ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕ - - Ξ - -

IPHIGENEI. . - . -

O.

val.]

ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ Η ΕΝ ΑΥΛΙΔΙ.

THE

IPHIGENEIA AT AULIS

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.

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 attract-
iveness 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
Iphigeneia 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.

<div style="text-align: right">E. B. ENGLAND.</div>

The Owens College,
    June, 1891.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Presbyths

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ.

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.
ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΗΣ.
ΧΟΡΟΣ. *Chorus*
ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ. *Menelaos*
ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΝΗΣΤΡΑ. *wife, echo*
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 falter. 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.) :

> Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, μακάριόν μέ τις θεῶν
> ἔμελλε θήσειν εἰ τύχοιμι σῶν γάμων.
> ζηλῶ δὲ σοῦ μὲν Ἑλλάδ', Ἑλλάδος δὲ σέ[1].

---

[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 determination[1].

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 developement 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 pourtrayed 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 τίς ἐστι καὶ λίαν ταρβεῖ 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 Aristotle[1] 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 διαλυθεῖσ᾽ 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,
> ἑλικτὰ κοὐδὲν ὑγιές, ἀλλὰ πᾶν πέριξ
> φρονοῦντες.

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 *Iphigeneia 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

www.libtool.com.cn
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 times[1]. 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 Euripi-
dem*, 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 [φίλαις[2]]
κεροῦσσαν, ἣν σφάζοντες αὐχήσουσι σὴν
σφάζειν θυγατέρα.

It was the attempt to conjecture in what part of the *Iphigeneia 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 con-
struction 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 transla-
tion of it (and the *Hecuba*) in 1524 which
was frequently reprinted, especially in
Italy: Ludovico Dolce about 1540 pub-
lished 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 Roch-
litz 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 *Iphigeneia at Aulis* was produced
at Drury Lane. An Italian translation
with notes of the two *Iphigeneia's*, by
Padre Dom. Giambbatt. Carraciolo, was
published at Florence in 1729, an un-
published Italian translation by A. de
Pazzi is also mentioned. About 1764
appeared a translation in blank verse
by the Italian Laurenzo 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 it[1]. 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, utra harum vera sit lectio, respondeo neutra. Nec quicquam mea refert; quippe qui persuasus sim, totam eam scenam abusque 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 *Iphigeneia 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 *Frogs* of Aristophanes. In *v.* 66 Dionysus says

<div align="center">

τοιουτοσὶ τοίνυν με δαρδάπτει πόθος
Εὐριπίδου.

</div>

Heracles thereupon asks: καὶ ταῦτα τοῦ τεθνηκότος; The scholiast's comment on this is: τινὲς βούλονται ἐν πρόσωπον λέγειν ὅλον. τινὲς δὲ διορίζουσι τὸ τοῦ τεθνηκότος· ὡς τοῦ Ἡρακλέους λέγοντος αὐτό. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ αἱ διδασκαλίαι φέρουσι, τελευτήσαντος Εὐριπίδου τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ δεδιδαχέναι ὁμωνύμως (so V, ὁμώνυμον G) ἐν ἄστει Ἰφιγένειαν τὴν ἐν Αὐλίδι, 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.*

www.libtool.com.cn

which we do not find in our text[1] 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 *Iphigeneia 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 *vv.* 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 Ἐρωτικῷ Χαιρήμονά φησι τὸν τραγικὸν λέγειν ὡς τὸν οἶνον τῶν χρωμένων τοῖς τρόποις κεράννυσθαι, οὕτως καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα· ὃς μετριάζων μέν ἐστιν εὔχαρις, ἐπιτεινόμενος δὲ καὶ διαταράττων χαλεπώτατος. διόπερ ὁ ποιητὴς οὗτος οὐ κακῶς αὐτοῦ τὰς δυνάμεις διαιρῶν φησι Δίδυμα γὰρ τόξα αὐτὸν ἐντείνεσθαι χαρίτων, τὰ μὲν ἐπ᾽ εὐαίωνι τύχᾳ, τὰ δ᾽ ἐπὶ συγκύσει βιοτᾶς· ὁ δ᾽ αὐτὸς οὗτος ποιητὴς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐρώντων ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Τραυματίᾳ φησὶν οὕτως

> Τίς οὐχὶ φήσει τοὺς ἐρῶντας 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, ἀθλιωτάτους.

---

[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.* 1309 ff. that Aristophanes was there quoting from the *Iphigeneia 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. vv.* 1089 ff. was the passage the scholiast had in his mind and he wrote ἐν Αὐλίδι by mistake for ἐν Ταύροις.

b 2

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 *Iphigeneia 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 Ἀποκοπτόμενος 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
Iphigeneia and the author of the *Traumatias*[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
the title Τραυματίας see Welcker, *Grie-*   *chische Tragoedien,* vol. III. pp. 1086 ff.

www.libtool.com.cn

manuscript containing it. Naturally the views of scholars on the spuriousness of particular passages have varied greatly. On the main question however Matthiae is found to be in company with Hermann (1831 and 1847), Hartung (1837), Monk (1840), Dindorf, Kirchhoff, Nauck, Paley, Klotz, Hennig[1] and Vitelli[2].

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. Firnhaber (*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 *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes says of the passage beginning ὧ νὺξ 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 λείπει μέλλουσα τυχεῖν—*i.e.* in the *Andromeda* the words μέλλουσα τυχεῖν followed θανάτου τλήμων. The words τ. π. 'Α. 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 'Ανδρομέδας 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:

ω νὺξ ἱερὰ
πῶς μακρὸν ἵππευμα διώκεις
ἀστεροειδέα νῶτα διφρεύουσ'
αἰθέρος ἱερᾶς
τοῦ σεμνοτάτου δι' 'Ολύμπου;
τί ποτ' 'Ανδρομέδα περίαλλα κακῶν
μέρος ἐξέλαχον
θανάτου τλήμων μέλλουσα τυχεῖν;

This passage is a monody—at *Thesm.* 1077 Mnesilochus, when interrupted by Euripides as Echo, says "ὦ 'γάθ' ἔασόν με μονῳδῆσαι"—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 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 δρᾶμα, 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' οὐξιὼν πρώτιστα μέν 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 *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, closes it effectually. The words ἐν ἀρχῇ πάντων τῶν δραμάτων are irreconcileable 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 line[1]. 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—thgouht this iambic passage 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

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 (*I. 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 another[1]. 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 blemish[2]. 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 iambics 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 support 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—*vv.* 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 rescue[1]. 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 :—

$$\delta\epsilon\iota\nu o\grave{\upsilon}s\ \ \mathring{a}\gamma\hat{\omega}\nu as\ \delta\iota\grave{a}\ \sigma\grave{\epsilon}\ \delta\epsilon\hat{\iota}\ \kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu o\nu\ \delta\rho a\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu.$$

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 not[2] 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 οὐδεὶς γε, πλὴν θανοῦσαν οὐχ ὁρᾶν 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 μηχανῇ χρηστέον ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω τοῦ δράματος ἢ ὅσα πρὸ τοῦ γέγονεν, ἃ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἄνθρωπον εἰδέναι, ἢ ὅσα ὕστερον, ἃ δεῖται προαγορεύσεως καὶ ἀγγελίας· ἅπαντα γὰρ ἀποδίδομεν τοῖς θεοῖς ὁρᾶν.

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 par-tially 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 ὁμιλίαν. 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 hand[1] 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.   ἑκοῦσα θνῄσκω· μή τις ἅψηται χροὸς
τοὐμοῦ, παρέξω γὰρ δέρην εὐκαρδίως.

Iph.   τοὐμὸν δὲ σῶμα...
θῦσαι δίδωμ' ἑκοῦσα...
πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ ψαύσῃ 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. vv. 535 ff.   δέξαι χοάς μου τάσδε...

...ἐλθὲ δ' ὡς πίῃς μέλαν

κόρης ἀκραιφνὲς αἷμ' ὅ σοι δωρούμεθα

στρατός τε κἀγώ.

Iph.   δέξαι τὸ θῦμα τόδ' ὅ γέ σοι δωρούμεθα

στρατός τ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ θ' ὁμοῦ,

ἄχραντον αἷμα 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
Iphigeneia 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 :

πλῆρες δ' ἐν χεροῖν λαβὼν δέπας

πάγχρυσον αἴρει χειρὶ παῖς Ἀχιλλέως.

In the *Iphigeneia* :

ὁ παῖς δ' ὁ Πηλέως ἐν κύκλῳ βωμὸν θεᾶς

λαβὼν κανοῦν ἔθρεξε, χέρνιβάς θ' ὁμοῦ.

It is inconceivable that Achilles, who, as we have seen, had done
his best to dissuade Iphigeneia 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.* 1569), ἵνα
πλήξειεν ἄν (*v.* 1579), πᾶς τις ᾔσθετ' ἄν (*v.* 1582), ἐραίνετ' (*v.* 1589), or
ταύτην μάλιστα τῆς κόρης ἀσπάζεται (*v.* 1594), but such unmetrical
verses as 1562, 1568, 1570, 1589 (ἧς αἵματι βωμὸς ἐραίνετ' ἄρδην
τῆς θεοῦ), 1593, 1596 (ἡδέως τε τοῦτ' ἐδέξατο καὶ πλοῦν οὔριον), 1599
(χωρεῖ τε πρὸς ναῦν ὡς ἡμέρᾳ τῇδε δεῖ—evidently the work of some
one whose pronunciation of ἡμέρᾳ 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 ἄναξ στείχει—
again scanned by the accent), and 1620 (τούσδ' αὐτοὺς ἔχων 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.* 1571) 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 Jacobs[2] 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. Wecklein[3], for instance, regards the fragment as of cardinal import-ance 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

$$\text{ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου}$$
$$\text{Ἄρτεμις Ἀχαιοῖς,}$$

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 αὐχήσουσι 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 Eu-ripidea* 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 κατεῖδες

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

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

over προσέβης at *v.* 824.

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 Shakspere, 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 existed[1].

[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 theatregoers. 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.* 67[1] connected with the expression of Dionysus's desire the statement of the didascaliae 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 ὁμωνύμως. ἑτερωνύμως might have been used of posthumous or other works published under another name than their author's, ἀνωνύμως of work published under no name, ὁμωνύμως would then mean 'name and all', 'keeping the author's name'.

The quotation from the didascaliae 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 Ἔλαφον δ' Ἀχαιοῖς χερσίν κ.τ.λ. were part of a speech spoken by Artemis to Agamemnon (αἴφ φαινομένη) in order to deter him from attempting to rescue Iphigeneia 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 οὔτω 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 εἵλετο έ, τὰς μὲν τέσσαρας περιών, τὴν δὲ μίαν μετὰ τελευτήν, ἐπιδειξαμένου τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦ ἀδελφιδοῦ αὐτοῦ Εὐριπίδου. The latter, speaking of the poet's third son (named Euripides), says ὃς ἐδίδαξε τοῦ πατρὸς ἔνια 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 scholar[1] 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 Λήδᾳ Θεστιάδι τρεῖς παρθένοι,
Φοίβη Κλυταιμνήστρα τ' ἐμὴ ξυνάορος   50
Ἑλένη τε· ταύτης οἱ τὰ πρῶτ' ὠλβισμένοι
μνηστῆρες ἦλθον Ἑλλάδος νεανίαι.
δειναὶ δ' ἀπειλαὶ καὶ κατ' ἀλλήλων φόνος

53. φθόνος Markland and Matthiae.

49. Θεστιάδι] Euripides is fond of these patronymic adjectives—other exx. are Τυνδαρίς, Τυνδάρειος, Ἡράκλειος, Πελιάς, 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 μνηστεύσοντες. Cf. Isocrates *Enc. Hel.* p. 216 ὑπεριδόντες τοὺς οἴκοι γάμους ἦλθον ἐκείνην μνηστεύσοντες. So *Hec.* 239 οἶσθ' ἡνίκ' ἦλθες Ἰλίου κατάσκοπος. *Or.* 1300 ἐλθ' ἐπίκουρον ἐμοῖσι

φίλοισι. *Ion* 297 ἐπίκουρος 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 Τυνδάρεῳ πατρί,　　　55
δοῦναί τε μὴ δοῦναί τε, τῆς τύχης ὅπως
ἅψαιτ' ἄθραυστα. καί νιν εἰσῆλθεν τάδε,
ὅρκους συνάψαι δεξιάς τε συμβαλεῖν
μνηστῆρας ἀλλήλοισι καὶ δι' ἐμπύρων
σπονδὰς καθεῖναι κἀπαράσασθαι τάδε·　　　60
ὅτου γυνὴ γένοιτο Τυνδαρὶς κόρη,
τούτῳ συναμυνεῖν, εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων λαβὼν
οἴχοιτο τόν τ' ἔχοντ' ἀπωθοίη λέχους,
[κἀπιστρατεύσειν καὶ κατασκάψειν πόλιν

54. ἂν written over μή 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 Ἰφιγενείᾳ τῇ ἐν Αὐλίδι) suited this passage better than the similar and commonplace ἄριστα. 62. συναμύνειν PL, συναμυνεῖν Heath. 63. ἀπώσασθαι (in an erasure) P, ἀπωθοίη L. 64. κἀπιστρατεύειν 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 ἀπειλαί 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 *Suppl.* 379 ἀμηχανῶ δὲ καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει φρένας, δρᾶσαί τε μὴ δρᾶσαί τε καὶ τύχην ἑλεῖν, but the construction of the two passages is different. In the first place, though δρᾶσαί τε μὴ δρᾶσαί 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 ἅψαιτ' 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. ὅρκους συνῆψαν *Phoen.* 1241: Isocr. *Enc. Hel.* 216 οὕτω δὲ κεκριμένου τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτῇ συνοικήσειν, ἀλλ' ἔτι κοινῆς τῆς τύχης οὔσης, οὕτω πρόδηλος ἦν ἅπασιν ἐσομένη περιμάχητος, ὥστε συνελθόντες πίστεις ἔδοσαν ἀλλήλοις ἦ μὴν βοηθήσειν εἴ τις ἀποστεροίη τὸν ἀξιωθέντα 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'.

www.libtool.com.cn

Ἕλλην' ὁμοίως βάρβαρόν θ' ὅπλων μέτα].　　65
ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπιστώθησαν, εὖ δέ πως γέρων
ὑπῆλθεν αὐτοὺς Τυνδάρεως πυκνῇ φρενί,
δίδωσ' ἐλέσθαι θυγατρὶ μνηστήρων ἕνα,
ὅποι πνοαὶ φέροιεν Ἀφροδίτης φίλαι.
ἣ δ' εἵλεθ', ὅς σφε μήποτ' ὤφελεν λαβεῖν,　　70
Μενέλαον. ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν ὁ τὰς θεὰς
κρίνων ὅδ', ὡς ὁ μῦθος Ἀργείων ἔχει,
Λακεδαίμον', ἀνθηρὸς μὲν εἱμάτων στολῇ

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 δή πως Heath, ὧδέ πως Klotz.　　68. δίδωσιν PL, δίδωσ' Markland, διδούς Elmsley.　　69. ὅτου PL, ὅπου suggested but not adopted by Markland (so too Heath), ὅτῳ Boissonade, ὅποι Lenting.　　70. ὥς γε 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 ἔξοχος Ἀργείων κεφαλὴν ἠδ' εὐρέας ὤμους occurs in Lucian's *Charon* (§ 8) as ἔξοχος ἀνθρώπων κεφαλὴν καὶ εὐρέας ὤμους: and Porson (*Adversaria*) that for Ἀργείοισιν at Τ 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 (πυκνῇ φρενί: cf. *v.* 57 καὶ νιν εἰσῆλθεν τάδε) 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 αὐτῇ 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 ὅτου 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 ὅτου) trans. πν. Ἀφ. by *amor a Venere inspiratus*, comparing θεοῦ πνοαί at *Bacch.* 1094.

72. ὅδ'] an extraordinary use of the pronoun, but, supported as it is by the quotation of Clem. Alex., it is impossible (with Wecklein, *Stud. z. 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 ὧδ' ἔχει λόγος.

73. ἀνθηρὸς] seems to refer to the

χρυσῷ τε λαμπρός, βαρβάρῳ χλιδήματι,
ἐρῶν ἐρῶσαν ᾤχετ' ἐξαναρπάσας   75
Ἑλένην πρὸς Ἴδης βούσταθμ', ἔκδημον λαβὼν
Μενέλαον· ὃ δὲ καθ' Ἑλλάδ' οἰστρήσας πόθῳ
ὅρκους παλαιοὺς Τυνδάρεω μαρτύρεται,
ὡς χρὴ βοηθεῖν τοῖσιν ἠδικημένοις.
τοὐντεῦθεν οὖν Ἕλληνες ἄξαντες δορί,   80
τεύχη λαβόντες στενόπορ' Αὐλίδος βάθρα
ἥκουσι τῆσδε, ναυσὶν ἀσπίσιν θ' ὁμοῦ
[ἵπποις τε πολλοῖς ἅρμασίν τ' ἠσκημένοι].
κᾆτα στρατηγεῖν κἀμὲ Μενέλεω χάριν

writers' abbreviations.   77. A late hand in P has corrected Μενέλαον· ὃ δὲ to Μενέλαος οὖν.—μόρῳ 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: δρόμῳ Markland, πόθῳ Toup: Herm. (*Opusc. ut sup.*) quotes a fragment of Menander (Meineke IV. 159) with the words οἰστρῶντι πόθῳ.   80. αἴξαντες P, ἄξαντες L.—Aristotle (*Rhet.* III. 11) in quoting this line has (evidently by an oversight) ποσίν for δορί.   83. θ' ἅρμασιν PL, ἅρμασίν 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 ἅρματα—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. ἥκουσι ναυσὶν ἀσπίσιν θ'. The dislocation of the τ' in the MSS. adds some slight force to these suspicions.   84. κἀμὲ στρατηγεῖν κᾶτα PL (the ι subscr. in P under the ᾶ 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 βαρβάροις ἐσθήμασι χρυσῷ τε λαμπρὸν ἐξεμαργώθης φρένας. It must not be imagined that the τε in *v.* 74 corresponds, as a δέ would, to the μέν in the preceding line: the μέν is left for a while 'pendens' and serves with the δέ in *v.* 77 to contrast the 'primrose path of dalliance' with the forlorn plight of the injured husband.

75. ἐρῶν ἐρῶσαν] 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. Λ 483 αὐτὰρ ὅγ' ἥρως ἀΐσσων ᾧ ἔγχει 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 ἵν' οἰκεῖ σεμνὰ Πηλίου βάθρα.

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

εἵλοντο, σύγγονόν γε. τἀξίωμα δὲ   85
ἄλλος τις ὤφελ᾽ ἀντ᾽ ἐμοῦ λαβεῖν τόδε.
ἠθροισμένου δὲ καὶ ξυνεστῶτος στρατοῦ,
ἥμεσθ᾽ ἀπλοίᾳ χρώμενοι κατ᾽ Αὐλίδα.

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 κᾆτα 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 κᾆτα στρατηγεῖν Μενέλεω χάριν (without the μὲν ἐμὲ) was found written, the κᾆτα should be expelled from the first place and get placed after the στρατηγεῖν: εἶτα might have been put there, but not κᾆτα. I believe, with Vitelli, that κᾆτα is the right word, but I think the confusion was due to the interchange by a careless copier of the two similar words κἀμὲ and κᾆτα, and hence that the line ought to stand κᾆτα στρατηγεῖν κἀμὲ Μενέλεω χάριν: the καὶ in κἀμὲ

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. εἵλοντο] ὅτι δὲ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐξ αἱρέσεως ἦν βασιλεὺς ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων, Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἰφιγενείᾳ δηλοῖ σαφέστατα Eustath. p. 57, 30 and at p. 185, 3 (of the same statement) οἷς καὶ ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἐν τῇ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν Ἰφιγενείᾳ συνηγορεῖ (Matthiae). At *Electra* 1082 in a notable passage El. says of her father ὃν Ἑλλὰς αὑτῆς εἵλετο 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. ἀπλοίᾳ 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.:—σιγαὶ δ᾽ ἀνέμων τόνδε κατ᾽ Εὔριπον 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 ἀντάια 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 Ἕλλησιν οὐκ ἐγίγνετο ἐπίφορα ἐξ Αὐλίδος πνεύματα ἀλλὰ ἄνεμος 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

www.libtool.com.cn

Κάλχας δ' ὁ μάντις ἀπορίᾳ κεχρημένοις
ἀνεῖλεν Ἰφιγένειαν ἣν ἔσπειρ' ἐγὼ   90
Ἀρτέμιδι θῦσαι τῇ τόδ' οἰκούσῃ πέδον,
καὶ πλοῦν τ' ἔσεσθαι καὶ κατασκαφὰς Φρυγῶν
[θύσασι, μὴ θύσασι δ' οὐκ εἶναι τάδε].
κλύων δ' ἐγὼ ταῦτ', ὀρθίῳ κηρύγματι

being the emphasizing καὶ—'*me* of all men,—I wish they hadn't'.   89. κεχρη-
μένος PL, κεχρημένῳ Hemsterhuys, κεχρημένοις 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-
σφαγάς 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 (Musurus?)
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 "certainement authentique". Perhaps F. was the less inclined to defend it
because (whether genuine or not) it gives some support to κεχρημένοις. 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, οὗ θύσαντες κρατήσειν
ἔμελλον τῶν πολεμίων· εἰ δὲ μὴ μάτην ἐγίγνετο 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 Aga-
memnon 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 con-
trary wind, while Aeschylus tells of speci-
ally stormy weather. It is a mistake to
go further and criticise the account as we
should a newspaper report of a cam-
paign—asking for instance, as it has been
done, 'why didn't they use their oars and
row away?'

91. πέδον] πεδίον is used of a level
tract, and like our 'plain' is often found
in the plural: πέδον 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 associ-
ations—either to 'native soil' or 'holy

ground'. So in Eur. γῆς πατρίδος πέδον,
πάτριον ἐμὸν πέδον, Φοίβου πέδον.

92. A verb of saying has to be under-
stood. 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 θύ-
σασι. The rest of the line is mere 'pad-
ding' modelled on *v.* 1007. The εἶναι
too, as Hennig observes, is harshly in-
consistent with the ἔσεσθαι of the previous
line. The πλοῦν ἔσεσθαι is repeated at
v. 358. Vitelli takes εἶναι to be *i. q.*
ἐξεῖναι.

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' ἀφιέναι στρατόν,   95
ὡς οὔποτ' ἂν τλὰς θυγατέρα κτανεῖν ἐμήν.
οὗ δή μ' ἀδελφὸς πάντα προσφέρων λόγον
ἔπεισε τλῆναι δεινά. κἂν δέλτου πτυχαῖς
γράψας ἔπεμψα πρὸς δάμαρτα τὴν ἐμὴν
στέλλειν Ἀχιλλεῖ θυγατέρ' ὡς γαμουμένην,   100
τό τ' ἀξίωμα τἀνδρὸς ἐκγαυρούμενος,
συμπλεῖν τ' Ἀχαιοῖς οὕνεκ' οὐ θέλοι λέγων,
εἰ μὴ παρ' ἡμῶν εἰσιν εἰς Φθίαν λέχος·
πειθὼ γὰρ εἶχον τήνδε πρὸς δάμαρτ' ἐμήν,
ψευδῆ συνάψας ἀντὶ παρθένου γάμον.   105
μόνοι δ' Ἀχαιῶν ἴσμεν ὡς ἔχει τάδε

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. τούνεκ' PL, in P a later hand has added the mark of crasis over the υ: οὕνεκ' Barnes.   105. ἀντὶ παρθένου PL, ἀμφὶ παρθένου Markl. and Musgr., ἀμφὶ παρθένον (or παρθένῳ) 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 τλὰς] Cf. Goodwin *Moods and Tenses* § 41, 3.

97. οὗ δή] used of time: cf. the ὅθι 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 ἀλλὰ 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 *Hec.* 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 (πειθώ being predicative) 'It was to persuade my wife that I used this scheme' (τήνδε being attracted into the gender of πειθώ) 'and I concocted a sham marriage to get' (ἀντὶ lit. 'as the price of') 'the maiden'. Monk takes this view of the ἀντὶ and retains it.

Κάλχας τ᾽ Ὀδυσσεὺς Μενέλεως ἐγώ θ᾽. ἃ δ᾽ οὐ
καλῶς τότ᾽ ἔγνων μεταγράφω καλῶς πάλιν
εἰς τήνδε δέλτον, ἣν κατ᾽ εὐφρόνη[ς σκιὰν
λύοντα καὶ συνδοῦντά μ᾽ εἰσεῖδες, γέρον.   110
ἀλλ᾽ εἶα χώρει τάσδ᾽ ἐπιστολὰς λαβὼν
πρὸς Ἄργος. ἃ δὲ κέκευθε δέλτος ἐν πτυχαῖς,
λόγῳ φράσω σοι πάντα τἀγγεγραμμένα·
πιστὸς γὰρ ἀλόχῳ τοῖς τ᾽ ἐμοῖς δόμοισιν εἶ.]   114

*   *   *   *   *

ΑΓΑ. Ὦ πρέσβυ, δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν   1

next *v.* Certainly, the absence of the ἐγώ is remarkable. Vitelli proposes Μενέλεως ἐγώ θ᾽. ἃ δ᾽ οὐ καλῶς τότ᾽ ἔγνων μεταγράφω καλῶς πάλιν. Herm. (*Opusc.*) doubted the correctness of the καλῶς πάλιν coming after the αὖθις 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 ἐγώ 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 αὖθις. 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 s, 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 countermanding 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 τἀγγεγραμμένα 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 εἰσεῖδες 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

στεῖχε. ΠΡ. στείχω. τί δὲ καινουργεῖς,
'Αγάμεμνον ἄναξ; ΑΓΑ. σπεύσεις; ΠΡ. σπεύδω.
μάλα τοι γῆρας τοὐμὸν ἄυπνον
καὶ ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀξὺ πάρεστιν.   5

over the words respectively L, δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν P.   3. πεύσῃ P, πεύσῃ
with the η crossed through and ει added, the last of these letters apparently in an
erasure L, σπεῦδε Pors., σπεύσεις Dobree. To judge from Vitelli's facsimile of L,
it looks as if πεῦσον may have been its original reading. After much hesitation
between σπεῦσον 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 ἀστὴρ ὅδε 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 dif-
ferent 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 δωμάτων, 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 tem-
porary σκηνή". But at v. 189 the Chorus
talks of the κλισίαι of the Achaeans : the
army therefore was encamped in tempo-
rary 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 extra-
ordinary 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 descrip-
tion 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 over-
poweringly conclusive, when we consider
how little comparatively of Euripides'
poetry is left on which to form them.

4 and 5. ἄυπνον and ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀξὺ]
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 πορθμεύει
    σείριος ἐγγὺς τῆς ἑπταπόρου
    Πλειάδος ἀΐσσων ἔτι μεσσήρης ;
    οὔκουν φθόγγος γ' οὔτ' 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. ἀΐσσων 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 οὔκουν to θαλάσσης to him also, rejecting from σιγαί to ἄναξ as spurious. Hermann (*Opusc.*) follows him, except that he rejects οὔτε

supply a separate ἐστί with ἄυπνον, but this gives too much weight to πάρεστιν, 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 ὀξύς, 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 πάρεστιν 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 στείχω is said by him while he is coming out, and that his question τί δὲ καινουργεῖς 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 καινουργεῖς Ἀγάμεμνον ἄναξ 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 σιγαί in the plural". Weil,

τόνδε κατ' Εὔριπον ἔχουσιν.

ΠΡ. τί δὲ σὺ σκηνῆς ἐκτὸς ἀίσσεις,
  'Αγάμεμνον ἄναξ;
  ἔτι δ' ἡσυχία τῇδε κατ' Αὖλιν
  καὶ ἀκίνητοι φυλακαὶ τειχέων.   15
  στείχωμεν ἔσω. ΑΓΑ. ζηλῶ σέ, γέρον,
  ζηλῶ δ' ἀνδρῶν ὃς ἀκίνδυνον
  βίον ἐξεπέρασ' ἀγνὼς ἀκλεής·
  τοὺς δ' ἐν τιμαῖς ἧσσον ζηλῶ.

ΠΡ. καὶ μὴν τὸ καλόν γ' ἐνταῦθα βίου.   20
ΑΓΑ. τοῦτο δέ γ' ἐστὶν τὸ καλὸν σφαλερόν·
  καὶ τὸ πρότιμον

θαλάσσης.   16. στείχομεν P, στείχωμεν L: this mistake of o for ω occurs several times in P. Ald. followed P and altered ἔσω to εἴσω metr. grat.   17 ff. This passage, from ζηλῶ σέ to the end of v. 20, is quoted by Stobaeus Serm. LVIII. 2, who has ἧσσον ἐπαινῶ (cp. Eur. Hipp. 264 οὕτω τὸ λίαν ἧσσον ἐπαινῶ τοῦ μηδὲν ἄγαν): also, down to ἀκλεής, by Plutarch, De Tranqu. An. p. 471 C. Cic. Tusc. III. 24 says nec 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 ὁ) φιλότιμον Lenting (so Firnh.), καὶ τὸ πρότιμον Nauck; Herm. rejects the verse as "verba interpretis vel τὸ καλόν declarare volentis, vel nescientis, recte ad explicanda praegressa verba, sine copula inferri γλυκὺ μέν". 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 Αὖλιν is governed by the preposition, and makes with it an adverbial expression. (Blomfield would have made them more alike by reading τήνδε for τῇδε 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 σύ] this stillness he contrasts with Ag.'s restlessness: the emphatic σύ

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. ὅς] ('the man who') is more definite than ὅστις ('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' ἀφικόμην κακοῦ.

γλυκὺ μέν, λύπῃ δὲ προσιστάμενον.
τοτὲ μὲν τὰ θεῶν οὐκ ὀρθωθέντ'
ἀνέτρεψε βίον, τοτὲ δ' ἀνθρώπων   ·   25
γνῶμαι πολλαὶ
καὶ δυσάρεστοι διέκναισαν.

ΠΡ. οὐκ ἄγαμαι ταῦτ' ἀνδρὸς ἀριστέως.
οὐκ ἐπὶ πᾶσίν σ' ἐφύτευσ' ἀγαθοῖς,
'Αγάμεμνον, 'Ατρεύς.   30
δεῖ δέ σε χαίρειν καὶ λυπεῖσθαι·
θνητὸς γὰρ ἔφυς. κἂν μὴ σὺ θέλῃς,

'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 τοὐστοῦν. ὁ δ' εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐστιν γλυκύ. καὶ μὴν τὸ πρὸς ὀστοῦν φασι κρέας εἶναι γλυκύ. ὁ Χαιρεφῶν δέ, καὶ μάλ' ὦ βέλτιστ', ἔφη, γλυκὺ μὲν προσιστάμενον δὲ λυπεῖ πανταχῇ. I have adopted Headlam's λύπῃ 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 *Cons. ad Ap.* p. 103 and again partially at *De Aud. Poet.* p. 33. Stob. has ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἔφυς and 'Ατρεῦ and νενόμισται 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 λύπῃ 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 commonly with θαυμάζω (Eur. *Hipp.* 1041).

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

τὰ θεῶν οὕτω βουλόμεν' ἔσται.

* * * *

[σὺ δὲ λαμπτῆρος φάος ἀμπετάσας
δέλτον τε γράφεις
τήνδ' ἣν πρὸ χερῶν ἔτι βαστάζεις,
καὶ ταὐτὰ 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 πρό in πρὸ χερῶν: the use of ὀπίσω for πάλιν or αὖθις: though the tragedians often use Homeric words they do not reproduce such undigested morsels as κατὰ δάκρυ χέων (Ζ 496, δ 556): *vv.* 41 f. (though of this I do not feel so sure) seem to be modelled on *Tro.* 797 τίνος ἐνδέομεν μὴ οὐ πανσυδίᾳ χωρεῖν ὀλέθρου 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 θυμαίνεσθαι (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

ποι γίγνονται ἐπὶ τῷ εὖ καὶ κακῶς πράττειν. Cf. also Eur. *fr.* 46 (Nauck) ὥστ' οὔτις 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. 73 τὸ ὑμέτερον 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 ἡλίου τ' ἀναπτυχαί at *Hipp.* 601, λαμπρᾶς αἰθέρος ἀμπτυχαί *Ion* 1445 and ὀμμάτων ἀναπτυχαί 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 αὖθις.

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

γλυκὺ μέν, λύπῃ δὲ προσιστάμενον.
τοτὲ μὲν τὰ θεῶν οὐκ ὀρθωθέντ'
ἀνέτρεψε βίον, τοτὲ δ' ἀνθρώπων   -   25
γνῶμαι πολλαὶ
καὶ δυσάρεστοι διέκναισαν.

ΠΡ.   οὐκ ἄγαμαι ταῦτ' ἀνδρὸς ἀριστέως.
οὐκ ἐπὶ πᾶσίν σ' ἐφύτευσ' ἀγαθοῖς,
'Αγάμεμνον, 'Ατρεύς.   30
δεῖ δέ σε χαίρειν καὶ λυπεῖσθαι·
θνητὸς γὰρ ἔφυς. κἂν μὴ σὺ θέλῃς,

'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 τουτοῦν. ὁ δ' εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ μήν ἐστιν γλυκύ. καὶ μὴν τὸ πρὸς ὀστοῦν φασὶ κρέας εἶναι γλυκύ. ὁ Χαιρεφῶν δέ, καὶ μάλ' ὦ βέλτιστ', ἔφη, γλυκὺ μὲν προσιστάμενον δὲ λυπεῖ πανταχῇ. I have adopted Headlam's λύπῃ 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 *Cons. ad Ap.* p. 103 and again partially at *De Aud. Poet.* p. 33. Stob. has ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἔφυς and 'Ατρεῦ and νενόμισται for βουλόμεν' ἔσται, Plut. has βουλόμεν' ἔσται. Markl. prefers ἐστὶν 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 λύπῃ 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 commonly with θαυμάζω (Eur. *Hipp.* 1041).

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

τὰ θεῶν οὕτω βουλόμεν ἔσται.

*　　*　　*　　*

[σὺ δὲ λαμπτῆρος φάος ἀμπετάσας
δέλτον τε γράφεις   35
τήνδ᾽ ἣν πρὸ χερῶν ἔτι βαστάζεις,
καὶ ταὐτὰ πάλιν γράμματα συγχεῖς
καὶ σφραγίζεις λύεις τ᾽ ὀπίσω
ῥίπτεις τε πέδῳ πεύκην, θαλερὸν

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 πρό in
πρὸ χερῶν: the use of ὀπίσω for πάλιν or αὖθις: though the tragedians often use
Homeric words they do not reproduce such undigested morsels as κατὰ δάκρυ χέων
(Ζ 496, δ 556): *vv.* 41 f. (though of this I do not feel so sure) seem to be modelled
on *Tro.* 797 τίνος ἐνδέομεν μὴ οὐ πανσυδίᾳ χωρεῖν ὀλέθρου 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
θυμαίνεσθαι (the upper half of the θ is obscured by a dot in P and erased in L)
the first τί ποιεῖς 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 ποιεῖς at the end of *v.* 42 and τί ποιεῖς 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

ποι γίγνονται ἐπὶ τῷ εὖ καὶ κακῶς πράττειν.
Cf. also Eur. *fr.* 46 (Nauck) ὥστ᾽ οὔτις
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. 73 τὸ ὑμέτερον 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 ἡλίου τ᾽ ἀναπτυχαί at *Hipp.*
601, λαμπρᾶς αἰθέρος ἀμπτυχαί *Ion* 1445
and ὀμμάτων ἀναπτυχαί 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 αὖθις.

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

κατὰ δάκρυ χέων,   40

καὶ τῶν ἀπόρων οὐδενὸς ἐνδεῖς

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

σῇ γάρ μ' ἀλόχῳ τότε Τυνδάρεως

πέμπει φερνὴν

συννυμφοκόμον τε δίκαιον.

          ✱   ✱   ✱

λέγε καὶ σήμαιν', ἵνα καὶ γλώσσῃ   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 πεύκην 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. φερνὴν] Cp. *v.* 869 χὥτι μ' ἐν ταῖς σαῖσι φερναῖς ἔλαβεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ —a verse which among other things serves, with *v.* 891, to prove that the πρεσβύτης and the θεράπων of the *drama-*

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

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

σύντονα τοῖς σοῖς γράμμασιν αὐδῶ.   118

ΑΓΑ.   πέμπω σοι πρὸς ταῖς πρόσθεν   115
       δέλτοις, ὦ Λήδας ἔρνος,   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 ᾠχόμην 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.   τὰς...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 συντείνει 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:—ἵνα, εἰδὼς αὐτά, ὁμολογῇς 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

μὴ στέλλειν τὰν σὰν ἶνιν πρὸς   119

τὰν κολπώδη πτέρυγ' Εὐβοίας   .   120

Αὖλιν ἀκλύσταν.

εἰς ἄλλας ὥρας γὰρ δὴ

παιδὸς δαίσομεν ὑμεναίους.

ΠΡ.   καὶ πῶς Ἀχιλεὺς λέκτρων ἀπλακὼν

οὐ μέγα φυσῶν θυμὸν ἐπαρεῖ;   125

τόδε καὶ δεινὸν

σοί, σῇ τ' ἀλόχῳ σήμαιν' ὅ τι φῄς.

---

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' ἀμπλακὼν 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, ἀπλακών Burney (see Monk on *Hipp.* 145 and Elmsley on *Med.* 115).   125. φυσσῶν 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 Πίσαν at *I. T.* 1 and P often, and L generally, writes ἐριννύων 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 σῇ 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 σῇ 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. μὴ 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 Αὖλιν 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 ἀρῶ unaltered (? *Pers.* 795).

127. σήμαιν' ὅ τι φῄς] 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 φῄς can-

ΑΓΑ. ὄνομ', οὐκ ἔργον παρέχων Ἀχιλεὺς
    οὐκ οἶδε γάμους, οὐδ' ὅ τι πράσσομεν,
    οὐδ' ὅτι κείνῳ παῖδ' ἐπεφήμισα   130
    νυμφείους εἰς ἀγκώνων
    εὐνὰς ἐκδώσειν λέκτροις.
ΠΡ. δεινά γ' ἐτόλμας, Ἀγάμεμνον ἄναξ.
    οὐ τῷ τῆς θεᾶς σὴν παῖδ' 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 διποδίαι. I conjecture therefore that the passage originally ran καὶ πῶς...ἑταρεῖ; | τόδε καὶ δεινόν σοι, σῇ τ' ἀλόχῳ | σήμαιν' ὅ,τι φής. (See explanatory notes.) 128. Libanius Ep. 1398, p. 642 τοῦτο δέ ἐστι δοκοῦντος φιλεῖν οὐ φιλοῦντος, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τραγῳδίαν ὄνομ' ἀντ' ἔργου παρεχομένου. Unger, who first quoted this passage (and emended the MS. ἐν τερπου to ἀντ' ἔργου) thinks we ought to read ἀντ' ἔργου for οὐκ ἔργον 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 ἀχιλεύς. 129. P began to write ποι- but altered it to πρασσ-. 130. ἐπέφησα PL, ἐπεφήμισα Markland. 132. ἐνδώσειν PL, ἐκδώσειν Markland. 133. δεινά γε τολμᾷς PL, δεινά γ' ἐτόλμας Markl. 134. οὕτω τῆς PL, ὃς 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 δεινόν to Ag., and taking τόδε to mean 'this other thing (that I am going to mention)'. To such a remark σήμαιν' ὅ τι φής 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 Firnhaber, that the words σήμαιν' ὅ τι φής 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

E. I.   2

φατίσας ἦγες σφάγιον Δαναοῖς;   135

ΑΓΑ. οἴμοι, γνώμας ἐξέσταν,
    αἰαῖ, πίπτω δ' εἰς ἄταν.
    ἀλλ' ἴθ' ἐρέσσων σὸν πόδα, γήρᾳ
    μηδὲν ὑπείκων. ΠΡ. σπεύδω, βασιλεῦ.   140

ΑΓΑ. μή νυν ἀλσώδεις ἵζου
    κρήνας, μήθ' ὕπνῳ θελχθῇς.

ΠΡ. εὔφημα θρόει.

ΑΓΑ. πάντῃ δὲ πόρον σχιστὸν ἀμείβων
    λεῦσσε, φυλάσσων μή τίς σε λάθῃ   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 ηs of θελχθῃs: 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.   *vv.* **149—151.** The original MSS. version of these much emended lines was

         ΠΡ. ἔσται ΑΓ κλήθρων δ' ἐξόρμα   149
            ἤν νιν πομπαῖς ἀντήσῃς   150
            πάλιν ἐξορμάσῃς χαλινούς.   151

the Greek tendency to modify the normal form of 'reported speech' to suit the exigencies of a particular case.—ἐπεφή-μισα seems used in the sense of 'allege', 'profess' (to Clytaemnestra): possibly the ἐπί has here something of the force it has in ἐπίορκος and ἐπιορκέω. ἐπιφάσκω was used in later Greek in the sense of 'pretend'.—κείνῳ λέκτροις = κείνου 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 ἵζομαι is found several times with ἕζομαι, and is common with θάσσειν.

