Classical Quarterly **38** (i) 98–115 (1988) *Printed in Great Britain*

PELOPID HISTORY AND THE PLOT OF *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS**

The plot of *Iphigenia in Tauris* is usually thought to be Euripides' own invention. Its basic assumption can be found in Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*, viz. that a deer was substituted for Iphigenia during the sacrifice at Aulis and that she herself was removed to the land of the Tauri. Her later rescue by Orestes and Pylades, however, cannot be traced with probability to any work of art or literature earlier than Euripides' play.[1] In this play, in which Orestes recognizes and then saves the sister whom he had long thought dead, it is assumed that her replacement by a deer went unseen by those present at the sacrifice.[2] The sequel which this assumption allowed Euripides to invent (if it was he who invented it) is original only in a limited sense, since it bears the imprint of several familiar story types. These types include the following: (1) the murder of a kinsman is narrowly averted by a recognition; (2) a reunion is followed by an intrigue; and (3) a maiden is rescued. Each is used elsewhere by Euripides. The first two, for example, are found in *Cresphontes*, the second in *Electra*, and the third in *Andromeda*.[3] Correspondences of this sort, based on plot

* This paper in an early form was the subject of a public seminar given at the University of Toronto in October, 1975.

[1] See Proclus, *EGF*, p. 19. Anne P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* (Oxford, 1971), p. 73, distrusts this attribution to the *Cypria* of a reference to the Taurians; but in any case by the time of Herodotus (4.103) these had already come to identify their goddess as Iphigenia, the daughter of Agamemnon. In both [Hesiod] (Merkelbach–West 23a, 23b) and Stesichorus (*PMG* 215) Iphigenia (or Iphimede) is saved by Artemis and deified as Hecate. A summary of views expressed before 1939 about the originality of the plot of *I.T.* can be found in A. Lesky, s.v. 'Orestes', *RE* xviii.1, 997ff. Discussion has centred on the content of Sophocles' *Chryses* and its date relative to that of *I.T.* Some would use as evidence for Sophocles' plot the story in Hyginus 120 (*ad fin.*) and 121, which takes the form of a sequel to the rescue of Iphigenia by Orestes. That assumption, if combined with the likelihood that *Chryses* antedated *I.T.*, constitutes an argument that Sophocles knew a lost earlier version of the rescue. But the derivation of Hyginus' story from Sophocles' plot is very questionable, and even the relative dating of *Chryses* and *I.T.* is not quite beyond doubt. On the first issue contrast U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, 'Die beiden Elektren', *Hermes* 18 (1883), 257–8, with Dana F. Sutton, *The Lost Sophocles* (Lanham, New York and London, 1984), pp. 29–31; on the second, see schol. Aristophanes' *Birds* 1240 (which implies that *Chryses* antedated 414) and A. M. Dale, *Eur., Helen* (Oxford, 1967), p. xxviii (where 414 is chosen on metrical grounds as 'the most likely date' for *I.T.*). For further evidence on the date of *I.T.* see n. 20, infra. H. Grégoire, who believes that *Chryses* was earlier than *I.T.* and that its plot followed the lines of Hyginus 120–1, also maintains that the rescue of Iphigenia was originally a local legend of Halae and Brauron which both Sophocles and Euripides adapted to the stage (ed. *I.T.* [Paris, 1948], pp. 96–9). His argument arises out of *I.T.* 1449ff. but seems otherwise largely speculative.

[2] See *I.T.* 176–7, which must imply a divinely inspired delusion. A similar version of the sacrifice is put in more explicit terms in Euripides, fr. 857 (*TGF*²), from the lost genuine end of *I.A.* See also A. O. Hulton, 'Euripides and the Iphigenia Legend', *Mnem.* 15 (1962), 364–8. [Hesiod] fr. 23a.21 (Merkelbach–West) speaks of an εἴδωλον.

[3] Cf. T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London, 1967), pp. 136–43, 192–9, 186; Burnett (supra, n. 1), p. 74. Other examples of the first type are Euripides' *Ion* and Sophocles' *Mysians* (if, as commonly assumed, the plot of the latter is reflected in Hyginus, *Fab.* 100); of the second, *Choephori*. Though Euripides' *Andromeda* (a play of 412 B.C.) is probably later than *I.T.*, the story is found earlier, as on the three vase-paintings of 450–440 B.C. reproduced in A. D. Trendall, T. B. L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London, 1971), pp. 63–4, and attributed there to Sophocles' *Andromeda*. Cf. Webster, *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play*², *BICS* Suppl. 20 (London, 1967), p. 147. The plot of *Helen* offers very close analogies to that of *I.T.*, but *Helen* is most probably the later play. See infra, n. 43.

patterns, will naturally gain in interest if it can be shown that they throw light on a play's meaning or on the process that led to its creation. The student of dramatic plots, however, soon discovers that analogies between them are easy to draw and can be quickly multiplied. It is much harder to decide which analogies are genuinely enlightening. This study addresses that question as it applies to *I.T.* and suggests certain criteria which may help to answer it for other plays as well.

The recurrence of patterns in tragic plots has been extensively discussed in recent decades, and it is now well understood how readily plots and their components can be classified and parallels drawn between them. Richmond Lattimore deals with this subject in a broad but enlightening way in a book which takes all of tragedy (and much else) for its subject. He shows that, since stories tend to crystallize in certain forms, these forms are encountered again and again in drama. T. B. L. Webster, in reviewing the evidence for Euripides' lost plays, also calls attention to recurrent plot elements but speaks as if these repetitions were the result of rapid composition and the pressure of time. Anne Burnett, in contrast, tabulates patterns in order to dwell on their variations, since she is convinced that Euripides' art lay partly in manipulating the educated expectations of an audience familiar with all the standard plot forms. She illustrates this theory by analysing seven Euripidean plays, one of which is *I.T.*, as combinatory adaptations of a limited set of six matrix plots. These three scholars write in English, but important work on plot forms had appeared earlier in German in such publications as Strohm's book on Euripides.[4] It is sometimes alleged against such studies that they tend to confuse the tabulated results of scholarly analysis and generalization with the creative thoughts of poets and, at their worst, reduce the art of tragedy to the management of abstractions; furthermore, that these classifications too readily generate dubious norms of critical judgement.[5] There is some truth in these charges. For all that, the practice of speaking of the tragic art in this way is well established; it is at least as old as Aristotle, who divides plots into the simple and the complex (which are said to be better), and whose other listings of typical plots and plot elements include a catalogue of recognition types in which

[4] Richmond Lattimore, *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy* (Ann Arbor, 1964); Webster (supra, n. 3), p. 12; Burnett (supra, n. 1), pp. 1–17; Hans Strohm, *Euripides: Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form* (Munich, 1957). Burnett's study of *Bacchae* ('Pentheus and Dionysus: Host and Guest', *CP* 65 [1970], 15–29) is also based on a typology of plots of divine punishment. Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Berlin, 1917), had done much to turn attention to plot construction. His influence is acknowledged by W. H. Friedrich (*Euripides und Diphilos* [Munich, 1953], p. 6), who believes that primary and secondary treatments of an action can be distinguished and the former sometimes deduced from the latter. But in treating the latter as 'counterpoints to lost melodies' (6) he is still in each case comparing dramatized versions of a single myth. See, however, his comments on Euripides' repeated use of plots based on catastrophe averted (59–60), a theme later re-examined by Burnett. The focus turns more clearly to general patterns in Walther Ludwig's Tübingen dissertation, *Sapheneia, Ein Beitrag zur Formkunst im Spätwerk des Euripides* (1954), and in Hans Strohm's book. Though Strohm was critical of Ludwig's methods (*Gnomon* 29 [1957], 494–8), the two have much in common. Both, for example, argue that Euripides varies his patterns and adapts them skilfully to the needs of each play. Earlier, F. Solmsen had combined the analysis of plot elements with reflections on Euripidean themes in his studies of *ἀναγνώρισις* and *μηχάνημα* in several of that author's plays ('Zur Gestaltung des Intriguenmotivs in den Tragödien des Sophokles und Euripides', *Philologus* 87 = N.F. 41 [1931–2], 1–17; 'Euripides' Ion im Vergleich mit anderen Tragödien', *Hermes* 69 [1934], 390–419).

