

## THE PROLOGUES OF EURIPIDES' *IPHIGENEIA IN AULIS*

Anyone who seeks to add to the already vast pile of literature dealing with the *I.A.* must needs feel apologetic, especially if he is conscious that little of what he will say is new. Nevertheless this seems to be one of those occasions when it is necessary to restate old arguments. Recent contributors to the debate about the problems of the opening of the play either fail to realize what the problems are or else attempt to explain away valid criticisms of the text with arguments that are methodologically suspect and parallels which will not hold water. In what follows I shall be defending old views and countering new objections to them. Little attempt will be made to attribute each old argument to its original author.<sup>1</sup>

### I

Questions of authenticity and interpolation in ancient authors are rarely settled to general satisfaction. Even so, in most cases a measure of agreement may be reached at least to the extent that those who approach a particular disputed passage are trying to answer the same questions. One might have thought that such a stage had been reached in the perennial dispute over Eur. *I.A.* 1-163. With a few notable exceptions<sup>2</sup> twentieth-century scholars have tended to attribute the present state of the text to some kind of editorial activity that took place after Euripides' death rather than to the design of the poet. From this position of agreement one went on to speculate about the nature and extent of the posited editorial activity and on the question of how much if any of the prologue was written by Euripides.

Of late, however, there have been several attempts to disrupt this measure of agreement and to show that all is well or at any rate nothing much is wrong with the lines in question. Those making such attempts are forced to go over old ground and to answer long-standing objections to the present arrangement. Before examining them, one must mention first a discussion of the problem that *does* start from the assumption that the state of the text in LP, where we are presented with the sequence, anapaestic dialogue, long speech in iambic tri-

<sup>1</sup> I refer to the following works by author's name alone: E.B. England, *The Iphigenia at Aulis of Euripides* (London, 1891); D.L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934); Ed. Fraenkel, 'Ein Motiv aus Euripides in einer Szene der neuen Komödie', *Studi in onore di U.E. Paoli* (Firenze, 1955), pp. 293-304 (= *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome, 1964) i. 487-502).

The doxography of the problem given by England (pp. xxi - xxv) may be supplemented by consulting the works of Valgiglio, Mellert-Hoffmann, and Knox (see below notes 18 and 19) and the dissertation of H.M. Schreiber, *Iphigenies Opfertod* (Frankfort, 1963). I feel no real disquiet about presenting a discussion of the

prologue in isolation from the other problems of the play (see Walter Nestle, *Die Struktur des Eingangs*, Vorwort) since I shall be making very few positive assertions and also because I sense that the problems of the prologue may indeed be special.

<sup>2</sup> W.H. Friedrich, *Hermes* 70 (1935), 72 ff. provides one of them. His interpretative essay contains a defence of the paradox which seems to me to be liable to the same kind of criticism as has been levelled against H.-D. Voigtländer's defence of Eur. *Med.* 1056 - 80 against Gerhard Müller's attack on it (see M.D. Reeve, *CQ* N.S. 22 (1972), 57). The same might be said of the recent article by van Potterbergh (see below, note 18).

meters, and, to end with, more anapaestic dialogue, is unsatisfactory, but produces a novel explanation to account for it.

C. W. Willink<sup>3</sup> argues that what confronts us in LP is not a conflation of two alternative prologues or a trimeter speech attached to an original anapaestic opening, but the result of an accident in transmission.<sup>4</sup> He seeks to show that Euripides intended his play to begin with the following sequence: iambic monologue (49–96), anapaestic dialogue (1–48), iambic trimeters in answer to a question from the old man (97–114), and finally further anapaestic dialogue (115–63). The structure of such an opening might on the surface appear more attractive than the one presented in LP, but one must point out, as Willink himself does, that there are no parallels for it in Euripides.

That Willink's transposition is unacceptable and no improvement on the existing state of affairs is seen most clearly when one examines the two new joins between trimeter and anapaestic passages and between anapaests and trimeters that result from it.

Agamemnon's monologue now opens the play and ends at 96:

κλυὼν δ' ἐγὼ ταῦτ', ὀρθίῳι κηρύγματι  
Ταλθύβιον εἶπον πάντ' ἀφιέναι στρατόν,  
ὥς οὔ ποτ' ἂν τλᾶς θυγατέρα κτανεῖν ἐμήν.

This must now be followed by the opening of the anapaests:

ὦ πρέσβυ, δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν  
στεῖχε.

An abrupt transition to say the least. Willink suggests that what we have in 96 ff. is a kind of trick to mislead the audience. When Agamemnon breaks off here and proceeds to his letter-writing in evident distress, the audience is misled into supposing that a 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 place*. The audience will think the letter is a summons to Iphigeneia and that Agamemnon now no longer rejects the oracle.

It seems doubtful, however, whether an audience would draw any such conclusion (or indeed any conclusion at all) if they saw Agamemnon writing a letter. Only if the sending of a letter summoning Iphigeneia to Aulis were a traditional element in the story, well enough known for the dramatist to be able to count on his audience's knowledge of it, would the effect Willink postulates here have any point or chance of success. Although in a matter like this certainty is unattainable, one feels reasonably confident in asserting that the introduction

<sup>3</sup> 'The Prologue of the *Iphigenia at Aulis*', *CQ* N.S. 21 (1971), 343–64.

<sup>4</sup> Willink is not the first to seek to account for the difficulties of the prologue by positing an accident of transmission. Hartung's suggestion (accepted both by Hermann, *Opuscula* VIII. 218 f., who rewrites 107 ff. so that they link properly with 1 ff., and with some further modifications by England) that the original order was 49–104, 1–48, lacuna, 115 ff. (see his

1835 edition, p. 85) was taken up by K. Bohnhoff who believed, unlike Hartung, that the dislocation had come about by accident (K. Bohnhoff, *Der Prolog der Iphigenie in Aulis des Euripides*, Programm des städtischen Gymnasium in Freienwalde, 1885). The Hartung transposition which has a good deal more to be said for it than Willink's is liable to the objections raised against Willink on p. 12.

of a letter (or rather of letters) into the story was an innovation on Euripides' part. We cannot be sure how the summons to Aulis was effected in the *Kypria*,<sup>5</sup> but one hardly expects a letter to have been employed. Nor can we affirm with certainty anything about this element in the *Iphigeneia* plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles. One may recall, however, that there are versions of the story quite different from the one given in *I.A.*, versions which do not presuppose the use of a letter or letters. In one Talthybius the herald was accompanied to Argos by Odysseus who tricked Klytaimnestra into sending her daughter to Aulis.<sup>6</sup> In another it was Diomedes who accompanied his friend Odysseus and together they returned to Aulis with Iphigeneia.<sup>7</sup>