143. εὔφημα θρόει] 'Mind what you say!'—a variety of εὔφημα φώνει, '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 Iphigeneia and her escort

ἢν ταῖς πομπαῖς ἀντήσῃς,   150
πάλιν ὅρμησον, σεῖε χαλινούς,
ἐπὶ Κυκλώπων ἱεὶς θυμέλας.
ΠΡ.   πιστὸς δὲ φράσας τάδε πῶς ἔσομαι,
λέγε, παιδὶ σέθεν [τῇ σῇ τ' ἀλόχῳ];

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 γὰρ was inserted between ἢν and νιν (without any alteration of the accent of the ἢν). ἀντήσῃς was in P corrected (not by the first hand) to ἀντήσεις and ἐξορμάσῃς corr. in both MSS. (certainly P and I think also L read -ῃς 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 σεῖε for ἐξορμάσεις in 151. Wecklein proposes ἐξορμώσαις in 149 and εἰσόρμα in 151. Weil ἐξόρμοις in 149 (Hermann had proposed ἐξόρμους in v. 151) and (ingeniously) ἐξ ὁρμᾶς in 151. Weil also reads οὖν for νιν in 150. I have adopted Weil's ἐξόρμοις and Blomfield's σεῖε (though the discovery that the MS. from which P and L were copied probably had ἐξορμάσῃς makes this seem less certain than before), I also read ταῖς for νιν (which I think may have been due to the ιν 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 ὅρμησον.   154. σέθεν τῇ σῇ τ' ἀλόχῳ PL. I have no hesitation in following Vitelli in regarding τῇ σῇ τ' ἀλόχῳ 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 ὀχυροῖσι παρθενῶσι of v. 738. Callimachus, he says, calls (*frag.* 118) young girls κατάκλειστοι. (ἢ ταῖς ἢ κατάκλειστος. So Philo *Jud.* II. 530 γύναια κατάκλειστα μηδὲ τῆς αὐλείου προερχόμενα, καὶ θαλαμευόμεναι παρθένοι.) 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 Κυκλωπὶς 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. σφραγῖδα φύλασσ᾽ ἣν ἐπὶ δέλτῳ   155
τήνδε κομίζεις. ἴθι. λευκαίνει
τόδε φῶς ἤδη λάμπουσ᾽ ἠὼς
πῦρ τε τεθρίππων τῶν Ἀελίου.
σύλλαβε μόχθων.   160
θνητῶν δ᾽ ὄλβιος εἰς τέλος οὐδεὶς
οὐδ᾽ εὐδαίμων·
οὔπω γὰρ ἔφυ τις ἄλυπος.

Πάροδος.

ΧΟ. ἔμολον ἀμφὶ παρακτίαν   στρ.

---

supposing he meets Iphigeneia after she has started.   155. The ΑΓ. before this
line is omitted in P.   156. τήνδε PL, τῇδε L¹.   164. παρ᾽ ἀκτὰν 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 *Ion*, 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 ἠώς for ἕως.' Rutherford *New Phryn.* p. 164.

vv. 161—163. These verses, forming the conventional conclusion to the scene, must have been spoken, as Firnhaber 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 (Firnh.).

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 τέλους. 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 Iphigeneia 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 νιν ἀμετέρων Κύπρι κάλλιστα 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 νεᾶνις confined to unmarried girls. At *v.* 489 of the *Andromache* the heroine is called τὴν τάλαιναν Ἰλιάδα κόραν (cf. also *Suppl.* 1073 and *El.* 481) and at *v.* 192 of the same play Andromache calls Hermione νεᾶνις (cf. Soph. *Trach.* 307 f. τίς ποτ᾽

www.libtool.com.cn

ψάμαθον Αὐλίδος ἐναλίας,   165
Εὐρίπου διὰ χευμάτων
κέλσασα στενοπόρθμων,
Χαλκίδα πόλιν ἐμὰν προλιποῦσ᾽,
ἀγχιάλων ὑδάτων τροφὸν
τᾶς κλεινᾶς ᾽Αρεθούσας,   170
᾽Αχαιῶν 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. στενόπορθμον 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 προλιποῦσα: in both the correction is made of shifting the πον 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 ἰδοίμαν 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 εἴδομεν, and the ed. princ. εἰσείδομεν) that ἐσ- may have been omitted after ὡς from the similarity of the abbreviations in cursive writing -ſ (ὡς) and ˌ5(εσ).   171. ᾽Αχαιῶν PL ᾽Ατρειδᾶν Camper on *Electr.* 246.   172. ᾽Αχαιῶν PL ἀγαυῶν Nauck. Hermann and

εἰ νεανίδων, ἄνανδρος, ἢ τεκνοῦσα;) 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 logaoedic 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 τροφόν] It seems to us more natural to regard the city or land as fed by the spring than as feeding it. A still stranger metaphorical use of the word occurs at *El.* 54:—ὦ νὺξ μέλαινα χρυσέων ἄστρων τροφέ.

170. τᾶς κλεινᾶς ᾽Αρεθούσας] The scholiast on ν 408 says ᾽Αρέθουσαι δὲ τέσσαρες, ἐν Συρακούσῃ, ἐν Σμύρνῃ, ἐν Χαλκίδι, καὶ ἐν ᾽Ιθάκῃ.

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
ἁμέτεροι πόσεις
ἐνέπουσ' Ἀγαμέμνονά τ' εὐπατρίδαν
στέλλειν ἐπὶ τὰν Ἑλέναν, ἀπ'
Εὐρώτα δονακοτρόφου
Πάρις ὁ βουκόλος ἂν ἔλαβε,   180
δῶρον τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας,
ὅτ' ἐπὶ κρηναίαισι δρόσοις
Ἥρᾳ Παλλάδι τ' ἔριν ἔριν
μορφᾶς ἁ Κύπρις ἔσχεν.

πολύθυτον δὲ δι' ἄλσος Ἀρ-   ἀντ. 185
τέμιδος ἤλυθον ὀρομένα,
φοινίσσουσα παρῇδ' ἐμὰν
αἰσχύνᾳ 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, ἡιθέων Markland. ὡς PL, οὓς Scaliger,
ἃς 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
-συ put into this *v.* from the next by a corrector: in L the whole word was written
in this *v.* originally.   177. ἐννέπουσ' 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 ἁ 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 Ὀδυσῆ, *El.* 439 Ἀχιλλῆ, or Ἀχιλῆ, *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. ὀρωμέναν PL, ὀρομένα Canter.

ships 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 *equip*, 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 νεηθαλής. The adj. con-
veys the notion of the *freshness*, and
brilliancy of the colour of the blush.—lit.

ὁπλοφόρους Δαναῶν θέλουσ᾽   190
ἵππων τ᾽ ὄχλον ἰδέσθαι.
κατεῖδον δὲ δύ᾽ Αἴαντε συνέδρω
τὸν Οἰλέως Τελαμῶνός τε γόνον,
τὸν Σαλαμῖνος στέφανον,
Πρωτεσίλαόν τ᾽ ἐπὶ θάκοις   195
πεσσῶν ἡδομένους μορ-
φαῖσι πολυπλόκοις,
Παλαμήδεά θ᾽, ὃν τέκε παῖς ὁ Ποσει-
δᾶνος, Διομήδεά θ᾽ ἡδο-

190. In P there was originally ἐθέλουσ᾽, 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. Ὀϊλέως PL, as at v. 263: it is possible that we ought to read Ἰλέως at both places. Τελαμῶνος ἔκγονον corr. to T. τε γόνον P, Τελαμῶνός τε γόνον L with an erasure before the γ.   194. τοῖς Σαλαμινίοις PL (corr. to τοῖς Σαλαμῖνος by a late hand in P), τὸν Σαλαμῖνος Hartung.   196. πεσσῶν P corr.

"reddening my cheek with the shame of fresh youth".

190. ὁπλοφόρους] 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 σὸν ἄνθος πόλεος ὁ Διὸς ἔκγονος.

196. ἡδομένους] the number of συνέδρω and its meaning suggest that the two Ajaces made a group by themselves apart from the two draught-players next mentioned. Hence we must suppose that ἡδομένους qualifies not, as Matthiae says, the Ajaces 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 (*Pyth.* IV. 318)—τὸν μὲν Ἐχίονα, κεχλάδοντας ἥβᾳ, τὸν δ᾽ Ἔρυτον—says, τὸ σχῆμα τῆς φράσεως Ἀλκμανικόν. πρὶν γὰρ εἰπεῖν τὰ δύο ὀνόματα μέσην ἔταξε τὴν μετοχήν. Another scholiast says the σχῆμα got its name οὐχ ὅτι ὁ μελοποιὸς Ἀλκμὰν εὗρεν αὐτὸ, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι, Ὁμήρου

εὑρόντος, ἔχαιρεν ἐκεῖνος τῷ σχήματι. Instances in Homer are Υ 138, Ε 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 προδιεζευγμένον καὶ καθ᾽ ὑπερβατόν, ὑπ᾽ ἐνίων δὲ ἀλκμανικόν. Cf. also Alcm. *frag.* 9 [3] Κάστωρ τε πώλων ὠκέων δματῆρες ἱππόται 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...... χρόνου τε διατριβὰς σοφωτάτας ἐφεῦρε φλοίσβου μετὰ κοπὴν καθημένοις, πέσσους 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   ἐπῳδός
λαιψηροδρόμον Ἀχιλῆα,
τὸν ἁ Θέτις τέκε καὶ
Χείρων ἐξεπόνησεν,
εἶδον αἰγιαλοῖσι   210
παρά τε κροκάλαις δρόμον ἔχοντα σὺν ὅπλοις·
ἅμιλλαν δ᾽ ἐπόνει ποδοῖν
πρὸς ἅρμα τέτρωρον

by a later hand to τεσσῶν, τεσσῶν L.   204. Νι is in an erasure in L. Νιρῆ Nauck.   209. ἐξεπόνασεν P, ἐξεπόνησεν 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 εὐδείελον· ἐν δ᾽ ὅρος αὐτῇ. The late position of the τε here and in *v.* 206, like the *schema Alcmanicum* in *v.* 196 gave doubtless a quaintness to the verse.

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

206. ἰσάνεμον ποδοῖν] ποδοῖν is I think best taken as a genitive, the construction being of the same kind as παράκοποι φρενῶν *Bacch.* 33, φρενῶν κεκομμένος Aesch. *Ag.* 479.

209. ἐξεπόνησεν] Jacobs compared with this use of the word Theocr. XIII. 8 ff. καί μιν πάντ᾽ ἐδίδαξε πατὴρ ὡσεὶ φίλον υἱέα...ὡς αὐτῷ κατὰ θυμὸν ὁ παῖς πεπονημένος εἴη.

210 f. αἰγιαλοῖσι παρά τε κροκάλαις] "*littoreis in harenis*" Erasmus. The παρά goes in sense with both the nouns: *by the sea-shore and the shingle.* Cf. Soph. *O. T.* 761 ἀγρούς σφε πέμψαι κἀπὶ 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, ἅμμος Hesych. (Musgrave). σὺν ὅπλοις· *i.e.* equipped as for battle.

213. ποδοῖν] gen.

ἐλίσσων περὶ νίκας. 215

ὁ δὲ διφρηλάτας ἐβοᾶτ᾽

Εὔμηλος Φερητιάδας,

ᾧ καλλίστους ἰδόμαν

χρυσοδαιδάλτους στομίοις

πώλους κέντρῳ θεινομένους, 220

τοὺς μὲν μέσους ζυγίους,

λευκοστίκτῳ τριχὶ βαλιούς,

τοὺς δ᾽ ἔξω σειροφόρους,

ἀντήρεις καμπαῖσι δρόμων,

πυρσότριχας, μονόχαλα δ᾽ ὑπὸ σφυρὰ 225

τάλαις P, κροκάλαις L.   215. νίκας PL, νύσσας Musgr.   216. βοᾶτ᾽ PL,
ἐβοᾶτ᾽ Dind.   218. εἰδόμαν PL, ἰδόμαν Dind.   219. στομίοισι P, στομίοις
L.   223. σειραφόρους 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᾽ ἐλισσέμεν) 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 ποδῶν, 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**] Β 603 ἵπποι μὲν
μέγ᾽ ἄρισται ἔσαν Φηρητιάδαο (though in
this passage Φηρητιάδης means Admetus)
τὰς Εὔμηλος ἔλαυνε. 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 *suited to*, here? and that
καμπαὶ δρόμων means the same as δρόμοι
κάμπιμοι 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 -ηρης in all the compounds in
which it forms the second part, even in
τριήρης itself, comes from the root ἀρ *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 ἀντάω &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 σφυρά the
acc. of specification.

ποικιλοδέρμονας· οἷς παρεπάλλετο
Πηλεΐδας σὺν ὅπλοισι παρ' ἄντυγα
καὶ σύριγγας ἁρματείους.   230

[ναῶν δ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἤλυθον   στρ.
καὶ θέαν ἀθέσφατον,
τὰν γυναικεῖον ὄψιν ὀμμάτων
ὡς πλήσαιμι μελίφρον' ἁδονάν.
καὶ κέρας μὲν ἦν   235
δεξιὸν πλάτας ἔχων
Φθιώτας ὁ Μυρμιδὼν Ἄρης
πεντήκοντα ναυσὶ θουρίαις.
χρυσέαις δ' εἰκόσιν κατ' ἄκρα Νη-
ρῇδες ἕστασαν θεαί,   240
πρύμναις σῆμ' Ἀχιλλείου στρατοῦ.

ρότριχας PL, πυρσότριχας Monk.   226. ποικιλοδέρμονας P, ποικιλλοδέρμονας L
and Ald., which is noticeable, as Ald. probably printed from P.   229. Πηλεΐ-
δας PL, Πηλεΐδας Elmsley. ὅπλοις PL, ὅπλοισι Heath.   233. γυναικείαν PL,
γυναικεῖον Boeckh.   234. μείλινον PL, μειλιχόν 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 μείλινον
(which whoever wrote it must have meant for an adjective from μέλι) nor μειλιχόν
furnish a corresponding rhythm to that of *v.* 245, I suspect that he wrote μελίφρον'
with the second syll. scanned long.   237. Μυρμιδόνων PL, Μυρμιδών Hermann
cf. *v.* 1352.   239. χρυσέαισι with the final ι erased P, χρυσέαις L (?): ἄκραν
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, ηϊ.   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—ὑ' ὁ φίλαυλος ἔπαλλε
δελφίς, and τετραβάμονες ἵπποι 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. χρυσαῖς εἰκόσιν] This is a
remarkable use of the dative.

241. The writer seems to have scan-

Ἀργείων δὲ ταισδ ἰσήρετμοι   ἀντ.

ναες ἔστασαν πέλας·

ὧν ὁ Μηκιστέως στρατηλάτας

παῖς ἦν, Ταλαὸς ὃν τρέφει πατήρ·   245

Καπανέως τε παῖς

Σθένελος· Ἀτθίδας δ' ἄγων

ἑξήκοντα ναῦς ὁ Θησέως

παῖς ἑξῆς ἐναυλόχει θεὰν

Παλλάδ' ἐν μωνύχοις ἔχων πτερω-   250

τοῖσιν ἅρμασιν θετὸν

εὔσημόν τε φάσμα ναυβάταις.

Βοιωτῶν δ' ὅπλισμα ποντίας   στρ.

247. Ἀτθίδος PL, Ἀτθίδας Dobree.   248. ναῦς corr. to ναῆς 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. ἑξῆς P, ἑξῆς L.   251. ἅρμασι P, ἅρμασιν L the ν looks here as if it might have been added by the first hand as a correction. θετόν seems corrupt. Firnhaber emends it to θοάν, Weil writes θεάν here and θοάν at the end of v. 249.   253. τῶν is

ned the penult of Ἀχιλλείου as a short syllable (cf. C. N. on Κυκλωπείας at vv. 265 and 1501).

242. Ἀργείων] 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 Diomede, with Sthenelus and Euryalus under him. Aeschylus never mentions Mycenae in his Orestean 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 Iphigeneia'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 ἅρμασιν stands for chariot and horses, just as ἵπποι in Homer often stands for horses and chariot. Weil quotes Herc. Fur. 881 ἅρμασι δ' ἐνδίδωσι κέντρον.

253. ὅπλισμα] 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
σημείοισιν ἐστολισμένας·   255
τοῖς δὲ Κάδμος ἦν
χρύσεον δράκοντ' ἔχων
ἀμφὶ ναῶν κόρυμβα·
Λήϊτος δ' ὁ γηγενὴς
ἆρχε ναΐου στρατοῦ·   260
Φωκίδος δ' ἀπὸ χθονός,
Λοκροῖς δὲ τοῖσδ' ἴσας ἄγων
ναῦς Οἰλέως τόκος κλυτὰν
Θρονιάδ' ἐκλιπὼν πόλιν.

Μυκήνας δὲ τᾶς Κυκλωπίας   ἀντ. 265
παῖς Ἀτρέως ἔπεμπε ναυβάτας
ναῶν ἑκατὸν ἠθροϊσμένους.
σὺν δ' Ἄδραστος ἦν
ταγός, ὡς φίλος φίλῳ,
τᾶς φυγούσας μέλαθρα   270
βαρβάρων χάριν γάμων
πρᾶξιν Ἑλλὰς ὡς λάβοι.
ἐκ Πύλου δὲ Νέστορος
Γερηνίου κατειδόμαν
πρύμνας σῆμα ταυρόπουν ὁρᾶν,   275
τὸν πάροικον Ἀλφεόν.

Αἰνιάνων δὲ δωδεκάστολοι   στρ.
νᾶες ἦσαν, ὧν ἄναξ Γουνεὺς

inserted before Βοιωτῶν in both P and L by a corrector. Ought we not to read πόντιον for ποντίας? 255. σημείοισιν (the ιν wholly or partially obliterated) εὐστολισμένας PL, ἐστολισμένας Scaliger. 260. ἆρχε PL (corr. in P to ἄρχε). 261. After this v. a space for two lines is left in both MSS. 262. Λοκροῖς PL, Λοκρός Scaliger and Canter, Λοκρῶν Heath, Λοκράς Markl. τοῖσδ' PL, Vitelli suggests ταῖσδ'. 263. Matthiae reads ναῦς ἦλθ' metr. grat. 265. Κυκλωπειας PL (corr. in P to Κυκλωπιας). 276. The word ὁρᾶν (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 Θρονιάδ' (v. 264) was long. 277. f. δώδεκα στόλοι ναῶν PL, δωδεκάστολοι νᾶες Hermann (an excellent emendation). 278. Ἰουνεύς P, Γουνεύς L (Canter proposed the

268. This introduction of Adrastus is inexplicable.

272. πρᾶξιν λαβεῖν τινός] for 'to take vengeance on some one' is a most extraordinary phrase.

ἄρχε· τῶνδε δ' αὖ πέλας
Ἤλιδος δυνάστορες,   280
οὓς Ἐπειοὺς ὠνόμαζε πᾶς λεώς·
Εὔρυτος δ' ἄνασσε τῶνδε·
λευκήρετμον δ' Ἄρη
Τάφιον ἦγεν, ὧν Μέγης ἄνασσε
Φυλέως λόχευμα,   285
τὰς Ἐχίνας λιπὼν * * * *
νήσους ναυβάταις ἀπροσφόρους.

Αἴας δ' ὁ Σαλαμῖνος ἔντροφος   ἀντ.
δεξιὸν κέρας πρὸς τὸ λαιὸν ξυνᾶγε,   290
τῶν ἆσσον ὥρμει πλάταισιν
ἐσχάταισι συμπλέκων
δώδεκ' εὐστροφωτάταισι ναυσίν· ὡς
ἄιον καὶ ναυβάταν
εἰδόμαν λεών·   295
ᾧ τις εἰ προσαρμόσει
βαρβάρους βάριδας,
νόστον οὐκ ἀποίσεται,
ἐνθάδ' οἷον εἰδόμαν
νάιον πόρευμα,   300
τὰ δὲ κατ' οἴκους κλύουσα συγ-

latter as an emendation).   281. ὀνόμαζε P (o for ω is a common error with P), ὠνόμαζε L.   284. ἦγεν ὧν PL, ἡγεμών 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 ἡγεμών was corrupted into ἦγεν ὧν. Firnhaber reads ἦγον, ὧν Μέγης ἄνασσε.   286. ἐχίδνας PL, in P a commentator has written at the side τὰς ἐχινάδάς φησι. Ἐχινάδας Voss, Ἐχίνας Brodeau.   290. ξύναγε PL, ξυνᾶγε Weil.   299. ἄιον PL, οἷον 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 ληϊστορες 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 que le poëte 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), ὅπλισμα πόντιον (253, if the reading is right), and νάιος στρατός (260).

κλητοῦ [μνήμην] σώζομαι στρατεύματος.]

’Επεισόδιον ά.

ΠΡ.   Μενέλαε, τολμᾷς δείν’, ἅ σ’ οὐ τολμᾶν χρεών.
ME.   ἄπελθε· λίαν δεσπόταισι πιστὸς εἶ.
ΠΡ.   καλόν γέ μοι τοὔνειδος ἐξωνείδισας.   305

suggests σύγκλυδος but prefers σύλλογον. 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 δὲ, σώζομαι for 'I remember' is a poetical but μνήμην σώζομαί τινος a most prosaic phrase. 303. δεῖν’ 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. **καλόν γέ μοι τοὔνειδος**] 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 ἁπάντων, Eur. *Phoen.* 821 γένναν ὀδοντοφυῆ, Θήβαις κάλλιστον ὄνειδος, *Bacch.* 852 ὠνείδισας δὴ τοῦτο Διονύσῳ 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 δεινόν γ’ ὄνειδος. At *Medea* 514 καλὸν γ’ ὄνειδος τῷ νεωστὶ νυμφίῳ, we probably have this phrase used ironically, 'a credit-

ΜΕ. κλαίοις ἄν, εἰ πράσσοις ἃ μὴ πράσσειν σε δεῖ.

ΠΡ. οὐ χρῆν σὲ λῦσαι δέλτον, ἣν ἐγὼ ᾿φερον.

ΜΕ. οὐδέ γε φέρειν σὲ πᾶσιν ῞Ελλησιν κακά.

ΠΡ. ἄλλοις ἁμιλλῶ ταῦτ᾿· ἄφες δὲ τήνδ᾿ ἐμοί.

ΜΕ. οὐκ ἂν μεθείμην. ΠΡ. οὐδ᾿ ἔγωγ᾿ ἀφήσομαι.   310

ΜΕ. σκήπτρῳ τάχ᾿ ἄρα σὸν καθαιμάξω κάρα.

ΠΡ. ἀλλ᾿ εὐκλεές τοι δεσποτῶν θνῄσκειν ὕπερ.

ΜΕ. μέθες· μακροὺς δὲ δοῦλος ὢν λέγεις λόγους.

ΠΡ. ὦ δέσποτ᾿, ἀδικούμεσθα. σὰς δ᾿ ἐπιστολὰς

---

the ι of λίαν is sometimes long.   306. κλαίεις P, corrected by an early hand to κλαίοις.   307. I have printed σὲ with Paley instead of the ordinary σε.—In P the mark of the breathing over the absent augment of (ἐ)φερον 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 ειν of φέρειν is in an erasure large enough to hold ειν σε. It is clear that the δεῖ has no business here but was originally an explanatory addition. 309. ἄλλως PL, ἄλλοις Markl. The ἁμιλλᾷ of Ald. may have been due to the fact that in P the ῶ resembles ᾷ: ἄλλως ἁμιλλᾷ gives a tolerable sense, but it is far more likely that ἄλλοις was miswritten ἄλλως, than that ἁμιλλᾷ was miswritten ἁμιλλῶ.   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 *Medea* we ought to read κακόν γ᾿ ὄνειδος. Anyhow this passage in the *Medea* 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 καλόν γ᾿ ὄνειδος. See Valckenaer and Geel or *Phoen. l.c.* and Vitelli on this passage. The above explanation seems better than to take the καλόν 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 *honour* Menelaus will unintentionally be doing him.

307. σὲ] 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 O. 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 : σκήπτρῳ δὲ τῷδε σὸν καθαιμάξω κάρα.

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

δοῦλος ὤν] 'for a slave': cf. Soph. *O. C.* 20 μακρὰν γὰρ ὡς γέροντι προὔσταλης ὁδόν, and *O. T.* 1078 and 1118.

ἐξαρπάσας ὅδ᾽ ἐκ χερῶν ἐμῶν βίᾳ,   315
Ἀγάμεμνον, οὐδὲν τῇ δίκῃ χρῆσθαι θέλει.

ΑΓΑ. ἔα·
    τίς ποτ᾽ ἐν πύλαισι θόρυβος καὶ λόγων ἀκοσμία;
ΜΕ. οὑμὸς οὐχ ὁ τοῦδε μῦθος κυριώτερος λέγειν.
ΑΓΑ. σὺ δὲ τί τῷδ᾽ ἐς ἔριν ἀφῖξαι, Μενέλεως, βίᾳ 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 πύλαισιν, 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 τίς 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 (*Opusc.*) 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 ΠΡ. 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 βίᾳ 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 follow-
ing scholion: τροχαικοί 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 him-
self.

319. τῷδ᾽] It is best to take the
dat. not, as at *Cyclops* 328 (Διὸς βρον-
ταῖσιν εἰς ἔριν κτυπῶν) directly with εἰς
ἔριν, but with the whole phrase εἰς ἔ. ἀφ.

βίᾳ τ᾽ ἄγεις] This ἄγεις is diffi-
cult. At *Tro.* 998 *e.g.* Hecuba says to
Helen βίᾳ γὰρ παῖδα φῂς σ᾽ ἄγειν ἐμόν:
there ἄγειν βίᾳ 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) *car-
ried off* his messenger by force (historic
present).

ΜΕ. βλέψον εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵν' ἀρχὰς τῶν λόγων ταύτας λάβω. 320
ΑΓΑ. μῶν τρέσας οὐκ ἀνακαλύψω βλέφαρον, Ἀτρέως γεγώς;
ΜΕ. τήνδ' ὁρᾷς δέλτον, κακίστων γραμμάτων ὑπηρέτιν;
ΑΓΑ. εἰσορῶ, καὶ πρῶτα ταύτην σῶν ἀπάλλαξον χερῶν.
ΜΕ. οὔ, πρὶν ἂν δείξω γε Δαναοῖς πᾶσι τἀγγεγραμμένα.
ΑΓΑ. ἦ γὰρ οἶσθ' ἃ μή σε καιρὸς εἰδέναι, σήμαντρ' ἀνείς; 325
ΜΕ. ὥστε σ' ἀλγῦναί γ', ἀνοίξας, ἃ σὺ κάκ' εἰργάσω λάθρᾳ.
ΑΓΑ. ποῦ δὲ κἄλαβές νιν; ὦ θεοί, σῆς ἀναισχύντου φρενός.

tone.   322. τηνδ' in an erasure in P. γραμμάτων PL, πραγμάτων or ἐργμάτων
Markl., ῥαμμάτων Gomperz. See Ex. Notes.   324. ἄπασι τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα
with the first ε of ἐγγ. crossed through P, πᾶσι τἀγγεγραμμένα, the τά 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 paren-
thetical 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' εἰδῇς, 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
saevum 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 Rhesum*) notices the
fact that the name Ἀτρεύς 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 con-
nexion between τρέσας and Ἀτρέως: in
pronunciation σ between the ε and α of
the former word would perhaps be some-
what 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 ὑπηρέτιν] fanciful,
but quite Euripidean: the servant bears
the tablet, and the tablet in its turn per-
forms the same office, and bears the
writing.

326. With ἀνοίξας it is best to under-
stand σήμαντρα, or δέλτον, and not to
take it, as L. and S. and others do,
directly with ἃ 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'. Firnhaber
takes ἃ σὺ κ.τ.λ. as the subj. to ἀλγῦναι,
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 κἄλαβές νιν] Porson on
Phoen. 1373 has collected many instances
of καί 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 καί. This καί
is generally placed immediately before
the verb, or only separated from it
by an unemphatic word, and is best ren-
dered by putting an emphasis on the

ΜΕ. προσδοκῶν σὴν παῖδ᾽ ἀπ᾽ Ἄργους εἰ στράτευμ᾽ ἀφίξεται.
ΑΓΑ. τί δέ σε τἀμὰ δεῖ φυλάσσειν; οὐκ ἀναισχύντου τόδε;
ΜΕ. ὅτι τὸ βούλεσθαί μ᾽ ἔκνιζε· σὸς δὲ δοῦλος οὐκ ἔφυν. 330
ΑΓΑ. οὐχὶ δεινά; τὸν ἐμὸν οἰκεῖν οἶκον οὐκ ἐάσομαι;
ΜΕ. πλάγια γὰρ φρονεῖς, τὰ μὲν νῦν, τὰ δὲ πάλαι, τὰ δ᾽ αὐτίκα.
ΑΓΑ. εὖ κεκόμψευσαι πονηρά· γλῶσσ᾽ ἐπίφθονον σοφή.

γε.   331. Hermann's οὐχὶ δεῖν᾽, εἰ for the MSS. οὐχὶ δεινά; is certainly not
refuted by Monk's statement that the following οὐκ would in that case have been μή.
—ἐάσομαι PL, ἐάσομεν Firnhaber, ἐᾷς ἐμέ Nauck.   333. ἐκκεκόμψευσαι· πονηρὸν
PL. εὖ κεκόμψευσαι· Ruhnken ad Tim. Lex. 155. ἐκκεκόμψευσαι πονηρόν, 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. πονηρόν, adverbially with ἐκκ.).   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 ἐπί with the acc.

auxiliary which accompanies the English
verb. Cf. Soph. Aj. 1290 δύστηνε, ποῖ
βλέπων ποτ᾽ αὐτὰ καὶ θροεῖς; 'with what
face can you utter it?' (Jebb, in lecture).—
I am inclined with Firnhaber to take νιν
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 indigna-
tion not at the opening of the letter but
at the interference with the messenger.
This is borne out by v. 329.

328. προσδοκῶν τοῦτον εἰ ἀφίξεται]
is a favourite Greek variety for προσδοκᾶν
εἰ οὗτος ἀφίξεται. Cf Thuc. IV. 42, 3 ἐπε-
τήρουν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους οἱ κατασχήσουσιν.
Most probably at Med. 669 παίδων ἐρευ-
νῶν σπέρμ᾽ ὅπως γένοιτό μοι, σπέρμα is acc.
Cf. also Thuc. VII. 63, 3 ἐκείνην τε τὴν
ἡδονὴν ἐνθυμεῖσθαι ὡς ἀξία ἐστὶ διασώσασ-
θαι.

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 impudentia? M. Quis autem ma-
litia 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. An-
drom. 581 πῶς; ἦ σὺ τὸν ἐμὸν οἶκον οἰκήσεις
μολὼν δεῦρ'; (adopting Lenting's cor-
rection of the v.). Even if this had been
the only instance of ἐάσομαι as a passive
(cf. Thuc. I, 142 οὐδὲ μελετῆσαι ἐασόμε-
νοι) that would not have been a sufficient
reason for altering it (see Crit. N.)

332. πλάγια] In the other two pas-
sages 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 open-
ing my letter) but it has been disgrace-

ΜΕ.   νοῦς δέ γ᾽ οὐ βέβαιον ἄδικος κτῆμα κοὐ σαφὲς φίλοις.
βούλομαι δέ σ᾽ ἐξελέγξαι, καὶ σὺ μήτ᾽ ὀργῆς ὕπο   335
ἀποτρέπου τἀληθές, οὔτ᾽ αὖ κατατενῶ λίαν ἐγώ.

('for'), is thus made to bear the sense of εἰς ('at'), and even εἰς 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 ἐκκεκ.
or κεκ.) decidedly wants an object.   In P ὤρ. (ὡραῖον), and in L γνω. (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 ἐγ᾽ written over δ᾽ οὐ by an early hand.   νοῦς δ᾽
ὁ μὴ 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.   κοὐ σαφὲς φίλοις PL, σαφὴς Monk, κοὐ
σοφοῖς φίλον Nauck.   See Ex. N.—κοὐ 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 an early
hand in L to δέ σ᾽ ἐξελέγξαι.   Over the τ᾽ of μήτ᾽ in P τοι is written by a late hand,
due probably to the οὔτοι in the following v.   In L the s ὕπο 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 καταινῶ λίαν σ᾽
ἐγώ PL, οὔτοι κατατενῶ λίαν ἐγώ Boeckh.   οὔτε κατατενῶ Herm., who also omits the
σ᾽.   As the corrector of P who wrote τοι over the μήτ᾽ in the previous v. saw, the
two negatives correspond; therefore, as μήτ᾽ cannot stand for μήτοι, we are almost
compelled to write οὔτε in v. 336.   It is hard though to see how the οι of οὔτοι arose.
οὔτ᾽ αὖ σ᾽ ἐκτενῶ Blomfield, οὔτ᾽ αὖ κατατενῶ 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 Agamem-
non 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 κοὐ σαφὲς φίλοις
would seem to mean 'a wrong thing for
a man (himself) to have, and one which
prevents his friends having any confi-
dence in him'.—'not a thing that his
friends can trust in'. σαφής in the sense
of 'trustworthy' occurs at Or. 1155,
I. T. 919, Herc. fur. 55 (σαφεῖς φίλοι),
Hipp. 890 (σαφεῖς ἀράς), Helen. 310 (ἔπη...

ἀληθείᾳ σαφῆ), Ion 1482 (δόλια κοὐ 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
κατατενῶ absolutely, or to supply τἀλη-
θές 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—δυοῖν λεγόντοιν, θατέρου θυμου-
μένου, ὁ μὴ ἀντιτείνων τοῖς λόγοις σοφώτε-
ρος. ἀντικατατείνω is also so used at
Plat. Rep. 348 A.

οἶσθ' ὅτ' ἐσπούδαζες ἄρχειν Δαναΐδαις πρὸς Ἴλιον,
τῷ δοκεῖν μὲν οὐχὶ χρῄζων, τῷ δὲ βούλεσθαι θέλων,
ὡς ταπεινὸς ἦσθα, πάσης δεξιᾶς προσθιγγάνων
καὶ θύρας ἔχων ἀκλῄστους τῷ θέλοντι δημοτῶν,   340
καὶ διδοὺς πρόσρησιν ἐξῆς πᾶσι, κεἰ μή τις θέλοι,
τοῖς τρόποις ζητῶν πρίασθαι τὸ φιλότιμον ἐκ μέσου.

of some Byzantine of the length of the penult in λίαν, but after the corrupt
καταινῶ 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, *New*

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 Ἀθηναίοις ἦρξε, cf. also Thuc. II. 2, 1 ; VI. 54, 6, and VII. 70, 1 ; also Hdt. VIII. 51 Καλλιάδεω ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοισι.

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 βούλεσθαί μ' ἔκνιζε, will help to make τῷ δὲ βούλεσθαι θέλων seem a little less curious. Weil translates the *v.* 'En apparence, tu n'y aspiris 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 συντιθεὶς ψέγει λόγῳ γυναῖκας ἐξῆς, σκαιός ἐστι κοὐ σοφός, and Philemon *Fr. Inc.* III. (Meineke) δειλοὶ πάλιν ἐξῆς πάντες εἰσὶν οἱ λάγῳ, and ρ 450. The phrase seems to have been a homely one. The word ἐξῆς is not used by Aeschylus or Sophocles.— κεἰ μή 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 νομίζεις ;

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

κᾆτ' ἐπεὶ κατέσχες ἀρχάς, μεταβαλὼν ἄλλους τρόπους
τοῖς φίλοισιν οὐκέτ' ἦσθα τοῖς πρὶν ὡς πρόσθεν φίλος, 344
δυσπρόσιτος ἔσω τε κλήθρων σπάνιος. ἄνδρα δ' οὐ χρεὼν
τὸν ἀγαθὸν πράσσοντα μεγάλα τοὺς τρόπους μεθιστάναι,
ἀλλὰ καὶ βέβαιον εἶναι τότε μάλιστα τοῖς φίλοις
ἡνίκ' ὠφελεῖν μάλιστα δυνατός ἐστιν εὐτυχῶν.
ταῦτα μέν σε πρῶτ' ἐπῆλθον, ἵνα σε πρῶθ' ηὗρον κακόν.
ὡς δ' ἐς Αὖλιν ἦλθες αὖθις χὠ Πανελλήνων στρατός, 350

Phrynichus p. 225).   345. In the margin is written ὠ (i.e. ὡραῖον) in P, ση
(i.e. σημείωσαι) 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. εὕρω 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 εὕρω is clear (Vit.). I think
Reiske's and Markland's εὗρον (better ηὗρον) right: εὕρω 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., αὖτις PL (corr. to αὖθις in P), καὶ ὁ PL—with χὠ 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 ΝΑΥΤΙΣΚΑΙΟ.
? ναύτης ὅδε—ναύτης being used adjectively as at Hec. 921 (ναύταν οὐκέθ' ὁρῶν ὅμιλον),
and καὶ ὁ having been a gloss written by some one who mistook ὅδε for ὁ δέ.

τρόποις in this v. helps the τρόπους 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 πράτ-
τειν ἔχοι δυσπρόσοδος ἦν καὶ δυσέντευκτος,
οἰκουρῶν καὶ κατακεκλειμένος. Porson
well compares Thuc. I. 130 (about Pau-
sanias).

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

δυσπρόσιτος κ.τ.λ.] hardly an asynde-
ton: i.e. not for ἀλλ' ἦσθα δυσπ. κ.τ.λ.; but
the adjs. are in explanatory subordina-
tion 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. φίλοις with βέβαιον as
with σαφές at v. 334.

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

349. Markland cf. Andr. 688 ταῦτ'
εὖ φρονῶν σ' ἐπῆλθον, οὐκ ὀργῆς χάριν: the
two passages well support each other in
a rare use of the verb and in its construc-
tion 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' ἄνολβον εἶχες ὄμμα σύγχυσίν τ' εἰ μὴ νεῶν
χιλίων ἄρχων τὸ Πριάμου πεδίον ἐμπλήσεις δορός.   355
κἀμὲ παρεκάλεις· τί δράσω; τίν' ἀπόρων εὕρω πόρον;
ὥστε μὴ στερέντα σ' ἀρχῆς ἀπολέσαι καλὸν κλέος.

Kirchhoff conj. αὐτίχ' ὅδε. ἦλθες αὐτὸς Monk.   351. οὐδὲν ἦσθ' PL, οὐδὲν ἦν
Weil, οὐδ' ἐνεῖσθ' Vitelli.   354. ὡς ἄνολβον 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 ἄνολβον has beeen 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 ἄνολβον κ.τ.λ. the principal sentence
to which *vv.* 350—353 form a series of subordinate clauses. Dindorf and Nauck,
(and Herm. *Opusc.*) 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.—ὄνομα 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. (*Opusc.*) 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 εὕρω ποθὲν PL, with a
δὲ inserted after τίνα by an early hand in both: τίν' ἀπορῶν εὕρω 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: (πόθεν 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 ὅδε. Cf. *vv.* 968 and 945 of this
play.—τῇ τύχῃ τῇ τῶν θεῶν is a variety
for the common θείᾳ 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 ἄνολβον, '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 εὕρω πόρον;] for the
genitive with πόρος of the thing *from*
which a way is sought cf. *Alc.* 213 τίς ἂν
πῶς πᾷ πόρος κακῶν; and see Crit. Notes.

κᾆτ' ἐπεὶ Κάλχας ἐν ἱεροῖς εἶπε σὴν θῦσαι κόρην
Ἀρτέμιδι, [καὶ πλοῦν ἔσεσθαι Δαναΐδαις, ἡσθεὶς φρένας
ἄσμενος] θύσειν ὑπέστης παῖδα· καὶ πέμπεις ἑκών,   360
οὐ βίᾳ, μὴ τοῦτο λέξῃς, σῇ δάμαρτι, παῖδα σὴν
δεῦρ' ἀποστέλλειν, Ἀχιλλεῖ πρόφασιν ὡς γαμουμένην.
[κᾆθ' ὑποστρέψας λέληψαι μεταβαλὼν ἄλλας γραφάς,
ὡς φονεὺς οὐκέτι θυγατρὸς σῆς ἔσει μάλιστά γε.]
οὗτος αὐτός ἐστιν αἰθὴρ ὃς τάδ' 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 (*Opusc.*) 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 ἑκών, οὐ βίᾳ. I think that from καὶ πλοῦν...to ἄσμενος is an interpolation concocted partly from *v.* 91. Nauck condemns the whole of *v.* 359 and leaves ἄσμενος.   363. λελήψαι PL, λελῆσαι a late corrector of P and the early editions. (κᾆθ' 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. ἔσῃ 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' οὖ), and rejects 365.   365. αὐτός PL (which Monk would retain), αὑτός 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, ἑκόντες 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 πρός? (Cf. ἔχειν ἐπί 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 κἄβλεψας 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.

ἐγκονοῦσ᾽ ἑκόντες, εἶτα δ᾽ ἐξεχώρησαν κακῶς,
τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ γνώμης πολιτῶν ἀσυνέτου, τὰ δ᾽ ἐνδίκως
ἀδύνατοι γεγῶτες αὐτοὶ διαφυλάξασθαι πόλιν.
Ἑλλάδος μάλιστ᾽ ἔγωγε τῆς ταλαιπώρου στένω,　　　370
ἣ θέλουσα δρᾶν τι κεδνόν, βαρβάρους τοὺς οὐδένας
καταγελῶντας ἐξανήσει διὰ σὲ καὶ τὴν σὴν κόρην.
μηδέν᾽ οὖν γένους ἕκατι προστάτην θείμην χθονός,
μηδ᾽ ὅπλων ἄρχοντα· νοῦν χρὴ τὸν στρατηλάτην ἔχειν·

368 f. Hennig condemns these two *vv.* 　　372. τὴν σὴν κάκην Nauck, perhaps
rightly. 　　373. μηδὲν ἂν χείους, corr. by an early hand to μηδέν᾽ ἂν χρέους P,
μηδέν᾽ ἂν χρέους (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
Inf. 3, 60 'Che fece per viltate 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 versum respicit Eubulus
Comicus ap. Athenae. XIII. 3 p. 569 A
Ἑλλάδος ἔγωγε τῆς ταλαιπώρου πέρι Στέ-

νω' Markl. Porson's comment on Mark-
land is: 'In Eubuli versu miror Mark-
landum non vidisse expungendum, tum
Euripidis auctoritate, tum metri jussu,
importunum istud πέρι'. The gen. Ἑλ-
λάδος 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 Ἑλλά-
δος here is the person commiserated.
Monk quotes *Hec.* 1256 and X 424 but
the genitives παιδὸς (with ἀλγεῖν) and
πάντων (with ὀδύρομαι), 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 ὦ τάλαιν᾽
ἐγὼ σέθεν.

