



Euripides VI: Bacchae, Iphigenia in Aulis, Rhesus, edited and translated by David Kovacs [Loeb Classical Library 495]. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2002. pp. viii + 455.

Reviewed by Donald J. Mastronarde
University of California, Berkeley
pinax@socrates.berkeley.edu

In *CJ* 92 (1996-97) 201-206, I reviewed the first volume of David Kovacs' Loeb Euripides, published in 1994, and welcomed it as a long-needed and carefully-executed replacement for the embarrassing old Loeb of A. S. Way. K. has now completed his very large task with admirable promptness and consistency. The final volume continues to show the merits and, for more conservative textual critics or more adventurous literary critics, the shortcomings of the earlier ones.

As a textual editor, Kovacs is fairly similar to Diggle in his willingness to contemplate emendations and to accept proposals for deletion. For a great many of the points where his text differs from the OCT, K. has promoted to the text what Diggle has merely recorded in the app. (including some of Diggle's own proposals), often in cases where Diggle marked a crux in the text. For some examples see *Ba.* 32, 877, 983, 998, 1031, 1157, 1163-4, 1174, *IA* 109, 149-51, 379, 578, 580, *Rhes.* 37b-38a, 59, 105, 435, 466, 561, 596, 811. There are, however, a few places where K. declines to emend in the text and uses the obelos, as at *IA* 84. There are also times when K. returns to the transmitted reading, rejecting an emendation adopted by Diggle. For the Loeb edition K. is very sparing in the use of the obelos and prefers to present a continuously readable text to match his continuously readable translation. In the difficult text of the *IA*, in particular, it is not in K.'s nature to practice the *ars nesciendi*, and he frankly states in the

introduction that “it is necessary to emend more frequently both in genuine and in interpolated parts.” An extension of K.’s editorial style is his habit of filling in lacunae of a verse or two with lines of his own composition. Along with some other reviewers of the Loeb Euripides, I regret this practice and would have preferred to see such suggestions left in the apparatus and the corresponding English supplement clearly distinguished in some typographical way from the surrounding translation of transmitted words. Apart from this, K. tends to be decisive and confident (or overconfident?) in crossing the boundary between judging something doubtful or unusual and judging it unacceptable. He defends some of his textual decisions in this and the previous Loeb volume in the companion study entitled *Euripidea Tertia* (Mnemosyne Supplement 240, Leiden and Boston 2003), which appeared a few months after Loeb VI. This review was initially written before I saw *Euripidea Tertia*, but in final revision I have taken it into account, although there is not space here to deal with its arguments in detail.

Each play is preceded by a few pages of introduction, giving essential background information, and in the case of *IA* and *Rhesus* a quick review of the special problems of mixed authorship or falsely-ascribed authorship. K. also takes a position on some of the interpretive issues, reflecting his already well-known straightforward and unironic approach, which is out of sympathy with much recent literary scholarship on Euripides. For *Ba*. he argues, unconvincingly to my mind, that Pentheus is merely curious to see the secret rites and not sexually voyeuristic: while moderns can and do easily overplay the psychoanalytic and sexual interpretations, the repeated references in the text to witnessing the shameful actions of the women indicate that one should not suppress entirely this aspect of interpretation. I do not accept K.’s textual or dramatic interpretations of *Ba*. 816, which are relevant to this issue (see p. 18 below).

Kovacs’ view of what is likely to be original in *IA* and what the work of a single Reviser of the fourth century (this does not exclude other additions or interferences with the text) will be argued for in detail in a forthcoming study in *JHS*, which I have not seen [see now *JHS* 123 (2003) 77-103]. In this volume he notes summarily that he considers the motif of a secret prophecy that is not known to the whole Greek army to be an importation of the Reviser and thus a diagnostic tool for denying various sections or passages to Eur. I myself don’t find such a simple approach promising, but I await his fuller argument. As a consequence, K. assigns a good deal of the remarkable double *agôn logôn* to the

Reviser, as well as half of Clytemnestra's speech at 1146ff. (including the odd claim that Agamemnon killed her first husband and a baby—as Pasquali once argued about suspected interpolations, one might more easily believe that Eur. came up with this outrageous variant than that some anonymous reviser did). K. ends his introduction to this play with an argument (more an assertion) that the patriotism and the self-sacrifice are to be read “straight.” Many will disagree in various ways with that view, especially in view of *IA*'s position at the end of a long series of tragic reflections on the (dubious) value and morality of the Trojan War and the self-refuting nature of so much of the rhetoric of Euripidean characters, especially in nearly contemporary plays like *Phoenissae* and *Orestes*. On p. 161 Kovacs claims that we can be sure that the *deus ex machina* fragment surviving in Aelian (presented on pp. 342-3) is not from the Euripidean original because ἀύχῆσουσι is used in the sense “they will suppose.” The fragment may well be from another non-Euripidean ending, but Barrett on *Hipp.* 952-5, to my mind, correctly asserts that the meaning is “feel confident that” and is quite normal for Euripides himself.

