

Citation style

Lloyd, Michael: Rezension über: Gunther Martin, Euripides, "Ion".
Edition and Commentary, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018, in:
Exemplaria Classica, 23 (2019), S. 319-324, DOI:
10.33776/ec.v23i0.3732, heruntergeladen über Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

GUNTHER MARTIN, *Euripides, Ion: edition and commentary*. Texte und Kommentare, Band 58. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2018, vii+613 p. €129,95. ISBN 978-3-11-052255-6.

This is a full-scale scholarly edition of Euripides' *Ion*, with a detailed commentary averaging one page for every four lines of text. Gunther Martin (hereafter 'M.') is well equipped for the task, with expertise in textual, metrical, and linguistic matters, extensive knowledge of the many issues relevant to the interpretation of the play, and a thorough grasp of the bibliography. It is very much a book for specialists, not least because of its price, and students and other non-specialist readers will continue to find their needs well served by the excellent edition by K.H. Lee in the Aris & Phillips series (1997).

The introduction has six sections:

- (1) Structure. M. is influenced by the 'pyramidal' model of dramatic action derived from G. Freytag, *The Technique of the Drama*, Chicago 1894, dividing the play into five sections: (i) exposition (1–509); (ii) rising plot (510–969); (iii) peripeteia (970–1047); (iv) falling plot (1048–1319); (v) lysis (1320–1622).
- (2) Problems of Interpretation. These include the role of Apollo, the play's treatment of Athenian identity including autochthony, and its status as a tragedy in view of its happy ending. M. disagrees with the defences of Apollo offered by such scholars as Wassermann and Burnett, although his detailed discussion of these issues is reserved for the commentary (see in particular his notes on lines 10–11, 68, 69–73, 355, 859–922, 1532–48, 1553–1605, 1558, 1610). He offers helpful introductory discussions of sections of the play in the commentary, addressing larger issues of interpretation as they arise.
- (3) Myth. This is a thorough and helpful treatment of the complex mythical background.
- (4) Date. M. prefers a somewhat later date (c. 410) than the one now generally accepted on the basis of the metrical criteria, although it should be said that his attempts to relate the play to its historical background are rather speculative.
- (5) Set, Entrances and Exits, Actor Distribution, including a useful survey of extra-scenic places mentioned in the play, and a summary of the entrances and exits.
- (6) The Text. M. is influenced by the criticisms of histrionic interpolation by D.L. Page and M.D. Reeve. He deletes a total of 128 lines (51, 74–5, 248, 374–80, 578–81, 595–606, 612–32, 647, 726, 737, 806–7,

830–1, 839–58, 937, 981–2, 1010–17, 1035, 1117, 1124, 1261–8, 1271–2, 1277–8, 1315–17, 1356–62, 1364–8, 1374–9, 1398–1400, 1515, 1621–2), and suspects another 18 lines (42 n. 156). By contrast, Diggle (OCT) deletes 35 lines and Kovacs (Loeb) deletes 52 lines. M. engages with textual issues in a lively and often controversial way throughout the commentary, and prints numerous conjectures of his own. He supplies a useful concordance of his text with Diggle's (113–6).

The commentary contains a great deal of detailed discussion, the full value of which will only become apparent with repeated use. I offer here some random comments on individual notes, inevitably highlighting points of disagreement. 30. Hermes quotes Apollo's request to go to Athens, adding in parenthesis οἶσθα γὰρ θεᾶς πόλιν ('For you know the city of the goddess'). M. comments: 'Apollo alludes in a flattering way to the omnipresence of herms in Athens and the Athenians' particular pride in them ... Such a complimentary remark makes a date of the play between 414 and 412, soon after the mutilation of the herms, unlikely'. This theory, previously aired in M.'s article "On the date of Euripides' *Ion*", *CQ* 60, 2010, 647–51, rests one speculative idea on another. The parenthesis can more easily be explained as flattery of the Athenians: Apollo assumes that his fellow god is familiar with their city (described as κλεινῶν, 'famous', earlier in the line). 68. κοῦ λέληθεν, ὡς δοκεῖ. M., as usual, resists an interpretation which might favour Apollo ('it has not escaped his notice as it seems to have done'), and makes the line a rather pointless statement that Apollo has not escaped Hermes' notice ('And he has apparently not gone unnoticed', with Apollo as subject), which admittedly avoids a difficult change of subject. 78. M. has Ion entering from a 'side door', but he 'lives in the temple' (55–6) so the central door would be appropriate. 86. M. follows Mastronarde (note on *Phoenissae* 207) in spelling 'Parnassos' with double sigma (as also at 155, 714, 1267), but might have noted that Lee anticipated him in this, despite ostensibly reproducing Diggle's text which has single sigma. Lee was aware of Mastronarde's discussion (see his note on line 155). 101. M. too readily accepts Diggle's arguments against ἀποφαίνεiv here being imperatival infinitive (*Studies on the Text of Euripides*, 10–11). Imperatival infinitive gives less convoluted syntax than consecutive or final (M.) or exegetic (Diggle), and would be highly appropriate here: see R.J. Allan, 'The *infinitivus pro imperativo* in ancient Greek: the imperatival infinitive as an expression of proper procedural action', *Mnemosyne* 63, 2010, 203–28. 185. See now C. Collard, *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy*, Stuttgart 2018, 174–5, questioning the view of P.T. Stevens that the 'imperfect of realisation' is colloquial. 188–9. M.'s changes produce the illogical 'Not only are there temples and altars in Athens, but also statues in Delphi'. M.'s parallel from *Polyid.* fr. 642 is not relevant, because the subject there is the same in both halves: 'Money not only brings pleasure in the banquet, but also provides strength amid troubles'. In any case, the context

