

## NOTES ON EURIPIDES, *HYPSIPYLE* <sup>1</sup>

### I

Fr. I. iii. 9-11 (p. 27 Bond, 63 Cockle)<sup>2</sup>

Ἄσιάδ' ἔλεγον ἰήιον  
Θρηῆις ἔβόα κίθαρις Ὀρφέως  
μακροπόλων πιτύλων κτλ.

9 Ἄσιάδ' Beazley: ἄσιᾶς Π

ἔλεγον Wilamowitz: ἐλεγεν Π

The choral lyrics at Fr. I. ii. 15ff. and Fr. I. iii. 18ff. are in responsion, as parts of a strophe and an antistrophe. It is generally assumed that the lyrics of Hypsipyle, at Fr. I. ii. 1-14 and Fr. I. iii. 1-17, which precede these choral lyrics, are also in responsion. It follows, from this assumption, that Fr. I. iii. 9 (cited above) responds with fr. I. ii. 8 ἰδοὺ κτύπος ὄδε κορτάλων (Maas: κροτάλων Π)<sup>3</sup>, and Fr. I. iii. 11-17 with Fr. I. ii. 9-14, and that Fr. I. iii. 10 originally responded with the line which was apparently omitted after Fr. I. ii. 8, where the corrector signals the omission (and the addition, no longer extant, in the upper margin) by the note αν(ω) after κροτάλων.

But nobody has yet succeeded in demonstrating how the earlier parts of Hypsipyle's lyrics (Fr. I. ii. 1-7 and Fr. I. iii. 1-8) can be brought into satisfactory responsion with each other. Bond's commentary does not conceal the difficulties. K. Itsumi («CQ» XXXIV [1984] 74) and H.J. Buijs («Mnemosyne» XXXVIII [1985] 84-5) show why Bond's text will not do. Buijs even prefers to look for antistrophic responsion not between Fr. I. ii. 1-14 and Fr. I. iii. 1-17 but between Fr. I. iii. 1-17 and Fr. I. iv. 1-9. He rightly observes that Fr. I. iii. 6-7 (τὸν ἄ τοῦ ποταμοῦ παρῑθένοσ Αἴγιν' ἐτέκνωσεν), which everyone changes to anomalous

---

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Dr Sir Charles Willink for helpful discussion of metrical issues.

<sup>2</sup> G.W. Bond, *Euripides, Hypsipyle* (Oxford 1963), W.E.H. Cockle, *Euripides, Hypsipyle, Text and Annotation based on a Re-examination of the Papyri* (Roma 1987).

<sup>3</sup> Iambic dimeters (Bond), not resolved glyconics (A.M. Dale, «JHS» LXXXIV [1964] 167), since there is no secure example of a resolved first long in the choriamb of Euripidean aeolo-choriambics (see *Euripidea: Collected Essays* [1994] 470-1).

aeolo-choriambics, are (in the transmitted text and colometry) impeccable ionics, comparable to Fr. I. iv. 2-4 (κυνᾶγόν τε Πρόκριν τὰν πόσις ἔκτα | κατεθρήνησεν ᾠοιδᾶς[]). But, as he admits, the rest of Fr. I. iv. 1-9 will not square with Fr. I. iii. 1-17, unless we assume that the scribe has accidentally omitted several metra in Fr. I. iv.

We should abandon the search for strophic responsion in what survives of Hypsipyle's lyrics. Her lyrics appear to have been an astrophic monody, divided into at least three parts by the lyrics of the chorus. Furthermore (as Sir Charles Willink has observed to me) we should abandon the belief that Fr. I. ii. 15ff. are the *opening* words of the chorus. These lines contain (as he puts it) 'not a hint of self-address'. The chorus will have entered before Hypsipyle begins her song. The traditional arrangement, which has the chorus enter during the middle of a strophic structure, is unparalleled<sup>4</sup>.

What, now, is the metre of Fr. I. iii. 10, quoted above? Even those who assume responsion between Hypsipyle's lyrics in Fr. ii and Fr. iii get no help from the assumed strophe, because (as I said at the beginning) the scribe appears to have omitted a line, the very line which must be assumed to have been in responsion with Fr. I. iii. 10. Bond (p. 62) analyses line 10 as '- ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ ∪ - - glyc.<sup>1</sup>', by which he presumably means the same length which A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (1968<sup>2</sup>) 216, calls 'choriambic dimeter A', whose normal shape is - ∪ ∪ - ∪ - ∪ -. In fact this length cannot properly be called either a glyconic or a choriambic dimeter, as emerges clearly from the discussion of these two cola by K. Itsumi («CQ» XXXII [1982] 59-74, XXXIV [1984] 66-82). It ought properly to be described as choriamb + iambic metron. Furthermore, '- ∪ ∪ - | ∪ - ∪ - has only a handful of examples as far as I know' (Itsumi [1984] 80). Here are some examples: *Alc.* 88 ~ 100<sup>5</sup>, *Hclid.* 910 ~ 919, *Ion* 506, *Ba.* 109 ~ 124, 573 (with Ferrari's conjecture), *Rh.* 361 ~ 371<sup>6</sup>. Occasionally this sequence has an iambic metron prefixed: *El.* 181-2 ~ 204-5 (Itsumi [1982] 66), *Or.* 811 ~ 823 (Itsumi 67), *Rh.* 243 ~ 254. And ∪ - ∪ - follows a choriambic dimeter at *IA* 794. But cola such as these, with an iambic metron after the choriamb, are irrelevant to the interpretation of our line: for ∪ ∪ - - is not an iambic metron.

