The first question is more striking (and surely less jejune) if we take ἥ δύστηνος Ἡλέκτρα; θέλεις μείνωμεν αὐτῷ κάνακούσωμεν γόον; "Αρ' ἔστιν ἦ δύστηνος Ἡλέκτρα; θέλεις μείνωμεν αὐτῷ κάνακούσωμεν γόον;

The first question is more striking (and surely less jejune) if we take ἥ δύστηνος (referring to ὅ μοι μοι δύστηνος 77) as subject and Ἡλέκτρα as predicate (and not ἥ δύστηνος Ἡλέκτρα together as e.g. in Jebb’s translation: “can it be the hapless Electra” and in other interpretations and translations).

κάνακούσωμεν: thus, generally speaking, the mss. Siding with Campbell, I cannot understand why ἀνακούω, although a ἀπαξ, should be rejected and replaced by ἐπακούω (κάπακούσωμεν Jebb, Kaibel, Bruhn, Groeneboom): ἐπακούσωμεν in L is no more than a gloss on κάνακούσωμεν. If we retain κάνακούσωμεν, ἀνα- will have the same function as in ἀναπτοῦναμαι, ἀναμανθάω, ἀναδιάπωμαι, ἀνερωτάω, and why it should have taken an accusative (Kaibel) is not easy to see (ἐπακούω is of course out of the question). But another possibility would be to divide thus: κάν ἀνακούσωμεν γόον (κάν = καὶ ἐὰν, cf. e.g. Ai. 1077); this division is to be found in Α, in R and in N (Matritensis, belonging to Turyn’s class ψ). The meaning would be “even if we shall hear laments” (which might be regarded as a malum omen for the enterprise).

El. 148, 149

όρμις ἀτυχομένα, Δίδυς ἄγγελος.

ἰδὶ παντλάμων Νιὸβα, σὲ δὲ ἔγωγε νέμω θεόν,

Kaibel is quite right in rejecting the traditional interpretation

1) Continuuntur e ser. IV XV 24 sqq.
('harbinger of spring' Σ and many commentators, an irrelevancy): "Zeus hat ihr diesen Boten gesandt, um sie zur unaufhörlichen Klage anzuhalten, daraus entnimmt sie die göttliche Bestätigung ihrer eigenen Auffassung"; cf. Bowra, *Sophoclean Tragedy*, 243: "The nightingale is the type of grief which is inconsolable because it is faithful". Does not Penelope compare herself with the nightingale? (Od. XIX 521-3). Again, in the next lines (λο...Νιόβα...δαχρόες), it is the faithfulness of Niobe which explains the exclamation, the everlasting grief which makes that Electra regards her as a god. The nightingale is Διός ἄγγελος, Niobe herself is a god.

El. 153-155 οὕτῳ σοι μοῦνα... ἄχος... πρὸς ὃ τι σὺ τῶν ἐνδον εἰ περισσά.

The natural interpretation of these words runs as follows: "no sorrow has come to you in particular in regard to which you are beyond (i.e. more afflicted than) those within". It is against classical Greek usage to regard ὃ τι as a substitute for ὃ in an anaphoric digressive relative clause 1) and to interpret: "not to you alone has come the sorrow, in regard to which you are excessive in your laments in comparison with those within". Nor is Bruhn's artifice (πρὸς ὃ τι) attractive. περισσάς, an adjective deriving from περί, has a meaning exactly corresponding to that of epic περί in περί πάντων or in περί γάρ μην ὄργον τέκε μήτηρ.

El. 159 κρυπτᾶ... ἄχεων ἐν ἠβα.

I reject the interpretation of ἄχεων as a participle, not only because ἄχεω 'to sorrow' does not occur elsewhere in tragedy but also because, as Campbell puts it, "the notion of Orestes sorrowing is out of place"; so I follow G. Hermann: "semota a doloribus in iuventa felix" and Campbell: "and he whose fortunate youth is hidden out of the way of sorrow". On the ablative genitive with κρυπτᾶ cf. Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 153, 4. The oxymoron ἄχεων (participle) ἐν κρυπτᾶ ἠβα ἀλβος would be pointless. The fact that Electra herself (602) says τλήμων Ὄρεστῆς δυστυχὴ τρίβει βλέν is irrelevant for the interpretation of what the Chorus put forward as 1) Cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *Autour de 'TE Épique'* (Amsterdam 1971), § 278, p. 329.