

# UC Berkeley

## UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

### Title

Review Article: Euripides' Heracles

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4mf5h5wp>

### Author

Mastronarde, Donald J.

### Publication Date

1983

Peer reviewed

**[93] REVIEW ARTICLE: EURIPIDES' *HERACLES***

Euripides: *Heracles*, with introduction and commentary by Godfrey W. Bond. Pp. xxxv + 429. Oxford University Press, 1981. Cloth. Canada \$71.25; U.S. \$62.00.

If modern critical judgement of artistic quality and dramatic impact were used to select a triad of Euripidean plays, they would presumably be *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, and *Bacchae*, and it is the good fortune of English-language classicists that they are able to read two of these plays with their students with the help of the most distinguished and detailed Euripidean commentaries available. If I had to choose only one more play for a student to study in order to deepen his appreciation of Euripidean tragedy, that play would be *Heracles*. Its tightly-knit structure of successive reversals, its typically Euripidean dialectic of hope and despair, its deployment of arguments that echo one another but have contradictory outcomes, its provocative world-view (which so alienates some critics that they refuse to recognize it and instead mistake what is deliberate for flawed construction), its Euripidean lapses from a straightforward, homogeneously “classical” or “tragic” tone (the archery-debate, the embarrassing excess of realism at 596-598, the dissonant declaration of faith at 1341-1346, the sudden harshness of the final stichomythia 1410-1417)—these features make the play an essential document in the literary study of the Euripidean oeuvre.

But the play has not been easy to approach for the student. The English school editions of 70-100 years ago are scarcely available and were in any case not distinguished works. Murray's text presents numerous puzzles of reading [94] and punctuation. The monumental *Herakles* of Wilamowitz is at hand for the teacher, but despite its stature as exquisite *Altertumswissenschaft*, if one is dealing closely with the Greek text, one will too often turn to Wilamowitz' commentary to find no note on the problem one has in mind and then turn to his translation to find that it is too good as German to be more than a loose paraphrase of the problematic Greek. It was with delight and relief, therefore, that Hellenists learned several years ago that a commentary on *Heracles* was in preparation

for the Clarendon Euripides Series. And now it can be said of the waiting audience that *δοκημάτων ἔντος ἤλθεν ἐλπίς*. The wait was longer than expected. With the commentary already well advanced in 1976, it was decided to print it with Diggle's new text rather than Murray's outmoded one.<sup>1</sup> The plates of Diggle's OCT were damaged in an earthquake in Athens, and this led to a delay for both books (the OCT was officially published a few weeks after Bond's book, which itself appeared at the end of 1981). Moreover, Bond's commentary, the longest by far ever published in the Clarendon Series format, was obviously a difficult one to produce in this time of impoverished academic presses and scarcity of competent Greek-font compositors. The long period of gestation and the changed circumstances of classical publishing [95] have left their mark upon the final product in the form of a few inconsistencies in the commentary, faults in copy-editing, and in typographical errors more numerous than one is accustomed to find in OUP productions (see list in footnote 9 below).

All in all, Bond has performed a difficult task very well. With Wilamowitz towering in the background, he has sometimes had to write a commentary on Wilamowitz (hereafter abbreviated Wil.) as well as on Euripides; and because of Wil.'s elliptical and allusive style of comment and exegesis, there are often pitfalls in understanding his intention. It is good to see that Wil.'s mistaken psychologizing of syntax and of unspoken motivations has been regularly noted and corrected by Bond; on the other hand, there are some statements in the commentary which are there only because Wil. made them (see footnote 2 below). Bond has cast his net wide and reports for his readers the relevant perceptions of scholars drawn from commentaries, periodicals, and dissertations. His tone is often reportorial, sometimes almost non-committal, rarely sharply polemical (654:

---

<sup>1</sup> This was surely a wise decision. There are naturally a number of disagreements between Bond and Diggle, but they are much fewer and of less sweeping import than the disagreements with Murray would have been. For some cases of disagreement, see the commentary on e.g. 72, 94, 184, 362, 381, 389, 394, 540, 543, 575, 581, 593, 678-81, 679, 860, 1212 (some of these involve differences in interpretation of the same text rather than different readings). In general, Bond is more inclined to defend L's readings and Diggle more inclined to make small changes which make a point sharper or more logical (for the reverse, cf. 575, 583f.). I found that, on the whole, I sided with Diggle more often than with Bond in the cases of disagreement.

“ineptly challenged as inept by Herwerden” is a rare—and justified—instance). This is an advantage in a commentary, but on occasion it has, I fear, led to repetition of an earlier view where an independent and critical reappraisal was needed. Some of the best notes in the commentary are those on the intellectual currents of the 5th century as reflected in particular words and arguments in the play, and Bond is usually at his best in explaining clearly why a transmitted reading requires emendation (he offers very few emendations of his own—e.g. at lines 121-3, 446, 845—and of these few strike me as convincing). He does not possess the consummate literary tact of Dodds or the sovereign, unvarying mastery of Greek language, grammar, and [96]style of Barrett—but who does?

The 19-page Introduction covers “The Meaning and Unity of *Heracles*” (10 pages), “Euripides’ Treatment of the Legend”, “The Date of *Heracles*”, and “The Text of *Heracles*”. In the first section, Bond finds the essential unity of the play in the violent antithesis between the confident theodicy which ends at line 814 and the overthrow of that theodicy with the appearance of Lyssa at 815ff. and suggests that the moral may be that “men tend to form hasty and ill-considered opinions about the gods”; friendship and endurance are viewed as two “shafts of light in this deeply pessimistic tragedy”. This is good as far as it goes, and perhaps one does not expect more than this in a commentary in this series. I myself would, however, have liked to see more examples given of the parallelisms and repeated images noticed by Kamerbeek and Schwinge (whose contributions are very briefly dismissed by Bond): it is true that such features should not be taken to be constitutive of “unity” in themselves, but they do reinforce the structure and meaning Bond himself posits and contribute to a unitary texture in the play as a whole. More could have been done with the complex of notions on which so much of the human aspirations and worries in this play revolve: hope (with *πόρος* and *ἀπορία*), time (with youth and old age, strength and weakness), change or reversal, virtue, and wealth (with injustice). For English-language students reference might have been made to the Introduction written by Arrowsmith for his translation of *Heracles* in the Chicago series; an article which appeared too late for Bond to refer to may also be mentioned—J. Shelton, “Structural Unity and the Meaning of Euripides’ *Heracles*,” *Eranos* 77 (1979) 101-110. Many of these themes were well discussed in H. O. Chalk’s important article in

*JHS* 82 (1962) 7ff., along with a theory about *aretê* and *bia* which I, like Bond, find [97]misguided. Bond does refer to Chalk, but I wish that he had made more references to him and fewer to Adkins' contribution in *CQ* 16 (1966) 209ff., which is repeatedly cited in the commentary and only twice (on 57 and on 1335) somewhat firmly rebuffed. There is a tendency in this discussion toward what I would call "minimalism" in appreciating the wider implications of what happens in the play. For instance, Bond is eager to show that Hera's hatred is to be accepted at face value and not interpreted as a symbol of anything; but I think he comes too close to suggesting that her intervention is positively rational or lawful. Granted that her role is traditional and appropriate, that does not ensure that the intervention is devoid of a wider meaning, if a wider meaning is suggested by the way the rest of the play probes the problem of the status of humanity and virtue and happiness in the universe. (For more on such minimalism, see on 1341-6, below, p. 111).

