CHAPTER FORTY-FIVE

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE CANTICA OF EURIPIDES’

ANDROMACHE*

103–25. On the choral entry and preceding ‘elegiac’ monody, see ch. 27 above.¹


281–2

βοτήρᾳ τ’ άμφι μονότροπων
νεανίδων ἔρημόν
Θ’ ἐστιοὺχον αὐλάν·

~ 291–2

πικρᾶν δὲ σύγχυσιν βίου
Φρυγῶν πόλει ταλαίναι
περγάμοις τε Τροίας·

A sequence better divided thus as three dimeters rather than as the traditional two trimeters (cf. also on 299–300/307–8 below).² The vulgate is open to the objection that πικρᾶν … πόλει as a trimeter lacks penthemimeral or hephthemimeral caesura,³ unless (with Kovacs) we accept Jackson’s πικρᾶν δ’ (ἐξουσί) σύγχυσιν βίου [Φρυγῶν] πόλει, for which there is insufficient justification.⁴

---

2 With an addendum in n. 45 below.
3 Nearly universal, but Murray’s lineation as 3ia : ba : ith has been followed by Garzya and Ebener.
4 Jackson (75–7) impugned the syntax of πικρᾶν δὲ σύγχυσιν … following 290 τερπνὸς μὲν ἄκοικαι. But Φρυγῶν is by no means superfluous (‘polis … of Troy’ is abnormal; and cf. 363 τὴν τάλαιναν … Φρυγῶν πόλιν). The elliptical ‘appositive accusative’ construction (sc. ‘involving, effecting’) is correctly explained by the scholia; but in the scholion given by Schwartz (ii. 275. 10) as βίου σύγχυσιν τῆς Τροίας κατασκευάζουσιν the participle should be corrected to κατασκευάζουσιν; cf. the other, briefer, scholion λειτεί τὸ ἐξουσί.
The antistrophe begins with recapitulation of the goddesses’ coming to the lonely αὐλή (281–3) of Paris in the forests of Mount Ida, while adding the beauty-enhancing ‘bathing’, before the going/coming to Paris himself, and the narrative of what happened after that.

It is noteworthy that the first verse ends symmetrically with … οὖρείαν (oùrèía<n>) in response with … Ἰδαίαν (‘Idaiá<n>?) following four dactyls. … : – ς – | is likely enough, ending a more purely dactylic verse (D⁴), before the shift to 3cr + ia (e e E). But a ‘dragged’ close (… − − − |) is equally likely. Perhaps a calculated ambivalence.

Also noteworthy is the epic ταί, unique in Euripides, but appropriate here to the dactylic and epic-toned context, like τοι δ’ ἀνα γᾶν Ἀκιαν … at A. Pers. 584.

Surprisingly few editors have accepted, or even noticed, Hermann’s palmary emendation here (including the stop after Πριαμίδαν).<sup>6</sup> ‘Comparing themselves (vying) with extravagances of words’ must refer to the goddesses’ competitive claims to be the fairest, supported by bribes, addressed to the adjudicator of the famous beauty-contest, as the continuation ‘Kypris won …’ confirms; not to eristic conversation between the goddesses during the ‘coming to Paris’ (as ἐβαν … παραβαλλόμεναι implies, with the vulgate punctuation). Given that the λόγοι in 288 are addressed to Paris, they need to be characterized as εὐφρόνες (‘gracious, friendly’), not δύσφρονες

---

<sup>5</sup> To judge from his apparatus (“284 ταίδε δ’ L”), Diggle treats the first verse as 284 (~ 294); but it must be 283–4 (~ 293–4), unless 281–2/291–2 are renumbered as 281–3/291–3).

<sup>6</sup> Wecklein (1911) is an honourable exception. Few editors even mention Hermann’s proposal here, though Stevens showed awareness of its merits. The sentence-end after ἐβαν δὲ Πριαμίδαν appropriately articulates the narrative.