The introduction to *Rhesus* is a fair summary of the problem of authorship and I have no dispute with K.'s conclusion that the play is not by Euripides. On pp. 352-3, however, he refers to Dicaearchus' plot summaries without any annotation mentioning the dispute over the authenticity of the ascription to Dicaearchus of the “Tales from the Tragedians” (in the stereotyped form of title, first line of play, and epitome of the background myth and action of the play). If the ascription is false (or the name Dicaearchus is not in fact to be restored in the prefatory material to *Rhesus*: P. Carrara, *ZPE* 90 (1992) 35-44), the date at which “Dicaearchus” quoted an alternative first line would be uncertain, presumably quite a bit later than Dicaearchus' own lifetime. In presenting on p. 455 Eur. fr. 1108, the first line of a *Rhesus* cited by (pseudo-?)Dicaearchus, K. seems to be far too dogmatic in claiming that the missing feminine noun going with ἡ διφρήλατος has to be the goddess Dawn; it could be simply θεά or some genealogical periphrasis for Selene/Artemis. More important, K.'s reconstruction of how this fragment continued is quite unlikely. At the opening of the play it will be made clear that it is the middle of the night, with ample time for the following events to occur in the dark as in *Iliad* 10. Announcing that Dawn is about to banish the moon's light would give the wrong temporal clue, suggesting that daybreak will occur within the play.

I now turn to selective comments on K.'s textual choices. The

emphasis here will be on doubts and disagreements, but it should go without saying that K. has worked very carefully and has made a large number of textual decisions that I fully accept as appropriate or plausible.

Bacchae

20 *πρῶτον*: lines 20-23 are textually difficult and the proper solution is uncertain; K.'s translation "I have now for the first time returned to Greece" does not correspond well to the Greek he prints (it imports the notion of return, and the translation of the adverb seems forced and unidiomatic). *πρώτην* is very attractive (*Christus Patiens*; Diggle), and if this reading is adopted, the redundancy with 23 should be taken as deliberately emphatic.

479 I prefer to keep *κούδεν* (against Diggle and K.).

496 I think there are insufficient grounds to replace *Διονύσου* with the dative.

816 the choice of Reid's *καθημένας* is, I think, unfortunate; *καθήμενος* is retained by Diggle, with the Aldine's needed *γ'* for *δ'*: *λάθρα* in the following line is clearly in favor of *καθήμενος*. LSJ indicates how *σιγῆ* shades over into the sense "secretly," and the word is a virtual equivalent of *λάθρα* in *Medea* 587 and Herodotus 2.140. K.'s view of these lines also seems to be inconsistent with Pentheus' ready agreement (*σάφ' ἴσθι*) that there would be a mixture of pleasure and distress in seeing the maenads.

860 K.'s adoption of Hirzel's *ἐντελής* is probably the best choice available in an uncertain passage.

996 (and 1016) I prefer (with Diggle) *γόνον γηγενῆ* to *τόκον γηγενῆ*.

1002 K. adopts Dodds' *σωφρόνισμα* and fixes the meter with the bold change of *ἀπροφάσιστος* to *ἀόκνως*, but I do not find the sense "to be unhesitating toward the gods" satisfactory in this passage or as a general proposition about Greek religious behavior.

1071 in *Euripidea Tertia* K. argues that ὄρθον should be emended to ὠρθου, with the adoption of μεθίεις from the papyrus for P's μεθίει. The Loeb has ὄρθου both in the text and in the apparatus criticus; if this is not simply a twofold typographical error but rather an attempt to make the emendation even closer to the transmitted reading, it is mistaken since omission of temporal augment is confined to anapaests and lyrics.

1207. I share Dodd's view that it is unnecessary and “enfeeble[s] the taunt” to change κᾶτα κομπάζειν to κᾶτ' ἀκοντίζειν, as both Diggle and K. do.