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

374. **ὅπλων**] poetic for ὁπλιτῶν, cf.
Phoen. 113 πολλοῖς μὲν ἵπποις μυρίοις δ᾽
ὅπλοις βρέμων, *Ion* 1292 οὗτοι σὺν ὅπλοις
ἦλθον εἰς τὴν σὴν χθόνα: so αἰχμή in the

www.libtool.com.cn

[πόλεος ὡς ἄρχων ἀνὴρ πᾶς, ξύνεσιν ἢν ἔχων τύχῃ.] 375

XO. δεινὸν κασιγνήτοισι γίγνεσθαι λόγους
 μάχας θ', ὅταν ποτ' ἐμπέσωσιν εἰς ἔριν.
ΑΓΑ. βούλομαί σ' εἰπεῖν κακῶς αὖ, βραχέα, μὴ λίαν ἄνω
 βλέφαρα πρὸς τἀναιδὲς ἀγαγών, ἀλλὰ σωφρονέστερον,
 ὡς ἀδελφὸν ὄντ'. ἀνὴρ γὰρ χρηστὸς αἰδεῖσθαι φιλεῖ. 380
 εἰπέ μοι, τί δεινὰ φυσᾷς αἱματηρὸν 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...τύχῃ, 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 θείμην. 376 and 377 are quoted by Stobaeus *Anth.* 82, 3. γίνεσθαι P, γίγνεσθαι L. 378. εὖ PL, αὖ Markland (Dobree defends εὖ, comparing εὖ διαβαλών at Thuc. 3, 42), οὔ Herm. (*Opusc.*), ἂν ὦ PL, L adding γρ. ἀνῶ 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. σωφρο-νέστερος 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 ως.—Wattenbach (*Gr. Pal. Suppl.* p. 17), says this ο sometimes stands for ον.—So with Matthiae and Monk I have written σωφρονέστερον. 380. αἰσχρὸς οὐκ PL, χρηστὸς χρηστὸν Stobaeus, χρηστὸς Grotius, in P ὦ (*i.e.* ὡραῖον) and γν (*i.e.*

sing. collectively *Heracl.* 275 ἥξω δὲ πολ-λὴν Ἄρεος Ἀργείου λαβὼν τάγχαλκον αἰχμὴν δεῦρο. Probably the use of χείρ and the Latin *manus* for *a force* is of the same kind as this of αἰχμή, *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 *incre-pare*, 'find fault with'; cp. Soph. *El.* 523 ἐγὼ δ' ὕβριν μὲν οὐκ ἔχω, κακῶς δέ σε λέγω κακῶς κλύουσα πρὸς σέθεν θαμά: in *male-dicere*, 'dire des injures', 'abuse', there is

the notion of ὕβρις.

379. πρὸς τἀναιδὲς] (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 *reck-lessness, 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 φυσᾶν] οἷον ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ ὑπὸ ὀργῆς ἀποσχετλιάζειν Phrynichus in Bekk. *Anecd.* 1, 36, 1. Cf. μέγα φυσῶν *v.* 125.

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

τίς ἀδικεῖ σε; τοῦ κέχρησαι; χρηστὰ λέκτρ' ἐρᾷς λαβεῖν;
οὐκ ἔχοιμ' ἂν σοι παρασχεῖν· ὧν γὰρ ἐκτήσω, κακῶς
ἦρχες. εἶτ' ἐγὼ δίκην δῶ σῶν κακῶν, ὁ μὴ σφαλείς;
ἦ δάκνει σε τὸ φιλότιμον τοὐμόν; ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις 385
εὐπρεπῆ γυναῖκα χρῄζεις, τὸ λελογισμένον παρεὶς
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.   381. λέκτρ' ἐρᾷς χρηστά PL, λέκτρα χρῆστ' ἐρᾷς
Heath, χρηστὰ λέκτρ' ἐρᾷς Reiske and Wecklein.   I prefer the latter, as it involves a
smaller change in the MSS. reading, and seems to me to emphasize χρηστά (see Ex.
Notes). Also, as Wecklein says, the corruption is easily explained, if this was the
order, from the similarity of -χρησαι and χρηστά.   384. δώσω PL, δῶ σῶν
Dawes *Miscell. Crit.* p. 341; a splendid emendation.   388. μετετέθην εὐβουλίᾳ
PL, μετεθέμην εὐβουλίαν Monk, who compares *Orestes* 254 μετέθου λύσσαν. 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
εὐβουλίᾳ 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 εὐβουλίᾳ.   389. Over μᾶλλον an early
hand in L has written μαίνῃ: a good instance of an explanatory addition in

look', Firnhaber '*mordgieriges Auge*'.
The ἔχων points to something more en-
during than a glance, and this, as well as
the general tone of the passage inclines
me to think with Monk that αἱ. ὁ. 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
χρηστά 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 ἀναλαβεῖν: but χρηστὰ λέκτρα (cp.
Hipp. 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 proiector, quod tu pec-
cas? tu delinquis, ego arguor? Pro male-
factis Helena redeat? virgo pereat inno-
cens? Tua reconcilietur uxor? mea necetur
filia?* (Ribbeck, *Ennius, v.* 194).

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

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

387. πονηροῦ φωτός] has the empha-
sis, '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 ὡραῖον
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 εὖ.   390
ὤμοσαν τὸν Τυνδάρειον ὅρκον οἱ κακόφρονες
φιλόγαμοι μνηστῆρες· ἡ δέ γ' ἐλπίς, οἶμαι μέν, θεός,
κἀξέπραξεν αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἢ σὺ καὶ τὸ σὸν σθένος·
οὓς λαβὼν στράτευ'· ἕτοιμοι δ' εἰσὶ μωρίᾳ φρενῶν·   394
οὐ γὰρ ἀσύνετον τὸ θεῖον, ἀλλ' ἔχει συνιέναι   394 a

a MS.   392. ἡ δέ γ' ἐλπίς, οἶμαι μέν PL, ἦγε δ' ἐλπίς κ.τ.λ. Matthiae and
Seyffert, ἡ γὰρ ἐλπίς κ.τ.λ. Hennig, ἡ δέ σφ' ἐλπίς ὥρμαινεν Herwerden: it
seems to me that all these changes are for the worse. See Expl. Notes.   393.
κἀξέπραξεν 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' εἴση PL,
only in P a γ is inserted by a later hand after στράτευε and before the stop.   στράτευ'
ἕτοιμοι δ' εἰσὶ 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. ὅρκους.   Though most modern editors adopt
Monk's emendation, they do not, as he did, regard ἕτ. δ' εἰσὶ 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 ὅρκον] 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 Eliza-
beth'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 commen-
tators 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 αὐτό, and indeed
the whole three lines, is an explanation
of the words θεοῦ σοι τὴν τύχην διδόντος
εὖ 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 personifica-
tion of ἐλπίς cf. Troades 987 ff. ἦν οὑμὸς
υἱὸς κάλλος εὐπρεπέστατος ὁ σὸς δ' ἰδών
νιν 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 fit dira cupido?
Headlam well quotes Theognis 1135 ἐλπὶς
ἐν ἀνθρώποις μούνη θεὸς ἐσθλὴ ἔνεστιν and
also ib. 637 f.

394 a.   This v. seems to be mainly a
comment on the word μωρίᾳ, 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 ὅρκους καὶ κατηναγκασμένους. 395
τἀμὰ δ' οὐκ ἀποκτενῶ 'γὼ τέκνα· κοὐ τὸ σὸν μὲν εὖ
παρὰ δίκην ἔσται κακίστης εὐνιδος τιμωρίᾳ,
ἐμὲ δὲ συντήξουσι νύκτες ἡμέραι τε δακρύοις,
ἄνομα δρῶντα κοὐ δίκαια παῖδας οὓς ἐγεινάμην.
βραχέα ταῦτά σοι λέλεκται καὶ σαφῆ καὶ ῥᾴδια· 400
εἰ δὲ μὴ βούλει φρονεῖν σύ, τἄμ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς.

ΧΟ. οἶδ' αὖ διάφοροι τῶν πάρος λελεγμένων
μύθων, καλῶς δ' ἔχουσι, φείδεσθαι τέκνων.

ΜΕ. αἰαῖ, φίλους ἄρ' οὐχὶ κεκτήμην τάλας.

Theophilus *ad Autolycum* II. 54, [37] and Stobaeus *Anth.* 28, 10. **395.** συνη-
ναγκασμένους PL, κατηναγκασμένους Theoph. and Stob. **396.** καὶ τὸ σὸν PL,
κοὐ 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
τιμωρίᾳ (it is true that the mss. omit the ι subscr., but so they do constantly in
datives, *e.g.* μωρίᾳ 393, εὐβουλίᾳ 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.** ἐγείναμεν PL, corr. by an early hand in L
to ἐγεινάμην. **400.** ῥᾴδια 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 κεκτήμην PL, ἄρ' οὐκ ἐκεκτήμην Heath,
ἂν οὐχὶ κεκτήμην 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. κοὐ κ.τ.λ.] for the idiomatic οὐ
negativing both a μέν and a δέ clause cf.
I. T. 116 f. οὗτοι μακρὸν μὲν ἤλθομεν
κώπῃ πόρον, ἐκ τερμάτων δὲ νόστον
ἀροῦμεν πάλιν.

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

398. With this *v.* is compared the
varying construction at *Med.* 25 τὸν πάντα
συντήκουσα δακρύοις χρόνον, *ib.* 141 ἡ δ' ἐν
θαλάμοις τήκει βιοτήν: Monk adds Ω 714
νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα 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 πράξειν. *Hel.* 814
δρῶντας γὰρ ἢ μὴ δρῶντας ἥδιον θανεῖν.

401. τἀμά] just like the τὸ σόν in
v. 396.

403. φείδεσθαι] a variety of the *im-
perative* use of the inf. Cf. *Tro.* 1031
νόμον δὲ τόνδε ταῖς ἄλλαισι θὲς γυναιξί,
θνῄσκειν ἥτις ἂν προδῷ πόσιν. Cf. also
Soph. *Ai.* 1264 and *v.* 512 below. (See
however Crit. N. for a suggested altera-
tion.)

404. Markland compares *Or.* 721
ἄφιλος ἦσθ' ἄρ' ὦ πάτερ πράσσων κακῶς.
κεκτήμην 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 πατρὸς ἐκ ταὐτοῦ γεγώς;

ΑΓΑ. συνσωφρονεῖν γὰρ οὐχὶ συννοσεῖν ἔφυν.

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. σκήπτρῳ νυν αὔχει, σὸν κασίγνητον προδούς.

*   *   *   *   *   *

[ἐγὼ δ' ἐπ' ἄλλας εἶμι μηχανάς τινας,

line a question.   407. συνσωφρονεῖν σοι βούλομ' ἀλλ' οὐ συννοσεῖν PL, συσσω-
φρονεῖν γάρ, οὐχὶ συννοσεῖν ἔφυ 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 οὔτοι συνεχθεῖν ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν, and like Nauck, Vitelli, Weil
and Wecklein prefers some emendation (βουλόμεσθ' οὐ Fix, βούλομαι κοῦ N., θέλομεν
ἀλλ' οὐ, and later βουλόμενος οὐ Vitelli, συνσωφρονεῖν ἕτοιμος, ἀλλ' οὐ Wecklein) which
will remove the impossible elision of the αι 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 ἔφυ for ἔφυν
was an intentional modification of what Euripides wrote, which may have been τάρ'.
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. θεὸν PL, θεῶν Porson.   412. αὐχεῖς 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 interpo-
lation. 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
(τῇ σῇ 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 λυπρόν,
συνασοφεῖν τοῖς μὴ σοφοῖς.

408. ἐς κοινόν] Adverbial phrases con-
sisting 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 ταπεινές v. 379. Cf. Soph.
Phil. 594 πρὸς ἰσχύος κράτος.

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,
Ἀγάμεμνον, ἥκω παῖδά σοι τὴν σὴν ἄγων,   415
ἣν Ἰφιγένειαν ὠνόμαξας ἐν δόμοις.
μήτηρ δ᾽ ὁμαρτεῖ, σῆς Κλυταιμνήστρας δέμας,
[καὶ παῖς Ὀρέστης, ὥστε τερφθείης ἰδών,]
χρόνον παλαιὸν δωμάτων ἔκδημος ὤν.
ἀλλ᾽ ὡς μακρὰν ἔτεινον, εὔρυτον παρὰ   420
κρήνην ἀναψύχουσι θηλύπουν βάσιν,
αὐταί τε πῶλοί τ᾽· εἰς δὲ λειμώνων χλόην
καθεῖμεν 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᾽. ὠνόμαζες Markl. 417. ὁμαρτεῖ L, ὁμαρτοῖ corrected by an early hand to ὁμαρτεῖ P. σῆς Κλυταιμνήστρας δέμας PL, σὴ Κλυταιμνήστρα δάμαρ Elmsley. 418. ὥστε τερφθείης PL, actually defended by Hartung, Firnhaber and Klotz, ὥς 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 καθίεμεν τάσδ᾽ in v. 423.—(ἀφεῖμεν αὐτάς Hennig). 422. αὐταί 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 Ἡρακληείη.

418. Paley quotes *Ion* 1375 f. (καί τι τερφθῆναι βίου) in support of Hermann's ὥς τι τερφθείης.

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

λόγον μακρὸν ἀποτείνειν, '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.

www.libtool.com.cn

ἥκω· πέπυσται γὰρ στρατός, ταχεῖα γὰρ   425
διῆξε φήμη, παῖδα σὴν ἀφιγμένην.
πᾶς δ' εἰς θέαν ὅμιλος ἔρχεται δρόμῳ,
σὴν παῖδ' ὅπως ἴδωσιν· οἱ δ' εὐδαίμονες
ἐν πᾶσι κλεινοὶ καὶ περίβλεπτοι βροτοῖς.
λέγουσι δ'· ὑμέναιός τις ἢ τί πράσσεται;   430
ἢ πόθον ἔχων θυγατρὸς Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ
ἐκόμισε παῖδα; τῶν δ' ἂν ἤκουσας τάδε·
Ἀρτέμιδι προτελίζουσι τὴν νεάνιδα,
Αὐλίδος ἀνάσσῃ. τίς νιν ἄξεταί ποτε;
ἀλλ' εἶα, τἀπὶ τοισίδ' ἐξάρχου κανᾶ,   435
στεφανοῦσθε κρᾶτα καὶ σύ, Μενέλεως ἄναξ,

Markland, αὐτοῖσι (? for αὐταῖσι) πώλοις Porson, ἵπποι τε πῶλοί 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. τοισίδ'
P, τοῖσιν L (the ν being by an early hand in an erasure).   436. 'Aut spurius

425 f. **ταχεῖα γὰρ διῆξε φήμη**] a paren-
thesis. It is possible that διῆξε was in-
tended by the writer to be a gnomic
aorist.

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

432. **ἂν ἤκουσας**] probably a mix-
ture of the *iterative* ἂν with the aor. ind.
(cf. Ar. *Lysistr.* 510 καὶ πολλάκις ἔνδον
ἂν οὖσαι ἠκούσαμεν ἄν τι κακῶς ὑμᾶς βου-
λευσαμένους μέγα πρᾶγμα) and the indefi-
nite, 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 pas-
sage. At Pollux 3, 38 in an account of
the pre-nuptial consecration only one
MS. has προτελίζεσθαι and προὐτέλιζον for

the more usual προτελεῖσθαι and προὐτέ-
λουν. 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. **ἄξεται**] 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 (ἐνῆρκται μὲν τὰ
κανᾶ) and Eur. *El.* 1142 (κανοῦν δ' ἐνῆρ-
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. εὐτρέ-
πιζε is very imperfectly palliated by the
awkward introduction of Menelaus. About
this point the interpolator (luckily) shows
signs of fatigue.

ὑμέναιον εὐτρέπιζε καὶ κατὰ στέγας
λωτὸς βοάσθω καὶ ποδῶν ἔστω κτύπος·
φῶς γὰρ τόδ᾽ ἥκει μακάριον τῇ παρθένῳ.

ΑΓΑ. ἐπήνεσ᾽· ἀλλὰ στεῖχε δωμάτων ἔσω·   440
τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἰούσης τῆς τύχης ἔσται καλῶς.]

*   *   *   *   *

ΑΓΑ. οἴμοι, τί φῶ δύστηνος; ἄρξομαι πόθεν;
εἰς οἷ᾽ ἀνάγκης ζεύγματ᾽ ἐμπεπτώκαμεν.
ὑπῆλθε δαίμων, ὥστε τῶν σοφισμάτων
πολλῷ γενέσθαι τῶν ἐμῶν σοφώτερος.   445
ἡ δυσγένεια δ᾽ ὡς ἔχει τι χρήσιμον.

aut corruptus' Nauck. Herm. (*Opusc.*) inserted φύλλοις before κρᾶτα and omits the next six words.   438. λοτὸς corr. (as in P, in *v.* 375 ἄρχον to ἄρχων) to λωτὸς PL.   441. ἰούσης PL, ἐώσης Lenting.   442. ἄξομαι PL, ἄρξωμαι Burges, σέθεν PI., 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 οἷα· εἰς οἷα 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 ἰούσης 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 ἕξει (καλῶς ἔσται ἢν θεὸς θέλῃ 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 οἷα** = ὅτι εἰς τοιαῦτα.

444. **ὑπῆλθεν**] 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 μόνοις, also Plat. *Ap.* 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 ῥᾳδίως αὐτοῖς ἔχει,
ἅπαντά τ' εἰπεῖν. τῷ δὲ γενναίῳ φύσιν
ἄνολβα ταῦτα. προστάτην δὲ τοῦ βίου
τὸν ὄγκον ἔχομεν τῷ τ' ὄχλῳ δουλεύομεν.   450
ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκβαλεῖν μὲν αἰδοῦμαι δάκρυ,
τὸ μὴ δακρῦσαι δ' αὖθις οὐ σθένω τάλας,
εἰς τὰς μεγίστας συμφορὰς ἀφιγμένος.
[εἶεν, τί φήσω πρὸς δάμαρτα τὴν ἐμήν;
πῶς δέξομαί νιν; ποῖον ὄμμα συμβάλω;   455
καὶ γάρ 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' ὄχλῳ δουλεύομεν (τὸν δῆμον, and τῷ τ' PL). Firm-
haber, 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' ὄγκῳ 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 ὄχλῳ.)   452. αὖτις 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.   *vv.* 454—459. I think these words are an interpolation by
the hand of the interpolator of *vv.* 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
vv. 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' ἔκβαλε θερμά, below *v.* 477,
Hec. 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...ἐλθοῦσα**] At *v.*
1237 below ἐλθεῖν ἐπί with the dat. is
used in quite a different sense. There
ἐπί means *with a view to,* here *on the top
of* or *in the midst of.*

ἐλθοῦσ' ἄκλητος. εἰκότως δ' ἅμ' ἕσπετο
θυγατρὶ, νυμφεύουσα καὶ τὰ φίλτατα
δώσουσ', ἵν' ἡμᾶς ὄντας εὑρήσει κακούς.]
τὴν δ' αὖ τάλαιναν παρθένον· τί παρθένον;   460
"Αιδης νιν ὡς ἔοικε νυμφεύσει τάχα·
ὡς ᾤκτισ'· [οἶμαι γάρ νιν ἱκετεύσειν τάδε·
ὦ πάτερ, ἀποκτενεῖς με; τοιούτους γάμους
γήμειας αὐτὸς χὥστις ἐστί σοι φίλος.
παρὼν δ' Ὀρέστης ἐγγὺς ἀναβοήσεται   465
οὐ συνετὰ συνετῶς· ἔτι γάρ ἐστι νήπιος.
αἰαῖ, τὸν] Ἑλένης ὥς μ' ἀπώλεσεν γάμον
γήμας ὁ Πριάμου Πάρις, ὅ μ' εἴργασται τάδε.

πάρα (by Musurus?) in P: in L ὑπῆρχε is written over πάρος by m². **458.** νυμ-φεύουσα PL, νυμφεύσουσα Markland (cf. on v. 885). **vv. 462—467.** I believe from οἶμαι in 462 to τόν 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* (ἱκετεῦσαι). 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. 1. 358), that *vv.* 468 and 469 are what the Baby is supposed to call out (ἀναβοήσεται). **462.** ἱκετεῦσαι 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 δ' μ' PL. Porson (on *Hec.* 13 where see his note) approves of Markland's (so also Musgrave and Heath) δ μ', but most editors have followed the alternative suggestion of Heath and Markland to reject the μ'. Surely it is more likely that the δ 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 ʃ 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 "Αιδης Ἀχιλλεὺς ἦν ἄρ', οὐχ ὁ Πηλέως ὅν μοι προτείνας πόσιν 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. *Tro.* 625 Ταλθύβιος αἴνιγμ' οὐ σαφῶς εἶπεν σαφές. Cp. also *Phoen.* 1506, and *I. T.* 1092.

www.libtool.com.cn

XO.   κἀγὼ κατῴκτιρ', ὡς γυναῖκα δεῖ ξένην
      ὑπὲρ τυράννων συμφορᾶς καταστένειν.   470

ME.   ἀδελφέ, δός μοι δεξιᾶς τῆς σῆς θιγεῖν.

ΑΓΑ. δίδωμι· σὸν γὰρ τὸ κράτος, ἄθλιος δ' ἐγώ.

ME.   Πέλοπα κατόμνυμ', ὃς πατὴρ τοὐμοῦ πατρὸς
      τοῦ σοῦ τ' ἐκλήθη, τὸν τεκόντα τ' Ἀτρέα,
      ἦ μὴν ἐρεῖν σοι τἀπὸ καρδίας σαφῶς   475
      καὶ μὴ 'πίτηδες μηδὲν ἀλλ' ὅσον φρονῶ.
      ἐγώ σ' ἀπ' ὄσσων ἐκβαλόντ' ἰδὼν δάκρυ
      ᾤκτιρα καὐτὸς ἀνταφῆκά σοι πάλιν
      καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἐξαφίσταμαι λόγων,
      οὐκ εἰς σὲ δεινός· εἰμι δ' οὖπερ 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 αἰαῖ.   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 (οἶδ' 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 συμφοράς.   481. τέκνον PL, τέκνα Elmsley. A very likely mistake; since the next line ends in ον and the

469. ὡς] The sense shows this to be not *causal* ('since') but *limiting* ('in as far as'). Firnh. 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 Firnhaber 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. ἀνταφῆκα] With this word is coupled ἐξαφίσταμαι and therefore to complete the sense of the former verb we must supply τοὺς παλαιοὺς 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, αἷσι 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 τοὐμόν. οὐ γὰρ ἔνδικον
σὲ μὲν στενάζειν, τἀμὰ δ' ἡδέως ἔχειν,
θνήσκειν τε τοὺς σούς, τοὺς δ' ἐμοὺς ὁρᾶν φάος.
τί βούλομαι γάρ; οὐ γάμους ἐξαιρέτους   485
ἄλλους λάβοιμ' ἄν, εἰ γάμων ἱμείρομαι;
ἀλλ' ἀπολέσας ἀδελφόν, ὅν μ' ἥκιστ' ἐχρῆν,
Ἑλένην ἕλωμαι, τὸ κακὸν ἀντὶ τἀγαθοῦ;
ἄφρων νέος τ' ἦ πρίν· τὰ πράγματ' ἐγγύθεν
σκοπῶν ἐσεῖδον οἷον ἦν κτείνειν τέκνα.   490
ἄλλως τέ μ' ἔλεος τῆς ταλαιπώρου κόρης
εἰσῆλθε, συγγένειαν ἐννοουμένῳ,
ἣ τῶν ἐμῶν ἕκατι θύεσθαι γάμων
μέλλει. τί δ' Ἑλένης παρθένῳ τῇ σῇ μέτα;
ἴτω στρατεία διαλυθεῖσ' ἐξ Αὐλίδος.   495
σὺ δ' ὄμμα παῦσαι δακρύοις τέγγων τὸ σόν,
ἀδελφέ, κἀμὲ παρακαλῶν εἰς δάκρυα.

three previous and the two following *vv.* all end in *ν*: again, τέκνα is better than τέκνον for the reason that the latter would make the following τοὐμόν ambiguous. Elmsley also proposed ἀποκτεῖναι 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 πρίν, and take it as a conjunction (*until*) with ἐσεῖδον. 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. ἐννοουμένῳ P, ἐννοούμενῳ L.   495. στρατιά PL, στρατεία Barnes. διαλυθεῖσ' P, διαλυσεῖσ' L, corrected by an early hand to διαλυθεῖσ'.   496. τέγκων P, τέγγων L.   498.

482. μήτ' ἀνθελέσθαι τοὐμόν] 'nor to put my interests in the place of your own'. Paley notices that Hesych. gives προκρῖναι 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 χρηστὰ λέκτρα there with the γάμοι ἐξαίρετοι here.

489. νέος] 'impatient'. For ἦ cf. Rutherford *New Phryn.* p. 242 ff.

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

492. ἐννοουμένῳ] 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 'μοὶ μετέστω· σοὶ νέμω τοὐμὸν μέρος.
ἀλλ' εἰς μεταβολὰς ἦλθον ἀπὸ δεινῶν λόγων.   500
εἰκὸς πέπονθα· τὸν ὁμόθεν πεφυκότα
στέργων μετέπεσον. ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ τόδε,
τρόποισι χρῆσθαι τοῖσι βελτίστοις ἀεί.
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, μὴ 'μοί Herm.   500. ἀλλ'
εἰς PL, εἰ δ' ἐς Herm. (*Opusc.*).   502 f. τρόποι with αι written over the οι
probably by the first hand PL. (Wilamowitz is wrong about P), τοιοίδε P, τοιαίδε
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 τοιοίδε and τροπαὶ τοιαίδε—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 ἀεί.—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 Agamem-
non'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 an-
other matter; I at all events do not wish
to be the gainer by such a sacrifice'. In
the words σοὶ νέμω τοὐμὸν μέρος he says
the same thing over again, rather fanci-
fully pursuing the idea of representing
his claim as a kind of commercial obliga-
tion: '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 sen-
tences 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 objec-
tion 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 con-
text 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 καταισχύνεις σέθεν.   505

ΑΓΑ. αἰνῶ σε, Μενέλεως, ὅτι παρὰ γνώμην ἐμὴν
     ὑπέθηκας ὀρθῶς τοὺς λόγους σοῦ τ' ἀξίως.

[ΜΕ. ταραχή γ' ἀδελφῶν γε δι' ἔρωτα γίγνεται
     πλεονεξίαν τε δωμάτων· ἀπέπτυσα
     τοιάνδε συγγένειαν ἀλλήλοιν πικράν.   510

ΑΓΑ.] ἀλλ' ἥκομεν γὰρ εἰς ἀναγκαίας τύχας,
     θυγατρὸς αἱματηρὸν ἐκπρᾶξαι φόνον.

ΜΕ. πῶς; τίς δ' ἀναγκάσει σε τήν γε σὴν κτανεῖν;

ΑΓΑ. ἅπας Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος στρατεύματος.

ΜΕ. οὔκ, ἤν νιν Ἄργος ἐξαποστείλης πάλιν.   515

γενναῖα λέξας, Herm. προγόνους δ'.   505. καταισχύνεις P, καταισχύνεῖς 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. ταραχή γ' PL, ταραχὴ 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 Ἀργείων, 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'), διά τ' ἔρωτα Dobree. ἀλλήλων PL, ἀλλήλοιν 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—ταραχή 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 m² 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. ἤν (not ἦν) L, in P the letter between the ἤ and the νιν is in an
erasure and a small blot: together the two letters look like ᾐ, and a ν is written

---

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

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. ἐκπρᾶξαι] 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 χρὴ λίαν ταρβεῖν ὄχλον.
ΑΓΑ. Κάλχας ἐρεῖ μαντεύματ᾽ Ἀργείων στρατῷ.
ΜΕ. οὔκ, ἢν θάνῃ γε πρόσθε· τοῦτο δ᾽ εὐμαρές.
[ΑΓΑ. τὸ μαντικὸν πᾶν σπέρμα φιλότιμον κακόν.   520
ΜΕ. κοὐδέν γ᾽ ἄχρηστον οὐδὲ χρήσιμον παρόν.]
ΑΓΑ. ἐκεῖνο δ᾽ οὐ δέδοικας οὔμ᾽ ἐσέρχεται;

above it.—εἰς Ἄργος ἀποστελεῖς PL, a γ᾽ being inserted between the words in both, certainly not by the first hand. ἀποστείλῃς 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 Ἄργος ἐξαποστείλῃς. (I had conjectured εἰσαποστείλῃς—and that εἰς had been by mistake put before Ἄργος by someone who did not see that it belonged to the verb. I now think Kirchhoff's the more likely word, and that the εἰς was originally an interlinear explanation which got by mistake into the text and necessitated the expulsion of the ἐξ-). As to the -στείλῃς 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 καταισχυνεῖς 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. *Ant.* 1055.—ἄχρηστον οὐδὲ χρήσιμον like our 'good or bad'.)   522. ὅ 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 ἀεί 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. ὃν μὴ σὺ φράζεις, πῶς ὑπολάβοιμ' ἂν λόγον;
ΑΓΑ. τὸ Σισύφειον σπέρμα πάντ' οἶδεν τάδε.
ΜΕ. οὐκ ἔστ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ὅ τι σὲ κἀμὲ πημανεῖ.   525
ΑΓΑ. ποικίλος ἀεὶ πέφυκε τοῦ τ' ὄχλου μέτα.
ΜΕ. φιλοτιμίᾳ μὲν ἐνέχεται, δεινῷ κακῷ.

*   *   *   *   *

[ΑΓΑ. οὐκοῦν δόκει νιν στάντ' ἐν Ἀργείοις μέσοις

letters), οὔμ' Markland. εἰσ- PL, ἐσ- Wunder.   523. ὑπολαβοιμεν PL, ὑπολάβοιμ'
ἂν Markland.   524. εἴδε P (a later hand—possibly that of Musurus—has written
an o 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 *two* 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 *Hec.* 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.
vv. 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 (*quamobrem*) which is by many (and I believe rightly) regarded as
inadmissible for tragedy and even for Attic prose of that period. (2) κᾆτα 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 Ἀργείους *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 baulked 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 ἐλαχίστοις in the sense of *fewest*,
and the unusual phrase σιγὴν φυλάσσετε in *v.* 542. (7) Lastly it must be remembered
that the reference to Clytaemnestra's presence in the camp (*vv.* 538 ff.) is inconsistent
with the view expressed above on *vv.* 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 φιλάρ-
γυρον εἶναι ὄνειδος λέγεταί τε καὶ ἔστιν;

We hear a good deal about φιλοτιμία in
this play.

www.libtool.com.cn

λέξειν ἃ Κάλχας θέσφατ' ἐξηγήσατο,
κἄμ' ὡς ὑπέστην θῦμα, κᾆτα ψεύδομαι,   530
'Αρτέμιδι θύσειν· ὃς ξυναρπάσας στρατόν,
σὲ κἄμ' ἀποκτείναντας 'Αργείους κόρην
σφάξαι κελεύσει. κἂν πρὸς "Αργος ἐκφύγω,
ἐλθόντες αὐτοῖς τείχεσιν Κυκλωπίοις
ξυναρπάσουσι καὶ κατασκάψουσι γῆν.   535
τοιαῦτα τἀμὰ πήματ'. ὦ τάλας ἐγώ,
ὡς ἠπόρημαι πρὸς θεῶν τὰ νῦν τάδε.
ἕν μοι φύλαξον, Μενέλεως, ἀνὰ στρατὸν
ἐλθών, ὅπως ἂν μὴ Κλυταιμνήστρα τάδε
μάθῃ, πρὶν "Αιδῃ παῖδ' ἐμὴν προσθῶ λαβών,   540
ὡς ἐπ' ἐλαχίστοις δακρύοις πράσσω κακῶς.
ὑμεῖς τε σιγήν, ὦ ξέναι, φυλάσσετε.]

ΣΤΆϹΙΜΟΝ ᾱ'.

XO.   μάκαρες οἳ 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 δόκει PL, οὔκουν δοκεῖς
(as a question) Musgrave.   νῦν P (with δὴ written over it by an early hand), νυ 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 *v* added by
a later hand in P and an early one in L.—κυκλωπείοις PL, corrected by an early hand
in P to κυκλωπίοις.   **535.** συναρπάσουσι PL, ἀνασπάσουσι or ἀναρπάσουσι
Markland.   **541.** χὡς 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 ψεύδο-
μαι. For κᾆτα ψεύδομαι cp. Xen. *Mem.*
I, 1, 5 προαγορεύων ὡς ὑπὸ θεοῦ φαινόμενα
κᾆτα ψευδόμενος.

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

538 ff. It is not at all clear how
Menelaus when he went among the
Greek soldiers could prevent Clytaem-
nestra'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 πράσσω κακῶς is an
inadequate expression for his contem-
plated 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
γαλανείᾳ χρησάμενοι
μανιάδων οἴστρων, ὅθι δὴ
δίδυμ' Ἔρως ὁ χρυσοκόμας
τόξ' ἐντείνεται χαρίτων,
τὸ μὲν ἐπ' εὐαίωνι πότμῳ,　　　　　　　　　550
τὸ δ' ἐπὶ συγχύσει βιοτᾶς.
ἀπενέπω νιν ἀμετέρων,

ἀναπαιστικὰ ἰαμβικά.—Over μάκαρες in L an early hand has written εἰσίν.　545.
λέκτρων PL, θέλκτρων 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 a is written
over ἔρως and β over ὁ χρ.　550. πότμῳ PL, τύχᾳ Athenaeus (see Introduction
p. xix).　552. ἀπεννέπων, 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 σύγχυσιν βίου recalls
the ἐπὶ συγχύσει βιοτᾶς of *v.* 551), and
the 2nd stasimon of the *Medea* (*vv.* 627
ff.). Firnhaber 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 'A.] ' 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 σωφροσύ-
νης κῦρσαι θνητοῖσιν ἄριστον, where it
may be taken either way.

547. ὅθι δή] ' Herein ', ὅθι for οὗ
is found only in the lyric parts of
tragedy. οὗ δή 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. ἐντείνεται] The middle is ex-
traordinary, but is supported by the
above-mentioned quotation in Athenaeus,
by Xen. *Cyr.* 4, 1, 3, where τόξα ἐντεί-
νασθαι and ἀνατεταμένος τὴν μάχαιραν
occur, by τείνεσθαι τόξον which is quoted
from Ap. Rhod. 2, 1043, by the common
Epic τόξα τανυσσάμενος, also by a passage
in Alexander Noumenius (Walz *Rhett.*
9, 271, 16 ἔρωτα παρεῖναι τόξα μὲν ἐντεινα-
μένους 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 λώβᾳ
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᾽ ὅσιοι,   555
καὶ μετέχοιμι τᾶς Ἀφροδί-
τας, πολλὰν δ᾽ ἀποθείμαν.

διάφοροι δὲ φύσεις βροτῶν,   ἀντ.
διάφοροι δὲ τρόποι· τὸ δ᾽ ὀρ-
θῶς ἐσθλὸν σαφὲς ἀεί·   560
τροφαί θ᾽ αἱ παιδευόμεναι
μέγα φέρουσ᾽ εἰς τὰν ἀρετάν·

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 τρόποις· ὁ δ᾽ ὀρθὸς 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.   ἀεί PL, corrected in P to
ἀεί.   561. πεδευόμεναι corr. (by p. m.) to παιδευόμεναι P.   562. εἰς τάν

Soph. *Trach.* 145 νιν is possibly corrupt,
and at best refers to a person—τὸ νέαζον)
it is best to refer it to Ἔρως : *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, δια-
λεκτέον ʻεἴης μοι, μέτριον δέ πως [Matt.
δέπας] εἴης, μήδ᾽ ἀπολείποις᾽) 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 μέν in *v.* 554, and the emphasis
thus given to the antithesis between με-
τρία and πολλάν, 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.

vv. 558—567. ʻOne 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 σαφές 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 ʻ*un
trésor assuré*᾽.

vv. 561 ff. Cp. *Hec.* 600 ff. ἔχει γέ τοι
τι καὶ τὸ θρεφθῆναι καλῶς δίδαξιν ἐσθλοῦ·
τοῦτο δ᾽ ἢν τις εὖ μάθῃ, οἶδεν τό γ᾽ αἰσ-
χρόν, κανόνι τοῦ καλοῦ μετρῶν. 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　　　　　　　　565
τὸ δέον, ἔνθα δόξα φέρει
κλέος ἀγήρατον βιοτᾷ.
μέγα τι θηρεύειν ἀρετάν,
γυναιξὶ μὲν κατὰ Κύπριν,
κρυπτάν τ', ἐν ἀνδράσι δ' αὖ　　　　　　　　570
κόσμος ἐνὼν ὁ μυριοπλη-
θὴς μείζω πόλιν αὔξει.

ἔμολες, ὦ Πάρις, ᾖτε σύ γε　　　　　　ἐπῳδός

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 μαινόμεν' ἄστρων ὅθι δή, the MSS. reading in v. 547. The words μέγα φέρουσ' εἰς look to me like a 'gloss'. Neither here nor at v. 547 do I think we have the right reading.　　563. σοφία PL, σοφίᾳ 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, βιοτᾷ 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. ἔνδον PL, ἐνὼν Markland. If this emendation is correct, we may suppose first that o 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 ᾖτε σύγε in v. 573 most commentators agree in regarding as hopeless. I am surprised that many think ἐτράφης (either after εὖτε or ἔνθα, 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. ἔνθα] 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 (μυριοπληθής), and has a larger sphere.

571. As an analogy to κόσμος ἐνών Markland quotes ὁπόταν καλοὶ ἐν ψυχῇ λόγοι ἐνόντες 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 Οὐλύμπου καλάμοις
μιμήματα πνέων,
εὔθηλοι δὲ τρέφοντο βοες,
ὅτι σε κρίσις ἔμηνε 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, ?Ἴδας. 577. Ὀλύμπου PL, Οὐλύμπου 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. ἔμενε PL, ἔμηνε 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 οὗ is adopted). ὅς PL, οὗ 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· ὥς 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.

576. Φρυγίων αὐλῶν] This amounts to calling Olympus a Phrygian: he is

generally spoken of as a Mysian. Cp. Suidas *s.v.* Ὄλυμπος, though *s.v.* ξυναυλίαν he says O. taught in Phrygia.

588 f. The hiatus between ἄγει and εἰς is remarkable.

[ἰὼ ἰώ· μεγάλαι μεγάλων   590
εὐδαιμονίαι· τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως
ἴδετ᾽ Ἰφιγένειαν ἄνασσαν ἐμὴν
τὴν Τυνδαρέου τε Κλυταιμνήστραν,

πέργαμα PL, εἰς πέργ. Τρ. 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
iambics 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 iambics. *E.g.*
Nauck rejects all from 619—637, excepting *vv.* 633 and 634, Kirchhoff 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 epeisodion, 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
epeisodion 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 iambics 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 L
μεγάλαι, which was first written in the line with ἰὼ ἰώ and then erased, is in an
erasure at the beginning of a fresh line.   592. εἶδετ᾽ PL. No editions seem to
have had this reading, but curiously enough Matthiae introduces εἶδετ᾽ as a correction
being, like Markland, under the impression that the first syllable of Ἰφιγένεια was
short. No doubt the composer of these lines was not responsible for the ἐμήν, which
was very likely put in by the same metrical "improver" who altered ἴδετ᾽ to εἶδετ᾽,
and introduced the articles in *vv.* 597 and 600.   593. γε PL, τε Ald.

593. **Τυνδαρέου**] this Epic form occurs   sages, the latter, like the present, ana-
also at *El.* 117 and 989, both lyric pas-   paestic. In the iambic parts of tragedy

ὡς ἐκ μεγάλων ἐβλαστήκασ'
ἐπί τ' εὐμήκεις ἥκουσι τύχας.   595
θεοί γ' οἱ κρείσσους οἵ τ' ὀλβοφόροι
τοῖς οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι θνατῶν.]
[στῶμεν, Χαλκίδος ἔκγονα θρέμματα,
τὴν βασίλειαν δεξώμεθ' ὄχων
ἄπο μὴ σφαλερῶς ἐπὶ γαῖαν,   600
ἀγανῶς δὲ χεροῖν μαλακῇ γνώμῃ,
μὴ ταρβήσῃ νεωστί μοι μολὸν
κλεινὸν τέκνον Ἀγαμέμνονος,
μηδὲ θόρυβον μηδ' 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
διὰ τὸ μέτρον referring expressly to the ο) L.—ὄχλων PL, ὄχων Canter.   600. τὴν
inserted by an early hand in P and L before γαῖαν. 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 ει 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 εὐμή-
κεις gives the necessary hint of a good
meaning in the τύχας.

596. ὀλβοφόροι] For similar com-
pounds cf. Hipp. 750 χθὼν ὀλβιόδωρος,
Bacch. 419 ὀλβοδότειραν Εἰρήναν, 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 com-
mentators (e.g. Musgrave and Weil) to
take the -φόρος as in ἀθλοφόρος, μισθοφό-
ρος to indicate the recipient.

598. στῶμεν] Hartung (Introd. pp.

72 f.) is of opinion that the 'homo pin-
guissimi et hebetissimi ingenii' who fabri-
cated vv. 598—606, got his material out
of vv. 613 ff. Certainly no better expla-
nation can be given of this senseless στῶ-
μεν, than that it is so due to the στῆτε 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 ἐνδότω (for δότω) in
617, and the ὡς ἂν (for ὡς) in 618, and
the Νηρηΐδος in 624 reveal the versifica-
tor.

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).

www.libtool.com.cn

Ἐπεισόδιον δ΄.