[5] See the review of Strohm's book (supra, n. 4) by P. T. Stevens in *CR* 9 (1959), 115–17 and B. M. W. Knox's criticisms of Burnett's book (supra, n.1) in his otherwise generally favourable appraisal in 'New Perspectives in Euripidean Criticism', *CP* 67 (1972), 277.

these too are ranked by merit. Even he has not escaped the charge that his exercises in classification were 'slightly artificial'.[6]

Whatever criticisms may be made against their excesses, these studies have undeniably advanced our understanding of traditional plot forms and shown to what degree tragic poets in the act of creation were constrained by precedent. But the kind and degree of attention that an audience was expected to pay to these recurrent forms is another matter. On this point Burnett at least has probably gone too far. She assumes that the typical spectator of a new tragedy was a man enthralled by its interplay of structural commonplace and constantly mindful of the formal precedents being followed or broken in the development of its plot.[7] In questioning this view I do not mean to deny that audiences were often aware of broad similarities between stories and poets ready to turn this fact to account. Tragedy may sometimes appeal to this awareness by its use of generalizations: ὁ μέγας ὄλβος οὐ μόνιμος ἐν βροτοῖς (Eur. *Or.* 340); πάθει μάθος (Aesch. *Ag.* 177); δράσαντα παθεῖν (Aesch. *Cho.* 313); ἀναγκάσαι θεοὺς | ἂν μὴ θέλωσιν οὐδ' ἂν εἷς δύναιτ' ἀνήρ (Soph. *O.T.* 280–1). Each of these comments links the story of its play to human experience but may also be thought of as calling to mind a large class of similar stories. Such generalizations as occur, however, tend to carry an ethical or religious point, and the sum of them would not match very well the lists of plot types developed by modern scholars. This is to be expected: not every plot follows the lines of a maxim. Aside from examples like these, we should be wary of assuming that poets and audiences were preoccupied with general patterns or 'norms' of tragic action or that an awareness of deviations from these norms could have been a central element governing anyone's reaction to a play. The Greeks understood well enough that almost nothing in myth is unprecedented, but the most striking evidence for this in the plays is neither commonplace patterns nor general statements but the large number of passages where the legend being dramatized is compared with some other specific legend.[8] In these

[6] D. W. Lucas, *Aristotle, Poetics* (Oxford, 1968), p. 294; cf. 186. See *Poetics* 1452a12ff., 1452b30–32, 1454b19–1455a21.

[7] See Burnett (supra, n. 1), p. 16, where the poet is said to 'arouse [in the audience] the combined memories of all the other tragedies of his chosen type and then transcend them with variations...'. It is likely enough, as she claims, that spectators of tragedy drew from their general experience of plots some expectations which helped to guide their reactions and laid them open to surprise. She has aptly compared such regularities of plot to rules of metre (pp. vii–viii). But the spectator she envisages on pp. 15–16 of her book seems at the least implausibly attentive to the mere prosody of tragic plots (to use her own figure) and unduly preoccupied with their formal irregularities. Observation of the latter, it appears, can be 'deeply disturbing' to him (16), and the disappointment of his trained expectations will teach him that he is not 'omniscient' (15). There may be an overstated point in this, but it is as if one were to describe the audience's reaction to a tirade of Pentheus as a series of responses to its deviations from metrical norms. The difference is that in metre the standard rhythms, against which deviant examples can be measured, are not in short supply, whereas in Burnett's theory of tragic action every real play is a variant and the norms merely deductions. Moreover, those humdrum plots that followed these norms most closely (and so might have provided us with the best evidence of their grip upon the imaginations of spectators) were the least likely to survive (16). All this seems an insecure basis on which to build a theory of audience expectations. Suspense and surprise were undoubtedly features of tragedy, but there is clearer evidence of another way of producing these, viz. the invention *ad hoc* of misleading detail. Friedrich (supra, n. 4), pp. 150–3, has shown how Sophocles toys with the audience in his *Electra*, but not with memories of well-worn patterns. More to the point here, R. Hamilton does something similar for *I.T.* itself (along with *Ion*, *Hel.*, *Alc.*) in 'Prologue, Prophecy, and Plot in Four Plays of Euripides', *AJP* 99 (1978), 283–8. (But I do not find his paraphrase of the prologue speeches in *I.T.* [p. 283] altogether accurate.)

[8] Antigone's story is like Niobe's (Soph. *Ant.* 824–33); Cassandra's like Procne's (Aesch. *Ag.* 1140–5); Medea's like Ino's (Eur. *Med.* 1282–92); Leda's like Callisto's, but – alas for Leda –

passages what occupies the foreground and engages the attention is the concrete detail of the counterpart legend itself. These mythological paradigms or *exempla* may fill an entire stasimon or a mere single line of dialogue and may refer to the whole action of a play or a passing moment. Their use in tragedy is an inheritance from earlier poetry, where meaning is often clarified or emotion heightened through the well-known names and incidents of some legend not itself the main subject of a poem. Beyond these familiar facts, two less obvious points about *exempla* deserve particular notice. (1) Although in tragedy they are often linked to their contexts by some expression of comparison, at times there is no such link and their function as paradigms must be inferred. The latter is also true of some Pindaric myths used as *exempla*, if common interpretations of these are valid.[9] (2) Although any analogy between a dramatized story and another legend will be based on similarity of form and will to that extent appeal to an awareness of pattern, the other legend may be chosen for its particular associations as much as for the general features which the two happen to share with many others. Whenever this is true, the relation of greatest interest will be one that joins specific legends, and the shared story pattern will be no more than one aspect of it.

This paper is meant to illustrate these last two points. It is a study of *I.T.* which finds analogies between its story and two other legends mentioned prominently in the play, the courtship of Pelops and Hippodameia and the sacrifice at Aulis. It will argue that the poet perceived a special relation between these legends and the action of his play and found means to convey this to the audience. In each case the relation is made perceptible through a shared pattern of action, but its affective power derives primarily from the blood tie which unites the principal agents of all three legends. Pattern repetition in this case is therefore the formal aspect of family history repeating itself, a subject of undeniable interest to fifth-century tragic poets.[10] Since Euripides

not nearly enough like it (Eur. *Hel.* 375–80). Agamemnon's story begins like that of Amphiaraus, but Electra doubts (wrongly) that it will follow the same course (Soph. *El.* 837ff.). Clusters of myths, each similar in some way to the story being dramatized, occur at Aesch. *Cho.* 585–651 and Soph. *Ant.* 944–87. Analogies may also exist between the parts of a complex legend; a trilogy will offer opportunities for exploiting these. See A. Lesky's discussion of *Oresteia* in *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*[3] (Göttingen, 1972), pp. 123–4. A precedent for the sustained presence of a background myth exists in the *Odyssey*, where the story unfolds against the analogies and contrasts of the Orestes legend (see esp. 1.298ff., 3.193ff. and 303ff., 11.405ff., 24.191ff.; also 1.35ff., 3.247ff., 4.521ff.). Bruno Snell speculates on the roots of the mythical paradigm in *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*[4] (Göttingen, 1975), pp. 188–91, and offers other Homeric examples. Eight Iliadic examples are discussed by M. M. Willcock in 'Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 14 (1964), 141–54. His intention is to show that in each case the paradigm is either wholly invented or freely adapted to its context. An inventory of examples from many authors, with analyses, can be found in R. Oehler, *Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (Aarau, 1925). H. Friis Johansen, *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis* (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 50–3, discusses the connection in tragedy between mythological *exempla* and the expression of general rules and notes some important distinctions.

[9] Oehler (supra, n. 8), pp. 87–9 cites Eur. *Hipp.* 525–64 as an example of an implicitly paradigmatic passage. Another, not cited, is Eur. *El.* 458–60, a reference to Perseus λαιμοτόμαν linked by no expression of comparison to the cutting of Clytemnestra's throat, which the chorus foresee in the last lines of this ode. But the paradigm was already familiar from Aesch. *Cho.* 831–7, a play much on Euripides' mind in composing his *El.* (see *El.* 520–46) and one which H.-J. Newiger thinks may have been revived a few years earlier ('Elektra in Aristophanes' Wolken', *Hermes* 89 [1961], 422–30). Its presence is also consistent with other passages in *El.* itself, e.g. 1218–23. See my discussion in *AJP* 85 (1964), 13–39. C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 278–316, esp. 298, 304–7, discusses the uses of myth in that author, including that of serving as implicit example.

[10] Bloody violence recurring in a family is the commonest form of this theme. See Aesch. *Cho.* 1065–76, Soph. *Ant.* 594–8, Eur. *Or.* 816–18. Cf. Ismene's chronicle of the Labdacids at

may actually have invented the story of Iphigenia's rescue, these related legends may also be the story's models. If that is so, his new sequel to Atreid history is fully organic. That assumption, however, will not be essential to the argument. It will be enough to show that these legends are present in *I.T.* as paradigms of the action, helping to colour and define it and foreshadowing its outcome.[11] As I have argued elsewhere, Euripides made a similar use of the Tantalus myth in *Orestes*;[12] therefore the technique displayed in *I.T.* is no isolated example.

Pelops' marriage contest is expressly referred to twice in *I.T.*, at the start of Iphigenia's first speech and at the climactic moment when she recognizes Orestes. The first of these passages, which is also the beginning of the play, reads:

> *Πέλοψ ὁ Ταντάλειος εἰς Πίσαν μολὼν*
> *θοαῖσιν ἵπποις Οἰνομάου γαμεῖ κόρην,*
> *ἐξ ἧς Ἀτρεὺς ἔβλαστεν· Ἀτρέως δὲ παῖς*
> *Μενέλαος Ἀγαμέμνων τε· τοῦ δ' ἔφυν ἐγώ....*[13]

For some reason, out of the long and complicated legend of the house of Atreus, Euripides has chosen to put at the beginning of his play an allusion to Pelops' successful contest with Oenomaus and his marriage to Hippodameia. The career of Tantalus is left out; he is mentioned only as Pelops' father. The gap in generations between Pelops and Iphigenia herself is bridged in steps as economical as the iambic metre allows. The family history is therefore effectively compressed into two events, the victory of Pelops and the sacrifice at Aulis. The latter will be narrated at length in the passage immediately following. Its great prominence in Iphigenia's opening speech requires no explanation, but it is not immediately apparent why she begins her speech, and the play, with Pelops.[14]

Ant. 49–60, where the flow of repetitive circumstance is expressed in a verbal pattern (*αὐτοφώρων...αὐτουργῷ...αὐτοκτονοῦντε...διπλᾶς...διπλοῦν...δύο*). For examples from Euripides see n. 48 infra.