implies that something architectural is being referred to. 241. ἐξέπληξιάς με ('you shocked me') is not 'instantaneous': the reference is to the past, as is shown by the following ὡς εἶδες ('when you saw', 243). 331. Ion, longing to find his mother, hears of a woman who has lost her son. M. suggests τίς; εἶπον· εἰ γὰρ ξυμβάλοι ... ('Who? Speak. For if she met with me ...'), but if συμβάλλω ('meet') were the correct verb, rather than the generally accepted συλλαμβάνω ('help'), one might have expected 'For if I met with her ...'.

374–80. M. deletes all these lines, stating rather characteristically: 'They do not contain anything essential, and the text is more succinct if they are deleted'. 403. The returning Xuthus says to Creusa μῶν χρόνιος ἔλθῶν σ' ἐξέπληξ' ὄρωδιαι; ('I hope that my late arrival did not strike you with dread'). M. observes 'Xuthus' question shows a degree of marital care not frequent in tragedy', and it could be added that μῶν ('I hope ... not') is common in polite contexts (e.g. *Alc.* 812, 820; *Med.* 1009). 469. M. remarks that the Chorus's reference to 'the ancient family of Erechtheus' is 'an anachronism in which the indication of time is given as if spoken from the audience's point of view' (cf. Owen's note on line 24), but it might be added that even within the dramatic fiction the family is portrayed as old and distinguished, with long-established traditions, although in the literal terms of mythical genealogy it has only been in existence for a couple of generations. In a somewhat comparable way, Deianira can say 'I received a gift long ago from an ancient beast' (*Soph. Trach.* 555–6; cf. 1141) of an event which took place in her own lifetime. 475. M. prints his own conjecture καρποφόρων, but his arguments in favour of it are not very clear. Diggle's καρποφόροι makes good sense and is closer to L. 525. M. plausibly divides the line into three parts (ὡς τί δῆ; φεύγεις με; σαυτοῦ γνωρίσας τὰ φίλτατα), and is right to reject Page's γνωρίσαι (accepted by Diggle), which gives awkward sense and as he says 'violates Wackernagel's law for the position of με'. M.'s punctuation would make excellent sense with Hermann's γνώρισον, but he prefers to continue the sense into Xuthus' next words κτεῖνε καὶ πύμπρη, translating 'Once you've recognised your dearest [...], then kill and burn me' (i.e. take care of Xuthus' funeral). 547. M. proposes transposition after 553, but δεῦρο (548) takes up ἐκεῖ (547), which need only refer generally to where Xuthus was in his youth.

569–667. M. describes this scene as an 'aborted agon' because Xuthus does not reply to Ion's speech, but no such reply is to be expected because Ion's speech is itself a reply to Xuthus' proposal that he go to Athens. Contrast *Med.* 1351–3, where a speech in reply is explicitly rejected, and after which there is the angry dialogue usual in the agon. The term 'agon' has little use if it is applied to any pair of speeches, including cases like this one where there are not actually two speeches. 585–647. M. deletes 612–20 and 647 in addition to Kovacs's deletions of 595–606 and 621–32, reducing Ion's speech from 63 to 29 lines. Lee, however, gives a good defence against the charge