It will not be out of place, I think, to show here how Bond's hesitant approach to repeated themes affects several points in his commentary. The note on 1186 refers (belatedly; it would be useful to the student to make this point earlier) to the instances of the image of flying away into the air to vanish: in this play the image is associated with (sudden, unexpected) loss of good fortune, and the fact that Euripides uses the metaphor several times suggests that at 69 it is meant to be noticed, though Bond suspects it is "threadbare" there; after 69 and 510, it seems to me ominous that Heracles uses *πτερωτός* playfully at 628 (as protector of his friends he is not secure, as he wrongly believes, but will soon "vanish" and become their slayer), and that use in turn affects the use at 1158 (so already Délulle, rejected by Bond). Secondly, the repeated scenic gesture of unveiling and looking up at the light instead of at darkness, a mark [98]of salvation or return from "death", links Heracles' rescue of his children (562-564) with Theseus' rescue of Heracles (1159, 1203-1204, 1215, 1226-1227): this significant parallelism of language and stage-action is weakened if one takes *φῶς* at 563 as an internal accusative, as Bond follows Wil. in doing. The theme of time, finally, is relevant at two places. The excellent note on 655-72 could have been strengthened by reference to this theme: time has been viewed as a source of pain by Megara and a realm of continued hope by Amphitryon, until Amphitryon is forced to concede *ὡς ἐλπίδας μὲν ὁ χρόνος οὐκ*

ἐπίσταται σῶζειν (506-507; note how similar the language is to line 346), and now the chorus is saying that (if the world had been properly arranged) time should be a guarantor of virtue with the scheme of double youth, but instead in its wheeling course the (life-) time (of a man) πλοῦτον μόνον αὔξει. (Bond does note this contrast of virtue and wealth in his note on 671f.). The culmination of this theme is in 777-780, where the chorus has been duped by events into reversing their perspective: they now see time as the punisher of the wicked man, for it is in the race-course of time that the evil man wrecks his chariot on the return-leg of the *diaulos*. This climax is spoiled if one refuses to see the *diaulos*-of-time-and-human-fortune image in these lines, the presence of which is suggested by the preparatory imagery earlier in the play and by a traditional metaphor of eventual punishment of a sinner (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 344 κάμψαι διαύλου θάτερον κῶλον πάλι). In his note on 736 Bond argues (probably rightly) for a race-course metaphor on very slim evidence and concludes with a reference to 778-780 (apparently accepting a race-metaphor in 778), but in his note on 772-8 he objects to the slightness of the clues for the metaphor (he is right that 772-777 do not contain any preparation) and pro-[99]pounds instead an unconvincing interpretation of χρόνου τὸ πάλι as “that part of time which lies ahead”, “time’s hereafter”—there is no parallel for such a sense in other uses of πάλι, and the decisive parallel at Pindar, *Ol.* 10. 86f. is best taken as a race-course metaphor as well (“a father who had already come to the reverse-lap of youth [= old age and the approach of death]”; Slater’s noncommittal “the reverse” is based on the scholia and Gildersleeve, who thinks τὸ πάλι can mean the same as ἔμπαλι). Under no circumstances should χρόνου be removed by conjecture, as Bond suggests for those who are dissatisfied with his view. (The meter of line 778 is repaired by Hermann’s transposition.)

The section on the date is brief and to the point, placing the play near 415 (it is overprecise to say “416 and 414 are both possible” as though we would be shocked to find a papyrus giving the date 417 or 413). Note 59 on p. xxxi makes one wonder what date Bond assigns to *Electra*; the answer comes on p. 182 n. 1 and is surprising, since one who believes that *El.* with approximately 17% resolutions dates to 413 can hardly use *Her.*’s 21.5% to place the play with great precision in 416 or 414. It seemed strange to me

that the Introduction did not touch even briefly on the relationship (chronological and dramatic/literary) between *Her.* and Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (the notes on 225 and 1353-7 and 1410f. refer to echoes and reveal that Bond assumes *Trach.* to be the earlier play; this is surely right against Wil.'s endorsement of the opposite relationship).

One good point of the commentary as a whole is that Bond pays careful attention to the staging that goes with the words of the text. Nevertheless, on many points I would have liked to see more precision or decisiveness. On p. 61, [100] in setting the scene, it should have been pointed out, against Wil.'s "in der Mitte der Bühne", that the altar, whether temporary or permanent, cannot have been centered in front of the door, where it would block the view of the door and its use and be in the way of the ekkyklema. Bond notes that 98-100 are "virtually a stage-direction": I wonder whether the tragedians tolerated this kind of dumb-show during a parodos (these lines could simply motivate the end of the dialogue in order to make way for the parodos and perhaps inform the more inattentive members of the audience what they should *imagine* the actors to be doing while their attention is (supposed to be) directed to the entering chorus). On p. 92 Bond touches on the old chestnut of the raised stage, but is less clear and pointed than he might have been. The essential points, it seems to me, are: (1) the impression of steepness is created in the words and need have no reality in the physical arrangements of the theater (to mention steepness is to highlight the decrepitude of old age: cf. Wil.); (2) since the steepness refers to the entrance from somewhere else into the public plaza of the stage/orchestra complex, the movement so described is best referred to that along the parodos and into position in the orchestra; (3) we certainly do not want the 15-member chorus mounting the stage (*if* the stage was slightly raised) during the parodos (*if* they mount, when do they come down?)—the stage-area already contains a fair-sized altar, 2 actors, 3 (child-sized) extras and will soon contain a third actor with no fewer than 2 attendants. If there was a low stage in the 5th century, its purpose was presumably to mark visually the separation between actors and chorus and to provide the actors and stage-tableau with some added height so that viewers sitting low in the auditorium would have a fairly clear view; this purpose is frustrated if a chorus [101] mounts the stage without good reason. (Of course, the switch from syncopated iambics to syncopated

trochees at 131 does not require an explanation in terms of arrival at or mounting of stairs.)

In line 107, the *γεραιὰ δέμνια* may or may not be Amphitryon's (see below, p. 105), but we can be certain that Amphitryon does not have a couch on stage, as Bond suggests: cf. 52 *ἀστρώτω πέδω πλευρὰς τιθέντες*; and 555. The note on 268 f. mentions three possible stagings: Kroeker's view seems to me best; if Euripides had wanted the attendants to cow the old men into submission, he would (to judge from the usual procedure in tragedy) have inserted a few lines in which Lycus orders and describes the threat.