IA

57 I am very doubtful of the possibility or appropriateness of ἄθραυστα here (the change was recommended first by Hemsterhuys, as reported by Musgrave, and I don't know why K. has attributed it to Nauck instead).

77 As in the earlier volumes, K. has had a great deal of interaction with Charles Willink, and a great many of Willink's proposals are to be seen in the apparatus or adopted in the text. Here the corrupt μόρω at line-end is emended with Willink to ἔρω (Stockert credits this emendation to Burges), while many editions have accepted Markland's δρόμω, which is at least equally plausible in sense and palaeography. For some other contributions by Willink see *IA* 84, 130, 232 [better left in the app.], 755, 769, 771 [an attractive change], 784, 1096.

237 K. retains transmitted Φθιώτας, but Diggle was right to accept Wilamowitz's Φθιωτίδας.

521 The apparatus should say “sic fere Murray” or should give some credit to Hermann or Diggle.

710 K. rightly keeps σοφώτερος, rejecting Musgrave's σοφωτέροις (accepted by Diggle).

714 K. accepts Dobree's second person ἀπάξεις, which has Clytemnestra wondering whether Agamemnon will conduct his daughter

to Phthia. This makes no sense in the particular situation (Agamemnon is about to depart to Troy) or in terms of the general practice for marriage, where the bridegroom “takes possession” of the bride in the bride’s father’s house (or here camp) and removes her from that place and from the care of her father.

804 this passage of Greek is not a model of clarity, but I don’t think following Hermann in treating this line as a question improves matters.

811 K. accepts Kirchhoff’s ἄλλος δὲ χρήζων for transmitted ἄλλος δ’ ὁ χρήζων. Kirchhoff said that “good Greek” would be ἄλλων δ’ ὁ χρήζων, but it is of course a question how “good” the Greek of these lines was. In any case, K. seems to me to translate ὁ χρήζων, for he uses an attributive relative clause, “some one else who wants to,” and not a conditional clause, “if he wants to”; conversely, Jouan printed ὁ χρήζων but translated “un autre, s’il le veut” as if the article were not present. I would note too that Achilles is speaking almost in terms of a legal complaint in these lines, and ὁ χρήζων might well remind an Athenian of the use of ὁ βουλόμενος used in laws to specify who is allowed to prosecute a certain type of case.

854 I think that with the transmitted text of this line K. is right to assume that a second door in the skene-background was used in this scene, but his stage direction for Achilles (“he starts to go toward the central door”) and lack of stage direction for Clytemnestra reveal the oddity of the text. The oddity was revealed long ago by N. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides* (Athens 1965) 21-2. If there is not something more serious wrong with the text, there are various ways to position and move the characters, but I am most sympathetic to the view Kovacs assumes for the movements of Clytemnestra and Iphigenia—namely, that these female characters go inside and emerge through the main skene-door (Agamemnon’s main tent) and not a side door representing a “women’s” tent. At this point in the scene, Clytemnestra has just said farewell and said she cannot any longer look the unrelated male Achilles in the eye. Those are the words of a woman who should be turning around and retreating into the central door, from which she had emerged. Achilles likewise wants to get away from Clytemnestra, whom he has no business talking to, so it would be very odd for him to head for the door from which Clytemnestra emerged, as this might bring him into contact

with other secluded females of Agamemnon's family. It would be more natural for Achilles to assume that Agamemnon is not present here and must be sought elsewhere, an intention which could be restored by changing τῶνδε δωμαίων ἔσω into τῶνδε δωμαίων ἄπο or making some other change. (Luigi Battezzato suggests to me that one could delete ἔσω and read <- U> τῶνδ' ἐκ δωμαίων in the second half of the line. Lucia Prauscello suggests to me something like τῶνδ' <ἀπόντ'> ἐκ δωμαίων or τῶνδ' <ἀπόντα> δωμαίων.) Thus the two characters would be departing in separate directions when the old servant emerges (either from the single central door or from a side door) and asks both to stop and wait (855-6).

865-6 it is reasonable to posit a lacuna between these lines (K. follows Walter), unless one changes δεξιᾶς in 866 to πίστεως. The emendation of Schwabl printed in 865 (where Diggle and Günther have obeli) is not very attractive.