[11] Other paradigms for the plot of *I.T.* are sometimes proposed. Burnett (supra, n. 1), in discussing the genesis of the story of Iphigenia's rescue, speaks of the innovating poet (who may well be Euripides, she says) as having seen 'the relevance of the Andromeda pattern' (74). But Andromeda is here a starting point for composition rather than, it appears, an element in the finished play; in any case, her name may be intended simply as the label for a plot type rather than as an image in the ruminating poet's mind. On the other hand, R. Caldwell, 'Tragedy Romanticized: the *Iphigenia Taurica*', *CJ* 70.2 (1974), 23–40, protests against Burnett's derivation of the play from a repertory of 'abstract hypothetical plots' (25) and argues for a single, concrete model, the *Oresteia* (25ff., 32). But his scheme of correspondences is too complex to be credible: plots must be truncated in order to match each other, and characters must undergo multiple cross-identifications (e.g. Iphigenia of *I.T.* has four counterparts in *Oresteia* [30]). He also thinks that one cannot and need not prove that Euripides or his audience was conscious of all this (24, 34).

[12] Forthcoming in *RhM*. In *Or.* what is foreshadowed does not include the final rescue.

[13] Quotations from *I.T.* conform to the text of J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1981).

[14] One view is that it is a mere genealogical 'hors d'oeuvre' (L. Méridier, *Le Prologue dans la tragédie d'Euripide* [Bordeaux, 1911], p. 58). Euripides often begins a play with a genealogical excursus, as in the seven extant and four lost plays cited by Méridier on pp. 54–5. These passages, like other elements of his prologue technique, have often been criticized. See the history of scholarly opinion in H. Erbse, *Studien zum Prolog der euripideischen Tragödie* (Berlin and New York, 1984), pp. 1–19 and the censorious views assembled by Max Treu in 'Wohl dem, der seiner Väter gern gedenkt', *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), 437–8. A limited relevance is sometimes conceded to *I.T.* 1–2; but it is not enough to say, as Grégoire (supra, n. 1) does in his note to line 1, that the later reference to Pelops during the recognition (823ff.) justifies the earlier one in the prologue. Why is the recognition made to hinge upon this reference? Cf. Erbse, p. 194, where the connection of 1–2 with 823ff. is also made. The question is treated at some length by

At the beginning of the second episode, Orestes is brought into Iphigenia's presence, and after a long dialogue he realizes her identity. His identity, in turn, is revealed by Pylades, who addresses him by name in her presence at line 792; but 35 lines will pass before she accepts the fact that this is her brother. He first calls her 'dearest sister' (795) and attempts to embrace her. When the chorus (or Iphigenia herself, according to Monk's reattribution) rebukes him and she turns away, he invokes the name of Agamemnon (801). Another expression of disbelief follows. But by line 806 her interest seems aroused:

ΙΦ. ἀλλ' ἡ Λάκαινα Τυνδαρίς σ' ἐγείνατο;
ΟΡ. Πέλοπός γε παιδὶ παιδός, οὗ 'κπέφυκ' ἐγώ.

His way of affirming his identity, as Pelops' descendant, is worth noting, though it cannot carry much weight by itself. Iphigenia now asks for evidence to support this claim. His reply, given in dialogue, is measured and orderly and designed to lead to a climax. First, what he has heard from Electra: that Atreus and Thyestes quarrelled over the golden lamb, and Iphigenia once wove this story on a tapestry; that the sun changed course, and she wove this too; that her mother gave her bathing water in preparation for what was supposed to be her marriage at Aulis; that before she was to be sacrificed she gave her mother locks of her hair as a relic. So much Orestes had from hearsay. He has kept till last what he saw with his own eyes:

Πέλοπος παλαιὰν ἐν δόμοις λόγχην πατρός,
ἣν χερσὶ πάλλων παρθένον Πισάτιδα
ἐκτήσαθ' Ἱπποδάμειαν, Οἰνόμαον κτανών,
ἐν παρθενῶσι τοῖσι σοῖς κεκρυμμένην (823–6)

This mention of the spear of Pelops, which Orestes saw hidden in Iphigenia's chamber, accomplishes the recognition and breaks down her reserve.

These lines mark the end of an unusually prolonged and suspenseful recognition-scene and receive much emphasis from their position. Once again, as at the beginning of the play, what is said in 811–26 constitutes a selective review of family history: the quarrel of the brothers and the consequent reversal of the sun's course, the sacrifice at Aulis, and Pelops' victory. All three involve memories personal to Iphigenia, but in the first case and the last this connection is established by contrivance (the tapestry, the hidden spear). Why did Euripides choose these three episodes? It is the beginning of an answer to observe that only the third is a happy memory. The recognition, itself a triumphant moment in the stage action, is achieved through the memory of an ancestral victory. The other memories, all bitter, serve as preamble and contrast. They end with a line and a word designed to stand in the sharpest emotional opposition to what follows: μνημεῖά γ' ἀντὶ σώματος τοὐμοῦ τάφῳ (821).

Even this partial explanation of 811–26, which speaks only of the emotional development of the lines, involves difficulties. In most accounts, the outcome of Pelops' contest with Oenomaus was not an unreserved triumph. At *Orestes* 988ff. and 1548 a version is assumed in which Pelops won with the help of Myrtilus, Oenomaus' charioteer; his help is explained in other sources as the removal of the linch-pins of his master's chariot, which caused it to crash. Pelops later killed Myrtilus, and his

Treu. He thinks Iphigenia's thoughts go out to Pelops as the founder of the house in Greece; lines 1–2 express her longing for home and family (pp. 443–5). But this way of looking at Pelops is never brought out in the text. That being so, his foreign origin gives him a very uncertain value in the thoughts of an Iphigenia supposedly concentrating on her ties to Greece. In the diatribe of Teucer at Soph. *Ajax* 1292 Pelops is called a barbarian, and in art he wears a Phrygian costume (see L. Séchan, *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique* [Paris, 1926], pp. 316, 460). For Sansone's view see n. 19 infra.

dying curse became the source of endless troubles in the house. For this reason, at Sophocles' *Electra* 505 Pelops' ride is called 'a source of many sorrows'. But at least one notable literary version of the legend before Euripides, that of Pindar's *Olympian I*, left out Myrtilus and allowed Pelops to win with the help of winged horses provided by Poseidon. The presence of different versions in the tradition means that care is needed in deciding whether Myrtilus' trick and his later curse are meant to be assumed in *I.T.*[15] The matter cannot be decided by saying that in the late fifth century they had become part of the standard version of the legend and could be presumed even when not explicitly mentioned. In a recent article, T. C. W. Stinton has discussed several tragedies in each of which important features of some legend in its standard version are purposefully ignored.[16] He shows that suppression of such detail is one aspect of an author's freedom to adapt myth. Moreover, it hardly needs argument to say of the author of *Helen* that he was not bound to treat his myths consistently from play to play. We cannot simply fill in *I.T.* 823–6 with details drawn from *Orestes* 988ff. In Murray's Oxford text of *I.T.* the evidence on this point was blurred by a conjecture printed *exempli causa* in a corrupt choral passage at 192–3, one which

[15] The legend is narrated at length in Apollodorus, *Epit.* 2.3–9. The early stages of its development are far from clear; the main question is whether Myrtilus' betrayal of Oenomaus is an accretion to the original myth. On the Chest of Cypselus, as described by Pausanias (5.17.7), Pelops drives winged horses, but Myrtilus is not said to be present. M.-L. Säflund, *The East Pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia* (Göteborg, 1970), p.120, says that even on the Chest Oenomaus 'can hardly do without a charioteer'. Even if this is granted, the latter is presumably one of the unnamed figures (Paus. 5.17.6 implies that there are some) and so will not have been thought of by the artist as playing the important role of the betrayer. Pherecydes mentions both Myrtilus and winged horses (*FGrHist* 3 F 37). On the Olympia pediment the horses are not winged, and it is unclear whether Myrtilus is there. Säflund, pp. 118–21, believes she has identified him as the third figure from the left (C), but her book also documents the lack of consensus on this point (pp. 11–59). There are various ways of sorting out this evidence. J. Kakridis, 'Des Pelops und Iamos Gebet bei Pindar', *Hermes* 63 (1928), 415–29 = W. M. Calder III, J. Stern, *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (Darmstadt, 1970), pp. 159–74, argues that the winged horses belong to the original version, perhaps as a gift of some other god than Poseidon; Myrtilus belongs to a later version, where his trickery displaces the winged horses as the means of Pelops' victory; Pindar introduces the motif of Poseidon's love and excludes Myrtilus (159–67). See also his 'Die Pelopssage bei Pindar', *Philologus* 85 (1930), 463–77 = Calder/Stern, *Pindaros*, pp. 175–90. More recent discussions are those of W. M. Calder III, 'Sophocles, Oinomaos and the East Pediment at Olympia', *Philologus* 118 (1974), 203–14, esp. 205, 211; A. Köhnken, 'Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops Story in Olympian 1', *CQ* 24 (1974), 199–206; D. E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One: a Commentary* (Toronto, 1982), pp. 134–6; and C. W. Willink, *Orestes* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 248–50. For the vase-paintings see L. Séchan (supra, n. 14), pp. 447–66; and T. B. L. Webster, *Monuments* (supra, n. 3), pp. 150, 161–2. In dealing with allusive poetic versions of the myth it is sometimes forgotten that missing elements may be absent because they have been suppressed (see the article by Stinton cited infra, n. 16). In this way Myrtilus is often wrongly introduced into discussions of *I.T.* E.g. for Burnett (supra, n. 1), p. 64, the spear of Pelops, for all its heroic connotations, is a 'symbol of the family's first crime', viz. the 'removal of a lower class accomplice'. Cf. C. Whitman, *Euripides and the Full Circle of Myth* (Cambridge, MA, 1974), p. 23: 'Pelops won by cheating and thus brought down the original curse on the family'. See also B. Vickers, *Towards Greek Tragedy* (London, 1973), pp. 298–300.

