τί μοι αἰτία ἔσσι, θεοί νύ μοι αἴτιοί εἰσιν ('you are not at all to blame in my eyes, it is the gods who are to blame', 3.164), we have to take into account both the rhetorical function of his words (to comfort H.) and the fact that they do not annul the appropriateness of her own guilt and self-criticism (repeated by H. herself at 3.173–5). So, although H. is a sympathetic character in the *Iliad* (who feels regret and shame for her actions), this does not change the fact that she is to blame for the destruction of Troy (the same is true of Priam and Hector, who, although sympathetic figures, each make disastrous errors in the course of the poem).⁵¹ In addition to H.'s responsibility for what she has done, the *Iliad* also foregrounds H.'s remarkable self-awareness,⁵² both of her own part in the war and of her role within the wider plan of Zeus. Yet for all her good sense when compared to Paris, H.'s inability to deny her disastrous presence in Troy is decisive.

H. is no less an unsettling figure in the *Odyssey*, where the poet depicts her in a different setting (she is home once more and in apparent control of the domestic sphere)⁵³ but in a manner similar to the *Iliad* (focusing on H.'s intellectual superiority to M. rather than to Paris). For H.'s obvious power over M. – she is both cleverer and more impressive⁵⁴ – is (in terms of Greek cultural norms) disturbing, especially given the importance of the wife as the centre of the heroic quest in return songs (*nostoi*) such as the *Odyssey*.⁵⁵ The uneasy reunion of husband and wife is signalled most clearly by the juxtaposition of H. and M.'s contrasting tales of H.'s encounters with Odysseus at Troy (4.234–89). In H.'s account of her kindly reception of the disguised Odysseus, she presents herself as wholly delighted by the prospect of Troy's fall because (she claims) she wanted to return home to Sparta. By contrast, M.'s story presents a very different version of her loyalties, as H. attempts to expose the stratagem of the Greeks

⁴⁹ See Williams (1993).

⁵⁰ Cf. Scodel (2002) 112 'The auditor who knows many variants about Helen – some exculpating her, others blaming her – is ideal.'

⁵¹ On the issue of H.'s sense of responsibility see also p. 64 below.

⁵² Including the particular awareness of her lasting fame (3.125–8) and its dependence on poetry (6.357–8), an insight which, within the *Iliad* itself, points to Homer's own creative transformation of H. as a figure in the epic tradition, but which also underlines how H.'s reputation will be variously handled in subsequent versions of her tale.

⁵³ Dale (1967) vii describes H. as 'restored to domestic tranquillity' but this is to gloss over the various signs of unease at Sparta. This is, after all, a household that needs drugs (administered by H. herself) to forget its sorrows (cf. 4.219–32)!

⁵⁴ H. preempts the slow-witted M. in interpreting the bird-omen that appears as Telemachus departs from Sparta (15.169–81), and she knows the extra value her gift (a dress for Telemachus' bride) will have in comparison to M.'s because she gave it (cf. 15.125–7).

⁵⁵ For H. as (like her sister Clytemnestra) a foil to the faithful Penelope, see 11.436–9, 23.215–24.

by imitating the voices of the wives of the men hidden inside the Trojan Horse (it was only Odysseus' quick thinking in restraining the Greeks, M. says, that saved their lives). The audience is encouraged to compare the two stories and thus realize that H.'s defence should not be taken at face value.⁵⁶ Both H. and M. do their best to maintain the façade of a happy household,⁵⁷ but there are signs that H. retains the potential to upset the balance.⁵⁸

The cosmic significance of the war fought for H., though not absent from Homer (cf. esp. *Il.* 12.8–33), is handled more explicitly elsewhere in early Greek epic, where H.'s birth, marriage, and departure for Troy are presented as important stages in the destruction of the age of heroes (cf. Hes. *WD* 156–73, which views the wars at Thebes as well as Troy in this light; Sem. fr. 7.117–18 W). In the cyclic epic *Cypria*, Zeus brings about the Trojan War in order to relieve Earth of the excessive burden of mankind (fr. 1 Bernabé/Davies), and the war is prepared for both by the marriage of Thetis to a mortal (Pelcus) and by the birth of Zeus's daughter H. As in the myth of Pandora, the καλὸν κακόν (Hes. *Theog.* 585) fashioned by the gods to punish Prometheus' deception, H. is presented as a woman whose beauty is exploited by Zeus for his own ends, and whose creation leads to a world order which is the direct result of power politics among the Olympians.

H. thus functions in the *Cypria* as both a Pandora-like origin of evils for mankind and as an instrument of divine punishment, purposes which are emphasized by the circumstances of her birth, as she is made the offspring of Zeus and Nemesis (fr. 9 Bernabé = fr. 7 Davies; cf. 16–22n.). H.'s cosmic role is similarly to the fore in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, where Zeus's plan to destroy the race of heroes is furthered by H. as catalyst of the Trojan War. As befits the importance of H.'s marriage in the preparations for the war (the suitors swear an oath to pursue anyone who abducts H.), the poet includes an extensive catalogue of H.'s suitors (frs. 196–204 MW).⁵⁹ Like the *Cypria*, the *Catalogue* also integrates Achilles into its account of the war, since although he was too young to be one of the suitors (παῖδ' ἔτ' ἕον[τ], fr. 204.89 MW), he and H. are central agents of Zeus's plan to end the race of heroes.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ On M.'s rejection of H.'s self-justifying tale, cf. Zeitlin (1996) 409, Scodel (2002) 80. Eur. adapts the myth to express similar doubts about H.'s loyalties, as she reveals Odysseus' identity to Hecuba, thus forcing Odysseus to supplicate the Trojan queen for his life: *Hec.* 239–48.

⁵⁷ H. ends her speech with explicit flattery of M., 'my husband who lacks nothing in either wisdom or looks' (4.263–4), while M. suggests that H. must have been compelled to act as she did by some pro-Trojan god (4.274–5).

⁵⁸ M.'s tale not only undercuts H.'s, but also mentions Deiphobus, her second Trojan partner after Paris' death (4.276; cf. 8.517) – can she ever be trusted? In addition, Telemachus' visit to Sparta began with the double wedding of M.'s son and daughter. The son, significantly called Megapenthes, is M.'s by a slave woman, since the gods prevented H. from bearing him a second child after Hermione. The lack of a male heir underlines how far their union is from being successful (cf. 4.3–14).

⁵⁹ See West (1985) 114–19, Cingano (2005), esp. 124–7.

⁶⁰ According to Proclus' summary, the *Cypria* told how Achilles desired to see H., and the two were brought together at Troy by Aphrodite and Thetis (*Arg.* p. 42.59–60 Bernabé = 32.77–8 Davies). Although we do not know the details of this episode (cf. Burgess (2001) 169), one can

H. is an equally controversial figure in lyric poetry, where her actions and predicament provoke a range of approaches.⁶¹ Sappho fr. 16 V is especially interesting, since it combines sympathy for H.'s subjection to the all-conquering power of love (1–6)⁶² with condemnation of her error in abandoning her family (H.'s husband, daughter, and parents are all emphatically mentioned: 7–10).⁶³ The multifaceted presentation of H.'s conduct is matched by the movement of the poem itself, as the narrator begins by comparing her own love (for Anactoria) with that of H. for Paris, but ends by likening herself to those thoughtlessly left behind by H. (as the absent Anactoria has abandoned her).⁶⁴ The narrator's awareness (and exploitation) of the power of love does not free H. from blame, but by presenting her as 'led astray' (H. is the object of *παράγασθαι*, 11) the speaker implies that H.'s basic sense of duty to her family was upset by Aphrodite. Thus Sappho uses H.'s story in a strikingly complex (and Homeric) manner, and one can best appreciate the sophistication of her account if we set it against the less nuanced tradition of invective directed at H.

In Alcæus fr. 42 V, for example, the narrator contrasts a virtuous Thetis with a blameworthy and ruinous H. Whereas Thetis, a 'delicate maiden' (*πάρθενον ἄβραν*, 8), gave birth to a fine son, Achilles, H.'s evil deeds resulted not only in the death of heroes like Achilles but also in the destruction of the Trojans and their city (1–4, 15–16). In Alcæus fr. 283 V there is no female foil to H., but the effect is no less damning. The narrator focuses on H.'s crazed passion for the treacherous Paris (*Τροίω δ' [ὕ]π' ἀνδρος | ἐκμάνεισα ξ[εν]ναπάτα*, 4–5) and on the abandonment of her daughter and husband (7–8). The last two surviving stanzas dwell in moving and bloody detail on the death of Paris' young brothers in battle 'for that woman's sake' (*ἔν[ε]κα κήνας*, 14).⁶⁵ Such visions of H. as a figure of loathing and execration formed over time a tradition of blame poetry which poets could either renew (as they did in variously critical ways)⁶⁶ or react against. Stesichorus, as we shall see in §4(a), did both.

see why a poet might think of depicting an erotic encounter between the two main instruments of Zeus's will.

⁶¹ For an overview of H.'s appearances in early Greek lyric, cf. Homeyer (1977) 13–22; Segal (1998) offers more detailed treatment of Sappho, Alcæus, and Ibycus.

⁶² In a newly discovered poem of Sappho, the narrator is similarly sympathetic to the dawn-goddess's unconquerable love for Tithonus, since Tithonus is young and handsome, but also mortal and doomed to decrepitude: cf. West (2005) 3–6.

⁶³ Scholarship has tended to focus on whether Sappho means to censure or excuse H. (for extensive bibliography on both positions, see Fredricksmeyer (2001) 75 n. 3), while the narrator in fact exploits a range of responses to H. which are already found in Homer.

⁶⁴ Cf. also Macleod (1974) 217 'Sappho is compared to Helen because both prefer their beloved to all else, but so too is Anactoria because both she (in Sappho's eyes) and Helen are the most beautiful thing in the world (cf. 1–4, 6–7).'

⁶⁵ Pindar pictures the homes of the Trojans 'set on fire for H.'s sake' (*ἀμφ' Ἑλένας πυρωθέντας*, *Pyth.* 11.33).

⁶⁶ Ibycus, for example, foregrounds Aphrodite's role in causing the war, but also underlines the importance of the human agents, H. the 'fair-haired beauty' (cf. *Paeon* 6.95–8 *περὶ δ' ὑψικόμω | Ἑλένας χρῆν ἄρα Πέργαμον εὐρύν ἀίστωσαι | σέλας αἰθομένου | πυρός*) and Paris the 'host-deceiver' (S151.5–10 *PMGF*; cf. *Bacch. Dithyramb* 15.57–61 (entitled *Ἀντηνοριδαὶ ἢ Ἑλένης Ἀπαιτησις*) on Paris' disastrous *ὑβρις*). The paralysing effect of H.'s beauty was treated

(b) Cult

There is no explicit mention in Homer of H.'s future status as a goddess. However, M. is told by Proteus in the *Odyssey* that he will not die but be conveyed by the gods to the Elysian plain because he is married to H. and thus Zeus's son-in-law (4.561–9). This passage appears to foreshadow H.'s apotheosis, because M.'s enhanced status is entirely due to her (as in *Hel.*: cf. 1676–7n.), which strongly suggests that something exceptional will happen to H. herself.⁶⁷ Yet the *Odyssey* poet leaves open the possibilities of what exactly is going to happen, perhaps in order to encompass a broad range of precise local possibilities, since H., as we shall see, might be worshipped in different communities as a heroine or as a goddess (one might compare the places in which Achilles, for example, was worshipped as a hero, and how many places claimed his corpse). As a goddess H. received cult of various kinds in several places, but some aspects of her myth have been taken to point to her origin as a Minoan goddess of vegetation or as an Indo-European goddess and daughter of the Sun who is abducted as part of an agricultural myth resembling that of Persephone.⁶⁸ It must be stressed, however, that H.'s status as a vegetation goddess *per se* is never mentioned in connection with any attested cult.⁶⁹

The major centres of H.'s worship were at Sparta and Therapne in Laconia.⁷⁰ At Sparta H. appears to have been worshipped in the context of a plane-tree cult (Paus. 3.15.3),⁷¹ while she shared the shrine at Therapne with M. (and the Dioscuri: cf. Alc. fr. 7.6–13 *PMGF*).⁷² The Therapne shrine is one of the earliest attested

by both Ibycus (fr. 296 *PMGF*) and Stesichorus (fr. 201 *PMGF*), the former concentrating on M.'s particular inability to punish his alluring wife (he drops his sword), which became a recurrent reproach (the motif of H. baring her breasts to disarm M. first appears in Eur. *Andr.* 629–30; cf. Ar. *Lys.* 155–6).

⁶⁷ H.'s apotheosis and M.'s translation to Elysium might both be compared to Achilles' extraordinary fate, as told in the Cyclic *Aethiopis* (Arg. p. 69.20–2 Bernabé = 47.26 ff Davies), where Thetis snatches him from the pyre and takes him to the White Island in the Black Sea. Indeed, Pausanias records a tradition in which H. and Achilles enjoyed a blissful after-life together on that very island: 3.19.13.

⁶⁸ Cf. West (1975), Clader (1976) 63–83, Skutsch (1987), Puhvel (1987) 141–3.

⁶⁹ The Dioscuri are also said to resemble the Vedic brothers called the *Asvins*, but in the Greek version (if such it is – the meagre and disparate evidence does not prove a common source) of the (Indo-European) myth they are made brothers of H. rather than suitors of the sun god's daughter (cf. Skutsch (1987) 189, Puhvel (1987) 59–60).

⁷⁰ Cf. Wide (1893) 340–2, Farnell (1921) 322–5, Lyons (1997) 8–9, 45–6, and especially the detailed survey of H.'s myths and cult status, with particular reference to the 'Menelaion' at Therapne (one and a half miles south-east of Sparta), by Robert Parker (forthcoming).

⁷¹ H.'s Spartan plane-tree cult (whose origins are explained aetiologically by Theoc. 18.43–8) has a parallel in the temple to Ἐλένη Δενδρῆτις on Rhodes (Paus. 3.19.9–10 gives the aetiology of H. having been hanged on a tree there by Polyxo to avenge the death of her husband Telemachus at Troy); for the Rhodians' local traditions and their relation to wider epic patterns, see Higbie (2003) 218.

⁷² Calame (1997) 191–202 distinguishes sharply between the two cults, seeing H. as an adolescent and heroine in Sparta and as a married woman and goddess at Therapne, but one surviving source connects Therapne with maidens (Hesychius κ 675 κἀνάσθρα, which describes

heroic cults, revered from the eighth century onwards.⁷³ It is often referred to as the 'Menelaion', but this name is attested only in later sources (Polyb. 5.18.21, Paus. 3.19.9), and Herodotus speaks of the temple as H.'s (6.61.2–5).⁷⁴ H.'s role as an initiatory heroine and role model for young girls of marriageable age may be a local (and pro-Spartan) counterweight to her role as the canonical adulterous wife in the wider poetic tradition, but it was in any case well enough known in Athens for Aristophanes to evoke the cultic dances of Spartan maidens with H. herself as their chorus-leader (Ar. *Lys.* 1296–1321, esp. 1314–15 ἀγῆται δ' Ἀλῆδας παῖς | ἀγνὰ χορογὸς εὐπρεπῆς).⁷⁵ However, the traditional view that H. was a goddess in her own right throughout the Greek world must be treated with scepticism, since in truth (as Robert Parker shows in his forthcoming study of the 'Menelaion') it is only in association with the Dioscuri that her cult passes beyond Laconia to any significant extent.

H. was the recipient of cult in Attica. The sacrificial calendar of the eastern Attic deme of Thoricus records the offering of full-grown sheep to H. and the Dioscuri (the latter identified by their Athenian title of Anakes) on the grounds that 'when they invaded Attica [i.e. to rescue H. from Theseus] they harmed none of the people'.⁷⁶ H. was also linked with Aphidnae (north-east Attica) in the myth of her childhood abduction by Theseus, a story left undeveloped in Athenian literature as being critical of the idealized Athenian monarch;⁷⁷ Stesichorus, by contrast, makes Iphigenia the daughter of Theseus and H. (fr. 191 *PMGF*). Finally, although we cannot be sure if H. received divine or heroic cult in Attica,⁷⁸ the distinction between these two forms of worship is in any case not so rigid or important as was formerly thought, and *Helen* certainly looks forward to her worship as a goddess throughout Greece (1666–91).⁷⁹ An Athenian audience would thus have a multifaceted conception of H. (as of most other major hero(in)es presented in tragedy), combining her identity as a human

the special wickerwork wagon used by the *parthenoi* in their procession), while another celebrates H.'s wedding, i.e. transition to adulthood, but also links this to her tree-cult at Sparta (Theoc. *Idyll* 18.43–8): cf. Larson (1995) 80–1.

⁷³ Cf. Catling (1976) 90, Antonaccio (1995) 155–66, Whitley (2001) 153.

⁷⁴ H.'s prominent role in the joint cult with M. at Therapne is also suggested by the fact that of the dedications found there so far five (including the oldest, c. 600) are to H., while three are to M.: cf. West (1985) 157.

⁷⁵ Cf. 1465–71; Dillon (2002) 211–12.

⁷⁶ *SEG* 33 147.37–8, c. 430 BC: cf. Parker (2005) 65 n. 58, 72; 1666–91.

⁷⁷ Cf. Flower and Marincola (2002) 237–8 on Hdt. 9.73.

⁷⁸ Equal treatment with the Dioscuri at Thoricus may suggest divine honours there at least.

⁷⁹ Indeed, such concepts as 'divine versus heroic cult' (a distinction now exploded by Ekroth (2002) as far as sacrificial ritual is concerned) and 'faded goddess' (still applied to H., but already criticized by Farnell (1921) 323–4) may be little more than inherited lumber. In Greek myth the deification of such heroes as Heracles and H. is exceptional (and linked to their status both as children of Zeus and as instruments of his wider cosmic plans); yet one can imagine circumstances where the distinction between H.'s precise status as goddess or heroine would make little difference to the worshipper or petitioner (whether in Attica or elsewhere: cf. Hdt. 6.61.2–5). Isocrates' insistence that at Therapne H. and M. were sacrificed to 'not as to heroes but as to gods' (οὐχ ὡς ἥρωσιν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῖς, *Hdt.* 63) does point to a basic hierarchy of ritual, but one must also take into account Isocrates' aim of boosting H. as much as possible.

character in the diverse narratives of myth with her status in cult as an immortal goddess or one of the powerful dead.⁸⁰

3. HELEN ON STAGE

Fifth-century Attic drama engages with many of the central episodes in H.'s myth, ranging from her unusual birth,⁸¹ through her elopement (or abduction) from Sparta, to her eventual (and controversial) return to Greece. H. is rarely an on-stage character in surviving tragedy, and appears as such only in Eur. (*Tro.*, *Hel.*, *Or.*),⁸² but she is frequently referred to by other figures, most insistently in those plays dealing directly with the Trojan War and its aftermath (Aesch. *Ag.*, Eur. *Andr.*, *Hec.*, *El.*, *Tro.*, *IT*, *Hel.*, *Or.*, *Ll.*).⁸³ Given tragedy's focus on the suffering and losses of the Trojan War, it is hardly surprising that H. is generally presented in a negative light.⁸⁴ She is an ἀρχὴ κακῶν ('beginning of evils') because her elopement sparked the war, and as such she is hated by the Greeks⁸⁵ as much as the Trojans.⁸⁶ She is frequently vilified as a whore

⁸⁰ H.'s role as daughter of Nemesis was reflected in the colossal marble statue made for the goddess' shrine at Rhamnus in Attica by Agoracritus (active c. 440–400; Paus. 1.33.3); see 16–22n. Eur. has also incorporated H.'s connection to the Attic island named after her into his unconventional account of her role in the Trojan War (1670–5n.).

⁸¹ H.'s birth from an egg (Leda's in *Hel.*: cf. 257–9) attracted the comic imagination of Cratinus, who portrayed H. as the offspring of Nemesis (cf. *Nemesis* K-A iv frs. 114–15; Jouan (1966) 150–1 sees the egg as a symbol of the Peloponnesian War), while his *Dionysalexandros* (produced c. 430) had Dionysus (disguised as Paris) taking H. off to Troy. Eupolis is said to have called Aspasia 'Helen' in *The Prospaltians* (probably produced in the early 420s; cf. Storey (2003) 231). The comic poets Philyllius, Anaxandrides (both early fourth century), and Alexis (c. 375–275) all wrote plays entitled *Helen*, but we know nothing about their content.

⁸² She appeared in a fifth-century tragedy by Ion of Chios on Odysseus' secret expedition to Troy (*TrGF* i 19 F 43a–49a). Tragedies entitled *Helen* are ascribed to Theodectas and Diogenes (founder of the Cynic school of philosophy), who were both active in the first half of the fourth century BC (*TrGF* i 72 F 3, 88 F 1b).

⁸³ Although H. does not feature in the surviving tragedies of Sophocles, she almost certainly appeared in his *The Demand for Helen's Return* (frs. 176–80a Radt; cf. Bacchyl. *Dithyramb* 15). *The Rape of Helen* (*TrGF* iv pp. 180–1), and *Helen's Wedding* (frs. 181–4 Radt), which linguistic evidence suggests was a satyr-play (cf. Redondo (2003) 428).

⁸⁴ Typified by the ominous etymologizing of ἄγ ἕρο ἐλένας ἐλανδρος ἐλέπτολις ('hellish to ships, hellish to men, hellish to cities', trans. Collard (2002)). On the figure of H. in fifth-century tragedy and comedy, cf. Homeyer (1977) 22–37, Pallantza (2005) 265–75; for her deployment by Eur. in particular, see de Romilly (1988), Harder (1995), McClure (1999) 186–93, Lange (2002) 125–7, 174–87. Pace Pallantza (2005) 265, who overlooks the disquieting aspects of Homer's H., tragedy does not represent a 'radical change' in the presentation of H., but is simply more explicit and insistent in its depiction of H.'s errors and guilt.

⁸⁵ The Chorus of the *Agamemnon*, for example, see the aim of the war as 'to punish a woman' (γυναικοποιῶν | πολέμων ἀρωγᾶν, 225–6), but doubt whether she was worth the lives of so many Greek soldiers (cf. 62–7, 445–51, 799–801, 1455–61). The *Agamemnon* is remarkable for the extent to which (picking up on the *Odyssey*, where Agamemnon is presented as the victim of H. and Clytemnestra's wickedness: 11.435–9) it conflates H. with her sister, the murderous Clytemnestra, who is the very antithesis of the ideal Greek wife (cf. esp. 1448–67).

⁸⁶ Among many examples: Hecuba argues that H. (not her daughter Polyxena) should be sacrificed on the tomb of Achilles, since she caused his death no less than the Trojans (*Hec.*

who left Sparta willingly,⁸⁷ overcome by desire not only for Paris but also for barbarian luxury.⁸⁸ Yet, as in epic (*Little Iliad* fr. 19 Bernabé/Davies), H.'s extraordinary beauty gives her a hold over M. that prevents him from punishing her after the war has ended (cf. e.g. *Tro.* 901–2, 1033–1051, *IT* 521–6).

Tragedy's debt to epic is also evident in the complexity of H.'s situation, for despite the many criticisms made by both Greeks and Trojans, we are reminded that H. is not solely responsible for the war or the many disasters that followed in its wake. The myth of H.'s phantom double may represent the most extreme (and paradoxical) defence of her conduct, but even within the more canonical tradition, which asserts her actual presence at Troy, it is clear that the efforts of various characters to scapegoat H. do not succeed. This complexity is present even in such plays as *Trojan Women*, where scholars have too often assumed that Hecuba, the *mater dolorosa* of the Trojan War, wins her debate with 'the steely glamor-girl'⁸⁹ hands down. Yet although Hecuba is right to refute H.'s claim that she was merely the victim of an overpowering goddess (cf. 938–50, 983–90),⁹⁰ Hecuba cannot escape her own share of responsibility, since (in *Alexandros*, the first play of the trilogy) she and Priam took Paris back into the royal household, despite her dream that Paris would destroy Troy.⁹¹ Indeed, Hecuba's central role (via Paris) is pointed out not only by H. (919–20) but also by Andromache (597–8), while her attempt to deny that the Judgement of Paris ever took place clearly fails (969–82), since the audience are well aware of the divine background to the war (the play began with Athena freely admitting to Poseidon her former hatred of Troy: 48–66).⁹² This is not to deny that H.'s arguments are ruthlessly self-serving (as is Clytemnestra's defence of H. at *Ag.* 1462–7), but our lack of sympathy for the speaker does not mean that her position is wholly groundless.

Nevertheless, it remains the case that H. is generally a negative character in fifth-century tragedy (as Electra says of her in *Orestes*, produced four years after *Helen* in 408, ἔστι δ' ἡ πάλαι γυνή, 'She's still the same old Helen', 129), not simply because of

262 70); the Chorus of Trojan captives hope they will not be transported to Sparta, the hated home of H. (*Tro.* 210–13).

⁸⁷ Cf. e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 62 πολυάνορος ἀμφὶ γυναικός; 407–8 βεβάκει ῥίμφα διὰ | πυλᾶν, ἄτλητα τλάσσει; Eur. *El.* 1065 (Electra to Clytemnestra) ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀρπασθεῖσ' ἐκοῦσ' ἀπώλετο, *El.* 1027–8 (Clytemnestra herself complains of her sister's crimes) 'Ἐλένη μάργος ἦν ὁ τ' αὐτῶν | ἀλοχὸν κολάζειν προδότιν οὐκ ἠπίστατο (cf. *LI* 1202–5).

⁸⁸ E.g. *Tro.* 991–3 (Hecuba to H. on Paris) ὄν εἰσιδοῦσα βαρβάροις ἐσθήμασιν | χρυσῶι τε λαμπρὸν ἐξεμαργώθη φρένας.

⁸⁹ Stanford's ((1983) 59) description of H. in *Trojan Women* is typical insofar as it tells only one side of the story.

⁹⁰ M.'s attempt to excuse H. on similar grounds (*Andr.* 680 'Ἐλένη δ' ἐμόχθησ' οὐχ ἐκοῦσ' ἀλλ' ἐκ θεῶν) is no more convincing in its context.

⁹¹ Cf. Scodel (1980) 35–40, Cropp in Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 36–42.

⁹² The disjunction between human judgements of H.'s character and her place within the larger cosmic scheme is starkest in *Orestes*, where Pylades urges Orestes to blot out the shameful title of μητροφόντης by becoming 'Ἐλένης τῆς πολυκτόνου φονεὺς (1140–2), yet their attempt on H.'s life is thwarted as she is whisked away and made a goddess in accordance with Zeus's will (1494–7, 1629–42). It is a fundamental aspect of H.'s myth that no tradition records her being punished.

tragedy's generic focus on the sufferings of the Trojan War, but because H. combines within herself the qualities that make her, in a patriarchal society such as Athens, both hugely powerful (no woman is more desirable than she is) and utterly dangerous (she is an adulteress who repeatedly outwits her husband: §6(b)).

4. THE 'NEW' HELEN

Although the mythical tradition surrounding H. was predominantly critical, this also gave poets and other authors the opportunity to display their skills in relation (and reaction) to it. The boldest response was to deny that H. ever went to Troy at all, and this version was elaborated by various authors, each with their own particular nuance and purpose. Three accounts of this kind have survived (by Stesichorus, Herodotus, and Eur.), but we should be cautious in concluding that these were the only ones available or that they necessarily influenced each other. After all we possess only a few droplets from the large stream of Greek myth, and although it is tempting to make connections between them, we can never be sure if they are as significant as they seem. The same caveat applies to the question of innovation, for we cannot be certain that Stesichorus was the first to develop the myth in this way, or that Herodotus was the first to rationalize it, or that Stesichorus and Herodotus were the only 'sources' available to Eur.

In any case, while each of these versions of H.'s story is very different from the central tradition, it is clear that their 'new' H. is still anchored in traditional myth and that they are dealing with the same themes. This is not in itself surprising, since Greek myths are not only protean (to suit the needs and purposes of the ever-changing society that produces them), but also remarkably cohesive, as poets strive to integrate their innovations within a wider framework, thereby boosting the authority and credibility of their particular versions. The very unorthodoxy of the alternative H. (the heroine is an exemplary wife, not an adulteress; she went to Egypt, not to Troy; etc.) has often obscured the pervasive continuity that exists between the 'new' versions and the canonical tradition they depart from. Yet such creative intertextuality is fundamental to Greek myth and thus to Greek poetry of all periods. The striking effects of Eur.'s H. therefore become clearer not only when we consider her peculiarity within tragedy, but also when we appreciate the ways in which her 'new' story skillfully transforms and supplants earlier currents of literature and myth.

(a) *Stesichorus*

Stesichorus, who was active in the first half of the sixth century, is said to have written among other poems a *Helen*, a *Wooden Horse*, a *Sack of Troy (Iliupersis)*, a *Homecomings (Nostoi)*, and an *Oresteia*. Although we cannot be sure that these titles were given by the poet himself,⁹³ they must be representative of the poems' content, and thus point to

⁹³ This caveat applies to all early Greek poetry: Nachmanson (1941). The titles of Greek drama, by contrast, are likely to stem from the poets themselves: cf. Sommerstein (2002).

Stesichorus' repeated engagement with the story of the Trojan War and its aftermath. H. is mentioned in the surviving fragments of the *Sack of Troy* (S 103.5 6 *PMGF*: ξ|ανθά δ' Ἑλένα Πρ[ιάμου | βα]σιλῆος αἰίδιμος), but it is the work allegedly named after her (frs. 187–91 *PMGF*) which most concerns us here, since it seems to have depicted the kind of traditional (i.e. adulterous) H. to which the so-called *Palinode* (discussed below) is such a striking reaction. (Indeed, as we shall see, the works later referred to as the *Helen* and the *Palinode* are probably parts of one single poem on H.) Moreover, Stesichorus' reputation as the 'most Homeric' of poets (whether in subject-matter, metre, or style: cf. τβ 5–18 *PMGF*) makes his anti-Homeric H. all the more conspicuous.

The so-called *Palinode* of Stesichorus constitutes one of the most radical and revealing examples of myth revision in early Greek poetry. Our earliest sources for the work, Plato and Isocrates, not only quote three lines of the poem but also offer a fascinating account of its genesis. Having delivered a speech on love, which he fears insulted the god Eros, Plato's Socrates insists that he should imitate Stesichorus, who recanted his earlier slander of H. (Pl. *Phaedr.* 243a–b = fr. 192 *PMGF*):

For those who offend in their telling of myths there is an ancient mode of purification, known not to Homer but to Stesichorus. For when he was blinded because of his defamation of Helen, he was not, like Homer, unaware of the reason, but being a Muse-inspired poet he understood the cause and at once wrote:

'It is not true, this account:
You did not go on well-benched ships,
Nor did you reach the towers of Troy.'⁹⁴

And having completed all of his so-called *Palinode*, he immediately regained his sight.

Isocrates, like Plato, presents Stesichorus composing his *Palinode* in reaction to a previous poem of his own which offended H. (Isoc. *Hel.* 64 = fr. 192 *PMGF*)

She (Helen) demonstrated her power to the poet Stesichorus as well: for after he had said something insulting about her at the beginning of his song, he stood up deprived of his sight; but when he had realized the cause of his misfortune and had written the so-called *Palinode*, she restored him to his former condition.

The manner in which the three lines of the *Palinode* are cited by Plato strongly implies that they give the essential thrust of the poem (or at least that part of it which contained the 'new' H.), which was to deny outright the traditional account of H.'s journey to Troy.⁹⁵ The triple negatives (οὐκ . . . οὐδ' . . . οὐδ') make for an arresting introduction to the poet's unfamiliar tale.

⁹⁴ οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος, | οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν εὐστέλμοις | οὐδ' ἴκεο πέργαμα Τροίας.

⁹⁵ The argument of Wright (2005) 86–110 that Plato's quotation is a fake and that Stesichorus did not overturn the traditional account of H.'s conduct and location is ingenious, but overly so. Some of the later sources for the *Palinode(s)* are contradictory, but this need not compel us to reject the evidence of Plato and Isocrates.

However, these are not likely to be the opening lines of the poem, since the phrase ‘all of his so-called *Palinode*’ (πᾶσαν τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωιδίαν) implies that the narrator went blind in a separate part of the poem, which in turn suggests that the quoted lines were *prefaced* by a reference to the poet’s previous offence and subsequent blindness. We may therefore posit a work with two sections,⁹⁶ the first proemic and partly in the first person, wherein the poet outlined his earlier (traditional) account of H.’s life (perhaps dealing with her birth and marriage)⁹⁷ and dwelt on its disastrous consequences for himself, the second devoted (largely in the third person) to the ‘new’ H. of his revised tale, beginning with the (in Plato’s time) famous words οὐκ ἔστ’ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος κτλ. Moreover, the narrator’s bold reformation of traditional (Homeric) myth is underlined by his agonistic use of the blindness motif, whose purpose is to show that he (Stesichorus) is a better poet than Homer (the famous blind bard) because he can learn from his error, sing a new version of H.’s story, and recover his sight in the process.⁹⁸

Two of the most striking features of Eur.’s plot – H.’s presence in Egypt and her phantom double’s at Troy – seem to have been part of Stesichorus’ account. Our earliest evidence linking Stesichorus with the phantom H. comes again from Plato, whose Socrates compares the multitude’s senseless pursuit of illusory pleasures with the warriors’ battle for H.’s phantom at Troy in ignorance of the truth (ὥσπερ τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης εἰδωλον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Τροίᾳ Στησίχορός φησι γενέσθαι περιμάχητον ἀγνοοῖαι τοῦ ἀληθοῦς, Pl. *Rep.* 586c).⁹⁹ Since Stesichorus does not deny that the Trojan War actually took place,¹⁰⁰ he still needs to explain why the war was fought despite H.’s absence from Troy (οὐδ’ ἴκεο πέργῃ Τροίας, as he says to H.). Given the presence in epic of other phantom doubles, one can see how Stesichorus (or a predecessor) may have come up with the idea for H.’s.¹⁰¹ Indeed, the depiction of the phantom Aeneas created by Apollo in the *Iliad* resonates most tellingly with that of H. (*Il.* 5.445–53).

⁹⁶ For reconstruction of Stesichorus’ poem along the following lines, see the brilliant study by Kelly (2007).

⁹⁷ We know that H.’s marriage was treated by Stesichorus in a work later called the *Helen* (cf. frs. 187, 189–90 *PMGF*); but as Kelly (2007) has shown, the evidence suggests that this was in fact the first part of the same poem as the *Palinode*.

⁹⁸ The connection between blindness and poetic skill is traditional (cf. Garvie (1994) 250–1 on *Od.* 8.63–4, where we are told that the Muse blinded Democloos when she gave him the gift of song), as is the motif of the singer being stripped of his poetic skill as a result of an offence to the gods (cf. *Il.* 2.591–600, where the Muses punish Thamyris). Stesichorus has deployed a skilful variation on both themes in which the punishment of blindness prompts him to compose a ‘better’ song and thereby win back his sight.

⁹⁹ Wright (2005) 107 n. 146 abolishes this evidence for Stesichorus’ εἰδωλον of H. by claiming that it is ‘really a ludic reference to his [Plato’s] own argument – and the Stesichorean forgery – in the *Phaedrus*’. This is, however, special pleading, necessitated by Wright’s overly sceptical attitude to the Stesichorean tradition.

¹⁰⁰ The Trojan War is spectacularly denied in Dio Chrysostom’s display-speech, the *Trojan Oration* (*Dio Chrys.* 11), written in the late first/early second c. AD.

¹⁰¹ Cf. the εἰδωλον of Iphimede at [Hes.] *Cat.* fr. 23(a).21 M-W; the evidence that Hesiod himself invented the phantom H. is dubious (fr. 358 M-W). For a fascinating study of the Doppelgänger motif in the western literary tradition, see Frenzel (1999) 94–113 (99 on Stesichorus and Eur. *Helen*).

During his *aristeia* Diomedes bows to Apollo's warning and ceases from attacking the wounded Aeneas. Apollo then removes Aeneas to his shrine in Troy (where he is healed by Leto and Artemis), but leaves the warrior's εἶδωλον on the battlefield so that *the Trojans and Achaeans fight over it* (cf. 5.451f. ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' εἰδῶλωι Τρῶες καὶ δῖοι Ἀχαιοὶ | δήϊου κτλ). Thus the idea of a phantom double as something to be fought over is not new in Stesichorus, and although the basic motif of the εἶδωλον as a source of strife is elaborated (in the case of H.) far beyond the Homeric examples, it is clear that Stesichorus (or his predecessor) is dressing his innovation in Homeric garb (in itself a typical poetic technique: cf. e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 6.28–43, where Pindar's version of Antilochus' death has been influenced by the Iliadic account of Nestor's rescue by Diomedes (*Il.* 8.80–117)).¹⁰²

Furthermore, if, as seems likely, Stesichorus' H. went to Egypt rather than to Troy,¹⁰³ this innovation (like H.'s phantom) has not been conjured *ex nihilo* but represents a skilful variation on epic tradition. For in both the *Odyssey* and the cyclic epic *Nostoi* M. and H. are blown off course by a storm on their return from Troy and land in Egypt.¹⁰⁴ Stesichorus (or a predecessor) may thus have adapted the epic narrative in much the same way as Eur., so that M.'s detour via Egypt after the war reunited him with the real H. In any case, the Stesichorean H.'s stay with Proteus would represent not only a further transformation of a familiar Homeric episode,¹⁰⁵ but also a clear precedent for Eur.'s treatment of H.'s stay in Egypt (though Eur. has naturally altered the figure of Proteus yet again to suit his own version of the myth).¹⁰⁶

In conclusion, Stesichorus' poem represents a daring revision of the H. myth, which reacts against the purely negative view of H. as a Pandora-like origin of evils (seen in the *Cypria*). Moreover, it emphasizes the change by incorporating (to follow our reconstruction above) the more critical version of H.'s conduct in its opening section, which in turn triggers the so-called *Palinode*. Yet Stesichorus' new version is still made up of traditional epic motifs (H. as a καλὸν κακόν and cause of war; fighting over a woman; the phantom double) and he is (like Eur. after him) essentially picking up on a tension inherent in Homeric myth (where H. is presented as a more positive figure than in the *Cypria*) and taking it a stage further.¹⁰⁷ A comparison of H.'s story in Homer, Stesichorus, and Euripides shows all three elaborating on a variety

¹⁰² Cf. Kelly (2006) 13–24, who cites further Pindaric examples.

¹⁰³ Cf. fr. 193 *PMGF* (*P. Oxy.* 2506): αὐτὸς δ' ἐφησ[ιν δ] Στησίχορο[ς] τὸ μὲν εἶδωλον ἐλθεῖν ἐς Τροίαν τὴν δ' Ἑλένην π[αρά] τῷ Πρωτεῖ καταμεῖν[αι].

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *Od.* 3.276–300, *Nostoi* Arg. p. 94.6–7 Bernabè (= 67.9–11 Davies).

¹⁰⁵ M.'s encounter in Egypt with Proteus, the prophetic and shape-shifting old man of the sea, described in *Od.* 4.351–569, formed the basis of Aeschylus' satyr-play *Proteus*; M.'s uncertain fate is foreshadowed earlier in the *Oresteia* (cf. *Ag.* 617–35, 674–9, *Cho.* 1040–1). However, the suggestion of Cunningham (1994) that the *Proteus* also included the story of H.'s εἶδωλον is not supported by the surviving evidence (frs. 210–115 Radt).

¹⁰⁶ If Stesichorus' οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν ἔυσσέλμοις suggests that his H. did not board any ship (not just the ship going to Troy), his narrative presumably involved H.'s conveyance to Egypt by the gods (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 44–6), which is in any case likely given the necessity of divine involvement in the creation of the εἶδωλον itself.

¹⁰⁷ Stesichorus' rehabilitation of H. is often traced to the poet's desire to please his hosts and audiences either in Sparta or in the Dorian colonies of Magna Graecia where H. was worshipped

of traditional motifs and pushing them in new directions. In short, there is a basic continuity between what all poets – epic, lyric, and tragic – are doing, and the various stories of H. which they tell embody that continuity.

(b) *Herodotus*

Herodotus (like Stesichorus) endorses a version of H.'s myth in which she ends up with Proteus in Egypt rather than at Troy (Hdt. 2.112–20). However, whereas Stesichorus' revised account was intended to exonerate H., Herodotus accepts her adulterous liaison with Paris (cf. 2.114.2) and uses it as the basis for a radical reinterpretation of events at Troy, where the Greeks are presented destroying the city (in accordance with the will of the gods: cf. 2.120.5)¹⁰⁸ despite the fact that the Trojans were telling the truth when they said H. was not in their possession. Herodotus introduces his very un-Homeric account of the Greek past while discussing the sacred precinct of the Egyptian king Proteus at Memphis; for, he says, the king's precinct also contains a temple built in honour of H. (2.112.2).¹⁰⁹ In response to Herodotus' questions, the priests at Memphis tell him how Paris and H. had been blown off course by a storm to Egypt, coming ashore at the Canopic mouth of the Nile; Thonis, the warden of that area, reported Paris' abduction of H. to Proteus at Memphis (c. 120 miles south of the Mediterranean coast), who confiscated both H. and the treasures Paris had stolen from Sparta; Paris was allowed to return to Troy empty-handed, but the Greeks destroyed the city in ignorance of the truth, and only after H. could not be found did the Greeks believe the Trojans' explanation and send M. to Proteus in Egypt.

Unlike Stesichorus (and Eur.), Herodotus has H. being detained in Egypt *on the way to Troy*, so that his narrative makes no attempt to exculpate H.¹¹⁰ Related to this is the second major difference from Stesichorus' (and Eur.'s) version, namely: the absence of any mention by Herodotus of H.'s εἶδωλον. Though we cannot be certain that Herodotus knew Stesichorus' poem, it is quite certain that he did not invent the story

as a goddess (e.g. Kannicht (1969) 1.37–8, Burkert (2001) 210, Pallantza (2005) 112–18). This is an attractive explanation, yet it is also possible that Stesichorus arrived at his version without any explicit political or religious motivation, but rather by a process of poetic competition, wherein his narrative persona engaged agonistically with the Homeric tradition (and the blind bard himself) and created a radically different view of H.

¹⁰⁸ This passage (2.120.5) is often taken to refer to divine punishment of the Greeks. The phrase πανωλεθρίη ἀπολόμενοι, however, refers primarily to the Trojans, and Herodotus has already stressed the transgressiveness of Paris' behaviour (cf. 115.4–6, esp. Proteus' ὦ κάκιστε ἄνδρῶν), making it clear that the Trojans suffer because of his misdeed (the rape of H.), an event that is basic even to Herodotus' otherwise atypical account of the war.

¹⁰⁹ Herodotus' identification of the 'foreign Aphrodite' (= Astarte), the temple's ostensible honorand, with H. is rendered plausible (for Hdt. and his Greek audience) by H.'s association with desire, especially sexual desire (cf. Hdt. 1.3 on Paris' rape of H.). Plutarch speaks of honours still being paid to H. and M. in Egypt (*The Malice of Herodotus* 857b). Harrison (2000) 214 notes that only here 'does Herodotus present an equation overtly as his own innovation'.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Hdt. 1.4.2 on the Persians' assumption (shared by most Greek men) that no young woman gets abducted unless she wants to be. Herodotus' catalogue of kidnapped women (Io, Europa, Medea, H.) constitutes in itself a whole series of rationalized myths (1.1–5).

of H.'s failure to go to Troy. Moreover, the Stesichorean motif of H.'s sojourn with Proteus is also present in Herodotus' narrative (Herodotus says that he had heard of H.'s time at the court of Proteus *before* he questioned the Egyptian priests about her: 2.112.2), so that the historian faces the same task (as did Stesichorus) of explaining why the Trojan War was fought despite H.'s absence from Troy. The reasons for the absence of the εἰδῶλον from Herodotus' account (assuming that he knew of it)¹¹¹ are threefold: (i) Herodotus is dealing with the traditional figure of the adulterous H., and so it is Homer (rather than Stesichorus) who is the main 'target' of his historical corrections, so that any mention of the εἰδῶλον would be out of place; (ii) Herodotus' rationalizing version of the past is directed to explaining why the Trojans did not return H. (for, he reasons, surely they would have done so, faced with such heavy losses and the threat of complete destruction: 2.120.1–3),¹¹² and again the presence of H. (whether real or phantom) at Troy would destroy Herodotus' argument; (iii) an εἰδῶλον, manufactured by the gods, is not in the spirit of rational explanation that Herodotus attributes to his sources (one might compare, for example, the way he dispenses with Gyges' magical ring: 1.8–14; cf. *Pl. Rep.* 359d–360b).

Herodotus rationalizes Homer in the sense that he (like Thucydides) views Homeric epic as a kind of poeticized fact-book which he can treat as a source for the past, but one that is distorted, since poets (as everyone knew) also exaggerate and lie (cf. c.g. Solon fr. 29 *W* πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἄοιδοι).¹¹³ Thus one of Herodotus' tasks as a historian is to strip away the distortions and errors of poets, creating a more truthful and authoritative version of the past.¹¹⁴ Indeed, Herodotus alleges that Homer himself knew of H.'s sojourn with Proteus (in the form given by the Egyptian priests) but chose to suppress it as being 'not so well-suited to the composition of epic poetry as the one he actually used' (2.116.1). However, the Homeric passages that Herodotus cites as evidence of this theory (*Il.* 6.289–92, *Od.* 4.227–30, 4.351–2) merely show that Homer presented H. going via Phoenicia on her way to Troy with Paris, and via Egypt on her way back to Greece with M. Moreover, Herodotus' own version of H.'s stay in Egypt shows the historian refiguring traditional tales just as readily as

¹¹¹ Stesichorus' poetry was presumably well known in Athens, even if it is disdained as old-fashioned in fifth-century Athenian comedy: cf. Storey (2003) 178–9, 322, 332.

¹¹² On Herodotus' argument here from what is likely (*eikos*) and this method's philosophical/rationalistic background, see Thomas (2000) 168 with n. 1. Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 4.16.5 offers a more cynical explanation: the Greeks, Achilles reports, having learned of H.'s abduction to Egypt, fought on regardless 'so as not to leave in disgrace' (ὡς μὴ αἰσχρῶς ἀπέλθοιμεν!).

¹¹³ Thucydides' rejection of τὸ μυθῶδες (1.21–2) is an essential part of his application of critical reason to the past (and his sources for it, including Homer: cf. 1.10.3 on Homer's poetic tendency to exaggerate).

¹¹⁴ Herodotus clearly believes his version of H.'s story to be an 'improvement' on the epic tradition of the Trojan War. However, Herodotus' reason for believing that Homer's version is inferior to that of the Egyptian priests (i.e. the Trojans, and Priam in particular, would surely have handed H. over) depends upon an over-simple reading of the *Iliad* itself, since Priam's mistaken decision not to return H. after the duel between M. and Paris (an error admitted by the Trojans themselves: esp. *Il.* 7.350–3, 389–93) is an important factor in the poem's account of Troy's destruction: cf. Allan (2006) 3–8.

Homer, Stesichorus, or Eur. Thus Homer's H. acquires her sorrow-banishing drugs in Egypt from the wife of Thon (Θῶνος παράκοιτις, *Od.* 4.228), whereas Thonis in Herodotus is an Egyptian official who informs Proteus of Paris' crime (2.114.1–2). We do not know if Thonis had already featured in Stesichorus, as did Proteus the king of Egypt (contrast the *Odyssey's* Proteus, a shape-shifting master of seals), but Herodotus is in any case drawing on (and reshaping) a variety of mythographical sources.¹⁵

(c) *Euripides*

The ways in which Eur. engages with the mythical past are very much like those of his poetic predecessors. For like other poets he took the traditional tales of his culture and articulated them afresh to suit both his own dramatic purposes and the expectations and preferences of his audience.¹⁶ As often in the study of Euripidean theatre, however, the Aristophanic picture of Eur. the dangerous and iconoclastic innovator (see §7 below) has blinded many critics to the fundamental continuities that exist between Eur. and other poets, so that he is often presented as being more extreme or otherwise atypical in his attempts at mythical innovation. Yet every treatment of every myth in Greek literature before Eur. is new in some sense, and although not all treatments of myth constitute as radical a revision as Stesichorus' poem about H., no two poets tell the same myth the same way.¹⁷ Thus Eur. himself adds to the Stesichorean tale of H.'s εἶδωλον, and though he innovates in various respects (as with the introduction of Theonoe and Theoclymenus, for example), he generates his new H. as much from the novel combination of pre-existing story-patterns and motifs (especially, as we shall see, elements drawn from the *Odyssey*) as from outright innovation.¹⁸

¹⁵ Unlike Herodotus, Hecataeus (*floruit* 499–4 BC) and Hellanicus (c. 480–395 BC) follow Homer in having H. blown off course to Egypt on the way back from Troy with M.: Hecataeus *FGHst* 1 F 307–9, Hellanicus *FGHst* 1v F 153. Interestingly, Hecataeus presents the couple staying with king Thon in the city of Thonis, while Hellanicus describes how the king himself (called Thonis) tried to rape H. and was killed by M. It is not possible to say whether Hellanicus' tale of H.'s near rape by the Egyptian king preceded or followed Eur.'s depiction of the lustful Theoclymenus in *Helen* (412 BC); in any case it is clearly (like Eur.'s) a variation on the story of Paris at Sparta, since Thonis (now host rather than guest) abuses the protocols of ξενία by approaching H. while M. is absent.

¹⁶ For a brief introduction to the techniques of mythical innovation used in tragedy (introducing a new character into an established plot, inserting new episodes into an established narrative framework, etc.), see Anderson (2005) 130–3; for Eur. in particular, cf. Stephanopoulos (1980) 21–41.

¹⁷ Thus poets can use the 'same' myth, but produce very different plots: cf. e.g. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 52 and 59 on the Philoctetes plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; or the same dramatists' extant tragedies dealing with the murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus.

¹⁸ Of course the audience did not need to know Stesichorus' poem in order to appreciate Eur.'s new version. For even if the *details* of specific myths were known to only a few spectators (as Arist. *Poet.* 1451b25–6 claims), all will have known of the Trojan War (a cataclysmic event for the generation of ἡμῶν, ending the 'heroic time' of Greek myth itself: cf. Hes. *HD* 156–65, *Hdt.* 3.122.2) and of H.'s traditional role in it.

Mythical innovation and even explicit disagreement with previous versions are standard features of Greek poetry: one thinks of Pindar's remoulding of the story of Pelops (where Pelops is kidnapped by Poseidon, who fell in love with him, rather than dismembered, partially eaten, and resurrected by the gods) and the poet's declaration, *υιὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι* (*Ol.* 1.36), yet no-one is tempted (in the spirit of Aristophanes' caricature of Eur.) to call Pindar a renegade. Like Pindar (and Aeschylus and Sophocles . . .), Eur.'s task is to create a new angle on a familiar story – in fact even the myth of H.'s phantom double may not have been as unfamiliar to an Athenian audience as it seems.¹¹⁹ So in *Orestes*, for example, Eur. adds the figure of Tyndareos (absent from the other surviving matricide plays) so that the audience can see the killing from his perspective, thereby adding the viewpoint of Clytemnestra's vindictive father to the more familiar one of her own guilt-ridden children.

Even when doing something radically novel (as in the example of Pindar's Pelops), the poet remains aware that the audience must be able to link his new version with the accounts they already know.¹²⁰ This can be seen most strikingly in the grave-offerings scene in Euripides' *Electra* (487–584), where (despite the speculations of some modern critics) Eur. is not debunking the myth in a sophistic or rationalistic spirit, but rather incorporating a traditional element (the siblings' recognition-tokens – that is, something an experienced audience of tragedy, or someone familiar with the myth, would look out for)¹²¹ and *recreating* it, so that it generates *new* meaning in context. Thus *Electra* gets the tokens all wrong and the recognition is achieved by the even more heroic symbol of Orestes' Odyssean scar (*El.* 572–5; cf. *Od.* 21.217–25). Far from launching a caustic or parodic 'challenge' to his predecessors (especially Aeschylus), Eur. is rather deploying a typical poetic technique – namely, appropriating a well-known version and then capping it with his own variation or addition – in a particularly overt way, and so advertising his poetic skill as he carves out something new¹²² from a combination of traditional scenes and motifs (cf. 255–66, 1055–6nn.).¹²³

¹¹⁹ At the close of Eur.'s *Electra* Castor refers very briefly to the innocent H.'s sojourn with Proteus in Egypt, the εἰδωλον's presence at Troy, and H.'s function as part of Zeus's plan for the Trojan War (Πρωτέως γὰρ ἐκ δόμων | ἤκει λιποῦσ' Αἴγυπτον οὐδ' ἤλθεν Φρύγας; | Ζεὺς δ' ὡς ἔρις γένοιτο καὶ φόνος βροτῶν, | εἰδωλον Ἑλένης ἐξέπευψ' ἐς Ἴλιον, 1280–3). The fact that the audience is expected to make sense of such an allusive summary suggests that stories of H.'s phantom and time in Egypt were fairly well known in Athens (the manner in which Plato cites Siesichorus' poem also supports this). Such tales will always have been unconventional (H. elopes to Troy in most versions), but they need not have been as rare as our sources suggest, since (as was noted above) only a fraction of myths and their versions have survived.

¹²⁰ Cf. Mastronarde (2002) 56 'The poets made their innovations more satisfying and "convincing" by interlocking them with mythic events and details known from previous sources.'

¹²¹ The lock of hair as a token of recognition is said to have been taken by Aeschylus himself from Siesichorus (*Cho.* 164–204); cf. Stes. fr. 217 *PMGF*.

¹²² Central to Eur.'s version is the contrast between a cautious Odysseus-like Orestes and an *Electra* whose daily humiliations have made her both obsessively resentful and impatient for heroic vengeance.

¹²³ Though Agathon's *Antheus* (*TrGF* 1 pp. 161–2) with its totally invented plot and characters 'pleases no less' (according to Arist. *Poet.* 1451b23), it proved to be an unusual experiment, and

Turning to *Helen*, we can see that its novel plot is generated in the same traditional way. For, as we have observed, H. had been associated with Egypt, Proteus, and her phantom double long before Eur., and these are the basic elements from which his play is constructed. Yet one cannot simply say that while these features are inherited, the rest of the plot is pure invention, because (i) Eur. (like Stesichorus and Herodotus before him) introduces his own variations on these inherited features, so that, for example, Egypt becomes a place of danger rather than a refuge; and (ii) much of the 'invented' plot is elaborated along familiar lines: thus M. relives many episodes from the *Odyssey* (see further below), while H. replays the experience of her courtship by a barbarian, but this time manages to resist him successfully. And since the tragedians (no less than other poets) regularly generate new plots by replicating patterns in the inherited myth,¹²⁴ one can appreciate Eur.'s decision to shape the story of his unconventional H. simply by extending the most familiar feature of her myth, namely M.'s struggle to free her from a lover (or, in Theoc.'s case, a would-be lover) in a foreign land.

Although there is no way of proving Eur.'s debt to Stesichorus, some influence seems likely, since two of the most prominent aspects of Stesichorus' tale, the εἶδωλον and the virtuous Proteus, are central to Eur.'s version too. Yet simply to call Eur.'s play 'a staging of Stesichorus' *Palinode*'¹²⁵ would be no less misleading than to describe it as a 'synthesis' of Stesichorus and Herodotus.¹²⁶ For quite apart from the fact that we cannot be sure Stesichorus and Herodotus were the only precedents known to Eur.,¹²⁷ each of these formulations seriously neglects the extent to which Eur.'s version goes beyond theirs, not least in the introduction of Theoc. and Theonoe. Moreover, even if we accept that the Stesichorean tale of H.'s εἶδωλον provided the basic raw material for Eur.'s play, we must not underestimate the extent to which Eur.'s elaboration of the myth is indebted to even older (epic) models.¹²⁸ For just as Eur. responds to myth elsewhere in a Homeric (rather than a Herodotean or rationalizing) way, so in *Helen* he puts a non-Homeric – and even anti-Homeric – episode in Homeric clothing. This transformation of the epic past is a natural result

later (fourth-century) tragedy remained essentially mythological, deploying the same traditional material and methods of combination (to judge from the few surviving fragments: cf. Nanthakis-Karamanos (1980)). The very fact that the same titles recur repeatedly in Attic tragedy (cf. Burian (1997a) 184) suggests that the poets were returning again and again to familiar stories, but handling them in new ways.

¹²⁴ One might compare, for example, Eur.'s version of Iphigenia's fate in the *IT*: what appears at first sight to be a total reversal of tragic tradition (Iphigenia does not die at Aulis: cf. e.g. *Ag.* 228–47) is in fact a novel extension of elements already present in her myth, as Iphigenia (who had been offered up to Artemis by Agamemnon) survives to become the priestess of an Artemis cult that practises human sacrifice.

¹²⁵ Gumpert (2001) 52. ¹²⁶ Cf. Austin (1994) 137 n. 1.

¹²⁷ Herodotus was well known in Athens from public performances of his work in the third quarter of the fifth century: cf. Olson (2002) liii–liv, Hornblower (1996) 19–38, 122–45. For Hdt. 4.102 as the likely source of Eur.'s account of Taurian customs in *IT*, see Cropp (2000) 45.

¹²⁸ Thus in the 'invention' of Theoc. and Theonoe, for example, Eur. is clearly adapting features of the Homeric tale of Proteus and his daughter Eidothea, where the Egyptian figures are variously threatening and helpful and both are associated with prophecy (*Od.* 4.351–569): cf. 4–15, 10–11nn.

of the poetic technique discussed above, wherein each poet takes elements from the myths known to him and reconstructs something *credible*. For *verifiability* is an important issue in Greek myth-making (the poet cannot innovate arbitrarily, but must take care to integrate his changes within the accounts already familiar to his audience) and the best way to deal with the challenge of verifiability is to make what is new look rather old – hence the importance of the epic tradition in the generation of tragic plots.

One of the most pervasive (and productive) epic patterns at work in *Helen* is that of the heroic *nostos* or return-story. As has long been recognized, M.'s eventful homecoming is modelled on that of Odysseus in a variety of ways.¹²⁹ But it is also important to emphasize that M. is already cast in this way in the *Odyssey* itself – where, like Odysseus, M. is stranded on a distant island (Pharos), helped by a goddess (Eidothea), hides himself with the aid of an animal (seal-skins), has to dissemble and endure, and is delayed in his return by neglect towards the gods (cf. *Od.* 4.351–480) – so that Eur. is essentially expanding an analogy which is already present in epic. Indeed, we can see this technique operating with particular effectiveness in H.'s scene with Teucer (68–163). For just as M.'s tale in *Od.* 4 is a precursor to Odysseus' in *Od.* 9–12, so Teucer's story of the war and its terrible aftermath is a structural precursor to that of M. In other words, Teucer functions as a 'pre-echo'¹³⁰ of M. within the play, but one whose *failure* to achieve his desired homecoming (cf. 90–104) contrasts with the eventual return of M. and H. to Sparta. Eur. thus draws attention to his own skill in shaping the myth along Homeric lines even as he plays with the Homeric model, since in Eur.'s version (as opposed to the *Odyssey*) it is Teucer rather than M. who gets to Egypt first, and Teucer who provides H. with an account of what has happened to M. since the fall of Troy (as M. and H. do of Odysseus when questioned by Telemachus: *Od.* 4.240–89, 551–60).

Significantly for the characterization of M., Eur. also reworks the epic pattern in which M. is depicted as a lesser version of Odysseus. For both heroes are cast ashore as naked shipwrecks, but instead of meeting the nubile and (eventually) welcoming Nausicaa, who instructs Odysseus on how to reach her father's palace (*Od.* 6.289–315), M. is confronted by a grumpy old woman who refuses his repeated requests for hospitality (435–82n.). This epic diminution of M. is carried through further in his intellectual inferiority to H. (cf. 1049n.), which is (as we saw: p. 11) such a striking feature of the couple's presentation in the *Odyssey*. Moreover, in line with the final phase of the *nostos* story-pattern (where the hero defeats his enemies and regains his wife and kingdom), Eur. adapts the basic plot of Odyssean disguise and deception, but relocates it to Egypt and stages the recognition of husband and wife *before* the defeat of the wife's new suitor (contrast the *Odyssey*, where the recognition-scene between Odysseus and Penelope comes after the killing of the suitors). This reversal underlines the initiative and cleverness of H., without whose help the slow-witted M. could not win back his wife (cf. 1032–92). Indeed, Eur.'s H. draws on a variety of epic models of

¹²⁹ Cf. esp. Eisner (1980), Lange (2002) 46–9, 131–41.

¹³⁰ I owe this illuminating term to Donald Mastrorarde (personal communication).

womanhood: she may be unexpectedly Penelope-like in her fidelity, endurance, and cleverness (cf. *Od.* 23.173–204, where Penelope tests and outwits the crafty Odysseus himself), but she can also deploy the seductiveness of her shameless double (cf. 1231n.), albeit as part of a scheme that *reverses* the epic model of her elopement from Sparta, as she here dupes her foreign suitor and makes off with her own husband back to Greece.

Eur.'s handling of the H. myth displays the kind of productive intertextuality with previous accounts (including his own: see §3 above for H. in other plays of Eur.) which is typical of tragedy,¹³¹ and we should not be misled by *Helen's* particularly overt denial of the heroine's traditional story and character into treating Eur.'s handling of the myth *per se* as in any way aberrant or 'untragic'. For just as *Helen* continually reworks motifs typically associated with H.'s more familiar role in the Trojan War, so it deals with the same central themes as more traditional versions: (i) H.'s role within the wider cosmic frame of the Διὸς βουλή (i.e. her function as catalyst of a war which is ultimately the will of Zeus); and (ii) her struggle as a human figure to make sense of her own responsibility for the war and its consequences.¹³² We shall return in more detail to the play's divine frame and the issue of H.'s liability, but may note here that far from being iconoclastic in its presentation of these ideas, *Helen* is largely an extension of elements already inherent in more traditional accounts. Nevertheless, it is also a peculiarly daring example of the poet's typical mythographical techniques, since it partially rewrites the myth of the Trojan War itself, a myth that played such a central role in the Greeks' sense of their own past and identity (especially in fifth-century Athens, where the Trojan War was appropriated in all forms of art).¹³³

In conclusion, Eur.'s *Helen* is strikingly original, yet also anchored in traditional accounts of H. and the Trojan War, and Eur.'s continual engagement with previous versions (typical of the intertextuality of Attic tragedy) encourages the audience to appreciate the individuality of his treatment of such a familiar figure and famous war. In this way the poet not only differentiates his work from that of his predecessors, but also strengthens the impact of his own achievement.

¹³¹ Hutchinson (2004) 26 discusses the contrasting Phaedras of Eur.'s two *Hippolytus* plays in this light. As he observes (pp. 27–8), the Athenians would (as connoisseurs of tragedy) enjoy comparing different presentations of the same mythical figure, whether in the plays of one author or between dramatists.

¹³² These ideas are also central to the encomia of H. composed by Gorgias and Isocrates. Though both authors assume the traditional story of H.'s elopement with Paris to Troy, each composes a defence of H.'s conduct that is no less daring or ingenious than Eur.'s revision of the myth. For while Gorgias denies outright H.'s responsibility for her actions by depicting her as the victim of various forms of coercion (the gods, force, persuasive speech, love), Isocrates accepts H.'s part in causing the Trojan War but celebrates it as a reason to praise her, since the war brought Greece many benefits, including freedom from barbarian rule (Isoc. *Hel.* 67; cf. H.'s similar argument at *Trö.* 932–4); for Isocrates' strategy of praise rather than apology, which makes his treatment (so he says: *Hel.* 14–15) superior to Gorgias', see Zagagi (1985) 82. Gorgias' work cannot be dated, though Isocrates' is certainly after Eur.'s *Helen*, c. 393–380.

¹³³ Cf. Anderson (1997) 192–245 for the fall of Troy in Attic vase-painting; also Castriota (2005), who discusses a range of iconographic evidence.

5. THE PRODUCTION

(a) *Setting and staging*

In setting the play at the palace of king Theoc. in Egypt, Eur. is building upon older traditions that connected H. to this unusual location (i.e. far from Sparta or Troy). And as with the placement of Iphigenia in *IT*, the choice of Egypt, while based upon earlier versions of the myth,¹³⁴ also provides a usefully distant and exotic location for the action, making the threat to the Greek protagonists, and the necessity of their rescue, seem all the more insistent in the eyes of a Greek audience.¹³⁵ Though we know of no other tragedy set in Egypt,¹³⁶ there is a parallel to *Helen's* presentation of it as a place of danger (as all barbarian lands potentially are, according to the popular Greek *Weltbild*) in Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*, where the audience see Egypt through the terrified eyes of the Danaids, who have been pursued to Greece by their cousins, the sons of Aegyptus. Like each of the Danaids, H. is under pressure to marry the son of an Egyptian autocrat, but her situation is initially even more pressing, since she is stranded in Egypt and has no male guardian or Greek allies to protect her (the Chorus, though Greek and sympathetic, are powerless female slaves).

H.'s opening words set the scene with vivid local detail (1–3):

Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
 ὃς ἀντὶ Δίᾳ ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδου
 λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος ὑγραίνει γύας.

Here are the lovely virgin streams of the Nile, which waters the ground of Egypt's fields not with rain sent from Zeus but with melted white snow.

The exotic location, which is clear from the very first word (Νείλου), is peopled with various foreign figures (cf. 4–15n.), so that when the audience realize who the speaker is (ἡμῖν δὲ γῆ μὲν πατρὶς οὐκ ἀνώουμος | Σπάρτη, πατὴρ δὲ Τυνδάρεως . . . , 16–17), they must mentally remove this well-known character to a far less familiar part of the mythical map. Yet once this is done and H. is clearly located in Egypt, the level of geographical precision is negligible, since what really matters in dramatic terms is H.'s remoteness from Greece and her former life. Thus the few spatial details given are all relevant to the action: namely, that Theoc.'s palace is within walking distance

¹³⁴ For Iphigenia among the Taurians, cf. *Cypria Arg.* p. 41.42–9 Bernabè (= 32.55–63 Davies), *Hdt.* 4.103.

¹³⁵ So too in *Helen's* companion play *Andromeda*, set in remote Ethiopia (cf. 769n.), the heroine's decision to defy her parents and leave her homeland (not the sort of behaviour expected of a *parthenos*) has a positive impact from the audience's perspective, since Andromeda will become the ancestor of many Greek heroes (cf. West (1985) 147–9, 177).

¹³⁶ Sommerstein (1996) 141–51 argues that *The Egyptians* was set there (as the *first* play of Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy), but this remains deeply uncertain: cf. Garvie (2006) 183–204. Nonetheless, Egypt is likely to have been the location of Aeschylus' satyr-play *Proteus* (frs. 210–15 Radt) and Eur.'s satyr-play *Busiris* (frs. 312–15 Kannicht), the latter featuring a murderous Egyptian king who is killed by Heracles (cf. Krumeich et al. (1999) 413–19).

of the seashore and the royal dockyards (cf. e.g. 425–9, 737–43, 1526–33). The fact that the palace is close to the sea (rather than further down the Nile at Memphis, as in Herodotus' account) is important, since the sea presents, to the Greek imagination,¹³⁷ the possibility of movement (and thus escape from Egypt), but also the certainty that such action will be risky (cf. Hesiod's advice on the dangers of sea-faring: *WD* 618–45).

Helen was first performed in late March 412 BC at the City Dionysia in Athens. The theatre was adjacent to the sacred precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus on the south slope of the Acropolis. Unfortunately the archaeological evidence for the theatre in this period is scanty; subsequent rebuilding throughout antiquity has destroyed or obscured earlier layers,¹³⁸ and the extant fifth-century remains are controversial.¹³⁹ The wooden theatre-building, or *skéné*, had been in use since the *Oresteia* in 458 at the latest; its central double door provides a strong visual focus for entrances and exits. In *Helen* the *skéné* represents the palace of Theoc., described by Teucer as an imposing corniced structure, worthy to be compared with the house of Wealth himself (68–70). It is unlikely that the stage-building was decorated to resemble such a palace; although scene-painting (*skénographia*) could in theory be managed by (for example) fixing painted panels to the front of the *skéné*, these panels would often need to be changed between plays (as with *Andromeda*, where the *skéné* represented a seashore cave), and it is surprising that such physical (as opposed to purely verbal) scene-setting is not exploited for ludicrous effect in Old Comedy.

H. has taken refuge from Theoc.'s advances at the tomb of Proteus, which is set (unusually so, from a Greek perspective: 1165–8n.) in front of the royal palace. She describes herself as a *léctis* who has flung herself upon the king's grave (64–5), and she has been there for some time, sleeping on a bed of straw (798–9).¹⁴⁰ Where was the tomb located – on the stage (if it existed) close to the *skéné* or further forward in the *orkhéstra*? The existence of a low raised stage in the fifth-century theatre of Dionysus seems on balance unlikely (though, given the state of the surviving evidence, it cannot

¹³⁷ For the sea as a means of mobility and connection (rather than a barrier) between communities in the ancient Greek (and Mediterranean) world, see Horden and Purcell (2000), esp. 123–35.

¹³⁸ A monumental new theatre was built in the time of Lycurgus (330s BC): cf. [Plut.] *Lives of the Ten Orators* 841c–e, Pickard-Cambridge (1946) 134–74.

¹³⁹ For an excellent discussion of the surviving archaeological evidence, with further bibliography, see Moretti (1999–2000); cf. also Csapo and Slater (1995) 79–88, Davidson (2005) 195–203.

¹⁴⁰ Proteus' tomb is the functional equivalent of the various religiously charged settings that serve as places of refuge in other suppliant scenes or full-blown suppliant dramas: cf. Aesch. *Supp.* (the altar and statues of the twelve gods at Argos), *Eum.* (Athena's statue in Athens); Soph. *OT* (the altars before Oedipus' palace at Thebes), *OC* (the sacred grove of the Eumenides at Colonus); Eur. *Held.* (the altar of Zeus Agoraios at Marathon), *Andr.* (Thetis' altar and shrine at Thetideion), *Supp.* (the altar of Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis), *Her.* (the altar of Zeus Soter at Thebes), *Ion* (the altar before the temple of Apollo at Delphi). Thus the tomb of Proteus radiates a protective power that is often associated with altars in other suppliant scenes: cf. 800–1n. Lowe (2000) 173 speaks of the 'conception of space [in tragedy] as a network of zones of *power*', and the suppliant's asylum is simultaneously a place of power and powerlessness. For the links between tragic ritual and the kinds of supplication being performed in the fifth century, see Allan (2001) 39–43.

be ruled out).¹⁴¹ Assuming, then, a performance-space on one level, one may still ask whether the tomb was placed in the *orkhēstra* or further back in the rectangular space in front of the *skēnē*. The tomb is described as a substantial stone monument (cf. 547, 962, 986), so that if it stood close to (or up against) the *skēnē*, it would have to be to one side of the main door lest it interfere with the movement and visibility of the actors and Chorus as they enter and exit the palace. Alternatively, the tomb may have been placed in a more central position in the *orkhēstra*.¹⁴² Certainty is again impossible, but the repeated references to Proteus and his tomb (c.g. 961–8, 1028–9, 1085–6, 1165–8), even after H. has finally left it (566), suggest a central position, exploiting the dramatic focus and power of that space, equally accessible to the sight lines of all spectators in the curved *theatron*.¹⁴³

The *eisodoi*, or 'entrance ways', on either side of the performance-space have an identity that is created specifically for, and used consistently in, each play. An incident alluded to by Aristotle suggests that ancient audiences set great store by accurate use of the *eisodoi* and stage door as loci of entrance and exit: for in a play by the fourth-century tragedian Carcinus, Amphiaras was returning from a shrine but entered from an inappropriate direction and the work was hissed off the stage (*Poet.* 1455a25–8). It therefore seems likely that the poet took care for the staging of entrances and exits and that these will have been rehearsed with basic logic and suitability in mind. As in other plays, a clear pattern is readily discernible in *Helen*, with one *eisodos* (let us simply call it A, rather than specify left or right) leading from or to the seashore and the other (B) leading from or to the Egyptian interior (where Theoc. is busy hunting as the play begins).¹⁴⁴ The frequency of movement between palace and shore means

¹⁴¹ *Ar. Wasps* 1341–4, which has been described as 'probably the best verbal evidence that can be cited for the existence of a low stage' (Csapo and Slater (1995) 268), is unfortunately ambiguous (cf. Taplin (1977) 441 n. 2). Some scholars find the stages depicted on vases decisive, but only one of these vases is Attic (a red-figure *chous*, c. 420 BC: cf. Csapo and Slater (1995) 64), and it may well depict a performance in a deme theatre. The argument that the *ekkyklēma*, or wheeled platform, would be much easier to use on boards than on packed earth is not conclusive. Indeed, there is no scene in surviving fifth-century drama (even the rowing scene in *Ar. Frogs* 180–270) that only makes sense with a raised platform. In any case, with or without a low stage, the chorus are free to approach the *skēnē* (and even enter: cf. *Hel.* 327–9, 515–27), while the actors may enter the *orkhēstra*, where the action often takes place.

¹⁴² Though not necessarily at the centre of a circle, since there is no irrefutable evidence of a circular *orkhēstra* before Epidaurus c. 330, and the earliest theatres, including the Attic deme theatres, have *orkhēstras* which are more or less rectilinear in shape: cf. Csapo and Slater (1995) 79, 83, Moretti (1999–2000) 392–6. (For the never-ending dispute between the 'circularists' and the 'rectangularists', see Revermann (1999) 25.) The argument that a circular *orkhēstra* would better suit the performance of dithyrambic choruses is not compelling, since tragic choruses, which are no less prominent at the City Dionysia, were rectangular in formation (cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 239–44).

¹⁴³ The tomb of Proteus itself was a movable piece of dramatic furniture (cf. the rock used in *Andromeda*), like the temporary altars used in other suppliant scenes. The idea that a permanent altar of Dionysus existed at the centre of the *orkhēstra* in the fifth-century theatre is mistaken: cf. Rehm (2002) 41.

¹⁴⁴ Thus, starting from the opening suppliant tableau of H. at the tomb (the actor who plays H. enters at the beginning of the play, but H. is imagined to have been there for some time),

that *eisodos* A is the busier, and entrances and exits become more rapid as the intrigue gets underway.

All speaking parts in Attic tragedy were divided between three actors, which meant not only that an actor often played more than one role, but also that the same role occasionally had to be divided between two or more actors (both practices were made easier because each character had not only a characteristic costume but also a characteristic mask). The importance of the actor's art is clear from the fact that a prize for best actor was established at the City Dionysia in 449 BC, and the existence of this prize also shows that audiences and judges were able to tell actors apart, despite their masks and multiplicity of roles. Actors were generally (and chorus members were always) Athenian citizens, and all actors and chorus members were adult males. Thus, despite the prevalence of female speaking roles in tragedy (cf. H., the Old Woman, Theonoe, and the Chorus in *Helen*, who together have the majority of lines in the play), no women were involved in the performance of Attic tragedy. Yet this did not deflect tragedy from a near constant concern with female characters and women's lives. Using masks, costume, vocal delivery, and gesture an actor would change his identity from scene to scene (as would a chorus from play to play). Acting was, then, a highly skilled profession, and also one that could bring a considerable degree of wealth and celebrity (increasingly so as the fifth and fourth centuries progressed).¹⁴⁵

Assuming (as seems likely) that the protagonist and deuteragonist took the major roles of H. and M., the speaking parts of *Helen* can be divided as follows:

the play's entrances and exits might be outlined as follows: Teucer enters from the shore (68) and departs by the same *eisodos* (163); the Chorus enter from the banks of the Nile (probably *eisodos* B, 179) and go into the *skéné*/palace with H. (385); M. enters from the seashore (386) and is confronted by the Old Woman, who comes out of the palace (437) and leaves by the same route (482); both the Chorus (515) and H. (528) then re-emerge from the palace; a Servant of M. arrives from the seashore (597) and exits on the same side (757); Theonoe comes out of the palace (865), escorted by servants, who purify her path and then return inside (872), as Theonoe eventually does herself (1029); H. goes into the palace to prepare her 'mourning' look (1106); Theoc. returns from hunting (*eisodos* B, 1165), escorted by servants, who take his equipment into the palace (1170); H. soon emerges from the palace (1184) and the deception begins (with M. taking shelter at the tomb: 1085-6, 1203); H., M., and Theoc. enter the palace (1300) to prepare for the 'funeral', and H. reappears (1369), closely followed by Theoc. and M. (the latter now in new clothes and armour), who are escorted by servants (1390); one of the servants is dispatched towards the dockyards (i.e. to the seashore/*eisodos* A, 1417), while another is sent inland (*eisodos* B, 1435) to announce to his subjects Theoc.'s impending 'wedding'; as Theoc. returns to the palace (1440), M. and H. leave for the shore (1450); Theoc.'s re-entry from the palace coincides with his servant's arrival from the shore as a Messenger (1512); after delivering his news the Messenger departs (presumably inland, i.e. by *eisodos* B, 1618); Theoc. makes to enter the palace (to punish Theonoe) but is prevented by the Chorus-leader (cf. 1627-41n.); Castor and Polydeuces arrive on the *μηχανή* or 'crane' (1642) and depart by the same route (1687); finally, Theoc. goes into the palace (1687) and the Chorus leave the *orkhēstra* by *eisodos* B (1692).

¹⁴⁵ Culminating in Aristotle's complaint that 'in dramatic contests actors are now more important than poets' (*Rhet.* 3.1403b33). Cf. Easterling (2002), esp. 331-2 on cash prizes and the development of a theatrical star circuit.

Protagonist: H. (1-385, 528-1106, 1184-1300, 1369-1450), Castor (1642-79)
 Deuteragonist: Teucer (68-163), M. (386-1300, 1385-1450), Messenger (1512-1618)
 Tritagonist: Old Woman (437-82), Servant (597-757), Theonoe (865-1029), Theoc.
 (1165-1300, 1385-1440, 1512-1687)

The role of Teucer could also be given to the tritagonist, but his function as a 'pre-echo' of M. (see p. 27) is enhanced if both characters are played by the same actor. The Old Woman was probably played by the third actor (which allowed the protagonist to rest and gave the major Egyptian roles to the same actor), but it would be a nice touch if the actor who had played H. (longing for news of M.: 306-23) re-emerged from the palace as the crotchety old gatekeeper (who pushes M. away). It is appropriate that M.'s heroic exploits be announced by the same actor (now the Messenger) who had played M. in his state of beggary and dejection, and that the protagonist play both H. and her brother Castor, who predicts H.'s eventual apotheosis. The intrigue plot also generates an unusual transformation, as the same two actors re-enter as H. and M., but do so in different costumes and – in H.'s case (see below) – a different mask (cf. 1184, 1390). Finally, in addition to the three main actors, several non-speaking extras are needed to take the parts of Polydeuces (1642-79) and various servants (e.g. 865-72, 1165-70).

An actor's costume and mask covered his entire body and head, which facilitated the changing and sharing of roles and the impersonation of female figures. Costumes seem to have been elaborate and formal,¹¹⁶ suiting the royal or aristocratic status of the central heroic characters, but differences in gender, class, and ethnicity will have been visible too (the details remain obscure, since no depictions of tragic actors survive on fifth-century Attic vases). The Greek Chorus of *Helen* draw attention to the 'barbarian costume' (1132) of foreign lands, and costume was one of the key ways in which a dramatist could evoke other peoples and places. Thus the actors with Egyptian roles (Theonoe, Theoc., Messenger) will have been immediately recognizable as non-Greeks and probably wore dark masks and long-sleeved garments that had been dyed to represent dark skin (cf. the dark-skinned and exotically costumed Egyptian Danaids of Aesch. *Supp.*: 120-2, 154, 234-7, 279-86).¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ To judge from depictions of tragic actors on near contemporary vases. For the possibility of using such artistic evidence to reconstruct ancient performance conditions, including costumes and masks, see Green (2002) 93-104. Tragic masks seem to have been fairly conventionalized (contrast the exaggerated masks of comedy), allowing the audience to project their emotions (or impressions of the characters' emotions) onto the mask. In a large outdoor theatre the nuance of facial movements would be lost, so a mask can be more effective and expressive: for an excellent discussion of the Greek tragic mask, see Halliwell (1993); cf. also Stewart (2002) 55-7 on the expressive potential of masks in many cultures.

¹¹⁷ For the use of non-Greek costume in tragedy, see Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 208-9. As Geddes (1987) 313 puts it, 'plays with exotic eastern settings needed special and expensive frocks.' Perhaps Theonoe was dressed in a markedly religious manner or Theoc. in hunting regalia (to match their entrances: cf. 865-72, 1165-70)? But this is speculation, since there is no reference to their costume in the text.

The actor playing H. wore a white dress and blond wig (cf. 1088, 1224), but re-enters mourning M.'s supposed death, a pretence that is represented visually by black robes and a mask with gashes in the cheeks and shorn hair (1053–4, 1087–9, 1186–90). M. too undergoes a conspicuous change of costume in mid-play: having entered as a shipwreck survivor dressed in tattered sailcloth, he leaves in fine new clothes and bearing a full set of armour (cf. 420–4, 554, 1079–80, 1281–4, 1379–84).¹⁴⁸ Aristophanes pokes fun at the ragged heroes of Eur. in particular (cf. 421–41.), not because Eur. was the first or only poet to present such figures – cf. Homer's Odysseus (*Od.* 6.178–9, 13.429–38), Aeschylus' Xerxes (*Pers.* 832–6, 1017–19), and Sophocles' Philoctetes (*Phil.* 38–9) – but because Aristophanes wishes to portray (for comic effect) Eur.'s 'debased' heroes as part of Eur.'s new-fangled and 'degraded' form of tragedy.¹⁴⁹ The exaggeration is intentionally ludicrous, and the comic spin is clear when 'Aesch.' accuses 'Eur.' of making his royal characters wear rags in order to appear piteous (*Frogs* 1063–4). Aristophanes and his audience know that in this respect Eur. is essentially no different from other poets, but the 'opposition' to Aeschylean tragedy is played (up) for laughs. Nor does Aristophanes care for the legitimate dramatic purpose of these 'rags' in their context. In *Helen*, which is not the only extant Euripidean play featuring a ragged protagonist (cf. *Electra* in *El.*), M. and H.'s contrasting costumes articulate the gulf between appearance and reality (a central theme of the play), and the change of costume marks M.'s return to his lost heroic identity (1382–41.).

(b) *Structure and dramatic technique*

The basic structural elements of a Greek tragedy are episodes of spoken dialogue and the choral songs that come in between them. Yet the general pattern of speech alternating with song was an extremely flexible one, allowing the dramatist to vary, for example, the length and complexity of an episode (by increasing the number of internal 'scenes', distinguished by the entrance and exit of speaking characters), or to modify an episode's emotional register (by introducing songs and chanted verses, delivered by actors or chorus). The elements and terminology laid down by Aristotle. *Poetics* ch. 12 – *prologos* (the part of the play prior to the chorus' entry), *parodos* (the chorus' entry-song), *episodion* (the part between choral songs), *stasimon* (a strophic choral song after the *parodos*), *exodos* (the scene(s) following the chorus' final *stasimon*) – remain useful, even if his 'naming of parts' approach to tragedy obscures the flexibility and variety of the poets' compositional techniques. Most importantly, a bare list of parts cannot capture the shifts of focus and expression created by the entry of new characters

¹⁴⁸ If M. was portrayed as he is in epic, i.e. with long blond hair (cf. ξανθὸς Μενέλαος. *Il.* 3.284 etc., and the epithet κόρη κομώντες of the Achaeans), the visual similarity between husband and wife would be striking, and would add to the irony of their failed recognition.

¹⁴⁹ H. is no less sensitive to his shameful condition than M. is himself: cf. 789–921., Aesch. *Pers.* 845–51 (the Persian queen singles out her son's rags as the most distressing aspect of his defeat).

and the variation of speech and song. Nonetheless, the basic structure of *Helen* may be analysed as follows:

Prologue 1-163

(i) monologue of H. 1-67

(ii) dialogue: H. and Teucer 68-163 (stichomythia 83-142)

Parodos 164-252 (ὦ μεγάλων ἀχέων . . .)

lyric exchange (*amoibaion*) between H. and Chorus, consisting of two pairs of corresponding stanzas and an epode

First Episode 253-514

(i) dialogue: H. and Chorus 253-329 (*rhesis* (speech) 255-305, stichomythia 306-16)

(ii) astrophic lyric exchange between H. and Chorus 330-85 (all exit)

(iii) monologue of M. 386-434

(iv) dialogue: M. and Old Woman 435-82 (stichomythia 445-75)

(v) monologue of M. 483-514

Epirarodos 515-27 (ἤκουσα τᾶς θεσπιωιδιοῦ κόρας . . .)

brief astrophic choral song

Second Episode 528-1106

(i) dialogue: H. and M. 528-96 (stichomythia 553-93)

(ii) dialogue: M. and Servant 597-624 ('messenger'-*rhesis* 605-21)

(iii) astrophic lyric (and partly spoken) exchange of H. and M. 625-97

(iv) dialogue: M. and Servant 700-60 (*rhesis*, 711-33, 744-57)

(v) dialogue: H. and M. 761-856 (stichomythia 779-841)

(vi) dialogue: H., M., and Theococ 857-1031 (major *rhesis* of H. (894-943) and M. (947-95) answered by Theococ (998-1029))

(vii) dialogue: H. and M. 1032-1106 (distichomythia 1035-84)

First Stasimon 1107-64 (σέ τᾶν ἐναύλοισι . . .)

two pairs of corresponding stanzas

Third Episode 1165-1300

dialogue: Theoc., H., and M. (*rhesis* 1165-92, stichomythia 1195-1277)

Second Stasimon 1301-68 (ὄρεία ποτὲ δρομάδι . . .)

two pairs of corresponding stanzas

Fourth Episode 1369-1450

dialogue: H., Theoc., and M. (*rhesis* 1369-89, stichomythia 1412-28)

Third Stasimon 1451-1511 (Φοίνισσα Σιδωνιάς . . .)

two pairs of corresponding stanzas

Exodos 1512-1692

(i) dialogue: Messenger and Theoc. 1512-1620 (messenger-*rhesis* 1526-1618)

(ii) dialogue in trochaic tetrameters: Theoc. and Chorus-leader 1621-41 (stichomythia 1627-41)

(iii) *rhesis* of *deus ex machina*: Castor 1642-87

(iv) anapaestic exit-tag of Chorus 1688-92

597 *μαστεύων* 'searching for' (with acc.); cf. 1321 for the alternative form *ματεύω*.
600 οὐ που: 95n.

601 *θαῦμα* . . . *ἔχον* 'It is a miracle, though the word "miracle" cannot express (lit. is less than) the fact of the matter.' Another variation on the 'name *versus* reality' antithesis (42–3, 66–7, 160–1, 577nn.), this time applied to language. The neuter participle *ἔχον* stands in the acc. absolute construction (more common with impersonal verbs: cf. 1159).

602 *ὡς* . . . *νέον* 'since you are bringing something strange': *νέον* whets the audience's curiosity. The 'something new' motif is often used in the introduction to speeches from messenger figures: cf. *Hec.* 217, *Tro.* 238, *IT* 237, *Bacch.* 1029.

τῆρι *σπουδῆι* 'to judge from this haste' (dat. of circumstance): a swift entrance is a further sign that the newcomer has important news (cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 1152).

603 *πόνους* . . . *μάτην*: from the Servant's current perspective M.'s suffering seems to have been 'in vain' because H. (so he believes) has disappeared from the cave (605–8). Later he too will be able to see the significance of the *εἰδωλον* for the war as a whole (707, 750): cf. 593n.

604 *παλαιά* . . . *πήματ'*: M. misinterprets the Servant, taking him to be saying (as many have before, hence these are 'old woes') that the war was a waste of effort.

ἀγγέλλεις δέ τι; the postponed interrogative underlines M.'s impatience to hear the Servant's news (cf. Thomson (1939) 148).

605–24 As the Servant's reaction to the sight of H. makes clear (616–21), he does not realize the full implications of the speech which he reports (608–15), since he takes it to have been delivered by H. herself. By contrast, M. has already been told of the phantom (582–90), and the news of its disappearance finally convinces him of H.'s identity (622–4).

605 *πρὸς αἰθέρος πτυχάς*: the phantom returns to its origins in the aether (cf. 613 *πατέρ' ἔς οὐρανόν*): 584n.

606 *ἀρθεῖσ'*: aor. pass. part. of *αἴρω*, 'I raise'.

607 *σεμνόν ἄντρον*: M. had hidden H. *ἐν ἄντρον μυχοῖς* (424) with no mention of its being sacred to any particular sea-god or nymph (cf. the cave of the Naiads on Ithaca where Odysseus conceals his treasure, *Od.* 13.103–12). But for the Servant the cave is now 'holy' because of the miraculous event that has taken place there, the vanishing of 'H.' into the sky. (There is no need to emend the text, *pace* West (1981) 66, who suggests *λιπουῖσ' ἄσεμνον*: 'from the lowly cave she has passed to heaven').

608–15 Like a *deus ex machina*, the phantom's speech gives access to a higher level of knowledge (Hera duped Paris; H. is innocent) and resolves an impasse in the plot, enabling the derailed recognition to proceed. The phantom not only has H.'s voice, but also echoes exactly what H. has expressed herself, and in strikingly similar language: pity for the Greeks and Trojans (608–9 *ὦ ταλαίπωροι* . . . | *Ἀχαιοί*: cf. 38–9n.), her responsibility for their deaths (609–10 *δί' ἐμ' ἐπὶ Σκαμανδρίοις | ἀκταῖσιν* . . . *ἔθνηισκετε* ~ (52–3) *δί' ἐμ' ἐπὶ Σκαμανδρίοις | ῥοαῖσιν ἔθανον*), Hera's plotting

(610 Ἦρας μηχαναῖς; cf. 25–36), the deception of all those fighting at Troy, especially Paris (611 δοκοῦντες Ἐλένην οὐκ ἔχοντ' ἔχειν Πάριον ~ 35–6 καὶ δοκεῖ μ' ἔχειν, | κενὴν δόκησιν, οὐκ ἔχων), and H.'s innocence and false reputation (614–15 φήμας. . | οὐδὲν αἰτία; c.g. 53–4 ἡ δὲ πάντα τλαῖσ' ἐγὼ | κατάρατος εἰμι). That the εἰδωλον itself should feel sympathy for H. (614 ἡ τάλαινα Τυνδαρίς) reinforces the impression that she has been cruelly exploited by the gods (compare the effect of Lyssa's unexpected sympathy for Heracles, whom Hera is determined to destroy: *Her.* 858–73).

610 ἐθνήσκετε: imperfect, 'you kept dying'.

611 δοκοῦντες: for the phantom as a divine illusion (δόκησις), cf. 119n.

οὐκ ἔχοντ' ἔχειν: 35–6n.

612 χρόνον . . . ὅσον μ' ἐχρῆν: i.e. until M. met the real H.

613 τὸ μόρσιμον σώσσασα 'having fulfilled my allotted role'.

πατέρ' ἐς οὐρανόν: cf. 34, 584nn.

614 ἄπειμι: emphatic position before pause.

616–21 Catching sight of H., the Servant assumes that her miraculous disappearance was a trick and rebukes her for deceiving the Greeks once again. The Servant's confusion is both amusing and indicative of the serious havoc caused by the phantom.

616 ἐνθάδ' ἦσθ' ἄρα 'so this is where you've been!' For ἄρα with the imperfect, especially of εἰμί, 'denoting that something which has been, and still is, has only just been realized', see *GP* 36.ii. The expression has a colloquial ring, appropriate to the Servant's animated reaction (cf. Stevens (1976) 62).

618 ἠγγελλον: imperf., 'I was just telling how . . .'.

618–19 εἰδὼς . . . | φοροίης 'since I had no idea that you had a winged body.' The Servant is being ironic, unaware that the H. he is talking about really did fly away: cf. 1516.

619–20 οὐκ . . . αὔθις 'I shall not let you delude us like this again.' For κέρτομος/κέρτομεῖν meaning 'delusive/delude', cf. *All.* 1125, *Ll* 849, Jackson (1955) 26.

621 πόνους: cf. 593, 6031n.

622–4 M. finally realizes that H. has been telling the truth about her identity and turns towards her, intent upon completing the embrace which he had earlier denied her (566–7).

622 τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνο: a colloquial expression (variations on τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο are common in Aristophanes), marking M.'s delighted recognition (616n.), 'That's it!'; cf. *Med.* 98, *Ion* 554, *Or.* 804, Stevens (1976) 32.

ξυμβεβᾶσι: perf. act. of συμβαίνω, 'turn out (in a certain way)': LSJ s.v. III 2. For the dat. (restored by Willink), Diggle (OCT app. crit.) compares Soph. *El.* 261–2 ἦι πρῶτα μὲν τὰ μητρόσ, ἦ μ' ἐγένεσσο, | ἐχθιστὰ συμβέβηκεν.

623 ὦ ποθινὸς ἡμέρα: cf. 540 ὡς ποθινὸς ἂν μόλοις, spoken by H.

624 εἰς ἐμὰς . . . ὠλένας: the embrace is not surprisingly a standard feature of recognition and reunion scenes (c.g. *El.* 579, *IT* 796, 828, *Ion* 560, 1438–40). For Aristophanes' obscene parody of the gesture, see 566n.

the ability to manipulate and combine various typical plot-structures -- recognition (both happy and disastrous), intrigue, revenge, rescue, etc. -- and to do so in a way that underlines the individuality of each creation.

Such individuality is often obscured by critics who take a narrowly formalist approach to the plays, merely tabulating similar story-patterns and neglecting the particular view of the world that they articulate: thus *Orestes* has appeared to many as 'merely another sensationalistic, incident-laden *mechanema* drama in the mould of *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, *Helen*, or *Antiope*.¹⁶³ Similarly, while both *Helen* and Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* are 'recognition' plays and each deals with problems of personal identity and (limited) human knowledge, their manifold differences (of tone, plot, outcome, etc.) are obvious. A tragedian's success was therefore closely bound up with his ability to adapt familiar plot-structures as much as traditional stories, and the ingenious recognition and escape sequence of *Helen*, like the frenetic escape-plot of *Orestes*, shows the dynamism of Euripidean tragedy at its most exuberant and intense.

(c) *Speech, song, language*

As was noted above (p. 34), the alternation of speech (in iambic trimeter, or occasionally trochaic tetrameter: 1621–41n.) and song (in various lyric metres)¹⁶⁴ underlies the movement of every Greek tragedy and is a central part of the genre's intellectual and emotional impact.¹⁶⁵ Indeed, tragedy represents a bold experiment in the development of Greek poetry, a fusion of choral song and dance with the solo performance of actors, which synthesizes and transforms what was present in other genres, especially choral lyric and epic, both in terms of subject matter (myths of the heroic age) and performance; here Homer's 'dramatic' narrative style, full of character-speech, and the various personae adopted by archaic lyric poets were particularly influential.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ Porter (1994) 45, who points out the superficiality of such a view.

¹⁶⁴ Herington (1985) 103–24 offers a succinct and illuminating discussion of the processes of adaptation and experiment by which the Attic tragedians borrowed and transformed the diverse metres of the numerous (non-tragic) poetic traditions which both preceded and surrounded them. For more detailed study of tragedy's lyric metres in particular, cf. esp. Dale (1968), West (1982) 98–137.

¹⁶⁵ We have almost no evidence about how to gauge the mood or emotional impact of any particular metre or metrical variation (though Griffith (1999) tries to go further in his discussion of the lyrics of *Antigone*). The exception is the dochmiac metre which is characteristic of tragedy (it occurs in every surviving play): cf. Dale (1969) 254 'These dochmiac and kindred types [cretic-molossus and prosodiacs] are I think the only lyric rhythms which carry an inherent emotional expression -- namely passionate feeling of some kind.' The dochmiac can express joy as well as distress, hence its use in the reunion duet between H. and M. (625–97n.).

¹⁶⁶ For the evolution of tragedy within the diverse 'song culture' of archaic and early classical Greece, see Herington (1985) esp. 3–40. It is all too easy to forget the dance that accompanied the choral songs of tragedy (as it did most other forms of choral performance: e.g. parthenia, epinikia), since we know almost nothing about it. The surviving evidence does, however, suggest vigorous and expressive movement: cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 246–57, Csapo and Slater (1995) 364–8.

The extended speeches characteristic of tragedy vary greatly in length and purpose – presenting essential information (c.g. 1–67, 605–21, 876–91), lamenting misfortune (255–305, 386–434), revealing decisions and character (998–1029), etc. – as do the passages of spoken dialogue which frame them, where the pace and intensity of exchanges are further altered by the use of *stichomythia* (cf. 553–96n.).

The use of lyric is no less protean, ranging from purely choral song and dance to actor's monody (for the shifting balance between the two, see below). Song may also be shared by the chorus and actor(s) or by the actors themselves; and such exchanges may be purely lyric (*amoibaia*: 167–252, 330–85) or split between a singing and a speaking voice, creating a contrast between emotional utterance and more measured reflection (625–97n.). It is a basic but important fact that when expressing itself as a unit the chorus always sings; the chorus-leader alone engages in spoken dialogue with an actor. In short, when doing what choruses typically do (singing and dancing), the chorus is a collective (by contrast, actors sing one at a time), presenting a communal response to the events which they not only witness but have also helped to shape (cf. 315–29, 515–27).¹⁶⁷ Finally, both chorus and actors are accompanied, when singing, by an *aulos*-player, whose music, we assume, will have matched the rhythmic variety of their songs (including the repetition of musical structure to match the identical metrical pattern of strophic or 'responding' stanzas: c.g. 164–228, ending with a metrically distinct epode 229–52).¹⁶⁸

The deployment of choral song, lyric dialogue, and actors' arias in *Helen* shows the same basic tendency as other late plays of Eur. (excluding *Bacchae* and *IA*) and Sophocles: namely, a diminution in the proportion of choral lyric relative to that sung by the actors. The plays of Aeschylus are characterized by a far higher proportion of choral song and recitative (ranging from 34% of total lines in *Eum.* to 55% in *Supp.*) than those of Sophocles and Eur. (an average of 16.7% and 15.2% respectively).¹⁶⁹ Yet while Sophocles and Eur. show little change over time in the overall proportion of lyric in their plays, both use an increasing amount of actors' song. In other words, the musical 'burden' is switching from chorus to actors, giving the latter more opportunity to display their vocal skills and thus enjoy the attention generated by virtuoso performance. This development is linked, as we shall see, not only to the professionalization of acting, but also to changes in musical culture and audience taste more generally. Its effects can be seen in *Helen*, which has only three formal choral odes (Soph. *Phil.* has only one: 676–729), with the first beginning at 1107, already two thirds of the way into the play.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ One must also allow for the division of parts between half-choruses (c.g. *Ajax* 866–78) or occasionally individual voices (c.g. *Ion* 184–236).

¹⁶⁸ The *aulos* also accompanied some passages that were chanted rather than sung: cf. 1621–41, 1688–92nn. For the various forms of delivery (speech, chant/recitative, and song) used in tragedy, see Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 156–64.

¹⁶⁹ Figures based on Griffith (1977) 123 and Csapo (1999–2000) 410–11.

¹⁷⁰ The Chorus' songs, which come after the long sequence of scenes containing the recognition, accelerate dramatic time and mark the successive stages of the intrigue, while also expanding the themes of the action (cf. 1107–64n.).

The gradual shift of lyric expression from chorus to actors culminated in the composition of *embolima* (lit. 'things thrown in'), i.e. choral interludes that had nothing to do with the plot of the play. Aristotle says this practice was started by Agathon (*Poet.* 1456a29), a popular tragedian of the late fifth century (for a parody of his 'feminine' and 'erotic' lyric style, cf. *Ar. Thesm.* 101–29), and such choral add-ons seem to have become the norm in fourth-century comedy: the manuscripts of late Aristophanes have merely *chorou* ('[a performance] of the chorus') – the songs themselves are absent (so too in the texts of New Comedy). Moreover, the phrase *chorou* is also found in papyri of tragedies performed from the mid-fourth century onwards (cf. *TrGF* 1 60 F 1h, *TrGF* Adesp. F 625.9), and Aristotle's complaints about *embolima* clearly show that a significant number of tragedians were willing to dispense with related choral songs. The trend was not universal, since *Rhesus*, the only extant fourth-century tragedy, has a particularly vocal and active chorus (arguably an archaizing touch), and Aristotle also envisages the performance of formal and organic odes. Yet it is clear that the tragic and comic chorus became less essential as time went on, and such developments need to be seen in the context of socio-historical changes in Athens (and beyond) which cannot be pursued here.¹⁷¹

It is important to bear in mind the changing role of the chorus in fifth-century tragedy because it has often been argued that the chorus is becoming increasingly irrelevant in the late plays of Euripides (*Bacchae* being an obvious exception). The main target of this approach in *Helen* is the second stasimon, where the Chorus tell how Demeter (identified here with the Mother of the Gods) searched for her missing daughter. Yet Eur. has taken great care to choose a myth that, far from having no connection to the action of the play, has several links to his version of H.'s story (cf. 1301–68n. 'Function'). Such picturesque narrative odes are characteristic of late Eur. and have been labelled 'dithyrambic',¹⁷² but the term is useful only if it is understood in terms of poetic diction, style, and metre, and not taken to imply irrelevance to the plot.¹⁷³ Moreover, the main features of the 'dithyrambic' style – lush imagery,

¹⁷¹ Apart from the increasing prominence of actors, we need to ask why less money was being spent by Athens and her wealthiest citizens on tragic choruses. It can hardly be a coincidence that traditional methods of funding choruses came to an end with the democracy itself at the end of the fourth century (cf. Wilson (2000) 270–6). Under the new system of government the emphasis on communal values and civic solidarity is likely to have decreased, as did (one could argue) the dramatic chorus' importance and usefulness as a vehicle for those values. For tragedy as an expression of shared cultural norms and beliefs, see p. 5.

¹⁷² Cf. Kranz (1933) 228–62, esp. 253–4, Panagl (1971).

¹⁷³ For difficulties with the term 'dithyrambic', see 1301–68n. These seemingly self-contained stasima simply extend the standard choral practice of reflecting upon the dramatic action by relating it to one or more mythological parallels: cf. e.g. *Soph. Ant.* 944–87 (an entire ode, comprising three separate narratives), *Eur. Med.* 1282–92, *Hipp.* 545–64, *Her.* 1016–24 (Oehler (1925) discusses the technique's widespread use in early Greek poetry). The effectiveness of many odes, not merely dithyrambic ones, has often been obscured by mistaken ideas of 'relevance' (as Parry (1978) 67–8 saw). Yet the wide-ranging vision of tragic odes, especially striking when compared to a play's spoken parts, is itself a feature shared with many genres of non-dramatic choral lyric (for the interaction between them and tragedy, cf. n. 179 below).

florid diction (especially new compound epithets), verbal repetition, and avant-garde musical effects – are also to be found in actors' lyric of the period, showing that the influence of the so-called New Music was not limited to tragic choruses but affected all aspects of tragic song.

The musical innovations introduced in the latter part of the fifth century (particularly by dithyrambographers and citharodes) included the extension of single syllables over several notes,¹⁷⁴ and the abandonment of regular metrical patterns and strophic responsion, creating a freer and more dynamic musical style (cf. the polymetric and astrophic monodies 229–52, 348–85, and the duct between M. and H. 625–97).¹⁷⁵ Yet this new style was also more demanding, which made it more difficult for amateur actors, choruses, and *aulos*-players to keep pace. The innovations of the New Musicians thus went hand in hand with the professionalization of acting and music, as star performers began to eclipse the efforts of amateur citizen choruses, accelerating the shift of focus in tragedy from choral to solo lyric. Yet, as with many other musical revolutions throughout history, such developments provoked a backlash from cultural conservatives.¹⁷⁶ Plato, for example, harks back to a supposed Golden Age before the various genres of song (lament, paeon, dithyramb, etc.) had been mixed together (*Laws* 700c–701a), but such nostalgia for an age of purity and stable tradition is misleading,¹⁷⁷ since musical genres had always been changing (not least because poets were always competing and innovating) and we can see tragedy itself appropriating other lyric genres from the earliest surviving plays of Aeschylus onward.

In this respect we must bear in mind not only tragedy's debt to, and transformation of, earlier choral tradition,¹⁷⁸ but also the basic fact that various genres of choral poetry (e.g. paeon, dithyramb, hymenaios, epinikion) continue to be performed throughout the fifth century and beyond: in other words, it is not merely a matter of tragedy's

¹⁷⁴ The practice is parodied as part of Eur.'s baroque lyrical style in *Ar. Frogs* (ἐλεεινίσσεται 1314, 1319).

¹⁷⁵ For further technical innovations (new notes, intervals, modes, and genera), see Barker (1984) 93–8, Comotti (1989), West (1992) 356–66, Csapo and Slater (1995) 336–48.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. West (1992) 371 'Chopin, Liszt, Wagner, Debussy, Mahler – these and many other great and original composers have suffered [. . .] assaults from the unadjusted.' The likelihood of such a reaction was all the greater in late fifth-century Greece, since poetry and song formed the essence of education (especially elite education: cf. Bundrick (2005) 74–80 on the linked aristocratic ideals of *mousikē* and *gymnastikē*) and music was believed to shape moral character (cf. e.g. *Arist. Pol.* 1340a5–12).

¹⁷⁷ As Csapo (2004) has shown, the hostile picture of the New Music given by Plato and other contemporary critics is distorted by a wider ideological agenda: thus their attempt to 'preserve' music against new developments is linked to their aristocratic fear of its popular appeal, which they then castigate as a sign of corruption and decay. Indeed, it remains a favoured tactic of Neo-Cons to *invent* a Golden Age before the so-called degenerate culture of the present. Such conservative resistance is both exploited and parodied by Aristophanes in figures like the Better Argument of the *Clouds* (cf. esp. 961–83 for good old songs and manners contrasted with modern ways). And for all the comically charged opposition of his characters to the New Music, Aristophanes' plays themselves show a diminution in the role of the chorus and an increase in actors' song.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. esp. Hutchinson (2001) 427–39.

The gradual shift of lyric expression from chorus to actors culminated in the composition of *embolima* (lit. 'things thrown in'), i.e. choral interludes that had nothing to do with the plot of the play. Aristotle says this practice was started by Agathon (*Poet.* 1456a29), a popular tragedian of the late fifth century (for a parody of his 'feminine' and 'erotic' lyric style, cf. *Ar. Thesm.* 101–29), and such choral add-ons seem to have become the norm in fourth-century comedy: the manuscripts of late Aristophanes have merely *chorou* ('[a performance] of the chorus') – the songs themselves are absent (so too in the texts of New Comedy). Moreover, the phrase *chorou* is also found in papyri of tragedies performed from the mid-fourth century onwards (cf. *TrGF* 160 f 11, *TrGF* Adesp. f 625.9), and Aristotle's complaints about *embolima* clearly show that a significant number of tragedians were willing to dispense with related choral songs. The trend was not universal, since *Rhesus*, the only extant fourth-century tragedy, has a particularly vocal and active chorus (arguably an archaizing touch), and Aristotle also envisages the performance of formal and organic odes. Yet it is clear that the tragic and comic chorus became less essential as time went on, and such developments need to be seen in the context of socio-historical changes in Athens (and beyond) which cannot be pursued here.¹⁷¹

It is important to bear in mind the changing role of the chorus in fifth-century tragedy because it has often been argued that the chorus is becoming increasingly irrelevant in the late plays of Euripides (*Bacchae* being an obvious exception). The main target of this approach in *Helen* is the second stasimon, where the Chorus tell how Demeter (identified here with the Mother of the Gods) searched for her missing daughter. Yet Eur. has taken great care to choose a myth that, far from having no connection to the action of the play, has several links to his version of H.'s story (cf. 1301–68n. 'Function'). Such picturesque narrative odes are characteristic of late Eur. and have been labelled 'dithyrambic',¹⁷² but the term is useful only if it is understood in terms of poetic diction, style, and metre, and not taken to imply irrelevance to the plot.¹⁷³ Moreover, the main features of the 'dithyrambic' style – lush imagery;

¹⁷¹ Apart from the increasing prominence of actors, we need to ask why less money was being spent by Athens and her wealthiest citizens on tragic choruses. It can hardly be a coincidence that traditional methods of funding choruses came to an end with the democracy itself at the end of the fourth century (cf. Wilson (2000) 270–6). Under the new system of government the emphasis on communal values and civic solidarity is likely to have decreased, as did (one could argue) the dramatic chorus' importance and usefulness as a vehicle for those values. For tragedy as an expression of shared cultural norms and beliefs, see p. 5.

¹⁷² Cf. Kranz (1933) 228–62, esp. 253–4, Panagl (1971).

¹⁷³ For difficulties with the term 'dithyrambic', see 1301–68n. These seemingly self-contained stasima simply extend the standard choral practice of reflecting upon the dramatic action by relating it to one or more mythological parallels: cf. e.g. *Soph. Ant.* 944–87 (an entire ode, comprising three separate narratives), *Eur. Med.* 1282–92, *Hipp.* 545–64, *Her.* 1016–24 (Oehler (1925) discusses the technique's widespread use in early Greek poetry). The effectiveness of many odes, not merely dithyrambic ones, has often been obscured by mistaken ideas of 'relevance' (as Parry (1978) 67–8 saw). Yet the wide-ranging vision of tragic odes, especially striking when compared to a play's spoken parts, is itself a feature shared with many genres of non-dramatic choral lyric (for the interaction between them and tragedy, cf. n. 179 below).

florid diction (especially new compound epithets), verbal repetition, and avant-garde musical effects – are also to be found in actors' lyric of the period, showing that the influence of the so-called New Music was not limited to tragic choruses but affected all aspects of tragic song.

The musical innovations introduced in the latter part of the fifth century (particularly by dithyrambographers and citharodes) included the extension of single syllables over several notes,¹⁷⁴ and the abandonment of regular metrical patterns and strophic responsion, creating a freer and more dynamic musical style (cf. the polymetric and astrophic monodies 229–52, 348–85, and the duet between M. and H. 625–97).¹⁷⁵ Yet this new style was also more demanding, which made it more difficult for amateur actors, choruses, and *aulos*-players to keep pace. The innovations of the New Musicians thus went hand in hand with the professionalization of acting and music, as star performers began to eclipse the efforts of amateur citizen choruses, accelerating the shift of focus in tragedy from choral to solo lyric. Yet, as with many other musical revolutions throughout history, such developments provoked a backlash from cultural conservatives.¹⁷⁶ Plato, for example, harks back to a supposed Golden Age before the various genres of song (lament, paeon, dithyramb, etc.) had been mixed together (*Laws* 700c–701a), but such nostalgia for an age of purity and stable tradition is misleading,¹⁷⁷ since musical genres had always been changing (not least because poets were always competing and innovating) and we can see tragedy itself appropriating other lyric genres from the earliest surviving plays of Aeschylus onward.

In this respect we must bear in mind not only tragedy's debt to, and transformation of, earlier choral tradition,¹⁷⁸ but also the basic fact that various genres of choral poetry (e.g. paeon, dithyramb, hymenaios, epinikion) continue to be performed throughout the fifth century and beyond: in other words, it is not merely a matter of tragedy's

¹⁷⁴ The practice is parodied as part of Eur.'s baroque lyrical style in *Ar. Frogs* (ελεεινιλισσετε 1314, 1319).

¹⁷⁵ For further technical innovations (new notes, intervals, modes, and genera), see Barker (1984) 93–8, Comotti (1989), West (1992) 356–66, Csapo and Slater (1995) 336–48.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. West (1992) 371 'Chopin, Liszt, Wagner, Debussy, Mahler – these and many other great and original composers have suffered [. . .] assaults from the unadjusted.' The likelihood of such a reaction was all the greater in late fifth-century Greece, since poetry and song formed the essence of education (especially elite education: cf. Bundrick (2005) 74–80 on the linked aristocratic ideals of *mousikē* and *gymnastikē*) and music was believed to shape moral character (cf. e.g. *Arist. Pol.* 1340a5–12).

¹⁷⁷ As Csapo (2004) has shown, the hostile picture of the New Music given by Plato and other contemporary critics is distorted by a wider ideological agenda: thus their attempt to 'preserve' music against new developments is linked to their aristocratic fear of its popular appeal, which they then castigate as a sign of corruption and decay. Indeed, it remains a favoured tactic of Neo-Cons to *invent* a Golden Age before the so-called degenerate culture of the present. Such conservative resistance is both exploited and parodied by Aristophanes in figures like the Better Argument of the *Clouds* (cf. esp. 961–83 for good old songs and manners contrasted with modern ways). And for all the comically charged opposition of his characters to the New Music, Aristophanes' plays themselves show a diminution in the role of the chorus and an increase in actors' song.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. esp. Hutchinson (2001) 427–39.

development from particular lyric genres (cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1449a10–11 on the dithyrambic origins of tragedy), but rather its *interaction* with the wider song-dance culture of its time.¹⁷⁹ Thus the tragedians can be seen to deploy the expectations generated by particular genres of choral lyric for their own dramatic ends: compare, for example, the paradoxical 'paean for the dead' at *Hel.* 177, or (on a larger scale) the use of epinician language and themes to underscore the short-lived victory of Heracles' labours and triumph over Lycus (*Her.* 348–441, 673–86, 781–9). Similar strategies of generic interaction are used in tragic monody as well: cf. e.g. Ion's blend of work-song and hymn to Apollo, expressing the singer's naïve devotion to the god (*Ion* 112–83).

Thus, while conservative critics see poets and musicians indulging their audiences' vulgar desire for novelty, the reality is more complex and less sinister: both sides (performers and public) contribute, so that sometimes the performers may be pushing the frontiers of a genre in order to outdo their rivals, while at other times they may be responding to their audience's acceptance (and enjoyment) of a new development.¹⁸⁰ The increasing prominence of actors' song in tragedy during the last quarter of the fifth century illustrates the symbiosis of audiences and performers most clearly.¹⁸¹ For just as solo song appealed to actors as a vehicle to showcase their musical and theatrical skills, so its capacity to generate pathos through the display of intensely personal feelings suited the public's desire for more overt and extreme emotional states (as well as more intense and exciting plots).¹⁸² It is, in short, a reflection of the dynamism of the late fifth-century theatre and in no way a symptom of musical or generic 'decline' (see §7 below).

The play's language and style are discussed in detail in the Commentary, which aims to address a wide range of phenomena, including the poet's choice of vocabulary and imagery, as well as his manipulation of syntax, levels of diction, and stylistic registers. Indeed, close *textual* study of a drama's verbal style is no less essential for understanding its impact than are those (recently more popular) *contextual* approaches to tragedy which foreground, for example, the political setting of the festival or the

¹⁷⁹ For a brief introduction to this understudied topic, see Battezzato (2005) 159–60, 162–3; Swift (forthcoming) promises to explore the issue in detail.

¹⁸⁰ The popularity of the lyrics of Eur. in particular (both in the fifth century and later) is well attested: cf. Plut. *Lys.* 15.2–3, *Nic.* 29, West (1992) 376–8.

¹⁸¹ It is also important to stress that the polymetric style of monody and lyric dialogue is found in the later plays of Sophocles as well as Euripides (e.g. Soph. *Phil.* 1169–1217, *OC.* 207–53; Eur. *Phoen.* 310–54, 1485–1581, *Or.* 1369–1502, *Bacch.* 576–603). Thus, despite Aristophanes' comic picture of tragic lyric, it is not the case that only a few renegade experimentalists (esp. Eur. and Agathon) are influenced by the musical developments of the late fifth century.

¹⁸² The idea that uncontrolled emotion was more characteristic of women (and barbarians) than adult Greek males underlies the preponderance of female monodists in Eur.: cf. Barner (1971) 284–5, E. Hall (1999), Csapo (2004) 230–2. The trend is evident in *Helen*, where song is almost wholly the domain of women (for M.'s brief burst of joyful lyrics, cf. 625–97n.). Actors' song clusters in the first half of the play as H. laments her fate (164–78, 191–210, 229–52, 348–85) and celebrates her reunion with M. (625–97). However, song does not automatically feminize male characters: its use by several Sophoclean heroes (Ajax, Heracles, Oedipus, Creon, Philoctetes) shows rather the capacity of monody to arouse emotion in the spectators as they witness the suffering and anguish of the central character.

ideology of fifth-century Athens (for these, see §1(b) above). The language of Attic tragedy is itself an artificial literary language (or *Kunstsprache*), which constitutes a unique fusion of Greek poetic styles, drawing especially on epic, lyric, and iambic traditions, as well as the language of formal prose.¹⁸³ Yet despite its composite nature, the language of tragedy was immediately comprehensible (theatre demands clear communication between characters and audience), while its Attic dialect, clearest in the spoken parts of the plays, derives from the genre's performance in Athens from the late sixth century onwards. Nonetheless, the Attic tragedians did not compose in a purely local literary world: the clearest evidence for this is the fact that their choruses and actors sing in a language that has a superficial but perceptible Doric colouring, as the tragedians appropriate the panhellenic traditions of archaic choral lyric (written in a no less artificial literary Doric) to create a new kind of song-dance performance. The principal Doric features of tragic lyric are long α for η (c.g. 212 σᾶς, 214 ματρόθεν, 218 ἔτλας, 235 τᾶν ἐμᾶν, 330 ἐδεξάμαν, 645 ὄναιμαν), first declension masc. gen. singulars ending in long α (c.g. 209–10 Εὐρώτα) and gen. plurals in -ᾶν (c.g. 210 νεανιᾶν, 1123b ταλαινᾶν).¹⁸⁴

The language of tragedy is characterized by complex word order and striking figures of speech, especially metaphor and imagery. Eur.'s language (like Sophocles') is less densely and boldly metaphorical than Aeschylus' (cf. c.g. *Ag.* 131–4, where the Greek army is the bridle-bit of Troy), but it still deploys the intensification of metaphor to great effect: c.g. *Hel.* 32 ἐξηνέωσα, 357 θῦμα τριζύγοις θεαῖσι, 1482–4 πρεσβυτάτου . . . ποιμένος. So too with Eur.'s patterns of imagery, which are on the whole less obvious and insistent than Aeschylus', but equally capable of taking on a thematic importance, as in the recurrent imagery of the virgin natural world in *Hipp.*, of the sea and travel in *IT*, or hunting in *Helen* (63, 119nn.). No less striking is the way simple words become significant through repetition and dramatic context: thus 'see' and 'seem' form a complex pattern of illusion and deception in *Helen*.¹⁸⁵

Tragic language is also marked by its stylized and elevated vocabulary.¹⁸⁶ As Aristotle observed, words and forms which are remote from everyday speech are particularly impressive (σεμνή δὲ καὶ ἐξαλλάττουσα τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν ἢ τοῖς ξενικοῖς κεχρημένα, *Poet.* 1458a20–1). The tragedians accordingly deploy a range of high-style alternatives to everyday language (δῶμα for οἰκία, δάμαρ for γυνή, κάρα for κεφαλή, κλύειν for

¹⁸³ For an outstanding introduction to the language of Attic tragedy, with a particular focus on Eur., see Mastrorarde (2002) 81–96; for distinctive aspects of Aeschylean language, see West (1990a) xxv–liii; for Soph., Budelmann (2000). The language of satyr-play is much closer to tragedy than to comedy: cf. López Eire (2003).

¹⁸⁴ For the Doric patina of tragedy's essentially Attic dialect, cf. esp. Björck (1950). Attic Old Comedy uses Doric forms to evoke a high lyric style or parody it (cf. c.g. the Pindaric poet of *Birds* 904–53); for Aristophanes' varied use of 'higher' lyric genres, especially tragedy, see Silk (2000) 160–206.

¹⁸⁵ For a stimulating introduction to the core functions of recurrent imagery in all three tragedians, see Porter (1986).

¹⁸⁶ Silk (1996) 458–64 offers a stimulating discussion of elevation, complexity, and intensity as features shared by the languages of Greek and Shakespearean tragedy.

ἀκούειν, etc.),¹⁸⁷ and such elevated diction is used by all tragic characters, regardless of their particular class, gender, age, or ethnicity. This gives the world of tragedy a 'grandeur' (μέγεθος) and 'dignity' (σεμνότης) appropriate to the age of heroic myth,¹⁸⁸ while it also helps to create a language that is suited to 'the universal, even metaphysical, vastness of tragedy's concerns'.¹⁸⁹ Yet the genre's stylized and formal language is flexible enough to allow for striking variations, especially in the differences of diction and syntax between speech (especially spoken dialogue) and song. Moreover, there is a wide range of styles and registers in the spoken parts in particular: take, for example, the contrasting styles of M. and the Old Woman, where the latter's plainer language and simpler manner throws M.'s high-flown lamentation and complaint into sharper relief (386–514; cf. 435–82n.).¹⁹⁰

The fact that we possess fewer than 4 per cent of the tragedies produced at the City Dionysia in the course of the fifth century¹⁹¹ means that we have to be particularly cautious when speaking about tragic language. Nevertheless, the surviving plays and fragments allow us to piece together a picture (most detailed for Eur.) of the poets' individual styles. To judge from the number of *hapax legomena*¹⁹² in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, all three are prodigious wordsmiths, enriching the shared *Kunstsprache* of tragedy with their own coinages and innovations. Aeschylus, for example, is particularly fertile in the creation of new compounds (he uses almost twice as many compound adjectives as Sophocles or Eur.),¹⁹³ a feature of his style which is ridiculed by Aristophanes (*Frogs* 824, 924–32, etc.); Sophocles is fond of abstract nouns;¹⁹⁴ Eur.'s dialogue is more open to colloquialisms.¹⁹⁵ Yet such general features

¹⁸⁷ See Dover (1997) 98–9, who uses *Hdt.* 10.43–4 to illustrate the differences between poetic and prose language, including the words δόμος, κτανεῖν, and ἀναξ; the absence of the definite article; the dative (δόμοις), without a preposition, in a locative sense; the use of ornamental compound adjectives. Speakers in Athenian law-courts and assemblies (as well as Athenian prose writers like Thucydides) make occasional use of poetic and especially tragic language for various effects (dignity, intensity, pathos, etc.): cf. e.g. MacDowell (1962) 19.

¹⁸⁸ The terms μέγεθος and σεμνότης are taken from Aristotle's remarks on the evolution of tragic diction (*Poet.* 1449a19–21).

¹⁸⁹ Silk (1996) 464.

¹⁹⁰ Contrasting styles of expression (esp. levels of diction and imagery) are an important means of characterization in all forms of theatre: cf. Katsouris (1975). Thus, for example, Theonoe's measured and thoughtful language (marked by sympathy for H. and M. and concern for their proper treatment) stands in contrast to Theoc.'s harsh and peremptory style of address (esp. 873–91, 998–1029, 1165–85, 1621–41). The siblings' opposing personalities emerge clearly: Theonoe looks to her family's reputation, Theoc. cares only for self-gratification.

¹⁹¹ Counting 31 extant tragedies (excluding *Rhesus* as a fourth-century work) and assuming 900 in total (i.e. three dramatists entering three tragedies each year).

¹⁹² The survival of only a fraction of Greek literature makes extrapolation from *hapax legomena* problematic, and we cannot be absolutely sure that any particular word is a neologism created by the author in question. Nonetheless, in the case of new compound forms which occur nowhere else in Greek, innovation by the poet is a likely explanation. Smercka (1936) 154–72 lists 585 *hapax legomena* in Eur. (an average of c. 30 per play), including 38 from *Helen* (these are discussed where appropriate in the commentary).

¹⁹³ Cf. Griffith (1977) 149–50. ¹⁹⁴ Long (1968), Budelmann (2000) 2–3.

¹⁹⁵ Stevens (1976), further refined by Collard (2005), esp. 355–60.

do not tell us much *per se* and each innovation or peculiarity has to be discussed in its context or else its effects will be obscured.

Moreover, ancient critics (with fuller access to tragic texts) point to various qualities that were felt to be particularly distinctive of Eur. In his comparison of the three tragedians, for example, Dio comments on the clarity and naturalness of Eur.'s language as well as his peculiarly rhetorical style, especially in set-piece debates (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 52.11–14). Indeed, clarity and simplicity seem to have been regarded as Euripidean hallmarks in his own time, even if Aristophanes exaggerates and distorts Eur.'s linguistic 'realism', so that whereas 'Eur.' is proud of his 'slimmed down' tragedy and 'democratically' talkative characters, 'Aeschylus' condemns their banal chatter as degrading (*Frogs* 937–79, 1056–73). Eur.'s spoken dialogue contains fewer new compound forms than those of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and he tends more to composite verbs (e.g. ἀποδιδῶμι, περιβαλεῖν) instead of grander simple verbs, a practice made possible by the allowance of new word-shapes within the iambic trimeter. He also uses such contemporary forms as ἔθηκᾰν and ἔδωκᾰν (Aeschylus and Sophocles have ἔθεσᾰν and ἔδοσᾰν), and admits more colloquialisms, though these are used sparingly even by Eur.¹⁹⁶ Aristotle praises the naturalness and plausibility of Euripidean dialogue, saying that he was the first to use vocabulary drawn from normal conversation (*Rhet.* 1404b18–25), while [Longinus] *On the Sublime* 40.3 observes that Eur.'s use of ordinary language can have great force, quoting *Her.* 1245 γέμω κακῶν δὴ κούκ' ἔσθ' ὅποι τεθῆι ('I am loaded with sufferings – there is no room for more').¹⁹⁷ Surviving fragments show that it was Eur.'s simpler and plainer dialogue style that became the dramatic *koinē* of the following centuries.

However, there are clear generic limits to Eur.'s 'realism', for although the spoken portions of his plays are closer to 'natural' dialogue than those of Aeschylus (especially), his language remains fundamentally poetic and part of the same high-style literary dialect used by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and other tragedians. Thus we should beware of taking Aristophanic parody too seriously and thinking of Eur. as 'prosaic'. (By the same token, Aristophanes clearly exaggerates the extent to which Aeschylus was impenetrable to the ordinary listener at the end of the fifth century. The undoubtedly more 'archaic' timbre of Aeschylus' language comes not from some ingrained archaizing mind-set but from his greater use of choral song and epic forms.) A similar caveat applies to Eur.'s lyrics: they may, compared to Aeschylus or Pindar, contain a larger number of words also found in prose,¹⁹⁸ but they are still composed on a consistently high stylistic level.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁶ See Stevens (1976) 64–5, who counts 49 in *Hel.*, a relatively high number, but in line with the large amount of stichomythia in the play.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. also Hor. *As Port.* 95–8 on the greater emotional impact of simple tragic language.

¹⁹⁸ Breitenbach (1934) 118 calculates that 41% of Eur.'s choral vocabulary is shared with prose. On the language of actors' song, cf. also Barlow (1986).

¹⁹⁹ Breitenbach (1934) remains the most comprehensive study of Eur.'s lyric manner, though his catalogue format leaves little room for discussion of the impact made by particular figures of speech in context. The main features of Eur.'s increasingly exotic ('dithyrambic') lyric style

6. A TRAGEDY OF IDEAS

As a form of public art and mass entertainment, tragedy provoked a variety of responses – aesthetic, emotional, and intellectual – which were closely interconnected. Indeed, like other early Greek thinkers such as the Presocratics and the Sophists, the tragedians reflect on a wide range of intellectual issues, from ethics and politics to epistemology and theology.²⁰⁰ Their plays explore central concepts of Greek, and especially Athenian, thought, using the world of divine and heroic myth to dramatize dilemmas and issues (such as justice, democracy, power, gender, and ethnicity) which were experienced and debated by their fifth-century audiences. Thus the varied intellectual concerns of *Helen* are a typical feature of tragedy, not a symptom of aberrant philosophizing on the part of Eur.

The intellectual seriousness of *Helen* has not always been recognized. Dale, for example, remarks: ‘it is surely hardly justified to claim as critics sometimes do that *Helen* gains in profundity, or qualifies as “tragic” (in our sense), because it concerns the interplay of illusion and reality. This is to allow oneself to be mesmerized by abstract nouns. There is much play with such antitheses as σῶμα/δνομα, and flashes of irony from this source point the dialogue; but there is no metaphysical or psychological depth here, nor would anything of the kind be either conceivable or appropriate.’²⁰¹ Dale’s scepticism is bracing and certainly useful insofar as it insists upon the play’s lighter elements; however, it is also too extreme, for it neglects contemporary interest in (*inter alia*) the fallibility of the senses (see p. 48 below) and thereby underestimates the importance of the drama’s philosophical concerns. Indeed, a number of scholars have stressed *Helen*’s playfulness and humour at the expense of its intellectual seriousness: one calls the work ‘a comedy of ideas’,²⁰² while another remarks that it is ‘the only play . . . in which Euripides . . . has provided a clearly satirical treatment of Sophistic themes’.²⁰³ Yet there is no contradiction or incongruity in the fact that *Helen* is both intellectually provocative and frequently amusing. Indeed, much of the play’s brilliance lies in its creation of a dramatic world whose at times humorous and domestic surface (a man thinks his wife is an adulteress, but is wrong) can have a serious philosophical import.²⁰⁴

(parodied by Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1301–63) are well summarized by Mastronarde (1994) 331: ‘short cola, an abundance of compound epithets (several unique in extant Greek or used in a uniquely eccentric sense), run-on appositions, accumulation of relative clauses and imbalance between main clauses and subordinate clauses, verbal repetition, and the paradoxical wedding of beautiful language and sensuous description to violent content.’ Although all of these features are attested in earlier tragedy (see, for example, Stinton (1990) 41 n. 42 on verbal repetition in Aeschylus and Sophocles), their marked development in the late plays of Eur. (c.g. *Hel.* 640 ὤλβισσαν ὤλβισσαν, 650–1 πῶσιν ἐμὸν <ἐμὸν> ἔχομεν ἔχομεν ὄν ἐμενον | ἐμενον, 664a–b λόγον οἴου | οἴου, 670 ὁ Διὸς ὁ Διός, etc.) is likely to be linked, as we have seen, both to changes in dramatic music and acting and to the audience’s appetite for new (and more extreme) kinds of theatrical and emotive expression.

²⁰⁰ For the common ground between early Greek poetry and philosophy, cf. Nussbaum (2003) 211–16, Allan (2005) 71–5.

²⁰¹ Dale (1967) xvi. ²⁰² Burnett (1960). ²⁰³ Conacher (1998) 110.

²⁰⁴ One might compare Gorgias’ *Encomium of Helen*, a παίγνιον or ‘amusement’ (ἐβουλήθη γράψαι τὸν λόγον Ἐλένης μὲν ἑγκώμιον, ἐμὸν δὲ παίγνιον, §21) which also serves the serious purpose of drawing attention to the power of rhetoric.

(a) Knowledge and reality

The limits of human knowledge and the gap between reality and appearance are central themes of *Helen*. Of course one cannot extract a systematic philosophy from this play or any other, since poets do not set themselves to explore the issues of (for example) truth and illusion *per se*, but rather harness the language and ideas surrounding those issues in order to explore the relevance of the myth as a whole for their society. One might compare the way Attic tragedy deploys legal language and concepts, as in e.g. the connection between written law and impartial justice, *ισονομία*, made by Theseus at Eur. *Supp.* 433–7: it does so because such language is a dominant currency of public life in Athens, but the legal and political issues themselves are not separable from the play as a whole. Or, to take another example: the gulf between divine and human knowledge is a fundamental feature of Greek thought (compared to a god, says Heraclitus, a human being is an ‘ape in wisdom’, DK 22 B 83), and it is especially important to tragedy, the poetic genre most dominated by human ignorance or delusion and their catastrophic consequences. Thus the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles stress repeatedly the limits of human knowledge and perception,²⁰⁵ yet it is typical of Eur.’s more overtly contemporary style that he should take such a traditional idea (which is implicit in almost every Greek myth)²⁰⁶ and present it in the language of current intellectual debate.

Helen draws on a rich tradition of philosophical thought concerning the problems of human knowledge. Parmenides, whom Plato represents as coming to Athens around the middle of the fifth century (Pl. *Parm.* 127b), had launched perhaps the most sustained criticism of the human senses and the illusory nature of perceptible appearances (DK 28 B 1–8). He urges his reader to reject the ‘way of opinion’ which is based on sense-perception, and to follow instead ‘the way of truth’ which is founded upon reason. Such a distinction between ‘appearance’ and ‘reality’ now seems so hackneyed that it is very difficult for us to realize the massive conceptual advance that it embodied. Yet it crucially influenced the subsequent history of Greek philosophy, for appearances (τὰ φαινόμενα) were recognized as being both an ineluctable feature of experience and, as Anaxagoras called them, ‘a glimpse of the hidden’ (ὄψις τῶν ἀδύλων τὰ φαινόμενα, DK 59 B 21a), thereby challenging later thinkers to get behind them to something more real. The question of how to tell the real from the unreal is central to *Helen*, where the confusion caused by the divinely created εἶδωλον underlines the importance of the senses even as it questions whether humans can have secure knowledge of anything at all. Eur. challenges the connection between knowledge and sight in particular, since seeing was popularly thought to be synonymous with reliable

²⁰⁵ Although these limits are especially prominent in *OT*, the gap between reality and appearance is central to all the surviving plays of Sophocles. In *Electra*, for example, the heroine clings to the urn when Orestes asks for it (1205–10), and her confusion is brought about not, as in *Helen*, by a false presence (an εἶδωλον), but by a false symbol of her ‘dead’ brother’s absence.

²⁰⁶ Cf. e.g. *Il.* 18.8–11, where Achilles, even though he is of all humans closest to the gods, still realizes the implications of Thetis’ oracle too late.

knowledge.²⁰⁷ Thus M.'s bewilderment is expressed in terms that stress his reliance on visual evidence above all, and words for sight accumulate at the crucial moment when M. rejects the real H. who stands before him (575–80):

ΜΕ. οὐ πού φρονῶ μὲν εὖ, τὸ δ' ὄμμα μου νοσεῖ;
 ΕΛ. οὐ γάρ με λεύσσω σὴν δάμαρθ' ὄραν δοκεῖς;
 ΜΕ. τὸ σῶμ' ὁμοῖον, τὸ δὲ σαφές γ' ἀποστατεῖ.
 ΕΛ. σκέψαι· τί σοι δεῖ πίστεως σαφεστέρας;
 ΜΕ. ἔοικας· οὗτοι τοῦτό γ' ἔξαρνήσομαι.
 ΕΛ. τίς οὖν διδάξει σ' ἄλλος ἢ τὰ σ' ὄμματα;

H.'s exasperated appeal to the testimony of M.'s eyes (580) is pointedly ironic, since it is precisely the phantom's convincing appearance which prevents M. from accepting H.'s claims about her identity.

The deceptiveness of appearances was also articulated in terms of the disjunction between the *name* (ὄνομα) that is given to something because of how it appears and its true *being* or reality (πρᾶγμα/ἔργον/σῶμα).²⁰⁸ Once again we see Eur. exploiting contemporary intellectual debate to further his dramatic ends, in this case by focusing audience attention on the gap between language and reality (e.g. 601, 728–33, 792), and thereby underlining the disastrous fallibility and incompleteness of his characters' beliefs. Moreover, the existence of two Helens – that is, two bodies sharing one name – means that the separation of name and object becomes an utterly puzzling problem for all the characters concerned: M. reacts to the news of a Spartan H. living in Egypt by concluding that different people and places can have the same names (483–99);²⁰⁹ the Greeks fought at Troy not for H., but for a mere 'name' (42–3; cf. 1100, 1653); H.'s name has been in many places, but her body has remained in Egypt (588); H.'s 'name' or reputation has been ruined, yet her body is still pure (66–7); and so on. Thus although the ὄνομα/σῶμα distinction is not peculiar to *Helen* (cf. e.g. *IT* 504, *Or.* 390), Eur. is able to develop it in more varied ways because of H.'s phantom double.²¹⁰ Moreover, he has used a traditional motif, namely that of

²⁰⁷ Odysseus, for example, praises Demodocus' skill as a bard by stressing that the truthfulness of his song is like that of an eyewitness (*Od.* 8.487–91). Or one might compare Herodotus' repeated emphasis on autopsy to enhance the authority of his narrative (cf. Schepens (1980) 33–93).

²⁰⁸ Protagoras, for example, responded to the claim that perception could be misleading with a form of relativism regarding truth, knowledge, and ethical values, so that what seems to each person true or false, good or bad etc. is so for that person (a position summed up in the motto 'man is the measure of all things', DK 80 A 19, v 1). For a detailed discussion of the ὄνομα/πρᾶγμα antithesis in early Greek, and especially Sophistic, thought, see Kannicht (1969) 1.57–60, Kraus (1987); cf. also Solmsen (1934), Assael (2001) 73–92, Egli (2003) 214–16, Wright (2005) 269–70.

²⁰⁹ Democritus developed four arguments, including the argument from homonymy, to prove that names are conventional rather than natural (DK 68 v 26).

²¹⁰ Indeed, a whole series of doubles – two prologues, two Greek warriors arriving in Egypt, two reports of M.'s death (both false, but the latter deliberately so), etc. – emphasizes the bewilderment of the human protagonists; cf. Segal (1971) 562 on 'the deliberate gemination of elements in the plot, beginning with the two Helens'.

gods creating εἰδῶλα to outwit and punish mortals, but has related it more overtly to contemporary debates about perception and knowledge.²¹¹ This is perhaps clearest in the characters' insistent use of δοκεῖν and its cognates (cf. esp. 35, 54, 576, 611, 658, 1020), and particularly in the use of the abstract noun δόκησις (36, 119, 121), a newly coined term characteristic of late fifth-century philosophical debate (cf. 35–6n.).

As a major participant in the best known and most celebrated poem of the heroic tradition, H. is an ideal figure to connect with the theme of epistemological fallibility.²¹² For if the characters in the play, and the audience itself, turn out to be utterly wrong in their beliefs about such a notorious figure, how certain can they be that they know anything? Thus H.'s phantom embodies the tragic themes of human ignorance and delusion in a dramatically striking manner, and in its presentation of language, knowledge, and reality, *Helen* is in many ways as chastening and bleak as even the most overtly pessimistic of tragedies. Yet unlike, say, Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Helen* also explores the limits of human knowledge with a marked playfulness. Indeed, there is a remarkable variety in the play's treatment of illusion, since after H. and M.'s recognition-scene, these former victims of appearance promptly turn it to their advantage as they outwit Theoc. with the tale of M.'s death.²¹³ H. ingeniously invents her own phantom M. – a conveniently dead and absent one – to delude her unwelcome suitor, and the tone of these deception scenes (1165–1300, 1390–1450) is altogether lighter than the treatment of 'knowledge', or false opinion, in the first part of the play. While such playfulness can (and in *Helen* does) have a serious purpose, underlining the vulnerability of humans to deception and manipulation by appearance, it also ensures there is more to the action of the play than pure disillusionment and nihilism.²¹⁴

(b) *Family, gender, authority*

Tragedy depicts a heroic society in which relationships of all kinds are thrown into crisis. The resulting conflicts often set friends or members of a single family against one another, or alienate individuals from a larger collective (e.g. the army or their community as a whole). Though heroes are typically excessive and problematic *individuals*,

²¹¹ See p. 20 above for examples of this motif in epic and Stesichorus as well as for Plato's interest in εἰδῶλα as symbols of the false world of the senses.

²¹² Cf. Segal (1971) 561 'whereas' Stesichorus' *eidolon* seems to have served primarily to exonerate Helen, Euripides' has the philosophical function of asking what reality is. This shift of emphasis may well be Euripides' innovation in the myth.'

²¹³ Cf. Downing (1990) 11 on the impact of the escape plan: 'It progresses from a negative evaluation of *apatē*, *technē*, *dolos*, *mēchanē*, etc. at the beginning of the play . . . to a positive evaluation of these same terms.'

²¹⁴ Wright (2005) 278–337 offers a brilliant analysis of illusion (in its many forms) in *Helen*, *IT*, and *Andromeda*. He ends, however, with (p. 337) 'a nihilistic conclusion'. Although Wright's dark reading is an appropriate reaction against views of *Helen* (in particular) as a non-serious 'tragicomedy', the impact of the plays' lighter scenes should not be neglected (see p. 69 below).

the disputes and tensions they create are always with (or within) larger social *groups*, especially the family and the city (or *oikos* and *polis*). For heroes (like gods and men) are social beings, and the family and the city are the principal contexts of social interaction both in the heroic world of the play and the contemporary (i.e. fifth-century Athenian) world of the audience. Moreover, tragedy is not only full of tensions within families or between obligations to family and the larger community, but is also characterized by the breakdown of traditional lines of authority – which, in the patriarchal worlds of heroic myth *and* Athenian society, often takes the form of conflict between men and women (e.g. M. and his supposedly adulterous wife) or parents and children (e.g. Proteus and his lustful son Theoc.).

As perhaps the most fundamental determinant of a (free) individual's socially instituted roles in both *oikos* and *polis*, gender plays a particularly important part in tragic representations of heroic society and its conflicts. Women and marriage are central to Greek tragedy, but before we consider the reasons for this we should stress that they will tell us just as much about *male* status and masculinity, since gender roles and relationships are reciprocal. The importance of the male self-image is hardly surprising, since tragedy (like nearly all Greek literature) was written by men for a largely male audience.²¹⁵ Nonetheless, women and marriage (and with it the transition from girlhood to motherhood) are such prominent issues in tragedy for the simple reason that they are central to Greek society and hence to Greek myth. For as the basic units of exchange in both heroic and contemporary Athenian society, women create links between families, transferring wealth, property, and other privileges, the most important in fifth-century Athenian society being that of citizenship itself (see further below). The crucial role played by women as carriers of power is emphasized in Greek myth by their frequent role as desirable royal heiresses. Thus M. succeeds Tyndareos in Sparta because of his marriage to H., and Orestes succeeds him because of his marriage to Hermione.²¹⁶

However, just as the myths make clear women's status as sources of power, so they also manifest women's role as the cause of conflict about power, and few more so than H., catalyst of the Trojan War. Moreover, if myth expresses social ideology in narrative form,²¹⁷ we can expect to see H.'s story expressing fundamental cultural concerns about women, since she is in many respects the archetypal woman of Greek

²¹⁵ The evidence for women's attendance at the theatre of Dionysus is scanty and controversial, but on balance favours their presence: see Csapo and Slater (1995) 286–7, 420 (with earlier bibliography). It is hard to see why women, who were certainly involved in the Dionysia's opening procession, should be excluded from its theatrical performances. As Csapo and Slater (1995) 286 remark, the argument against women's inclusion 'rests mainly upon the comic poets' habit of addressing the audience as "gentlemen". This fails to distinguish physical from ideological forms of exclusion.' Nonetheless, even if some women were present, the majority of the audience will have been male, and the male citizens of Athens dominate the plays' notional target audience and value system.

²¹⁶ Finkelberg (2005) 65–89 analyses this social pattern in Greek and Near Eastern myth.

²¹⁷ For this succinct and compelling definition of myth, see Csapo (2005) 9.

myth. Indeed, H.'s portrayal from the *Iliad* onwards sums up many of the basic questions asked by Greek men about women – could they be trusted? were they ruled by lust? and so on – making H. a central figure in the history of Greek gender ideology. In ideological terms H. is the ultimate woman in negative and positive ways – that is, she is both an adulteress and supremely desirable, and insofar as women are stereotypically ambivalent in Greek myth, H. is so especially.

The patriarchal nature of Greek society in general gives H. a powerful expressive force in Greek myth well beyond Athens (for H.'s largely negative portrayal in Athenian tragedy, see §3). Thus H.'s combination of positive and negative features embodies the potential of all women, and especially powerful women, to be dangerous. And even in *Helen*, where H. is not (as elsewhere) a transgressive adulteress but a Penelope-like icon of fidelity, her beauty and desirability still underlie the catastrophe of the Trojan War. Indeed, although the 'new' H. repeatedly laments and regrets her beauty (e.g. 27–9, 260–3, 304–5), her power to arouse desire in men (Paris and Theoc.) remains a source of misfortune to herself, her family, and her community.²¹⁸ In other words, even the unorthodox story of the faithful H. expresses the dangers of female sexual potency, and as with her traditional epic self, the 'new' H. remains a Pandora-like καλὸν κακόν, whose desirability becomes a cause of conflict and suffering. Thus the fact that H., even in her non-adulterous form, cannot escape the disastrous consequences of her sexuality tells us much about (largely male-generated) Greek views of women and the dangers of female power.

We saw in §1(b) the importance of reconstructing the values and beliefs of *Helen's* original fifth-century Athenian audience. Hence it is facile to bemoan Greek or Athenian misogyny from a modern perspective, since this does not help us understand the tragedies or the culture that produced them. So, for example, Athena and Apollo's support for the male 'in all things' (as Athena puts it: Aesch. *Eum.* 737 τὸ δ' ἄρσεν αἰνῶ πάντα) is disconcerting to modern readers, yet it echoes the strong divisions and hierarchies of Athenian society.²¹⁹ Moreover, the differences between men and women were expressed and maintained in all aspects of public and private life, from the clothes they wore²²⁰ to the forms and recipients of their religious devotion.²²¹ As

²¹⁸ H.'s beauty motivates her abductions by Theseus and Paris (the latter supplanted here by Hermes: 44–8n.). When Ovid's wrinkly old H. looks in the mirror she cannot believe she was abducted twice (*Met.* 15.232–3).

²¹⁹ Cf. Macleod (1983) 39 'when Apollo and Athena say that the man is the only begetter of the child, that is the statement, in physical terms, of a principle thought necessary for moral and social order'. Examples of Athenian sexual differentiation are legion (cf. Dover (1974) 95–102), but one might adduce as particularly revealing (and not mentioned by Dover) the Athenians' strong resentment that a woman (Artemisia) fought against them at Salamis, which, according to Hdt. 8.93, led the Athenians to offer a huge reward (10,000 drachmae) for her capture.

²²⁰ Cf. e.g. Pentheus' shame at putting on women's clothes (*Bacch.* 828–36).

²²¹ See Parker (2005), esp. 270–89; as he says (p. 270) 'It would be an exaggeration to say that Athenian men and Athenian women had different gods, but the differences between the relation of the two sexes to the gods go deep.'

elsewhere in Greece, the goal of an Athenian woman's life and the key determinants of her reputation and success were marriage and children. Moreover, as the power and wealth of the city expanded, the increasing value of Athenian citizenship gave women an even more important role in the maintenance of the Athenian citizen body as an exclusive descent group.²²²

Naturally, from a modern perspective, one is perhaps most struck by the constrained and limited nature of Athenian women's status – they could *transmit* property and citizenship, but could not own property or be citizens themselves, nor did they have any legal status independent of their male kin.²²³ Nevertheless, we must not ignore the fact that women did have – and, crucially, perceived themselves as having – a value in the Athenian system of which they could be proud.²²⁴ Thus to take part in the public women's festivals was a privilege granted only to αἱ Ἀττικαί, the wives and daughters of Athenian citizens, while the centrality of marriage and procreation to the continuation of the Athenian descent group ensured that Athenian wives and mothers enjoyed a high social status which was bolstered by the protection of their male kin.²²⁵ It is therefore no coincidence that Athenian tragedy shows repeatedly the disastrous consequences of insulting the status of wives and mothers: so, to return to Athena and Apollo's support for the matricide Orestes, the audience of the *Oresteia* can also see the justice of Clytemnestra's grievances: 'Apollo has not told the whole story, for Agamemnon himself sins against marriage by bringing a concubine into the house and by killing the daughter he shares with his wife.'²²⁶ Similarly, the Athenian audience of Euripides' *Medea*, for example, can see the mistakes made by both husband and wife: Jason betrays his debt to Medea, who in turn directs her vengeance against their innocent children.²²⁷ Yet, as is typical of Athenian tragedy, positive ideas emerge from the malfunctioning heroic world: thus an Athenian audience can

²²² The greater focus on the control of women in fifth-century Athenian literature and myth compared to that of earlier Greek society, and the impact of Pericles' citizenship law of 451/0, are well discussed by Scaford (1994) 206–20; cf. also Patterson (1981) 161.

²²³ For Athenian women's seemingly paradoxical legal status, cf. Gould (1980) 43–6, concluding (p. 46) 'women stand "outside" society, yet are essential to it (and in particular to its continued, ordered existence); their status derives from males but theirs, in turn, from the women who are their mothers.'