Bond notes the fact that the sons cannot immediately obey Megara at 520: see also my discussion, *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage* (University of California Publications: Classical Studies, vol. 21, Berkeley, 1979), 23.

At 529 Bond is inclined to take *τῶνδε* with *πλησίον σταθείς* and to understand *τῶνδε* to be the chorus. But it is quite pointless for Heracles to make any remark about standing near the chorus (and pointless to stand near them rather than go up to his family), and I assume that by 531 his family does surround and embrace him (Megara's order of 520 is fulfilled at this point): *τῶνδε* must be the family (it is still spoken out of dialogue-contact; there is no problem in the shift to *γύναι* when contact is established) and it may be taken *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* with *ἐκπύθωμαι* and *πλησίον*.

The notes on 815ff. (p. 280) and 880, in regard to the position and conveyance of Iris and Lyssa, either reflect unincorporated revision or an insufficiently incisive analysis. Bond's final view is that Lyssa's chariot in the lyric 880ff. is metaphorical, and this is surely right (the metaphor is introduced in 880 for the sake of what follows in 881-882), since no chariot ever entered the door on the Greek stage and since no indication is given earlier that the goddesses are on stage-level. The clue to the proper staging is contained in 872-873: Iris is to go back to Olympus, Lyssa is to disappear down (*δυσόμεθ'*) into the house (or courtyard). That is, Iris departs through the air, on the *mêchanê*, and Lyssa goes down through the trap-door of the *theologeion*, where the crane had deposited them together to speak their lines. This trap-door is used e.g. by Antigone and the Pedagogue in *Phoen.*, by Orestes and his companions in *Or.*, by Philokleon in *Wasps* 143-148. Since Iris departs on the *mêchanê*, it is obvious that both



arrived that way: for two actors on the crane at once, cf. the two Dioskouroi in *El.* and Apollo and Helen (?) in *Or.* This is the only staging that makes sense with the words. Wil. (whose view is given on II.148-149, not in the commentary and not in his sparse stage-directions) had both goddesses use the trap-door for both appearance and disappearance, but this makes nonsense of 872-873 (Wil.'s view of the origin of the *theologeion* as a substitute for use of the crane is not convincing either). Finally, on 1028ff., Bond rightly accepts use of the ekkyklema, but is too generous in calling [102]Pickard-Cambridge's sceptical arguments "a strong case".

Since there will surely not be another major edition of *Heracles* for a long time, I think it is appropriate to give now a detailed reaction to a number of points made in Bond's commentary, even at the risk of seeming ungrateful for the enormous toil and excellent overall quality of his achievement. I include in this survey a few comments which supplement rather than disagree with Bond's notes.

Line 1: (on *σύλλεκτρος*) a more general observation might be made, namely that compound adjectives of kin- and marriage-relationship take their precise meaning from the context in which they are used (e.g. *πατροφόνου Or.* 193 "mother who killed *my* father", Aesch. *Septem* 783 "hand that killed *his own* father", *πατροκτόνου IT* 1083 "hand of my slaying father"). 8 (also 27, 31): later mythographers had to interrelate chronologically the Labdacid dynasty and Cadmus' immediate family, but Euripides never asks his audience to assume that the Cadmus-Agave-Pentheus line can be related to the Cadmus-Polydorus-Labdacus line or that Creon father of Megara is the same as Creon brother of Jocasta (so rightly Wil. II.112). 11: both Bond and Wil. think some explanation is needed for Heracles' family to dwell in Amphitryon's house (and of course it is convenient for the plot, as they say); but it was the normal Greek practice (Priam's sons live with him; Alcinous' married sons live with him, *Od.* 6.63; Phaethon would have lived in his father's house; Bdelykleon lives with Philokleon; sons in New Comedy bring their brides to their father's house), and only in certain circumstances does a son have his own house or a father retire from the house (Laertes, Pheres, Peleus). 20f. Wil. is quoted for "a suggestion of madness" in the use

of κέντρα. Here (and elsewhere)<sup>2</sup> I believe a more sceptical attitude toward Wil.'s note would have been beneficial. The main metaphorical force of κέντρα is the expression of compulsion or constraint (Aesch. *Eum.* 427; the proverb πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν, etc.), and [103] that is all that is involved here. Io and Phaedra are frenzied because of their peculiar situations; Heracles during his labors is not comparable. On another topic at the end of this same note, Eurystheus' kingship could be counted as a motive for the labors of Heracles if it is combined with the common motif of assigning labors or trials to a challenger or rival in the hope that he won't return alive. 72: this note is rather indecisive in explaining ὑφειμένη, and only at the end is ὑφειμένους (printed by Diggle) mentioned. Here it looks as if the note was written for a text reading -μένη and not adequately revised to accompany Diggle's text.<sup>3</sup> If -μένη is read, surely "putting them under me" is the right sense (the other interpretation, "crouching low", lacks point, whether taken primarily of the bird or of Megara; Niobe's brooding over her dead children does not seem to me relevant). But Diggle's choice of -μένους is, I believe, correct.

75: Bond follows Wil. and indeed all interpreters since Barnes in referring τῷ νέῳ to the youth of the children: one thus gets translations like *ob teneram aetatis autem imbecillitatem* (Barnes), *puerili autem imperitia decepti* (Fix), "im Kinderwahn"

<sup>2</sup> See my comments on 164 and 1127 below. Two other examples: at *Her.* 54 "Wil. classifies the dative as locative", but no parallels or analogies are given by Wil. or Bond to support this (in the absence of proof for a locative interpretation, I view ἀπορία as a sociative/instrumental dative of manner or accompanying circumstance); at 837 the metaphor of ἐξίεναι κάλως is said to be from naval warfare, but this metaphor is from sailing generally, not from naval warfare in particular, and alludes to taking full advantage of a supporting wind (note that Greek warships in battle were powered by oars, not by sail, and that the ἐχθροί of *Med.* 278 are not part of the metaphor).

<sup>3</sup> In cases like this it is not clear whether Bond himself can be held responsible for the discrepancy, since it is unclear when his manuscript actually went into production (the Preface is dated 1979) and I know of at least one instance in another play in which Diggle promoted a conjecture from apparatus to text during the proof stage. Compare the case of Bond's notes on 140ff. and 701f., which try to explain περᾶ (701), but admit (with a caution) that περᾶς is probably right. In fact, a distinction must be made between 140ff. (where "talking at" changes to "talking to") and 701f. (where "talking of" changes to "talking to" and the two stages are linked by γὰρ)—the latter seems impossible and there should be no hesitation about reading περᾶς.