[16] T. C. W. Stinton, 'The Scope and Limits of Allusion in Greek Tragedy', *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy, Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher* (Calgary, 1986), 67–102. See especially p. 74, with its enlightening distinction between the basic schema of a legend, the current standard version, and mere trivial detail. Stinton's argument, mainly concerned with Sophocles' treatment of the central myths in *Ant.*, *O.T.*, *El.* and *Trach.*, extends as well to the use of *exempla* in tragedy. Of these he says: 'An *exemplum* is geared to its specific paradigmatic function' (81), a point relevant to the use of the Pelops story in *I.T.* O. Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action* (London, 1978), pp. 162–4, also insists on the dramatist's freedom to select, invent, and suppress details of myth. He concludes that 'what is not alluded to does not, within the play, exist' (p. 164).

introduced the killing of Myrtilus to the text.[17] But Myrtilus is not otherwise to be found in the play; nor can any claim be made that he is required in order to explain how Oenomaus died. In accounts in which Oenomaus is killed in the crash of his chariot, Myrtilus is the agent of his death and to that extent indispensable. But at *I.T.* 825, as at Pindar, *O.* 1.88, Pelops is named as the one who kills him; in neither version is Myrtilus mentioned, and in neither can his presence be assumed.[18] If he is absent from *I.T.*, then so is his curse, and the contest for the hand of Hippodameia need not be judged, in Sophocles' phrase, a πολύπονος ἱππεία (*El.* 505). The troubles in the house may be thought of as beginning later, with the quarrel of Atreus and Thyestes, mentioned in the corrupt passage at 193–7 and again at 812ff. The career of Pelops himself will figure only as an example of good fortune. To say that much helps to justify an allusion to it in the very limited context of this moment of recognition, where good fortune again prevails.

Its appearance at the beginning of the play, however, as the point of departure for family history, may mean that it has a less limited relevance. To begin with what is most obvious, this play, like Euripides' summary version of the Pelops legend, ends happily.[19] A review of the basic details of the legend reveals further analogies. The conditions imposed by Oenomaus upon anyone wishing to marry Hippodameia were that the suitor and his intended bride should ride off in a chariot, while Oenomaus, armed with a spear, rode in pursuit. Pelops won where others had lost and paid with their lives. Even in its barest outline, the legend implies a cruel Oenomaus. By the fifth century, he was being portrayed as a savage who cut off and exhibited the heads of unsuccessful suitors. This practice was attributed to him in Sophocles' *Oenomaus*, thought by some to have been an early production. One of the few fragments from

[17] δινευούσαις ἵπποισι ⟨ῥιφαὶ Πέλοπος⟩ παναΐς (G. Murray, *Eurip. Fab.* ii[3] [Oxford, 1913]). The horses, however, probably belong not to Pelops but to the sun, a view taken by several editors, including E. B. England (London, 1886), M. Platnauer (Oxford, 1938), and N. Wecklein, 3rd edn (Leipzig, 1904), *ad loc.* Both the participle and the adjective are suitable to the sun's team (cf. ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσων φλόγα at Eur. *Phoen.* 3, ἵπποις ἅμ πτεροέσσαις at Eur. *El.* 466, and πτερωτὸν...ἅρμα at Eur. *Or.* 1001–2), and the words that follow παναΐς in this corrupt and lacunose passage certainly refer to the change in the sun's course. (Murray's ῥιφαὶ is a term found in Lycophron.)

[18] Apollodorus, *Epit.* 2.7, mentions as alternative causes of Oenomaus' death: (1) that he is dragged to death while entangled in the reins; (2) that Pelops kills him. The second is unlikely to allude to a version like that of Pindar and *I.T.*, since it continues: ὃς ἐν τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν κατηράσατο τῷ Μυρτίλῳ. Probably, then, it refers to one in which Pelops kills him after Myrtilus has made his chariot crash. For examples of this in art see G. Körte, *I Rilievi delle Urne Etrusche*, ii. 1 (Rome and Berlin, 1890), pp. 109ff. and the corresponding plates, particularly V.1 and XLII.4. One cannot therefore say that line 825 by itself demonstrates the exclusion of Myrtilus from *I.T.* The sum of the play's references to Atreid history, however, leaves a heavy burden of proof on anyone who claims that he is implicitly present.

[19] Cf. D. Sansone, 'The Sacrifice-Motif in Euripides' *IT*', *TAPA* 105 (1975), 290: 'Pelops seems to have been the only member of the family...to have prospered...' as Iphigenia will in the end prosper. Sansone, however, has in mind something other than the contest with Oenomaus. He means that Pelops, like Iphigenia, was 'innocent of wrongdoing' and 'saved by the gods'; i.e. the gods (except Demeter) forbore to eat him when Tantalus served his flesh at a banquet. But in order to say this he must take 386–8 as an acceptance of this (the usual) version of the myth rather than as a denial, in the manner of Pindar, *O.* 1.52, that Pelops was ever offered as food to the gods. I see two difficulties with this theory: (1) Iphigenia clearly dismisses some version as unworthy of belief, and the existence of one more discreditable to the gods than the usual version is very uncertain (see Gerber [supra, n. 15], p. 87, and Roscher, *Lexikon* iii.2 s.v. 'Pelops', cols. 1870–1); (2) her words give no hint that she is willing to accept any version of the banquet or even knows of more than one. It is, therefore, more natural to read 386–8 as saying, with Pindar, that there was no cannibal feast from which Pelops had to be rescued. The relevant part of his legend is the marriage-contest.

that play is a reference to scalping 'in the Scythian fashion'. This is probably to be explained, in accordance with Herodotus 4.64, as an indignity like that practised by the Scythians upon the severed heads of slain enemies. In Sophocles' play, the impaled heads may have been part of the stage setting.[20] Less is known about Euripides' *Oenomaus*, the fragments of which throw little light on how the legend was handled. Hyginus 84.3 appears to summarize a tragic scene in which Pelops is so frightened by the heads of Oenomaus' victims that he regrets having come to challenge him; his source is sometimes taken to be Euripides' play.[21] Though individual authors certainly embellished the picture, the legend readily lent itself to the portrayal of Oenomaus as an ogre to be classed with several other mythical figures famous for outrages against strangers.[22] Seen in this light, Pelops' successful courtship of Hippodameia was also her rescue from cruel and savage surroundings.

Calder and Sutton, in writing about Sophocles' *Oenomaus*, have noticed that in extant tragedy the closest parallels to the vanquished ogre-king of Oenomaus' type are Thoas of *I.T.* and Theoclymenus of *Helen*. They do not connect this fact with the references to Pelops and Oenomaus in *I.T.*; but Calder, in speaking of the probable display of skulls in the prologue of Sophocles' play, calls the similar spectacle at *I.T.* 74–5 an 'imitation' of it.[23] This is a reference to Orestes' and Pylades' first sight of the temple of the Taurian Artemis and the altar stained with human blood; here Orestes immediately points out the 'spoils' (σκῦλ') attached under the cornice (74) and Pylades answers, 'Yes, first fruits of the foreigners who perished.' It seems almost certain that these words refer to a display of severed heads. This would tally with Herodotus 4.103, where the Taurians are said to sacrifice victims of shipwreck and fugitives from storms, then cut off and exhibit their heads.[24] In other ways too,

[20] As assumed by Calder, 'Sophocles...' (supra, n. 15), 206, and Sutton (supra, n. 1), p. 96. The fr. is no. 473 (*TrGF*). The evidence favouring an early date for Sophocles' play is summarized by Sutton, p. 97. It amounts to very little. Calder's article constructs a speculative case for 468. The essential point is that it antedated 414 (schol. Aristophanes, *Birds* 1337), which is Dale's preferred date for *I.T.* (supra, n. 1). Moreover, Martin Cropp and Gordon Fick, *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: the Fragmentary Tragedies*, *BICS* Suppl. 43 (London, 1985), p. 61, record three metrical criteria that favour placing *I.T.* after *Tro.*, hence after 415. According to Webster, *Monuments* (supra, n. 3), p. 150, Sophocles' *Oenomaus* begins to be reflected in vase-paintings *c.* 420. For the display of severed heads in Sophocles see fr. *473a (*TrGF*). Cf. Apollodorus, *Epit.* 2.5. On a vase illustrated by Séchan (supra, n. 14), p. 453, the severed heads of two previous suitors are affixed to the background. Séchan, p. 464, associates this painting with Euripides' play; Webster, *Monuments*, p. 150 (cf. pp. 161–2), would evidently prefer Sophocles, since it portrays an Oenomaus in his prime and 'Euripides' Oinomaos seems to have been an old man'. There is, however, no real proof that he was, though fr. 575 (*TGF*²), with context and speaker unknown, may suggest it. See also Webster's *Euripides* (supra, n. 3), p. 115.