of anachronism. 691. M. prints his own conjecture τῶιδε δ' εὐφημα, ('but auspicious to him'), but 'auspicious' is not the same as 'advantageous'. 692. M. prints ἔχει δόμον τε γᾶν θ' ὁ παῖς (τε γᾶν his own ingenious conjecture), paraphrasing 'he has received both a family and a people to belong to and rule in', but the crucial '... and rule in' is not in the text (*Med.* 448 shows that ἔχει by itself does not imply ruling). 752–62. M. offers no reasons for his assertion that the Chorus does not intend its deliberations to be heard by Creusa, and there are good parallels for working up to the announcement of bad news by stages. 791. M. prints his own conjecture βίον for βίοντον, apparently for metrical reasons although his note does not make this clear. He compares the same change made by Hermann at *Hec.* 1028, which is not accepted by Battezzato in his recent edition. 875. On ῥάτων εἶναι ('to feel easier'), see now Collard (above, 185 n.), 112. 882. M. prints his own conjecture ἀγραύλων, agreeing with μουσαῶν, but there are two problems with it apart from the resulting hyperbaton: (1) ἄγραυλος means 'sleep outside' (usually of animals or shepherds), and it would be disrespectful to call the Muses 'rough-sleepers' (they have δώματα καλά at *Hes. Th.* 63); (2) ἀγραύλοις (L) agreeing with κεράεσσιν evokes Homer's ἀγραύλοιο βοῶς κέρασ (*Il.* 24.81; cf. *Od.* 12.253), although it is doubtless bolder to apply ἄγραυλος to the horn rather than the animal. 922. On 'the gardens of Zeus', M. might have cited E. Kearns, 'Pindar and Euripides on sex with Apollo', *CQ* 63 (2013), 57–67, at 64–5, comparing Pindar, *Pyth.* 9.53, and with other comparisons between Creusa and Cyrene.

936–8. M. offers convincing criticism of the conjecture by Page accepted by Diggle. He also gives a good account of the conversational gambit in 'Do you know the Cecropian rocks?', mocked by Wilamowitz for having one Athenian asking another whether he knows the Acropolis. Such questions are devices to introduce a new topic (cf. 794, 987, 999; Battezzato on *Hec.* 1008). 946. κᾶιτ' ἐξέκλεψας πῶς Ἀπόλλωνος γάμους; M. thinks the Paedagogus refers to abortion, implying the translation 'And then how did you get rid of Apollo's child?'. This admittedly makes Creusa's reply ('I bore the child') more pointed, but M.'s parallels do nothing to convince that γάμους can mean 'unborn child'. He insists that ἐκκλέπτω 'always denotes clandestine physical removal' in Euripides, but for the range of meanings of κλέπτω and its compounds see Denniston on *El.* 364. 1029. Collard (above, 185 n.), 84, cites the doubts of M. Labiano (*Glotta* 93 [2017], 45) whether οἷσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον is colloquial at all, but rather 'a specifically tragic idiom reformulated and innovated mainly by Euripides ... a fossilized expression confined to the literary language of tragedy'. It occurred to me that the 'tragic' aorist (see below, 1614 n.) could be explained in a similar way. 1031. M. prints Battezzato's convincing conjecture ἡμῶν. 1063–4. M. prints his own conjecture ἐσεφέρετ', translating '(on account of which hope) was raised', but it is doubtful whether εἰσφέρω can have this meaning here. He compares

Helen's τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; ἐσφέρεις γὰρ ἐλπίδας | ὡς δὴ τι δράσων χρηστὸν ἐς κοινόν γε νῶιν (*Hel.* 1037–8), which may indeed invite translations like 'What is your drift? You raise hopes that you will benefit both of us' (Kovacs), but only because εἰσφέρω is often used of making proposals and introducing new ideas, which is not relevant to the *Ion* passage. 1312–19. M. argues that Creusa is not saved by the opportune arrival of the Pythia, and insists that Ion's words suggest that he will not violate Creusa's sanctuary, but he underestimates the ambiguity of Euripides' treatment of the action here. Athena later says that Apollo saved Creusa (1564–5) which he could only have done by causing the Pythia to arrive at the crucial moment (see Owen on line 1565). 1614. M. might have mentioned that his comment on ἦινεσ' ('The aorist creates distance: contrast the more effusive present [at] 1609') follows a somewhat controversial interpretation by the present reviewer, 'The tragic aorist', *CQ* 49, 1999, 24–45, at 38–9.

In conclusion, this learned and independent-minded edition makes a substantial contribution to the understanding of *Ion*, and will be of the greatest interest to all Euripidean scholars.

MICHAEL LLOYD
University College Dublin
michael.lloyd@ucd.ie