THE PROLOGUE OF *IPHIGENIA AT AULIS*[1]

IPHIGENIA AT AULIS presents many problems to the literary and textual critic. Among these the problem of the prologue is as clear-cut as it is controversial.[2] It may be summarized as follows:

(1) Our text opens abruptly with an anapaestic dialogue between Agamemnon and the Retainer (1–48), instead of the usual monologue in trimeters.

(2) In reply to a question from the Retainer, Agamemnon launches into a long iambic narrative (49–114), describing much that the Retainer must know already, and with no sign, for more than sixty lines, that the Retainer is being addressed. Moreover 49 (*Ἐγένοντο Λήδαι . . .*) reads like the first line of a conventional opening monologue.

(3) The closing lines of the iambics (variously designated: 105–14 in the Oxford Text) have been widely stigmatized, but are integral to the structure (such as it is); here at last (110) Agamemnon explicitly speaks to the Retainer, and answers his question.

(4) The rest (115–63) continues and concludes the dialogue in anapaests; 124 ff. is arguably inconsistent with 104 ff.

(5) There are some supposed stylistic anomalies, but no generally accepted grounds for denying Euripidean authorship of any major portion. Thus, whereas some have accepted the iambics and rejected the anapaests,[3] Fraenkel has reversed the attribution.[4] Both iambics and anapaests were cited in the fourth–third centuries, the former by Aristotle.[5]

Now it is well known that *I.A.* was exhibited posthumously, winning the prize in association with *Bacchae* and two lost plays.[6] It may have needed (or been considered to need) supplementation by the Exhibitor. Perhaps Euripides never wrote a prologue, and the extant one is, after all, an integral composition by some second hand. But we do not thus account for the contradiction between its fine verse and its flawed structure. It is unlikely (at least if we accept the First Episode as substantially authentic) that Euripides had left unplanned his necessarily complex play-opening.[7] And if only notes survived of his intentions, we should expect the verse to be indifferent, the structure good, not vice versa. Certainly there are numerous (if variously identified and explained) non-Euripidean features elsewhere in the play, including a wholly spurious Finale.[8] But no theory of gap-filling or inorganic supplementation can account

[1] I am grateful to Professor K. J. Dover for reading an early draft of this article and offering many helpful suggestions.

[2] For the fullest treatment, see now Gudrun Mellert-Hoffmann, *Untersuchungen zur 'Iphigenie in Aulis' des Euripides* (Heidelberg, 1969), 91–155. See Additional Note on p. 364.

[3] Bremi (1819); so G. Murray (Oxford Classical Text), and D. L. Page in *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), to whose convenient discussion frequent reference will be made (as *AIGT*).

[4] *Studi U. E. Paoli* (1955), 293–304.

[5] See Murray's *app. crit.* and *AIGT*, 128.

[6] Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 67; England (Ed. 1891), xviii ff., and *AIGT*, 9.

[7] The First Episode (303–542) opens with an abrupt confrontation which is unintelligible unless we have seen the Retainer before, and been told not only about *this* letter (307), but also about the previous one of which it is a cancellation; also about the seeds of dispute between Agamemnon and Menelaus. It could scarcely have been written thus by one who had not devised his play-opening in detail. Cf. p. 349, n. 2 below.

[8] I hope to publish something about these

for the prologue's anomalous *structure*, and we are not here concerned, except arguably in 105 ff., with second-rate composition. Whatever is wrong with the prologue may be wrong for reasons unconnected with the faults in the rest of the play. At least, there is no prima-facie connection; unless it be the generally inferior quality of LP's text, of which it is uncertain how much goes back to (even beyond) the Alexandrian Vulgate, and how much is to be blamed on the later Byzantine transmission.[1]

The integrity of the prologue has, indeed, found defenders; though one recent defender qualifies his defence by admitting 'marks of interpolation'.[2] One may also make allowances for unrevised composition, and (conceivably) for symptoms of dotage. It is true, and will be shown in detail below, that a great many false supporting arguments have been used to impugn the prologue's authenticity, or of parts of it. But the structural objections cannot be lightly brushed aside. In the first place, the form of the opening, as an anapaestic dialogue, is in conflict with the familiar and otherwise well-attested expository technique of Euripides.[3] *Rhesus* can hardly be adduced as a parallel,[4] and *Andromeda* is, at best, likely to have been exceptional in a quite different way.[5] This feature alone we might be forced to accept as an isolated experiment, if it were justified by over-all coherence. But it is not. The trimeters when they come, supposedly answer the Retainer's question *τί* **νέον** *περὶ σοί, βασιλεῦ;*

other problems at a future date. In general I shall argue that Euripides had all but completed *I.A.* before his death, and that almost all spurious passages are *inorganic additions*, not stopgaps or revisions. For two examples (413–14, 518–21) see below on pp. 362 and 363; a longer one is 231–302 in the Parodos (p. 361, n. 4). So also the Finale, Euripides having intended his play to end with a lyric *envoi* (cf. *Troades*), approximately as 1531, though he may not have got quite so far. There may have been two ancient attempts to provide the play with an iambic Exodus (*Angelos*-narrative and/or *Dea ex Machina*), both of which can be shown to be inconsistent with the Euripidean plot.

[1] Cf. G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), 102, 249 ff.

[2] W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1964), 101 ff. It is not very clear what he means by suspecting interpolation 'in 106–14', since this passage is the linch-pin of the structure he is defending.

[3] Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 946 f.; Arist. *Rhet.* 3. p. 1415^{a}18; Sch. E. *Hec.* 1. These passages explicitly confirm the Euripidean norm. They cannot, however, be held to exclude the possibility of an exception anciently attributed to Euripides. This qualification has a bearing on whether our prologue can have had its extant structure in antiquity. This is not the same question as whether the extant structure can be attributed to Euripides.

[4] Ritchie argues compellingly that *Rhesus* has lost its original prologue, for which there is both internal and external evidence (op. cit. 101–13, 29 ff.). The manner and date of its loss, if known, might be relevant to the present problem (below, pp. 363 f.). Ritchie (pp. 42 f.) assumes, on the basis of Hyp. ii, loss before Aristophanes of Byzantium. But we can surely identify the play-opening indexed by Dicaearchus (*Νῦν εὐσέλησον . . .*) with one of the *πρόλογοι διττοί* described in Hyp. i as extant ('*φέρονται*') in the third century B.C. (or later), at which date there were numerous copies with the variant openings ('*καὶ ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ . . .*'). One possibility is that Ar. Byz. himself excised it under a misapprehension (was the 'actors' *πρόλογος*' of 11 lines simply a clarifying '*pre-prologue*' in some texts?). But Ritchie neglects another obvious loophole: why should not Hyp. ii have been *modified later* (it was certainly abbreviated) to suit a beheaded text? The Aristophanic subject of *προλογίζουσι*, instead of *οἱ καὶ . . .*, may have been something like *δύο θεαί* (cf. Ritchie, p. 110). On the problems of *Rhesus*, see also Fraenkel's review of Ritchie in *Gnomon*, 37 (1965), 228–41.

[5] Sch. Ar. *Th.* 1015 ff. (cf. Ritchie, 103 f.). We might visualize Andromeda preceding her trimeters with an anapaestic *θρῆνος* occasioned by her visibly uncomfortable situation; but this (even if proved) would afford no support for a plunge *in medias res* in dialogue form.

(43). One does not answer such a question with an immense narrative that begins in the remote past with the birth of one's wife and *two* sisters-in-law, to say nothing of other irrelevances. 'Deferred exposition' is all very well: but this is ridiculous. Beyond question, 49 ff. were not written to follow 1–48.

England, following Hartung, Hermann, and Bohnhoff, wished to move the iambic exposition before 1–48. All these editors concluded that its closing lines (impossibly, thus, addressed to the Retainer) derive from some ancient revision or recent forgery, of which no satisfactory account has been given.

A more favoured view among recent critics has been that our text of 1–163 comprises parts of two different prologues, conflated by a later hand, to whom the closing lines of the iambics are assigned. There are three possibilities here: (*a*) Euripides wrote both (perhaps in an unfinished state); the conflation is then most naturally attributed to the Exhibitor. (*b*) Euripides wrote one, the Exhibitor or some early fourth-century poet wrote the other; preferably not the Exhibitor in this case, since a prologue passed over by him would scarcely have survived, even in part. (*c*) Euripides wrote neither.[1]

None of these possibilities is directly disprovable. Equally, none is obviously attractive. Against *a*, it is not likely that Euripides, if he ever contemplated opening his play with *Ἐγένοντο Λήδαι . . .*, also experimented with a highly uncharacteristic initial anapaestic dialogue. Against *b* and *c*, would not an early fourth-century audience have objected to the total cutting and replacement of (in effect) the first scene of a well-known prizewinning masterpiece? This applies more forcibly, perhaps, if we suppose that the anapaests came first and were later replaced by drily expository iambics. But if we give priority to the iambics, we can expect to be asked for evidence of anapaestic openings becoming favoured, as against iambic ones, in the early fourth century. And how did the unsatisfactory conflation become the booksellers' norm, or at least the version adopted by Aristophanes of Byzantium? *Ex hypothesi*, the alternatives had independently stood the test of production, and were separately superior to the conflation; one at least must have been well circulated, in so popular a play.[2] Finally, can we so lightly disregard the early citations of both iambics and anapaests, and the prima-facie Euripidean quality of both?

This, in outline, is the present unsatisfactory state of the question.

Suppose we take the postulated 'anapaestic prologue' and examine it as though what survives were a fragment. Murray considered it to be '*paene perfectum*', whereas the 'iambic prologue' is '*imperfectum*'. This judgement can be directly tested.

To begin with, we have the sense-gap between 48 and 115, if all the iambics are discounted. It is certainly deducible that at this point Agamemnon must at least (*a*) reveal to the Retainer his previous summons of Iphigenia;[3] (*b*) mention 'marriage with Achilles' in a way that the Retainer will misunderstand, after hearing its postponement in the letter;[4] (*c*) inform him that he is himself to be sent to Mycenae with the cancelling letter;[5] (*d*) the conclusion must make it clear that what Agamemnon says next will be the actual words

[1] The case for 'Conflated Prologues' is argued in *AIGT*, 138–40. Page himself favours *b*, assigning the anapaests to 'a good early writer'—not Euripides the Younger (as Bremi suggested, approved by Murray), for the reason given. 'One thinks of the romantic atmosphere of Chairemon' (p. 139).