[21] E.g. by Scherling in *RE* xvi.1, col. 1156, s.v. 'Myrtilos'. Some maintain that Euripides' *Oenomaus* was produced with *Phoenissae c.* 409. The evidence is a mutilated sentence in Aristophanes' hypothesis to the latter play. But see Lesky (supra, n. 8), p. 444. Cropp/Fick (supra, n. 20), p. 86, find the metrical evidence for dating inconclusive.

[22] These include Evenus, Antaeus, the Thracian Diomedes, and others. For the references see A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1917), fr. 473, n.; and *TrGF* iv fr. *473a, n.

[23] Calder, 'Sophocles...' (supra, n. 15), 208, 206; D. F. Sutton (supra, n. 1), p. 96.

[24] See also Ammian. Marcell. 22.8.34. Editors of *I.T.* differ on the meaning of line 74. Platnauer regards the display of heads as beyond doubt; England is less certain; and Wecklein, p. 19, thinks the σκῦλα referred to are weapons (all refs. supra, n. 17). J. C. G. Strachan, 'Iphigenia and Human Sacrifice in Euripides' *Iphigenia Taurica*', *CP* 71 (1976), 132, argues that armour is a more natural reference for the words ἀκροθίνια and σκῦλα. But at *I.T.* 459 ἀκροθίνια refers to the new victims themselves, and at Eur. *El.* 897 σκῦλον is used of a dead body and perhaps of a severed head. Eur. *Ba.* 1168ff. shows a similar taste for the horrific. Orestes' fright

Euripides represents the king of the Taurians as the ruler of a barbarous country and a man personally willing to enforce its customary abuse of strangers.[25] The parallel with Oenomaus, including the specific detail of line 74 with its probable reminiscence of Sophoclean staging, is clear. It is significant, however, only as part of a larger analogy that includes three of the play's characters. Iphigenia, like her ancestress Hippodameia, is held captive by a savage but finds a deliverer.

The name of her captor is Thoas,

> ...ὃς ὠκὺν πόδα τιθεὶς ἴσον πτεροῖς
> ἐς τοὔνομ' ἦλθε τόδε ποδωκείας χάριν (32–3)

Wilamowitz, in *Analecta Euripidea*, cited this etymology as a mere display of sophistic erudition.[26] If that is true, the charge is graver than it may seem, because Euripides, in attaching this name to Iphigenia's captor, has probably gone out of his way to create an opportunity for the etymology. If one sets aside the doubtful possibility that Sophocles' *Chryses* was both a sequel to the rescue of Iphigenia and an earlier play than *I.T.*,[27] there is no evidence that Thoas was the name of a Taurian king in legend or fact before the date of *I.T.* Thoas the Lemnian, the son of Dionysus, who is known to Herodotus (6.138), is another man, even though he is identified with the Taurian by two late authors in defiance of mythical chronology.[28] Euripides' character is 'a mere name', in Immisch's phrase,[29] endowed with definable traits but with no place in any genealogy. Why this name should have been chosen for Orestes' adversary is not immediately clear, as Wilamowitz himself later pointed out.[30] Significant names in Euripides, however, often make an important dramatic point. To take two other examples from prologues, Theonoe's 'godlike knowledge' gives her the power to ruin Helen and Menelaus, and the name of Dionysus declares the paternity that is the point at issue in *Bacchae*.[31] Why is the king of the Taurians swift? Learned irrelevance is not the only possible answer.[32] This is an escape play, and the threat which Thoas

before these σκῦλα (*I.T.* 102–3) is identical to Pelops' reaction before a spectacle of severed heads in the unknown source of Hyginus 84.3, which may be Euripides' *Oenomaus*. See Scherling (loc. cit., supra, n. 21).

[25] See lines 1429–30, and again cf. Hdt. 4.103.

[26] (Berlin, 1875), p. 190. General discussions of etymologizing in tragedy can be found in R. Kannicht, *Euripides, Helena* (Heidelberg, 1969), ii.21; in J. R. Wilson, 'The Etymology in Euripides *Troades* 13–14', *AJP* 89 (1968), 66–71; and in an article influenced by Wilson, H. Van Looy, '*Παρετυμολόγει ὁ Εὐριπίδης*', *Zetesis* [Festschrift E. de Strycker] (Antwerp and Utrecht, 1973), 345–66.

[27] See n. 1, supra.

[28] Hyginus, *Fab.* 15, 120; Valerius Flaccus, *Argon.* 2.300–2. Aristophanes, parodying *I.T.* 32–3 in fr. 373 (*PCG* = fr. 357 *CAF*, from the *Lemnians*), forges a comical link between one Thoas and the other. For the date of *Lemnians* see P. Geissler, *Chronologie der Altattischen Komödie*, ed. with *Nachträge* (Dublin and Zürich, 1969). pp. xvi, 55.

[29] S.v. 'Thoas' in Roscher, *Lexikon* v. col. 815.

[30] In 'Die beiden Elektren', *Hermes* 18 (1883), 254 n. 3. Having explained why the lines could not be deleted, he added: 'Aber wie in aller Welt kam Euripides dazu, den überflüssigen Namen zu erfinden, oder vielmehr aus der Sage von Hypsipyle...zu übertragen?' He had no answer.

[31] *Hel.* 13–14; *Ba.* 1–2, 27ff. and *passim* (see n. 32, infra).

[32] In fact, irrelevance of this order is hard to match in Euripides. Van Looy (supra, n. 26), who discusses 69 Euripidean etymologies, arranged by location, allows a wide range of comparison. Of those occurring near the end of a play (e.g. in a god's speech), most, so far as one can generalize from examples in extant plays, have no bearing on the action itself; all but one, however, have an aetiological purpose (pp. 354–8). The exception, *Or.* 1635, makes a dramatic point (by explaining why Helen has been rescued) through a play of etymology. A high proportion of those in the episodes and choral odes (pp. 358–65), including all explicit references in extant plays to the meaning or aptness of proper names, have at least minor and local

represents is that of a swift pursuer: at 1325–6 and 1422–34 he threatens to overtake the fugitives, and at 1435 he must be stopped by Athena. To that extent, his name fits: like Theonoe's name, it marks his function in the story. But even if it is strictly beyond proof that this is so by design,[33] there should be little doubt about the nature of Thoas' role. As the pursuer, no less than as the warder of Iphigenia, he is the counterpart of Oenomaus, whose speed as a charioteer enabled him to run down and kill thirteen suitors with his spear.[34] In both contests, the maiden flees with the young hero. Iphigenia rides in the ship with her brother; and, though the flight of Pelops is commonly described as a race with Oenomaus, it takes the form of a bride-theft. Hippodameia rides on Pelops' chariot; she does not wait at home for the outcome.[35]

Analogies can be carried only so far, and there are important and obvious differences between the two stories: in *I.T.*, the maiden rescued is a sister, not a bride;

dramatic relevance (e.g. *Su.* 496 [Capaneus], *Tro.* 891 [Helen], *Tro.* 989–90 [Aphrodite], *I.A.* 321 [Atreus], [?Eur.] *Rhes.* 158–9 [Dolon]) and sometimes have major relevance to the play's themes (e.g. *Phoen.* 636, 1493 [Polynices], *Ba.* 367, 507–8 [Pentheus], *Tro.* 1217 [Astyanax], fr. 781.12 [*TGF*] [Apollo], *Ion* 661, 802 [Ion]). Within this group, the derivation of Ion's name, in which Van Looy sees no serious intention (pp. 359–60), is actually a way of illustrating the important theme of τύχη (cf. 661–3 and 1512–15, and see A. S. Owen, *Ion* [Oxford, 1939], *ad* 1514). Among examples from the prologues, Van Looy concedes to three a clear dramatic justification (p. 354). These are Dionysus at *Ba.* 1–2 (see E. R. Dodds, *Ba.* 2nd edn [Oxford, 1960], *ad loc.*, and lines 27, 84, 466, 550, 859–60, 1340–2), Theonoe at *Hel.* 13 (see 317, 530, and esp. 823), and Thetideion at *Andr.* 20 (see P. T. Stevens, *Andr.* [Oxford, 1971], *ad* 16–21 and line 1231). His conclusion, however, that most prologue etymologies lack dramatic relevance (p. 354) is overstated. If one leaves out of account the above three and Thoas (in his view a mere παίγνιον [350, 354]), 12 of his remaining 17 examples from prologues (his own tally on p. 353 is slightly inaccurate) come from the fragments, where dramatic relevance cannot easily be assessed. (Of these, 5 are aetiological, which gives them at least a non-dramatic point.) In 3 others either the text or the etymologizing intention is open to question (*El.* 1, *Phoen.* 3 and 57–8). That leaves the possible play on Κύκλωψ at *Cy.* 21–2, which has certainly acquired some point by 462–3, and the derivation of Οἰδίπους at *Phoen.* 27. This last line is deleted by D. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 25–6, and by E. Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoenissen des Euripides*, Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Philos.-Hist. Kl., Sitzungsb. 1963. i.8–11. Genuine or not, it has some relevance to the sufferings of Oedipus, a theme which recurs at 801ff. Among passages not considered, the interpolations at *Hel.* 9–10 and *Tro.* 13–14 can be left out of account. Van Looy also regards *Hipp.* 29–33 as interpolated (p. 349), though few editors delete these. But the lines, if genuine, have an aetiological motive. In short, the wholly irrelevant etymology is at least exceptional in Euripides. Within the class of etymologies to which 'Thoas' belongs, viz. explicit references to the meaning or aptness of proper names found in extant plays (where relevance can best be judged), all the other examples in Van Looy either provide an *aition* or have dramatic point.

