

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

EURIPIDES

IPHIGENIA  
IN TAURIS

EDITED BY EMILY KEARNS



# CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

---

## GENERAL EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

*Regius Professor Emeritus of Greek, University of Cambridge*

PHILIP HARDIE

*Fellow, Trinity College, and Honorary Professor of Latin Emeritus,  
University of Cambridge*

†NEIL HOPKINSON

RICHARD HUNTER

*Regius Professor of Greek Emeritus, University of Cambridge*

S. P. OAKLEY

*Kennedy Professor of Latin, University of Cambridge*

OLIVER THOMAS

*Assistant Professor in Classics, University of Nottingham*

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON

*Professor of Latin Literature, University of Cambridge*

## FOUNDING EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

†E. J. KENNEY



EURIPIDES  
IPHIGENIA  
IN TAURIS

EDITED BY  
EMILY KEARNS  
*University of Oxford*





CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,  
New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a  
department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of  
education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107041806](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107041806)

DOI: 10.1017/9781107300842

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2023

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written  
permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2023

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ Books Limited, Padstow Cornwall

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*A Cataloging-in-Publication data record for this book is available from the Library of Congress*

ISBN 978-1-107-04180-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-107-61461-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence  
or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this  
publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will  
remain, accurate or appropriate.

*For Richard and Catherine  
in gratitude for our long friendship*





# CONTENTS

---

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	x
<i>Note on Spelling</i>	xi
Introduction	
1 <i>Euripides and his Career</i>	1
2 <i>Iphigeneia in Greek Culture</i>	4
(a) The Iphigeneia and Orestes stories	4
(b) Iphigeneia in cult	6
3 <i>Euripides and his Materials</i>	7
(a) Story	7
(b) Aetiology	11
(c) Ethnography and geography	15
4 <i>Production</i>	19
(a) Structure	19
(b) Staging	21
(c) Metre, music, and dance	27
5 <i>Themes</i>	30
(a) Non-‘tragic’ tragedy, ‘escape tragedy’	30
(b) Human sacrifice, a barbarian custom?	34
(c) Family	37
6 <i>Text and Transmission</i>	42
7 <i>Reception from Antiquity to the Present</i>	44
Sigla	55
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ Η ΕΝ ΤΑΥΡΟΙΣ	57
Commentary	109
<i>Glossary of Technical Terms</i>	300
<i>Works Cited</i>	302
Indexes	
<i>General Index</i>	315
<i>Index of Greek Words and Phrases</i>	327



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

My first thanks go to Pat Easterling, who on several occasions suggested that I should think of producing a volume in the Cambridge ‘green and yellow’ series, and commented with perspicacity and kindness on my initial proposal. Richard Hunter and Neil Hopkinson read my drafts at various stages, saved me from numerous errors, and applied themselves to the difficult task of making an unruly manuscript conform to series style; the latter’s untimely death is a sad loss not only to the series but to classical scholarship in general. Richard Rutherford read and improved the Introduction with his customary care and good judgement. For help and discussion on specific points I thank Mark Bilby, Patrick Bunting, Felix Budelmann, Charles Delattre, Patrick Finglass, Theodora Jim, Barbara Kowalzig, Philomen Probert, David Sider, and Stephanie West. I am grateful also to all at Cambridge University Press who worked hard to bring the book to completion, among them Michael Sharp, Liz Davey, Katie Idle, and above all my magnificent copy-editor Jane Burkowski. In proof-reading I was kindly helped by Michele Bianconi as well as by Raymond Howard of Cambridge University Press.

Anyone who prepares an edition of or commentary on a classical text, especially of an author as well served as Euripides, is conscious of how much is owed to predecessors. I have been helped immeasurably by works of Euripidean scholarship too numerous to mention here (they will be found in the bibliography), but I must make an exception for Laetitia Parker’s recent edition and commentary (Oxford 2016), which appeared after the first draft of this smaller-scale version was completed, but has been invaluable in its revision.

On a personal level I am very grateful to my colleagues at St Hilda’s, Rebecca Armstrong, Katherine Clarke, Andrew Sillett, and (again) Michele Bianconi, and to my students over the years, who have combined to provide a pleasant and stimulating base for operations. Once again Dimitris Koklanaris has provided a second home in which to write. And finally I thank Nicholas, who has helped me in more ways than he knows.

## ABBREVIATIONS

---

ARV <sup>2</sup>	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic red-figure vase-painters</i> . 2nd ed., Oxford 1963
Beekes	R. Beekes, <i>Etymological dictionary of Greek</i> . Leiden 2010
D-K	H. Diels and W. Kranz, <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> . 6th ed., Berlin 1951
FGrH	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Berlin 1923–30, Leiden 1940–58
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> . Berlin 1873–
Kühner-Gerth	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre</i> . 3rd ed., Hannover and Leipzig 1898
LIMC	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> . Zurich 1981–99
LSCG	F. Sokolowski, <i>Lois sacrées des cités grecques</i> . Paris 1969
LSS	F. Sokolowski, <i>Lois sacrées: supplément</i> . Paris 1962
NGSL	E. Lupu, <i>Greek sacred law: a collection of new documents</i> . 2nd ed., Leiden 2009
PMG	D. L. Page, <i>Poetae melici graeci</i> . Oxford 1962
Rh-Osb	P. J. Rhodes and R. G. Osborne, <i>Greek historical inscriptions, 404–323 BC</i> . Oxford 2003
Schwyzler	E. Schwyzler, <i>Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik</i> . Munich 1939
Smyth	H. W. Smyth, <i>Greek grammar</i> . Revised edition ed. G. M. Messing. Cambridge, MA 1956
ThesCRA	<i>Thesaurus cultus et rituum antiquorum</i> . Basel 2004–
TrGF	R. Kannicht, B. Snell, and S. Radt, <i>Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta</i> . Göttingen 1971–2004

\* Indicates words listed in the Glossary.

## NOTE ON SPELLING

---

Greek names for the most part have been spelled in direct transliteration rather than in latinate form. I make an exception for the most familiar names only, mainly those of authors (Aeschylus, Sophocles). Thus, I spell the heroine's name Iphigeneia throughout, although the play's title remains in its usual Latin form *Iphigenia in Tauris* (= 'Iphigeneia among the Taurians' or 'Iphigeneia at Tauroi'; see Introduction p. 18).



# INTRODUCTION

---

## 1 EURIPIDES AND HIS CAREER

Euripides, youngest of the three great Attic tragedians, was probably born around 485 BCE and died in 407/6. He was a younger contemporary of Sophocles, against whom he competed during the entirety of his career. Of his life little is known with certainty, since the biographical tradition surrounding early and classical Greek writers is notoriously inaccurate and has a tendency to fabricate episodes, sometimes of a fantastic nature, on the basis of fictional suggestions in the writers' works. It seems reasonably secure that his father's name was Mnesarchos or Mnesarchides and that the family's deme (ancestral area of Attica) was Phlya, near modern Chalandri in the Mesogeia (inland region), not very far from Athens itself. The ancient tradition also states that at the end of his life he accepted an invitation from King Archelaos of Macedonia to remain at his court, and that he wrote his last plays there, a supposition which is usually accepted. But although he certainly wrote plays appropriate to the Macedonian royal family (*Archelaos*, and probably *Temenos* and *Temenidai*), and may have made a trip to Macedonia to produce them, his death in Macedonia is much less certain; it is noteworthy that Aristophanes, whose *Frogs* is premised on the tragedian's recent death, makes no reference to that death occurring outside Athens.<sup>1</sup>

We must accept that apart from his productions we know almost nothing of Euripides' life, other than the supposition that even in democratic Athens a poet was likely to come from a reasonably well-off family background<sup>2</sup> which would give him the leisure to study poetic texts in depth, to associate with other literary figures, and to compose and produce his own plays. But thanks to the *didaskaliai*, official records of productions at the dramatic festivals of Athens, which ancient scholars were able to use in full and so transmit their findings to us, we are much better informed about his career as dramatist. From this source, we know that his first production was in 455 and the first of his five victories in 441. Thus, some of his extant plays can be dated with precision as follows (the date is that of the production at the City Dionysia in spring):

<sup>1</sup> See especially Scullion 2003.

<sup>2</sup> The running joke in Aristophanes that E.'s mother was a market gardener who sold vegetables publicly is a common comic play which may have some basis in the origins of family wealth but cannot be taken literally as indicating class.

438	<i>Alcestis</i>
431	<i>Medea</i>
428	<i>Hippolytus</i> <sup>3</sup>
415	<i>Troades</i> ( <i>Trojan Women</i> )
412	<i>Helen</i>
411 or later	<i>Phoenissae</i> ( <i>Phoenician Women</i> )
408	<i>Orestes</i>
c.405	<i>Bacchae</i> , <i>Iphigeneia at Aulis</i> (posthumous production)

The most important method for dating the remaining extant tragedies (whether it can be applied to the satyr-play *Cyclops* is less certain<sup>4</sup>) is a metrical criterion, namely the frequency and types of resolution of long syllables in the iambic trimeter, the chief metre of spoken dialogue. Already in the early nineteenth century Gottfried Hermann had noticed that the substitution of two short for one long syllable in the basic metrical pattern occurs with increasing frequency in the later plays of Euripides. This observation was taken up and refined in the twentieth century by Zieliński (1925), Ceadel (1941), Cropp and Fick (1985), and others. Though it would be implausible to expect that the percentage of resolved feet, including or (better) excluding proper names, would increase in a regular, linear fashion and hence allow us to pinpoint the exact year of a play, it is apparent that *Heraclidae* (*Children of Herakles*) belongs in an early group with the datable *Alcestis*, *Medea*, and *Hippolytus*, while at the other end the equally datable *Orestes*, *Bacchae*, and *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, all with percentages over 33.3 per cent, stand out from the next highest figure (27.5 per cent for *Helen*, in Ceadel's calculation). It is therefore a reasonable guess that the remaining plays, from *Helen* down to *Andromache*, with 11.3 per cent, should be dated in the twenty years between stretching backwards from 408. We might want to subdivide this batch into an earlier group comprising *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *Supplices* (*Suppliant Women*), and *Electra* (11.3–16.95 per cent) and a later one consisting of *Troades* (dated to 415), *Hercules Furens* (*Mad Herakles*), *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Ion*, *Helen* (dated 412), and *Phoenissae* (later than *Helen*) (21.5–27.5 per cent). A date of c.414 is often accepted for *IT*, based partly on the extensive stylistic analysis of K. Matthiessen,<sup>5</sup> which would place it between *Troades* and *Ion*. Metrical examination of the lyric sections seems to confirm that it is earlier than *Helen*. Itsumi has shown that Euripides innovates considerably

<sup>3</sup> If the play we have is indeed the second play of this title which E. wrote; for the alternative, see Gibert 1997, Hutchinson 2004 (*contra*, Cropp and Fick 2005).

<sup>4</sup> Seaford 1982 argues that an analysis of resolution in *Odysseus'* lines coheres with a likely date of c.408; cf. the discussion in Hunter–Laemmle 38–47.

<sup>5</sup> Matthiessen 1964.



in his treatment of the metrical line known as 'wilamowitzianum' or 'poly-schematist' in *Helen* and the plays known or safely assumed to follow *Helen*, but not in *Troades*, *HF*, *IT*, or *Ion*.<sup>6</sup> Since after having introduced such new forms there would be no reason to compose the lyric parts of a whole tragedy without using them, it would seem that the composition (if not necessarily the performance) of *IT* should be before 412.

In total, ninety-two plays were attributed to Euripides by ancient scholars; these included satyr-plays as well as tragedies, since the standard tragedian's production at the Dionysia consisted of three tragedies and a concluding satyr-play. It is possible that some of the ninety-two were not in fact Euripidean; such is likely to be the case with the surviving *Rhesus*.<sup>7</sup> Conversely, a few plays might have been lost at an early date. Substantial fragments exist of *Hypsipyle*, *Antiope*, *Phaethon*, and *Erechtheus*, and it is possible to reconstruct the rough outlines of many others.<sup>8</sup> The Athenian records listed twenty-two separate productions by Euripides, but only five of those (including the posthumous production of the trilogy<sup>9</sup> including *Bacchae* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*) won first prize. The method of judging the winner was complex and might not reflect the popular view on any one occasion,<sup>10</sup> but over a whole career this relative lack of success may be significant, especially compared with Aeschylus' thirteen and Sophocles' eighteen victories. It is tempting to link it with the mockery to which Euripides was subjected by Aristophanes, who consistently portrays him as a radical modernist, taking tragedy in inappropriate directions and littering his plays with obscure, pretentious verbiage, and to suppose that this comic exaggeration reflected some real, more widespread perception which adversely affected his popularity. Yet the twenty-two productions must indicate that a good number of people thought well of him, since otherwise he would not have been 'granted a chorus' as one of the three tragedians who competed at each festival. It is possible that he was loved and hated in equal measure.

<sup>6</sup> Itsumi 1982: 68–9; for possible implications, see below, p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> Fries 22–38, Fantuzzi 16–48 (in agreement with other recent studies).

<sup>8</sup> See for instance the reconstructions by Collard, Cropp, and Lee (1995); Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004); Collard and Cropp (2008).

<sup>9</sup> It seems from a didascallic fragment mentioned in the scholia to Aristophanes (schol. vet. Ar. *Ran.* 67 = *TrGF* I DID. C22), which lists *IA*, *Alkmaion in Corinth*, and *Bacchae*, but no satyr-play, that the production was indeed of a trilogy rather than a tetralogy.

<sup>10</sup> Names of possible judges were selected from each of the ten Cleisthenic tribes, and at the beginning of the contest the archon drew at random one name from each of the ten. Each of those selected then wrote his view of the order of merit of the three productions, and of these ten votes five were selected at random to give the verdict, and the decision calculated on a majority basis of these five lists. The testimonia are collected and discussed in Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 95–9.

## 2 IPHIGENEIA IN GREEK CULTURE

*(a) The Iphigeneia and Orestes stories*

After a few early experiments in dramatising events from recent history, of which Aeschylus' *Persae* is the sole surviving example, tragedy settled into a pattern of taking its plots from mythology, mainly that of the heroic age, and the dramatists therefore usually had at their disposal a number of earlier poetic treatments from which they could select material and against which they could showcase their own version. The most important of these earlier texts were the Homeric poems, along with the Cyclic epics narrating events concerned with the Theban and Trojan wars; parts of the Hesiodic corpus, mainly the *Catalogue of Women* and the *Great Eoiai*; and the lyric narrative of poets such as Simonides, Pindar, and above all Stesichorus. As Aristotle pointed out (*Poetics* 14.1453b), giving the example of Klytaimnestra killed by Orestes, it was not possible for tragedy to alter basic mythological 'facts', but it was the dramatist's job to use the transmitted material well; this would include selecting and elaborating the most appropriate versions, and in practice a certain amount of invention was also permissible.

Stories of the descendants of Pelops were prominent in tragedy's poetic antecedents, the most often repeated being those of the power struggle between the brothers Atreus and Thyestes, and the fortunes of Atreus' son Agamemnon at Troy and on his return. Yet Iphigeneia is nowhere mentioned in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. At *Iliad* 9.143–8, Agamemnon offers Achilles any one of his three daughters Chrysothemis, Laodike, and Iphianassa, which does not exclude the possibility that a fourth daughter Iphigeneia had been sacrificed at the beginning of the war, but does not encourage it either. However, the story of the (attempted) sacrifice of Iphigeneia is found in other texts which predate Euripides, and the claim that she was saved by Artemis from sacrifice, though not universal, is persistent. In the *Cypria*, according to the summary in Proclus' *Chrestomathia*,<sup>11</sup> Artemis was angered by Agamemnon's boast that in killing a deer while hunting he had surpassed the goddess herself; she caused storms which prevented the Achaian fleet, assembled at Aulis, from embarking on its route to Troy. The prophet Kalchas explained the cause of the problem, and further declared that Artemis could be appeased by the sacrifice of Agamemnon's daughter Iphigeneia. She was brought to Aulis on the pretext of marriage with Achilles, but on the point of being slaughtered she was saved by Artemis, who substituted a deer and removed Iphigeneia to the land of the Tauroi and made her immortal. A similar version appears in the

<sup>11</sup> Procl. *Chrest.* ad *Cypr.* 42–9 Bernabé, 55–63 Davies.

Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* or *Eoiai* (fr. 23a M–W), where she is called Iphimede, and again on the point of sacrifice she is saved and immortalised by Artemis, though the Tauroi are not mentioned; she becomes known as Artemis Einodie. When given this epithet (ἐνὸδία in Attic) the goddess has a similar character to Hekate, and both Pausanias in reporting this passage (1.43.1) and Philodemus in reporting Stesichorus<sup>12</sup> represent the author as saying that Iphigeneia became Hekate. Her identification with the Taurian goddess known as Παρθένος, ‘Maiden’, is canvassed by Herodotus, according to whom (4.103) the Taurians themselves say that the goddess for whom they perform human sacrifice is Iphigeneia the daughter of Agamemnon (below, pp. 15–17). But Pindar, in *Pythian* 11 (22–3), and Aeschylus, in the parodos narrative of the *Agamemnon* (218–49), leave little doubt that Iphigeneia was in fact put to death.<sup>13</sup>

Though Stesichorus’ *Oresteia*, like Aeschylus’ trilogy, included them both, the stories relating to Iphigeneia and Orestes are distinct and have only an indirect connexion. The story of Orestes and his vengeance on his father’s murderer or murderers is well known to the author of the *Odyssey*, where the return of Agamemnon and subsequent events form a running motif paralleling (and contrasting with) the return of Odysseus. The poet avoids saying in so many words that this vengeance included the murder of Orestes’ mother Klytaimestra alongside her lover Aigisthos, but since he (or rather his Agamemnon) is aware of Klytaimestra’s guilt (11.410, 24.199–202) he is almost certainly also aware of the tradition of the matricide. The Cyclic *Nostoi* was probably more explicit, since according to Proclus it narrated the avenging of Agamemnon, who had been murdered by Aigisthos and Klytaimestra, while the *Catalogue of Women* unambiguously states that Orestes killed his mother (fr. 23a.30 M–W). That his subsequent persecution by the Erinyes was told in Stesichorus’ influential *Oresteia* is suggested by the fact that he received a bow from Apollo in that poem (fr. 181 Finglass), which must have been intended for defence against their attacks. The tradition could be older; it is possible that local Peloponnesian (especially Arcadian) cultic and mythic material connected with Orestes<sup>14</sup> goes back to the early archaic period and suggests

<sup>12</sup> Fr. 178 Finglass; *De pietate* N248 III, Gomperz p. 24.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. also Soph. *El.* 530–2, 571–4. But even in *Agamemnon*, τὰ δ’ ἐνέθεν οὐτ’ εἶδον οὐτ’ ἐννέπω (‘What happened next I did not see, nor do I speak of it’, 248) could be thought to leave the door open for an unrecognised translation of Iphigeneia, though it is also an effective way of treating the horror of the killing.

<sup>14</sup> Arcadia: Hdt. 1.67–8, Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 135 (= 135 Fowler), *E. El.* 1273–5, *Or.* 1643–5, Paus. 8.34.1–4. Laconia: Paus. 3.22.1; less clear for the early period, but Pindar associates him with Amyklai at *Nem.* 11.34 (see Finglass 2007: 102–3). Troizen: Paus. 2.31.4, 8–9, with Pucci 2016. Achaia: Paus. 7.25.7. See 79–81n.

his hapless wanderings as he attempts to escape the pursuing Furies. The story that he was finally saved from their attacks in Athens must surely be of Athenian origin, whether or not it was invented by Aeschylus, whose version in *Eumenides* (458 BCE) swiftly became canonical. According to this, Orestes was tried at a proto-Areopagos homicide court, with the Erinyes prosecuting and Apollo defending; the votes of the people of Athens were equal or nearly so<sup>15</sup> and Athena gave her vote for the defence, thus securing Orestes' acquittal and the end of his persecution.

(b) *Iphigeneia in cult*

There is no unambiguous evidence for cult offered to Iphigeneia, whether as heroine or goddess, before Euripides. However, the immortalisation of Agamemnon's daughter Iphigeneia or Iphimede by Artemis which is such a strong tradition in early poetry is very suggestive of a widespread identification of Iphigeneia with an Artemis-like goddess or an aspect of Artemis, perhaps with an epithet beginning Iphi-. Pausanias in the second century CE knew a cult of Artemis Iphigeneia at Hermione or Hermion in the Argolid (2.35.1); of course we cannot say how old this is likely to have been. The same writer records other cults connected with Iphigeneia: a hero-shrine at Megara (1.43.1), presumably her tomb since the local story related that she died in Megara, and a temple of Artemis at Aigeira in Achaia, served by a virgin priestess, which contained an ancient statue identified locally as Iphigeneia daughter of Agamemnon (7.26.5); Pausanias, who is acquainted with the tradition of the apotheosis of Iphigeneia (1.43.1), conjectures that the temple was originally hers. In connexion with the Megarian *herōon*, Pausanias also mentions an Arcadian tradition, without further elaboration. For Attica, the existence of a cult of Iphigeneia at the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron on the east coast was once generally accepted, but depends largely on taking the concluding aetiology of *Iphigenia in Tauris* at face value (see below, pp. 13–14). Other evidence for Iphigeneia at Brauron (from the Hellenistic poet Euphorion and the scholia to Aristophanes)<sup>16</sup> is later than Euripides, although it seems to suggest an independent tradition. Euphorion refers to Brauron

<sup>15</sup> There is some dispute whether the original vote was to condemn Orestes by a majority of one, with Athena's vote making them equal and hence leading to acquittal, or whether the original numbers were equal and Athena made the casting vote for acquittal. The tendency recently has been to prefer the first option (e.g. Sommerstein 222–6, Mitchell-Boyask 2009: 78–86), but the arguments of Hester 1981 and Seaford 1995 are also worth considering.

<sup>16</sup> Schol. Ar. *Lys.* 645a–b, in which is embedded the quotation from Euphorion (fr. 95 Van Groningen).

as the κενήριον (empty grave monument) of Iphigeneia, which as the scholiast sees should reflect a version where the interrupted sacrifice takes place at Brauron rather than Aulis; it is expected that Iphigeneia will be buried where she is killed, at Brauron, but she survives and her tomb is therefore empty. This is quite different from Euripides, whose Athena declares that Iphigeneia will die and be buried (for real) at Brauron (1464).

Fortunately we do have independent evidence, dated earlier than Euripides' play, for a connexion – at least in Greek minds – of Iphigeneia with cult in the Tauric Chersonese. Herodotus (4.103) relates that the *daimōn* to whom the Taurians sacrifice Greeks and the victims of shipwreck, whom he calls first simply παρθένος (a title confirmed by the evidence of inscriptions),<sup>17</sup> is identified by the Taurians themselves as Iphigeneia the daughter of Agamemnon. Clearly there is some connexion with the account in the *Cypria* which has Artemis relocating Iphigeneia to live among the Taurians (below, pp. 14–15), although there is no local evidence for an identification of this goddess, known to her worshippers as Parthenos, 'Maiden', with Iphigeneia (below, pp. 15–18).

Like the literary evidence, the majority of cults connect Iphigeneia with Artemis, but the nature of the connexion is conceptualised in different ways by our sources. Iphigeneia is variously an epithet of Artemis, a sharer of her sanctuary or temple, or, in the case of the Taurian cult, an alternative identification of a local deity who could also be viewed as a form of Artemis.<sup>18</sup> And even in the case of any one particular cult, we cannot be certain that the relationship between the two was always viewed in the same way; identifications of cult entities are far from stable in Greek religion.<sup>19</sup> The presence of these different Iphigeneias in different parts of the Greek and extra-Greek world exists in a dynamic interplay with the Iphigeneias of literature.

### 3 EURIPIDES AND HIS MATERIALS

#### (a) *Story*

All the tragedians select, discard, and manipulate myth, but Euripides is perhaps the boldest in this respect. He may have invented Medea's murder of her children; he certainly diverged from the best-known versions in keeping both Jocasta and Oedipus alive at the time of the war between their sons' armies (*Phoenissae*) and in portraying a chaste Helen who spent the Trojan War years in Egypt (*Helen*). The storyline of *Orestes* is

<sup>17</sup> Guldager Bilde 2003. <sup>18</sup> Guldager Bilde 2009: 304–5.

<sup>19</sup> See Versnel 2011, esp. 60–88.

not incompatible with the usual version of the hero's adventures, but it is not known elsewhere and is generally thought to be Euripides' invention. What about *Iphigenia in Tauris*? We have seen that the tradition linking Iphigenia with the Tauric Chersonese is earlier than Euripides, but it is by no means clear that the same is true of Orestes' travels to that area.

Although Iphigenia and Orestes were both known as children of Agamemnon, so far as we can tell they are not otherwise brought together in pre-Euripidean literature; Orestes was still a baby when Iphigenia died or was translated, as Euripides makes clear (230–5). To have them meet in the land of the Taurians was quite possibly an invention of the playwright, inspired partly by stories of Orestes' distant wanderings pursued by the Erinyes and partly by the possibilities of cult aetiology and etymology (below, pp. 11–15).

Complications are raised, however, by the existence of a further story involving Iphigenia, Orestes, and the Taurian king Thoas. The mythographer Hyginus (*Fab.* 121) relates a narrative involving the son of Chryseis and Agamemnon, whose relationship is treated in the *Iliad*. Named Chryses after his maternal grandfather (the priest of *Iliad* 1), the young man took Orestes and Iphigenia captive when they put in at Sminthe on the return journey from the Tauric Chersonese, and was about to return them to Thoas when he learned for the first time of his own paternity. On discovering that the fugitives were his half-siblings, he joined Orestes in killing Thoas instead. Hyginus does not give the origin of this story, but it is a reasonable guess that it is the plot of Sophocles' lost play *Chryses* (of which the exiguous fragments supply no significant information). *Chryses* has usually been dated before 414,<sup>20</sup> in which case, given the traditional dating of *IT* to c.414–413 (see above, pp. 2–3), we would have a source for the Tauric adventures of Orestes and Iphigenia which precedes our play. But this seems unlikely; the plot given in Hyginus has the air of a sequel to *IT*, taking the story one stage further. In fact, it stands in much the same relation to the Euripidean story as the latter does to Aeschylus' *Eumenides*: it takes a story which had reached a satisfactory resolution (Orestes' acquittal, the fugitives' escape, both engineered by divine favour) and interposes another, unexpected, hurdle which must be cleared before a happy ending can be attained. In both cases, a slight modification must be made to the story as told in the original. A splinter group of Erinyes refused to be persuaded by Athena, while Thoas was not convinced by her at all, or changed his mind about the escape with the statue. But at the

<sup>20</sup> On Aristophanes, *Birds* 1240 (securely dated to 414), the scholiast comments that the phrase μακέλλι Ζηνός ἑξαστραφῆι is Sophoclean and taken from *Chryses* (fr. 727, with an emendation ἐν Χρύσει for χρύσει).

same time, each story builds on its predecessor, and can best be appreciated by an audience who knows the earlier tale. If Hyginus 121 does represent the Sophoclean *Chryses*, the easiest course is to reject the dating given by the scholia to Aristophanes, and accept that Sophocles was following Euripides' cue here – hardly an unthinkable possibility.<sup>21</sup>

It seems likely, then, that Euripides took some pre-existing poetic traditions, combined and re-worked them, and came up with something quite novel. We have seen that the *Cypria* and other poems made Iphigeneia into a goddess among the Taurians, a motif so successful that Herodotus can even state that the Taurians themselves give this account of their Maiden goddess. This version would be anomalous in tragedy, where apotheosis is very rare – but heroisation is another matter. Iphigeneia's death and subsequent cult status at Brauron in Attica are predicted in the concluding aetiology, spoken by Athena, so that during the play's action she can be situated among the Taurians as a living human being – a much more promising tragic scenario. Orestes' torments could be continued beyond the limits set by Aeschylus. Further, the conjunction of Orestes and Iphigeneia raised possibilities of simultaneous innovation and allusion, in a characteristically ingenious Euripidean way. Normally Orestes is closely associated with his sister Elektra, a relationship explored by Euripides himself in the two plays bearing their names, and at least from Aeschylus onwards the dramatic core of the relationship was the recognition scene between brother and sister consequent on Orestes' return home. In *IT*, the recognition is both protracted and central – but the participants are Orestes and the 'wrong' sister. And where in the usual story the recognition is linked to Orestes as kin-killer but is not necessary for that killing to take place, here it is essential that the characters should recognise each other (or at least that Iphigeneia should recognise Orestes) in order to avoid Orestes dying at the hands of another family member.

There are further features of the interaction between sister and brother which may remind us of Orestes and Elektra. Elektra cannot know whether her brother is dead or alive, and in Sophocles' play she is convinced by a false report that he is dead. Similarly in *IT*, Iphigeneia's misinterpretation of her dream leads her to believe that Orestes has died.<sup>22</sup> Both Elektra and

<sup>21</sup> Marshall 2009 also sees *Chryses* (which he suggests could have been a satyr-play) as a sequel to *IT*, but argues that the scholiast has reversed the relationship between the two phrases (previous note): Sophocles is imitating Aristophanes, who in turn is imitating Aeschylus (*Ag.* 525–6).

<sup>22</sup> If the date of *IT* is uncertain, the date of Sophocles' *Electra* is even more so. If there is direct influence from one play to the other, we cannot therefore be sure which influenced which.

Iphigeneia long for their brother's arrival not only for his own sake but in order to save them from an intolerable situation – Elektra from subordination (in one way or another) to her father's murderers, Iphigeneia from a distant, barbarian land where she is forced to sacrifice Greeks. Above all, the recognition is effected by a series of tokens (τεκμήρια, 808, 822) which recall, without exactly repeating, those of Aeschylus' *Choephoroi*. In Aeschylus, Orestes leaves physical objects at Agamemnon's tomb, a lock of his hair as an offering, and involuntarily his footprints; he then produces a third τεκμήριον to convince his sister of his identity, a piece of her own weaving (the clothes he is wearing?). Euripides' interest in the passage is shown in his humorous<sup>23</sup> re-working of the scene in *Electra* (509–44); in *IT*, the allusion is more subtle. The tokens are not actually present to the characters, but recalled, even at second hand (ἀκοῇ, 811) since Orestes was too young to remember Iphigeneia. From Elektra he learned of a piece of Iphigeneia's weaving, depicting not a design of animals as in Aeschylus, but an elaborate (and rather ill-omened) scene of family history, the reversal of the sun's course in response to Thyestes' theft of the throne from his brother Atreus. The funereal hair offering is echoed in Orestes' reference to the hair sent to her mother by Iphigeneia in preparation for her wedding (820–1n.), which in the event could only become a marker at her empty tomb. Orestes mentions also the purificatory water which her mother sent to her at the same time, which might distantly recall the liquid offerings which are the subject of the parodos of *Choephoroi*, but the final token, the one which clinches the matter for Iphigeneia, is his memory of the spear of Pelops, which used to be kept in her bedroom. The tokens, then, do not rely on any shared physical characteristics, as in Aeschylus, but rather on their shared knowledge of family tradition, and reprise once more the themes of the deeds and sufferings of the Pelopidai and the wedding-turned-sacrifice of Iphigeneia, both of which have already shown themselves insistent motifs in the play.

As Euripides, compared with the other tragedians, seems to take the most licence with pre-existing mythical and literary traditions, so too his plays show the most frequent allusions to their status as constructs. Not only is Aeschylus repeatedly recalled in *IT*, the characters' treatment of

<sup>23</sup> The idea that E. might here be employing a critical parody of Aeschylus has struck many readers as unpalatable, and the lines have often been regarded as an interpolation, although the arguments are not compelling. See Davies 1998. An alternative strategy denies or downplays any humorous intent in the passage, on the basis that since Elektra is wrong to reject the Aeschylean tokens, there must be a serious point about evidence and knowability – but this is not incompatible with parody and lines played for laughs.



their own past and that of other figures in the Trojan cycle often seems to draw attention to the fact that they are characters in a story. The scene in which Orestes brings Iphigeneia up to date on events in Greece (specifically, Greeks involved in the Trojan War) contains phrases such as ὡς κηρύσσεται (527), ὡς λόγος (534), which are not out of place in Orestes' reportage, but could also suggest the audience's experience of the mythological tradition. Pylades' later comment (670–1) that 'everyone knows' the misfortunes of the characters in the earlier conversation could be taken the same way. Matthew Wright has termed this type of reference 'metamythology', which he defines as 'a type of discourse which arises when mythical characters ... are made to talk about themselves and their own myths, or when myths are otherwise presented, in a deliberate and self-conscious manner'.<sup>24</sup> If this idea is accepted, it is easy to see a connexion with the overt questioning of myth which is a conspicuous feature of some Euripidean tragedies and which is exemplified in this play by Iphigeneia's disbelief in the Tantalos story (386–8), and also with the adoption or invention of unfamiliar versions of familiar stories. The effect is unsettling, and leaves the audience uncertain what to accept.

### (b) *Aetiology*

Aetiology – that is, the explanation of a fact or custom in the present by reference to an event in the past, usually set in the remote past of mythological time or given a strongly legendary colouring – is a staple of tragedy, particularly noticeable in the plays of Euripides. Thirteen of his seventeen surviving tragedies, including *IT*, include aetiologies in their final scenes, and others can be detected in several of the fragmentary plays.<sup>25</sup> Tragedy, however, as it represents events of the past, reverses the pattern and, rather than looking from the present into the past for an explanation, typically predicts a future observance or institution as a consequence or commemoration of the (past) events which have just happened. In Euripides, the aetiology most often occurs near the end of the play, as part of the speech of the *deus ex machina*, in which the deity addresses the human characters, commanding or predicting their personal futures as well as the remote future (the time in which the performance takes place). But several plays instead or in addition contain aetiological references at other points in the drama, particularly in the prologue;<sup>26</sup> since aetiologies look out from

<sup>24</sup> Wright 2005: 135; discussed and exemplified in 135–57.

<sup>25</sup> See the discussion in Dunn 1996: 45–63 (with a somewhat restrictive definition of aetiology/*aition*).

<sup>26</sup> *Hipp.* 29–33, *Ion* 15–26.

the play into the world of the dramatist and the audience, a tragedy's beginning and its end are naturally appropriate settings.

The sanctuary setting and the ancient, sky-fallen statue of Artemis suggest already in the prologue of *IT* that aetiological elements may have a place in the drama, but the statue is not given a location in familiar Attic cult until the play's conclusion, when Athena instructs Orestes to establish it at Halai Araphenides. Before we reach this point, however, Orestes has already supplied an aetiology in a different context: at 947–60, recounting his embarrassed reception as a matricide in Athens, he relates the peculiar compromise his hosts resorted to (giving each participant a separate portion of mixed wine and water, rather than pouring from a common mixing-bowl), and even states that this method of sharing wine has become an established annual custom. This explicit reference to the origin of a custom familiar to the Athenian audience is unparalleled in the middle of a play, and creates the effect of a brief pause in the action, as well as anticipating the play's strongly Athenian conclusion.<sup>27</sup> Much more in conformity with Euripides' normal practice is the context of the aetiology-cluster in Athena's concluding speech: her commands respectively to Orestes and Iphigeneia supply explanations for the ancient statue at Halai on the east coast of Attica, with its title of Tauropolos and the associated ritual of drawing blood, and for the practice of dedicating the clothes of women who had died in childbirth to Iphigeneia, represented as buried at the sanctuary of Artemis at nearby Brauron.

Tragic aetiologies have been termed 'embedded', inasmuch as they are typically told to a local audience in connexion with familiar institutions and without the distancing effect of intervening literary treatments (in contrast to the 'detached' aetiologies more typical of Hellenistic poetry).<sup>28</sup> However, an influential school of thought maintains that Euripides' aetiologies are in many cases poetic inventions. But while it is possible (though unprovable) that the explanatory stories are indeed products of the poet's imagination,<sup>29</sup> it is going too far to assert that the same is true of the rituals they purport to explain.<sup>30</sup> To invent details referring to real sanctuaries and cults within Attica, and hence within the direct experience of many in the audience, would be a very strange procedure.

<sup>27</sup> On 'Athenianisation' of heroes in tragedy, see Kowalzig 2006; in relation to *IT* and cult, Calame 2009.

<sup>28</sup> Asper 2013.

<sup>29</sup> We could note, however, that later writers, such as the local historians of Attica, often accept the Euripidean account as factual (within their myth-historical/early historical context). Braund 2018: 71–3 argues vigorously for a pre-Euripidean connexion between Artemis in Attica and Taurians or Scythians.

<sup>30</sup> As is done notably in Scullion 1999–2000 and Dunn 2000 (cf. also Dunn 1996: 56–7). For a response, see Seaford 2009.

To compare an example from our own culture, even very young readers are aware that the story 'How the leopard got his spots' is fiction; but the reader would reasonably feel puzzled by the whole story if leopards were actually striped rather than spotted, or were merely a creation of Kipling's imagination. Specifically with regard to our play, it has been argued that there is no trace of the cult of Iphigeneia at Brauron, in contradiction to 1462–7, and that the ritual described for the festival of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai (1458–61) is of a very different character from that attested in the *Epitrepontes* of Menander.<sup>31</sup> Yet a single festival – for instance the Anthesteria – can contain several rituals of diverse character (among others, a drinking rite for men and secret ceremonies for a small group of women, including a form of sacred marriage for the wife of the *basileus*), and arguments from silence are treacherous given the very fragmentary knowledge that we possess of Attic cult before the fifth century.<sup>32</sup> The same is true with regard to the archaeological evidence from Brauron: we should not necessarily expect to find evidence of Iphigeneia's presence there, nor does the absence of any mention of Iphigeneia in the Brauron clothing catalogues disprove the clothing dedications mentioned by Euripides.<sup>33</sup> We can agree with the sceptics that it is not entirely safe to use Euripides as evidence for the detail of cult practice, but we must conclude that it is equally unsafe to take the lack of contemporary corroboration as evidence for pure invention.

It is generally agreed that lines 949–60 give information about the conduct of the Choes, the men's ritual on the second day of the Anthesteria, largely because the evidence of Phanodemos, one of the local historians of Attica, gives further details which cohere with the general picture without echoing it suspiciously closely.<sup>34</sup> There is no such corroboration for the practice of dedicating the clothes of women dying in childbirth to Iphigeneia (1464–7), indeed no corroboration for Iphigeneia's cultic presence at Brauron, and in consequence this description has come under suspicion; indeed, Ekroth has argued that the practice makes little sense in the context of Greek offerings to the gods, which are normally designed either to give thanks for a favour received or to procure a new favour. And yet it is arguable that the more unusual features a cult act has, the more its description is likely to be accurate; an invented ritual

<sup>31</sup> Dunn 1996: 63, 2000: 18–23, Scullion 1999–2000: 226–8.

<sup>32</sup> The evidence for the Anthesteria is collected and discussed in Hamilton 1992. For a plausible reconstruction of the Tauropolia, see Bathrellou 2012: 169–70.

<sup>33</sup> For the clothing catalogues, see Cleland 2005. Scepticism on Iphigeneia at Brauron: Ekroth 2003. Hollinshead 1985 rejects the identification of the *adyton* of the Brauron temple as a shrine to Iphigeneia, but not her presence in the Brauronian cult, perhaps as an original birth goddess.

<sup>34</sup> See 958–60n.

would be likely to stick more closely to well-established lines. Rather than imagining non-existent cult practice, it is much less implausible that Euripides invented the connexion of Orestes with the Choes and that he identified a pre-existing Brauronian cult recipient with Iphigeneia. But even this cannot be regarded as certain, and the mythological links could predate the play.

Not all tragic aetiologies are Athenian: that of *Medea* describes Corinthian cult, *Hippolytus* Troizenian, and in *Hecuba* the eponymous character's tomb is predicted to be set up on the Thracian Chersonese.<sup>35</sup> But the majority have a connexion to Athens or Attica, and frequently, as in our play, supply an Athenian dimension to well-known mythological characters native to other Greek cities, sometimes even suggesting that they acquire a quasi-Athenian citizenship: Orestes will return to rule in Argos/Mycenae, but Iphigeneia will remain forever in Attica as the prototype of the priestess of Artemis at Brauron.<sup>36</sup> In *IT*, Athens occupies an almost teleological role, as the place where the Taurian statue of Artemis is destined to remain and mark the transition from barbarism to civilisation.<sup>37</sup> The changed cult on Attic soil supplies the answer to the problem of unacceptable sacrifice which plagues Iphigeneia (380–91). Euripides here conforms to a tragic theme first (for us) expressed in *Eumenides*: Athens is the place where, with the help of her patron goddess, seemingly intractable difficulties are solved and at the same time a model is set up for the future, which itself recalls the moment when proper civilised values were (in this respect at least) established. In both plays, too, as well as in Euripides' *Ion*, it is Athena who finally sorts out a difficulty which has been brought about, and only partially solved, by the Delphic Apollo.

Again, not all aetiologies are delivered as predictions by gods, and not all are concerned with cult, but a majority keep to this pattern. Aetiologies often present cult practice as a kind of compensation; a character who dies in the action of the play receives an honourable burial and implied or stated cult as a hero.<sup>38</sup> *Medea* and *Hippolytus* are quite explicit that the cult is recompense for suffering (*Med.* 1383, ἀντὶ τοῦδε δυσσεβοῦς φόνου; *Hipp.* 1423, ἀντὶ τῶνδε τῶν κακῶν). In *IT*, the aetiology of the Tauropolia ritual at Halai is also concerned with compensation, but in a different way: here it is the goddess, the transplanted Taurian Artemis, who receives

<sup>35</sup> See also *Andromache* (Delphi, Molossia, and Leuke Akte, 1239–62), *Electra* (Arcadia, 1273–5), *Orestes* (also Arcadia, 1643–7).

<sup>36</sup> Kowalzig 2006.

<sup>37</sup> On the Greek view that 'savage' rituals were a softening of rites practised by 'savage' peoples, particularly the Taurians, see Graf 1979.

<sup>38</sup> See Wolff 1992.

compensation (ἄποινα, 1459) in the form of the blood-letting ritual for the aborted sacrifice of Orestes and the discontinuation of human sacrifice in general. Both forms represent a transformation, in which the original unpleasing event or situation is recalled, but in the tamer, safer guise of regularly repeated religious worship, which has for its goal the protection and prosperity of the individual and more especially the community. The same could be said of the unusually placed aetiology for the Choes. Somewhat more difficult is the Brauronian aetiology which follows on directly from the lines concerning the Tauropolia. Here Iphigeneia's heroisation and status as recipient of the clothes of women who die in childbirth may be in the broadest of senses compensation for her near-sacrifice and subsequent years of suffering among the Taurians, inasmuch as becoming a hero (or heroine) is an extreme promotion from the normal human state. But the specific form of cult she is given – the offering of clothes belonging to women who have died in childbirth – is less positive than usual, and is made not to prevent an undesirable event, but only after that event has happened. The reception of such gloomy offerings transforms the outlandish, unacceptable custom of human sacrifice associated with Iphigeneia's life story into a more normal kind of death, but death and sadness remain at the heart of her cult, just as she herself is deprived of the outcome she wishes – a return to Argos and, presumably, marriage and children.

Finally, aetiologies represent a form of memorialisation. The same is true of tragedy itself, which even if it invents and selects details for its own purposes still presents itself as repeating events in the lives of the heroes of the distant past. A tragic aetiology therefore is in a sense a miniature version of the play itself, a kind of *mise en abîme*, which reminds the audience that – to the myth-historical sensibility of the Greeks – the characters have a real existence outside the play and are commemorated regularly in the course of the city's religious practice, even if the connexion has not previously been recognised. Since Euripidean aetiologies are regularly repeated by later authors, one can only suppose that at least on a literary level they were successful in establishing or propagating links between myth and cult or other practice, and in commemorating their heroic subjects.

(c) *Ethnography and geography*

As we have seen, the *Cypria* already located the immortalised Iphigeneia in the land of the Taurians, if we can trust the epitome of Proclus, and according to Herodotus (4.103) the contemporary Taurians themselves identified their goddess the Maiden (Παρθένος) with Iphigeneia daughter

of Agamemnon. For Herodotus, indeed, the cult of this goddess is the most interesting thing about the Taurians, and seems characteristic of this savage people whose livelihood comes from violence:

They sacrifice to the Maiden those who are shipwrecked, and any Greeks they can capture through sea-raids, in the following manner: they consecrate them and club them on the head. Then some say that they throw the body off the cliff (the sanctuary is situated on a cliff top) and place the head on a pole, while others, who agree about the head, say that the body is not thrown off the cliff but buried in the ground. The Taurians themselves say that this goddess to whom they sacrifice is Iphigeneia daughter of Agamemnon. The enemies they defeat in battle they treat as follows: each man cutting off a head carries it to his own house, then fastening it to a large piece of wood places it high above the house, usually above the chimney. They say that these are set aloft as guardians of the whole house. They live by piracy and warfare.

Several details in this description suggest that Euripides used this material for his imaginary portrait of the Taurians of the heroic age. Iphigeneia informs Orestes (626 and n.) that his sacrificed body will be disposed of by the holy fire and a chasm in the rock (of the cliff, presumably), which recalls without quite echoing the disposal methods in Herodotus. Still further changed is the context in 1429–30: when Thoas hears that the fugitives are being held back by contrary winds, he demands that they should be captured and either thrown from a cliff or crucified, thus using what Herodotus presents as the treatment of the heads and decapitated bodies of those killed in sacrifice in order to imagine appropriate methods of punishment and execution. Many believe that Euripides has in mind this description (or something like it) also when Orestes remarks on the σκῦλα hanging in the temple (74 with 72–5n.), and that these ‘spoils’ are the severed heads of victims. Both authors also place an emphasis on Greeks as particular victims of Taurian brutality (e.g. 72, 344–7).

Despite some exotic and unpleasant colouring, other details in Euripides’ version of the Taurian cult seem more Greek. Decapitation is not mentioned, nor is the fact that in Herodotus the kill is achieved by a blow to the head rather than by slitting the throat with a knife (the usual method of Greek animal sacrifice) or a sword (the pre-battle method of slaughter generally imagined for human sacrifice). The disposal of the bodies of sacrificial victims is given an exotic tinge (625–6), but in other respects sacrificial customs are envisaged as being like those of Greek cults: Iphigeneia performs the ‘beginning rite’ (κατάρχεσθαι) using water from sacrificial basins (χέρνιβες), presumably just as she would in Greece, and

Thoas mentions a sword as the sacrificial implement (1109). The temple, too, is evidently constructed like a Greek temple, with columns all around (405–6), a pediment and a frieze with triglyphs (113). The reason for this may be not only the greater ease of imagining what is familiar. Part of the horrific fascination of human sacrifice is the idea that the attention to detail might be just the same as in normal cult, and this idea is exploited in the play through the Taurians' enthusiasm for their ancestral rites and Iphigeneia's careful performance of her duties, within a setting which could be easily recognised and understood as a sanctuary of Artemis. The mixture of the normal and the transgressive is an effective means of locating a religious tradition which belongs to a people imagined as the most barbaric of barbarians, but which is also represented as the origin of a venerable local cult of Attica.

The play's geographical setting corresponds to that of Herodotus' Taurians, the area known to antiquity as the Tauric Chersonese (Ταυρικὴ Χερσόνησος), a name applied to the Crimean peninsula, or at least its southern part. In Euripides' day, the region was inhabited by peoples whom the Greeks called Taurians and Scythians, but also by Greeks, who from the seventh century onwards had established cities along the coast. Chersonesos was the name of one of these cities also, where the chief deity was called Parthenos; epigraphical sources confirm Herodotus' statement, and make it clear that this goddess was the city's patron, protector, and saviour.<sup>39</sup> There is of course no indication of human sacrifice. Probably the goddess in her developed form was the product of religious contact and interaction between Taurians and Greeks. Although she has much in common with Artemis, she is never given the name Artemis (or the title *Tauropolos*) by her local worshippers. Whether Herodotus is right to say that the Taurians identified her with Iphigeneia cannot be determined, but there is no other evidence for the name in use at Chersonesos or in the Tauric peninsula more generally.<sup>40</sup> But the Greeks of other regions were free to follow the literary tradition connecting a divinised Iphigeneia with the Taurians, or indeed, like Euripides, to identify Parthenos with Artemis.

Chersonesos may have been imagined by Euripides as the site of Thoas' city, in the past of heroic mythology, before the area had been colonised by Greeks. Although inhabited solely by barbarians, the setting is described as a polis, and just as the temple and cult exhibit Greek features, so the town is like a Greek city: it has a settled centre, an extra-urban sanctuary,

<sup>39</sup> See Guldager Bilde 2009: 304–5, Braund 2018: 51–5.

<sup>40</sup> On the figure of Parthenos and her relationship with the Iphigeneia story, see Braund 2018: 15–60, esp. 41–8.

and a clear form of government (monarchical, like that of Greek cities in the heroic age where tragedy is at home). It is likely, in fact, that ἐν Ταύροις in the post-Euripidean Greek title of the play actually means ‘at [the city] Tauroi’ rather than ‘among the Taurians’.<sup>41</sup>

Beyond the Tauric peninsula itself, the wider region of the Black Sea is evoked,<sup>42</sup> but perhaps impressionistically rather than with strict geographical exactitude. Although Herodotus is well aware that the north coast of the Black Sea west of the Tanais is geographically part of Europe (4.45), the chorus speak of themselves in their unwilling journey to the Chersonese as ‘leaving Europe’ (134–5;<sup>43</sup> cf. ‘exchanging Europe for Asia’, of Io, 396–7). This suggests a ‘travel view’ rather than a ‘map view’; the Crimea is accessed from mainland Greece by sailing east, then north-east through the Sea of Marmara and into the Black Sea, and so it is easy to see how conceptually it has more in common with Asia (which it faces across the sea) than with Greece and Europe. The contrast Asia/Europe also resonates with Pelopid family history: Pelops came from Asia to settle in Greece and Agamemnon led a force from Greece to conquer an Asian city, while Iphigeneia has been taken from Greece to be held effectively captive in another part of the East.

In describing the journey which a Greek would make, in the second strophe of the first stasimon, the chorus refer to the Symplegades (‘Clashing Rocks’ – see below), the coast of Phineus (the western Black Sea coast), the island of Leuke (at the mouth of the Danube), and the ‘racecourse of Achilles’, probably the Tendra Spit at the mouth of the Dnieper. These features would all be met with on a coastal voyage from the Bosporos to the Crimea, and in that order, but despite being around 200 km (125 miles) apart, the last two seem to be confused, presumably because both are associated with Achilles (435–7n.). While conforming to the no doubt rather vague geography of most of his audience, Euripides is more interested in creating a picture of an exotic seascape (more positive in this passage than elsewhere in the play) than in giving an exact travelogue. Elsewhere the Symplegades or Dark Rocks, supposed to be

<sup>41</sup> Sider 2017. The name cannot mean ‘Iphigeneia in [the place] Tauris’; this misunderstanding has come about partly by analogy with *Iphigeneia in/at Aulis* and partly through construing the Latin title (*Iphigenia in Tauris*, where *Tauris* is ablative plural) as though it were German or English, and has spread to other languages as well. There is no ancient authority for the form Ταυρίς as a place name, yet despite this many writers continue to use the form. I refer instead to ‘Taurike’ (for Ταυρικὴ Χερσόνησος), ‘the Tauric Chersonese’, or ‘the Tauric peninsula’.

<sup>42</sup> On Greek views of the Black Sea, see West 2003.

<sup>43</sup> Unless we accept an unpersuasive emendation Εὐρώταν for Εὐρώπαν: see 132–5n.



situated at the entrance to the Black Sea, are used to indicate the whole Black Sea region: at 123–5 (see n.), Iphigeneia addresses the local people as ‘inhabitants of the twin rocks of the Inhospitable Sea, which move together’, despite the great distance between the Bosporos and the Tauric Chersonese. These clashing rocks, presenting an obvious if unlikely danger to shipping, make an apt introduction to the perilous, barbarian world in which the play is set, summed up in the adjective ἄξεivos (125n.) for the sea itself. Both the sea and the inhabitants of the lands bordering on it are unfriendly to strangers. Mythologically, Euripides associates the area with Io, whose unwilling travels to distant lands are an apt parallel for the chorus and Iphigeneia herself (394–7). The heroic deeds of the Argo voyage are by contrast completely absent. The only Greek males who make the journey are motivated by desire for profit rather than for glory (in the chorus’ mind, 398–421) or by god-driven necessity, like Orestes and (for friendship’s sake) Pylades.

The sea in general, including the Black Sea, the Propontis, and the Aegean, is also a significant motif in the play. The temple of Artemis is located on the seashore, and the play frequently reminds us of the expanse of salt water which separates the Greek characters from home and safety. The sea can represent danger, sordid profit-making, slavery, and exile; but it also has positive connotations. It is associated with heroes and divinities, and it is a powerful agent of purification. Above all, it is the means of escape and the path of a safe return to Greece.

## 4 PRODUCTION

### (a) *Structure*

All Attic tragedies contain sung and spoken sections in a roughly alternating pattern, and Aristotle’s terminology for the parts of a typical tragedy remains in use: *prologos* (prologue) for the spoken scene before the entry of the chorus, *parodos* for the chorus’ chanted or sung entrance (sometimes, as in *IT*, shared with one or more actors), *epeisodion* (episode) for the largely spoken scenes which follow, *stasimon* for the choral odes subsequent to the parodos, which divide the *epeisodia*, and *exodos* for the final spoken scene. Episodes may be punctuated by short bursts of choral song or lyric dialogue between actors (or actor and chorus) or by monodies (solo songs by actors), and so division into episodes is not an exact science: in *IT*, for instance, this edition refers to the whole of 456–1088 as a single episode, but others regard the brief lyric dialogue at 644–56 as equivalent to a stasimon in producing a division, and end the episode at 643. Be that as it may, we can represent *IT* schematically as follows:

1–122	Prologue
1–66	Monologue of Iphigeneia
67–122	Dialogue between Orestes and Pylades
123–235	Parodos: astrophic lyrics shared between Iphigeneia and the chorus
236–391	First episode
236–59	Dialogue between Iphigeneia and Herdsman
260–339	Narrative speech of Herdsman
340–2	Comment by chorus
342–91	Speech of Iphigeneia, mostly monologue after dismissing the Herdsman
392–455	First stasimon
456–1088	Second episode
456–65	Chorus comment on entry of prisoners
466–642	Dialogue between Iphigeneia and Orestes
643–56	Lyric dialogue ( <i>kommós</i> ) between chorus, Orestes, and Pylades
656–724	Dialogue between Orestes and Pylades
725–826	Dialogue between Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades (from 798 between Iphigeneia and Orestes only)
827–99	Lyric dialogue ( <i>amóibaion</i> ) between Iphigeneia and Orestes
900–38	Dialogue between Iphigeneia and Orestes (with a few lines for Pylades)
939–86	Narrative speech of Orestes
987–1055	Dialogue between Iphigeneia and Orestes
1056–88	Dialogue between Iphigeneia and chorus
1089–1152	Second stasimon
1153–1233	Third episode: dialogue between Iphigeneia and Thoas
1234–83	Third stasimon
1284–1500	Exodos
1284–1326	Dialogue between Messenger, chorus, and Thoas
1327–1419	Narrative speech of Messenger
1420–34	Brief speeches of chorus and Thoas
1435–74	Speech of Athena
1475–89	Dialogue between Thoas and Athena
1490–1500	Concluding lines of chorus

Structurally the most striking feature of the play is the length of the second episode, which in effectively a single scene takes us from the first confrontation of Iphigeneia with the two strangers (Orestes and Pylades), where the question at issue is ‘Will Iphigeneia sacrifice her brother?’,

through a long-delayed recognition, to a situation where the question is rather 'Will the trio escape?' Euripides increases tension in his audience by drawing out the recognition process, creating several points at which the truth could easily have come out but does not, and to this end the process of question and answer is extensively deployed. Thus, spoken dialogue must predominate in the scene, and within this dialogue *stichomythia* (one-line exchange) is conspicuous, as Orestes and Iphigeneia exchange information. But Euripides varies the pace by including longer interchanges between Orestes and Pylades, and – once the recognition has been accomplished – a long (somewhat impractically long, in the circumstances) narrative speech by Orestes. The greatest variation is produced by the inclusion of lyric – the very brief *kommos* or lament at 643–56 where the chorus' song surrounds single spoken lines each from Orestes and Pylades, and the much longer exchange between Iphigeneia and Orestes, the emotional high point of the whole play, where Iphigeneia sings and Orestes speaks (probably: see 832–3n).

