

JAMES A. D. IRVINE

EURIPIDES' *ION* L.1 AND PAP. HERC. 1088 2 A RECONSIDERED

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 117 (1997) 1–8

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## EURIPIDES' *ION* L. 1 AND PAP. HERC. 1088 2 A RECONSIDERED<sup>1</sup>

*Ion* long enjoyed the rather doubtful distinction among those with a less than everyday acquaintance with Greek tragedy as 'the play whose first line breaches Porson's Bridge'.

Ἄτλας ὁ χαλκίοισι νότοις οὐρανὸν  
θεῶν παλαιὸν οἶκον ἐκτρίβων θεῶν  
μιᾶς ἔφυσε Μαίαν, ἣ' μ' ἐγένετο  
Ἐρμῆν μεγίστῳ Ζηνί, δαιμόνων λάτριν.

From the first promulgation of that metrical law, attempts have been made either to emend away, or to explain, the irregularity, and to these I return. My main purpose in this paper, however, is to re-examine the evidence that has been brought to bear more recently on the problem, in the form of Pap. Herc. 1088 2 a l. 21 f.

From the initial publication of this papyrus<sup>2</sup> it has been known that in the course of Philodemus' great list of poets and references which occupies the second part of *de pietate* as we have it and in which he strives to confute his opponents, Stoic and other, with their own tools of poetic exegesis<sup>3</sup>, at least a partial quotation of *Ion* l. 1 occurs.

The original was lost among many others<sup>4</sup>, presumably in the process of restoration, at some point in the first half of the last century, and we are obliged to rely upon one Neapolitan *disegno*, a reproduction of which will be found at the end of this article.

Here is a conservative restoration:

1088 2 a 18 f.	Καὶ
	ὁ Ἄτλας] τὸν [ . . . . . ]
	[ . . . οὐρα]νὸ[ν ἔρε-
	[ἴδει· καὶ] Εὐριπίδης
	[ . . . χ]αλκίοισ[ιν
	[ . . . . . ] νότοις ο[ . ]
	[ . . . . . ] Ἴωνι πεποί-
	[ηκεν

18 fin. κω cod., corr. Schober 19 ὁ Ἄτλας] Schober, qui sic pergit τὸν [γιγαντεῖον οὐρ]ανὸ[ν 20-21 [φέρει· καὶ] Schober (καὶ iam Gomperz): **ἔρεῖδει· καὶ**] Irvine; sic Aeschylus de Prometheo victo fabulam hoc loco citare, at perperam, Philodemum ex ll. 10 f. et 433 3 19 f. haud improbabile videtur. versus hi sunt: ἐπεὶ με καὶ κασιγνήτου τύχαι | τείρουσ' Ἄτλαντος, ὃς πρὸς ἐσπέρους τόπους | ἔστηκε κίον' οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθονὸς | ὅμοις ἐρείδων, ἄχθος οὐκ εὐάγκαλον (ll. 347 f.) 22 ο non [ο] e vestiglis codicis poni potest. τσ compendiose scriptum in κ male vertit indagator primus Neapolitanus.

<sup>1</sup> I should like to express much gratitude to Dr. Dirk Obbink for his generous encouragement and helpful advice in writing this paper, and to Dr. James Diggle for comments on an earlier attempt on the problem.

<sup>2</sup> First edited (in whatever sense) by Th. Gomperz, *Philodem über Frömmigkeit (Herkulanische Studien II* (Leipzig 1866), see 36-47) from the initial publication in *Herc. vol. quae supersunt coll. altera II* (1863). The text established by A. Schober (*Philodemi de pietate* pars prior, diss. ined. Regiomontani 1923) has been published with preface by M. Gigante (*Cron.Erc. XVIII* (1988), 65 f.) and will be superseded by the second part of Dirk Obbink's *ed. maior* (Oxford, 1996).

<sup>3</sup> See most recently Dirk Obbink, 'How to Read Poetry about Gods', in *Philodemus and Poetry* ed. Dirk Obbink (Oxford 1995), 189 f., with earlier bibliography, esp. nn. 23, 44. On the general arrangement of the treatise, see (*pro tempore*) Schober op. cit. p. 69.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. A. Henrichs, 'Towards a New Edition of Philodemus' Treatise *On Piety*', *GRBS XIII* (1972), 67 f.

