

187) to Lykos' own lack of brave exploits (ἔσθλόν τι³). Thus not only is the charge of cowardice against Herakles refuted, but the suggestion is insinuated that it is Lykos himself who should rather be branded as a coward.

At v. 185 L offers the 'hanging' nominative ἐρωτῶν, though clearly the subject of ἐπαινέσειεν (186) must be Dirphys. No doubt the error stems from the preceding nominative participle ἐπελθῶν (182) and perhaps also from the loss of σέ, which is required for both metre and sense, in 186⁴). Altering the participle to the *accusative*⁵), however, would remove any need to postulate an anacoluthon: so

Δίρφυν τ' ἐρωτῶνθ' ἢ σ' ἔθρεψ' Ἀβαντίδα,

and reading οὐκ ἂν σέ γ' αἰνέσειεν⁶) will restore the necessary emphasis: 'and if you were to ask Abantian Dirphys, which reared you (sc. whom it would select as the ἄνδρ' ἄριστον), it would not mention⁷) γοι at any rate; for never could you get your own country to testify to some brave deed of yours'.

Although the speech is essentially a defence of his son Herakles, Amphitryon lets no opportunity pass to hit at *Lykos'* cowardice. Thus, apart from the lines considered above, Lykos is twice addressed as κακός – 182, ὃ κάκιστε βασιλέων, and 208, αὐτὸς ὦν κακός – in contexts which clearly allude at least as much to his δειλία as to his general baseness and ignobility as an upstart incomer from Euboea. Indeed, in the latter case, where Amphitryon has been forced to concede that it is wise (σοφόν, 207) of Lykos to wish to get rid of Herakles' sons, he specifically – and ironically – attributes this desire to cowardice (δειλίας, 210) rather than the εὐλάβεια which Lykos has pleaded above (166). Likewise, in the very last line of his speech, Amphitryon drives home his point, viz. that the charge of cowardice should be transferred from Herakles to Lykos, by wishful thinking about how he would have dealt with Lykos had he but the strength, ὥστ' Ἀτλαντικῶν πέραν φεύγειν ὄρων ἂν δειλῆαι τοῦμόν δόρυ (234–5).

We see then that the aged Amphitryon does not lose his way through an unfortunate choice of witnesses. On the contrary, he neatly (and unobtrusively) appends to his citation of evidence in favour of Herakles 'evidence' which, if solicited, would show Lykos as a coward in the eyes of his own countrymen. This is clever pleading, not senile bumbling which has left its speaker at a loss for words.

Monash University, Australia

Alan S. Henry

3) For the language cf. Theokritos 16.14–15: ἐπ' ἔργμασιν . . . ἐσθλοῖς αἰνεῖσθαι.

4) The same omission of the pronoun occurs at v. 1254 (also after οὐκ ἂν), as well as at Hel. 1045 (see Kannicht ad loc.).

5) Since arriving at this solution, I have discovered that this emendation was first suggested by Reiske in the eighteenth century.

6) With Wilamowitz. L has οὐκ ἂν ἐπαινέσειεν with γ' suprascript.

7) This translation of αἰνεῖν seems demanded here (despite the strictures of Fraenkel on Agam. 1482 [q. v.] or Cunningham on Herodas 4.47). However, even if one insists upon the translation 'commend', that will not greatly alter the sense of the passage.