The play's scenes are of very varied length. The prologue of 122 lines is divided into two, the first half consisting of Euripides' favourite device of an expository prologue speech, while the second half shows the arrival of Orestes and Pylades at the temple. The third episode, in which Iphigeneia deceives Thoas, is by contrast with the second very short (the tautness of the play's second half, the escape plot, would suffer if it were longer drawn out), and as a consequence the third stasimon comes very soon after the second, while there is a much longer gap between first and second stasima. The first episode and the exodos are of more moderate length, and each contains a 'messenger speech', a favourite feature of especially Sophoclean and Euripidean tragedy, in which an anonymous character provides a narrative of action offstage. Each also contains another long speech, given to Iphigeneia and Athena respectively. These two speeches have some relation to each other: in the first, Iphigeneia speculates about the nature of the divine, and in the second, Athena confirms her speculations by reaffirming the cessation of human sacrifice and asserts 'proper' divine authority.

#### (b) *Staging*

Athenian tragedies were normally composed for production at the Theatre of Dionysos during the City Dionysia festival.<sup>44</sup> That much is

<sup>44</sup> Exceptionally, dramatists produced plays outside Athens: thus, probably, E. in Macedonia (above, p. 1), and certainly Aeschylus in Sicily (Herington 1967).

certain, but the implications for the conditions of production are much less so, because the theatre we now see was radically remodelled in the third quarter of the fourth century. It may be the case that the fifth-century *orchēstra*, the flat space occupied by the chorus (and possibly the actors) was closer to rectangular than to the circular form which we associate with Greek theatres, but even this is uncertain.<sup>45</sup> It is equally debated whether the actors shared the *orchēstra* space with the chorus or whether they performed on a stage at the back of the *orchēstra*; if there was a stage, it was certainly not raised very high above the *orchēstra* level, unlike the stages of Hellenistic- and Roman-period theatres. In *IT* 1068–70, this would make it possible for Iphigeneia to approach the chorus and supplicate them physically, in a way which could not have been achieved in later theatres (though it does not, of course, prove that she did so, see n.).

The backdrop to the performing area was formed by the *skēnē* ('hut'), probably in the fifth century a relatively simple wooden structure which could be painted (or hung with painted panels) to represent whatever the play's setting required, usually a building of some sort; in *IT*, the *skēnē* stands for the temple of Artemis. The structure was equipped with a door (more accurately a double door as usual in Greek buildings), and therefore the interior could serve as a changing and waiting area for the actors while representing part of the setting for the audience. When, as often, the *skēnē* represents a palace, there is frequently a sense of menace about its interior, as most obviously in the *Oresteia* trilogy; in *IT*, although the sacrifice will take place outside the temple, the temple is still a threatening place as the house of the apparently bloodthirsty goddess and the location where preparations for the sacrifice are made, as well as being the dwelling-place of Iphigeneia herself. Entrances and exits via the *skēnē* door are often fraught with anxiety. Particularly striking is the beginning of the exodos, where at 1302–6 the Messenger becomes convinced, correctly, that Thoas is inside the temple and the audience can only hope that the doors are not opened, for Thoas' entry on to the stage will endanger the whole escape plot.

Entrances and exits could also be made along the sides of the performance area, the *parodoi* (or *eisodoi*), which led directly into the *orchēstra*; indeed, the chorus would normally use only these routes,<sup>46</sup> and their

<sup>45</sup> On the form of the theatre in the fifth century, see Moretti 1999–2000, Rehm 2002: 39–40, Csapo and Goette 2007: 96–121.

<sup>46</sup> There is an unusual breach of this convention in *Helen*, where at 327 the chorus express a wish to enter the palace with Helen, who encourages them at 330–1; by or at the end of the lyric exchange, all have left the performance area by this route, leaving it clear for the entry of Menelaos.

entrance song was likewise known as *parodos*. In most tragedies, the two *parodoi* represent clearly defined directions, typically one side representing the direction of the city (or another part of the city) and the other the country or seacoast (although this does not seem to have been such an invariable rule as later sources suggest).<sup>47</sup> In *IT*, since the scene is set at an extra-urban sanctuary by the sea, we would expect one *parodos* to stand for the route from the Taurian city and the other to represent the direction further along the coast, leading to the place where Orestes' ship is moored and, at some distance, the cave where he and Pylades hide after their first entrance. But there are problems with this. The Herdsman enters from the seashore (236), but when he reaches the sanctuary of Artemis he has already escorted his prisoners to the king: could the king's palace, and therefore the city, lie in between the more distant part of the shore and the sanctuary? Again, when the 'purificatory' procession makes its way from the sanctuary to the more remote seashore, Iphigeneia, as instructed (1211–12), warns the citizens, especially those most vulnerable to the effects of ritual pollution, to keep away, so it might seem that the procession will pass through the city itself. Because of these sections, some scholars suppose that only one *parodos* is used in the play.<sup>48</sup> That would, however, be very unusual, and seemingly pointless, given that there are in fact two significant localities imagined just offstage. There is a similar problem in *Bacchae*, where Dionysos must take Pentheus through the city to reach the bacchantes on Mount Kithairon. Perhaps the dramatists were less precise about imagined direction than is sometimes supposed.<sup>49</sup> At any rate, it is clear that most of the entrances take place from the 'seashore' direction, and the main characters make their final exit that way (1233).

The fifth-century theatre had two further means of effecting entrances into the performing area, the *ekkyklēma* and the *mēchanē*. The former, which allowed the presentation of an indoor scene by 'rolling out' a platform from the *skēnē* doors, is not needed in *IT*. The *mēchanē*, or crane, could be deployed to represent the arrival of characters from above, or through the air, and was probably used for the entry of Athena at the end of the play (see 1435–74n.); the alternative possibility is that she

<sup>47</sup> Notably Pollux 4.126.15, although as it stands the passage must be corrupt.

<sup>48</sup> Confidently stated by Kyriakou (commentary, p. 38), following England and others. Hourmouziades (1965: 32) is less definite, noting the problem but suggesting that the second *parodos* is used by the chorus and probably Thoas.

<sup>49</sup> Arist. *Poet.* 17.1455a26–8, recounting the failure of a play of Karkinos because of some perceived incongruity in an entrance, is very uncertain of interpretation (Davidson 2003), but certainly cannot involve a confusion of the two *parodoi*, since the *ἱερόν* mentioned must be represented by the *skēnē*.

appeared on the *skēnē* roof, which was certainly used in some tragic scenes (for instance the episode in *Phoenissae* where Antigone and the *Paidagōgos* observe the army about to attack Thebes).

The performance space in many tragedies, including *IT*, requires structures other than the *skēnē*. It can be assumed that *Hippolytus*, for instance, had a statue of Aphrodite beside the *skēnē* doors (τὴνδ' ἢ πύλαισι σαῖς ἐφέστηκεν Κύπρις, 101) and perhaps a statue of Artemis as well. More often a quadrangular stone structure is required to represent an altar (typically in suppliant plays) or a tomb. It used often to be stated that the theatre of Dionysos possessed an altar to the god situated in the middle of the *orchestra* which could stand for an object of this sort, but in fact there is no evidence for this.<sup>50</sup> It is more likely that temporary structures were used as each play required. In *IT*, the *skēnē* represents the temple of Artemis, and an altar is therefore needed outside it, not merely because temples have external altars, but because this altar is the location of the sacrifice of humans, the play's most horrific theme. At 72–5 Orestes and Pylades describe this altar for the audience and make it clear that the blood and other traces (armour? clothing? heads? See n.) that it shows belonged to human victims.

Props are used sparingly in fifth-century drama, and partly for that reason are often particularly striking or significant. The two main portable objects used in our play are Iphigeneia's letter and the statue of Artemis. The former is simple in form, but is used to great effect in the recognition scene when Pylades 'delivers' it to Orestes standing next to him (791–2); since the actual tokens of recognition which convince Iphigeneia of her brother's identity in the following lines are remembered rather than produced, the letter performs the visual function of these tokens.<sup>51</sup> Its significance in this role is suggested by several fourth-century vases showing Iphigeneia, dressed as a priestess, handing the letter to Pylades.<sup>52</sup> The evidence of vase-painting further suggests that one or more lustral basins (χέρνιβες, see 58n.) may have been present on stage, at least in fourth-century productions.<sup>53</sup>

The cult statue of Artemis has been in the audience's consciousness long before they actually see it; already at 85–8 they learn that the aim of Orestes' and Pylades' journey is to steal the statue from its Taurian home and establish it for worship somewhere in Attica. And since the Greeks often implicitly identified statues with the gods they represented (Iphigeneia asks Artemis to leave a barbarian land and come to Athens,

<sup>50</sup> Rehm 2002: 41 and n. 26.      <sup>51</sup> Rosenmeyer 2013: 41–54.

<sup>52</sup> See below, p. 45.      <sup>53</sup> Taplin 2007: 154.

not to permit her statue to do so, 1086–8) the statue is the focus of the horror caused by the idea of a deity welcoming human sacrifice. At the same time, the audience must realise it will be identified with an Artemis in their own polis. When Iphigeneia emerges from the temple carrying the statue, the impact should be considerable; in a sense, this is the epiphany of Artemis which is missing at the end of the play, where the appearance of Athena takes its place. The statue must be quite small, in order to be carried by the priestess, the only person allowed to touch it (1045); it is shown this way in ancient art, both on fourth-century vases<sup>54</sup> and in Roman wall-painting (below, p. 46). Beyond this we cannot be clear about its likely appearance. As an ancient, wooden statue (βρέτας), believed to have fallen from the sky, and eventually identified with the cult image at Halai Araphenides, it would be unlikely in ‘real life’ to be strongly anthropomorphic, but on stage it may have been preferable to represent it as recognisably like Artemis, as it is shown in visual depictions of the drama.

The procession leading to the ‘purification’, described at 1222–5, requires various objects, in addition to the mute servants and attendants needed to escort the captives and carry the ritual paraphernalia. Clothes and jewellery for the statue, lit torches, and lambs to be slaughtered are mentioned, as well as ‘all the other things’ which Iphigeneia organised for the purification of the strangers and the goddess. The lambs might seem to present some problems on stage, but ancient audiences would be used to sacrificial processions and the sometimes erratic behaviour of the animals involved. Animals appear on the tragic stage also at *El.* 494–5 and *Helen* 1169, not to mention numerous occasions when entries are made by carriage or chariot. The procession is an elaborate and visually memorable way for the three Greek characters to leave the stage for the final time.

After the introduction of a third actor by Sophocles, tragedies were designed to be performed by three male actors alongside a chorus; no tragedy demands a fourth actor (though in *Oedipus at Colonus* one or more parts must be split if the three-actor rule is adhered to).<sup>55</sup> The three actors were of unequal status, with the *protagonistēs* taking the longest and most virtuoso role(s), usually that of the title character. In *IT*, the three actors must play respectively Iphigeneia (whose part is somewhat longer than that of Orestes, and who also sings), Orestes, and Pylades, who are all on stage together in the long central scene. The Iphigeneia actor probably

<sup>54</sup> E.g. *LMC* Iphigenia 19, 23.

<sup>55</sup> Rapid changeovers might be needed, notably at *Cho.* 886–900, but these do not seem to be impossible: Marshall 2003, esp. 261–3.

took the part of Athena, while Orestes and Pylades could have played the Herdsman, Thoas, and the Messenger in various combinations. Apart from the chorus, a number of mute extras are required to stage the play, representing temple personnel and attendants of Thoas (see 466–642n.). The roles of Orestes and Pylades in the procession (1222–33) were probably also taken by extras clothed in the appropriate costumes and wearing the appropriate masks. The actors playing these parts exit into the *skēnē* at 1080; one of them must then change costume and enter as Thoas at 1153, stepping into the *skēnē* only just before the procession comes onstage, while the other would have ample time to reappear as the Messenger at 1284.

The chorus, historically the heart of dramatic production, remained central in general perception: to produce a play, for the dramatist, was to ‘teach a chorus’. While actors were not yet the superstars they would become a few decades later, they were moving towards professional status, and a prize for the *protagonistēs* had been available since 447, but the chorus members, like those of dithyrambic choruses, were ordinary ‘lay’ citizens (fifteen in the late fifth century), although it remains possible that there was a bias towards the richer classes in society.<sup>56</sup>

It is difficult to state much for certain about tragic costume. Since tragic characters were mainly of noble birth, we can surmise that formal, fine-quality clothing was appropriate, and this is the impression we gain from vases which appear to show tragic productions; vase-painters may well have used their imagination rather than their memory for details, but they must have depicted something which looked generally plausible. The fact that Euripides was criticised for introducing heroes in rags (though Aeschylus did it first, with Xerxes in *Persae*) also suggests that there was a general expectation that tragic costumes would be sumptuous, at least for the main roles. Humbler characters such as servants and messengers would presumably be distinguished by less fine clothing. In *IT*, in addition to class distinctions, there is a distinction as in some other plays between Greek and barbarian, and it is hard to imagine this was not reflected in their clothing. The dialogue at lines 246–7 probably suggests that the Herdsman can identify the strangers as Greek by what they wear (246n.). The Taurian characters then would be somehow marked as barbarians by their costume. Since the Taurians were neighbours of the Scythians, it is conceivable that the Herdsman and the Messenger could even have worn trousers, but Thoas as king will have had robes appropriate to royalty, perhaps with an all-over pattern, which was considered un-Greek.

<sup>56</sup> On this question see Wilson 2000: 75–80, 123–30.



Orestes and Pylades would wear normal Greek dress of a style appropriate to young men, and no doubt would be marked out as travellers by the style of their footwear, and by wearing hats – as they are typically shown on fourth-century vases (below, pp. 44–5). Iphigeneia and the chorus would be dressed as unmarried Greek women, with Iphigeneia's dress no doubt distinguished by a richer appearance. As priestess (κληιδούχος, 130–1 n.), she probably carried a large temple key, as she is shown in vase-painting, and as real-life priestesses in Attica were often depicted on their grave monuments.

(c) *Metre, music, and dance*

Music, accompanied by dance, was a major part of tragic production, but one almost completely lost to us. Although some spoken lines are assigned to the chorus (usually spoken by the chorus-leader or *koryphaios* alone, it is generally assumed), its chief job was to sing, either alone or in dialogue with one or more of the actors, and simultaneously to dance. Typically the choral songs punctuate the action, with the entry song of the chorus (*parodos*) taking place after a spoken *prologos* (except in very early tragedy) and thereafter the introduction of three or more songs for the chorus alone (*stasima*) or with an actor. We speak of choral 'lyric' because the sung metres of early Greek poetry were often accompanied by the lyre, but the songs of tragedy, like their dithyrambic predecessors, were in fact sung to the accompaniment of the aulos, a wind instrument of double-reed type like the modern oboe but generally played in a pair; the aulos-player himself might become a celebrity, like the famous Pronomos.<sup>57</sup> Of the scanty remains of ancient Greek music, most pieces are of Hellenistic or Roman date, but a third-century fragmentary papyrus of the *Orestes* containing musical notation may represent Euripides' original composition, which it would likely have been desirable to preserve along with the text. This allows us to reconstruct music for a few lines of the first stasimon (338–44).<sup>58</sup> But this is not much to go on; apart from this, we can see the bare bones of musical form in the metres of the songs, which give us a sense of the rhythms used and above all allow us to see that most songs were composed in 'strophic' form, that is to say with rhythmic patterns, usually complex, repeated once exactly (or almost exactly), forming a 'strophe' and 'antistrophe' and usually followed by another 'strophic pair'. The

<sup>57</sup> Wilson 2007, Taplin and Wyles 2010.

<sup>58</sup> Pöhlmann and West 2001: 12–17; cf. 10–11 on the comments of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (following n.); Ercoles 2020: 137–8, also citing dissenting voices.

metrical repetition was mirrored by repetition of music,<sup>59</sup> and probably of dance; the 'turn/counter-turn' phraseology suggests that the steps of the antistrophe could have reversed those of the strophe.<sup>60</sup>

There were many different 'families' of lyric metre, and the tragic poets were skilled at producing almost infinitely varied patterns within these general groups. Most lyric metres were associated more with particular areas of Greece or with particular poets than with any one kind of emotion or situation. Lament, for instance, is ubiquitous in tragedy, but has no single metre proper to it. In *IT*, the parodos, essentially a lament, is in anapaestic form, but the laments of other tragedies use different metres, and lyric anapaests are used in many contexts other than mourning and lamentation. Only dochmiacs have a close association with a particular mood, being proper to heightened, strong emotion; but even in this case, strong emotion is commonplace in tragedy, and is not invariably expressed in dochmiacs. The lyrics of individual tragedies often show a preference for a general metrical type. Thus, in *IT*, after the anapaestic introduction, the purely choral passages are predominantly aeolo-choriambic (a very large metrical family, in which glyconics and pherecrateans are the commonest units), but with a generous admixture of metres of other types. The songs shared with the actors, on the other hand, have a mainly dochmiac rhythm. While choral lyric can express a variety of mental states from agitation to calm reflexion, the songs of actors, whether monody, 'punctuated monody' (see 827–99n.), or lyric dialogue, are almost always highly emotional, and here dochmiacs are appropriate. Full metrical analyses of all the lyric sections of *IT* will be found in the Commentary.

If differing rhythmic patterns are only very loosely and partially correlated with differing moods, the same is not true of melodic schemes. Greek music knew a number of different 'modes', or scales, supplying the notes available for any given melody; the closest modern equivalent would be the *rāgas* of Indian classical music, or in Western music the difference between major and minor keys. Somewhat like *rāgas*, these modes had particular associations, but rather than being linked with a time of day or a season they evoked different moods: in the *Republic*, Plato associated the Mixolydian and Syntonolydian modes with lamentation, and labelled the Lydian and Ionian as 'soft' and appropriate to drinking-parties; he therefore wished to restrict music in his ideal state to compositions in the Dorian and Phrygian modes, which he viewed as promoting courage in war and *sōphrosynē* in peace respectively.<sup>61</sup> Although not all Plato's

<sup>59</sup> Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 19.

<sup>60</sup> See Wiles 1997: 93–6.

<sup>61</sup> Pl. *Rep.* 3.398e–399c.

associations may have been universal,<sup>62</sup> it is still likely that the melodies of Euripides' songs would have set particular expectations appropriate to their texts. However, Euripides was linked by contemporaries with musical innovation, a complex of interrelated tendencies deplored by Plato and other conservative critics, and known to moderns as the 'new music'.<sup>63</sup> Where older styles were represented by critics as simple and unadorned, the music essentially subordinate to the words, the new music was thought to be characterised by florid ornamentation, music for its own sake. Aristophanes' parody of Euripides' use of multiple notes to one syllable is well known (εἰεἰεἰεἰεἰλίσσεται, *Frogs* 1314, cf. 1348); in addition, it appears that the coincidence of musical pitch with the normal pitch accent of spoken Greek was less closely observed, while the *Orestes* papyrus (above, p. 27) shows that the aulos-player's part need no longer be in unison with the vocal line. Contemporaries often regarded such music as shapeless and meandering, and verbally a similar lack of tautness, characterised by long, 'agglutinative' periods, can be observed in much late Euripidean lyric.<sup>64</sup> The first and second strophes of the first stasimon of *IT*, each composed of a single sentence, supply good examples. Another favourite Euripidean trope, though one with roots in earlier tragic and non-tragic lyric, is the use of textual reference to musical performance, so that the chorus sing and dance about song, dance, and choruses. In *IT*, the chorus remember their old life as maidens at the dance (1143–51), and evoke choruses or dances of Nereids (427–9), among other suggestive passages, and a great deal of imagery further draws on choral associations, so that the theme of music is kept in the forefront of the audience's mind and the real chorus of Athenian male citizens is temporarily approximated to choruses of young women and mythical beings.<sup>65</sup>

The importance of dance is seen in the name of the part of the performance area where the chorus was situated – the *orchēstra*, or dancing-place. In staging terms, although any number of effects could be created by the interplay of chorus and actors, the chorus' main and invariable function was to dance. The dance of tragedy, like other aspects of tragic performance, evolved from dithyramb, but the characteristic circular form of the latter was probably in tragedy gradually giving way to a rectangular layout during the fifth century, although both formations could have

<sup>62</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 8.1342a32–b5 explicitly criticises the *Republic* passage, on the grounds that the Phrygian mode, like the aulos, is ὀργιαστικὸν καὶ παθητικόν (West 1992: 180, 'exciting and emotional').

<sup>63</sup> See D'Angour 2020. <sup>64</sup> Csapo 2004: 225–6.

<sup>65</sup> Weiss 2018; see also Henrichs 1995.

co-existed, to be used in different productions.<sup>66</sup> Tragic dance was, as one might expect, measured and dignified compared with the dances of satyric or comic choruses, although it must have been capable of expressing excitement and joy, notably in the short lyric sections appearing in several of Sophocles' plays where the chorus reacts with extravagant hope just before a catastrophe.<sup>67</sup> How far choral dance was mimetic is a debatable point. References to 'poses' (σχήματα) and 'gestures' (χειρονομίαι) suggest a degree of representation rather than purely abstract movement, but this need not have been especially naturalistic. Indeed, if strophic responsion suggests an equal choreographic responsion, it is difficult to see how such imitation could have been achieved.<sup>68</sup> Perhaps the somewhat formal and patterned movement of the choral dances created a contrast with the more expressive and truly mimetic actions of the actors, as the sung parts of the drama contrasted with the spoken.

## 5 THEMES

### (a) *Non-'tragic' tragedy, 'escape tragedy'*

'Tragedy' and 'tragic' in modern parlance indicate circumstances or events which are perceived as sad or catastrophic. The Greek word τραγωδία has no such necessary connotations. Put simply, a Greek tragedy can have a happy ending. What defined a tragedy was not the type of plot deployed, but the existence of a tragic chorus, as opposed to a chorus of satyric or comic type. Secondary markers were an elevated 'poetic' register of diction, a degree of seriousness in plot and theme, and in production certain styles of costume, music, and dance (above, pp. 26–9). It is true that the majority of extant tragedies, including those most familiar to modern audiences and readers, conform to our notions of the tragic; and Aristotle's judgement, that a plot with a change of fortune from better to worse is superior to one which moves in the reverse direction,<sup>69</sup> has been extremely influential in forming an idea of what tragedy should be. But examples of tragedies with positive or ambiguous endings are not hard to find. If *Agamemnon*, with its horrific murders and foreshadowing of an endless cycle of revenge, seems to us properly 'tragic', the *Oresteia* trilogy ends

<sup>66</sup> Wiles 2000: 133–4.

<sup>67</sup> *Aj.* 693–718, *OT* 1088–1107, *Trach.* 205–24 (*Ant.* 1115–52 is longer and more like a regular stasimon).

<sup>68</sup> *Contra* Wiles 1997: 87–113, where much of the detailed analysis is unconvincing.

<sup>69</sup> *Arist. Poet.* 13.1453a13–16. Nonetheless, he cites *IT* approvingly in several places; see below, p. 45.

with Orestes acquitted and freed from pursuit by the Furies, while Athens and its civilising achievement are celebrated. The ending of *Oedipus at Colonus* is poised between the awe-inspiring translation of its protagonist (recompense for his earlier sufferings?) and anticipation of the horrors about to come in Thebes. Euripides' plays include some which temper a conclusion of total disaster with the sense that 'life must go on', even for the protagonist – 'catastrophe survived'<sup>70</sup> – and also some in which disaster is averted or negated, among them the early *Alcestis* (438) and the late *Orestes* (408). In this group, *Ion* and *Helen* are of roughly similar date to *IT* and have most in common with it. In all three plays, a delayed recognition is central to the action (though recognitions are also important in many more 'tragic' tragedies), in all three death is narrowly averted, and all three end with a homecoming, of one sort or another. Twentieth-century critics sometimes labelled the plays 'tragicomedies' or 'romantic melodrama'.<sup>71</sup> Such labels (at least the second) can be useful if applied loosely to designate a type of plot with a cliffhanger and a happy ending, which anticipates in some respects the later Greek novel; but they become seriously misleading if they are thought to imply a separate category characterised by blurring or crossing of generic lines.<sup>72</sup>

*Ion* further shares with *IT* the setting in a sanctuary, with concomitant evocation of cult action and temple service; some strong criticism of Apollo from the characters, softened by the positive outcome of events; and the narrowly averted killing of unrecognised close kin (Kreousa and Ion, mother and son, attempt to bring about each other's death, the latter in revenge). But the resemblance of *Helen* to *IT* is even closer. Both plays are set outside Greece (Egypt, the Tauric Chersonese), where a woman (Helen, Iphigeneia) is detained against her will until the arrival of a male family member (Menelaos, Orestes). Recognition is delayed by the false assumptions of one or both parties (Menelaos believes he has brought Helen with him to Egypt, Iphigeneia and Orestes each believe the other is dead), but is established in the end with great joy, and an escape is plotted. The man inclines to violence, but the woman crafts a plan using deception, which is successful (*Helen*) or fails at the last minute (*IT*), and at the end a god (the Dioskouroi, Athena) intervenes to calm the anger of the barbarian king and prevent disaster (the murder of Theonoe, the

<sup>70</sup> Burnett 1971.

<sup>71</sup> 'Tragicomedy' used by (among many) Vickers 1973: 299; 'romantic melodrama' proposed for *IT* by Kitto 1961: 311, though he treats it with *Alcestis*, *Ion*, and *Helen* under the 'not altogether satisfactory' heading of 'tragi-comedies'; 'romantic tragedy' by Conacher 1967: 14.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. the extended argument of Wright 2005: 6–43.

recapture of the escaping trio). The similarities are indeed striking, and metrically the degree of resolution in the trimeter (above, p. 2) would place *IT* close in date to *Helen* in 412. It is not perhaps surprising that Euripides' mind should have been working along the same lines for the same few years, but is the connexion stronger than this? A possibility attractive in some ways is that *IT* was the third tragedy which Euripides produced in 412, along with *Helen* and the lost *Andromeda* (which we already know were performed together).<sup>73</sup> Thematically linked trilogies are not certainly attested, but that does not mean they could not have existed. More problematic for this theory is the innovation in the lyric form known to moderns as the wilamowitzianum (above, pp. 2–3), which is found in *Helen* but not in *IT*, but as Parker cautiously observes, this tells us about the date of composition, not of production.<sup>74</sup>

Whether or not they were produced together, the three plays follow a similar storyline. Stories of escape from danger in strange, exotic locations go back in Greek literature to the *Odyssey*, where they form the central part of the epic. Bringing a woman, whether virginal or, like Helen, chastely married, into the picture adds an extra spice, since women are considered to be more vulnerable and also, as home dwellers, out of place in distant locations. However, *Andromeda* must have differed slightly from the other two plays in that the captive woman is herself barbarian, not Greek (her captivity is very literal, as she is chained to a rock as fodder to placate a sea-monster), and the man is not known to her – it is only after the rescue that he becomes her husband. The rescue motif seems also to have occupied only part of the play, with the remainder probably treating the opposition of Andromeda's parents to her marriage, and her choice of Perseus over her parents.<sup>75</sup> In this way Euripides varies the 'damsel in distress' motif slightly to give the heroine some agency and indeed perhaps the most ethically interesting part. In the surviving two plays, the female partners are conventionally unable to save themselves without the arrival of a man, but they then prove resourceful and ingenious in what is often represented as women's natural realm, that of deception; it is they, not their male counterparts, who devise the plan which allows them to escape.

The theme of recognition implies prior ignorance, and the relationship between the two is crucial to many tragedies. But in *IT* and *Helen*, Euripides introduces a variant. The theme of appearance and reality is

<sup>73</sup> Wright 2005: 47–54, tentatively also suggesting that *Cyclops* could have been the final play in the tetralogy. But see Hunter–Laemmlé 40–1.

<sup>74</sup> p. lxxix n. 164.

<sup>75</sup> [Eratosthenes] *Catast.* 17.

prominent in *Helen*, with its story of a phantom and a real Helen.<sup>76</sup> It may have been used in *Andromeda* as well; F 125 shows that on arrival Perseus believes Andromeda to be a statue. Where Menelaos believes that the εἶδωλον Helen is the real thing, Perseus takes the real Andromeda for an εἶδωλον. In *IT*, the application is somewhat different, centring on the gap between Iphigeneia's real fate and what everyone thinks had happened to her.<sup>77</sup> This point is introduced at the beginning of the play, when in line 7 Iphigeneia explains that her father 'slaughtered her, as it appears' (ἐσφαξεν ... ὥς δοκεῖ), and this is echoed in her lyrics at 176–7 (ἔνθα δοκήμασι κεῖμαι σφαχθεῖς ἅ τλάμων), and by Orestes at 831 (τὴν θανοῦσαν, ὥς δοξάζεται), while at 784–5 Agamemnon is said to have *thought* that he was putting his daughter to the sword (δοκῶν ἐς ἡμᾶς ὁξὺ φάσγανον βαλεῖν). It is this presupposition, shared by all of Greece, which prevents Orestes from recognising his sister, and it is the deceptive appearance (φάσματα) of a dream, whose narrative is likewise introduced by ἔδοξ', which leads Iphigeneia in turn to suppose that her brother is dead (42, 44). The first half of the play contains other appearance–reality contrasts and apparent misinterpretations; for instance, one of the Taurian herdsmen takes Orestes and Pylades to be gods (267–74), while Iphigeneia concludes that Artemis cannot really desire human sacrifice, and the Taurians mistakenly project their own savage nature on to their goddess (389–91).

When brother and sister achieve their mutual recognition, they also gain an understanding of how things really are; Orestes, impractically as Pylades suggests (902–8), launches into a long account of his sufferings since the murder of Klytaimestra, updating his sister on real events. In the second half of the play, the Greek characters plot their escape through deception: what seems to be the case to Thoas and the other Taurians is quite different from the reality. πιστὸν Ἑλλὰς οἶδεν οὐδέν ('Greece knows nothing trustworthy'), comments Iphigeneia (1205). Whereas she and Orestes are initially mistrustful of each other, and therefore slow to reveal things which might prompt a recognition, Thoas trusts Iphigeneia and is ready to believe her false explanation.<sup>78</sup> The Greeks have appropriated the confusion between seeming and being and turned it to their own advantage.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Extensively discussed since at least Solmsen 1934; for an overview, see Allan 47–9.

<sup>77</sup> On the theme in *IT* and *Helen*, see also the discussion in Wright 2005: 285–97.

<sup>78</sup> See Budelmann 2019.

<sup>79</sup> For a more elaborate and darker interpretation of the play through the themes of falsehood and deception, see Hartigan 1991: 89–106.

*(b) Human sacrifice, a barbarian custom?*

Human sacrifice, whether averted at the last moment or actually carried out, is a not uncommon motif in Greek mythology. Usually it is commanded by a deity in extreme circumstances and performed as a last resort in order to save a community, or as in the case of Iphigeneia's sacrifice at Aulis, to salvage a great enterprise. It is a theme explored several times in the extant tragedies of Euripides. Aside from the two Iphigeneia plays, *Heraclidae* (*Children of Herakles*) contains the voluntary sacrifice of Herakles' daughter to Kore in order to ensure the defeat of Eurystheus and his Argives, and *Phoenissae* that of Kreon's son Menoikeus to save Thebes against the Seven. The fragmentary *Erechtheus* included the sacrifice of one of King Erechtheus' daughters (joined voluntarily by her two sisters) to assure the victory of Athens over Eleusis. It is possible that Euripides invented some of these stories; he is clearly interested in exploring the wider theme of facing death willingly, as we see for instance in Alkestis' willingness to die in place of her husband Admetos (*Alkestis*) and Euadne's death on her husband's funeral pyre (*Suppliants/ Suppliant Women*). The Iphigeneia story is, however, considerably older (above, pp. 4–5), and lacks any voluntary element; Artemis decrees the sacrifice, for reasons which vary in different accounts, and Agamemnon carries it out – or thinks he does. This is the version of *IT*, although in the later *Iphigeneia at Aulis* the character conforms to the preferred Euripidean pattern, moving from horror at her impending sacrificial death to patriotically embracing her fate. Similarly, when Polyxene in *Hecuba* is to be sacrificed as an offering to the dead Achilles, in another Euripidean version of an older story, she accepts what must happen and goes willingly to her death.

The presentation of events at Aulis in *IT* is entirely different. Iphigeneia remembers those events and the cruel trick used to lure her there with only horror and despair – despair because although she was saved from death the result was that she must live far from her family in a foreign land, presiding over a horrible ritual: this is the end result of the sacrifice. There is no sense that her seeming death was for the greater good, and unlike the other Euripidean characters who face sacrifice, she survives. What her own presentation emphasises is the culpability of various actors in the whole affair: Helen for providing the reason for the war against Troy, Menelaos for wanting to get her back (or to exact vengeance), Kalchas for his prophecy requiring the sacrifice, and Odysseus for devising the story of a marriage to bring her to Aulis. She stops just short of blaming her father, but nonetheless, following Aeschylus (ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός, *Ag.* 224–5), Euripides understandably makes her



dwell on the particular horror that it was a father who sacrificed his own daughter. This moves beyond the sacrificial motif to fit into the larger pattern of kin-killing which characterises the family of Agamemnon (below, pp. 37–40). There follow the murders of Agamemnon by Klytaimnestra and of Klytaimnestra by Orestes, and in this version the near sacrifice of Orestes by Iphigeneia, which would neatly complete the circle.

This sacrificial doubling is another distinctive feature of the theme in this play. Iphigeneia has been saved from a sacrificial death only to find herself presiding over human sacrifice; at 358 she makes the parallel clear, wishing to punish Menelaos and Helen with ‘the Aulis here’ (τὴν ἐνθάδ’ Αὔλιαν), and the sacrifices she performs are distasteful to her. But the emotional charge and the suspense of the first part of the play, up until the recognition, lie in the possibility that she might unknowingly sacrifice her own brother.

With the Taurian sacrifices we move from the mythological domain of the one-off event necessitated by a crisis to the second area where human sacrifice is at home in Greek thought – as a regular practice among barbarians. Plato indeed suggests that the ritual is practised by the Arcadians,<sup>80</sup> a notoriously primitive people in the Greek imagination, but elsewhere Greek writers attribute it as a present-day custom solely to barbarians. Indeed, to predicate human sacrifice of a people is a powerful way of ‘othering’ the non-Greek.<sup>81</sup> Fifth-century Greeks associated the practice with Taurians, Scythians, and other northern barbarians,<sup>82</sup> as well as Phoenicians and Carthaginians,<sup>83</sup> and (in the past, at least) Egyptians. The story that Herakles had put an end to the Egyptian custom of sacrificing foreigners (mostly, of course, imagined as Greeks) by killing King Bousiris on his own altar was a popular one, to judge by vase-painting, if not always taken seriously.<sup>84</sup> Herodotus rejects the story as sensationalistic and implausible for a people who refuse to sacrifice even most animals,<sup>85</sup> and in *Helen* there is no suggestion that Menelaos is in danger of being sacrificed, rather than simply killed, by the Egyptian king Theoklymenos. Euripides’ Egypt is a curious blend of the more common barbarian

<sup>80</sup> Pl. *Rep.* 8.565d. <sup>81</sup> Bonnechere 1994: 237–40, Hall 1989: 146–8.

<sup>82</sup> e.g. Hdt. 4.62, 4.103.

<sup>83</sup> Soph. fr. 126 (from *Andromeda*), taken with [Pl.] *Minos* 315b–c, almost certainly refers to Carthaginian child sacrifice.

<sup>84</sup> Vases: LIMC Bousiris 1–30. In literature, the story features in Panyassis’ epic *Herakleia* (fr. 12 Bernabé), and in a satyr-play of E. and several comedies, as well as in the later epideictic speech of Isocrates. Further references in Livingstone 2001: 77–83.

<sup>85</sup> Hdt. 2.45.

stereotype of unreasoned violence (Theoklymenos) with cultural associations of extreme religiosity and advanced moral sensibility (Theonoe). But the Tauric Chersonese is free to be a place of unqualified barbarism. Thoas certainly shows religiosity, as do the two messengers, but they are convinced that their goddess welcomes the sacrifice of strangers, especially Greeks, and have no characteristics corresponding to Theonoe's purity and holiness. Thus, Iphigeneia can use the 'barbaric' nature of the Taurians as an unquestioned premise for her theory that humans project their own qualities on to the gods (389–90). She knows that Thoas will be scrupulous about matters of purity and pollution, as indeed he is – even though the sacrifice itself would be unthinkable polluting in a normal, Greek, context. What Thoas exemplifies, then, is a sort of perverted piety which is attentive to detail and respects the perceived will of the gods (he has no hesitation in complying with Athena's instructions at the end of the play), but radically misunderstands what the gods are like.

This misunderstanding is connected with the difference between a barbarian, savage culture and (Greek) civilisation, but perhaps this is not the whole story. 'What the gods are like' is a major preoccupation in Euripides' work, a problem that is not easily solved. Iphigeneia's avowal that she cannot believe Artemis would be so morally insensate (ἀμαθής) as to ordain human sacrifice is paralleled by many passages in other plays in which characters query beliefs about the gods or divine behaviour, and in which no barbarian context is involved. Kadmos in *Bacchae* and the old servant in *Hippolytus* remark that gods should not be angry or vengeful, while Ion expresses shock on hearing that the male gods have illicit sex with mortal women.<sup>86</sup> The difference here is that while for the purposes of the play these characters are all mistaken in their initial assumption of a superior divine morality, Iphigeneia seems to be correct. Since Apollo commands the removal of his sister's cult statue to Greece, since Artemis does not appear to object, and since Athena supplies the further details of Artemis' worship in Attica, we must assume that the goddess does not in fact desire (or no longer desires?) the human sacrifice which is the central part of her worship by the Taurians, even if she accepts a small amount of human blood as recompense. But while on the surface the story may seem to be one of a geographical and ethnic transition from barbarism to civilisation (as Iphigeneia suggests (1087–8), Artemis ought to prefer to live in and protect Athens rather than Taurike), the play throws up enough counter-suggestions to complicate matters. After all, Iphigeneia finds herself offering human sacrifice in accordance with barbarian custom only

<sup>86</sup> E. *Hipp.* 120, *Bacch.* 1348, *Ion* 436–51.

because of a human sacrifice offered by Greeks. If Artemis cannot really be guilty of ἀμαθία through desiring human sacrifice in Taurike, then the same must be true of her apparent demand at Aulis: in both cases the cause lies in the human realm, not the divine. The blame must fall on Kalchas, whom Iphigeneia certainly holds responsible (16–24, 531–3), but also on Agamemnon. Was it their own murderous instincts which led them to accept the idea that Artemis could want Iphigeneia to be sacrificed?

A related issue is Apollo's commanding Orestes to kill his mother. From the point of view of the play's narrative dimension it must be accepted that Apollo did make this order (just as, in Euripides' other plays, gods vent their anger, display cruelty, and have sex with mortal women) and seemingly, despite Orestes' doubts in the first part of the drama, that he was right to do so. But the order is inherently problematic: could a god really command such a wicked act?<sup>87</sup> Elsewhere, Euripides allows the suggestion that the proper, 'civilised' response to Klytaimestra's crime, indeed the one established by ancestral custom, would have been to banish her, not to kill her (*Or.* 507–25). To murder in retaliation is 'bestial and defiled by blood' (θηριῶδες ... καὶ μαιφόνον).<sup>88</sup> As for the peculiar horror of matricide, Thoas says it all: 'Not even among the barbarians would someone dare do that' (1174). Orestes has infringed not just the norms of civilised Greece, but a universal law. Despite the optimistic ending with its implications of progress from savagery to enlightenment, Euripides scatters hints that the dichotomy of cruel barbarian and refined, humane Greek might be too simple.

### (c) *Family*

The descent line to which Iphigeneia and Orestes belong is one of the favourites of the tragic dramatists, as Aristotle comments.<sup>89</sup> Right from the start, the audience is made aware that this descent will be an important theme in the play: Iphigeneia begins her prologue by tracing her ancestry, and the very first word is 'Pelops'. The misery she feels at the play's beginning is prompted by her belief that the dream she has just seen indicates her brother's death and hence the collapse of the family (οἶκος), signalled by the literal collapse of the house. Summoned by her to perform such funeral rites as they can, the chorus lament the history of the

<sup>87</sup> See especially Roberts 1984: 102–8.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. the criticism of Apollo by Kastor/the Dioskouroi *ex machina* at *El.* 1244–6.

<sup>89</sup> Arist. *Poet.* 13.1453a20 lists Orestes and Thyestes together with Alkmaion, Oedipus, Meleager, and Telephos.

family, recalling the quarrel over sovereignty between Atreus and Thyestes (189–96), later revealed as the subject of Iphigeneia's girlish weaving (811–17). Much of the early conversation of Orestes and Iphigeneia, before the recognition takes place, is concerned with the family to which they both belong, and the recognition tokens have reference not only to Iphigeneia's own story, the false wedding and the sacrifice at Aulis, but to remoter history as well: the quarrel of Atreus and Thyestes, and the winning of Hippodameia by Pelops.

An Athenian audience would naturally expect a mythological tragedy to include references to the characters' forebears and to the wider narrative frame in which the story is set (in this case the Trojan War and its aftermath). But an artful poet will do more than merely fill in historical background. Earlier stories may suggest an appropriate mood or hint at structural parallels with the main plotline. In the case of *IT*, there are certain recurring patterns. Pelops, represented in the play as the founder of the line,<sup>90</sup> comes from barbarian lands to win a Greek wife and settle in Greece, while the thoroughly Greek Iphigeneia and Orestes travel unwillingly to a barbarian country and eventually make their return. There may also be a parallel between the siblings' escape from swift-footed Thoas and the escape of Pelops, with his bride, in a contest of speed with the barbarous (if Greek) Oinomaos.<sup>91</sup> At any rate, the more favourable version of the contest is given here (see 1n.). No such favourable version can be found for the story of Atreus and Thyestes. The golden lamb and the sun's changing course (191–6, 812–17) stand for the earlier part of the story where Thyestes obtained the sovereignty-bestowing lamb, which rightly belonged to his brother Atreus, by sleeping with the latter's wife Aerope; the sun's changing course was sometimes connected with the sequel, Atreus' killing of Thyestes' children and serving them up as food to their father;<sup>92</sup> but here perhaps the alternative tradition is intended, that this was a divine sign in favour of Atreus. Although the text of the parodos where the story first appears is very corrupt, it seems certain that the gruesome child-eating sequel is not mentioned, or is only alluded to in the most general terms as 'more trouble' (195–7n.) This part of the

<sup>90</sup> Pelops' father Tantalos is mentioned as ancestor at 1, 200, and 988, but without any colouring. His appearance at 386–8 has in context more to do with the controversy on the believability of unpleasant myths than it has with the fact that he happens to be Iphigeneia's ancestor. E. could, if he had wished, have drawn a parallel between the child-eating stories of Tantalos and of his grandsons Atreus and Thyestes, but he refrains from doing so.

<sup>91</sup> O'Brien 1988.

<sup>92</sup> Schol. E. *Or.* 812, once thought to derive from Sophocles' *Atreus* (*TrGF* 4 p. 162).

story could hardly fail to suggest itself to the audience's minds, but even without it this area of family history has a very dark tone and makes a suitable backdrop to Iphigeneia's presentation of herself as 'doomed from the beginning' (203 and 203-4n.). The adultery of Aerope prefigures that of Helen, who is consistently blamed for Iphigeneia's misfortunes, and that of Klytaimestra. Atreus is wronged by his adulterous wife, as was Agamemnon later. The theme of fraternal strife caused by ambition, however, can be seen to be negated in the relationship between Orestes and Pylades, friends and cousins: Pylades is afraid that if he survives Orestes it will be thought he plotted against him in order to succeed to his position (679-82), yet in fact the two are so far from such destructive rivalry that each prefers to die to save the other.

The following history is even more insistently referenced. By the end of the play's first episode, Iphigeneia has narrated her Aulis experience three times – twice in trimeters, once in lyric (6-27, 209-17, 359-77), and it is alluded to in her questioning of the strangers and in the recognition lyrics, always closely linked to her father, the sacrificer. Agamemnon's death is less emphasised – none of the characters witnessed it – but it is present, eventually, in Orestes' replies to Iphigeneia's questions and raises an interesting question: how will Iphigeneia react to the death of the father who tried to kill her, especially given the suggestion in Pindar and Aeschylus that Klytaimestra's action was motivated at least in part by Iphigeneia's death? In fact, she expresses distress when she hears he is dead (549, quite unlike her reactions to hearing the fates of Helen, Kalchas, and Odysseus), and though on hearing the manner of his death she seems to pity both her parents (ὦ πανδάκρυτος ἢ κτανοῦσα χῶ θανών, 553) she evidently on balance does not blame Orestes for killing Klytaimestra in revenge (559-60n.), and she further states that she feels no animus against Agamemnon (992-3). Like most 'good' women in tragedy, Iphigeneia unquestioningly accepts the patriarchy, stating clearly (in the context of herself and Orestes, 1005-6) that the death of a man is of more account to a family than that of a woman. But the matricide is nonetheless the cause of all Orestes' troubles and the ultimate reason for his presence at Tauroi; his continued pursuit by the unplaced Erinyes assists in allowing the two strangers to be captured, and his impurity is the foundation for the escape plot. It is even the basis for a most unusual mid-drama aetiology (958-60n.). However, where Iphigeneia obsessively relives her own traumatic experience, Orestes never describes the murder he committed, only his consequent sufferings when he is pursued and afflicted with fits of madness by the Erinyes.

In the end, the troubles of this unfortunate family are dissolved in the relationship between sister and brother, whom Iphigeneia, momentarily

forgetting Elektra, sees as the only remaining descendants of Atreus (898–9). The brother–sister motif is an insistent one, founded on general cultural expectations of this relationship. A brother must protect and save his sister, as Iphigeneia hopes Orestes will do and as the terms of her letter make quite clear (774–8); a sister must perform funeral rites for her dead brother, as Iphigeneia does to the best of her ability for Orestes, and as Orestes wishes Elektra could do for him (628). Iphigeneia remains preoccupied with her supposedly dead brother throughout the first half of the play: she recalls him as a babe in arms when she left Argos (232–4), she proclaims that his loss has made her hard-hearted (344–53), and yet when faced with the strangers who are to be sacrificed she feels pity and wonders if they have a sister to grieve their death (473–5). Orestes, of course, though he cares for Elektra (706–7), does not think of the sister whom he believes to have died long ago (563–4), but he is quicker than the more sceptical Pylades to wonder about the identity of the Greek priestess who is to sacrifice them, suggesting that he feels some sort of unconscious affinity with her (660–72). And in fact, quite apart from their birth, Orestes and Iphigeneia have a lot in common: both are almost sacrificed to Artemis, both live separated from normal society, and both have been forced to kill inappropriately, Orestes by Apollo and Iphigeneia (perhaps) by Artemis.<sup>93</sup> And of course, each believes the other dead. This emphasis is necessary to underline the potential horror of sister killing brother, as they recognise after learning each other's identity (866–70), and indeed of the brother being responsible for his sister's death (οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην σοῦ τε καὶ μητρὸς φονεὺς, 1007). Such an event would in one way be appropriate in a family with a history of kin-killing, so its avoidance, made clear above all in the *amoiiaion* which is the response to the recognition and which is delivered with the participants in each other's arms (902–3), is a powerful sign that the troubles of successive generations are finally over. Family ties are at last a powerful and positive force.

The chorus has also a contribution to make to the theme. In the parodos they assist Iphigeneia in lamenting the fortunes of the Pelopids, but they also recall their own removal from Greece and their fathers' homes. In the first stasimon they echo Iphigeneia's wish that Helen might be led to sacrifice, but they end the ode with a wish of their own: rescue from Taurike and a return to their native land (πóλει πατρώϊαι, 454). Their insistent desire for reunion with their own families makes them not only a sounding board for Iphigeneia's fortunes, but an object of concern in their own right, since they imply that the heroine is only one woman

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Sansone 1975, O'Brien 1988.

among many held against their will in a barbarian land. At 576–7 they strikingly refer to their own situation – are their parents still alive? – with a kind of wistful envy of Iphigeneia’s good luck in receiving news from Greece. Later this side issue threatens to become more significant when Iphigeneia needs their help in concealing the escape plan. Will their envy lead them to refuse? Iphigeneia appeals to them on the basis that women should help one another, and undertakes to help them also to return. Despite some scepticism about the second point (‘just save yourself’, σώιζου μόνον, 1075), they generously accept her plea without hesitation, but in the song which follows, they call to mind the fall of their city and point out the contrast: a ship will carry Iphigeneia far away from Taurike, but they will be left behind, able only to daydream of flying home along the sun’s course to enjoy the maidens’ dances they had once known, not far from their mothers (1123–52). Euripides evokes the sufferings and loss of the anonymous many, as he does in the third stasimon of *Hecuba* (905–51), where the chorus, singing as ‘I’, give a vivid picture of one nameless woman’s terrible experiences on the night of Troy’s fall. Ultimately these passages look back to *Il.* 19.301–2, where from focusing on one woman’s sorrow we are reminded that each of her unnamed companions has equivalent, individual griefs: ‘Thus she spoke in tears, and the women wailed in response, seemingly for Patroklos, but each for her own sorrows.’<sup>94</sup> Because audience sympathies have been engaged more than usual with the plight of the chorus, it is important that they too are able to leave Taurike. They will return to Greece, although with their city fallen (1106–10) there will presumably be no return to the bosom of the family, any more than there is for Iphigeneia.

But it is only on the divine level that we find a parallel with the sibling relationship which is at the heart of the play. Both children of Agamemnon are associated, somewhat unwillingly, with a god: Iphigeneia with Artemis, who saved her and whose murderous cult she must serve, and Orestes with Apollo, who commanded the matricide and then brought him to the brink of sacrifice in wild barbarian lands. Apollo and Artemis are closely associated in cult and still more in myth, as full siblings, children of Zeus and Leto, and the human characters appeal to this relationship several times as the plot brings both deities together (86, 1012–14, 1084–5), each time assuming that the affairs of one concern the other. Orestes argues that Apollo would not demand an action which Artemis would not like, and Iphigeneia pleads with Artemis that if she fails to save them,

<sup>94</sup> “Ὦς ἔφατο κλαίουσ’, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες, | Πατρόκλου πρόφασιν, σφῶν δ’ αὐτῶν κήδε’ ἑκάστη.

Apollo's oracles will be proved false. In the latter case, it could even be supposed that 'gods and mortals collaborate ... for their mutual need and benefit', as the wider story of rescue from Taurike also suggests.<sup>95</sup> Finally the parallel between divine and human brother-sister pairs is made explicit when Iphigeneia (in the messenger speech, 1401-2) prays to Artemis on the basis of shared experience: 'You love your brother – you must realise that I too love my siblings.' The theme shifts only with the arrival of Athena, herself (half-)sister to the divine pair (1489), who in establishing new Attic cults of Artemis also separates the human sister and brother by commanding Iphigeneia to remain in Attica, at Brauron. Familial relationships eventually become sidelined in the new civic and present-day perspectives opened up by aetiology.

## 6 TEXT AND TRANSMISSION

Antiquity knew the complete texts of ninety-two dramas (tragedies and satyr-plays) attributed to Euripides, including some believed to be spurious, arranged in a complete edition by the Alexandrian scholar Aristophanes of Byzantium in about 200 BCE. Before this date, however, there was ample opportunity for change and corruption to the authorial text. Written copies will have circulated from the moment of production,<sup>96</sup> but when further copies were made they were subject not only to accidental scribal errors, but also probably to contamination from versions in which actors had made substantial changes to the original text. A law of Lykourgos (roughly third quarter of the fourth century) provided that copies of the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides should be kept in the public archives and that these copies should be made available for actors, in order that they should stick to the authorised text. This suggests that at least before this date actors had been freely altering their scripts, but there is no guarantee that the new law was effective. Some ancient scholars, as attested in the scholia, believed that the dramatic texts transmitted to them had been subject to changes made by actors, but we cannot always accept their evidence uncritically; in some passages at least, the idea of a change or interpolation originating in post-authorial performance may be no more than a guess to explain a real or apparent inconsistency.<sup>97</sup> The same is true of most modern conjectures of this

<sup>95</sup> Zeitlin 2006: 201-4.

<sup>96</sup> This is clear above all from the evidence of Ar. *Frogs* 52-3: Dionysos reads *Andromeda* to himself.

<sup>97</sup> For this explanation, see Hamilton 1974; further on reperformance and transmission, Finglass 2015.



sort – they are based on a subjective view of what Euripides ‘ought’ to have written. There are widely differing opinions on the extent of actors’ interpolations in tragic texts, and it remains possible that most of our texts are based on correct, authorial versions rather than performance scripts. We have to accept that short of time travel we are unlikely to solve this problem.

After Aristophanes’ edition, the text of Euripides will have remained more or less stable except for copyists’ errors and conjectural corrections of such errors. At some time in the imperial period (perhaps around 200 CE), a selection of ten plays of Euripides began to emerge or was deliberately made, corresponding to the seven-play selections for Aeschylus and Sophocles, and these plays (*Alcestis*, *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *Troades*, *Phoenissae*, *Orestes*, *Bacchae*, *Rhesus*) entered the medieval manuscript tradition very securely, being transmitted in a good number of manuscripts. The complete works, it is fair to conclude, were much less in circulation. However, whereas for the other two dramatists only the selected plays survive complete and in manuscript transmission, in the case of Euripides we are lucky to have another nine, the so-called ‘alphabetical plays’, which must represent part of a complete edition which had the titles arranged in alphabetical order. Among these is *Iphigenia in Tauris*.