In 22 f. the allusion is to the first line of *Ion* and of it we have the two words *χαλκείσιν* and *νότοις*. *Prima facie* there is no reason to assume that we have any more. Philodemus' concern in *de pietate* is not with the wording of the poets to whom he refers but in the shortcomings of their subject matter. For an Epicurean, nobody could seriously believe in divine personages who, like Atlas, undergo experiences of this nature. Throughout the work, his practice is to cite the poets' exact words only when they fit in with the syntax of his own sentence; thus a whole quotation is a rarity, and when the *ipsissima verba* do appear, they are quite likely to be in a different order from the original. The following is his professed code of practice, which does not inspire confidence:

ἐντυγχάνω] δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀκρεῖβέσι]ν ἐμ παντὶ μηδὲν] συκοφαντεῖν ἐλά]ν εὐρω[σι]ν ἐνηλλα[γα]μένον ὄνομα. διὰ | γὰρ] τὸ πλ[η]θὺς ἐκ[δό]σεω[ν, μάλ]λον δ' εἰκ[ό]τως διὰ τὸ σπεύδει]ν | μ' ἴν]α που μὴ φανῶ [τὸν | πολὺν προσεδρεῦ]σαι τοιούτοις χρόνον | οὐκ] ἀπώμοτον ὃ λέλ]γω γεγονέναι.<sup>5</sup>

(247 7 16-29. The text is that of Dirk Obbink (2497-2509), who offers numerous improvements on Schober).

Paraphrase is the general practice: The famous Aeschylus fr. 70 Radt appears in this condition: Αἰσχύλος] δ' ἐν Ἡλιά-ισιν τὸν Δία καὶ αἰθέ-|ρα λέγει] καὶ γῆν καὶ οὐρανὸ]ν καὶ τὰ πάν-|τα καὶ ὑ]πὲρ τὰ πάν-|τα ] (248 1 5 f.). The two sources that quote the fragment literally do so, of course, as Ζεὺς ἐστὶν αἰθῆρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ, Ζεὺς δ' οὐρανός | Ζεὺς τοὶ τὰ πάντα χῶ | τι τῶνδ' ὑπέρτερον. Here is an example where the original words are rearranged to suit the sentence in which they belong:

Ἵομηρος | δέ φησι **ν]εῖατα πείρα-|τα γαίης]** καὶ **πόντοι-|ο** εἶναι ἴν' Ἰά]πετός **τε | Κρόνος τ[ε ἦμενοι οὐ-|τ' ἀύγῆς Ἵ]περείονος | Ἡελίοιο] τέρποντ' οὐ-|τ' ἀνέμοι]σί, βαθὺς δέ | τε Τάρτ]αρος ἀμφίς | ἐνταῦθα.] ὅπου **Κρό-|νον εὐρύο]πα Ζεὺς γαίης νέρθε]** καθεῖσε καὶ | ἀτρυγέ]τιο θαλάσ-|σης. ] (248 7 1 f.)**

Two Homeric citations are combined for this seemingly unified account, in the first of which (8 478 f.) the construction is changed (ἴκηαι governs *πείρατα* and is omitted); in the second (XIV 203 f.) ὅπου is substituted for ὅτε τε.

Accordingly, the majority of editors have adopted the minimalist conclusion with which I began. Schober restored καὶ] Εὐριπίδης | μὲν ἐν **χ]αλκέ[ο]ις | [τοῦτον] νότοις** ἔ-|χοντ' ἐν]. Wilamowitz in his 1926 edition of *Ion* was no more optimistic, though his dealings with the papyrus were nothing short of Draconian: καὶ] Εὐριπίδης | [αὐτὸν] χαλκείος [ἐκ-|τρίβειν] νότοις ο[ὐ]ρανὸν] ἐν. In this he is followed by A. S. Owen (Clarendon edition, 1939) and by Biehl (Teubner, 1979). Philippson<sup>6</sup> was more optimistic, reading: [ἔχοντα **χ]αλκέ[ο]ις [Ἵ]ατλαντα] νότοις ο[ὐ]ρανόν].**

The matter was re-opened by D. L. Page<sup>7</sup>. He argues from the presence of a literal quotation from Hesiod in the vicinity (l. 28 f. = Hes. *Theog.* 517-9) that we may well have a similar case here ('what intervenes between *χαλκείος* and *νότοις* is as likely as not to be a direct quotation, and we have two words of Euripides'). That can hardly be considered an argument in itself, and in the sequel to the Euripides reference Simonides can only be said to be referred to. However he objected to the size and position of earlier restorations at line-beginnings (especially -τρίβειν and -ρανόν), pointing out that approximately eight letters intervene between *χαλκέ[ο]ις[* and *νότοις* and suggested that the literal citation went as follows: **ὃ χ]αλκέ[ο]ις[ιν οὐρανόν] νότοις [Ἵ]ατλας ἐν]** Ἴωνι κτλ.