ΚΛ. [ὄρνιθα μὲν τόνδ᾿ αἴσιον ποιούμεθα,
τὸ σόν τε χρηστὸν καὶ λόγων εὐφημίαν·
ἐλπίδα δ᾿ ἔχω τιν᾿ ὡς ἐπ᾿ ἐσθλοῖσιν γάμοις
πάρειμι νυμφαγωγός. ἀλλ᾿ ὀχημάτων   610
ἔξω πορεύεθ᾿ ἃς φέρω φερνὰς κόρῃ,
καὶ πέμπετ᾿ εἰς μέλαθρον εὐλαβούμενοι.
σὺ δ᾿, ὦ τέκνον μοι, λεῖπε πωλικοὺς ὄχους,
ἁβρὸν τιθεῖσα κῶλον ἀσθενές θ᾿ ἅμα.
ὑμεῖς δὲ νεανίαις νιν ἀγκάλαις ἔπι   615
δέξασθε καὶ πορεύσατ᾿ ἐξ ὀχημάτων.
καί μοι χερός τις ἐνδότω στηρίγματα,

χ of παρέχωμεν.   609. ἐσθλοῖσι P, ἐσθλοῖσιν (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᾿ ἅμα PL, χαμαί (with ἀσφαλῶς for ἀσθενές) Herm., ποδός Hennig (who takes ἁβρόν adverbially), I think however that it is more like the 'versificator' as it stands:—the phrase ἁβρὸν τιθεῖσα κῶλον being modelled on ἁβ. πόδα τιθεὶς Hel. 1528, and ὠκὺν πόδα τιθεὶς I. T. 33, and the ἀσθενές θ᾿ ἅμα being added to make up the verse.   615. νεανίαισιν P, νεανίδεσσιν (the εσ being a correction of an early hand for αι) L, νεάνιδές 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. νεανίας· 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 νεᾱ- in νεανίας or its derivatives was ever scanned as one syllable. At Ar. *Vesp.* 1067 and 1069 Dind. is very likely right in reading νᾱν-. 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᾿ ἐξ ὀχημάτων**] 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.
αἱ δ' εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν στῆτε πωλικῶν ζυγῶν,
φοβερὸν γὰρ ἀπαράμυθον ὄμμα πωλικόν· 620
καὶ παῖδα τόνδε τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος γόνον
λάζυσθ', Ὀρέστην· ἔτι γάρ ἐστι νήπιος.
τέκνον, καθεύδεις πωλικῷ δαμεὶς ὄχῳ;
ἔγειρ' ἀδελφῆς ἐφ' ὑμέναιον εὐτυχῶς·
ἀνδρὸς γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ κῆδος αὐτὸς ἐσθλὸς ὢν 625
λήψει, τὸ τῆς Νηρῇδος ἰσόθεον γένος.
ἑξῆς κάθησο δεῦρό μου ποδός, τέκνον,
πρὸς μητέρ', Ἰφιγένεια, μακαρίαν δέ με

necessary, as the men addressed are the same as those addressed in *vv.* 610—612.
619. αἱ δ' PL, οἱ δ' Dobree, which would remove some absurdity.   623. θακεύ-
εις corrected by a late hand to καθεύδεις P, θακεύεις L.   626. νηρηΐδος corrected
to νηρῃδος P, νηρῇδος L (Milton suggested τὸ Νήρεως παιδὸς, Portus τὸ τῆς Νηρῇδος.

619. **αἱ δ'**] It would be difficult to find another instance of the article used, as οὗτος 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 = οὗτος, it could stand, like it, as a vocative.

620. In both MSS. this line is marked as a beauty (ὡρ. for ὡραῖον) ! 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 ὂν 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. **δαμείς**] Weil translates 'assoupi', taking the word to be used in the sense of the Homeric μαλακῷ δεδμημένοι ὕπνῳ 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 *wearied*,

worn out, i.e. in the sense of the κόπῳ δαμέντες of *Rhes.* 764.

624. **ἔγειρ'**] for ἐγείρου: very suspicious, in spite of Porson's note on *Or.* 288 (294). Both at *Or.* 294 and 799 synizesis 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 καταπαύσας as = καταπαυσάμενος modern editors read θυσίαν not θυσιᾶν, as do four MSS. out of the seven cited by Prinz. Here, I should believe in synizesis of ου 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 Νηρῇδος (626) and ἑξῆς μου ποδός 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 ἑξῆς μου ποδός such as the 'miserable' interpolator was quite capable of : also that he went on with δός με μακαρίαν ξέναισι ταῖσδε in the sense of

E. I.

'Επεισόδιον β'.

ΚΛ. [ὄρνιθα μὲν τόνδ᾽ αἴσιον ποιούμεθα,
     τὸ σόν τε χρηστὸν καὶ λόγων εὐφημίαν·
     ἐλπίδα δ᾽ ἔχω τιν᾽ ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐσθλοῖσιν γάμοις
     πάρειμι νυμφαγωγός. ἀλλ᾽ ὀχημάτων   610
     ἔξω πορεύεθ᾽ ἃς φέρω φερνὰς κόρῃ,
     καὶ πέμπετ᾽ εἰς μέλαθρον εὐλαβούμενοι.
     σὺ δ᾽, ὦ τέκνον μοι, λεῖπε πωλικοὺς ὄχους,
     ἁβρὸν τιθεῖσα κῶλον ἀσθενές θ᾽ ἅμα.
     ὑμεῖς δὲ νεανίαις νιν ἀγκάλαις ἔπι   615
     δέξασθε καὶ πορεύσατ᾽ ἐξ ὀχημάτων.
     καί μοι χερός τις ἐνδότω στηρίγματα,

χ of παρέχωμεν.   609. ἐσθλοῖσι P, ἐσθλοῖσιν (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᾽ ἅμα
PL, χαμαὶ (with ἀσφαλῶς for ἀσθενές) Herm., ποδός Hennig (who takes ἁβρὸν
adverbially), I think however that it is more like the 'versificator' as it stands:—the
phrase ἁβρὸν τιθεῖσα κῶλον being modelled on ἁβ. πόδα τιθείς *Hel.* 1528, and ὠκὺν
πόδα τιθείς *I. T.* 33, and the ἀσθενές θ᾽ ἅμα being added to make up the verse.
615. νεανίδαισιν P, νεανίδεσσιν (the εσ being a correction of an early hand for αι)
L, νεάνιδές νιν Pierson (and Markland), νεανίαις νιν Lobeck. Though L. himself
subsequently rejected this, I agree with Hennig in preferring it. It is sup-
ported by *Hel.* 1262 νεανίαις ὤμοισι, and also by Phot. *Lex.* νεανίας· 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 νεᾱ- in νεανίας 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᾽ ἐξ ὀχημάτων] notice the weak repetition of this weak phrase from *v.* 610 f.

617. στηρίγματα] another suspicious word occurring only in late Greek else-where.

www.libtool.com.cn

θάκους ἀπήνης ὡς ἂν ἐκλίπω καλῶς.
αἱ δ᾽ εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν στῆτε πωλικῶν ζυγῶν,
φοβερὸν γὰρ ἀπαράμυθον ὄμμα πωλικόν·   620
καὶ παῖδα τόνδε τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος γόνον
λάζυσθ᾽, Ὀρέστην· ἔτι γάρ ἐστι νήπιος.
τέκνον, καθεύδεις πωλικῷ δαμεὶς ὄχῳ;
ἔγειρ᾽ ἀδελφῆς ἐφ᾽ ὑμέναιον εὐτυχῶς·
ἀνδρὸς γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ κῆδος αὐτὸς ἐσθλὸς ὢν   625
λήψει, τὸ τῆς Νηρῇδος ἰσόθεον γένος.
ἑξῆς κάθησο δεῦρό μου ποδός, τέκνον,
πρὸς μητέρ᾽, Ἰφιγένεια, μακαρίαν δέ με

necessary, as the men addressed are the same as those addressed in *vv.* 610—612.
619. αἱ δ᾽ PL, οἱ δ᾽ Dobree, which would remove some absurdity.   623. θακεύ-
εις corrected by a late hand to καθεύδεις P, θακεύεις L.   626. νηρηΐδος corrected
to νηρῇδος P, νηρῇΐδος L (Milton suggested τὸ Νήρεως παιδὸς, Portus τὸ τῆς Νηρῇδος.

619. **αἱ δ᾽**] It would be difficult to
find another instance of the article used,
as οὗτος 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 = οὗτος, it could stand, like it,
as a vocative.

620. In both MSS. this line is marked
as a beauty (ὡρ. for ὡραῖον)! 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 pas-
sages as the work of the interpolator who
brought the Baby on to the scene.

623. **δαμείς**] Weil translates 'assoupi',
taking the word to be used in the sense
of the Homeric μαλακῷ δεδμημένοι ὕπνῳ
and modern phrases like 'succumbing to,
overmastered by, sleep'. But for such
phrases the mention of the sleep is neces-
sary. It is more likely that the word
was used only in the sense of *wearied*,

worn out, *i.e.* in the sense of the κόπῳ
δαμέντες of *Rhes.* 764.

624. **ἔγειρ᾽**] for ἐγείρου: very suspicious,
in spite of Porson's note on *Or.* 288
(294). Both at *Or.* 294 and 799 synize-
sis 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 καταπαύσας as =
καταπαυσάμενος modern editors read θυ-
σίαν not θυσιᾶν, as do four MSS. out of
the seven cited by Prinz. Here, I
should believe in synizesis of ου 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 Νηρῇΐδὸς (626)
and ἑξῆς μου ποδός 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 ἑξῆς μου ποδός such as
the 'miserable' interpolator was quite
capable of: also that he went on with δός
με μακαρίαν ξέναισι ταῖσδε in the sense of

E. I.   5

ξέναισι ταῖσδε πλησία σταθεῖσα δός,
καὶ δεῦρο δὴ πατέρα πρόσειπε σὸν φίλον.] 630

ΚΛ. ὦ σέβας ἐμοὶ μέγιστον, Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ, 633
ἥκομεν, ἐφετμαῖς οὐκ ἀπιστοῦσαι σέθεν. 634

ΙΦ. ὦ μῆτερ, ὑποδραμοῦσά σ', ὀργισθῆς δὲ μή, 631
πρὸς στέρνα πατρὸς στέρνα τἀμὰ προσβαλῶ. 632
[ἐγὼ δὲ βούλομαι τὰ σὰ στέρν', ὦ πάτερ, 635
ὑποδραμοῦσα προσβαλεῖν διὰ χρόνου.
ποθῶ γὰρ ὄμμα δὴ σόν. ὀργισθῆς δὲ μή.

ΚΛ. ἀλλ', ὦ τέκνον, χρή· φιλοπάτωρ δ' ἀεί ποτ' εἶ
μάλιστα παίδων τῷδ' ὅσους ἐγὼ 'τεκον.]

*   *   *   *   *

ΙΦ. ὦ πάτερ, ἐσεῖδόν σ' ἀσμένη πολλῷ χρόνῳ. 640
ΑΓΑ. καὶ γὰρ πατὴρ σέ· τόδ' ἴσον ὑπὲρ ἀμφοῖν λέγεις.

Ald. put in παιδὸς after Νηρῆδος).   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 χρῆ P, χρῆ L (so I conclude
from Vitelli's silence), χρῶ is the Aldine reading.   639. τῶνδ' PL, τῷδ' 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 ʽτεκον

redde 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.

πολλῷ χρόνῳ] just the same dat. as τῷ χρόνῳ in v. 694 (cp. Krüger II. 48, 2, 11). Klotz well compares also *Tro.* 20 ὡς δεκασπόρῳ χρόνῳ ἀλόχους τε καὶ τέκν' εἰσίδωσιν 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'· εὖ δέ μ' ἀγαγὼν πρὸς σ' ἐποίησας, πάτερ.
ΑΓΑ.   οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως φῶ τοῦτο καὶ μὴ φῶ, τέκνον.
ΙΦ.   ἔα·
       ὡς οὐ βλέπεις εὔκηλον, 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 κοὐκ ἄλλοθι.
ΙΦ.   μέθες νυν ὀφρὺν ὄμμα τ' ἔκτεινον φίλον.
ΑΓΑ.   ἰδοὺ γέγηθά σ' ὡς γέγηθ' ὁρῶν, τέκνον.
ΙΦ.   κᾆτα λείβεις δάκρυ ἀπ' ὀμμάτων σέθεν;   650
[ΑΓΑ. μακρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἡ 'πιοῦσ' 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' ἐποί-
ησας P (a late hand accented the o of the προ and added a s), πρὸς σ' ἐποίησας L.
644. μ' εὔκηλον P, εὔκηλον L (Dobree ejected the μ' independently). Many modern
edd. have followed Blomfield in writing ἔκηλον instead of εὔκηλον 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 εὔκηλος.
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 εἰμί P, εἰμι L.   648. νυν with δή written
over it by a late hand (as an explanation) P, νῦν L. ὀφρῦν corrected to ὀφρὺν P,
ὀφρῦν L.   649. γέγηθ' ἕως γέγηθά σ' ὁρῶν PL, γέγηθά σ' ὡς γέγηθ' ὁρῶν
Musgrave (an excellent emendation).   651. (See on v. 652.) One of the Paris
copies of L has ἡ 'πιτυχοῦσ' for ἡ 'πιοῦσ', 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 εὔκηλον est placido
vultu esse, ut [σεμνὸν καὶ] πεφροντικὸς
βλέπειν Alc. 773, δριμὺ βλέπειν ap.
Aristoph.' Matthiae.
ἄσμενός μ' ἰδών] with a reference to
the ἐσεῖδόν σ' ἀσμένη of v. 640 and Ag.'s
answer in v. 641: 'for all your joy at
seeing me'.
648. ἔκτεινον] cp. Soph. fr. 768 ὡς ἂν
Διὸς μέτωπον ἐκταθῇ χαρᾷ.
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 ἤγγειλας οἷ' ἤγγειλας.
I. T. 575, Tro. 630, El. 289 and 1122,
Soph. O. T. 1376, O. C. 273, and 336
(εἴσ' οὕπερ εἰσί· 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.

5—2

ΑΓΑ. συνετὰ λέγουσα μᾶλλον εἰς οἰκτόν μ᾿ ἄγεις.

ΙΦ.   ἀσύνετα μὴν ἐροῦμεν, εἰ σέ γ᾿ εὐφρανῶ.

ΑΓΑ. παπαῖ· τὸ σιγᾶν οὐ σθένω· σὲ δ᾿ ᾔνεσα.   655

ΙΦ.   μέν᾿, ὦ πάτερ, κατ᾿ οἶκον ἐπὶ τέκνοις σέθεν.

ΑΓΑ. θέλω γε τὸ μένειν· οὐχ ἑκὼν 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 οἶδά θ᾿ ὅτι φῂς, κοἶδα 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 οἰκτον in v. 653. I have therefore enclosed both vv. in brackets.   653. μᾶλλον μ᾿ εἰς οἰκτον corrected by a late hand to μᾶλλον εἰς οἰκτον μ᾿ P, μᾶλλον εἰς οἰκτον μ᾿ L (as the -ον εἰ- and the -ον μ᾿ are corrections in erasures, L had no doubt the same mistake originally).   654. μὲν 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 νυν (enclitic) by some metrical corrector who thought that the υ of ἀσύνετα was long. This assumes that νυν 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 μὲν and an early corrector, as here, altered it to μέν γ᾿. In that case νυν 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 εἴ σε γ᾿ to εἰ σέ γ᾿.   655. παπαῖ 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 μὲν—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 ἑκὼν 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. *Tro.* 904 ὡς οὐ δικαίως, ἢν θάνω, θανούμεθα.

655. σὲ δ᾿ ᾔνεσα] ('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 ἔφυ : in both cases we might translate it by our '*for*'. Cp. also *Ion* 480 διαδέκτορα πλοῦτον ὡς ἕξοντες ἐκ πατέρων ἑτέροις ἐπὶ τέκνοις.

ΙΦ.　ὄλοιντο λόγχαι καὶ τὰ Μενέλεω κακά.

ΑΓΑ.　ἄλλους ὀλεῖ πρόσθ' ἀμὲ διολέσαντ' ἔχει.

ΙΦ.　ὡς πολὺν ἀπῆσθα χρόνον ἐν Αὐλίδος μυχοῖς.　660

ΑΓΑ.　καὶ νῦν γέ μ' ἴσχει δή τι μὴ στέλλειν στρατόν.

ΙΦ.　ποῦ τοὺς Φρύγας λέγουσιν ᾠκίσθαι, πάτερ;

ΑΓΑ.　οὗ μήποτ' οἰκεῖν ὤφελ' ὁ Πριάμου Πάρις.

ΙΦ.　μακρὰν ἀπαίρεις, ὦ πάτερ, λιπὼν ἐμέ;

ΑΓΑ.　εἰς ταὐτόν, ὦ <παῖ, συμφορᾶς> ἥκεις πατρί.　665

transposed the χ and the κ, and that the θέλειν for μένειν (due to the preceding θέλω, cf. on v. 660) came later. If it be objected that the inf. after θέλω would not have an article, it may be answered that it would be equally hard to find another instance of ἔχω with τὸ before the inf. If the vulgate is retained the second θέλειν 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 δύνασθαι. Cf. also Ν 106, γ 120 and the scholia. **659.** προσθ' ἀμὲ corrected by a second hand to πρόσθεν ἄ με P (the abbreviated εν above the line is in darker ink, and the same ink has obliterated a just discernible apostrophe after the θ), πρόσθεν 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 ἀπῆσθα P, ἀπῆσθα 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 v. 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 μακράν was long. On the whole the v. suits its context best as a question. **665.** εἰς ταὐτόν, ὦ θύγατερ, ἥκεις σῷ πατρί PL. In both MSS. a *late* hand has inserted σύ θ' above the v. before ἥκεις, a would-be metrical correction which leaves an anapaest in the 3rd foot and offends against Porson's canon in the 5th. Porson suggested ὦ θύγατερ ἥκεις καὶ σύ γ' εἰς ταὐτὸν πατρί. This emendation was made under the impression that the σύ θ' (though 'mendosum'), was to be reckoned with in reconstructing the line. I would suggest εἰς ταὐτόν, ὦ παῖ, συμφορᾶς ἥκεις πατρί. At *Or.* 374 (368 Porson), and I believe also at *I. T.* 5, some transcribers altered παῖς to θυγάτηρ, and I conjecture that this change was made here and led to the exclusion of συμφορᾶς 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 v. Firnhaber and Vitelli well compare *Med.* 1015 f. ΠΑΙΔ. θάρσει· κάτει τοι καὶ σὺ πρὸς τέκνων ἔτι. ΜΕΔ. ἄλλους κατάξω πρόσθεν ἡ τάλαιν' ἐγώ. 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. *Tro.* 684 εἰς ταὐτὸν ἥκεις συμφορᾶς, and elsewhere εἰς ταὐτὸν ἥκειν, 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 σύμπλουν ἐμέ.

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

ΙΦ.   σὺν μητρὶ πλεύσασ' ἢ μόνη πορεύσομαι;

ΑΓΑ. μόνη μονωθεῖσ', ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος.

ΙΦ.   οὔ πού μ' ἐς ἄλλα δώματ' οἰκίζεις, πάτερ;   670

ΑΓΑ. ἔασον. οὐ χρὴ τοιάδ' εἰδέναι κόρας.

ΙΦ.   σπεῦδ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν μοι, θέμενος εὖ τἀκεῖ, πάτερ.

ΑΓΑ. θῦσαί με θυσίαν πρῶτα δεῖ τιν' ἐνθάδε.

word and the introduction of the unmetrical σῷ.   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. ἵν' εὖ μνήσει Vitelli, who reminds us that at vv. 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. οὔ πού μ' εἰς (corrected by what I think was a late hand to ἦτον μ' ἐς) P, οὔ· τοῦ μ' ἐς (the ε in an erasure by an early hand) L. οὔ που was evidently the original reading: there are other instances of οὔ που being misunderstood and altered by transcribers: at Hel. 135 and (I believe) at Or. 426 it is altered to οὔπω. The εἰς is a natural blunder of an unmetrical scribe.   671. ἔα γε· οὐ χρή 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 ἔα γ'· ἔτ' οὐ χρὴ (in the sense of οὔπω χρὴ) or, as the earlier editions have it (senselessly enough) ἔα 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 Λ 242 ἀπὸ μνηστῆς ἀλόχου, comparing also N 227 ἀπ' Ἀργέος and 2nd Ep. to the Thess. I. 9 ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. I have adopted this punctuation, as I think the difficulty of taking μόνη μονωθεῖσ' together less than that of taking ἀπό in the sense of ὑπό.

672. θέμενος εὖ τἀκεῖ] Cp. Bacch. 48 f. εἰς δ' ἄλλην χθόνα, τἀνθένδε θέμενος εὖ, μεταστήσω πόδα. For εὖ θέσθαι cp. Elmsley on Med. 896 (926).

www.libtool.com.cn

ΙΦ.   ποίοις ξὺν ἱεροῖς; εἰ τόδ' εὐσεβὲς σκοπεῖν.

ΑΓΑ. εἴσει σύ· χερνίβων γὰρ ἑστήξεις πέλας.   675

ΙΦ.   στήσομεν ἄρ' ἀμφὶ βωμόν, ὦ πάτερ, χορούς.

ΑΓΑ. ζηλῶ σὲ μᾶλλον ἢ 'μὲ τοῦ μηδὲν φρονεῖν.
       χώρει δὲ μελάθρων ἐντός· ὀφθῆναι κόραις

οὗτοι χρὴ τάδ' Monk (and Vitelli).   674. ἀλλὰ ξὺν ἱεροῖς χρὴ 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 ἱερεῦσι.
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
ξυνούσας 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 δεῖ resulting from the εἰ got interchanged with a χρὴ from the previous v.
(where it seems more appropriate than the δεῖ), or a χρὴ was written under the δεῖ 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. ἑστήξει (the ει corrected by a late hand to η), ἑστήξῃ L,
ἑστήξεις 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. ἢ με
PL (altered in P, perhaps by Musurus, to ἢ '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 χώρει, or
they follow Hermann in supposing that two half lines have dropped out after ἐντός.
(He ingeniously suggests (*Opusc.*) that the lost passage was something like ὡς μετ'
ἀνδράσιν | μωμητὸν οἴκων ἐκτός, and that the omission was due to the confusion by the
transcriber's eye of the ἐκτός with the ἐντός.) All alike construe πικρὸν with φίλημα.
I think the true explanation is that ὀφθῆναι κόραις πικρὸν 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 πικρὸν 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 βωμὸν στῶσι χερνίβων
πέλας.

676. This seems more natural as a
suggestion than as a question. The light-
hearted eagerness with which the daugh-
ter 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 δεινὸν ἔνθα μὴ τέλη λύῃ
φρονοῦντι.

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

πικρὸν φίλημα δοῦσα δεξιάν τ' ἐμοί.
[μέλλουσα δαρὸν πατρὸς ἀποικήσειν χρόνον.]   680
ὦ στέρνα καὶ παρῇδες, ὦ ξανθαὶ κόμαι,
ὡς ἄχθος ἡμῖν ἐγένεθ' ἡ 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 κατῳκτίσθην ἄγαν.
[μέλλων Ἀχιλλεῖ θυγατέρ' ἐκδώσειν ἐμήν.]
ἀποστολαὶ γὰρ μακάριαι μέν, ἀλλ' ὅμως
δάκνουσι τοὺς τεκόντας, ὅταν ἄλλοις δόμοις
παῖδας παραδιδῷ 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. παρηῖδες PL (in L σ i.e. συνίζησις is
written over the beginning of the word). -ῇ- 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 Shakspere. Cp. e.g. the apostrophizing in the passage
of the *Medea* quoted in the Expl. Notes on vv. 679 ff. The εὐδαιμονοῖτον, 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 δέ μιν κεφαλήν
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 κατῳκτίσθην—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 some-
thing following, i.e. the εἰ κατῳκτίσθην 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. Firmhaber well compares *Med.*
1070 δότ' ἀσπάσασθαι μητρὶ δεξιὰν χέρα.
ὦ φιλτάτη χείρ, φίλτατον δέ μοι κάρα καὶ
σχῆμα καὶ πρόσωπον εὐγενὲς τέκνων· εὐ-
δαιμονοῖτον, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖ, and further on ὦ
γλυκεῖα προσβολή, ὦ μαλθακὸς χρὼς πνεῦ-
μά 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 sud-
den 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' ἀσύνετός εἰμι, πείσεσθαι δέ με
    καὐτὴν δόκει τάδ', ὥστε μὴ σὲ νουθετεῖν,
    ὅταν σὺν ὑμεναίοισιν ἐξάγω κόρην·
    ἀλλ' ὁ νόμος αὐτὰ τῷ χρόνῳ συνισχανεῖ.
    τοὔνομα μὲν οὖν παῖδ' οἶδ' ὅτῳ κατήνεσας,   695
    γένους δὲ ποίου χὠπόθεν, μαθεῖν θέλω.
ΑΓΑ. Αἴγινα θυγάτηρ ἐγένετ' Ἀσωποῦ πατρός.
ΚΛ. ταύτην δὲ θνητῶν ἢ θεῶν ἔζευξε τίς;
ΑΓΑ. Ζεύς· 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. συνανίσχει PL, corrected by an early hand in P to συνισχάνει, in L to συνανίσχεται, συνισχανεῖ Heath (taking it however from συνισχάνω), συνισχνανεῖ Quarterly Reviewer (Vol. III. p. 393), followed by Matthiae, Hermann and others. Porson on *Or.* 292 gives the true explanation: *i.e.* that ἰσχαίνω was the Attic form of ἰσχναίνω. 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' ὁποίου Porson.   697. ἐγένατ' P, ἐγένετ' L (ἐγείνατ' 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 τοὔνομα 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 τοὔνομα (ἐκείνου) 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 ὃ 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 βίᾳ θεῶν λαβών;

ΑΓΑ. Ζεὺς ἠγγύησε καὶ δίδωσ' ὁ κύριος.

ΚΛ. γαμεῖ δὲ ποῦ νιν; ἢ κατ' οἶδμα πόντιον;

ΑΓΑ. Χείρων ἵν' οἰκεῖ σεμνὰ Πηλίου βάθρα.　　　　705

ΚΛ. οὗ φασι Κενταύρειον ᾠκίσθαι γένος;

ΑΓΑ. ἐνταῦθ' ἔδαισαν Πηλέως γάμους θεοί.

ΚΛ. Θέτις δ' ἔθρεψεν ἢ πατὴρ Ἀχιλλέα;

ΑΓΑ. Χείρων, ἵν' ἤθη μὴ μάθοι κακῶν βροτῶν.

ΚΛ. φεῦ·

　　σοφὸς γ' ὁ θρέψας χὡ διδοὺς σοφώτερος.　　　　710

ΑΓΑ. τοιόσδε παιδὸς σῆς ἀνὴρ ἔσται πόσις.

ΚΛ. οὐ μεμπτός. οἰκεῖ δ' ἄστυ ποῖον Ἑλλάδος;

ΑΓΑ. Ἀπιδανὸν ἀμφὶ ποταμὸν ἐν Φθίας ὅροις.

ΚΛ. ἐκεῖσ' ἀπάξει σὴν ἐμήν τε παρθένον;

---

700. τοῦ PL, τὰ Elmsley.　　701. κόρην 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, ᾠκίσθαι Porson.　　709. μάθῃ PL, μάθοι Musgr. Cf. below *v.* 885.　　710. γ' PL, θ' Monk. σοφώτερος PL, σοφωτέροις Musgr., σοφῷ 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. Kirchhoff 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.

www.libtool.com.cn

ΑΓΑ. κείνῳ μελήσει ταῦτα, τῷ κεκτημένῳ.   715
ΚΛ. ἀλλ' εὐτυχοίτην. τίνι δ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ γαμεῖ;
ΑΓΑ. ὅταν σελήνης εὐτυχὴς ἔλθῃ κύκλος.
ΚΛ. προτέλεια δ' ἤδη παιδὸς ἔσφαξας θεᾷ;
ΑΓΑ. μέλλω· 'πὶ ταύτῃ καὶ καθέσταμεν τύχῃ.
ΚΛ. κἄπειτα δαίσεις τοὺς γάμους εἰσύστερον;   720
ΑΓΑ. θύσας γε θύμαθ' ἁμὲ χρὴ θῦσαι θεοῖς.
ΚΛ. ἡμεῖς δὲ θοίνην ποῦ γυναιξὶ θήσομεν;
ΑΓΑ. ἐνθάδε παρ' εὐπρύμνοισιν Ἀργείων πλάταις.
ΚΛ. κάλως ἂν ἀγκύρας τε; συνενέγκοι δ' ὁμῶς.
ΑΓΑ. οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον, ὦ γύναι; πιθοῦ δέ μοι.   725

3rd person here is preferable.   715. κείνῳ PL, κείνην Herm.   716. εὐτυ-
χείτην PL, εὐτυχοίτην Portus.   717. εὐτυχὴς PL, ἐντελὴς 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 ἐ 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' ἐ.   720. εἰς PL,
corrected by an early hand in both to ἐς.   721. ἅμ' ἐχρῆν PL. In both an
early hand has written περ over the line between the ἅ and the μ', ἁμὲ χρὴ (as an
alternative with ἅμ' ἐχρῆν) Porson, ἅ με χρεὼν Monk. The imperf., though difficult,
might be defended, but it may very well have arisen by the mistake of a scribe who
read the ε 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' ὅμως 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, *New Phryn.* 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 Ἀίδης Ἀχιλλεὺς ἦν ἄρ', οὐχ ὁ Πηλέως,
ὃν μοι, προτείνας πόσιν....

717. εὐτυχής] 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 διχομηνίδεσσιν
ἑσπέραις.

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

γινομένη.

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
follows in our present line does not
connect 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 τι.

ΚΛ.   τί χρῆμα; πείθεσθαι γὰρ εἴθισμαι σέθεν.

ΑΓΑ.   ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐνθάδ', οὗπέρ ἐσθ' ὁ νυμφίος,

ΚΛ.   μητρὸς τί χωρὶς δράσεθ', ἀμὲ δρᾶν χρεών;

ΑΓΑ.   ἐκδώσομεν σὴν παῖδα Δαναϊδῶν μέτα.

ΚΛ.   ἡμᾶς δὲ ποῦ χρὴ τηνικαῦτα τυγχάνειν;   730

ΑΓΑ.   χώρει πρὸς Ἄργος παρθένους τε τημέλει.

ΚΛ.   λιποῦσα παῖδα; τίς δ' ἀνασχήσει φλόγα;

ΑΓΑ.   ἐγὼ παρέξω φῶς ὃ νυμφίοις πρέπει.

ΚΛ.   οὐχ ὁ νόμος οὗτος, κἂν σὺ φαῦλ' ἡγῇ τάδε.

where however he ignores this passage), κάλως ἂν' ἀγκύρας τε; A. Palmer *Class. Rev.* II. 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 by the side of an erasure. εἴθισμαι σέθεν P. In L the αι of εἴθισμαι, which was written above the line, was erased, and ἐκ 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 ἐκ writing εἴθισμαι 'κ and quoting Soph. *El.* 409 for the construction. See Expl. Notes.   728. ἀμε PL, altered in P by a late hand (Musurus?) to ἂν με, and so Ald. Markl. corrected the accent and wrote ἀμὲ, ὧν με Reiske. It suits this animated stichomuthia much better to take τί as *what?* rather than as *why?* and ὧν certainly suits this meaning of τί best: but if we read ὧν 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' ἡγῇ PL. Of the many corrections of the metre which have been

726. πείθεσθαι...σέθεν] πείθεσθαι occurs with the gen. 4 times in Hdt. (I. 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 αὐτούς.

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' ὅδ' ἡμῖν ποῦ τετάξεται χοροῦ;

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

733. νυμφίοις] as at *Med.* 366 (ἔτ' εἴσ' 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
ΚΛ. καλὸν τεκοῦσαν τἀμά μ᾽ ἐκδοῦναι τέκνα.
ΑΓΑ. καὶ τάς γ᾽ ἐν οἴκῳ μὴ μόνας εἶναι κόρας.
ΚΛ. ὀχυροῖσι παρθενῶσι φρουροῦνται καλῶς.
ΑΓΑ. πιθοῦ. ΚΛ. μὰ τὴν ἄνασσαν Ἀργείαν θεάν.
ἐλθὼν σὺ τἄξω πρᾶσσε, τἀν δόμοις δ᾽ ἐγώ.   740
[ἃ χρὴ παρεῖναι νυμφίοισι παρθένοις.]
ΑΓΑ. οἴμοι· μάτην ᾖξ᾽, ἐλπίδος δ᾽ ἀπεσφάλην,
ἐξ ὀμμάτων δάμαρτ᾽ ἀποστεῖλαι θέλων.

suggested, I think Musgrave's κἂν σὺ φαῦλ᾽ is the best. The καὶ before the σὺ which stands in many texts was inserted by Ald. We must suppose the κἂν to have been early obliterated and the δὲ to have been introduced by an unmetrical scribe. κεὶ σὺ φαῦλ᾽ ἡγεῖ Weil.   735. ἐξομιλεῖσθαι PL. Neither ὁμιλεῖν 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. τἀμά γ᾽ PL, τἀμά 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 οὔ 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 παρθένοις is not Greek.   742. ᾖξα (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 ἀνῆψα 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 ᾖξ᾽] answers to our conversational 'it was a false move'. Dindorf well compares *Ion* 572 ὃ δ᾽ ᾖξας 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 κἀπὶ τοῖσι φιλτάτοις
τέχνας πορίζω, πανταχῆ νικώμενος.   745
[ὅμως δὲ σὺν Κάλχαντι τῷ θυηπόλῳ
κοινῇ τὸ τῆς θεοῦ φίλον, ἐμοὶ δ' οὐκ εὐτυχές,
ἐξιστορήσων εἶμι, μόχθον Ἑλλάδος.]
χρὴ δ' ἐν δόμοισιν ἄνδρα τὸν σοφὸν τρέφειν
γυναῖκα χρηστὴν κἀγαθήν, ἢ μὴ γαμεῖν.   750

ΣΤΆϹΙΜΟΝ Β'.

ΧΟ. ἥξει δὴ Σιμόεντα καὶ   στρ.

ν 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 ϙ, 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
κἀγαθήν. In the latter case the blame is
too strong for the circumstances: in the
former, the words χρηστὴν κἀγαθήν 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 μῆτ' ἐμοὶ—800), all in loga-
oedic verse (see scheme of metres at
the end of the book). An interpolator has
added vv. 773—783 (to προλιποῦσα) which

a metrical note in P describes as the se-
cond strophe to which vv. 783 (from μῆτ'
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 com-
plete; 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 expedi-
tion and the woes of the captive Trojan
women, which naturally enlist the sym-
pathies of the Chalcian women who com-
pose 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' ἑπτάπυλον.

www.libtool.com.cn

δίνας ἀργυροειδεῖς
ἄγυρις Ἑλλάνων στρατιᾶς
ἀνά τε ναυσὶ καὶ σὺν ὅπλοις
Ἴλιον εἰς τὸ Τροίας   755
Φοιβήιον δάπεδον,
τὰν Κασάνδραν ἵν' ἀκούω
ῥίπτειν ξανθοὺς πλοκάμους
χλωροκόμῳ στεφάνῳ δάφνας
κοσμηθεῖσαν, ὅταν θεοῦ   760
μαντόσυνοι πνεύσωσ' ἀνάγκαι.

στάσονται δ' ἐπὶ περγάμων   ἀντ.
Τροίας ἀμφί 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. παντόσυνοι P (this was
actually adopted by some of the earliest editions), μαντόσυνοι 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 logaoedic
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
ἰδών for ἐσιδών. 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 στάσονται) manning the walls would naturally
be followed by a reference to the attack on the city. The three datives too (πλάταις,
εἰρεσίᾳ, and ὀχετοῖς) with the one verb πελάζῃ, 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, Σιμουντίοις ὀχετοῖς from Eur.
Or. 809, εὐπρώροισι πλάταις modelled on εὐπρύμνοισι πλάταις above v. 723.

752. Cf. Ion 95 τὰς Κασταλίας ἀργυρο-
ειδεῖς βαίνετε δίνας (Monk).
754 f. τε] connects the two accusa-
tives Σιμόεντα and Ἴλιον, and εἰς τὸ Τρ.
Φ. δ. is in apposition to the latter. For
the ἀνὰ Musgr. quotes Greg. Cor. de dial.
Dor. XVIII. τὴν ἀνὰ, ἀντὶ τῆς σὺν λαμβά-
νουσιν. Cf. v. 1058 below.
756. Φοιβήιον δάπεδον] Weil cps.

Hel. 1510 οὐκ ἐλθοῦσα ποτ' Ἰλίου Φοιβείους
ἐπὶ πύργους. Here the adj. has its mean-
ing 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 εὐπρῴροισι πλάταις   765
εἰρεσίᾳ πελάζῃ
Σιμουντίοις ὀχετοῖς,]
τὰν τῶν ἐν αἰθέρι δισσῶν
Διοσκούρων Ἑλέναν
ἐκ Πριάμου κομίσαι θέλων   770
εἰς γᾶν Ἑλλάδα δοριπόνοις
ἀσπίσι καὶ λόγχαις Ἀχαιῶν.

[Πέργαμον δὲ Φρυγῶν πόλιν
λαΐνους περὶ πύργους
κυκλώσας Ἄρει φονίῳ,   775
λαιμοτόμους κεφαλὰς
σπάσας, [πόλισμα Τροίας]
πέρσας κατ᾽ ἄκρας πόλιν,
θήσει κόρας πολυκλαύστους
δάμαρτά τε Πριάμου.   780
ἁ δὲ Διὸς Ἑλένα κόρα
πολύκλαυτος ἐσεῖται
πόσιν προλιποῦσα.]

                    *   *

765. εὐπρῴροισι PL (in L the final ι has been erased).   767. Σιμουντίοις P,
Σιμουντείοις 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 φονίῳ—cf. Ἄρη φοίνιον Phoen. 1006.) Hartung was the first to
proclaim this passage spurious.   774. λαΐνους with αι written over L, αι possibly,
as Markl. thought, for ε i.e. λαινέους, or rather λαινέους.   775. In L the ει of ἄρει
is corrected from ω. φονίῳ PL, corrected by a late hand in P to φοινίῳ.   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' ἐμοὶ μήτ' ἐμοῖσι τέκνων τέκνοις
ἐλπὶς ἅδε ποτ' ἔλθοι,   785
οἵαν αἱ πολύχρυσοι
Λυδαὶ καὶ Φρυγῶν ἄλοχοι
στήσουσι, παρ' ἱστοῖς
μυθεῦσαι τάδ' ἐς ἀλλήλας·
τίς ἄρα μ' εὐπλοκάμου κόμας   790
ῥῦμα δακρυόεν τανύσας
πατρίδος ὀλομένας ἀπολωτιεῖ;
διὰ σέ, τὰν κύκνου δολιχαύχενος γόνον,
εἰ δὴ φάτις ἔτυμος,
ὡς ἔτυχεν Λήδα   795
μιχθεῖσα πταμένῳ,

-στ- stood in L.   784. In P and L the words μῆτ' ἐμοί form a single line: in L a metrical corrector has signified that μῆτ' ἐμοῖσι 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. εὐπλοκάμους PL, εὐπλοκάμου Dobree.   791. ἔρυμα PL, ῥῦμα Hermann. δακρυόεν τανύσας PL, a late hand in P put an apostrophe and breathing over the αν-.   792. οὐλομένας PL, ὀλομένας Monk, ὀλλυμένας Erfurdt.   793. γόνον PL, ἔκγονον Monk, γονὴν Hennig.   795. ἔτυχεν PL, σ' ἔτεκε Musgrave. Dind. cf. τεκὼν for τυχὼν at *O. T.* 1025. Λήδα PL (in P the α 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' ἱπταμένῳ PL, ὄρνιθι πταμένῳ Markl. I think Scaliger on Catull. p. 51, Ed. 1607 (μιγεῖσ' ὀρ.), and Porson (on *Med.* 1) showed us the right road. The latter conjectured ὡς ἔτυχεν Λήδα | μιχθεῖσ' ὄρνιθι πταμένῳ, but what with the next *v.*

785. **ἐλπὶς**] 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 λιπὼν δὲ Λυδῶν τῶν πολυχρύσων γύας.

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

789. **μυθεῦσαι**] Cf. *Ion* 197. For the simple μυθέω Herm. cites Photius μυθήσας· εἰπών. Those who correct the passage so as to introduce the more ordinary μυθεύω fail to see that *say* and not *narrate* is the word wanted here. For the Ionic ευ for ου in tragedy cf. *Med.* 423 ὑμνεῦσαι, *Hipp.* 167 ἀύτευν, Aesch. *P. V.* 122 εἰσοιχνεῦσιν, 645 πωλεύμεναι.

790 f. Herm. cites Aesch. *Sept.* 328 (ἄγεσθαι) ἱππηδὸν πλοκάμων and Aesch. *Suppl.* 431 ἀγομέναν ἱππηδὸν ἀμπύκων, also below *v.* 1367.

796. For πταμένῳ used by itself as a subs. cf. Plat. *Euthyphr.* 4 A πετόμενόν τινα διώκεις.

E. I.   6

Διὸς ὅτ᾽ ἠλλάχθη δέμας,
εἶτ᾽ ἐν δέλτοισι Πιερίσι
μῦθοι τάδ᾽ ἐς ἀνθρώπους
ἤνεγκαν παρὰ καιρὸν ἄλλως.   800

'Επειcόδιον ῑ'.

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

I believe to have happened is that Eur. wrote ὡς ἔτυχεν Λήδα | μιχθεῖσα πταμένῳ,
and that ὄρνιθι, which was originally put in as an explanation of πταμένῳ, ousted
μιχθεῖσα. 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 'Αχιλλέα 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᾽ ἡ τάλαινα Τυνδαρὶς ἄλλως κακὰς
ἤκουσεν. At *Hel.* 21 the heroine, after
relating this story as to her parentage,
expresses the same doubt in the words
εἰ σαφὴς οὗτος λόγος.

THIRD EPEISODION, *vv.* 801—1036.
The intervention of Achilles. Admirable
stage-craft is shown, both in the prepara-
tion furnished by the conversation in the
last episode for the appearance of Achil-
les, 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 sum-
mon him forth. This is one of the trans-
parent 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 spec-
tators (*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 'Αχαιῶν ἐνθάδ᾽**] Monk
says this is for τῶν ἐνθάδε 'Αχαιῶν but
Dobree is doubtless right in taking it as
at Ar. *Ran.* 432...Πλούτων᾽ ὅπου 'νθάδ᾽
οἰκεῖ and as the ἐνταῦθα at Soph. *Phil.* 16
σκοπεῖν θ᾽ ὅπου ᾽στ᾽ ἐνταῦθα δίστομος πέτρα:
i.e. as half superfluous with ποῦ: cf. also
Soph. *O. C.* 1256 f. ὃν ξένης ἐπὶ χθονὸς σὺν
σφῷν ἐφεύρηκ᾽ ἐνθάδ᾽, where the ἐνθάδε is
somewhat superfluous.

www.libtool.com.cn

οὐκ ἐξ ἴσου γὰρ μένομεν Εὐρίπου πέλας.
οἳ μὲν γὰρ ἡμῶν ὄντες ἄζυγες γάμων 805
[οἴκους ἐρήμους ἐκλιπόντες ἐνθάδε]
θάσσουσιν ἀκτάς, οἳ δ' ἔχοντες εὔνιδας
καὶ παῖδας· οὕτω δεινὸς ἐμπέπτωκ' ἔρως
τῆσδε στρατείας Ἑλλάδ' οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν.

was first written. 804. Εὐρίππου 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

οἳ μὲν γὰρ ἡμῶν <ἐσμὲν> ἄζυγες γάμων
<γόνων τ'> ἄπαιδες, οἳ δ' ἔχοντες εὔνιδας,
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' ἀκτὰς 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 ἐρίμους. 807. θάσσουσ' ἐπ' ἀκτὰς PL, ἐπ' ἀκταῖς Markl. (cf. *Hec.* 36), θάσσουσιν ἀκτὰς Hartung. 808. ἄπαιδες PL, καὶ παῖδας Musgrave (cf. above the note on the whole passage). 809. στρατείας corrected from στρατίας P. Ἑλλάδι γ' οὐκ PL², Ἑλλάδ' 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 ἄπαιδες must have meant (taken with θάσσουσιν) 'senza procrear 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.