The alphabetical plays are preserved in two manuscripts, of which the more important (for these plays) is L, an early fourteenth-century manuscript now in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence (shelf-mark Plut. 32.2).<sup>98</sup> The manuscript contains a large number of Greek poetical works, including most of the Euripidean selected plays (*Troades* and the second part of *Bacchae* are missing) as well as the alphabetical plays, and it was written by at least three different scribes for the Byzantine scholar Demetrios Triklinios (Triclinius); the section containing *IT* seems to have been written by Nikolaos Triklines, presumably a close relation.<sup>99</sup> Triclinius went over the text several times and made numerous corrections (some scholars claim to be able to distinguish three recensions, based on the colours of the inks used);<sup>100</sup> some of these are obvious improvements, others less well judged. The second manuscript, P, in the Vatican Library (Pal. gr. 287) is for the alphabetical plays a copy either of L or of its immediate ancestor, and in only a very few places in *IT* does it supply variants of interest. Scanty papyrus fragments so far found throw

<sup>98</sup> Digital images are online at <http://mss.bmlonline.it/s.aspx?Id=AWOIsmHbl1A4r7GxMLRU&c=III.%20Euripidis%20tragoediae%20XVIII#/oro/282> (accessed October 2022) (*IT* is 134<sup>v</sup>–135<sup>v</sup>, 137<sup>v</sup>–144<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>99</sup> Turyn 1957: 229–33. <sup>100</sup> Zuntz 1965: 38–62, Diggle 1994: 483–9.

light on some earlier readings in the play and occasionally confirm later conjectures;<sup>101</sup> quotations in later authors (Plutarch, Lucian) are subject to those authors' adaptations and memory lapses, as well as the same process of manuscript transmission as the original.

The earliest printed editions, beginning with that produced by Aldus Manutius in 1503, seem to have taken their text from a now lost copy of L, and the importance of L itself for the text of Euripides was not recognised until the edition of August Matthiae in his ten-volume edition of the dramatist beginning in 1813. By this time the text of the Aldine had already been considerably improved with a number of corrections and conjectures, a process which, though with diminishing returns, continues to the present. However, many passages remain where the true reading is still uncertain.

## 7 RECEPTION FROM ANTIQUITY TO THE PRESENT<sup>102</sup>

It seems that we look in vain for a contemporary response to *Iphigenia in Tauris* from Aristophanes, who parodies Euripides so freely. If indeed it was produced along with *Helen* and *Andromeda*, which is far from certain (see above, pp. 31–2), it made less impression on the comic dramatist than those two plays, or at least struck him as less promising material for parody.<sup>103</sup> In tragedy, Sophocles' *Chryses* may have represented a further development of Euripides' narrative (see above, pp. 40–1). But the earliest clear evidence for the play's popularity comes from fourth-century vase-paintings, mostly from southern Italy, which are more abundant for this tragedy than almost any other.<sup>104</sup> The relationship between tragedies and their depiction on painted pottery is by no means simple or unitary; sometimes a vase appears to show no more than a story whose popularity may be due to a certain tragic version, while in other cases there may

<sup>101</sup> The most extensive of these is P. Hibeh I, fr. 24, dated to the third century BCE.

<sup>102</sup> For a book-length treatment of the subject, see Hall 2012.

<sup>103</sup> Some scholars (Bobrick 1991, Wright 2005: 52, Cropp 62–3) believe that the final, successful, escape attempt in *Thesmophoriazusae* parodies elements of *IT*, pointing to the Scythian archer, the names Artemisia and Elaphion (supposedly referring to the deer substituted for Iphigeneia), and various situational parallels. But the parallels could be a lot closer (why does 'Euripides' not take the role of Orestes, for instance?), and it is hard to believe that Aristophanes would have so departed from his usual mode of parody and expected an audience to see the joke. In fact *Andromeda* may be a more influential model in this section of the play.

<sup>104</sup> Taplin 2007: 149–56.

be a clear allusion to, perhaps even depiction of, a particular scene in a particular play. In the case of *IT*, some representations perhaps evoke the play rather generally, but two scenes are especially popular: Orestes and Pylades bound and brought to Iphigeneia (456–642), and even more so, the scene with the letter (725–94).<sup>105</sup> The paintings do not show the scenes exactly as they would have appeared on stage. Artemis, sometimes with Apollo, is frequently to be seen as part of the composition, despite never appearing as a character in the play, and in the sole Attic example among these images, Thoas is present while Iphigeneia hands the letter to Pylades.<sup>106</sup> Similarly, the one surviving vase to show the escape scene (popular in later art) does not correspond at all to the solemn procession to the seashore which initiates the escape attempt. Depictions like these respond to and represent both the play as a whole and a specific scene. They naturally highlight the importance of visual elements such as the temple setting (sometimes adorned with *boukrania* or even in one case a human head), the sacrificial appurtenances, often carried by attendants, and the letter, which is the visible symbol of the recognition it triggers.

Still in the fourth century, the inscribed *didaskaliai* give evidence of a revival of one of Euripides' Iphigeneia plays, probably *IT*, at Athens in 342/1.<sup>107</sup> And Aristotle uses the play as an example in several passages (*Poetics* 11.1452b, 15.1454b, 16.1455a) concerned with the recognition and one (16.1455b) in relation to the whole plot. Pointing out (11.1452b) that the recognition in *IT* is in fact double (Orestes recognising Iphigeneia, Iphigeneia recognising Orestes), he approves the way the first is brought about, by the letter: 'for it is likely that she would want to send a letter' (16.1455a), but is much less enthusiastic about the second. He dislikes the use of 'tokens' (σημεῖα) in recognitions as too artificial, and considers the mention of such signs, as at 808–26, to be only slightly better than their physical appearance on stage (15.1454b). He records with some approval an earlier revision of the recognition scene by one 'Polyidos the sophist', in which the recognition comes about through Orestes' statement that he is being sacrificed just as his sister was (16.1455a). Probably this was a critical work ('he said it was plausible that Orestes should reflect ...') rather than a tragedy, but the idea would be picked up in several later re-workings. Polyidos and Aristotle confirm the impression we have from vase-painting that the play was very well known in the fourth century.

<sup>105</sup> Depictions are listed in *LIMC* Iphigenia 14–29, including some in media other than vases. Pictorial representations of the letter scene are discussed in Rosenmeyer 2013.

<sup>106</sup> *LIMC* 19, *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1440.1, Taplin 2007 no. 48.

<sup>107</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 2320.3.

Whether the play's popularity continued in the Hellenistic period is not clear, but Roman tragedians certainly used related stories.<sup>108</sup> The most famous example is a tragedy by Pacuvius, mentioned twice by Cicero,<sup>109</sup> in which both Orestes and Pylades claimed to be Orestes, in front of a hostile king (Thoas?) who was unaware of the truth. Clearly this scene has no place in Euripides' play, but equally clearly its 'I am Spartacus'-style presentation of the wish of each man to die in the place of the other is somehow related to it – either a re-working of the original, or perhaps more likely a version of the *Chryses* story (above, pp. 20–1).<sup>110</sup> In both the passages where he refers to the scene, Cicero mentions the audience's ecstatic approval of the self-sacrificing friendship of the two men, which although an important element in Euripides seems now to have become the emotional heart of the story.<sup>111</sup> Pompeian wall-paintings on the theme tend to emphasise the point by showing Orestes and Pylades in close proximity, and may take their inspiration from Latin authors as much as from Euripides. In Roman art generally, the favoured subjects are the captives brought before Iphigeneia (*LIMC* 52–4) and compositions including Orestes and Pylades, Iphigeneia holding the divine statue, and sometimes Thoas, evoking the escape stratagem (58–63).<sup>112</sup> The many sarcophagi based on the story more often show the actual escape (the embarkation) or the subsequent fight between the Greeks and the Taurians. Only one depiction, a mosaic of the late second or early third century CE from Rome, shows the letter (*LIMC* 65).

It seems possible, therefore, that there was a well-known Roman version which did not use the letter device, but brought about the recognition in some other way, perhaps even the circumstance suggested by Polyidos. That this could be so is suggested by Ovid's two versions of the story, a plot which appeals to him in his exile poetry because of the Black Sea connexion (even though Tomi, his place of exile, can only by a stretch of imagination be described as near the Tauric Chersonese). In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.2.45–94, the recognition is effected by means of a letter, though one written by Iphigeneia herself, not dictated earlier, and it happens just in

<sup>108</sup> On Roman versions, literary and visual, see Croisille 1963.

<sup>109</sup> *Amic.* 7.14, *Fin.* 5.63.

<sup>110</sup> Pacuvius fr. 122 D'Anna, *inveni, opino, Orestes uter esset tamen*, quoted by Nonius Marcellus as belonging to *Chryses*, must surely belong to the same episode. There is no direct evidence of a play by Pacuvius on the *IT* theme.

<sup>111</sup> See Hall 2012: 92–110.

<sup>112</sup> A sculptural composition of this sort, perhaps from a funeral monument, even appears to have been crafted in Britain (Black et al. 2012). Other scenes from the story have also been found in depictions from the northern provinces (*LIMC* Iphigenia 54, 73).

the nick of time as Iphigeneia is about to consecrate Orestes for sacrifice. But at *Tristia* 4.4.61–82, while the recognition is also at the last minute (*et iam constiterat stricto mucrone sacerdos*<sup>113</sup>), it occurs through something spoken: Iphigeneia knows her brother *vice sermonis*. Surely this must refer to Orestes' exclamation that his sacrificial fate mirrored that of his sister, a detail which was probably mediated to Ovid through a Roman tragedy. Like Pacuvius, Ovid gives a strong emphasis to the friendship between Orestes and Pylades; indeed, the *Ex Ponto* version is told by a local old man as an exemplum of true friendship, and the whole poem is an address to a friend.

It is also often in the context of male friendship that allusions to the story are to be found in Greek writers of the Second Sophistic. Inevitably, perhaps, Orestes and Pylades were sometimes seen as lovers, as in the *Erotes* (*Amores*) ascribed to Lucian.<sup>114</sup> But Lucian uses the relationship in a different way in his 'Greek–Scythian' dialogue on friendship, *Toxaris*, where he imagines Scythians giving divine honours to the two men because of their mutual loyalty. His version of the story strongly suggests the existence of earlier adaptations of Euripides which catered to a taste for violent action: it is a swashbuckling affair in which Orestes kills Thoas, and the pair demonstrate their friendship not by each choosing to be sacrificed in place of the other, but by defending each other in the skirmish which occurs in their escape attempt.<sup>115</sup>

The Taurian/Scythian setting was of interest in other ways. In the wider world of the Hellenistic period onwards, it could provide a convenient way of linking a community to Greek tradition. In the sixth century CE, John Malalas, in the course of an account of the story which contains some Euripidean material and much else besides, records an episode which is probably a considerably earlier invention:<sup>116</sup> on fleeing from 'Aulis in Scythia', Iphigeneia came with Orestes and Pylades to Palestine, where she was asked by the inhabitants to sacrifice a virgin named Nyssa, who became the eponym and τύχη of the city, also known as Skythopolis because it was then settled by Thoas' pursuing subjects. As we have seen (above, pp. 8–9), Euripides' tale could be extended to produce further adventures before, or instead of, the return home.<sup>117</sup>

<sup>113</sup> Unlike E., Ovid envisages the priestess as actually striking the fatal blow.

<sup>114</sup> Luc. *Am.* 47. <sup>115</sup> Luc. *Tox.* 1–6.

<sup>116</sup> Malalas *Chron.* 5.65 (139.16–21). See Braund 2018: 80–1 and, for the relationship to the Euripidean text, sometimes surprisingly close for an alphabetic play (above, p. 43) at this late date, D'Alfonso 2006: 9–13.

<sup>117</sup> For an example in Hyginus, see below, p. 51.

As well as brother–sister recognition, male friendship, and an exotic setting, *IT* offers an exciting escape plot, which often in combination with other escape stories gave rise to numerous more distant imitations. In particular, the ‘escape from barbarians’ motif in both *IT* and *Helen* was to prove remarkably adaptable. The text of a mime found at Oxyrhynchus, generally entitled *Charition* after its heroine, appears to be a humorous adaptation of the Iphigeneia story for the popular theatre of the imperial period.<sup>118</sup> Charition is a Greek woman apparently held against her will at a sanctuary of the Moon goddess<sup>119</sup> in India, and rescued by her brother. He is accompanied by a figure presumably representing his slave who has much in common with the earthy, foolish, and pretension-puncturing *bōmolochos* of Aristophanic comedy; his repeated farts and the mysterious language<sup>120</sup> spoken by the ‘Indians’ supply the chief humour in the piece. Like Iphigeneia, Charition appears to be on good terms with the locals (she can speak their language), she devises or at least part devises the escape stratagem (not a fake purification, but getting the king and his attendants drunk on unmixed wine), and she appears to be a priestess of the goddess, to whom (again like Iphigeneia, *IT* 1398–1402) she prays for a safe sea voyage (lines 105–6). Unlike Iphigeneia, she refuses to steal from the temple. The play is undoubtedly composed with *IT* somewhere in mind; it gains from a knowledge of the Euripidean original, but does not require it.

More distantly, echoes of the rescue–escape plot of *IT* can be discerned in later comedy and in the ancient novel. There are some similarities in Plautus’ *Miles gloriosus*: the heroine Philocomasium is held captive by the eponymous braggart soldier Pyrgopolynices, and the play ends with her departure accompanied by two men (her lover Pleusicles and his slave Palaestrio), engineered by a trick. Heliodorus’ *Aithiopika* makes its heroine Charikleia a priestess of Artemis and the story reaches its climax when she is nearly sacrificed, while in the *Leukippe and Kleitophon* of Achilles Tatius the heroine is also nearly sacrificed and the hero, attacked in the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, actually refers to human sacrifice offered to Artemis by the Taurians. Both novels, along with others, involve multiple rescue-and-flight scenarios. Even Christian texts drew on similar motifs: the *Acts of Paul and Thekla* describe exciting travels and vicissitudes in

<sup>118</sup> Text in Cunningham 2004: 42–7; commentary, Santelia 1991.

<sup>119</sup> No doubt there is a connexion here with Artemis’ lunar aspect, much stronger in this period than in E.’s day.

<sup>120</sup> It is possible that the non-Greek syllables are not simply gibberish but represent, however distantly, a real Dravidian language. Some suggestions and discussion are in Varadpande 1981: 98–110.

which the heroine repeatedly escapes danger and death, and even in one version is assumed to be a priestess of Artemis, while a recent study discerns closer echoes of *IT* in the Ephesian episode of the *Acts of the Apostles* (19.21–20.1).<sup>121</sup>

However, for the most part the influence of *IT* on these texts is indirect and forms only a small part of their literary pedigree. Closer parallels – to both *IT* and *Helen* – are to be found in considerably later works: numerous comic operas of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, ‘Turkish operas’, of which Mozart’s *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* (libretto by Gottlieb Stephanie, adapted from Christoph Friedrich Bretzner) and Rossini’s *L’Italiana in Algeri* (libretto by Angelo Anelli) are the only familiar examples today. The plotline of these pieces brings a young European woman to somewhere in the Ottoman Empire, where she attracts the attention of the local ruler; after many vicissitudes, she escapes with her sweetheart, having tricked the ruler or his attendants. The escape-from-barbarians motif is obvious here, and some of the tropes found in Euripides are to be seen in these dramas: the clever heroine, the cruel but easily fooled ‘barbarian’. However, ‘oriental’ settings had been used in European tragedy for several centuries, and at least since Dryden’s *Aureng-zebe* of 1675 had included noble and admirable characters. In Euripides too, Thoas is not entirely bad, and Theonoe in *Helen* is admirable. In opera the negative stereotypes can be complicated by other viewpoints and different agendas: the Pasha in the Mozart opera turns out to be more magnanimous than the hero’s father.

By the time these operas were popular, Euripides’ play was well known and had already been the subject of several adaptations. The first vernacular translation, indeed what seems to have been the first vernacular translation of any Greek tragedy, was made by Alessandro Pazzi de’ Medici in 1524 or shortly before.<sup>122</sup> About the same time, Giovanni Rucellai wrote a stage adaptation of the story, *Oreste*. This was a considerably longer piece than the original, with much elaboration of themes and a particularly bloodthirsty version of Thoas, and as its title suggests the emphasis was more on Orestes and his relationship with Pylades than on Iphigeneia.<sup>123</sup> In comparison with some later versions, however, it remains quite close to the original. Seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century dramas on the theme present a female Thoas, a Thoas married to Circe, a Thoas in love with Iphigeneia, an Iphigeneia who marries Pylades, and many other

<sup>121</sup> Hall 2012, citing Johnson 2006; Bilby and Lefteratou 2022.

<sup>122</sup> Not yet published in its entirety: see Solerti 1887.

<sup>123</sup> Di Maria 1996.

ingenious variations, usually with a love interest.<sup>124</sup> Some of these versions blur or invert the distinction between Greek and Taurian, lessening sympathy for Iphigeneia and creating decent or even praiseworthy Taurians. Overall, the dramas of this period play into the contemporary taste for a complex plot, an aura of classical antiquity without too much fidelity to classical sources, and an atmosphere of exoticism.

The following century's re-workings retained some of these features, notably the emphasis on the friendship of Orestes and Pylades and the greater role given to Thoas, while in other respects tending to greater simplicity. The two most famous post-Euripidean versions belong to this century, the opera of Gluck (with libretto by Nicolas-François Guillard, 1779) and the drama of Goethe (written in four versions between 1779 and 1786). Gluck's opera followed on numerous earlier operatic treatments, but diverged considerably from them.<sup>125</sup> Keen to move from the rigid musical conventions of *opera seria* towards a freer form, he also rejected convoluted plots in favour of simpler and more streamlined action. Guillard's libretto resembles Euripides far more closely than any earlier adaptation. Apart from giving a larger role to Thoas, the first three acts involve only minor changes to the general outline of Euripides' plot, and the author is interested both in the competitive friendship between Orestes and Pylades and in the growing sympathy between the unrecognised siblings – both important themes in the original. It is in the fourth and final act that significant divergences take place. Guillard follows Ovid in making it Iphigeneia's job to strike the fatal blow herself, and takes up the suggestion of Polyidos, preserved in Aristotle's *Poetics* (above, p. 45), that Orestes should compare his fate to that of his sister and so bring about the recognition. The escape plan is excised entirely, Pylades re-enters with Greek companions and kills Thoas,<sup>126</sup> and peace is brought about by Diana/Artemis, rather than Athena, *ex machina*; the cult statue must be handed over to the Greeks, but there are, unsurprisingly, no Athenian references. Humanity and civilisation have triumphed over barbarism.

<sup>124</sup> Female Thoas: Dennis, *Iphigenia* (1700). Thoas married to Circe: Davenant, *Circe* (1677), Stranitzky, *Der Tempel Dianae* (first quarter of eighteenth century), Theobald, *Orestes* (1731). Thoas in love with Iphigeneia: Davenant, Lagrange-Chancel, *Oreste et Pilade* (1697), Stranitzky. Iphigeneia and Pylades: Lagrange-Chancel, Dennis, Stranitzky, Theobald. These dramas are discussed, along with versions from the second half of the eighteenth century, in Heitner 1964; see also Wolfe 2020.

<sup>125</sup> Ewans 2007: 31–54.

<sup>126</sup> This has ancient precedent in Lucian's *Toxaris*, where Orestes, or the two together, overpowers the Taurian captors and kills the king (*Toxaris* 2, 6).



Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* has achieved at least as much fame as Euripides' play. In contrast to Guillard, the German poet retains the post-classical motif of a Thoas who wishes to marry Iphigeneia (perhaps also influenced by Theoklymenos in the Euripidean *Helen*) and allows one extra character, the king's friend Arkas, but the tone and implicit message are radically different from earlier interpretations of the story. Iphigeneia is presented in a very favourable light as a morally sensitive character with a good deal of agency. Like her Euripidean original, she believes that humans project on to the gods their own desires, and she has succeeded in putting an end to the custom of human sacrifice (reinstated angrily by Thoas in the first act, when she refuses to marry him); she also has strongly conflicted feelings about deceiving Thoas and escaping with Orestes. In the end it is her policy of persuasion, rather than the combination of deception and force espoused by Orestes and Pylades, which wins out. In the final act, Orestes realises that he has misunderstood Apollo's command to rescue 'the sister' unwillingly exiled in Tauris:<sup>127</sup> the god did not mean his own sister (Diana/Artemis in the form of her statue), but Orestes' sister. The Taurians can therefore retain their venerable statue, while Iphigeneia leaves with Orestes and Pylades, exhorting Thoas to let them part in friendship, which he does. It is evident that Goethe regards this reconciliation as a conspicuous improvement on the violence of its predecessors; it partly recalls Thoas' compliance with Athena's commands in Euripides, but in Goethe there is no divine epiphany, and the resolution comes about purely on the human level. This is a play which strongly advertises its Enlightenment values.<sup>128</sup>

Many later versions of the story have responded as much to Goethe as to Euripides. Others have connected the Taurian episode with Iphigeneia's sacrifice and sometimes with the rest of the tradition concerning Agamemnon's family, and in both cases the link with *IT* can be somewhat tenuous. The many German *Iphigenias*, naturally enough, look to Goethe's play, but sometimes avoid the Taurian setting in favour of other parts of the wider story: an episode narrated in Hyginus (*Fab.* 122), in which Iphigeneia comes to Delphi where Elektra, believing she has killed Orestes and Pylades, almost kills her, which Goethe himself had contemplated dramatising, proved particularly popular from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. Gerhart Hauptmann wrote plays both on this theme

<sup>127</sup> Like earlier authors, Goethe treats 'Tauris' as a place name.

<sup>128</sup> The reception of Goethe's play is a rich and complex subject. Many readers, writers, and critics in the twentieth century and later have found its depiction of 'ideal' Greek-Taurian relations patronising and colonialist. Hall (2012: 206–30) argues persuasively that to restrict it in this way is too simple.

and on the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, eventually incorporating them into an *Atridentralogie*. The Delphian Iphigeneia is portrayed as a priestess of Hekate, the darker version of Artemis, who has left 'Tauris' unwillingly; the play ends with her suicide in order to free the rest of her family from further bloodshed. The plays were written in the 1940s, and at times seem to invite a political reading, although on the surface their author had good relations with the Nazi government. Post-war German Iphigeneias, such as those of Langner and Vietta (both 1948), Fassbinder (1968), and Braun (1992), have also often contained political elements, alluding to Nazism, war, and their aftermath, to German reunification, and to the triumph of capitalism, and sometimes have been openly critical of Goethe's humanistic values.<sup>129</sup>

But German versions do not have a monopoly on political allusions. Yiannis Ritsos' *The Return of Iphigeneia* (Η επιστροφή της Ιφιγένειας), for instance, a dramatic monologue published in 1972, follows a pattern common in modern Greek poetry of using myth to talk about the contemporary state of the nation, and reflects his own sufferings as an opponent of the military junta then in power. The story has also been used to reflect on issues of gender and, especially, race and colonialism. Despite Euripides' interest elsewhere in the position of women in society, and despite his depiction of Iphigeneia as a woman with a degree of authority and intelligence, the text of *IT* does not, perhaps, give an easy way into the exploration of gender concerns; Iphigeneia appeals to the femaleness she shares with the chorus, but accepts without question the greater importance of men. Goethe's work shows more development of the theme, with Iphigeneia's opening monologue including reflexions on women's circumscribed lot, and her framing of her victorious conflict with Thoas explicitly in terms of female gentleness and persuasion against male force (Act 5 scene 3). Both authors, of course, can be given feminist readings. Theatre production has seen many feminist-influenced stagings and adaptations of Greek tragedy and myth, often running together several originals, and in this tradition is Ellen McLaughlin's *Iphigenia and Other Daughters* (1995), a re-writing of *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, Sophocles' *Electra*, and *IT*, created as a re-telling of the stories of Agamemnon's family from a feminist perspective; at its pessimistic conclusion, Iphigeneia effaces her own identity by becoming the statue of Artemis for Orestes. Productions

<sup>129</sup> Ilse Langner, *Iphigenie kehrt heim* (1948, begun in 1938), *Iphigenie Smith kehrt heim* (1968), *Iphigenie und Orest* (1977); Egon Vietta (Karl Egon Fritz), *Iphigenie in Amerika* (1948); Rainer Werner Fassbinder, *Iphigenie in Tauris von Johann Wolfgang von Goethe* (1968); Volker Braun, *Iphigenie in Freiheit* (1992). Goethe's play was the subject of an influential critical revaluation by Theodor Adorno in 1967.

linking Euripides' two Iphigeneia plays, like JoAnne Akalaitis' *Iphigenia Cycle* (1997), or based on them, like Mary-Kay Gamel's *Effie and the Barbarians* (1995), have also raised gender issues and incorporated feminist readings of the myths.

A Greek–barbarian contrast is more obvious in Euripides' play than a male–female one, and while in *IT* the dominant narrative is that of a successful move from barbarism (Taurike) to civilisation (Greece), there are sufficient complications to leave the door open to a different evaluation. Already Goethe's Thoas has some good qualities, and even earlier some versions, such as that of Lagrange-Chancel, introduced 'civilised' Taurians among the new characters. Twentieth-century political consciousness encouraged the development of a radically different picture. While in Ukraine Lesya Ukrainka infused her 'dramatic study' *Iphigenia v Tavrydi* (1898) with an idealistic, perhaps revolutionary fervour, and a sort of inverted nationalism (since Iphigeneia's longed-for Greece partly stands for an oppressed Ukraine, the location of Taurike), in Mexico Alfonso Reyes, in *Ifigenia Cruel* (1924), shows an Iphigeneia who chooses to remain as a priestess among the Taurians rather than return to Greece to marry and continue her family's murderous saga. In a passage which is deeply suggestive in its Mexican context, she criticises the Greeks for not being content with their own land (cf. *IT* 407–21), and for failing to understand the civilisation of the place they have come to. Despite his people's custom of human sacrifice, Thoas spares Orestes and Pylades and gives them sound moral advice – but they must leave without accomplishing their mission. This is a complex and subtle piece, and Reyes certainly goes further than earlier writers in confusing the moral values attached respectively to Greeks and to Taurians. Louis Nowra's *The Golden Age* (1985), set in Tasmania during the Second World War and framed by two performances of Euripides' play, goes further still in making the 'barbarians', the isolated descendants of a group of convicts (seen by some critics as a stand-in for Australian Indigenous people), into the sympathetic characters, whose treatment at the hands of the 'civilised' we are to deplore.

Although the original is not now one of the better-known Greek tragedies, the story of Iphigeneia in the Tauric Chersonese continues to spark interest and inspire works of imagination in different media. One of the most recent is Tony Harrison's *Iphigenia in Crimea* (2016), originally planned as a translation of Euripides to be performed in the ancient theatre at Sevastopol, and eventually broadcast as a radio play in which Euripides' text is performed by a group of British soldiers in the Crimean War; the framing sections explore the dissonance between the play-as-work-of-art and the savage reality of war, as well as Harrison's favourite

theme of classics and class. The circumstances which prevented its performance in Taurike itself continue, at the time of writing, to focus the world's shocked attention on the Crimean peninsula and the whole nation of Ukraine. But there is no reason to suppose that the future will not bring further adaptations, perhaps focusing on aspects of the original which have yet to be highlighted. Iphigeneia's long afterlife continues.

## SIGLA

---

L	Laurentianus (Florence: Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, <i>Plutei</i> 32.2; digitised at <a href="http://mss.bmlonline.it">http://mss.bmlonline.it</a> )
L corr.	correction probably by original scribe
L supr. lin.	variant probably by original scribe
Tr	correction in L probably by Triclinius
P	Palatinus (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. gr. 287)
P corr.	correction in P
apogr. Par. 2817	Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, Paris. gr. 2817
apogr. Par. 2887	Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, Paris. gr. 2887
Π <sup>1</sup>	P. Hibeh I fr. 24
Π <sup>2</sup>	P. Berol. 21133
Π <sup>3</sup>	P. Oxy. LXVII 4565
*	indicates an illegible letter



# ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ Η ΕΝ ΤΑΥΡΟΙΣ





## ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΝ ΤΑΥΡΟΙΣ

---

Ὁρέστης κατὰ χρησμόν ἐλθὼν εἰς Ταύρους τῆς Σκυθίας μετὰ Πυλάδου παραγενηθεὶς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμενον τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ξόانون ὑφελέσθαι προηριεῖτο· προελθὼν δ' ἀπὸ τῆς νεῶς καὶ μανεῖς, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐντοπίων ἅμα τῷ φίλῳ συλληφθεὶς ἀνήχθη κατὰ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐθισμόν, ὅπως τοῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱεροῦ σφάγιον γένωνται. τοὺς γὰρ καταπλεύσαντας ξένους ἀπέσφαττον.

ἡ μὲν σκηνὴ τοῦ δράματος ὑπόκειται ἐν Ταύροις τῆς Σκυθίας· ὁ δὲ χορὸς συνέστηκεν ἐξ Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν, θεραπαινίδων τῆς Ἰφιγενείας· προλογίζει δὲ Ἰφιγένεια.

τὰ τοῦ δράματος πρόσωπα· Ἰφιγένεια, Ὁρέστης, Πυλάδης, χορὸς, βουκόλος, Θόας, ἄγγελος, Ἀθηνᾶ [Ἀπόλλων].

ἐλθὼν <L>P: del. Tr

παραγενηθεὶς P: παραγενόμενος Tr: παρακινήθεῖς P corr.

μανεῖς Wilamowitz: φανεῖς L

ἐντοπίων <L>P: ἐγχωρίων Tr

post ἀπέσφαττον spatium vacuum sex vel septem linearum habet L, dimidium lineae P

Ἀπόλλων del. ed. Aldina

## ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ

---

Ίφιγένεια  
Ὀρέστης  
Πυλάδης  
Χορὸς θεραπαινίδων  
Βουκόλος  
Θόας  
Ἄγγελος  
Ἀθηναία

## ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ

Πέλοψ ὁ Ταντάλειος ἐς Πίσαν μολῶν  
 θααῖσιν ἵπποις Οἰνομάου γαμεῖ κόρην,  
 ἐξ ἧς Ἀτρεύς ἐβλαστέν· Ἀτρέως δ' ἄπο  
 Μενέλαος Ἀγαμέμνων τε· τοῦ δ' ἔφυν ἐγώ,  
 τῆς Τυνδαρείας θυγατρὸς Ἴφιγένεια παῖς, 5  
 ἦν ἀμφὶ δίναις ὅς θάμ' Εὐριπος πυκναῖς  
 αὔραις ἐλίσσων κυανέαν ἄλα στρέφει,  
 ἔσφαξεν Ἑλένης οὖνεχ', ὥς δοκεῖ, πατήρ  
 Ἀρτέμιδι κλειναῖς ἐν πτυχαῖσιν Αὐλίδος.  
 ἐνταῦθα γὰρ δὴ χιλίων νεῶν στόλον 10  
 Ἑλληνικὸν συνήγαγ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ,  
 τὸν καλλίνικον στέφανον Ἰλίου θέλων  
 λαβεῖν Ἀχαιοῖς τοὺς θ' ὕβρισθέντας γάμους  
 Ἑλένης μετελθεῖν, Μενέλεωι χάριν φέρων.  
 δεινῇ δ' ἀπλοῖαι πνευμάτων τ' οὐ τυγχάνων, 15  
 ἐς ἔμπυρ' ἦλθε, καὶ λέγει Κάλχας τάδε·  
 ὦ τῇσδ' ἀνάσσων Ἑλλάδος στρατηγίας,  
 Ἀγάμεμνον, οὐ μὴ ναῦς ἀφορμίστης χθονός,  
 πρὶν ἂν κόρην σὴν Ἴφιγένειαν Ἄρτεμις  
 λάβῃ σφαγεῖσάν· ὃ τι γὰρ ἐνιαυτὸς τέκοι 20  
 κάλλιστον, ἠῦξω φωσφόρῳ θύσειν θεᾷ.  
 παῖδ' οὖν ἐν οἴκοις σὴ Κλυταιμῆστρα δάμαρ  
 τίκτει — τὸ καλλιστεῖον εἰς ἔμ' ἀναφέρων —  
 ἦν χρή σε θῦσαι. καί μ' Ὀδυσσέως τέχναις  
 μητρὸς παρείλοντ' ἐπὶ γάμοις Ἀχιλλέως. 25  
 ἐλθοῦσα δ' Αὐλίδ' ἡ τάλαιν' ὑπὲρ πυρᾶς  
 μεταρσία ληφθεῖσ' ἐκαινόμην ξίφει·  
 ἀλλ' ἐξέκλεψέ μ' ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου  
 Ἄρτεμις Ἀχαιοῖς, διὰ δὲ λαμπρὸν αἰθέρα  
 πέμψασά μ' ἐς τήνδ' ὤικισεν Ταύρων χθόνα, 30  
 οὗ γῆς ἀνάσσει βαρβάροισι βάρβαρος  
 Θόας, ὃς ὠκύν πόδα τιθεῖς ἴσον πτεροῖς

1 ἐς Matthiae: εἰς L (et sic ubique) Πίσαν Dindorf (Πίσαν Barnes): πίσσαν  
 L 3 Ἀτρέως δ' ἄπο Badham: ἀτρέως δὲ παῖς L 4 τοῦ δ' Schaefer:  
 τοῦδε L 8 ἔσφαξεν ed. Brubachiana: ἔσφαξ' L 10 νεῶν Nauck: ναῶν  
 L 13 Ἀχαιοῖς Lenting: ἀχαιούς L 14 ἐλένης P corr.: ἐλένη L 15 δεινῇ  
 ... ἀπλοῖαι Rauchenstein: δεινῆς ... ἀπλοῖας L 8' Barnes: τ' L 18 ἀφορμίστης  
 Kirchhoff: -ιση L 20 λάβῃ Matthiae: λάβοι L 21 ἠῦξω Barnes: εὔξω  
 L 22 Κλυταιμῆστρα Wecklein: -μνήστρα L 28 ἐξέκλεψέ μ' Reiske: ἐξέκλεψεν  
 L 30 ὤκισεν Tr P corr. (= ὠκισεν): ὠκισε L

ἐς τοῦνομ' ἤλθε τόδε ποδωκείας χάριν.  
 ναοῖσι δ' ἐν τοῖσδ' ἱερέαν τίθησί με·  
 ὅθεν νόμοισιν οἷσιν ἥδεται θεὰ 35  
 Ἄρτεμις ἑορτῆς, τοῦνομ' ἦς καλὸν μόνον, 36  
 [θύω γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει, 38  
 ὃς ἂν κατέλθῃ τήνδε γῆν Ἕλληνα ἀνὴρ] 39  
 κατάρχομαι μὲν, σφάγια δ' ἄλλοισιν μέλει. 40  
 [ἄρρητ' ἔσωθεν τῶνδ' ἀνακτόρων θεᾶς] 41  
 τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη. 37  
 ἃ καὶνὰ δ' ἦκει νύξ φέρουσα φάσματα,  
 λέξω πρὸς αἰθέρ', εἴ τι δὴ τόδ' ἔστ' ἄκος.  
 ἔδοξ' ἐν ὕπνῳ τῆσδ' ἀπαλλαχθεῖσα γῆς  
 οἰκεῖν ἐν Ἄργει, παρθενῶσι δ' ἐν μέσοις 45  
 εὖδειν, χθονὸς δὲ νῶτα σεισθῆναι σάλωι,  
 φεύγειν δὲ κᾶξω στᾶσα θριγκὸν εἰσιδεῖν  
 δόμων πίτνοντα, πᾶν δ' ἐρείψιμον στέγος  
 βεβλημένον πρὸς οὐδας ἐξ ἄκρων σταθμῶν.  
 μόνος δ' ἐλείφθη στῦλος, ὥς ἔδοξέ μοι, 50  
 δόμων πατρῶων, ἐκ δ' ἐπικράνων κόμας  
 ξανθὰς καθεῖναι, φθέγμα δ' ἀνθρώπου λαβεῖν,  
 καὶ γὰρ τέχνην τήνδ' ἦν ἔχω ξενοκτόνον  
 τιμῶσ' ὕδραίνειν αὐτὸν ὥς θανούμενον,  
 κλαίουσα. τοῦναρ δ' ὥδε συμβάλλω τόδε· 55  
 τέθνηκ' Ὀρέστης, οὗ κατηρξάμην ἐγώ.  
 στῦλοι γὰρ οἰκῶν παῖδές εἰσιν ἄρσενες·  
 θνήσκουσι δ' οὓς ἂν χέρνιβες βάλωσ' ἐμαί.  
 [οὐδ' αὖ συνάψαι τοῦναρ ἐς φίλους ἔχω·  
 Στροφίῳ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν παῖς, ὅτ' ὠλλύμην ἐγώ.] 60  
 νῦν οὖν ἀδελφῶι βούλομαι δοῦναι χοᾶς  
 ἀποῦσ' ἀπόντι — ταῦτα γὰρ δυναίμεθ' ἂν —  
 σὺν προσπόλοισιν, ὧς ἔδωχ' ἡμῖν ἀναξ  
 Ἑλληνίδας γυναῖκας. ἀλλ' ἐξ αἰτίας

34 ἱερέαν Wecklein (ἱερίαν Tr): ἱερίαν <L>P 35 νόμοισιν οἷσιν Herwerden: νόμοισι  
 τοῖσινδ' <L>P: νόμοισι τοῖσιν Tr 38–9 del. Murray 41 del. Monk 37 post  
 41 trai. Markland 44 ἔδοξ' ἐν P corr., apogr. Par. 2817: ἔδοξεν L  
 45 παρθενῶσι δ' ἐν μέσοις Markland: παρθένοισι δ' ἐν μέσοις L 47 θριγκὸν  
 Tr, P corr.: θριγγὸν L 50 ἐλείφθη apogr. Par. 2887: ἐλήφθη L στῦλος  
 Scaliger: στῦλος L 51 δόμων P: δώμων L 52 καθεῖναι Brodaeus: καθεῖμαι L  
 54 ὕδραίνειν Musgrave: ὕδραινον L 57 στῦλοι Scaliger: στῦλοι L παῖδές εἰσιν  
 Artemid. 2.10, Men. Monost. 720 Jäkel, Stob. 4.24.56: εἰσὶ παῖδες L 58 οὓς  
 Scaliger, Stephanus: ὧς L βάλωσ' ἐμαί Canter: βάλωσί με L 59–60 del.  
 Monk 62 ἀποῦσ' ἀπόντι Badham: παροῦσα παντὶ L: παροῦσ' ἀπόντι Canter

οὐπω τίνος πάρεισιν· εἴμ' ἔσω δόμων  
ἐν οἷσι ναίω τῶνδ' ἀνακτόρων θεᾶς.

ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ

ὄρα, φυλάσσου μή τις ἐν στίβῳ βροτῶν.  
Πυ. ὀρῶ, σκοποῦμαι δ' ὄμμα πανταχῇ στρέφων.  
Ορ. Πυλάδῃ, δοκεῖ σοι μέλαθρα ταῦτ' εἶναι θεᾶς  
ἐνθ' Ἀργόθεν ναῦν ποντίαν ἐστείλαμεν; 70  
Πυ. ἔμοιγ', Ὀρέστα· σοὶ δὲ συνδοκεῖν χρεών.  
Ορ. καὶ βωμός, Ἕλλην οὗ καταστάζει φόνος;  
Πυ. ἐξ αἱμάτων γοῦν ξάνθ' ἔχει θριγκώματα.  
Ορ. θριγκοῖς δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῖς σκύλ' ὀραῖς ἡρτημένα;  
Πυ. τῶν κατθανόντων γ' ἀκροθίνια ξένων. 75  
ἀλλ' ἐγκυκλοῦντ' ὀφθαλμὸν εὖ σκοπεῖν χρεών.  
Ορ. ὦ Φοῖβε, ποῖ μ' αὖ τήνδ' ἐς ἄρκυν ἤγαγες  
χρήσας, ἐπειδὴ πατὴρ αἰμ' ἐτεισάμην,  
μητέρα κατακτάς, διαδοχαῖς δ' Ἐρινύων  
ἡλαυνόμεσθα φυγάδες ἔξεδροι χθονός 80  
δρόμους τε πολλοὺς ἐξέπλησα καμπίμους,  
ἐλθὼν δὲ σ' ἠρώτησα πῶς τροχηλάτου  
μανίας ἂν ἔλθοιμ' ἐς τέλος πόνων τ' ἐμῶν,  
[οὓς ἐξεμόχθουν περιπολῶν καθ' Ἑλλάδα]  
σύ δ' εἶπας ἐλθεῖν Ταυρικῆς μ' ὄρους χθονός, 85  
ἐνθ' Ἀρτεμῖς σοι σύγγονος βωμοὺς ἔχει,  
λαβεῖν τ' ἄγαλμα θεᾶς, ὃ φασιν ἐνθάδε  
ἐς τούσδε ναοὺς οὐρανοῦ πεσεῖν ἄπο·  
λαβόντα δ' ἢ τέχναισιν ἢ τύχῃ τινί,  
κίνδυνον ἐκπλήσαντ', Ἀθηναίων χθονὶ 90  
δοῦναι· τὸ δ' ἐνθένδ' οὐδὲν ἐρρήθη πέρα·  
καὶ ταῦτα δράσαντ' ἀμπνοᾶς ἔξιν πόνων.  
ἦκω δὲ πεισθεὶς σοῖς λόγοισιν ἐνθάδε  
ἄγνωστον ἐς γῆν, ἄξενον. σὲ δ' ἱστορῶ,  
Πυλάδῃ, σύ γάρ μοι τοῦδε συλλήπτωρ πόνου, 95  
τί δρῶμεν; ἀμφίβληστρα γὰρ τοίχων ὀραῖς

65 εἴμ' Hermann: εἴμ' <L>P 68 πανταχῇ Monk: πανταχοῦ L 73 θριγκώματα  
Ruhnken: τριχώματα L 75 γ' ἀκροθίνια Hermann: ἀκροθίνια L 76 Pyladae  
contin. Reiske, Orestae trib. L 77 τήνδ' L: τίνα δ' Kovacs 79 διαδοχαῖς  
L: διαδρομαῖς Monk Ἐρινύων Hermann (sicut mon. Heath): ἐρινύων L:  
(et sic ubique) 84 del. Markland, coll. 1455 86 σοι Kirchhoff: σύ L:  
σὴ P corr., apogr. Par. 2817 91 πέρα Brodaeus: πέραν L 92 καὶ L: ἢ  
Tournier 94 ἄγνωστον L: ἄγνωστος Gaisford ἄξενον ed. Aldina: ἄξεινον L

- ὑψηλά· πότερα κλιμάκων προσαμβάσεις  
 ἐμβησόμεσθα; πῶς ἄν οὖν λάθοιμεν ἄν;  
 ἢ χαλκότευκτα κληῖθρα λύσαντες μοχλοῖς  
 †ῶν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν†; ἦν δ' ἀνοίγοντες πύλας 100  
 ληφθῶμεν ἐσβάσεις τε μηχανώμενοι,  
 θανούμεθ'. ἀλλὰ πρὶν θανεῖν νεὼς ἔπι  
 φεύγωμεν, ἥτιπερ δεῦρ' ἐναυστολήσαμεν.  
 Πυ. φεύγειν μὲν οὐκ ἀνεκτὸν οὐδ' εἰώθαμεν,  
 τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ δὲ χρησμόν οὐκ ἀτιστέον· 105  
 ναοῦ δ' ἀπαλλαχθέντε κρύψωμεν δέμας  
 κατ' ἄντρ' ἃ πόντος νοτίδι διακλύζει μέλας  
 νεὼς ἄπωθεν, μή τις εἰσιδὼν σκάφος  
 βασιλεῦσιν εἴπηι καῖτα ληφθῶμεν βίαι.  
 ὅταν δὲ νυκτὸς ὄμμα λυγαίας μόληι, 110  
 τολμητέον τοι ξεστὸν ἐκ ναοῦ λαβεῖν  
 ἄγαλμα πάσας προσφέροντε μηχανάς.  
 †ὄρα δέ γ' εἴσω τριγλύφων ὅποι κενὸν  
 δέμας καθεῖναι† τοὺς πόνους γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ  
 τολμῶσι, δειλοὶ δ' εἰσὶν οὐδὲν οὐδαμοῦ. 115  
 οὗ τοι μακρόν μὲν ἤλθομεν κώπηι πόρον,  
 ἐκ τερμάτων δὲ νόστον ἀροῦμεν ἅλιν.  
 Ορ. ἀλλ' εὖ γὰρ εἴπας, πειστέον· χωρεῖν χρεῶν  
 ὅποι χθονὸς κρύψαντε λήσομεν δέμας.  
 οὐ γὰρ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γ' αἵτιος γενήσομαι 120  
 πεσεῖν ἄχρηστον θέσφατον· τολμητέον·  
 μόχθος γὰρ οὐδεὶς τοῖς νέοις σκῆψιν φέρει.  
 Ιφ. εὐφραμεῖτ', ὦ πόντου δισσὰς  
 συγχωρούσας

97 κλιμάκων Kayser: δωματίων L προσαμβάσεις Barnes: πρὸς ἀμβάσεις L  
 98 ἐμβησόμεσθα Blomfield: \*\*βησόμεσθα L: ἐκβησ- Tr P πῶς ἄν P corr.  
 (πῶς ἄν Tr): πῶς L λάθοιμεν Sallier: μάθοιμεν L 100 ὦν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν L:  
 ὦδ' οὐδὸν ἔσιμεν Badham: ὦδ' οἶκον ἔσιμεν Maehly ante versum lac. stat.  
 Holzner 105 οὐκ ἀτιστέον Valckenaer: οὐ κακιστέον L 113 ὅποι L:  
 ὅπου Bothe: ὅπηι Kirchhoff post v. lac. stat. Platnauer 116-17 Pyladae  
 contin. Hardion: Orestae trib. L: post 105 trai. Canter, post 119 Campbell: del.  
 Dindorf 118 χωρεῖν χρεῶν Scaliger: χώρει νεκρῶν L 120 τοῦ θεοῦ L: τοῦδὲ  
 Weil αἵτιος γενήσομαι Heath: αἵτιον γενήσεται L: τι τοῦμόν γ' αἵτιον γενήσεται  
 Bothe 123-5 Iphigeniae, 126-42 choro trib. Taplin: 123-36 Iphigeniae, 137-  
 42 choro L: 123-42 choro Tyrwhitt

- πέτρας ἀξείνου ναίοντες. 125  
 Χο. ὦ παῖ τᾶς Λατοῦς,  
 Δίκτυνν' οὐρεία,  
 πρὸς σὰν αὐλάν, εὐστύλων  
 ναῶν χρυσήρεις θριγκούς,  
 όσίας όσιον πόδα παρθένιον 130  
 κληιδούχου δοῦλα πέμπω,  
 Ἑλλάδος εὐίππου πύργους  
 καὶ τείχη χόρτων τ' εὐδένδρων  
 ἐξαλλάξας Ἐυρώπαν, 135  
 πατρώϊων οἰκων ἔδρας.  
 ἔμολον· τί νέον; τίνα φροντίδ' ἔχεις;  
 τί με πρὸς ναοὺς ἄγαγες ἄγαγες,  
 ὦ παῖ τοῦ τᾶς Τροίας πύργους  
 ἐλθόντος κλεινᾶι σὺν κώπαι 140  
 χιλιοναύται μυριοτεύχει  
 <  
 > Ἀτρειδᾶν τῶν κλεινῶν;
- Ιφ. ἰὼ δμωαί,  
 δυσθρηνήτοις ὡς θρήνοις  
 ἔγκειμαι, τὰν οὐκ εὐμουσον 145  
 μέλπουσα βοᾶν ἀλύροις ἑλέγοις,  
 ἔξ, ἐν κηδεῖσις οἰκτοῖς·  
 ἅταί μοι συμβαίνουσ', ἅται,  
 σύγγονον ἅμὸν κατακλαιομέναι·  
 τοῖαν ἰδόμαν ὄψιν ὀνείρων 150  
 νυκτός, τᾶς ἐξῆλθ' ὄρφνα.  
 ὀλόμαν ὀλόμαν·

125 ἀξείνου Markland: εὐξείνου L 130 όσίας όσιον πόδα παρθένιον Seidler: πόδα παρθένιον όσιον όσίας L 132 εὐίππου P corr.: τᾶς εὐ- L: τῆς εὐ- P 135 Εὐρώπαν L: Εὐρώταν Barnes 138 ἄγαγες ἄγαγες Tr P corr.: ἄγες ἄγες L 139 τᾶς ed. Aldina: τᾶς L 141 χιλιοναύται ed. Aldina: χιλιοναύτα L μυριοτεύχει Barnes: μυριοτεύχοις L: μυριοτεύχοῦς (χιλιοναύτα accepto) Seidler 142 Ἀτρειδᾶν τῶν κλεινῶν L: τῶν Ἀτρειδῶν μέγ' ἀρίστου Monk: γένος Ἀτρειδᾶν τ. κ. Dindorf: Ἀτρεῖδα (Altenburg) [τῶν κλεινῶν] Murray: ante v. lac. stat. Hermann 143 ἰὼ Seidler: ὦ L 145-6 τὰν οὐκ εὐμουσον μέλπουσα βοᾶν Κνίçala: τᾶς οὐκ εὐμούσου μολπᾶς βοᾶν L (βοᾶν Tr): secl. βοᾶν Bothe 147 ἔξ ἐν L: αἰαῖ ἐν Nauck: αἰαῖ αἰαῖ Murray οἰκτοῖς Seidler: οἰκτοῖσιν L 148 ἅταί Diggle: αἶ L: οἶαί Badham 149 κατακλαιομέναι Barnes: -να L 150 τοῖαν Elmsley: οἶαν ζωᾶς L: ζωᾶς οἶαν <οἶαν> Hermann: ζωᾶς οἶαν ἰδόμαν Tr: εἰδόμαν <L> 153 ὀλόμαν ὀλόμαν Heath: ὠλ- ὠλ- L

- οὐκ εἶς' οἴκοι πατρῷοι'  
οἴμοι <μοι> φροῦδος γέννα. 155  
φεῦ φεῦ τῶν Ἄργει μόχθων.  
ἰὼ δαῖμον,  
μόνον ὃς με κασίγνητον συλαῖς  
Ἄιδαι πέμπας, ὦι τάσδε χοᾶς  
μέλλω κρατῆρά τε τὸν φθιμένων 160  
ὑγραίνειν γαίας ἐν νώτοις  
παγὰς τ' οὔρειαν ἐκ μόσχων  
Βάκχου τ' οἰνηρὰς λοιβὰς  
ξουθᾶν τε πόννημα μελισσᾶν,  
ἃ νεκροῖς θελκτήρια χεῖται. 165  
ἀλλ' ἐνδος μοι πάγχρυσον  
τεῦχος καὶ λοιβὰν Ἄιδα.  
ὦ κατὰ γαίας Ἀγαμεμόνιον 170  
θάλος, ὡς φθιμένωι τάδε σοι πέμπω'  
δέξαι δ' οὐ γὰρ πρὸς τύμβον σοι  
ξανθὰν χαίταν, οὐ δάκρυ' οἶσω.  
τηλόσε γὰρ δὴ σᾶς ἀπενάσθην 175  
πατρίδος καὶ ἐμᾶς, ἔνθα δοκήμασι  
κεῖμαι σφαχθεῖς' ἃ τλάμων.  
Χο. ἀντιψάλμους ᾠιδὰς ὕμνον τ'  
Ἀσιήταν σοι, βάρβαρον ἀχάν, 180  
δέσποιν', ἐξαιδάσω, τὰν ἐν  
θρήνοις μούσαν νέκυσιν μέλεον  
τὰν ἐν μολπαῖς Ἄιδας ὕμνεῖ  
δίχα παιάνων. 185  
οἴμοι τῶν Ἀτρειδᾶν οἴκων'

155 οἴμοι <μοι> Hermann: οἴμοι L 158 μόνον ὃς με Bothe: ὃς τὸν μόνον με L 159 ᾠιδε. Hervag.: ᾠ L 161 ὑγραίνειν Blaydes: ὑδραίνειν L 163 παγὰς Monk: πηγὰς L οὔρειαν Paley: οὔρειων L 167 χεῖται Nauck: κεῖ\*\* L: κεῖτ' Tr: κεῖται Seidler 169 Ἄιδαι Seidler: αἶδα L 170 Ἀγαμεμόνιον Markland: ἀγαμεμόνειον L 173 πρὸς τύμβον Heath: πάρος τύμβου L 175 τηλόσε L: τηλο[θι] Π' 176 καὶ ἐμᾶς Porson: κέμας L δοκήμασι Porson: δοκίμα L 178 σφαχθεῖς' ἃ τλάμων Markland et ut vid. Π': σφαχθεῖσα τλάμων L 179–80 ὕμνον τ' ἀσιήταν L: ὕμνων τ' Ἀσιητᾶν Bothe 180 ἀχάν Nauck: ἰαχάν L 181 δέσποιν', ἐξαιδάσω P corr.: δέσποινά γ' ἐξαιδάσω L: δεσποίναι γ' ἐξαιδάσω Markland 183 θρήνοις P corr.: θρήνοισι L: θρήνοισιν Markland νέκυσιν Tr: νέκυσι L: delere mavult Parker μέλεον L: μελομέναν Markland 184 Ἄιδας Seidler: Αἶδας L 186–202 choro contin. Hermann, 186–235 Iphigeniae trib. L



- ἔρρει φῶς σκῆπτρόν τ' οἶμοι,  
πατρίων οἴκων.  
ἦν ἐκ τῶν εὐόλβων Ἄργει  
βασιλέων <τᾶς νῦν ἄτας> ἀρχά, 190  
μόχθος δ' ἐκ μόχθων αἰσσει·  
< >  
δινευούσαις ἵπποισιν <ἐπεῖ>  
πταναῖς ἀλλάξας [δ'] ἐξ ἔδρας  
ἱερὸν <μετέβασ> ὁμῖ' αὐγᾶς  
ἄλιος. †ἄλλοις† δ' ἄλλα προσέβα 195  
χρυσέας ἄρνός μελάθροις ὀδύνα,  
†φόνος ἐπὶ φόνωι, ἄχεα ἄχεσιν†  
ἔνθεν τῶν πρόσθεν δμαθέντων  
ἐκβαίνει ποιινὰ Τανταλιδᾶν 200  
εἰς οἴκους, σπεύδει δ' ἀσπούδαστ'  
ἐπὶ σοὶ δαίμων.  
Iφ. ἐξ ἀρχᾶς μοι δυσδαίμων  
δαίμων <  
> τᾶς ματρὸς ζώνας  
καὶ νυκτὸς κείνας' ἐξ ἀρχᾶς 205  
λόχιαι στερρὰν παιδείαν  
Μοῖραι συντείνουσιν θεαί,  
ἂν πρωτόγονον θάλος ἐν θαλάμοις 209  
ἀ μναστευθεῖσ' ἐξ Ἑλλάνων, 208  
Λήδας ἀ τλάμων κούρα 210  
σφάγιον πατρῷαι λῶβα  
καὶ θυμ' οὐκ εὐγάθητον  
ἔτεκεν, ἔτρεφεν εὐκταίαν'

187 φῶς Hermann: φώως L σκῆπτρόν τ' Burges: σκήπτρων L 189 ἦν Murray: τίν' L 190 <τᾶς νῦν ἄτας> suppl. Diggle 191 post hunc versum lac. stat. Dindorf, post 192 Kvíčala 192 ἵπποισιν Tr: ἵπποισι L <ἐπεῖ> Wecklein 193 δ' del. Musgrave ἐξ ἔδρας Elmsley: ἐξέδρας' L 194 <μετέβασ> Paley 195 ἄλλοις L: ἄλλαις Seidler: ἄλλοτε Jacobs 198 ἄχεα L: ἄχεά τ' Barnes: ἄχεά τ' ἐπ' Markland v. del. Hartung 200 ἐκβαίνει ποιινὰ Τανταλιδᾶν Monk: Τανταλιδᾶν ἐκβαίνει ποιινά γ' L 202 post δαίμων lac. stat. Hartung 203 ἐξ ἀρχᾶς Paris. gr. 2817, 2887 (ἐξαρχᾶς Tr): ἐξορχᾶς L 204 lac. stat Diggle 206 λόχια Hermann: λοχείαν L 207 συντείνουσιν Hermann: συντείνουσι L 209 θάλος P: θάλλος L 208 post 209 trai. Musgrave, post 220 Scaliger; ante versum lac. stat. Kovacs 213 ἔτεκεν ἔτρεφεν L: ἔτεκεν κᾶτρεφεν Seidler

- ἱππέοις <δ> ἐν δίφροισι  
 ψαμάθων Αὐλίδος ἐπέβασαν 215  
 νύμφαν, οἷμοι, δύσσυμφον  
 τῶι τὰς Νηρέως κούρας, αἰαῖ.  
 νῦν δ' ἄξείνου πόντου ξείνα  
 δυσχόρτους οἴκους νάϊω,  
 ἄγαμος ἄτεκνος ἄπολις ἄφιλος, 220  
 οὐ τὰν Ἄργει μέλπουσ' Ἥραν  
 οὐδ' ἰστοῖς ἐν καλλιφθόγγοις  
 κερκίδι Παλλάδος Ἀθίδος εἰκῶ  
 <καὶ> Τιτάνων ποικίλλουσ', ἀλλ'  
 αἰμορράντῳ δυσφόρμιγγι 225  
 ξείνων τέγγουσ' ἅται βωμούς,  
 οἰκτρὰν τ' αἰάζόντων αὐδὰν  
 οἰκτρὸν τ' ἐκβαλλόντων δάκρυον.  
 καὶ νῦν κείνων μὲν μοι λάθα,  
 τὸν δ' Ἄργει δμαθέντα κλαίω 230  
 σύγγονον, ὃν ἔλιπον ἐπιμαστίδιον,  
 ἔτι βρέφος, ἔτι νέον ἔτι θάλος  
 ἐν χερσὶν ματρὸς πρὸς στέρνοισι τ'  
 Ἄργει σκηπτοῦχον Ὀρέσταν. 235
- Χο. καὶ μὴν ὅδ' ἀκτὰς ἐκλιπὼν θαλασσίους  
 βουφορβὸς ἦκει σημανῶν τί σοι νέον.