²²⁴ An Athenian woman's privileged status would be evident to her in everyday interaction with metic (free, but non-citizen) and slave women.

²²⁵ Even if the term αἱ Ἀττικαί itself marks the circumscribed nature of women's political power, cf. Osborne (1985) 183 'That the links with the city established by the name Ἀθηναῖος only exist because of the political function of the city becomes clear from the case of Athenian women. αἱ Ἀθηναῖαι is not a possible form of reference to the wives of Athenian citizens, rather they are Ἀττικαί γυναῖκες.'

²²⁶ Macleod (1983) 39.

²²⁷ Despite the tendency of many modern scholars to map the world of the play onto that of the audience, there is no straightforward analogy between Medea's situation and that of contemporary women: not only is she a barbarian, but she has betrayed her father, killed her brother, and (as the audience know) will try to kill Theseus. Yet even though her alterity is evident, this does not cancel out Jason's errors: he too is a negative exemplum for contemporary Athenian men, who can see through his bogus claims of concern for his *oikos*.

compare Medea's desperate position with that of wives and mothers in their own society, and see that whereas Medea has no safety net, Athenian women have not only male kin but also their status within Athenian society to protect them (for this tragic pattern of heroic inversion see p. 7, and further below).

How then are we to explain the obvious contrast between the prominence of women on the tragic stage²²⁸ and their restricted role in Athenian public life? Here too the answer lies in the very *dissimilarity* between the play world and that of the audience, since tragedy not only illustrates, by a series of negative examples (i.e. powerful, independent, and dangerous women), the *centrality* of women to social exchange and ordered civic life, but also justifies the institutionalized *limits* to their choices and freedom that are part of fifth-century Athenian society.²²⁹ Recent work on the female figures of tragedy, building on the insights of feminist scholars beyond classical studies, has shown how the plays reflect and uphold contemporary Greek charter-myths for the constraint of female agency.²³⁰ It may be too one-sided a view to claim, as Zeitlin does, that the female figures of tragedy are ciphers used for the exploration of the male self,²³¹ since this neglects the extent to which tragedy defines women's roles and status as well as men's by comparing and contrasting them with the mythical past.²³² Nonetheless, Zeitlin is undoubtedly right insofar as women are always presented in relation to a male-dominated society (and for a default male audience).

Moreover, I would go further than Zeitlin does in her insightful analysis of 'the dynamics of misogyny', and argue that while tragedy expresses the legitimate status and important roles of women, it does so in a way that *never* challenges the inherently male-dominated culture and viewpoint of its original audience. In other words, tragedy can (and does) explore fifth-century norms regarding gender ideology (and much else), but does so in a way that ultimately affirms rather than undermines them.²³³

²²⁸ Esp. in Eur., of whose seventeen surviving tragedies eight are named after the heroine (only four after male protagonists), while no fewer than fourteen have a female chorus (the exceptions being *Alc.*, *Held.*, and *Her.*). Eur.'s preference for female choruses (continued in the lost plays, to judge from their titles, giving 15 male and 26 female choruses in total) was matched by Aesch. (14 male, 20 female) but not by Soph. (24 male, 15 female); for figures and titles, see Mastronarde (1998) 62 n. 11.

²²⁹ The *contemporary* setting of Old Comedy means that Athenian gender norms can operate there more overtly, as in the comic poets' mockery of the powerful and independent Aspasia, whose undue influence allegedly skews Pericles' conduct: cf. e.g. *Ar. Ach.* 526–39, where the theft of two of Aspasia's whores is said to have sparked the Peloponnesian War by prompting Pericles to issue the Megarian Decree.

²³⁰ Cf. esp. the ground-breaking articles collected in Zeitlin (1996) 87–171, 341–74, with further bibliography.

²³¹ Cf. Zeitlin (1996) 346–7.

²³² Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that the female spectators themselves, raised in Athenian society *to see themselves in a certain way*, are likely to have taken pride in their roles as wives, mothers, and guardians of the *oikos*.

²³³ Thus I do not agree with Zeitlin (1996) 365 when she says that in *Helen* '[Eur.] subverts the genre that was so firmly bound up with the context of the masculine civic world.' Similarly, E. Hall (1997) 103–10 offers a compelling account of the disasters that ensue when men are not in charge of the *oikos* in tragedy, but draws back from concluding that the genre affirms contemporary

And since tragedy's affirmation of Athenian values by heroic inversion extends to all aspects of social and political ideology, it is not surprising that such an important issue as sexual differentiation should be so prominent a theme in the surviving plays. Yet tragedy does not present this issue, as many modern scholars allege, in order to raise (and leave hanging in the air) deeply troubling questions about the relations of the sexes, but rather confronts these conflicts and tensions – which are a part of sexual dynamics in every society, not only patriarchies – in a way that appeals to a fifth-century Athenian audience, showing how the crises which result from such conflicts are exacerbated by the character of the heroic world itself, in contrast to the progress made by contemporary Athenian society. So, for example, a recent commentary on *Antigone* argues that when Creon insists 'on the need for men always to "be master" of women (e.g., 482–5, 531–5, 677–80, 740–50), even the most misogynistic and paternalistic Athenian must have felt some qualms'.²³⁴ However, this is to overlook the fact that the autocratic Creon is *not* a role-model for Athenian men, who will have disapproved not only of his tyrannical behaviour but also of Antigone's challenge to male authority. In other words, the Athenian spectator, witnessing the death of Antigone and the destruction of Creon's *oikos*, will have been conscious that his own society granted women status (but not full independence) and denied tyrants power in order to avoid such catastrophic conflict.²³⁵

Eur. has undoubtedly stressed H.'s cleverness and intellectual superiority to M., yet this is no more a proto-feminist statement than is Homer's depiction of the clever and resourceful Penelope (for Eur.'s use of Odyssean allusion in *Helen* see p. 27). This is not to deny that H.'s cleverness in both the *Odyssey* and *Helen* is, like that of any woman (according to Greek myth), double-edged and potentially unsettling, yet in *Helen* the focus is very much on the *positive* outcome of H.'s cleverness, which is combined (again as in the case of Penelope) with absolute fidelity.²³⁶ There is, indeed, from the perspective of an Athenian male, an imbalance of power in H. and M.'s

civic norms, stressing its 'polyphony' instead. Yet if we look at the wider heroic context of each play, the challenge to contemporary (male-dominated) attitudes invariably disappears; cf. n. 227 above on *Medea*.

²³⁴ Griffith (1999) 51.

²³⁵ This process of affirmation, it should be stressed, is *not* necessarily a conscious one, either on the part of the poet or his audience, but is central to the popularity and meaning of tragedy in its original cultural context. Indeed, far from being a conscious process, the cultural affirmation provided by Athenian tragedy springs from two main sources: firstly, the application of contemporary values to the (essentially different) world of the heroes; and secondly, the attempt (typical of Greek use of myth) to create something positive from the heroic past which enables the audience to make sense of its own society.

²³⁶ H. seduces Theoc. with the promise of marriage, but the negative potential of her sexual power is here redirected to a positive end, the reinstatement of her rightful marriage. Nevertheless, Wolff (1973) 77 is right to stress H.'s ambiguities even here, since such sexual power is never perceived as wholly innocent: 'Euripides has managed both to vindicate Helen's virtues and to endow her with edge, charm, and resourcefulness, echoing from a still audible erotic, guileful, and destructive power.'

relationship (as there is in Homer),²³⁷ but it is too simple an analogy to see this as a covert appeal on Eur.'s part for Athenian women to be given a higher status. After all, Athenian women took a leading role in managing the *oikos*, which was seen as requiring intellectual qualities, and it therefore seems likely that men would find such qualities both attractive and valuable (even if they would not want to be driven to M.'s situation of reliance upon his wife's cleverness to save his own life).²³⁸ Indeed, the dangers facing H. and M. in Egypt mean that in this context female agency and *dolos* (i.e. H.'s escape plan) do *not* threaten the patriarchal order, since H. is motivated above all by her loyalty to M.²³⁹ (Similarly, Theonoe's defiance of male authority in frustrating her brother's desire is not revolutionary but rather reaffirms the primacy of her father's will.) Moreover – and this essential point has often been neglected – H. *willingly acquiesces in her subordinate role as M.'s wife, despite being his intellectual superior* – a most reassuring scenario for male spectators.²⁴⁰

Finally, although the traditional (i.e. adulterous) H. turns out here to be a phantom, her replacement by H. the loyal wife represents no critique of male thinking or male-authored poetic tradition, since even the new H. is the cause of great suffering. Despite her sympathetic portrayal, the mythical associations triggered by H. will influence how the Athenian audience respond to her in the play. H. may no longer be an adulteress, but her new story shows that even the most chaste woman can create chaos if left unguarded by her husband.²⁴¹ And insofar as the exploration of the female in Greek literature and myth is always one of potential harm and disaster, H.'s portrayal of herself as personally blameless and her reaffirmation of the marital bond do not change the fact that she remains a figure of contention and the cause of fatal strife.

(c) *Greeks and Egyptians*

There is evidence of substantial contact between Greece and Egypt already in the second millennium BC. Mycenaean Greeks visited and traded with Egypt, and Mycenaean kings corresponded with their Egyptian counterparts, just as they did

²³⁷ Even if, as Dale (1967) viii notes, H. is 'careful to play down her superior cleverness and to build up his heroic part in their coming escape.'

²³⁸ For Greek views on the wife's authority in the *oikos*, see Pomeroy (1994) 33–9; cf. also 57–8, entitled 'The economics of patriarchy', stressing the importance of the wife's labour to the economic success of the household.

²³⁹ As Rademaker (2005) 158 observes, 'It is only in *Helen*, in which the conventional story of Helen is inverted in vindication of her virtue, that Helen is – paradoxically, but appropriately in this context – credited with the σωφροσύνη (*Hel.* 932, 1684) of marital loyalty.'

²⁴⁰ Thus the play's reflections upon masculinity are equally patriarchal, for although M., as a Spartan king, is no direct role model for contemporary Athenian men, it is significant that despite his intellectual inferiority, the honour owed to M. *qua* man and husband is central to H.'s conduct throughout (c.g. 56–67, 293–7, 340–5, 550–2, 566, 625–59, 926–39, 1294–1300, 1399–1409).

²⁴¹ For this traditional pattern in (tragic) myth, see E. Hall (1997) 103–10; cf. n. 233 above.

with the rulers of Anatolia and Mesopotamia.²⁴² Indeed, the invasions that destroyed Mycenaean civilization also affected Egypt, which was attacked in the early twelfth century by various groups known collectively as the Sea Peoples, including the Ekwesh, who are frequently identified as Achaeans. The 'orientalizing revolution' in Greek culture from the early eighth century onwards owed most to interaction with Near Eastern (or 'West Asiatic') civilizations, but it also saw a resurgence of Greek interaction with Egypt.²⁴³ These contacts intensified in the reign of Psammetichus I (664–610 BC) and can be seen most clearly in the influence of Egyptian quarrying and stonework on the development of the Greek architectural orders and the *kouros* statue-type.²⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the prominence of Egypt in the *Odyssey*, especially in Menelaus' *nostos* and Odysseus' lying tales (4.125–7, 228–32, 351–592, 14.243–87, 17.424–44), shows the continuity of Greek interest in Egypt many generations before the expansion of contacts (military, commercial, and cultural) in the middle of the seventh century.

As François Hartog has emphasized, 'There was no single [Greek] view of Egypt, no single, unified model.'²⁴⁵ Nevertheless, there are several recurrent ideas in Greek visions of Egypt. Already in Homeric epic we find an emphasis on the wealth²⁴⁶ and wisdom²⁴⁷ of Egypt, but the most insistent and enduring feature of Greek views was their fascination with Egypt's antiquity. Recognition of the great antiquity of Egyptian culture not only encouraged respect (especially for the Egyptians' accumulated knowledge), but also confirmed Greek ethnographers and historians in their efforts to trace Greek borrowings from Egyptian culture. Thus both respect and an awareness of Greek indebtedness underlie the Egyptian researches of Hecataeus and Herodotus.²⁴⁸ Herodotus, who justifies the length of his Egyptian *logos* by stressing the country's very

²⁴² For a comprehensive discussion of the history of the Greeks in Egypt from the Mycenaean age (c. 1580–1230 BC) down to the middle of the fifth century, see Lloyd (1975–88) 1.1 60. Royal correspondence and treaties between Greeks, Egyptians, and Hittites are discussed by Bryce (2002) 29–31 and Latacz (2004) 101–19.

²⁴³ See esp. Austin (1970).

²⁴⁴ Osborne (1998) 47–51, 75–85, Whitley (2001) 215–17, Burkert (2004) 13. Psammetichus needed Greek mercenaries to secure his power, and their presence increased the number of Greek merchants operating in Egypt, culminating in the establishment of Naukratis c. 560 as a permanent Greek trading city on the Nile (52 miles south-east of Alexandria): cf. Hdt. 2.178–80, Hicks (1962) 91–2, Moeller (2000).

²⁴⁵ Hartog (2001) 47, who traces (pp. 47–77) 'the development of the Greek visions of Egypt which continued to be constructed and developed from Homer down to the Neoplatonic philosophers.'

²⁴⁶ Besides the *Od.* passages just mentioned, cf. *Il.* 9.379–84 on the wealth of Egyptian Thebes. In *Helen* Theoc.'s palace is compared by the Greek Teucer to that of Wealth himself (68–70).

²⁴⁷ Helen is given the magical drug of forgetfulness by the Egyptian Polydamna, and the poet comments '[i.e. in Egypt] every man is a healer skilled above all other peoples' (*Od.* 4.231–2). In *Helen* Theonoe's prophetic skill is related to the pervasive Greek association of Egypt with religious wisdom (discussed below).

²⁴⁸ For a concise survey of Greek ethnographic studies of Egypt, see Lendle (1992) 269–70. Bowman (2002) 202–10 discusses Greek perceptions of Egypt, including its image as 'a repository of ancient culture' (pp. 205–7).

many marvels (ὅτι πλεῖστα θαυμάσια ἔχει, 2.35.1), is most struck by Egypt's influence upon Greece in the sphere of religion.²⁴⁹ Herodotus' emphasis on such debts is all the more remarkable when one considers the basic pattern of *inversion* that he uses to make sense of Egypt, in which the Egyptians are presented as a topsy-turvy people whose 'manners and customs are in almost all cases the opposite of the rest of mankind' (2.35.2).²⁵⁰ However, despite the Greeks' respect for Egypt's antiquity and influence, there is no sign, even in the relatively open-minded Herodotus, that this in any way undermined the Greeks' belief in their inherent superiority to the Egyptians (as to all non-Greek peoples).²⁵¹

Greek concepts of ethnicity in the fifth century were based not only on descent from a common ancestor (Hellen) and shared tokens of 'Greekness',²⁵² but also on a principle of opposition (Greek *versus* barbarian) which was intensified by the Persian Wars. As with cultural assumptions about the differences between men and women, it is facile to bemoan Greek ethnic ideology, but essential to recognize its pervasiveness in Greek society.²⁵³ Moreover, the major Greek *poleis* each had their own competing versions of ethnic self-assertion, and that of the Athenians, bolstered by a belief in their autochthony, was particularly strong.²⁵⁴ Thus Isocrates, for example, could argue (expecting his Athenian audience to agree) that Athenians are superior to other Greeks as Greeks to barbarians and humans to animals (*Antid.* 293). As the Athenian empire expanded in the earlier part of the century, both Egypt and Cyprus (for the latter, cf. 148–501.) became part of the Athenians' on-going struggle with Persia, and the 450s saw the Athenians endure great losses in Egypt after a six-year campaign

²⁴⁹ For Egypt's high status as a religious source in Herodotus, cf. Harrison (2000) 182, 189, Mikalson (2003) 171–2. Burkert (2004) 71–98 supports Herodotus' view insofar as it applies to Egyptian influence on Orphic religion.

²⁵⁰ The example given by Herodotus – Egyptian women go out to work while the men stay at home and do the weaving – is also used by Sophocles' Oedipus to contrast the behaviour of his useless sons and loyal daughters (*OC* 337–45). For each author's audience the force of the inversion is strengthened by the coupling of two basic categories of Greek thought (gender and ethnicity).

²⁵¹ The popular view of foreign influences on Greek culture is assumed by the Athenian in [Pl.] *Epinomis* 987d: 'We may take it that whatever Greeks borrow from barbarians they turn into something better in the end.'

²⁵² τὸ Ἑλληνικόν is famously defined by Herodotus' Athenians as 'common blood and common language, and the altars of the gods that we share, and rituals, as well as our common customs' (8.144.2).

²⁵³ Cf. Dover (1974) 83–7. Of course the Greeks were not alone in their feelings of ethnic superiority. As Tuplin (1999) 67 n. 49 remarks on the Egyptians' view of other races, 'mt (man) stands for "Egyptian", implying the non-humanity of outsiders'. Ironically, as shown by Petrochilos (1974) 35–53, the Greeks were later reviled by the Romans for many of the qualities (e.g. decadence, deceit, effeminacy) which they themselves regarded as typical of *barbaroi*.

²⁵⁴ By contrast with Erichthonius, born and bred in Athens, the ancestors of other Greek communities (e.g. Pelops, Cadmus, Danaus) came from barbarian lands, making them and their descendants (in Athenian eyes) mere migrants: cf. Loraux (1993) 3–26, 37–71. As Harig (2001) 65 points out, Hecataeus' claim that the early Athenian kings Cecrops and Erechtheus were of Egyptian origin stood no chance of being accepted by contemporary Athenians or their historians, the Attidographers.

aiding an Egyptian revolt against the Persians.²⁵⁵ Even when the demands of *Realpolitik* forced both the Athenians and the Spartans to court Persian support during the Peloponnesian War, there is no sign that this undermined the Greeks' common ideology of difference and superiority.²⁵⁶

Yet despite the pervasiveness of these views in the Greek world, it is frequently claimed by modern scholars that Attic tragedy, and the plays of Eur. in particular, deconstruct or problematize the categories of 'Greek' and 'barbarian'.²⁵⁷ Thus a recent study of *Helen* argues that 'In the escape-tragedies the standard dichotomy breaks down, and what one sees is not good, noble, splendid, familiar Greeks contrasted with rotten, cruel, savage, strange barbarians, as one might have expected, but something more peculiar and unsettling.'²⁵⁸ This so-called 'standard dichotomy' is in fact, however, a mirage, since it is constructed by many modern scholars of Greek ethnicity (and certainly by all of those who detect tragic problematization) as a simple *polarity* of Greek and barbarian, whereas the historical record reveals not a polarity but a *spectrum*, so that 'barbarians are more commonly viewed as being situated at the other end of a linear continuum which did in fact permit category crossing'.²⁵⁹ Moreover, the point of this spectrum is not so much to define ethnicity *per se* (i.e. exclusive sets of 'Greek' and 'barbarian' characteristics) as to portray the consequences, individual and social, of differing degrees of autocracy and freedom.²⁶⁰

The importance of autocracy is well illustrated by Theoc. and Theonoe: they have eminently Greek names, worship Greek gods, and have Greek ancestors (cf. 4–15), but Theoc. is king of Egypt and therefore behaves in a typically 'barbarian' manner – that is, in ways that fifth-century Athenians would regard as characteristic of autocrats. (From a fifth-century Athenian perspective, barbarians, pre-eminently the Persians, were still – to their detriment – ruled by kings, and this was equally true of the hierarchical society of the Egyptians.) Indeed, Theoc. displays many of the

²⁵⁵ At Aesch. *Eum.* 292–5, performed in 458, Orestes refers approvingly to Athena 'helping her friends' in Africa. Thuc. 1.109–10 charts the disastrous end of the campaign in 455/4; cf. Meiggs (1972) 101–8.

²⁵⁶ For continuing Persian influence in fifth- and fourth-century Greek affairs, despite the failure of the Persian invasions, see Cawkwell (2005), esp. 139–46.

²⁵⁷ Cf. e.g. E. Hall (1989) 201–23 ('Epilogue: The polarity deconstructed'). For full bibliography, selected readings, and an overview of the debate, see Harrison (2002).

²⁵⁸ Wright (2005) 179. ²⁵⁹ J. M. Hall (2002) 8.

²⁶⁰ One might compare Herodotus' technique: he too does not subvert a Greek/barbarian *dichotomy* but rather shows a *continuum* of *nomoi*, and a basic pattern of progress, insofar as contemporary Greeks have developed free systems of government in contrast to the autocratic Persians (and Greeks of the past). While Herodotus ends his *Histories* with the Athenians showing disturbingly 'barbaric' qualities in their crucifixion of Artaxctes (9.116–20), this episode does not (as is often claimed) undermine the 'polarity', but in fact *confirms* the general distinctions between Greeks and barbarians in Herodotus' world-view – in other words, the Athenians are beginning to behave like typical (Herodotean) autocrats, and the narrator disapproves of their conduct. The idea that the Athenians could err towards the negative end of the spectrum does not dissolve Herodotus' basic insistence on the superiority of Greek *nomoi* and freedom. As the Athenians knew, there was always a danger that they could revert to old ways (tyranny) and democracy had to be (and was) protected from oligarchic and tyrannical subversion.

typical characteristics of tragic tyrants, whose great wealth and power put them more at risk of committing hybriistic acts.²⁶¹ Thus Theoc. is savagely violent towards those who threaten his marriage to H. (e.g. 155, 781, 1171–6); his conduct is condemned as impious by his sister (1020–1; cf. 1028–9); he fails to live up to the paradigm of moral behaviour set by his father (998–1001, 1011–12); and finally, his desire for the married H. shows a sexual predatoriness and excess typical of tyrants.²⁶² Theoc. is not a subhuman monster, but operates with the same basic ethical system of *charis* as the Greeks (cf. 1234 χάρις γὰρ ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλθέτω). Nevertheless, this is far from breaking down or questioning Greek ethnic ideology, since Theoc. is an autocrat and not a figure fifth-century Athens would welcome.²⁶³ H. sums up the Greek view of autocratic barbarian kings and their slavish subjects: τὰ βαρβάρων γὰρ δοῦλα πάντα πλὴν ἐνός (276),²⁶⁴ while M. boasts that his soldiers obeyed him willingly, not compelled like the troops of a tyrant (395–6).²⁶⁵ The Athenians' fear and hatred of tyrants and the political system entailed by their rule was particularly strong, and so for the play's original audience Theoc.'s autocratic behaviour was no less significant than his being a barbarian.²⁶⁶

Yet *Helen* simultaneously accommodates a more positive view of barbarians in the figures of Proteus and Theonoe. This mirrors the world of the audience, where more than one Greek reaction to barbarians was possible: Herodotus, for example,

²⁶¹ Seaford (2003) 96–9 describes impiety, distrust of *philoï*, and greed as characteristic features of tyrants in Attic tragedy.

²⁶² Abuse of citizens' wives and daughters is a common charge levelled at tyrants (e.g. Hdt. 5.92 on Periander of Corinth). For autocrats and sexual deviance, cf. Hdt. 1.61, where the Athenian tyrant Peisistratus' making love to his wife 'in an unnatural way' (οὐ κατὰ νόμον) insults the woman's family and results in Peisistratus' flight from Athens. Theoc.'s desire for H. is even more offensive (especially to a largely male Greek audience) because it is not yet known whether her husband is dead (cf. 784–5); see 786n. The use of M.'s *fake* death to deceive Theoc. is therefore all the more appropriate.

²⁶³ By contrast, critics (like Wright above) who operate with the 'standard dichotomy' and expect 'rotten, cruel, savage, strange barbarians' are surprised when non-Greeks have admirable qualities and infer from this that the Greek/barbarian distinction is being subverted (cf. Wright (2005) 194 'Even Theoclymenus is not as barbaric as he might have been').

²⁶⁴ The equivalence of 'barbarian' and 'servile' (typified in Aristotle's defence of the innate inferiority of barbarians and his theory of 'natural slavery': *Pol.* 1252a24–b27, 1253b–55b30) was reinforced in Athens by the fact that most slaves were of non-Greek origin. For the essential role played by slavery in the creation of a leisured and democratic Athens, cf. de Ste. Croix (1981) 140–2.

²⁶⁵ Of course, insofar as H. and M. will themselves return to a Sparta ruled by kings, there is a certain dissonance (from a fifth-century Athenian perspective) in having heroic figures utter such *topoi* of anti-barbarian thought, but the audience is focused here on H. and M.'s ethnicity rather than their status. Moreover, the audience are aware of the gap between the heroic world and theirs (see p. 7 above), so that the basic sliding scale of (Greek) freedom and (barbarian) servitude is not undermined by H. and M.'s royal status.

²⁶⁶ Athenian democrats saw themselves as superior to non-democratic Greek communities (Osborne (1995) 39 'the whole ideology of democracy in Athens was elitist . . . as it separated off the Athenians as superior to all others, Greeks and barbarians alike'), which underlines the fact that their reaction to the plays will have been guided by a spectrum of freedom and servitude rather than a simple Greek/barbarian antithesis.

praises the courage and strength of the Persians at Plataea, even if (he adds) they could not match the Spartans in armour, training or skill (9.62). (Moreover, as we saw, recognition of Persian courage does not alter the fact of the Persians' despotic political system, which was anathema to Herodotus' Greek, and especially Athenian, audiences.) Thus the knowledge and piety of Theonoe are set in opposition to the violence and selfishness of Theoc., who is further condemned by the fault of moral degeneration from father to son, embodied by Proteus, H.'s former protector (e.g. 60–3, 909–23, 940–3, 961–8, 998–1001, 1009–12, 1028–9).²⁶⁷ The depiction of Proteus as a pious and respectful barbarian is not new, since it is found in Herodotus and may be borrowed from him (see p. 22). Specific to Eur.'s version, however, is the presentation of Zeus entrusting his own daughter H. to Proteus for safe-keeping during the war (44–6). One might compare *Hecuba*, where Priam entrusts his son Polydorus to Polymestor: whereas the latter breaks his promise, here Proteus keeps his, but Theoc. fails to live up to his father's example.²⁶⁸ Indeed, Hermes entrusts H. to Proteus because he judges him 'most *sôphrôn* of mortals' (47 πάντων προκρίνας σωφρονέστατον βροτῶν), a reference to Proteus' sexual restraint. Thus Proteus is a notable exception to the Greek (esp. Herodotean) model of the lustful tyrant, which is nonetheless transferred to his son.

Though Egypt, as discussed above, was famed as a land of religious wisdom in its own right, Theonoe's religious authority is understood in Greek terms, not only in the sense that she, like all other Egyptians in the play, worships Greek gods (e.g. 878–91, 1005–8, 1024–7),²⁶⁹ but also because religion was a major sphere of female authority in Greek culture.²⁷⁰ (Appropriately, she is rescued by the gods from punishment at the hands of Theoc.: 1642–9.) Nonetheless, to read Theonoe's defiance of her male *kurios* as challenging Athenian gender norms would be premature, since Theonoe is driven to this crisis because she is the sister of a hybriatic autocrat, and her reasons for doing so are hardly revolutionary: she obeys the decision of her father (cf. κυρία γὰρ ἔστι νῦν, 968n.).²⁷¹

²⁶⁷ Both motifs (contrasting barbarians – one wise, the other hybriatic – and degeneration from father to son) are also found in Aesch.'s portrayal of Darius and Xerxes in *Persians*.

²⁶⁸ By contrast, Theonoe respects her father's decision and lives up to it (940–1, 966–8, etc.). Theoc. is presented as even more isolated by H.'s claim that everyone in the king's household is friendly to her except Theoc. himself (314; cf. 481–2).

²⁶⁹ There is no trace of Egyptian animal worship, for example (cf. Friis Johansen and Whittle on Aesch. *Supp.* 220), nor, despite Theoc.'s ignorance of Greek burial customs (1065–6, 1241–77, 1429), of mummification (Aesch. *Cho.* 296, Soph. fr. 712 Radt), one of the most distinctive features of Egyptian culture from a Greek perspective (cf. Hdt. 2.85–90).

²⁷⁰ For the variety of women's and girls' roles in Athenian religion, see Parker (2005), esp. 218–49, 270–89.

²⁷¹ Griffith (2005) 349, for example, discusses the 'extraordinary moral authority' of women in tragedy, some of whom 'even carry out actions that are in explicit and overt defiance of male authority'. However, it is crucial for an Athenian audience that the male figure whom Theonoe resists (like Antigone and many other defiant heroines) is in fact a nasty autocrat (cf. e.g. Creon's insistence that the polis belongs to him alone: Soph. *Ant.* 733–9). Also, as noted by Goff (2004) 335, 'Helen and Theonoe . . . combine their talents for ritual action in order to rescue, rather than threaten, the male.'

In conclusion, the play reinforces the superiority of the Greeks, not least because their side is supported by the gods over the claims of the non-Greeks, no matter how that latter group acts individually. Indeed, as the virtuous Theonoe and Proteus illustrate, the Athenian audience does not need to damn every barbarian as completely odious in order to understand the inferiority of the barbarian system of *nomoi* as a whole, and their position within the divine scheme. In this case, Greek triumph is not only approved by the gods, but the audience (as in *IT*) can also enjoy the spectacle of Greeks outwitting a barbarian tyrant and securing the victory of escape (cf. 743, 1041–2, 1380–1, 1593–5, 1603–4).²⁷² The audience's basic ethnic assumptions do not make exploration of the concepts 'Greek' and 'barbarian' impossible, and the tragedians, far from being at the mercy of convention, are free to surprise their audiences, prompting them to think about their own norms and beliefs. Yet it is important to emphasize that such explorations only go so far, because they can only be undertaken within a specific intellectual context, which, in the case of classical Athens and its tragic poets, is predicated upon basic oppositions, the most glaring of which is the superiority of Greeks to non-Greeks and Athenians to non-Athenians. As with other surviving Attic tragedies, *Helen* does not problematize or deconstruct the categories 'Greek' and 'barbarian', but uses the drama's mythical setting (in this case, heroic-age Egypt) to illustrate the superiority of Greek *nomoi* and freedom.

(d) *The gods*

Tragedy is deeply rooted in the religious life of Athens, and not merely by virtue of the cultic contexts of its performance (City and rural Dionysia, and Lenaea). For its gods, like those of all Greek poetry, are simultaneously figures in traditional divine and heroic myth and also embodiments (however altered) of the audience's religious beliefs. Thus it would be a mistake to pick only one side of the gods of tragedy (their 'literariness' or their 'reality') and ignore or deny the other, since this creates a false dichotomy between myth on the one hand and religious belief or behaviour on the other, when in fact 'Myth was integral to Greek religion because it was through myth that the gods of cult were revealed.'²⁷³ Moreover, as Parker also notes, 'the tragedians can scarcely merely have reflected, but must also have shaped, the religious experience of the citizens, of which they formed a part. The theatre, it can be argued, was the most important arena in Athenian life in which reflection on theological issues was publicly expressed.'²⁷⁴ A particularly revealing example of tragedy's interaction with the religious beliefs and experience of its audience can be found in its handling of

²⁷² As E. Hall (1989) 122 observes, 'The popularity of these deceiving-the-barbarian scenes is reflected in Aristophanes' choice of a Scythian archer as a substitute for the barbarian king of tragedy in the send-up of Euripidean escape-plots constituted by *Thesmophoriazusae*.'

²⁷³ Parker (2005) 140.

²⁷⁴ Parker (2005) 136. For tragedy as a genre of 'religious exploration', see also Sourvinou-Inwood (2003). The tragedians are heirs to a long tradition of theological inquiry by Greek poets: cf. Allan (2005) 76–7.

cult and ritual aetiologies, as the tragedians depict the genesis of various religious practices and institutions, and thereby not only link the world of the play to that of the audience, but also claim the authority of heroic and cultic tradition for their own particular account of the myth (cf. 1666–9, 1670–5nn.).²⁷⁵

The peculiarity of Eur.'s treatment of the gods continues to be exaggerated in studies of Greek tragedy, as if Aristophanes' caricature of the poet as *atheos* (e.g. *Thesm.* 450–2) were taken seriously as a guide to his plays' contemporary reception rather than as a comic *distortion* of Eur.'s highly *traditional* gods.²⁷⁶ For not only is Eur. no different from Aeschylus and Sophocles in his awareness of the enormous gap separating the ethical and existential planes of gods and mortals, but his plays foreground this tragic gap between naïve human hopes and divine reality even more overtly than his predecessors. This, however, does not make his plays an atheistic challenge to contemporary religious beliefs – on the contrary, it is the very starkness and (in generic terms) *typicality* of Eur.'s gods which makes Aristophanes' charge so comically inappropriate.²⁷⁷ Moreover, although Eur.'s characters spell out with particular directness the (for mortals) disturbing ramifications of a world dominated by anthropomorphic gods (e.g. *Hipp.* 120, *Her.* 1341–6, *Bacch.* 1348),²⁷⁸ they do so in a traditional manner, as the plays (like those of Aesch. and Soph.) highlight the gods' self-interest and clashing wills, while also showing how such factors operate within the overarching system of Zeus's authority.²⁷⁹

Thus the experience of *Helen's* new heroine reflects the same patterns of divine motivation and divine/human interaction as the Homeric version of her story. Here too the gods' primary concern is their own τιμή:²⁸⁰ hence Hera's anger at the Judgment of Paris and her intervention to spite Aphrodite by creating H.'s εἶδωλον for

²⁷⁵ Recent attempts to argue for Eur.'s invention of actual cult details are implausible, since, as Parker (2005) 142 n. 28 observes, this 'would seem to undermine the aition's function of tying the past to a known present'. Moreover, the dramatist need not describe the exact form of ritual or cult known to the fifth-century audience, since he can allow for their subsequent development: cf. Parker (2005) 144 'Mythological time is . . . a time when the relations of gods and men had not yet been fixed in their final, historical mould.'

²⁷⁶ As Parker (2005) 137 puts it, 'Doubtless a Euripides who was as openly atheistical as Aristophanes pretended him to be would not have been tolerated in such a context [i.e. in a polis religious festival], but perhaps not in any other public gathering either.'

²⁷⁷ For the importance of generic conventions and (hence) audience expectations, see R. Parker (1997) on the striking contrast between the protecting, beneficent gods of civic theology (especially prominent in oratory) and the turbulent all-too-human gods of tragedy.

²⁷⁸ As a counterpoint to divine cruelty, one might compare how Thucydides shows the basic premise of anthropomorphism (the similarity of gods and humans) being ruthlessly exploited by the Athenians in the debate concerning the fate of Melos in 416: 'Our opinion of the gods and our clear knowledge of men lead us to believe that it is a universal and necessary law of nature to rule whatever one can' (5.105.2).

²⁷⁹ The model of a fractious divine society ruled by Zeus, who functions as the focal point of cosmic order and justice, is taken over from epic: cf. Allan (2006).

²⁸⁰ Aphrodite's self-justifying remark ἐνεστι γὰρ δὴ κὰν θεῶν γένοι τόδε | τιμώμενοι χαιρούσιν ἀνθρώπων ὑπο (*Hipp.* 7–8) could have been spoken (and its consequences pursued) by any god.

Paris to take to Troy (31–6; cf. 675–83). The dispute between the two goddesses continues, but now over H.'s return to Sparta, as Theonoe describes (878–86). No less traditional than the motif of divine rivalry is the fact that the goddesses' machinations do not conflict with Zeus's plan for the Trojan War, as H. herself makes clear: τὰ δ' αὖ Διὸς | βουλευμάτων ἄλλα τοῖσδε συμβαίνει κακοῖς (36–7). In other words, the εἶδωλον is created by Hera for personal ends, but it is also necessary from a cosmic perspective insofar as H. must go to Troy (or at least must seem to go there) in order to ensure that the Trojan War, a central element of the Διὸς βουλή, takes place. H. outlines Zeus's aims for the Trojan War: ὡς ὄχλου βροτῶν | πλήθους τε κουφίσειε μητέρα χθόνα | γνωτὸν τε θεῖη τὸν κράτιστον Ἑλλάδος (39–41). Zeus's desire to relieve the goddess Earth of her oppressive mortal population by bringing about the Trojan War was used in the cyclic epic *Cypria* to account for the destruction of the race of heroes (fr. 1 Bernabé/Davies), and Eur. also follows this version at *El.* 1282–3 and *Or.* 1639–42. Indeed, in *Electra* it is Zeus himself who is said to have sent H.'s εἶδωλον to Troy. In *Helen*, although the εἶδωλον has been created and sent by Hera, H. continues to play her traditional role as an instrument of Zeus's plan to end the heroic age.²⁸¹

In H.'s opening speech Eur. brings together two of the major instruments of Zeus's plan, H. and Achilles (cf. 41 γνωτὸν τε θεῖη τὸν κράτιστον Ἑλλάδος).²⁸² The war is fought, and Achilles dies, for the sake of H.'s εἶδωλον, and some critics see this as a particularly pessimistic or iconoclastic view of the Trojan War (or even of war in general). But quite apart from the play's traditional (epic) emphasis on the suffering of the Trojan War, as well as the inappropriateness of seeing *Helen* as an anti-war protest (for these important factors, see p. 6 above), the play is profoundly traditional in its (epic) view of suffering heroes who are rewarded by cult and worship (we shall return to this below). Equally traditional is the play's insistence that although the Trojan War is the will of Zeus (and so must happen), the limitedness of mortal knowledge means that the human characters, even the prophetess Theonoe (cf. 887–91, 1002–4nn.), cannot see the wider divine plan.²⁸³

²⁸¹ Cf. *Cypria* fr. 1.6–7 οἱ δ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ | ἦρωες κτείνονται, Διὸς δ' ἐτελετο βουλή; also Hes. *WD* 156–65, where the heroes are killed in the wars at Thebes and Troy (165 Ἑλένης ἐνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο). Like the *Cypria*, where H. is the daughter of Zeus and Nemesis (fr. 9 Bernabé = fr. 7 Davies), the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* emphasizes H.'s role in the destruction of the race of heroes, placing Zeus's decision immediately after H.'s wedding and citing Zeus's desire to end unions between gods and mortals (fr. 204.95–105 M-W). In short, these poems offer different angles on the same event (how the heroic age ended), but all involve H.

²⁸² The *Cypria* had presented Zeus's plans for the Trojan War in terms of the two unions (Thetis and Peleus, Zeus and Nemesis) which led to the birth of Achilles and H. (fr. 1 Bernabé/Davies); see p. 12.

²⁸³ For the gulf between divine and human knowledge, see esp. 1137–50n. Human ignorance and powerlessness are further underlined when mortal characters are able to see only τύχη ('chance') at work in events around them (e.g. 412, 1143, 1636). Such τύχη represents 'the prevailing uncertainty of human experience' (Cropp (2000) 37), in contrast to the greater power and knowledge of the gods. The mortals' inability to recognize the gods' plans also highlights their own ingenuity in turning τύχη (in the more constructive sense of 'luck') to their advantage (cf. 1369, 1374, 1409, 1424, 1445).

As in epic, H. is not only an agent of destruction within the plan of Zeus, but also a human figure trying to make sense of her mistakes or – as here, in the case of Eur.'s *innocent* H. – her *liability*. Thus H. bemoans the fact that, although innocent (cf. 615, where even the εἰδωλον itself calls her οὐδὲν αἰτία), she has a bad reputation (esp. 270–2, 281), and recognizes that she is considered responsible, and hence is universally blamed (as the Teucer scene makes particularly clear), for causing the war in the first place – after all, the Trojan War did take place and it was fought for her. So while Eur. removes the ambiguity associated with the traditional adulterous H. by splitting her into two people (one real and innocent, the other unreal and guilty), H. remains – in the eyes of others – a dangerous and destructive figure. (Thus even where Eur. appears to be most anti-Homeric, he is exploiting typically Homeric ideas.) Finally, that H. should be blamed for something she did *not* do is an integral part of her desperate predicament in Eur.'s unorthodox version of the myth (e.g. 53–5, 109–10, 362–3, 660–8, 1506–11).

The heroes' proximity to the gods is a dangerous condition, as illustrated throughout Greek myth and by tragedy in particular. Yet the unique status of the ἥμιθεοί also made them ideal for exploring central questions of Greek religion, since 'the problem of divine friendship could therefore be dramatized, with an immediacy and lucidity unknown in real life, by depicting the sufferings of sons and lovers of the gods, mortals bound to them by the closest of all ties of *philia*'.²⁸⁴ Moreover, the problem of divine *philia* is particularly acute in the case of figures such as H. and Heracles, the children of Zeus himself. Thus Eur.'s *Heracles* and *Helen* present mortal characters complaining bitterly of Zeus's apparent neglect of his son or daughter (cf. esp. *Her.* 339–47. *Hel.* 1144–8n.). Yet in both cases Zeus has a plan for his own children, even if mortals cannot see it, and even if it does not exclude other gods and goddesses having their own contrary wills and plans too.

Both H. and Heracles receive the consolation of hero-cult and apotheosis, and while such honours do not annul the fact of their sufferings (a point we shall return to), they are essential to an ancient audience's understanding of the heroes' lives and to their value as embodiments, however extreme or exceptional, of the mortal lot. The idea of consolation is a common one in heroic myth. The end of Pindar's *Ol.* 7, for example, gives us one type (funeral games and heroic honours for Tlapolemos, the founder of Rhodes), while tragedy abounds with consolations for the suffering heroes. In Euripides' *Orestes*, for example, M. and Orestes accept the pronouncements of Apollo and put their quarrel to bed, quite literally, in a way that strikes the modern critic as strange: Orestes removes his sword from Hermione's neck and agrees to marry her, if M. is willing to give her (*Or.* 1671–2). This is sudden, but no more sudden than Philoctetes' change of heart (*Phil.* 1445–68) or the simple ecstatic speech of Orestes prior to his departure in *Eumenides* (*Eum.* 754–77). In all these cases (and many others, especially in characters' reactions to *dei ex machina*), there are modern critics who talk about the unconvincing or ironic quality of the character's volte-face,

²⁸⁴ Parker (2005) 143.

but both the typicality of the pattern and the reality of consolation (whether Orestes' release from the pollution of murder or Philoctetes' cure and victory at Troy) argue otherwise.

H. and Heracles achieve the ultimate consolation: apotheosis.²⁸⁵ Thus in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* the audience know the familiar myth of the hero's ascent to divinity; but that Heracles himself dies without knowledge of his apotheosis makes his suffering greater and the reward the more impressive. In *Helen* Zeus's care is emphatically stated at the outset (45–6 οὐ γὰρ ἠμέλησέ μου | Ζεύς) and H.'s brothers, the Dioscuri, finally reveal that H.'s escape from Egypt and eventual apotheosis are the will of Zeus (166g Ζεὺς γὰρ ὦδε βούλεται). Of course, as noted above, the fact that mortal complaints about divine neglect are finally answered does not mean the audience forget about the characters' suffering and focus exclusively on the consolations and benefits. After all, suffering is a typical feature of human life (a basic Greek idea enshrined in Achilles' image of the two jars of Zeus, one containing evils, the other blessings: *Il.* 24.527–33); and indeed the consolations gained by the heroes only make sense when the audience fully understand the sufferings which preceded them. Moreover, for the heroic characters on stage, whose achievements are extraordinary, extraordinary suffering is also the norm. Thus a Greek audience will put H.'s sufferings in a wider context and see her as, in the end, one of the lucky ones whose suffering is balanced by good fortune, namely the restoration of her good name and the promise of heroic and divine honours.²⁸⁶

In other words, we should not view Eur.'s characters' complaints about the gods as in any way a challenge to religious norms or beliefs, since they function in context primarily as another manifestation of human limitations, especially the limits of human knowledge, and of the inevitable fact of human suffering. Thus the problem of human knowledge is strongly thematized in *Helen* by its connection to the motif of appearance versus reality and the deceptiveness of δόκησις, but this echoes in fifth-century terms the kind of complaints Agamemnon, for example, makes throughout the *Iliad* about the inscrutability of Zeus's will.²⁸⁷ This is not to deny that such divine inscrutability is disturbing from a human perspective (cf., for example, Orestes' bitter remark: δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὅτι ποτ' εἰσὶν οἱ θεοί, *Or.* 418), but it is also an utterly essential and traditional part of the Greek view of the gods, so that to view Eur.'s characters as in any way iconoclastic in this respect would be wrong.

As we emphasized at the beginning of this section, Eur. and his plays are the very opposite of *atheos*. In fact his work is 'most tragic' in this respect too (cf. Ar.

²⁸⁵ H.'s peculiarly strong bond of *philia* with the gods and her apotheosis are both suggested by Paul Valéry: 'And high on the hero grows the Gods I see, | Their antique smiles insulted by the spray, | Reaching their carved, indulgent arms to me' (from 'Helen', trans. Richard Wilbur, in the latter's *Things of This World*, 1956).

²⁸⁶ So too with Teucer, for example, whose future as the founder of Salamis is mentioned (146–50).

²⁸⁷ Cf. *Her.* 1341–6, where Heracles' insistence that 'a god lacks nothing, if he is truly a god' (1345) represents a contemporary version of a traditional complaint about the immortality of the gods.

Philoctetes 1453a29–30 for Eur. as τραγικώτατος . . . τῶν ποιητῶν in his arousal of pity and fear), since it foregrounds, in the starkest manner, the enormous gulf between the ethical and existential planes of gods and mortals. The purpose of his plays is not to challenge religious beliefs, despite the popularity of subversive readings of the plays, since the gods are traditionally portrayed in tragic myth as primarily interested in themselves (cf. n. 280 above); and insofar as tragedy presents figures who have a piously optimistic view of the gods, they are invariably shown to be naïve (e.g. *Ion* 339–42, 436–40). H. thus emerges, within the polytheistic framework of Greek religion, as a typically human (and tragic) victim of divine power and rivalry, but her suffering at the hands of individual gods, pulling in different directions, is offset by the enormous consolation of divine and heroic cult. H.'s apotheosis underlines that she is an exceptional figure (even by heroic standards), but her experience nevertheless communicates some basic ideas which are central to Greek myth and religion: namely, that suffering is the ordinary quality of human life; that the gods pursue their own interests above all, a situation which is potentially harmful to mortals, but inevitable; and finally, that although the Διὸς βουλή is inscrutable to mortals, the order imposed by it is supreme.²⁸⁸

7. GENRE

As one of Eur.'s so-called 'romantic tragedies' or 'tragicomedies' (for these terms, and their misleading effect, see below), *Helen* is a central text in modern debates about tragedy as a genre and its development. However, unlike many modern treatments of the play, which rely on narrow definitions of tragedy and the tragic, we shall stress not only the dynamism and variety of tragedy throughout the fifth century and beyond, but also the need to see these generic changes within a wider cultural context. But first it is important to consider the distorting influence of the critical and biographical tradition itself. Its tendentious view of Euripidean tragedy, in which (some of) Eur.'s plays are said to fall short of being 'real' tragedies or the 'best kind' of tragedy, has been shaped by two factors above all: firstly, and contemporaneously, by Aristophanes' comic parody and critique of Eur.; secondly, by the obsession of some later scholars with alleged 'rules' for the composition of tragedy, a prescriptive poetics whose roots lie in Aristotle's systematizing of the genre, but which was exaggerated and hardened by later critics.

It would be difficult to overstate the decisive influence exerted by Aristophanes' comic vision of the tragedian and his art on the subsequent interpretation not only of Eur.'s plays but also those of Aeschylus and Sophocles.²⁸⁹ Eur. is portrayed as a modern, rationalistic renegade who debases tragedy, yet one cannot treat this figure as a reflection of Aristophanes' or his Athenian audience's actual view of Euripidean

²⁸⁸ This conception of the gods may be austere, but it is not without benefits for those individuals and communities who worship their gods properly.

²⁸⁹ On Aristophanes' critique of Eur. and its influence, see Snell (1953) 113–35, Kovacs (1994a) 22–32.

tragedy, since – quite apart from the naiveté of supposing that Aristophanes, a comic poet, was constrained by real-life opinions – the Aristophanic Eur. is generated by a comic (i.e. fantastic) *polarization* of Aeschylus and Eur. So, for example, the Aristophanic Aesch. is made to say that he never put bad women on the stage (but what about the adulterous killer Clytemnestra?) and that he always eschewed the homely and everyday (cf. Cilissa's discussion of toilet-training at *Cho.* 752–60). Yet even where the alleged differences between the dramatists have some basis in fact, they present – for comic effect – grotesquely simplified views of the authors' styles that have little to do with serious literary analysis. Thus Aristophanes' frequent use of nostalgia and generational conflict as sources of humour makes Eur. an ideal comic target, since his tragedies place contemporary ideas, phrases, and institutions on stage in a more overt manner than either Aeschylus or Sophocles.²⁹⁰ The picture of generic decline that results from the opposition of old/traditional/wholesome Aeschylus and new/modern/degrading Eur. is, however, a comic illusion, which deliberately elides the traditional features shared by both tragedians. In his *Women at the Thesmophoria* Aristophanes suggests that *Helen* is not alone among Eur.'s works in being a fundamentally formulaic escape-play,²⁹¹ but he also singles it out as particularly unconventional, since the announcement by Euripides' Kinsman that he will imitate 'the new Helen' (950 τὴν καινὴν Ἑλένην μιμήσομαι) refers not only to *Helen*'s recent production the year before, but also to the striking novelty of the myth, a 'newness' that cannot be separated from Aristophanes' general presentation of Euripidean tragedy as new-fangled, decadent, and subversive of tragic tradition.²⁹²

Along with Aristophanes' comic critique, the other major influence on critical approaches to the development of Greek tragedy is Aristotle, or rather his post- and neo-classical epigones, who took the more prescriptive statements from his *Poetics* and hardened them into 'rules', which (not surprisingly) faulted any work that did not fit the mould of *Oedipus Tyrannus* (Aristotle's ideal tragedy).²⁹³ Later critics also took

²⁹⁰ Aristophanes criticizes Eur.'s foregrounding of contemporary features by presenting him as collapsing (to jarring and ludicrous effect) the gap between the heroic world of tragic myth and the everyday world of the audience (hence the notion of Eur.'s 'realism', which has played a prominent role in modern criticism), but this comic distortion conveniently overlooks the fact that Eur.'s plays show the same pattern of heroic inversion as Aeschylus' and Sophocles': see p. 7.

²⁹¹ Ar. *Thesm.* parodies no fewer than four of Eur.'s tragedies (*Telephus* of 438, *Palamedes* of 415, and *Hel.* and *Andromeda* of 412), but the *Helen*-scene (*Thesm.* 855–919) is the only example where we have the Euripidean original in full, making it a particularly valuable example of Aristophanes' paratragic technique: cf. Rau (1967) 53–65, Austin and Olson (2004) lx–lxii, 278–92; for possible allusions to *IT* in the final scene of *Thesm.*, see Cropp (2000) 62. Combining elements and verses from H.'s prologue, M.'s encounter with the Old Woman, and the recognition of husband and wife, Aristophanes adapts the ideas of imprisonment and escape to his own dramatic context, simplifying Eur.'s version so that it becomes 'the tale of a helpless woman who is carried off to safety (and bed) by a heroic male rescuer' (Austin and Olson (2004) lxi).

²⁹² By contrast, *καινός* is used as a term of praise in the parabasis of *Clouds* (547–8), where it is significant that Aristophanes is not mocking Eur.'s inventiveness, but celebrating his own.

²⁹³ According to Rosenmeyer (1985) 80, Aristotle 'was breaking the ground for a theory of genre, but he nevertheless remains primarily a tabulator of distinctions'. For the subsequent

further Aristotle's organic view of tragedy (cf. esp. *Poet.* 1449a14–15, where it is said that 'tragedy underwent many changes, but stopped evolving, since it had achieved its own nature')²⁹⁴ and developed various essentialist theories of 'the tragic'.²⁹⁵ However, such narrow and prescriptive approaches elide the extent to which Athenian tragedy itself transforms and incorporates earlier genres (including various types of choral and narrative poetry, and the invention of iambic dialogue). Moreover, they betray the extent to which critics of tragedy in particular are obsessed with 'rules' and appalled when they are 'broken' – yet literary conventions are there to be played with (scholars never complain when such things are done in comedy), and it is significant that the ancient scholia do not detect (and so are not appalled by) Eur.'s 'breaking the rules', which in turn suggests that they had a less strait-jacketed conception of the genre, and were more alive to its dynamism and variety, than many later critics.²⁹⁶

In recent decades the study of *Helen* and other (predominantly late) plays of Eur. (*Alc.*, *El.*, *IT*, *Ion*, *Hel.*, *Phoen.*, *Or.*, *LI*) has been distorted by categories such as 'tragicomedy', 'melodrama', and 'romantic tragedy', all of which are based on the assumption of a (superior) category of 'pure' tragedy from which these plays are excluded.²⁹⁷ Yet such categories are both anachronistic and potentially misleading, since they take the undeniable influence of Euripidean tragedy on later Greek comedy and the Greek novel (or 'romance') and *project it back* onto Eur.'s plays themselves, thereby detecting the intrusion of 'comic' or 'romantic' elements into tragedy.²⁹⁸ However, the fact that some tragedies present story-patterns (of recognition, reunion, intrigue, and escape) or exotic locations that were to feature in later literature does not mean they were perceived as 'comic' or 'romantic' by a fifth-century audience. After all, what an audience perceived as a comic element would be guided by the plays of their time (i.e. Attic Old Comedy), whose distinctive features of (for example) bawdy humour and political satire had little to do with tragedy.²⁹⁹ Thus to describe Eur.'s tales of last-minute recognition, intrigue, and escape as 'comic' is to be misled by hindsight into reading tragedy's influence in reverse. Even more importantly, such an approach

influence of the *Poetics* (in various 'rule'-bound forms), see e.g. Kelly (2005) 1–5, 111–24 on the Middle Ages, Burian (1997b) 240–7 on neo-classical theatre and criticism.

²⁹⁴ Fishelov (1993) 19–153 discusses the prevalence of metaphors (biological, familial, social, etc.) in the description of literary genres.

²⁹⁵ For 'the tragic' as a modern construct, and not part of the ancient concept of the genre, see Most (2000).

²⁹⁶ For the major interests of the tragic scholia, see Meijering (1987), esp. 49–52 (vividness and detail), 87–90 (history and fiction), 186–200 (structure, reality of the story, characterization), 209–11 (suffering and the emotions provoked by it).

²⁹⁷ For a brief anthology of such views, focused on English-language scholarship, see Wright (2005) 7–9.

²⁹⁸ For New Comedy's debt to tragedy, especially Eur., cf. Hunter (1985) 114–36. On Eur. and the Greek novel, and especially the latter's frequent setting in *Egypt*, see Rutherford (2005) 135–7; for the novel and *Helen* specifically, I have been unable to see Pautichis (1963).

²⁹⁹ It is significant that while Aristophanes lampoons Eur. for blurring the distance between the heroic world and the audience's present, he does not attack him for 'stealing' from comedy.

overlooks the use of similar story-patterns and locations in earlier Greek literature, especially the *Odyssey*, which, as we have seen (p. 27), exercised a major influence on Eur.'s *Helen*.³⁰⁰

Indeed, it was only by neglecting the prevalence of these so-called 'comic' or 'romantic' motifs in earlier myth and poetry (including earlier tragedy) that critics were able to categorize *Helen* and other plays as examples of the new sub-genres of tragicomedy and romantic tragedy. The distortion caused by such a narrow view of the poetic tradition is clearest in the way those plays with a 'happy ending' (i.e. a positive outcome for the major figures) have often been treated as insufficiently tragic or even anti-tragic.³⁰¹ Yet the need for such categories disappears when it is recognized that, for an ancient audience, the issue is not whether a play has an 'upward' or 'downward' plot, but whether its major figures suffer. For despite the positive endings of, for example, Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, and Eur.'s *IT*, the central characters suffer greatly (which is linked, as we saw (p. 65), to the exceptional consolation they eventually receive).³⁰² Thus, while it is important that we do not deny *Helen*'s lighter elements (cf. 435–821.), it remains typically tragic insofar as the audience see its protagonists suffer, even if they do escape.³⁰³

The traditional focus on 'tragicomedy' or 'romantic tragedy' as a distinctive aspect of Euripidean theatre also obscures the presence of similar plots in Aeschylus³⁰⁴ and Sophocles, not to mention other tragedians. Aristotle, after all, knew of many tragedies with positive endings, even if he considered them to be 'second-best' and – a revealing comment – pandering to popular taste (*Poet.* 1453a30–9). The fragments of Sophocles' second *Tyro*, for example, show him capable of composing a quintessentially 'romantic' plot, with exposed baby twins (Pelias and Neleus), the last-minute rescue of Tyro by her long-lost sons, and a climactic recognition of the twins' identity (via their former cradle: cf. *Ion* 1337–1438).³⁰⁵ The accidents of survival, however, mean that we are less able not only to appreciate the popularity of such plays, but also to see the variety of the genre as a whole. This is a crucial point, since the study of Greek tragedy has

³⁰⁰ Hence there is no need to 'explain' the presence of 'comic' or 'romantic' elements in *Hel.* and *IT* by labelling them, as Sutton (1972) does, 'pro-satyrical'.

³⁰¹ See Mastroradic (1999–2000), esp. 36–7. For *Helen* as 'comedy' in its happy ending, cf. e.g. Pucci (1997).

³⁰² Thus despite Aristotle's influential preference for tragedies that end disastrously for the protagonists, he too recognizes the effectiveness of those with a happy ending, and he praises the *IT* in particular for the pity and fear it evokes with its plot of narrowly averted disaster, as Iphigenia comes close to killing her brother (*Poet.* 1454a1–9).

³⁰³ In short, while lighter elements do feature, there is always a 'dark' aspect to the tragic genre insofar as the audience expect to see people in a desperate situation and/or dealing with their situation in a disastrous way.

³⁰⁴ The upward trajectory of the *Oresteia* is also a feature of Aesch.'s Danaid trilogy, so far as the main characters, the Danaids, are concerned.

³⁰⁵ For the *Tyro*-plays as underlining the variety of Sophoclean tragedy, cf. Kiso (1986) 162–4, Moodie (2003). A good example of Sophoclean experimentalism, which is obscured (once again) by Aristophanes' mockery of Eur.'s (monody) technique, is Sophocles' greater willingness to give solo songs to his male heroes (cf. Battezzato (2005) 156).

often suffered from a version of this fallacy.³⁰⁶ For our fifth-century texts are not evenly distributed (dating mainly from the last third of the fifth century), and if we had a wider range of texts, and more from Aeschylus and Sophocles, we might see both the *continuities* and the *variety* of the genre much more clearly. That our view of the genre is skewed by the surviving selection is obvious, yet a number of factors have combined to obscure the paucity of the selection,³⁰⁷ reinforcing the notion of a standard or ideal tragedy from which certain (mainly Euripidean) plays depart.³⁰⁸

Nevertheless, it is possible, despite the small proportion of surviving tragedies, to trace a number of developments in the genre. For as much as one must insist on the basic continuities that exist (e.g., in the handling of myth, the chorus, and theatrical space),³⁰⁹ tragedy is no more immune to change than any other art form,³¹⁰ since it too must respond to changes in audience taste and to developments in the wider cultural context.³¹¹ Firstly, it should be stressed that no dramatist has a single monolithic style: the differences between Aeschylus' *Persae* and *Agamemnon*, or between *Septem* and *Eumenides* (to take final plays in their trilogies), are striking, not least in the greater sophistication shown in interaction between characters. Secondly, the formal changes evident in the extant tragedies (presuming them to be a representative sample of the

³⁰⁶ The fallacy, that is, of generalizing too hastily from the tiny proportion of plays that survive: we have fewer than 4 percent of the tragedies produced at the Dionysia in the course of the fifth century; only a few fragments from the many dozens of fifth-century tragedians who competed alongside Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Eur. (cf. *TrGF* I for the 'Tragici Minores'); and a small fraction of the big three's work (six from Aesch.'s 70 to 90 plays, seven from Soph.'s 123, and 18 from around 88 by Eur.). Thus even if we had the complete works of the three most famous tragic poets, we would still have little more than a quarter of the plays produced at the City Dionysia in the fifth century.

³⁰⁷ Thummer (1986) 257 points to the crucial influence of Aristotle's preference for unhappy endings, as well as Seneca's tragedies of passions ending in disaster, and the moralizing tradition of error and punishment that underlies the selection of many tragic fragments.

³⁰⁸ Indeed, the very survival of the plays is likely to have been influenced by these factors, as well as by various pedagogical aims, during the many centuries in which the tragic canon was formed. Caution is required, since the selection process for all three tragedians is closed to us, but it is possible, for example, that the selection of the seven extant plays of Sophocles was influenced by his reputation as 'the tragic Homer' (cf. *TrGF* IV 1 115–16). It is also possible that the exclusion of the 'romantic tragedies' *IT*, *Ion*, and *Helen* from the 'select' plays of Eur. has something to do with Aristotle's seminal preference for unhappy endings.

³⁰⁹ It is striking that Aristotle does not detect any formal break between the three major tragedians.

³¹⁰ As Fowler (1982) 23 argues, genres are not fixed, but always changing because 'every literary work changes the genre it relates to.' Cf. also Heath (2002) 115 'the possibilities accessible within the conventions . . . of a genre have in common with language in general a basic incompleteness and open-endedness.'

³¹¹ The importance of viewing tragedy in terms of *change* rather than *decline* will be discussed more fully below. The reality of artistic change can be seen in the fact that certain features of Aeschylean tragedy (especially its language) appeared rather archaic by the latter part of the fifth century (cf. *Clouds* 1364–7, *Frogs* 818–25, 836–9, 1056–8), but this is no more a proof of 'decline' than the idea – also seen in *Frogs*, and the first sign of an emerging canon – that Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Eur. were exceptionally good. Dionysus dismisses other contemporary poets as merely 'pissing against Tragedy' (*Frogs* 95).

genre) – for example, longer scenes with more incident and more speaking roles, or greater use of monody and ‘mimetic’ metres – are linked not only to changes in the audience’s tastes, but also to wider cultural developments, including the increased professionalism of musicians and actors. Moreover, both sides (audiences and artists) contribute and thereby reinforce each other’s role in the process of change, so that at times the artists deliberately stretch conventions and at other times react to the acceptance (and enjoyment) of a new trend by the audience. Finally, the increasing professionalization of the theatre was matched as a catalyst of originality and innovation by the competitive nature of the dramatic festivals themselves, which encouraged poets to experiment in the hope of impressing the audience. As the Chorus of Aristophanes’ *Assemblywomen* put it, ‘they [the Athenians] hate watching the same old stuff again and again’ (μισοῦσι γὰρ ἦν τὰ παλαιὰ | πολλάκις θεῶνται, 580).

Thus a variety of factors came together to create the dynamism of fifth-century Attic tragedy: the public’s desire for a new angle on the traditional myths encouraged the tragic poets to create plots with more twists and turns (and hence longer episodes), while their taste for scenes of intense suffering led the poets to generate more emotion and pathos by including a greater amount of actor’s song.³¹² In this context a play such as Eur.’s *Orestes*, with its baroque aria sung by a Phrygian eunuch and its stunning final tableau (embracing stage, *skéné*-roof, and crane), should not be seen as a symptom of fin-de-siècle decadence, but as a sign of the audience’s enjoyment of such theatrical techniques – and as a sign of things to come, given Eur.’s overwhelming popularity in the fourth century and beyond. Tragedy developed rapidly in the seventy years or so between our earliest and latest plays (leaving aside the probably fourth-century *Rhesus*), and one of the most striking differences is the preponderance of grand choral songs in Aeschylus compared with the prominence of more intensely personal and emotional solo songs in the later period.³¹³ And just as we can see a greater self-consciousness about rhetoric (whether epideictic or practical) in late fifth-century Athenian society, not just in tragedy, so the tendency in tragedy towards more intense emotionalism should be seen as part of a larger movement in public verbal and musical performance, including in particular developments in dithyramb and the New Music (see p. 41 above).³¹⁴

³¹² A similar dynamism is also visible in changes in Greek theatre design throughout antiquity, as more elaborate stage machinery is developed to produce yet more spectacular effects: cf. Csapo and Slater (1995) 79–88.

³¹³ The trend is relative, of course, since earlier tragedy contains powerful solo songs (e.g. Cassandra’s prophetic outbursts in *Ag.*), while Eur. *Bacch.* deploys choral lyric almost exclusively.

³¹⁴ An analogous (but not necessarily causally related) movement can perhaps be seen in public art more generally, if we consider the greater emphasis on individual emotion and flamboyance in late fifth-century sculpture, as the so-called ‘wet’ look, with its details of ‘realistic’ (though in fact idealized, and usually female) body contours beneath the drapery, succeeds the ‘severe style’: cf. Robertson (1975) I.287–8, 350–1 and Whitley (2001) 274–5 on the Nike of Paionios at Olympia and the temple of Athena Nike in Athens (both c. 420). It is illustrative of the distorting effect of tragedy’s supposed ‘rules’ that scholars of fifth-century sculpture and vase-painting, for example, are not misled by notions of ‘decline’.

The surviving tragedies reveal a genre of enormous vitality and diversity. Yet the critical tradition has distorted tragedy's development, not only by presenting Eur. as the arch-experimenter (thus overlooking the innovativeness of other tragedians),³¹⁵ but also by framing tragedy's story – and Eur.'s contribution in particular – as one of decline rather than creative change. A major reason for this is the tantalizing simplicity of the rise-and-fall model in which Aeschylus represents the genre's primitive origins, Sophocles its classical peak, and Eur. its decadent fall. Yet as one scholar has observed, 'Literary history needs to do better than that.'³¹⁶ Moreover, the rise-and-fall model is reinforced by the standard picture of late fifth-century Athenian history as a period not just of crisis but of degeneration. We should reject such a vision of cultural downfall, however, not only because it is influenced by Aristophanes' comic nostalgia for an idealized past, but also because it overlooks the bias of Thucydides and Plato, our major sources for this period, whose aristocratic disaffection has skewed their representation, and hence our view, of Athenian society and culture.³¹⁷ For just as Aristophanes links the decline of tragedy to the decline of the polis in an all-too-simple comic manner (cf. *Frogs* 1417–1533), so Plato seeks an explanation of Athenian political (i.e. democratic) degeneration in the popular arts of the period, including tragedy and the New Music.³¹⁸ Yet in truth neither Athenian democracy nor tragedy was in decline and both flourished for much of the fourth century, so we should resist the decline and fall model of Athenian history as well as its mapping onto tragedy. Nevertheless, Plato's ideologically driven view of the tragedians playing to the gallery and indulging vulgar tastes is revealing insofar as it points not only to the massive popularity of tragedy, but also to the symbiotic relationship between poets and audience, which ensured that tragedy continued to change, as poets innovated and explored the genre's diverse range and potential, throughout the fifth century and beyond.

8. HELEN TRANSFORMED

Helen has proved to be one of the most fascinating and productive figures of classical myth and literature. Her story has been revisited by innumerable artists from Homer to Hollywood,³¹⁹ and their visions and revisions of H. show her character

³¹⁵ Even if this image of Eur. has been aided by basic features of the critical and biographical tradition: (i) we have more than twice as many of his plays; (ii) he is biographically more 'alive' (especially through Aristophanes); (iii) the polarization of Eur. and Aesch., part of Aristophanes' humour of old versus new, has been interpreted too literally.

³¹⁶ Rutherford (2005) 54.

³¹⁷ Euripides' *Orestes* in particular is often misread as a condemnation of Athenian democracy and society at the end of the fifth century (see p. 6). Yet the case for Eur.'s alleged disenchantment with Athenian political corruption is no more convincing than the view which sees *Orestes* itself as an instance of generic corruption.

³¹⁸ For an excellent discussion of prejudiced scholarly views of fourth-century drama and society, and of their origins in the reactionary conservatism of Plato and Isocrates in particular, see Wallace (1995) 199–202.

³¹⁹ Cf., for example, Judy Grahn's poem, 'Helen in Hollywood' (in *Queen of Wands*, 1982), which compares H.'s impact to that of Marilyn Monroe and other female icons: 'Look! Look!

and motivations being constantly reshaped.³²⁰ Such a rich creative history not only suggests new questions to put to our ancient sources, but also (and more directly) reveals the prejudices and interests of the cultures in which these later versions were produced. It is thus not surprising that H.'s successive incarnations since antiquity tell us much about each society's view of women.³²¹ Indeed, the title of a recent book, *Helen of Troy: goddess, princess, whore*, plays on the continuing power of H.'s provocative ambivalence in this respect.³²² And it is equally unsurprising that the vast majority of post-Euripidean versions have chosen to treat the H. of mainstream mythography, not the new H. of our play, since H.'s virtuous persona has proved far less compelling to male-dominated artistic traditions than her identity as a sexy adulteress.³²³ Nevertheless, a number of artists have been drawn to her intriguingly unconventional time in Egypt, and it is their versions which will be of particular interest to us.

As was noted in §7 above, tragedy did not decline but actually flourished in the fourth century, even if the dramatic texts are now largely lost.³²⁴ We know of two fourth-century tragedies called *Helen*, but cannot reconstruct their contents, since we have only the title of Diogenes' *Helen* (*TrGF* 1 88 F 1b) and two lines from 'Theodectas', albeit spoken by H. herself (*TrGF* 1 72 F 3): θεῖων δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν ἔκγονον ῥιζωμάτων | τις ἂν προσειπεῖν ἀξιώσειεν λάτριν; ('Who would think it right to call me a slave, who am the offspring of divine stock on both sides?'). Yet the massive popularity of Euripides,³²⁵ including his so-called 'romantic tragedies',³²⁶ will have kept knowledge

She is different. | Medium for all our energy | as we pour it through her. | Vessel of light, | Her flesh is like flax, | a living fiber. | She is the symbol of our dreams and fears | and bloody visions, all | our metaphors for living in America.'

³²⁰ See esp. Frenzel (1992) 315–20 (focusing on literature) and Reid (1993) 1498–505 (particularly detailed on opera and painting); cf. also Homeyer (1977), Schmiel (1980), Gumpert (2001), Bettini and Brillante (2002).

³²¹ Suzuki (1989) 150–263, for example, sets Spenser and Shakespeare's treatments of H. (in *Faerie Queene*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*) within the patriarchal cultures of Renaissance and Elizabethan England. Cf. also Hanna (1998) 120.

³²² Hughes (2005).

³²³ For the sympathetic viewpoint offered by H. D.'s *Helen in Egypt* (1961), the first epic about H. written by a female poet, see nn. 366–7 below. H.'s sexual allure, a central aspect of her identity, is similarly transformed by modern writers: cf. e.g. Margaret Atwood's poem, 'Helen of Troy Does Countertop Dancing' (from *Morning in the Burned House*, 1995): 'I do give value. | Like preachers, I sell vision, | like perfume ads, desire | or its facsimile. Like jokes | or war, it's all in the timing. | I sell men back their worse suspicions: | that everything's for sale, | and piecemeal. They gaze at me and see | a chain-saw murder just before it happens, | when thigh, ass, inkblot, crevice, tit, and nipple | are still connected. | Such hatred leaps in them, | my beery worshippers! . . .'

³²⁴ With the probable exception of the *Rhesus* ascribed to Eur., we have no complete example of fourth-century tragedy (though *TrGF* 1 lists 44 tragedians from the period). For what remains, the sole substantial study is still Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980).

³²⁵ Eur.'s dominance over Aeschylus and Sophocles in the fourth century and beyond derives not only from changing audience tastes (e.g., for increased emotional responses from the characters), but also from Eur.'s more accessible language and clearer signposting of myth (especially in his characters' expository prologue-monologues). For an outstanding study of Eur.'s reception in antiquity (particularly in Christian texts), see Funke (1965–6).

³²⁶ On fourth-century 'romantic plays', see Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980) 47–58, though the discussion of Eur.'s 'tragicomedies' and their influence is marred by a narrow view of the genre

of his new H. alive (in re-performances as well as texts), even if no trace of her survives in the remains of Hellenistic or later tragedy.³²⁷

The new Egyptian H. is equally invisible in the ancient iconographic tradition.³²⁸ It is particularly surprising that no Attic vase should show H. in Egypt or the *eidolon* story,³²⁹ since Ar. *Thesm.* suggests that *Helen's* recognition and escape plot made a great impression. Moreover, as Oliver Taplin shows in his study of the iconography of tragedy, the other 'escape plays' *IT* and *Andromeda* are strikingly popular in vase-paintings, making *Helen's* absence all the more puzzling. We could put this down to the chance of random selection, but such a refuge explains nothing.³³⁰

Similarly, although there is no certain evidence of any later parody of Eur.'s *Helen* itself in the manner of Ar. *Thesm.*, comic treatments of the Helen myth continued in the fourth century, and no fewer than three Middle Comedy poets (Alexis, Anaxandrides, and Antiphanes) are known to have written mythological burlesques called *Helen* (cf. Alexis fr. 70, Anaxandrides fr. 12 K-A).³³¹ The influence of Euripidean tragedy on New Comedy (both Greek and Roman) is pervasive, especially in its patterns of recognition and intrigue.³³² H.'s revelation of M.'s 'death' (Μενέλαος – οἶμοι, πῶς φράσω; – τέθνηκέ μοι, 1196) is recalled in Daos' words to Smikrines in Menander's *Aspis* (ἀδελφός – ὦ Ζεῦ, πῶς φράσω; – σχεδόν τί σου τέθνηκεν, 420). In a passage of feigned lamentation full of mock-tragic effects (cf. Daos' instruction to Chairesstratos: δεῖ τραγωιδῆσαι πάθος | ἄλλοῖον ὑμᾶς, 329–30), Daos' specific allusion to *Helen* exploits the

(p. 47) 'Only a mild sentimentality can be aroused. The appeal is to the audience's curiosity, expectation, intellect, and the happy ending replaces the tragic κόθορσις.'

³²⁷ The numerous dramatic festivals of the Hellenistic world (Soteria in Delphi, Heraia at Argos, Naia at Dodona, etc.) attest to the flourishing of tragedy long after the demise of Athenian democracy in the late 320s: cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos (1993), Le Guen (1995). For the Artists of Dionysus, who toured with a repertoire of 'classic' as well as new plays, see Csapo and Slater (1995) 239–55.

³²⁸ As J. Kahil remarks (*LIMC* s.v. Hélène, p. 500), Eur.'s *Helen* 'n'aura point d'influence sur l'iconographie.' Wiseman (2004) pl. 8 has recently argued that a fourth-century Etruscan cup offers visual evidence of the play's re-performance in Italy: 'the eagle in the scene above suggests that their version of Leda and the swan is taken from Euripides, *Helen* 17–21.' However, while the scene certainly shows knowledge of the eagle version (cf. 20–1n.), it need not be illustrating Eur.'s play specifically, and the image itself has no obvious theatrical features. There is one surviving image of H. in Egypt (*LIMC* no. 375), but it comes from a tenth-century Byzantine manuscript illustration of Nicander's *Theriaca* 309–19, which tells how H. crushed an African serpent known as the αἰμοπόλις, thereby explaining the species' peculiar halting movement. Moreover, the incident takes place as H., here called Αἰνελένη ('Bane-Helen', in Gow and Schofield's translation), is returning from Troy.

³²⁹ Cf. Bron (1996) 297.

³³⁰ Taplin (2007) 149 suggests 'It may be that this counter-version of the central myth of Helen at Troy was too ludic and literary to appeal to the visual artists?' But one might equally expect visual artists to be attracted by the unconventional elements: the exotic location, the two Helens (with a dumbfounded M. between them), H. and M.'s 'funeral' cortege, etc.

³³¹ A clearly theatrical and comic scene of H.'s birth from the egg (16–22n.) features on a fourth-century South Italian vase (Apulian bell-krater, c. 380): *LIMC* s.v. Helene, no. 5.

³³² Hunter (1985) 114–36. For Menander's debt in particular, see also Zagagi (1995) 50–7.

similarity between the dramatic situations, as a fake death (M.'s/Chairestratos') is used to outwit an unwelcome suitor (Theoc./Smikrines).

The relatively untrodden path represented by the myth of the new H. was well suited to the Alexandrian poets. In his *Hymn to Artemis*, Callimachus alludes to the less familiar version of H.'s birth as the daughter of Nemesis, who was worshipped at Rhamnus in north-east Attica (ἀμφ' Ἑλένη Ῥαμνουσίδι, 3.232; cf. 16–22n.).³³³ Yet Hellenistic literature's most extensive and exuberant deployment of H.'s story, and one involving both Egypt and H.'s phantom double, comes in Lycophron's *Alexandra*. The poem presents a prophecy by Cassandra of the ruin awaiting the Greeks as they return from Troy. Its 1474 iambic lines are packed (almost to the point of unreadability) with riddling mythological allusions, including a new account of H.'s time in Egypt, combining elements of Hdt.'s and Eur.'s versions, in which it is Proteus (not Hera, as in Eur.) who substitutes the phantom for the real H. (Lyc. *Alex.* 112–43), and M. realizes as soon as Troy is sacked (rather than later in Egypt) that he has been fighting for an illusion (*Alex.* 820–4).³³⁴

H.'s portrayal in early Roman literature, especially Republican tragedy, is scarcely visible to us, yet the surviving fragments and titles (e.g. Naevius' *Equus Troianus*, Ennius' *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *Iphigenia*) indicate that the myths of the Trojan War and its aftermath proved as productive for Roman tragedians as they had for their Greek predecessors (both Attic and Hellenistic).³³⁵ Most Latin poets present a traditionally negative view of H. as the cause of the Trojan War.³³⁶ However, given the huge popularity of Greek (and especially Euripidean) tragedy in Rome,³³⁷ it is likely that Roman poets and audiences were also familiar with Eur.'s unconventional version of H.'s myth, perhaps even in performance.³³⁸ Nonetheless, the only surviving allusion to H.'s innocence

³³³ For Egyptian Pharos as 'H.'s island' in *Aetia* 3, cf. [5]n.

³³⁴ Cassandra's description of M. ποθῶν δὲ φάσμα πτηνὸν εἰς αἴθρα φυγόν (822) echoes the Servant's announcement to M., βέβηκεν ἄλοχος σὴ πρὸς αἰθέρος πτυχᾶς (*Hel.* 605).

³³⁵ For the Roman experience of tragedy, both Greek and Roman, and the interaction between the two, see Goldberg (2005) 115–43.

³³⁶ See in general Carbonero (1989), whose focus is late Republican and Augustan poetry, though one might add, for example, Martial's pointed contrast between H. and Penelope (*iuvantemque secuta relicto | coniuge Penelope venit, abijt Helene*, 1.62.5–6) or Seneca's depiction of H. as luring Polyxena to her death (as a sacrifice to Achilles) with the promise of marriage to Achilles' son, Pyrrhus (*Tro.* 861–1008). For Virgil's portrayal of H., cf. also Reckford (1981), Suzuki (1989) 92–149; and for his extensive use of tragedy, see Hardie (1997). Jacobson (1987) argues for the specific influence of Eur.'s *Helen* on Virgil's Dido narrative, but the alleged points of contact and contrast (between H. and Dido, M. and Aeneas) seem tenuous. Given his focus on female heroines and their love lives, it is not surprising that Ovid's depictions of H. are particularly frequent and various: cf. Fulkerson (2005) 58–66, 97–9.

³³⁷ For Roman familiarity with tragedy, cf. Goldberg (2005) 127–31 on Cicero's ubiquitous use of tragic references. Already in Plautus we find comic characters exploiting their audience's knowledge of Euripidean plots: cf. e.g. *non ventus fuit, verum Alcmena Euripidi* (*Rudens* 86); also Friedrich (1934). For Plautus' possible reworking of Eur.'s *Alceme* in his *Amphitruo*, see Christenson (2000) 53–5.

³³⁸ Suet. *Aug.* 45, for example, describes the emperor's patronage of theatrical contests, including the performance of tragedies in Greek.

in Roman poetry is to the version associated with Stesichorus' *Palinode* (Hor. *Epodes* 17.42–4).³³⁹ Among treatments of H. in late antiquity, Lucian's is particularly inventive, although highly conventional in its premise: for H. is willingly abducted once again, but this time after her own death! And far from escaping with her new lover (Cinyras) from the Island of the Blessed, she is intercepted by M. 'just as they were entering the sea of milk near Cheeseland – they were as near as that to effecting their escape. They sailed back, towing the other ship by means of a chain of roses. Helen was weeping; she was embarrassed and kept her face covered.'³⁴⁰

As with her depiction in antiquity, H.'s modern reception has been dominated by her chequered career as M.'s errant wife. Dante, for example, writing in the early fourteenth century, sets H. among the lustful in Hell:

Elena vedi, per cui tanto reo
tempo si volse, e vedi 'l grande Achille,
che con amore al fine combatteo.
Inferno 5.64–6³⁴¹

The first modern editions of Greek tragedy were published in the early sixteenth century, while the tradition of its performance on the European stage was renewed by the production of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* at Vicenza in 1585. Yet despite these epochal events in the genre's renaissance, Eur.'s new H. was slow to make her mark on the European stage.³⁴² Indeed, her earliest appearance comes not in drama but in Pierre de Ronsard's sonnet cycle of 1578. *Sonnets pour Hélène*, where the myth of H.'s εἰδωλον is used to suggest the poet's ambivalent attitude to his beloved, Hélène de Surgères, whom he compares not only to the traditional Helen of Troy but also to her Egyptian variant. Thus, for example, the narrator becomes a Paris-like figure who achieves his desire merely in the form of a phantom that appears in his dreams (cf. *Hel.* 31–6):

Je reviendray demain. Mais, si la nuict, qui ronge
Mon cœur, me la donnoit par songe entre mes bras,
Embrassant pour le vray l'idole du mensonge,
Soulé d'un faux plaisir, je ne reviendrois pas!

³³⁹ Though Horace innovates by presenting both the blinding and the cure as inflicted by the Dioscuri rather than H. herself: cf. Watson (2003) 563 ad loc.

³⁴⁰ Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 2.26 (trans. B. P. Reardon).

³⁴¹ 'Helen I saw, for whom so many ruthless | Seasons revolved; and saw the great Achilles, | Who at the last hour combated with Love' (trans. Henry W. Longfellow). In juxtaposing H. and Achilles, Dante may have been influenced by the ancient tradition of their posthumous union on the island of Leuce (Paus. 3.19.13): see p. 12.

³⁴² H. was, however, treated by Renaissance artists as the exemplar of perfect beauty: Sabbatino (1997) 13–59 links their practice to the story told in antiquity about the painting of H. that Zeuxis of Heraclea made for the citizens of Crotona, which was said to have been created by combining the best features of the five most beautiful young women in the city (cf. Cic. *De inv.* 2.1.2–3).

Voyez combien ma vie est pleine de trespas,
 Quand tout mon reconfort ne depend que du songe!
Sonnets pour Hélène I.54³⁴³

Moreover, as with Eur.'s rehabilitation of H.'s 'name', Ronsard deploys Odyssean motifs to stress the Penelope-like chastity and fidelity of his Hélène:

Nom, malheur des Troyens, sujet de mon souci,
 Ma sage Penelope et mon Helene aussi,
 Qui d'un soin amoureux tout le cœur m'enveloppe;
 Nom, qui m'a jusqu'au ciel de la terre enlevé,
 Qui eust jamais pensé que j'eusse retrouvé
 En une mesme Helene une autre Penelope?
Sonnets pour Hélène I.3³⁴⁴

Absent from the masterpieces of seventeenth-century French classical theatre, the new H. first surfaces in drama in Pier Jacopo Martello's *L'Elena Casta* (c. 1700; published in 1723). Set on the island of Pharos (cf. *Hel.* 5), Martello's play adopts the basics of Eur.'s plot, but gives Teucer a much bigger role, so that, for example, it is he who announces M.'s shipwreck to Theoc. (here renamed Polibo). Martello's main innovation, however, is the introduction of Oenone (Enone), Paris' former lover, whose marriage to Polibo is predicted *ex machina* by the Dioscuri.³⁴⁵

Goethe's rehabilitation of H. takes an even more original form. For in Act III of *Faust Part Two*, the so-called 'Helena Act',³⁴⁶ Goethe depicts H.'s influence, especially on the men who desire her (Theseus, M., Paris, and Faust), over a (highly compressed) period of some three thousand years, beginning with H.'s return from Troy to Sparta (Scene i), followed by Faust's summoning of her to his medieval castle (Scene ii), and

³⁴³ 'I will return, but if in dream the night, | eater of my heart, in sweet delirium | yields to my arms the phantom of delight, | I'll hug my ghost of joy and will not come. Lady, how full of death that life must seem, | whose only consolation is a dream' (trans. H. Wolfe).

³⁴⁴ 'Anguish of Troy, name! ensign of my grief, | my wise Penelope, my Helen splendid | whose lovely torment holds the heart of me, | name, that enskied a lover beyond belief, | who could have guessed I'd find when all was ended | in the same Helen a new Penelope' (trans. H. Wolfe). For a fascinating discussion of Ronsard's use of the alternative H. myth, see Quainton (1995). As he points out (94 with n. 54), the paucity of references to the Egyptian version in Renaissance literature and mythography helps explain why Eur.'s *Helen* 'has been almost universally ignored as an intertext.' Yet Ronsard had access to Eur.'s play in the first modern editions, and may also have been influenced by his fellow poet, Jean-Antoine de Baif, who, like Ronsard, had been taught Greek by Jean Dorat at the Collège de Coqueret, and who published a translation of H.'s prologue speech in 1573 (Book IV, poem II in *Œuvres complètes I: Œuvres en Rime*). As Quainton (1995) 78 observes, Baif's translation 'coincided precisely with the composition period of the *Sonnets pour Hélène*.' (I am greatly indebted to Professor Quainton for sending me an offprint of his article and a copy of Baif's translation. There is no evidence that Baif translated the rest of the play.)

³⁴⁵ In his Preface to the play Martello defends his alterations, asking 'Son io da meno d'Euripide nell'autorità d'inventare?'

³⁴⁶ The Helena Act was first published as a separate poem in 1827 with the title 'Helena: a classical-romantic phantasmagoria. Intermezzo for *Faust*', then incorporated into the final version of *Faust Part Two*, published a few months after Goethe's death in 1832.

ending with the death of H. and Faust's son Euphorion in Arcadia (Scene iii).³⁴⁷ Faust's union with H. had been a traditional part of his legend since the sixteenth century,³⁴⁸ but Goethe radically alters H.'s impact so that she is no longer a symbol of Faust's downfall and damnation. Indeed, he underlines H.'s ambivalent and potentially more positive persona by recalling the myth of her phantom:

PHORKYAS: Doch sagt man, du erschienst ein doppelhaft Gebild,
In Ilios gesehen und in Ägypten auch.
HELENA: Verwirre wüsten Sinnes Aberwitz nicht gar.
Selbst jetzo, welche denn ich sei, ich weiß es nicht.
Faust 8872–5³⁴⁹

The 'Helena Act' has been described as 'one of the outstanding examples of the appropriation and at the same time transformation of Greek tragedy in German literature',³⁵⁰ and it is fitting that Goethe should use the myth of Eur.'s *Helen*, a particularly striking instance of poetic innovation, to develop both H.'s identity and her tragedy in a new direction. For having been summoned from the dead by Faust, H. wonders if she herself is real: 'Ich schwinde hin und werde selbst mir ein Idol' ('I vanish, I become a phantom even to myself', 8881).³⁵¹

The Judgement of Paris, and H.'s subsequent departure from Greece, form the basis of Jacques Offenbach's opera bouffe, *La belle Hélène* (1864), while Jules Lemaitre's comic drama, *La bonne Hélène* (1896), puts a similar emphasis on H.'s innocence in the face of Aphrodite's threats. Nonetheless, Richard Strauss' opera, *Die ägyptische Helena*, first performed in Dresden in 1928, represents the most ambitious musical transformation of H.'s story produced so far. Having playfully set himself the challenge of becoming 'the Offenbach of the twentieth century', Strauss took up Hugo von Hofmannsthal's suggestion of an opera based on the H. myth. Yet Hofmannsthal's

³⁴⁷ Euphorion is identified with Lord Byron (especially in the Chorus' lament: 9907–38), who had died in Greece in 1824. Euphorion's fall to his death also echoes Eur.'s *Phaethon*, whose fragments fascinated Goethe from 1821 onwards (his first attempts at a reconstruction of the play were published in 1823; cf. Petersen (1974) 173–96).

³⁴⁸ Marlowe's *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* (Act V, Scene i), first performed in 1594, is the best known treatment of their meeting in English ('Was this the face that launched a thousand ships, | And burnt the topless towers of Ilium? . . .').

³⁴⁹ 'PHORKYAS: But you appeared, they say: in duplicated shape, | Seen at the same time both in Egypt and in Troy. HELEN: This is a superstition of dark-tangled sense! | Which of them am I? Even now I do not know' (trans. D. Luke).

³⁵⁰ Gelzer (1997) 199 'eines der Musterbeispiele der Aneignung und zugleich der Transformation der griechischen Tragödie in der deutschen Literatur'.

³⁵¹ Cf. Reinhardt (1960) 281 'The whole Helen drama, almost from beginning to end, remains a masque of ghosts . . . the chorus turns into elemental spirits, Helen into the shadow she was, and the ugly old housemaid [Phorkyas], the manager of the whole, into the devil himself.' Nonetheless, Goethe's use of Eur.'s *Helen* is limited to this passage, which Gelzer (1997) 210 plausibly explains as being due to Goethe's low opinion of the play as a whole. Gelzer cites (208 n. 50) Goethe's criticisms of *Hel.* and *IT* for their alleged neglect of the chorus and poor dramatic structure, though it is also relevant that such 'happy ending' plays did not fit well with German Romantic views of the best kind of tragedy, despite Wieland's enthusiasm for *Helen* in particular (discussed by Kannicht (1969) 1.124).

libretto, which he regarded as his finest, took the myth into more serious territory than was possible in the lighter comic world of *La belle Hélène*, for in its second act 'Hofmannsthal brings into focus themes central to his other libretti [i.e. *Ariadne auf Naxos* and *Die Frau ohne Schatten*]: memory, fidelity, the restoration of trust.'³⁵² In Hofmannsthal and Strauss' version, H. remains the traditional H. of Troy who elopes with Paris, while the Egyptian variant, far from being true, is invented by the Egyptian sorceress Aithra in order to dupe M. into taking H. back.³⁵³ But having attacked phantom images of Paris and H., M. comes to believe he has killed his unfaithful wife, and even takes the real H. to be a phantom created by Aithra. In despair, and believing it to be poison given by the phantom, M. accepts a potion of remembrance from H.³⁵⁴ As his memory returns, M. is persuaded by H. to accept the reality of their past and so reject his idealized (and so inevitably disappointed) vision of her.³⁵⁵ For like all men, it is implied, M. had projected onto H. his own fantasies and desires.³⁵⁶ The work ends appropriately with the arrival of H. and M.'s child, Hermione, the embodiment of their troubled but saved marriage.³⁵⁷ Thus, while *Die ägyptische Helena* presents the alternative myth of the Egyptian H. as untrue, it is still used to explore – even if, as a lie, it cannot itself resolve – the problems caused by the infidelity of the traditional H.

Yet while marriage and infidelity may create powerful drama, twentieth-century treatments of H.'s story have inevitably focused to a greater degree on her role in the Trojan War itself, as writers found the ancient myth useful in confronting, and commenting on, world war in their times. Here, as elsewhere, we may distinguish between those treatments which deploy the myth of H.'s phantom – thereby highlighting the futility of warfare – and those which follow the more traditional account of H.'s role

³⁵² Strauss' collaboration with Hofmannsthal on *Die ägyptische Helena* is well discussed by Gilliam (1999) 130–3 (quotation from 131). For their *Elektra*, first performed in Dresden in 1909, see Goldhill (2002) 137–77.

³⁵³ The sympathy and prophetic skills of Eur.'s Theonoe are divided here between the Egyptian princess Aithra and the omniscient Seashell (die allwissende Muschel) – an unusual character even by operatic standards. It is the Seashell, for example, who reports that M. is nearby (AITHRA: Muschel, wo ist er? | MUSCHEL: Ganz nahe!, Act I, Scene iii); cf. *Hel.* 515–40, 873–5. In Act II, the roles of Altair, ruler of the Atlas mountains, and his son Da-ud, recall those of Proteus and Theoc., though here M. kills Da-ud (Scene iv), while H. is desired by both father and son (Scene ii).

³⁵⁴ Contrast the drugs of forgetfulness which H. brought back from Egypt in the *Odyssey* (4.220–6).

³⁵⁵ As H. sings at their final reunion, 'Deine, deine | Ungetreue | schwebend überm | Gefilde der Reue! | Ungetreue, Ungetreue, | deine, deine!' ('Yours, your own unfaithful one, suspended over realms of regret! Unfaithful, unfaithful, yours, yours!', Act II, Scene iv).

³⁵⁶ Aithra's words in the prologue about H.'s arrival are programmatic: 'Was wir sahen, da wir sehnten | träumend uns aus uns hinaus: | Einmal kommt es, mächtig prächtig, unversehens uns ins Haus!' ('The vision created from desire by our other dreaming self, sometimes comes, magnificently and unbidden, into our very house!').

³⁵⁷ A far less optimistic vision of H. and M.'s future together is the norm: cf. e.g. Rupert Brooke's poem 'Menelaus and Helen' (1911), ending 'Of she weeps, gummy-eyed and impotent; | Her dry shanks twitch at Paris' mumbled name. | So Menelaus nagg'd; and H. cried; | And Paris slept on by Scamander side.'

in the conflict. Let us first consider the latter group. Thus in Jean Giraudoux's play, *La guerre de Troie n'aura pas lieu*, first performed in 1935 during the build-up to World War II, Hector and Odysseus negotiate H.'s peaceful return, but belligerent factions on both sides scheme to ensure that the war goes ahead nonetheless.³⁵⁸ Similarly, Wolfgang Hildesheimer's *Das Opfer Helena*, a radio play of 1958, presents H.'s own desire for peace being sacrificed to satisfy the demands of Spartan and Trojan *Realpolitik*, as each side colludes in her abduction, convinced that they can win the 'just' war which will ensue. H., however, is powerless to resist the armies' plans, which she views as a greater crime than her initial desire for Paris.³⁵⁹

In his poem 'Ελένη, published in 1953, George Seferis engages specifically with Eur.'s play. Seferis sets three quotations from *Helen* as an epigraph to his work (*Hel.* 148–50, 582, 706–7), and these Euripidean lines articulate the central themes of the poem: Teucer's voyage to Cyprus (148–50), the presence of the εἶδωλον at Troy (582), and the suffering endured by both Greeks and Trojans for a mere 'cloud' (706–7).³⁶⁰ The narrator is Teucer, now living in Salamis in Cyprus. He laments the war, especially the death of his brother Ajax, whose loss has been rendered meaningless:

Τίποτε στὴν Τροία – ἓνα εἶδωλο.
 Ἔτσι τὸ θέλαν οἱ θεοί.
 Κι' ὁ Πάρης, μ' ἓναν ἴσκιο πλάγιαζε σὰ νά εἶταν πλάσμα ἀτόφιο·
 κι' ἐμεῖς σφαζόμεσταν γιὰ τὴν Ἑλένη δέκα χρόνια.³⁶¹

Seferis alludes repeatedly to *Helen's* first stasimon in particular, referring to the nightingales that sing in Cyprus and Egypt (cf. *Hel.* 1107–12), and giving an almost direct translation of *Hel.* 1137–8:

Ἀηδόνι ἀηδόνι ἀηδόνι,
 τ' εἶναι θεός, τί μὴ θεός; καὶ τί τ' ἀνάμεσό τους;³⁶²

The poem ends with the narrator fearing future wars, and the work's contemporary significance is underlined by the repetition of the opening line τ' ἀηδόνια δὲ σ' ἀφήνουμε

³⁵⁸ For H. as a pawn of male power politics in Giraudoux's bitter comedy, see Newman-Gordon (1968) 150–8; cf. also Gumpert (2001) 229–32. By contrast, H. is a positive symbol of beauty in Albert Camus' post-war essay, 'L'Exil d'Hélène', published in 1948: 'We have exiled beauty; the Greeks took up arms for her . . . All those who are struggling for freedom to-day are ultimately fighting for beauty' (trans. J. O'Brien).

³⁵⁹ As H. says to Hermione, 'Ich bin nicht schuldig. Oder doch nur zu einem kleinen Teil' (Hildesheimer (1965) 71).

³⁶⁰ Cf. Jay Macpherson's poem, 'Helen' (from *The Boatman*, 1957), beginning 'While Helen slept in Egypt, the cruel war | Roared, lashed and swallowed, spat up broken men. | But she knew nothing of this, lying withdrawn | Far by the heaven-fed river, the holy stream.'

³⁶¹ 'At Troy, nothing: just a phantom image. | The gods wanted it so. | And Paris, Paris lay with a shadow as though it were a | solid being; | and for ten whole years we slaughtered ourselves for Helen' (trans. Keeley and Sherrard). Cf. Osip Mandelstam's 'Without Helen | What could Troy mean to you, Achaean men?' ('Stone', in *Selected Poems*, trans. J. Greene).

³⁶² 'Nightingale nighungale nightingale, | what is a god? What is not a god? And what is there in between them?'

νὰ κοιμηθεῖς στὶς Πλάτρες ('The nightingales won't let you sleep in Platres'), Platres being a summer resort in modern Cyprus.³⁶³

John Heath-Stubbs's play, *Helen in Egypt*, published in 1958, makes a similar anti-war argument.³⁶⁴ Though modelled on Eur.'s *Helen*, it includes several new characters, including Sekhet-Amun, Chief Chamberlain to the Pharaoh. As in *Helen* (c.g. 880–3, 1218), the Pharaoh and Theonoe are aware of the phantom's existence, but here the Pharaoh, unlike Theoc., is happy to reunite H. and M. Thersites reports the disappearance of the phantom, causing H. to collapse and call on Theonoe, 'Lock me up again! Lock me up in my coffin!' (end of Act I). And when another Greek, Asclepias, runs off in search of the εἰδωλον shouting, 'Illusion! No, I will never believe that!', it is Thersites who comments: 'There goes another young fool. Like the generation of fools that ran to Troy!'

In Strauss' *Die ägyptische Helena*, as we saw, M. is led to realize that he should give up his disastrous idealization of H. Similarly, in H. D.'s (Hilda Doolittle's) *Helen in Egypt*, published in 1961, the myth of H.'s phantom is used to critique sexual politics (ancient and modern) as much as the destructiveness of war.³⁶⁵ In the prose poem, H. D. expresses her debt to Stesichorus and Eur., and having described *Helen* as Eur.'s palinode, parallel to Stesichorus', launches into her own defence of H. Indeed, the author's semi-dramatic first-person narrative style is reminiscent of Stesichorus' *Palinode*. Written in three-line stanzas, with brief prose introductions to each poem, H. D.'s *Helen in Egypt* extends to twenty books, arranged in three sequences, entitled *Palinode*, *Leuké*, and *Eidolon*. As the title *Leuké* suggests, the narrative is not confined to H.'s sojourn in Egypt, but also recreates the myth of H.'s posthumous union with Achilles.³⁶⁶ Achilles himself appears as a narrator, as do Theseus, Paris, and the *eidolon* of Thetis. The poem ranges across all aspects of H.'s classical myth, reinventing as it proceeds (as when, for example, Odysseus and Achilles make a deal that H. will be Achilles' prize if Troy is taken), and stresses throughout H.'s confusion and despair at the violence perpetrated for an illusion:

³⁶³ For Seferis' verbal reminiscences of *Hel.* underlining the absurdity of war, see further de Cuenca (1976). Spentzou (2006) discusses H.'s various appearances in modern Greek poetry more generally (cf. pp. 365–6 on Seferis).

³⁶⁴ By contrast, J. P. Lavallin's dramatic adaptation, *Helen in Egypt*, first performed in Oxford in 1882, scarcely challenges the necessity or cost of war. The play is set outside a temple of Osiris, where Theonoe is priestess. Its plot is remarkably close to Eur.'s, including the recognition-scene saved by M.'s Servant (here called Etion) and the stratagem of M.'s fake burial, but it veers off in a new direction at the end (Act II, Scene iii), where Theonoe announces that she had killed her brother with poisoned wine, and blesses the departing H. and M. while lamenting her own 'soft-hearted treachery'!

³⁶⁵ Cf. also (before H. D.'s *Helen in Egypt*) Laura Riding's 'Helen's Faces' (1938), which depicts the traditional H., only to add: 'But the original woman is mythical. . . . Contest and bitterness never raged around her.'

³⁶⁶ E.g. Doolittle (1961) 112–13 'They met, Hector and Achilles, | and Achilles slew Hector, | but later, a bowman from the Walls | let fly the dart; | some said it was Apollo, | but I, Helena, knew it was Love's arrow; | it was Love, it was Apollo, it was Paris; | I knew and I did not know this, | while I slept in Egypt.'

So it was nothing, nothing at all,
 the loss, the gain; it was nothing,
 the victory, the shouting
 and Hector slain; it was nothing . . .³⁶⁷

Turning finally to the performance history of Eur.'s play on the modern stage, the Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama in Oxford has catalogued 72 productions of *Helen* between 1876 and 2005 throughout Europe, the USA, and Japan. While this figure contrasts positively with the near total invisibility of the play in the mid-seventeenth to mid-nineteenth centuries,³⁶⁸ it still lags very far behind more 'conventional' tragedies such as *Hippolytus* or *Bacchae*, and the most plausible explanation of such comparative neglect is, one suspects, a lingering generic prejudice based on the play's status as a 'tragicomedy' which has discouraged producers from staging such a 'non-serious' work. Yet as is clear from the numerous twentieth-century adaptations of H.'s story discussed above, *Helen's* central themes of a war fought for an illusion, and of H.'s unexpected fidelity, lend themselves to contemporary reinterpretation, even if, owing to the huge social and political differences between the cultures involved, the modern resonances of such ideas will not necessarily match those created by the play's original performance context in fifth-century Athens.

9. THE TEXT AND ITS TRANSMISSION

It is bracing to recall how fortuitous our connection is to the original text of *Helen* performed at the City Dionysia in 412 BC. For as with all of the so-called 'alphabetic' plays of Eur., our text depends on a single manuscript, supplemented (in the case of *Helen*) by one ancient papyrus. Moreover, the earliest stages of the text's transmission, from the time of the play's original production to the first scholarly editions of the Alexandrians in the late third century BC, are particularly obscure.³⁶⁹ Copies of Eur.'s text will have been initially distributed, according to their parts, among the actors and chorus members. Given the nature of theatrical productions, it is not unlikely that Eur.'s text underwent several changes during rehearsals, and that the resulting text, revised by Eur., formed the basis for the earliest copies made for the reading public shortly after the play's first performance. There was evidently a market for tragic texts in the increasingly literate society of late fifth-century Athens, and one can easily imagine members of the public wishing to re-experience plays they had admired in performance. In Aristophanes' *Frogs*, produced in 405, Dionysus speaks of reading Eur.'s *Andromeda* to himself (52–4), a remark which, while it serves in context

³⁶⁷ Doolittle (1961) 255. On H. D.'s lifelong study (and numerous adaptations) of Eur., especially the *Helen*, see E. Gregory (1997) 179–231. Wasserman (1986) discusses various revitalizations of H.'s myth by several twentieth-century American poets, including H. D., Ezra Pound, Hart Crane, William Carlos Williams, John Ashbery, and Judy Grahn.

³⁶⁸ Cf. Hall and Macintosh (2005) 61, 188 n. 7.

³⁶⁹ On the history of tragic texts in antiquity, see Barrett (1964) 45–57, Zuniz (1965) 249–61, Kovacs (2005) 379–87.

to underline Dionysus' particular fondness for Eur. (he reads the play onboard a warship!), also constitutes our earliest surviving evidence for the availability of tragic texts to an enthusiastic public.³⁷⁰ Indeed, Aristophanes' parody of *Helen* and *Andromeda* (among other tragedies) in *Thesmophoriazusae* would be unthinkable without access to written copies of those plays,³⁷¹ and Aristophanes is in fact our oldest check on Eur.'s original text, enabling us to correct the manuscript tradition in two separate places (cf. 56, 56inn.).

Commercially available readers' copies will have proliferated as literacy spread in the course of the fifth and fourth centuries, but it is the versions adapted by actors for new productions which interfered most with the original performance texts.³⁷² Eur.'s greater popularity on the fourth-century stage meant that his plays were particularly prone to changes, as actors sought to magnify their roles, often by inserting pathetic (e.g. 299–302) or suspenseful (cf. 892–3) passages into speeches.³⁷³ In response to such interference the Athenian statesman Lycurgus had official copies of the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Eur. made and deposited in the state archives c. 330, decreeing by law that actors should not depart from these in future performances at Attic festivals ([Plut.] *Lives of the Ten Orators* 841). It would be reassuring to believe that Lycurgus had direct access to pristine original texts preserved by the (theatrical) families of the major tragedians, but we cannot be certain of this.³⁷⁴ Indeed, we do not know what measures Lycurgus took to procure his exemplars, or how long his law (which applied only to Athens) remained in force. In any case, even if the scholars of Alexandria had access to the official Athenian text,³⁷⁵ this itself 'is likely to have been

³⁷⁰ However, as Hutchinson (1985) xl–xli stresses, it is very likely that tragic texts were already circulating much earlier in the century: 'We can hardly suppose there was no demand for texts of Aeschylus' (xli). Nonetheless, fifth-century tragic 'books' (i.e. papyrus rolls, written without punctuation or spaces between words) may have been affordable only to the wealthier fans of tragedy (such as Aristophanes).

³⁷¹ Cf. Austin and Olson (2004) lx–lxii.

³⁷² Cf. Csapo and Slater (1995) 1 'It is generally supposed that the texts sustained more damage in the first century of their existence than in the following twenty-three altogether.' For actors' interpolations in tragedy, see Page (1934), Mastronarde (1994) 39–49. Kovacs (2005) 382 gives a concise inventory of the main types of interpolation, including repetitions caused by similar dramatic situations: cf., however, 780n. Editors naturally disagree over the extent of interpolation, and this edition is more lenient than, for example, those of Dale or Diggle: cf. Dale (1967) xxxii–xxxiv for liberal use of square brackets, including 287–92, 388–9, 742, 755–7, 764 (all retained by me, with some changes).

³⁷³ For performances of Euripidean 'classics' in the fourth and third centuries (some are attested for Sophocles, but none for Aeschylus), cf. Kannicht (1997) 69–71, who also shows how Eur.'s dominance is reflected in the number of references to the tragedians in Aristotle (Aesch. 4, Soph. 12, Eur. 37), quotations by Plutarch (Aesch. 34, Soph. 72, Eur. 173), and quotations in Stobaeus' *ἐκλογαί* (Aesch. 30, Soph. 200, Eur. 740).

³⁷⁴ For the importance of the individual tragedians' families in the early preservation of their work, cf. Griffith (1977) 232. The sons of Aeschylus (Euphorion), Sophocles (Iophon), and Eur. (Euripides) were all tragedians; cf. Sutton (1987), esp. 16–17 on the family of Eur.

³⁷⁵ The standard Athenian texts are said to have been stolen for the Library by Ptolemy III (reign 247–21), who sacrificed his deposit of fifteen talents of silver to keep them (Galen, *Commentary on the Epidemics of Hippocrates* 2.4).

no more than an ordinary text of its day, carrying most of the modifications established by actors during the preceding century'.³⁷⁶ Thus, insofar as the Alexandrian editions of the major tragedians are the distant ancestors of our medieval manuscripts, the textual tradition as we know it must be treated with circumspection, since it can take us back to editions made only in the late third century BC, a full two centuries or more after the texts' original composition.

The Alexandrian edition of Eur.'s collected works was in wide circulation for several centuries, but after c. AD 250 ten plays predominate: *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Phoenician Women*, *Hippolytus*, *Medea*, *Andromache*, *Alcestis*, *Rhesus*, *Trojan Women*, and *Bacchae*. Wilamowitz argued that in the second century AD someone had deliberately selected these plays for use in schools and written a commentary to accompany them. However, as Barrett points out, there is no way of knowing 'how far that process [i.e., the gradual pre-eminence of these ten plays] was crowned by a deliberate act of selection',³⁷⁷ and there are likely to have been factors at work in addition to pedagogy, including (most importantly) the eminent popularity of the 'select' plays among educated readers and theatre audiences.³⁷⁸ Whatever the precise cause, it is these ten plays which were most widely copied in late antiquity and which are transmitted in a number of medieval manuscripts.³⁷⁹

By contrast, the survival of the other nine plays, including *Helen*, depends on a single early fourteenth-century manuscript (L) now in the Laurentian library in Florence (Laur. 32. 2).³⁸⁰ These nine plays (preserved without scholia, but with occasional explanatory glosses) are *Hel.*, *El.*, *Held.*, *Her.*, *Supp.* [Ἰκέτιδες], *Li*, *IT*, *Ion*, and *Cyclops*. They are usually referred to as the 'alphabetic' plays because they begin with the Greek letters epsilon, eta, iota, and kappa, forming one or two codex volumes of a complete edition of Eur.'s works in roughly alphabetical order which by some lucky accident survived to the Middle Ages.³⁸¹ For *Helen*, as with the other 'alphabetic' plays, we have far fewer papyri than we do for the 'select' plays, and only one of real significance, P. Oxy. 2336, dating from the later first century BC, which covers lines 630–51, 658, 660, 663–7, and 670–4. The papyrus, which was brilliantly re-edited by Zuntz,³⁸² confirms the high quality of L's text, but also offers a few improvements: see 625–97n.³⁸³

³⁷⁶ Barrett (1964) 47. The Athenian copies are also unlikely to have had any musical notation, let alone the poets' original music: cf. Prauscello (2006) 68–78.

³⁷⁷ Barrett (1964) 53.

³⁷⁸ The 'select' plays predominate in the papyri from c. 200 BC onwards and will no doubt have stood at the core of the performance repertoire. For the role of performance in the formation of the dramatic canon and the survival of texts, cf. Easterling (1997b), esp. 225 'the demand for texts must often have been related to the demand for revivals'.

³⁷⁹ All of the select plays (apart from *Bacchae*) have survived with scholia (marginal or interlinear annotations), some of which may derive from ancient commentaries reaching as far back as Aristophanes of Byzantium himself: cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 192.

³⁸⁰ Nearly all of the surviving plays are contained in L (without scholia); it lacks *Trö.* and has only *Bacch.* 1–755.

³⁸¹ Zuntz (1965) 277 'Miracles then do happen.'

³⁸² Zuntz (1965) 217–48; cf. also Dale (1967) 170–3, Kannicht (1969) 1.89–90.

³⁸³ Lines 1429–33 are partially preserved in a recently published papyrus, dating from the second half of the first century AD. Unfortunately, however, the text of the new papyrus offers

I have naturally relied heavily on the magisterial edition of James Diggle,³⁸⁴ though the text printed here differs from his Oxford Classical Text in a number of places:³⁸⁵ 86–9 lines retained, 86 ποθ' ὄντιν', 112 καρπίμους, 121–2 lines retained, 131 εἶδ', 170 ὀμιλοῖτ', 171a–b delete ἡ φόρμιγγας, 172 <δ'>, 175 φόνιον ἄχαριν, 182a–b no obeli, 182b <τ'έν> αὐγαῖσι, 187 φύγδα, 188 νόμον, 236–7 lines retained, 237 γαμῶν, 257–9 lines retained, 287–92 lines retained, 288 ἀπ' Ἰλίου, 289 δίχα, 291 ἐλθόντες, ἃ φανέρ' ἦν μόνοις, ἐς ξύμβολα, 298 line retained, 298 οὐ, 334 οὐ μόλις, 344 <ν>, 347 ὁ τι, 352 no obeli, 354 δίωγμα, 355 λαιμορρύτου, 366 ἄχεά τ' ἄχεσι, πάθεα πάθεσι, 388–9 no obeli, 388 τότ', 389 ἐν δρόμοις, 434 ἔχοιεν, 441 ταῦτά ταῦτ' ἔπη κάλλως λέγειν, 448 σοὶ γ' ἔσαγγέλλειν λόγους, 494 ἀπλοῦν, 495 γαῖα τίς, 503–9 lines retained, 510 μὲν, 530–40 lines retained, 532 πεπλευκότα, 588 Ελ., 593 πόνων, 601 θαῦμ' ἔστ', 642 γ', 650 ἐμόν <ἐμόν> ἔχομεν ἔχομεν, 652 ἐγώ, 654 delete Ελ., 656 Ελ., 657 delete Ελ., 669 <δῆ>, 690 <ἐμόν>, 705–6 lines retained, 709 ἀληθῶς, 713–19 lines retained, 728–33 lines retained, 746–8 lines retained, 747 οὔτε, 752–7 lines retained, 752 ἐβούλετο, 764 line retained, 769 εἰ . . . σε, 770 τ', 771 line retained, 780 line retained, 798 ταλαίνας, 874 σοι, 906–8 lines retained, 912–14 lines retained, 932 ἐς, 936 κατεφθάρη, 974 τάμά μοι δοῦναι, 991–5 lines retained, 1002 Δίκης, 1008 line retained, 1033 δῆ σέ . . . φέροντα, 1074 καὶ νεῶς, 1089 no obeli, 1104 δωμάτων, 1141–2 ἀντιλόγοις, 1149–50 ὁ τι σαφές, ὁ τι ποτ' ἐν βροτοῖς τῶν θεῶν | ἔπος ἀλαθές εὐρω, 1158 αἰ . . . ἔλαχον, 1162 φόνιος, 1163–4 ἀθλία . . . ἔλειναῖς, 1197 line retained, 1197 τάδ' εὐτυχῶν, 1198 <δ'>, 1225 ἔστιν, ὡς ποτ' ἦν, ἐτ' ἐνθάδ' ὦν, after 1226 no lacuna, 1279 ἐξελοῦ, after 1279 no lacuna, 1314a–b κούραν <—x—υ—>. | μετὰ δ' <ἦιξαν>, 1316 πάνοπλος, 1317b <Ζεὺς ὁ παντόπτας ἐδράνων>, 1320 Μάτηρ, 1321 ματεύουσ' ἀπόνους, 1344 λυπᾶν ἐξελατ', 1353–4 ὦν οὐ θέμις <σ'> οὐδ' ὅσια | πύρωσας ἐν <γᾶς> θαλάμαις, 1368 line retained (but obeli at 1366–7), 1368 μορφᾶι, 1372 line retained, 1372 ἡλίου, 1374 δῆ τήνδ' ἦρπασεν τύχην, 1387 προσπίτνω μένειν, after 1387 no lacuna, 1422 no obeli, 1472 τροχὸν ἀτέρμονα, 1473 τᾶι <δῆ>, 1480 οἴωνοι στολάδες, 1488 δρόμου, 1495 οἶμον, 1512 εὐρήκαμεν, 1521 ἔχων, 1539 ἠσθημένοι, 1563–4 parentheses added, no obeli, 1563 δ', 1564 αἶρει, 1590 ἀντίαν, 1627–41 Χο. for Θε.^β throughout, 1650–5 lines retained, 1675 κλοπᾶς <σᾶς>, 1685 no obeli, 1688–92 lines retained. There are also differences in punctuation at 69, 84, 171b, 174b, 186b, 237, 290, 347, 352, 366, 433, 494, 529, 670, 1007, 1226, 1279, 1316, 1329, 1344, 1467, 1587, 1590.

nothing of value, since it diverges in no way from that of the medieval manuscripts; cf. Lendon (2003). For an overview of recent work on the papyri of Eur., see Bastianini and Casanova (2005) 1–9.

³⁸⁴ OCT vol. III (1994). For a detailed survey of modern editions of *Helen* since the Renaissance, see Kannicht (1969) 1.109–29.

³⁸⁵ The *apparatus criticus* is highly selective and offers essential information about only the most doubtful passages. Those wishing to see the full range of manuscript evidence, testimonia, and scholarly emendations should of course consult the apparatuses of Diggle and Kannicht.

ΕΛΕΝΗ

ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΕΛΕΝΗΣ

Ἡρόδοτος [2.112–20] ἱστορεῖ περὶ Ἑλένης καὶ φησὶν ἐλθεῖν μὲν αὐτὴν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ τοῦτο φάσκειν καὶ τὸν Ὅμηρον ποιοῦντα τὴν Ἑλένην παρέχειν τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐαι [4.219–32] τὸ λαθικηδὲς φάρμακον τὸ οἱ πόρε Πολύδαμνα Θόωνος παράκοιτις, οὐ μὴν δὲ οὕτως ὡς Εὐριπίδης φησὶν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ πλανωμένην φασὶν αὐτὴν μετὰ τοῦ 5
Μενέλεω μετὰ τὴν τῆς Ἰλίου πόρθησιν καὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον παραγενέσθαι κάκειθεν πεπορίσθαι τὰ φάρμακα· ὁ δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀληθῶς Ἑλένην φησὶ μηδ' ὀπωσοῦν ἐλθεῖν εἰς Τροίαν, τὸ εἶδωλον δὲ αὐτῆς. κλέψας γὰρ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἑρμῆς Ἦρας βουλήν Πρωτεΐ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς Αἰγύπτου φυλάττειν παρέδωκε· τούτου δὲ θανόντος ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Θεοκλύμενος ἐπειρᾶτο 10
γαμεῖν αὐτὴν, ἣ δὲ ἰκέτις παρεκάθητο τῷ τοῦ Πρωτέως μνήματι. ὅθεν αὐτῇ ἐπιφαίνεται Μενέλεως, τὰς μὲν ναῦς ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει ἀπολέσας, ὀλίγους δὲ τινὰς τῶν ἐταίρων ἐν ἄνθρωπῳ καθειργμένους σώζων. εἰς λόγους δὲ ἐλθόντες καὶ μηχανορραφήσαντες ἀπατῶσι μὲν τὸν Θεοκλύμενον, αὐτοὶ δὲ νηὶ ἐμβάντες ὡς δὴ τῷ Μενέλεω θανόντι κατὰ θάλατταν 15
θύσοντες εἰς τὴν Ἰδίαν διασώζονται.

τὰ τοῦ δράματος πρόσωπα · Ἑλένη, Τεῦκρος, χορός, Μενέλεως, γραῦς, θεράπων, Θεονόη, Θεοκλύμενος, ἄγγελος, Διόσκοροι.

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ

ΕΛΕΝΗ
ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣ
ΧΟΡΟΣ
ΜΕΝΕΛΕΩΣ
ΓΡΑΥΣ
ΘΕΡΑΠΩΝ
ΘΕΟΝΟΗ
ΘΕΟΚΛΥΜΕΝΟΣ
ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ
ΔΙΟΣΚΟΡΟΙ

ΕΛΕΝΗ

ΕΛΕΝΗ

Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
 ὃς ἀντί διὰς ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδον
 λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος ὑγραίνει γύας.
 Πρωτεὺς δ' ὅτ' ἔζη τῆσδε γῆς τύραννος ἦν,
 [Φάρον μὲν οἰκῶν νῆσον, Αἰγύπτου δ' ἄναξ,] 5
 ὃς τῶν κατ' οἶδμα παρθένων μίαν γαμεῖ,
 Ψαμάθην, ἔπειδὴ λέκτρ' ἀφῆκεν Αἰακοῦ.
 τίκτει δὲ τέκνα δισσὰ τοῖσδ' ἐν δώμασιν,
 Θεοκλύμενον ἄρσεν' [ἴδι δὴ θεοὺς σέβων
 βίον διήνεγκ'] εὐγενῆ τε παρθένον 10
 Εἰδώ, τὸ μητρὸς ἀγλαίσμ', ὅτ' ἦν βρέφος·
 ἔπει δ' ἐς ἡβην ἦλθεν ὠραίαν γάμων,
 καλοῦσιν αὐτὴν Θεονόην· τὰ θεῖα γὰρ
 τὰ τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα πάντ' ἠπίστατο,
 προγόνου λαβοῦσα Νηρέως τιμὰς πάρα. 15
 ἡμῖν δὲ γῆ μὲν πατρὶς οὐκ ἀνώνυμος
 Σπάρτη, πατὴρ δὲ Τυνδάρεως· ἔστιν δὲ δὴ
 λόγος τις ὡς Ζεὺς μητέρ' ἔπτατ' εἰς ἐμὴν
 Λήδαν κύκνου μορφώματ' ὄρνιθος λαβῶν,
 ὃς δόλιον εὐνήν ἐξέπραξ' ὑπ' αἰετοῦ 20
 δίωγμα φεύγων, εἰ σαφῆς οὗτος λόγος·
 Ἐλένη δ' ἐκλήθη. ἃ δὲ πεπόνθαμεν κακὰ
 λέγοιμ' ἄν. ἦλθον τρεῖς θεαὶ κάλλους πέρι
 Ἰδαῖον ἐς κευθμῶν' Ἀλέξανδρον πάρα,
 Ἥρα Κύπρις τε διογενῆς τε παρθένος, 25
 μορφῆς θέλουσαι διαπεράνασθαι κρίσιν.
 τούμὸν δὲ κάλλος, εἰ καλὸν τὸ δυστυχές,
 Κύπρις προτεῖνας' ὡς Ἀλέξανδρος γαμεῖ,
 νικᾷ. λιπῶν δὲ βούσταθμ' Ἰδαῖος Πάρις
 Σπάρτην ἀφίκεθ' ὡς ἐμὸν σχήσων λέχος. 30
 Ἥρα δὲ μεμφθεῖσ' οὔνεκ' οὐ νικᾷ θεᾶς
 ἐξηνέμωσε τᾶμ' Ἀλεξάνδρωι λέχη,
 δίδωσι δ' οὐκ ἔμ' ἄλλ' ὁμοιώσασ' ἔμοι

5 del. Dingelstad
10a del. Nauck

7 Αἰακοῦ Musgrave: αἰόλου L
11 Εἰδώ Matthiae: εἶδος L

8 τοῖσδ' ἐν Lenting: τοῖσδε L
12 ὠραίαν Reiske: -ων L

gb-

εἶδωλον ἔμπνουν οὐρανοῦ ξυυθεῖσ' ἄπο
 Πριάμου τυράννου παιδί· καὶ δοκεῖ μ' ἔχειν, 35
 κενὴν δόκησιν, οὐκ ἔχων. τὰ δ' αὖ Διὸς
 βουλεύματ' ἄλλα τοῖσδε συμβαίνει κακοῖς·
 πόλεμον γὰρ εἰσήνεγκεν Ἑλλήνων χθονὶ
 καὶ Φρυξὶ δυστήνοισιν, ὡς ὄχλου βροτῶν
 πλήθους τε κουφίσειε μητέρα χθόνα 40
 γνωτὸν τε θεῖη τὸν κράτιστον Ἑλλάδος.
 Φρυγῶν δ' ἐς ἀλκὴν προυτέθην ἐγὼ μὲν οὐ,
 τὸ δ' ὄνομα τοῦμόν, ἄθλον Ἑλλησιν δορός.
 λαβῶν δέ μ' Ἑρμῆς ἐν πτυχαῖσιν αἰθέρος
 νεφέλῃ καλύψας – οὐ γὰρ ἡμέλησέ μου 45
 Ζεὺς – τόνδ' ἐς οἶκον Πρωτέως ἰδρύσατο,
 πάντων προκρίνας σωφρονέστατον βροτῶν,
 ἀκέραιον ὡς σῶσαιμι Μενέλεωι λέχος.
 κάγῳ μὲν ἐνθάδ' εἶμ', ὁ δ' ἄθλιος πόσις
 στρατεύμ' ἀθροίσας τὰς ἐμὰς ἀναρπαγὰς 50
 θηρᾶι πορευθεὶς Ἰλίου πυργώματα.
 ψυχαὶ δὲ πολλαὶ δι' ἐμ' ἐπὶ Σκαμανδρίοις
 ῥοαῖσιν ἔθανον· ἢ δὲ πάντα τλᾶσ' ἐγὼ
 κατάρατός εἰμι καὶ δοκῶ προδοῦσ' ἐμόν
 πόσιν συνάψαι πόλεμον Ἑλλησιν μέγαν. 55
 τί οὖν ἔτι ζῶ; θεοῦ τόδ' εἰσήκουσ' ἔπος
 Ἑρμοῦ, τὸ κλεινὸν ἔτι κατοικήσειν πέδον
 Σπάρτης σὺν ἀνδρὶ, γνόντος ὡς ἐς Ἴλιον
 οὐκ ἦλθον, ἦν μὴ λέκτρ' ὑποστρώσω τινί.
 ἕως μὲν οὖν φῶς ἡλίου τόδ' ἔβλεπεν 60
 Πρωτεύς, ἄσυλος ἢ γάμων· ἐπεὶ δὲ γῆς
 σκότῳ κέκρυπται, παῖς ὁ τοῦ τεθνηκότος
 θηρᾶι γαμεῖν με. τὸν πάλαι δ' ἐγὼ πόσιν
 τιμῶσα Πρωτέως μνήμα προσπίτνω τόδε
 ἰκέτις, ἴν' ἀνδρὶ τὰμὰ διασώσῃ λέχη, 65
 ὡς, εἴ καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ὄνομα δυσκλεῆς φέρω,
 μή μοι τὸ σῶμά γ' ἐνθάδ' αἰσχύνῃ ὄφληι.

34 ἄπο Reiske: ὑπο L 42 προυτέθην Musgrave: προύθήμεν L
 δητ' L 59 ἦν Dobree: ἴνα L 63 ἐγὼ Dobree: ἐμόν L

56 οὖν Ar. *Thesm.* 868:

ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣ

- τίς τῶνδ' ἔρυμνῶν δωμάτων ἔχει κράτος;
 Πλούτῳ γάρ οἶκος ἄξιος προσεικάσαι,
 βασιλεία τ' ἀμφιβλήματ' εὐθριγκοί θ' ἔδραι.
 ἔα· 70
- ὦ θεοί, τίν' εἶδον ὄψιν; ἐχθίστης ὀρῶ
 γυναικὸς εἰκὼ φόνιον, ἧ μ' ἀπώλεσεν
 πάντας τ' Ἀχαιοῦς. θεοί σ', ὅσον μίμημ' ἔχεις
 Ἑλένης, ἀποπτύσειαν. εἰ δὲ μὴ ἴ ξένη
 γαίαι πόδ' εἶχον, τῶιδ' ἂν εὐστόχῳι πτερῶι
 ἀπόλαυσιν εἰκοῦς ἔθανες ἂν Διὸς κόρης. 75
- Ελ. τί δ', ὦ ταλαίπωρ', ὅστις εἶ μ' ἀπεστράφης
 καὶ ταῖς ἐκείνης συμφοραῖς ἐμέ στυγεῖς;
- Τε. ἤμαρτον· ὀργῆι δ' εἶξα μᾶλλον ἢ μ' ἐχρῆν·
 μισεῖ γάρ Ἑλλάς πᾶσα τὴν Διὸς κόρην.
 σύγγνωθι δ' ἡμῖν τοῖς λελεγμένοις, γύναι. 80
- Ελ. τίς δ' εἶ; πόθεν γῆς τῆσδ' ἐπεστράφης πέδον;
- Τε. εἷς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, ὦ γύναι, τῶν ἀθλίων.
- Ελ. οὐ τᾶρα σ' Ἑλένην εἶ στυγεῖς θαυμαστέον.
 ἀτὰρ τίς εἶ ποθ', ὄντιν' ἐξαυδᾶν σε χρή; 85
- Τε. ὄνομα μὲν ἡμῖν Τεῦκρος, ὃ δὲ φύσας πατήρ
 Τελαμών, Σαλαμῖς δὲ πατρὶς ἡ θρέψασά με.
- Ελ. τί δῆτα Νείλου τούσδ' ἐπιστρέφῃ γύας;
- Τε. φυγὰς πατρώιας ἐξελήλαμαι χθονός. 90
- Ελ. τλήμων ἂν εἶης· τίς δέ σ' ἐκβάλλει πάτρας;
- Τε. Τελαμών ὃ φύσας· τίν' ἂν ἔχοις μᾶλλον φίλον;
- Ελ. ἐκ τοῦ; τὸ γάρ τοι πρᾶγμα συμφορὰν ἔχει.
- Τε. Αἴας μ' ἀδελφὸς ὦλεσ' ἐν Τροίαι θανών.
- Ελ. πῶς; οὐ τί που σῶι φασγάνῳ βίου στερεῖς; 95
- Τε. οἰκεῖον αὐτόν ὦλεσ' ἄλμ' ἐπὶ ξίφος.
- Ελ. μανέντ'; ἐπεὶ τίς σωφρονῶν τλαίῃ τάδ' ἂν;
- Τε. τὸν Πηλέως τιν' οἶσθ' Ἀχιλλέα γόνον;
- Ελ. ναί·
 μνηστήρ ποθ' Ἑλένης ἦλθεν, ὡς ἀκούομεν.
- Τε. θανῶν ὃδ' ὀπλων ἔριν ἔθηκε συμμάχοις. 100
- Ελ. καὶ δὴ τί τοῦτ' Αἴαντι γίγνεται κακόν;

69 Πλούτῳ Nauck: -του L 72 ἐχθίστης Dingelstad: -ην L 76 πτερῶι Elmsley: πέτρῳ
 L 77 ἀπόλαυσιν Reiske: ἀπώλλυσ', ἰν' L 78 εἰ Cobet: ὦν L 86-g del. Diggle 86
 ποθ' ὄντιν' Jackson: πόθεν τίνος L 95 βίου Burges: βίου L

- Τε. ἄλλου λαβόντος ὄπλ' ἀπηλλάχθη βίου.
 Ελ. σὺ τοῖς ἐκείνου δῆτα πῆμασιν νοσεῖς;
 Τε. ὀθούνεκ' αὐτῶι <γ> οὐ ξυνωλόμην ὄμοῦ.
 Ελ. ἦλθες γάρ, ὦ ξέν', Ἰλίου κλεινὴν πόλιν; 105
 Τε. καὶ ξύν γε πέρσας αὐτὸς ἀνταπωλόμην.
 Ελ. ἦδη γὰρ ἤπται καὶ κατείργασται πυρί;
 Τε. ὥστ' οὐδ' ἶχνος γε τειχέων εἶναι σαφές.
 Ελ. ὦ τλῆμον Ἑλένη, διὰ σ' ἀπόλλυνται Φρύγες.
 Τε. καὶ πρὸς γ' Ἀχαιοί· μεγάλα δ' εἴργασται κακά. 110
 Ελ. πόσον χρόνον γὰρ διαπεπόρθηται πόλις;
 Τε. ἑπτὰ σχεδόν τι καρπίμους ἐτῶν κύκλους.
 Ελ. χρόνον δ' ἐμείνατ' ἄλλον ἐν Τροίαι πόσον;
 Τε. πολλὰς σελήνας, δέκα διελθούσας ἔτη.
 Ελ. ἦ καὶ γυναῖκα Σπαρτιᾶτιν εἴλετε; 115
 Τε. Μενέλαος αὐτὴν ἦγ' ἐπισπάσας κόμης.
 Ελ. εἶδες σὺ τὴν δύστηνον, ἦ κλυῶν λέγεις;
 Τε. ὥσπερ σέ γ', οὐδὲν ἤσσον, ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄρω.
 Ελ. σκόπει δὲ μὴ δόκησιν εἶχετ' ἐκ θεῶν.
 Τε. ἄλλου λόγου μέμνησο, μὴ κείνης ἔτι. 120
 Ελ. οὕτω δοκεῖτε τὴν δόκησιν ἀσφαλῆ;
 Τε. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὄσσοις εἰδόμην, καὶ νοῦς ὄραϊ.
 Ελ. ἦδη δ' ἐν οἴκοις σὺν δάμαρτι Μενέλεως;
 Τε. οὐκ οὐν ἐν Ἄργει <γ> οὐδ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα ῥοαῖς.
 Ελ. αἰαῖ· κακὸν τόδ' εἶπας οἷς κακὸν λέγεις. 125
 Τε. ὡς κείνος ἀφανῆς σὺν δάμαρτι κλήζεται.
 Ελ. οὐ πᾶσι πορθμὸς αὐτὸς Ἀργείοισιν ἦν;
 Τε. ἦν, ἀλλὰ χειμῶν ἄλλοσ' ἄλλον ὠρισεν.
 Ελ. ποίοισιν ἐν νώτοισι ποντίας ἄλός;
 Τε. μέσον περῶσι πέλαγος Αἰγαίου πόρου. 130
 Ελ. κακ' τοῦδε Μενέλεων οὔτις εἶδ' ἀφιγμένον;
 Τε. οὐδεῖς· θανῶν δὲ κλήζεται καθ' Ἑλλάδα.
 Ελ. ἀπωλόμεσθα· Θεστιᾶς δ' ἔστιν κόρη;
 Τε. Λήδαν ἔλεξας; οἷχεται θανοῦσα δῆ.
 Ελ. οὐ πού νιν Ἑλένης αἰσχροὺν ὤλεσεν κλέος; 135
 Τε. φασίν, βρόχῳ γ' ἄψασαν εὐγενῆ δέρην.
 Ελ. οἱ Τυνδάρειοι δ' εἰσὶν ἢ οὐκ εἰσὶν κόροι;
 Τε. τεθναῖσι κού τεθναῖσι· δύο δ' ἔστων λόγῳ.

104 <γ>Tr³

112 καμπίμους Nauck

119 σκόπει δὲ A. Y. Campbell: σκοπεῖτε L

121-2 del. W. Ribbeck

124 <γ> Musgrave

131 Μενέλεων Scaliger: -λαον L

- Ελ. πότερος ὁ κρείσσων; ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγὼ κακῶν.
 Τε. ἄστροις σφ' ὁμοιωθέντε φάσ' εἶναι θεῶ. 140
- Ελ. καλῶς ἔλεξας τοῦτο· θάτερον δὲ τί;
 Τε. σφαγαῖς ἀδελφῆς οὔνεκ' ἐκπνεῦσαι βίον.
 ἄλις δὲ μύθων· οὐ διπλᾶ χρήζω στένειν.
 ὦν δ' οὔνεκ' ἦλθον τούσδε βασιλείους δόμους,
 τὴν θεσπιωιδὸν Θεονόην χρήζων ἰδεῖν, 145
 σὺ προξένησον, ὡς τύχῳ μαντευμάτων
 ὀπηι νεῶς στείλαιμ' ἄν οὔριον πτερὸν
 ἐς γῆν ἐναλίαν Κύπρον, οὐ μ' ἐθέσπισεν
 οἰκεῖν Ἄπόλλων, ὄνομα νησιωτικὸν
 Σαλαμίνα θέμενον τῆς ἐκεῖ χάριν πάτρας. 150
- Ελ. πλοῦς, ὦ ξέν', αὐτὸς σημανεῖ· σὺ δ' ἐκλιπῶν
 γῆν τήνδε φεῦγε, πρὶν σε παῖδα Πρωτέως
 ἰδεῖν, ὅς ἄρχει τῆσδε γῆς· ἄπεστι δὲ
 κυσὶν πεπορθῶς ἐν φοναῖς θηροκτόνοις·
 κτείνει γὰρ Ἕλλην' ὄντιν' ἄν λάβῃ ξένον. 155
 ὄτου δ' ἕκατι μήτε σὺ ζήτει μαθεῖν
 ἐγὼ τε σιγῶ· τί γὰρ ἄν ὠφελοῖμί σε;
- Τε. καλῶς ἔλεξας, ὦ γύναι· θεοὶ δέ σοι
 ἐσθλῶν ἀμοιβὰς ἀντιδωρησαίατο.
 Ἐλένη δ' ὁμοιον σῶμ' ἔχουσ' οὐ τὰς φρένας 160
 ἔχεις ὁμοίας ἀλλὰ διαφόρους πολὺ.
 κακῶς ὄλοιτο μηδ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα ῥοὰς
 ἔλθοι· σὺ δ' εἴης εὐτυχῆς αἰεὶ, γύναι.
- Ελ. ὦ μεγάλων ἀχέων καταβαλλομένα μέγαν οἶκτον
 ποῖον ἀμιλλαθῶ γόον ἢ τίνα μοῦσαν ἐπέλθω 165
 δάκρυσιν ἢ θρήνοις ἢ πένθεσιν; αἰαῖ.
- πτεροφόροι νεάνιδες, [στρ. α
 παρθένοι Χθονὸς κόραι,
 Σειρῆνες, εἴθ' ἔμοῖς
 ὀμιλοῖτ' ἔχουσαι 170
 Λίβυν λωτὸν ἢ σύ-
 ριγγας αἰλίνοις κακοῖς·

162 κακῶς Wilamowitz: κ- δ' L 169 ἔμοῖς Aldina: ἔμοῖς γόοις L
 μόλοῖτ' L 171a-b ἢ σύριγγας Tr³: ἢ σύριγγας ἢ φόρμιγγας L

170 ὀμιλοῖτ' Willink:

τοῖς <δ'> ἔμοῖσι σύνοχα δάκρυα,
πάθεσι πάθεα, μέλεσι μέλεα,
μουσεῖα θρηνήμα-

σι ξυνωιδά πέμψαιτε,

Φερσέφασσα φόνιον ἄχαριν

175

ἴν' ἐπὶ δάκρυσι παρ' ἐμέθεν ὑπὸ

μέλαθρα νύχια παιᾶνα

νέκυσιν ὀλομένοις λάβηι.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

κυανοειδές ἀμφ' ὕδωρ

[ἀντ. α

ἔτυχον ἑλικά τ' ἀνὰ χλόαν

180

φοίνικας ἀλίωι

πέπλους χρυσέαισιν

<τ' ἐν> αὐγαῖσι θάλπουσ'

ἀμφὶ δόνακος ἔρνεσιν·

ἔνθεν οἰκτρὸν ὄμαδον ἔκλυον,

ἄλυρον ἔλεγον, ὅτι ποτ' ἔλακεν

185

<---> αἰάγμα-

σι στένουσα νύμφα τις,

οἶα Ναῖς ὄρεσι φύγδα

νόμον ἰεῖσα γοερόν, ὑπὸ δὲ

πέτρινα γύαλα κλαγγαῖσι

Πανὸς ἀναβοᾶι γάμους.

