

whom the Demos elects, two from the whole body of the citizens, one from the Eumolpidae, and one from the Kerykes". It is a carefully contrived arrangement; but for the Epidauria it is wholly set aside. A quite different official, the Arkhon, is put in charge. The reason may not be solely because it was a late creation, nor because the Arkhon marshalled other processions as well, but rather because for the Mystai it was an unlucky day; at least, they stayed indoors. Unlucky or not, the day of the Epidauria gave them a rest in preparation for the ensuing strenuous days of the Mysteries. The relatively new festival was meant to be distinct, and giving it to the Arkhon helped to emphasize this.

Boston College

Sterling Dow

ON THE FIRST VERSE OF EURIPIDES'
ELEKTRA

*Dedicated to A Turyn on the
occasion of his 70th birthday.*

My dear Turyn,

I take this opportunity to wish you πάντα καλά and to iterate the profession of my indebtedness to you. We share a concern with Euripides; it therefore seems proper on this occasion to offer you a few lines about him.

Step by step, and largely through your immense labours, we have gained some clarity about the extant evidence for his plays – its kind, value and shortcomings; and we know that, without a well-founded notion of the history of his text, any approach to his poetry is liable to miss the mark. I am not now, of course, speaking of those who, for the benefit of the Greekless crowd, translate corrupt texts as fluently as sound ones, but of those who are concerned to grasp the real word of the real poet. They will, I feel sure, before long be provided, by students younger than you and I, with the full evidence for the Byzantine triad; for the rest of the plays with scholia, the same has already been achieved or, at any rate, is within our grasp. And, finally, concerning the 'alphabetic plays', we know that the slender evidence is basically authoritative but beset with numberless cor-

ruption small and great (he who will not believe his eyes may consider the ancient citations listed e.g. by Wilamowitz on pp. 218f of his *Einleitung* or, now, the papyrus of *Helena*). Once you really know what the transmitted wording is, you will be in a position to evaluate, and deal with, problematical detail. This would be the purpose of a new and truly critical edition or, perhaps, of a long critical hypomnema. Within the present limited frame, may I invite you to glance with me at one small but symptomatic instance; namely, the first verse of the *Elektra*?

There can be no doubt about its transmitted wording. Fol. 192r of cod. Laur. 32. 2 (top) reads

† εὐριπίδου ἡλέκτρα †

† αὐτοῦργος:

ὦ γῆς παλαιὸν ἄργος · ἰνάχου ῥοαί ·

and P (Flor. Conv. soppr. 172, fol. 28r) copies this faithfully (though dropping the colon after ἄργος). In this form, then, the verse stood in the one manuscript on which Triclinius was able to lay hands about A.D. 1315; thus it was printed by P. Victorius in 1545 and by many – or all? – editors after him; yet with certain differences. Wecklein, for example, under his text quotes three conjectures and, in his Appendix, nine printed lines' worth of further suggestions, from Musgrave's down to H. Weil's and G. Vitelli's. G. Murray in his app. crit. mentions three of them and, besides, offers a justification of the transmitted wording or, rather, letters. Nearest to our own time, finally, L. Parmentier admits no need for either conjectures or justification; he prints the verse as it stands in LP, and he translates it.

Is this the measure of our progress, that we can understand, without effort, a wording which perplexed a Musgrave, a Reiske, a Kirchhoff *et hoc genus omne*? The translation will show. "Terre antique d'Argos": this is the rendering of ὦ γῆς παλαιὸν ἄργος ("terre antique": γῆς παλαιόν!); the rendering, not by one of the cheapjacks just mentioned, but by the authority who did the *Elektra* (and many other things) for the Collection Budé. Dare we correct him? Dare we say (what, of course, was not unknown to Professor Parmentier) that the cited words mean: "O ancient Argos of the earth?" It is small wonder that he preferred to hush it up; for this rendering may be ever so correct, but it makes no sense. And worse is to come; for this "ancient Argos" is immediately described as "the flowing river Inachos"; but whether "Argos" is supposed to denote the city, or the country, it is hard

to see how it could be equated with the river; and yet: that is what the text indicates. Its puzzles are not eliminated by incorrect translation.