[33] No-one at least can object that the notion is too naive for Euripides. 'Thoas, the pursuer' is no more naive than 'Ion, who comes out' and 'Theonoe, who knows like the gods'. But why a swift runner rather than a swift driver or sailor (32–3)?

[34] Pindar, *O.* 1.76–9; Diod. 4.73.4–5; Apoll. Rhod. 1.756–8. The horses of Oenomaus, which were sometimes identified by name (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1.752; see *FGrHist* 3 F 37), were the gift of Ares (Apollod. *Epit.* 2.5) and were faster than the north wind (Hyginus, *Fab.* 84.2; cf. Diod. loc. cit.). Unlike Oenomaus, Thoas does not mount his chariot or raise his spear; instead, he orders all the citizens to pursue the fugitives (1422ff.). But he speaks later as if he had intended to take part himself (παύσω δὲ λόγχην ἣν ἐπαίρομαι 1484). This expression, although it may be figurative, is reminiscent of Oenomaus' role in the Pelops legend. For the construction at 1484 cf. Eur. *Ba.* 789 and see *LSJ* s.v. ἐπαίρω I.2. Line 1326 may anticipate this image of the raised spear, but some commentators prefer to translate δόρυ there as 'ship' (e.g. England [supra, n. 17], *ad loc.*).

[35] So on the Chest of Cypselus (Pausanias 5.17.7) and on the five vase-paintings (H, I, J, K, L) discussed by Séchan (supra, n. 14), 454–8. At Apollod. *Epit.* 2.5 one of the terms of the contest is that Hippodameia must ride with Pelops. Cf. Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.752ff. and Philostr. *Imag.* 1.17.

the flight is by ship, not by chariot; and Iphigenia's captor is stopped by divine intervention, not killed. The first two arise from the intractable data of the Iphigenia legend. The killing of Thoas, on the other hand, is considered at 1020–3 and is expressly rejected by Iphigenia on moral grounds: one does not kill a ξένος. Here the desire to make a pointed ethical distinction between Iphigenia and Thoas, himself a ξενοφόνος, has caused a departure from the pattern of the older story. In other respects the correspondences are striking; they constitute the main reason for thinking that the references to one story foreshadow the outcome of the other. The emphatic position of these references, at the beginning of the play and at its emotional climax, also argues for their significance; standing where they do, they claim attention. It is fair to ask why Euripides, who had other choices in each passage, chose them. The answer proposed here is that they are suitable in a play that dramatizes an escape from danger and from barbarism. Mythical allusion, elsewhere common in the form of paradigms of misforture, here foreshadows deliverance. *I.T.*, therefore, in adding an epilogue to Atreid history, has also reshaped that history into one circumscribed by two episodes of good fortune.

The pattern so far discussed accounts for only a part of the plot, viz. the arrival of Orestes and his escape with Iphigenia. It omits the near-sacrifice of Orestes. As Burnett has explained it, this is not a simple rescue story but one which has embedded in it a misdirected and interrupted vengeance plot. This is true, provided one accepts a broad definition of 'vengeance plot'; but the terms used, being general, may not be the most useful ones. They are appropriate if we think of the poet as manipulating 'structural commonplaces' and arousing in the audience its 'combined memories' of all other rescue plots and vengeance plots.[36] But here again particular memories are the ones most obviously being aroused, and the structural analogy insisted upon in passage after passage links two stories, not many: the sacrifice of Orestes and the sacrifice of Iphigenia.[37]

[36] Burnett (supra, n. 1), pp. 49, 16. 'Vengeance' in her scheme has a technical sense (as on p. 49) and refers broadly to actions 'in which destruction [is] wrought by the principal upon another figure' (p. 16).

[37] The broad similarity in their fates (both are the intended victims of sacrifice) impressed Polyidus the Sophist, who thought Euripides might well have used it to bring about the recognition, or who perhaps actually wrote a play of his own in which it was so used. See Aristotle, *Poet.* 1455a7, where the text is problematic; and cf. b10. In contrast, modern criticism makes little of the coincidence that Orestes' fate is like his sister's. D. J. Conacher goes further than most in observing that in the first part of *I.T.* each thinks the other dead and that this matching of delusions is artfully brought out in prologue and kommatic parodos (*Euripidean Drama* [Toronto, 1967], pp. 305–6, 310). In Burnett's analysis (supra, n. 1, pp. 47–8), the play involves (by my count) eleven rescues, past, present, and to come, in seven of which Orestes and Iphigenia share; to that extent their fates are parallel. The most elaborate theory is that of D. Sansone (supra, n. 19). In his view Orestes and Iphigenia are the last two intended victims of a chain of human sacrifices in the family, of which the first was the banquet of Tantalus (288–9, 293); and Orestes' ordeal in the play is a ritual re-enactment of these crimes (286, 292–3) which finally purifies him and ends her bitterness about Aulis (286–7). There are several objections to this theory. (i) Iphigenia denies the truth of the banquet of Tantalus (supra, n. 19). (ii) The supposed references to the ritual re-enactment are a very mixed bag of the literal and the symbolic. Most of those cited on p. 287 have to do either with the routine preparation for Orestes' sacrifice (e.g. line 705) or are part of the ruse played on Thoas (e.g. lines 1191ff.); some actions mentioned as evidence are merely *like* purificatory acts (e.g. lines 255, 296–8). All function as parts of the alleged symbolic pattern. Lines 92 and 981, also cited, admittedly bear on Orestes' present madness and its prescribed cure, and here indeed is evidence that he still needs purifying after the Areopagus trial (cf. R. Parker, *Miasma* [Oxford, 1983], pp. 107, 129). But the cure for this madness is defined by Apollo as renewal of exile and the completion of a task (lines 85–92). There are parallels for such supplementary purification by exile and πόνοι

They are first associated in Iphigenia's opening monologue. This speech encompasses the allusion to Pelops (1–2), three transitional lines consisting largely of proper names (3–5), the sacrifice at Aulis (6–30), her life as priestess of Artemis (31–41), her recent dream (42–60), and her present intentions (61–6). The bulk of the speech is occupied by the sacrifice and the dream. The latter turns out to have taken the form of preparations for another sacrifice, that of Orestes, in which she plays the role of priestess. Her interpretation of it is wrong (that Orestes is already dead), but the dream itself is a true augury of her preparations to sacrifice him later in the play. Her speech, therefore, is largely occupied with her own apparent death, about which only she knows the truth (see line 8), and Orestes' apparent death, about which only she is deceived. Both deaths are cast in the form of sacrifices. Some parallelism of treatment is already discernible in all this.

It continues to be discernible in the parodos and kommos at 123ff. Here the two subjects recur, and there is more formal symmetry in the way they are balanced than in the earlier speech. If one omits the introductory lines before 143, the passage falls into three distinct parts, of which the first and last belong to Iphigenia (143–77, 203–35). The first is a lament for Orestes, with a brief reference to her own illusory sacrifice and death in the closing lines. The last is devoted to the same two subjects, but with their order and proportions reversed. The shorter chant of the chorus (179–202) which separates these is about the woes of the house, now reaching their final stage. As far as the corrupt text allows one to say, these begin with the quarrel of Atreus and Thyestes.

Up to this point, the correspondence between the two imagined deaths is merely something implicit in the poetic form. At 337–9 it becomes explicit, and it takes the special form of a claim that sacrifices of victims such as those now in hand can serve as retribution for the sacrifice at Aulis.[38] The speaker is the herdsman who brings news of the capture of Orestes and Pylades. Iphigenia responds to this report in a speech (342–91) full of bitter reminiscence about her two sources of grief, the supposed death of Orestes and her own slaying, here spoken of without mention of her final rescue. The two captives, she says, will find her unsympathetic and fierce, as she never was before with Greeks (344–53). Her preferred victims would be Helen and Menelaus, whom she would gladly pay back by a re-enactment of Aulis,

τὴν ἐνθάδ' Αὐλιν ἀντιθεῖσα τῆς ἐκεῖ (358)

She does not speak of the sacrifice of two innocents now in prospect as a new Aulis; that would erase the moral distinction between her and the sanguinary Taurians, and this distinction will be consistently maintained in the play.[39] But she does say that she has turned savage (ἠγριώμεθα) and that her victims will find her hostile (δύσνουν). Euripides allows her no further comment in that vein, but her words seem designed

in the legends of Heracles and Jason (Parker, pp. 370, 382; for exile as a component of purification see further pp. 114, 387). In short, the action of the play taken literally, not symbolically, is sufficient to account for the end of Orestes' madness. Finally, (iii) if Iphigenia forgets her bitterness about Aulis, it is reason enough that she has found her brother and that rescue is in sight; no curative ritual is needed. I agree with Sansone, however, on the importance of some passages, e.g. lines 338 and 358 (see text infra).