In any case there is no justification provided in the text for Willink's belief that the audience sees Agamemnon with a letter in his hand. If Euripides had wanted the audience to know at this stage that Agamemnon had a letter on his person, he would have drawn their attention to it by having Agamemnon mention it. Likewise if Agamemnon had interrupted his speech in order to resume his letter-writing, he would have informed us of this; even a much less complicated manoeuvre, an exit, is generally signalled by the Euripidean prologue-speaker (Iokaste in *Phoinissai* is exceptional in that she does not tell us she is leaving). In order to justify the transition here Willink is forced to make some large assumptions about the stage action following 96. 'There is a pause,<sup>8</sup> with stage-movement and "business" before Agamemnon summons the retainer from the skene . . . ' (349). 'Agamemnon breaks off here and proceeds to his letter writing in evident distress . . . ' 'There may be a stool beside the fixed stage altar to indicate that it is to serve as a writing-table [!] '. (347). There is not an ounce of support for this in the text. Such arbitrary assumptions violate an important principle for the interpretation of ancient dramatic

<sup>5</sup> ὥς ἐπὶ γάμον αὐτὴν Ἀχιλλεὺς μεταπεμψάμενοι θύει ἐπιχειροῦσιν is all that Proklos tells us (p. 104.17 Allen). The letter-motif looks characteristically Euripidean ('ce moyen romanesque' says Fr. Jouan, *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens* (Paris, 1966), p. 284, n.2). We know of four of his plays apart from this one in which letters played a part (*Hippolytos*, *Stheneboia*, *Palamedes*, and *I.T.*). The only other source which mentions a letter in connection with the summoning of Iphigeneia is Dictys Cretensis 1.20. Ulysses on his own initiative takes 'falsas litteras tamquam ab Agamemnone' to Clytaemnestra telling her that Achilles will not go to Troy unless as promised he is given the hand of Iphigeneia. This is no doubt a contamination of the traditional version with the letter-motif taken from Euripides.

<sup>6</sup> [Apollodoros] *Epitome* 3.22. Possibly this is the *Kypria* version. See T. Zieliński, *Tragodumenon Libri Tres* (Warsaw, 1925), p. 256.

<sup>7</sup> Hyginus 98.3 Rose. It has been

suggested that Sophocles lies behind this (Nauck, *TGF*<sup>2</sup> p.197, Zieliński, pp. 265 ff). We know for certain that Odysseus appeared in his play since our one fragment (284N) is introduced as spoken by him. Eur. *El.* 1020-3 seems to presuppose yet another version where Agamemnon personally takes Iphigeneia to Aulis (cf. also Eur. *I.T.* 370-1). See in general Preller-Robert, ii. 1100 ff.

<sup>8</sup> On pauses in the action in tragedy and the illegitimate practice of editors and commentators in introducing them see Oliver Taplin, *HSCP* 76 (1972), 57 and n.2. Murray mistakenly introduces one after 48 because he refuses to accept Reiske's obviously correct transposition of 117 f. to follow this line. Had Agamemnon broken off at this point 'grauiter commotus' either he would have said 'I cannot go on' (cf. Eur. *Or.* 671 ff.) or else the old man would have commented on his sudden silence (cf. Soph. *Phil.* 730-1, 805). 'When a Greek tragedian means something to be important or significant, then he draws his audience's attention to it' Taplin, op cit., p. 97.

texts. We must reconstruct the action from what the actors *say*.<sup>9</sup> There are indeed occasions when one has to go a little way beyond the words of the text when visualizing the stage-action — this is more true of comedy than of tragedy — never, however, as far as Willink goes here.<sup>10</sup> His procedure is all the more objectionable since these hypotheses about the action are brought forward to *support* a transposition.

The second new join entailed by the transposition is equally unsatisfactory. The first anapaestic section now ends with these words from the old man:

44                    τί πονεῖς; τί νέον περὶ σοί, βασιλεῦ;  
                       φέρε κοῖνωσον μῦθον ἐς ἡμᾶς.  
                       πρὸς δ' ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν πιστόν τε φράσεις.  
                       σῇ γάρ μ' ἀλόχῳ τότε Τυνδάρειω  
                       πέμπει φερνὴν  
                       συννυμφοκόμον τε δίκαιον.

To this Agamemnon must now reply:

97                    ὁ δὴ μ' ἀδελφός πάντα προσφέρων λόγον . . .

(ὁ δὴ being Willink's emendation of LP's οὗ δῆ).

This rearrangement has produced a transition just as unacceptable as the one it was seeking to replace.<sup>11</sup> ὁ δὴ μ' ἀδελφός κτλ. is no more convincing a reply to the old man's request than is ἐγένοντο Λῆδαι Θεοτιάδι κτλ. δῆ cannot be used as Willink wants to use it, to begin a narrative in answer to a question; it can only introduce a new stage in the narrative. Willink seems to recognize this when he speaks of δῆ 'marking off 97 ff. as a resumptive continuation *for the audience* [my italics] of 49 – 96'.<sup>12</sup>

At neither of the two new joins, then, does the transposition recommend itself. If one looks through the rest of the reconstituted prologue, one finds many further inconcinnities of thought and staging. For one thing Agamemnon has the δέλτος with him, but it is only in the thirty-fifth line of the anapaests that the first mention of it is made. That is to say we see from the start the man carrying an object which is not mentioned till the eighty-first line of the play.

Secondly, once the dialogue between the old man and Agamemnon gets under way, the old man asks of his master:

12                    τί δέ σὺ σκηνῆς ἐκτὸς αἴσεις;

<sup>9</sup> 'Nihil autem fere fit in Graecorum traegediis comoediisque quin fieri simul indicetur oratione' M. Haupt, *Opuscula* 2.460. See above all T. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*, pp. 140 ff. and also A. Spitzbarth, *Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der griechische Tragödie* (Winterthur, 1946), pp. 39 ff., Fraenkel, *Aesch. Ag.*, p. 642; W. Steidle, *studien zum antiken Drama* (Munich, 1968), pp. 22 f., O. Zwierlein, *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1966) pp. 55 ff. (and GGA 1970, 214) and J. Dingel in *Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich, 1971) p. 355.

<sup>10</sup> The tendency is exhibited frequently in the apparatus of the Oxford text (cf. n.8). Perhaps Murray was too familiar with his friend Shaw's stage directions.

<sup>11</sup> See p. 14.

<sup>12</sup> Willink considers it possible that something may have dropped out before 97 and argues that his case does not stand or fall with the acceptance or rejection of his emendation. His attempts to make δῆ do double duty (connecting for the audience this line with 96 and emphasizing [for the old man] ἀδελφός) gain no support from Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 238, and the *Republic* passage he cites as a parallel.

This is a question which makes good enough sense if it comes in the twelfth line of the play. It makes no sense at all if Agamemnon has been on stage for upward of forty lines and has only just called the old man out of his tent. In that case how can the man know that his master has been and still is making agitated movements?<sup>13</sup> According to Willink he has only just seen his master.

Agamemnon not only writes his letter during the alleged 'business' after 96. He continues to be occupied with it during the course of the dialogue with the old man. Because of the consideration mentioned in the previous paragraph we are forced to take 34 ff. not, as we would do on the assumption that the play really began with line one, as a description of the way Agamemnon was behaving in his tent before he departed having called on the old man to follow, but as a description of Agamemnon's present behaviour:

οὐδὲ λαμπτήρος φάος ἀμπετάσας  
 δέλτον τε γράφεις  
 τήνδ' ἦν πρὸ χερῶν ἔτι βαστάξεις  
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἀπάλω γράμματα συγχέεις  
 καὶ σφραγίζεις λύεις τ' ὀπίσω  
 ῥίπτεις τε πέδῳ πεύκην, θαλερόν  
 κατὰ δάκρυ χέων  
 καὶ τῶν ἀπόρων οὐδένοιο ἐνδείξ  
 μὴ οὐ μαίνεσθαι.