190

Ελ. ὦ θήραμα βαρβάρου πλάτας,

[στρ. β

Ἑλλανίδες κόραι,

ναύτας Ἀχαιῶν τις

ἔμολεν ἔμολε δάκρυα δάκρυσί μοι φέρων·

194-5

Ἰλίου κατασκαφαῖ

πυρὶ μέλουσι δαῖωι

δι' ἐμέ τάν πολυκτόνον,

172 <δ'> Willink 174b πέμψαιτε Bothe: -ψειε L 175 φόνιον ἄχαριν Willink: φονία
χάριτας L 176 ἐμέθεν: ἐμέ θ' L 182a-b πέπλους χρυσέαισιν | <τ' ἐν> αὐγαῖσι θάλπουσ'
Willink: πέπλους χρυσέαισιν αὐγαῖς | θάλπουσ' L 184 οἰκτρὸν Badham: οἰ- ἀνεβόασεν
L 185 ἔλεγον Tr': θρήνον L 186 <λαμπροῖσιν> Kovacs, <πολλοῖσιν> Lourenço,
<αὐλαῖσιν> Willink 187 φύγδα Heinen: φυγάδα L 188 νόμον Matthiae: γάμων
L 189 γύαλα Dindorf: μύαλα γ- L κλαγγαῖσι Murray: -ᾶς L 191 ὦ Wilamowitz:
ἰῶ ἰῶ L 196 κατασκαφαῖ Murray: -ᾶ L 197 μέλουσι δαῖωι Murray: μέλουσ' ἰδαῖω L

- δι' ἔμὸν ὄνομα πολύπονον,
 Λήδα δ' ἐν ἀγχόναϊς 200
 θάνατον ἔλαβεν αἰσχύ-
 νας ἐμᾶς ὑπ' ἀλγέων,
 ὃ δ' ἔμὸς ἐν ἀλί πολυπλανῆς
 πόσις ὀλόμενος οἴχεται,
 Κάστορός τε συγγόνου τε 205
 διδυμογενῆς ἄγαλμα πατρίδος
 ἀφανῆς ἀφανῆς ἱππόκροτα λέ-
 λοιπε δάπεδα γυμνάσιά τε
 δονακόντος Εὐρώ-
 τα, νεανιᾶν πόνον. 210
- Χο. αἰαῖ δαίμονος πολυστόνου 215 [ἀντ. β
 μοίρας τε σᾶς, γύναι.
 αἰὼν δυσαίων τις
 ἔλαχεν ἔλαχεν, ὅτε σ' ἐτέκετο ματρόθεν
 χιονόχρωι κύκνου πτερῶι
 Ζεὺς πρέπων δι' αἰθέρος.
 τί γὰρ ἄπεστί σοι κακῶν;
 τί δ' ἀνά βίοτον οὐκ ἔτλας;
 μάτηρ μὲν οἴχεται,
 δίδυμά τε Διὸς οὐκ εὐ- 220
 δαιμονεῖ τέκεα φίλα,
 χθόνα δὲ πάτριον οὐχ ὄραϊς,
 διὰ δὲ πόλιας ἔρχεται
 βᾶξις ἅ σε βαρβάροισι,
 πότνια, παραδίδωσι λέχεσιν, 225
 ὃ δὲ σὸς ἐν ἀλί κύμασί τε λέ-
 λοιπε βίοτον, οὐδέ ποτ' ἔτι
 πάτρια μέλαθρα καὶ τὰν
 Χαλκίοικον ὀλβιεῖ.
- Ελ. φεῦ φεῦ, τίς ἦ Φρυγῶν 230 [ἔπωι
 ἦ τίς Ἑλλανίας ἀπὸ χθονὸς
 ἔτεμε τὰν δακρυόεσσαν
 Ἰλίωι πεύκαν;

201-2 αἰσχύνας ἐμᾶς ὑπ' Μυρτίου: -ουσ' ἡμᾶς ἐπ' L 210 νεανιᾶν Lenting: -ίαν L 215
 χιονόχρωι Wecklein: -ως L 218 τί δ' ἀνά Brixh: τίνα δὲ L βίοτον Tr': βίου L 225
 πότνια, παραδίδωσι λέχεσιν Nauck: λέχεσι π- παραδίδωσιν L 228 ὀλβιεῖ Bothe: -οῖς L

- ἔνθεν ὀλόμενον σκάφος
 συναρμόσας ὁ Πριαμίδας
 ἔπλευσε βαρβάρῳ πλάται
 τὰν ἑμὰν ἐφ' ἑστίαν 235
 ἐπὶ τὸ δυστυχέστατον
 κάλλος, ὡς ἔλοι γαμῶν,
 ἃ τε δόλιος ἂ πολυκτόνος Κύπρις
 Δαναΐδαις ἄγουσα θάνατον·
 ὦ τάλαινα συμφορᾶς. 240
 ἂ δὲ χρυσεῖς θρόνοισι
 Διὸς ὑπαγκάλισμα σεμνόν
 Ἦρα τὸν ὠκύπουν
 ἔπεμψε Μαιάδος γόνον·
 ὃς με χλοερὰ δρεπτομέναν ἔσω πέπλων
 ῥόδεα πέταλα Χαλκίοικον 245a
 ὡς Ἀθάναν μόλοιμ'
 ἀναρπάσας δι' αἰθέρος
 τάνδε γαῖαν εἰς ἀνολβον
 ἔριν ἔριν τάλαιναν ἔθετο
 Πριαμίδαισιν Ἑλλάδος.
 τὸ δ' ἑμὸν ὄνομα παρὰ Σιμουντίοις ῥοαῖσι 250-1
 μαψίδιον ἔχει φάτιν.
- Χο. ἔχεις μὲν ἀλγείν', οἶδα· σύμφορον δέ τοι
 ὡς ῥᾶιστα τἀναγκαῖα τοῦ βίου φέρειν.
- Ελ. φίλαι γυναῖκες, τίني πότμῳ συνεζύγην; 255
 ἄρ' ἢ τεκοῦσά μ' ἔτεκεν ἀνθρώποις τέρας;
 γυνὴ γὰρ οὐθ' Ἑλληνίς οὔτε βάρβαρος
 τεῦχος νεοσσῶν λευκὸν ἐκλοχεύεται,
 ἐν ᾧ με Λήδαν φασὶν ἐκ Διὸς τεκεῖν.
 τέρας γὰρ ὁ βίος καὶ τὰ πράγματ' ἐστὶ μου, 260
 τὰ μὲν δι' Ἦραν, τὰ δὲ τὸ κάλλος αἴτιον.
 εἶθ' ἐξαλειφθεῖσ' ὡς ἄγαλμ' αὐθις πάλιν
 αἴσχιον εἶδος ἔλαβον ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ,
 καὶ τὰς τύχας μὲν τὰς κακὰς ἄς νῦν ἔχω
 Ἑλληνες ἐπελάθοντο, τὰς δὲ μὴ κακὰς 265

236-7 del. Dindorf 237 ὡς ἔλοι γαμῶν Dale: ὡς ἔλοι γάμων ἑμῶν L 238 ἃ τε Matthiae:
 ἂ δὲ L 239 θάνατον Nauck: θ- Πριαμίδαις L 241 ἂ Dindorf: εἰ L 253 τοι L. Dindorf:
 σοι L 257-9 del. Wieland 263 ἔλαβον ἂ- τοῦ κ- Wilamowitz: ἂ- τοῦ κ- λαβεῖν L

ἔσωιζον ὥσπερ τὰς κακὰς σῶιζουσί μου.
 ὅστις μὲν οὖν ἐς μίαν ἀποβλέπων τύχην
 πρὸς θεῶν κακοῦται, βαρὺ μὲν, οἰστέον δ' ὅμως·
 ἡμεῖς δὲ πολλαῖς συμφοραῖς ἐγκείμεθα.
 πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ οὔσ' ἄδικός εἰμι δυσκλεής· 270
 καὶ τοῦτο μεῖζον τῆς ἀληθείας κακόν,
 ὅστις τὰ μὴ προσόντα κέκτηται κακά.
 ἔπειτα πατρίδος θεοί μ' ἀφιδρύσαντο γῆς
 ἐς βάρβαρ' ἦθη, καὶ φίλων τητωμένη
 δούλη καθέστηκε· οὔσ' ἐλευθέρων ἄπο· 275
 τὰ βαρβάρων γὰρ δοῦλα πάντα πλὴν ἑνός.
 ἄγκυρα δ' ἦ μου τὰς τύχας ὥχει μόνη,
 πόσιν ποθ' ἦξιν καὶ μ' ἀπαλλάξιν κακῶν,
 ἐπεὶ τέθνηκεν οὗτος, οὐκέτ' ἔστι δῆ.
 μήτηρ δ' ὄλωλε καὶ φονεύς αὐτῆς ἐγώ, 280
 ἀδίκως μὲν, ἀλλὰ τ' ἀδικὸν τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐμόν.
 ἦ δ' ἀγλάισμα δωμάτων ἐμόν τ' ἔφυ,
 θυγάτηρ ἄναδρος πολιά παρθνεύεται.
 τῷ τοῦ Διὸς δὲ λεγομένω Διοσκόρω
 οὐκ ἔστόν. ἀλλὰ πάντ' ἔχουσα δυστυχή 285
 τοῖς πράγμασιν τέθνηκα, τοῖς δ' ἔργοισιν οὔ.
 τὸ δ' ἔσχατον τοῦτ', εἰ μόλοιμεν ἐς πάτραν,
 κλήθροισι ἂν εἰργοίμεσθα, τὴν ἀπ' Ἰλίου
 δοκοῦντες Ἑλένην Μενέλεώ μ' ἐλθεῖν δίχα.
 εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἔζη πόσις, ἀνεγνώσθημεν ἂν 290
 ἐλθόντες, ἃ φανέρ' ἦν μόνοις, ἐς ξύμβολα.
 νῦν δ' οὔτε τοῦτ' ἔστ' οὔτε μὴ σωθῆι ποτε.
 τί δῆτ' ἔτι ζῶ; τί ν' ὑπολείπομαι τύχην;
 γάμους ἐλομένη τῶν κακῶν ὑπαλλαγὰς
 μετ' ἀνδρὸς οἰκεῖν βαρβάρου, πρὸς πλουσίαν 295
 τράπεζαν ἴζουσ'; ἀλλ' ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς
 ξυνηὶ γυναικί, καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἔστιν πικρόν.
 θανεῖν κράτιστον· πῶς θάνοιμ' ἂν οὐ καλῶς;
 [ἀσχήμονες μὲν ἀγχόναι μετάρσιοι,
 κὰν τοῖσι δούλοις δυσπρεπὲς νομίζεται· 300

279 ἐπεὶ Cobet: οὗτος L 282 ἦ δ' Diggle: ὁδ' L ἐμόν Cobet: ἐμοῦ L 287-92 del. Goguel
 288 ἀπ' Ἰλίου Nauck: ὑπ' Ἰλίω L 289 δίχα Zuntz: μέτα L 291 ἐλθόντες, ἃ φανέρ' ἦν μόνοις, ἐς ξύμβολα Murray: εἰς ξύμβολ' ἐλθόντες ἃ φανερά μόνοις ἂν ἦν L 298 πῶς θάνοιμ' ἂν οὖν Stephanius (οὐ Wilamowitz): προθάνοιμ' ἂν οὐ L 299-302 del. Hartung (298-302 Clark)

- σφαγαί δ' ἔχουσιν εὐγενές τι καὶ καλόν,
 σμικρὸν δ' ὁ καιρὸς ἴαρετ' ἄπαλλάξαι βίου.]
 ἔς γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἤλθομεν βάθος κακῶν·
 αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλαι διὰ τὸ κάλλος εὐτυχεῖς
 γυναῖκες, ἡμᾶς δ' αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἀπώλεσεν. 305
- Χο. Ἐλένη, τὸν ἐλθόνθ', ὅστις ἐστὶν ὁ ξένος,
 μὴ πάντ' ἀληθῆ δοξάσης εἰρηκέναι.
- Ελ. καὶ μὴν σαφῶς γ' ἔλεξ' ὀλωλέναι πόσιν.
- Χο. πόλλ' ἂν λέγοιτο καὶ διὰ ψευδῶν σαφῆ.
- Ελ. καὶ τᾶμπαλὶν γε τῶνδ' ἀληθείας ἔπι. 310
- Χο. ἔς ξυμφορὰν γὰρ ἀντὶ τάγαθοῦ φέρη.
- Ελ. φόβος γὰρ ἔς τὸ δεῖμα περιβαλὼν μ' ἄγει.
- Χο. πῶς δ' εὐμενείας τοισίδ' ἐν δόμοις ἔχεις;
- Ελ. πάντες φίλοι μοι πλὴν ὁ θηρεύων γάμους.
- Χο. οἴσθ' οὖν ὁ δρᾶσον· μνήματος λιποῦσ' ἔδραν . . . 315
- Ελ. ἔς ποῖον ἔρπεις μῦθον ἢ παραίνεσιν;
- Χο. ἐλθοῦσ' ἔς οἴκους, ἢ τὰ πάντ' ἐπίσταται
 τῆς ποντίας Νηρηίδος ἐκγόνου κόρης
 πυθοῦ πόσιν σὸν Θεονόης, εἴτ' ἔστ' ἔτι
 εἴτ' ἐκλέλοιπε φέγγος· ἐκμαθοῦσα δ' εὖ
 πρὸς τὰς τύχας τὸ χάσμα τοὺς γούους τ' ἔχε.
 πρὶν δ' οὐδὲν ὀρθῶς εἰδέναι, τί σοι πλέον
 λυπουμένη γένοιτ' ἂν; ἀλλ' ἔμοι πιθοῦ.
 [τάφον λιποῦσα τόνδε σύμμιξον κόρηι,
 ὀθενπερ εἴσηι πάντα· τάληθ' ἔφρασαι
 ἔχουσ' ἐν οἴκοις τοῖσδε, τί βλέπεις πρόσω;]
 θέλω δὲ κάγῳ σοι συνεισελθεῖν δόμους
 καὶ συμπυθέσθαι παρθένου θεσπίσματα·
 γυναῖκα γὰρ δὴ συμπονεῖν γυναικὶ χρή. 325
- Ελ. φίλοι, λόγους ἐδεξάμαν·
 βᾶτε βᾶτε δ' ἔς δόμους,
 ἀγῶνας ἐντὸς οἴκων
 ὡς πύθησθε τοὺς ἐμούς.
- Χο. θέλουσαν οὐ μόλις καλεῖς.
- Ελ. ἰὼ μέλεος ἀμέρα. 335
 τίν' ἄρα τάλαινα τίνα λόγον
 δακρυόεντ' ἀκούσομαι;

302 σμικρὸς Stephanus σάρκ Hermann, ἀρθρ' Keil L 309 λέγοιτο Blaydes: γένοιτο
 L 309-10 σαφῆ . . . ἐπι Jackson: ἐπι . . . σαφῆ L 324-6 del. Goguel 326 τήνδε
 Nauck 334 οὐ με δις Elmsley 336-7 λόγον δακρυόεντ' Hermann: δακρυόεντα λ- L

- Χο. μὴ πρόμαντις ἀλγέων
 προλάμβαν', ὦ φίλα, γόους.
- Ελ. τί μοι πόσις μέλεος ἔτλα; 340
 πότερα δέρκεται φάος τέ-
 θριππά θ' ἀλίου κέλευθά τ' ἀστέρων
 ἢ <ν> νέκυσι κατὰ χθονὸς
 τὰν χρόνιον ἔχει τύχαν; 345
- Χο. ἐς τὸ φέρτερον τίθει
 τὸ μέλλον, ὃ τι γενήσεται.
- Ελ. σὲ γὰρ ἐκάλεσα, σὲ δὲ κατόμοσα
 τὸν ὑδρόεντι δόνακι χλωρὸν
 Εὐρώταν, θανόντος 350
 εἰ βάξις ἔτυμος ἀνδρὸς
 ἄδε μοι – τί τάδ' ἀσύνητα; –
 φόνιον αἰώρημα
 διὰ δέρας ὀρέξομαι,
 ἢ ξιφοκτόνον δίωγμα
 λαιμορρύτου σφαγᾶς 355
 αὐτοσίδαρον ἔσω πελάσω διὰ σαρκὸς ἄμιλλαν,
 θῦμα τριζύγοις θεαῖσι
 τῶι τε σήραγγας Ἴ-
 δας ἐνίζοντι Πριαμί-
 δαι ποτ' ἀμφὶ βουστάθμους.
- Χο. ἄλλοσ' ἀποτροπὰ κακῶν 360
 γένοιτο, τὸ δὲ σὸν εὐτυχές.
- Ελ. ἰὼ τάλαινα Τροία,
 δι' ἔργ' ἀνεργ' ὄλλυσαι μέλεά τ' ἔτλας.
 τὰ δ' ἐμὰ δῶρα Κύπριδος ἔτεκε
 πολὺ μὲν αἷμα, πολὺ δὲ δάκρυον 365
 ἄχεά τ' ἄχεσι, πάθεα πάθεσι·
 ματέρες τε παῖδας ὄλεσαν,

342-3 θ ἀλίου Badham: τ' ἀελ- L 344 <ν> Jacobs 345 χρόνιον Bothe: χθόνιον
 L 349 ὑδρόεντι Reiske: -τα L χλωρὸν Stephanius: χῶρον L 353b δέρας Diggle:
 -ης L 354 δίωγμόν Nauck 355 αἰμορρύτου Bothe 356 ἄμιλλαν Musgrave: -α
 L 357b-8 σήραγγας Ἴδας ἐνίζοντι Diggle: σύραγγ' αἰδαί σέβιζον L 362 ἰὼ τάλαινα
 Τροία Hermann: ἰὼ τρ- τά- L 364 Κύπριδος L. Dindorf: κύπρις L 366 ἄχεά τ' ἄχεσι,
 πάθεα πάθεσι Dale: ἄχεά τ' ἄχ**ι (ἄχεσι ΓΓ') δάκρυα δάκρυσιν ἔλαβε πάθεα L 367 ὄλεσαν
 Headlam: ὦλ- L

- ἀπὸ δὲ παρθένοι κόμας ἔ-
 θεντο σύγγονοι νεκρῶν Σκαμάνδριον
 ἀμφὶ Φρύγιον οἶδμα.
 βοᾶν βοᾶν δ' Ἑλλάς <αἴ'> 370
 ἐκελάδησεν ἀνοτότυξεν,
 ἐπὶ δὲ κρατὶ χέρας ἔθηκεν,
 ὄνυχι δ' ἀπαλόχροα γένυιν
 ἔδουσεν φοινίαισι πλαγαῖς.
- ὦ μάκαρ Ἀρκαδίαί ποτέ παρθένε 375
 Καλλιστοῖ, Διὸς ἄ λεχέων ἀπέ-
 βας τετραβάμοσι γυίοις,
 ὡς πολὺ κηρὸς ἐμᾶς ἔλαχες πλέον,
 ἄ μορφᾷ θηρῶν λαχνογυίων
 [ὄμματι λάβρωι σχῆμα λεαίνης]
 ἐξαλλάξασ' ἄχθεα λύπας· 380
 ἂν τέ ποτ' Ἄρτεμις ἐξεχορεύσατο
 χρυσοκέρατ' ἔλαφον Μέροπος Τιτανίδα κούραν
 καλλοσύνας ἔνεκεν· τὸ δ' ἐμὸν δέμας
 ὦλεσεν ὦλεσε πέργαμα Δαρδανίας
 ὀλομένους τ' Ἀχαιοὺς. 385

ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ

- ὦ τὰς τεθρίππους Οἰνομάωι Πίσαν κατά
 Πέλοψ ἀμίλλας ἐξαμιλληθεῖς ποτε,
 εἴθ' ὠφελές τόν [ἠνίκ' ἔρανον εἰς θεοὺς
 πεισθεῖς ἐποίεις] ἐν δρόμοις λιπεῖν βίον,
 πρὶν τὸν ἐμὸν Ἄτρεα πατέρα γεννησαί ποτε, 390
 ὃς ἐξέφυσεν Ἀερόπης λέκτρων ἄπο
 Ἀγαμέμνον' ἐμέ τε Μενέλεων, κλεινὸν ζυγόν.
 πλεῖστον γὰρ οἶμαι – καὶ τόδ' οὐ κόμπωι λέγω –
 στράτευμα κώπηι διορίσαι Τροίαν ἔπι,
 τύραννος οὐδὲ πρὸς βίαν στρατηλατῶν, 395

370 <αἴ'> Paley 371 ἐκελάδησεν ἀνοτότυξεν Wilamowitz: κελάδησε ἀνοτότυξεν
 L 376a-b ἀπέβας aragr. Par., Hartung: ἐπέβας L 377 κηρὸς Diggle: μητρός L 378
 λαχνογυίων Reiske: λάχνα γυίων L 379 del. Dinkelstad 380 ἄχθεα Hermann: ἄχθεα
 L 388l-ga del. Nauck (with τότ' for L's τόθ') 389 πεφθεῖς Anon. ἐν δρόμοις
 Kannicht: ἐν θεοῖς L 395 οὐδὲ Dohree: οὐδέν L

ἐκοῦσι δ' ἄρξας Ἑλλάδος νεανίαις.
 καὶ τοὺς μὲν οὐκέτ' ὄντας ἀριθμῆσαι πάρα,
 τοὺς δ' ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀσμένους πεφευγότας,
 νεκρῶν φέροντας ὀνόματ' εἰς οἴκους πάλιν.
 ἐγὼ δ' ἐπ' οἶδμα πόντιον γλαυκῆς ἀλὸς 400
 τλήμων ἀλῶμαι χρόνον ὅσον περ Ἴλιου
 πύργους ἔπερσα, κὰς πάτραν χρήζων μολεῖν
 οὐκ ἀξιοῦμαι τοῦδε πρὸς θεῶν τυχεῖν.
 Λιβύης δ' ἐρήμους ἀξένους τ' ἐπιδρομὰς
 πέπλευκα πάσας· χῶταν ἐγγύς ὦ πάτρας, 405
 πάλιν μ' ἀπωθεῖ πνεῦμα κοῦπτοτ' οὔριον
 ἐσῆλθε λαῖφος ὥστε μ' ἐς πάτραν μολεῖν.
 καὶ νῦν τάλας ναυαγὸς ἀπολέσας φίλους
 ἐξέπεσον ἐς γῆν τήνδε· ναῦς δὲ πρὸς πέτραις
 πολλοὺς ἀριθμοὺς ἄγνυται ναυαγίων. 410
 τρόπις δ' ἐλείφθη ποικίλων ἀρμοσμάτων,
 ἐφ' ἧς ἐσώθην μόλις ἀνελπίστῳ τύχηι
 Ἑλένη τε, Τροίας ἦν ἀποσπάσας ἔχω.
 ὄνομα δὲ χῶρας ἦτις ἦδε καὶ λεῶ
 οὐκ οἶδ'· ὄχλον γὰρ ἐσπεσεῖν ἠισχυνόμην, 415
 [ὥσθ' ἱστορῆσαι τὰς ἐμὰς δυσχλαινίας]
 κρύπτων ὑπ' αἰδοῦς τὰς τύχας. ὅταν δ' ἀνὴρ
 πράξει κακῶς ὑψηλός, εἰς ἀηθίαν
 πίπτει κακίῳ τοῦ πάλαι δυσδαίμονος.
 χρεῖα δὲ τεῖρει μ' οὔτε γὰρ σῆτος πάρα 420
 οὔτ' ἀμφὶ χρωτ' ἐσθῆτες· αὐτὰ δ' εἰκάσαι
 πάρεστι ναὸς ἐκβόλοις ἀμπίσχομαι.
 πέπλους δὲ τοὺς πρὶν λαμπρά τ' ἀμφιβλήματα
 χλιδὰς τε πόντος ἦρπασ'· ἐν δ' ἄντρου μυχοῖς
 κρύψας γυναῖκα τὴν κακῶν πάντων ἐμοὶ 425
 ἄρξασαν ἦκω, τοὺς γε περιλελειμμένους
 φίλων φυλάσσειν τὰ μ' ἀναγκάσας λέχη.
 μόνος δὲ νοστῶ, τοῖς ἐκεῖ ζητῶν φίλοις
 τὰ πρόσφορ' ἦν πῶς ἐξερευνήσας λάβω.
 ἰδῶν δὲ δῶμα περιφερὲς θριγκοῖς τόδε 430

404 δ' Hermann: τ' L
Bothe

409 πέτραις Heiland: -ας L
422 ἀμπίσχομαι Herwerden: ἀμπ- L

414 λεῶ Cobet: -ὼς L

416 del.

πύλας τε σεμνὰς ἀνδρὸς ὀλβίου τινὸς
 προσῆλθον· ἔλπις δ' ἔκ γε πλουσίων δόμων
 λαβεῖν τι ναύταις· ἔκ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντων βίον –
 οὐδ' εἰ θέλοιεν ὠφελεῖν ἔχοιεν ἄν.
 ὦή· τίς ἄν πυλωρὸς ἔκ δόμων μόλοι,
 ὅστις διαγγεῖλειε τὰ μ' ἔσω κακά;

435

ΓΡΑΥΣ

- τίς πρὸς πύλαισιν; οὐκ ἀπαλλάξῃ δόμων
 καὶ μὴ πρὸς αὐλείοισιν ἐστηκῶς πύλαις
 ὄχλον παρέξεις δεσπότης; ἢ κατθανῆι
 Ἕλληνα πεφυκῶς, οἷσιν οὐκ ἐπιστροφαί.
- Με. ὦ γραῖα, ταῦτά ταυτ' ἔπη κάλλως λέγειν
 ἔξεστι, πείσομαι γάρ· ἀλλ' ἄνες χόλου.
- Γρ. ἀπελθ'· ἐμοὶ γὰρ τοῦτο πρόσκειται, ξένη,
 μηδένα πελάζειν τοισίδ' Ἑλλήνων δόμοις.
- Με. ἄ, μὴ πρόσειε χεῖρα μηδ' ὦθει βίαι.
- Γρ. πείθηι γὰρ οὐδὲν ὦν λέγω, σὺ δ' αἴτιος.
- Με. ἄγγελον εἶσω δεσπότηισι τοῖσι σοῖς . . .
- Γρ. πικρῶς ἄν οἶμαί σοι γ' ἔσαγγέλλειν λόγους.
- Με. ναυαγὸς ἦκω ξένος, ἀσύλητον γένος.
- Γρ. οἶκον πρὸς ἄλλον νῦν τιν' ἀντὶ τοῦδ' ἴθι.
- Με. οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἔσω πάρειμι· καὶ σὺ μοι πιθοῦ.
- Γρ. ὄχληρὸς ἴσθ' ὦν· καὶ τάχ' ὠσθήσῃ βίαι.
- Με. αἰαῖ· τὰ κλεινὰ ποῦ ἔστι μοι στρατεύματα;
- Γρ. οὐκοῦν ἐκεῖ που σεμνὸς ἦσθ', οὐκ ἐνθάδε.
- Με. ὦ δαῖμον, ὡς ἀνάξι' ἠτιμώμεθα.
- Γρ. τί βλέφαρα τέγγεις δάκρυσι; πρὸς τίν' οἰκτρὸς εἶ;
- Με. πρὸς τὰς πάροιθε συμφορὰς εὐδαίμονας.
- Γρ. οὐκουν ἀπελθῶν δάκρυα σοῖς δώσεις φίλοις;
- Με. τίς δ' ἦδε χώρα; τοῦ δὲ βασιλῆιοι δόμοι;
- Γρ. Πρωτέως τάδ' ἐστὶ δώματ', Αἴγυπτος δὲ γῆ.

460

434 ἔχοιμεν Paley 441 ταῦτά ταυτ' ἔπη κάλλως λέγειν Henwerden: ταῦτα ταυτ' ἔπη καλῶς λέγεις L 442 χόλου Clark: λόγον L 445 πρόσειε Blomfield: προσεῖλει L 448 σοὶ γ' ἔσαγγέλλειν λόγους Kovacs (σοῦς γ' ἔσ- λ- Dale): γ' ἀγγελεῖν τοὺς σοῦς λόγους L 460 Πρωτέως . . . ἐστὶ Kirchlhoff (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 874): πρωτεὺς . . . οἰκεῖ L

- Με. Αἴγυπτος; ὦ δύστηνος, οἱ πέπλευκ' ἄρα.
 Γρ. τί δὴ τὸ Νείλου μεμπτόν ἐστί σοι γάνος;
 Με. οὐ τοῦτ' ἐμέμφθην· τὰς ἐμὰς στένω τύχας.
 Γρ. πολλοὶ κακῶς πράσσουσιν, οὐ σὺ δὴ μόνος.
 Με. ἔστ' οὖν ἐν οἴκοις ὄντιν' ὀνομάζεις ἄναξ; 465
 Γρ. τόδ' ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ μνήμα, παῖς δ' ἄρχει χθονός.
 Με. ποῦ δῆτ' ἂν εἶη; πότερον ἐκτὸς ἢ ἔνδομοις;
 Γρ. οὐκ ἔνδον· Ἕλλησιν δὲ πολεμιώτατος.
 Με. τίν' αἰτίαν σχῶν ἧς ἐπηυρόμην ἐγώ;
 Γρ. Ἐλένη κατ' οἴκους ἐστὶ τούσδ' ἢ τοῦ Διός. 470
 Με. πῶς φήεις; τίν' εἶπας μῦθον; αὐθὶς μοι φράσον.
 Γρ. ἡ Τυνδαρίς παῖς, ἢ κατὰ Σπάρτην ποτ' ἦν.
 Με. πόθεν μολοῦσα; τίνα τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἔχει λόγον;
 Γρ. Λακεδαίμονος γῆς δεῦρο νοστήσασ' ἄπο.
 Με. πότ'; οὐ τί που λελήισμεθ' ἐξ ἀντρῶν λέχος; 475
 Γρ. πρὶν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς, ὦ ξέν', ἐς Τροίαν μολεῖν.
 ἀλλ' ἔρπ' ἀπ' οἴκων· ἐστὶ γάρ τις ἐν δόμοις
 τύχη, τύραννος ἦι ταράσσεται δόμος.
 καιρὸν γὰρ οὐδέν' ἦλθες· ἦν δὲ δεσπότης
 λάβηι σε, θάνατος ξενία σοι γενήσεται. 480
 εὔνους γὰρ εἰμ' Ἕλλησιν, οὐχ ὅσον πικροὺς
 λόγους ἔδωκα δεσπότην φοβουμένη.
 Με. τί φῶ; τί λέξω; συμφορὰς γὰρ ἀθλίας
 ἐκ τῶν πάροιθε τὰς παρεστῶσας κλύω,
 εἰ τὴν μὲν αἰρεθεῖσαν ἐκ Τροίας ἄγων 485
 ἦκω δάμαρτα καὶ κατ' ἀντρα σώζεται,
 ὄνομα δὲ ταῦτόν τῆς ἐμῆς ἔχουσα τις
 δάμαρτος ἄλλη τοισίδ' ἐνναίει δόμοις.
 Διὸς δ' ἔλεξε παῖδά νιν πεφυκέναι·
 ἀλλ' ἦ τις ἐστὶ Ζηνὸς ὄνομ' ἔχων ἀνήρ 490
 Νείλου παρ' ὄχθας; εἷς γὰρ ὁ γε κατ' οὐρανόν.
 Σπάρτη δὲ ποῦ γῆς ἐστὶ πλήν ἵνα ῥοαὶ
 τοῦ καλλιδόνακός εἰσιν Εὐρώτα μόνον;
 ἀπλοῦν δὲ Τυνδάρειον ὄνομα κλήιζεται.
 Λακεδαίμονος δὲ γαῖα τίς ξυνώνυμος 495
 Τροίας τ'; ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἔχω τί χρὴ λέγειν.
 πολλοὶ γάρ, ὡς εἶξασιν, ἐν πολλῇι χθονὶ

- ὀνόματα ταῦτ' ἔχουσι καὶ πόλις πόλει
 γυνή γυναικί τ' οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστέον.
 οὐδ' αὖ τὸ δεινὸν προσπόλου φευξοῦμεθα· 500
 ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε βάρβαρος φρένας
 ὅς ὄνομ' ἀκούσας τούμὸν οὐ δώσει βοράν.
 κλεινὸν τὸ Τροίας πῦρ ἐγὼ θ' ὅς ἤψά νιν,
 Μενέλαος, οὐκ ἄγνωστος ἐν πάσῃ χθονί.
 δόμων ἄνακτα προσμενῶ· δισσὰς δέ μοι 505
 ἔχει φυλάξεις· ἦν μὲν ὠμόφρων τις ἦι,
 κρύψας ἑμαυτὸν εἶμι πρὸς ναυάγια·
 ἦν δ' ἐνδιδῶι τι μαλθακόν, τὰ πρόσφορα
 τῆς νῦν παρούσης συμφορᾶς αἰτήσομαι.
 κακῶν μὲν ἡμῖν ἔσχατον τοῖς ἀθλίοις, 510
 ἄλλους τυράννους αὐτὸν ὄντα βασιλέα
 βίον προσαιτεῖν· ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίως ἔχει.
 λόγος γὰρ ἔστιν οὐκ ἐμός, σοφῶν δέ του,
 δεινῆς ἀνάγκης οὐδὲν ἰσχύειν πλέον.
- Χο. ἤκουσα τᾶς θεσπιωιδουῖ κόρας 515
 ἃ χριζοῦσ' ἐπλάθην τυράννοις δόμοισιν,
 ὡς Μενέλαος οὔ-
 πω μελαμφαῆς οἴχεται
 δι' ἔρεβος χθονὶ κρυφθεῖς,
 ἀλλ' ἔτι κατ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον 520
 τρυχόμενος οὔπω λιμένων
 ψάσειεν πατρίας γᾶς,
 ἀλατεῖαι βιότου
 ταλαίφρων, ἀφίλος φίλων,
 παντοδαπᾶς ἐπὶ γᾶς πέδον 525
 χριμπτόμενος εἰναλίω
 κώπαι Τρωιάδος ἐκ γᾶς.
- Ελ. ἦδ' αὖ τάφου τοῦδ' εἰς ἔδρας ἐγὼ πάλιν
 στείχω, μαθοῦσα Θεονόης φίλους λόγους,
 ἦ πάντ' ἀληθῶς οἶδε· φησὶ δ' ἐν φάει 530
 πόσιν τὸν ἄμὸν ζῶντα φέγγος εἰσορᾶν,
 πορθμοὺς δ' ἀλᾶσθαι μυρίους πεπλευκότα

498 ταῦτ' Ropius: ταῦτ' L 503-9 del. Willink 505-6 δισσὰς . . . ἔχει Musgrave:
 ἔχει . . . δισσὰς L 510 μὲν Paley: δέ θ' L 513 δέ του Dobree: δ' ἔπος L 516
 ἐπλάθην . . . δόμοισιν Diggle: ἐφάνη . . . δόμοις L 525 πέδον Blaydes: πόδα L 530-40
 del. Willink 532 πεπλευκότα Matthiae: πεπλωκότα L

- ἐκεῖσε κάκεῖσ' οὐδ' ἀγύμναστον πλάνοις,
ἦξειν <δ'> ὅταν δὴ πημάτων λάβη τέλος.
ἐν δ' οὐκ ἔλεξεν, εἰ μολῶν σωθήσεται. 535
ἐγὼ δ' ἀπέστην τοῦτ' ἐρωτῆσαι σαφῶς,
ἦσθεῖσ' ἐπεὶ νιν εἶπέ μοι σεσωμένον.
ἐγγύς δέ νιν που τῆσδ' ἔφασκ' εἶναι χθονός,
ναυαγὸν ἐκπεσόντα σὺν παύροις φίλοις.
ᾧμοι, πόθ' ἦξεις; ὡς ποθεινός ἄν μόλοις. 540
ἔα, τίς οὗτος; οὐ τί που κρυπτεύομαι
Πρωτέως ἀσέπτου παιδὸς ἐκ βουλευμάτων;
οὐχ ὡς δρομαία πῶλος ἢ βάκχη θεοῦ
τάφωι ξυνάψω κῶλον; ἄγριος δέ τις
μορφὴν ὅδ' ἐστὶν ὅς με θηρᾶται λαβεῖν. 545
Με. σέ τὴν ὄρεγμα δεινὸν ἡμιλλημένην
τύμβου ἵτι κρηπίδ' ἐμπύρους τ' ὀρθοστάτας,
μεῖνον· τί φεύγεις; ὡς δέμας δείξασα σὸν
ἐκπληξιν ἡμῖν ἀφασίαν τε προστίθης.
Ελ. ἀδικούμεθ', ᾧ γυναῖκες· εἰργόμεσθα γὰρ 550
τάφου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε, καὶ μ' ἐλών θέλει
δοῦναι τυράννοις ᾧν ἐφεύγομεν γάμους.
Με. οὐ κλῶπές ἐσμεν οὐδ' ὑπηρέται κακῶν.
Ελ. καὶ μὴν στολήν γ' ἄμορφον ἀμφὶ σῶμ' ἔχεις.
Με. στῆσον, φόβον μεθεῖσα, λαιψηρὸν πόδα. 555
Ελ. ἴστημ', ἐπεὶ γε τοῦδ' ἐφάπτομαι τάφου.
Με. τίς εἶ; τίν' ὄψιν σὴν, γύναι, προσδέρκομαι;
Ελ. σὺ δ' εἶ τίς; αὐτὸς γὰρ σέ κᾶμ' ἔχει λόγος.
Με. οὐπῶποτ' εἶδον προσφερέστερον δέμας.
Ελ. ᾧ θεοί· θεὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ γιγνώσκειν φίλους. 560
<Με. Ἐλληνίς εἶ τις ἢ ἵπιχωρία γυνή;>
Ελ. Ἐλληνίς· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σὸν θέλω μαθεῖν.
Με. Ἐλένηι σ' ὁμοίαν δὴ μάλιστ' εἶδον, γύναι.
Ελ. ἐγὼ δὲ Μενέλεωι γε σ' οὐδ' ἔχω τί φῶ.
Με. ἔγνωσ ἄρ' ὀρθῶς ἀνδρα δυστυχέστατον. 565
Ελ. ᾧ χρόνιος ἐλθὼν σῆς δάμαρτος ἐς χέρας.
Με. ποίας δάμαρτος; μὴ θίγηις ἐμῶν πέπλων.

533 ἐκεῖσε κάκεῖσ' Canter: ἐκεῖσ' ἐκεῖσε L 534 <δ'> Wilamowitz 553 οὐδ' Hermann:
οὐχ L 555 φόβον Valckenaer: -ου L 556 τάφου Elmsley: τόπου L 561 restored
from Ar. *Thesm.* 907 by Markland 565 ἄρ' Ar. *Thesm.* 911: γὰρ L

- ὄνόματα ταῦτ' ἔχουσι καὶ πόλις πόλει
 γυνή γυναικί τ' οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστέον.
 οὐδ' αὖ τὸ δεινὸν προσπόλου φευξοῦμεθα· 500
 ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε βάρβαρος φρένας
 ὃς ὄνομ' ἀκούσας τούμῳ οὐ δώσει βοράν.
 κλεινὸν τὸ Τροίας πῦρ ἐγὼ θ' ὃς ἤψά νιν,
 Μενέλαος, οὐκ ἄγνωστος ἐν πάσῃ χθονί.
 δόμων ἀνακτα προσμενῶ· δισσὰς δέ μοι 505
 ἔχει φυλάξεις· ἦν μὲν ὠμόφρων τις ἦι,
 κρύψας ἑμαυτὸν εἶμι πρὸς ναυάγια·
 ἦν δ' ἐνδιδῶι τι μαλθακόν, τὰ πρόσφορα
 τῆς νῦν παρούσης συμφορᾶς αἰτήσομαι.
 κακῶν μὲν ἡμῖν ἔσχατον τοῖς ἀθλίοις, 510
 ἄλλους τυράννους αὐτὸν ὄντα βασιλέα
 βίον προσαιτεῖν· ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίως ἔχει.
 λόγος γὰρ ἔστιν οὐκ ἐμός, σοφῶν δέ του,
 δεινῆς ἀνάγκης οὐδὲν ἰσχύειν πλέον.
- Χο. ἤκουσα τᾶς θεσπιωιδουῦ κόρας 515
 ἃ χρῆζουσ' ἐπλάθην τυράννοις δόμοισιν,
 ὡς Μενέλαος οὐ-
 πω μελαμφαῆς οἴχεται
 δι' ἔρεβος χθονὶ κρυφθεῖς,
 ἀλλ' ἔτι κατ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον 520
 τρυχόμενος οὐπω λιμένων
 ψαύσειεν πατρίας γᾶς,
 ἀλατεῖαι βιότου
 ταλαίφρων, ἄφιλος φίλων,
 παντοδαπᾶς ἐπὶ γᾶς πέδον 525
 χριμπτόμενος εἰναλίωι
 κώπαι Τρωιάδος ἐκ γᾶς.
- Ελ. ἦδ' αὖ τάφου τοῦδ' εἰς ἔδρας ἐγὼ πάλιν
 στείχω, μαθοῦσα Θεονόης φίλους λόγους,
 ἦ πάντ' ἀληθῶς οἶδε· φησὶ δ' ἐν φάει 530
 πόσιν τὸν ἀμὸν ζῶντα φέγγος εἴσορᾶν,
 πορθμοὺς δ' ἀλᾶσθαι μυρίου πεπλευκότα

498 ταῦτ' Porius: ταῦτ' L 503-9 del. Willink 505-6 δισσὰς . . . ἔχει Musgrave:
 ἔχει . . . δισσὰς L 510 μὲν Paley: δέ θ' L 513 δέ του Dobree: δ' ἔπος L 516
 ἐπλάθην . . . δόμοισιν Diggle: ἐφάνη . . . δόμοις L 525 πέδον Blaydes: πόδα L 530-40
 del. Willink 532 πεπλευκότα Matthiae: πεπλωκότα L

- ἐκεῖσε κάκεῖσ' οὐδ' ἀγύμναστον πλάνοις,
ἦξειν <δ'> ὅταν δὴ πημάτων λάβη τέλος.
ἔν δ' οὐκ ἔλεξεν, εἰ μολῶν σωθήσεται. 535
ἐγὼ δ' ἀπέστην τοῦτ' ἐρωτῆσαι σαφῶς,
ἦσθεῖσ' ἐπεὶ νιν εἶπέ μοι σεσωμένον.
ἐγγύς δέ νιν που τῆσδ' ἔφασκ' εἶναι χθονός,
ναυαγὸν ἐκπεσόντα σὺν παύροις φίλοις.
ῶμοι, πόθ' ἦξεις; ὡς ποθεινὸς ἂν μόλοις. 540
ἔα, τίς οὗτος; οὐ τί που κρυπτεύομαι
Πρωτέως ἀσέπτου παιδὸς ἐκ βουλευμάτων;
οὐχ ὡς δρομαία πῶλος ἢ βάκχη θεοῦ
τάφωι ξυνάψω κῶλον; ἄγριος δέ τις
μορφὴν ὅδ' ἐστὶν ὅς με θηρᾶται λαβεῖν. 545
Με. σέ τὴν ὄρεγμα δεινὸν ἠμιλλημένην
τύμβου ἔπι κρηπίδ' ἐμπύρους τ' ὀρθοστάτας,
μεῖνον· τί φεύγεις; ὡς δέμας δείξασα σὸν
ἐκπληξιν ἡμῖν ἀφασίαν τε προστίθης.
Ελ. ἀδικοῦμεθ', ὦ γυναῖκες· εἰργόμεσθα γὰρ 550
τάφου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε, καὶ μ' ἐλῶν θέλει
δοῦναι τυράννοις ὧν ἐφεύγομεν γάμους.
Με. οὐ κλῶπές ἐσμεν οὐδ' ὑπηρέται κακῶν.
Ελ. καὶ μὴν στολὴν γ' ἄμορφον ἀμφὶ σῶμ' ἔχεις.
Με. στησον, φόβον μεθεῖσα, λαιψηρὸν πόδα. 555
Ελ. ἴστημ', ἐπεὶ γε τοῦδ' ἐφάπτομαι τάφου.
Με. τίς εἶ; τίν' ὄψιν σὴν, γύναι, προσδέρομαι;
Ελ. σὺ δ' εἶ τίς; αὐτὸς γὰρ σέ κάμ' ἔχει λόγος.
Με. οὐπῶποτ' εἶδον προσφερέστερον δέμας.
Ελ. ὦ θεοί· θεὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ γιγνώσκειν φίλους. 560
<Με. Ἑλληνὶς εἶ τις ἢ ἴπιχωρία γυνή;>
Ελ. Ἑλληνίς· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σὸν θέλω μαθεῖν.
Με. Ἑλένη σ' ὁμοίαν δὴ μάλιστ' εἶδον, γύναι.
Ελ. ἐγὼ δὲ Μενέλεωι γε σ' οὐδ' ἔχω τί φῶ.
Με. ἔγνωσ ἄρ' ὀρθῶς ἀνδρα δυστυχέστατον. 565
Ελ. ὦ χρόνιος ἐλθὼν σῆς δάμαρτος ἐς χέρας.
Με. ποίας δάμαρτος; μὴ θίγηις ἐμῶν πέπλων.

533 ἐκεῖσε κάκεῖσ' Canter: ἐκεῖσ' ἐκεῖσε L 534 <δ'> Wilamowitz 553 οὐδ' Hermann:
οὐχ L 555 φόβον Valckenaer: -ου L 556 τάφου Elmsley: τόπου L 561 restored
from Ar. *Thesm.* 907 by Markland 565 ἄρ' Ar. *Thesm.* 911: γὰρ L

- Με. ὦ φιλτάτα πρόσοψις, οὐκ ἐμέμφθην·
 ἴεχω τὰ τοῦ Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε.†
- Ελ. ἄν ὑπὸ λαμπάδων κόροι λεύκιπποι
 ξυνομαίμονες ὦλβισαν ὦλβισαν . . . 639-40
- Με. τὸ πρόσθεν, ἐκ δόμων δὲ νοσφίσας σ' ἐμοῦ
 πρὸς ἄλλαν γ' ἐλαύνει
 θεὸς συμφορὰν τᾶσδε κρείσσω.
- Ελ. τὸ κακὸν δ' ἀγαθὸν σέ τε κάμῃ συνάγαγεν, ὦ πόσι,
 χρόνιον, ἀλλ' ὁμως· ὀναίμαν τύχας. 645
- Με. ὄναιο δῆτα· ταῦτά δὲ ξυνεύχομαι·
 δυοῖν γὰρ ὄντοι οὐχ ὁ μὲν τλήμων, ὁ δ' οὔ.
- Ελ. φίλαι φίλαι,
 τὰ πάρος οὐκέτι στένομεν οὐδ' ἀλγῶ.
 πόσιν ἐμὸν <ἐμόν> ἔχομεν ἔχομεν ὄν ἔμενον
 ἔμενον ἐκ Τροίας πολυετῆ μολεῖν. 650
- Με. ἔχεις, ἐγὼ τε σ' ἠλίου δὲ μυρίουσ
 μόλις διελθὼν ἠισθόμην τὰ τῆς θεοῦ.
 ἐμὰ δὲ χαρμονᾶι δάκρυα πλεόν ἔχει
 χάριτος ἢ λύπας. 655
- Ελ. τί φῶ; τίς ἄν τάδ' ἠλπισεν βροτῶν ποτε;
 ἀδόκητον ἔχω σε πρὸς στέρνοις.
- Με. κάγῳ σέ, τὴν δοκοῦσαν Ἰδαίαν πόλιν
 μολεῖν Ἰλίου τε μελέους πύργους.
 πρὸς θεῶν, δόμων πῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ἀπεστάλης; 660
- Ελ. ἔῃ· πικρὰς ἐς ἀρχὰς βαίνεις·
 ἔῃ· πικρὰν δ' ἐρευνᾶις φάτιν.
- Με. λέγ', ὡς ἀκουστά· πάντα δῶρα δαιμόνων.
- Ελ. ἀπέπτυσσα μὲν λόγον οἶον
 οἶον ἐσοισόμεθα.
- Με. ὁμως δὲ λέξον· ἠδύ τοι μόχθων κλύειν. 665
- Ελ. οὐκ ἐπὶ βαρβάρου λέκτρα νεανία
 πετομένας κώπας, πετομένου δ' ἔρω-
 τος ἀδίκων γάμων . . .

636ⁿ Με. here Reisig: before οὐκ L 638ⁿ Ἐλ. Zuntz 641ⁿ Με. Dale 641 δὲ
 νοσφίσας Elmsley: δ' ἐνόσφισαν θεοί L ἐμοῦ Porius: ὁμοῦ L 642 γ' Π: δ' L 644ⁿ
 Ἐλ. Hermann 644 συνάγαγεν, ὦ πόσι Dindorf: -γεν ὦ ποσει Π: -γε πόσιν L 646ⁿ
 Με. Tyrwhitt: Ἐλ. L 646 δε Π: δὴ L 650 ἐμόν <ἐμόν> ἔχ- ἔχ- Scidler: ἐμόν ἔχ- ἔχ-
 L 653 μόλις Wecklein: μόγις L 654 χ- δάκρυα Elmsley: δ- χ- L χαρμονᾶι Hermann:
 -ᾶ L 664^b ἐσοισόμεθα Willink: -οισομαι L 666 βαρβάρου λ- Kluge: λ- βαρβάρου L
 λέκτρα L. Dindorf: λέκτρον L

- Με. τίς <δή> σε δαίμων ἢ πότμος συλαῖι πάτρας;
 Ελ. ὁ Διὸς ὁ Διὸς, ὦ πόσι, με παῖς <Μαίας τ'> 670
 ἐπέλασεν Νείλωι.
- Με. θαυμαστά· τοῦ πέμψαντος; ὦ δεινοὶ λόγοι.
 Ελ. κατεδάκρυσα καὶ βλέφαρον ὑγραίνω
 δάκρυσιν· ἅ Διὸς μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν.
- Με. Ἥρα; τί νῶιν χρήζουσα προσθεῖναι κακόν;
 Ελ. ὦμοι ἐγὼ κείνων λουτρῶν καὶ κρηῶν, 675
 ἵνα θεαὶ μορφὰν ἐφαίδρυναν, εὖτ'
 ἔμολον ἐς κρίσιν.
- Με. ἴτ' ἀ δ' εἰς κρίσιν σοι τῶνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κακῶν; †
 Ελ. Πάριν ὡς ἀφέλοιτο . . . Με. πῶς; αὔδα. 680
 Ελ. Κύπρις ὦι μ' ἐπένευσεν . . . Με. ὦ τλάμον.
 Ελ. τλάμονα τλάμον' ὦδ' ἐπέλασ' Αἰγύπτωι.
 Με. εἴτ' ἀντέδωκ' εἶδωλον, ὡς σέθεν κλύω.
 Ελ. τὰ δὲ <σά> κατὰ μέλαθρα πάθεα πάθεα, μᾶ-
 685
 τερ, οἱ ἔγω. Με. τί φῆσι;
- Ελ. οὐκ ἔστι μάτηρ· ἀγχόνιον δὲ βρόχον
 δι' ἐμὰν κατεδήσατο δύσγαμον αἰσχύναν.
- Με. ὦμοι· θυγατρὸς δ' Ἑρμιόνης ἔστιν λόγος;
 Ελ. ἄγαμος ἄτεκνος, ὦ πόσι, καταστένει
 γάμον ἄγαμον <ἐμόν>. 690
- Με. ὦ πᾶν κατ' ἄκρας δῶμ' ἐμόν πέρσας Πάρις.
 Ελ. τάδε καὶ σὲ διώλεσε μυριάδας τε
 χαλκεόπλων Δαναῶν.
 ἐμὲ δὲ πατρίδος ἀπο<πρό> κακόποτμον ἀραῖ-
 695
 ὄν ἔβαλε θεὸς ἀπὸ πόλεος ἀπὸ τε σέθεν,
 ὅτε μέλαθρα λέχεά τ' ἔλιπον οὐ λιποῦσ'
 ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς γάμοις.
- Χο. εἰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς τύχης εὐδαίμονος
 τύχοιτε, πρὸς τὰ πρόσθεν ἀρκέσειεν ἄν.
- Θε. Μελέλαε, κάμοι πρόσδοτον τῆς ἡδονῆς, 700

669 <δή> Zuntz 670 με παῖς <Μαίας τ'> Hermann: παῖς μ' I. 675 τί νῶιν Hermann:
 τίνων L. 676 ἐγὼ Badham: ἐμῶν L. κείνων Dale: δεινῶν L. κρηῶν Willink:
 -ῶν L. 677 εὖτ' Diggle: ἐθεν L. 678 ἔμολον ἐς κρίσιν Willink: ἔμολε κρίσις L. 679 τί
 δ' ἐς κρίσιν σοι τόνδ' ἔθηχ' Ἥρα κότον Diggle 680 -ι Πάριν . . . Κύπρις Reiske: κύπριν . . .
 πάριν L. 682 τλάμονα τλάμον' Hermann: -μων -μων I. 68,1 <σά> Hermann 687
 ἐμὰν Scaliger: ἐμὲ L. δύσγαμον Brodaeus: -γαμος L. 688 λόγος A. Y. Campbell: βίος
 L. 690 ἄγαμον <ἐμόν> Hermann: ἄγαμον αἰσχύνα L. 69,4 ἀπο<πρό> Diggle:
 ἀπο L. ἀραῖον Diggle: ἀραῖαν L. 696 ὅτε Barnes: ὅτι L. 700 πρόσδοτον Cobet:
 -δοτε L.

- ἦν μανθάνω μὲν καὐτός, οὐ σαφῶς δ' ἔχω.
 Με. ἀλλ', ὦ γεραιέ, καὶ σὺ κοινώνει λόγων.
 Θε. οὐχ ἦδε μόχθων τῶν ἐν Ἰλίῳ βραβεύς;
 Με. οὐχ ἦδε πρὸς θεῶν δ' ἡμεν ἠπατημένοι
 νεφέλης ἄγαλμ' ἔχοντες ἐν χεροῖν λυγρόν. 705
 Θε. τί φήεις;
 νεφέλης ἄρ' ἄλλως εἶχομεν πόνους πέρι;
 Με. Ἦρας τάδ' ἔργα καὶ θεῶν τρισσῶν ἔρις.
 Θε. τί δ'; ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν ἦδε σὴ δάμαρ;
 Με. αὐτῆ· λόγοις ἐμοῖσι πίστευσον τάδε. 710
 Θε. ὦ θύγατερ, ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἔφυ τι ποικίλον
 καὶ δυστέκμαρτον, εὐ δέ πως πάντα στρέφει
 ἐκεῖσε κάκεισ' ἀναφέρων· ὁ μὲν πονεῖ,
 ὁ δ' οὐ πονήσας αὖθις ὄλλυται κακῶς,
 βέβαιον οὐδὲν τῆς αἰεὶ τύχης ἔχων. 715
 σὺ γὰρ πόσις τε σὸς πόνων μετέσχετε,
 σὺ μὲν λόγοισιν, ὁ δὲ δορὸς προθυμίαι.
 σπεύδων δ' ὄτ' ἔσπευδ' οὐδὲν εἶχε· νῦν δ' ἔχει
 αὐτόματα πράξας τάγάθ' εὐτυχέστατα.
 οὐκ ἄρα γέροντα πατέρα καὶ Διοσκόρω 720
 ἦσιχυνας οὐδ' ἔδρασας οἶα κλήιζεται.
 νῦν ἀνανεοῦμαι τὸν σὸν ὑμέναιον πάλιν
 καὶ λαμπάδων μεμνήμεθ' ἄς τετραόροις
 ἵπποισι τροχάζων παρέφερον· σὺ δ' ἐν δίφροισι
 σὺν τῶιδε νύμφη δῶμ' ἔλειπες ὄλβιον. 725
 κακὸς γὰρ ὅστις μὴ σέβει τὰ δεσποτῶν
 καὶ ξυγγέγηθε καὶ συνωδίνει κακοῖς.
 ἐγὼ μὲν εἶην, κεῖ πέφυχ' ὅμως λάτρης,
 ἐν τοῖσι γενναίοισιν ἠριθμημένος
 δούλοισι, τοῦνομ' οὐκ ἔχων ἐλεύθερον, 730
 τὸν νοῦν δέ· κρεῖσσον γὰρ τόδ' ἢ δυοῖν κακοῖν
 ἐν' ὄντα χρῆσθαι, τὰς φρένας τ' ἔχειν κακὰς
 ἄλλων τ' ἀκούειν δοῦλον ὄντα τῶν πέλας.
 Με. ἄγ', ὦ γεραιέ, πολλὰ μὲν παρ' ἀσπίδα
 μοχθήματ' ἐξέπλησας ἐκπονῶν ἐμοί, 735

709 τί δ'; ὡς F. W. Schmidt: ἡ δ' οὐσ' L 710 λόγοις Paley: λ- δ' L 712 πάντα στρέ-
 φει Heinen: ἀναστρέφει L 713-19 del. Diggle 728-33 del. Willink 728 κει
 Musgrave: καὶ L 735 ἐκπονῶν ἐμοί Barnes: ἐκ πόνων ἐμῶν L

- καὶ νῦν μετασχῶν τῆς ἐμῆς εὐπραξίας
 ἄγγειλον ἔλθων τοῖς λελειμμένοις φίλοις
 τάδ' ὡς ἔχονθ' ἠῦρηκας οὐ τ' ἐσμέν τύχης,
 μένειν τ' ἐπ' ἄκταις τοὺς τ' ἐμούς καταδοκεῖν
 ἀγῶνας οἱ μένουσί μ', ὡς ἐλπίζομεν, 740
 εἰ τήνδε πῶς δυναίμεθ' ἐκκλέψαι χθονός,
 φρουρεῖν <θ> ὅπως ἂν εἰς ἓν ἐλθόντες τύχης
 ἐκ βαρβάρων σωθῶμεν, ἦν δυνώμεθα.
- Θε. ἔσται τάδ', ὦναξ, ἀλλά τοι τὰ μάντεων
 ἐσεῖδον ὡς φαῦλ' ἐστὶ καὶ ψευδῶν πλέα. 745
 οὐδ' ἦν ἄρ' ὑγιῆς οὐδὲν ἐμπύρου φλογὸς
 οὔτε πτερωτῶν φθέγματ'· εὐηθες δέ τοι
 τὸ καὶ δοκεῖν ὄρνιθας ὠφελεῖν βροτούς.
 Κάλχας γὰρ οὐκ εἶπ' οὐδ' ἐσήμηνε στρατῶι
 νεφέλης ὑπερθνήσκοντας εἰσορῶν φίλους 750
 οὐδ' Ἔλενος, ἀλλὰ πόλις ἀνηρπάσθη μάτην.
 εἴποις ἂν, οὐνεχ' ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐβούλετο.
 τί δῆτα μαντευόμεθα; τοῖς θεοῖσι χρῆ
 θύοντας αἰτεῖν ἀγαθὰ, μαντείας δ' ἔαν·
 βίου γὰρ ἄλλως δέλεαρ ἠῦρέθη τόδε, 755
 κούδεις ἐπλούτησ' ἐμπύροισιν ἀργὸς ὦν·
 γνώμη δ' ἀρίστη μάντις ἢ τ' εὐβουλία.
- Χο. ἐς ταῦτ' ἄμοι δόξα μάντεων πέρι
 χωρεῖ γέροντι· τοὺς θεοὺς ἔχων τις ἂν
 φίλους ἀρίστην μαντικὴν ἔχοι δόμοις. 760
- Ελ. εἶέν· τὰ μὲν δὴ δεῦρ' ἀεὶ καλῶς ἔχει.
 ὅπως δ' ἐσώθης, ὦ τάλας, Τροίας ἄπο
 κέρδος μὲν οὐδὲν εἰδέναι, πόθος δέ τις
 τὰ τῶν φίλων φίλοισιν αἰσθέσθαι κακά.
- Με. ἦ πόλλ' ἀνήρου μ' ἐνὶ λόγῳ μιᾷ θ' ὀδῶι. 765
 τί σοι λέγοιμ' ἂν τὰς ἐν Αἰγαίῳ φθορὰς
 τὰ Ναυπλίου τ' Εὐβοικὰ πυρπολήματα
 Κρήτης τε Λιβύης θ' ἅς ἐπεστράφην πόλεις
 σκοπιάς τε Περσέως; εἰ γὰρ ἐμπλήσαιμί σε

738 οὐ Τυνηίτι: οἱ L 740 μένουσί μ', ὡς Musgrave: μένουσιν οὐς L 741 εἰ . . . πῶς
 Herwerden: καὶ . . . πῶς L 742 <θ> Diggle 746-8 del. Wecklein 751 οὐδ'
 Ἔλενος Porson: οὐδὲν γε L 752-7 del. Willink 752 ἐβούλετο Herwerden: ἠβούλετο
 L 765 ἐνὶ λόγῳ Porson: ἐν ὀλίγῳ L 768 Κρήτης Kirchhoff: -ην L Λιβύης Reiske:
 -ην L 769 εἰ Pearson: οὐ L

- μύθοις, λέγων τ' ἄν σοι κάκ' ἀλγοίην ἔτι 770
 πάσχων τ' ἔκαμνον· δις δὲ λυπηθεῖμεν ἄν.
 ΕΛ. καὶ πλείον' εἶπας ἢ σ' ἀνηρόμην ἐγώ.
 ἐν δ' εἶπέ τ' ἄλλα παραλιπών· πόσον χρόνον
 πόντου ἵπὶ νώτοις ἄλιον ἐφθείρου πλάνον;
 ΜΕ. ἐν ναυσίν ὧν πρὸς τοῖσιν ἐν Τροίαι δέκα 775
 ἔτεσι διήλθον ἑπτὰ περιδρομάς ἐτῶν.
 ΕΛ. φεῦ φεῦ· μακρόν γ' ἔλεξας, ὦ τάλας, χρόνον·
 σωθεὶς δ' ἐκεῖθεν ἐνθάδ' ἦλθες ἐς σφαγὰς.
 ΜΕ. πῶς φήεις; τί λέξεις; ὥς μ' ἀπώλεσας, γύναι.
 ΕΛ. φεῦγ' ὡς τάχιστα τῆσδ' ἀπαλλαχθεὶς χθονός. 780
 θανῆι πρὸς ἀνδρὸς οὐ τὰδ' ἐστὶ δώματα.
 ΜΕ. τί χρῆμα δράσας ἄξιον τῆς συμφορᾶς;
 ΕΛ. ἦκεις ἀελπτος ἐμποδῶν ἐμοῖς γάμοις.
 ΜΕ. ἦ γὰρ γαμεῖν τις τὰμ' ἐβουλήθη λέχη;
 ΕΛ. ὕβριν γ' ὕβρίζων ἐς ἐμέ, κἄν ἔτλην ἐγώ. 785
 ΜΕ. ἰδίαί σθένων τις ἢ τυραννεύων χθονός;
 ΕΛ. ὅς γῆς ἀνάσσει τῆσδε Πρωτέως γόνος.
 ΜΕ. τόδ' ἐστ' ἐκεῖν' αἰνιγμ' ὃ προσπόλου κλύω.
 ΕΛ. ποίοις ἐπιστὰς βαρβάροις πυλώμασιν;
 ΜΕ. τοῖσδ', ἐνθεν ὥσπερ πτωχὸς ἐξηλαυνόμην. 790
 ΕΛ. οὐ που προσήτιεις βίοντον; ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγώ.
 ΜΕ. τοῦργον μὲν ἦν τοῦτ', ὄνομα δ' οὐκ εἶχεν τόδε.
 ΕΛ. πάντ' οἶσθ' ἄρ', ὡς ἔοικας, ἀμφ' ἐμῶν γάμων.
 ΜΕ. οἶδ'· εἰ δὲ λέκτρα διέφυγες, τόδ' οὐκ ἔχω.
 ΕΛ. ἄθικτον εὐνήν ἴσθι σοι σεσωμένην. 795
 ΜΕ. τίς τοῦδε πειθῶ; φίλα γὰρ, εἰ σαφῆ λέγεις.
 ΕΛ. ὀρᾶις τάφου τοῦδ' ἀθλίου ἐδρας ἐμάς;
 ΜΕ. ὀρῶ ταλαίνας στιβάδας· ὧν τί σοι μέτα;
 ΕΛ. ἐνταῦθα λέκτρων ἰκετεύομεν φυγὰς.
 ΜΕ. βωμοῦ σπανίζουσ' ἢ νόμοισι βαρβάροις; 800
 ΕΛ. ἐρρῦεθ' ἡμᾶς τοῦτ' ἴσον ναοῖς θεῶν.
 ΜΕ. οὐδ' ἄρα πρὸς οἴκους ναυστολεῖν <σ> ἔξεστί μοι;
 ΕΛ. ξίφος μένει σε μᾶλλον ἢ τούμὸν λέχος.

770 μύθοις Diggle: -ων L 771 del. Diggle 772 καὶ πλείον' Nauck: κάλλιον L 773
 τάλλα Herwerden: πάντα L 775 ἐν ναυσίν ὧν Palmer: ἐνιαύσιον L 780 del.
 Valckenaer 783 ἐμποδῶν Badham: -ὦν τ' L 785 γ' ὕβρίζων Kirchhoff: θ' ὕβριζειν
 L ἐς ἐμέ Diggle: εἰς ἐμ' L κἄν Sinton: ἦν L 792 εἶχεν Wecklein: εἶχον L 794
 τόδ' Reeve: τὰδ' L 798 ταλαίνας P²: τάλαινα L 802 <σ> Reiske 803 μένει σε
 Musgrave: μὲν εἰσι L

- Με. οὕτως ἄν εἶην ἀθλιώτατος βροτῶν.
 Ελ. μή νυν καταιδουῖ, φεῦγε δ' ἐκ τῆσδε χθονός. 805
 Με. λιπῶν σέ; Τροίαν ἐξέπερσα σὴν χάριν.
 Ελ. κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἢ σε τᾶμ' ἀποκτεῖναι λέχη.
 Με. ἄνανδρά γ' εἶπας Ἰλίου τ' οὐκ ἄξια.
 Ελ. οὐκ ἄν κτάνοις τύραννον, ὃ σπεύδεις ἴσως.
 Με. οὕτω σιδήρωι τρωτὸν οὐκ ἔχει δέμας; 810
 Ελ. εἴσηι· τὸ τολμᾶν δ' ἀδύνατ' ἀνδρὸς οὐ σοφοῦ.
 Με. σιγῆι παράσχω δῆτ' ἐμᾶς δῆσαι χέρας;
 Ελ. ἐς ἄπορον ἦκεις· δεῖ δὲ μηχανῆς τινος.
 Με. δρῶντας γὰρ ἢ μὴ δρῶντας ἥδιον θανεῖν.
 Ελ. μί' ἔστιν ἐλπίς ἢι μόνῃι σωθεῖμεν ἄν. 815
 Με. ὦνητὸς ἢ τολμητὸς ἢ λόγων ὑπο;
 Ελ. εἰ μὴ τύραννός <σ> ἐκπύθοιτ' ἀφιγμένον.
 Με. οὐ γνώσεταιί μ' ὅς εἰμ', ἐγῶιδ' ἐρεῖ δὲ τίς;
 Ελ. ἔστ' ἔνδον αὐτῶι ξύμμαχος θεοῖς ἴση.
 Με. φήμη τις οἴκων ἐν μυχοῖς ἰδρυμένη; 820
 Ελ. οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἀδελφῆ· Θεονόην καλοῦσί νιν.
 Με. χρηστήριον μὲν τοῦνομ' ὅτι δὲ δρᾶι φράσον.
 Ελ. πάντ' οἶδ', ἐρεῖ τε συγγόνωι παρόντα σε.
 Με. θνήσκοιμεν ἄν· λαθεῖν γὰρ οὐχ οἶόν τέ μοι.
 Ελ. ἴσως ἄν ἀναπείσαιμεν ἰκετεύοντέ νιν . . . 825
 Με. τί χρῆμα δρᾶσαι; τίν' ὑπάγεις μ' ἐς ἐλπίδα;
 Ελ. παρόντα γαίαι μὴ φράσαι σε συγγόνωι.
 Με. πείσαντε δ' ἐκ γῆς διορίσαιμεν ἄν πόδα;
 Ελ. κοινῆι γ' ἐκείνηι ραιδίως, λάθραι δ' ἄν οὔ.
 Με. σὸν ἔργον, ὡς γυναικί πρόσφορον γυνή. 830
 Ελ. ὡς οὐκ ἄχρωστα γόνατ' ἐμῶν ἔξει χερῶν.
 Με. φέρ', ἦν δὲ δὴ νῶιν μὴ ἀποδέξεται λόγους;
 Ελ. θανῆι· γαμοῦμαι δ' ἢ τάλαιν' ἐγὼ βίαι.
 Με. προδότις ἄν εἶης· τὴν βίαν σκήψασ' ἔχεις.
 Ελ. ἀλλ' ἄγνὸν ὄρκον σὸν κᾶρα κατώμοσα . . . 835
 Με. τί φῆις; θανεῖσθαι; κούποτ' ἀλλάξεις λέχη;
 Ελ. ταύτῶι ξίφει γε· κείσομαι δὲ σοῦ πέλας.
 Με. ἐπὶ τοῖσδε τοίνυν δεξιᾶς ἐμῆς θίγε.

808 ἄνανδρά γ' Cobei: -δρ' ἄρ' L 817 <σ> Schaefer 818 οὐ γνώσεταιί μ' ὅς εἰμ', ἐγῶιδ' ἐρεῖ δὲ τίς; Diggle: ἐρεῖ δὲ τίς μ'; οὐ γνώσεταιί γ' ὅς εἰμ' ἐγὼ L 825 ἴσως Kirchhoff: εἰ πως L 829 γ' Reiske: τ' L λάθραι δ' ἄν οὔ L. Dindorf: λάθρα δ' ὀμοῦ L

- Ελ. ψαύω, θανόντος σοῦ τόδ' ἐκλείψειν φάος.
 Με. κάγῳ στερηθεῖς σοῦ τελευτήσειν βίον. 840
 Ελ. πῶς οὖν θανούμεθ' ὥστε καὶ δόξαν λαβεῖν;
 Με. τύμβου ἴπι νώτοις σέ κτανῶν ἐμέ κτενῶ.
 πρῶτον δ' ἀγῶνα μέγαν ἀγωνιούμεθα
 λέκτρων ὑπὲρ σῶν· ὁ δὲ θέλων ἴτω πέλας. 845
 τὸ Τρωϊκὸν γὰρ οὐ καταισχυνῶ κλέος
 οὐδ' Ἑλλάδ' ἔλθων λήψομαι πολὺν ψόγον,
 ὅστις Θέτιν μὲν ἐστέρησ' Ἀχιλλέως,
 Τελαμωνίου δ' Αἴαντος εἰσεῖδον σφαγὰς
 τὸν Νηλέως τ' ἄπαιδα· διὰ δὲ τὴν ἐμήν
 οὐκ ἀξιώσω κατθανεῖν δάμαρτ' ἐγώ;
 μάλιστά γ' εἰ γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ σοφοί,
 εὐψυχον ἄνδρα πολεμίων θανόνθ' ὕπο
 κούφῃ καταμπίσχουσιν ἐν τύμβῳ χθονί,
 κακοὺς δ' ἐφ' ἔρμα στερεὸν ἐκβάλλουσι γῆς. 850
 Χο. ὦ θεοί, γενέσθω δὴ ποτ' εὐτυχὲς γένος
 τὸ Ταντάλειον καὶ μεταστήτω κακῶν. 855
 Ελ. οἱ γὰρ τάλαινα· τῆς τύχης γὰρ ὧδ' ἔχω·
 Μενέλαε, διαπεπράγμεθ'· ἐκβαίνει δόμων
 ἢ θεσπιωιδὸς Θεονόη· κτυπεῖ δόμος
 κλήθρων λυθέντων. φεῦγ'· ἀτὰρ τί φευκτέον;
 ἀποῦσα γὰρ σε καὶ παροῦσ' ἀφιγμένον
 δεῦρ' οἶδεν. ὦ δύστηνος, ὡς ἀπωλόμην.
 Τροίας δὲ σωθεῖς κάπῳ βαρβάρου χθονὸς
 ἐς βάρβαρ' ἔλθων φάσγαν' αὐθις ἐμπροσθεῖ.

ΘΕΟΝΟΗ

ἡγοῦ σύ μοι φέρουσα λαμπτήρων σέλας 865
 θείου τε σεμνὸν θεσμόν αἰθέρος μυχοῦς,
 ὡς πνεῦμα καθαρὸν οὐρανοῦ δεξώμεθα·
 σύ δ' αὖ κέλευθον εἴ τις ἔβλαψεν ποδὶ
 στείβων ἀνοσίωι, δὸς καθαρσίωι φλογί,

840 τελευτήσειν Musgrave: -σω L 845 κλέος Scaliger: λέχος L 849 Νηλέως Musgrave:
 θησέως L τ' ἄπαιδα Lenting: τε παῖδα L 866 θείου P²: θεῖον L τε Reiske: δὲ L
 σεμνὸν Hermann: -οῦ L μυχοῦς Wecklein: -ῶν L 867 δεξώμεθα Schaefer: -αίμεθα L

- κροῦσόν τε πεύκην, ἵνα διεξέλθω, πάρος·
νόμον δὲ τὸν ἐμὸν θεοῖσιν ἀποδοῦσαι πάλιν
ἔφέστιον φλόγ' ἐς δόμους κομίζετε.
Ἐλένη, τί τάμά – πῶς ἔχει; – θεσπίσματα;
ἦκει πόσις σοι Μενέλεως ὄδ' ἐμφανής,
νεῶν στερηθεῖς τοῦ τε σοῦ μιμήματος.
ὦ τλήμων, οἴους διαφυγῶν ἦλθες πόνους,
οὐδ' οἴσθα νόστον οἴκαδ' εἴτ' αὐτοῦ μενεῖς·
ἔρις γὰρ ἐν θεοῖς σύλλογός τε σοῦ πέρι
ἔσται πάρεδρος Ζηνὶ τῶιδ' ἐν ἡματι.
Ἦρα μὲν, ἦ σοι δυσμενῆς πάροιθεν ἦν,
νῦν ἔστιν εὐνους κὰς πάτραν σῶσαι θέλει
ξύν τῆιδ', ἵν' Ἑλλάς τοὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου γάμους
δώρημα Κύπριδος ψευδονύμφευτον μάθῃ·
Κύπρις δὲ νόστον σὸν διαφθεῖραι θέλει,
ὡς μὴ ξελεγχθῆι μηδὲ πριαμένη φανῆι
τὸ κάλλος Ἑλένης οὐνεκ' ἀνονήτοις γάμοις.
τέλος δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν εἴθ', ἃ βούλεται Κύπρις,
λέξασ' ἀδελφῶι <σ'> ἐνθάδ' ὄντα διολέσω
εἴτ' αὖ μεθ' Ἦρας σταῖσα σὸν σώσω βίον,
κρύψασ' ὄμαιμον, ὅς με προστάσσει τάδε
εἰπεῖν, ὅταν γῆν τήνδε νοστήσας τύχῃς.
[τίς εἶσ' ἀδελφῶι τόνδε σημανῶν ἐμῶι
παρόνθ', ὅπως ἂν τοῦμόν ἀσφαλῶς ἔχηι;]
Ελ. ὦ παρθέν', ἰκέτις ἀμφὶ σὸν πίτνω γόνυ
καὶ προσκαθίζω θᾶκον οὐκ εὐδαίμονα
ὑπὲρ τ' ἐμαυτῆς τοῦδέ θ', ὃν μόλις ποτὲ
λαβοῦσ' ἐπ' ἀκμῆς εἶμι κατθανόντ' ἰδεῖν·
μή μοι κατείπηις σῶι κασιγνήτῳ πόσιν
τόνδ' εἰς ἐμὰς ἦκοντα φίλτατον χέρας,
σῶσον δέ, λίσσομαί σε· συγγόνωι δὲ σῶι
τὴν εὐσέβειαν μὴ προδῶις τὴν σὴν ποτε,
χάριτας πονηρὰς κἀδίκους ὠνουμένη.

870 τε Reiske: δὲ L πάρος Reiske: πυρός L 875 μιμήματος Stephanus: τιμ- L 883
ψευδονύμφευτον Hermann: -νυμφεύτου L 885 μή ξελεγχθῆι L. Dindorf: μήτ' ἐλ- L 886
ἀνονήτοις Pierson: ὠνητοῖς L 888 <σ'> Reiske 892-3 del. Hartung 892 εἶσ'
Scaliger: εἰς L σημανῶν Scaliger: -νῶ γ L 898 μοι Leining: μου L 899 φίλτατον
Cobet: φιλτάτας L

μισεῖ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὴν βίαν, τὰ κτητὰ δὲ
 κτᾶσθαι κελεύει πάντας οὐκ ἐς ἀρπαγᾶς.
 [ἑατέος δ' ὁ πλοῦτος ῥᾶδικός τις ὦν.] 905
 κοινὸς γὰρ ἔστιν οὐρανὸς πᾶσιν βροτοῖς
 καὶ γαῖ', ἐν ἧι χρῆ δώματ' ἀναπληρουμένους
 τ' ἀλλότρια μὴ σχεῖν μηδ' ἀφαιρεῖσθαι βίαι.
 ἡμᾶς δὲ καιρίως μὲν, ἀθλίως δ' ἔμοι
 Ἐρμῆς ἔδωκε πατρὶ σῶι σῶιζεν πόσει 910
 τῶιδ' ὅς πάρεστι κάπολάζυσθαι θέλει.
 πῶς οὖν θανῶν ἂν ἀπολάβοι; κεῖνος δὲ πῶς
 τὰ ζῶντα τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἀποδοίη ποτ' ἂν;
 ἦδη τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς σκόπει·
 πότερον ὁ δαίμων χῶ θανῶν τὰ τῶν πέλας 915
 βούλοιντ' ἂν ἢ <οὐ> βούλοιντ' ἂν ἀποδοῦναι πάλιν;
 δοκῶ μὲν. οὐκουν χρῆ σε συγγόνωι πλέον
 νέμειν ματαίωι μᾶλλον ἢ χρηστῶι πατρί.
 εἰ δ' οὔσα μάντις καὶ τὰ θεῖ ἠγουμένη
 τὸ μὲν δίκαιον τοῦ πατρὸς διαφθερεῖς, 920
 τῶι δ' οὐ δικαίωι συγγόνωι δώσεις χάριν,
 αἰσχρὸν τὰ μὲν σε θεῖα πάντ' ἐξειδέναι
 τὰ τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα, τὰ δὲ δίκαια μὴ.
 τὴν δ' ἀθλίαν ἔμ', οἷσιν ἐγκειμαι κακοῖς,
 ῥῦσαι, πάρεργον δοῦσα τοῦτο τῆς δίκης. 925
 Ἐλένην γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ στυγεῖ βροτῶν·
 ἢ κλήιζομαι καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ὡς προδοῦσ' ἔμὸν
 πόσιν Φρυγῶν ὤικησα πολυχρύσους δόμους.
 ἦν δ' Ἑλλάδ' ἔλθω κάπιβῶ Σπάρτης <πάλιν>,
 κλυόντες εἰσιδόντες ὡς τέχναις θεῶν 930
 ὦλοντ', ἐγὼ δὲ προδότις οὐκ ἄρ' ἦ φίλων,
 πάλιν μ' ἀνάξουσ' ἐς τὸ σῶφρον αὐθις αὖ,
 ἐδνώσομαί τε θυγατέρ', ἦν οὐδεὶς γαμεῖ,
 τὴν δ' ἐνθάδ' ἐκλιποῦσ' ἀλητείαν πικρὰν
 ὄντων ἐν οἴκοις χρημάτων ὀνήσομαι. 935
 κεῖ μὲν θανῶν ὄδ' ἐν πυρᾷ κατεφθάρη,
 πρόσω σφ' ἀπόντα δακρύοις ἂν ἠγάπων·

903-8 del. Hapung 908 σχεῖν Headlam: χεῖν L 909 καιρίως Badham: μακαρίως
 L 912-14 del. Schenkl 913 ἀπ- ποτ' ἂν Porson: ἂν ἀπ- ποτέ L 914 ἦδη Scaliger: ἢ
 δὴ L 916 <οὐ> Canter 921 δώσεις Tr': σώσεις L χάριν Reiske: δίκην L 923
 μέλλοντα . . . μὴ Clark: μὴ . . . μὴ εἰδέναι L 924 ὄδ' Scaliger: τ' L 925 δίκης Wecklein:
 τύχης L 931 ἄρ' ἢ Collei: ἄρ' ἦν L 932 αὖ Canter: ἂν L 936 κατεφθάρη Schenkl:
 κατεσφάγη L

- νῦν δ' ὄντα καὶ σωθέντ' ἀφαιρεθήσομαι;
 μὴ δῆτα, παρθέν', ἀλλὰ σ' ἵκετεύω τόδε·
 δὸς τήν χάριν μοι τήνδε καὶ μιμοῦ τρόπους 940
 πατρὸς δικαίου· παισὶ γὰρ κλέος τόδε
 κάλλιστον, ὅστις ἐκ πατρὸς χρηστοῦ γεγώς
 ἐς ταύτῳ ἦλθε τοῖς τεκοῦσι τοὺς τρόπους.
- Xo. οἰκτρὸν μὲν οἱ παρόντες ἐν μέσῳ λόγοι,
 οἰκτρὰ δὲ καὶ σύ. τοὺς δὲ Μενέλεω ποθῶ 945
 λόγους ἀκοῦσαι τίνας ἐρεῖ ψυχῆς πέρι.
- Με. ἐγὼ σὸν οὐτ' ἂν προσπεσεῖν τλαίην γόνυ
 οὐτ' ἂν δακρῦσαι βλέφαρα· τήν Τροίαν γὰρ ἂν
 δειλοὶ γενόμενοι πλεῖστον αἰσχύνοιμεν ἂν.
 καίτοι λέγουσιν ὡς πρὸς ἀνδρὸς εὐγενοῦς 950
 ἐν ξυμφοραῖσι δάκρυ' ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν βαλεῖν.
 ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦτο τὸ καλόν, εἰ καλόν τόδε,
 αἰρήσομαι ἕως πρόσθε τῆς εὐψυχίας.
 ἀλλ', εἰ μὲν ἄνδρα σοι δοκεῖ σῶσαι ξένον
 ζητοῦντά γ' ὀρθῶς ἀπολαβεῖν δάμαρτ' ἐμήν, 955
 ἀπόδος τε καὶ πρὸς σῶσον· εἰ δὲ μὴ δοκεῖ,
 ἐγὼ μὲν οὐ νῦν πρῶτον ἀλλὰ πολλακίς
 ἄθλιος ἂν εἶην, σὺ δὲ γυνὴ κακὴ φανῆι.
 ἃ δ' ἄξι' ἡμῶν καὶ δίκαι' ἡγούμεθα
 καὶ σῆς μάλιστα καρδίας ἀνθάψεται, 960
 λέξω τάδ' ἀμφὶ μνημα σοῦ πατρὸς πεσών·
 ἕω γέρον, ὃς οἰκεῖς τόνδε λάϊνον τάφον,
 ἀπόδος, ἀπαιτῶ τήν ἐμήν δάμαρτά σε,
 ἦν Ζεὺς ἔπεμψε δεῦρό σοι σώζειν ἐμοί.
 οἷδ' οὐνεχ' ἡμῖν οὐποτ' ἀποδώσεις θανών· 965
 ἀλλ' ἦδε πατέρα νέρθεν ἀνακαλούμενον
 οὐκ ἀξιῶσει τὸν πρὶν εὐκλεέστατον
 κακῶς ἀκοῦσαι· κυρία γὰρ ἐστὶ νῦν.
 ὦ νέρτερ' Αἰδη, καὶ σὲ σύμμαχον καλῶ,
 ὅς πόλλ' ἐδέξω τῆσδ' ἕκατι σώματα 970
 πεσόντα τῶμῳ φασγάνῳ, μισθὸν δ' ἔχεις·
 ἦ νῦν ἐκείνους ἀπόδος ἐμψύχους πάλιν
 ἦ τήνδ' ἀνάγκασόν γ' ἔτ' εὐσεβοῦς πατρὸς

941 παισὶ Stob. 4. 29. 55: παιδι L 944ⁿ Xo. L.Dindorf: Θε. L 945 τοὺς Hermann:
 τοῦ L 953 ἕως Porson: τὸ L εὐψυχίας Heath: εὐδαιμονίας L 961 πεσών Badham:
 πόθῳ L 965 ἀποδώσεις Brodacus: -λέσεις L 973 γ' ἔτ' Bothe: γε L

- κρείσσω φανεῖσαν τάμα μοι δοῦναι λέχη.
 εἰ δ' ἐμέ γυναῖκα τήν ἐμήν συλήσετε, 975
 ἃ σοι παρέλιπεν ἦδε τῶν λόγων φράσω.
 ὄρκοις κεκλήμεθ', ὡς μάθης, ὦ παρθένε,
 πρῶτον μὲν ἐλθεῖν διὰ μάχης σῶι συγγόνωι,
 κάκεινον ἢ μὲ δεῖ θανεῖν· ἀπλοῦς λόγος.
 ἦν δ' ἔς μὲν ἀλκὴν μὴ πόδ' ἀντιθῆι ποδί, 980
 λιμῶι δὲ θηρᾶι τύμβον ἰκετεύοντε νῶ,
 κτανεῖν δέδοκται τήνδε μοι κᾶπειτ' ἐμόν
 πρὸς ἧπαρ ὥσαι δίστομον ξίφος τόδε
 τύμβου ἵπι νῶτοις τοῦδ', ἵν' αἵματος ῥοαὶ
 τάφου καταστάζωσι· κεισόμεσθα δὲ 985
 νεκρῶ δὴ ἔξῃς τῶιδ' ἐπὶ ξεστῶι τάφωι,
 ἀθάνατον ἄλγος σοί, ψόγον δὲ σῶι πατρί.
 οὐ γὰρ γαμεῖ τήνδ' οὔτε σύγγονος σέθεν
 οὔτ' ἄλλος οὐδεὶς· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σφ' ἀπάξομαι
 εἰ μὴ πρὸς οἴκους δυνάμεθ' ἀλλὰ πρὸς νεκρούς. 990
 τί ταῦτα; δακρύοις εἰς τὸ θῆλυ τρεπόμενος
 ἐλεινὸς ἦν ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ δραστήριος.
 κτεῖν', εἰ δοκεῖ σοι· δυσκλεᾶς γὰρ οὐ κτενεῖς·
 μᾶλλον γε μέντοι τοῖς ἐμοῖς πείθου λόγοις,
 ἵν' ἦις δικαία καὶ δάμαρτ' ἐμήν λάβω. 995
- Χο. ἐν σοὶ βραβεύειν, ὦ νεᾶνι, τοὺς λόγους·
 οὔτω δὲ κρῖνον ὡς ἄπασιν ἀνδάνηις.
- Θε. ἐγὼ πέφυκά τ' εὐσεβεῖν καὶ βούλομαι
 φιλῶ τ' ἐμαυτήν, καὶ κλέος τοῦμοῦ πατρός
 οὐκ ἂν μιάναίμ', οὐδὲ συγγόνωι χάριν 1000
 δοίην ἂν ἐξ ἧς δυσκλεῆς φανήσομαι.
 ἔνεστι δ' ἱερὸν τῆς Δίκης ἐμοὶ μέγα
 ἐν τῇ φύσει· καὶ τοῦτο Νηρέως πάρα
 ἔχουσα σώζειν, Μενέλεως, πειράσομαι.
 Ἦραι δ', ἐπεὶπερ βούλεται σ' εὐεργετεῖν, 1005
 ἐς ταῦτόν οἶσω ψῆφον· ἡ Κύπρις δὲ μοι
 ἴλεως μὲν εἶη, συμβέβηκε δ' οὐδαμοῦ·
 πειράσομαι δὲ παρθένος μένειν ἀεὶ.
 ἃ δ' ἀμφὶ τύμβωι τῶιδ' ὄνειδίσεις πατρός,

974 τάμα μοι δοῦναι Wecklein: τὰμ' ἀποδοῦναι L 980 πόδ' Badham: ποτ' L
 Diggle: -ος L 991-5 del. Schenkl 993 δυσκλεᾶς Wilamowitz: -εὼς L
 Canter: χάρις L 1008 del. Badham 1009 πατρός Wecklein: πατρί L

987 ψόγον
 1006 Κύπρις

- ἡμῖν ὄδ' αὐτὸς μῦθος· ἀδικοίημεν ἄν,
 εἰ μὴ ἀποδώσω· καὶ γὰρ ἄν κεῖνος βλέπων
 ἀπέδωκεν ἄν σοὶ τήνδ' ἔχειν, ταύτηι δὲ σέ.
 καὶ γὰρ τίσις τῶνδ' ἐστὶ τοῖς τε νερτέροις
 καὶ τοῖς ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις· ὁ νοῦς
 τῶν κατθανόντων ζῆι μὲν οὐ, γνώμην δ' ἔχει
 ἀθάνατον εἰς ἀθάνατον αἰθέρ' ἐμπροσθῶν.
 ὡς οὖν περαίνω μὴ μακράν, σιγήσομαι
 ἃ μου καθικετεύσατ' οὐδὲ μωρία
 ξύμβουλος ἔσομαι τῆι κασιγνήτου ποτέ.
 εὐεργετῶ γὰρ κεῖνον οὐ δοκοῦσ' ὁμως,
 ἐκ δυσσεβείας ὅσιον εἰ τίθημί νιν.
 αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸν τιν' ἐξευρίσκετε,
 ἐγὼ δ' ἀποστᾶσ' ἐκποδῶν σιγήσομαι.
 ἐκ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἄρχεσθε χίκετεύετε
 τὴν μὲν σ' ἐᾶσαι πατρίδα νοστήσαι Κύπριν,
 Ἥρας δὲ τὴν ἔννοιαν ἐν ταύτῳ μένειν
 ἦν ἐς σέ καὶ σὸν πόσιν ἔχει σωτηρίας.
 σὺ δ', ὦ θανῶν μοι πάτερ, ὅσον γ' ἐγὼ σθένω,
 οὔποτε κεκλήσῃ δυσσεβῆς ἀντ' εὐσεβοῦς.
 Χο. οὐδεὶς ποτ' ἠτύχησεν ἔκδικος γεγῶς,
 ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ δ' ἐλπίδες σωτηρίας.
 Ελ. Μενέλαε, πρὸς μὲν παρθένου σεσώμεθα·
 τούνηνδε δὴ σὲ τοὺς λόγους φέροντα χρῆ
 κοινήν ξυνάπτειν μηχανὴν σωτηρίας.
 Με. ἄκουε δὴ νυν· χρόνιος εἶ κατὰ στέγας
 καὶ συντέθραψαι προσπόλοισι βασιλέως.
 Ελ. τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; ἐσφέρεις γὰρ ἐλπίδας
 ὡς δὴ τι δράσων χρηστὸν ἐς κοινόν γε νῶιν.
 Με. πείσειας ἄν τιν' οἴτινες τετραζύγων
 ὄχων ἀνάσσουσ' ὥστε νῶιν δοῦναι δίφρους;
 Ελ. πείσαιμ' <ἄν>· ἀλλὰ τίνα φυγὴν φευξοῦμεθα
 πεδίων ἄπειροι βαρβάρου γ' ὄντες χθονός;
 Με. ἀδύνατον εἶπας. φέρε, τί δ' εἰ κρυφθεὶς δόμοις
 κτάνοιμ' ἄνακτα τῷδε διστόμῳ ξίφει;

1013-16 del. Hartung 1017 περαίνω Stephanus: παραινῶ L 1019 τῆι Dobree: τοῦ
 L 1021 ἐκ δυσσεβείας Brodacus: ἐξ εὐσεβ- L νιν Brodacus: νῦν L 1022 ὁδὸν τιν'
 ἐξευρίσκετε Nauck: τὴν ἐξοδὸν γ' εὐρίσκετε L 1041 <ἄν> Canter

- Ελ. οὐκ ἂν <σ> ἀνάσχοιτ' οὐδὲ σιγήσειεν ἂν
μέλλοντ' ἀδελφὴ σύγγονον κατακτανεῖν. 1045
- Με. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὴν ναῦς ἔστιν ἧι σωθεῖμεν ἂν
φεύγοντες· ἦν γὰρ εἶχομεν θάλασσο ἔχει.
- Ελ. ἄκουσον, ἦν τι καὶ γυνὴ λέξει σοφόν.
βούληι λέγεσθαι μὴ θανῶν λόγῳ θανεῖν; 1050
- Με. κακὸς μὲν ὄρνις· εἰ δὲ κερδανῶ, λέγε.
ἔτοιμὸς εἰμι μὴ θανῶν λόγῳ θανεῖν.
- Ελ. καὶ μὴν γυναικείοις <σ> ἂν οἰκτισαίμεθα
κουραῖσι καὶ θρήνοισι πρὸς τὸν ἀνόσιον.
- Με. σωτηρίας δὲ τοῦτ' ἔχει τί νῶϊν ἄκος;
παλαιότης γὰρ τῶι λόγῳ γ' ἔνεστί τις. 1055
- Ελ. ὡς δὴ θανόντα σ' ἐνάλιον κενῶι τάφῳ
θάψαι τύραννον τῆσδε γῆς αἰτήσομαι.
- Με. καὶ δὴ παρεῖκεν· εἶτα πῶς ἄνευ νεῶς
σωθησόμεσθα κενοταφοῦντ' ἐμὸν δέμας; 1060
- Ελ. δοῦναι κελεύσω πορθμίδ', ἧι καθήσομεν
κόσμον τάφῳ σῶι πελαγίους ἐς ἀγκάλας.
- Με. ὡς εὖ τόδ' εἶπας πλήν ἐν· εἰ χέρσῳι ταφὰς
θεῖναι κελεύσει σ', οὐδὲν ἧ σκῆψις φέρει.
- Ελ. ἀλλ' οὐ νομίζειν φήσομεν καθ' Ἑλλάδα
χέρσῳι καλύπτειν τοὺς θανόντας ἐναλίους. 1065
- Με. τοῦτ' αὖ κατορθοῖς· εἶτ' ἐγὼ συμπλεύσομαι
καὶ συγκαθήσω κόσμον ἐν ταύτῳι σκάφει.
- Ελ. σὲ καὶ παρεῖναι δεῖ μάλιστα τοὺς τε σοὺς
πλωτῆρας οἵπερ ἔφυγον ἐκ ναυαγίας. 1070
- Με. καὶ μὴν ἐάνπερ ναῦν ἐπ' ἀγκύρας λάβω,
ἀνὴρ παρ' ἀνδρα στήσεται ξιφηφόρος.
- Ελ. σὲ χρὴ βραβεύειν πάντα· πόμπιμοι μόνον
λαίφει πνοαὶ γένοιντο καὶ νεῶς δρόμος.
- Με. ἔσται· πόνους γὰρ δαίμονες παύσουσί μου.
ἀτὰρ θανόντα τοῦ μ' ἐρεῖς πεπυσμένη; 1075
- Ελ. σοῦ· καὶ μόνος γε φάσκε διαφυγεῖν μόρον
Ἄτρέως πλέων σὺν παιδί καὶ θανόνθ' ὄρα.
- Με. καὶ μὴν τάδ' ἀμφίβληστρα σώματος ῥάκη
ξυμμάρτυρές σοι ναυτικῶν ἐρειπίων. 1080

1045 <σ> Porius
Heath: -σομαι L
ξυμμαρτυρήσει L

1051 λέγε Scidler: λέγειν L

1064 κελεύσει L. Dindorf: -εὔει L

1053 <σ> Hermann

1061 καθήσομεν

1080 ξυμμάρτυρές σοι Pearson:

- Ελ. ἔς καιρὸν ἦλθε, τότε δ' ἄκαιρ' ἀπώλλυτο·
τὸ δ' ἄθλιον κεῖν' εὐτυχές τάχ' ἂν πέσοι.
- Με. πότερα δ' ἔς οἴκους σοι συνεισελθεῖν με χρῆ
ἢ πρὸς τάφῳ τῷδ' ἦσυχῳ καθώμεθα;
- Ελ. αὐτοῦ μὲν· ἦν γὰρ καὶ τι πλημμελές σε δρᾷ, 1085
τάφος σ' ὄδ' ἂν ρύσαιτο φάσγανόν τε σόν.
ἐγὼ δ' ἔς οἴκους βᾶσα βοστρύχους τεμῶ
πέπλων τε λευκῶν μέλανας ἀνταλλάξομαι
παρηιδί τ' ὄνυχα φόνιον ἐμβαλῶ χροός.
μέγας γὰρ ἀγῶν καὶ βλέπω δύο ροπάς· 1090
ἦ γὰρ θανεῖν δεῖ μ', ἦν ἀλῶ τεχνωμένη,
ἦ πατρίδα τ' ἐλθεῖν καὶ σὸν ἐκσῶσαι δέμας.
ὦ πότνι' ἦ Δίοισιν ἐν λέκτροις πίτνεις
Ἦρα, δὴ οἰκτρῶ φῶτ' ἀνάψυξον πόνων,
αἰτούμεθ' ὀρθὰς ὠλένας πρὸς οὐρανὸν 1095
ρίπτουθ', ἴν' οἰκεῖς ἀστέρων ποικίλματα.
σύ θ', ἦ ἔπι τῶμῳ κάλλος ἐκθήσω γάμῳ,
κόρη Διώνης Κύπρι, μὴ μ' ἐξεργάση.
ἄλις δὲ λύμης ἦν μ' ἔλυμήνῳ πάρος
τοῦνομα παρασχοῦσ', οὐ τὸ σῶμ', ἐν βαρβάροις. 1100
θανεῖν δ' ἔασόν μ', εἰ κατακτεῖναι θέλεις,
ἐν γῆι πατρώϊαι. τί ποτ' ἀπληστος εἶ κακῶν,
ἔρωτας ἀπάτας δόλια τ' ἐξευρήματα
ἀσκοῦσα φίλτρα θ' αἵματηρά δωμάτων;
εἰ δ' ἦσθα μετρία, τᾶλλα γ' ἠδίστη θεῶν 1105
πέφυκας ἀνθρώποισιν· οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω.
- Χο. σὲ τὰν ἐναύλοισ ὑπὸ δενδροκόμοις [στρ. α
μουσεῖα καὶ θάκουσ ἐνίζουσαν ἀναβοάσῳ,
τὰν ἀοιδοτάταν
ὄρνιθα μελωιδὸν ἀηδόνα δακρυόεσσαν, 1109b-10
ἔλθ' ὦ διὰ ξουθᾶν γενύων ἐλελιζομένα
θρήνων ἐμοὶ ξυνεργός,
Ἐλένας μελέους πόνους
τὸν Ἰλιάδων τ' ἀει-
δούσαι δακρυόεντα πότημον 1115

1104 σωμαίων Musgrave 1109a τὰν Diggle: σὲ τὰν L 1111 ἔλθ' ὦ Musgrave:
ἔλθε L 1112 θρήνων ἐμοὶ Wilamowitz: θρήνοις ἐμῶν L 1113 μελέους Hertmann: -ας
L 1114-15 ἀειδούσαι Lachmann: ἀείδουσα L 1115 πότημον Bachmann: πόνον L

Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὸ λόγχαις,
 ὄτ' ἔδραμε ρόθια πολιὰ βαρβάρωι πλάται
 ὃς ἔμολεν ἔμολε μέλεα Πριαμίδαις ἄγων
 Λακεδαίμονος ἄπο λέχεα
 σέθεν, ὦ Ἑλένα, Πάρις αἰνόγαμος 1120
 πομπαῖσιν Ἀφροδίτας.

πολλοὶ δ' Ἀχαιῶν δορὶ καὶ πετρίναις [ἀντ. α
 ῥιπαῖσιν ἐκπνεύσαντες Ἴιδαν μέλεον ἔχουσιν,
 ταλαινᾶν ἀλόχων
 κείραντες ἔθειραν, ἀνυμφα δὲ μέλαθρα κείται· 1124-5
 πολλοὺς δὲ πυρσεύσας φλογερὸν σέλας ἀμφιρύταν
 Εὐβοίαν εἴλ' Ἀχαιῶν
 μονόκωπος ἀνὴρ πέτραις
 Καφηρίσιν ἐμβαλῶν,
 Αἰγαίαις ἐνάλοις δόλιον 1130
 ἀκταῖς ἀστέρα λάμπσας·
 ἀλίμενα δ' ὄρια μέλεα βαρβάρου στολᾶς
 τότ' ἔστυτο πατρίδος ἀποπρὸ χειμάτων πνοᾷ
 γέρας οὐ γέρας ἀλλ' ἔριν
 Δαναῶν Μενέλας ἐπὶ ναυσὶν ἄγων 1135
 εἶδωλον ἱερὸν Ἦρας.

ὄτι θεὸς ἢ μὴ θεὸς ἢ τὸ μέσον [στρ. β
 τίς φησ' ἐρευνάσας βροτῶν;
 μακρότατον πέρας ἠὔρεν ὃς τὰ θεῶν ἔσορᾷ 1139-40
 δεῦρο καὶ αὖθις ἐκέϊσε καὶ πάλιν ἀντιλόγοις
 πηδῶντ' ἀνελπίστοις τύχαις.
 σὺ Διὸς ἔφυς, ὦ Ἑλένα, θυγάτηρ·
 πτανὸς γὰρ ἐν κόλποις σε Λή- 1145
 δας ἐτέκνωσε πατήρ·
 κἀιτ' Ἰαχήθης καθ' Ἑλλανίαν
 προδότις ἄπιστος ἄδικος ἄθεος· οὐδ' ἔχω

1117-18 ὄτ' Lening: ὃς L πεδία βαρβάρωι πλάται . . . μέλεα Πριαμίδαις ἄγων O. Schultze:
 μέλεα Πριαμίδαις ἄγων . . . πεδία βαρβάρωι πλάται L πολιὰ Henzen: πεδία L 1120
 ὦ Ἑλένα Bothe: ὡς εἶπε L 1123b ταλαινᾶν Hartung: τάλαιναν L 1130-1 δόλιον ἀκταῖς
 Hermann: ἀ- δ- L 1132 ὄρια Sterlianus: ὄρεα L 1133 τότ' ἔστυτο Diggle: ὅτε σὺ τὸ
 L 1134 γέρας οὐ γέρας Badham: τέρας οὐ τέρας L 1135 Μενέλας Wilamowitz: νεφέλαν
 L 1138 τίς φησ' Bothe: τί φῆς I. ἐρευνάσας Diggle: -ήσας L 1139-40 ἠὔρεν Dindorf:
 εὔρειν L 1141-2 δεῦρο Bothe: δεινά L ἀμφιλόγοις Dobree 1147 κἀιτ' Ἰαχήθης
 Hermann: καὶ Ἰαχή σῆ L 1148 προδότις Hermann: ἀδίκως προδότης L

ὅ τι σαφές, ὅ τι ποτ' ἐν βροτοῖς τῶν θεῶν
ἔπος ἀλαθές εὐρω. 1150

ἄφρονες ὅσοι τὰς ἀρετὰς πολέμωι [ἀντ. β
λόγχαισί τ' ἀλκαίου δορὸς
κτᾶσθ', ἀμαθῶς θανάτῳ πόνους καταλυόμενοι.
εἰ γὰρ ἄμιλλα κρινεῖ νιν αἵματος, οὔ ποτ' ἔρις 1155-6
λείψει κατ' ἀνθρώπων πόλεις·
ἄι Πριαμίδος γὰς ἔλαχον θαλάμους,
ἔξ ὄν διορθῶσαι λόγοις
σάν ἔριν, ὦ Ἑλένα. 1160
νῦν δ' οἱ μὲν Ἄιδαι μέλονται κάτω,
τείχεα δὲ φόνιος ὥστε Διὸς ἐπέσυτο φλόξ,
ἐπὶ δὲ πάθεα πάθεσι φέρεις ἀθλία
συμφοραῖς ἔλειναῖς.

ΘΕΟΚΛΥΜΕΝΟΣ

ὦ χαῖρε, πατρός μνημ' ἐπ' ἐξόδοισι γὰρ 1165
ἔθαφα Πρωτεῦ σ' ἐνεκ' ἐμῆς προσρήσεως·
ἀεὶ δὲ σ' ἐξιῶν τε κάσιων δόμους
Θεοκλύμενος παῖς ὄδε προσενέπω, πάτερ.
ὑμεῖς μὲν οὖν κύνας τε καὶ θηρῶν βρόχους,
δμῶες, κομίζετ' ἐς δόμους τυραννικούς. 1170
ἐγὼ δ' ἐμαυτὸν πόλλ' ἐλοιδόρησα δῆ·
οὐ γὰρ τι θανάτῳ τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζομεν.
καὶ νῦν πέπυσμαι φανερόν Ἑλλήνων τινὰ
ἐς γῆν ἀφίχθαι καὶ λεληθέναι σκοπούς,
ἦτοι κατόπτην ἢ κλοπαῖς θηρώμενον 1175
Ἑλένην· θανεῖται δ', ἦν γε δὴ ληφθῆι μόνον.
ἔα·
ἀλλ', ὡς ἔοικε, πάντα διαπεπραγμένα
ἠὔρηκα· τύμβου γὰρ κενὰς λιποῦσ' ἔδρας

1149 ὅ τι Schenk: τί τὸ L τῶν Willink: τὸ τῶν L 1150 εὐρω Willink: εὔρον L: εὐρεῖν Diggle 1152-3 λόγχαισί τ' ἀλκαίου δορὸς κτᾶσθ' Headlam: κτᾶσθε δορὸς τ' ἀλκαίου λόγχαισι L 1153-4 ἀ- θανάτῳ πόνους κατα- Willink: κατα- πόνους θνατῶν ἀ- L ἀμαθῶς Tyntmitt: ἀπ- L καταλυόμενοι Herwerden: -παυόμενοι L 1158 ἄι Reiske: αἰ L ἔλαχον Pflugk: ἔλιπον L 1162 φόνιος Herwerden: φλογερὸς L 1163 ἀθλία Dale: ἀθλίοις L 1164 ἔλειναῖς Wecklein: αἰλίνοις L 1168 προσενέπω Lenting: -ει L

- ἡ Τυνδαρίς παῖς ἐκπεπόρθμευται χθονός.
 ὦή, χαλᾶτε κληῖθρα, λύεθ' ἵππικὰς
 φάτνας, ὄπαδοί, κάκκομίζεθ' ἄρματα, 1180
 ὡς ἂν πόνου γ' ἕκατι μὴ λάθῃ με γῆς
 τῆσδ' ἐκκομισθεῖσ' ἄλοχος ἧς ἐφίεμαι.
 ἐπίσχετ'· εἰσορῶ γὰρ οὖς διώκομεν
 παρόντας ἐν δόμοισι κού πεφευγότας. 1185
 αὐτῆ, τί πέπλους μέλανας ἐξήψω χροὸς
 λευκῶν ἀμείψασ' ἐκ τε κρατὸς εὐγενοῦς
 κόμας σίδηρον ἐμβαλοῦσ' ἀπέθρισας
 χλωροῖς τε τέγγεις δάκρυσι σὴν παρηίδα
 κλαίουσα; πότερον ἐννύχοις πεπεισμένη 1190
 στένεις ὀνείροις ἢ φάτιν τιν' οἴκοθεν
 κλυοῦσα λύπηι σὰς διέφθαρσαι φρένας;
 ΕΛ. ὦ δέσποτ' – ἤδη γὰρ τόδ' ὀνομάζω σ' ἔπος –
 ὄλωλα· φροῦδα τὰμὰ κούδέν εἰμ' ἔτι.
 ΘΕ. ἐν τῷ δὲ κείσαι συμφορᾶς; τίς ἡ τύχη; 1195
 ΕΛ. Μενέλαος – οἴμοι, πῶς φράσω; – τέθνηκέ μοι.
 ΘΕ. οὐδέν τι χαίρω σοῖς λόγοις, τάδ' εὐτυχῶν.
 πῶς <δ> οἴσθα; μῶν σοι Θεονόη λέγει τάδε;
 ΕΛ. κείνη τε φησὶν ὃ τε παρῶν ὄτ' ὦλλυτο.
 ΘΕ. ἦκει γὰρ ὅστις καὶ τάδ' ἀγγέλλει σαφῆ; 1200
 ΕΛ. ἦκει· μόλοι γὰρ οἱ σφ' ἐγὼ χρήζω μολεῖν.
 ΘΕ. τίς ἐστι; ποῦ ἔστιν; ἵνα σαφέστερον μάθω.
 ΕΛ. ὄδ' ὅς κἀθηται τῷιδ' ὑποπτῆξας τάφωι.
 ΘΕ. Ἀπολλον, ὡς ἐσθῆτι δυσμόρφωι πρέπῃ.
 ΕΛ. οἴμοι, δοκῶ μὲν κάμὸν ὧδ' ἔχειν πόσιν. 1205
 ΘΕ. ποδαπὸς δ' ὄδ' ἀνὴρ καὶ πόθεν κατέσχε γῆν;
 ΕΛ. Ἕλλην, Ἀχαιῶν εἰς ἐμῷ σύμπλους πόσει.
 ΘΕ. θανάτῳ δὲ ποίωι φησὶ Μενέλεων θανεῖν;
 ΕΛ. οἰκτρόταθ', ὑγροῖσιν ἐν κλυδωνίοις ἀλός.
 ΘΕ. ποῦ βαρβάροισι πελάγεσιν ναυσθλούμενον; 1210
 ΕΛ. Λιβύτης ἀλιμένοις ἐκπεσόντα πρὸς πέτραις.
 ΘΕ. καὶ πῶς ὄδ' οὐκ ὄλωλε κοινωνῶν πλάτης;
 ΕΛ. ἐσθλῶν κακίους ἐνίῳτ' εὐτυχέστεροι.
 ΘΕ. λιπῶν δὲ ναὸς ποῦ πάρεστιν ἐκβόλα;
 ΕΛ. ὅπου κακῶς ὄλοιτο, Μενέλεως δὲ μῆ. 1215

1197 εὐτυχῶν Wilamowitz: εὐτυχῶ L 1198 <δ> Musgrave 1201 οἱ σφ' Lenting: ὡς
 L 1209 οἰκτρόταθ', ὑγροῖσιν ἐν Hermann: οἰκτρότατον ὑγροῖσι L 1212 κοινωνῶν
 Tr': κοινῶν L πλάτης Tr^u: -αις L

- Θε. ὄλωλ' ἐκεῖνος. ἦλθε δ' ἐν ποίῳ σκάφει;
 Ελ. ναῦται σφ' ἀνείλουντ' ἐντυχόντες, ὡς λέγει.
 Θε. ποῦ δὴ τὸ πεμφθὲν ἀντὶ σοῦ Τροίαι κακόν;
 Ελ. νεφέλης λέγεις ἀγαλμ'; ἐς αἰθέρ' οἴχεται.
 Θε. ὦ Πρίαμε καὶ γῆ Τρωιάς, <ὡς> ἔρρεις μάτην. 1220
 Ελ. κάγῳ μετέσχον Πριαμίδαις δυσπραξίας.
 Θε. πόσιν δ' ἄθαπτον ἔλιπεν ἢ κρύπτει χθονί;
 Ελ. ἄθαπτον· οἱ ἔγῳ τῶν ἐμῶν τλήμων κακῶν.
 Θε. τῶνδ' οὐνεκ' ἔτεμες βοστρύχους ξανθῆς κόμης;
 Ελ. φίλος γάρ ἐστιν, ὡς ποτ' ἦν, ἔτ' ἐνθάδ' ὦν. 1225
 Θε. ὀρθῶς μὲν ἦδε συμφορὰ δακρύεται;
 Ελ. ἐν εὐμαρεῖ γοῦν σὴν κασιγνήτην λαθεῖν.
 Θε. οὐ δῆτα. πῶς οὔν; τόνδ' ἔτ' οἰκήσεις τάφον; 1228
 Ελ. πιστὴ γὰρ εἰμι τῷ πόσει φεύγουσα σέ. 1230
 Θε. τί κερτομεῖς με, τὸν θανόντα δ' οὐκ ἔαις; 1229
 Ελ. ἀλλ' οὐκέτ' ἤδη δ' ἄρχε τῶν ἐμῶν γάμων. 1231
 Θε. χρόνια μὲν ἦλθεν, ἀλλ' ὅμως αἰνῶ τάδε.
 Ελ. οἴσθ' οὐν ὁ δρᾶσον· τῶν πάρος λαθώμεθα.
 Θε. ἐπὶ τῷ; χάρις γὰρ ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλθέτω.
 Ελ. σπονδὰς τέμωμεν καὶ διαλλάχθητί μοι. 1235
 Θε. μεθίημι νεῖκος τὸ σόν, ἴτω δ' ὑπόπτερον.
 Ελ. πρὸς νῦν σε γονάτων τῶνδ', ἐπεῖπερ εἶ φίλος . . .
 Θε. τί χρῆμα θηρῶσ' ἰκέτις ὠρέχθης ἐμοῦ;
 Ελ. τὸν κατθανόντα πόσιν ἐμὸν θάψαι θέλω.
 Θε. τί δ'; ἔστ' ἀπόντων τύμβος; ἢ θάψεις σκιάν; 1240
 Ελ. Ἕλλησιν ἐστὶ νόμος, ὃς ἂν πόντῳ θάνηι . . .
 Θε. τί δρᾶν; σοφοί τοι Πελοπίδαι τὰ τοιάδε.
 Ελ. κενοῖσι θάπτειν ἐν πέπλων ὑφάσμασιν.
 Θε. κτέριζ' ἀνίστη τύμβον οὐ χρήζεις χθονός.
 Ελ. οὐχ ὧδε ναύτας ὀλομένους τυμβεύομεν. 1245
 Θε. πῶς δαί; λέλειμμαί τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησιν νόμων.
 Ελ. ἐς πόντον ὅσα χρή νέκυσιν ἐξορμίζομεν.
 Θε. τί σοι παράσχω δῆτα τῷ τεθνηκότι;
 Ελ. ὄδ' οἶδ', ἐγὼ δ' ἄπειρος, εὐτυχοῦσα πρίν.
 Θε. ὦ ξένη, λόγων μὲν κληδόν' ἦνεγκας φίλην. 1250

1217 ἀνείλουντ' Cohe: ἀνεῖλον L 1218 δὴ Scaliger: δὲ L 1220 <ὡς> Scaliger 1225
 φίλος γὰρ ἐστιν, ὡς ποτ' ἦν, ἔτ' ἐνθάδ' ὦν Diggle: φίλος γὰρ ἐστιν ὃς ποτ' ἐστὶν ἐνθάδ'
 ὦν L 1227 λαθεῖν Jacobs: θανεῖν L 1229-30 transposed by Jackson, with speakers
 changed 1230 εἰμι τῷ . . . φεύγουσα σέ Jackson: ἐσσι σῶι . . . φεύγουσά με L 1232
 ἦλθεν Musgrave: -εσ L 1243 πέπλων Scaliger: -οις L 1249 ὄδ' Hartung: οὐκ L

- Με. οὔκουν ἑμαυτῶι γ' οὐδὲ τῶι τεθνηκότι.
 Θε. πῶς τοὺς θανόντας θάπτει ἐν πόντῳ νεκρούς;
 Με. ὡς ἂν παρούσης οὐσίας ἕκαστος ἦι.
 Θε. πλούτου λέγ' οὐνεχ' ὅτι θέλεις ταύτης χάριν.
 Με. προσφάζεται μὲν αἷμα πρῶτα νερτέροις. 1255
 Θε. τίνος; σὺ μοι σήμαινε, πείσομαι δ' ἐγώ.
 Με. αὐτὸς σὺ γίγνωσκ' ἀρκέσει γὰρ ἂν διδῶις.
 Θε. ἐν βαρβάροις μὲν ἵππον ἢ ταῦρον νόμος.
 Με. διδούς γε μὲν δὴ δυσγενὲς μηδὲν δίδου.
 Θε. οὐ τῶνδ' ἐν ἀγέλαις ὀλβίαις σπανίζομεν. 1260
 Με. καὶ στρωτὰ φέρεται λέκτρα σώματος κενά.
 Θε. ἔσται· τί δ' ἄλλο προσφέρειν νομίζεται;
 Με. χαλκήλαθ' ὄπλα· καὶ γὰρ ἦν φίλος δορί.
 Θε. ἄξια τὰδ' ἔσται Πελοπιδῶν ἃ δώσομεν.
 Με. καὶ τὰλλ' ὅσα χθῶν καλὰ φέρει βλαστήματα. 1265
 Θε. πῶς οὖν; ἐς οἶδμα τίνι τρόπῳ καθίετε;
 Με. ναῦν δεῖ παρεῖναι κἀρετμῶν ἐπιστάτας.
 Θε. πόσον δ' ἀπείργειν μῆκος ἐκ γαίας δόρυ;
 Με. ὥστ' ἐξορᾶσθαι ῥόθια χερσόθεν μόλις.
 Θε. τί δὴ; τόδ' Ἑλλάς νόμιμον ἐκ τίνος σέβει; 1270
 Με. ὡς μὴ πάλιν γῆι λύματ' ἐκβάληι κλύδων.
 Θε. Φοίνισσα κώπη ταχύπορος γενήσεται.
 Με. καλῶς ἂν εἴη Μενελέωι τε πρὸς χάριν.
 Θε. οὔκουν σὺ χωρὶς τῆσδε δρῶν ἀρκεῖς τάδε;
 Με. μητρὸς τόδ' ἔργον ἢ γυναικὸς ἢ τέκνων. 1275
 Θε. ταύτης ὁ μόχθος, ὡς λέγεις, θάπτειν πόσιν.
 Με. ἐν εὐσεβεῖ γοῦν νόμιμα μὴ κλέπτειν νεκρῶν.
 Θε. ἴτω· πρὸς ἡμῶν ἄλοχον εὐσεβῆ τρέφειν.
 ἐλθῶν δ' ἐς οἶκους ἐξελοῦ κόσμον νεκρῶι·
 καὶ σ' οὐ κενᾶισι χερσὶ γῆς ἀποστελῶ, 1280
 δράσαντα τῆιδε πρὸς χάριν· φήμας δ' ἐμοὶ
 ἐσθλὰς ἐνεγκῶν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀχλαινίας
 ἐσθῆτα λήψηι σῖτά θ', ὥστε σ' ἐς πάτραν
 ἐλθεῖν, ἐπεὶ νῦν γ' ἀθλίως <σ'> ἔχονθ' ὀρῶ.
 σὺ δ', ὦ τάλαινα, μὴ ἴπι τοῖς ἀνηνύτοις 1285
 τρύχουσα σαυτὴν <

> Μενελέως δ' ἔχει πότμον,

1268 ἀπείργειν Matthiae: -ει L 1279 ἐξελοῦ Cobet: ἐξελῶ L 1284 <σ'>
 Lenting 1286 lacuna proposed by Badham: suppl. c.g. <Μενελέων ἄγαν στένε. | σὺ μὲν
 βλέπεις φῶς,> Diggle

- κούκ ἄν δύναιτο ζῆν ὁ καθθανῶν γόοις.
 Με. σὸν ἔργον, ὦ νεᾶνι· τὸν παρόντα μὲν
 στέργειν πόσιν χρή, τὸν δὲ μηκέτ' ὄντ' ἔαν·
 ἄριστα γάρ σοι ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ τυγχάνον. 1290
 ἦν δ' Ἑλλάδ' ἔλθω καὶ τύχῳ σωτηρίας,
 παύσω ψόγου σε τοῦ πρίν, ἦν γυνὴ γένηι 1293
 οἶαν γενέσθαι χρή σε σῶι ξυνευνέτη. 1292
 Ελ. ἔσται τάδ' οὐδὲ μέμψεται πόσις ποτὲ
 ἡμῖν· σὺ δ' αὐτὸς ἐγγύς ὦν εἴσηι τάδε. 1295
 ἀλλ', ὦ τάλας, ἔσελθε καὶ λουτρῶν τύχε
 ἐσθῆτά τ' ἐξάλλαξον. οὐκ ἐς ἀμβολὰς
 εὐεργετήσω σ'· εὐμενέστερον γὰρ ἄν
 τῶι φιλτάτῳ μοι Μενέλεωι τὰ πρόσφορα
 δρώϊης ἄν, ἡμῶν τυγχάνων οἶων σε χρή. 1300
 Χο. ὀρεία ποτὲ δρομάδι κώ- [στρ. α
 λωι Μάτηρ ἐσύθη θεῶν
 ἀν' ὑλᾶντα νάπη
 ποτάμιόν τε χεῦμ' ὑδάτων
 βαρύβρομόν τε κῦμ' ἄλιον 1305
 πόθῳι τᾶς ἀποιχομένας
 ἀρρήτου κούρας.
 κρόταλα δὲ βρόμια διαπρύσιον
 ἴεντα κέλαδον ἀνεβόα,
 θηρῶν ὅτε ζυγίους 1310
 Ζεύξασα θεὰ σατίνας
 τὰν ἀρπασθεῖσαν κυκλίων
 χορῶν ἔξω παρθενίων
 κούραν <-x-υυ->.
 μετὰ δ' <ῆιξαν> ἀελλόποδες
 ἅ μὲν τόξοις Ἄρτεμις, ἅ δ' 1315
 ἔγχει Γοργῶπις πάνοπλος·
 αὐγάζων δ' ἐξ οὐρανίων
 <Ζεὺς ὁ παντόπτας ἐδράνων>
 ἄλλαν μοῖραν ἔκραινεν.

1287 γόοις Jackson: πόσις L 1292-3 transposed by Canter 1302 ἐσύθη θεῶν Diggle:
 θ- ἐ- L 1311 σατίνας Musgrave: -αν L 1314a-b κούραν <-x-υυ->. | μετὰ δ'
 <ῆιξαν> Maas: μετὰ κουρᾶν δ' ἀελλόποδες L: <ῆισαν> Allan 1316 Γοργῶπις Heath:
 γοργῶ L 1317b lacuna (incl. Ζεὺς and ἐδράνων) proposed by L. Dindorf παντόπτας
 Diggle

δρομαῖον δ' ὅτε πολυπλάνη-	[ἀντ. α
τον Μάτηρ ἔπαυσε πόνον	1320
ματεύουσ' ἀπόνους	
θυγατρὸς ἀρπαγὰς δολίους,	
χιονοθρέμμονάς τ' ἐπέρασ'	
Ἴδαιᾶν Νυμφᾶν σκοπιάς	
ρίπτει τ' ἐν πένθει	1325
πέτρινα κατὰ δρία πολυφιφέα.	
βροτοῖσι δ' ἄχλοα πεδία γᾶς	
< x - x - ~ ~ ~ >	
οὐ καρπίζουσ' ἀρότοις,	
λαῶν δὲ φθείρει γενεάν·	
ποιμναις δ' οὐχ ἴει θαλερὰς	1330
βοσκὰς εὐφύλλων ἐλίκων·	
πόλεων δ' ἀπέλειπε βίος,	
οὐδ' ἦσαν θεῶν θυσίαι,	
βωμοῖς δ' ἄφλεκτοι πελανοί·	
παγὰς δ' ἀμπαύει δροσερὰς	1335
λευκῶν ἐκβάλλειν ὑδάτων	
πένθει παιδὸς ἀλάστῳ.	
ἐπεὶ δ' ἔπαυσ' εἰλαπίνας	[στρ. β
θεοῖς βροτείῳ τε γένει,	
Ζεὺς μειλίσσων στυγίους	
Ματρὸς ὀργὰς ἐνέπει·	1340
Βᾶτε, σεμναὶ Χάριτες,	
ἴτε, τὰν περὶ παρθένῳ	
Δηῶ θυμωσαμέναν	
λυπᾶν ἐξελάτ' ἀλαλαῖ,	
Μοῦσαί θ' ὕμνοισι χορῶν.	1345
χαλκοῦ δ' αὐδὰν χθονίαν	
τύπανά τ' ἔλαβε βυρσοτενῆ	

1319-20 δρομαῖον . . . πολυπλάνητον . . . πόνον Murray (δρομαῖον Henverden, πόνον Nauck): δρομαίων . . . -ήτων . . . πόνων L 1321 ματεύουσα Hermann: μαστ- L -ουσα' ἀπόνους Verrall: ἀφανούς Allan 1323 γ' Elmsley: γ' L 1325 γ' Elmsley: δ' L 1327b lacuna proposed by Maas 1328 ἀρότους Maas 1329 γενεάν Seidler: γένναν L 1330 ποιμναις Canter: -ας L 1334 δ' Murray: γ' L 1335 παγὰς Diggle: πη- L δ' Hartung: γ' L 1337 ἀλάστῳ L Dindorf: -τωρ L 1343 Δηῶ Maas: δηῖω L θυμωσαμέναν Maas: -α L 1344 λυπᾶν ἐξελάτ' Maas: λύπαν ἐξαλλάξαιτ' L, λύπαν ἀλλάξαιτ' Musgrave (reading τᾶι . . . Δηοῖ), λύπαν ἐξαιρεῖτ' Willink 1345 χορῶν Matthiae: -όν L 1347 τύπανά Heath: τύμπ- L γ' ἔλαβε Hermann: τε λάβετε L βυρσοτενῆ Scaliger: πυρσογενῆ L

- καλλίστα τότε πρώτα μακά-
ρων Κύπρις· γέλασεν δὲ θεὰ
δέξατό τ' ἔς χέρας
βαρύβρομον αὐλὸν
τερφθεῖσ' ἀλαλαγμῶι. 1350
- ῶν οὐ θέμις <σ'> οὐδ' ὄσια [ἀντ. β
πύρωσας ἐν <γᾶς> θαλάμαις,
μῆνιν δ' ἔχεις μεγάλας 1355
Ματρός, ὦ παῖ, θυσίας
οὐ σεβίζουσα θεᾶς.
μέγα τοι δύνатаι νεβρῶν
παμποίκιοι στολίδες
κισσοῦ τε στεφθεῖσα χλόα 1360
νάρθηκας εἰς ἱεροῦς
ρόμβου θ' εἰλισσομένα
κύκλιος ἔνοσις αἰθερία
βακχεύουσά τ' ἔθειρα Βρομί-
ωι καὶ παννυχίδες θεᾶς. 1365
ἰεὺ δέ νιν ἄμασιν
ὑπέρβαλε σελάνατ
μορφᾶι μόνον ηὔχεις.
- ΕΛ. τὰ μὲν κατ' οἴκους εὐτυχοῦμεν, ὦ φίλαι·
ἢ γὰρ συνεκκλέπτουσα Πρωτέως κόρη 1370
πόσιν παρόντα τὸν ἐμὸν ἱστορουμένη
οὐκ εἶπ' ἀδελφῶι· κατθανόντα δ' ἠλίου
οὐ φησιν αὐγὰς εἰσορᾶν ἐμὴν χάριν.
κάλλιστα δὴ τήνδ' ἤρπασεν τύχην πόσις·
ἄ γὰρ καθήσειν ὄπλ' ἔμελλεν εἰς ἄλα, 1375
ταῦτ' ἐμβαλὼν πόρπακι γενναίαν χέρα
αὐτὸς κομίζει δόρυ τε δεξιᾶι λαβῶν,
ὡς τῶι θανόντι χάριτα δὴ συνεκπονῶν.
προὔργου δ' ἔς ἀλκὴν σῶμ' ὄπλοισ ἠσκήσατο,
ὡς βαρβάρων τροπαῖα μυρίων χερῖ 1380

1349 δὲ Scidler: τε L 1353 <σ'> Heinisch οὐδ' Hermann: οὐθ' L ὄσια Scaliger: ὄσια L
1354 πύρωσας Hermann: ἐπύρωσας L <γᾶς> Allan θαλάμαις Kannicht: θαλά-
μοις L 1357 θεᾶς Heath: θεοῖς L 1358 δύνатаι Musgrave: -ανται L 1360 κισσοῦ
Musgrave: -ῶ L 1362 ρόμβου Heath: -ω L 1363 κύκλιος Scaliger: -λοῖς L 1368
μορφᾶι Lonn.: μορφᾶ L 1372 ἠλίου Wecklein: ἐν χθονί L 1374 δὴ τήνδ' ἤρπασεν
τύχην Wecklein: δῆτ' ἀνήρπασεν ἐν τύχηι L

- θήσων, ὅταν κωπηῆρες ἐσβῶμεν σκάφος.
πέπλους δ' ἀμείψασ' ἀντὶ ναυφθόρου στολῆς
ἐγὼ νιν ἐξήσκησα καὶ λουτροῖς χροῖα
ἔδωκα, χρόνια νίπτρα ποταμίας δρόσου.
ἀλλ', ἐκπεραῖ γὰρ δωμάτων ὁ τοὺς ἐμοὺς
γάμους ἐτοίμους ἐν χεροῖν ἔχειν δοκῶν,
σιγητέον μοι· καὶ σέ προσπίτνω μένειν
εὖνουν κρατεῖν τε στόματος, ἦν δυνώμεθα
σωθέντες αὐτοὶ καὶ σέ συσσωσαί ποτε.
- Θε. χωρεῖτ' ἐφεξῆς, ὡς ἔταξεν ὁ ξένος,
δμῶες, φέροντες ἐνάλια κτερίσματα.
Ἐλένη, σὺ δ', ἦν σοι μὴ κακῶς δόξω λέγειν,
πεῖθου, μὲν' αὐτοῦ· ταῦτ' ἀ γὰρ παροῦσά τε
πράξεις τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν σὸν ἦν τε μὴ παρῆις.
δέδοικα γὰρ σε μὴ τις ἐμπεσῶν πόθος
πεῖσῃ μεθεῖναι σῶμ' ἐς οἶδμα πόντιον
τοῦ πρόσθεν ἄνδρὸς χάρισιν ἐκπεπληγμένην·
ἄγαν γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ παρόνθ' ὁμῶς στένεις.
- Ελ. ὦ καινὸς ἡμῖν πόσις, ἀναγκαίως ἔχει
τὰ πρῶτα λέκτρα νυμφικὰς θ' ὁμιλίας
τιμᾶν· ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ τὸ μὲν στέργειν πόσιν
καὶ ξυυθάνοιμ' ἄν· ἀλλὰ τίς κείνῳι χάρις
ξύν κατθανόντι κατθανεῖν <μ>; ἕα δέ με
αὐτὴν μολοῦσαν ἐντάφια δοῦναι νεκρῶι.
θεοὶ δέ σοί τε δοῖεν οἷ ἐγὼ θέλω
καὶ τῶι ξένῳι τῶιδ', ὅτι συνεκπονεῖ τάδε.
ἔξεις δέ μ' οἷαν χρή σ' ἔχειν ἐν δώμασιν
γυναῖκ', ἐπειδὴ Μενέλεων εὐεργετεῖς
κᾶμ' ἔρχεται γὰρ δὴ τιν' ἐς τύχην τάδε.
ὅστις δὲ δώσει ναῦν ἐν ἧι τὰδ' ἄξομεν,
πρόσταξον, ὡς ἂν τὴν χάριν πλήρη λάβω.
- Θε. χώρει σὺ καὶ ναῦν τοῖσδε πεντηκόντερον
Σιδωνίαν δὸς κἀρετμῶν ἐπιστάτας.
- Ελ. οὐκουν ὄδ' ἄρξει ναὸς ὅς κοσμεῖ τάφον;
- Θε. μάλιστ' ἀκούειν τοῦδε χρή ναύτας ἐμούς.
- Ελ. αὖθις κέλευσον, ἵνα σαφῶς μάθωσί σου.
- Θε. αὖθις κελεύω καὶ τρίτον <γ>, εἴ σοι φίλον.

1387 προσπίτνω μένειν Rauchenstein: προσποιοῦμεθα L
L 1403 <μ> Lening 1407 χρή σ' Matthisae: χρήν L

1399 καινὸς Reiske: κλεινὸς
1417 <γ> Tr²

- Ελ. ὄναιο· κάγω τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων.
 Θε. μή νυν ἄγαν σὸν δάκρυσιν ἐκτήξῃς χροῶ.
 Ελ. ἦδ' ἡμέρα σοι τὴν ἐμὴν δείξει χάριν. 1420
 Θε. τὰ τῶν θανόντων οὐδὲν ἀλλ' ἄλλως πόνος.
 Ελ. ἔστιν τι κάκεϊ κἀνθάδ' ὧν ἐγὼ λέγω.
 Θε. οὐδὲν κακίω Μενέλεώ μ' ἔξεις πόσιν.
 Ελ. οὐδὲν σὺ μεμπτός· τῆς τύχης με δεῖ μόνον.
 Θε. ἐν σοὶ τόδ', ἦν σὴν εἰς ἔμ' εὐνοίαν διδῶις. 1425
 Ελ. οὐ νῦν διδαξόμεσθα τοὺς φίλους φιλεῖν.
 Θε. βούλῃ ξυνεργῶν αὐτὸς ἐκπέμψω στόλον;
 Ελ. ἦκιστα· μή δούλευε σοῖς δούλοις, ἄναξ.
 Θε. ἀλλ' εἶα· τοὺς μὲν Πελοπιδῶν ἐὼ νόμους· 1430
 καθαρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν δώματ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐνθάδε
 ψυχὴν ἀφῆκε Μενέλεως. ἴτω δέ τις
 φράσων ὑπάρχοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς φέρειν γάμων
 ἀγάματ' οἴκους εἰς ἐμούς· πᾶσαν δὲ χρῆ
 γαῖαν βοᾷσθαι μακαρίαις ὑμνωδίαις,
 ὑμέναιος Ἑλένης κάμος ὡς ζηλωτὸς ἦι. 1435
 σὺ δ', ὦ ξέν', ἐλθὼν πελαγίους ἐς ἀγκάλας
 τῶι τῆσδε πρίν ποτ' ὄντι δούς πόσει τάδε
 πάλιν πρὸς οἴκους σπεῦδ' ἐμὴν δάμαρτ' ἔχων,
 ὡς τοὺς γάμους τοὺς τῆσδε συνδαίσας ἐμοὶ
 στέλλῃ πρὸς οἴκους ἢ μένων εὐδαιμονῆις. 1440
 Με. ὦ Ζεῦ, πατὴρ τε καὶ σοφὸς κλήιζι θεός,
 βλέψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ μετάστησον κακῶν.
 ἔλκουσι δ' ἡμῖν πρὸς λέπας τὰς συμφορὰς
 σπουδῆι σύναψαι· κἂν ἄκραι θίγηις χερί,
 ἦξομεν ἴν' ἐλθεῖν βουλόμεσθα τῆς τύχης. 1445
 ἄλις δὲ μόχθων οὖς ἐμοχθοῦμεν πάρος.
 κέκλησθέ τοι, θεοί, πόλλ' ἄχρηστ' ἐμοῦ κλύειν
 καὶ λύπρ' ὀφείλω δ' οὐκ ἀεὶ πράσσειν κακῶς,
 ὀρθῶι δὲ βῆναι ποδί· μίαν δέ μοι χάριν
 δόντες τὸ λοιπὸν εὐτυχῆ με θήσετε. 1450
- Χο. Φοίνισσα Σιδωνιάς ὦ [στρ. α
 ταχεῖα κώπα, ῥοθίοισι Νηρέως
 εἶρεσία φίλα,

1424 με δεῖ Musgrave: μέλει L 1427 βούλῃ Herwerden: -ει L 1429 εἶα Diggle: εἶα
 L 1435 ὑμέναιος... κάμος Paley: -ον... -όν L 1443 λέπας Musgrave: λύπας L 1447
 τοι Musgrave: μοι L πόλλ' ἄχρηστ' Musgrave: πολλά χρηστ' L 1452 Νηρέως Badham:
 μή(τη)ρ L

χοραγὲ τῶν καλλιχόρων
 δελφίνων, ὅταν αὐ-

ῤῥᾶν πέλαγος ἀνήνεμον ἦι,
 γλαυκὰ δὲ Πόντου θυγάτηρ
 Γαλάνεια τάδ' εἶπηι·

Κατὰ μὲν ἰστία πετάσατ', αὐ-
 ρας λιπόντες εἰναλίας,

λάβετε δ' εἰλατίνας πλάτας,
 ὧ ναῦται ναῦται,
 πέμποντες εὐλιμένους

Περσείων οἴκων Ἐλέναν ἐπ' ἄκτάς.

ἧ που κόρας ἄν ποταμοῦ
 παρ' οἶδμα Λευκιππίδας ἧ πρὸ ναοῦ

Παλλάδος ἄν λάβοι,
 χρόνῳ ξυνελθοῦσα χοροῖς

ἧ κώμοις Ὑακίν-
 θου νύχιον ἐς εὐφροσύναν,

ὄν ἑξαμιλλασάμενος
 τροχὸν ἀτέρμονα δίσκου

ἔκανε Φοῖβος, τᾶι <δὲ> Λακαί-
 ναι γᾶι βούθυτον ἀμέραν

ὁ Διὸς εἶπε σέβειν γόνος·
 μόσχον θ' ἄν ἴλιποιτ' οἴκοις†

< x-x-...->
 ἄς οὔπω πεῦκαι πρὸ γάμων ἔλαμψαν.

δι' αἰθέρος εἶθε ποτανοὶ

γενοίμεθ' ὅπαι Λιβύας
 οἰωνοὶ στολάδες

ὄμβρον χειμέριον λιποῦ-
 σαι νίσονται πρεσβυτάτου

σύριγγι πειθόμεναι
 ποιμένος, ἄβροχά θ' ὄς

πεδία καρποφόρα τε γᾶς

1455 αὐρᾶν Blaydes: -αις L 1456 ἀνήνεμον Murray: νήν- L 1459-60 αὐρας . . . εἰναλίας
 Diggle: αὐραις . . . ἐναλίαις L 1467 λάβοι Pflugk: -οις L 1470 εὐφροσύναν Matthiae:
 -φρόναν L 1471 ἑξαμιλλασάμενος Diggle: -ήσαμενος L 1472 τροχὸν ἀτέρμονα Willink:
 τροχῶι τέρμονι L 1473 <δὲ> Wilamowitz 1475 Διὸς Heath: Δ- δ' L 1476b lacuna
 proposed by Heath 1477 πρὸ Canter: πρὸς L 1478 αἰθέρος J. H. H. Schmidt: ἀέρος
 L εἶθε Barnes: εἶ L 1479 γενοίμεθ' ὅπαι Pearson: -μεθα L Λιβύας Hapting: Λίβυες
 L 1481 ὄμβρον χειμέριον λιποῦσαι Hermann: ὄ- λ- χ- L 1482 πρεσβυτάτου Paley:
 -τάται L 1484 ἄβροχά θ' ὄς Murray: ὄς ἄβροχα L

ἐπιπετόμενος Ιαχεΐ.
 ὦ πταναι δολιχαύχενες,
 σύννομοι νεφέων δρόμου,
 βᾶτε Πλειάδας ὑπὸ μέσας
 Ὕρίωνά τ' ἐννύχιον, 1490
 καρύξαστ' ἀγγελίαν
 Εὐρώταν ἐφεζόμεναι,
 Μενέλεως ὅτι Δαρδάνου
 πόλιν ἐλὼν δόμον ἤξει.

μόλοιτέ ποθ' ἵππιον οἶμον [άντ. β
 δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι, 1496

παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι,
 λαμπρῶν ἀστέρων ὑπ' ἀέλ-
 λαις οἷ ναίετ' οὐράνιοι,
 σωτῆρε τᾶς Ἑλένας, 1500

γλαυκὸν ἐπ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον
 κυανόχροά τε κυμάτων
 ῥόθια πολιὰ θαλάσσης,
 ναύταις εὐαεῖς ἀνέμων
 πέμποντες Διόθεν πνοάς, 1505

δύσκληϊαν δ' ἀπὸ συγγόνου
 βάλετε βαρβάρων λεχέων,
 ἄν Ἰδαιᾶν ἐρίδων
 ποιναθεῖσ' ἐκτήσατο, γᾶν
 οὐκ ἐλθοῦσά ποτ' Ἰλίου 1510
 Φοιβείους ἐπὶ πύργους.

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

ῥᾶναξ, τὰ κάκιστ' ἐν δόμοις εὐρήκαμεν· †
 ὡς καὶν' ἀκούσῃ πῆματ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ τάχα.

Θε. τί δ' ἔστιν; Αγ. ἄλλης ἐκπύνει μνηστεύματα
 γυναικός· Ἑλένη γὰρ βέβηκ' ἔξω χθονός. 1515

Θε. πτεροῖσιν ἀρθεῖσ' ἢ πεδοστιβεῖ ποδί;

1487 ὦ πταναι Canter: ὁπότεν αι L 1489 Πλειάδας Stephanus: πελειάδες L 1492
 Εὐρώταν Victorijs: -παν L 1495 οἶμον Blaydes: οἶμα L 1500 σωτῆρε Musgrave:
 -ες L 1508 ἄδαιᾶν Diggle: Ἰδαίων L 1509 ποιναθεῖσ' Hermann: πονηθεῖσ' L γᾶν
 Musgrave: τάν L 1510 ἐλθοῦσά ποτ' Bothe: -σαν ἐς L 1512 del. Dindorf

- Αγ. Μενέλαος αὐτὴν ἐκπεπόρθμευται χθονός,
 δς αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ἤλθεν ἀγγέλλων θανεῖν.
- Θε. ὦ δεινὰ λέξας· τίς δέ νιν ναυκληρία
 ἐκ τῆσδ' ἀπῆρε χθονός; ἄπιστα γὰρ λέγεις. 1520
- Αγ. ἦν γε ξένωι δίδως σύ· τοὺς δέ σοὺς ἔχων
 ναύτας βέβηκεν, ὡς ἂν ἐν βραχεῖ μάθης.
- Θε. πῶς; εἰδέναι πρόθυμος· οὐ γὰρ ἐλπίδων
 ἔσω βέβηκε μίαν ὑπερδραμεῖν χέρα
 τοσοῦσδε ναύτας ὧν ἀπεστάλης μέτα. 1525
- Αγ. ἐπεὶ λιποῦσα τοῦσδε βασιλείους δόμους
 ἢ τοῦ Διὸς παῖς πρὸς θάλασσαν ἐστάλη,
 σοφώταθ' ἀβρὸν πόδα τιθεῖσ' ἀνέστενευ
 πόσιν πέλας παρόντα κού τεθηκότα.
 ὡς δ' ἤλθομεν σῶν περίβολον νεωρίων,
 Σιδωνίαν ναῦν πρωτόπλουν καθείλκομεν
 ζυγῶν τε πεντήκοντα κάρετμῶν μέτρα
 ἔχουσαν. ἔργου δ' ἔργον ἐξημείβετο·
 ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἰστόν, ὁ δὲ πλάτην καθίστατο
 †ταρσόν τε χειρὶ † λευκά θ' ἰστί † εἶς ἐν ἦν†
 †πηδάλιά τε ζεύγλαισι παρακαθίετο. 1535
- κάν τῶιδε μόχθωι, τοῦτ' ἄρα σκοπούμενοι,
 Ἔλληνες ἄνδρες Μενέλεωι ξυνέμποροι
 προσῆλθον ἀκτὰς ναυφθόροις ἠσθημένοι
 πέπλοισιν, εὐειδεῖς μὲν, αὐχμηροὶ δ' ὄρᾶν. 1540
- ἰδῶν δέ νιν παρόντας Ἄτρεως γόνος
 προσεῖπε δόλιον οἶκτον ἐς μέσον φέρων·
 ὦ τλήμονες, πῶς ἐκ τίνος νεῶς ποτε
 Ἀχαιίδος θραύσαντες ἤκετε σκάφος;
 ἀλλ' Ἄτρεως παιῖδ' ὀλόμενον συνθάπτετε,
 δν Τυνδαρίς παιῖς ἦδ' ἀπόντα κενοταφεῖ.
 οἱ δ' ἐκβαλόντες δάκρυα ποιητῶι τρόπωι
 ἐς ναῦν ἐχώρουν Μενέλεωι ποντίσματα
 φέροντες. ἡμῖν δ' ἦν μὲν ἦδ' ὑποψία
 λόγος τ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισι, τῶν ἐπεσβατῶν
 ὡς πληθὸς εἶη· διεσιωπῶμεν δ' ὅμως
 τοὺς σοὺς λόγους σώιζοντες· ἄρχειν γὰρ νεῶς 1550

1521 δὲ Kirchhoff: τε L

1524 βέβηκε Murray: -κα L

1534 καθίστατο apogr. Par.: -ίστατο

L 1539 ἀκτὰς Heiland: -αῖς L ἠσκημένοι Porson

1545 ἀλλ' Zuniz: ἄρ' L 1546

ἀπόντα Brodacus: ἄκ- L

1550 τ' L. Dindorf: δ' L

ξένον κελεύσας πάντα συνέχεας τάδε.
 καὶ τᾶλλα μὲν δὴ ῥαϊδίως ἔσω νεὼς
 ἐθέμεθα κουφίζοντα· ταύρειος δὲ πούς 1555
 οὐκ ἤθελ' ὀρθὸς σανίδα προσβῆναι κάτα,
 ἀλλ' ἔξεβρυχᾶτ' ὄμμ' ἀναστρέφων κύκλωι,
 κυρτῶν τε νῶτα κὰς κέρας παρεμβλέπων
 μὴ θιγγάνειν ἀπειργεν. ὁ δ' Ἑλένης πόσις
 ἐκάλεσεν· ἴω πέρσαντες Ἰλίου πόλιν, 1560
 οὐχ εἴ' ἀναρπάσαντες Ἑλλήνων νόμωι
 νεανίαις ὤμοισι ταύρειον δέμας
 ἐς πρῶιραν ἐμβαλεῖτε (φάσγανόν δ' ἄμα
 πρόχειρον αἶρει) σφάγια τῶι τεθνηκότι;
 οἱ δ' ἐς κέλευσμ' ἐλθόντες ἐξανήρπασαν 1565
 ταῦρον φέροντές τ' εἰσέθεντο σέλματα.
 μονάμπυκος δὲ Μενέλεως ψήχων δέρην
 μέτωπά τ' ἐξέπεισεν ἐσβῆναι δόρυ.
 τέλος δ', ἐπειδὴ ναῦς τὰ πάντ' ἐδέξατο,
 πλήσασα κλιμακτῆρας εὐσφύρωι ποδι 1570
 Ἑλένη καθέζετ' ἐν μέσοις ἐδωλίοις
 ὃ τ' οὐκέτ' ὦν λόγοισι Μενέλεως πέλας·
 ἄλλοι δὲ τοίχους δεξιούς λαιούς τ' ἴσοι
 ἀνὴρ παρ' ἀνδρ' ἔζονθ', ὑφ' εἵμασι ξίφη
 λαθραῖ' ἔχοντες, ρόθιά τ' ἐξεπίμπλατο 1575
 βοῆς, κελευστοῦ φθέγμαθ' ὡς ἠκούσαμεν.
 ἐπεὶ δὲ γαίας ἤμεν οὔτ' ἄγαν πρόσσω
 οὔτ' ἐγγύς, οὔτως ἦρετ' οἰάκων φύλαξ·
 ἔτ', ὦ ξέν', ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν – ἦ καλῶς ἔχει; –
 πλεύσωμεν; ἀρχαὶ γὰρ νεὼς μέλουσι σοί. 1580
 ὁ δ' εἶφ' Ἄλις μοι. δεξιᾶι δ' ἐλών ξίφος
 ἐς πρῶιραν εἶρπε κάπτι ταυρείωι σφαγῆι
 σταθεῖς νεκρῶν μὲν οὐδενὸς μνήμην ἔχων,
 τέμνων δὲ λαιμὸν ἠύχετ'· ἴω ναίων ἄλα
 πόντιε Πόσειδον Νηρέως θ' ἀγναὶ κόραι, 1585
 σῶσατέ μ' ἐπ' ἀκτὰς Ναυπλίας δάμαρτά τε

1554 τᾶλλα Canter: ταῦτα L 1561 οὐχ εἴ Diggle: οὐκ εἴ L 1563 δ Diggle: θ L 1564
 αἶρει Hartung: ὡσει L 1566 ἴ Aldina: δ' L 1567 μονάμπυκος Schenkl: -ον L 1570
 εὐσφύρωι ποδι Barnes: -ου ποδός L 1575 ρόθιά Scaliger: ὀρθριά L 1576 κελευστοῦ
 Picson: κελεύθου L 1580 σοί Elmsley: μοι L 1584 λαιμὸν Stephanus: δαίμον' L

- ἄσυλον ἐκ γῆς. αἵματος δ' ἄπορροαί
 ἐς οἶδμ' ἐσηκόντιζον οὔριαι ξένωι.
 καί τις τόδ' εἶπε· Δόλιος ἤ ναυκληρία·
 πάλιν πλέωμεν· ἀντίαν κέλευε σύ, 1590
 σύ δὲ στρέφ' οἶακ'. ἐκ δὲ ταυρείου φόνου
 Ἄτρεως σταθεὶς παῖς ἀνεβόησε συμμάχους·
 Τί μέλλετ', ὦ γῆς Ἑλλάδος λωτίσματα,
 σφάζειν φονεύειν βαρβάρους νεώς τ' ἄπο
 ρίπτειν ἐς οἶδμα; ναυβάταις δὲ τοῖσι σοῖς 1595
 βοᾷ κελευστής τὴν ἐναντίαν ὄπα·
 Οὐχ εἴ' ὁ μὲν τις λοῖσθον ἀρεῖται δόρυ,
 ὁ δὲ ζύγ' ἄξας, ὁ δ' ἀφελῶν σκαλοῦ πλάτην
 καθαιματώσει κρᾶτα πολεμίων ξένων;
 ὀρθοὶ δ' ἀνήϊξαν πάντες, οἱ μὲν ἐν χεροῖν 1600
 κορμούς ἔχοντες ναυτικούς, οἱ δὲ ξίφη·
 φόνωι δὲ ναῦς ἐρρεῖτο. παρακέλευσμα δ' ἦν
 πρῦμνηθεν Ἑλένης· Ποῦ τὸ Τρωϊκὸν κλέος;
 δείξατε πρὸς ἄνδρας βαρβάρους. σπουδῆς δ' ὕπο
 ἔπιπτον, οἱ δ' ὠρθοῦντο, τοὺς δὲ κειμένους 1605
 νεκροὺς ἂν εἶδες. Μενέλεως δ' ἔχων ὄπλα,
 ὄπηι νοσοῖεν ζύμμαχοι κατασκοπῶν,
 ταύτηι προσῆγε χειρὶ δεξιᾷ ξίφος,
 ὥστ' ἐκκολυμβᾶν ναός, ἠρήμωσε δὲ
 σῶν ναυβατῶν ἐρέτμ' ἐπ' οἰάκων δὲ βὰς 1610
 ἀνακτ' ἐς Ἑλλάδ' εἶπεν εὐθύνειν δόρυ.
 οἱ δ' ἴστων ἦραν, οὔριαι δ' ἤκον πνοαί·
 βεβᾶσι δ' ἐκ γῆς. διαφυγῶν δ' ἐγὼ φόνον
 καθῆκ' ἑμαυτὸν εἰς ἄλ' ἄγκυραν πάρα·
 ἦδη δὲ κάμνονθ' ὀρμιατόνων μέ τις 1615
 ἀνείλετ', ἐς δὲ γαῖαν ἐξέβησέ σοι
 τάδ' ἀγγελοῦντα. σῶφρονος δ' ἀπιστίας
 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν χρησιμώτερον βροτοῖς.
 Χο. οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἠὔχουν οὔτε σ' οὔθ' ἡμᾶς λαθεῖν
 Μενέλαον, ὦναξ, ὡς ἐλάνθανεν παρών. 1620
 Θε. ὦ γυναικείαις τέχναισιν αἰρεθεὶς ἐγὼ τάλας·
 ἐκπεφύγασιν γάμοι με. κεῖ μὲν ἦν ἀλώσιμος

1588 οὔριαι Reiske: -ια L 1590 ἀντίαν Badham: ἀξίαν L 1597 ἀρεῖται Elmsley: αἰρεῖται
 L 1607 ὄπηι Elmsley: ὄποι L 1611 ἀνακτ' Emperius: ἀναξ L 1612 ἦραν Diggle:
 ἦιρον L

- ναῦς διώγμασιν, πονήσας εἶλον ἄν τάχα ξένους·
 νῦν δὲ τήν προδοῦσαν ἡμᾶς τεισόμεσθα σύγγονον,
 ἦτις ἐν δόμοις ὀρώσα Μενέλεων οὐκ εἶπέ μοι. 1625
 τοιγὰρ οὐποτ' ἄλλον ἄνδρα ψεύσεται μαντεύμασιν.
 Χο. οὔτος, ὦ, ποῖ σὸν πόδ' αἶρεις, δέσποτ', ἐς ποῖον φόνου;
 Θε. οἴπερ ἡ δίκη κελεύει μ' ἀλλ' ἀφίστασ' ἐκποδῶν.
 Χο. οὐκ ἀφήσομαι πέπλων σῶν· μεγάλα <γάρ> σπεύδεις κακά.
 Θε. ἀλλὰ δεσποτῶν κρατήσεις δοῦλος ὦν; Χο. φρονῶ
 γὰρ εὔ. 1630
 Θε. οὐκ ἔμοιγ', εἰ μὴ μ' ἐάσεις . . . Χο. οὐ μὲν οὖν σ'
 ἐάσομεν.
 Θε. σύγγονον κτανεῖν κακίστην . . . Χο. εὐσεβεστάτην
 μὲν οὖν.
 Θε. ἦ με προύδωκεν . . . Χο. καλήν γε προδοσίαν, δίκαια
 δρᾶν.
 Θε. τὰμὰ λέκτρ' ἄλλωι διδοῦσα. Χο. τοῖς γε κυριωτέροις.
 Θε. κύριος δὲ τῶν ἐμῶν τίς; Χο. ὅς ἔλαβεν πατρός πάρα. 1635
 Θε. ἀλλ' ἔδωκεν ἡ τύχη μοι. Χο. τὸ δὲ χρεῶν ἀφείλετο.
 Θε. οὐ σὲ τὰμὰ χρή δικάζειν. Χο. ἦν γε βελτίω λέγω.
 Θε. ἀρχόμεσθ' ἄρ', οὐ κρατοῦμεν. Χο. ὅσια δρᾶν, τὰ δ'
 ἔκδικ' οὔ.
 Θε. κατθανεῖν ἐρᾶν ἔοικας. Χο. κτεῖνε· σύγγονον δὲ σὴν
 οὐ κτενεῖς ἡμῶν ἐκόντων ἀλλ' ἔμ' ὡς πρό δεσποτῶν 1640
 τοῖσι γενναίοισι δούλοις εὐκλεέστατον θανεῖν.

ΚΑΣΤΩΡ

ἐπίσχεσ ὀργὰς αἴσιν οὐκ ὀρθῶς φέρηι,
 Θεοκλύμενε, γαίας τῆσδ' ἄναξ· δισσοὶ δέ σε
 Διόσκοροι καλοῦμεν, οὐς Λήδα ποτὲ
 ἔτικτεν Ἐλένην θ', ἣ πέφευγε σοὺς δόμους. 1645
 οὐ γὰρ πεπρωμένοισιν ὀργίζηι γάμοις,
 οὐδ' ἡ θεᾶς Νηρηίδος ἔκγονος κόρη
 ἀδικεῖ σ' ἀδελφῆ Θεονόη, τὰ τῶν θεῶν
 τιμῶσα πατρός τ' ἐνδίκους ἐπιστολάς.

1627ⁿ Χορός L Θεράπων Clark 1627 ὦ ποῖ Tr²: ὅποι L 1628 ἀφίστασ' Milton: -
 σθ L 1629 <γάρ> Tr² 1638 τὰ δ' ἐκδικ' οὔ Porson: τάνδ' ἐκδικῶ L 1640 ἐμ' ὡς
 Porson: ἐμέ L 1642η Κάστωρ Bothe: Διόσκοροι L 1643 γαίας τῆσδ' Nauck: γῆς τῆσδ'
 L 1647 ἔκγονος Matthiae: -γόνη L

- εἰς μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ τὸν παρόντα νῦν χρόνον 1650
 κείνην κατοικεῖν σοῖσιν ἐν δόμοις ἐχρῆν·
 ἐπεὶ δὲ Τροίας ἐξανεστάθη βάρβα
 καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς παρέσχε τοῦνομ', οὐκέτι·
 ἐν τοῖσι δ' αὐτοῖς δεῖ νιν ἐζεῦχθαι γάμοις
 ἐλθεῖν τ' ἐς οἴκους καὶ συνοικῆσαι πόσει. 1655
 ἀλλ' ἴσχε μὲν σῆς συγγόνου μέλαν ξίφος,
 νόμιζε δ' αὐτὴν σωφρόνως πράσσειν τάδε.
 πάλαι δ' ἀδελφὴν κἄν πρὶν ἐξεσώσαμεν,
 ἐπεὶπερ ἡμᾶς Ζεὺς ἐποίησεν θεούς·
 ἀλλ' ἦσσον' ἡμεν τοῦ πεπρωμένου θ' ἅμα 1660
 καὶ τῶν θεῶν, οἷς ταῦτ' ἔδοξεν ὧδ' ἔχειν.
 σοὶ μὲν τὰδ' αὐδῶ, συγγόνωι δ' ἐμῆι λέγω·
 πλεῖ ξὺν πόσει σῶι· πνεῦμα δ' ἔξετ' οὐριον·
 σωτῆρε δ' ἡμεῖς σὼ κασιγνήτῳ διπλῶ
 πόντον παριππεύοντε πέμψομεν πάτραν. 1665
 ὅταν δὲ κάμψῃς καὶ τελευτήσῃς βίον,
 θεὸς κεκλήσῃ [καὶ Διοσκόρων μέτα
 σπονδῶν μεθέξεις] ξενιά τ' ἀνθρώπων πάρα
 ἔξεις μεθ' ἡμῶν· Ζεὺς γὰρ ὧδε βούλεται.
 οὐ δ' ὠρμισέν σε πρῶτα Μαιάδος τόκος 1670
 Σπάρτης ἀπάρας τὸν κατ' οὐρανὸν δρόμον,
 κλέψας δέμας σὸν μὴ Πάρις γήμειέ σε,
 φρουρὸν παρ' Ἀκτὴν τεταμένην νῆσον λέγω,
 Ἑλένη τὸ λοιπὸν ἐν βροτοῖς κεκλήσεται,
 ἐπεὶ κλοπᾶς <σᾶς> ἐκ δόμων ἐδέξατο. 1675
 καὶ τῶι πλανήτῃ Μενέλεωι θεῶν πάρα
 μακάρων κατοικεῖν νῆσόν ἐστι μόρσιμον·
 τοὺς εὐγενεῖς γὰρ οὐ στυγοῦσι δαίμονες,
 τῶν δ' ἀναριθμήτων μᾶλλον ῥείσιν οἱ πόνοι†.
 Θε. ὦ παιῖδε Λήδας καὶ Διός, τὰ μὲν πάρος 1680
 νείκη μεθήσω σφῶιν κασιγνήτης πέρι·
 κείνη δ' ἴτω πρὸς οἶκον, εἰ θεοῖς δοκεῖ, 1683

1650-5 del. Willink 1650 εἰς . . . alcl Stephanus: εἰ . . . αἰεὶ L 1654 τοῖσι δ Bothe:
 τοῖσιν L 1655 τ' Hermann: δ' L 1656 ἴσχε Tr²: ἔσχε L 1658 κἄν πρὶν Heath:
 πρὶν γ L 1660 ἦσσον Pierson: -ves L 1663 πλεῖ Cobet: πλεῖν L 1667b-8a del.
 F. W. Schmidt 1670 ὠρμισέν Rauchenstein: ὠρμισέν L 1671 δρόμον Wilamowitz: δόμων
 L 1673 φρουρὸν Hermann: -οῦ L τεταμένην Reiske: τεταγμένη L 1675 <σᾶς>
 Tr²: κλοπαῖαν σ Henverden 1679 del. Hapung 1681 σφῶιν Diggle: σφῶν L 1682-
 3 transposed by A. Y. Campbell

ἐγὼ δ' ἀδελφὴν οὐκέτ' ἄν κτάνοιμ' ἐμήν. 1682
 ἴστον δ' ἀρίστης σωφρονεστάτης θ' ἅμα
 γεγῶτ' ἀδελφῆς ὁμογενοῦς ἀφ' αἵματος. 1685
 καὶ χαίρεθ' Ἑλένης οὐνεκ' εὐγενεστάτης
 γνώμης, ὃ πολλαῖς ἐν γυναιξίν οὐκ ἔνι.