# ΒΟΥΚΟΛΟΣ

- Ἀγαμέμνωνός τε καὶ Κλυταιμῆστρας τέκνον,  
 ἄκουε καινῶν ἐξ ἑμοῦ κηρυγμάτων.  
 Ιφ. τί δ' ἔστι τοῦ παρόντος ἐκπλήσσον λόγου; 240  
 Βο. ἦκουσιν ἐς γῆν, κυανέας Συμπληγάδας  
 πλάτῃ φυγόντες, δίπτυχοι νεανίαι,

214 ἱππέοις Markland: ἱππέοισιν L δ' add. Heath 216 νύμφαν Scaliger:  
 νύμφαιον (sic) L 217 τὰς Barnes: τὰς L αἰαῖ Hermann: αἰ αἰ L 224 καὶ  
 add. Tyrwhitt 225 αἰμορράντῳ Madvig: αἰμορράντων L δυσφόρμιγγι  
 Tyrwhitt: δυσφόρμιγγα L 226 τέγγουσ' Monk: αἰμάσσουσ' L ἅται Tyrwhitt:  
 ἅταν L 227-8 αὐδὰν οἰκτρὸν τ' Tyrwhitt: οὐδ' ἀνοικτρὸν τ' L 230 δμαθέντα  
 κλαίω L: δμαθέντ' ἀγκλαίω Weil 234 χερσὶν Markland: χερσὶ L στέρνοισι  
 Bothe: στέρνοισι L 237 σημανῶν ed. Aldina: σημαίνων L 238 τε Reiske: παῖ  
 L Κλυταιμῆστρας Wecklein: μνήστρας L 241 κυανέας Συμπληγάδας Bentley:  
 κυανέαν Συμπληγάδα L

- θεῶι φίλον πρόσφαγμα καὶ θυτήριον  
Ἄρτεμιδι. χέρνιβας δὲ καὶ κατάργματα  
οὐκ ἂν φθάνοις ἂν εὐτρεπῇ ποιουμένη. 245
- Ιφ. ποδαποί· τίνας γῆς σχῆμ' ἔχουσιν οἱ ξένοι;  
Βο. "Ἕλληνες· ἐν τοῦτ' οἶδα κοῦ περαιτέρω.  
Ιφ. οὐδ' ὄνομ' ἀκούσας οἶσθα τῶν ξένων φράσαι;  
Βο. Πυλάδης ἐκλήιζεθ' ἄτερος πρὸς θατέρου.  
Ιφ. τῷ ξυζύγῳ δὲ τοῦ ξένου τί τοῦνομ' ἦν; 250  
Βο. οὐδεῖς τόδ' οἶδεν· οὐ γὰρ εἰσηκούσαμεν.  
Ιφ. ποῦ δ' εἶδες αὐτοὺς κάντυχόντες εἴλετε;  
Βο. ἄκραις ἐπὶ ῥηγμίσιν ἄξένου πόρου.  
Ιφ. καὶ τίς θαλάσσης βουκόλοις κοινωνία;  
Βο. βοῦς ἦλθομεν νίψοντες ἐναλῖαι δρόσῳ. 255  
Ιφ. ἐκεῖσε δὴ πᾶνελθε, ποῦ νιν εἴλετε  
τρόπῳ θ' ὁποίῳ· τοῦτο γὰρ μαθεῖν θέλω.  
[χρόνιοι γὰρ ἤκουσ'· οὐδέ πω βωμὸς θεᾶς  
Ἑλληνικαῖσιν ἐξεφοινίχθη ῥοαῖς.]
- Βο. ἐπεὶ τὸν ἐκρέοντα διὰ Συμπληγάδων 260  
βοῦς ὑλοφορβούς πόντον εἰσεβάλλομεν,  
ἦν τις διαρρώξ κυμάτων πολλῶι σάλῳι  
κοιλωπὸς ἄγμός, πορφυρευτικαὶ στέγαι.  
ἐνταῦθα δισσοὺς εἶδε τις νεανίας  
βουφορβὸς ἡμῶν, κἀνεχώρησεν πάλιν 265  
ἄκροισι δακτύλοισι πορθμεύων ἵχνης.  
ἔλεξε δ' Οὐχ ὀρᾷτε; δαίμονές τινες  
θάσσουσιν οἶδε. θεοσεβῆς δ' ἡμῶν τις ὦν  
ἀνέσχε χεῖρας καὶ προσηύξατ' εἰσιδῶν·  
ᾧ ποντίας παῖ Λευκοθέας, νεῶν φύλας, 270  
δέσποτα Παλαῖμον, ἴλεως ἡμῖν γενοῦ,  
εἴτ' οὖν ἐπ' ἀκταῖς θάσσετον Διοσκόρω,  
ἦ Νηρέως ἀγάλμαθ', ὃς τὸν εὐγενῇ  
ἔτικτε πεντήκοντα Νηρήιδων χορόν.  
ἄλλος δὲ τις μάταιος, ἀνομίαί θρασύς, 275

246 σχῆμ' Monk: ὄνομ' L 250 τῷ ξυζύγῳ Elmsley: τοῦ ξυζύγου L 252 ποῦ  
Musgrave: πῶς L κάντυχόντες Reiske (καν- Π'): καὶ τυχόντες L 253 ἄκραις  
Plut. *Mor.* 602a: ἀκταῖσιν L 256 ποῦ Bothe: πῶς L 258-9 del.  
Monk 258 ἤκουσ' ed. Brubachiana: ἤκουσιν L οὐδέ πω L: οἶδ' ἐπεὶ  
Seidler 260 ἐκρέοντα Elmsley: εἰσρέοντα L 265 κἀνεχώρησεν Blomfield:  
κἀπεχώρησεν L 268 ὦν Tr P corr.: om. L 269 χεῖρας Mekler: χεῖρα L: χεῖρε  
Markland προσηύξατ' Dindorf: προσεύξατ' L

ἐγέλασεν εὐχαῖς, ναυτίλους δ' ἐφθαρμένους  
 θάσσειν φάραγγ' ἔφασκε τοῦ νόμου φόβωι,  
 κλυόντας ὡς θύοιμεν ἐνθάδε ξένους.  
 ἔδοξε δ' ἡμῶν εὖ λέγειν τοῖς πλείοσι,  
 θηρᾶν τε τῇ θεῶι σφάγια τὰπιχώρια. 280  
 κὰν τῶιδε πέτραν ἄτερος λιπῶν ξένοι  
 ἔστη κάρα τε διετίνας' ἄνω κάτω  
 κἄνεστέναξεν ὠλένας τρέμων ἄκρας,  
 μανίαις ἀλαίνων, καὶ βοᾷ κυναγὸς ὥς·  
 Πυλάδη, δέδορκας τήνδε; τήνδε δ' οὐχ ὀραῖς 285  
 Ἄιδου δράκαιναν, ὥς με βούλεται κτανεῖν  
 δειναῖς ἐχιδναῖς εἰς ἔμ' ἐστομωμένη;  
 ἧδ' ἐκ χιτώνων† πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον  
 πτεροῖς ἐρέσσει, μητέρ' ἀγκάλαις ἐμὴν  
 ἔχουσα, πέτρινον ἄχθος, ὡς ἐπεμβάληι. 290  
 οἴμοι, κτενεῖ με· ποῖ φύγω; παρῇν δ' ὀρᾶν  
 οὐ ταῦτα μορφῆς σχήματ', ἀλλ' ἡλλάσσετο†  
 φθογγὰς τε μόσχων καὶ κυνῶν ὑλάγματα,  
 ἧς φᾶσ'† Ἐρινὺς ἰέναι μιμήματα.  
 ἡμεῖς δὲ συσταλέντες, ὡς θανουμένου, 295  
 σιγῇ καθήμεθ'· ὃ δὲ χερὶ σπάσας ξίφος,  
 μόσχους ὀρούσας ἐς μέσας λέων ὅπως,  
 παίει σιδήρῳ λαγόνας ἐς πλευράς θ' ἰεῖς,  
 δοκῶν Ἐρινὺς θεὰς ἀμύνεσθαι τάδε,  
 ὥσθ' αἵματηρόν πέλαγος ἐξανθεῖν ἄλός. 300  
 κὰν τῶιδε πᾶς τις, ὡς ὀρεῖ βουφόρβια  
 πίπτοντα καὶ πορθοῦμεν', ἐξωπλίζετο,  
 κόχλους τε φυσῶν συλλέγων τ' ἐγχωρίους·  
 πρὸς εὐτραφεῖς γὰρ καὶ νεανίας ξένους

278 κλυόντας Parker: κλύοντας L 281 ξένοι Brodaeus: ξένην L 283 κἄνεστέναξεν  
 Monk: κἄπεστέναξεν L 284 κυναγὸς ὥς L: κυναγὸν ὥς Hermann: κυναγὸν  
 οὐ Weil: κυνώπιδα Nauck 288 ἧδ' ἐκ χιτώνων L: ἡ 'κ χειτόνων δὲ Jackson,  
 alii alia; post χιτώνων lac. stat. Heinisch 290 ἄχθος Bothe: ἔχθον L: ὄγκον  
 Heimsoeth 291 κτενεῖ P corr.: κτείνει L: κτανεῖ Longin. 15.2 292 ταῦτα  
 Markland: ταυτὰ (= ταυτὰ) L ἡλάσσετο L: εἰλίσσετο Diggle (... φθόγγαις ...  
 ὑλάγμασιν): ἡλαύνετο Kyriakou 293 φθογγὰς L: φθογγαῖς Bothe ὑλάγματα L:  
 ὑλάγματι Bothe post v. lac. stat. Bruhn 294 ἄς φᾶσ' L: ἄ φᾶσ' Brodaeus: ἄ φάσκ'  
 Badham: φάσκων Diggle v. del. Wilamowitz 295 θανουμένου Wilamowitz:  
 θανούμενοι L, μβ (h.e. θαμβούμενοι?) supr. lin. 296 χερὶ σπάσας Pierson:  
 περισπάσας L 298 πλευράς θ' Reiske: πλευράς L 299 del. West 300 ὥσθ'  
 Markland: ὡς L

φαύλους μάχεσθαι βουκόλους ἡγούμεθα. 305  
 πολλοὶ δ' ἐπληρώθημεν οὐ μακρῶι χρόνῳι.  
 πίπτει δὲ μανίας πίτυλον ὁ ξένος μεθεῖς,  
 στάζων ἀφρῶι γένειον· ὥς δ' ἐσείδομεν  
 προύργου πεσόντα, πᾶς ἀνὴρ εἶχεν πόνον  
 βάλλων, ἀράσσω. ἄτερος δὲ τοῖν ξένοιον 310  
 ἀφρόν τ' ἀπέψη σώματός τ' ἐτημέλει  
 πέπλων τε προυκάλυπτεν εὐπτήνους ὑφάς,  
 καραδοκῶν μὲν τὰπιόντα τραύματα,  
 φίλον δὲ θεραπεύεισιν ἄνδρ' εὐεργετῶν.  
 ἔμφρων δ' ἀνάϊξας ὁ ξένος πεσήματος 315  
 ἔγνω κλύδωνα πολεμίων προσκείμενον  
 [καὶ τὴν παροῦσαν συμφορὰν αὐτοῖν πέλας]  
 ὠιμῶξέ θ'· ἡμεῖς δ' οὐκ ἀνίμεν πέτροις  
 βάλλοντες, ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν προσκείμενοι.  
 οὔ δὴ τὸ δεινὸν παρακέλευμ' ἠκούσαμεν· 320  
 Πυλάδῃ, θανούμεθ', ἀλλ' ὅπως θανούμεθα  
 κάλλισθ'· ἔπου μοι, φάσγανον σπάσας χερσί.  
 ὥς δ' εἶδομεν δίπαλτα πολεμίων ξίφῃ,  
 φυγῇ λεπταίας ἐξεπίμπλαμεν νάπας.  
 ἀλλ', εἰ φύγοι τις, ἄτεροι προσκείμενοι 325  
 ἔβαλλον αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ τούσδ' ὠσαίατο,  
 αὔθις τὸ νῦν ὑπέϊκον ἥρασσον πέτροις.  
 ἀλλ' ἦν ἄπιστον· μυρίων γὰρ ἐκ χερῶν  
 οὐδεὶς τὰ τῆς θεοῦ θύματ' εὐτύχει βαλὼν.  
 μόλις δὲ νιν τόλμῃ μὲν οὐ χειρούμεθα, 330  
 κύκλωι δὲ περιβαλόντες ἐξεκλέψαμεν  
 πέτροισι χερῶν φάσγαν', ἐς δὲ γῆν γόνυ  
 καμάτῳι καθεῖσαν. πρὸς δ' ἄνακτα τῆσδε γῆς  
 κομίζομέν νιν. ὃ δ' ἐσιδὼν ὅσον τάχος  
 ἐς χέρνιβάς τε καὶ σφαγεῖ' ἔπεμπέ σοι. 335

306 οὐ μακρῶι Nauck: ἐν μακρῶι L: ἐν μικρῶι Tr (σμικρῶι Monk) 309 εἶχεν  
 Heiland: ἔσχεν L 311 ἀπέψη Elmsley: ἀπέψα L, Luc. Am. 47, Hsch.  
 s.v. 315 ἀνάϊξας Schaefer: ἀναΐξας L 316 ἔγνω Scaliger: ἔγνωκε  
 L 317 αὐτοῖν L corr.: αὐτοῖς L: αὐτοῖν England v. del. Bothe 318 πέτροις  
 L supr. lin.: πέτρους L 320 παρακέλευμ' Sansone (cf. 1405, 1483): παρακέλευσμ'  
 L 322 κάλλισθ' ed. Aldina: κάλλιστ' L 327 αὔθις Schaefer: οὔτις <L>P:  
 αὔτις Tr 331 περιβαλόντες Reiske: περιβάλλοντες L ἐξεκλέψαμεν L: ἐξεκόψαμεν  
 Bothe 333 καθεῖσαν Tr: καθεῖσα <L>P 335 ἐς Valckenaer: τε L σφαγεῖ'  
 Musgrave: σφαγί' L

- εὔχου δὲ τοιάδ', ὦ νεᾶνι, σοι ξένων  
σφάγια παρῆναι· κἄν ἀναλίσκης ξένους  
τοιοῦσδε, τὸν σὸν Ἑλλάς ἀποτείσει φόνον  
δίκας τίνουσα τῆς ἐν Αὐλίδι σφαγῆς.
- Χο. θαυμάστ' ἔλεξας τὸν μανένθ', ὅστις ποτὲ 340  
"Ἕλληνος ἐκ γῆς πόντον ἦλθεν ἄξενον.
- Ιφ. εἶέν· σὺ μὲν κόμιζε τοὺς ξένους μολῶν,  
τὰ δ' ἐνθάδ' ἡμεῖς ὅσια φροντιούμεθα.  
ὦ καρδία τάλαινα, πρὶν μὲν ἐς ξένους  
γαληνὸς ἦσθα καὶ φιλοικτίρμων αἰεί, 345  
ἐς θοῦμόφυλον ἀναμετρουμένη δάκρυ,  
"Ἕλληνας ἄνδρας ἡνίκ' ἐς χέρας λάβοις.  
νῦν δ' ἐξ ὀνείρων οἷσιν ἡγριώμεθα,  
[δοκοῦσ' Ὀρέστην μηκέθ' ἥλιον βλέπειν]  
δύσνουν με λήψουσθ', οἵτινές ποθ' ἦκετε. 350  
καὶ τοῦτ' ἄρ' ἦν ἀληθές, ἦισθημαι, φίλαι·  
οἱ δυστυχεῖς γὰρ τοῖσι δυστυχαστέροις  
αὐτοὶ κακῶς πράξαντες οὐ φρονοῦσιν εὔ.  
ἀλλ' οὔτε πνεῦμα Διόθεν ἦλθε πώποτε,  
οὐ πορθμῖς, ἥτις διὰ πέτρας Συμπληγάδας 355  
Ἑλένην ἐπήγαγ' ἐνθάδ', ἥ μ' ἀπώλεσεν,  
Μενέλεων θ', ἵν' αὐτοὺς ἀντετιμωρησάμην,  
τὴν ἐνθάδ' Αὐλιν ἀντιθεῖσα τῆς ἐκεῖ,  
οὔ μ' ὥστε μόσχον Δαναΐδα χειρούμενοι  
ἔσφαζον, ἱερεὺς δ' ἦν ὁ γεννήσας πατήρ. 360  
οἴμοι, κακῶν γὰρ τῶν τότε οὐκ ἀμνημονῶ,  
ὅσας γενεῖου χεῖρας ἐξηκόντισα  
γονάτων τε τοῦ τεκόντος ἐξαρτωμένη,  
λέγουσα τοιάδ'· ὦ πάτερ, νυμφεύομαι  
νυμφεύματ' αἰσχρὰ πρὸς σέθεν· μήτηρ δ' ἐμέ 365  
σέθεν κατακτείνοντος Ἀργεῖαί τε νῦν

336 εὔχου L: ἡύχου Mekler 338 ἀποτείσει Murray: ἀποτίσει L 340 μανένθ'  
Kaehler, Lakon: φανένθ' L 343 ὅσια Reiske: οἷα L 346 θοῦμόφυλον Barnes:  
τὸ ὀμόφυλον L 349 del. Nauck 351-3 del. F. W. Schmidt 351 ἦισθημαι  
Platnauer: ἡχθόμην L: ἡισθόμην Seager 352 τοῖσι δυστυχαστέροις Wecklein: τοῖσιν  
εὐτυχαστέροις L 353 αὐτοὶ κακῶς πράξαντες L: καὶ τοῖς (αὐτοῖς Kirchhoff) κακῶς  
πράξασιν Reiske 356 ἐπήγαγ' Haupt: ἀπήγαγ' L 357 Μενέλεων Barnes:  
Μενέλαόν L 359 οὐ Pierson: οἱ L 361 τότε ed. Aldina: τοῦδ' L 363 del.  
West 365 ἐμέ Reiske: ἐμή L 366 νῦν Heath, Tyrwhitt: νιν L: με Kirchhoff (ἐμή  
365 servato)

- ὕμνοῦσιν ὕμεναίοισιν, αὐλεῖται δὲ πᾶν  
 μέλαθρον· ἡμεῖς δ' ὀλλύμεσθα πρὸς σέθεν.  
 Ἄιδης Ἀχιλλεύς ἦν ἄρ', οὐχ ὁ Πηλέως,  
 ὃν μοι προτείνας πόσιν, ἐν ἀρμάτων <μ> ὄχοις 370  
 ἐς αἵματηρὸν γάμον ἐπόρθμευσας δόλωι.  
 ἐγὼ δὲ λεπτῶν ὄμμα διὰ καλυμμάτων  
 ἔχουσ', ἀδελφὸν οὐτ' ἀνειλόμην χεροῖν,  
 ὃς νῦν ὄλωλεν, οὐ κασιγνήτηι στόμα  
 συνῆψ' ὑπ' αἰδοῦς, ὥς ἰοῦσ' ἐς Πηλέως 375  
 μέλαθρα· πολλὰ δ' ἀπεθέμην ἀσπάσματα  
 ἐς αὔθις, ὥς ἦξουσ' ἐς Ἄργος αὖ πάλιν.  
 ᾧ τλήμον, εἰ τέθνηκας, ἐξ οἴων καλῶν  
 ἔρρεις, Ὅρέστα, καὶ πατρός ζηλωμάτων.  
 < >  
 τὰ τῆς θεοῦ δὲ μέφομαι σοφίσματα, 380  
 ἥτις βροτῶν μὲν ἦν τις ἄψηται φόνου,  
 ἥ καὶ λοχείας ἥ νεκροῦ θίγηι χεροῖν,  
 βωμῶν ἀπείργει, μυσαρὸν ὥς ἡγουμένη,  
 αὐτὴ δὲ θυσίαις ἥδεται βροτοκτόνοις.  
 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ἂν ἔτεκεν ἡ Διὸς δάμαρ 385  
 Λητῶ τοσαύτην ἀμαθίαν. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν  
 τὰ Ταντάλου θεοῖσιν ἐστιάματα  
 ἄπιστα κρίνω, παιδὸς ἡσθῆναι βορᾷ,  
 τοὺς δ' ἐνθάδ', αὐτοὺς ὄντας ἀνθρωποκτόνους,  
 ἐς τὴν θεὸν τὸ φαῦλον ἀναφέρειν δοκῶ· 390  
 οὐδένα γὰρ οἶμαι δαιμόνων εἶναι κακόν.
- Χο. κυάνεαι κυάνεαι σύνοδοι θαλάσσας,  
 ἵν' οἷστρος ὁ ποτ' ὄρμενος Ἀργόθεν  
 ἄξενον ἐπ' οἶδμα διεπέρασε <πόντου> 395

368 ὀλλύμεσθα P corr.: ὀλλύμεθα L 370 προτείνας Badham: προσεῖπας L:  
 προσείσας Bothe <μ> Bothe: om. L 373 οὐτ' ἀνειλόμην Tyrwhitt: τοῦτον  
 εἰλόμην L: τ' οὐκ ἀνειλόμην Hermann 378 καλῶν Reiske: κακῶν L 380 ante  
 v. lac. stat. Barnes 382 del. Badham 384 αὐτὴ Aem. Portus: αὕτη L  
 385 ἂν ἔτεκεν Bothe: ἔτεκεν ἂν L: ἔτικτεν Porson 390 τὴν ignotus ap. Markland:  
 τὸν L 391 οὐδένα L: οὐδὲν Nauck 394 ἵν' Hermann: ἦν L ποτ'  
 ὄρμενος Willink: πετόμενος L: ποτώμενος Tr ἵν' οἷστρος <ἰοῦς> ὁ πετόμενος <ἀπ>  
 Ἀργόθεν Diggle (v. 409 intra obelos posito) 395 ἄξενον Markland: εὔξενον  
 L: εὔξενον Tr διεπέρασε <πόντου> Schöne: διεπέρασεν L: διεπέρασεν <ἰοῦς> Erfurdt

- Ἀσιήτιδα γαῖαν  
 Εὐρώπας διαμείψας.  
 τίνες ποτ' ἄρα τὸν εὐυδρον δονακόχλοον  
 λιπόντες Εὐρώταν 400  
 ἥ ρεύματα σεμνὰ Δίρκας  
 ἔβασαν ἔβασαν ἄμεικτον αἶαν, ἔνθα κούραι  
 Δίαι τέγγει  
 βωμούς καὶ περικίονας 405  
 ναοὺς αἶμα βρότειον;
- ἥ ῥοθίοις εἰλατίνας δικρότοισι κώπας  
 ἔστειλαν ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα  
 νάιον ὄχημα λινοπόροισι τ' αὔραις, 410  
 φιλόπλουτον ἄμιλλαν  
 αὔζοντες μελάθορισιν;  
 φίλα γὰρ ἔλπις ἔγενετ' ἐπὶ πῆμασι βροτῶν†  
 ἄπληστος ἀνθρώποις, 415  
 ὄλβου βάρους οἱ φέρονται  
 πλάνητες ἐπ' οἶδμα πόλεις τε βαρβάρους περῶντες  
 κοινᾷ δόξαι·  
 γνώμα δ' οἷς μὲν ἄκαιρος ὄλ- 420  
 βου, τοῖς δ' ἐς μέτρον ἦκει.
- πῶς τὰς συνδρομάδας πέτρας,  
 πῶς Φινεῖδᾶν αὖ-  
 πνους ἀκτὰς ἐπέρα-  
 σαν παρ' ἄλιον αἰγιαλὸν ἐπ' Ἀμφιτρί- 425

399 δονακόχλοον Elmsley: δονακόχλο\* L: δονακόχλοα Tr 402 ἄμεικτον Murray: ἄμικτον L 403-4 κούραι Δίαι τέγγει Elmsley: κούρα διατέγγει L 405-6 περικίονας ναοὺς Elmsley: περὶ κίονας ναοῦ L 407 ἥ Barnes: ἥ L 407-8 εἰλατίνας ... κώπας Reiske: ἐλατίνοις ... κώπαις L (εἰλατίνοις Tr) 409 ἔστειλαν Rauchenstein: ἐπλευσαν L πόντια L: νότια Bergk: πόντι' ἐπὶ Sansone (ut vocī πετόμενος (394) respondeat) v. intra obelos pos. Diggle (cf. 394) 410 λινοπόροισι τ' Monk (τ' Markland): λινοπόροις αὔραις L 413-14 φίλα γὰρ ἐγένετ' ἐλπίς Wakefield: ἐν τε ποθήμασιν [βροτῶν] England: φίλα γὰρ ἐλπίς ἐπὶ τε πῆμασιν βροτῶν Grégoire: φιλεῖ γὰρ ἐλπίς γ' ἔτ' ἐπὶ πῆμασιν βρῦειν Willink 417 τε Tr: om. L 419 κοινᾷ δόξαι Bergk: κοιναὶ δόξαι L: κεναὶ δόξαι Tr 421 μέτρον Tucker (CR 12, 23-7): μέσον L 423 Φινεῖδᾶν Rauchenstein: Φινηίδας L: Φινεῖδας Tr αὖπνους L: λιγύπνους (Φινεῖδας servato) Wilamowitz 425 παρ' ἄλιον Seidler: παράλιον L



- τας ῥοθίῳ δραμόντες,  
 ὅπου πεντήκοντα κοῤῥαν  
 Νηρήιδων < ~ > χοροὶ  
 μέλπουσιν ἐγκύκλιοι,  
 πλησιστίοισι πνοαῖς 430  
 συριζόντων κατὰ πρύμν-  
 αν εὐναίων πηδαλίων  
 αὔραισιν νοτίαις  
 ἥ πνεύμασι Ζεφύρου,  
 τὰν πολυόρνιθον ἐπ' αἰ- 435  
 αν, λευκὰν ἄκταν, Ἀχιλῆ-  
 ος δρόμους καλλισταδίους,  
 ἄξεινον κατὰ πόντον;
- εἴθ' εὐχαῖσιν δεσποσύνοις  
 Λήδας Ἑλένα φίλα 440  
 παῖς ἐλθοῦσα τύχοι  
 Τρωιάδα λιποῦσα πόλιν, ἴν' ἀμφὶ χαί-  
 ται δρόσον αἵματηρὰν  
 ἐλιχθεῖσα λαιμοτόμῳ  
 δεσποίνας χειρὶ θάνη 445  
 ποινὰς δοῦσ' ἀντιπάλους.  
 ἦδιστ' ἂν δ' ἀγγελίαν  
 δεξαίμεσθ', Ἑλλάδος ἐκ  
 γὰς πλωτῆρων εἴ τις ἔβα,  
 δουλείας ἐμέθεν 450  
 δειλαίας παυσίπονος·  
 <κάν> γὰρ ὀνείροισι †συμβαί-  
 ην† δόμοις πόλει τε πατρῷ-

428 Νηρήιδων ed. Aldina (τῶν νη- Tr): νηρηιδων L 429 ἐγκύκλιοι Heath: ἐγκυκλίοις L (quo servato 428 ποσί Hermann, ποσσί Wilamowitz) 433 αὔραισιν Heath: αὔραις L: αὔραις ἐν Tr 435 πολυόρνιθον ed. Aldina: πολυ- L 436 Ἀχιλῆος ed. Aldina: ἀχιλλῆος L 438 ἄξεινον <L>P: εὔξεινον Tr 439 δεσποσύνοις Markland: δεσποσύνας L 442 Τρωιάδα Page: τὰν Τρωιάδα <L>P: τὰν Τρωάδα Tr 442-3 χαίτα (= χαίται) L: χαίταν ed. Aldina (cf. 622) 444 ἐλιχθεῖσα <L>P: εἰλιχθεῖσα Tr 445 χειρὶ Monk: χερὶ L 447 ἦδιστ' ἂν δ' Hermann: ἦδιστ' ἂν τήνδ' L 448 δεξαίμεσθ' Tr: δεξαίμεθ' L 452 <κάν> Herwerden: <καί> Tr ὀνείροισι Fritzsche: ὀνείρασι L 452-3 συνείην Fritzsche ὥς γὰρ ὀνείροισι ἀνυσαίμαν Wecklein

αι, τερπνῶν ὕπνων ἀπόλαυ-  
σιν, κοινὰν χάριν ὀλβου. 455

ἀλλ' οἶδε χέρας δεσμοῖς δίδυμοι  
συνερεισθέντες χωροῦσι, νέον  
πρόσφαγμα θεᾶς· σιγᾶτε, φίλοι.  
τὰ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων ἀκροθίνια δὴ  
ναοῖσι πέλας τάδε βαίνει· 460  
οὐδ' ἀγγελίας ψευδεῖς ἔλακεν  
βουφορβὸς ἀνήρ.  
ὦ πότνι', εἴ σοι τάδ' ἀρεσκόντως  
πόλις ἦδε τελεῖ, δέξαι θυσίας,  
ὅς ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν 465  
νόμος οὐχ ὀσίας ἀναφαίνει.

Ιφ. εἶέν·  
τὰ τῆς θεοῦ μὲν πρῶτον ὡς καλῶς ἔχη  
φροντιστέον μοι. μέθετε τῶν ξένων χέρας,  
ὡς ὄντες ἱεροὶ μηκέτ' ὦσι δέσμιοι.  
ναοῦ δ' ἔσω στείχοντες εὐτρεπίζετε 470  
ἃ χρὴ πῖ τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ νομίζεται.  
φεῦ·  
τίς ἄρα μήτηρ ἢ τεκοῦσ' ὕμᾱς ποτε  
πατήρ τ', ἀδελφὴ τ', εἰ γεγῶσα τυγχάνει;  
οἷων στερεῖσα διπτύχων νεανιῶν  
ἀνάδελφος ἔσται. τὰς τύχας τίς οἶδ' ὅτωι 475  
τοιαίδ' ἔσονται; πάντα γὰρ τὰ τῶν θεῶν  
ἐς ἀφανὲς ἔρπει, κούδέν οἶδ' οὐδεὶς σαφές·  
ἦ γὰρ τύχη παρήγαγ' ἐς τὸ δυσμαθές.  
πόθεν ποθ' ἦκετ', ὦ ταλαίπωροι ξένοι;  
ὡς διὰ μακροῦ μὲν τήνδ' ἐπλεύσατε χθόνα, 480  
μακρὸν δ' ἀπ' οἴκων χρόνον ἔσεσθε δὴ κάτω.

454 ὕπνων Hermann: ὕμνων L ἀπόλαυσιν <L>P: ἀπολαύειν Tr 455 ὀλβου  
Dupuy: ὀλβα L: ὀλβω Tr 455-66 choro contin. Bothe: 456-62 Iphigeniae,  
463-6 choro trib. L 456 δίδυμοι Markland: διδύμοις L 458-60 σιγᾶτε ...  
βαίνει post 462 trai. Elmsley 458 θεᾶς L: θεᾶι Toup, cl. 243 461 ἔλακεν Tr:  
ἔλακε L 465 ἀναφαίνει Bergk: Ἑλληνι διδοὺς ἀναφαίνει L 467 ἔχη (= ἔχη) Tr:  
ἔχει L 470 ναοῦ Valckenaer: ναοὺς L 472 ἄρα Tr: ἄρα L 474 στερεῖσα  
Scaliger: στερηθεῖσα L 477 σαφές Maas (σαφῶς Wecklein): κακόν L: ἄκος F. W.  
Schmidt 478 del. Hirzel: ante versum lac. stat. Bruhn 481 ἔσεσθε δὴ  
Dobree: ἔσεσθ' αἰεί L

- Ορ. τί ταῦτ' ὀδύρηι, κάπῃ τοῖς μέλουσι νῶν  
κακοῖς σέ λυπεῖς, ἥτις εἶ ποτ', ὦ γύναι;  
οὔτοι νομίζω σοφόν, ὅς ἂν μέλλων κτανεῖν  
οἴκτωι τὸ δεῖμα τοῦλέθρου νικᾶν θέληι, 485  
οὐδ' ὅστις Ἀιδην ἐγγύς ὄντ' οἰκτίζεται  
σωτηρίας ἀνελπις· ὥς δὴ ἐξ ἐνὸς  
κακῶ συνάπτει, μωρίαν τ' ὀφλισκάνει  
θνήσκει θ' ὁμοίως· τὴν τύχην δ' ἔαν χρεῶν.  
ἡμᾶς δὲ μὴ θρῆναι σὺ· τὰς γὰρ ἐνθάδε 490  
θυσίας ἐπιστάμεσθα καὶ γιγνώσκομεν.
- Ιφ. πότερος ἄρ' ὑμῶν ἔνθαδ' ἔνομασμένους  
Πυλάδης κέκληται; τότε μαθεῖν πρῶτον θέλω.
- Ορ. ὅδ', εἴ τι δὴ σοι τοῦτ' ἐν ἡδονῇ μαθεῖν.
- Ιφ. ποίας πολίτης πατρίδος Ἑλληνος γεγώς; 495
- Ορ. τί δ' ἂν μαθοῦσα τότε πλέον λάβοις, γύναι;
- Ιφ. πότερον ἀδελφῶ μητρός ἔστον ἐκ μιᾶς;
- Ορ. φιλότῃ γ'· ἔσμεν δ' οὐ κασιγνήτω γένει.
- Ιφ. σοὶ δ' ὄνομα ποῖον ἔθεθ' ὁ γεννήσας πατήρ;
- Ορ. τὸ μὲν δίκαιον δυστυχῆς καλοῖμεθ' ἂν. 500
- Ιφ. οὐ τοῦτ' ἐρωτῶ· τοῦτο μὲν δὲς τῇ τύχῃ.
- Ορ. τὸ σῶμα θύσεις τοῦμόν, οὐχὶ τοῦνομα.
- Ιφ. τί δὲ φθονεῖς τοῦτο; ἢ φρονεῖς οὕτω μέγα; 504
- Ορ. ἀνώνυμοι θανόντες οὐ γελῶμεθ' ἂν. 503
- Ιφ. οὐδ' ἂν πόλιν φράσεις ἥτις ἐστί σοι; 502
- Ορ. ζητεῖς γὰρ οὐδὲν κέρδος, ὥς θανουμένωι. 505
- Ιφ. χάριν δὲ δοῦναι τήνδε κωλύει τί σε;
- Ορ. τὸ κλεινὸν Ἄργος πατρίδ' ἐμὴν ἐπεύχομαι.
- Ιφ. πρὸς θεῶν, ἀληθῶς, ὦ ξέν', εἴ κεῖθεν γεγώς;
- Ορ. ἐκ τῶν Μυκηνῶν <γ>, αἶ ποτ' ἦσαν ὄλβιοι. 510
- Ιφ. καὶ μὴν ποθεινός γ' ἦλθες ἐξ Ἀργους μολών.
- Ορ. οὐκουν ἐμαυτῶι γ'· εἰ δὲ σοί, σὺ τοῦδ' ἔρα. 515
- Ιφ. φυγὰς <δ> ἀπῆρας πατρίδος, ἣ ποῖα τύχηι; 516

482 μέλουσι Knícala: μέλλουσι L 483 κακοῖς σέ Housman: κακοῖσι L  
484 κτανεῖν Seidler: θανεῖν L 486 οὐδ' Hermann: οὐχ L 487 ἀνελπις  
Brodæus: ἂν ἐλπίς L 491 γινώσκομεν Seidler: γινώσκομεν L 492 ἐνθάδ'  
L: εἶπατ' Weil 494 εἴ τι Tr: ἔστι L ut vid., P 498 γένει Koechly: γύναι  
L 500 Δυστυχῆς Barthold: δυστυχῆς L 504, 503, 502 hoc ordine pos.  
Barthold 503 ἢ Hermann: ἢ L 502 γελῶμεθ' Aem. Portus: γελῶμεθ'  
L 510 γ' add. Monk 515-16 post 510 trāi. Platnauer, post 512  
Kirchhoff 516 τοῦδ' ἔρα Barnes: τοῦτ' ἔρα L: τοῦθ' ὄρα Jacobs 511 <δ>  
Scaliger: om. L

Ορ.	φεύγω τρόπον γε δή τιν' οὐχ ἐκὼν ἐκὼν.	512
Ιφ.	ἄρ' ἂν τί μοι φράσειας ὦν ἐγὼ θέλω;	513
Ορ.	ὥς ἐν παρέργῳ τῆς ἐμῆς δυσπραξίας.	514
Ιφ.	Τροίαν ἴσως οἶσθ', ἥς ἀπανταχοῦ λόγος.	517
Ορ.	ὥς μήποτ' ὠφελόν γε μήδ' ἰδὼν ὄναρ.	
Ιφ.	φασὶν νιν οὐκέτ' οὔσαν οἴχεσθαι δορί.	
Ορ.	ἔστιν γὰρ οὕτως, οὐδ' ἄκραντ' ἠκούσατε.	520
Ιφ.	Ἐλένη δ' ἀφίκεται δῶμα Μενέλεω πάλιν;	
Ορ.	ἦκει, κακῶς γ' ἐλθοῦσα τῶν ἐμῶν τινι.	
Ιφ.	καὶ ποῦ ὅστι; κάμοι γάρ τι προφείλει κακόν.	
Ορ.	Σπάρτῃ ξυνοικεῖ τῷ πάρος ξυνευνέτῃ.	
Ιφ.	ὦ μῖσος εἰς Ἑλλήνας, οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνῃ.	525
Ορ.	ἀπέλαυσα καγὼ δὴ τι τῶν κείνης γάμων.	
Ιφ.	νόστος δ' Ἀχαιῶν ἐγένεθ', ὥς κηρύσσεται;	
Ορ.	ὥς πάνθ' ἅπαξ με συλλαβοῦς' ἀνιστορεῖς.	
Ιφ.	πρὶν γὰρ θανεῖν σε, τοῦδ' ἐπαυρέσθαι θέλω.	
Ορ.	ἔλεγχ', ἐπειδὴ τοῦδ' ἐρᾷς; λέξω δ' ἐγὼ.	530
Ιφ.	Κάλχας τις ἦλθε μάντις ἐκ Τροίας πάλιν;	
Ορ.	ὄλωλεν, ὥς ἦν ἐν Μυκηναίοις λόγος.	
Ιφ.	ὦ πότνι', ὥς εὔ. τί γὰρ ὁ Λαέρτου γόνος;	
Ορ.	οὔπω νενόστηκ' οἶκον, ἔστι δ', ὥς λόγος.	
Ιφ.	ὄλοιτο, νόστου μήποτ' ἐς πάτρην τυχών.	535
Ορ.	μηδὲν κατεύχου· πάντα τὰκείνου νοσεῖ.	
Ιφ.	Θέτιδος δ' ὁ τῆς Νηρηίδος ἔστι παῖς ἔτι;	
Ορ.	οὐκ ἔστιν· ἄλλως λέκτρ' ἔγημ' ἐν Αὐλίδι.	
Ιφ.	δόλια γάρ, ὥς ἴσασιν οἱ πεπονθότες.	
Ορ.	τίς εἶ ποθ'; ὥς εὔ. πυνθάνῃ τὰφ' Ἑλλάδος.	540
Ιφ.	ἐκεῖθ' ἐν εἰμὶ· παῖς ἔτ' οὔσ' ἀπωλόμην.	
Ορ.	ὀρθῶς ποθεῖς ἄρ' εἰδέναι τὰκεῖ, γύναι.	
Ιφ.	τί δ' ὁ στρατηγός, ὃν λέγουσ' εὐδαιμονεῖν;	
Ορ.	τίς; οὐ γὰρ ὃν γ' ἐγῶνιδα τῶν εὐδαιμόνων.	
Ιφ.	Ἀτρέως ἔλέγετο δὴ τις Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.	545
Ορ.	οὐκ οἶδ'· ἀπελθε τοῦ λόγου τούτου, γύναι.	
Ιφ.	μὴ πρὸς θεῶν, ἀλλ' εἴφ', ἵν' εὐφρανθῶ, ξένη.	
Ορ.	τέθνηχ' ὁ τλήμων, πρὸς δ' ἀπώλεσέν τινα.	

520 ἔστιν Tr: ἔστι L 521 δῶμα L: λέκτρα Weil 533 εὔ. τί Musgrave:  
 ἔστι L 538 ἄλλως Tr: ἄλλως δὲ <L>P ἔγημ' ἐν Dupuy: ἔγημεν L  
 539 ὥς ἴσασιν Nauck: ὥς φασὶν L: ὥς γε φασὶν Tr 543 εὐδαιμονεῖν L: εὐδαίμονα  
 Markland 547 εἴφ' ed. Aldina: εἴπ' L

- Ιφ. τέθνηκε; ποίαι συμφοραῖ; τάλαιν' ἐγώ.  
 Ορ. τί δ' ἐστέναςας τοῦτο; μὼν προσῆκέ σοι; 550  
 Ιφ. τὸν ὄλβον αὐτοῦ τὸν πάροιθ' ἀναστένω.  
 Ορ. δεινῶς γὰρ ἐκ γυναικὸς οἷχεται σφαγείς.  
 Ιφ. ᾧ πανδάκρυτος ἡ κτανοῦσα χῶ θανών.  
 Ορ. παῦσαί νυν ἤδη μῆδ' ἐρωτήσης πέρα.  
 Ιφ. τοσόνδε γ', εἰ ζῇ τοῦ ταλαιπώρου δάμαρ. 555  
 Ορ. οὐκ ἔστι· παῖς νιν ὃν ἔτεχ', οὗτος ὤλεσεν.  
 Ιφ. ᾧ συνταραχθεῖς οἶκος. ὥς τί δὴ θέλων;  
 Ορ. πατρός θανόντος τήνδε τιμωρούμενος.  
 Ιφ. φεῦ·  
 ὥς εὔ κακὸν δίκαιον ἐξεπράξατο.  
 Ορ. ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ πρὸς θεῶν εὐτυχεῖ δίκαιος ὢν. 560  
 Ιφ. λείπει δ' ἐν οἴκοις ἄλλον Ἀγαμέμνων γόνον;  
 Ορ. λέλοιπεν Ἡλέκτραν γε παρθένον μίαν.  
 Ιφ. τί δέ; σφαγείσης θυγατρὸς ἔστι τις λόγος;  
 Ορ. οὐδεὶς γε, πλήν θανοῦσαν οὐχ ὀρᾶν φάος.  
 Ιφ. τάλαιν' ἐκείνη χῶ κτανών αὐτὴν πατήρ. 565  
 Ορ. κακῆς γυναικὸς χάριν ἄχαριν ἀπώλετο.  
 Ιφ. ὁ τοῦ θανόντος δ' ἔστι παῖς Ἄργει πατρός;  
 Ορ. ἔστ', ἄθλιός γε, κουδαμοῦ καὶ πανταχοῦ.  
 Ιφ. ψευδεῖς ὄνειροι, χαίρετ'· οὐδὲν ἦτ' ἄρα.  
 Ορ. οὐδ' οἱ σοφοί γε δαίμονες κεκλημένοι 570  
 πτηνῶν ὀνείρων εἰσὶν ἀψευδέστεροι.  
 [πολὺς ταραγμὸς ἐν τε τοῖς θεοῖς ἐνι  
 κὰν τοῖς βροτείοις· †ἐν δὲ λυπεῖται μόνον†  
 ὅτ' οὐκ ἄφρων ὢν μάντεων πεισθεὶς λόγοις  
 ὄλωλεν ὥς ὄλωλε τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν.] 575  
 Χο. φεῦ φεῦ· τί δ' ἡμεῖς οἱ τ' ἐμοὶ γεννήτορες;  
 ἄρ' εἰσὶν, ἄρ' οὐκ εἰσὶ; τίς φράσειεν ἄν;  
 Ιφ. ἀκούσατ'· ἐς γὰρ δὴ τιν' ἤκομεν λόγον,  
 ὅμῃν τ' ὄνησιν, ᾧ ξένοι, σπεύδουσ' ἅμα

549 συμφορᾶ (= συμφοραῖ) P corr.: συμφορά L 553 θανών Tr: κτανών <L>P  
 554 ἐρωτήση(ι)s P corr., apogr. Par. 2887: ἐρωτήσεις L 559 ἐξεπράξατο  
 Elmsley: εἰσεπράξατο L 568 ἔστ' Tr: ἔστιν <L>P 570-5 Orestae tri-  
 buit Heath, Iphigeniae continuat L, ad 572 paragrapho adfixo (forsan  
 Tricliniano) 570 οὐδ' Hermann: οὐθ' L 572-5 del. Cropp (570-5  
 susp. habet Diggle) 572 θεοῖς Scaliger: θεοῖς L 573 λυπεῖται L, P corr.:  
 λύπεται P: λείπεται Tr, ut vid. 574 ὅτ' L: ὅς Monk 579 σπεύδουσ' Musgrave:  
 σπουδῆς L

- καμοί. τὸ δ' εὖ μάλιστά γ' ὧδε γίγνεται, 580  
 εἰ πᾶσι ταῦτὸν πρᾶγμ' ἄρεσκόντως ἔχει.  
 θέλοις ἄν, εἰ σώσαιμί σ', ἀγγεῖλαι τί μοι  
 πρὸς Ἄργος ἔλθων τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐκεῖ φίλοις,  
 δέλτον τ' ἐνεγκεῖν, ἣν τις οἰκτίρας ἐμέ 585  
 ἔγραψεν αἰχμάλωτος, οὐχὶ τὴν ἐμὴν  
 φονέα νομίζων χεῖρα, τοῦ νόμου δ' ὑπο  
 θνήσκειν †γε τῆς θεοῦ ταῦτα δίκαι' ἡγουμένης†;  
 οὐδένα γὰρ εἶχον ὅστις ἀγγεῖλαι μολῶν  
 ἐς Ἄργος αὖθις, τὰς <τ> ἐμὰς ἐπιστολάς 590  
 πέμψειε σωθῆις τῶν ἐμῶν φίλων τινί.  
 σὺ δ', εἴ γάρ, ὡς ἔοικας, οὔτι δυσμενῆς  
 καὶ τὰς Μυκῆνας οἶσθα χροῦς ἐγὼ φιλῶ,  
 σώθητι κεῖσε, μισθὸν οὐκ αἰσχρὸν λαβών,  
 κούφων ἕκατι γραμμαμάτων σωτηρίαν.  
 οὔτος δ', ἐπεὶ περ πόλις ἀναγκάζει τάδε, 595  
 θεᾷ γενέσθω θῦμα χωρισθεῖς σέθεν.  
 Op. καλῶς ἔλεξας τᾶλλα πλὴν ἔν, ὦ ξένη·  
 τὸ γὰρ σφαγῆναι τόνδ' ἐμοὶ βάρος μέγα.  
 ὁ ναυστολῶν γὰρ εἰμ' ἐγὼ τὰς συμφοράς,  
 οὔτος δὲ συμπλεῖ τῶν ἐμῶν μόχθων χάριν. 600  
 οὔκουν δίκαιον ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῷ τοῦδ' ἐμέ  
 χάριν τίθεσθαι καὐτὸν ἐκδῦναι κακῶν.  
 ἄλλ' ὡς γενέσθω· τῷδε μὲν δέλτον δίδου·  
 πέμψει γὰρ Ἄργος, ὥστε σοι καλῶς ἔχειν·  
 ἡμᾶς δ' ὁ χρῆζιν κτεινέτω. τὰ τῶν φίλων 605  
 αἴσχιστον ὅστις καταβαλὼν ἐς ξυμφοράς  
 αὐτὸς σέσσωται. τυγχάνει δ' ὅδ' ὦν φίλος,  
 ὃν οὐδὲν ἥσσον ἢ μὲ φῶς ὀρᾶν θέλω.  
 Iφ. ὦ λῆμ' ἄριστον, ὡς ἀπ' εὐγενοῦς τινος  
 ρίζης πέφυκας τοῖς φίλοις τ' ὀρθῶς φίλος. 610

580 τὸ δ' Markland: τόδ' L γ' ὧδε Porson: γ' οὕτω L 581 susp. habet Cropp 582 θέλοις Aem. Portus: θέλεις L 587 γε τῆς L: τ]ατ[o]υ Π': τὰ τῆς Hermann ταῦτα L: τάδε Pierson ἡγουμένης L: ἡγούμενος Hermann 589 [αὖ]θις Π': αὖτις L <τ> Bothe: om. L 590 τινί L sup. lin.: τινός L 591 οὔτι Campbell: οὔτε L δυσμενῆς P: δυσγενῆς L 592 ἐγὼ Markland: κἀγὼ L φιλῶ Musgrave: θέλω L 593 κείσε Heimsoeth (σώθητ' ἐκέισε Musgrave): καὶ σὺ L 596 θεᾷ(i) Tr: θεά L 598 τόνδ' ἐμοί Luc. Am. 47: τόνδε μοι L 599 εἰμ' Tr: εἶμ' L 604 πέμψει ... σοί L: πέμψω ... οἱ Luc. 607 σέσσωται Wecklein: σέσωσται L 608 ἢ μὲ Porson: ἢ με L 610 ὀρθῶς L sup. lin., forsan Tr: ὀρθός L

- τοιοῦτος εἶη τῶν ἐμῶν ὁμοσπόρων  
 ὅσπερ λείπειται. καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἐγώ, ξένοι,  
 ἀνάδελφός εἰμι, πλὴν ὅσ' οὐχ ὀρώσά νιν.  
 ἐπεὶ δὲ βούληι ταῦτα, τόνδε πέμψομεν  
 δέλτον φέροντα, σὺ δὲ θανῇ· πολλὴ δέ τις  
 προθυμία σε τοῦδ' ἔχουσα τυγχάνει. 615
- Ορ. θύσει δὲ τίς με καὶ τὰ δεινὰ τλήσεται;  
 Ιφ. ἐγώ· θεᾶς γὰρ τήνδε προστροπὴν ἔχω.  
 Ορ. ἄζηλον, ὦ νεᾶνι, οὐκ εὐδαίμονα.  
 Ιφ. ἀλλ' εἰς ἀνάγκην κείμεθ', ἦν φυλακτέον. 620  
 Ορ. αὐτὴ ξίφει κτείνουσα θῆλυς ἄρσενας;  
 Ιφ. οὐκ, ἀλλὰ χαίτην ἀμφὶ σὴν χερνίσομαι.  
 Ορ. ὁ δὲ σφαγεὺς τίς; εἰ τὰδ' ἱστορεῖν με χρή.  
 Ιφ. ἔσω δόμων τῶνδ' εἰσὶν οἷς μέλει τάδε.  
 Ορ. τάφος δὲ ποῖος δέξεταί μ', ὅταν θάνω; 625  
 Ιφ. πῦρ ἱερὸν ἔνδον χάσμα τ' εὐρωπὸν πέτρας.  
 Ορ. φεῦ·  
 πῶς ἂν μ' ἀδελφῆς χεῖρ περιστείλειεν ἄν;  
 Ιφ. μάταιον εὐχὴν, ὦ τάλας, ὅστις ποτ' εἶ,  
 ἠὔξω· μακρὰν γὰρ βαρβάρου ναίει χθονός.  
 οὐ μὴν, ἐπειδὴ τυγχάνεις Ἀργεῖος ὦν, 630  
 ἀλλ' ὦν γε δυνατὸν οὐδ' ἐγώ λλείψω χάριν.  
 πολὺν τε γὰρ σοι κόσμον ἐνθήσω τάφῳ,  
 ξανθῷ τ' ἐλαίῳ σῶμα σὸν <  
 > κατασβέσω,  
 καὶ τῆς ὀρείας ἀνθεμόρρυτον γάνος  
 ξουθῆς μελίσσης ἐς πυρὰν βαλῶ σέθεν. 635  
 ἀλλ' εἰμι δέλτον τ' ἐκ θεᾶς ἀνακτόρων  
 οἶσω· τὸ μέντοι δυσμενὲς μὴ μοῦγκαλῆις,  
 φυλάσσετ' αὐτούς, πρόσπολοι, δεσμῶν ἄτερ.  
 ἴσως ἅελπτα τῶν ἐμῶν φίλων τινὶ  
 πέμψω πρὸς Ἄργος, ὃν μάλιστ' ἐγώ φιλῶ, 640

614 βούληι Murray: βούλει L 616 προθυμία L: προμηθία Tournier 618 τήνδε  
 Π' (et Bothe): τῆσδε L προστροπὴν L: συμ[...]αν Π' 619 ἄζηλον Bothe:  
 ἀζηλά γ' L 621 κτείνουσα Π' (θεινουσα Maehly): θύουσα L 622 οὐκ Tr  
 et ut vid. Π': οὐκουν L χερνίσομαι L supr. lin.: χερνίσομαι L 626 πέτρας  
 L: χθονός Diod. Sic. 20.14 631 λλείψω Markland: λείψω L 633 inter  
 σὸν et κατασβέσω lac. stat. Jackson 635 πυρὰν βαλῶ Canter: πῦρ ἐμβαλῶν L  
 636 τ' ἐκ Tr: τε L 637 μοῦγκαλῆις Jackson (μοι ἔγκαλῆις Kirchhoff): μου  
 λάβης L

καὶ δέλτος αὐτῷ ζῶντας οὕς δοκεῖ θανεῖν  
λέγουσ' ἀπίστους ἡδονὰς ἀπαγγελεῖ.

