

ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ Η ΕΝ ΑΥΛΙΔΙ.

THE

IPHIGENEIA AT AULIS

OF

EURIPIDES.



ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ Η ΕΝ ΑΥΛΙΔΙ.

THE
39
ΙΡΗΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ ΑΤ ΑΥΛΙΣ
OF
EURIPIDES

EDITED WITH

INTRODUCTION AND CRITICAL AND
EXPLANATORY NOTES

BY



E. B. ENGLAND, M.A.,

ASSISTANT LECTURER IN CLASSICS IN THE OWENS COLLEGE,
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY, MANCHESTER.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK.

1891

[*The Right of Translation is reserved.*]

Cambridge :

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A., AND SONS,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.



PREFACE.

I BEGAN this edition five or six years ago, in the hope that I might be able to clear away some of the obstacles which perplex all readers of what is still a most attractive drama. Though I cannot say that this hope became stronger as the work went on, I have certainly felt more and more the attractiveness of the subject. If the task has turned out harder than I expected, it has at the same time come to seem more worth doing.

On the general question of the state of the text and its possible history I have no original views to propound. All I have tried to do is to ascertain and weigh the views of others, and to arrive by selection at what seems to me the most probable hypothesis. This is, speaking generally, that the *Iphigenia at Aulis* was left by Euripides in too unfinished a state to be put on the stage: that the man or men who prepared it for such representations not only added passages at the end and in the body of the play, but rearranged the prologue: and lastly that of small casual interpolations of a later date the text of this tragedy contains an exceptionally large share. For further details under this head I must refer the reader to my introduction and commentaries. My original contributions have been confined to attempts at the emendation and elucidation of particular passages, and for these likewise I must refer to the Critical and Explanatory Notes.

How largely this edition is based on the foundations laid by many generations of Greek scholars will be evident on every page. My indebtedness to Prof. G. Vitelli of Florence, however, calls for special acknowledgement. His collation of the Laurentian MS., to say nothing of the discussions in his *Osservazione*, or his edition of the tragedy, have been of constant and invaluable assistance to me.

I also here take the opportunity of expressing my gratitude to Monsignor Ciccolini, the Chief Librarian of the Vatican Library, for the facilities which he with great courtesy afforded me for collating the Palatine MS.: as well as to Prof. J. Strachan of this College, for his kindness in reading through my proof-sheets. But for the suggestive criticisms of the latter, and, I must add, but for the vigilant supervision of the authorities of the Cambridge University Press, this book would be far more imperfect than it is.

E. B. ENGLAND.

THE OWENS COLLEGE,

June, 1891.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Preface	v
Introduction : <i>Outline of the Action</i>	ix
<i>Dramaturgy</i>	xii
<i>Minor Scenes</i>	xiv
<i>Characters</i>	xv
<i>State of the Text</i>	xvi
<i>Time of Production</i>	xxxii
<i>The Manuscripts</i>	xxxii
Text and Notes	I
<i>Appendix</i>	155
Index to Greek words discussed in the Explanatory Notes . . .	163
Index to Subjects discussed in the Explanatory Notes . . .	168

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ.

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΗΣ.

ΧΟΡΟΣ.

ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ.

ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΝΗΣΤΡΑ.

ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ.

ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥΣ.

[ΘΕΡΑΠΩΝ.]*

[ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ.]

* See Critical Note on v. 855.

INTRODUCTION.

THERE is no tragedy of Euripides that has in recent times so severely exercised critical ingenuity as the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. On few Greek plays have more or longer disquisitions been written. As these disquisitions have dealt in the main with the imperfections of parts of the text, its editors would seem to have claimed for it the same sort of respect that Dogberry does for himself when he says he is "a fellow that hath had losses". Its notoriety however was not always of this unenviable kind. The tone of references in ancient authors shows the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* to have been among the best known and best liked of Greek tragedies, while in modern literature and art it is linked in various ways with such names as Erasmus, Racine, Glück, and Schiller. We may conclude therefore that in it we have a work of excellence and beauty, and if we can discover these first, the main outlines, as it were, of the picture will not be obscured by our perplexity about some of its details. At the same time we shall be more willing to give some effort to the consideration whether any of these difficulties can be removed.

It will be well then in the first place to turn a deaf ear to the discordant voices of the critics—to pass by all disputed points in the attempt to get a clear idea of the play as we have it—its main action, its personages, and the character of its principal scenes.

Outline of the Action.

The action opens at Aulis, on the Boeotian coast of the Euripus, where has assembled the Greek force that is to sail to Troy. The object of the expedition is to recover Helen and punish the barbarian who has carried her off. Though the Greek fleet has found at Aulis a convenient meeting-place, and a safe anchorage, further progress has

been made impossible by the want of a favourable wind. In the midst of the growing impatience of leaders and men alike, the seer Calchas has revealed to Agamemnon, the chief commander, and his two principal advisers, Menelaus and Odysseus, that they have incurred the displeasure of the goddess Artemis, whose temple stands at Aulis, and that she will keep them where they are till her wrath is appeased: that moreover this can only be done in one way: Agamemnon must sacrifice at the altar of the goddess his eldest daughter Iphigeneia. On first hearing this, Agamemnon refused to make the sacrifice, and resolved to abandon the expedition, but Menelaus and Odysseus over-persuaded him, and at the suggestion of Odysseus he sent for his daughter to come to him, telling her mother Clytaemnestra that he wished to give her in marriage to Achilles. As the day of her arrival approaches Agamemnon's mind shrinks afresh from the dreadful deed, and it is at this juncture that the play begins. He sends while it is still night an old household attendant, with a letter to his wife, countermanding his previous orders. This letter is intercepted by Menelaus, and at *v.* 317 the dispute between the two brothers begins again. In the end the sight of Agamemnon's grief seems to recall his brother's better feelings (*v.* 477): he is willing to renounce his claim, but Agamemnon here shows the impotence of an irresolute and feeble nature to renounce a pursuit once engaged in. He knows too that Odysseus and the army will not allow him to draw back now that he has gone so far. His own love of power and high position, to which his brother has skilfully appealed, concurs with this fear to drive him onwards. Accordingly he makes up his mind anew to proceed with his original plan. He meets his wife and daughter when they arrive, and though incapable of mastering his emotion, conducts them to his tent without betraying his purpose.

At *v.* 801 a fresh turn is given to the action by the appearance of Achilles on the scene. The new-comer knows nothing of the necessity of the sacrifice, or of the artifice in which his name has been used to lure Iphigeneia to Aulis. He comes full of impatience, to remonstrate, somewhat unreasonably, with Agamemnon on his continued inaction. The first person whom he meets before the general's tent happens to be Clytaemnestra. His surprise at finding who she is, is increased when she salutes him as her destined son-in-law. The intervention of the old attendant (who had been intrusted with the second letter) reveals to both their true position, and the dreadful fate which Iphigeneia's father is preparing for her.

Clytaemnestra then turns to Achilles as her only hope, and goes

on her knees to him to beg his protection. Achilles is moved both by indignation at the use that has been made of his name, and by pity for the helpless girl and her mother. He recommends the latter to try first by entreaties to dissuade her husband from the sacrifice, but promises that if she fails in this he will as a last resource use his own right hand to defend Iphigeneia from death.

Then follows a meeting between Clytaemnestra and Agamemnon, who has come to fetch his daughter for the sacrifice. Finding that his wife knows all, he attempts no further dissimulation. Neither the reproaches of his wife nor the prayers of his tearful daughter,—who comes on the scene at *v.* 1210,—can move him. He says he has not the power to draw back: it is a national question: his daughter must be sacrificed to the interests of Hellas. At this juncture Achilles returns with some of his men, prepared to redeem his pledge. He knows that the army is against him, but he tells Clytaemnestra that he and his handful of men will brave Odysseus at the head of the whole force sooner than let Iphigeneia be carried off. At this point comes the turning-point of the tragedy. The heroine has formed within her own breast, while listening to her mother and Achilles, the resolution to give herself willingly to death for the good of her nation, and to prevent a hopeless struggle between her brave defender and the relentless army. It is as if the loyal self-devotion of her champion had roused in her the desire to do likewise. *She* will be the champion of the women of her nation against barbarous ravishers. Thanks to her, no Greek woman shall again be carried off as Paris carried off Helen. In this decision the sorrowing mother is forced to acquiesce, and so is Achilles, though he renews his offer to die if necessary, in her defence:—he will be near till the end in case her resolution should alter. This is the natural expression of his growing admiration of the heroine. She had been called his bride, and he now regrets feelingly that she will not be his bride in reality, when he says (*vv.* 1404 ff.):

Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖ, μακάριόν μὲ τις θεῶν
ἔμελλε θήσειν εἰ τύχοιμι σῶν γάμων.
ζηλῶ δὲ σοῦ μὲν Ἑλλάδ', Ἑλλάδος δὲ σέ¹.

¹ There are some points of similarity between the position of Achilles in this play and that of the lover of the Virgin Martyr in Massinger's play of that name. With the Greek passage given above we may compare Antonio's words in Act IV. sc. 3, when Dorothea is being led to

execution:

She ascends,
And every step raises her nearer heaven.
What god soe'er thou art that must
enjoy her
Receive in her a boundless happiness!

The time has now come for the sacrifice, and when Iphigeneia quits the stage it is to go to death, and the chorus who are left sing her praises as the real champion of Hellas, the real taker of Troy. Schiller in his translation breaks off with Iphigeneia's parting words of farewell to life as she leaves the stage. All dramatic action, he truly says, closes here.

The play as we have it concludes with an epilogue in which a messenger describes to Clytaemnestra the scene of the sacrifice, and tells how, when the fatal blow had been struck, it was discovered that the immolated body was not that of the princess, but of a doe. The question of the authenticity of this passage will be discussed elsewhere. All that need be said here is that it is important to remember that the religious character of a Greek dramatic exhibition, and the special partiality of Euripides for a complete setting or framework for his subjects, are conditions which make it probable that the tragedy would not end merely, as a modern drama would, with the triumph of human courage and virtue, but would also indicate how the claims of the superintendent divinity were satisfied, and her approbation secured.

Dramaturgy.

Such then is the story. If we now turn to the method of its dramatic representation we shall find three turning-points in the action: viz.

1. The decision of Agamemnon to proceed with the sacrifice (*vv.* 510 f.):
2. The discovery by Clytaemnestra, her daughter, and Achilles that the sacrifice is intended:
3. Iphigeneia's resolution to die of her own accord.

Two classifications may conveniently be made of the *dramatis personae*. The first hangs on the question, are they or are they not aware from the beginning of the impending catastrophe? There are three who do know the fate that overhangs the heroine: Agamemnon, Menelaus and the old Attendant. The three who do not are Clytaemnestra, Iphigeneia and Achilles, and it is their discovery of it at *v.* 873 in the third scene of the third *ἐπεισόδιον* which forms the second *περιπέτεια*, or turning-point, of the play.

The second and more important classification has reference to the

disposition of mind with which the personages regard the sacrifice. Menelaus and Agamemnon decide to bring it about. Clytaemnestra, Iphigeneia, Achilles and the old Henchman regard it with horror, and are prepared to do their best to avert it. This division then, is not, like the former, an equal one: there are two on one side, and four on the other. But at *v.* 1368, in the 6th scene of the *ἔξοδος*, Iphigeneia, the most nearly concerned of all, deserts the larger party and ranges herself with her father and her uncle. This transition forms the supreme crisis of the tragedy.

Connected with the three *περιπέτειαι*—Agamemnon's decision, Clytaemnestra's discovery, and Iphigeneia's self-sacrifice—are four main scenes by which the action of the drama is advanced. The first is the 2nd scene of the first Epeisodion—*vv.* 317—542 (assuming, as it will afterwards be shown we may, that the scene with the messenger, *vv.* 414—441, is spurious), in which Agamemnon and Menelaus argue, the former against, the latter for the sacrifice. The disputants here have no great earnestness of tone. There is an almost unseemly eagerness shown on both sides, not so much to convince the opponent, as to make a telling answer. A fit end to such a scene is the (perhaps feigned) renunciation by Menelaus of his pursuit and the corresponding change of front on the part of his brother. Agamemnon ends by making up his mind to do what he has all along been arguing that he could not and ought not to do, just when his brother ceases to press him to do it.

Next of the four comes the scene following on the 2nd *περιπέτεια*:—the fourth scene of the third Epeisodion—*vv.* 896—1035. In this Clytaemnestra appeals to Achilles for help, and the appeal calls forth ready sympathy in the true-hearted warrior. There is no want of earnestness in this scene, but it has no conclusive issue. Achilles promises his help in the last resort, but bids Clytaemnestra first try by words to shake her husband's determination¹.

The third main scene—technically two scenes; the 2nd and 3rd of the Exodus—*vv.* 1106—1275—is that in which Agamemnon is brought face to face with his wife and daughter. The wife is unable by her reproaches, the daughter by her tearful prayers, to shake his

¹ This unexpected recommendation of Achilles seems to be due to dramatic necessity. As both mother and daughter appear in the play, *both* of them must have the opportunity of trying to shake Agamemnon's resolution. If either of

them did not do so, it would produce the impression that she had not the matter so much at heart as the other. It would be foreign to the nature of Greek Tragedy that both should try at once.

purpose. Clytaemnestra's language is here less impassioned than in the preceding scene, when she was under the full excitement of her new discovery, but it is more dignified. For the purposes of the action this scene is more important than the preceding. The alternative there left open—was the sacrifice to be averted by persuasion or force?—is here settled. Persuasion has done its utmost in vain.

Fourthly, in the 5th scene of the Exodus—*vv.* 1368—1466—we have Iphigeneia's resolution to sacrifice herself, and the justification from her own lips of the purpose, which throughout the play has given rise to such anxious discussion, and heated dissension,—thus putting an end, in the only way possible, to both.

Minor Scenes.

We have now reviewed the three turning-points in the action, and the scenes which form, as it were, the steps by which it proceeds. If we read these four scenes by themselves, we feel that we have had too much debating. But we are not left with these alone. In the pauses of the action come scenes which though not directly affecting the development of events, are of the first importance as revelations of the characters of the interlocutors. Of these there are two which I think dwell in our minds more than any others in the play. The first is the stichomuthia between Agamemnon and Iphigeneia on their meeting—*vv.* 640—677. The second is the meeting of Achilles and Clytaemnestra at *vv.* 819—854. It would be hard to find, in any drama whatever, two characters portrayed with more vivid individuality than are those of Iphigeneia and Achilles in these two short scenes. In the former the heroine's tender playfulness makes dissimulation an evident torture to her father, while it heightens for the spectator the pathos of her fate. In the latter we cannot witness without sympathy, nor altogether without amusement, the "biting jest" of which Fortune makes the stately queen the butt. Both the queen's chagrin and the humour of the situation are heightened by the fact that it is Achilles who inflicts the rebuff. All men looked up to this heaven-born prince, and Clytaemnestra was specially inclined to credit him with every virtue of conduct and demeanour. He shows in this scene, it is true, a little brusqueness and impatience, but though blunt he is not discourteous. In such company, and dealt by such a hand, the full force of the blow to the queen is clearly felt. Like Malvolio, she has indeed been "most notoriously abused."

Characters.

Notwithstanding the elaboration and distinctness of these several scenes the art of the poet never allows us to forget the central figure, and so arranges the supreme crisis in her lot, that her sacrifice serves as the touchstone to reveal the true character of all the personages in the drama. From all consideration of separate incidents and characters we turn again to the heroine, only to find her image more perfectly winning, more wonderfully noble. Each in its way the several characters are a foil to that of Iphigeneia. Even Achilles, who has in him the stuff that makes the manly ideal alike of ancient, mediæval, and modern society, who is the first (*vv.* 1404 ff.) to sympathize with the heroine's noble aspirations, who is high-souled, strong, and generous, seems harsh by the side of her tenderness. The inordinate share which a sense of personal indignity has with Achilles in determining him to act in the heroine's defence (*cf. vv.* 935—942), shows a weakness to which there is no counterpart in the heroic self-abandonment of Iphigeneia.

Clytaemnestra has a strong and true love for her daughter, but it is a narrow and self-regarding affection as compared with Iphigeneia's love for her father and her country—a blind passion of a character whose subsequent faithlessness to her husband balances her true-hearted love to her child.

Of Agamemnon, as he appears in this play, it must be allowed that his wife gives a true description when at *v.* 1012 she says *κακός τις ἔστι καὶ λίαν ταραβεί στρατόν*. He is a poor creature in a desperate situation. Whereas Iphigeneia's first impulse to save herself (*vv.* 1211—1252)—which no less a critic than Aristotle¹ has blamed as inconsistent with her later conduct—gives way to an enthusiastic self-devotion, her father's inconsistencies are all between good impulses and base action. He loves his daughter, but is incapable of renouncing his high position to save her. It is not the glory and honour of Greece, but fear of the consequences to himself that induces him to abandon his daughter to her fate. It is a marvellous 'touch of nature' that Iphigeneia, unlike her mother, is blind to Agamemnon's faults. To her he is an ideal father. Her love for him speaks in her intercession for him with Clytaemnestra at *vv.* 1456 and 1458; and her mention of him when she first reveals her determination to die (at *v.* 1369) shows us that love for her father, and a clear perception of his desperate situation, have had their part in forming her decision.

¹ *Poetics* c. 15, p. 1454, 31 a.

As to Menelaus, he is cool and crafty in the pursuit of his object—the recovery of his wife and the punishment of her lover. It is open to doubt, but I think his renunciation of his claims at *vv.* 471 ff. is meant by the poet to be only a simulated one. The suddenness with which he admits the force of the arguments he has just been combating, and the artful suggestion at *v.* 495—*ἴτω στρατεία διαλυθείσ' ἐξ Αὐλίδος*—of the consequences of the abandonment of the pursuit—and at *v.* 498 of Agamemnon's interest in the expedition—*εἰ δέ τι κόρης σῆς θεσφάτων μέτεστί σοι*—all point to the conclusion that he sees his brother is but half-hearted in his protest, and that all that is needed to decide him to sacrifice his daughter is that he should be brought face to face with the alternative. Such a character is consistent with the picture of Menelaus which Euripides gives of him in the *Andromache* and in the *Orestes*. It is natural too that such should be the character in Euripides of the king of that people of whom he wrote at *Andromache vv.* 446 ff. that they were

δόλια βουλευτήρια,
 ψευδῶν ἄνακτες, μηχανορράφοι κακῶν,
 ἔλικτὰ κούδεν ὑγιές, ἀλλὰ πᾶν περίξ
 φρονούντες.

It has been held by many that in the *Bacchae*, which like the *Iphigenia Aulidensis* was a work of the last days of the poet, Euripides had the special object of vindicating his belief in the supernatural against a charge of infidelity. It is well known that he had been called a woman-hater as well as an infidel by his contemporaries. Is it not possible that he designed in this other work of his old age to show the world that, in his fancy at least, a woman might be perfect?

State of the Text.

Having thus attempted to show that in the Euripidean *Iphigenia at Aulis* we have a great subject nobly treated—that the arrangement of the plot and the elaboration of the main scenes reveal consummate dramatic art—I now propose to consider what are the indications that the play as we have it has suffered something more than the usual 'wear and tear' of literary transmission.

The two manuscripts on which we depend for our text are No. 287 of the Palatine manuscripts in the Library of the Vatican, which I follow Prinz in calling P (Kirchhoff's *B*), and No. 32, 2 in the Laurentian Library at Florence, Prinz's L (Kirchhoff's *C*). Both of these mss. appear to have been copied from the same original, and to

date from the 14th century. The play was first printed in the Edition of Aldus published in the year 1503, which contained all the extant plays of Euripides with the exception of the *Electra*. Numerous translations and adaptations to the modern stage attest the interest which the tragedy has aroused in modern times¹. Till a little more than a hundred years ago no one seems to have suspected that the Greek text did not give us the play as it was left by Euripides. Since the publication in 1761 however of Musgrave's *Exercitationes in Euripidem*, the authenticity of large portions (and even of the whole) of the play has been repeatedly called in question. Musgrave was the first to direct attention to the following passage of Aelian *Hist. Anim.* vii. 39:

ὁ δὲ Εὐριπίδης ἐν τῇ Ἰφιγενείᾳ

ἔλαφον δ' Ἀχαιῶν χερσὶν ἐνθήσω [φίλαις²]
κεροῦσσαν, ἣν σφάζοντες αὐχῆσουσι σὴν
σφάζειν θυγατέρα.

It was the attempt to conjecture in what part of the *Iphigenia at Aulis* this quotation occurred, that gave the first impulse to a far-reaching sceptical criticism of the text. It was clear from the first that no place could be found for such lines as these in any part of our present text. Musgrave's own attention was directed to the irregularity in the construction of the prologue as compared with those of other Euripidean plays, and he expressed the belief that the lines quoted by Aelian come from a lost prologue spoken by Artemis to an imaginary auditor (*i.e.* one not present on the stage)—either Agamemnon or Clytaemnestra. Musgrave does not suspect our present opening of being spurious, he

¹ Erasmus published a Latin translation of it (and the *Hecuba*) in 1524 which was frequently reprinted, especially in Italy: Ludovico Dolce about 1540 published an Italian version, which though not a literal translation followed the lines of the story and action of the Greek. Thomas Sibilet translated it into French in 1549. From the same century date two German translations, one by Ch. H. Postellus and one by Baptista de Rochlitz 1584. An adaptation of the tragedy to the French stage was made by Rotrou in 1641, and in 1675 Racine founded upon it his *Iphigénie*. In the same year another tragedy of the same name was produced by MM. Le Clerc and Coras. In 1700 an Italian translation by Maggi

was published at Milan, and in the same year an *Iphigenia at Aulis* was produced at Drury Lane. An Italian translation with notes of the two *Iphigenia's*, by Padre Dom. Giambatt. Carraciolo, was published at Florence in 1729, an unpublished Italian translation by A. de Pazzi is also mentioned. About 1764 appeared a translation in blank verse by the Italian Lorenzo Guazzesi, and Glück's opera *Iphigenie en Aulide* was produced in Paris in 1774. I have not here mentioned any translation of the whole of Euripides.

² I cannot believe that *φίλαις* is the right word here. Wecklein suggests *λάθρα*.

imagines that the real prologue is lost. Porson at one time shared this view. In his *Praelectio in Euripidem* (1792) we read: "Cum enim Aelianus tres versus ex hac fabula citaverit, qui in dramate nostro, prout nunc habetur, nusquam comparent; cumque hi tres versus Dianae totam tragediae constitutionem exponenti aptissime congruant; quis dubitet, prologum hujus quoque olim fuisse dramatis, sed injuria temporis jamdudum periisse?" Subsequently Porson appears to have devoted particular attention to this play, and to have thought of editing it¹. His final judgement was that a large portion of the exodus of the tragedy was spurious—not added to the genuine tragedy, but occupying the place of a lost part—and that in this missing part Aelian's quotation occurred. His words are (*Supplem. ad Praef.* p. 23): "Si me rogas, ultra harum vera sit lectio, respondeo neutra. Nec quicquam mea refert; quippe qui persuasus sim, totam eam scenam abusive versu 1541 [1532] spuriam esse et a recentiori quodam, nescio quando, certe post Aeliani tempora suppositam". In his note too on v. 1338 of the *Orestes* he expresses doubts of the genuineness of this part of the *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

The next important piece of external evidence which influenced the theories of scholars on the subject was a scholion on v. 67 of the *Fraus* of Aristophanes. In v. 66 Dionysus says

τοιουτοσὶ τοίνυν με δαρδάπτει πόθος
Εὐριπίδου.

Heracles thereupon asks: καὶ τὰτα τοῦ τεθνηκότος; The scholiast's comment on this is: τινὲς βούλονται ἐν πρόσωπον λέγειν ὄλον. τινὲς δὲ διορίζουσι τὸ τοῦ τεθνηκότος· ὡς τοῦ Ἡρακλέους λέγοντος αὐτό. οὗτο γὰρ καὶ αἱ διδασκαλῖαι φέρουσι, τελετήσαντος Εὐριπίδου τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ δεδιδασχέναι ὁμώνυμος (so V, ὁμώνυμον G) ἐν ᾧσται Ἰφιγένειαν τὴν ἐν Αἰλίδι, Ἀλκμαίωνα, Βάκχας. Although it happened that the discovery of the fragment in Aelian had a greater and more immediate effect on the problem, this scholion is itself a more valuable piece of evidence. Its first effect was to suggest an explanation of the irregularities of structure and diction to which attention had been called. The mention of another hand as concerned in the production of the tragedy gave rise to the idea that two separate editions of it were produced at different times, and that we have pieces of both editions unskilfully joined to make our present text. This theory fits some of the facts—fits them too well perhaps. It accounts for passages quoted from ancient authors

¹ "De quo latius agam si quando *ad Praef. ad Hec.* p. 23. fabulam istam edendam curabo"; *Supplem.*

which we do not find in our text¹ by supposing that they occurred in some parts of one of the editions which have not been preserved, and as for discrepancies and irregularities, 'what,' says the theory, 'is more natural than that parts should not unite well which belonged originally to different wholes?'

This view of the two editions was supported in one form or other by Eichstadt (*De dramate Graecorum comico-satyrico*, Leipzig, 1793), Boeckh (*Graecae trag. princ. &c.*, Heidelberg, 1808), and by Bremi (*Phil. Beyträge aus der Schweiz* p. 143, Zürich, 1819). Zirndorfer (*Dr. Eur. Iph. Aul.*, Marburg, 1838) modified this theory by supposing that both the elder and the younger Euripides wrote a play of this name, and that long afterwards a grammarian selected parts of each to make into a single play, occasionally adding something of his own.

Another quotation from the *Iphigenia at Aulis* in an ancient author which has been the cause of some perplexity is to be found in the 13th book of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* p. 562. The difficulty in this case is not, as in that of Aelian's quotation, that the lines are not to be found in our text. It would have saved a good deal of trouble if they were not; but they are there:—at *v.* 548—551: and the difficulty is that they are there assigned to "the tragic poet Chaeremon". The passage of Athenaeus is as follows: Θεόφραστος δ' ἐν τῷ Ἑρωτικῷ Χαίρημονά φησι τὸν τραγικὸν λέγειν ὡς τὸν οἶνον τῶν χρωμένων τοῖς τρόποις κεράννυσθαι, οὕτως καὶ τὸν Ἑρωτα· ὅς μετριάζων μὲν ἐστὶν εὐχαρὶς, ἐπιτείνόμενος δὲ καὶ διαταράττων χαλεπώτατος. διόπερ ὁ ποιητῆς οὗτος οὐ κακῶς αὐτοῦ τὰς δυνάμεις διαιρῶν φησι Δίδυμα γὰρ τόξα αὐτὸν ἐντείνεσθαι χαρίτων, τὰ μὲν ἐπ' εὐαίῳνι τύχῃ, τὰ δ' ἐπὶ συγκύσει βιοτᾶς· ὁ δ' αὐτὸς οὗτος ποιητῆς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐρώντων ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Τραυματίᾳ φησὶν οὕτως

Τὶς οὐχὶ φήσει τοὺς ἐρώντας ζῆν μόνους;
εἰ δεῖ γε πρῶτον μὲν στρατευτικωτάτους
εἶναι, πονεῖν τε δυναμένους τοῖς σώμασιν
μάλιστα, προσεδρεύειν τ' ἀρίστους τῷ πόθῳ,
ποιητικούς, ἰταμούς, προθύμους, εὐπόρους,
ἐν τοῖς ἀπόροις βλέποντας, ἀθλωτάτους.

¹ There are two minor items of this kind of evidence which were known to Musgrave and used either by or soon after him to support his theory; (1) the gloss of Hesychius *ἄθραυστα· ἀπρόσκοπα· Εὐριπίδης Ἰφιγενείᾳ τῇ ἐν Αὐλίδι*, (2) the statement made by the scholiast on *Ar. Frogs* *v.* 309 ff. that Aristophanes was there quoting from the *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

As to the former point see on *v.* 57. As to the latter, the word *στωμύλλετε*, which could hardly have occurred in a tragic chorus, shows the passage to be a paraphrase, not a literal quotation. Very probably *Iph. Taur. v.* 1089 ff. was the passage the scholiast had in his mind and he wrote *ἐν Αὐλίδι* by mistake for *ἐν Ταύροις*.

Gruppe devotes a considerable space in his work on the Greek stage—*Ariadne*, Berlin, 1834—to the argument that in the construction of the plot and in its elaboration in the dialogue, the *Iphigenia at Aulis* is unlike, and superior to the work of Euripides. It might, he says, have been written by Sophocles, but never by Euripides. Athenaeus, he believes, has revealed to us its real author, Chaeremon. Euripides did write a tragedy of that name, and from that tragedy, Gruppe holds, Aelian quoted in his *Hist. Anim.* It is not necessary to confront this theory with all the external testimony which contradicts it, because Meineke's examination (*Hist. Crit. Comic. Graec.* p. 520) of the passage of Athenaeus has destroyed the force of its evidence. He has shown that the words from *Θεόφραστος* δ' to *βιοτᾶς* cannot have originally been written (at least intentionally) in the position and with the context they now have. Immediately before, Athenaeus had quoted a passage from the *Ἀποκοπόμενος* of Alexis. Stobaeus *Floril.* 119, 15 mentions a *Τραυματίας* by Alexis. The passage quoted by Athenaeus as written by *ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος ποιητής* is by its language, and still more by its metre, clearly declared to be from a comedy and not a tragedy. Hence Meineke thinks it evident that by *ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος ποιητής* Alexis is meant:—and moreover that Athenaeus, after writing the passage containing the two quotations from the comedies of Alexis, finding in Theophrastus the apposite quotations from Chaeremon and Euripides, inserted them carelessly, without giving the full context of the passage from Theophrastus, and taking no more care to distinguish between Euripides and Chaeremon than between the author of the *Iphigenia* and the author of the *Traumantias*¹.

With Matthiae, whose edition of Euripides appeared between the years 1813 and 1829, begins a new era in the criticism of our play. The course which he took is the one which the majority of subsequent critics have followed in the main. He rejects the above-mentioned conjectures as to the two editions or the two plays, and regards the tragedy as the work of Euripides, left by him incomplete at his death, finished and arranged by the younger Euripides for the stage, but in such a manner as to leave gaps and inconsistencies, which gave rise to later alterations and additions by various hands. The main points in this view are the recognition of an original imperfection, and of the varying character and date of the interpolations. The imperfection may have been due, as Matthiae thought, to the fact that the author left the work unfinished at his death, or to an early mutilation of the

¹ On the play of Chaeremon bearing *chische Tragödien*, vol. III. pp. 1086 ff. the title *Τραυματίας* see Welcker, *Grie-*

manuscript containing it. Naturally the views of scholars on the spuriousness of particular passages have varied greatly. On the main question however Matthiæ is found to be in company with Hermann (1831 and 1847), Hartung (1837), Monk (1840), Dindorf, Kirchhoff, Nauck, Paley, Klotz, Hennig¹ and Vitelli².

While these scholars differ among themselves in the appreciation and interpretation of the external evidence, they agree in holding that the internal evidence which condemns parts of the play is overpowering—that the inconsistencies, the superfluities, the inequalities of style, and (in the epilogue) the imperfections of the metre are so numerous and important as to compel the belief that other hands than that of Euripides have had a share in the work:—that if they did not make the gaps, at all events they filled up large gaps which they found.

Two scholars of note, however, stand champions for the integrity of the play as it has come down to us. Firmhaber (*Eurip. Iph. in Aulis*, Leipzig, 1841), and Weil (*Sept Tragédies d'Euripide*, Paris, 2nd ed. 1879) maintain that the text is genuine from beginning to end: that such imperfections as disfigure it are due to the ordinary accidents of manuscript transmission, and are not beyond the cure of an acute and learned textual criticism.

The full force of the internal evidence can only be brought out by a detailed commentary. Many of the debateable points turn on the interpretation of particular words and sentences which cannot be understood apart from their context. But there are one or two features of the text which may with advantage be viewed separately in this introduction, and which, I think, are enough to prove that the majority of modern scholars are right in their judgement of the general question.

To begin with: the prologue (*vv.* 1—163) consists of two passages of anapaestic dialogue with a long speech in iambics coming between them. If we leave the *Rhesus* out of account—partly because of its doubtful authorship, but still more because we are told in the second *ὑπόθεσις* to the play that it originally had an iambic prologue which had been lost, and for which another spurious prologue (also in iambics) had been substituted—the only other tragedy of Euripides which we have any reason to think began with anapaests was the *Andromeda*. The scholiast on *v.* 1065 of the *Thesmophoriazusæ* of Aristophanes says of the passage beginning ὦ νῆξ ἱερά that it is τοῦ προλόγου Ἀνδρομέδας εἰσβολή, and again at *v.* 1070 he says καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ

¹ *De Iph. Aul. forma ac condicione*, Berlin, 1870.

² *Osservazioni intorno ad alcuni luoghi della Ifigenia in Aulide* (Florence, 1877).

προλόγου, and at *v.* 1072 λέιπει μέλλουσα τυχεῖν—*i.e.* in the *Andromeda* the words μέλλουσα τυχεῖν followed θανάτου τλήμων. The words τ. π. Ἄ. εἰσβολή are usually taken to mean ‘the beginning of the prologue of the *Andromeda*’. Fritzsche in his note on the passage in Aristophanes translates the words “pars post prologum proxima”. Bohnhoff (“Der Prolog der Iphigenie in Aulis des Eur.”—*Programm des städtischen Gymn. in Freienwalde a. O.* 1885—p. 7) takes προλόγου to be a mistake for παρόδου. If there is a mistake, it seems to me preferable to conjecture that we have here an instance of the very usual confusion in uncial mss. between ἐκ and εἰς, and that the passage was described by the scholiast as τοῦ προλόγου Ἀνδρομέδας ἐκβολή (for the word in the sense of ‘conclusion’ cf. Hesych. and Eustath. p. 900). The whole passage as far as we can gather it from Aristophanes ran thus :

ὦ νύξ ἱερά
 πῶς μακρὸν ἵππευμα διώκεις
 ἀστροειδέα νῶτα διφρεύουσ'
 αἰθέρος ἱεράς
 τοῦ σεμνοτάτου δι' Ὀλύμπου ;
 τί ποτ' Ἀνδρομέδα περιάλλα κακῶν
 μέρος ἐξέλαχον
 θανάτου τλήμων μέλλουσα τυχεῖν ;

This passage is a monody—at *Thesm.* 1077 Mnesilochus, when interrupted by Euripides as Echo, says “ὦ γὰρ ἔασόν με μονωδῆσαι”—and is spoken by Andromeda. As it is an address to Night it may be supposed to be spoken before daybreak. *V.* 1098 of the *Thesm.* shows us that the monody preceded Perseus's first appearance on the stage. Probably Echo was brought in by Euripides in the *Andromeda*, but it is not necessary to suppose that she appeared in the place in which the comic poet introduces her—*i.e.* so as to interrupt the monody. It would be a natural arrangement that the monody should come at the end of an ordinary iambic prologue and accompany the approach of the chorus. The anapaests are apparently not lyric anapaests, but such as accompany a march. However that may be, it was not—like the anapaestic prologue in our text of the *Iph. in Aul.*—a dialogue, and it is difficult to see how a monody begun in such a strain could have been made to serve the purpose of enlightening the spectator about the circumstances of the following action. This however is a question about which I, at least, cannot be certain, and it is possible that after all εἰσβολή is the right word and that it meant ‘beginning’.

It remains for us to consider the bearing of this matter on the

present question. In the face of the scholion at the beginning of the *Hecuba*—ἐποίησε δὲ τοῦτο ὁ ποιητῆς ἐξεπίτηδες, ἵνα δῆλα πᾶσι ποιήσῃ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Πολυῦδωρον, ὃ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ δραμάτων ποιεῖν εἴρωθεν—and of the words of Aristotle at *Rhet.* III. p. 1415, 13 a—καὶ οἱ τραγικοὶ δηλοῦσι περὶ τὸ δράμα, κἂν μὴ εὐθύς ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδης, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ γέ που δηλοῖ, ὥσπερ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς “ἐμοὶ πατήρ ἦν Πόλυβος”—and of the ridicule of Aristophanes on this very ground—*Frogs* 946, where Euripides is made to say:

ἀλλ' οὐξίων πρώτιστα μὲν μοι τὸ γένος εἶπ' ἂν εὐθύς
τοῦ δράματος—

in the face of all this distinct testimony to Euripides's universal custom, I think it is difficult to admit on the strength of the Aristophanes scholion above quoted that the *Andromeda* formed an exception. But surely this admission, if made, instead of opening the door, as some have thought, for a further admission in the case of the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, closes it effectually. The words ἐν ἀρχῇ πάντων τῶν δραμάτων are irreconcilable with *two* exceptions.

It may be taken then as nearly certain that Euripides provided our play with an iambic prologue of the usual kind. Such a prologue we have in *v.* 49—114. As Wecklein says, it did not need the quotation of a line of it by Aristotle (*Rhetoric* III. 1411, 29 b) to stamp it as the genuine work of Euripides. It bears that stamp on every line¹. But in our text it does not stand as a prologue (in the narrower sense), but as an answer to the Old Attendant's eager question in *v.* 43 τί πονεῖς; τί νέον περὶ σοί, βασιλεῦ; Such an answer—a historical review of all the previous circumstances, and a detailed statement of the present predicament of the Greek leaders and their army, containing no hint until *v.* 110 that it is addressed to any special person—is ridiculously out of place. Besides the Old Man knew it almost all already. The change of metre too is awkward. Nowhere else can be found one long iambic passage answering and answered by anapaests, and forming with the anapaests an uninterrupted conversation. It should be remembered moreover that the most vital characteristic of the Euripidean prologue was, not that it was in iambics, nor that it was a monologue, but that it *at once* (εὐθύς) put the audience in a position to understand the action, motives, and condition of the dramatis personae. Now, however significant this somewhat rambling conversation (*vv.* 1—48) may be to those who know what is happening,

¹ G. Dindorf, *Eur.* III. p. 441, *Poet. Scen.* p. 264—thought this iambic pas-

sage unworthy of Euripides and assigned it to Euripides minor.

we may feel sure that it would have puzzled and amazed an audience who came to hear a play of Euripides, to have to search for their clue in 50 lines of conversation between Agamemnon and an Old Man on the time of night, on the disadvantages of rank, and the necessity of contentment.

A second difficulty which attends the usual arrangement of the prologue is this. At *v.* 106, after explaining the plan by which Iphigeneia is to be brought to Aulis, Agamemnon says none of the Greeks know of it except Calchas, Odysseus, Menelaus, and himself. Yet at *v.* 124 the Old Attendant asks 'how can Achilles be expected to put up with the loss of his bride?' To this Agamemnon at *v.* 128 answers that Achilles knows nothing of their plan. If this were a comedy Agamemnon's long speech might be conceived to have sent the old man to sleep, and thus we could account for his not knowing what Agamemnon had just told him. But this is not a comedy; so commentators who uphold the *mss.* arrangement have to suppose either, as Hermann did at first, though he gave it up later, that Agamemnon had spoken 106 ff. (for some inconceivable reason) aside—"submissiore voce et aversum ab sene"—or else, as Weil, and (practically) Firnhaber do, that the old man was exceptionally stupid. Weil thinks that the old man's denseness (or inattention) was arranged by the poet to give an opportunity of saying over again a thing which it was important for the spectators to notice. This does not sound like tragic art.

Hennig, to remove this difficulty, rejects *vv.* 124—132 as spurious—put in by some one who thought *vv.* 133 ff. *δεινά γ' ἐτόλμας κ. τ. λ.* inconsistent with Agamemnon's words as given in *vv.* 115—123. But, as Vitelli well observes, it is even easier to believe that a manifest inconsistency such as that between *vv.* 124 ff. and 106 ff. should be left by inadvertence by the author of the play, than that it should be deliberately inserted by a would-be improver.

Wecklein (*Ztschr. f. d. Oest. Gymn.* xxix. p. 721) would get out of both difficulties by rejecting all the anapaests which come before the iambic passage (*i.e.* *vv.* 1—48) as spurious, and supposing that the old man only came on the stage after the iambic passage had been spoken.

Hartung (whose arrangement Hermann approves of in his latest discussion of the play, see *Opusc.* viii. 218 ff.) also avoids both difficulties—*i.e.* that arising out of the position of the iambic prologue and secondly that of the contradiction between *vv.* 106 f. and *vv.* 124 ff. He supposes that, as Euripides wrote this play, first came the iambic prologue (*vv.* 49 ff.); then the first anapaestic passage (*vv.* 1—48), and

present question. In the face of the scholion at the beginning of the *Hecuba*—ἐποίησε δὲ τοῦτο ὁ ποιητὴς ἐξεπίτηδες, ἵνα δῆλα πᾶσι ποιήσῃ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Πολύδωρον, ὃ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ δραμάτων ποιεῖν εἴωθεν—and of the words of Aristotle at *Rhet.* III. p. 1415, 18 a—καὶ οἱ τραγικοὶ δηλοῦσι περὶ τὸ δράμα, κἂν μὴ εὐθὺς ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδης, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ γέ που δηλοῖ, ὥσπερ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς “ἐμοὶ πατὴρ ἦν Πόλυβος”—and of the ridicule of Aristophanes on this very ground—*Frogs* 946, where Euripides is made to say :

ἀλλ' οὐξὼν πρότιστα μὲν μοι τὸ γένος εἶπ' ἂν εὐθὺς
τοῦ δράματος—

in the face of all this distinct testimony to Euripides's universal custom, I think it is difficult to admit on the strength of the Aristophanes scholion above quoted that the *Andromeda* formed an exception. But surely this admission, if made, instead of opening the door, as some have thought, for a further admission in the case of the *Iphigenia at Aulis*, closes it effectually. The words ἐν ἀρχῇ πάντων τῶν δραμάτων are irreconcilable with *two* exceptions.

It may be taken then as nearly certain that Euripides provided our play with an iambic prologue of the usual kind. Such a prologue we have in *vv.* 49—114. As Wecklein says, it did not need the quotation of a line of it by Aristotle (*Rhetoric* III. 1411, 29 b) to stamp it as the genuine work of Euripides. It bears that stamp on every line¹. But in our text it does not stand as a prologue (in the narrower sense), but as an answer to the Old Attendant's eager question in *v.* 43 τί ποιεῖς; τί νέον περὶ σοί, βασιλεῦ; Such an answer—a historical review of all the previous circumstances, and a detailed statement of the present predicament of the Greek leaders and their army, containing no hint until *v.* 110 that it is addressed to any special person—is ridiculously out of place. Besides the Old Man knew it almost all a eady. The change of metre too is awkward. Nowhere else can be found one long iambic passage answering and answered by anapaests, and forming with the anapaests an uninterrupted conversation. It should be remembered moreover that the most vital characteristic of the Euripidean prologue was, not that it was in iambics, nor that it was a monologue, but that it *at once* (εὐθύς) put the audience in a position to understand the action, motives, and condition of the dramatis personae. Now, however significant this somewhat rambling conversation (*vv.* 1—48) may be to those who know what is happening,

¹ G. Dindorf, *Eur.* III. p. 441, *Poet.* sage unworthy of Euripides and assigned to Euripides minor.
Scen. p. 264—thought this iambic pas-

we may feel sure that it would have puzzled and amazed an audience who came to hear a play of Euripides, to have to search for their clue in 50 lines of conversation between Agamemnon and an Old Man on the time of night, on the disadvantages of rank, and the necessity of contentment.

A second difficulty which attends the usual arrangement of the prologue is this. At *v.* 106, after explaining the plan by which Iphigeneia is to be brought to Aulis, Agamemnon says none of the Greeks know of it except Calchas, Odysseus, Menelaus, and himself. Yet at *v.* 124 the Old Attendant asks 'how can Achilles be expected to put up with the loss of his bride?' To this Agamemnon at *v.* 128 answers that Achilles knows nothing of their plan. If this were a comedy Agamemnon's long speech might be conceived to have sent the old man to sleep, and thus we could account for his not knowing what Agamemnon had just told him. But this is not a comedy; so commentators who uphold the *mss.* arrangement have to suppose either, as Hermann did at first, though he gave it up later, that Agamemnon had spoken 106 ff. (for some inconceivable reason) aside—"submissiore voce et aversum ab sene"—or else, as Weil, and (practically) Firmhaber do, that the old man was exceptionally stupid. Weil thinks that the old man's denseness (or inattention) was arranged by the poet to give an opportunity of saying over again a thing which it was important for the spectators to notice. This does not sound like tragic art.

Hennig, to remove this difficulty, rejects *vv.* 124—132 as spurious—put in by some one who thought *vv.* 133 ff. *δαινά γ' ἐτόλμας κ. τ. λ.* inconsistent with Agamemnon's words as given in *vv.* 115—123. But, as Vitelli well observes, it is even easier to believe that a manifest inconsistency such as that between *vv.* 124 ff. and 106 ff. should be left by inadvertence by the author of the play, than that it should be deliberately inserted by a would-be improver.

Wecklein (*Ztschr. f. d. Oest. Gymn.* xxix. p. 721) would get out of both difficulties by rejecting all the anapaests which come before the iambic passage (*i.e.* *vv.* 1—48) as spurious, and supposing that the old man only came on the stage after the iambic passage had been spoken.

Hartung (whose arrangement Hermann approves of in his late discussion of the play, see *Opusc.* viii. 218 ff.) also avoids both difficulties—*i.e.* that arising out of the position of the iambic prologue and secondly that of the contradiction between *vv.* 106 f. and *vv.* 124 ff. He supposes that, as Euripides wrote this play, first came the iambic prologue (*vv.* 49 ff.); then the first anapaestic passage (*vv.* 1—48), and

then the second anapaestic passage (*vv.* 115 ff.). But inasmuch as *v.* 115 (or *v.* 117) does not make sense when following immediately on *v.* 48, he supposes that a passage (of 10 or 15 lines) was lost—"resectis utrimque uno alterove versu, substitutisque novis quibusdam", Hartung (*J. in A.*) p. 85. In these lines Agamemnon would no doubt have told the old servant what the former letter contained, and that he now wished to send another¹. Bohnhoff (*ut supra*) adopts the same arrangement of the different passages and the assumption of a lacuna after *v.* 48, but differs from Hartung in his conjectures as to the origin of the transposition which has produced the mss. arrangement. The latter thinks the passages were deliberately transposed by some one who thought the Euripidean prologue artistically a blemish². Bohnhoff (*ut supra* p. xxii.) believes that the transposition was due to an accident: that the first page in a ms. copy of the play got loose and was turned round sideways and bound up the wrong way—so that what was really p. 1 became p. 2, and *vice versa*: that on the original p. 1 was the iambic prologue, and on p. 2 the first 55 or 60 anapaests, of which the few last have been lost owing to the damaging of the lower part of the loose page: that *vv.* 110—114 were the work of a late interpolator into whose hands the ms. came in its transposed form, and who saw that the gap must be filled up somehow.

While then all these considerations do not enable us to say that it is *impossible* that Euripides could have arranged a prologue such as our mss. give us (or that there is no possible way out of the second difficulty but those given above), I have no hesitation in accepting the hypothesis of a subsequent displacement of the parts of the prologue, as affording the most satisfactory explanation of the facts, and I have in the arrangement of the text endeavoured to restore the 'erratic block' to its original position, though I cannot hope to remove all traces of its long sojourn on foreign soil, nor to efface the scars which its intrusion has left in its unnatural position. That is, I have printed the iambs first, and left a lacuna in the middle of the anapaests. For the sake of convenience of reference I have affixed the ordinary numbers at the side of the lines.

To proceed: it is almost universally admitted that the second half of the first stasimon is an interpolation. The reasons for this belief will be found in the commentary on *vv.* 231—302.

¹ The probability that we have a lacuna between *vv.* 33 and 34, the possible spuriousness of *vv.* 43—48 and of *vv.* 110—114 (see commentary), serve to sup-

port this hypothesis.

² See also Hartung's views on the Exodus.

The only other part of the play which need be discussed here is the Exodus—*v.* 1532 to the end. It has been seen above that Porson condemned it. He was doubtless moved both by the imperfections of metre and language, as well as by the passage in Aelian. There is however a third kind of internal evidence to consider besides the metrical and the linguistic, and that is the fitness of the Exodus from the point of view of Euripidean dramatic construction. It will be seen that the tragedian must have been in no little perplexity as to his *dénouement*. Every indication in the play up to *v.* 1531 points to a consummation of the sacrifice. But the death of the heroine could not fail to jar upon an audience who were familiar—and had been made familiar by a previous play of the poet himself—with the story of her rescue by means of the substitution of a doe. On the other hand, according to all versions of the story, Iphigeneia's own contemporaries know nothing, until long afterwards, of her rescue¹. Clytaemnestra, both by Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1417) and by Sophocles (*Electra* 530 ff.), is made to plead Iphigeneia's sacrifice as a justification of her husband's murder. In this very play, at *v.* 1182, and still more clearly at *v.* 1455, she uses words which would clearly indicate to the audience her intention to revenge her daughter by the murder of her husband on his return from Troy when she says to her daughter:—

δεινούς ἀγῶνας διὰ σὲ δεῖ κείνον δραμεῖν.

Schiller's remark quoted above (p. xii.) shows that he would have been content that the play should end without any explicit statement of the heroine's fate and its effect on the survivors. It may be doubted whether a Greek audience would have submitted to this obscuration of the crowning action of the piece. Certainly Euripides would be the last man among dramatic authors to leave the whole of a tale untold. Not only did he make more use than his contemporaries of messengers' speeches to enable him to tell his story fully, but he liked the story itself, as it were, to be fitted with a framework of previous and subsequent history. His prologues bring up the history to the point where the action begins, and when he uses a *deus ex machina* (as he was notoriously prone to do) it was not² because there was a "*dignus*

¹ At *v.* 563 of the *Iph. in Taur.* Iphigeneia asks Orestes τί δέ; σφαγείσης θυγατρὸς ἔστι τις λόγος; and he answers οὐδέίς γε, πλὴν θανοῦσαν οὐχ ὄρᾶν φάος.

² See Hartung *ut sup.* pp. 92 f., also Mahaffy, *Euripides* p. 122. Aristotle is to be followed rather than the hint of Horace in a definition of the province in

Greek tragedy of a *deus ex machina*. His words are (*Poet.* c. 15): ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀνὴ χρηστέον ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω τοῦ δράματος ἢ ὅσα πρὸ τοῦ γέγονεν, ἀ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἀνθρώπων εἰδέναι, ἢ ὅσα ὑστερον, ἀ δέτται προαγορεύσεως καὶ ἀγγελίας· ἅπαντα γὰρ ἀποδίδομεν τοῖς θεοῖς ὄρᾶν.

vindice nodus," but because he wishes, by the help of a divine fore-knowledge, to put before the spectators such future events or unknown circumstances as shall settle their minds, satisfy all curiosity, and connect the subject of the piece with subsequent events, or even with the times of living men.

It must be confessed that the Exodus of this play succeeds partially in avoiding the peculiar difficulties of the situation. It does not definitely state, either that Iphigeneia was slaughtered or was not. The spectators would know what the sudden appearance of the doe meant, but the survivors on the stage would not. *They* are left with the belief that Iphigeneia has been taken away to the gods. The messenger says at *v.* 1608 ἡ παῖς σαφῶς σοι πρὸς θεοὺς ἀφίπτατο, and Agamemnon at *v.* 1622 ἔχει γὰρ ὄντως ἐν θεοῖς ὀμιλίαν. There is nothing here to preclude the future discovery that she has been taken away by Artemis to be her priestess among the Tauri. At the same time we have nothing to show us that the divine interposition had at all reconciled Clytaemnestra to the loss of her daughter, or diminished her desire to be revenged for it upon her husband. In this respect the conclusion is not one which we should expect from Euripides.

When we come to examine the passage in detail we find in it several marks proclaiming it the work of another hand¹ than that of Euripides. It is very difficult to believe that the poet would have reproduced so closely—in some instances verbally—the scene of the slaughter of Polyxena in the *Hecuba*. The full correspondence of the two scenes can only be felt when both are read together. As the most striking instances of verbal correspondence may be mentioned the following.

Hec. vv. 548 f. ἐκούσα θνήσκω· μή τις ἀψηγται χροὸς
τοῦμοῦ, παρέξω γὰρ δέρην εὐκαρδίως.

Iph. τοῦμόν δὲ σῶμα...
θῦσαι δίδωμ' ἐκούσα...
πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ ψεύσῃ τις Ἀργείων ἐμοῦ·
σιγῇ παρέξω γὰρ δέρην εὐκαρδίως.

¹ It would be more correct to say 'other hands', for from *v.* 1568 onwards far more and grosser faults of all kinds are discernible than in the previous part of the Exodus. (The fresh handwriting in P begins at *v.* 1572. We might almost fancy that the first copier wrote two

lines, and, finding what the rest was like, let it alone.) The main charge however — of being a manifest imitation of the scene in the *Hecuba*—applies to both parts of the Exodus, so the variety of hands need not be noticed here.

Hec. v. 535 ff. δέξαι χόας μου τάσδε...
 ...ἐλθὲ δ' ὡς πίης μέλαν
 κόρης ἀκραιφνὲς αἶμ' ὃ σοι δωρούμεθα
 στρατός τε κἀγώ.

Iph. δέξαι τὸ θῦμα τὸδ' ὃ γέ σοι δωρούμεθα
 στρατός τ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ θ' ὀμοῦ,
 ἄχραντον αἶμα καλλιπαρθένου δέρης.

Talthybius too is made to discharge the herald's part in both the sacrifices. But, what is most suspicious of all, Achilles is made in the *Iphigenia* to take a very similar part in the sacrifice of the heroine to that taken at Polyxena's by his son. In the *Hecuba* (*v.* 523) we read :

πλήρες δ' ἐν χερσίν λαβῶν δέπας
 πάγχρυσον αἶρει χειρὶ παῖς Ἀχιλλεύς.

In the *Iphigenia* :

ὃ παῖς δ' ὃ Πηλέως ἐν κύκλῳ βωμὸν θεᾶς
 λαβῶν κανοῦν ἔθρεξε, χέρνιβας θ' ὀμοῦ.

It is inconceivable that Achilles, who, as we have seen, had done his best to dissuade Iphigenia from her act of self-devotion, and had even promised to be at hand with an armed force to rescue her if she should relent at the last moment, should appear in this character at the sacrifice itself.

Some further indications of a late hand may be mentioned. We find, not only such linguistic peculiarities as ἔθρεξε (*v.* 1560), ἵνα πλήξειεν ἄν (*v.* 1579), πᾶς τις ἦσθετ' ἄν (*v.* 1582), ἐραίνετ' (*v.* 1589), or ταύτην μάλιστα τῆς κόρης ἀσπάζεται (*v.* 1594), but such unmetrical verses as 1562, 1568, 1570, 1589 (ἦς αἵματι βωμὸς ἐραίνετ' ἴρδην τῆς θεοῦ), 1593, 1596 (ἠδέως τε τοῦτ' ἐδέξατο καὶ πλοῦν οὐριον), 1599 (χωρεῖ τε πρὸς ναῦν ὡς ἡμέρα τῆδε δεῖ—evidently the work of some one whose pronunciation of ἡμέρα by the accent took the place of the classical rules as to quantity), 1610, 1611, and 1612, and such anapaestic lines as 1617, 1619 (καὶ μὴν Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ στείχει—again scanned by the accent), and 1620 (τοῦσδ' αὐτοὺς ἔχον σοι φράζειν μύθους — — — — —). On the other hand in the 74 iambic lines beginning at *v.* 1540 there are, if we omit proper names, hardly 10 trisyllabic feet: a proportion far lower than is usual in any of Euripides's later plays.

Matthiae, from the fact that at the moment of the sacrificial prayer we are told (at *v.* 1577) that the eyes of all were turned to the ground, conjectured, not unnaturally, that the passage was written

by a Christian, inasmuch as that was not an attitude familiar to an old Greek religious assembly.

It is further to be noticed that in P from *v.* 1570 to the end is written in a different hand—the same hand that wrote the first 36 lines of the spurious fragment of the *Danae*¹. The new hand begins two lines from the bottom of p. 146 b (of the ms.), and after the *Danae* fragment there is a column and three following pages left blank. This looks as if the writer of P either had not found any more in the ms. from which he copied, or else did not think what was there was worth copying, and had left some blank pages in his ms. which were afterwards filled in by another hand, copying perhaps from another original. The *Hippolytus*, which is the next play which follows after the gap, is in the same hand as all the rest of the ms. At all events it is the fact that some of the *Danae* fragment, which has been well shown by Elmsley and Jacobs² to be spurious, is in the same hand as the latter part of our Exodus. This indication that the two came from the same source involves the latter in suspicion.

Then comes the question, what are we to say to Aelian's quotation? Weil tries to show that it could not possibly have come in the play. But his arguments would equally exclude the fragment from any play on the same subject. Most modern scholars accept Aelian's testimony, and believe the verses to have been part of the missing Exodus of the play. Wecklein³, for instance, regards the fragment as of cardinal importance to the criticism of the play, and acquits Aelian of any mis-quotation or mis-citation. I cannot arrive at this certainty myself. It should be observed that Aelian does not say the lines come from the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, only from the *Iphigeneia* of Euripides. It seems to me very possible that an indistinct remembrance of the words

ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου

* Ἄρτεμις Ἀχαιοῖς,

which occur at *v.* 28 of the Tauric *Iphigeneia*, led Aelian to locate there a fragment which came from somewhere else:—not, I think, from Sophocles' *Iphigeneia*; for this use of ἀντήσουσι was not Sophoclean, though it was common later:—possibly from the *Iphigeneia* of Polyeidus the Sophist mentioned by Aristotle in the *Poetics* (c. 16). Everyone

¹ Wilam.-Moellendorf (*Analecta Euripidea* p. 8) thinks this hand the same that wrote the earliest corrections. The hand that wrote the last 27 lines of the *Danae* fragment seemed to me the same as that which wrote the word κατείδες

over προσέβης at *v.* 824.

² See the references in Dindorf *Poet. Scen. Eur. Frag.* 1117.

³ *Zeitschr. für die Oesterr. Gymn.* Vol. XXIX. (1878) p. 721.

knows in his own case, and in that of others, how a quotation which, owing to some prominent feature, has acquired an independent existence in the memory, loses its hold on its original context and easily makes new connexions—*i.e.* becomes associated in the mind with some other slightly similar context. For instance, the indistinct memory of King Lear's words ;

“that she may feel
How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is
To have a thankless child”

often leads to the assigning well-known parts of Amiens' song in Act II. Sc. 7 of *'As you like it'* to King Lear. In ancient times the difficulty of procuring copies of authors, the difficulty, in the absence of numbered pages and lines, of finding a special passage, left an author tenfold more exposed to the danger of mis-locating a quotation. But we need not go only to ancient times, or to obscure or ill-trained minds, for such mistakes. It is curious that at p. 46 of vol. IV. of the collected edition of his prose works (1878) Sir Henry Taylor quotes a passage from the *'Taming of the Shrew'*, and says in a footnote (added in this edition) that it comes from the *'Winter's Tale'*. If a distinguished writer, after the publication of a Concordance to Shakspeare, can make such a slip, how much more likely was a man in Aelian's day to make a similar one.

With this possibility of error in view, and in consideration of the difficulty which has been generally felt of finding a place in our play for Aelian's fragment—of imagining, that is, circumstances under which the words could have been spoken to any of the personages—we ought, I think, to refuse to this piece of evidence the high position which Wecklein and others assign to it. It started the discussion, but it ought not to rule it.

I have given reasons for thinking that our Exodus is not the work of Euripides, but of at least two distinct hands of very unequal skill. Many scholars will still prefer to believe that Euripides did write an Exodus, and that the fragment in Aelian was a part of it. I incline to think that Aelian cited the passage wrongly and that Euripides left the play unfinished. The claims of this latter view can only be estimated properly by one who has carefully examined all the other passages where it is likely that spurious lines have been interpolated, and where it is possible therefore that gaps existed¹.

¹ There is much that is attractive and much that is ingenious about Vitelli's way of unravelling the mystery. He holds (*Osserv.* &c. p. 61 ff.) that Euripides the younger found the play without an exodus, and composed one: that as

Time of Production.

The second important piece of external evidence mentioned above (p. xviii.), *i.e.* the scholiast's note on Aristoph. *Frogs* v. 67, is, I think, to be trusted without hesitation, though its significance has not always been clearly understood. The passage of Aristophanes as well as the scholiast's note must be considered. Dionysus in the *Frogs* must be taken to represent the average public opinion of the Athenian theatre-goers. An expression by Dionysus of a longing for Euripides roused by reading his *Andromeda*, and a resolution to fetch him up from the dead, can only mean that the Athenian public would gladly again see Euripides on the stage. Such a desire might conceivably have been satisfied by the reproduction of some old plays, but it is on all accounts more natural to suppose that both Aristophanes and his audience knew that the poet had left some unpublished dramas behind him at his death. At any rate the scholiast on v. 67¹ connected with the expression of Dionysus's desire the statement of the didascalie that Euripides the younger produced after the poet's death the three tragedies which he names. "As a matter of fact (καί)" he says "that is what did happen. Euripides did appear on the stage. His son produced three of his tragedies at the great Dionysia, and in so doing, instead of producing them in his own name, preserved the name of the author"—*i.e.* *Εὐριπίδης ὁ Μνησάρχου*—for this I take to be the meaning of the much discussed *ὀμωνύμως*. *ἑτερονύμως* might have been used of posthumous or other works published under another name than their author's, *ἄνωνύμως* of work published under no name, *ὀμωνύμως* would then mean 'name and all', 'keeping the author's name'.

The quotation from the didascalie is supported in its main facts by statements made by Suidas (*s.v.* *Εὐριπίδης*) and the author of the life of

far as v. 1571 we have his work, and that the fragment of Aelian belongs to the latter half of the younger Euripides' exodus, lost at a much later time by an accident, the place of which lost passage was filled by some late Byzantine with our *vv.* 1572—1629: that the words *ἐλαφον δ' Ἀχαιοὺς χερσὶν κ.τ.λ.* were part of a speech spoken by Artemis to Agamemnon (*ὄψ φαινόμενη*) in order to deter him from attempting to rescue Iphigenia at the last moment from the sacrificial knife, and to make him resigned to the divinely

ordered course of events. Vitelli prefers to think that such resignation, though possible in Agamemnon, was impossible for Clytaemnestra.

¹ I believe that the scholion on v. 67 consists of two independent notes, so that the *γάρ* after the *οὕτω* does not introduce an explanation of the previous words about the division of the line between the interlocutors, but is the ordinary *γάρ* with which such explanatory notes are often introduced.

Euripides. The words of the former are: *νίκας δὲ ἔλλετο εἰ, τὰς μὲν τέσσαρας περιῶν, τὴν δὲ μίαν μετὰ τελευτὴν, ἐπιδειξαμένον τὸ δράμα τοῦ ἀδελφίδου αὐτοῦ Εὐριπίδου.* The latter, speaking of the poet's third son (named Euripides), says *ὃς ἐδίδαξε τοῦ πατρὸς ἕνα δράματα.*

Euripides died some time in the summer of 406 B.C. The *Frogs* was produced at the Lenaea, *i.e.* in January B.C. 405. We may conjecture therefore with much probability, that the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, with the *Bacchae* and the *Alcmaeon* (the one called *ὁ διὰ Κορίνθου*), was put on the stage by the younger Euripides at the Great Dionysia,—in March, that is, in the year 405 B.C.

The Manuscripts.

In the critical notes are set down the readings of the mss. P and L (see above, p. xvi.) wherever they differ from each other, or from the printed text. On giving the readings of L, I rely, with much gratitude to its learned author, on the collation and facsimiles published by Prof. Vitelli of Florence in his *Osservazioni i. a. alc. luo. d. If. in Aul.* Florence 1877. The ms. P I have collated myself. I also compared with the ms. the critical notes of Kirchhoff, and the collation of v. Wil.-Moellendorf given in his *Analecta Euripidea*. Of these two collations I found the latter by far the more complete and accurate, though I am by no means always ready to accept the decision of this scholar¹ as to the distinction between P, P², and p. I was not able myself to arrive at any very definite conclusion about the dates of the corrections. Some are evidently of much later date than others. There are a large number of apparently early corrections of P to the reading of L; others again where both mss. had the same original reading and are corrected in the same way. I do not think there are nearly so many where L has been assimilated to P. This would suggest that P was compared with L or an early copy of it. At least one ignorant reader has left traces in P in the shape of stops put in where he thought there was a break in the construction, and 'long' marks over vowels where he thought the metre required it. It is possible that this reader was the same as the latest corrector. (See C. N. on *v.* 92.)

¹ See *Analecta Eur.* p. 8.

ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ

ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ Η ΕΝ ΑΥΛΙΔΙ.

Πρόλογος.

ΑΓΑ. ἐγένοντο Λήδα Θεστιάδι τρεῖς παρθένοι,
 Φοίβη Κλυταιμνήστρα τ' ἐμὴ ξυνάορος
 Ἐλένη τε· ταύτης οἱ τὰ πρῶτ' ὠλβισμένοι
 μνηστῆρες ἦλθον Ἑλλάδος νεανίαι.
 δειναὶ δ' ἀπειλαὶ καὶ κατ' ἀλλήλων φόνοσ

50

53. φθόνος Markland and Matthiae.

49. Θεστιάδι] Euripides is fond of these patronymic adjectives—other exx. are Τυνδαρίς, Τυνδάρειος, Ἡράκλειος, Πε-
 λιάς, Τιτανίς.

50. Φοίβη] not mentioned elsewhere except by Ovid *Her.* viii. 77. ἐμὴ ξυνάορος] It is usual in a Euripidean prologue for the speaker to announce his (or her) name. In this case Ag. sufficiently declares who he is when he says that his wife's name is Clytaemnestra.

52. μνηστῆρες ἦλθον] As a secondary predicate to ἐλθεῖν an adjective or verbal noun often indicates a purpose: ταύτης μνηστῆρες ἦλθον is equivalent to ταύτην ἦλθον μνηστεύσοντας. Cf. Isocrates *Enc. Hel.* p. 216 ὑπεριδόντες τοὺς οἴκοι γάμους ἦλθον ἐκείνην μνηστεύσοντας. So *Isc.* 239 οἶσθ' ἦνικ' ἦλθες Ἰλίου κατά-
 σκοπος. *Or.* 1300 ἐλθ' ἐπικούρον ἐμοῖσι

φλοισι. *Ion* 297 ἐπικούρος ἐλθών. Ἑλλάδος] this gen. may depend purely on νεανίαι or (better) partly also on τὰ πρῶτ' ὠλβισμένοι which words are a 'tragic', i.e. somewhat grandiose variety of the simple ὀλβιώτατοι. Cf. for the gen. *Soph. Ajax* 435 τὰ πρῶτα καλλιστεῖ ἀριστεύσας στρατοῦ, and *ib.* v. 1300 στρατοῦ τὰ πρῶτ' ἀριστεύσας.

53—57. 'And it was frightful to hear one threaten the other with death if he failed to win the maiden. So difficult was the decision, the giving and the refusing alike, that her father Tyndareos was at a loss how to enjoy fortune's blessing without disaster'.

53. κατ' ἀλλήλων] But for these words the sentence would imply that each suitor threatened Tyndareos with death if his request were refused.

ξυνίσταθ', ὅστις μὴ λάβοι τὴν παρθένον.
 τὸ πρᾶγμα δ' ἀπόρως εἶχε Τυνδάρεω πατρί, 55
 δοῦναί τε μὴ δοῦναί τε, τῆς τύχης ὅπως
 ἄψαιτ' ἄθραυστα· καὶ νῦν εἰσῆλθεν τάδε,
 ὄρκους συνάψαι δεξιὰς τε συμβαλεῖν
 μνηστῆρας ἀλλήλοισι καὶ δι' ἐμπύρων
 σπονδὰς καθεῖναι κἀπαράσασθαι τάδε· 60
 ὅτου γυνὴ γένοιτο Τυνδαρὶς κόρη,
 τούτῳ συναμνεῖν, εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων λαβῶν
 οἴχοιτο τὸν τ' ἔχοντ' ἀπωθοίη λέχους,
 [κἀπιστρατεύσειν καὶ κατασκάψειν πόλιν

54. *ἄν* written over *μὴ* in L without much regard for the construction, by someone who thought the *ὅστις* clause must refer to the object of the threats.
 56. Hemsterhuys had the penetration to see that *ἄθραυστα* (Hesych. *ἄθραυστα*· ἀπρόσκοπα. Εὐριπίδης Ἰφιγενεῖα τῇ ἐν Αὐλίδι) suited this passage better than the similar and commonplace *ἄριστα*. 62. *συναμνεῖν* PL, *συναμνεῖν* Heath.
 63. ἀπάσασθαι (in an erasure) P, ἀπωθοίη L. 64. *καπιστρατεύειν* PL, *κἀπιστρατεύσειν* Markland.—*κατασκάψειν* corr. to *κατασκάπτειν* P, *κατασκάψειν* L.

54. ξυνίσταθ'] Literally 'began to take shape'. ὅστις μὴ λάβοι 'such as should fail to win'. The oblique form and the ἀπειλάι in the previous line suggest the way in which this very contracted sentence is to be expanded (see the translation above).

55 and 56. Markland was very likely right in thinking that Eur., who was a careful student of Aeschylus, in writing these words had in mind Aeschylus *Supplic.* 379 ἀμνηχανῶ δὲ καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει φρένας, δρᾶσαι τε μὴ δρᾶσαι τε καὶ τύχην ἐλεῖν, but the construction of the two passages is different. In the first place, though δρᾶσαι τε μὴ δρᾶσαι τε is 'to do or not to do', the difficulty felt by Tyndareos was not whether he should or should not give his daughter, nor even *to whom* he should give her, but how, *in the giving and in the refusing*, he should escape the enmity of the disappointed suitors—how he should seize the good fortune and escape the evil. There is therefore no reason for the θ' which Markland proposed, which would correspond to the καὶ in Aeschylus. δοῦναί τε μὴ δοῦναί τε is in apposition to

τὸ πρᾶγμα and τῆς τύχης ὅπως ἄψαιτ' ἄθραυστα is dependent on ἀπόρως εἶχε.

57. ἄθραυστα] It is difficult to decide whether by ἀπρόσκοπα (see Crit. notes) Hesych. meant 'without stumbling' or 'without giving offence'. I think the former.

58. Cf. ὄρκους συνῆψαν *Phoen.* 1241: Isocr. *Enc. Hel.* 216 οὕτω δὲ κεκριμένου τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτῇ συνοικήσειν, ἀλλ' ἐτι κοινῆς τῆς τύχης οὐσης, οὕτω πρόδηλος ἦν ἅπασιν ἐσομένη περιμάχητος, ὥστε συνελθόντες πίστευσι ἔδοσαν ἀλλήλοις ἢ μὴν βοηθήσειν εἰ τις ἀποστεροῖ τὸν ἀξιώθοντα λαβεῖν αὐτήν, νομίζων ἕκαστος τὴν ἐπικουρίαν ταύτην αὐτῷ παρασκευάζειν.

60. καθεῖναι] an unusual expression for pouring liquid over anything. So at *Ion* v. 435 εἰς ἀπορραντήρια δρόσον καθήσω. At *I. T.* 51 f. Eur. uses the word in another rather noteworthy way: ἐκ δ' ἐπικράνων κόμας ξανθὰς καθεῖναι: he seems to have found the word significant and picturesque; cf. *I. T.* 1181, *Bacch.* 695.

63. τὸν ἔχοντα] 'the husband'.

Ἕλλην' ὁμοίως βάρβαρόν θ' ὄπλων μέτα]. 65
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπιστάθησαν, εὖ δέ πως γέρων
 ὑπῆλθεν αὐτοὺς Τυνδάρεως πυκνῆ φρενί,
 δίδωσ' ἐλέσθαι θυγατρὶ μνηστήρων ἕνα,
 ὅποι πνοαὶ φέροισιν Ἀφροδίτης φίλαι.
 ἢ δ' εἴλεθ', ὅς σφε μήποτ' ὄφελεν λαβεῖν, 70
 Μενέλαον. ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν ὁ τὰς θεὰς
 κρίνων ὄδ', ὡς ὁ μῦθος Ἀργείων ἔχει,
 Λακεδαίμων', ἀνθηρὸς μὲν εἰμάτων στολῆ

65. Hermann (*Opusc.* VIII. p. 218 ff.) suspected this verse and the next four as well. If any are spurious I think it is 64 and 65. 66. εὖ δέ πως PL, ἐμπέδως Nauck, εὖ δὴ πως Heath, ὦδὲ πως Klotz. 68. δίδωσιν PL, δίδωσ' Markland, διδούς Elmsley. 69. ὄτου PL, ὄπου suggested but not adopted by Markland (so too Heath), ὄτω Boissonade, ὄποι Lenting. 70. ὡς γέ PL, ὅς σφε Monk: λαβεῖν could not have Helen for subject: ὡς δέ Herm. 72. κρίνας PL, κρίνων Clemens Alex. *Paed.* III. 2 who also has Ἀργείων for the MSS. ἀνθρώπων. I have adopted both Clemens' readings, the former on its merits, the latter because the change from Ἀργ. to ἀνθρ. is much more likely to have been made by inadvertence than the opposite change. Vitelli notices that Γ 227 ἐξοχος Ἀργείων κεφαλὴν ἢ δ' εὐρέας ὤμους occurs in Lucian's *Charon* (§ 8) as ἐξοχος ἀνθρώπων κεφαλὴν καὶ εὐρέας ὤμους: and Porson (*Adversaria*) that for Ἀργείοισιν at T 124 *Et. Mag.* p. 21, 53 has ἀνθρώποισιν (so too Didymus). The confusion was no doubt due to

67. Tyndareos circumvented the suitors by his clever plan (πυκνῆ φρενί: cf. v. 57 καὶ νῦν εἰσῆλθεν τὰδε) of binding them beforehand by a solemn oath to support the rights of the selected husband. The emendations given in the critical notes on vv. 66 and 68 show that some interpreters suppose the clever plan here spoken of to be the allowing his daughter to choose her husband instead of making the decision himself.

68. Cf. Aristotle *Rhet.* 1401 b αἴρεσις γὰρ αὐτῆ ἐδόθη παρὰ τοῦ πατρός (of Helen). In Massinger's *Virgin Martyr* I. 1, Diocletian's daughter, when her father says "Thou shalt not choose" [a husband] "with mine eyes but thine own", answers "It is a bounty, The daughters of great princes seldom meet with".—For the short syllable before μν at the beginning of the next word cf. v. 847 of this play.

69. Those who retain the mss. read-

ing are forced to make both ὄτου and Ἀφροδίτης depend on πνοαί, and completely obscure the simple metaphor, which is the same as at *Taming of the Shrew* I. 2, "What happy gale Blows you to Padua here from old Verona?" Schoene (keeping ὄτου) trans. πν. Ἀφ. by amor a Venere inspiratus, comparing θεοῦ πνοαί at *Bacch.* 1094.

72. ὄδ'] an extraordinary use of the pronoun, but, supported as it is by the quotation of Clem. Alex., it is impossible (with Wecklein, *Stud.* 2. *Eur.* 387) to doubt it. As a rule when it is used of persons, they are present. We must suppose it is here used picturesquely, to add to the vividness of the description of Paris which follows. "Compares licet Latinorum eccum, ecillum, ellum, in absentibus usurpata", Bothe. For the intrans. ἔχει cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 343 ὦδ' ἔχει λόγος.

73. ἀνθηρὸς] seems to refer to the

χρυσῶ τε λαμπρός, βαρβάρῳ χλιδήματι,
 ἔρών ἔρωσαν ὄχετ' ἔξαναρπάσας 75
 Ἑλένην πρὸς Ἴδης βούσταθμ', ἔκδημον λαβῶν
 Μενέλαον· ὃ δὲ καθ' Ἑλλάδ' οἰστρήσας πτόθω
 ὄρκους παλαιούς Τυνδάρεω μαρτύρεται,
 ὡς χρὴ βοηθεῖν τοῖσιν ἠδίκημένοις.
 τούντεὔθεν οὖν Ἑλληνας ἄξαντες δορί, 80
 τεύχη λαβόντες στενόπορ' Αὐλίδος βάθρα
 ἤκουσι τῆσδε, ναυσὶν ἀσπίσιν θ' ὁμοῦ
 [ἵπποις τε πολλοῖς ἄρμασὶν τ' ἠσκημένοι].
 κᾶτα στρατηγεῖν κάμῃ Μενέλεω χάριν

writers' abbreviations. 77. A late hand in P has corrected Μενέλαον· ὃ δὲ to Μενέλαος οὖν.—μόρφ PL corr. in P by a late hand to μόνος. As is often the case in a line of more than the average length the last word was obliterated or otherwise lost: δρόμω Markland, πτόθω Toup: Herm. (*Opusc. ut sup.*) quotes a fragment of Menander (Meineke IV. 159) with the words οἰστρῶντι πτόθω. 80. αἴξαντες P, αἴξαντες L.—Aristotle (*Rhet.* III. 11) in quoting this line has (evidently by an oversight) ποσὶν for δορί. 83. θ' ἄρμασιν PL, ἄρμασὶν τ' Reiske: Hartung and Herm. (*Opusc. ut sup.*) suspect this line: this use of ἀσκεῖν is generally confined in tragedy to elaborate personal adornment. Herodotus (see L. and S.) uses it also of the adornment of buildings. The peculiar usage of the word here and the fact that 'horses and chariots' are not elsewhere so specified by Eur.—who always uses either ἵπποι alone for chariots and horses (e.g. *Phoen.* 113), or else uses an adj.—ἵππιος or πωλικός qualifying ὄχοι or ἄρματα—go far to justify the suspicions. The line may well have been interpolated by someone who did not understand the use of the dat. in the constr. ἤκουσι ναυσὶν ἀσπίσιν θ'. The dislocation of the τ' in the MSS. adds some slight force to these suspicions. 84. κάμῃ στρατηγεῖν κᾶτα PL (the ι subscr. in P under the ᾱ is added by a corrector). Of the numerous substitutes for κᾶτα the earliest—that of Heath—κάρτα comes nearest to the MSS. reading, and has found general acceptance. But κᾶτα is *prima facie* not likely to be the result of an error or a correction, and, as Vitelli says (*Osservazioni*), the fact that Agamemnon's

bright colours of Paris's dress: the βαρβ. χλιδ. in the next line applies not merely to the gold but to the general oriental splendour both of colour and ornament. Cf. *Troad.* 991 ὃν εἰσιδοῦσα βαρβάρους ἐσθήμασι χρυσῶ τε λαμπρὸν ἐξεμαργώθησ φρένας. It must not be imagined that the τε in v. 74 corresponds, as a δὲ would, to the μέν in the preceding line: the μέν is left for a while 'pendens' and serves with the δὲ in v. 77 to contrast the 'primrose path of dalliance' with the forlorn plight of the injured husband.

75. ἔρών ἔρωσαν] cf. γ 272 (of Aegis-

thus and Clytaemnestra) τὴν δ' ἐθέλων ἐθέλουσαν ἀνήγαγεν ὃν δὲ δόμον δέ.

80. ἄξαντες δορί] δορί is a 'dative of effective accompaniment'—'darting forth spear in hand'. Cf. A 483 αὐτὰρ ὄγ' ἦρωσ ἀίσσων ᾗ ἐγχει ἀμύνετο νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. "*Crotone saniora sunt vulgata, vide Aristoph., Lysistr.* 1151" [ἐλθόντες δορί] Porson.

81. στενόπορ' Αὐλίδος βάθρα] 'The land of Aulis on the strait'. *Phoen.* 982 σεμνὰ Δωδώνης βάθρα. Cf. v. 705 Χείρων ἴν' οἰκεῖ σεμνὰ Πηλίου βάθρα.

82. ναυσὶν ἀσπίσιν θ'] 'dat. of effective accompaniment'.

εἴλουτο, σύγγονόν γε. τὰξίωμα δὲ
 ἄλλος τις ἄφελ' αὐτ' ἐμοῦ λαβεῖν τόδε.
 ἤθροισμένου δὲ καὶ ξυνεστῶτος στρατοῦ,
 ἤμεσθ' ἀπλοῖα χρώμενοι κατ' Αὐλίδα.

85

connexion with Menelaus led to his selection is insisted on quite enough in the next line by the *σύγγονόν γε*: the *κάρτα* overweights the sentence in this direction. Vitelli ingeniously suggests that the orig. reading was *κᾶτα στρατηγεῖν μὲν ἐμὲ Μενέλεω*. That in such a line the *μὲν ἐμὲ* should be left out in copying is very likely, and the line itself, though a jingling one, admirably suits the context; but it is difficult to see how, when *κᾶτα στρατηγεῖν Μενέλεω χάριν* (without the *μὲν ἐμὲ*) was found written, the *κᾶτα* should be expelled from the first place and get placed after the *στρατηγεῖν*: *εἶτα* might have been put there, but not *κᾶτα*. I believe, with Vitelli, that *κᾶτα* is the right word, but I think the confusion was due to the interchange by a careless copier of the two similar words *κάμῃ* and *κᾶτα*, and hence that the line ought to stand *κᾶτα στρατηγεῖν κάμῃ Μενέλεω χάριν*: the *καὶ* in *κάμῃ*

85. It is implied in this account that of the two brothers Ag. was the greater prince. There seems to have been no question between Ag. and Men., only between Ag. and the other princes. Agamemnon here modestly attributes the preference of himself to his special interest in the object of the expedition. **εἴλουτο]** ὅτι δὲ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐξ ἀίρσεως ἦν βασιλεὺς ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων, Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἰφιγενείᾳ δηλοῖ σαφέστατα Eustath. p. 57, 30 and at p. 185, 3 (of the same statement) οὖς καὶ ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἐν τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν Ἰφιγενείᾳ συνηγορεῖ (Matthiae). At *Electra* 1082 in a notable passage El. says of her father ὃν Ἑλλάς αὐτῆς εἴλετο στρατηλάτην. It looks as if Eustathius knew this play better than the *Electra*. Perhaps Matt. is right in thinking that Eust. refers to *vv.* 337 ff.

88. **ἀπλοῖα χρώμενοι]** 'weather-bound' as we should say. Hennig (on *vv.* 6—11) prefers to consider that it was the want of any wind—a dead calm—that kept the Greeks at Aulis. The only passage in this play which favours this view is *vv.* 10 f.:—*σιγαί δ' ἀνέμων τόνδε κατ' Ἐὐριπιδῶν ἔχουσιν*. But this was in the night, and there could be no question of the fleet's starting in the night. At *v.* 352 the detention is spoken of as due to the

lack of an *οὐρία πομπή*. At *v.* 1323 Iph. wishes Zeus had never sent the Greek fleet the *ἀνταῖα πομπά* which prevented their sailing.

Aeschylus (*Ag.* 192 ff.) represents the Greek fleet as prevented from sailing by stormy weather. *V.* 15 of *Eur. I. T.* has been very variously emended and made to suit the 'calm' theory as well as the 'storm' theory.

Soph. *El.* 564 has also been variously interpreted and emended. Livy (xxviii. 6) in describing the port of Aulis says it is about as bad a station for a fleet as could be found anywhere. The squalls were sudden and violent and the constant—the proverbial—changes of current quite baffled calculation. Pausanias viii. 28. 4 says ὡς δὲ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν οὐκ ἐγίγνωτο ἐπίφορα ἐξ Αὐλίδος πνεύματα ἀλλὰ ἀνεμος σφᾶς βίαιος ἐπὶ χρόνον εἶχεν ἐγκλείσας κ.τ.λ. Euripides himself had no doubt often seen crowds of ships waiting for a wind at this spot. When we consider that, in addition to the natural difficulties of the place, the Greeks suffered from special divine interposition enhancing those difficulties, we shall see that it is out of place to enquire too closely into the possibilities of the case, or to expect to find in the work of the tragedian an

Κάλχας δ' ὁ μάντις ἀπορία κεκρημένοις
 ἀνεῖλεν Ἴφηγένηιαν ἦν ἔσπειρ' ἐγὼ 90
 Ἄρτεμιδι θύσαι τῇ τόδ' οἰκούσῃ πέδον,
 καὶ πλοῦν τ' ἔσεσθαι καὶ κατασκαφᾶς Φρυγῶν
 [θύσασι, μὴ θύσασι δ' οἶκ εἶναι τάδε].
 κλύων δ' ἐγὼ ταῦτ', ὀρθίῳ κηρύγματι

being the emphasizing καὶ—'me of all men,—I wish they hadn't'. 89. *κεκρη- μένος* PL, *κεκρημένῳ* Hemsterhuys, *κεκρημένοις* Heath and Markland, and so almost all edd. Firnhaber keeps the MSS. reading, referring to Achilles' abuse of seers at *vv.* 956 ff. But this amounts to saying that Ag. believed Calchas had no divine warrant for demanding Iph.'s sacrifice, and consequently that it would have no efficacy to secure a fair wind. There is not a hint of this elsewhere. 92. *κατα- σφαγᾶς* PL. In P a late hand has crossed out φ and γ and written κ and φ over them respectively. So Ald. and all edd. except Mehlhorn and Firnhaber. Other instances will be noticed in this play where the late corrections of P correspond with the readings of Ald., suggesting either that the corrections were made by someone who had the Aldine edition in hand, or that the scholar (Masurus?) who superintended the printing of that edition used this MS. and corrected it as he went on. 93. Nauck, followed by Vitz and Hennig, condemns this line. Even Firnhaber thinks it may have been added by a scribe. Weil pronounces it "certainment authentique". Perhaps F. was the less inclined to defend it because (whether genuine or not) it gives some support to *κεκρημένοις*. Vitelli (*Oss.* p. 3) calls attention to a paraphrase in Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 59 § 9) of a verse from the *Philoctetes* of Euripides—*δεικνύντα τὸν Χρύσης βωμόν, οὐ θύσαντες κρατήσειν ἔμελλον τῶν πολεμίων· εἰ δὲ μὴ μάτην ἐγίγνωτο ἡ στρατεία*. I think it extremely probable that it is this verse which has crept in here with the end slightly modified.

exact statement of the reasons why Agamemnon could not move his fleet. All we can say is that Euripides in alluding to the difficulty speaks of the want of a favourable and the prevalence of a contrary wind, while Aeschylus tells of specially stormy weather. It is a mistake to go further and criticise the account as we should a newspaper report of a campaign—asking for instance, as it has been done, 'why didn't they use their oars and row away?'