[2] Continuous popularity in antiquity: cf. *AIGT*, 9 f., 128.

[3] Cf. 133–5.

[4] Cf. 124–6.

[5] Cf. 118, 139.

of the letter.[1] These revelations will in practice require more than just a line or two. Now there is no warrant for assuming, *a priori*, the absence here (loss or non-composition) of more *anapaests*. Anapaests are fine for developing the emotional implications of a dramatic situation; they are ill-suited to the primary communication of essential information. The very complexity of the 'pre-curtain' situation in this play more than usually cries out for the clarity of trimeters. And a prologue consisting of 100(+) lines of anapaests and no iambics would be a phenomenon without parallel in Greek Tragedy. It is thus a reasonable inference that the prologue in which the anapaests featured contained, or was intended to contain, an iambic passage between 48 and 115 —so far, not necessarily a single speech: but we may note that the extant iambics from about line 97 exactly cover the essential matter outlined above in *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d*; also that the Retainer's words at 117 f., 124 ff., and 133 ff. appear to express his *first* (still confused) reactions to *a*, *b*, and *c*, so that what is needed to fill the 'gap' is a single speech, not a passage of dialogue. England objected on principle to the intrusion of an iambic speech between two passages of anapaestic dialogue. But there will hardly have been a rule forbidding such a feature, given a context in which the speech is dramatically appropriate.

Further inferences are possible. Murray, presumably, visualized a minimal link between 48 and 115 as sufficient to complete his 'anapaestic prologue'. Did he not observe that the extant anapaests mention neither the oracle of Calchas, on which so much depends, nor Menelaus, in preparation for the abrupt opening of the First Episode? True, we do not want a long exposition of the general background in reply to the Retainer's question (the very fault complained of in the extant prologue-structure); but let it not be thought that this background could be left to the audience's imagination. The Aulis story was familiar in its outlines, but the details were variable, and there had been many versions of the circumstances in which Calchas (or Artemis) demanded the sacrifice of Iphigenia.[2] The place for all this, and any other, introductory matter is before 1–48, detailed study of which will confirm the need for a previous exposition. The Retainer, like the rest of the army, is already acquainted with all that is public knowledge.[3] Those who regard the anapaests as a fragment can have no reason to deny that they were preceded (before the postulated conflation) by a monologue opening from Agamemnon, who *then* summons the Retainer and converses with him.

Now it is evident that the first three-quarters (or so) of the extant iambics would do very well as a monologue before line 1 (so England and others); and we have seen that the last quarter (or so) covers the ground that Agamemnon must cover with the Retainer. There would seem, surely, to be a hypothesis here worth testing, viz. that:

(1) The extant anapaests were written for a prologue constructed as follows: A. iambic monologue; B. anapaests 1–48; C. further iambics in reply to the Retainer's question; D. anapaests 115–63.

(2) *A and C in fact survive in our text, brought together, and apparently indissolubly welded, as 49–114.*

[1] 115 ff.—or rather 117–18–15–16? (see below on p. 356).

[2] Cf. M. Platnauer, *Iph. Taur.* (Oxford, 1938), x–xii. See also p. 348, nn. 5–6 below.

[3] The public nature of Calchas' oracle is here taken as certain, though some critics seem to have misunderstood, or missed the significance of, this cardinal feature of the plot. See further on pp. 361 f.

(3) For reasons that will become clear, I divide the iambics into A. 49–96 and C. 97–114. Close attention will be paid to the suture at 96/7.

On this hypothesis the poet of the anapaests becomes identifiable with Euripides; so also the poet of the iambics, subject to the possibility that the dislocation of his prologue involved some makeshift adjustments, or more far-reaching revision, to suit the new arrangement. The plausibility of the hypothesis will be enhanced if (*a*) the prologue as rearranged is found to be coherent with itself, harmonious with the Euripidean plot as a whole, and consistent in detail with Euripidean authorship; (*b*) we can give a tentative explanation of how it became dislocated, at least as plausible as explanations which postulate the conflation of alternatives.

A. Iambics 49–96

The play opens with Agamemnon before his quarters at Aulis. In the Greek theatre we need to be told this (before the action begins, if not at the beginning of the exposition), since there was little or no illusionist scenery.[1] But there is a λαμπτήρ which at once tells us that it is night,[2] and there may be a stool beside the fixed stage-altar, to indicate that it is to serve as a writing-table.[3] Agamemnon does not 'enter', the play opening rather with a simple tableau.[4]

He begins, in characteristic Euripidean style, with economically self-identifying genealogy, and proceeds to narrate:

51–65: the wooing of Helen, and the Tyndarean Oath.
66–79: Helen's choice of Menelaus, and her rape by Paris.
80–6: the gathering at Aulis, and his own elective status.
87–96: the ἄπλοια, and the oracle of Calchas.

There is little need to argue that this whole passage strongly suggests the hand of Euripides. It may be that his style was imitable, but prima facie the lines are authentic. The following critical points bear on the wider interpretation of the prologue, or of the play as a whole:[5]

51 ff. For the μνηστῆρες and the oath, cf. Thuc. 1. 9. It looks as though the prominent treatment of this episode was designed to reassert, at the outset, the mythic tradition against Thucydides' rejection of it. The poet is saying to the audience: 'Forget Thucydides: Agamemnon was not an all-powerful warlord, and it was he, not the "princes orgulous", who was subject to fear.' The precise terms of the oath are linked with Agamemnon's fears at 531–5, and serve to authenticate that passage.[6] Here, and elsewhere, we can be certain

[1] P. Arnott, *Greek Scenic Conventions in the 5th century B.C.* (Oxford, 1962), 106.

[2] Cf. 34—a passing reference as to something that has long been in view. Agamemnon himself will take it within at 163.

[3] A new suggestion, I think, but cf. Arnott, op. cit. 43 ff. Agamemnon does not, presumably, brandish his δέλτοι throughout 49–96.

[4] So Helen, Andromache, and others (*Hcld.*, *Suppl.*) are discovered as suppliants at a μνῆμα or βωμός. Cf. also *Rh.*, *Hec.*, *Tro.*, *Or.*

[5] Minor textual points: in 53 f. I should read . . . φθόνος (Markland) | ξυνίσταθ', ὅστις δὴ λάβοι τὴν παρθένον, as the *positive* question at issue. In 77 I should prefer οἰστρήσας ἔρωι (or γ' ἔρωι): cf. 382–7. In 80 Aristotle's ἄιξαντες ποσί is the better variant ('at a run' —see LSJ); δορί tiresomely anticipates τεύχη λαβόντες, and this dative would here be happier with a supporting epithet.

[6] Certainly 531–5 is melodramatic (*AIGT*, 157 f.), but not for that reason un-Euripidean. We are meant, I think, to hear the

that Euripides also had in mind the Parodos of *Agamemnon*.[1] At *Ag.* 212 f. the dilemma-horn is quite simply expressed: πῶc λιπόναυc γένωμαι, ξυμμαχίαc ἁμαρτών; By stressing the Tyndarean Oath, Euripides gives this more substance.

84. cτρατηγεῖν †κἄτα†. Should the sense be 'chose me *as commander-in-chief*'? One wonders then: 'why Agamemnon, not Menelaus himself?' The only reason given ('for Menelaus' sake, being his brother') is insufficient to the point of illogicality. The sense, I think, was 'elected me *to share* the cτρατηγία': cτρατηγεῖν κατ' ἴcα.[2] The *joint*-leadership of the Atridae was traditional,[3] and by no means incompatible with this play.[4] If cτρατηγεῖν κατ' ἴcα suggests the Athenian cτρατηγία (especially in conjunction with εἵλοντο), we find a similar political topicality in 366 ff.

89 ff. The oracle has been delivered to the assembled Greeks, or at least to the assembled chieftains, not to a select few. No explanation is given (except the ἄπλοια itself), and it is nowhere implied that Agamemnon had offended the goddess Artemis. Calchas has spoken—that is all. In *I.T.* 18–24, Agamemnon had been held by Calchas to a rash vow that he would sacrifice to Artemis 'the fairest offspring of the year'.[5] But for the plot of *I.A.*, such a vow would be an unwanted complication in the fraternal and conjugal wrangles, and would blur the patriotic motivation of Iphigenia's volte-face in 1374 ff. Euripides avoids contradicting his previous play, while broadly, in both *I.T.* and *I.A.*, following Aeschylus in respect of the exculpation of Artemis, the prior innocence of Agamemnon, and the crucial mantic role of Calchas.[6]

fears there as exaggerated; pessimism is a characteristic of Euripides' Orestes also.

[1] Cf. below, nn. 3, 6; p. 350, n. 2; p. 358, n. 5; p. 359, n. 4; p. 362, nn. 2, 4, 6; also p. 351, n. 6; p. 352, n. 7; p. 357, n. 2; p. 358, n. 4.

[2] κατ⟨ιc⟩α: cf. 130. A copyist was no doubt satisfied by κατὰ Μενέλεω χάριν—someone else then desperately made it κἄτα for the metre. κατ' ἴcα: cf. *Il.* 11. 336 and LSJ s.v. ἴcoc iv. 2 (adverbial phrases).

[3] *Il.* 1. 16 Ἀτρεΐδα . . . κοcμήτορε λαῶν; A. *Ag.* 43 f. διcκήπτρου τιμῆc.

[4] Cf. 173–8, 818, 842, 928 f. (*contra* 414, but see p. 362, n. 5).

[5] Not (*pace* Platnauer) alluded to in *I.A.* 530, which refers to *I.A.* 360. Editors strangely infer (despite the absence of πάλαι or the like in *I.T.* 21 or 23) that the vow had been taken before Iphigenia's birth. The absurdity of such a story (vow in abeyance for fifteen years? Baby prize adjudicated fifteen years too late?) makes it vain to postulate allusiveness to a non-extant version of the myth in the imagined sense. Cicero (*De Off.* 3. 25. 95) worded his version clumsily, but apparently placed the vow in the current year ('*eo quidem anno*'). If so, he was right. We are to understand that Agamemnon had made the vow recently at Aulis, in a dark hour (cf. φωcφόρωι 21); he was then trapped by Calchas' perversely mantic interpretation of the vow's wording. A degree of perversity in the interpretation is appropriate (cf. n. 6 below), as long as the perversity is that of the hated Calchas (*I.T.* 531 ff., etc.). It was as a maiden, not as a baby, that Iphigenia was adjudged καλλίcτη. *I.T.* 22 ff. = 'Well now (οὖν) your wife has (τίκτει) a beautiful daughter . . . whom (as this year's fairest τόκοc, even if not born within the year) you must sacrifice (before the fleet can sail from Aulis).' Payment had to *precede* the desired benefit (18 ff.); and the *year's* womb does not only bring forth babies.