1108 and 1110 K. apparently regards the surrounding scene as essentially Euripidean and keeps both these lines, but I agree with those who find the combination of the two incoherent, especially if Heimsoeth's emendation is accepted, as it is by K.

Rhesus

27 I think Musgrave's emendation is unnecessary.

467-9 K. supplies a line between 467 and 468 rather than accepting the unusual but understandable syntax of the genitive of exchange in "such things will I allow you to exact from me in return for my long absence." Worse, however, is his acceptance of the impossible ἐπειδάν with short alpha in 469: although Kühner-Blass I.122 and LSJ appear to sanction this, more recent authorities have recognized that such a form is illusory in Herodotus as well as in Aesch. *Sept.* 734 and here: see J. Wackernagel, *Glotta* 7 (1915) 193-4 and Schwyzer II.659.

518 I agree with K.'s decision to return to the reading of the mss, plural imperative (Diggle prints Kirchhoff's singular imperative).

636 K. prints his own emendation οἴπερ ἦξις; but antithesis with

τοῦτον in the previous line supports the generally accepted emendation ᾧπερ, and the present tense ἦκεις is apt for a goddess speaking of what is and is not fated to happen on this night. In *Euripidea Tertia* K. indicates that he finds the reference of ἦκεις objectionable (“his arrival at Troy is a long time ago, and his arrival at the tent of Rhesus still lies in the future”), but the goddess means “your coming here into the enemy camp tonight.”

686 I approve K.’s choices in 686, where (unlike D.) he follows the many edd. who have given 686a to Odysseus and supplied <μή> before ἀλλά.

725 K. adopts Wilamowitz’s δράσας in 725, translating “at what ill fortune?”: this requires that δρᾶν be taken as equivalent to πράσσειν = “fare,” an equivalence which I continue to believe should be rejected (*Contact and Discontinuity* [Berkeley and Los Angeles 1979] 122-3 and my note on *Phoen.* 376), even for the unknown author of *Rhesus*. The emendation derives from Wilamowitz’s note on *Her.* 540, where he implausibly assigns a weakened meaning to δρᾶν in such questions in half a dozen passages (a view rightly rejected by Bond on *Her.* 540). Dindorf’s δρᾶσαι (anticipating the construction of περᾶσαι) is the best available solution.

785 I would have adopted Musgrave’s ἀρτηρίων here.

811 I would have left Naber’s emendation in the app. If this is a fourth-century work, it is hardly certain that ἀπώσατε instead of ἀπεώσατε is not possible, and the illogicality of the addition of οὔτ’ ἐξιόντας may be an effect of vehement utterance.

911 again, K.’s own emendation, πλέουσ’ ἐπλάθη, seems to me unnecessary. His argument for it in *Euripidea Tertia* is faulty. “Phrygian bed” refers to a bed already shared with Paris, her new sexual partner, not to a bed in Phrygia she has yet to reach, as K. assumes. The metrical argument used by K. applies properly to passages of single-short rhythm and is misapplied in this passage containing double-short movement: the lack of period end in these enoplians is correctly accepted by Wilamowitz, Zanetto, and Dale.

As throughout the volumes, the translation is written in a clear and straightforward style, with occasional stylistic flourishes and justifiable reordering of ideas or suppression of subordination to suit English idiom, but still close enough to the Greek to be of real help to students puzzled by the Greek and free of the extraneously introduced metaphors and similes that make some poetic translations confusing or misleading. In such a style, the presence of “’twas” at *IA* 707 is rather surprising. Rarely, K. seems to omit a word entirely in his rendering: sometimes this looks like a deliberate simplification of a pleonastic tragic phrase (*Ba.* 700 ἀγρίους, 711 γλυκεῖαι, 1096 κραταιβόλους), but elsewhere one is uncertain whether it is deliberate or an oversight: *Ba.* 84 θεόν (the word is after all thematic here), 548 ἤδη (losing the contrast with τάχα in 546), *IA* 420-1 “by an abundantly flowing spring,” 1207 σοι, 1257 γύναι, 1274 βαρβάρων ὑπο (which is thematic); *Rhes.* 828 πάντα, 983 ἤδη (including “henceforth” would make the chorus’ remark less cold). In difficult passages K. rarely lets the reader know of uncertainty (the note on *IA* 1375 containing an alternative translation is a rarity).

Since the Loeb edition will long be a standard resource for students and teachers of Euripides, I shall note here in detail the places where I regard the translation as misleading or where I would have preferred a different approach.