91. *πέδον* *πεδῖον* is used of a level tract, and like our 'plain' is often found in the plural: *πέδων* is only used in the singular like our 'soil' or 'ground', and seems to have been readily applied to any piece of ground which had special associations—either to 'native soil' or 'holy

ground'. So in Eur. *γῆς πατρίοις πέδον, πάτριον ἐμόν πέδον, Φοίβου πέδον*.

92. A verb of saying has to be understood. Exactly the same construction might be used in English. As Hennig says, *v.* 91 is the protasis and *v.* 92 the apodosis, and then in *v.* 93 the *πρότασις* is most awkwardly repeated in the *θύσασι*. The rest of the line is mere 'padding' modelled on *v.* 1007. The *εἶναι* too, as Hennig observes, is harshly inconsistent with the *ἔσεσθαι* of the previous line. The *πλοῦν ἔσεσθαι* is repeated at *v.* 358. Vitelli takes *εἶναι* to be *i. γ. ἐξείναι*.

94. *κλύων*] a good instance of the aoristic use of this participle.—*ὀρθίῳ*] Monk translates by 'rousing'; perhaps it is only 'shrill'.

Ταλθύβιον εἶπον πάντ' ἀφίεναι στρατόν, ὡς οὔποτ' ἂν τλᾶς θυγατέρα κτανεῖν ἐμήν. οὐδ' ἤ μ' ἀδελφὸς πάντα προσφέρων λόγον ἔπεισε τλήναι δεινά. κἂν δέλτου πτυχαῖς γράφας ἔπεμψα πρὸς δάμαρτα τὴν ἐμήν στέλλειν Ἀχιλλεῖ θυγατέρ' ὡς γαμουμένην,	95 100
τό τ' ἀξίωμα τᾶνδρὸς ἐκγαυρούμενος, συμπλεῖν τ' Ἀχαιοῖς οὔνεκ' οὐ θέλοι λέγων, εἰ μὴ παρ' ἡμῶν εἰσιν εἰς Φθίαν λέχος· πειθῶ γὰρ εἶχον τήνδε πρὸς δάμαρτ' ἐμήν, ψευδῆ συνάψας ἀντὶ παρθένου γάμον. μόνοι δ' Ἀχαιῶν ἴσμεν ὡς ἔχει τάδε	 105

98. πτύχαις PL, corr. in P to πτυχαῖς; in L a circumflex over the *ι* had been erased.
100. πέμπειν PL. Markl. in view of the ἔπεμψα in the preceding line, and the στέλλειν in *v.* 119, sugg. that the true reading here is στέλλειν, and that the πέμπειν was an explanation written over it which had displaced it. Monk, Bothe, Weil and Vitelli adopt στέλλειν. An additional objection to πέμπειν is that it certainly does not exclude, and may even suggest the notion that Clyt. should bring her daughter— (Paley translates it here 'escort', and it is more often used in this sense than in that of 'send'),—and yet Ag. shows at *v.* 456 that such an arrangement had been far from his thoughts. 102. οὔνεκ' PL, in P a later hand has added the mark of crasis over the *υ*: οὔνεκ' Barnes. 105. ἀντὶ παρθένου PL, ἀμφὶ παρθένου Markl. and Musgr., ἀμφὶ παρθένου (or παρθένῃ) Hennig: I have retained the mss. reading (see expl. notes). Herwerden pronounces the *v.* an interpolation. 106, 107, 108. Hennig puts a comma at the end of *v.* 106 and reads Κάλχας τ' in the

96. ὡς οὔποτ' ἂν τλᾶς] Cf. Goodwin *Moods and Tenses* § 41, 3.

97. οὐδ' ἤ] used of time: cf. the οἷοι δὴ at *v.* 547. It is strange that Firnhaber takes it as 'gen. obj.' dependent on λόγον.

98. κἂν] the καί here introduces an explanation of the preceding words, of a kind which is more commonly introduced by a γάρ or a καὶ γάρ. In a similar way ἀλλά is used at *I. T. v.* 64 where an ἀλλά γάρ would have been more usual.

100. Ἀχιλλεῖ] should be taken not closely with στέλλειν but with γαμουμένην. The position of the Ἀχιλλεῖ is intentionally emphatic.

101. ἐκγαυρούμενος] This compound does not occur elsewhere. Paley cps. the use of ἐκπαγλούμενοι at *Iliad*. 1157. Both

words seem used in the sense of 'to make much of.' Stadtmüller (Fleck. *Jahrb.* 1888, pp. 665 ff.) would read ἐκπαγλούμενος here, quite unnecessarily.

103. λέχος] for λέχος in the sense of 'wife' cf. *vv.* 389, 1266, 1275, and 1355. Markl. cps. the use of *lectus* at Prop. II. 5, *Felix Admeti coniux et lectus Ulyxis.*

104 f. συνάψας is explanatory of the τήνδε. I take the meaning to be not: 'I had' or 'used this means of persuading', but (πειθῶ being predicative) 'It was to persuade my wife that I used this scheme' (τήνδε being attracted into the gender of πειθῶ) 'and I concocted a sham marriage to get' (ἀντί lit. 'as the price of') 'the maiden'. Monk takes this view of the ἀντί and retains it.

Κάλχας τ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Μενέλεως ἐγὼ θ'. ἃ δ' οὐ
καλῶς τότ' ἔγνων μεταγράφω καλῶς πάλιν
εἰς τῆνδε δέλτον, ἦν κατ' εὐφρόνη[ς σκιάν
λύοντα καὶ συνδοῦντά μ' εἰσείδες, γέρον. 110
ἀλλ' εἶα χώρει τάσδ' ἐπιστολὰς λαβὼν
πρὸς Ἄργος. ἃ δὲ κέκευθε δέλτος ἐν πτυχαῖς,
λόγῳ φράσω σοι πάντα τὰγγεγραμμένα·
πιστὸς γὰρ ἀλόχῳ τοῖς τ' ἐμοῖς δόμοισιν εἶ.] 114

* * * * *

ΑΓΑ. Ὡ πρέσβυ, δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν 1

next *v.* Certainly, the absence of the *ἐγὼ* is remarkable. Vitelli proposes *Μενέλεως ἐγὼ θ'.* ἃ δ' οὐ καλῶς τότ' ἔγνων μεταγράφω καλῶς πάλιν. Herm. (*Opusc.*) doubted the correctness of the καλῶς πάλιν coming after the *ἄθις* and the καλῶς of the previous *v.* I have adopted Vitelli's reading. We must suppose the lines to have been deliberately reconstructed. After the loss of the *ἐγὼ θ'* the καλῶς would be taken from the beginning of *v.* 108 and put at the end of *v.* 107. This would leave τότ' ἔγνων μεταγράφω καλῶς πάλιν. Some copiers would have left this *v.* so, but there are many indications in this play that some one or more hands have set themselves to put in correct shape whatever they found or fancied awry. Hence the corrector wrote *ἔγνων τότ'* and put in *ἄθις.* 109—114. In the following 6 verses, if the view I have shown reasons in the Introduction for adopting be correct, we have further deliberate work of a corrector. At the end of *v.* 109 P has *εὐφρόνης σκιάν*, the *σκ* in an erasure; L has *εὐφρόνην*, the final *ν* being in an erasure, corrected from an original *ς*, and no *σκιάν*. I believe, with Hartung, that the genuine speech of Ag. ends with the word *εὐφρόνην* (or *εὐφρόνης*), and that he went on to say that under cover of the night he meant to send the second letter counteraanding the orders of the first. I further believe that when, from whatever cause, the iambic prologue got displaced, *vv.* 110 to 114 were composed to patch together the iambic verses with the following anapaests (*vv.* 115 ff.). *Vv.* 112 and 113 seem to have been taken from *Iph. in Taur.* vv. 760 ff., and the *τὰγγεγραμμένα* which replaces the *ἀναγγεῖλαι φίλοις* of the latter passage comes in very lamely here after the *ἃ δὲ κέκευθε δέλτος* of the preceding line. *V.* 114 was suggested apparently by *vv.* 45—48 of the present play. I think too, though this is a small point, the *εἰσείδες* looks as if it were employed *metri gratia*. The ind. *εἰσεῖδον* is very rare in Eur. though *εἰσορῶ* and *εἰσιδεῖν* &c. are very common. In the original arrangement then I believe that after Ag. had concluded the iambic prologue by stating his intention of sending the second letter before day-break, he summoned the old man from the tent in the following anapaests. 1. τῶνδε δόμων πάροιθεν with a β, α, γ, written

1. πρέσβυ] the same personage (see on *v.* 47) who is here called *πρεσβύτης* is at 855 in both mss. (Kirchh. wrong) called *Θεράπων*, a word which in its Homeric and tragic use corresponds to the older English use of 'squire' or 'henchman'. The *θεράπων* was a subordinate of equal

social position, and often a close personal friend. Patroclus, for instance, is the *θεράπων* of Achilles. This irregularity in naming the personage may have been due to the fact that Euripides left the play without indicating the persons throughout, and that this indication was

στείχε. ΠΡ. στείχω. τί δὲ καινουργεῖς,
 Ἀγάμεμνον ἀναξ; ΑΓΑ. σπεύσεις; ΠΡ. σπεύδω.
 μάλα τοι γῆρας τοῦμὸν ἄυπνον
 καὶ ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄξυ πάρεστιν.

5

over the words respectively L, δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν P. 3. πείση P, πείση with the η crossed through and ει added, the last of these letters apparently in an erasure L, σπευδε Pors., σπεύσεις Dobree. To judge from Vitelli's facsimile of L, it looks as if πείσον may have been its original reading. After much hesitation between σπεύσον and σπεύσεις; I have adopted the latter. 4. τὸ PL, τοι Barnes.

Vv. 6—9. The MSS. make v. 6 a separate question and give vv. 7 and 8 to Πρεσβ. as its answer, Σείριος being thus treated as the proper name of the star. Bremi however called attention to a passage of Eratosthenes *de Ast.* c. 33 in which σείριος is said to be an adjective technically applied by ἀστρολόγοι to large bright stars διὰ τὴν τοῦ φλογὸς κίνησιν. Matthiae gives quotations from the scholiast on Apollon. Rhod. II. 518 from *Et. Mag.* p. 710, 28 and from Suidas, all supporting this use of σείριος. Still more to the point is a passage (first pointed out I believe by Kirchhoff) from Theon of Smyrna *περὶ ἀστρονομίας* XVI. (p. 202 ed. H. Martin) who after making the same statement about σείριος quotes among other passages the one in the text in the form Τί ποτ' ἄρ' ὁ ἀστήρ ὄδε πορθμεύει σείριος. The MSS. distribution gets some support from the imitation of the passage by Ennius preserved in Varro *L. L.* v. 19, VII. 73 Ag. *Quid noctis videtur in altisono Caeli clipeo?*

carelessly made or was the work of different hands in different parts. The list of *dramatis personae* in both MSS. gives Πρεσβύτης and Θεράπων as if they were two distinct people.—The building which formed the σκηνή for this play is here called δόμων, at v. 440 δωμαίων, and at v. 863 βασιλείων δόμων. At v. 12 Ag.'s dwelling is spoken of as a σκηνή. Monk and Hermann see in this a reason for rejecting the passage in which σκηνή occurs as spurious. They say "evidently, Ag. was living in a building, not a temporary σκηνή". But at v. 189 the Chorus talks of the κλισίαι of the Achaeans: the army therefore was encamped in temporary huts, and in all probability their leaders were also living in temporary erections of some kind. If the original stage decoration (the permanent stone σκηνή) was probably not built at Athens till about 330 B.C.) was so slight that the word σκηνή became the technical term for it, it is not hard to imagine that the scenic decoration in this piece was so draped as to represent the general's

tent. To such a building it is not extraordinary that the general term δόμοι or δώματα should be applied. So at *Hec.* 665 tents are spoken of as δόμοι. We can form some idea of the building used by princes in a camp from the description given in the last book of the *Iliad* of the κλισίη of Achilles (vv. 448 ff., 643, 673, 675. See Buchholz *Hom. Real.* II. 1, 342).

2. Wil.-Moell. (*Analecta Eur.* p. 197) thinks that the division of anapaestic lines here and at vv. 3, 16, 140 and 149 between different speakers, is a proof that this anapaestic part of the prologue was not written by Eur. He admits that Sophocles allowed himself that licence. This argument is of some force, but such rules cannot be admitted to be overpoweringly conclusive, when we consider how little comparatively of Euripides' poetry is left on which to form them.

4 and 5. ἄυπνον and ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄξυ seem, from the run of the sentence, to be two predicates to πάρεστιν, both qualified by μάλα. Some interpreters prefer to

ΑΓΑ. τίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀστὴρ ὅδε πορθμένει
 σείριος ἐγγὺς τῆς ἑπταπόρου
 Πλειάδος αἴσσων ἔτι μεσσήρης;
 οὐκουν φθόγγος γ' οὐτ' ὀρνίθων
 οὔτε θαλάσσης: σιγαὶ δ' ἀνέμων

10

Sen. *Temo superat Cogens sublime etiam atque etiam Noctis iter.* But the evidence of so free a paraphrase cannot outweigh: (1) the testimony of Theon: (2) the difficulty, observed by many commentators from Scaliger downwards, of supposing that Euripides could talk of Sirius as being near the Pleiades: and (3) the want of any apparent connexion in the ideas—(Ag. 'What is that star?' Sen. 'Sirius: it is still in mid heaven, and has come near the Pleiads'. Ag. 'The cocks are not crowing and the sea is still'). Hennig tries desperately hard to make some connexion apparent. Though he credits Eur. with the astronomical blunder about Sirius, he makes Ag. draw a very abstruse conclusion from the position of the star: Sirius, he says, is only in mid heaven at such an hour *late in the year*—'here' he makes Ag. say 'is Autumn come, and yet the weather is still so hot that the birds are quiet and the sea is still'. 8. αἴσσων PL, but in L a second hand has written "συνίζησις" over the word. Cp. Hemst. on Ar. *Plut.* 732, Valck. *Phoen.* 1388, Dawes *M. C.* 230. 9—13. Monk, following the mss. in giving 7 and 8 to the old man, gives from οὐκουν to θαλάσσης to him also, rejecting from σιγαὶ to ἀναξ as spurious. Hermann (*Opusc.*) follows him, except that he rejects οὔτε

supply a separate ἐστὶ with ἀνπνον, but this gives too much weight to πάρεστω, as if it were used in some special sense. What he says is: 'Old age is a foe to sleep, and lends nimbleness to my eyes': *i.e.* 'they are ready at once to open'. The various 'tropical' uses of ἀξύς, which correspond very much to those of our 'sharp', have given rise to doubts as to the meaning here. Generally, as applied to eyes, it means 'keen-sighted', but this idea is foreign to the context here. (Erasmus, however, by the *ergo* at the beginning of his next line connects the king's question with this sense of the word.)—It is important to understand when the old man appears on the stage. I think, with Bremi, that it is not till v. 12: that from σπεύδω to πάρεστω are spoken from behind the scene through the door of the tent from which he appears when Ag. has finished the soliloquy contained in vv. 6—11 (see critical notes on vv. 6—9). It is certain that the old man is not on the stage to begin with,

for Ag. calls to him to come out of the tent. At first sight it looks as if πείχω is said by him while he is coming out, and that his question τί δὲ καιουργεῖς is spoken after he has appeared. But even supposing the σπεύσεις; of v. 3 not to be the correct reading, the σπεύδω of the answer shows that the old man is not out yet, but is still making all the haste he can to leave his couch and appear outside. If then τί δὲ καιουργεῖς Ἀγάμεμνον ἀναξ was spoken through the tent door vv. 4 and 5 may well have been so spoken also.

9. We must suppose that Ag. in his soliloquy puts the question about the star, like the child in Miss Taylor's hymn, without giving it an answer. His musings on the sky, the hour, and the weather serve to tell the spectators what it is important for them to know of the circumstances under which the action begins.

10. Monk says "the poet could not have used σιγαὶ in the plural". Weil,

τόνδε κατ' Εὐριπον ἔχουσιν.

ΠΡ. τί δὲ σὺ σκηνῆς ἐκτὸς αἰσσεις,

Ἄγάμεμνον ἄναξ;

ἔτι δ' ἡσυχία τῆδε κατ' Αὔλιν

καὶ ἀκίνητοι φυλακαὶ τειχέων.

15

στείχωμεν ἔσω. ΑΓΑ. ζηλῶ σέ, γέρον,

ζηλῶ δ' ἀνδρῶν ὃς ἀκίνδυνον

βίον ἐξεπέρασ' ἀγνώσ ἀκλεής·

τοὺς δ' ἐν τιμαῖς ἦσσον ζηλῶ.

ΠΡ. καὶ μὴν τὸ καλὸν γ' ἐνταῦθα βίου.

20

ΑΓΑ. τοῦτο δέ γ' ἐστὶν τὸ καλὸν σφαλερόν·

καὶ τὸ πρότιμον

θαλάσσης. 16. *στείχωμεν* P, *σείχωμεν* L: this mistake of *σ* for *ω* occurs several times in P. Ald. followed P and altered *ἔσω* to *εἰσω* *metr. grat.* 17 ff. This passage, from *ζηλῶ σέ* to the end of *v. 20*, is quoted by Stobaeus *Serm.* LVIII. 2, who has *ἦσσον ἐπαιῶν* (cp. Eur. *Hērō.* 264 οὕτω τὸ λαν ἦσσον ἐπαιῶν τοῦ μηδὲν ἄγαν): also, down to *ἀκλεής*, by Plutarch, *De Tranqu. An.* p. 471 C. Cic. *Tusc.* III. 24 says *non siletur illud potentissimi regis anapaestum, qui laudat senem, et fortunatum esse dicit, quod inglorius sit atque ignobilis ad supremum diem perventurus.* Barnes quotes Ov. *Trist.* III. 4, 25 *Crede mihi bene qui latuit, bene vixit.* 22. καὶ τὸ φιλότιμον PL: many corrections of the metre have been attempted: καὶ φιλότιμον or τό τε φιλότιμον Markl., Dindorf adopts the latter; χῶ (i.e. καὶ δ) φιλότιμον Lenting (so Firmh.), καὶ τὸ πρότιμον Nauck; Herm. rejects the verse as “verba interpretis vel τὸ καλὸν declarare volentis, vel nescientis, recte ad explicanda praegressa verba, sine copula inferri γλυκὺ μὲν”. I have adopted Nauck’s reading: φιλότιμος and φιλοτιμία are constantly used in late Greek for ‘distinguished’ and

rightly, I think, holds that the poetic beauty of the plural *σιγαί* is such that it may dispense with the authority of a parallel passage.

11. There is more difference than at first appears between this sentence and the similar one at *v. 14*. Here, as at *v. 40*, we have a case of ‘*tmesis*’: in *v. 14* Αὔλιν is governed by the preposition, and makes with it an adverbial expression, (Blomfield would have made them more alike by reading *τῆνδε* for *τῆδε* at *v. 14*.) The reference in Ag.’s words is to the stillness of nature, while in the latter passage the old man says that no one is stirring yet in the town or the camp.

12. τί δὲ σὺ] this stillness he contrasts with Ag.’s restlessness: the emphatic *σὺ*

brings out this contrast, and serves to call out Ag.’s moralizings on the difference between the lot of a prince and that of common men:—they may rest when he cannot.

15. τειχέων] used of the defences of the camp, not of the walls of the town. This *v.* does not mean, ‘the watch has not gone or been changed yet’ but: ‘there is no sign of commotion among the sentinels’.

17. ὄς] (*‘the man who’*) is more definite than ὄστις (*‘a man who’*), there being a special reference to the lot of the old man himself.

20. It is best perhaps to take βίου with ἐνταῦθα. Monk quotes Aesch. *Cho.* 891 ἐνταῦθα γὰρ δὴ τοῦδ’ ἀφικόμεν κακοῦ.

γλυκὺ μὲν, λύπη δὲ προσιστάμενον.
 τοτὲ μὲν τὰ θεῶν οὐκ ὀρθωθέντ'
 ἀνέτρεψε βίον, τοτὲ δ' ἀνθρώπων
 γυνῶμαι πολλαὶ

25

καὶ δυσάρεστοι διέκναισαν.

ΠΡ. οὐκ ἄγαμαι ταῦτ' ἀνδρὸς ἀριστέως.
 οὐκ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν σ' ἐφύτευσ' ἀγαθοῖς,
 Ἄγάμεμνον, Ἄτρεῦς.
 δεῖ δέ σε χαίρειν καὶ λυπεῖσθαι.
 θνητὸς γὰρ ἔφυσ. κὰν μὴ σὺ θέλῃς,

30

'distinction', but in Eur. the words mean 'ambitious' and 'ambition'; cf. *vv.* [520] and 527. 23. Pors. and other scholars quote a passage of the comic poet Macho which evidently parodies this line: εἶπεν, μάγειρε, μὴ προσίστα τοῦτό μοι τοῦστοῦν. ὁ δ' εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ μὴν ἔστιν γλυκὺ. καὶ μὴν τὸ πρὸς ὄστοῦν φασὶ κρέας εἶναι γλυκὺ. ὁ Χαιρέφων δέ, καὶ μάλ' ὦ βέλτιστ', ἔφη, γλυκὺ μὲν προσιστάμενον δὲ λυπεῖ πανταχῇ. I have adopted Headlam's *λύπη* for the mss. *λυπεῖ*. He would emend *λυπεῖ* in the quotation from Macho in the same way. In this way the *πανταχῇ* gains greatly in force. *Vv.* 28—33 are quoted by Stobaeus *Flor.* XCIII. (though some copier, finding the lines in parallel columns, has read them down instead of along), and by Plutarch, at *Cous. ad Ap.* p. 103 and again partially at *De Aud. Poet.* p. 33. Stob. has ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἔφυσ and Ἄτρεῦ and *νενομίσται* for *βουλόμεν' ἔσται*, Plut. has *βουλόμεν' ἔσται*. Markl. prefers *ἐστίν* for *ἔσται*, so too Herwerden.—*ἀριστέος* PL, *ἀριστέως* Stob. *V.* 29 occurs in a papyrus fragment of Chrysippus (Letronne,

23. *προσιστάμενον*] Weil takes the word here in the sense of 'to be repugnant', 'to give offence'; but the *μὴ προσίστα* in the passage of Macho quoted in the critical notes, and the context here, both make for the simpler meaning of 'approach, encounter'.—If *λυπεῖ* is correct what he says is: 'on nearer acquaintance we find it grievous'. But Headlam's *λύπη* gives a much better sense:—'a near neighbour to Sorrow'. He quotes Soph. *O. C.* 1216: *λύπας ἐγγυτέρω*.

24 ff. The displeasure of heaven and the ill-will of the multitude, spoken of by Ag. as the banes of rulers, are not mentioned here without special reference to the action of the drama. The helplessness of the Greek armament is the result of the former; and we shall find Ag. influenced in his decision by the fear of

the latter. His wife says of him at *v.* 1012 *λίαν ταρβεῖ στρατόν*.—Hartung is, in my opinion, the only commentator who has rightly interpreted *τὰ θεῶν ὀρθωθέντ'*: his note is "*errant qui ad deorum cultum neglectum haec verba referunt: nam τὰ θεῶν sunt quae divinitus eveniunt hominibus, quae cum prospera accidunt ὀρθοῦσθαι dicuntur*". There is no reference at all in this play to the story given in the prologue to the *I. T.* that Ag. had incurred the wrath of Artemis by failing to pay a vow.

28. *ἀνδρὸς ἀριστέως*] the genitive of the 'person in whom', as common'y with *θανμάζω* (Eur. *Hipp.* 1041).

29. *ἐπὶ*] has here the same force as in *ἐφ' ᾧτε, ἐπὶ ταῦτοις* ('on these terms'). In other words 'unmixed good fortune was not pledged to you at your birth'. Vitelli quotes Andoc. II. 5 *πάντες ἀνθρω-*

τὰ θεῶν οὔτω βουλόμεν' ἔσται.

* * * *

[σὺ δὲ λαμπτήρος φάος ἀμπετάσας
 δέλτον τε γράφεις
 τήνδ' ἦν πρὸ χερῶν ἔτι βαστάζεις,
 καὶ ταῦτὰ πάλιν γράμματα συγχεῖς
 καὶ σφραγίζεις λύεις τ' ὀπίσω
 ῥίπτεις τε πέδῳ πεύκην, θαλερὸν

35

Journ. des Sav. 1838, p. 313) with the reading ἀριστέως. *Vv.* 34—42. I have marked these *vv.* as spurious for the following reasons: (1) the transition from *v.* 33 to *v.* 34 ff. is very abrupt: (2) if, as is clumsily implied by the historic presents, the Old Man saw Ag. writing the letter he must have been in the same tent, or rather division of the tent, as Ag. If so, why did Ag. call him out to speak to him? It is also more in accordance with the habit of the Greek stage that the Πρεσβύτης should make his appearance from a side door. If the old man had seen through a chink in the wall, or a door connecting his room with Ag.'s, it is not like Eur. not to have told us so: (3) in the language the following points are suspicious: the use of πρὸ in πρὸ χερῶν: the use of ὀπίσω for πάλιν or αὐθις: though the tragedians often use Homeric words they do not reproduce such undigested morsels as κατὰ δάκρυ χέων (*Z.* 496, δ 556): *vv.* 41 f. (though of this I do not feel so sure) seem to be modelled on *Tro.* 797 τίνας ἐνδόμενον μὴ οὐ πανσυδία χωρεῖν δλέθρου διὰ παντός; (4) there is indication both in P and L of uncertainty about the reading in *v.* 42, especially at the end of the *v.* Besides the fact that both MSS. seem to have originally read μὴ θυμῖνεσθαι (the upper half of the θ is obscured by a dot in P and erased in L) the first τί πονεῖς is in L crowded into a small space made by an erasure. *v.* 43 in L begins with τί νέον τί νέον, the first τί νέον straggling over an erasure. In P a corrector has added the second τί νέον. Vitelli conjectures with great probability, that L had originally τί νέον τί πονεῖς at the end of *v.* 42 and τί πονεῖς τί νέον at the beginning of *v.* 43. I conjecture that, when the prologue was remodelled (cf. *Introd.* p. xxv), a passage somewhat to this purport—telling of the writing of this second letter, and the anxiety and hesitation in which it was written—was struck out

ποὶ γίγνονται ἐπὶ τῷ εὐ καὶ κακῶς πράττειν. Cf. also Eur. *fr.* 46 (Nauck) ὅστ' οὐτις ἀνδρῶν εἰς ἅπαντ' εὐδαιμονεῖ.

33. It is best to take together τὰ θεῶν βουλόμενα in the sense of 'the will of heaven'. Weil quotes from Antiphon *v.* 7: τὸ ἑμέτερον δυνάμενον, and τὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν βουλόμενον. οὕτως (καλῶς &c.) ἔσται is the fut. of οὕτως (καλῶς &c.) ἔχει.

34. ἀμπετάσας] this must be, as Weil says, a poetical word for 'having kindled'. He compares ἡλιου τ' ἀναπυχαί at *Hēr.* 601, λαμπρᾶς αἰθέρος ἀμπυχαί *Ion* 1445 and ὀμμάτων ἀναπυχαί at *El.* 868. Most commentators take it most prosai-

cally as 'having made the flame broader'—*i.e.* as we should say 'having snuffed the candle'—a mark of deliberation not likely in Ag.'s desperate state.

36. πρὸ χερῶν] can only be accounted for by supposing that the writer had the phrase πρόχειρον ἔχειν in his head. Cf. however, *Rhes.* 274.

38. ὀπίσω] is used of time in the sense of 'hereafter, in the future', but never (as here) for 'afterwards' in the sense of πάλιν or αὐθις.

39. πεύκην] best taken, with Musgr., to mean 'a writing tablet', not, as some, 'a torch'.

κατὰ δάκρυ χέων, 40
καὶ τῶν ἀπόρων οὐδενὸς ἐνδείῃς
μὴ οὐ μαίνεσθαι. τί πονεῖς;]
τί πονεῖς; τί νέον παρὰ σοί, βασιλεῦ;
φέρε κοίνωσον μῦθον ἐς ἡμᾶς.
πρὸς δ' ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν πιστόν τε φράσεις· 45
σῆ γάρ μ' ἀλόχῳ τότε Ἰνυδάρεως
πέμπει φερνήν
συννυμφοκόμον τε δίκαιον.

* * *

λέγε καὶ σήμαιν', ἵνα καὶ γλώσση 117

from the end of the iambic prologue, and that the sense of it was given in these anapaests, which were put in to lead up to *v.* 110 in the spurious part of the iambic prologue composed by the same person. If the remodelling was, as Bohnhoff thinks, consequent on the accidental interchange of the two first pages, we must assume that a considerable number of the original anapaests have been lost here, *i.e.* between *vv.* 33 and 43: this may well have been the case anyhow. L has *πέυκη* *πέδω* with *β* and *α* over the words respectively. 43. *περὶ* PL, *παρὰ* Pors. (also Dobree). 45. *πρὸς ἄνδρ'* PL, *πρὸς δ' ἄνδρ'* a corrector of P. 48 and 117. The arrangement of the text which I have shown reasons in the Introduction for adopting brings these verses together. In the MSS. the verses that follow *v.* 114 are those numbered 115 and 116. Reiske placed *vv.* 117 and 118 before them and this transposition has been generally adopted by later editors. Vitelli rejects *vv.* 117 and 118. It seems to me the least violent and unnatural of the suppositions that have been made about the state of the text, to suppose that some anapaestic lines following *v.* 48 have either been accidentally lost or purposely omitted in the remodelling of the prologue. It is now our task to conjecture what the substance of these lines may have been. From what has gone before we conclude that the old 'henchman' did not know anything more than that Agamemnon was greatly disturbed and perplexed about something. From what follows we find that he had been told that a previous letter had been sent to Clytaemnestra bidding her send Iphigeneia to be married to Achilles, and that he was now at once to set off with a second letter to Clytaemnestra. The *διασκευαστής* who recast the prologue conveyed this information, I conjecture, partly in the interpolated passage—*vv.* 34—43,—and partly in the further interpolation at the end of the iambics—*vv.* 110—114—and, in case these anapaestic lines which followed *v.* 48 were not accidentally lost as Bohnhoff supposed, owing to the tattered condition of the bottom of the loose first

46. *τότε*] as often, referring to some well-remembered occasion—here to Ag.'s wedding.

47. *φερνήν*] Cp. *v.* 869 *χῶτι μ' ἐν ταῖς σαῖσι φερναῖς ἔλαβεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ*—a verse which among other things serves, with *v.* 891, to prove that the *πρεσβύτης* and the *θεράπων* of the *δραμα-*

tis personae were one and the same. Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 979 *θεραποντίδα φερνήν* of the maiden attendants given by Danaus as his daughter's dowry.

48. *συννυμφοκόμον*] not found elsewhere; it seems to mean 'bridal attendant'.

	<i>σύντονα τοῖς σοῖς γράμμασιν αὐδῶ.</i>	118
ΑΓΑ.	<i>πέμπω σοι πρὸς ταῖς πρόσθεν</i>	115
	<i>δέλτοις, ᾧ Λήδας ἔρνος,</i>	116

page, he (the 'diaskeuast') would naturally leave them out as saying the same thing over again. These lost anapaestic lines, then, I conjecture to have contained the statement by Agamemnon to the Old Man that he had sent a letter ordering Iphigeneia to come to be married to Achilles, and that now he, the old man, is to be the bearer of a second letter to Clytaemnestra. As the spectators already knew, from the iambic prologue, the true state of the case, it was not necessary for the poet here to be more explicit, and a few lines only need be supposed to be lost. This supposition, after a long consideration of the various difficulties in the way of any supposition whatever, I think decidedly less difficult than any other view. The transposition, in the MSS. text, of *vv.* 115 and 116 points to an original confusion at this point in some earlier MS., and this is somewhat in favour of a lacuna at this point. The old man's *λέγε καὶ σήμαιν'* κ.τ.λ. (*vv.* 117 and 118) may have been the result of a question of Agamemnon's as to whether he should tell him the contents of this second letter, or they may have been the concluding words of a longer speech of the old man asking to be told what the second letter contained. On the supposition of this lacuna, and with the arrangement of the prologue given in the text, the question of the Old Man at *vv.* 124 ff. is intelligible, but not otherwise. We must then further suppose that at *v.* 133, when the old man learns that the promised marriage was only a pretence, the same suspicion suddenly enters his mind, which we are told at *v.* [433] entered the minds of some of the army when they heard of Iphigeneia's arrival—*i.e.* that she was to be sacrificed for the common good of the Greeks. In *v.* 136 Ag. virtually confesses that this suspicion is correct. It is important in this connexion to compare the old man's words at *v.* 891. When there asked by Clyt. how he knew that Ag. meant to sacrifice Iph. his answer is *δέλτον ψόχου φέρων σοι, πρὸς τὰ πρὶν γεγραμμένα*. This accords very well with the theory that it was not till he heard the contents of the second letter that the old man found out what Agamemnon's purpose had been. 115. *τάς...δέλτους* Monk, who

118. *σύντονα*] Dindorf remarks that this meaning of *σύντονος* 'in harmony with' is not the usual one. The word generally means 'eager, vehement, violent'; and, of sounds 'shrill'. At *Bacch.* 1091 (*συντόνοις δρομήμασι*) it is generally taken to mean 'eager, swift', but it might there mean 'uniform', *i.e.* 'keeping step together'. At *v.* 126 of the same play, though the passage is probably corrupt, it seems to mean 'shrill', but at *Hipp.* 1361, which Weil quotes as an analogy for the use here, the word certainly cannot mean 'violently'. Weil there translates it 'également'. The technical sense (in music) of the compound *διάτονος* is in favour of the possibility of using

σύντονος in the sense of *σύμμετρος*. Paley thinks *συντέλει* at *Hec.* 189 means 'agrees'.—The reason given here, for reading out to a messenger the contents of the letter he is to carry, is not the same as that given at *I. T.* 760 ff., but the same reason as this is assigned in a passage of the *Cyrop.* (iv. 5. 26) which has been often compared with this passage:—*ἴνα, εἰδὼς αὐτά, ὁμολογῆς ἂν τί σε πρὸς ταῦτα ἐρωτᾷ*.

115—123. It should be observed that in reading out the letter Ag. changes from the 'regular' anapaests of the conversation to 'threnic' or 'lyric' anapaests, characteristics of which are the Doric dialect (*τὰν σάν*), the prevalence of

	μη στέλλειν τὰν σὰν ἴνιν πρὸς	119
	τὰν κολπώδη πτέρυγ' Εὐβοίας	120
	Ἀῦλιν ἀκλύσταν.	
	εἰς ἄλλας ὥρας γὰρ δὴ	
	παιδὸς δαίσομεν ὑμεναίους.	
ΠΡ.	καὶ πῶς Ἀχιλεὺς λέκτρων ἀπλακῶν	
	οὐ μέγα φυσῶν θυμὸν ἐπαρεῖ;	125
	τόδε καὶ δεινὸν	
	σοί, σῆ τ' ἀλόχῳ σήμαιν' ὅ τι φῆς.	

compares *v.* 891. 120. Dindorf and Monk, followed by Paley, reject the τὰν at the beginning of *v.* 120, under the impression that it was added *metri gratia*.

122. In both P and L an early hand (perhaps the first) has added τὰς above εἰς ἄλλας. In P it is written fully, in L small and in an abbreviated form. This looks as if in the MSS. from which P and L were copied, the τὰς had been added small over the line—no doubt by some one who wanted to make a complete dimeter. 124. Ἀχιλλεύς P, Ἀχιλεύς L, with space for second λ.—λέκτρ' ἀπλακῶν PL, in L κατὰ is added above λέκτρ' by an early hand, and the ἀμ is in an erasure large enough for 4 or 5 letters: λέκτρων Scaliger, ἀπλακῶν Burney (see Monk on *Hipp.* 145 and Elmsley on *Med.* 115).

125. φυσῶν PL (the first σ perhaps crossed out in L). This doubling of the σ was due to a desire to get the metre right on the part of someone who did not know the quantity of the vowel: so these MSS. write πίσσαν for Πισσαν at *I. T.* 1 and P often, and L generally, writes ἐρινύων for Ἐρινύων.—ἐπαίρει PL, ἐπαρεῖ Pors., Elms., Cobet.—The Aldine ed. put the ; after ἐπαίρει and no stop after ἀλόχῳ. I believe all subsequent editors but Firnhaber put the ; after ἀλόχῳ.

127. In P τόδε καὶ δεινὸν is written as a separate verse, in L σοί σῆ τ' ἀλόχῳ is stuck in rather awkwardly (as a fresh verse—this is indicated by a small τέλος and a gap—) at the end of the preceding line, with a dash at the end. There is also a dash at the beginning of the next verse, which dashes indicate that the writer of them thought that σοί σῆ τ' ἀλόχῳ and the τόδε καὶ δεινὸν ought to form one line.

spondees and the frequency of catalectic lines. Such an irregular anapaestic line as *v.* 123, where a dactyl is followed by an anapaest, is more likely to occur in lyric anapaests than in the systematic anapaests.

119. μη στέλλειν] For πέμπειν with no direct obj. and followed by an infin., like a verb of commanding, L. and S. compare Xen. *Hel.* III. 1. 7, πέμπουσιν οἱ ἔφοροι ἀπολιπόντα Λάρισσαν στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ Καρίαν.

120. κολπώδη πτέρυγ' Εὐβοίας] 'the wing-shaped Euboean bay'. I think Paley is right in taking the Ἀῦλιν of the

next *v.* in apposition to πτέρυγα, and in regarding the whole expression as a description of the bay of Aulis. The poet calls it the Euboean bay, by way of indicating that Euboea made one side of it.

125. ἐπαρεῖ] Cobet (*Var. lect.* 607) remarks that *I. T.* 117 is the only passage in which transcribers have left the future ἄρῳ unaltered (? *Pers.* 795).

127. σήμαιν' ὅ τι φῆς] This is difficult. At first sight it looks as if he were going to say 'tell me what you mean to say' (i.e. 'when Achilles visits you with his wrath'). But the φῆς can-

ΑΓΑ. ὄνομ', οὐκ ἔργον παρέχων Ἀχιλεὺς
 οὐκ οἶδε γάμους, οὐδ' ὅ τι πράσσομεν,
 οὐδ' ὅτι κείνῳ παιδ' ἐπεφήμισα
 νυμφείους εἰς ἀγκώνων
 εὐνάς ἐκδώσειν λέκτροις.

130

ΠΡ. δεινά γ' ἐτόλμας, Ἀγάμεμνον ἄναξ.
 οὐ τῷ τῆς θεᾶς σὴν παιδ' ἄλοχον

These amount to slight indications of a confusion in the MS. from which P and L were copied, as to the relative position of the two anapaestic *διποδία*. I conjecture therefore that the passage originally ran *καὶ πῶς...ἐπαρεῖ; | τῶδε καὶ δεινὸν σοι, σῆ τ' ἀλόχῳ | σήμαιν' ὅτι φῆς*. (See explanatory notes.) 128. Libanius *Ep.* 1398, p. 642 *τούτο δέ ἐστι δοκοῦντος φιλεῖν οὐ φιλοῦντος, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν ἔνομι' ἀντ' ἔργου παρεχομένου*. Unger, who first quoted this passage (and emended the MS. *ἐν τερπῶνι* to *ἀντ' ἔργου*) thinks we ought to read *ἀντ' ἔργου* for *οὐκ ἔργου* here. So Nauck. If Libanius did quote from this tragedy he most likely slightly altered the original to illustrate his point better.—*ἀχιλλεύς* PL, corr. in P to *ἀχιλεὺς*. 129. P began to write *ποι-* but altered it to *πρασσ-*. 130. *ἐπέφημισα* PL, *ἐπεφήμισα* Markland. 132. *ἐνδώσειν* PL, *ἐκδώσειν* Markland. 133. *δεινά γε πολμᾶς* PL, *δεινά γ' ἐτόλμας* Markl. 134. *οὕτω τῆς* PL, *ὅς τῷ τῆς* one of the Paris copies of L and so Canter. Markl. reads *οὕτω τῷ θεᾶς* and puts a ; after *Δαναοῖς*. I have adopted Markland's ; and suggest *οὐ τῷ τῆς*. This involves less alteration

not refer to the future, and *σήμαινε* means 'say distinctly, explain', rather than merely 'tell'. Several editors have accordingly followed Musgrave in giving the words *τόδε καὶ δεινὸν* to Ag., and taking *τόδε* to mean 'this other thing (that I am going to mention)'. To such a remark *σήμαιν' ὅτι φῆς* would be a very good answer on the part of the old man, but on reading the whole passage we see that the question begun in *v.* 124 wants an answer; and that *vv.* 128—132 *must* be the answer to that question. If the text is right I think it is best to suppose, with Firmhaber, that the words *σήμαιν' ὅτι φῆς* are a request from the old man for an explanation of some gesture or exclamation on the part of the king. This being the best that can be made of the existing text, it is natural to suppose that something is wrong in it. (See critical notes.) The meaning of the text as I have printed it would be 'This is enough to make you afraid; let me know what

you are saying' (in the letter, that is) 'to your wife' (about it).

128. If Unger is right (see C. N.) in supposing Libanius to refer to this passage it is a proof that the passage was a very well known one; for it is not in itself either striking or a strikingly apposite parallel to the words it illustrates. Cp. on *v.* 1173 below.

129 'Knows nothing about a marriage or of our plot either.'

130. *κείνῳ*] I doubt if any other instance can be found of an oblique case of *ἐκεῖνος* used in a subordinate sentence of the subject of a principal verb of saying or knowing. Hennig compares *Or.* 292: there however *ἐκεῖνος* is in the nom., and the contrast necessary between it and the *ἐγὼ δ'* of the next *v.* makes its employment natural. It is going too far though to say that this use of *κείνῳ* is impossible. There is no danger of its being taken to refer to any one but Achilles. It is an extreme instance of

- φατίσας ἦγες σφάγιον Δαναοῖς; 135
- ΑΓΑ. οἴμοι, γνώμας ἐξέσταν,
αἰαῖ, πίπτω δ' εἰς ἄταν.
ἀλλ' ἴθ' ἐρέσσω σὸν πόδα, γήρα
μηδὲν ὑπέικων. ΠΡ. σπεύδω, βασιλεῦ. 140
- ΑΓΑ. μὴ νυν ἀλσώδεις ἴζου
κρήνας, μὴθ' ὑπνω θελχθῆς.
- ΠΡ. εὐφήμα θρόει.
- ΑΓΑ. πάντη δὲ πόρον σχιστὸν ἀμείβων
λεῦσσε, φυλάσσω μὴ τίς σε λάθη 145
τροχαλοῖσιν ὄχοις παραμειψαμένη
παῖδα κομίζουσ' ἐνθάδ' ἀπήνη
Δαναῶν πρὸς ναῦς.
- ΠΡ. ἔσται τάδε. ΑΓΑ. κλήθρων δ' ἐξόρμοις

of the mss. reading than any other alteration, and suits the view I have adopted in the Introduction (p. xxiv f.). These words express the first utterance on the part of the old man of his sudden guess at the true state of the case. 141. I have left out the *μητ'* which L and P have before *ἀλσώδεις*: there are indications that some would-be metrical reformer has been at work in this passage expanding catalectic dimeters to acatalectic ones, and I think the introduction of this *μητ'* was a piece of his work. In P there is an erasure big enough to hold 2 or 3 letters before the *ης* of *θέλχθης*: possibly the same metrical corrector had introduced a syllable into this word to make this line also a full dimeter. 145. *τί σε* PL, *τίς σε* Markl. 148. *ναούς* corr. by a late hand to *ναῦς* P, *ναούς* with the *ο* erased and a *ˆ* added over the *υ* L. *υν*. 149—151. The original mss. version of these much emended lines was

- ΠΡ. ἔσται ΑΓ κλήθρων δ' ἐξόρμα 149
ἦν νυν πομπαῖς ἀντήσης 150
πάλιν ἐξορμάσης χαλινοῦς. 151

the Greek tendency to modify the normal form of 'reported speech' to suit the exigencies of a particular case.—*ἐπεφήμινα* seems used in the sense of 'allege', 'profess' (to Clytaemnestra): possibly the *ἐπι* has here something of the force it has in *ἐπιτορκος* and *ἐπιτορκέω*. *ἐπιφάσκω* was used in later Greek in the sense of 'pretend'.—*κείνω λέκτροις* = *κείνων λέκτροις*.

136. In these words Ag. admits the truth of the astonished old man's suspicion.

138 f. In a fragment of the *Iphigenia* of Ennius we read *procede gradum pro-*

ferre pedum, Nitere: cessas o fide senex? words which clearly recall these lines, as was first perceived by Scaliger.

142. *κρήνας*] Such an accusative, though not found elsewhere, with *ἴζομαι* is found several times with *ἴζομαι*, and is common with *θάσσειν*.

143. *εὐφήμα θρόει*] 'Mind what you say!'—a variety of *εὐφήμα φθνεῖ*, 'favete linguis'—vehemently repelling the suggestion that it was possible that he should go to sleep on such a mission.

149. *κλήθρων*] The barred doors, from which Iphigenia and her escort

ἦν ταῖς πομπαῖς ἀντήσης,
 πάλιν ὄρησον, σείε χαλινούς,
 ἐπὶ Κυκλώπων ἰεῖς θυμέλας.

150

ΠΡ. πιστὸς δὲ φράσας τάδε πῶς ἔσομαι,
 λέγε, παιδι σέθεν [τῆ σῆ τ' ἀλόχῃ];

The emending began in the MSS. L has *ἔσται τάδε* for the simple *ἔσται* of P. In L in 149 there is an erasure before the *ο* of *ἐξόρμα*. In both MSS. a *γάρ* was inserted between *ἦν* and *νω* (without any alteration of the accent of the *ἦν*). *ἀντήσης* was in P corrected (not by the first hand) to *ἀντήσεις* and *ἐξορμάσης* corr. in both MSS. (certainly P and I think also L read *-ης* originally) to *ἐξορμάσεις*. In L a *τοὺς* was inserted after *ἐξορμάσεις* in *v.* 151 (by the metrical reformer who thought the penult of *χαλινούς* was short). The more important corrections made in later times are Hermann's transposition of *v.* 149:—he put it after *v.* 152 but subsequently adopted Monk's view that it was spurious:—Blomfield's *ἐξόρμα σείε* for *ἐξορμάσεις* in 151. Wecklein proposes *ἐξορμάσαις* in 149 and *εἰσόρμα* in 151. Weil *ἐξόρμοις* in 149 (Hermann had proposed *ἐξόρμους* in *v.* 151) and (ingeniously) *ἐξ ὀρμᾶς* in 151. Weil also reads *ὄν* for *νω* in 150. I have adopted Weil's *ἐξόρμοις* and Blomfield's *σείε* (though the discovery that the MS. from which P and L were copied probably had *ἐξορμάσης* makes this seem less certain than before), I also read *ταῖς* for *νω* (which I think may have been due to the *ω* in the *πάλιν* at the same place in the next line) and I imagine that the origin of the corruption in *v.* 151 was that a transcriber, with the *ἐξόρμ<οις>* of *v.* 149, and possibly also the common phrase *πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς* in his head, wrote by mistake *πάλιν ἐξόρμα*, (or perhaps *πάλιν ἐξόρμησον*) instead of *πάλιν ὄρησον*. 154. *σέθεν τῆ σῆ τ' ἀλόχῃ* PL. I have no hesitation in following Vitelli in regarding *τῆ σῆ τ' ἀλόχῃ* as an interpolation due to a reminiscence of *v.* 126. Not only is there no reason why either Ag. or the old man should think Clytaemnestra would be with Iphigeneia when he met her, but the addition makes both question and answer unmeaning. The old man is not asking how he is to gain credit for the *letter* but for his *words* (*φράσας τάδε*),

may have emerged, are I think rightly explained by Weil to be those of the *ὄχυροῖσι παρθενῶσι* of *v.* 738. Callimachus, he says, calls (*frag.* 118) young girls *κατάκλειστοι*. (*ἡ παῖς ἡ κατάκλειστος*. So Philo *Jud.* II. 530 *γόναια κατάκλειστα μηδὲ τῆς ἀλλείου προερχόμενα, καὶ θαλαμνόμεναι παρθένου*.) Eur. has transferred to the heroic age the customs of his own time. Homer's maidens are not so shut up.

152. *ἐπὶ Κυκλώπων θυμέλας*] Musgrave translates *θυμέλαι* by *atria ampla et magnifica*. Weil, following a traditional interpretation for which I can find no early authority, says they are *les murs sacrés*. So Paley—'the piles of ancient masonry'. At *El.* 715 Euripides

uses the word apparently in the sense of *temple*:—the altar, being to the temple what the hearth is to the home, may well have been used instead of it. If this is the meaning of the word here we must suppose the expression, like the *Κυκλωπῆς ἑστία* cf. *I. T.* *v.* 845, to be a picturesque synonym for Mycenae—'the Cyclopean shrines'. (So Monk.)

153 f.—156. If the old man met Iphigeneia on the way, he would not be able to give her the letter; that was for her mother's hands, and neither he nor Agamemnon anticipated that Clytaemnestra would come with her daughter (cp. C. N. on *v.* 100). Such a message delivered verbally would naturally want confirma-

ΑΓΑ. σφραγίδα φύλασος' ἦν ἐπὶ δέλτω	155
τῆνδε κομίζεις. ἴθι. λευκαίνει	
τόδε φῶς ἦδη λάμπουσ' ἠὼς	
πῦρ τε τεθρίππων τῶν Ἀελίου.	
σύλλαβε μόχθων.	160
θνητῶν δ' ὄλβιος εἰς τέλος οὐδεὶς	
οὐδ' εὐδαίμων·	
οὔπω γὰρ ἔφθυ τις ἄλυπος.	

Πάροδος.

ΧΘ. ἔμολον ἀμφὶ παρακτίαν	στρ.
---------------------------	------

supposing he meets Iphigenia after she has started. 155. The AG. before this line is omitted in P. 156. τῆνδε PL, τῆδε L¹. 164. παρ' ἀκτῶν PL corr.

tion. Agamemnon meets the difficulty admirably: he says, in effect 'you need not undo the letter: keep the seal intact and that will be a sufficient warrant for your message'.

vv. 156—159. With these lines compare the words with which, at vv. 82 ff. of the *Ioni*, the hero on his first appearance salutes the dawn. I think the run of the sentence here is in favour of taking *λευκαίνει* intransitively and *λάμπουσα* transitively. Most editors prefer though to take them the other way.

157. ἠὼς] This is the only instance of this epic form in tragedy. Photius has preserved the fact that Xenophon used ἠὼς for ἔως.' Rutherford *Νεω Πηγῶν*. p. 164.

vv. 161—163. These verses, forming the conventional conclusion to the scene, must have been spoken, as Firmhaber remarks, after the old man had left the stage. The 'γνώμη' is quoted by Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* III. 3, 23 (Weil) and Orion *Anthol.* VIII. 8 (Firmh.).

εἰς τέλος] These words cannot here have their ordinary meaning of 'at last', nor is there any reason, except that such a translation would give a suitable meaning in this passage, for taking them as equivalent to *διὰ τέλος*. I think that

here and at *Hec.* 817 *ἐς τέλος* is used nearly in the sense of *in fact*; somewhat like the French *enfin*.

At v. 164 begins the Parodus. The chorus consists of young married women from Chalcis whose curiosity has led them to come across the strait to see the encampment at Aulis. That they were young we may conclude from vv. 186 f. and from the fact that they are addressed by Iphigenia at v. 1310 as *κόραι*, and at vv. 1468 and 1492 as *νεάνιδες*. This latter fact has been taken by Hermann (*Dissertatio* &c.) as supporting Dindorf's statement that the members of the chorus were unmarried girls, and his consequent rejection of vv. 171—184 because in them the chorus talks of their husbands. Dindorf does not however reject vv. 548 f. in which the chorus say *ἀπενέπω νῦν ἀμετέρων Κύπρι καλλίστα θαλάμων*, which hardly sounds natural in the mouths of unmarried girls. Nor, again, as Arnoldt (*Chor. Tech.* 103) has shown, are the terms *κόρη* and *νεάνις* confined to unmarried girls. At v. 489 of the *Andromache* the heroine is called *τὴν τάλαιαν Ἰλιάδα κόραν* (cf. also *Syrph.* 1073 and *El.* 481) and at v. 192 of the same play Andromache calls Hermione *νεάνις* (cf. Soph. *Trach.* 307 f. *τίς ποτ'*

ψύμαθον Αὐλίδος ἐναλίας, 165
 Εὐρίπου διὰ χευμάτων
 κέλσασα στενοπόρθμων,
 Χαλκίδα πόλιν ἐμὰν προλιπούσ',
 ἀγχιάλων ὑδάτων τροφὸν
 τᾶς κλεινᾶς Ἀρεθούσας, 170
 Ἄχαιῶν στρατιὰν ὡς ἐσιδοίμαν
 ἀγαυῶν τε πλάτας ναυσιπόρους

by an early hand in both to παρακτίαν, in P the accent is altered and the apostrophe and breathing crossed out, in L only the ι is inserted. 167. στενοπόρθμων PL. στενοπόρθμων Weil (the mistake of ο for ω is a common one in these MSS.) 168 f. Both P and L originally made 168 end at the ι of προλιπούσα: in both the correction is made of shifting the που from v. 169 to the end of 168, leaving the σ' in 169. Such a curiously identical correction could not have been made independently in each Ms. and yet it is by an early hand. In 189, the v. of the antistrophe corresponding to 168, in L the ας of κλισίας is erased and is added at the beginning of v. 190. There are in L several other such shiftings, but in most cases the transposed syllables have been shifted back again (see Vitelli's facsimile). 171. ὡς ἴδοιμ' ἂν PL with no gap or erasure after the ὡς, καὶ ἴδοιμ' ἂν a Paris copy of L (where the καὶ is a mistake for ὡς), ὡς ἂν ἴδοιμαν Markl. ὡς ἐσιδοίμαν Elms. ὡς κατιδοίμαν Dind. I have adopted Elmsley's reading, as I think it very likely (Vitelli compares *El.* 1242 where the ms. has ὡς εἶδομεν, and the ed. princ. εἰσειδομεν) that ἐσ- may have been omitted after ὡς from the similarity of the abbreviations in cursive writing -ς (ὡς) and -ς(εσ). 171. Ἄχαιῶν PL Ἀτρειδᾶν Camper on *Electr.* 246. 172. Ἄχαιῶν PL ἀγαυῶν Nauck. Hermann and

εἰ νεανίδων, ἀνανδρος, ἢ τεκνοῦσσα;) Another reason for supposing the members of the chorus to be married women is that it would have seemed to the audience (cf. above on v. 149) impossible for a troop of unmarried girls to have come on such an expedition.—The parodus does nothing to further the action of the tragedy. It serves to give the audience a view of the surroundings of the scene of action—of the composition, situation and anticipations of the Greek forces encamped at Aulis. The metre is mostly iogaeodic but in the middle of the strophe and antistrophe comes an ionic passage (vv. 171—174, and 192—195). See the appendix on the metres at the end of the book. The strophe and antistrophe are followed by an epode (vv. 206—230).—Nearly

all editors are agreed in regarding vv. 231—302 as a later interpolation and not from the hand of Euripides. It is a mere catalogue of the forces modelled on that in the second book of the *Iliad*—'putidissimus index' Hermann calls it.

169. ὑδάτων τροφὸν] It seems to us more natural to regard the city or land as fed by the spring than as fed by it. A still stranger metaphorical use of the word occurs at *El.* 54:—ὦ νύξ μέλαινα χρυσέων ἄστρων τροφέ.

170. τᾶς κλεινᾶς Ἀρεθούσας] The scholiast on v. 408 says Ἀρέθουσαι δὲ τέσσαρες, ἐν Συρακούσῃ, ἐν Σμύρῃ, ἐν Χαλκίδι, καὶ ἐν Ἰθάκῃ.

171—178. In these verses the chorus say why they came: they wanted to see firstly the *army* (v. 171) and secondly the

ἡμιθέων, οὓς ἐπὶ Τροί-
 αν ἐλάταις χιλιόναυσιν
 τὸν ξανθὸν Μενέλαόν θ' 175
 ἀμέτεροι πόσει
 ἐνέπουσ' Ἀγαμέμνονά τ' εὐπατρίδαν
 στέλλειν ἐπὶ τὰν Ἑλέναν, ἀπ'
 Εὐρώτα δονακοτρόφου
 Πάρις ὁ βουκόλος ἂν ἔλαβε, 180
 δῶρον τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας,
 ὅτ' ἐπὶ κρηναίαισι δρόσοισι
 Ἥρα Παλλάδι τ' ἔριν ἔριν
 μορφᾶς ἅ Κύπρις ἔσχευ.

πολύθυτον δὲ δι' ἄλσος Ἄρ- 185
 τέμιδος ἤλυθον ὀρομένα,
 φοινίσσουσα παρῆδ' ἐμᾶν
 αἰσχύνα νεοθαλεῖ,
 ἀσπίδος ἔρυμα καὶ κλισίας

Monk had noticed that if the Ἀχαιῶν were repeated δέ and not τε was the right particle to follow it. (In the article in his *Opuscula* Hermann cuts to pieces, rearranges and alters this chorus to such an extent as finally to settle the question of its authorship.) 173. ἡμιθέων PL, ἡθέων Markland. ὡς PL, οὓς Scaliger, ἄς Herm. at *I. T.* 58 P has ὡς where L has οὓς. 175. Μενέλαον PL, Μενέλαόν θ' Weil. The θ' helps both sense and metre: the line is in the middle of a stanza or period, and therefore no such pause is possible as would make the -ον equal to a long syllable (cf. *v.* 196). 174. χιλιόναυσι PL. In P the ν is added and the -σν put into this *v.* from the next by a corrector: in L the whole word was written in this *v.* originally. 177. ἐνέπουσ' PL, corrected in both to ἐνέπουσ'. 180. ἔλαβεν P with the ν obliterated by a blot (which Wil.-Möll. thinks accidental: and that there was no ν under it). ἔλαβε L. 183 f. ἔριν ἔριν | μορφᾶς ἅ PL, ἔριν ἔκρινε | μορφᾶς ἂν Pors. This correction was made on the assumption that Νιρέα is in quantity - ~ -: but even supposing that Nauck is not right in reading Νιρῆ there (cf. *Rhes.* 708 Ὀδυσσῆ, *El.* 439 Ἀχιλλῆ, or Ἀχιλλῆ, *Alc.* 25 ἱερῆ), the -εα can be scanned as one long syllable as at Ar. *Thesm.* 26 Ἡρακλέα, and at *Rhes.* 977 ἔπειτ' Ἀχιλλέα. Θέτιδος ἐν πένθει ποτέ. 186. ὀρομέναν PL, ὀρομένα Canter.

shíps of the chieftains (ἀγανῶν ἡμιθέων—
 M 23 ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν of the war-
 riors who fell on the banks of the Simois)
 who had joined the expedition. στέλλειν
 in *v.* 178 does not mean *εἰμίρ*, or *send*,
 but *lead, take, conduct*.

185. πολύθυτον] As Vitelli well says,

this adjective, applied to the sacred grove
 of Artemis, “is already a hint of another
 sacrifice soon to be accomplished there”.
 188. νεοθαλεῖ] At *Ion* 112 Eur.
 uses the form νεοθαλής. The adj. con-
 veys the notion of the *freshness*, and
brilliance of the colour of the blush.—lit.

ὄπλοφόρους Δαναῶν θέλουσ' 190
 ἵππων τ' ὄχλον ιδέσθαι.
 κατεῖδον δὲ δὺ' Αἴαντε συνέδρω
 τὸν Οἰλέως Τελαμῶνός τε γόνον,
 τὸν Σαλαμῖνος στέφανον,
 Πρωτεσίλαόν τ' ἐπὶ θάκοις 195
 πεσσῶν ἠδομένους μορ-
 φαῖσι πολυπλόκοις,
 Παλαμῆδεά θ', ὃν τέκε παῖς ὁ Ποσει-
 δᾶνος, Διομήδεά θ' ἠδο-

190. In P there was originally *ἔθελουσ'*, the first *ε* being crossed out, in L there is an erasure before the *θ*. 191. *ὄχλον τ' P*, *ὄχλον* followed by an erasure L, *τ' ὄχλον* Heath. 193. *'Οἰλέως PL*, as at *v. 263*: it is possible that we ought to read *'Ιλέως* at both places. *Τελαμῶνος ἔκγονον* corr. to T. *τε γόνον P*, *Τελαμῶνός τε γόνον L* with an erasure before the *γ*. 194. *τοῖς Σαλαμῖνοις PL* (corr. to *τοῖς Σαλαμῖνος* by a late hand in P), *τὸν Σαλαμῖνος* Hartung. 196. *πεσῶν P* corr.

“reddening my cheek with the shame of fresh youth”.

190. **ὄπλοφόρους]** It is clear that the second half of this compound has quite lost its force, the whole word being equivalent to *martial, soldiers*.

192. **συνέδρω]** (penult long here) means ‘sitting talking together’.

194. **τὸν Σαλαμῖνος στέφανον]** Cf. *Herc. Fur.* 875 ἀποκείρεται σὺν ἄνθος πόλεος ὁ Διὸς ἔκγονος.

196. **ἠδομένους]** the number of *συνέδρω* and its meaning suggest that the two Ajaxes made a group by themselves apart from the two draught-players next mentioned. Hence we must suppose that *ἠδομένους* qualifies not, as Matthiae says, the Ajaxes as well but only Protesilaus and Palamedes. This construction is called the *σχῆμα Ἀλκμανικόν*. A scholiast on a passage of Pindar in which it occurs (*Pynh.* IV. 318)—*τὸν μὲν Ἐχίωνα, κεχλάδοντιαι ἦβα, τὸν δ' Ἐρυτον*—says, *τὸ σχῆμα τῆς φράσεως Ἀλκμανικόν. πρὶν γὰρ εἰπεῖν τὰ δύο ὀνόματα μέσση ἔταξε τὴν μετοχὴν*. Another scholiast says the *σχῆμα* got its name *οὐχ ὅτι ὁ μελοποιὸς Ἀλκμᾶν εἶπεν αὐτὸ, ἀλλ' ὅτι, Ὁμήρου*

εὐρόντος, ἔχαιρεν ἐκείνος τῷ σχήματι. Instances in Homer are *Υ* 138, *E* 774, *κ* 513 where (finite) plural verbs come in between two singular subjects. The scholiast on the last named passage says *τοῦτο τὸ σχῆμα καλεῖται προδιεξευγμένον καὶ καθ' ὑπερβατόν, ὑπ' ἐνίων δὲ ἀλκμανικόν*. Cf. also *Alcm. frag.* 9 [3] *Κάστωρ τε πῶλων ὠκίων ματῆρες ἵππῆται σοφοί, καὶ Πωλυδεύκης κυδρός*. The irregularity of the construction is lessened here by the fact that the plural *θάκοις* has shown that more than one man is being talked of. Protesilaus would not be sitting on two chairs.

198. With reference to Palamedes Vitelli quotes *Soph. fr.* 380 *οὗτος..... χρόνον τε διατριβὰς σοφωτάτας ἐφεύρε φλόισβον μετὰ κοπῆν καθημένους, πείσους κύβους τε, τερπνὸν ἀργίας ἄκος*: the *οὗτος* is said by Eustathius, who preserved the fragment, to be Palamedes.

196. **μορφαῖσι πολυπλόκοις]** *intricate patterns*; the intricacy was not entirely that apparent to the eye: the word *πολυπλόκοις* doubtless refers to the skill required for the game, whatever it was.

ναῖς δίσκου κεχαρημένον,	200
παρὰ δὲ Μηριόνην, Ἄρεος	
ὄζον, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι,	
τὸν ἀπὸ νησαίων τ' ὀρέων	
Λαέρτα τόκον, ἅμα δὲ Νι-	
ρέα, κάλλιστον Ἀχαιῶν.	205
τὸν ἰσάνεμόν τε ποδοῖν	ἐπώδός
λαιψηροδρόμον Ἀχιλλῆα,	
τὸν ἅ Θετίς τέκε καὶ	
Χείρων ἐξεπόννησεν,	
εἶδον αἰγιαλοῖσι	210
παρὰ τε κροκάλαις δρόμον ἔχοντα σὺν ὄπλοις·	
ἄμιλλαν δ' ἐπόνει ποδοῖν	
πρὸς ἄρμα τέτρωρον	

by a later hand to πεσσῶν, πεσσῶν L. 204. Νι is in an erasure in L. Νιρῆ Nauck. 209. ἐξεπόνασεν P, ἐξεπόννησεν L, corr. to ἐξεπόνασεν. 211. κρο-

200. **κεχαρημένον**] Other instances of this form are at *Hymn. Hom.* v. 458 and VII. 10, and Ar. *Wasps* 389, Theocr. XXVII. 71. *κέχαρμαι* is commoner.

201. **Ἄρεος ὄζον**] This is a slight variety of the very common Homeric ὄζος Ἄρηος, just as the following words are a modification of the Homeric θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι. It has been suggested that Eur. had in mind the fact mentioned by Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* I. 7. 7. that Molus (who was the father of Meriones) was the son of Ares.

203. **νησαίων ὀρέων**] This is another Homeric reminiscence. At ι 21 Odysseus says ναιετάω δ' Ἰθάκην εὐδέελλον· ἐν δ' ὄρος αὐτῆ. The late position of the τε here and in v. 206, like the *schema Alimanicum* in v. 196 gave doubtless a quaintness to the verse.

205. **κάλλιστον Ἀχ.**] This fact is almost all that Homer tells us about Nireus. B 671—673.

206. **ἰσάνεμον ποδοῖν**] ποδοῖν is I think best taken as a genitive, the con-

struction being of the same kind as παράκοποι φρενῶν *Bacch.* 33, φρενῶν κεκομμένους Aesch. *Ag.* 479.

209. **ἐξεπόννησεν**] Jacobs compared with this use of the word Theocr. XIII. 8 ff. καὶ μιν πάντ' ἐδίδαξε πατὴρ ὡσεὶ φίλον υἷα...ὡς αὐτῷ κατὰ θυμὸν ὁ παῖς πεπονάμενος εἶη.

210 f. **αἰγιαλοῖσι παρὰ τε κροκάλαις**] "*littoræis in harenis*" Erasmus. The παρὰ goes in sense with both the nouns: *by the sea-shore and the shingle*. Cf. Soph. *O. T.* 761 ἀγροῦς σφεπέμψαι καπὶ ποιμνίων νομάς. Jebb, in his note on that passage, cites vv. 734 and 1205 of the same play, and Soph. *El.* 780—οὔτε νυκτὸς οὔτ' ἐξ ἡμέρας, as other instances of this construction. There is no need to put in a prep. with αἰγ. as Herm. (ἐπ') and Fritzsche (ἐν) propose. κροκάλαι· ψῆφοι, ἀκταί, ἄρμος Hesych. (Musgrave). σὺν ὄπλοις· i.e. equipped as for battle.

213. **ποδοῖν**] gen.

ἐλίσσων περὶ νίκας. 215
 ὁ δὲ διφρηλάτας ἐβοᾶτ'
 Εὐμηλος Φερητιάδας,
 ᾧ καλλίστους ἰδόμαν
 χρυσοδαϊδάλους στομίους
 πάλους κέντρῳ θεινομένους, 220
 τοὺς μὲν μέσους ζυγίους,
 λευκοστίκῳ τριχὶ βαλιούς,
 τοὺς δ' ἕξω σειροφόρους,
 ἀντήρεις καμπαῖσι δρόμων,
 πυρσότριχας, μονόχαλα δ' ὑπὸ σφυρᾶ 225

τάλαις P, κροκάλαις L. 215. νίκας PL, νόσσας Musgr. 216. βοᾶτ' PL,
 ἐβοᾶτ' Dind. 218. εἰδόμαν PL, ἰδόμαν Dind. 219. στομοῖσι P, στομίους
 L. 223. σειροφόρους PL, σειροφόρους Dind. 224. καμπαῖσι PL, (?)
 perhaps Wil.-Möll. is right in saying that L originally had *καμπαῖς*. 225. πυρ-

215. *ἐλίσσων*] *going round and round*
 (the course), with especial reference to
 the turning-point or goal. The active is
 thus used at Ψ 309 (οἶσθα γὰρ εὖ περὶ
 τέρμαθ' ἐλίσσόμεν) with ἵππους under-
 stood; at *Or.* 172 we have the phrase
ἐλίσσειν πόδα in the sense of turn (to
 depart). It is easy to see how the active
 came (as at *Phoen.* 241 and *Or.* 1292—
 ἀλλ' αἱ μὲν ἐνθάδ' αἱ δ' ἐκεῖσ' ἐλίσσετε) to
 be used in the same sense as ἐλίσσεσθαι.
 Jacobs and Matthiae take *ἐλίσσων* as
 governing ἄμιλλαν here. Bremi supplies
 πόδε, from ποδοῶν, as its object.

περὶ νίκας] At Ψ 437, in the account
 of the chariot race, we have ἐπειγόμενοι
 περὶ νίκης.

217. Φερητιάδας] The termination
 here, as in Αἰακίδας as applied to Achil-
 les, means the descendant of, not the son
 of. Eumelus was the son of Admetus,
 who was the son of Pheres.

218. καλλίστους] B 603 ἵπποι μὲν
 μέγ' ἄριστοι ἔσαν Φερητιάδαο (though in
 this passage Φερητιάδης means Admetus)
 τὰς Εὐμηλος ἔλανε. Cf. also the account
 of the chariot race in Ψ.

223. σειροφόρος] καὶ ἄζυξ ὁ λεγόμε-
 νος κέλης ἵππος. Suidas.

224. ἀντήρεις] Is it not possible that

this word means *suitéd to*, here? and that
καμπαῖ δρόμων means the same as δρόμοι
κάμπιοι at *I. T.* 81? i.e. the horses could
 turn the corners better because the two
 outside ones were not yoked. Some
 extraordinary explanations have been
 given of ἀντήρης on the assumption that
 the second part of the word is the root of
ἐρέσσω (see e.g. Suidas s.v.). It is now
 generally held (see L. and S. s.v.—ήρης)
 that the -ήρης in all the compounds in
 which it forms the second part, even in
τρήρης itself, comes from the root ἄρ *fit*.
 In conjecturing though that ἀντήρης
 means *convenient for, suited to*, I do not
 rely so much on this derivation—for the
 -ήρης in all these compounds seems little
 more than a derivative syllable—as on the
 sense of *meeting* in ἀντῶ &c. and that of
equivalent to, corresponding to, which
ἀντί has e.g. in ἀντιδίδωμι, and which
 developed—in its derivative *antidote*—
 almost into the meaning *suitable for*.
 Such a derivative as ἀντήρης may have
 had sometimes one of the meanings of
ἀντί, sometimes another. At *Phoen.* 761
 it means 'as an opponent', at 1376 'in
 battle'.

225. ὑπό] is adverbial and σφυρᾶ the
 acc. of specification.

ποικιλοδέρμονας· οἷς παρεπάλλετο
 Πηλείδας σὺν ὄπλοισι παρ' ἄντυγα
 καὶ σύριγγας ἀρματείους. 230

[ναῶν δ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἤλυθον στρ.
 καὶ θεὰν ἀθέσφατον,
 τὰν γυναικίον ὄψιν ὀμμάτων
 ὡς πλήσαιμι μελίφρον' ἀδονάν.
 καὶ κέρας μὲν ἦν 235
 δεξιὸν πλάτας ἔχων
 Φθιώτας ὁ Μυρμιδῶν Ἄρης
 πεντήκοντα ναυσὶ θουρίαις.
 χρυσέαις δ' εἰκόσιν κατ' ἄκρα Νη-
 ρῆδες ἔστασαν θεαί, 240
 πρύμναις σῆμ' Ἀχιλλείου στρατοῦ.

ρότριστας PL, πυρσότριστας Monk. 226. ποικιλοδέρμονας P, ποικιλοδέρμονας L and Ald., which is noticeable, as Ald. probably printed from P. 229. Πηλείδας PL, Πηλείδας Elmsley. ὄπλοισι PL, ὄπλοισι Heath. 233. γυναικίαν PL, γυναικίον Boeckh. 234. μέλινον PL, μελιχόν Markl. and Musgr. The writer of these verses hardly ever forsakes the trochaic measure, and does not put in a dactyl unless in a proper name with two short syllables, or in the place in the strophe or antistrophe which corresponds to such a name. As a rule he carefully observes the strophical correspondence. Seeing that neither μέλινον (which whoever wrote it must have meant for an adjective from μέλι) nor μελιχόν furnish a corresponding rhythm to that of v. 245, I suspect that he wrote μελίφρον' with the second syll. scanned long. 237. Μυρμιδόνων PL, Μυρμιδῶν Hermann cf. v. 1352. 239. χρυσέαισι with the final ι erased P, χρυσέαις L (?): ἄκρα PL, ἄκρα Pierson. 240. With reference to Wil.-Möll.'s note on v. 819 (*An. Eur.* p. 41) it may be worth noticing here that both P and L have an ι subscript under the η, and not, as often, ἦι. 241. πρύμναισι corr. to πρύμναις PL.

226. παρεπάλλετο] 'went bounding along by'. Suidas gives ἄλλεται as one of the meanings of πάλλει. At *EL* 435 and 477 Eur. uses the active of πάλλω in the same sense—ἔν' ὁ φιλαυλὸς ἔπαλλε δελφίς, and τετραβάμονες ἔπποι ἔπαλλον.

231. ἀριθμός] is not used like our 'number' in the sense of 'a multitude'; εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἐλθεῖν is a phrase probably coined by the writer on the analogy of εἰς λόγους ἐλθεῖν: 'I fell to numbering' the fleet, (and took in) the boundless view'.

236. πλάτας] Brodeau and Weil are doubtless right in taking this to be gen.

sing. in the sense of *fleet*; but the usage does not appear to be a classical one. It is one thing to use a word for *oar* (see L. and S. *s.v.* κώπη) as a general poetical equivalent for travelling by sea, or the means of such travelling—to say, *e.g.* 'The Greek oar is swift' instead of 'the Greek fleet is swift'—and quite another to use *oar* for *fleet* in such an enumeration as the present, and to talk of the 'right wing of the Greek oar'.

239. χρυσέαις εἰκόσιν] [This is a remarkable use of the dative.

241. The writer seems to have scan-

Ἄργείων δὲ ταῖσδ' ἰσῆρετμοὶ ἀντ.
 νᾶες ἕστασαν πέλας' /
 ὧν ὁ Μηκιστέως στρατηλάτας
 παῖς ἦν, Ταλαὸς δὲν τρέφει πατήρ' 245
 Καπανέως τε παῖς
 Σθέnelος· Ἄτθιδας δ' ἄγων
 ἐξήκοντα ναῦς ὁ Θησέως
 παῖς ἐξῆς ἐναυλόχει θεάν
 Παλλάδ' ἐν μωνύχοις ἔχων πτερω- 250
 τοῖσιν ἄρμασιν θετὸν
 εὔσημόν τε φάσμα ναυβάταις.
 Βοιωτῶν δ' ὄπλισμα ποντίας στρ.

247. Ἄτθιδος PL, Ἄτθιδας Dobree. 248. ναῦς corr. to νῆας P (apparently the corrector wanted to get the same number of syllables as in v. 237, where he read Μυρμιδόνων), ναῦς L. In P the παῖς was originally written in this line and then crossed out and put in at the beginning of the next. (This sort of correction is made in P at several places but I have not thought it worth while to record it always.) In L also παῖς is written in 248 and marked to be transposed to the next v. 249. ἐξῆς P, ἐξῆς L. 251. ἄρμασι P, ἄρμασιν L the ν looks here as if it might have been added by the first hand as a correction. θετὸν seems corrupt. Firnhaber emends it to θαάν, Weil writes θεάν here and θαάν at the end of v. 249. 253. τῶν is

ned the penult of Ἀχλλείου as a short syllable (cf. C. N. on Κυκλωπέας at v. 265 and 1501).

242. Ἄργείων] The writer of this catalogue mentions a force from Argos under Euryalus (the son of Mecisteus) and, at v. 265, a separate force from Mycenae. This, Hennig says, is enough by itself to prove that no contemporary of the great tragedians wrote this catalogue. Homer makes Mycenae the city of the Atreidae: Argos and some neighbouring cities he puts under Diomedes, with Sthenelus and Euryalus under him. Aeschylus never mentions Mycenae in his Oresteia trilogy: with him Argos is Agamemnon's city. Sophocles in the *Electra* mentions the two cities as distinct and puts them both under Agamemnon. Euripides also mentions both cities, but, as Hennig has shown by an examination of many passages from the two *Iphigenia's*, the *Electra* and the *Orestes* (cf. Hennig pp. 49-52), he does not distinguish

between them, but uses now the name of the one city, now that of the other, when he is speaking of the seat of Agamemnon's power.

245. τρέφει] historic present; so often τίκτει in genealogies.

248. ὁ Θησέως παῖς] At B 552 Menestheus (an enemy of Theseus) is mentioned as the leader of the Athenian contingent, there numbered at 50 ships.

249. ἐναυλόχει] generally this word means *to lie in ambush* and even (trans. *to lie in wait for*).

250. μωνύχοις] This epithet shows that ἄρμασιν stands for chariot and horses, just as ἔπποι in Homer often stands for horses and chariot. Weil quotes *Herc. Fir.* 881 ἄρμασι δ' ἐνδίδωσι κέντρον.

253. ὄπλισμα] is as strange a word for fleet in its way as πλάτη at v. 236, and the ποντίας νῆας is very childish: the suggestion made in the critical notes would amend both faults.

πεντήκοντα νῆας εἰδόμαν σημείουσιν ἔστολισμένας·	255
τοῖς δὲ Κάδμος ἦν χρῦσειον δράκοντ' ἔχων ἀμφὶ ναῶν κόρυμβα· Λήϊτος δ' ὁ γηγενῆς ἄρχε ναῖτον στρατοῦ·	260
Φωκίδος δ' ἀπὸ χθονός, Λοκροῖς δὲ τοῖσδ' ἴσας ἄγων ναῦς Οἰλέως τόκος κλυτὰν Θροιάδ' ἐκλιπῶν πόλιν.	
Μυκῆνας δὲ τὰς Κυκλωπίας παῖς Ἀτρέως ἔπεμπε ναυβάτας ναῶν ἑκατὸν ἠθροῖσμένους. σὺν δ' Ἄδραστος ἦν ταγός, ὡς φίλος φίλω, τὰς φυγούσας μέλαθρα βαρβάρων χάριν γάμων πρᾶξιν Ἑλλάς ὡς λάβοι. ἐκ Πύλου δὲ Νέστορος Γερηνίου κατειδόμαν πρῦμας σῆμα ταυρόπουν ὄραν, τον πάροικον Ἀλφεόν.	ἀντ. 265 270 275
Αἰνιάνων δὲ δωδεκάστολοι νᾶες ἦσαν, ὧν ἀναξ Γουνεὺς	στρ.

inserted before Βοιωτῶν in both P and L by a corrector. Ought we not to read πόντιον for ποντίας? 255. σημειουσιν (the *υ* wholly or partially obliterated) εὔστολισμένας PL, ἔστολισμένας Scaliger. 260. ἄρχε PL (corr. in P to ἄρχε). 261. After this *v.* a space for two lines is left in both MSS. 262. Λοκροῖς PL, Λοκρῶν Heath, Λοκράς Markl. τοῖσδ' PL, Vitelli suggests ταῖσδ'. 263. Matthiae reads ναῦς ἦλθ' *metr. grat.* 265. Κυκλωπίας PL (corr. in P to Κυκλωπίας). 276. The word ὄραν (originally put at the end of *v.* 275 and crossed out) is written over the first word in this line: the word was probably τόν, as in L. The author of this correction (which is adopted by Ald.—possibly made by Musurus himself?) evidently thought the *ι* in Θροιάδ' (*v.* 264) was long. 277. f. δώδεκα στόλοι ναῶν PL, δωδεκάστολοι νᾶες Hermann (an excellent emendation). 278. Ἴουνεύς P, Γουνεὺς L (Canter proposed the

268. This introduction of Adrastus is inexplicable. take vengeance on some one' is a most extraordinary phrase.

272. πρᾶξιν λαβεῖν τινός] for 'to

ἄρχε· τῶνδε δ' αὖ πέλας
 Ἕλιδος δυνάστωρες, 280
 οὓς Ἐπειοὺς ὠνόμαζε πᾶς λεώς·
 Εὐρυτος δ' ἄνασσε τῶνδε·
 λευκήρετμον δ' Ἄρη
 Τάφιον ἦγεν, ὦν Μέγης ἄνασσε
 Φυλέως λόχευμα, 285
 τὰς Ἐχίνας λιπὼν * * * *
 νήσους ναυβάταις ἀπροσφόρους.

 Αἴας δ' ὁ Σαλαμῖνος ἔντροφος 287
 δεξιὸν κέρας πρὸς τὸ λαῖον ξυνᾶγε, 290
 τῶν ἄσσον ὄρμει πλάταισιν
 ἐσχάταισι συμπλέκων
 δώδεκ' εὐστροφωτάταισι νασίν· ὡς
 ἄιον καὶ ναυβάταν
 εἰδόμαν λεών· 295
 ᾧ τις εἰ προσαρμόσει
 βαρβάρους βάριδας,
 νόστον οὐκ ἀποίσειται,
 ἐνθάδ' οἶον εἰδόμαν
 νάιον πόρευμα, 300
 τὰ δὲ κατ' οἴκου κλύουσα συγ-

latter as an emendation). 281. ὠνόμαζε P (o for ω is a common error with P), ὠνόμαζε L. 284. ἦγεν ὦν PL, ἠγεμών Herm. The word ἄνασσε which stands in the mss. at the end of this v. cannot stand here: it probably was put in by a transcriber after the ἠγεμών was corrupted into ἦγεν ὦν. Firmhaber reads ἦγον, ὦν Μέγης ἄνασσε. 286. ἐχίνας PL, in P a commentator has written at the side τὰς ἐχίνας φησι. Ἐχινάδας Voss, Ἐχίνας Brodeau. 290. ξυνάγε PL, ξυνᾶγε Weil. 299. ἄιον PL, οἶον Herm. 301. συγκλήτου PL, Dind.

280. **δυνάστωρ**] is 'a vile word' formed on the analogy of *ἀνάκτωρ*.

285. **Φυλέως λόχευμα**] This use of *λόχευμα* with the genitive of the *father* is outrageous: the writer must have used something of the nature of a 'Gradus'.

287. **ναυβάταις ἀπροσφόρους**] Vitelli refers to ο 427 where we read of **Τάφιοι λήστορες ἄνδρες**.

289—293. Weil's comment on these lines begins as follows: 'Pour trouver le sens de ces lignes, il ne faut pas prendre pour point de départ les mots,

qui sont obscurs, mais il faut d'abord se demander ce qui le poète a dû dire'.

296. **προσαρμόσει**] apparently used here in the sense of *bring to close quarters with*; the sense of the whole passage is 'whoever brings outlandish hulks to attack such a fleet as this will not be allowed to escape'.

300. **νάιον πόρευμα**] another lame phrase for 'fleet'; the author has previously used *πλάτη* (236), *ὄπλισμα πόντιον* (253, if the reading is right), and *ναῖος στρατός* (260).

κλήτου [μνήμην] σφίζομαι στρατεύματος.]

Ἐπεισόδιον δ.

ΠΡ. Μενέλαε, τολμᾶς δειν', ἃ σ' οὐ τολμᾶν χρεών.

ΜΕ. ἄπελθε· λίαν δεσπότηαισι πιστὸς εἶ.

ΠΡ. καλὸν γέ μοι τοῦνειδος ἔξωνείδισας.

305

suggests σύγκληδος but prefers σύλλογου. I am inclined to think that μνήμην in *v.* 302 is an explanatory addition, and that *v.* 301 originally ended with the first syllable of συγκλήτου, the gen. στρατεύματος depending on the τὰ δέ, σφίζομαι for 'I remember' is a poetical but μνήμην σφίζομαί τινος a most prosaic phrase. 303. δειν' PL. 304. A late hand in P inserted γε after λίαν: Aldus printed the γε: Barnes was the first to reject it. The corrector evidently did not know that

FIRST EPISODE *vv.* 303—542.