[6] Critics of the *Agamemnon* Parodos commonly fall into the error of seeking to explain why Artemis demanded a victim (so, despite some useful insights, N. G. L. Hammond in *JHS* lxxxv [1965], 42–55). The Chorus nowhere say that she did. Nor do they say that either the eagles or the winds were sent by any god. The whole point of the elaborate 'portent' is to make it clear that the 'prescription' (μῆχαρ 199) came from a human augur who could have been challenged (186). Calchas is wrily allowed to be a *proficient* seer (122, 249): but nothing guarantees his divine spokesmanship (cf. 201 f.); and Agamemnon himself in 206–17 does not claim to be obeying *the gods*, in performing

93. Wantonly deleted by Nauck, followed by Murray. The line is blameless in expression, and the negative converse of the prediction is as indispensable here as it would be redundant if repeated at 359.[1]

94–6. κλύων δ' ἐγὼ ταῦτ', ὀρθίωι κηρύγματι
Ταλθύβιον εἶπον πάντ' ἀφιέναι στρατόν,
ὡς οὔποτ' ἂν τλὰς θυγατέρα κτείνειν ἐμήν.

The army is still at Aulis (81 f., 88), and there is evidently something left unsaid. In the traditional text (continuing directly with 97 ff.) we can, indeed, infer either that Talthybius never proclaimed the dismissal, or that it was proclaimed and subsequently countermanded. Or perhaps the dismissal, thus equivocally described, was only of the particular congregation at which Calchas delivered his oracle. But why mention Talthybius and the dismissal at all, rather than simply 'hearing this, I at first flatly refused to sacrifice my daughter . . .'? Consider now the effect of the proposed division of the iambics at 96. When Agamemnon breaks off here and proceeds to his letter-writing in evident distress, the audience is misled into supposing that little time has elapsed since Calchas' oracle and its rejection, for it seems that the dismissal of the army from Aulis *has not yet taken effect*. This deception has a definite purpose. The natural expectation of the audience is that (despite 96) the letter in view contains Iphigenia's *summons*—the more so, because of Agamemnon's tears (see below). The abortive *countermanding* letter is surely an Euripidean invention,[2] and will therefore come as a complete surprise. The effect of the break at 96 is to delay and so to enhance the surprise; and for this 'double-cross' there has to be both equivocation and reticence[3]—not only here, but throughout the following section of anapaests (1–48), for the interpretation of which we now have an important new clue.

B. Anapaests 1–48

There is a pause, with stage-movement and 'business', before Agamemnon summons the Retainer from the *skene*, which justifies the change of metre without change of speaker.[4] Normally it is a new voice that initiates the anapaests in a prologue, but the situation here makes that inappropriate. It is enough that this section is dominated by the Retainer's garrulity. Agamemnon's actions are clearly described in 34–42: by then he has finished his letter, not without

an explicitly 'impious' sacrifice (219 ff.). Aeschylus' treatment was no doubt an innovation calculated to *absolve* Artemis from the savagery attributed to her in cult and myth; it was surely so understood by Euripides (see also *I.T.* 385–91).

[1] Murray's 'cf. 359' is obscure, if intended as a ground for deletion. He was surely not (as implied in *AIGT*, 137) thinking 93 to be derived from 359; but neither does it conflict with it.

[2] The invention was dramatically fruitful: it leads naturally to a dispute with Menelaus which would otherwise have had to precede the decision to send for Iphigenia; and a structurally important role is created for the Retainer. Both of these (and the very novelty of the idea) look like Euripidean features.

[3] A legitimate veil is drawn over what 'in fact' the Atridae said to keep the army at Aulis (cf. 818 μελλήματα) and over the 'actual' time-lapse since the oracle (travelling-time was freely distorted or disregarded by the dramatists, as in A. *Ag.*). The narrative-ellipse, here explained as necessary for a special dramatic effect, is also appropriately in character: Agamemnon stresses his first, creditable reaction and stops short of revealing his subsequent tergiversations (Menelaus' account at 359 f. is rhetorically distorted in the opposite direction). For Euripidean misdirection in prologues cf. W. S. Barrett on *Hp.* 41–50.

[4] Cf. 1475, *Andr.* 103.

erasures, sealed, reopened, and cast it on the ground, weeping uncontrollably the while. This 'business' cannot all be accommodated between 28 and 33; he must have been involved with his letter ever since (and before) the Retainer emerged, except when moved to voice his grief (16 ff., 21 ff.). He is in no mood for polite conversation. In conflict with this reading of the scene are the remarks assigned to Agamemnon at 6 and 9 ff. But there are notorious difficulties in the text, and it will be argued that the whole of 4–15 should be assigned to the Retainer.

1–5. '*Old man, come forth before this building.*' '*I come: but what novelty are you engaged upon, King Agamemnon?*' '*Make haste.*' '*I hasten* (also *I am zealous*)*: my old age is sleepless, and my eyes keen . . .*' The action has begun, and it is essential in the Greek theatre that we should know what sort of 'building' the Retainer is being summoned from. The uninformative phrase δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν is technically improper unless the *skene* is already identifiable as Agamemnon's quarters at Aulis. It is hard to see how the identification could be made if line 1 were the first line of the play. στεῖχε.—στείχω. The division of an anapaestic metron between two speakers is rare, but exactly paralleled in *Rh.* 16 *θάρσει.*—*θαρσῶ*[1]—evidently a special case, which recurs at once in 3 †πεύσῃ†. —σπεύδω. Editors choose between *σπεῦδε* (Porson) and *σπεύσεις;* (Dobree); but the archetype more probably had *σπεύσῃ;* and the middle, though rare, seems possible in the light of *Il.* 15. 402 *σπεύσομαι εἰς Ἀχιλῆα.*[2] καινουργεῖς: perhaps a new word,[3] recurring in 838 which seems securely authentic. Brief though it is, this exchange is already strikingly Euripidean, especially in the characterization and elegant idiom of 4–5.

6–8. Having emerged from the *skene*, the Retainer looks up at the stars, almost as though to demonstrate his unimpaired faculties. He has to make the running in this conversation, and continues: '*Whatever means this blazing star Sirius, rushing still in mid course near the seven-faring Pleiad? . . .*' I read *τί ποτ' ἆρ' ἀστὴρ ὅδε πορθμεύει | Σείριος . . .;* (restorable from the citation by Theon of Smyrna—see below), and interpret as follows: (*a*) 'Why is the Dogstar active at this ungodly hour?' τί ποτ' ἆρ' . . . suits the Retainer's quasi-jocular attitude of wonderment and protestation.[4] (*b*) The mention of the Dogstar is heard as an indication of late summer;[5] the projected campaign has been long delayed, but not yet ruled out by the arrival of autumn. The Dog Days began about three weeks after midsummer,[6] and from then on Sirius and the Pleiades are both prominent in the late-night sky. The hour, not the season, is further defined by ἄισσων ἔτι μεσήρης: not only is it long past normal bedtime, but

[1] The parallel is overlooked in *AIGT*, 131. Ritchie indeed (op. cit. 290 ff.) would remove *Rh.* 16 and insert ⟨*Χο. Φοῖβος· θάρσει*⟩ after *Rh.* 12; but his reasons for so bold a step seem inadequate. The asyndeton and 3rd person verb in 13 f. are consistent with the question in 12 being unanswered by these undisciplined guards; so also the repeated 'speak up!' in line 14. Further, 16 is satisfactory *in situ*: Hector's *θαρσῶ* can be taken as a (rebuking?) acknowledgement of the Chorus's *θάρσει*, and I see no reason to insist that his following questions are 'agitated'—he is rather denying (*μῶν . . .;*) the need for the *guards*' agitation. It is hardly conceivable that the medieval copyists of *Rh.* were familiar with the text of *I.A.*, and it is sounder to regard *I.A.* 2–3 and *Rh.* 16 as providing mutual support.

[2] Cf. A. *Ag.* 151 and *Eu.* 360; also *Med.* 153 and 183 (codd.).

[3] See further below on p. 359.

[4] Cf. S. *Aj.* 905. *τί*+*ἆρα* recurs in *I.A.* 1228.

[5] Contrast *Ba.* 661 f. (*CQ* N.S. xvi [1966], 227): were these companion dramas consciously set in opposite seasons of the year?

[6] Arat. 148; Pliny 24. 17. 12.