In fact, Argos – whether town or river – could not have been mentioned in this verse at all, for “this Argos” comes in v. 6. There, it indicates the scene of the play, in accordance with Euripides’ ‘almost invariable praxis’ (Barrett on *Hippol.* 12), and this formal indication could not, without any reference, have been anticipated five verses earlier. It is useless, in justification to point to the totally different style of Herodotus (as Denniston does); besides, Herodotus in cases of ‘repetition’ (of the kind quoted by Denniston) does recall the earlier mention by adding a demonstrative pronoun; not so Euripides in the passage under discussion. G. Murray appreciated this difficulty and sought to overcome it by a device which appealed also to Denniston, who commented: “ἄργος, with a small *a*, is, I think, sound.”

The admirable sensitivity of Greek audiences! There they sit in the theatre awaiting the first performance of a new play. They know that it will center on Elektra, the princess of Argos; they hear the word ‘Argos’ in the opening line; and they are quick to realize that Argos, the home of Agamemnon and his daughter, is not meant (but something different of which, as we shall presently see, they had never heard). Five lines later, though, when hearing the same sound a-r-g-o-s, it is (according to Denniston *ad* v. 6) “clearly felt as a proper name”, i. e. this time it is acknowledged as denoting the home of the Atridae.

It could not denote anything else in the first verse either – if indeed it did occur there. We may perhaps grant Denniston that “the word (ἄργος) originally means plain”; but the audience of Euripides did not know that. Our knowledge on this point comes from Strabo, who says (viii. 372) that the *νεώτεροι*, i. e. Hellenistic poets, used the word ἄργος with this connotation; he stresses that this usage does not occur in Homer (whose use of the name Argos is otherwise so wide), and indeed we only know it from Kallimachos and one other Hellenistic poet (see Pfeiffer *ad* Callim. fr. 299). Strabo adds that the noun is supposed to be Macedonian or Thessalian; Stephanos Byz. (followed by Eustathios) specifies the meaning (“almost any plain by the sea”) but otherwise gives no more. At any rate, the word is not Homeric and not Attic and it did not occur with the great lyric poets – this follows from Strabo’s statement and is confirmed by the (negative) evidence –; it therefore could not have been used be-

fore an Athenian fifth century audience; and least of all in the opening line of an Argive play.

But suppose the impossible to have happened: we should be faced with the same dilemma as before. How could the 'old plain' have been equated with the river Inachos? (The two could not have been connected by 'and': Camper's conjectures – see Wecklein – are sufficient to show this much.) Denniston indeed asserts that the 'apposition' (i.e. the addition, unconnected, to the word 'plain') of the streams which water the plain is easy, but the stubborn fact remains that a plain *is* not a river; he also asserts that γῆς means 'of our land' and that "'our' is easily supplied from the context". C.H. Keene had, long ago, described this as "a very bold ellipse"; in fact, there is no 'context' to explain the very first word of the play. Unaided and unqualified, it can only mean 'earth'; and what *is* that 'old plain of the earth' which *is* also the river Inachos?

It has, I suspect, become clear that (a) 'Argos' is indeed transmitted and could only be intended as the proper name, and (b) it cannot be original. Our result is anything but new. H. Weil, a century ago, observed (*ad loc.*): "Les mots ὃ γῆς παλαιὸν Ἀργὸς sont certainement altérés, quoiqu'en disent Seidler et Matthiae", and Musgrave had perceived this another hundred years earlier. The fault does not appear to be a scribal slip – the conjectures based on this supposition, ἄγγος, ἄγκιος, ἄργος, ἄλσος, ἄνθος, are its sufficient refutation –; rather, it was a gloss. This too was noted by Weil ("la glose Ἀργὸς a expulsé un autre mot") and, at greater length, by Keene. The original text, then, must have contained a word which (a) could reasonably be glossed by Ἀργὸς and (b) would fit the context and, in particular, could be defined, or specified, by Ἰνάχου ῥοαί; and this word need not have looked, or sounded, similar to the gloss.

Among the many suggestions that have been made, Kirchhoff's γάνος bears the mark of his thorough perception of the Euripidean style (cf. esp. *Suppl.* 1150 and *Hel.* 462); but although it fulfills our second requirement, it hardly satisfies the first; and it has the further weakness of necessitating a change of the transmitted order of the words (ὃ γῆς γάνος παλ.). Vitelli's proposal ἔρκος likewise is in the true Euripidean style (cf. esp. *Held.* 441), but it does not perfectly suit the context, seeing that the Inachos does not by any means 'gird' the Argive land but flows through the middle of it. The same objection applies to the similar suggestions ῥεῖον (Rauchenstein) and ὀρίσματ(α) (Wecklein); still

others (see Wecklein's Appendix) are unsatisfactory for other, obvious reasons. Denniston thus seems justified, at least, in observing that "none of the suggested emendations is attractive", and if I venture to propose still another one, I do not flatter myself that it could escape similar censure. However, a text is not proved sound by people making bad conjectures on it.