It is with a sigh of relief that every student must turn from the perplexities of the prologue and the doggerel navy list at the end of the parodus, to a scene of definite intelligible action, and of a genuine Euripidean stamp. Menelaus, impatient for Iphigeneia's arrival (*vv.* 328 and 330) has gone out at daybreak to look for her along the road. All he sees is the old henchman going *from* the camp in haste, the bearer of the letter which is to send Iphigeneia back. The suspicions of Menelaus are aroused. He challenges the messenger, robs him of his letter and reads its contents. At *v.* 303 Menelaus appears before Agamemnon's tent struggling with the old henchman, who is endeavouring to recover the stolen letter. At *v.* 314 the latter calls to his master for aid. Agamemnon appears, and a brisk 'stichomuthia' between the two Atreidae forms an introduction to a formal pleading between the two, such as an Athenian play-goer loved to listen to.

On the question of the spurious passage that follows, see Notes on *vv.* 413—441. After this pleading both sides give way. Agamemnon bewails his fate, and the sight of his brother's dismay and grief, or else his natural cunning, then moves Menelaus to waive his claim. He offers

to abandon the expedition. Agamemnon however will not accept his offer, and the first Episode closes on the understanding that the sacrifice must proceed.

It is perhaps a mark of the unfinished state in which the author left the play, that there are no anapaests at the end of the parodus such as those in which the chorus usually announce the arrival of a new character. Such formal lines approach very nearly in kind to our stage directions, and may well have been put in after the main scenes had been composed.

SCENE I.

The Old Man and Menelaus.

305. καλὸν γέ μοι τοῦνειδος] a proverbial oxymoron: 'your reproach does me credit'. Cf. the 'proverb' quoted (from Diogenianus IV. 85) by Suidas *s.v.* γαστήρ· γαστέρα μοι προφέρεις, κάλλιστον ὄνειδος ἀπάντων, Eur. *Phoen.* 821 γένναν ὀδοντοφυῆ, Θήβαις κάλλιστον ὄνειδος, *Bacch.* 852 ἀνειδισας δὴ τοῦτο Διονύσω καλόν. It is a proof of the familiar nature of the phrase that Eustathius on A 211, and on P twice quotes Soph. *O. T.* 1035 as καλὸν γ' ὄνειδος instead of δεινὸν γ' ὄνειδος. At *Medea* 514 καλὸν γ' ὄνειδος τῷ νεωστί νυμφίῳ, we probably have this phrase used ironically, 'a credit-

- ΜΕ. κλαίοις ἄν, εἰ πράσσοις ἂ μὴ πράσσειν σε δεῖ.
 ΠΡ. οὐ χρῆν σέ λῦσαι δέλτον, ἦν ἐγὼ ἴφ'ερον.
 ΜΕ. οὐδέ γε φέρειν σέ πᾶσιν Ἑλλησιν κακά.
 ΠΡ. ἄλλοις ἀμιλλῶ ταύτ'· ἄφες δὲ τήνδ' ἐμοί.
 ΜΕ. οὐκ ἂν μεθειμην. ΠΡ. οὐδ' ἐγὼ γ' ἀφήσομαι. 310
 ΜΕ. σκήπτρω τάχ' ἄρα σὸν καθαιμάξω κάρα.
 ΠΡ. ἀλλ' εὐκλεές τοι δεσποτῶν θνήσκειν ὕπερ.
 ΜΕ. μέθες· μακροὺς δὲ δούλους ἂν λέγεις λόγους.
 ΠΡ. ὦ δέσποτ', ἀδικούμεσθα. σὰς δ' ἐπιστολάς

the ι of *λίαν* is sometimes long. 306. *κλαίεις* P, corrected by an early hand to *κλαίοις*. 307. I have printed *σέ* with Paley instead of the ordinary *σε*.—In P the mark of the breathing over the absent augment of (ἐ)φ'ερον is obliterated by a dot of ink. L has the breathing but no accent. 308. *οὐδέ γε φέρειν σε δεῖ* PL, corrected in both by an early hand to *οὐδέ σε φέρειν δεῖ*: the correction of *γε* to *σε* is manifest in both: in L the *εἰν* of *φέρειν* is in an erasure large enough to hold *εἰν σε*. It is clear that the *δεῖ* has no business here but was originally an explanatory addition. 309. *ἄλλως* PL, *ἄλλοις* Markl. The *ἀμιλλᾶ* of Ald. may have been due to the fact that in P the *ω* resembles *α*: *ἄλλως ἀμιλλᾶ* gives a tolerable sense, but it is far more likely that *ἄλλοις* was miswritten *ἄλλως*, than that *ἀμιλλᾶ* was miswritten *ἀμιλλῶ*. 313. In P a late hand has written an explanatory *γάρ* over the

able sort of reproach that', though its very familiarity may have led to a mistake such as that made by Eustathius. Vitelli suggests that in the *Μεδία* we ought to read *κακὸν γ' ὄνειδος*. Anyhow this passage in the *Μεδία* is the only one which at all bears out the extraordinary statement made by the scholiast on Eur. *Phoen.* 821 *ἔστι δὲ τὸ ὄνειδος τῶν μέσων λέξεων, ὡς καὶ τύχη, καὶ δόλος, καὶ ζῆλος*: a statement made also by Eust. on A 211 and Z 367, and in the *Et. Mag.* 626, 37—due probably to a misapprehension of the proverbial *καλὸν γ' ὄνειδος*. See Valckenauer and Geel or *Phoen. l.c.* and Vitelli on this passage. The above explanation seems better than to take the *καλὸν γε* ironically here: 'a pretty sort of reproach'. When at *v.* 311 Menelaus repeats ('more explicitly' as Weil says) the threat of *v.* 306, the Old Man again refers to the *λοιοῦ* Menelaus will unintentionally be doing him.

307. *σέ*] emphatic because of the *σε*

δεῖ of the previous line: 'you talk of my duties, let me remind you of yours'.

308. For the rare *οὐδέ γε* cf. Soph. *El.* 1347 *Ο. οὐχὶ ξυνίης*; H. *οὐδέ γ' ἐς θυμὸν φέρω*, Xen. *Cyr.* i. v. 11 (bis). Usually some word or words intervene between the *οὐδέ* and the *γε*. *δέ γε* is not uncommon.

310. The *ἀφήσομαι* shows that by this time the old man had got hold of the letter. Probably an unsuccessful attempt to do so caused Menelaus to say what he does at *v.* 306, and he succeeded in getting it when he said the word *τήνδ'* in *v.* 309.

311. At *Andr.* 587 Peleus says to Menelaus: *σκήπτρω δὲ τῶδε σὸν καθαιμάξω κάρα*.

313. *μέθες*] very likely at this word, as Paley says, M. snatches the letter from his hand.

δούλος ὦν 'for a slave': cf. Soph. *O. C.* 20 *μακρὰν γὰρ ὡς γέροντι προῦστάλης ὁδον*, and *O. T.* 1078 and 1118.

ἐξαργάσας ὄδ' ἐκ χερῶν ἐμῶν βία,
'Αγάμεμνον, οὐδὲν τῇ δίκη χρῆσθαι θέλει.

315

ΑΓΑ. ἔα·

τίς ποτ' ἐν πύλαισι θόρυβος καὶ λόγων ἀκοσμία;

ΜΕ. οὐμὸς οὐχ ὁ τοῦδε μῦθος κυριώτερος λέγειν.

ΑΓΑ. σὺ δὲ τί τῷδ' ἐς ἔριω ἀφίξαι, Μενέλεως, βία τ' ἄγεις;

δέ. 317. At Bekker, *Anecdota* 1, 369 this *v.* is quoted in the form *τίς ποτ' ἐν θύραισι κ.τ.λ.* P has *τίς δῆτ' ἐν πύλαισι*, L *τίς δῆτ' ἐν πύλαις κ.τ.λ.* with an erasure before *τις*, after *πύλαις* and after *θόρυβος*. Evidently the erased additions and the *δῆτ'* for *ποτ'* are to be explained by the fact that in L the line was originally written as two (iambic!) verses. The hand that erased the additions wrote *ἀρχή* over *τις* and *τέλος* over *ἀκοσμία*: i.e. he had found out that it was only one trochaic line, though apparently he thought the second syllable of *θόρυβος* was long. *πύλαισι*, the grander word of the two, is probably right, and not *θύραισι*. Hermann (*Orusc.*) thought a verse spoken by the old man was missing after *v.* 317, and so Kirchhoff. Anyhow H. was right in ascribing *v.* 318 not, as P and L do, to IIP. but to Menelaus. See Expl. Notes. Nauck suggests *καιριώτερος κλύειν* for *κυριώτερος λέγειν*: this amounts to re-writing Euripides: moreover *κυριώτερος* better suits Menelaus' imperious

316. This seems rather a weak line. It would be easy to believe that the preceding line ended originally with *ἔχει*, and that the author, or some later hand, in finally adapting it for the stage altered the *ἔχει* to *βία* and added *v.* 316 solely in order to bring in 'Agamemnon', the name of the character who now appears. Anyhow such is the purpose of the line. The 'playbill' element in tragedy must not be judged by rigid canons of style.

SCENE II.

Agamemnon, Menelaus. The Old Man probably retires at v. 319.

By the side of *v.* 317 L has the following scholion: *τροχαικοὶ διὰ τὸ μετὰ δρόμου ἐξελθεῖν τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα*. The livelier metre not only suits a rapid appearance on the stage, but also the hasty tempers of the interlocutors in the following scene.

318. The old man has called his master out from his tent; it is natural that the first words of Agamemnon should

be addressed more particularly to the man who has summoned him. These words of Menelaus are spoken to draw his attention from the old man to himself.

319. τῷδ'] It is best to take the dat. not, as at *Cyclops* 328 (*Διὸς βρονταῖσι* *εἰς ἔριω κτυπῶν*) directly with *εἰς ἔριω*, but with the whole phrase *εἰς ἔ. ἀφ.*

βία τ' ἄγεις] This *ἄγεις* is difficult. At *Tro.* 998 *e.g.* Hecuba says to Helen *βία γὰρ παῖδα φῆς σ' ἄγειν ἐμὸν*: there *ἄγειν βία* has its natural sense of *carry off by force*: so too at *Heracl.* 254: at *Medea* 1216 *εἰ δὲ πρὸς βίαν ἄγοι* means: *but if he dragged at it violently*; but in the present case there seems to be nothing resembling a *carrying off* or a *dragging*, unless it be at the letter. But the old man apparently had ceased at *v.* 315 f. to hold the letter. Unless *ἄγεις* is corrupt, perhaps the best explanation is that Agamemnon here accuses his brother with having (waylaid and) *carried off* his messenger by force (historic present).

- ΜΕ. βλέψου εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵν' ἀρχὰς τῶν λόγων ταύτας λάβω. 320
 ΑΓΑ. μῶν τρέσας οὐκ ἀνακαλύψω βλέφαρον, Ἀτρέως γεγῶς;
 ΜΕ. τήνδ' ὄρᾳς δέλτον, κακίστων γραμμάτων ἰπηρετίυ;
 ΑΓΑ. εἰσορῶ, καὶ πρῶτα ταύτην σῶν ἀπάλλαξον χερῶν.
 ΜΕ. οὐ, πρὶν ἂν δείξω γε Δαναοῖς πᾶσι τὰ γεγεγραμμένα.
 ΑΓΑ. ἦ γὰρ οἶσθ' ἂ μὴ σε καιρὸς εἰδέναι, σήμεντ' ἀνεῖς; 325
 ΜΕ. ὥστε σ' ἀλγύναι γ', ἀνοίξας, ἂ σὺ κάκ' εἰργάσω λάθρα.
 ΑΓΑ. ποῦ δὲ κάλαβές νιν; ὦ θεοί, σῆς ἀναισχύντου φρενός.

tone. 322. τήνδ' in an erasure in P. γραμμάτων PL, πραγμάτων or ἐργμάτων Markl., ραμμάτων Gomperz. See Ex. Notes. 324. ἅπασι τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα with the first εἰ of ἐγγ. crossed through P, πᾶσι τὰ γεγεγραμμένα, the τὰ being in an erasure and the σι written above it L. Vitelli 'dubitanter' πάντα for πᾶσι: this is no improvement to the sense but provides a possible explanation for the erasure in L. Ald. and subsequent early editors adopted P.'s ἅπασι and omitted the

320. ἵν' ἀρχὰς κ.τ.λ.] This parenthetical use of ἵνα with an ellipsis of a previous *I say it* is not uncommon in Greek. A well known instance is to be found in St Matthew ix. 6: another at Soph. *Phil.* 989 (Ζεὺς ἔσθ', ἵν' εἰδῆς, Ζεὺς ὁ τῆσδε γῆς κρατῶν), probably also, though all commentators do not so take it, at Soph. *Ant.* 310. The Latin *ut* is used in somewhat the same way: e.g. Ovid *Met.* XIII. 177 *Utque alios taceam, qui sacrum perdere posset Hectora nempe dedi*: only the Latin *ut* is here consecutive, the Gk. ἵνα is final.

321. 'Do you expect the son of Atreus to shut his eyes from fear?'—Vater (*Prolegg. ad Rhesium*) notices the fact that the name Ἀτρεΐς is said by Plato (*Crat.* 395 B) to be significant from its likeness to ἄτρεστος (among other words). No doubt the poet here was thinking of a possible etymological connexion between τρέσας and Ἀτρέως: in pronunciation σ between the ε and α of the former word would perhaps be somewhat slurred over.—βλέφαρον for ὄμμα is common in tragedy; but perhaps here, as in the passage of Aristotle (quoted—wrongly—in L. and S⁷.) p. 444 252 βλέφαρον is literally eyelid and ἀνακαλ. means lift (a covering).

322. γραμμάτων ἰπηρετίυ] fanciful, but quite Euripidean: the servant bears the tablet, and the tablet in its turn performs the same office, and bears the writing.

326. With ἀνοίξας it is best to understand σήμεντρα, or δέλτον, and not to take it, as L. and S. and others do, directly with ἂ σὺ κ.τ.λ. in the sense of *disclose, make public*. Menelaus had not yet made his discovery public. Ag. has asked 'Have you undone the seal and do you know what you have no business to know?' Men. answers 'Yes, to your cost, I have opened it, and I know the evil you wrought in secret'. Firmhaber takes ἂ σὺ κ.τ.λ. as the subj. to ἀλγύναι, but this leaves ἀνοίξας in a very awkward position: it is best therefore to suppose the relative clause as governed by the οἶδα which is implied in the γε.

327. ποῦ δὲ κάλαβές νιν] Porson on *Phoen.* 1373 has collected many instances of καὶ thus placed after an interrogative word: among them several in which, as here and at v. 1192, a δέ comes between the interrogative and the καὶ. This καὶ is generally placed immediately before the verb, or only separated from it by an unemphatic word, and is best rendered by putting an emphasis on the

- ΜΕ. προσδοκῶν σὴν παῖδ' ἀπ' Ἄργους εἰ στρατεύμ' ἀφίξεται.
 ΑΓΑ. τί δέ σε τὰμὰ δεῖ φυλάσσειν; οὐκ ἀναισχύντου τόδε;
 ΜΕ. ὅτι τὸ βούλεσθαί μ' ἔκνιξε· σὸς δὲ δοῦλος οὐκ ἔφην. 330
 ΑΓΑ. οὐχὶ δεινὰ; τὸν ἐμὸν οἰκεῖν οἶκον οὐκ εἴσομαι;
 ΜΕ. πλάγια γὰρ φρονεῖς, τὰ μὲν νῦν, τὰ δὲ πάλαι, τὰ δ' αὐτίκα.
 ΑΓΑ. εὖ κεκόμψευσαι πονηρά· γλῶσσ' ἐπίφθονον σοφῆ.

γρ. 331. Hermann's οὐχὶ δεῖν', εἰ for the MSS. οὐχὶ δεινὰ; is certainly not refuted by Monk's statement that the following οὐκ would in that case have been μή.—εἴσομαι PL, εἴσομεν Firnhaber, ἔς ἐμε Nauck. 333. ἐκκεκόμψευσαι· πονηρὸν PL. εὖ κεκόμψευσαι· Ruhnken *ad Tim. Lex.* 155. ἐκκεκόμψευσαι πονηρὸν, Matthiae. εὖ κεκόμψευσαι πονηρά, Monk. πονηρῶν Bothe and Nauck (so Weil and Vitelli). ἐπίφθονον PL, ἐπὶ φθόνον Musgrave (so Bremi, Hartung, Hermann, Dindorf and Vitelli). Bremi, followed by Matthiae, Bothe, Firnhaber and Vitelli prefer to keep ἐκκεκόμψευσαι, reading πονηρῶν (Firn. πονηρὸν, adverbially with ἔκκ.). I have, with Paley and Jebb (on Soph. *Ant.* 324) adopted Monk's reading of the line. Musgrave's ἐπὶ φθόνον seems at first sight a simple solution of the difficulty, but ἐπὶ with the acc.

auxiliary which accompanies the English verb. Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 1290 δόστηνε, ποῖ βλέπων ποτ' αὐτὰ καὶ θροεῖς; 'with what face can you utter it?' (Jebb, in lecture).—I am inclined with Firnhaber to take *νῦν* to refer not to the letter, but to the messenger. In that case the question takes up that put at *v.* 319 (see notes there): not 'where', or 'how' (cf. *v.* 406) 'did you get it?'—both these questions would be unnecessary after the old man's words at *v.* 315—but 'where did you get hold of him?' The exclamation at the end of the *v.* is prompted by indignation not at the opening of the letter but at the interference with the messenger. This is borne out by *v.* 329.

328. προσδοκᾶν τοῦτον εἰ ἀφίξεται] is a favourite Greek variety for προσδοκᾶν εἰ οὗτος ἀφίξεται. Cf. Thuc. IV. 42, 3 ἐπετήρουν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους οἱ κατασχέσουσιν. Most probably at *Med.* 669 παίδων ἐρευνῶν σπέρμ' ὅπως γένοιτό μοι, σπέρμα is acc. Cf. also Thuc. VII. 63, 3 ἐκείνην τε τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐνθυμείσθαι ὡς ἀξία ἐστὶ διασώσασθαι.

329. Cicero *Tusc.* IV. 77 quotes from Ennius a fragment of a conversation between Agamemnon and Menelaus in

the course of which, he says, '*alternis versibus intorquentur inter fratres gravis-simae contumeliae*'. The fragment is A. *Quis homo te exsuperavit usquam gentium imprudentia?* M. *Quis autem malitia te?* It looks as if Ennius had here followed Euripides pretty closely.

330. Ag.'s twice repeated charge of impudence would seem to have stung Menelaus to show how impudent he really could be.

331. For τὸν ἐμὸν οἰκεῖν οἶκον cf. *Androm.* 581 πῶς; ἢ σὺ τὸν ἐμὸν οἶκον οἰκήσεις μολῶν δεῦρ'; (adopting Lenting's correction of the *v.*). Even if this had been the only instance of εἴσομαι as a passive (cf. Thuc. I, 142 οὐδὲ μελετήσαι εἰσόμενοι) that would not have been a sufficient reason for altering it (see Crit. N.)

332. πλάγια] In the other two passages cited for this word in the lexx. from poets it is used, like the English *crooked*, metaphorically, in the sense of *perverse* or *deceitful*: here the following words fix its meaning as *changeable*:—'you go zigzagging about'.

333. *i.e.* 'You can talk finely about your conduct (in intercepting and opening my letter) but it has been disgrace-

ΜΕ. νοῦς δέ γ' οὐ βέβαιον ἄδικος κτῆμα κοῦ σαφές φίλοις.
 βούλομαι δέ σ' ἐξελέγξαι, καὶ σὺ μῆτ' ὀργῆς ὑπο 335
 ἀποτρέπου τάληθές, οὐτ' αὖ κατατενωῶ λίαν ἐγώ.

('for'), is thus made to bear the sense of *eis* ('at'), and even *eis φθόνον* 'clever at malice', is not the sense we want. The substance of Menelaus' answers has been a defence of his own base conduct: his accusations of Ag. are only made incidentally for that purpose. It is in favour of Monk's *πονηρά* that the verb (whether *έκεκ.* or *κεκ.*) decidedly wants an object. In P *ώρ.* (*ώραιον*), and in L *γνώ.* (*γνώμη*) are written in the margin by this line. 334. *νοῦς δ' οὐ* P, corr. by a late hand to *νοῦς δέ γ' οὐ*, *νοῦς δ' οὐ* L, with *έγ'* written over *δ' οὐ* by an early hand. *νοῦς δ' οὐ μῆ* Hense (on the ground that *οὐ* is often found as a gloss upon *μή* in MSS.). I think the change to *μή* would be for the worse. *κοῦ σαφές φίλοις* PL, *σαφῆς* Monk, *κοῦ σοφοῖς φίλον* Nauck. See Ex. N.—*κοῦ* was in L originally written '*καὶ οὐ*'. In view of the difficulty of the *ἄδικον* I would suggest that Euripides wrote *νοῦς δέ γ' οὐ βέβαιον ἄδικος κτῆμα*, following somewhat the order of the last words of Ag. 335. *δέ σ' ἐλέγξαι* PL, corrected by a late hand in P and by an early hand in L to *δέ σ' ἐξελέγξαι*. Over the *τ'* of *μῆτ'* in P *τοι* is written by a late hand, due probably to the *οὔτοι* in the following *v.* In L the *ε* *υπο* is written (by an early hand) in an erasure. 336. *ἀποστρέφου* corrected (probably by an early hand in both, though the ink in P is rather dark), to *ἀποτρέπου* PL. In these three lines it looks as if P had been corrected by being compared with L. *οὔτοι κατανωῶ λίαν σ' ἐγώ* PL, *οὔτοι κατατενωῶ λίαν ἐγώ* Boeckh. *οὔτε κατατενωῶ* Herm., who also omits the *σ'*. As the corrector of P who wrote *τοι* over the *μῆτ'* in the previous *v.* saw, the two negatives correspond; therefore, as *μῆτ'* cannot stand for *μήτοι*, we are almost compelled to write *οὔτε* in *v.* 336. It is hard though to see how the *αι* of *οὔτοι* arose. *οὔτ' αὐ σ' ἐκτενωῶ* Blomfield, *οὔτ' αὐ κατατενωῶ* Hartung, whom I follow. The *σ'* after *λίαν* was, probably, not merely due, as Vitelli supposed, to the ignorance on the part

ful. I hate a clever speaker': to which Men. naturally answers; that there are other bad things besides a clever tongue.

334. The irresoluteness of Agamemnon already spoken of by Men. at *v.* 332, is the point on which he mainly enlarges in the following speech.

ἄδικον is an extraordinary word here: we should have expected something more like *αἰσχρόν* in meaning: *σαφές* too is difficult. *ἄδικον κτῆμα κοῦ σαφές φίλοις* would seem to mean 'a wrong thing for a man (himself) to have, and one which prevents his friends having any confidence in him'.—'not a thing that his friends can trust in'. *σαφῆς* in the sense of 'trustworthy' occurs at *Or.* 1155, *I. T.* 919, *Herc. fur.* 55 (*σαφεῖς φίλοι*), *Hipp.* 890 (*σαφεῖς ἀράς*), *Helen.* 310 (*έπη...*

ἀληθεία σαφῆ), *Ion.* 1482 (*δόλια κοῦ σαφῆ τάδε*). The emendation I have proposed in the C. N. and adopted in the text gives the following sense: 'yes but a wicked heart is a shifty piece of goods: no friend can trust it'. Cf. *v.* 347.

335 *fin.* and 336. 'Don't *you* angrily deny true charges, and I won't make them any more bitter than I can help'. I do not know whether it is better to take *κατατενωῶ* absolutely, or to supply *τάληθές* as its object: in favour of the former is the somewhat similar absolute use of *ἀντιτείνω* in Eur. *fr.* 656—the general sense of which throws light on this passage—*δυσὸν λεγόντων, βατέρον θυμουμένου, ὁ μὴ ἀντιτείνων τοῖς λόγοις σοφώτερος*. *ἀντικατατείνω* is also so used at Plat. *Rep.* 348 A.

οἶσθ' ὅτ' ἐσπούδαζες ἄρχειν Δαναΐδαις πρὸς Ἴλιον,
 τῷ δοκεῖν μὲν οὐχὶ χρήζων, τῷ δὲ βούλεσθαι θέλων,
 ὡς ταπεινὸς ἦσθα, πάσης δεξιᾶς προσθηγάνων
 καὶ θύρας ἔχων ἀκλήστους τῷ θέλοντι δημοτῶν, 340
 καὶ δίδουσι πρόσρησιν ἐξῆς πᾶσι, κεῖ μὴ τις θέλοι,
 τοῖς τρόποις ζητῶν πρίασθαι τὸ φιλότιμον ἐκ μέσου.

of some Byzantine of the length of the penult in *λιαν*, but after the corrupt *κατανω* had crept in, an object to it was necessary. The *σ* is omitted in the Paris copies of L. 339. *ἦς ἀπάσης* P, *ἦς ἀπάσης* with an erasure between the two words and a comma under the erasure L, *ἦσθα πάσης* Markland (cf. Rutherford, *Νετω*

337—349. The first instance of the uncertainty and changeableness of Agamemnon's mind was the difference between his behaviour as a candidate for office and his behaviour after being elected.

350—364. The second instance was the way in which he at first was ready and willing to do anything, even sacrifice his daughter, to further the expedition, and now was drawing back. Observe the similarity of phrase in *vv.* 343 and 363.

337. *ἄρχειν Δαναΐδαις πρὸς Ἴλιον*] In prose it would have been *ἀ. Δαναΐδαις τῆς πρὸς Ἴλιον στρατείας*. The dative with *ἄρχω* seems to have been used specially of a temporary office: cf. Thuc. I. 93, 3 *ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρχῆς ἧς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Ἀθηναῖοις ἤρξε*, cf. also Thuc. II. 2, 1; VI. 54, 6, and VII. 70, 1; also Hdt. VIII. 51 *Καλλιᾶδew ἀρχοντος Ἀθηναίωσι*.

Matthiae thinks it was perhaps to the present passage that the words of Eustathius refer, on *Il.* p. 57, 30. See above on *v.* 85.

338. A reference to *v.* 330, where Menelaus says *ὅτι τὸ βούλεσθαι μ' ἐκνίξε*, will help to make *τῷ δὲ βούλεσθαι θέλων* seem a little less curious. Weil translates the *v.* 'En apparence, tu n'y aspirais point; mais, à sonder ta volonté, tu le désirais', and quotes Tac. *An.* I. 3 *specie recusantis flagrantissime cupiverat*. Hennig condemns the line firstly because it ends in the same syllable as the two following, secondly because it adds no-

thing to the sketch of Ag.'s behaviour. As to the latter objection: it is surely quite in keeping with the falseness and untrustworthiness which he is describing, and with the general nature of candidates' civilities, that they should conceal from the recipients of these civilities the desire which prompted them. The line seems to me Euripidean.

341. For *ἐξῆς πᾶσι* ('every single one') cf. Eur. *Fr.* 658 *ὅστις δὲ πάσας συντιθεῖς ψέγει λόγῳ γυναικας ἐξῆς, σκαιὸς ἐστι καὶ σοφός*, and Philemon *Fr. Inc.* III. (Meineke) *δειλοὶ πάνιν ἐξῆς πάντες εἰσιν οἱ λόγῳ*, and ρ 450. The phrase seems to have been a homely one. The word *ἐξῆς* is not used by Aeschylus or Sophocles.—*κεῖ μὴ τις θέλοι* does not mean that Ag. accosted men *against their will*, but *even though they did not seek it,—were not looking for it*. Cf. Xen. *Hiero* VIII. 3 *ἰδὼν γὰρ πρῶτον προσειπάτω τινὰ φιλικῶς ὅ τε ἄρχων καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης. ἐν τούτῳ τὴν ποτέρου πρόσρησιν μᾶλλον εὐφραίνειν τὸν ἀκούσαντα νομίσεις*;

342. *τὸ φιλότιμον*] Monk translates this '*popularity*': I think it rather means *advancement*. The noun *φιλοτιμία* and the adj. *φιλότιμος* by no means always meant *ambition* and *ambitious*. In later Greek especially they were used for *pride of place* (or even *high place*), and *distinguished*, respectively.—Hennig thinks this line is concocted by the interpolator who did not add '*de suo*', but '*qui multa ex ipsa fabula extracta inculcavit*'. The

καὶ τ' ἐπεὶ κατέσχευ ἀρχάς, μεταβαλὼν ἄλλους τρόπους
 τοῖς φίλοισιν οὐκέτ' ἦσθα τοῖς πρὶν ὡς πρόσθεν φίλος, 344
 δυσπρόσιτος ἔσω τε κλήθρων σπάνιος. ἄνδρα δ' οὐ χρεῶν
 τὸν ἀγαθὸν πρᾶσσοντα μεγάλα τοὺς τρόπους μεθιστάναι,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ βέβαιον εἶναι τότε μάλιστα τοῖς φίλοις
 ἠνίκ' ὠφελεῖν μάλιστα δυνατός ἐστιν εὐτυχῶν.
 ταῦτα μὲν σε πρώτ' ἐπήλθον, ἵνα σε πρώθ' ἠῦρον κακόν.
 ὡς δ' ἐς Αὐλὴν ἦλθες αὖθις χῶ Πανελλήνων στρατός, 350

Phrynichus p. 225). 345. In the margin is written ὦ (*i.e.* ὠραῖον) in P, ση (*i.e.* σημειῶσαι) in L. These marginal marks (also γν for γνώμη) against choice passages often occur in this tragedy. 349. σε corrected by a late hand to σοι P, cf. *Bacch.* 736, σε L. εὔρω PL, in P the ω, if it is an ω, is written small, above the line, and is partially obscured by a dot of ink in its second half. In L there seems to have been some correction in the κακόν, but the εῦρω is clear (Vit.). I think Reiske's and Markland's εὔρον (better ἠῦρον) right: εῦρω having been the misreading of a copier who had only the final use of ἵνα in his mind at the time. 350. ἦλθεν PL, ἦλθες Ald., αὖθις PL (corr. to αὖθις in P), καὶ ὁ PL—with χω written over it in both mss. I have accepted the above corrections, but I think the true reading has not yet been recovered, and that some old corruption lurks in the letters ΝΑΥΤΙΚΑΙΟ. ? ναύτης δδε—ναύτης being used adjectively as at *Hec.* 921 (ναύταν οὐκέθ' ὄρων ὄμιλον), and καὶ ὁ having been a gloss written by some one who mistook δδε for ὁ δε.

τρόποις in this *v.* helps the τρόποις in the next: this makes for the genuineness of the *v.*—πρίασθαι ἐκ μέσου something like our *buy in the open market*; another homely phrase.

345. **δυσπρόσιτος** κ.τ.λ.] Cf. *Plut. Nic.* v. p. 536 εἰ δὲ μηδὲν ἐν κοινῷ πράττειν ἔχου δυσπρόσοδος ἦν καὶ δυσέντευκτος, οἰκουρῶν καὶ κατακεκλιμένος. Porson well compares *Thuc.* i. 130 (about Pausanias).

ἔσω κλήθρων] furnishes the contrast to θύρας ἔχων ἀκλήστους (*now* he lived behind a barred door): σπάνιος to διδ. πρόσρησιν ἐξῆς πᾶσι καὶ μή τις θέλοι: *now* he was hard to find if any one wanted him.

δυσπρόσιτος κ.τ.λ.] hardly an asyndeton: *i.e.* not for ἀλλ' ἦσθα δυσπ. κ.τ.λ.; but the adjs. are in explanatory subordination to οὐκέτ' ἦσθα φίλος.

346. **ἀγαθόν**] is here used much in the sense of *kind, friendly*, as at *v.* 45

πρὸς δ' ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν πιστόν τε φράσεις.

347. The dat. φίλους with βέβαιον as with σαφές at *v.* 334.

348. **εὐτυχῶν**] in causal subordination to δυνατός ἐστιν: *because* he is prosperous:—'just when his prosperity puts it most within his power to aid them'.—In the margin of my copy of Canter's Euripides an old hand has written against this passage (345 ff.), 'ὁ honores non mutandos mores'.

349. Markland cf. *Andr.* 688 ταῦτ' εὖ φρονῶν σ' ἐπήλθον, οὐκ ὀργῆς χάριν: the two passages well support each other in a rare use of the verb and in its construction with an acc. of the person: in the *Andr.* however the ταῦτα means *this reproof*; here the ταῦτα is most probably antecedent to ἵνα and means *about this*. So in English we might say '*that is the first fault I find with you*', in either of the two senses 'ἵνα *in qua re* as at *v.* 469' (Monk).

οὐδὲν ἦσθ', ἀλλ' ἐξεπλήσσου τῇ τύχῃ τῇ τῶν θεῶν,
οὐρίας πομπῆς σπανίζων, Δαναΐδαι δ' ἀφιέναι
ναῦς διήγγελλον, μάτην δὲ μὴ πονεῖν ἐν Αὐλίδι.
ὡς δ' ἀνολβον εἶχες ὄμμα σύγχυσίν τ' εἰ μὴ νεῶν
χιλιῶν ἄρχων τὸ Πριάμου πεδίον ἐμπλήσεις δορός. 355
κἀμὲ παρεκάλεις· τί δράσω; τίν' ἀπόρων εὐρω πόρον;
ὥστε μὴ στερέντα σ' ἀρχῆς ἀπολέσαι καλὸν κλέος.

Kirchhoff conj. αὐτίχ' ὄδε. ἦλθες αὐτὸς Monk. 351. οὐδὲν ἦσθ' PL, οὐδὲν ἦν Weil, οὐδ' ἐνεῖσθ' Vitelli. 354. ὡς ἀνολβον PL, but in L a δ' is added above the end of the ὡς by an early hand and possibly in P by a late one, though it is not clear. The harsh asyndeton of ὡς ἀνολβον has been avoided by Ald., Canter, Matthiae and most later editors and critics (Monk, Herm., Hart., Bothe, Firnh., Paley, Hennig) by admitting the δ' after ὡς, by Weil and Vitelli by alterations of οὐδὲν ἦσθ' (see above on v. 351) which make ὡς ἀνολβον κ.τ.λ. the principal sentence to which vv. 350—353 form a series of subordinate clauses. Dindorf and Nauck, (and Herm. *Orusc.*) get rid of this and other difficulties by rejecting vv. 354 and 355. (Nauck rejects v. 351 as well.) As Hennig says, the Δ might easily have fallen out before the Α.—δνομα P, ὄμμα L (at *I. T.* 905 there seems to have been the same mistake made in both MSS. which P makes here). Though strongly inclined to reject 354 f. with Dind. and Nauck, I think it is safer to read ὡς δ'. Hartung transposes 351 and puts it after 353: this Herm. (*Orusc.*) approves. 355. τὸ Πριάμου τε PL, with the τὸ crossed out in both. Elmsley rejected the τε and so all later editors. ἐμπλήσας PL, τ' εἰ for τε (PL) (in 354), and ἐμπλήσεις Musgrave, ἐμπλήσων Matt., ἐμπλήσαις Lenting (a bad form). I have adopted Musgrave's correction. The τε after Πριάμου was evidently put in by some one who thought Ag. feared (cf. v. 357) to lose the command of the fleet and this insertion may have gone along with the change of ἐμπλήσεις to ἐμπλήσας. 356. τίνα πόρον εὐρω ποθὲν PL, with a δὲ inserted after τίνα by an early hand in both: τίν' ἀπορῶν εὐρω πόρον Nauck. Weil has improved on this by reading ἀπόρων. Monk and Wecklein adopt at *I. T.* 897 Hermann's reading ἀπόρων πόρον (for the MSS. πόρον ἄπορον), where the gen. has exactly the same sense as here: (ποθὲν L. Dind.). 357. στερέντα σ' PL, στερέντας Musgrave. Nearly all recent editors accept Musgrave's emendation. If we follow them we ought to take στερέντας, as Dobree says, to apply to both the

351. οὐδὲν ἦσθ'] with reference to the ὡς ταπεινὸς ἦσθα of the previous charge. 'This time you were brought lower still'. Monk compares *I. T.* 115. Cf. also *Tro.* 1007 εἰ δ' εὐτυχοῖεν Τρῶες, οὐδὲν ἦν ὄδε. Cf. vv. 968 and 945 of this play.—τῇ τύχῃ τῇ τῶν θεῶν is a variety for the common θεῖα τύχῃ of prose. What the visitation of heaven was is explained in the following participial clause.

354. ὄμμα σύγχυσίν τ'] form a sort

of hendiadys, both being in sense qualified by ἀνολβον, 'a piteous confusion of face'. Cf. v. 1127.

355. χιλίων νεῶν ἄρχων] as Vitelli says, not so much as 'although you were master of a thousand ships', but simply 'at the head of your thousand ships'.

356. τίν' ἀπόρων εὐρω πόρον;] for the genitive with πόρος of the thing *fron* which a way is sought cf. *Alc.* 213 τίς ἄν πῶς πᾶ πόρος κακῶν; and see Crit. Notes.

καὶτ' ἐπεὶ Κάλχας ἐν ἱεροῖς εἶπε σὴν θύσαι κόρην
 Ἄρτέμιδι, [καὶ πλοῦν ἔσεσθαι Δαναΐδαις, ἡσθεὶς φρένας
 ἄσμενος] θύσειν ὑπέστης παῖδα· καὶ πέμπεις ἐκών, 360
 οὐ βία, μὴ τοῦτο λέξης, σὴ δάμαρτι, παῖδα σὴν
 δεῦρ' ἀποστέλλειν, Ἀχιλλεῖ πρόφασιν ὡς γαμουμένην.
 [καὶθ' ὑποστρέψας λέλῃσαι μεταβαλὼν ἄλλας γραφάς,
 ὡς φονεὺς οὐκέτι θυγατρὸς σῆς ἔσει μάλιστά γε.]
 οὗτος αὐτός ἐστιν αἰθῆρ ὃς τὰδ' ἤκουσεν σέθεν. 365
 μυρίοι δέ τοι πεπόνθασ' αὐτό· πρὸς τὰ πράγματα

brothers. If it had referred to Ag. alone it would almost certainly have been in the nom. I see no great difficulty however in supposing the quotation of Ag.'s words to stop at the end of *v.* 356. There is much to be said for Hermann's later view (*Orhisc.*) that the verse is an interpolation. 359 f. The *ἡσθεὶς φρένας* and the *ἄσμενος* are not only themselves extraordinary and inconsistent with *vv.* 94 ff., but they greatly weaken the force of the following *ἐκών, οὐ βία*. I think that from *καὶ πλοῦν...to ἄσμενος* is an interpolation concocted partly from *v.* 92. Nauck condemns the whole of *v.* 359 and leaves *ἄσμενος*. 363. *λελήσαι* PL, *λελήσαι* a late corrector of P and the early editions. (*καὶθ' P*, without the *ι* subs. which has been so often added in this ms. by a late hand.) Nauck condemns this verse. 364. In P a corrector has indistinctly altered *οὐκέτι* (I think, into *οὐκ εἶ*), *οὐκ αὖ* Paley. *ἔση* PL. Nauck and Hartung follow Dindorf in condemning this verse: "Versus a grammatico aliquo ad explicanda verba praecedentia compositus, et satis misere quidem: nam particulae *ἔτι* et *μάλιστά γε* nullum alium usum habent quam ut mensuram versus expleant". At *v.* 1594 another instance will be found in which an interpolator has used *μάλιστα* as a stop-gap. Hennig retains 363 and 364 (reading *μάλιστά γ' οὐ*), and rejects 365. 365. *αὐτός* PL (which Monk would retain), *αὐτός* Markland. ? *τότ'* for *τάδ'*. 366 f. I have adopted Wecklein's punctuation of 366, putting the *·* after *αὐτό* instead of after *πράγματα*, and in 367 I have also (not without doubt) adopted his *ἐγκονοῦσ'* for the *ἐκπονοῦσ'* of the MSS. *ἔχοντες* PL, *ἐκόντες* Canter and Scaliger. I think it possible that *πρὸς τὰ πράγματα ἐκπονοῦσ'* *ἔχοντες* is after all the right reading, and that *ἔχοντες πρὸς τὰ πράγματα* is for *νοῦν ἔχοντες πρὸς τὰ πράγματα*. *προσέχειν* with the dat. has exactly the sense of *νοῦν προσέχειν* with the dat., why should not *ἔχειν πρὸς* have the sense of *νοῦν ἔχειν πρὸς*? (Cf. *ἔχειν ἐπὶ* in the sense of *ἐπέχειν* at Soph. *Ant.* 986, χ 75.) The meaning then would be *attend devotedly, labour their utmost in attending to public business.*

358. ἐν ἱεροῖς] *inter sacrificandum*: cf. *v.* 674 *ξὺν ἱεροῖς*, and *v.* 1491 *παρ' ἱεροῖς*.

362. πρόφασιν] Cf. Hdt. *v.* 33 *ἔπλεε πρόφασιν ἐπ' Ἑλλησπόντου*.

365. If this *v.* is given correctly and in its right order, we must suppose the connexion of ideas with what precedes to be this: 'you *did* promise it' (refer-

ring to *ὑπέστης* in *v.* 360); 'this is the very same sky that heard you, I appeal to it as a witness'. Markland compares *Troad.* 1024 *κάβλεψας πόσει τὸν αὐτὸν αἰθέρ'*.

366. τὰ πράγματα] seems to mean 'the conduct of affairs, the government', as in the phrases *ἔχειν τὰ πράγματα, οἱ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν*.

ἐγκοινοῦσ' ἐκόντες, εἶτα δ' ἐξεχώρησαν κακῶς,
 τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ γνώμης πολιτῶν ἀσυνέτου, τὰ δ' ἐνδίκως
 ἀδύνατοι γεγῶτες αὐτοὶ διαφυλάξασθαι πόλιν.
 'Ελλάδος μάλιστα' ἔγωγε τῆς ταλαιπώρου στένω, 370
 ἢ θέλουσα δρᾶν τι κεδνόν, βαρβάρους τοὺς οὐδένας
 καταγελῶντας ἐξανήσει διὰ σέ καὶ τὴν σὴν κόρην.
 μηδέν' οὖν γένους ἕκατι προστάτην θείμην χθονός,
 μηδ' ὄπλων ἄρχοντα· νοῦν χρὴ τὸν στρατηλάτην ἔχειν·

368 f. Hennig condemns these two *vv.* 372. τὴν σὴν κάκην Nauck, perhaps rightly. 373. μηδέν ἂν χείους, corr. by an early hand to μηδέν' ἂν χρείους P, μηδέν' ἂν χρείους (the ε in an erasure) L. μηδέν' ἂν θείμην is ungrammatical, and χρείους (or χρέους) is a *vox nihili*. It is useless to give the many corrections that have been made. I have adopted in the text Monk's μηδέν' οὖν γένους (Reiske also γένους) as, though it is by no means convincing, it seems to me to make the best sense with the whole context. Firnhaber, who holds all 'so-called' emendations of the MSS. reading in abhorrence, actually defends μηδέν' ἂν θείμην. 374. Hennig

367. ἐξεχώρησαν κακῶς] Cf. Dante *Infer.* 3, 60 'Che fece per villate il gran rifiuto'.

368 f. 'Some men relinquish power because of undeserved unpopularity, some because they are really in themselves incompetent'. It seems better, with Hermann, to take ἐνδίκως closely with ἀδύνατοι γεγῶτες in the sense of 'really', 'truly'. (Cf. our use of 'fairly', 'properly' in the sense of 'thoroughly'.) If it be taken in the sense of 'rightly'—*i.e.* in the sense that it was quite right they should lose their power,—the men could hardly be said ἐκχωρῆσαι κακῶς. The change spoken of is one from eager devotion to base inactivity, in the case of a ruler, and the notion of his being rightly or wrongly deprived of office is foreign to the matter. I think the poet must here have had Alcibiades in mind, and the disappointment he caused at Athens by his conduct of the expedition with which he was entrusted after his return to the city in B.C. 407. See Grote VII. 393 ff. (chapter 64).

370. 'Hunc versus respicit Eubulus Comicus ap. Athenae. XIII. 3 p. 569 A 'Ελλάδος ἔγωγε τῆς ταλαιπώρου πέρι Στέ-

νω' Markl. Porson's comment on Markland is: 'In Eubuli versu miror Marklandum non vidisse expungendum, tum Euripidis auctoritate, tum metri jussu, importunum istud πέρι'. The gen. 'Ελλάδος with στένω comes under the head of the causal genitive which goes with verbs of emotion and with exclamations, but it is so far irregular that while the genitives referred to usually express the thing which causes the emotion 'Ελλάδος here is the person commiserated. Monk quotes *Hec.* 1256 and X 424 but the genitives παιδός (with ἀλγεῖν) and πάντων (with οὐδύρομαι), though genitives of persons, still represent the *source* of the grief, which is for their loss. The same is the case, though not quite so directly, with the gen. in Soph. *El.* 1209 ᾧ τάλας' ἐγὼ σέθεν.

371. δρᾶν τι κεδνόν] Vitelli compares Soph. *Ai.* 468 δρῶν τι χρηστόν. Cf. also *Heracl.* 795 μῶν τι κεδνὸν ἠγωνίζετο; *Trag.* 683 πράξειν τι κεδνόν (πράξειν there is intransitive).

374. ὄπλων] poetic for ὀπλίτων, cf. *Phoen.* 113 πολλοῖς μὲν ἵπποις μυρίοις δ' ὀπλοῖς βρέμων, *Ion* 1292 οὔτοι σὺν ὀπλοῖς ἦλθον εἰς τὴν σὴν χθόνα: so αἰχμῆ in the

[πόλεος ὡς ἄρχων ἀνὴρ πᾶς, ξύνεσιν ἦν ἔχων τύχη.] 375

XO. δεινὸν κασιγνήτοισι γίνεσθαι λόγους
μάχας θ', ὅταν ποτ' ἐμπέσωσιν εἰς ἔριν.

ΑΓΑ. βούλομαι σ' εἰπεῖν κακῶς αὖ, βραχέα, μὴ λίαν ἄνω
βλέφαρα πρὸς τάναιδές ἀγαγών, ἀλλὰ σωφρονέστερον,
ὡς ἀδελφὸν ὄντ'. ἀνὴρ γὰρ χρηστὸς αἰδεῖσθαι φιλεῖ. 380
εἰπέ μοι, τί δεινὰ φύσ᾽ αἵματηρὸν ὄμμ' ἔχων;

condemns this verse. 375. πόλεως PL, πόλεος Grotius. I agree with Hartung in thinking that first some 'sententiarum generalium venator' wrote the (Stoic-like) iambic trimeter 'nescio unde petitum' ἄρχων...τύχη, at the side; next it got into the text 'scribarum errore', finally 'aliquis numerorum male peritus' (he evidently scanned by *accent* and neglected vowel length), made it into a tetrameter by prefixing πόλεως ὡς.—It will be seen that out of the last 13 lines of Menelaus' speech more than half have by one commentator or another been pronounced spurious. This is not healthy, but it is very hard to say where the fault lies. At any rate difficulties of this kind are not to be solved by following a scholar who spends 3½ pages in defending the syntax of μηδέν ἂν θέιμην. 376 and 377 are quoted by Stobaeus *Anth.* 82, 3. γίνεσθαι P, γίνεσθαι L. 378. εὖ PL, αὖ Markland (Dobree defends εὖ, comparing εὖ διαβαλῶν at Thuc. 3, 42), οὖ Herm. (*Orusc.*), ἂν ὦ PL, L adding γρ. ἀνω in the first hand, in P there may have been an erasure where the ν stands, ἄνω Stobaeus, who quotes 378, 379 and 380 at *Anth.* 31, 2. 379. σωφρονέστερος PL, σωφρονεστέρως Stobaeus: in P at all events the ος, as in Ald., is indicated by an ο over the ρ. It is more likely that this was a mistake for ον than for ωs.—Wattenbach (*Gr. Pal. Suppl.* p. 17), says this ο sometimes stands for ον.—So with Matthiae and Monk I have written σωφρονέστερον. 380. αἰσχυρὸς οὐκ PL, χρηστὸς χρηστὸν Stobaeus, χρηστὸς Grotius, in P ὦ (*i.e.* ὠραίων) and γν (*i.e.*

sing. collectively *Heracl.* 275 ἦξω δὲ πολλὴν Ἄρεος Ἄργεῖον λαβὼν πάγχαλκον αἰχμὴν δεῦρο. Probably the use of χεῖρ and the Latin *manus* for a *force* is of the same kind as this of αἰχμῆ, *i.e.* collective.

376 f. This anticipation of Dr Watts ('But 'tis a shameful sight, When children of one family Fall out and chide and fight') seems to have been popular in antiquity. Stobaeus quotes it in his Anthology.

378. Weil keeps the mss. εὖ and translates 'je veux te dire des injures, mais les dire convenablement': but κακῶς εἰπεῖν (or λέγειν) does not so much mean *maledicere*, 'abuse', in Tragedy, as *increpare*, 'find fault with'; cp. Soph. *El.* 523 ἐγὼ δ' ἔβριον μὲν οὐκ ἔχω, κακῶς δέ σε λέγω κακῶς κλύουσα πρὸς σθένε θαμά: in *maledicere*, 'dire des injures', 'abuse', there is

the notion of ἔβρις.

379. πρὸς τάναιδές] (for the form of phrase cf. ἐς κοινὸν v. 408) must be considered along with the σωφρονέστερον and the αἰδεῖσθαι in the next v.: it is probably not *effrontery*, or even *disdain*, but *recklessness*, *mercilessness*, which Ag. says his gestures shall not express. It is difficult to decide whether βλέφαρα here means *eyes* or *eyelids*. Cf. v. 321, and Prov. 30. 13 'There is a generation, oh how lofty are their eyes! And their eyelids are lifted up'.

381. δεινὰ φύσ᾽ αἰμ.] οἶον ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ ὑπὸ ὀργῆς ἀποσχετλιάζεω Phrynichus in Bekk. *Anecd.* 1, 36, 1. Cf. μέγα φουσῶν v. 125.

αἵματηρὸν ὄμμα] Monk renders *vultum sanguine suffusum*, Paley 'that sanguinary

τίς ἀδικεῖ σε; τοῦ κέχρησαι; χρηστὰ λέκτρ' ἐράς λαβεῖν;
οὐκ ἔχοιμ' ἄν σοι παρασχέιν' ὦν γὰρ ἐκτήσω, κακῶς
ἦρξες. εἴτ' ἐγὼ δίκην δῶ σῶν κακῶν, ὃ μὴ σφαλείς;
ἢ δάκνει σε τὸ φιλότιμον τοῦμόν; ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις 385
εὐπρεπῆ γυναικα χρῆζεις, τὸ λελογισμένον παρεῖς
καὶ τὸ καλόν, ἔχειν; πονηροῦ φωτὸς ἡδοναὶ κακαί.
εἰ δ' ἐγὼ γνοὺς πρόσθεν οὐκ εὖ μετεθέμην εὐβουλίαν,
μαίνομαι; σὺ μᾶλλον, ὅστις ἀπολέσας κακὸν λέχος

γνώμη) are written at the side. 382. λέκτρ' ἐράς χρηστὰ PL, λέκτρα χρῆστ' ἐράς Heath, χρηστὰ λέκτρ' ἐράς Reiske and Wecklein. I prefer the latter, as it involves a smaller change in the mss. reading, and seems to me to emphasize χρηστὰ (see Ex. Notes). Also, as Wecklein says, the corruption is easily explained, if this was the order, from the similarity of -χρησαι and χρηστὰ. 384. δῶσω PL, δῶ σῶν Dawes *Miscell. Crit.* p. 341; a splendid emendation. 388. μετετέθην εὐβουλίαν PL, μετεθέμην εὐβουλίαν Monk, who compares *Orestes* 254 μετέθου λύσαν. The word μετεθέμην is very liable to be mis-written (Monk says a Paris copy had μετέθην), as is also the last syllable in a tetrameter; on the other hand μετετέθην εὐβουλίαν is not a natural Greek expression, and in particular, though μεταθέσθαι for 'to change one's mind' is common, the passive is, I believe, nowhere so used. Weil accepts μετεθέμην but keeps εὐβουλίαν. 389. Over μᾶλλον an early hand in L has written μαίνη: a good instance of an explanatory addition in

look', Firnhaber '*mordgieriges Auge*'. The ἔχων points to something more enduring than a glance, and this, as well as the general tone of the passage inclines me to think with Monk that αἰ. ὃ. ἔχων means 'with flushed face'. Menelaus had shown no fratricidal hate.

382. κέχρησαι] elsewhere it is only the participle κεχρημένος that is used in the sense of 'want'. There is, I think, a significance in the emphatic position of χρηστὰ which helps us to understand the train of thought. Ag. says in effect: 'you have had a bad wife, are you angry because you can't get a good one?' cp. v. 486 and see notes there.

Some have thought that λαβεῖν stood for ἀλαβαεῖν: but χρηστὰ λέκτρα (cp. *Hērō*. 636 and frag. 524 Nauck) cannot refer to Helen.

383. 'That is more than I can promise to secure to you, you managed so ill last time'. Vater compares *Andromache* 591 ff.

384. 'Imitatur Ennius *Iphigenia* apud J. Rufinianum de *Fig. Sent. et Eloc.* c. 37' Pors. The lines quoted from Ennius are: *Ego proictor, quod tu peccas? tu delinquis, ego arguor? Pro malefactis Helena redeat? virgo pcreat innocens? Tua reconcilietur uxor? mea necetur filia?* (Ribbeck, *Ennius*, v. 194).

385. τὸ φιλότιμον] used as in v. 342.—ἀλλ' 'No'.

386. τὸ λελογισμένον] Monk translates 'discretion'. τὸ λελ. and τὸ καλόν answer roughly to our *expediency* and *duty*.

387. πονηροῦ φωτὸς] has the emphasis, 'des plaisirs honteux sont la marque d'un homme sans valeur' Weil: 'proprii di turpe uomo sono turpi piaceri' Vitelli. The v. is marked γνώμη in L and ὥραϊον in P.

389. In κακόν there is a re-echoing of the charge made at the end of v. 387.

ἀναλαβεῖν θέλεις, θεοῦ σοι τὴν τύχην διδόντος εὔ. 390
 ὤμοσαν τὸν Τυνδάρειον ὄρκου οἱ κακόφρονες
 φιλόγαμοι μνηστῆρες· ἡ δέ γ' ἔλπις, οἶμαι μὲν, θεός,
 κάξέπραξεν αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἢ σὺ καὶ τὸ σὸν σθένος·
 οὓς λαβὼν στράτευ'· ἔτοιμοι δ' εἰσὶ μωρία φρενῶν· 394
 οὐ γὰρ ἀσύνητον τὸ θείου, ἀλλ' ἔχει συνιέναι 394 α

a MS. 392. ἡ δέ γ' ἔλπις, οἶμαι μὲν PL, ἦγε δ' ἔλπις κ.τ.λ. Matthiae and Seyffert, ἡ γὰρ ἔλπις κ.τ.λ. Hennig, ἡ δέ σφ' ἔλπις ὠρμαινεν Herwerden: it seems to me that all these changes are for the worse. See Expl. Notes. 393. κάξέπραξεν PL, corrected in P to ἐξέπραξεν which is printed in Ald. This is one of the many corrections made by Musurus, the Greek scholar who owned the MS. and who most probably superintended the printing from it at Venice of Aldus' first edition of Euripides. 394. στράτευε . οἶμαι δ' εἰση PL, only in P a γ is inserted by a later hand after στράτευε and before the stop. στράτευ' ἔτοιμοι δ' εἰσι Monk. Matthiae is doubtless right in conjecturing that the alteration of this *v.* arose from the loss of *v.* 394a and the consequent necessity of finding a verb to govern τοὺς κακ. παγ. ὄρκους. Though most modern editors adopt Monk's emendation, they do not, as he did, regard ἐτ. δ' εἰσι as a parenthesis. 394a. This verse does not occur in the MSS. and early editions, but was discovered by Reiske, Heath, Markl., Musgr. and Valckenaer quoted along with *v.* 395 by

391. τὸν Τυνδάρειον ὄρκου] a good instance of the identity in use of the adj. formed from a proper name and the genitive in Greek. It is only to a very limited extent that this is the case in English: e.g. *Elizabethan*, *Darwinian* could only in a few cases stand for *Elizabeth's* or *Darwin's*.

391—393. The difficulty here lies chiefly in the αὐτὸ in *v.* 393. It cannot be right to interpret it, as most commentators do, of the taking of the oath. There could be no question of Menelaus's using force to compel the suitors to take Tyndareos's oath. He was himself on a level with all the other suitors at that time, and took it like the rest. But when we see that ἐξέπραξεν αὐτὸ, and indeed the whole three lines, is an explanation of the words θεοῦ σοι τὴν τύχην διδόντος εὔ all difficulties vanish. The connexion of ideas is this. After saying in 390 'you want to get her back just because a divinity has given you a good chance of doing so', Ag. digresses to explain that

Hope was the divinity in the case, and that as Hope had made the suitors swear, it was she who had 'brought it about', i.e. made the expedition possible, and so given Menelaus the chance.

For the converse of this personification of ἔλπις cf. *Troades* 987 ff. ἦν οὐμὸς υἱὸς κάλλος εὐπρεπέστατος ὁ σὸς δ' ἰδῶν νῦν νοῦς ἐποιήθη Κύπρις· τὰ μῶρα γὰρ πάντ' ἐστὶν Ἀφροδίτη βρότοις. Monk quotes *Cyclops* 316 ὁ πλοῦτος ἀνθρωπίσκε τοῖς σοφοῖς θεός and Verg. *Aen.* IX. 185 *an sua cuique deus sit dira cupido?* Headlam well quotes Theognis 1135 ἔλπις ἐν ἀνθρώποις μόνη θεὸς ἐσθλή ἐνεστιν and also *ib.* 637 f.

394 a. This *v.* seems to be mainly a comment on the word μωρία, though the position of the word in its sentence hardly seems important enough to justify such a comment.—'They are ready to go, fools that they are:—they *must* be fools not to know that Heaven would not hold them bound by oaths fastened on them by wicked force'. *παγέντας* lit.

τοὺς κακῶς παγέντας ὄρκους καὶ κατηναγκασμένους. 395
 τὰμὰ δ' οὐκ ἀποκτενῶ ἴγῳ τέκνα· κού τὸ σὸν μὲν εὖ
 παρὰ δίκην ἔσται κακίστης εὐνιδος τιμωρία,
 ἐμὲ δὲ συντήξουσι νύκτες ἡμέραι τε δακρυοῖς,
 ἄνομα δρῶντα κού δίκαια παίδας οὖς ἐγεινάμην.
 βραχέα ταυτά σοι λέλεκται καὶ σαφῆ καὶ ῥάδια· 400
 εἰ δὲ μὴ βούλει φρονεῖν σύ, τὰμ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς.

ΧΟ. οἶδ' αὖ διάφοροι τῶν πάρος λελεγμένων

μύθων, καλῶς δ' ἔχουσι, φείδεσθαι τέκνων.

ΜΕ. αἰαί, φίλους ἄρ' οὐχὶ κεκτῆμην τάλας.

Theophilus *ad Autolyicum* II. 54, [37] and Stobaeus *Anth.* 28, 10. 395. *συνηναγκασμένους* PL, *κατηναγκασμένους* Theoph. and Stob. 396. *καὶ τὸ σὸν* PL, *κού τὸ σὸν* Lenting (on *Androm.* 307) and Hermann. 397. *πέρα δίκης* PL, *παρὰ δίκης* Reiske, *παρὰ δίκην* Pors. Monk (like all editors before Musgr.) reads *τιμωρία* (it is true that the MSS. omit the *ι* subscr., but so they do constantly in datives, e.g. *μωρία* 393, *εὐβουλία* 388 (L)),—keeping *καὶ* in *v.* 396, and he understands *τὸ σὸν εὖ* in the sense of 'that which benefits you', 'your advantage', comparing *τὸ δ'* *εὖ* at *Ag.* 119 and *I. T.* 580. 399. *ἐγεινάμεν* PL, corr. by an early hand in L to *ἐγεινάμην*. 400. *ῥάδια* PL. It is probable that like so many last words in a tetrameter this is a corruption. Stadtmüller suggests *καίρια* comparing *v.* 829. 401. *εὖ* PL, σύ Markland. 403. Perhaps we ought to read here *καλῶς δ' ἔχει σε φείδεσθαι τέκνων*. 404. *ἄρ' οὐχὶ κεκτῆμην* PL, *ἄρ' οὐκ ἐκεκτῆμην* Heath, *ἀν οὐχὶ κεκτῆμην* Elmsley (ingeniously but needlessly). Monk and Weil make the

'compacted', 'made fast', as if the oath were a cage or a trap into which the suitors had been forced.

396. *κού κ.τ.λ.*] for the idiomatic *οὐ* negating both a *μὲν* and a *δέ* clause cf. *I. T.* 116 f. *οὗτοι μακρὸν μὲν ἤλθομεν κώπη πόρον, ἐκ τερμάτων δὲ νόστον ἀροῦμεν πάλιν*.

397. *παρὰ δίκην*] *παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον* Hesych. (Dind.), *παρὰ τ' ἐλπίδα καὶ παρὰ δίκαν* *Trag. adesp.* fr. 72 Nauck. *τιμωρία* an extended use of the dat. of *manner*.

398. With this *v.* is compared the varying construction at *Med.* 25 *τὸν πάντα συντήκουσα δακρυοῖς χρόνον, ἰθ.* 141 *ἢ δ' ἐν θαλάμοις τῆκει βιοτήν*: Monk adds Ω 714 *νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέματα δακρυχέουσα*.

399. *δρῶντα*] a sort of historic present used as a poetic variety for the aorist, 'the doer' of wrong for 'because I did' wrong. Cf. *Herc. Fur.* 727 *προσδόκα δὲ*

δρῶν κακῶς κακόν τι πράξεν. *Hel.* 814 *δρῶντας γὰρ ἢ μὴ δρῶντας ἦδιον θανεῖν*.

401. *τὰμὰ*] just like the *τὸ σὸν* in *v.* 396.

403. *φείδεσθαι*] a variety of the *imperative* use of the inf. Cf. *Tro.* 1031 *νόμον δὲ τόνδε ταῖς ἀλλαισι θὲς γυναιξί, θνησκείν ἦτις ἀν προδῶ πόσιν*. Cf. also *Soph. Ai.* 1264 and *v.* 512 below. (See however *Crit. N.* for a suggested alteration.)

404. Markland compares *Or.* 721 *ἄφίλος ἦσθ' ἄρ' ὦ πάτερ πρᾶσσω κακῶς*. *κεκτῆμην* is in sense an imperf. This converse of the historic present—*i.e.* the using a past tense in talking of some state still continuing—is common in many languages. In Greek *ἄρα* as indicating a discovery naturally accompanies it. For the omission of the augment cf. *Soph. Ant.* 411.

- ΑΓΑ. εἰ τοὺς φίλους γε μὴ θέλεις ἀπολλύναι. 405
 ΜΕ. δείξεις δὲ ποῦ μοι πατὴρὸς ἐκ ταύτου γεγώς;
 ΑΓΑ. συνσωφρονεῖν γὰρ οὐχὶ συννοσεῖν ἔφην.
 ΜΕ. ἐς κοινὸν ἀλγεῖν τοῖς φίλοισι χρὴ φίλους.
 ΑΓΑ. εὖ δρῶν παρακάλει μ', ἀλλὰ μὴ λυπῶν ἐμέ.
 ΜΕ. οὐκ ἄρα δοκεῖ σοι τάδε πονεῖν σὺν Ἑλλάδι; 410
 ΑΓΑ. Ἑλλὰς δὲ σὺν σοὶ κατὰ θεῶν νοσεῖ τινα.
 ΜΕ. σκῆπτρῳ νῦν αὔχει, σὸν κασίγνητον προδοῦς.

* * * * *

[ἐγὼ δ' ἐπ' ἄλλας εἶμι μηχανάς τινας,

line a question. 407. συνσωφρονεῖν σοι βούλομαι ἄλλ' οὐ συννοσεῖν PL, συνσωφρονεῖν γάρ, οὐχὶ συννοσεῖν ἔφην Plut. II. p. 64 c (first pointed out by Porson). Fix conjectures that Plutarch, quoting from memory, was misled by a remembrance of Soph. *Ant.* 523 οὕτω συνεχθεῖν ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφην, and like Nauck, Vitelli, Weil and Wecklein prefers some emendation (βουλόμεισθ' οὐ Fix, βούλομαι κοῦ N., θέλομεν ἄλλ' οὐ, and later βουλόμενος οὐ Vitelli, συνσωφρονεῖν ἔρομμος, ἄλλ' οὐ Wecklein) which will remove the impossible elision of the *ai* in βούλομαι. It seems to me less likely on the whole that Plutarch should have quoted the line wrong than that modern scholars should have guessed it right. At the same time the *σοι* of the MSS. fits the context much better than Plutarch's γάρ. Perhaps the γάρ, like the ἔφην for ἔφην was an intentional modification of what Euripides wrote, which may have been τὰρ. The γάρ is at any rate not more abrupt than the δὲ in v. 411. Porson notices that where at *Ion* 1521 the MSS. have γάρ, the scholiast on *Phoen.* 909 has σοι, which he thinks right there. 411. θεῶν PL, θεῶν Porson. 412. αὐχέας PL, αὔχει Tyrwhit (a beautiful emendation). vv. 413—441. I have no hesitation in following L. and G. Dindorf, Kirchhoff and Nauck in regarding these verses as an interpolation. They contain just three good lines (vv. 427—429) which I should conjecture to have been borrowed by the interpolator. The inequality of texture is specially noticeable at the two junctures, but there are throughout many irregularities in both thought and language which will be commented on in the Explanatory Notes. This omission involves important dramaturgical results. Clytaemnestra appears in the next Epeisodion. Agamemnon first addresses her at v. 685 without any expression of astonishment at seeing her, though in all earlier references to the expected arrival (τῆ σῆ τ' ἀλόχῳ at v. 154 being probably spurious) whether made by Ag. or Menelaus, the *daughter* only is spoken of. Still greater difficulty is occasioned by vv. 456—459 where Agam. definitely implies that Clytaemnestra was *not* expected. This fact makes it still more remarkable that Ag.'s first words to his wife at

407. Cf. *Phoen.* 394 καὶ τοῦτο λυπρὸν, συνασφεῖν τοῖς μὴ σοφοῖς.

408. ἐς κοινόν] Adverbial phrases consisting of a prep. and a noun or adj. are as common in Greek as in English. Other instances in this play are εἰς τέλος

v. 161, πρὸς τανειδὲς v. 379. Cf. Soph. *Phil.* 594 πρὸς ἰσχύος κρᾶτος.

409. *i.e.* 'Such a claim comes with a bad grace from one who is *causing* his friends pain'.

φίλους τ' ἐπ' ἄλλους. ΑΓΓ. ὦ Πανελλήνων ἄναξ,
 Ἄγάμεμνον, ἦκω παῖδά σοι τὴν σὴν ἄγων, 415
 ἦν Ἰφιγένειαν ὠνόμαξας ἐν δόμοις.
 μήτηρ δ' ὀμαρτεῖ, σῆς Κλυταιμνήστρας δέμας,
 [καὶ παῖς Ὀρέστης, ὥστε τερφθείης ἰδών,]
 χρόνον παλαιὸν δωμαίων ἔκδημος ὢν.
 ἀλλ' ὡς μακρὰν ἔτεινον, εὐρυτον παρὰ 420
 κρήνην ἀναψύχουσι θηλύπουν βάσιν,
 αὐταὶ τε πῶλοί τ'. εἰς δὲ λειμώνων χλόην
 καθείμεν αὐτάς, ὡς βορᾶς γευσαίατο.
 ἐγὼ δὲ πρόδρομος σῆς παρασκευῆς χάριν

v. 685 (to which the fact that they begin midway in a line gives a specially off-hand air—making them seem like the resumption of a former conversation) should contain not only no formal welcome but no reference to the fact that her coming is a surprise to her husband. On these grounds I cannot help believing that a passage containing the first meeting of husband and wife has been lost. Probably this passage came before v. 640. This belief involves the rejection of at least vv. 456—459 where see Crit. Notes. 413 and 414 Hennig, who protests against rejecting the whole passage, rejects these two verses. This lightens the ship considerably but cannot save it. 416. ὠνόμαξας PL, (though Vitelli is silent) with ποτ' added by a late hand in P, doubtless by Musurus, who printed ὠνόμασας ποτ'. ὠνόμαξες Markl. 417. ὀμαρτεῖ L, ὀμαρτοῖ corrected by an early hand to ὀμαρτεῖ P. σῆς Κλυταιμνήστρας δέμας PL, σὴ Κλυταιμνήστρα δάμαρ Elmsley. 418. ὥστε τερφθείης PL, actually defended by Hartung, Firnhaber and Klotz, ὡς τι τερφθείης Herm., ὡς σὺ τ. Monk, ὥστ' ἂν ἠσθείης Hennig. 421. Hennig proposes χηλόπουν for the θηλύπουν of the MSS. thus avoiding (see on next v.) the absurdity of talking of sending the ladies and the horses together into the field to feed. Musgrave avoided this by reading καθείμεν τάσδ' in v. 423.—(ἀφείμεν αὐτάς Hennig). 422. αὐταὶ τε πῶλοι γ' PL (the γ' added later in P), πῶλοί τ'

414. φίλους τ' ἐπ' ἄλλους] This comes in very awkwardly just after Men. (v. 404) had bewailed his friendless condition.

417. δέμας] Paley quotes *Electr.* 1340 and *Hec.* 724 and Monk *Orest.* 107 for this use of δέμας with a gen. of a person. It is a circumlocution of the same kind as the Homeric βίη Ἑρακλεΐη.

418. Paley quotes *Iou* 1375 f. (καὶ τι τερφθῆναι βίον) in support of Hermann's ὡς τι τερφθείης.

420. ὡς μακρὰν ἔτεινον] At Soph. *Aj.* 1040, Aesch. *Ag.* 1296 μακρὰν τελευτὴν is used in the sense of the prose

λόγον μακρὸν ἀποτεινεῖν, 'to speak at length', and it is strange to find it used in so different a sense here. The tense too is strange. L. Dindorf says a clause in which ὡς means *nam* can never come before its principal clause. This seems an arbitrary rule, and indeed Hermann quotes from Xen. *Cyr.* 4, 2, 29, a clear instance in which it does so.

424. σῆς παρασκευῆς χάριν] It is not till after a digression of 10 lines that we find what this strange expression means. The possessive σῆς is used subjectively, not objectively.

ἦκω· πέπυσται γὰρ στρατός, ταχεῖα γὰρ
 διῆξε φήμη, παῖδα σὴν ἀφιγμένην. 425
 πᾶς δ' εἰς θεάν ὄμιλος ἔρχεται δρόμῳ,
 σὴν παῖδ' ὅπως ἴδωσιν· οἱ δ' εὐδαίμονες
 ἐν πᾶσι κλεινοὶ καὶ περίβλεπτοι βροτοῖς.
 λέγουσι δ'· ὑμείναιός τις ἢ τί πράσσεται; 430
 ἢ πόθον ἔχων θυγατρὸς Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ
 ἐκόμισε παῖδα; τῶν δ' ἂν ἤκουσας τάδε·
 Ἄρτέμιδι προτελίζουσι τὴν νεάνίδα,
 Αὐλίδος ἀνάσση. τίς νιν ἄξεταί ποτε;
 ἀλλ' εἶα, τάπῃ τοισιδ' ἐξάρχου κανᾶ, 435
 στεφανοῦσθε κράτα καὶ σύ, Μενέλεως ἄναξ,

Markland, αὐτοῖσι (? for αὐταῖσι) πῶλοις Porson, ἔπποι τε πῶλοι τ' Hennig. 425. ταχεῖα γὰρ PL (the γὰρ being corrected by an early hand in P to δέ), Hartung reads δέ for the first γὰρ and keeps the second unchanged. 430. πράσσεται PL, with an alternative πράσσετε in L. 434. ποτε PL, πόσις Nauck. 435. τοισιδ' P, τοῖσιν L (the ν being by an early hand in an erasure). 436. 'Aut spurius

425 f. ταχεῖα γὰρ διῆξε φήμη] a parenthesis. It is possible that διῆξε was intended by the writer to be a gnomic aorist.

430. ὑμείναιός τις ἢ τί πράσσεται] I think these words have an especially modern ring.

432. ἂν ἤκουσας] probably a mixture of the *iterative* ἂν with the aor. ind. (cf. Ar. *Lysistr.* 510 καὶ πολλάκις ἔνδον ἂν οἶσαι ἠκούσαμεν ἂν τι κακὸς ὑμᾶς βουλευσαμένους μέγα πρᾶγμα) and the indefinite, general use of the 2nd person in the sense of our 'one' doubtless familiar to the interpolator in Latin (*videres, diceres, crederes* and the like). (If this were the only instance of Latin idiom in the passage there would not be this probability.)

433. A clumsy attempt at tragic irony. This very significant hint of Iphigeneia's fate is dragged in 'by the head and shoulders'.

προτελίζουσι] The form is a slight indication of the late origin of the passage. At Pollux 3, 38 in an account of the pre-nuptial consecration only one MS. has προτελίζεσθαι and προτέλιζον for

the more usual προτελείσθαι and προτέλιζον. In classic Greek there are about a dozen verbs which may be said to have alternative present forms in -έω and -ίζω. In post-classical Greek -ίζω grew in favour and many verbs, which had only -έω in earlier times, then assumed the favourite ending.

434. ἄξεταί] Another Latinism. ἄγειν and ἄγεσθαι never got the special sense of 'marry' which *ducere* did. Though used with γυναῖκα as *object* (Hdt. I. 59, II. 47) it is not used exclusively with the husband as the *subject* (Hdt. I. 34).

435. ἐξάρχου κανᾶ] The interpolator was doubtless familiar with such passages as Aeschines 70, 31 (ἐνήρκται μὲν τὰ κανᾶ) and Eur. *El.* 1142 (κανοῦν δ' ἐνήρ-κται), but, like the 7th ed. of Liddell and Scott (*s.v.* ἐνάρχομαι), he confounded ἐνάρχεσθαι with ἐξάρχεσθαι. The clumsy change from the sing. ἐξάρχου to the plural στεφανοῦσθε and back to the sing. εὐτρέπιζε is very imperfectly palliated by the awkward introduction of Menelaus. About this point the interpolator (luckily) shows signs of fatigue.

ὕμναιον εὐτρέπιζε καὶ κατὰ στέγας
λωτὸς βοάσθω καὶ ποδῶν ἔστω κτύπος·
φῶς γὰρ τόδ' ἤκει μακάριον τῇ παρθένῳ.

ΑΓΑ. ἐπήνεσ'· ἀλλὰ στεῖχε δωμάτων ἔσω·
τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἰούσης τῆς τύχης ἔσται καλῶς.]

440

* * * * *

ΑΓΑ. οἴμοι, τί φῶ δύστηνος; ἄρξομαι πόθεν;
εἰς οἷ' ἀνάγκης ζεύγματ' ἐμπεπτώκαμεν.
ὑπήλθε δαίμων, ὥστε τῶν σοφισμάτων
πολλῶ γενέσθαι τῶν ἐμῶν σοφώτερος.
ἢ δυσγένεια δ' ὡς ἔχει τι χρήσιμον.

445

aut corruptus' Nauck. Herm. (*Opusc.*) inserted *φύλλοις* before *κρᾶτα* and omits the next six words. 438. *λωτὸς* corr. (as in P, in *v.* 375 *ἄρχων* to *ἄρχων*) to *λωτὸς* PL. 441. *ιούσης* PL, *έώσης* Lenting. 442. *ἄξομαι* PL, *ἄρξομαι* Burges, *σέθεν* PL, *πόθεν* Grotius. 443. *εἰς οἷ γ' ἀνάγκης* with the *γ* crossed out—*i.e.* the *γ* had been put in by someone who was correcting P by L, but there is no trace of the *α* of *οἶα*· *εἰς οἶα γ' ἀνάγκης* L. In P the *μ* of *ἐμπεπτώκαμεν* is put in

440. **ἐπήνεσα]** does not seem to be used like the pres. both of this verb and *αἰνέω* in the sense of 'no, thank you'. It generally corresponds to our 'good!', and the French 'c'est bien'. It is better to punctuate more decidedly after the word, as Paley does. The *ἀλλά* will then be 'pray', not 'but', which gives no sense. There is no *contrast* between Ag.'s commendation and his request to the messenger to go inside the tent. The line is a copy of *Medea* 1019, where however a reason for the request follows.

441. What are τὰ ἄλλα? and what does *ιούσης τῆς τύχης* mean? Hermann's translation '*fortuna cursum suum persequente*' as against the old '*favente fortuna*' (he quotes Soph. *O. T.* 1458) is now generally approved of. Paley says the phrase is intentionally ambiguous. In the third place *καλῶς ἔσται* with τὰ ἄλλα as its subject is irregular for *καλῶς ἔξει* (*καλῶς ἔσται ἦν θεὸς θέλη* at Ar. *Plut.* 1188 and at Xen. *Anab.* 7, 3, 43 gives it some support, but there the *ἔσται* has no subject). When all is said and done we

get 'But the other things, in the course of events, will turn out well'.

443. **εἰς οἶα** = *ὅτι εἰς τοιαῦτα*.

444. **ὑπήλθεν]** is used in very much the same sense at *v.* 67.—These laments of Ag. are generally supposed to be caused by the announcement of his wife and daughter's arrival. As I have said above, I believe no such announcement had been made, and I take these words to refer to the crossing of his plans by the interception of the letter. He knew now that his daughter must arrive soon.

446—449. Cp. Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Maid's Tragedy* v. 2 'But such the misery of greatness is, They have no time for tears'. For *ἅπαντα εἰπεῖν* (*quidvis dicere*) Musgr. compares Diphilus (in Athenaeus 4, 223 B) *οἷς ἐξουσία ἐστὶν λέγειν ἅπαντα καὶ ποιεῖν μόνους*, also Plat. *Ar.* 38 D and 39 A. Ennius [*Iph.* v. 197 Ribbeck (fr. xi. Vahlen)] imitates this passage: *Plebes in hoc regi antestat loco: licet Lacrumare plebi, regi honeste non licet*.

καὶ γὰρ δακρῦσαι ῥαδίως αὐτοῖς ἔχει,
 ἅπαντά τ' εἰπεῖν. τῷ δὲ γενναίῳ φύσιν
 ἄνολβα ταῦτα. προστάτην δὲ τοῦ βίου
 τὸν ὄγκον ἔχομεν τῷ τ' ὄχλω δουλεύομεν. 450
 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκβαλεῖν μὲν αἰδοῦμαι δάκρυ,
 τὸ μὴ δακρῦσαι δ' αὐθις οὐ σθένω τάλας,
 εἰς τὰς μεγίστας συμφορὰς ἀφιγμένος.
 [εἶεν, τί φήσω πρὸς δάμαρτα τὴν ἐμήν;
 πῶς δέξομαί νιν; ποῖον ὄμμα συμβάλω; 455
 καὶ γὰρ μ' ἀπώλεσ' ἐπὶ κακοῖς ἅ μοι πάρος

by a later hand above the line. 448—450. In P and L ἄνολβα begins *v.* 448 and ἅπαντα *v.* 449. Musgrave was the first to see that these two words were accidentally transposed. In P ἐστι is written (though not by the first hand, I think) over ἅπαντα. This is an indication that ἄνολβα once stood there. ἐστι would not so naturally be supplied to ἅπαντα (it would have been put in after ταῦτα). The ἐστι was copied in the right line by someone who did not notice that the words were transposed.—γε τοῦ PL, δὲ τοῦ in Plutarch, who at *Nic.* 526 c has προστάτην δὲ τοῦ βίου τὸν ὄγκον ἔχομεν τῷ δ' ὄχλω δουλεύομεν (τὸν δῆμον, and τῷ τ' PL). Firthaber, the great champion of the MSS. leaves ἄνολβα and ἅπαντα untransposed (though he adopts Matthiae's τε for the MSS. γε in *v.* 449), and prefers δῆμον to ὄγκον, but he actually proposes (and prints) an emendation in the latter half of the line. Here it is: τῷ τ' ὄγκω δουλεύομεν!! (It is hard to account for δῆμον. Probably ὄχλον was first written by mistake for ὄγκον, and then δῆμον substituted by an "improver" for ὄχλον.—Bremi thinks it got in as a gloss on ὄχλω.) 452. αἴτις PL, αἰδοῦμαι PL, clearly repeated by mistake from the preceding *v.*, οὐ δύναμαι Markl., ἀδύνατος Wecklein, οὐκ ἔχω or οὐ σθένω Dobree. I think Dobree's second is the best of all the guesses. *v.* 454—459. I think these words are an interpolation by the hand of the interpolator of *v.* 413—441. Some reference to Clytaemnestra's unexpected arrival was inevitable here if Agamemnon knew of it. It is equally necessary though that when Ag. first meets his wife he should express his surprise. This expression however our interpolator has failed to provide for us. As we have the text Ag. first addresses his wife in the middle of *v.* 685. See above on *v.* 413 ff. 455. συμβάλω PL, corrected by a later hand in P to συμβαλῶ—the same question as came before us on *v.* 442. In both cases I have left the MSS. reading unchanged. It is curious that a Paris copy of L should have ὄνομα for ὄμμα here (cf. on *v.* 354). It shows that this common mistake was due to the eye or ear, and not to a misapprehension of the sense. 456. πάρος PL, corrected to

451. ἐκβαλεῖν δάκρυ] Cf. τ 362 δάκρυα δ' ἐκβαλε θερμά, below *v.* 477, *Her.* 298, *Heracl.* 129, *Ion* 924.

455. For ποῖον ὄμμα Vitelli compares *Soph. Ai.* 462: ὄμμα συμβαλεῖν does not seem to occur in this sense elsewhere, but it sounds good Greek. Indeed this

and the preceding *v.* are two good lines: far better than the following four.

456 f. ἐπὶ κακοῖς..ἐλθούσα] At *v.* 1237 below ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ with the dat. is used in quite a different sense. There ἐπὶ means *with a view to*, here *on the top of* or *in the midst of*.

ἔλθοῦσ' ἄκλητος. εἰκότως δ' ἄμ' ἔσπετο
 θυγατρὶ, νυμφεύουσα καὶ τὰ φίλτατα
 δώσουσ', ἵν' ἡμᾶς ὄντας εὐρήσει κακοῦς.]
 τὴν δ' αὖ τάλαιναν παρθένον· τί παρθένον; 460
 "Αἰδῆς νιν ὡς ἔοικε νυμφεύσει τάχα·
 ὡς ἔκτισ'· [οἶμαι γάρ νιν ἱκετεύσειν τάδε·
 ὦ πάτερ, ἀποκτενεῖς με; τοιοῦτους γάμους
 γήμειας αὐτὸς χῶστίς ἐστί σοι φίλος.
 παρῶν δ' Ὀρέστης ἐγγὺς ἀναβοήσεται 465
 οὐ συνετὰ συνετῶς· ἔτι γάρ ἐστι νήπιος.
 αἰαί, τὸν] Ἑλένης ὡς μ' ἀπώλεσεν γάμον
 γήμας ὁ Πριάμου Πάρις, ὃ μ' εἵργασται τάδε.

πάρα (by Musurus?) in P: in L ὑπῆρχε is written over πάρος by m². 458. νυμ-
 φεύουσα PL, νυμφεύουσα Markland (cf. on v. 885). vv. 462—467. I believe
 from οἶμαι in 462 to τὸν in 467 to be an interpolation. In the first place the wish
 expressed by Iph. in 464 is stupid in itself and utterly out of harmony with the
 heroine's character. It was doubtless suggested by *I. T.* 364 (ὦ πάτερ νυμφεύομαι
 νυμφεύματ' αἰσχρὰ πρὸς σέθεν). As Hennig says, too, such a wish is an *imprecation*,
 not a *supplication* (ἱκετεύσαι). Markland took it ironically. In the next place I
 thoroughly agree with Wecklein that the Baby is a supposititious one, and that all
 passages in which he is introduced are, like itself, not Euripidean (see Introduction).
 Possibly it was introduced by some enterprising theatrical manager, who thought
 a baby in arms would improve the look of the group or please the audience. One
 funny idea about this Baby is that of P. Brumoy (*Théâtre des Grecs* Eng. Trans. i.
 358), that vv. 468 and 469 are what the Baby is supposed to call out (ἀναβοήσεται).
 462. ἱκετεύσαι PL, ἱκετεύσειν (which is much better) Markl. 466. οὐ ξυνετὰ
 ξυνετῶς P, in L these words begin with σ (m¹) in an erasure: i.e. ξ was in the original
 from which P and L were copied. ἀσύνετα σ. Monk. 468. ὅς μ' PL. Porson
 (on *Hec.* 13 where see his note) approves of Markland's (so also Musgrave and Heath)
 ὅς μ', but most editors have followed the alternative suggestion of Heath and Markland
 to reject the μ'. Surely it is more likely that the ὅ should have been turned to ὅς than

458. τὰ φίλτατα] An ordinary peri-
 phrasis for τέκνον (cf. Valckenaer's note
 on *Phoen.* 437 [434]). It comes in very
 lamely here.

459. ἵνα] A Latinism, *ubi* could
 stand very well for *wherein*, but not ἵνα.
 At ζ 27 ἵνα means *when, an occasion on*
which, but the words here do not (I think)
 mean that Clyt. will find out his villainy
on the occasion of the actual marriage, but
 that she will find out that he has played
 her false *in the matter of the marriage*.

460. τί παρθένον;] Cf. *Hec.* 612 παρ-

θένον τ' ἀπάρθενον, spoken of Polyxena
 in a like situation.