[38] Cf. Sansone (supra, n. 19), 284. The herdsman speaks in general terms of killing 'strangers like these', and he uses the present subjunctive of repeated action (ἀναλίσκῃς 337). But the form of expression can hardly be said to stress the quantity of victims required for payment, as argued by J. C. G. Strachan (supra, n. 24), 136. The emphasis is on their quality; τοιάδε and τοιοῦσδε call attention to what the herdsman has already said about the noble looks and bravery of the captives (267, 321–2).

[39] Lines 36, 389–90, 585–6, 1021.

to place her for a moment in the attitude of a vengeful killer about to balance her own sacrifice with the one to come. This attitude will not be maintained when the victims appear, but while it lasts it keeps alive the herdsman's notion of retributory correspondence.

The intended sacrifice is forestalled by the revelation of Orestes' identity. In the *amoibaion* which follows this recognition, it becomes clear that what happened at Aulis and what has just now happened here are linked both in Iphigenia's thoughts and in the design of the poet; this fact is reflected in the structure of the central section (850–72). Orestes begins this by stating a theme:

> γένει μὲν εὐτυχοῦμεν, ἐς δὲ συμφοράς,
> ὦ σύγγον', ἡμῶν δυστυχὴς ἔφυ βίος (850–1)

Of the many misfortunes that might have illustrated this statement, only two are mentioned, and the language used of these is chosen to reflect their essential similarity. Aulis comes first: the knife at the throat, the ruse of the betrothal to Achilles, the holy water. Then there is a transition to the attempted sacrifice of Orestes, which is linked with Aulis by a simple responsion of the idea 'reckless action committed against one's own kin'. Speaking of the earlier sacrifice, Orestes says ὤμωξα κἀγὼ τόλμαν ἣν ἔτλη πατήρ (862); of the later one, Iphigenia says ὦ μελέα δεινᾶς τόλμας· δεί' ἔτλαν, | ἔτλαν δεί', ὤμοι, σύγγονε (869–70). When she goes on to say that Orestes has barely escaped an unholy death, ἐξ ἐμᾶν δαϊχθεὶς χερῶν, her language is not easily reconciled with her statement at 622–4 that she sprinkles holy water on the victims but others do the killing (cf. 40, 54). A possible explanation is that what she says here is meant to make her more clearly the counterpart of her father in the role he plays earlier in this same passage, ὅτε φάσγανον δέρᾳ 'φῆκέ μοι μελεόφρων πατήρ (852f.). A specific reminiscence may also be intended, since the verb she uses, δαΐζω, is unparalleled in Euripides but is used by Aeschylus at *Ag.* 208 of the sacrifice of Iphigenia. At all events, this lyric exchange is so managed as to concentrate attention equally upon these two averted misfortunes while charting a pattern into which both will fit. It becomes clear that, in a sense she did not foresee, Iphigenia has performed the re-enactment she envisaged at line 358: τὴν ἐνθάδ' Αὐλιν ἀντιθεῖσα τῆς ἐκεῖ.

The re-enactment is closer than the imagined sacrifice of Menelaus and Helen because it too ends with the victim's escape from the knife. For Iphigenia this was a swift flight through the air; for Orestes the escape has just begun and will be less simple.[40] Its completion will require the intrigue, the deception of Thoas, the flight to the ship, and Athena's intervention. In the development of this part of the tragedy,

[40] Iphigenia's words at 843–4, δέδοικα δ' ἐκ χερῶν με μὴ πρὸς αἰθέρα | ἁμπτάμενος φύγῃ, may remind us that after her own escape from death at Aulis she was sent διὰ ... λαμπρὸν αἰθέρα (29). The coincidence is striking, but it may be deceptive. References to flight through the air involving one or more of the terms ἀναπέτομαι, πρὸς αἰθέρα (or αἰθέριος etc.), and πτεροῖς (or πτερωτός etc.), are commonplace in Euripides (and not unknown in other authors) to express one of the following: (1) a disappearance or loss, usually deplored; (2) an escape desperately desired; (3) an escape ironically dismissed as impossible. Examples of each include: (1) *Andr.* 1219, *Hec.* 334, *HF* 69 and 653, *Med.* 440, and the parody of Euripides at Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1352 (cf. Empedocles, 31 B 2.4 [*Vorsokr.*]); (2) *Hec.* 1100ff., *HF* 1158, *Hipp.* 1290–3, *Ion* 1238, Eur. fr. 781.61ff. (*TGF*²); (3) *Hec.* 1264, *Hel.* 1516, *Med.* 1297, *Or.* 1593, *Phoen.* 1216 (cf. Herodotus, 4.132.3). *I.T.* 843–4 falls easily into the first category, and more than that perhaps should not be said about it. It may be, however, that these well-worn expressions occasionally come to life in surroundings where their literal meaning is particularly apt. So interpreted here, Iphigenia's way of expressing her fear would fall easily into the pattern of parallels linking brother and sister.

where a young man and woman flee before a savage pursuer, the paramount analogy is the flight of Pelops. But both of these myths in the background of the story, the sacrifice at Aulis and the flight of Pelops, end with an escape from death; to that extent both are mirrored in the conclusion of *I.T.* The connection with Aulis is made explicit at lines 1082–4; here Iphigenia asks Artemis to play once more the role she played at Aulis so that the present story will end as that one did:

> ὦ πότνι', ἥπερ μ' Αὐλίδος κατὰ πτυχὰς
> δεινῆς ἔσωσας ἐκ πατροκτόνου χερός,
> σῶσόν με καὶ νῦν τούσδε τ'...

She asks Artemis to save them once again at 1398–1402, when the wave threatens to bring them back to shore.[41] The active agents in her rescue, however, turn out to be three other gods: Athena, who stops the pursuit by Thoas; Poseidon, who stills the sea; and Apollo, by whose command Orestes is acting (1435–45).[42] Iphigenia's repeated pleas do not cause any direct intervention by Artemis, though Artemis' acquiescence in the outcome can be assumed. Their principal effect, in reminding us of the goddess's more active role in the rescue at Aulis, is to keep alive the parallel between that former rescue and the more complicated present one, which began with the recognition and is now about to be completed.

Of the two legends reflected in the plot of *I.T.* the sacrifice at Aulis comes to the surface more often in the utterances of the characters. This is natural, since it is part of Iphigenia's own past, whereas the story of Pelops is a distant part of family tradition. Aulis means several things to Iphigenia: a betrayal of her hopes for marriage, a threat of death, an escape, and the beginning of exile. In the prologue of the play, the meaning she reads into her dream seems to put beyond remedy her separation from her family. In spite of her rescue at Aulis, the end result for her has not been happy, and it has left the need for another deliverance. In allowing his story to develop partly along the lines of that earlier averted sacrifice, Euripides has done more than fall into the familiar general pattern of kin-slaying averted by recognition; he has found a way to interweave two particular stories, in each of which Iphigenia has a role. While one story is acted out, the other emerges by reminiscence. Both arouse powerful emotions, and the lyric that follows the recognition is in equal measure about both. That dramatic moment is strengthened by the coincidence of theme which this interweaving allows: a brother has almost been killed by a sister as she once was by her father; brother and sister have until now each thought the other dead. Since each now knows the other's identity, their present emotions, like their past experiences, are matched and complementary. Earlier, while they were both still in ignorance, the recollection of Aulis was used to give the present story an ironic cast. For example, at 344ff., Iphigenia speaks of her harsh feelings towards the present victims; though these arise from the recent dream, her speech turns mainly on Aulis and the unfeeling treatment she suffered there from her father. We cannot fail to be made aware that at this moment her own actions are unwittingly moving in a pattern similar to his.

[41] There is a further reference to the Aulis story at 1418–19, where the messenger ends by saying that Iphigenia has forgotten Aulis and betrayed the goddess. But there are difficulties in 1414–19 that have brought these final lines under suspicion, and 1413 would be an effective conclusion to the speech. See England (supra, n. 17), *ad loc.*, and Page (supra, n. 32), p. 78.