Χο. πολλαὶ μορφαὶ τῶν δαιμονίων,
 πολλὰ δ' ἀέλπτως κραίνουσι θεοί·
 καὶ τὰ δοκηθέντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθη,
 τῶν δ' ἀδοκῆτων πόρον ἤϊρε θεός.
 τοιόνδ' ἀπέβη τόδε πρᾶγμα. 1690

1685 ὁμογενοῦς Canter; μονογ- L. 1688-92 del. Hartung

COMMENTARY

Hypothesis. The dramatic hypotheses ('prefaces' or 'plot summaries') which are preserved in the surviving medieval manuscripts and ancient papyri fall into three general categories (Zuntz (1955a) 129–52; cf. also van Rossum-Steenbeek (1998) 1–39; for the papyri, see Haslam (1975) 150–6, Diggle (2005)).

The first and most valuable are those derived from the Alexandrian edition of Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 192–6, Mastronarde (1994) 168 n. 2). Although only fragments of these survive (occasionally combined with the two other types of hypothesis), we have enough material to be able to piece together the scope and typical features of Aristophanes' introductory notes (for Eur., cf. *Alc.*, *Med.*, *Hipp.*, *Andr.*, *Hec.*, *Phoen.*, *Or.*, *Bacch.*, *Rhes.*). They combine basic points of scenography (e.g. where the play is set, the identity of the chorus and prologue speaker) with more scholarly information regarding such topics as the treatment of the myth by the other two tragedians, the date of the play, the titles of companion plays, and the results of the contest (*Alc.* second prize, *Med.* third prize, *Hipp.* first prize, *Phoen.* second prize).

The second type of hypothesis is uniquely Euripidean, stemming from a collection of Euripidean plot summaries, arranged alphabetically by the first letter of the title, which was composed in the first or second century AD. To gain scholarly respectability, the collection was ascribed to Aristotle's fourth-century BC pupil Dicaearchus of Messene. These *Tales from Euripides* (as Zuntz (1955a) 135 called them) were, however, written for a popular audience, and their narratives were intended to be simple summaries of the plot. As Rusten (1982) 358 observes, '[they] contained no critical comments or didascalic information; they were thus designed for readers who wished to be familiar with Euripidean plots without reading the plays themselves, and belonged not to scholarship but to mythography.' The third category of hypothesis comprises 'the elaborations of Byzantine grammarians' (Zuntz (1955a) 131), prefaces to the plays which were intended for use in schools.

The hypothesis to *Helen* combines categories two and three (as outlined above). Its first section (1–9 Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορεῖ . . . τὸ εἶδωλον δὲ αὐτῆς) alludes briefly to different versions of H.'s time in Egypt, highlighting the difference made by Eur.'s use of the phantom. For whereas Homer's H. acquired her soothing drugs of forgetfulness in Egypt on the way back from Troy (*Od.* 4.227–30; cf. *Hdt.* 2.116.4), Eur.'s H. never went to Troy at all. Both the style of the passage and its proud display of mythical variants point to Byzantine authorship: cf. Zuntz (1955a) 133–4, (1965) 143. (However, its implication that Herodotus followed Homer in his account of H.'s time in Egypt (οἱ μὲν γὰρ πλανωμένην φασίν) is incorrect: *Introd.* p. 23.) The second part (9–17 κλέπας γὰρ αὐτήν . . . διασώζονται) consists of a short but accurate summary of the plot, in the manner of the *Tales from Euripides*. The hypothesis is preserved in the early fourteenth-century manuscript known as P (a copy of L in the case of the 'alphabetic'

plays: Introd. p. 84), but not in L itself. It is likely that the person who inserted the hypothesis in P also composed it, writing the first part himself.

Dramatis personae. The characters are listed in order of appearance. M.'s slave is misleadingly designated Ἄγγελος because of his role as a reporter of offstage events (597–624n.). Of the Dioscuri only Castor speaks, Polydeuces being a κωφὸν πρόσωπον. The date and authorship of such cast lists are unknown, but they may go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. Barrett (1964) 153–4).

1–163 PROLOGUE

The scene. Before the palace of Theoclymenus in Egypt. In front of the *skéné* (stage-building) at the centre of the *orkhēstra* stands the tomb of Theoc.'s father Proteus, where Helen sits as a suppliant (64–5, 543–4, 556, 797–801). It is seventeen years since H. was separated from Menelaus and brought to Egypt (111–14, 775–6).

The opening scene is divided into two parts, H.'s monologue (1–67) and her dialogue with the Greek warrior Teucer (68–163). A similar sequence of prologue-style speech followed by dialogue is used to introduce the predicament of M.: see 386–434, 435–82nn. Although an opening monologue is used by Aesch. (*Ag.*, *Eum.*; cf. West (1990b) 7–8) and once by Soph. (*Trach.*), the sequence of introductory speech plus dialogue is characteristic of Eur., occurring in twelve of his seventeen extant tragedies (see Schmidt (1971) 34–44; and Leo (1908) 63 for the form's influence on later drama, especially Roman comedy). Here the sequence of monologue and dialogue creates a powerful contrast between H.'s exposition of her innocence and Teucer's disgusted response to seeing her 'double' (71–7, 160–3). The introductory section thus articulates one of the central themes of the play, the gap between reality and appearance, particularly as this applies to H.'s conduct and character: cf. 35–6, 42–3, 53–5, 66–7, 72–7, 117–22, 137–42, 158–63, Introd. §6(a).

1–67 *Helen's monologue*

With the exception of the disputed prologue of *Al*, all the surviving plays of Eur. begin with a monologue in iambic trimeters. By contrast, the lost *Andromeda*, *Hel.*'s companion play, began with an anapaestic monody, indicating not only Eur.'s willingness to experiment with new forms, but also the influence of the new musical styles on his theatrical technique (see Introd. §5(c)). Yet both the opening monody of *Andromeda* and the prologue-monologues of the other plays serve the same dramatic purpose: to set the scene and to inform the audience of the central characters and their situation.

The structural uniformity of the extant openings is undeniable (Eur.'s prologue technique is parodied by Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1177–1250; and this prologue specifically at *Thesm.* 855–68), yet these speeches are much more than bare factual summaries of 'the story so far', for their portrayal of character and motivation serves to guide the audience's response to later events. This is particularly true when, as here, the prologue-speaker is also one of the major characters of the drama (cf. *Held.*, *Andr.*, *Her.*,

IT, Phoen., Or., Bacch.). Moreover, H.'s monologue is especially arresting in its emotional effect since the audience is confronted with a surprisingly chaste and innocent heroine. H.'s unconventional presentation as a blameless victim of divine will is central to the development and meaning of the play, and her opening speech is structured so that the details of her novel identity and situation clearly emerge: 1–15 Egypt and its royal family; 16–30 H.'s origins and her unwilling role in the Judgement of Paris; 31–43 the phantom H. and the Trojan War; 44–55 H.'s removal to Egypt and the unjustified destruction of her reputation; 56–67 the importance of H.'s continuing chastity (made clear by a prophecy of Hermes) and the threat posed by Theoc.'s desire to marry her.

In chronological terms the narrative moves from the past (the genealogy of Theoc.'s family, the origins of the Trojan War) to the dramatic present (H.'s supplication at the tomb of Proteus, 64–5). The broad canvas (both geographical and temporal) of H.'s monologue is carefully organized so as to illuminate several important themes: the power of prophecy (13–15, 56–9; cf. 317–21, 744–57, 919–23); divine selfishness and apparent indifference to human suffering (20–1, 23–6, 31, 36–40; cf. 676–8, 884–6, 1446–8); the dangers of female beauty (23, 26, 27; cf. 260–3, 383–5); the fallibility of the senses (19, 33–6, 42–3, 54–5, 66–7; cf. 575–93); the waste and apparent futility of the Trojan War (52–5; cf. 362–74, 608–11, 1122–36, 1151–64); and the virtue or viciousness of barbarians (46–7, 60–3; cf. 940–3, 1000–4, 1627–41, 1657).

1–3 H. begins by making clear the action's Egyptian setting, unique in extant tragedy. For the conventional 'This is the city/palace/island of . . .' used to set the scene, see Griffith on [Aesch.] *PV* 2, Scodel (1980) 22, Kuntz (1993) 18, 20. The play's opening words conjure up an exotic and intriguing location. In the prologue of *IT* the audience does not learn of the setting, the barbarian and mythically unconventional land of the Taurians, until line 30, intensifying the surprise. Here, by contrast, the audience is told immediately of the setting, but the identity of the speaker is delayed (16), prompting the audience's curiosity as to how H. came to Egypt and why she is seeking asylum at the tomb of Proteus.

Νείλου . . . ποταί: communities are commonly identified by their local river or spring (cf. Dionysus at Thebes, πάρειμι Δίρκης νόμαθ' Ἰσμηνοῦ θ' ὕδωρ, *Bacch.* 5). The Nile is called Αἴγυπτος in Homer (*Od.* 4.477, 581, 14.258). Writing in the late sixth to early fifth centuries, the Greek mythographer and ethnographer Hecataeus describes Egypt itself as a 'gift of the Nile' (*JGrHist* 1 F 310); so too Herodotus (2.5.1).

καλλιπάρθενοι 'with beautiful maidens/nymphs' or (with reference to the purity of the waters) 'lovely virgin [streams]'. A rare adjective, perhaps a Eur. coinage, which occurs elsewhere only at *LI* 1574 (αἷμα καλλιπαρθένου δέρης, 'blood from the neck of a beautiful maiden'), in a passage that is probably not Euripidean. Like a Greek river (e.g. the Boeotian Asopus at *Her.* 785–8), the Nile may be pictured with its own entourage of nymphs, guardians of its tributary waters (on the iconography of Greek river-gods, see Weiss (1984)); for the Nile's 'hundred mouths', cf. *Bacch.* 406–8. Though a rare word, καλλιπάρθενος is entirely apposite here, since both beauty and virginity will be important themes of the play, as H.'s sexual allure and quasi-parthenaic status (cf. 68–70, 184–90nn.) not only make her vulnerable to the desires of Theoc. (63n.),

but also stress the importance of H.'s return to Greece and the resumption of married life there with her husband (e.g. 244–9, 1349, 1355–711n.).

ἀντὶ . . . ψακάδος 'instead of rain'. The Nile's annual inundation of the surrounding countryside, despite low rainfall, puzzled Greeks from the earliest times. H.'s explanation (melting snow swelling the river in summerime) is found already in Aesch. *Supp.* 559 (cf. Aesch. fr. 300.3–5 R, Soph. fr. 882 R). This notion is rejected, along with other accounts of the Nile's flooding, by Hdt. 2.20–4, who argues that there is no snow in Libya or Ethiopia to feed the Nile's source (2.22). Hdt.'s reasoning is sustained and impressive (cf. Thomas (2000) 182–5), yet the actual cause, massive rainfall in the Ethiopian highlands, eluded even him. (And despite Hdt.'s criticisms, the popularity of the melting-snow theory led to its interpolation in the prologue of Eur. *Archelaus* fr. 228.3–5 K: cf. Harder (1985) 182, Egli (2003) 74–5.) For another fifth-century hypothesis, Diogenes of Apollonia's theory of evaporation and displacement, see Dover on Ar. *Clouds* 272.

δαίς: the adj. δῖος 'of heaven' is often used in epic in the extended sense 'noble, illustrious', but occurs first in tragedy in the sense 'of Zeus', whether 'born of Zeus' (e.g. *IT* 404, *Ion* 200) or, as here, 'sent from Zeus' (cf. Bergson (1956) 114–15).

πέδον . . . γύας: both objects are governed by ὑγαίνει in a part-and-whole relationship (καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος: cf. K-G 1.289–90, Bond on *Her.* 162) which defines more precisely the area of the Egyptian plain that is afflicted: '(the Nile which) waters the plain of Egypt, (namely) its fields'. Some editors replace the second acc. γύας with Heiland's δρόσωι ('waters with moisture'), but the double acc. is supported by Aristophanes' parody of the passage at *Thesm.* 855–7, which uses the same construction (cf. Austin and Olson (2004) ad loc.).

λευκῆς . . . χιόνος: gen. absolute. Snow was (and remains) sufficiently exotic in (parts of) Greece to excite wonder; see Dodds on *Bacch.* 661–2.

τακέσης: aor. pass. part. (gen. fem. sg.) τήκω 'I melt'.

4–15 *The family of Proteus*. Prologue-speakers often begin by identifying themselves and their ancestors (e.g. *Hec.* 3–4, *Supp.* 3–7). By contrast, H. delays her own introduction (16–22) and outlines the history of Egypt's ruling family. The unusual sequence is influenced by the novel situation: contrary to previous versions of the myth, Proteus is no longer alive to protect H., and the figures of Theoc. and Theonoe have probably been invented by Eur., albeit by adapting features of the Homeric tale of Proteus and his daughter Eidothea: see *Introd.* §4(c).

4 In the *Odyssey* Proteus is the 'infallible old man of the sea' (γέρων ἄλιος νημερτής, 4.349, 384), a shape-shifting immortal who is forced by M. to reveal his prophetic knowledge (cf. Virg. *Georg.* 4.387–529). Here, as in Hdt. (2.112–20), Proteus is a morally upright Egyptian king, but Eur. differs from Hdt. in having Proteus die before H. is reclaimed by M. Nevertheless, H.'s supplication at Proteus' tomb, and frequent reference to the dead king (46, 61, 64, 152, 460, 542, 787, 1165–6, 1370), ensure that he remains an important influence on the atmosphere and direction of the play, especially as a role-model for his daughter Theonoe (cf. 909–23, 940–3, 959–68, 998–1029).

[5] ‘living on the island of Pharos, but lord of Egypt’. The line is acceptable stylistically; but nothing else in the play suggests an island setting and all indications are that the action takes place on the Egyptian mainland (e.g. 1–3, 460–2, 1039–42). The verse looks like an attempt to refine line 4 (‘Proteus was ruler of this land’) by making it chime with the *Odyssey*, where Proteus is located on Pharos (4.354–7), the very thing a later actor or clever scholiast might do (Pharos is called ‘Helen’s island’ by Callimachus (*SH* 254.5)). Despite the mainland setting, however, the action does take place close to the sea (H. can walk from the palace to the coast, 1526–7) and the audience will have imagined a location close to the mouth of the Nile. By contrast, Hdt. visited a τέμενος (‘sacred precinct’) of Proteus far inland at Memphis (2.112).

6–7 τῶν . . . μίαν ‘one of the maidens of the sea’ (κατ’οἶδμα ‘along the sea-swell’ is used adjectivally): for Nereus’ (fifty) daughters, see 1585; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 240–61, Hom. *Il.* 18.39–49 (naming 33), Barringer (1995). According to *Theog.* 1003–5, Psamathe (‘Sandy’) bore Aeacus a son, Phocus (‘Seal’), ancestor of the Phocians (later killed by his half-brothers, Peleus and Telamon). Psamathe’s subsequent marriage to Proteus is first attested here and may be Eur.’s invention, linking their gifted child Theonoe to the prophetic powers of Nereus (13–15, 317–18).

γαμεῖ: historic present (here in place of the aor.). Such present forms are used to mark ‘events that the narrator considers crucial or decisive for the development of the plot’ (Rijksbaron (2006) 128, with further examples).

λέκτρ’ ἀφῆκεν Αἰακοῦ: as a goddess Psamathe can ‘cast aside’ her mortal union with impunity; likewise her Nereid sister Thetis, who abandoned Peleus, son of Aeacus (Apollod. 3.13.6; but cf. *Andr.* 1253–8). Such divine freedom contrasts strongly with H.’s anguished struggle to safeguard her own marriage (63–5; cf. 834–42). There was, however, also a tradition that Psamathe tried to resist Aeacus’ advances, transforming herself into a seal to elude him (attested in Apollod. 3.12.6 and a scholion to *Andr.* 687); cf. Larson (2001) 71–3 for such tales of a nymph’s capture. If this version was known to a fifth-century audience (as is suggested by *Theog.* 1003–5, which is post-Hesiodic but pre-Euripidean; cf. also Pind. *Nem.* 5.12–13), there is an ominous parallel between Psamathe and H.’s own situation, as she tries to escape the bed of Theoc. (62–3).

[9b–10a] ἵδρι δῆτ’ θεοῦς σέβων | βίον διήνεγκ’ ‘[because] he spent his life honouring the gods’. These words are clearly interpolated. Both the sentiment and the aorist διήνεγκ’ suit the dead Proteus rather than his threatening young son (for Theoc.’s impiety, cf. 542, 1021, 1054). The interpolation of proper names is one of the most common corruptions (cf. Merkelbach (1967), Barrett on *Hipp.* 72, Diggle (1994) 459 n. 79), but here the inserted material is an etymological explanation of the name (Θεοκλύμενος); for genuine examples, see 13–15n. The interpolator has sought to explain Theoc.’s name, supplying an etymology to match Theonoe’s (13–14; cf. *Tro.* 13–14, where Poseidon’s prologue contains an interpolated etymology of the Trojan Horse). Θεο-κλύμενος, ‘god-renowned’ or ‘inspired by the god(s)’, is found already in Homer as the name of a seer (*Od.* 15.256), but θεοῦς σέβων here suggests that the interpolator erroneously took it to mean ‘obedient to the god(s)’ (cf. Sansone

(1985) 33 n. 49). Moreover, the causal ὅτι δὴ (joining name and etymology) added by Triclinius is metrically problematic in that the sixth resolved element extends over separate words (-εν' ὅτ-): Maas (1962) 67, West (1982) 41, 86. In the genuine version Θεοκλύμενον ἄρσεν' εὐγενῆ τε παρθένον, the proper name scans — √ √ √, with synizesis. On theophoric names in general, see Parker (2000a). The name Theoc. is not attested epigraphically in the classical period, but is found later at Marathon in Attica (second century AD) and at Sparta (AD 100-150): see Fraser (1987) 2.218, 3.204.

10-11 '(and she bore) a noble maiden, Eido, her mother's glory when she was a baby'.

Εἰδῶ 'Beauty'. Psamathe's pet name for her daughter comes from Εἰδοθέα ('beautiful as a goddess'); such shortened forms have endearing connotations (cf. Meier-Brügger (1992) 2.39-40, Dickey (1996) 51). Proteus' (divine) daughter is called Eidothea in the *Odyssey* (4.366), where she helps M. by telling him how to subdue her shape-shifting father (4.399-424). The shortened form of the name was used in Aeschylus' satyric *Proteus* (fr. 212 R), where Eido may have been a dramatic character. Here it is 'Eido' herself who can save or destroy M. (cf. 1017-29, 1624-6). For Theonoc's pivotal role, see Introd. p. 36. (The name Εἰδῶν is attested in Attica in the early fourth century BC: Masson (2000) 135.)

ἀγλάισμ(α): lit. 'ornament', 'honour' (well rendered by Kovacs as 'her mother's glory'), expanding the infant nickname 'Beauty'. H. later laments the fate of her own ἀγλάισμα (282), her daughter Hermione, whose beauty withers away in maidenhood back in Sparta (282-3). ἀγλάισμα is an exclusively poetic word in archaic and classical Greek, found only in tragedy (Aesch. *Ag.* 1312, *Cho.* 193; Soph. *El.* 908; Eur. *El.* 325).

12 ἡβην . . . ὥρασαν γάμων 'the age ripe for marriage'. Theonoc forgoes a young woman's regular transition to married life (under her husband's authority) in order to submit herself totally to the service of the gods. Moreover, her state of virginity is permanent (unusually so: see 1007-8n.) and a symbol of her peculiar dedication to the sacred and divine (13 τὰ θεῖα).

13-15 'they called her Theonoc, for she knew . . .' The Greeks were fond of such etymologies (cf. e.g. Harrison (2000) 263 n. 48 for a catalogue of 'speaking names' in Herodotus) and, as their prevalence in tragedy shows (see Collard on *Supp.* 496-7a with addenda p. 442), took them seriously as omens of both character and destiny (e.g. Soph. *Aj.* 430-3, where Ajax puns bitterly on his own name): cf. 1674-5n. In tragedy the naming of Thoas ('swift', *IT* 32-3) and Ion ('going', *Ion* 661-3) are closest to the present example. Such verbal play is particularly frequent in late Euripides and may reflect the poet's interest in philosophical discussions of language, especially in names and their ability to refer to actual objects; see Introd. p. 47. The child's adult name Theonoc ('she who knows divine things') marks the recognition of her peculiar religious abilities. As M. remarks, 'the name is certainly oracular' (χρηστήριον μὲν τοῦνομ' 822). (The name Theonoc is attested only in Campania (South Italy) in the imperial period: Fraser (1987) 3.304.)

τά τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα: the expression is formulaic in the context of prophecy: cf. e.g. Calchas ὅς ἥϊδη τά τ' ἔοντα τά τ' ἔσόμενα πρό τ' ἔοντα (*Il.* 1.70). Theonoc's

divinatory skills and her knowledge of the gods' (conflicting) plans are central to the development of the plot, forcing H. and M. to win her support (815ff.) and generating much suspense as the escape proceeds (878–86n.).

προγόνου . . . παρά 'receiving these privileges from her ancestor Nereus'. The hyperbaton gives prominence to προγόνου. The accent on παρά is thrown back (anastrophe) when following its noun (cf. 23–4 περί | . . . παρά). It is now clear why Eur. has introduced Psamathe: with Proteus stripped of divine foreknowledge (4n.), Theonoe's skill is traced back through her mother to another 'Old Man of the Sea', Nereus, traditionally endowed with both justice (Hes. *Theog.* 233–6; cf. 1002–4, 1647–8) and the gift of prophecy (317–20, *Or.* 364, *Hor. Odes.* 1.15). τιμάς combines the ideas of both 'office' (*IT* 748) and 'duty' (*IT* 776).

16–22 In Homer H. is often called the daughter of Zeus (e.g. *Il.* 3.199, *Od.* 4.184), but her mother is never named. Leda appears in *Od.* 11.298–304, but only as mother (by Tyndareos) of the twins Castor and Polydeuces (cf. 1644–5, *Or.* 465). The *Cypria* makes Helen the daughter of Nemesis and Zeus (fr. 9 Bernabè = fr. 7 Davies), a version reflected in Nemesis' shrine at Rhamnus in north-east Attica, where the goddess's daughter was portrayed as being presented to her by Leda (cf. Kerényi (1945) 12–13, Kearns (1989) 158), while Sappho (fr. 166 V) has Leda find the egg (produced presumably by Nemesis), a version which, by making Leda H.'s foster-mother, reconciles the two accounts of her mother's identity. Although Leda was well known in myth, especially Spartan myth, as mother of H. (and Clytemnestra), the story of H.'s miraculous birth from an egg produced by Leda herself is first attested here: cf. 257–9n.

16 οὐκ ἀνώνυμος 'not nameless' = 'glorious', emphatic understatement (litotes). For the depiction of Sparta in the play and its relationship to the Peloponnesian War, see *Introd.* p. 8.

17–21 ἔστιν δὲ δὴ | λόγος τις . . . εἰ σαφῆς οὗτος λόγος '(Tyndareos is my father) but there is indeed a story that . . . if this story is true' (for σαφῆς = 'true', cf. 309–10n.). H.'s reserve has a double function: firstly, within the drama itself, H.'s doubts about her origins spring naturally from the misery of her present condition (would Zeus really neglect his own daughter in this way?), and her despairing scepticism provokes sympathy: cf. 214–16, 256–9, 1144–6. Moreover, the speaker's uncertainty challenges the god to prove his paternity (cf. *Her.* 353–4, *Ion* 1559–60, *Bacch.* 26–31), a challenge met by the play, as Zeus ensures not only Helen's return from Egypt (cf. 45–6) but also promises her a blessed future as a goddess (1666–9): cf. *Or.* 1629–37, where Apollo reveals that he saved H. from Orestes' sword at Zeus's behest. Secondly, H.'s scepticism provokes reflection upon the nature and truth value of mythology itself, which was an issue of debate among intellectuals of the period: cf. *Hdt.* 2.120 (defending the 'Egyptian' version of H.'s absence from Troy), *Pl. Phdr.* 229c–30a (mocking the rationalistic interpretation of myth). Thus, as H. proceeds to outline in the rest of her prologue the 'true' version of events, the audience are encouraged to reflect upon (and enjoy) the fictiveness of Eur.'s own poetic 'reality'.

18 ἔπττα(ο): 3rd sg. aor. πέτομαι, 'fly'.

19 μορφώματ . . . λαβών: metamorphoses are often used to deceive (as here with Leda). Like the traditional Proteus (4n.), Zeus can take different forms, so that one name (Zeus) is applied to many bodies. Such delusions are especially relevant to H.'s predicament, since her name is being applied to two bodies, the real H. and her unreal double, and it is the phantom's apparent reality which has made possible both the Trojan War and H.'s disgrace: cf. 42–3, 53–5, 72–4, 109–10, 362–3, 593, 666–97.

20–1 In the *Cypris* Zeus forces himself upon Nemesis, who conceives H. κρατερῆς ὑπ'ἀνάγκης ('under severe constraint', fr. 9.3 Bernabé = fr. 7.3 Davies). Here, however, the threat of violence is replaced by trickery, as Zeus pretends to flee from an eagle (ὑπ'αίετοῦ | δίωγμα φεύγων). The choice of eagle as bird of prey is partly traditional (cf. Janko on *Il.* 13.531–3), but there is added resonance in this context, for as the bird most closely associated with Zeus (e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 1.6–7), the eagle embodies the god's powers and leads us to picture Leda as the true victim of Zeus's contrived pursuit. Kovacs deletes the lines (cf. Kovacs (2003) 3–4), but they effectively expand our view of the exploitation of Leda. The version of Leda's seduction presented here (19, 214–16, 1144–6; cf. *Or.* 1385–6) is also found on a fourth-century vase where an eagle is shown attacking a swan (Zeus) which is being protected by Leda (*LIMC* s.v. Leda (in Etruria), no. 1): see *Introd.* p. 74 n. 328.

δόλιον εὐνήν ἐξέπραξε(ε): lit. 'achieved a deceitful bed'. εὐνή stands metonymically for sex: cf. *Hipp.* 495–6 (the Nurse to Phaedra) οὐκ ἄν ποτ' εὐνῆς οὐνεχ' ἠδονῆς τε σῆς | προηγόν ἄν σε δεῦρο, *Ion* 860–1 (Creusa sings) πῶς δὲ σκοτίας ἀναφήνω | εὐνάς, αἰδοῦς δ' ἀπολειφθῶ;

22 Ἐλένη (—): West (1982) 81–2 calculates that 40% of first-foot tragic anapaests accommodate proper names.

22–3 λέγοιμ' ἄν: the 1st pers. potential optative is more courteous than the simple future (Barrett on *Hipp.* 336). The phrase prepares the audience for H.'s full account of her sufferings.

23–30 The myth of the Judgement of Paris/Alexandros is deployed in a variety of ways in Eur.'s surviving plays (see Jouan (1966) 95–6, Stinton (1990) 26–75); on each occasion, whether in rhetorical *agon* (*Tro.* 919–31, 971–82, the latter a rationalizing attack on the very idea of the gods acting in such a way: cf. 17–21n.), choral lyric (*Andr.* 274–92, *Hec.* 629–56, *IA* 573–89, *Hel.* 1120–1, 1158–60) or monody (*LI* 1283–1310), individual details of the story are connected to the themes of the dramatic action (cf. 357–9, 364–6, 676–83, 707, 882–6, 1097–8, 1508–9). As befits the prologue, H.'s outline is brief, but far from perfunctory: she stresses her role as both an innocent victim of divine rivalry (it was the goddesses who wanted to compete about beauty: 26 μορφῆς . . . κρίσιν) and an unwilling tool of Aphrodite's ambition (28 προτείνασ', 'offering (my beauty) as a bribe').

23–4 κάλλους πέρι 'about (the judgement of) their beauty'; for the anastrophe, cf. 13–15n.

Ἰδαίου ἐς κευθμών 'to a valley on Mt. Ida': cf. Ἰδαίου | ἐς νάπαν ('to Ida's glen', *Andr.* 274–5). κευθμών (lit. 'hiding-place') suggests a remote and secret spot (at *Hec.* 1

it refers to the hidden recesses of Hades). Not surprisingly, Eur. passes over the myth (known to Hellanicus, c. 480–395 BC, *IGrHist* IV F 29) of Paris' bucolic romance with Oenone, whom he abandoned for H. (cf. Ovid, *Her.* 5), since this would spoil the effect of his solitude.

25–6 In the *Cypris* the three goddesses are led to Paris by Hermes (p. 38.4–7 Bernabè = p. 31.7–10 Davies); so 100 *Andr.* 275–6, *LI* 1302. Here the god's role is first mentioned at a later point in Sparta (44).

διογενής τε παρθένος: the epithet 'Zeus-born' is particularly pointed for Athena, sprung from her father's head; cf. Ἰλιάδι Διογενεῖ κόραι (*Tro.* 526), referring to Athena's temple on the acropolis of Troy. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* it is said that only three goddesses can resist Aphrodite's powers and remain virgins for ever: the first is Athena, followed by Artemis and Hestia (7–32). H.'s list of *parthenoi* (1, 6, 10, 25) reinforces her identity here as a quasi-parthenaic figure (cf. 63, 68–70, 184–90nn.) and prepares for the revelation of her own (surprising) chastity (48, 59, 61, 65–7).

διαπεράνασθαι 'to settle': the middle voice (aor. inf. of διαπεραίνω) expresses the goddesses' personal interest in Alexander's decision (Smyth §1714).

μορφῆς . . . κρῖσιν 'beauty contest': the language of H.'s account is unadorned and clear (a typical feature of Euripidean prologues). The Judgement of Paris was a popular myth in Greek art from the mid-seventh century onwards: cf. Raab (1972), Snodgrass (1998) 143, *Introd.* p. 10.

27–9 The accusative τοῦμόν δὲ κάλλος (object of προτεῖναι) is made emphatic by being placed first, and the sudden switch from divine to human beauty has an ironic effect: the goddess Aphrodite needs a mortal woman's beauty to assert the supremacy of her own.

εἰ καλὸν τὸ δυστυχές 'if what brings misfortune can be beautiful'. H.'s beauty and its terrible consequences are a familiar theme from the *Iliad* onwards (e.g. *Il.* 3.154–8, Eur. *Her.* 635–7). Herodotus describes how a nurse prayed to H. in her shrine at Therapne to make an ugly baby beautiful (6.61). Yet Greek attitudes to beauty, especially female beauty, were ambivalent, and it was typically seen as seductive and dangerous: the adulterous H. is fussy about her looks (e.g. *Or.* 128–9). Here, while H.'s exceptional beauty leads to great suffering for others (364–5, 383–5), it is also presented by the non-adulterous H. as a source of disaster for herself (e.g. 260–1, 304–5; cf. Soph. *Trach.* 24–5, 463–5): see *Introd.* p. 51.

γαμεῖ: sc. με, implied by τοῦμόν κάλλος.

γαμεῖ, | νικᾷ: enjambment, juxtaposition, and tense ('he will marry', 'she won' (the latter historic present: 6–7n.)) express the decisive part played by Aphrodite's 'bribe' (cf. 885–6, *Andr.* 289–92, *LI* 1300). For Hera and Athena's competing offers of military and political power, see *Tro.* 925–8, where they are adduced by H. as part of her ingenious defence. In (the probably non-Euripidean) *Rhesus*, Athena disguises herself as Aphrodite and deceives Paris, reassuring him that (647–8) 'Your war is a concern of mine, nor do I forget the honour you paid me, and I thank you for treating me so well.'

29–30 λιπών δὲ βούσταθμ' 'leaving the cow-sheds' (cf. 359). Exposed as a child, Alexander was raised among herdsmen (his return to Troy and eventual recognition had been dramatized in the *Alexander* of 415, the first play of Eur.'s 'Trojan trilogy', also containing *Palamedes* and *Trojan Women*: see 767n.). The Judgement's rustic setting, elaborated and idealized in Euripidean lyric (*Andr.* 280–6, *Ll* 573–81), is simply evoked at the scene's first (and only) mention in the *Iliad*, where the goddesses come to Alexander's sheepfold (24.29).

Ἰδαῖος . . . λέχος: Alexander/Paris (24, 28, 29; cf. 1117–21n.) moves straight from his bucolic lifestyle near Troy to the abduction of H. at Sparta; the rapid narrative underlines the impact of H.'s beauty. Paris is shown as a herdsman on Mt. Ida in most (but not all: see Hedreen (2001) 188–9) early Greek artistic depictions of the Judgement.

Σπάρτην ἀφίκεθ': the terminal acc. (or acc. without preposition) with verbs of motion is a distinctive feature of lyric and tragic syntax (51, 83, 105, 144, etc.); cf. Bers (1984) 62–85.

ὡς . . . σχήσω: the fut. part., particularly after verbs of motion (cf. ἀφίκεθ'), denotes purpose (Goodwin §840). The adverbial ὡς (rare after verbs of motion) points more precisely to Paris' intention (to carry H. off), which was in this version never fulfilled; cf. Smyth §2086, Lee on *Ion* 18, where Creusa exposes her child ὡς θανούμενον.

ἐμόν . . . λέχος: H.'s 'marriage' to Paris (cf. 32) is repeatedly bewailed (e.g. 690, 1120). Lines 224–5, 666–8, and 1506–7 focus in particular on the shame of a 'barbarian bed'. Just as Paris' desire for H. took her from her homeland (though not, as he imagined, to Troy: 35–6), so Theoc.'s desire for marriage risks thwarting her return.

31–6 *The substitution of the idolon*. Though Eur. did not invent the story of the phantom, his play is the earliest surviving source to attribute its creation to Hera (cf. 585–6). The intervention of the jealous and angry goddess is both plausible and productive, for it enables the unconventional 'breathing image' (εἶδωλον ἔμπνου, 34) to be made an integral part of the traditional myth connecting the Judgement of Paris and the Trojan War. Eur. has innovatively shaped the tale of the εἶδωλον for his own dramatic ends: see Introd. §4(c).

31 μεμφθεῖσ' 'found fault with' or 'was offended'; fem. nom. sg. aor. part. of μέμφομαι, with οὔνεκα . . . θεάς explaining Hera's complaint.

32 ἐξηνέμωσε 'turned (my marriage) to thin air'. At *Andr.* 938 H.'s daughter Hermione says she was 'puffed up with foolishness' (ἐξηνεμώθην μωρίαί, the only other occurrence of the verb in extant Greek poetry), but here the metaphor has an ironic literal undertone, since the image embraced by Paris is indeed fashioned from heaven's air (34). To begin the description of Hera's response with this striking word emphasizes both the ingenuity and the power of the goddess. (H. is enthroned beside Hera at the end of *Orestes*, 1686–7.)

τᾶμ': crasis (cf. 27 τοῦμόν) with elision, τὰ ἐμά.

34 εἶδωλον: the word has connotations of deception, being used for images that are misleading or unreal (*Ag.* 839, *Aj.* 126, *Phoen.* 1543, *Pl. Theaet.* 150c). Human simulacra

are fashioned by the gods in both epic (e.g. *Il.* 5.449–53, *Od.* 4.796) and tragedy (*Bacch.* 629–31), but the closest parallel to Hera's substitution of H. in an erotic context is the replacement of Hera herself when Ixion tries to rape her, so that Ixion lay instead with a cloud fashioned by Zeus; cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.36–7, where the divine copy is called a 'sweet lie' (ψεῦδος γλυκύ), Aesch. fr. 89 R. However, while Zeus intervenes to protect his wife from violation, Hera has no concern for H.'s marriage or sexual integrity, being motivated instead by her own damaged pride and her desire to embarrass Aphrodite.

ἐμπνουν 'breathing' is arresting, since such images are typically lifeless. By contrast, the mortal Admetus can enjoy only an inert replica of his dead wife, 'a cold pleasure' (*Alc.* 353 ψυχράν . . . τέρψιν). In Aesch. *Ag.* 416–19 M., still in Sparta, detests the empty gaze of statues that remind him of his absent wife: εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν | ἔχθεται χάρις ἀνδρὶ | ὁμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχηνίαις | ἔρρει πᾶσ' ἀφροδίτα.

οὐρανοῦ ξυθθεῖσ' ἀπο 'which she had made from air': the aor. part. ξυθθεῖσ', like ὁμοιώσασ', is subordinate to δίδωσι (33).

35–6 Unaware of Paris' death, Troy's destruction, and the removal of her image by M. (cf. 105–16), H. still speaks of Paris' delusion in the present tense ('he imagines').

παιδί: indirect obj. of δίδωσι (33); the hyperbaton is emphatic.

μ' ἔχειν . . . οὐκ ἔχων: the repetition underlines the false appearance of physical possession (cf. *Alc.* 352 δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν), while the sexual resonance of ἔχειν (e.g. Thuc. 6.54.2, on Aristogeiton's 'possession' of the younger Harmodius: ἐραστῆς ὧν εἶχεν αὐτόν) emphasizes this H.'s loyalty to her husband: cf. 611.

κενήν δόκησιν: internal acc. (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 752–7), expressing the 'empty' result of Paris' imagining (δοκεῖ). Similarly, Theoc. 'imagines' that he has H. for himself (ἔχειν δοκῶν, 1385–6), though it is there the *real* H. who *means* to deceive. For δόκησις as illusion (sent by the gods), see 119. New abstract nouns in –σις are a feature of the intellectual revolution of the late fifth century and are particularly characteristic of Eur. and Thucydides: cf. Vowles (1928) 45–7, Long (1968) 33–5, Dunbar on Ar. *Birds* 94.

36–43 Eur. combines the unconventional myth of the phantom (31–6) with the more familiar story of Zeus's desire for the Trojan War (38–41n.), a plan fulfilled by H.'s apparent presence at Troy (42–3). In *El.* 1280–3, produced a few years before *Hel.*, the Dioscuri describe how Zeus sent the εἰδῶλον to Troy 'so that there would be strife and killing of mortals'. Though the phantom is here ascribed to Hera, the gods' separate plans fortuitously coincide (36–7; cf. 1660–1): Zeus wanted to bring about a war, while Hera aimed to avenge her defeat by Aphrodite, and both plans were served by the phantom H. That different divine wills should interact and result in what one can with hindsight call the Διὸς βουλή is a narrative pattern central to early Greek myth: cf. Allan (2006).

36–7 τὰ . . . ἄλλα 'again the plans of Zeus in their turn': ἄλλος (in the sense 'separately', 'as well') is made yet more emphatic by its predicative position (cf. Smyth §1272, LSJ s.v. 11 8).

τοῖσδε συμβάλει κακοῖς 'reinforce (lit. "are in agreement with") these woes'.

38-41 In the *Cypria*, Zeus brought about the Trojan War (using the Judgement of Paris) in order to unburden the Earth of excessive human population (fr. 1 Bernabé/Davies); cf. Burgess (2001) 149. For the motif of overpopulation in mythologies of the Near East, Iran, and India, see Burkert (1992) 100-6, Mayer (1996) 3-11. Eur. retains Zeus's traditional and, from a mortal perspective, ruthless motivation for the war (cf. *Or.* 1639-42), and adds a second, the glorification of Achilles (41). For H. and Achilles as major figures in Zeus's plan to destroy the race of heroes, see *Introd.* p. 63.

38-9 H.'s pity for the 'miserable Trojans' is the first of many expressions of sympathy and remorse (despite her innocence), feelings not shared by M. (cf. 109, 196-9, 270-2, 362-9, 608, 691), but supported by the Chorus (esp. 1151-64).

39-40 'to relieve mother Earth of the troublesome mass (lit. "trouble and number") of mortals'. Both nouns (ὄχλου . . . πλήθους) are gen. of separation with κουφίζω (a word used in medicine: cf. Willink on *Or.* 43-4). The Muse, mother of the dead Rhesus, curses Helen, who has 'emptied (ἐκένωσεν) countless cities of their best men' (*Rhes.* 913-14); cf. 52-3.

41 τὸν κράτιστον 'Ελλάδος: in the context of military prowess, the audience will naturally think of Achilles, 'the best of the Achaeans' (*Il.* 1.244).

42-3 προυτέθη 'I was put forward (as a prize)', 1st sg. aor. pass. of προτίθημι: cf. *Thuc.* 2.46 (Pericles speaks of the rewards given by the city to its dead soldiers and their descendants) ἡ πόλις . . . ὠφέλιμον στέφανον . . . προτιθεῖσα. The expression and passive voice stress H.'s role as an instrument of the gods (23-30n.); cf. Priam's sympathetic (and partial) judgement οὐ τί μοι αἰτία ἐσσί, θεοί νύ μοι αἰτιοί εἰσιν ('I do not blame you, I blame the gods', *Il.* 3.164).

ἐγὼ μὲν οὐ, | τὸ δ' ὄνομα τοῦμόν: the first of many variations on the name/body antithesis, given special force when (as here) the speaker is H. herself (66-7, 199, 250-1, 588, 1100), since she is the σῶμα to which the ὄνομα *fails* to correspond; cf. Egli (2003) 214-16. One might compare Achilles' lack of control over his name in *IA* (cf. 128 ὄνομ', οὐκ ἔργον, παρέχων Ἀχιλεὺς): see Michelakis (2002) 84-92.

44-8 *Helen's abduction to Egypt*. The familiar story of H.'s departure from Sparta is radically reshaped, with H. utterly unwilling to leave, and Hermes replacing Paris as H.'s true abductor (670-1, 910). Hermes, escort of the dead to the Underworld (cf. e.g. *Cho.* 124-6), leads H. to Egypt, land of the dead, creating the first parallel between H. and Persephone (cf. 175-8, 244-5, 1301-52). Unlike Hades, however, Proteus protects the woman's 'purity' (48). The brevity of the account underlines the miraculous speed of H.'s removal to Egypt; compare Paris and H.'s amazingly swift three-day voyage from Sparta to Troy in the *Cypria*, recorded by Hdt. 2.117, which he takes to prove the poem's non-Homeric authorship.

44-5 ἐν πτυχαῖσιν αἰθέρος 'in the recesses of the sky' (cf. 605), suggesting 'remoteness and invisibility or concealment' (Mastrorarde on *Phoen.* 84 οὐρανοῦ πτυχαί). H. later tells M. that her counterfeit image was manufactured from αἰθήρ: see 584,

1013–16nn. Similarly, Zeus uses the element to deceive when he breaks off a piece of aether to create a fake baby Dionysus for Hera (*Bacch.* 292–4).

νεφέληι καλύψας: disappearances brought about by the gods often involve being swept up in a cloud or mist: c.g. *Il.* 3.381 (Aphrodite saves Paris), Acts 1.9 ('and a cloud received him [Jesus] out of their sight'). The phantom itself is said to be made of cloud (707, 750, 1219). H.'s route is gradually revealed: she was picking flowers for the temple of Athena when Hermes swept her up (244–7); they touched down on an island just off Attica (1670–5) before arriving in Egypt.

45–6 Though Zeus's concern for his daughter is stressed, it cannot diminish H.'s present misery (17–21n.), not least because she has no knowledge of the consolation Zeus has in store for her: see *Introd.* p. 65.

οὐ . . . ἡμέλησε: emphatic litotes, as in 16. For ἀμελέω used of divine neglect, cf. *Ion* 438–9 (rebuking Apollo).

48 ἀκέραιον . . . λέχος: H.'s description of her bed as 'pure' (ἀκέραιον, lit. 'unmixed') must have had a stunning impact (the word placed emphatically at the beginning of the clause), and the novel claim is repeated in 65 (cf. 795–6). For Tyn-dareos' traditional punishment (after failing to sacrifice to Aphrodite) in the form of adulterous and promiscuous daughters (Timandra, Clytemnestra, and Helen), see *Hes.* fr. 176 M-W, *Stes.* fr. 223 *PMGF*.

49–55 The story of H.'s abduction to Egypt is immediately followed by an account of the lives lost at Troy, powerfully emphasizing the seeming futility of the war (453n.). The Trojans' acceptance of the phantom (as with the real H.) seals their destruction; as Burkert (1979) 74 says, 'Helen is a kind of Trojan horse herself.'

50–1 τὰς ἐμὰς ἀναρπαγὰς . . . θηρᾶι: lit. 'hunts down my seizure'. The phrase expresses M.'s desire not only to regain H. (the person seized) but also to punish Paris (the seizer). In contrast to the 'hunter' Theoc. (cf. 153–4, 1169–70), whose pursuit of H. is also identified by the verb θηράω (63, 314, 981), M. has a right to his 'prey' (cf. 545, 1175). ἀρπαγαί (pl.) is regularly used of H.'s abduction by Paris (e.g. *Hdt.* 5.94); ἀναρπαγή is a *hapax legomenon* with the same sense as the basic verbal noun ἀρπαγή (*pace* LSJ, who gloss ἀναρπαγή as 'recapture'); cf. 246n.

52–3 ψυχαι δὲ πολλαί . . . ἔθανον: H. sums up the Trojan War in a single phrase combining regret, bitterness, and self-reproach. The evocation of the *Iliad* proem (πολλὰς . . . ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν | ἠρώων, 1.3–4) is appropriate (cf. *Andr.* 611), since H., despite her absence from Troy, shares the sense of responsibility and remorse felt by her Iliadic self: δι' ἐμ' '(they died) because of me' is emphatic. Significantly, the *eidōlon* does not free H. from a sense of responsibility (c.g. 109, 196–9), even if she regards her lot as unfair (280–1): see *Introd.* p. 64. For the idea of one destroying many, applied to H., cf. *Aesch. Ag.* 1455–7.

ἐπι Σκαμανδρίοις | ῥοαΐσιν: Scamander and Simois serve as markers of place (as does the Nile, 1–3n.), but both rivers are associated with suffering and death (250, 367–9, 609–10; cf. *Trō.* 374, 1151).

53–5 ἡ δὲ πάντα τλαῖσ' ἐγὼ | κατάρατος εἰμι: H. concludes the story of her past by encapsulating her unbearable condition. Though she herself has 'suffered everything',

she is 'cursed by all' as an adulteress (contrast the situation of H.'s daughter, Hermione, who *has* acted wrongly: *Andr.* 838-9 ἄ κατάρματος ἐγὼ κατὰ | ρατος ἀνθρώποις).

δοκῶ: H.'s betrayal of M. and her instigation of the war are mere appearance; for this important theme, see 35-6n., Introd. §6(a).

συνάψαι: aor. inf. of συνάπτω ('join together'), 'to have brought [a great war] upon [the Greeks]'

56-67 The audience know the setting to be the palace of the late king Proteus in Egypt (4, 46), but H.'s striking position before it remains unexplained. The prologue thus ends by identifying the tomb of Proteus and explaining why H. has sought refuge there as a suppliant. For the tension created by an opening suppliant tableau, and its use in other plays, see Introd. p. 30.

56-9 *The prophecy of Hermes.* H.'s report of the prophecy is similar to the predictions of divine or supernatural prologue speakers (cf. *Alc.* 64-71, *Hipp.* 42-8, *Hec.* 42-50, *Tro.* 77-86, *Ion* 69-75, *Bacch.* 47-54), whose pronouncements prime the expectations of the audience and thus allow for various effects of complication and surprise as the plot develops. There is, however, an important difference between such speakers and H., since she is a character in the ensuing drama (so too the exceptional Dionysus of the *Bacchae*) and lacks the privileged knowledge of the divine or supernatural narrator. (On the general issue of narrative authority in tragic prologues, see Segal (1992).) Here the expectation of a happy outcome does not diminish the suspense or excitement generated by events on stage, as when Theonoe and the gods decide whether to support H.'s escape from Egypt (878-91). The prophecy of H.'s return to Sparta confirms her continuing endurance (56) and resistance to Theoc. (59, 62-3). Moreover, H.'s anguish at the news of M.'s death, despite her knowledge of the prophecy (cf. 131-3, 277-9), sharpens the portrayal of her bafflement.

56 τί οὖν ἐτι ζῶ; A tragic *topos* (cf. Bond on *Hec.* 1301), prompted here by the preceding account of H.'s misery. Aristophanes' τί οὖν (*Thesm.* 868; for the hiatus, cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 598) gives better sense than L's τί δῆτ' (retained by Alt and Dale), as H. responds to an imagined question, 'Why then do I still live?', with the details of the prophecy (for the question and answer form in tragedy, see Schmid-Stählin (1940) 808).

56-7 ἔπος: the plain 'word' is marked as an authoritative speech, a prophecy, by the surrounding θεοῦ . . . Ἐρμου.

ἐτι κατοικήσειν: later H.'s imagined return to Sparta outrages Teucer (162-3) and naturally provokes a range of reactions in H. herself, from trepidation (287-9) and despair (595-6) to hope for her ultimate vindication (929-35; cf. 1650-5).

58-9 γνόντος: gen. abs., referring to M., despite the adjacent dative (ἀνδρῖ). The construction is abnormal, since the gen. abs. is normally used when a *new* subject is introduced. The effect of breaking the rule is to 'make the participial clause more prominent and to express its relation (time, cause, etc.) with greater emphasis' (Goodwin §850; cf. Page on *Med.* 910); so here 'once he has learned that . . .' (cf. 658-60).

59 ἦν . . . ὑποστρώσω: 1st sg. aor. subjunc. of ὑποστρόνυμι, lit. 'as long as I do not make anyone's bed', a euphemism for serving a man sexually.

τινί: i.e. anyone other than M. Attempts to defend the transmitted ἵνα are unconvincing (*pace* Kannicht). Dobree's ἦν neatly reinstates the desired construction: the fulfilment of Hermes' prophecy is *conditional* upon H.'s fidelity.

60–2 For Eur.'s mortal Proteus, see 4n. Proteus' protection of H.'s chastity casts him in the role of a surrogate father or guardian, stressing the inappropriateness of Theoc.'s desire and increasing the pressure on Theonoe to support H. and M.'s escape (cf. 46–7, 909–11, 940–1, 962–4, 1009–12).

φῶς ἡλίου τόδ' ἔβλεπεν: the phrase βλέπειν or ὄρᾶν φῶς ('to be alive') is always used positively, 'to be dead' being expressed by οὐκ εἰμι, οὐκέτι εἰμί, οὐδέν εἰμι *vel sim.*: cf. Acerts (1965) 20. For light, both literal and metaphorical, as a symbol of salvation, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 22–4, Mastronarde on *Medea* 482.

ἄσυλος ἢ γάμων 'I was safe from marriage'. The (two-termination) adj. ἄσυλος also suggests the ἀσυλία or 'inviolability' claimed by suppliants (cf. *Med.* 728, *Held.* 243–4, *Soph.* *OC* 922–3), and thus stresses the connection between H.'s threatened 'marriage' to Theoc. and her current position at Proteus' tomb. On the restitution of 1st pers. ἦ, frequently replaced in the manuscripts by the later ἦν, see Barrett on *Hipp.* 700.

63 θηρᾶι γαμεῖν με: the hunting metaphors used of Theoc.'s desire for H. (50–1n.) suggest a raw and dangerous sexuality. H. fears being raped by him ('married by force', 833), if she and M. fail to escape. For the imagery and language of hunting in connection with erotic courtship, see Barringer (2001) 70–124.

τὸν πάλαι . . . πόσιν 'my husband of old'. H. remains faithful, though she has not seen M. for seventeen years (111–14). Such a long separation from her husband, who may well be dead (cf. 131–2), reinforces H.'s presentation as a quasi-parthenaic figure who is (in Theoc.'s eyes at least) ready once more for marriage.

64–5 μνημα . . . διασώση: the protective power of Proteus' tomb and the sacrifices offered there (547) are typical features of Greek hero-cult (cf. Dodds on *Bacch.* 6–12, the tomb of Semele). By supplicating the spirit of the dead king H. has transformed his tomb into a place of asylum (cf. 800–1, 1203nn.). The tombs of Darius and Agamemnon are central to the action of the *Persae* and *Choephoroi* (cf. Niobe sitting immobile at the tomb of her dead children, Aesch. fr. 154a6–7 R), but all other surviving plays in which the action revolves around suppliants are set at altars (Aesch. *Supp.*, Eur. *Held.*, *Andr.*, *Supp.*, *Her.*; cf. also the supplication scenes of *OT* and *Ion*) or at a sacred grove (*OC*), though the corpse of Ajax briefly becomes a place of asylum. It was open to Eur. to set H. at an altar (with the tomb of Proteus nearby), but he has chosen instead to place her at the tomb, which is both psychologically plausible (the grave has particular importance for the dead king's family, making it a powerful place of asylum) and dramatically productive, reminding the audience of Proteus' conduct towards H. and turning the dead man into almost another dramatic figure (4n.).

προσπίτνω . . . Ικέτις: compare H.'s supplication of Theonoe (894 ὦ παρθέν', Ικέτις ἀμφὶ σὸν πίτνω γόνυ) and M.'s supplication at the tomb (961 ἀμφὶ μνημα σοῦ πατρὸς πεσῶν). As we later learn, H. is permanently encamped at Proteus' tomb and has been there for some time (315, 797–9, 1228).

διασώση: 3rd sg. aor. subjunc. διασώζω 'preserve', the subject being Proteus' tomb (64 μνήμα).

66-7 ὥς, εἰ 'so that, even if . . .'. The repeated purpose clauses (65-6 ἵν' . . . ὥς) emphasize H.'s determination to resist Theoc.

τὸ σῶμά γ' 'my body at least'; cf. 42-3n., and contrast Orestes' formulation of the antithesis, τὸ σῶμα θύσεις τοῦμόν, οὐχὶ τοῦνομα (*IT* 504), where it is one's name or reputation that matters.

μή . . . ἀσχύνην ὀφλή: 3rd sg. aor. subjunc. ὀφλισκάνω 'incur'. H.'s concern for her sexual integrity and reputation contrasts strikingly with the literary tradition's portrayal of her as πολυάνωρ ('a woman with many husbands', Aesch. *Ag.* 62); for a sexually explicit version of her punishment, see *Cycl.* 179-87.

68-163 Dialogue of Helen and Teucer

H.'s supplication at the tomb of Proteus means that she cannot easily leave the stage (cf. 315-16, 543-4). Thus, having delivered the opening monologue, she continues as an interlocutor in the dialogue (cf. *Alc.*, *Med.*, *Held.*, *Andr.*, *El.*, *Her.*, *Tro.*, *Or.*; by contrast, in *Hipp.*, *IT*, and *Phoen.* the interlocutors enter after the departure of the monologue-speaker). The arrival of Teucer, a Greek who fought at Troy, enables H. to ask in sustained stichomythia about the outcome of the war and the fate of her alter ego (105-22); she learns that M. and his 'wife' are reported dead in a shipwreck (123-32), and that her mother and brothers are said to have killed themselves out of shame at her conduct (133-42). It is therefore clear that the Teucer scene has been inserted before the arrival of M. in order to underline H.'s reputation, confirming H.'s recognition that, though she did nothing wrong, she is universally reviled for causing the Trojan War (cf. 54-5, 72-4, 80-1) and (as she now learns) for killing her family too. In short, the Teucer scene emphasizes H.'s liability even as it portrays her innocence (for this traditional notion of liability, which is central to Greek myth and ethics, see *Introd.* p. 64).

The scene also presents the power of δόκησις ('appearance', cf. 35-6n.) in striking dramatic terms: T. is doubly deceived (just as M. will be: e.g. 590-3), since he believes not only that H. is evil, but also that the woman before him is an innocent lookalike (cf. 158-63). Finally, T.'s desire to consult Theonoe (145-50) stresses the extent of her knowledge (cf. 13-15), which will play an important role in the salvation of H. and M. (cf. 1369-73, 1624-6). For discussion of the scene, with particular attention to how it prepares for the meeting of H. and M., see Schwinge (1968) 317-29 and *Introd.* p. 27.

68-70 T. enters along the *eisodos* from the coast, alone and equipped with a bow and arrows (76-7). He is struck by the magnificence of the royal palace (so too M.: 430-2). This is verbal scene-painting, and need not correspond to the actual appearance of the σκηνή.

Πλούτῳ: brachylogy, sc. Πλούτου οἴκῳ, 'the house is worthy to be compared with Ploutos' own' (cf. 295-6). From a Greek perspective Theoc.'s great wealth and power (cf. 430-4) mean that he is at greater risk of hybriatic behaviour (this is a constant

pattern in Hdt.'s account of Greek tyrants and Persian kings: cf. *Introd.* §6(c)), and the suspicion is confirmed by Theoc.'s determination to marry H. Yet Teucer's phrase also suggests Plouton, a euphemism for Hades (cf. Pl. *Crat.* 403c: Hades has more than he wants, so he's called Plouton (the wealthy one)), marking Egypt as a land of the dead and Theoc. as its menacing ruler (H. is also of course seeking sanctuary at a *tomb*): cf. Robinson (1979) 164–6 for further similarities between Theoc. and Hades. This marks the first stage in the play's presentation of H. as akin to Persephone not only in the circumstances of her abduction (244–9n.) but also in her abnormal status as a *parthenos*-like figure trapped in Egypt who eventually returns to her proper role as wife and mother in Sparta (1349n.). The fact that Ploutos (whom [Hes.] *Theog.* 969–74 makes a son of Demeter) and Plouton were connected and confused (sometimes deliberately) in Eleusinian cult (see Parker (2005) 336–7, 419) is particularly helpful to Eur. as he presents his Athenian audience with a mythical construct which links H. to Demeter and Persephone (1301–68n.).

ἀμφιβλήματ' 'enclosing walls'; also used of garments, as at 423 (cf. 1079).

εὐθριγκοί θ' ἔδραι 'beautifully corniced chambers' (εὐθριγκος is a *hapax legomenon*). Despite the foreign setting, there is no attempt to suggest specifically Egyptian architecture. So too with Artemis' Greek-style temple among the Taurians, though it is located beside an altar stained with *human* blood (cf. *IT* 69–76, 96–114).

71 ξα: the exclamation expresses T.'s displeasure and surprise (cf. 541, 1177, Perdicoyianni-Paléologue (2002) 73), and marks the moment when, passing from the *eisodos*, he makes full contact with the scene on stage.

72–5 ὦ θεοί: T.'s baffled appeal is to the very powers who have created his confusion: cf. 119, 585–6, 683.

εἰκῶ . . . μίμημ': the language ('image', 'likeness') is that of realistic portraiture (cf. Webster (1939) 167), underlining Teucer's inability to distinguish the woman before him from H.; cf. 262–3n., Steiner (2001) 54.

ὅσον: for the causal use of exclamatory ὅσος ('such a likeness you bear'), see Barrett on *Hipp.* 877–80.

ἀποπτύσειαν 'may they spit [you] out' (opt. of wish), i.e. abominate H. (cf. 664).

76–7 τῶιδ . . . εὐστόχῳ πτερῶι 'by this unerring arrow' (lit. 'feather', by synecdoche: cf. 147n.), said either pointing to his quiver or having already drawn an arrow and strung his bow. For T.'s skill as an archer, cf. *Il.* 8.266–334, 23.859–69, Soph. *Phil.* 1057.

ἀπόλαυσιν 'as reward (for looking like H.)'; for the ironic use of the verb ἀπολαύω, cf. *Andr.* 543, *IT* 526, *Phoen.* 1205, LSJ s.v. II. Barrett (on *Hipp.* 752–7) criticizes the common description of this construction as 'acc. in apposition to the sentence', as it makes the acc. sound less integral to the sentence than it in fact is. As he explains, it is really an application of the internal acc. (cf. 35–6n.).

εἰκοῦς: gen. sg., instead of prosaic εἰκόνας (cf. 73 εἰκῶ ~ εἰκόνα).

78–82 H. disassociates herself from blame for the sufferings of the Trojan War, but T. is unable to grasp the full force of her distinction between the phantom (79 ἐκεῖνης) and herself (ἐμέ). From his limited perspective, he can only understand her

words to mean that she is not in fact H., which in turn enables H. to proceed with her questions as she does.

78 ἀπεστράφη: T. has turned his body or head away in disgust (cf. 75 ἀποπτύσειαν), but re-establishes contact with H. at 80 ἡμαρτον ('I apologize').

79 συμφοραῖς 'by reason of her misfortunes' (dat. of cause), i.e. because of the sufferings caused by 'that woman' (ἐκείνης, causal gen.) at Troy.

80 ὀργῆ: T. has particular reason to be angry with H., since the Trojan War has made him an exile from his own land (90–104); for T. as hostile to both H. and the Atridae, cf. Soph. *Aj.* 1310–12.

83–104: In Soph. *Aj.* 1006–21, T. imagines his father Telamon's anger upon learning that he was unable to protect Ajax, and he predicts his own banishment from Salamis. Sophocles handled the myth in his *Teucer* (frs. 576–9 R), and it was probably treated in Aeschylus' *Women of Salamis*, the final play of his Ajax trilogy (frs. 216–20 R; the first two plays were *Judgement of the Arms* and *Thracian Women*). T.'s post-war experience makes him a suitable interlocutor here, for, as one of the few Greek leaders who succeeded in returning to Greece (albeit only temporarily), he is able to answer H.'s questions about the fate of her husband and family (123–42). Like H., T. has also suffered unjustly as a result of the Trojan War.

83 τίς δ' εἶ: it is likely from 73–4 and 81 that T. is a Greek, but H. wants to know exactly who he is.

πόθεν 'whence?', rather than 'for what reason?'

γῆς . . . πέδον: tragic periphrasis; cf. e.g. *Med.* 666 (Medea to Aegeus) πόθεν γῆς τῆσδ' ἐπιστρωφᾶι πέδον;

84–5 T. confirms his Greek identity, with a note of self-pity ('one of the miserable Achaeans').

τᾶρα: crasis, τοι ᾶρα ('Well then, indeed'), intensifying the speaker's agreement that T.'s hatred of 'H.' is natural.

86–9 Requests for identification often contain numerous questions (cf. e.g. *Ion* 258–9 (Ion to Creusa) τίς δ' εἶ; πόθεν γῆς ἦλθες; ἐκ ποίας πάτρας | πέφυκας; ὄνομα τί σε καλεῖν ἡμᾶς χρεών;), while the triplet of 87–8 (name, father's name, country) is quite regular (e.g. *Ion* 260–1). H.'s repeated questions are dramatically effective, expressing her excitement as she finally encounters a Greek who may have news of her husband and family. Rather than delete the whole passage (so Diggle (1981) 48, Kovacs (Loeb); Dale deletes 86–8 and posits a lacuna before 89 containing mention of Teucer's name), emendation of 86 will suffice (τίνος ἐξ- creates an unwanted anapaest). The most satisfactory suggestion is that of Jackson (1955) 181–2, which retains most of the transmitted text.

87–8: T.'s mother, Hesione, daughter of Laomedon, was given to Telamon by Heracles when he sacked Troy; cf. Soph. *Aj.* 434–6. Like his half-brother Ajax, T. was worshipped as a hero on Salamis; cf. Parker (1996) 313, 315.

89 Νείλου . . . γύας: cf. 1–3n. The answer to H.'s question 'Why have you come to Egypt?' is postponed until 144–50, as their dialogue moves from T.'s suffering in the aftermath of the war to that of H.'s family.

90–104: Each of T.'s responses prompts a new question from H., culminating in the reason for Telamon's decision to banish his surviving son (104).

91 τλήμων ἄν εἴης 'You poor man!' An exile herself, H. reacts with sympathy to the news of Teucer's banishment. The potential opt. (Goodwin §236) is here equivalent to an exclamation; cf. 834 (M. to H.) προδότις ἄν εἴης.

92 τίν' . . . φίλον; i.e., one's father is the last person one would expect to do such a thing.

93 ἐκ τοῦ 'for what reason?': cf. 1270.

τὸ . . . ἔχει 'since this deed [Telamon banishing you, his son] implies some disaster'. H. does not say outright that T. may have blood on his hands, though this would be a probable cause of exile. After T. mentions Ajax's death (94), however, she explicitly asks if he has killed his own brother (95). T.'s reply shows that matters are very different, and the succeeding dialogue makes clear the relationship between Ajax's suicide at Troy (96) and T.'s exile from Salamis (104). For M.'s sense of responsibility for Ajax's death, see 848.

95 οὐ (τί) που introduces 'incredulous or reluctant questions' (GP 492.ii): cf. Stevens (1976) 24.

96 οἰκῆιον: its position stresses that the leap, as much as the sword, were Ajax's own; cf. Soph. *Aj.* 833 (Ajax prays that he will die upon his sword) ξὺν ἀσφαδαίστῳ καὶ ταχῆϊ πηδήματι.

97 μανέντ'; 'was he mad?', agreeing with αὐτόν (96). The *Little Iliad* seems to have presented Ajax committing suicide while still insane (p. 74.4–5 Bernabé = p. 52.4–5 Davies), whereas Sophocles' hero kills himself after he has recovered from his divinely induced madness.

98 τὸν . . . τιν': T. adds the indefinite pronoun ('the son of Peleus, a certain Achilles') since, as far as he knows, his interlocutor may never have heard of the Greek hero.

99 Achilles' role as one of H.'s suitors is first attested here. Traditionally, he was too young to woo H.; otherwise, as [Hes.] *Catalogue of Women* fr. 204.89–93 M-W points out, M. would have stood no chance against him. Achilles' portrayal as a suitor stresses H.'s desirability (cf. 27–9, 260–6, 304–5) and makes the revelation of his death (100 θανών) yet more powerful (cf. 41, 847). H.'s observation thus combines wistfulness with grief.

100 δπλων ἔριν: the contest for the arms of Achilles, proposed by Thetis and won by Odysseus (cf. *Od.* 11.541–65), was dramatized by Aeschylus, who presented Ajax and Odysseus quarrelling on stage (fr. 175 R; cf. 83–104n.). Pindar complains that Ajax was unfairly treated by his comrades (*Nem.* 7.20–30), and even alleges that the votes were tampered with (*Nem.* 8.26), a charge repeated by T. in Sophocles' play (*Aj.* 1135).

102 ἄλλου λαβόντος: the identity of the winner was well known to the audience, but the suppression of his name also suggests T.'s hatred of Odysseus.

ἀπηλλάχθη βίου: the verb is often used of departing from an unpleasant state (LSJ s.v. ἀπαλλάσσω B 1 lists examples with δουλοσύνης, κακῶν, and φόβου among others), and so mirrors Ajax's hatred of his ruined life.

104 'Yes (γε), because I did not die with him.' T. refers bitterly to Telamon's angry reaction, implying that only his own death at Troy could have saved him from exile (cf. 83–104n.).

106 ξὺν . . . πέρσας 'having joined in sacking (the city)': emesis, a relatively rare phenomenon in tragic dialogue (cf. *Hec.* 1172, *Her.* 53).

ἀνταπωλόμην 'I perished in turn': cf. 104n.

107 κατείργασται: 3rd sg. perf. pass. κατεργάζομαι, 'levelled', 'devastated'. For the burning of Troy, cf. 196–7, 1162, *Tro.* 1260–1332.

108 Consecutive ὥστε + inf. with οὐ, rather than the normal μή, expressing a strong negative ('Yes, so that not even a trace . . .'): see Goodwin §§598–9.

109–10 H.'s sympathy for the Trojans (38–9n.) is not contradicted by T.: κακά refers to the sufferings endured by both sides.

τλῆμον: studied ambivalence: H. means 'poor' (cf. 117 τὴν δύστηνον, 681–2n.), but T. understands 'reckless'.

καὶ πρόσ: adverbial, 'and besides', often with γε; e.g. *Hdd.* 641 καὶ πρόσ γ' εὐτυχεῖς.

111 γάρ ('then') introduces a request for additional information (*GP* 83).

διαπεπόρθηται: διά in verbal compounds marks completion (LSJ s.v. D IV), 'utterly destroyed'.

112 ἑπτὰ σχεδόν τι: 'almost seven'; corresponding to *Od.* 4.81–2, where M. says he returned to Sparta 'in the eighth year' (counting inclusively).

καρπίμους ἑτῶν κύκλους: Greeks measured time in relation to the periodic cycles of the natural world, especially the agricultural seasons (e.g. *Tro.* 20 δεκασπόρω χρόνῳ, *El.* 1152 δεκέτεσιν σποραῖσιν; cf. ἄροτος for 'year' at *Soph. Trach.* 69, 825) and the sun, moon, and stars (114 σελήνας). The juxtaposition of διαπεπόρθηται (111) and καρπίμους reinforces our image of the devastation of the Trojan landscape (cf. 107–8).

113 ἄλλον 'in addition', i.e. to the seven years since the end of the war. The inversion of the interrogative (χρόνον . . . πόσον, cf. 111) emphasizes the opening word (see Devine and Stephens (2000) 101) and thus the length of time spent by the Greeks at Troy.

116 M.'s 'wife' is dragged off by the hair (κόμης, partitive gen.: cf. *Tro.* 882), receiving the same treatment as the captive women of Troy (*Andr.* 401–2). At *Ll* 1365–6 the threat to seize Iphigenia in this way underlines another breakdown in family loyalties.

117–22 This exchange typifies the play's exploration of the fallibility of the senses and the limitations of human knowledge (cf. 119n.). As with M. (548–93, esp. 575–80), T.'s trust in appearances blinds him to the facts. The density of visual vocabulary (εἶδες, ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀρῶ, σκόπει . . . δόκησιν, δοκεῖτε . . . δόκησιν, ὄσσοις εἰδόμην . . . ὀρᾶι) underlines his mistaken confidence.

117–18 ἢ κλυῶν λέγεις; since 'mere hearsay' is usually opposed to (reliable) autopsy, the complete failure of the latter in T.'s gruff response (118) becomes yet more emphatic. The pleonasm ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀρῶ (common in epic and tragedy: Sideras (1971) 147) has a particular point here, compounding the irony of T.'s subjective certainty (cf. 122 ὄσσοις εἰδόμην).

119 εἶχετ' : 2nd pl. (after sg. σκόπει), as all the Greeks were (and remain) taken in by the divine illusion (δόκησιν . . . ἐκ θεῶν). The abstract noun δόκησις is a term appropriate to (and perhaps invented for) late fifth-century discussions of epistemology (cf. 35–6n.). Its use here to mean both 'illusion' and 'impression' (121) reflects current debates on the nature of knowledge and perception: see *Introd.* §6(a).

121–2: These lines are deleted by most editors (including Dale, Diggle, and Kovacs), but in fact make an effective climax to the discussion of seeing and seeming. T.'s attempt to change the subject (120) is overridden by H.'s eagerness to continue questioning the reliability of the senses.

οὕτω . . . ἀσφαλῆ 'so trustworthy'.

εἰδόμην: aor. middle ('saw for myself').

νοῦς ὁρᾷ: either 'and my mind (still) sees (her)', i.e. 'I still see her in my mind's eye' (with the irony that only now does his mind actually see the real H., though it refuses to grasp her identity) or, more daringly, a reference to the perceptive powers of the mind, 'and my mind saw her too'. Kannicht detects an allusion here to a saying of Epicharmus, a Sicilian comic dramatist active in the first quarter of the fifth century, νοῦς ὁρῆι καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει· τᾶλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά ('The mind sees and the mind hears: the rest is dumb and blind', DK 23 B12). This is possible, although the view attributed to Epicharmus seems to oppose the mind to the senses, or elevate it far above them, whereas T. could only mean that his mind confirmed the evidence of his senses (compare the relationship posited between the two at *Tro.* 988 (Hecuba to H.) ὁ σὸς δ' ἰδὼν νιν νοῦς ἐποιήθη Κύπρις). Yet regardless of the precise relationship to Epicharmus (whose saying may be a comic parody rather than a genuine fragment of philosophy), the phrase draws on a wider discussion of perception and cognition and adds to the philosophical dimension of the play.

123–32 The news that M. is thought to have died in a shipwreck shatters H.'s confidence in the prophecy of Hermes (cf. 56–9n., 203–4, 277–9), and prepares for the Chorus' role in persuading her to consult Theonoe for more certain information in the following scene (306–23).

124 The sense is 'no: at least (γ) not in Argos nor in Sparta'. Argos, the seat of Agamemnon's kingdom, was traditionally the first place M. came to after landing at Nauplia (cf. 1586, *Or.* 356–74).

Εὐρώτα: Doric gen. sg. (cf. 162, 493). For rivers as landmarks, see 1–3, 52–3nn.

125 H. fears the worst (αἰαῖ), but protects her identity by lamenting M.'s disappearance in the most general terms: 'sad is this news for those whom the sad news touches' (Pearson).

126 ὡς '(know) that', with ἴσθι understood (cf. 831, Diggle (1981) 88).

128 ἦν 'Yes', i.e. (in answer to 127) 'All the Argives did sail back together.' However, a god-sent storm decimated and scattered the Greek fleet (cf. 397–9, 1077–8, *Aesch. Ag.* 617–80, *Tro.* 77–97), while adverse winds have for seven years prevented M. from returning to Sparta (400–7, 520–7, 766–9, 773–6).

ἄλλοσ' ἄλλον ὠρίσεν: lit. 'determined a different course (sc. πορθμὸν) in different directions'.

130 περῶσι: dat. pl. pres. part. of περάω, ‘as they were crossing’, agreeing with πᾶσι . . . Ἀργείοισιν (127).

131 κάκ τοῦδε ‘since then’. Scaliger’s Μενέλεων (for the unmetrical Μενέλαον) is here trisyllabic: for the synizesis of the last two syllables, cf. *IT* 357, *Or.* 18, Björck (1950) 248.

132 θανῶν δὲ κλήζεται: cf. 126 ἀφανῆς . . . κλήζεται: the repetition of ‘he is said’ emphasizes that T. is merely reporting a rumour (cf. 123–32n.). Nonetheless, the juxtaposition of 132–3 underlines H.’s despair as she initially believes the news of M.’s death to be true; cf. 308–9, 317–21, 515–40.

133–42 The suicides of Leda and the Dioscuri are first attested here and are probably Euripidean innovations, making H.’s situation as desperate as possible prior to her reunion with M. Only the latter report is contradicted in the course of the play (1642–61).

133 ἀπωλόμεθα: spoken as an aside, like ὦ τάλαιν’ ἐγὼ κακῶν (139), to disguise H.’s identity (cf. Bain (1977) 39–40).

135 In Greek thought the disgrace of one family member afflicts the others: cf. 720–1. *Her.* 292–3 οἱ γὰρ εὐγενεῖς | κάμνουσι τοῖς αἰσχροῖσι τῶν τέκνων ὑπερ.

οὐ που ‘surely noi’: cf. 575, 600, 791, 95n.

αἰσχρόν . . . κλέος: a striking oxymoron, since κλέος is never pejorative by itself. The word’s epic associations (cf. 845, 1603) suggests H.’s ‘shameful fame’ as Paris’ lover. Despite her innocence of this, H. still feels responsible for Leda’s death: cf. 200–2, 280–1, 686–7.

136 For hanging as a typically female form of suicide in Greek tragedy, see Loraux (1987) 17–21 (but cf. 299–302n.).

137 Τυνδάρειοι: adjectives formed from proper names are a feature of the high poetic register of tragedy: cf. *Ar. Thesm.* 919 τὴν Τυνδάρειον παῖδ’ (paratragic), K-G 1.261–2.

138–9 τεθνᾶσι κού τεθνᾶσι: Aristophanes parodies paradoxical statements of this kind (e.g. *Alc.* 141, 521, *Ion* 1444) as clever, but empty, rhetorical tricks (*Ach.* 395–401: Eur. is ‘home and not at home’). In fact, however, they point to Eur.’s intense interest in the potential of words to persuade or deceive. So here H. (mistakenly) allows herself to believe the worst (284–5).

δύο δ’ ἐστὸν λόγῳ | Ελ. πότερος ὁ κρείσσων: T. and H. deploy both the language and the ideas of the sophists (cf. *Suip.* 486–8, *Phoen.* 469–72, *Antiope* fr. 189 K). Protagoras had claimed that for every issue there are two opposing λόγοι, the weaker (ἡττων λόγος) and the stronger (κρείττων λόγος), i.e. the less and the more convincing argument (DK 80 B6). H. wants the truth, but gets only more rumours (140 φάσ’) and cannot tell which is correct.

140 This is the earliest evidence for the Dioscuri appearing in the form of stars, rather than simply among them (cf. 1498–9, *Tro.* 1000–1, *El.* 991–2). For their role as epiphanic ‘saviours’ (σωτῆρε), cf. 1500, 1664.

141 θάτερον: an Attic contraction of τὸ ἄτερον (cf. LSJ s.v. ἄτερος 2), ‘the other (account)’.

142 A version unique to here: see 133-42n. For the Dioscuri's potential shame at their sister's conduct, cf. *Il.* 236-42.

143 ἄλις δὲ μύθων 'but enough of these stories'. T. brings H.'s enquiries to an abrupt end.

οὐ διπλᾶ: because to recount suffering renews the pain: cf. 769-71, Virg. *Aen.* 2.3 *infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem*. T. is of course unaware that his answers have caused H. just as much distress.

144-50 T.'s foundation of the new Salamis in Cyprus was well known (cf. Pind. *Nem.* 4.46-7). Eur. innovates in having T. travel by way of Egypt, so that H. can learn of the Trojan War and its aftermath before the arrival of M.

145 τὴν θεσπιωιδὸν Θεονόην: cf. the advice given to M. in Egypt by Eidothea and Proteus (*Od.* 4.363-569).

146 προξένησον: aor. imper., προξενέω 'introduce', an apt word to use for an approach to the prophetess Theonoe, *proxenos* being the technical term for an official who hosted visitors to oracular shrines (cf. *Andr.* 1103, *Ion* 551).

147 νεῶς . . . πτερόν 'ship's sail': sails and oars are often imagined as 'wings' (cf. 667, *Med.* 1, [Aesch.] *PV* 468).

οὐριον: proleptic, 'so as to catch a favourable wind'.

148-50 T.'s mission is of considerable interest to an Athenian audience, since Athens had been trying to prevent the Persians from gaining control of Cyprus for much of the fifth century (cf. *Hdt.* 5.108-15, *Thuc.* 1.112.2-4). Athenian control of the island of Salamis in the Saronic Gulf also gave them a particular interest in Cypriot Salamis, whose kings regarded themselves as descendants of T. The Chorus of Aeschylus' *Persians* (894-6) describe Salamis as the 'mother-city' of its Cypriot namesake, suggesting that the people of the latter city were encouraged by the empire-building Athenians to consider themselves obligated to their 'founders'.

149 Oracles, especially Apollo's shrine at Delphi, played a central part in the foundation of colonies (and their new cults and rituals) throughout the Greek world: see Parker (2000b) 85-7. For Apollo's role here, cf. Hor. *Odes* 1.7.27-9 *nil desperandum Teucri duce et auspice Teucri. | certus enim promisit Apollo | ambiguum tellure nova Salamina futuram*. Similarly, Cadmus founds Thebes in obedience to an oracle of Apollo (*Phoen.* 638-48).

150 τῆς ἐκεῖ χάριν πάτρας 'in honour of my homeland there (sc. Attic Salamis)'.

151 πλοῦς . . . αὐτὸς σημανεῖ: H. reassures T. of the success of his mission: 'The voyage itself will show you', i.e. Apollo himself will see to it that T. reaches his destination. (For the expectation that Apollo should support those who obey his oracle, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 579-680, Eur. *Or.* 1666-9.) H.'s hasty reply creates tension by emphasizing her fear of Theoc.'s imminent return.

152 φεῦγε: the real H. does not destroy Greeks but saves them.

154-5 ἐν φοναῖς θηροκτόνοις | κτείνει: the epithet ('beast-killing') has a negative force: Theoc.'s literal (cf. 1169-70) as well as his metaphorical 'hunting' (cf. 50-1, 63nn.) are characterized by H. as cruel and barbaric (φονή itself suggests bloody 'slaughter')

or 'carnage': cf. *El.* 1207, where it is used by Orestes to describe his matricide). The effect is strengthened by the similar roots of θηροκτόνοις | κτείνει: H. presents Theoc. as an indiscriminate killer, hunting down Greeks ('Ἕλληνας . . . ξένους) as well as wild animals. One might compare the sinister absence of the Cyclops Polyphemus at the start of his play, who returns from hunting animals (*Cycl.* 130) to kill (and eat) two of Odysseus' crew.

κυσὶν πεποιθώς 'trusting in his hounds'.

156–7 ὅτου δ' ἕκατι 'on account of what', i.e. why the king kills all Greeks (cf. 1175–6).

ἐγὼ τε σιγῶ: H. avoids the issue because she cannot explain Theoc.'s behaviour without revealing her identity.

159 ἀντιδωρησαίετο: 3rd pl. aor. middle opt., 'may the gods give you a return of good things in exchange'. The Ionic endings -αίετο and -οίετο are found approximately 30 times in Attic poetry in place of the Attic -αίνετο or -οίνετο, usually at line-end, where it suits the iambic trimeter ending: (x)–υ–.

160–1: polyptoton (i.e., repetition of a word in a different form, ὁμοιον . . . ὁμοίας) and antithesis (οὐ . . . ἀλλά) underline the confusing situation: this woman looks like H., but her personality is very different.

ὁμοιον σῶμα: whereas the prologue set up an opposition between H.'s 'body' and her 'name' in terms of real/stable σῶμα versus unreal/illusory ὄνομα (cf. 42–3, 66–7), T.'s experience shows that because it is replicated in the phantom, H.'s σῶμα can be no less misleading (cf. 559–96).

ἔχουσ' (concessive) 'although you have'.

162–3 T.'s mistaken distinction ('may she . . . but may you . . .') highlights once again the Greeks' unjustified hatred of H. (cf. 81), while his curse (κακῶς ὄλοιτο) and wish that H. never return to Sparta are unwittingly undone by his final words ('may you always enjoy good fortune'). T. now returns to his ship. Though he has failed to consult Theonoc, the ostensible reason for his visit, T.'s real dramatic function is fulfilled: H. has learned of the fall of Troy and now believes M. to be dead (cf. 68–163n.).

164–252 PARODOS

The entry of the Chorus is integrally connected to the events of the previous scene, as H. begins an emotional lyric lament for the deaths of her mother, brothers, and husband. The Chorus enter to find out the reason for H.'s cries and are drawn sympathetically into her song, mirroring the way grief is ordered as a female communal event in the world of the audience. As captive Greek women (cf. 191–2), the Chorus embody in collective form H.'s own sense of abandonment.

Following a brief prelude of three dactylic lines recited by H., the parodos takes the form of a lyric dialogue (*amoiibaion*) between H. and the Chorus. Several tragedies feature parodoi which are shared between the chorus and the actor(s): [Aesch.] *PV*; Soph. *El.*, *Phil.*, *OC*; Eur. *Med.*, *Held.*, *El.*, *Tro.*, *IT*, *Ion*, *Or.* And in line with his bold

use of actor's monody (cf. Introd. §5(c)), Eur. often sets the song of a solo figure before the entry of the chorus (*Andr.*, *Hec.*, *El.*, *Tro.*, *Ion*, *Andromeda*, *Hypsipyle*, so too [Aesch.] *PI*, Soph. *El.*). In all other surviving tragedies, however, the monody is metrically independent of the parodos, and the parodos itself is initiated by the chorus. Here, by contrast, H. sings the opening strophe, while the Chorus' entry-song begins as a metrically dependent response to it (179–90). The novel form heightens the impact of the Chorus' entry (which, as it were, 'interrupts' the actor's monody) and creates a seamless transition from H.'s anguished lament to the involvement of her sympathetic compatriots.

Tragic monodies tend to be songs of emotional *reaction* (cf. 164n., Barner (1971) 310), and are often lamentatory. In the parodoi of *Tro.* (142–52) and *IT* (138–42) the chorus is explicitly summoned by the protagonist to share in her lamentation; here the Chorus enter of their own accord in response to H.'s cries (cf. *Med.* 131–3), but their concern has a similar effect, creating a form of antiphonal lament which the fifth-century audience can relate to the antiphonal dirges (θρῆνοι: cf. 166) of their own mourning rituals.

The song has a coherent structure: H.'s opening invocation of the Sirens (167–78) is balanced by the Chorus' explanation of their own arrival (179–90). In the second strophe H. bewails her new sufferings (the fall of Troy and the death of her loved ones: 191–210), and her complaints are repeated by the Chorus, who stress the injustice of her personal disgrace (211–28). Prompted by this, H.'s concluding epode traces the origins of her disgrace back to Paris' voyage to Sparta and the rivalry of Aphrodite and Hera (229–52). Thus the parodos constitutes a lyric development of many themes already established in the prologue.

Metre. H. chants two dactylic hexameters and a pentameter (164–6) before beginning her song (for Eur.'s use of dactyls in laments, cf. 375–85, Parker (1997) 52). The metre of her lyric exchange with the Chorus is iambo-trochaic (predominantly trochaic), with much resolution and syncopation (i.e. the suppression of short syllables); Parker (1997) 37 compares 'the manner of *threnetic* resolution in iambic' (my italics). The first stanza begins with two *lekythia*, a sequence that becomes more prominent in the second strophic pair and epode (196ff. ~ 215ff., 235ff.; for the *lekythion* as a bridge between iambic and trochaic metra, see Parker (1990) 331). The transmitted text of the first strophic pair presents several problems of syntax and responsion. These have been carefully analysed by Willink (1990) 80–96, some of whose emendations are accepted here (cf. 170, 175, 182a–b). The second strophic pair continues the syncopated trochaic rhythm, with period-end at 212 (hiatus) and 221 (*brevis in longo*), where τέκνα may also scan contracted (~–). Dale (1968) 93 remarks (on 200ff.) 'It is a type of lyric which could easily degenerate into a somewhat empty *coloratura* performance of the δάκρυα δάκρυα type ridiculed by Aristophanes.' Yet the impression of unrestrained emotion is achieved with considerable skill, as thematic and metrical responsion reinforce our sense of H.'s misery at the destruction of her family: e.g. 194 ἔμολεν ἔμολε ~ 214 ἔλαχεν ἔλαχε, 200 Λήδα δ' ἐν ἀγκύοναίς ~ 219 μάτηρ μὲν οἴχεται,

207–8 (of the Dioscuri's death) λέ|λοιπε ~ 226a–b (of M.'s) λέ|λοιπε. The epode's syncopated iambo-trochaic rhythm blends in well with the previous stanzas. For the unusual *breviſ in longo* within the syntactic period at 230, see Stinton (1990) 319.

167–90 first strophe and antistrophe

υυυ-υ-υ-			
πτεροφόροι νεάνιδες,	167	lckythion	
κυανοειδές ἀμφ' ὕδωρ	179		
σευσευσευ-			
παρθένοι Χθονός κόραι,	168	lckythion	
ἔτυχον ἔλικά τ' ἀνά χλόαν	180		
--υ-υ-			
Σειρῆνες, εἶθ' ἔμοῖς	169	sync tr dim	
φοίνικας ἀλίωι	181		
υ---υ---			
ὀμιλοῖτ' ἔχουσαι	170	2ba	
πέπλους χρυσέαισιν	182a		
υ---υ---			
Λίβυν λωτὸν ἢ σύ-	171a	2ba	
<τ' ἐν> αὐγαῖσι θάλλουσα'	182b		
--υσευ-υ-			
ριγγας αἰλίνοις κακοῖς·	171b	lckythion	
ἀμφὶ δόνακος ἔρνεσιν·	183		
--υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-			
τοῖς <δ'> ἔμοῖσι σύνοχα δάκρυα,	172	2tr	
ἔνθεν οἰκτρὸν ὄμαδον ἔκλυον,	184		
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-			
πάθεσι πάθεα, μέλεσι μέλεα,	173	2tr	
ἄλυρον ἔλεγον, ὅτι ποτ' ἔλακεν	185		
--υ---υ			
μουσεῖα θρηνήμα-	174a	sync tr dim	
<---υ> αἰάγμα-	186a		
--υ-υ-υ-			
σι ξυνωιδά πέμψαιτε,	174b	sync tr dim	
σι στένουσα νύμφα τις,	186b		
-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-			
Φερσέφασσα φόνιον ἄχαριν	175	2tr	
οἶα Ναῖς ὄρεσι φύγδα	187		

<p>υυυ<u>κ</u>υυυυυυυυ ἴν' ἐπὶ δάκρυσι παρ' ἐμέθεν ὑπὸ νόμον λείσα γοερόν, ὑπὸ δὲ</p>	<p>176 188</p>	<p>21r</p>
<p>υυυυυ---υ μέλαθρα νύχια παιᾶνα πέτρινα γύαλα κλαγγαῖσι</p>	<p>177 189</p>	<p>sync tr dim</p>
<p><u>κ</u>υυυυυ---υ νέκυσιν ὀλομένοις λάβηι. Πανὸς ἀναβοᾶι γάμους.</p>	<p>178 190</p>	<p>lckythion</p>
191–228 second strophe and antistrophe		
<p>---υ---υ--- ὦ θήραμα βαρβάρου πλάτας, αἰαῖ δαίμονος πολυστόνου</p>	<p>191 211</p>	<p>sync tr trim cat</p>
<p>---υ---υ--- Ἑλλανίδες κόραι, μοίρας τε σᾶς, γύναι.</p>	<p>192 212</p>	<p>sync tr dim</p>
<p>---υ---υ--- ναύτας Ἀχαιῶν τις αἰῶν δυσαιῶν τις</p>	<p>193 213</p>	<p>sync tr dim</p>
<p>υυυυυυυυυυυ---υ ἔμολεν ἔμολε δάκρυα δάκρυσί μοι φέρων· ἔλαχεν ἔλαχεν, ὅτε σ' ἐτέκετο ματρόθεν</p>	<p>194–5 214</p>	<p>31r_A</p>
<p><u>κ</u>υ---υ---υ--- Ἰλίου κατασκαφαί χιονόχρωι κύκνου πτερῶι</p>	<p>196 215</p>	<p>lckythion</p>
<p><u>κ</u>υ---υ---υ--- πυρὶ μέλουσι δαίωι Ζεὺς πρέπων δι' αἰθέρος.</p>	<p>197 216</p>	<p>lckythion</p>
<p>υυυ---υ---υ--- δι' ἐμέ τάν πολυκτόνον, τί γάρ ἄπεστί σοι κακῶν;</p>	<p>198 217</p>	<p>lckythion</p>
<p>υυυυυ<u>κ</u>υ---υ--- δι' ἐμόν ὄνομα πολύπνονον, τί δ' ἀνά βίοτον οὐκ ἔτλας;</p>	<p>199 218</p>	<p>lckythion</p>
<p>---υ---υ--- Λήδα δ' ἐν ἀγχόναϊς μάτηρ μὲν οἴχεται,</p>	<p>200 219</p>	<p>sync tr dim</p>
<p>υυυυυ---υ--- θάνατον ἔλαβεν αἰσχύ- ἰδυμά τε Διὸς οὐκ εὐ-</p>	<p>201 220</p>	<p>sync tr dim</p>

—υ—υ—υ— νας ἐμᾶς ὑπ' ἀλγέων, δαιμονεῖ τέκεα φίλα,	202 221	Ickythion
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ὁ δ' ἐμὸς ἐν ἀλί πολυπλανῆς χθόνα δὲ πάτριον οὐχ ὀραῖς,	203 222	Ickythion
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— πόσις ὀλόμενος οἴχεται, διὰ δὲ πόλιας ἔρχεται	204 223	Ickythion
—υ—υ—υ—υ— Κάστορός τε συγγόνου τε βάξις ἅ σε βαρβάροισι,	205 224	2tr
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— διδυμογενὲς ἄγαλμα πατρίδος πότνια, παραδίδωσι λέχεσιν,	206 225	2tr
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἀφανὲς ἀφανὲς Ἰππόκροτα λέ- ὁ δὲ σὸς ἐν ἀλί κύμασί τε λέ-	207 226a	2tr
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— λοιπε δάπεδα γυμνάσιά τε λοιπε βίοτον, οὐδέ ποτ' ἔτι	208 226b	2tr
υ—υ—υ—υ— δονακόεντος Εὐρώ- πάτρια μέλαθρα καὶ τὰν	209 227	sync tr dim
—υ—υ—υ—υ— τα, νεανιῶν πόνον. Χαλκίοικον ὀλβιεῖ.	210 228	Ickythion
229–52: epode		
—υ—υ—υ— φεῦ φεῦ, τίς ἦ Φρυγῶν	229	sync tr dim
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἦ τίς Ἑλλανίας ἀπὸ χθονός	230	sync tr trun cat
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἔτεμε τὰν δακρυόεσσαν	231a	sync tr dim
—υ—υ—υ— Ἰλίωι πεύκαν;	231b	sync tr dim
—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἐνθεν ὀλόμενον σκάφος	232	Ickythion

υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- συναρμόσας ὁ Πριαμίδας	233	2ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ἔπλευσε βαρβάρωι πλάται	234	2ia
-υ-υ-υ-υ- τάν ἐμάν ἐφ' ἔστιαν	235	lekkythion
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ἐπὶ τὸ δυστυχέστατον	236	lekkythion
-υ-υ-υ-υ- κάλλος, ὡς ἔλοι γαμῶν,	237	lekkythion
-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ἄ τε δόλιος ἄ πολυκτόνος Κύπρις	238	3tr _Λ
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- Δαναΐδαις ἄγουσα θάνατον	239	2tr
-υ-υ-υ-υ- ᾧ τάλαινα συμφορᾶς.	240	lekkythion
-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ἄ δὲ χρυσεῖοις θρόνοισι	241	2tr
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- Διὸς ὑπαγκάλισμα σεμνόν	242	2tr
-υ-υ-υ-υ- Ἥρα τὸν ὠκύπουν	243a	sync tr dim
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ἔπεμψε Μαιάδος γόνον	243b	2ia
-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ὄς με χλοερά δρεπτομέναν ἔσω πέπλων	244	3tr _Λ
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ρόδεα πέταλα Χαλκίοικον	245a	2tr
-υ-υ-υ-υ- ὡς Ἀθάναν μόλοιμ'	245b	2cr
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ἀναρπάσας δι' αἰθέρος	246	2ia
-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- τάνδε γαῖαν εἰς ἀνολβον	247	2tr
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ἔριν ἔριν τάλαιναν ἔθετο	248	2tr

~~~~~	Πριαμίδαισιν Ἑλλάδος.	249	lekythion
~~~~~	τὸ δ' ἔμὸν ὄνομα παρὰ Σιμουντίοις ῥοαῖσι	250-1	3tr
~~~~~	μαψίδιον ἔχει φάτιν.	252	lekythion

**164-6** H. begins with a brief προοίμιον (prelude) expressing the magnitude of her grief (μεγάλων . . . μέγαν) and preparing for her invocation of the Sirens (τίνα μοῦσαν). The dactylic hexameters, evocative of epic, provide an appropriate introduction to a song so concerned with the origins and aftermath of the Trojan War (cf. the hexameter prelude to Timotheus' *Persae* fr. 788 *PMG*; Hordern (2002) 128).

**164** 'As I begin a great lament for my great sorrows . . .'. As one would expect in songs of emotional reaction, Eur.'s monodies and lyric dialogues are replete with first-person references (a feature parodied by Aristophanes: *Thesm.* 1015-55, *Frogs* 1329-63).

καταβαλλομένα: lit. 'laying down the foundations of (my lament)' (LSJ s.v. καταβάλλω II 7; cf. *Her.* 1261). Metaphor and self-apostrophe (ὦ + voc. participle) create a solemn and impressive opening to H.'s song.

**165** ποῖον . . . ἢ τίνα: the (nearly synonymous) alternatives mark H.'s *aporia* as to how her lament could do justice to her loss.

ἀμιλλασθῶ is deliberative subjunc. (aor. of ἀμιλλάομαι), 'What lament can I bring forth?' The verb's underlying sense of 'contest' (cf. 387, 1471) suggests not only the effort involved (cf. 356, 546) but also H.'s desire to perform her song in an impressive and appropriate manner.

τίνα μοῦσαν ἐπέλθω: H. is asking what form of song she should adopt (rather than which Muse she should approach): cf. *IT* 181-2 τὰν ἐν | θρήνοις μοῦσαν νέκυσι μῆλεον. Allusions to various types of song (paeon, hymenaios, epinician, etc.) are found throughout tragedy and show the tragic poets' creative exploitation of other genres. Here H. and the Chorus' frequent references to forms of lament (165-6, 174, 185-6, 188) evoke the sympathy and pity associated with real-life *gooi* and *thrēnoi*, and trigger these responses for the audience.

**166** is deleted by Willink (1990) 79 as a 'redundant appendage', but the piling up of further alternatives emphasizes H.'s struggle to find appropriate (lyrical) expression for her grief (cf. *Her.* 1025-7).

**167-78** H. answers her question (164-6) by calling upon the Sirens, whose corresponding music and song, performed in the Underworld, will, she hopes, enable Persephone to hear her lament.

**167-9** πτεροφόροι . . . Σειρήνες: Dale suggests that H. is reacting to a depiction of Sirens (birds with girls' faces) on the tomb of Proteus. Though possible (Sirens are found on tombs of the classical period: cf. *LIMC* s.v. Scirenes §IV, Vermeule (1979)

201–4, with fig. 27), such a visual cue is not necessary to explain their presence here, for the Sirens' connection in art and myth to both death and music (cf. *Od.* 12.39–54, 158–200, Alcman fr. 30 *PMGF* ἄ Μῶσα κέκλαγ' ἄ λίγηα Σηρήν) makes them ideal partners in H.'s lament. Moreover, as well as being singers, the Sirens are *parthenoi* (albeit dangerous ones, whose sexuality is used to destroy men) and so serve to reinforce the connections between H. and Persephone (175–8, 244–9, 1349nn.).

169–71 'May you join me (ὁμιλοῖτ') in my mournful woes (ἔμοῖς . . . αἰλίνοις κακοῖς), bringing (ἔχουσαι) . . .'

Λιβυὸν λωτόν: metonymy for 'Libyan *aulos*', since the wood of the North African lotus tree was used for its pipes (cf. Barker (1984) 67). H.'s own song is being accompanied by an *αὐλητής* on stage.

ἡ σύριγγας [ἡ φόρμιγγας] 'or panpipes [or lyres]': the panpipe is not always a rustic instrument (cf. *Tro.* 127). The lyres do not belong here, since (responsion apart) H.'s dirge is an *ἄλυρος ἔλεγος* (185).

172–4 'And may you, singers in tune with my laments (μουσεῖα θρηνήμασι ξυνωιδά), send tears in accord with my tears, pains with my pains, and songs with my songs.' *Andromeda* fr. 116 K ποῖαι λιβάδες, ποῖα σειρήν is attributed to Andromeda by Kannicht; as Gibert in Collard et al (2004) 157 suggests, 'she perhaps asks what tears of pity will be shed for her plight, what Siren will sing a comforting lament for her death'. The joint dirge of H. and the Sirens, by contrast, commemorates the death of others, for which the heroine herself feels responsible (109–10, 135–6, 142, 198–210, etc.).

172 σύνοχα ('in accord with', 'matching') modifies δάκρυα, πάθεα, and μέλεα, which are all the object of πέμπαιτε (2nd pl. aor. opt.). The actions of the Sirens (in Hades) are to mirror H.'s exactly. (πάθεα are the painful and distinctive acts of grief: tearing the hair, scratching the cheeks, and beating the breast.)

173 πάθεσι πάθεα, μέλεσι μέλεα: polyptoton (the repetition of a word in different forms: 160–1n.) is far more common in Eur. than his predecessors (cf. *Ar. Frogs* 1336–55, Breitenbach (1934) 221–6, Denniston on *El.* 337), and such double polyptota with asyndeton are almost unique to him (cf. 195).

174 μουσεῖα: nom. pl. in apposition, here meaning 'singers' rather than their place of singing (as at 1107–8): cf. *Ar. Frogs* 93, where Dionysus contemptuously describes the new wave of tragic poets as χελιδόνων μουσεῖα.

θρηνήμασι ξυνωιδά: the same phrase is used by Electra of the sympathetic Argive Chorus in *Orestes* (132–3 θρηνήμασιν | φίλαι ξυνωιδοί).

175–8 'so that Persephone in her halls of night may receive from me with my tears a paeon, bloody and joyless, for the dead that are gone.'

Φερσέφασσα: according to *Ap. Rhod. Arg.* 4.896–8, the Sirens were companions of Persephone before she was raped by Hades, which would make them all the more suitable as intermediaries. In *Soph. fr.* 861 R the Sirens sing τοὺς Αἰδου νόμους. For the form of Persephone's name, see 1306–7n.

φόνιον ἄχαριν . . . παιᾶνα: H.'s invocation culminates in a paradoxical paeon for the dead. As typically joyful cult hymns, paeans differed greatly from dirges and

might be emphatically contrasted with them (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 342–4, *IT* 182–5). Thus ‘paeon for the dead’ (meaning ‘lament’) is a striking oxymoron, exploited by Aesch. and Eur. to stress the actual impact of suffering and death (e.g. *Ag.* 645 παιῶνα τόνδ’ Ἐρινύων, *Cho.* 151 παιᾶνα τοῦ θανόντος ἐξαιδωμένης, *Alc.* 424 παιᾶνα τῷ κάτωθεν ἄσπονδον θεῶι): cf. Rutherford (2001) 118–20, Loraux (2002) 65. The dissonance is increased here by the reception of H.’s ‘paeon’ in Hades itself.

**179–90** The Chorus explain their entry as a response to a distraught woman’s cries (cf. *Med.* 131–8) and speculate about the cause of her distress. Full contact with H. at the tomb of Proteus is established only at 191 (cf. Mastronarde (1979) 22).

**179–83** The Chorus’ opening words emphasize their sex. As slaves (cf. 191–2), the Chorus may well be washing and drying the palace’s laundry rather than their own (purple [φοίνικας] suggests luxurious royal garments: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 910–65). Their everyday task is described in vivid picturesque detail (cf. *Hipp.* 121–30), and the calm of the riverside scene is broken by the sudden irruption of H.’s lamentations (184–90).

**179** κυανοειδές ‘dark-blue’: more often the colour of the sea (e.g. *IT* 7), but here used of a river (either the Nile itself or a tributary), since laundry is not washed in the sea (cf. *Hipp.* 126 ποταμίαι δρόσῳ) and the reeds used to support the clothes (183) are fresh-water plants. The density of colour words (four in as many lines: green, purple, and gold follow) and the brightness of the sun (182) contrast strongly with the μέλαθρα νύχια of Hades in H.’s invocation (177).

**180** ἔτυχον (with participle θάλπουσ’) ‘I happened to be drying’.

**181–2** ἀλίῳ . . . χρυσαίῳ <τ’ ἐν> αὐγαῖσι: poetic hendiadys for ‘in the bright sun’.

**183** ἀμφὶ δόνακος ἔρνεσιν: the clothes are spread out to dry ‘on (ἀμφὶ + dat.) stalks of reed’ (contrast ἀμφὶ + acc. in 179 meaning ‘near’); cf. *Od.* 6.94–5 (clothes spread out on a clean pebbled beach), *Hipp.* 128–9 (on the back of a warm rock).

**184–90** The Chorus’ work is disturbed by H.’s lament, which they compare to the cry of a Naiad being raped by Pan. The assimilation of H. to the abducted nymph reinforces the depiction of H. as a *parthenos* whose sexual integrity is under threat from Theoc. (cf. 68–70n.). After the colourful scene by the river (179n.) comes a passage packed with sound (ten terms in seven lines), expressing the intensity of H.’s grief and its startling effect on the Chorus.

**184–5** οἰκτρὸν ὄμαδον . . . ἄλυρον ἔλεγον ‘(there I heard) a pitiable wail, a lament not fit for the lyre’: lack of stringed instruments is often equated with lack of joy (e.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 331–3, *Supp.* 681; Soph. *OC* 1221–2; Eur. *Alc.* 447, *IT* 144–6; cf. Diggle (1994) 101–2). Laments were usually accompanied by the *aulos* (as is H.’s) rather than the lyre: cf. 169–71n. In addition, H. is compared to a Naiad threatened by Pan, a god noted for his pipe-playing.

ἔλακεν ‘she screamed’ (3rd sg. aor. λάσκω).

**186** The missing word may be an epithet of αἰάγμασι (onomatopoeic, from αἰαῖ; cf. Soph. *Aj.* 430–2): see the app. crit., and Lourenço (2000b) 601 for πολλοῖσιν. Willink (1990) 93–4 suggests ἐντεῦθεν or αὐλάθεν (though the latter is not found in

extant Greek), emphasizing the Chorus' realization that the sound is coming from the direction of the palace.

**187–90** Like the Naiad, H. too is fleeing unwanted sexual advances (63n.). For the sexual vulnerability of nymphs, connected to their life outdoors, see Larson (2001) 42–3; the vulnerability of mortal girls found alone in the countryside is central to Archil. fr. 196a W.

**187** οἶα: i.c. 'such (αἰάγματα) as a Naiad (expresses . . .)'.  
 φύγδα (adverbial) 'in flight'.

**188** νόμον . . . γοερὸν '(uttering) her mournful strain': νόμος specifies a type of song, here threnodic.

**189** γύαλα ('hollows') are secluded places (here rocky caverns), marking the Naiad's helplessness; cf. *Phil.* 1081–2 ὦ κοίλας πέτρας γύαλον | θερμὸν καὶ παγετώδες κτλ.

κλαγγαῖσι 'with echoing cries'. Verbal and metrical parallels enhance the connection between H.'s grief and the Naiad's laments: 176–7 ὑπὸ | μέλαθρα νύχια παιᾶνα ~ 188–9 ὑπὸ δὲ | πέτρινα γύαλα κλαγγαῖσι.

**190** ἀναβοᾶι 'shouts aloud ("Pan is trying to rape me")', for as Diggle (1994) 437 remarks, 'An accusative with βοᾶν or ἀναβοᾶν expresses the content of the βοή.' For γάμος as a euphemism for rape, cf. *Ion* 72 ὡς . . . καὶ γάμοι τε Λοξίου | κρυπτοὶ γένωνται.

**191–210** H. informs the Chorus of her new sufferings, reviewing for them T.'s account (193 ναύτας Ἀχαιῶν τις) of events in Troy and Greece.

**191–3** ὦ . . . κόραι: the identity of the Chorus is quickly established: they are Greek women captured by foreign pirates and sold into slavery (lit. 'spoil of a barbarian oar': cf. 234, 1117). They are thus captives like H. (cf. the choruses of *Hec.* and *Tro.*), but of a much lower status (as in *IT*, though there the Greek chorus are the slaves of Iphigenia herself). Eur. exploits the dynamic between female protagonist and sympathetic female chorus in a number of plays (*Med.*, *Hipp.*, *Andr.*, *Hec.*, *El.*, *Tro.*, *IT*, *Ion*, *Phoen.*, *Or.*, *Ll*). In both *IT* and *Hel.* the barbarian setting and the chorus' Greek identity accentuate the heroine's desire to return home.

θήραμα: though the hunting metaphor is less sexual than in its application to Theoc. (63n.), H. still sees the women as captured like herself; cf. *Or.* 1316 (Electra on Hermione) καλὸν τὸ θήραμ', ἦν ἀλῶι, γενήσεται.

**195** Anadiplosis of ἐμολε(ν) and polyptoton (173n.) emphasize H.'s distress. For anadiplosis of verbs in Eur. (cf. 214, 331, 384, 640, 650–1, etc.), see Diggle (1994) 388–90. Ar. *Frogs* 1352–5 mocks anadiplosis as a Euripidean mannerism. Although such repetitions are found in Aesch. and Soph., Eur. is much more fond of the technique, especially in his late plays (Breitenbach (1934) 214–21 lists all occurrences).

**196–9** As elsewhere, H.'s compassion for the Trojan victims comes first (cf. 109, 362–9; cf. 1114–16).

**196–7**: lit. 'the ruins of Ilium are a concern (μέλουσι) to destructive fire' (cf. *Andr.* 850 ἵνα θανοῦσα νεπτέροισιν μέλω). The expression is ironically macabre, personifying the fire itself. For the association of κατασκαφή with burning, cf. *Rhes.* 391–2, Soph. *OC* 1318–19, Connor (1985) 85. πυρὶ δαίωι is an epic phrase (e.g. *Il.* 8.181), appropriate to the razing of Troy (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 222).

**198-9** Anaphora (δι' ἐμέ . . . | δι' ἐμόν) and rhyme (πολυκτόνον | . . . πολύπονον) accentuate H.'s expression of responsibility.

δι' ἐμέ τὸν πολυκτόνον: cf. 52-3.

ὄνομα πολύπονον: 42-3n. There may be an additional allusion to the 'destructiveness' of H.'s name: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 689 ἑλένας ἔλανδρος ἑλέπολις.

**200-10** An emotional synopsis of T.'s report, as it concerns H.: Leda's suicide (200-2 ~ 133-6), the presumed drowning of M. (203-4 ~ 123-32), and the disappearance of H.'s brothers (205-10 ~ 137-142).

**201-2** αἰσχύνας ἐμᾶς ὑπ' ἀλγέων 'because of her pain at my shame' (cf. 417 ὑπ' αἰδοῦς).

**203-4** As with Iphigenia's lament for Orestes, H. mourns for someone who is not in fact dead (*IT* 143-77).

ἐν ἄλλῃ πολυπλανῆς: for Eur.'s use of Odyssean motifs in the presentation of M.'s *nostos*, see *Introd.* p. 27.

**205-6** Κάστωρος . . . πατρίδος 'twin glories of their native land, Castor and his brother': the genitives depend on ἀγαλμα (for the 'double genitive' denoting different relations, see Smyth §1338). For cult of the Dioscuri at Athens as well as Sparta, see 1495-1511n.

διδυμογενές ('twin-born') is a *hapax*.

**207-8** ἵπποκροτα . . . γυμνάσια: H.'s brothers have left behind their characteristic (aristocratic) activities and haunts: cf. *Il.* 3.237 Κάστωρά θ' ἵππόδαμον καὶ πύξ ἀγαθὸν Πολυδεύκεα (= *Od.* 11.300). For the Dioscuri's association with horses and their function as paradigms for young Spartan men (parallel to H.'s status as a role-model for Spartan *parthenoi*) cf. 1495-6n.

ἵπποκροτα ('resounding with horses' hoofs') qualifies δάπεδα ('plains'); it is a rare epithet (surprisingly so, given the prominence of horses in poetry), found only three times in extant classical Greek: cf. *Hipp.* 228-9 (Phaedra raving) δέσποιν' ἄλλας Ἀρτεμι Λίμνας | καὶ γυμνασίων τῶν ἵπποκρότων, *Pind. Pyth.* 5.92.

**209-10** δονακόεντος Εὐρώτα: 'reedy' is the river's regular epithet (349, 493, *LI* 179 δονακοτρόφου, etc.).

νεανιᾶν πόνον: i.e. the equestrian grounds and gymnasia are where young men experience πόνος, combining the idea of 'exertion' with that of 'achievement through hard work' (cf. *Pind. Nem.* 4.1-2 ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων | Ιατρός).

**211-28** The Chorus take up H.'s lament for her family and bewail the constant suffering of her life, from her disgrace as an adulteress to her abandonment far from Greece. The absence of any consolation from their song is striking and appropriate, for both H. and the Chorus now believe that M. is dead (226-8), annulling (it seems) the prophecy of Hermes (cf. 56-9).

**211-12** δαίμονος . . . μοῖρας τε σᾶς: causal genitives, as often in exclamations (Smyth §1407). The Chorus see H.'s life ruled by a power (δαίμων; cf. 455, 669) and an apportioned lot (μοῖρα) that are equally full of sorrow (πολυστόνου). The notion that one's destiny was set at birth leads naturally to an account of H.'s conception (213-16).

**213-14** αἰὼν δυσαιῶν: δυσ- or α-compound adjectives combined with a cognate noun or verb form a type of oxymoron popular in tragedy, e.g. 363 ἔργ' ἀνεργ', 690 γάμον ἄγαμον; cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1142 νόμον ἄνομον, Breitenbach (1934) 236-8.

ἔλαχεν ἔλαχεν: with reference to a person's destiny this verb ('obtain as his or her lot') usually has the person as subject. Sometimes, however, 'the concept is reversed, and an individual is "received as his portion" by a power responsible for his destiny' (Barrett on *Hipp.* 79-81). So here H. herself is the object ('A miserable life received you [σε understood] as its portion'), and the construction suggests H.'s role as a passive victim of external powers. The Chorus' emotional concern is also marked by anadiplosis at the same point as in H.'s strophe (195n.).

**214-16** The Chorus focus on Zeus (Leda receives only one word ματρώθεν) because H.'s semi-divine status has played a large part in her misery. The peculiar closeness of the ἡμίθεοι to the gods (cf. Hes. *WD* 159-60) makes them both awesome and vulnerable.

πρέπων 'conspicuous' (cf. 1204), here of the swan's dazzling 'snow-white-skinned wing' (cf. 18-21).

**217-18** Two brief but forceful questions, preparing for the the catalogue of H.'s sufferings in 219-28.

ἀνὰ βίωτον 'in the course of your life' (LSJ s.v. ἀνά c 11).

**220-1** οὐκ εὐδαιμονεῖ: a vague, but sinister, phrase, based on the Dioscuri's disappearance from Sparta (207 ἀφανές).

**223-5** πόλις: Ionic acc. pl. (also in *Andr.* 484).

βάξις 'rumour', 'report', usually of bad news (cf. 351); an exclusively poetic word. At *Or.* 1557 M. calls the news of H.'s miraculous disappearance (rather than death) a κενὴν βᾶξιν.

παραδίδωσι: lit. '(which) hands you over (to a barbarian bed)', personifying the rumour itself.

**226-8** ὁ δὲ σός (sc. πόσις), an unusual ellipse, but clear from the context.

ἐν ἀλὶ κύμασσι τε: hendiadys; cf. 203.

οὐδέ . . . ὀλβιεῖ 'and he will never again gladden his ancestral halls or Athena of the Bronze House.' L's ὀλβιοῖς (emended to ὀλβιεῖς in P) has the Chorus address their prediction to H., but the sudden change of subject seems surprising. Moreover, the Chorus have already remarked on H.'s absence from Sparta (222). The corruption is understandable, however, for M.'s death does indeed mean the end of H.'s own hopes for a return home (cf. 56-9, 277-9).

τᾶν Χαλκίοικον: Athena was worshipped as a protectress and citadel-goddess in many cities besides Athens (cf. *Iliad* 6.269-311). Her Spartan cult-title Χαλκίοικος derived from her distinctive bronze-plated temple on the acropolis (cf. *Top.* 1113, Thuc. 1.128.2, 134, Paus. 3.17.1-3). Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, produced in 411, ends with the Spartan ambassador singing a hymn to τᾶν δ' αὖ σιᾶν τᾶν παμμάχον, τᾶν Χαλκίοικον (1321), as both Spartans and Athenians celebrate a fantastic and utopian peace. For further Athenian perceptions of the goddess's Spartan cult, cf. 1465-7n.

**229–52** H. concludes her lament by looking back to the origins of the war itself. Her epode is a good example of the kind of polymetric and astrophic monody first introduced into tragedy (as far as we can tell) by Eur.: cf. 348–85. The entire passage has recently been condemned as an ‘early fourth-century composition of “Euripidean lyric pastiche” for the stage’ (Lourenço (2000a) 133). Alleged examples of ‘inapposite imagery and woolly phraseology’ (Lourenço (2000a) 134) will be considered in due course, our conclusion being that, one minor interpolation aside (cf. 239), H.’s epode represents a typical example of late Euripidean lyric. Her song falls into two parts, separated by an exclamation of sorrow (240): she deals first with Paris’ voyage to Sparta, accompanied by Aphrodite (229–39), then recalls her (actual) abduction from Sparta to Egypt and the subsequent outbreak of war (241–52).

**229–39:** Already in the *Iliad* Paris’ ships are called ‘initiators of evil’ (5.63 ἀρχεκάκους) and the captive Trojan women of *Hecuba* deplore Paris’ voyage to fetch H. in similar terms (631–5). As often in reflections on the Trojan War, the misfortunes of both sides are traced back to their beginnings (Stevens on *Andr.* 274–308; cf. *Med.* 1–6).

**229–31** τίς . . . χθονός: the disjunction is equivalent to τίς βροτῶν (cf. 257).

ἔτεμε . . . πεύκαν: cf. (at the root of another disaster) *Med.* 3–4 μηδ’ ἐν νάπαισι Πηλίου πεσεῖν ποτε | τμηθεῖσα πεύκη.

δακρυέεσσαν ‘causing tears’ (but also, of a pine tree, ‘exuding resin’: cf. *Med.* 1200 πεύκινον δάκρυ).

**232** ὀλόμενον σκάφος: ὀλόμενος is ‘accursed’ (i.e. something which would provoke one to say ὄλοιο), but the active meaning ‘destructive’ is also felt (cf. Willink on *Or.* 1364–5).

**234** βαρβάρωι πλάται: cf. 192, 1117. Lourenço (2000a) 136–7 claims that the repeated lyric use of βάρβαρος with πλάτη is suspicious and an argument for the epode being spurious; this is not persuasive, however, since tragic poets (and their audiences) do not seem to have been bothered by such repetitions (cf. Jackson (1955) 220–2).

**236–7** These lines were deleted by Dindorf as a hodgepodge of 27–30 (he is followed by Diggle and Kovacs). However, their content (H.’s pernicious beauty) is thematically coherent (cf. 261–3, 304–5, etc.) and Dale’s slight change heals the metre (κάλλος is the object of the purpose clause ὡς ἔλοι γαμῶν).

**238–9** τε connects Aphrodite with Paris (233) as the subject of ἐπλευσε (234). For the goddess accompanying Paris to Sparta, see *Tro.* 940, 983–4; cf. *Hel.* 1117–21.

δόλιος . . . πολυκτόνος: cf. 882–6, 1102–6.

**240** For τάλαινα and other expressions of self-pity as peculiarly characteristic of female speech in tragedy, see McClure (1995) 45–8.

**241–3** Lourenço (2000a) 137 objects that Hermes’ mother is usually Μαῖα elsewhere in Eur. and Μαιάς only here, at 1670 and *Or.* 998 (the latter deleted in the OCT). However, his proposal to delete 1670–5 (with Hartung) is not convincing (cf. 1670–5n.), nor is there any good reason to reject these lines. Having recalled Aphrodite’s victory in the Judgement of Paris (232–9), H. now describes the reaction of her rival (cf. 31–6, 44–6).

ὑπαγκάλισμα (lit. 'object of embrace', which can be used of a child (e.g. *Tro.* 757) or, as here, a sexual partner (Soph. *Trach.* 540)) is nom., the whole phrase χρυσεῖς . . . σεμνόν being in apposition to ἅ Ἥρα: 'But Hera, seated on her golden throne (cf. χρυσόθρονος Ἥρη in epic), proud beloved of Zeus's embraces . . .'. ὑπαγκάλισμα has a bitter tone in H.'s mouth, given her own enforced separation from her husband.

σεμνόν underlines Hera's status and thus the offence to her τιμή (losing to Aphrodite in the Judgement) which provoked her intervention.

**244-9** The motif of flower-picking as a prelude to rape is found in a number of myths: cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 5-8, *Ion* 887-96, Mosch. *Europa* 32-6, 63-9; at Theoc. 11.25-7 Polyphemus first sees and falls in love with Galatea as she is plucking flowers. Whereas Persephone, Creusa, and Europa are all young virgin girls abducted for sex, H. is a mature married woman whose abduction rescues her from Paris' advances. However, it is a basic feature of such mythical parallels as the one made throughout this play between H. and Persephone that they need only be *partial* in order to be effective (cf. also 1312-14a with note). So here the reference to flower-picking confirms H.'s symbolic status as a *parthenos* figure who is threatened by Theoc.'s sexual desires and severed from her proper status as M.'s wife (cf. 1349n.). More generally, Eur. applies the *anodos* paradigm typically associated with Persephone to H., and just as Persephone's story is linked to Zeus's plans for mankind (esp. in the establishment of the seasons: e.g. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 399-403, 445-7), so Eur. retains H.'s fundamental cosmic role (as catalyst of the Trojan War) but switches the focus from the Judgement of Paris to a less traditional version of her abduction and return. (For H.'s cosmic role in early Greek myth, see p. 12.)

**244-5** χλοερά . . . ῥόδεα πέταλα: H. intended to plait a garland of flowers as an offering to Athena (probably to adorn her statue: cf. *Hipp.* 73-83); for roses in the context of a maiden's 'plucking', cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 6, Mosch. *Europa* 36. Flower-gathering festivals in honour of various goddesses, including Athena and Persephone, were celebrated throughout Greece: cf. Richardson (1974) 141-2.

Χαλκίοικον ὡς Ἀθάναν μόλοιμ': purpose clause with aor. opt. The article is optional when the deity's name is given: cf. 226-8n.

**246** ἀναρπάσας: the word, used elsewhere of H.'s rape by Paris (cf. 50-1n.), marks Hermes as the true abductor of (the real) H.

**247** ἀνολβον 'to this unhappy land': H. refers to her predicament as an exile and suppliant.

**248** ἔριν ἔριν τάλαιναν ἔθετο: emotive anadiplosis (195n.), with με understood from 244, 'made me the cause of miserable strife'. For H. and her phantom as the cause of ἔρις, cf. 1134-6, 1155-6, 1160, Aesch. *Ag.* 1455-61.

**250-2** Lourenço (2000a) 139 objects to these lines because elsewhere H. is concerned about her reputation in Greece (cf. 66, 81, 223-5). Yet the reference to Troy ('beside the streams of Simois': 1-3n.) is doubly appropriate: firstly, it stresses the fact that H. is universally reviled (cf. 52-5); and secondly, her name does indeed have 'a false reputation' (μαψίδιον φάτιν) because it was only her ὄνομα which went to Troy (cf. 42-3, 160-1nn.).

μαψιδιον: a poetic word, occurring only here in extant Eur. (the adverb μαψιδίως, 'thoughtlessly', occurs 10 times in Homer and the Homeric Hymns).

### 253-514 FIRST EPISODE

*Helen* features an exceptionally long and complex sequence of scenes (253-1106) between the Chorus' entry song and their first stasimon: see 528-1106n., *Introd.* p. 36. Rather than use conventional choral odes to vary the pace and register of the action, Eur. alternates spoken dialogue with other types of song (cf. 330-85, 515-27, 625-97nn.). The first part of this long sequence itself consists of six sections:

- 255-305: a speech by H. in which she once again bewails her beauty and her sufferings.
- 306-29: dialogue with the Chorus-leader, who persuades H. to consult Theonoe about M.'s reported death.
- 330-85: lyric exchange between H. and the Chorus (all leave the stage).
- 386-434: entry of M. and monologue.
- 435-82: entry of Old Woman and argument with M. (Old Woman leaves the stage).
- 483-514: monologue by a confused M.

One-actor units following strophic choral odes or parodoi are very rare in tragedy (Poe (1993) 369 counts only seven examples among 105 extant cases). The fact that no new character enters until both H. and the Chorus have themselves left the stage (at 385) emphasizes H.'s isolation and helplessness. The sequence of speech (255-305), dialogue (306-29), and lyric exchange (330-85) mirrors the play's opening scenes (H.'s prologue speech, dialogue with T., and parodos) in both form and subject matter.

253-4 The Chorus-leader's conventional advice (cf. e.g. *Med.* 1018 κούφως φέρειν χρῆ θνητὸν ὄντα συμφοράς) will be rebutted by H.'s reasoning: τί δῆτ' ἔτι ζῶ; (293).

255-305: H.'s speech takes up the themes of her lyric lament, but presents her reaction to T.'s news in a more reflective manner.

255-66 H. begins by blaming Hera for her 'monstrous life', and wishes she could have exchanged her beauty for a good reputation: cf. 27-9n., 236-7, 241-3. To express doubts concerning one's birth and paternity is a traditional motif of divine and heroic myth (cf. Telemachus' complaint to Athena/Mentes at *Od.* 1.215-16), but here Eur. uses it to underline his own poetic inventiveness, as Leda herself, to H.'s shame and disbelief, is presented as giving birth to the egg.

255-6 τίνοι πότμωι συνεζύγην | . . . ἢ τεκοῦσά μ' ἔτεκεν: the yoke metaphor is often applied to inescapable suffering (e.g. *Andr.* 98 στερρόν τε τὸν ἐμὸν δαίμον' ὦι συνεζύγην), and such misery is frequently traced back to its source at birth (*Hipp.* 1082, *Her.* 1258-68; cf. 211-12n.).

ἄρ' . . . τέρας: the question invites assent, for as H.'s description shows (257-61), she is a τέρας ('monstrosity'; lit. 'portent') both in the circumstances of her birth and the subsequent course of her life.

**257–9** As in her prologue-speech, H.'s tone of scepticism at the details of her birth (259 φασίν, 'they say') highlights her sense of abandonment by the gods (cf. 17–21n.). Most editors (including Diggle and Kannicht) have followed Wieland in deleting these lines, which Page (1934) 79 called 'probably an early actor's expansion of τέρας in 256'. The lines are, however, perfectly acceptable as they stand: for γάρ in 257 and 260 having the same reference, namely 256, see Dale on 256ff.; there is no need to change γάρ to δ' ἄρ' in 260, as suggested by Stinton (1990) 255–6.

τεῦχος νεοσσῶν λευκόν: lit. 'a white vessel for nestlings'. The elaborate periphrasis suggests H.'s horror at the freakishness of her birth. This is the earliest surviving reference to the egg being produced by Leda herself (cf. 16–22n.); for H.'s birth from the egg in art, see *LIMC* s.v. Helene, nos. 1–13. In Greek mythology egg-births are more common in the context of cosmogony (cf. Dunbar on *Ar. Birds* 694–5). Later sources say that the egg also contained Polydeuces, the divine twin (Apollod. 3.10.7): cf. 1659n. The egg itself was still on display in Pausanias' day, tied with ribbon in the temple of the Leucippides at Sparta (Paus. 3.16.1); cf. 1465–7n.

νεοσσῶν: though νεοσσός is also used of young children (most frequently in tragedy to evoke pity on their behalf: e.g. *Alc.* 403, *Held.* 239, *Andr.* 441), the image of Leda's egg remains bizarre and (to H.'s mind) grotesque.

**260–1** 'Yes (γάρ), my life is monstrous, and my situation too, partly (τὰ μὲν) because of Hera, and partly (τὰ δέ) because of my beauty.' The dangers of H.'s heart-stopping beauty are a staple of Greek myth (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 737–43). Moreover, Hera's involvement in H.'s life derives from anger at the slighting of her own beauty: cf. 25–31, 675–83. For adverbial τὰ μὲν . . . τὰ δέ, cf. Soph. *Trach.* 534–5, its only other occurrence in tragedy.

**262–3** The traditional H. was saved by her beauty at the end of the war when M. was disarmed by the sight of her breasts (*Andr.* 629–30, *Or.* 1287), and she took special care to preserve her appearance (*Or.* 128–9). The 'new' Helen, by contrast, wishes that she could have effaced her good looks long ago and so avoided the suffering caused by them.

ἔξαλειφθεῖσ' ὡς ἄγαλμ' 'wiped clean like a statue (or a painting)', i.e. so that it can be painted once again (αὐθις πάλιν) to look less attractive (αἰσχίον εἶδος . . . ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ). It is hard to choose between the two senses of ἄγαλμα because paint was applied to statues and they too, like pictures, could be 'wiped clean' (at Aesch. *Ag.* 1327–30 a picture is destroyed by a wet sponge). Kannicht insists upon 'statue' (so too Steiner (2001) 55), claiming that the sense 'painting' is only attested much later, but the early use of ἄγαλμα for any attractive image or object suggests that it could also be taken to refer to a painting. The idea of being repainted to look less attractive is also perhaps more readily applicable to a painting than a statue (which even when unpainted would resemble H.), but this is perhaps to press H.'s analogy too far. In any case, H.'s choice of simile recalls the pictorial language used of her by Teucer (72–5n.). By comparing her own body to a beautiful statue or painting, H. emphasizes its power to deceive the senses of those who look at it (or its double), just as Teucer is deceived, and M. soon will be. (M. is said to hate statues at Sparta which remind

him of H.: Aesch. *Ag.* 416-19.) Finally, the analogy with a manufactured object also suggests that it is possible, for a deity at any rate, to fashion a copy of H. herself.

**264-6** continue the unattainable wish introduced by εἶθε (262): '(and I wish) that the Greeks had forgotten the evil fortune that I now have . . .'

ἔσωζον 'they remembered' (cf. 1552).

τὰς δὲ μὴ κακὰς: H.'s (hypothetical) 'good fortune' would mean being considered innocent of all the evils now ascribed to her by the Greeks.

**267-92** The central section of H.'s speech is a detailed exposition of her misfortunes, leading up to the climactic τί δῆτ' ἔτι ζῶ; (293). The cumulative structure of her argument is clearly marked: πρῶτον μὲν (270), ἔπειτα (273), δέ (277, 280, 282, 284).

**267-9** function as a foil to the succeeding catalogue: unlike the man who is disappointed in one thing, H.'s sufferings are multiple and unbearable (contrast 253-4).

ἐς μίαν ἀποβλέπων τύχην 'has his thoughts fixed on one issue'. ἀποβλέπω implies looking away from (ἀπό) other things in order to concentrate on a particular matter.

**270-2** identify the gap between H.'s reputation and her actual conduct. Given the importance in Greek society and ethics of how one is regarded by others, it is understandable that H. should put her concern for her 'social being' first.

οὐκ οὐσ' ἀδίκος εἰμι δυσκλήης: the emphatic litotes and the juxtaposition of H.'s two radically differing states ('innocent', 'reviled') stress the injustice of her situation.

τῆς ἀληθείας: as the following clause makes clear, the 'truth' in question is that of having a bad reputation because one has actually done wrong.

δοσις: expegetical of τοῦτο, 'when one is blamed for crimes one did not commit'. For the anacoluthon, see Diggle on *Phaeth.* 160-2, adding *El.* 816; cf. also Barrett on *Hipp.* 426-7.

τὰ μὴ προσόντα κακά: lit. 'evils that do not belong'.

κέκτηται: 3rd sg. perf. κτάομαι, 'has incurred/possesses (a reputation for)'; cf. *IT* 676 δειλίαν γὰρ καὶ κάκην κекτήσομαι.

**274** τητωμένη 'deprived', perf. part. of τητάομαι, with gen.

**276** justifies H.'s somewhat exaggerated description of herself as a slave (275). For the popular Greek equation of barbarian government with despotism and lawlessness (contrast Hdt.'s more nuanced picture of Egyptian society), cf. *Med.* 536-8, *Held.* 423-4, *Andr.* 665-6, *LA* 1400-1, *Introd.* §6(c).

**277-9** Teucer's (false) report of M.'s death has destroyed H.'s trust in the prophecy of Hermes (56-9). Her last hope (or 'anchor', 277; cf. *Hec.* 80) is, she thinks, gone, and her mistaken rejection of the god's words not only enhances the impact of her reunion with M. (541-697), but also reveals her limited (human) understanding of the gods' plans.

**277** ὤχει: 3rd sg. imperf. of ὀχέω, 'held fast'.

**280** For H. as the cause of Leda's death, cf. 135-6, 200-2.

**281** The line encapsulates H.'s dilemma: the charge of murder is 'unjust' (ἀδίκως) because H. herself did nothing to shame Leda, yet she is inevitably blamed and held responsible for the damage caused by her double; cf. 270, 1147-8.

**282-3** The first mention of Hermione, H.'s only child (cf. *Il.* 3.175, *Od.* 4.12-14), whose failure to marry completes the ruin of H.'s family.

ἀγλαίσμα: cf. 10-11n.

θυγάτηρ ἀνάνδρος: since marriage and motherhood were considered the goal of every girl's life, Hermione's condition is a kind of living death weighing on H.'s conscience: cf. 688-90, 933, 1476-7.

πολιὰ παρθενεύεται: lit. 'is a virgin greyingly' (πολιά, adv. acc.), i.e. grows old in virginity. The clashing terms express H.'s despair at Hermione's 'unnatural' fate. (The miserable life of an ageing unmarried woman is invoked in a speech to Hermione at *Andr.* 347-51.)

**284-5**: for the content and the duals, cf. 138-42.

**285-6** 'I am as good as dead, though in fact alive.' The opposition of πρᾶγμα and ἔργον is less transparent than the common λόγος / ἔργον antithesis (cf. 1050-2).

**287-92** are deleted by most recent editors. However, the textual and metrical problems (cf. 289, 291) are not incurable, and the lines form a plausible extension of H.'s woes: she would not be allowed back into Sparta even if she could get there (287-9), while the death of M. means they will never recognize one another by their secret tokens (290-2).

**288-9** κλήθροισι ἀν εἰργοίμεσθα 'the gates would be barred to me.' H. thinks of the Spartans forbidding her access, though they might be more likely to lynch her (cf. *Tro.* 1055-7). We should not reject the lines as bathetic, however, since the permanent exclusion that is implied counts as a kind of 'social death' (cf. 286 τοῖς πράγμασιν τέθνηκα).

δοκοῦντες: the nom. pl. part. (an instance of *nominativus pendens*: cf. K-G 2.105-7) marks a sudden shift from H.'s perspective to that of the Spartans ('thinking that . . .'); for anacolutha as 'the stuff of natural speech', cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 23.

τὴν . . . δίχα: lit. 'since they would think that I, H. from Troy, was returning without M.' The opposite of L's μέτα ('with M.') is needed because H.'s entire speech is premised upon his death. Zuntz's δίχα restores the required sense (as a prep. δίχα typically follows its noun or pronoun in tragedy): the Spartans would never believe H.'s explanation of her innocence unless M. was alive to confirm it (cf. Zuntz (1955b) 69-70). Moreover, the phrase τὴν ὑπ' Ἰλίωι | . . . Ἑλένην suggests a related misconception, since the speaker is not in fact 'H. of Troy' at all.

ἀπ' Ἰλίου: the transmitted ὑπ' Ἰλίωι is elsewhere used of the Greek troops encamped before Troy (Aesch. *Ag.* 860) or of the Trojans killed there (*Hec.* 764).

**290-1** ἀνεγνώσθημεν: 1st pl. aor. pass. ἀναγιγνώσκω, 'we would recognize one another'.

ἐλθόντες . . . ξύμβολα 'by recourse to tokens known to us alone' (Murray's rearrangement offers the best solution to L's unmetrical text): the motif of secret signs (σήματα) was familiar from the *Odyssey* (23.108-10) and the recognition scenes of tragedy feature various proofs of identity (e.g. *Ion* 1337-62). In the *Helen*, however, the possibility of such a recognition is created only to be frustrated by M.'s insistent

belief in appearances (557–96). The audience might well imagine a scene in which M. tests H.'s knowledge of their allegedly shared past (as with Iphigenia and Orestes at *IT* 809–26), but the process of recognition is complicated here by the existence of H.'s double. This unique situation cannot be resolved by 'tokens', and the resulting impasse motivates the spectacular epiphany of the phantom (597–621).

**292** σωθῆι: subjunc. (3rd sg. aor. pass. σώζω) after οὐ μὴ in an emphatic denial (Smyth §2755a), 'nor will he ever return home safe.'

**293–305** In the final part of the speech H. weighs her alternatives – life in Egypt as Theoc.'s wife or suicide – and chooses death. She ends by lamenting once again the destructiveness of her beauty (cf. 261–6).

**293** τί δῆτ' ἔτι ζῶ; cf. 56n.

**294–7** One might compare Andromache's contemplation of her fate as Neoptolemus' concubine (*Tro.* 661–72), which emphasizes a wife's loyalty to her dead husband. Though H. will escape Andromache's servile status (295–6 πρὸς πλουσίαν | τράπεζαν ἰζουσα), she shrinks from marrying a foreigner (295 μετ' ἀνδρὸς οἰκεῖν βαρβάρου).

**294** ὑπαλλαγάς (poetic pl., + gen.) 'as a change from', i.e. exchanging one misfortune (life without *philoi*) for another (marriage to Theoc.); ὑπαλλαγή is a rare word, found only here in extant poetry.

**297** καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἐστὶν πικρὸν 'even her own body becomes hateful to her': the repetition (πόσις πικρὸς | . . . πικρὸν) stresses the woman's physical revulsion (cf. *Tro.* 665–8).

**298–302** The smooth join between 298 and 303 suggests that 299–302 are spurious: 'How can it not be right for me to die? For such is the depth of misery to which I have sunk . . .' As Kovacs (2003) 30 remarks, 'It is possible that οὐ was corrupted to οὖν in some ancient copies [creating 'How then can I die well?'] and that this provoked the discussion of suicide methods [in 299–302].' Cf. Page (1934) 79.

[**299–302**] assert that hanging is too base even for slaves, but that there is some nobility in death by the sword. Quite apart from the awkwardness of this statement after H. has heard of her own mother's hanging (136), the lines are contradicted by 353–6, where H. herself contemplates both methods of suicide as equally valid. This is in line with the position of tragic characters elsewhere, e.g. *Tro.* 1012–14 (Hecuba speaking) ἡ βρόχοις ἀρτωμένη | ἡ φάσγανον θήγους, ἃ γενναῖα γυνὴ | δράσειεν ἄν; *Andr.* 811, 816, 844 (hanging), 813, 841 (sword); cf. Willink on *Or.* 953–4 "'Sword or noose" is formulaic in suicide contexts.' Though hanging is more typical of women than men in tragedy (e.g. Jocasta, Antigone, Phaedra), it is not exclusively so: Orestes considers hanging himself (Aesch. *Eum.* 746, *Or.* 1035–6) and Deianeira stabs herself with a sword (Soph. *Trach.* 930–1; so too Eurydice at Soph. *Ant.* 1315–16, Jocasta in Eur. *Phoen.* 1455–9). Fowler (1987b) 10–13 argues that these lines are genuine and intentionally amusing, but there is no reason to see here (as he does) any parody of, or even reference to, Soph. *Helen* fr. 178 R ἐμοὶ δὲ λῶιστον αἶμα ταύρειον πιεῖν | καὶ μὴ πῖ πλείον τῶνδ' ἔχειν δυσφημίας (adapted by Ar. *Knights* 83).

[299] *μετάρσιοι* 'in the air' (Ionic/poetic for Attic *μετέωρος*; cf. Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 845–6).

[300] *κάν*: crasis, *καί ἐν*.

*δυσπρεπές* ('undignified') is a *hapax*.

[302] *σμικρόν*: unless we change to *σμικρός*, this is a neuter predicate adj., modifying *καιρός*; the construction occurs mainly in the statement of general truths (Smyth §1048): cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 443–6.

†*ἀρτ†*: if Hermann's *σάρκ* ('flesh', 'body') is right, the interpolator may have been thinking of H.'s later promise of suicide (356 *διὰ σαρκός*).

303 *βάθος κακῶν*: for the metaphor, cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 465 *Ξέρξης δ' ἀνώιμωξευ κακῶν ὀρῶν βάθος* (where Xerxes is also watching the disaster from the heights above Salamis), and the expression *πέλαγος κακῶν* (*Hipp.* 822, *Supp.* 824, *Hec.* 1087).

304–5: 27–9, 262–3nn.

306–29 The Chorus-leader casts doubt upon Teucer's report of M.'s death and urges H. to consult Theonoe.

307 *μή . . . δοξάσης* 'do not assume'.

308 *καί μὴν σαφῶς γ' ἔλεξ'* 'and yet he clearly (emphatic *γε*) said (that my husband was dead)'. In fact, T. had merely said that M. 'is reported' (126/132 *κλήιζεται*) to be dead. For adversative *καί μὴν* in tragedy, see Wakker (1997) 225; cf. 554.

309–10 As Jackson (1955) 41 saw, interlinear transposition of *σαφῆ* and *ἐπι* led to the corruption of *ἐπι* to *ἐπη*. The restored text gives a pointed stichomythic exchange (Jackson's translation): 'CHORUS-LEADER: Many things are said to be certainties, but are lies. HELEN: Yes – and there is the other sort of things, said to be certainties, and true.'

*διὰ ψευδῶν*: *διὰ* + noun is equivalent to an adv. (= *ψευδῶς*); cf. LSJ s.v. *διὰ* A III C.

*ἀληθείας ἐπι*: i.e. *ἐπ' ἀληθείας* (cf. 23–4n.), also used adverbially (= *ἀληθῶς*): LSJ s.v. *ἐπί* A III 3.

311 *γάρ* here 'provides a motive for the language used, or the tone adopted, by the previous speaker'; so Denniston (*GP* 75.3), who translates 'You say so because you are inclined to pessimism.'

312 *τὸ δεῖμα*: 'the dreaded thought', i.e. that M. is actually dead.

313 *πῶς . . . ἔχεις*; 'How do you stand?' (cf. Stevens (1976) 57), with gen. of respect (*εὐμενείας*), 'as regards goodwill'.

314 *πάντες φίλοι μοι*: this information supports the Chorus-leader's plan, since it implies that Theonoe will at least consider H.'s inquiry.

*ὁ θηρεύων γάμους*: cf. 50–1n.

315 *οἴσθ' οὖν δὲ δρᾶσον*: 'Here is what you should do'. The idiomatic use of *οἴσθ' ὁ* + imperative is characteristic of Eur. and comedy (cf. Stevens (1976) 36, Diggle (1994) 500); *οἴσθ' ὁ* has lost its interrogative force and serves instead to draw attention to the following command. The colloquial style marks the urgency of the Chorus-leader's advice.

**316** For such τί λέγεις; interventions in dialogue, which do not disturb the syntax of the interrupted remark, see Mastronarde (1979) 57.

**317–29** An extended passage of choral speech: more than four trimeters is unusual (cf. West (1981) 61), but here we have ten (deleting 324–6). The speech's length reflects its significance, since the Chorus-leader's advice (establishing sympathetic contact with Theonoe) will prove important for the development of the play, while the concluding offer of assistance leads to the atypical, but effective, exit of the Chorus (cf. 327–8n.).

**317** ἔλθοῦσ' ἐς οἴκουσ; as we later learn, Theoc. is hunting and so absent from the palace (1169–70).

ἦ . . . ἐπίσταται: the relative clause is proleptic, referring to Theonoe (319).

**318:** cf. 7–15, 1647.

**319** πυθοῦ 'inquire about' (aor. middle imper. πυθάνομαι).

**321** πρὸς τὰς τύχας 'according to your fortunes', i.e. depending on whether Theonoe's response is good or bad.

τὸ χάσμα τοὺς γόους τ': τε is equivalent to 'either . . . or . . .'; for its disjunctive use (normally τε . . . τε or τε . . . καί), see *GP* 515.

**322** 'Until you know anything (οὐδέν) for sure'; for the redundant negative after πρὶν, see Smyth §2753, K-G 2.219. There is therefore no need to change to πρὶν οὖν τὰδ' (so Kovacs (2003) 31).

τί . . . πλεόν 'what good', 'what advantage'.

**323** ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ 'take my advice' (aor. middle imper. πεῖθω).

[324–6] merely rehash 317–23. The interpolator has taken off from ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ and repeated the gist of the Chorus-leader's advice.

[324] σύμμιξον 'meet with' (aor. imper. συμμείγνυμι + dat.).

[325] εἰσηι 'you will know' (2nd sg. fut. οἶδα).

[326] Nauck's τήνδε (for τοῖσδε) means one need not supply αὐτήν as the object of ἔχουσ': 'since you have her in this house to tell you the truth'.

τί βλέπεις πρόσω; 'why look elsewhere?'

**327–8** The Chorus-leader's offer to accompany H. on her mission to Theonoe motivates the Chorus' exit from the performance space (385). Such exits and re-entries by the chorus in the middle of the action are rare in surviving tragedy (five examples in thirty-two tragedies: Aesch. *Eum.* 231–44, Soph. *Aj.* 814–66, Eur. *Alc.* 746–861, *Hel.* 385–515, [*Rhes.*] 564–674), but each has a specific function, isolating a character or characters on stage to various dramatic ends (the Aeschylean and Sophoclean examples also involve a change of location). Yet this is the only example where the chorus departs into the *skēnē*-building itself, allowing M. to enter an empty stage where he can deliver what is in effect a second prologue (386–434n.). M.'s isolation means that the Chorus remain as ignorant as H. regarding his arrival and identity; cf. Iphigenia's exit into the temple of Artemis immediately after her prologue speech (*IT* 66), and just before the entry of Orestes and Pylades, which itself precedes the arrival of the chorus. This not only enhances the impact of M.'s sudden discovery by H. (541–56), but also adds to the excitement and tension of their gradual recognition.

**329** γυναῖκα . . . γυναῖκί: cf. 191–3n.

330–385 *Lyric dialogue between Helen and the Chorus*

As H. prepares to enter the palace to consult Theonoc, she concludes her long opening scene with a second lyric exchange. The song recalls the parodos in both form and content, passing from lyric dialogue with the Chorus (here astrophic) to monody, and lamenting the many deaths caused by the Trojan War (almost all Euripidean *amoibaia* are lamentations). Though formally a dialogue until 361, H. does not engage with the Chorus' remarks, and from 348 onwards her song is essentially monodic (cf. 229–52 n., Barner (1971) 302). After renewed thoughts of suicide (348–61), H.'s lyrics extend far beyond the dramatic situation at hand, as she pictures the grief of other women, both Trojan and Greek (362–74), and invokes legendary parallels to her destructive beauty (375–85). The exchange is characteristic of late Eur. in its lyrical expansion of ideas already expressed in spoken dialogue; central themes are revisited in the emotionally higher register of song, while both actor and Chorus are given another chance to display their musical skills.

*Metre.* H.'s second lyric dialogue with the Chorus is astrophic (a feature characteristic of the New Music: Introd. p. 41). As in the Parodos (164–252), there is a transition from lyric dialogue to monody and, in 330–74, a similarly iambo-trochaic rhythm (with much resolution and syncopation), save for a single hexameter at 356 which foreshadows the dactylic final stanza (375–85). In the predominantly iambic opening section (330–47) period-end is marked by change of speaker (or catalexis at 342–3), while, as Diggle (1994) 424 n. 20 observes, each of H.'s contributions ends with a Ickythion (so too 359 and the end of every stanza in the parodos: 178~190, 210~228, 252). For the resolved bacchius at 335 (rare in tragedy), cf. Parker (1997) 412–13. Metrical continuity favours Hermann's transposition at 336–7 and Badham's ἑ'άλιου at 342–3 (maintaining a run of five trochaic metra). The trochaics of H.'s first extended solo (348–59) are punctuated by a single dactylic hexameter (356) whose epic connotations underline H.'s heroic resolve for suicide (cf. [299–302], 841 nn.). The third (362–74) and fourth (375–85) sections are purely monodic. The former is marked by frequent resolution, expressing H.'s agitation as she imagines the destruction of Troy (364–6) and the grief of the Greek widows (373). The dactyls of the final stanza recall the lamentatory opening of the parodos (164–6), while the ithyphallic clausula (385) rounds off the dominant iambo-trochaic rhythm of the whole song (cf. 369b).

— — — — — |

φίλοι, λόγους ἐδεξάμαν'

330          2ia

— — — — — |

βᾶτε βᾶτε δ' ἐς δόμους,

331          Ickythion

— — — — — |

ἀγῶνας ἐντὸς οἴκων

332          2ia_Λ

—υ—υ—υ—   ὡς πύθησθε τοὺς ἐμούς.	333	lekythion
υ—υ—υ—υ—   θέλουσαν οὐ μόλις καλεῖς.	334	2ia
υ—υ—υ—υ—  ἰὼ μέλεος ἀμέρα.	335	sync ia dim
υ—υ—υ—υ—  τίν' ἄρα τάλαινα τίνα λόγον	336	2ia
υ—υ—υ—υ—   δακρυόεντ' ἀκούσομαι;	337	lekythion
—υ—υ—υ—  μῆ πρόμαντις ἀλγέων	338	lekythion
υ—υ—υ—υ—   προλάμβαν', ὦ φίλα, γόους.	339	2ia
υ—υ—υ—υ—  τί μοι πόσις μέλεος ἔτλα;	340	2ia
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ πότερα δέρκεται φάος τέ-	341	2tr
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—   θριππά θ' ἀλίου κέλευθά τ' ἀστέρων	342-3	3tr _Λ
—υ—υ—υ—υ—  ἦ <ἵ> νέκυσι κατὰ χθονὸς	344	lekythion
—υ—υ—υ—υ—   τὰν χρόνιον ἔχει τύχαν;	345	lekythion
—υ—υ—υ—υ—  ἔς τὸ φέρτερον τίθει	346	lekythion
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—   τὸ μέλλον, ὃ τι γενήσεται	347	2ia
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—  σέ γὰρ ἐκάλεσα, σέ δὲ κατόμοσα	348	2tr
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—  τὸν ὑδρόεντι δόνακι χλωρὸν	349	2tr
—υ—υ—υ—υ—  Εὐρώταν, θανόντος	350	sync tr dim
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—  εἰ βᾶξις ἔτυμος ἀνδρὸς	351	sync tr dim

—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἄδε μοι — τί τάδ' ἀσύνετα; —	352	sync tr dim
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— φόνιον αἰώρημα	353a	sync tr dim
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—   διὰ δέρας ὀρέξομαι,	353b	2tr _λ
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἦ ξιφοκτόνον διώγμα	354	2tr
—υ—υ—υ—   λαιμορρύτου σφαγᾶς	355	sync tr dim cai
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—   αὐτοσίδαρον ἔσω πελάσω διὰ σαρκὸς ἄμιλλαν,	356	dactylic hexameter
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— θῦμα τριζύγοις θεαῖσι	357a	2tr
—υ—υ—υ— τῶι τε σήραγγας ἴ-	357b	sync tr dim
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— δας ἐνίζοντι Πριαμί-	358	sync tr dim
—υ—υ—υ—υ—   δαι ποτ' ἀμφὶ βουστάθμους.	359	lekythion
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἄλλοσ' ἀποτροπὰ κακῶν	360	lekythion
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—   γένοιτο, τὸ δὲ σὸν εὐτυχές.	361	2ia
υ—υ—υ—υ— ἰὼ τάλαινα Τροία,	362	2ia _λ
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—   δι' ἔργ' ἀνεργ' ὄλλυσαι μέλεά τ' ἔτλας.	363	sync ia trim
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— τὰ δ' ἐμὰ δῶρα Κύπριδος ἔτεκε	364	2tr
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— πολὺ μὲν αἷμα, πολὺ δὲ δάκρυον	365	2tr
υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ἄχεά τ' ἄχεσι, πάθεα πάθεσι·	366	2tr
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— πτερές τε παῖδας ὄλεσαν,	367	2tr



—υ—υ—υ—υ—||

ώλεσεν ὤλεσε πέργαμα Δαρδανίας

384

5da_Λ

υ—υ—υ—||

ὀλομένους τ' Ἀχαιοῦς.

385

ithyphallic

**330** ἔδεξάμαν 'I accept (your advice)': the Chorus-leader's scepticism (306–9) has proven persuasive. For such 'tragic' or 'instantaneous' aorists, see Lloyd (1999), esp. 36–8 on ἔδεξάμην; cf. 348.

**331** βᾶτε βᾶτε δ': H. takes up the Chorus-leader's offer (327–8). For the postponed particle after repetition, see Devine and Stephens (1994) 349–50; cf. 370.

**332–3** ἀγῶνας ἐντὸς οἰκῶν | ὡς πύθησθε τοὺς ἐμούς 'so that you may learn within about my trials.' Kovacs (2002) 47 suggests placing 333 before 332, but the hyperbaton is not unusual and emphasizes H.'s 'trials' by placing them first.

**334** θέλουσαν οὐ μόλις 'very willing indeed', emphatic understatement (cf. 16n.), with με understood; for οὐ μόλις, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 864 θυραῖος ἔστω πόλεμος οὐ μόλις παρών, Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1082. (Elmsley's οὐ με δις (Dale, OCT) is neat, but unnecessary.)

**335** μέλεος (exclamatory nominative) is, as the fem. form of the adj. (cf. 340), unique to Eur. (cf. *Hes.* 877 μέλεος Ἑλλάς).

**338–9** πρόμαντις . . . προλάβαν: the repetition of προ- underlines H.'s hastiness and pessimism (as the Chorus see it) since she mourns M.'s death too soon. For the Chorus' countervailing optimism, cf. 311, 346–7. In addition, H.'s alleged προμαντεία underlines the need to consult the genuine prophet, Theonoe (318–23).

**341–3** are a lyric expansion of the common periphrasis 'see the light = be alive' (e.g. *Alc.* 18 θανῶν . . . μηκέτ' εἰσορᾶν φάος).

τέθριππά θ' ἄλιου: Helios' chariot was drawn by winged horses: cf. *El.* 466, *Or.* 1001–2, Diggle on *Phaeth.* 173.

**344** ἔν = ἐν ('among the dead'), prodelision.

**346** ἔς τὸ φέρτερον τίθει 'make the most of': the comparative φέρτερος ('better', 'braver'), frequent in epic, is found only once elsewhere in tragedy ([Aesch.] *PV* 768).

**348–59** H. swears she will kill herself if M. is dead: cf. 293–8.

**348** σέ γὰρ ἐκάλεσα, σέ δὲ κατόμοσα: the metrical and syntactical balance 'imparts the solemnity of a religious formula' (Diggle on Eur. *Phaeth.* 99), enhanced by anaphora and rhyme. For the performative aorists (common with δμνυμι, 'I swear'), see K-G 1.165, Lloyd (1999) 33. κατόμοσα lacks the temporal augment (replaced in L κατώμοσα): cf. Diggle (1981) 65–6, 120.

**349–50** τὸν . . . Εὐρώταν: as the symbol of H. and M.'s homeland (cf. Νείλου . . . ῥοαί, 1–3n.), the Eurotas is well suited to an oath that binds the two of them so closely (209–10n.).

**350–2** θανόντος | . . . τί τάδ' ἀσύνετα; '(I swear that) if this story of my husband's death is true – how is this unclear?' An echo of H.'s earlier certainty about M.'s death: cf. 308–10. For ἀσύνετος, 'a characteristic adj. in Eur.'s later plays', see Willink on *Or.* 492–3; cf. also *Phoen.* 1731 (Oedipus on the Sphinx's riddle) αἰνιγμ' ἀσύνετον εὐρών.

βάξις: 223–5n.

353–6 See 229–302n.

353 φόνιον αιώρημα . . . ὀρέξομαι ‘I will fasten a deadly noose round my neck’.

354–6 The horrendous violence of the act is marked by an agglomerative style and rare compound adjs. (two of them, λαιμόρρυτος and αὐτοσίδαρος, being *hapax legomena*), with almost every word suggesting exertion, pain or death.

ξίφοκτόνον δίωγμα: lit. ‘a sword-slaying thrust’, obj. of πέλασω (‘I will drive’). For δίωγμα in its more common sense of ‘pursuit’, see 20–1.

λαιμορρύτου σφαγᾶς ‘of slaughter gushing from the throat’: the method of killing, more appropriate to the slaying of an animal, prefigures H.’s explicit description of her death as a ‘sacrifice’ (357). Bothe’s αἰμορρύτου (accepted by Diggle) is supported by the fact that compounds ending in -ρ(ρ)υτος usually denote the liquid with which the relevant noun flows (e.g. [LI 1515] αἱματόρρυτος, Aesch. *Supp.* 868 ἀλῖρρυτος, *Sept.* 938 φονόρρυτος), but Eur. *IT* 634–5 ἀνθεμόρρυτον γάνος | ξουθῆς μελίσσης offers an exception analogous to λαιμόρρυτος.

αὐτοσίδαρον . . . ἀμιλλαν (lit. ‘a contest of self-inflicted steel’) is internal acc., describing the sword thrust. LSJ are probably wrong to gloss αὐτοσίδηρος as ‘of sheer iron. “with cold steel”’: see Kannicht on 353–6 for details.

357–9 H.’s description of her death as a ‘sacrificial offering’ (θύμα) to the three goddesses and to Paris is both shocking and sarcastic, since she has no reason to honour, and is in no mood to appease, those responsible for her ruin (cf. 1093–1106). As often elsewhere in tragedy, the language of animal sacrifice serves to magnify the horror of human murder or human sacrifice (for Eur.’s pervasive use of sacrificial language and metaphor, see Henrichs (2000)). So here H. imagines her own suicide as if it were a brutally violent human sacrifice to the three goddesses (and their human agent), thus highlighting her status as an innocent victim of divine (and human) self-interest: cf. 23–30n.

τριζύγοις θεαῖσι ‘to the triple team of goddesses’: cf. *Trō.* 924 ἔκρινε τρισσὸν ζεῦγος ὄδε τριῶν θεῶν, Diggle on *Phaeth.* 104 τριπλοῦν ζεῦγος.

τῶι . . . βουστάθμους ‘and to the son of Priam who once sat in the caves of Ida near his cattle-stalls.’ The MS text σύραγγ’ αἰδοῖται σέβιζον is corrupt. Badham’s conjecture σήραγγας Ἰδαίας ἐνίζοντι restored Paris to his traditional haunts on Mt. Ida, the scene of the Judgement (cf. 23–4, 29–301n.); for a discussion of other conjectures, and a defence of the text adopted here (slightly different from Badham’s on metrical grounds), see Diggle (1994) 421–4.

ἐνίζοντι: a rare verb, used again by the Chorus at 1108, the word’s only other occurrence in tragedy; so too with σῆραγγ (‘cave’), used only at Soph. fr. 549 R κρημνούς τε καὶ σήραγγας ἠδ’ ἐπακτίας | αὐλῶνας, but similarly evocative of a secluded scene.

360–1 ἀποτροπά: the Chorus’ wish is literally ‘apotropaic’, intended to ward off the bad omen of H.’s threatened suicide.

362–85 A monodic lament for the destruction caused by H.’s beauty, focusing first on the bereaved, both Trojan and Greek (362–74), then on H.’s unique suffering,

which is said to exceed that of other women famously ruined by their beauty. The Chorus listen to H.'s lament before going into the palace with her. The idea that they exit in silence during H.'s song is supported by Dale (exit by 374, leaving H. to sing her dactylic stanza alone) and Taplin (1977) 376; Kannicht (on 381-2) even suggests that the Chorus *dance* from *orkhēstra* to stage during 375-85. However, any such movement by the Chorus would distract attention from H.'s lament.

362 ἰὼ τάλαινα Τροία: cf. 38-9n.

363 δι' ἔργ' ἀνεργ' 'for deeds never done', i.e. the rape of H., the cause of Troy's destruction, which never really took place. For the oxymoron, see 213-14n. ἀνεργος occurs only here in archaic or classical Greek.

364 τὰ δ' ἐμὰ δῶρα Κύπριδος: H. means her beauty, 'gift' being ironic.

366 The transmitted text (ἄχεά τ' ἄχεσι δάκρυα δάκρυσιν ἔλαβε πάθεα) is impossible to construe. Dale calls ἄχεά τ' ἄχεσι, πάθεα πάθεσι the result of 'rough-and-ready first aid', but it has a fair chance of being right (cf. 195, 1163) and is preferable to outright deletion. The accumulation of phrases in 165-6 and the repeated polyptota are characteristic of Eur.: cf. 173n., Gygli-Wyss (1966) 126-7.

367 ὄλεσαν ('they lost') is the unaugmented form (ὠλεσαν replaced in L): cf. 348n., 371 ἀνωτότυξεν (for ἀνωτότυξεν).

368-9 H. imagines the ritual hair-cutting of the Trojan mourners (here the sisters of the fallen warriors), a custom that is soon to be exploited by H. herself (cf. 1053-4, 1187-88, 1224). This ritual is mentioned or performed many times in tragedy (e.g. *Alc.* 426-7, *Supp.* 973-4, *Tro.* 480), as is the related act of offering hair at a tomb (for the significance of the latter, see Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 7).

ἀπὸ . . . κόμας ἔθεντο: imesis is a typical feature of tragic lyric (cf. 106n.), especially Eur. (Breitenbach (1934) 266 counts 56 examples), and is parodied by Aristophanes (Henderson on *Lys.* 262-3; K-G 1.535); cf. 628, 1459.

Σκαμάνδριον . . . οἶδμα 'beside the Trojan river Scamander': for the identification of communities by their rivers, cf. 1-3n. Both wished to delete Σκαμάνδριον, but two adjs. where one would do is a regular poetic device: cf. 1451 Φοίνισσα Σιδωνιάς.

370 Ἑλλάς (αἴ'): Ἑλλάς is adjectival, 'the <land> of Greece' (for the loss of αἴα, cf. *Hipp.* 537 βούταν φόνον Ἑλλάς <αἴ'> αἴξει). Kannicht treats 'Hellas' as equivalent to 'the women of Hellas' (for the bereaved wives of Greece, cf. *Andr.* 1037-41), but the image is rather of a personified Greece (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 181-99) grieving for her dead. Her repeated cries of grief are marked by anadiplosis of βοῶν and asyndeton (371).

371 ἀνωτότυξεν: 3rd sg. unaugmented aor. of ἀνωτοτύζω (the verb occurs only once elsewhere, as the Chorus react to Cassandra's cries by asking τί ταῦτ' ἀνωτότυξας ἀμφὶ Λοξίου;, *Ag.* 1074). The exclamation itself (ὀτοτοτοῖ *vel sim.*) takes various forms in tragedy (cf. Willink on *Or.* 1390-1).

372-4 describe typical gestures of lamentation: cf. e.g. *Andr.* 1209-11 (beating head and tearing hair), *Hec.* 652-6 (beating head and scratching cheeks). As part of his legislation against ostentatious funerals Solon is said to have outlawed the self-laceration of female mourners (Plut. *Sol.* 21). The gesture's prominent role in tragedy (it is found only once in epic: *Il.* 19.284-5) is an expression of the extreme grief

experienced by its characters, and of the possibilities of theatrical, as opposed to narrative, presentation.

ἀπαλόχροα ('tender-skinned') stresses the violence of the rending.

ἔδευσεν: 3rd sg. aor. δέω 'wet', 'drench'.

**375–85** H. compares herself to two women, Callisto and the daughter of Merops, who were both destroyed by their beauty. Yet whereas they were transformed into animals and so left not only their allure but also their suffering behind, H.'s beauty and suffering continue. Moreover, their beauty ruined only their own lives, but H.'s has killed countless Trojans and Greeks.

**375–80** The myth of Callisto ('very beautiful') has several variants (Henrichs (1987) 254–67 presents a detailed discussion of them with a useful table), but all feature her seduction by Zeus and subsequent metamorphosis into a bear. Like the daughter of Merops (381–5), Callisto was a hunting companion of Artemis before her transformation. As with H.'s assimilation to Persephone (244–9n.), the reference here to another *parthenos* who was raped stresses the threat posed by Theoc. to H.'s sexual integrity.

**375** ὦ μάκαρ: Callisto is 'fortunate' because of the loss of her beauty (375–85n.). ὦ μάκαρ is also the expression traditionally used to congratulate a bride or groom (cf. 1434–5, *Trö.* 311–13, 335–7), and thus appropriate to the virgin (παρθένε) Callisto, whose 'marriage' is (from H.'s particular viewpoint) a happy one.

Ἄρκαδιαι ('in Arcadia'), of which the eponymous hero Arcas was the son of Zeus and Callisto (cf. Larson (2001) 154–5).

**376** ἀπέβας is a certain change for the transmitted ἐπέβας, since Callisto did not 'mount' the bed of Zeus as a bear, but became one only after their union.

τετραβάμοσι γυίοις 'on four paws' (lit. 'with four-footed limbs'). τετραβάμων in archaic and classical Greek is used by Eur. only, referring elsewhere to horses (*El.* 477, *Trö.* 516 (the Trojan horse), *Phoen.* 792) and the Sphinx (with her four claws, *Phoen.* 808).

**377** ὡς . . . πλέον 'how much better was your lot than my fate'. L's μητρός introduces a pointless reference to Leda, spoiling the connection between H. and Callisto. κηρός (gen. sg. of κήρ), first suggested by Diggle (1994) 178–9, gives excellent sense and requires less extensive change than any previous proposal.

**378–80** 'for in the form of a shaggy-limbed beast [with violent eye the shape of a lioness] you shed your burden of pain.' Line 379 makes no sense, since Callisto became a bear, not a lioness, and there is no reason to mention her fierce gaze in this (as H. sees it) positive context. Murray's suggestion ὄμματι δ' ἄβρωι σχῆμα λεαίνεις ('you soften your shape with a gentle look') is problematic, since H.'s main point is that Callisto's new shape was a blessing. The origins of the intrusion remain obscure: it may be that a scribe felt the need to make the description of 'shaggy-limbed beasts' (378) more explicit (λαχνόγυιός is a *hapax*), but, being unaware of Callisto's transformation into a bear (which was familiar enough to the original audience to be left implicit), he presumed the 'four-footed' animal to be a lioness instead.

ἄχθεα λύπας: i.e. the burden of her beauty.

**381–3** This is our only source for the story of Merops' daughter. She may be the eponymous heroine of the island Cos: Stephanus of Byzantium states in his *Ethnica*, a study of place-names (s.v. Κῶς), 'Named after Cos the daughter of Merops.'

ὄν . . . κούραν: the voc. with μάκαρ (cf. 375) is to be understood with the relative clause, 'And (fortunate are you too), Titan daughter of Merops, whom Artemis once . . .'.

Τιτανίδα: i.e., belonging to the generation of gods preceding the Olympians. Her father Merops is also otherwise unknown.

ἐξεχορεύσατο 'drove from her dances'. The rare verb ἐκχορεύω ('to break out of the chorus') is first attested here, the middle voice (3rd sg. aor.) suggesting Artemis' personal interest in, and control over, her own χοροί (Smyth §§1714, 1720). For maidens dancing in honour of Artemis, cf. e.g. *Tr.* 551–5.

χρυσοκέρατ' ἔλαφον 'as (i.e. transformed into) a golden-horned doe'. The deer is often associated with Artemis in myth and art: one of her cult epithets was ἐλαφηβόλος ('shooter of deer': cf. *Hom. Hymn Art.* 27.2). In some accounts of Iphigenia's sacrifice, Artemis saves her by substituting a doe (*IT* 28–30, 783–5, *LI* 1587–97). Here the doe's golden horns (i.e. horns made of gold, rather than merely gilded, as with a sacrificial victim) mark out the animal as a divine creation (cf. *Pind. Ol.* 1.26–30, where Heracles returns to Artemis the golden-horned doe which Taygeta, one of the Pleiades, had once given to her).

καλλοσύνας ἔνεκεν 'because of your beauty', of which Artemis was presumably jealous. The phrase picks up Καλλιστοῖ (376), marking the essential point of comparison with these mortal women. For H.'s alleged pride in her own beauty, cf. 1368n.

**383–5**: cf. 27–9, 262–3nn.

ώλεσεν ὠλεσε: emotional repetition, cf. 195n.

ὄλομένους 'accursed', with a note of disapproval rather than pure pity (cf. 232n.).

**385** H. and the Chorus go into the palace: cf. 327–8, 362–85nn.

### 386–434 Menelaus' monologue

M. arrives, shipwrecked, bedraggled, and lost. His entry-speech resembles in part a second prologue: M. is alone on stage, his opening vocative and genealogy are characteristic of several Euripidean openings (vocatives: *Cycl.*, *Alc.*, *Andr.*, *Supp.*, *El.*, *Phoen.*; genealogies: *Her.*, *IT*, *Ion*, *Hel.*, *Phoen.*, *Or.*, *Bacch.*, *IA* 49–52), and his speech describes at length the background to his current predicament. By presenting M.'s entry as a 'second beginning', Eur. prepares the audience for the 'M. act' to follow (386–514), and emphasizes M.'s importance from now on as a focus and catalyst of the action alongside H.

In the first part of his speech (386–407), following his self-introduction, M. recalls the Greek expedition to Troy, contrasting his own miserable wanderings with the fate of those who died in battle or managed to reach home. In the second part (408–34) he describes the shipwreck that has ruined his own hopes of returning home and reduced him to shameful beggary. Dressed in tattered sailcloth (421–4n.),

M.'s appearance demonstrates his complete loss of status, and like H.'s phantom, his desperate condition seems to call into question the 'glory' of the war (cf. 393–6, 453nn.).

**386–7** Pelops is identified by his most famous achievement, the defeat of Oenomaus, king of Pisa near Olympia, in a chariot-race. Since Pelops' victory won him the hand of Oenomaus' daughter Hippodameia, who gave birth to Atreus, M.'s father, the chariot-race is also an apt starting point for the genealogy that M. wishes could be undone, cancelling out his own existence (cf. *IT* 1–5, 823–5).

ὦ . . . ποτε: the formality and grandiloquence of M.'s unusually elaborate apostrophe (note the interlaced word order) emphasizes the illustriousness of his ancestor, but also suggests M.'s own sense of self-importance, which will soon be shown to be completely at odds with his situation (435–82n.).

ἀμιλλας ἐξαμιλληθείς: aor. part. of ἐξαμιλλάομαι ('to compete vehemently'), with Oenomaus in the dat. as the person against whom the ἀμιλλα is aimed; the intensive ἐκ-compound (the verb is confined to Eur. in archaic and classical Greek: *Cycl.* 628, *Or.* 38, 431) and the cognate acc. stress both the importance of the contest, which is in effect for Pelops' life or death, and the effort required to win it (cf. 1471).

**388b–9a** Pelops' murder at the hands of his father Tantalus, who served his dismembered body at a banquet for the gods, was a well-known myth (contradicted and refashioned by Pindar, *Ol.* 1.25–58), but any reference to it here (as in the MSS) is highly unlikely. Quite apart from the peculiar shamefulness of this episode in his family's past, M.'s extended evocation of Pelops' victory at Pisa (386–7) suggests that his wish for Pelops' death is far more likely to be connected to that event (previous losers in the chariot-race having been killed by Oenomaus) than to any misfortune in the previous generation. Kannicht's ἐν δρόμοις neatly restores the required sense. (The interpolation probably stems from a desire to include another (in)famous episode from the myth of Pelops. πεισθείς implies an otherwise unattested version in which Pelops was persuaded by Tantalus to be part of the banquet, hence the anonymous conjecture πεφθείς, 'cooked', among others.)

**390** γεννῆσαι: aor. inf. γεννάω, 'to father'.

**391** In Eur.'s *Cretan Women* (produced in 438) Acrope bore M. and Agamemnon to Pleisthenes, son of Atreus (cf. Webster (1967) 37–9, Gantz (1993) 555–6). For Acrope's adultery with Thyestes and its consequences, cf. Eur. *El.* 720–46, *Or.* 1009–10.

**392** κλεινὸν ζυγόν 'a famous pair': cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 44 ὄχυρόν ζεῦγος Ἀτρεΐδων.

**393–6** M. foregrounds his role as leader of the Trojan expedition. The suppression of Agamemnon, the traditional commander in chief, is in line with the play's particular focus on the fate of M. (and H.), whose delusion and suffering are emblematic of the war as it is portrayed in the first part of the play (cf. 1603–4n.). For an audience who know Homer, however, the tone of M.'s words is strikingly pompous: cf. 435–82, 453nn.

**393** γάρ is to be taken not with κλεινόν (392) but with the whole of 386–92: i.e. the magnitude of the Trojan expedition and M.'s subsequent misery (393–407) explain his opening wish that he had never been born.

οὐ κόμπωι: by protesting too much M. in fact draws attention to his boastful tone.

**394** κώπηι διορίσαι 'took over by ship', lit. 'with the oar': for the synecdoche, cf. 191-3n., and for the particular use of parts of ships in such *pars pro toto* expressions, see Breitenbach (1934) 174(d).

**395-6** M.'s insistence on the absolute willingness of the troops, eliding the Greek leaders' oaths to avenge H.'s abduction (cf. Stes. fr. 190 *PMGF*, *L1* 57-67) or the power of Agamemnon to compel their assent (cf. Thuc. 1.9.3), characterizes him sympathetically (from an Athenian democratic perspective) as the freely elected leader of the army: cf. *El.* 1082, *Or.* 1168, *L1* 84-5 for similar claims by or about Agamemnon.

τύρανος . . . νεανίαις: for such 'emphatic repetition with *variatio*' as a feature of tragic style, cf. Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 630.

**397-400** τοὺς μὲν . . . | τοὺς δ' . . . | ἐγὼ δ': M. first contrasts those who died at Troy with those who returned home (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 433-55), then contrasts the fate of both groups with his own ongoing affliction.

**397** ἀριθμῆσαι πάρα (= πάρεστι: cf. 422) 'it is possible to count up'.

**398** For the dangers of the sea, cf. 126-32, 408-10.

**399** νεκρῶν . . . ὀνόματ': the names of their drowned comrades, rather than their own 'because they returned home after being given up for dead' (Dale). However, M. himself will later agree to be called dead 'in report' (1050-2 λόγῳ θανεῖν).

**400-7** M. has been wandering the seas for seven years (cf. 112, 766-9, 775-6) until his arrival, shipwrecked and destitute, in Egypt. In the *Odyssey*, by contrast, his wanderings begin after his time in Egypt and are an opportunity to collect much treasure (4.81-5).

**401** χρόνον ὅσονπερ 'ever since'.

**403** πρὸς θεῶν: in fact the gods are about to choose between competing plans for M.'s homecoming: cf. 876-86.

**404** Λιβύης . . . ἐπιδρομῶς 'the landing-places of Libya'. M.'s visit to 'fertile' Libya in the *Odyssey* (4.85-9) reflects early Greek colonial interests in the region of Cyrene (cf. Malkin (1998) Index s.v. Libya). Here its coastline is 'desolate and inhospitable', stressing the hardships suffered by M.

**405-7** In the *Odyssey* M.'s fleet is hit by a storm as it rounds Cape Malca (3.286-90) and he does not see Greece again for another seven years. The description here of being repeatedly 'close to my country' (ἐγγύς . . . πάτρας), only to be driven back each time, magnifies his misery and frustration.

**405** χῶταν: crisis, καὶ ὅταν.

**406** οὐριον: sc. πνεῦμα, 'a favourable wind'.

**408-13** M. arrives in Egypt with five ships in both the *Odyssey* (3.299-300) and cyclic *Nostoi* (p. 94.6-7 Bernabé = p. 67.9-11 Davies). Here, however, his last ship is destroyed (410n.) and much ingenuity will be needed to furnish a replacement (1059-92).

**409** ἐξέπεσον 'I have been cast up'; cf. 539, 1211.

**410** ἀριθμούς (in the sense 'separate pieces': cf. LSJ s.v. 1 4) is an acc. of result (Smyth §1578), stressing the impossibility of salvaging a sailworthy vessel: '[my ship] is broken into countless bits of wreckage'.

**411-13** M. and 'H.' survive by clinging to the broken keel (τρόπις), just as Odysseus had done before landing on Ogygia, the island of Calypso (*Od.* 5.130-1; cf. Rutherford on 19.278-82).

**411** ποικίλων ἄρμοσμάτων 'of its skilfully fitted pieces (only the keel was left)'. The noun ἄρμοσμα ('joined work') is a *hapax legomenon*.

**413** ἀποσπάσας ἔχω '(Helen whom) I dragged (from Troy) and have with me.' M.'s emphasis on his possession of H. is understandable, since he spent ten years fighting to regain her. For his dragging of H. by the hair, cf. 116n.

**414-17** Embarrassment at his condition has prevented M. from approaching people to find out where he is. The combination of αἰσχύνη (415 ἠισχυνόμενῃ) and αἰδῶς (417 ὑπ' αἰδοῦς) is emphatic, expressing the power of M.'s shame. H. too is appalled by the idea that her husband has been reduced to begging (790-1).

**415** ἐσπεσεῖν: aor. inf. εἰσπίπτω, 'go among (the crowd)'.

[**416**] Reference to M.'s 'shabby clothes' (δυσχλαινίας; cf. *Hee.* 240) seems out of place, since his appearance is introduced at 421-4 as if it were an additional aspect of his misery. Here, however, M. is speaking more generally of his shame at everything that has happened to him (417 τὰς τύχας). The interpolator has tried to elucidate M.'s embarrassment, but, influenced by 421-4, has done so too specifically.

**417-19** The idea that it is better (i.e. less painful) to be constantly unfortunate than to suffer the change from prosperity to misfortune is a piece of popular wisdom espoused by several Euripidean characters and choruses (e.g. *Hee.* 375-6, *Tro.* 639-40, *IT* 1117-22; interpolated at *Her.* 1291-3). M.'s sententiousness (cf. 513-14) is a plausible reaction to the stress of his unfamiliar condition.

ὑψηλός 'of high status', 'prosperous'.

εἰς ἀθηθίαν 'into an unfamiliar state'.

κακίω = κακίονα, modifying ἀθηθίαν.

**420** τείρει: a poetic word (cf. e.g. *Il.* 4.315 (Agamemnon to Nestor) ἀλλά σε γῆρας τείρει ὁμοίον), here emphasizing M.'s destitution: 'need presses hard on me'.

πᾶρα = πάρεστι 'is available'.

**421-4** Though Aristophanes mocked Eur. for his ragged heroes (*Ach.* 410-79, *Peace* 146-8, *Frogs* 841-2, 1063-6), M.'s costume is used to great dramatic effect. As well as reminding the audience of his desperate situation throughout, M.'s tattered appearance helps deceive Theoc. by supporting a false version of the shipwreck (cf. 1079-82, 1204-5). By the same token, M.'s fine new clothes, given to him by H. (1382), symbolize a positive change in their fortunes as the escape plan develops, and his entrance dressed as a warrior foreshadows his success as a fighter on board the escaping ship (1375-81, 1600-12): cf. *Introd.* § 5(a).

**421-2** 'One can guess this by the cast-offs from the ship that I am wearing.'

αὐτά is emphatic by position: cf. Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 557, who helpfully glosses αὐτά here as 'the facts themselves'. By 'the facts themselves' M. means his general state of neediness (420-1), not simply his lack of clothes.

ναὸς ἐκβόλοις: M. has clothed himself in material salvaged from the ship. His description at *Ar. Thesm.* 935 as a 'sail-stitcher' (λοτιοράφος) makes it very likely that

he was wrapped in pieces of sailcloth in Eur.'s play, the target text of Aristophanes' parody. He also carries a sword (cf. 983, 1044).

ἀμπύσχομαι: *crasis*, ἄ ἀμπύσχομαι, '(the ἐκβολα) which I am clothed in'.

423–4 λαμπρά τ' ἀμφιβλήματα | χλιδᾶς τε 'bright cloaks and luxurious garments', symbols of M.'s former prosperity.

424–6 ἐν δ' ἀντροῦ μυχῶς | κρύψας γυναῖκα: as soon as he reaches Ithaca, Odysseus hides the treasures given to him by the Phaeacians in a cave (*Od.* 13.367–9). By contrast, M. is still far from home and has hidden in a cave the cause of his own suffering.

τὴν κακῶν πάντων ἔμοι | ἄρξασαν: M.'s unsympathetic attitude to his wife is emphasized, since it will play an important role in his refusal to recognize the real H. (541–96).

426–7 περιλειμμένους: *perf. pass. part.* περιλείπομαι, 'those of my friends who survived'; cf. 599, 737.

ἀναγκάσας: M.'s men must be forced to guard H. The detail suggests not only M.'s continuing distrust of H., but also the Greeks' readiness to be rid of her.

λέχη ('bed') = 'wife', cf. 475, 584, 590, 784, 974, etc. The metonymy is indicative of Greek gender ideology: the 'husband' is not so readily defined with regard to his sexual role.

428–9 μόνος: M.'s solo mission marks both his status as leader and his concern for his companions (cf. *Od.* 10.144–7).

νοστῶ: usually 'I return', but here simply 'I come': cf. 474, 891. Nevertheless, the word evokes the delayed *nostos* of M. in early epic (405–7n.).

τὰ πρόσφορ' 'what is needed', i.e. food and drink.

430–1 Like Teucer, M. is impressed by the masonry and scale of the palace (68–70n.); Odysseus marvels too as he approaches Alcinous' palace (*Od.* 7.81–135).

432–4 M. explains his decision to approach this particular house (430 δῶμα . . . τόδε): the rich are better able to help beggars than the poor.

433 ἐκ δὲ μὴ χόντων βίον 'but from the poor'; for μὴ + *part.* in general or conditional statements, cf. Smyth §§2728, 2734.

434 οὐδ' . . . ἔχοιεν ἂν' – they couldn't help even if they wanted to.' Paley's emendation (ἔχοιμεν for ἔχοιεν) removes the *anacoluthon* ('from the poor we could get no help even if they wanted to give it'), but the abrupt change conveys M.'s dismissive certainty.

#### 435–482 Menelaus' dialogue with the Old Woman

M. calls inside for someone to relay his request for assistance. An old female slave (cf. 441 ὦ γραῖα) comes out of the palace and gruffly orders him to leave. More than any other scene in the play, this encounter has been interpreted as a sign of *Helen's* 'sub-tragic' quality. M.'s treatment by the Old Woman, it is often claimed, is absurd and out of place: e.g. Burnett (1971) 82 'for a moment he [M.] makes an open farce of her [H.'s] already ridiculous tragedy.' It would be a mistake, however, to condemn

the intrusion of such 'comic elements' as a violation of tragedy's generic purity: see *Introd.* §7.

What, then, is specifically 'comic' about M.'s dialogue with the Old Woman and what purpose does the humour serve? Though it is unclear whether M. actually knocks on the door as well as shouting (Taplin (1977) 340–1 thinks not, while Brown (2000) 6 thinks it reasonable to suppose that he does), both motifs (knocking and shouting indoors) are more numerous in comedy than in tragedy, and 'the comedy of doors' was, and remained, a staple of comic drama (cf. Scolnicov (1994) 41–7). However, there is nothing amusing about the use of these stage-conventions elsewhere in tragedy (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 653–8, Eur. *IT* 1304–8, *Phoen.* 1069–71, *Bacch.* 170–5), which suggests that they are, in the fifth century at least, *cross-generic* features rather than peculiar to comedy. In other words, the impact of such stage-actions depends on their context.

Here, however, unlike the other tragic examples, M.'s command is made to seem ludicrous by the doorkeeper's peremptory response: the conqueror of Troy must beg an old female slave to stop being angry (442) and not push him away (445). Moreover, the humour is accentuated by Eur.'s reworking of the epic pattern in which M. is cast as a lesser version of Odysseus, for instead of meeting the nubile and helpful Nausicaa, M. is confronted by a cantankerous old woman. The scene's comic qualities were immediately appreciated by Aristophanes, who quotes from it in his parody of *Helen*, as Inlaw/'Helen' takes on the doorkeeper's function of informing Eur./'M.' about Egypt, while Critylla performs the role of abusing 'M.' (cf. *Thesm.* 871–88). Nonetheless, the humour of the Euripidean scene differs from that produced by the recalcitrant slaves of comedy (one should also note that the incidence of colloquial expressions in the dialogue is no higher than elsewhere in the play: 439, 475nn.). For it is hardly all uproarious (*pace* Seidensticker (1982) 175–7, who exaggerates the comic tone and reduces the scene to buffoonery), and, most importantly, there is a bleak and disturbing edge to the situation, since it highlights above all M.'s loss of status and his desperation.

In conclusion, M.'s encounter with the Old Woman is funny, even while it has a serious import, *since these two aspects can coexist*. Moreover, such polytonality is not confined to Eur., since Aesch. and Soph. also use the interaction of various tones and styles (e.g. the Watchman and the Herald in *Ag.*, the Nurse in *Cho.*, Lichas and the Messenger in *Trach.*, the Guard in *Ant.*) to enhance the tragic impact of the action. As here, the humorous passages in Aesch. and Soph. all involve lower-class (and usually anonymous) characters. Finally, M.'s dialogue with the Old Woman also marks an important stage in his gradual recognition of the truth, since he first learns from her that H., daughter of Zeus (cf. 470–2), has been living in Egypt since before the Trojan War began (470–6).

435 ὦή is often used to attract attention ('Hey there!'): cf. 1180, *IT* 1304, *Phoen.* 1067, 1069 (all before closed doors).

τίς ἄν . . . μόλοι: a question with potential opt. can be an idiomatic way of expressing a wish or command.

**437–40** The Old Woman's opening words are a series of commands and threats, and she continues in this vein until 460, when she begins to answer M.'s requests for information. M. is ashamed of his condition (cf. 415–17), but now learns that his situation is far worse than he had feared, for all Greeks are to be killed (439–40).

**438** πρὸς αὐλείοισιν . . . πύλαις 'at the courtyard gate': as with a Greek house, the outer gate of the Egyptian palace leads into a courtyard (behind the stage-building and so out of sight): cf. Jebb on Soph. *Ant.* 18 ἐκτὸς αὐλείων πυλῶν.

**439** For colloquial ὄχλον παρέχειν ('to be a nuisance'), cf. *Med.* 337, *Or.* 282, Stevens (1976) 56.

**440** οἷσιν οὐκ ἐπιστροφαί 'for whom (i.e. οἱ Ἕλληνες) there is no approach'; cf. H.'s warning to Teucer (155).

**441–2** ὦ . . . | ἔξεστι 'Old lady, you may say those same words in a different tone.' The MS text is corrupt (see apparatus criticus). The slight changes to ταῦτά and κἄλλως λέγειν make it possible to retain ἔπη (changed to ἐπεὶ by Murray and endorsed by Kannicht) and avoid isolating ἔξεστι.

ἀνες: aor. imper. of ἀνίημι, with separative gen., 'relax', 'cease from' (LSJ s.v. 11 8 c).

**443** ἐμοί . . . πρόσκειται: lit. 'this (task) has been laid upon me', said as she advances threateningly towards M.

**445** For the use of ἄ ('a sharp cry of protest, commonly followed by a prohibition with μή'), see Barrett on *Hipp.* 503–4.

μή πρόσσειε χεῖρα 'don't shake your fist', i.e. as a gesture of rejection. Blomfield's πρόσσειε is preferable to L's μή προσσεῖλαι χεῖρα ('don't force your hand (against me)'), since προσσεῖλω is not otherwise attested in Attic poetry. Bond remarks (on *Her.* 1218) that πρόσσειε 'seems too mild for the context (μηδ' ὤθει βίαι follows, cf. 452)'. But there is no reason why this (familiar) gesture should not be mentioned first, before the mention of force. Moreover, μηδ' ὤθει βίαι implies only the threat of force, and 452 shows that it has not been used.

**446** γάρ 'Yes, I will push you, because . . .' (cf. *GP* 74.2).

**448** Despite Kannicht's attempt to defend L's text, there is no certain instance of ἄν with the future infinitive in classical Greek (cf. Moorhouse (1982) 216–17). A present or aor. inf. is needed, and Kovacs's conjecture (adapting Dale's σοὺς γ' ἔσαγγέλλειν λόγους) reinforces the Old Woman's warning: her compliance with his request would be disastrous (πικρῶς) for M. (σοι) himself.

**449** M. tries to mollify the Old Woman's anger by reminding her of his special status as a shipwrecked foreigner (protected by Zeus Xenios and Hikesios: cf. *Cycl.* 299–301, Burkert (1985) 130).

**451** οὐκ is accented to show ellipse of the verb (εἶμι, responding to 450 ἴθι, 'go!'): cf. Moorhouse (1959) 27.

πιθοῦ: 323n.

**452** ὠσθήση: 2nd sg. fut. passive of ὠθέω, 'push'.

**453** M.'s despairing question, with its insistence on his former status as leader of the Greek expedition, sounds pompous in context: 393–6, 454nn. The revelation

of the phantom will in due course make the apparent futility of the Trojan War itself clear to all: 707, 1151–64, 1220. It is important, however, not to exaggerate the significance of M.'s complaint here, as if it were a claim (with extra-dramatic import for the audience) about the futility of war *per se*: see Introd. §1(b). For a more positive evaluation of the Trojan War, and from the perspective of H. herself, see p. 336.

αἰαί: M.'s high tragic style (cf. 455 ὦ δαῖμον, 461 ὦ δύστηνος) contrasts forcefully with the Old Woman's blunter manner, underlining how misguided M. was in his expectation of sympathy and hospitality (427–36).

454 The response is stark and crushing: 'You were obviously important somewhere else, but here you are not.'

455 ὦ δαῖμον: by invoking his own *daimon*, the power that drives his life (which, so far, had always been one of high status), M. both underscores and bemoans the shameful condition of his present condition.

456 τί . . . δάκρυσι: as is shown by M.'s own justification of his refusal to shed tears before Theonoe (947–53), weeping *per se* is not necessarily un-heroic, but the risk that it might be construed as 'cowardly' or 'womanish' (cf. 950–3n.) made it a risky and potentially embarrassing gesture. (Of course, in masked theatre, weeping and other expressions must be imagined by the audience: cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 171–2.) Here M.'s show of emotion is undercut and rendered ludicrous by the Old Woman's blunt refusal to pity him.

πρὸς . . . εἶ; lit. 'in whose eyes are you worthy of pity?', implying 'you are not so in mine.'

457–8 M. returns to the contrast with his former good fortune (453, 455), but the Old Woman's remarkably brusque response ('Won't you go away and give your tears to your friends (so that they may pity you)?') stresses once again her humiliating treatment of him (cf. 455 ὡς ἀνάξι ἠτιμώμεθα).

460 Kirchoff's adaptation of Ar. *Thesm.* 874 Πρωτέως τάδ' ἐστὶ μέλαθρα answers M.'s question exactly (with 459–60 forming a chiasmus: land/palace ~ palace/land). Kannicht defends L's reading Πρωτεύς τάδ' οἰκεῖ δώματ' on the grounds that 'the dead Proteus still counts here as the ruler'; yet although Proteus' conduct towards H. remains an important reference point for the contrasting actions of his children, it is clear that Theoc. is now the ruler (cf. 466), while the only building that the dead Proteus could be said to inhabit (οἰκεῖ) is his tomb, which makes no sense as a response to M.'s question about the palace in 459.

461 οἶ is exclamatory, 'to what a land (have I then sailed)!'; ἄρα marks M.'s realization of the truth: cf. *GP* 40.4. For M.'s arrival in Egypt in other versions of the myth, see 408–13n. Having been buffeted around the Mediterranean for seven years (400–7), M. now finds himself further away from Greece than he has ever been before.

462 τὸ Νείλου . . . γάνος 'the Nile's sparkling water'. Dodds on *Bacch.* 261 notes 'The root meaning of the word [γάνος] seems to be "brightness" . . . ; it is used especially to describe the sheen or sparkle of liquids.' Here the word suggests the Old Woman's pride in her native river, and hence her annoyance with M.'s apparent

complaint about Egypt. For the Nile's alleged source in melting mountain snows, cf. 1–3n.

**463** ἐμέμφθην (aor. with present sense) 'I do not find fault with it'; cf. Lloyd (1999) 42 'The aorist here is more restrained and polite . . . than the present would have been.'

**464** is a version of the most common *topos* of consolation, 'you are not the only one to suffer' (e.g. *Alc.* 416–19, *Andr.* 1041–2), but here the Old Woman has no wish to console M. and her tone is impatient and dismissive. For δὴ with pronouns (especially σὺ), where 'the emphasis is often ironical, contemptuous, or indignant in tone', see *GP* 208.ii.

**465** ἔστ' . . . ἔναξ; M. has never even heard of Proteus (460) and so naturally does not know that he is dead.

**467** ποῦ . . . εἴη 'Where might *he* be then?' δῆτα and the potential opt. emphasize M.'s impatient desire to meet with the king, regardless of his exact identity.

**468** οὐκ ἔνδον (sc. ἔστι): cf. 153–4, 1169–70.

Ἐλλησιν δὲ πολεμιώτατος: cf. 155, 439–40. M. does not discover the reason for Theoc.'s hostility to the Greeks until 781–8, since the dialogue takes a new turn when he learns of (a certain) H.'s presence in Egypt (470–6).

**469** τίν' αἰτίαν σχών 'What reason does he have (to be so opposed to the Greeks)?'

ἧς ἐπηυρόμην ἐγώ: lit. 'of which I got the benefit'; for the sarcastic use of ἐπαυρίσκομαι, cf. *Il.* 1.410 (Achilles on the Greeks) ἵνα πάντες ἐπαύρωνται βασιλῆος, and 76–7n. on ἀπολαύω.

**470–2** ἡ τοῦ Διός | . . . ἡ Τυνδαρίς παῖς: the exact description heightens M.'s puzzlement at the identity of this 'other' Spartan H. (487–96). The sequence of questions by M. in 471–5 underlines his astonishment still further.

**473** τίνα . . . λόγον 'how is this matter to be explained?': an aside, like the second part of 475 (cf. Bain (1977) 42–3).

**474** νοστήσασ' 'coming': cf. 428–9n.

γῆς . . . ἄπο: anastrophe (23–4n.).

**475** οὐ τί που: see 95n. M. cannot believe what he is hearing.

λελήτισμεθ': 1st pl. perf. pass. λήιζομαι, 'rob', with internal acc.

λέχος: 426–7n.

**478** τύχη . . . ἦι ταρασσεται: the disturbing turn of events is Theoc.'s desire to marry H., which has made her flee the royal palace.

**479** καιρὸν . . . οὐδέν' (adverbial acc.) = καιρίως, πρὸς/ἔς καιρὸν (cf. 1081). Timely and untimely arrivals are of course a staple of narrative development, especially in drama (e.g. *Hipp.* 899–900, *Phoen.* 106, *Or.* 384): cf. 1081, Race (1981).

**480** θάνατος ξενιά σοι γενήσεται: M.'s appeal to the rights of a *xenos* (449) will evidently count for nothing. The perversion of guest-friendship threatened by the Old Woman recalls Odysseus' meeting with Polyphemus, where the Cyclops' promise to eat the hero last of all is presented as a ξεινήιον (*Od.* 9.369–70, *Eur. Cycl.* 342–4). The echo is a further link between M. and Odysseus: 411–13, 424–6nn.

481–2 οὐχ ὅσον ‘I am in fact well-disposed to Greeks for all (lit. *not to the extent of*) the harsh words I spoke in fear of my master.’ The Old Woman’s parting revelation of her underlying goodwill is highly effective, since it stresses the danger posed by Theoc., which will be the catalyst of the escape plot, while also making clear that not all Egyptians are hostile to the Greeks: cf. 998–1029, *Introd.* §6(c).

483–514 *Menelaus’ second monologue*

A bewildered M. tries to make sense of the news that a Spartan woman called H., daughter of Zeus and Tyndareos, is living in Egypt (483–99). Having examined the information before him (490–6: the apparent existence of two Helens, two Spartas, etc.), M. concludes that many people and places have the same names (497–9). Thus, like Teucer before him, M. is able to retain a false conviction (*his* H. is a bad woman) by believing that the Egyptian H. is merely an innocent double or homonym. There is nothing intrinsically ludicrous about M.’s reasoning (nor is there any need to delete 497–9, *pace* Kovacs (2003) 35–6): he begins by arguing that there cannot be two Helens, two Troys, etc., but the alternative scenario – *the* H. is living in the palace and never went to Troy – is (for him) unthinkable, which makes the existence of homonyms a plausible solution. The audience might well be amused by M.’s confusion, but they could also appreciate the serious implications of his epistemological dilemma: see *Introd.* §6(a).

483 τί φῶ; τί λέξω; cf. 496 and M.’s baffled speechlessness when he actually sees H. (548–9).

484 ἐκ τῶν πάροιθε ‘in succession to the ones before’.

παρεστῶσας: fem. acc. pl. perf. part. of παρίστημι, ‘to be at hand’ (LSJ s.v. B 11 2).

489 ἔλεξε ‘she said’, i.e. the Old Woman (470).

490–1 ἀλλ’ ἦ is used in questions to express surprise (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 858–9): ‘Is there really some man called Zeus by the banks of the Nile?’ Though M. rejects the idea initially, his question evokes some of the most advanced theological speculation of the fifth century: Herodotus argued that the Greeks had gotten the names of nearly all their gods, including Zeus, from Egypt (2.50), while Prodicus claimed that the gods were originally humans deified for their good services to mankind (cf. Henrichs (1975) 111–15). In the *Bacchae* Pentheus mocks the Lydian stranger with the suggestion that ‘some Zeus’ (by implication a mortal) might live in Lydia producing ‘new gods’ such as Dionysus (467).

493 τοῦ καλλιδόνακος . . . Εὐρώπα: 209–10η. καλλιδόναξ (‘with beautiful reeds’) is a *hapax*.

496 οὐκ ἔχω ‘I don’t know’, lit. ‘I do not have [the knowledge of] what to say’; cf. 564 οὐδ’ ἔχω τί φῶ.

497–9 Ironically, M. solves the problem of multiplicity here by separating the name from its referent (the individual man, woman, or city), the very concept he is

unable to grasp when confronted by the real H., who must remind him that 'a name can be in many places' (588).

**497** '(But I suppose it is credible) for . . .'; γάρ marks M.'s transition from perplexity to acceptance that the sharing of names might not be so startling (499 θαυμαστέον) after all.

ὡς εἴξασιν (= Attic form of εἰοίκασιν) is the personal equivalent ('as they seem') of ὡς εἰοικε ('as it seems').

ἐν πολλῇι χθονί 'in the wide world'.

**498** ταῦτ': crasis, τὰ αὐτὰ, with receding accent, 'the same (names)'.

**500–14** Having resolved his confusion, M. determines to seek help from the king, despite the Old Woman's warnings, relying on his fame as the conqueror of Troy.

**500** τὸ δεινὸν προσπόλου: the absence of the article with προσπόλου has a contemptuous force, 'the warning of a (mere) servant'; cf. 439–40, 479–80.

**501–2** M.'s confidence in the hospitality of his host and the power of his name recalls Odysseus' mistaken assumptions about the Cyclops: 'We are the conquerors of Troy and have come as suppliants, so give us presents, as is the right of strangers' (paraphrase of *Od.* 9.263–71). M.'s encounter with the Old Woman has barely affected his sense of self-importance; cf. 393–6, 453nn.

**501** βάρβαρος φρένας: for the cruelty of *barbaroi*, cf. e.g. *Or.* 485 (Tyndarcos to M.) βεβαρβάρωσαι, χρόνιος ὦν ἐν βαρβάροις.

**502** ὄνομ' ἀκούσας: a further irony (cf. 497–9n.) will be felt when M. survives by *concealing* his name: 1077–8.

τούμόν: crasis, τὸ ἐμόν.

**503–9** There is no need to reject these lines (*pace* Willink, followed by Diggle and Kovacs): their mixture of bravado and reasoning suits M. (cf. 490–502), while the implicit stage-directions (M. will conceal himself (507 κρύψας ἐμᾶντόν) so as to observe the king's demeanour before deciding whether to approach him) explain why M. remains unseen until H. catches sight of him near the tomb at 541. (In fact Theoc. does not enter for over 600 lines, but when he does, M. is crouching out of sight at the tomb: cf. 1085–6, 1178–9, 1203.)

**503** ἦψα: 1st sg. aor. act. of ἄπτω, 'set on fire, light'. Note the explanatory asyndeton ('He will not refuse me food, because . . .'); so too at 505, which picks up the central idea of 500ff. ('I shall not flee . . . but I shall await . . .').

**504** is deleted by Kannicht as being superfluous after ὄνομ' . . . τούμόν (502) and κλεινόν (503), but the emphasis on M.'s pride in his name is apposite: 497–9, 502nn.

οὐκ ἄγνωστος: litotes, 'very famous'.

**505–6** δισσὰς . . . | . φυλάξεις: lit. 'two securities', i.e. two ways of coping with the king's attitude, whether hostile or favourable.

ἔχει (= παρέχει), '(awaiting the king) provides'.

**508** ἐνδιδῶι τι μαλθακόν '(if) he shows some compassion'.

**508–9** τὰ πρόσφορα | . . . συμφορᾶς 'what is needed in (lit. fitting for) my current misfortune'.

**510** κακῶν . . . ἔσχατον '(this is) the worst of my sufferings'.

511-12 For the disgrace involved in begging, cf. 790-1.

513-14 The attribution of such a commonplace to 'some wise man' suggests M.'s eagerness to compensate somehow for his humiliation: cf. 417-19n.

## 515-527 EPIPARODOS

In each of the few surviving instances where the chorus leave the stage for a time (cf. 327-81.), their re-entry (ἐπιπάροδος) is naturally handled to suit the individual dramatic context: the Furies enter sporadically in pursuit of Orestes at Athens (Aesch. *Eum.* 244-75); the two semi-choruses of Salaminian sailors rush from different directions in search of their endangered leader (Soph. *Aj.* 866-78); the chorus of Trojan soldiers come upon Odysseus and Dionedus in the Trojan camp ([Eur.] *Rhesus* 675-91); the old men of Pherae accompany Admetus in a funeral procession (*Alc.* 861-934). Here the Chorus return from the palace with news of Theonoe's response. (It is not entirely clear whether H. remains silent during their song or re-enters only after they have finished: the latter seems more probable, *pace* Halleran (1985) 23; cf. Taplin (1977) 194 n. 3.)

Brief astrophic choral songs are occasionally used instead of stasima in circumstances of great urgency so as not to slow the pace of the action (cf. Dodds on *Bacch.* 1153-64, Rode (1971) 86). Here the short ode gets the Chorus back on stage quickly so that the long-awaited recognition scene can begin. Theonoe's pronouncement – M. is not dead (517-19), but still wanders the seas (520-7) – undoes the grief caused by the 'rumour' of M.'s death (cf. 132n.), while leaving open the issue of his eventual fate (so as not to dissipate the suspense of the following scenes): cf. 535-7n.

*Metre.* After an iambic introduction, a single aeolo-choriambic stanza of three periods, each ending with a pherecratean (i.e. a glyconic with catalexis). On Eur.'s fondness for the 'choriambic dimeter' or 'wilamowitzianus' (00-x-uu-), also prominent in the second and third stasima, see Itsumi (1982) 59, 72.

---u---u---u-	ἤκουσα τᾶς θεσπιωίδου κόρας	515	sync ia trim
u---u---u---u-	ἄχρηζουσ' ἐπλάθην τυράννοις δόμοισιν,	516	4 bacchiacs
---u---u-	ὡς Μενέλαος οὔ-	517	clodrans A
---u---u-	πω μελαμφαῆς οἴχεται	518	glyconic
uuu---u---	δι' ἔρεβος χθονὶ κρυφθεῖς,	519	pherecratean
---u---u-	ἀλλ' ἔτι κατ' οἴδμ' ἄλιον	520	^chor dim

—υ—υ—υ—υ—	τρυχόμενος οὔπω λιμένων	521	chor dim
—υ—υ—υ—	ψάσειεν πατρίας γᾶς,	522	pherecratean
υ—υ—υ—υ—	ἀλατείαι βιότου	523	^chor dim
υ—υ—υ—υ—	ταλαίφρων, ἀφιλος φίλων,	524	glyconic
—υ—υ—υ—υ—	παντοδαπᾶς ἐπὶ γᾶς πέδον	525	glyconic
—υ—υ—υ—υ—	χριμπτόμενος εἰναλίωι	526	^chor dim
—υ—υ—υ—	κώπαι Τρωιάδος ἐκ γᾶς.	527	pherecratean

515 τᾶς θεσπιωιδουῦ κόρας: for Theopoc's powers of prophecy, cf. 13–15, 145, 317–20.

516 ἃ χρήζουσ' ἐπλάθην 'what I desired (to hear) when I entered (the royal palace).' Diggle (1994) 424–7 has shown that traditional interpretations of L's χρήζουσ' (corrected in the Aldine edition to χρήζουσ) ἐφάνη as 'she clearly prophesied' are impossible, since neither χρήζειν nor χρήζειν can mean 'to prophesy' (*pace* LSJ, whose only example is this passage). If we take χρήζουσ' in its regular sense as 'desiring', the subject must be the Chorus itself, and Diggle's ἐπλάθην (aor. pass. of πελάζω, 'I approach, enter') gives better sense than Triclinius' ἐφάνην ('I appeared'): cf. 327–8.

518–19 μελαμφαῖς . . . | δι' ἔρεβος 'through the dark gloom (of the Underworld)'; cf. Ar. *Frogs* 1331 νυκτὸς κελαινοφαῖς ὄρφνα, where the parody of Euripidean lyric mannerisms touches upon 'the element –φαῖς [which] seems to serve simply as a suffix to a colour-term' (Dover ad loc.).

χθονὶ κρυφθεῖς: for the dead as 'hidden in the earth', cf. Soph. *Ant.* 24–5, Eur. *Andr.* 1264, *Hec.* 897, Thuc. 2.34.6.

521 τρυχόμενος 'worn out' (cf. the active form τρύχουσα at 1286).

523 ἀλατείαι βιότου: not '(miserable) through lack of livelihood' (Kannicht) but 'through a life of wandering'.

524 ἀφιλος φίλων: for expressions of this kind, using the gen. of separation with cognate alpha-privative adjectives to emphasize the lack of something (e.g. Eur. *Supp.* 35 ἄπαιδας . . . τέκνων), see Breitenbach (1934) 192.9; cf. 213–14n.

525–7 παντοδαπᾶς . . . | χριμπτόμενος 'approaching lands of every kind'; cf. 404–7.

εἰναλίωι | κώπαι: synecdoche, 'with his seafaring ship': cf. 394n.

Τρωιάδος ἐκ γᾶς 'ever since (leaving) Troy' (for the temporal use of ἐκ, see LSJ s.v. II 2).

## 528-1106 SECOND EPISODE

The long and elaborate central section of the play (between the return of the Chorus and their delayed first stasimon: 1107-64n.) presents two major dramatic sequences embracing M.'s eventual recognition of H. (528-760) and the first stages of their escape plan (761-1106). Despite the episode's great length (a feature of late fifth-century tragedy in particular: *Introd.* p. 36), the action is enlivened by the alternation of two- and three-figure scenes, and in each case the entry of the third character brings about a crucial development: the Servant's report triggers the recognition (597-760), while Theonoe's agreement enables the initiation of the escape plan (857-1031). The general structure is as follows:

- 528-96:** M. and H. meet, but M. refuses to recognize H.  
**597-760:** the Servant's news convinces M.; the recognition is celebrated in song (625-97).  
**761-856:** H. tells M. of the threat to his life; they determine to persuade Theonoe.  
**857-1031:** H. and M. supplicate Theonoe, who agrees to support them.  
**1032-1106:** H. proposes to escape using the feigned ritual of burial at sea.

The process of recognition and the planning of escape are both elaborated by complicating factors: M.'s unwillingness to believe that he fought for a phantom prevents his immediate acceptance of H.'s identity (541-96, esp. 593), while Theonoe's powers make a direct attack on Theoc. impossible (cf. 809-32, 1043-6). M. and H. are thrown back on their own ingenuity, and dramatic ironies proliferate as the escape plan turns ignorance of identity (the root of their suffering) to their own advantage: cf. 1165-1300, 1369-1450nn.

**528-96** The failure of recognition exposes the tragic consequences of M.'s trust in appearances, especially for H., who is rejected by the very person for whom she has waited seventeen years (cf. 594-6). Scepticism and reluctance to accept who the other figure says he is are familiar features of recognition scenes from the *Odyssey* onwards (cf. esp. *Od.* 23.166-246). However, the existence of the phantom leads to novel complications which enhance the suspense and emotional effect of the reunion: whereas Iphigenia, for example, thinks that Orestes is dead (in *IT*, so too Electra Orestes in Soph. *El.*), M.'s problem is that there are too many Helens, and the existence of his 'other wife' (581) makes him unable to recognize the real one.

**528-9** τάφου τοῦδ' εἰς ἔδρας 'to my seat at this tomb'. H. re-enters from the palace (ἦδ' αὖ . . . πάλιν | στειχῶ) to take up her suppliant position once again, unaware that M. is hiding by the tomb (503-9n.). She does not see him, nor does he hear her, until 541; for such patterns of delayed contact in tragedy, cf. Mastronarde (1979) 23-4.

**530-40** There is no need to reject these lines: the repetition and elaboration of the Chorus' report (517-27) from the protagonist's perspective follows a regular

tragic pattern (cf. Schadewaldt (1926) 242), while the juxtaposition of 540 and 541 is theatrically stunning and darkly ironic: H. wishes her husband would appear, but immediately runs from him in terror.

**530–1** The triple repetition of ‘alive’ (ἐν φάει | . . . ζῶντα φέγγος εισορᾶν) marks H.’s joy and amazement at the news of M.’s survival (cf. 537 σεσωμένον).

**531** ἄμόν = ἐμόν (with long alpha, used *metri gratia*); for ἀμός (also equivalent to ἡμέτερος) in tragedy, see Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 425–8.

**532–3** πεπλευκότα: L has πεπλωκότα, but since the Attic pf. part. (of πλέω, ‘I sail’) scans, there seems no need to use the Ionic form (from πλώω); cf. 405, 461.

οὐδ’ ἀγύμναστον πλάνοις: litotes, ‘not unharassed’, i.e. ‘utterly worn out by his wanderings’.

**534** ἦξειν . . . τέλος ‘(and she says that) he will come (i.e. to Egypt) when he has reached the end of his troubles (i.e. his wanderings).’

**535–7** H.’s failure to ask Theococ about M.’s fate beyond his arrival in Egypt is well-motivated dramatically, since certainty of success would diminish the threat to H. and M. and so lessen the excitement of the following scenes: cf. 56 gn. For a similarly motivated omission, one might compare *Ion* 541 τερφθεις τοῦτο, κείν’ οὐκ ἠρόμην, where Xuthus’ delight (cf. H.’s ἠσθεῖς, 537) at Apollo’s oracle prevents him from asking about the identity of Ion’s mother.

**535** εἰ μολῶν σωθήσεται ‘whether he will survive after he has come here’, i.e. whether he will be able to escape being killed by Theoc.

**536** ἀπέστην ‘I refrained from (asking this explicitly)’: for the inf. ἐρωτῆσαι, cf. *Med.* 742 δρᾶν τάδ’ οὐκ ἀφίσταμαι (Aegeus: ‘I do not shrink from doing this (sc. swearing an oath)’).

**538** ἐγγύς . . . χθονός: as H. will soon discover, M. is meanwhile not merely ‘somewhere near this land’, but actually in it.

**539** ἐκπεσόντα ‘cast ashore’, ἐκπιπτω being the standard term for shipwreck (LSJ s.v. 1): cf. 409, 1211.

**541–5** H. sees the ragged M. by the tomb (528–9n.) and takes him to be one of Theoc.’s men, intent upon handing her over to the king (cf. 551–2).

**541** οὐ τί που: 95n.

κρυπτεύομαι ‘I am being ambushed’: when Electra notices the ‘strangers’ Orestes and Pylades, she too thinks they have come to ambush her and rushes towards the safety of her house (*El.* 215–19).

**542** ἀσέπτου ‘impious’, because H. fears that Theoc. may violate the sanctity of her asylum (cf. 1021, 1054).

**543–4** The emphasis on H.’s swiftness (546n., 555 λαιψηρόν πόδα) does not imply realistic sprinting: movement on the tragic stage is stylized, not naturalistic, and H. does not reach Proteus’ tomb until 556: cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 175–6.

ὡς δρομαία πῶλος ἢ βάκχη θεοῦ: maenads are compared to fillies being released from the yoke at *Bacch.* 166–9, 1056–7. The parthenaic connotations of πῶλος (an ‘unyoked’ virgin) suggest H.’s determination to remain ‘pure’ in Egypt (66–7n.), when

she is in fact fleeing from her own husband. The wildness of the imagery (untamed horses and energetic maenads) combines with the wildness of the place H. is rushing back to (a bed of straw in the open air: 798) to stress H.'s abnormal condition, a form of enforced 'virginity' which she hopes to escape from, back to the 'natural' (i.e. 'tamed') context of her marriage with M. (cf. 68–70, 244–9, 375–80, 1431–511).

**τάφωι ξυνάψω κῶλον:** lit. 'I shall join my limb to the tomb', i.e. reach it. Physical contact with the sacred space (usually an altar or precinct: cf. 800–11.) was essential to asylum. The suppliant was considered the property of the protecting deity (e.g. *Ion* 1285 (Creusa to Ion) ἱερὸν τὸ σῶμα τῶι θεῶι δίδωμ' ἔχειν; note also Hdt. 2.113, where Paris' slaves seek refuge in a temple of Heracles after telling Proteus of H.'s abduction), and to 'steal' such property (e.g. *Held.* 243–4 συλαῖσθαι βίαι | . . . βωμόν) was an act of gross impiety (cf. 542 ἀσέπτου). Nevertheless, attempts to infringe or undermine the rights of suppliants are well-attested in the fifth century: cf. Allan (2001) 39–43.

**545 θηρᾶται:** M. now takes on the role of (sexual) predator in H.'s eyes; cf. 50–11.

**546 σέ** 'you there . . .': M. calls abruptly for H.'s attention; the initial acc. (with ellipse of the governing verb, e.g. καλῶ) is peremptory, in contrast to the customary polite vocatives of dialogue (e.g. 151, 158).

**δρεγμα δεινὸν ἠμιλλημένην:** lit. 'straining with fearful stretching', i.e. 'reaching with great effort towards': for ἀμιλλάομαι, cf. 16511.

**547** 'towards the base of the tomb and its pillars where burnt-offerings are made.' The offering of burnt sacrifices on top of the tomb does not (*pace* Kannicht) imply that Proteus is honoured as if he were a god, since it was regular practice to sacrifice at the tombs of heroes: Burkert (1985) 205. (It remains uncertain whether animal sacrifice was practised in grave rituals for the ordinary dead in classical Athens: cf. Mikalson (1991) 36 n. 90.) Eur. diverges from the *Odyssey* in making Proteus a mortal (see 4n.), yet although his tomb is not explicitly called a *herōon*, its location apart from other graves (1165–8n.), the offering of sacrifices, together with its size, decoration, and ability to function as a place of asylum all suggest that the audience would take Proteus as a hero, not simply one of the ordinary dead.

**549 ἐκπληξιν . . . ἀφασίαν τε:** amazed speechlessness is a typical motif of recognition scenes: cf. 564, 630–1, 656, *IT* 777, 849–40, *Ion* 1446. Although M.'s instincts are right, the woman's astonishing resemblance to H. is not enough to convince him: cf. 566–93.

**550 εἰργόμεσθα:** pres. pass. of εἰργω, 'I shut out, keep away from', with gen. of separation.

**552 ὦν ἐφεύγομεν γάμους:** cf. 63, 187–90111.

**553–96** Stichomythia and distichomythia (cf. 1035–84) are used extensively in Eur.'s later plays (their prominence partly accounts for the greater length of the later plays), especially in scenes of recognition and intrigue, where line-for-line dialogue provides an ideal format for scenes of questioning, planning, and deception: cf. 779–841 (questioning and planning), 1035–84 (planning), 1195–1277, 1412–28 (deception

of Theoc.). Moreover, stichomythia is regularly used in the build up to the moment of recognition to show how the initial reluctance of one partner in the dialogue is overcome: cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 214-24, Soph. *El.* 1174-1231, Eur. *El.* 553-84, *IT* 803-26, *Ion* 1402-36. By thus arousing the audience's expectations, Eur. makes M.'s refusal to accept H.'s identity all the more surprising.

554 καὶ μὴν στολήν γ' 'and yet your clothes (are those of a thief and evildoer)', responding to 553: H. too is in her own way misled by appearances (cf. 421-4n.).

555 φόβον μεθεῖσα 'giving up your fear'; cf. 1236, 1631.

556 H. reaches the safety of the tomb once again (543-4n.).

557-8 τίς εἶ . . . | σὺ δ' εἶ τίς: neither H. nor M. answer this essential question right away, since both are stunned by the other's appearance.

αὐτὸς . . . λόγος 'the same question grips both you and me.'

κάμ': crasis, καὶ ἐμέ.

559 προσφερέστερον 'more like (H.'s body)'.

560 H. recognizes M. Unlike him, however, she is not compelled by circumstances to change her mind (cf. 549n.). Thus, in contrast to some of the most famous recognition scenes of epic and tragedy, it is not the identity of the newcomer that must now be proven (Odysseus; Orestes in Aesch. *Cho.*, Eur. *El.*), but that of the person who has been awaiting him.

ὦ θεοὶ . . . φίλους 'O gods! For the recognition of one's own is also something divine!' The deification of abstract ideas is not unusual (cf. 1002-4n., Burkert (1985) 184-6, Dover (1974) 142-4), but its striking frequency in Eur. (e.g. *Her.* 557 Αἰδώς, *Phoen.* 532 Φιλοτιμία; see Dodds on *Bacch.* 370-2, Grube (1941) 41-2) shows his particular interest in analysing the nature of the divine and, through the apotheosis of *Tyche* in particular, the extent to which humans comprehend it: Introd. p. 63. Dale (ad loc.) regards H.'s words as 'a whimsical by-product of the exclamation ὦ θεοὶ', but this underestimates the theological significance of the scene: M.'s initial failure to recognize H., eventually resolved by the epiphany of the phantom, underlines the fact that only divine knowledge is certain, while mortals are painfully subject to confusion and error.

561 is restored from Aristophanes' parody of the scene (*Thesm.* 906-9 = *Hel.* 558, 561-3), where the reunion of 'M./Eur and 'H./Inlaw is blocked by Critylla, who refuses to play the helping role of Theonoe (897-8). Aristophanes exploits to ludicrous effect the gap between the (paratragically exaggerated) emotion of 'M.' and 'H.' and Critylla's gruff rejection of their escape. The identical beginning of *Hel.* 561-2 will have caused a copyist to skip a line.

ἴπιχωρία: prodelision, ἐπιχωρία ('native').

562 καὶ τὸ σόν 'yours too', i.e. M.'s nationality.

563 ὁμοίαν δὴ μάλιστ' 'most like'.

566-7 Overcome with joy at the confirmation of his identity (564-5), H. leaves the protection of the tomb and attempts to embrace M., who indignantly pushes her away. (For rejected embraces at the start of other recognition processes, cf. Eur. *IT* 798-9, *Ion* 1404-6; treated amusingly at *Ion* 519-25.)

566 ὡ χρόνιος ἐλθών: 'at long last' (cf. 625-6, 645) is a standard motif of reunions: e.g. *El.* 578-9, 585.

σῆς δάμαρτος ἐς χέρας: Aristophanes parodies the (attempted) embrace by changing ἐς χέρας to ἐσχάρας, 'hearth', slang for the female genitals (*Thesm.* 913).

567 ποίας δάμαρτος 'what do you mean, "wife"?' The repetition of 'wife' and the colloquial use of ποῖος both express M.'s indignation and incredulity (cf. Stevens (1976) 38-9, Diggle (1981) 50-1). M. recoils from the embrace, unwilling to believe that this is H.; compare Teucer's reaction to H.'s uncanny 'double' (78).

569-70 M. appeals to the chthonian goddess Hecate to send him 'kindly visions' (φάσματ' εὐμενῆ), unaware that he himself has spent the past seven years with a divine apparition.

φωσφόρ': worshipped at night (cf. 570 νυκτίφαντον, *Ion* 1049), Hecate is often depicted holding torches (*LIMC* s.v. Hecate 56-94; cf. *Ar. Thesm.* 858, *Lys.* 443 Φωσφόρον, *Paus.* 2.30.2).

νυκτίφαντον πρόπολον Ἐνοδίας 'nocturnal attendant of Enodia'. νυκτίφαντος is attested once elsewhere, used of dreams at [*Aesch.*] *PIV* 657, though some editors prefer to read νυκτίφοιτ' ὄνειρατα. Hecate, whose origins seem to be Carian (cf. Burkert (1985) 171), was syncretized with the Thessalian Ἐνοδία, 'the one of the roads', a protector of crossroads and roadside graves.

571-82 The transmitted order makes sense as it stands. Kannicht detects dislocations in the text at 570-1, 574-5, and 581-2, proposing the order 570, 575-80, 581, 574, 571-3, 582ff. West (1981) 66 agrees that 575 should follow 570 (moving straight from Hecate's visions to M.'s damaged eyes) and, slightly less complicatedly than Kannicht, places 571-4 after 580. However, M.'s objection to the idea of having two wives (571) follows on perfectly well after 570, given the emphasis on H. as his real wife in 566-8. Kannicht's other objections involve unnecessary hairsplitting, inappropriate to an animated conversation such as this (and 571 does not make an apt response to 574).

571 οὐ μὴν . . . πόσις 'nor again am I the husband of two wives.' For protesting οὐ μὴν, see *GP* 335-6. The juxtaposition of εἰς δυοῖν is antithetical, underlining the rejection of bigamy; cf. *Andr.* 177-8 οὐδέ γὰρ καλὸν | δυοῖν γυναικοῖν ἀνδρ' ἐν ἡνίας ἔχειν, *Andr.* 465-70, *Soph. Trach.* 459-60.

572 λέκτρων: metonymy, 'bedfellow, wife'; 475n.

δεσπότης: cf. 1193n.

573 ἦν ἀντρα κεύθει 'the one hidden in the cave'. H. now learns that the phantom still accompanies M. (cf. 539).

575-80 As in H.'s meeting with Teucer (cf. 117-22n.), the concentration of words for sight and visual evidence is striking (ὄμμα, λεύσσω, ὄραν, ὄμοιον, σκέψαι, πίστεως, εἰοικας, ὄμματα). Ironically, H. herself appeals (576, 578, 580) to the very source of 'knowledge' which her circumstances show to be wholly unreliable as a guide to reality. Thus, given M.'s belief in the phantom, H.'s argument is self-refuting and M. rejects her visual 'proof' (573 πίστις) of her identity on the evidence (partly: cf. 593n.) of his own eyes.

575 οὐ που: cf. 95n.

φρονῶ . . . εὖ 'I am of sound mind': cf. *Ion* 520 (as Ion resists his 'recognition' by Chionius) εὖ φρονεῖς μέν; ἢ σ' ἔμηνεν θεοῦ τις, ὧ ξένε, βλάβη;

577 τὸ σῶμ' ὅμοιον 'your appearance is similar'. M. experiences the same confusion as Teucer (160-1n.): normally reliable σῶμα ('reality', opposed to unreliable ὄνομα) is no longer enough to provide 'certainty' (τὸ σαφές).

τὸ δὲ σαφές γ' ἀποστατεῖ 'but certainty is lacking'. For the use of σαφής where we might say 'true' or 'certain', cf. 21, 309-10.

578 σκέψαι: aor. middle imper. of σκέπτομαι, 'Look carefully!'

579 'You look like her: that at least (γ) I shall not deny.'

580 For the eyes as the most reliable of the senses, cf. Heraclitus DK 22 B101a.

σ' . . . σ': σε . . . σά.

581 ἐκεῖ νοσοῦμεν is defined by the ὅτι clause. νοσέω is used here in a less specifically physical sense than at 575 (M.'s 'diseased eye'), and is equivalent to 'my difficulty is this': cf. 1607. Having transposed 571-4 to follow 580, West (1981) 66 reads νοσοῦμεν and takes ἐκεῖ to refer to Troy (i.e. 'We suffered at Troy because I have another wife'), but the transmitted order gives good sense: 571-82n.

582 εἶδωλον: 34n.

583 καὶ τίς is sceptical and derisory, 'and who exactly . . .?': cf. *GP* 309-10.

βλέποντα σώματα 'living bodies': cf. 34 εἶδωλον ἔμπνουν.

ἐξεργάζεται 'bring to completion' suggests the (to M.'s mind insuperable) difficulty of such a task.

584 αἰθήρ is what lies between our terrestrial realm and the sky (cf. 44, 866, Dover on *Ar. Clouds* 265) or it is the stuff of which the stars and sky are made (Dodds on *Bacch.* 292-4). Here it is used interchangeably with sky (οὐρανός) for the material basis of the εἶδωλον (34 οὐρανοῦ ξυνθείσ' ἄπο; cf. 605, where the phantom disappears πρὸς αἰθέρος πτυχάς), but is also given particular nuance by its role in Theonoe's eschatology: 1013-16n.

θεοπόνητ' . . . λέχη 'wife produced by the gods' (426-7n.): the phrase is also found at *Tro.* 953 (the only other occurrence of the adj. θεοπόνητος), where H., engaged in an *agôn* with Hecuba, cites her 'marriage that was brought about by the gods' (i.e. her relationship with Paris).

585 πλάσαντος: aor. part. (of πλάσσω, 'I make') in gen. absolute.

ἀελπτα 'unbelievable'.

586 Ἥρας διάλλαγμα 'Hera made her [with πλασάσης understood] as a substitute'.

ὡς . . . λάβοι: cf. 31-6.

587 πῶς οὖν: is often used to emphasize a following question: cf. 1228, 1266, *Med.* 1376 πῶς οὖν; τί δράσω; *Hipp.* 598, 1261, *Hec.* 876.

ἄμ' . . . ἄμα: the double ἄμα, restored by an anonymous corrector of L's unmetrical text, effectively underlines M.'s astonishment at H.'s claim to have been in two places at once.

588 Cf. 497-9, 577nn.

589 μέθεις: aor. imper. of μεθίημι, 'let me go'.

λύπης ἄλις 'enough grief': from war, wanderings, and shipwreck (397–434).

590 κέν' . . . λέχη 'your phantom wife': cf. 36 κενὴν δόκησιν.

591 'Yes (I am leaving), and I wish you well, since you look like H.' Compare Teucer's parting blessing (158–63).

592 λαβοῦσα σ' 'although I have found you'. The long-awaited reunion of husband and wife is delayed, stirring the audience's curiosity as to how it might finally be brought about (553–96n.).

593 encapsulates the tragic ramifications of recognition, particularly for M. If H. is who she says she is, the πόννοι suffered at Troy (to regain *his* wife) would be meaningless. The thought that he and the other Greeks could have suffered all they have for the sake of an εἶδωλον is, from M.'s limited perspective and at this point in the play, unbearable. Yet we should be careful about treating the εἶδωλον in a modern sense, as if saying the war was fought for an 'illusion' implied there was no divine plan (the plans of Hera and Zeus are made clear in H.'s prologue: 31–43) or annulled the fact that M. and the other Greeks had a legitimate grievance and plenty to gain from the war; cf. 453n.

τούκεϊ: crisis, τὸ ἐκεῖ (i.e. at Troy).

(τὸ) μέγεθος τῶν πόνων 'the magnitude of our labours' (by an oversight the OCT has κακῶν for πόνων).

με . . . πεῖθει, σὺ δ' οὔ: M. trusts his experiences more than he does H. because he has more faith in his own identity than he does in hers.

594 οἱ γῶ (with prodelision of ἐγῶ) is an expression used only by women in Eur. (cf. 685, 857), often in passages of lamentation (cf. 1223). Here it marks H.'s despair at the loss (yet again) of M.

595 λείπουσι: M. evidently began to exit at 593.

597–624 *A servant tells of the phantom's disappearance, Menelaus embraces Helen*

As M. makes his way towards the *eisodos* leading back to the shore, a surprise entry stops him in his tracks. The figure is an old man (734 ὦ γεραιέ), once a servant in the household of H.'s parents (720–5), who fought for M. at Troy (734–5). His function as a reporter of the miraculous offstage events is paramount (hence the designation Ἄγγελος in L), but rather than leave directly after his announcement (as many tragic messengers do), he remains to offer his own opinion of the gods and their prophets (711–19, 744–57), while his characterization as a loyal old servant of H. and M. adds to the sentimental effect of the reunion. (M. meets the Servant to the side of the acting area by the *eisodos*, and the latter does not notice H. until 616.) The Servant's intervention well illustrates how the arrival of a third character (i.e. speaking actor) can radically alter the movement of a scene and the direction of a play (for the likely distribution of parts between actors, see *Introd.* p. 33).

597–9 The accumulation of participles suggests the breathless urgency of the Servant: cf. Bond on *Her.* 700.

575 οὐ που: cf. 95n.

φρονῶ . . . εὖ 'I am of sound mind': cf. *Ion* 520 (as Ion resists his 'recognition' by Xuthus) εὖ φρονεῖς μὲν; ἢ σ' ἔμηνεν θεοῦ τις, ὦ ξένη, βλάβη;

577 τὸ σῶμ' ὁμοιον 'your appearance is similar'. M. experiences the same confusion as Teucer (160–1n.): normally reliable σῶμα ('reality', opposed to unreliable ὄνομα) is no longer enough to provide 'certainty' (τὸ σαφές).

τὸ δὲ σαφές γ' ἀποστατεῖ 'but certainty is lacking'. For the use of σαφής where we might say 'true' or 'certain', cf. 21, 309–10.

578 σκέψαι: aor. middle imper. of σκέπτομαι, 'Look carefully!'

579 'You look like her: that at least (γ) I shall not deny.'

580 For the eyes as the most reliable of the senses, cf. Heraclitus DK 22 B101a.

σ' . . . σ': σε . . . σά.

581 ἐκεῖ νοσοῦμεν is defined by the ὅτι clause. νοσέω is used here in a less specifically physical sense than at 575 (M.'s 'diseased eye'), and is equivalent to 'my difficulty is this': cf. 1607. Having transposed 571–4 to follow 580, West (1981) 66 reads νοσοῦμεν and takes ἐκεῖ to refer to Troy (i.e. 'We suffered at Troy because I have another wife'), but the transmitted order gives good sense: 571–82n.

582 εἶδωλον: 34n.

583 καὶ τίς is sceptical and derisory, 'and who exactly . . .?': cf. *GP* 309–10.

βλέποντα σώματα 'living bodies': cf. 34 εἶδωλον ἔμπνουσιν.

ἐξεργάζεται 'bring to completion' suggests the (to M.'s mind insuperable) difficulty of such a task.

584 αἰθήρ is what lies between our terrestrial realm and the sky (cf. 44, 866, Dover on *Ar. Clouds* 265) or it is the stuff of which the stars and sky are made (Dodds on *Bacch.* 292–4). Here it is used interchangeably with sky (οὐρανός) for the material basis of the εἶδωλον (34 οὐρανοῦ ξυμφεῖσ' ἄπο; cf. 605, where the phantom disappears πρὸς αἰθέρος πτυχάς), but is also given particular nuance by its role in Theonoe's eschatology: 1013–16n.

θεοπόνητ' . . . λέχη 'wife produced by the gods' (426–7n.): the phrase is also found at *Tro.* 953 (the only other occurrence of the adj. θεοπόνητος), where H., engaged in an *agōn* with Hecuba, cites her 'marriage that was brought about by the gods' (i.e. her relationship with Paris).

585 πλάσαντος: aor. part. (of πλάσσω, 'I make') in gen. absolute.

ἄελπτα 'unbelievable'.

586 Ἥρας διάλλαγμα 'Hera made her [with πλάσσης understood] as a substitute'.

ὡς . . . λάβοι: cf. 31–6.

587 πῶς οὖν: is often used to emphasize a following question: cf. 1228, 1266, *Med.* 1376 πῶς οὖν; τί δράσω; *Hipp.* 598, 1261, *Hec.* 876.

ἄμ' . . . ἄμα: the double ἄμα, restored by an anonymous corrector of L's unmetrical text, effectively underlines M.'s astonishment at H.'s claim to have been in two places at once.

588 Cf. 497–9, 577nn.

589 μέθες: aor. imper. of μεθίημι, 'let me go'.

λύπης ἄλις 'enough grief': from war, wanderings, and shipwreck (397–434).

590 κέν' . . . λέχη 'your phantom wife': cf. 36 κενὴν δόκησιν.

591 'Yes (I am leaving), and I wish you well, since you look like H.' Compare Teucer's parting blessing (158–63).

592 λαβοῦσα σ' 'although I have found you'. The long-awaited reunion of husband and wife is delayed, stirring the audience's curiosity as to how it might finally be brought about (553–96n.).

593 encapsulates the tragic ramifications of recognition, particularly for M. If H. is who she says she is, the πόννοι suffered at Troy (to regain *his* wife) would be meaningless. The thought that he and the other Greeks could have suffered all they have for the sake of an εἶδωλον is, from M.'s limited perspective and at this point in the play, unbearable. Yet we should be careful about treating the εἶδωλον in a modern sense, as if saying the war was fought for an 'illusion' implied there was no divine plan (the plans of Hera and Zeus are made clear in H.'s prologue: 31–43) or annulled the fact that M. and the other Greeks had a legitimate grievance and plenty to gain from the war; cf. 453n.

τούκει: crasis, τὸ ἐκεῖ (i.e. at Troy).

(τὸ) μέγεθος τῶν πόννων 'the magnitude of our labours' (by an oversight the OCT has κακῶν for πόννων).

με . . . πείθει, σὺ δ' οὐ: M. trusts his experiences more than he does H. because he has more faith in his own identity than he does in hers.

594 οἱ γῶ (with prodelision of ἐγῶ) is an expression used only by women in Eur. (cf. 685, 857), often in passages of lamentation (cf. 1223). Here it marks H.'s despair at the loss (yet again) of M.

595 λείπουσι: M. evidently began to exit at 593.

597–624 *A servant tells of the phantom's disappearance, Menelaus embraces Helen*

As M. makes his way towards the *eisodos* leading back to the shore, a surprise entry stops him in his tracks. The figure is an old man (734 ὦ γεραῖέ), once a servant in the household of H.'s parents (720–5), who fought for M. at Troy (734–5). His function as a reporter of the miraculous offstage events is paramount (hence the designation Ἄγγελος in L), but rather than leave directly after his announcement (as many tragic messengers do), he remains to offer his own opinion of the gods and their prophets (711–19, 744–57), while his characterization as a loyal old servant of H. and M. adds to the sentimental effect of the reunion. (M. meets the Servant to the side of the acting area by the *eisodos*, and the latter does not notice H. until 616.) The Servant's intervention well illustrates how the arrival of a third character (i.e. speaking actor) can radically alter the movement of a scene and the direction of a play (for the likely distribution of parts between actors, see Introd. p. 33).

597–9 The accumulation of participles suggests the breathless urgency of the Servant: cf. Bond on *Her.* 700.

597 μαστεύων 'searching for' (with acc.); cf. 1321 for the alternative form ματεύω.  
600 οὐ που: 951.

601 θαῦμα' . . . ἔχον 'It is a miracle, though the word "miracle" cannot express (lit. is less than) the fact of the matter.' Another variation on the 'name *versus* reality' antithesis (42–3, 66–7, 160–1, 5771n.), this time applied to language. The neuter participle ἔχον stands in the acc. absolute construction (more common with impersonal verbs: cf. 1159).

602 ὡς . . . νέον 'since you are bringing something strange': νέον whets the audience's curiosity. The 'something new' motif is often used in the introduction to speeches from messenger figures: cf. *Hec.* 217, *Trö.* 238, *IT* 237, *Bacch.* 1029.

τῆιδε τῆι σπουδῆι 'to judge from this haste' (dat. of circumstance): a swift entrance is a further sign that the newcomer has important news (cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 1152).

603 πόνους . . . μάτην: from the Servant's current perspective M.'s suffering seems to have been 'in vain' because H. (so he believes) has disappeared from the cave (605–8). Later he too will be able to see the significance of the εἶδωλον for the war as a whole (707, 750): cf. 593n.

604 παλαιὰ . . . πῆματ': M. misinterprets the Servant, taking him to be saying (as many have before, hence these are 'old woes') that the war was a waste of effort.

ἀγγέλλεις δὲ τί; the postponed interrogative underlines M.'s impatience to hear the Servant's news (cf. Thomson (1939) 148).

605–24 As the Servant's reaction to the sight of H. makes clear (616–21), he does not realize the full implications of the speech which he reports (608–15), since he takes it to have been delivered by H. herself. By contrast, M. has already been told of the phantom (582–90), and the news of its disappearance finally convinces him of H.'s identity (622–4).

605 πρὸς αἰθέρος πτυχάς: the phantom returns to its origins in the aether (cf. 613 πατέρ' ἐς οὐρανόν); 584n.

606 ἀρθεῖσ': aor. pass. part. of αἶρω, 'I raise'.

607 σεμνὸν ἄντρον: M. had hidden H. ἐν ἄντρον μυχοῖς (424) with no mention of its being sacred to any particular sea-god or nymph (cf. the cave of the Naiads on Ithaca where Odysseus conceals his treasure, *Od.* 13.103–12). But for the Servant the cave is now 'holy' because of the miraculous event that has taken place there, the vanishing of 'H.' into the sky. (There is no need to emend the text, *pace* West (1981) 66, who suggests λιποῦσ' ἄσεμνον: 'from the lowly cave she has passed to heaven').

608–15 Like a *deus ex machina*, the phantom's speech gives access to a higher level of knowledge (Hera duped Paris; H. is innocent) and resolves an impasse in the plot, enabling the derailed recognition to proceed. The phantom not only has H.'s voice, but also echoes exactly what H. has expressed herself, and in strikingly similar language: pity for the Greeks and Trojans (608–9 ὦ ταλαίπωροι . . . | Ἀχαιοί: cf. 38–9n.), her responsibility for their deaths (609–10 δὲ ἐμ' ἐπὶ Σκαμανδρίοις | ἀκταῖσιν . . . ἔθνησκετε ~ (52–3) δὲ ἐμ' ἐπὶ Σκαμανδρίοις | ῥοαῖσιν ἔθανον), Hera's plotting

(610 Ἦρας μηχαναῖς: cf. 25–36), the deception of all those fighting at Troy, especially Paris (611 δοκοῦντες Ἐλένην οὐκ ἔχοντ' ἔχειν Πάριον ~ 35–6 καὶ δοκεῖ μ' ἔχειν, | κενὴν δόκησιν, οὐκ ἔχων), and H.'s innocence and false reputation (614–15 φήμας. . | οὐδὲν αἰτία; e.g. 53–4 ἡ δὲ πάντα τλαῖσ' ἐγὼ | κατάρατός εἰμι). That the εἰδωλον itself should feel sympathy for H. (614 ἡ τάλαινα Τυνδαρίς) reinforces the impression that she has been cruelly exploited by the gods (compare the effect of Lyssa's unexpected sympathy for Heracles, whom Hera is determined to destroy: *Her.* 858–73).

610 ἐθυήσκατε: imperfect, 'you kept dying'.

611 δοκοῦντες: for the phantom as a divine illusion (δόκησις), cf. 119n.

οὐκ ἔχοντ' ἔχειν: 35–6n.

612 χρόνον . . . ὅσον μ' ἐχρῆν: i.e. until M. met the real H.

613 τὸ μόρσιμον σώσσασα 'having fulfilled my allotted role'.

πατέρ' ἐς οὐρανόν: cf. 34, 584nn.

614 ἄπειμι: emphatic position before pause.

616–21 Catching sight of H., the Servant assumes that her miraculous disappearance was a trick and rebukes her for deceiving the Greeks once again. The Servant's confusion is both amusing and indicative of the serious havoc caused by the phantom.

616 ἐνθάδ' ἦσθ' ἄρα 'so this is where you've been!' For ἄρα with the imperfect, especially of εἰμι, 'denoting that something which has been, and still is, has only just been realized', see *GP* 36.ii. The expression has a colloquial ring, appropriate to the Servant's animated reaction (cf. Stevens (1976) 62).

618 ἠγγελλον: imperf., 'I was just telling how . . .'.

618–19 εἰδὼς . . . | φοροῖς 'since I had no idea that you had a winged body.' The Servant is being ironic, unaware that the H. he is talking about really did fly away: cf. 1516.

619–20 οὐκ . . . αὔθις 'I shall not let you delude us like this again.' For κέρτομος/κέρτομεῖν meaning 'delusive/delude', cf. *Alc.* 1125, *Ll* 849, Jackson (1955) 26.

621 πόνους: cf. 593, 603nn.

622–4 M. finally realizes that H. has been telling the truth about her identity and turns towards her, intent upon completing the embrace which he had earlier denied her (566–7).

622 τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνο: a colloquial expression (variations on τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο are common in Aristophanes), marking M.'s delighted recognition (616n.), 'That's it!'; cf. *Med.* 98, *Ion* 554, *Or.* 804, Stevens (1976) 32.

ἔσυμβεβᾶσι: perf. act. of συμβαίνω, 'turn out (in a certain way)': LSJ s.v. III 2. For the dat. (restored by Willink), Diggle (OCT app. crit.) compares Soph. *El.* 261–2 ἡ πρῶτα μὲν τὰ μητρός, ἢ μ' ἐγείνατο, | ἔχθιστα συμβέβηκεν.

623 ὦ ποθεινὸς ἡμέρα: cf. 540 ὡς ποθεινὸς ἂν μόλοις, spoken by H.

624 εἰς ἐμὰς . . . ὠλένας: the embrace is not surprisingly a standard feature of recognition and reunion scenes (e.g. *El.* 579, *IT* 796, 828, *Ion* 560, 1438–40). For Aristophanes' obscene parody of the gesture, see 566n.

*625–697 Reunion duet*

H. and M. embrace, celebrating their reunion in an emotionally charged lyric exchange (*amoibaion*). Such a moment, the climax of tragic recognition scenes, is followed by song in several other plays of the period: Soph. *El.* 1232–87 (Electra and Orestes), Eur. *IT* 827–99 (Iphigenia and Orestes), *Ion* 1439–1509 (Creusa and Ion), *Hypsipyle* fr. 64.70–111 Bond (Hypsipyle and her sons); cf. Cerbo (1989). With the exception of Soph. *El.* 1232–87, which is strophic in form, these exchanges (like M. and H.'s) are astrophic and composed in a mixture of spoken and sung verses, predominantly dochmiac (see *Metre* below); compare the short astrophic song of the chorus following the recognition in Eur. *El.* 585–95. These reunion duets are usually split between a female singing character and a male speaking one, who delivers either trimeters or parts of lyric verses spoken in *antilabe*: this pattern, called 'punctuated monody' by Willink (1989) 46, is found in the second half of the *Helen* duet, the so-called 'Interrogation' (660–97), where a more restrained M. questions H. about her actual history since she disappeared from Sparta seventeen years before. In the first part, however, which also features an unusually extended embrace appropriate to husband and wife (625–59), H. and M. both sing (for this unique element, see Popp (1971) 264), expressing their intense mutual joy at their reunion.

Like the other recognition duets, H. and M.'s song combines elation at their unexpected reunion with recollection of past sufferings (cf. Cyrino (1998) 92). Yet given the exceptional circumstances of their separate histories, their exchange is appropriately concerned to a peculiar degree with reviewing and reconstructing the past, specifically H.'s, which must be distinguished from that of the εἶδωλον. (Thus, unlike the *IT* duet (876–99), there is no glance forward to the escape plan, which is not developed until 778–829, after the second scene with the Servant.)

A papyrus fragment of the first century BC, edited by C. H. Roberts as *P. Ox.* 2336 (= *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 22 (1954) 107), contains parts of 630–51, 658, 660, 663–7, and 670–4 (see *Intro.* p. 84). It confirms the high quality of L's text, but also offers several improvements, e.g. 633 ἀνεπτέρωσα for ἀνεπτέρωκα, 634 χέρας for χεῖρας. For a transcription and discussion of the papyrus, see Zuntz (1965) 217–48 (with a photograph of the papyrus as plate xvi). Its readings are discussed at the relevant points in the commentary below.

*Metre.* As in Eur.'s other recognition 'duets', the predominant metres are dochmiac and iambic (including a run of bacchiacs (642–3; cf. *Ion* 1446)), with occasional anapaests and enoplians (for the latter as a valid metrical term, see Itsumi (1991–3) 243–4, 255–8). Unique to this exchange, however, is the lyric male voice of M., whose sung phrases underline not only his joy at being reunited with the real H. (654–5), but also his distress at the pointless destruction of Troy (659). By contrast, M.'s confinement to iambic trimeters in the latter part of the scene (660–91) suits his calmer role as questioner, to whom H. replies in emotionally charged lyrics as she is forced to recall her shameful abduction and the subsequent bloodshed on her behalf, including her mother's suicide (684–7). The dochmiac (whose various tragic forms are catalogued



υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	ἔχῳ τὰ τοῦ Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε.†	637	ia ba ba?
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	ἄν ὑπὸ λαμπάδων κόροι λεύκιπποι	638	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	ξυνομαίμονες ὠλβισαν ὠλβισαν . . .	639-40	enoplian
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	τὸ πρόσθεν, ἐκ δόμων δὲ νοσφίσας σ' ἐμοῦ	641	3ia
υ-υ-υ-	πρὸς ἄλλαν γ' ἐλαύνει	642	2ba
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	θεὸς συμφορὰν τᾶσδε κρείσσω.	643	3ba
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	τὸ κακὸν δ' ἀγαθὸν σέ τε κάμῃ συνάγαγεν, ὦ πόσι,	644	enoplian
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	χρόνιον, ἀλλ' ὁμῶς ὀναίμαν τύχας.	645	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	ὄναιο δῆτα· ταῦτά δὲ ξυνεύχομαι·	646	3ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	δυοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιν οὐχ ὁ μὲν τλήμων, ὁ δ' οὔ.	647	3ia
υ-υ-	φίλοι φίλοι,	648	ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	τὰ πάρος οὐκέτι στένομεν οὐδ' ἀλγῶ.	649	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	πόσιν ἐμὸν <ἐμὸν> ἔχομεν ἔχομεν ὄν ἐμενον	650	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	ἐμενον ἐκ Τροίας πολυετῆ μολεῖν.	651	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	ἔχεις, ἐγὼ τε σ' ἠλίους δὲ μυρίους	652	3ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	μόλις διελθὼν ἠισθόμην τὰ τῆς θεοῦ.	653	3ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	ἐμὰ δὲ χαρμοναῖι δάκρυα πλέον ἔχει	654	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-	χάριτος ἢ λύπας.	655	doch

υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	τί φῶ; τίς ἄν τάδ' ἤλπισεν βροτῶν ποτε;	656	3ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-	ἀδόκητον ἔχω σε πρὸς στέρνοις.	657	enoplian
---υ-υ-υ-	κάγῳ σέ, τήν δοκοῦσαν Ἰδαίαν πόλιν	658	3ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-	μολεῖν Ἰλίου τε μελέους πύργους.	659	2 doch
---υ-υ-υ-	πρὸς θεῶν, δόμων πῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ἀπεστάλης;	660	3ia
---υ-υ-	ἔ ἔ· πικρὰς ἐς ἀρχὰς βαίνεις·	661	ia doch
---υ-υ-	ἔ ἔ· πικρὰν δ' ἐρευνᾷς φάτιν.	662	ia doch
υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-	λέγ', ὡς ἀκουστά· πάντα δῶρα δαιμόνων.	663	3ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-	ἀπέπτυσσα μὲν λόγον οἴου	664a	enoplian
---υ-υ-	οἴου ἐσοισόμεθα.	664b	hemiepes (D)
υ-υ-υ-υ-	ὁμως δέ λέξον· ἡδύ τοι μόχθων κλύειν.	665	3ia
---υ-υ-	οὐκ ἐπὶ βαρβάρου λέκτρα νεανία	666	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-υ-	πετομένας κώπας, πετομένου δ' ἔρω-	667	2 doch
υ-υ-υ-	τος ἀδίκων γάμων . . .	668	doch
---υ-υ-	τίς <δή> σε δαίμων ἢ πότημος συλαῖ πάτρας;	669	3ia
υ-υ-υ-υ-	ὁ Διὸς ὁ Διὸς, ὦ πόσι, με παῖς <Μαίας τ'>	670	2 doch
υ-υ-	ἐπέλασεν Νείλωι.	671	doch
---υ-υ-	θαυμαστά· τοῦ πέμψαντος; ὦ δεινοὶ λόγοι.	672	3ia





**636** ὦ φιλτάτα πρόσοψις: M.'s eyes are finally a source of non-deluded pleasure: cf. 575–80n.

οὐκ ἐμέμφθην: emphatic litotes, 'I have no complaint' (cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 137), in the sense 'I am delighted'. The words look forward to 637, which explains why M. is happy. Lloyd (1999) 42 follows Kannicht in seeing here a reference back to 632–5, as if M. is saying 'I do not disapprove of your joyful outburst', but this seems forced.

**637** Both sense ('I have the marriage-bed of Zeus and Leda') and metre (*ia ba ba*) are faulty and none of the proposed emendations is fully satisfactory: cf. Willink (1989) 52–3, Diggle (1994) 398 n. 122. Willink's οὐκ ἐμέμφθην | ἐγὼ τᾶς Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε <γῆμας> has M. make no complaint that he is married, but ἔχω should be retained since it is the fact that M. now has (and holds) H. which is important (not that he is married to her). Kovacs (2003) 37 suggests ἔχω τὰν Διὸς Λήδας τ' ἔκγονον, which gives the required sense, but does not account for λέκτρα in L and the papyrus.

**638–40** H. recalls the nuptial blessing (δλβισμός: cf. *Alc.* 919, *Andr.* 1218, 375n.) delivered by her brothers.

ὑπὸ λαμπάδων: H.'s torch-lit wedding procession is described in greater detail by the Servant (722–5); for the significance of the hymeneal imagery used to depict her return to Sparta, see 722–5, 1431–5, 1663–51n.

λευκίπποι: the Dioscuri, who ride white horses (cf. Pind. 1.66 λευκοπῶλων Τυνδαριδῶν), carry off the matching sisters, the Leucippides; cf. 1465–7, 1495–6, 1665.

**641–3** νοσφίσας 'having separated (you from me)', aor. part. of νοσφίζω.

ἐλαύνει | θεός: M. sees a divine power at work in the recognition and is optimistic about H.'s future, unaware of the gods' more problematic personal interests: cf. 876–91, *Intro.* §6(d).

τᾶσδε κρείσσω '(a fate) better than this one'.

**644–5** τὸ κακὸν δ' ἀγαθόν: H. continues M.'s positive re-assessment of events, calling his shipwreck a 'fortunate misfortune' (for the oxymoron, compare Hesiod's description of Pandora as a καλὸν κακόν, *Theog.* 585).

χρόνιον, ἀλλ' ὁμως: i.e. better late than never (the adj. χρόνιον modifies τὸ κακὸν ἀγαθόν): cf. 1232 χρόνια μὲν ἦλθεν, ἀλλ' ὁμως αἰνῶ τάδε. For the idiomatic ellipse ἀλλ' ὁμως (the cause of many interpolations 'completing' the sense), see Renchan (1969) 28–9. Dodds on *Bacch.* 1027–8 compares 'but still' in colloquial English, which may also end a sentence.

ὄναίμαν τύχας: 1st sg. aor. middle opt. of ὀνίνημι (with Doric alpha), 'may I enjoy this good fortune!'.

**646–7** ταῦτά δὲ ξυνεύχομαι: M. makes the same prayer for himself (i.e. ὄναίμαν καὶ ἐγώ).

οὐχ ὁ μὲν τλήμων, ὁ δ' οὐ: the rhetorical periphrasis ('one is not miserable without the other') underlines the unity of their fates: cf. 839–40.

**648–51** H. addresses the Chorus once more (cf. 627 φίλοι) to announce that her mourning of the past is over. She cannot foresee M.'s painful interrogation of her history (660–97).

**650** The sequence πόσιν ἐμόν ἔχομεν ἔχομεν ὄν ἐμενον (in both L and, it seems, the papyrus) requires two short syllables to maintain the metre (dochmiac dimeter). The simplest solution is to add a second ἐμόν: Scidler placed it after the first, while Hermann proposed πόσιν ἔχομεν ἔχομεν ἐμόν <ἐμόν> ὄν ἐμενον. The run of anadiploses is conceivably Euripidean (cf. 195n., Breitenbach (1934) 220, Diggle (1994) 376–8); on balance, then, Scidler’s solution is simpler than Hermann’s transposition.

**651** πολυετη: the temporal adj. (modifying ὄν) is adverbial (cf. 566), ‘for whose arrival from Troy I waited, waited many years!’

**653** ἡισθόμην τὰ τῆς θεοῦ ‘but now I recognize the goddess’s hand’, i.e. Hera’s part in creating the phantom and making him endure so many years of suffering (ἡλίους . . . | διελθών). The phantom itself spoke of the deaths caused Ἡρας μηχαναῖς (610).

**654–9** There is no need to adopt (as does the OCT) the speaker-changes proposed by Kretschmar at 654–5 (given to H.), 656 (M.), and 657 (H.). M. is capable of weeping and emotional dochmiacs (654–5, 659), while the ‘recognition and embrace’ section of the song ends at 659 (cf. 625–97n.) with two balancing trimeter plus lyric sequences (656–7, 658–9) spoken by H. and M.

**654–5** χαρμοναῖ: causal dat., ‘through joy’.

πλέον . . . | λύπας ‘contain more delight than grief’.

**656–7** τί φῶ; cf. 483, 549nn.

ἦλπισεν . . . | ἀδόκητον: unexpectedness is a further leitmotif of recognition and reunion scenes (e.g. *IT* 802, *Ion* 1447 ἀδόκητος ἡδονά): cf. 566, 624, 625–6nn.

**660–97** M. begins to question H. about the cause of her disappearance from Sparta. H.’s shameful reluctance to speak of her past means that M. must repeat his request several times (660, 663, 665, all ‘rational’ trimeters) before she starts to tell her story (in agitated dochmiacs). The contrast of speech and song (or ‘punctuated monody’: 625–97n.) throughout this section highlights H.’s distress at the recollection of her abduction and its disastrous consequences for her family.

ἀπεστάλης: 2nd sg. aor. pass. of ἀποστέλλω, ‘you departed’.

**661–2** εἰ ἐπικράς . . . | εἰ ἐπικράν: the repetition of sound, metre, and structure reflects the style of ritual lamentation (see further Stevens on *Andr.* 497), an effect reinforced by H.’s cries of pain.

πικράν . . . φάτιν ‘painful is the story you inquire after’.

**663** ‘Tell your story, since it is fit to hear. Everything is a gift of the gods’. This punctuation (Hermann’s) seems preferable to the alternative (with no pause after ἀκουστά, ‘Tell your story, since all gifts of the gods are fit to hear’) since it emphasizes ἀκουστά (M. must overcome H.’s reluctance to speak), while πάντα δῶρα δαιμόνων points to Hera’s role in H.’s ruin (cf. 653n.).

**664** ἀπέπτυσσα: a performative aor. (and tragic idiom, most common in Eur.), expressing the act of abomination (‘I spit out/upon’) in words (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 614, Lloyd (1999) 26–8). H. is revolted by the tale (λόγος) of her own life.

οἶον | οἶον: emotive anadiplosis (195n.).