461. For the idea of this v. cf. *I. T.*
 369 "Αἰδῆς Ἀχιλλεύς ἦν ἄρ', οὐχ ὁ Πηλέως
 ὄν μοι προτεινῶς πόσω κ.τ.λ. Monk also
 compares *Or.* 1109, *Soph. Ant.* 653, and
 815, *Romeo and Juliet* iv. 5 and v. 3.

465. The ἐγγὺς is evidently put in to
 make out the verse.

466. For οὐ συνετὰ συνετῶς Vitelli
 cf. *Trō.* 625 Ταλθύβιος αἰνυγμ' οὐ σαφῶς
 εἶπεν σαφές. Cp. also *Phoen.* 1506, and
I. T. 1092.

- ΧΟ. *κἀγὼ κατόκτιρ', ὡς γυναῖκα δεῖ ξένην*
ὑπὲρ τυράννων συμφορᾶς καταστένειν. 470
- ΜΕ. *ἀδελφέ, δός μοι δεξιᾶς τῆς σῆς θιγέιν.*
- ΑΓΑ. *δίδωμι· σὸν γὰρ τὸ κράτος, ἄθλιος δ' ἐγώ.*
- ΜΕ. *Πέλοπα κατόμνυμ', ὃς πατὴρ τοῦμοῦ πατρὸς*
τοῦ σοῦ τ' ἐκλήθη, τὸν τεκόντα τ' Ἀτρεά, 475
ἧ μὴν ἐρεῖν σοι τὰπὸ καρδίας σαφῶς
καὶ μὴ 'πίτηδες μηδὲν ἀλλ' ὅσον φρονῶ.
ἐγὼ σ' ἀπ' ὅσων ἐκβαλόντ' ἰδὼν δάκρυ
ῶκτιρα καὐτὸς ἀνταφήκά σοι πάλιν
καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἐξαφίσταμαι λόγων,
οὐκ εἰς σὲ δεινός· εἶμι δ' οὔπερ εἶ σὺ νῦν· 480
καί σοι παραινῶ μήτ' ἀποκτείνειν τέκνα

that a *μ'* should have been inserted. Hartung rejects this verse, taking *γάμον* as acc. after *αἰά*. 470. If it were not for the quotation of *v.* 377 by Stobaeus I should believe that it and *v.* 403 and this *v.* 470 were all added by an interpolator (*οἷδ'* having been put for *τάδ'* at 403). Anyhow I think there must be some corruption here (see Ex. Notes). Perhaps we ought to read *ἀνδρῶν τυράννων συμφορᾶς*. 481. *τέκνον* PL, *τέκνα* Elmsley. A very likely mistake; since the next line ends in *ου* and the

469. *ὡς*] The sense shows this to be not *causal* ('since') but *limiting* ('in as far as'). Firmh. aptly quotes *Rhes.* 904 where *ὅσον* is used.

470. *ὑπὲρ τ. συμφορᾶς*] The simple *στένω* is properly intransitive, but *καταστένω* is always transitive, and it is very extraordinary to find it here with *ὑπέρ*. There is no special point in the *τυράννων* coming after *ξένην*. If for *ξένην* we had had some word meaning 'subject' it would have been in place, but now it is not.

471. It is not, as Firmhaber says, '*tout comme chez nous*', in token of reconciliation, but as part of the formality of swearing the oath that follows in *v.* 473, that Menelaus asks Ag. to let him take his hand.

472. *σὸν γὰρ τὸ κράτος*] *κράτος* *ἔχειν* is a common periphrasis in Euripides for *κρατεῖν*: here *σὸν γὰρ τὸ κράτος* = *κεκράτηκας* 'you have won, I give way, and I will agree to anything you wish'. Apparently he regarded Menelaus's re-

quest for his hand as a proposal to make a covenant with him.

476. *ἐπίτηδες*] The unusual significance of this word is made clear by the addition of *ἀλλ' ὅσον φρονῶ*. Unpremeditated expression of feeling is opposed to carefully calculated attempts to deceive. Menelaus 'protests too much'.

478. *ἀνταφήκα*] With this word is coupled *ἐξαφίσταμαι* and therefore to complete the sense of the former verb we must supply *τοὺς παλαιούς λόγους* from the genitives which complete the sense of the latter. (Vitelli wrongly supplies *δάκρυ*.) Hence *καὐτὸς* is *and of my own accord*, not *I myself too*.

480. *οὐκ εἰς σὲ δεινός*] Cp. *Bacchae* 856 *ἐκ τῶν ἀπειλῶν τῶν πρὶν, αἰσι δεινὸς ἦν*. The rest of the *v.* apparently means 'I will now go along with you' (—'where you are going') *i.e.* 'I will no longer try to go a different way—no longer oppose you'. Monk says it means 'I will place myself in your present situation'.

μήτ' ἀνθελέσθαι τοῦμόν. οὐ γὰρ ἔνδικον
 σὲ μὲν στενάζειν, τὰμὰ δ' ἠδέως ἔχειν,
 θηήσκειν τε τοὺς σοὺς, τοὺς δ' ἐμούςς ὄραν φάος. 485
 τί βούλομαι γάρ; οὐ γάμους ἐξαιρέτους
 ἄλλους λάβοιμ' ἂν, εἰ γάμων ἰμείρομαι;
 ἀλλ' ἀπολέσας ἀδελφόν, ὅν μ' ἤκιστ' ἔχρην,
 Ἐλένην ἔλωμαι, τὸ κακὸν ἀντὶ τάγαθοῦ;
 ἄφρων νέος τ' ἢ πρὶν· τὰ πράγματ' ἐγγύθεν
 σκοπῶν ἐσείδον οἶον ἦν κτείνειν τέκνα. 490
 ἄλλως τέ μ' ἔλεος τῆς ταλαιπώρου κόρης
 εἰσῆλθε, συγγένειαν ἐννοουμένην,
 ἢ τῶν ἐμῶν ἕκατι θύεσθαι γάμων
 μέλλει. τί δ' Ἐλένης παρθένῳ τῇ σῆ μέτα;
 ἴτω στρατεία διαλυθεῖς' ἐξ Αὐλίδος. 495
 σὺ δ' ὄμμα παῦσαι δακρῦοις τέγγων τὸ σόν,
 ἀδελφέ, κἀμὲ παρακαλῶν εἰς δάκρυα.

three previous and the two following *vv.* all end in *v*: again, *τέκνα* is better than *τέκνον* for the reason that the latter would make the following *τοῦμόν* ambiguous. Elmsley also proposed *ἀποκτείναι* for *ἀποκτείνειν* without sufficient reason I think. 484. This line seems to me very much like an interpolation. There was no question of the *death* of any one belonging to Menelaus. 489. *τὰ πράγματα* δ' PL, *τὸ πρᾶγμα* δ' Barnes. The MSS. δ' is evidently an (unmetrical) attempt to get rid of an asyndeton (one of the commonest sources of wilful errors in MSS.). Lenting would put a stop before, but not after *πρὶν*, and take it as a conjunction (*until*) with *ἐσείδον*. At first sight this seems plausible, but it makes very poor sense. I much prefer the asyndeton as I have printed it, and next to this Barnes' *τὸ πρᾶγμα* δ'. (For the asyndeton see *vv.* 500 ff.) 492. *ἐννοουμένην* P, *ἐννοουμένην* L. 495. *στρατιά* PL, *στρατεία* Barnes. *διαλυθεῖς'* P, *διαλυσεῖς'* L, corrected by an early hand to *διαλυθεῖς'*. 496. *τέγγων* P, *τέγγων* L. 498.

482. μήτ' ἀνθελέσθαι τοῦμόν] 'nor to put my interests in the place of your own'. Paley notices that Hesych. gives *προκρίναι* as an equivalent for *ἀνθελέσθαι*.

486. εἰ] with the ind. pres. here means 'if, as you say', referring to *v.* 382, where Ag. had suggested that what Men. wanted was perhaps a good wife. Cf. the *χρηστά λέκτρα* there with the *γάμοι ἐξαιρέτοι* here.

489. νέος] 'impatient'. For ἢ cf. Rutherford *Νεῖον Πηργην.* p. 242 ff.

491. ἄλλως τε] is (I think) used elliptically for *ἄλλως τε καὶ*, just as *ἄλλο τι* is sometimes used for *ἄλλο τι ἢ* in questions: it means 'above all'.

492. ἐννοουμένην] Euripides always uses the middle tenses or the 1st aor. pass. of this verb. For the change of case cf. *Medea* 57. Vitelli remarks that though the change from the dat. to the acc. is common, these two passages contain the only instances of the converse change (*Soph. O. T.* 350 ff. not being precisely analogous).

εἰ δέ τι κόρης σῆς θεσφάτων μέτεστί σοι,
 μὴ ἴμοι μετέστω· σοὶ νέμω τοῦμόν μέρος.
 ἀλλ' εἰς μεταβολὰς ἦλθον ἀπὸ δεινῶν λόγων. 500
 εἰκὸς πέπονθα· τὸν ὁμόθεν πεφυκότα
 στέργων μετέπεσον. ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ τόδε,
 τρόποισι χρῆσθαι τοῖσι βελτίστοις ἀεὶ.

ΧΟ. γενναῖ' ἔλεξας Ταντάλῳ τε τῷ Διὸς

This *v.* I have left as it is in the MSS. Markland proposed *μοι* for *σοι*: Weil not only adopted this change (as have several other editors), but transposed *μοι* and *σῆς*. (See Explanatory Notes.) 499. *μή μοι* PL, *μή μοι* Herm. 500. *ἀλλ' εἰς* PL, *εἰ δ' ἐς* Herm. (*Orusc.*). 502 f. *τρόποι* with *αι* written over the *οι* probably by the first hand PL. (Wilamowitz is wrong about P), *τοιοῖδε* P, *τοιαιδε* with an *οι* written over the *αι* by the first hand L (in P the *οι* had a circumflex, corrected to an acute), in L *γνω.* (*γνώμη*) is written at the side. The *χρῆσθαι τοῖσι βελτίστοις* as it stands (whether *βελτίστοις* be taken as masc. or neut.) seems a very meagre expression. The variation in the MSS. points, as Wilamowitz says, to two readings—*τρόποι τοιοῖδε* and *τροπαὶ τοιαῖδε*—in the original MSS. from which P and L were copied. It seems to me likely that the last word of *v.* 502 was obliterated early and that the original reading of the two *vv.* may have been *ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ τόδε, | τρόποισι χρῆσθαι τοῖσι βελτίστοις ἀεὶ.*—In L a *τό* is written by an early hand over (the *χρ* of) *χρῆσθαι*. 504 f. To get rid of the asyndeton Pierson proposed

498 f. In these two lines Menelaus is, I think, playing again on the string which he touched in *v.* 495. While ostensibly urging his brother to spare his daughter's life he cunningly suggests to Agamemnon's mind just those consequences of such a course which he knew he could not bear to think of. At *v.* 495 it is the dissolution of the armament which had chosen him its chief and looked to him to lead it to glory. Here he says in effect: 'If you have anything to gain by doing as the oracle bids you that is another matter; I at all events do not wish to be the gainer by such a sacrifice'. In the words *σοὶ νέμω τοῦμόν μέρος* he says the same thing over again, rather fancifully pursuing the idea of representing his claim as a kind of commercial obligation: 'all *my* interest I make over to *you*'.

500. *ἀλλά*] 'the fact is'.—In the word *δεινῶν* especially, and in the whole sentence there seems to be a reference to the *δεινός* in *v.* 480 where Menelaus is

saying that he has changed his tone and his language. Between the three sentences of which this is the first there is the same forcible asyndeton that was noticed in the critical note on *v.* 489. Weil takes *ἀλλά*, as at *Hipp.* 966 and 1013, as introducing an imaginary objection and puts a ; at the end of the *v.* On the whole I think this less likely: the remark is more natural as a statement of Men. than as an (imaginary) objection made by his brother.

501. *εἰκὸς πέπονθα*] This use of *εἰκός* is unusual: elsewhere it is the plural *εἰκότα* that is so used, and the singular *εἰκός* is only used for *εἰκός ἐστι*.

502. *στέργων μετέπεσον*] The context makes the sense of the participle quite clear. It does not bear to the finite verb the relation which a participle bears to *παύομαι* or *λήγω*, but has the force of a participle with *ἄρχομαι*, *φθάνω* and *τυγχάνω*. *μεταπίπτω* is not used by Sophocles or Aeschylus.

- πρέποντα· προγόνους οὐ κατασχύνεις σέθεν. 505
- ΑΓΑ. αἰνῶ σε, Μενέλεως, ὅτι παρὰ γνώμην ἐμήν
ὑπέθηκας ὀρθῶς τοὺς λόγους σοῦ τ' ἀξίως.
- [ΜΕ. παραχῆ γ' ἀδελφῶν γε δι' ἔρωτα γίγνεται
πλεονεξίαν τε δωμάτων· ἀπέπτυσα
τοιάνδε συγγένειαν ἀλλήλων πικράν. 510
- ΑΓΑ.] ἀλλ' ἤκομεν γὰρ εἰς ἀναγκαίας τύχας,
θυγατρὸς αἱματηρὸν ἐκπράξαι φόνον.
- ΜΕ. πῶς; τίς δ' ἀναγκάσει σε τήν γε σὴν κτανεῖν;
- ΑΓΑ. ἅπας Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος στρατεύματος.
- ΜΕ. οὐκ, ἦν νιν Ἄργος ἔξαποστείλῃς πάλιν. 515

γενναῖα λέξας, Herm. προγόνους δ'. 505. κατασχύνεις P, κατασχύνεις L.
506. Μενέλαος PL, Μενέλεως Barnes. (If Μενέλα', as Musgr. and an earlier
anonymous critic suggested, was the original, it would be harder to explain how
Μενέλαος came in.) 508—510. The MSS. give these *vv.* to Menelaus and 511
and 512 to Ag. Hermann would give all the *vv.* to Ag. παραχῆ γ' PL, παραχῆ δ'
Herm. γε δι' ἔρωτα PL (in P the ' over the ι are added by a later hand just
as they are in v. 518 between *μαντεύματ'* and Ἄργείων, while in L there is the mark
of an erasure before the ἔρωτα and an early hand has written *τις* over the line between
ἀδελφῶν and δι'), διὰ τ' ἔρωτα Dobree. ἀλλήλων PL, ἀλλήλου Markland. The
majority of editors have, as I think, rightly followed Boeckh in rejecting the three *vv.*
as an interpolation. Burges further suggested that the interpolator meant them
to be spoken by the chorus. (They give us two *vv.* beginning with anapaests
following on 507 which also so begins: (to say nothing of the dactyl in the 3rd
foot) they contain two words—*παραχῆ* and *πλεονεξία*—which it is not likely Euripides
would have used—especially close together: and above all they form an irrelevant
interruption in a pointed and coherent speech.) 513. In both P and L the *σε*
is inserted above by an early hand. (Vitelli says *m*² in L, I think *p. m.* in P.) Such
a fact as this is a decided indication that the two MSS. were copied from the same
original. Apparently the original left the *σε* out—a very likely omission after *-σει*.
One Paris copy of L has *ἀναγκάσειε*: evidently this copy was made before the *σε* was
inserted. 515. ἦν (not ἦν) L, in P the letter between the ἦ and the νιν is in an
erasure and a small blot: together the two letters look like *ι*, and a *ν* is written

506. αἰνῶ σε] Cf. on v. 440. The
Scholiast on Ar. *Ran.* 509 interprets
ἐπαιῶ by οὐ βούλομαι εἰσελθεῖν, and at v.
513 on πάνυ καλῶς says: *παραιτουμένοι οἱ*
παλαιοὶ ἔλεγον 'κάλλιστ' ἐπαιῶ', καὶ
'ἐπήρουν'.

507. ὑπέθηκας κ.τ.λ.] 'you have made
a suggestion that is honest, and worthy
of yourself'. Weil thinks *ὑπ-* has here
the meaning *substitute*, i.e. put in the place
of the former language.

512. ἐκπράξαι] For this infin. see
note on v. 403. Here however the infin.
has rather more support in the previous
words, which in sense are equivalent to
ἀνάγκη ἐστί.

515. It is remarkable that the earlier
editors thought that νιν referred to the
Greek army. Markland saw that as all the
Greek force had not come from Argos they
would not have to go back there (and so
proposed *οἴκους* for Ἄργος). Bremi point-

- ΑΓΑ. λάθοιμι τοῦτ' ἄν. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖν' οὐ λήσομεν.
 ΜΕ. τὸ ποῖον; οὔτοι χρῆ λίαν ταρβεῖν ὄχλον.
 ΑΓΑ. Κάλχας ἐρεῖ μαντεύματ' Ἀργείων στρατῶ.
 ΜΕ. οὐκ, ἦν θάνη γε πρόσθε· τοῦτο δ' εὐμαρές.
 [ΑΓΑ. τὸ μαντικὸν πᾶν σπέρμα φιλότιμον κακόν.
 ΜΕ. κοῦδέν γ' ἄχρηστον οὐδὲ χρήσιμον παρόν.]
 ΑΓΑ. ἐκεῖνο δ' οὐ δέδοικας οὐμ' ἐσέρχεται;

520

above it.—*eis* "Αργος ἀποστελεῖς PL, a γ' being inserted between the words in both, certainly not by the first hand. ἀποστελεῖς Markland. The early editions all neglect the ἦν of the MSS. and read εἰ...ἀποστελεῖς. The γ' has no authority (in P I think it was inserted by Musurus). Kirchhoff, in his ed. of 1855, suggests ἦν νιν "Αργος ἐξαποστελεῖς. (I had conjectured εἰσαποστελεῖς—and that *eis* had been by mistake put before "Αργος by someone who did not see that it belonged to the verb. I now think Kirchhoff's the more likely word, and that the *eis* was originally an interlinear explanation which got by mistake into the text and necessitated the expulsion of the ἐξ-). As to the -στελεῖς it is easier to believe that that was changed to -στελεῖς than that εἰ was changed to ἦν. Perhaps the hand that wrote -στελεῖς was the same that wrote the ^ over the last syllable of καταισχύεις in L. 516. λήσομεν PL (αι was added by a late hand in P who did not see or did not understand the abbreviation for εν). 520 and 521. I think it is so manifest that these two lines are an interpolation that it is useless to record the various emendations which they have themselves undergone or have caused to be made in the previous line. Hartung and Vitz both mark them as spurious. (I had independently come to the same conclusion. They look to me like a quotation from a comic poet who is parodying Soph. *Ani.* 1055.—ἀχρηστον οὐδὲ χρήσιμον like our 'good or bad'.) 522. ὁ μ' P, ὅτι μ' L (ὅτι being written by an early hand, in an erasure which possibly held two

ed out that that idea was inconsistent also with λάθοιμι τοῦτ' ἄν, and that νιν must refer to Iphigeneia.

517. οὔτοι κ.τ.λ.] Such a suggestion as this would do more, as Menelaus doubtless knew, to keep alive in Agamemnon the fear of the multitude than to allay it. It is moreover a sentiment quite in keeping with the character of the typical Spartan which Euripides gives to Menelaus. (Cf. above on *vv.* 498 ff.)

519. This cold-blooded suggestion has to some commentators seemed too shocking to be allowed to stand. It should be remembered though that it is Menelaus who makes it, and Euripides's Menelaus was 'capable de tout'. Also as Hartung says, as somebody had to die it was

better that it should be Calchas than Iphigeneia. At *v.* 533 of the *I. T.* Iph. expresses great joy at the news of Calchas's death.

520. For this use of σπέρμα cp. Eur. *fr.* 1001 ἀεὶ ποτ' ἐστὶ σπέρμα κηρύκων λάλον, and *Hec.* 254: below in *v.* 524 it is used in a different sense.—For the general sense of the *v.* cf. *Hipp.* 1059, *Ion* 374 ff., *Hel.* 744 ff., *El.* 400, *Phoen.* 772, *fr.* 793.

522 f. With these two *vv.* Monk compares *I. T.* 657 f.—'two instances, among a multitude, of that studied or affected simplicity of sentiment in Euripides, which was a constant topic of censure and ridicule among his rivals and detractors'.

ΜΕ. ὄν μὴ σὺ φράξεις, πῶς ὑπολάβοιμ' ἂν λόγον;

ΑΓΑ. τὸ Σισύφειον σπέρμα πάντ' οἶδεν τάδε.

ΜΕ. οὐκ ἔστ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ὃ τι σὲ καμὲ πημανεῖ. 525

ΑΓΑ. ποικίλος αἰὲ πέφυκε τοῦ τ' ὄχλου μέτα.

ΜΕ. φιλοτιμία μὲν ἐνέχεται, δεινῷ κακῷ.

* * * * *

[ΑΓΑ. οὐκοῦν δόκει νιν στάντ' ἐν Ἀργείοις μέσοις

letters), οὐμ' Markland. εἰσ- PL, ἐσ- Wunder. 523. ὑπολαβοιμεν PL, ὑπολάβοιμ' ἂν Markland. 524. εἶδε P (a later hand—possibly that of Musurus—has written an ο over the first ε and added a ν to the second), εἶδεν L. 526. τοῦ γ' PL, τοῦ τ' Reiske. Monk retained the γ' and Matthiae was inclined to do so. I have adopted τ' because I think that, one of the points in Menelaus' spirited and pointed expression of contempt being that they are *τινω* and Od. only one, Ag. here answers 'yes, but he has the multitude with him'. If the γ' is retained it would mean 'and the reason of it is that'. Bothe (who also keeps the γ') compares *Hee.* 254 ff. 527. ἐνέχεται PL. This word (which is very prosaic and not quite apt here in its classical use) I conjecture to have been a marginal interpretation of (possibly) ἄρχεται. *sv.* 528—542. Dindorf pronounces the whole of this passage an interpolation, but he has not I believe been supported in this view by any other commentators. An examination of the passage reveals the following facts: (1) οὐκοῦν δόκει involves a use of οὐκοῦν (*γματοῦνται*) which is by many (and I believe rightly) regarded as inadmissible for tragedy and even for Attic prose of that period. (2) *κᾶτα ψεύδομαι* breaks Porson's rule about the spondee in the fifth foot. (3) The *ὅς* in the next line is loose: from its position it should properly refer to Calchas, but it evidently is meant to refer to Odysseus. (4) It should be noticed that at *v.* 515 Ag. assumes that he has got so far as to send Iphigeneia home, and then goes on to say what he will have to fear from Calchas afterwards, and then (at *v.* 522 ff.) what he has to fear from Odysseus, supposing Calchas has been got rid of. At *v.* 532 f. however he talks as if Iph. were still at Aulis. (This inconsistency has not, I think, been noticed before.) (5) It is outrageous to suppose that the army of Greeks (for Ἀργείοις *v.* 532 need not be pressed to mean literally only Agamemnon's own people of Argos) who had assembled to avenge the wrongs of Menelaus should, when balked of their purpose, turn on him and his brother, slay them, or pursue them to Argos and then deal with it as they had hoped to deal with the city of the barbarians which they meant to attack. (6) Further suspicious words and phrases are ἠπόρημαι (*ἄνθρωπος ἠπορημένος* in an anonymous comic writer: Meineke 353) in 537, the weak *τάδε* at the end of the line after *τὰ νῦν*: the doubtful ὅπως ἂν after φύλαξον for ὅπως (followed in the next *v.* by *πρὶν* c. subj. *without ἂν*), the use of *ελαχίστοις* in the sense of *fewest*, and the unusual phrase *σιγῆν φυλάσσετε* in *v.* 542. (7) Lastly it must be remembered that the reference to Clytaemnestra's presence in the camp (*sv.* 538 ff.) is inconsistent with the view expressed above on *sv.* 413 ff. that Ag. knows nothing of the arrival of his wife and daughter until somewhere about *v.* 640. For all these reasons I decidedly

527. δεινῷ κακῷ] Cf. Plat. *Rep.* 347 B ἢ οὐκ οἶσθα, ὅτι τὸ φιλότιμόν τε καὶ φιλόργυρον εἶναι ὄνειδος λέγεται τε καὶ ἔστιν;

We hear a good deal about *φιλοτιμία* in this play.

λέξεν ἃ Κάλχας θέσφατ' ἐξηγήσατο,
 κᾶμ' ὡς ὑπέστην θῦμα, κᾶτα ψεύδομαι, 530
 Ἄρτεμιδι θύσειν' ὃς ξυναρπάσας στρατόν,
 σὲ κᾶμ' ἀποκτείναντας Ἄργείους κόρη
 σφάξαι κελεύσει. κᾶν πρὸς Ἄργος ἐκφύγω,
 ἐλθόντες αὐτοῖς τείχεσιν Κυκλωπίους
 ξυναρπάσουσι καὶ κατασκάψουσι γῆν. 535
 τοιαῦτα τὰμὰ πῆματ'. ὦ τάλας ἐγώ,
 ὡς ἠπόρημαι πρὸς θεῶν τὰ νῦν τάδε.
 ἔν μοι φύλαξον, Μενέλεως, ἀνὰ στρατόν
 ἐλθόν, ὅπως ἂν μὴ Κλυταιμνήστρα τάδε
 μάθῃ, πρὶν Ἄιδῃ παῖδ' ἐμὴν προσθῶ λαβών,
 ὡς ἐπ' ἐλαχίστοις δακρῦοις πρᾶσσω κακῶς. 540
 ὑμεῖς τε σιγῆν, ὦ ξένοι, φυλάσσετε.]

ΣΤΑΣΙΜΟΝ Δ'.

XO. μάκαρες οὐ μετρίας θεοῦ

στρ.

agree with Dindorf in regarding the present passage (528—542) as an interpolation. At the same time I do not think that *v.* 527 immediately preceded the first stasimon (543 ff.), and therefore I conclude that a passage of a few lines spoken by Ag. has been lost here. I could believe that *v.* 536 formed part of this passage. It is even possible that *vv.* 528 f. (as emended by Musgrave) were also part of this passage. (See also below in Ex. Notes on *v.* 538.)

528. οὐκοῦν δοκεῖ PL, οὐκουν δοκεῖς (as a question) Musgrave. νῦν P (with δὴ written over it by an early hand), νῦν L (and so Canter who only knew the reading νῦν). 531. ὃς PL, οἷς Tyrwhitt, οὐ Musgrave, taking the sent. as a question. 534. τείχεσι PL, with ν added by a later hand in P and an early one in L.—κυκλωπέοις PL, corrected by an early hand in P to κυκλωπίοις.

535. συναρπάσουσι PL, ἀνασπάσουσι or ἀναρπάσουσι Markland. 541. χῶς ἐπ' ὀλιγίστοις Herwerden. 543. By the side in P is written *χοριαμβικὰ στρ. κῶλων ιε'*, and also *ἀντισπαστικὰ ἰωνικὰ χοριαμβικὰ*

530 f. *θύσειν*] depends on *ὑπέστην* only, and not on the parenthetical *ψεύδομαι*. For *κᾶτα ψεύδομαι* cp. Xen. *Mem.* I, 1, 5 *προαγορεύων ὡς ὑπὸ θεοῦ φαινόμενα κᾶτα ψευδόμενος*.

535. *γῆν*] is used here in the sense of *πόλιν* as at *Tro.* 868: cp. also on *v.* 1070 below (some emendation of *συναρπάσουσι* is necessary).

538 ff. It is not at all clear how Menelaus when he went among the Greek soldiers could prevent Clytaemnestra's hearing of her husband's plan to

sacrifice her daughter. The army knew nothing of it as yet.

541. As inadequate a consideration to conclude with as *πρᾶσσω κακῶς* is an inadequate expression for his contemplated act.

First Stasimon *vv.* 543—589. Like the two subsequent stasima (and the Parodos) it consists of a strophe, an anti-strophe, and an epode, and, as in them, the metre is logaoedic. (See scheme at the end of the book.) The subject of the strophe and epode is 'Love the De-

μετά τε σωφροσύνας μετέ-
σχον λέκτρων Ἀφροδίτας, 545
γαλανεία χρησάμενοι
μανιάδων οἴστρων, ὅθι δὴ
δίδυμ' Ἔρως ὁ χρυσοκόμας
τόξ' ἐντέλειται χαρίτων,
τὸ μὲν ἐπ' εὐαίωσι πότμῳ, 550
τὸ δ' ἐπὶ συγχύσει βιοτᾶς.
ἀπενέπω νιν ἀμετέρων,

ἀναπαιστικά λαμβικά.—Over μάκαρες in L an early hand has written εἰσίν. 545. λέκτρων PL, θέλεκτρων Nauck. It is mainly on account of the support given to λέκτρων by the θαλάμων in 553 that I hesitate to adopt Nauck's very taking conjecture. 547. μαινόμεν' PL, μαινομένων Reiske, μαινολῶν Nauck, μανιάδων Wecklein. μαινομένων was possibly written as an explanation of μανιάδων: then the ων, written above this and the next word in an abbreviation, was by mistake only written once, hence μαινόμεν'.—ὅθι P, ὅθι L. 548. ὁ χρυσοκόμας ἔρως PL, a later hand in P has crossed out the ἔρως and put it in before ὁ, and in L α is written over ἔρως and β over ὁ χρ. 550. πότμῳ PL, τύχα Athenaeus (see Introduction p. xix). 552. ἀπενέπων, corrected by an early hand to ἀπενέπω PL, only in P

stroyer'; while the antistrophe describes the temper and training necessary to counteract the baneful influence. For the general tenour cp. *Merch. of Venice* 3, 2, 111, and *Andromache* *vv.* 274 ff., (where the phrase σύγχυσον βίου recalls the ἐπὶ συγχύσει βιοτᾶς of *v.* 551), and the 2nd stasimon of the *Medea* (*vv.* 627 ff.). Firmhaber also compares *Hipp.* 443 and 529 and Fragments 505 and 670.

544. μετά τε] The τε shows that we must not take μετρίας θεοῦ as governed by μετέσχον but by μετά. See note on 1085 f. below.

545. μετέσχον λέκτρων Ἀ.] 'Enter Love's bonds'. λέκτρα is used as an abstract name for *union* or *wedlock* as well as in the concrete sense of *wife* as above at *v.* 382. Cf. *Fr.* 505 μετρίων λέκτρων, μετρίων δὲ γάμων μετὰ σωφροσύνης κύρσαι θνητοῖσιν ἄριστον, where it may be taken either way.

547. ὅθι δὴ] 'Herein', ὅθι for οὗ is found only in the lyric parts of tragedy. οὗ δὴ occurs at *I. T.* 320 in a

temporal sense. Here, like οὗ at *Soph. Phil.* 1049, and *Soph. El.* 1259, ὅθι is used of *circumstances*. Cf. our colloquial 'that's where it is'.

549. ἐντέλειται] The middle is extraordinary, but is supported by the above-mentioned quotation in Athenaeus, by *Xen. Cyr.* 4, 1, 3, where τόξα ἐντελευσθαι and ἀνατεταμένος τὴν μάχαιραν occur, by *τενεσθαι τόξον* which is quoted from *Ar. Rhod.* 2, 1043, by the common Epic τόξα τανυσάμενος, also by a passage in Alexander Noumenius (Walz *Rhet.* 9, 271, 16 ἔρωτα παρῆναι τόξα μὲν ἐντελευμένους βέλη δὲ ἐφαρμόττοντας—possibly a reference to this passage, and by *Ar. Nub.* 968.

550. ἐπὶ] c. dat. not, as Paley, of the object shot at, but of the *object* or *result* of the shooting. Vitelli cps. ἐπὶ λῶβῳ at *Soph. Ant.* 792.

552. νιν] Weil and Vitelli take this to refer to (the second) τόξον, but in the face of the very scanty authority for νιν = αὐτό in tragedy (*Aesch. Cho.* 542: at

Κύπρι καλλίστα, θαλάμων.
 εἴη δέ μοι μετρία μὲν
 χάρις, πόθοι δ' ὕσιοι,
 καὶ μετέχοιμι τᾶς Ἀφροδί-
 τας, πολλὰν δ' ἀποθείμαν.

555

διάφοροι δὲ φύσεις βροτῶν,
 διάφοροι δὲ τρόποι· τὸ δ' ὀρ-
 θῶς ἐσθλὸν σαφὲς αἰεί·
 τροφαί θ' αἱ παιδευόμεναι
 μέγα φέρουσ' εἰς τὰν ἀρετάν·

ἀντ.

560

the original letters are discernible, in L they have been erased. 553. ὦ Κύπρι P, in L the ὦ has been erased. 557. τ' PL, δ' Reiske. 559 f. διάτροποι δὲ τρόποι· ὁ δ' ὀρθῶς PL, διάφοροι Hoepfner, τρόποι is mentioned as a var. lect. by Barnes, but he does not give its source; whoever read τρόποι must have also read the following words as τὸ δ' ὀρθῶς, as Musgrave (?) and Hermann afterwards corrected them, unless like Firnhaber he quite disregarded metrical rules. διάτροποι is manifestly a vox nihili. I have adopted the above mentioned corrections. ο for ω is a common mistake. It occurs (as Monk says), at v. 610 of *I. T.* in this same word in both P and L, where L has an alternative ὀρθῶς. αἰεί PL, corrected in P to αἰί. 561. παιδευόμεναι corr. (by p. m.) to παιδευόμεναι P. 562. εἰς τὰν

Soph. *Trach.* 145 νω is possibly corrupt, and at best refers to a person—τὸ νέαςον) it is best to refer it to "Ἐρως: i.e. the wrong sort of Love.

555. χάρις] of the charm exerted on, πόθοι of the love felt for, another. It has been thought that a passage in Plut. *De tuend. san.* p. 132 B (πρὸς δὲ τὸν οἶνον, ὅπερ Εὐριπίδης πρὸς τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, διαλεκτέον 'εἴη μοι, μέτριον δὲ πως [Matt. δέπας] εἴη, μὴδ' ἀπολείπεις') refers directly to this passage. If so it is not a quotation, but an adaptation of the general sense of the poet's words to the subject of wine. Most probably, though, it is a quotation from a lost play.

556 f. The δέ in v. 557 corresponds to the μὲν in v. 554, and the emphasis thus given to the antithesis between μετρία and πολλὰν, and the position of the latter word, entitle us to supply μετρίας in sense with Ἀφροδίτας in v. 556. If we do not the μετέχοιμι τᾶς Ἀ. is very

tame.

v. 558—567. 'One man is unlike another, in nature and also in manners, but true goodness never faileth. The nurture of the teacher also is a mighty aid to virtue: for wisdom brings modesty, and the feeling which discerns the right has an all-transforming charm. If that be present, fame crowns life with never-fading glory.'

560. It is possible that σαφὲς here means only *clearly discernible*, but I think it more likely that Euripides used it in the sense of *undoubted*—i.e. of *undoubted value*. It is a word full of meaning. Fix and Le Bas translate it here 'un trésor assuré'.

v. 561 ff. Cp. *Hec.* 600 ff. ἔχει γὰρ τοῖ τι καὶ τὸ θερεθῆναι καλῶς διδάξω ἐσθλοῦ· τοῦτο δ' ἦν τις εὖ μάθη, οἶδεν τό γ' αἰσχρόν, κανόνι τοῦ καλοῦ μετρώων. Just before (in v. 599) τροφαί is used in the same sense as in our present passage.

τό τε γὰρ αἰδεῖσθαι σοφία,
 πᾶν τ' ἐξαλλάσσουσαν ἔχει
 χάριν ὑπὸ γνώμας ἐσορᾶν
 τὸ δέον, ἔνθα δόξα φέρει
 κλέος ἀγήρατον βιοτᾶ.
 μέγα τι θηρεύειν ἀρετάν,
 γυναίξι μὲν κατὰ Κύπριν,
 κρυπτάν τ', ἐν ἀνδράσι δ' αὖ
 κόσμος ἐνὼν ὁ μυριοπλη-
 θῆς μείζω πόλιν αὔξει.

565

570

ἔμολες, ᾧ Πάρις, ἦτε σύ γε

ἐπφοδός

written over *εἰς* followed by two or three indistinguishable letters P, *εἰς ἀρετάν* the σ being in an erasure large enough to have held three or four letters L. Probably the τάν was erased to make the *v.* correspond in metre with *μαυόμεν' οἰστρων ὄθι δῆ*, the MSS. reading in *v.* 547. The words *μέγα φέροισ'* *εἰς* look to me like a 'gloss'. Neither here nor at *v.* 547 do I think we have the right reading. 563. *σοφία* PL, *σοφία* Ald., corrected by Scaliger to *σοφία*. 564. τάν τ' PL, I read πᾶν τ' (Monk suggested πάντ'), I think every one must recognize that the article of the MS. is 'otiose' here. 566. δόξαν PL, δόξα Barnes. 567. βιοτάν PL, βιοτᾶ Markland. 569 f. κατὰ Κύπριν | κρυπτάν, ἐν ἀνδράσι δ' αὖ PL, in P a letter has been erased after κρυπτάν, and ἐν δ' ἀνδράσιν αὖ is corrected to ἐν ἀνδράσι δ' αὖ, L apparently had ἐν ἀνδράσι δ' αὖ at first: there is an erasure over the end of the ἐν, as if δ' had been inserted over the *v.* by a corrector and then erased. Following the indication of the erasure in P after κρυπτάν, I read κρυπτάν τ'. κατὰ Κύπριν κρυπτάν would certainly be used in a *bad* sense by Euripides, and it is too violent a twisting of plain words to interpret it "by keeping free from illicit love", see Exp. Notes. 571. ἐνδον PL, ἐνὼν Markland. If this emendation is correct, we may suppose first that ο was written for ω (as was often done) and that then, with or without the influence of the mistaken ἐν δ' in the previous line, the δ was added. *vv.* 573—589. I do not agree with Dindorf and Vitelli in thinking this epode spurious. It is however sadly mutilated. *ἔμολες* and *ἦτε σύγε* in *v.* 573 most commentators agree in regarding as hopeless. I am surprised that many think *ἐπράφης* (either after *εἴτε* or *ἐνθα*, or standing as the principal verb) can have the participles *συρίζων* and *πνέων* subordinated to it. I have therefore marked a lacuna after *μόσχοις*, taking *vv.* 576 ff. as part of a description of the scene

563. Here *ἔχει* must be supplied from the following *v.*

566. *ἐνθα*] *i.e.* in the man of right feeling.

569 ff. In the case of women virtue must be sought in the relations of love, and it is a hidden—what Milton calls a 'cloistered'—virtue, whereas a man's

honour and fame is won in many ways (*μυριοπληθῆς*), and has a larger sphere.

571. As an analogy to *κόσμος ἐνὼν* Markland quotes *ὅπταν καλοὶ ἐν ψυχῇ λόγοι ἐνόητες μηδὲν ποιῶσι πλέον* from Plato *Legg.* III. [689 B]; the verb is, in the finite moods, very common in Euripides.

βουκόλος ἀργενναῖς ἐτράφησ
 Ἰδαίαις παρὰ μόςχοις, 575

* * *

βάρβαρα συρίζων, Φρυγίων
 αὐλῶν Οὐλύμπον καλάμοις
 μιμήματα πνέων,
 εὐθηλοὶ δὲ τρέφοντο βόες,
 ὅτι σε κρίσις ἔμνη θεᾶν, 580

ἅ σ' Ἑλλάδα πέμπει
 ἐλεφαντοδέτων πάροι-
 θεν θρόνων, ὅθι τᾶς Ἑλένας
 ἐν ἀντωποῖς βλεφάροισιν
 ἔρωτα τ' ἔδωκας, 585
 ἔρωτι δ' αὐτὸς ἐπτοάθης.
 ὅθεν ἔρις ἔριν
 Ἑλλάδα σὺν δορὶ ναυσί τ' ἄγει
 εἰς πέργαμα Τροίας.

and circumstances of the appearance of the three goddesses. Several attempts have been made to re-write the beginning of the epode. 575. Ἰδαίαις PL, ?Ἰδας. 577. Ὀλύμπον PL, Οὐλύμπον Heath (the musician's name is written Οὐλ. at Ar. *Equ.* 9). 578. πλέων corrected by an early hand to πνέων and by a later (that of Musurus?) to πλέκων P, πνέων L, πνείων Dind. 580. ὅτι PL. This cannot be right as the text stands. ὅθι and ὅτε have often been proposed instead, but the belief that we have lost an important part of the sentence before v. 576 makes it impossible to decide what word is wanted here. ἔμνη PL, ἔμνη Herm. 582 f. πάροιθεν P, πάροιθε with an erasure after it L (the erasure is probably due to the fact that δόμων was first written in v. 582 and then erased and put in at the beginning of v. 583, where it is written in the margin, and [so Vitelli] in an erasure). δόμων PL, θρόνων Herm. (a very possible copier's mistake (cp. on v. 1174). The sense is much improved by θρόνων, more especially if ὅθι or οὐδ is adopted). ὅς PL, οὐδ Musgr. Weil writes ὅθι with no comment.—I think it very possible that we have lost a line or more between vv. 581 and 582. 585. ἔρωτα δέδωκας PL, ἔρωτα τ' ἔδωκας Blomfield. 587. In the margin L has the following scholium: τὴν ἐριστικὴν Ἑλλάδα· ὡς που καὶ πόλεμον ἔριν ἔφη τὸν ἐριστικόν. The meaning of the first part of this scholium seems to be that *Greek strife* is the same as *angry Greece* (it seems better to suppose the scholiast knew that Ἑλλάδα could be used as an adj.): the latter part is an explanation of ἔρις as used for πόλεμος. 589. ἐς Τροίας

574. ἀργενναῖς] An Epic word for which the only other reference in tragedy is in a passage of Chaeremon quoted by Ath. 608 F. generally spoken of as a Mysian. Cp. Suidas s.v. Ὀλυμπος, though s.v. ξιναυλίαν he says O. taught in Phrygia.

576. Φρυγίων αὐλῶν] This amounts to calling Olympus a Phrygian: he is 588 f. The hiatus between ἄγει and εἰς is remarkable.

[ὠὸ ἰὸ· μεγάλοι μεγάλων
 εὐδαιμονίαι· τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως
 ἴδεν· Ἴφιγένειαν ἀνασσαν ἐμὴν
 τὴν Τυνδαρέου τε Κλυταιμνήστραν,

590

πέργραμμα PL, eis πέργ. Tr. Blomfield. *vv.* 590—639. I agree with Dindorf that this whole passage is spurious. It is clear however that it is not all by one hand. It falls into various sections. *Vv.* 590—597 might, as far as the language goes, have been written by Euripides, but as Hennig (whose analysis of the whole passage seems to me one of the best parts of his book, though I do not agree with his defence of a good deal of the iambic parts of this passage) says, it is too coarse a bit of ‘irony’, to be Euripidean. It is inconceivable that Euripides should make the chorus, who knew the fate prepared for Iphigeneia, talk in such fulsome language as that of *vv.* 594—597 of her exceptional good fortune and blessedness. But the nonsense of the rest of the anapaests (to say nothing of the metre of *vv.* 602—604) condemns them as the work of a “miserrimus interpolator” (cf. Hennig pp. 80—83). Of the iambs too some are much worse than others. Porson was the first to attack any part of them (*Misc. Crit.* p. 223) and he began near the end. Later commentators, from Matthiae onwards, have rejected more or less of the rest of the iambs. *E.g.* Nauck rejects all from 619—637, excepting *vv.* 633 and 634, Kirchoff does not even except these. It is evident that Clytaemnestra and Iphigeneia make their first appearance on the stage at the beginning of the second episodion, but I think that the anapaests with which the chorus would naturally greet their arrival were either left unwritten by Euripides or have been accidentally lost. In the beginning of the episodion it seems impossible that there should not have been some words of greeting spoken by Agamemnon to his wife, even if he did not give expression to the surprise with which he saw her. Such a passage as this can hardly be supposed to have been left unwritten by the poet. Either it has been accidentally lost or has been intentionally cut out by a διασκευαστής. The reasons for this excision may have been the desire to remove inconsistencies between this passage and the passage interpolated after *v.* 412, and the necessity of introducing some mention of the baby Orestes, who, as we above saw reason to believe, was another interpolation. The genuine look of *vv.* 633 and 634 (and also, I think, of *vv.* 631 and 632 which should follow them) inclines me to believe in an intentional reconstruction of the passage—these two couplets being selected patches of the old material. *Vv.* 607 and 608 have also an Euripidean sound and may likewise have formed part of the original scene, and have been spoken to Agamemnon. All the rest of the iambs and the anapaests from *v.* 598 to the end may well have been the work of the same rash hand. Special imperfections will be noticed on the separate lines. *v.* 590. In I μεγάλοι, which was first written in the line with ἰὸ ἰὸ and then erased, is in an erasure at the beginning of a fresh line. 592. εἶδεν PL. No editions seem to have had this reading, but curiously enough Matthiae introduces εἶδεν as a correction being, like Markland, under the impression that the first syllable of Ἴφιγένεια was short. No doubt the composer of these lines was not responsible for the ἐμὴν, which was very likely put in by the same metrical “improver” who altered ἴδεν to εἶδεν, and introduced the articles in *vv.* 597 and 600. 593. γε PL, τε Ald.

593. Τυνδαρέου] this Epic form occurs also at *El.* 117 and 989, both lyric passages, the latter, like the present, anapaestic. In the iambic parts of tragedy

ὡς ἐκ μεγάλων ἐβλαστήκασ'
 ἐπί τ' εὐμήκεις ἤκουσι τύχας. 595
 θεοί γ' οἱ κρείσσους οἷ τ' ὀλβοφόροι
 τοῖς οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι θνατῶν.]
 [στῶμεν, Χαλκίδος ἔκγονα θρέμματα,
 τὴν βασιλείαν δεξώμεθ' ὄχων
 ἄπο μὴ σφαλερῶς ἐπὶ γαίαν, 600
 ἀγανῶς δὲ χερσῶν μαλακῇ γνώμη,
 μὴ ταρβήσῃ νεωστί μοι μολδὸν
 κλεινὸν τέκνον Ἀγαμέμνωνος,
 μηδὲ θόρυβον μῆδ' ἔκπληξιν
 ταῖς Ἀργείαις 605
 ξεῖναι ξείναις παρέχωμεν.]

597. τῶν is inserted by an early hand in both P and L before θνατῶν.
 599. τήνδε P (the δε is scratched through and the accent altered by an early hand), τὴν (in an erasure) L. δεξώμεθα P, δεξόμεθα (the ο in an erasure and a note at the side inserted by an early hand in P and L before γαίαν. Heath was the first to eject it on metrical grounds. 603. τὸ inserted by an early hand before κλεινὸν PL. 606. ξείναις with an erasure before the ν and εἰ written as a correction P, ξείναισι with the final ι erased L. In L there is an erasure not filled up between the 1st ε and the

Eurip. uses the form Τυνδάρεως. At Aesch. Ag. 83 (anapaests) M gives the gen. Τυνδάρεω with a variant Τυνδαρέου.

595. εὐμήκεις τύχας] 'high estate'. See Jebb's note on Soph. Ant. 393 for μακρός as applied to ὄλβος and similar words. In all these instances, however, the noun has a far more positive meaning than τύχη. Perhaps the εὐ in the εὐμήκεις gives the necessary hint of a good meaning in the τύχας.

596. ὀλβοφόροι] For similar compounds cf. Hipp. 750 χθῶν ὀλβιόδωρος, Bacch. 419 ὀλβοδότειραν Εἰρήνην, and 572 (of a river) τὸν ὀλβοδόταν. The epithet here gracefully implies the wealth of which we are expecting to hear. They must be rich to be bounteous. This seems to me better than with many commentators (e.g. Musgrave and Weil) to take the -φόρος as in ἀλλοφόρος, μισθοφόρος to indicate the recipient.

598. στῶμεν] Hartung (Introd. pp.

72 f.) is of opinion that the 'homo pinguis et hebetissimi ingenii' who fabricated vv. 598—606, got his material out of vv. 613 ff. Certainly no better explanation can be given of this senseless στῶμεν, than that it is so due to the στήτε in v. 619.

ἔκγονα θρέμματα] ἔκγονος in tragedy is always a substantive (at Hel. 318 and 1647 ἐκγόνου and κόρης are in apposition). This phrase and the ἐνδότηω (for δότηω) in 617, and the ὡς ἂν (for ὡς) in 618, and the Νηρηΐδος in 624 reveal the versificator.

601 ff. It is questionable whether the 'versificator' knew what he meant by this line. It has about as much sense as the next two verses have metre. In v. 604 the second syllable of θόρυβον was meant by the writer to be long. In fact it is marked long in P, but not by the first hand: (so too the ι of νεωστί, by the same hand).

Ἐπεισόδιον β'.

- ΚΔ. [ὄρνιθα μὲν τόνδ' αἴσιον ποιούμεθα,
τὸ σόν τε χρηστὸν καὶ λόγων εὐφημίαν·
ἐλπίδα δ' ἔχω τιν' ὡς ἐπ' ἔσθλοῖσιν γάμοις
πάρεμι νυμφαγωγός. ἀλλ' ὄχημάτων 610
ἔξω πορεύεθ' ὡς φέρω φερνάς κόρη,
καὶ πέμπετ' εἰς μέλαθρον εὐλαβούμενοι.
σὺ δ', ὦ τέκνον μοι, λέιπε πωλικούς ὄχους,
ἄβρον τιθεῖσα κῶλον ἀσθενές θ' ἄμα.
ὕμεῖς δὲ νεανίαις νιν ἀγκάλαις ἔπι 615
δέξασθε καὶ πορεύσατ' ἔξ ὄχημάτων.
καὶ μοι χερός τις ἐνδότηω στηρίγματα,

χ of παρέχωμεν. 609. ἔσθλοῖσι P, ἔσθλοῖσιν (the ν being a subsequent addition by the first hand) L. 613. In L there is a stop (=a comma) after μοι: i.e. the writer took the phrase for a σχῆμα Κολοφώνιον. Cf. *Alc.* 313. 614. θ' ἄμα PL, χαμαί (with ἀσφαλῶς for ἀσθενές) Herm., ποδός Hennig (who takes ἄβρον adverbially), I think however that it is more like the 'versificator' as it stands:—the phrase ἄβρον τιθεῖσα κῶλον being modelled on ἄβ. πόδα τιθείς *Hel.* 1528, and ὠκὴν πόδα τιθείς *I. T.* 33, and the ἀσθενές θ' ἄμα being added to make up the verse. 615. νεανίδασιον P, νεανίδεσσιν (the εσ being a correction of an early hand for αι) L, νεάνιδες νιν Pierson (and Markland), νεανίαις νιν Lobeck. Though L. himself subsequently rejected this, I agree with Hennig in preferring it. It is supported by *Hel.* 1262 νεανίαις ὤμοισι, and also by Phot. *Lex.* νεανίαις· τολμηρούς. Though we can hardly dispense with an acc. the vocative is not absolutely

607 f. These two lines—especially the former one—are quite Euripidean, but the feebleness of the contrasted clause and the utter want of any contrast in the sense ('I take your kind words as a good omen *but* I am not without hopes that I am on a happy errand'), shows that they were not originally written in their present connexion. Indeed the peculiar position of the τε in v. 608 suggests that possibly even these two verses were themselves not originally neighbours.

610. The word νυμφαγωγός is not elsewhere found except in late Greek.

613. πωλικούς] Attention has by several commentators been called to the frequent repetition of this word in the passage. Wecklein associates with it the fact that also in the *Rhesus* this word is of frequent occurrence, as indicating a

common authorship.

615. It is extremely doubtful whether νεᾶ- in νεανίαις or its derivatives was ever scanned as one syllable. At *Ar. Vesp.* 1067 and 1069 Dind. is very likely right in reading νᾶν-. It is possible that at *Eur. I. T.* 647 we ought to scan νεανία as a trisyllable, but the reading of the earlier part of that v. is doubtful. It is curious that Pierson who leaves in his correction the anapaest here, actually introduces an anapaest at *Cyclops* 28 by reading νεανίαι for the MSS. νέα νέοι.

616. πορεύσατ' ἔξ ὄχημάτων] notice the weak repetition of this weak phrase from v. 610 f.

617. στηρίγματα] another suspicious word occurring only in late Greek elsewhere.

θάκουσ ἀπήνης ὡς ἂν ἐκλίπω καλῶσ.
 αἰ δ' εἰσ τὸ πρόσθεν στῆτε πωλικῶν ζυγῶν,
 φοβερὸν γὰρ ἀπαράμυθον ὄμμα πωλικόν· 620
 καὶ παῖδα τόνδε τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονοσ γόνον
 λάζυσθ', Ὀρέστην· ἔτι γὰρ ἔστι νῆπιοσ.
 τέκνον, καθεῦδεισ πωλικῶ δαμεῖσ ὄχῳ;
 ἔγειρ' ἀδελφῆσ ἐφ' ὑμέναιον εὐτυχῶσ·
 ἀνδρὸσ γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ κῆδοσ αὐτὸσ ἐσθλοὸσ ὄν 625
 λήψει, τὸ τῆσ Νηρηΐδοσ ἰσόθεον γέννοσ.
 ἐξῆσ κᾶθησο δεῦρὸ μου ποδοσ, τέκνον,
 πρὸσ μητέρ', Ἰφιγένεια, μακαρίαν δέ με

necessary, as the men addressed are the same as those addressed in *vv.* 610—612. 619. αἰ δ' PL, οἰ δ' Dobree, which would remove some absurdity. 623. θακεύεισ corrected by a late hand to καθεῦδεισ P, θακεύεισ L. 626. νηρηΐδοσ corrected to νηρηδοσ P, νηρηΐδοσ L (Milton suggested τὸ Νήρρωσ παιδοσ, Portus τὸ τῆσ Νηρηΐδοσ).

619. αἰ δ'] It would be difficult to find another instance of the article used, as οὔτοσ sometimes is, as a vocative, for the pron. of the 2nd person. The idea of the writer seems to have been that as ὁ δέ sometimes = οὔτοσ, it could stand, like it, as a vocative.

620. In both mss. this line is marked as a beauty (ὤρ. for ὠραίων)! It is just possible that, as Hermann (*Opusc.*) holds, φοβ. was meant to be taken as an adverb qualifying ἀπ. Others prefer to take φοβ. in the sense of 'timid', or as 'an object of terror'. Weil supplies ὄν with ἀπαρ. If ἀπαράμυθοσ is to be scanned as at Aesch. *P. V.* 185 we should have an anapaest in the 3rd foot—the second in the line.

622. ἔτι κ.τ.λ.] This repetition from *v.* 466 may be taken to mark both passages as the work of the interpolator who brought the Baby on to the scene.

623. δαμεῖσ] Weil translates 'assoupi', taking the word to be used in the sense of the Homeric μαλακῶ δεδημημένοι ἕπνω and modern phrases like 'succumbing to, overmastered by, sleep'. But for such phrases the mention of the sleep is necessary. It is more likely that the word was used only in the sense of *wearyed*,

worn out, i.e. in the sense of the κόπω δαμέντεσ of *Rhes.* 764.

624. ἔγειρ'] for ἐγείρω: very suspicious, in spite of Porson's note on *Or.* 288 (294). Both at *Or.* 294 and 799 synzesis of the final οὐ with a following vowel seems a less violent explanation than that which Porson gives. At *Hec.* 916 ff. where Porson takes καταπαύοσασ as = καταπαυσάμενοσ modern editors read θυσίαν not θυσίαν, as do four mss. out of the seven cited by Prinz. Here, I should believe in synzesis of ον if I thought that the passage had been written by a man who was scholar enough to be careful about the difference between active and middle. But it is doubtful whether the man who could write Νηρηΐδοσ (626) and ἐξῆσ μου ποδοσ for 'close to my feet' (in 627) would be careful to observe such a distinction.

628 ff. Certainly it is impossible to make this *v.* fit on in sense to the previous line. Hennig thinks something has been lost both before and after *v.* 628. I think πρὸσ μητέρ' is a conversational repetition of the ἐξῆσ μου ποδοσ such as the 'miserable' interpolator was quite capable of: also that he went on with δὸσ με μακαρίαν ξέναισι ταῖσδε in the sense of

- ξέναισι ταῖσδε πλησία σταθεῖσα δός,
καὶ δεῦρο δὴ πατέρα πρόσειπε σὸν φίλον.] 630
- ΚΛ. ὦ σέβας ἐμοὶ μέγιστον, Ἄγαμέμνων ἄναξ,
ἤκομεν, ἐφετμῶϊς οὐκ ἀπιστοῦσαι σέθεν. 633
- ΙΦ. ὦ μήτηρ, ὑποδραμοῦσά σ', ὀργισθῆϊς δὲ μή,
πρὸς στέρνα πατρὸς στέρνα τὰμὰ προσβαλῶ. 632
- [ἐγὼ δὲ βούλομαι τὰ σὰ στέρν', ὦ πάτερ,
ὑποδραμοῦσα προσβαλεῖν διὰ χρόνου.
ποθῶ γὰρ ὄμμα δὴ σόν. ὀργισθῆϊς δὲ μή.
ΚΛ. ἀλλ', ἂ τέκνον, χροή· φιλοπάτωρ δ' αἰεὶ ποτ' εἶ
μάλιστα παίδων τῶδ' ὄσους ἐγὼ ἔτεκον.] 635
- * * * * *
- ΙΦ. ὦ πάτερ, ἐσεῖδόν σ' ἀσμένη πολλῶ χρόνῳ. 640
- ΑΓΑ. καὶ γὰρ πατήρ σέ· τόδ' ἴσον ὑπὲρ ἀμφοῖν λέγεις.

Ald. put in παιδὸς after Νηρήδος). 631. σ' altered to γ' by an early hand in both P and L. 632. περιβαλῶ PL, προσβαλῶ Porson. 637. δὴ added above the line by a second (early) hand in both P and L. 638 f. Given by P and L to Ag., by Porson to Clytaemnestra. χρῶ corrected to χροή P, χρῆ L (so I conclude from Vitelli's silence), χρῶ is the Aldine reading. 639. τῶνδ' PL, τῶδ' Monk and Fix. τέκνον (corrected by a late hand to τέκον) P, τέκον L (Vitelli says nothing of the correction to τέκνον in L mentioned by Wil.-Moell.). Heath conjectured ἔτεκον

reddē me beatam his mulieribus (in the eyes of these women). At any rate what could be weaker than *v.* 630, with its *δεῦρο* repeated from *v.* 627?

640. At this line we begin to breathe again. Indeed the beauty of the scene which now follows is of itself a sufficient vindication of the labour which has been expended by many generations of students in unravelling the perplexities of this mutilated and interpolated tragedy. Agamemnon's thoughts have been laid bare in the previous scenes. The distraction and despair which his answers to his daughter half reveal to us heighten the exquisite sense of the girlish innocence which cannot interpret the signs of distress and thinks of nothing but the joy of the meeting.

In the absence of any definite announcement of Agamemnon's appearance on the

stage we can only conjecture about it. Bothe thinks that at *v.* 607 Clytaemnestra is already addressing her husband. Most editors however take *v.* 630 as an indication that Ag. has just come out. See above the critical notes on *vv.* 590 ff.

πολλῶ χρόνῳ] just the same dat. as τῶ χρόνῳ in *v.* 694 (cp. Kriiger II. 48, 2, 11). Klotz well compares also *Trō. 20* ὡς δεκασπόρῳ χρόνῳ ἀλόχους τε καὶ τέκν' εἰσιδῶσιν ἄσμενοι.

641. καὶ γάρ] The meanings of καὶ γάρ fall into two classes according as the first or second particle takes the prominent share of significance. Here the καὶ is prominent. Cp. e.g. *Soph. Phil.* 1121, *Xen. Cyr.* III. 1, 11. Usually the γάρ has the greater significance.—ἴσον not an adverb here, but used predicatively with λέγεις and qualifying τόδ'.

ΙΦ. χαῖρ'. εὐ δέ μ' ἀγαγὼν πρὸς σ' ἐποίησας, πάτερ.

ΑΓΑ. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως φῶ τοῦτο καὶ μὴ φῶ, τέκνον.

ΙΦ. ἕα·

ὡς οὐ βλέπεις εὐκηλον, ἄσμενός μ' ἰδών.

ΑΓΑ. πόλλ' ἀνδρὶ βασιλεῖ καὶ στρατηλάτῃ μέλει.

645

ΙΦ. παρ' ἐμοὶ γενοῦ νῦν, μὴ 'πὶ φροντίδας τρέπου.

ΑΓΑ. ἀλλ' εἰμὶ παρὰ σοὶ νῦν ἅπας κοῦκ ἄλλοθι.

ΙΦ. μέθες νυν ὄφρυν ὄμμα τ' ἔκτεινον φίλον.

ΑΓΑ. ἰδοῦ γέγηθά σ' ὡς γέγηθ' ὄρων, τέκνον.

ΙΦ. κάπειτα λειβεις δάκρυ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων σέθεν;

650

[ΑΓΑ. μακρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἡ 'πιούσ' ἀπουσία.

ΙΦ. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι φήσ, οὐκ οἶδα, φίλτατ' ἐμοὶ πάτερ.]

independently. 642. δ' ἐμ' altered by an early hand to δέ μ' P. *προ σ' ἐποίησας* P (a late hand accented the *ο* of the *προ* and added a *ς*), *πρὸς σ' ἐποίησας* L. 644. μ' εὐκηλον P, εὐκηλον L (Dobree ejected the μ' independently). Many modern edd. have followed Blomfield in writing *ἐκηλον* instead of *εὐκηλον* here. I cannot see sufficient reason for this. Both are Epic words of apparently the same meaning. Sophocles evidently preferred the former. Euripides uses the word nowhere else. In the one passage of Aeschylus in which it occurs the orig. MS. reading is *εὐκηλον*. 645. *στρατηλάτει* corrected (by a later hand in P) to *στρατηλάτῃ* PL (a merely mechanical slip, caused by the neighbouring words ending in *ει*. As the error occurs in both MSS. it must have stood in the MS. from which they were copied). 646. *παρ' ἐμοῦ* (sic) with the *παρ'* crossed through and *πρὸς* written over it by a late hand P, *παρ' ἐμοί* L (the *ἐμοῦ* in P was no doubt due to a similar error to that noticed in *v.* 645—due, *i.e.* to the *ου* in *γενοῦ*). *καὶ μὴ* PL, Barnes ejected the *καὶ*. 647. *εἰμι* corrected (by a late hand) to *εἰμὶ* P, *εἰμι* L. 648. *νυν* with *δη* written over it by a late hand (as an explanation) P, *νῦν* L. *ὄφρυν* corrected to *ὄφρυν* P, *ὄφρυν* L. 649. *γέγηθ' ἕως γέγηθά σ' ὄρων* PL, *γέγηθά σ' ὡς γέγηθ' ὄρων* Musgrave (an excellent emendation). 651. (See on *v.* 652.) One of the Paris copies of L has *ἡ 'πιτυχοῦσ'* for *ἡ 'πιούσ'*, a good instance of the way in which an explanation (and a wrong one) gets into the text. 652. This *v.* which I have given as it occurs in the MSS. is equally inexplicable as an answer to the preceding

644. *βλέπειν εὐκηλον est placido vultu esse*, ut [σεμνὸν καὶ] πεφροντικὸς βλέπειν *Alc.* 773, *δρμυὸν βλέπειν ar.* Aristoph.' *Matthiae*.

ἄσμενός μ' ἰδών] with a reference to the *ἐσεῖδόν σ' ἄσμενός* of *v.* 640 and Ag.'s answer in *v.* 641: 'for all your joy at seeing me'.

648. **ἔκτεινον**] cp. *Soph. fr.* 768 *ὡς ἀν Διὸς μέτωπον ἐκταθῆ χαρᾶ*.

φίλον] proleptic; not merely 'thy dear face': still less the weak Homeric use

for a possessive pronoun.

649. **γέγηθα ὡς γέγηθα**] A favourite idiom with Greek tragic writers. Its reticence always veils a sinister thought. Cf. *Med.* 1011 *ἡγγεῖλας οἶ' ἡγγεῖλας. I. T.* 575, *Tro.* 630, *El.* 289 and 1122, *Soph. O. T.* 1376, *O. C.* 273, and 336 (*εἶσ' οὐπερ εἶσ'*. *O. C.* 974 which Jebb on *v.* 273 compares is not parallel). Cp. the English 'we shall see what we shall see', where however the reticence is not generally sinister.

ΑΓΑ. *συνετὰ λέγουσα μᾶλλον εἰς οἶκτόν μ' ἄγεις.*

ΙΦ. *ἀσύνετα μὴν ἐροῦμεν, εἰ σέ γ' εὐφρανῶ.*

ΑΓΑ. *παπαί. τὸ σιγᾶν οὐ σθένω· σέ δ' ἤνεσα.*

655

ΙΦ. *μέν, ὦ πάτερ, κατ' οἶκον ἐπὶ τέκνοις σέθεν.*

ΑΓΑ. *θέλω γε τὸ μένειν· οὐχ ἐκὼν ἀλγύνομαι.*

and as the ground of the following verse. Ag.'s reference to his impending absence was perfectly intelligible; a profession that what he said was unintelligible could by no possibility have called forth from her father a comment on his daughter's sense (*συνετὰ λέγουσα*). Hence no emendations which merely get rid of the two anapaests in 652 will meet the difficulty, nor will the suggestions that we have here some marginal explanation or parallel passage incorporated by mistake in the text. Weil's *οὐκ οἰδᾶ θ' ὅτι φῆς, κοῖδα φίλτατ' ὦ πάτερ* may be said to furnish a riddle to which *v.* 653 is an answer, but it is itself inexplicable as an answer to *v.* 651. The course which presents far the least difficulty to my mind is to reject *both* 651 *and* 652. There is enough in the half playful expostulation of *v.* 650 to call for the father's comment and also the "δάκρυα" of 650 leads on to the *οἶκτον* in *v.* 653. I have therefore enclosed both *vv.* in brackets.

653. *μᾶλλον μ' εἰς οἶκτον* corrected by a late hand to *μᾶλλον εἰς οἶκτον μ' P*, *μᾶλλον εἰς οἶκτον μ' L* (as the *-ου εἰ-* and the *-ον μ'* are corrections in erasures, L had no doubt the same mistake originally).

654. *μέν P* (corrected by a late hand to *μέν γ'*), *νῦν L*. Both Monk and Nauck (independently) suggest *δῆτ'*. It is possible that the *δῆτ'* was changed to *νῦν* (enclitic) by some metrical corrector who thought that the *ν* of *ἀσύνετα* was long. This assumes that *νῦν* was the earlier reading and *μεν* a mistake of a copier. If *μεν* was the earlier reading I should suggest *μὴν*, comparing Soph. *O. C.* 28 *ἀλλ' ἔστι μὴν οἰκητός*, where the MSS. have *μέν* and an early corrector, as here, altered it to *μέν γ'*. In that case *νῦν* was a mistake for *μὴν*, the pronunciation helping.—I heartily agree with Hennig's indignant vindication of this beautiful answer from Dindorf's charge of spuriousness. A corrector of P changed *εἰ σε γ'* to *εἰ σέ γ'*.

655. *παπαί PL*. 657. *θέλω γε· τὸ θέλειν δ' PL*, *θέλω· τὸ δὲ θέλειν* (or *τὸ δ' ἐθέλειν*) Scaliger (so as to get rid of the *γε—δὲ* used like *μέν—δὲ*, which Monk and Hermann also condemn), *τὸ τελεῖν* Markland and Nauck, *τὸ θέλον δ'* Campbell, *θέλω· τὸ δ' ἔργον* Wecklein. I do not believe in the impossibility of the *γε—δὲ* but I think the *δὲ* looks like an addition. I conjecture that Eur. wrote *θέλω γε τὸ μένειν· οὐχ ἐκὼν ἀλγύνομαι* and that the *δ'* was only added after a transcriber had

653. This verse was perhaps half an 'aside'.

654. A striking instance of the indiscriminate way in which in tragedy the two numbers were used in the first person. Cf. *Tr.* 904 *ὡς οὐ δικάως, ἦν θάνω, θανούμεθα*.

655. *σέ δ' ἤνεσα*] ('you're a good girl', cf. *vv.* 440 and 506) is addressed to Iphigeneia but all before it in this *v.* is an 'aside'.

656. *ἐπὶ τέκνοις*] 'for your children'.

I cannot find anywhere another instance of *ἐπὶ* used quite as it is here with the dative of a person. It does not mean only *near* or *with*, as most take it. There must be some notion of *purpose* in it. I think the instance most nearly parallel is *Fr.* 324 *ἔρως γὰρ ἀργὸν κἀπὶ τοῖς ἀργοῖς ἔφν*: in both cases we might translate it by our 'for'. Cp. also *Ion* 480 *διαδέκτορα πλοῦτον ὡς ἔξοντες ἐκ πατέρων ἐτέροις ἐπὶ τέκνοις*.

- ΙΦ. ὄλουντο λόγχοι καὶ τὰ Μενέλεω κακά.
 ΑΓΑ. ἄλλους ὀλεῖ πρόσθ' ἀμέ διολέσαντ' ἔχει.
 ΙΦ. ὡς πολὺν ἀπήσθα χρόνον ἐν Αὐλίδος μυχοῖς. 660
 ΑΓΑ. καὶ νῦν γέ μ' ἴσχει δὴ τι μὴ στέλλειν στρατόν.
 ΙΦ. ποῦ τοὺς Φρύγας λέγουσιν ᾠκίσθαι, πάτερ;
 ΑΓΑ. οὐ μήποτ' οἰκεῖν ᾠφελ' ὁ Πριάμου Πάρις.
 ΙΦ. μακρὰν ἀπαίρεις, ᾧ πάτερ, λιπὼν ἐμέ;
 ΑΓΑ. εἰς ταῦτόν, ᾧ <παῖ, συμφορᾶς> ἦκεις πατρί. 665

transposed the χ and the κ , and that the $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ for $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ (due to the preceding $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$, cf. on ν . 660) came later. If it be objected that the inf. after $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ would not have an article, it may be answered that it would be equally hard to find another instance of $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ with $\tau\acute{o}$ before the inf. If the vulgate is retained the second $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ must be supposed to have the sense given to it by the scholiast on Aristoph. *Birds* 582 and on Φ 366 (οὐδ' ἔθελε προρέειν) of $\delta\acute{\nu}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. Cf. also \mathbf{N} 106, γ 120 and the scholia. 659. $\mu\acute{\rho}\sigma\theta'$ ἀμέ corrected by a second hand to $\mu\acute{\rho}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$ ἄ με P (the abbreviated $\epsilon\nu$ above the line is in darker ink, and the same ink has obliterated a just discernible apostrophe after the θ), $\mu\acute{\rho}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$ ἄ με L (as I have said elsewhere, I believe P to have been corrected to agree with L). This is made specially interesting by the fact that Porson arrived independently at the right reading. 660. ἀπῆλθα corrected by an early hand to ἀπήσθα P, ἀπήσθα L (the λ was due to the preceding λ in πολὺν). 662. ᾠκῆσθαι PL, ᾠκίσθαι Porson. 664. μακρὰν ἀπαίρεις PL (between these words γ' is inserted by a corrector in L, Vitelli is not sure whether by an early or late one). In P there is a ; at the end of the ν . possibly an addition of a late hand. Wilamowitz thinks that the corrector of L put in the γ' because he did not know that the last syllable of μακρὰν was long. On the whole the ν . suits its context best as a question. 665. εἰς ταῦτόν, ᾧ θύγατερ, ἦκεις σῶ πατρί PL. In both MSS. a late hand has inserted $\acute{\sigma}\acute{\upsilon}$ θ' above the ν . before ἦκεις, a would-be metrical correction which leaves an anapaest in the 3rd foot and offends against Porson's canon in the 5th. Porson suggested ᾧ θύγατερ ἦκεις καὶ $\acute{\sigma}\acute{\upsilon}$ γ' εἰς ταῦτόν πατρί. This emendation was made under the impression that the $\acute{\sigma}\acute{\upsilon}$ θ' (though 'mendosum'), was to be reckoned with in reconstructing the line. I would suggest εἰς ταῦτόν, ᾧ παῖ, συμφορᾶς ἦκεις πατρί. At *Or.* 374 (368 Porson), and I believe also at *I. T.* 5, some transcribers altered $\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ to $\theta\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho$, and I conjecture that this change was made here and led to the exclusion of $\mu\acute{\nu}\mu\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ or some such

658. τὰ Μενέλεω κακά] not as Weil '*les maux qui nous viennent de Ménélas*', but '*the wrongs of Menelaus*', his *grievances*.—With this and the following ν . Firmhaber and Vitelli well compare *Med.* 1015 f. ΠΑΙΔ. θάρσει· κάτει τοι καὶ σὺ πρὸς τέκνων ἔτι. ΜΕΔ. ἄλλους κατὰξω πρόσθεν ἢ τάλαν' ἐγώ.

664. To this question as to the previous one Agamemnon's distracted state of mind prevents his giving a direct

answer. His mind is evidently working with horror at his daughter's impending fate, to which in his next few utterances he refers with growing clearness.

665 ff. Cf. *Trō.* 684 εἰς ταῦτόν ἦκεις συμφορᾶς, and elsewhere εἰς ταῦτόν ἦκειν, used as here in the sense of *to be in the same plight* with some one. That Iphigeneia takes her father's words in this sense is clear from the next line, where she at once jumps at the idea of going on

ΙΦ. φεῦ·

εἴθ' ἦν καλόν μοι σοί τ' ἄγειν σύμπλον ἐμέ.

ΑΓΑ. ἔτ' ἔστι καὶ σοὶ πλοῦς, ἕν' εὖ μνήσει πατρός.

ΙΦ. σὺν μητρὶ πλεύσασ' ἢ μόνῃ πορεύσομαι;

ΑΓΑ. μόνῃ μονωθεῖς, ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος.

ΙΦ. οὐ ποῦ μ' ἐς ἄλλα δώματ' οἰκίζεις, πάτερ;

670

ΑΓΑ. ἔασον. οὐ χρὴ τοιάδ' εἰδέναι κόρας.

ΙΦ. σπευδ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν μοι, θέμενος εὖ τὰ κεῖ, πάτερ.

ΑΓΑ. θύσαι με θυσίαν πρῶτα δεῖ τιν' ἐνθάδε.

word and the introduction of the unmetrical σῶ. 666. εἰ δ' corrected by a late hand to εἴθ' P, εἴθ' L. 667. αἰτεῖς τι PL (as a question in L, Vitelli), ἔτ' ἔστι Porson. In L ἔσται is written by an early hand over πλοῦς. ἵνα μνήσῃ PL, with ὑπο written over the beginning of the latter word in an early hand in L. It was evidently interpreted as a subjunctive. All modern editors have seen that it is a fut. indic. ἕν' εὖ μνήσει Vitelli, who reminds us that at *vc.* 68 and 847 an initial *μν* fails to make the preceding short vowel long, and that *α* and *ευ* were very easily interchanged in MSS. This whole scene has apparently suffered greatly from the indistinctness or obliteration of some MS. 669. *μονωθεῖς* corrected by a later hand to *μονωθεῖς* P, *μονωθεῖς* L. 670. οὐ ποῦ μ' εἰς (corrected by what I think was a late hand to ἦπου μ' εἰς) P, οὐ ποῦ μ' εἰς (the *ε* in an erasure by an early hand) L. οὐ που was evidently the original reading: there are other instances of οὐ που being misunderstood and altered by transcribers: at *Hel.* 135 and (I believe) at *Or.* 426 it is altered to οὐπω. The *εἰς* is a natural blunder of an unmetrical scribe. 671. εἶα γε· οὐ χρὴ τοι τάδ' PL, and in P an early (?) hand has added a τ slightly above the other letters between the γε and the οὐ. ἔασον Blomfield, who compares *Orest.* 627, *Hipp.* 521, and Aesch. *Prom.* 340. Here we have further traces of obliteration; the gap being filled by a hasty transcriber with the ubiquitous γε. It is not clear whether the man who filled the gap still left between the γε and the οὐ meant the line to run εἶα γ'· ἔτ' οὐ χρὴ (in the sense of οὐπω χρὴ) or, as the earlier editions have it (senselessly enough) εἶα γέ τ'· οὐ χρὴ. τοιάδ' Markland.

a journey with her father. In *v.* 667 however he obscurely hints that the journey he means is that to 'The undiscovered country from whose bourn No traveller returns', and that she will bear with her a vivid memory of him though he will not accompany her. In *v.* 668 she very naturally asks, if he is not to be with her is it her mother who will take her? Apparently in her next question (*v.* 670) she is not thinking of going as a bride, only of being banished from her home. Ag.'s answer however (*v.* 671) assumes rather brutally that such a notion had been in his daughter's mind.

669. ἀπό] is strangely used here. Markland thinks we ought to put a comma before it, and take it as at Δ 242 ἀπὸ μνηστῆς ἀλόχου, comparing also N 227 ἀπ' Ἀργείος and 2nd Ep. to the Thess. 1. 9 ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. I have adopted this punctuation, as I think the difficulty of taking μόνῃ μονωθεῖς together less than that of taking ἀπό in the sense of ὑπό.

672. θέμενος εὖ τὰ κεῖ] Cp. *Bacch.* 48 f. εἰς δ' ἄλλην χθόνα, πάνθενδε θέμενος εὖ, μεταστήσω πόδα. For εὖ θέσαι cp. Elmsley on *Med.* 896 (926).

ΙΦ. ποίοις ξὺν ἱεροῖς; εἰ τόδ' εὐσεβὲς σκοπεῖν.
 ΑΓΑ. εἴσει σύ· χερνίβων γὰρ ἐστήξεις πέλας.
 ΙΦ. στήσομεν ἄρ' ἀμφὶ βωμόν, ὦ πάτερ, χορούς.
 ΑΓΑ. ζηλω σὲ μᾶλλον ἢ 'μὲ τοῦ μηδὲν φρονεῖν.
 χῶρει δὲ μελάθρων ἐντός' ὀφθῆναι κόραις

675

οἱτοι χρῆ τὰδ' Monk (and Vitelli). 674. ἀλλὰ ξὺν ἱεροῖς χρῆ τόδ' εὐσεβὲς σκοπεῖν P, L has τό γ' for τόδ', otherwise it agrees with P. Most editors adopt τό γ' and follow Musgrave in interpreting ἱεροῖς as a masc. meaning the same as ἱερεῖσι. But *Ion* 1224 (which M. quotes) is not enough to prove this use for ἱερός. Besides, as Weil says, even so *v.* 675 is no answer to our present line. Weil conjectures *ξυνοῦσας* for ξὺν ἱεροῖς. I too think the line has suffered in the same way as several others in this scene, but I start from the τόδ' of P, believing it not to be a mistake for τό γ' but part of the original line which the writer of L corrected to suit the already transformed remainder. What I believe Eur. to have written was something very near ποίοις ξὺν ἱεροῖς; εἰ τόδ' εὐσεβὲς σκοπεῖν. The ποίοις became obliterated, and either a δέι resulting from the εἰ got interchanged with a χρῆ from the previous *v.* (where it seems more appropriate than the δέι), or a χρῆ was written under the δέι as an explanation of it, and so got into the next *v.* 675. εἴση (with *ι* subs. added by a late hand) P, εἴση L. ἐστήξει (the *εἰ* corrected by a late hand to *η*), ἐστήξει L, ἐστήξεις Elmsley (cf. Curtius *Gk. Vb.* p. 436 Eng. Tr., Cobet *N. L.* 264, Rutherford *New Phrynichus*, p. 411 f.). 676. Following a hint of Markland's, I have removed the ; which usually stands at the end of this *v.* See Expl. N. 677. ἦ με PL (altered in P, perhaps by Musurus, to ἦ 'μὲ, a manifest improvement. So too Blomfield, correcting Barnes and Musgrave). 678 f. Commentators all take one of two courses with reference to these two lines. Either they attempt to make sense out of them as they stand, taking ὀφθῆναι as an infinitive of purpose after χῶρει, or they follow Hermann in supposing that two half lines have dropped out after ἐντός. (He ingeniously suggests (*Orusc.*) that the lost passage was something like ὡς μετ' ἀνδράσιν | μωμητὸν οἶκον ἐκτός, and that the omission was due to the confusion by the transcriber's eye of the ἐκτός with the ἐντός.) All alike construe πικρόν with φίλημα. I think the true explanation is that ὀφθῆναι κόραις πικρόν is a parenthesis, and have put the stops accordingly. (It is worth mentioning that a late hand in P put a stop (·) after ἐντός.) I further think it not improbable that πικρόν is a mistake for

674. σκοπεῖν] used here just as we might often put *think about* instead of *ask about*. Cp. *Soph. O. T.* 286 and 291.

675. For χερνίβων πέλας and ἀμφὶ βωμόν (in *v.* 676) Firnhaber compares *El.* 792 ὡς ἀμφὶ βωμῶν στῶσι χερνίβων πέλας.

676. This seems more natural as a suggestion than as a question. The light-hearted eagerness with which the daughter settles how it is all to be arranged gives rise to the father's next remark.

677. This *v.* is best taken I think, like part of *v.* 655, as an 'aside'. For the sense Monk quotes *Soph. Ajax* 552 f. and Gruppe well compares *O. T.* 316 φεῦ φεῦ φρονεῖν ὡς δευδὸν ἔνθα μὴ τέλη λύη φρονοῦντι.

678. ὀφθῆναι κόραις πικρόν] Cp. Pseudo-Phocylides 216 f. παρθενικὴν δὲ φύλασσε πολυκλείστοις θαλάμοισιν· μηδέ μιν ἄχρι γάμων πρὸ δόμων ὀφθῆμεν εἴση. Cf. *v.* 738, *El.* 343 f. *Phoen.* 89 ff. Here (if πικρόν is the right reading), the refer-

πικρόν· φίλημα δοῦσα δεξιάν τ' ἐμοί.
 [μέλλουσα δαρὸν πατρὸς ἀποικήσειν χρόνον.] 680
 ὦ στέρνα καὶ παρήδες, ὦ ξανθαὶ κόμαι,
 ὡς ἄχθος ἡμῖν ἐγένεθ' ἢ Φρυγῶν πόλις
 Ἑλένη τε· παύω τοὺς λόγους· ταχεῖα γὰρ
 νοτὶς διαίσσει μ' ὀμμάτων ψαύσαντά σου.
 ἴθ' εἰς μέλαθρα. σὲ δὲ παραιτοῦμαι τόδε, 685
 Λήδας γένεθλον, εἰ κατφκτίσθην ἄγαν.
 [μέλλων Ἀχιλλεῖ θυγατέρ' ἐκδώσειν ἐμήν.]
 ἀποστολαὶ γὰρ μακάριαι μὲν, ἀλλ' ὅμως
 δάκνουσι τοὺς τεκόντας, ὅταν ἄλλοις δόμοις
 παῖδας παραδιδῶ πολλὰ μοχθήσας πατήρ. 690

αἰσχρὸν (see Expl. Notes). 679. τ' ἐμοί PL, Matthiae, followed by Monk, τέ μοι. 680. I have enclosed this *v.* and *v.* 687 in brackets as I believe them to be interpolations. They are weak, unnecessary, and of monotonously similar construction. In the former instance the motive seems to have been the explanation of the πικρόν as qualifying φίλημα. 681. παρήδες PL (in L σ *i.e.* συνίησις is written over the beginning of the word). -ῆ- Barnes. 682. ἡμῖν PL, ὑμῖν Musgrave: an emendation which gives to the sentence a fascinatingly modern turn, but one which I believe even in Euripides impossible. Such apostrophizings, in Greek Tragedy, never got beyond an appeal. The impersonation does not become as complete as it does *e.g.* in Shakspeare. Cp. *e.g.* the apostrophizing in the passage of the *Medea* quoted in the Expl. Notes on *vv.* 679 ff. The εὐδαιμονότον, being in the *dual* after the *four* vocatives shows that the address is really directed in form to the two boys. 684. διώκει PL. Nauck very properly calls this word suspicious. I would suggest that the original word was διαίσσει, and that ὀμμάτων was meant to be taken with ψαύσαντα: cp. ρ 39 κύσσε δὲ μιν κεφαλῆν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλά. 685. τάδε PL. The plural seems right if we adopt the punctuation suggested by Markland—putting a comma before τάδε and taking the word with κατφκτίσθην—but this is rather harsh. I have therefore suggested τόδε, which provides παραιτοῦμαι with a needed object of the thing as well as the person, and in this use the τόδε has its natural reference to something following, *i.e.* the εἰ κατφκτίσθην ἄγαν. 687. See above on *v.* 680.

ence is to the feelings of girls themselves rather than to other people's ideas about them—'I know girls hate being seen'.

679 ff. Firnhaber well compares *Med.* 1070 δὸτ' ἀσπάσασθαι μητρί δεξιάν χέρα. ὦ φιλιτάτη χεῖρ, φίλιτατον δέ μοι κára καὶ σχῆμα καὶ πρόσωπον εὐγενὲς τέκνων· εὐδαιμονότον, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖ, and further on ὦ γλυκεῖα προσβολή, ὦ μαλθακὸς χρῶς πνεύμα θ' ἥδιστον τέκνων: also *Or.* 1049 f.

681. ξανθαὶ κόμαι] This colour is the common one in tragedy and even in

Homer for the hair of princely youths and maidens.

683 f. ταχεῖα γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] 'for a sudden flood wells up in me' (lit. 'springs through me'), 'as I' (*i.e.* 'my lips') 'touch your eyes'. See Critical Notes.

685. See above Crit. Notes on *vv.* 413 ff. At *Hec.* 890 we have another instance of a change, in the middle of the line, of the person addressed.

690. πολλὰ μοχθήσας] 'After all his trouble': *i.e.* in bringing her up.