Bacchae

40 K. does not want to take the whole participial phrase as supplementary with ἐκμαθεῖν in 39 (“learn that it is uninitiated...”) and renders “This city, though it is uninitiated in my bacchic rites, must learn them to the full” (even proposing τᾶμ’ ὅμως βουλευύματα in the apparatus to convey that sense more naturally); but the pregnant expression is acceptable, and the sense is well captured by Seaford’s “must learn to the full ... what it is to be uninitiated in my bacchanals.” One may compare various formulas of threatening of the type “you will learn (to your cost)” discussed by Fraenkel on Aesch. *Agam.* 1649, Friis-Johansen & Whittle on Aesch. *Supp.* 939, Wilkins on Eur. *Hclid.* 65, and Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 659-60

69 like Seaford, K. has followed Diggle (*Euripidea* [Oxford 1994] 3-4)

in taking ἔκτοπος ἔστω as “let everyone come forth.” I might agree with this rendering if there were a separative genitive οἴκων or the like, or a nearby imperative “look upon us.” Absent such features, I think Dodds and others were right: “let anyone (everyone) keep a distance, keep out of our way.” “In the street” and “in the house” form a universalizing polar expression (“wherever you may be, keep away from our sacred rites”). The chorus is not “proselytizing” but wrapped up in its own worship and remarkably lacking in interaction with the Thebans on stage in the first two-thirds of the play; in a series of short excited questions in asyndeton, it is overlogical to insist on the relevance of the question specifically to anyone indoors.

154 by an oversight Tmolus has here become a river (it is correctly rendered as a mountain in 65); the sense is rather “pride of Mt. Tmolus, source of a gold-flowing stream.”

427-8 K. may be right to follow Dodds’ recommendation about the sense here, but I think the context and the “character” of this chorus point rather in the direction of the sense that Hermann preferred, “keep at arm’s length the clever wit and subtlety that proceed from men who reject the common rule.” In late Euripidean lyric I am not put off by the need to take the nouns in a transferred sense as “product of thought” rather than “seat of thought.”

504 K renders αὐδῶ με μὴ δεῖν, σωφρονῶν οὐ σώφροσιν as “And I forbid it: I am sane and you are not,” which sounds as if the stranger is addressing Pentheus only. It could be argued that σώφροσιν is a true plural here (“you and your henchmen”), and an address that includes the henchmen is a better prompt to Pentheus’ rebuttal κυριώτερος σέθεν.

622 “without a word” for ἥσυχος is perhaps too limited a sense, as there is a contrast in the scene between the eerie calm and poise of the god and the agitation and futile effort of the human antagonist.

652 K. agrees with Seaford in assigning ὀνειδισας ... καλόν to Pentheus (though K. posits a lacuna after the line and Seaford doesn’t); I prefer Diggle’s treatment, with lacuna before and Dionysus as speaker. For the type of rebuttal see *IA* 305 and my note on *Phoen.* 821.

831 “First on your head I will cause your hair to grow long.” In Greek the phrase is ταναὸν ἐκτενῶ. This rendering is K.’s solution to the logical puzzle that Pentheus ought to be short-haired when he mocks the Stranger’s long hair in 455-6. Dodds argued that dressing Pentheus in a wig is meant, and Roux that Pentheus’ bound-up hair is to be let loose.

872 K. takes συντείνῃ δράμημα κυνῶν as “calls back his coursing dogs”; but the point of θωύσσων and other uses of συντείνω support the meaning assumed by LSJ and various editors, “intensifies his dogs’ running pursuit.”

1060 like Diggle K. adopts Jackson’s μανιάδων ... νόσων, but the translation “bacchic frenzy” may be a little weak here (perhaps “the insane behavior of their bacchic rites”; cf. Seaford’s “the diseased raving women”).

1125 for “his right hand” read “his left hand.”

IA

172 it is unclear why K. transposes the epithet “Achaean” (which might have simply been omitted in English) from the demigods to their ships.

201 not “next to Meriones,” but “next <to the aforementioned> I saw Meriones ... and the son of Laertes,” with παρά as adverb, not preposition.

225-6 “[the horses] were spotted below their solid-hoofed ankles” makes no sense; England’s solution was to take ὑπό as adverbial and σφυρά as acc. of respect, but more likely ὑπό + acc. here means either “up to”/“close to” (as several translators have taken it; cf. LSJ s.v. C.I.2 ad fin., especially Isocr. 4.108) or possibly “along” of spatial extension analogous to the sense of temporal extension of ὑπό + acc., “during.”