The sequence ∪ - - - is occasionally found after the choriamb: - | - ∪ ∪ - | ∪ - - - *Alc.* 576 ~ 586, *Hi.* 130 ~ 140, - x | - ∪ ∪ - | ∪ - - - *Med.* 159 ~ 183<sup>7</sup>, *Su.* 957 ~ 965, *IT* 1093 ~ 1110, *Ion* 1060 ~ 1073. For Sophoclean instances see Dale 154-5. In these cases, it is reasonable to treat the final two longs as a spondee

<sup>4</sup> This is observed by O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (1977) 64 n. 1.

<sup>5</sup> But perhaps not *Alc.* 215-16 ~ 228-9 - ∪ ∪ - ∪ - ∪ ∪ | - ∪ ∪ - ∪ - ∪ -, where the two anomalies, (i) *brevis in longo*, (ii) irregular responsion after the choriamb (on which see *Euripidea* 259, 472-3), suggest that a different colometry may be preferable.

<sup>6</sup> I have printed another instance at *Hec* 947, but I now doubt whether I was right to do so.

<sup>7</sup> See n. 8.

added to a conventional colon<sup>8</sup>. The sequence – u u – | u – – – is found twice (in a passage which continues with ionics) at *Ba.* 73-7 ~ 88-93, if we accept either of these analyses: – u u – u – – – | u u – u – – – | u u – u – – – | – u u – u – – – | u u – u – – – | u u – u – – – (so for example Dale 127) or – u u – u – – – | – u u – u – – – | – u u – u – – – | – u u – u – – – | – u u – u – – – (so T.C.W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* [1990] 325)<sup>9</sup>. I have preferred (*OCT*, 1994) the latter analysis. But Sir Charles Willink (who agrees that we should reject the former) observes that the latter is vulnerable to the objection that the sequence – u u – u – – (here four times in synapheia) is elsewhere always followed by word-end. He prefers to analyse as – u u – u – | – – u u – u – | – – u u – u – – – (dodrans | – dodrans [= telesilleian] | – dodrans [= telesilleian] spondee), *bis*, comparing, for the third colon, *Alc.* 576-586.

Neither this last passage (however we choose to analyse it) nor any of the others which I have quoted offers any parallel for the resolution of the antepenultimate long (u ♀ – –) in the sequence – u u – | u – – –, and I judge such a resolution to be unthinkable.

I suggest that we delete Ὀρφέως. Proper names are commonly interpolated (see *Euripidea* 459 n. 79). And this papyrus has interpolations in the text at fr. 20/21. 12 (p. 36 Bond, 87 Cockle) γη ηδε (ηδε del. Π<sup>c</sup>) and fr. 64. 66 (p. 47 Bond = fr. 64. ii. 9 p. 119 Cockle) τέκνα (del. edd. pr.). The colon is now a hemiepes. Hemiepes follows iambic dimeter (as here) at *Tr.* 565-6 and perhaps *Ph.* 1511-12, and follows syncopated iambic dimeter (lekythion) at *Andr.* 136-7 ~ 142-3, *Tr.* 1093-4 ~ 1111-12. Then, since we are no longer looking for responsion between Fr. I. iii. 11-17 and Fr. I. ii. 9-14, we should follow the colometry of the papyrus in 11-17. Line 11 (μακροπόλων πιτύλων) is another hemiepes (cf. perhaps *Ph.* 1513; for a longer series of hemiepeses see *Tr.* 1094-8 ~ 1112-16), and 12-16 are anapaestic, not dactylic. Those who look for responsion between 12-16 and Fr. I. ii. 9-13 are obliged to print four dactylic tetrameters all with most unnatural word-overlaps.

Ὀρφέως was deleted by Adelh. Mette, according to H.J. Mette, «Lustrum» XXIII-XXIV (1981-1982) 274.