there is plenty of the course left to run before daybreak puts an end to it (ἔτι δ' ἡcυχία 13).[1] (*c*) The celestial Dogs are the attendant hounds of the huntsman Orion, and the flight of the Pleiades (or Πελειάδεc) before Orion was a familiar poetic theme.[2] **ἐγγὺc . . . Πλειάδοc** is astronomically questionable, but hardly an 'error' (*AIGT*, 131). Cf. Pi. *N.* 2. 10 ff. ἔcτι δ' ἐοικὸc | ὀρειᾶν γε Πελειάδων | μὴ τηλόθεν Ὠαρίωνα νεῖcθαι. The (true) proximity of Orion is here poetically extended to his Dog, and we are not concerned with straightforward astronomy. (*d*) **τί . . . πορθμεύει:** πορθμεύειν is invariably transitive in Euripides, except perhaps in *I.T.* 1445; for other metaphorical uses of this characteristic verb, cf. *Or.* 1032, *I.T.* 371. 'What (ferrying) does Sirius ferry?' —there is an allusive quality in the Greek, wherein the hearer, if not the speaker, is aware of diverse overtones.[3] We are indirectly put in mind of the πορθμός of the Euripus and the πορθμεία of the fleet to Troy; also that of Iphigenia to Aulis, which we suppose at this stage to be the purport of Agamemnon's letter. Given this (partial) understanding of what is afoot, for which a previous exposition is clearly indispensable, we hear further overtones. The ἀcτὴρ Cείριοc sounds like a portent of danger (LSJ s.v. cείριοc), its nearness to the Pleiad figuring the threat to the dove-like Iphigenia; and the threat is ἔτι μεccήρηc, i.e. not yet averted, despite Agamemnon's refusal to sacrifice his daughter (94 ff.). There are some close parallels: (i) *Or.* 1005 f. ἑπταπόρου τε δράμημα Πελειάδοc | εἰc ὁδὸν ἄλλαν Zεὺc μεταβάλλει, where the heavenly 'running' of the Pleiad is somewhat obscurely linked with the Atreid curse; the point is less obscure if we suppose that the 'hunted dove' symbolism was so familiar as to need only a touch on a plangent chord. (ii) *Rh.* 529 ff. πρῶτα | δύεται cημεῖα, καὶ ἑπτάποροι | Πλειάδεc αἰθέριαι, μέca δ' Αἰετὸc | οὐρανοῦ ποτᾶται: A. S. Way showed this to be literally true at about 3 a.m. in midsummer,[4] but it should be observed also that the Eagle is a portent of doom for the Trojans;[5] at this point in *Rh.* their hopes are buoyant, but a terrible enemy is about to swoop on them out of the night; and the setting of the Pleiades had been linked with the fall of Troy in A. *Ag.* 826.[6] (iii) The Pleiades are mentioned twice in *Phaethon* (frs. 773, 22 and 779, 4), possibly with similar overtones; in *Ion* 1152 f. and *Hel.* 1489 f. they are bracketed with Orion, confirming this association (as of Orion with Sirius in *Hec.* 1004). All these parallels, especially the recurrence of the epithet ἑπτάπορος, not only help to elucidate our passage, but also point strongly to its authenticity;[7] those who deny it have to postulate 'skilful imitation' or the like.

In LP the text runs differently: Αγ. τίc ποτ' ἄρ' ἀcτὴρ ὅδε πορθμεύει; Πρ. Cείριοc . . . and this version of 6 has invariably been accepted by editors,

[1] Not 'still on the meridian'. The Retainer has neither compass nor sextant; nor with that rendering is 'still' intelligible (Sirius is on the meridian before dawn in late September).

[2] *Il.* 22. 29; *Od.* 11. 572 ff.; LSJ s.v. Πλειάδεc.

[3] Cf. Licymn. 2 Ἀχέρων ἄχεα πορθμεύει βροτοῖcιν.

[4] There is no error in *Rh.* 529 ff. (as stated in *AIGT*, 132). The error was the failure of Crates, according to the scholiast, to take αἰθέριαι as predicative, so that he thought that Euripides was describing the Pleiades as setting. [For πρῶτα I should prefer πρώτας (sc. νυκτός or φυλακῆc).]

[5] *Il.* 8. 247; 12. 201.

[6] In *Ag.* 826 ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύcιν cannot simply (if at all) have a calendar significance, and the phrase is regarded by Denniston–Page as inexplicable. Aeschylus wanted, I think, a vivid indication of night-time suitable for a context full of images drawn from *hunting* (for this reason I should retain παγάc in 822).

[7] Cf. *Rh.* Hyp. i ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρcια δὲ ἐν αὐτῶι πολυπραγμοcύνη τὸν Εὐριπίδην ὁμολογεῖ.

despite generally admitted difficulties of interpretation. Apparently supporting the traditional pointing (if not τίς against τί) is the Ennian parallel:[1] *AG. Quid nocti' videtur in altisono | caeli clupeo? SEN. Temo superat* . . . Yet many have been ready to discount Ennius by continuing 7–8 to Agamemnon.[2] It is possible that Ennius himself reshaped, not merely paraphrased, the conversation, but more probable that he knew a version similar to LP's (presumably that of the recent edition of Aristophanes of Byzantium), and that there were variant assignations in antiquity.[3] It is certain that Theon of Smyrna read 6–8 as an unbroken sentence, for his planetary interpretation (though mistaken) depends on such pointing;[4] it is also certain that he read τί, which is further supported by the anaphoric τί δὲ . . . in 12 (see below). LP's version would be suspect even without Theon's citation: (*a*) the question 'What is yonder star?' from Agamemnon is unmotivated (unless testing the Retainer's eyesight?) and in conflict with his engrossment in the letter (34 ff.); (*b*) why ποτ' ἄρ' ('what*ever*')? (*c*) πορθμεύει, taken to mean 'transits', is unparalleled in this intransitive sense; (*d*) ἐγγύς and ἔτι μεσσήρης in the Retainer's reply are not explicable in astronomical terms; (*e*) the connection of thought in 9 οὔκουν . . . γ' is very obscure, however the continuation is assigned, unless *both* question *and* continuation are assigned to the Retainer.[5]

9–11. '. . . *At any rate, there is no sound of birds or sea, and the winds are all silent here at the Euripus* . . .' Atmospheric lines, which finely evoke the sultry calm of a summer night. Although the calm night is consistent with adverse winds by day, it seems tolerably clear that Euripides was thinking of the ἄπλοια as having been caused by doldrums, but this aspect of the ἄπλοια was probably not of prime interest to him.[6] **οὔκουν . . . γ':** the Retainer is (with unconscious irony) contrasting the untimely activity of the sinister Dogstar (and, in the sequel, of Agamemnon) with the ἡσυχία which prevails at Aulis. **σιγαὶ δ' ἀνέμων:** the plural σιγαί is rare, but by no means to be viewed with suspicion.[7] Line 11 is a paroemiac, whose full close marks a slight pause while

[1] Enn. ap. Varr. *L.L.* 5. 19.

[2] Bremi; so Kirchhoff, England, *et al.* Their motive has usually been to make ἀστὴρ Σείριος refer to an unnamed planet or star, to obviate the 'astronomical error' in ἐγγύς. Despite Theon's similar view in antiquity (n. 4 below), there can be no question that Σείριος is here the Dogstar, in the light of the parallels given above.

[3] Cf. Sch. *Med.* 148. See further on p. 363 below.

[4] Theon Smyrn. περὶ ἀστρ. 16. p. 202 Martin: ὁ τραγικὸς ἐπί τινος τῶν πλανήτων· τί ποτ' ἄρα ὁ ἀστὴρ ὅδε πορθμεύει Σείριος; Cf. n. 2 above.

[5] Paley assigned 9–11 (but not 6) to the Retainer.

[6] There is good reason to suppose that there was such a rival version of the story (*contra* A. *Ag.* 147 f., 192 ff.). England, arguing otherwise on *I.T.* 15, overlooked Callim. *Dian.* 230. S. *El.* 564 is ambiguous and textually uncertain, but the best Greek is Froehlich's τὰ πλοῖ' ἀπνεύματ' ἔσχ' ἐν Αὐλίδι (with Artemis as the subject). In *I.T.* also the text is controversial (see Platnauer, *ad loc.*), but there is no good reason for altering πνευμάτων τ' οὐ τυγχάνων (πνευμάτων τε τυγχάνων is quite impossible Greek for 'obtaining *adverse* winds'). *I.A.* 813 (λεπταῖς πνοαῖς) is decisive, if the text is sound. It is vain to dispute whether adverse winds or doldrums make more rational sense of the irrational Aulis episode. The pre-Aeschylean legend was very likely noncommittal ('without favourable winds'), following, e.g., the pattern of *Od.* 4. 351–63. The preparation and rich detail in A. *Ag.* is consistent with *ad hoc* invention, in this as in other features (p. 348, n. 6; p. 358, n. 5); Aeschylus' defiance of climatic plausibility was not binding on his immediate successors, but his positive, colourful explanation of the ἄπλοια naturally prevailed in later antiquity.

[7] Cf. A. *Ag.* 412 (Fraenkel).

the Retainer contemplates the night, Agamemnon wrestles with his δέλτοι, and the audience bestir their imaginations.

12–15. '*And why do you, King Agamemnon, emulate the rushing-about of Sirius? There is yet quiet here in the army at Aulis . . . (so)*[1] *let us go within.*' **τί δὲ cύ** (not cὺ δὲ τί) : the structure is anaphoric, looking back to τί ποτ' ἆρ' ἀστήρ (6), just as ἀΐccειc 12 echoes ἄιccων 8. Rather than directly contrasting the wakeful king with the silent world of nature, the Retainer compares his activity with that of the Dogstar—a much subtler stroke, carrying with the comparison the overtones described above. ἀΐccειc need not imply that Agamemnon is literally rushing round the stage; for most of this scene he is more appropriately seated, though *mouvementé*.

16–48 (in summary). '*I envy your lowly estate.*' '*But it is to the great that* τὸ καλόν *belongs.*' '*Ah, but that* τὸ καλόν, *though sweet, is fraught with grief.*' '*Such thoughts are unseemly in a prince. You must accept disappointments. And what is this letter, whose composition so troubles you? Unburden your mind to a loyal servant, long ago sent by Tyndareus with your wife as a dowry slave, a trusty bridal-escort.*' 16–33: the Retainer consoles his master for the frustration of his ambitions (cf. 93), with an allusiveness which only a previous exposition can put us in a position to appreciate. Needless to say, he is friendly and loyal in this scene, approving of Agamemnon's *nolle prosequi* (94–6); it is not his place to refer more explicitly to a distasteful incident which he regards as closed. At the same time, in order to maintain the equivocation about the army's dismissal (p. 349), the consolation proceeds in generalities. **τὸ καλόν**: 'the good life', thought of in terms of success in the eyes of the world, as in *Hp.* 382, where τὸ καλόν is similarly described as a ἡδονή.[2] . . . **cφαλερόν, [καὶ τὸ φιλότιμον] γλυκὺ μὲν λύπηι δὲ προcιcτάμενον**: Bothe's ejection of καὶ τὸ φιλότιμον as derived from a gloss on τὸ καλόν is much the most plausible solution.[3] λύπηι (Hermann) is clearly better than the finite verb λυπεῖ (a common sort of corruption): προcιcτάμενον by itself means little ('τὸ καλόν vexes when it προcίcταται'), and the point must surely be 'sweet, but involving pain' (lit. 'adhering to', or perhaps better 'being weighed against'). 34–42: see above on p. 347 (λαμπτήρ), and pp. 349–50 (Agamemnon's actions during these anapaests). 43–8: we are still misinterpreting the letter as containing Iphigenia's *summons*: in the light of this, note the piquant irony of **cυννυμφοκόμον** (very likely an *ad hoc* coinage). The Retainer means only to refer to his long-ago escorting of Clytemnestra; but we think of another νύμφη, whom we suppose that the Retainer is going to be sent to fetch.