ἔσοισόμεθα '(which) I am about to utter'. λόγον εἰσφέρω (fut. εἰσοίσω) is the usual expression (cf. *Andr.* 757, *Bacch.* 650); the middle (replacing L's ἔσοίσομαι on metrical grounds: Willink (1989) 62–3) stresses that the action affects H. personally (Smyth §§1713–14). The switch from 1st pers. sg. (ἀπέπτυσσα) to the 'poetic' plural (ἔσοισόμεθα) for metrical reasons (or simple variation) is not uncommon.

665 ἡδύ τοι μόχθων κλύειν: proverbial, 'to hear of sufferings that are past is a pleasure': cf. e.g. *Od.* 12.212, 15.400, *Virg. Aen.* 1.203 *forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit*. The sentiment recurs in *Helen's* companion play *Andromeda* fr. 133 K (probably spoken by Perseus, who had slain the Gorgon Medusa) ἀλλ' ἡδύ τοι σωθέντα μεμνησθαι πόνων.

666–8 H. begins by restating her innocence (cf. 582, 586, 611, 614–15, 658–9): she did not travel on Paris' ship to Troy and she was not seized by adulterous desire.

οὐκ . . . | πετομένας . . . πετομένου: both gen. absolutes are negated, with play on the different meanings of πέτεσθαι, emphasizing the speed of the ship (κώπας: cf. 147, 394nn.) and the 'flightiness' of desire. Repetition is common in excited dochmiacs (cf. Diggle (1994) 297, 376–8), e.g. 670 ὁ Διὸς ὁ Διὸς, 684 πάθεα πάθεα.

νεανία: used as an adj. (qualifying 'bed') and transferred by hypallage from βαρβάρου: it is Paris who is youthful.

669 δαίμων ἢ πότμος: cf. 211–12n. For δαίμων (originally 'apportioner') as equivalent to θεός in poetry, see Barrett on *Hipp.* 1111–14.

συλαῖ πατρας: gen. of separation, 'stole you from your native land'.

670–1 <Μαίας τ'> is necessary since ὁ Διὸς . . . παῖς is not enough to identify Hermes (cf. 243 Μαιάδος γόνον, 1670 Μαιάδος τόκος).

ἔπέλασεν: 3rd sg. aor. of πελάζω, 'I approach'; the causal sense found here ('bring to') is confined to poetry: LSJ s.v. B.

672 τοῦ πέμψαντος; gen. absolute, 'at whose bidding?' As the messenger of the gods, Hermes is more likely to be acting under orders than of his own will.

673–4 κατεδάκρυσσα 'I weep bitterly' (κατά is intensive: LSJ s.v. ε ν): for 'emotional aorists' in tragedy, see Lloyd (1999) 43. The compound verb καταδακρύω is first attested here. Willink (1989) 64 rejects κατεδάκρυσσα . . . | δάκρυσιν as tautologous and suggests κατὰ δ' ἔκλαυσσα instead, but such repetitious language is not untypical of lament (661–2n.). For the Greek ear as comparatively insensitive to redundancy of this kind, see Dodds on *Bacch.* 647.

675 M. already knows about Hera's responsibility for the phantom, but he does not yet understand why she created it (653n.). His question ('Why did she want to inflict harm upon us?') reveals his ignorance of Hera's motives and her plan, as if the goddess's aim was to harm H. and himself, when in fact they are (from a divine perspective) mere 'collateral damage'.

676–8 For the Judgement of Paris (26 μορφής . . . κρίσιν), see 23–30nn.

κείνων: gen. of cause, as often following ὦμοι, οἴμοι or φεῦ ('alas for those springs . . .').

Ἰνα 'where'.

ἐφαίδρυναν: the verb φαίδρύνω implies washing something clean so that it shines (φαιδρός = ‘beaming’; cf. *Ag.* 1107–9 (Cassandra on Clytemnestra’s bathing of Agamemnon) ἰὼ τάλαινα, τόδε γὰρ τελεῖς; | τὸν ὁμοδέμνιον πόσιν | λουτροῖσι φαιδρύνασα· πῶς φράσω τέλος;); the goddesses competed in making themselves look ‘radiant’.

**679** Despite textual problems, the sense required here is clear from the context. As in 675, M. is trying to make sense of Hera’s actions. H. has just spoken of the Judgement (676–8), so M. now looks for the connection between it and Hera’s hostility. 680 (‘so that she might . . .’) answers the question ‘Why?’, so it is likely that 679 began τί δ’ rather than τὰ δ’. Numerous conjectures have been made, and most of them are discussed and disposed of by Diggle (1994) 181–3, whose own τί δ’ ἐς κρίσιν σοι τόνδ’ ἔθηχ’ Ἥρα κότον (‘why did Hera bear you this rancour over the judgement?’) seems to be the best so far proposed.

**680–1** Animated ἀντιλαβή as M. finally comprehends Hera’s motive: H. was taken to Egypt to avenge Aphrodite’s bribing of Paris.

Πάριν . . . | Κύπρις (κύπριν . . . πάριν L): the transposition of initial words in adjacent lines is common.

Πάριν ὡς ἀφέλοιτο . . . ἐπένευσεν ‘so that she (Hera) might take (me) away from Paris . . . to whom Aphrodite had allotted (lit. nodded) me’.

**681–2** ὦ τλάμον | τλάμονα τλάμον: M.’s pity (‘O poor woman!’) is echoed insistently by H.: she is the goddess’s victim.

ἐπέλασ’ Αἰγύπτωι: cf. ἐπέλασεν Νείλωι (670–1n.).

**683** M. fills in the final stage of Hera’s response, the creation of the phantom.

ἀντέδωκ’ ‘gave as a substitute’.

ὡς σέθεν κλύω: 582–8.

**684–90** H. laments the death of Leda and the misery of Hermione, both the result of her apparent ‘shameful marriage’ (687).

**684–5** τὰ δὲ <σά> . . . πάθεα πάθεα: exclamatory acc., with emotional anadiplosis (195n.).

οἱ γῶ: 594n.

**686–7** ἀγχόνιον δὲ βρόχον | . . . κατεδήσατο ‘she tied a strangling noose’: cf. 136 βρόχωι γ’ ἄψασαν εὐγενῆ δέρην; 299–302n.

δί’ ἐμᾶν . . . δύσγαμον αἰσχύναν: for Leda’s suicidal shame, cf. 201–2 αἰσχύνας ἐμᾶς ὑπ’ ἀλγέων. Though innocent of any disgraceful behaviour, H. still feels responsible for her mother’s death: 281n.

**688** λόγος ‘is there word (of our daughter Hermione)?’ L’s βίος (‘is she alive?’) would take a dat. rather than a gen.

**689–90** ἄγαμος ἄτεκνος: see 282–3n.

ἄγαμος . . . | γάμον ἄγαμον: Hermione and H. are both ἄγαμος, but in different ways: Hermione is literally ‘unmarried’, and she laments (689 καταστένει) her mother’s ‘marriage that is no marriage’ (213–14n.), i.e. her adulterous union with Paris. Moreover, as Willink (1989) 67 points out, ‘my γάμος ἄγαμος’ also suggests, from H.’s

own point of view, ‘either her *sundered* marriage with Menelaus or her *illusory* adultery with Paris’ (my italics).

691 ὦ πᾶν . . . πέρσας Πάρις: apostrophe and alliteration underline Paris’ crime.

κατ’ ἄκρας: the phrase is typically used of sacking a city (e.g. *Phoen.* 1176 κατ’ ἄκρων περγάμων ἐλεῖν πόλιν). According to the *Iliad*, Paris stole many treasures from M.’s palace as well as his wife (3.91–3). Yet the metaphor also emphasizes the devastation suffered by both sides: the victorious M., who razed Paris’ house and city ‘from the top down’, endured in turn the destruction of his own family (δῶμ’ ἐμὸν).

692–7 H. concludes the duet by reviewing the disastrous consequences of her bogus ‘marriage’ to Paris (690), focusing in particular detail, and with unrestrained self-pity, on her own misfortunes (694–7).

692–3 τάδε refers principally to 691, but embraces the whole background to Paris’ destruction of M.’s family, stretching back to the Judgement on Mt. Ida and Hera’s fabrication of the phantom (676–83).

μυριάδας τε | χαλκεόπλων Δαναῶν: the epicizing epithet (‘bronze-armoured’, a *harax*) is poignant, evoking the many Greeks killed at Troy, for the sake of an εἰδωλον: cf. *Tr.* 369 (Cassandra on the ‘conquering’ Greeks) θηρῶντες Ἐλένην μυρίους ἀπώλεσαν; 52–3n.

694–7 sum up H.’s peculiarly unfortunate status as a victim of divine malice (694–5) and human prejudice (696–7).

694–5 ‘But far from my country the god cast me, doomed and accursed, away from my city and from you.’

ἀπο<πρό>: the preposition (used postpositively, as at 1133 πατρίδος ἀποπρό) is found six times elsewhere in Eur. lyric. For its restoration here (regularizing the dochmiac rhythm), see Diggle (1994) 184–5.

ἀραῖον ‘accursed’, since she is unfairly vilified as an adulteress (cf. 54 κατάρατος εἰμι, 66–7, 223–5, 250–2, 270–2, 614–15, 666–8).

696–7 ὅτε . . . ἔλιπον οὐ λιποῦσ’ ‘when I left, though I did not leave’. H.’s actual departure was different: it was the phantom who left with Paris ἐπ’ αἰσχροῖς γάμοις.

698–9 Actor’s song is regularly followed by a choral couplet, separating the lyrics from the following dialogue. As is typical, the Chorus-leader’s comment here is both sympathetic and sententious. The structural function of these brief dividing units is paramount, hence the frequent banality of their content. Though H. and M. will indeed ‘get good fortune’, it is far from clear that this can ‘suffice for’ all that they and others have suffered.

τὰ λοιπά ‘in the future’: cf. *IT* 841 (Orestes to Iphigenia) τὸ λοιπὸν εὐτυχοῖμεν ἀλλήλων μέτα.

πρὸς τὰ πρόσθεν ἀρκέσειεν ἄν ‘that would make up for the past’.

#### 700–760 *The Servant reflects upon the revelation of the phantom*

The Servant, who has been a silent and increasingly puzzled bystander since line 621, intervenes to ask M. for an explanation of his joyful reunion with H. M. confirms that

the Trojan War was fought for an 'image made of cloud' created by Hera (705-8), prompting the Servant to deliver two speeches dealing with the complexity of the divine (711-33) and the worthlessness of prophets (744-57). Many critics have wondered why the Servant remains on stage after reporting the miraculous disappearance of 'H.' (605-21). Comparison with the reunion scene of the *IT* may help: there too actor's lyric is followed by a choral couplet before Pylades intervenes, taking the action in a new direction by reminding Orestes that they must now think of an escape plan (902-8). Here, by contrast, Eur. has postponed the issue of escape (778-829, though it is adumbrated at 739-43) and deliberately slowed the pace of the plot. Far from creating an 'amusing little interlude' (Arnott (1993) 149), Eur. has paused the action because he wants the audience, like the Servant, to reflect in all seriousness upon the wider ramifications of the phantom's existence, and to do so from the 'ordinary' perspective of a non-heroic figure.

**700-1** πρόσδοτον: dual aor. imper. of προσδίδωμι, 'give a share of' (+ gen.), replacing L's unmetrical πρόσδοτε. The plural verb is addressed to H. and M., while the singular vocative (Μενέλαε) picks out their representative (and the Servant's leader): see Diggle (1994) 506.

μανθάνω μὲν . . . οὐ σαφῶς δ' ἔχω: the Servant can see M.'s joy for himself (μανθάνω = 'I perceive'), but is unable to grasp its meaning properly. For ἔχω = 'I understand', see LSJ s.v. λ 19.

**702** ἀλλ' signifies compliance ('very well, then'): *GP* 17.i.

κοινωνεὶ λόγων: present imper. of κοινωνέω (+ gen.), 'take part in our conversation'.

**703** βραβεύς is used here uniquely in the sense of 'author' or 'cause'; it originally referred to the umpire of an ἀγών (athletic or otherwise): cf. 996, 1073.

**704-7** mark the Servant's important realization of the tragic futility of the war. τί φής; (706) may be seen as a unique extension of the *extra metrum* exclamations found elsewhere in tragedy. Though such 'interrogative exclamations' are found among trimeters in Sophocles, only one example (Soph. *OC* 315 τί φῶ;) is part of an iambic metron rather than a full monometer (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1216; the OCT of Sophocles adopts Meineke's τί φωνῶ;). Nevertheless, this unusual feature of the Servant's speech may be justified as an appropriate response to the disquieting revelation of divine deception (704-5).

**704** οὐχ ἦδε forcefully contradicts the Servant's identical opening (703).

**705** νεφέλης ἀγαλμ' . . . λυγρόν 'a destructive image made of cloud': cf. 750 νεφέλης ὑπερβηθίσκοντας, 1219 νεφέλης ἀγαλμ', and the fate of Ixion (341).

**707** νεφέλης . . . περί: anastrophe (23-4n.) combined with hyperbaton.

ἄλλως 'in vain': cf. 593, 603nn.

**708** θεῶν τρισσῶν ἔρις 'the result of the strife between the three goddesses'. For M.'s gradual comprehension of the link between Ἥρας ἔργα and the Judgement of Paris, see 653, 675nn.

**709** 'What? This woman here is really your wife?' The question builds up to the climactic words 'your wife', expressing the Servant's amazement and disbelief. (The

MS text begins ἡ δ' οὐσ', but F. W. Schmidt's τί δ; ὡς removes the awkwardness of ἡδε coming after ἡ δ'.)

**711–33** The Servant's first speech begins with general reflection on the unpredictability of the divine (711–15), which is then illustrated by the fortunes of H. and M. (716–19). The blessings of H.'s marriage song are renewed (720–5), leading into a concluding section on the virtues of being a 'noble slave' (726–33). The OCT deletes over half of the Servant's two speeches (713–19, 728–33, 746–8, 752–7). The majority of these lines are of a moralizing nature, but since it would be misleading to treat sententiousness *per se* as a mark of interpolation (especially in Eur.), each of these passages must be judged individually on its stylistic and dramatic coherence. Taken as a whole the Servant's speech reveals a thoroughly traditional view of both the unknowability of the gods and the fragility of human fortune (cf. esp. *Il.* 24.527–33 on Zeus's two jars, one containing blessings, the other ills, where the most one can hope for is a mixed lot). Thus H. and M. had their share of suffering (716–17), but now they are 'lucky' (719) because of the change to good fortune embodied in their reunion.

**711–13** The revelation of H.'s true identity and her reunion with M. prompts reflection upon the instability and inscrutability of the divine: see 1137–50nn.

ὦ θύγατερ: an affectionate form of address (cf. 616).

ὁ θεός is used generically, without reference to any particular god: cf. e.g. 1137, *Her.* 1345–6, and the use of τὸ θεῖον in the *Sisyphus* fragment (*TrGF* 1 43 F 19.16 = *TrGFS* p. 177).

ποικίλον suggests both 'complex' and 'changeable'.

δυστέκμαρτον 'hard to interpret': cf. *Tro.* 885 (Hecuba on Zeus) δυστόπαστος εἰδέναι. The adj. δυστέκμαρτος (once each in [Aesch.], Soph., and Eur.) is used by Prometheus to describe the 'difficult art' of sacrifice (*PIV* 497) and by Oedipus of the 'track of ancient guilt' leading back to Laius' killer(s) (*OT* 109). The idea that human knowledge of the gods is uncertain is a central concern of the *Helen*: see 1137–8, 1148–50nn.

εὖ δέ πως: πως qualifies the adverb (εὖ = 'thoroughly', no approval is implied; cf. *Hipp.* 504), i.e. the Servant can see the great confusion caused by the gods, but is unable to explain it. For πως as an expression of the mysterious nature of the divine, cf. *Ion* 1615 χρόνια μὲν τὰ τῶν θεῶν πως, ἐς τέλος δ' οὐκ ἀσθενῆ. (που is also used in this way: see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 182f.)

πάντα στρέφει: Herwerden's conjecture supplies an object for both στρέφει and ἀναφέρων. The scribe who introduced ἀναστρέφει (L) was probably influenced by ἀναφέρων, and the mistake was aided by the use of ἀναστρέφω elsewhere to describe the gods 'overturning' human affairs, e.g. Eur. *Supp.* 331 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς πάντ' ἀναστρέφει πάλιν.

ἐκείσε κάκεισ' ἀναφέρων 'arranging (them) this way and that'. The sudden and unpredictable changes brought about by 'divinity' liken it to 'chance': cf. *Ion* 1512–14 ὦ μεταβαλοῦσα μυρίουσ ἤδη βροτῶν | καὶ δυστυχῆσαι καὶ θῆσ αὐ πρᾶξαι καλῶσ | τύχη.

713–19 illustrate further the capriciousness of divinity, first in general terms (713–15), then with reference to the fortunes of H. and M. (716–19).

714 αὐθις ‘afterwards’.

715 τῆς ἀεὶ τύχης: ἀεὶ qualifying a noun phrase = ‘at any given time’, ‘at each particular moment’, i.e. his fortunes are constantly insecure.

716–17 σὺ . . . πόσις τε σὸς . . . | σύ: the Servant focuses on the unexpected change from bad to good fortune in the lives of H. and M.

μετέσχετε ‘you had your share (of troubles)’.

λόγοισιν ‘through (people’s) talk’, causal dat.: for H.’s disgraced reputation, cf. 66, 135, etc.

718–19 ὅτ’ ἔσπευδ’ ‘when he strove’, i.e. to regain H.

αὐτόματα . . . τάγάθ’ ‘blessings that come of themselves’, i.e. without effort.

εὐτυχέστατα: superlative adv., modifying πράξας, ‘faring very fortunately’. Such interlacing is one of several kinds of hyperbaton found in tragedy: see Stinton (1990) 98–112, csp. 102–3.

720–1 Remarking on H.’s supposed ‘shamefulness’, the Servant thinks of H.’s male kin (father and brothers), the guardians of her family’s honour.

ἄρα marks the speaker’s realization of the truth: *GP* 40.4.

722–5 The Servant renews (ἀνανεοῦμαι . . . πάλιν) the blessing of the marriage hymn (*hymenaios*) which he once sang for H. (cf. 1431–5n.), and recalls how he accompanied the chariot that brought her from her father’s house to that of M. (1663–5n.).

καὶ λαμπάδων μεμνήμεθ’ ‘and I remember the torches’: cf. 638 ὑπὸ λαμπάδων.

ἄς . . . | . παρέφερον ‘which I carried as I ran along beside the four-horse chariot’. The chariot is showered with apples, flowers, and garlands in Stesichorus’ account of the procession (fr. 187 *PMGF*). For H. and M.’s wedding in art, cf. *LMC* s.v. Helene 61–9.

σὺν τῷιδε: gesturing towards M.

726–33 The Servant’s maxim-like statements form a coherent argument. 726–7 define the ‘good slave’ in terms of loyalty to one’s master and sympathy with his mood (cf. *Med.* 54–5, *Andr.* 56–9, 87–90). The Servant then focuses on his own claim to be counted among those ‘noble slaves’ (cf. 1641) who have a ‘free mind’ even if they lack a free man’s ‘name’. The Servant’s remarks are far from rebellious in context, but by pointing to the gap between the label ‘slave’ and the ‘free mind’ of the individual who bears that label, Eur. is adapting current ideas about the contingent nature of such categories as ‘slave’ and ‘free’: see Guthrie (1971) 155–60, Hall (1997) 110–18. As Gregory (2002) 161 has shown, however, the many passages dealing with the nature and status of slaves in Eur. do not establish the playwright as a ‘social activist’ (cf. Heath (1987) 150 n. 56 on Eur.’s use of the stock aristocratic figure of the ‘loyal retainer’). Passages of general reflection tend to cluster at the end as well as the beginning of speeches (cf. Friis-Johansen (1959) 98).

726 τὰ δεσποτῶν ‘the interests of his master(s)’.

727 ξυγγηθέω (‘rejoice with’) is a *hapax*; συνωδιῶ (‘suffer with’) occurs only here in archaic or classical poetry.

728 κελ: crasis, καὶ εἰ.

πέφυχ' . . . λάτρις: the Servant is not an enslaved former aristocrat (a frequent figure of tragedy, especially in the form of women taken into captivity after the fall of their city, e.g. Cassandra (Aesch. *Ag.*), Iole (Soph. *Trach.*), Andromache (*Andr.*), Hecuba (*Hec.*, *Tro.*): see Hall (1997) 123–4) but was born in servitude, making his claim to a 'free mind' all the more arresting.

730–1 For slavery as a mere 'name' or title (albeit a shameful one), cf. Eur. *Ion* 854–6 (which I would not delete, *pace* Diggle), fr. 511 K. The slave's 'free mind' is mentioned in a fragment of Sophocles (εἰ σῶμα δοῦλον, ἀλλ' ὁ νοῦς ἐλεύθερος fr. 940 R), and both ideas are combined in Eur. fr. 831 K (πολλοῖσι δούλοις τοῦνομαῖσ χρόν, ἡ δὲ φρήν | τῶν οὐχὶ δούλων ἐστ' ἐλευθερωτέρα) 'The name brings shame to many slaves, but their mind is more free than that of those who are not slaves.'

731–2 κρεῖσσον . . . | . χρῆσθαι 'for that is better than to suffer two evils at once' (lit. 'than for one person to suffer two evils'): the antithesis of εἰς with other numbers (δυοῖν . . . ἐν) is often used for rhetorical emphasis and contrast (cf. 571), or may be equivalent (as here) to ἄμα (Barrett on *Hipp.* 1403, Denniston on *El.* 649). The 'two evils' are elaborated by the two infinitives ἔχειν . . . ἀκούειν (732–3).

733 ἀκούειν (+ gen.) 'to obey': cf. 1415.

734–43 The Servant is sent back to the shore with instructions for M.'s men that prepare for their role in the escape (cf. 1069–72, 1537–1612).

734–5 παρ' ἀσπίδα is simultaneously heroic (suggesting the lesser fighter who accompanies the Homeric warrior) and contemporary (evoking the shield-by-shield formation of the hoplite phalanx: cf. *Med.* 250–1): see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1073–4. For παρ' ἀσπίδα combined with ἐκπονῶν ('labouring to perform'), cf. *Or.* 653 σοὶ παρ' ἀσπίδ' ἐκπονῶν.

ἔξέπλησας: 2nd sg. aor. act. of ἐκπίμπλημι, 'I complete, accomplish'.

736–8 μετασχών: cf. 716 πόνων μετέσχετε.

εὐ πραξίας: cf. 719 πράξας . . . εὐτυχέστατα.

οὐ τ' ἐσμέν τύχης 'where our fortunes stand'. The lack of movement in uncompounded εἶναι tells against L's οἶ: cf. Dunbar on Ar. *Birds* 9, Diggle (1994) 186 n. 23.

739–43 The three infinitives (μένειν . . . καρδοκεῖν . . . φρουρεῖν) are all governed by ἀγγεῖλον (737 aor. imper., 'and tell them to . . .').

739–40 καρδοκεῖν | . . . μ' 'to wait for the outcome of the struggles that lie in store for me'. For the sense of καρδοκεῖν, cf. Mastronarde on *Med.* 1107 'the verb implies waiting with nervous expectation for an outcome, often in a military context with the notion of determining one's behaviour according to who wins a battle'. Here the word marks M.'s gradual return to his role and status as a military leader, as he and H. move from beggary and supplication to developing a strategy for escape.

ὡς ἐλπίζομεν 'as I expect'.

741 εἰ . . . πῶς δυναίμεθ' 'in case I might somehow be able to . . .'.

742 φρουρεῖν <θ' > ὅπως ἂν 'and to watch for a way . . .'. Dale and Kovacs follow Jackson (1955) 239–40 in deleting πῶς . . . | φρουρεῖν (741–2) and retaining καὶ τήνδ'

(741), but Herwerden's εἰ in 741 and the addition of θ' by Diggle give the conditional clauses (εἰ . . . ἦν δυνώμεθα) a distinct and proper purpose (cf. Diggle (1994) 186–8).

εἰς ἐν ἐλθόντες τύχης 'combining our fortunes'.

744–57 Before departing the Servant condemns all prophets as liars, since neither Calchas nor Helenus (the Trojan prophet, and a son of Priam) revealed the existence of the phantom. Prophets and divination are criticized or questioned throughout Greek literature from the *Iliad* onwards (c.g. *Il.* 1.106–8, 12.237–40, 24.220–4). Prophets may be suspected of prostituting their craft for material gain (c.g. *Od.* 2.186, Aesch. *Ag.* 1195, Soph. *Ant.* 1035–47, 1055, *OT* 387–9, Eur. *Bacch.* 255–7, *LI* 520–1), rejected as impostors with no access to the gods (*OT* 390–8), or (as here) presented as practising a false skill because the gods (though they exist) do not communicate with humans via sacrificial offerings and birds. It is important to note that the Servant's criticisms are not an attack on the gods themselves (indeed he urges sacrifice and prayer to them: 753–4), but on the fallible human practitioners of μαντική (cf. Xenophanes DK 21 A52, Eur. *Hipp.* 1055–9). The same distinction is found in Eur.'s *El.* 399–400, where Orestes declares Λοξίου γὰρ ἔμπεδοι | χρησμοί, βροτῶν δὲ μαντικὴν χαίρειν ἔω (cf. Soph. *OT* 497–503, Eur. *Phoen.* 954–9). That the tragedians should be fascinated by prophecy is hardly surprising, since tragedy is essentially concerned with the divine and how humans may gain knowledge of it; for Eur. in particular, see Radermacher (1898). Moreover, the validity of divination was an especially controversial issue in the later fifth century as rational explanations based on science began to challenge the authority of traditional religious practices (cf. Lloyd (1979) 10–15, Burkert (1985) 311–17, Rihll (1999) 17).

Several critics have detected particular venom and topicality in the Servant's attack here (performed in 412), since Thucydides tells us that in the previous summer, when news of the disastrous defeat of the Sicilian Expedition reached Athens, the Athenians were enraged with the prophets and reciters of oracles who had predicted a successful campaign (Thuc. 8.1). As Parker (2005) 113–14 observes, however, 'Certainly, Euripides' *Helen*, produced in the year after the disaster, contains the most general denunciation of seers to be found in Attic literature . . . But, in the long term, false prophecies usually create an appetite for true ones, not a wholesale rejection of the institution.' Moreover, as we have seen, the fallibility of prophets is a traditional theme, and the passage must be linked first and foremost to the world of the play. Insofar as the success of the escape plan depends upon the goodwill and support of the prophet Theonoe, it is clear that, despite the Servant's attack, not all who claim to understand the will of the gods are selfish charlatans. (Of course audiences were also familiar with the regular pattern in tragedy whereby the predictions of seers are fulfilled, however unlikely they look to the characters in the action; cf. 746–81.) Matthiessen (1968) 696 and Kannicht (on 744–60) deny that the Servant's speech has any bearing on Theonoe, since she is not the same kind of seer as Calchas or Helenus (who use sacrifice and birds), but the audience have been told nothing of Theonoe's methods, and Teucer has spoken of her skills in language typical of Greek divination (145–6 τὴν θεσπιωιδὸν Θεονόην . . . | . ὡς τύχῳ μαντευμάτων). Thus,

the Servant's condemnation of prophets raises the possibility that Theonoe herself will prove unhelpful and hostile, choosing her own self-interest before the happiness of M. and H. Moreover, as well as creating suspense about how Theonoe will act, the Servant's speech highlights the significant and disturbing fact that the gods chose *not* to reveal the truth about the εἶδωλον (through the 'signs' of divination or otherwise).

Editors differ considerably in their view of the Servant's gnomic style, the coherence of his train of thought, and hence the extent of their deletions. Alleged linguistic and stylistic difficulties boil down to one real problem (the later Attic temporal augment in 752 ἠβούλετο) which can be easily remedied (see below). In conclusion, the Servant's speech is highly relevant to the play, and its style and structure effectively characterize the speaker as a shocked yet spirited old man, prone to moralizing reflection.

**744–5** ἔσται τάδ' : a formula of agreement (cf. 1294, *Hec.* 898, *El.* 650, etc.), here expressing compliance with M.'s orders. Collard (2005) 371 contrasts 'this originally solemn formula' with 'the more everyday expression' δράσω τάδε (e.g. *Hipp.* 1088).

ἀλλά τοι 'but, you know': 'τοι brings the point home to the person addressed' (*GP* 548).

ἔσεῖδον: the aor. of verbs of understanding stresses the completeness as well as the instantaneity of the insight (Lloyd (1999) 44–5), 'now I truly understand how . . .':

τὰ μάντεων: lit. 'the things of prophets', the neuter article and possessive gen. being a common periphrasis for the people themselves (or their interests: cf. 726 τὰ δεσποτῶν).

**746–8** The Servant rejects two of the chief methods of divination: the flames of sacrifice and the cries of birds (cf. Burkert (1985) 112).

ἦν ἄρ' : for the sense and colloquial nature of the expression, see 616n.

ὕγιες οὐδέν: also colloquial (Stevens (1976) 25–6), 'nothing wholesome' = 'no good' (nine examples in Eur., once in Soph. *Phil.* 1006, performed in 409), first with dependent gen. (ἐμπύρου φλογός), then with predicate nom. (πτερωτῶν φθέγμασι: cf. *Andr.* 952–3 ὕγιες γὰρ οὐδέν αἱ θύραθεν εἰσοδοὶ | δρῶσιν γυναικῶν). The Servant's simple language enhances his forthright opinion.

εὐθεῖς . . . | τὸ καὶ δοκεῖν: the articular infinitive is nom., 'and even to think that (birds benefit mortals) is stupid.' The Servant's scepticism is at odds with the general pattern in tragedy whereby to ignore omens is to court disaster; cf. Hector's deluded rejection of *ornithomanteia* in the *Iliad* (12.237–43).

**749–51** reformulate the theme of the war's futility from the perspective of prophecy.

οὐκ εἶπ' οὐδ' ἐσήμηνε στρατῶσι: far from being 'inelegant padding' (Kovacs (2003) 41), the repetition emphasizes the culpable silence of the prophets, and the effect is strengthened by the use of σημαίνω, which is *vox propria* for divine 'signs': cf. Heraclitus DK 22 B93 ὁ ἀναξ, οὗ τὸ μαντεῖόν ἐστι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει.

νεφέλης . . . | . μάτην: cf. 593, 603, 707nn.

752 εἴποις ἄν: the Servant imagines a potential explanation for the prophets' failure, 'It was because the god did not want (to give a sign).' Ion, servant of Apollo, stresses that one cannot hope to extort information from the gods, either by sacrifice or bird omens, if they are unwilling to give it (*Ion* 373–7). Yet in contrast to Ion, who urges Creusa not to ask awkward questions, the Servant turns the unwillingness of the gods against the prophets themselves (753–4). Ironically, however, the Servant's imaginary defence is actually valid in this case: the gods *did* conceal the εἶδωλον from the prophets. The truth is more disturbing than the Servant realizes.

ἐβούλετο: a certain change for L's ἠβούλετο since the temporal augment ἠ- with βούλομαι and other verbs (ἠδυνάμην, ἠμελλον) is a morphological development that features sporadically in prose of the fourth century and beyond (e.g. *Dem.* 1.15), but nowhere else in fifth-century literature (cf. Sihler (1995) 486).

753–4 spell out the implications of 752: if prophets cannot guarantee knowledge of the divine, it is better to sacrifice and pray to the gods directly.

θύοντας αἰτεῖν ἀγαθά: ἀγαθά is one of the most frequently used words in prayers, since prayer was seen as 'asking for good things' (Pulleyn (1997) 7–8); cf. e.g. *Eur. Bacch.* 285 ὥστε διὰ τοῦτον [sc. Dionysus, when poured out as wine during prayer] τάγάθ' ἀνθρώπους ἔχειν.

755–7 are deleted by Dale on the grounds of 'irrelevance', yet they effectively expand the Servant's criticisms of prophecy and end his speech with a gnomic statement (757) that is highly appropriate to the subsequent course of the action.

βίου . . . τὸδε 'for that (i.e. μαντεία) was invented merely as one of life's traps.' The δέλεαρ ('trap, bait, temptation': cf. *Andr.* 264, *IT* 1181) is the (mere) promise of success given by prophecy.

ἀργὸς ὦν 'without making an effort', i.e. nobody ever prospered simply by making divinatory sacrifices; cf. *Hes. WD* 303–4 τῶι δὲ θεοὶ νεμεσῶσι καὶ ἀνέρες, ὅς κεν ἀεργὸς | ζῶι.

γνώμη . . . εὐβουλία 'the best predictor of the future is intelligence and good planning.' The Servant's rejection of the traditional art of divination in favour of human judgement deploys the rationalist language and thought of the sophistic enlightenment: cf. Antiphon DK 87 λ9 for μαντική as 'the conjecture of an intelligent man' (ἀνθρώπου φρονίμου εἰκασμός), *Eur. fr.* 973 K μάντις δ' ἄριστος ὅστις εἰκάζει καλῶς, 744–57n. But his declaration also prefigures the action to come, where, despite the tacit support of the prophet Theonoe, H. and M. must rely for success upon their own intelligence and planning: cf. esp. 1022–3.

758–60 As the Servant returns to the shore, the Chorus-leader expresses general agreement with his opinion of prophecy, reaffirming the importance of the gods' goodwill (cf. 753–4). The comment is just as important structurally as it is for the 'character' of the Chorus (cf. 698–9n.): the scene of initial reaction to the reunion is over and the lengthy dialogue that follows between M. and H. represents the first phase of the escape plot (esp. 815–29).

758 ταὐτὸ κάμοι: crasis for τὸ αὐτό and καὶ ἐμοί, lit. 'the opinion about prophets turns out the same for me too as for the old man.'

761–856 *Dialogue between Helen and Menelaus*

The transition from recognition to planning is handled in animated stichomythia (cf. 553–96n.). M. learns of the threat to his life (778–88) and a plan emerges with H.'s suggestion that they supplicate Theonoe and win her support (825–31). In the opening dialogue H. questions M. about his wanderings since the end of the Trojan War (761–77). Thus, rather than forming part of the reunion scene (cf. *Od.* 23.306–43), the review of M.'s troubled *nostos* comes just before the threat to his life is revealed, emphasizing that the series of dangers and struggles facing M. and H. is far from over.

761 εἶέν: the interjection (found 28 times in Eur.; cf. Stevens (1976) 34) is often used 'to move the discussion and action forward after a lyric or messenger's narrative or other delaying element' (Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1615).

δεῦρ' αἶ: δεῦρο is temporal and is intensified by αἶ, 'right up to now' (with καλῶς ἔχει the phrase has an idiomatic ring: 'so far, so good').

763–4 πόθος δέ τις | . . . φίλοισιν: dat. of possession, 'loved ones long (to hear . . .)'. For the thought, cf. 665n.

φίλων φίλοισιν: polyptota (173n.) with φίλος and ἐχθρός are used frequently in tragedy, stressing the reciprocity of the relationships; cf. Gygli-Wyss (1966) 67.

765 ἀνήρου: 2nd sg. aor. of ἀνείρομαι, with double acc., 'I ask x about y'.

ἐνὶ λόγῳ μιᾷ θ' ὀδῶι 'in one word and at one go' (for the colloquial tone of μιᾷ ὀδῶι, cf. Stevens (1976) 49), i.e. with her single question H. has asked him to recount many sufferings.

766–9 A summary of M.'s wanderings in *praeteritio* ('Why should I tell you of . . .?'): cf. 400–7, 405–7nn.

766 φθοράς 'shipwrecks', referring to the many Greeks killed during the return from Troy: cf. 127–30.

767 τὰ . . . πυρπολήματα 'the beacon-fires [πυρπόλημα is a *hapax*] set by Nauplius on Euboea'. Palamedes, son of Nauplius, had exposed Odysseus' madness (feigned so as to avoid joining the expedition to Troy) and was killed by the Greeks through the plotting of Odysseus. The story was narrated in the cyclic *Cypria* (see pp. 40.30–3, 43.66 Bernabé = pp. 31.41–3, 33.86 Davies). In retaliation for his son's murder, Nauplius lit false beacons and lured the storm-driven Greek ships to wreck themselves on Cape Caphereus. The murder of Palamedes was a popular subject of tragedy: Aeschylus (frs. 181–2 R), Sophocles (frs. 478–81 R) and Euripides (frs. 578–90 K) all wrote plays about it (for a reconstruction of Euripides' *Palamedes*, see Scodel (1980) 43–63, Collard in Collard et al (2004) 95–6). Nauplius' revenge was presented in Sophocles' *Nauplius Sails In* and *Nauplius Lights a Fire* (frs. 425–38 R), and is alluded to in Euripides' *Trojan Women* (90–1), which followed Eur.'s *Palamedes* in the production of 415; Nauplius tragedies were also written by Philocles (*TrGF* 1 24 τ 1), Astydamos II (*TrGF* 1 60 F 5), and Lycophron (*TrGF* 1 100 τ 3). Beyond tragedy, Gorgias wrote an exhibition speech called the *Defence of Palamedes* (DK 82 B11a: cf. Cole (1991) 75–6), while Timotheus composed a citharodic *nomos* (or perhaps dithyramb) entitled *Nauplius* (fr. 785 *PMG*). See further 1126–31n.

768 Κρήτης τε Λιβύης θ': in the *Odyssey* some of M.'s ships are driven by storms to Crete, while M. himself is driven to Egypt (3.291–302). For Libya, cf. 404n.

ἐπιστράφην: 1st sg. aor. pass. of ἐπιστρέφομαι, 'I go back and forwards' (cf. 83, 89): 'the cities of Crete and Libya which I visited on my wanderings'.

769 σκοπιάς τε Περσέως: Herodotus (2.15) places 'Perseus' Watchtower' in Egypt at the westernmost point of the Nile Delta. M., however, has never been to Egypt before (cf. 460–3) and he clearly has somewhere else in mind. The place was named after Perseus' rescue of Andromeda from the sea-monster, and since the *Helen's* companion play *Andromeda* was set among the Ethiopians of the Atlantic (cf. fr. 145 Κ ὁρῶ δὲ πρὸς τῆς παρθένου θοινάματα | κῆτος θοάζον ἐξ Ἀτλαντικῆς ἀλός), M. probably means that he wandered to the western extremity of the Mediterranean. For the division of the Ethiopians into those dwelling in the east and the west, see *Od.* 1.22–4. The allusive reference to 'Perseus' Watchtower' may suggest that the *Andromeda* preceded the *Helen* in the production of 412; but since we do not know the order of the plays, it may also be a trailer for the story of Perseus that will follow: see 1463–4n., p. 4.

769–71 For the thought, see 143n.

ἐμπλήσοιμι: 1st sg. aor. opt. of ἐμπιμπλημι (+ dat.), 'if I were to satisfy your appetite with stories'.

λέγων τ' . . . | πάσχων τ': for the comparative use of τε . . . τε ('just as . . . so . . .'), see *GP* 515.

πάσχων τ' ἔκαμνον 'just as I suffered while enduring them (sc. κάκα)'. Diggle (OCT) deletes 771, but the line aptly reinforces the prospect of M.'s renewed suffering.

772 καὶ πλείον': Nauck's conjecture ('you have answered more fully than my question expected') not only reacts to M.'s ἤ πόλλ' ἀνήρου ἐνὶ λόγῳ μιᾷ θ' ὀδῶν (765), but also emphasizes the extent of his suffering. L's κάλλιον ('you have answered better than my question') makes for a strange response.

773–6 H. already knows that seven years have passed since the fall of Troy (cf. 111–12) and that M. has been wandering ever since (520–7, 766–9), but the repetition prepares for the powerful contrast of 777–8 (φεῦ φεῦ· μακρόν γ' . . . | . ἐς σφαγάς).

773–4 τᾶλλα παραλιπών: crasis, τὰ ἄλλα, 'leaving out the rest'. For τᾶλλα opposed to ἐν, cf. e.g. *IT* 597 καλῶς ἔλεξας τᾶλλα πλὴν ἐν.

ἐφθείρου: 2nd sg. imperf. of φθείρομαι, 'I wander, drift' (of shipwrecks: LSJ s.v. II 4; cf. 766 φθοράς), with internal acc. ἄλιον πλάνον.

775–6 πρὸς (+ dat.) 'in addition to'.

περιδρομάς ἐτών: for time's 'revolutions', cf. 112n.

777–88 M. learns why his arrival prompts the enmity of Theoclymenus.

777–8 ὦ τάλας . . . | . σωθεις: cf. 762 ἐσώθης, ὦ τάλας. The repetition underlines the illusion of M.'s 'safety': he is in fact headed 'for slaughter'.

779 τί λέξεις: a shocked 'what do you mean to say?' The future tense implies the speaker's desire for elaboration. The idiom is unique to Eur. (see Barrett on *Hipp.* 353).

780 (= *Phoen.* 972) is deleted by many editors (following Valckenacr). The line makes perfect sense here, since H. can as yet see no alternative to M.'s flight. That

such a formulaic line should reappear a few years later in another play is hardly reason enough to suspect it here.

**782** τί χρῆμα = ‘what?’ (for its colloquial ring, see Stevens (1976) 21–2), often combined with a form of δρᾶν, especially in animated *sūchomythia*: cf. 826 (δρᾶσαι), 1238.

**784** ἦ γάρ introduces a surprised question (*GP* 284–5), ‘What? Does someone want . . .?’

τᾶμ’ . . . λέχη: cf. 426–7n.

**785** ‘Yes, committing an outrage against me, which I would have endured (i.e. had you not arrived).’

ὕβριν . . . ὑβρίζων: the *figura etymologica* (where words with the same etymological derivation are used together) is characteristically Euripidean: cf. *Hcl.* 18, *Supp.* 512, *Her.* 708, 741, *Bacch.* 247, *Al* 961. Here it refers to (and the rhetorical figure stresses) the outrage of H.’s rape. She would only have married Theoc. under duress, as her suppliance makes clear.

κἄν ἐτλην ἐγώ: L’s ἦν ἐτλην ἐγώ would imply that H. had endured rape, which is neither true nor likely to be followed by M.’s reply (786). κἄν introduces an unfulfilled conditional clause, reassuring M. that his wife has not been sexually coerced (cf. Stinton (1990) 308–9, 443–5).

**786** M. asks if the man is a powerful individual or the country’s ruler (τυραννεύων χθονός). The latter description is here given a negative charge by the sexual context (for the importance of context in determining the sense of τύραννος and its cognates in fifth-century literature, see Bond on *Her.* 29); to force himself sexually upon women is typical of a tyrant (cf. *Hdt.* 3.80.5, from the debate on constitutions: the tyrant’s crimes include βιάται γυναῖκας).

**788** The Old Woman’s account (460–80) is no longer a ‘riddle’ (αἰνίγμα), i.e. M. is now able to understand why Theoc. will want to kill him.

**789–92** H.’s sensitivity to M.’s shameful loss of status matches his own: cf. 414–17, 513–14nn.

**789** ποίοις . . . πυλώμασιν: cf. 437 τίς πρὸς πύλαισιν;

**790** For M.’s humiliating rejection by the Old Woman, see 435–82n.

ὥσπερ πτωχός: M. is trying to minimize the disgrace of his condition: he was not simply treated like a beggar, but actually came as one (cf. 420–1, 428–9, 510–12).

**791** οὐ που: 95n.

**792** The forced deployment of the ὄνομα/ἔργον antithesis marks M.’s shame at his lowly condition (he could not bring himself to say the word ‘beggar’).

**793–801** M. learns of H.’s supplication at the tomb of Proteus.

**794** εἰ δὲ λέκτρα διέφυγες: despite H.’s reply at 785 that she has so far escaped Theoc.’s advances, M. wants to be absolutely sure.

οὐκ ἔχω: 496n.

**796** πειθῶ ‘proof, assurance’: M. does not take H.’s fidelity for granted, since they have been separated for seventeen years and the attentions of a country’s ruler

are hard to resist. For the significance of her exemplary 'female' conduct, see *Introd.* p. 60.

σαφῆ 'ιτυς': cf. 21.

797 τάφου τοῦδ' ἄθλιους ἔδρας: cf. 528-9n. ἄθλιος ('wretched, pitiable') is here treated as a two-termination adj.

798 ταλαίνας στιβάδας 'a miserable bed of straw'. Of L's τάλαινα Dale rightly asks 'Why τάλαινα when he has still to ask what it has to do with her?'

ὦν τί σοι μέτα (= μέτεστι); M. cannot imagine how his wife came to be camped at a tomb (800-1n.).

799 λέκτρων ἱκετεύομεν φυγᾶς: H. had earlier described how she came to Proteus' tomb as a ἱκέτις, ἴν' ἀνδρὶ τὰμὰ διασώσῃ λέχη (65); ἄθικτον εὐνήν . . . σεσωμένην (795). ἱκετεύομεν (with long syllable ἱκ-) is imperfect.

800-1 M.'s question ('for lack of an altar or because of foreign custom?') suggests that the Greek audience too will have found H.'s choice of asylum unusual. Aristophanes parodies this passage when he has Critylla attack Euripides' kinsman for daring to call the on-stage altar a tomb (*Thesm.* 887-8). Suppliants in tragedy (as in real life) normally take refuge at altars or temples rather than tombs (cf. e.g. Aesch. *Suppl.* 83-5; Soph. *OC* 1158-60; Eur. *Al* 911; Lys. 12.98 on altars and temples ἃ καὶ τοῖς ἀδικοῦσι σωτήρια γίνονται). However, it would be misleading to see here any specific reference to Egyptian cults of the dead or to a peculiarly Egyptian respect for grave monuments. The respect accorded Proteus' grave is an extension of essentially Greek ideas. The Chorus-leader of Aeschylus' *Choephori* tells Electra, 'I revere your father's tomb as if it were an altar' (106 αἰδουμένη σοι βωμόν ὡς τύμβον πατρός; cf. *Cho.* 336-7) and Simonides wrote of the heroic dead at Thermopylae, 'Their tomb is an altar' (fr. 531.3 *PMG* βωμός δ' ὁ τάφος). Proteus is treated as a hero, not simply as one of the ordinary dead (see 547n.), and in the Greek world heroic tombs were charged with extraordinary power. The tomb has been chosen here as H.'s place of asylum because Eur. wants to keep Proteus, and his protection of H. (both in life and in death), firmly in the minds of the audience, since the former king's conduct will be a major influence on Theonoc's decision and hence the outcome of the play (cf. 909-23, 940-1, 961-8, 987).

σπανίζουσι: for σπανίζω + gen. ('to be in want of'), cf. 1260, *Med.* 960-1 (Jason to Medea) δοκεῖς σπανίζειν δῶμα βασιλείου πέπλων, | δοκεῖς δὲ χρυσοῦ;

ἐρρύεθ': 3rd. sg. imperf. ῥύομαι ('to protect'); cf. e.g. *Il.* 6.403 οἶος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἐκτωρ.

802-14 Theoc. cannot be killed; another plan is needed. The technique of exploring and rejecting ἀδύνατα ('impossible plans') before hitting upon the best scheme is typical of plotting scenes: cf. Eur. *El.* 615-18 (Aegisthus is protected by bodyguards), *IT* 1020-7 (Iphigenia will not murder her 'host' Thoas), *Ion* 971-7 (Creusa refuses to burn Apollo's temple or kill Xuthus).

802 ναυστολεῖν <σ> 'to take you home by ship'. τοῦμόν λέχος in H.'s reply (803) shows that σε is needed here (otherwise the verb would mean simply 'to sail home by ship').

**805** μή . . . καταιδοῦ: pres. imper. of καταιδέομαι, ‘do not be ashamed (to flee)’. M., however, feels that flight would be ‘cowardly’ (808; cf. 948–9).

**806** σὴν χάριν ‘for your sake’.

**807** ‘Better that (i.e. to leave) than for my marriage to kill you.’

**808** γ’: exclamatory (*GP* 127.i), underlining M.’s refusal to flee.

ἴλιου τ’ οὐκ ἄξια: M. cannot give up the idea of Trojan glory, although he now knows that the war was fought for an εἶδωλον: 845–9, 1603–4nn.

**810** ‘Is his body so invulnerable to the sword?’ M.’s ironic question reveals his warrior mentality (the vulnerability of one’s opponents is a *topos* of epic, cf. *Il.* 4.510–11, 21.568–9), but the impracticability of violence necessitates a more ingenious solution (1049n.).

**811** εἴσῃ ‘you’ll find out’, i.e. why the king cannot be killed. M. learns of Theonoe’s protective role at a later stage of the planning (1043–6).

ἀδύνατ’: cf. 802–14n.

ἀνδρὸς οὐ σοφοῦ: the gen. + infinitive expresses what it is natural or characteristic of the person to do (*Smyth* §1304).

**812** σιγῆι (emphatically line-initial) marks M.’s disgust at the idea of surrendering so meekly.

παράσχω . . . δῆσαι: deliberative subjunc. with infinitive of purpose, ‘am I to hold out (my hands) for binding?’

**813** encapsulates the structure and motivation of Eur.’s so-called ‘recognition and intrigue’ plays: *Introd.* p. 36.

ἐς ἄπορον: ἄπορος (lit. ‘impassable’) is used idiomatically of difficult circumstances: *LSJ* s.v. II 1.

δεῖ δὲ μηχανῆς τινοῦ: the ‘scheme’ itself has two stages: first, the persuasion of Theonoe (prepared for here, 815–31); second, the discovery of an appropriate plan (1033–92).

**814** M. continues in martial spirit: cf. *Il.* 22.304–5 (Hector facing Achilles) μὴ μὰν ἄσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην, | ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, 810n.

**815–31** H. realizes that the only way to prevent Theoc. from finding out about M. is by persuading Theonoe to remain silent. Her support will also be crucial to any escape plan. The dialogue prepares for Theonoe’s entry in the following scene.

**816** ὠνητὸς ἢ τολμητὸς: the two-termination adjs. modify ἐλπὶς (815), ‘by bribery, daring, or persuasion?’ Like Odysseus, M. is ready to use trickery and deceit, but is not as smart as he is – or as H.: cf. 1049n. For the play’s pervasive intertextuality with the *Odyssey*, see *Introd.* p. 27.

**818** Diggle’s transposition seems superior to any of the conjectures made thus far. By ending with the question ‘Who will tell him?’, emphasizing that (as far as M. knows) there is nobody who can, H.’s reply gains in force. As Diggle (1994) 189–91 has shown, the transmitted text (ἐπεὶ δὲ τίς μὲ; οὐ γνώσεται γ’ ὅς εἰμ’ ἐγώ) is defective: the ellipsis of ἀφιγμένον in the first question is awkward; the combination of a strong pause after the

first metron with a caesura after the following monosyllable (οὐ) is highly irregular; and finally, Triclinius' γ does not give the necessary connection between the remarks (as Dale says, we seem to need γάρ).

ἐγῶιδ': crasis, ἐγὼ οἶδα.

**819** ξύμμαχος ('ally', here fem., hence ἴση) stresses that it will be hard for M. and H. to overcome Theonoc's natural loyalty to her brother.

**820** 'Some divine voice established in the inmost recesses of the house?' M. imagines a domestic oracle; prophets were a regular part of a leader's household in the heroic age: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 409, *Cho.* 37–42.

ἐν μυχοῖς: prophecies regularly emerge μυχόθεν; compare Apollo's entrance from his μαντικοὶ μυχοί (i.e. his temple at Delphi) in Aesch. *Eum.* 180.

**822** χρηστήριον μὲν τοῦνομ': cf. 13–15n.

ὅτι δὲ δρᾶι: another instance of the ὄνομα/ἔργον antithesis (792n.). Although having a prophetic name does not guarantee prophetic powers, the symmetry is true in Theonoc's case, as H.'s response makes clear (823).

**824** θνήσκοιμεν ἄν 'I am dead then!': cf. 91n.

οὐχ οἶόν τε 'it is impossible' (ἔστι understood).

**825** ἰκετεύοντε: pres. dual participle., preparing for the joint supplication of Theonoc (894–995).

**826** τί χρῆμα δρᾶσαι: 782n.

ὑπάγεις 'lead on'.

**827** μὴ φράσαι depends on ἰκετεύοντε (825), as M.'s questions do not interrupt the syntax: '(supplicate her . . .) not to tell her brother that you are in the country.'

**828** πείσαντε 'and when we have persuaded (her)': the obj. is supplied from the preceding exchange.

διορίσαιμεν . . . πόδα 'leave' (lit. 'carry the foot across the border'): cf. 394 κώπηι διορίσαι.

**829** κοινῆι γ' ἐκείνηι 'yes, with her help' (lit. 'together with her'); for κοινῆι as a prep. with dat., see LSJ s.v. κοινός B 113. The absolute necessity of Theonoc's support increases the suspense of the following scene. The effect is heightened by ραιδίως, which is something of an exaggeration: the success of the escape plan is far from assured (cf. 1032–1106).

**830** M. asserts that Theonoc will be more open to a request from H. For appeals to female solidarity made woman to woman cf. 329 (female Chorus-leader to H.), *Med.* 822–3 (Medea to female servant), *IT* 1061–2 (Iphigenia to female chorus). M.'s brief gnomic remark says much about the ancient Greek male's perception of women as a group (often seen as complicitous), and also suggests the strategies of mutual trust which marginal groups are forced to adopt in many cultures.

σὸν ἔργον: a colloquial expression, 'That's for you to do' (cf. Stevens (1976) 39).

πρόσφορον 'suited to', neuter in a gnomic statement: cf. Diggle (1994) 260 'Its use is particularly common when "woman" is the subject', e.g. Eur. *El.* 1035 (Clytemnestra speaking) μῶρον μὲν οὖν γυναῖκες.

**831** ὡς (with ellipse of ἴσθι) 'be sure that . . .' (cf. 126).

οὐκ ἀχρωστα: emphatic double litotes, 'not untouched (+ gen.).'

832–42 M. and H. resolve to die together, if they cannot persuade Theonoc.

832 φέρ' ἦν . . . λόγους: an elliptical question ('What if . . .?', 'Suppose . . .?'), as often with τί or φέρε followed by ἦν with subjunc. (as here) or εἰ with opt. (1043–4): cf. Stevens (1976) 30–1, Diggle (1994) 109 n. 62.

νῶιν 'our (appeal)': gen. dual form of ἐγώ.

834 Despite H.'s proven and exceptional fidelity, M. considers her potential remarriage a betrayal. In his eyes, H. is better dead than in the hands of another man (cf. 988–90). It is no coincidence that their suicide 'pact' (cf. 835n.) involves H. being killed first (842).

προδότις ἄν εἴης: exclamatory opt. (cf. 91, 824nn.), 'You traitor!'

σκήψασ' ἔχεις: aor. part. of σκήπτω, 'I allege (as an excuse)', in periphrastic construction (see 413n.): 'your talk of force (cf. 833 βίαι) is merely an excuse'.

835 H. begins to swear an oath, which M. takes to be the start of a pledge that she will die rather than take a new husband (836). However, given H.'s assumption that she would survive M.'s death (833), she is more likely to swear an oath repudiating the unjust charge of betrayal in 834. Her oath is thus 'a conversational denial . . . which Menelaus treats as the beginning of a formal oath. Helen then finds herself committed to *his* interpretation of her words' (Lloyd (1999) 31–2, my italics). Although H. had already threatened to kill herself if M. proved to be dead (353–6), it is significant that M. is first to think of suicide here, and that he does so out of possessiveness as much as devotion (contrast the voluntary suicide of Evadne on her husband's pyre: Eur. *Supp.* 1063–71).

σὸν κάρα 'by your head', acc. of the object sworn by (cf. e.g. *Med.* 746–7 ὄμνυ πέδον Γῆς πατέρα θ' Ἥλιον πατρός | τοῦμοῦ θεῶν τε συντιθείς ἅπαν γένος). Since oaths frequently involve the invocation of venerable objects or deities, H.'s choice of M. himself (the head standing for the whole person, as often in tragedy: cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 651–2) underlines the great value she attaches to both him and their marriage bond.

κατώμοσα: 348n.

836 θανεῖσθαι: fut. infinitive dependent on κατώμοσα. M. supplies the content of H.'s oath.

837 Far from rejecting M.'s suggestion, H. embraces the idea of joint suicide (835n.): cf. *IT* 684–6, *Or.* 1151–2 (Pylades will share Orestes' death).

838 ἐπὶ τοῖσδε 'on these terms', i.e. the content of the oath, sworn in the following couplet (839–40).

δεξιᾶς ἐμῆς θίγε 'grasp my hand': right hands were clasped when making pledges (cf. *Med.* 21–2 βοᾶι μὲν ὄρκους, ἀνακαλεῖ δὲ δεξιᾶς | πίστιν μεγίστην).

841 ὥστε καὶ δόξαν λαβεῖν: since the manner of death is an essential aspect of a hero's posthumous reputation, H. is concerned that their death should bring glory. (Though suicide was generally admired as an escape from dishonour in classical Athens (Dover (1974) 168–9), there was also a risk that it be misperceived as cowardly: cf. *Her.* 1246–54, 1347–51).

**842** τύμβου ἔπι νώτοις: M. explains the reasons for this to Theonoe (982–7).

ἐμέ: reflexive, for ἐμαυτόν (K-G 1.559).

**843–54** M. will seek a glorious death in combat, fighting for H.

**843** ἄγωνά μεγαν: cf. 1090–2n.

**844** ὁ δὲ θέλων ἴτω πέλας: a general challenge, ‘let any who wants (to fight) come near.’

**845–9** M.’s refusal to shame his Trojan κλέος is striking. Although he knows that the war was fought for an εἶδωλον, he still believes that the victory was glorious, for otherwise the sacrifice made by his dead comrades becomes meaningless. M. cannot abandon his heroic values, yet the situation reveals their tragic limitations. κλέος may be just as illusory as the ‘Helen’ for whom the Greeks and Trojans perished (1603–4n.).

**846** οὐδ’ . . . ψόγον: the suicide pact is momentarily forgotten so that M. can consider, and reject, the reprehensible idea of returning to Greece alone. (For a less serious treatment of the heroic refusal to flee, see Eur. *Cycl.* 198–202, where Odysseus, like M., is anxious to retain his Trojan reputation.)

**847** ὅστις introduces an explanatory relative clause, ‘for it was I who deprived Thetis . . .’.

**848** Τελαμωνίου . . . σφαγᾶς: for the suicide of Ajax and Telamon’s grief, see 94–104.

**849–50** τὸν Νηλέως τ’ ἄπαιδα ‘the son of Neleus childless’: Nestor, son of Neleus, had lost his own son Antilochus at Troy (cf. *Od.* 3.111–12). Antilochus was killed while trying to save his father from the onslaught of Memnon (narrated in the cyclic *Aethiopsis*: p. 68.13 Bernabé = p. 47.17–18 Davies; cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 6.28–42), making his death especially painful to Nestor (cf. Soph. *Phil.* 421–7). L’s τὸν Θησέως τε παῖδα is impossible, since Theseus’ sons, Demophon and Acamas, survived the war and returned to Greece: cf. Eur. *Tro.* 31. The deaths of Achilles, Ajax, and Antilochus are mentioned together by Nestor at *Od.* 3.109–12, making the corrections of Musgrave and Lenting very likely.

διὰ δὲ τὴν ἐμὴν | . . . ἐγώ: this question, answered emphatically in 851, completes the argument of the previous lines (846–9), i.e. if such great warriors died for the sake of (διὰ) his wife, how can M. refuse to do so? The evocation of the grieving parents (Thetis, Telamon, and Nestor) makes the thought of returning to Greece without H. especially shameful, for M. would have to face their reproaches among others (846 Ἐλλάδ’ ἐλθὼν λήψομαι πολὺν ψόγον).

**851** μάλιστα γ’ (‘certainly, of course’) answers M.’s own rhetorical question.

εἰ γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ σοφοί: M. is not questioning divine wisdom (for complaints of that kind, cf. Eur. *El.* 971–2, 1245–6, *Her.* 347, 655–6, *IT* 570–1, *Phoen.* 86–7), but endorsing the gods’ ‘wise’ treatment of the brave and the cowardly, which motivates him (γὰρ) to stay and risk his life for what is rightfully his (as often, σοφός here implies moral, rather than intellectual, correctness).

**852–4** In contrast to the man who fights and dies bravely, the coward is denied proper burial, an extreme form of punishment (cf. e.g. Soph. *Ajax* 1047–1420, *Ant.* 21–30, 45–6, etc.).

κούφη . . . χθονί 'with a light covering of earth': compare the chorus' prayer at *Alc.* 463 κούφα σοι χθών ἐπάνωθε πέσοι, γύναι, a frequent sentiment in later Greek (and Latin) epitaphs (cf. Lattimore (1942) 65–74).

καταμπισχουσιν 'they cover' (a *hapax*): cf. *Trō.* 1147–8 ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν, ὅταν σὺ κοσμήσεις νέκυν, | γῆν τῶιδ' ἐπαμπισχόντες ἀροῦμεν δόρυ.

κακούς . . . γῆς 'but towards they cast out on a ridge of hard rock', taking γῆς with ἔρμα rather than with ἐκβάλλουσι (*pace* Dale and Kannicht, who take ἔρμα to mean 'reef' and see reference here to death by drowning at sea); the corpse cannot be buried on the hard ridge. στερεόν contrasts with κούφη, ἐκβάλλουσι with καταμπισχουσιν.

**855–6** The Chorus-leader's prayer for good fortune (cf. 698–9n.) ends the opening phase of the planning (761–856, 815–31nn.) and looks forward to the crucial encounter with Theonoe, which will decide the fate of H. and M.

γενέσθω . . . μεταστήτω: middle and act. 3rd sg. aor. imperatives (μεθίστημι, 'I change').

δή ποτ' 'at last' (*GP* 213.ii.b).

γένος | τὸ Ταντάλειον: mention of Tantalus triggers recollection of the prodigious history of suffering in the family of M.: 388–9n.

#### 857–893 *Theonoe emerges from the palace*

The introduction of Theonoe (an additional 'blocking figure' absent from the escape plot of the *IT*: see *Introd.* p. 36 n. 156) expands and varies the action by making it necessary to secure her support before attempting to outwit Theoclymenus. The importance of Theonoe's decision, and the exceptional nature of her knowledge, are magnified by the religious solemnity of her entrance (865–72n.). In addition, her report of dissent among the gods concerning the return of H. and M. to Greece (878–86) heightens the suspense of their developing escape plan. The scene is symmetrically structured, with the appeals of H. and M. (894–943, 947–995) framed by the two speeches of Theonoe, the first setting out the divine background to her decision (cf. 887 τέλος δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν), the second explaining her reasons for it (998–1029).

**857–64** As the palace doors are unlocked, H. expresses her fear at the arrival of Theonoe (815–31n.). Theonoe's entrance is visually striking, since she is accompanied by two servants who purify the air with sulphur and cleanse her path with the flame of a torch (865–72n.). H.'s despair (cf. 862 ὦ δύστηνος, ὡς ἀπωλόμην) accentuates the tension surrounding Theonoe's impending decision.

857 οἱ γὰρ τάλαινα: cf. 240, 594nn.

τῆς τύχης γὰρ ὧδ' ἔχω: lit. 'for that is how I stand in respect of fortune' (cf. 3131n.), explaining the exclamation οἱ γὰρ τάλαινα.

858 διαπεπράγμεθ' 'we are finished!': cf. 111n.

**859–60** κτυπεῖ 'resounds'. For entry announcements exploiting sound effects, cf. *Ion* 515–16, *Or.* 1366–8, *Bacch.* 638.

κλήθρων λυθέντων: gen. abs., 'as the bars are released'.

**861–2** Flight is futile since Theonoe knows of M.'s arrival whether or not she sees him (cf. 530–40).

**863–4** Τροίας . . . κάπὸ . . . χθονός: *crasis*, καὶ ἀπό, with the preposition governing both nouns, as often in poetry (c.g. *Hec.* 144 ἴθι ναούς, ἴθι πρὸς βωμούς).

βαρβάρου . . . | βάρβαρ': the polyptoton (173n.) underlines the constant adversity experienced by M., who has survived the Trojan War only to face execution in Egypt. This is the first explicit statement depicting Egypt as a second barbarian threat on a par with Troy; the equation encourages the audience to think of M.'s escape from Egypt as a mini-Trojan War, fought this time for the real H. (1603–4n.).

**865–72** Although Theonoe's active participation in the drama is far from being a surprise (cf. 10–15, 145, 317–29, 515–27, 819–31), the detailed instructions given to her two female attendants (865/868 ἡγοῦ σὺ . . . | σὺ δ' αὖ . . .) add weight to her ceremonial entrance, while also drawing attention to the purificatory rituals involved (fumigation and fire). Some scholars have seen here an effort on Eur.'s part to give Theonoe's religious practices an Egyptian flavour (cf. Zuntz (1960) 204, Mikalson (1991) 97). Yet although the Egyptians employed a variety of methods to ensure ritual purity and cleanliness (cf. *Hdt.* 2.37–41, Shaw (2000) Index s.v. religion, esp. p. 334), purification by fire and fumigation by sulphur are no less typical of Greek religion (Parker (1983) 57–8, 227–8). Theonoe, therefore, does not reflect Greek perceptions of specifically Egyptian beliefs and practices (she also speaks solely of Greek divinities: 878–91, 1005–8, 1024–7). Nevertheless, her emphasis on the 'sky's pure air' (867), like her later appeal to the sentient nature of the aether (1013–16n.), is meant to be arresting, even if both are extensions of essentially Greek ideas. For as well as creating a visually impressive entrance (compare Cassandra's torches at *Tro.* 298–352), the fumigation and fire rituals serve to associate Theonoe from her first appearance with purity and proper conduct, and so prepare for her decision to support the 'just' and 'pious' example of her father (cf. 902, 919–23, 940–3, 998–1029).

**865** φέρουσα λαμπτήρων σέλας ('carrying the lantern's flame') refers to the sulphur burner swung by the first attendant. (Such implements were of Babylonian-Assyrian origin: Burkert (1985) 62.)

**866** θείου: sg. pres. imper. of θειόω, 'fumigate (with sulphur)'. For the purifying effects of sulphur, cf. *Il.* 16.228 (Achilles cleans a cup before praying to Zeus to preserve Patroclus), *Od.* 22.481–94, 23.50 (Odysseus fumigates his hall after killing the suitors), *IT* 1216 (Thoas is to cleanse Artemis' temple).

σεμνόν θεσμόν: internal acc., 'according to holy ordinance'.

αἰθέρος μυχούς: obj. of θείου; cf. 584n.

**867** πνεῦμα καθαρὸν οὐρανοῦ: since the air *per se* was not normally felt to be impure (cf. *IT* 1177, where Iphigenia brings the goddess's statue outside σεμνόν γ' ὑπ' αἰθέρ', ὡς μεταστήσω φόνου), Theonoe's cathartic ritual stresses her particular concern with purity (865–72n.).

**868–70** The second attendant is to strike her torch against the ground, burning off the pollution left by impure passers-by.

**868** ἐβλαψεν: equivalent here to 'defiled'.

**869** καθαρσίωι φλογί: the purifying power of fire is a familiar Greek idea (cf. e.g. *Her.* 937 καθάρσιον πῦρ), but the act of burning off polluted footprints is itself unparalleled, suggesting once again perhaps Theonoe's peculiar sensitivity.

**871** νόμον . . . ἀποδοῦσαι 'and having rendered my customary service to the gods'.

**872** ἐφέστιον φλόγ': the sulphur burner and torch are to be returned to the palace hearth from which they were lit.

κομίζετε: the attendants are dismissed (cf. Stanley-Porter (1973) 80, Bain (1981) 32), leaving Theonoe alone to hear the appeals of H. and M.

**873** 'What of my prophecies? How do they stand?' The additional question (πῶς ἔχει;) is inserted parenthetically: cf. 1579–80 ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν – ἢ καλῶς ἔχει; – | πλεύσωμεν;, Diggle (1994) 428–9. For Theonoe's revelations thus far, see 515–27, 530–40.

**875** νεῶν . . . μιμήματος 'deprived of his ships and of your false image'. Theonoe knows even of the phantom's disappearance: cf. 13–14, 530, 819, 823. Eur. is the only poet to use μίμημα (eight times: cf. *Hel.* 74), a word used frequently by Plato of various (counterfeit) images, including artistic and musical representations (e.g. *Laws* 798d).

**877** οὐδ' οἶσθα νόστον οἴκαδ': H. had earlier omitted to ask about M.'s final return to Greece (for good dramatic reasons: see 535–71).

**878–86** Fractious divine assemblies are particularly characteristic of epic, especially the *Iliad*, where they vividly dramatize the opposing wills of the gods. Here Theonoe's extraordinary detailed knowledge of the divine conflict and its motives generates great suspense, as she reveals that the gods are to meet in council this very day (879 τῶιδ' ἐν ἡματι). Yet it is also made clear that they have not yet reached a final decision concerning H. and M. (a decision that remains obscure – again for reasons of dramatic tension – until Castor's concluding *deus ex machina* speech), thereby focusing the audience's attention all the more sharply on Theonoe's own reaction to the suppliants' appeals: 887–91n.

**879** πάρεδρος Ζηνί: lit. 'sitting beside Zeus', implying his role as arbiter: cf. 1669.

**880–6** Although Hera has altered her stance in favour of M. and H.'s return to Greece, she and Aphrodite both remain driven by rivalry and self-interest rather than by any moral concern for M. and H. themselves: *Introd.* p. 62.

**883–4** ἴν' Ἑλλάδι . . . μάθη: if Hera prevails, Aphrodite's 'gift' will be exposed, i.e. all will know that her bargain with Paris was never honoured. ψευδούμφευτος ('falsely married') is a *hapax*.

**884–6** The gods too feel embarrassment, and fear criticism, if their discreditable behaviour is revealed: cf. *Ion* 1557–9 (Athena has come in place of Apollo, who wishes to avoid reproach from Ion and Creusa), *IT* 712–3 (Apollo is ashamed of his prophecies, says Orestes, and so has driven him as far away from Greece as possible). Aphrodite's desire to conceal her failure implies that she too knows it to be shameful.

**885–6** ὡς μὴ ξελεγχθῆι 'lest she be shown up': cf. *Ion* 367 (Ion speaking to Creusa about Apollo) αἰσχύνεται τὸ πρᾶγμα· μὴ ξελεγχέ νιν.

μηδὲ . . . | κάλλος: φαίνομαι with the participle (πριαμένη φανῆι) emphasizes the reality of Aphrodite's disgrace (Smyth §2143), 'and be clearly seen to have bought the prize for beauty'.

Ἐλένης . . . γάμοις 'with a marriage that, so far as H. is concerned, never happened'. ἀνονήτοις (lit. 'unprofitable, to no purpose') stresses that the bargain was never fulfilled: cf. 883–4n. L's ὠνητοῖς may have been influenced by πριαμένη in the line above; in any case it makes no sense since Aphrodite's bribery of Paris was common knowledge, while Hera and Athena had made their own counter-offers: cf. *Trö.* 925–31.

887–91 Theonoe's words τέλος δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν look forward to the deliberative subjunctives διολέσω and σώσω, and refer to Theonoe's *independent* decision whether to tell her brother of M.'s arrival. Theonoe's choice does not pre-empt that of the gods or render their strife irrelevant (*contra* e.g. Dunn (1996) 147), nor could it force the gods to change their mind. The gods' decision is separate and left deliberately uncertain, magnifying the importance of Theonoe's role and hence the tension of the supplication that follows.

889 μεθ' Ἡρας στᾶσα 'taking my stand on Hera's side'.

[892–3] Both Theonoe's character and the structure of H.'s speech (894–943) suggest that these lines are an interpolation (with a view to Theoc.'s intended killing of his sister at 1632–41), intended to heighten the urgency of the ensuing supplication. Dale defends them as a request directed to the Chorus, and finds it credible that Theonoe should suddenly think of her own safety. Quite apart, however, from the peculiarity of appealing to a Greek Chorus to betray M., the selfish sentiment does not suit Theonoe's character as displayed in her response to the suppliants' appeals (998–1029; the same objection applies to the rewriting of the lines by Holzhausen (1995) 191–3 εἰ δ' εἰς ἀδελφῶνι τόνδε στηριανεῖ γ' ἐμῶν | παρόντα, πῶς ἂν τοῦμόν ἀσφαλῶς ἔχοι;, where, in addition, εἰς is wrongly used for τις). Moreover, one would expect H. to appeal immediately against such a request, but she does not; indeed, as Mastroradic (1979) 113 observes, 'her speech is constructed like an appeal to someone still undecided rather than one who has decided adversely.'

#### 894–1029 *Supplication of Theonoe*

Having left the refuge of Proteus' tomb (64–5, 543–4, 800–1nn.), H. now establishes direct ritualized contact with Theonoe herself, embracing her knees in supplication and begging her not to tell Theoc. of M.'s arrival. As a ritual charged with powerful religious and social sanctions (see Gould (1973)), supplication is used throughout tragedy for a variety of purposes. Medea, for example, uses it to sway both Creon and Aegeus (*Med.* 324–56, 709–58), while Hecuba supplicates Agamemnon to support her punishment of Polymestor (*Hec.* 752–904). The pattern of two speeches presented before an arbiter (see esp. 996–7 for Theonoe's role as 'judge') is reminiscent of the agon-scenes of Eur. (*pace* Lloyd (1992) 9, who draws too rigid a distinction between

agon and supplication: cf. Dubischar (2001) 73–5 on supplicatory agons), the difference here being that both speeches argue for the same position (similarly *Ll* 1098–1275). Thus rather than choose between the speakers (as done, for example, by Agamemnon in *Hec.* or M. in *Tro.*), Theonoe must choose between them and the wishes of her brother.

**894–943** H.'s speech falls into two major sections: the first focuses on M.'s right to regain his wife, with an appeal to Theonoe to live up to the pious reputation of her father (898–923); in the second part H. turns to her own rescue and vindication (924–38), and her speech is rounded off by a final reminder to Theonoe of the legacy of Proteus (939–43).

**894** ἀμφὶ σὸν πίτνω γόνυ: the knees, along with the chin and hands, are the main areas of supplicatory contact (cf. e.g. *Andr.* 572–4). The gesture marks the powerlessness and vulnerability of the petitioner: cf. Gould (1973) 94–5, Burkert (1979) 44–7.

**895** προσκαθίζω θᾶκον: lit. 'I sit a seat', internal acc., referring to H.'s suppliant posture.

**896** μόλις ποτέ 'at long last': cf. 597.

**897** ἐπὶ ἀκμῆς (+ inf.) 'on the verge of': the idiom derives from the proverbial 'razor's edge' (ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς), first found in *Il.* 10.173 to describe the fate of the Achaeans, which is poised between destruction and survival.

**898** μοι: a so-called ethical dat., 'I beg you' (Smyth §1486).

**901** τὴν εὐσέβειαν μὴ προδῶις: H.'s request refers to Theonoe's pious character as a whole, but also more specifically to the reverence that is owed to suppliants.

**902** χάριτας . . . ὠνούμενη: just as Aphrodite fears disgrace from 'buying the prize or beauty' (885), so Theonoe should not 'buy gratitude that is wicked and unjust', i.e. sell her information (and, it is implied, her integrity) for the sake of Theoc.'s gratitude.

**903–8** illustrate the idea that it is wrong to seize or retain another's property (with a view to Theoc.'s treatment of M.'s wife). 905–8 are deleted in the OCT (following Hartung), but the comparison with the natural world in 906–8 suits the argument and lends the concept of rightful property the desired general validity.

**903–4** ὁ θεός: as with τοῦ θεοῦ (914) and ὁ δαίμων (915), H. means the gods in general, rather than one specific deity.

τὰ κτητὰ . . . | κτᾶσθαι κελεύει: H. revealingly defines herself as one of M.'s 'possessions': cf. 915–16. The alliteration is expressive of her vehement pleading.

ἐξ ἀρπαγᾶς 'by (violent) seizure' (50–11.): for ἐξ conveying manner, cf. 1297 ἐξ ἀμβολᾶς, 'with delay'.

[905] Besides being unmetrical, the line is alien to the argument, since reference to wealth (as opposed to 'property') does not suit H.'s status as M.'s wife. Rather than being an actor's interpolation, the line was probably written in the margin as a (Euripidean) parallel to H.'s moralizing maxim and later integrated into the text (for this kind of interpolation, see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 555–[8]).

**906–8** The fact that the sky and the earth are the common possession of all mankind supports the idea that everyone has an equal right to property, and, by extension, an equal right not to have it seized by others.

δώματ' ἀναπληρουμένους 'as they fill up their homes (with possessions)'.  
 τὰλλότρια: crasis, τὰ ἀλλότρια, 'what belongs to others'.

909–18 H. applies the general principle of 903–8 to her particular situation (a regular argumentative technique: cf. Friis Johansen (1959) 140–1): she was entrusted to Proteus for safekeeping, but still belongs to M. and should now be returned to him.

909 καιρίως: Hermes' intervention was 'timely' (479n.) because it saved H. from being taken to Troy by Paris, yet it also led to her current misery (ἀθλίως δ' ἐμοί).

911 κάπολάζυσθαι: crasis, καὶ ἀπολάζυσθαι (ἀπολάζυμαι (a *hapax*) = ἀπολαμβάνω; cf. 912, 955), 'and wants to get me back.'

912–14 are deleted in the OCT (following Schenkl), but as with 906–8 the case against them is not convincing. H.'s insistence on the wishes of 'god and father' is likely to appeal to Theonoe (cf. 894–943n.), making the repetition (914–15) both understandable and effective.

θανών 'if he (M.) were dead', picked up by τοῖς θανοῦσιν (913).

κεῖνος refers to Proteus (not Theoc.). H. emphasizes that Proteus, though dead (cf. 915 χῶ θανών), is still her guardian, i.e. that it is *his* wishes Theonoe should respect, not her brother's.

ἤδη . . . σκόπει: ἤδη is emphatic, 'now is the time to consider . . .'.

τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τοῦ πατρός: the neuter article + gen. has a wide range of meanings besides mere ownership (as in 915 τὰ τῶν πέλας) and can even function as a 'periphrasis for the thing itself' (cf. Smyth §1299); so here 'now is the time to consider the gods (903–4n.) and your father', or (given what follows) 'what the gods and your father would do'.

916 βούλοιντ' ἂν ἢ <οὐ> βούλοιντ' ἂν: the pleonasm is rhetorically effective, forcing Theonoe to think of her dead father's conduct. Kovacs (Loeb) suggests <σ'> after πότερον (915), translating 'would the god and your dead father wish <you> to give back their neighbors' goods or not?', but there is no need to alter the focus on what Proteus and the god would do themselves.

917–18 δοκῶ μὲν 'I think (they would be willing)', i.e. to return another's property. The phrase's emphatic first position in the line, followed by a full-stop, strengthens the force of H.'s answer.

πλέον | νέμειν (+ dat.) 'pay more respect to'.

ματαίωι 'rash, reckless', since Theoc. disregards M.'s divinely sanctioned rights of ownership. His conduct is opposed to that of his 'noble/honest father' (χρηστῶι πατρί).

919–23 H. concludes her defence of M.'s claim with a powerful appeal to Theonoe's sense of (divine) justice (answered at 1002–4) and her desire to live up to the standards of her father (cf. 999–1000, 1009–12).

919 τὰ θεῶν ἠγούμενη 'believing in the gods' (cf. 1020–1).

921 δώσεις χάριν 'do (him) a favour': cf. 1000–1 οὐδὲ συγγόνωι χάριν | δοίην, 902 χάριτας . . . ὠνούμενη.

922–3 αἰσχρόν . . . ἐξειδέναι 'it is shameful that you should know well . . .'.

θεΐα . . . | . μέλλοντα: cf. 13–14.

925 ῥύσαι: aor. imper. of ῥύομαι, 'I save, rescue'.

πάρεργον . . . δίκης: lit. 'granting this (i.e. my rescue) in addition to justice (i.e. M.'s claim to me)'. The transmitted τύχης would mean 'granting this in addition to my good fortune (i.e. reunion with M.)', but the focus on Theocoe's decision in δίκης better fits the context.

926 στυγεῖ: cf. 71–85, ending οὐ τᾶρα σ' Ἑλένην εἰ στυγεῖς θαυμαστέον.

927–8 ὡς προδοῦσ' ἐμὸν | πόσιν: for the 'new' H. the charge of infidelity is unbearable: cf. 54–5, 223–5, 270–2, 614–15, 666–8, 696–7, 931.

ῶικησα: ingressive aor., 'I went to live in' (cf. Goodwin §55).

πολυχρύσους: for the accusation that H. had given in to her taste for (barbarian) luxury, cf. *Cycl.* 182–6, *Trp.* 991–7, *Or.* 1113–14, *LA* 73–5.

929 κάπιβῶ: crasis, καὶ ἐπιβῶ, 1st sg. aor. subjunc. of ἐπιβαίω (+ gen.), 'I set foot in'.

930–1 κλύοντες εἰσιδόντες: the second asyndetic participle intensifies the first, 'hearing, indeed even seeing that . . .'. For the (at times misleading) authority of visual evidence, cf. 117–22n.

τέχναις θεῶν | ὠλοντ': for the gods' schemes and their significance, cf. 36–43, 675nn.

οὐκ ἄρ' ἦ 'and that I was not after all . . .': 616n.

932 πάλιν . . . αὖθις αὖ 'once more': the pleonasm suggests H.'s longing for vindication.

ἐς τὸ σῶφρον '(they will restore me) to my virtuous reputation'. (By an oversight the OCT has ἐπὶ τὸ σῶφρον.)

933 ἐδνώσομαι 'I shall betroth', i.e. provide Hermione with a dowry (ἔδνα). In Homer suitors regularly give gifts to the bride's parents; for the productive 'anachronism' of contemporary marriage practice (dowry: e.g. *Hdt.* 1.196) in the heroic world, see Mastronarde on *Med.* 232. H.'s rehabilitation will enable her daughter to marry: cf. 282–3, 689–90nn.

934 τὴν . . . ἀλητεῖαν πικρὰν 'this bitter life of begging' (contrast 523).

936–8 By imagining her reaction to M.'s death far from Egypt, H. underlines the awfulness of losing him when he is both alive and reunited with her. Ironically, it is precisely by elaborating the story of M.'s death elsewhere that H. is able to deceive Theoc. (cf. e.g. 1398 for the deceptive use of her imaginary grief).

κατεφθάρη 'consumed': numerous emendations have been proposed for L's κατεσφάγη, 'butchered' (for details, see Kannicht ad loc.), but Schenkl's conjecture seems the best remedy: cf. Kovacs (2003) 43–4. As Dale remarks, 'The antithesis is dead body reduced to ashes far away/living man whole-and-sound present.'

πρόσω 'far away', modifying ἀπόντα.

ἠγάπων: 1st sg. imperfect of ἀγαπάω. As Mastronarde remarks on *Phoen.* 1327 νέκυν τοι παιδὸς ἀγαπάζων ἐμοῦ, the use of ἀγαπάω/ἀγαπάζω to mean 'show affection and honour to the dead' (cf. *Eur. Supp.* 764, the only other instance of ἀγαπάω in tragedy) may be a Euripidean mannerism.

**939–43** H. repeats her appeal and ends with a gnomic generalization that explains (941 γάρ) why Theonoe should support her. For the pattern of request and generalizing reflection at the end of tragic speeches, see Friis Johansen (1959) 151ff.

**939** μή δῆτα: a passionate negative, with ellipse, 'No, don't (do this)': cf. *GP* 276.2.

**940–1** δὸς τὴν χάριν μοι τήνδε: i.e. it is H., not Theoc., who deserves Theonoe's goodwill: cf. 921n.

μιμοῦ τρόπους | πατρός δικαίου: cf. 919–23n.

**942–3** πατρός χρηστοῦ: such as Proteus (cf. 918 χρηστῶι πατρί).

ἐς ταῦτόν ἦλθε: crasis (τὸ αὐτόν = τὸ αὐτό) and gnomic aor., 'comes to be the same as his parents in character' (τοὺς τρόπους = acc. of respect). Respect for one's parents was central to Greek morality and was matched by pressure to live up to (if not surpass) their reputation: cf. Dover (1974) 273–4.

**944–6** For the use of brief choral interventions as structural markers or dividers, especially in Eur., see Mastronarde (1979) 34. It is also characteristic of agons (894–1029n.) that the chorus deliver two or three iambic lines between speeches: Lloyd (1992) 5. The Chorus-leader's comment here is typically insubstantial (cf. 698–9n.) and serves merely to introduce M.'s speech. Dale defends at length L's attribution of the lines to Theonoe, but considerations of both character (would Theonoe say something so conventional?) and technique (these interventions are otherwise spoken by the chorus) tell against it.

παρόντες ἐν μέσῳ 'under consideration': cf. 630, 1542.

ψυχῆς πέρι 'to save his life': cf. *Il.* 22.161 ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεῶν Ἴκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο.

**947–95** Although M. deploys many of the same arguments as H. (appealing to Theonoe's sense of justice (954–8) as well as her desire not to fall short of her father's reputation for piety (966–8, 973–4)), his speech is delivered in a tone that is far less polite, relying less on Theonoe's moral conscience and filial obedience than on threats of violence, suicide, and pollution (975–87).

**947–9** M.'s refusal to supplicate Theonoe on the grounds that it would be cowardly and would bring shame on Troy (cf. 808) points to the self-abasement and recognition of inferiority required by the suppliant: cf. Eur. *Supp.* 164–7 (Adrastus must overcome his feelings of disgrace in order to supplicate Theseus), *Phoen.* 1622–4 (Oedipus refuses to betray his nobility by supplicating Creon). Unlike H., M. cannot bring himself to adopt the humbled stance of the suppliant and chooses to adopt a more peremptory attitude instead.

ἐγὼ is emphatic, marking the contrast with H.'s actions.

τὴν Τροίαν. | . . . πλεῖστον ἀσχύνομεν: cowardice on M.'s part would demean the Trojans since they would be 'regarded henceforward as having yielded to an unworthy foe' (Denniston on Eur. *El.* 184–9, who gives further examples of the idea, including *Cycl.* 198–200, *Hipp.* 976–80, *Andr.* 329).

**950–3** Whereas Homeric heroes weep with no fear of criticism, fifth-century tragedy contains a number of passages where tears are labelled or rejected as unmanly (cf. Soph. *Aj.* 319–20, *Trach.* 1071–5, 1199–1201, Eur. *Her.* 1354–6, *Or.* 1031–2).

M. reflects this ambivalence, for although he has heard that it is noble to weep in times of disaster (950–1), and having wept himself at his humiliation by the Old Woman (455–7), he now declares his preference for courageous resolution (953 τῆς εὐψυχίας).

950 πρὸς (+ gen.) ‘befitting’.

954–8 M. presents Theonoe’s alternatives: save him and support what is right (954–6) or don’t save him and be exposed as wicked (956–8).

954 σῶσαι ξένον: since M. claims the rights of hospitality and protection granted to a *xenos* (449, 480nn.), killing him would be particularly impious.

956 πρὸς: adverbial, ‘in addition’; cf. 110.

σῶσον (sc. με).

957–8 M. is accustomed to suffering, whereas Theonoe, if she rejects his appeal, will endure a bad reputation for the first time.

σὺ . . . φανῆι: the curt expression and fut. indicative (after potential ἄν εἶην) make the threat of disgrace seem even more vivid and pressing.

959–74 M. invokes Proteus (962–8) and Hades (969–74). Though very different powers (969–74n.), each is capable of persuading or compelling (cf. 973 ἀνάγκασον) Theonoe to decide in his favour. As Parker (2005) 366 n.167 observes, ‘Menelaus states that an appeal to a dead man, useless in itself, may prove useful in shaming a living relative of the dead man; and he is right (1009–16: but the living relative sees the dead man as retaining perception [cf. 1014n.]).’

959 ἄξι ἡμῶν: unlike formal supplication, M. considers his appeals to Proteus and Hades ‘worthy’ of himself (947–9n.).

960 ἀθάπεται (+ gen.) ‘will touch’ (cf. *Med.* 55 φρενῶν ἀθάπτεται). Like H. (920, 940–3), M. openly exploits Theonoe’s feelings for her dead father.

961 πεσῶν: while H. embraces Theonoe (it seems likely that ritual contact is broken only when her request has been granted, i.e. at 1029), M. falls at the tomb of Proteus, a powerful gesture intended to sway Theonoe as much as the spirit of her father (cf. 965).

962 τόνδε λίθινον τάφον ‘this tomb of stone’: for Proteus’ substantial stone monument, cf. 547n., 797–801.

964 ἦν Ζεὺς ἐπεμψε: cf. 44–8.

σώζειν ἐμοί: M. repeats the argument that Proteus was merely H.’s guardian, keeping his wife in trust for his return: cf. 910–11.

965 θανῶν (‘since you are dead’) explains why Proteus himself cannot give H. back, and so prepares for the burden being past to Theonoe in 966–8.

966 νέρθεν ἀνακαλούμενον ‘whom I call up from below’.

968 κακῶς ἀκοῦσαι: Theonoe will acknowledge concern for Proteus’ reputation as one of her main reasons for supporting H. and M. (999–1000, 1028–9).

κυρία γάρ ἐστι νῦν ‘for she now has the power’, i.e. to restore H. M. depicts Theonoe as the inheritor of her father’s obligation, and as possessing as much authority as her brother when it comes to preserving their father’s good name. So although Theonoe will break the bond with her brother, she will be doing what her father

would want her to do (as Theonoe says herself when explaining her decision: 1011–12, 1028–9). Thus Theonoe's behaviour does not subvert gender or familial hierarchies, since she behaves like a good Greek daughter, and as a foil to her autocratic brother: cf. *Introd.* §6(b).

**969–74** Unlike Proteus (and, by extension, Theonoe), Hades would appear to be under no obligation to M. as far as H. is concerned, but M. adduces an ingenious and macabre argument to prove that he is. In a variation on the common prayer technique of first reminding the deity how he or she has benefited from the petitioner (cf. e.g. 1097–8), M. claims that Hades has received 'payment' for H. (971 μισθόν δ' ἔχεις) in the form of the many men he has killed for her sake. The god is then urged either to give back the payment (i.e. resurrect the dead, a clear impossibility) or ensure that H. is returned.

**969** ὦ νέρτερ' Ἄϊδη: prayers to Hades, especially those that name the god directly, are rare in Greek literature: see Harder (1985) 86 on Eur. *Cresph.* fr. 448a.87–8 K; cf. Pulleyn (1997) 114 'If people felt that the name was too dreadful to speak, they might use the euphemism Πλούτων ("Pluto, the wealthy one") instead.' M. avoids euphemism and addresses the god directly in order to outline the consequences of their supposed transaction.

**971** τῶμῶι: crasis, τῶι ἐμῶι.

μισθόν: for the idea that Hades is 'made rich' by death, cf. Soph. *OT* 30 Ἄϊδης στεναγμοῖς καὶ γόοις πλουτίζεται (playing on the equation of Hades and Πλούτων).

**973–4** ἢ . . . γ' 'or compel this woman (Theonoe) at least (to give me back my wife)'.  
 ἐτ' . . . | . φανείσαν 'showing herself to be even greater than her pious father', i.e. in actually ensuring H.'s restoration.

**975–90** Raising himself to his feet (961n.), M. delivers a chilling threat: if H. is not returned to him, he will either fight Theoc. to the death or kill both H. and himself upon Proteus' tomb.

**975** εἰ . . . συλήσετε: 2nd pl. (referring to Theonoe/Proteus and Theoc.) and fut. (with εἰ, in a threatening future condition: Smyth §2328) of συλάω, 'I rob'.  
**976** ἃ . . . παρέλιπεν ἠδε τῶν λόγων 'what this woman (H.) left unsaid' (773–4n.).  
**977** ὄρκοις κεκλήμεθ: lit. 'we are closed in/barr'd by oaths'. The metaphor underlines the strength of their pact: cf. *IT* 788 (Pylades to Iphigenia) ὦ ραιδίους ὄρκοισι περιβαλοῦσά με.

ὡς μάθης: a parenthetic (and, in context, menacing) final clause, 'just so you know'.  
**978–9** πρῶτον: as a warrior M. naturally gives priority to the option that will result in glory or a heroic death. For the fifth-century Athenian civic ideology of the 'glorious death' in battle, see Michclakis (2002) 64–6.  
 ἐλθεῖν διὰ μάχης (+ dat.) 'to fight with' (cf. 843–4). The periphrasis διὰ + cognate noun + verb of motion = verb (so here = μάχεσθαι: cf. e.g. *Her.* 220 διὰ μάχης μολών) is an Attic idiom found frequently in tragedy (see further Barrett on *Hipp.* 542–4).

ἀπλοῦς λόγος 'it's as simple as that' (lit. 'simple is the speech/matter'), another idiomatic expression (cf. e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 554 ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος), marking M.'s tone of forthright defiance.

980 πόδ' ἀντιθῆι ποδί: such phrases, involving polyptota (173n.) of weapons and body parts, evoke the closeness of hoplite combat (e.g. *Il.* 13.130-3 φράξαντες δόρυ δουρί, σάκος σάκει προθελύμνω . . ., Tyrtaeus fr. 11.31-3 W καὶ πόδα παρ ποδί θείσ καὶ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος ἀσπίδ' ἐρείσας . . ., Eur. *Held.* 836-7 πούς ἐπαλλαχθεὶς ποδί, | ἀνήρ δ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ στάς; cf. Fowler (1987a) 24), and can be readily transferred (as here) to the hand-to-hand fighting of a duel.

981-7 The 'rules' of supplication could be manipulated or even ignored in real life (Thuc. 3.81.5 describes how suppliants were dragged from altars or killed upon them during the civil war in Corcyra in 427), and starvation (981 λιμῶι) was one of the methods used to force suppliants to leave their place of asylum; cf. Gould (1973) 78, 82-4. By the same token, however, suppliants themselves (in drama, at any rate) might seek to manipulate their 'hosts', as when the daughters of Danaus, like M. and H. here, threaten suicide if their supplication is not accepted (Aesch. *Supp.* 455-67).

981 θηρᾶι: for Theoc. the 'hunter', cf. 50-1n.

ἰκετεύοντε νῶ: dual acc. pl. of pres. participle and first person personal pronoun (ἐγώ), 'as we supplicate (at the tomb)'.

982 δέδοκται: the perfect is more decisive and emphatic than the aor. ἔδοξε: their decision is final. For the suicide pact, see 835-42, with 835n.

983 πρὸς ἦπαρ ὤσαι: for suicide by a sword-thrust to the liver, cf. e.g. Soph. *Trach.* 931, *Ant.* 1315, Eur. *Or.* 1063; [209-302n.].

δίστομον 'double-edged': cf. Eur. *El.* 164 ξίφεσι . . . ἀμφιτόμοις ('cutting on both sides').

984-5 τύμβου 'πὶ νῶτοις: cf. 842.

ἴν . . . καταστάζωσι 'so that streams of blood will drip down upon the grave.' The pollution of death *per se* is magnified, firstly by H. and M.'s status as suppliants, and secondly by their threat to kill themselves upon the grave of Proteus, a sacred site (cf. Parker (1983) 65-6, 185). The daughters of Danaus similarly threaten to hang themselves from the statues of the gods in Argos (981-7n.), and Orestes recalls how he once threatened Apollo's Delphic sanctuary with pollution by starving himself there (*IT* 973-5).

985-6 κεισόμεσθα . . . | νεκρῶ δύ: H. and M. will lie together in death at least: cf. 988-90, *Alc.* 363-8 (Admetus plans to be buried with Alcestis).

τῶιδ' ἐπὶ ξεστῶι τάφωι 'upon this grave of hewn stone': 547n.

987 ἄλγος . . . ψόγον: acc. in apposition (cf. Diggle (1994) 191-3, 223-4 for a defence of his conjecture). The corpses of M. and H. will be a source of 'reproach' as well as pollution, since Proteus will have failed to protect them.

988-90 Cf. 834n.

989 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σφ' ἀπάξομαι: the middle voice expresses M.'s personal interest in recovering his wife (Smyth §1714), 'I shall take her (who belongs to me) away (for myself)'.

990 εἰ μή . . . ἀλλὰ 'if not . . . then at least . . .': *GP* 12.

991–5 are deleted in the OCT (following Schenkl), yet they provide an effective conclusion to M.'s speech. Overcome by the image of H.'s death (990 πρὸς νεκρούς). M. is moved to weep, but restrains himself (991 τί ταῦτα); then, urging himself to be a 'man of action' (992 δραστήριος), he orders Theonoe to kill them if she will (993), followed by (as Jackson (1955) 37 puts it) 'the typical relapse into the better part of valour: "or preferably listen to reason".'

991–2 τί ταῦτα; breaks off a line of thought or action. Dale (ad loc.) and Stevens (1976) 31 translate it here as 'What sort of talk is this?', but M. is not repudiating what he has just said. On the contrary, his threat has moved him to tears and he breaks off the emotion, 'What is this (good for)?'

δακρῦσις . . . | . δραστήριος 'if I turned womanish and wept, I'd be pitiful rather than active'. M. reaffirms his 'manly' restraint: 950–3n. Tragic women are more prone than men to weeping and 'exaggerated emotionality' (McClure (1995) 59), reflecting Greek (male-generated) views of women's 'natural' inability to resist their emotions (cf. Dover (1974) 101).

ἦν (probably never used by Aesch. or Soph.) is the contemporary form of the older Attic 1st pers. sg. ἦ (scribes commonly replaced the older form with the newer one in the manuscripts: cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 700). Editors have often attempted to emend (or delete) the six passages where ἦν is required by the metre (*Alc.* 655, *Hipp.* 1012, *Her.* 1416, *Ion* 280, *Hel.* 992, *LA* 944), but as Stevens comments (on *Andr.* 59), 'there seems little justification for removing it from Eur., who in some other respects is nearer than Aesch. or Soph. to Aristophanes and the spoken language of his day.' The presence of ἦν is therefore not sufficient in itself to mark a passage as spurious.

993 δυσκλεῆς 'people of bad repute' (cf. 270, 1001) seems better than L's δυσκλεῶς, since the adverb would have to be taken with the implied object ('so as to give (us) a bad reputation'), which seems rather strained.

995 ἴν' ἦις δικαία: cf. 919–23, 947–95nn.

996–7 The Chorus-leader's introduction to Theonoe's speech (cf. 944–6n.) emphasizes her role as 'judge' (βραβεύειν / κρῖνον) between the Greeks and her brother (cf. 894–1029n.).

ἐν σοί '(it is) in your power'.

βραβεύειν: the verb ('to act as judge') is found in extant Greek poetry only here and at 1073; cf. 703n.

#### 998–1029 *Theonoe agrees to support Helen and Menelaus*

Theonoe's reply shows that she has taken the arguments of H. and M. very much to heart. The first part of her speech (998–1016), which sets out her reasons for helping them, foregrounds her piety and sense of justice, along with her concern to safeguard her own and her dead father's reputation for these qualities (894–943, 947–95nn.). In the second part (1017–29) she outlines the nature of her assistance (she will not help them find a way to escape, but will, as requested, keep M.'s arrival secret from

her brother), and finally urges both H. and M. to pray for divine support. Theonoe's speech is remarkable both for its emphasis on internal moral standards (esp. 1002–4n.) and for its view of the mind's posthumous fate (1013–16n.).

**998** πέφυκα . . . και βούλομαι 'it is in my nature and I want (to be pious)'.

**999** φιλῶ τ' ἑμαυτήν: although love of self can sometimes lead to selfishness (cf. *Med.* 85–6), Theonoe's actions are clearly to be seen as commendable. In context the phrase looks back to Theonoe's internal moral sense (998 πέφυκα . . .) and forward to her concern for reputation (999–1001). As Cairns (1993) 282 observes, '[although] it seems equally possible that the enlightened *philautia* to which Theonoe refers should refer *either* to the self-respect which renders one true to one's own principles *or* to the impulse towards self-protection against the criticisms of others (my italics) . . . the passage (is) a clear demonstration of the compatibility in the Greek moral outlook of self-regarding and other-regarding motives.'

**1000** μιάναιμι: aor. opt. of μιαίνω, 'I defile, stain, pollute', a powerful word indicative of Theonoe's respect for her father's *kleos* and of her desire to maintain his standards (942–3n.).

χάρις: cf. 902n.

**1002–4** ἔνεστι . . . | . φύσει 'There is a great temple of Dike in my nature.' The deification of Justice as the goddess Dike, daughter of Zeus and Themis, was an inheritance from archaic Greek thought, which freely deified abstract powers (cf. esp. Hes. *WD* 213–85: Dike trounces Hybris). Although Dike does not seem to have been worshipped in fifth-century Athenian cult (for the worship of 'personifications' in Attica, see Parker (1996) 235–6), she often features in poetry (especially tragedy) as both a symbol of cosmic order and an enforcer of Zeus's will (see Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 645–8, adding Soph. *OC* 1381–2, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 875–6), and even appeared as a character in an unknown play of Aeschylus (fr. 281a R). Theonoe's 'great temple of Dike' also recalls the 'altar of Dike' invoked at Aesch. *Ag.* 381–4 and *Eum.* 539–43. Thus the metaphor of Dike's temple is thoroughly based in traditional thought, yet its application to an *internal* mental state is unusual (Ronnef (1979) 256 speaks in modern terms of Theonoe's 'conscience' intervening) and calls attention not only to Theonoe's process of moral deliberation (a characteristic interest of Eur.: cf. esp. *Med.* 1078–80, *Hipp.* 380–404) but also to the contrasting insouciance and selfishness of the gods.

Νηρέως πάρα: Nereus is traditionally associated with justice as well as prophecy (13–15n.). His introduction here adds to the pressure on Theonoe to live up to her ancestors, since she is already determined to protect her father's reputation for justice (cf. 920, 940–1, 1047–9).

**1005–8** Theonoe relates her decision to the plans of the rival goddesses. Foreseeing Aphrodite's anger, she seeks to propitiate her.

**1005** βούλεται σ' εὐεργετεῖν: for Hera's change of mind, and her motives, see 880–6n.

**1006** ἡ Κύπρις: Aphrodite is asked to overlook Theonoe's decision against her. L's Χάρις here is an obvious corruption: Aphrodite's association with the Charites

(Graces) was well known (c.g. *Il.* 5.338), and is presumably the cause of the confusion here. Charis appears as Hephaestus' wife in the *Iliad* (18.382), a role taken elsewhere in epic by Aphrodite. But this merely shows that the *Iliad* poet chose to use a different version, not that Charis stands for Aphrodite. A fifth-century Athenian audience would understand ἡ Χάρις as a reference to one of the Graces; the metonymy of Χάρις = Aphrodite is unparalleled.

1007–8 ἴλεως 'gracious, kindly' (scanned here as two long syllables, by synizesis).

συμβέβηκε δ' οὐδαμοῦ 'though she does not suit me at all' (lit. 'has nowhere agreed with me': 36–7n.), expanded in the following line.

παρθένος μένειν αἰεὶ: in favouring Hera over Aphrodite, Theonoe, who has already chosen maidenhood instead of marriage, once again sets herself apart from the goddess of sexuality. She is therefore anxious not to appear biased (contrast Hippolytus' abnormal sense of purity and his open rejection of Aphrodite: *Hipp.* 102–113), and her remark 'I shall try to remain a virgin forever' (cf. H.'s honorific address, ὦ παρθέν' 894, 939) points to the (in Theonoe's opinion) positive religious aspects of her virginity (12n.). In addition, Theonoe takes great care to explain that her decision was reached in accordance with justice and piety: 1002–4, 1010–11, 1021, 1028–9. It is important to note that from a Greek point of view Theonoe's determination to remain a virgin forever is a highly unusual choice. For although certain religious positions required the holder to remain chaste while in office (cf. Fehrle (1910) 54–64), there is very little evidence (and none in Athens) for a priest(ess) or prophet(ess) being a virgin for life: see Parker (1983) 86–94. Badham's deletion of 1008 should therefore be resisted. The sentiment is appropriate to Theonoe, and the repetition of πειράσομαι (1004 ~ 1008) reaffirms her resolution to do what she thinks right.

1009–12 Theonoe further validates her support by identifying herself with Proteus.

ἄ . . . | ἡμῖν δὲ αὐτὸς μῦθος: the opening relative clause stands in an acc. of respect relationship to the main clause, 'as far as concerns the reproaches you made at the tomb of my father here, my view is the same.'

κεῖνος βλέπων 'if that man (i.e. Proteus) were alive, (he would . . .)'. ἄν gravitates towards the start of the sentence or next to the verb, but often (as here) both features combine and ἄν is used twice (see Barrett on *Hipp.* 270).

σοὶ τῆνδ' ἔχειν, ταύτηι δὲ σέ: the chiasmus (her to you, you to her) stresses the fairness of reuniting both partners.

1013–16 'Indeed, retribution for these matters (i.e. the neglect of such moral duties as returning what is owed to a person) comes to all people, both the dead below and those above. For when people die, their mind does not live on, but it retains an immortal consciousness once it has merged with the immortal aether.' These lines have been deleted by many editors, yet they present a coherent, if highly idiosyncratic, view of mind and the afterlife, and are relevant to Theonoe's argument, explaining how both she and her dead father are affected by the treatment of H. and M. (to call them 'eschatological mumbo jumbo' (Sansone (1985) 27) seems rather harsh). Archaic and classical sources attest a wide range of views about the afterlife (Bremmer (2002)), but Theonoe's focus on the mind (νοῦς) and its posthumous consciousness (γνώμη)

amidst the aether – significantly, she does not speak of ψυχή or the punishment of sinners in the Underworld – evokes contemporary philosophical debates. As in 865–72, Eur. presents Theonoe as distinctive and exotic by adapting Greek ideas rather than by trying to mimic specifically Egyptian ones. Air and aether were central to the cosmologies of many philosophers, especially those of Anaximenes (DK 13 A5, B2), Empedocles (DK 31 B38, 100, 109), and Diogenes of Apollonia (DK 64 B5), while Anaxagoras had developed a system in which mind (νοῦς) was capable of controlling all matter in the universe (DK 59 B12; for criticism, cf. Pl. *Phaedo* 97c–99b). Eur. draws on such ideas here, but does so quite freely, since he is not attempting to promulgate a coherent system of beliefs, but rather seeking to portray Theonoe as a reflective character, for whom justice has a secure foundation. (The complex intellectual background to Theonoe's conception of the mind and consciousness is well discussed by Egli (2003) 104–10.)

1013 τίσις: the precise nature of the afterlife was (perhaps not surprisingly) disputed (cf. Heraclitus DK 22 B27 'When people die things await them that they do not expect or even imagine'), but the idea of *post mortem* punishment of sins is widely attested: cf. e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 227–31, *Eum.* 269–72, Ar. *Frogs* 145–50, Pl. *Rep.* 330d–e; see Dover (1974) 261–8.

1014 ὁ νοῦς: what Theonoe here says of the mind – that it is (at least in part) immortal and that it returns to the aether after death – are qualities more commonly attributed to the soul (ψυχή) or spirit (πνεῦμα): cf. Eur. *Supp.* 531–6 (after death the body returns to the earth, the spirit to the aether), an idea also found in contemporary grave inscriptions (Lattimore (1942) 26–31, Parker (2005) 366); also *Supp.* 1139–40, *Or.* 1086–7, *Erechtheus* fr. 370.71–72 K. Herodotus says the Egyptians were the first to argue that the soul was immortal (2.123), but the idea is deeply embedded in Greek thought. In any case, Theonoe's focus on mind (νοῦς) and its eternal existence in the aether is clearly related to current debates among Greek philosophers (1013–16n.); as at *Tro.* 884–7, where Hecuba prays to Zeus as a controlling power identifiable with εἴτ' ἀνάγκη φύσεος εἴτε νοῦς βροτῶν, Eur. is using contemporary language to express conventional ideas in a striking form, whether they concern the supreme power of Zeus or (as here) popular belief in a (potentially unhappy) afterlife.

1015–16 γνώμην . . . ἀθάνατον: though the mind no longer 'lives' (because the body in which it operated is dead), it retains some form of personal consciousness (a unique use of γνώμη; cf. 757, 1687), and so can be aware of past misdeeds and punished accordingly. For popular beliefs about the feelings or perceptions of the dead, see Dover (1974) 243–6.

εἰς ἀθάνατον αἰθέρ' ἐμπροσθόν: as well as being a fundamental element in some contemporary cosmologies (1013–16n.), the aether was also treated as a god in its own right: see Dover on Ar. *Clouds* 570, where the Clouds address their father Αἰθέρα σεμνότατον, βιοθρέμμονα πάντων. Aristophanes mocked Euripides' frequent references to aether (*Thesm.* 14–15, *Frogs* 892, etc.; cf. Bond on *Her.* 510); its use in *Helen* is particularly varied: 584n., 605–6, 865–7, 1219.

1017 ὡς οὖν περαινῶ μὴ μακράν 'to keep my speech brief'.

σιγήσομαι: repeated in 1023, outlining the extent of Theonoe's assistance (cf. 1387-9). Theonoe's agreement does not, however, mean (*pace* Matthiessen (1968) 695) that the decision of the gods is no longer in doubt. Theonoe may have devoted herself to what is just (1002-4), but this does not guarantee that the gods will do the same: Aphrodite could still ruin the escape, hence the need to pray to her (1025). Theonoe's promise of silence parallels that sworn to by the conspiratorial Chorus (1385-9n.).

1018 μωρία: for Eur.'s use of μῶρος to denote 'culpable lack of intelligence' with regard to 'sexual intemperance', see Barrett on *Hipp.* 642-4.

1020-1 οὐ δοκοῦσ' ὄμωσ: lit. 'though I seem not to', i.e. though he might not think that I am doing him any good.

ἐκ δυσσεβείας ὄσιον: cf. 900-1, 972-4, 998, 1032.

1022-3 H. and M. must rely on their own ingenuity and intelligence in order to escape: cf. 755-7n., 813, 1033-4, 1049.

ἀποστᾶσ' ἐκποδῶν: 'standing out of the way'.

1024-7 Theonoe urges them to pray for divine support: H. appeals to Hera and Aphrodite before entering the palace (1093-1106), while M. later prays to Zeus as they leave for the shore (1441-50).

χίκετεύετε: crasis, καὶ ἴκετεύετε.

τὴν ἔννοιαν. |. . σωτηρίας 'her intention of (providing) safety'.

ἐν ταύτῳ: crasis, τῷ αὐτῷ, '(remain) in the same place'.

1028-9 Theonoe ends as she began (cf. 998-1000), with her overriding concern for piety and her father's reputation (894-943, 947-95nn.). Her address to Proteus in his tomb answers that of M. (962-8).

1030-1 As Theonoe returns to the palace (cf. 858-60), the Chorus-leader comments on the advantages of justice.

γεγώς (epic γεγασώς) is a poetic alternative to prose γεγονώς (perf. part. of γίνομαι), in the sense 'having proved to be'.

ἐλπιδες σωτηρίας: instances of the key-word σωτηρία cluster here (1027, 1034, 1055; cf. 1032 σεσώμεθα, 1047, 1060, etc.) as the escape plot gets fully under way.

#### 1032-1106 Helen develops an escape plan

Having secured Theonoe's assistance, H. and M. turn their attention to the details of the planning. When M.'s suggestions prove impossible, H. takes charge with her superior intellect and inventiveness (1049n.). The escape plan involves a feigned ritual at sea, as in the *IT*, where Iphigenia pretends to cleanse the matricide Orestes, his accomplice Pylades, and the statue of Artemis (which they have polluted) by washing them in the sea (*IT* 1029-49, 1157-1233). H. is to bury the shipwrecked M. at sea by giving him his last rites in an 'empty grave' (1057). The scene develops in animated distichomythia (cf. 553-96n.) as H. outlines her strategy in response to M.'s questions. After final instructions to M. and prayers to Hera and Aphrodite (1085-1106), H. goes into the palace to begin the deception of Theoc.

**1032-4** H. invites M. to suggest a plan that will save them both. The stress on σέ (1033) underlines M.'s inability to suggest anything practicable and prepares for H.'s emergence as the better plotter (1035-48, 1049nn.). Both Diggle and Kovacs accept Jackson's emendation of 1033 (τοῦνθένδε δ' εἰς ἔν τοὺς λόγους φέροντε χρῆ: cf. Jackson (1955) 154-5), announcing the need for joint planning, but the emphasis on M.'s failure is ἀπρ. λόγους φέρειν without a compound (εἰσ-, προσφέρειν) or prepositional phrase such as εἰς μέσον (cf. *Tro.* 54) is unusual, but that it here means 'contribute a plan' and not 'bring a message' is quite clear from the context.

πρὸς . . . παρθένου 'as far as the maiden is concerned' (1007-8n.).

**1035-84** Distichomythia is relatively rare in Eur., though the late plays feature passages that are longer than those of Aesch. and Soph. (*Or.* 217-54, 1022-57, *Bacch.* 935-62, *IA* 819-54). It is even more formal than stichomythia; here it marks the significant moment of the escape plot's invention.

**1035-48** M.'s suggestions (escape by chariot, killing Theoc.) are immediately rejected. The resulting impasse makes H.'s plan appear all the more impressive. The sequence 'escape from Egypt / or kill Theoc. / despair requiring μηχανή' was used before the Theonoe scene at 805-13. As with H.'s superior intelligence (1049n.), there is epic precedent for M.'s lack of it: cf. *Od.* 4.589-619, where M.'s offer of a gift of horses and chariot (unsuitable for rocky Ithaca) is tactfully declined by Telemachus.

**1035-6** For ἄκουε δὴ νῦν as a 'favourite Euripidean formula' (δὴ νῦν making the command more urgent), see *GP* 218.

συντέθρασαι: 2nd sg. perf. pass. of συντρέφω, 'you have grown familiar with Theoc.'s servants'.

**1038** τι . . . χρηστὸν εἰς κοινόν 'some good to us both'.

νῶιν: cf. 832n. In 1040 and 1055 it is dative.

**1039-40** οἴτινες . . . ἀνάσσουσ': ἀνάσσειν may originally have meant simply 'to control' (cf. Scaford on Eur. *Cycl.* 86) but its later sense ('to be lord of') led to its metaphorical use in classical poetry, as with the noun ἄναξ: cf. 1610-11 οἰάκων . . . | ἄνακτ' ('helmsman'). In a discussion of the orator's use of metaphor (*Rhet.* 405a 28-30) Aristotle criticizes such phrases (quoting κώπης ἀνάσσειν, 'ruling over the oar', from Eur. *Telephus* fr. 705 K) as 'inappropriate, because the word "ruling" is more dignified than the subject warrants, so that the artifice is no longer hidden', but poetry differs from prose, and such metaphors are part of the elevated *Kunstsprache* of tragedy (and are parodied in turn by Aristophanes: e.g. *Lys.* 706 ἀνασσα πράγους τοῦδε καὶ βουλευματος).

**1041-2** M. has neglected to consider that they have no idea how to escape by land through Egypt. The suggestion also ignores M.'s surviving companions, whose welfare he earlier thought important: 428-33, 737-43.

πέισαιμι <ἄν>: 828n.

**1043-6** M. proposes killing Theoc., though the idea was rejected as 'impossible' at 809-11. Schwinge (1968) 127 n. 34 defends the repetition as 'reasonable' on the grounds that Theonoe has now agreed to help them, but her speech made clear both the extent of her assistance and her concern for her brother (1017-23). That M. is

prone to think of violence is not in itself surprising behaviour from a warrior-chieftain (810n.), but in context the repetition seems intended to characterize him as rather slow-witted (cf. 1049n.).

1043–4 ἀδύνατον εἶπας: see 802–14n.

τι δ' εἶ: the ellipse (832n.) conveys M.'s animation as he searches for another idea.

διστόμωι: as Dover (1997) 98 n. 8 points out, the adj. is not meaningless, 'for it imparts an awareness of the fierce efficiency of the sword used against a man attacked from ambush . . . Similarly in *Hel.* 983 the adjective helps to convey the pathos of pain and death.'

1047–8 M. finally, and despairingly, realizes that a ship is essential to their escape. By contrast, H. integrates it into her plan from the start (1061–2).

ἀλλ' . . . ἐστίν 'and besides we do not even have a ship'. For ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὴν introducing a new argument, see *GP* 345.ii; compare the use of καὶ μὴν at 1053, 1071, and 1079, marking separate stages in the development of the plan.

ἦν . . . θάλασσαν ἔχει: for the wreck of M.'s ship, cf. 408–13.

1049 As in Eur.'s other surviving recognition and intrigue plays, it is the woman who takes control of the situation (cf. *El.* 647–67, *Ion* 985–1038, *IT* 1029–81). Both Iphigenia and H. take the leading role in the escape, and their ingenuity and cleverness are clearly to be admired. By contrast, M. and Orestes are scarcely able to think beyond killing the king (*IT* 1020–3). M.'s belligerence is out of place and he cannot cope with the challenge facing him in Egypt. H. prevails, however, through her own no less heroic (Odyssean) resourcefulness (cf. 816n.). Such *dolos* is (in Greek gender ideology) typically female (since women can rarely rely on brute force, as men often do), but it is not necessarily a negative quality; context is crucial, and since the audience are meant to support H.'s plans, her emergence here as (like Penelope) a positive *dolos* figure represents an ingenious reworking of traditional epic motifs. Moreover, it would be misleading to see H.'s intellectual superiority to M. as posing a serious challenge to fifth-century norms which asserted that women were intellectually inferior to men (cf. Dover (1974) 99), since not only is M. a Spartan autocrat (and so no model for an Athenian male citizen), but H. herself is motivated by loyalty to M. and the re-establishment of their *oikos*: see *Introd.* §6(b).

ἀκουσον: it is now M.'s turn to listen (cf. 1035).

ἦν . . . σοφόν 'in case even a woman can say something clever.' H.'s tentativeness is in the circumstances deeply ironic.

1050–6 Having suffered the consequences of a divine illusion for many years, H. now turns the deceptiveness of appearances to her and M.'s advantage. Her trick is similar to that of Orestes: like M. in H.'s plan, Orestes feigned his own death in order to outwit his enemies (Aesch. *Cho.* 674–718, Soph. *El.* 53–66, 1442–80). Indeed, the parallels with Sophocles (his Orestes speaks of dying λόγῳι and of the κέρδος that justifies deception: *El.* 59–61: cf. *Hel.* 1050–2) led Dale (on *Hel.* 1050ff.) to suggest that Sophocles' *Electra* had been produced shortly before *Helen*, probably in 413. This is possible, but not certain (Ringer (1998) 141–2, for example, sees the influence working the other way). In any case, the trick dates back to Aesch. (and is probably much

older: cf. 1055–6n.), while the motif of exploiting one's misfortunes (real or feigned) for profit is also found in the *IT* (1034) with reference to Orestes' matricide. The audience may have recalled Orestes' scheme of a fake death, but need not have done so, since the details of H.'s (more elaborate) plan are sufficient to establish her status as a formidable figure in her own right.

1050–2 μή θανῶν λόγῳ θανεῖν: the repetition of these words in M.'s reply is deliberate, emphasizing his dependence on H.'s new plan, despite his inability (as 1055–6 show) to grasp its full meaning.

κακὸς . . . ὄρνις: the mention of death is a 'bad omen', but justified by the 'gain' involved; cf. Soph. *El.* 59–61. (For methods used to defuse ill-omened words, see Parker (1983) 219).

1053–4 Unlike Sophocles' *Electra*, H. is fully aware that the death of her closest *philos* is bogus (indeed, she is its instigator), so that her grief will be feigned (cf. *El.* 1126–70). Thus, whereas the fiction of Orestes' death generates massive sympathy for *Electra* (even though, or rather, precisely because the audience can see Orestes standing at her side as she laments), that of M.'s death is a relatively benign illusion geared towards the excitement and ironies of Theoc.'s deception.

γυναικεῖσις . . . | κουραῖσις: for the shorn hair of female mourners, cf. 368–9n.

πρὸς τὸν ἀνόσιον 'before the impious man', stressing that Theoc.'s conduct justifies the fake rituals of grief.

1055–6 M. cannot grasp how H.'s story could provide a 'remedy for our safety' (σωτηρίας . . . ἄκος), since, so he claims, 'it seems rather old' (παλαιότης . . . τις). Dale sees here a humorous response to Sophocles' *Electra*, calling it a 'mischievous interpolation' on Eur.'s part, implying 'The idea isn't a very original one.' Objecting, however, to the idea that M. could make a seemingly extra-dramatic comment of this kind, some editors emend the text. Kovacs (2003) 44–5, for example, endorses Cobet's ματαιότης ('Your story seems a bit pointless'). Yet there is no need to emend, since M.'s comment is one of several tragic passages which allude to earlier dramatizations, often to emphasize (among other things) the originality of the new version (cf. Cropp on Eur. *El.* 487–584, Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 751–2). Like several other passages in tragedy, M.'s comment has been discussed in terms of 'metatheatre': e.g. Segal (1997) 370, Lada-Richards (2002) 399–400. However, the term is best avoided (cf. Rosenmeyer (2002) 107) since Eur. is not making any self-conscious reference to theatre *per se*, but rather alluding intertextually to previous versions of the feigned death plot, which is an entirely traditional mode of drawing attention to one's skill as a poet or shaper of myth. So there is intertextual allusion here, but it is not (*pace* Dale) limited to Sophocles' *Electra*. For in that play Orestes himself remarks, 'I have *often in the past* seen clever men falsely reported dead; and then when they return home they are honoured all the more' (62–4, my italics). Nor is it likely that Sophocles (if his play was produced before *Helen*) is thinking simply of Aesch. *Cho.*, since the story pattern will have been known before that (the *Odyssey* exploits it, though Odysseus does not himself spread the rumour of his death). In any case, Eur. had used the plot of a hero spreading such a report in his *Cresphontes*, which was produced before 424 (Harder (1985) 3–4), so there

is no need to see here a specific reference to Sophocles (cf. Michelini (1987) 335–6). But granted that Eur. is exploiting the motif's intertextual history, what is its meaning here? What does it reveal about M. and his abilities as a planner? Aeschylus' Orestes makes no apology for using deceit, while Sophocles' points to the scheme's previous success in order to overcome his uneasiness (cf. *El.* 61 'I think that no word that brings profit is bad'). In both cases, however, the scheme worked, so that by criticizing it as 'rather old' (with an additional hint of 'stupid' or 'simple-minded': cf. *OT* 290 καὶ μὴν τὰ γ' ἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ παλαί' ἔπη), M. is characterized as unimaginative and dejected. Moreover, his scepticism highlights the originality of Eur.'s version of the 'reported death' plot, as well as the cleverness and complexity of H.'s plan.

**1057** ὡς δὴ θανόντα σ' ἐνάλιον 'on the ground that / with the plea that you died at sea': unlike Orestes or Cresphontes, for example, but an essential detail of H.'s plan, as her subsequent replies show.

**1059–60** καὶ δὴ παρεῖκεν 'granted then, he agrees'. For this sense of καὶ δὴ, cf. *Med.* 386, *Hipp.* 1007, *GP* 253.v 'denoting imaginary realization, "suppose that so-and-so happens"'.  
**ἀνευ νεώς:** 1047–8n.

**κενοταφοῦντ(ε):** nom. pl. dual pres. part.

**1061–6** H. will exploit Theoc.'s ignorance of Greek custom (cf. 1065 νομιζεῖν, 1246) in order to motivate a shipboard ceremony (1239–1300). Since one could perform proper burial rites, and would do so on land, only for those whose bodies had been recovered from the sea (for the importance of doing so, cf. Pl. *Apol.* 32b), H.'s plan for a burial there will appear particularly anomalous from a Greek perspective (which, it turns out, is one also shared by Theoc. himself: 1240, 1244–8nn.). Burial of one's enemies might be prevented by throwing them into the sea, but this was an exceptional form of revenge: cf. Parker (1983) 45 n. 47.

**1062** κόσμον τάφωι σῶι: the gifts offered to the dead would be appropriate to the deceased's status and gender (cf. 1253). As a royal warrior, M. receives expensive bronze armour (1263–4), an item also conducive to the escape plan (1255–78n.). For κόσμος and κοσμέω used of M.'s 'grave' goods, cf. 1068, 1279, 1414.

**πελαγίους ἐς ἀγκάλας** 'into the sea's embrace': a poetic metaphor (cf. 1436, Aesch. *Cho.* 587, Eur. *Or.* 1387 (of Ocean encircling the sea with his arms)), first found in Archilochus fr. 213 W κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις (quoted at Ar. *Frogs* 704); also applied to the rock that 'embraces' Prometheus ([Aesch.] *PV* 1019). The personification of the sea in this way may have begun as a way of mitigating the awfulness of such a death (1061–6n.).

**1063–4** M.'s objection is plausible (cenotaphs were in fact built for those who had been lost at sea: cf. Lattimore (1942) 199–202), but H. has thought of a way around it.

**οὐδὲν . . . φέρει** 'the pretext (of burial at sea, to get a ship) accomplishes nothing'.

**1065–6** H.'s inventive explanation raises the issue of Theoc.'s reaction: will he actually care about the Greeks' religious customs? The uncertainty of the situation will lead H. to supplicate him, itself another Greek religious custom (1237–49): for the (allegedly surprising) 'Greekness' of Eur.'s 'barbarians', see *Introd.* §6(c).

1067–8 τοῦτ' αὐ κατορθοῖς 'you have solved this (problem) too.'

ταύτῳι: *crasis*, τῳι αὐτῳι, '(in) the same (ship)'.

1069–70 H. realizes that M.'s men will be necessary to secure control of the ship (cf. 1537–1612).

οἴπερ . . . ναυαγίας: cf. 426–7, 539, 737–43.

1072 ἀνὴρ παρ' ἀνδρα: as in battle formation: cf. 980n., 1574. M. reassures H. that his men will be prepared.

1073–4 σὲ χρῆ βραβεύειν πάντα 'you must take complete control' (cf. 996–7n.): H. entrusts M. with the fighting, but her instructions confirm his dependence on her as the deviser of their escape (1049n.).

πόμπιμοι . . . νεῶς 'may the winds now blow favourably in our sail and the ship run on!' Compare the Chorus' prayer to the Dioscuri once the voyage is underway (1504–5).

1075–6 ἔσται . . . μου: M.'s optimism about the gods is soon complicated by H.'s account of Aphrodite's cruelty (1097–1106): cf. 876–86.

ἀτὰρ . . . πεπυσμένη 'but from whom will you say you heard about my death?' ἀτὰρ expresses a sudden change of topic (*GP* 52), while the interrogative τοῦ (= τίνος) goes with πεπυσμένη, perf. part. instead of the infinitive (πεπύσθαι): cf. 537 ἐπεὶ νιν εἶπέ μοι σεσωμένον, Goodwin §910 'Some verbs which regularly have the infinitive or ὅτι and ὡς in indirect discourse occasionally take the participle.' Schwinge (1968) 128–9 exaggerates M.'s importance here when he says that his question 'modifies' H.'s 'faulty' plan. In fact, H. has already thought of making M. the reporter of his own death, as is shown by her decisive reply (1077–8).

1078 Ἀτρέως . . . σὺν παιδί: cf. 390–2.

1079–82 M.'s ragged appearance will support H.'s account of the shipwreck, which will in turn transform the rags from a shameful marker of M.'s loss of status (421–4n.) into a useful *costume* geared to the deception of Theoc. (cf. 1204).

καὶ μῆν: cf. 1053, 'and then indeed . . .'.

τάδ' . . . ῥάκη 'these rags cast around my body': cf. Eur. *Telephus* fr. 697 K (Telephus on his disguise) πτώχ' ἀμφίβλητα σώματος λαβῶν ῥάκη.

ξυμάρτυρες . . . ἐρειπίων '(will) confirm your story of the shipwreck.'

ἐς καιρὸν . . . ἄκαιρ' 'It (i.e. the loss of your clothes) has turned out to be advantageous, although at the time the loss was harmful' (trans. Race (1981) 206 n. 23). καιρός is a remarkably polysemous word: temporal senses (esp. 'appropriate or opportune time') predominate, but these shade easily into 'advantage' or 'profit' (as here); for a comprehensive study of καιρός, see Trédé (1992).

τότε: i.e. at the time of the shipwreck.

1083–4 Once again M.'s question acknowledges that H. is firmly in charge of the plan (1049, 1050–6nn.).

1085–6 M. is to take up H.'s former position at the tomb of Proteus. Thus, dressed only in rags, M. remains visible on stage during the following choral ode on the senselessness of war (1151–64n.). He does not speak again until 1251, as H. takes the lead in the deception of Theoc. (1193ff.).

τι πλημμελές ‘anything outrageous’, a veiled reference to Theoc.’s plan to put to death any Greek who comes to his palace (439–40, 443–4, 479–80); cf. *Med.* 306 (Medea to Creon) σὺ δ’ οὖν φοβῆι με· μὴ τί πλημμελές πάθῃς;

τάφος . . . ἄν ῥύσαιτο: 800–1n.; cf. also Goodwin §505 on the optative with ἄν as ‘merely a softened expression for the future indicative’.

φάσγανόν τε σόν: for M.’s willingness to fight to the death, cf. 843–54, 978–9.

**1087–9** Ατ 1184 H. re-enters from the palace dressed in black mourning clothes, her hair cropped (368–9n.) and cheeks torn.

βοστρύχους τεμῶ: for ‘Helen of the beautiful locks’, cf. Pind *Ol.* 3.1. Unlike the H. of *Orestes* (128–9), here she does not hesitate to spoil her looks (262–3n.).

πέπλων . . . ἀνταλλάξομαι: Death himself is ‘black-robed’ (*Alc.* 823–4 ἀνακτα τὸν μελάμπεπλον νεκρῶν | Θάνατον).

παρῆιδι . . . χροός ‘and I shall force my nail into my cheek, bloodying the skin’: banned from fifth-century funerals in Athens, this female gesture of mourning underlines the extremity of suffering and grief depicted in tragedy (see 372–4n.). The cheeks, along with the hair and skin, are traditional points of reference for female beauty (compare the Homeric epithet καλλιπάρης, applied to H. at *Od.* 15.123).

**1090–2** H.’s stark presentation of the potential (and utterly divergent) outcomes of the plot heightens the tension of the intrigue scenes that follow (cf. Eur. *El.* 690–2, *IT* 1056–74).

μέγας γὰρ ἀγών (= ὁ ἀγών) ‘a lot is at stake’: a colloquial expression (absent from Aesch. and Soph.); cf. Mastroianni on *Phoen.* 860.

δύο ῥοπᾶς ‘two possibilities’, lit. ‘two ways the scale could tip’; compare the Homeric scales of Zeus, in which the fates of mortals are weighed (*Il.* 8.68–74, 16.658, 19.223–4, 22.209–13), Hippolytus’ demise (Ἰππόλυτος οὐκέτ’ ἔστιν, ὡς εἶπεῖν ἔπος· | δέδορκε μέντοι φῶς ἐπὶ σμικρᾶς ῥοπῆς, *Hipp.* 1162–3), or Oedipus on his imminent death: ῥοπή βίου μοι (*OC* 1508).

**1093–1106** With the escape plan ready to begin, H. follows Theonoe’s advice (1024–7) and prays to Hera and Aphrodite (cf. 1441–50n.). The consultation scenes of Eur.’s intrigue plays regularly close with characters or Chorus praying to the gods to support their plan: *El.* 671–83, *Ion* 1048–60, *IT* 1082–8 (cf. Soph. *El.* 1376–83). H.’s invocations are tailored to the very different attitudes of the two goddesses (as revealed by Theonoe: 880–6): Hera, already well-disposed to H. and M.’s escape (cf. 1026–7), albeit for her own selfish reasons (880–6n.), is briefly urged to relieve their suffering (1093–6); Aphrodite, on the other hand, is rebuked and cajoled to change her ways as well as simply appealed to (1097–1106). Both goddesses feature prominently in the Chorus’ subsequent ode, where their part in the destruction of the Trojan War is criticized (1118–21, 1134–6), reminding the audience that a positive response to H.’s prayer is by no means certain.

**1093–4** ὦ πότνι . . . Ἥρα ‘O lady Hera’: the honorific term πότνια may have originally referred to a Mycenaean goddess, but is combined with the names of other goddesses already in the Mycenaean tablets (cf. Burkert (1985) 43–6) and later, in

Homer, with the names of mortal women (as in tragedy: c.g. Eur. *El.* 563 ὦ πότνι' . . . 'Ηλέκτρα).

Δίοισιν ἐν λέκτροις: although it is not unusual to invoke Hera as Zeus's wife or bedfellow (cf. 426–7n.), the description is particularly appropriate to H. and M.'s efforts to renew their marriage.

πίτνεις 'lie down'.

δύ(ε) οἰκτρῶ φῶτ(ε): dual acc. pl., 'two pitiable humans'.

ἀνάψυξον: aor. imper. of ἀναψύχω, 'I revive', here in sense 'release (from their toils)': cf. *Ion* 1604–5 (Athena to Ion and Creusa) ἐκ γὰρ τῆσδ' ἀναψυχῆς πόνων | εὐδαιμόν' ὑμῖν πότμον ἐξαγγέλλομαι.

1095–6 αἰτούμεθ . . . | ῥίπτουθ (= ῥίπτοντε, dual nom. pl. part., 'throwing'): H. and M. extend their hands to the sky (for this as the regular posture of Greek prayer, see Pulleyn (1997) 188–95).

ἴν' . . . ποικιλματτα: for heaven (1095 πρὸς οὐρανὸν) as home to both the gods and the stars, cf. *Or.* 1684–5 (Apollo on H.'s apotheosis among the λαμπρῶν ἀστρῶν). ποικίλμα is used of the starry sky by Critias (*TrGF* 1 43 F 19.33–4 τό τ' ἀστερωπὸν οὐρανοῦ σέλας, | Χρόνου καλὸν ποικίλμα, τέκτονος σοφοῦ), while the author of the *Prometheus Bound* calls Night ποικιλείμων, 'of spangled dress' (*PIV* 24). West (1997) 579–80 relates this image to the star-spangled garments worn by Near Eastern divinities. On the development of star imagery by the lyric and tragic poets, see Kidd (1997) 13.

1097–1100 H.'s invocation of Aphrodite begins by recalling her protracted exploitation by the goddess, creating moral pressure to spare her life. The address as a whole is constructed with much rhetorical skill as H.'s admonitory tone gradually turns to flattery (1105–6).

1097–8 πῖ τῶμῳ: prodelision and crasis, ἐπὶ τῶι ἐμῳ . . . γάμῳ, 'at the price of my marriage', i.e. by bribing Paris.

κάλλος ἐκτήσω 'you won (the prize of) beauty': cf. 885–6.

κόρη Διώνης: Dione is mentioned as Aphrodite's mother only once in early Greek epic (*Il.* 5.370–417); otherwise she is 'daughter of Zeus' (Διὸς θυγάτηρ). Here the rare mention of her mother may be an attempt to appeal to Aphrodite's filial sentiments (the mother-daughter relationship is particularly marked in the *Iliad* passage, as Kirk notes ad loc.), since H. has lost her own mother (133–42n.) and has a daughter in need of her back in Greece (282–3, 689–90nn.).

1099–1100 λύμης . . . ἐλυμήνω: 2nd sg. aor. middle of λυμαίνομαι, with *figura etymologica* (785n.), 'you have already inflicted enough outrage upon me'.

τούνομα . . . οὐ τὸ σῶμ': cf. 42–3, 66–71n.

ἐν βαρβάροις: i.e. the Trojans.

1101–2 θανεῖν . . . | . πατρώϊαι: a pathetic plea (cf. *Il.* 17.645–7, where Ajax prays to Zeus at least to allow the Achaeans to die in the light).

1102–6 The female choruses of *Medea* (627–44), *Hippolytus* (525–64, 1268–82), and *Iphigenia at Aulis* (543–89) sing of Eros and Aphrodite's awesome power and wish that she come to them 'in moderation' (*Med.* 630–1 εἰ δ' ἄλις ἔλθοι | Κύπρις, *Hipp.* 529 μηδ' ἄρρυθμος ἔλθοις, *IA* 554–5 εἴη δέ μοι μετρία | μὲν χάρις). H.'s bewilderment

(1102 τί ποτ') at the destructive impact of the goddess acts as a foil to her concluding 'confession' (1106 οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω) of Aphrodite's 'sweetness'. The skilful transition from the violent and disapproving language of 1098–1104 (μή μ' ἐξεργάση . . .) to the mollifying close (1105 μετρία . . . ἡδίστη) is geared to persuade the goddess to relent.

**1102 ἄπληστος . . . κακῶν:** the idea of 'insatiability' is appropriate to Aphrodite, goddess of desire, but here it has a strong critical force: she is made to seem no more self-controlled than her human victims, while her appetite is for 'evil' (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 976–7 ἄπληστον κακῶν . . . στάσιν).

**1103–4** The harm inflicted by the goddess is catalogued in a crescendo of noun phrases (the series begins asyndetically, ἔρωτας ἀπάτας, expressing H.'s agitation). For the deception and devastation created by Aphrodite among both gods and mortals, cf. Soph. *Ant.* 781–800, *Trach.* 497–502.

φίλτρα . . . δωμάτων 'and love charms that bring bloodshed upon houses'. Diggle (OCT) prints Musgrave's σωμάτων, where the gen. is governed by φίλτρα rather than by αἱματηρά, but L's text is acceptable Greek and H.'s own 'house-destroying' beauty offers a parallel (cf. 27–9, 262–3, 383–5).

**1105–6 εἰ δ' ἦσθα μετρία:** 1102–6n.

τᾶλλα γ': lit. 'in (all) other respects certainly'.

ἡδίστη θεῶν: cf. *Med.* 630–2 εἰ δ' ἅλις ἔλθοι | Κύπρις, οὐκ ἄλλα θεὸς εὐχαρίς οὕτως.

οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω ('I do not deny it'): H.'s generous admission makes her criticism of Aphrodite all the more effective.

#### 1107–64 FIRST STASIMON

As Helen goes into the palace to prepare herself for the pretended mourning of M.'s death (1053–4, 1087–9), the Chorus dance and sing the first stasimon of the play. While the surviving oeuvre of Eur. (and Soph.) shows a progressive shift of lyrical expression away from the chorus and towards the actors (see *Intro.* p. 39 for details), the songs of the chorus, though (on average) fewer and shorter than before, remain fundamentally important to the audience's experience and understanding of the later plays. It is, for example, a striking and unique feature of the *Helen* that there is no formal stasimon for over 1100 lines, but thereafter three choral odes in remarkably quick succession (1107–64, 1301–68, 1451–1511). Nonetheless, both the delay and the concentration of choral lyric in the latter part of the play are the result of deliberate and skilful choice, not a sign of the irrelevance of the chorus. Since their entry song (shared with H., 164–252) the Chorus have sung twice, firstly to engage in a second lyric dialogue with H. (330–85) and then delivering a brief astrophic song to mark their return from the palace (515–27). The long second episode contains actors' lyric early on (625–97), but there is no choral song to punctuate the action as the plot accelerates: the reunion of H. and M. (622–60) is followed by the revelation of Theoc.'s desire (783–8), which in turn leads into the Theonoe scene, since she is the real barrier to their escape (819–31). One might have expected the Chorus to celebrate in dance and song H. and M.'s

successful supplication of Theonoe (894–1029), but instead we are plunged into the plot to deceive Theoc. (1032–92). After the reunion, therefore, as attention shifts to the threat posed by Theoc. and the urgent need for planning, no choral ode is allowed to retard the play's gathering momentum. Thus the outburst of choral song, after so many scenes of speech and dialogue, has a sudden and arresting intensity.

Despite the long tradition of treating Eur.'s choral odes, and particularly those of his later plays, as *εμβόλιμα* ('interlude songs'; a false inference from Arist. *Poet.* 1456a25–31), all three stasima of the *Helen* are intimately and significantly connected to the events unfolding around them. The present ode expands the audience's view of H. and M.'s predicament beyond the here and now of the developing escape plot. Significantly, its opening invocation marks it as a song of grief (1112 θρήνων ἐμοὶ ξυνεργός, 'share in my lamentation'). Although the episode just ended saw H. and M. reunited and the intrigue begun, the Chorus show no sign of reacting to the hopeful thrust of the action, but look back to, and try to fathom, the suffering of the Trojan War. After the following episodes, by contrast, once Theoc. has accepted H.'s lying tale of M.'s death and is willing to supply all that is needed for his 'funeral', the second and third stasima glance hopefully forward, the latter even envisioning H. and M.'s long-awaited return to Sparta (1465–94). As in every tragedy, the stasima taken together form a coherent and meaningful song-cycle, whose range of emotions and ideas reflects the trajectory of the action: so here (broadly speaking) the Chorus sing of uncertainty and death (first stasimon), then of absence and reunion (second stasimon), and finally of home-coming and H.'s vindication (third stasimon).

*Structure.* Like the second and third stasima, the first consists of two strophic pairs. There is a notable modulation as the song progresses from the specific to the general, from the factual to the philosophical: the first strophic pair concentrates on the suffering brought upon both sides by the Trojan War, while in the second the Chorus become more reflective, focusing on the unpredictability of the gods and the madness of war. Yet despite this shift, the two parts cohere: it was the gods who began the war, and so the second half reflects upon the causes of the misery lamented in the first half. Moreover, though each stanza is self-contained, the figure of H. joins them together: she appears in every one and is addressed several times (1120, 1144, 1160).

There are further links and correspondences within each strophic pair. The first two stanzas lament the deaths of Trojans and Greeks, both in battle and during the *nostoi* ('returns') of the survivors from Troy. Each stanza ends with a sea-journey: in the strophe Paris takes 'H.' to Troy (the beginning of the war), in the antistrophe M. is driven off course while bringing her home (part of the war's disastrous aftermath). Both men are equally mistaken, thinking that they 'lead' (ἄγω, 1118, 1135) the real H., while in fact they are bringing a 'cause of woe for the Trojans' (μέλεα Πριαμίδαις, 1118) and 'strife for the Greeks' (ἔριν | Δαναῶν, 1134–5). Finally, both Paris and M. are shown as victims of divine caprice: Paris brings his baneful bride to Troy 'escorted by Aphrodite' (πομπαῖσιν Ἀφροδίτας, 1121), while M. brings not, as he supposes, his wife, but 'Hera's divine phantom' (εἰδῶλον ἱερὸν Ἥρας, 1136). Thus the two goddesses

who are central to the story (23–43, 669–83, etc.), and to whom H. prayed at the end of the previous scene (1093–1106), close each stanza, their names and actions in exact responsion (1121~1136), in motive as well as metre.

The responsibility of Aphrodite and Hera for the events lamented in the first strophic pair creates a provocative context for the Chorus' reflections on the gods at the beginning of the second strophe. Their bafflement at the divine is rooted in the specific fate of H., daughter of Zeus (1144–8); similarly, in the antistrophe, the Chorus' rejection of violence in favour of arbitration is rooted in the horrendous and (from their perspective) pointless losses of the Trojan War. The apostrophe of the warmongers ('You are all fools who . . .', 1151ff.) is strengthened by the Chorus' insistence that their goal was a mere phantom. The song ends by addressing H. (1160) and restating her pitiable condition (1163–4), thus returning to the sombre and personal tone of the opening lament.

*Function.* The central ideas of the stasimon (H.'s innocence, the sufferings of Trojans and Greeks) have been aired before, and lamented at length in the Chorus' lyric dialogues with H. (164–252, 330–85). But whereas the earlier songs naturally presented events largely from H.'s viewpoint, the narrative traditions of choral lyric enable the Chorus to adopt a more universalizing and reflective stance. Having bewailed a series of human catastrophes in the song's first two stanzas, the Chorus are at a loss to explain or justify them. With H.'s fate in mind, they are no longer confident that they understand the gods: how can an innocent woman, a daughter of Zeus, be so neglected and abused? Their conclusion is stark: all that humans can hope to discern of the gods is the unpredictable outcome of their activities (1140–2).

Such an emphasis on the impenetrability of the divine is a traditional feature of Greek thinking about the gods (1137–50n.), but here it gains particular force from the dramatic context. M.'s optimistic claim that 'the gods will put an end to my troubles' (1075) was immediately countered by H.'s powerful and detailed indictment of Aphrodite's cruelty (1097–1106). H. and M. have Theonoe's support (1005–29), but it remains uncertain which way the gods will decide (cf. 878–86), and there is no guarantee that Aphrodite will abide by their decision, should it go against her. Thus the Chorus' reminder of the unexpected shifts of fortune brought about by the gods reinforces the tension and excitement of the drama's developing escape plot: despite H.'s cleverness and ingenuity, Aphrodite may well try to derail her return.

The needless devastation of the Trojan War has been a leitmotif of the play (52–3, 109–10, 196–9, 229–39, 362–74, 692–37, 707–8, 749–51, 847–9, 969–71). Here the Chorus give the theme its fullest lyrical expression. As noted above, the third stasimon looks forward, rather than back to the Trojan War, presenting a more optimistic picture of H.'s future and the gods' influence upon it. Here, by contrast, H.'s unwilling role in the slaughter of Greeks and Trojans is expanded into a statement of the pity and the waste of war in general (1151–64n.). The Chorus' insistence on the madness of war is given an added dimension by the presence of M., left behind at the tomb of Proteus when H. went into the palace (1085–6). Though such a situation is far from unusual (Aichele (1971) 55 calculates that about 40 per cent of surviving choral odes

are sung in the presence of at least one actor), it is significant that the audience should experience a song about the senselessness of warmongers while M. is in sight. Finally, it is typical of Eur. to present the Trojan War and its aftermath from the perspective of its female victims, both Trojan and Greek, particularly in the emotionally heightened register of choral odes and actor's lyrics (e.g. *Andr.* 274–308, 1037–46, *Hec.* 68–97, 154–215, 475–83, 629–56, *Tro.* 153–229, 511–67). Though the Greek women of the Chorus here are not prisoners of war, they are captives in a foreign land (191–2), and they express a moving sympathy for the calamity faced by the Trojan women and for the wives left widowed in Greece (1114–15, 1123–5).

*Metre.* The first strophic pair is written in a variety of acolic cola (as are the second and third stasima) with an admixture of iambic and dactylo-epitrite elements. The first two stanzas are each built of six periods. The periods correlate closely with units of sense, and there are significant effects of thematic correspondence between them. In the fourth period, for example, the strophe deals with the suffering brought upon H. and the Trojan women by the Greeks (1113–16), while the responding period of the antistrophe (1128–31) details the warriors' own destruction at the hands of a fellow Greek: see further 1132–6n. The most striking metrical effects occur in the fifth period of each strophe (1117–18~1132–3), where the heavily resolved iambs express the recklessness of Paris' voyage in the first instance, and the chaos of the storm that scatters M.'s fleet in the second. Such resolutions are also characteristic of lamentation (cf. Parker (1997) 30). At 1109 the deletion of  $\sigma\epsilon$  restores responsion; cf. Diggle (1994) 438 n. 66 for the responsion of  $\sigma\alpha$  before the choriamb. For the initial resolution of the telesilleian ( $\times-\cup\cup-\cup-$ ) in 1113~1128, see Isumi (1991–3) 250.

The second pair of stanzas is written in a blend of dactylo-epitrite with a considerable proportion of resolved iambs, a metrical form which Dale (1968) 191 says 'might more properly be described as dactylo-iambic' (cf. Wilamowitz (1921) 455). Periods one and two open with the same sequence (ia D 2ia) as the first strophic pair (1107–8, 1122–3). The first period of each stanza (1137–43, 1151–7) contains the Chorus' general reflections; the second period is addressed to H. (1144, 1160). The final transition from the more measured and regular dactylo-epitrite elements to resolved iambs marks the Chorus' emotional turbulence as they move from contemplation of wider issues to confront directly the inexplicable negligence of the gods (1147–50) and the catastrophes of the Trojan War (1161–4).

#### 1107–36 first strophe and antistrophe

$\times-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-$

σέ τὰν ἐναύλοις ὑπὸ δειδροκόμοις	1107	ia D
πολλοὶ δ' Ἀχαιῶν δορὶ καὶ πετρίναις	1122	

$-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-$

μουσεῖα καὶ θάκουσ ἐνίζουσαν ἀναβοάσω,	1108	2ia ithyphallic (2nd
ῥίπαϊσιν ἐκπνεύσαντες Ἄιδαν μέλεον ἔχουσιν,	1123	long resolved)

σϛ—υυ—		
τάν άοιδοτάταν	1109a	oo choriamb
ταλαινᾶν άλόχων	1123b	
—υυ—υυ—υυυυ—		
ὄρνιθα μελωιδὸν ἀηδόνα δακρυόεσσαν,	1109b-10	x praxillean (4th long
κείραντες ἔθειραν, ἄνυμφα δὲ μέλαθρα κέϊται·	1124-5	resolved)
—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—		
ἔλθ' ὦ διὰ ξουθᾶν γενύων ἔλελιζομένα	1111	- c - D ²
πολλοὺς δὲ πυρσεύσας φλογερὸν σέλας	1126	
ἀμφιρύταν		
—υ—υ—υ—		
θρήνων ἔμοι ξυνεργός,	1112	2ia _Λ
Εὐβοίαν εἴλ' Ἀχαιῶν	1127	
υυ—υυ—υ—		
Ἑλένας μελέους πόνους	1113	telesillean (with initial
μονόκωπος ἀνήρ πέτραις	1128	resolution)
υ—υ—υ—υ—		
τὸν Ἰλιάδων τ' αἰ-	1114	telesillean
Καφηρίσιν ἔμβαλῶν,	1129	
—υ—υ—υ—υ—		
δούσαι δακρυόεντα πότμον	1115	glyconic (final long
Αἰγαίαις ἐνάλοις δόλιον	1130	resolved)
ϛ—υ—υ—υ—		
Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὸ λόγχαις,	1116	pherecratean
ἀκταῖς ἀστέρα λάμπας·	1131	
υυ—υυ—υυ—υ—υ—		
ὄτ' ἔδραμε ρόθια πολιά βαρβάρωι πλάται	1117	3ia
ἀλίμενα δ' ὄρια μέλεα βαρβάρου στολᾶς	1132	
υυ—υυ—υυ—υϛ—υ—		
ὄς ἔμολεν ἔμολε μέλεα Πριαμίδαις ἄγων	1118	3ia
τότ' ἔσυτο πατρίδος ἀποπρὸ χειμάτων	1133	
πνοᾶι		
υυ—υυ—υϛ—υϛ—		
Λακεδαιμόνος ἀπο λέχεα	1119	telesillean
γέρας οὐ γέρας ἀλλ' ἔριν	1134	(cf. 1113 ~ 1128)
υυ—υυ—υυ—υ—		
σέθεν, ὦ Ἑλένα, Πάρις αἰνόγαμος	1120	2an
Δαναῶν Μενέλας ἐπὶ ναυσὶν ἄγων	1135	

---υεεε---|||

πομπαῖσιν Ἀφροδίτας.

1121

2ia_Λ

εἶδωλον ἱερὸν Ἦρας.

1136

## 1137-64 second strophe and antistrophe

υυυυ---υυ---υυ-|

ὅτι θεὸς ἢ μὴ θεὸς ἢ τὸ μέσον

1137

ia D

ἄφρονες ὅσοι τὰς ἀρετὰς πολέμωι

1151

---υ---υ---υ-|

τίς φησ' ἐρευνάσας βροτῶν;

1138

2ia

λόγχαισὶ τ' ἀλκαίου δορὸς

1152

---υυ---υυ---υυ---υυ-|

μακρότατον πέρας ἠὔρεν ὅς τὰ θεῶν ἔσορᾶι

1139-40

D × D

κτᾶσθ', ἀμαθῶς θανάτῳ πόνους καταλυόμενοι.

1153-4

---υυ---υυ---υυ---υυ-|

δεῦρο καὶ αὖθις ἐκέϊσε καὶ πάλιν ἀντιλόγοις

1141-2

D-D

εἰ γὰρ ἀμιλλα κρινεῖ νιν αἵματος, οὐποτ' ἔρις

1155-6

---υ---υ---υ-||

τηδῶντ' ἀνελπίστοις τύχαις.

1143

2ia

λείπει κατ' ἀνθρώπων πόλεις.

1157

υυυυ---υυ---υυ-|

σύ Διὸς ἔφυς, ὦ Ἑλένα, θυγάτηρ.

1144

ia D

ἄι Πριαμίδος γᾶς ἔλαχον θαλάμους,

1158

---υ---υ---υ-

πτανὸς γὰρ ἐν κόλποις σε Λή-

1145

2ia

ἔξὸν διορθῶσαι λόγοις

1159

---υυ---υυ-||

δας ἐτέκνωσε πατήρ.

1146

D

σὺν ἔριν, ὦ Ἑλένα.

1160

---υ---υ---υ-|

καίτ' Ἰαχίθης καθ' Ἑλλανίαν

1147

ia_Λ ia_Λ ia

νῦν δ' οἱ μὲν Ἄιδαι μέλονται κάτω,

1161

υυυεεευυυυυεεε-||

προδότις ἀπιστος ἄδικος ἄθεος· οὐδ' ἔχω

1148

3ia

τείχεα δὲ φόνιος ὥστε Διὸς ἐπέσυτο φλόξ,

1162

υυυυυυεεε-υυ-|

ὁ τι σαφές, ὁ τι ποτ' ἐν βροτοῖς τῶν θεῶν

1149

ia ia_Λ ia

ἐπὶ δὲ πάθεα πάθεσι φέρεις ἀθλία

1163

⚡—⚡—|||

ἔπος ἀλαθῆς εὐρω.

1150

ithyphallic

συμφοραῖς ἔλειναῖς.

1164

**1107–21** *First strophe.* The Chorus call upon the nightingale to join in their lament for H. and the women of Troy, victims of the war begun by Paris' abduction of H.

**1107–12** The myth of the nightingale is an evocative symbol of female lamentation. The story is first referred to in *Od.* 19.518–23, where Penelope compares her agitated mind to the trilling voice of the nightingale (1111–12n.). In the Homeric version (according to the scholia) the bird/mother, Aedon (taking ἀηδών 'nightingale' (19.518) as a proper name), once daughter of Pandareus, king of Crete, mourns the death of her son, Itylus, whom she bore to Zethus, king of Thebes, but then killed accidentally. The more familiar Attic version (or something very like it) was already known to Hesiod, *WD* 568–9 and Sappho fr. 135 V, who call the swallow (i.e. Philomela) the daughter of Pandion, king of Athens. In this version, dramatized in full by Sophocles (*Tereus*, frs. 580–95b R), Philomela is raped by Tereus, the husband of her sister Procne and king of Thrace (cf. *Thuc.* 2.29.3). To escape detection Tereus cuts out Philomela's tongue but she weaves a tapestry depicting her ordeal and has it sent to her sister. Procne takes revenge by killing Itys, her son by Tereus, and serving him the flesh. As Tereus tries to kill the women, all three are transformed into birds, Tereus into a hoopoe, Philomela a swallow, and Procne a nightingale, forever lamenting the death of her son (the bird's cry being interpreted as a continual calling of Itys' name, making the myth aetiological: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1142–5, Soph. *El.* 147–9, Eur. *Phaeth.* 67–70). Though we cannot be certain of the date of Sophocles' *Tereus*, we can be sure that it was produced before 414 (and so before *Hel.*), since it is lampooned in Aristophanes' *Birds* of that year (cf. *Birds* 15–16, 100–1). In any case, the nightingale had long since become a familiar embodiment of female suffering and mourning, especially in tragedy, e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 57–72, *Ag.* 1140–9; Soph. *El.* 107–9, 1076–7, *Alj.* 628–30, *Trach.* 963; Eur. *Hec.* 336–8, *Rhes.* 546–50; cf. Oehler (1925) 92–4, Suksi (2001) 650–1. For the myth's relation to religious rituals and social patterns throughout Greece, see Burkert (1983) 179–85, Forbes-Irving (1990) 99–107; cf. also 1109–10, 1111–12nn.

**1107–8** σέ . . . ἀναβοάσω: the Chorus' invocation recalls the opening of the parodos, where H. called upon the Sirens (167–78), figures of death and mourning like the nightingale, to join in her lament for the victims of the Trojan War. The verb (ἀναβοάσω) is hortatory aor. subjunctive; cf. H.'s performative aorists σέ γάρ ἐκάλεσα, σέ δὲ κατόμοσα ('I call upon you, I swear by you', 348n.).

ἐναύλοις ὑπὸ δενδροκόμοις: lit. 'in (your) haunts beneath tresses of trees'. The adj. δενδροκόμος occurs only here in Eur. and first in Ar. *Clouds* 280 (lyr.). For phrases adding 'hair' (foliage) to meadows and trees (e.g. ὑλόκομον νάπος, *Andr.* 284), see Breitenbach (1934) 167, and Hordern (2002) 186 on Tim. *Pers* 106 δενδροέθειραι 'tree-tressed'. Naturally enough, the nightingale is often imagined amid foliage: *OC* 671–3, *Phoen.* 1515–16, *Birds* 215 (cf. Diggle (1996) 193).

μουσεῖα καὶ θάκουσ ἐνίζουσας: Willink's translation 'sitting within perched halls of song' (quoted by Diggle (1994) 423 n. 13) seeks to capture the hendiadys 'places of singing and seats'. In Eur. *Alceme* fr. 89 K ivy is called χελιδόνων μουσεῖον 'singing place of swallows', a phrase adapted by Dionysus ('choirs of swallows') to describe tragedians who are inferior to Eur. (*Frogs* 93); cf. 174n. For Eur.'s bird imagery in general, see Delulle (1911) 18–21, Pauer (1935) 140–2.

1109–10 τὰν ἀοιδοτάταν: the nightingale's musical skill is proverbial (ἀηδῶν ~ ἀείδων was a frequent source of wordplay); despite the pain of her cry, her song is beautiful. Bacchylides says of his own poetry καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν | Κηΐας ἀηδόνας ('and nien will praise also the charm of the honey-tongued Cean nightingale', 3.97–8 S-M). The narrator of Theocritus 12.6–7 uses the superlative adj. ἀοιδότατος to describe how welcome is the arrival of his lover: ὅσσον ἀηδῶν | συμπάντων λιγύφωνος ἀοιδοτάτη πετεηνῶν ('as the clear-voiced nightingale sings best of all winged creatures').

ἀηδόνα: in apposition to ὄρνιθα, '(I call upon you . . .) the melodious bird, most gifted in song, tearful nightingale'. The proximity of ἀοιδότατος and ἀηδῶν emphasizes the bird's characteristic act (ἀείδων). In the fable of the hawk and the nightingale (*W/D* 202–12), Hesiod underlines the fact that the nightingale (the victim of arrogant assault) stands for himself by drawing attention to its role as an ἀοιδός (208), both 'singer' and 'poet'.

δακρυόεσσας: the nightingale is not the only bird of sorrowful song (cf. e.g. the halcyon: *IT* 1089–95; or swan: Aesch. *Ag.* 1444–6, *El.* 151–5, *Met.* 110–11), but it is pre-eminent in the poetic tradition, in part because of the richness and gruesomeness of the myth; for the bird's association with death in Greek literature, see Thompson (1936) 16–22. It is also a popular motif in Latin poetry: Accius wrote a tragic *Tereus*: cf. also Ovid, *Met.* 6.424–674, Syndikus (1984–90) 11.196–7 on Cat. 65.13–14, Thomas (1988) 233 on Virg. *Georg.* 4.511–15.

1111–12 The Chorus intensify their invocation by addressing the nightingale in the vocative.