ΚΛ. οὐχ ὧδ' ἀσύνητός εἰμι, πείσεσθαι δέ με
καύτην δόκει τάδ', ὥστε μὴ σὲ νουθετεῖν,
ὅταν σὺν ὑμεναίοισιν ἐξάγω κόρην·
ἀλλ' ὁ νόμος αὐτὰ τῷ χρόνῳ συνησανεῖ.
τοῦνομα μὲν οὖν παῖδ' οἶδ' ὅτῳ κατήνεσας,
γένους δὲ ποίου χῶπόθεν, μαθεῖν θέλω.

695

ΑΓΑ. Αἴγινα θυγάτηρ ἐγένετ' Ἀσωποῦ πατρός.

ΚΛ. ταύτην δὲ θνητῶν ἢ θεῶν ἐξευξε τίς;

ΑΓΑ. Ζεὺς· Αἰακὸν δ' ἔφυσεν, Οἰνώνης πρόμον.

693. This line looks to me like an interpolation, but I have not ventured to enclose it in brackets.

694. *συναίσχει* PL, corrected by an early hand in P to *συνισχάνει*, in L to *συναίσχεται*, *συνισχανεῖ* Heath (taking it however from *συνισχάνω*), *συνισχανεῖ* Quarterly Reviewer (Vol. III. p. 393), followed by Matthiae, Hermann and others. Porson on *Or.* 292 gives the true explanation: *i.e.* that *ισχάνω* was the Attic form of *ισχναίνω*. The *αὐτὰ* is difficult. It would be more natural as referring to the *τάδ'* in *v.* 692 if *v.* 693 were not there. If *v.* 693 be retained, I should be disposed to suggest *αὐτῷ τῷ χρόνῳ*, in which case *χρόνῳ* would be instrumental or governed by the *συν* in *συνισχανεῖ*.

696. *γένους δ' ὀποίου* Porson.

697. *ἐγένεατ'* P, *ἐγένετ'* L (*ἐγένεατ'* Ald.).

692. *σέ*] is the object, not the subject of *νουθετεῖν*. To many this may seem self-evident, but that the caution is needed is proved by the fact that Erasmus translated the words '*Ita ut nihil monitore te fuerit opus*'.

694. *νόμος*] has been thought to have here the extraordinary but not unnatural meaning of *habit, use, i.e.* the getting accustomed to something. It must be remembered, though, that such a force in *νόμος* is more restricted than in the case of the English words. The Greek word could only be applied to something which, like marriage, was an established custom already. The word means here rather 'the customariness of it'. Again, though it is a modern commonplace to talk of time's healing powers, *τῷ χρόνῳ* is best taken temporally, in the sense of the more common *χρόνῳ* as at Soph. *El.* 1013. In two points then Weil has strained the sense of the Greek in translating '*l'usage, ainsi que le temps adou-*

cira ta douleur'. Vitelli compares *Alc.* 381 *χρόνος μαλάξει σ'*, and, like Weil, takes *χρόνῳ* as governed by the *συν* in *συνισχανεῖ*.

695. Perhaps it is best to take *τοῦνομα* as the direct object of *οἶδα*, and *ὅτῳ κατήνεσας* as a relative sentence and not as an indirect question. In this way the contrast is brought out between the name (and fame) of the man himself, and his ancestry and native land. The distinction between *ὅς* and *ὅστις* is certainly not so sharp as Weil would have it. He says the construction *οἶδα τοῦνομα (ἐκέλευον) ὅτῳ* 'ne pourrait se justifier que s'il y avait ᾧ et non ὅτῳ'. On the other hand we find *ὅς*, where *ὅστις* would be more usual, as at Ar. *Ach.* 442 *δεῖ... τοὺς μὲν θεατὰς εἰδέναι μ' ὅς εἰμ' ἐγώ*, and (perhaps) in the much discussed *οἶσθ' οὖν ὁ δρᾶσον*.

699. *Οἰνώνη*] was the ancient name of Aegina. Cf. Schol. on B 562. Pind. *Nem.* VIII. 12.

- ΚΛ. τοῦ δ' Αἰακοῦ παῖς τίς κατέσχε δώματα; 700
 ΑΓΑ. Πηλεύς· ὁ Πηλεὺς δ' ἔσχε Νηρέως Θέτιν
 ΚΛ. θεοῦ διδόντος, ἢ βία θεῶν λαβῶν;
 ΑΓΑ. Ζεὺς ἠγγύησε καὶ δίδωσ' ὁ κύριος.
 ΚΛ. γαμεῖ δὲ ποῦ νιν; ἢ κατ' οἶδμα πόντιον;
 ΑΓΑ. Χείρων ἴν' οἰκεῖ σεμνὰ Πηλίου βάρθρα. 705
 ΚΛ. οὐ φασι Κενταύρειον ὀκίσθαι γένος;
 ΑΓΑ. ἐνταῦθ' ἔδαισαν Πηλέως γάμους θεοί.
 ΚΛ. Θέτις δ' ἔθρεψεν ἢ πατὴρ Ἀχιλλέα;
 ΑΓΑ. Χείρων, ἴν' ἦθη μὴ μάθοι κακῶν βροτῶν.
 ΚΛ. φεῦ·
 σοφός γ' ὁ θρέψας χῶ διδοὺς σοφώτερος. 710
 ΑΓΑ. τοιοῦδε παιδὸς σῆς ἀνὴρ ἔσται πόσις.
 ΚΛ. οὐ μεμπτός. οἰκεῖ δ' ἄστνυ ποῖον Ἑλλάδος;
 ΑΓΑ. Ἀπιδανὸν ἀμφὶ ποταμὸν ἐν Φθίας ὄροις.
 ΚΛ. ἐκεῖσ' ἀπάξει σὴν ἐμήν τε παρθένον;

700. τοῦ PL, τὰ Elmsley. 701. κόρη PL, Θέτιν Geel (on *Phoen.* 1402). This I have adopted because Cly.'s two following questions imply that she had not heard of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis: yet at *v.* 708 she mentions Thetis by name. *v.* 626 in which Cly. is made to refer to Thetis occurs in a passage which has on other grounds been condemned as spurious. 702. θεοῦ PL, τίνος Elmsley. θεῶν PL, θεοῦ Markl., θεὸν Porson. 704. ἢ PL, ἢ Barnes. 705. πηλείου PL, Πηλίου Canter. 706. οἰκεῖσθαι PL, ὀκίσθαι Porson. 709. μάθη PL, μάθοι Musgr. Cf. below *v.* 885. 710. γ' PL, θ' Monk. σοφώτερος PL, σοφωτέροις Musgr., σοφῶ τρέφειν Nauck. As to the former emendation, there is nothing in the context to suggest that Chiron was wiser than Peleus. A definite motive for sending Achilles to a Centaur to educate is stated in *v.* 709: he was to be secluded from the society of mankind. This is the proceeding which Clytaemnestra selects for special praise. Hence I do not agree with Nauck that σοφώτερος is 'ineptum'. 714. ἀπάξει PL, ἀπάξεις Dobree, followed by most editors. But, as the τῷ κεκτημένῳ of Ag.'s answer shows that he takes the question to refer to the bride's movements after the marriage, it seems to me that the

701. Kirchoff found a parody of this line in the following *v.* of the poet Philetaerus quoted by Athenaeus XIV. p. 474 D Πηλεύς· ὁ Πηλεὺς δ' ἐστὶν ὄνομα κεραμέως.

703. The historic present following the aorist marks that the betrothal (naturally) preceded the wedding.

709. We are reminded by this line of Swift's Houyhnhnms and Yahoos.

710. For this use of φεῦ cp. that at *v.*

977, also spoken by Clytaemnestra.—This *v.* is not, as Musgrave thought, a general statement that it is wiser of a parent to hand over his son's education to another, but a commendation of a special device for the seclusion of children, when being trained, from the possible contamination of bad men.

712. Cly. here introduces the second of the two questions broached at *v.* 696.

- ΑΓΑ. κείνῳ μελήσει ταῦτα, τῷ κεκτημένῳ. 715
 ΚΛ. ἀλλ' εὐτυχοίτην. τίνι δ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ γαμεῖ;
 ΑΓΑ. ὅταν σελήνης εὐτυχῆς ἔλθῃ κύκλος.
 ΚΛ. προτέλεια δ' ἤδη παιδὸς ἔσφαξας θεᾶ;
 ΑΓΑ. μέλλω· 'πὶ ταύτῃ καὶ καθέσταμεν τύχῃ.
 ΚΛ. κᾶπειτα δαίσεις τοὺς γάμους εἰσύστερον; 720
 ΑΓΑ. θύσας γε θύμαθ' ἀμὲ χρῆ θύσαι θεοῖς.
 ΚΛ. ἡμεῖς δὲ θοῖνῃν ποῦ γυναιξὶ θήσομεν;
 ΑΓΑ. ἐνθάδε παρ' εὐπρύμνοισιν Ἀργείων πλάταις.
 ΚΛ. κάλως ἀν' ἀγκύρας τε; συνενέγκοι δ' ὁμῶς.
 ΑΓΑ. οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον, ᾧ γύναι; πιθοῦ δέ μοι. 725

3rd person here is preferable. 715. κείνῳ PL, κείνην Herm. 716. εὐτυ-
 χεῖτην PL, εὐτυχοίτην Portus. 717. εὐτυχῆς PL, ἐντελής Musgr., σελήνης
 κύκλος however by itself meant *the full moon*. 719. μέλλω ἐπὶ P. A γ' is in-
 serted by a late hand in P after μέλλω, and so Ald., μέλλω, 'πι L. I am not sure
 whether the ε̄ of the ἐπι, which is written above the line in P is also by a late
 hand: I think not. Porson and Heath both rejected the γ' ε̄. 720. εἰς PL,
 corrected by an early hand in both to ἐς. 721. ἄμ' ἐχρῆν PL. In both an
 early hand has written περ over the line between the ᾶ and the μ', ἀμὲ χρῆ (as an
 alternative with ἄμ' ἐχρῆν) Porson, ἄ με χρεῶν Monk. The imperf., though difficult,
 might be defended, but it may very well have arisen by the mistake of a scribe who
 read the ε̄ along with the following letters. The emphasis on the pronoun has the
 same implication as the ἡμεῖς μὲν in v. 727, i.e. that it was the father's special
 business. 722. θήσομεν PL, δαίσομεν Nauck. 724. καλῶς δ' ἀναγκαίως
 τε συνένεγκαι δ' ὁμῶς P and so L except that it omits the δ', φαύλως ἀναξίως τε
 Musgr., κακῶς Markl., who also apparently corrected the accent of συνένεγκαι, κακῶς,
 ἀναγκαίως δέ Heath, συνενέγκοι L. Dind. (cf. Rutherford, *Νετω Phryg.* pp. 433 ff.

715. Weil thinks there is a sinister
double entendre here, and that Ag. is
 thinking of the God of the world below
 who will soon claim the heroine for his
 own, comparing with Hartung, *I. T.*
 369 Ἄϊδης Ἀχιλλεύς ἦν ἄρ', οὐχ ὁ Πηλέως,
 ὄν μοι, ποσειδάς πῶσιν...

717. εὐτυχῆς] Musgrave notices that
 at Pindar *Isth.* VII. 44 the wedding of
 Peleus and Thetis is said to have taken
 place at the full moon—ἐν διχομηρίδεσσιν
 ἐσπέρας.

718. προτέλεια] Schol. on Ar. *Thesm.*
 973 Ἦρα τελεία καὶ Ζεὺς τέλειος ἐτιμῶντο
 ἐν τοῖς γάμοις ὡς πρῶταίεσι ὄντες τῶν
 γάμων· τέλος δὲ ὁ γάμος. διὸ καὶ προ-
 τέλεια ἐκαλεῖτο ἡ θυσία ἢ πρὸ τῶν γάμων

γνωμένη.

719. τύχῃ] Intentionally ambiguous:
 Cly. with the μέλλω in her mind would
 interpret it to mean *position, condition of*
affairs. Ag. in saying it would think of
 the ἔσφαξας of the question.

725. οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον] This 'collo-
 quial breach of strict grammar' is well
 discussed by Jebb on Soph. *O. T.* 543.
 Compare also Postgate in *Camb. Phil.*
Soc. Trans. Vol. III. 1, p. 50, and Ruther-
 ford *Babrius* p. 38 f. The δέ which
 connects πιθοῦ directly with δρᾶσον, but
 marks the last 3 words of the v. as a
 parenthesis, and there is no need to
 change, with Cobet, the δέ into τῆ.

- ΚΛ. τί χρῆμα; πείθεσθαι γὰρ εἶθισμαι σέθεν.
 ΑΓΑ. ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐνθάδ', οὐπὲρ ἐσθ' ὁ νυμφίος,
 ΚΛ. μητρὸς τί χωρὶς δράσεθ', ἀμὲ δρᾶν χρεῶν;
 ΑΓΑ. ἐκδώσομεν σὴν παῖδα Δαναϊδῶν μέτα.
 ΚΛ. ἡμᾶς δὲ ποῦ χρὴ τηνικαῦτα τυγχάνειν; 730
 ΑΓΑ. χῶρει πρὸς Ἄργος παρθένους τε τημέλει.
 ΚΛ. λιπούσα παῖδα; τίς δ' ἀνασχῆσει φλόγα;
 ΑΓΑ. ἐγὼ παρέξω φῶς ὃ νυμφίοις πρέπει.
 ΚΛ. οὐχ ὁ νόμος οὔτος, κἂν σὺ φαῦλ' ἡγή τάδε.

where however he ignores this passage), *κάλως ἀν' ἀγκύρας τε*; A. Palmer *Class. Rev.* 11. p. 262. *ὁμῶς* Nauck. After spending a day over the line I have come to the conclusion that Prof. Palmer's emendation provides the best way out of the difficulty, though I do not like disregarding the δ' of the Palatine ms. Perhaps we ought to insert it after *κάλως*. 726. In P the *αι* of *πείθεσθαι* is written by a corrector for the side of an erasure. *εἶθισμαι σέθεν* P. In L the *αι* of *εἶθισμαι*, which was written above the line, was erased, and *έκ* written in its place by an early hand. It looks as if a corrector of P intended to make the same alteration, but erased the wrong *αι*, and that the original *αι* was restored by another hand. Porson adopted the *έκ* writing *εἶθισμαι 'κ* and quoting Soph. *El.* 409 for the construction. See Expl. Notes. 728. *ἄμε* PL, altered in P by a late hand (Musurus?) to *ἄν με*, and so Ald. Markl. corrected the accent and wrote *ἀμέ, ὦν με* Reiske. It suits this animated stichomuthia much better to take *τί* as *what?* rather than as *why?* and *ὦν* certainly suits this meaning of *τί* best: but if we read *ὦν με* we sacrifice the emphasis on the pronoun which is necessary to the sense of the line. It is best therefore to give up the attraction. 731. *ἄργους* P, corrected to *ἄργος, ἄργος* L. 734. *σὺ δὲ φαῦλ' ἡγή* PL. Of the many corrections of the metre which have been

726. *πείθεσθαι...σέθεν*] *πείθεσθαι* occurs with the gen. 4 times in Hdt. (1. 126, v. 29 and 33, vi. 12); it is natural that the word should follow the analogy of *ὑπακούειν*, and not remarkable for an Ionism to be found in the dialect of tragedy, but the construction has the further support of Thuc. vii. 73, 2 *καὶ πάντα μᾶλλον ἐλπίζειν ἂν σφῶν πείθεσθαι αὐτοῖς*.

727. Ag. in his perplexity has at all events settled one thing: that his wife, whose unexpected arrival has so disconcerted him, must be sent away as soon as possible, but whatever encouragement he may have got from her ominous professions of subordination in v. 726 is soon dissipated. His wife is very quick to see what is implied in the *ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐνθάδε*,

and protests vigorously at once at being separated from her husband before the wedding is over.

729. *Δαναϊδῶν μέτα*] Ag. here introduces sideways, as it were, the same argument which he enforces explicitly in v. 735.

730. *τυγχάνειν*] See Rutherford *New Phryn.* p. 343 for other instances of the omission of the participle with *τυγχάνειν*. For the sense cf. *I. T.* 1046 *Πυλάδης δ' ὄδ' ἡμῶν ποῦ τεράζεται χοροῦ*;

731. *παρθένους*] *Vv.* 737 f. show that Ag. refers to their other daughters. Cf. v. 1164.

733. *νυμφίοις*] as at *Med.* 366 (*ἔτ' εἶσ' ἀγῶνες τοῖς νεωστὶ νυμφίοις*) the reference is specially to the bride.

734. Cf. *Phoen.* 344 ff. *ἐγὼ δ' οὔτε σοι*

- ΑΓΑ. οὐ καλὸν ἐν ὄχλῳ σ' ἐξομιλῆσαι στρατοῦ. 735
 ΚΑ. καλὸν τεκοῦσαν τὰμά μ' ἐκδοῦναι τέκνα.
 ΑΓΑ. καὶ τὰς γ' ἐν οἴκῳ μὴ μόνας εἶναι κόρας.
 ΚΑ. ὀχυροῖσι παρθενῶσι φρουροῦνται καλῶς.
 ΑΓΑ. πιθοῦ. ΚΑ. μὰ τὴν ἄνασσαν Ἀργεῖαν θεάν.
 ἐλθὼν σὺ τᾶξω πρῶσσε, τὰν δόμοις δ' ἐγώ. 740
 [ἃ χρῆ παρεῖναι νυμφίοισι παρθένοισ.]
 ΑΓΑ. οἴμοι· μάτην ἦξ', ἐλπίδος δ' ἀπεσφάλην,
 ἐξ ὀμμάτων δάμαρτ' ἀποστεῖλαι θέλων.

suggested, I think Musgrave's *κἄν σὺ φαῦλ'* is the best. The *καί* before the *σὺ* which stands in many texts was inserted by Ald. We must suppose the *κἄν* to have been early obliterated and the *δὲ* to have been introduced by an unmetrical scribe. *κεῖ σὺ φαῦλ' ἦγεί* Weil. 735. *ἐξομιλῆσαι* PL. Neither *ὀμιλεῖν* nor any of its compounds (*προσομιλεῖν* is the only one in common use) occur elsewhere in the middle voice: the active of *ἐξομιλεῖν* occurs at *Cycl.* 518 in the sense of *consort*. It is therefore very bold of L. and S. to follow Abresch (quoted in the 'Variorum' ed.) in taking the middle of this verb as 'to be away from one's friends'. *ἐξαμιλλᾶσθαι* Herwerden, the objections to which are that we cannot imagine the present dispute between the husband and wife to have been carried on ἐν ὄχλῳ στρατοῦ, and that the next *v.* clearly refers to the time of the wedding. I much prefer to read *ἐξομιλῆσαι*, supposing *ἐξ* to have its usual intensive force—as we might say "right in the middle" as an intensive of "in the middle". 736. *τὰμά γ'* PL, *τὰμά μ'* Markl. It is awkward (though possible) to supply the *με* from the *σε* of the preceding *v.*, and the emphasis which the *γ'* throws on the *ἐμά* is out of place. 739. Wil-Möll. (*An. Eur.* p. 197) puts the whole of this verse in the mouth of Agamemnon. In L the original hand has written an *οὐ* over the *μὰ*, perhaps by way of explanation of what he takes to be the sense. 740. *ἐλθὼν δὲ* P, *ἐλθὼν* (sic) *γε* L, the *γ* being by an early hand in an erasure. *ἐλθὼν σὺ* Markl. If the suggestion of Wil-Möll. mentioned on *v.* 739 were adopted the *δὲ* of the mss. would stand. 741. Monk was the first to recognize that this verse is an interpolation. It weakens the force of the declaration with which Cly. departs, and the use of *νυμφίοισι* as an adjective qualifying *παρθένοισι* is not Greek. 742. *ἦξα* (sic) PL. In P the *α* is crossed through, and an apostrophe written over it by a late hand. 743. In P the final

*πυρὸς ἀνήψα φῶς | νόμιμον ἐν γάμοις, | ὡς
 πρέπει ματέρι μακαρίᾳ.* Cf. also *Med.*
 1027 *λαμπάδας τ' ἀνασχεθεῖν.*

738. Cf. above on *v.* 149.

739. *μὰ τὴν ἄνασσαν*] A feminine form of oath: cf. *Andr.* 934, *Hipp.* 307.

740. *ἐλθὼν*] Schiller in his translation has a note on this word. He says it contains an implied rebuke to Ag. for having left his home and his home duties. All the less, his wife hints, ought he to

interfere in what so intimately concerns the household.

'His dictis abit irata' Bothe.

742. *μάτην ἦξ'*] answers to our conversational 'it was a false move'. Dindorf well compares *Ion* 572 *δ δ' ἦξας ὀρθῶς, τοῦτο κἄμ' ἔχει πόθος.*

743. Whether this *v.* is genuine or not the disappointment expressed in the preceding *v.* was no doubt that felt at the failure to get rid of Clytaemnestra.

σοφίζομαι δὲ κατὰ τοῖσι φιλτάτοις
 τέχνας πορίζω, πανταχῇ νικώμενος. 745
 [ὄμως δὲ σὺν Κάλχαντι τῷ θνηπόλῳ
 κοινῇ τὸ τῆς θεοῦ φίλον, ἐμοὶ δ' οὐκ εὐτυχές,
 ἐξιστορήσων εἴμι, μόχθον Ἑλλάδος.]
 χρῆ δ' ἐν δόμοισιν ἄνδρα τὸν σοφὸν τρέφειν
 γυναῖκα χρηστὴν κάγαθὴν, ἢ μὴ γαμεῖν. 750

ΣΤΑCΙΜΟΝ Β'.

ΧΟ. ἤξει δὴ Σιμόεντα καὶ στρ.

v of θέλων is by a late hand. We could do very well without this line. 746—748. Monk also expunges these 3 *vv*. They make nonsense as they stand, τὸ τῆς θεοῦ φίλον is, as M. says, very bad Greek for 'the pleasure of the goddess', and however explained μόχθον Ἑλλάδος remains intolerably harsh. Hennig would only reject *v*. 748, supposing that something of the original has been lost here. Certainly the lacuna, if this is the case, begins after the words τῆς θεοῦ. On the whole though I prefer to follow Monk. 747. In L κοινῇ is crossed through. In L an early, and in P a late hand has inserted a γ' after φίλον. 748. In P the *ι* of ἐξιστορήσων is corrected (I think) from *ε*, there is a space following it in which something has been erased and the *στ* is by a later hand than the rest of the word. In L too there is the same space after the *ι*, which is itself in an erasure. Vitelli says nothing about the *στ*. The original word must have been an unusual one. I should guess it to have been ἐξευπορήσων (*π* might easily be altered to *γ*, which is how *στ* is written in P). μόχθων P, corrected by a later hand to μόχθον. 750. The second τρέφειν is evidently due to 'dittography'. Hermann writes γαμεῖν for it,

744 f. σοφίζομαι δὲ κ.τ.λ.] 'I use subtleness, I plot against those dear to me, and I am baffled at every point'.

749 f. Some commentators have thought that the emphasis is on the ἐν δόμοισιν, others that it is on the χρηστὴν κάγαθὴν. In the latter case the blame is too strong for the circumstances: in the former, the words χρηστὴν κάγαθὴν have been thought to imply equally too much praise: but perhaps they were used as formal epithets and with a slight irony.

Here Ag. quits the stage.

The second stasimon consists of strophe (751—761), antistrophe (762—772) and an epode (783 μήτ' ἐμοὶ—800), all in logaedic verse (see scheme of metres at the end of the book). An interpolator has added *vv*. 773—783 (το προλιποῦσα) which

a metrical note in P describes as the second strophe to which *vv*. 783 (from μήτ' ἐμοὶ)—800 is the antistrophe. Hermann also (*Opusc.*) thus arranges the passage, and has been at some pains to alter *vv*. 773—783 to make the correspondence complete; but most editors who accept the whole as genuine regard *vv*. 773—800 as the epode.—The subject of the stasimon is a forecast of the success of the expedition and the woes of the captive Trojan women, which naturally enlist the sympathies of the Chalcian women who compose the chorus. The whole structure of this choric passage is ably discussed by Hennig pp. 101 ff.

751. καὶ] is here used to connect words in apposition: Vit. compares Θήβας καὶ πόλισμ' ἐπτάπυλον.

δίνας ἀργυροειδῆς
 ἄγυρις Ἑλλάνων στρατιᾶς
 ἀνά τε ναυσὶ καὶ σὺν ὄπλοις
 Ἴλιον εἰς τὸ Τροίας 755
 Φοιβήιον δάπεδον,
 τὰν Κασάνδραν ἴν' ἀκούω
 ῥίπτειν ξανθοὺς πλοκάμους
 χλωροκόμφω στεφάνῳ δάφνας
 κοσμηθεῖσαν, ὅταν θεοῦ 760
 μαντόσσυνοι πνεύσωσ' ἀνάγκαι.

 στάσσονται δ' ἐπὶ περγάμων 761
 Τροίας ἀμφὶ τε τείχη
 [Τρῶες, ὅταν χάλκασπις Ἄρης

and nothing better has been suggested. Herwerden excludes these two lines as well. 754. In L a second hand has written σὺν over ἀνά. ναυσὶν P, ναυσὶ L. 755. In P εἰς is corrected by a second hand to ἐς. 761. παντόσσυνοι P (this was actually adopted by some of the earliest editions), μαντόσσυνοι L (and so Markland before he knew of the ms. reading).—In L the σ' of πνεύσωσ' is in an erasure. 764—767. Hennig (pp. 100 ff.) argues forcibly that these 4 verses were not written by Euripides but put in by a later hand to fill a gap caused by the mutilation of an early ms. His grounds are mainly metrical. It is extremely rare that in logaedic verses a trochee or spondee comes between two dactyls. The only example in Euripides is *Or.* 841, where it would be easy to get rid of the anomaly by reading *ιδῶν* for *ἔσιδῶν*. Aristophanes too, though he ridicules other unusual Euripidean glyconics never ridicules this. Of these 4 lines *two* have this fault (764 and 765). H. also takes exception to the matter. The arrival of the fleet at the mouth of the Simois has been already forecast in the strophe, and the picture of the Trojans (supposing Τρῶες to be the subject of *στάσσονται*) manning the walls would naturally be followed by a reference to the attack on the city. The three datives too (*πλάταις*, *εἰρεσίᾳ*, and *ὄχετοῖς*) with the one verb *πελάξῃ*, overload it, as he says. He grants that the expressions of the passage are 'omnia exquisita, scilicet ex aliis poetarum locis': *χάλκασπις Ἄρης* from Pind. *Isthm.* vi. 25, *Σιμωντιοῖς ὄχετοῖς* from Eur. *Or.* 809, *εἰπρόφοισι πλάταις* modelled on *εὐπρόθυμοισι πλάταις* above v. 723.

752. Cf. *Ion* 95 τὰς Κασταλλίας ἀργυροειδῆς βαλνέτε δίνας (Monk).

754 f. τε] connects the two accusatives *Σιμβέντα* and Ἴλιον, and εἰς τὸ Τρ. φ. δ. is in apposition to the latter. For the ἀνά Musgr. quotes Greg. *Cor. de dial. Dor.* xviii. τὴν ἀνά, ἀπὲ τῆς σὺν λαμβάνουσιν. Cf. v. 1058 below.

756. Φοιβήϊον δάπεδον] Weil cps.

Hel. 1510 οὐκ ἔλθοῦσα ποτ' Ἴλιον Φοιβέλιον ἐπὶ πύργους. Here the adj. has its meaning illustrated by what follows. That Phoebus has power on Trojan soil is attested by the spirit of prophecy which possesses Cassandra. The mention of this prophetess of evil to her native city is a subtle suggestion of the success of the Greek armament.

πόντιος εὐπρόροισι πλάταις 765
 εἶρεσία πελάξῃ
 Σιμουντίοις ὄχετοῖς,]
 τὰν τῶν ἐν αἰθέρι δισσωῶν
 Διοσκούρων Ἑλέναν
 ἐκ Πριάμου κομίσαι θέλων 770
 εἰς γᾶν Ἑλλάδα δοριπόνοισ
 ἄσπίσι καὶ λόγχαις Ἀχαιῶν.

[Πέργαμον δὲ Φρυγῶν πόλιν
 λαῖνους περὶ πύργους
 κυκλώσας Ἄρει φονίω, 775
 λαιμοτόμους κεφαλὰς
 σπάσας, [πόλισμα Τροίας]
 πέρσας κατ' ἄκρας πόλιν,
 θήσει κόρας πολυκλαύστους
 δάμαρτά τε Πριάμον. 780
 ἃ δὲ Διὸς Ἑλένα κόρα
 πολύκλαυτος ἐσεῖται
 πόσιν προλιπούσα.]

* *

765. εὐπρόροισι PL (in L the final ι has been erased). 767. Σιμουντίοις P, Σιμουντέιοις L. 773—783. (See Expl. Notes at the beginning of the Chorus.) This interpolation is by a hand inferior to that which filled the gap in the antistrophe. The genuine epode (783—800) passes to the woes of the captive women. The interpolator thought this significant transition too rapid and prefixed a few halting lines describing the sack of the city and the taking of the captives. Even if we suppose with Hennig that the πόλισμα Τροίας in v. 777 was due to the error of a scribe who incorporated a marginal gloss on Πέργαμον in the text, there remains much to blame and nothing to praise. The detailed enumeration of events is foreign to the rapid allusive style of the whole stasimon. V. 773 reads like the first notice of a city in a geographical text-book: the words κόρα and πολύκλαυτος occur twice within 4 lines: the Doric ἐσεῖται occurs nowhere else in tragedy; and the idea of Helen's reluctance to leave Paris is quite foreign to Euripides' or even Homer's conception of her character. (It is possible that the interpolation was made when the antistrophe was intact and θέλων in v. 770 had a word denoting the Greek general to agree with and not Ἄρης, in which case we are not reduced to the absurd Ἄρης κυκλώσας Ἄρει φονίω—cf. Ἄρη φοίνιον Rhod. 1006.) Hartung was the first to proclaim this passage spurious. 774. λαῖνους with αι written over L, αι possibly, as Markl. thought, for ε i.e. λαῖνέους, or rather λαινέους. 775. In L the ει of ἄρει is corrected from ω. φονίω PL, corrected by a late hand in P to φονίω. 776. λαιμητόμους P, λαιμοτόμους L, η corrected in P to ο by a late hand. 778. κατ' ἄκρας PL, the " being crossed through in P by a later hand. 779. In L the θήσει is a correction for something else. 782. πολύκλαυτος PL, but originally

μήτ' ἔμοι μήτ' ἔμοῖσι τέκνων τέκνοις
 ἔλπις ἄδε ποτ' ἔλθοι, 785
 οἶαν αἶ πολύχρσοι
 Λυδαὶ καὶ Φρυγῶν ἄλοχοι
 στήσουσι, παρ' ἰστοῖς
 μυθεῦσαι τὰδ' ἐς ἀλλήλας·
 τίς ἄρα μ' εὐπλοκάμου κόμας 790
 ῥῦμα δακρυόεν τανύσας
 πατρίδος ὀλομένας ἀπολωτιεῖ;
 διὰ σέ, τὰν κύκνου δολιχαύχενος γόνου,
 εἰ δὴ φάτις ἔτυμος,
 ὡς ἔτυχεν Λήδα 795
 μυχθεῖσα πταμένῳ,

-στ- stood in L. 784. In P and L the words μήτ' ἔμοι form a single line: in L a metrical corrector has signified that μήτ' ἔμοῖσι ought to be added to it and a fresh *v.* to begin at τέκνων: I have not noted whether the same correction is made in P.—τέκνοις P, τέκνοισιν L. 788. στήσουσι PL, σχήσουσι Tyrwhitt. 790. εὐπλοκάμου PL, εὐπλοκάμου Dobree. 791. ῥυμα PL, ῥύμα Hermann. δακρυόεν τανύσας PL, a late hand in P put an apostrophe and breathing over the *av*-. 792. οὐλομένας PL, ὀλομένας Monk, ὀλλυμένας Erfurdt. 793. γόνου PL, ἔκγονου Monk, γονάν Hennig. 795. ἔτυχεν PL, σ' ἔτεκε Musgrave. Dind. cf. τεκῶν for τυχῶν at *O. T.* 1025. Λήδα PL (in P the *a* is not written as usual, in L it is followed by : as a sign that the *v.* ought to end there, Λήδα σ' Elmsley. 796. ὄρνιθ' ἰπταμένῳ PL, ὄρνιθι πταμένῳ Markl. I think Scaliger on Catull. p. 51, Ed. 1607 (μυγεῖσ' ὄρ.), and Porson (on *Med.* 1) showed us the right road. The latter conjectured ὡς ἔτυχεν Λήδα | μυχθεῖσ' ὄρνιθι πταμένῳ, but what

785. ἔλπις] For the use of this word for the expectation of evil Markland compares *Or.* 859 and Lucian *Tyrann.* p. 694 τῶν μελλόντων κακῶν ἐλπίς.

786. Markl. compares *Bacch.* 13 λιπῶν δὲ Λυδῶν τῶν πολυχρήσων γίας.

788. στήσουσι] ('raise', or 'rear') is an extraordinary word to govern ἐπιδα. The nearest parallels that have been found are below *v.* 1039 ἔστασεν ἰαχᾶν and στήσαι κραυγῆν *Or.* 1529, Soph. *O. T.* 697 μῆνυ στήσας. Perhaps the neighbourhood of ἰστοῖς, with which word στήσαι is so often joined in the phrase ἰσπὸν στήσαι, made it seem more in place. It is best to put a comma after στήσουσι and to take the following words closely

with the next *v.*

789. μυθεῦσαι] Cf. *Ion* 197. For the simple μυθέω Herm. cites Photius μυθήσας· εἰπῶν. Those who correct the passage so as to introduce the more ordinary μυθεῖω fail to see that *say* and not *narrate* is the word wanted here. For the Ionic *eu* for *ou* in tragedy cf. *Med.* 423 ὑμνεῖσαι, *Hipp.* 167 ἀύτευν, Aesch. *P. V.* 122 εἰσοιχεῖσιν, 645 πωλεύμενα.

790 f. Herm. cites Aesch. *Sept.* 328 (ἄγεσθαι) ἰππηδὸν πλοκάμων and Aesch. *Suipr.* 431 ἀγομῆν ἰππηδὸν ἀμπύκων, also below *v.* 1367.

796. For πταμένῳ used by itself as a subs. cf. Plat. *Enthyphr.* 4 Α πετρίμενόν τινα δῶκεῖς.

Διὸς ὅτ' ἠλλάχθη δέμας,
εἴτ' ἐν δέλτοισι Πιερίσι
μῦθοι τάδ' ἐς ἀνθρώπους
ἤνεγκαν παρὰ καιρὸν ἄλλως.

800

ἘΠΕΙΣΟΔΙΟΝ Γ'.

ΑΧ. ποῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐνθάδ' ὁ στρατηλάτης;
τίς ἂν φράσειε προσπόλων τὸν Πηλέως
ζητοῦντά νιν παῖδ' ἐν πύλαις Ἀχιλλεία;

I believe to have happened is that Eur. wrote *ὡς ἔτυχεν Λήδα* | *μυθεῖσα παταμένω*, and that *ὄρνιθι*, which was originally put in as an explanation of *παταμένω*, ousted *μυθεῖσα*. The *ὅτε* marks the time spoken of as that of Zeus's appearing to Leda, not that of the birth of her children: hence *ἔτεκε* would be out of place here. Monk proposed to insert *πλαθεῖσ'* before *ὄρνιθι*. 797. *ἀλλάχθη* PL, *ἠλλάχθη* Monk. 798. *δέλτοις* PL, *δέλτοισι* Monk. 802. *τῶν* PL, corrected in both to *τὸν*. 803. In P the *λλ* of *Ἀχιλλεία* are in an erasure: perhaps a single *λ* was what

798. ἐν δέλτοισι Πιερίσι] *i.e.* 'in the writings of the poets'.

800. ἄλλως] For *ἄλλως* in the sense of *to no purpose, falsely* cf. *Hel.* 614 f. *φήμας δ' ἢ πάλαινα Τυνδαρίς ἄλλως κακὰς ἤκουσεν*. At *Hel.* 21 the heroine, after relating this story as to her parentage, expresses the same doubt in the words *εἰ σαφῆς οὗτος λόγος*.

THIRD EPISODE, *vv.* 801—1036. The intervention of Achilles. Admirable stage-craft is shown, both in the preparation furnished by the conversation in the last episode for the appearance of Achilles, and also in the subordinate incidents, and the main features and motives of his intervention. The second scene (*vv.* 819—854) is exquisitely amusing.

In the first scene (801—818) Achilles appears before the door of the general's dwelling and calls for some one to summon him forth. This is one of the transparent devices of the Greek stage for securing that the events of the drama should take place where the spectators could see and hear them. It must not be supposed that the regular Greek way of seeking an interview with a superior, or even an equal or an inferior, was to

stand before his door and shout for a servant to fetch his master into the street.

After doing this he proceeds to speak his mind—to the chorus, or to the spectators (*vv.* 804—818), and explain the purpose of his visit. There are many difficulties in this short monologue. The gist of it I take to be this: 'I do not come as the spokesman of the whole army: our circumstances are too different (*i.e.* 'though all may be impatient'—for this is implied—'the grounds of their impatience are various'): each man must speak for himself. My position is this: I have left my father's house to sit here idle;—idle, because it does not suit the Atridae to move: my men rebel at this inactivity, and clamour either to be led on or else to be led home'.

801. τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐνθάδ'] Monk says this is for τῶν ἐνθάδε Ἀχαιῶν but Dobree is doubtless right in taking it as at Ar. *Lian.* 432... Πλούτων' ἔπον' ἐνθάδ' οἰκεῖ and as the ἐνθάθα at Soph. *Phil.* 16 σκοπεῖν θ' ἔπον' ἐνθάθα δίστομος πέτρα: *i.e.* as half superfluous with ποῦ: cf. also Soph. *O. C.* 1256 f. δὲ ξένης ἐπὶ χθονὸς σὺν σφῶν ἐφεύρηκ' ἐνθάδ', where the ἐνθάδε is somewhat superfluous.

οὐκ ἐξ ἴσου γὰρ μένομεν Εὐρίπου πέλας.
 οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἡμῶν ὄντες ἄζυγες γάμων
 [οἴκους ἐρήμους ἐκλιπόντες ἐνθάδε]
 θάσσουσιν ἀκτάς, οἱ δ' ἔχοντες εὐνίδας
 καὶ παῖδας· οὕτω δεινὸς ἐμπέπτωκ' ἔρωσ
 τῆσδε στρατείας 'Ελλάδ' οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν.

805

was first written. 804. Εὐρίπου P (it is curious that the same mistake was made by L at v. 813).—πύλας PL, πέλας Barnes: no doubt the scribe, who made several mistakes just about here, was misled by catching sight of the πύλαις in the preceding v. Vv. 804—818. Hermann treats v. 804 as a question, connecting it with οὕτω δεινὸς κ.τ.λ. in v. 808: “quanta cupiditate bellandi flagret Graecia...eo quod par est utrorumque studium, cognoscitur”. Hennig pp. 113 ff. rejects vv. 805—809 on the ground that if they are retained the whole passage has no logical connexion. I do not think he is right (see Explanatory Notes for a summary of the speech) except in what he says about the ἐρήμους in v. 806. Certainly it is just those who were *not* married who would be least likely to be oppressed with the thought of the *unprotected* state of their homes (the word means more than simply *empty*). I would suggest that v. 806 has got out of place, and that the passage originally ran

οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἡμῶν <ἐσμὲν> ἄζυγες γάμων
 <γόνων τ'> ἄπαιδες, οἱ δ' ἔχοντες εὐνίδας,
 οἴκους ἐρήμους ἐκλιπόντες ἐνθάδε
 θάσσουσιν· οὕτω δεινὸς ἐμπέπτωκ' ἔρωσ
 κ.τ.λ.

The ὄντες in v. 805 was perhaps due to the -οντες in ἔχοντες or in ἐκλιπόντες, and the ἐπ' ἀκτάς or ἐπ' ἀκταῖς supplied from *Hec.* v. 36. This reconstruction however involves so many assumptions, that I have not ventured to print it in the text, but have contented myself with inclosing v. 806 in brackets to signify that at all events it will not do where it is. Dindorf follows a writer in the *Classical Museum* vol. II. p. 106 (? Conington) in rejecting vv. 810—818. This writer remarks that the interpolator is fond of speeches within speeches (cf. vv. 430 ff. and 463 f.). 806. In P ἐρήμους was first written ἐρμους. 807. θάσσουσ' ἐπ' ἀκτάς PL, ἐπ' ἀκταῖς Markl. (cf. *Hec.* 36), θάσσουσιν ἀκτάς Hartung. 808. ἀπαιδες PL, καὶ παῖδας Musgrave (cf. above the note on the whole passage). 809. στρατείας corrected from στρατίας P. 'Ελλάδι γ' οὐκ PL², 'Ελλάδ' οὐκ L¹ (probably, for ι γ' is in an erasure), Scaliger and Porson, the latter taking it as a dative. Porson's authority

804. γὰρ] As Hennig says, this γὰρ is proleptic. It gives the grounds for what is said in v. 810, where μὲν οὖν resumes after the digression.

808. If the order of verses be kept as in the mss. (see Crit. Notes) we must, I think, adopt Musgrave's καὶ παῖδας. I share some of Vitelli's distrust of the

emendation, but I cannot go with him in thinking that ἀπαιδες must have meant (taken with θάσσουσιν) 'senza procreare figliuoli'.

οὕτω δεινὸς κ.τ.λ.] A natural comment on such a sacrifice as that mentioned in the preceding statement, implying almost a condemnation of the expedition.

τοῦμὸν μὲν οὖν δίκαιον ἐμὲ λέγειν χρέος· 810
 ἄλλος δ' ὁ χρήζων αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ φράσει.
 γῆν γὰρ λιπῶν Φάρσαλον ἠδὲ Πηλέα

.

μένω 'πὶ λεπταῖς ταισίδ' Εὐρίπου ῥοαῖς,
 Μυρμιδόνας ἴσχων· οἱ δ' αἰὲ προσκείμενοι
 λέγουσ'· Ἀχιλλεῦ, τί μένομεν; ποῖον χρόνον 815
 ἔτ' ἐκμετρήσαι χρεὶ τὸν Ἴλιου στόλου;
 ὅρα τί δράσεις, ἢ ἄπαγ' οἴκαδε στρατόν,

is great, but surely it is better with Elmsley (*Quart. Rev.* 1819) to take it as acc.: he cites Soph. *O. C.* 942 where ἐμπέσοι governs αὐτοῦς, and where it should be noticed that the subject (ἰήλος) is also a feeling. On *Med.* 93 however Elmsley rejects 'Ελλάδ' and reads οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τῶς, leaving ἐμπέτωκ' without an object. 810. χρεῶν PL, χρέος Hennig (τοῦμὸν δίκαιον is a little strange, but still quite good Greek for *my rights*, or *my claim*, but such a meaning is out of place here. Hennig's emendation seems to me altogether to restore its equilibrium to the line: as he says, the θεῶν in *v.* 809 may have influenced the change to χρεῶν). 811. αὐτοῦ P, αὐτοῦ Victori-
 812. φαρσάλιον corrected to φάρσαλον P, φαρσάλιον L, Φάρσαλω Musgrave.—In P a gap of three lines ruled each with red ink follows this *v.*, occurring at the bottom of the first column. There is no gap in L. 813. ταῖσδέ γ' PL, ταισίδ' Blomfield and Dobree, εὐρίππου corrected to εὐρίπου L.—πνοαῖς PL, ῥοαῖς Markland, who quotes from Strabo i. p. 104 the words of Ion of Chios λεπτός Εὐρίπου κλύδων. At Soph. *Ant.* 1238 the MSS. are divided between ῥοήν and πνοήν. There too it is the last word in the line. 814. οἱ μ' PL, οἱ δ' Monk. 815. ποῖον PL, πόσον Monk. (I have not ventured to adopt this because I think ποῖον may have been used for πόσον in an *indignant* question. The πόσον would merely ask for information's sake what the length of the time would be.) 816. πρὸς Ἴλιου (with *ov* written above *ou* by an early hand) PL. Ἴλιου is retained by most edd. and is probably the right reading: but how is πρὸς to be taken? not with Ἴλιου, for that would be *from Ilium*: ἐκμετρήσαι πρὸς cannot mean *to spend upon*: Weil takes πρὸς (with Ἴλιου) in the sense of *until*—'until we start for Troy':—but besides giving πρὸς a very unusual sense it does the same to στόλος: the στόλος had begun already. As I see no way of interpreting the text as it stands I have ventured to print a conjecture of my own: ἔτ' ἐκμετρήσαι χρεὶ τὸν Ἴλιου στόλου. πρὸς Ἴλιου was, I think, written over Ἴλιου as an explanation of the genitive: hence the πρὸς, which ousted the τὸν, and the Ἴλιου. 817. δρᾶ γ' εἴ τι P (it is doubtful whether the γ' is by the first hand), δρᾶ εἴ τι L, δρᾶ δ' εἴ τι Fix, ὅρα τί F. W. Schmidt. ἢ ἄπαγ' PL (with the ἄ crossed through by a late hand

810. Cf. *v.* 1188 below ἀλλ' ἐμὲ δίκαιον ἀγαθὸν εὐχεσθαι τί σοι.

812. For the Epic ἠδὲ cf. *Hec.* 323,

Schol. on *Phoen.* 1689.

816. τὸν Ἴλιου στόλου] For the

gen. cf. *I. T.* 1066 γῆς πατρίδας νόστος.

τὰ τῶν Ἀτρειδῶν μὴ μένων μελλήματα.

- ΚΛ. ὦ παῖ θεᾶς Νηρηῆδος, ἔνδοθεν λόγων
τῶν σῶν ἀκούσασ' ἐξέβην πρὸ δωμαίων. 820
- ΑΧ. ὦ πότνι' αἰδώς, τήνδε τίνα λεύσσω ποτὲ
γυναῖκα, μορφὴν εὐπρεπῆ κεκτημένην;
- ΚΛ. οὐ θαυμά σ' ἡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, οἷς μὴ πάρος
προσῆκες· αἰνῶ δ' ὅτι σέβεις τὸ σωφρονεῖν.
- ΑΧ. τίς εἶ; τί δ' ἦλθες Δαναϊδῶν εἰς σύλλογον,
825
γυνὴ πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀσπίσι πεφραγμένους;
- ΚΛ. Αἴδας μὲν εἶμι παῖς, Κλυταιμνήστρα δέ μοι
ὄνομα, πόσις δὲ μούστιν Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ.
- ΑΧ. καλῶς ἔλεξας ἐν βραχεῖ τὰ καίρια.
830
αἰσχρὸν δέ μοι γυναιξὶ συμβάλλειν λόγους.

in P). 818. μελλήματα PL (altered in P by a late hand—Musurus?—to μελήματα). 819. Νηρηῆδος PL, corrected in P, by a late hand, to Νηρηῆδος, in L to Νηρηῆδος. 823. οὖς PL, οἷς Nauck. 824. προσέβης ἂν· αἰνῶ P, with the ἂν crossed through: over προσέβης is written γρ. (i.e. γράφε, or ? γράφεται) κατέιδες in the hand, I think, which wrote the last 27 lines of the Danae fragment which follows this tragedy in P. προσέβης· αἰνῶ L, with ἂν written above the line over the end of the former word. (Several editions—mised, I expect, by the Paris copies of L—erroneously state that the προσέβης ἂν stands for the σέβεις.) προσῆκες Nauck. 825. τίς δ' εἶ PL, τίς εἶ Monk: it would be hard to find two questions close together each introduced by δέ. 826. The ν in ἀσπίσι was by a second hand in L. 828. μοι ἴστιν PL, μούστιν Matthiae. 829. ἐν is in an erasure

818. This concluding line shows that the speaker has come to charge Agamemnon with the delay. Markland compares Aesch. c. *Cleus*. 72 οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀναμένειν μελλήματα.

819. Sc. 2.

821. ὦ πότνι' αἰδώς] An almost comically outspoken expression of surprise. 'In the name of Modesty, whom have we here?' The same expression occurs in a fragment of the Ἰππόλυτος ἀναπτόμενος 439 Nauck.

823. μὴ] The same generalizing μὴ as at v. 834, but it is slightly more remarkable here, as the relative with which it is joined has its antecedent expressed (ἡμᾶς).

824. προσῆκες] Cf. *I. T.* 550 μῶν

προσῆκέ σοι; *Suppl.* 472 (a corrupt passage however) προσῆκοντ' οὐδὲν Ἀργείων πόλει.

σέβεις] So *Heracl.* 6 τὸ συγγενὲς σέβων: the active is constantly used by Aesch. and Eur. in the sense of *hold in honour, show respect to*.

826. ἄσπ. πεφρ.] Cf. below v. 1387, and P 268 φραχθέντες σάκεσι. For the idea of the whole v. cf. above v. 735.

830. In mitigation of the brusqueness, not to say discourtesy, of these words, we may imagine that Achilles, full of his business as he is, fancies, notwithstanding v. 820, that Cly. has been sent out by Ag. to confer with the visitor in his (Ag.'s) place. In L the v. is marked as a γνώμη. With these words Achilles

- ΚΛ. μείνον· τί φεύγεις; δεξιάν τ' ἐμῇ χειρὶ
σύναψον, ἀρχὴν μακαρίων νυμφευμάτων.
- ΑΧ. τί φῆς; ἐγὼ σοι δεξιάν; αἰδοίμεθ' ἂν
'Αγαμέμνον', εἰ ψαύοιμεν ὧν μὴ μοι θέμις.
- ΚΛ. θέμις μάλιστα, τὴν ἐμὴν ἐπεὶ γαμεῖς 835
παῖδ', ὃ θεὰς παῖ ποτυίας Νηρηίδος.
- ΑΧ. ποίους γάμους φῆς; ἀφασία μ' ἔχει, γύναι,
εἰ μὴ τι παρανοοῦσα καινουργεῖς λόγον.
- ΚΛ. πᾶσιν τόδ' ἐμπέφυκεν, αἰδεῖσθαι φίλους 840
καινοὺς ὀρώσι καὶ γάμου μεμνημένοις.
- ΑΧ. οὐπῶποτ' ἐμνήστουσα παῖδα σὴν, γύναι,
οὐδ' ἐξ Ἀτρείδων ἤλθέ μοι λόγος γάμων.
- ΚΛ. τί δῆτ' ἂν εἶη; σὺ πάλιν αὖ λόγους ἐμούς
θαύμαζ'· ἐμοὶ γὰρ θαύματ' ἐστὶ τὰ παρὰ σοῦ.
- ΑΧ. εἶκαζε· κοινόν ἐστιν εἰκάζειν τάδε· 845

in P. 831. δεινόν τι P (I think), δεινόν τι L, μείνον· τί Valckenaer.—γ' ἐμῇ PL, τ' ἐμῇ Markl., δ' ἐμῇ Matthiae. 832. μακαρίαν PL, μακαρίων Markl. 833. αἰδοίμεθ' P, αἰδοίμεθ' L. 834. ψαύοιμεν ἂν ὦν PL (in P the ἂν has been almost obliterated). 835. γαμοῖς PL (I have noted in P no trace of the late correction to γαμεῖς mentioned by Wil.-Möll.). No printed edition has, I think, perpetuated the mistake of the mss. 836. νηρηίδος P, νηρηίδος corrected by an early hand to νηρηίδος L. 837. ἔφησθ' PL, φῆς Barnes: the ἔφησθ' was probably written over the original φῆς as an explanation. Firmh. cps. *Hel.* 471 πῶς φῆς; τίν' εἶπας μῦθον, and almost the same words at *Phoen.* 915. 839. In L the ν in πᾶσιν is added by another hand. 844. τὰ παρὰ σοῦ PL, τὰπὸ σοῦ Dobree:

turns hurriedly to depart, most probably not, as at *v.* 854, into the building, but back to his tent, *i.e.* by the right-hand side entrance to the stage.

833. Achilles may well have been surprised, as he knew nothing of Iphigenia's presence in the army. He could only suppose that Clytaemnestra was making love to him.

834 f. Firmhaber and Vitelli compare *Electr.* 223 ἀπελθε, μὴ ψαῦ' ὧν σε μὴ ψαύειν χρεῶν: to which words of Electra Orestes answers οὐκ ἔσθ' ὄτου θίγοιμ' ἂν ἐνδικώτερον. γαμεῖς is more probably the present than the future.

μοι.] Vitelli refers to O. Schneider on Isocr. *Panegyrr.* § 14 for a collection of instances of this indiscriminate use of the

sing. and plur. of the first person, and gives many himself from Eur.

837. ἀφασία μ' ἔχει.] Firmh. cps. *H. F.* 515 ἀφασία δὲ κάμ' ἔχει and *Hel.* 549 ἐκπληξιν ἡμῖν ἀφασίαν τε προστίθης.

844. θαύμαζ'.] A strong expression for δεῖ σε θανάμζειν: 'you may well wonder'. For the (rare) tribrach in the 5th foot cf. below *vv.* 1247 and 1415. Nauck (*Stud. Eur.* 2. 64) by reading ἀμ- for ἀνα- in compounds gets rid of a great many instances.

845—852. Achilles' native politeness now gains the upper hand, but Clytaemnestra, when she realizes the state of affairs, is naturally so overpowered with shame that she cannot accept the way out of her confusion which the blunt

- ἄμφω γὰρ οὐ ψευδόμεθα τοῖς λόγοις ἴσως.
 ΚΑ. ἀλλ' ἢ πέπονθα δεινά; μνηστεύω γάμους
 οὐκ ὄντας, ὡς εἴξασιν· αἰδοῦμαι τάδε.
 ΑΧ. ἴσως ἐκερτόμησε καὶ σέ τις.
 ἀλλ' ἀμελία δὸς αὐτὰ καὶ φαύλως φέρε. 850
 ΚΑ. χαῖρ'· οὐ γὰρ ὀρθοῖς ὄμμασιν σ' ἔτ' εἰσορῶ,
 ψευδῆς γενομένη καὶ παθοῦς' ἀνάξια.
 ΑΧ. καὶ σοὶ τόδ' ἐστὶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ· πόσιν δὲ σὸν
 στείχω ματεύσων τῶνδε δωμαίων ἔσω.
 ΠΡ. ὦ ξέν', Αἰακοῦ γένεθλον, μείνον, ὦ σέ τοι λέγω, 855
 τὸν θεᾶς γεγῶτα παῖδα, καὶ σέ τὴν Λήδας κόρην.
 ΑΧ. τίς ὁ καλῶν πύλας παροίξας; ὡς τεταρβηκὸς καλεῖ.
 ΠΡ. δοῦλος, οὐχ ἀβρύνομαι τῷδ'· ἡ τύχη γὰρ οὐκ ἐᾷ.

cf. below *v.* 1214. 847. ἢ PL, ἢ Barnes: Heath first put the ;. 848. In L εἰόκασιν is written over εἴξασιν. 850. ἀμελία PL: in P an early hand wrote over it Ἰωνικῶς διὰ τὸ μέτρον, and a late hand has changed εἰ into ι. 851. ὄμμασιν ἔτ' PL: a late hand in P σ' ἔτ'. 853. Matthiae first accented the σοί. 855. In both P and L this speaker is modern editor Θεράπων all through this scene. Markland was apparently the first of modern editors to see that he is the same as the Περσβύτης who has appeared before (cf. for proof *v.* 891). ὡς σέ PL, ὦ σέ Markl. (who cps. Ar. Av. 275). 857. τεταρβηκὸς PL. This I have altered to τεταρβηκὸς (adv., cp. Alc. 773), as I think it better suits the ὡς which here is *exclamatory*. 858. In P a letter has been erased before the β of

soldier suggests: she only feels that 'she can never look him in the face again'. At 846 Ach. tells her he does not imagine she has invented the story, but she will not accept this; she is ψευδῆς γενομένη, she has said what is not true: like Malvolio she 'has been most notoriously abused'—παθοῦς' ἀνάξια.—κοινόν ἐστιν means 'it is open to us both'. Cp. Elmsley on *Heracl.* 426 for ἀλλ' ἢ; and Porson on *Hec.* 958 (972—a probably spurious passage) for ὀρθοῖς ὄμμασιν.

849. ἐκερτόμησε] So used by Soph. *Phil.* 1235. Photius gives κερτομῶν· χλευάζων, ἐρεθίζων, σκόπτων.

853. τῷδ'] *i.e.* χαῖρε (Matthiae and Monk).—Ach., in pursuance of his original object, makes for the central door of the σκηνή, and is disappearing through it, as the old henchman half opens the left-hand or tritagonist's door, and calls to

him to stop. Cly. was also departing (καὶ σε 856); possibly by the right-hand door.

855. Sc. 3. A metrical note on the margin of P says: τροχαϊκοῖς, ὅτι μετὰ σπουδῆς ὁ θεράπων ἀφίκετο. The metre corresponds to the exciting nature of the old man's communication.

857. παροίξας] The old man is afraid to show himself until he has ascertained that neither Ag. nor Menelaus is in sight.

858. οὐχ ἀβρύνομαι τῷδ'] "Non quoad hoc delicatum ago" Heath: 'I do not show pride in this matter': *i.e.* I am not ashamed to confess it: οὐχ ἄβ. τῷδ' (see Crit. N.) could, I think, only mean 'I am not proud of this'. Bothe quotes Bekker *Anecd.* p. 322 ἀβρύνεται· θρύνεται, καυχᾶται. Cp. the use of σεμνύνομαι at *v.* 901.

- ΑΧ. τίνος; ἐμὸς μὲν οὐχί· χωρὶς τὰμὰ κάγαμέμνονος.
 ΠΡ. τῆσδε τῶν πάροιθεν οἴκων, Τυνδάρεω δόντος πατρός. 860
 ΑΧ. ἔσταμεν· φράζ', εἴ τι χρῆζεις, ὧν μ' ἐπέσχεσ εἴνεκα.
 ΠΡ. ἢ μόνω παρόντε δῆτα ταῖσδ' ἐφέστατον πύλαις;
 ΑΧ. ὡς μόνουιν λέγοις ἄν, ἔξω δ' ἔλθῃ βασιλείων δόμων.
 ΠΡ. ὦ τύχη πρόνοιά θ' ἡμῆ, σώσαθ' οὐς ἐγὼ θέλω.
 ΑΧ. ὁ λόγος εἰς μέλλοντ' ἂν * ὥση χρόνον· ἔχει δ' ὄγκον τινά. 865
 ΚΑ. δεξιᾶς ἕκατι μὴ μέλλ', εἴ τί μοι χρῆζεις λέγειν.
 ΠΡ. οἶσθα δῆτά μ' ὅστις ὦν σοὶ καὶ τέκνοις εὐνοὺς ἔφην.
 ΚΑ. οἶδά σ' ὄντ' ἐγὼ παλαιῶν δωμάτων ἐμῶν λάτρην.
 ΠΡ. χῶτι μ' ἐν ταῖς σαῖσι φερναῖς ἔλαβεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.

ἀβρόνομαι.—In L an *ο* is written by an early hand over the *φ* of τῶδ', *i.e.* it suggests a variant τὶδ'. τὰδ' Dobree.—γάρ μ' οὐκ PL, γὰρ οὐκ Elmsley, and so, acc. to Monk, one of the Paris copies of L. 860. τῶνδε τῶν P, τῆσδε τῆς L, τῆσδε, τῶν Herm., which seems to me to give a better sense and to explain the variation of the mss.: we might perhaps omit the comma and make one gen. dependent on the other. 861. ἔσταμεν P. 862. πάροιθεν PL, παρόντε Dobree and Lenting, a good instance of the way in which a similar word in a neighbouring *v.* caught a scribe's eye.—παῖσδ' with the *σ* crossed through P, ταῖσδ' L: a curious instance of a merely mechanical error: its consequence was that Ald. (and the other early editions) read μόνω and παιδ', Canter (1571) (μόνω and) παῖς δ', but it is hard to see what either of them understood by the words. Erasmus in 1519 translates the *v.* 'Num fores ad hasce soli vos duo consistitis?' What edition did he use? 863. In both P and L this verse is given to Achilles. 864. σώσας P (not σώσασ' as Wil.-Möll., the abbreviation ✓ is not I think used in P except for a final *as*, and the mark which looks like an apostrophe has come through from the other side of the page, which is very thin here), corrected by a late hand to σώσον. σώσασ' L (acc. to Vitelli), σώσαθ' Kirchhoff. (It is possible that σώσον was the original reading and that the *as* was due to a suggested *ās* for *oūs* and that this *as* ousted the final *on*, which may have been written in an abbreviation above the line.) 865. ἂν ὥση PL, ἀνοίσει Markl., μέλλοντα λείσσει Reiske. Countless other corrections have been proposed. I think the case is hopeless. The general sense of the line I take to be 'I see we shall have to wait some time for the speech (he has so much to say by way of preface): but the man seems to have something important to say'. As a less violent correction than many I would propose *εἰς μέλλοντα νεύσει χρόνον*, lit. 'will fall in the future'. 866. μέλ' P, μέλ' the first hand of L, but an early hand has written a second *λ* above the line. 867. δῆθ' ὅστις corrected to δῆτα γ' ὅστις PL, δῆτα μ' ὅστις Porson. ὄν corrected by early hand to ὦν P. 868. παλαιῶν PL; all editions have παλαιῶν, but I think the mss. are right, παλαιῶν δωμάτων being the same as τῶν πάροιθεν οἴκων in *v.* 860. 869. χῶτι με ταῖς σαῖς P (δῆ put in above the line by

859. *i.e.* 'You can have no business with me': a hasty attempt to get rid of the old man. 'do not wait for a pledge', *i.e.* you surely need have no hesitation in speaking to me.

866. δεξιᾶς ἕκατι] cannot mean πρόσ 869. Cf. a 276—278 for an instance (σε) δεξιᾶς, as some take it: rather it is of the bride's father giving a dowry with

- ΚΑ. ἦλθες εἰς Ἄργος μεθ' ἡμῶν κάμους ἦσθ' αἰεὶ ποτε. 870
 ΠΡ. ὦδ' ἔχει. καὶ σοὶ μὲν εὐνοὺς εἰμί, σῶ δ' ἦσσον πόσει.
 ΚΑ. ἐκκάλυπτε νῦν ποθ' ἡμῖν οὔστινας στέγεις λόγους.
 ΠΡ. παῖδα σὴν πατῆρ ὁ φύσας αὐτόχειρ μέλλει κτανεῖν.
 ΚΑ. πῶς; ἀπέπτυσ', ὦ γεραιέ, μῦθον· οὐ γὰρ εὖ φρονεῖς.
 ΠΡ. φασγάνῳ λευκὴν φονεύων τῆς τάλαιπώρου δέρην. 875
 ΚΑ. ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγώ· μεμηνῶς ἄρα τυγχάνει πόσις;
 ΠΡ. ἀρτίφρων, πλὴν εἰς σὲ καὶ σὴν παῖδα· τοῦτο δ' οὐ φρονεῖ.
 ΚΑ. ἐκ τίνος λόγου; τίς αὐτὸν οὐπάγων ἀλαστόρων;
 ΠΡ. θέσφαθ', ὡς γέ φησι Κάλχας, ἵνα πορευῆται στρατός.
 ΚΑ. ποῖ; τάλαιν' ἐγώ, τάλαινα δ' ἦν πατῆρ μέλλει κτανεῖν. 880
 ΠΡ. Δαρδάνου πρὸς δώμαθ', Ἑλένην Μενέλεως ὅπως λάβη.
 ΚΑ. εἰς ἄρ' Ἴφιγένειαν Ἑλένης νόστος ἦν πεπρωμένος;
 ΠΡ. πάντ' ἔχεις· Ἀρτέμιδι θύσειν παῖδα σὴν μέλλει πατῆρ.
 ΚΑ. ὁ δὲ γάμον τιν' εἶχε πρόφασιν, ὅς μ' ἐκόμισεν ἐκ δόμων.

an early hand before *με, σαῖς* in an erasure). *χ' ὦτι μ' ἐν ταῖς σαῖσι* L (all but *χ' ὦ* being in an erasure). 870. *εἰς* PL (corrected to *εἰς* in L by an early hand).—*καὶ ἐμοὶ* P, *καὶ ἐμός* L (corrected to *κάμους* by an early hand). 872. *δὴ* is written over *νῦν* in L (as an explanation).—*λέγεις* PL, *στέγεις* F. W. Schmidt (a certain emendation). 873. *κτανεῖν* PL, so too at *τι*. 880 and 1131. *κτενεῖν* Elmsley: cp. Rutherford, *Neu Rhyn.* pp. 420 ff., Herwerden on *Ion* 665, and Porson on *Or.* 929. Probably in all infinitives with *μέλλω* the nature of the action of the verb in the inf. had something to do with the tense. 876. *ἄρα* PL. 881. *λάβοι* PL (corrected to *λάβη* by a late hand in P—for the common error see *vv.* 709 and 885). 884. *ὁ δὲ γάμος τιν' εἶχε πρόφασιν ἢ μ' ἐκόμισ' ἐκ δόμων*; PL. An early (and unskillful) metrical corrector in P inserted a *τὴν* before *πρόφασιν*. Markland and Heath really mended the metre by reading *ἐκόμισεν. παρείχε* (for *τίν' εἶχε*) Gomperz: Weil reads *τιν'* and discards the ; (certainly the next *v.* could in

her. Generally in Homer it is the bridegroom who gives the bride's father a gift in return for the bride.

871. Cf. *Andr.* 59 where the *Θεράπων* says to Andromache *εἵνους δὲ καὶ σοὶ ζῶντί τ' ἦν τῷ σῶ πόσει* (Firnhaber). *Ion* 811 f. *καὶ σὸν οὐ στυγῶν πόσιν λέγω, σὲ μέντοι μᾶλλον ἢ κείνον φιλῶν.*

877. Monk cps. *Or.* 540 *ἐγὼ δὲ πᾶλλα μακάριος πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ, πλὴν εἰς θυγατέρας· τοῦτο δ' οὐκ εὐδαιμονῶ.*

879. This *v.* answers the questions of the preceding *v.* in inverse order.

882. *εἰς ἄρ' Ἰ...πεπρωμένος*] Though *πεπρωμένος εἰς* here does not correspond

word for word to the English *fatal to*, there is not much difference in the meaning of the expressions. In the Greek the preposition carries most of the sinister meaning—the notion of hurtfulness, hostility—hence its prominent position.

884. *γάμον τιν'*] The *τιν'* expresses contempt or scorn, not, of course, for the pretended bridegroom, but for the hollowness and nonentity of the marriage. The scorn is all the more natural from one who had herself been duped.

ὄς] For a similar *ὄς*, gaining some emphasis by being separated from its antecedent, cf. below *v.* 895.

- ΠΡ. ἴνα γ' ἄγοις χαίρουσα Ἄχιλλεῖ παῖδα νυμφεύουσα σὴν. 885
 ΚΛ. ὦ θύγατερ, ἤκεις ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ καὶ σὺ καὶ μήτηρ σέθεν.
 ΠΡ. οἰκτρὰ πάσχετον δὺ' οὔσαι· δεινὰ δ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἔτλη.
 ΚΛ. οἴχομαι τάλαινα, δακρύων νάματ' οὐκέτι στέγω.
 ΠΡ. εἶπερ ἀλγεινὸν τὸ τέκνων στερόμενον, δακρυρροεῖ.
 ΚΛ. σὺ δὲ τάδ', ὦ γέρον, πόθεν φῆς εἶδέναι πεπυσμένους; 890
 ΠΡ. δέλτον ὠχόμην φέρων σοι πρὸς τὰ πρὶν γεγραμμένα.
 ΚΛ. οὐκ ἔῶν ἢ ξυγκελεύων παῖδ' ἄγειν θανουμένην;
 ΠΡ. μὴ μὲν οὖν ἄγειν· φρονῶν γὰρ ἔτυχε σὸς πόσις τότ' εὔ.
 ΚΛ. κατὰ πῶς φέρων γε δέλτον οὐκ ἐμοὶ δίδως λαβεῖν;
 ΠΡ. Μενέλεως ἀφείλεθ' ἡμᾶς, ὃς κακῶν τῶνδ' αἴτιος. 895

no way be an answer to the question *τίνα πρόφασιν εἶχε*);. But there still remain these difficulties: (1) that after such an expression as *furnished a pretext* a past indicative tense is out of place, and (2) that Cly. should be made to represent the pretended wedding as a trick to entice *her* from home. Ag. at *vv.* 731, 735 and 737 had told her plainly that her presence was not wanted; but even if he had not, she knew that it was preeminently her daughter who was wanted. Therefore I would read *γάμων* for *γάμος*—so far following Hennig's *γάμον τόνδ'*,—and adopt Monk's *ὄς* for *ἦ*. The meaning will then be: 'So he made a wedding his pretext and this wedding has fetched me from my home'. (Along with several other alternatives I have considered *γάμον τόνδ'* (Hennig), and *νῦν ἐκόμισ'* for some time, but finally rejected them.) 885. *ἴν' ἀγάγης* PL, *ἴν' ἀγάγοις* Blomfield (cf. above *v.* 709), *ἴνα γ' ἄγοις* Vitelli; the *γ'* seems necessary if we discard the interrogative *τίν'* in the previous *v.* 886. In L the *ω* of *ὀλέθρῳ* is in an erasure, and something has been erased over the *θρ.*—*καὶ σὴ* P, *σὴ* L, *καὶ σὺ* Ald. 888. *δακρύων τ' ὄμματ'* P (*δακρύων* L², the *-ον* being in an erasure).—*στέγω* P (corrected by a late hand to *στέγει*. *στέγει* L² (the *-ει* being in an erasure). *δακρύων νάματ' οὐκέτι στέγω* O. Hense (*Philologus* 27. 3). The early editions read *δακρύοντ' ὄμματ'*. (Cf. *Phoen.* 370.) 889. *στερομένην δακρυρροεῖν* PL, *στερόμενον, δακρυρροεῖ* Weil (τὸ στερόμενον 'l'état de celui qui est privé'). Bothe had already read τὸ στερόμενον. 890. *πεπυσμένα* (with the *a* corrected to *ον*) P, *πεπυσμένους* L² (the *-ος* being in an erasure). 895. *τῶν* stood before *κακῶν*

885. 'In *χαίρουσα* a good omen for the sacrifice is implied, the cheerfulness resulting from a belief in the coming marriage' Paley.

889. The old man says, in effect, 'Let your tears flow: you have good cause for weeping'. For this use of the neut. part. cp. *Herac.* 214 where τὸ προσῆκον is used for 'the question of relationship', *Hipp.* 248 τὸ μαινόμενον = τὸ μαινέσθαι, also *Or.* 250, *Hec.* 299, Campbell on *Soph. O. C.* 1220, Jebb

on *O. C.* 267, who quotes several Thucydidean analogies.

891. *πρὸς*] 'about', *not* 'in addition to' as Erasmus (*praeter*).

895. *ἀφείλεθ' ἡμᾶς*] This verb is used with only the acc. of the person robbed also at *Bacch.* 496 αὐτὸς μ' ἀφαιροῦ (τὸν θύρσον) (Firmh.).

ὄς κ.τ.λ.] For a different order of these words see *Med.* 332 (so Porson would read them here).

- ΚΛ. ὦ τέκνον Νηρηῆδος, ὦ παῖ Πηλέως, κλύεις τάδε ;
 ΑΧ. ἔκλουν οὔσαν ἀθλίαν σε, τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ φαύλως φέρω.
 ΚΛ. παιδία μου κατακτενοῦσι σοῖς δολώσαντες γάμοις.
 [ΑΧ. μέμφομαι ἀγὼ πόσει σφ, κοῦχ ἀπλῶς οὔτω φέρω.
 ΚΛ.] οὐκ ἐπαιδευθὴσόμεσθ' οὖν προσπεσεῖν τὸ σὸν γόνυ, 900
 θνητὸς ἐκ θεᾶς γεγῶτα· τί γὰρ ἐγὼ σεμνύνομαι ;
 ἐπὶ τίνι σπουδαστέον μοι μᾶλλον ἢ τέκνου πέρι ;
 ἀλλ' ἄμνον, ὦ θεᾶς παῖ, τῇ τ' ἐμῇ δυσπραξίᾳ
 τῇ τε λεχθείσῃ δάμαρτι σῇ, μάτην μὲν, ἀλλ' ὅμως.
 σοὶ καταστέψασ' ἐγὼ νιν ἦγον ὡς γαμουμένην, 905
 νῦν δ' ἐπὶ σφαγᾶς κομίζω· σοὶ δ' ὄνειδος ἕξεται,
 ὅστις οὐκ ἤμυνας· εἰ γὰρ μὴ γάμοισιν ἐξύγης,
 ἀλλ' ἐκλήθης γοῦν ταλαίνης παρθένου φίλος πόσις.

in both P and L, but is crossed through in both. 896. νηρηῆδος (with the ἦ thus) P, who generally writes -ῆ- or at most -ῆ-. 897. A late hand in P inserted a γε before σε (above the line): both P and L have the σε. 899. Hennig is doubtless right in ascribing this verse, with its intolerably weak repetition of the close of 897 and its 'frigid' beginning, to an interpolator. 900. When this ζ. stood immediately after ν. 898 it doubtless contained some particle connecting it thereto. The man who could so tamper with a MS. as to introduce ζ. 899 would make nothing of getting rid of this particle. ἐπαιδευθῆσομαι γε PL, ἐπαιδευθῆσόμεσθα Herm., ἐπαιδευθῆσόμεσθ' οὖν Hennig (which I have adopted as a possible restoration of the connexion). Paley rejects ζζ. 900—902 as spurious. 901. γεγῶτα has ος written over the α by an early hand in L (Elms. cps. Aesch. P. V. 144, Soph. Ant. 1001). 902. ἐπὶ τίνος PL, ἢ τίνος Porson, ἐπὶ τίνι Herm., περὶ τίνος Schaefer. Against Porson's emendation (as against Wecklein's καὶ τίνος) Hermann's objection is valid, that the two questions are not independent: the second is either a repetition of or a reason for the first. Hermann's reading seems to me the right one. The mistake mentioned below may have been the cause of the substitution of τίνος for τίνι.—μοι σπουδαστέον μᾶλλον with another μοι put in above the line over the beginning of μᾶλλον P. The same mistake and correction occur in L. (I expect the correction was first made in L and transferred from it to P.) 904. Blomfield was the first to put a full stop at the end of this ν.

896. With these words Cly. turns from the Πρεσβύτης to Achilles: the τάδε refers to the whole of the old man's story, not merely to his last words.

901. σεμνύνομαι] used much as ἀβρύνομαι is above at ν. 858.

902. This is one of the Euripidean lines which touch hearts of all times. For σπουδάζειν ἐπὶ τίνι cf. Xen. Mem. 1. 3. 11 σπουδάζειν δὲ ἀναγκασθῆναι ἐφ' οἷς

οὐδ' ἂν μαινόμενος σπουδάσειεν ;

907. ὅστις οὐκ ἤμυνας] "ferre opem qui sis gravatus" Erasmus.

εἰ] although: with καὶ it is common in this sense, not without. Here the ἀλλὰ makes its meaning clear. Cf. Hyperides ap. Stob. 124 εἰ δὲ γήρως θνητοῦ μὴ μετέσχον, ἀλλ' εὐδοξίαν ἀγῆρατον εἰλήφασιν, and Soph. O. C. 661 and 974.

πρὸς γενειάδος σε, πρὸς σῆς δεξιᾶς, πρὸς μητέρος·
 ὄνομα γὰρ τὸ σὸν μ' ἀπώλεσ', ᾧ σ' ἀμναθεὶν χρεῶν. 910
 οὐκ ἔχω βωμὸν καταφυγεῖν ἄλλον ἢ τὸ σὸν γόνυ,
 οὐδὲ φίλος οὐδεὶς γελᾷ μοι· τὰ δ' Ἀγαμέμνονος κλύεις
 ὠμὰ καὶ πάντολμ' ἀφύγμαι δ', ὥσπερ εἰσορᾶς, γυνή
 ναυτικὸν στράτευμ' ἀναρχον [κάπι τοῖς κακοῖς θρασύ,
 χρησίμων δ', ὅταν θέλωσω]. ἦν δὲ τολμήσης σύ μου 915
 χεῖρ' ὑπερτεῖναι, σεσώσμεθ'· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ σεσώσμεθα.

and only a comma at σῆ. 909. γενειάδος, πρὸς PL, γενειάδος σε πρὸς Markland, γενειάδος δὲ Hense.—πρὸς γε μητέρος P, πρὸς μητέρος L¹ (and so Markland), πρὸς τε μητέρος L². Markland would also read σε for σῆς. 910. ἀμναθεὶν PL, ἀμναθεὶν Elmsley (on *Med.* 186), and so first Kirchhoff among editors. 911. ἄλλον PL (the *ον* in P was written as *ο* above the *ν*, and has been partially obliterated by accident or design). (Paley quotes *Suzrl.* 267 ἔχει γὰρ καταφυγὴν θῆρ μὲν πέτραν, δοῦλος δὲ βωμοὺς θεῶν, suggesting *καταφυγὴν* here: I think it more likely that we ought to read *καταφυγεῖν* there.) 912. The way in which all editors (except Vitelli and Paley—Bothe, though he does not adopt, praises Markland's emendation) accept Markland's *πέλας* (or *πελᾶ*) for the MSS. *γέλα* seems to me shocking. (In the passage from the *Alcestis* which M. cites there is in the *πέλας* no idea of *being near to aid*: it goes on *ὅστις ἂν εἴποι*.) *γελᾷ* is confirmed by the contrasted *ὠμὰ* in the following *v.* 914 f. *κάπι...θέλωσω*. It seems to me almost certain that these words were an interpolation, made perhaps out of deference to the susceptibilities of the seafaring audience of the Peiraeus. The *ἐπὶ τοῖς κακοῖς θρασύ*, if good Greek—as it may have been, though we can hardly be sure that it was,—is unnecessary. It is quite enough for Cly.'s purpose to describe a force of men on a voyage away from their country as under less strict discipline than at home. The main objection however lies against the excessively weak qualification of praise that follows, which is out of place, and disturbs the course of the thought. The more

910. ὄνομα γὰρ τὸ σὸν] It should be observed that this comes just after *πρὸς μητέρος*. So at *I. T.* 663 Orestes expresses surprise that Iph. should have known Ἀχιλλέως ὄνομα, when Iph. had not mentioned the word Ἀχιλλεύς, but only called him *παῖς Θέτιδος τῆς Νηρηίδος*. This was his *ὄνομα*. *ὀνομάζω* in Homer often means 'give a man his proper style or title', *i.e.* his *patronymic* (K 68 *πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον*). In the case of Achilles it was his mother who gave him distinction, and 'son of the Nereid Thetis' is said to be his *ὄνομα*. (I think it was from failing to see this that Hennig doubted the genuineness of the *v.*) ᾧ instrumental, I

think; not the object of *ἀμναθεὶν* as most take it.—With *χρεῶν* supply *εἶσι* not ἦν. Cly. means Ach. must now use all the prestige of his parentage in the defence of her daughter.

912 f. οὐδὲ φίλος οὐδεὶς γελᾷ μοι κ.τ.λ.] 'Not a single friendly smile to greet me! My husband, a bloodthirsty, unbridled villain!' Monk remarks that *πάντολμ'* here may well be a reminiscence of the *παντότολμον* at Aesch. *Ag.* 221. Perhaps *γελᾷ* here means literally *looks bright* as in the Epic passages where it is used of inanimate things.

916. Monk cites *Andr.* 242 and 254 for two other instances of *μη* and *οὐ* forming a crasis although a comma intervenes.

ΧΟ. δεινὸν τὸ τίκτειν καὶ φέρει φίλτρον μέγα,
 πᾶσιν τε κοινὸν ἐσθ' ὑπερκάμνειν τέκνων.

ΑΧ. ὑψηλόφρων μοι θυμὸς αἴρεται πρόσω·
 [ἐπίσταται δὲ τοῖς κακοῖσι τ' ἀσχαλᾶν

920

lengthened tirade against *ναντικὴ ἀταξία* or *ἀναρχία* at *Ηec.* 606—608 perhaps suggested the amplification of this passage. (Schiller admires greatly the *χρήσιμον δ'*, *ὅταν θέλωσω*, attributing it to a sudden consciousness that it would not do so to describe the force in speaking to one of its leaders. Others have seen in it a suggestion that Ach., if he 'takes them the right way', may find the sailors' help useful in Iphigeneia's defence.) 917. *φέρειν* PL (corrected by a late hand in P to *φέρει*). 918. *πᾶσι* P (corrected by a late hand to *πᾶσιν*), *πᾶσιν* L (just the reverse as to the two MSS. at 839).—*ᾠσθ'* PL, *ἐσθ'* Reiske (this emendation lightens the construction, and gives the words the conventional 'Choric' turn). 919. *ὑψηλόφρων* PL (corrected to *-η-* by an early hand in L—a likely mistake from the analogy of the numerous compounds in *ὑψι-*).—In P either *εἴρεται* has been corrected into *αἴρεται*, or *αἴρεται* changed to *ἀείρεται*.—*πρόσω* PL, *πτερῶ* Wecklein (*πρόσω* certainly looks suspicious; it may well have been put in by some ignorant late scribe who thought *πρόσω*, as it meant 'far' in some connexions, might also mean 'high'). 920—927. On the subject of the much discussed question of the authenticity of passages of this speech I submit the following conclusions: (1) *v.* 920 was never written to follow *v.* 919. Not only does *ὑψ. θυμὸς* make a bad subject for *ἐπίσταται κ.τ.λ.*, but *αἴρεται* refers to a present state of feeling, *ἐπίσταται κ.τ.λ.* to a general characteristic: and where is the contrast implied in the *δέ* between 919 and 920 f.? If then what follows 919 is genuine, we must have lost some lines between 919 and 920, and 920 f. must be a description of a character which, however admirable, is *not* that of Achilles. But the longer I have considered *vv.* 920—927 the more inevitably does the passage resolve itself, to my mind, into an ill-joined patchwork of 4 *detached couplets*. They are all good enough to have come from some genuine ancient author (920 f. seem to have been modelled on Archilochus fr. 66 Bergk—first cited here by Musgrave), but there is no knowing how they came here. Hennig holds that the genuine *vv.* were 919, 924 and 926 f. and that there was no lacuna. But apart from the *μὲν οὖν*, which is more natural in a resumption after a somewhat lengthy digression, or a turning from the general to the particular, the sense of 926 f. is *not* merely 'I am a plain blunt man':—this ignores the prominent *εὐσεβειστάτου*:—it is: 'the result of my godly schooling is that I hate deceit' (cf. the never to be forgotten utterance of the same speaker at I 312 f.), and this does not square well either with 924 or 928 ff. The connexion of ideas would be 'It is true that to be lowly-minded saves trouble and pain, but I hate deceit, and will never (so far belie my nature as to) obey an unjust command'. The notion of deceitfulness acting as a possible curb on pride, suggested by such words as these, seems to me unreal. It is venom not pride that grows in a deceitful heart. It is just conceivable that 928 was written to follow directly upon 919, but I think it more likely that a passage has been lost here, and therefore mark a lacuna. Perhaps the author, after writing the first verse, as the key-note of the speech, himself left a gap which he did not live to fill up. 920. In *ἀσχαλᾶν* the λ is by a late hand in an erasure.

919. *αἴρεται πρόσω*] Cp. Soph. reading these words must mean 'is O. T. 914. If *πρόσω* is the right borne far onwards'. Somewhat similar

μετρίως τε χαίρειν τοῖσιν ἐξωγκωμένοις.
 λελογισμένοι γὰρ οἱ τοιοῖδ' εἰσὶν βροτῶν
 ὀρθῶς διαζήν τὸν βίον γνώμης μέτα.
 ἔστιν μὲν οὖν ἴν' ἠδὺ μὴ λίαν φρονεῖν,
 ἔστιν δὲ χάπτον χρήσιμον γνώμην ἔχειν.
 ἐγὼ δ' ἐν ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβεστάτου τραφεῖς
 Χείρωνος, ἔμαθον τοὺς τρόπους ἀπλοῦς ἔχειν.]

925

* * * * *
 καὶ τοῖς Ἀτρείδαις, ἣν μὲν ἠγῶνται καλῶς,
 πεισόμεθ'· ὅταν δὲ μὴ καλῶς, οὐ πείσομαι.
 ἀλλ' ἐνθάδ' ἐν Τροίᾳ τ' ἐλευθέραν φύσιν
 παρέχων, Ἄρη τὸ κατ' ἐμέ κοσμήσω δορί.
 [σὲ δ', ὦ παθοῦσα σχέτλια πρὸς τῶν φιλλάτων,

930

922 and 923 are ascribed to the Chorus by the MSS. All editors have followed Burges in giving them to Achilles. Wilamowitz thinks some scribe mistook a marginal χρ. (i.e. χρήσιμον) for χορ.—Over τοι- is written κοιν. (i.e. κοινή συλλαβή) in P.—εἰσι P,—the ρο in βροτῶν in L is a correction from something. 925. ἔστι corrected by an early hand to ἔστιν L.—χ' ἄπτον L. 929. οὐ πείσομεθα P, οὐ πείσομαι (with the αι by an early hand in an erasure) L (so also Scaliger corrected P's reading later). 931. ἄρει with η written over the ει (by the original hand in L and possibly in P) PL (in P the η is crossed through).—τῷ PL, τὸ Brodaeus. 932. σχέτλια παθοῦσα PL, παθοῦσα σχέτλια Barnes. 932—934. Conington (*Class. Mus.* II. 106) condemns 932—943 as spurious. He points out that after the fashion of the interpolator he gets his material from the neighbouring verses: ἀ δὴ κατ' ἀνδ. κ.τ.λ. from τὸ κατ' ἐμέ in 931, περιβαλὼν καταστειλῶ (whatever he meant by it) from κοσμήσω, παρέξω τοῦμόν δέμας from ἐλευθέραν φύσιν παρέχων and τοῦνομα κ.τ.λ. (938 f.) from 947. As to the last instance we shall find that it is the later verse which in this case is spurious, so that the argument serves only to establish 938 the more securely, and in the last but one the resemblance is very slight. The first three lines however are in themselves so weak that they succumb to the attack. 932 comes from Aesch. *Eum.* 100, and both the general sense and the language of 933 f. condemn them at once. Why should a young man be deemed naturally

uses of the passive of αἰρω may be found at *Hipp.* 735 and *Bacch.* 748. Firmhaber for this use of πρόσω compares Soph. *Trach.* 547 ἔρπουσαν πρόσω and *Hel.* 326 τί βλέπεις πρόσω;

921. τὰ ἐξωγκωμένα] lit. *fulness*, i.e. prosperity.