C. Iambics 97–114

When pressed to reveal his *new* trouble, Agamemnon reverts to trimeters, since this further exposition must be lucid in view of the deceptive treatment, in A and B, of the contents of the letter. No long retrospect is required at this point, which for the audience would involve tiresome repetition. The Retainer, like the audience, knows about the ἄπλοια and the remedy proposed by Calchas; and Agamemnon has only been asked (or thinks he has) to explain his

[1] A comma suffices before στείχωμεν ἔcω: cf. *I.T.* 64 f. (Platnauer).

[2] *C.Q.* N.S. xviii (1968), 14. Cf. also *Ba.* 881 (*CQ* N.S. xvi [1966], 229 ff.).

[3] There is practically nothing to be said for Nauck's πρότιμον (non-tragic, and not extant at all in quite the required sense).

letter-writing. It is like him to be reticent, especially to a servant, about the ugly purpose behind Iphigenia's earlier summons; it is also like him to begin by blaming his brother.

ὁ δή μ' ἀδελφὸς πάντα προσφέρων λόγον
ἔπεισε τλῆναι δεινά· κἀν δέλτου πτυχαῖς
γράψας ἔπεμψα πρὸς δάμαρτα τὴν ἐμὴν
πέμπειν Ἀχιλλεῖ θυγατέρ' ὡς γαμουμένην,
τό τ' ἀξίωμα τἀνδρὸς ἐκγαυρούμενος,
συμπλεῖν τ' Ἀχαιοῖς οὕνεκ' οὐ θέλοι λέγων,
εἰ μὴ παρ' ἡμῶν εἶσιν ἐς Φθίαν λέχος.

97 ὁ δή scripsi: οὗ δή LP 100 στέλλειν Markland

At 97 we find just the sort of imperfect suture that our hypothesis has led us to expect. We have seen the (surely planned) dramatic effectiveness of a break at 96 (p. 349); and in detail 97 follows ill after 96, though there is a superficial continuity in the narrative (indeed *for the audience* Agamemnon is virtually resuming where he broke off at 96). (*a*) τλῆναι δεινά looks *forward* to the revelation of the marriage-plot and previous letter, and is echoed by 133 δεινά γ' ἐτόλμας; but the juxtaposition with τλὰς . . . κτείνειν (96) makes it sound, crudely, as though τλῆναι δεινά = κτείνειν τὴν θυγατέρα. (*b*) οὗ δή apparently means 'and *that* was the moment when . . .' (cf. *I.T.* 320); such emphasis by Agamemnon on the immediacy of the persuasion is out of place, unless we interpret ἔπεισε as ἔπειθε—wrongly, in view of the continuation. The present hypothesis does not stand or fall by the minimal correction of οὗ δή to ὁ δή. There could have been more extensive adjustments consequent on the reversal of 49–96 and 1–48, even wholesale rewriting: but apart from the flawed continuity there is nothing un-Euripidean in the immediately succeeding lines.[1] A few lines could have dropped out: but we do not want resumptive lines that prematurely put the Retainer in the picture. It looks as though the new suture consisted only of οὗ δή, and the original is likely to have included the definite article ὁ, emphasizing 'my brother', and with the enclitic pronoun idiomatically placed between article (plus post-positive) and noun.[2] The choice, I think, lies between ⟨ὁ μέν⟩, ⟨ὁ γάρ⟩, and ⟨ὁ δή⟩. The first would look forward to 107, the second back to the question (43). But ὁ δή seems at least equally good, neutral in 'direction', and further emphasizing the brother whom Agamemnon is weakly blaming, while marking 97 ff. as a resumptive continuation *for the audience* of 49–96[3].

The remaining lines of the iambics have been widely condemned, but the censure is mostly misconceived.

[1] πέμπειν in 100 (so obtrusive after ἔπεμψα 99) is more likely to be a false variant than '*operis non perfecti vestigium*' (Murray). Conceivably Euripides preferred πέμπειν here (as against στέλλειν in 119) to express an ambiguity in the wording of the summons, thus preparing the ground for Clytemnestra's uninvited arrival (cf. on 154 below); but such a point here would be a rather esoteric subtlety, not worth the stylistic blemish. If a pointer be sought to the authenticity of 97–103, ἐκγαυρούμενος (ἅπ. λεγ.) is a strong one: cf. *Ba.* 1144 γαυρουμένη.

[2] Cf. *Hp.* 10 ὁ γάρ με Θησέως παῖς . . . (Barrett); also Hdt. 1. 115. 2 οἱ γάρ με ἐκ τῆς κώμης παῖδες . . . and Pl. *Smp.* 177a ἡ μέν μοι ἀρχὴ τοῦ λόγου . . .

[3] Cf. Pl. *R.* 350c ὁ δὴ Θρασύμαχος ὡμολόγησε μὲν πάντα ταῦτα, and Denniston, *Particles*, 238.

πειθὼ γὰρ εἶχον τήνδε πρὸς δάμαρτ' ἐμήν—
[ψευδῆ συνάψας ἀντὶ παρθένου γάμον] 105
μόνοι δ' Ἀχαιῶν ἴσμεν ὡς ἔχει τάδε—
Κάλχας Ὀδυσσεὺς Μενέλεώς θ'. ἃ δ' οὐ καλῶς
ἔγνων τότ', αὖθις μεταγράφω καλῶς πάλιν
ἐς τήνδε δέλτον, ἣν κατ' εὐφρόνης ⟨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.

105 del. Herwerden 109 εὐφρόνης ⟨L⟩P (εὐφρόνην Tr.), σκιάν conj. *p* in rasura suarum litterarum.[1]

104–7. This passage embodies the only serious accusation against the closing lines of the 'iambic prologue': (*a*) the explicitness of 104 f. and 106 f. (as normally punctuated) seems inconsistent with the Retainer's question in 124 ff. (*b*) 105 is ill-expressed, though Markland's ἀμφί mitigates this fault. (*c*) ἴσμεν cannot have as its subject three names without an expressed 'and I'. The simple remedy for all three faults is Herwerden's deletion of the inorganic 105, which permits the pointing of 106 as a parenthesis. Probably we have a sequence of ancient confusion, involving (*a*) wrong pointing, with no stop after τάδε 106, so that 104 became a disjunct line with εἶχον necessarily taken as 1st person; (*b*) expansion of the misinterpreted 104, designed to elaborate πειθὼ τήνδε and drive home the point about the 'false marriage'.[2] One might consider transposing 104/5, but the quality of 105 is not in favour of its authenticity, and its content will be shown below to be decisively objectionable. The restored meaning is: '. . . *for this way of persuading my wife was suggested*[3] (*and we alone of the Achaeans know about this*) *by Calchas, Odysseus, and Menelaus.*' Agamemnon's object is apologetic, not simply informative. He means, no doubt, to exclude Achilles from the list of those in the know; but he has not, *for the Retainer*, connected the summons of Iphigenia with the mooted sacrifice, and without 105 there is no explicit indication that the marriage is a sham, only hints of an ugly intrigue. It is not surprising if, in the sequel, the old man shows confusion and/or reluctance to believe what has not yet been spelt out.

108–14. Linguistic and stylistic objections[4] are here negligible:

108. μεταγράφω here only in poetry—not surprisingly; it is none the less *vox propria* for the activity described. The threefold αὖθις / μετα- / πάλιν is appropriate (following τότε), since this is the sentence which at last undeceives the audience, making it clear that *two* letters are involved, and an unsuspected time-lapse (above, p. 349).

[1] For the corrected apparatus of 109, see now Zuntz, op. cit. 97 f. σκιάν is a post-Triclinian stopgap, of sufficient but not commanding merit.

[2] *Med.* 777 ff. includes a strikingly similar interpolation: ὡς καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ταῦτα καὶ καλῶς ἔχει | [γάμους τυράννων οὓς προδοὺς ἡμᾶς ἔχει], | καὶ ξύμφορ' εἶναι καὶ καλῶς ἐγνωσμένα. Deletion of 778 obviates other emendation, which still leaves the repeated ἔχει as a blemish. Someone thought to clarify ταῦτα, but he mistook the point, since ταῦτα should (without 778) be taken as referring to Medea's *exile*.

[3] εἶχον is sound, though the rendering may suggest εἶπον . . . ἐμοί. πειθὼ ἔχειν can sufficiently imply utterance (cf. σκῆψιν, μομφήν, etc.), and εἶπον would be open to misunderstanding before πρός.

[4] *AIGT*, 138.

110. 'indicative εἰcεῖδον very rare in Eur.' (England). This and *Hel.* 848 may be the only places where εἰc- is *required*, but ἐcεῖδον is frequent, often with the first syllable anceps.[1]

112 f. ἃ δὲ κέκευθε . . . τἀγγεγραμμένα pleonastic, and the whole sentence based on *I.T.* 760–1. The pleonasm ('but as to *the contents* of the δέλτοc, I will tell you all that is *written therein*') is by no means objectionable, and an improvement on τἀνόντα κἀγγεγραμμένα in *I.T.* 760. Euripides' tendency to repeat his own phraseology in similar *loci* is sufficiently illustrated by comparing *I.T.* 760 with *I.T.* 763 (φράcει . . . τἀγγεγραμμένα) and 787 (τἀν δέλτοιcιν ἐγγεγραμμένα).[2]

In sum, 'general lameness of the verses'. This seems to be special pleading. Apart from the evident dislocation in 104–7 (with the lameness of 105) and the lacuna in 109, the whole of 97–114 is sound, accurate in content (cf. p. 346), and uniformly consistent with Euripides' plainer style; and an air of lucid simplicity is in place here.

D. Anapaests 115–63

The metre changes back to anapaests, Agamemnon's lines with an admixture of heavy paroemiacs, appropriate to the heaviness of his heart.[3] Agamemnon has said that he will read the cancelling letter, and proceeds to do so. The letter is effectively couched in a contrasting metre, but it is arguable that the Retainer originally spoke 117–18 between 114 and 115, so that the change of metre was also marked by a change of speaker. It is natural for the Retainer to continue in anapaests, since that has been his metre all along.