(Hartung), “kindisch spielend” (Wil., who takes ζῆτοῦσι to mean “gehn sie ... suchen”), “too small to understand” (Arrowsmith). Perhaps troubled by the relevance and tact of such a reference to the νηπιότης of the children, Bond honestly comments that “Euripides has in mind the pathos of youth, rather than its rashness and folly” (rashness and folly are in mind in the parallels cited by scholars for τῶ νέω). These translations seem to me to undervalue the force of ἐσφαλμένοι. I suggest that τῶ νέω refers to “strangeness”, not “youth” and that the sense is “confused by the strangeness of the situation [Heracles had always returned before: 22ff., [104]425ff.], they seek [ask about, *not* go to seek] their father, but I put them off...” 87: Bond well states the argument for transposition, and I grant that transposition may be correct and that disagreement will no doubt continue. Nevertheless, I would prefer to keep 87 as the last line of Megara’s long speech. The question comes down to how provocative and attacking the tone of 87 is. I think Megara anticipates her argumentative position: she is ready to recognize utter weakness and *aporia*, and time brings only painful delay. Amphitryon will not admit *aporia* so directly until much later, since for him time still represents hope. At this stage I would not expect to find him making the explicit concession ὄντες ... ἀσθενεῖς (he himself is old and weak as a protector, but that is not the same as conceding the hopelessness of the family’s position). So in 88-89 Amphitryon brushes aside Megara’s challenge with a vague paradox, and in response to this evasion she taunts him quite sharply in 90. I do not find the sense “lest death is already a foregone conclusion but we stretch out the time although we are weak [and unable to ward it off]” contorted, as Bond does. 97: the notion of Heracles’ return is already implied in 22-25 and 44-46.

105f.: a very good note on *elpis*, but I think that the characterization of Amphitryon’s position as irrational and stubborn is not quite on the mark. I would associate Megara’s “good sense” position rather with a resigned, heroic/tragic world view, to be considered “old-fashioned” (in the tradition of the genre tragedy) by comparison with Amphitryon’s more optimistic (or even sophistic) faith that man can control his destiny (if not now, then perhaps by waiting), a faith in hope and *poros* with proud rejection of *aporia* (105-106). When Amphitryon’s position is viewed in this light, it consorts very well with his rationalistic/humanistic criticism of Zeus and is also

relevant, I think, to the debate about [105]the hoplite (traditional and limited in his resources) and the archer (non-traditional [in terms of the prejudices of Greek poetry and of Athenian society] and resourceful). 107: Bond is misleading about the possibility of reading *ὑπόροφα*. This adjective does not allude to height or grandeur (as *ὑψόροφα* does) and so does not have point as a description of the palace; both *ὑπορόφιος* and *ὑπώ(ό)ροφος* imply only enclosure or being indoors as opposed to outdoors (so *Or.* 147, *Phoen.* 299). If *ὑπ-* is kept, then one is almost compelled to favor the view (of Scaliger and Elmsley) that the building and old man's bed described are the chorus', not Amphitryon's (the point is "weak as we are, we have left the indoors and our beds"—the parallelism between a bedridden old Amphitryon and a bedridden old chorus would be deliberate); we would then have a common parodos-motif here, the mention of the (near or distant) place from which the chorus has come (*Aesch. Su.* 4; *Eur. Hec.* 99, *Tro.* 176, *Phoen.* 202, *Ba.* 64, *IA* 168; cf. *Hel.* 179, *Aesch. Choe.* 22). But since Scaliger's *⟨λιπῶν⟩* creates metrical problems in what is probably a simple iambic context and since the corruption of Elmsley's *ἐξέβην* to *ἐστάλην* is not very likely, *ὑψ-* should be read, not merely for exact responsion but for superior sense (an epithet with point rather than one without).

107-37: for "neither expected..." say rather "neither expected *by the characters...*"; the audience certainly expects some chorus to appear, which is why the tragedians need not motivate their presence in advance. 115: here and in the notes on 485-9, 485, 633-6 Bond lets slip a certain annoyance with Euripides' rhetorical or lyric style. Since the blurb on the dust jacket and Bond's own Preface (p. v) stress the wish to make the play more accessible to modern taste by explaining Euripides' style, it would have been more conducive to this goal to suppress subjective complaints such as these notes contain. The pleonasm at 115 is not "a regrettable development", but a legitimate poetic tool which intensifies the pathos by an intensification of sound; the rhetorical taxis at 485 effectively marks the surfeit of objects of grief (cf. *Phoen.* 1524ff.).

138: the first letters of *τόνδε/τῶνδε* [106]do not survive on the papyrus, so one should not refer to *τόνδε* as "the probable reading of Π". 140-251: Bond might have had less cause to object to the "imbalance" of this *agôn-scene* if he had compared

the structure of another persecutor/persecuted scene, *Andr.* 309-463. 146f.: Bond's interpretation of ὡς and ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀξίαν seems to me forced and unconvincing, and his discussion does not accurately reflect the nature of Wil.'s interpretation,<sup>4</sup> which I consider correct (see Wil.'s translation as well as his Greek paraphrase on III.39). ὡς is exclamatory ("how much beyond what the matter deserves"), and the whole exclamation is explanatory in that it explains the "epileptic" tone of 140-146a (for "epileptic" questions, see my *Contact...*, 13-14). 161: a good note on the archery-debate, to which one might add something about the *poros/aporía* theme (see my comment on 105f. above). 164: Bond repeats Wil.'s claim that ἄλοκα is to be related to metaphors of reaping which are sometimes used of the carnage of warfare; this is wrong—ἄλοξ refers to sowing, not reaping, and sometimes alludes to the growth from the furrow (but not its gathering). Bond suggests that "the brave warrior ... looks upon the advancing enemy armour which is cutting a swift furrow (or swathe) in his own ranks". But hoplites (note τάξις ἐμβεβώς) did not (in classical times)<sup>5</sup> form deep lines which allowed for a lengthy swathe to be cut in them; they formed a few rows in front of the formation (in archaic times light-armed troops might hover behind them: Tyrtaeus 11.35ff.). The essential parallel, missed by Bond, is Tyrtaeus 12.11 τετραίη ... ὀρώων φόνον αἰματόεντα, which seems to me to favor the traditional rendering (e.g. Arrowsmith "dares to face the gash the spear may make"). ὀρώων in Tyrtaeus refutes Bond's charge of ineptness. 177: Diggle's apparatus seems to have suppressed a minor orthographic detail, with the result that Bond's mention of the acute accent in L becomes confusing (Dr. Diggle reports to me that L does have the acute); but in any case, this accent is no evidence for τ', since scribes of the Palaeologan era (including the scribe of L) often treat δ' as an enclitic for the purposes of accentuation.

203: Bond suspects that ἐκ τύχης is corrupt. I think it is sound and believe that τύχη is not the Thucydidean "luck of war" but rather whatever is outside of one's

<sup>4</sup> Compare Bond's note on 157: Wil.'s argument is not that 157 begins a new section, but that 155-156 form a climactic conclusion to the form of attack begun at 150 and that this conclusiveness is in favor of a break at 157.