As a description of what the audience and the old man are seeing at the time this smacks of comedy.<sup>14</sup> Does Willink really believe that Agamemnon throws down the letter (39) in view of the audience? When does he do so? Surely not at the very moment the old man is saying *ῥίπτεις τε πέδῳ πεύκην*? If not then, but earlier, one would have expected at least a cry of surprise from the old man.

These absurdities disappear once one accepts that 1 ff. is indeed the beginning of the play. Agamemnon comes out of the stage building, calling on the old man to follow. The latter's question at 12 (which I am inclined to think is his first utterance in full view of the audience<sup>15</sup>) 'why do you rush out of the tent?' makes perfect sense.<sup>16</sup> In the lines just quoted (34 ff.) the old man is clearly describing activities which we are to imagine as having occurred off stage in Agamemnon's tent before the play began. *ἔτι* in 36 confirms this; the old man has seen Agamemnon inside his tent, writing, sealing and unsealing, throwing on the ground, and weeping over the letter he *still* has in his hands.<sup>17</sup> The question he asks as he makes his way out *τί δὲ καωουργεῖς*; refers simply to Agamemnon's departure from his tent and to his request to the old man to join him.

<sup>13</sup> I hardly think that many will accept Willink's assertion that these words do not necessarily imply that Agamemnon is standing and that they do not exclude the possibility that he is sitting at a writing-desk (353). In any case one expects a Greek prince to write with his tablets *ἐπὶ γούνασιν*.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 200 ff.

<sup>15</sup> See England on 4 and 5. A. E. Housman demonstrated once and for all that 7-8 was not the old man's answer to a question in 6 *τίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀστήρ ὄδε*

*πορθμεύει*; (CR 28 (1914), 267 = *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge, 1972), ii. 886).

<sup>16</sup> *ἐκτός* with a verb of motion meaning 'out of' as at line 1117 of this play.

<sup>17</sup> 'The writing had been done *κατ' εὐφρόνης σκιά* and he has not ceased to keep the letter in his hand now that the morning was approaching. The present tenses do not so much express what he is doing at the moment as what he has been doing for some time past', Paley on 36.

## II

There being nothing to be said in favour of and a great deal to be said against Willink's transposition, we are driven back to more traditional questions with regard to *I.A.* 1 – 163. In recent times many people have assumed that the prologue is acceptable as it stands and there have been various attempts at a defence of it,<sup>18</sup> the most considerable of which being an article by Bernard Knox which bears the combative title 'Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulide* 1 – 163 (in that order).<sup>19</sup> In this section I will restate the case against the transmitted prologue. Most of the fire will be directed against Knox.

There are two<sup>20</sup> obvious and compelling objections to the transmitted text. No one has succeeded in shaking them.<sup>21</sup>

The first of these concerns the improper transition from anapaestic dialogue to Agamemnon's trimeter speech. In reply to the old man's request that he unburden himself of his troubles (44 ff. quoted above, p. 13), Agamemnon delivers a speech of sixty lines or so which is, apart from its last six lines, identical to the kind of expository prologue-speech with which Euripides was wont to begin his plays. The information in this speech can only be for the benefit of the audience. The old man does not need to be told that Agamemnon is married to Klytaimnestra (as is said in the second line of the speech): he was after all part of her dowry, a fact which most significantly is mentioned in the very question which provokes Agamemnon's reply.<sup>22</sup> No amount of pseudo-analogies for the structure of this scene can counterweigh such an impropriety of technique as this. The Euripidean prologue speech is for the audience and for the audience alone.<sup>23</sup> On occasions, admittedly, the speaker of such a prologue may not be the only person on stage. If that is the case, however, he draws attention (for

<sup>18</sup> W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*, pp. 102 f., thinks the prologue can stand as long as we take out 106–14 (in that case λέγε καὶ σήμανε in 117 takes up 104 f. which is surely out of the question). E. Valgiglio, *RSC* 4 (1956), 174 ff. thinks that Euripides wrote what we have, but accepts that it is possible that he did not put the finishing touches to his work, hence the contradiction between 106 ff. and 124 ff. A. Rome, 'Sur la date de composition de *L'Iphigénie à Aulis* d'Euripide', *Miscellanea G. Mercati* IV (*Studi e testi* 124) 1956, 13–26, like T.B.L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London, 1967) 258, accepts without question that the present prologue is Euripidean. Most of Gudrun Mellert-Hoffmann's *Untersuchungen zur "Iphigenie in Aulis" des Euripides* (Heidelberg, 1969) is devoted to a defence of the prologue as it stands. On this work see J. Diggle, *CR* N.S. 21 (1971), 178–80. The latest defence of the *paradosis* I know of is that of R. van Pottelbergh, *L'Antiquité classique* 43 (1974), 304–8.

<sup>19</sup> *Yale Studies in Classical Philology* 22 (1972), 239–61.

<sup>20</sup> Knox sets up and attempts to knock down 'eleven counts against the manuscript prologue' (241). This seems to me to

obscure the issue since some points are obviously more weighty than others. My first point corresponds to his second and third points, my second to his fifth.

<sup>21</sup> They are firmly restated by Fraenkel (298, 301, n.1). See also England, pp. xxiii–iv.

<sup>22</sup> Knox tries to answer Page who also makes this objection (256) by arguing that he is applying too rigid a standard of realism and by comparing other prologues where the speaker is not alone on stage. But there is a great difference between a prologue-speaker like Iolaos drawing our attention to a tableau on stage and Agamemnon here replying to a request from his dialogue-partner by delivering a speech over his head and at the audience. For this the 'messenger' speech is scarcely an analogy. It is admittedly highly stereotyped and formal but it does provide information intended equally for the people on stage and the audience. *I.A.* 695–6 which Knox also adduces as a parallel may be unnatural, but it is at least a genealogy produced in response to a request for a genealogy.

<sup>23</sup> It is for them, but does not admit that they are present. See my article 'Audience Address in Greek Tragedy' *CQ* N.S. 25 (1975), 22 f.

the benefit of the audience) to whoever else is present: he does not address his companions.<sup>24</sup> Likewise the 'postponed' prologue found in New Comedy (Alexis fr. 108 Kock, *Men. Asp.* 87 ff., *Heros, Per.* 121 ff. Sandbach) is no parallel for the opening of *I.A.*<sup>25</sup> What Tyche says in *Aspis* or *Agnoia* in *Per.* is addressed directly to the audience on an empty stage.