922. λελογισμένοι εἰσὶν] lit. 'have laid their plans': not very different in effect from our 'have the sense to'.

924. φρονεῖν] The following *v.* shows that φρονεῖν here means not 'to be proud', but 'to be sensible'. The exact

correspondence of Horace's 'dulce est desipere in loco' suggests that this like *v.* 920 came originally from a lyric poet. Seneca *de Tranqu. an.* 15 says: *Si Graeco poetae credimus aliquando et insanire incundum est.* Stiblinus cps. Soph. *Ai.* 554 ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἠδιστος βίος.

930 f. The participial clause—ἐλευθέραν φύσιν παρέχων—contains the most important part of the declaration: 'while I do my best as a soldier I will keep myself a free man still'.

ἄ δὴ κατ' ἄνδρα γίγνεται νεανίαν,
 τοσοῦτον οἶκτον περιβαλὼν καταστελῶ,]
 κοῦποτε κόρη σὴ πρὸς πατρὸς σφαγήσεται, 935
 ἐμὴ φατισθεῖς· οὐ γὰρ ἐμπλέκειν πλοκάς
 ἐγὼ παρέξω σῶ πόσει τοῦμόν δέμας.
 τοῦνομα γάρ, εἰ καὶ μὴ σίδηρον ἤρατο,
 τοῦμόν φονεύσει παῖδα σὴν. τὸ δ' αἴτιον
 πόσις σός· ἀγνὸν δ' οὐκέτ' ἐστὶ σῶμ' ἐμόν, 940
 εἰ δι' ἔμ' ὀλεῖται διὰ τε τοὺς ἐμοὺς γάμους
 ἢ δεινὰ τλάσα κοῦκ ἀνεκτὰ παρθένος.
 [θανμαστὰ δ' ὡς ἀνάξι' ἠτιμασμένη.]
 ἐγὼ κάκιστος ἦν ἄρ' Ἀργείων ἀνὴρ,
 ἐγὼ τὸ μηδέν, Μενέλεως δ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν· 945
 [ὡς οὐχὶ Πηλέως, ἀλλ' ἀλάστορος γεγώς,

poor in pity? (τοσοῦτον must be correlative to ἄ δὴ): and what, with or without περιβαλὼν, can καταστελῶ mean? At most καταστελῶ σε is *I will set you to rights*, not *I will right you*. Perhaps by περιβαλὼν καταστελῶ was meant *I will wrap you round in, will enfold you in*. (Hesych. καταστέλλω· περικαλύπτω.) *vv.* 935 ff. seem to me to follow admirably after 931 (though it is possible we ought to read οὔποτε for κοῦποτε). 933. γίνεταί PL. 937. Nauck thought at one time that this *v.* (from which apparently *v.* 947 was concocted) originally ended: τοῦμόν ὄνομα σῶ πόσει. 938. εἰ μὴ καί PL, εἰ καὶ μὴ Ald.—ἤρατο PL, ἠράμην Nauck. 940. ἀγνός P, ἀγνὸν L. 943. ἠτιμασμένη P (corrected by a late hand to ἠ-), ἠ- L. Nauck and Herm. (*Orusc.*) rightly reject this *v.* θανμαστὰ ὡς is late Greek for the prose θανμαστῶς ὡς, and the latter part of the line comes from *Hel.* 455 ὦ δαίμον ὡς ἀνάξι' ἠτιμώμεθα. 945. τ' ἐν PL, but the first hand in L has written a δ' over the τ'. 946 and 947. I suspect that the interpolator of these two *vv.* had in mind *L. T.* 369 (ff.). "Αἰδῆς Ἀχιλλεύς ἦν ἄρ', οὐχ ὁ Πηλέως κ.τ.λ. and therefore that there is a little more sense in them than Hennig gives them credit for, though he and others are doubtless right in condemning them, as having no connexion with what precedes. The absolute use of φονεύσει is not Greek. The interpolator doubtless meant them to refer to Achilles, but as they stand they can only refer

936. φατισθεῖς'] Cp. above *v.* 135.
 937. τοῦμόν δέμας] a mere periphrasis for 'myself'. See however Crit. N.
 938. εἰ...ἤρατο] A bold picturesque expression, of somewhat the same character as Aeschylus's ἄνυρος ἄρδις used of the gad-fly's sting. There we have 'an arrow-point which no fire has forged': here, 'a murderer who never lifted sword', *i.e.* 'my name'.
 940. σῶμ' ἐμόν] not a mere periphra-

sis here, like the τοῦμόν δέμας of *v.* 937. Perhaps he is thinking, as Clytaemnestra does below, of his possible future wedding. 'It will be a personal stain upon me'.
 944. κάκιστος] not *vilest* in a moral sense, but *most cowardly*.
 945. τὸ μηδέν] Cp. Monk on *Hipp.* 634 (638). Cf. above *v.* 371 for a variety of the expression.—ἐν ἀνδράσιν. Cp. Monk on *Alc.* 748 (732).

εἶπερ φονεύσει τοῦμόν ὄνομα σῶ πόσει.]
 μὰ τὸν δι' ὑγρῶν κυμάτων τεθραμμένον
 Νηρέα, φυτουργὸν Θέτιδος ἢ μ' ἐγείνατο,
 οὐχ ἄψεται σῆς θυγατρὸς Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ, 950
 οὐδ' εἰς ἄκραν χεῖρ', ὥστε προσβαλεῖν πέπλοις.
 > [ἢ Σίπυλος ἔσται πόλις ὄρισμα βαρβάρων,
 ὅθεν πεφύκασ' οἱ στρατηλάται γένος,
 Φθία δὲ τοῦμόν τ' οὐδαμοῦ κεκλήσεται.]
 πικροὺς δὲ προχύτας χέρνιβας τ' ἐνάρξεται 955
 Κάλχας ὁ μάντις. τίς δὲ μάντις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ,

to Menelaus. 947. ὅσπερ φονεύει PL, εἶπερ Ald., φονεύσει Schaefer. *zv.* 952—954. Nauck suspects *v.* 953, Hennig condemns 953 and 954. I think all three verses ought to go. They are a clumsy parallel to *zv.* 945 and 946. ὄρισμα is possibly an ignorant scribe's Greek translation of the Lat. *finis*. 954. φθία δὲ τοῦμόν τ' οὐδαμοῦ L, φ. δ. τοῦμόν τοῦδαμοῦ P, the τ being crossed through. The accent of the τοῦμόν, the absence of the ' after the second τ, and the shape of the letter itself, prove that this second τ was a subsequent addition to P (probably when it was corrected to agree with L). Hennig is probably right in holding that the composer of the line by τοῦμόν meant τοῦμόν ὄρισμα (supplied from *v.* 952). The inserter of the τ' before οὐδαμοῦ probably supplied γένος from 953. Φθίας δὲ τοῦνομ' οὐδαμοῦ Jacobs. This emendation has been adopted by all editors who believe the *v.* to be genuine. 955. ἀνάξεται PL, ἐνάρξεται Musgr. *zv.* 959—974. Hennig (pp. 125 ff.) has, I think, proved these *zv.* to be spurious. He also shows good cause for thinking that *zv.* 963 and 964, and again *zv.* 973 and 974, betray in their language, as well as in their want of sense, a far later interpolator than the rest of the passage. In the latter we find a character which at first sight seems to fit Achilles (cf. Hor. *A. P.* 121 f., Homer I 395 f.). A little reflection however shows this particular expression of the character to be quite irreconcilable with the earlier part of the speech. There he expresses indignation that his name should have been used as the instrument of such a deed as the sacrifice of Iphigeneia: here he is made to say that, if his dignity had not been offended by the way in which it had been done, he would have consented; and moreover he is made

948. This *v.* is marked as ὠραῖον in the margin of P.

951. εἰς] here apparently means 'so much as', lit. 'to the extent of'. The hand (ἄκρα χεῖρ) spoken of is Agamemnon's. 'He shall not even so much as touch her garments with his hand'. Cf. Homer's use of εἰς in I 158 αἰνῶς ἀθανάτησι θεῆς εἰς ὧπα ἔοικεν and in α 411 οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι κακῶ εἰς ὧπα ἐφύκει—perhaps 'as far as face goes'. Paley compares εἰς πλησμονῆς in *Tro.* 1211.

955. πικροῦς] 'to his cost' as Paley

says. Cp. Cobet *V. L.* 573.

956. The ἀνὴρ joined to μάντις (cf. the Homeric ἱγρὸς ἀνὴρ Δ 514, ἀνὴρ ὀχετηγὸς Φ 257, νομεὺς ἀνὴρ Soph. *O. T.* 1118, and the English *fisherman*, *beggar man*, *sailor man*) marks the noun as the designation of a *calling*, and so, like the English 'professional' and 'professed', may be used in a slightly derogatory sense. Without the ἀνὴρ the words would most naturally have meant 'ἄνθρωπος ἵς ἅσπερ?'

ὅς ὀλίγ' ἀληθῆ, πολλὰ δὲ ψευδῆ λέγει
 τυχῶν, ὅταν δὲ μὴ τύχη, διοίχεται;
 [οὗ τῶν γάμων ἕκατι, μυρία κόραι
 θηρῶσι λέκτρον τοῦμόν, εἶρηται τόδε· 960
 ἀλλ' ὕβριν ἐς ἡμᾶς ὕβρισ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ·
 χρῆν δ' αὐτὸν αἰτεῖν τοῦμόν ὄνομ' ἐμοῦ πάρα,
 θήραμα παιδός· ἢ Κλυταιμνήστρα δ' ἐμοὶ
 μάλιστ' ἐπέισθη θυγατέρ' ἐκδοῦναι πόσει.
 ἔδωκά τ' ἄν Ἑλλησιν, εἰ πρὸς Ἴλιον 965
 ἐν τῷδ' ἔκαμνε νόστος· οὐκ ἠρνούμεθ' ἂν
 τὸ κοινὸν αὔξειν ὧν μέτ' ἐστρατευόμεν.
 νῦν δ' οὐδὲν εἰμι παρά γε τοῖς στρατηλάταις,
 ἐν εὐμαρεῖ τε δρᾶν τε καὶ μὴ δρᾶν καλῶς.

to say it in Clytaemnestra's presence. If we suppose, on the other hand, that some of this part of the speech was an 'aside', not meant for Clytaemnestra's ears, it amounts to a confession that his previous indignation was feigned, and his character becomes that of a contemptible swaggerer. Neither supposition can be entertained for a moment. 959 f. ἢ P, ἦ, L, οὐ Lenting, γαμοῦντων PL, γάμων Canter. Hermann and Hartung would reject the parenthesis *μυρία—τοῦμόν* and insert δ' before *εἶρηται*. 963. δέ μοι PL, δ' ἐμοὶ Matthiae. Hermann reads εἰ for the MSS. ἢ with only a comma after πόσει in v. 964. 965. ἔδωκε τ' ἂν PL, ἔδωκα Hervagius, τῶν Gaisford. 967. ἐστρατευόμεν PL, ἐστρατεύομεν Monk: the

958. **τυχῶν** 'when he succeeds': *i.e.* 'at best' (he tells many lies for every truth).—Firnhaber and Vitelli are doubtless right both in taking *ὅς* as the subject of *διοίχεται*, and in interpreting the latter to mean 'he is nowhere to be found', 'he has vanished'. Barnes, Matthiae, Hermann, Weil, and others give translations of the word with *res* as its subject.—Firnhaber, on v. 515 above, has an interesting discussion (two pages long and more) on the way *μάντεις* and their art are spoken of in tragedy. It is interesting to notice that Euripides, like a true dramatist, gives us the view of 'the other side' as well: at *Phoen.* 954 Teiresias says ὅστις δ' ἐμπύρω χρῆται τέχνη, μάταιος· ἦν μὲν ἐχθρὰ σημήνας τύχη, πικρὸς καθέστηχ' οἷς ἂν οἰωνοσκοπῆ· ψευδῆ δ' ὑπ' οἴκτου τοῖσι χρωμένους λέγων ἀδουκεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν. I think Firnhaber is wrong in finding in Tei-

resias's words in the *Bacchae* (*e.g.* v. 298 ff.), and in his character in that play, an attempt to bring ridicule on the seer's art.

961. Cf. *Bacchae* 247 ὕβρεις ὑβρίζειν and 1297 ὕβριν γ' ὑβρισεῖς.

963 f. **θήραμα**] generally means 'prey', but the interpolator seems to have used it in the sense of 'snare', *i.e.* 'means of catching'. The two datives *ἐμοὶ* and *πόσει* must both have been meant to go with *ἐκδοῦναι*, and this gives a very loose construction, which is not improved by the weak *μάλιστ'*.

965 f. **εἰ πρὸς Ἴλιον ἐν τῷδ' ἔκαμνε νόστος**] This seems to have been borrowed from *I. T.* 1018 f. τῆδε γὰρ νοσεῖ νόστος πρὸς οἶκον.

969. Commentators are divided as to whether to regard Achilles as the subject or object of *δρᾶν*.

- τάχ' εἴσεται σίδηρος, ὃν πρὶν εἰς Φρύγας 970
 ἔλθειν, φόνου κηλίσιν αἵματι χρανῶ,
 εἴ τίς με τὴν σὴν θυγατέρ' ἐξαιρήσεται.
 ἀλλ' ἠσύχαζε· θεὸς ἐγὼ πέφηνά σοι
 μέγιστος, οὐκ ὦν· ἀλλ' ὅμως γενήσομαι.]
- ΧΟ. ἔλεξας, ὦ παῖ Πηλέως, σοῦ τ' ἄξια 975
 καὶ τῆς ἐναλίας δαίμονος, σεμνῆς θεοῦ.
- ΚΛ. φεῦ·
 πῶς ἂν σ' ἐπαινέσαιμι μὴ λίαν λόγοις;
 [μήτ' ἐνδεῶς μὴ τοῦδ' ἀπολέσαιμι τὴν χάριν;]
 αἰνούμενοι γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ τρόπον τινὰ
 μισοῦσι τοὺς αἰνοῦντας, ἦν αἰνώσ' ἄγαν. 980
 [αἰσχύνομαι δὲ παραφέρουσ' οἰκτροὺς λόγους,
 ἰδίᾳ νοσοῦσα· σὺ δ' ἄνοσος κακῶν γ' ἐμῶν.

active is much commoner in Eur. than the middle. 970. σίδηρον P corrected by a late hand to σίδηρος, σίδηρος L the -os being in an erasure by the first hand. 971. αἵματι PL, αἵματος Porson, who read φόνον, omitting the comma after ἔλθειν. Perhaps Weil is right in regarding αἵματι as a gloss on φόνου κηλίσιν which ousted a word—Herwerden suggests Ἑλληνος, used, as at *I. T.* 72, as an adj. αἵματοχρανῶ Bothe. Possibly αἵματώσομεν originally stood at the end of the verse, and αἵματι χρανῶ was a marginal gloss intended as an explanation of φόνου κηλίσιν αἵματώσομεν. 978. μήτ' ἐνδεῶς μὴ τοῦδ' ἀπολέσαιμι τὴν χάριν PL: in L ης is written (by m² Vit. says) over ὦς. I think that this was a foolish addition by an early scribe, intended as an aside, and that he wrote ἀπολέσω, which was afterwards assimilated in termination to the ἐπαινέσαιμι in v. 977. Its meaning would then be 'nor too little, for fear I may lose this man's favour'. Many attempts have been made to mend the metre and construction of the MSS.: μήτ' ἐνδεῶς μήτ' ἀπ- Ald., μήτ' ἐνδεῆς τοῦδ' ἀπ- Markl., μὴδ' ἐνδεῆς τοῦδ' ἀπ- Dind., μὴδ' ἐνδεῶς που διολέσαιμι Weil. But whether mended or not the verse seems to me equally out of place. The following words refer exclusively to v. 977. 979. ἀγαθοὶ PL, corrected by a late hand in P to οἰγαθοὶ or οἱ ἀγαθοὶ. ἀγαθοὶ Pors. 980. ἦν PL, altered by a late hand in P to εἶν. 981—989. Hennig rejects these verses and Wecklein follows him. (1) Why should the queen, after thanking Ach. effusively for his offered help, turn

970. Monk compares *Phoen.* 1677 ἴστω σίδηρος ὄρκιον τέ μοι ξίφος and 253 ἂν Ἄρης τάχ' εἴσεται.

973. It is possible that the interpolator here used φάινεσθαι in the sense of δοκεῖν. If not, it is hard to find any sense in the following verse.

977. The μὴ shows that the sentence is meant as a wish. In effect she says: 'My fear is that I shall not be able to avoid excess in my praise of you'.

979 f. Barnes cps. *Orestes* 1162 βάρος τι κὰν τῷδ' ἐστίν, αἰνεῖσθαι λίαν, and Monk adds *Heracl.* 202 καὶ γὰρ οὖν ἐπιφθονον λίαν ἐπαινεῖν ἐστί.

981. παραφέρουσ'] Not the same as προσφέρουσα: there is in the παρα- the notion of bringing in something *foreign to the occasion*. The word would very well suit the first introduction of a sufferer's petition, though not a repetition of it.

ἀλλ' οὖν ἔχει τοι σχῆμα, κἄν ἄπωθεν ἦ
 ἀνὴρ ὁ χρηστός, δυστυχοῦντας ὠφελεῖν.
 οἴκτιρε δ' ἡμᾶς· οἴκτρα γὰρ πεπόνθαμεν. 985
 ἢ πρῶτα μὲν σε γαμβρόν οἰηθείς' ἔχειν,
 κενὴν κατέσχον ἐλπίδ'· εἰτά σοι τάχα
 ὄρνις γένοιτ' ἂν τοῖσι μέλλουσι γάμοις
 θανοῦσ' ἐμῇ παῖς, ὃ σε φυλάξασθαι χρεών.]
 ἀλλ' εὖ μὲν ἀρχᾶς εἶπας, εὖ δὲ καὶ τέλη· 990
 σοῦ γὰρ θέλοντος παῖς ἐμῇ σωθήσεται.
 βούλει νιν ἰκέτιν σὸν περιπτύξαι γόνυ;
 ἀπαρθένευτα μὲν τὰδ'· εἰ δέ σοι δοκεῖ,

afresh to supplications, and begin them in words which directly contradict words she has used in her supplications before, *i.e.* 900 ff.? (*αἰσχύνομαι δὲ—οὐκ ἐπαυθησόμεσθ' οὖν κ.τ.λ.*). (2) Then the passage breaks up internally: 981—984 stands by itself; so does 985—*ἐλπίδ'* in 987. The *πρῶτα μὲν σε* and *εἰτά σοι* have only the merest superficial pretence of a connexion of ideas. It is impossible to join the two passages together in thought, as two reasons for the same conclusion. The latter half of 989 is manifest 'padding'. 985 is a capital line in itself. (Schiller thinks this spasmodic recurrence to a suppliant's tone a natural sign of the bewildered anxiety of the distressed mother. This notion of a *studied inconsistency* cannot however be admitted for Greek Tragedy.) 983. P has what I think was *ἄπωθεν ὦν* corrected by a late hand to *ἄπωθεν ἦ* which is the reading of L. Both here and at 979 P and L have *γνώ[μη]* in the margin. 988. *τοῖσι PL, σοῖς τε Markland, σοῖσι Herm. (Orhisc.)*. 990. *καὶ τέλη PL, ? πανταχῇ* (see Expl. Notes). 993. *ἀπαρθένευτα· οὐ*

983. **ἔχει τοι σχῆμα**] A somewhat dignified form of '*It looks well*'. Monk translates 'he' (*i.e.* as he takes it, *ἀνὴρ ὁ χρηστός*) 'has good grounds', but a comparison of *Trō.* 470 (*θῦμος δ' ἔχει τι σχῆμα κικλήσκειν θεοῦς*) shows that Musgrave was nearer in rendering "*habet speciem, vel gratiam*" and Hermann in taking *ἔχει* impersonally, and *ἦ* with *ἀνὴρ*. (The *τοι* seems in place here and the *τι* there: cf. however *Hec.* 228, and *Soph. O. C.* 47, where the MSS. are divided between *τοι* and *τι*.)

κἄν ἄπωθεν ἦ] Cp. *Fr.* 894 *σοφὸν γὰρ ἀνδρα, κἄν ἐκὰς ναίῃ χθονός, κἄν μήποτ' ὄσσοις εἰσίδω, κρινῶ φίλον*. Here *ἄπωθεν* is apparently used in the sense of unconnected by ties of family or race; though the connexion of the idea with the *ἄνοσος κακῶν ἐμῶν* shows that it

was used in quite a general sense. For the *δυστυχοῦντας ὠφελεῖν* in the next *v.* cf. *δυστυχοῦντας ὠφελῶν* in *v.* 1008 below.

990. The rejection of the previous 9 lines (see Crit. Notes), as Hennig says, restores to this *v.* its natural meaning. All such emendations as Kirchhoff's *τέλει*—for which absolute use of *τελέω* there is no parallel—and attempts to explain *τέλη* by supplying a verb in the imperative, are unnecessary. The words are a concise expression of the praise spoken of in the previous verses (977, 979 and 980). The plurals (*ἀρχὰς* and *τέλη*) add a dignity to the statement: for *ἀρχαί* cf. above *v.* 320 and *I. T.* 939 *ἀρχαί δ' αἶδε μοι πολλῶν πόνων*. At *Hec.* 661 L gives *ἀρχὰς* as a variant for *ἀρχάν*. Cf. also the adverbial *κατ' ἀρχάς*. But I



- μέγιστος ὑμᾶς ἐξαπαλλάξαι κακῶν.
 ὡς ἔν γ' ἀκούσασ' ἴσθι, μὴ ψευδῶς μ' ἐρεῖν· 1005
 ψευδῆ λέγων δὲ καὶ μάτην ἐγκερτομῶν
 θάνοιμι· μὴ θάνοιμι δ', ἣν σώσω κόρην.
 ΚΛ. ὄναιο συνεχῶς δυστυχοῦντας ὠφελῶν.
 ΑΧ. ἄκουε δὴ νυν, ἵνα τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἔχη καλῶς.
 ΚΛ. τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας ὡς ἀκουστέον γέ σου; 1010
 ΑΧ. πείσον μεταῦθις πατέρα βέλτιον φρονεῖν.
 ΚΛ. κακός τίς ἐστί καὶ λίαν тарβεῖ στρατόν.
 ΑΧ. ἀλλ' οὖν λόγοι γε καταπαλαίουσι φόβους.

ἀνικετεύω θ'. Weil). 1004. ἐξ ἀπαλλάξαι P corrected by a late hand to ἐξαπαλλάξαι. 1005—1007. J. C(onington) regards these *νν*. as spurious, and Dindorf has followed him. 1007. The *μ* of the second θάνοιμι is added above the line, I think by a second hand, in P. 1008. I suspect that *συνεχῶς*, which is not a poetical word, and is weak here, whether taken (as is best) with *ὄναιο* or with *ὠφελῶν*, is either a gloss or, more likely, a comment, directing that two words should be read as one (see above on *ν*. 1004), which has crept into the text. This latter suggestion may be regarded as a faint support of the view that *νν*. 1005—1007 are spurious: *i.e.* the *συνεχῶς* may conceivably have referred to the word ἐξαπαλλάξαι. Possibly the words ousted by *συνεχῶς* were δ' αὐτὸς or καὶ σὺ. 1009. δὴ νῦν PL, δὴ νυν Barnes. Cp. on *ν*. 1146 below.—*ἔχη* corrected by an early hand to *ἔχει* P, *ἔχη* with *ει* written over the *η* by the first hand (Vit.) L. Those who wrote *ἔχει* apparently took ἵνα in the sense of *ἵσθι*, a natural extension of its use for *the circumstances in which*. 1011. *πειθωμεθ' αὐτίς* PL, but in P there is an erasure over the *ω* extending back to the *θ* and the *θ* itself is a correction, I think, for an earlier *σ*, while in I. *πειθωμεν* is written over the former word. *πειθωμεν* Scaliger, *αὐτίς* Matthiae, *αὐτῆς* Monk. Markland says the Paris copies of L vary between *πείθομεθ'* and *πείθομεν*. I believe that the original was *πείσον μεταῦθις* and that a copyist's erroneous writing of the second word as *μεθαῦτις* was the source of all the subsequent corruption. The imperative suits the passage better than the 1st pers. subj., for it is clear that Achilles does not mean to take any part in the attempt to prevail on Agamemnon. *μεταῦθις*, 'from henceforth', would be naturally used of a change of mind. 1013. *οἱ*

1006. *μάτην ἐγκερτομῆν*] very nearly corresponds to the English 'swagger'.

1007. *μὴ θάνοιμι δ' κ.τ.λ.*] These words seem to us at first a weak conclusion. The expression has been influenced by its antithetical form. Probably in effect they were meant as an assurance:—'As I hope for life I will save the maiden'.

1010. I have adopted Markland's punctuation of this line, but not quite his

interpretation, which is: "*Quid hoc dicis quare me oportet audire te?*" I think *ὡς* is *that* (conj.) and that the sentence is 'short' for 'what is this which you mean when you say I must hear (something) from you?' The passage Markland cites from the *Troades* (*ν*. 889) is not parallel: the *ὡς* there is exclamatory.

1012. See Introduction p. xv and above *ν*. 517, and cp. *Fr.* 716 κακός τίς ἐστί προξένω σοὶ χρώμενος.

ΚΛ. ψυχρά μὲν ἐλπίς· ὅ τι δὲ χρεῶν με δρᾶν φράσον.
 ΑΧ. ἰκέτευ' ἐκέεινον πρῶτα μὴ κτείνειν τέκνα· 1015
 ἦν δ' ἀντιβαίνοιη, πρὸς ἐμέ σοι πορευτέον.

* * * * *

[εἶη γὰρ τὸ χρῆζον ἐπίθετ', οὐ τοῦμὸν χρεῶν
 χωρεῖν· ἔχει γὰρ τοῦτο τὴν σωτηρίαν.
 καγὼ τ' ἀμείνων πρὸς φίλον γενήσομαι,
 στρατός τ' ἂν οὐ μέμψαιτό μ', εἰ τὰ πράγματα 1020
 λελογισμένως πρᾶσσοιμι μᾶλλον ἢ σθένει.

PL, οὖν Markl., λόγους PL, φόβους Musgrave (and so Wecklein). 1014. In ψυχρά in P the ρ is inserted over the line in darker ink: *i.e.* the first hand wrote ψυχά, a mistake significant of the nature of the copyist.—τί δὲ χρή PL (χρή corrected in L by the first hand from χρῆ), ὅ, τι δὲ χρή Reiske, Markland and Musgrave, and so most editors. Scaliger's impossible χρεῶ suggested to Hermann χρεῶν, which is I think the best emendation:—χρή may well have been an explanation of the more unusual χρεῶν. 1016. ἂν PL, ἦν Markland. 1017. εἶη γὰρ τὸ χρῆζον ἐπίθετ' PL (the η erased by a late hand in P), καὶ δὴ τὸ χρῆζον ἐπιθεῖν Monk, ἦ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Weil, who takes ἐπίθετ' to be for ἐπίθετε, εἰ γὰρ τὸ χρηστὸν πείσεται Blomfield. This verse is so corrupt that it seems to me impossible to determine whether it was originally spurious or not. 1018—1023. At any rate the following six verses will, I think, generally be allowed to be an interpolation. The chief indications of their late origin are the following: χωρεῖν used in the sense of χωρεῖν πρὸς ἔργον, the weakness of the rest of the line, with its vague τοῦτο, the prosaic λελογισμένως: the καὶ in 1022 shows that κρᾶνθέντων (used as gen. abs. with τούτων or τῶν πραγμάτων understood) was scanned by the accent as ---: lastly in 1023 κᾶν for καὶ is evidently a resource of a poor versifier. Monk rejected *v.* 1022, Dindorf *vv.* 1017—1023 and Nauck follows him in so doing. Weil rejects the last two *vv.* only, Hennig (who reads ἦ...ἐπιθεῖν), none. I think very possibly the interpolator of this passage had in mind *Hecuba vv.* 854—856:—εἶπως φανείη γ' ὥστε σοὶ τ' ἔχειν καλῶς, στρατῶ τε μὴ δόξαιμι κ.τ.λ. 1019. In P a late hand has written an explanatory τοι over the τ. 1021. σθένει P, σθένει L (with ω

1017. τὸ χρῆζον] Lit. 'that which desires' (cf. Thuc. 1. 36 τὸ δεδιὸς and τὸ θαρσοῦν), a periphrasis for 'desire', but not, as most interpreters take it, for 'entreaty'; for though, like the English *require, desiderate*, the word is sometimes used of the *expression* of a need, it properly applies to *feeling* the need. Hennig (see C. N.) sees no difficulty in making a general clause with a *quasi* gnomic aorist (ἦ τὸ χρῆζον ἐπιθεῖν: "quia optatio persuasit") subordinate to words which must apply to the particular case: "non me opus est intercedere". It must

be admitted that Weil's ἦ makes the χωρεῖν easier.

1019. For ἀμείνων πρὸς φίλον, which has a suspicious ring about it, Monk compares *Alc.* 433 ἀμείνων εἰς ἐμέ, and Vitelli *vv.* 1179 and 1184 (κακῆν περὶ σέ) below, and *Med.* 82 οἶος εἰς ὑμᾶς, and *Xen. Cyrop.* v. 2. 27 (τοιούτος εἰς σέ). Both the γενήσομαι and the μέμψαιτο ἂν clauses must be taken together as apodosis to the following εἰ clause.

1021. λελογισμένως] 'by plan'—well enough as a contrast to 'by force', but not the contrast which is in place here.

καλῶς δὲ κρανθέντων καὶ πρὸς ἡδονὴν φίλοις
σοὶ τ' ἂν γένοιτο κἂν ἐμοῦ χωρὶς τάδε.]

KΛ. ὡς σῶφρον' εἶπας. δραστέον δ' ἅ σοι δοκεῖ.
ἦν δ' αὖ τι μὴ πράσσωμεν ὧν ἐγὼ θέλω,
ποῦ σ' αἰθις ὀψόμεσθα; ποῦ χρὴ μ' ἀθλίαν
ἐλθοῦσαν εὐρεῖν σὴν χέρ' ἐπίκουρον κακῶν;

1025

ΑΧ. ἡμεῖς σε φύλακος οὐ χρέος φυλάξομεν.
μή τις σ' ἴδῃ στείχουσαν ἐπτοημένην
Δαναῶν δι' ὄχλου· μηδὲ πατρῶων δόμον
αἴσχυν'· ὁ γάρ τοι Τυνδάρεως οὐκ ἄξιος
[κακῶς ἀκούει· ἐν γὰρ Ἑλλησιν μέγας].

1030

written over *ει* by an early hand). 1022. *κρανθέντων* καὶ P, and in L there is an erasure of one or two letters after *κρανθέντων*. 1024. *ὡς σῶφρον'* PL, but an early hand in both corrected to *ὡς σῶφρον'*: the correction is more complete in L as the circumflex has been erased. (The first stage in the error was probably the accidental omission of one of the two sigmas; then a later scribe, taking *εἶπας* for a participle, altered *ὦ* into *ῶ*.) 1025. *αὐτὰ* PL, *αὖ τι* Monk. *ἅ* P, *ἂν* L, *ὧν* Monk. 1026. The *σ* in *ὀψόμεσθα* was added by an early hand in L. Wecklein would read *ποῖ* for the second *ποῦ*. 1028. *φύλακες οὐ χρεῶν φυλάσσομεν* PL, *φυλάξομεν* Markland. I think the *φύλακες φυλάξομεν* is very weak, and suggest that originally the line ran *ἡμεῖς σε φύλακος οὐ χρέος φυλάξομεν*. 1032. I have no hesitation in

To advise supplication is hardly to 'conduct the affair by plan'.

1022. It is possible that the *καὶ* was not due to the original writer: if so the line is open to a different though less serious metrical objection: *i.e.* the lack of a caesura in the middle, and the division into two halves. If the *καὶ* was part of the original line it was probably intended to go with the following *τ'* as *both—and*: if a subsequent addition, it was probably made by some one who did not see the sense of the two lines and thought *καλ. κραν.* wanted joining to *πρὸς ἡδ. φίλ.*—I think we are meant to supply *τῶνδε* from the *τάδε* in *v.* 1023 and not *τῶν πραγμάτων*, as most, with *κρανθέντων*.

1023. The *ἂν* in *κἂν* must be supposed to be a *repeated ἂν*.—A miserable rag of sense we get from the sentence at best: 'If these things are brought to a successful issue they will please your friends,

and please you, without help from me'.

1024. *ὡς σῶφρον' εἶπας*] These words could hardly refer to *v.* 1015 and 1016. It is probable therefore that the spurious 1017—1023 were composed to fill a gap in the text. Hardly any one, though, but their author could suppose that *ὡς σῶφρον' εἶπας* could refer to *them*.

1025. Monk cps. *I. T.* 513 *ἄρ' ἂν τί μοι φράσειας ὧν ἐγὼ θέλω*;

1028 f. I have followed Markland's note in putting a full stop at *φυλάξομεν*. Most editors take *μή τις σ' ἴδῃ κ.τ.λ.* as depending upon *φυλάξομεν*, but it is best to make them begin a separate prohibition. Cly. has asked Ach. where she is to find him when she wants him. His answer is that he will come when he is wanted, and that she is not to venture—in her excited state too—to traverse the camp. (Monk puts a full stop after *φυλάξομεν*, but says in his note that it is a mistake for a comma.)

ΚΛ. ἔσται τὰδ'. ἄρχε· σοί με δουλεύειν χρεών.
εἰ δ' εἰσι θεοί, δίκαιος ὦν ἀνὴρ, θεῶν
ἔσθλων κυρήσεις· εἰ δὲ μή, τί δεῖ πονεῖν; 1035

ΣΤΑΣΙΜΟΝ Γ'.

ΧΟ. τίς ἄρ' ὑμέναιος διὰ λωτοῦ Λίβυος στρ.
μετά τε φιλοχόρου κιθάρας
συρίγγων θ' ὑπὸ καλαμοεσ-
σᾶν ἔστασεν ἰαχάν,
ὅτ' ἀνὰ Πήλιον αἰ καλλιπλόκαμοι 1040

following F. W. Schmidt (and Nauck) in rejecting this line, thus giving a speech of the same length as that to which it is an answer, and getting rid of a senseless line. 'Bringing shame on her father's house' is not the same thing as causing Tyndareus 'to be ill spoken of' (κακῶς ἀκούειν). 1033. ἔστω PL, ἔσται Markl. 1034. In P this *v.* is in cramped writing and ends with ἀνὴρ. In L σύγῃ is added, but not by the original hand (Vit. calls it an early hand, Wil.-Möll. *recentissima*). σύ τοι Valckenaer, with Porson's approbation, which words Heimsoeth would put after θεοί. Hermann (*Opusc.*) begins the *v.* σὺ δ', εἰ μὲν εἰσιν θεοί. Vitelli, following Monk in taking ἔσθλων in *v.* 1035 as masc. with θεῶν supplied, would fill the gap by θεῶν. This I have adopted. The similarity of the ending of the previous *v.* may have caused the loss of θεῶν. See Porson's note on *Phoen.* 5, where he gives several instances of the loss of some case of θεός. 1035. In P δεῖ is corrected by an early hand from (I think) δῆ. 1036. τίς PL, τίν' (and Ὑμέναιος) Markl. (See Expl. N. on *v.* 1039.) 1038. καλαμώεσσαν PL, καλαμοεσσᾶν Markland. 1039. ἔστασαν PL, ἔστασεν Portus. 1040. In P this *v.* begins with ὅταν ἀνὰ

1034. For the synzesis of θεοί following a short syllable cf. Soph. *O. T.* 1519 ἀλλὰ θεοῖς γ' ἔχθιστος ἦκω.

1035. For (θεῶν) ἔσθλων κυρήσεις Monk compares *Ion* 1269 ἔσθλου δ' ἔκυρσα δαίμονος. For τί δεῖ πονεῖν Vitelli cps. Soph. *O. C.* 1022 εἰ δ' ἐγκρατεῖς φεύγουσιν, οὐδὲν δεῖ πονεῖν.

1036—1097. Third Stasimon. "Omnium in Euripide, mea opinione, pulcherrimum et suavissimum" Markland. The subject of the strophe and antistrophe is the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, with which in the Epode is contrasted the mock wedding between their son and Iphigeneia.

1039. ἔστασεν] There is, I believe, no other instance of any variety of the phrase ἰσᾶναι βόην being used with *song*

or *music*, instead of a *person* as its subject. It is this fact which makes Markland's τίν'...Ὑμέναιος worthy of consideration. It is quite conceivable though, that in lyric poetry such a phrase as 'what song raised its strains' would be used as an intentional variety of the ordinary expression.

ἰαχάν] Cf. Elmsley on *Heracleidae v.* 752 and Nauck *Stud. Eur.* 1. 111 f. [ἰαχή and ἰαχέω always in tragedy, though the aor. ἰαχον (*Or.* 1465, *Tro.* 829): where the metre demands ἰᾶ read ἄχά—cf. *v.* 1045—i.e. ἠχή: the forms in κχ are confined to Ἰακχος and its derivatives ἰακχάζω and ἐπεξιακχάζω.]

1040. ἀνὰ Πήλιον] apparently means along the ridge of Pelion (on their way from Mt Olympus?): so ἀν' ὄρος in *v.* 1046.

Πιερίδες παρὰ δαιτὶ θεῶν
 χρυσεοσάνδαλον ἔχοντες
 ἐν γᾶ κρούσουσαι
 Πηλέως εἰς γάμον ἦλθον,
 μελωδοῖς Θέτιν ἀχήμεσι τὸν τ' Αἰακίδαυ 1045
 Κενταύρων ἀν' ὄρος κλέουσαι
 Πηλιάδα καθ' ὕλαν;
 [ὁ δὲ Δαρδανίδαυ, Διὸς
 λέκτρων τρύφημα φίλον, 1050

(with a space between) corrected to ὄτ' ἀνά, in L an erasure follows *λαχάν* and ὄτ' ἀνά is in an erasure. I conjecture that the confusion arose from the presence in some MS. of an *ἀντάν* by the side of *λαχάν*, intended either as a variant or an explanation. 1041—1043. *Vv.* 1041 and 1063 should correspond metrically, but as they stand in the MSS. they are: Πιερίδες ἐν δαιτὶ θεῶν and: παῖδες αἱ Θεσσαλαί, μέγα φῶς, which certainly do not. In *v.* 1063 I have adopted Weil's modification of Kirchhoff's reading (παῖδά σε Θεσσαλία μέγα φῶς, with γεννάσειν in 1065), and, with some doubt, Kirchhoff's παρὰ for ἐν in 1041. Hennig, on the ground that these words can only mean that 'the Muses came to Peleus's wedding, while beating the ground (etc.) in a banquet of the gods', reads Πιερίδες, χάρμ' ἐπὶ δαιτὶ θεῶν and (in 1063) παῖδες οἱ Θεσσαλίας, μέγα φῶς. He argues from the fact that in a chorus of the *Bacchae* Πιερία corresponds to κατὰ φάος, that the ι in Πιερίδες might be treated in Lyric poetry as a short syllable—a very inconclusive deduction. His objection to the meaning of the ordinary reading is well founded. It can only be met by saying that κρούουσαι is used 'habitually', in the sense of 'who often beat' (the ground etc. at the feasts of the gods). But this would at least need the article before κρούουσαι. I propose to avoid this difficulty by reading κρούουσαι in *v.* 1043 for the MSS. κρούουσαι. In such a position a σ may well have slipped out, especially in an uncial MS. The δαιτὶ θεῶν I take therefore to be the same as that spoken of in *v.* 1060, that, *i.e.*, at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. 1044. Πηλέως (with σ, *i.e.* συνίησις, over ἔως) P, Πηλέως L. 1045. μελωδοῖ PL, μελωδοῖς Elmsley (on *Heracle.* 752). λαχήμεσι PL (with ἀντὶ μῖας written over the *λα* in both MSS.), ἀχήμεσι Elmsley. 1046. ἐν ὄρεσι PL, but in L ἐν, which Vitelli gives as the reading, looks, in his facsimile, as if it had been altered by a later hand to ἀν', which is the reading of Paris A. ἀν' ὄρος Herm. When ἀν' became ἐν, ὄρος would naturally become ὄρεσι. κλύουσαι PL, κλείουσαι Brodaeus, and Paris A, κλέουσαι Monk. 1049—1053. I have no hesitation in rejecting these *vv.* and the corresponding *vv.* 1071—1075. Ganymede and the arms of Achilles were two stock mythological 'tags' worked in here possibly by the same interpolator who dished up for us earlier in the play the Homeric catalogue of the ships. The mention of what happened at the feast interrupts awkwardly here the account of the guests trooping to it along the mountain and of the sea-nymphs' dance on the sea-shore. 1050. φίλιον PL

1042. χρυσεοσάνδαλον] Euripides has seven (generally accepted) instances of compounds in χρυσεο- (instead of the ordinary forms in χρυσο-), always in lyrical

passages, Aeschylus one (χρυσεοστέδμους in a trochaic tetrameter), Sophocles none. Euripides is the only tragedian who uses compounds beginning with χαλκεο-.



χρυσέοισιν ἄφυσσε λοιβάν
 ἐν κρατήρων γυάλοις,
 ὁ Φρύγιος Γανυμήδης.]
 παρὰ δὲ λευκοφαῆ ψάμαθον
 εἰλισσόμεναι κύκλια
 πεντήκοντα κόραι γάμους
 Νηρέως ἐχόρευσαν.

1055

ἀνὰ δ' ἐλάταισι στεφανώδει τε χλόα
 θίασος ἔμολεν ἵπποβάτας
 Κενταύρων ἐπὶ δαίτα τῶν
 θεῶν κρατήρᾳ τε Βάκχου.
 μέγα δ' ἀνέκλαγον ὦ Νηρηὶ κόρα,
 παῖδα σὲ Θεσσαλίᾳ μέγα φῶς
 μάντις ὁ φοιβάδα μούσαν

ἀντ.

1060

(with ἀντὶ μᾶς over ἰων in L), φίλον Musurus. 1055. κύκλια Weil rejects as an interpolation, and in *zv.* 1056 f. transposes Νηρέως and γάμους (see on *v.* 1078 in the antistrophe). I think it impossible that the strophe and antistrophe could have ended with lines which correspond so badly as γάμους ἐχόρευσαν and Πηλέως θ' ὑμεναίους, so I have adopted the transposition. 1056. Νηρέως corrected by (perhaps) an early hand to Νηρηῖ P, Νηρηῖος L, but the ἦος is in an erasure: the correction, V. says, is an early one. 1058. A good instance of the short-sighted way in which mss. are sometimes corrected is the fact that an early hand in L so accents these words as to make them read στεφάνω δεῖ τε. 1059. ἵπποβότας PL, ἵπποβάτας Paley and Gomperz, who compare the use (Soph. *Trach.* 1095) of ἵπποβάμων as an epithet for the Centaurs. Paley compares *Cyclops* 54, at which place L¹ reads ἀγροβάτα and L² and P ἀγροβάτα. I do not think Hennig's objection, founded on the difference of meaning between -βάτης and -βάμων, conclusive. 1062. Νηρηεὶ corrected by a not very early hand to Νηρηεὶ P, Νηρηεὶ L. 1063. παῖδες αἱ Θεσσαλαὶ PL, παῖδα σὲ Θεσσαλίᾳ Kirchhoff, in which Weil changes σὲ to σε. 1064. δ' ὁ φοιβα μούσαν εἰδῶς P (an early hand crossed through the δ' and a later

1058. 'Among the pines, with their green crowns', στεφανώδει being used with reference to the flat circular shape often assumed by the foliage of the silver fir. Weil reads ἐλάταις σὺν στ., and takes the words to mean 'leaning on pine-stems, and garlanded with green leaves', quoting (after Lenz and Matthiae) Hes. *Scut.* 188, where ἐλάται are mentioned as the weapons of the Centaurs. Vitelli also compares the Homeric χρυσέω ἀνὰ σκήπτρω A 15 and 374. But the passage as it stands gives us at least as good a

sense. For the images it suggests cp. *Alc.* 585 f. ὑψικῶμων πέραν βαίνοσ' ἐλάτων, and *Bacch.* 38 χλωραῖς ὑπ' ἐλάταις. For the ἀνά cf. above, *v.* 754.

1062. I think it is best to take μέγα as an adv. qualifying ἀνέκλαγον and not as part of the Centaurs' song, which begins at ὦ and goes down to πυρώσων. This again is better than taking 'δ...φῶς' and 'δς...πυρώσων' to be words uttered by Cheiron only.

1063. For Θεσσαλίᾳ μέγα φῶς cp. below *v.* 1502 ἔθρεψας Ἑλλάδι μέγα φῶς.

εἰδὼς γεννάσειν 1065
 Χείρων ἐξονόμαζεν,
 ὃς ἤξει χθόνα λογχήρεσι σὺν Μυρμιδόνων
 ἀσπισταῖς Πριάμοιο κλεινὰν
 Ἰλιάδα πυρώσων. 1070
 [περὶ σώματι χρυσέων
 ὄπλων Ἑφαιστοπόνων
 κεκορυθμένος ἔνδυν', ἐκ θεᾶς
 ματρὸς δωρήματ' ἔχων
 Θέτιδος, ἃ νιν ἔτικτε.] 1075
 μακάριον τότε δαίμονες
 τᾶς εὐπάτριδος γάμου
 Νηρηΐδος τ' ἔθεσαν ποτνίας

one changed φοῖβα into φοῖβος, and inserted a ὀ before μουσαν and a τ' after it), δ' ὀ φοῖβα μουσαν εἰδὼς (corrected to δ' ὀ φοῖβος ὀ μουσᾶν τ' εἰδὼς) L. I am not sure about the original accents in P. The εἰδὼς in Vitelli's collation (*Oss.* p. 70) is a misprint for εἰδὼς, the first ' being the apostrophe of the τ'. ὀ φοῖβάδα μουσαν εἰδὼς Hermann. 1065. γεννάσεις PL (γεννήσεις is written over it in P and η is written over a in L), γεννάσειν Weil. 1066. ἐξονόμασεν PL, ἐξονόμαζεν Monk and Firnhaber (Hermann, who reads ἀνέκλαγεν in 1062, reads ἐξονομάζων here). 1067. ἤξει PL, but the adoption of the above-mentioned emendations almost seems to necessitate ἤξει. 1068. λογχήρεσι PL (σσ corrected to σ in L but not in P). 1069. ἀσπισταῖς P, ἀσπισταῖσι L (with a 'quasi erasure', Vitelli says, of the final ι). 1070. γαῖαν ἐκπυρώσων PL. Weil calls attention to the fact that there is no place here for *both* γαῖαν and χθόνα and reads Πέργαμά τε πυρώσων, which, as he says, also restores the strophical correspondence: I have ventured to read Ἰλιάδα πυρώσων. In uncials γαῖαν and Ἰλιάδα are very similar, and when once γαῖαν had taken its place the ἐκ would be added for the sake of the metre. 1075. ἔτικτε PL, ἔτικτεν L². 1078. Νηρηΐδος ἔθεσαν πρώτας PL. In both a later hand has altered N. to Νηρηΐδος and written ἀντι μας over the -δος, meaning it, I think, to apply to the two syllables -δος ἐ-. In L -ης is written by an early hand—Vit.

1066. ἐξονόμαζεν] Used as *ονομάζω* at I 515 and Σ 449 in the sense of *state distinctly, promise*. It is a little difficult to find an exact force for the imperfect here; perhaps it may be given by putting an *always* with the English verb; '*always foretold*'.

1070. For χθόνα...πυρώσων cf. Soph. *Anl.* 286 f. πυρώσων...γῆν, and cf. above v. 535, and Kuster on Ar. *Thesm.* 115 where he gives several instances from tragedy of χθών or γῆ used instead of πόλις.

1071—1075. If these *vv.* were admitted into the text we should have to suppose the Centaurs' song to end at ἐξονόμαζεν, for Thetis could not be spoken of in the third person by name in a song addressed to her. Paley sees in the assumption of these *vv.* that Achilles would go to Troy already possessed of the armour made by Hephaestus, a proof that Euripides did not know *our* 'Homer'.—The acc. ἐνδυνά with κεκορυθμένος and the ἐκ which follows it are questionable Greek.

Πηλέως θ' ὑμεναίους.

σὲ δ' ὦ κόρα στέψουσι καλλικόμαν ἐπῳδός 1080

πλόκαμον Ἀργεῖοι, βαλιὰν

ὥστε πετραίων ἀπ' ἄντρων ἐλθοῦσαν ὀρέων

μόσχον ἀκήρατον, βρότειον

αἰμάσσοντες λαιμόν·

οὐ σύριγγι τραφέισαν, οὐδ'

1085

ἐν ροιβδήσει βουκόλων,

παρὰ δὲ ματέρι νυμφόκομον

Ἰναχίδαις γάμον.

ποῦ τὸ τᾶς αἰδοῦς

ἢ τὸ τᾶς ἀρετᾶς ἔχει

1090

says m. pr.—over *-as*. Most editors have adopted Heath's *Νηρήδων*. Weil, see on *vv.* 1055—6 above, reads here *Νηρήδός τ' ἔθεσαν γάμον*, which last word he takes from *v.* 1077 to put in the place of *πρώτας* which he rejects as a gloss. (The *τ'* is Hermann's.) I venture to prefer *Νηρήδός τ' ἔθεσαν ποτνίας*. I take *πρώτας* to have been originally an explanation of *ποτνίας* (scanned ~ -). 1080. *ἐπὶ κόρα* PL, *ὦ κόρα* Herm. (*Orusc.*). 1081. *γ' ἀλιᾶν* PL, *βαλιὰν* Scaliger (cf. *Hec.* 90). 1082. *ὀρέων* PL, *ὀρέων* Monk, but there is no objection of any kind to the gen. Cf. *Soph. Ant.* 289 *πέλωσ ἀνδρες*. 1086. *ροιβδήσει* PL, *ροιβδήσει* Dobree. 1087. *νυμφόκομον* PL, *νυμφόκομον* Reiske. 1090. *δύνασιν ἔχει* PL. I agree with Bothe that we ought only to have *ἔχει* here, that the word *δύνασιν* was written originally in *v.* 1093, and that *δύναμιν*, being written over it as an explanation, took its place, *δύνασιν* being transferred by a copyist's mistake to 1090. Hartung excludes both *δύνασιν* and *ἔχει* in 1090 and reads *σθένει* in 1091. I have adopted Bothe's reading, but I think the process of the error was more probably this: that *δύνασιν* was put in with the first *ἔχει* by way of explanation, to show, *i.e.*, that

1083. **βρότειον**] I think it is worth suggesting that here and possibly at *Heracl.* 822 (*λαιμῶν βροτείων*) *βρότειος* has nothing to do with *βροτός* mortal, but is derived from the Homeric *βρότος αἰματώεις*, and means *gory* (here *proleptic*).

1085. **σύριγγι**] Cf. on 210 above. The *ἐν* before *ροιβδήσει* must be supplied mentally with *σύριγγι* too, *ἐν* being here 'within the sound of'. The *ροιβδήσεις* would doubtless be made by *σύριγγες*, so that the whole expression is equivalent to *οὐκ ἐν ροιβδήσει βουκολικῶν συρίγγων*. For the position of the prep. cf. *Soph. Ant.* 367 *ποτὲ μὲν κακόν, ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἐσθλὸν ἔρπει*. *Ant.* 1176, *O. T.* 734,

Ar. Ach. 533, Lobeck on *Soph. Ai. vv.* 395 ff., *Eur. Phoen.* 361 *οὔτω δὲ τάρβος εἰς φόβον τ' ἀφικόμην*: this idiom is post-Homeric.

1087 f. These lines are hard: they seem to mean 'having not yet left her mother, though attired as a bride for some Argive husband'. For *γάμος* in the sense of bride Weil cps. *Androm.* 103. There is no parallel for *νυμφόκομος* in the sense of 'in bridal attire', but nothing else can be made of it here, and the analogy of similar compounds allows it, and at *Med.* 985 the verb *νυμφοκομεῖν* is used in the neuter sense of 'to appear as a bride'.

σθένειν τι πρόσωπον;
 ὁπότε τὸ μὲν ἄσεπτον ἔχει
 δύνασιν, ἃ δ' ἀρετὰ κατόπι-
 σθεν θνατοῖς ἀμελεῖται,
 ἀνομία δὲ νόμων κρατεῖ,
 καὶ μὴ κοινὸς ἀγὼν βροτοῖς,
 μὴ τις θεῶν φθόνος ἔλθη.

1095

ΚΛ. ἐξῆλθον οἴκων προσκοπομένη πόσιν,
 χρόνιον ἀπόντα κάκλειοπτότα στέγας.
 [ἐν δακρύοισι θ' ἢ τάλαινα παῖς ἐμή,
 πολλὰς ἰεῖσα μεταβολὰς ὄδυρμάτων,
 θάνατον ἀκούσας, ὃν πατήρ βουλευέται.]

1100

this ἔχει was equivalent in force to the following δύνασιν ἔχει, and that when it had made its way into the text, the second δύνασιν was altered, for variety's sake, to δύναμιν. 1093. δύναμιν PL, δύνασιν Bothe (see on 1090). 1096. καὶ κοινὸς PL, καὶ μὴ κοινὸς Herm. This emendation of sense and metre alike is adopted by all editors but Firmhaber. 1098. προσκοπομένη PL: a late hand in P altered the σσ into σ. 1099. ἀπόντ' ἐκλειοπτότα P, altered by an early hand to ἀπόντα κάκλειοπτότα: the latter is the reading of L, but not the original one, as the letters τα κ are in an erasure. 1100—1102. I have marked these three *vv.* as spurious. The first and last seem to me weak lines, and all three make an awkward interruption in Cly.'s speech. The most decided blot in them is the *ὃν βουλευέται* for *ὃν βουλεύει*. The only acc. which βουλεύεσθαι can take is an adverbial or cognate acc. of a neuter pronoun. Markland altered θ' in 1100 to δ'. Weil suspects θάνατον in 1102 and suggests τὸν γάμον. Monk would have expelled *vv.* 1099—1103, reading *δέμας* or *πόδα* in *v.* 1098 for *πόσιν*.—

1091. For αἰδοῦς and ἀρετὰς πρόσωπον Firmhaber well compares Ar. *Birds* 1324 τὸ τῆς ἀγανόφρονος ἡσυχίας εὐήμερον πρόσωπον.

1093. κατόπισθεν] *i.e.* men turn their backs on virtue.

1098. Here the fourth episodion begins. When Cly. left the stage at *v.* 1035 it was to seek her husband and try to dissuade him from his purpose. Ag. left the stage at the end of the second episodion. We may suppose that, though his wife thought (*cf. v.* 740) that he was then going into the camp, she had imagined at *v.* 1035 that he might by that time have returned. She now comes out, with the same purpose as that with

which she went in. But, however we imagine it, it is nothing more than a matter of stage arrangement: a device, that is, to bring about the following meeting and conversation.

προσκοπομένη] 'in the course of my watching or waiting (for my husband)', not 'to watch' for him.

1101. Headlam calls attention to the technical musical sense of μεταβολή. Cf. Aristid. *de Mus.* 1. p. 42 μεταβολή δὲ ἐστὶ ρυθμικὴ ρυθμῶν ἀλλοίωσις ἢ ἀγωγῆς, and Quintilian IX. 4. 50 *Illū [rhythmi], quomodo coeferant, currunt usque ad μεταβολήν, id est transitum in aliud genus rhythmi.*

μνήμην δ' ἄρ' εἶχον πλησίον βεβηκότος
 Ἀγαμέμνονος τοῦδ', ὃς ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ τέκνοις
 ἀνόσια πρᾶστων ἀντίχ' εὐρεθήσεται.

1105

ΑΓΑ. Λήδας γένεθλον, ἐν καλῷ σ' ἔξω δόμων
 ἠῦρηχ', ἵν' εἶπω παρθένου χωρὶς λόγους
 οὐς οὐκ ἀκούειν τὰς γαμουμένας πρέπει.

ΚΛ. τί δ' ἔστιν, οὐ σοι καιρὸς ἀντιλάζυται;

ΑΓΑ. ἔκπεμπε παῖδα τῶνδε δωμάτων πάρος·
 ὡς χέρυβες πάρισιν ἠὔρεπισμένοι,

1110

In 1100 P has *ἐδακρνοισι θ'*.—In 1101 the first hand of P wrote *λεῖσα*. 1104. αὐτοῦ PL, altered by an early hand in L to αὐτοῦ. 1110. The MSS. have *δωμάτων πατρὸς μέτα*. The *πατρὸς μέτα*, even when taken proleptically (for 'so as to be with', or 'to go with her father'), is weak and out of place. This is the first interview between the husband and wife since Cly. left the stage at *v.* 740 with the declaration that she certainly would not give up to Ag. the duty of attending on the bride. There Ag. accepts (*vv.* 742 ff.) the situation, and it is inconceivable that he should begin this interview with what is merely a feeble reiteration of his previous request. I have small doubt that Nauck was right in conjecturing that *πατρός* is a mistake for *πάρος*. Heimsoeth, accepting *πάρος*, rejected *μέτα* and inserted *δεῦρο* before *δωμάτων*. I have adopted these emendations, preferring, however, to write *τῶνδε* as being a word more likely than *δεῦρο* to have fallen out or been ejected. 1111. *ἠὔρεπισμένοι* PL (altered by a late hand

1103. *μνήμην ἔχειν*] is here used as at *Hel.* 1583 and *Hdt.* 1. 14, IV. 79 and 81, in the sense of *μνησθῆναι*, *mention*. Below at *v.* 1231 it has the commoner sense of 'bear in mind'.—*ἄρ'* marks Cly.'s sudden discovery that the man she has been talking of is approaching.

1104. For *ἐπὶ* 'against' cp. *Phoen.* 1379 *ἦξαν δρόμημα δεῖνον ἀλλήλοις ἐπι*: this use is poetical.

1105. "*πρᾶσσειν*] = *machinari*, *Or.* 1579, 1587 etc." Vitelli.

1107. *ἵν' εἶπω*] *ἵνα* here is used elliptically. The idea of *purpose*, which is implied in the words *ἐν καλῷ*, is what has to be supplied. The train of the thought was probably: 'fortunately, that is, for my purpose of telling'. Compare the parenthetical use of *ἵνα* mentioned above on *v.* 320.

1108. *οὐκ...πρέπει*] It is not often that a negative is so far separated from the word it negatives as *οὐ* is here from *πρέπει*. We must not think that *οὐκ* is meant to go specially with *ἀκούειν*, but rather that *ἀκούειν πρέπει* was felt to be a compound verbal expression, either part of which might be negated with the effect of negating the whole. The same explanation applies to *Thuc.* 1. 70. 1 *περὶ ὧν οὐκ αἰσθάνεσθαι ἡμῖν γε δοκεῖτε οὐδ' ἐκλογίσασθαι πώποτε κ.τ.λ.* though the following *οὐδέ* here makes the position of the *οὐ* less marked.

1109. 'What is it for which you find the occasion so apt?' *σοι* is dat. of the person judging. The verb *ἀντ.* occurs again at *v.* 1227.

1110. *ἔκπεμπε*] 'fetch', or 'bring': cf. below on *vv.* 1115 f.

προχύται τε βάλλειν πῦρ καθάρσιον χεροῖν,
 μόσχοι τε, πρὸ γάμων ἄς θεῆ πεσεῖν χρεῶν
 [Ἄρτέμιδι, μέλανος αἵματος φυσήματα].

ΚΛ. τοῖς ὀνόμασιν μὲν εὖ λέγεις, τὰ δ' ἔργα σου

1115

in P to -αι). 1112. πῦρ καθάρειον χερῶν PL (Wil.-Möll. is wrong in giving καθάρσιον as the MSS. reading). An early hand in both MSS. wrote an ἐκ over the *v.* between κ. and χ. Reiske Pierson and Markland all conjectured καθάρσιον (cf. *v.* 1472 below). The χερῶν, which makes no sense, was manifestly due to the scribe's eye wandering to the χρεῶν at the end of the following *v.* All editors (even Firnhaber, though he does not say so) have adopted Musgrave's emendation χεροῖν (dat.). 1113. μόσχοτε προγαμῶν P, altered by a late hand into μόσχοι τε πρὸ γαμῶν, which is apparently the reading of L. 1114. φυσήματα P, φυσήματα L with a second σ written beneath the σ by an early hand, see above on *v.* 125. I suspect that this line has no business here:—that μέλανος αἵματος φυσήματα comes from some other tragedy, and that the Ἄρτέμιδι is due to the patcher who introduced the quotation. The words make a very harsh apposition to μόσχοι (or ἄς), and the six consecutive short syllables are not euphonious. 1115. ὀνόμασι PL, in P a ν is written above the ι by an early hand.

1112. προχύται τε βάλλειν πῦρ] A comparison of *El.* 803 f. (Hermann) λαβῶν δὲ προχύτας...ἔβαλλε βωμούς explains this expression. The χέρνιβες were for the ceremonial washing of the hands, and the barley-meal for sprinkling on the altar-fire, and sometimes on the victim. (This was followed by cutting off and burning a tuft of the victim's hair.) Cf. A 458 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νίψαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλλοντο. The technical term for the performance of these ceremonies preliminary to the sacrifice was *κατάρχεσθαι*, though the word is sometimes applied to the cutting the lock of the victim's hair alone.—πῦρ καθάρσιον. Cp. *H. F.* 937 and *vv.* 928 f. Fire was regarded as, even in a higher degree than water, a purifying element. In the passage of the *H. F.* referred to above, is described the mode in which the χέρνιβες were consecrated: *i.e.* by plunging into the water a burning brand from the altar: the fire is there called, as here, καθάρσιον πῦρ.

1115 f. An unusually elaborate conceit:

'Brave show your words make; yet I

know not how

In words approval of your deeds to show.'

For εὖ λέγειν, as used in *v.* 1116 with a *not* cognate object, for 'speak well of', 'approve', cf. *Alcest.* 1070 ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἔχοιμ' ἂν εὖ λέγειν τύχην: the other sense, that in which it is used in *v.* 1115, absolutely, or with a cognate acc., is far commoner. So at *Soph. O. C.* 1764 πράσσειν καλῶς, which almost always means 'to fare well', is used with ταῦτα for object in the sense of 'to discharge duly'.

With these words it is possible that Cly. entered the door of the royal tent to fulfil the request made by Ag. in *v.* 1110, immediately returning (at *v.* 1120—see *Crit. Notes*) with her daughter. Such a proceeding would be unusual on the Greek stage, where the usual practice was to call characters out and not to fetch them. But Cly.'s words *πειθαρχοῦσά σοι* in 1120 do not agree so well with a summons like that of *v.* [1117] as with a message conveyed by the mother from the father to the daughter.

οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως χρῆ μ' ὀνομάσασαν εὖ λέγειν.

[χῶρει δὲ θύγατερ ἐκτός, οἶσθα γὰρ πατρὸς
πάντως ἂ μέλλει, χυτὸ τοῖς πέπλοις ἄγε
λαβοῦσ' Ὁρέστην σὸν κασίγνητον, τέκνον.]

ἰδού πάρεστιν ἥδε πειθαρχοῦσά σοι.

1120

τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐγὼ πρὸ τῆσδε κάμαντῆς φράσω.

ΑΓΑ. τέκνον, τί κλαίεις, οὐδ' ἔθ' ἠδέως ὄρας,

εἰς γῆν δ' ἐρείσασ' ὄμμα πρόσθ' ἔχεις πέπλους;

ΚΛ. φεῦ·

τὶν' ἂν λάβοιμι τῶν ἐμῶν ἀρχὴν κακῶν;

1117—1119. The mention of the baby is enough, I think, to condemn these three lines, even if consistent weakness of idea and expression did not help to drag them down. Paley was the first to reject them, but he rejected the foll. four *vv.* as well: making Iph. first appear at *v.* 1211. But if only Cly. is present, to whom could the plur. ἤκετε be addressed in *v.* 1127?—(See explanatory notes there.)—hardly to Cly. and the chorus. 1117. χῶρει PL, in P *ει* is corrected

from what looks like *ε* to *ει*, and in L the *ει* is in an erasure which has extended to the following δὲ. 1118. μέλλει χυτὸ PL, with a *γε* inserted in both MSS.

by an early hand above the line between *ι* and *χ*. This *γε* maintained itself in the text till Gaisford expelled it. 1121. πρὸς τῆσδε PL, πρὸ τῆσδε Barnes.

Cf. on *v.* 1201 below. 1122. A late corrector of P (probably Musurus) altered οὐδ' ἔθ' (which is also the reading of L) to οὐδέ θ' and so Ald. and the early editions. Reiske and Markland had the perception to alter it back. Markland proposed to insert μ' before ὄρας. 1124—1126. These three *vv.* are assigned in both P and L to Cly., but a late corrector of P, hastily assuming that, as 1122 f.

1116. πατρός] This is explained as equivalent to *περὶ πατρός*.

1120. After speaking these words to Agamemnon Cly. turns away from him.

1121. This *v.* is intended to account for the presence of Iph. (probably standing at the door of the tent) as a *muta persona* till *v.* 1211. It is convenient that Iph. should hear all that follows: otherwise fresh explanations would be necessary when she came on to the stage. The words are to be understood as not said to Agamemnon, but, like *vv.* 1124 f., to be a soliloquy. (So too Vitelli.) Clytaemnestra is screwing herself up to the point of bringing the great charge against her husband. So in *Hec.* *vv.* 736 ff. Hecuba soliloquizes for some time in the presence of Agamemnon before she makes up her mind finally to

address him, though he repeatedly asks her to do so.

1122 f. οὐδ' ἔθ'. There is no longer the glad greeting which met Ag. in the former scene (*vv.* 640 ff.). The heroine's head is bowed down, and her face covered in sign of grief. This indication gives the spectators just the information conveyed by the spurious *vv.* 1100—1102, and in a more effective way. The absolute use of ὄρας is remarkable: probably it is not merely the same as βλέπεις, but, as we see from the next *v.*, has also the notion 'use your eyes'. Firnhaber cps. Soph. *Phil.* 935 ἄλλ' ὡς μεθήσων μήποθ', ὡς ὄρᾳ πάλιν, Headlam better, Hes. *Sc.* 426 δεινὸν ὄρων ἔσσοισι.

1124 f. The heroine still keeps her face hidden, and Cly. still turned away from Agamemnon continues her soliloquy,

- ἅπασι γὰρ πρότοισι χρήσασθαι πάρα
 [κάν ὑστάτοισι κάν μέσοισι πανταχοῦ]. 1125
- ΑΓΑ. τί δ' ἔστιν; ὥς μοι πάντες εἰς ἐν ἤκετε
 σύγχυσιν ἔχοντες καὶ ταραγμὸν ὀμμάτων.
- ΚΛ. εἶφ' ἂν ἐρωτήσω σε γενναίως, πόσι.
- ΑΓΑ. οὐδὲν κελευσμοῦ δεῖ γ' ἐρωτᾶσθαι θέλω. 1130

were addressed to Iph., this must be her answer, altered κλυ (which is in the usual red-ink used for the indication of the speakers) to ἰφ (in black): and so Ald. and all early editions. Bremi (p. 237) first suggested that the *vv.* belonged to Cly., and Hermann's was, I think, the first edition which so gave them. Bremi however (followed by Matthiae and Weil), believed that the 3 *vv.* were inserted from some other tragedy, on the ground that they are evidently the beginning of a long speech. I do not agree with this view (see Explan. Notes), but I have no hesitation in following Monk, Nauck and Vitelli in rejecting *v.* 1126. It is evidently a reminiscence or a quotation of part of another passage. In L *κάν* (*i.e.* *καὶ ἂν*) is written both times. This looks as if it belonged to a passage of a totally different construction from that of the present one. Even if we read *κάν* it would puzzle us to fit the words in with the previous construction, which, moreover, gives a complete sense in itself.—In 1124 Herm. (*Opusc.*) very plausibly conjectures *λόγων* for *κακῶν*. It is possible that *κακῶν* may have been due to a reminiscence of *El.* 907 (see Expl. Notes). *λόγων*, however, does not suit the following *v.* so well as *κακῶν*. *Vv.* 1129—1140. Several editors (mainly Hartung and Hermann) have proposed to rearrange these *vv.* in various ways. The chief motive seems to have been the desire to bring *v.* 1131 before 1140, or at all events to a later position in the conversation than it holds in the mss. I believe that the apparent inconsistencies are due to the fact that some of Ag.'s words are, as in some of his previous conversations, spoken aside (see Expl. Notes), and that no change is needed. 1129. Over *ἂν* in P is written *ἂ ἂν* as an explanation, in L it is written *ἂν*. 1130. οὐδὲν κελευσμ' οὐ δεῖ γ' PL (in L an *ἦ* is written over the *εἰ*—*i.e.* to suggest *οὐ δὴ*—and Vitelli marks no breathing over the *υ* of *ου*), οὐδὲν κελευσμοῦ δεῖ γ' Canter (as printed, without comment, in his edition of 1571), δεῖ μ' Markland, and δεῖ σ' Dobree. Either *μ'* or *σ'* would give an excellent sense, but it is difficult to see how they could have been altered to *γ'*, even after the corruption to *οὐ δεῖ*, and the *γ'* is not out of

but must be supposed to turn towards her husband before he speaks *v.* 1127.—IHeath cps. Eur. *El.* 907 f. *εἰεν· τίν' ἀρχὴν πρῶτα σ' ἐξείπω κακῶν, ποίας τελευτάς; τίνα μέσον τάξω λόγον;*

1127 f. I have removed the comma usually printed at the end of this line because I think that the participle *ἔχοντες* is to be taken closely with *εἰς ἐν ἤκετε*:— 'How you all combine to show me', or 'agree in showing me, faces full of trouble and distress'. *μοι* is an ethic

dative. *τί δ' ἔστιν;* still spoken to Iphigeneia.—From the word *πάντες* we may conclude (Monk) that Iphigeneia was surrounded by attendants, but there is doubtless a reference to Cly. as well. As Iph. is to be supposed still veiled, it cannot be the expression of *her* face to which her father refers.

1129. Firnhaber cps. *Heracel.* 890 f. *ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοιοῖσδε χρὴ ἀψευδὲς εἶναι τοῖσι γενναίοις στόμα.*

ΚΛ. τὴν παῖδα τὴν σὴν τὴν τ' ἐμὴν μέλλεις κτανεῖν;

ΑΓΑ. ἔα·

τλήμονά γ' ἔλεξας, ὑπονοεῖς θ' ἂ μὴ σε χρή.

ΚΛ. ἔχ' ἥσυχος,

κάκεινό μοι τὸ πρῶτον ἀπόκριναι πάλιν.

ΑΓΑ. σὺ δ', ἦν γ' ἐρωτᾷς εἰκότ', εἰκότ' ἂν κλύοις.

ΚΛ. οὐκ ἄλλ' ἐρωτῶ, καὶ σὺ μὴ λέγ' ἄλλα μοι.

1135

ΑΓΑ. ὦ πότνια μοῖρα καὶ τύχη δαίμων τ' ἐμός.

ΚΛ. κάμὸς γε καὶ τῆσδ', εἰς τριῶν δυσδαιμόνων.

ΑΓΑ. τί μ' ἠδίκησας; ΚΛ. τοῦτ' ἐμοῦ πεύθει πάρα;

place here. 1131. κτανεῖν PL, κτενεῖν Elmsley. (Cf. Goodwin, *M. and T.* § 74.)

1132. In P a late hand has senselessly altered the τ in τλήμονα to π. The first hand in L wrote τλήμον' ἔλεξας, but ἀγ' was added early above the line.—In P the θ' is in an erasure: I think what was first written was δ'. Among the many alterations made in this and the next *v.* with the view of including within the line the words ἔχ' ἥσυχος may here be mentioned Herm.'s ὑπονοεῖς τ'· ἔχ' ἥσυχος. In both P and L ἥσυχος is followed by : to indicate that the verse is broken off short, *i.e.* that the words are *extra metrum*. Ald. omits them. 1134. εἰκότα κλύεις PL, εἰκότ' ἂν κλύοις Markl. and Musgr. Farnhaber retains the MSS. reading.

1135. οὐκ ἄλλ' PL (in L there is a · after οὐκ; if there is one also in P, I have failed to notice it) and so Aldus: (1571) is the first edition in which I have found οὐκ ἄλλ'.

1136. τύχη καὶ μοῖρα δαίμων τ' ἐμός PL (altered in P to τ. κ. μ. καὶ δαίμων γ' ἐμός). Musgrave set the metre right by transposing the words μοῖρα and τύχη.

1137. κάμὸς τε PL, κάμὸς γε Matthiae. 1138.

τί μ' ἠδίκησας P, τί μ' ἠδίκησε L: in P altered to τίν' ἠδίκησαι (the ν is written twice, in the place of the μ by an early hand, and above it by a late one; the -as is indistinct, as it has been scratched through and αἰ written above it, altered

1132 ff. Here and in *vv.* 1134 and 1137 Ag.'s first impulse is, naturally, to repel his wife's suggestion. The exclamatory *v.* 1136 was not spoken to Cly. and not meant to be heard by her; nor, probably, was *v.* 1140. And from Cly.'s words in *v.* 1142 f. it looks as if, whether she heard these last two *vv.* of Ag. or not, she refused to take them as an answer to her questions, for she says that when pressed, her husband is silent, and that this, and his exclamations (τὸ στενάξειν πολλά), she takes as confirmation of his guilt.

1133. ἔχ' ἥσυχος] Used here, as at *Med.* 550, *Hipp.* 1313, *Ar. Plut.* 127, to deprecate interruption. Elsewhere a

slight variation of the phrase (such as μέν' ἥσυχος) means 'do not distress yourself'. At *Hdt.* v. 92. 3 we have εἶχον ἐν ἡσυχίῃ, and at *Eur. Suppl.* 305 εἶχον ἡσύχως. κάκεινο might possibly refer to a question which is to follow, in which case πάλιν would merely mean 'back'—'answer me back': but Ag.'s answer is rather in favour of the view that he understood the original question to be repeated. 'First answer again what I asked just now'.

1138 f. τί μ' ἠδίκησας] 'Why do you wrong me so?' These words of Ag. refer to what he still ventures to assert is an unwarrantable suspicion on Cly.'s part: *i.e.* that expressed in *v.* 1131. Cly. adroitly uses the words of Ag.'s question

- ΑΓΑ. ὁ νοῦς ὄδ' αὐτὸς νοῦν ἔχων οὐ τυγχάνει.
ἀπωλόμεσθα. προδέδοται τὰ κρυπτά μου. 1140
- ΚΛ. πάντ' οἶδα καὶ πεπύσμεθ' ἃ σὺ μέλλεις με δρᾶν·
αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ σιγᾶν ὁμολογοῦντός ἐστὶ σου
καὶ τὸ στενάζειν πολλά. μὴ κάμῃς λέγων.
- ΑΓΑ. ἰδοὺ σιωπῶ· τὸ γὰρ ἀναίσχυντον τί δεῖ
ψευδῆ λέγοντα προσλαβεῖν τῇ συμφορᾷ; 1145
- ΚΛ. ἄκουε δὴ νυν· ἀνακαλύψομεν λόγους,

from ε which was written by the early hand. In L ν' is written above the μ' with ἦ after it). τί σ' ἠδίκησα or τίς σ' ἠδίκησε Markl., τίν' ἠδίκησα and afterwards (*Orusc.*) τί δ' ἠδίκησαι Herm. There is much here that is inexplicable. The theory that seems to me best to fit the mss. is that the original of P and L had τί μ' ἠδίκησας, that L wrote ἠδίκησε by mistake, and afterwards suggested τίν' for τί μ' to make sense out of nonsense, then that the first corrector of P adopted L's suggestion of τίν' ἠδίκησε which Musurus further altered to τίν' ἠδίκησαι. I have therefore printed what I believe to have been the first reading of P. (See Explanatory Notes.) 1139. In both P and L this *v.* is given to Ag. 1141. πέπεισμ' ἃ σὺ with γε inserted above after σὺ PL, over μ in L is an erasure which Vitelli says contained αι (*i.e.* πέπεισμαι), πέπυσμ' Ald., πεπύσμεθ' ἃ σὺ Elmsley (*Quart. Rev.*, No. XIV.) and Erfurdt. 1143. κάμῃς PL, κάμῃς Porson. 1144. με δεῖ PL, τί δεῖ Elmsley, with a ; at the end of the sentence. (It is a curiosity of textual criticism that Firnhaber proposes μὴ δεῖ, referring to his third excursus for this use of μὴ.) As Weil says, με was a marginal completion of the construction which ousted the τί. 1146. δὴ νῦν P, δὲ νῦν L, δὴ νυν Matthiae (cf. on *v.* 1009 above and Valck. on *Phoen.* 918).—ἀνακαλύψω λόγους P, with γὰρ inserted by an early hand over the line, ἀνακαλύψω γὰρ λόγους L, ἀνακαλύψομεν Kirchhoff. Very possibly the same corrector, who changed πεπύσμεθ' into πέπυσμ' or πέπυσμαι, here also altered the plu. into the sing. Weil and Vitelli keep L's reading, but the asyndeton after ἄκουε (cf. *Heec.* 788 and 833) adds even more vigour to the sense than the short ο adds rhythm to the metre. As at *v.* 1141 the γε, so here the γὰρ, put in to save the metre, originates with L. I think it possible that the original scribe of P scanned the first, and that of L the second α of ἀνακαλύψω as a long syllable. The χρῆσώμεθ' in the

to put *him* in the wrong. In the next *v.* Ag. says 'The cleverness that can put such a question is no cleverness, but folly'. τυγχάνει is a natural variety for ἐστὶ in a sentence in which the predicate is a participle: it is best to take αὐτός, as Markl. says, closely with τυγχάνει and to pause at ὄδ': for οὐ τυγχάνει νοῦν ἔχων cp. *Bacchae* *v.* 252 (ἀναίνομαι) τὸ γῆρας ὑμῶν εἰσρωῶν νοῦν οὐκ ἔχων, and *v.* 270 f. (θρασύς τε) καὶ λέγειν οἶδς τ' ἀνὴρ κακὸς πολίτης γίγνεται νοῦν οὐκ ἔχων. For the

form Dobree cps. Plat. *Gorg.* 519 D καὶ τούτου τοῦ λόγου τί ἂν ἀλογώτερον εἴη πρᾶγμα; Firnhaber cps. for the sense *Bacch.* 655 σοφὸς σοφὸς σὺ, πλὴν ἃ δεῖ σ' εἶναι σοφόν. Cf. also Soph. *Phil.* 1244 σοφὸς πεφικὸς οὐδὲν ἐξανδᾶς σοφόν.

1140. Evidently spoken aside. The weak and changeable Ag. finds himself unable to support the deception any longer. The reference in *v.* 1142 to his silence shows that Ag. stopped abruptly after saying *v.* 1140.

κοῦκέτι παρῳδοῖς χρησόμεσθ' αἰνίγμασιν.
 πρῶτον μὲν, ἵνα σοι πρῶτα τοῦτ' ὀνειδίσω,
 ἔγγημας ἄκουσάν με κᾶλαβες βία,
 τὸν πρόσθεν ἄνδρα Τάνταλον κατακτανών, 1150
 βρέφος τε τοῦμὸν ζῶν προσοῦδισας πέδῳ,
 μαστῶν βιαιῶς τῶν ἐμῶν ἀποσπάσας.

next *v.* in L suggests that at some time ἀνακαλίψωμεν may have been read here.

1147. *χρησόμεθ'* P, *χρησώμεθ'*, corrected to *χρησόμεσθ'* by the first hand, L.

1148. *ὀνειδήσω* corrected by a late hand to *-ίσω* P, *ὀνειδίσω* L. 1151. *σῶ προσοῦρησας πάλῳ* P, *σῶ προσοῦρισας πάλῳ* L. In P something is written over *ρη* by a fairly late hand which may have been *ρι*, but I cannot see exactly why the *ρ* should have been interfered with. It may be doubted whether the writers took *προσοῦρισας* (they evidently meant it for an indicative) as the aor. of an Ionic form of *προσορίζω* (such a form would gain some support from *πρόσουρος* Soph. *Phil.* 691 and *τηλουρός*) or, as Musgrave (in his first edition) preferred, as from *προσουρίζω* (formed like *κατουρίζω*) a derivative of *οὔρος* a fair wind. *σῶ προσώρισας πάλῳ* Monk and Hartung, *σῶ προσοῦδισας πέδῳ* (or *πάτῳ*) Scaliger, and so Milton. Musgrave in his second edition conjectured *ζῶν πρὸς ὀκρίδας βαλῶν*, of which Jacobs adopted the *ζῶν* to go with Scaliger's *προσοῦδισας πέδῳ*. This compounded reading gives the best sense (Monk objects to the "horrid cruelty" of the action: but this was a mere trifle to what the Pelopidae could do), and is adopted by Herm. (*Orisc.*—In his edition he read *προσοῦρισας* as a participle with *σῶ* and *πάλῳ*). Among other notions, it has been proposed to take *πάλῳ*, not as usual in the sense of *lot*, but of 'shaking'. Lindau's view (mentioned by Firm.) that *πάτῳ* denoted *tread* (cf. Plut. *Mor.* p. 670 B) is worth considering—*σῶ προσοῦδισας πάτῳ*, 'crushed to the ground with

1147. *παρῳδοῖς*] apparently *distorted*, or *distorting*. In this adj., which does not seem to occur elsewhere, the main significance lies in the *παρά*. Euripides uses the adjectives *ἀπῳδός*, *ἐπῳδός*, and *προσῳδός* in a somewhat similar figurative sense: the commonest of them is *συνῳδός*.—Vitelli cps. Aesch. *Ag.* 1183 *φρενώσω δ' οὐκέτ' ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων*.

1148. *πρῶτον μὲν*] Weil's note is: "Clytemnestre remonte bien haut. Mais dans les querelles entre personnes qui vivent ensemble, les femmes, et même les hommes, ont assez l'habitude de revenir, avant d'arriver au fait, sur d'anciens griefs et de se décharger de tout ce qu'ils avaient sur le cœur depuis longtemps. Euripide était excellent observateur". For the parenthetic *ἵνα* clause cp. above

on *v.* 320.

1149 f. Eustathius quotes these verses in his commentary on λ 430, observing that Homer knew nothing of any previous marriage of Cly. (Brodeau).

Τάνταλον] This was a son of Thyestes not mentioned in all accounts of the house of Atreus: Musgrave and others refer to Pausanias.

1151. Vitelli refers to Hdt. 1. 155 where Cyrus says *ὁμοίως γὰρ μοι νῦν γε φαίνομαι πεπονηκέναι, ὡς εἴ τις πατέρα ἀποκτείνας τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ φείσεται*, and the line of Stasinos *νήπιος δὲ πατέρα κτείνας παῖδας καταλείπει*, also to *Anārom.* 519 ff., and *Herc. Fur.* 166 ff.—The Ionic *προσοῦδίζω* is supported by the frequent use of *οὔδας* in tragedy.

