

**Eur. HF 1303f.**

χορευέτω δὴ Ζηνὸς ἢ κλεινὴ δάμαρ  
 †κρούουσ' Ὀλυμπίου Ζηνὸς ἀρβύλῃ πόδα†.

This is the text in Diggle's OCT (II, Oxford 1981), with Hermann's δὴ for transmitted δέ in 1303, but with 1304 left uncorrected. The line is metrically and syntactically deficient, and yet the desired sense is clear enough. Can we do better than leaving it between *crucēs*?

The first word we can restore is †κρούουσ'†. There are two possibilities, both only a letter away from the transmitted text: Triclinius's κρούουσ' and Murray's (II, Oxford 1904) κροτοῦσ'. Either verb can be used for striking the ground with the foot in celebration. For κρούω cf. *IA* 1042f. χρυσεοσάνδαλον ἴχνος / ἐν γὰ κρούουσαι, *El.* 180 εἰλικτὸν κρούσω πόδ' ἐμόν [Canter : πόλεμον **L**]; also *Phae.* fr. 779,6 K. = 173 Diggle, of a rider striking the sides of his horse with his feet. For κροτέω cf. *Tro.* 545f. παρθένοι δ' / ἄειρον ἄμα [Diggle : ἀέριον ἀνὰ codd.] κρότον ποδῶν, *Hclid.* 782f. ὀλολύγματα παννυχίοις ὑπὸ παρ-/θένων ἰαχεῖ ποδῶν κρότοισιν, *Soph.* fr. 269a,40f. R.<sup>2</sup> ποδῶν δὲ χηλ[αὶ ...] / κροτοῦσι θράγ[...], *Pind.* fr. 52f,18 Sn.-M. = D6,18 Ruth. ποδὶ κροτέο[ντι γὰν θο]ῶ. I incline to κρούουσ' because the repetition of ου could have confused a scribe; however, given that the corruption involves the loss of a single letter this is hardly a decisive argument. This verb is also preferred by Lee and Kovacs<sup>1</sup>.

The following word Ὀλυμπίου gives a medial caesura. While not impossible in tragedy<sup>2</sup>, this is undesirable, especially when there is no other break in the second metron. Heath<sup>3</sup> consequently removed the iota to give Ὀλύμπου. Hermann<sup>4</sup> preferred to emend to Ὀλύμπω. The latter is problematic in its very simplicity. A bare locative dative with this noun is uncomfortably stark. The force of Heracles'

<sup>1</sup> K.H. L., *Euripides. Heracles*, Leipzig 1988; D. K., *Euripides: Suppliant Women. Electra. Heracles*, London-Cambridge, Mass. 1998.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. Stephan, *Die Ausdruckskraft der caesura media im iambischen Trimeter der attischen Tragödie*, Königstein 1981.

<sup>3</sup> B. Heath, *Notae sive lectiones ad Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*, in *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschylī Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*, Oxford 1762, 150-152.

<sup>4</sup> G. Hermann, *Euripidis Hercules furens*, Leipzig 1810.

rhetoric suits a more expansive description such as is often found with references to Olympus in tragedy (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 609f. κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου / μαρμαρόεσσαν αἴγλαν, Eur. *Bacch.* 411 σεμνὰ κλειτὺς Ὀλύμπου, *Tro.* 215 κρηπῖδ' Οὐλύμπου καλλίσταν, fr. 114,5 K. τοῦ σεμνοτάτου δι' Ὀλύμπου). On being told that Hera taps her feet «on Olympus», we might reasonably ask ‘but where else is she supposed to tap them?’ Nor can we provide an adjective to go with the noun without wholesale alteration elsewhere in the line.

Heath's Ὀλύμπου, on the other hand, is closer to the paradosis than Hermann's conjecture. Moreover, an original Ὀλύμπου could easily have been corrupted to Ὀλυμπίου under the influence of Ζηνός to give the common phrase «Olympian Zeus»<sup>5</sup>. This raises the question of what Ζηνός is doing in the text at all. According to Murray it goes with ἀρβύλη, but what would Hera be doing with Zeus' shoe<sup>6</sup>? As editors have recognised, the word has been mistakenly copied from the line above. The corruption of Ὀλύμπου to -ίου will have occurred after this intrusion.

What then could Ὀλύμπου go with? We need a noun with which it could function as a descriptive genitive, and perhaps also an adjective to accompany that noun. This would give us a weightier expression, equal to the contempt which Heracles shows for the gods in his speech. Brodaeus's πέδον<sup>7</sup> for final πόδα supplies just that noun. The same corruption is probably found at *Hel.* 525, where Diggle<sup>8</sup> and Kovacs<sup>9</sup> accept Blaydes's πέδον for L's πόδα. Housman<sup>10</sup> also suggested πέδοι for ποδί at Aesch. *Pers.* 163. The gap left by Ζηνός then leaves space for an adjective to qualify πέδον.

