EURIPIDES, HERACLES 185-6

τῶι τοῦ Διὸς μὲν Ζεὺς ἀμυνέτω μέφει παιδός· τὸ δ' εἰς ἔμ', 'Ηφάκλεις, ἐμοὶ μέλει λόγοισι τὴν τοῦδ' ἀμαθίαν ὑπὲφ σέθεν δεῖξαι· κακῶς γάφ σ' οὐκ ἐατέον κλύειν.	170
τὴν σὴν νομίζω δειλίαν, Ἡράκλεες)	175
Διὸς κεραυνὸν ἠρόμην τέθριππά τε ἐν οἶς βεβηκὼς τοῖσι γῆς βλαστήμασιν	
τὸν καλλίνικον μετὰ θεῶν ἐκώμασεν·	180
Φολόην ἐπελθών, ὧ κάκιστε βασιλέων, ἐροῦ τίν' ἄνδρ' ἄριστον ἐγκρίνειαν ἄν· ἢ οὐ παΐδα τὸν ἐμόν, δν σὸ φὴις εἶναι δοκεῖν; Δίρφυν τ' ἐρωτῶν ἥ σ' ἔθρεψ' 'Αβαντίδα, οὐκ ἄν (σ') ἐπαινέσειεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπου	185
	παιδός· τὸ δ΄ εἰς ἔμ', 'Ἡράκλεις, ἐμοὶ μέλει λόγοισι τὴν τοῦδ' ἀμαθίαν ὑπὲρ σέθεν δεῖξαι· κακῶς γάρ σ΄ οὐκ ἐατέον κλύειν. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τἄρρητ' (ἐν ἀρφήτοισι γὰρ τὴν σὴν νομίζω δειλίαν, 'Ἡράκλεες) σὺν μάρτυσιν θεοῖς δεῖ μ' ἀπαλλάξαι σέθεν. Διὸς κεραυνὸν ἡρόμην τέθριππά τε ἐν οἰς βεβηκὼς τοῖσι γῆς βλαστήμασιν Γίγασι πλευροῖς πτήν' ἐναρμόσας βέλη τὸν καλλίνικον μετὰ θεῶν ἐκώμασεν· τετρασκελές θ' ὕροισμα, Κενταύρων γένος, Φολόην ἐπελθών, ἀ κάκιστε βασιλέων, ἐροῦ τίν' ἀνδρ' ἄριστον ἐγκρίνειαν ἄν· ἢ οὐ παίδα τὸν ἐμόν, δν σὸ φὴις εἶναι δοκεῖν; Δίρφυν τ' ἐρωτῶν ἡ σ' ἔθρεψ' 'Αβαντίδα,

Anacolutha may well be 'the stuff of natural speech'l), but one may feel a certain reluctance to adduce the phenomenon as a justification of the text of L (vv. 185–6) in so carefully structured a piece as Amphitryon's cleverly wrought reply to Lykos (vv. 170 ff.)²). I wish to argue that, with a minimum of alteration to the text, sense and syntax can be restored and the thrust of the argument maintained.

Amphitryon begins his rebuttal (170–1) with a casual comment on Lykos' accusation about Herakles' parentage (v. 149): Zeus can deal with that himself. His concern (ἐμοὶ μέλει) is to remove the unspeakable slur on Herakles' character, viz. that Herakles is a coward (171 ff.). This he does in some dozen lines of argumentation, which begin with divine witnesses (σὺν μάρτυσιν θεσίς, 176) to Herakles' bravery and end with Lykos' own country implicitly called as witness (μάρτυσα,

¹⁾ So Barrett on Hipp. 23, cited by Bond in his commentary on *Heracles* (Oxford, 1981) at v. 185 f.

²⁾ I do not dispute the fact that many examples of anacoluthon of similar form can be cited (see, for example, J. Diggle, Studies on the Text of Euripides [Oxford, 1981] 107). My point is that Amphitryon here chooses his words much too carefully to allow us to suspect him guilty of *inadvertently* going astray in his argument.

188 Miszellen

187) to Lykos' own lack of brave exploits $(\mathring{c}\sigma\vartheta\lambda\acute{o}v\,\iota\iota)^3$). 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 ἐπελθών (182) and perhaps also from the loss of σέ, which is required for both metre and sense, in 1864). Altering the participle to the accusative⁵), however, would remove any need to postulate an anacoluthon: so

Δίρφυν τ' ἐρωτῶνθ' ἤ σ' ἔθρεψ' 'Αβαντίδα,

and reading οὖν ἄν 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 ἄνδο' ἄριστον), it would not mention⁷) you 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, ὧ κάκιστε βασιλέων, and 208, αὐτὸς ὧν 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, ιστ' ἀτλαντικών πέραν φεύγειν δοων αν δειλίαι τοὐμὸν 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 ἄν), 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.