One of Euripides’ finest and most characteristic odes has a little-discussed blemish in its first pair of stanzas (at line 922), unnoticed in the current Oxford Text; and some other features, beginning with the metre, merit further discussion.

905–13

εὖ μὲν, ὁ πατρὶς Ἡλιάς,
τὸν ἀπορθήτον πόλις οὐκέτι λέξηι
τοῖον Ἐλλάνων νέφος ἀμφὶ σε κρύπτει
dορὶ δὴ δορὶ πέρσαν·
ἀπὸ δὲ στεφάναν κέκαρσαι
πῦργων, κατὰ δ’ αἰθάλου [καπνοῦ]
κηλίδ’ οἰκτροτάταν κέχρωσαί·
tάλαιν’, οὐκέτι ε’ ἐμβατεύσω.

914–22

μεσονύκτιος ὀλλύμαιν,
[ἀντ.]
ἡμος ἐκ δεῖπνων ὕπνος ἡδὺς ἐπ’ ὀσοῖς
σκίδναται, μολπᾶν δ’ ἀπο καὶ χοροποιῶν
θυσίαν κατασκαύσας
πόσις ἐν θαλάμῳς ἐκεῖτο,
ζυτὸν δ’ ἐπὶ πασσάλωι,
ναύται οὐκέθ’ ὀρῶν ὀμίλον
†Τροίαν †Ηλιάδ’ ἐμβεβότα·

911 καπνοῦ del. Canter
916–17 v. l. χοροποιῶν θυσίαν (ετιαμ χαρο- nonnulli)
922 τροίαν om. GRSSa

---

1 Mnemosyne 57 (2004) 45–53, there combined with chs. 36 (on Ion 663–803) and 37 (on Ba. 402–33) in a single article (45–79, including an Abstract). I am grateful to Professor David Kovacs (with whom I have had several exchanges) for valuable comments and criticisms.


3 I give a simplified apparatus (see Diggle and Daitz for fuller treatments).
Metre

1–4. The stanza begins with an enoplian (D/e) sequence:  \( T | e - D - | e - D - : \) \( \circ \circ - \circ \circ - \circ - \ | \). The rising colon \( \circ - \circ - \circ - \circ - \ ) (my ‘\( T \)’), akin to the telesillean \( \times - \circ - \circ - \circ - \), is a favourite of Euripides, but already appears similarly in Pindar (\( Ol. \) 9. 1 τό μὲν Αρχιλόχου μέλος | ..., and \( Nem. \) 10. 1 with word-overlap). The second verse (like \( Med. \) 631, \( Andr. \) 770 etc.) is then repeated in 3 with an extended cadence (4), which I indent in accordance with that interpretation, i.e. with the implication that 3–4 might legitimately be combined \textit{uno versu}, like the extended third verse of the sapphic stanza \( (- \circ - \times - \circ - \circ - \circ - x | - \circ - \circ - - ) \).\(^5\)

A more closely analogous pattern of ‘repetition with extension’, though in a different metrical genre, can be seen at \( A. \) \( Ag. \) 449–51 (∼468–70):

\[
\begin{align*}
tάδε εἴγα τίς βαύζει, & \\
φθονερ' ὑπ' ἄλγος ἔρπει & \\
προδίκοις Ατρέιδας.
\end{align*}
\]

Here too I indent the clausal colon as an indication of continuity: the colon \( \circ - \circ - \circ - \circ - \ ) scarcely exists as a verse in its own right, and the extension of the preceding anacreontic is better regarded (if not simply combined with it \textit{uno versu}) as ... \( \circ - \circ - \circ - - \ ), i.e. as an aristophanean with a ‘dovetailing’ one-syllable overlap. ‘Dovetailing’ may be defined as a species of metrical syncopation in which a pendent long syllable (\( \ldots \circ - \circ - - \ldots \)) does double duty, serving also as the initial long syllable of the continuation.\(^7\)

\(^4\) My metrical terms and notations for the most part follow those of West (\( GM \), 1982), but with some additions: see \textit{comm. Or.}, xx–xxi, also p. 347 n. 3 above. In line with the practice of Stinton (310–61), my ‘verse’ is not synonymous with ‘period’, but simply denotes a line of verse, and my ‘colon’ is a metrical length, part of a longer whole, \textit{bounded by word-end}, except when a colon boundary disappears (i.e. no diaeresis) between the cola of a dicolon (as between the ‘laps’ of a dromos).

\(^5\) Murray indented 909/918, but as one among many indentations of various lengths employed for the sake of pattern on the page.

\(^6\) Here too anticipated by Murray, again with a different motive (cf. n. 5 above). Editors have disagreed over the colometry here: West follows Fraenkel’s divisions after βαύζει and ἔρπει (without indentation) [but West indents the last line]. Page, by contrast, treated the whole of 447–51/466–70 as a single iambic, then choriambic period with repeated word-overlaps.

\(^7\) For Maas, to whom we owe the term (44), ‘dovetailing’ is a ‘phenomenon’ observable in certain poets who ‘deliberately affect word-end after the first syllable of the following sequence’. My modified definition embraces this phenomenon, but