314 ἀδικούμεθα could well be a true plural, as the speaker includes the addressee (Agamemnon) in the harm done by Menelaus.

342 πρίασθαι τὸ φιλότιμον ἐκ μέσου is more likely to be “purchase the object of ambition, removing it from free and open competition” (in

other words, cornering the market) than simply “buy advancement from the multitude.” ἐκ μέσου should be connected to the more common ἐς μέσον and ἐν μέσῳ (see Stockert).

482 it makes no sense for Menelaus to say here “nor to take mine in their stead.” ἀνθελέσθαι τοῦμόν is “give precedence to my interests rather than your own.”

502 K. renders “I have changed and begun to love a brother,” which would be fine for στέργω μεταπεσῶν, but στέργων μετέπεσον ought to be “because I love a brother I have changed my mind.”

522-23 the artificiality of the stichomythia comes across as more Housmanesque than it need be: translate ἐκεῖνο as “that other point.”

531 συναρπάσας στρατόν needs a less literal rendering than “grab the Greek army”; rather “sweep along with him, carry away with passion” (Stockert: mitreissen; Jouan: entraîné).

557 ἀποθείμαν probably better “renounce” than “send away.”

715 the translation “the one who weds her” loses the ambiguity of “that one who has taken possession of her” (applying apparently to Achilles but really to Hades). Or rather, K.’s translation is ambiguous enough only for those readers familiar with the motif of “marriage to death.”

733 νυμφίοις should be “the bridal couple” rather than “the groom.” K. renders the same term correctly in the former sense in 741.

882 I agree with (e.g.) Stockert and Jouan that νόστος should here be translated “return” and not simply “journey,” as K. renders it.

945 K. wrongly renders “it seems that all along I have been the meanest of the Greeks, a nobody, a Menelaus among men,” mistaking a fairly common type of contrastive rhetorical indignation: “I a nobody, but Menelaus one of the real men!” (like Soph. *Ant.* 484-5)

986-7 I would have preferred to see the aorist κατέσχον translated with something that reflects the aspect more accurately than “I was nurturing

a vain hope”: the force of the aorist is “in my belief [οἰηθεῖς’ may be taken as coincident aorist] that I had you as a son-in-law, I conceived (came to hold, took up) a vain hope.”

1079 πρῶτα (of Thetis among the Nereids) should here be “best” or “most outstanding,” not “eldest.”

1132 K., like other translators, fails to convey very well the ambiguity of ὑπνοεῖς ἄ μή σε χρῆ (“ought not to” both because the suspicions are outrageous according to normal morality and because Agam. had intended his intentions to be kept secret from his wife).

1154 “with the flashing of cavalry” makes it sound as if the Dioscuri led a cavalry squadron; the sense is rather “the Dioscuri on their flashing bright horses” or “the Dioscuri, flashing bright on their horses.”

1193 “will they want you to pull one of them away for slaughter?” ascribes a much too violent sense to Weil’s (needed) emendation προσέμενος: rather “so that after welcoming them to your embrace you may then kill one of them.”

1370 καρτερεῖν would better be rendered as “resist” or “persevere against” than “endure” (cf. Stockert and Jouan).

1549 “turning his head away” would be clearer than “bending his head backward.”

Rhesus

1-3 With the punctuation adopted here (colon at end of 1, as in OCT and Ebener, correctly, I think), the initial imperative should be taken as self-addressed (cf. Σ and Ebener), a standard way for the chorus to make clear to the audience where it is headed; K. thinks it is addressed to “any of the prince’s squires and armor bearers,” who are the subject of the question in 2-3.

36 “Pan, Cronus’ son”: a footnote might have been in order for this odd genealogy; the meaning may be simply “descendant of Cronus.”

46 middle ἐφιέμενοι with an accusative object perhaps ought to mean something like “urging some new colloquy/deliberation” rather than K.’s “desiring to hear some new report,” which normally would require a genitive object, although K. is not the only one to take the phrase thus. W. H. Porter’s commentary cites Xenophon, *Agesilaus* 11.14 for an instance of the accusative, but that passage is textually defective (there may have been an infinitive after ἐφιέμενος that governed the missing noun that went with the accusative adjectives).