<sup>5</sup> In Xen. *Anab.* 1.2.15 a normal battle formation is said to be four lines deep; *Anab.* 7.1.23 a taxis not meant for battle is eight lines deep.

personal control, resources, or skill (the hoplite's safety in a phalanx depends on the "chance" factor of his neighbors' endurance and valor; the archer is not subject to such "chance" [107]but controls his own destiny). 227: I doubt that τὰ δ' means "but assuredly" at *Hel.* 1197; rather τὰ δ' implies a (τὰ) μὲν with the previous clause ("I don't take pleasure..., but in some respects I enjoy good fortune [by your words]"); therefore, I am not convinced of *profecto* for τὰ δ' here. If an emphatic demonstrative τὰ is unacceptable, why not read τὰ δ' ᾧ in asyndeton? (οὐ cannot, I think, be defended by *Alc.* 345). 235: the grammar has been incorrectly diagnosed—this is not a matter of repeated ἄν, but of the use of ἄν with an infinitive of result after ὥστε not in indirect discourse, a natural (if hypercharacterizing) marking of the potentiality of the infinitive in this construction. See Goodwin, *GMT* §211 and 596; K-G II.507f. An exact parallel to Euripides' use of infinitive with ὥστε and ἄν after an unreal apodosis with ἄν is *Thuc.* 7.42.3. 238: in none of the other examples of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ elements is that element so far away from the first member or is there such an *unexpected* need to shift mental gears from a construction one has tentatively assumed. The contrast without an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction seems to me just as good: Lycus does not condescend to admit that the insulting words hurt him, but then can tauntingly contrast his δράσω with his opponent's λέγειν and triumphantly climax in a κακῶς which goes only with his own δράσω. 252-74: Aesch. *Ag.* 1348-1371 is not on a par with the other parallels, since 12 separate voices are involved. 289: I agree with Barrett that δειλίας ὑπο should be taken as an expression of attendant circumstances: Amphytrion will die in circumstances of δειλία if he suffers an ignominious death by fire. 353f.: when a woman sleeps with a god in Greek myth, she is always impregnated thereby, and there can be no realistic quibbles arising from "promiscuity". 368: Bond is very good on encomiastic motifs in this ode; one might add that the geographic or mythological witness is also an encomiastic motif (for references see E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* I.17 n. 42). 445: a fine note on the textual problem; but surely ἀπαλοῖς would be feebly pointless in this context. 482: Bond suggests that L's φρενῶν can be kept, wrongly: the genitive of cause/specification is used with exclamations and with

exclamatory nominatives and vocatives; there is no parallel for its use with dative *δυστήνω*, which Bond rightly approves. 533: the two questions of 533 are addressed to different persons; for an exact parallel, cf. *Hec.* 1122 (*Contact...*, 70-71 with note 61). 562-582 and 604f.: Bond strangely claims that an audience would assume that Heracles carries out his threats against the faithless Thebans. I don't see how such a thing could ever have occurred to a Greek audience: people don't sneak out of the back door of the stage-palace and do things offstage during a choral ode, and the (belated) plurals of 940 and 967 either are vague plurals (= Lycus alone) or include reference to the few attendants he brought into the house with him at 725. In the last line of his note on 604f. Bond seems to recant his view; it is a pity the two notes were not properly revised.

595-8: one may also note that Heracles' premonition makes nonsense (retrospectively) of his surprise at 525ff. 655f.: Bond prefers to translate *κατ' ἀνδρας* as "such as men have" or "by human standards"; Morel's [108]interpretation of it as "in their conduct of human affairs" involves a frequent use of *κατά* (*Andr.* 741, *Su.* 84; LSJ s.v. IV.2; esp. Aesch. *Eum.* 310, 930, which may be considered decisive if this is another Aeschylean echo in the *Her.* — see Bond's index under Aeschylus) and seems to me perfectly suitable in context. This is not the moment (and the chorus is not the voice) for a strongly provocative statement such as Bond prefers (comparing Amphitryon's 339-347): Heracles has returned, and the only complaint is that the gods allowed such a mess to arise in the first place by not arranging the world as one might wish that they had. It is of course provocative, as Bond notes, that the words *σοφία* and *ξύνεσις* are applied to the gods. 655-72: on double youth cf. perhaps the "Pindar" epigram on

Hesiod, *δὲς ἠβήσας* (Page, *Epigr. gr. sel.* 428). 664: Bond says "there is not enough evidence for a ruthless elimination of the instances of *ζωή*, but the pattern of survival and corruption is highly suggestive of *ζωή* being an intruder in poetic texts (see Barrett on *Hipp.* 816, Diggle's apparatus at *IT* 150).

729: Bond prefers redivision of L's *γενήσεται* as *γ' ἐνήσεται* to Elmsley's bolder change and argues that the verb will be middle; but *ἐνήσεται* will surely be felt as passive (*μετήσασθαι* at Hdt. 5.35.4 is certainly passive: see J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus*

s.v.) and as such is unattractive.<sup>6</sup> (Bond notes the absence of the sense “arrive” in LSJ s.v. γίγνομαι: cf. however prosaic παραγίγνομαι, and the simple verb is so used by Hdt.— Powell, *Lexicon* s.v. IV.5.) 752: the statement about πόρσω/πρόσω should have been put more strongly. The change of πρόσω to πόρσω is *necessary*, so far as I can see, in all the passages listed by Bond, and corruption of πόρσω to πρόσω is quite likely here (cf. Diggle on *Phaethon* 7): although ≈ respension is possible, there was no reason for Euripides to choose it when πόρσω was available for use (only) at metrical need.

757-9: a good, long note; but not fully revised (on p. 261 Bond is cautious about a reference to Protagoras and in n. 1 he quotes Stinton’s perceptive remark on a similar τις, but on p. 262 he sees a reference to a particular book of Protagoras; the note on 757 ἀνομία χραίνων p. 263 should have preceded that on οὐρανίων p. 261). At the end of the note Bond contemplates Amphitryon as a candidate for blame for impious discourse against the gods; but surely the chorus mean the man of crime (e.g. Lycus), whose actions are matched by words which scoff at the notion of being punished by the gods (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 369ff. and *Eum.* 561; impious talk combined with impious deeds in a traditional context also Soph. *OT* 884 and, I suspect, 892-894). Amphitryon does not doubt the *power* of the gods, only their wisdom and sense of morality. 757: following up what I have just argued, I would prefer to interpret the gods’ ἀνομία [109] as their failure to uphold νόμος (that is what the criminal boldly asserts, and that is what people in the play have so far worried about), not of their doing things which violate νόμος; this charge of ἀνομία is exactly countered by the chorus’ pious μέλουσι, at 772. 782: on the vexed questions of Theban topography, reference should be made to F. Schober, “Thebai” *RE* 5A (1934) 1423ff., and P. Roesch in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton, 1976), 904ff. 788f.: on accusatives governed by the verbal force of an adjective or noun, see Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981), 58. 819: it is curious that in this play Euripides twice seems to be punning on the prefix πεδ(α)-: κῶλον here, πόδα 872. 822-73: Bond should have listed the scenes he means by “second prologues”; Kannicht on *Hel.* 386ff. mentions

<sup>6</sup> Martin Cropp (whom I thank here for his helpful comments on a draft of this review) notes in addition that Bond’s justification of γε is weak.