τοὐμὸν μὲν οὖν δίκαιον ἐμὲ λέγειν χρέος·   810
ἄλλος δ' ὁ χρῄζων αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ αὑτοῦ φράσει.
γῆν γὰρ λιπὼν Φάρσαλον ἠδὲ Πηλέα

.   .   .   .

.   .   .   .

.   .   .   .

μένω 'πὶ λεπταῖς ταισίδ' Εὐρίπου ῥοαῖς,
Μυρμιδόνας ἴσχων· οἱ δ' ἀεὶ προσκείμενοι
λέγουσ'· Ἀχιλλεῦ, τί μένομεν; ποῖον χρόνον   815
ἔτ' ἐκμετρῆσαι χρὴ τὸν Ἰλίου στόλον;
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 αὐτούς, and where it should be noticed that the subject (ζῆλος) is also a feeling. On *Med.* 93 however Elmsley rejects Ἑλλάδ' and reads οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινός, leaving ἐμπέπτωκ' without an object.   810. χρεών PL, χρέος Hennig (τοὐμὸν 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 χρεών).   811. αὑτοῦ P, αὐτοῦ Victorius.   812. φαρσάλιον corrected to φάρσαλον P, φαρσάλιον L, Φάρσαλιν 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, ταισὶ δ' 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 λεπτὸς 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. τοῖον PL, πόσον Monk. (I have not ventured to adopt this because I think τοῖον 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 Ἰλίου (with ου written above ου by an early hand) PL. Ἰλίου is retained by most edd. and is probably the right reading: but how is πρός to be taken? not with Ἰλίου, for that would be *from Ilium*: ἐκμετρῆσαι πρός cannot mean *to spend upon*: Weil takes πρός (with Ἰλίου) in the sense of *until*—'until we start for Troy':—but besides giving πρός 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' ἐκμετρῆσαι χρὴ τὸν Ἰλίου στόλον. πρὸς Ἰλίον was, I think, written over Ἰλίου as an explanation of the genitive: hence the πρός, which ousted the τόν, and the Ἰλίον.   817. ὅρα γ' εἴ τι P (it is doubtful whether the γ' is by the first hand), ὅρα εἴ τι L, ὅρα δ' εἴ τι Fix, ὅρα τί F. W. Schmidt.   ἢ ἄπαγ' PL (with the ἀ crossed through by a late hand

810. Cf. *v.* 1188 below ἀλλ' ἐμὲ δίκαιον ἀγαθὸν εὔχεσθαί τί σοι.   Schol. on *Phoen.* 1689.
812. For the Epic ἠδέ cf. *Hec.* 323,   816. τὸν Ἰλίου στόλον] For the gen. cf. *I. T.* 1066 γῆς πατρῴας νόστος.

τὰ τῶν Ἀτρειδῶν μὴ μένων μελλήματα.

ΚΛ. ὦ παῖ θεᾶς Νηρῇδος, ἔνδοθεν λόγων
τῶν σῶν ἀκούσασ' ἐξέβην πρὸ δωμάτων. 820

ΑΧ. ὦ πότνι' αἰδώς, τήνδε τίνα λεύσσω ποτὲ
γυναῖκα, μορφὴν εὐπρεπῆ κεκτημένην;

ΚΛ. οὐ θαῦμά 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 ἀσπίσιν πεφραγμένους;

ΚΛ. Λήδας μέν εἰμι παῖς, Κλυταιμνήστρα δέ μοι
ὄνομα, πόσις δὲ μοὐστὶν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.

ΑΧ. καλῶς ἔλεξας ἐν βραχεῖ τὰ καίρια.
αἰσχρὸν δέ μοι γυναιξὶ συμβάλλειν λόγους. 830

in P). 818. μελλήματα PL (altered in P by a late hand—Musurus ?—to
μελήματα). 819. Νηρηΐδος PL, corrected in P, by a late hand, to Νηρῇδος,
in L to Νηρῇδος. 823. οὓς PL, οἷς Nauck. 824. προσέβης ἂν· αἰνῶ P,
with the ἂν crossed through: over προσέβης is written γρ. (i.e. γράφε, or ? γράφεται)
κατεῖδες 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—misled, 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 ἀσπίσιν was by a second
hand in L. 828. μοι 'στὶν PL, μοὐστὶν Matthiae. 829. ἐν is in an erasure

818. This concluding line shows that
the speaker has come to charge Agamem-
non with the delay. Markland compares
Aesch. c. Ctes. 72 οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων
ἀναμένειν μελλήματα.

819. Sc. 2.

821. ὦ πότνι' αἰδώς] An almost
comically outspoken expression of sur-
prise. 'In the name of Modesty, whom
have we here?' The same expression
occurs in a fragment of the Ἱππόλυτος
καλυπτόμενος 439 Nauck.

823. μή] The same generalizing μή
as at v. 834, but it is slightly more re-
markable 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 pas-
sage however) προσήκοντ' 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. ἀσπ. πεφρ.] Cf. below v. 1387,
and P 268 φραχθέντες σάκεσιν. 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. μεῖνον· τί φεύγεις; δεξιάν τ' ἐμῇ χερὶ
σύναψον, ἀρχὴν μακαρίων νυμφευμάτων.

ΑΧ. τί φής; ἐγώ σοι δεξιάν; αἰδοίμεθ' ἂν
'Αγαμέμνον', εἰ ψαύοιμεν ὧν μή μοι θέμις.

ΚΛ. θέμις μάλιστα, τὴν ἐμὴν ἐπεὶ γαμεῖς   835
παῖδ', ὦ θεᾶς παῖ ποντίας Νηρηΐδος.

ΑΧ. ποίους γάμους φής; ἀφασία μ' ἔχει, γύναι,
εἰ μή τι παρανοοῦσα καινουργεῖς λόγον.

ΚΛ. πᾶσιν τόδ' ἐμπέφυκεν, αἰδεῖσθαι φίλους
καινοὺς ὁρῶσι καὶ γάμου μεμνημένοις.   840

ΑΧ. οὐπώποτ' ἐμνήστευσα παῖδα σήν, γύναι,
οὐδ' ἐξ 'Ατρειδῶν ἦλθέ μοι λόγος γάμων.

ΚΛ. τί δῆτ' ἂν εἴη; σὺ πάλιν αὖ λόγους ἐμοὺς
θαύμαζ'· ἐμοὶ γὰρ θαύματ' ἐστὶ τὰ παρὰ σοῦ.

ΑΧ. εἴκαζε· κοινόν ἐστιν εἰκάζειν τάδε·   845

---

in P.   831. δεινόν τι P (I think), δεινὸν· τι L, μεῖνον· τί Valckenaer.—γ' ἐμῇ PL, τ' ἐμῇ Markl., δ' ἐμῇ Matthiae.   832. μακαρίαν PL, μακαρίων Markl. 833. αἰδούμεθ' P, αἰδοίμεθ' L.   834. ψαύοιμεν ἂν ὧν 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. νηρηῖδος P, νηρηΐδος corrected by an early hand to νηρηΐδος L.   837. ἔφησθ' PL, φής Barnes: the ἔφησθ' was probably written over the original φής as an explanation. Firnh. cps. *Hel.* 471 πῶς φής; 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, τἀπὸ 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 Iphigeneia's presence in the army. He could only suppose that Clytaemnestra was making love to him.

834 f. Firnhaber and Vitelli compare *Electr.* 223 ἄπελθε, μὴ ψαῦ' ὧν σε μὴ ψαύειν χρεών: to which words of Electra Orestes answers οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅτου θίγοιμ' ἂν ἐνδικώτερον. γαμεῖς is more probably the present than the future.

μοι] Vitelli refers to O. Schneider on Isocr. *Panegyr.* § 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] Firnh. cps. *H. F.* 515 ἀφασία δὲ κἄμ' ἔχει and *Hel.* 549 ἔκπληξιν ἡμῖν ἀφασίαν τε προστίθης.

844. θαύμαζ'] A strong expression for δεῖ σε θαυμάζειν: '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.

ΚΛ. ἀλλ' ἦ πέπονθα δεινά; μνηστεύω γάμους
οὐκ ὄντας, ὡς εἴξασιν· αἰδοῦμαι τάδε.

ΑΧ. ἴσως ἐκερτόμησε κἀμὲ καὶ σέ τις.
ἀλλ' ἀμελίᾳ δὸς αὐτὰ καὶ φαύλως φέρε.   850

ΚΛ. χαῖρ'· οὐ γὰρ ὀρθοῖς ὄμμασίν σ' ἔτ' εἰσορῶ,
ψευδὴς γενομένη καὶ παθοῦσ' ἀνάξια.

ΑΧ. καὶ σοὶ τόδ' ἐστὶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ· πόσιν δὲ σὸν
στείχω ματεύσων τῶνδε δωμάτων ἔσω.

ΠΡ. ὦ ξέν', Αἰακοῦ γένεθλον, μεῖνον, ὦ σέ τοι λέγω,   855
τὸν θεᾶς γεγῶτα παῖδα, καὶ σὲ τὴν Λήδας κόρην.

ΑΧ. τίς ὁ καλῶν πύλας παροίξας; ὡς τεταρβηκὸς καλεῖ.

ΠΡ. δοῦλος, οὐχ ἁβρύνομαι τῷδ'· ἡ τύχη γὰρ οὐκ ἐᾷ.

cf. below *v.* 1214.   847. ἦ PL, ἦ Barnes: Heath first put the ;.   848. In
L ἐοίκασιν is written over εἴξασιν.   850. ἀμελείᾳ PL: in P an early
hand wrote over it 'Ιωνικῶς διὰ τὸ μέτρον, and a late hand has changed ει
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 called Θεράπων
all through this scene. Markland was apparently the first of modern editors to see
that he is the same as the Πρεσβύτης who has appeared before (cf. for proof *v.* 891).
ὡς σέ PL, ὦ σέ Markl. (who cps. Ar. *Av.* 275).   857. τεταρβηκὼς 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 ψευδὴς γενομένη,
she has said what is not true: like Mal-
volio she 'has been most notoriously
abused'—παθοῦσ' ἀνάξια.—κοινόν ἐστιν
means 'it is open to us both'. Cp.
Elmsley on *Heracl.* 426 for ἀλλ' ἦ; 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, σκώπτων.

853. τόδ'] *i.e.* χαῖρε (Matthiae and
Monk).—Ach., in pursuance of his origi-
nal 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 ἁβρύνομαι 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 ἀβ. τόδ'
(see Crit. N.) could, I think, only mean
' I am not proud of this '. Bothe quotes
Bekker *Anecd.* p. 322 ἁβρύνεται· θρύπ-
τεται, καυχᾶται. Cp. the use of σεμνύνο-
μαι at *v.* 901.

AX. τίνος; ἐμὸς μὲν οὐχί χωρὶς τἀμὰ κἀγαμέμνονος.

ΠΡ. τῆσδε τῶν πάροιθεν οἴκων, Τυνδάρεω δόντος πατρός. 860

AX. ἕσταμεν· φράζ', εἴ τι χρῄζεις, ὧν μ' ἐπέσχες εἴνεκα.

ΠΡ. ἦ μόνω παρόντε δῆτα ταῖσδ' ἐφέστατον πύλαις;

AX. ὡς μόνοιν λέγοις ἄν, ἔξω δ' ἐλθὲ βασιλείων δόμων.

ΠΡ. ὦ τύχη πρόνοιά θ' ἡμή, σώσαθ' οὓς ἐγὼ θέλω.

AX. ὁ λόγος εἰς μέλλοντ' ἂν *ὤσῃ χρόνον· ἔχει δ' ὄγκον τινά. 865

ΚΛ. δεξιᾶς ἕκατι μὴ μέλλ', εἴ τί μοι χρῄζεις λέγειν.

ΠΡ. οἶσθα δῆτά μ' ὅστις ὢν σοὶ καὶ τέκνοις εὔνους ἔφυν;

ΚΛ. οἶδά σ' ὄντ' ἐγὼ παλαιῶν δωμάτων ἐμῶν λάτριν.

ΠΡ. χὤτι μ' ἐν ταῖς σαῖσι φερναῖς ἔλαβεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.

ἁβρύνομαι.—In L an ὁ is written by an early hand over the ῷ of τῷδ', i.e. it suggests a variant τόδ'. τἀδ' 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. ἕσταμεν 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.—ταῖσδ' 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 μόνῳ and παῖδ', 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 ας, 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 σῶσον. σώσασ' L (acc. to Vitelli), σώσαθ' Kirchhoff. (It is possible that σῶσον was the original reading and that the ας was due to a suggested ᾶς for οὓς and that this ας ousted the final ον, which may have been written in an abbreviation above the line.) 865. ἂν ὤσῃ PL, ἀνοίσει Markl., μέλλοντα λεύσσει 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 ὤν P. 868. παλαιῶν PL; all editions have παλαιόν, but I think the MSS. are right, παλαιῶν δωμάτων being the same as τῶν πάροιθεν οἴκων in v. 860. 869. χὤτι με ταῖς σαῖς P (δή 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.

866. **δεξιᾶς ἕκατι**] cannot mean πρός (σε) δεξιᾶς, as some take it: rather it is

'do not wait for a pledge', i.e. you surely need have no hesitation in speaking to me.

869. Cf. a 276—278 for an instance of the bride's father giving a dowry with

ΚΛ. ἦλθες εἰς Ἄργος μεθ' ἡμῶν κἀμὸς ἦσθ' ἀεί ποτε. 870
ΠΡ. ὧδ' ἔχει. καὶ σοὶ μὲν εὔνους εἰμί, σῷ δ' ἦσσον πόσει.
ΚΛ. ἐκκάλυπτε νῦν ποθ' ἡμῖν οὕστινας στέγεις λόγους.
ΠΡ. παῖδα σὴν πατὴρ ὁ φύσας αὐτόχειρ μέλλει κτανεῖν.
ΚΛ. πῶς; ἀπέπτυσ', ὦ γεραιέ, μῦθον· οὐ γὰρ εὖ φρονεῖς.
ΠΡ. φασγάνῳ λευκὴν φονεύων τῆς ταλαιπώρου δέρην. 875
ΚΛ. ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγώ· μεμηνὼς ἆρα τυγχάνει πόσις;
ΠΡ. ἀρτίφρων, πλὴν εἰς σὲ καὶ σὴν παῖδα· τοῦτο δ' οὐ φρονεῖ.
ΚΛ. ἐκ τίνος λόγου; τίς αὐτὸν οὑπάγων ἀλαστόρων;
ΠΡ. θέσφαθ', ὥς γέ φησι Κάλχας, ἵνα πορεύηται στρατός.
ΚΛ. ποῖ; τάλαιν' ἐγώ, τάλαινα δ' ἣν πατὴρ μέλλει κτανεῖν. 880
ΠΡ. Δαρδάνου πρὸς δώμαθ', Ἑλένην Μενέλεως ὅπως λάβῃ.
ΚΛ. εἰς ἄρ' Ἰφιγένειαν Ἑλένης νόστος ἦν πεπρωμένος;
ΠΡ. πάντ' ἔχεις· Ἀρτέμιδι θύσειν παῖδα σὴν μέλλει πατήρ.
ΚΛ. 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. ἐς PL (corrected to εἰς in L by an early hand).—καὶ ἐμοὶ P, καὶ ἐμὸς L (corrected to κἀμὸς by an early hand). 872. δὴ is written over νυν in L (as an explanation).—λέγεις PL, στέγεις F. W. Schmidt (a certain emendation). 873. κτανεῖν PL, so too at vv. 880 and 1131. κτενεῖν Elmsley: cp. Rutherford, New Phryn. 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. ἆρα PL. 881. λάβοι PL (corrected to λάβῃ 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 unskilful) metrical corrector in P inserted a τὴν before πρόφασιν. Markland and Heath really mended the metre by reading ἐκόμισεν. παρεῖχε (for τιν' εἶχε) Gomperz: Weil reads τιν' and discards the ; (certainly the next v. could in

her. Generally in Homer it is the bride-groom who gives the bride's father a gift in return for the bride.

871. Cf. Andr. 59 where the θεράπων says to Andromache εὔνους δὲ καὶ σοὶ ζῶντί τ' ἦν τῷ σῷ πόσει (Firnhaber). Ion 811 f. καὶ σὸν οὐ στυγῶν πόσιν λέγω, σὲ μέντοι μᾶλλον ἢ κεῖνον φιλῶν.

877. Monk cps. Or. 540 ἐγὼ δὲ τἄλλα μακάριος πέφυκ' ἀνήρ, 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.

ὅς] For a similar ὅς, gaining some emphasis by being separated from its antecedent, cf. below v. 895.

ΠΡ.　ἵνα γ' ἄγοις χαίρουσ' Ἀχιλλεῖ παῖδα νυμφεύουσα σήν. 885
ΚΛ.　ὦ θύγατερ, ἥκεις ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ καὶ σὺ καὶ μήτηρ σέθεν.
ΠΡ.　οἰκτρὰ πάσχετον δύ' οὖσαι· δεινὰ δ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἔτλη.
ΚΛ.　οἴχομαι τάλαινα, δακρύων νάματ' οὐκέτι στέγω.
ΠΡ.　εἴπερ ἀλγεινὸν τὸ τέκνων στερόμενον, δακρυρρόει.
ΚΛ.　σὺ δὲ τάδ', ὦ γέρον, πόθεν φὴς εἰδέναι πεπυσμένος; 890
ΠΡ.　δέλτον ᾠχόμην φέρων σοι πρὸς τὰ πρὶν γεγραμμένα.
ΚΛ.　οὐκ ἐῶν ἢ ξυγκελεύων παῖδ' ἄγειν θανουμένην;
ΠΡ.　μὴ μὲν οὖν ἄγειν· φρονῶν γὰρ ἔτυχε σὸς πόσις τότ' εὖ.
ΚΛ.　κᾆτα 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 γάμον for γάμος—so far following Hennig's γάμον τόνδ',—and adopt Monk's ὅς for ἤ. 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. ἵν' ἀγάγῃς PL, ἵν' ἀγάγοις Blomfield (cf. above v. 709), ἵνα 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 (δακρύον 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, δακρυρρόει Weil (τὸ στερόμενον 'l'état de celui qui est privé'). Bothe had already read τὸ στερόμενον.　　890. πεπυσμένα (with the α corrected to ον) P, πεπυσμένος 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. *Heracl.* 214 where τὸ προσῆκον is used for 'the question of relationship', *Hipp.* 248 τὸ μαινόμενον = τὸ μαίνεσθαι, 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 αὐτός μ' ἀφαιροῦ (τὸν θύρσον) (Firnh.).

ὃς κ.τ.λ.] For a different order of these words see *Med.* 332 (so Porson would read them here).

www.libtool.com.cn

ΚΛ. ὦ τέκνον Νηρῇδος, ὦ παῖ Πηλέως, κλύεις τάδε;

ΑΧ. ἔκλυον οὖσαν ἀθλίαν σε, τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ φαύλως φέρω.

ΚΛ. παῖδά μου κατακτενοῦσι σοῖς δολώσαντες γάμοις.

[ΑΧ. μέμφομαι κἀγὼ πόσει σῷ, κοὐχ ἁπλῶς οὕτω φέρω.

ΚΛ.] οὐκ ἐπαιδεσθησόμεσθ' οὖν προσπεσεῖν τὸ σὸν γόνυ,   900
       θνητὸς ἐκ θεᾶς γεγῶτα· τί γὰρ ἐγὼ σεμνύνομαι;
       ἐπὶ τίνι σπουδαστέον μοι μᾶλλον ἢ τέκνου πέρι;
       ἀλλ' ἄμυνον, ὦ θεᾶς παῖ, τῇ τ' ἐμῇ δυσπραξίᾳ
       τῇ τε λεχθείσῃ δάμαρτι σῇ, μάτην μέν, ἀλλ' ὅμως.
       σοὶ καταστέψασ' ἐγώ νιν ἦγον ὡς γαμουμένην,   905
       νῦν δ' ἐπὶ σφαγὰς κομίζω· σοὶ δ' ὄνειδος ἵξεται,
       ὅστις οὐκ ἤμυνας· εἰ γὰρ μὴ γάμοισιν ἐζύγης,
       ἀλλ' ἐκλήθης γοῦν ταλαίνης παρθένου φίλος πόσις.

in both P and L, but is crossed through in both.   896. νηρῇδος (with the *ῇ*
thus) P, who generally writes -ηϊ- or at most -ῇ-.   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 *v.*
stood immediately after *v.* 898 it doubtless contained some particle connecting it
thereto. The man who could so tamper with a MS. as to introduce *v.* 899 would
make nothing of getting rid of this particle. ἐπαιδεσθησόμαί γε PL, ἐπαιδεσθη-
σόμεσθα Herm., ἐπαιδεσθησόμεσθ' οὖν Hennig (which I have adopted as a possible
restoration of the connexion). Paley rejects *vv.* 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 *v.*

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 ἁβρύ-
νομαι is above at *v.* 858.

902. This is one of the Euripidean
lines which touch hearts of all times.
For σπουδάζειν ἐπί τινι cf. Xen. *Mem.* I.
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 ἀλλά
makes its meaning clear. Cf. Hyperides
ap. Stob. 124 εἰ δὲ γήρως θνητοῦ μὴ
μετέσχον, ἀλλ' εὐδοξίαν ἀγήρατον εἰλή-
φασιν, and Soph. *O. C.* 661 and 974.

πρὸς γενειάδος σε, πρὸς σῆς δεξιᾶς, πρὸς μητέρος·
ὄνομα γὰρ τὸ σόν μ' ἀπώλεσ', ᾧ σ' ἀμυναθεῖν χρεών.　910
οὐκ ἔχω βωμὸν καταφυγεῖν ἄλλον ἢ τὸ σὸν γόνυ,
οὐδὲ φίλος οὐδεὶς γελᾷ μοι· τὰ δ' Ἀγαμέμνονος κλύεις
ὠμὰ καὶ πάντολμ'· ἀφῖγμαι δ', ὥσπερ εἰσορᾷς, γυνὴ
ναυτικὸν στράτευμ' ἄναρχον [κἀπὶ τοῖς κακοῖς θρασύ,
χρήσιμον δ', ὅταν θέλωσιν]. ἢν δὲ τολμήσῃς 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.—πρός γε μητέρος P, πρὸς μητέρος L¹ (and so Markland), πρός τε μητέρος L². Markland would also read σε for σῆς.　　910. ἀμυνάθειν PL, ἀμυναθεῖν Elmsley (on *Med.* 186), and so first Kirchhoff among editors.　　911. ἄλλον PL (the ον in P was written as ο above the υ. and has been partially obliterated by accident or design). (Paley quotes *Suppl.* 267 ἔχει γὰρ καταφυγὴν θήρ 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 πελᾷ) for the MSS. γελᾷ 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. κἀπὶ...θέλωσιν. 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 σόν] 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 Νηρῇδος. This was his ὄνομα. ὀνομάζω in Homer often means 'give a man his proper style or title', *i.e.* his *patronymic* (Κ 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 ἀμυναθεῖν as most take it.—With χρεών supply ἐστί 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 μὴ and οὐ forming a crasis although a comma intervenes.

www.libtool.com.cn

XO. δεινὸν τὸ τίκτειν καὶ φέρει φίλτρον μέγα,
  πᾶσίν τε κοινόν ἐσθ᾿ ὑπερκάμνειν τέκνων.

AX. ὑψηλόφρων μοι θυμὸς αἴρεται πρόσω·
  [ἐπίσταται δὲ τοῖς κακοῖσί τ᾿ ἀσχαλᾶν   920

lengthened tirade against ναυτικὴ ἀταξία or ἀναρχία at *Hec.* 606—608 perhaps suggested the amplification of this passage. (Schiller admires greatly the χρήσιμον δ᾿, ὅταν θέλωσιν, 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 I. (just the reverse as to the two MSS. at 839).—ὥσθ᾿ PL, ἐσθ᾿ Reiske (this emendation lightens the construction, and gives the words the conventional 'Choric' turn). 919. ὑψιλόφρων 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 αἴρεται has been corrected into αἴρεται, or αἴρεται changed to ἀείρεται.—πρόσω PL, πτερῷ 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. θυμός 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 εὐσεβεστάτου:— 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. *O. T.* 914. If πρόσω is the right

reading these words must mean ' is borne far onwards'. Somewhat similar

μετρίως τε χαίρειν τοῖσιν ἐξωγκωμένοις.
λελογισμένοι γὰρ οἱ τοιοίδ᾽ εἰσὶν βροτῶν
ὀρθῶς διαζῆν τὸν βίον γνώμης μέτα.
ἔστιν μὲν οὖν ἵν᾽ ἡδὺ μὴ λίαν φρονεῖν,
ἔστιν δὲ χὤπου χρήσιμον γνώμην ἔχειν.   925
ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἐν ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβεστάτου τραφεὶς
Χείρωνος, ἔμαθον τοὺς τρόπους ἁπλοῦς ἔχειν.]

*   *   *   *   *   *

καὶ τοῖς Ἀτρείδαις, ἢν μὲν ἡγῶνται καλῶς,
πεισόμεθ᾽· ὅταν δὲ μὴ καλῶς, οὐ πείσομαι.
ἀλλ᾽ ἐνθάδ᾽ ἐν Τροίᾳ τ᾽ ἐλευθέραν φύσιν   930
παρέχων, Ἄρη τὸ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ κοσμήσω δορί.
[σὲ δ᾽, ὦ παθοῦσα σχέτλια πρὸς τῶν φιλτάτων,

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. κοινὴ συλλαβή) in P.—εἰσὶ P,—
the ρο in βροτῶν in L is a correction from something.   925. ἐστί corrected
by an early hand to ἔστιν L.—χ᾽ ὤπου L.   929. οὐ πεισόμεθα 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: ἃ δὴ κατ᾽ ἀνδ.
κ.τ.λ. from τὸ κατ᾽ ἐμέ in 931, περιβαλὼν καταστελῶ (whatever he meant by it) from
κοσμήσω, παρέξω τοὐμὸν δέμας from ἐλευθέραν φύσιν παρέχων and τοὔνομα 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 αἴρω may be found
at Hipp. 735 and Bacch. 748. Firnhaber
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 εἰσίν] 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 iucundum est. Stiblinus cps.
Soph. Ai. 554 ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν
ἥδιστος βίος.

930 f. The participial clause—ἐλευθέ-
ραν φύσιν παρέχων—contains the most
important part of the declaration: 'while
I do my best as a soldier I will keep my-
self a free man still'.

ἃ δὴ κατ' ἄνδρα γίγνεται νεανίαν,
τοσοῦτον οἶκτον περιβαλὼν καταστελῶ,]
κοὔποτε κόρη σὴ πρὸς πατρὸς σφαγήσεται,   935
ἐμὴ φατισθεῖσ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐμπλέκειν πλοκὰς
ἐγὼ παρέξω σῷ πόσει τοὐμὸν δέμας.
τοὔνομα γάρ, εἰ καὶ μὴ σίδηρον ἤρατο,
τοὐμὸν φονεύσει παῖδα σήν. τὸ δ' αἴτιον
πόσις σός· ἁγνὸν δ' οὐκέτ' ἐστὶ σῶμ' ἐμόν,   940
εἰ δι' ἔμ' ὀλεῖται διά τε τοὺς ἐμοὺς γάμους
ἢ δεινὰ τλᾶσα κοὐκ ἀνεκτὰ παρθένος.
[θαυμαστὰ δ' ὡς ἀνάξι' ἠτιμασμένη.]
ἐγὼ κάκιστος ἦν ἄρ' Ἀργείων ἀνήρ,
ἐγὼ τὸ μηδέν, Μενέλεως δ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν·   945
[ὡς οὐχὶ Πηλέως, ἀλλ' ἀλάστορος γεγώς,

poor in pity? (τοσοῦτον must be correlative to ἃ δή): and what, with or without
περιβαλών, 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
κοὔποτε).   933. γίνεται PL.   937. Nauck thought at one time that this v.
(from which apparently v. 947 was concocted) originally ended: τοὐμὸν ὄνομα σῷ
πόσει.   938. εἰ μὴ καὶ PL, εἰ καὶ μὴ Ald.—ἤρατο PL, ἠράμην Nauck.   940.
ἁγνός P, ἁγνὸν L.   943. ἠτιμασμένη P (corrected by a late hand to ἠ-), ἠ- L.
Nauck and Herm. (*Opusc.*) rightly reject this v. θαυμαστὰ ὡς is late Greek for
the prose θαυμαστῶς ὡς, and the latter part of the line comes from *Hel.* 455 ὦ δαῖμον
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 *I. T.* 369 (ff.). Ἅιδης Ἀχιλλεὺς 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 inter-
polator doubtless meant them to refer to Achilles, but as they stand they can only refer

936. φατισθεῖσ'] Cp. above v. 135.

937. τοὐμὸν δέμας] a mere periphrasis
for '*myself*'. See however Crit. N.

938. εἰ...ἤρατο] A bold picturesque
expression, of somewhat the same charac-
ter as Aeschylus's ἄπυρος ἀρδις 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 τοὐμὸν 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).

εἴπερ φονεύσει τοὐμὸν ὄνομα σῷ πόσει.]
μὰ τὸν δι' ὑγρῶν κυμάτων τεθραμμένον
Νηρέα, φυτουργὸν Θέτιδος ἥ μ' ἐγείνατο,
οὐχ ἅψεται σῆς θυγατρὸς Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ,   950
οὐδ' εἰς ἄκραν χεῖρ', ὥστε προσβαλεῖν πέπλοις.
[ἢ Σίπυλος ἔσται πόλις ὅρισμα βαρβάρων,
ὅθεν πεφύκασ' οἱ στρατηλάται γένος,
Φθία δὲ τοὐμόν τ' οὐδαμοῦ κεκλήσεται.]
πικροὺς δὲ προχύτας χέρνιβάς τ' ἐνάρξεται   955
Κάλχας ὁ μάντις. τίς δὲ μάντις ἔστ' ἀνήρ,

to Menelaus. 947. ὅσπερ φονεύει PL, εἴπερ Ald., φονεύσει Schaefer. vv. 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 vv. 945 and 946. ὅρισμα is possibly an ignorant
scribe's Greek translation of the Lat. *fines*. 954. φθία δὲ τοὐμόν τ' οὐδαμοῦ L, φ. δ.
τοὐμὸν τοὐδαμοῦ P, the τ being crossed through. The accent of the τοὐμὸν, 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 τοὐμὸν meant τοὐμὸν
ὅρισμα (supplied from v. 952). The inserter of the τ' before οὐδαμοῦ probably supplied
γένος from 953. Φθίας δὲ τοὐνομ' οὐδαμοῦ Jacobs. This emendation has been adopted
by all editors who believe the v. to be genuine. 955. ἀνάξεται PL, ἐνάρξεται
Musgr. vv. 959—974. Hennig (pp. 125 ff.) has, I think, proved these vv. to be
spurious. He also shows good cause for thinking that vv. 963 and 964, and again
vv. 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
irreconcileable 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 ὡραῖον 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 Agamem-
non's. 'He shall not even so much as
touch her garments with his hand'. Cf.
Homer's use of εἰς in Γ 158 αἰνῶς ἀθανά-
τῃσι θεῇς εἰς ὦπα ἔοικεν and in a 411 οὐ
μὲν γάρ τι κακῷ εἰς ὦπα ἐῴκει—perhaps
'as far as face goes'. Paley compares
εἰς πλησμονὰς in Tro. 1211.

955. πικροὺς] 'to his cost' as Paley

says. Cp. Cobet V. L. 573.

956. The ἀνήρ joined to μάντις (cf.
the Homeric ἰητρὸς ἀνήρ Λ 514, ἀνὴρ ὀχετ-
ηγὸς Φ 257, νομεὺς ἀνήρ Soph. O. T. 1118,
and the English *fisherman, beggar man,
sailor man*) marks the noun as the desig-
nation of a *calling*, and so, like the
English 'professional' and 'professed',
may be used in a slightly derogatory
sense. Without the ἀνήρ the words would
most naturally have meant '*who is a
seer?*'

ὃς ὀλίγ' ἀληθῆ, πολλὰ δὲ ψευδῆ λέγει
τυχών, ὅταν δὲ μὴ τύχῃ, διοίχεται;
[οὐ τῶν γάμων ἕκατι, μυρίαι κόραι
θηρῶσι λέκτρον τοὐμόν, εἴρηται τόδε·   960
ἀλλ' ὕβριν ἐς ἡμᾶς ὕβρισ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ·
χρῆν δ' αὐτὸν αἰτεῖν τοὐμὸν ὄνομ' ἐμοῦ πάρα,
θήραμα παιδός· ἡ Κλυταιμνήστρα δ' ἐμοὶ
μάλιστ' ἐπείσθη θυγατέρ' ἐκδοῦναι πόσει.
ἔδωκά τἂν Ἕλλησιν, εἰ πρὸς Ἴλιον   965
ἐν τῷδ' ἔκαμνε νόστος· οὐκ ἠρνούμεθ' ἂν
τὸ κοινὸν αὔξειν ὧν μέτ' ἐστρατευόμην.
νῦν δ' οὐδέν 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, ἢ', L, οὐ Lenting, γαμούντων PL, γάμων Canter. Hermann and Hartung would reject the parenthesis μυρίαι—τοὐμὸν and insert δ' before εἴρηται.   963. δέ μοι PL, δ' ἐμοὶ Matthiae. Hermann reads εἰ for the MSS. ἢ with only a comma after πόσει in v. 964.   965. ἔδωκέ τ' ἂν PL, ἔδωκα Hervagius, τἂν Gaisford.   967. ἐστρατευόμην PL, ἐστρατεύομεν Monk: the

958. τυχών] *'when he succeeds'*: i.e. ' at best ' (he tells many lies for every truth).—Firnhaber and Vitelli are doubtless right both in taking ὃς 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' ἐμπύρῳ χρῆται τέχνῃ, μάταιος· ἢν μὲν ἐχθρὰ σημήνας τύχῃ, πικρὸς καθέστηχ' οἷς ἂν οἰωνοσκοπῇ· ψευδῆ δ' ὑπ' οἴκτου τοῖσι χρωμένοις λέγων ἀδικεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν. I think Firnhaber is wrong in finding in Tei-

resias's words in the *Bacchae* (*e.g.* vπ. 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' ὑβρισθείς.

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. τῇδε γὰρ νοσεῖ νόστος πρὸς οἴκους.

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
ἐλθεῖν, φόνου κηλῖσιν αἵματι χρανῶ,
εἴ τίς με τὴν σὴν θυγατέρ' ἐξαιρήσεται.
ἀλλ' ἡσύχαζε· θεὸς ἐγὼ πέφηνά σοι
μέγιστος, οὐκ ὤν· ἀλλ' ὅμως γενήσομαι.]

ΧΟ.   ἔλεξας, ὦ παῖ Πηλέως, σοῦ τ' ἄξια   975
    καὶ τῆς ἐναλίας δαίμονος, σεμνῆς θεοῦ.

ΚΛ.   φεῦ·
    πῶς ἄν σ' ἐπαινέσαιμι μὴ λίαν λόγοις;
    [μήτ' ἐνδεῶς μὴ τοῦδ' ἀπολέσαιμι τὴν χάριν;]
    αἰνούμενοι γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ τρόπον τινὰ
    μισοῦσι τοὺς αἰνοῦντας, ἢν αἰνῶσ' 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 -ος being in an erasure by the first hand. 971. αἵματι PL, αἵματος Porson, who read φόνον, omitting the comma after ἐλθεῖν. Perhaps Weil is right in regarding αἵματι as a gloss on φόνου κηλῖσιν which ousted a word—Herwerden suggests Ἕλληνος, used, as at *I. T.* 72, as an adj. αἱματοχρανῶ Bothe. Possibly αἱματώσομεν originally stood at the end of the verse, and αἵματι χρανῶ was a marginal gloss intended as an explanation of φόνου κηλῖσιν αἱματώσομεν. 978. μήτ' ἐνδεῶς μὴ τοῦδ' ἀπολέσαιμι τὴν χάριν PL: in L ης is written (by m² Vit. says) over ὡς. 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' ἐνδεὴς τοῦδ' ἀπ- Markl., μηδ' ἐνδεὴς τοῦδ' ἀπ- Dind., μηδ' ἐνδεῶς του 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 οἱγαθοὶ or οἱ ἀγαθοί. ἀγαθοὶ Pors.   980. ἢν PL, altered by a late hand in P to ἐάν.   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 ὁρκίων τέ μοι ξίφος and 253 ἐν Ἄρης τάχ' εἴσεται.

973. It is possible that the interpolator here used φαίνεσθαι 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 κἂν τῷδ' ἐστίν, αἰνεῖσθαι λίαν, and Monk adds *Heracl.* 202 καὶ γὰρ οὖν ἐπίφθονον λίαν ἐπαινεῖν ἐστι.

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, κἂν ἄπωθεν ᾖ
ἀνὴρ ὁ χρηστός, δυστυχοῦντας ὠφελεῖν.
οἴκτιρε δ' ἡμᾶς· οἰκτρὰ γὰρ πεπόνθαμεν.   985
ᾗ πρῶτα μέν σε γαμβρὸν οἰηθεῖσ' ἔχειν,
κενὴν κατέσχον ἐλπίδ'· εἶτά σοι τάχα
ὄρνις γένοιτ' ἂν τοῖσι μέλλουσιν γάμοις
θανοῦσ' ἐμὴ παῖς, ὅ σε φυλάξασθαι χρεών.]
ἀλλ' εὖ μὲν ἀρχὰς εἶπας, εὖ δὲ καὶ τέλη·   990
σοῦ γὰρ θέλοντος παῖς ἐμὴ σωθήσεται.
βούλει νιν ἱκέτιν σὸν περιπτύξαι γόνυ;
ἀπαρθένευτα μὲν τάδ'· 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 ἐπαιδεσθησόμεσθ' οὖν κ.τ.λ.). (2) Then the passage breaks up internally: 981—984 stands by itself; so does 985—ἐλπίδ' in 987. The πρῶτα μέν σε and εἶτά 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 ᾖ 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. (*Opusc.*).   990. καὶ τέλη PL, ? πανταχῆ (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 *Tro.* 470 (ὅμως δ' ἔχει τι σχῆμα κικλήσκειν θεούς) shows that Musgrave was nearer in rendering "*habet speciem*, vel *gratiam*" and Hermann in taking ἔχει impersonally, and ᾖ with ἀνήρ. (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.)

κἂν ἄπωθεν ᾖ] Cp. *Fr.* 894 σοφὸν γὰρ ἄνδρα, κἂν ἑκὰς ναίῃ χθονός, κἂν μήποτ' ὄσσοις εἰσίδω, κρίνω 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 ἀρχαὶ δ' αἵδε μοι πολλῶν πόνων. At *Hel.* 661 L gives ἀρχὰς as a variant for ἀρχάν. Cf. also the adverbial κατ' ἀρχάς. But I

7—2

ἥξει, δι᾽ αἰδοῦς ὄμμ᾽ ἔχουσ᾽ ἐλεύθερον·
εἰ δ᾽ οὐ παρούσης ταὐτὰ τεύξομαι σέθεν,   995
μενέτω κατ᾽ οἴκους· σεμνὰ γὰρ σεμνυντέα.
[ὅμως δ᾽ ὅσον γε δυνατὸν αἰδεῖσθαι χρεών.]

ΑΧ. σὺ μήτε σὴν παῖδ᾽ ἔξαγ᾽ ὄψιν εἰς ἐμήν,
μήτ᾽ εἰς ὄνειδος ἀμαθὲς ἔλθωμεν, γύναι·
στρατὸς γὰρ ἀθρόος ἀργὸς ὢν τῶν οἴκοθεν   1000
λέσχας πονηρὰς καὶ κακοστόμους φιλεῖ.
πάντως δέ μ᾽ ἱκετεύοντες ἥξετ᾽ εἰς ἴσον,
εἴ τ᾽ ἀνικετεύτως· εἰς ἐμοὶ γάρ ἐστ᾽ ἀγὼν

πρέποντα παρθένοις, Σοφοκλῆς Ἰφιγενείᾳ τῇ ἐν Αὐλίδι. Hesych.   994. ἥξει δι᾽ PL,
ἔξεισιν Porson: but αἰδοῦς ἐλεύθερον would be 'no compliment' (Monk) to a maiden who
was doing what was unmaidenly (ἀπαρθένευτα). The same applies to F. W. Schmidt's
δίχ᾽ αἰδοῦς. At the same time δι᾽ αἰδοῦς ἔχουσα is colourless and inexpressive, and
though if ἥξει δι᾽ αἰδοῦς be taken together the sense, so far, is more positive, it not
only takes away the necessary prominence from ἥξει, but leaves a still weaker
residuum in ὄμμ᾽ ἔχουσ᾽ ἐλεύθερον. Possibly ἔχουσ᾽ is a corruption of some word
meaning veiling or holding down, or ἐλεύθερον a corruption of some word or words
meaning veiled, or cast down.   995. ἰδού PL, εἰ δ᾽ οὐ Hartung and Nauck.
ταῦτα PL, ταὐτὰ Heath.   996. σεμνύνεται PL, σεμνυντέα F. W. Schmidt,
rightly, I think. The ordinary reading is a strong description, implying, if anything,
a little reproach. This was felt by the interpolator of the next v. This v. is given
to ΑΧ. and the next to ΚΛ. in the MSS. Elmsley gave both to Cly.   997.
"Melius aberit" Nauck. I think this v. was an interpolation, springing out of a
mistake in the previous v. (see above). The qualifying γε is quite out of place. The
sense of the passage thus remodelled is in effect, 'For she is very shy: but for all
that we must respect her shyness wherever we can'. I imagine that the interpolation
was made before v. 996 was given to ΑΧ., and that the man who made this further
alteration understood by 997 'For all that, we are bound to show you (Achilles)
what respect we can'.   1002. ἴξετ᾽ or ἔξετ᾽ corr. by a late hand to ἥξετ᾽ P,
ἔξετ᾽ L.   1003. εἴ τ᾽ ἀνικέτευτος ἦς· PL, εἴ τ᾽ ἀνικετεύτως· εἰς Nauck (ἐπ᾽

---

know of no other instance of a similar
plural to τέλος in the sense of end—τέλη
usually having various other special
meanings.