- Χο. κατολοφύρομαι σὲ τὸν χερνίβων  
ράνισι μελόμενον < > αἵμακταῖς. 645
- Ορ. οἶκτος γὰρ οὐ ταῦτ', ἀλλὰ χαίρετ', ὦ ξένοι.
- Χο. σὲ δὲ τύχας μάκαρος, ὦ νεανία,  
σεβόμεθ', ἐς πάτρην ὅτι πόδ' ἐμβάσῃ.
- Πυ. ἄζηλά τοι φίλοισι, θνηθσκόντων φίλων. 650
- Χο. ὦ σχέτλιοι πομπαῖ, φεῦ φεῦ,  
<δύο> διολλῦσαι, αἰαῖ.  
πότερος ὁ †μέλλων†  
ἔτι γὰρ ἀμφίλογα διδυμα μέμονε φρήν, 655  
σὲ πάρος ἢ σ' ἀναστενάξω γόοις.
- Ορ. Πυλάδη, πέπονθας ταῦτό πρὸς θεῶν ἐμοί; 658
- Πυ. οὐκ οἶδ' ἐρωτᾷς οὐ λέγειν ἔχοντά με.
- Ορ. τίς ἐστὶν ἡ νεᾶνις; ὥς Ἑλληνικῶς 660  
ἀνῆρεθ' ἡμᾶς τοὺς τ' ἐν Ἰλῖω πόνους  
νόστον τ' Ἀχαιῶν τόν τ' ἐν οἰωνοῖς σοφὸν  
Κάλχαντ' Ἀχιλλέως τ' ὄνομα, καὶ τὸν ἄθλιον  
Ἀγαμέμνον' ὥς ὠικτιρ' ἀνηρώτα τέ με  
γυναικα παῖδός τ'. ἔστιν ἡ ξένη γένος 665  
ἐκεῖθεν Ἀργεῖα τις; οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε  
δέλτον τ' ἔπεμπε καὶ τάδ' ἐξεμάνθανεν,  
ὥς κοινὰ πράσσουσ', Ἄργος εἰ πράσσει καλῶς.
- Πυ. ἔφθης με μικρόν· ταῦτά δὲ φθάσας λέγεις, 670  
πλὴν ἔν· τὰ γὰρ τοι βασιλέων παθήματα  
ἴσασι πάντες, ὦν ἐπιστροφή τις ἦν.  
ἀτὰρ διήλθον χᾶτερον λόγον τινά.

642 λέγουσ' ἀπίστους Weil (λέγουσα ἵπιστας (sic) Aem. Portus); λέγουσα πιστάς L  
645 <μέλεον> Monk; <ράνισιν> Seidler: om. L 646 οἶκτος γὰρ οὐ ταῦτ', ἀλλὰ L:  
ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ οἶκτος ταῦτα Weil 647 σὲ δὲ τύχας μάκαρος, ὦ νεανία L: σὲ δέ, νεανία,  
τύχας μάκαρος, ὦ Diggle 649 πόδ' Elmsley: ποτ' L ἐμβάσῃ Seidler: ἐπεμβάσῃ  
L 650 ἄζηλά τοι Burges: ἄζηλα τοῖς L 651-2 choro trib. Tr, Pyladae  
contin. <L>P 653 <δύο> διολλῦσαι Bothe: διόλλυσαι L: διόλλυται Cropp αἰαῖ  
Hartung: αἰ αἰ αἰ αἰ L 654 μέλλων L: μάλλον Musgrave, cui verbo <τλάμων>  
add. Willink 655 ἀμφίλογα ed. Brubachiana: ἀμφίφλογα L μέμονε L  
supr. lin.: μέμνηε L 664 ὠικτιρ' Heath: ὠικτιρεν L τέ με Schaefer: τ' ἐμέ  
L 669 ταῦτά (= ταῦτά) P corr.: ταῦτα L 670 γὰρ τοι Hermann: γὰρ τῶν  
L 672 διήλθον Porson: διήλθε L



- Ορ. τίν'· ἐς τὸ κοινὸν δούς ἄμεινον ἂν μάθοις.  
 Πυ. αἰσχρὸν θανόντος σοῦ βλέπειν ἡμᾶς φάος·  
 κοινῇ τ' ἔπλευσα δεῖ τε καὶ κοινῇ θανεῖν. 675  
 καὶ δειλίαν γὰρ καὶ κάκην κεκτήσομαι  
 Ἄργει τε Φωκέων τ' ἐν πολυπτύχῳ χθονί,  
 δόξω δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖσι, πολλοὶ γὰρ κακοί,  
 προδοὺς σεσῶσθαι σ' αὐτὸς εἰς οἴκους μόνος  
 ἦ καὶ φονεῦσαί σ' ἐπὶ νοσοῦσι δώμασι 680  
 ῥάψας μόρον σοι σῆς τυραννίδος χάριν,  
 ἔγκληρον ὥς δὴ σὴν κασιγνήτην γαμῶν.  
 ταῦτ' οὖν φοβοῦμαι καὶ δι' αἰσχύνῃς ἔχω,  
 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ χρή συνεκπνεῦσαί μέ σοι  
 καὶ συσφαγῆναι καὶ πυρωθῆναι δέμας, 685  
 φίλον γεγῶτα καὶ φοβούμενον ψόγον.  
 Ορ. εὐφημα φώνει· τὰμὰ δεῖ φέρειν κακά,  
 ἀπλᾶς δὲ λύπας ἐξόν, οὐκ οἶσω διπλᾶς.  
 ὃ γὰρ σὺ λυπρὸν κάπονείδιστον λέγεις,  
 ταῦτ' ἔστιν ἡμῖν, εἴ σε συμμοχθοῦντ' ἐμοὶ 690  
 κτενῶ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰς ἔμ' οὐ κακῶς ἔχει,  
 πράσσονθ' ἅ πράσσω πρὸς θεῶν, λήγειν βίου.  
 σὺ δ' ὀλβίός τ' εἶ, καθαρὰ τ', οὐ νοσοῦντ', ἔχεις  
 μέλαθρ', ἐγὼ δὲ δυσσεβῆ καὶ δυστυχή.  
 σωθεῖς δέ, παῖδας ἐξ ἐμῆς ὁμοσπόρου 695  
 κτησάμενος, ἦν ἔδωκά σοι δάμαρτ' ἔχειν,  
 ὄνομά τ' ἐμοῦ γένοιτ' ἂν, οὐδ' ἄπαις δόμος  
 πατρῷος οὐμός ἐξαλειφθεῖη ποτ' ἂν.  
 ἀλλ' ἔρπε καὶ ζῇ καὶ δόμους οἶκει πατρός.  
 ὅταν δ' ἐς Ἑλλάδ' ἵππιόν τ' Ἄργος μόληις, 700  
 πρὸς δεξιᾶς σε τῆσδ' ἐπισκῆπτω τάδε·  
 τύμβον τε χῶσον κάπτιθες μνημεῖά μοι,  
 καὶ δάκρυ' ἀδελφῇ καὶ κόμας δότω τάφῳ.  
 ἄγγελλε δ' ὥς ὀλωλ' ὑπ' Ἀργείας τινὸς  
 γυναικός, ἀμφὶ βωμὸν ἀγνισθεῖς φόνῳι. 705

673 μάθοις L corr.: μάθης L 674 σοῦ Porson: σου L 675 τ' ἔπλευσα L:  
 δὲ πλεύσας Elmsley τε West: με L 679 σεσῶσθαι σ' Stinton (σεσῶσθαί σ'  
 Elmsley): σε σώζεσθ' L 680-1 φονεῦσαί σ' ... ῥάψας Bergk: φονεύσας ... ῥάψαι  
 L: 681 del. Kníčala 687 κακά L: ἐμέ Porson 689 κάπονείδιστον Tr: κέπ-  
 <L>P 690 ταῦτ' ἔστιν L Dindorf: ταῦτ' ἔστιν L 692 λήγειν L supr. lin.:  
 λήσειν L: λύσειν P βίου Markland: βίον L 697 ante hunc versum lac. stat.  
 dubitanter Diggle 698 πατρῷος Tr: πατρώιος (= πατρώιος) L

- καὶ μὴ προδῶις μου τὴν κασιγνήτην ποτέ,  
 ἔρημα κήδη καὶ δόμους ὀρῶν πατρός.  
 καὶ χαῖρ· ἐμῶν γὰρ φίλτατόν σ' ἧῤρον φίλων,  
 ᾧ συγκυναγέ καὶ συνεκτραφεῖς ἐμοί,  
 ᾧ πόλλ' ἐνεγκῶν τῶν ἐμῶν ἄχθη κακῶν. 710  
 ἡμᾶς δ' ὁ Φοῖβος μάντις ὦν ἐψεύσατο·  
 τέχνην δὲ θέμενος ὡς προσώταθ' Ἑλλάδος  
 ἀπήλασ', αἰδοῖ τῶν πάρος μαντευμάτων.  
 ᾧ πάντ' ἐγὼ δούς τὰμὰ καὶ πεισθεῖς λόγοις,  
 μητέρα κατακτὰς αὐτὸς ἀνταπόλλυμαι. 715  
 Πυ. ἔσται τάφος σοι, καὶ κασιγνήτης λέχος  
 οὐκ ἂν προδοίην, ᾧ τάλας, ἐπεὶ σ' ἐγὼ  
 θανόντα μᾶλλον ἢ βλέπονθ' ἔξω φίλον.  
 ἀτὰρ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σ' οὐ διέφθορέν γέ πω  
 μάντευμα· καίτοι κἀγγύς ἔστηκας φόνου. 720  
 ἀλλ' ἔστιν, ἔστιν, ἢ λίαν δυσπραξία  
 λίαν διδοῦσα μεταβολάς, ὅταν τύχηι.  
 Ορ. σίγα· τὰ Φοίβου δ' οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ μ' ἔπη·  
 γυνή γὰρ ἦδε δωμάτων ἔξω περᾶι.  
 Ιφ. ἀπέλθεθ' ὑμεῖς καὶ παρευτρεπίζετε 725  
 τᾶνδον μολόντες τοῖς ἐφεστῶσι σφαγῇ.  
 δέλτου μὲν αἶδε πολύθυροι διαπτυχαί,  
 ξένοι, πάρεισιν· ἃ δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσδε βούλομαι,  
 ἀκούσατ'. οὐδεὶς αὐτὸς ἐν πόνοις <τ> ἀνὴρ  
 ὅταν τε πρὸς τὸ θάρσος ἐκ φόβου πέσῃ. 730  
 ἐγὼ δὲ ταρβῶ μὴ ἀπονοστήσας χθονὸς  
 θῆται παρ' οὐδὲν τὰς ἐμὰς ἐπιστολάς  
 ὁ τήνδε μέλλων δέλτον εἰς Ἄργος φέρειν.  
 Ορ. τί δῆτα βούληι; τίνος ἀμηχανεῖς πέρι;  
 Ιφ. ὄρκον δότω μοι τάσδε πορθμεύσειν γραφὰς 735  
 πρὸς Ἄργος, οἷσι βούλομαι πέμψαι φίλων.  
 Ορ. ἦ κἀντιδῶσεις τῶνδε τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους;  
 Ιφ. τί χρῆμα δράσειν ἢ τί μὴ δράσειν; λέγε.  
 Ορ. ἐκ γῆς ἀφήσειν μὴ θανόντα βαρβάρου.

708 ἧῤρον Paley: εὔρον L 713 ἀπήλασ' Heath: ἀπήλασεν L 714 ᾧ (= ᾧ) Tr:  
 ᾧ L 719 σ' οὐ διέφθορέν γέ πω Nauck: γ' οὐ διέφθορέν μέ πω L 720 κἀγγύς  
 Erfurd: γ' ἐγγύς L 727 πολύθυροι Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1407b35: πολύθυρνοι  
 L 728 ξένοι Pierson: ξένους L 729 αὐτὸς Valckenaer: αὐτὸς L <τ> add.  
 Koehly 734 βούληι Murray: βούλει L 736 del. Badham

Ιφ.	δίκαιον εἶπας· πῶς γὰρ ἀγγεῖλειεν ἄν;	740
Ορ.	ἦ καὶ τύραννος ταῦτα συγχωρήσεται;	
Ιφ.	ναί.	
	πεῖσω σφε, καυτὴ ναὸς εἰσβήσω σκάφος.	
Ορ.	ᾄδνυ· σὺ δ' ἔξαρχ' ὄρκον ὅστις εὐσεβής.	
Ιφ.	δώσεις λέγειν χρὴ τήνδε τοῖς ἐμοῖς φίλοις.	
Πυ.	τοῖς σοῖς φίλοισι γράμματ' ἀποδώσω τάδε.	745
Ιφ.	κἀγὼ σὲ σώσω κυανέας ἔξω πέτρας.	
Πυ.	τίν' οὖν ἐπόμνυς τοισίδ' ὄρκιον θεῶν;	
Ιφ.	Ἄρτεμιν, ἐν ἧσπερ δώμασιν τιμὰς ἔχω.	
Πυ.	ἐγὼ δ' ἄνακτά γ' οὐρανοῦ, σεμνὸν Δία.	
Ιφ.	εἰ δ' ἐκλιπὼν τὸν ὄρκον ἀδικοῖς ἐμέ;	750
Πυ.	ἄνοστος εἶην· τί δὲ σύ, μὴ σώσασά με;	
Ιφ.	μήποτε κατ' Ἄργος ζῶσ' ἵχνος θείην ποδός.	
Πυ.	ἄκουε δὴ νυν ὃν παρήλθομεν λόγον.	
Ιφ.	ἀλλ' εὐθύς ἔστω κοινός, ἦν καλῶς ἔχη.	
Πυ.	ἐξαίρετόν μοι δὸς τόδ', ἦν τι ναῦς πάθῃ,	755
	χὴ δέλτος ἐν κλύδωνι χρημάτων μέτα	
	ἄφανής γένηται, σῶμα δ' ἐκώσω μόνον,	
	τὸν ὄρκον εἶναι τόνδε μηκέτ' ἔμπεδον.	
Ιφ.	ἀλλ' οἷσθ' ὃ δράσω; πολλὰ γὰρ πολλῶν κυρεῖ	
	τὰνόντα κἀγγεγραμμέν' ἐν δέλτου πτυχαῖς	760
	λόγῳ φράσω σοι πάντ' ἀναγγεῖλαι φίλοις.	
	ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ γάρ· ἦν μὲν ἐκσώσης γραφήν,	
	αὐτὴ φράσει σιγῶσα τἀγγεγραμμένα	
	ἦν δ' ἐν θαλάσσῃ γράμματ' ἀφανισθῇ τάδε,	
	τὸ σῶμα σώσας τοὺς λόγους σώσεις ἐμοί.	765
Πυ.	καλῶς ἔλεξας τῶν τε σῶν ἐμοῦ θ' ὕπερ.	
	σήμαινε δ' ὦι χρὴ τάσδ' ἐπιστολὰς φέρειν	
	πρὸς Ἄργος ὃ τι τε χρὴ κλυόντα σοῦ λέγειν.	
Ιφ.	ἄγγελ' Ὀρέστη, παιδί τἀγαμέμνονος	769
Πυ.	ὦ θεοί. Ιφ. τί τοὺς θεοὺς ἀνακαλεῖς ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς;	780

740 δίκαιον L: ἀρχαῖον Housman: εἰκαῖον Lindau 744 δώσεις Bothe: δώσω L  
 τοῖς ἐμοῖς L: τοῖσι σοῖς (δώσω servato) Seager 746 κἀγὼ σὲ Hermann: κἀγὼ  
 σε L 747 τοισίδ' Markland: τοῖσιν L 752 ποδός L corr. vel Tr: ποτε L, ut  
 vid. 754 εὐθύς ἔστω Fix: αὐτίς ἔσται L: οὔτις ἔστ' Bothe κοινός Markland:  
 καινός L: ἄκαιρος Bothe 763 αὐτὴ ed. Hervag. post.: αὐτή L 766 τε σῶν  
 Haupt: θεῶν L 768 κλυόντα West: κλύοντα L 769–82 versus hoc ordine  
 posuit Jackson 769 τἀγαμέμνονος ed. Aldina: τῷ ᾧγαμέμνονος L 780 Pyladae  
 trib. Tr ut vid. (personae notam om. L), Orestae Burges

- Πυ. οὐδέν· πέραινε δ'· ἐξέβην γὰρ ἄλλοσε. 781  
 Ιφ. Ὅρέσθ', ἴν' αὖθις ὄνομα δις κλύων μάθης, 779  
 Ἥ ἢν Αὐλίδι σφαγεῖσ' ἐπιστέλλει τάδε 770  
 ζῶσ' Ἰφιγένεια, τοῖς ἐκεῖ δ' οὐ ζῶσ' ἔτι —  
 Ορ. ποῦ δ' ἔστ' ἐκείνη; κατθανοῦσ' ἦκει ἅλιν; 775  
 Ιφ. ἦδ' ἦν ὁραῖς σύ· μὴ λόγων ἔκπλησσε με.  
 Κόμισαί μ' ἐς Ἄργος, ὧ σὺναιμε, πρὶν θανεῖν,  
 ἐκ βαρβάρου γῆς καὶ μετάστησον θεᾶς  
 σφαγίων, ἐφ' οἷσι ξενοφόνους τιμὰς ἔχω.  
 Ορ. Πυλάδην, τί λέξω; ποῦ ποτ' ὄνθ' ἠυρήμεθα; 778  
 Ιφ. ἦ σοῖς ἄραία δώμασιν γενήσομαι. 782  
 τάχ' οὖν ἐρωτῶν σ' εἰς ἄπιστ' ἀφίξεται·  
 λέγ' οὐνεκ ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου θεᾶ  
 Ἄρτεμις ἔσωσέ μ', ἦν ἔθυσ' ἐμὸς πατήρ,  
 δοκῶν ἐς ἡμᾶς ὀξύ φάσγανον βαλεῖν, 785  
 ἐς τήνδε δ' ὠικισ' αἶαν. αἶδ' ἐπιστολαί,  
 τὰδ' ἐστὶ τὰν δέλτοισιν ἐγγεγραμμένα.  
 Πυ. ὦ ῥαιδίους ὄρκοισι περιβαλοῦσά με,  
 κάλλιστα δ' ὁμόσας, οὐ πολὺν σχήσω χρόνον,  
 τὸν δ' ὄρκον ὃν κατώμοσ' ἐμπεδώσομεν. 790  
 ἰδοῦ, φέρω σοι δέλτον ἀποδιδωμί τε,  
 Ὅρέστα, τῆσδε σῆς κασιγνήτης πάρα.  
 Ορ. δέχομαι· παρεῖς δὲ γραμμάτων διαπτυχᾶς  
 τήν ἡδονήν πρῶτ' οὐ λόγοις αἰρήσομαι.  
 ὦ φίλτατῃ μοι σύγγον', ἐκπεπληγμένος 795  
 ὅμως σ' ἀπίστωι περιβαλὼν βραχίονι  
 ἐς τέρψιν εἶμι, πυθόμενος θαυμάστ' ἐμοί.  
 Ιφ. ξέν', οὐ δικαίως τῆς θεοῦ τήν πρόσπολον  
 χραίνεις ἀθίκτοις περιβαλὼν πέπλοις χέρας.  
 Ορ. ὦ συγκασιγνήτῃ τε καὶ ταῦτοῦ πατρός 800  
 Ἀγαμέμνονος γεγῶσα, μὴ μ' ἀποστρέφου,  
 ἔχουσ' ἀδελφόν, οὐ δοκοῦσ' ἔξειν ποτέ.

781 Pyladae trib. L, Orestae Burges 779 αὖθις ed. Hervag. pr.: αὖτις L  
 773 λόγων Seidler: λόγοις L 777 ἠυρήμεθα Barnes: εὐρ- L v. post 778 trai.  
 Parker 778 δώμασιν Tr: -σι L 782 Iphigeniae trib. Markland, Pyladae  
 contin. (post 781) L οὖν L: οὐκ Hermann ἀφίξεται Burges: -ομαι L  
 786 ὠκισ' (= ὠικισ') P corr.: ὠκησ' LP 787 τάδ' L: ταῦτ' Plut. Mor. 182e ἐστὶ  
 τὰν Plut. Mor. 182e: ἐστιν ἐν L 789 ὁμόσας' L: ὁμόσας L supr. lin. 796 σ'  
 ἀπίστωι Markland: ἀπιστῶ L 798 Iphigeniae trib. Monk, choro L ξέν'  
 Elmsley: ξεῖν' L 799 χέρας Herwerden: χέρα L 800 συγκασιγνήτῃ L supr.  
 lin., vel Tr: κασιγνήτῃ L

- Ιφ. ἐγὼ σ' ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἑμὸν; οὐ παύσῃ λέγων;  
 τό τ' Ἄργος αὐτοῦ μεστὸν ἦ τε Ναυπλία.  
 Ορ. οὐκ ἔστ' ἐκεῖ σός, ὦ τάλαινα, σύγγονος. 805  
 Ιφ. ἀλλ' ἡ Λάκαινα Τυνδαρίς σ' ἐγείνατο;  
 Ορ. Πέλοπός γε παιδί παιδός, οὐ 'κπέφυκ' ἐγώ.  
 Ιφ. τί φῆις; ἔχεις τι τῶνδ' ἐμοὶ τεκμήριον;  
 Ορ. ἔχω· πατρῶϊων ἐκ δόμων τι πυνθάνου.  
 Ιφ. οὐκουν λέγειν μὲν χρή σέ, μανθάνειν δ' ἔμέ; 810  
 Ορ. λέγοιμ' ἂν ἀκοῇ πρῶτον Ἥλέκτρας τάδε·  
 Ἄτρεως Θυέστου τ' οἶσθα γενομένην ἔριν;  
 Ιφ. ἦκουσα· χρυσεῖς ἄρνός ἦν νείκη πέρι.  
 Ορ. ταῦτ' οὖν ὑπήνασ' οἶσθ' ἐν εὐπῆνοις ὑφαῖς;  
 Ιφ. ὦ φίλτατ', ἐγγὺς τῶν ἐμῶν χρίμπτῃ φρενῶν. 815  
 Ορ. εἰκὼ τ' ἐν ἱστοῖς ἡλίου μετάστασιν;  
 Ιφ. ὕφηνα καὶ τόδ' εἶδος εὐμίτοις πλοκαῖς.  
 Ορ. καὶ λούτρ' ἐς Αὔλιν μητρὸς ἀδέξω πάρα;  
 Ιφ. οἶδ'· οὐ γάρ ὁ γάμος ἐσθλὸς ὢν μ' ἀφείλετο.  
 Ορ. τί γάρ; κόμας σὰς μητρὶ δοῦσα σῇ φέρειν; 820  
 Ιφ. μνημεῖά γ' ἀντὶ σώματος τοῦμοῦ τάφωι.  
 Ορ. ἃ δ' εἶδον αὐτός, τάδε φράσω τεκμήρια·  
 Πέλοπος παλαιὰν ἐν δόμοις λόγχην πατρός,  
 ἣν χερσὶ πάλλων παρθένον Πισάτιδα  
 ἐκτήσαθ' Ἰπποδάμειαν, Οἰνόμαον κτανών, 825  
 ἐν παρθενῶσι τοῖσι σοῖς κεκρυμμένην.  
 Ιφ. ὦ φίλτατ', οὐδὲν ἄλλο, φίλτατος γὰρ εἶ,  
 ἔχω σ', Ὀρέστα, τηλύγετον ἀπὸ πατρίδος  
 Ἀργόθεν, ὦ φίλος. 830  
 Ορ. καγὼ σέ, τὴν θανοῦσαν, ὡς δοξάζεται.  
 Ιφ. κατὰ δὲ δάκρυα, κατὰ δὲ γόος ἅμα χαρᾶι

803 ἐγὼ L: ἔχω Diggle 804 τό τ' Ἄργος Bothe: τὸ δ' Ἄργος L 807 γε  
 Seidler: τε L οὐ 'κπέφυκ' Elmsley (οὐ πέφυκ' Seidler): ἐκπέφυκ' L 808 τι τῶνδ'  
 μοι ed. Aldina: τί τῶνδ' ἐμοί L 809 τι ed. Aldina: τί L 810 οὐκουν Platnauer:  
 οὐκοῦν L χρή σέ Seidler: χρή σε L 811 del. Monk ἀκοῇ Reiske: ἄκουε  
 L Ἥλέκτρας L supr. lin.: Ἥλέκτραι L 812 οἶσθα ed. Brubachiana: οἶδα  
 L 813 ἦν νείκη Mekler, Radermacher: ἡνίκ' ἦν L 815 χρίμπτῃ Wecklein:  
 κάμπτῃ L 818 ἀδέξω Kirchhoff: ἀνέδεξω L 819 suspectum mul-  
 tis 824 Πισάτιδα Barnes: Πισσ- L 829 χθονὸς post τηλύγετον L: del.  
 Murray 831 καγὼ σέ Willink: καγὼ σε L 832-3 Iphigeniae trib. Bauer:  
 Orestae contin. L: 832 Iphigeniae, 833 Orestae Lohmann: κατὰ ... βλέφαρον  
 Iphigeniae, cetera Orestae Lee (τὸ σὸν 833 mutato in τοῦμόν) 832 δάκρυα  
 Bothe: δάκρυ L

- τὸ σὸν νοτίζει βλέφαρον, ὡσαύτως δ' ἐμόν.  
 σὲ δ' ἔτι βρέφος  
 ἔλιπον ἀγκάλαισι νεαρὸν τροφοῦ 835  
 νεαρὸν ἐν δόμοις.  
 ὦ κρεῖσσον ἢ λόγοισιν εὐτυχοῦσά μοι  
 ψυχά, τί φῶ; θαυμάτων  
 πέρα καὶ λόγου πρόσω τάδ' ἀπέβα. 840
- Op. τὸ λοιπὸν εὐτυχοῖμεν ἀλλήλων μέτα.  
 Iφ. ἄτοπον ἡδονὰν ἔλαβον, ὦ φίλοι·  
 δέδοικα δ' ἐκ χερῶν με μὴ πρὸς αἰθέρα  
 ἀμπαταμένα φύγηι·  
 ἰὼ Κυκλωπὶς ἐστία· ἰὼ πατρίς, 845  
 Μυκὴνα φίλα,  
 χάριν ἔχω ζῶας, χάριν ἔχω τροφᾶς,  
 ὅτι μοι συνομαίμονα τόνδε δόμοις  
 ἐξεθρέψω φάος.
- Op. γένει μὲν εὐτυχοῦμεν, ἐς δὲ συμφοράς, 850  
 ὦ σύγγον', ἡμῶν δυστυχῆς ἔφυ βίος.  
 Iφ. ἐγὼ δ' ἄ μέλεος, οἶδ', ὅτε φάσγανον  
 δέραι θῆκί μοι μελεόφρων πατήρ.  
 Op. οἴμοι, δοκῶ γὰρ οὐ παρῶν σ' ὄρᾶν ἐκεῖ. 855  
 Iφ. ἀνυμέναιος, <ὦ> σύγγον', Ἀχιλλέως  
 ἐς κλισίαν λέκτρων δόλιον ἀγόμεν·  
 παρὰ δὲ βωμόν ἦν δάκρυα καὶ γόοι. 860  
 φεῦ φεῦ χερνίβων ἐκεί<νων> οἴμοι>.  
 Op. ὦιμωξά κάγῳ τόλμαν ἦν ἔτλη πατήρ.  
 Iφ. ἀπάτορ' ἀπάτορα πότμον ἔλαχον.  
 ἄλλα δ' ἐξ ἄλλων κυρεῖ 865  
 δαίμονος τύχαι τινός. 867
- Op. εἰ σὸν γ' ἀδελφόν, ὦ τάλαιν', ἀπώλεσας. 866  
 Iφ. ὦ μελέα δεινᾶς τόλμας. δεῖν' ἔτλαν, 868/9  
 ἔτλαν δεῖν', ὦμοι, σύγγονε, παρὰ δ' ὀλίγον 870/1

834 σὲ δ' ἔτι Collard: τὸ δέ τι L 837 εὐτυχοῦσά μοι Collard (εὐτυχοῦσ' ἐμὰ Markland): εὐτυχῶν ἐγὼ L 838 ψυχά P: ψυχᾶι L 840 ἀπέβα Reiske: ἐπέβα L 844 ἀμπαταμένα Seidler: ἀμπατάμενος L 845 Κυκλωπὶς ἐστία Hermann: Κυκλωπίδες ἐστία L 847 ζῶας Blomfield: ζῶας L 852 ἐγὼ δ' ἄ Bruhn (ἐγὼ δ' ἄ Seidler): ἐγὼ L 854 μοι Tr: μ\* L 856 <ὦ> Bothe: rasura L 857 λέκτρων Tr: λέκων <L>P 858 δόλιον Dindorf: δολίαν δτ' L: δόλι' ὅτ Hermann 861 Iphigeniae contin. Tyrwhitt, Orestae trib. L ἐκεί<νων> οἴμοι> Jackson: ἐκεῖ L 862 Orestae trib. Tyrwhitt, Iphigeniae L 866 post 867 trai. Monk 870 ἔτλαν δεῖν', ὦμοι Diggle: δεῖν' ἔτλαν, ὦμοι L

- ἀπέφυγες ὄλεθρον ἀνόσιον ἐξ ἐμᾶν  
 δαΐχθεις χερῶν.  
 †ά δ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖσι† τίς τελευτά;  
 τίς τύχα μοι συγκυρήσει; 875  
 τίνα σοι <τίνα σοι> πόρον εὐρομένα  
 πάλιν ἀπὸ ξένας, ἀπὸ φόνου πέμψω  
 πατρίδ' ἐς Ἀργεῖαν,  
 πρὶν ἐπὶ ξίφος αἵματι σῶι πελάσαι; 880  
 τόδε τόδε σόν,  
 ὦ μελέα ψυχά, χρέος ἀνευρίσκειν.  
 πότερον κατὰ χέρσον, οὐχὶ ναῖ,  
 ἀλλὰ ποδῶν ῥιπαί; 885  
 θανάτῳ πελάσεις ἄρα, βάρβαρα φύλα  
 καὶ δι' ὁδοὺς ἀνόδους στείχων· διὰ κυανέας μάν  
 στενοπόρου πέτρας μακρὰ κέλευθα να- 890  
 ῖοισιν δρασμοῖς.  
 τάλαιν' <ἐγώ>, τάλαινα.  
 †τίς ἂν οὖν τάδ' ἂν ἦ θεὸς ἢ βροτὸς ἢ 895  
 τί τῶν ἀδοκῆτων†  
 ἀπόρων πόρον ἐξανύσας,  
 δυοῖν τοῖν μόνοιν Ἀτρεΐδαιν φανεῖ  
 κακῶν ἔκλυσιν;  
 Χο. ἐν τοῖσι θαυμαστοῖσι καὶ μύθων πέρα 900  
 τάδ' εἶδον αὐτὴ κοῦ κλυοῦσ' ἀπ' ἀγγέλων.  
 Πυ. τὸ μὲν φίλους ἐλθόντας εἰς ὄψιν φίλων,  
 Ὅρέστα, χειρῶν περιβολὰς εἰκὸς λαβεῖν·  
 λῆξαι δέ τ' οἴκτων κάπ' ἐκεῖν' ἐλθεῖν χρεῶν,  
 ὅπως τὸ κλεινὸν ὄμμα τῆς σωτηρίας 905  
 λαβόντες ἐκ γῆς βησόμεσθα βαρβάρου.

871 ἀπέφυγες Musgrave: ἀμφέφυγες L 874 ἄ δ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖς Bothe: ἄ δ' ἀπ' ἄθλοις Diggle, alii alia 875 συγκυρήσει Bothe: συγχωρήσει L 876 <τίνα σοι> Diggle: om. L 877 ξένος Koehly: πόλεως L 878 ἀπὸ φόνου L: ἀνδροφόνου Sansone 888 δι' ὁδοὺς Barnes: διόδους L 889 μάν Diggle: μὴν L 891 ναῖοισιν Seidler: ναῖοισι L 893 τάλαιν' <ἐγώ>, τάλαινα Diggle: τάλαινα τάλαινα L 895 τίς ἂν οὖν L: τίς ἄρ' οὖν Markland τάδ' ἂν L: τάλαν Bothe 896 τί τῶν ἀδοκῆτων L: τί <μέσον τούτων ἀδοκῆτων Willink (<μέσον τῶνδ' ὄν> Bruhn) 897 ἀπόρων πόρον Hermann: πόρον ἄπορον L 898 τοῖν μόνοιν L: τλημόνοι Tucker φανεῖ Tr: om. L 901 κοῦ Bothe: καὶ L κλυοῦσ' West: κλύουσ' L ἀπ' ἀγγέλων Hermann: ἀπαγγελῶ L 902-9 Pyladae trib. Heath, Musgrave: choro contin. L 902 post v. lac. stat. Diggle 904 λῆξαι δέ τ' Markland: λήξαντα δ' L 905 ὄμμα apogr. Paris. 2887: ὄνομα L

- σοφῶν γὰρ ἀνδρῶν τοῦτο, μὴ ῥβάντας τύχης,  
 καιρὸν λαβόντας ἡδονὰς ἄλλας λαβεῖν.
- Ορ. καλῶς ἔλεξας· τῇ τύχῃ δ' οἶμαι μέλειν  
 τοῦδε ξύν ἡμῖν· ἦν δέ τις πρόθυμος ἦι, 910  
 σθένειν τὸ θεῖον μᾶλλον εἰκότως ἔχει.
- Ιφ. οὐ μὴ μ' ἐπίσχησις οὐδ' ἀποστήσεις λόγου,  
 πρῶτον πυθέσθαι τίνα ποτ' Ἥλέκτρα πότμον  
 εἴληχε βιότου· φίλα γὰρ ἔστι τᾶμ' ἐμοί.
- Ορ. τῶιδε ξυνοικεῖ βίον ἔχουσ' εὐδαίμονα. 915
- Ιφ. οὗτος δὲ ποδαπὸς καὶ τίνος πέφυκε παῖς;  
 Ορ. Στρόφιος ὁ Φωκεὺς τοῦδε κλήζεται πατήρ.  
 Ιφ. ὁ δ' ἔστι γ' Ἀτρεὺς θυγατρός, ὁμογενὴς ἐμός;  
 Ορ. ἀνεψιὸς γε, μόνος ἐμοὶ σαφὴς φίλος.  
 Ιφ. οὐκ ἦν τόθ' οὗτος ὅτε πατήρ ἔκτεινέ με. 920  
 Ορ. οὐκ ἦν· χρόνον γὰρ Στρόφιος ἦν ἅπαις τινά.  
 Ιφ. χαῖρ' ὦ πόσις μοι τῆς ἐμῆς ὁμοσπόρου.  
 Ορ. κᾶμός γε σωτήρ, οὐχὶ συγγενὴς μόνον.  
 Ιφ. τὰ δεινὰ δ' ἔργα πῶς ἔτλης μητρός πέρι;  
 Ορ. σιγῶμεν αὐτά· πατρὶ τιμωρῶν ἐμῶι. 925  
 Ιφ. ἦ δ' αἰτία τίς ἀνθ' ὅτου κτείνει πόσιν;  
 Ορ. ἔα τὰ μητρός· οὐδὲ σοὶ κλύειν καλόν.  
 Ιφ. σιγῶ· τὸ δ' Ἄργος πρὸς σέ νῦν ἀποβλέπει;  
 Ορ. Μενέλαος ἄρχει· φυγάδες ἔσμεν ἐκ πάτρας.  
 Ιφ. οὐ που νοσοῦντας θεῖος ὕβρισην δόμους; 930  
 Ορ. οὐκ, ἀλλ' Ἐρινύων δεῖμά μ' ἐκβάλλει χθονός.  
 Ιφ. ἔγνωκα· μητρός <σ> οὐνεκ' ἡλάστρουν θεαί.  
 Ορ. ὥσθ' αἱματηρὰ στόμι' ἐπεμβαλεῖν ἐμοί. 935  
 Ιφ. ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἄκταῖς κἀνθάδ' ἡγγέλης μανεῖς; 932  
 Ορ. ὦφθημεν οὐ νῦν πρῶτον ὄντες ἄθλιοι. 933  
 Ιφ. τί γὰρ ποτ' ἐς γῆν τήνδ' ἐπόρθμευσας πόδα; 936  
 Ορ. Φοίβου κελευσθεὶς θεσφάτοις ἀφικόμην.  
 Ιφ. τί χρῆμα δρᾶσαι; ῥητὸν ἦ σιγῶμενον;  
 Ορ. λέγοιμ' ἂν· ἀρχαὶ δ' αἶδε μοι πολλῶν πόνων.

907–8 del. Dindorf 907 τοῦτο Barrett: ταῦτα L 909 μέλειν Tr:  
 μέλ\*ειν L 910 ξύν Tr: σύν L 912 οὐ μὴ Elmsley: οὐδέν L ἐπίσχησις ...  
 ἀποστήσεις Monk: ἐπίσχη γ' ... ἀποστήση L (-ῆσει P) 914 ἔστι τᾶμ' Schöne:  
 ἔσται πάντ' L: ἔστι ταῦτ' Markland: ἔστε πάντ' Vitelli 918 ὁ δ' L. Dindorf: δδ'  
 L 927 σοὶ Hermann: σοὶ L 930 ὕβρισην Tr: ὕβρισε L 934 <σ> add.  
 Markland 932–3 post 935 trai. Monk 932 ἄρ' Tr: ἄρ' L ἡγγέλης L:  
 ἡγγέλης Porson 938 δρᾶσαι Elmsley: δράσειν L



- ἐπεὶ τὰ μητρός ταῦθ' ἃ σιγῶμεν κακὰ 940  
 ἐς χεῖρας ἤλθε, μεταδρομαῖς Ἑρινύων  
 ἡλαυνόμεσθα φυγάδες, ἔνθεν μοι πόδα  
 ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας δὴ ῥέπεμψε Λοξίας,  
 δίκην παρασχεῖν ταῖς ἀνωνύμοις θεαῖς.  
 ἔστιν γὰρ ὅσια ψῆφος, ἦν Ἄρει ποτὲ 945  
 Ζεὺς εἶσατ' ἐκ τοῦ δὴ χερῶν μιάσματος.  
 ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκέισε, πρῶτα μὲν μ' οὐδεὶς ξένων  
 ἐκὼν ἐδέξαθ', ὥς θεοῖς στυγούμενον·  
 οἱ δ' ἔσχον αἰδῶ, ξένια μονοτράπεζά μοι  
 παρέσχον, οἰκῶν ὄντες ἐν ταυτῷ στέγει, 950  
 σιγῇ δ' ἐτεκτῆναντ' ἀπρόσφθεγκτόν μ', ὅπως  
 δαιτός τ' ὀναίμην πώματός τ' αὐτῶν δίχα,  
 ἐς δ' ἄγγος ἴδιον ἴσον ἅπασι βακχίου  
 μέτρημα πληρώσαντες εἶχον ἡδονήν.  
 καγὼ ῥελέγξαι μὲν ξένους οὐκ ἤξιουν, 955  
 ἡλγουν δὲ σιγῇ ἀδρόκου οὐκ εἰδέναι,  
 μέγα στενάζων οὔνεκ' ἡ μητρός φονεύς.  
 κλύω δ' Ἀθηναίοισι τὰμὰ δυστυχῇ  
 τελετὴν γενέσθαι, κατὰ τὸν νόμον μένειν,  
 χοῆρες ἄγγος Παλλὰδος τιμᾶν λεῶν. 960  
 ὥς δ' εἰς Ἄρειον ὄχθον ἦκον, ἐς δίκην  
 ἔστην, ἐγὼ μὲν θάτερον λαβὼν βᾶθρον,  
 τὸ δ' ἄλλο πρέσβειρ' ἤπερ ἦν Ἑρινύων.  
 εἰπὼν <δ> ἀκούσας θ' αἵματος μητρός πέρι,  
 Φοῖβός μ' ἔσωσε μαρτυρῶν, ἴσας δέ μοι 965  
 ψήφους διηρίθμησε Παλλὰς ὠλένηι·  
 νικῶν δ' ἀπῆρα φόνια πειρατήρια.  
 ὅσαι μὲν οὖν ἔζοντο πεισθεῖσαι δίκῃ,  
 ψῆφον παρ' αὐτὴν ἱερὸν ὠρίσαντ' ἔχειν·  
 ὅσαι δ' Ἑρινύων οὐκ ἐπείσθησαν νόμῳ, 970  
 δρόμοις ἀνιδρύτοισιν ἡλάστρουν μ' αἰεί,  
 ἔως ἐς ἀγνὸν ἦλθον αὖ Φοίβου πέδον,  
 καὶ πρόσθεν ἀδύτων ἐκταθεῖς, νῆστις βορᾶς,

942 ἡλαυνόμεσθα Tr: ἡλαυνόμεθα L 943 δὴ ῥέπεμψε Elmsley: δὴ γ' ἔπεμψε  
 L 947 μ' οὐδε[ῖς] P<sup>2</sup>, sicut coni. Scaliger: οὐδεὶς L 950 στέγει ed. Aldina:  
 τέγει L 951 ἀπρόσφθεγκτόν Hermann: ἀπόφθεγκτόν L 952 τ' ὀναίμην  
 Housman: γενοίμην L τ' αὐτῶν Scaliger: τ' αὐτοῦ L: ]γαυ[ P<sup>2</sup> 955 καγὼ  
 ῥελέγξαι Markland: καγὼ γ' ῥελέγξαι L 957 del. Herwerden 962 ἔστην  
 Bothe: τ' ἔστην L 964 δ' add. Elmsley

- ἐπώμοσ' αὐτοῦ βίον ἀπορρήξειν θανών,  
 εἰ μὴ με σώσει Φοῖβος, ὅς μ' ἀπώλεσεν. 975  
 ἐντεῦθεν αὐδὴν τρίποδος ἐκ χρυσοῦ λακῶν  
 Φοῖβός μ' ἔπεμψε δεῦρο, διοπετέες λαβεῖν  
 ἄγαλμ' Ἀθηνῶν τ' ἐγκαθιδρῦσαι χθονί.  
 ἀλλ' ἦνπερ ἡμῖν ὥρισεν σωτηρίαν,  
 σύμπραξον' ἦν γὰρ θεᾶς κατάσχωμεν βρέτας, 980  
 μανιῶν τε λήξω καὶ σὲ πολυκώπῳ σκάφει  
 στείλας Μυκῆναις ἐγκαταστήσω πάλιν.  
 ἀλλ', ὦ φιληθεῖς, ὦ κασίγνητον κάρα,  
 σῶσον πατρῷον οἶκον, ἔκσωσον δ' ἐμέ·  
 ὥς τᾶμ' ὄλωλε πάντα καὶ τὰ Πελοπιδῶν, 985  
 οὐράνιον εἰ μὴ ληψόμεθα θεᾶς βρέτας.
- Χο. δεινὴ τις ὀργὴ δαιμόνων ἐπέξεσε  
 πρὸς Ταντάλειον σπέρμα διὰ πόνων τ' ἄγει.
- Ιφ. τὸ μὲν πρόθυμον, πρίν σε δεῦρ' ἔλθεῖν, ἔχω  
 Ἄργει γενέσθαι καὶ σέ, σύγγον', εἰσιδεῖν. 990  
 θέλω δ' ἄπερ σύ, σέ τε μεταστῆσαι πόνων  
 νοσοῦντά τ' οἶκον, οὐχὶ τῷ κτανόντι με  
 θυμουμένη, πατρῷον ὀρθῶσαι· θέλω·  
 σφαγῆς τε γὰρ σῆς χεῖρ' ἀπαλλάξαιμεν ἂν  
 σώσαιμὶ τ' οἴκους. τὴν θεὸν δ' ὅπως λάθω 995  
 δέδοικα καὶ τύραννον· ἡνίκ' ἂν κενᾶς  
 κρηπίδας εὖρηι λαΐνας ἀγάλματος,  
 πῶς οὐ θανοῦμαι; τίς δ' ἔνεστί μοι λόγος;  
 ἀλλ', εἰ μὲν ἦεν τι τοῦθ' ὅμοῦ γενήσεται,  
 ἄγαλμά τ' οἴσεις κᾶμ' ἐπ' εὐπρύμνου νεῶς 1000  
 ἄξεις, τὸ κινδύνευμα γίγνεται καλόν·  
 τούτου δὲ χωριθεῖς ἔγῳ μὲν ὄλλυμαι,  
 σὺ δ' ἂν τὸ σαυτοῦ θέμενος εὖ νόστου τύχοις.  
 οὐ μὴν τι φεύγω γ', οὐδὲ σ' εἰ θανεῖν χρεῶν  
 σώσασαν· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἀνὴρ μὲν ἐκ δόμων 1005

976 λακῶν Scaliger: λαβών L 978 ἐγκαθιδρῦσαι Hermann: ἐγκαθιδρύσαι L  
 979 ὥρισεν Tr: ὥρισε L 980 ἦν Seidler: ἂν L 981 καὶ σὲ Seidler: καὶ σε L  
 984 δ' ἐμέ Seidler: δέ με L 986 ληψόμεθα L: ληψόμεσθα P corr. 988 πρὸς  
 Page: τὸ L ἄγει Canter: ἀεί L 990 εἰσιδεῖν P corr.: ἐς- L 991 σέ ... πόνων  
 Canter: σοί ... πόνων L (πόνων apogr. Paris. 2887) 992 τῷ κτανόντι Heath: τῷ  
 κτανούντι L 993 θέλω L (punctum add. Murray): πάλιν (cl. Soph. *Ant.* 163)  
 Markland 995 σώσαιμὶ τ' Markland: σώσαιμι δ' L 998 πῶς Bothe: πῶς δ' L  
 999 ἐν τι τοῦθ' L: ἡμῖν ταῦθ' Schmidt 1004-5 σ' ... σώσασαν Kirchhoff: μ' ...  
 σώσασα σ' L

- θανών ποθεινός, τὰ δὲ γυναικὸς ἀσθενῇ.  
 Ορ. οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην σοῦ τε καὶ μητρὸς φονεὺς·  
 ἄλλος τὸ κείνης αἷμα· κοινόφρων δὲ σοὶ  
 καὶ ζῆν θέλοιμ' ἂν καὶ θανών λαχεῖν ἴσον.  
 ἄξω δέ σ', ἥνπερ καὐτὸς ἐντεῦθεν περῶ, 1010  
 πρὸς οἶκον, ἢ σοῦ κατθανών μενῶ μέτα.  
 γνώμης δ' ἄκουσον· εἰ πρόσαντες ἦν τόδε  
 Ἀρτέμιδι, πῶς ἂν Λοξίας ἐθέσπισε  
 κομίσαι μ' ἄγαλμα θεᾶς πόλισιμ' ἐς Παλλάδος  
 < >  
 καὶ σὸν πρόσωπον εἰσιδεῖν· ἅπαντα γὰρ 1015  
 συνθεῖς τάδ' εἰς ἓν νόστον ἐλπίζω λαβεῖν.  
 Ιφ. πῶς οὖν γένοιτ' ἂν ὥστε μῆθ' ἡμᾶς θανεῖν,  
 λαβεῖν θ' ἃ βουλόμεσθα; τῇδε γὰρ νοσεῖ  
 νόστος πρὸς οἴκους· ἡ δὲ βούλησις πάρα.  
 Ορ. ἄρ' ἂν τύραννον διολέσαι δυναίμεθ' ἂν; 1020  
 Ιφ. δεινὸν τόδ' εἶπας, ξενοφονεῖν ἐπήλυδας.  
 Ορ. ἀλλ', εἰ σὲ σώσει κάμέ, κινδυνευτέον.  
 Ιφ. οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην· τὸ δὲ πρόθυμον ἤνεσα.  
 Ορ. τί δ', εἴ με ναῶι τῶιδε κρύψειας λάθρα;  
 [Ιφ. ὥς δὴ σκότον λαβόντες ἐκσωθεῖμεν ἂν; 1025  
 Ορ. κλεπτῶν γὰρ ἡ νύξ, τῆς δ' ἀληθείας τὸ φῶς.]  
 Ιφ. εἶσ' ἔνδον ἱεροὶ φύλακες, οὓς οὐ λήσομεν.  
 Ορ. οἴμοι, διεφθάρμεσθα· πῶς σωθεῖμεν ἂν;  
 Ιφ. ἔχριν δοκῶ μοι καινὸν ἐξεύρημά τι.  
 Ορ. ποῖόν τι; δόξης μετὰδος, ὥς καγὼ μάθω. 1030  
 Ιφ. ταῖς σαῖς ἀνίαις χρήσομαι σοφίσματι.  
 [Ορ. δειναὶ γὰρ αἱ γυναῖκες εὐρίσκειν τέχνας.  
 Ιφ. φονέα σε φήσω μητρὸς ἐξ Ἀργούς μολεῖν.]  
 Ορ. χρῆσαι κακοῖσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς, εἰ κερδανεῖς.  
 Ιφ. ὥς οὐ θέμις σε λέξομεν θύειν θεᾷ. 1035  
 Ορ. τίν' αἰτίαν ἔχουσ'; ὑποπτεύω τι γάρ.