339 probably “and the consideration (recommendation) you (the messenger) urge is also opportune” (in dissuading Hector from his rash plan; Ebener “und angemessen deine Vorsicht”) rather than literally “you have done timely lookout duty” (Lattimore’s translation is similar); the former is more to the point and correctly balances the first half of the line “you (the chorus-leader) give good advice.”

377 as Barrett on *Hipp.* 230 indicates, δαπέδοις usually means precisely the sacred ground of a precinct and not simply “plains”; that fits here as well, alluding to dancing specifically in the precinct of Argive Hera.

574-5 not “careful! I see empty beds of the enemy here. — Yes: Dolon said that here Hector was sleeping,” but rather “What’s this? [noticing something new, as usual with ἔα] I <unexpectedly> see these beds empty [predicative] of the enemy. — But Dolon did say Hector was sleeping here, and he’s the one against whom we’ve drawn our swords.” The context makes clear that Odysseus and Diomedes have come here to kill Hector and are surprised and disappointed to find him not where they were told to find him. καὶ μήν has its adversative sense (Denniston, *Greek Particles* 357-8).

616 I would translate “chariot” rather than “chariots,” since it is only Rhesos who has come with splendid chariot-horses.

627 it is better to keep Athena’s spirit of solidarity with her protégés by rendering καθ’ ἡμᾶς as “toward us” rather than freely as “toward you.”

646 K. translates “I, Cypris” as if Naber’s emendation φυλάσσω were in the text, but he prints φυλάσσει and does not mention Naber’s change

in the apparatus. Naber is probably, but not quite certainly, right: see Barrett on *Hipp.* 1285 and note *Electra* 1239 for an instance with third person vs. several others with first, including *Hipp.* 1285 and *Or.* 1626, both of which have third person as MS variant for the first person (editors print the latter).

685 K. translates the emendation that is in the apparatus, while the Greek text is left daggered.

692 K.'s stage direction has the chorus go down one eisodos and come back in immediately; it is more likely that the chorus milled about uncertainly toward that side and then returned toward center.

711 the mysterious word ὑπαφρον (cf. Soph. fr. 236 with Radt's apparatus) is more likely to be "rheumy-eyed," as LSJ and some previous translators have taken it (part of appearing a starving beggar in rags) than "disguised," which is probably an ad hoc guess of the scholiast.

753 read "he" for "we"; although in 762 the Driver unusually pairs himself with Rhesus as fated to die at Troy, κέλσαντ' ἐπίκουρον in 753 refers to Rhesus alone.

875-6 not "it is no mere word I have launched against you, as you disdainfully suppose," but rather "the curse I utter is not directed at you, according to your selfish boast—but Justice knows the truth [sc. that the curse does properly fall upon you]." Cf. Ebener's "Mein Wort zielt nicht auf dich, wie prahlend du behauptest." The force of γάρ is "<I feel free to utter my curse against the slayer in your very presence,> for on your own hypothesis it doesn't apply to you."

943 "your unutterable mysteries" (addressed to Athena, but alluding to Eleusinian rites) strikes me as odd; why not simply "the [or its] unutterable mysteries"?

The standard of production and proofreading is high, as is normal in the Loeb series. I noticed only Αὐδλίδος for Αὐλίδος in the app. on p. 330, μάρτυρας for μάρτυρας in the quotation of Aelian on p. 342, "gate" for "gait" in the translation of *Rhesus* 212, "Valkenaer" for "Valckenaer" in app. at *Rhes.* 670, ἔπλευσα for ἔπλευσε in app. at

Rhes. 911. At *Ba.* 592 perhaps a line of the apparatus has been dropped, since one would expect Diggle's transposition τάδε διάδρομα (printed in the text) to be noted (but cf. *IA* 548, where there is again no note recording the acceptance of Triclinius' transposition; *IA* 561 no note on acceptance of Blaydes' δ'; *IA* 1279 no note on Murray's transposition). At *Ba.* 598 the accent of κεραινόβολος seems to have survived accidentally from Murray (so too Seaford), but with the emendation βροντά as subject the transmitted κεραινοβόλος is correct. At *IA* 435 read εἶα for εἷα. The app. at *IA* 1058 ascribes ἐλάταισιν to L, giving the impression that the reading is closer to Weil's emendation ἐλάταις σύν than it really is (L lacks the final nu). On pp. 284-304 there are a number of apparatus criticus notes that have somehow been repositioned on the page after the one on which they should have appeared.