995. οὐ] because Iph. actually was
absent.

996. σεμνὰ γὰρ σεμνυντέα] simply
'(her) shyness must be respected'. σεμ-
νύνονται at Plat. Rep. 405 A is generally
taken as a passive in the sense of 'are
respected', 'gain respect'.

999. ὄνειδος ἀμαθές] (incur) 'the re-
proach of the foolish'.

1000. τὰ οἴκοθεν] Their home occu-
pations and interests.

1003. εἴ τ᾽ ἀνικετεύτως] The adv.
here, with which we must supply ἥξετε
from the preceding v., must be taken
actively: i.e. 'if you come without a
suppliant's prayer'. Other instances of
similarly formed adjectives used actively
(e.g. ἀφύλακτος, ἄπρακτος) are given by
Krüger 41, 11, 26. Closely parallel to
ἀνικέτευτος is the ἀνευκτος quoted by Mark-
land from an epigram in Plat. Alc. 143 A,
where it is used actively.

www.libtool.com.cn

μέγιστος ὑμᾶς ἐξαπαλλάξαι κακῶν.
ὡς ἕν γ' ἀκούσασ' ἴσθι, μὴ ψευδῶς μ' ἐρεῖν·   1005
ψευδῆ λέγων δὲ καὶ μάτην ἐγκερτομῶν
θάνοιμι· μὴ θάνοιμι δ', ἢν σώσω κόρην.

ΚΛ. ὄναιο συνεχῶς δυστυχοῦντας ὠφελῶν.
ΑΧ. ἄκουε δή νυν, ἵνα τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἔχῃ καλῶς.
ΚΛ. τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας ὡς ἀκουστέον γέ σου;   1010
ΑΧ. πεῖσον μεταῦθις πατέρα βέλτιον φρονεῖν.
ΚΛ. κακός τίς ἐστι καὶ λίαν ταρβεῖ στρατόν.
ΑΧ. ἀλλ' οὖν λόγοι γε καταπαλαίουσιν φόβους.

ἀνικετεύτῳ θ'. Weil). 1004. ἐξ ἀπαλλάξαι P corrected by a late hand to
ἐξαπαλλάξαι. 1005—1007. J. C(onington) regards these *vv.* 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 *v.* 1004), which has crept into the text. This
latter suggestion may be regarded as a faint support of the view that *vv.* 1005—1007
are spurious: *i.e.* the συνεχῶς may conceivably have referred to the word ἐξα-
παλλάξαι. Possibly the words ousted by συνεχῶς were δ' αὐτὸς or καὶ σύ.
1009. δὴ νῦν PL, δὴ νυν Barnes. Cp. on *v.* 1146 below.—ἔχῃ corrected by an
early hand to ἔχει P, ἔχῃ with ει written over the η by the first hand (Vit.) L.
Those who wrote ἔχει apparently took ἵνα in the sense of *how*, a natural extension
of its use for *the circumstances in which.* 1011. πειθωμεθ' αὖτις 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 L πειθωμεν is written over the former
word. πειθωμεν Scaliger, αὖθις Matthiae, αὐτῆς Monk. Markland says the Paris
copies of L vary between πειθομεθ' and πειθομεν. I believe that the original was
πεῖσον 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 ἐγκερτομῶν] very nearly
corresponds to the English 'swagger'.

1007. μὴ θάνοιμι δ' κ.τ.λ.] These
words seem to us at first a weak conclu-
sion. The expression has been influ-
enced by its antithetical form. Probably
in effect they were meant as an assu-
rance :—'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* (*v.* 889) is not parallel: the
ὡς there is exclamatory.

1012. See Introduction p. xv and
above *v.* 517, and cp. *Fr.* 716 κακός τίς
ἐστι προξένῳ σοὶ χρώμενος.

ΚΛ. ψυχρὰ μὲν ἐλπίς· ὅ τι δὲ χρεών με δρᾶν φράσον.

ΑΧ. ἱκέτευ' ἐκεῖνον πρῶτα μὴ κτείνειν τέκνα·   1015
    ἢν δ' ἀντιβαίνῃ, πρὸς ἐμέ σοι πορευτέον.

    *   *   *   *   *   *   *

    [εἴη γὰρ τὸ χρῇζον ἐπίθετ', οὐ τοὐμὸν χρεὼν
    χωρεῖν· ἔχει γὰρ τοῦτο τὴν σωτηρίαν.
    κἀγώ τ' ἀμείνων πρὸς φίλον γενήσομαι,
    στρατός τ' ἂν οὐ μέμψαιτό μ', εἰ τὰ πράγματα   1020
    λελογισμένως πράσσοιμι 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 χρῇ), ὅ, τι δὲ χρή Reiske, Markland and Musgrave, and so most editors. Scaliger's impossible χρεώ suggested to Hermann χρεών, which is I think the best emendation:—χρή may well have been an explanation of the more unusual χρεών.   1016. ἂν PL, ἢν Markland.   1017. εἴη γὰρ τὸ χρῇζον ἐπίθετ' PL (the η erased by a late hand in P), καὶ δὴ τὸ χρῇζον ἔπιθεν Monk, ᾗ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Weil, who takes ἐπίθετ' to be for ἐπίθετε, εἰ γὰρ τὸ χρηστὸν πεῖσετ' 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 κρανθέντων (used as gen. abs. with τούτων or τῶν πραγμάτων understood) was scanned by the accent as ⏑−−: lastly in 1023 κἂν 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 ᾗ...ἔπιθεν), none. I think very possibly the interpolator of this passage had in mind *Hecuba vv.* 854—856:—εἴπως φανείη γ' ὥστε σοί τ' ἔχειν καλῶς, στρατῷ 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 χρῇζον] Lit. '*that which desires*' (cf. Thuc. I. 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 (ᾗ τὸ χρῇζον ἔπιθεν: "*qua optatio persuasit*") subordinate to words which must apply to the particular case: "*non me opus est intercedere*". It must

be admitted that Weil's ᾗ makes the χωρεῖν easier.

1019. For ἀμείνων πρὸς φίλον, which has a suspicious ring about it, Monk compares *Alc.* 433 ἀμείνον' εἰς ἐμέ, and Vitelli *vv.* 1179 and 1184 (κακὴν περὶ σέ) below, and *Med.* 82 οἷος εἰς ὑμᾶς, and Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 2. 27 (τοιοῦτος 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
σοί τ' ἂν γένοιτο κἂν ἐμοῦ χωρὶς τάδε.]
ΚΛ. ὡς σῶφρον' εἶπας. δραστέον δ' ἅ σοι δοκεῖ.
ἢν δ' αὖ τι μὴ πράσσωμεν ὧν ἐγὼ θέλω,   1025
ποῦ σ' αὖθις ὀψόμεσθα; ποῦ χρή μ' ἀθλίαν
ἐλθοῦσαν εὑρεῖν σὴν χέρ' ἐπίκουρον κακῶν;
ΑΧ. ἡμεῖς σε φύλακος οὗ χρέος φυλάξομεν.
μή τίς σ' ἴδῃ στείχουσαν ἐπτοημένην
Δαναῶν δι' ὄχλου· μηδὲ πατρῷον δόμον   1030
αἴσχυν'· ὁ γάρ τοι Τυνδάρεως οὐκ ἄξιος
[κακῶς ἀκούειν· ἐν γὰρ Ἕλλησιν μέγας].

written over ει by an early hand).   1022. κρανθέντων καί P, and in L there is
an erasure of one or two letters after κρανθέντων.   1024. ὦ 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 εἶτας for a
participle, altered ὡ into ὦ.)   1025. αὐτὰ PL, αὖ τι Monk. ἃ P, 'ἃν L, ὧν Monk.
1026. The σ in ὀψόμεσθα was added by an early hand in L. Wecklein would read
τοῖ for the second ποῦ.   1028. φύλακες οὗ χρεὼν φυλάσσομεν PL, φυλάξομεν
Markland. I think the φύλακες φυλάξομεν is very weak, and suggest that originally
the line ran ἡμεῖς σε φύλακος οὗ χρέος φυλάξομεν.   1032. I have no hesitation in

To advise supplication is hardly to 'con-
duct the affair by plan'.

1022. It is possible that the καί 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 divi-
sion into two halves. If the καί 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 ἄν.—A miserable rag of
sense we get from the sentence at best:
'If these things are brought to a success-
ful issue they will please your friends,

and please you, without help from me'.

1024. ὡς σῶφρον' εἶπας] These words
could hardly refer to vv. 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 ἆρ' ἄν τι
μοι φράσειας ὧν ἐγὼ θέλω;

1028 f. I have followed Markland's
note in putting a full stop at φυλάξομεν.
Most editors take μή τίς σ' ἴδῃ κ.τ.λ. as
depending upon φυλάξομεν, but it is best
to make them begin a separate prohibi-
tion. 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 φυλά-
ξομεν, but says in his note that it is a
mistake for a comma.)

ΚΛ. ἔσται τάδ'. ἄρχε· σοί με δουλεύειν χρεών.
    εἰ δ' εἰσι θεοί, δίκαιος ὢν ἀνήρ, θεῶν
    ἐσθλῶν κυρήσεις· εἰ δὲ μή, τί δεῖ πονεῖν;   1035

ΣΤΆCIMON Γ'.

ΧΟ. τίς ἄρ' ὑμέναιος διὰ λωτοῦ Λίβυος   στρ.
    μετά τε φιλοχόρου κιθάρας
    συρίγγων θ' ὑπὸ καλαμοεσ-
    σᾶν ἔστασεν ἰαχάν,
    ὅτ' ἀνὰ Πήλιον αἱ 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.** ἔστιν PL, ἔσται Markl.   **1034.** In P this v. is in cramped writing and ends with ἀνήρ. In L σύγε 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 μέν εἰσιν θεοί. Vitelli, following Monk in taking ἐσθλῶν 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) δή.   **1036.** τίς PL, τίν' (and Ὑμέναιος) Markl. (See Expl. N. on v. 1039.)   **1038.** καλαμόεσσαν PL, καλαμοεσσᾶν Markland.   **1039.** ἔστασαν PL, ἔστασεν Portus.   **1040.** In P this v. begins with ὅταν ἀνὰ

1034. For the synizesis of θεοί following a short syllable cf. Soph. *O. T.* 1519 ἀλλὰ θεοῖς γ' ἔχθιστος ἥκω.

1035. For (θεῶν) ἐσθλῶν κυρήσεις Monk compares *Ion* 1269 ἐσθλοῦ 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 ἱστάναι βοήν 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 *Heraclidae* v. 752 and Nauck *Stud. Eur.* I. 111 f. [ἰαχή and ἰαχέω always in tragedy, though the aor. ἴαχον (*Or.* 1465, *Tro.* 829): where the metre demands ἰᾱ read ἀχά— cf. v. 1045—*i.e.* ἠχή: the forms in κχ are confined to Ἴακχος 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 ἴχνος
ἐν γᾷ κρούσουσαι
Πηλέως εἰς γάμον ἦλθον,
μελῳδοῖς Θέτιν ἀχήμασι τόν τ' Αἰακίδαν   1045
Κενταύρων ἀν' ὄρος κλέουσαι
Πηλιάδα καθ' ὕλαν;
[ὁ δὲ Δαρδανίδας, Διὸς
λέκτρων τρύφημα φίλον,   .   1050

(with a space between) corrected to ὅτ' ἀνὰ, in L an erasure follows ἰαχὰν and ὅτ'
ἀνὰ is in an erasure. I conjecture that the confusion arose from the presence in some
MS. of an ἀντάν by the side of ἰαχάν, 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 Θεσσαλίᾳ 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 κρούσουσαι 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.* συνίζησις, over έως) P, Πηλέος
L.   1045. μελῳδοὶ PL, μελῳδοῖς Elmsley (on *Heracl.* 752). ἰαχήμασι PL (with
ἀντὶ μιᾶς written over the ἰα in both MSS.), ἀχήμασι 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 (χρυσεοστόλμους
in a trochaic tetrameter), Sophocles none.
Euripides is the only tragedian who uses
compounds beginning with χαλκεο-.

χρυσέοισιν ἄφυσσε λοιβὰν
ἐν κρατήρων γυάλοις,
ὁ Φρύγιος Γανυμήδης.]
παρὰ δὲ λευκοφαῆ ψάμαθον
εἰλισσόμεναι κύκλια   1055
πεντήκοντα κόραι γάμους
Νηρέως ἐχόρευσαν.

ἀνὰ δ' ἐλάταισι στεφανώδει τε χλόᾳ   ἀντ.
θίασος ἔμολεν ἱπποβάτας
Κενταύρων ἐπὶ δαῖτα τὰν   1060
θεῶν κρατῆρά τε Βάκχου.
μέγα δ' ἀνέκλαγον· ὦ Νηρηὶ κόρα,
παῖδα σὲ Θεσσαλίᾳ μέγα φῶς
μάντις ὁ φοιβάδα μοῦσαν

(with ἀντὶ μᾶς over ιον in L), φίλον Musurus.   1055. κύκλια Weil rejects as
an interpolation, and in vv. 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 Νηρῆος P, Νηρῆος L, but the ῆος 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 στεφάνῳ δεῖ τε.   1059.
ἱπποβόταs PL, ἱπποβάταs Paley and Gomperz, who compare the use (Soph. Trach.
1095) of ἱπποβάμων as an epithet for the Centaurs. Paley compares Cyclops 54, at
which place L¹ reads ἀγροβότα and L² and P ἀγροβάτα. I do not think Hennig's
objection, founded on the difference of meaning between -βάτηs and -βάμων, conclusive.
1062. Νηρηεῖ corrected by a not very early hand to Νηρηὶ P, Νηρηὶ L.   1063.
παῖδεs αἱ Θεσσαλαὶ PL, παῖδα σὺ Θεσσαλίᾳ Kirchhoff, in which Weil changes σὺ to σε.
1064. δ' ὁ φοιβα μουσαν εἰδώς 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 ἐλάταιs 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 χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ
σκήπτρῳ 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. ὑψικόμων πέραν βαίνουσ' ἐλα-
τᾶν, and Bacch. 38 χλωραῖs ὑπ' ἐλάταιs.
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 'ὦ...
φῶς' and 'ὃs...πυρώσων' to be words
uttered by Cheiron only.

1063. For Θεσσαλίᾳ μέγα φῶς cp.
below v. 1502 ἔθρεψαs Ἑλλάδι μέγα φάοs.

εἰδὼς γεννάσειν   1065

Χείρων ἐξονόμαζεν,

ὃς ἥξει χθόνα λογχήρεσι σὺν Μυρμιδόνων

ἀσπισταῖς Πριάμοιο κλεινὰν

Ἰλιάδα πυρώσων.   1070

[περὶ σώματι χρυσέων

ὅπλων Ἡφαιστοπόνων

κεκορυθμένος ἔνδυτ', ἐκ θεᾶς

ματρὸς δωρήματ' ἔχων

Θέτιδος, ἅ νιν ἔτικτε.]   1075

μακάριον τότε δαίμονες

τᾶς εὐπάτριδος γάμον

Νηρῆδός τ' ἔθεσαν ποτνίας

one changed φοιβα into φοιβοs, and inserted a ὁ before μουσαν and a τ' after it), δ' ὁ φοιβα μουσαν ἰιδώs (corrected to δ' ὁ φοῖβοs ὁ μουσᾶν τ' εἰδώs) L. I am not sure about the original accents in P. The εἰδὼs in Vitelli's collation (Oss. p. 70) is a misprint for εἰδὼs, the first ' being the apostrophe of the τ'. ὁ φοιβάδα μοῦσαν εἰδώs Hermann.   1065. γεννάσειs PL (γεννήσειs is written over it in P and η is written over a in L), γεννάσειν Weil.   1066. ἐξωνόμασεν PL, ἐξονόμαζεν Monk and Firnhaber (Hermann, who reads ἀνέκλαγεν in 1062, reads ἐξονομάζων here).   1067. ἥξει PL, but the adoption of the above-mentioned emendations almost seems to necessitate ἥξοι.   1068. λογχήρεσσι PL (σσ corrected to σ in L but not in P).   1069. ἀσπισταῖs 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 strophic 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. Νηρῆδοs ἔθεσαν πρώταs PL. In both a later hand has altered N. to Νηρηῖδοs and written ἀντὶ μιαs over the -δοs, meaning it, I think, to apply to the two syllables -δοs ἔ-. In L -ηs is written by an early hand—Vit.

1066. ἐξονόμαζεν] Used as ὀνομάζω 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. Ant. 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 πόλιs.

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. ἐνδυτά with κεκορυθμένοs and the ἐκ which follows it are questionable Greek.

χρυσέοισιν ἄφυσσε λοιβὰν
ἐν κρατήρων γυάλοις,
ὁ Φρύγιος Γανυμήδης.]
παρὰ δὲ λευκοφαῆ ψάμαθον
εἱλισσόμεναι κύκλια   1055
πεντήκοντα κόραι γάμους
Νηρέως ἐχόρευσαν.

ἀνὰ δ' ἐλάταισι στεφανώδει τε χλόᾳ   ἀντ.
θίασος ἔμολεν ἱπποβάτας
Κενταύρων ἐπὶ δαῖτα τὰν   1060
θεῶν κρατῆρά τε Βάκχου.
μέγα δ' ἀνέκλαγον· ὦ Νηρηὶ κόρα,
παῖδα σὲ Θεσσαλίᾳ μέγα φῶς
μάντις ὁ φοιβάδα μοῦσαν

(with ἀντὶ μιᾶς over ιων in L), φίλον Musurus.   1055. κύκλια Weil rejects as an interpolation, and in vv. 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 Νηρῆος P, Νηρῆος L, but the ῆος 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. ἱπποβότας PL, ἱπποβάτας Paley and Gomperz, who compare the use (Soph. Trach. 1095) of ἱπποβάμων as an epithet for the Centaurs. Paley compares Cyclops 54, at which place L¹ reads ἀγροβότα and L² and P ἀγροβάτα. I do not think Hennig's objection, founded on the difference of meaning between -βάτης and -βάμων, conclusive.   1062. Νηρηεῖ corrected by a not very early hand to Νηρηὶ P, Νηρηὶ L.   1063. παῖδες αἱ Θεσσαλαὶ PL, παῖδα σὺ Θεσσαλίᾳ Kirchhoff, in which Weil changes σὺ to σε.   1064. δ' ὁ φοιβα μουσαν εἰδώς 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 χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ Α 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. ὑψικόμων πέραν βαίνουσ' ἐλα-τᾶν, 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 'ὦ... φῶς' and 'ὅς...πυρώσων' to be words uttered by Cheiron only.   1063. For Θεσσαλίᾳ μέγα φῶς cp. below v. 1502 ἔθρεψας Ἑλλάδι μέγα

εἰδὼς γεννάσειν   1065
Χείρων ἐξονόμαζεν,
ὃς ἥξει χθόνα λογχήρεσι σὺν Μυρμιδόνων
ἀσπισταῖς Πριάμοιο κλεινὰν
Ἰλιάδα πυρώσων.   1070
[περὶ σώματι χρυσέων
ὅπλων Ἡφαιστοπόνων
κεκορυθμένος ἔνδυτ', ἐκ θεᾶς
ματρὸς δωρήματ' ἔχων
Θέτιδος, ἅ νιν ἔτικτε.]   1075
μακάριον τότε δαίμονες
τᾶς εὐπάτριδος γάμον
Νηρῇδός τ' ἔθεσαν ποτνίας

one changed φοιβα into φοιβος, and inserted a ὁ before μοισαν and a ⁻ after ι., ι·
φοιβα μουσαν ειδώς (corrected to δ' ὁ φοῖβος ὁ μοισᾶν τ' εἰδώς) L. I am not sure
about the original accents in P. The εἰδὼς in Vitelli's collation ... ι. is a
misprint for εἰδὼς, the first ' being the apostrophe of the τ'. ὁ μοισᾶν μουσαν also
Hermann.   1065. γεννάσεις PL (γεννήσεις is written over ... ' in ... '
written over α in L), γεννάσειν Weil.   1066. ἐξονόμαζεν PL, ἐξονόμαζεν Μοnk
and Firnhaber (Hermann, who reads ἀνέκλαγεν in 1062, reads ἐξονόμαξεν here).
1067. ἥξει PL, but the adoption of the above-mentioned emendation seems
to necessitate ἥξου.   1068. λογχήρεσσι PL (ἐν corrected u r n L, and not in ὁ').
1069. ἀσπισταῖς P, ἀσπισταῖσι L (with a 'quasi erasure' Vitelli says, ... not in
1070. γαῖαν ἐκπυρώσων PL. Weil calls attention to the fact that there is no place
here for both γαῖαν and χθόνα and reads Πέργαμα ... which is no also
also restores the strophical correspondence: I have ventured to read Dindorf's ...
In uncials γαῖαν and Ἰλιάδα are very similar, and when one ... had taken its
place the ἐκ would be added for the sake of the metre.   1075. ... PL,
ἔτικτεν L².   1078. Νηρῇδος ἔθεσαν ποτνίας PL. In both a later hand has
altered N. to Νηρῇδος and written ... over the ..., meaning it, I think,
to apply to the two syllables ἔθεσ ... Ἐν L ... is written by an early hand—Vit.

1066. ἐξονόμαζεν] Used as impossible
at I 515 and Σ 449 in the sense of name
distinctly, promise. It is a little difficult
to find an exact force for the imperfect
here; perhaps it may be given in rating
an always with the English verb: 'al-
ways foretold'.

1070. For χθόνα ... Σ ...
Ant. 286 f. τρωικ... γᾶς ... ἐ...
v. 535, and ...
where he gives ...
tragedy of χθὼ ... ῶ ...
πόλις.

1071—1075. If these ... were ad-
mitted into the text we should have to
suppose the Centaur sang to and ad-
dressing ... for These could not be
spoken of in the third person by ...
... a song addressed to him. Paley uses
as 1 the assumption of these to show
... these would go to Troy already pos-
sessed of the armour made by Hephaestus,
a point that Homerists did not have at
... that Homer ... with two
Homers.—We are ... with two
... in the ... which follows it are

e
.f.
δὲ
γῆς,
ἀμὶ},
uc ad
. aliud

Πηλέως θ' ὑμεναίους.

σὲ δ' ὦ κόρα στέψουσι καλλικόμαν   ἐπῳδός   1080
πλόκαμον Ἀργεῖοι, βαλιὰν
ὥστε πετραίων ἀπ' ἄντρων ἐλθοῦσαν ὀρέων
μόσχον ἀκήρατον, βρότειον
αἱμάσσοντες λαιμόν·
οὐ σύριγγι τραφεῖσαν, οὐδ'   1085
ἐν ῥοιβδήσεσι 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 Νηρῇδων. Weil, see on
vv. 1055—6 above, reads here Νηρῇδός 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 Νηρῇδός τ' ἔθεσαν ποτνίας. I take πρώτας to have
been originally an explanation of ποτνίας (scanned ⏑ –).   1080. ἐπὶ κάρα PL,
ὦ κόρα Herm. (Opusc.).   1081. γ' ἁλιὰν PL, βαλιὰν Scaliger (cf. Hec. 90).
1082. ὀρέων PL, ὀρείαν Monk, but there is no objection of any kind to the gen.
Cf. Soph. Ant. 289 πόλεως ἄνδρες.   1086. ῥοιβδήσει PL, ῥοιβδήσεσι Dobree.
1087. νυμφοκόμον PL, νυμφόκομον Reiske.   1090. δύνασιν ἔχει PL. I agree
with Bothe that we ought only to have ἔχει here, that the word δύνασιν was writ-
ten 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
αἱματόεις, and means gory (here proleptic).

1085. σύριγγι] Cf. on 210 above.
The ἐν before ῥοιβδήσεσι must be supplied
mentally with σύριγγι too, ἐν being here
'within the sound of'. The ῥοιβδήσεις
would doubtless be made by σύριγγες,
so that the whole expression is equivalent
to οὐκ ἐν ῥοιβδήσεσι βουκολικῶν συρίγγων.
For the position of the prep. cf. Soph.
Ant. 367 ποτὲ μὲν κακόν, ἄλλοτ' ἐπ'
ἐσθλὸν ἕρπει. Ant. 1176, O. T. 734,

Ar. Ach. 533, Lobeck on Soph. Ai. vv.
395 ff., Eur. Phoen. 361 οὕτω 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, ἁ δ᾽ ἀρετὰ κατόπι-
σθεν θνατοῖς ἀμελεῖται,
ἀνομία δὲ νόμων κρατεῖ,   1095
καὶ μὴ κοινὸς ἀγὼν βροτοῖς,
μή τις θεῶν φθόνος ἔλθῃ.

ΚΛ.   ἐξῆλθον οἴκων προσκοπουμένη πόσιν,
χρόνιον ἀπόντα κἀκλελοιπότα στέγας.
[ἐν δακρύοισι θ᾽ ἡ τάλαινα παῖς ἐμή,   1100
πολλὰς ἱεῖσα μεταβολὰς ὀδυρμάτων,
θάνατον ἀκούσασ᾽, ὃν πατὴρ βουλεύεται.]

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 Firnhaber.   1098. προσσκοπουμένη PL: a late
hand in P altered the σσ into σ.   1099. ἀπόντ᾽ ἐκλελοιπότα P, altered by
an early hand to ἀπόντα κἀκλελοιπότα: 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 βουλεύεται 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 ἀρετᾶς πρόσωπον
Firnhaber well compares Ar. *Birds* 1324
τὸ τῆς ἀγανόφρονος ἡσυχίας εὐήμερον πρόσ-
ωπον.

1093. κατόπισθεν] *i.e.* men turn their
backs on virtue.

1098. Here the fourth epeisodion be-
gins. 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
epeisodion. 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.

προσκοπουμένη] '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.* I. p. 42 μεταβολὴ δέ
ἐστι ῥυθμικὴ ῥυθμῶν ἀλλοίωσις ἢ ἀγωγῆς,
and Quintilian IX. 4. 50 *Illi* [*rhythmi*],
quomodo coeperant, currunt usque ad
μεταβολήν, *id est transitum in aliud*
genus rhythmi.

μνήμην δ' ἄρ' εἶχον πλησίον βεβηκότος
'Αγαμέμνονος τοῦδ', ὃς ἐπὶ τοῖς αὑτοῦ τέκνοις
ἀνόσια πράσσων αὐτίχ' εὑρεθήσεται.   1105

ΑΓΑ.   Λήδας γένεθλον, ἐν καλῷ σ' ἔξω δόμων
        ηὕρηχ', ἵν' εἴπω παρθένου χωρὶς λόγους
        οὓς οὐκ ἀκούειν τὰς γαμουμένας πρέπει.
ΚΛ.   τί δ' ἔστιν, οὔ σοι καιρὸς ἀντιλάζυται;
ΑΓΑ.   ἔκπεμπε παῖδα τῶνδε δωμάτων πάρος·   1110
        ὡς χέρνιβες πάρεισιν ηὐτρεπισμέναι,

In 1100 P has ἐδάκρυσι θ'.—In 1101 the first hand of P wrote λεῦσα.   1104. αὑτοῦ 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. 741 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. ηὐτρεπισμένα PL (altered by a late hand

1103.   μνήμην ἔχειν] is here used as at *Hel.* 1583 and Hdt. I. 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 ἐπί 'against' cp. *Phoen.* 1379 ᾖξαν δρόμημα δεινὸν ἀλλήλοις ἔπι: this use is poetical.

1105.   "πράσσειν] = *machinari*, Or. 1579, 1587 etc." Vitelli.

1107.   ἵν' εἴπω] 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 negatived with the effect of negativing the whole. The same explanation applies to Thuc. I. 70. I 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.

www.libtool.com.cn

προχύται τε βάλλειν πῦρ καθάρσιον χεροῖν,
μόσχοι τε, πρὸ γάμων ἃς θεᾷ πεσεῖν χρεὼν
['Αρτέμιδι, 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 χρεών 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. φυσσήματα 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 'Αρτέμιδι is due to the
patcher who introduced the quotation. The words make a very harsh apposition
to μόσχοι (or ἅς), 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) λαβὼν
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 προ-
βάλοντο. The technical term for the
performance of these ceremonies pre-
liminary 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 puri-
fying element. In the passage of the
H. F. referred to above, is described the
mode in which the χέρνιβες were conse-
crated: 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 con-
ceit:
'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, abso-
lutely, 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 πειθαρ-
χοῦσά 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 χρή μ' ὀνομάσασαν εὖ λέγειν.
[χώρει δὲ θύγατερ ἐκτός, οἶσθα γὰρ πατρὸς
πάντως ἃ μέλλει, χ' ὑπὸ τοῖς πέπλοις ἄγε
λαβοῦσ' Ὀρέστην σὸν κασίγνητον, τέκνον.]
ἰδοὺ πάρεστιν ἥδε πειθαρχοῦσά σοι.   1120
τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐγὼ πρὸ τῆσδε κἀμαυτῆς φράσω.

ΑΓΑ. τέκνον, τί κλαίεις, οὐδ' ἔθ' ἡδέως ὁρᾷς,
εἰς γῆν δ' ἐρείσασ' ὄμμα πρόσθ' ἔχεις πέπλους;

ΚΛ. φεῦ·
τίν' 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. ἥκετε be addressed in *v.* 1127?—(See explanatory notes there.)—hardly to Cly. and the chorus.   1117. χώρει 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 δέ.   1118. μέλλει χ' ὑπὸ 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 ὁρᾷς.   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 ὁρᾷς 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 ἀλλ' ὡς μεθήσων μήποθ', ὡς ὁρᾷ πάλιν, Headlam better, Hes. *Sc.* 426 δεινὸν ὁρῶν ὄσσοισι.

1124 f. The heroine still keeps her face hidden, and Cly. still turned away from Agamemnon continues her soliloquy,

ἄπασι γὰρ πρώτοισι χρῆσασθαι πάρα   1125
[κἂν ὑστάτοισι κἂν μέσοισι πανταχοῦ].
ΑΓΑ. τί δ' ἔστιν; ὥς μοι πάντες εἰς ἓν ἥκετε
σύγχυσιν ἔχοντες καὶ ταραγμὸν ὀμμάτων.
ΚΛ. εἴφ' 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 ιφ (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 κἂν (*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 κἂν 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 ἃ ἂν as an explanation, in L it is written ἂν.   1130. οὐδὲν κελευσμ' οὐ δεῖ γ' PL (in L an ἢ is written over the εῖ—*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.— Heath cps. Eur. *El.* 907 f. εἶεν· 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 ἓν ἥκετε :— '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. *Heracl.* 890 f. ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοιοῖσδε χρὴ ἀψευδὲς εἶναι τοῖσι γενναίοις στόμα.

E. I.   8

ΚΛ. τὴν παῖδα τὴν σὴν τὴν τ' ἐμὴν μέλλεις κτανεῖν;

ΑΓΑ. ἔα·
τλήμονά γ' ἔλεξας, ὑπονοεῖς θ' ἃ μή σε χρή.

ΚΛ. ἔχ' ἥσυχος,
κἀκεῖνό μοι τὸ πρῶτον ἀπόκριναι πάλιν.

ΑΓΑ. σὺ δ', ἤν γ' ἐρωτᾷς εἰκότ', εἰκότ' ἂν κλύοις.

ΚΛ. οὐκ ἀλλ' ἐρωτῶ, καὶ σὺ μὴ λέγ' ἄλλα μοι.   1135

ΑΓΑ. ὦ πότνια μοῖρα καὶ τύχη δαίμων τ' ἐμός.

ΚΛ. κἀμός 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. Firnhaber retains the MSS. reading.
1135. οὐκ ἀλλ' PL (in L there is a · after οὐκ; if there is one also in P, I have
failed to notice it) and so Aldus: Canter's (1571) is the first edition in which I
have found οὐκ ἀλλ'.   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. κἀμός τε PL, κἀμός 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
-ας is indistinct, as it has been scratched through and αι 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 excla-
matory *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 στενά-
ζειν 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.
κἀκεῖνο 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 fa-
vour 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 ὅδ᾽ 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 ἐστί σου
καὶ τὸ στενάζειν πολλά. μὴ κάμῃς λέγων.
ΑΓΑ. ἰδοὺ σιωπῶ· τὸ γὰρ ἀναίσχυντον τί δεῖ
ψευδῆ λέγοντα προσλαβεῖν τῇ συμφορᾷ;   1145
ΚΛ. ἄκουε δή νυν· ἀνακαλύψομεν λόγους,

from ε which was written by the early hand. In L ν᾽ is written above the μ᾽ with ἡ after it). τί σ᾽ ἠδίκησα or τίς σ᾽ ἠδίκησε Markl., τίν᾽ ἠδίκησα and afterwards (*Opusc.*) 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. κάμνῃς 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 μή.) 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. *Hec.* 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 χρησώμεθ᾽ 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 ἐστί 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 ὅδ᾽: for οὐ τυγχάνει νοῦν ἔχων cp. *Bacchae v.* 252 (ἀναίνομαι) τὸ γῆρας ὑμῶν εἰσορῶν νοῦν οὐκ ἔχον, and *v.* 270 f. (θρασύς τε) καὶ λέγειν οἷός 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 σύ, πλὴν ἃ δεῖ σ᾽ εἶναι σοφόν. Cf. also Soph. *Phil.* 1244 σοφὸς πεφυκὼς οὐδὲν ἐξαυδᾷς 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.

8—2

κοὐκέτι παρῳδοῖς χρησόμεσθ' αἰνίγμασιν.
πρῶτον μέν, ἵνα σοι πρῶτα τοῦτ' ὀνειδίσω,
ἔγημας ἄκουσάν με κἄλαβες βίᾳ,
τὸν πρόσθεν ἄνδρα Τάνταλον κατακτανών,   1150
βρέφος τε τοὐμὸν ζῶν προσούδισας πέδῳ,
μαστῶν βιαίως τῶν ἐμῶν ἀποσπάσας.

next *v.* in L suggests that at some time ἀνακαλύψωμεν 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. σῷ προσούρησας πάλῳ P, σῷ προσούρισας 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 προσούρισας (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 οὖρος *a fair wind.* σῷ προσώρισας πάλῳ Monk and Hartung, σῷ προσούδισας πέδῳ (or πάτῳ) Scaliger, and so Milton. Musgrave in his second edition conjectured ζῶν πρὸς ὀκρίδας βαλών, of which Jacobs adopted the ζῶν to go with Scaliger's προσούδισας 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. (*Opusc.*—In his edition he read προσουρίσας as a participle with σῷ 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 Firnh.) that πάτῳ denoted *tread* (cf. Plut. *Mor.* p. 670 B) is worth considering—σῷ προσούδισας 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 μέν**] 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 γάρ μοι νῦν γε φαίνομαι πεποιηκέναι, ὡς εἴ τις πατέρα ἀποκτείνας τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ φείσαιτο, and the line of Stasinus νήπιος ὃς πατέρα κτείνας παῖδας καταλείπει, also to *Androm.* 519 ff., and *Herc. Fur.* 166 ff.—The Ionic προσουδίζειν is supported by the frequent use of οὖδας in tragedy.

καὶ τὼ Διός σε παῖδ' ἐμῶ δὲ συγγόνω
ἵπποισι μαρμαίροντ' ἐπεστρατευσάτην·
πατὴρ δὲ πρέσβυς Τυνδάρεώς σ' ἐρρύσατο   1155
ἱκέτην γενόμενον, τἀμὰ δ' ἔσχες αὖ λέχη.
οὗ δὴ καταλλαχθεῖσα περὶ σὲ καὶ δόμους
συμμαρτυρήσεις ὡς ἄμεμπτος ἦ γυνή,
εἴς τ' Ἀφροδίτην σωφρονοῦσα καὶ τὸ σὸν
μέλαθρον αὔξουσ', ὥστε σ' εἰσιόντα τε   1160
χαίρειν θύραζέ τ' ἐξιόντ' εὐδαιμονεῖν.
σπάνιον δὲ θήρευμ' ἀνδρὶ τοιαύτην λαβεῖν
δάμαρτα· φλαύραν δ' οὐ σπάνις γυναῖκ' ἔχειν.
τίκτω δ' ἐπὶ τρισὶ παρθένοισι παῖδά σοι.
τῶνδ' οὖν μιᾶς σὺ τλημόνως μ' ἀποστερεῖς.   1165

thy tread',—*i.e.* 'beneath thy foot'.   1153. Διός γε PL, Διός σε Markl.—ἐμῶ
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 ἐμῶ δὲ here.   1157. οὗ σοι PL. I have ventured to bring
this passage into agreement with others (*e.g. I. T.* 320, Plato *Menex.* 243 c)
where οὗ is used for '*thereupon*' in a narrative, by assuming that the (unnecessary)
σοι is a mistake for δή. τοι was very near δή in mediaeval pronunciation, and
may well have formed the bridge from δή to σοι. Or δή may have been wilfully
altered to σοι by some scribe who took οὗ 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 gram-
matico 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 τρισσί PL. This seems to have been corrected in
the earliest editions.   1165. τῶνδ', ὦν 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 ὦν. I have put

1154. ἵπποισι μαρμαίροντ'] For the
form of the phrase cf. *Androm.* 1146 ἔστη
φαεννοῖς δεσπότης στίλβων ὅπλοις, and
Phoen. 113 πολλοῖς μὲν ἵπποις μυρίοις δ'
ὅπλοις βρέμων.

1156. αὖ] This implies that the
Dioscuri had taken Cly. away from Aga-
memnon.

1157. περὶ σὲ] 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 posi-
tion of the τῶνδ' serves to point out that
it was a second case in which Ag. had
taken a child from her.

www.libtool.com.cn

κἂν τίς σ᾽ ἔρηται τίνος ἕκατί νιν κτενεῖς,
λέξον, τί φήσεις; ἢ ’μὲ χρὴ λέγειν τὰ σά;
Ἑλένην Μενέλεως ἵνα λάβῃ. καλόν γέ τοι
κακῆς γυναικὸς μισθὸν ἀποτείσεις τέκνα.
τάχιστα τοῖσι φιλτάτοις ὠνούμεθα.   1170
ἄγ᾽, ἢν στρατεύσῃ, [καταλιπών μ᾽ ἐν δώμασιν,
κἀκεῖ γενήσῃ] διὰ μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας
τίν᾽ ἐν δόμοις με καρδίαν ἕξειν δοκεῖς,

a stop at the end of v. 1164 and read here τῶνδ᾽ οὖν.   1167. ἢ ’με (the apostrophe perhaps not by the first hand) P, ἤ με L.   1168. Μενέλαος PL, Μενέλεως Dobree.—γένος PL. All editors but Firnhaber (who also keeps ταχθεῖσα in 1170) agree that this is corrupt. Most corrections 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 μισθὸν in the next v. where see note.   1169. ἀποτῖσαι PL, and so all editors before Herm. who gives ἀποτῖσαι. I believe καλὸν μισθὸν go together (the καλόν being contrasted with κακῆς), and have therefore written ἀποτείσεις, to which the accent of ἀποτῖσαι gives some support.   1170. ταχθεῖσα PL, ταίχιστα Stiblinus, whence τάχιστα Brodeau, approved by Canter, Scaliger and Milton. (I am in some doubt whether we ought not, following the suggestion of Musgrave's ὠνουμένω, 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 καταλιπών...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. ἢν 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 Cassandra's words at *Tro.* 370 ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς ὁ σοφὸς ἐχθίστων ὕπερ τὰ φίλτατ᾽ ὤλεσ᾽, ἡδονὰς τὰς οἴκοθεν τέκνων ἀδελφῷ δοὺς 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 Iphigeneia'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 τοιούτῳ τὸν νέον, τὸ λεγόμενον, τίνα οἴει καρδίαν ἴσχειν; The τὸ λεγόμενον points, I think, to the fact that these lines were commonly quoted,

ὅταν θρόνους μὲν τῆσδε προσβλέπω κενούς,
κενοὺς δὲ παρθενῶνας, ἐπὶ δὲ δακρύοις   1175
μόνη καθῶμαι, τήνδε θρηνῳδοῦσ᾿ ἀεί.
[ἀπώλεσέν σ᾿, ὦ τέκνον, ὁ φιτεύσας πατήρ,
αὐτὸς κτανών, οὐκ ἄλλος οὐδ᾿ ἄλλῃ χερί,
τοιόνδε μισθὸν καταλιπὼν πρὸς τοὺς δόμους.]
ἐπεὶ βραχείας προφάσεως ἔδει μόνον,   1180
ἐφ᾿ ᾗ σ᾿ ἐγὼ καὶ παῖδες αἱ λελειμμέναι
δεξόμεθα δέξιν ἥν σε δέξασθαι χρεών.

and used διά in the sense of *after*.) The first hand in P wrote δόμασιν.   1174.
ὅταν θρόνους τῆσδ᾿ εἰσίδω πάντας κενούς PL. This line is quoted in Apsines, *Rhet.
Gr.* IX. 502 (593 Walz) ὅταν δόμους μὲν τούσδε προσίδω κενούς. I think Weil is
right in restoring ὅταν θρόνους μὲν τῆσδε προσβλέπω κενούς. δόμους (cf. C. N. on
v. 583) and τούσδε are slips of memory :—τούσδε 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 κενοὺς δὲ
παρθενῶνας is immediately contrasted with it. These two errors our MSS. fortunately
correct for us, but προσίδω for προσβλέπω they apparently shared, and most likely
τῆσδ᾿ εἰσίδω πάντας κενούς is an attempt to correct the metre of τῆσδε προσίδω 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, φιτεύσας 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, χαὶ Markl.   1182. δεξόμεσθα 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 Aphobum II. p. 842 τίνα οἴεσθε
αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἕξειν 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
μεστὸν ἥ 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. ἐπὶ] With this word Cly.
follows up the hint given in 1173 that
her feelings would prompt her to re-
venge.