1006 γυναικὸς P: γυναικῶν L 1008 δὲ σοὶ Seidler: δέ σοι L 1009 ζῆν L: ζῶν  
 Musgrave 1010 ἄξω δέ σ' Canter: ἤξω δέ γ' L ἐντεῦθεν περῶ Seidler: ἐνταυθοῖ  
 πέσω L 1011 ἢ L supr. lin.: εἴ L σοῦ apogr. Paris. 2887: σου L 1014 post  
 hunc versum lac. stat. Koehly 1018 νοσεῖ Markland: νόει L 1019 ἡ δὲ  
 βούλησις L: ἡδε βούλευσις Markland 1022 εἰ σὲ Seidler: εἴ σε L 1025-6 del.  
 Markland 1025 σκότον Dindorf: σκότος L ἐκσωθεῖμεν Brodaeus:  
 ἔξω θεῖμεν L 1027 ἱεροὶ L: ἱεροῦ Dobree: ἱερο- Markland 1031 σοφίσματι  
 West: σοφίσμασι L 1032-3 susp. habet Diggle, 1033-4 Czwalina 1035 σε  
 Reiske: γε L 1036 ἔχουσ' L: ἔχοντ' Reiske τι Seidler: τί L

- Ιφ. οὐ καθαρὸν ὄντα· τὸ δ' ὅσιον δώσω φόνωι.  
 Ορ. τί δῆτα μᾶλλον θεᾶς ἄγαλμ' ἀλίσκεται;  
 Ιφ. πόντου σε πηγαῖς ἀγνίσαι βουλήσομαι.  
 Ορ. ἔτ' ἐν δόμοισι βρέτας, ἐφ' ᾧ πεπλεύκαμεν. 1040  
 Ιφ. κακῆϊνο νίψειν, σοῦ θυγόντος ὥς, ἐρῶ.  
 Ορ. ποῖ δῆτα πόντου νοτερόν εἰ παρ' ἐκβολον;  
 Ιφ. οὐ ναῦς χαλινοῖς λινοδέτοις ὀρμεῖ σέθεν.  
 Ορ. σὺ δ' ἢ τις ἄλλος ἐν χεροῖν οἴσει βρέτας;  
 Ιφ. ἐγὼ· θυγεῖν γὰρ ὅσιόν ἐστ' ἐμοὶ μόνῃ. 1045  
 Ορ. Πυλάδης δ' ὅδ' ἡμῖν ποῦ τετάζεται πόνου;  
 Ιφ. ταῦτόν χεροῖν σοὶ λέξεται μίασμ' ἔχων.  
 Ορ. λάθρα δ' ἀνακτος ἢ εἰδότος δράσεις τάδε;  
 Ιφ. πείσασα μύθοις· οὐ γὰρ ἂν λάθοιμί γε.  
 σοὶ δὲ μέλειν χρή τᾶλλ' ὅπως ἕξει καλῶς. 1051  
 Ορ. καὶ μὴν νεῶς γε πίτυλος εὐήρης πάρα. 1050  
 ἐνὸς μόνου δεῖ, τάσδε συγκρῦψαι τάδε. 1052  
 ἀλλ' ἀντίαζε καὶ λόγους πειστηρίους  
 εὕρισκ'· ἔχει τοι δύναμιν εἰς οἶκτον γυνή.  
 τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἴσως ἂν πάντα συμβαίη καλῶς. 1055  
 Ιφ. ᾧ φίλταται γυναῖκες, εἰς ὑμᾶς βλέπω,  
 καὶ τᾶμ' ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστὶν ἢ καλῶς ἔχειν  
 ἢ μηδὲν εἶναι καὶ στερηθῆναι πάτρας  
 φίλου τ' ἀδελφοῦ φιλτάτης τε συγγόνου.  
 καὶ πρῶτα μὲν μοι τοῦ λόγου τάδ' ἀρχέτω· 1060  
 γυναῖκές ἐσμεν, φιλόφρον ἀλλήλαις γένος  
 σώζειν τε κοινὰ πράγματ' ἀσφαλέσταται.  
 σιγήσαθ' ἡμῖν καὶ συνεκπονήσατε  
 φυγὰς. καλὸν τοι γλῶσσ' ὅτῳ πιστὴ παρῆι.  
 ὁρᾶτε δ' ὥς τρεῖς μία τύχη τοὺς φιλτάτους, 1065  
 ἢ γῆς πατρῴας νόστος ἢ θανεῖν ἔχει.  
 σωθεῖσα δ', ὥς ἂν καὶ σὺ κοινωνήης τύχης,  
 σώσω σ' ἐς Ἑλλάδ'. ἀλλὰ πρὸς σε δεξιᾶς  
 σὲ καὶ σ' ἰκνοῦμαι, σὲ δὲ φίλης παρηίδος,

1037 φόνωι ed. Aldina: φόβωι L 1041 νίψειν Madvig: νίψαι L 1042 εἰ  
 παρ' Reiske: εἶπας L 1044 σὺ δ' ἢ τις Jacobs: σοὶ δὲ τίς L 1046 πόνου  
 Brodaeus: φόνου L 1047 σοὶ Barnes: σοι L 1050–1 inter se  
 trai. Koehly 1051 μέλειν Tr: μέλ\*ειν L 1052 Iphigeniae trib.  
 Koehly 1055 ἂν πάντα Markland: ἅπαντα L v. del. Monk 1056 εἰς  
 Hermann: ὥς L 1059 φιλτάτης Livineius: φιλτάτου L 1064 πιστὴ Bothe:  
 πίστις L 1066 νόστος Valckenaer: νόστον L

- γονάτων τε καὶ τῶν ἐν δόμοισι φιλτάτων 1070  
 [μητρὸς πατρὸς τε καὶ τέκνων ὅτῳ κυρεῖ.]  
 τί φατέ; τίς ὑμῶν φησιν ἢ τίς οὐ θέλειν –  
 φθέγξασθε – ταῦτα; μὴ γὰρ αἰνουςῶν λόγους  
 ὀλῶλα καὶ γὰρ κασίγνητος τάλας.
- Χο. θάρσει, φίλη δέσποινα, καὶ σώιζου μόνον· 1075  
 ὥς ἐκ γ' ἐμοῦ σοι πάντα σιγηθήσεται,  
 ἴστω μέγας Ζεὺς, ὦν ἐπισκῆπτεις πέρι.
- Ιφ. ὄναισθε μύθων καὶ γένοισθ' εὐδαίμονες.  
 σὸν ἔργον ἤδη καὶ σὸν ἐσβαίνειν δόμους· 1080  
 ὥς αὐτίχ' ἤξει τῆσδε κοῖρανος χθονός,  
 θυσίαν ἐλέγξων εἰ κατείργασται ξένων.  
 ᾧ πότνι', ἥπερ μ' Αὐλίδος κατὰ πτυχᾶς  
 δεινῆς ἔσωσας ἐκ πατροκτόνου χερός,  
 σῶσόν με καὶ νῦν τοῦσδε τ' ἢ τὸ Λοξίου 1085  
 οὐκέτι βροτοῖσι διὰ σ' ἐτήτυμον στόμα.  
 ἀλλ' εὐμενῆς ἔκβηθι βαρβάρου χθονός  
 ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας· καὶ γὰρ ἐνθάδ' οὐ πρέπει  
 ναίειν, παρόν σοι πόλιν ἔχειν εὐδαίμονα.
- Χο. ὄρνις, ἃ παρὰ πετρίνας 1090  
 πόντου δειράδας, ἀλκυῶν,  
 ἔλεγον οἶτον αἰεῖδεις,  
 εὐξύνετον ξυνετοῖς βοάν,  
 ὅτι πόσιν κελαδεῖς αἰεὶ μολπαῖς,  
 ἐγὼ σοι παραβάλλομαι 1095  
 θρήνους, ἅπτερος ὄρνις,  
 ποθοῦσ' Ἑλλάνων ἀγόρους,  
 ποθοῦσ' Ἀρτεμιν λοχίαν,  
 ἃ παρὰ Κύνθιον ὄχθον οἶ-  
 κεῖ φοινικά θ' ἄβροκόμαν  
 δάφναν τ' εὐερνέα καὶ 1100  
 γλαυκάς θαλλὸν ἱερὸν ἐλαί-

1070 susp. habet Cropp 1071 del. Dindorf τε Tr: om. L 1072 θέλει  
 Musgrave: θέλει L 1081 ἐλέγξων Markland: ἐλέγχων L 1082 πτυχᾶς  
 Elmsley: πτύχας L 1083 πατροκτόνου χερός L: τεκνοκτόνου χερός Herwerden:  
 χερὸς παιδοκτόνου Bothe v. suspectum habet Diggle 1085 σ' P: σέ L  
 1091 οἶτον L: οἰκτρὸν Barnes 1092 εὐξύνετον L supr. lin.: ἀξύνετον L  
 1097 λοχίαν Musgrave (et L ante corr.): λοχείαν L corr. 1101 θαλλὸν ed.  
 Brubachiana: θάλλος L

ας, Λατοῦς ὠδῖνι φίλον,  
λίμναν θ' εἰλίσσουσαν ὕδωρ  
κύκλιον, ἔνθα κύκνος μελωι-  
δὸς Μούσας θεραπεύει. 1105

ὦ πολλαὶ δακρύων λιβάδες,  
αἱ παρηίδας εἰς ἑμὰς  
ἔπεσον, ἀνίκα πύργων  
ὀλομένων ἐν ναυσὶν ἔβαν  
πολεμίων ἑρετμοῖσι καὶ λόγχαις. 1110  
ζαχρύσου δὲ δι' ἐμπολᾶς  
νόστον βάρβαρον ἦλθον,  
ἔνθα τᾶς ἔλαφοκτόνου  
θεᾶς ἀμφίπολον κόραν  
παῖδ' Ἀγαμεμνονίαν λατρεύ- 1115  
ω βωμούς τ' οὐ μηλοθύτας,  
ζηλοῦσα τὸν διὰ παν-  
τὸς δυσδαίμον' ἐν γὰρ ἀνάγ-  
καις οὐ κάμνει σύντροφος ὦν.  
†μεταβάλλει δυσδαιμονία† 1120  
τὸ δὲ μετ' εὐτυχίαν κακοῦ-  
σθαι θνατοῖς βαρὺς αἰών.

καὶ σὲ μέν, πότνι, Ἀργεῖα  
πεντηκόντερος οἶκον ἄξει·  
συρίζων θ' ὁ κηρόδετος 1125  
Πανὸς οὐρείου κάλαμος  
κώπαις ἐπιθωῶξει,  
ὁ Φοῖβός θ' ὁ μάντις ἔχων  
κέλαδον ἐπτατόνου λύρας  
ᾄδων ἄξει λιπαρὰν 1130  
εὖ σ' Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ γᾶν.

1102 ὠδῖνι Aem. Portus: ὠδῖνα L φίλον Markland: φίλαν L: φίλας idem Markland 1104 κύκλιον Seidler: κύκνειον L 1107 εἰς ἑμὰς Tr: ἐς ἑμὰς L 1116 τ' οὐ Musgrave: τοὺς L 1117 ζηλοῦσα τὸν Greverus (ζηλοῦσαν τὸν et -σα τὰν iam Bothe): ζηλοῦσ' ἄταν L 1119 κάμνει Milton: κάμνεις L 1120 μεταβάλλει δ' εὐδαιμονία Markland: μεταβάλλειν δυσδαιμονία Musgrave 1121 εὐτυχίαν Scaliger: εὐτυχίας L 1124 πεντηκόντερος Kannicht: -ορος L 1125 θ' Elmsley: δ' L κηρόδετος Porson: κηροδέτας L 1126 Πανὸς οὐρείου κάλαμος Diggle: κάλαμος οὐρείου Πανὸς L 1131 εὖ σ' Bothe: ἔς L

†μέ δ' αὐτοῦ λιποῦσα†  
 βάσῃ ροθίοις πλάταις·  
 †ἀέρι δ' ἰστία πρότοννοι κατὰ πρῶιραν ὑ-  
 πέρ στολὸν ἐκπετάσουσι πόδα†  
 νὰς ὠκυπομποῦ. 1135/6

λαμπροὺς ἵπποδρόμους βαίην,  
 ἔνθ' εὐάλιον ἔρχεται πῦρ·  
 οἰκείων δ' ὑπὲρ θαλάμων 1140  
 ἐν νώτοις ἄμοις πτέρυγας  
 λήξαιμι θαάζουσα·  
 χοροῖς δ' ἐνσταίην, ὅθι καὶ  
 παρθένος εὐδοκίμων δόμων,  
 παρὰ πόδ' εἰλίσσουσα φίλας 1145  
 ματρός, ἡλίκων θιάσοις  
 ἐς ἀμίλλας χαρίτων  
 ἄβροπλούτου τε χλιδᾶς  
 εἰς ἔριν ὀρνυμένα, πολυποίκιλα φάρεα  
 καὶ πλοκάμους περιβαλλομένα 1150/1  
 γένυας ἐσκιάζον.

## ΘΟΑΣ

ποῦ 'σθ' ἡ πυλωρὸς τῶνδε δωμάτων γυνή 1153  
 Ἑλληνίς; ἥδη τῶν ξένων κατήρξατο;  
 ἀδύτοις ἐν ἀγνοῖς σῶμα λάμπονται πυρί; 1155  
 Χο. ἥδ' ἐστίν, ἥ σοι πάντ', ἄναξ, ἐρεῖ σαφῶς.  
 Θο. ἔα·  
 τί τότε μεταίρεις ἐξ ἀκινήτων βάρων,  
 Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, θεᾶς ἄγαλμ' ἐν ὠλέναις;  
 Ιφ. ἄναξ, ἔχ' αὐτοῦ πόδα σὸν ἐν παραστάσιν.  
 Θο. τί δ' ἔστιν, Ἰφιγένεια, καινὸν ἐν δόμοις; 1160  
 Ιφ. ἀπέπτυσ' Ὅσαι γὰρ δίδωμ' ἔπος τότε.

1132-3 ροθίοις βήσῃ λιποῦσα Dale 1133 βάσῃ Diggle: βήσῃ L  
 1134-6 [ἀέρι] ἰστία δ' ἐς πρότοννον κατὰ πρῶιραν ὑπὲρ στολὸν ἐκπετάσουσι πόδες  
 Platnauer 1136 ἐκπετάσουσι Tr: -σιν L ὠκυπομποῦ scripsi: ὠκυπόμπου L  
 1141 ἐν νώτοις ἄμοις πτέρυγας Fritzsche: πτέρυγας ἐν νώτοις ἄμοις L 1143 δ'  
 ἐνσταίην Platnauer: δὲ σταίην L 1144 δόμων Koechly: γάμων L 1146 ματρός  
 Tr: ματέρος L θιάσοις Lachmann: θιάσους L 1148 ἄβροπλούτου τε England:  
 ἄβροπλούτοιο L χλιδᾶς Markland: χαίτας L 1152 γένυας Markland:  
 γένυσιν L 1153 'σθ' Tr P: ἐσθ' L 1154 ἥδη Reiske: ἡ δὴ L 1155 del.  
 Page 1159 παραστάσιν Tr: παραστάσι L

- Θο. τί φροιμιάζει νεοχμόν; ἐξαύδα σαφῶς.  
 Ιφ. οὐ καθαρὰ μοι τὰ θύματ' ἠγρεύσασθ', ἄναξ.  
 Θο. τί τοῦκιδιδάξαν τοῦτό σ'; ἡ δόξαν λέγεις;  
 Ιφ. βρέτας τὸ τῆς θεοῦ πάλιν ἔδρας ἀπεστράφη. 1165  
 Θο. αὐτόματον, ἡ νιν σεισμός ἐστρεψε χθονός;  
 Ιφ. αὐτόματον· ὄψιν δ' ὁμμάτων ξυνήρμοσεν.  
 Θο. ἡ δ' αἰτία τίς; ἡ τὸ τῶν ξένων μύσος;  
 Ιφ. ἦδ', οὐδὲν ἄλλο· δεινὰ γὰρ δεδράκατον.  
 Θο. ἀλλ' ἡ τιν' ἔκανον βαρβάρων ἀκτῆς ἔπι; 1170  
 Ιφ. οἰκεῖον ἦλθον τὸν φόνον κεκτημένοι.  
 Θο. τίν'; εἰς ἔρον γὰρ τοῦ μαθεῖν πεπτώκαμεν.  
 Ιφ. μητέρα κατειργάσαντο κοινωνῶι ξίφει.  
 Θο. Ἀπολλον, οὐδ' ἐν βαρβάροις ἔτλη τις ἄν.  
 Ιφ. πάσης διωγμοῖς ἠλάθησαν Ἑλλάδος. 1175  
 Θο. ἡ τῶνδ' ἕκατι δῆτ' ἄγαλμ' ἔξω φέρεις;  
 Ιφ. σεμνόν γ' ὑπ' αἰθέρ', ὥς μεταστήσω φόνου.  
 Θο. μίσσμα δ' ἔγνωσ τοῖν ξένοιν ποίωι τρόπῳ;  
 Ιφ. ἤλεγχον, ὥς θεᾶς βρέτας ἀπεστράφη πάλιν.  
 Θο. σοφὴν σ' ἔθρεψεν Ἑλλάς, ὥς ἦισθου καλῶς. 1180  
 Ιφ. καὶ μὴν καθεῖσαν δέλεαρ ἡδύ μοι φρενῶν.  
 Θο. μῶν Ἀργόθεν τι φίλτρον ἀγγέλλοντέ σοι;  
 Ιφ. τὸν μόνον Ὀρέστην ἔμὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐτυχεῖν.  
 Θο. ὥς δὴ σφε σώσας ἡδοναῖς ἀγγελμάτων.  
 Ιφ. καὶ πατέρα γε ζῆν καὶ καλῶς πράσσειν ἔμὸν. 1185  
 Θο. σὺ δ' ἐς τὸ τῆς θεοῦ γ' ἐξένευσας εἰκότως.  
 Ιφ. πᾶσάν γε μισοῦς Ἑλλάδ', ἡ μ' ἀπώλεσεν.  
 Θο. τί δῆτα δρῶμεν, φράζε, τοῖν ξένοιν πέρι;  
 Ιφ. τὸν νόμον ἀνάγκη τὸν προκείμενον σέβειν.  
 Θο. οὐκουν ἐν ἔργῳι χέρνιβες ξίφος τε σόν; 1190  
 Ιφ. ἄγνοῖς καθαρμοῖς πρώτῃ νιν νίψαι θέλω.  
 Θο. πηγαῖσιν ὑδάτων ἡ θαλασσίαι δρόσωι;  
 Ιφ. θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τὰνθρώπων κακά.  
 Θο. ὀσιώτεροι γοῦν τῇ θεῶι πέσοιεν ἄν.  
 Ιφ. καὶ τὰμά γ' οὕτω μάλλον ἂν καλῶς ἔχοι. 1195  
 Θο. οὐκουν πρὸς αὐτὸν ναὸν ἐκπίπτει κλύδων;

1168 ἡ Tr: ἡ L τὸ L: τι Dobree 1173 κατειργάσαντο Tr: κατειργάσατο L  
 1174 ἔτλη Gaisford: τόδ' ἔτλη L 1181 μὴν Monk: νῦν L καθεῖσαν Tr: καθεῖσαν  
 L 1182 μῶν Badham: τῶν L τι Matthiae: τί L 1190 οὐκουν Markland:  
 οὐκοῦν L 1194 ὀσιώτεροι Tournier: ὀσιώτερον L 1196 οὐκουν Markland:  
 οὐκοῦν L



- Ιφ. ἐρημίας δεῖ· καὶ γὰρ ἄλλα δράσομεν.  
 Θο. ἄγ' ἔνθα χρήζεις· οὐ φιῶ τᾶρρηθ' ὀρᾶν.  
 Ιφ. ἀγνιστέον μοι καὶ τὸ τῆς θεοῦ βρέτας.  
 Θο. εἴπερ γε κηλὶς ἔβαλε νιν μητροκτόνος. 1200  
 Ιφ. οὐ γάρ ποτ' ἄν νιν ἡράμην βάθρων ἄπο.  
 Θο. δίκαιος ἡσύεβεια καὶ προμηθία.  
 Ιφ. οἷσθ' ἄ μοι γενέσθω; Θο. σὸν τὸ σημαίνειν τόδε.  
 Ιφ. δεσμὰ τοῖς ξένοις πρόσθε. Θο. ποῖ δέ σ' ἐκφύγοιεν ἄν;  
 Ιφ. πιστὸν Ἑλλάς οἶδεν οὐδέν. Θο. ἴτ' ἐπὶ δεσμά,  
 πρόσπολοι. 1205  
 Ιφ. κᾶκκοιζόντων γε δεῦρο τοὺς ξένους— Θο. ἔσται τάδε.  
 Ιφ. κρᾶτα κρύψαντες πέπλοισιν. Θο. ἡλίου πρόσθεν φλογός.  
 Ιφ. σῶν τέ μοι σύμπεμπ' ὀπαδῶν. Θο. οἷδ' ὁμαρτήσουσί σοι.  
 Ιφ. καὶ πόλει πέμψον τιν' ὅστις σημανεῖ— Θο. ποίας τύχας;  
 Ιφ. ἐν δόμοις μῖμνεν ἅπαντας. Θο. μὴ συναντῶσιν φόνωι. 1210  
 Ιφ. μυσσὰρὰ γὰρ τὰ τοιάδ' ἐστί. Θο. στεῖχε καὶ σήμαινε σύ—  
 Ιφ. μηδέν' εἰς ὄψιν πελάζειν. Θο. εὖ γε κηδεύεις πόλιν.  
 Ιφ. καὶ φίλων γ' οὕς δεῖ μάλιστα. Θο. τοῦτ' ἔλεξας εἰς ἐμέ.  
 Ιφ. <εὖ λέγεις.> Θο. ὥς εἰκότως σε πᾶσα θαυμάζει πόλις.  
 Ιφ. σὺ δὲ μένων αὐτοῦ πρὸ ναῶν τῇι θεῶι— Θο. τί χρῆμα  
 δρῶ; 1215  
 Ιφ. ἄγνισον χρυσῶι μέλαθρον. Θο. καθαρὸν ὥς μόλῃς πάλιν.  
 Ιφ. ἡνίκ' ἄν δ' ἔξω περῶσιν οἱ ξένοι— Θο. τί χρὴ με δρᾶν;  
 Ιφ. πέπλον ὁμμάτων προθέσθαι. Θο. μὴ παλαμναῖον βλέπω.  
 Ιφ. ἦν δ' ἄγαν δοκῶ χρονίζειν— Θο. τοῦδ' ὄρος τίς ἐστί μοι;  
 Ιφ. θαυμάσης μηδέν. Θο. τὰ τῆς θεοῦ πρᾶσσ' ἐπὶ σχολῇς  
 καλῶς. 1220  
 Ιφ. εἰ γὰρ ὥς θέλω καθαρμὸς ὅδε πέσοι. Θο. συνεύχομαι.  
 Ιφ. τοῦσδ' ἄρ' ἐκβαίνοντας ἤδη δωμάτων ὀρῶ ξένους  
 καὶ θεᾶς κόσμους νεογνούς τ' ἄρνας, ὥς φόνωι φόνον  
 μυσσὰρὸν ἐκνίψω, σέλας τε λαμπάδων τὰ τ' ἄλλ' ὅσα

1201 ἡράμην Musgrave: ἀνηράμην L 1206 γε Elmsley: δὲ L 1207 κρᾶτα  
 κρύψαντες Musgrave: κατακρύψαντες L ἡλίου πρόσθεν φλογός Thoanti trib.  
 Markland, Iphigeniae contin. L 1209 τιν' Barnes: τίν' L 1210 συναντῶσιν  
 Elmsley: συναντῶεν L 1212 personarum notas corr. Markland: μηδέν' ... πελάζειν  
 Thoanti contin., εὖ ... πόλιν Iphigeniae trib. L 1213 οὕς δεῖ Badham: οὐδείς  
 L τοῦτ' ... ἐμέ Thoanti trib. L corr.: Iphigeniae contin. L 1214 εὖ λέγεις sup-  
 pl. Herwerden (lac. stat. Hermann): v. del. Dindorf 1216 χρυσῶι L: πυρσῶι  
 Reiske: μόλῃς L: μόλη Monk 1218 βλέπω Bauer: λάβω L 1220 πρᾶσσ'  
 P corr.: πρᾶσσ' L σχολῇς Schaefer: σχολῇ L 1223 κόσμους L: μόσχους  
 Wecklein ἄρνας Pierson: ἄρσενας L

- προυθέμην ἐγὼ ξένοισι καὶ θεᾷ καθάρσια. 1225  
 ἐκποδὼν δ' αὐδῶ πολίταις τοῦδ' ἔχειν μιάσματος,  
 εἴ τις ἢ νᾶων πυλωρὸς χεῖρας ἀγνεύει θεοῖς  
 ἢ γάμον στείχει συνάψων ἢ τόκοις βαρύνεται,  
 φεύγετ', ἐξίστασθε, μή τωι προσπέσῃ μύσος τόδε.  
 ὦ Διὸς Λητοῦς τ' ἄνασσα παρθέν', ἦν νίψω φόνον 1230  
 τῶνδε καὶ θύσωμεν οὗ χρή, καθαρὸν οἰκήσεις δόμον,  
 εὐτυχεῖς δ' ἡμεῖς ἐσόμεθα. τᾶλλα δ' οὐ λέγουσ', ὅμως  
 τοῖς τὰ πλεῖον' εἰδόσιν θεοῖς σοὶ τε σημαίνω, θεά.
- Χο. εὖπαις ὁ Λατοῦς γόνος,  
 ὃν ποτε Δηλιάσιν καρποφόροις γυάλοις 1235  
 <ἔτικτε,> χρυσοκόμαν  
 ἐν κιθάραι σοφόν, ὅστ' ἐπὶ τόξων  
 εὐστοχίαι γάνυται· φέρε δ' ἴνιν  
 ἀπὸ δειράδος εἰναλίας, 1240  
 λοχεῖα κλεινὰ λιποῦσα, τάν  
 ματέρ' ἀστάκτων ὑδάτων  
 συμβακχεύουσαν Διονύ-  
 σωι Παρνάσιον κορυφάν·  
 ὅθι ποικιλόντως οἶνωπὸς δράκων, 1245  
 σκιερᾷ κατάχαλκος εὐφύλλωι δάφναι,  
 γᾶς πελώριον τέρας, ἄμφεπε μαντεῖον χθονός.  
 τότε νιν ἔτι βρέφος, ἔτι φίλας 1250  
 ἐπὶ ματέρος ἀγκάλαισι θρώσκων  
 ἔκανες, ὦ Φοῖβε, μαντεῖων δ' ἐπέβας ζαθέων,  
 τρίποδί τ' ἐν χρυσέωι θάσσεις ἐν ἄψευδεῖ θρόνωι  
 μαντείας βροτοῖς θεσφάτων νέμων 1255  
 ἀδύτων ὕπο, Κασταλίας ρέεθρων γείτων, μέσον  
 γᾶς ἔχων μέλαθρον.

1233 εἰδόσιν Bothe: εἰδόσι L θεά Tr: θεᾶ L 1235 Δηλιάσιν Burges: δηλιάς  
 ἐν L 1236 ἔτικτε add. Paley, τεκούσα Markland χρυσοκόμαν Musgrave:  
 χρυσοκόμαν Φοῖβον L 1238 ὅστ' Burges: ᾗ τ' L 1239 γάνυται Barnes:  
 γάνν- L φέρε δ' ἴνιν Kirchhoff (φέρειν ἴνιν Burges): φέρει δέ νιν L 1240 εἰναλίας  
 Tr: ἐναλίας L 1241-2 λιποῦσα, τάν ματέρ' ἀστάκτων ὑδάτων Sansone (ματέρ'  
 Jacobs): λιποῦσα ἀστάκτων μάτηρ ὑδάτων τάν L 1243 συμβακχεύουσαν  
 Diggle: βακχεύουσαν L 1246 κατάχαλκος εὐφύλλω L: κάτεχ' ἄλσος εὐφυλλον  
 Burges 1249 ἄμφεπε Seidler: ἀμφέπει L χθονός Furley et Bremer:  
 χθόνιον L τότε νιν Diggle (νιν Seidler): ἔτι μιν L 1255 βροτοῖς  
 Seidler: βροτοῖς ἀναφαίνων L νέμων Musgrave: ἐμῶν L 1256 ὕπο Seidler:  
 ὕπερ L

Θέμιν δ' ἐπεὶ Γαῖαν  
 παῖδ' ἀπενάσσαστο < ~ ~ > ἀπὸ ζαθέων 1260  
 χρηστηρίων, νύχια  
 Χθών ἐτεκνώσαστο φάσματ' ὀκνείρων>,   
 οἱ πόλεσιν μερόπων τά τε πρῶτα  
 τά τ' ἔπειθ', ἅ τ' ἔμελλε τυχεῖν, 1265  
 ὕπνου κατὰ δνοφερὰς χαμεύ-  
 νας ἔφραζον· Γαῖα δὲ τὰν  
 μαντείων ἀφείλετο τι-  
 μὰν Φοῖβον, φθόνῳ θυγατρός.  
 ταχύπους δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον ὀρμαθεὶς ἄναξ 1270  
 χέρα παιδὸν ἔλιξεν ἐκ Διὸς θρόνων  
 Πυθίων δόμων χθονίαν ἀφελεῖν μῆνιν θεᾶς.  
 γέλασε δ', ὅτι τέκος ἄφαρ ἔβα  
 πολύχρυσά θέλων λατρεύματα σχεῖν· 1275  
 ἐπὶ δὲ σείσας κόμαν παῦσεν νυχίου ἐνοπάς,  
 ὑπὸ δ' ἀλαθοσύναν νυκτωπὸν ἐξείλεν βροτῶν,  
 καὶ τιμὰς πάλιν θῆκε Λοξίαι, 1280  
 πολυάνορι τ' ἐν ξενόεντι θρόνῳ θάρση βροτοῖς  
 θεσφάτων αἰοδαῖς.

## ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

ὦ ναοφύλακες βώμιοί τ' ἐπιστάται,  
 Θόας ἄναξ γῆς τῆσδε ποῦ κυρεῖ βεβῶς; 1285  
 καλεῖτ' ἀναπτύξαντες εὐγόμφοις πύλας  
 ἔξω μελάθρων τῶνδε κοίρανον χθονός.  
 Χο. τί δ' ἔστιν, εἰ χρὴ μὴ κελευσθεῖσαν λέγειν;  
 Αγγ. βεβᾶσι φροῦδοι δίπτυχοι νεανίαι  
 Ἀγαμεμνονείας παιδὸς ἐκ βουλευμάτων 1290

1259 ἐπεὶ Canter: ἐπὶ L Γαῖαν Bruhn: γὰς ἰών L 1260 ἀπενάσσαστο  
 Barnes: ἀπενάσσαστο L: ἀπένασσεν ὁ Nauck: ἀπενάσσαθ' ὁ Mekler <Λατῳῖος>  
 Nauck: <Πυθῶνος> Hermann 1263 δονείρων Tr: ὁ L 1264 πόλεσιν Tr:  
 πολέσι L 1265 ἅ τ' Seidler: ὅσα τ' L: ὅσ' Burges 1266 ὕπνου L: ὕπνῳ  
 Markland δνοφερὰς Musgrave: δνοφερὰς L χαμεύνας Linder: γὰς εὐνάς  
 L 1267 τὰν Seidler: τὴν L 1268 μαντείων Seidler: μαντείῳ L 1271 ἔλιξεν  
 Seidler: ἔλι\*\* L: ἔλιξ Tr 1273 μῆνιν θεᾶς Wilamowitz: θεᾶς μῆνιν νυχίου τ' ἐνοπάς  
 L (νυχίου τ' ἐνοπάς del. Seidler) 1276–7 ἐπὶ δὲ σείσας ... παῦσεν Musgrave:  
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἔσεισε ... παῦσε L ἐνοπάς Burges (cf. ad 1272): δονείρους L 1278 ὑπὸ  
 Wecklein: ἀπὸ L δ' ἀλαθοσύναν Nauck: δὲ λαθοσύναν L 1279 ἐξείλεν Burges:  
 ἐξείλε L 1281 τ' Bergk: δ' L 1282 θάρση Tr: θάρσει L ut vid.: θάσσει  
 Nauck 1283 αἰοδαῖς L: αἰοδός Nauck 1285 γῆς τῆσδε Tr: τῆσδε γῆς L

- φεύγοντες ἐκ γῆς τῆσδε καὶ σεμνὸν βρέτας  
λαβόντες ἐν κόλποισιν Ἑλλάδος νεώς.
- Χο. ἄπιστον εἶπας μῦθον· ὃν δ' ἰδεῖν θέλεις  
ἄνακτα χώρας, φροῦδος ἐκ ναοῦ συθείς.
- Αγγ. ποῖ; δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν εἰδέναι τὰ δρώμενα. 1295
- Χο. οὐκ ἴσμεν· ἀλλὰ στείχε καὶ διώκέ νιν  
ὅπου κυρήσας τούσδ' ἀπαγγελεῖς λόγους.
- Αγγ. ὀρᾷτ' ἄπιστον ὥς γυναικεῖον γένος·  
μέτεστι χύμῃν τῶν πεπραγμένων μέρος.
- Χο. μαίνει· τί δ' ἡμῖν τῶν ξένων δρασμοῦ μέτα;  
οὐκ εἰ κρατοῦντων πρὸς πύλας ὅσον τάχος; 1300
- Αγγ. οὐ, πρίν γ' ἂν εἴπηι τοῦπος ἑρμηνεύς τόδε,  
εἴτ' ἔνδον εἴτ' οὐκ ἔνδον ἀρχηγὸς χθονός.  
ὦή, χαλᾷτε κληῖθρα, τοῖς ἔνδον λέγω,  
καὶ δεσπότηι σημήναθ' οὔνεκ' ἐν πύλαις 1305  
πάρεμι, καινῶν φόρτον ἀγγέλλων κακῶν.
- Θο. τίς ἀμφὶ δῶμα θεᾶς τόδ' ἴστησιν βοήν,  
πύλας ἀράξας καὶ ψόφον πέμψας ἔσω;
- Αγγ. ἔφασκον αἶδε, καὶ μ' ἀπήλαυνον δόμων,  
ὥς ἐκτὸς εἴης· σὺ δὲ κατ' οἶκον ἦσθ' ἄρα. 1310
- Θο. τί προσδοκῶσαι κέρδος ἢ θηρώμεναι;
- Αγγ. αὐθις τὰ τῶνδε σημανῶ· τὰ δ' ἐν ποσὶ  
παρόντ' ἄκουσον. ἡ νεᾶνις ἡ ἠθάδε  
βωμοῖς παρίστατ', Ἰφιγένει', ἔξω χθονός  
σὺν τοῖς ξένοισιν οἴχεται, σεμνὸν θεᾶς 1315  
ἄγαλμ' ἔχουσα· δόλια δ' ἦν καθάρματα.
- Θο. πῶς φῆις; τί πνεῦμα συμφορᾶς κεκτημένη;
- Αγγ. σῶζιζουσ' Ὀρέστην· τοῦτο γὰρ σὺ θαυμάσηι.
- Θο. τὸν ποῖον; ἄρ' ὃν Τυνδαρίς τίκτει κόρη;
- Αγγ. ὃν τοῖσδε βωμοῖς θεᾶι καθωσιώσατο. 1320
- Θο. ὦ θαῦμα — πῶς σφε μεῖζον ὀνομάσας τύχῃ;
- Αγγ. μὴ ἔνταῦθα τρέψῃς σὴν φρέν', ἀλλ' ἄκουέ μου·  
σαφῶς δ' ἀθρήσας καὶ κλυὼν ἐκφρόντισον

1299 χύμῃν Markland: θ' ὑμῖν L 1301 choro, 1302–6 nuntio tribuerunt  
Heath, Musgrave: 1301 nuntio, 1302–6 choro L 1302 εἴπηι Porson: εἴπ\*  
L: εἴποι L corr. vel Tr τόδε L: ὅδε Murray 1307 τόδ' L: ὅδ' Tournier (cl.  
Supp. 395) ἴστησιν Tr: ἴστησι L 1309 ἔφασκον England: ψευδῶς ἔλεγον L:  
λέγουσαί μ' αἶδε Pierson: ψευδῶς ἄρ' ἔλεγον, αἶ Rauchenstein: alii alia 1310 εἴης  
Canter: ἦς L 1312 αὐθις Schaefer: αὐτῆς L 1319 κόρη Tr: κόρα  
L 1320 θεᾶι ed. Aldina: θεά L 1321 σφε Diggle: σε L μεῖζον L: μείον  
Markland 1323 κλυὼν Schulze: κλύων L

	διωγμὸν ὅστις τοὺς ξένους θηράσεται.	
Θο.	λέγ· εὖ γὰρ εἶπας· οὐ γὰρ ἀγχίπλουι πόρον φεύγουσιν, ὥστε διαφυγεῖν τοῦμόν δόρυ.	1325
Αγγ.	ἐπεὶ πρὸς ἀκτάς ἤλθομεν θαλασσίας, οὗ ναῦς Ὀρέστου κρύφιος ἦν ὠρμισμένη, ἡμᾶς μέν, οὓς σὺ δεσμὰ συμπέμπεις ξένων ἔχοντας, ἐξένευσ' ἀποστῆναι πρόσω	1330
	Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖς, ὡς ἀπόρρητον φλόγα θύουσα καὶ καθαρμὸν δν μετώιχετο, αὐτὴ δ' ὀπισθε δέσμ' ἔχουσα τοῖν ξένοι ἔστειχε χερσί. καὶ τὰδ' ἦν ὑποπτα μέν, ἤρεσκε μέντοι σοῖσι προσπόλοις, ἄναξ.	1335
	χρόνῳ δ' ἴν' ἡμῖν δρᾶν τι δὴ δοκοῖ πλέον, ἀνωλόλυξε καὶ κατῆιδε βάρβαρα μέλη μαγεύουσ', ὡς φόνον νίζουσα δῆ. ἐπεὶ δὲ δαρὸν ἦμεν ἡμενοὶ χρόνον, ἐσῆλθεν ἡμᾶς μὴ λυθέντες οἱ ξένοι	1340
	κτάνοιεν αὐτὴν δραπεταὶ τ' οἰχοίατο. φόβῳ δ' ἅ μὴ χρῆν εἰσορᾶν καθήμεθα σιγῇ· τέλος δὲ πᾶσιν ἦν αὐτὸς λόγος στείχειν ἴν' ἦσαν, καίπερ οὐκ ἐωμένοις. κάνταυθ' ὀρώμεν Ἑλλάδος νεὼς σκάφος	1345
	ταρσῶι κατήρει πίτυλον ἐπτερωμένον, ναύτας τε πεντήκοντ' ἐπὶ σκαλμῶν πλάτας ἔχοντας, ἐκ δεσμῶν δὲ τοὺς νεανίας ἐλευθέρους <	
	> πρύμνηθεν ἐστῶτες νεὼς	1349
	σπεύδοντες ἦγον διὰ χερῶν πρύμνησια,	1352
	κοντοῖς δὲ πρῶϊραν εἶχον, οἱ δ' ἐπωτίδων	1350
	ἄγκυραν ἐξανήπτον, οἱ δὲ κλίμακας	1351
	πόντῳ διδόντες τοῖν ξένοι καθίσαν.	1353

1324 διωγμὸν Hermann: διωγμός L 1329 οὓς L corr. vel Tr: οὗ  
L 1334 χερσί Tr: χερ<οῖν> L 1336 δοκοῖ Matthiae: δο\*\* L: δοκῇ L corr.  
vel Tr 1338 μαγεύουσ' Reiske: ματεύουσ' L 1343 αὐτὸς Valckenaer: αὐτὸς  
L 1346 del. Diggle, post 1394 trai. Hermann ταρσῶι κατήρει L: ταρσῶι  
κατῆρες Markland: ταρσῶν κατῆρη Dobree (ταρσῶι κατῆρη Bothe) 1349 inter  
ἐλευθέρους et πρύμνηθεν lac. stat. Koechly ἐστῶτες Koechly: ἐστῶτας L νεὼς  
ed. Aldina: νεῶν L 1351 ἄγκυραν Scaliger: ἀγκύρας L κλίμακας L: κλίμακα  
Kirchhoff 1352 σπεύδοντες L: συ[ Π<sup>3</sup> v. post 1349 trai. Koechly, del.  
Wecklein πρυμνήσια L: πρύμνης τ' ἀπο Musgrave 1353 διδόντες Kirchhoff:  
δὲ δόντες L τοῖν ξένοι Seidler: τὴν ξένην L: τὴν ξένοι P: τῇ ξένηι Musgrave

ἡμεῖς δ' ἀφειδήσαντες, ὡς ἐσείδομεν  
 δόλια τεχνήματ', εἰχόμεσθα τῆς ξένης 1355  
 πρυμνησίων τε, καὶ δι' εὐθυνηρίας  
 οἴακας ἐξηιροῦμεν εὐπρύμνου νεώς.  
 λόγοι δ' ἐχώρουν· Τίνι λόγῳ πορθμεύετε  
 κλέπτοντες ἐκ γῆς ξόανα καὶ θηηπόλους;  
 τίνος τίς ὦν <σύ> τήνδ' ἀπεμπολαῖς χθονός; 1360  
 ὁ δ' εἶπ'· Ὁρέστης, τῆσδ' ὅμαιμος, ὡς μάθης,  
 Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖς, τήν δ' ἐμήν κομίζομαι  
 λαβῶν ἀδελφὴν, ἣν ἀπώλεσ' ἐκ δόμων.  
 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἦσσον εἰχόμεσθα τῆς ξένης  
 καὶ πρὸς σ' ἔπεσθα διεβιαζόμεσθ' αἰν' 1365  
 ὄθεν τὰ δεινὰ πλήγματ' ἦν γενειάδων.  
 κείνοι τε γὰρ σίδηρον οὐκ εἶχον χεροῖν  
 ἡμεῖς τε· πυγμαί δ' ἦσαν ἐγκροτούμεναι,  
 καὶ κῶλ' ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν τοῖν νεανίαιν ἅμα  
 ἐς πλευρὰ καὶ πρὸς ἦπαρ ἤκοντίζετο, 1370  
 ὥστε ξυναλγεῖν καὶ συναποκαμεῖν μέλη.  
 δεινοῖς δὲ σημάτωντροισιν ἐσφραγισμένοι  
 ἐφεύγομεν πρὸς κρημνόν, οἳ μὲν ἐν κάραι  
 κάθαιμ' ἔχοντες τραύμαθ', οἳ δ' ἐν ὄμμασιν·  
 ὄχθοις δ' ἐπισταθέντες εὐλαβεστέρως 1375  
 ἐμαρνάμεσθα καὶ πέτροις ἐβάλλομεν.  
 ἀλλ' εἶργον ἡμᾶς τοξόται πρύμνης ἔπι  
 σταθέντες ἰοῖς, ὥστ' ἀναστεῖλαι πρόσω.  
 καὶν τῶιδε — δεινὸς γὰρ κλύδων ὥκειλε ναῦν  
 πρὸς γῆν, φόβος δ' ἦν <τῇ ξένηι> τέγξαι πόδα — 1380  
 λαβῶν Ὁρέστης ὤμον εἰς ἀριστερόν,  
 βὰς ἐς θάλασσαν καπτὶ κλίμακος θορών,  
 ἔθηκ' ἀδελφὴν τ' ἐντὸς εὐσέλμου νεώς,  
 τό τ' οὐρανοῦ πέσημα, τῆς Διὸς κόρης  
 ἄγαλμα. ναὸς δ' ἐκ μέσης ἐφθέγξατο 1385

1358 πορθμεύετε P corr.: πορθεύετε L 1359 ξόανα Reiske: ξόανον L θηηπόλους  
 Musgrave: θηηπόλον L 1360 <σύ> Markland: om. L 1362 τήν δ' L:  
 τήνδ' P 1368 δ' ed. Aldina: τ' L 1371 ξυναλγεῖν Hermann: ξυνάπτειν  
 L 1376 πέτροις Paley: πέτρους L 1377 εἶργον ed. Aldina: εἶργον  
 L 1380 <τῇ ξένηι> Kirchhoff: spatium habet L: <παρθένω> Badham: <ὥστε  
 μή> Tr 1382 κλίμακος L: κλίμακας Wecklein (cf. 1351) 1383 τ' Hermann:  
 om. L εὐσέλμου apogr. Paris. 2817 (man. alt.) sicut conl. Pierson: εὐσήμου  
 L 1384-5 τό τ' ... δ' ἐκ apogr. Paris. 2887 (man. alt.), sicut conl. Markland: τό  
 δ' ... ἐκ L 1385 ναὸς Monk: νηὸς L

βοή τις· ὦ γῆς Ἑλλάδος ναύτης λεὼς  
 λάβεσθε κώπης ρόθιά τ' ἐκλευκαίνετε·  
 ἔχομεν γὰρ ὦνπερ οὔνεκ' ἄξενον πόρον  
 Συμπληγάδων ἔσωθεν εἰσεπλεύσαμεν.  
 οἱ δὲ στεναγμόν ἤδην ἐκβρυχώμενοι 1390  
 ἔπαισαν ὄλμην. ναῦς δ' ἕως μὲν ἐντὸς ἦν  
 λιμένος ἐχώρει, στόμια διαπερώσα δὲ  
 λάβρῳ κλύδωνι συμπεσοῦσ' ἠπείγετο·  
 δεινὸς γὰρ ἔλθων ἄνεμος ἐξάφνης νεὼς  
 ὤθει ἑπάλιν πρυμνήσι· τ' οἱ δ' ἐκαρτέρουν 1395  
 πρὸς κύμα λακτίζοντες· ἐς δὲ γῆν πάλιν  
 κλύδων παλίρρους ἤγε ναῦν. σταθεῖσα δὲ  
 Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖς ἠῦξατ'· ὦ Λητοῦς κόρη  
 σῶσόν με τήν σὴν ἱερέαν πρὸς Ἑλλάδα  
 ἐκ βαρβάρου γῆς καὶ κλοπαῖς σύγγνωθ' ἐμαῖς. 1400  
 φιλεῖς δὲ καὶ σὺ σὸν κασίγητον, θεά·  
 φιλεῖν δὲ κάμει τοὺς ὁμαίμονας δόκει.  
 ναῦται δ' ἐπευφήμησαν εὐχαῖσιν κόρης  
 παιᾶνα, γυμνὰς ἐκ <πέπλων> ἐπωμίδας  
 κώπῃ προσαρμόσαντες ἐκ κελεύματος. 1405  
 μᾶλλον δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς πέτρας ἦει σκάφος·  
 χῶ μὲν τις ἐς θάλασσαν ὠρμήθη ποσίν,  
 ἄλλος δὲ πλεκτὰς ἐξανήπτεν ἀγκύλας.  
 καὶ γὰρ μὲν εὐθύς πρὸς σὲ δεῦρ' ἀπεστάλην,  
 σοὶ τὰς ἐκέιθεν σημανῶν, ἄναξ, τύχας. 1410  
 ἀλλ' ἔρπε, δεσμὰ καὶ βρόχους λαβὼν χεροῖν·  
 εἰ μὴ γὰρ οἶδμα νήνεμον γενήσεται,  
 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς τοῖς ξένοις σωτηρίας.  
 πόντου δ' ἀνάκτωρ Ἰλιὸν τ' ἐπεσκόπει

1386 ναύτης λεὼς F. W. Schmidt: ναῦται νεὼς L 1387 κώπης Reiske: κώπαις  
 L τ' ἐκλευκαίνετε Scaliger: τε λευκαίνετε L 1388 ἄξενον Markland: εὐξενον  
 L 1392 ἐχώρει, στόμια διαπερώσα Markland: ἐχώρει στόμια, διαπερώσα  
 L 1394 νεὼς L: σκάφος Paley 1395 ὤθει L: ὤθει Kirchhoff πάλιν  
 πρυμνήσι L: παλιμπρυμνηδὸν Hermann (1346 ante v. translato): παλιμπρυμν' istf  
 Mekler 1396 δὲ γῆν ed. Brubachiana: γῆν δὲ L 1397 παλίρρους Tr P  
 corr.: παλίρρους L 1398 ἠῦξατ' Dindorf: εὐξατ' L 1399 ἱερέαν Wecklein  
 (ἱερίαν Scaliger): ἱερίαν L 1403 εὐχαῖσιν Tr: εὐχαῖσι L 1404 <πέπλων>  
 Markland: spatium habet L: <χερῶν> P corr.: <βαλόντες> Tr: <ὠλένας> ἐπωμίδος  
 Hartung 1405 κελεύματος Paris. gr. 2887: κελεύσματος L 1406 ἦει Tr P  
 corr.: εἶη L 1408 ἄλλος L corr.: ἄλλω L: ἄλλοι P corr. ἔξανήπτεν Tr: ἔξανήπτον  
 L 1414-19 del. England 1414 ἐπεσκόπει Matthiae: ἐπισκοπεῖ L

- σεμνὸς Ποσειδῶν, Πελοπίδαις ἐναντίος, 1415  
καὶ νῦν παρέξει τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος γόνον  
σοὶ καὶ πολίταις, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐν χεροῖν  
λαβεῖν, ἀδελφὴν θ', ἣ φόνου τοῦ ἵν' Αὐλίδι  
ἄμνημόνευτος θεὰν προδοῦσ' ἁλίσκεται.
- Χο. ὦ τλήμον Ἰφιγένεια, συγγόνου μέτα 1420  
θανῇ· πάλιν μολοῦσα δεσποτῶν χέρας.
- Θο. ὦ πάντες ἄστοι τῆσδε βαρβάρου χθονός, 1425  
οὐκ εἶα πῶλοις ἐμβαλόντες ἡνίας  
παράκτιοι δραμεῖσθε κᾶκβολὰς νεῶς  
Ἑλληνίδος δέξσθε, σὺν δὲ τῇ θεῷ  
σπεύδοντες ἄνδρας δυσσεβεῖς θηράσετε,  
οἳ δ' ὠκυπομποὺς ἔλξετ' ἐς πόντον πλάτας,  
ὡς ἐκ θαλάσσης ἐκ τε γῆς ἱππεύμασι  
λαβόντες αὐτοὺς ἢ κατὰ στύφλου πέτρας  
ρίψωμεν, ἢ σκόλοπι πῆξωμεν δέμας; 1430  
ὕμᾱς δὲ τὰς τῶνδ' ἱστορας βουλευμάτων,  
γυναῖκες, αὖτις ἡνίκ' ἂν σχολὴν λάβω  
ποινασόμεσθα· νῦν δὲ τὴν προκειμένην  
σπουδὴν ἔχοντες οὐ μενούμεν ἥσυχοι.

## ΑΘΗΝΑΙΑ

- ποῖ ποῖ διωγμὸν τόνδε πορθομένους, ἄναξ 1435  
Θόας; ἀκουσον τῆσδ' Ἀθηναίας λόγους.  
παῦσαι διώκων ῥεῦμά τ' ἐξορμῶν στρατοῦ·  
πεπρωμένος γὰρ θεσφάτοισι Λοξίου  
δεῦρ' ἦλθ' Ὀρέστης, τὸν τ' Ἑρινύων χόλον  
φεύγων ἀδελφῆς τ' Ἄργος ἐσπέμψων δέμας 1440  
ἄγαλμά θ' ἱερὸν εἰς ἐμὴν ἄξων χθόνα,  
τῶν νῦν παρόντων πημάτων ἀναψυχάς. 1441b  
πρὸς μὲν σ' ὅδ' ἤμιν μῦθος· ὃν δ' ἀποκτενεῖν 1442  
δοκεῖς Ὀρέστην ποντίῳ λαβὼν σάλωι,  
ἤδη Ποσειδῶν χάριν ἐμὴν ἀκύμονα

1415 ἐναντίος Bothe: δ' ἐναντίος L 1418 ἀδελφὴν θ' Musgrave: τ' ἀδελφὴν  
L φόνου τοῦ ἵν' Badham: φόνον τὸν L 1419 ἄμνημόνευτος Markland:  
ἄμνημόνευτον L θεὰν Badham: θεᾶ L 1423 εἶα L corr. vel Tr: εἶα L  
1426 θηράσετε L corr. vel Tr: θηράσσετε L 1432 γυναῖκες Markland: γυναῖκας  
L αὖτις ed. Aldina: αὖτις L 1433 τὴν προκειμένην L: τῶν προκειμένων  
Barnes 1436 τῆσδ' L: τοῦσδ' Markland 1438 πεπρωμένος Hermann: -οις  
L 1441b om. P 1442 σ' L corr. vel Tr, P: σὲ L



- πόντου τίθησι νῶτα πορθμεύων πλάτη. 1445  
 μαθὼν δ', Ὀρέστα, τὰς ἐμὰς ἐπιστολάς  
 (κλύεις γὰρ αὐδὴν καίπερ οὐ παρῶν θεᾶς)  
 χώρει λαβὼν ἄγαλμα σύγγονόν τε σὴν.  
 ὅταν δ' Ἀθήνας τὰς θεοδμήτους μόληις, 1450  
 χῶρός τις ἔστιν Ἀτθίδος πρὸς ἐσχάτοις  
 ὄροισι, γείτων δειράδος Καρυστίας,  
 ἱερός, Ἀλὰς νιν οὐμὸς ὀνομάζει λεώς·  
 ἐνταῦθα τεύξας ναὸν ἵδρυσαι βρέτας,  
 ἐπώνυμον γῆς Ταυρικῆς πόνων τε σῶν,  
 οὓς ἐξεμόχθεις περιπολῶν καθ' Ἑλλάδα 1455  
 οἷστροις Ἐρινύων. Ἄρτεμιν δέ νιν βροτοὶ  
 τὸ λοιπὸν ὑμνήσουσι Ταυροπόλον θεᾶν.  
 νόμον τε θὲς τόνδ' ὅταν ἐορτάζῃ λεώς,  
 τῆς σῆς σφαγῆς ἅποιν' ἐπισχέτω ξίφος  
 δέρι πρὸς ἀνδρὸς αἰμά τ' ἐξανιέτω, 1460  
 ὀσίας ἕκατι θεὰ θ' ὅπως τιμὰς ἔχη.  
 σὲ δ' ἄμφι σεμνάς, Ἰφιγένεια, κλίμακας  
 Βραυρωνίας δεῖ τῇδε κληιδουχεῖν θεᾷ·  
 οὗ καὶ τεθάρπη καταθανοῦσα, καὶ πέπλων  
 ἄγαλμά σοι θήσουσιν εὐπήνους ὑφάς, 1465  
 ἃς ἂν γυναῖκες ἐν τόκοις ψυχορραγεῖς  
 λείπωσ' ἐν οἴκοις. τάσδε δ' ἐκπέμπειν χθονὸς  
 Ἑλληνίδας γυναῖκας ἐξεφίεμαι  
 γνώμης δικαίας οὔνεκ' <  
 > ἐκώσασά σε  
 καὶ πρὶν γ' Ἀρείοις ἐν πάγοις ψήφους ἴσας 1470  
 κρίνας, Ὀρέστα· καὶ νόμισμ' ἔσται τόδε,  
 νικᾶν ἰσῆρεις ὅστις ἂν ψήφους λάβῃ.  
 ἀλλ' ἐκκομίζου σὴν κασιγνήτην χθονός,  
 Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖ. καὶ σὺ μὴ θυμοῦ, Θόας.

1445 πορθμεύων L: πορθμεύειν Tyrwhitt πλάτη L (= πλάτη): πλάτην Musgrave 1452 Ἀλὰς Aem. Portus: ἄλὰς L 1453 τεύξας Pierson: τάξας L 1454 γῆς Hermann: τῆς L 1458 θὲς Bothe, Porson: θέσθε L 1460 ἐξανιέτω Heath: ἐξ ἀνυέτω L 1461 θεὰ θ' Markland: θεᾶς L 1462 κλίμακας L: λείμακας Pierson 1463 τῇδε ... θεᾷ Markland: τῆσδε θεᾶς L 1467 λείπωσ' L: λίπωσ' Tournier 1469 lac. stat. Reiske, post ἐξεφίεμαι Brodaeus 1469-70 ἐκώσασά σε καὶ πρὶν γ' L: ἐξέσωσα δὲ ... σ' schol. Ar. *Ran.* 685 (καὶ om. V) 1471 ἔσται (Dupuy) τόδε Markland: εἰς ταυτό γ' L 1473 κασιγνήτην Elmsley: κασίγνητον L

- Θο. ἄνασσ' Ἀθάνα, τοῖσι τῶν θεῶν λόγοις 1475  
 ὅστις κλύων ἄπιστος, οὐκ ὀρθῶς φρονεῖ.  
 ἐγὼ δ' Ὀρέστηι τ', εἰ φέρων βρέτας θεᾶς  
 βέβηκ', ἀδελφῇ τ' οὐχὶ θυμοῦμαι· τί γάρ;  
 πρὸς τοὺς σθένοντας θεοὺς ἀμιλλᾶσθαι καλόν;  
 ἵτωσαν ἐς σὴν σὺν θεᾶς ἀγάλματι 1480  
 γαῖαν, καθιδρύσαιντό τ' εὐτυχῶς βρέτας.  
 πέμψω δὲ καὶ τάσδ' Ἑλλάδ' εἰς εὐδαίμονα  
 γυναικας, ὥσπερ σὸν κέλευμ' ἐφίεται.  
 παύσω δὲ λόγχην ἣν ἐπαίρομαι ξένοις  
 νεῶν τ' ἔρετμά, σοὶ τάδ' ὥς δοκεῖ, θεά. 1485
- Αθ. αἰνῶ· τὸ γὰρ χρεῶν σοῦ τε καὶ θεῶν κρατεῖ.  
 ἴτ', ὦ πνοαί, ναυσθλοῦτε τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος  
 παῖδ' εἰς Ἀθήνας· συμπορεύσομαι δ' ἐγὼ  
 σῶζιζουσ' ἀδελφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς σεμνὸν βρέτας.
- Χο. ἴτ' ἐπ' εὐτυχίαι τῆς σωιζομένης 1490  
 μοίρας εὐδαίμονες ὄντες.  
 ἄλλ', ὦ σεμνή παρά τ' ἀθανάτοις  
 καὶ παρά θνητοῖς, Παλλὰς Ἀθάνα,  
 δράσομεν οὕτως ὥς σὺ κελεύεις.  
 μάλα γὰρ τερπνὴν κἀνέλπιστον 1495  
 φήμην ἀκοαῖσι δέδεγμαι.
- ὦ μέγα σεμνή Νίκη, τὸν ἐμὸν  
 βίοτον κατέχοις  
 καὶ μὴ λήγοις στεφανοῦσα.

1478 punc. post τί γάρ add. Reiske 1479 del. Diggle 1483 κέλευμ' Paris.  
 gr. 2887: κέλευσμ' L 1485 νεῶν Boissonade: νηῶν L θεά ed. Aldina: θεᾶ  
 L 1486 personae notam add. L man. rec. (om. L), habent et apogr. Paris.  
 2817, 2887 χρεῶν L corr. vel Tr: χρεῶν L 1487-9 Minervae trib. ed. Aldina,  
 Apollini L 1487 ναυσθλοῦτε Canter: ναυσθλοῦσθε L 1488 εἰς ed. Aldina:  
 ἐς L 1490-1 choro trib. Seidler, Minervae L 1491 εὐδαίμονες ed.  
 Aldina: εὐδαίμονος L ὄντες L corr. vel Tr: ὄντος L 1495 τερπνὴν L. Dindorf:  
 τερπνὸν L κἀνέλπιστον Tr: \*ἀνέλπιστον L 1497-9 secl. edd. com-  
 plures 1497 νίκη Tr: νικά L

## COMMENTARY

---

### 1-122 PROLOGOS

The prologue falls into two halves, the first a monologue of the sort which commonly opens Euripidean plays, spoken by Iph., the second divided between two characters and representing the arrival of Orestes and Pylades in the Taurian land. There is a sharp break between the two: after her speech, Iph. enters the temple which is also her dwelling-place (65-6), and she neither sees nor is seen by the two men. It is essential that neither party is yet aware of the other, and Euripides emphasises both their separation and the limits of their respective knowledge by this division of the prologue, which also sets up the potential antagonism that the situation entails between sister and brother: the priestess in charge of the sacrifice of strangers, and the strangers intent on the theft of the temple statue.