*Or.* 356ff., *Ba.* 215ff. and refers to Schadewaldt's discussion. 853: Bond is right against West; but the harm done to men by the famous sinners did affect the gods and their *timê*, by insulting the divinely-sponsored institution of *xenia* and by inhibiting worship by *theoroi*. 862: Bond's rejection of *οἶστρος* seems to me overfastidious and I do not understand the claim that "*πνέων* indicates that *οἶστρος* has its primary sense of 'gadfly'" (gadflies do, so far as I know, *sting* as well as annoy by merely brushing the skin, if this is what Bond means in commenting on *πνέων*); as a noun of action "stinging" is a much better yokemate of *σεισμός* than *οἶστός* would be. 860: the various possibilities are well presented, but Bond's support of L's *ἀνακαλῶν* over *-καλῶ* is not cogent: this verb is used of deliberate, rational summoning, not of inadvertently attracting something.

977: a clear presentation of the possible interpretations of this difficult line. I do not feel that "moving in a circle round the boy" is adequately supported by the special transferred use of *ἐλίσσω* = "dance in honor of" at *Her.* 689, nor (p. 317 n. 1) is it correct to equate the phrase at *Ion* 397 (unfolding something that requires secrecy) with that at *Or.* 892 (either "hurling in swift succession" or "twisting") and claim that *ἐξ* is without meaning. Harsh as it is, I would like to believe in Wil.'s interpretation. 1016-24: the fourth stasimon of *Antigone* is chilly, but it is, I believe, that chorus' attempt at consolation (note *καί* in 944 and 986 implying the consolation-motif *οὐ σοὶ μόνω*).

1054: Bond almost concedes that L's *ἀτρεμέα* could stand, but it should not; it is just a phonetic error for *ἀτρεμαῖα* (same error in some recentiores and the Moschopoulean recension at *Phoen.* 177); Euripides uses *ἀτρεμαῖος* thrice, *ἀτρεμής* occurs nowhere in tragedy. 1103f.: Bond's charge that "*πλουτῶνά τ'* must be corrupt" seems to me based on overfastidious grounds. 1127: this note should have ended at the third word of the fourth line. The trend to sexual explicitness in the work of some Oxford scholars is well known, but it was with shocked amusement that I read of the "clear" implication in this line that Hera "is seated on her *θρόνος*" and "with her is Zeus, engaged in some form of sexual intercourse". This is a development of Wil.'s note: he thought that Euripides (carelessly) used *παρὰ* and *θρόνους* because of (inapposite) reminiscence of *II.* 15.4-5 and that *Amphitryon* was thinking of Zeus as lulled to sleep

(somewhere else than on Hera's [110] *thronos*) and now roused by his cry. Bond has paid more serious attention to *θρόνους*, but in his interpretation Zeus has surely not been asleep (we may leave it to the authors of *The Joy of Sex* to inform us further about the exact positions of the Olympian lovers). At *Hel.* 241 Kannicht is probably right that the meaning is "Hera, who is embraced on a golden throne by Zeus", but that need evoke only the image of the two gods together on one throne with Zeus hugging Hera (a considerably more decorous image in a considerably less serious play). 1148-52: only two methods of suicide also at *Phoen.* 331-4. 1172-7: I don't think "aside" is the right term for comments that follow visual contact but precede direct address (*Contact...*, 23).

1205: Bond never clearly translates<sup>7</sup> the whole line in accordance with his interpretation (which includes a contribution by West). He seems to want "Show your face to the sun. My (physical) weight as a counterpoise (to you?) wrestles (against you?) along with my tears: I beseech you...." or "My weight in opposition (to you) wrestles etc." What is the point of *ἀντίπαλον* when Heracles is stationary and inactive (or does Bond believe that Heracles under his cover is shoving the old man off of him?) and why is Amphitryon's *βάρος* highlighted? (In literal wrestling contexts *βάρος* implies the strength and force of the wrestler, but Amphitryon would not describe himself as physically forceful.) I am still sympathetic toward Hermann's *δακρύοισιν ἀμιλλᾶται* in the sense "A counterpoised weight [= the appeals of myself and Theseus] rivals your tears of grief". 1211: Bond suggests *ὄς ... ἐξάγει* with *σε* understood, but it is better to have two second person verbs enclosed between the two vocatives *ὦ παῖ* and *τέκνον*. 1212: *βρόμον* (L) is defended, but the time for roaring is long past and Heracles' new threat is a rationally calculated one (1153), even though fierce emotion lies behind it. 1212f.: at this point the reference is surely to suicide only and no longer to patricide. 1226f.: the psychologizing view of Heracles as depressed strikes me as inappropriate; he has recovered full normal awareness of his situation by 1146 and has reasoned in a normal heroic manner in 1146-1162; he is not comparable to

<sup>7</sup> The note on the difficult couplet 1238-1239 would also have been clearer if Bond had provided a translation of both lines.

Agave at *Ba.* 1264ff. (Of course, Heracles does need therapy of a kind, a therapy of arguments which will shake him from his instinctive heroic response and persuade him to live on, and this Theseus supplies.) 1232-4: I do not believe that the βῶλος at *Or.* 982ff. (any more than the rock at *Or.* 6) is the sun (σχολιαστῶν οἶδε δύστηνοι λόγοι). 1241f.: if the sequence in L is unacceptable (and the elliptical nature of the passage is odd), then the best solution is a lacuna (as Diggle prints it). The removal of *καθθανεῖν* seems to me disastrous and unsuitable for the Heracles of this play. Moreover, the perfect tense *παρεσκευάσμεθ'* makes best sense with *καθθανεῖν* ("Yes, that's why it's already resolved that I'm to die"). With *καὶ θενεῖν* or *καββαλεῖν* or similar monstrosities, [111]we have an instantaneously developed threat (elicited by 1240, as Bond notes), to which the perfect is unsuited. Wil.'s *καὶ κρατεῖν* does not fall prey to this objection, but it involves the strained assumption of a misunderstanding between Heracles and Theseus. 1338f.: "The interpolation would have been an early one...." is a strange statement: most interpolations were in tragic texts by the Roman period. The Favorinus papyrus is 3rd century, but the work itself was written in the first half of the 2nd century. 1341-6: for the most part a fine note, staying clear of Verrallism, but perhaps erring rather on the side of minimalism—that is, too readily discounting a dissonance by reference to the "rhetoric of the situation" (on this problem in general, see D. J. Conacher, "Rhetoric and Relevance in Euripidean Drama," *AJP* 102 (1981) 3-25). I am sorry (for reasons on which I shall elaborate in another place outside this review) to find the statement (p. 400) that the lines "may well represent Euripides' own considered view". 1352: Bond is tempted to keep *μυρίων*, but it gives poor sense within its own line and is not really needed for the rhetorical contrast between 1352 and 1353, where the opposition is carried primarily by *πόνων δῆ* (vs. *δώρων*: the connection in thought is correctly explicated by Bond); the *δῆ* serves to strengthen that contrast and does not mean "as men know" (as Bond suggests in his note on 1353, perhaps misapplying part of Wil.'s note on the sufficiency here of a summary phrase instead of a grandiose enumeration of labors).