<sup>5</sup> This is of course the exact reverse of his practice in P.Herc. 1676 where he maintains that the alteration in order (*μετάθεσις*) of the single words of a poet affects the entire composition as an entity (e. g. cols. xvii 2-xviii 5). Cf. David Armstrong, 'The Impossibility of Metathesis', in Dirk Obbink op. cit. n. 3, p. 210 f., esp. 221 f. It is for precisely this reason that I interpret ἐνηλλαγμένον ὄνομα in this citation to refer to the disposition of individual words (the less probable alternative is that he is speaking of attributions to different authors).

<sup>6</sup> *Hermes* LV (1920), 245.

<sup>7</sup> *PCPS* VII (1961), 69.

To this W. Luppe, in the most recent treatment of the problem<sup>8</sup>, makes some cogent objections. Page entirely ignores (indeed, denies) the unmistakable final omicron of l. 23, nor, as Luppe says, are alpha and omicron possible alternatives in this script. This from all points of view annuls his suggestion. Luppe proceeds to the further point that such a restoration is syntactically incomplete. This is no less significant; the version of the line suggested by Page would aid Philodemus' case here little and he seems not to have asked himself what point Philodemus is making *via* these citations. However, in a modified form, a similar point may be made against Luppe.

Luppe is no less confident than Page that a iambic line lurks here, but prefers Schober's idea that the last letter of 23 is indeed the *verb*. This will inevitably entail rearrangement of the syntax of the following lines, and he is not slow to do so, impugning l. 2 with the irregular meaning he considers ἐκτρίβων to have forced upon it, l. 3 with the construction of the genitive with ἔφυσε, and l. 2 with a more complicated consideration, which I had better quote: 'Daß θεῶν μιᾶς – der von μιᾶς abhängige Genitiv θεῶν – über das Versende hinweg miteinander zu verbinden wäre, ist zumindest ungewöhnlich, zumal θεῶν im Vers allein stünde, syntaktisch vom Vorausgehenden getrennt. (Die Hauptzäsur des Verses wäre dann vor dem letzten Iambus.)'.

He proposes to restore ὀ]χῶν in l. 23 of the papyrus<sup>9</sup>, and accomodates his remaining objections as follows:

ὁ χαλκείοισιν οὐρανὸν νότοις ὀχῶν  
θεῶν παλαιὸν οἶκον, ἐκ θεῶν μιᾶς  
τρίβων ἔφυσε Μαίαν, .....

The name Atlas will have intruded itself as a gloss when the allusion in the first line was deemed obscure. ὀχῶν accordingly was displaced, and at some point, when a verb was sought, τρίβων' was misunderstood as the active participle from τρίβω. Considered as such, the preposition governing the previous three words no longer made sense, so ἐκ was joined to the supposed τρίβων and thus the arrangement we find in L came into being, all this leaving the metre unimpaired.

As this paper is primarily concerned with assessing the value of the papyrus evidence, I do not intend to dwell at undue length on the philological problems of *Ion* I.1-3. But, in an answer to Luppe, nor can they be ignored.

The difficulty of ἐκτρίβων ('eigentlich *aufreiben*', Luppe) had not passed unnoticed before the new discovery increased the possibility that another locution occupied the available space. Emendation of this word had hitherto been largely incidental to the emendation of the final θεῶν of l. 2<sup>10</sup> – Luppe's third objection – and arose not least from the perceived oddity of Hermes referring to his grandmother as just θεῶν μία. (Thus Murray, combining contributions by Elmsley and Dindorf as follows: "Ἀτλας ὁ νότοις χαλκείοισιν (transp. Elmsley) οὐρανοῦ | ὀχῶν παλαιὸν οἶκον Ἑσπερίδων θεῶν | μιᾶς κτλ. θεοῦ | ἀλίας was suggested by Shilleto. Dindorf and Kuiper also suggested ἐκ τριῶν μιᾶς | θεῶν which is ingenious.) However ἐκτρίβων does require interpretation, and I offer it as follows. The verb is aptly suited to describing the wear and tear that might be inflicted upon a garment in constant use – thus Plut. *Qu. conv.* 680A τῶν ὑποδημάτων τὰ τριβόμενα, Dioscorides II 151 (p. 217 Wellmann) κρόμυον ... ὁ δὲ χυλὸς ... πρὸς ἐκτρίμματα ὑποδημάτων χρήσιμος and the most notable cognate is the noun τρίβων, the mot-juste for a worn-out cloak (E. fr. 282 12, Ar. *Ach.* 184 etc.), especially as affected by philosophers. Now if the heavens could be regarded in metaphor as a kind of mantle, which is

<sup>8</sup> *Cron. Erc.* XIII (1983), 45 f.