καὶ τῷ Διὸς σε παῖδ' ἐμῷ δὲ συγγόνῳ
 ἵπποισι μαρμαίροντ' ἐπεστρατευσάτην·
 πατὴρ δὲ πρέσβυς Τυνδάρεώς σ' ἐρρύσατο 1155
 ἰκέτην γενόμενον, τὰμὰ δ' ἔσχεσ ἀὺ λέχη.
 οὐ δὴ καταλλαχθεῖσα περὶ σὲ καὶ δόμους
 συμμαρτυρήσεις ὡς ἄμεμπτος ἦ γυνή,
 εἷς τ' Ἀφροδίτην σωφρονούσα καὶ τὸ σὸν
 μέλαθρον αὖξουσ', ὥστε σ' εἰσιόντα τε 1160
 χαίρειν θύραζέ τ' ἐξιόντ' εὐδαιμονεῖν.
 σπάνιον δὲ θήρευμ' ἀνδρὶ τοιαύτην λαβεῖν
 δάμαρτα· φλαύραν δ' οὐ σπάνις γυναικ' ἔχειν.
 τίκτω δ' ἐπὶ τρισὶ παρθένοισι παιδά σοι.
 τῶνδ' οὖν μίᾳς σὺ τλημόνως μ' ἀποστερεῖς. 1165

thy tread',—i.e. 'beneath thy foot'. 1153. Διὸς γε PL, Διὸς σε Markl.—ἐμῷ τε PL. In two similar cases, at *Med.* 970 and at *Andr.* 25, where we have two designations of the same person, Elmsley substituted δέ for the MSS. τε, and so Matthiae ἐμῷ δὲ here. 1157. οὐ σοι PL. I have ventured to bring this passage into agreement with others (e.g. *I. T.* 320, Plato *Menex.* 243 C) where οὐ is used for 'thereupon' in a narrative, by assuming that the (unnecessary) σοι is a mistake for δὴ. τοι was very near δὴ in mediaeval pronunciation, and may well have formed the bridge from δὴ to σοι. Or δὴ may have been willfully altered to σοι by some scribe who took οὐ literally as ἐν τῷ λέχει. 1160. ὥστ' εἰσιόντα PL, ὥστε σ' εἰσιόντα Canter. 1162 f. Conington (*Class. Mus.* II. 108) was the first to throw doubts on this passage, but he confined them properly to 1163. Dind. suspects both, and Hennig condemns them as "ab aliquo grammatico inventa" or "aliunde sumpta", because he cannot believe that Euripides ever allowed three consecutive lines to end in the same syllable. The τοιαύτην shows that the *vv.* were composed to come after some such description as that of *vv.* 1158—1161. If any of the passage be rejected I think it should be only 1163, but I cannot think Hennig's ground strong enough, especially in view of the pause after *v.* 1161. 1163. φλαύραν PL, corrected by a late hand in P to φλαύραν. 1164. ἐπὶ τρισὶ PL. This seems to have been corrected in the earliest editions. 1165. τῶνδ', ὧν PL. The view expressed often above that Orestes was not present at all during this tragedy necessitates the excision of this τῶνδ', which in itself is awkward, coming just before the ὧν. I have put

1154. ἵπποισι μαρμαίροντ'] For the form of the phrase cf. *Androm.* 1146 ἔστη φαεινοῖς δεσπότης στίλβων ὄπλοις, and *Phoen.* 113 πολλοῖς μὲν ἵπποις μυρλοῖς δ' ὄπλοις βρέμων.

1156. αἶ] This implies that the Dioscuri had taken Cly. away from Agamemnon.

1157. περὶ σέ] The same use of the

prep. below at 1184.

1160. μέλαθρον] for the length of the second syllable cf. above *v.* 685 and *Tro.* 651.

1165. τῶνδ' οὖν] The emphatic position of the τῶνδ' serves to point out that it was a second case in which Ag. had taken a child from her.

κἄν τις σ' ἔρηται τίνος ἕκατί νιν κτενεῖς,
λέξου, τί φήσεις; ἢ 'μέ χρη' λέγειν τὰ σά;
Ἐλένην Μενέλεως ἵνα λάβῃ. καλόν γέ τοι
κακῆς γυναικὸς μισθὸν ἀποτείσεις τέκνα.
τᾶχθιστα τοῖσι φιλτάτοις ὠνούμεθα. 1170
ἄγ', ἣν στρατεύσῃ, [καταλιπὼν μ' ἐν δώμασιν,
κάκει γενήσῃ] διὰ μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας
τύν' ἐν δόμοις με καρδίαν ἔξειν δοκεῖς,

a stop at the end of *v.* 1164 and read here τῶνδ' οὖν. 1167. ἢ 'μέ (the
apostrophe perhaps not by the first hand) P, ἢ με L. 1168. Μενέλαος PL,
Μενέλεως Dobree.—γένος PL. All editors but Firmhaber (who also keeps ταχθείσα
in 1170) agree that this is corrupt. Most corrections (who have consisted in putting
some other substantive in its place, and supplying ἐστί with it. I think Fix's γέ τοι
(adopted by Nauck, Paley, Weil and Headlam) is the best of the guesses because,
among other reasons, it leaves it open to us to take καλόν with μισθόν in the next
v. where see note. 1169. ἀποτίσαι PL, and so all editors before Herm.
who gives ἀποτίσαι. I believe καλόν μισθόν go together (the καλόν being contrasted
with κακῆς), and have therefore written ἀποτείσεις, to which the accent of ἀποτίσαι
gives some support. 1170. ταχθείσα PL, ταῖχθιστα Stiblinus, whence τᾶχθιστα
Brodeau, approved by Canter, Scaliger and Milton. (I am in some doubt whether
we ought not, following the suggestion of Musgrave's ὠνούμενω, to read ὠνούμενος
as the end of the *v.*, putting a comma at the end of the previous verse; but the
asyndeton is impressive, and the first person plural is perhaps useful as an introduction
to Cly.'s own case, which she proceeds to consider.) Conington was for rejecting
the *v.* altogether. 1171 f. I agree with Conington that we ought to reject
καταλιπὼν...γενήσῃ. The γενήσῃ as an aor. is a false form. κατ. κ.τ.λ. is out of
place. There had been no question of Cly. going with Agamemnon, and the
ἐν δώμασιν makes the ἐν δόμοις of 1173 a useless repetition. Elmsley certainly mends
the passage by substituting εἰ for the MSS. ἣν and taking the verbs to be *futures*
(which γενήσῃ may have been meant to be: see on *v.* 1186), but I prefer Conington's
treatment of the passage. I further think that διὰ μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας will not go with
στρατεύσῃ any better than with γενήσῃ. I have therefore put a comma at στρατεύσῃ,
and no stop at the end of the *v.* (The interpolator apparently by ἐκεῖ meant Argos

1168 f. καλόν γέ τοι κ.τ.λ.] 'In your
child' (*i.e.* 'in sacrificing your child'),
'you will be paying a good price for a
bad woman'.

1170. Canter and others quote Cas-
sandra's words at *Tro.* 370 ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς
ὁ σοφὸς ἐχθίστων ὑπερ τὰ φίλτατ' ὤλεσ',
ἠδονὰς τὰς οἴκοθεν τέκνων ἀδελφῶ δούς
γυναικὸς εἵνεκα (where I would suggest
that τέκνων is perhaps an explanation of
τὰς οἴκοθεν which has ousted κακῆς or
some such epithet of γυναικὸς).

1172 f. τίν' κ.τ.λ.] 'How, think you,
shall I feel, as the dreary hours go by?'
There is perhaps also a reference in διὰ
μ. ἀπ. to Iphigenia's long absence as
well as that of her father, but the primary
reference is to the absence of Ag. and
we must therefore, literally translating,
say 'throughout your long absence'. Cp.
Plat. *Rep.* 492 C ἐν δὴ τοιοῦτω τὸν νέον,
τὸ λεγόμενον, τίνα οἶει καρδίαν ἴσχειν; The
τὸ λεγόμενον points, I think, to the fact
that these lines were commonly quoted,

ὅταν θρόνους μὲν τῆσδε προσβλέπω κενούς,
 κενούς δὲ παρθενώνας, ἐπὶ δὲ δακρύοις
 1175 μόνῃ καθῶμαι, τῆνδε θρηνηφοῦσ' αἶε.
 [ἀπώλεσέν σ', ὦ τέκνον, ὁ φυτεύσας πατήρ,
 αὐτὸς κτανών, οὐκ ἄλλος οὐδ' ἄλλη χερί,
 τοιόνδε μισθὸν καταλιπὼν πρὸς τοὺς δόμους.]
 ἐπεὶ βραχείας προφάσεως ἔδει μόνον,
 1180 ἐφ' ἣ σ' ἐγὼ καὶ παῖδες αἱ λελειμμένοι
 δεξόμεθα δέξιν ἢν σε δέξασθαι χρεών.

and used *διά* in the sense of *after*.) The first hand in P wrote *δόμασιν*. 1174. ὅταν θρόνους τῆσδ' εἰσῖδω πάντας κενούς PL. This line is quoted in Apsines, *Rhét. Gr.* ix. 502 (593 Walz) ὅταν δόμους μὲν τοῖσδε προσῖδω κενούς. I think Weil is right in restoring ὅταν θρόνους μὲν τῆσδε προσβλέπω κενούς. δόμους (cf. C. N. on v. 583) and τοῖσδε are slips of memory:—τοιῖσδε could not have been put here by anyone who remembered that Cly. was speaking at Aulis and not at Argos; nor could δόμους μὲν have been spoken by anyone who remembered that κενούς δὲ παρθενώνας is immediately contrasted with it. These two errors our MSS. fortunately correct for us, but προσῖδω for προσβλέπω they apparently shared, and most likely τῆσδ' εἰσῖδω πάντας κενούς is an attempt to correct the metre of τῆσδε προσῖδω κενούς. The πάντας is painfully redundant. 1176. κάθημαι PL, καθῶμαι Elmsley. 1177—1178. I think these lines are an interpolation. It has been noticed above (in the Critical Note on vv. 804—818) that one of the interpolators is fond of speeches within speeches. The greatest difficulty is presented by v. 1179. Monk declared it to be spurious. The favourite explanation of it is that a verse has been lost which originally followed it containing πάλιν ἀφίξει, which went with πρὸς τοὺς δόμους. 1177. ἀπώλεσέ σ' PL, ἀπώλεσέν σ' early edd.—φυτεύσας PL, φυτεύσας Elmsley, which improves the metre. At *Alc.* 294 all the MSS. but one have the more familiar φυτεύσειν though it is there metrically impossible. 1180. ἔδει μόνον PL, ἔνδει μόνον Reiske and Markland, δεοίμεθ' ἄν Hennig. ἔνδει is largely adopted, but I believe ἔδει to be sound: see Expl. Notes. 1181. καὶ PL, χαί Markl. 1182. δεξόμεθα PL with the σ

and this is borne out by the quotation of v. 1174 by Apsines. (See Crit. Notes.) Weil cps. the similar expression of Dem. *Contra Aphroditum* II. p. 842 τίνα ὄλεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἔξειεν ὅταν ἐμὲ μὲν κ.τ.λ.; 1174. It is better to take τῆσδε as dependent on κενούς than on θρόνους. For the corresponding use of the opposite μεστός cf. *I. T.* 804 τὸ δ' Ἄργος αὐτοῦ μεστόν ἢ τε Ναυπλία. Cf. *Alc.* 945 f., *Suppl.* 1095.

1175. ἐπὶ δὲ δακρύοις] ἐπὶ here with the dat. has the notion of prospect or purpose: 'with nothing to do but weep'.

1180. ἐπεὶ] With this word Cly. follows up the hint given in 1173 that her feelings would prompt her to revenge.

ἔδει] Your previous conduct (as described in vv. 1149—1152) has been such that we were already inclined to treat you as an enemy. This is I think the explanation of the impf., and δεξόμεθα in v. 1182 is a 'vivid' future instead of the more regular δεχοίμεθα, and is all the more in place here as it implies that the vengeance may yet be taken.

1182. See Expl. N. on v. 649, and

μη̄ δῆτα πρὸς θεῶν μη̄τ' ἀναγκάσης ἐμὲ
κακὴν γενέσθαι περὶ σέ, μη̄τ' αὐτὸς γένη.
εἶεν·

θύσεις δὲ παῖδ'· ἐνταῦθα τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς; 1185

τί σοι κατεύξει τὰγαθόν, σφάζων τέκνον;
νόστον πονηρόν, οἰκοθέν γ' αἰσχροῦς ἰών;
ἀλλ' ἐμὲ δίκαιον ἀγαθὸν εὐχεσθαί τί σοι;
οὐ̄ τὰρα συνετώς τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγοίμεθ' ἄν,
εἰ τοῖσιν ἀθένταισιν εὖ φρονήσομεν. 1190

erased in L. 1185. *θύσεις δὲ παῖδ'· ἐνθα τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς*; PL, but in L a corrector inserts *τὴν* before *παῖδ'*, and the *ἐν* is in an erasure. This is, I think, an indication that the same corrector who put in the *τὴν* changed *ἐνταῦθα* into *ἐνθα*. To account for the *ἐνθα* of P we must suppose that both *ἐνθα* and *ἐνταῦθα* were written in the MS. from which P and L were copied. The *τὴν* seems to have been inserted in the early editions independently of the corrector of L. It is extraordinary that a long series of editors saw nothing wrong in *ἐνθα*. The *δὲ*, if it be sound, must be explained as a weak *δὴ*. There is much to recommend Nauck's version of the *v.*: *εἶεν· σὺ θύσεις παῖδα· τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς*; 1186. *κατεύξει* PL (so often the ending of the sec. pers. mid. and pass. of principal tenses), in P *γενέσθαι σοι δῆλον* is written over it.—In L there is an erasure before *σφάζων* which Vitelli thinks contained *ὀ*. 1187. *πονηρόν* PL, *ἀπόνητον* F. W. Schmidt. Monk considers the line an importation. 1189. *οὐ̄τ' ἄρ' ἀσυνέτους* PL. I have ventured to read *οὐ̄ τὰρα συνετώς*. I think *ἡγοίμεθ'* was used absolutely as at *Bacch.* 1326 *ἡγείσθω θεοὺς* and *Hec.* 800 *τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγοίμεθα*, and that *-τώς* was assimilated by mistake to the foll. *τοὺς*. It is a question whether we should read *οὐ̄ τὰρ' ἀσυνέτως* interrogatively or *οὐ̄ τὰρα συνετώς* without the *;*. Though at *vv.* 1187, 1188 and 1191 P has the *;* (due to a later hand than the first), at 1190 it is omitted, as also in the early edd. Monk prefers *ἦ τὰρ'* because he doubts whether *οὐ̄τοι* can be used interrogatively. *εἰ φρονήσομεν* PL,

cf. *Bacchae* 955 *κρύψει σὺ κρύψιν ἦν σε κρυφθῆναι χρεών*.

1186. **τὰγαθόν**] The following *v.* shows this to be used ironically (and this meaning is helped by the possible similar use of *κατεύχομαι* which is often used of imprecations): much as at *Soph. Aut.* 275.

1187. I think it is doubtful whether we ought to read this *v.* as a question. The sense seems to be: 'that your homecoming may match your out-going'. 'That', she implies, 'would be a fit prayer'. Hennig and Vitelli prefer to take *νόστον* in the sense in which it is used in *v.* 1261 below, *i.e.* of the *journey*

to Troy; but I think the juxtaposition of *οἰκοθέν* rather makes for the interpretation given above.

1188. 'So much for *you*: have I any right to pray for any blessing for you?' There is no need with Nauck to put emphasis on the *σοι* (*τι σοί*).

1189. 'We shall be foolish to believe in the gods and at the same time to take the side of unnatural malefactors'. Cf. *Hec.* 919 where Helen says to Theonoe: *εἰ δ' οὐσα μάντις καὶ τὰ θεῖ' ἡγουμένη τὸ μὲν δίκαιον τοῦ πατρὸς διαφθερεῖς, τῷ δ' οὐ δίκαιω συγγόνῳ δώσεις χάριν, αἰσχροὺν τὰ μὲν σε θεῖα πάντ' ἐξειδέναι, τὰ τ' ὄντα καὶ μὴ, τὰ δὲ δίκαια μὴ εἰδέναι.*

ἤκων δ' ἂν Ἄργος προσπέσοις τέκνοισι σοῖς;
 ἀλλ' οὐ θέμις σοι. τίς δὲ καὶ προσβλέψεται
 παίδων σ', ἵν' αὐτῶν προσέμενος κτάνης τινά;
 ταῦτ' ἦλθες ἤδη διὰ λόγων, ἧ σκῆπτρά σοι

εὐφρον' ἄσομεν Musgrave, εὐφρον' ἤσομεν Dobree and Weil. 1191—1193. Hennig rejects these *vv.* partly because of the unmetrical form in which 1193 occurs in the MSS. (see below), but mainly because they seem to him to interrupt the line of argument. He thinks that 1194 ff. refer to the suggestion Cly. has just made that Agamemnon could not hope for good fortune on his journey (as he takes νόστος) if he did such a wicked deed at starting. But 1196 ff. show that she was not then urging the inexpediency of the deed, but the unfairness (*v.* 1299) that he should be the only sufferer. Hennig admits that the *iniquity* would be the same whoever sacrificed his daughter, but says Cly., being a woman and a mother, could not be expected to be logical enough to see this, where her own child's safety was concerned. This is very special pleading. 1191. εἰς PL, ἐς Ald.—προσπέσης PL, προσπεσεῖ Musgrave, προσπέσοις Ald. This I think is the right reading (*η* and *οι* are often interchanged), and therefore read ἂν for the unmetrical εἰς. Very possibly ἂν was mistaken for ἀνά with the *α* elided and altered to εἰς. 1193. ἐὰν αὐτῶν προθέμενος PL, ἐὰν σφῶν π. Reiske, ἵν' αὐτῶν προέμενος Elmsley, ἵν' αὐτῶν προσέμενος Weil. Hennig thinks the original composer of the *v.* thought that both syllables of ἐάν were short. It is more likely that this mistake was made by a foolish corrector, who could only see a reference to Iphigeneia's case, which in her argument Cly. has at *v.* 1185 supposed already settled. προσέμενος comes nearer to the MSS. προθέμενος, of which it is a very possible *mispronunciation*, and gives a very natural sense, especially after προσβλέψεται. 1194. ἦλθ' PL, corrected, V. says, by the first hand in L to ἦλθεν, ἦλθον Ald., ἦλθες Herm.: the -ες was very possibly written above the line, and escaped the notice of a scribe, who understood by the words (as L did) 'has this entered

1191. Cly. conducts her husband in imagination stage by stage through the consequences of his action.—ἤκειν is very often used of a *return*.—The position of the ἂν is peculiar here (see Crit. N.), but not impossible, I think. A somewhat similar instance is Soph. *O. T.* 285 f. παρ' οὐ τις ἂν σκοπῶν τὰδ', ὦναξ, ἐκμάθοι σαφέστατα. The best explanation here, at all events, is that the writer began as if he were going to put *τινο* ἂν's, but left the second out. (It must be remembered that the προσπέσης of the MSS. points to προσπέσοις more clearly than to anything else, and if we have προσπέσοις we must have an ἂν somewhere; also that the Ἄργος can do very well without ἐς.)

1192 f. καὶ] The same καὶ of *animated questions* which was noticed above on *v.* 327. 'What child *will* greet you, pray, when it knows that death will follow your embrace?'—lit. 'in order that, taking her to your bosom, you may kill her'.—προσβλέψεται] 'meet you *with a look*', cf. above *v.* 1122. This I think is a more likely meaning of the Gk words than 'even look at you'.

1194. διὰ λόγων ἔλθειν] might equally well mean *to discuss* (*with another, or before an audience*), or *to consider* (*with oneself, in one's own mind*), according to the meaning of λόγος in either case. Vitelli says if the phrase is to have the latter meaning the reflexive pronoun must be expressed. The only reason he gives

μόνον διαφέρειν καὶ στρατηλατεῖν μέλει; 1195
 ὃν χρῆν δίκαιον λόγον ἐν Ἀργείοις λέγειν·
 βούλεσθ', Ἀχαιοί, πλείν Φρυγῶν ἐπὶ χθόνα;
 κλήρον τίθεσθε παῖδ' ὅτου θανεῖν χρεῶν.
 ἐν ἴσῳ γὰρ ἦν τόδ', ἀλλὰ μὴ σ' ἐξαίρετον
 σφάγιον παρασχεῖν Δαναΐδαισι παῖδα σὴν, 1200
 ἢ Μενέλεων πρὸ μητρὸς Ἑρμιόνην κτανεῖν,
 οὐπὲρ τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἦν. νῦν δ' ἐγὼ μὲν ἢ τὸ σὸν
 σφύζουσα λέκτρον παιδὸς ἐστερήσομαι,
 ἢ δ' ἐξαμαρτοῦσ', ὑπόροφον νεάνιδα

into your calculation?' 1195. σε δεῖ PL. But this can hardly stand after the σοι in 1194. Monk proposed to read σά for σοι, I think the better change is to read μέλει here with Musgrave. A simple mistake of Δ for Λ would give με δεῖ, which would be certainly corrected to σε δεῖ. (Vitelli reads σα and σ' ἔδει, agreeing with Hennig that ταῦτα means *the arguments against the expedition*, and that ἠλθες διὰ λόγων means '*expounded in speech*'. If I took this view I should prefer to read τοι for σοι.) 1196. χρῆ PL, χρῆν Reiske and Markland. 1199. μὴ σ' PL and early edd., μὴ σ' Herm. 1201. πρὸς PL, πρὸ Scaliger. 1203. ὑστερήσομαι PL, ἐστερήσομαι Pors., παῖδ' ἀποστερήσομαι Markland. 1204. ὑπόστροφον P, ὑπότροφον L, ὑπόροφον Scaliger (cf. *Orest.* 147), ὑπότροπος Heath. Monk says that as the schol. on χ 35 [and Hesych. s. v. ὑπότροπος] gives ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς as an explanation of ὑπότροπον, it is likely that the same explanation written here over the ν. gave rise to ὑπόστροφον, of which ὑπότροφον was a modification. But νεάνιδα cannot do without an adj. If ὑπότροπος were read, we should have to transpose νεάνιδα and

is that at *Mei.* 872 ἐγὼ δ' ἐμαυτῇ διὰ λόγων ἀφικόμην the pronoun is so expressed. I cannot see that the difference in the meaning of λόγος matters at all to the question whether the dat. is to be expressed or not. I therefore consider ταῦτ' ἦ. ἦ. δ. λ. here as equivalent to ἡδη διελογίσω ταῦτα;

1195. διαφέρειν] lit. 'bear always about with you': "*gestare*" Heath.—Agamemnon has shown above, that the fear of losing his high position is stronger with him than any other motive. Cf. Menelaus' taunt above at *vv.* 354 ff.

1196. δν] certainly does not agree with λόγον, but refers to Ag. and provides an animated transition to another thought: 'why, you ought to have &c.'

1199 f. ἐν ἴσῳ ἦν τόδ'] 'That was a fair course'. The imperf. ἦν is of the same kind as that in χρῆν just above, and ἔδει at *v.* 1180. εἶκος ἦν at Thuc. VI. 78. 4. Cf. Menander 19 ἀπλοῦν γὰρ ἦν, Xen. *An.* VII. 7. 40 αἰσχροῦν ἦν (Krüger 53, 2, 7).—Most edd. take παρασχεῖν in the following *v.* as depending on χρῆν. In this case ἐν ἴ. γ. ἦ. τ. would be a parenthesis. I think it depends on ἐν ἴσῳ ἦν. The full expression would have been ἐν ἴσῳ ἦν τοὺς μὲν Ἀχαιοὺς κληροῦσθαι, σὲ δὲ μὴ παρασχεῖν, κ.τ.λ.

1201. κτανεῖν] This must be taken to depend on the χρῆν of *v.* 1196.

1202. οὐπὲρ τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἦν] '*His* concern it was, not yours'.

- Σπάρτη κομίζουσ', εὐτυχῆς γενήσεται. 1205
 τούτων ἀμειψαί μ' εἴ τι μὴ καλῶς λέγω·
 εἰ δ' εὖ λέλεκται μετανόει δὴ μὴ κτανεῖν
 τὴν σὴν τε καμὴν παῖδα, καὶ σῶφρων ἔσει.
 ΧΟ. πιθοῦ. τὸ γάρ τοι τέκνα συνσώξεν καλόν,
 Ἀγάμεμνον· οὐδεὶς τοῖσδ' ἂν ἀντίποι βροτῶν. 1210
 ΙΦ. εἰ μὲν τὸν Ὀρφέως εἶχον, ὦ πάτερ, λόγον
 πείθειν ἐπάδουσ', ὥσθ' ὀμαρτεῖν μοι πέτρας.
 κηλεῖν τε τοῖς λόγοισιν οὐς ἐβουλόμην,
 ἐνταῦθ' ἂν ἦλθον. νῦν δὲ τὰπ' ἐμοῦ σοφά,

γενήσεται and read εὐτυχῆ. 1206. In P a late hand wrote *ον* over *αι*, i.e. it suggested ἀμείψον for ἀμειψαί μ'. 1207. εἰ δ' εὖ λέλεκται νῶι μὴ δὴ γε κτάνης PL, only P wrote νῶι to which a late hand added an ι. In L there is an erasure after νῶι which V. says contained a κ. νῶι μὴ δὴ γε is evidently a clumsy piece of stuffing. What Euripides wrote has gone. A better stop-gap would be τὰμὰ (Elmsley) τήνδε μὴ. (νῶι as a disyllable and a dative occurs also in our texts of Theocritus, XII. 166.) Heimssoeth conj. μετανόει δὴ μὴ κτανεῖν: this assumes, and possibly rightly, that the syllables νῶι have some authority. At the same time it helps the καὶ σῶφρων ἔσει in the next v., which follows better on μετανόει than on the simple μὴ κτάνης. I have therefore followed Weil and Headlam in adopting it. 1209. συνσώξεν PL, σοι σώξεν Nauck. 1210. πρὸς τὰδ' ἀντίποι PL, ἀντερεῖ Elmsl., but Burges' and Monk's τοῖσδ' ἂν ἀντίποι admits of a ready explanation of the error of the MSS., i.e. that the ἂν was omitted owing to the following ἀν- and that to help out the metre τοῖσδ' was changed to πρὸς τὰδ'. 1214. ἀνῆλθον PL, corrected by a fairly early hand in P to ἂν ἦλθον.

1205. κομίζουσ'] Has here its early Epic sense, unusual in Tragedy, of *keep safe*: the word was doubtless chosen here for variety's sake because σώζουσα has just been used above in v. 1203. Bothe cps. *Heracl.* 91 τοῦ ποτ' ἐν χειρὶ σᾶ κομίζεις κόρους νεοστρεφεῖς;

1206. τούτων] depends on εἴ τι.—For the acc. of the person after ἀμειψαί cf. *Syrphl.* 517 καὶ πρῶτα μὲν σε πρὸς τὰ πρῶτ' ἀμείψομαι and *Or.* 608.

1209. If συνσώξεν is correct here it must mean *help* (your wife) *to rescue*. At *Hel.* 1388 it means *to rescue along with another*.

1211 ff. It is best to take πείθειν and κηλεῖν as dependent on εἶχον (if *I were able*), and λόγον as governed by ἐπάδουσ'. At the only other place where ἐπαιεῖν occurs in Eur. (*El.* 864) it has an acc.

(ψῶν), and at Plat. *Rep.* 608 A we have ἐπᾶδοντες ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὃν λέγομεν, καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐπιφθῆν.—ὥσθ' ὀμαρτεῖν depends directly on πείθειν. The analogy of the similar passage in the *Alcestis* (357, where too the apodosis κατήλθον ἂν is curiously like the ἐνταῦθ' ἂν ἦλθον here) might lead us at first sight to take λόγον as governed by εἶχον, and so those editors who put a comma after λόγον seem to have taken it.

1213. ἐβουλόμην] quite regularly in the same tense as εἶχον. So at *I. T.* 354 εἶθε...Διόθεν ἦλθε...πορθμίς, ἦτις...ἀπήγαγ'. It is the same sort of imperf. as that which is used with final particles to denote an unfulfilled purpose in past time.

1214. ἐνταῦθ' ἂν ἦλθον] 'I would have taken that way'.

δάκρυα παρέξω· ταῦτα γὰρ δυναίμεθ' ἄν. 1215
 ἰκετηρίαν δὲ γόνασιν ἐξάπτω σέθεν
 τὸ σῶμα τοῦμόν, ὅπερ ἔτικτεν ἦδε σοι,
 μή μ' ἀπολέσης ἄωρον· ἡδὺ γὰρ τὸ φῶς
 λεύσσειν· τὰ δ' ὑπὸ γῆς μή μ' ἰδεῖν ἀναγκάσης.
 πρώτη σ' ἐκάλεσα πατέρα καὶ σὺ παιδ' ἐμέ· 1220
 πρώτη δὲ γόνασι σοῖσι σῶμα δοῦσ' ἐμόν
 φίλας χάριτας ἔδωκα κἀντεδεξάμην.
 λόγος δ' ὁ μὲν σὸς ἦν ὅδ'· ἀρά σ', ὦ τέκνον,
 εὐδαίμον' ἀνδρὸς ἐν δόμοισιν ὄψομαι,
 ζῶσάν τε καὶ θάλλουσαν ἀξίως ἐμοῦ; 1225
 οὐμὸς δ' ὅδ' ἦν αὖ περὶ σὸν ἐξαρτωμένης
 γένειον, οὗ νῦν ἀντιλάζυμαι χερί·
 τί δ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ σέ; πρέσβυν ἄρ' εἰσδέξομαι
 ἐμῶν φίλαισιν ὑποδοχαῖς δόμων, πάτερ,

1215. *δυναίμεθα* PL, *δυναίμεθ' ἄν* Markl. 1219. *βλέπειν*· τὰ δ' ὑπὸ γῆς PL, *λεύσσειν*· τὰ δ' ὑπὸ γῆν Plut. *de Aud. Poet.* 17 D. "Omnino legendum *Λεύσσειν* cuius scholium est *βλέπειν*". Pors. As to the case with ὑπὸ Matthiae on *Hec.* 144 (147) says: "*Vulgaris consuetudo proseret τοὺς ὑπὸ γῆς ὄντας, exquisitius est τοὺς ὑπὸ γῆν*". He cps. Hdt. II. 127, and Aesch. *Eum.* 952, and *Alc.* 896. 1221. *γόνασι* PL, *γόνασι* Barnes. (So at *Andr.* 895 L and some other MSS. have *γόνασιν*, such a mistake is the mark of a scribe used to copying Homer. In *Andr.* 892 *γονάτων* is demanded by the metre, but L and the two best MSS. have *γονάτων*.)—*δοῦσ'* PL. Monk, commenting on the awkwardness of *δοῦσ'* followed closely by *ἔδωκα*, suggests *ἀφείσα'*. 1224. *εὐδαίμονος ἀνδρὸς* PL, *εὐδαιμονοῦντος* Matthiae, *εὐδαίμον' ἀνδρὸς* Pierson. 1227. *νῦν* P, *νῦν* L, *ἀντιλάζομαι* PL, *ἀντιλάζομαι* Markl. Cp. Pors. on *Med.* 1213

νῦν δὲ τὰ π' ἐμοῦ σοφά, δάκρυα παρέξω]
 'Mais, pour toute science, je t'apporte
 mes larmes'. Fix and Le Bas.

1216. For the idea cf. *Heracl.* 226
ἀλλ' ἄντομαι σε καὶ καταστέφω χεροῖν,
and Andr. 894 *στεμμάτων δ' οὐχ ἦσ-*
συνας σοῖς προστίθῃμι γόνασιν ὠλένας
ἐμάς, Or. 383 *ἀφύλλου στόματος ἐξάπτων*
λιτάς, in which the *ἀφύλλου στόματος* is
 explained by Hesychius to mean *ἄνεν*
ἰκετηρίας. For the dat. *γόνασιν* with
ἐξάπτω we are referred to *Tro.* 1208
κόσμον ἐξάπτειν νεκρῶ.

1220. Cp. Lucr. I. 93 f. *Nec miserae
 prodesset in tali tempore quibat quod patrio
 princeps donarat nomine regem.*

1221. *δοῦσ'* seems to express the
 willingness with which she took her place
 on her father's knee. But the expression
 is peculiar, more particularly as *ἔδωκα*
 follows closely in the same sentence.
 M. Patin translates: "*penchée sur les*
genoux".

1222. *φίλας χάριτας*] 'fondling ca-
 resses'.

1224. *ἀνδρὸς*] 'a husband's'.

1226. *ἐξαρτωμένης*] agrees with the
ἐμοῦ which is implied in *οὐμὸς*.

1228. The early edd. put the ; after
πρέσβυν (and so Porson), Markl. after *σε*,
 Finh. after *δ'*.

πόνων τιθνηούς ἀποδιδούσά σοι τροφάς; 1230
 τούτων ἐγὼ μὲν τῶν λόγων μνήμην ἔχω,
 σὺ δ' ἐπιλέλῃσαι, καί μ' ἀποκτείνειαι θέλεις.
 μὴ πρὸς σέ Πέλοπος καὶ πρὸς Ἀτρέως πατρὸς
 καὶ τῆσδε μητρός, ἢ πρὶν ὠδίνουσ' ἐμέ
 νῦν δευτέραν ὠδίνα τήνδε λαμβάνει. 1235
 τί μοι μέτεστι τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου γάμων
 Ἐλένης τε; πόθεν ἦλθ' ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῷμῳ, πάτερ;
 βλέψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὄμμα δὸς φίλημά τε,
 ἵν' ἀλλὰ τοῦτο καθανούσ' ἔχω σέθεν
 [μνημείον, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἐμοῖς πεισθῆς λόγους. 1240
 ἀδελφέ, μικρὸς μὲν σὺ γ' ἐπίκουρος φίλοις,
 ὅμως δὲ συνδάκρυσον, ἰκέτευσον πατρὸς
 τὴν σὴν ἀδελφὴν μὴ θανεῖν· αἴσθημά τοι

(1216). 1233. γε PL, σε Markland. 1234. τῆς γε P, τῆσδε L. 1240. I have no hesitation in following Nauck in rejecting this *v.* For the *σέθεν* in *v.* 1239 cf. above 995 ταῦτά τεύξομαι σέθεν, and Krüger II. 47, 14, 3.—*εἰ...πεισθῆς* PL, *εἰ πέθει* Pors., *ἦν...πεισθῆς* Matthiae, *εἰ...πέσει* Elmsl. (which Weil defends, saying *πεισθῆς* arose out of *πεισθήσει* [a gloss on *πέσει*]). But, grammar apart, whatever the previous *v.* gains from the *μνημείον* is more than counterbalanced by the weakening of the pathetic *καθανούσ'* by the words which follow *μνημείον*. 1241—1248. These stage-manager's lines on the 'small auxiliary' must go with the rest of the references to him. The gen. *πατρὸς*, the otiose and even confusing *γε* in 1244, the senseless *βίον* in 1246, and the disjointed concluding couplet:—all help to attest the authorship of the passage. 1242. *σὺν δάκρυσιν* P, *συνδάκρυσον* L. 1243. *αἴσθημά τοι* PL, with the *ο* erased in L and crossed through by a late hand

1230. *πόνων*] an adjectival genitive = the English 'devoted', qualifying *τιθνηούς τροφάς*. Weil cps. Aesch. *P. V.* 900 *δυσπλάνους ἀλατείαις πόνων*. Cp. 1 Timothy v. 4 *μανθανέτωσαν...ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς προγόνοις*.

1235. *δευτέραν ὠδίνα*] Cp. Galatians iv. 19 *τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω ἀχρὺς οὐδὲ μορφωθῆναι Χριστὸς ἐν ἡμῖν*. For *λαμβάνειν ὠδίνα* in the sense of *ὠδίνειν* cf. above *v.* 1124 *λαβεῖν ἀρχὴν* for *ἀρχεσθαι*, and *Σιγρῆ*. 1050 *ὄργην λάβοις ἀν*. The present is here used in the sense of 'is on the point of incurring'.

1237. *πόθεν ἦλθ'*] must be explained with Brodeau and Hermann 'How is it that he (*i.e.* Paris) came?' For this

common use of *πόθεν* see L. and S. s. v. 1. 4.—*ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ*. For a different sense of *ἐπὶ* c. dat. cf. above *v.* 456 f.

1238. *ἡμᾶς*] *i.e.* Cly. and Iph. For the first part of this *v.* cf. *v.* 320, and for the last part cf. *v.* 679.—*ὄμμα δὸς*] It is possible that this does not, like *προσέσχον ὄμμα* at *H. F.* 931, mean 'turn your eyes on us', but 'give us your *face*' (to kiss).

1239. *ἀλλὰ τοῦτο*] 'This, if nothing else'. With the whole line *H. F.* 331 has aptly been compared: *ὡς ἀλλὰ ταῦτά γ' ἀπολάχωσ' οἴκων πατρὸς*. See Crit. N. on *v.* 1240.

1241. *μικρὸς ἐπίκουρος*] Cp. *Bacch.* 1367 *μικρὸς ἐπίκουρος πατήρ*.

κὰν νηπίοις γε τῶν κακῶν ἐγγίγνεται.
 ἰδοὺ σιωπῶν λίσσεται σ' ὄδ', ὦ πάτερ. 1245
 ἀλλ' αἰδεσαί με καὶ κατοίκτιρον βίον.
 ναί, πρὸς γενείου σ' ἀντόμεσθα δύο φίλω·
 ὃ μὲν νεοσσός ἐστιν, ἡ δ' ἠϋξήμενη].
 ἔν, συντεμοῦσα πάντα, νικήσω λέγων·
 τὸ φῶς τίδ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἥδιστον βλέπειν, 1250
 τὰ νέρθε δ' οὐδέν· μαίνεται δ' ὄς εὐχεται
 θανεῖν. κακῶς ζῆν κρεῖσσον ἢ καλῶς θανεῖν.

ΧΟ. ὦ τλήμον Ἐλένη, διὰ σὲ καὶ τοὺς σοὺς γάμους

in P. 1244. κὰν corrected by a late hand to κὰν P (both MSS. have ἐγγίγνεται).
 1245. σ' ὦ P (corrected by an early hand to σε δ' ὦ and by a late one to σε γ' ὄδ' ὦ),
 σ' ὄδ' ὦ L. 1247. δύο PL, which Barnes, Dawes, Porson, and Valckenaer changed
 to δύο, thus correcting metre and grammar at once (though the metre—see on v. 844
 —still halts somewhat). 1248. There is some confusion in the middle of this v.
 in L, Nauck suspects the ἐστὶν and Hermann and Hennig propose οὔτος for it.
 1249. νικήσω λόγον PL, κινήσω λόγον Canter. I prefer to read ἔν, συντεμοῦσα πάντα,
 νικήσω λέγων. 1250. In P the οἱ of ἀνσίω (for ἀνθρώποισιν) is in an erasure.
 1251. οὐδεὶς PL, οὐδέν Stobaeus (119), whence Heath and Valckenaer restored it
 here. 1252. In P the θανεῖν which begins this v. was first written at the end
 of v. 1251 and then crossed through and put (outside the v.) before κακῶς, with which
 this v. originally began. In L too this v. originally began with κακῶς, and an early
 hand added the θανεῖν before it, but Vitelli says nothing of its having been put
 in first at the end of the preceding v. A late hand in P put α over the last θανεῖν in
 this v. and β over καλῶς. This order was adopted in all edd. up to Kirchhoff. The
 mistake in the position of the first θανεῖν was probably due to writing from dictation

1246. αἰδεσαί με καὶ κατοίκτιρον] Cr. X 82 τάδε τ' αἰдео καί μ' ἐλέησον.

1247. δύο φίλω] *Rhoen.* 1659 ἀλλ' εὐκλεές τοι δύο φίλω κείσθαι πέλας. It is somewhat inconsistent that, after joining herself in v. 1238 with her mother in her appeal, Iph. should here leave her out.

1249. Even when not emended (see Crit. Notes) this v. has been read in many different ways. It is best then to take πάντα with λόγον as an internal or cognate acc. to νικήσω. ('Win my cause entirely'.—Monk and Weil prefer to take πάντα λόγον to mean 'every conceivable argument on the other side'.) There still remains the question, does ἔν συντεμοῦσα mean 'saying one thing by way of summing up', 'with (this) one

brief word'? or ought we to take συντεμοῦσα absolutely, or with λόγον supplied, and take ἔν predicatively with it as meaning 'in one'? Of these two difficult interpretations I incline to the latter, but I think the substitution of λέγων for λόγον a less violent course than either.

1251 f. μαίνεται κ.τ.λ.] 'None but a madman would wish for death'. Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 967 ὦν γὰρ ἡράσθη τυχεῖν ἐκτῆσθαί' αὐτῷ, θάνατον ὄνπερ ἤθελεν, and on the other hand, with the following words, Achilles' memorable words at λ 488 ff. μὴ δὴ μοι θανάτον γε παραῦτα φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ. βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρονος εἶν θητενέμεν ἄλλω, ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρω, ᾧ μὴ βίωτος πολλὸς εἶη, ἢ πᾶσιν νεκρέσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.

ἀγῶν Ἀτρείδαις καὶ τέκνοις ἦκει μέγας.
 ΑΓΑ. ἐγὼ τὰ τ' οἰκτρὰ συνेतὸς εἰμι καὶ τὰ μῆ, 1255
 φιλῶ τ' ἔμαντοῦ τέκνα· μαινοίμην γὰρ ἄν.
 δεινῶς δ' ἔχει μοι τοῦτο τολμήσαι, γύναι,
 δεινῶς δὲ καὶ μῆ· ταῦτ' ἀ γὰρ πρᾶξαί με δεῖ.
 ὀρᾶθ' ὅσον στράτευμα ναύφρακτον τόδε,
 χαλκέων θ' ὄπλων ἄνακτες Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι, 1260
 οἷς νόστος οὐκ ἔστ' Ἴλιου πύργους ἐπι
 εἰ μὴ σε θύσω, μάντις ὡς Κάλχας λέγει,
 οὐδ' ἔστι Τροίας ἐξελεῖν κλεινὸν βᾶθρον.
 [μέμνηε δ' ἀφροδίτη τις Ἑλλήνων στρατῶ

and was at least as early as the MS. from which P and L were copied. 1256.
 φιλῶν PL, φιλῶ τ' Markland. 1257. με PL, μοι Reiske, who suggested, but
 did not adopt it, and Monk, who was the first to print it.—ταῦτα PL. If the
 conjecture I make about the τοῦτο in the next *v.* is correct we ought to read τοῦτο
 here. 1258. τοῦτο PL, ταῦτ' Kirchhoff. I conjecture that τοῦτο originally
 stood after μοι in *v.* 1257 and that ταῦτ' in this *v.*, coming directly underneath it, was
 transposed for it in the copying and then altered to ταῦτα. Weil writes τί ποτε for
 τοῦτο here with ; at the end of the *v.* 1259. A late hand in P puts a mark of
 interrogation at the end of this *v.* 1260. καλκέων PL, corrected by a late
 hand in P and an early one in L to χαλκέων. These facts accord with the belief
 that the writers of P and L were not very good scholars, and that P was at some
 time corrected by L. 1262 f. Three views have been held about these 2 *vv.*
 and supported by competent critics: (1) that they should be transposed: (2) that 1263
 is spurious: (3) that they are right as they stand in the MSS. with the exception
 of the word καινὸν PL, for which everybody accepts Reiske's κλεινὸν, which occurred
 independently to several critics (as to the confusion of the two words cf. Elmsley on
H. F. 38). I incline decidedly to the third, and believe that (1) and (2) have arisen
 from a misapprehension of the clause μάντις ὡς Κάλχας λέγει. This clause does not
 qualify θύσω, but is a parenthesis qualifying νόστος οὐκ ἔστ': *i.e.* the meaning is *not*:
 'unless I slay you as Calchas bids me to do'. See Expl. Notes. 1264—1268.
 Hennig points out that *vv.* 1264—1266 are seriously inconsistent with *vv.* 1269—1275.

1255. τὰ τ' οἰκτρὰ συνेतὸς εἰμι] Cp.
 Xen. *Cyr.* III. 3. 9 ἐπιστήμονες δὲ ἦσαν
 τὰ προσήκοντα τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος ὀπλίσει
 (Krüger I. 46, 4, 5): Weil cps. *Med.* 686
 τρίβων τὰ τοιάδε.

1256. μαινοίμην γὰρ ἄν] See Krüger
 I. 54, 12, 9.

1257. γύναι] Ag. first addresses his
 wife, as she had spoken first.

1258. πρᾶξαι] intrans. here.

1259. ὀρᾶθ'] The plural shows that
 here Ag. addresses both wife and
 daughter. This is best taken as an im-

perative, as at *Rhoen.* 101 σκόπει δὲ πεδία
 καὶ παρ' Ἰσημοῦ ῥόας, Δίρκης τε νᾶμα,
 πολεμίων στράτευμ' ὅσον.

1260. ὄπλων ἄνακτες] Weil is no
 doubt right in taking this as a poetical
 periphrasis for ὀπλίται. He quotes Aesch.
Pers. 371 πᾶς ἀνὴρ κώπης ἀναξ ἐς ναῦν
 ἐχώρει, πᾶς θ' ὄπλων ἐπιστάτης.

1261—1263. 'Unless I slay thee (so
 says Calchas), they can never sail against
 walled Ilium, no, nor overturn the stately
 piles of Troy'.

1264. ἀφροδίτη τις] The name of

πλείν ὡς τάχιστα βαρβάρων ἐπὶ χθόνα, 1265
 παῦσαί τε λέκτρων ἀρπαγὰς Ἑλληνικάς·
 οἳ τὰς ἐν Ἄργει παρθένους κτενοῦσὶ μου
 ὑμᾶς τε καμέ, θέσφατ' εἰ λύσω θεᾶς.]
 οὐ Μενελεύς με καταδεδοῦλωται, τέκνον,
 [οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὸ κείνον βουλόμενον ἐλήλυθα,] 1270
 ἀλλ' Ἑλλάς, ἧ δεῖ, κἂν θέλω κἂν μὴ θέλω,
 θῦσαί σε· ταύτης ἥσσοιες καθέσταμεν.

The latter passage, especially in the last three lines, urges the *claims* of Greece on all true patriots, the former says the Greeks are so madly bent on vengeance, that whoever withstands their fury will perish, with all his house. Such an appeal to fear, not the clumsiest rhetorician would prefix to an appeal to patriotism. Besides, the passage neither follows well on *v.* 1263 nor fits in with what follows, *i.e.* the mention of Menelaus in 1269, besides containing at least one very questionable phrase. On the other hand Hennig is quite right to defend *vv.* 1269 and 1271—1275 against Dindorf. The above-mentioned inconsistency between the two passages becomes an additional argument in favour of the latter. 1267. κτενοῦσὶ PL., κτενοῦσὶ Scaliger. 1268. θέσφατον PL., θέσφατ' Scaliger. 1270. This slipshod verse, which adds nothing to 1269 and obstructs the grammatical and logical connexion of οὐ Μενελεύς in 1269 with ἀλλ' Ἑλλάς, Hennig rightly condemns, and Nauck agrees with him. A corrector of P put " over the line before the κ of κεινον. The ms. must have fallen into bad hands. 1272. τούτου δ' PL., ταύτης Nauck, which I have adopted. The τούτου is taken to refer to the necessity just mentioned, or generally (as Weil says) to *patriotism*. If so it is impossible to imagine anyone wilfully changing the simple ταύτης into what is

the goddess is used here in the same sense as ἔρω above at *v.* 808, and the Lat. *cupidō*, whereas in the passage in the *Phoenissae* (*v.* 399), which is quoted in support of this use here, it has the meaning of the Latin *venus*, *i.e.* *charm*. The dative στρατῶ with μέμνηε is also peculiar, and led Lobeck to conj. ξηνηε ... στρατόν.

1266. λέκ. ἀρπ. Ἑλληνικάς] In support of this somewhat harsh enallage Vitelli quotes Soph. *Ant.* 793, and *Bacch.* 866. Cf. also Ar. *Vesp.* 838 τρυφαλίδα τυροῦ Σικελικὴν κατεδήδοκεν, below *v.* 1347 πονηρὸν εἶπας οἰωνὸν λόγων. The harshness here comes from the fact that, with ἀρπαγὰς, the adj. Ἑλλ. would more naturally have a subjective, active meaning, than that of 'suffered by the Greeks' which is necessary for the meaning here.

1268. θέσφατ' εἰ λύσω] *λύειν* is used here in the quite legitimate sense of *put an end to, cancel*, but the expression, when considered in its context, reveals incoherence of thought. If the most natural construction be put upon it, and θέσφατα be interpreted 'the demand of the oracle', the only way of cancelling or satisfying that would be the sacrifice. But the words θέσφ. εἰ λύσω are here put for 'if I fail to sacrifice'. Cf. below 1486 where θέσφατ' ἐξαλείψω is used of satisfying the goddess by submitting to the sacrifice.

1269. Ag. here refers to *v.* 1168.

1271. ἧ] not *to* whom, but *for* whom = ἧς ἐνεκα. (This is better than to take it as the rare dat., of the person bound, with δεῖ, for Ag. always speaks of *himself*, and not the Greeks, as the sacrificer.) *με* must be supplied with δεῖ.

ἐλευθέραν γὰρ δεῖ νιν, ὅσον ἐν σοί, τέκνον,
 κάμοι, γενέσθαι, μηδὲ βαρβάρων ὑπο
 "Ἑλληνας ὄντας λέκτρα συλᾶσθαι βία.

1275

ΚΛ. ᾧ τέκνον, ᾧ ξένοι,
 οἷ γὼ θανάτου τοῦ σοῦ μελέα.
 φεύγει σε πατὴρ "Αἰδη παραδούς.

ΙΦ. οἷ γὼ, μᾶτερ· ταῦτόν γὰρ δὴ
 μέλος εἰς ἄμφω πέπτωκε τύχης,
 κούκέτι μοι φῶς
 οὐδ' ἀελίου τόδε φέγγος.

1280

ἰὼ ἰώ.
 υἱόβολον Φρυγῶν νάπος "Ιδας τ'

far more difficult. I rather believe that the *διασκευαστής* was puzzle-headed enough to put *τούτου* as a masc. referring to Menelaus, ignoring the context, or perhaps reading the sentence as a question. 1274. *βαρβάρους* PL, *βαρβάρων* Musgrave. Weil is doubtless right in suggesting that the alteration to the dative was made under the impression that β. ὑπὸ went closely with ὄντας and not *συλᾶσθαι*. Puzzle-headed again. 1275. L at first wrote *συλλᾶσθαι* and then erased the 1st λ. 1276. Monk would read *τέκνον* for *ξένοι*. 1277. οἷ ἐγὼ PL, corrected in P by a late hand to οἷ ἐγὼ.—*θανάτου σοῦ* PL, *θανάτου τοῦ σοῦ* Heath and Musgrave. 1279. οἷ ἐγὼ μᾶτερ ταῦτόν ταῦτόν γὰρ P with the α of *μᾶτερ* corrected to η, *μᾶτερ* substituted for the first *ταῦτόν* and the *ον* of the second altered to ο; the last correction by a later hand than the others, οἷ ἐγὼ μᾶτερ μᾶτερ ταῦτό γὰρ L. Vitelli says that in L the first *μᾶτερ* has its α corrected to η, the second is in an erasure, *ταῦτό* was originally *ταῦτόν*, and something has been erased after the *γὰρ*. P apparently gives the earliest of the mss. readings. Dobree's *γὰρ δὴ* after a single *ταῦτόν* is the best of the many attempts to mend the metre. It is possible that in some MS. the δὴ, being written above the γὰρ and somewhat to the left, was mistaken for *dis*, i.e. an indication that *ταῦτόν* was to be repeated. 1284. The ι of *υἱόβολον* is in an erasure in P, it looks as if it had been an ε—*Φρυγῶν νάπος* PL, *νάπος Φρυγῶν*

1273. The ellipsis of *ἔστι* or *γίγνεται* is common with *ὅσον*.

1276—1335. After a few words interchanged between the mother and daughter (6 anapaests introduced by a dochmiac) Iphigenia begins at v. 1283 a monody of mixed metres in which she bewails her fate.

1279. *μᾶτερ*] The Doric forms of this word, and *ἀελου* below, are irregular, as these six lines seem to be systematic and not threnic anapaests.

γάρ] introduces a justification of the repeated exclamation.

1280. *εἰς ἄμφω πέπτωκε*] not 'has befallen both', but 'befits both'.

τύχης] It is rather hard to say what this gen. depends on. Most probably in strict grammar it depends on *μέλος*, though its position after *πέπτωκε* gives it a somewhat adverbial force: lit. 'The same cry about our lot'.

1281. It is better to supply *ἔστι* than *ἔσται*: 'It exists no more for me, it has come to an end'.

1284 f. *νάπος* and *ἕρα* form a hendiadys. The speaker appeals to the bleak glen, or glen-side among the

- ἄνθεα ἰακίνθινά τε θεάσι δρέπειν]·
 ἔνθα ποτὲ Παλλὰς ἔμολε 1300
 καὶ δολιόφρων Κύπρις
 "Ἡρα θ' Ἑρμῆς θ',
 ὁ Διὸς ἄγγελος,
 ἃ μὲν ἐπὶ πόθῳ τρυφῶσα
 Κύπρις, ἃ δὲ δουρὶ Παλλῆϊς, 1305
 "Ἡρα τε Διὸς ἄνακτος
 εὐναῖσι βασιλίσῳ,
 κρῖσιν ἐπὶ στυγνὰν ἔριν τε [τᾶς] καλλονᾶς
 ἐμοὶ δὲ θάνατον, ὄνομα μὲν
 φέροντα Δαναΐδαισιν, ᾧ κόραι. 1310
- XO. πρόθυμά σ' ἔλαβεν Ἄρτεμις πρὸς Ἴλιον.

rejected καὶ ῥόδ...δρέπειν. It looks like a slightly altered passage from an idyllic or elegiac poem, where the strange ῥόδεντα would suit the metre. The awkwardness of ἄνθεα following ἄνθεσι was noticed by Markland. The mention of the goddesses also is premature. (Hermann and others explain it of the nymphs or the goddesses generally, not of the three soon to be mentioned.) I have also rejected χλωροῖς as being a very unlikely epithet for ἄνθεσι. (This objection is met by von Sybel by reading ἔρνεσι instead of ἄνθεσι. Dobree proposes ἄλσεια for ἄνθεα.) It was possibly, in the form χλοεροῖς or χλοερούσιν, an epithet of λειμῶσιν in the poem from which the passage is taken. 1300—1303. Hennig suspects these four lines of being either corrupt, or added to fill a gap. 1302. The θ' after Ἑρμῆς is wanting in P and added by an early hand in L. 1305. δουρὶ PL, δουρὶ Monk. 1307. βασιλοῖσι P¹, βασιλίσσι P² and L. 1308. Matthiae rejects the τᾶς "non solum ob metrum, sed etiam quod abhorret a more tragicorum". 1309—1311. I have printed these *vv.* as the MSS. give them, not because I think they can be explained, but because I see no clue to a satisfactory emendation. 1309. ἐμοὶ

PL, ἐμὸν Elmsley. 1310. ὄνομα μὲν P, ὄνομα μὲν^{αν} L: Weil reads πομπὰν for the two words, thus providing something to make sense with πρὸς Ἴλιον: others read ὄνομα μὲν. Possibly ἄν or μὲν is due to a τιμᾶν written as an explanation over ὄνομα. Monk's and Hartung's suggestion to write ᾧ κόρα for the MSS. ᾧ κόραι, and to give it to the chorus seems to me a likely one. (The latter also rejects μὲν and makes the chorus begin at ὄνομα.) Headlam writes Δαναΐδαις, σίνος κόρα, adopting Elmsley's προθύματ' in the next *v.*, assigning that *v.*, as Elmsley does, to Iph., and reading μὲν after ὄνομα. 1311. The words πρὸς Ἴλιον certainly cannot stand as they are

1304. τρυφᾶν ἐπὶ] corresponds in meaning to the lighter English phrase *to plume oneself upon*. At *Andr.* 279 (ἔριδι στυγερᾷ κεκορυθμένον εὐμορφίας, which has often been compared with *v.* 1308 below) κεκορυθμένον is used in a similar sense, I think.

1309. θάνατον] this is explained to be governed by ἐπὶ supplied from the preceding line.

1311. πρόθυμα] Whatever was the original force of the preposition in the compounds πρόσφαγμα and πρόθυμα (probably it meant *in front of* the

- ΙΦ. ὁ δὲ τεκὼν με τὰν τάλαιναν,
 ὦ μᾶτερ ὦ μᾶτερ,
 οἴχεται προδοῦς ἔρημον.
 ὦ δυστάλαιν' ἐγὼ, πικρὰν
 πικρὰν ἰδοῦσα δυσελέναν. 1315
 φονεύομαι διόλλυμαι.
 σφαγαῖσιν ἀνοσίοισιν ἀνοσίου πατρός.
 μὴ μοι ναῶν χαλκεμβολάδων
 πρύμνας Ἀύλις δέξασθαι 1320
 τούσδ' εἰς ὄρμους
 ὦφελεν ἐλάταν πομπαίαν,
 μηδ' ἀνταίαν Εὐρίπῳ
 πνεῦσαι πομπὰν Ζεὺς, μελίσσων

for τῆς πρὸς Ἴλιον στρατείας. I think some word for *expedition* has been lost here, of which πρὸς Ἴλιον was an explanation. See below on *v.* 1321. 1317. ἀνοσίοισιν P, but it is doubtful whether L had at first ἀνοσίοισιν or ἀνοσίοις, most probably the former. 1320. ᾗδ' Ἀύλις, PL, Ἀύλις Monk. The ᾗδ', which is insufferable by the side of the τούσδ' in the next *v.* was doubtless introduced by a metrical 'improver'. Nauck agrees with Monk. 1321. ὄρμους εἰς Τροίαν PL. Here again I think Monk is quite right in suspecting an interpolation, and I have with him rejected εἰς Τροίαν. Hermann (*Orusc.*) accepts this view. Cf. above on *v.* 1311. Πομπαῖος might more easily have such words as εἰς Τροίαν dependent on it as an epithet of a wind, than as an epithet of ἐλάτα. For τούσδ' I am inclined to suggest τάνδ'. 1322. ὦφελεν PL, ὦφειλ' Bothe and Nauck, to avoid the proceleusmatic. 1323. μῆτ' PL, μηδ' Hermann. Hennig would reject Εὐρίπῳ and write μηδ'...πομπὰν as a complete dimeter. (In both P and L μηδ'...πομπὰν are written as a single line.) His reason is, that "geographical regions have not backs and fronts". But it is

altar), it seems to have lost it, and only to have been recognized as suitable to the idea of sacrifice. Weil compares Aesch. *Ag.* 227 προτέλεια ναῶν.

1316. ἰδοῦσα] is difficult. Perhaps it means 'when I saw', *i.e.* 'It was a luckless day for me when I first set eyes on Helen'. πικρὰν 'to my cost'. See above *v.* 955 and Suppl. 1222.

1320. πρύμνας] Headlam well quotes *El.* 1022 πρυμνοῦχον Ἀῶν.

1322. ἐλάταν πομπαίαν] ἐλάτη is used here, like κώπη at *I. T.* 140, in the collective sense of *fleet*; πομπαίαν is a natural epithet of κώπη in its ordinary sense of oar, and is transferred here along with it.

1323. Εὐρίπῳ] a local dative. In some places Zeus is sending favourable winds, but on the Euripus he sends a contrary one.

1324 f. πομπὰν] ἀνταίαν πομπὰν is best understood by a comparison of the phrase οὐρίας πομπῆς above at *v.* 352. As an object to πνεῦσαι, πομπή is a natural poetical variety for ἀνεμος.

μελίσσων αὔραν] Lit. 'making the wind pleasant', *i.e.* sending a favourable wind. The participle does not mean 'while sends'—that would be ὁ μελίσσων, but 'while', or 'whereas he is sending'. It is curious that the words Ζεὺς μελίσσων occur together also at *Hel.* 1399. Cf. Ζεὺς Μετρίχσιος.

αὔραν ἄλλοις ἄλλαν θνατῶν 1325
λαίφεσι χαίρειν,
[τοῖς δὲ λύπαν, τοῖς δ' ἀνάγκαν,]
τοῖς δ' ἐξορμᾶν, τοῖς δὲ στέλλειν,
τοῖσι δὲ μέλλειν.
ἧ πολύμοχθον ἄρ' ἦν γένος, ἧ πολύμοχθον 1330
ἀμερίων, τὸ χρεῶν δέ τι δύσποτμον
ἀνδράσιν ἀνευρεῖν.
ἰὼ ἰώ,
μεγάλα πάθεα, μεγάλα δ' ἄχρα
Δαναΐδαις τιθείσα Τυνδαρις κόρα. 1335

not right to take *ἀνταίαν* and *Εὐρίπῳ* together. The latter word is necessary to the passage as a local dative. 1327. I have followed Hennig in rejecting this *v.* It overloads the passage and obstructs the connexion of ideas. He takes it to be a "parallel passage" which has been mistaken for part of the text. Its unmetrical form—Heath would emend the metre by writing *τοῖσι* in both cases—gives support to this view. 1329. I suspect this *v.* of being an interpolation, but see Expl. Notes. 1331. *χρεῶν* PL, τὸ χρεῶν Hermann. 1332. *ἀνευρεῖν* PL, *εὐρεῖν* Dind., *ἀντλεῖν* Weil, *ἔρπει* Herwerden. I think the fault is in the *ἀνδράσιν*, which is very strange in the place of *ἀνθρώποις* or *βροτοῖς*. Possibly a simple *ἐστίν* stood here and was ousted by an abbreviated *ἀνθρώπων* written as an explanation of *ἀμερίων*. 1333. Both P and L had originally only one *ἰώ*: the second was added in both by an early hand. This *v.* with the two following *vv.* is assigned to the chorus in the MSS. Blomfield restored them to Iph. 1335. In P an early (I think) and in L a late (so Vitelli) hand inserted a *τοῖς* before *Δαν.*, so as to

1325 f. It is best not to take *ἄλλοις* with *λαίφεσι* (so Firmhaber and Weil), but to connect the latter word closely with *χαίρειν*, which, like the following infinitives, is epexegetical—a wind to make the mariners rejoice in their sails as they see them filling.

1328. *στέλλειν*] is used in its idiomatic sense of *take down, furl*. It is possible that, if, as I suspect, the following *v.* is spurious, *στέλλειν* does not mean that a contrary wind makes the sailors take in sail, but that, as favourable winds start some men on their journeys (*ἐξορμᾶν*—intr. lit. 'so that some can start'—), so they take others safe to port and let them furl their sails at the end of their journey. In that case *ἄλλαν ἄλλοις αὔραν* would not mean, as most interpreters take it, '(sending) a favourable breeze to some and a con-

trary one to others', but '(sending) various favourable breezes according to the directions in which the men wish to go'. *V.* 1330 however somewhat supports the former interpretation, and therefore I have not ventured to bracket *v.* 1329.

1331 f. *τὸ χρεῶν κ.τ.λ.*] The sense of these somewhat doubtful words seems to be: 'When men search out their fate they are sure to find that it is a hard one'.

1335. *τιθείσα*] The construction is the same as in the exclamation *ὦ πάλας ἐγώ*. Markl. cps. *I. T. ὦ ῥαδίους ὄρκοισι περιβαλοῦσά με* and Soph. *Phil.* 1402 *ὦ γενναῖον εἰρηκῶς ἔπος*, so too Plato *Euth.* 303 c *ὦ μακάριοι σφῶ*. But in these cases the participle or adj. is in the voc. The nom. with *ὦ* may indeed

ΧΟ. ἐγὼ μὲν οἰκτίρω σε συμφορᾶς κακῆς
τυχοῦσαν, οἷας μήποτ' ὄφελος τυχεῖν.

ΙΦ. ὦ τεκοῦσα μήτηρ, ἀνδρῶν ὄχλον εἰσορῶ πέλας.

ΚΛ. τὸν τε τῆς θεᾶς παῖδα, τέκνον· εὖ δὲ δεῦρ' ἐλήλυθεν.

ΙΦ. διαχαλατέ μοι μέλαθρα, δμῶδες, ὡς κρύψω δέμας. 1340

ΚΛ. τί δέ, τέκνον, φεύγεις; ΙΦ. Ἀχιλλέα τόνδ' ἰδοῦσ' αἰσχύνομαι.

ΚΛ. ὡς τί δῆ; ΙΦ. τὸ δυστυχές μοι τῶν γάμων αἰδῶ φέρει.

ΚΛ. οὐκ ἐν ἀβρότητι κείσαι πρὸς τὰ νῦν πεπτωκότα.
ἀλλὰ μίμν' οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον· ἴν' ἀμυνώμεθα.

make an iambic trimeter.

1336.

κακῶν P, κακῆς L.

1337.

A suspicious-

looking *v*. See above on *v*. 470.

1339.

τὸν τε τῆς θεᾶς Ἀχιλλέα τέκνον ᾧ δεῦρ'

P (with γ' inserted by a subsequent hand after τέκνον), τὸν τε τῆς θεᾶς παῖδ' ᾧ τέκνον γ' ᾧ (sic Vitelli) δεῦρ' L. (Vitelli marks the letters δ' ᾧ and γ' as in an erasure.)

This last is evidently the attempt of a very ignorant scribe to make out the *v*. on the assumption that θεᾶς could only be scanned as two syllables. He has counted syllables and neglected quantity. Therefore we need take no account of the ᾧ before τέκνον and the γ' after it (which P² has copied). It is generally assumed that Ἀχιλλέα in P is a gloss on παῖδα which has got to the text by mistake. Editors are divided between the *τε* of the mss. and Reiske's γε. Heath (writing παῖδα for Ἀχ.) read ᾧ γε, but Hermann's ᾧ σὺ is now generally adopted. But the dat. is very harsh, and the whole remark makes a most unmotherly taunt. Apart from the rest of the *v*. it is just as possible that παῖδ' was an explanation of the gen. in τὸν τε τῆς θεᾶς Ἀχιλλέα, as that Ἀχιλλέα was a gloss on παῖδα. I have ventured however, for the last part, to write εὖ δὲ δεῦρ' ἐλήλυθεν. The δὲ may have dropped out owing to the δε- which follows, the εὖ have been misread as ᾧ, and then changed to θας. The early edd. (e.g. Ald. and Canter) have the reading of L as there corrected. How did they get it?

1341.

τί δὲ φεύγεις, τέκνον PL, τί

δὲ, τέκνον, φεύγεις Heath.—τὸν ἰδεῖν PL, τόνδ' ἰδεῖν Musgr. (There is no trace in either ms. of the τὸν which the early editions inserted before Ἀχιλλέα.)

I have ventured to change ἰδεῖν to ἰδοῦσ', as τόνδε could hardly be used of a person whom she refused to look at. Hartung reads τί δὲ σὺ φεύγεις τέκνον; ΙΦ. ἄνδρα τόνδ' κ.τ.λ.

1343. In P πράγματα is inserted as an explanation after πεπτωκότα, this led to the reading πεπραγμένα which is found in the editions before Markland.

1344.

οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον, ἦν δυνώμεθα PL, οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον ἀνδρώμεθα Weil. This is

be really the same thing as an apostrophizing voc. with ᾧ as it is written.

“Ut Aemyl. Portus notat, redolet Homericum illud ἦ μυρί' Ἀχαιοὶς ἀλγε' ἔθηκε” Barnes.

1342. ὡς τί δῆ;] Why? The ὡς is otiose here, as sometimes with future participles and in such phrases as ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, ὡς ἐς μάχην (παρεσκευάζετο), ὡς ἀληθῶς. Cp. *I. T.* 557, *Or.* 796,

Ion 525.

1343. πρὸς] ‘In view of’. The general sense of this expressive line is: ‘you are not in a position to deal with your present lot in a fastidious spirit’.

1342. ὡς τί δῆ;] Why? The ὡς is otiose here, as sometimes with future participles and in such phrases as ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, ὡς ἐς μάχην (παρεσκευάζετο), ὡς ἀληθῶς. Cp. *I. T.* 557, *Or.* 796,

1344. ἀλλά] This word adds force to the imperative: ‘Stay, I command you: this is no time for reserve: stay, that we may plan some measures of defence’.

- AX. ὦ γύναι τάλαινα, Λήδας θύγατερ, ΚΛ. οὐ ψευδῆ θροεῖς. 1345
 AX. δεῖν' ἐν Ἀργείοις βοᾶται. ΚΛ. τίνα βοήν; σήμαινέ μοι.
 AX. ἀμφὶ σῆς παιδός, ΚΛ. πονηρὸν εἶπας οἰωνὸν λόγων.
 AX. ὡς χρεῶν σφάξαι νιν. ΚΛ. ὦμοι· κοῦτις ἀντιάζεται;
 AX. εἰς θόρυβον ἔγωγε καὐτὸς ἤλυθον, ΚΛ. τίν', ὦ ξένε;
 AX. σῶμα λευσθηναί πέτροισι. ΚΛ. μῶν κόρην σφῶζων ἐμήν; 1350
 AX. αὐτὸ τοῦτο. ΚΛ. τίς δ' ἂν ἔτλη σώματος τοῦ σοῦ θιγεῖν;
 AX. πάντες Ἑλληνες. ΚΛ. στρατὸς δὲ Μυρμιδῶν οὐ σοι παρήν;
 AX. πρῶτος ἦν ἐκείνος ἐχθρός. ΚΛ. δι' ἄρ' ὀλώλαμεν, τέκνον.
 AX. οἷ με τὸν γάμων ἀπεκάλουν ἤσσουν'. ΚΛ. ἀπεκρίνω δὲ τί;

very ingenious, but wants a future not a subjunctive. ἔν' ὀδυνώμεθα Herm. Those who retain the MSS. reading suppose an aposiopesis. I prefer to read ἔν' ἀμυνώμεθα, taking οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον as a parenthesis. 1345—1348. These speeches of AX. are assigned to XO. in P and L. They were first rightly given in ed. Brubach. 1346. δεῖν' L.—βοᾶται ΚΛ. τίνα βοήν; σήμαινέ μοι PL. This construction is harsh. It is possible that we ought to read βοῶσι, or put the; after τίνα. 1347. λόγων PL, λόγων Markland. 1348. νιν. ΚΛ. κοῦδεις ἐναντία λέγει PL. In P an early hand inserted τοῖσδ' after κοῦδεις, and a late hand altered ἐναντία to ἐναντίον. οὔδεις Markl., who held that the κ was due to the K for Clytaemnestra. οὔδεις δ' οὔδεν ἀντίον λέγει Vitelli. I incline to the belief that ἐναντία λέγει was an interlinear explanation which has ousted the true reading, which I conjecture to have been ὦμοι· κοῦτις ἀντιάζεται; The middle of ἀντιάζω does not appear to be found, but the sense 'set oneself against' is a very natural one here, and the rareness of the word would be a ground for the explanation. κοῦδεις is a very possible mistake for κοῦτις. The weak point in this suggestion is the supposition that ὦμοι has fallen out. 1349. ἐγὼ τοι PL, ἔγωγε Markl. with the approval of Pors. and Dobree, who quotes ἔγωγε καὶ αὐτὸς from Plat. Gorg. 506 B. Cf. also Phaedo 117 C ἀλλ' ἐμοῦ γε βία καὶ αὐτοῦ and 59 B καὶ αὐτὸς ἔγωγε. ἐγὼ τι Musgrave. The same hand which originally wrote δὴ by way of explanation over the νιν in v. 648 may have written τοι over γε here. ἤλυθον. ΚΛ. ἐς τίν' PL, ἤλθον ἐς τίν' Markland, ἤλυθον τίν' Nauck. 1350. σώζειν PL, σῶζων Canter. 1351. τοῦ σώματος PL, but in L τοῦ is crossed out, and no edition seems to have printed it. 1352. Μυρμιδῶν PL, Μυρμιδῶν Elmsley. 1354. Το Matthaiae belongs the credit of restoring independently the τὸν of P and L which the early editions had corrupted to τῶν. It is amusing to find that Firnhaber prints τῶν and condemns as unnecessary Matthaie's emendation of the "manuscript reading".—ἤσσουνα P, and so probably L originally

1345. οὐ ψευδῆ θροεῖς] *i.e.* 'when you call me τάλαινα'. Possibly we ought to put the comma after γύναι.

1347. λόγων] gen. of definition. For the enallage cf. above on v. 1266.

1351. ἔτλη] The lengthening of ἐ before τλ is extraordinary.

1353. δι' ἄρ' ὀλώλαμεν] Cf. Krüger

II. 68, 48, 1 and 2, and above vv. 11, [40], and 268.

1354. οἷ] 'Why, they'—The relatives at the beginning of this v. and 1356 are slightly exclamatory, somewhat like the οἶος which is explained to be = ὅτι τοιοῦτος.

- ΑΧ. τὴν ἐμὴν μέλλουσαν εὐνὴν μὴ κτανεῖν, ΚΛ. δίκαια γάρ. 1355
 ΑΧ. ἦν ἐφήμισεν πατήρ μοι. ΚΛ. κάργ’ ἔθεν γ’ ἐπέμψατο.
 ΑΧ. ἀλλ’ ἐνικώμην κεκραγμοῦ. ΚΛ. τὸ πολὺ γὰρ δεινὸν κακόν.
 ΑΧ. ἀλλ’ ὅμως ἀρήξομέν σοι. ΚΛ. καὶ μαχεῖ πολλοῖσιν εἰς;
 ΑΧ. εἰσορᾶς τεύχη φέροντας τοῦσδ’; ΚΛ. ὄναιο τῶν φρενῶν.
 ΑΧ. ἀλλ’ ὀνησόμεσθα. ΚΛ. παῖς ἄρ’ οὐκέτι σφαγήσεται; 1360
 ΑΧ. οὐκ, ἐμοῦ γε ζῶντος. ΚΛ. ἤξει δ’ ὅστις ἄψεται κόρης;
 ΑΧ. μυριοὶ γ’ ἄξει δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς. ΚΛ. ἄρ’ ὁ Σισύφου γόνος;
 ΑΧ. αὐτὸς οὗτος. ΚΛ. ἴδια πράσσω, ἢ στρατοῦ ταχθεὶς ὑπο;
 ΑΧ. αἰρεθεὶς ἐκῶν. ΚΛ. πονηράν γ’ αἵρεσι, μαιφονεῖν. 1364

(Vit. says the ‘ of ἦσον’ is in an erasure). *ὑπεκρίνω* P, and so L originally, though possibly the first hand (Vit.) altered the *υ* to *ά*. Possibly in the ms. from which P and L were copied an *ά* was written over the *υ* as a suggested correction, and P mistook it for the last letter of the preceding word, while L adopted the correction. But whoever made the correction originally it ought to be adopted. The *υ* was doubtless due to some scribe’s familiarity with Homeric forms. Cp. on *v.* 1221 above. 1355. *εὐνὴν* PL, *εἶναι* Scaliger, *εἶνιν* Herm. (*Orisc.*). I think it is possible that Cly.’s part of this *v.* should begin at *μη*. 1356. *ἐφήμισε* PL, *ν* added by a late hand in P. 1357. *ἐνικώμην* P, the *ο* corrected by an early hand to *ω*. 1358. *μάχη* PL, *μαχεῖ* Elmsley. 1359. *τοῦσδε* PL, corrected in P by a late hand to *τοῦσδ’*, see above on *v.* 1354. 1360. *ὀνησόμεσθα* PL, *ὀνησομεν* *σέ* Elmsley. 1361. *γ’ ἐκόντος* PL, *γε ζῶντος* Nauck, Vit. cps. A. 88, *Heracl.* 66, 650 and *Herc. Fur.* 261. We need the stronger pledge here. ‘If I can help it’ is far too weak for the context. 1363. *ἴδια* PL, and so Heath for the *ἴδια* of the early edd. (In P there is a mark under the *α* which is really the ink on the other side of the page, which happens to be thin here. This was mistaken doubtless by

1355. *μέλλουσαν*] For this absolute use of the part. of *μέλλω* cp. below *v.* 1380 and *El.* 626 ἢ πρὸ μέλλοντος τόκου; The precisely similar sense of *λέχος* and the use of *εὐνή* at *Tro.* 831 (though the reading there is doubtful), *Androm.* 907, *Hipp.* 885, *Soph. Ant.* 1224 are enough to justify the metonymical use of *εὐνή* for *wife*.

1357. *τὸ πολὺ*] A poetical variety of *οἱ πολλοί*. Vitelli quotes *Or.* 772 *δεινὸν οἱ πολλοί*. So at *v.* 1401 below *τὸ...δοῦλον* stands for *οἱ...δοῦλοι*.

1359. *τεύχη*] Probably, as Headlam says, these were Achilles’s own arms (it does not mean *these armed men*). He points to the men bearing his arms as a proof that he is ready to fight, even

though single-handed.

1360. *ἀλλ’ ὀνησόμεσθα*] The *ἀλλὰ*, like the old English *may*, adds strength to the asseveration ‘I shall have a reward’: *i.e.* I shall win a bride.

οὐκέτι] not ‘no longer’ but ‘now... not’.

1362. *ἄξει*] probably not ‘will bring them’, still less ‘will be their leader’ as Erasmus has it (“*dux Ulysses agminis*”), but ‘will (*i.e.* ‘is to’) carry her off”—an answer to the *ὅστις ἄψεται κόρης* in the last *v.* The same duty was assigned to Odysseus at *Hec.* 220 ff. and *Soph. Phil.* 6 *ταχθεὶς τὸδ’ ἔρδειν τῶν ἀνασσόντων ὑπο*.

1364. *μαιφονεῖν*] depends on the *αἰρεθεὶς* at the beginning of the *v.* Monk

- AX. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σχήσω νιν. ΚΛ. ἄξει δ' οὐχ ἔκοῦσαν ἀρπάσας;
 AX. δηλαδή ξανθῆς ἐθείρας. ΚΛ. ἐμὲ δὲ τί χρῆ δρᾶν τότε;
 AX. ἀντέχου θυγατρός. ΚΛ. ὡς τοῦδ' εἴνεκ' οὐ σφαγήσεται.
 AX. ἀλλὰ μὴν εἰς τοῦτό γ' ἤξει. ΙΦ. μήτηρ, εἰσακούσατε
 τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων· μάτην γάρ σ' εἰσορῶ θυμουμένην
 σῶ πόσει· τὰ δ' ἀδύναθ' ἡμῖν καρτερεῖν οὐ ῥάδιον. 1370
 τὸν μὲν οὖν ξένον δίκαιον αἰνέσαι προθυμίας·
 ἀλλὰ καὶ σὲ τοῦθ' ὀρᾶν χρῆ, μὴ διαβληθῆ στρατῶ,
 καὶ πλέον πράξωμεν οὐδέν, ὅδε δὲ συμφορᾶς τύχη.
 οἶα δ' εἰσῆλθεν μ', ἄκουσον, μήτηρ, ἐννοουμένην.

Musurus for an *ι* subscript.) 1366. *ἔθειρας* PL, *ἔθειρας* L. Dindorf. 1367. *ἀντέχη*, corrected by a subsequent hand to *ἀντέχου* P, *ἀντέχου* L.—*ἔνεκ'* PL, *οὐνεκ'* Ald., *εἴνεκ'* Nauck. (The MSS. reading here is an argument in favour of the Ionic form. *εἴνεκα* is much more likely than *οὐνεκα* to have become *ἔνεκα*. This argument however needs to be supported by cases in which MSS. give *εἴνεκα*.) 1368. In P *λείπει* is written over the end of *εἰσακούσατε*, i.e. in some MS. Iph.'s speech was made to begin at the beginning of a line and *μήτηρ εἰσακούσατε* was taken to be an unfinished *v.* (Wil.-Möll. is wrong in saying that in P the *λείπει* is written over the early part of the following *v.*) 1369. *τῶν ἐμῶν· μάτην γάρ εἰσορῶ* P (an early hand inserted *λόγων* after *ἐμῶν* above the line, and a *σ* after the *σ* of *εἰσορῶ*, i.e. *εἰς σ' ὀρῶ*, but without putting a breathing to the *ὀ*. *τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων· μάτην γάρ σ' L*, but Vit. says the *τῶν ἐμῶν* and the *σ'* are added by a different hand and *λείπει* (crossed out) is in the margin. Hense suggested that the original was *τῶν ἐμῶν ἐπῶν*, accounting for the omission of the latter word by its similarity to the preceding *ἐμῶν*, Weil *μύθων*, as beginning with the same letter as *μάτην*: but L seems to establish *λόγων*. Probably an early MS. was accidentally damaged at this point. 1372. *διαβληθῆς* PL, *διαβληθῆ* Monk and Hartung. The *ὅδε* in the next *v.* prevents us from taking this *v.* to be addressed to Achilles. 1373. *ὁ δὲ* PL, in L 'Αχιλλεύς is written over it, *ὅδε δὲ* Musgrave, who says he found it in one of the Paris copies of L. For a similar *ὅδε δὲ* cp. *Or.* 896. 1374. In L the *-εν* of *εἰσῆλθεν* is written by a late hand in an erasure,—*ἐννοουμένη* P, with a *ν*

well cps. *Hel.* 1633 ΘΕΟΚ. ἦ με προῦ-
 δωκεν ΧΟ. καλὴν γε προσοίαν, δίκαια
 δρᾶν.

1366. If the reading here is correct (Kirchhoff proposed *δρᾶν τί χρῆ*), we have another extraordinary lengthening of a vowel. Cf. above on *v.* 1351.

1367. *ὡς*] for *εἶ ἔσθι ὡς*, as in the similar line *Hel.* 400 *ὡς τῆσδ' ἔκοῦσα παιδὸς οὐ μεθήσομαι*: Cf. Elmsley on *Med.* 596 (609).

1368. *εἰς τοῦτο*] i.e. 'to violence', so that it really refers to the same thing as the *τοῦδ'* of the previous *v.*

εἰσακούσατε] For the plural used in the same sentence with the singular Weil cps. *Soph. O. C.* 1104 *προσέλθετ', ὦ παῖ, πατρί*. In both cases there is the same reason for it: i.e. there is another person present who is meant to hear what is in form only addressed to one. In the *Oedipus* it is *Ismene*, here it is *Achilles*.

1370. *καρτερεῖν*] is here used, as Heath says, of *active* not *passive* courage (L. and S. wrong). *τὰ ἀδύνατα* is a cognate acc. 'It is hard to bear up against impossible odds'.

1371. *αἰνέσαι*] *thank*.

καθτανεῖν μὲν μοι δέδοκται· τοῦτο δ' αὐτὸ βούλομαι, 1375
 εὐκλεῶς πράξαι παρεῖσά γ' ἐκποδῶν τὸ δυσγενές.
 δεῦρο δὴ σκέψαι μεθ' ἡμῶν, μῆτερ, ὡς καλῶς λέγω·
 εἰς ἔμ' Ἑλλάς ἡ μεγίστη πᾶσα νῦν ἀποβλέπει,
 κὰν ἐμοὶ πορθμὸς τε ναῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν κατασκαφαί,
 τὰς τε μελλούσας γυναῖκας μηκέθ' ἀρπάξιν ἐὰν 1380
 [τὸν Ἑλένης τείσαντας ὄλεθρον, ἣν ἤρπασεν Πάρις].
 ταῦτα πάντα καθτανοῦσ' ἄρ' οἶσομαι, καὶ μου κλέος,

added by a late hand, ἐννοουμένην L. Probably some ms. had (by mistake) εἰσηλθον, and this led to the nom. ἐννοουμένη in P. 1376. *δυσμενές* P, *δυσγενές* L. At *I. T.* 591 P has *δυσμενής* and L *δυσγενής*. 1378. *συναποβλέπει* PL, corrected in both by an early hand to *νῦν ἀποβλέπει*. 1380—1382. Conington (in the *Class. Mus.* 11. p. 108) and Herm. (*Orusc.*) seem to me to have hit on the right solution of the many difficulties presented by these two *vv.* in rejecting the weak *ἦν τι δρῶσι βάρβαροι* (which comes after *γυν.*) and *τὰς ὀλβίας ἐξ Ἑλλάδος* (after *ἐάν*) and reading what remains of the two *vv.* as a single line. This involves the rejection (so too Monk and Hartung) of *v.* 1382. We have no need therefore to provide a syntax for *τείσαντας*, a defence for *ὄλεθρον*, or a supplement to the halting metre such as a late hand in P and L did by writing *ἦντων* for the MSS. *ἦν*. 1383. *καθτανοῦσα ῥύσομαι* PL. *ῥύσομαι* will bear no sense that will fit this passage, I therefore read, with very slight alteration, *καθτανοῦσ' ἄρ' οἶσομαι*. (As to the two passages quoted in L. and S. in support of a meaning 'fend off', 'get rid of', for *ῥύομαι*:

1375 f. I venture to think that all commentators on this passage have erred in supposing that *τοῦτο αὐτὸ* refers back to *καθτανεῖν*, instead of to the following *εὐκλεῶς πράξαι*. Independently of anything else *αὐτὸ τοῦτο πράξαι* is a very unnatural expression in reference to *being sacrificed*. Those who so take it are driven moreover by a consideration of the drift of the whole passage to explain *δέδοκται* as 'it has been determined' (by the Greeks, that is), and either to suppose that the dative *μοι* is used in a quite extraordinary way for the accusative, or to emend the passage in some way (e.g. Herwerden and others read *ἐμέ* for *μοι*). I take *καθθ. μ. μ. δ.* to be Iph.'s declaration of her *sudden* formed resolution to meet death (cp. *Introduction*, p. xiii), and translate the following words: 'My one wish is to act nobly, to clear myself from all taint of baseness'. (Cf. *κλέος*

v. 1383 and *δόξα v.* 1399.) For *αὐτὸ τοῦτο* referring to what immediately follows cf. *Soph. Phil.* 77 f. *ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο δεῖ σοφισθῆναι, κλοπεύς ὅπως γένησθε τῶν ἀνικῆτων ὅπλων*.

1379 f. *κὰν ἐμοὶ*] Cp. *I. T.* 1507 *καὶ τᾶμ' ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστιν ἢ καλῶς ἔχειν ἢ μὴδὲν εἶναι*, 'it lies with me'. An infin. dependent on *ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔστι* and representing an action contemplated as possible (*ἐάν κ.τ.λ.*), naturally has the negative *μὴ* with it. (Those who read *ἐῶντες* have hard work to account for the *μηκέθ'*.)

1381. *μηκέθ' ἀρπάξιν ἐάν*] *i.e.* τοὺς βαρβάρους. For a similar ellipse of the subj. of the infin. dependent on *ἐάν* cp. *Or.* 899 *οὔτος κτανεῖν μὲν οὔτε σ' οὔτε σύγγονον εἶα*.