<sup>8</sup> See Itsumi (1984) 78-82. If his interpretation of the two final longs as a spondee is accepted, we must abandon belief in irregular responsion at *Med.* 159 ~ 183 – – | – u u – | u – u – («CQ» XXXIII [1983] 346-8 = *Euripidea* 258-60).

<sup>9</sup> I decline to accept the restoration of – u u – | u – – – at *El.* 116 (see *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry ... presented to Sir Denys Page* [1978] 177 n. 38 = *Euripidea* 195 n. 38) and of ♀ u u – | u – – – at *Ba.* 877=897 (*Euripidea* 471).

## II

Fr. 60. 3-6 (p. 40 Bond, 101 Cockle)

(Εὐρ.)	[ c. x ] .. μηδ' ἀναμν[ησ- – ο –	
	. ν . π[...]. γ . [.] ποι παιδί θ' ὄν διώ[λεσας.	
<Υψ.>	οὕτω δοκεῖ μ', ᾧ [π]ότνι', ἀποκτείνε[ιν ο –	5
	ὀργῆι πρὶν ὀρθῶς πρᾶγμα διαμαθε[ῖν τόδε;	

Line 3 is preserved by *P. Petrie* II 49 (c), the beginning of 4 (. ν . π[ ]) by *P. Oxy.* 852, the rest of 4 by *P. Petrie*. The earlier parts of 5-6 are preserved by *P. Petrie*, the later parts by *P. Oxy.*

In the lines which immediately precede<sup>10</sup>, Eurydice tries to cut short the pleas of Hypsipyle. In line 3 she will have told her not to remind her of her sufferings. The noun which I should expect to find linked to ἀναμν[ησ- is κακῶν, as at *Alc.* 1045 μή μ' ἀναμνήσῃσ (LPQ: με μι\*μνήσῃσ B: με μισῃσ O: με μιμνήσκεισ V) κακῶν, and possibly *El.* 504 μων τὰμὰ διὰ χρόνου σ' ἀνέμνησεν κακῶν (ἀνέμνησαν κακά L: see «ICS» II [1977] 115-16 = *Euripidea* 158-9). Similarly *Or.* 1032 ἐσ δάκρυα πορθμεύουσ' ὑπομνήσει (Musgrave: ὑπόμνησιν codd.) κακῶν. In *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (1981) 37 I compared *H. Od.* III 103 ἐπεὶ μ' ἔμνησας οἰζύος, *Men. Sic.* 357-8 ἀνέμνησας πάθους / τὸν ἄθλιόν με, fr. 402 γέροντα δυστυχοῦντα τῶν θ' αὐτοῦ κακῶν / ἐπαγόμενον λήθην ἀνέμνησας πάλιν. Here is further illustration: *Theogn.* 1123 μή με κακῶν μίμνησκε, *S. Ph.* 1169-70 πάλιν πάλιν παλαιὸν ἄλ-ι γημ' ὑπέμνασας, fr. 210. 78-9 Radt π[ολ]λῶν κακῶν / μνήμην παρέξεις τοῖσ . [, *Hdt.* VI 21.2 ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκῆια κακά.

If the line began with an imperative or with a prohibition (μή + present imperative or aorist subjunctive), then it will have continued with μηδ' ἀναμν[ήσῃσ (F. Petersen, «Hermes» XLIX [1914] 157). But it may have begun with οὐ or οὐ μή + future indicative, and then it will have continued with μηδ' ἀναμν[ήσεισ, like<sup>11</sup> *Hi.* 498-9 οὐχὶ συγκλήσεισ στόμα / καὶ μὴ μεθήσεισ ...; 606 οὐ μὴ προσοίσεισ χεῖρα μηδ' ἄψηι πέπλων; , *Hel.* 437-9 οὐκ ἀπαλλάξει δόμων / καὶ μὴ ... / ὄχλον παρέξεισ δεσπόταισ; , *Ba* 343-4 οὐ μὴ προσοίσεισ χεῖρα ... / μηδ' ἐξομόρξει μωρίαν τὴν σὴν ἐμοί; , *S. Ai.* 75 οὐ σῖγ' ἀνέξει μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρῆι; , *OT* 637-8 οὐκ εἶ σὺ τ' οἴκουσ σὺ τε, Κρέον, κατὰ στέγασ / καὶ μὴ τὸ μηδὲν ἄλγοσ ἐσ μέγ' οἴσετε; , *Tr.* 1183 οὐ θᾶσσον οἴσεισ μηδ' ἀπιστήσεισ ἐμοί; , *Ar. Nub.* 296 οὐ μὴ

<sup>10</sup> In Fr. 22. 11 Robert's λ[όγων] (rather, λό[γων]) is certainly right (as against Page's λ[όγοισ]). Then ταῦτα is governed by the phrase ἀντιλάζουσαι λό[γων] (see *Phaethon* 69n, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* [1981] 58). In line 12 Page plausibly supplied καὶ γούνατ' ἀμ]πέχουσα, and the first letter could well be π (the traces are compatible with the right tip of the horizontal and the foot of the right vertical of π).