<sup>9</sup> Dindorf (and Ge. Schmid) had earlier invoked ὀχῶν as part of a quite different reconstruction directed to different ends; for the former see below.

<sup>10</sup> An exception being Wakefield's ἐνερείδων, doubtless with *PV* l. c. in mind.

constantly worn by Atlas about his shoulders, our phrase becomes readily explicable. That it might be is certainly suggested by Hes. *Theog.* 126 f.

Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἴσον ἐωυτῇ  
 Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ', ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα καλύπτουσι.<sup>11</sup>

Popular thought conceived it as resembling a πνιγεύς (Ar. *Nu.* 96) or fire-damper; moreover the stars may be considered as a form of bejewelment ('caelum stellis ardentibus aptum' Verg. *Aen.* XI 202)<sup>12</sup>. A mantle would most properly be cast about the shoulders and it is upon his shoulders, neck or upper arms that Atlas is most generally conceived to bear the heavens (as here, A. *PV* 347 f., 427 f., TrGF 655, 7 Snell-Kannicht, Apollodorus I 2 3, Ovid *fast.* V 180, *met.* II 296 f., VI 175, Verg. *Aen.* VIII 137 etc.). Hence at *Il.* XV 307 f. the sinister cloud of darkness hovering about Apollo's upper person is identified as if it were a garment (πρόσθεν δὲ κί' αὐτοῦ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλωνος | εἰμένος ὄμοιον νεφέλην). Darkness can also be 'worn' at, for example, *Il.* XIV 282 and S. *OC* 1701; why not then the sky? The purport of the prefix ἐκ- might be merely that of emphasis, though Hermann could well be right to comment 'sic est dictum, ut in aeternum significetur'.

For the perfectly comprehensible use of φύω which constitutes Luppe's second objection one may adduce *Med.* 804 f. (τῆς νεοζύγου | νύμφης τεκνώσει παῖδα where the expressed παῖδα is the only element wherein it differs from the present instance<sup>13</sup>.)

Luppe's third objection represents only a minor aspect of the true problems in l. 2-3. Firstly, there is the curiously studied ambiguity about the identity of Atlas' wife ('one of the goddesses'); secondly, there is the appearance of θεῶν at beginning and end of the same line.

Only if we assume that Euripides is a truly pedantic genealogist is it helpful to recall that there was indeed disunity in the tradition concerning the identity of his spouse (the testimony is equal for either of the Oceanids Pleione or Aethra, and two late sources add Calypso and Hesperis), and to argue that he was signifying a scholar's caution by his mode of expression. The second point might be dismissed as another example of the alleged insensitiveness of Greek dramatists to the use of the same word in close proximity, alien to our taste. John Jackson<sup>14</sup> has done much to warn us of this, but it is possible to show even from the lists of instances he offers that in cases where the words in question are positioned as here, we should speak not of an unconscious, but of a significant, iteration. The hearer is invited to contemplate the juxtaposition, which is designed for verbal point<sup>15</sup>. (Wilamowitz' contention that there was a significant phonetic distinction to be detected in the final θε(α)ων is unprovable.)

<sup>11</sup> A variant ἐέργου exists in some MSS of Cornutus 17 and West ad loc. points out that the hemistich ἵνα μιν περὶ πᾶσαν ἐέργου, quoted in schol. T ad *Il.* XII 5, probably refers to the same tradition.

<sup>12</sup> Other examples in O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (1984), fr. 145 ad loc.

<sup>13</sup> A similar point seems to have worried Kirchhoff, who felt emboldened to write θεῶν κραδαίων οἶκον ἐκ Πελειάδων.

<sup>14</sup> *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford 1955), addendum A, p. 220 f.