115–23. '*I instruct you, O daughter of Leda . . .*' '*Speak and explain, that I may avoid contradicting your written message.*' '*. . . not to send your daughter to Aulis; for we shall celebrate her marriage at a later date.*' The interruption comes rather awkwardly. True, in *I.T.* 772, the reading of Iphigenia's letter is interrupted by Orestes, but the motivation there is obvious. Murray's defence fails, since λέγε καὶ cήμαινε does not mean '*perge legens*'. Reiske's transposition is metrically an improvement (for the change of speaker after 114) and otherwise excellent: 117 f. thus provides a natural 'prompt' in the necessary pause while Agamemnon prepares to read. The Retainer is in fact not merely prompting Agamemnon (λέγε), but asking for an explanation (cήμαινε); his request, however, is not understood, and the king simply reads the letter; the Retainer then repeats the second half of his request (127).[4] Continuity of sense (φράcω, then the letter) could have led a copyist to skip; either he noticed his mistake quickly, or 117–18 were added later in the margin. There is no reason to connect this displacement (if so it be) with the major one.

124–7. '*But surely Achilles, disappointed of his marriage, will be furious with your wife and yourself? This is a* δεινόν *affair. Explain your words.*' τόδε καὶ δεινόν (not καὶ τόδε δεινόν): the Retainer is not pointing out the equal δεινότηc of alienating Achilles, but expressing fear as well as bewilderment. He is having

[1] e.g. *I.T.* 308, *Hel.* 745, etc. Was England misled by the artificial sundering of 'ἐcεῖδειν' and 'εἰcεῖδειν' in Beck's *Index*?

[2] 'One might say then that these were phrases which Euripides carried in his mind' (Ritchie, op. cit. 224, discussing similar repetitions within *Rh.* and between *Rh.* and other plays).

[3] Cf. *I.T.* 123–235, *Tro.* 122–229; cf. also *Ion* 144–83.

[4] Cf. *I.T.* 252, 256.

to deduce for himself the true explanation of his master's manœuvres from his prior knowledge of the oracle of Calchas.

128–32. '*Providing* ὄνομα, *not* ἔργον, *Achilles knows not of (the) marriage, nor what we are doing . . .*' This is so far expressed with more elegance than clarity.[1] Then:

οὐδέ τι κείνωι παῖδ' ἐπεφήμιcα
νυμφείουc εἰc ἀγκοινῶν
εὐνὰc ἐνδώcειν λέκτροιc.

130 οὐδ' ὅτι LP, correxi ἐπέφηcα LP, corr. Markland 131 νυμφείοιc malim ἀγκοινῶν scripsi: ἀγκώνων LP

The clue to the right text is the meaning of ἐπεφήμιcα. φημίζειν is scarcely to be distinguished from φατίζειν. Both properly mean 'to utter', and are used when the point is to stress the act or fact of utterance (whether intransitive, or the utterance of a specified name or statement). Both verbs recur in their strict sense later in the play, LSJ in each case mistaking the meaning: (*a*) φατίcαc 135 (see below); (*b*) in 936 ἐμὴ φατιcθεῖc' is clearly 'spoken (of as) mine', not 'promised to me'; (*c*) so too in 1356 (εὐνὴν . . . ἣν ἐφήμιcεν πατήρ μοι) the meaning is 'bespoke *for* me', not 'promised *to* me'.[2] Neither verb is constructed naturally with a dative of the hearer; but a prefix to the verb makes a difference, and ἐπιφημίζειν τινί may be expected to stand in the same relationship to φημίζειν as ἐπιβοᾶν τινι to βοᾶν. Hence κείνωι παῖδ' ἐπεφήμιcα . . . ἐνδώcειν should mean '*to him* I uttered an intention of giving my daughter (to him)' and must describe what Agamemnon did *not* do. To put 'nor does he know that . . .' in front results in near-gibberish. The text is otherwise open to objection: οὐδ' ὅτι is unwelcome after οὐδ' ὅ τι, and κείνωι is oddly quasi-reflexive.[3] The best we can make of it is 'nor that I uttered (*to my wife*) an intention of giving my daughter to him'. But the omission of 'to my wife' and the misplacement of κείνωι (likely to be taken with the wrong verb and illogically emphatic) are intolerable. The correction required is trivial, and the τι helps the sense ('nor *at all* to him did I . . .').[4] 131–2: the periphrastic expression is (with the above correction of 130) elegant and also wittily characterized; Agamemnon is thinking of Achilles' hypothetical disappointment in more crudely sexual terms than the Retainer meant. **ἐνδώcειν** comes into its own: the technical word for 'give-in-marriage' is unnecessary in a periphrasis, indeed less appropriate for the sense 'give as a bed-partner'; and it is unlikely that ἐκ— has been corrupted to the much rarer ἐν—.[5] **ἀγκώνων** ('of elbows') has oddly escaped comment; the archetype may have intended ἀγκωνῶν (see LSJ), but Euripides will surely have used the epic ἄγκοιναι.[6] Such epicisms are a recognized feature of his style.[7] **νυμφείουc** makes sense, but style would seem to favour νυμφείοιc, since λέκτροιc is in greater need of adjectival support; the epithet may well have been corrupted to agree with the nearer εὐνάc.

[1] On the characteristic ὄνομα/ἔργον opposition, cf. D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama* (Oxford, 1967), 290 f.

[2] The four occurrences point to unity of authorship, at least of their contexts, much as φημίζειν occurs thrice in A. *Ag.*

[3] Adversely criticised in *AIGT*, 135, and recalled on p. 138 as one of the cornerstones of the anti-Euripidean case. Probably it is in itself defensible: cf. *Alc.* 18.

[4] Perhaps the original co-ordination was οὐκ . . . οὔθ' . . . οὐδέ: cf. Denniston, 193, and p. 360, n. 4. There may be (appropriately enough) a further overtone from the ἐπι- prefix: 'nor to him *additionally* did I utter . . .'.

[5] Elsewhere in Euripides only in *Cyc.* 510.

[6] *Il.* 14. 213 Ζηνὸc . . . ἐν ἀγκοίνηιcιν ἰαύειc. (Also Hes., A.R., *AP.*)

[7] Cf. Ritchie, 156, 178 f., 181.

133–5. The Retainer now understands all, and delivers his reproachful verdict. **δεινά γ' ἐτόλμας** echoes *ἔπειτ' ἐτλῆναι δεινά* (98, q.v.), and follows closely on *τόδε καὶ δεινόν* (127), his previous reaction, now seen to be fully justified. **τῶι τῆς θεᾶς σὴν παῖδ' ἄλοχον φατίσας**: 'bespeaking your daughter as a wife *for* Achilles', not (as LSJ) 'promising your daughter *to* Achilles'—which the Retainer now knows not to be the case. **ἦγες σφάγιον Δαναοῖς**: the climactic denunciation takes Agamemnon by surprise, since he has refrained from mentioning the sacrifice to the Retainer, hoping to gloss over its connection with his letters and the cancelled marriage. Note his reticences and euphemisms in 98 (*τλῆναι δεινά*), 106 (*ὡς ἔχει τάδε*), 107 (*ἃ δ' οὐ καλῶς ἔγνων τότ'*), 129 (*ὅ τι πράσσομεν*). The connection is not clear to the Retainer (though feared, since Aulis is no place for Iphigenia after Calchas' oracle), until he hears definitely that the marriage-plan is a sham. This is the decisive reason for rejecting 105 (see above) as prematurely explicit.

136–63. Agamemnon's reaction to the denunciation is characteristic (cf. 1132–6): he exclaims, laments his evil fate,[1] and proceeds to terminate the embarrassing conversation by sending the Retainer on his way. The rest calls for little elucidation (some linguistic and textual points are considered below). One supposed anomaly is *τῆι σῆι τ' ἀλόχωι* (154), deleted by Vitelli on the ground that Agamemnon cannot at this stage be visualizing his wife as accompanying Iphigenia. But the speaker is the Retainer! The latter naturally expects to meet Clytemnestra, and is allowed to drop a hint of his expectation; Agamemnon, however, is so bemused by his wretched ambition and so thoughtless a family man, that he fails to take the point and visualizes only the need to convince his wife at Mycenae. Page comes to a similar conclusion in finding no inconsistency;[2] but he seems to deprecate the 'want of clarity': 'the dramatic effect of Kl.'s arrival *if unexpected* would gain enormously, if we knew beforehand that she was not expected. But we do not know: only *στέλλειν* in 119 told us,[3] and we missed that.' But who in the audience can be in any doubt as to whether Agamemnon is expecting his wife—of all appalling complications? And how could Agamemnon or anyone else be more explicit without spoiling the whole point, which is that he has simply *sent for his daughter* without any thought for his wife's reactions (as he himself tell us in 454–9)? Her arrival is meant to be a surprise without being an act of disobedience, and we can be sure that the original audience found it a piquant and novel twist to the story (cf. p. 349, n. 2). *All* previous versions of the Aulis story (with at most one very doubtful exception) had left Clytemnestra at Mycenae;[4] whether (if at all) previous versions had convincingly explained Iphigenia's unattended presence at Aulis is another question, hardly relevant here.[5]

[1] 137 *αἰαῖ, πίπτω δ' εἰς ἄταν*: cf. *Tro.* 137 *ἐς τάνδ' ἐξώκειλ' ἄταν*.

[2] *AIGT*, 204 f.

[3] But *στέλλειν* could be right in 100 also (p. 354, n. 1).

[4] 'The tradition was variable' (*AIGT*, 205). But the only variation in this aspect of the tradition seems to be Zielinski's view (*Trag. Libr. Tres*, 257) that Aeschylus had brought Clytemnestra to Aulis (against the unanimity of the *Cypria*, Sophocles, and Euripides' earlier plays). There is no question that Clytemnestra had been an *οἰκουρὸς γυνή* in the *Oresteia*: she would hardly have failed to mention the fact if she had personally witnessed her daughter's death. Only one enigmatic line survives of Aeschylus' *Iphigenia* (fr. 94, Nauck); there is no means of knowing what ladies are there referred to (a protesting Chorus?).

[5] Cf. Denniston on *El.* 1020 ff. (Oxford, 1939). In one form or another 'marriage with Achilles' seems to have been the usual pretext (if any) for getting her there, and

We may now collectively review those features which have been adduced as cumulative evidence against Euripidean composition of the anapaests.[1]

A. Language

(i) Word here only in literature
48 *cυννυμφοκόμοc* (but *νυμφοκόμοc* in 1087).