ἔδει] Your previous conduct (as de-
scribed 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

μὴ δῆτα πρὸς θεῶν μήτ' ἀναγκάσῃς ἐμὲ
κακὴν γενέσθαι περὶ σέ, μήτ' αὐτὸς γένῃ.
εἶεν·
θύσεις δὲ παῖδ'· ἐνταῦθα τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς;   1185
τί σοι κατεύξει τἀγαθόν, σφάζων τέκνον;
νόστον πονηρόν, οἴκοθέν γ' αἰσχρῶς ἰών;
ἀλλ' ἐμὲ δίκαιον ἀγαθὸν εὔχεσθαί τί σοι;
οὐ τἄρα συνετῶς τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγοίμεθ' ἄν,
εἰ τοῖσιν αὐθένταισιν εὖ φρονήσομεν.   1190

erased in L.   1185. θύσεις δὲ παῖδ'· ἔνθα 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 ἔνθα. To account for the ἔνθα of P we must suppose that both ἔνθα 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 ἔνθα. 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. κατεύξῃ 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 ὁ.   1187. πονηρὸν PL, ἀπόνητον F. W. Schmidt. Monk considers the line an importation.   1189. οὔτ' ἄρ' ἀσυνέτους PL. I have ventured to read οὗ τἄρα συνετῶς. I think ἡγοίμεθ' was used absolutely as at Bacch. 1326 ἡγείσθω θεοὺς and Hec. 800 τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγούμεθα, and that -τῶς was assimilated by mistake to the foll. τοὺς. It is a question whether we should read οὐ τἄρ' ἀσυνέτως interrogatively or οὐ τἄρα συνετῶς 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 τἄρ' because he doubts whether οὗτοι can be used interrogatively.   εὖ φρονήσομεν PL,

cf. Bacchae 955 κρύψει σὺ κρύψιν ἥν σε κρυφθῆναι χρεών.

1186. τἀγαθόν] 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. Ant. 275.

1187. I think it is doubtful whether we ought to read this v. as a question. The sense seems to be: 'that your home-coming 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 οἴκοθεν 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 male-factors'. Cf. Hel. 919 where Helen says to Theonoe: εἰ δ' οὖσα μάντις καὶ τὰ θεῖ' ἡγουμένη τὸ μὲν δίκαιον τοῦ πατρὸς διαφθερεῖς, τῷ δ' οὐ δικαίῳ συγγόνῳ δώσεις χάριν, αἰσχρὸν τὰ μέν σε θεῖα πάντ' ἐξειδέναι, τά τ' ὄντα καὶ μή, τὰ δὲ δίκαια μὴ εἰδέναι.

ἥκων δ' ἂν Ἄργος προσπέσοις τέκνοισι σοῖς;
ἀλλ' οὐ θέμις σοι. τίς δὲ καὶ προσβλέψεται
παίδων σ', ἵν' αὐτῶν προσέμενος κτάνῃς τινά;
ταῦτ' ἦλθες ἤδη διὰ λόγων, ἢ σκῆπτρά σοι

εὔφρον' ᾄσομεν Musgrave, εὔφρον' ᾔσομεν 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.—προσπέσῃς 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 ἀνὰ 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 ἐὰν 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.—ἥκειν 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' οὗ τις ἂν σκοπῶν τάδ', ὦναξ, ἐκμά-
θοι σαφέστατα. The best explanation
here, at all events, is that the writer
began as if he were going to put *two*
ἂν's, but left the second out. (It must
be remembered that the προσπέσῃς 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 *ani-
mated 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 ἐλθεῖν] 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, πλεῖν Φρυγῶν ἐπὶ χθόνα;
κλῆρον τίθεσθε παῖδ᾽ ὅτου θανεῖν χρεών.
ἐν ἴσῳ γὰρ ἦν τόδ᾽, ἀλλὰ μὴ σ᾽ ἐξαίρετον
σφάγιον παρασχεῖν Δαναΐδαισι παῖδα σήν,   1200
ἢ Μενέλεων πρὸ μητρὸς Ἑρμιόνην κτανεῖν,
οὗπερ τὸ πρᾶγμ᾽ ἦν. νῦν δ᾽ ἐγὼ μὲν ἡ τὸ σὸν
σῴζουσα λέκτρον παιδὸς ἐστερήσομαι,
ἡ 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 σά and σ᾽ ἔδει, agreeing with Hennig that ταῦτα means *the arguments against the expedition*, and that ἦλθες διὰ λόγων means '*expounded in speech*'. If I took this view I should prefer to read τοι for σοι.)   1196. χρὴ 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 *v.* 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 *Med.* 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. ἤ. δ. λ. here as equivalent to ἤδη 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. ὅν] 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. εἰκὸς ἦν at Thuc. VI. 78. 4. Cf. Menander 19 ἁπλοῦν γὰρ ἦν, Xen. *An.* VII. 7. 40 αἰσχρὸν 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. οὗπερ τὸ πρᾶγμ᾽ ἦν] '*His* concern it was, not yours'.

www.libtool.com.cn

Σπάρτῃ κομίζουσ', εὐτυχὴς γενήσεται.　　　　1205
τούτων ἄμειψαί μ' εἴ τι μὴ καλῶς λέγω·
εἰ δ' εὖ λέλεκται μετανόει δὴ μὴ κτανεῖν
τὴν σήν τε κἀμὴν παῖδα, καὶ σώφρων ἔσει.

ΧΟ.　πιθοῦ. τὸ γάρ τοι τέκνα συνσώζειν καλόν,
'Αγάμεμνον· οὐδεὶς τοῖσδ' ἂν ἀντείποι βροτῶν.　1210

ΙΦ.　εἰ μὲν τὸν 'Ορφέως εἶχον, ὦ πάτερ, λόγον
πείθειν ἐπάδουσ', ὥσθ' ὁμαρτεῖν μοι πέτρας,
κηλεῖν τε τοῖς λόγοισιν οὓς ἐβουλόμην,
ἐνταῦθ' ἂν ἦλθον. νῦν δὲ τἀπ' ἐμοῦ σοφά,

γενήσεται and read εὐτυχῆ.　　　1206. In P a late hand wrote ον over αι, i.e. it suggested ἄμεῖψον for ἄμειψαί μ'.　　　1207. εἰ δ' εὖ λέλεκται νῶι μὴ δή γε κτάνῃς PL, only P wrote νῶ to which a late hand added an ι.　In L there is an erasure after νῶι which V. says contained a κ.　νῶι μὴ δή γε is evidently a clumsy piece of stuffing.　What Euripides wrote has gone.　A better stop-gap would be τἀμὰ (Elmsley) τήνδε μὴ.　(νῶι as a disyllable and a dative occurs also in our texts of Theocritus, XII. 166.)　Heimsoeth 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 σώφρων ἔσει in the next v., which follows better on μετανόει than on the simple μὴ κτάνῃς.　I have therefore followed Weil and Headlam in adopting it.　　　1209. συνσώζειν PL, σοι σώζειν Nauck.　　　1210. πρὸς τάδ' ἀντείποι PL, ἀντερεῖ Elmsl., but Burges' and Monk's τοῖσδ' ἂν ἀντείποι 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 τάδ'.　　　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 σᾷ κομίζεις κόρους νεοτρεφεῖς;

1206. τούτων] depends on εἴ τι.—For the acc. of the person after ἄμειψαι cf. *Suppl.* 517 καὶ πρῶτα μέν σε πρὸς τὰ πρῶτ' ἀμείψομαι and *Or.* 608.

1209. If συνσώζειν 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 ἐπᾴδειν occurs in Eur. (*El.* 864) it has an acc.

(ᾠδὰν), and at Plat. *Rep.* 608 A we have ἐπᾴδοντες ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὃν λέγομεν, καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐπῳδήν.—ὥσθ' ὁμαρτεῖν depends directly on πείθειν. The analogy of the similar passage in the *Alcestis* (357, where too the apodosis κατῆλθον 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, ἥτις... 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
ἱκετηρίαν δὲ γόνασιν ἐξάπτω σέθεν
τὸ σῶμα τοὐμόν, ὅπερ ἔτικτεν ἥδε σοι,
μή μ' ἀπολέσῃς ἄωρον· ἡδὺ γὰρ τὸ φῶς
λεύσσειν· τὰ δ' ὑπὸ γῆς μή μ' ἰδεῖν ἀναγκάσῃς.
πρώτη σ' ἐκάλεσα πατέρα καὶ σὺ παῖδ' ἐμέ·   1220
πρώτη δὲ γόνασι σοῖσι σῶμα δοῦσ' ἐμὸν
φίλας χάριτας ἔδωκα κἀντεδεξάμην.
λόγος δ' ὁ μὲν σὸς ἦν ὅδ'· ἆρά σ', ὦ τέκνον,
εὐδαίμον' ἀνδρὸς ἐν δόμοισιν ὄψομαι,
ζῶσάν τε καὶ θάλλουσαν ἀξίως ἐμοῦ;   1225
οὑμὸς δ' ὅδ' ἦν αὖ περὶ σὸν ἐξαρτωμένης
γένειον, οὗ νῦν ἀντιλάζυμαι χερί·
τί δ' ἆρ' ἐγὼ σέ; πρέσβυν ἆρ' εἰσδέξομαι
ἐμῶν φίλαισιν ὑποδοχαῖς δόμων, πάτερ,

1215. δυναίμεθα PL, δυναίμεθ' ἄν Markl.   1219. βλέπειν· τὰ δ' ὑπὸ γῆς PL, λεύσ-
σειν· τὰ δ' ὑπὸ γῆν Plut. de Aud. Poet. 17 D. "Omnino legendum Λεύσσειν cujus
scholium est βλέπειν". Pors. As to the case with ὑπὸ Matthiae on Hec. 144 (147)
says: "Vulgaris consuetudo posceret τοὺς ὑπὸ γῆς ὄντας, exquisitius est τοὺς ὑπὸ γῆν".
He cps. Hdt. II. 127, and Aesch. Eum. 952₁ and Alc. 896.   1221. γούνασι
PL, γόνασι Barnes. (So at Andr. 895 L and some other MSS. have γούνασιν, such a
mistake is the mark of a scribe used to copying Homer. In Andr. 892 γουνάτων 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 ἀφεῖσ'.
1224. εὐδαίμονος ἀνδρὸς PL, εὐδαιμονοῦντος Matthiae, εὐδαίμον' ἀνδρὸς Pierson.
1227. νιν P, νῦν L, ἀντιλάζομαι PL, ἀντιλάζυμαι Markl. Cp. Pors. on Med. 1213

νῦν δὲ τἀπ' 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-
σονας σοῖς προστίθημι γόνασιν ὠλένας
ἐμάς, Or. 383 ἀφύλλου στόματος ἐξάπτων
λιτάς, in which the ἀφύλλου στόματος is
explained by Hesychius to mean ἄνευ
ἱκετηρίας. For the dat. γόνασιν with
ἐξάπτω we are referred to Tro. 1208
κόσμον ἐξάπτειν νεκρῷ.

1220. Cp. Lucr. I. 93 f. Nec miserae
prodesse 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 tes
genoux".

1222. φίλας χάριτας] 'fondling ca-
resses'.

1224. ἀνδρὸς] 'a husband's'.

1226. ἐξαρτωμένης] agrees with the
ἐμοῦ which is implied in οὑμός.

1228. The early edd. put the ; after
πρέσβυν (and so Porson), Markl. after σε,
Firnh. after δ'.

πόνων τιθηνοὺς ἀποδιδοῦσά σοι τροφάς;   1230
τούτων ἐγὼ μὲν τῶν λόγων μνήμην ἔχω,
σὺ δ᾽ ἐπιλέλησαι, καί μ᾽ ἀποκτεῖναι θέλεις.
μὴ πρός σε Πέλοπος καὶ πρὸς Ἀτρέως πατρὸς
καὶ τῆσδε μητρός, ἣ πρὶν ὠδίνουσ᾽ ἐμὲ
νῦν δευτέραν ὠδῖνα τήνδε λαμβάνει.   1235
τί μοι μέτεστι τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου γάμων
Ἑλένης τε; πόθεν ἦλθ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ὀλέθρῳ τώμῷ, πάτερ;
βλέψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὄμμα δὸς φίλημά τε,
ἵν᾽ ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κατθανοῦσ᾽ ἔχω σέθεν
[μνημεῖον, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἐμοῖς πεισθῇς λόγοις.   1240
ἀδελφέ, μικρὸς μὲν σύ γ᾽ ἐπίκουρος φίλοις,
ὅμως δὲ συνδάκρυσον, ἱκέτευσον 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 ταὐτὰ τεύξομαι σέθεν, and Krüger II. 47, 14, 3.—εἰ...πεισθῇς PL, εἰ
πείθει Pors., ἢν...πεισθῇς Matthiae, εἰ...πείσει Elmsl. (which Weil defends, saying
πεισθῇς arose out of πεισθήσει [a gloss on πείσει]). But, grammar apart, whatever
the previous v. gains from the μνημεῖον is more than counterbalanced by the
weakening of the pathetic κατθανοῦσ᾽ by the words which follow μνημεῖον.   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 τι-
θηνοὺς τροφάς. Weil cps. Aesch. P. V.
900 δυσπλάνοις ἀλατείαις πόνων. Cp.
1 Timothy v. 4 μανθανέτωσαν...ἀμοιβὰς
ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς προγόνοις.

1235. δευτέραν ὠδῖνα] Cp. Galatians
iv. 19 τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω ἄχρις
οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. For λαμ-
βάνειν ὠδῖνα in the sense of ὠδίνειν cf.
above v. 1124 λαβεῖν ἀρχήν for ἄρχεσθαι,
and Suppl. 1050 ὀργὴν λάβοις ἄν. 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.
I. 4.—ἐπ᾽ ὀλέθρῳ. For a different sense
of ἐπί 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 πατρός. See Crit. N.
on v. 1240.

1241. μικρὸς ἐπίκουρος] Cp. Bacch.
1367 μικρὸς ἐπίκουρος πατήρ.

κἂν νηπίοις γε τῶν κακῶν ἐγγίγνεται.
ἰδοὺ σιωπῶν λίσσεταί σ' ὅδ', ὦ πάτερ.   1245
ἀλλ' αἴδεσαί με καὶ κατοίκτιρον βίον.
ναί, πρὸς γενείου σ' ἀντόμεσθα δύο φίλω·
ὃ μὲν νεοσσός ἐστιν, ἣ δ' ηὐξημένη].
ἕν, συντεμοῦσα πάντα, νικήσω λέγων·
τὸ φῶς τόδ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἥδιστον βλέπειν,   1250
τὰ νέρθε δ' οὐδέν· μαίνεται δ' ὃς εὔχεται
θανεῖν. κακῶς ζῆν κρεῖσσον ἢ καλῶς θανεῖν.
ΧΟ.   ὦ τλῆμον Ἑλένη, διὰ σὲ καὶ τοὺς σοὺς γάμους

in P.   1244. κἂν corrected by a late hand to κἄν 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' ὅδ' ὦ),
σ' ὅδ' ὦ L.   1247. δύω 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 ἐστιν and Hermann and Hennig propose οὗτος for it.
1249. νικήσω λόγον PL, κινήσω λόγον Canter. I prefer to read ἕν, συντεμοῦσα πάντα,
νικήσω λέγων.   1250. In P the οι of ἀνσισιν (for ἀνθρώποισιν) is in an erasure.
1251. οὐδεὶς PL, οὐδὲν 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. αἴδεσαί με καὶ κατοίκτιρον]
Cp. X 82 τάδε τ' αἴδεο καί μ' ἐλέησον.

1247. δύο φίλω] Phoen. 1659 ἀλλ'
εὐκλεές τοι δύο φίλω κεῖσθαι 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 con-
ceivable argument on the other side'.)
There still remains the question, does ἐν
συντεμοῦσα mean 'saying one thing by
way of summing up', 'with (this) one

brief word'? or ought we to take συντε-
μοῦσα absolutely, or with λόγον supplied,
and take ἐν 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 ὧν γὰρ ἠράσθη τυχεῖν ἐκτήσαθ'
αὑτῷ, θάνατον ὅνπερ ἤθελεν, and on the
other hand, with the following words,
Achilles' memorable words at λ 488 ff.
μὴ δή μοι θάνατόν γε παραύδα φαίδιμ'
Ὀδυσσεῦ. βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἐὼν θη-
τευέμεν ἄλλῳ, ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ
βίοτος πολὺς εἴη, ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθι-
μένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.

ἀγὼν Ἀτρείδαις καὶ τέκνοις ἥκει μέγας.

ΑΓΑ. ἐγὼ τά τ᾽ οἰκτρὰ συνετός εἰμι καὶ τὰ μή,   1255
φιλῶ τ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ τέκνα· μαινοίμην γὰρ ἄν.
δεινῶς δ᾽ ἔχει μοι τοῦτο τολμῆσαι, γύναι,
δεινῶς δὲ καὶ μή· ταὐτὰ γὰρ πρᾶξαί με δεῖ.
ὁρᾶθ᾽ ὅσον στράτευμα ναύφρακτον τόδε,
χαλκέων θ᾽ ὅπλων ἄνακτες Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι,   1260
οἷς νόστος οὐκ ἔστ᾽ Ἰλίου πύργους ἔπι
εἰ μή σε θύσω, μάντις ὡς Κάλχας λέγει,
οὐδ᾽ ἔστι Τροίας ἐξελεῖν κλεινὸν βάθρον.
[μέμηνε δ᾽ ἀφροδίτη τις Ἑλλήνων στρατῷ

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, ταὐτὸ Kirchhoff. I conjecture that τοῦτο originally
stood after μοι in v. 1257 and that ταὐτὰ 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. τά τ᾽ οἰκτρὰ συνετός εἰμι] Cp.
Xen. Cyr. III. 3. 9 ἐπιστήμονες δὲ ἦσαν
τὰ προσήκοντα τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἔκαστος ὁπλίσει
(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. ὁρᾶθ᾽] The plural shows that
here Ag. addresses both wife and
daughter. This is best taken as an im-

perative, as at Phoen. 101 σκόπει δὲ πεδία
καὶ παρ᾽ Ἰσμηνοῦ ῥοάς, Δίρκης τε νᾶμα,
πολεμίων στράτευμ᾽ ὅσον.

1260. ὅπλων ἄνακτες] Weil is no
doubt right in taking this as a poetical
periphrasis for ὁπλῖται. He quotes Aesch.
Pers. 371 πᾶς ἀνὴρ κώπης ἄναξ ἐς ναῦν
ἐχώρει, πᾶς θ᾽ ὅπλων 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

πλεῖν ὡς τάχιστα βαρβάρων ἐπὶ χθόνα,　　　　　　1265
παῦσαί τε λέκτρων ἁρπαγὰς Ἑλληνικάς·
οἳ τὰς ἐν Ἄργει παρθένους κτενοῦσί μου
ὑμᾶς τε κἀμέ, θέσφατ' εἰ λύσω θεᾶς.]
οὐ Μενέλεώς με καταδεδούλωται, τέκνον,
[οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὸ κείνου βουλόμενον ἐλήλυθα,]　　　　1270
ἀλλ' Ἑλλάς, ᾗ δεῖ, κἂν θέλω κἂν μὴ θέλω,
θῦσαί σε· ταύτης ἥσσονες 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. κτεί-νουσί PL, κτενοῦσί Scaliger.　　1268. θέσφατον PL, θέσφατ' Scaliger.　　1270. This slipshod verse, which adds nothing to 1269 and obstructs the grammatical and logical connexion of οὐ Μενέλεως 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 κεινου. 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 ἔρως above at *v.* 808, and the Lat. *cupido*, 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 στρατῷ with μέμηνε is also peculiar, and led Lobeck to conj. ἔμηνε ...στρατόν.

1266. λέκ. ἁρπ. 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 ἁρπαγάς, 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. ᾗ] not *to* whom, but *for* whom =ᾗς ἕνεκα. (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,
κἀμοί, γενέσθαι, μηδὲ βαρβάρων ὕπο
Ἕλληνας ὄντας λέκτρα συλᾶσθαι βίᾳ.   1275
ΚΛ.   ὦ τέκνον, ὦ ξέναι,
       οἲ 'γὼ θανάτου τοῦ σοῦ μελέα.
       φεύγει σε πατὴρ Ἅιδῃ παραδούς.
ΙΦ.   οἲ 'γώ, μᾶτερ· ταὐτὸν γὰρ δὴ
       μέλος εἰς ἄμφω πέπτωκε τύχης,   1280
       κοὐκέτι μοι φῶς
       οὐδ' ἀελίου τόδε φέγγος.
       ἰὼ ἰώ.
       νιφόβολον Φρυγῶν νάπος Ἴδας 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. βαρβάροις PL, βαρβάρων Musgrave. Weil
is · doubtless right in suggesting that the alteration to the dative was made
under the impression that β. ὑπό 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 ξέναι.   1277. οἲ ἐγὼ PL, corrected in P by
a late hand to οἲ ἐγώ.—θανάτου σοῦ PL, θανάτου τοῦ σοῦ Heath and Musgrave.
1279. οἲ ἐγὼ μᾶτερ ταὐτὸν ταὐτὸν γὰρ P with the a of μᾶτερ corrected to η, μᾶτερ
substituted for the first ταὐτὸν and the ον of the second altered to ο; the last correction
by a later hand than the others, οἲ ἐγω μᾶτερ μᾶτερ ταὐτὸ γὰρ L. Vitelli says that
in L the first μᾶτερ has its ᾶ corrected to ῆ, the second is in an erasure, ταὐτὸ was
originally ταὐτὸν, and something has been erased after the γάρ. P apparently gives
the earliest of the MSS. readings. Dobree's γὰρ δὴ after a single ταὐτὸν is the best
of the many attempts to mend the metre. It is possible that in some MS. the δή,
being written above the γάρ and somewhat to the left, was mistaken for δίς, i.e.
an indication that ταὐτὸν was to be repeated.   1284. The ι of νιφόβολον is
in an erasure in P, it looks as if it had been an ε—Φρυγῶν νάπος PL, νάπος Φρυγῶν

1273. The ellipsis of ἐστί or γίγνεται
is common with ὅσον.

1276—1335. After a few words inter-
changed between the mother and daughter
(6 anapaests introduced by a dochmiac)
Iphigeneia begins at v. 1283 a monody
of mixed metres in which she bewails her
fate.

1279. μᾶτερ] The Doric forms of
this word, and ἀελίου below, are ir-
regular, 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 ἐστί than
ἔσται: 'It exists no more for me, it has
come to an end'.

1284 f. νάπος and ὄρεα form a hen-
diadys. The speaker appeals to the
bleak glen, or glen-side among the

ὄρεα, Πρίαμος ὅθι ποτὲ βρέφος ἁπαλὸν ἔβαλε   1285
ματρὸς ἀποπρὸ νοσφίσας
ἐπὶ μόρῳ θανατόεντι
Πάριν, ὃς Ἰδαῖος
Ἰδαῖος ἐλέγετ' ἐλέγετ' ἐν Φρυγῶν πόλει.   1290
μή ποτ' ὤφελεν τὸν ἀμφὶ
βουσὶ βουκόλον τραφέντα
[Ἀλέξανδρον]
οἰκίσαι ἀμφὶ τὸ λευκὸν ὕδωρ, ὅθι
κρῆναι Νυμφᾶν κεῖνται   1295
λειμών τ' ἄνθεσι θάλλων
[χλωροῖς, καὶ ῥοδόεντα

Hennig *metr. grat.*   1286. μητρὸς PL, ματρὸς Herm. and Monk, μητέρος Seidler.   1291. ὤφειλε PL, ὤφελες Elmsley, who supposed this to be still addressed to the νιφόβολον νάπος: but οἰκίσαι could not have a mountain as its subject: ὤφελεν Herm.   1292 f. τραφέντ' Ἀλέξανδρον PL (both MSS. make a verse end with the ν of τραφέντ'), Monk, Bothe, and Hartung reject Ἀλέξανδρον as being out of place and unmetrical, Hartung improved the metre by writing τραφέντα.   1296. Both MSS. put a : after ἄνθεσι, though they make the verse end with χλωροῖς, *i.e.* they thought the five words ought to make two verses and not one.   1297. I have no doubt that Wil.-Möll. is right in saying that both P and L have καὶ and not οὔ. The abbreviation for καὶ in P is badly written, but it has a grave accent over it, which would not be the case if it stood for οὔ. Monk

Phrygian mountains, where the infant Paris was exposed. 'Why', she asks, in effect, why 'was not that exposure his death, as his father intended?'

1289 f. Probably it was the music which was mainly responsible for this double repetition.

1291. ὤφελεν] *i.e.* (so Barnes) Priam, but οἰκίσαι cannot have applied to the original exposure. Apparently then Priam made two attempts to get rid of his son. First he exposed him as a baby. This attempt was as usual frustrated by a shepherd. The child grew up as a shepherd with the name Idaeus. Then, according to the story of the Cypria, which Euripides probably adopted, more or less, in his *Alexandros*, this Idaeus came to the city and successfully contended against his brothers in some public games, was recognized

by Cassandra, and then, as we should conclude, sent back again to the hills by Priam, that he might not do the harm to the city which Cassandra had prophesied (cf. Eur. *Androm.* 294 ff.). A comparison of *Hel.* 29—λιπὼν δὲ βούσταθμ' Ἰδαῖος Πάρις Σπάρτην ἀφίκεθ' —suggests that Euripides's version of the story supposed Paris, on his recognition by his family, not to have stayed in Troy, but to have returned to his hill pastures.

1294. λευκὸν ὕδωρ] Eurip. uses λευκός twice elsewhere as an epithet of water: *H. F.* 573 (Δίρκης τε νᾶμα λευκὸν αἱμαχθήσεται), and *Hel.* 1336. It does not mean *clear*; that is μέλας (Phot. μελάνυδρος βαθεῖα· κυρίως δὲ καθαρὰ ὕδατος· (cf. W. G. Clark, *Peloponnesus*, p. 236), but *sparkling, bright.*

ἄνθεα ὑακίνθινά τε θεαῖσι δρέπειν]·
ἔνθα ποτὲ Παλλὰς ἔμολε   1300
καὶ δολιόφρων Κύπρις
Ἥρα θ' Ἑρμᾶς θ',
ὁ Διὸς ἄγγελος,
ἃ μὲν ἐπὶ πόθῳ τρυφῶσα
Κύπρις, ἃ δὲ δουρὶ Παλλάς,   1305
Ἥρα τε Διὸς ἄνακτος
εὐναῖσι βασιλίσιν,
κρίσιν ἐπὶ στυγνὰν ἔριν τε [τᾶς] καλλονᾶς
ἐμοὶ δὲ θάνατον, ὄνομα μὲν
φέροντα Δαναΐδαισιν, ὦ 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 ῥοδόεντα 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 ἄλσεα for ἄνθεα.) It was possibly, in the form χλοεροῖς or χλοεροῖσιν, 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 Ἑρμᾶς is wanting in P and added by an early hand in L.   1305. δορὶ PL, δουρὶ Monk. 1307. βασιλοῖσι P¹, βασιλίσι 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 (with ἀν above) L: Weil reads πομπὰν for the two words, thus providing something to make sense with πρὸς Ἴλιον: others read ὄνομα μὰν. Possibly ἀν or μὰν is due to a τιμὰν written as an explanation over ὄνομα. Monk's and Hartung's suggestion to write ὦ κόρα for the MSS. ὦ 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, σῖνος κόρᾳ, adopting Elmsley's προθύματ' in the next v., assigning that v., as Elmsley does, to Iph., and reading μὰν after ὄνομα.   1311. The words πρὸς Ἴλιον certainly cannot stand as they are

1304. τρυφᾶν ἐπί] 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

9—2

ΙΦ. ὁ δέ τεκών με τὰν τάλαιναν,
ὦ μᾶτερ ὦ μᾶτερ,
οἴχεται προδοὺς ἔρημον.
ὦ δυστάλαιν᾽ ἐγώ, πικρὰν   1315
πικρὰν ἰδοῦσα δυσελέναν.
φονεύομαι διόλλυμαι.
σφαγαῖσιν ἀνοσίοισιν ἀνοσίου πατρός.
μή μοι ναῶν χαλκεμβολάδων
πρύμνας Αὐλὶς δέξασθαι   1320
τούσδ᾽ εἰς ὅρμους
ὤφελεν ἐλάταν πομπαίαν,
μηδ᾽ ἀνταίαν Εὐρίπῳ
πνεῦσαι πομπὰν Ζεύς, μειλίσσων

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. ἅδ᾽ Αὐλὶς, PL, Αὐλὶς Monk. The ἅδ᾽, 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. ὅρμους εἰς Τροίαν PL. Here again I think Monk is quite right in suspecting an interpolation, and I have with him rejected εἰς Τροίαν. Hermann (*Opusc.*) 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. ὤφελεν PL, ὤφειλ᾽ 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 Αὐλίῳ.

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 ἄνεμος.

μειλίσσων αὔραν] Lit. 'making the wind pleasant', *i.e.* sending a favourable wind. The participle does not mean 'who sends'—that would be ὁ μειλίσσων, but 'while', or 'whereas he is sending'. It is curious that the words Ζεὺς μειλίσσων occur together also at *Hel.* 1399. Cf. Ζεὺς Μειλίχιος.

αὔραν ἄλλοις ἄλλαν θνατῶν   1325

λαίφεσι χαίρειν,

[τοῖς δὲ λύπαν, τοῖς δ' ἀνάγκαν,]

τοῖς δ' ἐξορμᾶν, τοῖς δὲ στέλλειν,

τοῖσι δὲ μέλλειν.

ἢ πολύμοχθον ἄρ' ἦν γένος, ἢ πολύμοχθον   1330

ἀμερίων, τὸ χρεὼν δέ τι δύσποτμον

ἀνδράσιν ἀνευρεῖν.

ἰὼ ἰώ,

μεγάλα πάθεα, μεγάλα δ' ἄχεα

Δαναΐδαις τιθεῖσα Τυνδαρὶς 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. χρεὼν PL, τὸ χρεὼν Hermann.   1332. ἀνευρεῖν PL, εὑρεῖν Dind., ἀντλεῖν Weil, ἕρπει Herwerden. I think the fault is in the ἀνδράσιν, which is very strange in the place of ἀνθρώποις or βροτοῖς. Possibly a simple ἐστὶν 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 Firnhaber 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 αὖραν 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 χρεὼν 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. τιθεῖσα] The construction is the same as in the exclamation ὦ τάλας ἐγώ. Markl. cps. *I. T.* ὦ ῥᾳδίοις ὅρκοισι περιβαλοῦσά με and Soph. *Phil.* 1402 ὦ γενναῖον εἰρηκὼς ἔπος, so too Plato *Euth.* 303 c ὦ μακάριοι σφώ. But in these cases the participle or adj. is in the voc. The nom. with ὦ may indeed

www.libtool.com.cn

ΧΟ.   ἐγὼ μὲν οἰκτίρω σε συμφορᾶς κακῆς
      τυχοῦσαν, οἵας μήποτ' ὤφελες τυχεῖν.

ΙΦ.   ὦ τεκοῦσα μῆτερ, ἀνδρῶν ὄχλον εἰσορῶ πέλας.
ΚΛ.   τόν τε τῆς θεᾶς παῖδα, τέκνον· εὖ δὲ δεῦρ' ἐλήλυθεν.
ΙΦ.   διαχαλᾶτέ μοι μέλαθρα, δμῶες, ὡς κρύψω δέμας.   1340
ΚΛ.   τί δέ, τέκνον, φεύγεις; ΙΦ. Ἀχιλλέα τόνδ' ἰδοῦσ' αἰσχύνομαι.
ΚΛ.   ὡς τί δή; ΙΦ. τὸ δυστυχές μοι τῶν γάμων αἰδῶ φέρει.
ΚΛ.   οὐκ ἐν ἀβρότητι κεῖσαι πρὸς τὰ νῦν πεπτωκότα.
      ἀλλὰ μίμν'· οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον· ἵν' ἀμυνώμεθα.

make an iambic trimeter.   1336. κακῶν P, κακῆς L.   1337. A suspicious-looking *v*. See above on *v*. 470.   1339. τόν τε τῆς θεᾶς Ἀχιλλέα τέκνον ᾧ δεῦρ' P (with γ' inserted by a subsequent hand after τέκνον), τόν τε τῆς θεᾶς παῖδ' ὦ τέκνον γ' ὦ (*sic* Vitelli) δεῦρ' L. (Vitelli marks the letters δ' ὦ 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 ὦ 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 τόν 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 θεν 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, τὸνδ' 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, ἣν δυνώμεθα PL, οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον ἀνδυώμεθα Weil. This is

be really the same thing as an apostrophizing voc. with ὦ as it is written. "Ut Aemyl. Portus notat, redolet Homericum illud ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε" Barnes.

1342. ὡς τί δή;] *Why?* The ὡς is otiose here, as sometimes with future participles and in such phrases as ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ, 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'.

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'.

ΑΧ. ὦ γύναι τάλαινα, Λήδας θύγατερ, ΚΛ. οὐ ψευδῆ θροεῖς. 1345
ΑΧ. δείν' ἐν Ἀργείοις βοᾶται. ΚΛ. τίνα βοήν; σήμαινέ μοι.
ΑΧ. ἀμφὶ σῆς παιδός, ΚΛ. πονηρὸν εἶπας οἰωνὸν λόγων.
ΑΧ. ὡς χρεὼν σφάξαι νιν. ΚΛ. ὤμοι· κοὔτις ἀντιάζεται;
ΑΧ. εἰς θόρυβον ἔγωγε καὐτὸς ἤλυθον, ΚΛ. τίν', ὦ ξένε;
ΑΧ. σῶμα λευσθῆναι πέτροισι. ΚΛ. μῶν κόρην σῴζων ἐμήν; 1350
ΑΧ. αὐτὸ τοῦτο. ΚΛ. τίς δ' ἂν ἔτλη σώματος τοῦ σοῦ θιγεῖν;
ΑΧ. πάντες Ἕλληνες. ΚΛ. στρατὸς δὲ Μυρμιδὼν οὔ σοι παρῆν;
ΑΧ. πρῶτος ἦν ἐκεῖνος ἐχθρός. ΚΛ. δι' ἄρ' ὀλώλαμεν, τέκνον.
ΑΧ. οἵ με τὸν γάμων ἀπεκάλουν ἥσσον'. ΚΛ. ἀπεκρίνω δὲ τί;

very ingenious, but wants a future not a subjunctive. ἵν' ὀδυνώμεθα Herm. Those who retain the MSS. reading suppose an aposiopesis. I prefer to read ἵν' ἀμυνώμεθα, taking οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον as a parenthesis. 1345—1348. These speeches of ΑΧ. are assigned to ΧΟ. in P and L. They were first rightly given in ed. Brubach. 1346. δείν' 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. λόγον PL, λόγων Markland. 1348. νιν. ΚΛ. κοὐδεὶς ἐναντία λέγει PL. In P an early hand inserted τοῖσδ' after κοὐδεὶς, and a late hand altered ἐναντία to ἐναντίον. οὐδεὶς Markl., who held that the κ was due to the Κ for Clytaemnestra. οὐδεὶς δ' οὐδὲν 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 ὤμοι· κοὔτις 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. κοὐδεὶς is a very possible mistake for κοὔτις. The weak point in this suggestion is the supposition that ὤμοι has fallen out. 1349. ἐγώ 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 βίᾳ καὶ αὐτοῦ and 59 B καὶ αὐτὸς ἔγωγε. ἐγώ τι Musgrave. The same hand which originally wrote δὴ by way of explanation over the νυν in v. 648 may have written τοι over γε here. ἤλυθον PL, ἦλθον ἐς τίν' Markland, ἤλυθον τίν' Nauck. 1350. σῴζειν PL, σῴζων Canter. 1351. τοῦ σώματος PL, but in L τοῦ is crossed out, and no edition seems to have printed it. 1352. Μυρμιδόνων PL, Μυρμιδὼν Elmsley. 1354. To Matthiae 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 Matthiae's emendation of the "manuscript reading".—ἥσσονα 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. οἵ] 'Why, they'—The relatives at the beginning of this v. and 1356 are slightly exclamatory, somewhat like the οἷος which is explained to be = ὅτι τοιοῦτος.

ΑΧ. τὴν ἐμὴν μέλλουσαν εὐνὴν μὴ κτανεῖν, ΚΛ. δίκαια γάρ. 1355
ΑΧ. ἣν ἐφήμισεν πατήρ μοι. ΚΛ. κἀργόθεν γ᾽ ἐπέμψατο.
ΑΧ. ἀλλ᾽ ἐνικώμην κεκραγμοῦ. ΚΛ. τὸ πολὺ γὰρ δεινὸν κακόν.
ΑΧ. ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως ἀρήξομέν σοι. ΚΛ. καὶ μαχεῖ πολλοῖσιν εἷς;
ΑΧ. εἰσορᾷς τεύχη φέροντας τούσδ᾽; ΚΛ. ὄναιο τῶν φρενῶν.
ΑΧ. ἀλλ᾽ ὀνησόμεσθα. ΚΛ. παῖς ἄρ᾽ οὐκέτι σφαγήσεται; 1360
ΑΧ. οὔκ, ἐμοῦ γε ζῶντος. ΚΛ. ἥξει δ᾽ ὅστις ἅψεται κόρης;
ΑΧ. μυρίοι γ᾽· ἄξει δ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς. ΚΛ. ἆρ᾽ ὁ Σισύφου γόνος;
ΑΧ. αὐτὸς οὗτος. ΚΛ. ἴδια πράσσων, ἢ στρατοῦ ταχθεὶς ὕπο;
ΑΧ. αἱρεθεὶς ἑκών. ΚΛ. πονηράν γ᾽ αἵρεσιν, μιαιφονεῖν. 1364

(Vit. says the ' of ἧσσον' is in an erasure). ὑπεκρίνω P, and so L originally, though possibly the first hand (Vit.) altered the ὑ to ἁ. Possibly in the MS. from which P and L were copied an ἁ was written over the ὑ 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 ὑ was doubtless due to some scribe's familiarity with Homeric forms. Cp. on v. 1221 above. 1355. εὐνὴν PL, εἶναι Scaliger, εὖνιν Herm. (Opusc.). I think it is possible that Cly.'s part of this v. should begin at μή. 1356. ἐφήμισε PL, ν added by a late hand in P. 1357. ἐνικόμην P, the ο corrected by an early hand to ω. 1358. μάχῃ PL, μαχεῖ Elmsley. 1359. τούσδε PL, corrected in P by a late hand to τούσδ᾽, see above on v. 1354. 1360. ὀνησόμεσθα PL, ὀνήσομεν σέ Elmsley. 1361. γ᾽ ἑκόντος 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 ἰδίᾳ 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 πολύ**] 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 ἀλλά, like the old English *nay*, 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 ἅψεται κόρης in the last v. The same duty was assigned to Odysseus at Hec. 220 ff. and Soph. Phil. 6 ταχθεὶς τόδ᾽ ἔρδειν τῶν ἀνασσόντων ὕπο.

1364. **μιαιφονεῖν**] depends on the αἱρεθεὶς at the beginning of the v. Monk

AX. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σχήσω νιν. ΚΛ. ἄξει δ' οὐχ ἑκοῦσαν ἁρπάσας;
AX. δηλαδὴ ξανθῆς ἐθείρας. ΚΛ. ἐμὲ δὲ τί χρὴ δρᾶν τότε;
AX. ἀντέχου θυγατρός. ΚΛ. ὡς τοῦδ' εἵνεκ' οὐ σφαγήσεται.
AX. ἀλλὰ μὴν εἰς τοῦτό γ' ἥξει. ΙΦ. μῆτερ, εἰσακούσατε
τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων· μάτην γάρ σ' εἰσορῶ θυμουμένην
σῷ πόσει· τὰ δ' ἀδύναθ' ἡμῖν καρτερεῖν οὐ ῥᾴδιον. 1370
τὸν μὲν οὖν ξένον δίκαιον αἰνέσαι προθυμίας·
ἀλλὰ καὶ σὲ τοῦθ' ὁρᾶν χρή, μὴ διαβληθῇ στρατῷ,
καὶ πλέον πράξωμεν οὐδέν, ὅδε δὲ συμφορᾶς τύχῃ.
οἷα δ' εἰσῆλθέν μ', ἄκουσον, μῆτερ, ἐννοουμένην.

Musurus for an ι subscript.) 1366. ἐθείρης PL, ἐθείρας L. Dindorf. 1367. ἀντέχη, corrected by a subsequent hand to ἀντέχου P, ἀντέχου L.—ἕνεκ' PL, οὕνεκ' Ald., εἵνεκ' Nauck. (The MSS. reading here is an argument in favour of the Ionic form. εἵνεκα is much more likely than οὕνεκα to have become ἕνεκα. This argument however needs to be supported by cases in which MSS. give εἵνεκα.) 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 μῆτερ 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 γὰρ εἰσορῶ P (an early hand inserted λόγων after ἐμῶν above the line, and a σ after the σ of εἰσορῶ, i.e. εἰς σ' ὁρῶ, but without putting a breathing to the ὁ. 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 an early MS. was accidentally damaged at this point. Probably an early λόγων. 1372. διαβληθῇς PL, διαβληθῇ 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 Ἀχιλλεὺς is written over it, ὅδε δὲ Musgrave, who says he found it in one of the Paris copies of L. For a similar ὅδε δέ 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 πρού-δωκεν ΧΟ. καλήν γε προδοσίαν, δίκαια δρᾶν.

1366. If the reading here is correct (Kirchhoff proposed δρᾶν τί χρή), we have another extraordinary lengthening of a vowel. Cf. above on v. 1351.

1367. ὡς] for εὖ ἴσθι ὡς, as in the similar line Hec. 400 ὡς τῆσδ' ἑκοῦσα 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.