<sup>15</sup> There are two distinct mannerisms in question: (a) the 'logical' repetition of a word to underline its importance to the argument (b) the repetition to call attention to the juxtaposition *per se*. (a): E. *El.* 1016 f. ἦν μὲν ἀζίως μισεῖν ἔχη | στυγεῖν δίκαιον· εἰ δὲ μή, τί δεῖ στυγεῖν; *Ion* 1551 f. μὴ τὰ δαιμόνων | ὀρώμεν, εἰ μὴ καιρὸς ἐσθ' ἡμᾶς ὀρᾶν, *IA* 1251 f. μαίνεται δ' ὅς εὐχεται | θανεῖν· κακῶς ζῆν κρείσσον ἢ καλῶς θανεῖν, Ar. *Thesm.* 794 ἔνδοθεν ἡύρετε φροῦδον τὸ κακὸν καὶ μὴ κατελαμβάνετ' ἔνδον. (b) *El.* 1004 f. δούλη γὰρ ἐκβεβλημένη | δόμων πατρῶων δυστυχεῖς οἰκῶ δόμους. The point is the contrast between the two very different δόμοι that Electra has occupied, as she casts back in Clytaemestra's face her συμικρὸν γέρας, καλὸν δὲ κέκτημαι δόμοις (1003). *Pho.* 1637 f. καὶ παρθενεύου τὴν ἰούσαν ἡμέραν | μένουσ', ἐν ἧ σε λέκτρον Αἴμονος μένει. A play on words; Antigone awaits the day and the day awaits her. *Ion* 950 ὁ παῖς δὲ ποῦ ἔστιν, ἵνα σὺ μηκέτ' ἦς ἄπασις. No parallels will be needed for the juxtaposition of a word with its prefixed negation for rhetorical effect. *Hec.* 501 f. ἔα· τίς οὐδὲτος σῶμα τοῦμὸν οὐκ ἐᾷ | κεῖσθαι. An etymological play on words. *Hel.* 775 f. is corrupt, though our point is unaffected: † ἐνιαύσιον † πρὸς τοῖσιν ἐν Τροίᾳ δέκα | ἔτεσι διήλθον ἑπτὰ περιδρομάς ἐτῶν (ἐν ναυσὶν ὦν Palmer). The repetition adds weary tone to the enumeration of the years. *Ba.* 647 has the repetition at the end of parallel clauses, but is an example of the same phenomenon – στησον πόδ', ὀργῆ δ' ὑπόθεσις ἡσυχον πόδα. As Dodds notes, the first

There is none here, unless we wish to attribute to Euripides the frigidity of making poetic capital from the fact that Atlas *both* carried the home of the gods *and* married one of its inmates. It seems more than likely that the scribe has mistakenly re-copied the first word of the line and obliterated the last iambus in so doing – in which case I would address both problems with e. g. μιᾶς | Νυμφῶν. Cf. E. *Rhes.* 393 παῖ τῆς μελωδοῦ μητέρος Μουσῶν μιᾶς, *Hel.* 6 ὃς τῶν κατ' οἶδμα παρθένων μίαν γαμεῖ.

There is moreover a serious objection of sense to Luppe's τριβῶν ἔφυσε Μαίαν. He admits that the adjective is almost always found with an accompanying genitive (or accusative of respect), as one would expect with a word meaning 'experienced (in)', and the example of E. *El.* 1127 (τριβῶν γὰρ οὐκ εἴμ', ἄτοκος οὖσ' ἐν τῷ πάρος) is not an exception, as the second adjective gives the sense and the context gives the meaning. But what does it contribute to the sense here? 'Kundig' is Luppe's translation, which he explains thus: '[Es] wäre jedenfalls eine passende Eigenschaft für die Mutter des Hermes!'. This is specious argumentation, and there is an equally serious point of word order. Placed as Luppe does, the adjective must be predicative - that is to say that the unwarranted acquisition of 'shrewdness' here bestowed upon Maia will be placed in a direct relation to the fact of her being born (ἔφυσε) from Atlas and his wife.

In a word, Luppe's radical rearrangement of l. 1-3 of *Ion* does not accord with the conventional ways whereby texts become corrupt.

Let us return to the theme with which we began; do we learn anything of the text of l. 1 from the Herculaneum papyrus?

I have already given a typical example of the use Philodemus makes of the poet's original words, and there are many others. It is also very likely that the Stoic source whose use of them he is reprehending cited them in a no less tachygraphic manner<sup>16</sup>.