Secondly, how can one believe that a single mind contrived it that the old man should ask in 124 f. *καὶ πῶς Ἀχιλλεύς λέκτρων ἀπλακῶν | οὐ μέγα φουσῶν θυμὸν ἐπαρεῖ*; when a mere twenty lines before (105 ff.) he had been told that the only people who knew of the *ψευδὴς γάμος* were Kalchas, Menelaos, Odysseus, and Agamemnon himself? Attempts to counter this are unsatisfactory. Friedrich mysteriously suggests that for the moment the old man is allowed to know more than he should.<sup>26</sup> Page (134 f.) produces an elaborate 'psychological' defence which demands far too much of an audience.<sup>27</sup> The latest attempt to explain away the inconsistency, that of Knox, proceeds on similar lines and is equally unconvincing. In line 106, he tells us, *ὥς ἔχει τὰδε* is deliberately ambiguous. 'At this point it is not clear from what Agamemnon says whether Achilles and the army think that Iphigeneia is coming to Aulis but do not know that the marriage is a mere pretext or whether Achilles and the army do not know anything at all — that they are not even aware that Iphigeneia has been sent for.' The kind of spectator to whom the former possibility might occur would surely be a very perverse one. Even if we were to accept, however, that an audience would divide over the interpretation of *ἔχει τὰδε*, it would be difficult to find a reason for their being so misled. What is the point of the ambiguity? Why raise it only to resolve it a mere twenty lines later? Such an effect ill suits a part of the play which is generally noted for clarity rather than obscurity. The slippery statements of prologue deities in other plays are no parallel for what Knox alleges we have here.<sup>28</sup> There are two ways out of the

<sup>24</sup> The prologues of Euripides which begin with more than one person on stage are those of *Hkld.*, *Hik.*, *Her.*, *Tro.*, and *Or.* In each play the prologue-speaker refers in the third person to the others who happen to be on stage, using a deictic pronoun (*Hkld.* 11, 24, 40; *Hik.* 8, 17, 20, 21, 35; *Her.* 9, 14, 42; *Tro.* 36; *Or.* 35). Iolaos' address to the children of Herakles (*Hkld.*) is distinct from the expository part of the speech.

<sup>25</sup> Knox admits this (244).

<sup>26</sup> 'Der Alte fragt aus einer un-oder voreuripideischen Situation heraus' op. cit., p. 79.

<sup>27</sup> 'In 106-7 Agam. said "We four alone know *ὥς ἔχει τὰδε*, the facts of the plot" [a somewhat question-begging translation, better simply "the present situation" cf. A. Ag. 1406, Eur. *Kret.* 5]; the old man at once assumes that Achilleus is not in the plot . . . but he also assumes . . . that Achilleus was at least told that Iphigeneia was coming to marry him . . . Agamemnon said "K. and O. and M. and I alone know the truth"; the old man thinks "so these four have made a plot. They have told Ach. that Iph. is coming to be his bride". This

explanation which reads like E. Bruhn on Sophocles (see H. Lloyd-Jones, *CQ N.S.* 22 (1972), 215 ff.) treats the play like a record of real events. It is tantamount to cross-examining the characters. The old man is a fictional creation: he has no independent existence. No competent Greek dramatist would force us to make such elaborate inferences (and for what purpose?) about the thought processes of his characters. While the play is being performed there simply is not time to pause and work all this out. Something resembling Page's explanation is to be found in J.B. Hutter's perfectly useless *Über den Prolog und Epilog in Euripides' Tragödie die Iphigenie in Aulis* (Munich, 1844), p. 14.

<sup>28</sup> Knox like Willink takes Barrett's name in vain, quoting with approval his note on Eur. *Hipp.* 42. The effect achieved there and at *Ion* 71 ff. seems to me quite different from what Knox supposes to be happening in *I.A.* For one thing, deities are speaking those prologues: for another, the statements are applicable for the bulk of the plays, not being corrected immediately as in the *I.A.*

difficulty. Either we follow Hennig<sup>29</sup> in deleting 124 – 32 or – and this is where the consideration mentioned above helps to settle the matter – we assume that the anapaests and the trimeters were written by different persons and that the contradiction arises because there are two minds at work.

These then are the clinching objections to the present arrangement.

Corroboration is provided by the observation that the prologue as presented by LP – and indeed the prologue as reconstructed by Willink – is equipped with a superfluous amount of expository detail as regards the locale. We learn first of all from the conversation between the old man and Agamemnon that the play is set in Aulis *ἐτι δ' ἡσυχία τῇδε κατ' Αὔλῳ* (14) and are reminded of this by Agamemnon at 81, *στενόπορ' Αὐλίδος βάθρα ἤκουσι τῆσδε* and again at 88 *ἀπλοῖαι χρώμενοι κατ' Αὐλίδα*. Further mention of the place name comes when Agamemnon reads out the letter (120 f.).<sup>30</sup>

Once we admit we are dealing with a conflation of some kind, whether one arrived at by accident or design, which brings together two kinds of prologue, this impression of redundancy disappears.<sup>31</sup> We recognize at once two different, but familiar techniques for exposition. The technique of the trimeters is well known to anyone who has read a Euripidean play. The prologue speaker informs the audience of his identity<sup>32</sup> and of the locale (I leave out for the moment the question of the time). The distinctive exposition technique of the anapaests on

<sup>29</sup> H. Hennig, *De Iphigeniae Aulidensis forma ac condicione* (Berlin, 1869), pp. 18 f. (he is followed by Nauck and Pohlenz). There are objections that may be raised against the deletion, most notably the fact that 133 ff. is a better response to 124–32 than to 123 (see N. Wecklein, *Zeitschrift für die öst. Gymnasien* 29 (1878), 728).

<sup>30</sup> Note too the first words of the chorus on entering, *ἔμολον ἀμφὶ παρακτίαν ψάμαθον Αὐλίδος ἐναλίας* 164 ff. Willink's arrangement heightens the redundancy. 'Here in Aulis' says the old man at 14 and this follows *στενόπορ' Αὐλίδος . . . τῆσδε* 81. Similarly the frequent repetition of Agamemnon's name (1, 13, 30, 133) seems unnecessary since, on Willink's arrangement, Agamemnon's identity has been established since the second line of the play.

<sup>31</sup> It is not the mere repetition of the place name that strikes one as redundant (Thebes and the Thebans are mentioned just as frequently in the prologue of *Bakchai*, 1, 23, 48, 50); it is the appearance of the name twice in conjunction with deictic words (*τῇδε* 14 *τῆσδε* 82). This is not Euripidean technique – in the *Ba.* prologue there is always a reason for the mention of the town or the people. In our passage the old man need not have mentioned Aulis in 14; he could simply have said 'here'. The repetition of place names at Eur. *Hipp.* 12 and 29 and *Hek.* 8 and 33 at first sight looks like a parallel for what

we have here. In each case, however, when the place name is repeated it is to distinguish *this land* from another land that has been or is about to be mentioned, in the first instance Trozen being distinguished from Athens, in the second the Chersonese from Troy. Editors and commentators tend to claim that expository elements in prologue speeches are repeated in order that anyone inattentive enough to have missed the first mention of them may be put in the picture (e.g. Dodds on Eur. *Ba.* 53–4 commenting on the emphasis Dionysos appears to lay on his human disguise). This is not at any rate the case in Euripides with regard to the naming of the locale. In *Alk.* we learn from the first line that this is Admetos' house, but there is no further specification in the prologue. One mention of the locale is sufficient for the nurse in *Medea* (10) and for Iolaos (*Hkld.* 38), Aithra (*Hik.* 2), Iokaste (*Pboin.* 4), and Elektra (*Or.* 46 – N.B. the delay). In most of these cases and in other prologues there are other incidental details which suggest where the play is taking place, but their mention is not primarily a reminder to the audience: e.g. at *Andr.* 22 where the audience has learned the locale from 16 f. the repetition can hardly be intended as a reminder so soon after the first mention. Rather it is there to make clear the status of Peleus.