**1-66** *Iphigeneia recounts her history and the ominous dream of the previous night.* Expository prologue speeches open all extant Euripidean plays, with the possible exception of *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, and are enough of a trademark feature of his dramaturgy to be mocked by Aristophanes in a famous passage of *Frogs* (1198-1247; the opening lines of *IT* at 1232-3). They present the subject matter and set the scene, rejecting the careful Sophoclean naturalism by which this information is inserted into dialogue between characters (*Trach.* being an exception to the method) in favour of what is effectively a direct address to the audience – although the presence of the audience is never overtly acknowledged, as it is in comedy; here Iph. addresses her words ‘to the sky’ (43). Her speech proceeds chronologically, with 1-4 establishing her genealogy, 5-27 dealing with the sacrifice at Aulis, with which the audience will be familiar, and 28-40 with the less familiar sequel of her translation to the land of the Taurians. Lines 42-66 mark a new development: the dream of the previous night which she interprets as indicating her brother’s death, and her intention to perform his funeral rites *in absentia*.

**1-5** The genealogy is given briefly and factually, although all the names Iph. mentions are capable of negative mythical connotations, and will later bear them (see 1, 3-4nn.).

**1 Πέλοψ ὁ Ταντάλειος:** Iph. begins her family tree with her great-grandfather Pelops, traditionally the first of the line to come from Lydia to Greece, where he became the eponym of the Peloponnese. Like Pindar (*Ol.* 1.86-8), Euripides here suppresses the usual but discreditable story

of Pelops' method of winning the race against Oinomaos for his daughter's hand, by bribing his charioteer to replace the chariot's linchpins with wax, thus bringing about his death (see 823-6n.). But this is in the interests of brevity; later Orestes will refer to Pelops' murder of Oinomaos, when in the recognition scene the ancestral spear of Pelops becomes the final remembered token which establishes his identity (822-6).

**Πῖσαν:** i.e. Olympia. The city nearest to the sanctuary was named Pisa, and originally controlled the festival, but by the fifth century had been conquered by Elis.

**2 θοᾶσιν ἵπποις:** grammatically the phrase is construed more easily with *μολών* than with *γαμεῖ*: 'Pelops, coming to Pisa with his swift mares ...' But associatively the mares can hardly be separated from the manner of Pelops' winning of his bride: the same horses which took him to Olympia also gave him victory there.

**γαμεῖ:** in tragic narrative, verbs concerned with marriage and child-bearing, especially *γαμέω* and *τίκτω* (23n.), appear more frequently in the present than in past tenses, describing a relationship based on a past event. See Rijksbaron 1991: 1-4. Examples of *γαμέω* in Euripidean prologue narratives are *Andr.* 9, *Ion* 58, *Hel.* 6, *Phoen.* 13 (where, as here, the marriage relationship is in the past), 53, *Or.* 9.

**3-4** Atreus is mentioned only by name; the main story associated with him, the quarrel with his brother Thyestes and Atreus' horrible revenge, is alluded to later at 812ff., and more allusively at 192-6. Menelaos is named alongside Agamemnon because of his crucial role in the episode which is narrated immediately afterwards; Iph. blames him and Helen for her plight (8, 14).

**5 τῆς Τυνδαρείας θυγατρὸς:** Klytaimestra (cf. 806, 1319), though Helen was also, at least in name, a daughter of Tyndareus. Iph. does not yet know anything of the sequel (she learns the outline from Orestes later, at 545-58, before the recognition), but for the audience the allusion to Klytaimestra is inseparable from her murder of her husband and the revenge killing by her son.

**6-27** The treatment of Iph.'s sacrifice owes much to the description in Aeschylus, *Ag.* 184-249: the emphasis on the father sacrificing his daughter (8, cf. *Ag.* 224-5, *ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρὸς*), the dubious goal of the retrieval of Helen (*Ἑλένης οὐνεχ'*, 8; *Μενέλαωι χάριν φέρων*, 14; Orestes' assessment at 566, *κακῆς γυναικὸς χάριν ἄχαριν*, is more blunt; cf. *Ag.* 225-6, *γυναικοποιῶν πολέμων ἄρωγάν*), the implied motivation of Agamemnon as leader of a great fleet (10-13, cf. *Ag.* 212-13, *πῶς λιπόναις γένωμαι συμμαχίας ἀμαρτῶν*), the role of Kalchas (16ff., cf. *Ag.* 122-57, 197-204, 248), and especially the raising of the sacrificial victim above the altar flame (27, cf. *Ag.* 232-5, *δίκαν χιμαίρας ὕπερθε βωμοῦ*

... λαβεῖν ἄερδην). The marked differences are the explanation given by Kalchas of Artemis' demand (below, 17ff.) and of course the fact that Iph.'s death was only apparent.

**6-9** The action, the (supposed) sacrificial death of Iph., is sandwiched within an ornamental description of Aulis (6-7, 9).

**6-7** 'by the whirlpools which often the Euripos twists, making spirals in the dark sea with constant winds'. The Euripos separates Euboeia from the mainland, and was known for its complex and puzzling currents (referred to proverbially by Plato, *Phaedo* 90c), including vortex formation.

**πυκναῖς αὔραις**: according to Livy (28.6.10), winds from the mountains above add to the difficulties for navigation caused by the tides. This is the usual situation, ironic in view of the *lack* of winds which necessitated the sacrifice (15).

**8 ἔσφαξεν** 'slaughtered'; though the word can be used by extension of any violent death, its proper application is to sacrificial killing. The assertion that Iph. was killed, followed by its modification ὡς δοκεῖ, parallels and perhaps echoes the account of the *Eoiai* (Introduction, pp. 4-5), where the Achaeans 'slaughtered' (σφάξαν) Iphimede, only for this statement to be contradicted four lines later by εἶδω[λον]: it was a likeness of the girl that was sacrificed, and the real Iphimede was saved by Artemis. The 'dead, but not really' formulation is taken up by Orestes at 831; see Introduction, pp. 32-3.

**10 γάρ** introduces a more detailed version of events, explaining how the sacrifice came about.

**χιλίων νεῶν στόλον**: the thousand ships are well known in English from Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (Act 5 scene 1: 'the face that launched ...'), but appear elsewhere in Euripides as a round number for the Achaian fleet, described as χιλιόναυς (*Andr.* 106, *Or.* 352, cf. *Rhes.* 262; cf. also χιλιοναύτα, 141 below). The Iliadic catalogue of ships (2.494ff.) in fact lists 1,186.

**11 Ἑλληνικόν** is an anachronism for Homeric times, but the ships came from cities whose inhabitants later called themselves Ἕλληνες, and the expedition against a common enemy provoked fifth-century comparisons with the Persian Wars. The use of Ἑλλάς, Ἕλληνες, κτλ. in their post-Homeric sense is standard in tragedy.

**12 καλλίνικον στέφανον**: καλλίνικος is a common compound, and 'the glorious-victorious crown' for 'the crown of glorious victory' is typical of both tragic and lyric style. Compare, for instance, in tragic lyric φιλόπλουτον ἄμιλλαν (411) 'wealth-loving striving' = striving for wealth, motivated by love for it.

**14 Μενέλεωι**: the Attic form of the name. See 357n.

**15** 'But in extremity of adverse weather, not meeting with winds'. ἀπλοία refers to any weather condition which makes sailing difficult or

impossible; πνευμάτων τ' οὐ τυγχάνων further defines this, indicating that it is a lack of wind, rather than contrary winds (as in *Ag.* 192ff.), causing the difficulty. δεινῇι ... ἀπλοῖαι corrects the manuscript δεινῆς ... ἀπλοίας, which can hardly be right as the line stands: a genitive absolute would be very awkward in close proximity to (οὐ) τυγχάνων, and if taken as dependent on τυγχάνων it will necessitate the removal of the negative: πνευμάτων τε τυγχάνων.

**16 ἐς ἔμπυρ' ἦλθε:** in Aeschylus, Kalchas prophesies in a more Homeric style, by the interpretation of an omen (110–257). ἔμπυρα are divinatory signs obtained from the way the god's sacrificial portion burns on the altar, a common form of prophecy in post-Homeric times. Euripides gives a more detailed description of one such sign at *Phoen.* 1255–8.

**λέγει:** historic present, a common feature of narrative in prologues and messenger speeches, and often, as here, in close proximity to past tenses. (γαμῇ (2), τίκτει (23), and perhaps τίθησι (34) are not quite comparable; see nn.). Direct speech is used sparingly, perhaps for special effect, in prologue narratives; closest to this passage is *Phoen.* 17–20, the oracular response given to Laios.

**18 οὐ μὴ ... ἀφορμίσῃς:** οὐ μὴ with (usually aorist) subjunctive indicates an emphatic denial: 'there is no way you will launch your ships ...' (Smyth §2755).

**20–1** This is the earliest surviving reference to Agamemnon's vow as the motive for the sacrifice of Iph. The *Cypria* (Proclus, *Chrestomathia* and fr. 23 Bernabé; see Introduction, p. 4) has the version much less creditable to Agamemnon in which he provokes Artemis' anger by killing an animal sacred to her and comparing his skill at archery favourably with hers, while in Aeschylus the cause of Artemis' anger is somewhat enigmatic: Kalchas states that she is angered by the attack of the eagles on the pregnant hare, which presumably stands for the whole Trojan expedition (*Ag.* 134–7). The 'rash vow' motif is known across many cultures, and a close parallel to this version, also resulting in a sacrifice, is found in the biblical story of Jephtha and his daughter (*Judges* 11). By adopting this explanation, Euripides convicts Agamemnon of nothing more than foolishness, and Iph. here shows more bitterness towards Kalchas and Odysseus; later she will pity her father, both for his situation at Aulis and for his death (549, 565).

**21 φωσφόρῳι ... θεᾷ:** the 'light-bringer' is a common epithet for Artemis, either with a lunar aspect or, like Hekate to whom she is often very close, holding torches. νῆ τῇν Φωσφόρον is a woman's oath at Ar. *Lys.* 443.

**22 Κλυταιμῆστρα:** the name should probably be read thus throughout, corrected from L's Κλυταιμνήστρα to the form attested for the fifth

century. (But see 208 and 209/8–13n. for a possible allusion to the alternative spelling.)

**23 τίκει:** for the tense, see 2n. Since Iph. is now of marriageable age, the birth must have taken place at least twelve years before the date to which she is referring; the vow has remained unfulfilled since then.

**καλλιστεῖον** the prize or winner's title in a beauty contest. Iph.'s interruption in her own person of Kalchas' speech is explanatory, but also suggests bitterness: her beauty was only misfortune to her. Cf. *Hel.* 27, τοῦμόν δὲ κάλλος, εἰ καλὸν τὸ δυστυχές, where the point is helped by the wide semantic range of καλός in Greek, and Soph. *Trach.* 25 (both from women's first-person prologue narratives).

**24–5 Ὀδυσσέως τέχναις ... Ἀχιλλέως** 'and by means of Odysseus' wiles they (a vague subject, referring to the Achaians, or some of them) took me away from my mother for a marriage with Achilles'. As so often in the Cyclic poems and in tragedy, Odysseus' cleverness is turned to evil or questionable use. The pretext of the marriage with Achilles was part of the *Cypria* story, according to Proclus, Bernabé p. 41; Euripides fully elaborates it in his later Iphigeneia play (*IA* 97–107 and *passim*). The emendation τέχναι gives a subject to παρείλοντ', but is scarcely necessary.

**26–7 ὑπὲρ πυρᾶς μεταρσία ληφθεῖς** 'held aloft over the fire'. In sacrifice animals such as sheep and goats were usually held over the altar as the blow was struck; the procedure here emphasises the horror of Iph.'s treatment as a sacrificial beast, and is a direct reminiscence of Aesch. *Ag.* 232–5, δίκαν χιμαίρας ... λαβεῖν ἄερδην.

**27 ἐκαινόμην:** the imperfect is used here for an uncompleted action; cf. 36on.

**ξίφει:** in a normal sacrifice, the implement used was a knife (μάχαιρα), which the μάγειρος (slaughterer-butcher) then used to cut up and prepare the animal for cooking. But in pre-battle sacrifice, often called σφάγιον, where the emphasis was on killing and divination rather than consumption, a sword was often used instead, mimicking the desired slaughter of the enemy (Jameson 1993). Since human sacrifice was said to have happened at moments of crisis, especially of a military nature, it is often imagined as falling in this category (cf. *Hec.* 543), and may have affinities with murder and/or death in battle as well as with sacrifice. The Taurian sacrificial ritual is different in some respects from Greek (621–6), but the sword is still used (cf. 621, 1190).

**28 ἀλλ' ἐξέκλεψέ μ'** for the story, see Introduction, pp. 4–5. Deer are closely associated with Artemis in her huntress aspect; she is frequently surnamed ἐλαφιβόλος, and called ἐλαφοκτόνος later in the play (1113). Wilkins on *Heracl.* 399–409 suggests that when human sacrifice is commuted, 'an animal from the non-sacrificial category is chosen'; but deer,

though wild, were not infrequently sacrificed, especially to Artemis: see Larson 2017. Some sort of equivalence between deer and girl may also lie behind the tradition. Girls probably performed rituals for Artemis connected with deer in some parts of the Greek world, as they did bear-rituals for her at Brauron; see Dowden 1989: 41–2. Young girls are also often compared to wild or immature animals in archaic and classical poetry; for examples specifically of deer or fawns, see Dodds on *Bacch.* 873–6, to which add Archil. 196A.46.

**29** The upper air or *aithēr* (see 43n.) has divine affinities, and gods can thus use it for the rapid transport of mortals when necessary. Helen was ‘hidden in folds of *aithēr*, in a cloud’ by Hermes (ἐν πτυχαῖσιν αἰθέρος | νεφέλῃ καλύψας, *Hel.* 44–5) and taken to a land ruled by a foreign king, in this case the Egypt of Proteus; the concealing cloud or mist is the usual Iliadic device for gods who wish to remove humans from their current place (e.g. *Il.* 3.381). The *aithēr* is commonly called ‘shining’ (λαμπρός, cf. *Ion* 1445, *Or.* 1087, *TrGF* 5.1 443; cf. also *IT* 1138).

**30** ἐς τήνδ’ ... Ταύρων χθόνα: this is the first verbal indication of the play’s setting, though spectators who knew the *Cypria* will have guessed it. The temple as described seems very much like a Greek one, so there were probably no visual clues to the location. But see 72–5n.

**31** βαρβαροῖσι βάρβαρος: a favourite form of tragic \*polyptoton. Compare, for instance, *Hipp.* 319, οὐχ ἐκοῦσαν οὐχ ἐκὼν and below, 62, ἀποῦσ’ ἀπόντι. Here the repetition has the function of underlining the ‘barbaric’ nature of both Thoas and the cult of the Taurian Artemis.

**32–3** The point is made at some length. Etymologising allusions to names are very common in tragedy; for the explanatory form compare especially *Hel.* 13–14, καλοῦσιν αὐτὴν Θεονόην· τὰ θεῖα γάρ | τὰ τ’ ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα πάντ’ ἠπίστατο. Ar. fr. 373 K–A (Θόας, βραδύτατος ὦν [τῶν MSS] ἐν ἀνθρώποις δραμεῖν) is clearly a parody of this line and this kind of explanation.

**34** Artemis, not Thoas, is the subject of τίθησι, for the establishment of Iph. as priestess completes the action begun with the removal from the altar and airborne transport to the land of the Taurians. Her later doubts (380–91) as to whether Artemis can really demand human sacrifice have no bearing on this, since the later passage views the matter in a quite different perspective.

The present tense of τίθησι probably indicates a past event leading to a continuous state; cf. γαμεῖ (2) and τίκτει (23) with nn.

ἱερεάν: a variant form of the more usual ἱέρειαν.

**35–40** ‘Whence, in accordance with the customs which please the goddess Artemis, I perform the beginning of the festival [but see below, 40], of which only the name is fair – but the slaughter is the business of others.



For the rest I am silent, fearing the goddess.' Iph. hints that there is a dark secret connected with the local worship of Artemis, and it is likely that many in the audience would either know or suspect that it entails human sacrifice. Nonetheless, it is dramatically effective (and perhaps also psychologically plausible) that she does not at first reveal this fact.

It is probable that lines 38-9 are an interpolation added to clarify the point, by someone who failed to appreciate the disadvantages of explicitness. Not only is it dramatically weak for Iph. to declare at this point the nature of her ritual duties, it is patently absurd for her to do so when she has just said (in the line-order of the text as transmitted) that she will keep silent about them. Line 41 is also very doubtful, because it is clear from the second part of the *prologos* (72ff.) that the sacrificial altar is as normal outside, not inside, the temple. Given that the original seems to have been thoroughly tampered with, it is also quite possible that some rearrangement of lines has taken place, and line 37, bringing a sense of closure on a note of enigmatic menace (echoing exactly the Watchman's words in the prologue of *Agamemnon*, line 36), is better transposed to follow 40.

**40** *κατάρχομαι* refers properly to the 'beginning' of the sacrificial rite, actions which included the cutting of a few hairs from the victim, its sprinkling with water, and the recitation of a prayer over it. These actions were performed by the priest or priestess (or other person, such as a magistrate or the male head of a household, presiding over the sacrifice); it was not necessary for the priest to wield the knife, and priestesses in particular did so only in exceptional cases, if at all. See further 621, 622nn. The commonest construction for the verb is with a genitive of the victim thus consecrated, but since the word can be used in a looser sense to refer to beginnings more generally, even outside a sacrificial context, a construction 'begin the festival' seems possible (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 304c, 655d). The two senses are to an extent merged, so that in one action Iph. begins the ritual and consecrates the victim.

**37** *τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη*: in normal religious circumstances, fear to say more might suggest that the speaker was reluctant to divulge secret rites (ἄρρητα, ἀπόρρητα), but Taurian human sacrifice is far from secret. Iph. refuses to continue because to do so would expose her revulsion from the custom. At 380-91 she will rebel and overcome her reluctance, but end on a note which exonerates the goddess from blame.

**42** *καινά* indicates a shift in subject matter, from older events to something new. It soon becomes clear that this is a new misfortune to add to those she has just related.

**43** *λέξω πρὸς αἰθέρ'*: both an excuse for Iph. to continue her monologue, and a way of drawing attention to it. At Soph. *El.* 424 Chrysothemis explains that Klytaimestra similarly wishes to reveal her dream to the sun,

and the scholiast comments that this was an ancient apotropaic custom: possibly merely an inference from the passage itself, but Babylonian and Assyrian parallels, in which Šamaš the sun god is the most frequent recipient of prayers to negate the effect of inauspicious dreams (West 1997: 54), might suggest otherwise. The αἶθήρ is not the air we breathe but the sky, and so more or less equivalent to the sun which exists within it. See also 29n.

εἴ τι δὴ τόδ' ἔστ' ἄκος 'if indeed this is any remedy', that is, if telling her dream to the sky can prevent its fulfilment. εἰ ... δὴ often suggests a degree of scepticism: see Denniston 1954: 223–4.

**44–55** Iph. dreams that she is in her old home in Argos, when the palace's roof and supporting columns are destroyed by an earthquake. Only one column remains, which sprouts hair and acquires a human voice, and she sprinkles this column with water, as if before a sacrifice.

Dreams, like other forms of omen and portent, are not infrequent in tragedy, though less common in Sophocles and Euripides than in Aeschylus (*Hec.* 68–78 is the only other example from Euripides' extant plays, if *Rhesus* is excluded). Although tragic dreams may, as here, represent as yet unknown events from the dreamer's point of view, they should generally be seen as predictive plot devices rather than as giving an insight into the dreamer's psychology, *pace* Devereux (1976: 259–317 on this and 'related' dreams). In this case, Iph.'s location in her old home in Argos is necessary for the interpretation of the remaining house pillar as Orestes, although secondarily it may express her wish to return. Similarly, the pillar's growth of hair and human voice, though it has the weirdness typical of real dreams, also helps to confirm the correctness of the identification. The remaining details will be shown to be prophetic, although not in the way Iph. herself interprets them.

**45 παρθενῶσι δ' ἐν μέσοις:** Iph. sleeps at home in her 'maiden chamber' (παρθενών), an inner room or rooms which served as bedrooms for the unmarried daughters of the house; this room will later be important as the location of Pelops' spear, the final and clinching token in the recognition scene (see 826 and n.). The emendation makes much better sense in context than the MS reading παρθένοισι δ' ἐν μέσοις, which has Iph. sleeping among her friends and equals. It is notable that her dream involves her sleeping and then waking elsewhere than her actual location; it may thus represent the 'false awakening' of actual dream experience.

**46–9** 'The earth's surface was shaken with an upheaval. Getting up and running outside I saw the upper stone-course of the house falling, and the whole building thrown in ruins to the ground from the tops of the pillars.' The whole section is in indirect statement following ἔδοξ' (44).

**47** **φεύγειν δὲ κᾶξω στᾶσα**: an instinctive, if misguided, response to an earthquake.

**48** **ἐρείψιμον**: from ἐρείπω ‘throw down, ruin’.

**51** **ἐπικράνων**: an ἐπικρανόν is something placed ‘on the head’; for a column, its capital, but the word’s more literal meaning helps to convey the merging of column and human figure in the dream. The word’s second syllable must be scanned long, implying a syllabic division ἐπικ-ράνων, which runs contrary to the word’s derivation from ἐπί and κρα-. Cf. ἐπέκλωσεν at *Or.* 12.

**52** **ξανθάς**: in reference to hair, the word usually means mid-brown. Blonde (or red) hair was characteristic of northern barbarians such as Thracians. See also 73n.

**53–4** ‘And I, paying respect to (observing) the stranger-killing craft which I possess, seemed to be sprinkling water ...’ Priests might not be religious experts in general, but they knew the correct methods to use for the divinity they served, whereas others might lack this knowledge; their knowledge could therefore be described as τέχνη. In *Euthyphro* 14e, Plato’s Socrates suggests that piety and gifts to the gods could be seen as an ἐμπορικὴ τέχνη. Iph.’s priestly expertise is of a particularly unusual kind; this is the first time she explains what it actually involves (see 35–40n.).

**54** **ὕδραίνειν**: infinitive with ἔδοξα understood from ἔδοξε at 50. At a sacrifice, the priest or priestess sprinkles the animal victim with water just before the kill (see 40n.). ὕδραίνω, however, unlike κατάρχομαι (40, 1154) and χερνίπτομαι (622), is not a technical term relating to this action, and may thus be linked with pouring water in other contexts: the funeral libations for Orestes (Whitman 1974: 8) and perhaps the purification rituals for Orestes and the statue of Artemis (Trieschnigg 2008: 475–8).

**55** **κλαίουσα**: the word is emphasised by its appearance at the beginning of the line, with a strong break in sense following.

**τοῦναρ δ’ ὥδε συμβάλλω τόδε**: although professional dream interpreters are known from Homer onwards (e.g. *Il.* 1.53), amateurs also tried their hand at deciphering prophetic dreams, as does the disguised Odysseus in *Od.* 19.535–58 (though Penelope is sceptical). In tragedy, the most famous dream interpretation is Orestes’ recognition that the snake which Klytaimestra gives birth to in her dream is himself (Aesch. *Cho.* 523–50). Iph.’s interpretation here relies on traditional imagery of support: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 897–8, and see Alexiou 2002: 193–4. The added twist is that though reasonable enough it is incorrect in a crucial particular; the dream will be fulfilled in a more literal manner than the dreamer imagines.

**56** **κατηρέάμην**: 40n.

**58** **χέρνιβες**: a χέρνιψ is a basin containing water for hand-washing (χεῖρ, νίπτω) or for sprinkling water on the victim (see Van Straten 1995: 31–43,

*ThesCRA* v.168–70); the word is used quite often in this play referring \*metonymically to sacrifice in general (see e.g. 643–5n.). See also Dem. 22.78, pairing χέρνιψ with κανοῦς (basket) to stand for sacrificial procedure, and the visual depictions of sacrifice given in the above works.

**59–60** If Iph. speaks these lines, she anticipates a possible objection that the dream figure might have referred to someone other than Orestes. Strophios was Agamemnon's brother-in-law (918–19 and 918n.), and his son Pylades is Orestes' cousin and loyal companion; but it is hard to see how he could possibly have been regarded as a 'pillar' of his *uncle's* house. According to the interpretation Iph. has just proposed at 57, only a son of Agamemnon would qualify. Lines 59–60 were probably added to indicate that she is unaware of the existence of Pylades, which will matter later, when she fails to recognise the name (249–50). An explanation for her ignorance is hardly necessary, and the lines should be deleted.

**61** χοάς: liquid offerings to the dead, an important part of funerary ritual; they are described at 160ff. (on which see 159–66n.).

**62** ἀποῦσ' ἀπόντι: '[myself], being absent, to him who is absent'. Rather than giving libations directly to Orestes' corpse or ashes, Iph. will pour them in his absence, while Orestes will receive them from a sister who is absent. This gives a much neater sense than παροῦσ' ἀπόντι, while the reading of L, παροῦσα παντί, makes no sense. Normally χοαί would be poured at the tomb, and so to perform the rite *in absentia* is second best (ταῦτα γὰρ δυνάμεθ' ἄν).

**63–5** σύν προσπόλοισιν ... πάρεισιν: the audience is here informed of the identity of the chorus, as also of the fact that the prologue will continue further before the parodos. It is understandable that Thoas has given the Greek priestess Greek handmaidens, but their ethnicity will later be crucial in the escape plot.

**65** εἴμ' ἔσω δόμων: a clear stage direction; it is essential for the plot that Iph. does not overhear the following dialogue and so realise the identity of the new arrivals. Like Ion (*Ion* 315), who is, however, a νεωκόρος (temple caretaker) rather than a priest, Iph. lives in the temple of the deity that she serves.

**67–122** *Orestes and Pylades discuss how best they should attempt to steal the statue of Artemis.* The second part of the scene introduces Orestes and Pylades, intent on the task that has been laid upon Orestes by Apollo, as gradually becomes clear. They identify the place where they have arrived, before Orestes addresses Apollo, giving the audience the explanation for their presence among the Taurians: the Delphic god has told him that he can finally rid himself of the remaining Erinyes, who are pursuing him after the murder of Klytaimestra, if he brings the statue of the Taurian Artemis to Attica and establishes it there. Orestes then addresses Pylades,

suggesting some approaches to the theft of the statue, but despairing at the difficulty of the task. Pylades strengthens his resolve, and the two make their exit in order to hide until nightfall, when they will make their attempt. As the meeting and recognition of Orestes and Iph. parallels the established story of the meeting between Orestes and Electra (Introduction, pp. 9–10), so too this second part of the prologue, and its relationship to the first half, is comparable to the second part of the prologue of Euripides' *Electra* (83–111).

**67** Orestes and Pylades enter slowly and warily. Stealth is necessary; even if the new arrivals were not conscious of the danger in which they stand as Greeks (or non-Taurians), their plan to steal the cult statue of Artemis would necessitate the utmost caution.

**ὄρα** here combines the sense of looking with that of being careful, keeping a watch: 'look out!'

**69–70** 'Pylades, do you think this is the abode of the goddess, (the place) to where we sent our seafaring ship from Argos?' The pair are identified for the audience by Orestes' naming of his friend, and (for the slower-witted) by Pylades' reply at 71. Line 70 breaks the regular \*stichomythia and could be a later addition to supplement the sense; stichomythia is often quite allusive. It is, however, roughly balanced by 75–6.

**71** σοὶ δὲ συνδοκεῖν χρεών 'one must agree with you'. χρεών with ἔστι understood ('there is need') is a very common usage in tragedy.

**72–5** These lines describe the altar and, probably, the temple exterior. The altar, like the rest of the sanctuary (see Bacon 1961: 132–6) is remarkably Greek in form. An altar normally stood outside the temple, and would show bloodstains from the sacrifices performed there, since it was usual to spatter it with the victim's blood (Burkert 1985: 59, Van Straten 1995: 104, and esp. Ekroth 2005); in this case Orestes and Pylades interpret what they see as the remains of the human sacrifice, specifically of Greeks, which they know to be practised here. θριγκώματα, if correct, must refer to the altar copings. The manuscript reading τριχώματα, 'growths of hair', makes little sense and may have come into the text due to the interpretation of the σκυῶνα as human heads (below), with perhaps a glance at Iph.'s dream of the pillar growing human hair: θριγκοῖς ... ὑπ' αὐτοῖς, 'under the actual copings', may then refer to the temple copings, where one might expect objects to be displayed rather than on the altar. Many commentators assume that the σκυῶνα ('spoils') in 74 are the severed heads of victims, which in the account of Herodotus (4.103, Introduction, p. 16) the Taurians set up on poles (ἀνασταύρουσι), presumably in the sanctuary (somewhat as the Greeks fixed heads of cattle to the walls, on which Van Straten 1995: 159–60), but there is nothing in the text to justify the assumption that Euripides has this custom in mind. Even though

a fourth-century vase shows a human head in the temple (Introduction, p. 45), such paintings are far from production snapshots, and it is better to assume that the σκῦλα are clothing, weapons, and other equipment taken from the sacrificial victims and dedicated as firstfruits or part-offerings, the normal meaning of ἀκροθίνια: see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 203 and Jim 2014: 45-6. On the whole description, see Wright 2005: 185.

**73 ξανθῖ:** ξανθός covers a range of yellow to brown; here it must be brownish, the colour of dried blood.

**75 γ'** here indicates agreement with what has been said and at the same time adds something, namely that the 'spoils' have been taken from dead strangers. This is a common usage in tragic \*stichomythia: see Denniston 1954: 133-5.

**76** This line must belong to Pylades, who probably suits the action to the words by moving off a short distance for a little while. Orestes is thus able to address Apollo in solitude, before turning to Pylades again at 94.

**77-103** *Orestes' speech.* Orestes' vengeance on Klytaimestra is always closely linked in tragedy to oracles given by the Delphic Apollo, and his pursuit by Erinyes after the deed is also traditional. Much less familiar, and possibly Euripides' own invention, is Apollo's advice to Orestes that he can make an end to this persecution by bringing the image of the Taurian Artemis to Athens (Introduction, pp. 8-9). There is as yet no hint that Euripides is giving any acknowledgement of the Aeschylean version, where Orestes is finally rid of the Erinyes by the casting vote of Athena in the Areopagos court (see 968-71 n. and Introduction, pp. 5-6). As well as supplying the audience with the necessary plot information, the first part of the speech expresses Orestes' sense of his endless difficulties and the near impossibility of the task he must accomplish.

**77-9** 'Why (to what end) have you once more led me into this snare with your prophecies, once I had avenged my father's blood through killing my mother?' The words indicate that Euripides is following the traditional story in which Orestes consults Apollo before killing Klytaimestra, and again afterwards in an attempt to rid himself of the Erinyes. The metaphor of hunting with nets is also traditional, inasmuch as the net is a powerful and recurrent image in Aeschylus' *Oresteia* trilogy. But the expected picture of the Erinyes as the hunters is at first replaced by Apollo, normally Orestes' protector, driving him into a hunting-net, perhaps actually in alliance with the Erinyes.

**79-81** 'And we (= I) are driven as fugitives, uprooted from (my) land, and I have completed (cf. γον.) travel on many roads which turn back on themselves.' διαδοχᾶς indicates apparently endless numbers or successive attacks, rather than literally 'relays' of unplacated Erinyes. Orestes' many wanderings as he tries to shake off his pursuers are a sign of his suffering,

but may also hint at an aetiological element, since he was associated in myth with various Greek localities, sometimes together with Erinys-like beings: see Introduction, pp. 5–6 and n. 14. For the language, compare the later account at 941–2: μεταδρομαῖς Ἐρινύων | ἡλαυνόμεσθα φυγάδες. (Hence the conjecture διαδρομαῖς in this passage.)

**δρόμους ... καμπίμους:** the metaphor is that of a racecourse, where the καμπή marks the turning-post; see 82–3n.

**82–92** When Orestes retells his story to Iph. (940–86), he says that Apollo's response at this point was to send him to Athens to undergo trial at the Areopagos; when some of the Furies are still not convinced by his acquittal, he goes for a third time to Delphi, and is told to bring back the Taurian Artemis to Attica. But at this point to go into such detail would be inappropriate to Orestes' mood, his (and the audience's) sense of danger, and the overt purpose of his speech.

**82–3 τροχηλάτου μανίας:** the pursuit by Erinyes brings madness in Aeschylus, where the chorus interpret Orestes' vision of the Furies as a disturbance of mind (*Cho.* 1048–62), and the 'binding hymn' of the chorus in *Eumenides* describes itself as παρακοπά, παραφορά, φρενοδαλῆς ... δέσμιος φρενῶν (*Eum.* 330–2, 342–5). In this play, the madness is vividly described in the Herdsman's speech (281–308 and nn.), and similarly in *Orestes* the insanity is sporadic, marked by hallucinations and symptoms reminiscent of epilepsy. The madness is 'wheel-driven' (cf. *Or.* 36, *El.* 1252–3, where τροχηλατεῖν is used as a verb, again in connexion with Orestes' madness), a metaphor from chariot racing, suggested also in the previous line by the δρόμους ... καμπίμους, 'roads with turnings (back)'; the sense is one of violent, rapid, and precarious motion. The language of 81–3 invites comparison with the later narrative at 971: δρόμοις ἀνιδρύτοισιν ἡλάστρουν μ' αἶε. The image of Orestes as a charioteer who has lost control of his horses first occurs at Aesch. *Cho.* 1022–3.

**84** This line is identical, apart from the verb form, to 1455, where it is a perfect fit for the context (περιπολῶν explaining Artemis' new epithet Ταυροπόλος). It is unnecessary here, and probably derives from a marginal note concerning passages.

**86 Ἄρτεμις σοι σύγγονος:** many Greek cults of Artemis, and many more of non-Greek goddesses identified with her, seem to indicate a personality rather different from the sister of Apollo. But the mythological connexion is nonetheless a strong one, and is naturally brought in here. The brother–sister pairing reflects that of Orestes and Iph. on the human level, a parallel made explicit at 1401–2 (see Introduction, pp. 41–2).

**88 οὐρανοῦ πεσεῖν ἄπο:** very ancient cult statues were thought particularly venerable, and this tale was told of several, notably the Palladion, the talismanic statue of Athena in Troy which was identified with one



of Athena's statues in Athens (among other places). See Burkert 1985: 91 n. 84 and Platt 2011: 96–7 with n. 68, comparing images from the sea as a form of divine epiphanic arrival. The testimony is mostly late, but Euripides' use of the motif suggests that it was already known. Here, Orestes attributes the belief to local (if we should read οὐνθάδε) or general tradition, in either case, we must assume, repeating what he has been told by Apollo. From the audience's point of view, φασιν (87) may act as a distancing device, expressive of the uncertainty of traditions remote in space and time.

**89** Results may be gained by skill or through luck or chance; the antithesis is pointed through the assonance between τέχνη and τύχη, as also in *On Ancient Medicine* 1–2, 12, with other Hippocratic texts, and, in tragedy, at Agathon *TrGF* 1 fr. 6 and (with an emendation) fr. 8. See Whitman 1974: 6–7.

**90 κίνδυνον ἐκπλήσαντ'** 'undergoing danger to the end', with the notion of completeness, like ἐξέπλησα in 81.

**Ἀθηναίων χθονί:** so far in Orestes' account there is no reason for him to bring the statue to Attica, and so this instruction is somewhat puzzling, though an Athenian audience may have found it easier to accept; his earlier experiences in Athens are not narrated until 943–67.

**91 οὐδὲν ἐρρήθη πέρα:** 978 shows that the 'gift' of the statue is to include its establishment (ἐγκαθιδρύσαι, 978n.) in a cult place, but no instructions on its form of worship are given. These will be revealed by Athena *ex machina* at the end of the play (1456–61). The line is not contradicted by the next, which is not a command but a revelation of the consequences for Orestes if he performs what he has been told to do.

**93–115** In the second part of the speech, Orestes turns to Pylades, who must be presumed to have returned to his side after examining the neighbourhood, and reviews possible methods of stealing the statue. Should they scale the outer temple walls, or try to force the doors? He gives in to despair at the danger and difficulty of the task, before his nerve is strengthened by Pylades.

**93 πεισθεῖς σοῖς λόγοισιν:** a first indication of Pylades' role in emboldening Orestes, picked up in 104–5.

**94 ἄξενον:** the 'inhospitality' of the Taurian land, with a reference to the Axeinos/Euxeinos Pontos (Black Sea, usually in this play itself called ἄξε(ι)νος; see 125n.), is a recurrent motif in the drama. At 75 it is already revealed that previous ξένοι have been killed.

**96–7 ἀμφίβληστρα ... τοίχων ... ὑψηλά** 'high encirclings of walls', for 'high encircling walls'. Line 96 has an unusual rhythm, with a marked break in the first metron and the caesura obscured by the close connexion of γάρ, unusually late in the line, with the preceding word (ἀμφίβληστρα).



**97 κλιμάκων προσαμβάσεις:** the ‘upward approaches of ladder-steps’ is a periphrasis for ‘ladders’. Having pointed out the height of the walls, Orestes wonders how to get over them, but concludes that if they try they will be seen. The phrase, paralleled in *Phoen.* 483, 1173, *Bacch.* 1213, is a plausible correction for δωμάτων πρὸς ἀμβάσεις, ‘towards the ascents of the building’, which is obscure.

**98 ἄν** is sometimes repeated for emphasis (Smyth §1765b); here, it stresses the unlikelihood of avoiding detection: ‘however could we ...?’

**99–100** Orestes’ second idea is to use crowbars to force the bolts (χαλκότευκτα κληῖθρα) of the temple doors, but he realises that death will be the inevitable result of detection. This much is clear, but the text is very uncertain. As it is transmitted, Orestes appears to break off his sentence: ‘Or, loosening the bronze-crafted bolts with crowbars, of which we know nothing—But if we are caught opening the doors ...’ This is not very satisfactory, since in addition to the syntactical awkwardness it adduces two objections to the plan when only one is necessary. Alternatives are: (a) emending ὦν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν, though no entirely convincing emendation has been proposed; (b) retaining MS μάθοιμεν for λάθοιμεν at 98 and deleting 99, resulting in ‘how could we learn what we do not know?’, presumably where to find ladders, though this is not very clear; (c) assuming a line has fallen out after 99.

**100 ἀνοίγοντες:** a common alternative form of the present participle, as if from \*ἀνοίγω rather than ἀνοίγνυμι.

**104–5** Pylades emphatically rejects Orestes’ despairing conclusion. His rhetorical strategy is to encourage Orestes with the implication that his apparent cowardice is not characteristic (also reassuring the audience) and that they are in this together (‘it is not *our* custom’). His follow-up point, made in the second of two end-stopped lines linked by μέν and δέ, is that they should not dishonour the god’s oracular pronouncement; this recalls his crucial intervention in Aeschylus (*Cho.* 900–2), reminding the hesitating Orestes of Apollo’s prophecies.

**105** The postponed δέ may give emphasis to the word immediately preceding, θεοῦ, but it is also metrically convenient: cf. 380.

**106–12** Pylades’ practical advice now follows: they should hide in a cave, at a distance from their ship, until nightfall, and then make their attempt. This is sensible, but it draws our attention to the awkward fact of the ship – surely the vessel will in any case alert the Taurians to the presence of strangers? Pylades’ proposal to keep at a distance from the craft does not quite deal with this. In fact, the sight of the ship comes as a complete surprise to the Taurians delegated to accompany Iph. as she purifies the statue and the intended victims (1345ff.). The cave the pair choose is identical with the ‘hollow cliff’ (263) where the Herdsman and his companions will later spot them.

**107** ‘... in caves which the dark sea washes over with moisture ...’

**110** *νυκτὸς ὄμμα λυγαίας*: ὄμμα and synonyms are often used in poetic language to indicate ‘appearance’, and this phrase (‘the face of shadowy night’) is closely paralleled in *Phoen.* 543, as well as Aesch. *Pers.* 428.

**111-12** *ξεστόν ... ἄγαλμα*: the adjective (‘polished’) may be an etymological allusion to the word *ξόανον* for the statue (see Donohue 1988: 9-12), though this is, perhaps surprisingly, used only once; see 1359n.

**112-14** Mention of *πάσας μηχανάς* leads Pylades to consider a possible *μηχανή* – entering the temple through some empty space. The text is, however, corrupt and/or lacunose. As transmitted it would mean something like: ‘But see inside the triglyphs, to where (or, with an emendation, where) an empty (space) to let down a body’, and it has often been supposed that the proposal is to enter the temple through a space in the frieze. But there are serious problems with this. Even if εἴσω could mean ‘between’, there is no evidence that there were ever empty spaces between triglyphs (the vertical sections of the frieze on a Doric temple). It is possible that ‘triglyphs’ could be used to mean the frieze as a whole, as seems to be the case in *Or.* 1372 and probably *Bacch.* 1214, in which case some sort of space between the frieze and the roof is envisaged; or more likely (Roux 1961) ‘within the triglyphs’ might refer to the whole roof space, and Pylades is pointing out a hole in the roof. The linguistic problems are more intractable. The combination *δέ γε* should be strongly adversative, which is inappropriate for the sense (Pylades is backing up, not contradicting, his previous words), and the construction of the infinitive *καθεῖναι* is obscure. We can, however, be reasonably certain that the suggestion is indeed to enter the temple through some empty space. See also Kovacs 2003: 4-6.

**114-17** Pylades gives two reasons for not giving up. The first is a generalising noble sentiment: ‘the brave/good dare (to take on) trials, but cowards are nowhere’. This is in accord with standard aristocratic Greek ethics as seen notably in the epinician poetry of Pindar, where the victor is typically praised for striving in a way appropriate to his status and excellence, and paralleled elsewhere in Euripides: fr. 237, from *Archelaus*, further links the obligation laid on those of good repute with youth (cf. 122), while fr. 519 (from *Meleager*) reiterates the idea that cowards ‘do not count’ (*οὐκ ἔχουσιν ... ἀριθμόν*). The second (attributed to Orestes in the manuscript, deleted by some editors, and moved elsewhere by others) is a more practical point: ‘we have certainly not come a long journey by oar but will start again from our goal on our return journey’ (*οὐ* negates the whole statement, not just the first clause, so the sense is that they have not come such a long way only to return home). The lines cannot belong to Orestes, since 118 must introduce his reply to his friend. For *οὐδαμοῦ*

(115), ‘out of the running’, see Collard and Stevens 2018: 111; the double negative is emphatic.

**120–1** ‘For I will not be responsible for (letting) the god’s prophecy fall useless. (We) must dare.’ Having accepted Pylades’ argument, Orestes adds a further point: for his part, he will not neglect the god’s oracular command and cause the divine plan to fail (whatever the god himself does). The manuscript reading τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γ’ αἴτιον γενήσεται, by contrast, should mean that the god would not allow his pronouncement to go unfulfilled. Even given Orestes’ newfound resolve at this point, this would be a remarkable contrast with his earlier negative attitude to the Delphic Apollo, and does not fit well into the sequence of thought between 118–19 and 122.

**122** ‘No labour provides an excuse for the young’, the young have no excuse for not taking on toil and hardship. Again this is a commonplace: fr. 237 (above, 114–17n.) and fr. 461 (from *Cretan Women*) are further Euripidean examples.

### 123–235 PARODOS

The parodos, like those of *Med.*, *Heracr.*, *El.*, *Tro.*, *Ion*, *Hel.*, and *Or.*, is divided between the chorus and an actor (in some cases more than one actor participates). Here Euripides uses the form to establish the important relationship between protagonist and chorus. Although many of Euripides’ plays have a female chorus who are sympathetic to the female protagonist, the bond between Iph. and the chorus of Greek women in this play is particularly close; not only are they her servants, they are in the same position of unwilling presence in a foreign land. The closest parallel, as often, is found in *Helen*.

As if beginning a ritual for the goddess, the chorus launch into something like a processional hymn, starting with an invocation to Artemis, which leads into a recollection of their enforced transition from their homes in Greece to their current position. But, as we know from her prologue speech, Iph. has summoned them not to worship the goddess but to assist in an improvised funeral ritual for her brother. Lamentation is itself part of such ritual, and Iph. as chief mourner begins the dirge (at 143), which the chorus answer at 179 (ἀντιψάλμους ὠιδάς indicating the format). But Iph. also pours out χοαί, drink-offerings to the dead, one of the most important and characteristic actions in funeral ritual (159–73), giving the parodos a central visual component. From this point on, both chorus and Iph. extend their lament to the house of Atreus more generally, and finally Iph. laments her own fate, returning to the death of Orestes, as the final blow, in the last lines. The division of lines given in L is plainly impossible

at some points, and there has been some disagreement among modern editors. The chief difficulties concern lines 123-5 and 188-201: see below.

### *Metre*

After the anapaestic introduction, the song proper opens with two dochmiacs in 'dragged' form, the penultimate syllable lengthened so that the unit consists of five long syllables. This introduces a system of lyric anapaests which is heavily spondaic, common enough in anapaestic lyric, but appropriate here not only because of the solemn tone of lament but also because suited to the action of libation. The units are mainly dimeters, with some single anapaestic metra and a few possible tripodies. Despite the chorus' claim to sing 'answering songs' (177) there is no strophic responsion.

123	-----	an dim
	-----	an
125	----- ~	an dim
	-----	dochmiac ('dragged')
	-----	doch
	-----	anapaestic dimeter catalectic
	-----	an dim cat
130	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ -	an dim
	-----	an dim cat
	- υ υ - - - -	an dim cat
	-----	an dim
135	-----	an dim cat
	-----	an dim cat
	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ -	an dim
	υ υ - - - - υ υ - υ υ	an dim
	-----	an dim
140	-----	an dim
	- υ υ - - υ υ - -	an dim
	< >	
	< ~ ~ > - - - -	an dim cat
	-----	an
	-----	an dim cat
145	-----	an dim
	- υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ -	an dim
	υ υ - - - -	an dim cat
	-----	an dim
	- υ υ - υ υ - υ υ -	an dim

150	--υυ--υυ--	an dim
	-----	an dim cat
	υυ-υυ-	an
	-----	an dim cat
155	-----	an dim cat
	-----	an dim cat
	----	an
	υυ-υυ-----	an dim
	υυ-----υυ-	an dim
160	-----υυ-υυ-	an dim
	-----	an dim
	-----	an dim
	-----	an dim cat
165	--υυ--υυ--	an dim cat
	-----υυ--	an dim
	-----	an dim cat
	-----	an dim cat
170	-υυ-- υυ-υυ-	an dim
	υυ-υυ- υυ----	an dim
	-----	an dim
	-----υυ--	an dim
175	-υυ-- υυ--	an dim
	υυ-υυ- υυ-υυ	an dim
	-----	an dim cat
	-----	an dim
180	υυ-- υυ--	an dim
	-----	an dim
	-----υυ-υυ-	an dim
	-----	an dim
185	υυ----	an
	-----	an dim
	-----	an dim cat
	υυ----	an
	-----	an dim
190	υυ-<----->--	an dim
	-----	an dim cat
	<. . . . .>	
	-----υυ-	an dim
	-----	an dim
	υυ-<υυ->----	an dim cat

195	- ∪ ∪ - - - - ∪ ∪ -	an dim
	- - - - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ -	an dim
	[ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ] ?	
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
200	- - - - - - ∪ ∪ -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	∪ ∪ - - -	an
	- - - - - - - -	an dim cat
	- - <            ?	
	> - - - - - ?	
205	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	∪ ∪ - - - - - -	an dim cat
	- - - - - - - -	an dim cat
209	- - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ -	an dim
208	- - - - - - - -	an dim
210	- - - - - - - -	an dim cat
	∪ ∪ - - - - - -	an dim cat
	- - - - - - ∪	an dim cat
	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ - - -	an tripod? (see n.)
	- - - - - - - -	an dim cat
215	∪ ∪ - - ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ - -	an dim cat
	- - - - - - - -	an dim cat
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim cat
220	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	an trip? (see n.)
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
225	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- - - - - - ∪ ∪ -	an dim
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
230	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ ∪	an dim
	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	an trip?
	- - - - - - - -	an dim
	- - - - ∪ ∪ - -	an dim cat

**123–5** Iph. re-enters from the temple, accompanied by one or more attendants (168–9n.) bearing the equipment for the offerings to Orestes. At the same time the chorus make their first entry along the *parodoi* (or perhaps one *parodos* representing the road from the town; see Introduction, p. 23). As priestess it is appropriate for Iph. to command silence at the beginning of a ceremony, and the chorus, composed of her servants and assistants, follow up with an address to the goddess.

L assigns the whole of 123–36 to Iph., but at least 126–36 must be given to the chorus (κληιδούχου δούλα, 131). Many editors attribute the whole to the chorus, which is not impossible, but there is a good parallel for a short opening from the main character followed by a choral section in *Hipp.* 58–72 (also near the beginning of the play and also in a context of prayer), and her initial command nicely establishes the important relation between herself and the chorus, as well as indicating her authority in the Taurian community (she addresses the whole population, as masculine *ναῖοντες* shows).

**123 εὐφραμεῖτ'**: properly 'speak words of good omen', but when it appears as a command in a ritual context *εὐφραμεῖν* means 'be silent'. It is usual to address the bystanders with this command at the beginning of a ceremony, to avoid inauspicious or unseemly noises. See Naiden 2012: 149–51 and for an extended treatment, including the literary use of the concept, Gödde 2011. If Iph. speaks the words, she opens her prayer to the goddess by in effect commanding silence from the local inhabitants and enjoining auspicious words from her attendants.

**123–5 δισσᾶς συγχωρούσας πέτρας**: *ναῖω* may take a direct object of the place inhabited. The 'clashing rocks', Symplegades, are known chiefly from the Argo story (Pind. *Pyth.* 4.209–10; E. *Med.* 2, Ap. Rhod. 2.317–40, 549–610) as a variant of (or addition to) the 'wandering rocks', Planktai, mentioned in this connexion in the *Odyssey* (12.59–72). They were said to be situated at the entrance to the Black Sea from the Sea of Marmara, and are here referred to \*metonymically to indicate the Black Sea area in general. (In fact, Tauroi is a long way from the Black Sea entrance; see Introduction, pp. 17–19.)

**125** Euripides links the inhospitality of the area, extending as far as the slaughter of ξένοι, to the name of the Black Sea itself. Although here and in some other passages the manuscripts have 'normalised' the sea's name to εὐξεινος, ἄξεινος/ἄξενος appears in other parts of the text and should probably be read throughout. It is possible that ἄξεινος was the original form of the name, deriving from Old Iranian *axšaēna*, 'dark', and re-formed in Greek to mean 'inhospitable' (Allen 1947).

**126–36** In response to Iph.'s command for εὐφημία, the chorus begin a sort of hymnic address, although after a brief invocation to Artemis they focus more on themselves and their temple service in a strange land.

**127 Δικτυνν' οὐρεία:** Diktynna was originally a Cretan goddess with a famous sanctuary in Kydonia (Hdt. 3.59.2), and identified with the equally Cretan Britomartis by later writers. In the fifth century she was often identified with or approximated to Artemis (cf. Ar. *Frogs* 1358, though the name Artemis there may be a gloss), as here ('Leto's child'). Both Diktynna and Artemis are associated with wild places (οὐρεία, 'of the mountains').

**128–9** '... to your court, the gilded copings of the lovely-pillared temple' (ναῶν, plural for singular). Again the temple is described as resembling a Greek building (cf. 72–5 and n.). For gold used in the decoration of temples, cf. χρυσήρεις οἴκους, *Ion* 157.

**130–1** Lit. 'Slave of the sanctified keyholder, I send my sanctified maiden foot' (to your court, πρὸς σάν αὐλάν, 128). The chorus stress the religious propriety of their arrangements. ὁσιος indicates not something holy in itself, but something which is acceptable to the gods. Just as the temple resembles a Greek one, so (aside from the crucial particular of the human sacrifice) the style of worship practised here is reminiscent of Greece, with the chorus representing a group of young girls such as those who are often gathered for the worship of Artemis. But they are also slaves, an important factor in their depiction; here they refer to themselves specifically as the personal slaves of Iph. See Introduction, pp. 40–1 and Kowalzig 2013: 203–4.

κληιδούχος, 'keyholder', indicates 'priestess', and the verb κληιδουχεῖν is used later (1463) to describe Iph.'s future position at Brauron. The word can be used of male priests also (*Hypsipyle*, fr. 752h28 = Bond fr. 1.iv.28), but whereas grave reliefs of priests give prominence to the sacrificial knife, priestesses are depicted holding the huge temple key, so that their role as keepers of the divine house is emphasised (Connelly 2007: 92–104, showing also vase-paintings of Iph. herself holding the key, evidently inspired by this play).

**132–5** 'leaving the towers and walls of well-horsed Hellas, and Europe with its pastures of fine trees'. The construction Ἑλλάδος εὐίππου πύργους καὶ τεῖχη is in a sense reversed by the following χόρτων ... εὐδένδρων ... Εὐρώπαν. In the first, Ἑλλάδος is a genitive of possession, while χόρτων εὐδένδρων is a descriptive genitive. As we learned at 64, and as no doubt was obvious from their dress, the chorus are Greek women; later we discover that they are war captives, sold on into the Tauric Chersonese (1105–15). The passage is reminiscent of Mardonios' advice to Xerxes in Hdt. 7.5.3, both in the near-synonymous use of 'Hellas' and 'Europe', and in its characterisation of the land as fruitful and full of trees. The land of the Scythians, on the other hand, does not produce wood (Hdt. 4.61.1) – although the Taurians pasture their cattle among trees (261). The walls,



towers, and horses suggest the warlike capacities of the people as well as their cities (for horses, cf. ἵππιόν τ' Ἄργος, 700). The emendation Εὐρώταν (the river of Sparta; cf. 400, where it is mentioned in parallel with Dirke, the river representing Thebes) for Εὐρώπαιαν has found some favour, but is unnecessary. The fact that the Taurian peninsula itself was considered technically to be in Europe, though known to Herodotus (4.45.2 attests the river Phasis as the boundary), would probably be lost on a majority of the Athenian audience, for whom places east of Greece would be 'Asia'; and there seems no point in identifying the chorus as natives of Sparta in particular. Elsewhere they are Greeks of unspecified cities.

**137** The chorus cease their address to Artemis and turn to her priestess, who at 63–5 gave us to understand that she had asked them to attend; evidently she has not told them why.

**138** ἄγαγες ἄγαγες: this simple kind of repetition (\*anadiplosis) is characteristic of Euripidean lyric, and parodied by Aristophanes in *Frogs* 1352–5.