κατθανεῖν μέν μοι δέδοκται· τοῦτο δ' αὐτὸ βούλομαι,   1375
εὐκλεῶς πρᾶξαι παρεῖσά γ' ἐκποδὼν τὸ δυσγενές.
δεῦρο δὴ σκέψαι μεθ' ἡμῶν, μῆτερ, ὡς καλῶς λέγω·
εἰς ἔμ' Ἑλλὰς ἡ μεγίστη πᾶσα νῦν ἀποβλέπει,
κἀν ἐμοὶ πορθμός τε ναῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν κατασκαφαί,
τάς τε μελλούσας γυναῖκας μηκέθ' ἁρπάζειν ἐὰν   1380
[τὸν Ἑλένης τείσαντας ὄλεθρον, ἣν ἥρπασεν Πάρις].
ταῦτα πάντα κατθανοῦσ' ἄρ' οἴσομαι, καί μου κλέος,

added by a late hand, ἐννοουμένην L.   Probably some MS. had (by mistake) εἰσῆλθον,
and this led to the nom. ἐννοουμένη in P.   1376. δυσμενὲς 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. II. p. 108) and Herm. (*Opusc.*) seem to me to have hit on the right
solution of the many difficulties presented by these two *vv.* in rejecting the weak
ἤν τι δρῶσι βάρβαροι (which comes after γυν.) and τὰς ὀλβίας ἐξ Ἑλλάδος (after ἐὰν)
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 ἥντιν' for the MSS. ἤν.   1383. κατ-
θανοῦσα ῥύσομαι PL. ῥύσομαι will bear no sense that will fit this passage, I therefore
read, with very slight alteration, κατθανοῦσ' ἄρ' οἴσομαι. (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 κατθανεῖν, instead of to the following
εὐκλεῶς πρᾶξαι. Independently of any-
thing else αὐτὸ τοῦτο πρᾶξαι 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 ex-
traordinary way for the accusative, or to
emend the passage in some way (e.g.
Herwerden and others read ἐμὲ for μοι).
I take κατθ. μ. μ. δ. to be Iph.'s declara-
tion of her *own suddenly 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 fol-
lows cf. Soph. *Phil.* 77 f. ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο
δεῖ σοφισθῆναι, κλοπεὺς ὅπως γένησει τῶν
ἀνικήτων ὅπλων.
1379 f. κἀν ἐμοὶ] Cp. *I. T.* 1507
καὶ τἄμ' ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν ἢ καλῶς ἔχειν ἢ
μηδὲν εἶναι, 'it lies with me'. An
infin. dependent on ἐν ἐμοί ἐστι and
representing an action comtemplated as
possible (ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.), naturally has the
negative μὴ with it. (Those who read
ἐῶντες have hard work to account for the
μηκέθ'.)
1381. μηκέθ' ἁρπάζειν ἐὰν] i.e. τοὺς
βαρβάρους. For a similar ellipse of the
subj. of the infin. dependent on ἐᾶν cp.
Or. 899 οὗτος κτανεῖν μὲν οὔτε σ' οὔτε
σύγγονον εἴα.
1383. οἴσομαι] used in the epic (and
tragic) sense of *win as a prize*.

'Ελλάδ' ὡς ἠλευθέρωσα, μακάριον γενήσεται.
καὶ γὰρ οὐδέ τοί τι λίαν ἐμὲ φιλοψυχεῖν χρεών·   1385
πᾶσι γάρ μ' ῞Ελλησι κοινὸν ἔτεκες, οὐχὶ σοὶ μόνῃ.
ἀλλὰ μυρίοι μὲν ἄνδρες ἀσπίσιν πεφραγμένοι,
μυρίοι δ' ἐρέτμ' ἔχοντες, πατρίδος ἠδικημένης,
δρᾶν τι τολμήσουσιν ἐχθροὺς χὐπὲρ 'Ελλάδος θανεῖν;
ἡ δ' ἐμὴ ψυχὴ μί' οὖσα πάντα κωλύσει τάδε;   1390
καὶ τί τούτοις τῶν δικαίων ἔχομεν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος;
κἀπ' ἐκεῖν' ἔλθωμεν· οὐ δεῖ τόνδε διὰ μάχης μολεῖν
πᾶσιν 'Αργείοις γυναικὸς εἵνεκ' οὐδὲ κατθανεῖν.
εἷς ἀνὴρ κρείσσων γυναικῶν μυρίων ὁρᾶν φάος.
εἰ δ' ἐβουλήθη τὸ σῶμα τοὐμὸν ῎Αρτεμις λαβεῖν,   1395

in Soph. O. T. 312 ῥῦσαι 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 λύσεσθαι for ῥύσεσθαι.) 1385. οὐδέ τοι λίαν ἐμὲ PL. A late hand in P inserted γ' after λίαν 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—χὐπὲρ P¹L¹, τε χὐπὲρ P³L² (Wil.-Möll.— Vit. says nothing about τε in L).   1391. τί τὸ δίκαιον τοῦτ' ἄρ' ἔχοιμεν PL (with an erasure over υτ, but no circumflex in L). An early hand in L and a late one in P has τοῦτό γ' ἄρ'. This alteration satisfied the demands of metre in a fashion, but not those of syntax: the ἔχοιμεν 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 τουτ may be a remnant of τούτοις which was written over the line and which was afterwards inserted in the wrong place. τί τὸ δίκαιον; ἄρ' ἔχοιμεν τοῖσδ' ἂν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος Monk, τί τὸ δίκαιον ἆρα τούτοις ἔχομεν κ.τ.λ. Weil. 1393. εἵνεκ' PL, οὕνεκ' an early hand in L, εἵνεκ' 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 τοὐμὸν 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 ἡγεῖτο γὰρ αὐτῶν ἕκαστος οὐχὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ μόνον γεγενῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ πατρίδι, and

Firnhaber Eur. Erecth. fr. 362, 14 f. ἔπειτα τέκνα τοῦδ' ἕκατι τίκτομεν, ὡς θεῶν τε βωμοὺς πατρίδα τε ῥυώμεθα.

1394. Monk cps. Or. 805 f. ὡς ἀνὴρ (? εἷς ἀνὴρ) ὅστις τρόποισι συντακῇ θυραῖος ὤν, μυρίων κρείσσων ὁμαίμων ἀνδρὶ κεκτῆσθαι φίλος.

ἐμποδὼν γενήσομαι 'γὼ θνητὸς οὖσα τῇ θεῷ;
ἀλλ' ἀμήχανον· δίδωμι σῶμα τοὐμὸν Ἑλλάδι.
θύετ', ἐκπορθεῖτε Τροίαν. ταῦτα γὰρ μνημεῖά μου
διὰ μακροῦ, καὶ παῖδες οὗτοι καὶ γάμοι καὶ δόξ' ἐμή.
βαρβάρων δ' Ἕλληνας ἄρχειν εἰκός, ἀλλ' οὐ βαρβάρους,
μῆτερ, Ἑλλήνων· τὸ μὲν γὰρ δοῦλον, οἳ δ' ἐλεύθεροι.   1402

XO.   τὸ μὲν σόν, ὦ νεᾶνι, γενναίως ἔχει·
       τὸ τῆς τύχης δὲ καὶ τὸ τῆς θεοῦ νοσεῖ.

ΑΧ.   Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, μακάριόν μέ τις θεῶν   1405
       ἔμελλε θήσειν, εἰ τύχοιμι σῶν γάμων.
       ζηλῶ δὲ σοῦ μὲν Ἑλλάδ', Ἑλλάδος δὲ σέ.

δέμας τόδ' Ἄρτεμις λαβεῖν σφαγῇ, and σφαγῇ was dropped *metri gratia* when σῶμα
τοὐμὸν was inserted in the text.   1396. γενήσομ' ἐγὼ PL, γενήσομαι 'γὼ Reiske
and others.   1398. θύετε πορθεῖτε P, θύετ' ἐκπορθεῖτε L, and P is corrected by
an early hand to the reading of L.   1400. εἰκὸς ἄρχειν PL, ἄρχειν εἰκὸς Aristotle
Pol. 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 *Heracl.* 591
ταῦτ' ἀντὶ παίδων ἐστί μοι κειμήλια καὶ
παρθενείας, and (Firnh.) *Or.* 1050 τάδ'
ἀντὶ παίδων καὶ γαμηλίου λέχους.

1400 f. With this passage have been
compared *Andr.* 665 βάρβαροι δ' ὄντες
γένος Ἕλλησιν ἄρξουσ'; *Fr.* 717 Ἕλληνες
ὄντες βαρβάροις δουλεύσομεν; where see
Nauck's note for other similar words.
Aristotle's way of introducing his quo-
tation of this passage (διὸ φασιν οἱ ποιηταὶ)
shows that it was a 'commonplace' of
Gk. tragedy. Ar.'s further words (ὡς
ταὐτὸ 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 ἑνός 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 τύχοις.

θήσειν] "*Athen.* II. p. 501 C τὸ
ποιῆσαι θεῖναι πρὸς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐλέγετο"
Vitelli. Photius τίθησι· ποιεῖ, and θεῖναι·
ποιῆσαι. This use is Homeric. Cf.
Cobet, *N. L.* 261, Plat. *Symp.* 197 D.

1407. ζηλῶ 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 ἀξιῶ οὔτ' οὖν σὲ 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᾽ εἶπας ἀξίως τε πατρίδος·
[τὸ θεομαχεῖν γὰρ ἀπολιποῦσ᾽, ὅ σου κρατεῖ,
ἐξελογίσω τὰ χρηστὰ τἀναγκαῖά τε.]   1410
μᾶλλον δὲ λέκτρων σῶν πόθος μ᾽ ἐσέρχεται
εἰς τὴν φύσιν βλέψαντα· γενναία γὰρ εἶ.
ὅρα δ᾽· ἐγὼ γὰρ βούλομαί σ᾽ εὐεργετεῖν
λαβεῖν τ᾽ ἐς οἴκους· ἄχθομαί τ᾽, ἴστω Θέτις,
εἰ μή σε σώσω Δαναΐδαισι διὰ μάχης   1415
ἐλθών· ἄθρησον, ὁ θάνατος δεινὸν κακόν.

ΙΦ.   λέγω τάδ᾽   *   *   *   *   *
      ἡ Τυνδαρὶς 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 ὅ has no antecedent but the "*divinum
numen*" implied in τὸ θεομαχεῖν. As Vitelli says, *v.* 1396 provided the interpolator
with his matter here.—ἐξελογήσω 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᾽. τἀναγκαῖά τε Reiske (τἀναγκαῖά 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. ἄρχει PL, ἀρκεῖ

1412. **τὴν φύσιν**] From the σῶν of
the previous *v.* σου would naturally be
supplied with these words.   Perhaps
Firnhaber 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. **ὁ 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 φόνους· σὺ δ', ὦ ξένε,
μὴ θνῆσκε δι' ἐμὲ μηδ' ἀποκτείνῃς τινά.   1420
ἔα δὲ σῶσαί μ' Ἑλλάδ', ἢν δυνώμεθα.
ΑΧ. ὦ λῆμ' ἄριστον, οὐκ ἔχω πρὸς τοῦτ' ἔτι
λέγειν, ἐπεί σοι τάδε δοκεῖ· γενναῖα γὰρ
φρονεῖς· τί γὰρ τἀληθὲς οὐκ εἴποι τις ἄν;
ὅμως δ', ἴσως γὰρ κἂν μεταγνοίης τάδε,   1425
[ὡς οὖν ἂν εἰδῇς τἀπ' ἐμοῦ λελεγμένα]
ἐλθὼν τάδ' ὅπλα θήσομαι βωμοῦ πέλας.
[ὡς οὐκ ἐάσων σ' ἀλλὰ κωλύσων θανεῖν.]
χρήσει δὲ καὶ σὺ τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις τάχα,
ὅταν πέλας σῆς φάσγανον δέρης ἴδῃς.   1430
[οὔκουν ἐάσω σ' ἀφροσύνῃ τῇ σῇ θανεῖν·
ἐλθὼν δὲ σὺν ὅπλοις 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 vv. 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 τἀπ' 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. χρήσῃ PL with an ι 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 σῶν 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 τἀληθὲς 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' ὅπλα] 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'.

κᾱρᾰδοκήσω σὴν ἐκεῖ παρουσίαν.]

ΙΦ.   μῆτερ, τί σιγῇ δακρύοις τέγγεις κόρας;

ΚΛ.   ἔχω τάλαινα πρόφασιν ὥστ' ἀλγεῖν φρένα.   1435

ΙΦ.   παῦσαί, με μὴ κάκιζε· τάδε δ' ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ.

ΚΛ.   λέγ', ὡς παρ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἀδικήσει, τέκνον.

ΙΦ.   μήτ' οὖν σὺ τὸν σὸν πλόκαμον ἐκτέμῃς τριχός,

        [μήτ' ἀμφὶ σῶμα μέλανας ἀμπίσχῃ πέπλους.]

ΚΛ.   τί δὴ τόδ' εἶπας, τέκνον; ἀπολέσασά σε   1440

ΙΦ.   οὐ σύ γε· σέσωσμαι, κατ' ἐμὲ δ' εὐκλεὴς ἔσει.

ΚΛ.   πῶς εἶπας; οὐ πενθεῖν με σὴν ψυχὴν χρεών;

ΙΦ.   ἥκιστ', ἐπεί 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, 'μὲ Porson. But the emphatic 'μὲ is out of place before the following ἐμοί. 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 κακίσῃς would have been more in place) is a gloss, and that the original was something like παῦσαί με θηλύνουσα· or else that παῦσαί has usurped the place of some such word as κλαυθμῷ. 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. παρά.   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 δὴ Barnes, τέκνον Markland.

1434. We have much the same expression at Med. 922 and Hel. 1189.

1435. πρόφασιν] Firnhaber 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 ἄξιοι παρ' ὑμῶν τὰ δίκαια ἕξουσιν. Xen. Cyr. 5, 5, 13 τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀδίκημα. For the passive fut. in -σομαι cp. above v. 331 ἐάσομαι and v. 1203 ἐστερήσομαι.

1438. μήτ'] Probably Iphigeneia was going on to say what she does say eventually 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 μνῆμα τῆς Διὸς κόρης.   1445

ΚΛ. ἀλλ᾽ ὦ τέκνον, σοὶ πείσομαι· λέγεις γὰρ εὖ.

ΙΦ. ὡς εὐτυχοῦσά γ᾽ Ἑλλάδος τ᾽ εὐεργέτις.

ΚΛ. τί δὴ κασιγνήταισιν ἀγγελῶ σέθεν;

ΙΦ. μηδ᾽ ἀμφὶ κείναις μέλανας ἐξάψῃς πέπλους.

ΚΛ. [εἴπω δὲ παρὰ σοῦ φίλον ἔπος τι παρθένοις;   1450

ΙΦ. χαίρειν γ᾽. Ὀρέστην τ᾽ ἔκτρεφ᾽ ἄνδρα τόνδε μοι.

ΚΛ. προσέλκυσαί νιν ὕστατον θεωμένη.

ΙΦ. ὦ φίλτατ᾽, ἐπεκούρησας ὅσον εἶχες φίλοις.]

ΚΛ. ἔσθ᾽ ὅ τι κατ᾽ Ἄργος δρῶσά σοι χάριν φέρω;

ΙΦ. πατέρα τὸν ἀμὸν μὴ στύγει πόσιν τε σόν.   1455

ΚΛ. δεινοὺς ἀγῶνας διὰ σὲ δεῖ κεῖνον δραμεῖν.

1444. For the unintelligible MSS. τί δή; τὸ θνήσκειν οὐ τάφος νομίζεται; (δή or δὲ with the second letter in an erasure P, δαὶ with the αι in an erasure L: see below on v. 1448), many emendations have been proposed. Monk is satisfied with putting the first ; after θνήσκειν. Paley and Herwerden propose θανοῦσιν, Weil τεθνεῶσιν, Vitelli τυθεῖσιν. I think we should regard the erasure in the MSS. after the δ as an indication. If δή 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 ἄρ᾽.   1448. δὲ P, δὴ changed to δαὶ 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.— ἐξάψῃ PL, ἐξάψῃς 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. κεῖνον δεῖ PL, δεῖ κεῖνον 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. δεινοὺς 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. δόλῳ δ', ἀγεννῶς Ἀτρέως τ' οὐκ ἀξίως.
ΙΦ. τίς μ' εἶσιν ἄξων πρὶν σπαράσσεσθαι κόμης;
ΚΛ. ἔγωγε μετὰ σοῦ ΙΦ. μὴ σύ γ'· οὐ καλῶς λέγεις. 1460
ΚΛ. πέπλων ἐχομένη σῶν. ΙΦ. ἐμοί, μῆτερ, πιθοῦ.
  μέν'· ὡς ἐμοί τε σοί τε κάλλιον τόδε.
  πατρὸς δ' ὀπαδῶν τῶνδέ τίς με πεμπέτω
  Ἀρτέμιδος εἰς λειμῶν', ὅπου σφαγήσομαι.
ΚΛ. ὦ τέκνον, οἴχει; ΙΦ. καὶ πάλιν γ' οὐ μὴ μόλω. 1465
ΚΛ. λιποῦσα μητέρ'; ΙΦ. ὡς ὁρᾷς γ', εὐκαρδίως.
ΚΛ. σχές, μή με προλίπῃς. ΙΦ. οὐκ ἐῶ στάζειν δάκρυ.
  ὑμεῖς δ' ἐπευφημήσατ', ὦ νεάνιδες,

σπαράσσεσθαι Elmsley. As Matthiae says, perhaps the αξ 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. σπαράξασθαι, 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, μετά γε PL, ἔγωγε μετὰ Markland.   1465. οἴχῃ 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 ἐῶ in the next v., and that this, slightly modified, ousted the genuine reading here. I have printed εὐκαρδίως as a possible stop-gap. γε κἀξίως Bremi, εὖ κἀξίως Hermann, σοῦ γ' ἀξίως Vitelli.   1468. ἐπεφημήσατ'

mother's words as a threat. Cf. above vv. 1180 ff.

1458. Ἀτρέως τ' οὐκ ἀξίως] Cf. above v. 1233 πρὸς Ἀτρέως πατρός, and v. 1031 ὁ γάρ τοι Τυνδάρεως οὐκ ἄξιος. 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 θανεῖν νεὼς ἔπι φεύγωμεν. The meaning of the v. is: 'who will take me and prevent my being seized by the hair?' σπαράσσειν (fut. σπαράξομαι) κόμην is to tear the hair (as at Andr. 1209 οὐ σπαράξομαι κόμαν;). Here the pass. is used as a variety for ἁρπασθῆναι. 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 τῇ μῇ συμφορᾷ Διὸς κόρην
Ἄρτεμιν. ἴτω δὲ Δαναΐδαις εὐφημία.   1470
κανᾶ δ' ἐναρχέσθω τις, αἰθέσθω δὲ πῦρ
προχύταις καθαρσίοισι, καὶ πατὴρ ἐμὸς
ἐνδεξιούσθω βωμόν· ὡς σωτηρίαν
Ἕλλησι δώσουσ' ἔρχομαι νικηφόρον.

ἄγετέ με τὰν Ἰλίου   1475
καὶ Φρυγῶν ἑλέπτολιν.
στέφεα περίβολα δίδοτε, φέρετε·
πλόκαμος ὅδε καταστέφειν·
χερνίβων τε παγάς.
ἑλίσσετ' ἀμφὶ βωμὸν   1480

P¹, ἐπευφήμησατ' P² and L.   1471. κενᾶ, altered by a later hand to κανᾶ, P.
1479. παγαῖσι PL, παγάς Reiske and Seidler—the acc. is governed by δίδοτε, πλόκ.

1468 ff. The dative συμφορᾷ is governed
by the ἐπ- in ἐπευφημῆσατ', 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 κοινὸς ἀρσένων
ἴτω κλαγγὰ τὸν εὐφαρέτραν Ἀπόλλω, Ar.
Av. 857 ἴτω ἴτω δὲ Πυθιὰς βοὰ θεῷ.
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. ὧν θαλίαις ἔμπεδον εὐφα-
μίαις 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 ἐνδεξιόομαι,
which is 'dextra prehendere', and inter-
preting to mean ἐνδέξια περιέρχεσθαι. Cf.
H. F. 926 f., and Ar. Pax 956 ἄγε δὴ τὸ
κανοῦν λαβὼν σὺ καὶ τὴν χέρνιβα Περίιθι
τὸν βωμὸν ταχέως ἐπιδέξια (quoted by
Firnhaber on v. 1557 below).

Vv. 1475—1509. With this κομμός
Iphigeneia quits the scene, and so, pro-
bably, 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 think-
ing 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. ἑλίσσετ'..."Ἄρτεμιν] For the
acc. of the deity honoured by the dance

ἀμφὶ βωμὸν Ἄρτεμιν,
τὰν ἄνασσαν Ἄρτεμιν,
τὰν μάκαιραν· ὡς ἐμοῖσιν, εἰ χρεών,
αἵμασι θύμασι   1485
θέσφατ᾽ ἐξαλείψω.
ὦ πότνια πότνια μᾶτερ, οὐ δάκρυά γέ σοι
δώσομεν ἀμέτερα·
παρ᾽ ἱεροῖς γὰρ οὐ πρέπει.   1490

XO.   ὦ νεάνιδες,
συνεπαείδετ᾽ 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 πήματα, 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.—μῆτερ the early edd. (μερ L), μᾶτερ 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 ὦ πότνια πότνια μᾶτερ 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, ἰώ, ἰώ 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 πυρὸς τὸν Λατοῦς εὔπαιδα γόνον εἱλίσσουσαι καλλίχορα. It is the same acc. of the indirect object which is formed with ᾄδειν, χορεύειν and even κόπτεσθαι.

1485. αἵμασι] For the plural cf. El. 1172 ἀλλ᾽ οἶδε μητρὸς νεοφόνοις ἐν (νεοφόνοισιν Nauck) αἵμασιν πεφυρμένοι βαίνουσιν ἐξ οἴκων 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 δακρυρρόει σεμναῖσι Δηοῦς ἐσχάραις παρημένη.

1492. συνεπαείδετε] 'Join me' (the

10—2

Χαλκίδος ἀντίπορον,
ἵνα τε δόρατα μέμονε δάϊα   1495
[δι' ἐμὸν ὄνομα] τᾶσδ' Αὐλίδος
ἐν στενοπόροισιν ὅρμοις.

ΙΦ.   ἰὼ γᾶ μᾶτερ ὦ Πελασγία,
      Μυκηναῖαί τ' ἐμαὶ θεράπναι.

ΧΟ.   καλεῖς πόλισμα Περσέως,   1500
      Κυκλωπίων πόνον χερῶν;

ΙΦ.   ἔθρεψας Ἑλλάδι με φάος·
      θανοῦσα 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 ὅρμοις is erased and written (with a smooth breathing) at the beginning of the following *v.*—In P the *vv.* in this passage end at δόρατα, ὄνομα, στενοπόροισιν and μῆτερ.   1498. μῆτερ PL, μᾶτερ Seidler.   1499. θεράπαιναι 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 ἐπᾴδειν (cf. above *v.* 1212) does not take an acc. of the person.

1495. δόρατα] probably not (as Musgrave) *ships*, but *spears*.

μέμονε δάϊα] 'are thirsting for the fight'.

1498. Πελασγία] At *Or.* 960 Electra in view of her own approaching death also addresses her native land as ὦ Πελασγία, and at 1601 of the same play we have ἐν Ἄργει τῷδε τῷ Πελασγικῷ.

1499. θεράπναι] αὐλῶνες, σταθμοί, Hesych. Θεράπναι· τόπος ἐστὶν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι· οὗ μνημονεύει καὶ Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Ἀλκαῖος, Photius.

1500. Περσέως] Perseus is said by

Pausanias (II. 3. 16) to have founded Mycenae.

1503. θανοῦσα 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*

XO.   κλέος γὰρ οὔ σε μὴ λίπῃ.

ΙΦ.   ἰὼ ἰώ.
       λαμπαδοῦχος ἁμέρα Δι-   1505
       ός τε φέγγος, ἕτερον
       ἕτερον αἰῶνα καὶ μοῖραν οἰκήσομεν.
       χαῖρέ μοι, φίλον φάος.

[XO.   ἰὼ ἰώ.
       ἴδεσθε τὰν Ἰλίου   1510
       καὶ Φρυγῶν ἑλέπτολιν
       στείχουσαν, ἐπὶ κάρα στέφη
       βαλλομέναν χερνίβων τε παγαῖς,
       βωμόν γε δαίμονος θεᾶς
       ρανίσιν αἱματορρύτοις   1515
       θανοῦσαν εὐφυῆ τε σώματος δέρην
       σφαγεῖσαν. εὔδροσοι παγαὶ

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. στέφεα Seidler.   1513. βαλομέναν Seidler, βαλουμέναν Hartung,—παγαῖς PL, but in L as is written over the αἷs.   1514. διαίμονος Markland, δ' αἵμονος Hennig. Monk omits θεᾶς as being a gloss upon δαίμονος. 1516. ρανοῦσαν Markland, χρανοῦσαν 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 εὖ δράσας δέ σ' οὐκ ἀναίνομαι) 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 οἰκή-σομεν] 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 ἄλυτος οἰκεῖν (Nauck: the Variorum ed. gives ἄλυπον οἰκεῖν βίοτον), 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 βωμὸν to be an acc. of the goal after στείχουσαν, θανοῦσαν and σφαγεῖσαν to agree with ἑλέπτολιν, 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.

πατρῷαι μένουσί σε χέρνιβές τε
στρατός τ' Ἀχαιῶν θέλων
Ἰλίου 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,
Ἀγαμέμνονά τε λόγχαις
Ἑλλάδι κλεινότατον στέφανον
δὸς ἀμφὶ κάρα ἐὸν   1530
κλέος ἀείμνηστον ἀμφιθεῖναι.

ΑΓΓ.   ὦ Τυνδαρεία παῖ, Κλυταιμνήστρα, δόμων
        ἔξω πέρασον, ὡς κλύῃς ἐμῶν λόγων.
ΚΛ.   φθογγῆς κλύουσα δεῦρο σῆς ἀφικόμην,
        ταρβοῦσα τλήμων κἀκπεπληγμένη φόβῳ.   1535
        μή μοί τιν' ἄλλην ξυμφορὰν ἥκεις φέρων
        πρὸς τῇ παρούσῃ; ΑΓΓ. σῆς μὲν οὖν παιδὸς πέρι
        θαυμαστά σοι καὶ δεινὰ σημῆναι θέλω.

introduced into the text.   1524. In L the ι of πότνια has been erased.   1529.
Ἑλλάσι Markland.   1530. κάρα τέον Aldus, κάρα θ' ἐὸν Scaliger, κρᾶθ' ἐὸν
Seidler. The hiatus between κάρα and ἐὸν (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 κλύῃς L.   1536. ἥκεις PL. I have retained this,
putting a . at φόβῳ and a ; at παρούσῃ. ἥκῃς Portus, with a , at φόβῳ and a . at παρούσῃ,
and so all subsequent editions. It would be possible to retain the earlier punctuation
and yet read ἥκεις. 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 διαίμονος.
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 *vv.* 801—818

above.

1535. Cf. *Bacchae* 604 ἐκπεπληγμέναι
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
θαυμαστά, and read. that way the line
becomes weak.

ΚΛ. μὴ μέλλε τοίνυν, ἀλλὰ φράζ' ὅσον τάχος.

ΑΓΓ. ἀλλ' ὦ φίλη δέσποινα, πᾶν πεύσῃ σαφῶς.   1540
λέξω δ' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἤν τι μὴ σφαλεῖσά μου
γνώμη ταράξῃ γλῶσσαν ἐν λόγοις ἐμήν.
ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἱκόμεσθα τῆς Διὸς κόρης
Ἀρτέμιδος ἄλσος λείμακάς τ' ἀνθεσφόρους,
ἵν' ἦν Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος στρατεύματος,   1545
σὴν παῖδ' ἄγοντες, εὐθὺς Ἀργείων ὄχλος
ἠθροίζεθ'. ὡς δ' ἐσεῖδεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ
ἐπὶ σφαγὰς στείχουσαν εἰς ἄλσος κόρην,
ἀνεστέναζε, κἄμπαλιν στρέψας κάρα
δάκρυα προῆγεν, ὀμμάτων πέπλον προθείς.   1550
ἣ δὲ σταθεῖσα τῷ τεκόντι πλησίον
ἔλεξε τοιάδ'· ὦ πάτερ, πάρειμί σοι,
τοὐμὸν δὲ σῶμα τῆς ἐμῆς ὑπὲρ πάτρας
καὶ τῆς ἁπάσης Ἑλλάδος γαίας ὕπερ
θῦσαι δίδωμ' ἑκοῦσα πρὸς βωμὸν θεᾶς   1555
ἄγοντας, εἴπερ ἐστὶ θέσφατον τόδε.
καὶ τοὔπ' ἔμ' εὐτυχεῖτε, καὶ νικηφόρου
δώρου τύχοιτε πατρίδα τ' ἐξίκοισθε γῆν.

Weil.   1541. μου PL, που Markland.   1544. ἀνθεσφόρους 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 Ἀχαϊκοῦ
στρατοῦ, with the ὄχλος in which Har-
tung 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 mean-
ing 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 Euri-
pides, and probably translated into Greek
the poetical Latin *lacrimasque ciebat*.

ὀμμάτων πέπλον προθείς] Cicero, *Ora-
tor* 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 con-
clude absolutely from this that Latin
authors knew nothing of such a
suggestion in a Greek tragedy, but at all
events they did not think, as Firnhaber
(p. 285) suggests, that the painter bor-
rowed from Euripides.

1556. εἴπερ ἐστὶ θέσφατον τόδε] 'If
that is what the oracle bids'. Cf. Hdt.
IV. 164 μαθὼν τὸ μαντήιον ἐὸν τοῦτο.

πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ ψαύσῃ τις Ἀργείων ἐμοῦ·
σιγῇ παρέξω γὰρ δέρην εὐκαρδίως.   1560
τοσαῦτ' ἔλεξε· πᾶς δ' ἐθάμβησε κλύων
εὐψυχίαν τε κἀρετὴν τῆς παρθένου.
στὰς δ' ἐν μέσῳ Ταλθύβιος, ᾧ τόδ' ἦν μέλον,
εὐφημίαν ἀνεῖπε καὶ σιγὴν στρατῷ·
Κάλχας δ' ὁ μάντις εἰς κανοῦν χρυσήλατον   1565
ἔθηκεν ὀξὺ χειρὶ φάσγανον σπάσας
κολεῶν ἔσωθεν, κρᾶτά τ' ἔστεψεν κόρης.
ὁ παῖς δ' ὁ Πηλέως ἐν κύκλῳ βωμὸν θεᾶς
λαβὼν κανοῦν ἔθρεξε χέρνιβάς θ' ὁμοῦ,
ἔλεξε δ'· ὦ παῖ Ζηνὸς Ἄρτεμις θηροκτόνε,   1570
τὸ λαμπρὸν εἱλίσσουσ' ἐν εὐφρόνῃ φάος,
δέξαι τὸ θῦμα τόδ' ὅ γέ σοι δωρούμεθα
στρατός τ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ θ' ὁμοῦ,
ἄχραντον αἷμα καλλιπαρθένου δέρης,
καὶ δὸς γενέσθαι πλοῦν νεῶν ἀπήμονα   1575
Τροίας τε πέργαμ' ἐξελεῖν ἡμᾶς δορί.
εἰς γῆν δ' Ἀτρεῖδαι πᾶς στρατός τ' ἔστη βλέπων.
ἱρεὺς δὲ φάσγανον λαβὼν ἐπεύξατο,

1567. κουλεῶν P, the ου altered by a late hand to ο, κολεῶν L, the ο 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.) ὦ 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 ̂ and the top of the ζ still show) and wrote διὸς in their place.—ὦ παῖ Ζηνὸς, ὦ θηροκτόνε Nauck.   1578. ἱρεὺς P, ἱερεὺς 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 ἐξεῖλκε κολεοῦ in *Hec.* 544 makes it probable that the word κολεός was used here. It will hardly be believed that Firnhaber swallows the words whole, explaining that σπάσας is here used for

λαβών 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.

λαιμόν τ' ἐπεσκόπειθ', ἵνα πλήξειεν ἄν·
ἐμοὶ δέ τ' ἄλγος οὐ μικρὸν εἰσῄει φρενί,   1580
κᾆστην νενευκώς· θαῦμα δ' ἦν αἴφνης ὁρᾶν·
πληγῆς κτύπον γὰρ πᾶς τις ᾔσθετ' ἂν σαφῶς,
τὴν παρθένον δ' οὐκ οἶδεν οὗ γῆς εἰσέδυ.
βοᾷ δ' ἱερεύς, ἅπας δ' ἐπήχησε στρατός,
ἄελπτον εἰσιδόντες ἐκ θεῶν τινος   1585
φάσμ', οὗ γε μηδ' ὁρωμένου πίστις παρῆν·
ἔλαφος γὰρ ἀσπαίρουσ' ἔκειτ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ
ἰδεῖν μεγίστη διαπρεπής τε τὴν θέαν,
ἧς αἵματι βωμὸς ἐραίνετ' ἄρδην τῆς θεοῦ.
κἀν τῷδε Κάλχας πῶς δοκεῖς χαίρων ἔφη·   1590
ὦ τοῦδ' Ἀχαιῶν κοίρανοι κοινοῦ στρατοῦ,
ὁρᾶτε τήνδε θυσίαν, ἣν ἡ θεὸς
προύθηκε βωμίαν, ἔλαφον ὀρειδρόμον;
ταύτην μάλιστα τῆς κόρης ἀσπάζεται,
ὡς μὴ μιάνοι βωμὸν εὐγενεῖ φόνῳ.   1595
ἡδέως τε τοῦτ' ἐδέξατο, καὶ πλοῦν οὔριον
δίδωσιν ἡμῖν Ἰλίου τ' ἐπιδρομάς.
πρὸς ταῦτα πᾶς τις θάρσος αἶρε ναυβάτης,
χώρει τε πρὸς ναῦν· ὡς ἡμέρᾳ τῇδε δεῖ
λιπόντας ἡμᾶς Αὐλίδος κοίλους μυχοὺς   1600
Αἰγαῖον οἶδμα διαπερᾶν. ἐπεὶ δ' ἅπαν
κατηνθρακώθη θῦμ' ἐν Ἡφαίστου φλογί,
τὰ πρόσφορ' ηὔξαθ', ὡς τύχοι νόστου στρατός.
πέμπει δ' Ἀγαμέμνων μ' ὥστε σοι φράσαι τάδε,
λέγειν θ' ὁποίας ἐκ θεῶν μοίρας κυρεῖ   1605
καὶ δόξαν ἔσχεν ἄφθιτον καθ' Ἑλλάδα.
ἐγὼ παρών τε καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμ' ὁρῶν λέγω·
ἡ παῖς σαφῶς σοι πρὸς θεοὺς ἀφίπτατο.

1580. ἄργος P, corrected by first hand to ἄλγος.   1583. αἱ γῆς P, corrected
to οὗ 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 υ
is not used in P, so probably this word was taken down from dictation from the
mouth of some one who doubtless pronounced the word (in English letters) nar-
wa-tees.) ναυβάτης L.   1607. παρών τε P, παρών δὲ (the δὲ in an erasure) L.

1581. νενευκώς] With reference to
Matthiae's suggestion, mentioned in p.
xxviii. of the Introduction, we ought to
cf. Soph. *Ant.* 270 and 441, where a
similar attitude results in the one case
from fear, in the other from (perhaps)
despondency.

λύπης δ' ἀφαίρει καὶ πόσει πάρες χόλον·
ἀπροσδόκητα δὲ βροτοῖσι τὰ τῶν θεῶν,   1610
σῴζουσί θ' οὓς φιλοῦσιν. ἦμαρ γὰρ τόδε
θανοῦσαν εἶδε καὶ βλέπουσαν παῖδα σήν.

ΧΟ. ὡς ἥδομαί τοι ταῦτ' ἀκούσ ισ' ἀγγέλου·
ζῶν δ' ἐν θεοῖσι σὸν μένειν φράζει τέκος.

ΚΛ. ὦ παῖ, θεῶν τοῦ κλέμμα γέγονας;   1615
πῶς σε προσείπω; πῶς δ' οὐ φῶ
παραμυθεῖσθαι τούσδε μάτην μύθους,
ὡς σοῦ πένθους λυγροῦ παυσαίμαν;

ΧΟ. καὶ μὴν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ στείχει,
τούσδ' αὐτοὺς ἔχων σοι φράζειν μύθους.   1620

ΑΓΑ. γύναι, θυγατρὸς ἕνεκ' ὄλβιοι γενοίμεθ' ἄν·
ἔχει γὰρ ὄντως ἐν θεοῖς ὁμιλίαν.
χρὴ δέ σε λαβοῦσαν τόνδε μόσχον νεαγενῆ
στείχειν πρὸς οἴκους· ὡς στρατὸς πρὸς πλοῦν ὁρᾷ.
καὶ χαῖρε· χρόνιά γε τἀμά σοι προσφθέγματα   1625
Τροίηθεν ἔσται. καὶ γένοιτό σοι καλῶς.

ΧΟ. χαίρων, Ἀτρείδη, γῆν ἵκου Φρυγίαν,
χαίρων δ' ἐπάνηκε,
κάλλιστά μοι σκῦλ' ἀπὸ Τροίας ἑλών.]

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 δὲ.   1618. παυσαίμην L (originally).
1621. οὕνεκα PL, corrected in both MSS. to ἕνεκα.

APPENDIX.

SCHEME of the metre of the Lyric passages.

(In this Scheme the following signs are used : ‿ ◡ represents a '*cyclic*' dactyl, ⌐ a long syllable held on in singing for three '*times*' or *morae*, ‹ an '*irrational*' long syllable, and ʌ 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 ◡◡◡ ‿◡ ─◡ ─ʌ   185
     ◡◡◡ ‿◡ ◡◡◡ ─ʌ
     ⌐   ⌐   ‿◡ ─◡   ─ʌ
     ⌐   ⌐   ‿◡ ⌐   ─ʌ

     ‿◡ ◡◡◡ ‿◡ ─ʌ
     ‿◡ ‿◡ ─◡ ─ʌ   190
170 ⌐   ⌐   ‿◡ ⌐   ─

(Choriambic)

195

175

200

180

205

EPODE.

206

210

215

220

225

STASIMON I.

Strophe and Antistrophe.

543 ∪∪∪　⌣∪　－∪　－ʌ　　　558
　∪∪∪　⌣∪　－∪　－ʌ
545 ∟　　∟　　⌣∪　∟　　－ʌ　560
∪　－<　∟　　⌣∪　－ʌ
　∪∪∪　－<　⌣∪　－ʌ
　∪∪∪　－<　⌣∪　－ʌ
　－<　－⌣̆　⌣∪　－ʌ
550 ∪∪∪　－<　⌣∪　－ʌ　565
　∪∪∪　－∪　⌣∪　－ʌ
　∪∪∪　－∪　⌣∪　－ʌ
　⁻∪̆∪　－<　⌣∪　－ʌ
　－∪　⌣∪　∟　　－
555 －∪　⌣∪　－ʌ　　　570
　⌣∪　－∪　⌣∪　－ʌ
　∟　　∟　　⌣∪　∟　　－ʌ

Epode.

573 ∪∪∪　⌣∪　⌣∪　－ʌ
　⌣∪　－<　⌣∪　－ʌ
575 －<　⌣∪　∟　　－ʌ
　＊　＊　＊　＊　＊
　⌣∪　－<　⌣∪　－ʌ
　－<　－<　⌣∪　－ʌ
∪　－∪　－∪　－ʌ
　－<　⌣∪　⌣∪　－ʌ
580 ∪∪∪　∪∪∪　⌣∪　－ʌ
　∟　　⌣∪　∟　　－ʌ
∪∪　⌣∪　－∪　－ʌ
　－∪　⌣∪　⌣∪　－
∪　∟　　∟　　⌣∪　－∪
585 ∪　⌣∪　－∪
∪　－∪　－∪　－∪　∟　　－ʌ
　∪∪∪　∪∪∪
　⌣∪　⌣∪　⌣∪　－ʌ
　∟　　⌣∪　∟　　－ʌ

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 −‿ ‿‿ ⌞ −∧

     ⌞ ⌞ ‿‿ ⌞ −∧
     ⌞ ⌞ −‿ ‿‿ −∧
     ⌞ ‿‿ ⌞ −∧

790

795

800

STASIMON III.

STROPHE AND ANTISTROPHE.

1036

1060

1040

1065

1045

1070

1050

1075

1055

EPODE.

1080 ⏑ –⏑ L L –⏑ ⏗⏑ –⋀
     ⏑⏑⏑ L L ⏗⏑ –⋀
     ⏗⏑ L –⏑ L L L ⏗⏑ –⋀
     ⏗⏑ –⏑ –⏑ L –⋀
     L L –⋖ L –⋀

1085 L L ⏗⏑ –⏑ –⋀
      L L ⏗⏑ –⏑ –⋀
     ⏑⏑⏑ ⏗⏑ ⏗⏑ –⋀
     ⏗⏑ –⏑ –⋀

     –⏑ L L –⋀
1090 –⏑ ⏗⏑ –⏑ –
   ⏑ ⏗⏑ L –⋀

     ⏑⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ ⏗⏑ –⋀
     ⏑⏑⏑ ⏗⏑ ⏗⏑ –⋀
     L L ⏗⏑ L –⋀

1095 ⏑⏑⏑ ⏗⏑ –⏑ –⋀
     L L ⏗⏑ –⏑ –⋀
     L L ⏗⏑ L –⋀

MONODY OF IPHIGENEIA 1283—1335

PRECEDED BY ONE DOCHMIAC (1276) AND SIX ANAPAESTIC
LINES (1277—1283).

1283 ⏑ –⏑ –⋀

     ⏑⏑⏑ –⏑ ⏗⏑ L –⋀
1285 ⏑⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑
     –⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ –⏑ –⋀

     ⏑⏑⏑ L ⏑⏑⏑ –⏑
     ⏑⏑⏑ L –⏑
1290 L –⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑ –⏑ –⏑ –⋀

     –⏑ –⏑ –⏑ –⏑
     –⏑ –⏑ –⏑ –⏑
     ⏗⏑ ⏗⏑ ⏗⏑ ⏗⏑
1295 –⋖ –⋖ –⋖
     L L ⏗⏑ L –⋀

1300

1305

1310

1315

1319—1322 anapaestic.

1330

1335

COMMOS.

vv. 1475—1508.

1475

E. I. 11

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.*

INDEX

TO SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THE EXPLANATORY NOTES.

N.B. *The numbers refer to the verses of the play.*