<sup>32</sup> On Agamemnon's failure to name himself see p. 18.



the other hand is the one favoured, as far as we can tell from the plays we have, by Sophocles. The locale, dramatic situation, identity of the speakers, and (possibly) the time come out in the course of dialogue between two actors.<sup>33</sup>

In the anapaests here we learn the identity of the speakers immediately. The play begins ὦ πρόεσθι and that is sufficient identification in tragedy for a character like the old man. Agamemnon's name occurs in the old man's first utterance.<sup>34</sup> We learn the locale more quickly in the anapaests than in the trimeters.<sup>35</sup> Line 11 gives us the general area; line 14 is specific.<sup>36</sup> It is less essential in most cases that we should know the time,<sup>37</sup> but the effect of this particular scene depends to a great extent on its nocturnal atmosphere and so we learn from 4 ff. that it is still night (presumably the audience knew that the play was supposed to begin in darkness before the actors started to speak because they saw them carrying torches, but they still have to be told that it is almost morning). As the anapaests now stand, we miss of course sufficient information about the antecedents of the play to understand fully what follows and we must assume that they have been curtailed, vital information which came between 48 and 115 having been excised. Those who seek to deny that what we have in 1 – 163 is a conflation of some kind try to discredit the case that the anapaests were originally a self-contained prologue, by claiming that this hypothesis entails the loss of a great deal of detailed information, information that would be difficult to convey through the medium of anapaestic dialogue.<sup>38</sup> This claim is unimpressive since if the poet, Euripides or whoever may have written the lines, chose to put over expository material through a medium other than the usual expository prologue speech, there is no need to believe, and indeed it might be thought *a priori* unlikely, that he would try to incorporate in his prologue all the features of that type of speech or to attempt to reproduce the extensive parade of detail found there.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>33</sup> The prologue of Soph. *Ant.* is a close parallel for the anapaestic opening of *I.A.*. For the motif of people coming out of the stage building to hold a secret conversation (which is not at all unrealistic in the Greek world) see W.M. Calder III, *GRBS* 9 (1968), 392, n.18 whose remarks answer England's question (p.13) 'if [the old man was in the tent] why did Ag. call him and speak to him?'

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1 (Antigone names Ismene) and 11 (Ismene begins by naming Antigone).

<sup>35</sup> For this delay in the trimeters compare the prologue of *Orestes*.

<sup>36</sup> Willink claims that 'δόμῳ τῶνδε παροιθεν is technically improper unless the skene is already identifiable as Agamemnon's headquarters at Aulis. It is hard to see how the identification could be made if line 1 were the first line of the play'. This is arbitrary and unconvincing.

<sup>37</sup> In *Ion* much is made for atmospheric purposes of the time, dawn, but this comes in the 'Affektiv' part of the prologue,

*Ion*'s anapaestic entry, rather than in the expository prologue by Hermes. See the following note.

<sup>38</sup> So Friedrich, p. 94, Willink, p. 346, and Knox, p. 245. The fact that on the present arrangement expository material is divided between the iambic 'prologue' and the anapaests argues against the arrangement being Euripidean (see M. Imhof, *Bemerkungen zu den Prologen der soph. u. eur. Tragödien* (Winterthur, 1957), pp. 104 f. — one makes Nestle's distinction here between exposition of 'Stimmung' and of 'Handlung': in the *Ion* prologue Hermes deals with the latter, *Ion* in his anapaests gives us the former. In *I.A.*, however, 'Handlung' spreads over into the anapaests).

<sup>39</sup> Also, if one does not believe that the plot and the prologues of the play were conceived by one and the same person, one is not compelled to suppose that the person who composed the anapaestic prologue felt the same urge towards the full exposition of the themes of the play as the person who devised the plot might have felt.

## III

If we find that the *paradosis* in *I.A.* 1 – 163 is still indefensible and if we incline to see in the lines the remains of two types of expository prologues, it is natural that we should suspect that at least one of them was not written by Euripides. Although there is no evidence that Euripides left *I.A.* incomplete when he died, the uneven quality of the play as a whole taken together with the knowledge that the play was produced posthumously by his son<sup>40</sup> makes it plausible to suggest that this was the case. If so, it would be somewhat surprising if Euripides had drafted two alternative prologues for (say) his son to amalgamate.<sup>41</sup>

If we discard that hypothesis, we are left with a choice of further hypotheses to explain the present state of *I.A.* 1 – 163:

(1) The anapaests represent what Euripides wrote and were intended to open the play. Someone else has disrupted the original connection between them by cutting some lines and inserting his own trimeters.

(2) The anapaests are Euripidean. A later writer composed an alternative prologue in trimeters and a third (perhaps editorial) hand has combined the two, deleting portions of both trimeters and anapaests and adding (or rewriting) trimeters to effect a link between trimeters and anapaests.

(3) The trimeter prologue is Euripidean. Another hand wrote the anapaests and inserted the trimeter prologue between them, recasting or composing some trimeters to effect the connection.

(4) The trimeter prologue is Euripidean. Another hand wrote the anapaests intending them as an alternative and a third made a combination of the two in the manner suggested in hypothesis (2).

(5) Euripides left no complete prologue. In this case each of the previous four hypotheses may be considered with 'unknown poet' (or possibly 'Euripides the son of Euripides') substituted for Euripides on each occasion.<sup>42</sup>

None of these hypotheses can be dismissed out of hand and, although some perhaps may appear more likely than others,<sup>43</sup> none is inherently improbable.<sup>44</sup> The fifth hypothesis might appear *prima facie* to be the most attractive. If the poet left no prologue, the possibility of competing prologues coming into being would have been the greater. But even a genuine Euripidean prologue would not have had a guaranteed survival nor would its existence have discouraged others

<sup>40</sup> Σ Aristoph. *Frogs* 67.

<sup>41</sup> Recent expressions of this belief, however, are to be found in D.J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama* (Toronto, 1967), p. 253, n.11 and in A. Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*<sup>3</sup> (Göttingen, 1972), p. 494.

<sup>42</sup> Since there are degrees of incompleteness it is always possible to argue that the composer of the prologue was able to use some lines written by Euripides and that even if the structure of the prologue owes nothing to Euripides some of his verses are preserved in it.

<sup>43</sup> The motives of the interpolator in hypothesis 1 might seem a trifle obscure (perhaps one should not worry too much

about the motives of interpolators — see M.D. Reeve, *GRBS* 13 (1972), 259). One might perhaps conceive of a person who, confronted by a Euripidean play which unusually lacked an expository prologue, felt the need to supply one and hit upon the idea of inserting it within the anapaestic dialogue since there was scarcely any other place where it might go. By doing so he failed to realize that he was producing something even more unEuripidean than what he had found before he went to work.