1410-1417: both in his notes on these lines and in an appendix (pp. 417-418) Bond has helpfully highlighted the dramatic and textual difficulties of the dialogue, and I

can confirm from tutorials with graduate students that the tone and import of these lines strike many readers as problematic. (Difficulties of tone and meaning in Euripidean endings are not, however, rare: cf. *Alc.*, *Hclid.*, *Or.*) Bond finds the dispute between Theseus and Heracles unedifying and speaks of Theseus' inhumanity and of Heracles' acrimony. I don't think that the lines need be acted with quite so much harshness as that. To me, the dramatic point of the passage is to display the common humanity of Theseus and Heracles and to show that judging and learning can work both ways—there can be no facile judgment of the proper amount of tears of grief nor of how “low” a hero may feel and act. Theseus had “cured” Heracles by reminding him of his bravery, but in this scene Heracles reasserts that he cannot just return to the *status quo ante* in his feelings of self-sufficiency. The fact that [112]the argument used to “cure” Heracles at 1250 recurs in a failing effort at 1410 is not a problem, but a deliberate effect desired by Euripides (just as Heracles' suicide-decision echoes Megara's, but in the different circumstances is, in dramatic terms, judged differently), an effect which underscores the lability of man's understanding of his place in the world. There is a comparable “inconsistency” (troubling to many scholars, who posit interpolation as the cause) in the use of mythological references in exhortation in *Phoen.* 1688 and 1732-1733: in the former passage Antigone appeals to Oedipus' conquest of the Sphinx to dispel the old man's despairing refusal of aid, but in the latter she dismisses reminiscence of the Sphinx in order to bring lamentation (and the play) to an end. In the appendix, Bond suggests that 1410-1417 might work better if placed in the earlier scene of argumentative exhortation, between 1253 and 1254. In that position many new problems arise, however: (1) 1410 is not so good after 1253 because Heracles has just rejected the value of his previous toils (they are small in comparison with his present woe and they were futile); (2) in 1413 the burden placed upon *σοι* by Bond's interpretation seems too great; (3) at 1414 Theseus is denying what at 1250 and 1252 he wanted Heracles to believe and remember; (4) the motivation of the *tu quoque* argument in 1415 is unconvincingly explained by Bond (“stung perhaps by the repeated argument and the sanctimonious tone”); (5) if Heracles argues back so forcefully before 1254, this would detract from the decisiveness of his entering into a *ἄμιλλα λόγων* at 1255 (this decision was crucial: although he is not

necessarily swayed by Theseus' arguments as a whole, the activity of debate and consideration has the therapeutic effect of shaking Heracles' from his instinctive resolve to die). 1422: Bond thinks that *δυσκόμιστα γῆ* is defensible, if less pointed than *δυσκόμιστ' ἄχρη*. If the phrase is retained, the difficulty implied in [113]δυσ- can only be due to grief and not to pollution, since earth refuses burial to a sinner, not to his innocent victims. But the dative *γῆ* is very harsh, and *κομίζω* is not a normal word for interment. LSJ s.v. II.1 cites Soph. *Ai.* 1397 and Eur. *Andr.* 1264: Jebb, rightly I think, does not so translate the word at *Ai.* 1397, and *κομίζω* in *Andr.* 1264 is definitely used in the well-attested sense of transport of the body (to the appropriate house from which the *ἐκφορά* is later to take place)—cf. *Phoen.* 1316 and especially Isaeus 8.21 *ἤκον γὰρ ἐγὼ κομιούμενος αὐτὸν ὡς θάψων ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ* (also misinterpreted in LSJ).

Bond's metrical analyses are detailed, sensitive, and sensible, as they should be in a modern commentary. There is no point in pretending that the commentary is aimed at schoolboys and that sophistication of metrical analysis is inappropriate. But it would have been helpful if Bond had explained his terminology and symbols: not every user of the book will be familiar with “glyc.<sup>3</sup>” and “pher.<sup>1</sup>”. Bond's use of the period-end symbol || is rather haphazard. In a detailed commentary such as this I would prefer to see a consistent effort to establish period-end, such as Wil. always made in his metrical studies.<sup>8</sup> To be sure, there are uncertainties in such a quest. In the lyrics of tragedy there are many cola which we know are not period-final because of word-overlap or synapheia; there are fewer which we *know* are period-final because of hiatus or *brevis in longo*; and there are some which we *suspect* are period-final because of catalexis [114] or perhaps rhetorical pause, and others about which we cannot make any decision. Within these limits, however, it is useful to establish as much as possible. Bond sometimes adds || after *brevis in longo* and sometimes does not (e.g. p. 149); catalexis is the (unmentioned) justification for || at 111 = 123 (p. 92), but no mark is made at the similar catalexis 108 = 120, where Wil. assumed period-end on the basis of catalexis, or at 410 = 427 (p. 149), where

<sup>8</sup> Although there is a reference to Stinton's important article on p. 244 and in one or two footnotes, it seems that Bond's work was substantially done before that article or Parker's equally valuable one were available: L. P. E. Parker, “Catalexis,” *CQ* 26 (1976) 14-28; T.

catalexis is reinforced by strong rhetorical pause and period-end is virtually certain. Likewise, on pp. 225-226, contrast the marking of 648 = 666 with the failure to mark 638 = 656 and 646 = 664. Similarly, the final element of a stanza is sometimes marked  $\wedge$  (771 = 780, p. 264), but more often —. Apart from these details of presentation, the metrical analyses are admirable, and the demonstrations of isometric echoes (e.g. 736ff.) are very welcome. I have only a few comments, more by way of supplement than of correction.