There remains a most important point. What, according to Luppe, is a verbatim quotation here, is introduced by πεποίηκε(ν). Ποιεῖν, however, in the sense in which Philodemus uses it in this discourse, is not a suitable verb to introduce a syntactically incomplete quotation, and, indeed, unlike λέγει or φησί, is not appropriate to a literal citation at all, except incidentally, as it best approximates to the English 'depict (as)', in this respect falling into the same category as Philodemus' other synonyms for this (εἰσήγαγε, ὑποτίθενται, παρεισήχασιν, παραδεδώκασιν, τίθησιν etc.). Some examples:

τὸν δὲ Ἄδωνιν οἱ | πλείστοι τελευ[τῶν-]τα ποιοῦσιν (247 3 14 f.)

τοῦτον παρεσ[τῶτα] | τα τῷ Διὶ π[οιοῦσι] | πέλεκυν ἔχον[τα] (433 4 12 f.)

καὶ τὸν | Ἥλιον [καὶ ἄλλους | τινὰς] [θεοὺς πολυ-]μόχθ[ους] πεποιή-|κασιν (1088 2 b 4 f.)

διότι καὶ ἄν[δρας] εἰς | θηλείας θρα[συνομένο-]ις ἐπο[ίου]ν (243 5 2 f.)

ἀλλὰ [δ]ὴ καὶ | νοσοῦντας πεποι-|ήκασιν τ[ὸ]ν Ἡρακλέ-|α καὶ τὴν [Λητ]ῶ (1088 1 14 f.)

Ἡσίοδ[ος] δὲ κατα-|κολουθ]ήσας **ζμερ-|δαλέ' εὐρώ]εντα** ποι[εῖ] | τά πείρατα] **τά τε στυ]γέουσι θεοί]** **περ** | (248 7 14 f.)

This is a good example of the use of ποιεῖν with fragments of the original words, as I believe we have with in the case of the citation of the first line of *Ion*. No-one would search for new evidence for an earlier text of *Theog.* 738 f. from this; not only has Philodemus written ζμερδαλέα for the MSS ἀργαλέα in 739 through confusion with *Il.* XX 65, but the restoration τὰ πείρατα from 738, necessary in l. 17, here follows rather than precedes the adjective to which it refers. Similarly *Theog.* 567= *OD* 52 in [ἀλλὰ καὶ | δεύτερο]ν ὑπ' [αὐτοῦ δι-|ηπατήσ]θαι [κατακρύ-|ψαντος] μά[λα σοφῶς | **ἐν κοίλῳ** **νάρθηκι** | π]οιοῦσι | | (1609 3 16 f.)

πόδα is literal, the second metaphorical (βάσιν has been mistakenly suggested by Blomfield for the second instance). Cf. also D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin 1969), 186 f.

<sup>16</sup> The περὶ θεῶν of Apollodorus of Athens is one possibility (so A. Henrichs, 'Philodems *De Pietate* als mythographische Quelle', *Cron.Erc.* V (1975) 5 f.). Another (and earlier) possibility is Diogenes of Babylon's περὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς which we know from Philodemus to have been the object of polemic from his own master, Zeno of Sidon, and whom he cites himself (*P.Herc.* 1428 6 16-7, 12). See D. Obbink op. cit. (n. 3) pp. 201, 203 n. 53. Neither are a promising source for literal quotation.

Of course ποιεῖν *can* introduce a quotation, but when it does so it means not ‘depict (as)’ but ‘compose the line ...’, a quite different idiom. Luppe quotes from Aristotle to show this, and I follow with two other quotations from the same author to demonstrate the distinction:

συνέβη δὲ καὶ Λυσάνδρῳ τῷ Λάκωνι πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς γενέσθαι τὰ ἔλκη ταῦτα. ἔτι δὲ τὰ περὶ Αἴαντα καὶ Βελλεροφόντην, ὧν ὁ μὲν ἐκστατικὸς ἐγένετο παντελῶς, ὃ δὲ τὰς ἐρημίας ἐδίωκεν. διὸ καὶ οὕτως ἐποίησεν Ὅμηρος (*Pr.* 953 a 23; there follows *Il.* VI 200-2 verbatim)

οἶος γὰρ οὗτος μεθύων νῦν ἐστίν, ἄλλος τις τοιοῦτος φύσει ἐστίν, ὁ μὲν λάλος, ὁ δὲ κεκνημένος, ὁ δὲ ἀρίδακρυς· ποιεῖ γὰρ τινὰς καὶ τοιούτους, διὸ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐποίησε **καὶ μέ φησι δάκρυ πλώειν βεβαρημένον οἴνῳ** (*Pr.* 953 b 11, quoting (incorrectly) *Od.* XIX 122)

This is no different in principle from an example such as Ar. *Thesm.* 193: (Ἀγάθων) ἐποίησάς ποτε | **χαίρεις ὀρών φῶς πατέρα δ’ οὐ χαίρειν δοκεῖς**; The exact words of the poet are adduced as evidence, not indeed to focus attention on the precise wording, but to present evidence in a different way and with a different emphasis. The distinction is common to English and Greek and needs no further illustration.