<sup>44</sup> I would not agree with Knox (pp. 259 f.) that the prosecution presents a much greater demand than the defence in this case.

from trying their hands at an alternative.<sup>45</sup> The success and fame of a play (and *I.A.* seems to have been successful<sup>46</sup>) does not ensure that those who revive or republish it will adhere faithfully to the original words and intentions of the author. Haslam's recent discoveries about the opening lines of Eur.*Phoin.* and Soph.*El.* provide striking evidence for interpolators tampering with the openings of very well-known plays, possibly at an early stage in their transmission.<sup>47</sup>

The kind of activities envisaged in the hypotheses set out above do not seem beyond those we know to have been undertaken by actors or possibly playwrights used by actors in the fourth century.<sup>48</sup> That period was notoriously an age of actors and these hypotheses would square with the kind of large scale tampering with the text that has been posited for another, popular, Euripidean play, *Phoinissai*.<sup>49</sup> The anapaests were known by the middle of the third century B.C.<sup>50</sup> and it is virtually certain that the trimeters were known to Aristotle.<sup>51</sup> This allows us to suppose that the interpolation of the prologue took place in the fourth century.

It is unreasonable to complain, as does Knox (p.260, n.57), that there is no external evidence for the existence of more than one prologue or for any doubt

<sup>45</sup> Willink's objection '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' (345) betrays a naïve trust in the memories of audiences and in the integrity of actors. If we accept Wilamowitz's assertion that Eur. *Hek.* 73-8 and 90-7 were written by an actor who wanted the play to begin with Hekabe's anapaestic entrance rather than the trimeter speech of Polydoros, we would have a parallel for the suppression of a prologue in a 'popular' play (and also for the activity envisaged in hypothesis 4). Wilamowitz's deletion is certain (*Hermes* 44 (1909), 446 - 9 = *Kleine Schriften* IV. 225-8; see also W. Biehl, *Philologus* 101 (1957), 55-62 and J. Bremer, *Mnemosyne* iv.24 (1971), 231-50): one may note as a further argument against 73 ff. the metrical solecism of  $\delta\psi\omega$  | (*brevis in longo*)  $\eta\nu\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \pi\alpha\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$  (contrast 88). His suggestion that the interpolator intended to cut the prologue is attractive but not certain (note the popularity of the prologue - it was obviously known to Pacuvius or to Pacuvius' model when he wrote the *Iliona*). The loss of the iambic prologues of the *Rhesos* might supply a parallel, but the case is more complicated if one believes, as I do, that the play we have is not Euripides'. One had perhaps best leave out of account the puzzling question of how Euripides' *Melanippe Sophe* began (see Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften* 1.449 and P.Oxy.2455 fr.1 and M.W. Haslam, *GRBS* 16 (1975), 171.

<sup>46</sup> I am assuming, perhaps without justification, that *IG* ii. <sup>2</sup>2320 refers to a

revival acted by Neoptolemos in 341 of *I.A.* rather than *I.T.* A friendly critic reminds me that if the iconographic tradition is a guide, *I.T.* far surpassed *I.A.* in popularity.

<sup>47</sup> M.W. Haslam, *GRBS* 16 (1975), 149-74. Note especially the discussion and parallels adduced in 170 ff. The question of the date of this tampering and its relation to the Alexandrian recension must remain open.

<sup>48</sup> N.B. the implications of Plut. *Vit. Orat.* 841 f. The latest discussion of the question of interpolation in tragedy, that by R. Hamilton, *GRBS* 15 (1974), 387-402, is rightly sceptical of the value of statements in the scholia about the activities of actors (cf. Reeve, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 249, n.6), but over-optimistic when it comes to dealing with the relationship between fourth-century booksellers and authors' autographs. (op. cit., p. 391). The arguments of Reeve, *GRBS* 14 (1973), 171, satisfy me that it is correct in many instances to speak of 'actors' interpolations and that revivals of fifth-century classics had an effect on the transmission of their texts.

<sup>49</sup> See Ed. Fraenkel, *SBAW* (1963), M.D. Reeve, *GRBS* 13 (1972), 451 ff., M.W. Haslam, *CQ* N.S. 26 (1976) 4 ff.

<sup>50</sup> Line 28 is quoted by Chrysippos (*SVF* ii.53.26) line 23 exploited by Machon (25 Gow).

<sup>51</sup> Fraenkel (p. 302, n.3) was mistaken in his treatment of the citation in the *Rhetoric* which might well be the beginning of *I.A.* 80. See R. Kassel, *Der Text der aristotelischen Rhetorik* (*Peripatoi* Band 3, Berlin, 1971), pp. 146-7.

in antiquity over the authenticity of the prologue, and to use this as a defence of the paradosis. That nothing has survived to show what Alexandrian scholarship thought about the opening of the play is no guarantee that there was no suspicion expressed concerning the prologue in antiquity. If *I.A.* were not one of the 'alphabetic' plays, if it had survived in that branch of the tradition where there was at least a chance of its retaining an informative hypothesis and scholia which preserved something of reputable ancient scholarship, we might well have been in possession of just such evidence. All the evidence concerning the alternative prologues of *Rhesos* and of the doubt that existed in antiquity that the play in the Alexandrian library was the one written by Euripides comes from the hypothesis to that play.<sup>52</sup>

## IV

Debate about what lies behind the present absurd state of affairs in LP will not get far if the argument sticks to general probability. Judgement must depend on what one thinks of the quality of part or all of the trimeters and of the quality of part or all of the anapaests. Accordingly I append some notes on points of detail which seem to me relevant to the question of Euripidean authorship.<sup>53</sup>

## A. The Anapaests

(a) It must be stated at the outset that it is unusual for a play to begin with anapaestic dialogue,<sup>54</sup> or for anapaests to be used as a medium for exposition (choral exposition in Aeschylus being excepted). All the other Euripidean plays we possess begin with iambic monologues. We need not believe that *all* his plays began in such a manner.<sup>55</sup> Indeed on present evidence it seems that what opened his *Andromeda*, a play produced in 412, was something quite different. If we believe that the text of the scholion on Ar. *Thesm* 1056 is sound, we must accept that the first lines of that play were ὦ νῦξ ἱερὰ, ὡς μακρὸν ἦπνευμα διώκεις.<sup>56</sup> It appears that in the prologue there was also a 'conversation' between *Andromeda* and *Echo*. It is doubtful, however, whether we can proceed on this evidence to assert that we have an exact or even a close parallel for the anapaestic opening of *I.A.* The probability surely is that what opened *Andromeda* was a lyric monody by the heroine. It is hard to believe that *Echo* served a function at all similar to that of the old man in *I.A.*, the function of

<sup>52</sup> See Ritchie, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>53</sup> I do not discuss ἀπαξ ἐληγμένα. For the dangers that arise when they are used in arguments of this sort see Ed. Fraenkel, *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 230. One must also acknowledge that many of the oddities in the prologue might be attributable to textual corruption. Caution is needed when dealing with a text as miserably preserved as this one. One cannot use the rather jejune phrase κατ' εὐφρόνης σκιάν in 114 to argue against Euripidean authorship since σκιάν seems to be a conjecture intended to complete a line that could no longer be read in its entirety. For a discussion see G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 97 f., and

Barrett's *Hippolytos*, p. 249, n.1.