(ii) Words here only in poetry
120 *κολπώδηc*, 130 *ἐπιφημίζειν*.

(iii) Words here only before 4th century or later
2 *καινουργεῖν* (also in 838), 121 *ἄκλυcτοc*, 141 *ἀλcώδηc*.

(iv) Words here only in tragedy
146 *τροχαλόc*, 157 *ἠώc*. To these I have added 131 *ἄγκοιναι*.

(v) Miscellanea
10 *cιγαί* pl., 44 *κοινοῦν* +*εἰc*, 118 *cύντονα*, 141 *ἴζεcθαι* +acc., 146 *ὄχοι* = 'wheels' and *παραμείβεcθαι* (Soph.), 151 *εἰcορμᾶν* (conj.), 161 *ἐc τέλοc*.

This is a very unimpressive list, that could be matched from any Euripidean passage of comparable form and length; suspicion might rather be aroused if there were fewer rarities or originalities of diction.[2] Some of the above (if not already discussed) require qualification:

44. *κοινοῦν μῦθον εἰc* is covered by LSJ, *εἰc* I. 3 (cf. S. *O.T.* 93).
118. *cύντονα*: to the parallels cited by Page (especially *Ba.* 126) add *cύντονον τὸ πᾶν | cῶμ' ἐξακριβώcωμεν εἰc ὅcον πάρα*, conj. in *Christus Patiens* 1467 from the lost portion of *Bacchae*.[3] At *Ba.* 872 *cυντείνηι* may mean 'co-ordinates' rather than (or as well as) 'spurs on'.
141. *ἴζου* +acc.: cf. *Andr.* 1265 f.[4]
146 *ὄχοι* does not mean 'wheels': an 'equipage' may be described as *τροχαλόc*, and the plural (in conjunction with *ἀπήνη* 147) is here used vaguely as in *ἁρμάτων ὄχοι* (*I.T.* 370, etc.).
151. *εἰcόρμα* (Wecklein) is probably to be accepted. The context seems to demand a precise antonym to *ἐξορμ-* in 149, and this justifies the novelty of the locution, if so it be. But no argument should be based on this corrupt passage.
157. *ἠώc*: a strong pointer against authenticity, according to *AIGT*, 135, 138. But *ἀώc* is tragic (e.g. *Rh.* 535 in a passage otherwise close to ours; also *Rh.* 556, *Or.* 1004, *El.* 730). So read *ἀώc* here also, like *Ἀελίου* 159 (cf. *El.* 729 f.).
161. *ἐc τέλοc*: 'to the end' seems easy enough; but cf. the difficult *ἐν τέλει* in *Ba.* 860.[5] The sense may be 'to completion/perfection'. Euripides is as likely to have used such a phrase as anyone else.

away from her mother. As in other features, the *Agamemnon* Parodos strikes a different note: at *Ag.* 243–7 Iphigenia is simply and effectively (if strangely) pictured as having been regularly present at her father's warrior parties.

[1] *AIGT*, 131–6. I omit some features which Page himself discounts; also *πρότιμον* (false conj. in 22) and *κείνωι* 130, which have already been dealt with (pp. 353 and 357).

[2] Ritchie (pp. 141–92) gives valuable statistical tables for *Rh.* and other plays.

[3] *CQ* N.S. xvi (1966), 45.

[4] Cf. also A. *Ag.* 183 *cέλμα cεμνὸν ἡμένων*.

[5] *CQ* N.S. xvi (1966), 228.

B. Metrica

The rare division of an anapaestic metron between speakers (2, 3) was discussed above on p. 350.[1] 149 as transmitted is a still rarer divided paroemiac,[2] but the text of 149 ff. is certainly corrupt. The Retainer's word(s) of assent may well be interpolated, like *οὐκ ἔστι* in *Rh.* 17.[3] Given this, it is not difficult to restore 149 f. as a heavy paroemiac couplet (*undivided*), like 115 f., 122 f., 131 f., 136 f.[4] Read, for example, *κλήιθρων δ' ἐξορμα⟨θείσαις⟩ . . .*[5] These are scarcely significant anomalies, when set against the characteristically Euripidean combination of ordinary anapaests and mainly spondaic paroemiacs.[6]

C. Over-all Structure

Since it is deducible that whoever wrote these anapaests envisaged a prior exposition, their *only* non-Euripidean feature, viz. the initial position of 1–48 in our text, has no weight as an argument against authenticity. The anapaests exhibit perfect structural compatibility with the drama as a whole, and several points of intricate contact, both verbal[7] and in the treatment of plot and character.[8] The *ἠθοποιία* is typically Euripidean; so too the basic conception of an early anapaestic dialogue with an Attendant.[9] Linguistic and stylistic evidence is as strongly indicative of authenticity as such evidence can be, despite attempts to prove the contrary.[10] The common authorship of iambics and anapaests is demonstrable even without the proposed transposition: between them they *economically* tell us all that we need to know, developing it without repetition or contradiction and with the most natural sort of cross-references.[11] It is really inconceivable that this degree of harmony could have been achieved by piecing together bits of prologues written by two different people.

It remains only to justify the structure iambics—anapaests—iambics—anapaests, if it be thought to need justification. Though no other prologue of Euripides has this exact sequence, he allowed himself great variety after the opening iambic exposition, and two parallels suffice, in combination: (*a*) *Alcestis*: iambics—anapaests —iambics, followed by anapaestic Parodos; (*b*) *Ion*: iambics—anapaests—lyrics—anapaests with heavy paroemiacs.

[1] 16 and 140 were wrongly criticized by Wilamowitz as further examples of irregular *ἀντιλαβή* (cf. *AIGT*, 131). The division there falls between metra, and only the lineation is in question.

[2] S. *Tr.* 977; *Rh.* 561 is doubtful (Ritchie, 292).

[3] Ritchie, 290. For the apparatus of 149, see now Zuntz, op. cit. 98.

[4] This leaves 141 f. as the only place where the heavy paroemiacs do not come in pairs. 141 becomes a paroemiac (cf. n. 5 below) if we delete the superfluous *μήτ'*, leaving *μὴ . . . μήτε . . .* : cf. 978, 1319 ff. (codd.), p. 357, n. 4 and Denniston, *Particles*, 509.

[5] *ἐξόρμοις* (Bothe) may well not be the right treatment of †*ἐξόρμα*† (*ἐξώρμ' primitus* L). The present suggestion might at once explain the mess at the end of the line and the wrong *ἐξορμάσεις* in 151. The symptoms are of transcriptional muddle, very possibly involving *marginalia*, accompanied or followed by the common attempt to pad paroemiacs into dimeters.

[6] Cf. p. 356, n. 3.

[7] e.g. 2/838; 130/1356; 135/936.

[8] e.g. 9 ff./813; 46 ff./860; 136 f./1132–6; 155/307.

[9] Cf. *Med.* 96 ff., *Hp.* 176 ff.; similarly *Hec.* 59 ff., *Tro.* 98 ff. (Chorus of Attendants).

[10] See especially on 4 f., 7 f., 20 ff., 128, 130, 137, 161. I have not thought it necessary to multiply parallels throughout.

[11] e.g. 19/85 f.; 12+34/109; 37 f./110; 46 ff./55+114; 116/49; 133/98.

Possible Explanations of the Disorder

A. The passages thus transposed (1–48 and 49–96) comprise 48 lines each, and one may well think in the first instance of a mechanical accident in some recent archetype. A 24-line page has been deduced in the archetype of *I.T.*[1] The confused or lacunose endings of both *I.A.* and *Ba.* are likely to be connected with their respective codical positions as last of a group of Alphabetic Plays and last of the Select Decad;[2] and it is quite possible that *I.A.*'s archetype was faulty at the beginning as well. Perhaps the second leaf of the play fell out, by coincidence leaving no immediately obvious gap (96/7: same metre and speaker, and apparent verbal continuity in the narrative); by a further chance, the loose page comprised a self-contained block of anapaests imaginable as a dramatic opening, for which the beheaded *Rhesus* will have seemed a sufficient parallel. In such circumstances (perhaps as recently as in Triclinius' *scriptorium*) a loose page is likely enough to have been put back in the wrong place.

B. Another opportunity for more-or-less accidental transposition will have occurred much earlier. The dramatist's papers may well have been in uncertain order at his death, and wrongly assembled by his literary executors. The prologue is (if uncomfortably) playable in its transmitted form, and could imaginably have been arranged thus throughout antiquity.[3] Those responsible for the Première may not have been remarkable for their critical acumen. Some inappropriate secondary features are apparently early, and have been plausibly attributed to this formative moment in the play's history.[4]

C. Dislocation at a date between these *termini*, at a time when other copies existed for comparison, may seem less likely, but it remains a possibility if the following requirement is satisfied: could some misguided producer or editor have imagined any positive gain in the transposition of 1–48 and 49–96? Two possible motives suggest themselves. (*a*) Anyone who missed the point of Euripides' ingenious double-cross (p. 349) will have been puzzled by the suture 96/1 and by the sundered sections of iambic narrative, when 97 ff. seemed so nearly sequential to 96. (*b*) Anyone who believed the oracle of Calchas to have been confidential will have felt that its narration ought to be included among Agamemnon's 'revelations' to the Retainer. Now the latter misconception has demonstrably arisen more than once in the play's history, and a digression is necessary here, in which the first task must be to establish that it is indeed a misconception.

Modern scholars, in their references to Calchas' oracle, have curiously combined divergence of view with seeming unawareness of the divergence. England certainly visualized a confidential oracle,[5] against Paley's correct appreciation of its publicity. But no one seems to have discussed the point, not even Page, though it is of cardinal relevance for the interpretation or

[1] See Platnauer on *I.T.* 1380/1404 and 1346/1394.

[2] Cf. Zuntz, op. cit. 102.

[3] Cf. p. 344, n. 3.

[4] e.g. 231–302 by T. W. Allen in *CR* v (1891), 364 ff. But there is no evidence that Euripides the Younger ever wrote anything, and I should think rather of Cephisophon (*Vit. Eurip.* and Ar. *Ran.* 944, 1408, 1452 f.).