διὰ ξουθᾶν γενύων ἐλελιζομένα: the phrase is strikingly reminiscent of *Birds* 213–14, produced two years before: (Tereus describes the nightingale) ἐλελιζομένη διεροῖς μέλεσιν | γένυος ξουθῆς, 'trilling forth fluid melodies from your vibrant throat' (tr. Henderson). As Dunbar (1995) 205 observes, 'it is an attractive possibility . . . that for once Eur. may be imitating Ar., not vice versa, though alternatively both may be imitating a common model unknown to us.' The nightingale's 'being set astir' (ἐλελιζομένα) is transferred here to her (trilling) song; cf. Mastrorarde on *Phoen.* 1514, where the active ἐλελίζω means 'utter a shrill, mournful cry'. The bird's quivering notes are a traditional feature: *Od.* 19.521, *Ag.* 1142; cf. *Rhes.* 547 πολυχορδοτάται (her voice 'has many notes'). The idea of modulating song is reinforced by the adj. ξουθός (cf. Bergson (1956) 134), which may refer to vibrating sounds and movements (see Dunbar (1995) 206), rather than simply colour, 'brown, tawny, gold' (*pace* Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1142 'in the fifth century the word was always taken to refer to colour'). Whether

the Chorus themselves sang here in an oscillating melody is impossible to say (no musical papyri of *Helen* have survived), but recently published papyrus fragments of a tragedy on Achilles (perhaps by Sophocles) indicate such a ‘trilling’ melody: cf. West (1999) 49, Hall (2002) 19–20. Like *ταλαιῶν* in 1123, *ξουθῶν* is the Doric form of the fem. gen. plural.

*θρήνων ἔμοι ξυνεργός*: the Chorus seek a respondent for their antiphonal lament (as H. herself did in the parodos, 164–78); cf. *Phoen.* 1518 *ἔμοις ἄχεσι συνωιδός* (Antigone invokes the nightingale), *Hipp.* 523 *συνεργός εἷης* (the Nurse prays to Aphrodite). The nightingale is a fitting companion in a lament for H.: Philomela was raped, while H. is threatened with an unwanted marriage; Procne killed her own son (cf. *Ion* 1482, where the myth evokes Creusa’s loss of her son), while H. feels responsible for ruining the life of her daughter (688–90). By contrast, the bird imagery of the third stasimon is purely joyful (1478–94).

**1113–16** The Chorus bewail not only their fellow countrywoman but also the women of Troy, now captives in a foreign land, as the Chorus themselves are. Similar songs of sympathy for women of the other side are found at *Hec.* 647–56 (Trojan women imagine the pain of bereaved Spartan wives and mothers) and *Li* 773–93 (Greek women from Chalcis envisage with horror the bloody destruction of Troy and the forced deportation of its female population).

*τὸν Ἰλιάδων τ’ ἄει | δούσαι δακρυσθέντα πτόμμον*: the fem. dat. sg. part. *ἀειδούσαι* modifies *ἔμοι* (1112). Ionic *ἀείδω* is an epic word (cf. Burkhardt (1906) 17), appropriate to a lament for Troy’s destruction (on epic forms in Euripides, see Smercka (1936) 54–7). The Chorus echo H.’s expressions of pity for Troy (107–9, 362–69) and emphasize her own suffering and innocence (1113).

**1117–21** The story of H.’s misery and Troy’s fall is traced back to its ultimate origin, the conduct of Paris at the instigation of Aphrodite (cf. *Andr.* 274–300).

*ρόθια πολιά* ‘grey surge’ (acc. of extent of space). Herwerden’s *πολιά* ‘grey’ for L’s *πεδία* ‘surging plains (of the sea)’ gains support from 1503 *ρόθια πολιά θαλάσσης* and the epic *πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης* (*Il.* 4.248).

*βαρβάρωι πλάται*: cf. 234, 394nn.

*ἔμολεν ἔμολε*: for the anadiplosis, see 195n. *μέλεα* agrees with *λέχεα* (‘bringing your marriage-bed [metonymic for ‘bringing you as his bride’], a source of misery to the sons of Priam’).

*Πάρις αἰνόγαμος*: the Chorus of *Agamemnon* imagine the Trojans themselves lamenting *Πάριν τὸν αἰνόλεκτρον* (‘Paris, fatal in your marriage!’; 710–13); cf. Haupt’s <*αινογάμων*> *γάμων* at Eur. *Supp.* 995 (Enevadne recalls her wedding day). Similarly, the Trojan Chorus of *Hecuba* curse the ‘fatal Paris’ (945 *αἰνόπαριν*; cf. Alcm. fr. 77 *PMGF* *Δύσπαρις Αἰνόπαρις κακὸν Ἑλλάδι βωτιανείραι*) for his ‘marriage that was no marriage’ (948 *γάμος οὐ γάμος*; cf. *Hel.* 690, *Andr.* 104–5). As Stinton (1990) 45 n. 54 points out, ‘In Greek poetry Trojans nearly always use the name Alexandros . . . and the rare occasions when they call him Paris are in close connection with his marriage (*Andr.* 103, *Tro.* 398) . . . Paris is evidently a name of ill-omen in Trojan ears’; cf. *Il.*

3.39 (Hector speaking) Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές ἠπεροπευτά ('Paris you pest, good for nothing but your looks, you woman-crazed seducer!' tr. Hammond). For αἶνο-compounds in Homer and tragedy, see Sideras (1971) 162-3.

πομπᾶσιν Ἀφροδίτας: the final words of the first two stanzas reveal the divine forces behind the human catastrophe: cf. 1136 εἰδῶλον ἱερὸν Ἥρας.

1122-36 *First antistrophe*. The stanza has three parts, each progressively closer in both space and time to the narrating Chorus: the Greeks who died at Troy and the sorrow of their widows (1122-25); the deaths of yet more on the way home as a result of Nauplius' trick (1126-31); the misfortunes of M., who, returning to Greece with the phantom, has been blown off course to Egypt (1132-36).

1122-5 ΠΕΤΡΙΝΑΙΣ | ῥίπαῖσιν: lit. 'by rocky hurlings' (causal dat., equivalent to ΠΕΤΡῶΝ ῥίπαῖσιν), i.e. many were killed by stone-throws.

ἔχουσιν 'inhabit (grim Hades)'.  
 κείραντες ἔθειραν: lit. 'they cut the hair [of their miserable wives]', but the verb has a causative force (Smyth §1711): the soldiers' deaths cause their widows to cut their hair in mourning. At 368-9 H. envisioned the sisters of the slain Trojan warriors cutting their hair and throwing it into the Scamander. Now she herself is inside the palace cutting her hair in pretended grief (1087, 1187-8). However, rather than being an indictment of H.'s deception, as it is in *Or.* 128-9 ('Did you see how she cut off just the tips of her hair, preserving her beauty?', asks Electra), the motif of hair-cutting here underlines the fact that, like the Greek and Trojan widows, H.'s suffering at the loss (albeit non-fatal) of her husband has been real and undeserved.

ἄνυμφα 'husbandless': cf. *Hec.* 416 (Polyxena speaking) ἄνυμφος ἄνυμέναιος ὧν μ' ἐχρῆν τυχεῖν. Since the adj. may also mean 'brideless', the word stresses the absolute destruction of the marriage. On Eur.'s fondness for privative adjectives (with their varied emotional effects), and his talent for creating new ones, see Breitenbach (1934) 77-81.

κεῖται: the homes 'lie' husbandless. The verb reinforces the image of empty marriage beds.

1126-31 As in their lament for H. and other victims of the war, the Chorus here return in greater detail and with a wider perspective to an idea mentioned before: the false beacons set by Nauplius at Cape Caphereus in southern Euboea to avenge the death of his son Palamedes. The myth's evocation of war-time treachery (Odysseus' plot against Palamedes at Troy), and the destruction of the returning fleet by a fellow Greek, prepare for the Chorus' rejection of war and perpetual strife in the final stanza (1151-6). For Nauplius and Palamedes in fifth-century literature, especially tragedy, see 767n.

πυρσεύσας . . . | Εὐβοίαν 'having lit up sea-girt Euboea (direct obj.) with a fiery beacon (φλογερόν σέλας, internal acc.)'. Unlike the lighthouse, the ancient shore-beacon marked a safe harbour. The Homeric epithet ἀμφιρύτος 'sea-girt' – found in extant tragedy only here and at *Soph. Aj.* 134-5 (of Ajax's Salamis) – heightens the pathos of the Greeks warriors' unheroic end.

εἶλ' 'killed' (LSJ s.v. αἰρέω λ ιι).

μονόκωπος ἀνήρ: the audience, familiar with the myth (767n.), can supply the man's name (cf. *IA* 198). The sense of μονόκωπος is not 'having one oar' but rather 'having oars and being alone or apart from others' (see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1517–18, discussing μονο- + substantive stem adjectives), implying that Nauplius rowed out alone to set the false beacon-fires. The emphatic (initial) πολλούς reinforces the ingenuity of Nauplius' trick, which enabled a single man to destroy an entire fleet (a stratagem worthy of his proverbially clever son Palamedes). It also suggests that an entire army may suffer for the failings of its leaders (cf. 1151–6).

ἐμβαλῶν . . . λάμπας: aor. participles, like πυρσεύσας (1126), explaining how Nauplius 'killed' (ἐλκ', 1127) the Greeks: 'hurling (them) on the Capherean rocks, (and by) flashing his treacherous star on the sea-headlands of the Aegean'.

Αἰγαίαις ἐνάλοις . . . | ἀκταῖς: locative datives (Smyth §1531); for the phrase cf. *Tim. Pers.* 98 ἐπὶ ἀκταῖς ἐνάλοις (of the defeated Persians who have managed to get ashore). For the smoother colometry (glyconic + pherecratean) achieved by Hermann's transposition (δόλιον ἀκταῖς), see Isumi (1984) 70.

δόλιον . . . ἀστέρα: a striking image for Nauplius' beacon-fires. The baleful star recalls one of the most famous similes of the *Iliad*, where Priam sees Achilles approaching Troy, shining in his armour like the Dog-Star, 'a sign of evil' (κακὸν . . . σῆμα 22.25–32, cf. 22.317–20). An even closer parallel, since it betokens ill for the Greeks, is the simile, capping the day of greatest Trojan success, which compares the thousand Trojan camp-fires burning in the plain to stars shining in the clear sky (*Il.* 8.553–65). Here the star-image also evokes Nauplius' exploitation of the darkness of night, when seafarers are most vulnerable.

1132–6 M.'s failed *nostos* connects the Chorus' narrative directly to the dramatic present. A nadir of pessimism is reached in their presentation of the Trojan War: whereas the first strophe ended with H.'s abduction as seen from Paris' conventional perspective (that is, as involving the real H., 1117–21), the antistrophe closes with the revelation, experienced by M. in the preceding episode, that the prize of war (1134 γέρας) was a mere illusion. The stanzas are further linked by significant metrical and thematic respiration (1117 βαρβάρωι πλάται (Paris' voyage) ~ 1132 βαρβάρου στολᾶς (M.'s wanderings); 1118 ὅς ἐμολεν (Paris) ~ 1133 τότ' ἔσυτο (M.); 1120 Ἐλένα ~ 1135 Μενέλας; 1121 πομπᾶισιν Ἀφροδίτας ~ 1136 εἶδωλον ἱερὸν ἼΗρας). The text of 1132–6 has drawn much attention; see Nordheider (1980) 35 n. 3, Basta Donzelli (1980).

1132 ἀλίμενα δ' ὄρια μέλα 'grim (cf. 1118 μέλα), harbourless lands': for M.'s post-war sea-wanderings, lasting seven years, see 128–30, 400–13, 520–7, 765–76. The dangers of landing a ship on a 'harbourless shore' (ἀλίμενον χθόνα) are vividly described by the Egyptian Danaos at Aesch. *Supp.* 764–9.

βαρβάρου στολᾶς 'where foreign dress is worn'. For the use of non-Greek costume in the play, see *Introd.* p. 33.

1133 ἔσυτο: 3rd sg. epic aor. pass. σέυομαι 'to be put in motion'.

πατρίδος ἀποπρό '(then he was driven) far from his native land' (the preposition is postpositive, as often in poetry; Smyth §1665a); for ἀποπρό, cf. 694–511.

**1134** γέρας οὐ γέρας: the expression 'X not X' is a characteristic trope of Eur., e.g. *Hec.* 948 (quoted above, 1117–211.), *Phoen.* 1495 σὰ δ' ἔρις – οὐκ ἔρις ἀλλὰ φόνωι φόνος ('Your strife – no strife but murder upon murder'); see Breitenbach (1934) 238.

**1136** εἶδωλον ἱερὸν Ἥρας: anything that belongs to a god or goddess may be called *ipso facto* 'divine', but the word has an added resonance here, since only the gods are capable of creating such a 'living image': see 33–4, 582–6, 683. The final words of the antistrophe reveal with devastating force the mutual delusion of Paris and M., and the apparent futility of the Trojan War (cf. 453, 704–8).

**1137–50** *Second strophe.* 'Who among mortals can understand what deity is? You, Helen, are Zeus's daughter, but you are universally disgraced. I do not know if mortals know anything certain about the gods.' The Chorus' general reflections are rooted first and foremost in the action of the play (cf. 758–60, 1688–92n.): the unpredictability of events and the limitations of human knowledge are now illustrated at the level of theology (see Wildberg (2002) 1–11). Yet the Chorus' state of *aporia* is to be interpreted in the light of the wider myth (familiar to the audience) and the 'theological' remarks made earlier by the Servant: like the Chorus, the Servant marvelled at the inscrutability of the divine (711–13), but presented a *positive* view of divine influence in the face of H. and M.'s reunion (716–19); the Chorus by contrast can see no consolation, and point to H.'s fate as a paradigm of human vulnerability (1144–8). Thus the stanza as a whole reveals the Chorus' own limited perspective on events, since they themselves are unable to understand the will of Zeus and his plan for H., which involves her suffering. However, the Chorus' complaints about divine neglect will eventually be answered by Zeus (1144–8n.).

**1137–8** ὁ τι θεὸς . . . βροτῶν 'What is god, or not god, or in between, which mortal can say after searching?' Several passages in tragedy remark on the mystery of the divine, but while some do so in a spirit of 'religious humility in the face of the unknowable' (Dodds on *Bacch.* 894 ὅτι ποτ' ἄρα τὸ δαιμόνιον, 'whatever it is that is divine'), others have a more pungent and critical force: 'We are slaves to the gods, whatever "the gods" are' (*Or.* 418 δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὅτι ποτ' εἰσὶν οἱ θεοί), 'Then Zeus, whoever Zeus is, sired me as Hera's enemy' (*Hec.* 1263–4 Ζεὺς δ', ὅστις ὁ Ζεὺς, πολέμιόν μ' ἐγένεατο | Ἥραι). Here the Chorus' reflections have to be set in the context of the gods' self-interested motives for bringing about the Trojan War and their subsequent conduct (esp. 23–43, 878–86).

ὅτι θεὸς ἢ μὴ θεὸς ἢ τὸ μέσον: to express 'all X' by breaking 'X' into opposing parts is a typically Greek style of thought: see Breitenbach (1934) 203–4 'polar expressions', Wilamowitz on *Hec.* 1106; for division into three parts, where the 'middle' term is usually put last, see Fehling (1969) 276. The 'in between' should not therefore be taken to refer to 'demi-gods' (so Jerram, Dale; also Wilamowitz (1931–2) 1.367 n. 2): it is the nature of god which is at issue, not the distinction between god, man, and semi-divine heroes or heroines (such as H.). The expression is thus a 'pleonastic catch-all formula' (Griffith on [Aesch.] *PV* 116, cf. also Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 197) reminiscent of the 'archaic precautionary and all-embracing formula beginning

prayer-hymns' (Collard (2002) 122 on Aesch. *Ag.* 160–1 Ζεύς, ὅστις ποτ' ἐστίν, εἰ τόδ' αὖ | τῶι φίλον κεκλημένωι, 'Zeus, whoever he is, if it pleases him to be called by this name'). The Chorus' religious language makes their subsequent claims about the remoteness and unknowability of the divine even more arresting.

ἔρευνάσας: aor. part. ἔρυνάω 'I search, enquire after'; cf. 662, *Med.* 1084 (where the chorus asserts female wisdom).

**1139–43** The rhetorical form of the Chorus' opening question (1137–8) implies that *no* mortal has yet been able to say who or what god is. In these lines, accordingly, the Chorus present their view of what humans *do* (and can hope to) know about the gods, outlining the 'furthest boundary' (μακρότατον πέρασ 1139) of their discoveries. The result is bleak.

μακρότατον πέρασ: πέρασ also means 'limit', but the Chorus do not mean that human knowledge is *necessarily* incomplete; it simply is so, as far as the gods are concerned.

ἠὔρεν: gnomic aor., since the Chorus intend their statement to apply not only to the past but for all time; cf. Goodwin §§154–5, Beetham (2002) 236 'The aorist aspect indicates the viewpoint of a speaker or writer outside an action *not necessarily in the past*, of which the beginning and end are in view.'

τὰ θεῶν 'the actions / dealings / dispensations of the gods'; cf. *IT* 476–7 πάντα γὰρ τὰ τῶν θεῶν | ἐς ἀφανὲς ἔρπει ('All the gods' designs are obscure in their outcome'), *Phoen.* 382 δεῖ φέρειν τὰ τῶν θεῶν ('What the gods send one must endure').

δεῦρο . . . πάλιν: the zig-zagging run of the adverbs captures the bewilderment of the human spectator. The language and thought recall 712–13.

πηδῶντ' 'leaping', modifying τὰ θεῶν; for the vivid metaphor, cf. *Trō.* 67 (Poseidon addressing Athena) τί δ' ὧδε πηδᾶις ἄλλοτ' εἰς ἄλλους τρόπους . . . ; ('But why do you leap about in this fashion from one temper to another?'). For the pejorative use of πηδάω, cf. *Or.* 895–6 (bracketed by Diggle) τὸ γὰρ γένος τοιοῦτον· ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχῆ | πηδῶσ' ἀεὶ κήρυκες ('Heralds are like that, always leaping over to join the successful man').

ἀντιλόγοις: the adj. ἀντίλογος is found only here in Eur. (see Smereka (1936) 155) and nowhere else in extant archaic and classical literature, but the noun ἀντιλογία 'contradiction' is common in the classical period (LSJ s.v.), making the adj. an easy and readily comprehensible formation. (Protagoras is said to have written two books of ἀντιλογία: DK 80'α 1, β' 5; cf. *Ar. Frogs* 775.) Although some recent editors (Diggle, Kovacs) prefer Dobree's ἀμφιλόγοις 'uncertain, wavering' (cf. *IT* 655), the manuscript reading gives good sense and need not be changed: the Chorus are looking forward to the example of H. (1144–8), whose situation is indeed contradictory. The notion of 'uncertainty' is already emphasized in both τύχη and ἀνέλπιστος (contrast the positive 'unexpected fortune' at 412). To call the gods 'contradictory' in their effects adds greatly to the critical force of the Chorus' vision. Greek polytheism means different gods with different personalities, whose desires and plans are sometimes contradictory; so here Hera and Aphrodite are pulling the lives of the characters, and the play, in opposite directions.

ἀνεπίστοις: contrast Heraclitus DK 22 B18 (Kahn fr. vii) ἐάν μὴ ἔλπηται ἀνεπίστον οὐκ ἐξευρήσει, ἀνεξερεύνητον ἔον καὶ ἄπορον ('He who does not expect the unexpected will not find it, since it is trackless and unexplored').

τύχαις: humans perceive divine activity as mere 'chance', that is, as fundamentally incomprehensible and incalculable (cf. 715, 719, *Hipp.* 1106–10). The concept of τύχη is used to manifold effect in tragedy, especially in the later plays of Eur.: see Busch (1937) 45–54, Maithiessen (1964) 180–5. While τύχη may be dispensed by the gods (e.g. *Soph. Phil.* 1316–17, *Eur. Alc.* 785–6, *Ion* 1512–14), the idea that the world is governed by (malignant) chance rather than by the gods is shocking (cf. *Soph. OT* 977–8, *Eur. Cycl.* 606–7, *Hec.* 488–91, *TrGF* 11 F 506), since τύχη, like death and necessity, is fundamentally beyond our influence and appeasement (the personification and worship of Tyche as a goddess, prevalent from the fourth century onwards, is meant to replace such chaos with order and reciprocity). However, to see the Chorus suggesting 'that god is no more than our name for unpredictable chance' (Dunn (1996) 148) is too restrictive. The Chorus are not denying the reality and power of the gods, but lamenting the fact that we can comprehend only the chaotic effects of their impact on our world.

1144–8 The Chorus' inability to understand the divine is embodied in the figure of H., Zeus's daughter and yet (καίτ' 1147) an outcast. One might compare the challenge to Zeus (and the Olympians in general) arising from the destruction of his son Heracles (*Trach.*, *Her.*). Yet in both cases Zeus has a plan for his own children, even if mortals cannot see it, and even if this does not prevent other deities from having their own plans too (as with Hera's desire to destroy Heracles).

σὺ Διὸς ἔφυσ . . . θυγάτηρ: for a similarly bewildered response to Zeus's apparent neglect, see 17–21. The word order 'you of Zeus' emphasizes the god's responsibility for his kin.

πτανός . . . πατήρ: the words artfully enclose Leda. For πτανός ('winged', with Doric α for η), cf. 1487; for Zeus's flight, see 18, 215–16. The proverbially 'winged' god is Eros (e.g. *Hipp.* 1271–5), an association that suits Zeus's purpose.

ἐν κόλποις . . . Λήδας 'in Leda's womb': cf. Callim. *Hymn to Zeus* 15 ἐνθα σ' ἐπέι μήτηρ μεγάλων ἀπεθήκατο κόλπων, LSJ s.v. κόλπος 1 2.

ἔτέκνωσε: the act. forms of τεκνῶω are usually used of the man ('father'), the middle of the female ('bear').

καίτ': crasis for καὶ εἶτα, 'and yet'.

λαχίθης 'you were proclaimed', 2nd sg. aor. pass. of λαχέω. λαχίθης is scanned — — — ( — — — when the augment is dropped): see Diggle (1994) 387.

καθ' Ἑλλανίαν: with γαῖα or χθῶν understood; cf. 230.

προδοτίς: the Chorus echo H.'s own assessment of her ruined reputation: cf. 54 καὶ δοκῶ προδοῦσ', 927 προδοῦσ'.

ἄπιστος ἄδικος ἄθεος: the asyndetic tricolon of alpha-privative adjs. ('faithless, lawless, godless') concludes the Chorus' estimate of H.'s condition with great forcefulness. Though such tricola are found in Homer, Aeschylus, and Sophocles, they

become a mannerism in Eur. (see Stevens on *Andr.* 491; Breitenbach (1934) 226 counts eight examples), who on one occasion employs four adjs., *IT* 220 ἄγαμος ἄτεκνος ἄπολις ἄφιλος (Iphigenia singing of her miserable fate among the Taurians).

**1148–50** A notorious crux. The text printed here (that of Kovacs, incorporating the conjectures of Schenkl and Willink) gives excellent sense and manages to keep as much of the transmitted text as possible: ‘and I do not know what certain, what true word about the gods I can find among mortals.’ Various solutions have been offered: a popular start, present in Paley, Murray, and Alt, is to punctuate after βροτοῖς, making the Chorus’ final statement one of confident piety. Thus Murray gives οὐδ’ ἔχω | τί τὸ σαφές ἐτι [Musgrave] ποτ’ ἐν βροτοῖς· τὸ τῶν θεῶν <δ’> [Barnes] ἔπος ἀλαθῆς ἡῦρον. Yet this is to introduce confidence and reliability where they do not belong. Moreover, Alt’s attempt [(1963) 186] to connect ἔπος to the prophecy of Hermes (56–7) is unconvincing, since any reference to such optimistic prophecy is entirely misplaced here, and without effect (there is no sign of it in the following antistrophe, for example).

ἔχω ‘I know’: LSJ s.v. Α 111 2; cf. 496, 564. There is period-end here (established by hiatus) if we accept ὁ τι. The lack of pause is unusual, but not impossible (cf. Stinton (1990) 344–5).

σαφές . . . ἀλαθές: the Chorus still lack confidence in human knowledge; cf. 21 εἰ σαφῆς οὗτος λόγος (‘if this story is true/reliable’), *Her.* 62 ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώποισι τῶν θεῶν σαφές (‘how little of what the gods send can humans know for sure’). To insist on the unknowability of the gods is, however, far from atheism. Indeed, it is the Chorus’ belief in the gods, and their apparent indifference to human suffering, which have caused their confusion (1137–50n.).

εὔρω: deliberative subjunc. in indirect question (οὐδ’ ἔχω ὁ τι . . .); cf. 564, Goodwin §572, Smyth §2668d.

**1151–64** *Second antistrophe.* ‘You who try to win glory by war are fools. Strife will never end, if people seek to decide disputes through violence. If only the quarrel over you, Helen, had been resolved by words; the Trojans would not be dead, their city destroyed, and you would not be so desolate.’ The Chorus continue to reflect on the larger problems exposed by H.’s torment, ending their song with a powerful indictment of warfare and violence. Among the competing *poleis* of archaic and classical Greece warfare was a basic fact of life (cf. the Heraclitean metaphor ‘War is father of all and king of all’, DK 22 B 53; 83 Kahn), and every community maintained a citizen army (and also a navy, if necessary: cf. *Thuc.* 1.15.3–5). Yet the Chorus repudiate militarism in the strongest terms, both as a means of winning glory and as a method for resolving disputes (1151–7). Indeed, their second person plural address ‘All of you are mad who by war acquire . . .’ (1151–3 ἄφρονες . . . κτᾶσθ) has encouraged many critics to see particular extra-dramatic resonance in these lines. The foolishness of war is, however, a *topos* of tragedy (1158–60n.). These lines make sense in their dramatic context, where the Trojan War is lamented as a catastrophe by all concerned, and it is unlikely that an Athenian audience would transfer them to the Peloponnesian War: see *Introd.* p. 8.

**1151–4** The Trojan War is already portrayed in critical and unheroic terms in Aesch. *Ag.* 437–51, 555–67, etc.

**1151–3** ἄφρονες . . . κτᾶσθ: the delayed verb reveals the statement to be an apostrophe of the warmongers themselves, sharpening the charge of foolishness against them.

τὰς ἀρετάς: i.e. the fame arising from acts of ἀρετή (excellence) in battle.

πολέμῳ | λόγχαισι τ' ἀλκαίου δορός: lit. 'by war and the point of the mighty spear'. For both language and thought, cf. *Supp.* 949–51 ὦ ταλαίπωροι βροτῶν, | τί κτᾶσθε λόγχας καὶ κατ' ἀλλήλων φόνους | τίθεσθε; ('Suffering mortals, why do you get spears and bring upon yourselves each other's blood?'). ἀλκαῖος occurs only here in extant Greek, formed from ἀλκή 'strength', an eminently Homeric word. The epic quality underlines the Chorus' rejection of the warrior mentality.

**1153–4** ἀμαθῶς θανάτῳ πόνους καταλυόμενοι: the verb is conative present (Goodwin §25), 'foolishly trying to win release from the toils of war in death'. For the correction of L's καταπαυόμενοι, Diggle (1981) 17 compares the prose expressions καταλύεσθαι πόλεμον, κ. ἔχθρας. L's πόνους θανάτων refers to 'mortal sufferings' in general, but the specific military sense better suits the context: it is fighters who are being addressed. ἀμαθῶς picks up and reinforces ἄφρονες (1151): the 'foolish' never learn the lessons of war; cf. *Thuc.* 3.82.2 for a critical view of war as a 'violent teacher' (βίαιος διδάσκαλος).

**1155–7** 'For if competition in bloodshed is to settle it, strife will never cease among the cities of men', taking νιν as singular and referring to ἐρις 'strife'; others take it as plural, referring to πόνους or even τὰς ἀρετάς. However, the Chorus are looking ahead to the ἐρις over H. (1160 σὰν ἐριν, ὦ Ἑλένα), while also condemning the mentality that seeks to resolve every dispute through violence (ἄμιλλα . . . αἵματος, obj. gen.), since this breeds only further conflict.

**1158–64** The Chorus' rejection of warfare (1151–7) is illustrated (and justified) by the specific example of the Trojan War.

**1158–60** L's †αἱ Πριαμίδος γᾶς ἔλιπον θαλάμους† is corrupt. The two likeliest solutions are either to read αἱ (dat. sg.) for αἱ and ἔλαχον for ἔλιπον, 'by which [strife] they won as their lot chambers of Trojan earth', or to read ἃ (nom. sg.) for αἱ and ἔλιπ' ἄν for ἔλιπον, '(strife) which would have left (i.e. spared) the bedchambers of Priam's land'. The former is preferable, since it retains the stanza's focus on the fighters and their fatal method of resolving disputes, whereas the latter switches the focus to the Trojan widows. Moreover, the metaphorical use of θάλαμος as 'chamber beneath the earth', i.e. 'grave', is more striking, and better suited to the context, than the simple 'bedchamber'; for the figurative use of the word in tragedy, cf. Collard on *Supp.* 1022. Finally, the second option introduces an unwanted conditional clause (ἄν), since the acc. absolute ἐξόν has greater force if taken as 'when it was possible to resolve . . .' than as 'had it been possible to resolve . . .'.

Πριαμίδος γᾶς . . . θαλάμους '(The Greeks occupy) tombs in the earth of Troy'; cf. *Ag.* 453 θήκας Ἰλιάδος γᾶς.

ἔλαχον: the word points ironically to the warriors' failed ambitions: they set out to 'acquire glory in war' (1151–3), but instead 'have won graves'.

διορθῶσαι λόγοις 'to resolve with words'. The Chorus' preference for negotiations and wise judgements rather than war is a traditional one (c.g. Hes. *WD* 225–9, Aesch. *Supp.* 701–3). Moreover, the idea of diplomacy is not new: the Greeks tried it, but the embassy of M. and Odysseus was rejected by the Trojans (*Il.* 3.205–24). For the Chorus' faith in the power of speech, cf. *Phoen.* 516–17 (Eteocles criticizing his brother's attack on Thebes) πᾶν γὰρ ἔξαιρεῖ λόγος | ὃ καὶ σίδηρος πολεμίων δράσειεν ἄν ('speech captures everything that an enemy's sword might accomplish'), *Supp.* 744–9.

σὸν ἔριν 'the quarrel over you'; for the possessive pronoun taking the role of an objective gen., cf. 1236, Smyth §1197.

ὦ Ἑλένα: H. is apostrophized by the Chorus for the third time (1120, 1144), as their song moves from the losses of the Trojan War to the closing depiction of her own predicament (1163–4).

1161–4 The final vision of Troy's destruction, like the stasimon as a whole, embraces the suffering of Greeks, Trojans, and H. herself (cf. 1113–16, 1122–5, 1144–8).

1161 νῦν δ': i.e. since diplomacy provided no solution (an unsurprising result, given that the Trojan War was part of Zeus's plan for mortals).

οἱ μὲν Αἰδαὶ μέλονται κάτω: an ironic expression, suggesting that the men (Greek and Trojan alike) are now 'cared for' by Hades; cf. 196–7n.

1162 The burning of Troy is briefly, yet vividly, imagined (cf. 107–8, 196–7, 303, *Tro.* 1260–1332): the (Greek) fire is compared to Zeus's lightning, which has 'swept over' (ἐπέευστο) the walls of the city.

φόνιος . . . φλόξ: among the various suggested improvements on L's clumsy φλογερός . . . φλόξ, Heuverden's φόνιος ('murderous flame') is the most appealing; cf. *Tro.* 1318 (Hecuba addressing Troy and its temples) τὰν φόνιον ἔχετε φλόγα δορός τε λόγγαν. One can imagine a scribe confusing φόνιος with φλογερός, influenced by φλόξ and perhaps by φλογερός shortly before (1126).

ὥστε Διός 'like (that = the flame) of Zeus', i.e. the god's lightning.

ἐπέευστο: 3rd sg. aor. pass. ἐπισεύομαι 'rush upon'; cf. 1133n. The verb is found only in lyric in tragedy, and with double σσ in Homer (see Sideras (1971) 86).

1163–4 The Chorus end with a powerful description of H.'s misery, abounding in words denoting distress.

ἐπι δὲ πάθεια πάθει 'sufferings upon sufferings'. For the polyptoton, and its capacity to excite sympathy, see 173n. The separation of the preposition and the noun it governs is not unusual: see Fehling (1969) 232–3; for examples of polyptoton with ἐπί (used in prose to mark solemnity), see Gygli-Wyss (1966) 75 n. 2.

φέρεις 'you endure' rather than 'you bring, cause'; cf. 254.

ἀθλία: Dale's emendation (for the dat. pl. ἀθλίους) makes the adj. agree with the fem. sg. subject (H.).

συμφοραῖς ἔλειναῖς: clatives of cause after ἀθλία (Smyth §1517), 'made miserable through pitiful suffering'.

## 1165-1300 THIRD EPISODE

Theoc.'s return from hunting (cf. 153-4) means that the deception, which has been in preparation since 815, can finally begin. The third and fourth episodes are the shortest of the play, and the pace of the action increases markedly as the intrigue takes effect in passages of rapid dialogue (1195-1277, 1412-28: cf. 553-96n.). Theoc.'s opening speech (1165-92) is followed by suchomythic exchange, first with H. (1195-1249), then with M. (1250-77), until Theoc., now thoroughly deceived, not only approves the burial rites but even promises the shipwrecked stranger (i.e. M.) a safe return to Greece (1279-84). The whole scene, like the next, is permeated by illusion, duplicity, and dramatic irony: Theoc. is the only figure who does not understand the significance of what is happening, and so cannot appreciate the double meaning of much that is said, not only by H. and M. (cf. esp. 1201, 1205, 1215, 1251, 1273, 1288-1300), but even by himself (1230, 1246, 1250, 1254, 1264, 1278-84). H. and M. exploit the superficial plausibility of appearances for their own ends: M., whom H. had feared dead (cf. 132, 203-4, 226-8, 277-9, 308), now pretends to be so.

**1165-92** Theoc. enters from the countryside with attendants leading hounds and carrying hunting-nets (cf. 1069-70). Having addressed his father's tomb, he vows to kill the Greek who has recently arrived at the palace (1171-6). Then, noticing that H. is no longer seated as a suppliant at the tomb (1177 ξα), Theoc. calls to his servants to organize a pursuit, but is immediately halted by H.'s entrance from the palace, dressed in mourning (1184ff.). The entrance-speech integrates the newcomer into the dramatic action with particular dexterity.

**1165-8** Theoc. not only greets his dead father but gives an explanation for the tomb's unusual placement beside the palace doors – so that Theoc. can address Proteus as he comes and goes from the palace. The passage draws attention to Theoc.'s respect for the dead, a fundamental idea in the dialogue that follows, but also reminds the audience of Theoc.'s distance from his father in his treatment of H. There is no reference here to Egyptian burial practices (tombs and necropolises were kept well apart from living spaces in Egypt as well as Greece), and the dramatic need to combine tomb and palace prevails over ethnographic realism of any kind. Theoc.'s explanation stresses his own decision to place the grave where he did, implying that this is a feature peculiar to Proteus' tomb, even in his 'Egypt': cf. *Introd.* p. 30.

**1165** ὦ χαῖρε: before the fourth century BC χαῖρε was not used (on epitaphs) to address the ordinary dead, but was associated with heroization and deification: see Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 180-216. Thus Theoc.'s greeting as he approaches the grave reinforces the idea of Proteus' heroic status: cf. 547n.

**1167** κρίσιών: crisis, καὶ ἐσιών.

**1168** Theoc. addresses his father (1166) and names himself: since there is no choral entrance-announcement to name the newcomer, Theoc. must do it himself, but the combination of father and son also indicates pride in his ancestry (cf. 386-92).

παῖς . . . πάτερ: Theoc., like his sister (999-1000, 1028-9), is eager to honour his father, even if his desire for H. prevents him from acting as Proteus did.

**1169–70** The attendants enter the palace through the central doors; the dogs and cumbersome hunting-nets are thus quickly removed. The imagery of Theoc. as an erotic ‘hunter’ (50–1n.) is now embodied in literal physical terms, just as he captures (or so he thinks) H., his sexual ‘prey’.

**1171–6** Theoc. has learned of M.’s arrival, but (as is crucial for the escape plot) not of his identity.

**1171–2** Theoc. upbraids himself for failing to enforce discipline among his sentries (1174 σκοπούς), who are κακούς for allowing the Greek to elude them. The audience may be reminded of the Old Woman, whose gruffness was forced on her by her master (cf. 481–2n.).

πολλ(ά) . . . δὴ ‘many times indeed’: δὴ emphasizes adverbial πολλά, not (as it usually does) the immediately preceding word: *GP* 227 11.1.

**1173** φανερόν emphasizes the laxity of the guards.

**1175–6** Unlike Thoas in the *IT*, who is motivated to kill foreigners by Artemis’ demand for human sacrifice, Theoc. is driven to kill Greeks by his own desire for H. (1168n.).

θηρώμενον: Theoc. projects his own intentions onto the newcomer: cf. 50–1n.

ἦν . . . μόνον: γε δὴ emphasizes ἦν, as does μόνον, ‘if only he is caught’; *GP* 245.1 illustrates its use as an ‘emphatic limitative’. γε δὴ is common in prose, but rare in tragedy: see Griffith on [Aesch.] *PV* 42.

**1177** ἔα: cf. 71n. Theoc. sees the empty space where H. used to sit, without seeing M., who must be crouching on the other side, and infers that she has made off with the stranger.

διαπεπραγμένα ‘(already) accomplished’ (the perf. ἤρρηκα underlines the idea of completion), referring to H.’s removal from the tomb (cf. 1179 ἐκπεπόρθμευται, ‘has been carried off (by ship)’, 1183 ἐκκομισθεῖσ’).

**1179** ἐκπεπόρθμευται: the verb ἐκπορθμεύω (‘to carry away by sea’) is found only in *Heloi*; see 1517–18n.

**1180–3** Theoc. calls inside to the servants to open the palace doors and the stables (ἵππικὰς | φάτνας) which are imagined as being in a courtyard behind them.

**1180** χαλᾶτε κληῖθρα: 859–60n.

**1181** κάκκομιζεθ’: crasis and elision, καὶ ἐκκομίζετε.

**1182** πόνου γ’ ἔκατι ‘as far as my efforts are concerned’ (*LSJ* s.v. ἔκητι 11 2), i.e. not for want of exertion on Theoc.’s part.

**1184** ἐπίσχετ’ ‘stop!’ As Theoc. speaks of tracking down his would-be ‘wife’ (1183 ἄλοχος), the palace doors open to reveal not, as expected, the servants and chariots, but H. herself, dressed in mourning. Taken aback, Theoc. cancels his own orders.

οὓς: the generalizing plural is masculine in Greek, even when it refers to a single female (= ἦν): Smyth §1015.

διώκομεν: for Theoc. as an eroticized hunter, cf. 1169–70n.

**1186** αὐτή: when the demonstrative pronoun is used as a vocative (‘you there’) it usually has a tone of impatience, surprise, or disapproval (cf. 1627, Stevens (1976)

37-8); so here Theoc. is taken aback by H.'s appearance and asks her a series of urgent questions to find out what has happened (1186-92).

**1186-90** As H. herself predicted (1087-9n.), she has transformed herself into a figure of mourning (effected theatrically by a black costume and a new mask with cropped hair and furrowed cheeks). The beauty that destroyed her life, and that she wished could be undone (260-3), is now marred, and in an effort, appropriately enough, to re-establish her marriage and former happiness.

**1186** ἐξήψω: 2nd sg. aor. middle of ἐξάπτω, 'fasten to', with gen. (χροός, 'skin').

**1188** σιδηρον ἐμβαλοῦσ': cf. *Or.* 966 (of the personified Mycenae) σιδαρον ἐπὶ κάρα τιθεῖσα κούριμον.

ἀπέθρισας: 2nd sg. aor. of ἀποθερίζω, 'cut off'; cf. *Or.* 128-9 (Electra on the 'old' H.) ἴδετε γὰρ ἄκρας ὡς ἀπέθρισεν τρίχας, | σώζουσα κάλλος. According to Plutarch *Lyc.* 15.5, Spartan brides had their hair cut off on the eve of marriage. H.'s hair-cutting would thus make a nice prelude to her new 'marriage' with Theoc. (in reality the renewal of her old one with M.), but it is doubtful whether an Athenian audience would readily make such a connection here.

**1189** χλωροῖς . . . δάκρυσι: χλωρός ('fresh') connotes 'glistening' as well as 'moist' (cf. τέγγεις): see Mastronarde on *Med.* 906.

**1190-1** πεπεισμένη | . . . ὄνειροις: dreams and their interpreters are a feature of Greek literature from Homer onwards: e.g. *Il.* 1.63 (sent by Zeus, as with all dreams in the *Iliad*), *Od.* 4.795-841. (Athena sends a dream-image of Iphitime to Penelope). Fifth-century Hippocratic scientists argued that dreams had a physiological rather than a divine origin (*On dreams* (= *On regimen* 4), *On the sacred disease*), but dream-interpreters operated throughout antiquity; on the Greeks' attitudes to their dreams, see Dodds (1951) 102-34. Dreams in tragedy create various narrative effects of prediction and suspense as the characters struggle to interpret them (Aesch. *Pers.* 181-99, *Cho.* 32-42, 523-50; Soph. *El.* 417-25; Eur. *Hec.* 68-91, *IT* 42-55; [Eur.] *Rhes.* 780-8): see Cropp on *IT* 42-66.

**1191-2** φάτιν τιν' οἴκοθεν 'some news from home', brought perhaps by the recently arrived Greek (1173-4).

**1193** ὦ δέσποτ' . . . ἔπος: H.'s first words to Theoc. represent a brilliantly manipulative use of the conventions of Greek address, whose forms can denote many nuances of status and authority: cf. Wendel (1929) 139-40 (for Eur.'s practice), Dickey (1996) 95-8, 272 (on the use of δέσποτα). As H.'s earlier application of δεσπότης to M. shows (572), the word may express a husband's authority over his wife (as well as a master's over his slaves: cf. 1630). H.'s 'master', emphasized by her explanation (γάρ) of this surprising form of address (cf. *Andr.* 56-7, 64-5, *Ion* 517), immediately creates the impression that she has given up all resistance to Theoc. and is now willing to accept him as her husband-to-be (cf. 1231; note also Medea's pejorative use of the word at *Med.* 233-4 πόσιν πρίσσει δέσποτην τε σώματος | λαβεῖν). H.'s plan works and by the end of the scene Theoc. addresses her sympathetically as ὦ τάλαινα (1285).

**1194** φροῦδα τὰμά: crasis, τὰ ἐμά, 'my hopes are gone'.

κοῦδέν εἰμ' ἔτι: *crasis*, καὶ οὐδέν; for the idiom of 'being nothing' (= 'to be dead'), cf. 60–2n., Soph. *El.* 677, *Phil.* 951, Eur. *Andr.* 1077, Cooper (1971) 152.

1195–1277 represents the first and longer of two passages of stichomythia in which Theoc. is deceived (cf. 1412–28). H. begins by convincing Theoc. that the Greek stranger at Proteus' tomb is an eyewitness to M.'s death at sea (1195–1221). Then, having successfully supplicated Theoc. to allow her to give M. a 'proper' burial (1222–48), H. leaves it to the Greek 'stranger' to supply the details of the burial's ritual requirements, each one of which is in fact also geared to their escape (1249–78, esp. 1255–78n.). The audience will undoubtedly have enjoyed the inventiveness of H. and M. and the irony of their responses, but there is more to the deception of Theoc. (and to the deception of Thoas at *IT* 1153–1233) than mere fun and amusement, since the action raises genuinely troubling issues of human ignorance and misperception, albeit at the expense of a gullible barbarian (Intro. §6(a)).

1195 ἐν τῷ . . . συμφορᾷς: partitive gen. after interrogative τῷ (= τίνι), 'what misfortune are you in?'

τίς ἡ τύχη 'what has happened?'

1197–8 1197 foregrounds not only Theoc.'s basic humanity ('I do not rejoice at all in your words', said in sympathy), which H. and M. will soon exploit to secure 'burial' for M., but also Theoc.'s happiness at his improved prospects of marriage to H. ('though they bring me good fortune'), which too will be a crucial factor in the ensuing dialogue. So disruption of the stichomythia is no argument against 1197 (1198 being crucial to what follows) since irregularities are common, especially at the beginning of such sequences.

1198 μῶν (contracted from μὴ οὖν) serves here as 'little more than a sign of interrogation' (Barrett on *Hipp.* 794, who discusses the various implications of starting a question with μῶν). Theoc. names the other possible source of such news (cf. 1191–2n.).

1199 κείνη τε φησίν: H.'s confidence in Theonoc's support proves justified: cf. 1370–3n.

ὁ τε παρών ὅτ' ὠλλυτο 'and someone who was present when he died'. H. of all people knows how important visual evidence is as proof, even at second hand (cf. 117–22, 575–80nn.).

1200 ὅστις καὶ . . . σαφῆ: the stress is on the final word: cf. *GP* 295.ii 'καὶ following a relative (especially the universalizing ὅστις) often gives an effect of limitation, by imposing an additional qualification.'

1201 μόλοι . . . μολεῖν ('if only he would go where I want him to go!') is a deft piece of double talk, which would be savoured by the audience: Theoc. understands H. to wish the survivor a bad end (since he has brought such unwelcome news), whereas H. is in fact wishing M. a safe return home. Cf. also Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1604–5: 'the wish is connected with γάρ because it explains the bitter tone with which the short preceding phrase (i.e. ἦκει) was uttered.'

1203 Theoc.'s double question (1202) is immediately answered (cf. 1206–7) as H. points to the tomb.

ὑποπτήξας 'cowering': H. tactically draws attention to M.'s weakness and desperation, stressing that he is no threat to Theoc.

**1204** Ἀπολλον: 'invocation of Apollo, as healer and averter of evils, was a colloquial expression of alarm' (Lloyd on *Andr.* 900); cf. *Her.* 538 (Heracles reacts to the news that his children are about to be killed) Ἀπολλον, οἷσις φροϊμίσις ἀρχηι λόγου, *IT* 1174 (Thoas on the matricide) Ἀπολλον, οὐδ' ἐν βαρβάροις ἔτλη τις ἄν. The religious world of the play is Greek, despite its Egyptian setting: cf. 865–72n.

ἔσθῃτι δυσμόρφωι: M.'s costume begins to have the desired effect: 421–4, 554, 1079–82nn.

**1205** κάμὸν: crasis, καὶ ἐμὸν, 'I suppose my husband too must be in such a condition.'

**1206** κατέσχε denotes travel by sea, 'put in to shore'.

**1209** οἰκτρόταθ' (clided adverb, οἰκτρότατα) 'in the most pitiful way', since death at sea prevented proper burial rites: 1061–6n.

ὑγροῖσιν: a common epithet of the sea; compare the Homeric 'watery ways', ὑγρὰ κέλευθα. If there was a widespread Greek conception that barbarians were unable to swim (cf. Hordern (2002) 153), the manner of M.'s demise may be intended to strike Theoc. as especially terrifying.

**1210** βαρβάροισι: Theoc. paradoxically shares the Greek audience's ethnographic viewpoint (cf. 1258) as well as its religious one (1204n.). However, we should beware of reading such remarks (cf. also Thoas', quoted above on 1204) as a sign of Eur.'s subverting the distinction between Greek and barbarian, since the heroic age Greeks are not the same as the fifth-century audience, and there is no simple dichotomy of Greek and barbarian at work in the texts: see *Introd.* §6(c).

ναυσθλούμενον: masc. acc. sg. pres. part. pass. of ναυσθλώ ('I carry by sea'); the verb is used in tragedy only by Eur.

**1211** Λιβύης . . . πέτραις: a coastline that M. happens to know all too well: 404n.

ἀλιμένοις: the Chorus described M.'s wanderings in the same terms: 1132n.

**1212** κοινωνῶν πλάτης 'since he shared the (same) ship'. For the synecdoche, cf. 191, 234, 1117, 394n.

**1213** κακίους = κακίονες. A typical piece of aristocratic 'wisdom', which deflects Theoc.'s surprise (1212 καὶ πῶς . . .); 'common people are often luckier than the noble.' But if H.'s words are understood in a moral (rather than simply social) sense, they can be taken as a veiled complaint about the better fortune of 'bad men' like Theoc.

**1214** λιπῶν is modified by ποῦ and placed first for emphasis: 'but where did he leave the wreckage of the ship before he came here?'

**1215** By cursing the wreckage H. cleverly evades Theoc.'s question, lest he search for the wreck and discover M.'s crew (cf. 1069–70). The passage echoes the exchange between Odysseus and the Cyclops (154–5, 501–2nn.), where Odysseus successfully pretends that the rest of his men perished in the shipwreck (*Od.* 9.279–86). But here it is H. who plays the part of the resourceful Odysseus: cf. 1049n.

**1216** ὄλωλ' ἐκεῖνος: Theoc. has fallen for (the first part of) the trick: 1195–1277n.

**1217** Anonymous sailors brought the stranger from Libya (1211). H.'s vagueness is calculated.

ἀνειλοντ': L has ἀνειλον, but the middle is regularly used of rescuing the shipwrecked: cf. 1616, Pl. *Apol.* 32b3.

**1219** νεφέλης . . . ἀγαλμ': 705n.

ἐς αἰθέρ': 584, 613nn.

**1220** ὦ . . . Τρωιάς: Theoc.'s reflection on the war gains emotional intensity from the apostrophe of the dead Priam and his devastated city; cf. 362–3, *Andr.* 105–6.

μάτην: for the futility of the war (from the perspective of certain Greeks), see 453, 593, 707nn. Once again, however, it is important to resist the notion that Theoc.'s comment challenges the superiority of Greek over barbarian (1210n.). The Greeks have a limited viewpoint on the war, and Theoc. himself is hardly one to judge them. The point of his comment is to underline the absolute destruction of Troy, which is clear to all, and the baffling purposes of the gods. He is after all speaking about the εἶδωλον (1219), which has been made and deployed by the gods.

**1222** With M.'s death established (1216), the focus turns to the issue of his burial.

**1223** οἱ' γῶ: H.'s expression of grief continues the pretence of mourning: cf. 594n. Having already lamented M.'s death, believing it to be genuine (203–4; cf. *IT* 56–8, 143–77), H. now does so as part of the deception.

**1224** ξανθῆς κόμης: M. too was renowned for his blond hair (cf. ξανθὸς Μενέλαος: *Il.* 3.284, etc.) and is likely to have worn an appropriate mask, a further (visual) link between husband and wife.

**1225** As a reply to Theoc.'s question ('Is that why you have cut your hair?'), L's text φίλος γάρ ἐστιν ὅς ποτ' ἐστιν ἐνθάδ' ὦν is clearly impossible ('Yes, for he is dear, whoever he is that is here'). Diggle prefers φίλος γάρ ἐστιν, ὡς ποτ' ἦν, ἔτ' ἐνθάδ' ὦν ('Yes, for he is still as dear (to me) here as he once was'). His recommendation is perhaps the best (Kannicht reviews almost two dozen conjectures), since it delivers the *double entendre* with the minimum change of letters.

ἐνθάδ' ὦν: the point rests in the ambiguity not only of 'here' (M. really is present) but also of ὦν, which can stand as an 'imperfect' participle ('when he *was* here'): cf. 1199, 1249, 1437.

**1226** ὀρθῶς . . . δακρύεται 'Is it really (μέν) right that this misfortune be lamented?' In other words, Theoc. can still scarcely believe that M. is in fact dead and H. is forced to appeal once more to Theonoe's reputation for knowledge (1227); cf. 1199.

μέν: cf. *GP* 367 'It [μέν] generally implies that unless the answer is "yes", the discussion cannot go on.'

**1227** ἐν εὐμαρεῖ (a periphrasis for εὐμαρές ἐστι; cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 784–5): 'It's an easy thing, I suppose (γοῦν), to elude your sister.' For ironic γοῦν, see *GP* 455.ii.

**1228** πῶς οὖν marks a change of topic (cf. 587n.), 'What now?'

**1230–29** The transposition proposed by Jackson (1955) 25–7 restores 1229 to Theoc. (as sense demands) and has H. make a characteristic pledge to remain faithful

to her husband (1230), which she then dramatically abandons (or so it seems) in 1231, to Theoc.'s delight. Kovacs (2003) 45–6 defends Willink's suggestion that we keep the transmitted order and mark lacunae before 1229 and 1230, but Jackson's is the more economical and plausible solution.

**1231** ἤδη . . . γάμων: for the wedding arrangements, cf. 1431–5. H. pretends to give up her marriage with M. in order to begin a new one with a barbarian king – she is, in other words, playing her old 'self' (i.e. the traditional adulterous H.), but in the service of rescuing the 'new' one. Eur. is using H.'s intertextual history to novel and striking effect.

**1232** χρόνια . . . τάδε 'this (i.e. her agreement to marry him) has been long in coming, but thank you nonetheless.'

αἰνῶ expresses approval and thanks, but here in a patronizing manner (Lloyd (1999) 38–9 compares *Med.* 908, *IT* 1486, and [*Rhes.*] 191 as examples of the present (ἐπ)αινῶ with a condescending tone).

**1233** οἶσθ' . . . δρᾶσον: see 315n.

λαθώμεθα: hortatory aor. subjunctive, 'let us forget (the past).'

**1234** ἐπὶ τῷ 'on what terms?': cf. 838 ἐπὶ τοῖσδε.

χάρις . . . ἀντὶ χάριτος: the repetition emphasizes the reciprocity of favours. Theoc.'s adage (cf. *Soph. Aj.* 522, *OC* 779) sets up H.'s appeal for burial (1237–49) once she has apparently renounced her quarrel with him (1235).

**1235** σπονδὰς τέμωμεν 'let us make a truce': the language is formal and ceremonial, magnifying H.'s agreement and reinforcing the impression of trustworthiness.

διαλλάχθητι: aor. pass. imper. of διαλλάττω, 'be reconciled (with me)'; cf. *Med.* 896–7 (spoken in a similar situation of bogus reconciliation) διαλλάχθηθ' . . . | τῆς πρόσθεν ἔχθρας ἐς φίλους.

**1236** νεῖκος τὸ σόν 'my quarrel with you': cf. σὸν ἔριν (1158–60n.).

**1237** H. falls to the ground and embraces Theoc.'s knees: cf. 894n.

πρὸς νῦν σε γονάτων '(I implore) you by your knees': the ellipse of the verb (ἱκετεύω) governing σε is regular in such appeals; cf. Mastrorarde on *Med.* 324.

ἐπείπερ εἰ φίλος: H. entices Theoc. with the prospect of being 'dear' to her, as M. once was: cf. 1225n.

**1238** τί χρῆμα: 782n.

θηρῶσ': a key-word for Theoc. (50–1n.), but now he is H.'s 'prey' (1175–6n.).

ῶρέχθης: 2nd. sg. aor. pass. ὀρέγομαι (+ gen.), 'reach out for'.

**1239** To go unburied was the ultimate disaster for a hero. (For the additional problems created in the afterlife by the lack of proper burial, cf. *Il.* 23.69–74, *Od.* 11.51–80, 12.8–15.)

**1240** Theoc., though a barbarian, shares Greek expectations of what constitutes a proper burial: 1061–6, 1204, 1210nn. His question is unintentionally ironic: M. is both alive and present (ἔστ' ἀπόντων τύμβος;). Moreover, although there is no 'shade' to bury (ἢ θάψεις σκιάν;), σκιά can denote the unreal, and they will indeed bury a 'shadow' (i.e. a 'nothing'), since M. is not dead. According to Herodotus (6.58.3), if a

Spartan king was killed fighting abroad (and his body was not recovered), the Spartans would make a statue of him and bury it with full honours.

τί δέ (shortened from τί δ' ἔστι: cf. 600, 1514) expresses Theoc.'s incredulity.

**1241** Ἐλληνισίν ἔστι νόμος: as in the *IT* (1153–1233), 'Greek' ritual is used to deceive the barbarian king (1032–1106n.). The disparity between Greek and barbarian *nomoi* is consciously exploited (cf. 1246), yet it is significant that the difference is *invented* (1240n.). Similarly, both Iphigenia and the Greek chorus of the *IT* reject human sacrifice as a 'barbarian' practice (389–90, 464–6), despite Agamemnon's decision to sacrifice Iphigenia herself (359–71): cf. 1210, 1220nn.

**1242** σοφοί . . . Πελοπίδαι: does Theoc. mean the Peloponnesians/Greeks in general or the Spartan royal house in particular? 1264 supports the latter, 1429 the former. In either case, they are both expert (compared to an Egyptian) in Greek burial customs, and there is unconscious irony in the fact that the Pelopids M. and H. (386–92) are being far more 'clever' about the burial than Theoc. realizes.

**1243** κενοῖσι . . . ὑφάσμασιν: M.'s empty shroud and covered bier (1261) evoke the state funerals of Athens itself, where an empty bier represented all the fallen whose bodies had not been recovered (cf. Thuc. 2.34.3). Yet the 'ancestral custom' (πάτριος νόμος: Thuc. 2.34.1) of symbolic burial is necessarily adapted here for death – and, more importantly, escape – by sea. Moreover, the empty shroud and bier seem to honour H.'s 'missing' husband, yet the burial is indeed κενός (cf. 1057, 1060, 1243, 1261, 1546) in the sense of 'pointless, void' (LSJ s.v. 1 2), since M. is not in fact dead.

**1244–8** Theoc.'s suggestion that they build a cenotaph for the missing M. (the actual Greek custom in the case of those lost at sea: 1063–4n.) triggers the introduction of the invented ritual.

**1244** ἀνίστη: pres. imper., 'erect'.

**1246** πῶς δαί: the colloquial particle δαί (not found in Aesch. or Soph.; cf. *GP* 263.2, Stevens (1976) 45–6) marks Theoc.'s surprise at H.'s rejection of his suggestion, 'So how *do* you bury them?'

λέλειμμα: 'I am ignorant of' (lit. 'I have been left behind in', a racing metaphor: LSJ s.v. λείπω B II 2–3). Theoc.'s ignorance enables H.'s deception, yet his admission is also ironic (and amusingly so for the Greek audience) since the Greek customs in question do not actually exist.

**1247** The combination of ἐξ πόντον and ἐξορμίζομεν ('we take out') underlines the most crucial aspects of the ritual: it requires a ship and must be done in the open sea (cf. 1266–9).

**1249–78** H. entrusts the details of the ritual to M., presenting him as an expert in such matters (1249 ὁδ' οἶδ', ἐγὼ δ' ἄπειρος) in order to ensure his participation in the 'burial' itself. It is likely that H. now releases Theoc. from her suppliant clasp and stands up again (since he has just agreed to her request), while M. steps forward from the tomb to converse with Theoc. (1085–6n.).

**1250** λόγων . . . φίλην: Theoc. makes no attempt to disguise his pleasure at the news of M.'s death.

**1253** ὡς . . . ἦ: lit. 'as each man is in respect of his available wealth' (for εἶναι + part. gen., cf. 738 οὐ τ' ἐσμὲν τύχης, *Ion* 1252 ἴν' εἰ τύχης), i.e. 'as well as each man's wealth allows'. M. entices Theoc. to display his status by making the offerings as generous as possible.

**1254** ταύτης χάριν: Theoc.'s response shows his infatuation with H.

**1255–78** Each of the items required for the burial is simultaneously geared to the escape plan. The sacrificial animal (1255), bier (1261), armour (i.e. possessions valued by the deceased, 1263), food offerings (1265), and presence of closest kin (1275) are all regular features of Greek burials (Burkert (1985) 192–3), but they also provide food, clothing, and armour conducive to the escape, while ensuring H.'s presence on board the ship (the one item (1267) not required by genuine ritual, but fundamental to the plan).

**1257** αὐτὸς σὺ γίγνωσκ' 'you decide yourself'.

ἀρκέσει once again invites Theoc.'s generosity (1253n.).

**1258** ἐν βαρβάροις: both animals were also sacrificed as part of Greek funerary rituals, although the horse only rarely (Burkert (1983) 51, 53): see 1210n. The offer of a bull, the most valuable sacrificial animal in Greek terms, or a horse, whose meat, unlike the bull's, would not be eaten (1255–78n.), underlines Theoc.'s wealth and generosity (for horses as symbols of wealth in Athens, see Parker (1996) 140–1).

**1259** 'Give, but make sure you don't give anything malformed.'

γε μὲν δῆ: cf. *GP* 395 'This rare combination is confined to tragedy . . . [It is] definitely, and strongly, adversative.'

δυσγενές μηδέν: sacrificial animals must be healthy and unblemished.

**1260** οὐ τῶνδ' . . . σπανίζομεν 'we do not lack these' (800–1n.), i.e. suitable bulls and horses.

**1261** στρωτὰ . . . λέκτρα: the bier is to be covered with robes (cf. 1243n.), which may later be used for clothing (cf. 428–9).

**1263–4** Cf. 1062n., 1375–81, 1606–8.

**1266** πῶς οὖν: 'what then?': 1228n.

**1267** κάρετμῶν ἐπιστάτας: crasis with καί, 'and rowers'. For the poetic periphrasis, cf. 1039–40n.

**1268** πόσον . . . δόρυ: lit. 'what distance from land is it necessary (sc. δεῖ 1267) to separate the ship?'

**1269** ῥόθια 'the splash (of the oars)'

χερσόθεν 'from the shore'.

**1270** τί δῆ . . . ἐκ τίνος: the repetition ('Why? For what reason . . .?') indicates Theoc.'s puzzlement at the Greek 'custom' (νόμιμον: cf. 1277).

**1271** ὡς . . . κλύδων 'so that the tide does not carry the pollution back to land.' The λύματα are the byproducts of the sacrifice, cast into the sea, which was viewed as a powerful purifier (cf. *Soph. Aj.* 654–5, *Eur. IT* 1039, 1193 θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τάνθρώπων κακά). But whereas the Greeks usually thought of the sea as absorbing (and so neutralizing) the pollution (cf. Parker (1983) 229–30), M. raises the (invented) danger of the pollution being washed ashore in order to justify rowing far from land.

**1272** ταχύπαρος 'swiftly moving' (applied to Achilles at Eur. *El.* 451). The Phoenicians were renowned seafarers: cf. e.g. *Od.* 15.415, *Hdt.* 4.42-4 (circumnavigation of 'Libya', i.e. Africa).

**1273** Μενέλεώι τε πρὸς χάριν ('and would be pleasing to M.') is doubly ironic, since spoken by M. himself, who knows, as Theoc. does not, exactly how the swift ship will be pleasing.

**1275** M.'s prescription reflects actual Greek burial customs, since the corpse was bathed, anointed, and dressed by close relatives, normally the women of the family: e.g. *Tr.* 377-8 (the Greeks killed at Troy were not dressed for burial by their wives), *IT* 627 (Orestes laments not being buried by his sister Electra).

**1276** ὡς λέγεις 'from what you say'.

**1277-8** M. secures H.'s participation with an appeal to 'piety', ironically so in view of the focus on Theoc.'s impiety in departing from the conduct of his father (900-2, 919-23, 973-4, 998-1001, 1020-1, 1028-9). The contrast of attitude underlines Theoc.'s obsession with H., for whom he was prepared even to murder innocent Greeks. We have already seen one aspect of Theoc.'s respect for his dead father (1165-8n.), and the appeal to proper burial (a divinely sanctioned claim and a major theme of Greek literature, especially of epic and tragedy: cf. esp. Soph. *Aj.* 1332-45, *Ant.* 450-60, Eur. *Supp.* 558-63) is likely to have an effect, particularly as Theoc. has nothing to lose by consenting.

**1277** ἐν εὐσεβεί (=εὐσεβές ἐστί): 1227n.

γοῦν 'Yes, for . . .': cf. *GP* 451.ii '[γοῦν] introduces a statement which is . . . evidence for a preceding statement' (i.e. 1277 shows that it is H.'s task to bury her husband).

κλέπτειν implies deprivation, so here 'to cheat the dead of their due' (Dale).

**1278** ἴτω expresses acquiescence, 'very well, then'.

πρὸς ἡμῶν (ἐστίν) 'it is in my interest'.

ἄλοχον εὐσεβῆ τρέφειν: Theoc.'s complacency and his view of H. as his 'wife' (encouraged by H. herself: 1193n., 1399) are of course wholly misconceived (cf. 1385-6, 1423, 1431-5).

**1279-84** Theoc. promises to reward the Greek sailor for bringing the 'good news' of M.'s death (contrast 1176, where he threatened to kill the Greek, thinking he was after H.).

**1279** κόσμον νεκρῶι: cf. 1062n.

**1280-2** The audience can appreciate the irony of Theoc.'s words: M. certainly hopes not to leave 'empty-handed', having done a 'favour' to H., while the news is not 'good' for Theoc.

**1282-4** M.'s transformation from ragged beggar to impressive fighter is unwittingly furthered by Theoc. himself (cf. 1379-81).

ἀντὶ τῆς ἀχλαινίας 'in place of your rags' (cf. 416). ἀχλαινία (lit. 'want of a cloak') is a *hapax*.

**1285-7** Theoc. turns finally to H. herself, seeking to console her for M.'s death.

μη. . . | σαυτήν 'do not, wasting yourself away to no purpose, . . .': the lacuna posited by Badham will have contained the missing imperative. Diggle's *exempli gratia*

supplement (see the app. crit.) gives the required sense, ‘do not . . . mourn M. excessively’. The words will presumably have dropped out through a scribe’s oversight (*saut du même au même*).

κοῦκ . . . γόοις: the idea that one cannot bring the dead back to life through weeping is a familiar theme of consolations (e.g. *Il.* 24.551, Eur. *Alc.* 985–6; cf. Kassel (1958) 63). H. is playing the part of the mourning wife quite convincingly (cf. 1419).

1288–1300 Before all three characters exit into the palace, M. and H. exchange advice and encouragement, their true meaning disguised by Theoc.’s ignorance of the situation. The barrage of references to H.’s ‘husbands’ (1289, 1292, 1294, 1299) generates much intentional and inventive ambiguity at Theoc.’s expense.

1288–9 σὸν ἔργον (cf. 830n.) refers to the following advice.

ὦ νεᾶνι (‘young lady’) maintains the tone of a well-meaning stranger.

τὸν παρόντα μὲν | . . . τὸν δὲ μηκέτ’ ὄντ: Theoc. understands this as referring to himself and M. respectively; speaker, addressee, and audience understand the opposite.

1290 πρὸς τὸ τυγχάνον (‘(for that is best for you) in view of the present circumstances’) is deliberately vague.

1293 ψόγου . . . τοῦ πρίν: for H.’s unjustly ruined reputation, cf. 223–5, 250–2, 270–2, 694–7.

γυνή γένη: the repetition of the same or similar syllable in successive words did not ‘sound offensive to the ancient ear’ (as Diggle (1994) 32 points out, with examples), and in some cases (as here) the assonance seems emphatic.

1294–5 ἔσται τὰδ’ expresses H.’s assent (cf. 744) and her confidence of success (cf. Collard on Eur. *Supp.* 1182).

εἴση: 2nd sg. fut. of οἶδα, ‘you will know’.

1296–7 For M.’s bath and fresh clothes, cf. 1382–4.

1297–8 οὐκ ἐς ἀμβολάς (‘I shall take good care of you) without delay’ (903–4n.). For the apocope of ἀναβολή, see LSJ s.v. II 2.

1298–1300 H.’s final words are charged with double meaning.

εὐμενέστερον: adverbial, ‘more kindly’.

τά πρόσφορα (‘what is suitable/fitting’) refers ostensibly to M.’s funeral rites but can also be understood (by everyone except Theoc.) as a comment on the imminent escape.

ἡμῶν . . . χρή (‘if you get from me what you ought to’) is similarly ambiguous: Theoc. thinks of M.’s bath and change of clothes, but the audience understand the phrase more generally in terms of H.’s assistance in the deception. (Dimock (1977) 19 sees here a hint that H. and M. will make love while inside.) All three exit into the palace (1369–89n.).

### 1301–1368 SECOND STASIMON

The choral odes of tragedy regularly involve the chorus reflecting upon an earlier moment in the play or its related myths. Thus in the first stasimon the Chorus lamented

the origins of the Trojan War and its consequences for both sides (1107ff.). In the third stasimon, by contrast, they look forward in time (beyond the boundaries of the action) and envisage H. and M.'s joyful arrival back in Sparta (1451ff.). Here in the second stasimon, however, the allegedly excessive distance between the content of the Chorus' song and the action of the play has led to strong scholarly condemnation of the stasimon itself (cf. Whitman (1974) 65 'generally considered the most irrelevant ode in Greek tragedy'), while Dale (on 1301–68) describes it as 'a strange ode, perhaps reflecting something of the style of contemporary dithyramb'. These two complaints – that the ode is an irrelevant 'interlude' (or ἐμβόλιμον) and that it is 'dithyrambic' – are connected, and need to be considered in more detail, not only for what they tell us about critical attitudes to later Euripidean tragedy, but also because they compel us to consider the precise relationship of the second stasimon to the action that surrounds it.

In his *Poetics* Aristotle prescribes that 'The chorus should be treated as one of the actors; it should be a part of the whole and should participate [sc. in the action], not as in Euripides but as in Sophocles. With the other poets, the songs are no more integral to the plot than to another tragedy – hence the practice, started by Agathon, of singing interlude songs (ἐμβόλιμα)' (1456a25–9, tr. Halliwell). As elsewhere in the *Poetics*, Aristotle's own preference for Soph. over Eur. is clear, but perhaps the most striking aspect of this passage is the way later critics have misinterpreted it, as if Aristotle's remarks justified their own search for, and condemnation of, ἐμβόλιμα in Eur. Yet Aristotle ascribes such sung interludes to 'other poets', not to Soph. or Eur., while his complaint that Eur.'s choruses do not 'participate' (συναγωνίζεσθαι) in the way Soph.'s do is very different, perhaps pointing to the tendency of Euripidean choruses to be more distanced in their reflectiveness, thus appearing more disengaged from the action itself.

The second complaint – that the song is a 'dithyrambic' interlude (c.g. Dale xiii) – is no less problematic. For although Kranz's influential study of 'dithyrambic stasima' ((1933) 252–60) focused on narrative odes ('διε λῆτορικά') like the present one, it seems misleading to define the choral narration of myth as specifically 'dithyrambic' (nor is third-person mythical narrative confined to the eleven odes discussed by Kranz). A more rewarding approach is to consider Eur.'s lyrics in relation to the music, style, and diction of the so-called New Music, whose chief exponents experimented with the dithyramb among other genres. With regard to Eur.'s choral style in particular, Aristophanes' parody of it in *Frogs* (1309–22) illustrates, albeit with comic exaggeration, a number of features which were undoubtedly influenced by contemporary dithyrambographers: florid imagery, densely poetic language, the invention of new compound words, frequent anadiplosis, and innovative musical effects. Thus, as in his polymetric and astrophic monodies (cf. 229–52n.), Eur.'s choral odes reflect, in their most decorative and picturesque passages, the impact of the new 'dithyrambic' style (Intro. p. 40). It is in this sense that the second stasimon may be said to be 'dithyrambic', though the term is perhaps best avoided (unless, for example, the tragic chorus is in fact singing a hymn to Dionysus, as in the parodos of *Bacchae*, 64–169), since

these innovations were applied to other lyric genres as well (such as, for example, the citharodic monody or *nomos*, best preserved in Timotheus' *Persae*: *PMG* 788–91: cf. Hordern (2002) esp. 25–35).

*Structure.* In the first and third stasima, following an opening address (to the nightingale and the Phoenician ship respectively), the Chorus name H. in the very first strophe (1113, 1464), thus dissolving the initial distance between their words and the preceding action. Here, by contrast, the connection between the Chorus' mythical narrative and the events of the drama is far less direct or immediate, and H. is mentioned (not by name) only in the final stanza (ὦ παῖ 1356). In itself such a delayed connection is not at all unusual in Eur., since the link between his choruses' reflections and the dramatic situation is frequently made explicit only towards the end of the stasima, often using such deictic words as *vūv*, *σοι*, and *ὄδε* (the technique, rare in Aesch., is more common in Eur. than Soph.: cf. Kranz (1933) 204–7; for deixis as a feature of choral lyric in general, see e.g. Danielewicz (1990), D'Alessio (2004)). Yet despite the Chorus' address to H. in the second antistrophe, where they fault her for neglecting the rites of the Great Mother, the nature of the link here has proved controversial, since many have viewed both the mythical narrative itself and H.'s alleged misconduct as completely unconnected to the rest of the play; see, however, 1355–7n.

The narration of the myth takes up three of the song's four stanzas. The Chorus begin by describing the goddess's search for her abducted daughter, aided by Artemis and Athena. The antistrophe focuses on the goddess's grief and its disastrous effects upon the natural world, resulting in barrenness, starvation, and the cessation of sacrifice to the gods. The second strophe recounts the resolution of this crisis as Zeus seeks to assuage the anger of the Great Mother by delighting her with music and dance. The Chorus then apostrophize H. and remind her of the goddess's power and the importance of her worship. Despite textual problems at both the beginning and the end of the final stanza, it is clear that the Chorus believe H. to have neglected the goddess's worship and that the previous myth is largely intended to emphasize the danger of her anger. Thus, as often in Eur.'s stasima, the Chorus seek to trace the origins of present suffering in past events.

*Syncretism.* The second stasimon is the earliest surviving literary evidence for the blending (or syncretism) of the myth of Demeter's search for her daughter with the rites of the Mother of the Gods, a deity of Anatolian origin, also known as Cybele. In the first half of the stasimon Mother searches and grieves for her lost daughter; in the second she is identified as Deo (i.e. Demeter, 1343) and her rites are equated with those of Dionysus (1358–65), thus forging a link between all three deities (Mother, Demeter, and Dionysus). Far from inventing these ritual connections, Eur. is responding to contemporary religious ideas and practices, since the three were linked in Attic cult. An altar of Demeter and Kore stood beside the Metroon (Mother's shrine) in the Athenian Agora in which she also watched over the state archives, while statues of Mother have been found at Eleusis, the centre of Demeter and Persephone's worship (see Roller (1999) 162, 175), where Dionysus also had a sanctuary (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1119–21,

where the Chorus invoke Dionysus as 'you who rule in the vales of Eleusinian Deo, open to all').

In addition to the cultic links between Mother and Demeter as fertility goddesses, the former's orgiastic rites encouraged syncretism with Dionysus. Hence Mother's rites at Agrai in Attica, the so-called Lesser Mysteries, were treated as a prelude to the greater Mysteries at Eleusis and involved worship of Dionysus as well as Demeter (cf. Parker (2005) 341, 344–5). The goddess's association with Dionysus is also reflected in the parodos of the *Bacchae*, where the Chorus recall how Cybele's instrument, the tympanon (cf. 1347 τύπανα . . . βυρσοτενῆ), was invented by the Corybants and given to 'Mother Rhea' (as mother of Zeus, Rhea easily merged with Cybele in her guise as Mother of the Gods: cf. 1302 Μάτηρ . . . θεῶν), who then used the drum to beat time for the ecstatic Bacchants. Thus the tendency to assimilate Cybele with established Greek deities such as Demeter and Dionysus was a long-standing one. For as a non-Olympian newcomer to the divine pantheon, Cybele had no Greek mythology of her own; nor did she ever have a daughter who was abducted, hence her fusion with Demeter here. Thus, although this stasimon is the earliest extant evidence for the transferral of Demeter's Eleusinian myth to her, it is one encouraged by the popular association (and even identification) of Demeter and Cybele/Mother in Attic cult, an identification made easier by the fact that Demeter and Persephone were sometimes referred to as Mother and Kore at Eleusis (e.g. Hdt. 8.65.4). On Cybele's role in tragedy and other texts of the period, see Allan (2004), esp. 140–6.

*Function.* The second stasimon has struck many as having no particular bearing on the action itself. Thus, with regard to H.'s alleged offence against the Great Mother (1355–7), Dale (on 1301–68) speaks of 'the complete irrelevance of this motif to all the rest of the play'. The fact that the goddess is not mentioned anywhere else in the drama – where the focus is on the plans of Zeus, Hera, and Aphrodite – no doubt contributes to the sense that the song is extraneous. Kannicht (1969) 2.334 accounts for the goddess's unexpected anger by arguing that the H. who is warned by the Chorus in the final stanza is 'no longer simply the H. of this drama, but a metaphor for a particular human way of relating to the spiritual powers of the ecstatic rites and mysteries.' Yet this seems too far removed from the dramatic context, where the Chorus' narration of the Mother's myth is a foil for their warning of H. specifically (μῆνιν δ' ἔχεις μεγάλας | Μαρτός, ὦ παῖ . . . 1355–6). Kannicht is nevertheless partly right insofar as the H. they address has (on a literal level) little in common with 'the H. of this drama'; however, the significance of the stasimon (argued in detail at 1355–7, 1368nn.) is that in trying to explain H.'s suffering the Chorus interpret it as divine punishment for an offence whose meaning is *figurative* rather than literal, and connected to H.'s symbolic identity as a *quasi-parthenaic* figure.

*Metre.* Two aeolo-choriambic strophic pairs, the predominant metre in each being the 'choriambic dimeter' and its acephalous form (cf. 515–27n. '*Metre*'), with occasional glyconics (described by Itsumi (1984) 80 as 00–υυ–υυ in tragedy) and related aeolic cola (pherecratean, telesillean, reizianum, and dodrans). The first strophic pair also contains (non-aeolic) iambic dimeters (1308–9~1326–7), preceded by five longs

(1307~1325), of which Dale (1981) 128 says '[these] could be dragged dochmiac but would then be unrelated to anything in the context: if the middle syllable is a contracted double-short, it is a reizianum like the double clausula 1351-2, 1368'. Adopting Diggle's transposition (ἔσϋθη θεῶν) in 1302, a glyconic corresponds with a choriambic dimeter (1302~1320: cf. 1459~1473, 1460~1474, 1481~1498, 1487~1504). There is synizesis of θεά at 1311 and 1349.

## 1301-37 first strophe and antistrophe

ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
ὄρεια ποτὲ δρομάδι κώ-	1301	glyconic
δρομαῖον δ' ὅτε πολυπλάνη-	1319	
-----ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
-----ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
λῶι Μάτηρ ἔσϋθη θεῶν	1302	glyconic
τον Μάτηρ ἔπαυσε πόνον	1320	chor dim
ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
ἀν' ὑλᾶντα νάπη	1303	dodrans B
ματεύουσ' ἀπόνους	1321	
ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
ποτάμιόν τε χεῦμ' ὑδάτων	1304	chor dim
συγατρὸς ἀρπαγᾶς δολίους,	1322	
ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
βαρύβρομόν τε κῦμ' ἄλιον	1305	chor dim
χιονοθρέμμονάς τ' ἑπέρασ'	1323	
ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
πόθῳι τᾶς ἀποιχομένας	1306	chor dim
Ἰδαῖαν Νυμφᾶν σκοπιάς	1324	
-----		
ἀρρήτου κούρας.	1307	5 longs
ρίπτει τ' ἐν πένθει	1325	
ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
κρόταλα δὲ βρόμια διαπρύσιον	1308	2ia
πέτρινα κατὰ δρία πολυσιφέα.	1326	
ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
ἰέντα κέλαδον ἀνεβόα,	1309	2ia
βροτοῖσι δ' ἄχλοα πεδία γᾶς	1327a	
-----ῡ-ῡ-ῡ-		
θηρῶν ὅτε ζυγίους	1310	^chor dim
< x-x-ῡ-ῡ->	1327b	

--x--u--			
ζεύξασα θεά σατίνας	1311	^chor dim	
οὐ καρπίζουσ' ἀρότοις,	1328		
-----u--			
τὰν ἀρπασθεῖσαν κυκλίων	1312	chor dim	
λαῶν δὲ φθείρει γενεάν·	1329		
x-----u--!			
χορῶν ἔξω παρθενίων	1313	chor dim	
ποιμναις δ' οὐχ ἴει θαλεράς	1330		
---x--u--			
κούραν <-x--u-->.	1314a	chor dim	
βοσκὰς εὐφύλλων ἐλίκων·	1331		
u--u--u--u--!			
μετὰ δ' <τήϊξαν> ἀελλόποδες	1314b	telesillean (with	
πόλεων δ' ἀπέλειπε βίος,	1332	resolution)	
---σ--u--!			
ἄ μὲν τόξοις Ἄρτεμις, ἄ δ'	1315	chor dim	
οὐδ' ἦσαν θεῶν θυσίαι,	1333		
-----u--			
ἔγχει Γοργῶπις πάνοπλος·	1316	chor dim	
βωμοῖς δ' ἄφλεκτοι πελανοί·	1334		
-----u--			
αὐγάζων δ' ἔξ οὐρανίων	1317a	chor dim	
παγὰς δ' ἀμπαύει δροσεράς	1335		
-x-----u--			
<Ζεὺς ὁ παντόπτας ἐδράνων>	1317b	chor dim	
λευκῶν ἐκβάλλειν ὑδάτων	1336		
---u--			
ἄλλαν μοῖραν ἔκραινεν.	1318	pherecratean	
πένθει παιδὸς ἀλάστωι.	1337		

## 1338–68 second strophe and antistrophe

x--u--u--u--			
ἐπεὶ δ' ἔπαυσ' εἰλαπίνας	1338	chor dim	
ῶν οὐ θέμις <σ> οὐδ' ὄσια	1353		
u--u--u--u--			
θεοῖς βροτείωι τε γένει,	1339a	chor dim	
πύρωσας ἐν <γᾶς> θαλάμαις,	1354		

---σ---υ---	Ζεὺς μειλίσσων στυγίους μῆνιν δ' ἔχεις μεγάλας	1339b 1355	^ chor dim
-υ---υ---	Ματρὸς ὀργὰς ἐνέπει· Ματρὸς, ὦ παῖ, θυσίας	1340 1356	^ chor dim
-υ---υ---	Βᾶτε, σεμναὶ Χάριτες, οὐ σεβίζουσα θεᾶς.	1341 1357	^ chor dim
υ---υ---υ---!	ἴτε, τὰν περὶ παρθένωι μέγα τοι δύνανται νεβρῶν	1342 1358	telesillean (with initial resolution)
---σ---υ---	Δηὼ θυμωσαμένα παμποίκιλοι στολίδες	1343 1359	^ chor dim
---χ---υ---	λυπᾶν ἐξελατ' ἀλαλαῖ, κισσοῦ τε στεφθεῖσα χλόα	1344 1360	chor dim
---σ---υ---	Μοῦσαι θ' ὕμνοισι χορῶν. ἄρθηκας εἰς ἱεροῦς	1345 1361	^ chor dim
-----υ---	χαλκοῦ δ' αὐδὰν χθονίαν ρόμβου θ' εἰλισσομένα	1346 1362	^ chor dim
υ---υ---υ---υ---	τύπανά τ' ἔλαβε βυρσοτενῆ κύκλιος ἔνοσις αἰθερία	1347 1363	chor dim
---υ---υ---υ	καλλίστα τότε πρῶτα μακά- βακχεύουσά τ' ἔθειρα Βρομί-	1348 1364	glyconic
-υ---υ---υ---	ρων Κύπρις· γέλασεν δὲ θεὰ ωι καὶ παννυχίδες θεᾶς.	1349 1365	glyconic
-υ---υ---	δέξατό τ' ἐς χέρας ἰεῦ δέ νιν ἄμασιν	1350 1366	dodrans A
υ---υ---	βαρύβρομον αὐλὸν ὑπέρβαλε σελάνα†	1351 1367	reizianum

--υυ--|||

τερφθειῖσ' ἀλαλαγμῶι.

1352

rcizianum

μορφᾶι μόνον ἠύχεις.

1368

**1301–18** *First strophe*. Unlike the first and third stasima, which begin with elaborate apostrophes, the second opens straight into rapid and vivid narrative. The song starts from the goddess's search for her daughter and moves backwards in time to the moment of the girl's abduction, followed by Zeus's intervention to foil the rescue attempt made by Artemis and Athena. The pace of the narrative, together with the swift movement of the characters themselves (*δρομάδι κῶλωι, ἐσύθη, ἀελλόποδες*), emphasize the goddess's anguished and frantic journey over the earth in search of her missing daughter.

**1301–2** *ὄρεϊα* . . . |. *Μάτηρ* . . . *θεῶν* 'the mountain Mother of the Gods'. Cybele merged with various Greek mountain cults (acquiring the title *Μήτηρ ὄρεϊα*: cf. *Hipp.* 144) as well as with a perhaps indigenous mother of the gods (for evidence of such a figure in early Greek religion, see Robertson (1996)), hence her identification with Rhea (cf. Hipponax fr. 156 W).

*δρομάδι κῶλωι* ('on speeding foot') is instrumental dat. *δρομάς* is used elsewhere in Eur. of movement that is wild or out of control (as Mastronarde comments on *Phoen.* 1124–5 'it is almost a *Lieblingswort*: *Hipp.* 550, *Supp.* 1000, *Tro.* 42, *Hel.* 1301, *Bacch.* 731'). Here (in combination with *ἐσύθη*) it denotes the goddess's frenetic searching; cf. 1319 *δρομαῖον*. H. had urged herself to flee from M. (543) *ὡς δρομαῖα πῶλος* (see n. ad loc).

*ἐσύθη*: 3rd sg. aor. pass. of *σεύομαι* (1133n.), '(she) rushed'; cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 43–4 (Demeter looking for Persephone) *σεύατο δ' ὡς τ' οἰωνὸς ἐπὶ τραφερὴν τε καὶ ὑγρὴν | μαιομένη*.

**1303–5** mark the extent of the Mother's journey, 'through the wooded glades and the flowing river waters and the deep-roaring wave of the sea'.

*βαρύβρομον* (an adj. unique to Eur. in tragedy) is also applied to the *aulos* taken up by the goddess when she relents from her anger (1351).

**1306–7** *πόθωι* 'in longing for' (+ gen.): cf. 763, 1395, *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 201 = 304 *πόθωι μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρὸς*; also Aesch. *Ag.* 414–15 (on M.'s longing for H.) *πόθωι δ' ὑπερποντίας | φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν*.

*τᾶς* . . . | . . . *κούρας* 'her vanished daughter whose name may not be spoken'. The name of Demeter's daughter (in Attic prose, Pherrephatta or Pherrophatta) was spelled in many different ways (cf. 175, Jebb on Soph. *Ant.* 894). Perhaps because of its association with the girl's role as Queen of the Dead, the name was considered ill-omened and she was called simply Kore ('the Maiden'): Pl. *Crat.* 404c–d, Pulleyn (1997) 113–14. Thus the name itself became one of many *ἄρρητα* ('unspeakable things') that celebrants of the Eleusinian Mysteries were forbidden to divulge (cf. Burkert (1987) 106 with n. 109). According to a recent etymology by Rudolf Wachter (2005), Persephone's name comes from an Indo-European root meaning 'sheaf-beater' (in early

Greek = 'Persóphatta'), which would accord well with her agricultural role in Greek myth and ritual.

1308–9 κρόταλα . . | . ἀνεβόα 'and the roaring cymbals, raising a piercing din, cried out': a striking concatenation of sound words, with the fervent striking of the instruments expressed in the resolved iambic dimeters. The *krótala* are not simply 'clappers' or 'castanets', but larger cymbal-like percussion instruments (West (1992) 125 calls them 'cymbal-clappers'), sometimes made of bronze (cf. 1346, Eur. *Cycl.* 205) and often connected to the worship of Cybele and Dionysus (e.g. Pindar's second dithyramb, fr. 70b.8–11 Machler). The *Hom. Hymn to the Mother of the Gods* (14.3–4) names the other instruments characteristic of her worship (ἡ κροτάλων τυπάνων τ' ἰαχή σὺν τε βρόμος αὐλῶν | εὐαδεν) whose aetiology is narrated here (1346–52).

1310–11 θηρῶν . | . . σατίνας 'when the goddess yoked her chariot to a team of wild beasts'. Though identified as Demeter (1343), the goddess's composite identity is clear, for besides her association with ecstatic music and Anatolia (cf. 1324 Ἰδαίῳ) it is Cybele who is carried on a lion-drawn chariot. The Chorus of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, for example, invoke Cybele-Rhea-Earth (another striking instance of syncretism) as μάκαιρα ταυροκτόνων | λεόντων ἔφεδρε (400–1), and in archaic and classical Greek iconography Cybele is frequently depicted with both *lymphana* (cf. 1347) and lions (*LLMC* s.v. Kybele, esp. 29–39, 81–98).

σατίνας: σατίνη (attested only in the pl.) is a rare word (found only here in tragedy). Its usage suggests a vehicle used primarily by women: cf. Sappho fr. 44.13–15 V (the Trojan women travel on σατίναις . . . εὐτρόχοις to the wedding of Hector and Andromache), Anacreon fr. 388.10–12 *PMG* (mocking a man who rides around with gold carriages and a woman's parasol). The latter passage may also reflect a residual connection with the east (albeit negatively charged as 'oriental' luxury; for the putative eastern origins of the word σατίνη, cf. Janko (1982) 169–70). This would be appropriate to Cybele, but Athena herself is presented in the early (probably seventh-century) *Hom. Hymn to Aphrodite* as teaching joiners to build σατίνας τε καὶ ὄρματα ποικίλα χαλκῶι (13), suggesting that such carriages (like Cybele herself) had become a familiar element of Greek life.

1312–14b The text printed here is Maas's persuasive rearrangement of L's μετὰ κούραν δ' ἀελλόποδες, with lacunae marked after κούραν and μετὰ δ' (restoring respension with 1331–2). On this reconstruction τῶν . | . . κούραν ('her daughter, snatched away from the maidens' circling choruses') still lacks a governing verb (as does the next clause referring to Artemis and Athena: cf. 1314b–16n.), but the general sense of the missing phrase ('sought for', 'called after' *vel sim.*) is clear from the context. Kovacs (Loeb) suggests e.g. ὄρμα σωσομένα.

κυκλίων | χορῶν . . . παρθενίων: in *Hom. Hymn Dem.* Persephone is dancing with the daughters of Ocean (as well as picking flowers: 244–9n.) when she is abducted by Hades (cf. also *Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 117–20, where Aphrodite in disguise recalls how she was abducted ἐκ χοροῦ by Hermes as she danced with a group of women). Here the motif is underlined by the Chorus' own dancing, which evokes the original χορός of Persephone and her friends (the Chorus themselves have become companions of the

abducted H.: e.g. 255, 330). This is the first of several self-referential allusions to choral song and dance which connect the performance of the Chorus in the *orkhēstra* to that of other choruses elsewhere (not infringing, but enhancing, the Chorus' identity as characters within the drama): cf. 1345, 1454–5, 1468nn. The allusion to Persephone the abducted *parthenos* triggers once again the paradigm of H. as a quasi-parthenaic figure. The identification is partial, not complete (on a 'logical' level, H. is a mature and married woman longing to return to her husband), but the mythical overlap created throughout the play between H. and Persephone is enough for the symbolic parallel to work (cf. 244–9n.); one might compare the way that Penelope (a prototype for Eur.'s new H.: Introd. p. 27) is likened to a *parthenos* in the *Odyssey*, with all the symbols of a wedding contest that come at the end of the poem. For the underlying *anodos* pattern and its relevance to *Helen*, see 1349n.

**1314b–18** The efforts of Artemis and Athena to prevent Persephone's abduction are first attested here, but may well have been known to the poet of the Homeric Hymn, who has the goddesses present at the flower-picking (*Hom. Hymn Dem.* 424). In the Hymn, Persephone attempts to resist but her cries are not heard by Zeus, who sits apart from the other gods, having approved his daughter's marriage to his brother Hades (27–30, 77–80). Here, by contrast, the goddesses themselves give chase but are prevented by Zeus from rescuing Persephone – significantly H., like Persephone, is abducted with Zeus's consent (cf. 36–43n.). The story is told allusively: the goddesses advance to battle, but Zeus 'brought to pass a different fate'. The encounter is presented in greater detail in Claudian's unfinished epic (written in the early fifth century AD), *De rapto Proserpinae* 2.204–32, where Zeus hurls a thunderbolt and forces the goddesses to retreat, allowing Hades to ride off with Persephone in his chariot.

**1314b–16** The goddesses lack a verb (of movement) and Maas's ἦξαν (aor. of αἰσσω) supplies it (ἦισαν may also be worth considering, though the swiftness of ἦξαν better suits ἀελλόποδες).

ἀελλόποδες ('storm-footed') is used of the messenger Iris (*Il.* 8. 409 = 24.77, 159) and of horses (*Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 217, *Pind. Nem.* 1.6); this is its sole use in extant tragedy. Cf. *Bacch.* 873–4, where a fawn is described: μόχθοις δ' ὠκυδρόμοις ἀελλόποδες θρώϊσκη πεδίου | παραποτάμιον.

**1315–16** τόξοις . . . | ἔγχει pick out the weapons (bow and spear) with which each goddess intends to oppose Hades. Like πάνοπλος, Γοργῶπις ('the Fierce-eyed One') stresses Athena's prowess as a warrior goddess (cf. *Soph. Aj.* 450 ἡ Διὸς γοργῶπις ἀδάματος θεά).

**1317–18** To restore respension with 1336, a verse of the shape –x–x–uu– is needed, which will also specify the subject of ἔκραινεν and supply a noun to agree with οὐρανίων. The text printed here combines the suggestions of L. Dindorf and Diggle (see the app. crit.). Wilamowitz (1921) 215 proposed Ζεὺς ὁ παντάρχας ἐδράνων; both epithets are appropriate (cf. *Soph. OC* 1085–6 ἰὼ θεῶν πάνταρχε παντόπτα Ζεῦ), but Diggle's παντόπτης ('all-seeing') better fits the context, as Zeus looks down from the heavens and 'sees clearly' (αὐγάζων; cf. Dodds on *Bacch.* 596–9) the goddesses' pursuit of Persephone, which he promptly ends. Zeus's panoramic

vision (implying his superior knowledge) is traditional: cf. c.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 139 πατήρ ὁ παντόπτας.

ἄλλαν μοῖραν ἔκραινεν: as he will do for H. herself; cf. 166g Ζεὺς γὰρ ᾧδε βούλεται.

1319–37 *First antistrophe.* In contrast to the frantic movement and vivid landscapes of the opening strophe the *antistrophe* portrays immobility and barrenness. Collapsing in grief for her daughter, the Mother makes the earth infertile. As humans and animals starve, the gods receive no sacrificial offerings. The suffering of gods as well as humans illustrates the power of the Mother's anger, preparing for the Chorus' criticism of H. in the final stanza.

1319–20 δρομαῖον . | . . πόνον 'When the Mother ended her swift, far-wandering toil'. The introductory clause echoes the opening of the first stanza, re-emphasizing the goddess's frantic search: 1301–18, 1303–5nn. Murray's restoration of acc. δρομαῖον κτλ. seems necessary, since intransitive παύω is unparalleled: cf. Bers (1984) 110.

1321–2 ματεύουσ' . | . . δολίους 'frenziedly tracking her daughter's treacherous abduction'.

ἀπόνους: though the adj. ('desperate, mad') is not found elsewhere, it well expresses the Mother's panic and increasing hopelessness. ἀφανοῦς ('unseen, vanished'; cf. 126, 207) may also be worth considering: it is used euphemistically of Persephone (cf. 1306–7n.) at Soph. *OC* 1556–7 εἰ θέμις ἐστὶ μοι τὰν ἀφανῆ θεῶν | . . . λιταῖς σεβίζειν.

ἀρπαγὰς 'abduction' or 'abductor': 50–1n.

1323–4 χιονοθρέμονας . | . . σκοπιὰς 'she reached the snow-clad crags of the Nymphs of Ida'. Cybele was known as the 'Idaeon Mother' (cf. *Ox.* 1453 'Ἰδαία μᾶτερ μᾶτερ) after her prominent cult at Mt. Ida in the Troad (cf. *Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 1.1128, *Strabo* 1.2.38, 10.3.12). As with her vehicle (1310–11n.), the goddess's route makes clear the adaptation of the original myth, centred around Eleusis, to the syncretistic figure of Cybele-Demeter.

χιονοθρέμονας: lit. 'snow-nurturing'. A *hapax*, so too χιονοτρόφον at *Phoen.* 802 (describing Mt. Cithaeron).

ἐπέρασ': for περᾶν + acc. meaning 'arrive', see Barrett on *Hipp.* 782–3.

1325–6 ῥίπτει (historic present: 6–7n.) is intrans. (cf. *Cycl.* 166, *Alc.* 897), 'and hurled herself down'.

πέτρινα . . . πολυσιφεία 'among the rocky thickets deep in snow'. The emphasis on the remoteness, harshness, and coldness of the location (πολυσιφής = *hapax*) is expressive of the goddess's grief (1325 ἐν πένθει, 1337 πένθει παιδὸς ἀλάστωι; cf. 188–9, where the Naiad is raped ὑπὸ . . . | πέτρινα γύαλα). The resolved iambs (after the five longs of 1325) underline her headlong collapse.

1327–37 The famine's impact is similarly described in *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 305–12.

1327–8 The missing line (corresponding to 1310 θηρῶν ὅτε ζυγίους) will have specified the Mother's role in rendering the fields ἄχλοα ('barren', lit. 'grassless'). Kannicht suggested τεύχει, τεύχε, or τίθησι, while Kovacs (Loeb) has proposed ἔθηκε.

οὐ καρπίζουσ' ἄρότοις: the nom. sg. fem. part. καρπίζουσα refers to the goddess, 'and (she made) the fields of the earth barren for mortals (. . .), making nothing fruitful

through tillage': cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 308–9 πολλά δὲ καμπύλ' ἄροτρα μάτην βόες  
 ἔλκων ἀρούραις, | πολλὸν δὲ κρῖ λευκὸν ἐτώσιον ἔμπεσε γαίηι.

**1329** λαῶν . . . γενεάν: cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 310 καὶ νύ κε πάμπαν ὄλεσσε γένος  
 μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

**1330–1** ποίμναις . . . | . ἔλικων 'for the herds she sent forth no fresh pasture of leafy  
 tendrils'.

οὐχ ἴει: cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 306–7 οὐδέ τι γαῖα | σπέρμ' ἀνίει.

ἔλικων: cf. 180 ἔλικά τ' ἀνὰ χλόαν, *Ar. Frogs* 1321 (from the parody of Eur.'s choral  
 lyrics) βότρυος ἔλικά παυσίπνονον.

**1332–4** indicate the consequences of the animals' deaths for humans and gods  
 alike.

πόλεων . . . βίος 'and cities were dying out'.

θεῶν θυσίαι 'sacrifices for the gods': cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 311–12 γεράων τ' ἐρικυδέα  
 τιμὴν | καὶ θυσιῶν ἡμερσεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντας.

ἀφλεκτοὶ πελανοί 'and no offerings were burnt'. πελανός was a mixture of barley,  
 honey, and oil that could be formed into small sacrificial 'cakes' (πελανοί) and burnt  
 on altars: cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 147, *Tro.* 1063, *Ion* 707.

**1335–7** The grieving Mother inflicts drought as well as famine.

ἀμπαύει . . . | . ἐκβάλλειν 'she stopped . . . from pouring forth'.

λευκῶν: λευκός ('clear', 'limpid') is applied to the water of springs (cf. *Her.* 573, *Ll*  
 1294, and the Homeric λευκὸν ὕδωρ, *Il.* 23.282, *Od.* 5.70.). The contrast here is with  
 the type of water that Homer calls μέλαν (because of its depth), i.e. water in wells (cf.  
*Od.* 4.359). The epithet underlines the fact that the goddess has taken away the fresh  
 water essential to human and animal life.

πένθει . . . ἀλάστωι: the phrase is epic (cf. *Il.* 24.105, *Od.* 1.342, 24.423). ἀλαστος  
 was traditionally derived from ἀ + λαυθάνομαι and translated as 'unforgettable' (cf.  
 e.g. LSJ s.v.), but this analysis has been refuted: see Barrett on *Hipp.* 877–80, who  
 glosses ἀλαστα as "causing or involving grievous hurt", just as the ἀλάστωρ is "he  
 who causes grievous hurt". L's ἀλάστωρ would foreground the harm caused by  
 the goddess ('an avenger in grief for her daughter'), but the epic πένθος ἀλαστον  
 effectively restates the severity of the Mother's pain, which has been central to the  
 narrative so far.

**1338–52** *Second strophe.* The Mother's grief and anger have disturbed the natural  
 order both in heaven and on earth. As in the *Hom. Hymn Dem.* (473–82), Zeus's  
 attempt to mollify 'Deo' (1343) leads to the institution of a new cult in her honour, yet  
 in keeping with the song's syncretism of Demeter and Cybele the *Hymn's* aetiology  
 of the Eleusinian Mysteries is here replaced by an aetiology of the ecstatic music and  
 worship of Cybele herself (1346–52).

**1338–9a** ἐπεὶ . . . | . γένει: the restatement of the consequences of the goddess's  
 grief marks the transition to the next stage of the narrative (compare the start of the  
 second stanza: 1319–20n.).

εἰλαπίνας 'seas'.

**1339b-40** *μειλίσσων*: conative pres. part. (Smyth §1878), ‘trying to appease’. A rare verb, occurring only here in Eur. (if we accept Tyrwhitt’s *ειλίσσων* at *Ll* 1324); an Athenian audience might think of Zeus Meilichios, the honorand of their greatest Zeus festival, the Diasia: cf. Thuc. 1.126.6. As FJW note on Aesch. *Supp.* 1029, ‘μειλίσσειν and its nominal derivatives are most frequently used of propitiatory libations to the dead or the potentially hostile powers below’; here it is Zeus himself who seeks to placate the Mother’s destructive anger at the disappearance of her own daughter to the world below.

*στυγίους* | . . . *ὄργάς*: contrast *Med.* 195–200, where the Nurse laments that no one has discovered how to end the *στυγίους λύπας* of mortals through music.

**1341–5** In the *Hom. Hymn Dem.* (325–30) Zeus sends all the gods in turn to propitiate Demeter with gifts, but she gives up her anger only when reunited with her daughter. Here Zeus’s instructions to the Charites, Muses, and (as 1346–9 reveal) Aphrodite rely upon the consolatory powers of music (1344n.), and although the narrative stops short of mentioning the reunion, the goddess’s laughter and her acceptance of the *aulos* (1349–52) prefigure the success of Zeus’s plan.

*Χάριτες* | . . . *Μοῦσαι*: in Hesiod the Charites (‘Graces’) dwell beside the Muses on Olympus, an expression of their common interests in poetry, song, and dance (*Theog.* 64–5; for the Muses’ wider range of cultural roles, see Murray (2004), arguing that (389) ‘they change with the changing forms of human creativity’). The goddesses are frequently associated with one another, e.g. Sappho fr. 128 V δευτέων ἄβραι Χάριτες ἀλλικόμοι τε Μοῖσαι, Eur. *Her.* 673–5 οὐ παύσομαι τὰς Χάριτας | ταῖς Μούσαισιν συγκαταμει| γνύς, ἠδίσταν συζυγίαν. The Charites were also connected to cults of Dionysus in several cities (cf. Dodds on *Bacch.* 414), making their participation here in ecstatic Dionysiac dancing (1364–5) all the more appropriate.

**1341–2** *βᾶτε* . . . | *ἴτε*: the repeated imperatives mark the urgency of Zeus’s command. Short passages of direct speech are often included in lyrics, both solo and choral: cf. 1459–64. Kranz (1933) 259 mentions the main examples, but his discussion of the technique is marred by prejudice against late Euripidean style.

**1342–3** *περὶ παρθένωι* | . . . *θυμωσαμέναν*: cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 77 ἀχνημένην περὶ παιδὶ τανυσφύρωι.

*Δηώ* = Demeter: cf. Richardson on *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 47 πότνια Δηώ.

**1344** *λυπᾶν ἐξελᾶτ’*: the idea that music can alleviate grief was traditional: cf. esp. Hes. *Theog.* 98–103. The combination here of choral song and dance with ecstatic cries of *ἀλαλαί* (cf. 1352 *ἀλαλαγμῶι*) embodies the syncretism of Eleusinian music with that of Cybele. For the ecstatic and cathartic functions of music and dance in mystery cults, see Burkert (1987) 113, Hardie (2004) 18. As a musical performance, tragedy itself may be said to provide emotional catharsis (as well as entertainment) through the aesthetically ordered depiction of violence, death, and mourning.

**1345** *ὑμνοισι χορῶν*: the palliative effect of the Muses’ *choreia* has its dramatic (and mortal) equivalent (1312–14b, 1454–5nn.) in the Chorus’ well-intentioned advice to H. in the final stanza (1353ff.).

**1346–52** The music of Dionysiac and other ecstatic cults features prominently in Eur. (see Barker (1984) 73–8), especially in the *Bacchae*, where the Chorus of Asian Bacchantes relate the invention of the *tympanon* by the Corybants, the companions of Mother Rhea (123–9). Though different in its details, the musical aetiology offered here resembles that of the *Bacchae* in its focus on the origins of the cult itself, as the instruments' first use marks the beginning of Demeter–Cybele's worship through orgiastic music (cf. 1348 τότε πρῶτα). The Mother's delight in the music of cymbals, *tympana*, and *auloi* is central to the short Homeric Hymn in her honour: 1308–9n. The goddess's itinerant devotees, the *metragyrtaí* ('begging priests of the Mother'), played and danced to these instruments, achieving a state of frenzied divine possession. For Eur.'s particular interest in music and musical innovation, see *Intro.* p. 41.

**1346** χαλκοῦ . . . αὐδὴν χθονίαν ('the rumbling (lit. "earthy") voice of bronze') refers to the cymbals characteristic of Cybele's cult (1308–9n.). Hardie (2004) 17 sees here a reference to the bronze gong (ἤχεϊον) that was struck by the priest of Kore at Eleusis. Yet even if we could be sure that Apollodorus, who mentions the ἤχεϊον (*FGRH* 244 F 110), is describing a practice that dates back to the fifth century, the presence of oriental drums and pipes suggests that the audience would think more readily of the bronze cymbals of Cybele.

**1347** τύπανα . . . βυρσοτενῆ 'the drums of stretched hide': cf. *Bacch.* 124 βυρσότονον κύκλωμα τόδε. For the corruption of τύπανα to τύμπανα, see Diggle (1994) 458. The drum is an integral part of the classical iconography of Cybele (1310–11n.). The *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods* found inscribed in the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus (dated to the fourth or third century BC: Maas (1933) 141–7, West (1970) 213–15, Furlley and Bremer (2001) 1.214–24, 2.167–75) presents Zeus responding to the Mother's grief and isolation by striking the earth with thunderbolts and threatening to take away her drums (11–14). Undaunted, the goddess demands dominion over much of the world (half of the heaven, earth, and sea).

**1348** καλλίστα: the adj. is especially appropriate to Aphrodite (but not confined to her: cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 61–71).

τότε πρῶτα 'then for the first time' (or alternatively 'then . . . the first (*tympana*)'): the phrase emphasizes the moment of invention and hence the origins of Cybele's distinctive music.

**1349** γέλασεν δὲ θεά: in the *Hom. Hymn Dem.* (202–5) the goddess's laughter at the jesting of Iambe initiates a transition from isolated grief, as she takes the baby Demophoon into her care. A similar narrative pattern operates here as the goddess, delighting in the new instruments, relinquishes her grief and anger, which in turn foreshadows the end of the famine and the restoration of the natural order. (The sequence of events thus differs from the Homeric Hymn, where the famine comes after the laughter and is only ended by the return of the goddess's daughter.) The goddess's reconciliation marks the turning-point in the play's pervasive *anodos* pattern (244–9n.), thus linking Persephone's abduction and return from Hades to H.'s abduction and return from Egypt: cf. Segal (1971) 569–73, Wolff (1973) 63–4, Foley (2001) 306–7. Moreover, H.'s *anodos*, like that of Persephone, marks her transition from the status of

a *parthenos* to that of a *gynē* (for parthenaic motifs in the play, cf. also Zweig (1999b) 162–4, Foley (2001) 325–7); in other words, the myth of Persephone's return told by the Chorus looks forward to H.'s reunited marriage with M., after her period of enforced *parthenos*-like seclusion from the sexual predations of Theoc. (63, 184–90nn.); cf. Zweig (1999b) 168, 1355–71.

**1351–2** βαρύβρομον αὐλόν: Kannicht (ad loc.) and Barker (1984) 76 n. 95 see in the epithet 'resounding' a reference to the so-called 'Phrygian' *aulos*, one of whose pair of pipes 'was a horn-pipe, having a cow-horn attached to the end of the pipe and curving upwards from it' (West (1992) 91), giving it a deeper pitch than Greek *auloi*. The Chorus of the *Bacchae* depict the Corybants mingling the sound of the newly invented *tympanon* with ἀδυβόαι Φρυγίων | αὐλῶν πνεύματι (127–8). The related syncretism of the *Bacchae* scene and the oriental origins of Cybele herself (1323–4n.) may favour the specific identification with the 'Phrygian' *auloi*, but conventional *auloi* could be 'deep-sounding' in their lowest notes (cf. Ar. *Clouds* 313, where the competing chorus of the City Dionysia are accompanied by the μουσα βαρύβρομος αὐλῶν). They are also described as ὀργιαστικόν in and of themselves (Arist. *Pol.* 1341a21); hence Aristotle's recommendation that *auloi* should not be used to teach children music in schools: cf. Ford (2004) 325–6.

τερφθεῖσ' ἀλαλαγμῶι 'delighted (fem. sg. aor. pass. part. of τέρπω + dat.) by its sound'. ἀλαλαγμός describes the sound of Bacchic *tympana* at Eur. *Cycl.* 65.

**1353–68** *Second antistrophe*. In the concluding stanza the Mother's anger is finally connected to the dramatic situation of which the Chorus are part. Apostrophizing H. (1356 ὦ παῖ), the Chorus allege that the goddess is enraged by H.'s failure to honour her rites.

**1353–4** Given the Chorus' emphasis on the Mother's disrespected rites (1356–68), it seems preferable, if possible, not to abolish the idea of sacrifice contained in ἐπύρσας. I therefore adopt, among other changes, Hermann's πύρσας, which helps restore the metre. L's text †ὦν οὐ θέμις οὐθ' ὄσια | ἐπύρσας ἐν θαλάμοις† has been endlessly emended, producing a diverse range of openings for the final stanza (for a sample, cf. Ali (1963) 188–90, Pearson's Appendix p. 204).

**1353** ὦν . . . πύρσας 'you burned (= ἐπύρσας) what it is not right or holy for you (to burn)'. The charge of improper sacrifice is intended to establish H.'s guilt: 1355–7n.

θέμις . . . ὄσια: the insistence upon 'divine law' underlines H.'s apparent impiety.

**1354** ἐν <γαῖς> θαλάμαις 'in her cavern(s) beneath the earth': Eur. uses the word θαλάμη of a variety of subterranean spaces: e.g. *Supp.* 980 (Caraneus' grave), *Phoen.* 931 (the lair where the Theban dragon was born). The present passage exploits the word's status as 'a *vox propria* for a sacred cave' (Dodds on *Bacch.* 120 θαλάμευμα Κουρήτων): cf. *Ion* 393–4, where the oracular cave of Trophonius is called τὰς Τροφωνίου | . . . θαλάμας. The goddess's secluded shrine is a far more plausible location for the sacrifice than H.'s own chamber (the standard interpretation of ἐν θαλάμοις).

**1355–7** If the interpretation of 1353–4 offered here is correct, the Chorus' explanation of the Mother's anger is based upon the idea of improper sacrifice. This may be

seen as a variation upon the (more common) accusation of neglected sacrifice, which is frequently cited as a cause of divine anger: e.g. *Il.* 1.65, 9.533–42; cf. also *Soph. Aj.* 172–81, *Eur. Hipp.* 145–7. The disruption of sacrifice is a plausible basis for divine resentment because the notion of reciprocity between humans and gods is fundamental to Greek religion. Here the Chorus point to the goddess's anger at her abused rites and go on to remind H. of the great power that lies in the worship of Dionysus and the Mother (1358–65). The typical nature of the allegation might suggest that the Chorus are merely speculating in an effort to make sense of H.'s suffering, as at 1137–50. Yet this leaves the central problem of the ode completely unexplained; namely, why the Chorus suddenly introduce the Great Mother (rather than Hera or Aphrodite, for example) as the goddess who is angry with H.

However, if we think of H. more in *figurative* than in literal terms, we can see that the Chorus' charge makes sense, as does their choice of Mother/Demeter as the goddess who is allegedly punishing H., since it is motivated by Demeter's connection, via the *anodos* pattern, to H.'s renewal of her normal status as a sexually mature *gynē* back in Greece. For in her role as an allegorical parthenaic figure (1312–14b, 1349nn.), H. is behaving in a typically transitional-parthenaic way by rejecting marriage, as symbolized here by her failure to participate in the rites of Mother/Demeter (*qua* goddess of fertility and sexuality). Of course, on the *literal* level, in terms of her actual behaviour in the play, where she rejects marriage to Theoc., H. does *not* merit criticism. However, in wider cultural terms such behaviour on the part of *parthenoi* is socially disruptive and is accordingly criticized in surviving parthenaia; for a detailed elaboration of this argument, see Swift (forthcoming). Thus, from the universalizing perspective of the Chorus, H. is being presented as the archetypal *parthenos*, who must come to realize the necessity of reconciling herself to marriage (for H. as the chorus-leader of *parthenoi* in Spartan transition rituals, see 1465–7n.). Fortunately, everyone (except Theoc.) agrees that H. should not marry Theoc., and a way is eventually found whereby H. is able instead to find a marriage she can enter into joyfully, thus fulfilling her figurative transition to maturity, i.e. by resuming her 'normal' life as a married woman back in Sparta; cf. 722–5, 1431–5, 1663–5nn.

1355 ἔχεις: the present tense is appropriate (cf. ἔσχεις Hermann, εἶχεις Musgrave, ἔξεις Bothe) since the Chorus are concerned with (as they see it) the current impact of the goddess's anger upon H.

1356–7 ὦ παῖ is normally used (like ὦ τέκνον) when the addressee is younger than the speaker (cf. Kovacs (1994b) 163, Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 686). Here, however, rather than implying that the Chorus are older than H. (cf. 193 Ἑλλαπίδες κόραι), the vocative ('my child') marks the Chorus' authoritative tone as they criticize H.'s apparent misconduct, and underlines H.'s *parthenos*-like status, as a girl (*korē*), like the Chorus themselves (cf. 1364–5n.).

θευσις refers principally to honouring the goddess through sacrifice (cf. e.g. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 367–9 for the punishment that comes to those who fail to make proper offerings). The disruption of sacrifice was a sign of crisis in the narrative section of the stasimon as well: cf. 1333–4. However, the word also prepares for 1358–65, which

depict the goddess's θυσίαι in the broader sense of 'rites' or 'ceremonies' and, by implication, H.'s neglect of them.

οὐ σεβίζουσα: thus H. is allegedly repeating the mistake of her father Tyndareos (17, 472, 494, 568, etc.), who is said to have been punished when he forgot to sacrifice to Aphrodite (48n.).

1358–65 assert and enhance the power of the Mother's cult through syncretism with the ecstatic ὄργια of Dionysus. (At *Bacch.* 120–34 a similar process of assimilation enables the music of Mother Rhea to be incorporated in the cult of Dionysus: see *Syncretism*, p. 295; 1346–52n.) The passage corresponds (thematically as well as metrically) with 1342–49, where the origins of the goddess's rites and music were described.

1358–9 μέγα: adv. acc., cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 950 μέγα γὰρ δύναται πότην Ἐρινύς. τοι: apostrophizing H. ('mark you'): *GP* 538.

δύναται . . . στολίδες: the sg. form of the verb (required by the metre) is followed by a plural noun, an instance of the figure known to ancient scholars as the *schema Pindaricum*. It is most common with ἐστί or ἦν followed by a plural subj. (Soph. *Trach.* 520, Eur. *Hec.* 1000–2, *Ion* 1146; cf. West on Hes. *Theog.* 321). Other verbs are also found, but the construction is relatively rare in tragedy (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 49, *Supp.* 714–15, Eur. *Phoen.* 349, *Bacch.* 1350). The sg. form is influenced here by the listing of several attributes of the Mother's cult (στολίδες κισσοῦ τε . . . χλόα . . . ῥόμβου θ' . . . ἐνοσίς etc. – the level of parataxis is striking) in which 'a collection of subjects are mentally unified' (Dodds on *Bacch.* 1350).

νεβρῶν | . . . στολίδες ('great is the power of) the dappled fawn-skin robes': the characteristic costume of Bacchantes (e.g. *Bacch.* 24 νεβρίδ' ἐξάψας χροός). The skins of various animals were thought to transmit the slain animal's vitality (μέγα τοι δύναται) to the human wearer; cf. Burkert (1983) 166–7.

1360–1 κισσοῦ . . . | . . . ἱερούς 'and the greenery of ivy that crowns the holy thyrsus'. The twining of ivy leaves turned the νάρθηξ (fennel stalk) into a θύρσος, the symbol *par excellence* of raw Dionysiac energy (and potential violence): cf. Dodds on *Bacch.* 113–14 ἀμφὶ δὲ νάρθηκας ὑβριστᾶς | ὀσιοῦσθ'.

1362–3 ῥόμβου . . . | . . . αἰθέρα 'the circular curling shake of the bull-roarer high in the air'. The *rhombos* 'consists of a shaped piece of wood whirled round on the end of a string to produce a demonic roaring noise . . . it was used in some mystery cults, especially those of Dionysus and Cybele' (West (1992) 122).

1364–5 βακχεύουσα . . . ἔθειρα Βρομ|ῶν 'the hair streaming out for Bromios'. Such movements are characteristic of ecstatic cults (the Chorus of *Bacchae* present Dionysus himself (150) τρυφερόν <τε> πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθέρα ῥίπτων). Dodds (1951) 273–4 discusses the gesture's representation in ancient art and literature, together with its capacity to induce (religious) hysteria in several modern cultures. Like Dionysus, the Mother of the Gods also combined a wild, exotic mythical identity and ecstatic rites with a respectable function in polis life, and her temple doubled as the state archive. As Parker (2005) 134 observes, 'Much about the informal cult of Mother . . . was regularly criticized – its begging priests, its tambourines – but the continuing existence of the cult, which was very popular, seems not to have been questioned.'

βακχεύουσα: the part. ('act like a Bacchant') personifies ἔθειρα.

Βρομίῳ could also be causal dat. (= 'inspired by Bromios'), but this is already implied by βακχεύουσα. Βρόμιος ('Roarer') is a frequent title of Dionysus; the god is the ideal complement to Cybele's κρόταλα βρόμια (1308). H. and Dionysus had been connected in Cratinus' comedy *Dionysalexandros*, produced c. 430 BC (K-A frs. 39–51), where Dionysus usurped the role of Paris and abducted H. from Sparta. Here, by contrast, the 'new' H. is faulted for her failure to participate in the god's worship; cf. 1355–7n.

καὶ παννυχίδες θεᾶς 'and the goddess's all-night festivals': a *pannychis* was an integral element of many festivals: cf. *Trō.* 1071–3 (addressed by the Trojan women to Zeus) φροῦδαί σοι θυσίαι χορῶν τ' | εὐφημοὶ κέλαδοι κατ' ὄρφιναν τε παννυχίδες θεῶν. Herodotus (4.76) describes a night-festival of the Mother of the Gods at Cyzicus (in the southern Propontis), while the festival of the Thracian goddess Bendis, newly established in Athens, involved an impressive *pannychis* (ἦν ἄξιον θεάσασθαι, Adimantus says to Socrates: *Pl. Rep.* 328a7). The Mother of the Gods was honoured in public cult at Agrai in Attica, and although no 'all-nighters' for her are attested as part of any state festival, it is possible that these were celebrated privately by less formal cult associations. In any case, the Chorus envisage such devotions for the goddess here, and fault H.'s absence from them. Moreover, this criticism comes from a group of *young women* (193 Ἑλλανίδες κόραι; cf. 1356–7n.), underlining H.'s neglect of parthenaic ritual (*parthenoi* took part in *pannychides* at several Athenian festivals, including the Mysteries, Panathenaea, Taurotopia, and Brauronia; cf. Parker (2005) 166).

1366–7 L's text | εὐ δέ νιν ἄμασιν | ὑπέρβαλε σελάνα | is corrupt (if we keep σελάνα, ὑπέρβαλε is unmetrical, the whole passage nonsensical: 'the moon surpassed her well by day') and has not been convincingly repaired by any suggested emendations. σελάνα is very likely to be genuine, however, referring back to the time of the goddess's all-night rites (1365). The question then becomes what the moon is likely to have been doing while H. gloried in her beauty (1368). The plural ἄμασιν ('by day'; Doric for ἡμασι, from ἡμαρ) is suspicious and can in any case hardly be combined with σελάνα. If we therefore adopt Heath's ἄρμασιν (of the moon's chariot), keeping L's ὑπέρβαλε in mind, it is tempting to read Schenkl's ὑπερθε, with the verb understood (ἦν or εἶη: for εὔτε + opt., with imperf. in the apodosis (cf. ηὔχεις), meaning 'whenever', see LSJ s.v. εὔτε 1 3): 'but when (or whenever) the moon was in her chariot above (εὔτε δ' ἐν ἄρμασιν | ὑπερθε σελάνα), you gloried in your beauty alone.'

σελάνα: since the calendars of all Greek *poleis* were essentially lunar, each month started with the new moon (νουμηνία) and progressed through the full moon to the moon's vanishing (cf. Burkert (1985) 225–7). Some festivals coincided with the full moon (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 450–1 on the Spartan Carneia, ἀειρομένας | παννύχου σελάνας), which was also a particularly suitable time for a *pannychis*.

1368 μορφαῖ: as with the Chorus' criticism of H. for neglecting the Mother's rites, their final charge, 'you gloried in your beauty alone', is best understood figuratively (see 1355–7n.). For in the course of the play H. has complained repeatedly about her

beauty and the suffering it has caused (27, 236–7, 261–5, 303–5, 375–85; cf. Voelke (1996)), so the Chorus' claim makes no sense on a literal level. However, to rely on, or show pride in, their beauty was thought characteristic of *parthenoi* (cf. Alcman fr. 1.50–9, 64–77 *PMGF*). Thus H.'s alleged misconduct makes sense figuratively as part of the parthenaic motifs surrounding her (1349n.), while the Chorus' vision of a vain H., while not literally true of her character in the play, is rendered more credible by the vanity often ascribed to H. in more traditional versions of her myth (Introd. §3).

ἡύχαις: for the sense 'glory in', cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 952 ἡδὴ νυν αὐχέι 'When it is used absolutely or with dat., "feel confident (in)" naturally moves over to "plume or pride oneself (on)".'

#### 1369–1450 FOURTH EPISODE

By staging a second confrontation with Theoc., Eur. prolongs the suspense of the escape (the *IT*, by contrast, has a single deception scene (1153–1233)). Theoc. suggests once more that H. stay behind and let others perform the burial (1392–8; cf. 1274–8), prompting H. to further ingenuity in order to ensure her participation. M. remains silent until after Theoc.'s departure, thus focusing our attention on H.'s cleverness and her ability to manipulate Theoc. The final preparations for the 'burial' are made in a second passage of deception stichomythia (1412–28; cf. 1195–1277), enlivening the action and providing more irony and humour (e.g. 1418, 1420, 1424, 1426) as the plan approaches its climax. Following Theoc.'s return to the palace, the short scene ends with a prayer from M. (1441–50) as he and H. lead the 'funeral' procession towards the shore.

**1369–89** H. enters from the palace and informs the Chorus of the plan's successful progress so far (as with all stasima, the Chorus' preceding song is taken to cover whatever span of time is required by the action of the play). Theonoe has concealed M.'s presence from Theoc., while M. himself has managed to gain control of the armour intended as a burial offering. As Theoc. and M. come out of the palace, H. appeals to the Chorus not to divulge their plan.

**1370–3** Having promised to 'stand out of the way and be silent' (1023), Theonoe has had to lie in response to a direct question, telling Theoc. that M. is dead (cf. 1198–9, 1226–8).

συνεκκλέπτουσα . | . . Ιστορουμένη 'helping to conceal . . . when questioned'. For the various senses (all involving deceit) of κλέπτειν and its compounds, see Denniston on *El.* 364–5 (Orestes to Electra) πρὸς θεῶν, ὁδ' ἀνὴρ ὃς συνεκκλέπτει γάμους | τοὺς σοῦς, Ὀρέστην οὐ καταισχύνειν θέλων;

ἡλίου | . . . αὐγὰς εἰσορᾶν 'she said for my sake that he is dead and does not see the light of the sun.' L's ἐν χθονί (1372) is impossible: it cannot mean 'upon the earth' (ἐπι χθονί), nor is M. 'inside the earth' (he supposedly died at sea). Diggle follows Prinz in deleting 1372, but the line (with Hermann's ἡλίου) emphasizes Theonoe's courage in defying Theoc.; cf. also 530–1n.

ἐμὴν χάριν 'for my sake': the adv. acc. of χάρις takes the gen. (c.g. 1254 ταύτης χάριν) or, as here, a possessive pronoun (LSJ s.v. 1v 1).

1374 L's text (κάλλιστα δῆτ' ἀνήρπασεν ἐν τύχηι πόσις) is meaningless as it stands, but insofar as it seems to conceal a garbled comment by H. in praise of her husband's conduct, Wecklein's suggestion restores excellent sense with the minimum of change.

κάλλιστα . . . τύχην 'my husband seized this chance very skilfully indeed', explained in 1375ff. (γάρ).

ἦρπασεν τύχην underlines M.'s own resourcefulness in exploiting the opportunity.

1375–84 prepare the audience for M.'s radically different appearance when he enters dressed in fine clothes and full armour (1390–1n.). For the significance of M.'s change of costume, see 421–4n.

1375 καθήσειν . . . ἐμελλεν '(the arms which) he was supposed to sink' (cf. 1247, 1266).

1376 ἐμβαλὼν . . . χέρα 'putting his noble arm through the shield strap'. This anachronism describes a contemporary hoplite shield, the πόρπαξ being the bronze arm-band through which the hand passed before gripping a handle at the shield's edge (cf. van Wees (2000) 84–5).

1378 ὡς . . . δῆ (+ part.) are ironical (*GP* 230.ii), expressing M.'s alleged motive for carrying the shield and spear, 'as if he were joining in doing service to the dead man'.

1379 προύργου (adv., = πρὸ ἔργου) 'conveniently (for battle)'.

ἤσκησατο: 3rd sg. aor. middle of ἀσκέω, 'he has fitted himself out' (compare the active form in 1383), referring to the armour (helmet, greaves, corslet) worn on M.'s body.

1380–1 ὡς . . . | θήσων 'meaning to set up trophies over countless barbarians with his hand'. An expression of victory, the trophies imagined as erected upon M.'s return to Greece. For the armour's importance in the closing fight, cf. 1606–10.

κωπηῆρες 'oared': cf. 1413, 1452, 1461, 1534, 1598–1601.

1382–4 It is appropriate that H. herself should oversee his bathing and clothing, since the change is an important stage in the restoration of her marriage (cf. *Od.* 23.153–5, where Odysseus is washed and given new clothes before his reunion with Penelope).

ναυφθόρου στολῆς 'his shipwrecked clothes'. M.'s men have naturally suffered a similar fate: cf. 1539–50 (the only other use of ναύφθορος in extant tragedy).

χρόνια νίπτρα: acc. in apposition, lit. 'long-awaited water for washing'.

ποταμίας δρόσου 'of pure river water', as opposed to the sea water with which M. was encrusted after the shipwreck (408–9).

1385–9 As Theoc. is heard at the palace door, H. appeals to the Chorus to remain silent. Such requests are used in tragedy for a variety of dramatic purposes (see Barrett on *Hipp.* 710–12). Here, as in all other scenes of this kind (with the exception of Eur. *Ion*, where the chorus of Creusa's maidservants disobey Xuthus' demand

for silence (666-7)), the Chorus are sympathetic to the figure making the request (cf. *Med.* 259-68, *Hipp.* 710-14, *IT* 1056-77) and they do not need to reply to make clear their consent (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 555, 581-2, Soph. *El.* 468-71, Eur. *El.* 272-3, *Or.* 1103-4). H.'s appeal to the Chorus is, however, not merely 'perfunctory' (Dale), since it serves to highlight once more the dangers facing the conspirators. H. also mentions the possibility that the Chorus themselves may be rescued (1388-9), which, although a deliberate inducement, suggests her unselfish nature. Unlike the *IT*, however, where Athena forbids Thoas from punishing the chorus and commands him to return them to Greece (1431-4, 1467-9, 1482-3), there is no mention of the Chorus' release later in the play. The focus turns instead to the punishment and salvation of Theococ (cf. 1621-41, 1647-9, 1656-7, 1682), since it is her promise to remain silent (rather than the Chorus' implicit agreement) which has been treated as central to the success of the escape plan (829, 1017-23).

**1385** ἀλλὰ . . . γάρ is used in a number of entrance-announcements (mostly Eur.), with ἀλλὰ marking a break-off from what precedes and γάρ explaining the main clause (which may be elliptical): *GP* 103.4, Bond on *Her.* 138.

**1386** ἔχειν δοκῶν: Theococ's delusion about his 'marriage' resembles Paris' mistaken belief that he has the real H.: καὶ δοκεῖ μὲν ἔχειν | . . . οὐκ ἔχων (35-6n.); both men are fooled, Paris by the εἰδωλον, and Theococ. by H. herself.

**1387** προσπίτνω μένειν 'I beg you to remain (loyal and hold your tongue)'. Diggle prints a lacuna after 1387 (following Hartung), but Rauchenstein's emendation suits the tense situation, as H. figuratively supplicates (προσπίτνω) her fellow Greek captives. L's προσποιούμεθα is problematic since the zeugma with κρατεῖν seems strained ('we lay claim to you as a well-wisher and (bid you?) to hold your tongue'). As Dale remarks (ad loc.), 'probably the termination of the next line [-μεθα] has been contagious.'

**1389** σωθέντες . . . συσσωσῶσαι: cf. *IT* 1067-8 (Iphigenia to the chorus) σωθεῖσα . . . | σώσω σ' ἐς 'Ελλάδα'.

**1390-1** Theococ. enters from the palace, followed by M. and a group of servants, some of whom carry the funeral offerings, while others attend the king himself. Bain (1981) 30-2 has argued that the first group departs immediately towards the shore (1390 χωρεῖτ'), since (p. 30) 'it would be odd . . . if the escort were present . . . to hear 1441-50 in which Menelaos speaks with complete candour about his hopes.' However, M.'s prayer to Zeus (1441-50) is quite compatible with the servants' presence, while H.'s references to 'these offerings' (τάδε) at 1410 and 1437 suggest that the bier and food offerings continue to be visible, along with the armour carried by M. Were the bull and horse also paraded at this point, or will it have been enough to hear of them later (1555ff.)? Mules or horses did appear when chariot-borne entries were staged (e.g. Eur. *Tro.* 568-76, *El.* 998-9), but there is nothing to imply the presence of animals here, and dramatic convenience suggests that their passage to the shore was left to the imagination of the audience (mules or horses yoked to a chariot are relatively easy to control, but an unyoked animal, especially a bull, is not). Two more of Theococ.'s slaves are dispatched at 1417 and 1433; the remainder leave with him at 1440.

**1390** ἐφεξῆς . . . ἔταξαν: both words ('in file . . . ordered') suggest military discipline and combine with M.'s appearance in full armour to underline his new authority.

**1392** Ἑλένη: Theoc.'s use of H.'s name marks a new level of intimacy (cf. Dickey (1996) 46–50, 243 'in tragedy such address [sc. by first name] is rare, for the usual way of addressing unrelated women is γύναι'), which is reciprocated deceptively by H. ('my new husband' (1399), 'my lord' (1428)); cf. 1193n.

**1393–4** ταῦτά: crasis, τὰ αὐτά. Yet H. can object (cf. 1403–4) that she cannot perform 'the same service' for her husband if she is absent from his burial (1275n.).

**1395–7** Theoc.'s fear that H. might drown herself is ironically misplaced; in the end she urges M. and his men to throw the Egyptian sailors into the sea (1602–4).

μεθεῖναι: aor. act. inf. of μεθίημι, 'to throw': cf. Eur. *Supp.* 1070 καὶ δὴ παρεῖται σῶμα, where Evadne throws herself onto the pyre of her husband Capaneus.

ἐκπεπληγμένην: perf. pass. part. of ἐκπλήττω, which used together with χάρισιν has an erotic charge; cf. *Hipp.* 38–9 κάκπεπληγμένη | κέντροις ἔρωτος.

**1399–1411** H. responds to Theoc.'s show of concern with an effusive declaration of her loyalty to him ('O my new husband', 1399), yet the stress throughout her speech (delivered in M.'s presence) on the respect she still owes her 'first marriage' (1400 τὰ πρῶτα λέκτρα) makes clear the true nature of her devotion.

**1399** ὦ καινός . . . πόσις: the nominative is sometimes used vocatively in tragedy, usually with ὦ (cf. Diggle (1994) 155 n. 3, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1072, Schwyzler 2.64). Lee (1986) defends L's κλεινός, arguing that it simultaneously flatters Theoc. (κλεινός is a regular term for royalty: cf. Denniston on Eur. *El.* 327) and alludes to M.'s Trojan fame (cf. 105, 392, 453, 503). However, the contrast between H.'s 'new' and 'former' husbands (cf. 1397 τοῦ πρόσθεν ἀνδρός, 1400 τὰ πρῶτα λέκτρα) better suits the rhetorical context. Confusion between the two words is common in L: see Bond on Eur. *Her.* 38.

**1402** ξυνοθάνοιμί ἄν is truer than Theoc. realizes: cf. 835–42.

**1404** ἐντάφια 'funeral gifts', i.e. typical offerings for the dead (here carried by the servants) such as libations, flowers, and cakes as well as the armour (carried by M.): see 1255–78n.

**1405** οἷ ἐγὼ θέλω is ironically ambiguous, turning an apparent wish for good fortune, at least as far as it concerns Theoc. (σοί), into a curse.

**1406** συνεκπονεῖ describes the stranger's 'assistance' with the rites (cf. 1378).

**1407** οἷαν χρή σ' ἔχειν: i.e. no wife at all.

**1409** τίς ἐς τύχην ('to some happy end') is deliberately vague, allowing Theoc. to think of his marriage, while the audience can appreciate the reference to H. and M.'s imminent escape.

**1412–13** Theoc. commands an attendant to arrange a ship for the burial: the language recalls 1267–72 (1413 Σιδωνίαν ~ 1272 Φοίνισσα κώπη, 1413/1267 κάρετμῶν ἐπιστάτας), where the issue of the ship (but not its commander: cf. 1414–17) was first raised.

**πεντηκόντερον:** the trireme had rendered the fifty-oared ship obsolete by the start of the Persian Wars (cf. Thuc. 1.14), but the latter's use in epic (e.g. *Il.* 16.169–70) made it an appropriate vessel for the heroes of tragedy.

**Σιδωνίαν:** i.e. Phoenician (1451, 1531, 1272n.).

**κάρετμῶν ἐπιστάτας:** 1267n.

**1414–17** Before Theoc.'s attendant can leave, H. suggests an additional order for the ship's crew. The reason for her insistence on M.'s command soon becomes clear, as do the consequences for Theoc. of his agreement (1549–53).

**ἀκούειν τοῦδε** '(must) obey this man'.

**1418** **κἀγώ:** *crasis*, **καὶ ἐγώ**, with ellipse of *ὄναιμην*, 'and may I too profit from what I intend to do!'

**1419** Theoc. misinterprets H.'s tears as yet more weeping for her dead husband. The audience can perceive her joy at securing for M. the crucial role of commander (cf. 1411).

**ἐκτήξις:** 2nd sg. aor. subjunc. of *ἐκτῆκω*, 'don't spoil your cheeks'.

**1420** **χάριν** is doubly ironic, not only referring to H.'s 'gratitude' to Theoc. (shown by her escape from him), but also suggesting the power of her own *χάρις* ('charm') in duping him (cf. 1234, 1254nn.).

**1421** Theoc.'s dismissal of the afterlife ('the dead are nothing'; a tragic topos: cf. Parker (2005) 365) contrasts strongly with Theonoc's view of the mind's enduring *νώμη* (1015–16), while his description of care for the dead as 'wasted effort' (cf. *Trō.* 48–50) is at odds with his own concern for his dead father (1165–8n.). Yet the remark must be understood in context: Theoc. is still trying to persuade H. to give up her grief and with it her desire to perform the burial herself (cf. 1427).

**1422** is particularly dense and ambiguous, but there is no need to obelize (OCT) or delete (so Dale, along with 1421). In response to Theoc.'s claim that the burial rites are pointless, H. reaffirms the prerogatives of the dead: 'Those of whom I speak have some power both in this world and the next.' While H. speaks of the man who stands beside her, Theoc. thinks of the dead M. (and replies accordingly).

**1423** **Μενέλεω:** gen. of comparison, 'a husband no worse than M.'

**1424** **οὐδὲν . . . μεμπτός:** emphatic litotes, 'you are impeccable', i.e. would make for an outstanding husband.

**τῆς τύχης:** Theoc.'s response shows that he interprets H.'s 'good luck' (needed for the escape) in terms of their future as husband and wife.

**1425** **ἐν σοί** 'in your power' (cf. 996).

**1426** **οὐ νῦν** is emphatic ('I don't need to be taught now to love my friends'): H.'s conduct has been guided throughout by her devotion to M.

**διδασκόμεσθα:** future middles with passive force are common in tragedy: cf. Bond on *Her.* 582, K-G 1.114–16.

**1427** **βούληι . . . ἐκπέμψω:** *βούληι/εσθε* + deliberative subjunc. (instead of the subjunc. alone) is colloquial (Stevens (1976) 60–1). For the spelling *βούληι* in poetic texts, as opposed to L's *βούλει*, the form preferred in prose and comedy, see Smyth §628.

**1428** H. deflects Theoc.'s potentially disastrous offer with a deft appeal to his sense of status; cf. Aesch. *Ag* 943 (Clytemnestra to Agamemnon) πιθοῦ· κρατεῖς μέντοι παρεῖς γ' ἐκῶν ἐμοί.

ἥκιστα 'of course not' (Stevens (1976) 14), the opposite of μάλιστα (851, 1415).

μη δούλευε σοῖς δούλοις; cf. *Bacch.* 803 (Pentheus to the Lydian stranger, i.e. Dionysus) τί δρῶντα; δουλεύοντα δουλείαις ἐμαῖς;

**1429** Theoc. finally allows H. to perform the rituals herself.

ἀλλ' εἶα 'very well, then'. The particles regularly mark a transition to an imperative, here ἴτω (1431), which follows after Theoc.'s explanation of his decision (1430 γάρ . . . γάρ). L has εἶα (so too LSJ, *GP* 14, Stevens (1976) 33, etc.), but the rough breathing is supported by papyri of Sophocles (Radt on Aesch. fr. 78a.18, Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 970).

Πελοπιδῶν: cf. 1242n.

ἐῶ 'I let be', in the sense 'I will no longer worry about'.

**1430–1** Corpses infected the place of death with pollution (cf. Parker (1983) 38 n. 20).

δώματ' . . . ἐνθάδε: unknown to Theoc., M. was prepared to die there (977–85).

**1431–5** A second attendant (cf. 1417) is ordered to begin preparations for the wedding.

ὑπάρχουσιν refers to Theoc.'s subordinate chiefstains (cf. LSJ s.v.). They are to honour him with 'wedding presents' (γάμων | ἀγάλματ').

βοᾶσθαι: for the construction (an intransitive verb in the passive: K-G 1.126–7), cf. 1147 ἰαχήθης, Eur. *El.* 691 ὀλολύξεται πᾶν δῶμα, *IT* 367 αὐλεῖται δὲ πᾶν μέλαθρον.

μακαρίαις ὑμνωδίαις | ὑμέναιος: the accumulation of marriage terms marks Theoc.'s ironic delusion as well as his eagerness (1231n.), since the *hymenaios* that he calls for to celebrate his wedding are in fact appropriate to H. and M., whose actual marriage will soon be renewed back in Sparta; cf. 722–5, 1663–5nn. For the μακαρισμός, or 'calling blessed', in connection with marriage, cf. [Hes.] fr. 211.7 MW (from a wedding song for Pelcus and Thetis) τρις μάκαρ Αἰακίδαη καὶ τετράκις ὄλβιε Πηλεῦ.

**1436–40** Theoc.'s parting instructions to the Greek stranger are laden with irony, since H.'s 'former husband' (1437) does indeed intend to 'hurry her back home' (1438 πάλιν πρὸς οἴκουσ σπεῦδ').

πελαγίους ἐς ἀγκάλας: cf. 1062n.

τοῦς γάμους . . . συνδαίσας ἐμοί 'having shared the feast with me at her wedding', a strikingly incongruous image, underlining once again the extent of Theoc.'s ignorance.

στέλλη: 2nd sg. pres. mid.-pass. subjunc. (of purpose after ὡς), 'you may set out' (cf. 1527 ἐστάλη).

**1441–50** As Theoc. returns to the palace, M. prays for divine aid (cf. *IT* 1230–3, where Iphigenia prays to Artemis before launching the escape). Just as H. had invoked Hera and Aphrodite (also at the end of an episode), the two divinities most directly linked to her suffering (1093–1106n.), so M. prays first to Zeus in his role as 'father'

and ‘wise god’, implicitly challenging Zeus to live up to these titles (1441n.), then admonishes the gods as a whole by reminding them of their past cruelty towards him (1447–50). Dale (1969) 182–4 discusses several examples of such ‘challenging’ prayers in late Eur.

**1441 σοφός:** Euripidean characters often question the ‘wisdom’ of the gods directly (cf. 851n.). M.’s prayer is less openly confrontational, but still powerful, since it implies that for Zeus not to aid their escape would be a sign of his lack of ‘wisdom’, understood in a moral sense (for the moral extension of σοφός, and the assimilation of intellectual and ethical terms in Greek thought, see Dover (1974) 119–23). Nevertheless, as the tragedies themselves repeatedly show, human expectations of the gods’ superior ‘wisdom’ can be excessively optimistic (cf. esp. *Hipp.* 120).

**1443–4 ἔλκουσι . . . συμφοράς:** a striking metaphor that likens M. and H. to animals dragging a heavy load (their misfortunes) up a hill.

πρὸς λέπας ‘to the summit’.

σύναψαι: aor. middle imper. of συνάπτω (+ dat.), ‘help (us as we drag . . .)’. M. cannily foregrounds their own efforts, a prerequisite of divine assistance (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 811).

**1444 κἄν ἄκραι θιγῆις χερσί:** the image underlines the ease with which Zeus could rescue them from disaster, ‘even if you touch us with the very tip of your finger’.

**1446** For ὄλις + gen. and emphatic *figura etymologica* (μόχθων . . . ἐμοχθοῦμεν), cf. 099.

**1447–8** M. recalls his many prayers that were both ‘useless (i.e. unheeded) and full of pain’ (ἄχρηστ’ . . . | καὶ λύπη).

κέκλησθε: 2nd pl. perf. pass. of καλέω, ‘you have been summoned’.

τοι ‘as you well know’: for the particle used in a remonstrating sense, cf. *GP* 5.40–1.

κλύειν: West (1984) 179 prefers to accentuate as aor. inf. κλυεῖν, but the present well stresses the continued hearing of the gods (rather than, as with the aor., the simple occurrence of the prayer): Smyth §1865.

**1449–50 μίαν . . . | δόντες:** despite his criticism of the gods’ past neglect, M. has no choice but to pray once again for their help.

εὐτυχῆ: the gods do support the escape (cf. esp. 1584–8, 1662–79), but this does not cancel out the terrible consequences of their disregard for mortals (Introd. §6(d)).

### 1451–1511 THIRD STASIMON

As H. and M. depart for the shore, accompanied by Theoc.’s servants carrying the funeral offerings, the Greek women of the Chorus sing of the couple’s return home, escorted on the voyage by the Dioscuri, whose aid they invoke.

*Structure.* The Chorus begin by apostrophizing the ship itself, whose passage is described in idyllic terms, surrounded by ‘dancing’ dolphins (1454–5n.) and assisted by the goddess Galancia (‘Calm’). The goddess’s address to the sailors states the purpose

of their voyage – to bring H. back to Sparta (1463–4) – and this leads into the anti-strophe's depiction of Spartan life, as the Chorus imagine H.'s renewed participation in the city's rituals and her reunion with her daughter Hermione. In the second strophe the Chorus' wish that they might join the migrating cranes in flight expresses their eagerness that the news of M.'s homecoming be brought quickly to Sparta (even before his arrival there). The song ends with a prayer to the Dioscuri, who are invoked as 'H.'s saviours' (1500), first in general terms as marine gods (bringing the sailors fair winds) and then more specifically as H.'s brothers (removing her evil reputation as an adulteress): the requests prepare for, and are answered by, the Dioscuri's epiphany in the closing scene (cf. 1652–5, 1663–5, 1672, 1684–7).

*Function.* The song's emphasis on rapid movement towards Greece (the ship's divinely assisted voyage, the flight of birds, the Dioscuri's flying horses) not only evokes the escape taking place behind the scenes (soon to be reported by the Messenger), but also anticipates the success of the recently completed deception: instead of singing wedding songs for H. and Theoc. (cf. 1433–5), the Chorus celebrate the restoration of H. and M.'s married life in Sparta. The ode also extends the play's geographical and cultural scope, as H.'s reintegration into Spartan society is envisaged in ritual terms, as she joins the Leucippides and dances in honour of Hyacinthus, a scene embracing two of the city's most distinctive cults (1465–75). And since H.'s return to communal life depends on the reinstatement of her good name, the Chorus end their song by affirming her innocence and undeserved suffering (1506–11), a central theme of the play (Intro. p. 64).

Thus, if we look for continuities and development across the play's three stasima (reading them as a cycle of lyric reflections on the Trojan War, with H.'s predicament as their connecting thread), we can see a general transition from despair to hope, matching the trajectory of the plot. The Chorus' uncertainty about divine motivation and their disillusionment with war in the first stasimon are followed by a warning against divine anger in the second, giving way to a new tone of optimism in the third, as they look forward to H.'s return and rehabilitation (rather than back to her past suffering, the subject of their lyrics from the parodos onwards).

*Metre.* As in the epiparodos and second stasimon, the metre is predominantly acoloriambic. Given the iambic opening and final bacchius, 1452~1466 may be described as iambo-choriambic (contrast 1464~1477, a so-called 'chor trim catalectic': Itsumi (1982) 70). A glyconic corresponds with a choriambic dimeter at 1459~1473, 1460~1474, 1481~1498, 1487~1504 (cf. 1302~1320). For the five longs at 1462~1476a, cf. Dale's comment on 1307~1325 (quoted above, 1301–68n. 'Metre'). The first line of the second strophe ends pendant (~–x, 1478), creating period-end: cf. Stinton (1990) 326 'Pendant close is always a mark of period-end, if it is followed by a short or anceps.' The multiple resolutions of 1485–6~1502–3 mark both the beating of the crane's wings and the clashing waves of the sea (cf. 1117–18~1132–3, 1308–9~1326–7). The responsion of ~~~ and -- in 1493–4~1510–11 is unusual in tragic glyconics (cf. Itsumi (1984) 68–9, Brown (1974) 210–11).

## 1451–77 first strophe and antistrophe

---υ---υ---	Φοίνισσα Σιδωνιάς ὦ	1451	chor dim
	ἤ που κόρας ἄν ποταμοῦ	1465	
υ---υ---υ---	ταχεῖα κώπα, ῥοθίοισι Νηρέως	1452	chor dim bacchius
	παρ' οἶδμα Λευκιππίδας ἤ πρό ναοῦ	1466	
---υ---υ---	εἶρεσία φίλα,	1453	dodrans A
	Παλλάδος ἄν λάβοι,	1467	
υ---υ---υ---	χοραγέ τῶν καλλιχόρων	1454	chor dim
	χρόνωι ξυνελθοῦσα χοραῖς	1468	
---υ---υ---	δελφίνων, ὅταν αὐ-	1455	sp chor
	ἤ κώμοις Ὑακίν-	1469	
---υ---υ---	ἄν πέλαγος ἀνήνεμον ἤι,	1456	chor dim
	δοῦ νύχιον ἐς εὐφροσύναν,	1470	
σ---υ---υ---	γλαυκά δέ Πόντου θυγάτηρ	1457	chor dim
	ὄν ἐξαμιλλασάμενος	1471	
υ---υ---υ---	Γαλάνεια τάδ' εἶπηι·	1458	pherecratean
	τροχὸν ἀτέρμονα δίσκου	1472	
υ---υ---υ---υ---	Κατὰ μὲν ἱστία πετάσατ', αὐ-	1459	glyconic
	ἔκανε Φοῖβος, τᾶι <δέ> Λακαί-	1473	chor dim
---υ---υ---υ---	ρας λιπόντες εἰναλίας,	1460	chor dim
	ναι γὰι βούθυτον ἀμέραν	1474	glyconic
υ---υ---υ---υ---	λάβετε δ' εἰλατίνας πλάτας,	1461	glyconic
	ὁ Διὸς εἶπε σέβειν γόνος·	1475	
---υ---υ---	ὦ ναῦται ναῦται,	1462	5 longs
	μόσχον θ' ἄν ἴλίποισι οἴκοισι†	1476a	
---υ---υ---	πέμποντες εὐλιμένους	1463	^chor dim
< x-x-υ--->		1476b	

-----υ-υ--||

Περσείων οἰκῶν Ἑλέναν ἐπ' ἄκτάς.	1464	chor dim ba
ἄς οὐπῶ πεῦκαι πρὸ γάμων ἔλαμψαν.	1477	

1478—1511 second strophe and antistrophe

υ-υ-υ-υ-υ--||

δι' αἰθέρος εἶθε ποτανοὶ	1478	enoplian
μόλοιτέ ποθ' ἵππιον οἶμον	1495	

υ-υ-υ-υ-|

γενοίμεθ' ὅπαι Λιβύας	1479	prosodiac
δι' αἰθέρος ἴεμενοι,	1496	

-----υ-υ--||

οἰωνοὶ στολάδες	1480	sp chor
παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι,	1497	

-----υϣυ-υ-

ὄμβρον χειμέριον λιποῦ-	1481	glyconic
λαμπρῶν ἀστέρων ὑπ' ἀέλ-	1498	chor dim

-----υ-υ-υ-|

σαι νίσονται πρεσβυτάτου	1482	chor dim
λαις οἱ ναίετ' οὐράνιοι,	1499	

-----υ-υ-υ-|

σύριγγι πειθόμεναι	1483	^chor dim
σωτῆρε τᾶς Ἑλένας,	1500	

-----υ-υ-υ-|

ποιμένος, ἄβροχά θ' ὄς	1484	hemicpes (D)
γλαυκὸν ἐπ' οἰδμ' ἄλιον	1501	

υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-|

πεδία καρποφόρα τε γᾶς	1485	lekkythion
κυανόχροά τε κυμάτων	1502	

υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-||

ἐπιπετόμενος ἰαχεῖ.	1486	zia^
ρόθια πολιά θαλάσσης,	1503	

-----υϣυ-υ-|

ὦ πταναι δολιχαύχενες,	1487	glyconic
ναύταις εὐαεῖς ἀνέμων	1504	chor dim

-----υ-υ-υ-|

σύννομοι νεφέων δρόμου,	1488	glyconic
πέμποντες Διόθεν πνοάς,	1505	

—x—uu—		
βᾶτε Πλειάδας ὑπὸ μέσας	1489	glyconic
δύσκειαν δ' ἀπὸ συγγόνου	1506	
uu—uu—		
ὤρίωνά τ' ἐννύχιον,	1490	chor dim
βάλετε βαρβάρων λεχέων,	1507	
—x—uu—		
καρύξασ' ἀγγελίαν	1491	^ chor dim
ἄν Ἰδαιᾶν ἐρίδων	1508	
—x—uu—		
Εὐρώταν ἐφεζόμεναι,	1492	chor dim
ποιναθεῖσ' ἐκτήσατο, γᾶν	1509	
x—uu—		
Μενέλεως ὅτι Δαρδάνου	1493	glyconic
οὐκ ἔλθοῦσά ποτ' Ἰλίου	1510	
x—uu—		
πόλιν ἐλών δόμον ἦξει.	1494	pherecratean
Φοιβείους ἐπὶ πύργους.	1511	

**1451–64** *First strophe.* The opening stanza marks the ode as an extended προπεμπτικόν, that is, a song (or speech) wishing a friend a safe journey – in this case a safe sailing home to Greece (on the history of the form, first attested in Sappho and Alcaeus, and popular in Hellenistic and Roman poetry, see Hunter on Theoc. 7.52–89). The Chorus of Greek women similarly predict Iphigenia's safe voyage from the land of the Taurians to Athens, aided by Pan and Apollo (*IT* 1123–31). But whereas the *IT* ode is set between scenes of plaining and deception, the present song comes after the deception is complete and the journey is imagined as already under way, thus linking the Chorus' apostrophe of the ship (1451f.) and prayer for fair winds (1495–1505) to simultaneous events offstage.

**1451–3** κώπη ('oar') and εἰρεσία ('oarage') stand for the whole vessel (394n.), 'O swift Phoenician ship from Sidon, oared vessel dear to the waves of Nereus'. For the seafaring prowess of the Phoenicians, see 1272n.

**1454–5** χοραγέ . . . | δελφίνων: the dolphins swimming around the ship are compared to circling dancers, making the ship itself their 'Chorus-leader'. Though he does not mention this choral ode, Csapo (2003) explores the connections in Greek thought between 'circular choruses' of dolphins and the choral dances of cult and dramatic performance. The dolphin was thought to be attracted (and inspired to 'dance') by the sound of the αὐλός played to mark time for the rowers (1575–6n.): cf. Hdt. 1.23–4 (Arion, inventor of the dithyramb, saved by a dolphin), Eur. *El.* 435–7 (on the Greek fleet sailing to Troy) Ἴν' ὁ φιλαυλος ἐπαλλε δελ | φισ πρώιραις κυανεμβόλοι

| σιν εἰλισσόμενος. The sea has been portrayed so far as a place of danger, wandering, and death (c.g. 129–32, 203–4, 400–2, 408–10, 520–7, 773–6, 1117, 1126–36), but it is now celebrated as the medium of H.'s escape. On Eur.'s frequent use of seafaring imagery, cf. Pauer (1935) 117–26.

καλλιχόρων: as with the dances described in the second stasimon (1312–13, 1345), καλλιχορος evokes the Chorus' own performance, which here serves to integrate them more closely with the imaginary escape scene. For the adj. as a signal of 'choral projection' in other Euripidean stasima (*Held.* 359–60, *Her.* 690, *Phoen.* 786), see Henrichs (1996) 51.

1455–6 The opening vocatives of the apostrophe lead into a (temporal) relative clause introduced by ὅταν. Such extended apostrophes are particularly characteristic of Eur.'s later lyrics (cf. Kranz (1933) 238–40) and are parodied by Aristophanes (*Frogs* 1309–16 'you halcyons . . . and you spiders . . .'). Fraenkel (on *Agam.* 1407f., p. 698) discusses the roots of this loose form of apostrophe in prayers.

ὅταν . . . ἀνήνεμον ἦ: the presence of Galancia, goddess of Calm, implies that there are no winds for sailing, making Murray's ἀνήνεμον a compelling conjecture. The adj. takes a genitive (cf. Soph. *OC* 677–8 ἀνήνεμον . . . | χειμώνων), supporting Blaydes' αὐράν.

1457–8 γλαυκά: the adj. ('grey-eyed') is applied to the sea once in Homer (*Il.* 16.34), but is a common epithet thereafter: cf. 400, 1501. Γλαυκή is a sea nymph in *Il.* 18.39 and (alongside Γαλήνη) Hes. *Theog.* 244.

Γαλάνεια: Hesiod's Γαλήνη is the daughter of Nereus and granddaughter of Pontos (*Theog.* 233–44). Here the goddess of Calm is daughter of Pontos, i.e. sister of Nereus, the grandfather of Theonoe and Theoc. (13–15n.). The form γαλάνεια is confined to Eur. (*Her.* 402, *Ll* 546, *Hyps.* fr. 1 iii 4–5 Bond), and is personified only here.

1459–61 present Galancia's instructions to the sailors (cf. 1341–2n.): 'Let the sails hang down freely, leaving the sea breezes behind, and take up your fir-wood oars.' The windless calm means that the rowers must set to work.

κατὰ . . . πετάσατ': aor. imper. of καταπετάννυμι, with tmesis (368–9n ἀναπετάννυμι is used in the sense 'spread out/unfurl (the sails to the winds)' (*Il.* 1.48 etc.), while καταπετάννυμι seems here to imply that the sails are to be allowed to hang down against the mast while the rowers propel the ship. This interpretation seems superior to that which treats the line as equivalent to 'spread the sails', since there are no winds here to fill them (1455–6n.). In these circumstances, rowing will get them back to Greece fastest.

λιπόντες: as Diggle (1994) 436 observes, the sense is 'leaving the sea-breezes (not only behind but also) out of the reckoning'. For λείπω in this sense, see LSJ s.v. λ 13, and cf. 753 παραλιπών.

εἰλατίνας: the lightness of fir made it an ideal material for ship-building: cf. Meiggs (1982) 118–19.

1463–4 πέμποντες . . . ἀκτάς: lit. 'escorting H. to the well-harboured shores of Perseus' home'. The ship will dock at Nauplia, the port that served the inland kingdoms of Argos and Mycenae (cf. 124n.). This passage, along with the (Euboean)

Chorus' description of Mycenae as the πόλισμα Περσέως (*Ll* 1500), are the earliest surviving references to the tradition that Mycenae was founded by Perseus. This took place after the events dramatized in *Andromeda*, but it is possible that it was referred to there prospectively (140n.). We cannot be sure whether *Andromeda* preceded or followed *Helen*, but the allusion to Perseus' heroic achievements is appropriate either way; cf. 769n.

**1465–77** The Chorus jump ahead to H.'s arrival in Sparta and her reunion with the daughters of Leucippus and her own daughter Hermione. Such a swift transition between scenes is typical of choral narrative, in which different times and places are juxtaposed, leaving the audience to supply the connections and thus round out the narrative sequence – contrast the linear and connected movement of the Messenger speech (1526ff.). The local details (river, temple, festal dancing, singing and feasting) present both an idyllic Sparta and a joyful view of H.'s homecoming. The Chorus' optimistic vision, prompted by the imminent escape, thus contrasts strongly with their earlier picture of Greek mourning (1122–5) and with H.'s own anxiety about her reception by the Spartans (287–9, 929–31). Moreover, the cults chosen to symbolize H.'s reintegration into Spartan society are both connected with the transition to adult (married) life, and are thus appropriate to H.'s own return to her proper status as wife of M. (1431–5, 1663–5nn.).

**1465–7** ἢ ποῦ . . . ἂν λάβοι 'she will, I think, find . . .': cf. *GP* 286 'the hesitation implied by ποῦ imposes a slight check on the certainty implied by ἢ.'

κόρας . . . Λευκιππίδας: the daughters of Leucippus, Phoebe and Hilacira, were the wives of Castor and Polydeuces, who had snatched them from the altar as they were about to marry Idas and Lynceus (Messianic princes later killed by Polydeuces to avenge the death of Castor: cf. 1659n.). Like their sister-in-law H., the Leucippides were the recipients of cult in Sparta (cf. Wide (1893) 326–32, Farnell (1921) 229–33) and were probably connected, as H. certainly was, to the initiation of Spartan girls into marriage and adulthood: cf. Calame (1997) 185–91, *Introd.* §2(b). Larson (1995) 67–9 is sceptical of the Leucippides' initiatory role, but their manifold connections to H. (they too were abducted – for a 'better' marriage to the Dioscuri, at least from a Spartan (i.e. anti-Messianic) perspective – and Leda's egg was displayed in their shrine (Paus. 3.16.1)), together with the identity of their virgin priestesses as 'fillics' (πῶλοι), make it very likely that the Leucippides played a role in the training of Spartan girls, who will have honoured them (as they did H.) as ideal maidens and brides in choral song and dance (cf. 1468).