<sup>54</sup> I exclude from consideration the non-Euripidean *Rhesos*.

<sup>55</sup> I am prepared to believe that πάντων in Σ Eur. *Hek.* 1 may be an exaggeration.

<sup>56</sup> See Fraenkel, 303 ff. and Knox, p. 243, n.19 (for another example of ἐλαβολή referring to the opening of a play see Σ Eur. *Med.* 1). Without the Ravenna scholion on *Thesm.*, however, Nestle's case op. cit., pp. 130 ff. against an anapaestic prologue would be unassailable and one wonders whether the scholion is corrupt or whether there were versions of *Andromeda* circulating which lacked the original Euripidean trimeter prologue (cf. note 45).



(g) 161 ff: whatever the meaning of ἐς τέλος in 161<sup>66</sup> the generalization seems incredibly trite and does not connect well with what precedes.

#### B. The trimeters

In the tragedies of Euripides that have survived complete the only prologue speakers (apart from the αὐτουργός in *Elektra* for he is a nameless character) who fail to reveal their names to the audience are Apollo in *Alkestis* and Agamemnon here. Leo who believed that the trimeters constituted the original Euripidean prologue felt that the absence of Agamemnon's name from them was an indication that they had been curtailed.<sup>67</sup> This is a point that must be considered.<sup>68</sup> Even if it is quite clear from the second line of the trimeters who the speaker is,<sup>69</sup> one expects consistency in these stereotyped speeches. There is in fact a certain amount of variation to be observed in the manner in which Euripides lets the audience know the identity of the prologue-speaker. In *Herakleidae* Iolaos, like Agamemnon here, makes it quite clear from the outset who is speaking: πόνων πλείστων μετέσχον εἰς ἀνὴρ Ἡρακλέει (6 ff). His name is not mentioned until the thirtieth line and it is introduced obliquely: the name is put into the mouth of some imagined future observer of the way in which he has looked after the children of Herakles. Similarly in the prologue of *Oineus*, it is immediately clear who the speaker is. Diomedes mentions Tydeus and describes him as 'my father'.<sup>70</sup> He continues, however, without mentioning his own name. We have a considerable part of the prologue of *Stheneboia* with no mention of the speaker's name.<sup>71</sup> These instances show that the immediate mention of the prologue-speaker's name was not inevitable. Since one of the assumptions about the state of the prologues in *I.A.* demands that we consider the iambic part incomplete, it remains open to us to believe that Agamemnon's name did in fact occur later in the prologue.<sup>72</sup> Even so the delay seems to be exceptional.

The most serious objections to the trimeters have been levelled against their conclusion:

105      πειθῶ γὰρ εἶχον τήνδε πρὸς δάμαρτ' ἐμήν,  
             ψευδῇ συνάψας ἀντὶ παρθένου γάμον.  
             μόνοι δ' Ἀχαιῶν ἴσμεν ὥς ἔχει τάδε

<sup>66</sup> I would take it as 'completely' rather than 'up to the end'.

<sup>67</sup> *Der Monolog in Drama* (Abb. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Klasse n.f. x.5) (Berlin, 1908), p. 25.

<sup>68</sup> Friedrich (p. 91, n.2.) and Knox (p. 255) use it to argue that the anapaests and trimeters are complementary.

<sup>69</sup> This point is stressed by Hermann, *Opuscula* 8.24.

<sup>70</sup> Fr. 558N

ὦ γῆς πατρώιας χαῖρε φίλτατον πέδον  
 Καλυδῶνος, ἐνθεν αἶμα συγγενές φυγῶν  
 Τυδεὺς τόκος μὲν Οἰνέως, πατὴρ δ' ἐμός,  
 ὠκησεν Ἴδρυος κτλ.

<sup>71</sup> See Page, *Greek Literary Papyri*, no. 16. Of course this prologue is lacunose.

Wilamowitz wanted the mention of the name to come after line 6 (*CPh* 3 (1908), 227, n.2.

= *Kleine Schriften* i. 276, n.2.). On the analogy of the *Hkld.* prologue it could come just as well after 13 in the speech of the τροφός which Bellerophon reports. See also B. Zühlke, *Philologus* 105 (1961), 201 who suggests that the name came after 27. I am not convinced by the arguments of N.C. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides* (Athens, 1965), p. 153.

<sup>72</sup> *Contra* Leo, I think it improbable that anything is missing before the opening line of the trimeters. It looks like the opening of a Euripidean play (cf. *I.T.* 1 ff.). If one were to suggest a place for the name, it might be worth guessing that the corrupt line 84 is the product of a join after the passage had been lost in which Agamemnon had let his name slip.

- Κάλχας Ὀδυσσεὺς Μενέλεως θ'. ἃ δ' οὐ καλῶς  
 ἔγνων τότε, αὐθις μεταγράψω καλῶς πάλιν  
 110 ἔς τήνδε δέλτον, ἣν κατ' εὐφρόνης σκιάν  
 λύοντα καὶ συνδούντά μ' εἰσείδες, γέρον.  
 ἀλλ' εἶα χώρει τάσδ' ἐπιστολάς λαβῶν  
 πρὸς Ἀργος, ἃ δὲ κέκευθε δέλτος ἐν πτυχαῖς  
 113 λόγῳ φράσω σοι πάντα τὰ γγεγραμμένα·  
 πιστὸς γὰρ ἀλόχῳ τοῖς τ' ἐμοῖς δόμοισιν εἶ.

These lines must be considered in the light of

- (1) the clumsy language of 105
- (2) the next to impossible omission of ἐγώ as part subject of ἵσμεν in 106
- (3) the pleonastic inelegance of 107b – 8
- (4) the striking resemblance of 112 – 13 to *I.T.* 760 f.

The first three objections may be removed by emendation,<sup>73</sup> but whether or not we accept emendations here depends on what we think of the lines collectively. The last objection surely decides us. It is not sufficient to make reference to 'Euripides' tendency to repeat his own phraseology in similar *loci*' and to quote two phrases from the same sort of context in *I.T.*<sup>74</sup> or to assert that Attic tragedy uses the same expressions whenever writing is mentioned.<sup>75</sup> The resemblance condemns the *I.A.* passage when one realizes with Fraenkel that the writer of this portion of the trimeters at least has the anapaests in mind. The natural inference is that the man who wrote 112 f. has borrowed the phraseology of *I.T.* 760 f. to effect a link between trimeters and anapaests. To defend the passage one must show that Fraenkel was wrong in asserting that the motivation provided in 112 f. for the reading of the letter compares most unfavourably with the corresponding motivation for the reading of the letter in *I.T.*<sup>76</sup> This no one has succeeded in doing.<sup>77</sup>

There are fewer objections that can be raised against the rest of the prologue, but suspicion must attach to 71 ff. :

ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν ὁ τὰς θεὰς  
 κρῶν ὄδ', ὥς ὁ μῦθος ἀνθρώπων ἔχει,<sup>78</sup>  
 Λακεδαῖμον', ἀνθηρὸς μὲν εἰμάτων στολῇ  
 χρυσῷ τε λαμπρὸς, βαρβάρῳ χιλιδήματι

<sup>73</sup> Markland suggested ἀμφὶ for ἀντί in 105. Vitelli elegantly rewrote 107 f.:

Κάλχας Ὀδυσσεὺς Μενέλεως ἐγὼ θ'  
 ἃ δ' οὐ  
 καλῶς τότε, αὐθις μεταγράψω καλῶς  
 πάλιν.