Not all editors have accepted Brodaeus's conjecture. In defending the paradosis, Lee points to two passages where κρούω takes πόδα as its object. But as we have seen from the examples cited earlier, κρούω and κροτέω may take as an object either the foot or the thing struck by the foot. There is reason to suppose that the latter is the case here, as the dative ἀρβύλη is difficult to reconcile with the accusative πόδα. As the text stands, it can only be a locative dative, but to say that Hera is «tapping her foot in her shoe» is close to *bathos* in its triviality. Moreover, keeping πόδα requires us to read Ὀλύμπω, leaving two awkward locatives in the

<sup>5</sup> So rightly G.W. Bond, *Euripides. Heracles*, Oxford 1981, ad 1304. For «Olympian Zeus» cf. *Il.* I 353f., *Od.* XV 523, *Theogn.* 851, *Soph. Tr.* 275, *Ap. Rh.* IV 95.

<sup>6</sup> For ἀρβύλη «used in Tragedy as a general word for shoe» see E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*, Oxford 1950, ad 944 (II 429).

<sup>7</sup> J. Brodaeus ap. C. Stiblinus, *Euripides poeta tragicorum princeps, in Latinum sermonem conversus, adiecto e regione textu Graeco*, Basel 1562, 810.

<sup>8</sup> J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae*, III, Oxford 1994.

<sup>9</sup> D. Kovacs, *Euripides. Helen. Phoenician Women. Orestes*, London-Cambridge, Mass. 2002.

<sup>10</sup> A.E. Housman, *On certain corruptions in the Persae of Aeschylus*, «AJPh» IX (1888) 317-325: 319 (= «The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman», ed. J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear, I, Cambridge 1972, 14-21: 15f.). The conjecture is called «highly probable» by H.D. Broadhead, *The Persae of Aeschylus*, Cambridge 1960, 72 ad l. (see also 262).

space of three words. ἀρβύλη should rather be taken like ποδί in Pind. fr. 52f,18 Sn.-M. = D6,18 Ruth. cited above. This means that we need an accusative to denote the target of Hera's tapping. Brodaeus gives us such a target at the price of a minimal alteration. Like many true conjectures, it solves more than one problem at once: it gives us a noun to go with Ὀλύμπου, and allows ἀρβύλη to take its natural interpretation. The corruption is also easy to explain: the reference to tapping made it almost inevitable that a final πέδον should be corrupted into the metrically equivalent πόδα.

We have now arrived at the text proposed in Diggle's apparatus, κρούουσ' Ὀλύμπου <– ∪ > ἀρβύλη πέδον. Since Ζηνός has displaced another word we should pay no attention to the *ductus litterarum* when casting around for a supplement. Most likely we are missing an adjective to qualify πέδον, which is bare without one. Moreover, a neuter singular accusative of a thematic adjective will give precisely the metre which we are looking for.

The range of possibilities is large. Heath suggested σεμνόν, ἱερόν or μακρόν<sup>11</sup>, Nauck δῖον (adopted by Kovacs)<sup>12</sup> and Paley λαμπρόν (preferred by Bond, who retains πόδα) or θεῖον<sup>13</sup>. I wish to make a proposal which yields a similar sense, but which has the advantage of giving a better account of the corruption: namely, κλεινόν. This gives the repetition κλεινή ... κλεινόν in 1303f., accentuating the speaker's contempt<sup>14</sup>. In the following lines Heracles bitterly contrasts this 'renowned' world of the gods with the far from renowned deeds for which they are responsible. But instead of repeating the adjective, a scribe repeated Ζηνός by mistake. Hence this provides an example of the common scribal mistake that has recently been christened the *Error Wattianus*, according to which «a scribe, having to repeat one of two words which he has just written, repeats the wrong one»<sup>15</sup>. We thus have a reason why the proper name has intruded itself, as well as a text which makes good sense.

All Souls College, Oxford

P. J. FINGLASS

<sup>11</sup> Heath, *o.c.* 150f.

<sup>12</sup> J.A. Nauck, Lipsiae 1854<sup>1</sup> (I am grateful to Mr L.B.T. Houghton for checking this reference for me).

<sup>13</sup> F.A. Paley, *Euripides*, Londini 1860, 93: the conjectures are not in his second edition of *Euripides* (Londini 1880) or his *The Hercules Furens of Euripides*, Cambridge 1883; λαμπρόν was subsequently conjectured by S.A. Naber, *Euripidea*, «Mnemosyne» n.s. X (1882) 1-26, 136-162, 258-289: 162.

<sup>14</sup> For contemptuous κλεινός cf. Eur. *El.* 327, Soph. *El.* 300.

<sup>15</sup> W.S. Watt, *Error Wattianus*, «CQ» n.s. LIV (2004) 658-660: 658. Cf. R.G.M. Nisbet, *William Smith Watt*, in *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows III*. «Proceedings of the British Academy» CXXIV (2004) 359-372: 371. See also my *Error Wattianus in Greek*, forthcoming.