The conclusion to this paper is therefore disappointingly negative, if, I hope, a truer account of what we may hope to learn from P.Herc. 1088 2 of *Ion* l. 1. Luppe has performed the undoubted service of reminding us of what is in the papyrus, in particular the vital omicron of l. 23. I would therefore favour a restoration which allows for one missing letter at the end of that line, for which room seems to exist (see the *disegno*)<sup>17</sup>.

καὶ] Εὐριπίδης |  
 αὐτὸν **χ**]αλκέοισ[ιν |  
 ἔχοντα] **νότοις ο**[ὐ- |  
**ρανὸν** ἐν] Ἰωνί πεποί- |  
 ηκεν ]

It seems that Porson’s Law is not to be the beneficiary from Philodemus’ evidence. It also seems quite probable that the text of Euripides from which he was citing – albeit at some distance (see n. 16) – had the words in that order. Otherwise it is something of a coincidence that L has them similarly disposed. Here one may object that Philodemus, if indeed he is identical with the poet known from Cicero and from the Greek Anthology, is unlikely to have tolerated a metrical error of this nature – to which one must answer that his purpose here is quite incompatible with literary finesse (see P.Herc. 86 B, quoted above), still less with emending other poets’ work. It is nonetheless still possible that he was not consciously quoting the original words in the first place.

What of the text itself? The paradosis has not wanted sympathetic interpreters in the past, from Hermann who detected a metrical ‘joke’ – Atlas’ task is heavy and the line too is ‘heavy’<sup>18</sup> – to Horna<sup>19</sup> who found a direct allusion to the verse of satyr-play, programmatic of the nature of the play. More scientifically, Paul Maas (approved by Wilamowitz) suggested that what Euripides wrote was νότοις’ and that the Attic ear could detect the elision. Parallels for this ‘exception’ to the Law have been alleged at *S. Aj.* 1101, *Phil.* 22, *Hclld.* 529; *Cycl.* 304 is an example from satyr play. (I am not here concerned to discuss examples of elided dissyllables, which may constitute a separate class, e. g. *OT* 219 τοῦ λόγου τοῦδ’ ἐξερῶ, *Phil.* 1277, *OC* 505, *Ant.* 910 etc., or examples where ἄν, following its verb, constitutes the first syllable of the final cretic.) In the *Hclld.* example

<sup>17</sup> It is less probable that we should assume more space at the end of l. 23 and restore e. g. ο[ὐρα-λὸν ἐν τῷ] Ἰωνί.

<sup>18</sup> That is to say, ‘hunc graviorem et quasi ponderosiorum numerum bene convenire moli, quae hic describitur’. Observations upon ‘iusta recitatio’ follow, ‘ad quam rem et criticum et quicumque vim numerorum sentire vult attendere oportet, nec scandere versus, ut faciunt pueri’.

<sup>19</sup> ‘Metrische Bemerkungen zum Prolog des Ions’, *WS L* (1932), 175 f.

ἡγεῖσθ' ὅπου δεῖ σῶμα κατθανεῖν τόδε  
καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατάρχεσθ' εἰ δοκεῖ

Diggle obelizes the last three words and Elmsley ('dubitanter') contributed *κατάρχετ'*. The note of hesitance is apt, as only the middle will bear the religious sense here intended (*Andr.* 1198 f. *θανόντα δεσπότην γούσις κατάρξω* is at most an *allusion* to this special meaning; at *Pho.* 573 there is disunity in the tradition). However *εἰ δοκεῖ* is pointless and indeed detrimental; why this apparent trivialisation of ritual in the deeply solemn *devotio* speech of Macaria? ('And do go on to add *stemmata* and make a preliminary sacrifice, if you want to'). This is the reason why H. D. Broadhead's *καὶ στεμματοῦσθαι καὶ κατάρχεσθαι δοκεῖ*<sup>20</sup> recommends itself, and probably his *δῆ* for *δεῖ* in 528 is a further improvement.