The second verse states that, from the place indicated in the first, Agamemnon set out for Troy. That place, generally speaking, was Argos; it was here indicated in a way which suited its description, immediately afterwards, as 'stream of Inachos'. It might seem not unreasonable to assume that the river itself was described as providing, for Argos, the harbour, or roadstead, from which Agamemnon's journey started; and indeed, where else could he have embarked – seeing that the subjection of Nauplia was, at the time, a matter of the distant future? Recalling *Hec.* 450 Δωρίδος ὄρμον αἴας, we may present ὄρμος as a competitor for the place occupied by the gloss Ἄργος. The roadstead formed by *priscus Inachus* – perhaps the place of the later Temenion – well deserved the epithet 'ancient'; no more so, though, than the Argive land itself (cf. schol. *Soph. El.* 4), and this land could have been intimated by the adjective 'ancient' referring, rather, to it.

If, then, as an alternative to other suggestions, we beg to consider reading

ᾠ γῆς παλαιᾶς ὄρμος, Ἰνάχων ῥοαί,

we may refer to the analogy of Eur. *Suppl.* 658 παλαιᾶς Κεκροπίας οἰκήτορες and *Andr.* 1265 παλαιᾶς χοιράδος κοιλὸν μυχόν; still basing ourselves on the assumption that the two syllables of Ἄργος have ousted two original syllables. It is however perfectly possible, and perhaps even probable, that the whole phrase παλαιὸν Ἄργος was taken over from Sophokles' *Elektra* v. 4; be it for explanation or as a parallel. It thus could have ousted five original syllables. If this is so, our chances of recovering the original wording shrink to a minimum – until, with luck, a papyrus brings enlightenment. This much however ought to be admitted: what we read in LP is not the original form of the first verse of Euripides' *Elektra*.

The few lines which I proposed to write to you have grown into pages, quite out of proportion with the slight subject. Perhaps, though, you have of late been reminded, as I have been, of the words of a certain classical scholar of the last century ... let me quote a few of them, in conclusion: "Wozu Griechen? wozu

Römer? – Alle Voraussetzungen zu einer gelehrten Cultur, alle wissenschaftlichen Methoden waren bereits da; man hatte die große, die unvergleichliche Kunst, gut zu lesen, bereits festgestellt – diese Voraussetzung zur Tradition der Cultur...”

Our illustrious colleague was referring to the end of Antiquity. Perhaps, though, his words have some contemporary applicability? And, perhaps, we are beholden, in our little way, to resist the trend which they describe?

Buxton

Yours ever
Günther Zuntz

PHRYNICHOS UND DIE RÜCKBERUFUNG DES ALKIBIADES*

Die bei Thukydides 8, 50–51 geschilderten etwas fragwürdig erscheinenden Versuche des athenischen Strategen Phrynichos, die Rückberufung des Alkibiades zur athenischen Flotte in Samos zu verhindern, sind in letzter Zeit mehrfach behandelt worden. Ohne Zweifel gebührt dabei dem Aufsatz von H.D. Westlake¹⁾ das Verdienst, das Tatsächliche dieser zwielichtigen Affäre endgültig geklärt zu haben: die beiden scheinbar landesverräterischen Briefe des Phrynichos an den spartanischen Nauarchen Astyochos waren bewußt geplante Scheinmanöver mit der Absicht, die in Phrynichos' Augen für Athen gefährliche Rückkehr des Alkibiades zu hintertreiben.

Westlake ist allerdings der Ansicht, daß der Bericht des Thukydides äußerst unklar formuliert sei und daß, was der Scharfsinn des kritischen Historikers heute eruiere, eigentlich fast Thukydides zum Trotz gewonnen werde.

Die beiden anderen Arbeiten, die sich mit der Episode befassen, E. Delebecques Buch „Thucydide et Alcibiade“²⁾ und

*) Aus der ungedruckten Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von K. Deichgräber, Göttingen 1968.

1) Phrynichos and Astyochos (Thucydides VIII 50–1), JHS 76, 1956, 99–104.

2) Publications des Annales de la Faculté des Lettres, Aix-en-Provence, Nouvelle Série 49, 1965, 86–89.