ποταμοῦ | παρ'οἶδμα: lit. 'by the swell of the river', i.e. on the banks of the Eurotas, the river of Sparta (cf. 209–10, 349–50). In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, produced in 411, a Spartan ambassador describes how young girls dance like 'fillics' (πῶλοι) beside the Eurotas, with H. as their Chorus-leader (1305–15). This passage of Aristophanes is important for what it tells us about the Athenians' knowledge of maiden-choruses, for although they did not operate to the same extent in Athens as they did elsewhere (cf. Parker (2005) 183 'The idea that *parthenoi* learnt by learning to dance is, it seems, appropriate only to certain areas of the Greek world'), the Athenians were clearly

familiar with the transitional-parthenaic function of such choruses, and with H.'s identity as a role-model for Spartan girls, and so could make sense of H.'s role in the play as a quasi-parthenaic figure (cf. esp. 1349, 1355–7nn.).

πρὸ ναοῦ | Παλλάδος: for Athena's temple on the Spartan acropolis, cf. 226–8n.; and for a discussion of the goddess's worship there, see Villing (1997) 82–9. H. had been gathering rose petals for Athena of the Brazen House when she was seized by Hermes and taken to Egypt (244–9), and the same goddess is the recipient of the Spartan hymn that ends *Lysistrata* (1320–1). Evidence for her cult is scarce, but there may be a parallel between Athena Chalkioikos' role as a virginal protector of the city and H.'s function as a symbol of girls' readiness for marriage, a transition essential for maintaining the exclusive descent group of Spartan citizens (cf. Calame (1997) 196).

1468 χρόνῳ . . . χοροῖς 'as she joins in the dancing at long last': H. is imagined participating (together with the Leucippides) in the kind of ritual choral dancing that Spartan girls would later perform in her honour (1465–7n.). Unlike the *IT* (1132–52), the Chorus' reference to choral dancing back in Greece (cf. 1454–5n.) does not prompt any explicit nostalgia for their own former life, since the focus here is kept exclusively on H. and M.'s fate rather than theirs: cf. 1385–9n.

1469–75 The Chorus evoke the Hyacinthia, one of the three major cults of Apollo at Sparta (cf. Pettersson (1992) 9–41), alluding not only to its choral performances (1469 κώμοις) and nightlong celebrations (1470 νύχιον ἐς εὐφροσύναν), but also to the origins of the festival itself. Having accidentally killed his young lover Hyacinthus with a discus throw, Apollo instituted sacrifices in his honour. (This is the earliest surviving literary reference to Hyacinthus' death. Although the story is certainly older, earlier vase-paintings focus on Apollo's erotic pursuit of his beloved rather than his death: *LIMC* s.v. Hyakinthos 3–11.) The myth reflects the merging of Apollo with the pre-Greek Hyacinthus, and the relationship between god and hero conforms to the common pattern whereby a god or goddess kills their 'mortal double', to whom they are connected in cult, e.g. Artemis and Iphigenia, Poseidon and Erechtheus: see Burkert (1985) 202–3. Though more common in *deus ex machina* speeches in Eur. (1642–79n.), such cult aetiologies are also found outside them: e.g. *Ion* 15–26, 267–7 (the Athenian Arrephoria), *IT* 947–60 (the Choes ritual of the Anthesteria). Despite its sombre aetiology, the three-day Hyacinthia was characterized by a transition from grief to joy, making the cult an appropriate choice here, as the Chorus imagine the happy renewal of H.'s (married) life at Sparta.

1469–70 ἢ κώμοις Ὑακίν | θου 'or (takes part in) the revels for Hyacinthus': κώμος may refer to an uproarious procession, but the proximity of χοροῖς makes its other meaning 'song of celebration' more likely.

1470 The prep. ἐς expresses purpose (LSJ s.v. v 2), lit. 'for joy at night'.

1471–3 ὄν . . . | . Φοῖβος 'whom Phoebus killed, having exerted himself with the round discus.'

ἐξαμιλλασάμενος: for the implied effort, cf. 165n.

τροχὸν ἀτέρμονα: lit. 'endless wheel', ἀτέρμων here being used like ἀπείρων (LSJ s.v. β 3) in the sense 'round'.

δίσκου: Apollo kills his young lover with an object emblematic of their relationship.

**1473–5** τᾶι . . . γόνος ‘and the son of Zeus ordered the land of Sparta to observe a day of sacrifice’. The Hyacinthia, honouring Apollo of Amyclae (near Sparta), began with offerings being made at the tomb of the hero himself. The tomb, shaped like an altar, is said to have formed a pedestal for a large bronze statue of Apollo (Paus. 3.19.3). The shrine thus displayed not only the close connection between god and hero (expressed in the myth by their erotic relationship), but also their relative status and power.

**1476–7** Despite textual problems, there can be no doubt that the μόσχος (‘heifer’) referred to by the Chorus is Hermione, whose unmarried state has been lamented by H. (cf. 282–3, 688–90; Mossman (1995) 150–1 discusses Eur.’s use of the word to denote young and often vulnerable people of either sex). In referring to Hermione’s marriage (the bridal torches have ‘not yet’ (οὐπω) blazed for her), the Chorus underline their confidence that the escape will be successful: cf. 933.

**1478–94** The Chorus wish that they could join the migrating cranes on their flight home to Libya. As they flee the wintry north, the birds (and, by extension, the Chorus women themselves) are imagined passing over Sparta, where they are to land and deliver the news of M.’s imminent return.

**1478–9** δι’ . . . | γενοίμεθ’ ‘if only we could fly through the air’. The wish that one could escape on wings from a desperate situation is a *topos* of tragic lyric: cf. e.g. *Andr.* 862, *Ion* 796–8. Padel (1974) 235–40 discusses the present ode in terms of escapism, but unlike *Hipp.* 732–75 and particularly *IT* 1138–52, the focus here is much more on H. and M.’s return to Sparta than on the escape of the Chorus (cf. 1468n.).

**1479–82** ὅπαι . . . νίσονται ‘to where the Libyan birds go in close array, leaving the winter rain behind’. Cranes feature in a number of poetic similes: cf. *Il.* 3.3–5, the cries of the advancing Trojans are compared to those of the migrating cranes, where as Kirk points out, ‘The common elements are the cranes, their noise, and more loosely their landing or taking off and their association with rivers.’ All of these elements are present here: the leading bird is compared to a pipe-player and the cranes land beside the Eurotas.

**1479** Λιβύας: Λιβύη (area) and Λιβυς (adj.) normally refer to the whole of North Africa west of the Nile.

**1480** στολάδες: the adj. στολάς denotes ordered movement (like a στόλος, ‘military unit’, LSJ s.v. 13), here applied to the V- or double-V formation of the migrating birds.

**1482** νίσονται: νίσ(σ)ομαι (‘I go/come’) is a frequent epic word, but rare in tragedy (six times in lyrics and anapaests, once in trimeters: Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1233–5). The Chorus’ fantastic wish is expressed in suitably elevated language.

**1482–6** πρεσβυτάτου | . . . ἰαχεῖ ‘obedient to the piping of the eldest, their leader, who calls out as he flies over the rainless and the fruitful plains of the earth.’

σύριγγι . . . | ποιμένος: the leader of the flock is likened to a shepherd with his panpipes, an idyllic image (cf. Eur. *El.* 702–6, *Ion* 498–501) which stresses the Chorus’ desire for flight (cf. *IT* 1125–7). If the αὐλός-player in the theatre ever attempted

to imitate other instruments mentioned in a play, the σῦριγξ will have been (as another wind instrument) among the easiest: cf. West on *Or.* 145, one of the likeliest examples.

ἄβροχα . . . γᾶς: Kannicht interprets this as a reference to Egypt ('the rainless and yet fruitful plains of the land'; cf. 1–3n.), but the Chorus is thinking more generally of the various terrains crossed by the migrating birds (ἐπιπετόμενος with acc. = 'fly over', rather than 'fly to'); cf. 1479n.

λαχεῖ: ornithologists describe the crane's impressive 'clarion-call' as 'a loud, clear, non-guttural bugling' (Dunbar on *Ar. Birds* 710).

**1487–94** Having imagined themselves joining the cranes in flight, the Chorus now address the flock ('O long-necked birds . . .') and urge them to land in Sparta with the news that M. will soon be home.

**1487** δολιχαύχενες: the rare adj. δολιχαύχην is used of the swan that sired H. (*L1* 794 διὰ σέ, τὸν κύκνου δολιχαύχενος γόνου), and is otherwise attested only once (Bacchyl. *Dith.* 2.6) of a swan that pleases Apollo.

**1488** σύννομοι νεφέων δρόμου 'partners of the racing clouds' (for δρόμος = 'racing' rather than 'path', see Mastrorarde on *Phoen.* 163–4; cf. 1074 νεὼς δρόμος), i.e. the cranes are as swift as the clouds themselves (cf. *Alc.* 245 οὐράνιαι τε δῖναι νεφέλας δρομαίου). σύννομος, applied to animals, often has its original meaning 'feeding with', but is here used in the generalized sense 'partner of'.

**1489–90** βᾶτε . . . | . ἐννύχιον 'fly beneath the Pleiades in mid-course and Orion in the night'. As Dunbar observes (on *Ar. Birds* 710), 'Cranes migrating from the north reach the Mediterranean in mid- to late October on their way to the river valleys of the Sudan and Ethiopia.' Thus their crossing of Greece coincides with the setting of the Pleiades and Orion; cf. Hesiod, who uses both the cranes and the stars as a marker of the ploughing season (*WD* 383–4, 448–50, 615–17).

Πλειάδας: a cluster of seven stars in the constellation Taurus, who were identified as seven daughters of Atlas and thought to be pursued by the great hunter (and lover) Orion: cf. *Ion* 1152–3, *L1* 7–8. The form Πελεΐαδες ('Doves') found in L refers to 'a secondary folk-etymology' (West on *Hes. WD* 383–4) and conflicts with Eur.'s spelling Πλ- elsewhere (cf. Willink on *Or.* 1005–6).

**1491** καρύξαι: aor. imper. of κηρύσσω, 'announce'.

**1492** Εὐρώταν ἐφεζόμεναι 'as you land beside the Eurotas': for the river a toponym, cf. 349–50n.

**1493–4** Μενέλεως ὅτι Δαρδάνου | πόλιν ἔλῶν: the Chorus' newfound optimism allows for no hint of the war's cost (cf. 1451–1511 'Function'), in contrast to their view the conflict in the first stasimon (esp. 1122–5, 1151–4). Moreover, by naming M. here so emphatically, the Chorus confirm his heroic achievement in winning the war: see 453, 1600–12nn.

**1495–1511** The song ends with a prayer to the Dioscuri, 'saviours' (1500 σωτῆρε) both of sailors and their sister H. Like the opening stanza, the last evokes H.'s voyage home with divine assistance, but here the Chorus go on to imagine the effects of H.'s (unjustified) reputation back in Greece and urge the Dioscuri to vindicate her. Teucer's

earlier uncertainty about the fate of H.'s brothers (137–42; cf. 284–5) is replaced by the Chorus' conviction that they have become gods, a belief exemplified in the Dioscuri's final epiphany above the palace. As with H. herself, the Indo-European origins of the Dioscuri's worship are compelling but obscure: cf. Eitrem (1920) 144–50, Burkert (1985) 212, West (1975) 8–9, *Introd.* p. 14. Despite their close mythological ties to Sparta and their major cult centre at Therapne (1659n.), the Dioscuri were very popular throughout Greece (for their cults, cf. Farnell (1921) 175–228; they were also in 484 BC the earliest Greek gods to be adopted by the Romans). In Athens the Dioscuri were identified with the Ἄνακες, worshipped in the Anakeion in the centre of the city (Andocides 1.45, Paus. 1.18.1–2); they were honoured with an athletic festival (for the Anakeia, see Parker (2005) 457) and also received ritual hospitality in the Prytaneion (Burkert (1985) 107); cf. 1666–9n.

**1495–6** μόλοιτε . . | . ἴεμενοι 'come rushing through the air on the path your horses make'. The Dioscuri, riders of white horses, functioned as role models for the aristocratic youths of Sparta (207–8, 638–40nn.). Their statues stood by the racetrack (Paus. 3.14.7) and they were frequently represented with symbols of Laconian cult (*LIMC* s.v. Dioskouroi 58–64). The Spartan poet Aleman calls them 'tameers of swift steeds and skilled horsemen' (fr. 2 *PMGF* Κάστωρ τε πώλων ώκέων δυατῆρες ἴπποται σοφοὶ | καὶ Πωλυδεύκης κυδρός) and the athletic Lampito swears 'by the Ἴωιν Gods' (Ar. *Lys.* 81 ναὶ τῶ σιῶ), yet their association with horsemanship extended far beyond Sparta and was part of their panhellenic identity: an altar to them stood at the turning-post of the hippodrome in Olympia (Paus. 5.15.4), where they were entrusted with supervision of the games by Heracles (Pind. *Ol.* 3.33–8), and in his hymn to the Dioscuri, Alcæus of Lesbos addresses the gods as 'you who ride over the wide earth and all the sea on your swift-footed horses' (fr. 34.5–6 Ὡ σὶ | κατ' εὐρηαν χ[θόνα] καὶ θάλασσαν | παῖσαν ἔρχεσθ' ὦ[κυπό]δων ἐπ' ἵππων).

**οἶμον**: the evidence of ancient papyri suggests that the aspirated form is preferable to Blaydes' οἶμον; cf. Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 1.27.

**1498–9** λαμπρῶν . . | . οὐράνιοι 'you who dwell in the heavens beneath the whirling of the bright stars'. The Dioscuri not only dwell among the stars, but are often depicted with them or said to be stars themselves, owing to their appearance in the form of St. Elmo's fire (1500n.); cf. 140n., *LIMC* s.v. Dioskouroi 232–7.

**ἄλλαις**: contemporary cosmologists speculated on the effects of the whirling motion of atoms (Democritus DK 67 A 1) and the outer heaven (which prevented it from collapsing upon the earth, according to Empedocles: DK 31 A 49) and on the genesis and motion of the stars, viewed as deposits of fire (Empedocles DK 31 A 53) or fiery stones set in the aether (Anaxagoras DK 59 A 42). The present passage may have prompted some to recall such theories, but ἄλλα is not itself attested in the vocabulary of the Presocratics (who speak of rotation as δίνη/δίνος or περιχώρησις; cf. Dover on Ar. *Clouds* 380) and the idea of the stars' movement through the sky is not incongruously scientific.

**1500** σωτῆρε τᾶς Ἑλένας: the Dioscuri had already proved themselves 'saviours of H.' by rescuing her from Athens when she was abducted by Theseus (cf. 27–9,

1642–79nn.). But here, in the context of H.'s voyage home, the description evokes the Dioscuri's particular status and cult as maritime σωτήρες (cf. 1664, Eur. *El.* 992–3, 1348, *Or.* 1637). Their power to rescue sailors from storms is attested in Alcacus' hymn (fr. 34 V) and the *Homeric Hymn to the Dioscuri* (33.6–17), which is perhaps also archaic (cf. Page (1955) 267–8). Alcacus' poem describes the gods' manifestation in the electrical discharge known as St. Elmo's fire, visible around the masts and rigging of ships during storms (9–12), which Xenophanes had attempted to explain rationally in terms of νεφέλια . . . κατὰ τὴν ποιὰν κίνησιν παραλάμποντα (DK 21 A 39). The Dioscuri were naturally very popular in maritime Athens, and decrees survive from the fifth century which show that taxes paid by merchants using the Piraeus were used to finance their cult (*IG* 1³ 133: cf. Garland (1992) 111, Parker (1996) 125).

**1501–3** γλαυκόν . . . | . . . θαλάσσης: lit. 'over the green salt swell and the dark blue-grey surge of the sea waves'. All three colour adjs. (γλαυκόν . . . κυανόχροα . . . πολιά) denote dark shades (cf. Maxwell-Stuart (1981) 1.234–5), enhancing the danger of the sea and H.'s escape upon it.

**1504–5** ναύταις . . . | . . . πνοάς 'as you send the sailors fair-blowing winds from Zeus': cf. 1663.

**1506–11** The Chorus end their song with an appeal for the restoration of H.'s good name. Her undeserved disgrace (1506 δύσκλειον) has been repeatedly lamented (e.g. 53–5, 250–2, 362–3, 694–7, 926–8) and its position here at the climax of the Chorus' prayer illustrates once again the divine origins of H.'s suffering and its importance to the fundamental seriousness of the play.

**1508–9** ἄν . . . | . . . ἐκτήσατο: the rel. ἄν (= ἦν) refers to the antecedent δύσκλειον, '(the bad reputation . . .) which she incurred as a punishment for the strife on Mt. Ida'. The injustice is clear, as H. is made to pay for the goddesses' vanity and ambition: cf. 23–30, 675nn.

**1509–11** The simple syntax and language of the ode's conclusion reinforce the startling effect of H.'s absence from Troy. The 'towers of Troy' evoke the myth's earliest surviving expression in Stesichorus' Palinode οὐδ' ἴκει πέργαμα Τροίας (fr. 192.3 *PMGF*).

**1511** Φοιβείους . . . πύργους: Apollo and Poseidon had built the walls of Troy for Laomedon, Priam's father (cf. *Il.* 7.452–3, *Andr.* 1009–18, *Tro.* 4–6, *Or.* 1388–9, *I.* 755–6, [*Rhes.*] 231–2). But Laomedon's failure to pay the gods led to his death at the city's capture by Heracles (e.g. Virg. *Georg.* 1.501–2 *satis iam pridem sanguine nosti Laomedontae luimus periuria Troiae*). The Chorus thus evoke the first Trojan expeditee even as they stress H.'s absence from the second. Yet the particular emphasis Φοιβείους (i.e. Laomedon's treachery) underlines the Trojans' share of responsibility for the destruction of their city, just as in the Trojan War itself (cf. 1114–21).

## 1512–1692 EXODOS

Following the intricate and ironic sequences of recognition and deception which have dominated the action thus far (541–1511, almost two-thirds of the play), the final scenes

present the escape and its consequences (which extend to contemporary Attic cult) in three rapid encounters, each involving Theoc.: the Messenger reveals the illusion of M.'s death and H.'s mourning (1512–1620); Theoc. is restrained by the Chorus-leader from killing Theonoc (1621–41); the Dioscuri intervene to halt the pursuit of H. and M., and Theoc. accepts their instructions (1642–87).

**1512–1618** As Theoc. comes out of the palace, he is met by one of the servants who accompanied H. and M. to the shore carrying the 'burial' offerings. Such messenger-scenes (containing reports by minor figures of major off-stage events) are found in all of Eur.'s surviving plays (except *Tro.*), and this can be classed as the second such scene in *Helen*, if one includes the earlier entry of Menelaus' servant; but for differences, see 597–624n. In any case, multiple messenger-scenes are a feature of late Eur. (*IT* (2), *Phoen.* (4), *Or.* (2), *Bacch.* (2): see de Jong (1991) 179–82) and part of his more expansive presentation of events.

Similarities between the narrative styles of the tragic messenger-speech and epic, especially in the quotation of direct speech and the greater use of epithets, are frequently noted (cf. Barrett (2002) 1–6, 69–73; for the omission of temporal augment, another feature of epic narrative, see Page on *Med.* 1141). Indeed, Barrett (2002) xvii speaks of the messenger 'appropriating the narrative voice of Homer', but one should not forget that the tragic messenger is a mortal reporter with his own particular perspective: he does not rely on the divine Muses as does the epic narrator, but derives his authority from autopsy (or feigned autopsy: cf. Soph. *El.* 680–763). Nevertheless, the narrative importance and artistry of the tragic messenger-speech are undeniable, as it brings to life a wide array of voices and viewpoints (here those of M., H., and various Egyptians: e.g. 1543–6, 1589–91, 1603–4), and dissolves the boundary between those actions seen by the audience and those taking place 'off-stage', now rendered no less vivid and enthralling by the messenger's performance: cf. Goward (1999) 18–20, 26–32, 35–6.

As is conventional, the Messenger's speech is prefaced by a brief dialogue giving the central facts of his report (1512–25). From the very beginning of his narrative the Messenger makes frequent use of his retrospective awareness that the sea burial was a sham (cf. 1528 σοφώταθ', 1529 πόσιν πέλας παρόντα κού τεθηκότα, 1537 τοῦτ' ἄρα σκοπούμενοι, 1542 δόλιον οἶκτον, 1547 ποιητῶι τρόπωι, etc.). As de Jong (1991) 55–6 remarks, such 'narrating focalization' is geared to exonerate the Messenger of any blame: he has to report unwelcome news to his superior and so takes care to point out not only the extent of the Greeks' deception, but also the crucial role played by Theoc.'s own mistake in putting M. in charge of the ship (1549–53; cf. 1414–17).

**1512** is not only unmetrical (beginning — — —) but also nonsensical, since the Messenger has come from the shore, not from the palace. (Holzhausen (1995) 202–3 suggests τὰ κάκιστ', ἄναξ, <σοῖς> ἐν δόμοις εὐρήκαμεν, understanding δόμος in the wider sense of family or household, but ἐν tells against this (cf. 477–8), and the initial anapaest so divided is unthinkable.) The line has probably been interpolated to plug a gap left by the scene's missing opening, with ἐν δόμοις perhaps alluding to Theonoc's betrayal of her brother; this, however, is ignored in the subsequent dialogue and first

raised only after the Messenger's departure (1621–41). In any case, comparison with other Euripidean messenger-scenes allows us to guess how the initial contact between Messenger and addressee may have been handled, and suggests that the missing line or lines may have contained little beyond conventional introductory remarks.

1513 ὥς is exclamatory (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 879), 'how startling are the sufferings . . .'. Messengers often remark at their entry upon the bad news to come (e.g. *Andr.* 1070–1, *Or.* 852–4).

1514 μνηστειύματα 'wooing' (found only here and *Phoen.* 580); Theoc.'s wedding plans are over (cf. 1431–5).

1516 Theoc.'s ironic question expresses incredulity at the idea of H. leaving Egypt, 'Did she soar on wings or walk on foot?' Flight is impossible (cf. *Med.* 1297, *Hec.* 1264, *Phoen.* 1216, *Or.* 1593), for the real H. at least (cf. 605–6, 1219), as is escape by land (1039–42).

πεδοστιβεῖ: lit. 'ground-treading', a grandiloquent epithet, confined to tragedy in classical Greek (cf. *Ar. Pers.* 127, *Suppl.* 1000, *Eur. Med.* 1123, [*Eur.*] *Rhes.* 253, 763).

1517–18 reveal to Theoc. the illusion of M.'s death.

ἐκπεπόρθηται is perf. pass. at 1179; here the middle voice marks M.'s particular interest in the action, 'has taken her out of the country by ship.'

αὐτόν: the pronoun (= ἐαυτόν) as subj. of the inf. θανεῖν is not strictly necessary, but it makes the sentence much easier to follow, and its emphatic juxtaposition with αὐτός underlines the daring and ingenuity of M.'s report.

1519 τίς . . . | . χθονός 'what ship has taken them out of this land?' ναυκληρία is equivalent here to 'ship', as the Messenger's reply makes clear (cf. 1589, where the sense is 'voyage'), though the word's root meaning of shipowning and commerce (cf. Mastrorarde on *Med.* 527) may suggest a suspicion that M. has hired a ship and crew to transport them from Egypt.

1520 ἄπιστα: explained in 1523–5; cf. *IT* 1293 (the Chorus' dissembling reaction to the Messenger) ἄπιστον εἶπας μῦθον.

1521–2 ἦν γέ 'the very one which . . .'.

δίδως: historic present, stressing the action (in the past) and its consequences (in the present); cf. 6–7n. σύ adds further emphasis.

ἐν βραχεῖ: i.e. the essential facts, followed by the full report (1512–1618n.).

1523–4 πρόθυμος: εἰμι is understood, omission of the copula being common in poetry (e.g. 468, 824), though ellipse of the first person is rarer than the third (see Denniston on *Eur. El.* 37). The phrase motivates the Messenger's following account (cf. *IT* 1323–5, more elaborately).

οὐ . . . | . βέβηκε: lit. 'it has not passed within my expectations', i.e. 'I never expect that one man . . .'.

1526–36 *The 'burial' procession and preparation of the ship.*

1526 ἐπεὶ is commonly used as an introduction to messenger-speeches, usually alluding to some earlier event (e.g. *Andr.* 1085, *El.* 774, *Ion* 1122). The subsequent narrative carefully articulates the sequence of events (1530 ὥς, 1537 κὰν τῶιδε μόχθωι, 1569 τέλος . . . ἐπειδή, 1577 ἐπεὶ, 1615 ἤδη).

1528 σοφώταθ' . . . ἀνέστενευ 'she very craftily lamented': the first of several remarks which show the Messenger's knowledge of later events and in turn guide the audience through his narrative of deceit and false appearances (1512-1618n.).

ἀβρόν πόδα τιθεῖσ' 'as she stepped gracefully along'. Insofar as the Messenger is hostile to H.'s deception, his description may exploit the negative connotations in Athenian democratic discourse of the word ἀβρός, suggesting aristocratic luxury and sensuality (cf. Willink on *Or.* 349 Μενέλαος ἄναξ, πολὺς ἀβροσύνη). Nevertheless, the audience can appreciate H.'s skilled performance of the role of mourning wife.

1530-6 For a similarly detailed description of the launching of a ship, see *IT* 1344-53 with Cropp's note ad loc.

1530 σῶν περιβόλον νεωρίων 'the enclosure of your dockyards'.

1531 Σιδωνίαν ναῦν: cf. 1272n., 1413, 1451.

πρωτόπλουον ('making its first voyage') underlines Theoc.'s generous treatment of H. and (by implication) her ingratitude.

1532-3 'with room (μέτρα) for fifty rowing benches (ζυγῶν) and oars (crasis, καὶ ἔρετμων).' For the 'heroic' penteconter (in fact an invention of the archaic period), see 1412-13n.

ἔργου . . . ἐξημειβετο 'and one task followed another'.

1534-6 Despite the corruption of 1535, these lines carefully describe the preparation of the mast (ἱστόν), oars (πλάτην), sails (ἱστία), and rudders (πηδάλια).

καθίστατο (3rd sg. imperf. middle καθίστημι, 'was setting in place') is preferable to L's aor. middle καθίστατο (from καθίζω, whose aor. form in the fifth century would in any case be καθέισα and ποι, as later, ἐκάθισα: see Barrett on *Hipp.* 29-32), since the Messenger uses several imperfects (1531-6) to describe a series of actions and their progress, whereas aorists would point to the simple fact of their occurrence: cf. Goodwin §35.

1535 †ταρσόν τε χειρῆ: in a nautical context ταρσός (LSJ s.v. 'frame of wicker-work') refers to the full array of a ship's oars (cf. Cropp on *IT* 1346), and it is hard to see how this could be combined with πλάτην and the dat. χειρῆ.

†εἰς ἔν ἦν† ('were together') seems to refer to the furling of the sails (the mast and sails are first raised at 1612), but εἰς ἔν is usually accompanied by a verb of motion (cf. 742, Stevens on *Andr.* 1172). Another imperfect verb may have dropped out.

1536 ζεύγλαισι παρακαθίετο ('and the rudders) were lowered by ropes (sc. into the sea)'). παρακαθίεμι is first found here (and only here in extant tragedy). Such double compound verbs (cf. e.g. 1406 συνεκπονεῖ) proliferated in later Greek; Breitenbach (1934) 104 counts 32 new examples in Eur., compared to 9 in Aesch. and 40 in Soph.

1537-53 *The arrival and embarkation of M.'s crew.*

1537 κὰν τῷδε μόχθωι 'while this was going on': also used in messenger-speeches at *Ion* 1196 and *Phoen.* 1396.

τοῦτ' . . . σκοπούμενοι 'who had been watching for this (opportunity)': for M.'s instructions to his men, cf. 739-43.

ἄρα marks the Messenger's subsequent realization of the truth, 'as it transpired' (cf. *GP* 36.2); so too 1538 Μενέλεωι ξυνέμποροι.

**1539–40** ναυφθόροις . . . | πέπλοισιν: like M. (421–4), and to similarly deceptive effect (1079–82n.).

ἡσθημένοι: perf. pass. part. of ἑσθέω, ‘dressed’. The verb occurs nowhere else in tragedy, but Porson’s ἡσκημένοι seems unnecessary (despite 1379).

εὐειδεῖς μὲν, αὐχμηροὶ δ’ ὄραν ‘handsome men, but squalid to look at’ (epexegetic inf.). The insistence on their good looks (temporarily obscured by their rags) helps characterize M.’s crew, from a Greek perspective, as good and admirable (for the application of words meaning ‘attractive’ or ‘beautiful’ to moral values and conduct, see Dover (1974) 69–73).

**1541** νιν = αὐτούς.

**1542** ἐς μέσον: the phrase’s Athenian/democratic connotations of openness and transparency in public discourse (cf. Croally (1994) 165 n. 9) serve to emphasize M.’s deceptiveness (contrast 944, where the Chorus’ pity for H. is genuine).

**1543–6** By quoting M.’s speeches (cf. 1560–4) the Messenger shows the extent of his elaborate deceit.

**1543–4** πῶς ἐκ τίνος: for the double question, cf. Eur. *El.* 779–80 τίνες | πόθεν πορεύεσθ’; *Ion* 793 πῶς δὲ ποῦ νιν εἰσιδῶν;

θραύσαντες . . . σκάφος ‘after shattering the vessel’.

**1545–6** ἀλλ’: a command, not a question, is wanted here, since the Greeks are supposed to have no knowledge of M.’s death. Hortatory ἀλλά + imper. (cf. 477) gives them the necessary information and direction (cf. Zuntz (1955b) 70–1, correcting L’s ἀρ’).

ἀπόντα: the irony is now clear to Theoc. as well (cf. 1240, 1289, 1437, 1529).

**1547** ποιητῶι τρόπωι ‘in a feigned manner’: their tears are as false as H.’s (cf. 1186–90).

**1548** Μενέλεωι ποντίσματα ‘the offerings to be thrown into the sea for M.’ Since M.’s men are destitute (cf. 428–9, 433) and have no prior knowledge of his ‘death’ this must refer to the offerings supplied by Theoc., which the Greeks simply join carrying (πόντισμα is found nowhere else in archaic or classical Greek). Yet they have brought something of their own aboard: 1574–5.

**1549–53** The Messenger blames Theoc. himself for the subsequent chaos on the ship (1512–1618n.).

**1550** ἐπεσβατῶν ‘additional passengers’; a *hapax*.

**1552–3** The men’s suspicions were cancelled out by Theoc.’s emphatic orders (1414–17: cf. *IT* 1333–5).

σῶζοντες ‘obeying’ (cf. 613 τὸ μόρσιμον σώσασα).

συνέχεας: 2nd sg. aor. of συγγέω, ‘you caused all this confusion’.

**1554–68** *The sacrificial bull’s refusal to board the ship.*

**1554–5** κουφίζοντα describes ‘the other things’ (τάλλα: crasis, τὰ ἄλλα), which could be carried aboard easily ‘because they were light’.

**1555–8** ταύρειος . . . πούς (rather than simply ταῦρος) guides the audience to visualize a specific aspect of the scene at the ‘gangway’ (1556 σανίδα), as ‘the baulking, slithering hooves take the centre of the picture’ (Dale).

1528 σοφώταθ' . . . ἀνέστενευ 'she very craftily lamented': the first of several remarks which show the Messenger's knowledge of later events and in turn guide the audience through his narrative of deceit and false appearances (1512–1618n.).

ἄβρον πόδα τιθεῖσ' 'as she stepped gracefully along'. Insofar as the Messenger is hostile to H.'s deception, his description may exploit the negative connotations in Athenian democratic discourse of the word ἄβρος, suggesting aristocratic luxury and sensuality (cf. Willink on *Or.* 349 Μενέλαος ἀναξ, πολὺς ἀβροσύνη). Nevertheless, the audience can appreciate H.'s skilled performance of the role of mourning wife.

1530–6 For a similarly detailed description of the launching of a ship, see *IT* 1344–53 with Cropp's note ad loc.

1530 ὧν περίβολον νεωρίων 'the enclosure of your dockyards'.

1531 Σιδωνίαν ναῦν: cf. 1272n., 1413, 1451.

πρωτόπλουν ('making its first voyage') underlines Theoc.'s generous treatment of H. and (by implication) her ingratitude.

1532–3 'with room (μέτρα) for fifty rowing benches (ζυγῶν) and oars (crasis, καὶ ἔρετμῶν).' For the 'heroic' penteconter (in fact an invention of the archaic period), see 1412–13n.

ἔργου . . . ἐξημείβετο 'and one task followed another'.

1534–6 Despite the corruption of 1535, these lines carefully describe the preparation of the mast (ιστόν), oars (πλάτην), sails (ιστία), and rudders (πηδάλια).

καθίστατο (3rd sg. imperf. middle καθίστημι, 'was setting in place') is preferable to L's aor. middle καθίσατο (from καθίζω, whose aor. form in the fifth century would in any case be καθείσα and ποι, as later, ἐκάθισα: see Barrett on *Hipp.* 29–32), since the Messenger uses several imperfects (1531–6) to describe a series of actions and their progress, whereas aorists would point to the simple fact of their occurrence: cf. Goodwin §35.

1535 †ταρσόν τε χειρί†: in a nautical context ταρσός (LSJ s.v. 'frame of wicker-work') refers to the full array of a ship's oars (cf. Cropp on *IT* 1346), and it is hard to see how this could be combined with πλάτην and the dat. χειρί.

†εἰς ἐν ἦν† ('were together') seems to refer to the furling of the sails (the mast and sails are first raised at 1612), but εἰς ἐν is usually accompanied by a verb of motion (cf. 742, Stevens on *Andr.* 1172). Another imperfect verb may have dropped out.

1536 ζεύγλαισι παρακαθίετο '(and the rudders) were lowered by ropes (sc. into the sea)'. παρακαθίημι is first found here (and only here in extant tragedy). Such double compound verbs (cf. e.g. 1406 συνεκπονεῖ) proliferated in later Greek; Breitenbach (1934) 104 counts 32 new examples in Eur., compared to 9 in Aesch. and 40 in Soph.

1537–53 *The arrival and embarkation of M.'s crew.*

1537 κἄν τῶιδε μόχθῳ 'while this was going on': also used in messenger-speeches at *Ion* 1196 and *Phoen.* 1396.

τοῦτ' . . . σκοπούμενοι 'who had been watching for this (opportunity)': for M.'s instructions to his men, cf. 739–43.

ἄρα marks the Messenger's subsequent realization of the truth, 'as it transpired' (cf. *GP* 36.2); so too 1538 Μενέλεωι ξυνέμποροι.

1539–40 ναυφθόροις . . . | πέπλοισιν: like M. (421–4), and to similarly deceptive effect (1079–82n.).

ἡσθημένοι: perf. pass. part. of ἑσθίω, 'dressed'. The verb occurs nowhere else in tragedy, but Porson's ἡσκημένοι seems unnecessary (despite 1379).

εὐεῖδεις μὲν, ἀύχμηροι δ' ὄραν 'handsome men, but squalid to look at' (exegetic inf.). The insistence on their good looks (temporarily obscured by their rags) helps characterize M.'s crew, from a Greek perspective, as good and admirable (for the application of words meaning 'attractive' or 'beautiful' to moral values and conduct, see Dover (1974) 69–73).

1541 νιν = αὐτούς.

1542 ἐς μέσον: the phrase's Athenian/democratic connotations of openness and transparency in public discourse (cf. Croally (1994) 165 n. 9) serve to emphasize M.'s deceptiveness (contrast 944, where the Chorus' pity for H. is genuine).

1543–6 By quoting M.'s speeches (cf. 1560–4) the Messenger shows the extent of his elaborate deceit.

1543–4 πῶς ἐκ τίνος: for the double question, cf. Eur. *El.* 779–80 τίνες | πόθεν πορεύεσθ';, *Ion* 793 πῶς δὲ τοῦ νιν εἰσιδών;

θραύσαντες . . . σκάφος 'after shattering the vessel'.

1545–6 ἀλλ': a command, not a question, is wanted here, since the Greeks are supposed to have no knowledge of M.'s death. Hortatory ἀλλά + imper. (cf. 477) gives them the necessary information and direction (cf. Zuntz (1955b) 70–1, correcting L's ἄρ').

ἀπόντα: the irony is now clear to Theoc. as well (cf. 1240, 1289, 1437, 1529).

1547 ποιητῶι τρόπῳ 'in a feigned manner': their tears are as false as H.'s (1186–90).

1548 Μενέλεωι ποντίσματα 'the offerings to be thrown into the sea for M.' Sin M.'s men are destitute (cf. 428–9, 433) and have no prior knowledge of his 'death' this must refer to the offerings supplied by Theoc., which the Greeks simply join in carrying (πόντισμα is found nowhere else in archaic or classical Greek). Yet they have brought something of their own aboard: 1574–5.

1549–53 The Messenger blames Theoc. himself for the subsequent chaos on the ship (1512–1618n.).

1550 ἐπεσβατῶν 'additional passengers'; a *hapax*.

1552–3 The men's suspicions were cancelled out by Theoc.'s emphatic orders (1414–17: cf. *IT* 1333–5).

σώζοντες 'obeying' (cf. 613 τὸ μόρσιμον σώσασα).

συνέχεας: 2nd sg. aor. of συγχέω, 'you caused all this confusion'.

1554–68 *The sacrificial bull's refusal to board the ship.*

1554–5 κουφίζοντα describes 'the other things' (τᾶλλα: crisis, τὰ ἄλλα), which could be carried aboard easily 'because they were light'.

1555–8 ταύρειος . . . ποῦς (rather than simply ταῦρος) guides the audience to visualize a specific aspect of the scene at the 'gangway' (1556 σανίδα), as 'the baulking, slithering hooves take the centre of the picture' (Dale).

οὐκ ἤθελ: sacrificial animals were supposed to go willingly to their deaths (cf. Burkert (1983) 3–4). The bull's resistance is ominous, foreshadowing (and focalizing from the Messenger's Egyptian perspective) the animal's deceptive sacrifice (1581–8), while providing an opportunity for M. and his men to display their strength and determination (1560–4n.) before the fighting begins (1600–10).

ἐξεβρυχᾶτ': 3rd sg. imperf. of ἐκβρυχάομαι ('to bellow forth'), also used to describe the roar of the escaping Greek sailors at *IT* 1390–1 οἱ δὲ στεναγμὸν ἠδὺν ἐκβρυχώμενοι | ἔπαισαν ἄλμην (the verb's only other occurrence in extant Greek).

ὄμ' . . . κύκλωι: compare the rolling eyes of the crazed Heracles, who is likened to a bull about to charge (*Her.* 868–9).

κυρτῶν τε νῶτα 'arching its back'.

κάς (καί ἐς) κέρας παρεμβλέπων ('and looking along its horns') well depicts the suspicious and threatening gaze of the angry bull; cf. *Bacch.* 743 (of the bulls torn apart by the women of Thebes) κάς κέρας θυμούμενοι.

**1560–4** The hoisting of the bull on the 'sturdy shoulders' (1562 νεανίαις ὤμοισι) of M.'s men will have reminded a Greek audience of the ritual attested in Athens and other cities from the fifth century onwards (cf. 1560 Ἑλλήνων νόμωι), whereby men displayed their strength by lifting a bull above the altar for sacrifice. *IG* I³ 82.29–30 (421/0 BC) speaks of 200 Athenians being chosen by the priests for this purpose: cf. Stengel (1910) 105–12, van Straten (1995) 108–13 with plate 115, Himmelmann (1997) 22–6 with plate 13. As Diggle (2004) 480–1 points out (on *Theophr.* *Char.* 27.5), the earliest evidence for this being a peculiarly *ephebic* practice comes from the second century BC (cf. Parker (1996) 254 n. 127). In any case, the ritual allusion prepares for the physical exertion of M.'s crew in the battle aboard the ship, but also links M.'s men to the Athenian audience, encouraging them to support M. and his Greek comrades in their efforts to escape from Egypt.

**1560** ὦ πέρσαντες Ἰλίου πόλιν: dressed in full battle-dress (cf. 1375–81), M. reasserts his confidence in the achievements of the Trojan War; cf. 1600–12, 1603–4nn.

**1561** οὐχ εἶα (1429n.) + interrogative fut. (1563 ἐμβαλεῖτε . . .;) is equivalent to an imperative, 'Come on . . . put him (in the prow)': cf. 1597, *IT* 1423, *Or.* 1622, Diggle on *Phaeth.* 221; for the phrase's colloquial tone, see Collard (2005) 356, whose evidence shows that the incidence of colloquialisms in tragedy is much the same in direct and reported speech.

**1562** νεανίαις: as an adj. νεανίας does not imply that M.'s men are young, since it is applied 'regardless of age to what is young in character' (Bond on *Her.* 1095), so here 'sturdy', 'vigorous'.

**1563–4** φάσανον . . . | . αἶρει: a parenthetical description of M. ('and here he raised his drawn sword'), interrupting the report of his words (for the technique in a messenger-speech, cf. Eur. *El.* 788–9, *Phoen.* 1452).

σφάγια τῶι τεθνηκότι 'as a sacrificial offering to the dead man' is rhetorically apt, since it expresses the (hogus) purpose of the men's bull-lifting.

**1565** ἐξανήρπασαν: 3rd pl. aor. act. of ἐξαναρπάζω ('to snatch away'); cf. *LA* 75 (on Paris' abduction of H.) ἐρῶν ἐρῶσαν ὠιχετ' ἐξαναρπάσας (the verb's only other occurrence in extant Greek).

1566 ταῦρον . . . εἰσέθεντο σέλματα: the second acc. is governed by εἰς- (for the construction, cf. Diggle (1981) 116). The σέλματα are, strictly speaking, rowing-benches, but the phrase simply amounts to 'they put into the ship' (see Willink on *Or.* 242).

1567–8 Though the horse is not sacrificed (cf. 1258n.), its inclusion underlines Theoc.'s deluded generosity.

μονάμπυκος: gen. sg. of μονάμπυξ (lit. 'having one frontlet'; cf. *Alc.* 428, *Supp.* 586, 680), here denoting a single horse (cf. 1129 μονόκωπος ἄνηρ).

ψήχων 'stroking (its neck and forehead)'.  
 1569–76 *H., M., and the Greeks board the ship.*

1570 πλήσσασα . . . εὐσφύρωι ποδί: the detail of H.'s shapely foot (cf. 1528) has the effect of a cinematic close-up (Barlow (1971) 64, de Jong (1991) 86 n. 66). For the (here instrumental) dat. corrupted to gen. after πίμπλημι, cf. 769–70 ἐμπλήσαιμι . . . | μύθοις (μύθων L), Jackson (1955) 239, Diggle (1994) 189. For the gen. used correctly, cf. 1575–6 ἐξεπίπλατο | βοῆς '(the surge) was filled with our shouting'.

κλιμακτῆρας are the rungs of the ladder.

1571 ἔδωλοις 'the quarterdeck', towards the stern of the ship (cf. 1603 πρύμνηθεν).

1572 οὐκέτ' ὦν λόγοισι: cf. 1050–2.

1574 ἀνὴρ παρ' ἀνδρ': the Greeks are arranged in pairs. The phrase foreshadows the fighting to come: see 980, 1072nn.

1575–6 The boatswain (κελευστής), sometimes accompanied by an *aulos*-player (*IT* 1125–7, *Ar. Ach.* 554), gave the rowers their cadence (cf. *Ar. Frogs* 208 (Charon to Dionysus) ὦσπόπ, ὦσπόπ), and the latter replied with rhythmic shouts (*Frogs* 1073 (Aeschylus recalls the cry made by the crew of the *Paralus*) ρυππαπαῖ).

1577–88 *Sacrifice and prayer.*

1577–80 The ship is rowed a 'safe distance' (cf. 1268–71) from the shore.

1578 οἰάκων φύλαξ 'the helmsman': οἰάξ refers to the handle of the rudd' (πηδάλιον): cf. 1536, 1591.

1579–80 For the double question, see 873n.

πλεύσωμεν: 1st pl. aor. deliberative subjunc., 'shall we row?'

1581–4 Descriptions of on-board sacrifice are very rare in Greek literature (cf. Wachsmuth (1967) 123 n. 198), since offerings would normally be made on dry land before or after a voyage (e.g. *Od.* 3.178–9 Ποσειδάωνι δὲ ταύρων | πόλλ' ἐπὶ μῆρ' ἔθεμεν, πέλαγος μέγα μετρήσαντες). The need here to get the ship out to sea dictates the unusual location, while the offering itself reinforces M.'s prayer to Poseidon, since he is not only god of the sea but also particularly associated with bull sacrifices (Burkert (1985) 138; cf. *Hipp.* 1169–70, 1213–14). As often in tragedy, the sacrificial killing of an animal is followed by human slaughter: cf. *Soph. Trach.* 756–82 (the maddened Heracles kills Lichas), *Eur. Andr.* 1113–60 (Neoptolemus is killed at Delphi), *Her.* 922–1000 (Heracles murders his wife and children), and esp. *El.* 774–843 (Orestes kills Aegisthus with the sacrificial cleaver). For murders at sacrifices outside tragedy, see Parker (1983) 159–60, who points out that the Athenians were willing to overlook such impiety if the ends justified the means (as with Harmodius and Aristogeiton's plot to kill the tyrant Hippias at the Panathenaea of 514,

which ended in the murder of his brother Hipparchus: Hdt. 5.55–65, Thuc. 1.20, 6.53–9).

**1581** Ἄλις μοι ‘That’s (far) enough for me!’ For ἄλις in a variety of colloquial phrases, see Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1656 and 1659.

**1582** ἐς πρῶϊραν: M. makes his way to the front of the ship to perform the sacrifice (cf. 1571).

κάπι: crasis, καὶ ἐπί, ‘for the purpose of (slaughtering the bull)’.

**1583** μνήμην ἔχων ‘making mention (of none among the dead)’: M.’s prayer concerns the living instead (1586–7), arousing suspicion among the Egyptians.

**1584–5** Prayers often begin by mentioning places where the god is likely to be (see Sommerstein on Aesch. *Eum.* 292–6).

Νηρέως: the ‘just’ god may be likely to support M.’s escape: see 1002–4n.

**1586–7** A dramatically charged moment, as the details of M.’s request reveal both his identity and actual intentions.

σώσατε . . . | ἄσυλον ‘bring (us) safe and sound’ (cf. 61).

ἐπ’ ἀκτᾶς Ναυπλίας: cf. 1463–4n.

**1588** ἔσηκόντιζον: 3rd pl. imperf. of εἰσακόντιζω (‘to hurl (javelins)’), common in military prose, esp. in Thuc.), used absolutely (i.e. without a direct object) to create a graphic image of the ‘spouting’ or ‘darting’ streams of blood (the verb is attested only here in poetry).

οὔριαι ξένωι ‘propitious for the stranger’: the blood’s spurting straight into the sea (the domain of Poseidon and the Nereids) is interpreted as a favourable response to I.’s prayer (cf. 1612 οὔριαι δ’ ἤκον πνοαί).

**1589–99** *Speeches from both sides before the fighting begins.*

**1589–91** καὶ τις τόδ’ εἶπε: anonymous *tis*-speeches are characteristic of both epic and messenger-narratives (see Barrett (2002) 87–8).

ἀντίαν (sc. ὀδόν) κέλευε σύ, | σύ δὲ στρέφ’ οἶακ’: the first command is addressed to the boatswain (κέλευστής: 1575–6n.), ‘you order (the rowers) in the opposite direction’, the second to the helmsman (1578n.).

**1591–2** ἐκ . . . | . σταθείς: the sacrifice is completed: cf. 1582–3 ἐπί . . . | σταθείς.

ταυρείου φόνου: the adj. in place of a gen. noun is typically poetic: cf. 1582 ταυρείωι σφαγῆι (K-G 1.261–3, Schwyzer 2.177).

ἀνεβόησε συμμαχούς: cf. Diggle (1994) 437–9 ‘An accusative with βοᾶν or ἀναβοᾶν expresses the content of the βοή . . . he did not call “σύμμαχοι”, but used the ornate periphrasis ὦ γῆς Ἑλλάδος λωτίσματα.’

**1593–9** The opposing paracletic speeches of M. and the Egyptian are reminiscent of the battlefield exhortations of epic (cf. Collard on Eur. *Supp.* 694–717). The prelude to the battle thus encourages the audience to see M.’s struggle as a second, miniature Trojan War fought to rescue his wife from a foreign suitor (1603–4n.).

**1593** λωτίσματα: lit. ‘picked flowers’, the metaphor suggesting that only the best men have been selected; cf. Aesch. fr. 99.17–18 (of the Greeks attacking Troy) κλέος γὰρ ἦκειν Ἑλλάδος λωτίσματα | πάσης, Eur. *Tr.* 808–9 (of Heracles’ earlier sack of Troy) Ἑλλάδος ἄγαγε πρῶτον ἄνθος.

**1594** σφάζειν φονεύειν: cf. Mastrorarde on *Phoen.* 1193 ἔθνησκον ἐξέπιπτον 'verbal asyndeton at the start of a trimeter is an intensifying device used by all three tragedians, frequently in narratives of violence.' Insofar as σφάζειν suggests the act of slaughtering a sacrificial animal (see Henrichs (2000) 179–80), M.'s use of the word stresses the violence of the scene still further.

**1595** σοῖς: the Messenger addresses himself ostensibly to Theoc. throughout (cf. 1530, 1551–2, 1606, 1616).

**1596** βοᾷ: the historic present form recreates the Messenger's experience as an eyewitness, who now narrates the events as he experienced them (de Jong (1991) 38–45); it also draws attention to the action as being particularly important for the development of the narrative (cf. Rijksbaron (2006) 128), since the boatswain's order begins the fighting.

κελευστής: 1575–6n.

τὴν ἐναντίαν ὄπα 'the opposite command'.

**1597–9** Οὐχ εἶ . . . ἀρεῖται . . . καθαιματώσει: for the construction and imperatival futures (of αἶρομαι, 'pick up' and καθαιματόω, 'bloody'), see 1561n.

ὁ μὲν τις: the combination of def. and indefinite articles picks out a particular but anonymous individual: cf. *Med.* 1141, *IT* 1407, 98n.

λοῖσθον . . . δόρυ '(one of you pick up) a spar as a spear!'

ἄξας: aor. part. of ἄγνυμι, 'break up (the benches)'.

σκαλμοῦ '(take an oar) from its tholepin': cf. *IT* 1347–8 (the Taurian Messenger on Orestes' ship) ναύτας τε πεντήκοντ' ἐπὶ σκαλῶν πλάτας | ἔχοντας.

**1600–12** *Victory and departure of the Greeks.* The narrative's epic elements culminate in the battle itself and H.'s exhortation of the Greeks to remember their Trojan glory (see 1603–4n.). M.'s transformation from shipwrecked beggar to warrior is now complete (1375–84n.). Some critics, however, detect a more pessimistic view of warfare and κλέος in the scene: Segal (1971) 607, for example, comments, 'A work which has bitterly condemned violence requires violence, finally, for its resolution.' Yet the play has not condemned violence *per se*; rather, certain figures have lamented the seemingly pointless suffering of the Trojan War, but this does not prevent the audience from enjoying the Greeks' successful getaway here, nor does the narrative draw attention to Egyptian suffering as it did earlier to the destruction of the Trojans. The Trojan War is in fact viewed in a variety of ways, depending on speaker and context (see 453n.), and its positive evaluation here by M. and H., while fulfilling the tactical aim of encouraging the Greeks to fight, also reaffirms the basic rightness of their cause (H. is M.'s wife and their return to Greece is supported by the gods).

**1600–1** ὀρθοὶ δ' ἀνῆξαν 'leapt to their feet'.

κορμούς . . . ναυτικούς: the Egyptians have only 'pieces of ship's timber' with which to defend themselves. The detail is part of the Messenger's defensive rhetoric concerning their defeat (cf. 1512–1618n. for such 'narrating focalization').

**1602** φόνω: δὲ ναῦς ἐρρεῖτο 'the ship was made to flow (imperf. pass. of ῥέω) with blood'.

παρακέλευσμα: H. herself joins in the exchange of bolstering speeches; cf. 1593-9n.

**1603-4** H.'s brief paraenesis is rhetorically accomplished: a taunting question ('Where is your Trojan glory?', with ellipse of *ἔστιν*), followed by a rousing imperative ('Show these barbarians!'). Like M. before her, H. appeals to the Greeks by evoking the Trojan War and calling for another victory over barbarians (cf. 1560, 1594). Critics are often too gloomy in their reading of the κλέος of Troy here: e.g. Juffras (1993) 56, Meltzer (1994), Rehm (1994) 126 'Helen's conversion into a cheerleader for battle sounds a bitterly ironic note.' However, the Trojan War can be evaluated positively as well as negatively (cf. 1600-12n.), and the Greeks' victory is framed here as a Trojan War in miniature, fought this time for the real H.: cf. 1560-4, 1593-9nn.

δείξατε: aor. imper. of δείκνυμι.

**1604-6** σπουδῆς δ' ὑπο: lit. 'through eagerness (for the fight)', i.e. 'in the hard battle'.

ἐπιπτον 'some fell', with οἱ μὲν understood, balancing οἱ δέ (cf. *Hec.* 1161-2, *Her.* 636, *IT* 1350, *Or.* 1489). The ellipse makes for a more rapid narrative: for many examples from Homer onwards, see *GP* 166.ii, *K-G* 2.266.

ὠρθοῦντο: 3rd pl. imperf. middle of ὀρθόω, '(others) picked themselves up again'.  
τούς . . . | νεκρούς 'but the ones lying still you could see were dead'.

εἶδες: 1595n.

**1606-10** Despite its being narrated by an enemy Messenger to an equally hostile addressee (Theoc.), M.'s concern for his comrades is, from the audience's perspective, 'mirable (1600-12n.).

**1606** ἔχων ὄπλα: a further reason to consider Theoc. culpable (1512-1618n.); cf. 1375ff., csp. 1379-81.

**1607-8** ὅπηι is balanced by another local adv. ταύτηι. (L has ὅποι, implying movement, but corruption of -πη(ι) to -ποι is common: cf. Willink on *Or.* 430.)

νοσοῖεν 'were struggling', 'were in distress'.

κατασκοπῶν has strong military associations (e.g. *Thuc.* 6.50.5). The verb occurs only here in tragedy, but the noun κατάσκοπος ('scout', 'spy') is used at *Hec.* 239 of Odysseus' time as a spy in Troy, of Pentheus' spying on the Maenads at *Bacch.* 916, 956, 981, and several times in the *Rhesus* (set in the Trojan camp near the Greek ships). The sense is more positive here as M. keeps a close watch on his men's fortunes.

**1609-10** ἐκκολυμβᾶν 'dive off': the subject of the infinitive (σοὺς ναυβάτας) is understood from what follows. There is no need to posit a lacuna after 1608 (so Kovacs, following Rassow) in order to supply the subject.

ἠρήμωσε: 3rd sg. aor. of ἔρημόω, 'he cleared (the benches)'.

**1610-11** οἰάκων . . . | ἄνακτ': 1039-40, 1578nn.

εὐθύνειν δόρυ 'to steer the ship': the phrase occurs at *Aesch. Pers.* 411, *Eur. Cycl.* 15. For δόρυ = ship, cf. 1268, 1568 (*LSJ* s.v. 1 2).

**1612** ἦραν: 3rd pl. aor. of αἶρω, 'they raised (the mast)'. Cf. Diggle (1994) 440 'The ship must have left shore with its mast lowered. If its mast had been raised,

Menelaus would have given his game away, for, by raising the mast, he would have indicated that he intended to use sail, that is, to sail on the high sea.'

οὐριαί: 1588n.

**1613–18** *The Messenger's escape and concluding reflection.* Barrett (2002) 89 n.58 claims that the narrator's narrow escape 'parod[ies] the convention of the messenger endowed with a status comparable to that of the Homeric narrator.' There is, however, no trace of parody: the Messenger must explain how he survived to tell his tale (cf. the Herdsman at *Bacch.* 734–5), and his privileged (eyewitness) knowledge of events would be useless without his survival and escape (the Homeric narrator, by contrast, owes his privileged perspective to the Muses).

**1613** βεβᾶσι δ' ἐκ γῆς: a pointed summary of the entire narrative (1602n.).

**1615** ὀρμιατόνων 'fishermen' (*ἵαρος*: ὀρμιά ('fishing-line') + τείνω).

**1616** ἐξέβησε: causal aor. (LSJ s.v. ἐκβαίνω B), 'put (me) ashore'.

**1617** ἀγγελοῦντα: fut. part. of purpose (Goodwin §840).

**1617–18** Tragic messengers often end their accounts with a moralizing reflection related to the events they have just narrated: e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1242–3 (the suicide of Haemon shows ἀβουλία to be the greatest evil), Eur. *Med.* 1224–30 (the deaths of Creon and his daughter make clear that human happiness is never secure); cf. the Servant's sententious reflections at 752–7. So here the Messenger's generalization about the great usefulness of 'sober scepticism' (σώφρονος ἀπιστίας) can be interpreted as a comment on the consequences of Theoc.'s conduct, since it was his credulous excitement at the thought of marrying H. (compare his reaction to the news: 1622 ἐκπεφεύγασιν γάμοι με) which enabled H. and M. to outwit him and escape.

**1619–20** As the Messenger departs, the Chorus-leader reacts to his speech by maintaining the fiction that the Chorus were not party to the intrigue (contrast *IT* 1420–1).

ἠὺχουν: 1st sg. imperf. of αὐχέω, 'I would never have expected . . .' (for its use with the inf., see Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1497, Barrett on *Hipp.* 952–5).

**1621–41** are in trochaic tetrameters. According to Aristotle, this was the principal metre of early tragic dialogue until it was replaced by the iambic trimeter (*Poet.* 1449a20–1). Aristotle also describes the tetrameter as more suited to dancing and satyric poetry, the trimeter as suited to action (*Poet.* 1449a22–3, 1459b37–8), and the tetrameter's use in surviving tragedy shows the poets exploiting its capacity to mark not only an acceleration of tempo but also a heightening of emotion and dramatic tension. The metre is used in all of Eur.'s later plays (from *Her.* onwards), often (as here) in passages of excited dialogue and animated movement, sometimes rendered even more dynamic by the presence of antilabe (1630–9): cf. *Ion* 530–62, *IT* 1203–21, *Phoen.* 603–24, *Or.* 744–98, *Ll* 1341–68, Köhler (1913) 38–40; for a general survey, see Drew-Bear (1968). Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 158–60 argues that most of these scenes may have been delivered in recitative to the accompaniment of the *aulos*, which, if true, would be a further indication of increased emotion and excitement. Insofar as the trochaic tetrameter was associated with an older style, it also created an air of

authenticity, and so can be seen as part of Eur.'s wider project of constructing *new* myths along *traditional* lines: cf. *Intro.* §4(c).

**1621–6** Theoc. realizes Theonoc's duplicity immediately and determines to kill her, neglecting the potential involvement of the Chorus: cf. 1385–9n.

**1621** γυναικείαις τέχναισιν: Theoc. is thinking of H. as well as Theonoc, but his complaint is refuted by the justice of H.'s return to her rightful husband, as it is by Theonoc's admirable concern for their father's wishes. Moreover, Theoc.'s tyrannical character means that he is hardly one to pronounce on the morality of others.

**1622–3** κελ: *crasis*, καὶ ἐλ.

ἀλώσιμος | . . . διώγμασιν: as Theoc. himself acknowledged, however, the ship is too fast to be caught: 1272, 1531nn.

**1624** τεισόμεσθα: fut. middle of τίνω, 'I shall punish'.

**1625** ἦτις . . . μοι: for the 'indicting' use of the general relative pronoun, see Willink on *Or.* 285–6 Λοξία δὲ μέμφομαι, | ὅστις . . .

**1626** τοιγάρ 'for that reason' (*GP* 566).

**1627–41** The identity of Theoc.'s interlocutor is disputed. Many scholars follow Clark in giving these lines to a male servant, who now enters to block Theoc.'s path into the palace (cf. e.g. Stanley-Porter (1977)). However, the Chorus-leader seems better suited to this role than an anonymous (and unannounced: cf. Taplin (1977) 8 n. 2) newcomer, since the Chorus (like Theoc.'s interlocutor) have full knowledge of Theonoc's grounds for supporting H. and have declared their support for her principles (cf. 1030–1). The use of the masculine singular (δοῦλος ὦν) in 1630 has been taken by many to exclude the (female) Chorus-leader, but this objection is not compelling (see 1630n.). While one might have expected Theoc. to register the sex and nationality of such an opponent, he repeatedly stresses the speaker's inferior status as a slave. It is very improbable that the Messenger remains on stage to intervene here, since tragic messengers invariably depart or remain inactive once they have finished their accounts. No less unsatisfactory is the solution offered by Ley (1991) 32, who thinks Theoc. was originally stopped by the intervention of the Dioscuri.

**1627** οὗτος is peremptory, 'you there', and an unusually curt way of addressing one's superior (1186n.). By contrast, the vocative ὦ . . . δέσποτ' is mollifying (cf. 1193n.), since the Chorus-leader wishes to convince Theoc. that her apparent disobedience is justified (cf. 1630, 1638).

**1628** ἡ δίκη: Theoc.'s conception of what justice demands clashes strongly with his sister's (1002–4n.), as Theonoc herself had predicted (1020).

ἀφίστασ(α): 2nd sg. pres. middle imper. of ἀφίστημι ('step back'), corrected (by John Milton) from the pl. ἀφίστασθε(ε), which violates Porson's law that the syllable before a final trisyllabic cretic (—υ— ἐκποδών) must be short (unless it is a monosyllable): West (1982) 84–5. The Chorus-leader, prompted by Theoc.'s threats against Theonoc (1624–6), has moved to block his path into the palace.

**1629** οὐκ ἀφήσομαι πέπλων σῶν: in an effort to restrain Theoc., the Chorus-leader clutches his robes. The action is unique in extant tragedy, but other choruses

come close to physical confrontations with unjust rulers: cf. Aesch. *Ag* 1612–73 (partly in tetrameters), Soph. *OC* 835–43, Eur. *Her.* 252–74.

**1630–9** Antilabe increases both the pace and tension of the exchange, as the Chorus-leader not only restrains Theoc. physically (1628–9), but counters each of his statements, questions, or threats with a capping response.

**1630** ἀλλά conveys Theoc.'s indignation (equivalent to ἀλλ' ἦ;, *GP* 8.ii), 'What! Are you, a slave, going to rule your master?'

δεσποτῶν: poetic pl., expressing Theoc.'s sense of his own status.

δούλος ὦν: the masc. sg. is justified (although Theoc. is addressing a woman) because the question has a generalizing force (cf. FJW on Aesch. *Supp.* 245): Theoc. implies that slaves should by definition never oppose their masters.

φρονῶ γὰρ εὖ 'yes, since what I think is right'.

**1631–2** μὲν οὖν is in each case strongly adversative (*GP* 475.3.i), 'No, I shall not allow you . . . Not evil, but a most pious woman.'

εὐσεβεστάτην: cf. 998–1029, 1020–111n.

**1633** καλήν γε προδοσίαν: the cognate acc. and oxymoron ('noble betrayal') add force to the refutation of Theoc.'s προύδωκεν.

**1634–5** τάμὰ λέκτρ': crasis, τὰ ἐμά, and metonymy, 'my marriage-bed' = 'my wife' (cf. 426–7n.).

κυριωτέροις | κύριος . . . πατρός πάρα: the language of guardianship (introduced by the Chorus-leader) evokes the transferral of the Greek bride from one guardian (κύριος) to another, i.e. normally from father to husband, making M.'s claim to H. far stronger than Theoc.'s (cf. 968n.).

**1636** ἡ τύχη . . . χρέων: the Chorus-leader trumps Theoc. once again, deploying the topos of the irresistibility of 'necessity' (cf. *Alc.* 962–84).

**1638** ἀρχόμεσθ' . . . κρατοῦμεν: Theoc. is enraged by the apparent challenge to his authority, 'I am a subject then, not the ruler!'

ὅσια δρᾶν: the epexegetic inf. takes off from κρατοῦμεν: '(you rule) to do what is right'.

**1640–1** ἡμῶν ἐκόντων: gen. absolute. In tragedy the generalizing masc. pl. may be used when a female speaks of herself using a plural verb (Smyth §1009).

πρὸ δεσποτῶν | . . . θανεῖν: for the Chorus-leader's 'noble' loyalty to Theonoc, cf. 726–33n.

**1642–79** The sudden appearance of the Dioscuri prevents the murder of Theon and reveals the gods' plans for H. and M. Eur. is particularly fond of bringing 1 plays to a close with a divine epiphany (*Hipp.*, *Andr.*, *Supp.*, *El.*, *IT*, *Ion*, *Or.*, *Bac* (lacunose), *Ll* (probable, but now lost); cf. e.g. *Antiope* (Hermes), *Erechtheus* (Athena), *Hypsipyle* (Dionysus), [*Rhesus*] (Muse)), and the technique is also used by Sophocles in *Philoctetes* (1409–51). Insofar as Castor's speech aims to prevent further violence, its closest analogues are *IT* 1435–45 (Athena orders Thoas to cancel his pursuit of Iphigenia and Orestes), *Or.* 1625–57 (Apollo instructs M. not to storm Agamemnon's palace and tells Orestes to remove his sword from Hermione's throat), and *Antiope*

fr. 223 K (Hermes orders Amphion and Zethus to spare Lycus). In *Erechtheus* Athena urges another god, Poseidon, not to attack Athens (fr. 370.55–7 K).

In common with all such closing epiphanies in Eur., Castor's speech makes use of aetiology to link the heroic and mythical world of the play to that of the fifth-century audience; indeed, such aetiological connections are made in all of Eur.'s surviving tragedies except *Alc.* and *Tro.* For although H. was worshipped primarily in Laconia, Eur. links his *new* H. to contemporary Attica: see 1666–9, 1670–5nn. As always, the gods chosen to appear are appropriate to the concerns of the drama and its characters: the Dioscuri are naturally concerned for their sister's survival and had rescued H. from Athens when she was kidnapped by Theseus (for the myth in early Greek literature and art, see Gantz (1993) 288–91, *LIMC* s.v. Dioskouroi 174–6). More specifically, since the Dioscuri were worshipped in Sparta and were invoked throughout Greece as maritime 'saviours' (1495–1511, 1500nn.), they are fitting escorts for H.'s voyage home (1663–5n.), where she too will become a goddess (1666–9n.). The first part of their speech is addressed to Theoc. (1642–61): as well as vindicating Theonoc, the Dioscuri reveal the gods' approval of the destruction of Troy. They then address H. herself, predicting her deification and M.'s posthumous happiness on the Isle of the Blessed (1662–79). Far from being an alienating device (*pace* Dunn (1996) 135), the *deus ex machina* scene underlines Zeus's concern for his daughter (1669) and is thereby highly traditional in its emphasis on the limited nature of human knowledge.

*Staging.* The Dioscuri's promise that they will escort H. on her voyage home to Greece 'riding our horses over the sea' (1665 πόντον περιπτεύοντε) makes it very likely that they entered on the μηχανή or 'crane', which was widely used for divine epiphanies and other flying entrances in tragedy and comedy: cf. Mastronarde (1990), esp. 270, 280, 284 on *Hel.* The use by the gods of both the crane and the *skênê* roof is often an expression of their separation from the mortal world of suffering and death. Thus H.'s appearance on the crane together with Apollo at the end of *Or.* symbolizes her *immediate* translation there to divine status. The Dioscuri had already made a flying entrance at the end of Eur. *El.* (cf. 1235–6 οὐ γὰρ θνητῶν γ' | ἦδε κέλευθος), and the reference to their riding (περιπτεύοντε) suggests that they may have been portrayed here (if not also in *El.*) as riding on dummy horses; Oceanus had entered on a winged griffin ([Aesch.] *PV* 284–7), Bellerophon on Pegasus the winged horse (Eur. *Bellerophon*, earlier than the parody by Ar. *Ach.* 426–9 in 425; cf. also Ar. *Peace* 76–178), and Helen's companion play *Andromeda* featured a flying Perseus equipped with winged sandals by Hermes (parodied by Ar. *Thesm.* 1010–1134).

**1642 ἐπίσχε:** aor. imper. of ἐπέχω, 'stop/check'. Epiphanic gods often begin their speeches with an imperative, either calling for attention (e.g. Eur. *El.* 1238 Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, κλυθί) or commanding a specific action (e.g. *Ion* 1553 μὴ φεύγετ). Here the order's immediate impact (in contrast to the Chorus-leader's failed opposition to Theoc.) underlines the Dioscuri's divine authority.

**1643–4 δισσοί . . . | . καλοῦμεν** 'we, the two Dioscuri, call you': the text does not specify which of the twins speaks, but Castor does so in Eur. *El.* (cf. 1240 Κάστωρ κασίγνητός τε Πολυδεύκης ὄδε) and is otherwise the more prominent of the two

in tragedy: cf. 205, *Trö.* 132–3 (Hecuba on H.) Κάστορι λώβαν | τῶι τ' Εὐρώται δύσκειαιαν.

**1646** οὐ . . . πεπρωμένοισιν: Theoc.'s anger is pointless, since his marriage to H. was 'not fated'. References to fate, necessity, and Zeus's will abound in closing divine speeches (1651, 1654, 1660–1, 1669, 1677).

**1647–9** Theonoe's decision to support H. and M. on the basis of justice and piety is now endorsed by the Dioscuri.

θεᾶς . . . ἔκγονος: 6–7n., 318.

ἐνδίκους ἐπιστολάς: for the 'just commands' of Proteus, cf. 46–8, 910–20, 940–3, 962–8, 1009–12, 1028–9.

**1650–5** Kovacs (2003) 47–8 transposes these lines to follow 1646, finding them 'intrusive', coming as they do between two passages that deal with Theonoe (1647–9, 1656–7). Yet the abab pattern in the manuscript text is perfectly comprehensible: Theoc.'s marriage to H. is impossible (1646) / Theonoe is innocent (1647–9) / H.'s marriage to M. is to be renewed (1650–5) / so recognize that Theonoe acted rightly in aiding their escape (1656–7).

**1650** εἰς . . . αἰεὶ τὸν παρόντα νῦν χρόνον: an elaborately phrased equivalent of the temporal expression (unique to tragedy) δεῦρο . . . αἰεὶ (c.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 596, Eur. *Med.* 670, *Ion* 56; cf. 761n.), 'until now'. The amplification suits the god's exalted and didactic tone.

**1652–3** οὐκέτι is highly elliptical but is easily supplemented from 1651: 'but now that Troy's foundations have been uprooted and she has lent her name to the gods, (she) no longer (has to stay in your home).'

τοῦνομῖ: cf. 42–3n.

**1654** ἐξεῦχθαι: perf. pass. inf. of ζεύγνυμι, 'she must remain joined in the same marriage', i.e. to M. The depiction of H.'s post-war home life in the *Odyssey* (Books 4 and 15) will have been well known to the audience. Even the 'old' H. regained her conjugal happiness, and the 'new' faithful H. deserves no less.

**1656** μέλαν ξίφος: the epithets μέλας and κελαινός are applied with sinister effect ('dark', 'murderous') to swords and spears: cf. *Or.* 1472 μέλαν ξίφος, *Bacch.* 628 ξίφος κελαινόν, Soph. *Aj.* 231 κελαινοῖς ξίφεσιν, *Trach.* 856 κελαινὰ λόγχα, Bergson (1956) 130. The word may also be taken proleptically to refer to the blood that 'blackens' the sword (cf. Willink on *Or.* 821–2 μελάνδετον δὲ φόνωι | ξίφος).

**1658–61** Gods may explain their non-intervention, failed protection, or apparent cruelty in terms of the contrary workings of other gods (*Hipp.* 1328–34, *Trö.* 23–5) or the will of Zeus/fate/necessity (Eur. *El.* 1298–1302, *Bacch.* 1348–9). Such 'apologie' (cf. Scodel (1999) 104) offer little comfort to the human figures concerned; nonetheless the human characters have no choice but to accept the supremacy of the Διὸς βουλή, here involving H.'s role in the Trojan War, and there is often, as here, consolation for their suffering: see *Introd.* p. 64.

**1658** πάλαι . . . (καὶ) πρῖν: emphatic pleonasm. 'long ago'.

κᾶν (= καὶ ἄν) ἐξεσώσαμεν: contrast the Dioscuri's attitude to their other sister Clytemnestra, whom they would not have sought to protect (Eur. *El.* 1242–4).

**1659** ἡμᾶς . . . θεούς: the cyclic epic *Cypria* calls Castor mortal, Polydeuces immortal (fr. 8 Bernabè = fr. 6 Davies). In Pindar *Nem.* 10.80-8, Zeus tells Polydeuces that Castor is the son of Tyndareos, while he is the son of Zeus, but that he may share his immortality with his brother (who has been killed). Polydeuces chooses to save his brother and they alternate between living one day on Olympus, the next day beneath the earth at Therapne near Sparta (cf. *Nem.* 10.56-7, *Pyth.* 11.61-4, Hom. *Od.* 11.298-304). Regardless of their split parentage and the circumstances of their apotheosis, however, the Dioscuri were worshipped together throughout Greece, and were very popular in Attica (1666-9n.).

**1660-1** ἦσσαν ἡμεν . . . | . τῶν θεῶν: as newcomers to divinity, the Dioscuri have a relatively low status in the hierarchy of gods: compare their reluctance to criticize Apollo (*El.* 1245-6): Φοῖβος δέ, Φοῖβος - ἀλλ' ἀναξ γάρ ἐστ' ἐμός, | σιγῶ. The explanatory power of fate (τοῦ πεπρωμένου), like that of 'necessity' (cf. *El.* 1301 μοῖρά τ' ἀνάγκη τ' ἦγ' ἐς τὸ χρεῶν), is undeniable, and even Zeus may be portrayed as subservient to fate: cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 518. It is often cited when (as here) the speaker aims to evoke a reaction of resigned submission to events (usually past, but also future: cf. *El.* 1247-8 τάντεῦθεν δὲ χρῆ | πράσσειν ἅ Μοῖρα Ζεὺς τ' ἔκρανε σοῦ περὶ).

οἷς . . . ἔχειν: as in Eur. *El.* 1280-3, where Castor announces that H. did not go to Troy and that Zeus sent an εἰδῶλον in her place (cf. 36-43n.), the revelation stresses the disparity between human expectations of the gods and their actual conduct.

**1662** σοὶ . . . λέγω: the rest of Castor's speech is addressed to H. as she sails away with M. to Greece. Athena similarly instructs the departing Orestes and Iphigenia in *IT* 1446-74 and the unseen Poseidon in *Erechth.* fr. 370.55-117 K. Gods can hear, and be heard, from far away (e.g. Sappho fr. 1.6-7 V). The divine voice of Castor confirms for H. the story of her brothers' deification, refuting the tale of their suicide (cf. 133-42n.).

**1663-5** As maritime 'saviours' (1664 σωτῆρε: see 1500n.), the Dioscuri make for ideal escorts on the voyage back to Greece. So too Athena promises to accompany Ion (*Ion* 1616) and Orestes (*IT* 1488-9) on their journeys back to Athens, while Apollo will escort H. to heaven (*Or.* 1683-5).

πλεῖ: pres. imper.

πνεῦμα . . . οὐριον answers the Chorus' prayer to the Dioscuri (1504-5).

παριππεύοντε: H.'s brothers accompany her as if she were a bride in a wedding procession (for their presence at H.'s original marriage in Sparta, see 638-40), thus bringing the series of hymeneal allusions surrounding H. and M.'s reunion and escape to a joyful conclusion; cf. 722-5, 1431-5nn.

**1666-9** The Dioscuri are the most widely attested recipients of *theoxenia* ('god-feasting') throughout Greece, including Athens (cf. 1495-1511n.), a form of ritual hospitality in which tables of offerings were prepared for the divine guests. However, Castor's prediction that H. will share in such entertainment (1668 ξένια) is the earliest extant evidence for H. being worshipped in this way. It is possible that H.'s involvement in the rite here is a case of 'ad hoc invention' by Eur. (as Willink calls the marine cult of H. predicted by Apollo in *Or.* 1635-7), but before we conclude that Eur. freely

invented cult actiologies we must remember how scanty the evidence is for Greek cults and rituals. (See *Introd.* p. 62 for additional arguments against Eur.'s invention of actual cult details.) In any case, H.'s inclusion in the rite of Theoxenia would fit the wider pattern of her worship outside Sparta whereby (as Robert Parker shows in his forthcoming study of the 'Menelaion') H. is worshipped 'as a junior partner in cult primarily addressed to her brothers the Dioscuri'. For evidence of H. and the Dioscuri receiving cult together in Attica, see *Introd.* p. 15.

**1666** κάμψης . . . βίον: the metaphor is from racing, κάμπτω 'to round the bend' (καμπτήρ, 'turning-post') having come to mean 'to reach the end' (Barrett on *Hipp.* 87 τέλος . . . κάμψαιμι . . . βίου).

**1667** θεός κεκλήσηι: 2nd sg. fut. perf. pass. of καλέω, 'you will be called a goddess'. Such exalted transformations are rare; *deus ex machina* figures more often predict the foundation of hero cult (e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 1423–30). Apart from H.'s (unusually premature) apotheosis in *Or.*, one might compare Thetis' promise to make Peleus an immortal (*Andr.* 1255–6) and Athena's announcement that she has deified the daughters of Erechtheus and Praxithea as the Hyacinthids (*Erechth.* fr. 370.71–89 K).

**1667b–8a** και . . . | . μεθέξεις add little to the promise of shared *theoxenia* (1668–9), which will have naturally included libations. It therefore seems likely that the phrase is interpolated, especially as many interpolations stem from the urge to supply proper names (Διοσκόρων μέτα ~ μεθ' ἡμῶν): cf. [9b–10a]n. If genuine, the phrase would emphasize H.'s new divine status, but the dull repetition (cf. μεθέξεις ~ ἐξεις μεθ', Διοσκόρων μέτα ~ ἀνθρώπων πάρα ~ μεθ' ἡμῶν) suggests that it was added later.

**1669** Ζεὺς . . . βούλεται: an appeal to the final authority, as often in tragedy; cf. e.g. *Andr.* 1269 (Thetis to Peleus) Ζηνὶ γὰρ δοκεῖ τάδε, also in the context of deification. Not surprisingly Zeus himself almost never appears on stage in tragedy; for as Parker (2005) 147 puts it, 'the ultimate explanation cannot itself be dragged on stage and required to give an account of itself.'

**1670–5** The rocky island called 'Helen' (now Makronissos) lies off the south-east coast of Attica. Writing in the early fifth century, Hecataeus of Miletus had said that H. disembarked there on her return from Troy (*JGrHist* 1 F 128; cf. Paus. 1.35.1–2), while Strabo (9.1.22; cf. 9.5.3) records a source that identified 'Helen' with Cranac ('rocky' the island mentioned in *Il.* 3.443–5 as the place where Paris and H. first made love on their voyage from Sparta to Troy (the sources for the island are collected by Duchene 1940), though her suggestion that the island lies off Egypt, not Attica, is contradicted by 1673, which there is no reason to delete). We cannot be certain which (if either) of these stories gave the local actiology of the island's name in Eur.'s time: Hecataeus may be the earlier source, but there is no trace of his version in early epic, whereas Strabo's is linked to the *Iliad* and to the journey away from Sparta, as here. Nevertheless, we can be quite sure that they are both more plausible candidates than Eur.'s version, since they take as their basis the traditional story of H.'s abduction from Sparta and presence at Troy. Wishing to maintain the connection between the Attic island's name

and H.'s role in the Trojan War, Eur. has invented a divine stopover for Hermes on his flight from Sparta to Egypt. The detour, while geographically implausible, is an ingenious solution to the problem of reconciling the new H. with local tradition, and shows Eur.'s eagerness (displayed throughout the *deus ex machina* speeches) to integrate his novel version of events with established cultic or mythological details, thereby displaying his poetic skill and inventiveness (cf. 1666–9n.).

1670–1 οὐ . . . δρόμον 'And where Maia's son first set you down on your journey through the sky after carrying you off from Sparta'.

ᾠρμισεν: aor. of ᾠρμιζω, here in the sense 'set down', though the verb's basic meaning is 'to bring safely into harbour', thus cleverly evoking, while simultaneously denying, H.'s traditional journey by sea from Sparta to Troy.

Μαιάδος τόκος: cf. 241–3n.

ἀπάρας: aor. part. of ἀπαίρω, 'I carry off'.

1673 φρουρόν . . . τεταμένην 'stretched out as a guard along the coast of Attica'. The island, stretching c. 12 km from Cape Sounion up to Thoricos, is presented as sheltering 'Acte' (lit. 'coast', but also another name for Attica, whose coastline is extensive) from the Aegean.

1674–5 Ἑλένη . . . | κλοπᾶς: the aetiology contains etymological word-play, since 'Ἑλένη suggests the verbal-root ἔλ- 'to take'; for grimmer play on the root ἔλ-, also meaning 'to destroy', cf. Aesch. *Ag* 681–90. But rather than being the active 'destroyer' in the more familiar version of her elopement with Paris, H. is presented here as the passive victim who is 'stolen' (by Hermes) from Sparta; cf. also 1672 κλέψας. For a similar combination of aetiology and invented etymology in *deus ex machina* speeches, cf. *Ion* 1580 (the tribe of the Aigikores named after the αἰγίς of the κόρη, i.e. Athena's aegis), *IT* 1453–7 (Artemis Tauropolos = 'Taurian-roaming Artemis'). Such verbal 'connections', in addition to displaying etymological ingenuity (13–15n.), are a further expression of the poet's desire to link the mythical world of the play (with its names, cults, and the like) to that of the fifth-century audience: cf. 1670–5n.

τὸ λοιπὸν . . . κεκλήσεται: as in other name aetiologies, e.g. *Her.* 1329–31 (Theseus speaking of his precincts, now offered to Heracles) ταῦτ' ἐπωνομασμένα | σέθεν τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκ βροτῶν κεκλήσεται | ζῶντος, *IT* 1457 (Athena on Artemis) τὸ λοιπὸν ὑμνήσουσι Ταυροπόλον θεάν.

ἐπεὶ . . . ἐδέξατο 'since it received you when you were stolen from home'. For the abstract noun with personal pronoun κλοπᾶς <σᾶς> as equivalent to a part. (κεκλεμένην σε) or adj. phrase (hence Herwerden's κλοπαίαν σ', accepted by Diggle), cf. 50–1 τὰς ἐμὰς ἀναρπαγὰς | θηρᾶι, 'he hunts me down, his stolen wife'.

1676–7 In the *Odyssey* (4.561–9) Proteus tells M. that he will not die, but will be conveyed by the gods to the Elysian plain, 'where life is easiest for men', because he is married to H. and thus the son-in-law of Zeus. Such a privileged fate is exceptional in Homeric epic, since even Achilles and the other great heroes (excluding Heracles, like H. the offspring of Zeus: *Od.* 11.601–4) reside as shades in Hades (*Od.* 11.387–567), yet it shows the strong influence of H.'s divine birth (and perhaps of her own divinity and immortality, which are otherwise excluded from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*):

see *Introd.* p. 14. Though less exclusive than the Odyssean Elysium, the Isle(s) of the Blessed (1677 μακάρων . . . νῆσον) are a privileged destination: cf. e.g. Hes. *WD* 167–73 (reserved for the ὄλβιοι ἥρωες by Zeus), Pind. *Ol.* 2.70–83 (Cadmus, Pelcus, and Achilles). In tragedy Dionysus predicts that Ares will rescue Cadmus and Harmonia (Ares' daughter) and settle them in the 'Land of the Blessed' (*Bacch.* 1338–9).

τῶι πλανήτηι: although M.'s fortunate after-life is owed in part to his marriage relation with H. (as Pelcus owes his immortality to his wife Thetis: *Andr.* 1253–6), he has also suffered greatly, and by calling him 'the wanderer M.', Castor affirms his heroic endurance (for the play's adaptation of Odyssean themes, cf. *Introd.* p. 27).

θεῶν πάρα | . . . ἐστι μόρσιμον 'it is fated by the will of the gods': cf. 1669n.

1678–9 Castor's insistence that 'the gods do not hate the nobly born' is a piously reassuring response to the fate of 'the wanderer M.', who has finally received his own reward (cf. 1678 γάρ). Unless 1679 is interpolated, its approximate sense must be 'but they (i.e. the noble) suffer more than the countless mass.' The suffering of royal or aristocratic figures dominates Greek myth and tragedy, but Castor's consoling speech is no place to address the theologically disturbing aspects of the heroes' afflictions, which are in large part a consequence of their peculiar closeness to the gods; see *Introd.* p. 64.

1680–7 Theoc.'s brief speech accepting the divine commands and the play's swift conclusion thereafter are regular features of *deus ex machina* endings: cf. *Andr.* 1273–83 (Pelcus to Thetis), *Supp.* 1227–31 (Theseus to Athena), *IT* 1475–85 (Thoas to Athena), *Ion* 1606–13 (Ion and Creusa to Athena), *Or.* 1666–81 (Orestes and M. to Apollo), *Soph. Phil.* 1445–7 (Philoctetes and Neoptolemus to Heracles). By contrast, in *Hipp.* 1342–1461, *El.* 1292–1356, and *Bacch.* 1344–87, the god's speech is followed by further dialogue in which the human characters lament their fate and protest against divine cruelty and ruthlessness.

1680–1 τὰ μὲν πάρος | νείκη . . . πέρι: lit. 'I shall let go my former quarrels regarding your sister', i.e. Theoc. renounces his anger at H.'s refusal to marry him (cf. 1236).

σφῶιν: gen. dual form of the second person pronoun (*Smyth* §325).

1683–2 The transposition of these lines makes for a smoother transition from κασιγνήτης to κείνη (both referring to H.) and restores the necessary emphasis to ἐγώ (1682).

εἰ θεοῖς δοκεῖ: cf. 1646, 1680–7111. Like his sister, Theoc. recognizes the same gods as the Greeks.

1684–5 ἴστον . . . | γεγῶτε: dual imper. of οἶδα and dual perf. part. of γίγνομαι, 'know that you are born from the same blood as a most excellent and virtuous sister.'

σωφρονεστάτης suggests the sexual purity of the 'new' H., a quality now paradoxically praised by her former pursuer (cf. 63, 314, 981).

1686–7 χαίρεθ . . . οὐνεκ 'I wish you well for the sake of . . .'. The audience's reaction to Theoc.'s concluding generalization about women will have been affected by both context and speaker: see 16211.

ὁ: the neuter relative encapsulates the preceding idea (i.e. 'to have a noble character'), 'a thing which . . . '.

ἐνι = ἔνεστι, 'is (not) found in . . . '.

**1688-92** As the Dioscuri fly off to accompany H. home (cf. 1664-5) and Theoc. returns to the palace, the Chorus chant their final remarks (in anapaests, with a final paroemiac, and probably accompanied by the *aulos*-player: see Pickard-Cambridge (1988) 162) before they too leave the stage. The same choral lines appear at the end of *Alc.*, *Andr.*, *Bacch.*, and (with πολλῶν ταμίας Ζεὺς ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ as the opening line) *Med.* Opinion is divided on their genuineness and appropriateness in each case: Barrett (on *Hipp.* 1462-6), for example, argues that only the *Alc.* is likely to be genuine and that the passage was added to the other plays by later actors 'to cater for a public addicted to sententious commonplaces'. (Diggle (OCT), by contrast, accepts the lines in both *Alc.* and *Andr.*) However, as Roberts (1987) has shown, most of the surviving codas of tragedy (including this example) serve a genuine closural function. Moreover, they regularly do so in a moralizing and universalizing manner, which makes them particularly well suited to delivery by the chorus, as observers of the preceding events who are prone to gnomic reflection. The present lines are clearly different from the extra-dramatic prayer to Nike ('Victory') that ends the *IT*, *Phoen.*, and *Or.* Such an illusion-breaking request for a prize is indeed redolent of the activities of later actors, but the same cannot be said of this choral reflection on the unpredictability of the gods. The sentiment is both traditional and fundamental to the religious world of Greek tragedy, and its very conventionality, far from being a sign of spuriousness, may well be an essential part of Eur.'s purpose. For by hearing the chorus deliver such a trite explanation of the terrible events they have witnessed, the audience is prompted to reflect anew on the gods' role in (the) human suffering (of the drama): cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 415-17; 1642-79, 1658-61nn.

**1689** ἀέλπτως 'unexpectedly'.

**1690-1** δοκηθέντ: aor. pass. part. of δοκέω, the form ἐδοκήθην being the rarer (mainly poetic) equivalent of ἐδόχθην.

ἔτελέσθη | . . . ἦῤυρε: gnomic aorists (1139-43n.).

**1692** ἀπέβη: aor. of ἀποβαίνω, 'to turn out' (LSJ s.v. 11 2).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Adams, A. M. (1988) *Helen in Greek literature: Homer to Euripides*. Ph.D. diss., Aberystwyth
- Aerts, W. J. (1965) *Periphrastica*. Amsterdam
- Aichele, K. (1971) 'Das Epeisodion', in W. Jens, ed. *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich) 47–83
- Allan, W. (2000) *The Andromache and Euripidean tragedy*. Oxford  
(2001) *Euripides: The Children of Heracles*. Warminster  
(2004) 'Religious syncretism: the new gods of Greek tragedy', *HSCP* 102: 113–55  
(2005) 'Tragedy and the early Greek philosophical tradition', in J. Gregory, ed. *The Blackwell companion to Greek tragedy* (Oxford) 71–82  
(2006) 'Divine justice and cosmic order in early Greek epic', *JHS* 126: 1–35
- Alt, K. (1963) 'Bemerkungen zum Text der *Helena* II', *Philologus* 107 (1963) 173–92
- Anderson, M. J. (1997) *The fall of Troy in early Greek poetry and art*. Oxford  
(2005) 'Myth', in J. Gregory, ed. *The Blackwell companion to Greek tragedy* (Oxford) 121–35
- Antonaccio, C. (1995) *An archaeology of ancestors: tomb cult and hero cult in early Greece*. Lanham, MD
- Arnott, W. G. (1993) 'Euripides and the unexpected', in I. McAuslan and P. Walcot, eds. *Greek Tragedy* [Greece & Rome Studies, vol. 11] (Oxford) 138–52 [originally published in *G&R* 20 (1973) 49–64]
- Assael, J. (2001) *Euripide, philosophe et poète tragique*. Louvain
- Austin, C. and Olson, S. D. (2004) *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazusae*. Oxford
- Austin, M. M. (1970) *Greece and Egypt in the archaic age*. Cambridge
- Austin, N. (1994) *Helen of Troy and her shameless phantom*. Ithaca
- Backès, J.-L. (1984) *Le mythe d'Hélène*. Clermont-Ferrand
- Bain, D. (1977) *Actors and audience: a study of asides and related conventions in Greek drama*. Oxford  
(1981) *Masters, servants, and orders in Greek tragedy: a study of some aspects of dramatic technique and convention*. Manchester
- Barker, A. (1984) *Greek musical writings*, vol. 1 *The musician and his art*. Cambridge
- Barlow, S. A. (1971) *The imagery of Euripides*. Bristol  
(1986) 'The language of Euripides' monodies', in J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, and J. R. Green, eds. *Studies in honour of T. B. L. Webster*, vol. 1 (Bristol) 10–22
- Barner, W. (1971) 'Die Monodie', in W. Jens, ed. *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich) 277–320
- Barrett, J. (2002) *Staged narrative: poetics and the messenger in Greek tragedy*. Berkeley
- Barrett, W. S. (1964) *Euripides: Hippolytos*. Oxford
- Barringer, J. M. (1995) *Divine escorts: Nereids in archaic and classical Greek art*. Michigan  
(2001) *The hunt in ancient Greece*. Baltimore
- Basta Donzelli, G. (1980) 'Eurip. *Helena* 1132–36', *GIF* 32: 195–206

- Bastianini, G. and Casanova, A., eds. (2005) *Euripide e i papiri*. Florence
- Battezzato, L. (2005) 'Lyric', in J. Gregory, ed. *The Blackwell companion to Greek tragedy* (Oxford) 149–66
- Becker, M. (1939) *Helena: Ihr Wesen und ihre Wandlungen*. Strasbourg
- Beckham, F. (2002) 'The aorist indicative', *G&R* 49: 227–36
- Bergson, L. (1956) *L'Épithète ornementale dans Eschyle, Sophocle et Euripide*. Lund
- Bers, V. (1984) *Greek poetic syntax in the classical age*. New Haven
- Bettini, M. and Brillante, C. (2002) *Il mito di Elena: immagini e racconti dalla Grecia a oggi*. Turin
- Björck, G. (1950) *Das Alpha impurum und die griechische Kunstsprache*. Uppsala
- Bowman, A. (2002) 'Recolonising Egypt', in T. P. Wiseman, ed. *Classics in progress: essays on ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford) 193–223
- Breitenbach, W. (1934) *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik*. Stuttgart
- Bremmer, J. N. (2002) *The rise and fall of the afterlife*. London
- Bron, C. (1996) 'Hélène sur les vases attiques: Esclave ou double d'Aphrodite', *Kernos* 9: 297–310
- Brown, P. G. McC. (2000) 'Knocking at the door in fifth-century Greek tragedy', in S. Godde and T. Heinze, eds. *Skenika: Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption, Festschrift für H.-D. Blume* (Darmstadt) 1–16
- Brown, S. G. (1974) 'Metrical innovations in Euripides' later plays', *AJP* 95: 207–34
- Bryce, T. (2002) *Life and society in the Hittite world*. Oxford
- Budelmann, F. (2000) *The language of Sophocles: communality, communication and involvement*. Cambridge
- Bundrick, S. D. (2005) *Music and image in classical Athens*. Cambridge
- Burgess, J. S. (2001) *The tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the epic cycle*. Baltimore
- Burian, P. (1997a) 'Myth into *muthos*: the shaping of tragic plot', in P. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy* (Cambridge) 178–208
- (1997b) 'Tragedy adapted for stages and screens: the Renaissance to the present', in P. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy* (Cambridge) 228–83
- Burkert, W. (1979) *Structure and history in Greek mythology and ritual*. Berkeley
- (1983) *Homo necans: the anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*. Berkeley
- (1985) *Greek religion*. Oxford
- (1987) *Ancient mystery cults*. Cambridge, MA
- (1992) *The orientalizing revolution: Near Eastern influence on Greek culture in the early archaic age*. Cambridge, MA
- (2001) *Kleine Schriften I: Homeric* [Riedweg, C., ed.]. Göttingen
- (2004) *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern contexts of Greek culture*. Cambridge, MA
- Burkhardt, H. (1906) *Die Archaismen des Euripides*. Hannover
- Burnett, A. P. [as A. N. Pippin] (1960) 'Euripides' *Helen*: a comedy of ideas', *CP* 55: 151–63
- (1971) *Catastrophe survived: Euripides' plays of mixed reversal*. Oxford
- Busch, G. (1937) *Untersuchungen zum Wesen der τυχῆ in den Tragödien des Euripides*. Heidelberg

- Cairns, D. L. (1993) *Aidôs: the psychology and ethics of honour and shame in ancient Greek literature*. Oxford
- Calame, C. (1997) *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece: their morphology, religious role, and social functions* (trans. D. Collins and J. Orion). Lanham, MD
- Carbonero, O. (1989) 'La figura di Elena di Troia nei poeti latini da Lucrezio a Ovidio', *Orpheus* 10: 378–91.
- Castriota, D. (2005) 'Feminizing the barbarian and barbarizing the feminine: Amazons, Trojans, and Persians in the Stoa Poikile', in J. M. Barringer and J. M. Hurwit, eds. *Periklean Athens and its legacy: problems and perspectives* (Texas) 89–102
- Cadling, H. W. (1976) 'New excavations at the Menelaion, Sparta', in U. Jantzen, ed. *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern* (Tübingen) 77–90
- Cawkwell, G. (2005) *The Greek wars: the failure of Persia*. Oxford
- Cerbo, E. (1989) 'La scena di riconoscimento in Euripide: dall'amebeo alla monodia', *QUCC* 33: 39–47
- Christenson, D. M. (2000) *Plautus: Amphitruo*. Cambridge
- Cingano, E. (2005) 'A catalogue within a catalogue: Helen's suitors in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (frs. 196–204)', in R. Hunter, ed. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Cambridge) 118–52
- Clader, L. L. (1976) *Helen. The evolution from divine to heroic in Greek epic tradition*. Leiden
- Cole, T. (1991) *The origins of rhetoric in ancient Greece*. Baltimore
- Collard, C. (2002) *Aeschylus: Oresteia*. Oxford
- (2005) 'Colloquial language in tragedy: a supplement to the work of P. T. Stevens', *CQ* 55: 350–86
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., Lee, K. H., eds. (1995) *Euripides: selected fragmentary plays*, vol. I. Warminster
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., Gibert, J., eds. (2004) *Euripides: selected fragmentary plays*, vol. II. Warminster
- Comotti, G. (1989) 'La musica nella tragedia greca', in L. de Finis, ed. *Scena e spettacolo nell' antichità* (Florence) 43–61
- Conacher, D. J. (1998) *Euripides and the sophists*. London
- Connor, W. R. (1985) 'The razing of the house in Greek society', *TAPA* 115: 79–102
- Conomis, N. C. (1964) 'The dochmiacs of Greek drama', *Hermes* 92: 23–50
- Cooper, G. L. (1971) *Zur syntaktischen Theorie und Textkritik der attischen Autoren*. Zurich
- Costa, C. D. N. (2001) *Greek fictional letters*. Oxford
- Croally, N. T. (1994) *Euripidean polemic: The Trojan Women and the function of tragedy*. Cambridge
- Cropp, M. J. (2000) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Warminster
- Cropp, M. J. and Fick, G. (1985) *Resolutions and chronology in Euripides: the fragmentary tragedies*. London
- Csapo, E. (1999–2000) 'Later Euripidean music', *ICS* 24–5: 399–426
- (2003) 'The dolphins of Dionysus', in E. Csapo and M. C. Miller, eds., *Poetry, theory, praxis: the social life of myth, word and image in ancient Greece. Essays in honour of William J. Slater* (Oxford) 69–98

- (2004) 'The politics of the New Music', in P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds. *Music and the Muses: the culture of mousike in the classical Athenian city* (Oxford) 207–48
- (2005) *Theories of mythology*. Oxford
- Csapo, E. and Slater, W. J. (1995) *The context of ancient drama*. Ann Arbor
- Cuenca, L. A. de (1976) 'La *Hélène* de Euripides y un poema de Giorgos Seferis', *Eclás* 20: 371–8
- Cunningham, M. (1994) 'Thoughts on Aeschylus: the satyr play *Proteus* – the ending of the *Oresteia*', *LCM* 19: 67–8
- Cyrino, M. S. (1998) 'Sex, status and song: locating the lyric singer in the actors' duets of Euripides', *QUCC* 60: 81–101
- Dale, A. M. (1967) *Euripides: Helen*. Oxford
- (1968) *The lyric metres of Greek drama*, 2nd edn. Cambridge
- (1969) *Collected papers*. Cambridge
- (1981) *Metrical analyses of tragic choruses: Aeolo-choriambic*. London
- D'Alcissio, G. B. (2004), 'Past future and present past: temporal deixis in Greek archaic lyric', *Arethusa* 37 (2004) 267–94
- Daniciewicz, J. (1990) 'Deixis in Greek choral lyric', *QUCC* 34: 7–17
- Davidson, J. (2005) 'Theatrical production', in J. Gregory, ed. *The Blackwell companion to Greek tragedy* (Oxford) 194–211
- Delulle, H. (1911) *Les répétitions d'images chez Euripide*. Louvain
- Devine, A. M. and Stephens, L. D. (1981) 'A new aspect of the evolution of the trimeter in Euripides', *TAPA* 111: 43–64
- (1994) *The prosody of Greek speech*. Oxford
- (2000) *Discontinuous syntax: hyperbaton in Greek*. Oxford
- Dickey, E. (1996) *Greek forms of address: from Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford
- Diggle, J. (1981) *Studies on the text of Euripides*. Oxford
- (1994) *Euripidea*. Oxford
- (1996) 'Epilegomena Phaethontea', *Ant. Cl.* 65: 189–99
- (2004) *Theophrastus: Characters*. Cambridge
- (2005) 'Rhythmical prose in the Euripidean hypotheses', in G. Bastiniani and A. Casanova, eds. *Euripide e i papiri* (Florence) 27–67
- Dillon, M. (2002) *Girls and women in classical Greek religion*. London
- Dimock, G. E. (1977) 'God, or not god, or between the two?' *Euripides' Helen*. Northampton, MA
- Dodds, E. R. (1951) *The Greeks and the irrational*. Berkeley
- Doolittle, H. (1961) *Helen in Egypt*. New York
- Dover, K. J. (1974) *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford
- (1997) *The evolution of Greek prose style*. Oxford
- Downing, E. (1990) 'Apate, agon, and literary self-reflexivity in Euripides' *Helen*', in M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde, eds. *Cabinet of the Muses: essays on classical and comparative literature in honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer* (Atlanta) 1–16
- Drew, D. L. (1930) 'The political purpose in Euripides' *Helena*', *CP* 25: 187–9
- Drew-Bear, T. (1968) 'The trochaic tetrameter in Greek tragedy', *AJP* 89: 385–405

- Dubischar, M. (2001) *Die Agonszenen bei Euripides*. Stuttgart
- Duchemin, J. (1940) 'L'Île d'Hélène dans la tragédie d'Euripide', *REG* 53: 163–71
- Dunbar, N. (1995) *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford
- Dunn, F. M. (1996) *Tragedy's end: closure and innovation in Euripidean drama*. Oxford
- Easterling, P. (1995) 'Gods on stage in Greek tragedy', in J. Dalfen, G. Petersmann, and F. F. Schwartz, eds. *Religio Graeco-Romana: Festschrift für Walter Pötscher* (Graz) 77–86
- (1997a) 'Constructing the heroic', in C. Pelling, ed. *Greek tragedy and the historian* (Oxford) 21–37
- (1997b) 'From repertoire to canon', in P. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy* (Cambridge) 211–27
- (2002) 'Actor as icon', in P. Easterling and E. Hall, eds. *Greek and Roman actors: aspects of an ancient profession* (Cambridge) 327–41
- Egli, F. (2003) *Euripides im Kontext zeitgenössischer intellektueller Strömungen. Analyse der Funktion philosophischer Themen in den Tragödien und Fragmenten*. Munich
- Eisner, R. (1980) 'Echoes of the *Odyssey* in Euripides' *Helen*', *Maia* 32: 31–7
- Eitrem, S. (1920) *Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte*, vol. III. Kristiania
- Ekroth, G. (2002) *The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods*. Liège
- Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. van (1987) 'Euripides and Melos', *Mnemosyne* 40: 414–19
- Fairweather, J. (1974) 'Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers', *Ancient Society* 5: 234–55
- Fantuzzi, M. (1990) 'Sulla scenografia dell' ora (e del luogo) nella tragedia greca', *MD* 24: 9–30
- Farnell, L. R. (1921) *Greek hero cults and ideas of immortality*. Oxford
- Fehling, D. (1969) *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*. Berlin
- Fehrle, E. (1910) *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*. Gießen
- Finkelberg, M. (2005) *Greeks and pre-Greeks: Aegean prehistory and Greek heroic tradition*. Oxford
- Fishclov, D. (1993) *Metaphors of genre: the role of analogies in genre theory*. University Park, PA
- Flower, M. A. and Marincola, J. (2002) *Herodotus: Book IX*. Cambridge
- Foley, H. P. (2001) 'Anodos dramas: Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Helen*', in her *Female acts Greek tragedy* (Princeton) 301–31
- Forbes-Irving, P. M. C. (1990) *Metamorphosis in Greek myths*. Oxford
- Ford, A. (2004) 'The power of music in Aristotle's *Politics*', in P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds. *Music and the Muses: the culture of music in the classical Athenian city* (Oxford) 309–36
- Fowler, A. (1982) *Kinds of literature: an introduction to the theory of genres and modes*. Cambridge, MA
- Fowler, R. L. (1987a) *The nature of early Greek lyric: three preliminary studies*. Toronto
- (1987b) 'The rhetoric of desperation', *HSCP* 91: 5–38

- Fraser, P. M. et al., eds. (1987–) *A lexicon of Greek personal names*. Oxford
- Fredricksmeyer, H. C. (1996) *The many faces of Helen in archaic and classical Greek poetry (Homer, Sappho, Alcaeus, Stesichorus)*. Ph.D. diss., UT Austin, Texas
- (2001) 'A diachronic reading of Sappho fr. 16 LP', *TAPA* 131: 75–86
- Frenzel, E. (1992) *Stoffe der Weltliteratur: ein Lexikon dichtungsgeschichtlicher Längsschnitte*, 8th edn. Stuttgart
- (1999) *Motive der Weltliteratur: ein Lexikon dichtungsgeschichtlicher Längsschnitte*, 5th edn. Stuttgart
- Friedrich, W. H. (1934) 'Euripides in der lateinischen Literatur', *Hermes* 69: 300–15
- Fris Johansen, H. (1959) *General reflection in tragic rhesis: a study of form*. Copenhagen.
- Fris Johansen, H. and Whitte, E. W. (1980) *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*. 3 vols. Copenhagen
- Fulkerson, L. (2005) *The Ovidian heroine as author: reading, writing, and community in the Heroides*. Cambridge
- Funke, H. (1965–6) 'Euripides', *JbAC* 8–9: 233–79
- Furley, W. D. and Bremer, J. M. (2001) *Greek hymns*. 2 vols. Tübingen
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources*. Baltimore
- Garland, R. (1992) *Introducing new gods: the politics of Athenian religion*. London
- Garvie, A. F. (1994) *Homer: Odyssey vi–viii*. Cambridge
- (2006) *Aeschylus' Supplikes: play and trilogy*, 2nd edn. Exeter.
- Geddes, A. G. (1987) 'Rags and riches: the costume of Athenian men in the fifth century', *CQ* 37: 307–31
- Gelzer, T. (1997) 'Goethes Helena und das Vorbild des Euripides', in H. Flashar, ed. *Tragödie: Idee und Transformation* (Stuttgart) 199–234
- Gilliam, B. (1999) *The life of Richard Strauss*. Cambridge
- Goff, B. (2004) *Citizen Bacchae: women's ritual practice in ancient Greece*. Berkeley
- Goldberg, S. M. (2005) *Constructing literature in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge
- Goldhill, S. (1990) 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, eds. *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian drama in its social context* (Princeton) 97–129
- (2000) 'Civic ideology and the problem of difference: the politics of Aeschylean tragedy, once again', *JHS* 120: 34–56
- (2002) *Who needs Greek? Contests in the cultural history of Hellenism*. Cambridge
- Gösswein, H.-U. (1975) *Die Briefe des Euripides*. Meisenheim am Glan
- Gould, J. (1973) 'Hiketia', *JHS* 93: 74–103 [reprinted with Addendum in his *Myth, ritual, memory, and exchange: essays in Greek literature and culture* (Oxford, 2001) 22–77]
- (1980) 'Law, custom, and myth: aspects of the social position of women in classical Athens', *JHS* 100: 38–59 [reprinted in his *Myth, ritual, memory, and exchange: essays in Greek literature and culture* (Oxford, 2001) 112–57]
- Goward, B. (1999) *Telling tragedy: narrative technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides*. London
- Graver, M. (1995) 'Dog-Helen and Homeric insult', *CA* 1995: 41–61

- Green, R. (2002) 'Towards a reconstruction of performance style,' in P. Easterling and E. Hall, eds. *Greek and Roman actors: aspects of an ancient profession* (Cambridge) 93–126
- Gregory, E. (1997) *H. D. and Hellenism: classic lines*. Cambridge
- Gregory, J. (2002) 'Euripides as social critic', *G&R* 49: 145–62
- Griffin J. (1998) 'The social function of Attic tragedy', *CQ* 48: 39–61
- Griffith, M. (1977) *The authenticity of Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge  
 (1999) *Sophocles: Antigone*. Cambridge  
 (2005) 'Authority figures', in J. Gregory, ed. *The Blackwell companion to Greek tragedy* (Oxford) 333–51
- Groten, F. J. (1968) 'Homer's Helen', *G&R* 15: 33–9
- Grube, G. M. A. (1941) *The drama of Euripides*. London
- Guardini, M. L. (1987) *Il mito di Elena: Euripide e Isocrate*. Treviso
- Gumpert, M. (2001) *Grafting Helen: the abduction of the classical past*. Madison
- Guthrie, W. K. C. (1971) *The sophists*. Cambridge
- Gygli-Wyss, B. (1966) *Das nominale Polyptoton im älteren Griechisch*. Göttingen
- Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*. Oxford  
 (1993) 'Political and cosmic turbulence in Euripides' *Orestes*', in A. H. Sommerstein, S. Halliwell, J. Henderson, and B. Zimmermann, eds. *Tragedy, comedy and the polis* (Bari) 263–85  
 (1997) 'The sociology of Athenian tragedy', in P. Easterling, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy* (Cambridge) 93–126  
 (1999) 'Actor's song in tragedy', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, eds. *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge) 96–122  
 (2002) 'The singing actors of antiquity', in P. Easterling and E. Hall, eds. *Greek and Roman actors: aspects of an ancient profession* (Cambridge) 3–38
- Hall, E. and Macintosh, F. (2005) *Greek tragedy and the British theatre 1660–1914*. Oxford
- Hall, J. M. (2002) *Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture*. Chicago
- Halleran, M. (1985) *Stagecraft in Euripides*. London
- Halliwell, S. (1993) 'The function and aesthetics of the Greek tragic mask', in N. W. Slater and B. Zimmermann, eds. *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödi*. (Stuttgart) 195–211
- Hanna, S. (1998) 'Shakespeare's Greek world: the temptations of the sea', in J. Gilli and V. M. Vaughan, eds. *Playing the Globe: genre and geography in English Renaissance drama* (Madison) 107–28
- Harder, A. (1985) *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos*. Leiden
- Harder, R. E. (1995) 'Die Figur der Helena in den Tragödien des Euripides', in B. Zimmermann, ed. *Griechisch-römische Komödie und Tragödie* (Stuttgart) 135–55
- Hardie, A. (2004) 'Muses and mysteries', in P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds. *Music and the Muses: the culture of mousiké in the classical Athenian city* (Oxford) 11–37
- Hardie, P. (1997) 'Virgil and tragedy', in P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Virgil* (Cambridge) 312–26

- Harrison, T. (2000) *Divinity and history: the religion of Herodotus*. Oxford  
 cd. (2002) *Greeks and barbarians*. Edinburgh
- Hartog, F. (2001) *Memories of Odysseus: frontier tales from ancient Greece* (trans. J. Lloyd).  
 Chicago
- Haslam, M. W. (1975) 'The authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles,  
*Electra* 1', *GRBS* 16: 149–74
- Heath, M. (1987) *The poetics of Greek tragedy*. London  
 (2002) *Interpreting classical texts*. London
- Hedreen, G. (2001) *Capturing Troy: the narrative functions of landscape in archaic and early  
 classical Greek art*. Michigan
- Henrichs, A. (1975) 'Two doxographical notes: Democritus and Prodicus on religion',  
*HSCP* 79: 93–123  
 (1987) 'Three approaches to Greek mythography', in J. Bremmer, ed. *Interpretations  
 of Greek mythology* (London) 242–77  
 (1996) 'Dancing in Athens, dancing on Delos: some patterns of choral projection  
 in Euripides', *Philologus* 140: 48–62  
 (2000) 'Drama and dromena: bloodshed, violence, and sacrificial metaphor in  
 Euripides', *HSCP* 101: 173–88
- Herington, J. (1985) *Poetry into drama: early tragedy and the greek poetic tradition*. Berkeley
- Herrman, J. (2004) *Athenian funeral orations*. Newburyport, MA
- Hicks, R. I. (1962) 'Egyptian elements in Greek mythology', *TAPA* 93: 90–108
- Higbie, C. (2003) *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek creation of their past*. Oxford
- Hildesheimer, W. (1965) *Das Opfer Helena, Monolog: Zwei Hörspiele*. Frankfurt am Main
- Himmelmann, N. (1997) *Tieropfer in der griechischen Kunst*. Opladen
- Holzhausen, J. (1995) 'Textprobleme in der *Helena* des Euripides', *Philologus* 139: 191–  
 203
- Homeyer, H. (1977) *Die spartanische Helena und der Trojanische Krieg: Wandlungen und Wan-  
 derungen eines Sagenkreises vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart*. Wiesbaden
- Horden, P. and Purcell, N. (2000) *The corrupting sea: a study of Mediterranean history*.  
 Oxford
- Hordern, J. H. (2002) *The fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford
- Hornblower, S. (1996) *A commentary on Thucydides*, vol. II: *Books IV–V.24*. Oxford
- Hose, M. (1995) *Drama und Gesellschaft: Studien zur dramatischen Produktion in Athen am Ende  
 des 5. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart
- Hourmouziades, N. C. (1965) *Production and imagination in Euripides*. Athens
- Hughes, B. (2005) *Helen of Troy: goddess, princess, whore*. London
- Hunter, R. (1985) *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1985) *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas*. Oxford  
 (2001) *Greek lyric poetry*. Oxford  
 (2004) 'Euripides' other *Hippolytus*', *ZPE* 149: 15–28
- Itsumi, K. (1982) 'The "choriambic dimeter" of Euripides', *CQ* 32: 59–74  
 (1984) 'The glyconic in tragedy', *CQ* 34: 66–82

- (1991–3) 'Enoplians in tragedy', *BICS* 38: 242–61
- Jackson, J. (1955) *Marginalia scaenica*. Oxford
- Jacobson, H. (1987) 'Virgil's Dido and Euripides' *Helen*', *AJP* 108: 167–8
- Janko, R. (1982) *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. Diachronic development in epic diction*. Cambridge
- Jong, I. J. F. de (1991) *Narrative in drama: the art of the Euripidean messenger speech*. Leiden
- Jouan, F. (1966) *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens*. Paris
- Jouan, F. and Van Looy, H., eds. (1998–2003) *Euripide. Tome VIII. Fragments. 1e–4e parties*. Paris
- Juffras, D. M. (1993) 'Helen and other victims in Euripides' *Helen*', *Hermes* 121: 45–57
- Kakridis, J. T. (1971) 'Problems of the Homeric Helen', in his *Homer revisited* (Lund) 25–53
- Kannicht, R. (1969) *Euripides: Helena*. 2 vols. Heidelberg  
(1997) 'TrGF v Euripides', in G. W. Most, ed. *Collecting fragments: Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen) 67–77
- Kassel, R. (1958) *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur*. Munich
- Kausouris, A. G. (1975) *Linguistic and stylistic characterization: tragedy and Menander*. Ioannina
- Kearns, E. (1989) *Heroes of Attica*. London
- Kelly, A. (2006) 'Neoanalysis and the Nestorbedrängnis: a test case', *Hermes* 134: 1–25  
(2007) 'Stesikhoros and Helen', *Museum Helveticum* 64: 1–21
- Kelly, H. A. (2005) *Ideas and forms of tragedy from Aristotle to the Middle Ages*. Cambridge
- Kerényi, K. (1945) *Die Geburt der Helena*. Zurich
- Kidd, D. (1997) *Aratus: Phaenomena*. Cambridge
- Kiso, A. (1986) 'Tyro: Sophocles' lost play', in J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, and J. R. Green, eds. *Studies in honour of T. B. L. Webster*, vol. 1 (Bristol) 161–9
- Klimek-Winter, R. (1993) *Andromedatragödien: Sophokles, Euripides, Livius Andronikos, Ennius, Accius*. Stuttgart
- Knöbl, R. (2005) 'Euripides, *Helena* 1970–2000', *Lustrum* 47: 485–525
- Köhler, W. (1913) *Die Versbrechung bei den griechischen Tragikern*. Darmstadt
- Kovacs, D. (1994a) *Euripides: Cyclops, Alcestis, Medea*. Cambridge, MA  
(1994b) *Euripidea*. Leiden  
(1997) 'Gods and men in Euripides' Trojan trilogy', *Colby Quarterly* 33: 162–76  
(2002) *Euripides: Helen, Phoenician Women, Orestes*. Cambridge, MA  
(2003) *Euripidea tertia*. Leiden  
(2005) 'Text and transmission', in J. Gregory, ed. *The Blackwell companion to Greek tragedy* (Oxford) 379–93
- Kranz, W. (1933) *Stasimon*. Berlin
- Kraus, M. (1987) *Name und Sache: Ein Problem im frühgriechischen Denken*. Amsterdam
- Krumeich, R., Pechstein, N., and Seidensticker, B., eds. (1999) *Das griechische Satyrspiel*. Darmstadt
- Kuntz, M. (1993) *Narrative setting and dramatic poetry*. Leiden

- Lada-Richards, I. (2002) 'The subjectivity of Greek performance', in P. Easterling and E. Hall, eds. *Greek and Roman actors: aspects of an ancient profession* (Cambridge) 395–418
- Lange, K. (2002) *Euripides und Homer: Untersuchungen zur Homernachwirkung in Elektra, Iphigenie im Taurerland, Helena, Orestes und Kyklops*. Stuttgart
- Larson, J. (1995) *Greek heroine cults*. Madison  
(2001) *Greek nymphs: myth, cult, lore*. Oxford
- Latacz, J. (2004) *Troy and Homer: towards a solution of an old mystery*. Oxford
- Lattimore, R. (1942) *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs*. Urbana
- Le Guen, B. (1995) 'Théâtre et cités à l'époque hellénistique: "Mort de la cité" – "Mort du théâtre"', *REG* 108: 59–90
- Lec, K. H. (1986) 'Helen's famous husband and Euripides' *Helen* 1399', *CP* 81: 309–313
- Lefkowitz, M. (1981) *The lives of the Greek poets*. London
- Lendle, O. (1992) *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung*. Darmstadt
- Leo, F. (1908) *Der Monolog im Drama: Ein Beitrag zur griechisch-römischen Poetik*. Berlin
- Ley, G. (1991) 'Scenic notes on Euripides' *Helen*', *Eranos* 89: 25–34
- Lindsay, J. (1974) *Helen of Troy: woman and goddess*. London
- Lloyd, A. B. (1975–88) *Herodotus: Book II*. 3 vols. Leiden
- Lloyd, G. E. R. (1979) *Magic, reason and experience: studies in the origins and development of Greek science*. Cambridge
- Lloyd, M. (1992) *The agon in Euripides*. Oxford  
(1999) 'The tragic aorist', *CQ* 49: 24–45
- Long, A. A. (1968) *Language and thought in Sophocles*. London
- López Eire, A. (2003) 'Tragedy and satyr-drama: linguistic criteria', in A. H. Sommerstein, ed. *Shards from Kolonos: studies in Sophoclean fragments* (Bari) 387–412
- Loraux, N. (1987) *Tragic ways of killing a woman*. Cambridge, MA  
(1993) *The children of Athena: Athenian ideas about citizenship and the division between the sexes*. Princeton  
(2002) *The mourning voice: an essay on Greek tragedy*. Ithaca
- Lourenço, F. (2000a) 'An interpolated song in Euripides? *Helen* 229–52', *JHS* 120: 132–8
- Lourenço, F. (2000b) 'Two notes on Euripides' *Helen* (186; 1472)', *CQ* 50: 601–3
- Lowe, N. J. (2000) *The classical plot and the invention of western narrative*. Cambridge  
(2004) 'Euripides', in I. J. F. de Jong, R. Nünlist, and A. M. Bowie, eds. *Narrators, narratees, and narratives in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative* (Leiden) 269–80
- Lundon, J. (2003) 'A new fragment of Euripides' *Helen* (1429–33)', *ZPE* 145: 19–21
- Luppe, W. (1997) 'Euripides führte 22mal auf – wirklich?', *Museum Helveticum* 54: 93–6
- Lyons, D. (1997) *Gender and immortality: heroines in ancient Greek myth and cult*. Princeton
- Maas, P. (1933) 'Epidaurische Hymnen', *Schr. Der Königsberger Gel. Ges.* 9.5: 127–62  
(1962) *Greek metre* (trans. H. Lloyd-Jones). Oxford
- MacDowell, D. M. (1962) *Andokides: On the Mysteries*. Oxford

- MacLeod, C. W. (1974) 'Two comparisons in Sappho', *ZPE* 15: 217–20 [= *Collected essays* (Oxford, 1983) 16–19]  
 (1983) *Collected essays*. Oxford
- Malkin, I. (1998) *The returns of Odysseus: colonization and ethnicity*. Oxford
- Masson, O. (2000) *Onomastica Graeca selecta*, vol. III. Paris
- Mastrorarde, D. J. (1979) *Contact and discontinuity: some conventions of speech and action on the Greek tragic stage*. Berkeley  
 (1990) 'Actors on high: the skene roof, the crane, and the gods in Attic drama', *CA* 9: 247–94  
 (1994) *Euripides: Phocnissac*. Cambridge  
 (1998) 'Il coro euripideo: autorità e integrazione', *QUCC* 60: 55–80  
 (1999–2000) 'Euripidean tragedy and genre: the terminology and its problems', *ICS* 24–5: 23–39  
 (2002) 'Euripidean tragedy and theology', *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 5: 17–49
- Matthiessen, K. (1964) *Elektra, Taurische Iphigenie und Helena: Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und zur dramatischen Form im Spätwerk des Euripides*. Göttingen  
 (1968) 'Zur Theonoeszene der Euripideischen *Helena*', *Hermes* 96: 685–704  
 (2002) *Die Tragödien des Euripides*. Munich
- Maxwell-Stuart, P. G. (1981) *Studies in Greek colour terminology*, 2 vols. Leiden
- Mayer, K. (1996) 'Helen and the ΔΙΟΣ ΒΟΥΛΗ', *AJP* 117: 1–15
- McClure, L. K. (1995) 'Female speech and characterization in Euripides', in F. de Martino and A. H. Sommerstein, eds. *Lo spettacolo delle voci* (Bari) 35–60  
 (1999) *Spoken like a woman: speech and gender in Athenian drama*. Princeton
- Meier-Brügger, M. (1992) *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*, 2 vols. Berlin
- Meiggs, R. (1972) *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford  
 (1982) *Trees and timber in the ancient Mediterranean world*. Oxford
- Meijering, R. (1987) *Literary and rhetorical theories in Greek scholia*. Groningen
- Meltzer, G. S. (1994) 'Where is the glory of Troy? Kleos in Euripides' *Helena*', *CA* 13: 234–55 [reprinted in Meltzer (2006) 188–222]  
 (2006) *Euripides and the poetics of nostalgia*. Cambridge
- Merkelbach, R. (1967) 'Interpolierte Eigennamen', *ZPE* 1: 100–2 [= *Philologica Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* (Stuttgart, 1997) 532–4]
- Michelakis, P. (2002) *Achilles in Greek tragedy*. Cambridge
- Micheli, A. N. (1987) *Euripides and the tragic tradition*. Madison
- Mikalson, J. D. (1991) *Honor thy gods: popular religion in Greek tragedy*. Chapel Hill  
 (2003) *Herodotus and religion in the Persian Wars*. Chapel Hill.
- Moeller, A. (2000) *Naukratis. Trade in archaic Greece*. Oxford
- Moodie, G. (2003) 'Sophocles' *Tyro* and late Euripidean tragedy', in A. H. Sommerstein, ed. *Shards from Kolonos: studies in Sophoclean fragments* (Bari) 117–38
- Moorhouse, A. C. (1959) *Studies in the Greek negatives*. Cambridge  
 (1982) *The syntax of Sophocles*. Leiden
- Moretti, J.-C. (1999–2000) 'The theater of the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus in late fifth-century Athens', *ICS* 24–5: 377–98

- Mossman, J. (1995) *Wild justice: a study of Euripides' Hecuba*. Oxford
- Most, G. W. (2000) 'Generating genres: the idea of the tragic', in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of genre: authors, canons, society* (Cambridge, MA) 15–35
- Murray, P. (2004) 'The Muses and their arts', in P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds. *Music and the Muses: the culture of mousike in the classical Athenian city* (Oxford) 365–89
- Nachmanson, E. (1941) *Der griechische Buchtitel: einige Beobachtungen*. Göteborg
- Newman-Gordon, P. (1968) *Hélène de Sparte: la fortune du mythe en France*. Paris
- Nordheider, H. W. (1980) *Chorlieder des Euripides in ihrer dramatischen Funktion*. Frankfurt
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2003) 'Philosophy and literature', in D. Sedley, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek and Roman philosophy* (Cambridge) 211–41
- Oehler, R. (1925) *Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung*. Aarau
- Olson, S. D. (2002) *Aristophanes: Acharnians*. Oxford
- Osborne, R. (1985) *Demos: the Discovery of classical Attica*. Cambridge
- (1995) 'The economics and politics of slavery at Athens', in A. Powell, ed. *The Greek world* (London) 27–43
- (1998) *Archaic and classical Greek art*. Oxford
- Padel, R. (1974) '“Imagery of the elsewhere”': two choral odes of Euripides', *CQ* 24: 227–41
- Page, D. L. (1934) *Actors' interpolations in Greek tragedy*. Oxford
- (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus: an introduction to the study of ancient Lesbian poetry*. Oxford
- Pallantza, E. (2005) *Der Troische Krieg in der nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Stuttgart
- Panagl, O. (1971) *Die 'dithyrambischen Stasima' des Euripides: Untersuchungen zur Komposition und Erzähltechnik*. Vienna
- Parker, L. P. E. (1990) 'Trochee to iamb, iamb to trochee', in E. Craik, ed. *'Owls to Athens': essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford) 331–48
- (1997) *The songs of Aristophanes*. Oxford
- Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma: pollution and purification in early Greek religion*. Oxford
- (1996) *Athenian Religion*. Oxford
- (1997) 'Gods cruel and kind: tragic and civic theology', in C. Pelling, ed. *Greek tragedy and the historian* (Oxford) 143–60
- (2000a) 'Theophoric names and the history of Greek religion', in S. Hornblower and E. Matthews, eds. *Greek personal names: their value as evidence* (Oxford) 53–79
- (2000b) 'Greek states and Greek oracles', in R. Buxton, ed. *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford) 76–108
- (2005) *Polytheism and society at Athens*. Oxford
- (forthcoming) 'The cult', in H. W. Calling ed. *Menelaion II: the sanctuary of Helen and Menelaus*. British School at Athens
- Parry, H. (1978) *The lyric poems of Greek tragedy*. Toronto
- Patterson, C. B. (1981) *Pericles' citizenship law of 451–50 BC*. New York
- Pattichis, P. L. (1963) *Euripides' Helen and the Romance tradition*. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, New York

- Pauc, K. (1935) *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*. Breslau
- Percicoyianni-Paléologuc, H. (2002) 'The interjections in Greek tragedy', *QUCC* 70: 49–88
- Petersen, U. (1974) *Goethe und Euripides*. Heidelberg
- Petrochilos, N. K. (1974) *Roman attitudes to the Greeks*. Athens
- Pettersson, M. (1992) *Cults of Apollo at Sparta: the Hyakinthia, the Gymnopaïdai and the Karneia*. Stockholm
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968) *History of classical scholarship from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age*. Oxford
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1946) *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*. Oxford  
(1988) *The dramatic festivals of Athens*, 2nd edn, rev. J. Gould and D. Lewis. Oxford
- Poc, J. P. (1992), 'Entrance-announcements and entrance-speeches in Greek tragedy', *HSCP* 94: 121–56  
(1993) 'The determination of episodes in Greek tragedy', *AJP* 114: 343–96
- Pomeroy, S. B. (1994) *Xenophon: Oeconomicus. A social and historical commentary*. Oxford
- Popp, H. (1971) 'Das Amoibaion', in W. Jens, ed. *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich) 221–75.
- Porter, D. H. (1986) 'The imagery of Greek tragedy: three characteristics', *SO* 61: 19–42
- Porter, J. R. (1994) *Studies in Euripides' Orestes*. Leiden
- Post, L. A. (1964) 'Menander and the Helen of Euripides', *HSCP* 68: 99–118
- Prauscello, L. (2006) *Singing Alexandria: music between practice and textual transmission*. Leiden
- Preller, L. (1894–1926) *Griechische Mythologie*, rev. C. Robert. Berlin.
- Prost, W. (1977) *The eidolon of Helen: diachronic edition of a myth*. Ph.D. diss., Catholic University, Washington DC
- Pucci, P. (1997) 'The Helen and Euripides' "comic" art', *Colby Quarterly* 33: 42–75
- Puhvel, J. (1987) *Comparative mythology*. Baltimore
- Pulleyn, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek religion*. Oxford
- Quainton, M. D. (1995) 'Ronsard's *Sonnets pour Hélène* and the alternative Helen myth' in J. O'Brien, ed. *(Ré)interprétations: études sur le seizième siècle*, Michigan Roman Studies 15: 77–112
- Raab, I. (1972) *Zu den Darstellungen des Parisurteils in der griechischen Kunst*. Bern
- Race, W. H. (1981) 'The word *καίρος* in Greek drama', *TAPA* 111: 197–213
- Rademaker, A. (2005) *Sophrosyne and the rhetoric of self-restraint*. Leiden
- Radermacher, L. (1898) 'Euripides und die Mantik', *RhM* 53: 497–510
- Rau, P. (1967) *Paratragodia: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*. Munich.
- Reekford, K. J. (1964) 'Helen in the *Iliad*', *GRBS* 5: 5–20  
(1981) 'Helen in *Aeneid* 11 and 61', *Arethusa* 14: 85–99
- Redondo, J. (2003) 'Satyric diction in the extant Sophoclean fragments: a reconsideration', in A. H. Sommerstein, ed. *Shards from Kolonos: studies in Sophoclean fragments* (Bari) 413–31

- Rehm, R. (1994) *Marriage to death: the conflation of wedding and funeral rituals in Greek tragedy*. Princeton
- (2002) *The play of space: spatial transformation in Greek tragedy*. Princeton
- Reid, J. D. (1993) *The Oxford guide to classical mythology in the arts, 1300–1990s*, 2 vols. Oxford
- Reinhardt, K. (1960) 'Goethe and antiquity: the Helen episode of Goethe's *Faust*', in his *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung* (Göttingen) 274–82
- Renchan, R. (1969) *Greek textual criticism: a reader*. Cambridge, MA
- Revermann, M. (1999) 'The shape of the Athenian orchestra in the fifth century: forgotten evidence', *ZPE* 128: 25–8
- Richardson, N. J. ed. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford
- Rihll, T. E. (1999) *Greek science*. Oxford
- Rijksbaron, A. (2006) 'On false historic presents in Sophocles (and Euripides)', in I. J. F. de Jong and A. Rijksbaron, eds. *Sophocles and the Greek language: aspects of diction, syntax and pragmatics* (Leiden) 127–49
- Ringer, M. (1998) *Electra and the empty urn*. Chapel Hill
- Roberts, D. H. (1987) 'Parting words: final lines in Sophocles and Euripides', *CQ* 37: 51–64
- Robertson, M. (1975) *A history of Greek art*, 2 vols. Cambridge
- Robertson, N. (1996) 'The ancient mother of the gods: a missing chapter in the history of Greek religion', in E. N. Lanc, ed. *Cybele, Attis and related cults* (Leiden) 239–304
- Robinson, D. B. (1979) 'Helen and Persephone, Sparta and Demeter: the "Demeter Ode" in Euripides' *Helen*', in G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and M. C. J. Putnam, eds. *Arktouros: Hellenic studies presented to B. M. W. Knox* (Berlin) 162–72
- Rode, J. (1971) 'Das Chorlied', in W. Jens, ed. *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich) 85–115.
- Roller, L. E. (1999) *In search of God the Mother: the cult of Anatolian Cybele*. Berkeley
- Romilly, J. de (1988) 'La belle Hélène et l'évolution de la tragédie grecque', *LEC* 56: 129–43
- Ronnet, G. (1979) 'Le cas de conscience de Théonoé, ou Euripide et la sophistique face à l'idée de justice', *Revue de Philologie* 53: 251–9
- Roscher, W. H. (1886–90) *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. 1. ii Leipzig
- Rosenmeyer, T. G. (1985) 'Ancient literary genres: a mirage?', *Yearbook of comparative and general literature* 34: 74–84
- (2002) 'Metatheater: an essay on overload', *Arion* 10: 87–119
- Rossum-Steenbeck, M. van (1998) *Greek readers' Digests? Studies on a selection of subliterate papyri*. Leiden
- Rusten, J. (1982) 'Dicaearchus and the tales from Euripides', *GRBS* 23: 357–67
- Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's paeans: a reading of the fragments with a survey of the genre*. Oxford
- Rutherford, R. B. (2005) *Classical literature: a concise history*. Oxford

- Sabbatino, P. (1997) *La bellezza di Elena: l'imitazione nella letteratura e nelle arti figurative del Rinascimento*. Florence
- Ste Croix, G. E. M. de (1981) *The class struggle in the ancient world*. London
- Sansone, D. (1985) 'Theonoe and Theoclymenus', *SO* 60: 17–36
- Schadewaldt, W. (1926) *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*. Berlin
- Schepens, C. (1980) *L'«autopsie» dans la méthode des historiens grecs du Ve siècle*. Brussels
- Schmid, G. B. (1982) *Die Beurteilung der Helena in der frühgriechischen Literatur*. Freiburg
- Schmid, W. and Stählin, O. (1940) *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, vol. 1/3. Munich
- Schmidt, H. W. (1971) 'Die Struktur des Eingangs', in W. Jens, ed. *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich) 1–46
- Schmiel, R. (1980) 'The Helen theme', *EMC* 24: 95–102
- Schwinge, E.-R. (1968) *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides*. Heidelberg
- Scodel, R. (1980) *The Trojan trilogy of Euripides*. Göttingen  
 (1999) *Credible impossibilities: conventions and strategies of verisimilitude in Homer and Greek tragedy*. Stuttgart  
 (2002) *Listening to Homer: tradition, narrative, and audience*. Ann Arbor
- Scolnicov, H. (1994) *Woman's theatrical space*. Cambridge
- Seaford, R. (1994) *Reciprocity and ritual: Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state*. Oxford  
 (2003) 'Tragic tyranny', in K. A. Morgan, ed. *Popular tyranny: sovereignty and its discontents in ancient Greece* (Austin) 95–115
- Segal, C. (1971) 'The two worlds of Euripides' *Helen*', *TAPA* 102: 553–614  
 (1992) 'Tragic beginnings: narration, voice, and authority in the prologues of Greek drama', *JCS* 29: 85–112  
 (1997) *Dionysiac poetics and Euripides' Bacchae*, 2nd edn. Princeton  
 (1998) 'Beauty, desire, and absence: Helen in Sappho, Alcacus, and Ibycus', in his *Aglaia: the poetry of Alcaeus, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna* (Lanham, MD) 63–83
- Segal, E. (1983) 'Euripides: poet of paradox', in E. Segal, ed. *Oxford readings in Greek tragedy* (Oxford) 244–53
- Seidensticker, B. (1982) *Palintonos Harmonia: Studien zu komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie*. Göttingen
- Shaw, I., ed. (2000) *The Oxford history of ancient Egypt*. Oxford
- Sideras, A. (1971) *Aeschylus Homericus: Untersuchungen zu den Homerismen der aischyleis Sprache*. Göttingen
- Sihler, A. L. (1995) *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford
- Silk, M. S. (1996) 'Tragic language: the Greek tragedians and Shakespeare', in M. Silk, ed. *Tragedy and the tragic* (Oxford) 458–96  
 (2000) *Aristophanes and the definition of comedy*. Oxford
- Skutsch, O. (1987) 'Helen, her name and nature', *JHS* 1987 107: 188–193
- Smereka, J. (1936) *Studia Euripidea*, vol. 1 *De sermone Euripideo – De vocabulorum Euripideorum copia*. Lwow

- Snell, B. (1953) *The discovery of the mind: the Greek origins of European thought* (trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer). Cambridge, MA
- Snodgrass, A. (1998) *Homer and the artists: text and picture in early Greek art*. Cambridge
- Solmsen, F. (1934) 'Onoma and Pragma in Euripides' *Helen*, *CR* 48: 119–21
- Sommerstein, A. H. (1996) *Aeschylean tragedy*. Bari  
(2002) 'The titles of Greek dramas', *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 5: 1–16
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1995) *'Reading' Greek death*. Oxford  
(2003) *Tragedy and Athenian religion*. Lanham, MD
- Spentzou, E. (2006) 'Defying history: the legacy of Helen in modern Greek poetry', in V. Zajko, and M. Leonard, eds. *Laughing with Medusa: classical myth and feminist thought* (Oxford) 355–79
- Stanford, W. B. (1983) *Greek tragedy and the emotions*. London
- Stanley-Porter, D. P. (1973) 'Mute actors in the tragedies of Euripides', *BICS* 20: 68–93  
(1977) 'Who opposes Theoclymenus?', *CP* 72: 45–8
- Steiger, H. (1908) 'Wie Entstand die *Helena* des Euripides', *Philologus* 67: 202–37
- Steiner, D. T. (2001) *Images in mind: statues in archaic and classical Greek literature and thought*. Princeton
- Stengel, P. (1910) *Opferbräuche der Griechen*. Leipzig
- Stephanopoulos, T. K. (1980) *Umgestaltung des Mythos durch Euripides*. Athens
- Stevens, P. T. (1956) 'Euripides and the Athenians', *JHS* 76: 87–94  
(1976) *Colloquial expressions in Euripides*. Wiesbaden
- Stewart, S. (2002) *Poetry and the fate of the senses*. Chicago
- Stinton T. C. W. (1990) *Collected papers on Greek tragedy*. Oxford
- Storey, I. C. (2003) *Eupolis: poet of Old Comedy*. Oxford
- Suksi, A. (2001) 'The poet at Colonus: nightingales in Sophocles', *Mnemosyne* 54: 646–58
- Sutton, D. F. (1972) 'Satyric qualities in Euripides' *Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Helen*', *RSC* 20: 321–330  
(1987) 'The theatrical families of Athens', *AJP* 108: 9–26
- Suzuki, M. (1989) *Metamorphoses of Helen: authority, difference, and the epic*. Ithaca
- Swift, L. A. (forthcoming) *The hidden chorus: echoes of genre in tragic lyric*. Oxford
- Syndikus, H. P. (1984–90) *Catull: Eine Interpretation*, 3 vols. Darmstadt
- Taplin, O. (1977) *The stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford  
(1999) 'Spreading the word', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, eds. *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge) 33–57  
(2007) *Pots and plays: interactions between tragedy and Greek vase-painting of the fourth century BC*. Malibu
- Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in context: ethnography, science and the art of persuasion*. Cambridge
- Thomas, R. F. (1988) *Virgil: Georgics*, vol. II *Books III–IV*. Cambridge
- Thompson, D. W. (1936) *Glossary of Greek birds*. Oxford
- Thomson, G. (1939) 'The postponement of interrogatives in Attic drama', *CQ* 33: 147–52

- Thummer, E. (1986) 'Griechische "Erlösungsdramen"', in W. Meid and H. Trenkwalder, eds. *In Bannkreis des alten Orients: Studien zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients und seines Ausstrahlungstraumes Karl Oberhuber zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* (Innsbruck) 237–59
- Trédé, M. (1992) *Kairos: L'à-propos et l'occasion*. Paris
- Tuplin, C. (1999) 'Greek racism? Observations on the character and limits of Greek ethnic prejudice', in G. R. Tsatskheladze, ed. *Ancient Greeks west and east* (Leiden) 47–75
- van Straten, F. T. (1995) *Hiera kala: images of animal sacrifice in archaic and classical Greece*. Leiden
- van Wees, H. (2000) 'The city at war', in Osborne, R., ed., *Classical Greece 500–323 BC* (Oxford) 81–110
- Vermeule, E. (1979) *Aspects of death in early Greek art and poetry*. Berkeley
- Villing, A. C. (1997) 'Aspects of Athena in the Greek polis: Sparta and Corinth', in A. B. Lloyd, ed. *What is a god? Studies in the nature of Greek divinity* (London) 81–100
- Voelke, P. (1996) 'Beauté d'Hélène et rituels féminins dans l'*Hélène* d'Euripide', *Kernos* 9: 281–96
- Vowles, G. R. (1928) 'Studies in Greek noun-formation', *CP* 23: 34–59
- Wachsmuth, D. (1967) *ΠΟΜΠΙΜΟΣ Ο ΔΑΙΜΩΝ: Untersuchung zu den antiken Sakralhandlungen bei Seereisen*. Berlin
- Wachter, R. (2005) 'Persophatta', published online at <http://pages.unibas.ch/klaphil/idg/persophatta/home.html>
- Wakker, G. (1997) 'Emphasis and affirmation: some aspects of μήν/μῆν in tragedy', in A. Rijksbaron, ed. *New approaches to Greek particles* (Amsterdam) 209–31
- Wallace, R. W. (1995) 'Speech, song and text, public and private: evolutions in communications media and fora in fourth-century Athens', in W. Eder, ed. *Die Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* (Stuttgart) 199–217
- Wasserman, R. (1986) *Helen of Troy: her myth in modern poetry*. Ph.D. diss., CUNY, New York
- Watson, L. C. (2003) *A commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford
- Webster, T. B. L. (1939) 'Greek theories of art and literature down to 400 bc', *CQ* 33: 166–179
- (1967) *The tragedies of Euripides*. London
- Weiss, C. (1984) *Griechische Flußgottheiten in vorhellenistischer Zeit: Ikonographie und Bedeutung*. Würzburg
- Wendel, T. (1929) *Die Gesprächsaufrede im griechischen Epos und Drama der Blütezeit*. Stuttgart
- West, M. L. (1970) 'Melica', *CQ* 20 (1970) 205–15
- (1975) *Immortal Helen*. London
- (1981) 'Tragica v', *BICS* 28: 61–78
- (1982) *Greek metre*. Oxford
- (1984) 'Tragica vii', *BICS* 31: 171–92
- (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: its nature, structure, and origins*. Oxford

- (1990a) *Aeschylus: Tragödien*. Stuttgart
- (1990b) *Studies in Aeschylus*. Stuttgart
- (1992) *Ancient Greek music*. Oxford
- (1997) *The east face of Helicon: west Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth*. Oxford
- (1999) 'Sophocles with music? Ptolemaic music fragments and remains of Sophocles (Junior?)', *Achilleus*, *ZPE* 126: 43–65
- (2005) 'The new Sappho', *ZPE* 151: 1–9
- Whitley, J. (2001) *The archaeology of ancient Greece*. Cambridge
- Whitman, C. H. (1974) *Euripides and the full circle of myth*. Cambridge, MA
- Widc, S. (1893) *Lakonische Kulte*. Leipzig
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1921) *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin
- (1931–2) *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols. Berlin
- Wildberg, C. (2002) *Hyperesie und Epiphanie: ein Versuch über die Bedeutung der Götter in den Dramen des Euripides*. Munich
- Williams B. (1993) *Shame and necessity*. Berkeley
- Willink, C. W. (1989) 'The reunion duo in Euripides' *Helen*', *CQ* 39: 45–69
- (1990) 'The parodos of Euripides' *Helen* (164–90)', *CQ* 40: 77–99
- Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian institution of the Khoregia*. Cambridge
- Wiseman, T. P. (2004) *The myths of Rome*. Exeter
- Wolff, C. (1973) 'On Euripides' *Helen*', *HSCP* 77: 61–84
- Worman, N. (2001) 'This voice which is not one: Helen's verbal guises in Homeric epic', in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds. *Making silence speak: women's voices in Greek literature and society* (Princeton) 19–37
- Wright, M. (2005) *Euripides' escape-tragedies*. Oxford
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. (1980) *Studies in fourth-century tragedy*. Athens.
- (1993) 'Hellenistic drama: developments in form and performance', *Platon* 45: 117–33
- Zacharia, K. (2003) *Converging truths: Euripides' Ion and the Athenian quest for self-definition*. Leiden
- Zagagi, N. (1985) 'Helen and Troy: encomium and apology', *WS* 19: 63–88
- (1995) *The comedy of Menander: convention, variation and originality*. Bloomington
- Zajonz, S. (2002) *Isokrates' Enkomion auf Helena: ein Kommentar*. Göttingen
- Zeidin, F. I. (1996) *Playing the other: gender and society in classical Greek literature*. Chicago
- Zuntz, G. (1955a) *The political plays of Euripides*. Manchester
- (1955b) 'Three conjectures in Euripides, *Helena*', *CQ* 5: 68–71
- (1960) 'On Euripides' *Helena*: theology and irony', in O. Reverdin, ed. *Euripide* (Entretiens Hardt vol. vi, Geneva) 201–41
- (1965) *An inquiry into the transmission of the plays of Euripides*. Cambridge
- Zweig, B. (1999a) 'Euripides' *Helen*: introduction and translation', in R. Blondell, M.-K. Gamel, N. S. Rabinowitz, and B. Zweig, eds. *Women on the edge: four plays by Euripides* (New York) 219–301
- (1999b) 'Euripides' *Helen* and female rites of passage', in M. W. Padilla, ed. *Rites of passage in ancient Greece: literature, religion, society* (Lewisburg, PA) 158–80

# INDEXES

## 1. SUBJECTS

- abstract nouns 152  
Accius 272  
accusative  
  absolute 214  
  adverbial 202, 311  
  cognate 195, 339  
  double 145, 234  
  internal 152, 158, 235, 243, 246  
  of respect 255  
  terminal 157  
Achilles 14, 63, 153, 160, 273  
actors 32-3, 83  
  costume 33-4, 311  
  interpolations 83  
  masks 33, 221, 287  
  professionalization 71  
  song 39, 42, 71  
  *see also* monody  
adjectives  
  alpha-privative 206, 274, 278  
  tricolon of 278  
  two-termination 238  
Aeschylus 1, 2, 5, 39, 43, 44, 45, 66  
  *Agamemnon* 16, 17, 70, 152, 315  
  *Choephoroi* 25, 67, 237, 260  
  *Danaids* 37, 69  
  *Egyptians* 29  
  *Eumenides* 8, 30, 37, 51, 58, 64, 69, 70, 205, 239  
  *Oresteia* 30, 52, 69  
  *Persians* 34, 60, 70, 164, 184  
  [*Prometheus Bound*] 340  
  *Proteus* 21, 29, 147  
  *Seven against Thebes* 70  
  *Suppliant Women* 6, 29, 30, 33  
aether 256  
*Aethiopsis* 14, 241  
after-life 255, 314  
Agathon 25, 40, 42, 293  
agon 246, 249  
Alcaeus 13, 327  
Alcman 14, 326  
Alexis 74  
alliteration 226  
'alphabetic' plays 84  
*amoibaion* 39, 165, 186, 216  
  *see also* monody  
anacoluthon 181, 182  
Anacreon 300  
anadiplosis 174, 178, 192, 223, 273  
anapaests 149  
anaphora 175, 190  
anastrophe 148, 149, 202, 227  
Anaxagoras 256, 326  
Anaxandrides 74  
Anaximenes 256  
*anodos* 178, 301, 305, 307  
anulabe 216, 225, 337, 339  
Antiphanes 74  
Antiphon 233  
aorist  
  causal 337  
  gnomic 249, 277, 346  
  ingressive 248  
  performative 221, 223, 271  
  'tragic'/'emotional' 190, 221, 224  
Aphrodite 264-5, 267  
apocope 292  
apostrophe 226, 281, 294, 308, 321  
apotheosis 65, 343  
appearance *versus* reality 47-9, 143  
  *see also* δόκησις  
Aristophanes 1, 66  
  *Acharnians* 53  
  *Assemblywomen* 71  
  *Clouds* 41, 256  
  *Frogs* 34, 45, 72  
  *Lysistrata* 15, 176, 322  
  *Thesmophoriazusaë* 40, 67, 74, 83, 143, 199, 210, 237, 256, 340  
  *Wasps* 1, 31  
Aristotle 31, 65, 67, 68, 293, 337  
asyndeton 172, 192, 204, 248, 265, 278  
Athena Chalkioikos 176, 323  
Athena Nike, temple of 71  
Atwood, Margaret 73  
*aulos* 39, 306, 333, 337, 346  
  
Bacchants 308  
Bacchylides 13  
Baif, Jean-Antoine de 77  
Brooke, Rupert 79  
bull-lifting 332  
burial rites 288, 291  
Byron, Lord 78  
  
Callimachus 75, 146  
Callisto 193

- Camus, Albert 80  
 canon 84  
 Catullus 272  
 causative verb 274  
 cenotaph 261, 289  
 Charites 304  
 chiasmus 255  
 chorus of tragedy 40–1  
   and dance 38, 301  
   and interaction with other choral genres 42, 171  
   compared to dolphins 320  
   exit and re-entry 185  
   female choruses 53  
   funding 40  
   ‘projection’ of 321  
   silence of 311  
 Claudian 301  
 colloquialisms 44, 200, 211, 215, 232, 234, 236, 239, 263, 289, 314, 332, 334  
   *see also* language; vocabulary  
 Corybanus 305  
 crane (bird) 324  
 crane (μηχανή) 32, 340  
 Cratinus 16, 307  
 cult  
   actiologies 62, 323, 343  
   invention of details 62  
 Cybele 299, 300, 302  
   *see also* Mother of the Gods; syncretism  
 Cypria 10, 12, 21, 63, 153, 234, 342  
  
 Dante 76  
 dative  
   causal 229, 274, 281  
   ethical 246  
   locative 275  
 deixis, in choral lyric 294  
 Demeter 294–5  
   *see also* Mother of the Gods  
 Democritus 48, 326  
 demonstrative pronoun, used as a vocative 283  
*deus ex machina* 340, 345  
 Dike 254  
 Dio Chrysostom 20  
 Diogenes of Apollonia 256  
 Dionysus 295, 300, 308  
   *see also* syncretism  
 Dioscuri 14, 15, 143, 163, 175, 222, 317, 326, 342  
 distichomythia 209, 258  
 dithyramb 31, 71  
 ‘dithyrambic’ odes 40, 42, 293  
   *see also* New Music  
  
 dochmiac 38, 216  
*dolos* 259  
 Doolittle, Hilda [*aka* H. D.] 81–2  
 Doric forms 162  
 dowry 248  
 dreams 284  
  
 Egypt(ians) 29–30, 55–61, 243, 286  
*eisodoi* 31–2  
*ekkyklēma* 31  
 Eleusinian Mysteries 303, 304  
 ellipse 209, 222, 238, 249, 288, 329, 336, 341  
*embolima* 40, 266, 293  
 Empedocles 256, 326  
 enjambment 150  
 Ennius 75  
 Epicharmus 162  
 Erichthonius 57  
 escape 4, 36–8, 68, 324  
 etymology 147, 344  
 Eupolis 16  
 Euripides  
   career 2–3  
   life 2  
   *Alekestis* 152, 205, 346  
   *Aemene* 75, 272  
   *Alexandros* 17, 151  
   *Andromache* 2, 30, 333, 346  
   *Andromeda* 4, 29, 31, 37, 74, 82, 143, 172, 224, 235, 322, 340  
   *Antiope* 339  
   *Archelaus* 2  
   *Auge* 37  
   *Bacchae* 6, 51, 155, 336, 346  
   *Bellerophon* 340  
   *Busiris* 29  
   *Children of Heracles* 8, 30  
   *Cresphontes* 260  
   *Cretan Women* 195  
   *Cyclops* 3, 165, 241  
   *Electra* 25, 34, 63, 208, 237, 333  
   *Erechtheus* 340, 342  
   *Hecuba* 177, 273, 336  
   *Heracles* 30, 42, 45, 64, 65, 215, 286, 304, 333  
   *Hippolytus* 28  
   *Hypsipyle* 216  
   *Ion* 30, 42, 66, 69, 208, 216, 237, 244, 273  
   *Iphigenia at Aulis* 273  
   *Iphigenia in Taurus* 17, 26, 69, 74, 144, 174, 175, 194, 207, 216, 227, 237, 243, 244, 257, 260, 283, 286, 291, 310, 312, 320, 339, 346  
   *Medea* 52, 337, 346

- Orestes* 6–7, 17, 25, 38, 64, 71, 72, 148, 263, 339, 346  
*Palamedes* 234  
*Phaethon* 78  
*Phoenician Women* 249, 281, 346  
 [*Rhesus*] 3, 40, 71, 73, 150, 153, 205, 336  
*Suppliant Women* 6, 7, 8, 30, 47, 240, 249  
*Telephus* 262  
*Trojan Women* 6, 8, 17, 150, 162, 183, 226, 256, 291  
 fr. 369 K 6
- fate 342  
*figura etymologica* 236, 316  
 focalization 328, 335
- gender 49–55  
 genitive  
   absolute 155, 212, 224, 242, 339  
   double 175  
   of cause 159, 175  
   of respect 184  
   of separation 153, 200, 206, 224  
   partitive 161  
 genre 66–72  
   rise-and-fall model 72  
 Giraudoux, Jean 80  
 gods 61–6  
   anger of 307  
   τιμή of 62  
   unknowability of 228, 276–8  
   *see also* prophecy; *deus ex machina*
- Goethe 77–8  
 Gorgias 28, 46, 234  
 Grahn, Judy 72  
 Greek *versus* barbarian 57–61
- hanging 163, 183  
*hapax legomena* 44  
   *see also* vocabulary
- Heath-Stubbs, John 81  
 Hecataeus 24, 56, 144, 343  
 Helen  
   and her εἰδωλον/phantom double 17, 20–1, 22–3, 24, 26, 47, 62, 63, 151, 213, 215  
   as ἀρχή κακῶν 16  
   as recipient of cult 14–16  
   born from an egg 148, 180  
   Eur.'s transformation of her myth 24–8  
   her beauty 150, 180, 310  
   her sense of responsibility 11, 28, 64, 154  
   in art 10  
   island of 343  
   offspring of Nemesis 12, 16, 75, 148  
   Pandora-like 12, 21, 51  
   Penelope-like 28, 51, 77  
   quasi-parthenaic status 144, 150, 156, 158, 173, 178, 193, 295, 301, 306, 307, 309, 310, 323  
   transformation in post-Euripidean art 72–82
- Helen*  
   as *nostos* or return-story 27–8  
   as 'tragicomedy' 9, 66–72, 199  
   Athenian context of 4–9  
   date 4  
   doubling 48  
   reception 72–82  
*Helen*, of Diogenes 73  
*Helen*, of Theodectas 73  
 Hellenistic 24, 150  
 hendiadys 272  
 Heraclitus 47, 212, 232, 256, 278, 279  
 hero-cult 36, 64, 156, 209  
   *see also* apotheosis  
 Herodotus 10, 15, 22–4, 56, 57, 58, 288  
 heroic inversion 7, 8, 53, 54, 67  
 Hesiod  
   *Theogony* 12  
   *Works and Days* 6, 12  
 [Hesiod]  
   *Catalogue of Women* 12  
 Hildesheimer, Wolfgang 80  
 Hofmannsthal, Hugo von 78  
 Homer  
   *Iliad* 10–11, 20, 23, 47, 65, 154, 226, 232, 244, 275  
   *Odyssey* 6, 11–12, 14, 23, 25, 27–8, 48, 56, 69, 207, 238, 260, 344  
 hoplite combat 252, 311  
 Horace 76, 148, 164  
 Hyacinthia 323  
*hymenaios* 229, 315, 342  
 hypallage 224  
 hyperbaton 148, 152, 190, 227, 229  
 hypothesis 142–3
- Ibycus 13  
 imagery 43, 264, 272, 293, 321  
 infinitive  
   articlar 232  
   epexegetic 339  
 Ion of Chios 16  
 Isocrates 9, 15, 28, 57
- Judgement of Paris 149, 150
- Kore 299  
   *see also* Persephone

- lamentation 192  
*see also* weeping
- language 38–45, 258  
*see also* colloquialisms; imagery; style;  
 vocabulary
- Lavallin, J. P. 81
- Leda 148, 149, 163
- Lemaitre, Jules 78
- Leucippides 322
- litotes 148, 154, 181, 204, 208, 222, 240,  
 314
- Little Iliad* 17, 160
- Lucian 76
- Lycophron 75
- Macpherson, Jay 80
- Mandelstam, Osip 80
- Marlowe, Christopher 78
- Martello, Pier Jacopo 77
- Marial 75
- masculinity 50
- Melos 62
- Menander 74
- Menelaus  
 and Odysseus 202  
 costume of 311  
 mini-Trojan war of 243, 336  
*nostos* of 234, 275  
 pomposity of 195, 200  
*see also* ragged heroes
- messenger-scenes 328  
 parody of 337
- metaphor 258, 277, 316, 334,  
 343
- 'metatheatre' 260
- metonymy 198, 211, 255, 273
- metre, affect of 38  
*see also* dochmiac
- metrical criteria, in dating Eur.'s plays 3
- Middle Comedy 74
- monody 39, 42, 69, 71, 166, 177, 191
- Mother of the Gods 40, 294–5, 305, 308  
*see also* Cybele; syncretism
- Muses 304
- music 84  
*see also* New Music
- Naevis 75
- Nauplius 274  
*see also* Palamedes
- Nausicaa 27, 199
- New Comedy 74
- New Music 41, 71, 186, 293
- nightingale 271
- Nile 144–5, 201
- nominative  
 exclamatory 190  
 used in address 313
- nomos*, invented 289
- Nostoi* 196
- nymphs, sexually vulnerable 174
- oaths 240
- Offenbach, Jacques 78
- optative, exclamatory 240
- oracles 164  
*see also* prophecy
- 'orientalizing revolution' 56
- orkhēstra* 31
- Ovid 51, 75, 150, 272
- oxymoron 163, 176, 192, 222, 339
- pacan 172
- Palamedes 234, 274
- pannychis* 309
- papyrus 84, 216
- Parmenides 47
- Penelope 11, 54, 311
- pentecoster 314, 330
- Persephone 14  
 name of 299
- Persians 9, 58
- Pindar 21, 25, 64, 152, 160, 175, 342
- Plato 5, 8, 41, 57, 72, 148
- Plautus 75
- pleonasm 161, 247, 248, 341
- plural  
 generalizing 283  
 poetic 339
- polar expressions 276
- pollution 252, 290, 315
- polyptoton 165, 172, 234, 243, 252, 281
- Porson's law 338
- prayer, to Hades 251
- present  
 conative 280, 304  
 historic 146, 150, 329, 335
- Presocratics 46
- Prodicus 203
- propemptikon* 320
- prophecy 155, 231–2
- Protagoras 48, 163
- Proteus 59, 145
- ragged heroes 197, 262, 291, 331
- 'realism' 45
- recognition 36–7, 182, 207, 223,  
 259
- resolutions, in iambic trimeter 3
- rhyme 175, 190

- Riding, Laura 81  
 Ronsard, Pierre de 76-7
- sacrifice  
 disruption of 307  
 human 191  
 on board a ship 333
- Salamis (in Cyprus) 164  
 Sappho 13, 148, 300, 304  
*saut du même au même* 292  
*schemata Pindaricum* 308  
 scholia 68  
 sea 321  
 seashell, omniscient 79  
 Scleris, George 80-1  
 Semonides 12  
 Seneca 75  
 sex, 'unnatural' 59  
 Shakespeare 73  
 Sicilian Expedition 9  
 singular, for plural 221  
 Sirens 171  
*skênographia* 30  
 slavery 59, 229  
 Solon 23  
 song 38-45  
 astrophic 205  
*see also monody*
- Sophists 46  
 Sophocles 1, 2, 5, 16, 36, 39, 44, 66, 70, 293  
*Ajax* 205  
*Andromeda* 4  
*Antigone* 40, 54, 60, 294, 337  
*Electra* 47, 207, 216, 259, 260  
*Oedipus at Colonus* 8, 30, 57  
*Oedipus Tyrannus* 30, 38, 49, 67, 76  
*Philoctetes* 34, 64, 69  
*Tereus* 271  
*Teucer* 159  
*Trachiniae* 36, 65, 333  
*Tyros* 37, 69
- sound effects 242  
 Spartan cult 7  
 speech 38-45  
 Spenser 73  
 stage 31
- Stesichorus 15, 18-22, 81, 327  
 stichomythia 39, 209, 234, 282, 285, 310  
*see also distichomythia*
- Strauss, Richard 78-9  
 style 42, 45  
 gnomic 232, 233, 239, 249  
*see also imagery: language*
- subjunctive, deliberative 238  
 suicide 240  
 supplication 156, 209, 245, 252  
 swimming, inability of barbarians 286  
 syncretism 294-5  
 synecdoche 158, 196, 206, 286  
 synizesis 163, 296
- temporal augment 233, 328  
 Teucer 27, 33, 36, 65, 80  
 Theoclymenus 58-9  
 as hunter 156, 164, 252, 283  
 Theocritus 15  
 Theonoe 58-60  
 purity of 243  
 virginity of 255
- theophoric names 147  
*theoxenia* 342  
 Thucydides 8, 23, 72, 152  
 Timotheus 171, 234, 275, 294  
*tis*-speeches 334  
 tmesis 161, 192, 221, 321  
 trochaic tetrameters 337  
 Trojan War 267-8, 335  
*tyche* ('chance') 63, 228, 277, 278
- Valery, Paul 65  
 Virgil 75, 145, 164, 224, 272, 327  
 vocabulary 43, 44
- weeping 201, 249, 253  
 women, presence in theatre 50
- Xenophanes 327
- Zeus  
 authority of 62  
 plan of 28, 63, 64, 66, 152, 276, 278, 341  
 Zeusis 76

## 2. GREEK WORDS AND AFFIXES

- ἄ 200  
 ἄγαλμα 180  
 ἀγαπάω 248  
 ἀγλάισμα 147
- αἰδῶ 273  
 αἰ Ἀττικαί 52  
 αἰθήρ 212  
 αἰνο- 274

- αίνῳ 288  
 ἄλαστος 303  
 ἄλκαϊος 280  
 ἄλλ' ἢ 203  
 ἀλλ' οὐδέ μὴν 259  
 ἀμιλλάομαι 171  
 ἄν 255  
 ἀναρπαγή 154  
 ἀνάσσω 258  
 ἀνοτοτύζω 192  
 ἀντίλογος 277  
 ἀπαλλάσσω 160  
 ἀποβλέπω 181  
 ἀπολαύω 158  
 ἀπόνους 302  
 ἀποπρό 226, 275  
 ἄρα 201, 215, 229, 330  
 ἄσυλος 156  
 ἀσύνητος 190  
 ἄτάρ 262
- βάξις 176  
 βούλη 314  
 βραβεύειν 253  
 βραβεύς 227
- γάμος 174  
 γεγώς 257  
 γε δὴ 283  
 γοῦν 287
- δαί 289  
 δαίμων 224  
 δεσπότης 284  
 διά 161, 184  
 διογενής 150  
 δῖος 145  
 δίωγμα 191  
 δόκησις 49, 65, 157, 162
- ἕα 158  
 εἰδῶ 147  
 εἰσακόντιζω 334  
 ἐκ 206  
 ἐκ- 195  
 ἐκπίπτω 208  
 ἐκπορθμεύω 283  
 ἐκχορεύω 194  
 ἐλελίζω 272  
 ἐπ' ἀκμῆς 246  
 ἔς 246  
 εὐνή 149  
 ἔχω 227
- ἦ 156  
 ἡμίθεοι 24, 64  
 ἦν 253
- θάλαμος 280  
 Θεοκλύμενος 146
- ἰσονομία 47
- καὶ δὴ 261  
 καὶ μὴν 184, 259  
 καινός 67  
 καὶ πρὸς 161  
 καιρός 262  
 κατὰ 224  
 κευθμών 149  
 κλέος 241  
 κοινῇ 239  
 κόσμος 261
- λευκός 303
- μέγεθος 44  
 μίμημα 244  
 μονόκωπος 275  
 μῶν 285  
 μῶρος 257
- νεοσσός 180  
 νοῦς 256
- ξουθός 272
- οἴσθ' ὃ 184  
 ὀλόμενος 177  
 ὄνομα 46, 48  
 ὄσος 158  
 οὐ μὴν 211  
 οὐ μόλις 190  
 οὐ που 163
- πελανός 303  
 περᾶν 302  
 πόντια 263  
 πρίν 185  
 προ- 190  
 προξενέω 164  
 πρὸς 250  
 πῶς 228
- σατίνη 300  
 σαφής 148, 212  
 σεμνότης 44

σοφός 241  
σύννομος 325  
σῶμα 46, 48  
σωφροσύνη 55

τάλαινα 177  
τετραβάμων 193  
τύραννος 236

ὑπαγκάλισμα 178

φόνιος 281

χλωρός 284

ὡς 151, 329  
ὥστε 161