<sup>11</sup> I ignore the corruptions of the mss. (future commonly corrupted to subjunctive).

κώψει μηδὲ ποήσεις ...; *Ran.* 298-9 οὐ μὴ καλεῖς μ', / ... μηδὲ κατερεῖς τοῦνομα;,  
*Eccl.* 1144-5 οὐκουν ἄπασι δῆτα γενναίως ἐρεῖς / καὶ μὴ παραλείψεις μηδέν'  
 ...; *Pl. Symp.* 175a οὐκουν καλεῖς αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ ἀφήσεις; *Call. fr.* 194. 98-9  
 οὐκ ὦ τάλαινα παυσόμεθα ... μηδ' ἐροῦμεν ...; See Barrett on *Hi.* 212-14.

For the two traces before μηδ' Cockle (p. 135) reports 'of the second, upper part of a vertical'. I have examined *P. Petrie* under the microscope. In fact the larger part of the vertical is visible. Since the vertical shows no sign of curvature, it is likely to represent I or the right vertical of N (not the right vertical of H, M, or Π, which has a prominent curve). The sense would be satisfied by something like οὐκ ἐκποδὼν] εἶ (cf. *Or.* 1161, 1447). That the second verb can stand without an object (με) is suggested by *S. Ph.* 1169-70 and *Hdt.* VI 21.2, both cited above.

In line 4 the first editor of *P. Petrie* (J.P. Mahaffy) read *κοι*, F. Kenyon (ap. Petersen, «Hermes» XLIX [1914] 625) read *ποι*, and Bond and Cockle read *ποι*. But H.J.M. Milne, *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum* (1927) 53, read *μοι*, and *μοι* is certain. Visible are the right leg (compatible with M or Π) and before it the right part of the cross-stroke, which shows a decided dip, incompatible with the horizontal of Π and clearly suggesting the cross-stroke of M. Since *παῖδι θ'* must have been preceded by another dative, *μοι* is that dative.

Before *ποι* (my *μοι*) Cockle reads ] γ. [ ] ('first, trace of a foot; next, a vertical with cross-bar at top – γ most likely, but π, τ or flat-topped ν possible; third, part of foot'). I doubt if the second letter is Γ. The cross-bar projects to the right of the vertical; but there is also a trace projecting to the left. This suggests to me rather T or (the left vertical and the horizontal of) Π. At all events, not N. If the letter was Π, then the space between Π and M (of *μοι*) might have been occupied by only a single letter. My diagnosis would therefore be either ] π. [( )]μοι or ] τ. [ ]μοι.

We want a neutral supplement at the end of line 5, since lines 5-6 are not deficient in either sense or style. Wilamowitz's *κακῆτι* is insipid. I suggest ἄρα, a fit partner for οὐτω δοκεῖ (cf. *S. OC* 1431 οὐτως ἄρ', ὦ παῖ, ταῦτά σοι δεδογμένα; *IA* 410 οὐκ ἄρα δοκεῖ σοι τάδε πονεῖν σὺν Ἑλλάδι;). When ἄρα is not placed early in the sentence it normally stands with the main verb (as *Tr.* 411-12 ἀτὰρ τὰ σεμνὰ καὶ δοκήμασιν σοφὰ / οὐδέν τι κρείσσω τῶν τὸ μηδὲν ἦν ἄρα, *fr.* 377. 1-2 μάτην δὲ θνητοὶ τοὺς νόθους φεύγουσ' ἄρα / παῖδας φυτεύειν), but it may also stand with an infinitive (as *S. Ai.* 925-6 ἔμελλεσ τάλασ ἔμελλεσ χρόνωι / στερεόφρων ἄρ' ἐξανύσσειν κτλ.). See Denniston, *GP* 41-2, West on *Hes. Th.* 920<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> I forbear to comment on the treatment of 3-6 by F.C. Gōrschen, «APF» XIX (1969) 29.

## III

Fr. 66.4 (p. 49 Bond, 126 Cockle)

]ν' όια ετο[

οί' έτο[ιμ- *edd. pr.*<sup>13</sup>. More likely οί' έτο[λμ-, like *El.* 277 οί' έτολμήθη, *Med.* 165 οί' έμè (Kaibel: οί γέ με *ferè codd.*) πρόσθεν τολμῶς' άδικεΐν.

Cambridge

JAMES DIGGLE

<sup>13</sup> Similarly Górschen, *o.c.* 35.