1383. *οἶσομαι*] used in the epic (and tragic) sense of *wish as a prize*.

‘Ελλάδ’ ὡς ἠλευθέρωσα, μακάριον γενήσεται.
 καὶ γὰρ οὐδέ τοί τι λῖαν ἐμὲ φιλοψυχεῖν χρεῶν’ 1385
 πᾶσι γάρ μ’ Ἐλλησι κοινὸν ἔτεκες, οὐχὶ σοὶ μόνῃ.
 ἀλλὰ μυρῖοι μὲν ἄνδρες ἀσπίσιν πεφραγμένοι,
 μυρῖοι δ’ ἐρέτμ’ ἔχοντες, πατρίδος ἠδίκημένης,
 δρᾶν τι τολμήσουσιν ἐχθροὺς χυπὲρ Ἑλλάδος θανεῖν;
 ἢ δ’ ἐμῇ ψυχῇ μί’ οὐσα πάντα κωλύσει τάδε; 1390
 καὶ τί τούτοις τῶν δικαίων ἔχομεν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος;
 κάπ’ ἐκεῖν’ ἔλθωμεν· οὐ δεῖ τόνδε διὰ μάχης μολεῖν
 πᾶσιν Ἀργείοις γυναικὸς εἶνεκ’ οὐδὲ καταθεῖν.
 εἷς ἀνὴρ κρείσσω γυναικῶν μυρῖων ὄρᾶν φάος.
 εἰ δ’ ἐβουλήθη τὸ σῶμα τοῦμὸν Ἀρτεμις λαβεῖν, 1395

in Soph. *O. T.* 312 ῥῶσαι can quite well have its ordinary meaning of ‘rescue’, if, with Jebb, we take its object πᾶν μίασμα to mean “all that is defiled”; and at Thuc. v. 63 Dobree is, I think, right in conjecturing λύσσει for ῥύσει.)
 1385. οὐδέ τοι λῖαν ἐμὲ PL. A late hand in P inserted γ’ after λῖαν and the Aldine editor altered ἐμὲ to ἐμοί: both these mistaken alterations were corrected by Markland, but it was reserved for Elmsley to emend the metre satisfactorily by introducing τι after τοί. Monk says one of the Paris copies of L has οὐδέ τι and the other οὐδέ τοι. 1388. I think it possible that this line is spurious.
 1389. τολμήσουσ’ P¹L¹, τολμήσουσιν P²L²—χυπὲρ P¹L¹, τε χυπὲρ P²L² (Wil.-Möll.—Vit. says nothing about τε in L). 1391. τί τὸ δίκαιον τοῦτ’ ἀρ’ ἔχομεν PL (with an erasure over *ντ*, but no circumflex in L). An early hand in L and a late one in P has τοῦτὸ γ’ ἀρ’. This alteration satisfied the demands of metre in a fashion, but not those of syntax: the ἔχομεν will not stand without an ἄν. The sense too seems to demand a dative to go with ἀντειπεῖν. Bremi and Elmsley are of opinion that the line originally ended with ἔχομεν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος. What went before we can only conjecture. The line as I have printed it might have been so obliterated as to leave only τί τὸ δίκαιον, and the *τοῦτ* may be a remnant of *τούτοις* which was written over the line and which was afterwards inserted in the wrong place. τί τὸ δίκαιον; ἀρ’ ἔχομεν τοῖσδ’ ἄν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος Monk, τί τὸ δίκαιον ἄρα τούτοις ἔχομεν κ.τ.λ. Weil.
 1393. ἐνεκ’ PL, οὐνεκ’ an early hand in L, εἶνεκ’ Nauck. (See above on *v.* 1367.)
 1394. εἷς γ’ PL, εἷς Hermann. Monk says one of the Paris copies of L has εἷς γάρ. It is possible that, like the Paris scribe, some early copier inserted a γάρ which was afterwards altered *metr. grat.* to γ’.
 1395. ἐβουλήθη σῶμα PL. An early hand in P inserted τὸ before σῶμα. σῶμα τοῦμὸν is probably a marginal interpretation (drawn from *v.* 1397) of some lost words. Perhaps the *v.* originally ran εἰ δ’ ἐβουλήθη

1386. κοινὸν] The sentence gains much in expressiveness from this neuter, which is almost equal to a noun. For the general sense Weil well compares Dem. *de Cor.* § 205 ἠγείτο γὰρ αὐτῶν ἕκαστος οὐχὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ μόνον γεγενῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ πατρίδι, and

Firnhaber Eur. *Erechth. fr.* 362, 14 f. ἔπειτα τέκνα τοῦδ’ ἕκατι τίττομεν, ὡς θεῶν τε βωμοὺς πατρίδα τε ἠνώμεθα.

1394. Monk. *cps. Or.* 805 f. ὡς ἀνὴρ (? εἷς ἀνὴρ) ὅστις τρόποισι συντακῆ θυραῖος ὢν, μυρῖων κρείσσω ὁμαίμων ἀνδρὶ κек-τήσθαι φίλος.

ἐμποδῶν γενήσομαι ἴγῳ θνητὸς οὔσα τῇ θεῷ;
 ἀλλ' ἀμήχανον· δίδωμι σῶμα τοῦμόν 'Ελλάδι.
 θύετ', ἐκπορθεῖτε Τροίαν. ταῦτα γὰρ μνημεῖά μου
 διὰ μακροῦ, καὶ παῖδες οὔτοι καὶ γάμοι καὶ δόξ' ἐμή.
 βαρβάρων δ' Ἕλληνας ἄρχειν εἰκός, ἀλλ' οὐ βαρβάρους,
 μήτηρ, Ἕλλήνων· τὸ μὲν γὰρ δοῦλον, οἱ δ' ἐλεύθεροι. 1402

XO. τὸ μὲν σόν, ᾧ νεᾶνι, γενναίως ἔχει·

τὸ τῆς τύχης δὲ καὶ τὸ τῆς θεοῦ νοσεῖ.

AX. Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖ, μακάριόν μέ τις θεῶν 1405

ἔμελλε θήσειν, εἰ τύχοιμι σῶν γάμων.

ζηλωῶ δὲ σοῦ μὲν Ἑλλάδ', Ἑλλάδος δὲ σέ.

δέμας τόδ' Ἄρτεμις λαβεῖν σφαγῇ, and σφαγῇ was dropped *metri gratia* when σῶμα τοῦμόν was inserted in the text. 1396. γενήσομ' ἔγῳ PL, γενήσομαι ἴγῳ Reiske and others. 1398. θύετε πορθεῖτε P, θύετ' ἐκπορθεῖτε L, and P is corrected by an early hand to the reading of L. 1400. εἰκός ἄρχειν PL, ἄρχειν εἰκός Aristotle *Fal.* 1, 2, and so Heinsius. This *v.* was in the early editions written as two *vv.* Grotius and Barnes both corrected this, the former even trying to remedy the metre by writing ἄρχεν "Dorice." Like most later editors Barnes left the subsequent numbers of the *vv.* untouched. 1402. τὸ δ' ἐλεύθερον PL. An early hand in L and a late one in P have corrected this to οἱ δ' ἐλεύθεροι. 1407. τοῦ PL, σοῦ

1398 f. With this have often been compared Macaria's words at *Heacl.* 591 ταῦτ' ἀντὶ παίδων ἐστὶ μοι κειμήλια καὶ παρθενείας, and (Firn.) *Or.* 1050 τὰδ' ἀντὶ παίδων καὶ γαμηλίου λέχους.

1400 f. With this passage have been compared *Andr.* 665 βάρβαροι δ' ὄντες γένος Ἕλλησιν ἄρξουσ'; *Fr.* 717 Ἕλληνας ὄντες βαρβάρους δουλεύσομεν; where see Nauck's note for other similar words. Aristotle's way of introducing his quotation of this passage (διὸ φασιν οἱ ποιηταὶ) shows that it was a 'commonplace' of Gk. tragedy. Ar.'s further words (ὡς ταῦτὸ φύσει βάρβαρον καὶ δοῦλον ὄν) are also exactly in keeping with *v.* 1402, with which Firnhaber cps. *Hel.* 276 τὰ βαρβάρων γὰρ δοῦλα πάντα πλὴν ἐνός and *Or.* 1115.

1406. ἔμελλε θήσειν εἰ τύχοιμι] 'meant to make me if I won'. In using the opt. τύχοιμι Ach. puts himself back in the position when it was still possible for him to win Iph. as his bride. For the

opt. cp. *Bacchae* 612 τίς μοι φύλαξ ἦν εἰ σὺ συμφορᾶς τύχους.

θήσειν] "*Athen.* II, p. 501 C τὸ ποιῆσαι θείναι πρὸς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐλέγετο" Vitelli. Photius τίθησι· ποιεῖ, and θείναι· ποιῆσαι. This use is Homeric. Cf. Cobet, *N. L.* 261, Plat. *Symp.* 197 D.

1407. Ζηλωῶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] We have had the same gen. of the ground of the congratulation with *ζηλοῦν* above at *v.* 677. These words do not mean, as Hennig and Vitelli say: 'I grudge you to Hellas', but 'Hellas is happy in having such a daughter, and you are happy in being a daughter of such a country as Hellas'. With this passage Firnhaber well compares *Andr.* 328 f. οὐκ ἀξιώσῃτ' οὐδ' σέ Τροίας, οὔτε σοῦ Τροίαν ἔτι, though here it is hard to justify the rhetorical antithesis—see Nauck, *Stud. Eur.* II, p. 101—perhaps it means: 'you are not worth Troy any more than Troy as it now is' (ἔτι), i.e. in ruins, 'is worth you'.

εὖ γὰρ τόδ' εἴπας ἀξίως τε πατρίδος·
 [τὸ θεομαχῆν γὰρ ἀπολιποῦσ', ὃ σου κρατεῖ,
 ἐξελογίσω τὰ χρηστὰ τὰναγκαῖά τε.] 1410
 μᾶλλον δὲ λέκτρων σῶν πόθος μ' ἐσέρχεται
 εἰς τὴν φύσιν βλέψαντα· γενναία γὰρ εἶ.
 ὄρα δ'· ἐγὼ γὰρ βούλομαι σ' εὐεργετεῖν
 λαβεῖν τ' ἐς οἴκους· ἄχθομαί τ', ἴστω Θέτις,
 εἰ μὴ σε σώσω Δαναΐδαισι διὰ μάχης 1415
 ἐλθών· ἄθρησον, ὃ θάνατος δεινὸν κακόν.

ΙΦ. λέγω τάδ' * * * * *
 ἢ Τυνδαρις παῖς διὰ τὸ σῶμ' ἀρκεῖ μάχας

superscribed in one Paris ms., and so first Canter. 1408. Hermann (*Opusc.*) condemns this *v.* along with the two following *vv.* If it does not belong here it is taken from some lost tragedy: it is certainly not by the same hand as *vv.* 1409 f. These two lines would of themselves be enough to show that a “*miserrimus interpolator*” had been at work in this play. Monk was the first to call attention to their inconsistency with the nature and the neighbouring words of the speaker. “They reduce his admiration of the young princess’s noble spirit and generous patriotism to a mere compliment on her prudence in surrendering to necessity”. Hennig has also called attention to the fact that ὃ has no antecedent but the “*divinum numen*” implied in τὸ θεομαχῆν. As Vitelli says, *v.* 1396 provided the interpolator with his matter here.—ἐξελογίσω corrected to ἐξελογίσω P, ἐξελογίσω L.—τάδ' ἀναγκαῖα γε P, τά τ' ἀναγκαῖα γε L. In L an accent has been erased from the final α of ἀν., and in P τάδ' has been corrected to τά τ'. τὰναγκαῖά τε Reiske (τὰναγκαῖά γε Markl.). No doubt, as Wil.-Möll. says, this last confusion arose from the fact that an earlier MS. wrote τὰ ἀναγκαῖα and the hiatus was variously filled up. 1411. μοι σῶν PL, the μοι being crossed through by a late hand in both MSS. 1412. τὴν PL, σὴν Scaliger and Canter. 1413—1416. These *vv.* were rejected by Hartung as unworthy of Euripides, and Dindorf follows him. But, as Vitelli and Weil say, Iph.’s following words are inexplicable unless Achilles has renewed his offer to defend her. 1416. ἄθροισον P and the early edd., ἄθρησον L and so Canter. 1417. λέγω τάδ' PL. P has “λείπει” above the line after τάδ'. Perhaps the words originated in a marginal “ΙΦ. λέγει τάδε” in a copy which had omitted to mark the person speaking at *v.* 1417. A later hand in both P and L added οὐδὲν οὐδὲν εὐλαβουμένη and in L λειπ. has been erased. Ald. altered the second οὐδὲν to οὐδέν'. Whatever meaning can be extracted from these words is inapposite. 1418. ἀρχει PL, ἀρκεῖ

1412. τὴν φύσιν] From the σῶν of the previous *v.* σου would naturally be supplied with these words. Perhaps Firmhaber is right in supposing that the article may have had some demonstrative force here.

1413—1415. The emphatic pronoun gives the key to the point urged here by

Achilles: ‘It is my own wish to serve you...it is a personal grief to me if I am not to (*i.e.* if you will not let me) fight to rescue you’.

1416. ὃ θάνατος δεινὸν κακόν] Cp. *Measure for Measure* III. I. 117, “Death is a fearful thing”.

1418 f. διὰ τὸ σῶμα] goes closely

- ἀνδρῶν τιθεῖσα καὶ φόρους· σὺ δ', ὦ ξένη,
 μὴ θνήσκε δι' ἐμὲ μηδ' ἀποκτείνης τινά. 1420
 ἔα δὲ σῶσαι μ' Ἑλλάδ', ἣν δυνώμεθα.
 AX. ὦ λῆμ' ἄριστον, οὐκ ἔχω πρὸς τοῦτ' ἔτι
 λέγειν, ἐπεὶ σοι τάδε δοκεῖ· γενναῖα γὰρ
 φρονεῖς· τί γὰρ τᾶληθές οὐκ εἴποι τις ἄν;
 ὅμως δ', ἴσως γὰρ κἂν μεταγνοίης τάδε, 1425
 [ὡς οὖν ἂν εἰδῆς τὰπ' ἐμοῦ λελεγμένα]
 ἐλθὼν τάδ' ὄπλα θήσομαι βωμοῦ πέλας.
 [ὡς οὐκ εἰσὼν σ' ἀλλὰ κωλύσων θανεῖν.]
 χρήσει δὲ καὶ σὺ τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις τάχα,
 ὅταν πέλας σῆς φάσγανον δέρης ἴδης. 1430
 [οὐκὼν εἰσὼ σ' ἀφροσύνη τῇ σῇ θανεῖν·
 ἐλθὼν δὲ σὺν ὄπλοις τοῖσδε πρὸς ναὸν θεᾶς

Hardouin.—In L η is written over the second *a* of μάχας. Such a suggestion shows us that the scribe of L was more venturesome and therefore often less trustworthy than that of P. 1422—1433. This perplexing passage has been very variously dealt with. Most editors reject 1426 and refuse to admit both 1427 f. and 1431 f., though they vary in their choice between the two passages. Transposition has also been suggested. I believe we ought to reject *v.* 1426, 1429 and 1431—1433, 1425. γε κἂν PL (though Vit. does not say so of L), γὰρ κἂν Herm. γὰρ ἂν Hennig. The change to γε was the result of the insertion of the following *v.* 1426. This *v.* was apparently inserted to account for the τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις in *v.* 1428. The τὰπ' ἐμοῦ was meant to be τὰ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ in the sense of τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, and this in itself condemns the *v.*, which moreover evidently interrupts the connexion of ideas in the passage without adding anything of moment. 1427. ἐλθόντα δ' P, altered by a late hand to ἐλθὼν τάδ', which is the reading of L. 1428. This is a very feeble *v.* As Vitelli says, the antithesis is quite out of place. 1429. χρήση PL with an *i* subsc. added by a late hand in P to the second η. 1431—1433. The

with μάχας τιθεῖσα: and in these words Iph. glances at Ach.'s expressed love for herself (λέκτρων ὧν πόθος in *v.* 1411), 'It is enough that love for Helen should stir up deadly strife: let not your desire to save me give rise to more'. For τιθεῖσα cp. above on *v.* 1406.

1420. τινά] more vague than the prosaic and usual μηδένα.

1422. ὦ λῆμ' ἄριστον] The same expression occurs at *I. T.* 609.

1424. τί γὰρ τᾶληθές οὐκ εἴποι τις ἄν] In these words Ach. admits that his judgment has gone with Iph.'s decision, and refers rather to οὐχ ἔχω κ.τ.λ.

than to the immediately preceding words.

1427. τάδ' ὄπλα] The τεύχη referred to in *v.* 1359. He will place his arms near the altar as a sign that he is prepared to take them up in her defence, even at the last moment, in case Iph. should repent. We must of course suppose Ach. to imply that he will himself remain by his arms. The middle θήσομαι means I will put them there for my own use, and in itself suggests this.

1429. 'You may decide to have recourse to my promised aid at the last moment'.

- καραδοκήσω σὴν ἐκεῖ παρουσίαν.]
- ΙΦ. μήτηρ, τί σιγή δακρύοις τέγγεις κόρας;
- ΚΛ. ἔχω τάλαινα πρόφασιν ὅστ' ἀλγείν φρένα. 1435
- ΙΦ. παῦσαί, με μὴ κάκιζε· τίδε δ' ἐμοὶ πιθού.
- ΚΛ. λέγ', ὡς παρ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἀδικήσει, τέκνον.
- ΙΦ. μήτ' οὖν σὺ τὸν σὸν πλόκαμον ἐκτέμης τριχός,
[μήτ' ἀμφὶ σῶμα μέλανας ἀπίσχη πέπλους.]
- ΚΛ. τί δὴ τόδ' εἶπας, τέκνον; ἀπολέσασά σε 1440
- ΙΦ. οὐ σύ γε· σέσωσμαι, κατ' ἐμέ δ' εὐκλεῆς ἔσει.
- ΚΛ. πῶς εἶπας; οὐ πευθεῖν με σὴν ψυχὴν χρεῶν;
- ΙΦ. ἦκιστ', ἐπεὶ μοι τύμβος οὐ χωσθήσεται.

mention of the *ναὸς θεᾶς* is enough to condemn this passage. There is no other mention (cf. on *v.* 1480 below) of a temple of Artemis at which the sacrifice is supposed to take place. Besides, the definite statement made here and in *v.* 1427 is inconsistent with Achilles' present proposal, which is that his action is to depend entirely on Iph.'s decision. 1436. *παῦσαί με* PL, *παῦσαι, 'μέ* Porson. But the emphatic *'μέ* is out of place before the following *ἐμοὶ*. If the mss. text is sound, we must read *παῦσαί, με*, making a pause before the *με*, notwithstanding that it is an enclitic. I think, however, that it is possible that *μὴ κάκιζε* (for which *μὴ κακίστης* would have been more in place) is a gloss, and that the original was something like *παῦσαί με θηλύνοσα*· or else that *παῦσαί* has usurped the place of some such word as *κλαιθμῶ*. 1437. *ἀδικήσῃ* PL. A late hand in P has written something indistinguishable in the place of the *κη. ἀτυχήσεις* Canter (and Cobet, *V. L.* 598, who does not mention Canter), but this would need a gen. in this sense. Monk thinks a *γ'* may have been lost after *ἡμῶν*. Cobet would read *πρὸς* for the mss. *παρὰ*. See Expl. Notes. 1438. *γε* PL, *σὺ* Elmsley. 1439. Burges was the first to eject this *v.* The interpolator thought the *μήτ'* in 1438 ought to have a companion, and slightly altered *v.* 1449. 1440. *τί δῆτα* and *ὦ τέκνον* PL, *τί δῆ* Barnes, *τέκνον* Markland.

1434. We have much the same expression at *Med.* 922 and *Hel.* 1189.

1435. *πρόφασιν*] Firmhaber notes that at *Hec.* 340 this word is explained by the scholiast to mean *αἰτία, ἀφορμή*.

1437. *παρ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἀδικήσει*] "Of me you shall have no cause to complain". The expression is a quasi-legal one. Cp. *Dem. adv. Lept.* p. 507 *οἱ ἄλλοι παρ' ἡμῶν τὰ δίκαια ἔξουσιν*. *Xen. Cyr.* 5, 5, 13 *τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀδίκημα*. For the passive fut. in *-σομαι* cp. above *v.* 331 *ἔασσομαι* and *v.* 1203 *ἔστέρησομαι*.

1438. *μήτ'*] Probably Iphigeneia was going on to say what she does say even-

tually at *v.* 1449 (i.e. that her sisters were not to mourn for her either), when she was stopped by the requirements of the stichomuthia.

τριχός] is not governed by the *ἐκ*-but depends on *πλόκαμον*.

1441. *σέσωσμαι*] The spectators would probably refer this to the actual interposition of Artemis at the moment of the sacrifice: an instance of tragic 'irony'.

1443. Iph. means that as there will be no mound on which to place the locks of mourners' hair, or pour funeral libations over, the ceremonial of the *πένθος* cannot take place.

- ΚΛ. τί δ', εἰ τεθνήξεις, οὐ τάφος νομίζεται;
 ΙΦ. βωμὸς θεᾶς μοι μνήμα τῆς Διὸς κόρης. 1445
 ΚΛ. ἀλλ' ὦ τέκνον, σοὶ πείσομαι· λέγεις γὰρ εὖ.
 ΙΦ. ὡς εὐτυχούσά γ' Ἑλλάδος τ' εὐεργέτις.
 ΚΛ. τί δὴ κασιγνήταισιν ἀγγελῶ σέθεν;
 ΙΦ. μηδ' ἀμφὶ κείναις μέλανας ἐξάψης πέπλους.
 ΚΛ. [εἶπω δὲ παρὰ σοῦ φίλον ἔπος τι παρθένους; 1450
 ΙΦ. χαίρειν γ'. Ὀρέστην τ' ἔκτρεφ' ἄνδρα τόνδε μοι.
 ΚΛ. προσέλκυσάι νιν ὕστατον θεωμένη.
 ΙΦ. ὦ φίλτατ', ἐπεκούρησας ὅσον εἶχες φίλους.]
 ΚΛ. ἔσθ' ὅ τι κατ' Ἄργος δρώσά σοι χάριν φέρω;
 ΙΦ. πατέρα τὸν ἀμὸν μὴ στύγει πόσιω τε σόν. 1455
 ΚΛ. δεινούς ἀγῶνας διὰ σέ δεῖ κείνον δραμεῖν.

1444. For the unintelligible MSS. τί δὴ; τὸ θνήσκων οὐ τάφος νομίζεται; (δὴ or δὲ with the second letter in an erasure P, δαι with the αἰ in an erasure L: see below on *v.* 1448), many emendations have been proposed. Monk is satisfied with putting the first; after *θνήσκων*. Paley and Herwerden propose *θανούσων*, Weil *τεθνεῶσιν*, Vitelli *τυθείσων*. I think we should regard the erasure in the MSS. after the δ as an indication. If δὴ was the original reading, who would want to alter it? I have therefore ventured to print τί δ', εἰ τεθνήξεις, οὐ τάφος νομίζεται; 1446. An ignorant late hand in P altered ἀλλ' to ἀρ'. 1448. δὲ P, δὴ changed to δαι L. 1449. κείναις PL, κείνας Monk, who argues that the interpolator of *v.* 1439 would have written ἀμφὶ σώματι if he had read κείναις here. But it is not too much to suppose that the interpolator was familiar with both constructions.—ἐξάψη PL, ἐξάψης Reiske. 1450—1453. I have bracketed these four lines because of the mention of Orestes as present. The last two *vv.* are good ones, but the first two are poor. The only other instances of the verb ἐπικουρέω in tragedy are to be found in the *Rhesus* (*vv.* 937 and 956). This lends some support to Wecklein's view that it and several interpolations in our present tragedy were by the same hand, that of the younger Euripides. See above Ex. note on *v.* 613. 1450. τί PL, τι H. Stephanus. 1455. τὸν ἐμὸν PL¹, γε τὸν ἐμὸν L², τὸν ἀμὸν Scaliger. 1456. κείνον δεῖ PL, δεῖ κείνον Porson. 1459. σπαράξεσθαι PL,

1444. 'Why, if you are to die, should a tomb not be your due?'

1445. It is implied that not only would the funeral ceremonies be a sacrilege to the altar, but that the altar will discharge the other purpose of the funeral mound—that i.e. of preserving a memorial of the dead.

1447. γ'] Here, and in *vv.* 1440 and [1450], γε stands, as often, in an answer, in place of a repetition (in another person) of the verb of the question. So above at *v.* 326.

1449. The mention of her sisters recalls to Iph.'s mind what she was on the point of saying at *v.* 1437. She says it now instead of giving a direct answer to her mother's question. The interpolator, thinking that the present *v.* could not serve for such an answer, makes Cly. repeat her question.

1456. δεινούς ἀγῶνας] The plural shows that Cly. is not thinking of the sacrifice, but of some results of the hatred which Iph. deprecates. Iph.'s answer in the next *v.* shows that she understood her

- ΙΦ. ἄκων μ' ὑπὲρ γῆς Ἑλλάδος διώλεσεν.
 ΚΛ. δόλω δ', ἀγεννώς Ἀτρέως τ' οὐκ ἀξίως.
 ΙΦ. τίς μ' εἶσιw ἄξων πρὶν σπαράσσεσθαι κόμης;
 ΚΛ. ἔγωγε μετὰ σοῦ ΙΦ. μὴ σύ γ' οὐ καλῶς λέγεις. 1460
 ΚΛ. πέπλων ἐχομένη σῶν. ΙΦ. ἐμοί, μήτηρ, πιθοῦ.
 μέν· ὡς ἐμοί τε σοί τε κάλλιον τόδε.
 πατρὸς δ' ὀπαδῶν τῶνδ' ἐτίς με πεμπέτω
 Ἀρτέμιδος εἰς λειμῶν', ὅπου σφαγήσομαι.
 ΚΛ. ᾧ τέκνον, οἴχει; ΙΦ. καὶ πάλιν γ' οὐ μὴ μόλω. 1465
 ΚΛ. λιπούσα μητέρ'; ΙΦ. ὡς ὄρᾳς γ', εὐκαρδίως.
 ΚΛ. σχέες, μὴ με προλίπησ. ΙΦ. οὐκ ἐῷ στάξεν δάκρυ.
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπευφημήσατ', ᾧ νεάνιδες,

σπαράσσεσθαι Elmsley. As Matthiae says, perhaps the ἀξ in ἄξων misled the scribe here.—κόμης PL, κόμας a late hand in P, probably Musurus, as the Aldine reads κόμας. Even supposing that πρὶν could be followed by a fut., or, what is less unlikely, that σπαράσσω could have a 1 aor. mid. σπαράσσεισθαι, the active sense of the verb would imply that it was the conductor she here asks for who was imagined by Iph. as tearing her hair. See Expl. N. 1460. ἐγὼ, μετὰ γε PL, ἔγωγε μετὰ Markland. 1465. οἴχη PL. 1466. γ' οὐκ ἀξίως PL. If these words are correct, they ought to be read γ' οὐκ ἀξίως; but I believe that some commentator wrote οὐκ ἀξίω as a paraphrase of οὐκ ἐῷ in the next v., and that this, slightly modified, ousted the genuine reading here. I have printed εὐκαρδίως as a possible stop-gap. γε ἀξίως Bremi, εἰ ἀξίως Hermann, σοῦ γ' ἀξίως Vitelli. 1468. ἐπευφημήσατ'

mother's words as a threat. Cf. above v. 1180 ff.

1458. Ἀτρέως τ' οὐκ ἀξίως] Cf. above v. 1233 πρὸς Ἀτρέως πατρός, and v. 1031 ὁ γὰρ τοι Τυνδάρους οὐκ ἀξίως. Perhaps, as Paley thinks, there is a reference here, as at v. 321 above, to the supposed connexion of Ἀτρεὺς with ἄτρεστος. Ag. acts from fear.

1459. πρὶν] used for 'instead of', or 'to prevent' something happening, as at I. T. 102 ἀλλὰ πρὶν θανῆν νεὼς ἐπιφειγόμεν. The meaning of the v. is: 'who will take me and prevent my being seized by the hair?' σπαράσσειw (fut. σπαράξομαι) κόμην is to tear the hair (as at Andr. 1209 οὐ σπαράξομαι κόμαν); Here the pass. is used as a variety for ἀρπασθῆναι. The expression nearly corresponds to the colloquial English 'to be clawed by the hair'. The gen. is the

same as that above at v. 1366. At v. 1463 Iph. shows what was in her mind here: i.e. that if Odysseus or Calchas sent men to fetch her they would treat her violently, and therefore she wishes to be taken by a friendly hand.

1461. πέπλων ἐχομένη] not to keep her from going (ἀντεχομένη, cf. v. 1367), but to be as near her as possible. For μὴ σύ γε cf. Hec. 408.

1464. λειμῶν] An open grassy place is often spoken of as sacred to some deity. Cf. Phoen. 24, Soph. Trach. 200, Aesch. Suppl. 558 f. In this case the erection of the altar to Artemis would make the place sacred to her. The indefinite ὅπου perhaps indicates that Iph. has no distinct knowledge of the place where the altar is to stand, though she knew the kind of place that would be chosen.

παιᾶνα τήμῃ συμφορᾷ Διὸς κόρην
 "Αρτεμιν. ἴτω δὲ Δαναΐδαις εὐφημία. 1470
 κανᾶ δ' ἐναρχέσθω τις, αἰθέσθω δὲ πῦρ
 προχύταις καθαρσίοισι, καὶ πατήρ ἐμὸς
 ἐνδεξιούσθω βωμόν· ὡς σωτηρίαν
 "Ἐλλησι δώσουσ' ἔρχομαι νικηφόρον.

ἄγετέ με τὰν Ἴλιου 1475
 καὶ Φρυγῶν ἐλέπτολιν.
 στέφεια περίβολα δίδοτε, φέρετε·
 πλόκαμος ὄδε καταστέφειν·
 χερνίβων τε παγᾶς.
 ἐλίσσετ' ἀμφὶ βωμόν 1480

P¹, ἐπευφήμησατ' P² and L. 1471. *kenā*, altered by a later hand to *kanā*, P. 1479. *παγαῖσι* PL, *παγᾶς* Reiske and Seidler—the acc. is governed by *δίδοτε*, *πλόκ.*

1468 ff. The dative *συμφορᾷ* is governed by the ἐπ- in *ἐπευφήμησατ'*, and the acc. *κόρην* the direct object of *εὐφημεῖν*, *παιᾶνα* being an adverbial cognate accusative. 'Sing a paean to Artemis at my death'.

1470. ἴτω δὲ Δαναΐδαις εὐφημία.] For ἴτω cf. *Phoen.* 524 ἴτω μὲν πῦρ, ἴτω δὲ φάσγανα, *Suppl.* 1025 ἴτω φῶς γάμοι τε, *Soph.* *Trach.* 207 ἐν δὲ κωνὸς ἀρσένων ἴτω κλαγγὰ τὸν εὐφάρετραν Ἀπόλλω, *Ar.* *Av.* 857 ἴτω ἴτω δὲ Πυθιάς βοᾶ θεῶ. These passages, where ἴτω is used of the *starting* or *raising* of a shout or song, and the recent use of *ἐπευφημεῖν* and *παιᾶν* in the present passage, make it possible that *εὐφημία* is here used in the later sense of a *song of praise*:—cf. *Pind. Pyth.* x. 53 f. ὦν θαλάσσις ἔμπεδον εὐφαιμίας τε μάλιστ' Ἀπόλλων χαίρει:—'Let your song sound in the ears of the Greeks'. But the dat. presents difficulty. The paean referred to is evidently (from what follows) meant to be sung at the moment of the sacrifice. Perhaps the word means: 'let it' (*i.e.* the paean) 'rise, a sound of good omen for the Greeks'. The passage has also been taken to mean: 'let a solemn silence be proclaimed among the Greeks'.

1471 f. For the ceremonies observed

at a sacrifice cf. above on *vv.* 1111 f.

1473. ἐνδεξιούσθω βωμόν.] Hartung is probably right in refusing to accept the ordinary explanation of *ἐνδεξόμαι*, which is '*dextra prehendere*', and interpreting to mean *ἐνδέξια περιέρχεσθαι*. Cf. *H. F.* 926 f., and *Ar.* *Pax* 956 ἄγε δὴ τὸ κανοῦν λαβῶν σὺ καὶ τὴν χέρνιβα Περσίδι τὸν βωμόν ταχέως ἐπιδέξια (quoted by *Firnhaber* on *v.* 1557 below).

Vv. 1475—1509. With this *κομμοῦς* Iphigeneia quits the scene, and so, probably, does Euripides. After begging the Chorus to attend her to the altar and to deck her for the sacrifice, she renews her request to them to honour the goddess, mentioning this time the dance which is to accompany the song. (See the passage from the *H. F.* quoted below on *v.* 1480.) Hartung is wrong in thinking that at *v.* 1475 begins the paean asked for at *v.* 1469. Like the interpolator of *vv.* 1510—1531, he failed to see that that was to be sung, not on the stage, nor even on the way to the altar, but during the sacrifice.

1477. περίβολα.] *περίβολος* is elsewhere used as a noun.

1480 f. ἐλίσσετ'... Ἀρτεμιν.] For the acc. of the deity honoured by the dance

ἀμφὶ βωμὸν Ἄρτεμιν,
 τὰν ἄνασσαν Ἄρτεμιν,
 τὰν μάκαιραν ὡς ἐμοῖσιν, εἰ χρεῶν,
 αἵμασι θύμασι 1485
 θέσφατ' ἐξαλείψω.
 ὦ πότνια πότνια μήτηρ, οὐ δάκρυά γέ σοι
 δώσομεν ἀμέτερα
 παρ' ἱεροῖς γὰρ οὐ πρόπει. 1490

ΧΟ. ὦ νεάνιδες,
 συνεπαιίδετ' Ἄρτεμιν
 * * * *

ὅδε κατ. being a parenthesis. 1480. λαὸν P, ναὸν L, to which a later hand corrected P. Monk is, I think, right in regarding ναὸν as spurious (cp. above on v. 1432). I have also followed him, though with more doubt, in substituting βωμὸν for it. Heimsoeth, Herwerden and Vitelli regard ἀμφὶ ναὸν as a Byzantine 'gloss' on ἀμφὶ βωμὸν. 1485. θύμασί τε PL, in L τλ (for τέλος) is written over τε and : put after it to show that the verse should end here. Bothe rejects θύμασί τε, considering it, I suppose, as due to a 'gloss' explaining αἵμασι. Monk writes θύμασίν τε. I prefer to reject the τε as Hermann suggests, comparing Aesch. P. V. 691 πῆματα, λύματα, δείματα. Cf. also Eur. El. 711 φάσματα, δείματα. 1487—1490. These vv. are assigned in P and L to the Chorus. Seidler gave them to Iph. and nearly all editors have followed him. In v. 1488 the mss. and all editions have ὡς. If the vv. are not, as Hartung thought, spurious, we ought surely to read οὐ for ὡς. Otherwise there is a direct inconsistency with the heroine's words at v. 1467 as well as in the passage itself: for the fut. δώσομεν can only refer to the time of the sacrifice.—μητέρα the early edd. (μερ L), μήτηρ Herm. 1491—1497. These vv. I have given to the Chorus (i.e. to the κορυφαῖος). If there had not been in some mss. an indication that the Chorus spoke some lines somewhere about here, it is inexplicable that the lines beginning α πότνια πότνια μήτηρ should have been given to them. The only objection is in the δι' ἐμὸν ὄνομα, but these words must be corrupt (see below). Monk also gives these vv. to the Chorus, but he makes the Chorus begin at v. 1487. ὦ PL, ἰὼ, ἰὼ Nauck. 1492. After this v. I have followed Monk in indicating a gap. "One word at least must

after ἐλίσσειν Monk cps. H. F. 687 ff. παιᾶνα μὲν Δηλιάδες ὑμνοῦσ', ἀμφὶ πυρᾶς τὸν Λατοῦς εὐπαιδα γόνον εἰλίσσουσαι καλλιχοροί. It is the same acc. of the indirect object which is formed with ἄδεν, χορεύειν and even κόπτεσθαι.

1485. αἵμασι.] For the plural cf. El. 1172 ἄλλ' οἶδε μητρὸς νεοφόνους ἐν (νεοφόνουσαν Nauck) αἵμασιν πεφυρμένοι βαλνουσιν ἐξ ὄκων πόδα, also I. T. 73 ἐξ

αἱμάτων...ξάνθ', Orestes 1548, Phoen. 1051 and 1292 δι' αἱμάτων.

θύμασι.] So used in the plur. in the sense of θυσία at Med. 1054, Phoen. 573.

1486. ἐξαλείψω] lit. 'blot out'. What she will do away with is the prohibition to the fleet contained in the oracle.

1490. Monk cf. Suppl. 289 f. μὴ δακρυρρῶει σεμναῖσι Δηοῦς ἐσχάrais παρημένῃ.

1492. συνεπαιίδετε] 'Join me' (the

- Χαλκίδος ἀντίπορον,
 ἵνα τε δώρατα μέμονε δαία 1495
 [δι' ἐμὸν ὄνομα] τᾶσδ' Αὐλίδος
 ἐν στενοπόροισιν ὄρμοις.
- ΙΦ. ἰὼ γὰρ μᾶτερ ᾧ Πελασγία,
 Μυκηναϊαί τ' ἐμαὶ θεράπναι.
- ΧΟ. καλεῖς πόλισμα Περσέως, 1500
 Κυκλωπίων πόνου χερῶν;
 ΙΦ. ἔθρεψας Ἑλλάδι με φάος·
 θανούσα δ' οὐκ ἀναίνομαι.

have been lost, in which was γᾶν or γαῖαν or πέδον, or something of the kind, with which the adj. ἀντίπορον agreed. That word is the epithet, not of Diana, but of a place or region, as in every other instance where it is found". The τε in the following v. shows that another description of the place preceded this. Prof. Strachan suggests ἀντιπέραν. 1495. Both P and L originally had δώρατα, but it was corrected early. 1496. δι' ἐμὸν ὄνομα PL. Monk rightly rejected these words (he also rejects the following τᾶσδ'). They are only consistent with μέμονε on the assumption that it meant *remain*. It is possible that they are a corruption of the two previous words repeated, or that there stood here an infin. depending on μέμονε. 1497. Before στενοπόροισιν in P is inserted in faint ink what I take to be ἐν. This correction I have adopted.—In L ὄρμοις is erased and written (with a smooth breathing) at the beginning of the following v.—In P the v. in this passage end at δώρατα, ὄνομα, στενοπόροισιν and μῆτερ. 1498. μῆτερ PL, μᾶτερ Seidler. 1499. θεράπναι PL, θεράπναι Scaliger. 1501. Κυκλωπίων PL (and not, as usual, -είων). 1502. Ἑλλάδι μέγα φάος PL, Ἑλλάδι με φάος Elmsley. (Ἑλλάδος με φῶς Nauck.) I have adopted Elmsley's correction, partly because, as he says, it gives a metre like that of the neighbouring lines, and partly because the speaker's reference to herself in the

leader of the Chorus) 'in appeasing'. The simple ἐπάδειν (cf. above v. 1212) does not take an acc. of the person.

1495. δώρατα] probably not (as Musgrave) *ships*, but *spears*.

μέμονε δαία] 'are thirsting for the fight'.

1498. Πελασγία] At *Or.* 960 Electra in view of her own approaching death also addresses her native land as ᾧ Πελασγία, and at 1601 of the same play we have ἐν Ἄργει τῷδε τῷ Πελασγικῷ.

1499. θεράπναι] αὐλῶνες, σταθμοί, Hesych. θεράπναι· τόπος ἐστὶν ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι· οὗ μνημονεύει καὶ Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Ἄλκαϊος, Photius.

1500. Περσέως] Perseus is said by

Pausanias (II. 3. 16) to have founded Mycenae.

1503. θανούσα δ' οὐκ ἀναίνομαι] If these words are correctly given in the mss. they must mean 'That I die causes me no regret'. It was pointed out by Monk in his note on this v., as by Goodwin (*Gk. M. and T.* § 881 at the end) that though, when meaning *refuse*, ἀναίνομαι takes an infin., when it means *regret* it takes a participle. But a comparison of all the instances of participles thus subordinated given in Goodwin, *M. and T.* §§ 143—152 and 881, shows that this case stands alone. Nowhere else is found an *aorist* participle subordinated to a *present* verb and referring to a *future*

ΧΟ. κλέος γὰρ οὐ σε μὴ λίπη.

ΙΦ. ἰὼ ἰώ.

λαμπαδοῦχος ἰμέρα Δι-

1505

ός τε φέγγος, ἕτερον

ἕτερον αἰῶνα καὶ μοῖραν οἰκήσομεν.

χαῖρέ μοι, φίλον φάος.

[ΧΟ. ἰὼ ἰώ.

ἴδεσθε τὰν Ἰλίου

1510

καὶ Φρυγῶν ἐλέπτολι

στείχουσαν, ἐπὶ κἀρα στέφη

βαλλομένην χερνίβων τε παγαῖς,

βωμόν γε δαίμονος θεᾶς

ῥανίσιν αἱματορρύντοις

1515

θανοῦσαν εὐφυνῆ τε σώματος δέρην

σφαγεῖσαν. εὐδροσοι παγαῖ

following verse is awkwardly abrupt in the absence of some such reference in this. The μέγα may have been due to a reminiscence of μέγα φῶς in *v.* 1063. In L ἐμὲ is written by way of explanation over the end of *ἔθρεψας*. 1510. I have followed Kirchhoff in holding that all that follows is spurious. For the Epilogue (*vv.* 1532—1629) see the Introduction, pp. xxvi. ff. As to the Choric passage (*vv.* 1510—1531), it is a feeble and at times senseless reproduction of the language and the ideas of *vv.* 1475 ff., following the supposed hint of *vv.* 1468 f. As has been said in the Introduction, some such addition as this Chorus and the Epilogue may well have been deemed necessary to the production of the tragedy on the stage. 1512. στέφεια Seidler. 1513. βαλλομένην Seidler, βαλουμένην Hartung,—παγαῖς PL, but in L as is written over the αἰς. 1514. δαίμονος Markland, δ' αἰμονος Hennig. Monk omits θεᾶς as being a gloss upon δαίμονος. 1516. θανοῦσαν Markland, χθανοῦσαν Monk. The word δέρην is in both P and L crossed out at the end of this *v.*, and put in at the beginning of the next. 1517. Many editors follow Dindorf in regarding σφαγεῖσαν as a gloss on θανοῦσαν wrongly

event. Elsewhere (*e.g.* Eur. *H. F.* 1235 εὐ δράσας δέ σ' οὐκ ἀνανομαι) such a construction means: 'I do not regret *having done*—'. The defence of this passage must lie in the meaning of the verb θανοῦσα.

1508. ἕτερον αἰῶνα καὶ μοῖραν οἰκήσομεν] This use of οἰκεῖν with such accusatives is a bold extension of its absolute use in the sense of 'live', for which cf. Eur. *Fr.* 708 ἄλυπος οἰκεῖν (Nauck: the Variorum ed. gives ἄλυπον οἰκεῖν βίοντον), Soph. *O. T.* 1390 τὸ γὰρ τὴν φροντίδ' ἔξω τῶν κακῶν οἰκεῖν γλυκύ.

This bold vague phrase gains additional impressiveness from the consideration that this and the following line were perhaps the last words Euripides wrote.

1514 ff. If these words are as their author wrote them we must suppose he meant βωμόν to be an acc. of the goal after στείχουσαν, θανοῦσαν and σφαγεῖσαν to agree with ἐλέπτολι, and δέρην to be an acc. of respect with σφαγεῖσαν.

1517 ff. This sentence is not so flabby in construction as the last, but in the connexion of its thoughts it is flabbier.

πατρῶαι μένουσί σε χέρνιβές τε
στρατός τ' Ἀχαιῶν θέλων
Ἴλιου πόλιν μολεῖν. 1520
ἀλλὰ τὰν Διὸς κόραν
κλήσωμεν Ἄρτεμιν, θεῶν ἄνασσαν,
ὡς ἐπ' εὐτυχεῖ πότμῳ.
ὦ πότνια, θύμασι βροτησίοις
χαρεῖσα, πέμψον εἰς Φρυγῶν 1525
γαῖαν Ἑλλάνων στρατὸν
καὶ δολόεντα Τροίας ἔδη,
Ἄγαμέμνονά τε λόγχαις
Ἑλλάδι κλεινότατον στέφανον
δὸς ἀμφὶ κάρᾳ ἐὼν 1530
κλέος ἀείμνηστον ἀμφιθεῖναι.

- ΑΓΓ. ὦ Τυνδαρεία παῖ, Κλυταιμνήστρα, δόμων
ἔξω πέρασον, ὡς κλύης ἐμῶν λόγων.
ΚΛ. φθογγῆς κλύουσα δεῦρο σῆς ἀφικόμην,
ταρβοῦσα τλήμων κάκπεπληγμένη φόβῳ. 1535
μή μοί τιν' ἄλλην ξυμφορὰν ἤκεις φέρων
πρὸς τῇ παρουσίῃ; ΑΓΓ. σῆς μὲν οὖν παιδὸς πέρι
θανμαστὰ σοὶ καὶ δεινὰ σημήναι θέλω.

introduced into the text. 1524. In L the *ι* of *πότνια* has been erased. 1529.
'Ελλάσι Markland. 1530. *κάρᾳ τέον* Aldus, *κάρᾳ θ' ἐὼν* Scaliger, *κράθ' ἐὼν*
Seidler. The hiatus between *κάρᾳ* and *ἐὼν* (cf. *A.* 533), and the word *δολόεντα* in
v. 1527, show the interpolator to have been familiar with Homeric forms. 1532—
1629. See Introduction, pp. xxvi. ff. 1533. *κλύεις* corrected by a late hand
to *κλύοις* P, *κλύεις* corrected to *κλύης* L. 1536. *ἤκεις* PL. I have retained this,
putting a . at *φόβῳ* and a ; at *παρούση*. *ἤκεις* Portus, with a , at *φόβῳ* and a . at *παρούση*,
and so all subsequent editions. It would be possible to retain the earlier punctuation
and yet read *ἤκεις*. Cf. Krüger, *i.* 54, 8, 12, Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, § 358 (*d*),
Goodwin, *M. and T.* § 269. Cf. also *Phoen.* 93. 1538. *δεινὰ* PL, *κεδνὰ*

1522. *θεῶν ἄνασσαν*] by no means
an appropriate title for Artemis, is a
reminiscence of *v.* 1482.

1525. *χαρεῖσα*] As Dindorf points
out, Markland is wrong in deriving
support from this place for his *διαίματος*.
The aorist participle cannot refer to the
goddess' general predilections, but only
to the satisfaction it is expected she will
feel in this particular sacrifice.

1532 f. Cf. note on *v.* 801—818

above.

1535. Cf. *Bacchae* 604 *ἐκπεπληγμένα*
φόβῳ.

1537. *μὲν οὖν*] has its adversative force
here. This makes the following *δεινὰ*
appear, as Weil held it to be, quite out
of place (see Crit. N.). If it is genuine
it must have exactly the same meaning as
θανμαστὰ, and read that way the line
becomes weak.

- ΚΛ. μὴ μέλλε τοίνυν, ἀλλὰ φράζ' ὄσον τάχος.
 ΑΓΓ. ἀλλ' ὦ φίλη δέσποινα, πᾶν πεύση σαφῶς. 1540
 λέξω δ' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἣν τι μὴ σφαλεῖσά μου
 γνώμη ταραξή γλώσσαν ἐν λόγοις ἐμήν.
 ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἰκόμεσθα τῆς Διὸς κόρης
 Ἄρτέμιδος ἄλσος λείμακάς τ' ἀνθροφόρους,
 ἔν' ἦν Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος στρατεύματος, 1545
 σὴν παῖδ' ἄγοντες, εὐθὺς Ἀργείων ὄχλος
 ἠθροίζεθ'. ὡς δ' ἐσείδεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ
 ἐπὶ σφαγᾶς στείχουσαν εἰς ἄλσος κόρην,
 ἀνεστέναζε, κάμπαλιν στρέψας κᾶρα
 δάκρυα προῆγεν, ὀμμάτων πέπλον προθείς. 1550
 ἣ δὲ σταθείσα τῷ τεκόντι πλησίον
 ἔλεξε τοιάδ'· ὦ πάτερ, πάρεμί σοι,
 τοῦμόν δὲ σῶμα τῆς ἐμῆς ὑπὲρ πάτρας
 καὶ τῆς ἀπάσης Ἑλλάδος γαίας ὑπερ
 θῦσαι δίδωμ' ἐκούσα πρὸς βωμόν θεᾶς 1555
 ἄγοντας, εἴπερ ἐστὶ θέσφατον τόδε.
 καὶ τοῦπ' ἐμ' εὐτυχεῖτε, καὶ νικηφόρον
 δώρου τύχοιτε πατρίδα τ' ἐξέκοισθε γῆν.

Weil. 1541. μου PL, που Markland. 1544. ἀνθροφόρους PL: in L an η is written above -εσ- by an early hand, and in P a later hand has tried to alter -εσ- into -η-. 1550. προῆγεν PL, προῆκεν Dindorf. 1557. εὐτυχοῖτε Ald.

1545. Cf. *v.* 514 above, and *Hec.* 521 f. where Polyxena's sacrifice is being described: *παρῆν μὲν ὄχλος πᾶς Ἀχαικοῦ στρατοῦ*, with the *ὄχλος* in which Hartung also compares the *ὄχλος* in *v.* 1546. Bang (*Vitelli Oss.* p. 39 note), to get rid of the contradiction between this *v.* and 1546 f., would give *σύλλογος* here, not the meaning it had in *v.* 514 but, the meaning it has in *Xen. Cyr.* VI. 2. 11, of an habitual 'mustering'. Such a meaning is unlikely for poetry.

1548. The double construction after *στείχουσαν* (*ἐπὶ σ.* and *εἰς ἄ.*) is awkward.

1550. **προῆγεν**] If the author of this passage is responsible for this word he must certainly have lived long after Euripides, and probably translated into Greek the poetical Latin *lacrimasque ciebat*.

ὀμμάτων πέπλον προθείς] Cicero, *Oration* 22. 74, with reference to the celebrated

picture by Timanthes of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, says: "*pictor ille vidit, cum in immolanda Iphigenia tristis Calchas esset, tristior Ulixes, maereret Menelaus, obvolvendum caput Agamemnonis esse, quoniam summum illum luctum penicillo non posset imitari*". Cf. also Pliny *H. N.* xxxv. 10. 36, Quintilian II. 13. 13. The veiling of Agamemnon's face was therefore regarded as an *invention* of the painter's. It may not be lawful to conclude absolutely from this that these Latin authors knew nothing of such a suggestion in a Greek tragedy, but at all events they did not think, as Firmhaber (p. 285) suggests, that the painter borrowed from Euripides.

1556. **εἴπερ ἐστὶ θέσφατον τόδε**] 'If that is what the oracle bids'. Cf. *Hdt.* IV, 164 *μαθὼν τὸ μαντήιον ἐὼν τούτο*.



πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ ψαύσῃ τις Ἀργείων ἐμοῦ·
 σιγῇ παρέξω γὰρ δέρην εὐκαρδίως. 1560
 τοσαῦτ' ἔλεξε· πᾶς δ' ἐθάμβησε κλύων
 εὐψυχίαν τε κάρετῆν τῆς παρθένου.
 στὰς δ' ἐν μέσῳ Ταλθύβιος, ᾧ τόδ' ἦν μέλον,
 εὐφημίαν ἀνείπε καὶ σιγῆν στρατῶ·
 Κάλχας δ' ὁ μάντις εἰς κανοῦν χρυσήλατον 1565
 ἔθηκεν ὄξυ χειρὶ φάσγανον σπάσας
 κολεῶν ἔσωθεν, κρατὰ τ' ἔστεψεν κόρης.
 ὁ παῖς δ' ὁ Πηλέως ἐν κύκλῳ βωμὸν θεᾶς
 λαβῶν κανοῦν ἔθρεξε χέρνιβας θ' ὁμοῦ,
 ἔλεξε δ'· ᾧ παῖ Ζηνὸς Ἄρτεμις θηροκτόνε, 1570
 τὸ λαμπρὸν εἰλίσσουσ' ἐν εὐφρόνῃ φάος,
 δέξαι τὸ θῦμα τόδ' ὃ γέ σοι δωρούμεθα
 στρατός τ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ θ' ὁμοῦ,
 ἄχραντον αἶμα καλλιπαρθένου δέρης,
 καὶ δὸς γενέσθαι πλοῦν νεῶν ἀπήμονα 1575
 Τροίας τε πέργαμ' ἐξελεῖν ἡμᾶς δορί.
 εἰς γῆν δ' Ἀτρεΐδαι πᾶς στρατός τ' ἔστη βλέπων.
 ἱρεὺς δὲ φάσγανον λαβῶν ἐπεύξατο,

1567. *κολεῶν* P, the *ou* altered by a late hand to *o*, *κολεῶν* L, the *o* in an erasure.

1568. Πηλέως P, Πηλέος L. 1570. With this *v.* (which is the last line but one on the second column of the back of p. 146) a new hand begins in P. It continues through the rest of this play and down to *v.* 35 of the Danae fragment which succeeds it, *i.e.* down to the bottom of the second column of the back of p. 147. The remaining *vv.* of the Danae fragment are in a hand different from either of the two preceding ones, and occupy the first column of p. 148 (*a*), and one line of the second column. The rest of the second column of 148 (*a*) and the whole of pp. 148 (*b*) and 149 (*a*) and 149 (*b*) are blank. (1570.) ᾧ παῖ ζηνὸς Ἄρτεμις θηροκτόνε P, and so also no doubt L originally (see Vitelli, p. 72 note); in P from *παῖ* to *θηροκτόνε* is crossed out by a fairly early hand which writes for it: *θηροκτόν' Ἄρτεμι παῖ Διός*. In L the first hand erased *παῖ ζηνὸς* (the \wedge and the top of the ζ still show) and wrote *διὸς* in their place.—ᾧ παῖ Ζηνὸς, ᾧ θηροκτόνε Nauck. 1578. *ιρεὺς* P, *ιερεὺς* L.

1561 f. Cf. *Hec.* 542 *τοσαῦτ' ἔλεξε, πᾶς δ' ἐπηύξατο στρατός*. The following line, with the *τῆς* before the *παρθένου* and no article before the first two nouns, is a very bad one.

1567. *κολεῶν ἔσωθεν*] Probably corrupt. The *ἐξεῖλε* *κολεοῦ* in *Hec.* 544 makes it probable that the word *κολεός* was used here. It will hardly be believed that Firmhaber swallows the words whole, explaining that *σπάσας* is here used for

λαβῶν and that the sword *was* put into the *κανοῦν* *with its scabbard on!*

1568. Cf. *H. F.* 926 ff., a passage already referred to above on *v.* 1112.

The monstrosities in the following *vv.*, some of which have been referred to in the Introduction p. xxviii., are too evident to need special comment, and I do not think any gain can result from their correction. It would be better to write the whole passage over again.



λαμόν τ' ἐπεσκοπέϊθ', ἵνα πλήξειεν ἄν·
 ἐμοὶ δέ τ' ἄλγος οὐ μικρὸν εἰσῆει φρενί,
 1580 κάστην νενεκῶς· θαῦμα δ' ἦν αἴφνης ὄραν·
 πληγῆς κτύπον γὰρ πᾶς τις ἦσθετ' ἄν σαφῶς,
 τὴν παρθένον δ' οὐκ οἶδεν οὐ γῆς εἰσέδου.
 βοᾷ δ' ἱερεύς, ἅπας δ' ἐπήχησε στρατός,
 1585 ἄελπτον εἰσιδόντες ἐκ θεῶν τιнос
 φάσμ', οὐ γέ μῃδ' ὀρωμένου πίστις παρήν·
 ἔλαφος γὰρ ἀσπαίρουσ' ἔκειτ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ
 ἰδεῖν μεγίστη διαπρεπῆς τε τὴν θέαν,
 ἧς αἵματι βωμὸς ἐραίνετ' ἄρδην τῆς θεοῦ.
 1590 κὰν τῷδε Κάλχας πῶς δοκεῖς χαίρων ἔφη·
 ὦ τοῦδ' Ἀχαιῶν κοίρανοι κοινοῦ στρατοῦ,
 ὁράτε τήνδε θυσίαν, ἣν ἡ θεὸς
 προύθηκε βωμίαν, ἔλαφον ὀρειδρόμον·
 ταύτην μάλιστα τῆς κόρης ἀσπάξεται,
 1595 ὡς μὴ μᾶνοι βωμῶν εὐγενεὶ φόνω.
 ἡδέως τε τοῦτ' ἐδέξατο, καὶ πλοῦν οὐριον
 δίδωσιν ἡμῖν Ἰλίου τ' ἐπιδρομάς.
 πρὸς ταῦτα πᾶς τις θάρσος αἶρε ναυβάτης,
 χῶρει τε πρὸς ναῦν· ὡς ἡμέρη τῆδε δεῖ
 1600 λιπόντας ἡμᾶς Αὐλίδος κοίλους μυχοῦς
 Αἰγαίου οἶδμα διαπερᾶν. ἐπεὶ δ' ἅπαν
 κατηνθρακώθη θῦμ' ἐν Ἡφαίστου φλογί,
 τὰ πρόσφορ' ἠῦξασθ', ὡς τύχοι νόστου στρατός.
 πέμπει δ' Ἀγαμέμνων μ' ὥστε σοι φράσαι τάδε,
 1605 λέγειν θ' ὁποίας ἐκ θεῶν μοίρας κυρεῖ
 καὶ δόξαν ἔσχεν ἀφθιτον καθ' Ἑλλάδα.
 ἐγὼ παρών τε καὶ τὸ πράγμ' ὀρών λέγω·
 ἡ παῖς σαφῶς σοι πρὸς θεοῦς ἀφίπτατο.

1580. ἄργος P, corrected by first hand to ἄλγος. 1583. οἱ γῆς P, corrected to οὐ γῆς by a later hand. 1589. ἐραίνετ' P, with a second ρ written below the -ρα- by an early hand, ἐρραίνετ' L. 1592. ἡ θεὸς P, ὁ θεὸς L, corrected by an early hand to ἡ θεὸς. 1598. ναυάτης P, corrected by a subsequent hand to ναυβάτης. (The earlier uncial form of β which resembles ν is not used in P, so probably this word was taken down at dictation from the mouth of some one who doubtless pronounced the word (in English letters) *nav-wa-tees*.) ναυβάτης L. 1607. παρών τε P, παρών δὲ (the δὲ in an erasure) L.

1581. **νενεκῶς]** With reference to similar attitude results in the one case Matthiae's suggestion, mentioned in p. from fear, in the other from (perhaps) xxviii. of the Introduction, we ought to despondency. cf. Soph. *Ani.* 270 and 441, where a

- λύπης δ' ἀφαίρει καὶ πόσει πάρες χόλον·
ἀπροσδόκητα δὲ βροτοῖσι τὰ τῶν θεῶν,
σφύζουσί θ' οὐς φιλοῦσιν. ἡμαρ γὰρ τόδε
θανοῦσαν εἶδε καὶ βλέπουσαν παῖδα σήν.
1610
- ΧΟ. ὡς ἤδομαί τοι ταῦτ' ἀκούο' ἄγγελου·
ζῶν δ' ἐν θεοῖσι σὸν μένειν φράζει τέκος.
- ΚΛ. ὦ παῖ, θεῶν τοῦ κλέμμα γέγονας;
1615 πῶς σε προσεῖπω; πῶς δ' οὐ φῶ
παραμυθεῖσθαι τούσδε μᾶτην μύθους,
ὡς σου πένθους λυγροῦ παυσαίμαν;
- ΧΟ. καὶ μὴν Ἀγαμέμνων ἀναξ στείχει,
1620 τούσδ' αὐτοὺς ἔχων σοι φράζειν μύθους.
- ΑΓΑ. γύναι, θυγατρὸς ἔνεκ' ὄλβιοι γενοίμεθ' ἄν·
ἔχει γὰρ ὄντως ἐν θεοῖς ὀμιλίαν.
χρῆ δέ σε λαβοῦσαν τόνδε μύσχον νεαγενῆ
στείχειν πρὸς οἴκουσ' ὡς στρατὸς πρὸς πλοῦν ὄρα.
καὶ χαῖρε· χρόνιά γε τὰμά σοι προσφθέγματα
1625 Τροίηθεν ἔσται. καὶ γένοιτό σοι καλῶς.
- ΧΟ. χαίρων, Ἀτρείδη, γῆν ἴκου Φρυγίαν,
χαίρων δ' ἐπάνηκε,
κάλλιστά μοι σκύλ' ἀπὸ Τροίας ἐλών.]

1610. Both P and L have *γνώμη* in the margin opp. to this *v.* 1615. του L.
1616. A corrector of L altered δ' οὐ to δέ. 1618. *παυσαίμην* L (originally).
1621. *οἴνεκα* PL, corrected in both MSS. to *ἔνεκα*.

APPENDIX.

SCHEME of the metre of the Lyric passages.

(In this Scheme the following signs are used: $\sim\sim$ represents a 'cyclic' dactyl, L a long syllable held on in singing for three 'times' or *morae*, $<$ an 'irrational' long syllable, and \wedge a pause equal to one *mora* at the end of a verse. I have in one or two instances marked as *long*, before such a pause, a syllable by nature short, on the ground that its position made it long. Where the bar is finished in the next verse, *i.e.* when the next verse begins with an *anacrusis*, I have put no pause mark. I have marked the end of a *κῶλον* by a space between the verses.

Such divisions, and generally the arrangement of the syllables in what seem to have been the *bars*, so to speak, of the music, must, in the absence of that music, be always merely tentative. But I have myself found such attempts useful, and I hope this may help my readers.

Almost all the Lyric passages in the Iph. at Aulis are in Logaoedic metre, which, speaking musically, is in triple time.

The Parodos and the three Stasima each consist of a Strophe, an Antistrophe and an Epode.

I have not given any scheme of the spurious part of the Parodos, nor of the choric passage 1510—1531. The metre of the former is of a puerile character; mostly trochees.)

PARODOS.

STROPHE AND ANTISTROPHE.

164	$\sim\sim\sim$ $\sim\sim$ $-\sim$ $-\wedge$ $\sim\sim\sim$ $\sim\sim$ $\sim\sim\sim$ $-\wedge$ L L $\sim\sim$ $-\sim$ $-\wedge$ L L $\sim\sim$ L $-\wedge$	185
170	$\sim\sim$ $\sim\sim\sim$ $\sim\sim$ $-\wedge$ $\sim\sim$ $\sim\sim$ $-\sim$ $-\wedge$ L L $\sim\sim$ L $-$	190

	(Choriambic)	∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪	┌	-
		∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪	┌	- ^
			∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪	- ^		
			∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪	┌	- ^	195
175			┌	┌	∪ ∪	┌	- ^	
			∪ ∪	- ∪	-			
		∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪	- ^		
			┌	┌	∪ ∪	- ∪	- ^	200
180			∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪	- ∪	∪ ∪ ^		
			┌	┌	∪ ∪	┌	- ^	
			∪ ∪ ∪	- ^	∪ ∪	- ^		
			- ^	∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪	- ^		
			┌	┌	∪ ∪	┌	- ^	205
EPODE.								
206		∪	∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪	- ^			
			┌	∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪	- ∪		
		∪	┌	┌	∪ ∪	┌	- ^	
210			- ∪	∪ ∪	- ∪			
		∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪	┌	-
		∪ ∪	┌	∪ ∪	- ∪	-		
215		∪	┌	∪ ∪	┌	- ^		
			∪ ∪ ∪	- ∪	∪ ∪	-		
		^	┌	┌	∪ ∪ ∪	-		
		^	┌	┌	∪ ∪	-		
220		∪ ∪	┌	┌	∪ ∪	-		
		^	┌	- ^	∪ ∪	-		
		^	- ∪	∪ ∪	- ^			
			┌ ^	┌	┌	∪ ∪ ∪	- ^	
			┌ ^	┌	∪ ∪	-		
		^	┌	- ^	∪ ∪	- ^		
225			∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪		
			∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪		
			∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪		
			┌	┌	- ∪	- ∪	┌	- ^

STASIMON I.

STROPHE AND ANTISTROPHE.

543	υ υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ	υ υ	- Λ	558
	υ υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ	υ υ	- Λ	
545	┌	┌	υ υ υ	┌	- Λ	560
	υ	- <	┌	υ υ υ	- Λ	
	υ υ υ υ	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ		
	υ υ υ υ	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ		
	- <	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ		
550	υ υ υ υ	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ		565
	υ υ υ υ	- υ	υ υ υ	- Λ		
	υ υ υ υ	- υ	υ υ υ	- Λ		
	υ υ υ υ	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ		
	υ υ υ υ	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ		
555	υ υ	υ υ υ	┌	-		570
	υ υ	υ υ υ	- Λ			
	υ υ υ	- υ	υ υ υ	- Λ		
	┌	┌	υ υ υ	┌	- Λ	

EPODE.

573	υ υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	- Λ	
	υ υ υ	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ	
575	- <	υ υ υ	┌	- Λ	
	*	*	*	*	*
	υ υ υ	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ	
	- <	- <	υ υ υ	- Λ	
	υ	- υ	- Λ		
	- <	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	- Λ	
580	υ υ υ υ	υ υ υ υ	υ υ υ	- Λ	
	┌	υ υ υ	┌	- Λ	
	υ υ	υ υ	- Λ		
	- υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	-	
	┌	┌	υ υ υ	υ υ	
585	υ υ υ	- υ	- υ	┌	- Λ
	υ υ υ	- υ	- υ	┌	- Λ
	υ υ υ υ	υ υ υ υ			
	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	- Λ	
	┌	υ υ υ	┌	- Λ	

STASIMON II.

STROPHE AND ANTISTROPHE.

(The following scheme is very unsatisfactory. It can only be said to furnish a further proof that the whole stasimon has come down to us in a very imperfect and corrupt state.)

751	┌	┌	~ ~	- ~	- ^	762
	┌	┌	~ ~	┌	- ^	
	~ ~	┌	┌	~ ~	-	
	~ ~	- ^	~ ~	- ^		765
755	~ ~	- ^	┌	- ^		
	~ ~	~ ~	- ^			
	┌	┌	~ ~	┌	- ^	
	┌	┌	~ ~	- ^		
	~ ~	~ ~	~ ~	-		770
760	┌	~ ~	~ ~	- ^		
	~ ~	- ^	~ ~	┌	- ^	

EPODE.

773	[- ~	~ ~	- ~	- ^		
	- ~	~ ~	┌	-		
775	┌	- ~	~ ~	- ^		
776 and 777	~ ~	~ ~	- ~	- ^		
(omitting πό-	┌	~ ~	- ~	- ^		
λισμα Τροίας)	┌	- ~	~ ~	┌	-	
780	- ~	~ ~	- ^			
	~ ~	~ ~	- ~	-		
	~ ~	┌	-			
	~ ~	┌	- ^			
	- ~	┌	- ~	~ ~	- ~	- ^
785	- ~	~ ~	┌	- ^		
	┌	┌	~ ~	┌	- ^	
	┌	┌	- ~	~ ~	- ^	
	┌	~ ~	┌	- ^		

EPODE.

1080	υ	- υ	┌	┌	- υ	υ υ	- λ		
		υ υ υ	┌	┌	υ υ	- λ			
		υ υ	┌	- υ	┌	┌	┌	υ υ	- λ
		υ υ	- υ	- υ	┌	- λ			
		┌	┌	- λ	┌	- λ			
1085		┌	┌	υ υ	- υ	- λ			
		┌	┌	υ υ	- υ	- λ			
		υ υ υ	υ υ	υ υ	- λ				
		υ υ	- υ	- λ					
		- υ	┌	┌	- λ				
1090		- υ	υ υ	- υ	-				
	υ	υ υ	┌	- λ					
		υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ	- λ				
		υ υ υ	υ υ	υ υ	- λ				
		┌	┌	υ υ	┌	- λ			
1095		υ υ υ	υ υ	- υ	- λ				
		┌	┌	υ υ	- υ	- λ			
		┌	┌	υ υ	┌	- λ			

MONODY OF IPHIGENEIA 1283—1335

PRECEDED BY ONE DOCHMIAC (1276) AND SIX ANAPAESTIC LINES (1277—1283).

1283	υ	- υ	- λ						
		υ υ υ	- υ	υ υ	┌	- λ			
1285		υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ		
		- υ	υ υ υ	- υ	- λ				
		υ υ υ	┌	υ υ υ	- υ				
		υ υ υ	┌	- υ					
1290		┌	- υ	υ υ υ	υ υ υ	- υ	- υ	- λ	
		- υ	- υ	- υ	- υ				
		- υ	- υ	- υ	- υ				
		υ υ	υ υ	υ υ	υ υ				
1295		- λ	- λ	- λ					
		┌	┌	υ υ	┌	- λ			

		[L	L	~u	-u			
		~u	uuu	-u	uuu	~u	-u]
1300		L	uuu	-u	uuu			
		L	uuu	-u	-u			
		L	L	L	L			
		uuu	~u					
		-u	uuu	-u	-u			
1305		-u	-u	-u	-u			
		L	-u	uuu	-u			
		L	-u	uuu	-u			
		uuu	-u	-u	-u			
		-u	-u	-u	uuu			
1310		uuu	-u	-u	uuu	-u	-u	-
u		-u	uuu	-u	-u	-u	-u	-u
		uuu	-u	-u	-u			
		L	-u	L	-u			
		-u	-u	-u	-u			
1315		L	-u	-u	-u	-		
u		-u	-u	uuu	-			
u		-u	-u	-u	-			
u		-u	uuu	-u	uuu	-u	-u	-u
		1319—1322 anapaestic.						
1330		~u	~u	~u	~u	-u		
		~u	~u	~u	~u			
		L	uuu	L	-u			
u		-u	-u					
		uuu	uuu	uuu	uuu			
1335		uuu	-u	-u	-u	-u	-u	-u

COMMOS.

VV. 1475--1508.

1475	u	uuu	L	-u	-u
		-u	-u	-u	-u
u		uuu	uuu	uuu	uuu
		uuu	uuu	-u	-u
		-u	-u	L	-u

1480	∪	-∪	-∪	-∪				
		-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
		-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
		-∪	-∪	-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧	
		∪∪	∪∪					
1485		-∪	-∪	L	-∧			
		L	∪∪	∪∪	-∪	-∪	∪∪∪	-∧
		∪∪	-∪	∪∪∧				
1490		∪∪∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
		-∪	∪∪					
		∪∪∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
		*	*	*	*	*		
		∪∪	-∪	∪∪∧				
1495		∪∪∪	∪∪∪	∪∪∪	∪∪			
		[∪∪∪	∪∪∪]	L	∪∪			
	<	∪∪∪	-∪	L	-∧			
		∪-	L	-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧	
	∪	L	L	-∪	-∪	L	-∧	
1500	∪	-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
	∪	-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
	∪	-∪	-∪	∪∪∪	-∧			
	∪	-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
	∪	-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			
	∪	-∪	-∧					
1505		-∪	-∪	-∪	-∪			
		-∪	-∪	∪∪∪				
		∪∪∪	L	-∪	L	-∪	L	-∪ -∧
		-∪	-∪	-∪	-∧			

INDEX

TO GREEK WORDS DISCUSSED IN THE EXPLANATORY NOTES.

N.B. *The numbers refer to the verses of the play.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p> <i>ἀβρίνομαι</i> 858
 <i>ἀγαθόν</i> 346
 <i>ἄγειν</i> and <i>ἄγεσθαι</i> in the sense of <i>marry</i>
 434
 <i>ἀγών</i> 1455
 <i>ἀδικήσομαι</i> pass. 1436
 <i>ἄθραυστα</i> 57
 <i>αἰδώς</i> 821
 <i>αἶματα</i> 1485
 <i>αἰνέσθαι</i> <i>lian</i> 979
 <i>αἰνέσαι</i> <i>thank</i> 1371
 <i>αἰνέω</i> 440, 506
 <i>ἀλγεῖν</i>, genitive with, 370
 <i>ἀλλά</i> 500, 1239, 1360
 <i>ἀλλά</i> with imperat. 1344
 <i>ἄλλως</i> <i>to no purpose, falsely</i> 800
 <i>ἀμπετάσας</i> 34
 <i>ἄν</i> 96
 <i>ἄν</i>, position of, 1191
 <i>ἄν</i> iterative 432
 <i>ἀνά</i> c. dat. 754
 <i>ἀνά</i> 1040, 1058
 <i>ἀναινομαι</i> with inf. and with part. 1503
 <i>ἀνήρ</i> joined to designations 956
 <i>ἀνθελέσθαι</i> 482
 <i>ἀνθηρός</i> 73
 <i>ἀνικετεύτως</i> 1003
 <i>ἀντί</i> 104
 <i>ἀντί</i> in comp. 224
 <i>ἀντιλάξνμαι</i> 1109 </p> | <p> <i>ἀπλοία</i> 88
 <i>ἀπό</i> 669
 <i>ἄπωθεν</i> 983
 <i>ἄρα</i> 404
 <i>ἀργεννός</i> 574
 <i>Ἄρεθουσα</i> 170
 <i>ἀριθμός</i> 231
 <i>ἄρματα</i> for <i>chariot and horses</i> 250
 <i>ἀρχαί</i> 990
 <i>ἀρχω</i>, dat. with, 337
 <i>ἄσκειν</i> 83
 <i>Ἄτρεύς</i> 321
 <i>ἀφαιρεῖν</i> with only the acc. of person
 robbed 895
 <i>ἀφασία</i> 837
 <i>Ἄφροδίτη</i> 1264

 <i>βάθρα</i> 81
 <i>βάρβαροι</i> 1400
 <i>βλέπειν</i> with adv. 644
 <i>βλέφαρον</i> 321, 379
 <i>βρότειος</i> 1083

 <i>γάμος</i> in the sense of <i>bride</i> 1087
 <i>γάρ</i> proleptic 804
 <i>γε</i> 1446
 <i>γέγηθα ὡς γέγηθα</i> 649
 <i>γελάω</i> 912
 <i>γῆ</i> or <i>χθών</i> used instead of <i>πόλις</i> 535,
 1070 </p> |
|---|--|

- δέ γε 308
 δεινός 480
 δέλτοι 798
 δέμας 417, 937
 δῆ νυν 1009
 διὰ λόγων ἐλλεῖν 1194
 διαφέρειν 1195
 διοίχεσθαι 958

 εἶδομαι as a passive 331
 ἐγκερτομῆν 1006
 εἶδει instead of δεῖ 1180
 εἰ *although* 907
 εἰκός 501
 εἰς *to the extent of* 951
 εἰσεῖδον 110
 εἰς ἐν 1127
 εἰς ταῦτόν ἦκειν 665
 εἰς τέλος 162
 ἕκατι 866
 ἕκγονος 598
 ἐκγαυρούμενος 101
 ἐκεῖνος 130
 ἐκπονεῖν 209
 ἐκτείνειν 648
 ἐλάται 1058
 ἐλάτη and κώπη in the collective sense of
fleet 1322
 ἐλίσσειν with acc. of indirect object 1480
 ἐλίσσω 215
 ἐλπῖς used for the expectation of evil 785
 ἐλπῖς, personifications of, 392
 ἐν 358, 943, 1085
 ἐνδεξιόμοι 1474
 ἐνδίκως 368
 ἐν ἐμοί ἐστι 1379
 ἐνθάδε superfluous 801
 ἐν ἰσφ 1199
 ἐν καλῷ 1107
 ἐννοεῖσθαι 492
 ἐνταῦθα 1214
 ἐντεινασθαι 549
 ἐξαλείφω 1486
 ἐξαπατᾶν with dat. 1216
 ἐξῆς πᾶσι 341 (cf. also Plato *Symp.* 195 E)
 ἐξονομάζω 1066
 ἐπάδω 1212, 1492
 ἐπαινέω 506
 ἐπᾶρεῖ 125

 ἐπήνεσα 440
 ἐπί 29
 ἐπί in comp. 130
 ἐπί c. dat. 456, 550, 656, 1104, 1175,
 1237
 ἐπελεθεῖν 349
 ἐπιφημίζειν 130
 εὐ for οὐ in tragedy 789
 εὖ θέσθαι 672
 εὖ λέγειν *speak well of* 1115
 εὐνή *wife* 1355
 εὐφημία 1470
 εὐφημος 143
 ἔχ' ἤσυχος 1133
 -έω and -ίζω alternative present forms in
 -ίζω in post-classical Greek 433

 ζηλοῦν with gen. of ground of congratulation 1407

 ἠγεῖσθαι 1189
 ἠδέ 812
 ἠκειν *return* 1191
 ἦν instead of ἐστὶ 1199
 ἦνεσα 655
 ἦώς 157

 θάνατος 1415
 θανμάζω 28
 θεοί, synizesis of, 1034
 Θεράπναι 1499
 θεράπων 1
 Θεοστίας 49
 θήραμα 963
 θυμέλαι 152

 ἰᾶχή, ἰᾶχέω and ἰᾶχον 1039
 ἰζομαι c. acc. 142
 ἵνα 459
 ἵνα, parenthetical use of, 320, with ellipsis
 1107
 ἰσάναι βοήν 1039
 ἴσσημι 788
 ἴτω 1470

 καθεῖναι 60
 καί 98, in animated questions 1192, placed
 after an interrogative word 327, used to
 connect words in apposition 751

- καὶ γὰρ 641
 κακῶς εἰπεῖν 378
 καλὸν ὄνειδος 305
 καρδίαν ἔχειν 1172
 καρτερεῖν 1370
 καταρχεσθαι 1112
 καταστένω 470
 καταστέφω 1216
 κατατείνω 335
 κατεύχομαι 1186
 κερτομέω 849
 κεχαρημένος 200
 κεχρημένος 382
 κέχρησαι 382
 κλύω, aoristic use of, 94
 κοινός 845
 κομίζω *keep safe* 1205
 κόρη 164
 κράτος ἔχειν for κρατεῖν 472
 κροκάλοι 210
 Κύκλωπες 152
 κώπη *fleet* 1322
- λειμών 1453
 λέκτρα 545
 λελογισμένος 386, 922
 λελογισμένως 1021
 λευκός of water 1294
 λέχος 1355, in the sense of *wife* 103
 λῆμα 1421
 Λυδοί 786
 λύνειν *to put an end to* 1268
- μακρός 595
 μαρμαίρω with dat. 1154
 μάτηρ 1279
 μέλας of water 1294
 μέλλω, absolute use of the participle of, 1355
 μέμονε 1495
 μὲν οὖν 1537
 μεταβολή, musical sense of, 1100
 μεταπίπτω 502
 μή and οὐ forming a crasis although a comma intervenes 916
 μνήμην ἔχειν in the sense of *μνησθῆναι* *mention* 1103
 μυθεῖσθαι 789
 μυθέω 789
- ναυλοχέω 249
 νεανίας as a trisyllable 615
 νεᾶνις 164
 νεοθαλεῖ 188
 νικᾶν with cognate acc. 1249
 νιν = αὐτό 552
 νόμος 694
- ξανθαὶ κόμαι 681
 ξυρίσταθ' 54
- ὄδε 72
 ὄζος 201
 ὄθι for οὐ, οὐ in a temporal sense 547
 ὄθι used of circumstances 547
 οἰκεῖν 1508
 οἰκεῖν οἶκον 331
 Οἰνώνη ancient name of Aegina 699
 οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον 725
 ὄμμα 455, 1238
 ὄνειδος 305
 ὄνομα 910
 ὀνομάζω 1066
 ὄξις 5
 ὀπίσω 38
 ὀπλοφόρους 190
 ὄπλων poetic for ὀπλίτων 374
 ὄπλων ἀνακτες 1260
 ὄρθιος 94
 ὀρθοῦσθαι 24
 ὀρῶ, absolute use of, 1122
 οὐ instead of μή 995
 οὐ negating both a μέν and a δέ clause 396
 οὐ δὴ used of time 97
 οὐδέ γε 308
 οὐκέτι for *now...not* 1360
- παγῆναι 394
 παρά 397, 1436
 παρά in comp. 981
 παρεπάλλετο 226
 Πάρις 1291
 παρωδός 1147
 πέδον 91
 πείθειν ὥστε 1211
 πείθεσθαι with the gen. 726
 Πελασγία 1498
 πέμπω 119, 1110

- πένθος 1442
 πεπρωμένος εἰς 882
 περί 215, 1157
 περίβολος as adj. 1477
 Περσέως 1500
 πεύκη 39
 πικρός 678, 955, 1316
 πίπτειν εἰς 1280
 πλάγιος 332
 πλάτη 236
 πόθεν 1235
 πολυπλόκος 196
 πομπή 1324
 πόρος, gen. with, 356
 πράγμα 1202
 πράγματα 366
 πράσσειν = machinari 1105
 πρῖν, used for *instead of*, 1458
 πρό 36
 πρόθυμα 1311
 πρὸς *in view of* 1343
 πρὸς 1019
 προσῆκε 824
 προσιστάμενον 23
 προσουδίζειν 1151
 πρόσω 919
 πρόσωπον 1091
 προτέλεια 718
 προτελείσθαι 433
 προτελίζω 433
 πρόφασιν 362
 πρόφασις 1434
 προχύται 1112
 πτάμενος as a subs. 796
 πωλικός 613
- σαφής 560
 σέβω 824
 Σείριος 7
 σειροφόρος 223
 σεμνός 996
 σεμνύνομαι 901
 σιγαί in the plural 10
 σκηνή 1
 σκοπεῖν 674
 σοι, dat. of the person judging, 1109
 σοφίζομαι 744
 σπαράσσειν 1458
 σπέρμα 520
- σπουδάξεν ἐπὶ τινι 902
 στέλλειν 178, 1328
 στένω 470, gen. with, 370
 σύλλογος 1545
 συνάπτω 58, 105
 σύνεδρος 192
 συνετός εἰμι with acc. 1255
 συννυμφοκόμον 48
 σύντονος 118
 σύριγγες 1085
 σχῆμα Ἀλκμανικόν 196
 σῶμα 1417
- Τάνταλος son of Thyestes 1149
 τείνειν μακράν 420
 τειχέων 15
 τέλη 990
 τίθημι for ποιέω 1405
 τις 884
 τλ making position 1351
 τὸ μηδέν 945
 τὸ πολὺ for οἱ πολλοί 1357
 τὸ στερόμενον = τὸ στέρεσθαι 889
 τότε referring to some well-remembered occasion 46
 τὸ χρῆζον a periphrasis for *desire* 1017
 τροφαί 561
 τροφός 169
 τρυφᾶν ἐπὶ 1304
 τυγχάνει for ἐστί 1138
 τυγχάνειν, omission of the participle with, 730
 Τυνδαρέου 593
 τυχῶν 958
- ὑπ- 507
 ὑπήλθεν 444
 ὑπόροφος 1204
- φατίζω 936
 φέρεσθαι 1383
 φερνή 47
 φιλοτιμία 22, 527
 φιλότιμος, τὸ, 342, 385
 φιλότιμος 22
 φυσᾶν 381
 Φοίβη 50
 -φορος 596
 φράσσω 826

φρονεῖν 924

φῶς 1063

χαλκεο-, compounds in, 1042

χάρις 555, 1222

χειρ ἄκρα 951

χέρνιψ 1112

χθών or γῆ used instead of πόλις 1070

χρεών, τὸ, 1332

χρῆν instead of χρῆ 1199

χρόνος 640

χρυσεο-, compounds in, 1042

ῶ with nom. 1335

ᾠδῆς used figuratively 1235

-φῶδῆς 1147

ὡς 469, otiose 1342

ὡς for εἰ ἴσθι ὡς 1367

INDEX

TO SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THE EXPLANATORY NOTES.

N.B. *The numbers refer to the verses of the play.*

- adjectival gen. 1230
 adjective formed from a proper name 391
 adverbial phrases 379, 408
 Argos 242
 article used as a vocative, for the pron. of
 the 2nd pers. 619
 'asides' 1140
 Aulis 88; detention of Greek fleet at, *ib.*

 ceremonies preliminary to sacrifice 1112
 change from acc. to dat. 492
 change in the middle of the line of the
 person addressed 685
 character, Spartan 517
 conditional clause suppressed 1256

 dative, local 1323; of effective accompani-
 ment 80, 82; of person judging 1109
 dowry 869

 education 558, 710
 election of sovereigns 85
 enallage 1266
 Ennius 138, 329, 384, 446
 Eubulus 370
 Euripus 88

 genitive 20, of definition 1347, of goal
 816

 hendiadys 354, 1284
 historic present 245, 399

 infinitive, imperative use of, 403

 Molus 201

 Mycenae 242

 negative far from the word it negatives
 1108
 neuter participle used for the verbal noun
 889, 1017

 Olympus 576
 oxymoron 305

 Palamedes 198
 Paris 1291
 past tense used of state still continuing
 404
 patronymic adjectives 49
 plur. of 2nd pers. used in addressing one
 person 1368
 'position' 68, 1160, 1351
 preposition implied with the first of two
 nouns, when only the second has it 210,
 1085

 'Rhesus' 613

 sing. and plur. of 1st pers. used indis-
 criminately 834
 stage devices 801, 1098, 1115

 Timanthes, picture by, 1550
 tmesis 11
 tribrach in the fifth foot of a trimeter
 iambic 844
 trochaic metre, character of, 317, 855

 wedding of Peleus and Thetis 1036