See John Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica*, p. 209 (Murray's error in reporting Vitelli probably stems from using the report of his conjecture in England's apparatus).

<sup>74</sup> So Willink who follows Herwerden in deleting 105 and treating 106 as a parenthesis. It is hard to have to wait so long for a subject for εἶχον and even harder in this context to take εἶχον as third person.

<sup>75</sup> So Knox, p. 255.

<sup>76</sup> As Fraenkel says: 'von einer solchen sinnvollen Motivierung as *I.T.* 760 ff. und

*I.A.* 117 ff. ist aber an den entsprechenden Stelle des Trimeterprologs 112 f., nicht das geringste zuspüren.'

<sup>77</sup> Knox's statement 'no motive is stated but one leaps to mind' (256) condemns itself.

<sup>78</sup> Apart from grounds of palaeographical probability ('I have adopted both Clement's readings, the former on its merits, the latter because the change from *Αργ.* to *ανθρ.* is much more likely to have been made by inadvertence than the opposite change' England) I do not know what it is that makes editors prefer the reading *Ἀργείων* found in Clement (Clem. Al. *Paed.* iii.2 Stählin i. p.243) to LP's *ἀνθρώπων*. Why should the *Argives* allege that Paris judged (or was a habitual judge

Here we must note the remarkable use of ὅδε in 72, remarkable not because Paris is not physically present at the time,<sup>79</sup> but because the pronoun is used in an expression *introducing* a mention of him. In such a context one expects οὗτος.<sup>80</sup> Secondly, as Fraenkel observes, in the context of a prologue speech such an emotional expression of scorn as is contained in these lines is unique. Prologue speakers in Euripides, especially those in his later plays are emotionally restrained. They may permit themselves the odd commiseratory or deprecatory adjective: they never go as far as this.<sup>81</sup> This on its own would not be sufficient to cast doubt on the lines, but the strong resemblance between this passage and *Tro.* 991 f. where the emotion is entirely in place and not at all surprising is conclusive proof that the man who wrote these lines was someone familiar with Euripides, but not the poet himself.

## V

It seems to me that we have enough evidence to show that the trimeters are not Euripidean,<sup>82</sup> and good grounds for at least hesitating as regards the authenticity of the anapaests.<sup>83</sup> There can be no doubt that in part at least the trimeters depend upon them (105 ff. ~ 35 ff. and possibly also *τλῆναι δευά* in 98 ~ *δευά γ' ἐτόλμας* in 133 – cf. also 303). If genuine they would be a new venture for Euripides and one might expect them to contain phenomena that were hard to parallel.

The assumption that Euripides did not write a prologue at all is an attractive one,<sup>84</sup> but I do not see that on present evidence we shall ever know how the

of) divine beauty contests? If anything it should be *μῦθος* 'Ἰδαίων. *ὥς μῦθος ἀνθρώπων ἔχει* 'as people say', 'as is said' is protected by *ὥς μὲν ἀνθρώπων λόγος* Cratinus fr. 228 Kock, *ἀνθρώπων ὥς μῦθος* Theocritus 15.107, *ὥς φάτις ἄνδρων* Soph. *Ant.* 829, *αἰνός τις ἀνθρώπων* Archilochos fr. 174 West, *ὥς μεμύθηται βρότοις* Eur. *Ion* 265 (cf. also *βρότοι . . . φασίν* Eur. *Ba.* 295).

<sup>79</sup> See H. Lloyd-Jones, *CR* N.S. 15 (1965), 242.

<sup>80</sup> As e.g. at Soph. *El.* 301 and Soph. *O. T.* 1452. See Kühner-Gerth 2.645 and Dover, *Aristophanes Clouds*, p. 104.

<sup>81</sup> Fraenkel calls it 'völlig gegen den Stil einer euripideischen Prologerzählung'. Perhaps the nearest analogy would be found in the pathetic way in which Polydorus' ghost (Eur. *Hek.* 28 ff.) draws attention to his fate:

*κεῖμαι δ' ἐπ' ἀκταῖς, ἄλλοις ἐν πόντου σάλωι πολλοῖς διαύλοις κυμάτων φορούμενος ἄκλιντος ἄταφος . . .*

(on privative dicola see Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 412).

<sup>82</sup> I am not sure that we can decide whether we have two people at work in the composition of them, the composer of an alternative trimeter prologue and a man who composed 105 ff. as a link with the anapaests, or whether all the trimeters are attributable to a single interpolator.

<sup>83</sup> For other problems in the anapaests

see Page, pp. 131–6. I feel some misgivings about 141–63 and suspect they may have been a later edition. The old man is told to be on his way in 140 and indicates that he is leaving *σπεύδω, βασιλεῦ* yet he is rather pointlessly detained while Agamemnon gives him further hypothetical instructions. As well as the feeble *gnome* 161 ff. the passage contains a description of dawn in 156 ff. whose close resemblance to *Ion* 82 ff. may not be accidental.

<sup>84</sup> So Diggle, *CR* N.S. 21 (1971), 180. Webster, op. cit., argues that the degree of resolution in the trimeters supports Euripidean authorship (on my count there are only 16 resolved *longa* in 65 lines as against 26 in 63 lines of the prologue of the contemporaneously produced *Bakchai* – more significant, however, might be the presence of *ξυναμυνεῖν* before the penthemimeral caesura in 62 on which see Zieliński, op. cit., p. 195, and Dale's *Helen* commentary, p. xxvii.). This is not conclusive since, although some later tragedians, e.g. the author of *Rhesos*, Moschion, and the Pleiad attempted to go against the Euripidean tide of resolution, there are plenty of fourth-century dramatists who show the same tendencies as Euripides (see C.F. Müller, *De pedibus solutis in tragicorum minorum trimetris iambicis* (Kiel, 1879), 20 f. and C. Collard, *JHS* 90 (1970), 30).



play began when it was first produced.<sup>85</sup> What does seem certain, however, is that what we have in LP is a blend of two different prologue schemes. That certainty is at least something to be grateful for. It may be that in the future someone will come upon a criterion by which the question may be settled. In the meantime let us stick to well-worn paths and not propound new theories and multiply pseudo-parallels in order to defend an indefensible paradosis.

*University of Manchester*

DAVID BAIN

<sup>85</sup> The suggestion that Euripides wrote another prologue which has since disappeared need not detain us here. The lines quoted by Aelian do not come from a prologue (see Page, p. 200) and if genuine they must have formed part of an alternative exodos. As they stand they are either non-Euripidean or corrupt. It remains a possibility that

Euripides did not intend there to be a scene between Agamemnon and the old man before the parodos. We do not need to have *seen* the old man to make sense of his entrance at 303 ff. If we had been *told* about him and the letter he was carrying, there is no problem, the situation becoming completely clear by 314 f.