[42] At 1439–41, spoken by Athena, Orestes' rescue of his sister is now included in the details of his mission from Apollo and made syntactically parallel with his return of the statue. This implies that the rescue was part of Apollo's intention. The lacuna after 1014 may have contained matter relevant to this question. For the meaning of 1440 see Platnauer (supra, n. 17), *ad loc.*

Unlike the sacrifice at Aulis, the courtship of Pelops and Hippodameia is no part of Iphigenia's personal experience and seems at first sight an unlikely cause of strong emotion in her or in Orestes. What sets it apart from the other legends of the house and gives it a claim to special relevance is the correspondence of form between its story and the plot of *I.T.*: both are escapes from a barbarous pursuer, and both end happily. Euripides, however, has also contrived a place for it in Iphigenia's life, in the form of the spear hidden in her chambers. Moreover, he has so placed the recollection of this token that it brings about the recognition and releases the strongest outburst of emotion in the play (822ff.). As far as anyone knows, the hidden spear is his own invention; as a means of recognition it stands well apart from the usual repertoire of necklaces, rings, scars, and articles of clothing. But if Euripides' purpose was to remind the audience of Pelops' victory over Oenomaus, nothing could have served better. The degree of artifice in all this should not be underestimated. A similar artifice, found at the start of the play, is that of beginning the family's history with the same victory, rather than earlier or later.[43] In spite of their prominent positions, the two passages are short, and they are given little attention by modern scholars. Here the ancient spectator of *I.T.* undoubtedly had the advantage, since the legend of the contest with Oenomaus is known to have been a theme of sculpture, painting, and lyric in the fifth century and, it is likely, of at least one tragedy before *I.T.*[44] In stating what that spectator was likely to be alert to we must therefore include the readily visible coincidences of plot line between one story and the other and at least one striking reminiscence of the Oenomaus legend in the staging of *I.T.* (72–5). Admittedly, the capacities of the ancient spectator to grasp and interpret such references are not well understood. The direct testimony about his knowledge of myths is inconclusive.[45] It is clear, however, from tragic parodies in comedy and from

[43] It is perhaps no coincidence that in the 'second prologue' of *Helen* with its genealogical proem (386ff.) Menelaus, like Iphigenia at *I.T.* 1ff., begins with Pelops' victory over Oenomaus. (The *Binneninterpolation* at *Hel.* 388–9, which would have complicated this allusion with a reference to the banquet of Tantalus, is sufficiently discredited by the discussion of Kannicht [supra, n. 26] *ad loc.*) Pelops is Menelaus' ancestor too, and his success in escaping with Helen from a barbarian king is closely modelled on the escape from Thoas in *I.T.* This relation between the plays will be reversed if we take *I.T.* to be later than *Helen*, as argued by G. Perrotta, 'Studi Euripidei I', *SIFC* N.S. 6 (1928), 28–9, and Max Pohlenz, *Die Griechische Tragödie*[2] (Göttingen, 1954), p. 391. But metrical evidence is against this dating. See Dale, loc. cit., supra, n. 1. Perrotta's argument, in any case, requires assuming a date of 413 for Euripides' *Electra*; against this see the arguments of G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester, 1955), pp. 64–71.

[44] By Sophocles; possibly also by Euripides (nn. 20, 21, supra). For evidence of sculpture, painting, lyric see nn. 15, 20, supra. Sophocles' *Oenomaus* evidently achieved some fame. It is parodied at *Birds* 1337 (schol. *ad loc.*) and, according to Hesychius s.v. ἀρουραῖος Οἰνόμαος, was revived in the fourth century by a company that included Aeschines. There is some confusion in the evidence about this production. See J. B. O'Connor, *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, 1908), pp. 74–7, 106; *TrGF* vol. 4, p. 381; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*[2], rev. by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (Oxford, 1968), p. 50 n. 5. That it was Sophocles' play seems most likely, though O'Connor, who does not cite Hesychius, assumes Euripides. In contrast, not much can be said about possible dramatic versions of the sacrifice at Aulis that may have antedated *I.T.* The extended lyric account at Aesch. *Ag.* 104–257 does not mention a rescue of the victim. Aeschylus and Sophocles each wrote an *Iphigenia*, about which a little is known, and Friedrich (supra, n. 4), pp. 89–109 has attempted some inferences. See also E. Fraenkel, *Aesch. Ag.*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1950), *ad* 247 and 1523ff. In any case, *I.T.* 6–30 gives the audience a full account of the event.

[45] See Pickard-Cambridge (supra, n. 44), pp. 52, 275–8. The sharpest apparent contradiction is between the evidence of Antiphanes, fr. 191 (*CAF*) and that of Aristotle, *Poet.* 1451b25–6. As an example of divergent modern interpretations, contrast D. W. Lucas, *Aristotle, Poetics* (Oxford, 1968), *ad loc.*, and Pickard-Cambridge, p 276.

the often fleeting allusions to myth in tragedy itself that poets habitually wrote as if for a knowing audience; and the relevant issue is the practice of poets rather than the culture of spectators.[46] The long tradition of the *exemplum* in epic, lyric, and drama had, in any case, familiarized both poet and audience with the use of mythological paradigms. By convention, any legend can become part of the presentation of any other legend if it resembles it in some way and if mythical chronology allows its use. The relation between them is easiest to recognize when marked by ὡς, ὅπως, τὼς καὶ ἐγώ, παραβάλλομαι or some other such term. But poetic logic is not always explicit, and not every paradigm will have its function announced so clearly. Euripides does not have Iphigenia or Orestes say after *I.T.* 826 that their fates have been similar, though by that point the similarity should be clear to us, as it was to Polyidus the sophist;[47] and Pelops' contest is mentioned only before the pattern it foreshadows is complete.

My argument has been about a single Euripidean tragedy but may point the way to more general conclusions about recurrent plot patterns in Euripides. Among the many echoes of previous stories which these patterns bring into a play, some may be more important than others. Whenever this can be proved, the creation of the tragic πρᾶξις will turn out to have been more than the artful management of a standard repertoire of forms. Some plots, admittedly, may lend themselves to nothing more than formal analysis, couched in general terms. Even here, we might keep in mind that our ability to interpret allusions and recognize particular analogies is limited by the loss to us of most of the literature known to Euripides. In deciding whether any of the many possible prototypes of an action has special significance, we should take into account Euripides' interest in the continuity of family history, a topic now given much less than its due. Euripidean characters and choruses, like those of Aeschylus and Sophocles, often mention family history and sometimes do so as an explanation or a model for the events being dramatized.[48] These references are frequently dismissed as mere undigested relics of the tradition, since Euripides, unlike Aeschylus, is thought to be more interested in the inner life of his characters than in the actions of their ancestors.[49] He is, of course; but there is no need to think of these interests as

[46] There are well-known comic examples at *Frogs* 830–1471 and *Thesm.* 848–1135; Oehler (supra, n. 8), pp. 78–111, gives many examples from tragedy. In comic poets this practice is sometimes thought to imply little more than flattery of the audience, irony, or reliance on general features of tragic style and on the notoriety of certain quotations; otherwise, references may be confined mainly to recent, well-remembered productions. Tragic poets, it is supposed, aim some allusions at the learned few. See K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 188–9; Pickard-Cambridge (supra, n. 44), pp. 276–7; O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), p. 17.

[47] Supra, n. 37.

[48] At *Hipp.* 337–43, Phaedra finds that her troubles repeat those of her mother and her sister, also victims of love, and concludes: ἐκεῖθεν ἡμεῖς, οὐ νεωστί, δυστυχεῖς. At *Ba.* 337–41, Cadmus warns Pentheus to avoid the fate of his cousin Actaeon, who offended a god and died by σπαραγμός, an example that Pentheus has begun to follow. At *El.* 1147ff., Clytemnestra is killed while the chorus sing about Agamemnon's death; here the earlier event is both model and cause. Later in *El.*, the Dioscuri trace the troubles of Electra and Orestes to ἄτη πατέρων (1307). In *Or.*, the punishment of Tantalus provides a distant precedent for Orestes' present situation (supra, n. 12). In *Ion* the theme of family solidarity among the Erechtheids is overshadowed by that of Athenian nationalism, with which it merges; it is clearly present, however, at 469–70 and 1464–7, which link the fortunes of the γένος and δόμος with those of Creusa and Ion. Its relevance to the shape of the plot is suggested in Burnett's remarks (supra, n. 1), p.105, about the parallel careers of Ion and Erichthonius. The latter proves to have been a model from birth for his descendant Ion, who like him will become king of Athens (lines 20–6, 1427–9).

[49] The common refusal to attach any importance to genealogical detail in the prologues is one expression of this attitude (supra, n. 14). Another is the belief that notions such as inherited ἄτη

mutually exclusive or to judge Euripides incapable of combining them. It is clear, for example, that many of his characters retain a strong sense of their origins. Whenever they present their own experiences as the latest episodes of family history they call attention to family continuity and solidarity. One effect of this is to give added significance to any present crisis or success. Iphigenia's dream is threatening because it seems to mark the end of the house as well as the death of her brother. When she sees that she has misread it, both the house and her brother are in sight of rescue.[50] The recurrence within that rescue of old patterns of action is a reminder of the continuity of the house and of the involvement of its fortunes in the outcome of the play. As a tragedy with a happy ending, *I.T.* contains more than it might seem to at first sight: not only a cheering sequel to the Orestes and Iphigenia legends, but also an alternative history of the Pelopids, one that begins and ends with a tale of success.

University of Toronto MICHAEL J. O'BRIEN

cannot coexist with the highly developed personal motivation of Euripidean characters except as empty formulas or marginal themes. W. C. Greene, *Moira* (Cambridge, MA, 1944), p. 204, speaks of the pronouncement of the Dioscuri at the end of *El.* as 'jumbled' because of their insistent use of ἄτη πατέρων and similar terms (see line 1307). Cf. Lesky (supra, n. 8), p. 404, who uses the word 'Randmotif' of the same phrase. J. C. Kamerbeek, 'Mythe et réalité dans l'oeuvre d'Euripide', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* vi, ed. O. Reverdin (Vandoeuvres-Genève, 1960), 1–41, defends at length his theory of a contradiction between Euripides' own realism and a legacy of myth with which he did not feel completely at ease but found charming and ornamental as an Alexandrian poet might have. Genealogical elaboration in the prologues is explained in this light (9–10, 29, 39).

[50] *I.T.* 50–1, 154–5, 848–9, 992, 995. Orestes is equally concerned about the house: see 697–8, 984–5 (σῶσον πατρῷον οἶκον...).