127: the possibility of keeping unelided forms (with period-end) at 114 = 126 is mentioned, but one should add that the colon so produced is rare and not attractive in this stanza (Soph. *Trach.* 102 has a rather different feel). At 365 Bond assumes that the alpha of  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\alpha\nu$  is long; but as T. C. W. Stinton has pointed out to me,  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\bar{\alpha}\nu$  is not firmly established, since *brevis in longo* at period-end is a probable or possible interpretation of *Hec.* 159, *Andr.* 119, *IT* 155, *Phoen.* 795, and (this passage) *Her.* 365. Only *Phoen.* 810 definitely requires  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\check{\alpha}\nu$ , but Triklinios'  $\tau\grave{\alpha}\nu$  for  $\grave{\alpha}\nu$  would eliminate that example too. At 645 = 663 (p. 225) and at 881, 896, and 907 (pp. 296-297), Bond might have discussed whether the colon-final elements he marks as  $\wedge$  are not rather to be considered instances of link-anceps without metrical pause (for if they are really *breves in longo*, there is a period-end): this interpretation is possible in the latter three examples, but can be ruled out in 645-663 if the first element of the pherecratean<sup>3</sup> (or aeolic heptasyllable B) 646 = 664 is (as it seems) an anceps. For the concept of link-anceps (and some dispute about its existence), see L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* 26 (1976) 25-28 and T. C. W. Stinton, *CQ* 27 (1977) 65-66. At p. 256 n. 2 Bond (with Lloyd-Jones) is right, I think, in being sceptical about  $\beta\omicron\grave{\alpha}$  *extra metrum* (so Diggle and Wil.; Wil. had qualms but suppressed them, III.165 n. 1). 791: Bond defends the possibility of retaining Ἐλικωνιάδων with  $\asymp$  responsion in aeolics; this license is related to inversion of (or within) the sequence ...  $\times - \times - \times$  ... which precedes the choriamb of aeolic cola. 791 is based on  $-\times - - \cup \cup - (- \cup -)$  [115] rather than  $\times - \times - \cup \cup - (- \cup -)$ , as at *IT* 1130 = 1145 (cited by Bond)  $\times - - \times - \cup \cup -$  produces  $\cup \asymp - - - \cup \cup -$ . Cf. Dale, *Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1968), 134, 153. Compare also the rare aeolic opening  $\asymp \cup \cup$  based on  $\times -$ , as at *Phoen.* 208 = 220 (208 Ἴόνιος: there is no secure

---

C. W. Stinton, "Pause and Period in the Lyrics of Greek Tragedy," *CQ* 27 (1977) 27-66.

evidence for Ἰόνιος in Greek; Latin poets always have *Ionius*), *IT* 1092 = 1109, 1129 = 1144, *Ba.* 410 = 425, *IA* 753 = 764, 754 = 765 (the metrical license should not be used to call Euripidean authorship of this stanza or of part of it into question, as was done by Page). 821: Bond is rather oblique in informing his readers that this line is a dochmiac, marking a climax of emotion; given the dochmiac, 820 might be two spondees, not an iambic metron. On p. 296 n.4 Bond quotes Diggle for a rejection of a scansion involving *brevis in longo* and metrical pause after a bacchiac + dochmiac colon (this ban is based on the conclusion of Conomis that such pause is much more severely restricted in dochmiacs than in other lyrics); but in his note on 1061 Bond correctly regards Conomis' conclusion as overdrawn and rejects Diggle's ⟨γ'⟩, which serves only to prevent hiatus between dochmiac metra (a phenomenon accepted by Diggle in his text of *Tro.* 310). The dochmiacs at *Her.* 1061-1063 could be rearranged as δ || 2δ | 2δ. On p. 297 a footnote on the scansion γεραῖον could have been added (with a cross-reference to the note on 116). In two remarks on the trimeter Bond's statements are too brief to help the uninitiated: on line 8 he alludes to the ugliness of the trimeter with virtually no caesura, and on 1126 he mentions the problem of caesura in one version of the line but does not explain why Heath's solution does not raise the same problem (cf. Maas, *Greek Metre* §137 on monosyllabic postpositives at position 6).

In conclusion, I want to remark again that I hope that this reviewer's catalogue of disagreements will not mislead anyone into mistaking the excellent quality and usefulness of Bond's *Heracles*, which are displayed in the thoroughness, honesty, and clarity of note after note. The author is to be heartily congratulated on a work which is to remain for years (or rather decades) to come a vital resource for mature students of Euripides, and the Oxford University Press is to be thanked for undertaking the project and for bringing it to conclusion. Unfortunately, our gratitude to the Press must be tempered by regret at a certain decline in production [116]quality<sup>9</sup> and by sorrow at the

---

<sup>9</sup> First, some slips in copy-editing. Pp. xxxiv-v twice mention the *fragmenta dubia* "in this edition", but p. 175 of Diggle's OCT has not been reprinted. Lines 121-3: "West (l.c.)" is unhelpful (cf. *Philologus* 117 [1973] 145-151); it would not have taken too much space to provide a brief bibliography of useful articles, including those of Kamerbeek, Chalk, West, etc. Of recent work, add M. Cropp in *CQ* 29 (1979) 56-61. 271: the comment is on

current price. Unless a paper-bound edition is forthcoming (as a deliberate marketing strategy, not as a begrudging form of reprint), one must give up hope of ordering this book for an undergraduate Greek class. And with the pricing of British academic paperbacks, even that might be unaffordable.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY    DONALD J. MASTRONARDE

---



---

*ᾠκήσαμεν*; the text prints *ᾠνήσαμεν*. (See above, footnote 3). Pp. 263 & 261: the note on *ἀνομία χραίνων* is out of order. Pp. 322ff.: note on 1016-38 should have followed metrical scheme for 1016-85. P. 324: the line number 1075 is used as assigned in the texts of Nauck and Murray, but Diggle's text has returned to the numeration of Barnes and Dindorf. 1002: Eur. fr. 125 is quoted with *τυχισμάτων*, but at 1094-7 the same fr. has *τυκ-* (cf. Bond's note on 945). Numerous lemmata requiring bold-face Greek are in normal type (2, 394, 427, 465, 469, 470, 529, 544, 669f., 845, 860 [p. 294, 2nd line], 1091, 1190-4), while bold-face type is sometimes used inconsistently where the words are not as they appear in the text (54, 291, 301 [last line of p. 137], 305, 637, 845). Second, typographical corrections in the commentary. Line 40 *φόνον*. P. 74 l.6 Lycus. L.116 *γεραῖε*. P. 108 l.3 delete "with". L.234f. pillars. L.236 "or" not "of". P. 127 l.1 *ἀντηλίους*. L.290 "husband" not "son" (9th line). P. 151 n. 1 *αἶ*. P. 165 l.1 *μηλο-*. P. 167 l.2 *τ'*. P. 167 l.3 *κόρας*. L.457 (L) not (M). L.480 fiends. L.490 *Ἄιδη*. L.584 Radermacher. P. 224 l.23 "Eteocles" not "Polyneices". P. 225 "650 = 668" should be one line lower. L.687 *μὲν*. P. 248 n.2 "for" not "or". L.776 *ἑφέλκων*. L.819 parodos. P. 285 n. 1 Kitto. L.878 *παρέδραμεν*. L.925 Canter. L.1188 dimeter. P. 374 n.3 Kokolakis. L.1321 "Eteocles" not "Polyneices". L.1371 *δεσπότην* in *Hel.* 481.