Of the Sophoclean examples, *Aj.* 1101 is also inherently suspicious and easily emended (*ἦγεν* Porson); of *Phil.* 22 the first condition is true, the second less so.

ἅ μοι προσελθὼν σίγα σήμαιν' εἴτ' ἔχει  
χῶρον τὸν αὐτὸν τόνδ' ἔτ' εἴτ' ἄλλη κυρεῖ,  
ὡς τὰπίλοιπα τῶν λόγων σὺ μὲν κλύης,  
ἐγὼ δὲ φράζω, κοινὰ δ' ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἴη.

Jebb and Hermann find that the pauses in the sense justify the licence, which is most dubious. The emendations *σημαίνειν* (Porson) and *σημαινεῖς* (Nauck) give a strange construction which requires *εἴτε* to be understood from 23. R. D. Dawe<sup>21</sup> was the first to challenge the *sense*, pointing out that gesticulation is irrelevant to the inquiry upon which Neoptolemus is engaged and otiose with the final clause. This consideration prompts him to conjecture *μάνθαν'*, arguing that a scribe may have been puzzled by a (mistaken) conjunction of *σίγα* with the main verb, and that parts of *σημαίνειν* were congenial to him from its frequent appearance in scholia. This attributes too much to scribal intellect; say rather that the verb is an intrusion from 37 where it appears at exactly the same point in the line.

I am not sympathetic to any of these supposed licences, and prefer to follow J. Diggle's scepticism<sup>22</sup>.

And that would appear to leave us with Elmsley's simple transposition

Ἄτλας ὁ νῶτοις χαλκείοισιν οὐρανόν.

Balliol College, Oxford

James A. D. Irvine

<sup>20</sup> *Tragica* (Christchurch 1968), 142 f. *κατάρχεσθαι* is not passive, however.

<sup>21</sup> *Studies on the Text of Sophocles III* (Brill 1978), 121 f.

<sup>22</sup> *CR XXXIV* (1984), 67 = *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford 1994), 314, commenting on M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982), 84-5. For recent, mostly favourable, discussions cf. J. Decroix, *Le trimètre iambique* (Macon 1931), 318 f., F. X. Bill, *Beiträge zur Lex Porsoniana* (Emsdetten 1932), p. 3 f. (almost all examples involving ἔν – see above), D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik* (Darmstadt 1968), 50, P. Maas, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1968, tr. H. Lloyd-Jones), § 139, Seth L. Schein, *The Iambic Trimeter in Sophocles and Aeschylus* (Brill 1979), 40.

ΑΠΡΟΣ	ΕΣΤΙ
ΣΤΗΝΕΑ	ΤΕΚ
ΥΤΡΑΠΕ	ΧΕΡΕ
ΤΛΑ	ΗΛΙΟΝ
ΝΟΝΚΩ	ΤΙΝΑΘ
ΙΤΩΝ	ΜΟΧΘΟ
ΘΑΙΧΑΙ	ΚΑΚΙΩ
ΙΣΤ	ΑΛΛΗΟ
ΤΙΘΕ	ΜΟΝΩ
ΥΤΟΥ	Ο...ΥΠ
ΜΗΘΕΙΤΑΙ	ΕΤΕ...Τ
ΚΑΥΜΑΤΩΝ	ΜΥΟ...Ι
ΙΜΩΝΩ...ΘΕ	ΤΙ...Ι
ΤΩΝΣΠ...ΑΓ	ΤΑΚΑΤ
ΣΟΛΑΨΕΩ	Μ...Ι
ΟΝΑΚΚΥΝΑ	Δ...ΕΙ
ΑΙ...ΕΣΑ	Τ...Ν
ΣΙΝ...ΚΩ	
ΤΟΝ	ΜΟΥ
ΩΝΟ	ΤΟΝΙ
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΗΣ	ΠΟΙΕΙΝ
ΑΛΚΕ...Κ	ΟΝ...Π
ΝΩΤΟΙΟ	ΥΜ...Υ
ΙΩΝΙΠΕΡΟΙ	ΜΕ...Ι
ΙΜΩΝΙΔΗΣ	ΝΥΙ...Ι
ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝΕ	ΔΗ...Ι
ΩΜΩΝΑΥ	ΦΓ...Ι
ΣΙΝ...Α	ΧΟ...Ι
ΥΝΕΧ...ΚΡΑ	ΜΑ...Ι
ΝΑΡΚΗΣ	ΕΓΡ...Ν
	ΓΡ...Δ