[5] 'The seer Calchas has revealed to Agamemnon, the chief commander, and his two principal advisers, Menelaus and Odysseus . . .' (England, p. x). 'Chief commander' is also questionable (above, p. 348).

rejection (whether partial or absolute) of such stigmatized passages as 425 ff., 513–42, 590 ff., etc. This is no trivial or extraneous matter, of indifference to the dramatist. Euripides may sometimes have been carelessly inconsistent over details,[1] but the whole mechanism of this intricate plot turns on how much is known, when, and by whom; and the words of Calchas are the mainspring of the action. For the story, a public oracle is clearly more potent than a confidential one, as intensifying Agamemnon's predicament (especially in this democratic army); furthermore this accords with the traditional role of Calchas as a pan-Achaean prophet-priest.[2] 'But Clytemnestra might have learnt about the oracle prematurely.' We can accept without difficulty the reticence of the undescribed summoner and the absence of other means of communication between Aulis and Mycenae during the indeterminate period in question;[3] when she comes, Clytemnestra *does* learn the truth prematurely. The Prologue is in fact against England's view, even as it stands: the recipients of the oracle in 89 ff. (p. 348) can only be ⟨ἡμῖν τοῖς Ἕλλησι⟩, and the dismissal by Talthybius is wholly inconsistent with secrecy.

But perhaps the rest of the play will force us to reconsider the publicity of the oracle. Quite the reverse:

411. What is Agamemnon blaming Ἑλλάς for, if not for its ruthless attitude to the sacrifice of a girl?[4]

425–34. The Forerunner's exquisite speech has been shabbily treated, but its full vindication must wait.[5] This part of it describes the army's speculations on seeing Iphigenia, and the *double entente* in 433 f. depends on our knowing that the soldiers know more than the Forerunner.[6]

513 ff. 'Who will compel you to kill your daughter?' 'The whole Argive army.' 'Not if you send her back to Argos.'

538 ff. 'Go about the army and arrange that Clytemnestra does not hear about this prematurely.'

817 f. Achilles and the Myrmidons are not blaming the Atridae for the bad sailing weather, but for their inability to make up their minds. They have *all* heard of Iphigenia's arrival (425 f.), and Achilles can afford to be delicately allusive. So δρᾶ γ' εἴ τι δράσεις (817). He nowhere suggests that he is hearing for the first time of the idea of sacrificing Iphigenia.

890. Clytemnestra asks the Retainer how he knows about the sham marriage (τάδε refers to 884 ff., as the reply makes clear); she does not ask how he knows about the oracle—Achilles' failure to challenge the statement in 879 is sufficient confirmation for her of this part of the story. Note his silence throughout this exposé.

Later on (1259–75, 1345 ff.) the knowledge of the whole army is explicit; yet we are nowhere told that Calchas, Odysseus, or Menelaus has suddenly

[1] G. Norwood, *Essays on Euripidean Drama* (Cambridge, 1954), 37 ff.

[2] *Il.* 1. 68 ff.; A. *Ag.* 122 στρατόμαντις.

[3] See p. 349, n. 3.

[4] Cf. A. *Ag.* 214–17.

[5] One objection (*AIGT*, 153) is quickly dealt with: read αὖ τάσδ' for αὐτάς in 423. There is, admittedly, something wrong with the Forerunner's entry in mid line. But excision of 413–14 (perhaps only of 414) leaves no scar. With the simple opening Ἀγάμεμνον, ἥκω . . . cf. *Ba.* 434 Πενθεῦ, πάρεσμεν . . . Note that the words ὦ Πανελλήνων ἄναξ conflict with the view taken above of 84 (p. 348). The interpolation is variously explicable, but lack of space precludes further discussion here.

[6] προτελίζουσι: very likely suggested by A. *Ag.* 65 and 227 (προτέλεια). All these passages (and cf. *I.A.* 718 f.) depend on the root meaning '(perform) a preliminary rite'—not necessarily preliminary to marriage.

let the cat out of the bag. All that has been needed to rouse the army, especially the Myrmidons (1353), is the arrival of Iphigenia and the renewed demagogy of Odysseus (526, 1362).

It is necessary thus to labour what may seem sufficiently obvious, for there is one glaring contradiction, namely 518 ff. We must not be deterred by a grotesque and certainly interpolated piece of dialogue.[1] The excision of 518–21 suffices, and can be justified on many grounds, not least by the convincing effect of 522–3 directly following 516–17.[2] 528 ff. may seem to confirm the contradiction, but, if the rest has been put right, there is no difficulty in interpreting λέξειν in 529 as meaning '*commemoraturum*' not '*nuntiaturum*'; so also τάδε in 524 (as in 106 and 890) as referring to the only confidential transactions, i.e. Agamemnon's acquiescence, the marriage-plot, and the letter(s).

Now whoever inserted 518 f.[3] had evidently misconceived the publicity of Calchas' previous μαντεύματα. What could have caused his misconception? One answer might be that the prologue was already dislocated, presumably (in this case) because of an error before the Première ('B' on p. 361). But a sufficient, and more direct, cause can be found in 528 ff. The latter passage, misinterpreted, might well have suggested to someone that Calchas' θέσφατα were so far known only to a few, in which case it would seem that the need to silence the seer had been overlooked; and Euripides had written the nearby dialogue in an allusive style that invited expansion. The transposition in the Prologue is then viewable as a *consequential* alteration, attributable either to the same person, or to some later custodian of the text.

None, therefore, of the three possibilities outlined as A, B, and C on p. 361 can be excluded. Some additional pointer may emerge from a more detailed study of the rest of the play; but the dating of secondary features (even when identified) is notoriously hazardous. My own inclination is to give some weight to one further possible clue in the prologue itself, but what follows is highly speculative. It looks as though correct and incorrect versions of 6–11 were simultaneously current in later antiquity.[4] Of these, the incorrect version appears to have featured in the Alexandrian Vulgate; and yet a virtually correct text was known to Theon of Smyrna in A.D. 200. One may guess that the latter was not in fact unknown to Aristophanes of Byzantium, but was recorded as a variant in his scholia (possibly with commendation). Now the ancient existence of variants in 6–11 could be unconnected with our problem. But the Vulgate assignation of 6 and 9 ff. to Agamemnon implies a misunderstanding of the intended stage-action in 1–48 (pp. 349 f.), and possibly therefore of the whole manner in which the play should open. Perhaps, therefore, the error in 6–11 is to be associated with the dislocation of the prologue. And yet the true

[1] Few, since Hartung, have not condemned at least 520–1. The casual cold-bloodedness of 519 was rightly condemned by Hermann, and Page suspected the whole of 506–42 (*AIGT*, 158). But most of the context is certainly integral (cf. on p. 347 with n. 6).

[2] ἐκεῖνο refers to the same thing in 516 and 522, viz. the demagogy of Odysseus who knows about the marriage-plot. Agamemnon speaks allusively, and Menelaus has to force him to say what he means. Even then Agamemnon is inexplicit (τάδε 524: cf. 106) until further pressed. This is a well-characterized fraternal exchange. The interpolator, having seriously mistaken the point, tried to answer the question in 517, and to 'clarify' ἐκεῖνο in 516. Cf. *Med.* 778 (p. 355, n. 2).

[3] 520 f. is, I think, a *secondary* interpolation, of inferior, derivative quality and perhaps never intended as stichomythia. Cf. on *Hp.* 405–12 and 1045–50 in *CQ* N.S. xviii (1968), 21 ff., 34 ff.

[4] Above, pp. 350–2.

version of 6–11 had survived. It might thus be inferred that the prologue-structure, like the assignation of 6–11, *was faulty in the Vulgate, but not in all pre-Vulgate texts*, and therefore that the transposition of 1–48 and 49–96 was first effected by some producer or editor *between 400 and 200 B.C.* It was preceded or accompanied by the misconceived and misleading interpolation of 518–19 (–521); the unintelligent interpolation of 105 (p. 355) is probably assignable to the same early phase of the play's transmission.[1] It is entirely credible that Aristophanes of Byzantium should have followed, in his Vulgate text, a corrupt and interpolated 'popular' tradition, despite the minority survival of a purer stream;[2] it is even barely possible that it was the Editor himself, deceived by previous interpolations, who first conceived the idea of rearranging the prologue in harmony with what he imagined to be the dramatist's intention.[3]

Eton College C. W. WILLINK

[1] Cf. *AIGT*, 14.

[2] Cf. Zuntz, op. cit. 251 f.

[3] Cf. the possibility that Ar. Byz. arbitrarily published *Rhesus* without a prologue, and so with an abruptly dramatic opening (p. 344 n. 4).

Additional Note

Gudrun Mellert-Hoffmann's book (p. 343, n. 2) arrived after this article had gone to press. Pp. 91–155 concern the Prologue, superseding previous studies in comprehensiveness of discussion and bibliography. Her position is that (i) particular arguments against the authenticity of the Iambics and/or the Anapaests lack force; (ii) the over-all structure of the Prologue is to be accepted; (iii) the 'panhellenic' motif is here (as elsewhere in the play) of critical significance. As to (i), her fuller treatment usefully supplements mine, especially in vindicating the Iambics against the view of Fraenkel (referred to on p. 343 above), which has since been followed by other German scholars. As to (ii), this, for M-H, is a necessary consequence of (i), whereas I have sought to show that the Prologue is at once authentic (or substantially so) and dislocated. The extant prologue-structure was, perhaps, too summarily impugned above on pp. 344–5. Against M-H's defence of it, I should dissent as follows:

1. M-H infers that in *Andromeda* Echo featured in an opening anapaestic dialogue (pp. 125 f.). The argument is speculative, and even this would be, in effect, an ornate form of monody (cf. p. 344, n. 5). On p. 127 she suggests that Sch. *Hec.* 1 (p. 344, n. 3) refers only to the Annotated Plays; but is it not likelier to have been based on some knowledge of the *whole* Euripidean corpus, as still probably accessible to scholars?

2. Regardless of whether Euripides *could* begin a play with an anapaestic dialogue, there are *particular* indications that *I.A.* 1–48 was written to follow an exposition. See above on vv. 1, 6–8 (*d* on p. 351), 16–33, 43–8. Cf. Ritchie's similar line of argument as to the lost exposition of *Rhesus* (op. cit. 105 ff.).

3. In pp. 138 ff. M-H defends 49 ff. as sequential to 43–8; but she scarcely confronts the absurdity as outlined above on p. 345, nor the *prologue-opening* character of 49–50 (et seqq.). The question now to be answered is: 'Why should Euripides have arranged his material thus?' The present hypothesis has at least demonstrated that a better (and more 'Euripidean') arrangement was available to him.