**139–42** 'O child of him who came to the towers of Troy with glorious sailing (lit. oar) of a thousand ships and ten thousand sets of arms ...' The chorus address Iph. with an elaborate and heroic periphrasis, honouring her as the daughter of Agamemnon, conqueror of Troy, looking back to her own proud awareness of her paternal ancestry (as evidenced in her prologue speech), but also with some irony, given that they and she are as yet unaware of his fate. χιλιοναύται μυριοτεύχει (note the repeated metrical and semantic form, with large number plus noun) again emphasises the scale of the expedition (see 10n.). Agamemnon's journey and victory over an Asian city contrasts with the women's unwilling travel to Asia in the previous lines (see Introduction, p. 18).

It is likely that some words describing Agamemnon have fallen out before Ἀτρειδᾶν τῶν κλεινῶν. The manuscript reading of the preceding words is χιλιοναύτα μυριοτεύχοις; emending the latter to μυριοτεύχους gives two genitives qualifying τοῦ ἐλθόντος, yet the words are far better applied to the expedition (κῶπαι) than to its leader. A suitably honorific description is then required for Agamemnon, of which the genitive plural Ἀτρειδᾶν τῶν κλεινῶν can be only part. A less satisfactory alternative is to supply a single word, e.g. γένος or σπέρμ', so that the line refers again to Iph.; but 'child of the glorious sons of Atreus' is a strange description.

**143–56** In answer, Iph. revisits the dream she has earlier recounted and the interpretation she has given it, but this time in lyric style – with the appropriate vocabulary and arrangement of words, but also elliptically and with much lamentation. Treatment of the same material, by the same character, in both lyric and trimeter form is a notable feature of tragedy, allowing a situation to be explored in different registers, but it is more common

for the lyric version to precede the spoken trimeters: see, e.g., Heath 1987: 126. Iph. tells the chorus that she has had a dream in consequence of which she believes her brother dead, and begins to offer him funerary libations.

**144** *δυσθρηνήτοις ... θρήνοις*: this expression is rather different from the usual noun-and-adjective grouping where the noun's root is repeated in the adjective with a negative prefix (α-privative or δυσ-), which is a very frequent figure in tragedy (e.g. Soph. *OT* 1214, ἄγαμον γάμον, 'marriage which is no marriage'; *IT* 216, νύμφαν ... δύσνυμφον, 'a bride ill-bridalled'; cf. 201, 566, 889). Such examples are \*oxymoronic and usually, though not always, negate something that normally has positive connotations. Here, the effect of the adjective is to intensify the noun's negative associations. Comparable is 203-4, δυσδαίμων δαίμων, and closer still Soph. *Ant.* 1276, πόνοι ... δύσπονοι.

**144-5** *ὥς ... ἔγκειμαι* 'how (exclamatory use of ὥς) I lie in the midst of (am beset by) ...'

**145-6** *τὰν οὐκ εὔμουσον ... βοάν* (roughly 'the cry without well-omened music') and *ἀλύροις ἐλέγοις* ('with lyreless elegies') may each express a similar point, contrasting the musical form of the lament being sung (thus self-referential) with the joyousness which music often suggests. οὐκ εὔμουσον does not mean 'unmusical', and ἀλύροις may similarly convey no more than 'lacking in celebration'. But it is also possible that Euripides alludes to the association of elegy with the aulos rather than the lyre, and rather more clear that he refers to a view which links the elegiac metre with lament and an etymology (certainly current in later times) from ἔξ ἔλεγειν, showing his interest in the history and theory of poetry: Bowie 1986: 22-7. (Some editors change ἔξ in line 147 to αἰᾶ, which suits the metrical context if the text mentioned below is adopted, but removes the etymological point.) The topos of sound without joyful music, especially without lyres, is a familiar one in tragedy (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 990, E. *Phoen.* 1028, and almost certainly the exact phrase ἄλυρον ἔλεγον at *Hel.* 185). Cf. below, 184-5: τὰν ἐν μολπαῖς Ἀιδας ὑμνεῖ δίχα παιάνων.

An alternative method of dealing with L's unmetrical text in these lines is to retain the genitives in τᾶς οὐκ εὔμούσου μολπᾶς and delete βοάν: 'in lyreless elegies of the melody without joyful music'.

**147** *ἐν κηδείῳ οἴκτοις*: juxtaposed with 'laments', the obvious meaning of κηδείος is 'pertaining to a funeral'. But since the root meaning of κηδος is 'care, concern', there is an underlying implication of 'laments for loved ones'.

**148-9** 'Disasters come upon me, disasters, as I weep for my brother'. ἄτη in tragedy generally means 'ruin, disaster', rather than its typical epic sense of the kind of catastrophic misjudgement which precipitates a disaster.

**150–5** From the presumed death of her brother, Iph. moves to its corollary, the end of her father's *oikos*, in accordance with the dream interpretation which originally (55–7) led her to make the connexion in the opposite direction, and finally to Argos as a whole, where troubles derive from those of the ruling house.

**150–1** 'Such a vision of dreams I saw in the night whose darkness has passed.' τοῖαν is exclamatory; ἰδόμεν, like epic ἰδόμην, is unaugmented aorist middle, equivalent in sense to the active. ἐξέρχομαι often has a temporal sense, referring to the end of a period of time.

**156** τῶν Ἄργει μόχθων: genitive of exclamation, 'alas for ...'

**157** δαῖμον can indicate either a god, or some vague external force bringing about a sudden (usually unpleasant) change: for the range of meaning, see Eidinow 2011: 44–5.

**158–9** 'you who rob me of my only brother, sending him to Hades'. συλᾶν (with double accusative) is a strong word, something like 'plunder'. Those who lament focus frequently on the effect of the death on themselves, sometimes even reproaching the dead person for dying (Alexiou 2002: 182–4); Iph. does not go that far, perhaps because her lament is about to modulate into the making of offerings to the dead man.

**159–66** '... for whom I intend to cause these offerings and this bowl of the dead to make wet the surface of the earth: streams from mountain cattle, and the winy pourings of Bacchos, and the work of darting bees, which are poured out as things to soothe the dead'. χοαί, the 'pourings' of liquid offerings to the dead and sometimes to underworld deities, are distinct from σπονδαί, libations to the gods, although both may be included in the word λοιβαί (164, 169; cf. Soph. *El.* 51–3 for the use of λοιβαί in connexion with funerary ritual). Both kinds of offering may involve the liquids mentioned here (milk, wine, honey), as well as water and oil, although in σπονδαί wine is by far the most commonly used substance, and conversely, it is sometimes prohibited in χοαί. The distinction resides in the method of pouring: σπονδαί are poured sparingly, from a cup or mixing-bowl usually on to a nearly flat dish and thence on to an altar or sometimes the ground, while in χοαί vessels are emptied completely, into the earth (at the tomb where appropriate and possible). For the ritual, see Garland 2001: 113–15. Iph. is aware that she is unable to perform the ritual in the best way at the tomb (61–2, 173–4), but in other respects her words suggest the ceremoniousness of the actions. Libations of different sorts are frequently described in tragedy, e.g. in great detail at Soph. *OC* 468–90. The elaborate periphrases for the liquids, recalling the description of the liquids used in the ritual for Darius in Aesch. *Pers.* (610–15, perhaps a model for Euripides), emphasise their value and purity. The vessel used is entirely of gold (168), a substance not only valuable but

pure (cf. 1216n.). Evidently the three liquids are mixed together in one bowl (κρατήρα, 160).

**159–60** χοάς ... κρατήρά τε: ‘choai and bowl’ is equivalent to ‘a bowlful of choai’.

**161** ὑγραίνειν: the normal construction with acc. of the thing made wet and dat. of the wetting instrument (‘to wet the ground with libations’) is here reversed (‘to wet/pour libations on the ground’).

**165** ξουθάν ... μελισσάν: the word ξουθός seems not to be a colour term, probably referring instead to rapid movement or the glancing effect of light. It may be, however, that in Euripides’ time the word had become a conventional epithet with little or no sense of its actual meaning remaining: Silk 1983: 317–19.

**πόνημα**: for honey or honeycomb as the toil or work of bees, cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 6.50 μελισσάν ... τρητὸν πόνον.

**166** θελκτήρια: ‘comforts’, with a sense of gifts which will gain the good will of the dead person. The word echoes μελικτήρια in the corresponding description in Aesch. *Pers.* (610); cf. also E. *Hec.* 535–6, where χοαί are called κληκτήριοι (propitiatory). The dead, even when close kin, are potentially dangerous and must be kept on side.

**168–9** Iph. speaks here not to a member of the chorus, who were unaware of the reason for their summons (137), but to a silent attendant at her side.

**170–8** Just as prayer accompanies a libation to the gods, so a similar address to the recipient is spoken as choai are poured. Iph. announces her action to the dead Orestes and asks him to receive her offering, in accordance with standard practice (Naiden 2012: 52–5). She further adds a regretful and part-apologetic explanation of her inability to make offerings at the actual tomb.

**170** Ἀγαμεμόνιον: the adjective formed from a personal noun, used in a patronymic sense, is an epic and tragic alternative to the genitive case; cf. Ταντάλειος, line 1. This form recurs at 1115, with Ἀγαμεμόνειος at 1290.

**171** θάλλος, from θάλλω denoting growth and flourishing, is (unlike θάλλος) always applied to a human offspring. Iph. uses it twice more in the parodos (at 209 and 233).

**172–4** Mourners typically make offerings of hair and shed tears; cf. *Od.* 24.46. The parallelism suggests that the tears too are perceived as a sort of offering to the dead, almost a form of χοή.

**176–8** The concrete expression (‘I lie slaughtered in appearance’, rather than ‘I am thought to lie slaughtered’) echoes the expression of 6–9, ‘whom ... her father slaughtered ... as it seems’. ἃ τλάμων (‘miserable one’) reflects the situation of both the supposedly sacrificed

and the real Iph., far from her homeland and bereaved of her brother. See Introduction, pp. 32–3.

**179–202** The chorus take up Iph.'s lament, recalling the tribulations of the royal house of Argos, of which Orestes' supposed death and Iph.'s consequent grief and isolation are the latest instalment.

L gives only 179–85 to the chorus, 186 onwards to Iph., but this cannot be right: 202 must belong to the chorus (since σοί cannot mean Orestes, who has not been mentioned recently), 203 to Iph. Some editors give 186–91 to Iph., the rest to the chorus (see 187–8n.), but this has the disadvantage that the chorus fail to fulfil their signal that they will lament. It is best to take the whole of 179–202 as the chorus' response to Iph.

**179 ἀντιψάλμους ᾠδᾶς** 'songs which are played in response' (ψάλλω is to play a stringed instrument). The chorus indicate that they will reply to Iph., although there is no formal metrical correspondence.

**179–80 ὕμνον τ' Ἀσιήταν ..., βάρβαρον ἄχάν** 'and an Asiatic strain, a foreign sound'. Lament, though a native Greek custom, was in its less restrained forms often associated with 'barbarians', but here, although the chorus are Greek, the association is especially apt because of the play's setting, and no doubt the music was designed to suggest an Asiatic flavour. In later songs, the chorus will treat Greek themes and emphasise their own Greekness in a foreign land.

**181–5** '... the unhappy muse (= song) among laments for the dead which (τάν = ἄν, ἦν) Hades sings in melodies far removed from paians'. νέκυσι is a dative loosely attached to θρήνοις with the idea 'intended for, given to'. The image of Hades himself singing dirges is perhaps comparable with that of Apollo singing paians (*Ion* 905–6), and more generally with visual depictions of gods engaged in libation and sacrifice: the deity is thought of as pursuing activities which humans associate with him. For μολπαὶ δίχα παϊάνων see 145–6 and n. Paians are typically sung for Apollo and evoke or celebrate the power of the god to save, so that even when sung in danger they are hopeful; see Rutherford 2001, esp. 48–50. Tragedy often juxtaposes or contrasts paians and laments: cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 342–3, Soph. *OT* 5.

**187–8** Addressing Iph., the chorus identify Orestes as light and sceptre of her father's house. For 'light' used figuratively to indicate salvation, see 847–9n.; for the sceptre see 235n. Some have felt that πατρίων οἴκων should indicate that these lines belong to Iph., but this is not necessary. The chorus bewail the royal house of Argos because it is quite normal in lament to adopt the perspective of the chief mourner, outwardly at least: so at Patroklos' death, the slave women lament apparently for him, but in actuality each for her own loss (*Il.* 19.302). In this play, the chorus' private troubles come into view only later, in the first stasimon.

**189-202** In the whole of this section the text of L is extremely corrupt and it is impossible to have complete confidence in any proposed emendation.

**189-91** 'The origin of the current disaster (τᾶς νῦν ἄτυχας) was from the prosperous kings of Argos.' This text incorporates Murray's correction ἦν for L's τίς, and Diggle's supplement in the second line; but it has also been suspected that either Ἀργεῖ or ἄρχαί is corrupt. It seems that the chorus here begin to trace the troubles of the Tantalids, which is certainly the subject of the following lines.

**192-5** '... when the sun, changing (course) with his whirling winged mares, moved the holy face of his beams from its place'. However, at least one line must have fallen out before or after 192, and from L it is not clear whether the horses are those of the Sun, as suggested in this text and translation, or the winged horses of Pelops (for their wings, see Pind. *Ol.* 1.87 and Pausanias' description of the sixth-century chest of Kypselos, 5.17.7), the place where Iph. begins her family history in the prologue (1-2). Some change is necessary to L's text of 192, but if we reject Wecklein's supplement of ἐπεῖ and instead correct ἵπποισι to ἵπποις (which in turn will involve something other than or additional to Paley's <μετέβασ> in 194) the mares could be those of Pelops with which he won his bride (1n.) and founded the dynasty. In either case, 193-5 certainly refer to the tradition that the sun reversed its course in horror at some point in the story, perhaps when Atreus' wife Aerope gave the golden lamb as token of sovereignty to her lover and brother-in-law Thyestes (Pl. *Plt.* 269a); cf. 812-17 (the story depicted in Iph.'s weaving) and *El.* 707-42.

**195-7** The text is again uncertain, but the sense must be that after the golden lamb episode yet more troubles ensued; the next episode was in fact the murder of Thyestes' children by Atreus, and the stewing and serving up of the children to their father. The chorus must be unaware of the murders of Agamemnon and Klytaimnestra, so their words are truer than they know.

The transmitted text would have to mean 'different pains of (from) the golden lamb came to different halls', but only one house, that of the Pelopids, has been affected by the golden lamb. No emendation is entirely convincing.

**198** The words and even the succession of short syllables (a strong contrast with the free use of spondees in the ode more generally) sound Euripidean, but as they stand they will not fit into the surrounding anapaestic pattern. In addition, the two \*hiatuses are suspicious, although the break after φόνωι could perhaps be justified by rhythm and sense, and τ' or τ' ἐπ' added after ᾄχεα. Parker suggests the line may derive from a parallel passage originally written in the margin, but her view that the line is

intrusive in sense is not altogether convincing; ‘slaughter upon slaughter, pains upon pains’ suits the context quite well.

**199–202** ‘... whence recompense for the Tantalids who were killed of old comes upon the house (family), and the *daimōn* brings things unwished for upon you’.

ποινή means the price or penalty demanded by the murder of the person in the genitive, so τῶν πρόσθεν δαμθέντων ... ποινὰ Τανταλιδᾶν refers to those descendants of Tantalos who were overcome (δαμθέντων) by their own kin. As a consequence (ἐκβαίνει), the chorus say, the family is still suffering, through some divine agency (δαίμων). σπεύδει δ’ ἀσπούδαστ’, ‘hastens on things undesired’ (cf. *Bacch.* 913), is an example of a common type of *\*figura etymologica* juxtaposing a word with its negatively prefixed compound; see 144n.

**203–35** This section of Iph.’s lament repeats the structure of her prologue speech, moving from the sacrifice at Aulis to her unhappy situation among the Taurians, and finally to the latest development, the supposed death of Orestes.

**203–4** This phrase is at best highly elliptical: ‘from the beginning my *daimōn* was unlucky, of my mother’s girdle and of that night’. It is likely therefore that some words have fallen out. Iph. is probably thinking of her own conception, her mother’s wedding night, ζώνη, ‘girdle’, being frequently paired with ‘loosening’ to indicate the untying of the garments at first intercourse. This is more likely than a reference to her birth, since babies may be born either by day or by night (and no known tradition places Iph.’s birth in the night), whereas legitimate conceptions normally take place at night. Taken together ζώνας and νυκτός therefore suggest a wedding night. Iph. was ill-fated from her conception because of Agamemnon’s vow.

With her first words, Iph. picks up and corrects the chorus’ preceding reference to a δαίμων (201–2); not only now, but right from the beginning, she has been ill-fated. For δυσδαίμων δαίμων cf. 216, νύμφαν ... δύσνυμφον (though that phrase means ‘a bride suffering misfortune’, this one a *daimōn* causing it), and see 144n. ἐξ ἄρχᾶς may recall *Od.* 11.436–8, where Agamemnon’s ghost declares that Zeus has hated the offspring of Atreus ἐξ ἄρχῆς, thus linking Iph.’s troubles with those of her ancestors.

**205–7** ‘From the beginning, the Fates, goddesses of childbirth, have inflicted a hard upbringing on me.’ In literature, though not in religious practice, the Moirai (Fates) are strongly associated with birth (cf. e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 1.26), underlined here by λόχια, ‘of childbirth’, an epithet given to both Artemis and the nymphs in cult.

**συντείνουσιν:** the literal meaning is to make something taut and hard by stretching or pulling, which suits the traditional image of the Fates as



spinners; the fate they spin for Iph. is a hard one. In a context concerned with birth, the present tense is used by analogy with verbs of bearing and begetting (23n.).

**209/8–13** ‘whom, as her firstborn offspring in her chambers, she who was wooed from among (all) the Greeks, Leda’s unfortunate daughter, bore and reared, a sacrifice in her [Iph.’s] father’s disgraceful act (λώβαι) and a joyless offering, (destined) to fulfil a vow’. Iph.’s self-pity here turns to pity of her mother, φόνωι contrasting the splendour of her courtship with the result of her marriage – the slaughter of her firstborn child. μνάσ τευθεῖς may allude to the alternative form of Klytaimestra’s name, Κλυταιμνήστρα (see 22n.), ‘with glorious suitors’ or ‘renowned through her suitors’. Klytaimestra’s sister Helen certainly attracted suitors from all over Greece (Hesiod fr. 196–202 M–W). Our text transposes lines 208 and 209. Many editors prefer the more radical solution of moving 208 to follow 220, in which case it will refer to Iph. herself; but elsewhere we hear only of the pretended marriage to Achilles, not that she was courted by suitors from all over Greece.

**211–12 σφάγιον**, etymologically emphasising the cutting of the throat in sacrifice, often refers to sacrifices made immediately before battle, while θυμᾶ is a more inclusive term: see Casabona 1966: 146–50, 180–9, esp. 188 on this passage. Sacrifices are normally associated with festivity and good cheer, but this one was an exception (οὐκ εὐγάθητον).

**πατρῶναι** has subjective, not objective, force: ‘the injury which my father inflicted’. Although she assigns more blame to Kalchas (16, 531–3), Iph. does not exonerate her father entirely (the tone of 360–71 also suggests a degree of blame). It is not until she hears of Agamemnon’s death, at 548, that she begins to feel more kindly towards him, and at 992–3 declares explicitly that she is not angry with him.

**213 ἔτεκεν, ἔτρεφεν**: the meaning is clear (‘gave birth to and raised’), but the metre is uncertain. Inserting a καί (to give κατρεφεν) restores some regularity, but destroys the typical Euripidean \*asyndeton (cf. 220, and see Diggle 1994: 99–100). Parker analyses the whole line as iambus plus molossus, or alternatively (disregarding word-end) an anapaestic tripod (220n.). It is possible that there is some deeper corruption here, involving also εὐκταῖαν, ‘relating to, promised in, a vow’, although this can certainly apply to Iph. (see 20–1 and n.).

**214–15** ‘They put me in a horse-drawn chariot (δίφρος often plural in this sense, e.g. *Hel.* 724) on the sands of Aulis.’ ἐπιβαίνω usually has a causative sense in the aorist, and takes a genitive of the position on or in which someone or something is placed. The horse-drawn chariot is typical of a grand wedding (370n.); from her destiny as sacrificial victim, Iph. moves to the pretext for bringing her to Aulis, reprising with more pathos what was outlined at 25.



**216** *νύμφαν ... δύσνυμφον* ‘a bride ill-bridalled’. For this common type of tragic \*oxymoron, see 144n.

**218–19** ‘Now I live in infertile territory, a guest of the inhospitable sea.’ Iph. sees herself as a stranger in a land hostile to foreigners (cf. 94, 125), although, as the following scenes make clear, she in fact holds an honoured position. Priests and priestesses were normally of citizen status, but the Taurian cult is clearly anomalous, and Iph. has been appointed by Artemis herself (34).

*δυσχόρους οἴκους* alludes to the chorus’ words near the beginning of the parodos (134) and the contrast between fertile, pleasant Greece and the land of the Taurians.

**220** Runs of two or three α-privative compounds in \*asyndeton are common in Euripides, but this is the only example of four compounds so used. Not only was the marriage a sham, resulting in Iph.’s continued childlessness and depriving her of the future she might have expected, but she is far from her city, family, and friends, and in the following lines she recalls her old life, contrasting it with the present. The line is composed entirely of short syllables, a favourite feature in emotional passages, and could be analysed as a resolved iambic dimeter (Diggle 1981: 96), as tribrachic anapaests (i.e. anapaests consisting of three short syllables, West 1982: 123–4), or as an anapaestic tripod (three, rather than four, anapaests, with the long syllables resolved, an alternative suggestion in Parker, p. 86).

**221–4** Iph. remains a *parthenos*, and appropriate activities for unmarried girls include choral singing to honour deities (Calame 1997 [1977]) and weaving (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.18–19 on Kyrene’s rejection of this pursuit). She thinks naturally of singing for the patron goddess of Argos, just as Elektra is asked to join Hera’s festival (*El.* 167–74). Song and dance as an occupation for maidens is also the concluding theme of the second stasimon. Weaving an image of Athena, especially with a pattern depicting one of the battles of the gods, seems to have a more Athenian flavour, particularly with the goddess described as Παλλάδος Ἀθίδος, ‘Attic Pallas’. But rather than ‘the Athena worshipped in Athens’, the epithet may mean ‘Athena, who is associated with Athens/Attica’, and if the weaving recalls the robe presented to the goddess at the Panathenaia, it was not only in Athens that fine robes were presented to Athena (*Il.* 6.288–310). The Panathenaic peplos showed the battle with the Giants, not the earlier one with the Titans, and it was in the Gigantomachy that Athena played a starring role. But although *Hec.* 466–74 similarly appears to confuse the two episodes, this time very definitely in the context of the Panathenaic peplos (perhaps a deliberate mistake in the mouths of the Trojan chorus, Stamatopoulou 2012), there need be no error in the

present passage: Iph. describes weaving subjects appropriate for presentation to a deity, of which battles featuring, for instance, Athena or the Titans are examples, and so creating a finished object similar to, but not identical with, that which the Athenian audience recognised as an essential part of the Panathenaia. See also Sourvinou-Inwood 1997: 172–3 and n. 41. Iph.’s former occupations relate to familiar religious rituals and stories about the gods (the festival of Hera, the story of the triumph of the Olympians over the Titans, the presentation of textiles to Athena), thus making a particularly pointed contrast with the outlandish and shocking rite which she must now engage in, the subject of the next lines.

**222 ἱστοῖς ἐν καλλιφθόγγοις:** the sound of weaving is often described as song-like, especially due to the action of the *κερκίς*, not the shuttle but a type of hand-held beater used to pack in the weft. It was moved rapidly across the warp threads, ‘making a soft succession of plucking sounds ... as characteristic of weaving as is to us the rhythmic thud of the batten’ (Crowfoot 1936–7: 44–6). Compare Ar. *Frogs* 1316 (Euripidean parody).

**224 ποικίλλουσ’:** the verb often refers to embroidery, but can be used of the creation of decoration by any method (*Il.* 18.590 of metalwork). Here it must mean the creation of intricate woven patterns by the use of different coloured threads.

**224–6** ‘... but wetting the altars with blood-flowing, ill-musicked destruction of strangers ...’ Iph. finally admits (see 35–40n.) the horrible nature of her particular duties. Although that much is clear, this text is the result of substantial emendation; L has αἰμορράντων δυσφόρμιγγα ξείνων αἰμάσσουσ’ ἄταν βωμούς, ‘bloodying the ill-musicked destruction altars of blood-flowing strangers’, which is problematic both metrically (there is one syllable too many to form two anapaestic dimeters) and in terms of sense (the participle appears to govern two unrelated accusatives, ἄταν and βωμούς). Some of the problems can be dealt with by deleting βωμούς, but ἄταν remains the unlikely object of αἰμάσσουσ’, itself suspicious after αἰμορράντων. It is better to suppose that αἰμάσσουσ’ is a marginal explanation which has replaced a word such as τέγγουσ’ (thus restoring metre), to emend ἄταν to ἄται (dative), and to make the adjectives agree with ἄται.

**227–8** The genitives qualify ξείνων in the preceding line. Iph. vividly evokes the terror and misery of the victims of the Taurian cult, and suggests (οἰκτρὰν ... οἰκτρὸν) the pity she feels for them (see 344–7 and n.).

**229** After the long digression, Iph. returns to the matter for which she has summoned the chorus and which formed the immediate occasion for the lament, the death of Orestes.

**230 δμαθέντα:** ‘overcome [by death]’, hence ‘dead’. Cf. *Alc.* 127. The emendation δμαθέντ’ ἀγκλαίω (= ἀνακλαίω) would regularise the syllabic division, but Euripides does not always follow the expected pattern; cf. 51n., 1148n.

**231–4** Iph. expresses the relationship between herself and Orestes as she has known it: the love of an elder sister for her baby brother. The lines also give her impression of the closeness of the bond between Orestes and his mother – the baby is held at his mother’s breast, in her arms, not those of his nurse (contrast 834–5). Of course Iph. as yet knows nothing of the sequel.

ἔτι θάλος must be understood together with νέον, ‘still a young shoot’.

**235 σκηπτούχον:** used \*proleptically. As the only male child of Agamemnon, Orestes would naturally inherit the kingship, symbolised by the sceptre (cf. the usage of σκηπτούχος at *Il.* 1.279, 2.86, 14.93). Agamemnon’s sceptre, inherited from Pelops and of divine origin, was of particular interest to the author of the *Iliad* (2.100–8), and as an object symbolising power and family tradition may parallel Pelops’ spear (823–6n.), which will play a crucial role in the recognition scene (see Xian 2020). The name Orestes is significantly postposed to the very end of the parodos; previously Iph. has referred to him as her brother (149, 158, 231) and the child of Agamemnon (170–1), while the chorus have referred to his supposed death only in very general terms. The final word Ὀρέσταν also marks the end of this sung portion of the play, before spoken lines resume together with the action at 236. The effect is emphatic and lingering.

## 236–391 FIRST EPISODE

Like the prologue, the first episode falls into two halves, but in this case they interlock through the person of Iph., who is on stage throughout; the second part of the scene represents her reaction to the news conveyed in the first. The episode is dominated by two long speeches, that of the Herdsman-messenger followed by Iph.’s reflective soliloquy. It intensifies and makes immediate the danger to Orestes and Pylades, as it becomes clear that they have been captured for sacrifice, and then that Iph. is in no mood even to feel pity.

**236–41** *A herdsman reports to Iphigeneia the exciting news that two Greek men have been captured for sacrifice to Artemis.*

**236 καὶ μὴν** frequently signals the entry of a new character in Euripides and Sophocles (Denniston 1954: 356). One of the stage entrance/exits must be assumed to represent the route to the seashore (see Introduction, p. 23).

θαλασσίους is unusually here a two-termination adjective (contrast 1327, θαλασσίας).

**237** The chorus may recognise the messenger’s occupation from his style of dress; it is more important that they give the audience this

information. Their assumption that he has news to convey suggests an element of metatheatres, since it is a convention that when a low-status character enters he does so as a messenger.

**σημανῶν:** future participle indicating purpose.

**τί:** indefinite with acute accent preceding the enclitic σοι.

**238–9** The Herdsman enters and confirms the chorus' supposition that he has important news. The character will be played by the second or third actor, who took the parts of Orestes and Pylades respectively in the preceding scene; he thus describes the actions and (if he also plays Orestes) delivers the words of the character he has earlier depicted directly. See Easterling 2014: 235–8. His formal address to Iph. is typical of his often highflown style.

**240** **ἐκπλήσσον**, present participle, is used adjectivally; 'what is there that is surprising in the present speech (the *καὶνὰ κηρύγματα* which he has promised)?' The alternative interpretation, 'what is it that interrupts the present speech?', i.e. her exchange with the chorus, is less likely.

**241** **Συμπληγάδας:** 124n.

**242** **δίπτυχος** means literally 'double-folded', but in verse is frequently used like Eng. 'twofold' to mean 'double', or in the plural simply 'two', 'a pair'.

**243** **πρόσφαγμα καὶ θυτήριον:** the root *sphag-* relates to the slaughtering aspect of sacrifice, while *thy-* is connected etymologically with the ascending smoke; *thy-* words are more neutral and general terms for sacrifice. The prefix gives the meaning 'preliminary sacrifice' to πρόσφαγμα, which normally has reference to funerary ritual. The sense 'preliminary' has been lost here and in 458, but a latent suggestion of funeral rites may be intentional on Euripides' part, rather than his speaker's: the worship of the goddess is simultaneously the death ritual of her victims (Casabona 1966: 173, and cf. 170–3 on other uses of the word).

The description of the two strangers as a sacrifice is \*proleptic (they are not yet consecrated for sacrifice to Artemis), but barely so: as a loyal Taurian, the Herdsman naturally sees strangers as representing sacrificial material.

**244–5** The Herdsman suggests that the priestess should make ready the materials for beginning a sacrifice. For *χέρνιβες*, see 58n. *κατάργματα* are literally the things for beginning the sacrifice (*κατάρχομαι*, 'begin sacrifice') such as barley grains, to be scattered over the victim. See 40n.

**οὐκ ἄν φθάνοις:** 'you would not be too soon in ...', a colloquial phrase encouraging haste. See Collard and Stevens 2018: 63.

**246** **σχῆμ'** is a likely correction for *ἄνομ'* in L. The Herdsman, it is implied, can recognise the strangers as Greeks from their dress (LSJ s.v. *σχῆμα* 4b). For the distinctiveness of Greek dress, cf. *Heracl.* 130–1,

καὶ μὴν στολήν γ' Ἑλληνα καὶ ῥυθμὸν πέπλων | ἔχει ... There was probably some differentiation in costume between Greek and Taurian characters (Introduction, pp. 26–7).

**248** ‘Nor, having heard the strangers’ name, do you know it, to tell?’ φράσαι can be construed with οἶδα (to know how to say), but given that the sense is more or less complete without it (to know the name) it is better to take it as an infinitive of purpose (Smyth §2008).

It is more likely that Iph. wishes to know if she has heard of these fellow Greeks than that, as Murray suggested, she is interested as a priestess in taking an omen from the strangers’ names.

**249–51** It is absolutely necessary that the recognition of brother and sister should not be anticipated by Iph.’s hearing the name Orestes; the fact that the Herdsman has not heard his name continues a sense of suspense for the audience, whose superior knowledge creates an effect related to irony. This chance ignorance prefigures Orestes’ later deliberate concealment of his identity. It is not surprising that the name of Orestes’ friend and cousin is unknown to the older Iph.

**249 ἄτερος πρὸς θατέρου:** ἕτερος is used like ἄλλος, ‘one ... on the part of the other’. These are the normal forms of ἕτερος in \*crasis with the definite article; the apparent irregularity is probably due to the use of an older form ἄτερος (with short alpha; the vowel in crasis is long) for ἕτερος.

**252–7** Iph. asks the Herdsman where the strangers were captured; he replies ‘at the Inhospitable Sea breakers’ edge’ (again grandiose language), which leads her to ask in turn why cowherds should spend time near the sea. When he has explained this, she asks him to go back (ἐκεῖσε δὴ ἵπναλθε) and explain the circumstances of the capture; this leads into the play’s first messenger speech. (With the transmitted text, πῶς rather than ποῦ in lines 252 and 256, line 253 must represent the Herdsman’s attempt to launch into his narrative, which is immediately interrupted by Iph.)

**253 πόρου:** πόρος, properly a crossing or journey, is sometimes used in poetry as a synonym for ‘sea’; cf. *Andr.* 1262, *Hel.* 130.

**255** Salt water was considered purifying (see 1191–3n.), and washing cattle in the sea was probably a health measure. Later writers advise that sheep should be bathed in the sea after shearing and the application of an ointment, to prevent scabies (Cato *De agr.* 96.2, Columella 7.4.8). The *Geoponica* mention the use of salt water to treat certain diseases of oxen (17.19, 20.5).

**ἐναλῖαι δρόσωι:** a poetic expression for ‘salt water’; δρόσος, properly ‘dew’, is very commonly used in poetry for water of other sorts and even for other liquids.

**258–9** ‘They have come after a long time; never yet has the goddess’ altar been reddened with Greek streams [of blood]’ (the adjective χρόνιος

is commonly used where English would use an adverbial phrase). Much ingenuity has been expended on emending these lines, or alternatively in explaining how it is possible that no Greeks have ever before been sacrificed at the altar. It is probably better to treat the lines as an interpolation, perhaps from another play on a similar theme. At 346–7 it becomes clear that in the course of her duties Iph. has prepared Greeks for sacrifice, and at 584–7 that these Greeks have not returned to their native land. Although minor inconsistencies (or perhaps, different emphases) between scenes are possible in tragedy, this is surely too glaring a discrepancy to stand. Alternatively, one could adopt the emendation οἷδ' ἐπεὶ for οὐδέ πω: 'These men have come a long time after the goddess' altar was (last) made red with streams of Greek blood' (ἐπεὶ in the sense of 'since, after', linking present with more distant time, is paralleled e.g. in Aesch. Ag. 40–7, δεκατὸν μὲν ἔτος τόδ' ἐπεὶ ... στόλον ... ἦραν.

**260–339** *Speech of the Herdsman*. This is the first of two messenger speeches, the second being the report of the escape attempt at 1327–1419. Other Euripidean plays with two messenger sequences are *Helen*, *Orestes*, and *Bacchae*; *Phoenissae* has four. This messenger narrative occurs unusually early in the play, and forms part of the sequence bringing sister and brother together, preceding the long-drawn-out recognition scene itself; it thus fulfils a similar function to the Old Man's account of the appearance of offerings at Agamemnon's tomb in *Electra* (509–17), and in neither case does the sister realise the significance of the report. In other respects, there are some parallels between this and the second messenger speech (see 1327–1419n.). Unlike many messengers, but like the second messenger in this play, the Herdsman is a participant in much of his own narrative, rather than a simple observer (see De Jong 1991: 6–7).

The description of the skirmish, though overtly narrated from the standpoint of the Taurian cowherds, is constructed to emphasise the superior courage and fighting skills of the Greeks; the cowherds are shown as doubting their own ability to overcome the two young men until reinforcements arrive (304–5), their weapons are stones not swords, and they prevail only by disarming their opponents, a form of deceit rather than daring (330–3 and n.). The narrative further enlists the audience's sympathy for Orestes and Pylades by 'secondary focalisation' (intrusion of a point of view other than the dominant one, which in this case is the narrator's), both in the use of direct speech (321–2) and in the description of Pylades' actions in helping his friend, where his aims and thought processes are recreated (310–14). In this way the account of even a hostile witness reinforces the pair's positive characteristics of courage and mutual friendship, which we have seen introduced in the prologue and which will be highlighted in the following scenes.

The Herdsman is the first Taurian to appear in the play, and as such his characterisation is significant, as is what he relates of his companions. They are disposed to violence (although they eventually have provocation in the attack on their animals), but would be no match for Greeks in a fair fight (279–80, 302–5, 330–3). For the most part, they are a people of simple religiosity, but they are capable of producing, and listening to, a sceptic who doubts a ‘divine epiphany’ (275–9). Above all, they are devoted to the bloodthirsty local sacrifices to their goddess (279–80, 336–9).

**260–3** ‘When we were putting the woodland-grazing cattle into the sea that flows out through the Symplegades, there was a hollow cliff, cut by much surging of the waves, shelters for murex-fishers.’ εἰς is omitted after εἰσεβάλλομεν, which instead is followed by a double accusative of the object put and the thing into which it is put. πολλῶι σάλωι is instrumental dative depending on διαρρώξ, adjective from διαρρήγνυμι, ‘break through’.

The idiom ‘when *x* happens/happened, there is/was *y*’, with *y* referring to a place, though strictly illogical, is quite common in tragedy and recurs at 1449–50. The hollow cliff existed independently of the herdsman’s presence, but this fact is subordinated to the narrator’s experience. This sea cave is the place where Orestes and Pylades are hiding until nightfall (118–19).

Euripides’ messengers frequently begin their narrative with an ἐπεὶ clause, here perhaps blended with the typical opening of a geographical description. The ἐπεὶ clause functions by reminding the audience of information they have been given earlier in the play; in this case, unusually, it refers back to information only just given by the messenger himself, in the immediately preceding dialogue (Rijksbaron 1976: 297).

**ύλοφορβούς:** pasturing cattle in woods and forests was common in the ancient world. Cf. Hes. *Op.* 589 (βοὸς ύλοφάγοιο).

**260** The current flows out of, not into, the Black Sea through the Symplegades, and so modern editors prefer to read ἐκρέοντα rather than the manuscripts’ ἐσρέοντα, although it is possible that Euripides and his audience were less precise in their geography.

**263 πορφυρευτικαὶ στέγαι:** the cave served as a bothy for harvesters of the murex (πορφυρευταί, ‘purplers’), a shellfish which was the source of much-prized purple dye. The picturesque yet realistic detail should probably not be pressed to provide information about the degree of civilisation enjoyed by Euripides’ Taurians.

**264–80** *Sighting of the strangers and response to the report.* The first to sight the Greeks and the next man mentioned assume that the strangers must be gods; the Taurians are not used to strangers appearing seemingly out of nowhere. The man who picks up on the report is characterised as θεοσεβής, ‘god-revering’, while the second respondent is called μάταιος,

ἀνομίοι θρασύς, ‘a useless fellow, bold and lawless’. The stand-off between the two would doubtless resonate with contemporary Athenians: simple old-fashioned piety versus morally suspect sophistication. But despite the narrator’s condemnation, perhaps reflecting his reaction at the time, it is the ‘useless fellow’ whose naturalistic explanation is correct (or almost – Orestes and Pylades are not shipwrecked, but have come deliberately to the land of the Taurians, not something most would choose to do). This irony is, however, complicated by the fact that it is through divine design that Orestes and Pylades are here.

**266** ‘Conveying his footsteps on the ends of his toes.’ The cowerd retreats on tiptoe through fear, to avoid alerting the strangers to his presence – a humorous touch. πορθμεύω, properly to take something across a stretch of water, occurs unusually often in this play, a fact it is tempting to connect with the thematic importance of travel to and from the Black Sea area.

**267–8** δαίμονές τινες θάσσουσιν οἶδε: ‘some deities are sitting, these ones’. οἶδε functions to point out and emphasise, almost equivalent in this context to ‘here’. δαίμων is more or less synonymous with θεός, but may sometimes suggest a slightly lesser divine being than an august Olympian.

**269** The usual gesture of prayer, except to underworld gods, was to extend and raise the arms, with palms facing upwards.

**270–4** ‘O child of ocean-dwelling Leukothea, guardian of ships, lord Palaimon, be favourable to us, whether it is the Dioskouroi sitting on the shore, or darlings of Nereus, father of the well-born dance troupe of fifty Nereids.’ θάσσετον must be a third person, not second, dual; the prayer is addressed not to the supposed deities just sighted, whose identity is uncertain, but to a god the speaker knows. All those mentioned, however, have strong maritime connexions. Leukothea is a sea goddess identified with the once mortal Ino already in the *Odyssey* (5.333–5), while Palaimon was taken to be her son Melikertes; both are complex figures with variable mythology, but most traditions agree that Ino leapt into the sea holding the infant Melikertes. The *Odyssey* passage shows Leukothea saving the shipwrecked Odysseus. The baby Melikertes in early sources is said to have died and been washed ashore at Isthmia, where he was given a tomb and heroic honours; his cult was in fact incorporated in the Isthmian Games. The present passage seems to be the earliest to attest his role as guardian of ships (νεῶν φύλαξ), but this aspect is later mentioned by ps.-Apollodorus for both mother and son, and suggested also by his identification with Portunus in Roman writers. See Pache 2004: 135–80.

The Dioskouroi (Kastor and Polydeukes) are often invoked as saviours of ships (e.g. E. *El.* 1378–9), while Nereus and his fifty daughters (see 427–9n.) are permanent inhabitants of the sea. This suggests the



interests of the Taurians (even when, like the cowherds, their occupations are concerned with the land), but still more of the play itself (see Introduction, pp. 17–19).

**271 ἱλῆως ἡμῖν γενεοῦ:** a request to the deity to be favourably disposed is a standard feature of prayer (Pulleyn 1997: 143, 219), and is particularly understandable when some unexpected manifestation of divinity has occurred.

**273 Νηρέως ἀγάλασθ’:** someone’s ἀγαλαμα (‘delight’) is usually their child, but Nereus is only known to have fathered daughters, except in one late source where he has a single son (Ael. NA 14.28, attributed to λόγοι θαλάττιοι), and the two strangers are obviously male. Most commentators assume, probably rightly, that grandchildren are therefore meant. In mortal life, men without sons frequently regarded their daughters’ sons as the closest approximation (Golden 2015: 116–18). In the context of the cowherd’s uncertainty about the strangers’ precise identity, it is unimportant that there is no strong tradition of Nereus’ grandsons apart from Achilles.

**274 πεντήκοντα Νηρήιδων χορόν:** 427–9 and n.

**275–8** ‘But another man, a useless fellow, bold and lawless (lit. bold in lawlessness), laughed at (his) prayers, and said (kept saying?) that shipwrecked (lit. destroyed) sailors were sitting in the cave for fear of the law/custom, having heard that here we sacrifice strangers.’ In the Herdsman’s mind, and probably that of some audience members, rationalism and scepticism about the divine, extending to mockery of the piety of others, is linked with immorality more generally.

**276 ἐφθαρμένους:** shipwrecked sailors are naturally ‘ruined’, having lost their livelihood and means of returning home, but any unfortunate enough to be wrecked on the Taurian coast are as good as dead.

**277 θάσσειν** regularly takes the accusative of the place or object sat in or upon (φάραγγ’).

**279–80** ‘He seemed to most of us to speak well, and we decided to hunt local sacrifices for the goddess.’ ἔδοξε is first used personally, with the ‘useless fellow’ as the subject, and then understood impersonally in the second clause: ‘it seemed good to us, we decided’. The majority of the cowherds are convinced by the sceptic, but they are far from sceptical concerning religious observance in general: they are keen to hunt down the strangers and thus supply ‘the local sacrifices’ to the goddess. See 260–339n.

**281–300** *Orestes’ fit of madness.* Before the cowherds can begin their hunt (θηρᾶν, 280) Orestes is suddenly aware that he is being pursued by the Erinyes. Although hunting is a natural metaphor for this pursuit (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 131–2, 147, etc.), it is not made quite explicit here (cf. 284n.), and in the end it is the Taurians, not the Erinyes, who will

capture the two men. Orestes' vision is presented as a sudden attack of madness (μανίαις ἀλαίνων, 284).

Madness is a staple of tragedy, depicted in most detail in the cases of Herakles (*HF* 928–2000) and Agaue (*Bacch.* 1168–1284). The victims always recover their sanity, although madness may be a recurrent phenomenon (as with Orestes in this play and elsewhere), and it is caused by the intervention of some deity. It is marked most importantly by hallucinations or delusions in which the victim wrongly identifies what is before him or her, and slaughter often results: thus, Herakles kills his own children thinking they are the family of the tyrant Lykos, Agaue kills her son Pentheus thinking he is a lion, and Ajax in Sophocles tortures and kills sheep and cattle thinking they are the Achaian army who have wronged him. Orestes usually simply sees the pursuing Furies where others do not (*Aesch. Cho.* 1048–62, *E. Or.* 251–79), but here this is combined with the misdirected slaughter motif, so that he kills the cattle, mistaking them for Erinyes, an idea perhaps inspired by Ajax's slaughter of the beasts in Sophocles. Unlike the other characters who suffer madness, in the case of Orestes there is potential ambiguity as to the reality or otherwise of the visions, since the madness is usually represented as caused by the Erinyes whom he actually sees; this can play different ways in different dramatic contexts.

The mad fit includes symptoms of epilepsy, commonly attributed to divine visitation. As well as hallucinations, Orestes experiences foaming at the mouth and various impairments to motor control (violent head-shaking, trembling of the arms or hands, and eventually collapse). All of these are paralleled in other tragic descriptions of madness (see below).

**281** ἄτερος: 249n.

**282** κᾶρα τε διετίναξ' ἄνω κάτω: like the mad Herakles (*HF* 867). Bacchantes too are noted for violent head movements, tossing their hair free into the air (*Bacch.* 150, 930; cf. *LIMC* supp. Mainades 797, although Carpenter 1997: 82–3 suggests that the tipped-back heads shown in vase-painting represent singing rather than bacchic ecstasy or madness).

**283** ὠλένας τρέμων ἄκρας 'trembling at the tips of his forearms', that is in his hands, which may be included in ὠλένη (see also 966n.).

**284** κυναγός ὦς: Orestes calls out like a hunter alerting his companion to the presence of wild and dangerous beasts. Some editors object to the phrase on the grounds that Orestes is here being hunted rather than hunting, but this is an unnecessarily polarised view of the situation; in a wild beast hunt, hunter and prey each try to kill the other, and soon Orestes will attack what he believes to be the pursuing Furies. See also 709n. Nauck's conjecture κυνώπιδα, 'dog-faced', would form the first word of Orestes' speech and give an epithet to the first Erinyes he sees, otherwise undescribed (see 285–90n.). For dog-like Erinyes, cf. *El.* 1252, *Or.* 260.

**285** With 321, this line confirms the Herdsman's information at 249 that one of the strangers is named Pylades.

**285–7** 'Don't you see this one, a she-snake of Hades, how she's trying to kill me, aiming at me with her dreadful vipers?' The image seems to be one of a large and monstrous snake using smaller, poisonous snakes (ἔχιδνα = viper) as weapons. δράκων (fem. δράκαινα) typically indicates a large snake with some religious, portentous, or supernatural affinity (Ogden 2013: 2–4).

**287** ἑστομωμένη: στομόμοι, of a weapon, means to be pointed and ready for attack; it is used also of a personal agent at *Cretans* fr. 472e.44. Another possibility is that the 'mouth' sense is retained here, and the word suggests the gaping mouths of the snakes.

**285–90** Orestes appears to see three Erinyes, the first one (first τήνδε, 285) not described (but see 284n.), the second snake-like, the third fiery and winged.

**288–90** 'This one ... breathing fire and gore (or, by \*hendiadys, deadly fire), beats the air (lit. rows) with her wings, holding my mother in her arms, a burden of stone, so that she may throw [it at me].' The text as transmitted has 'this one from her tunics' breathing fire, which is scarcely satisfactory sense. Jackson's conjecture ἡ 'κ γειτόνων δέ, perhaps 'the one next in line', though it has found some favour, seems too colloquial for the context; ἐκ γειτόνων is attested in comedy and prose texts, and means 'next door'. No other suggestion is wholly convincing. At any rate, the third Erinyes breathes fire and approaches flying through the air. Orestes sees winged Furies also in *Or.* 273–4. She carries in her arms a stone image of Klytaimestra, or perhaps Klytaimestra herself, heavy as a stone, and threatens to hurl her burden at Orestes, a strange and powerful image which seems to have no parallel in extant Greek literature. The stone may hint at the story of Orestes' ancestor Tantalos, who in one version was punished for his impiety by a stone constantly suspended above him (Parker); or there may be a link with the tradition of statues which fall on and kill the enemies of those they represent, known to Aristotle possibly in a tragic context (*Poet.* 9.1452a). See Jones 1998.

**291–4** 'It was possible to see not these shapes of appearance (the Erinyes whom Orestes has described) but ... voices of calves and barking of dogs, which(?) they say(?) the Erinyes emit as imitations.' Something is very wrong with the text. ἡλ(λ)όσσετο, 'exchanged', does not make sense, and various emendations have been suggested, such as εἰλίσσετο, 'he was encircled', or ἡλάυνετο, 'he was driven', which in turn involve changing the accusatives of 293 to datives. ἄς φᾶσ' is very difficult, because if the antecedent is φθογγὰς τε μόσχων καὶ κυνῶν ὑλάγματα we would expect ἃ not ἄς. Further, there is no confirmation elsewhere that 'they say' that the

Erinyes make noises like cattle or dogs. Emendations such as φάσκων or (better) ἄ φάσκ' give this idea to Orestes, which makes better sense: he now believes that his pursuers are taking on the forms and voices of cattle and other animals, the prelude to his attack on the watchers' herd. The general sense of the lines seems to be that the figures seen by Orestes were not actually visible, and that only animal noises – cattle lowing and dogs barking – could be heard.

**295 συσταλίντες** 'drawing close together', from συστέλλω, 'contract'. The herdsmen are understandably wary, but the severity of the fit is such that they expect Orestes (the unexpressed subject of genitive absolute θανουμένου) to die. (With the reading θαμβούμενοι, they are simply – and more weakly – amazed.)

**296–314** *Attack on the herd and ending of the madness.* Orestes mistakes the cattle for the Erinyes and wades into the sea to attack them. Seeing this, the herdsmen summon help, but Orestes' frenzied action suddenly ceases and he falls down senseless. The herdsmen are now emboldened to attack him, while Pylades tends him and tries to fend off the assault.

**297 λέων ὄπως:** the herdsmen are naturally familiar with attempted attacks on their animals by wild beasts, but lions are hardly the commonest predators, and the brief comparison has an epic touch. For lion similes in the *Iliad*, see e.g. Mueller 1984: 116–20: lions are noble and fierce fighters but not invariably victorious. Even in his madness, Orestes has the strength and nobility of a lion.

**298–9** 'he strikes (a vivid historic present) (them) with iron and thrusts (his sword) into their flanks and ribs, thinking that he is warding off the divine Erinyes with these actions'. πλευραί are ribs, λαγόνες the hollow areas below them.

**τάδε:** internal accusative with ἀμύνεσθαι, 'to defend (with) these defences'. The Erinyes are the external accusative, the object warding off; the middle ἀμύνεσθαι expresses self-defence.

**300** 'so that the sea flowered in blood'. Orestes must wade into the sea to attack the animals being washed there, thus allowing Euripides to create a striking image of blood spreading in water like a blossom opening. For the figure of the sea 'flowering' as a result of death cf. Aesch. Ag. 659, ὀρώμεν ἀνθοῦν πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον νεκροῖς.

**πέλαγος** is frequently coupled with other words meaning sea, as here with gen. ἁλός.

**αἵματηρόν** is used \*proleptically of the sea to express the effect of the process being described.

**301–3** The cowherds, seeing their livelihood being destroyed, now have another reason to capture Orestes and his companion.

**303** When expertly blown, a conch shell can make an impressively loud and prolonged noise. Shells are naturally to hand on the seashore, so can be used to summon help, but conches were also said to have been in general use in war before the trumpet (thought to be an Etruscan invention, cf. Soph. *Aj.* 17) and so suggest primitive antiquity.

**304–5** The herdsmen are well aware that man for man or even with the small number of their initial group they would be no match for the two young, godlike strangers, and indeed the following account emphasises that a large number of Taurians are required to force Orestes and Pylades into submission.

**304** *νεανίας*: used adjectivally, parallel to *εὐτραφεῖς*.

**306** *ἐπληρώθημεν*: perhaps ‘we reached full complement’; all or almost all the able-bodied men of the cowherd community reached the scene.

**307** *μανίας πίτυλον*: *πίτυλος* is any rapid rushing or sweeping motion, often the sweep of oars (as at 1050), but also attacking movements; hence ‘onslaught of madness’, which Orestes ‘lets go of’ as he collapses. The ending of his madness is as sudden as its beginning.

**308** *στάζων ἀφρῶι γένειον* ‘dripping with foam as to his chin’. See 281–300n.

**309** *προύργου*: contracted form of *πρό ἔργου*, ‘conveniently’. The event is clearly narrated from the point of view of the Herdsman himself and his companions.

**310–14** The Herdsman’s hostility is here allowed to fade into the background of his narrative, as Euripides wishes to emphasise Pylades’ loving care for his friend: evidently undismayed at this familiar phenomenon, he wipes the froth from Orestes’ mouth and covers him with his own cloak, attempting to protect him from the Taurians’ missiles, all the while dodging these himself. His kind actions, similar to those of Elektra in *Orestes* (219–22), form a pointed contrast to those of the narrator and his companions.

Throughout the speech, the focalisation of the narrative fluctuates between the point of view one might expect from the Herdsman, a simple Taurian hostile to strangers, and the presumed position of the dramatist and his audience, sympathetic to Greeks in danger.

**310** *βάλλων, ἀράσων*: the same phrase occurs at *Andr.* 1154, *Hec.* 1175. The placing of two participles or finite verbs in \*asyndeton, the second with one more syllable than the first, at the beginning of a line is a notable idiom in Sophocles and Euripides: Bond gives other examples in his n. on *HF* 602.

*ἄτερος*: 249n.

**311** *ἀπέψη*: imperfect of *ἀποψάω*, ‘wipe off’, a verb which exhibits irregular contraction.

ἐτήμελει ‘he was taking care for’, unusually governing the genitive σώματος.

**312** ‘... and was covering him (προυκάλυπτεν = προεκάλυπτεν) with the well-woven threads of (his own) clothes’. εὔπηνος is formed from πήνη, the weft thread, which has been well woven into the warp. The phrase εὔπηνους ὑφός is repeated in quite different contexts at 814 (in the dative) and 1465.

**313** **καραδοκῶν** implies waiting on events and tailoring one’s response accordingly; thus, Pylades looks out for the stones being thrown and dodges them, avoiding the wounds. τὰπιόντα (= τὰ ἐπιόντα) τραύματα, ‘the oncoming wounds’, is a bold phrase in which the epithet properly belonging to the things hurled (stones) has been transferred to their potential effect (wounds).

**315–35** *Fight with the herdsmen and capture of the strangers.*

**315** **ἔμφρων**: emphatic at line opening, confirming that the madness has left Orestes.

**ἀνάξας ... πεσήματος** ‘darting up from his fall’, with a genitive of separation.

**316** **κλύδωνα** ‘wave, rough water’. Marine imagery is extremely common in tragedy, especially for troubles and difficulties, and the specific force of this word is probably felt no more than ‘wave’ may be in English. In conjunction with προσκείμενον, however, it expresses well the size and movement of the attacking force.

**317** This line is weakly expressed after the forceful 316 and may have been added to clarify κλύδωνα πολεμίων.

**318** **ἀνίμεν**: impf. of ἀνίημι: ‘we did not let up in hurling ...’

**320–2** The exhortation is ‘terrible’ because it spells trouble for the herdsmen, although the quoted direct speech impresses the audience once more with the heroes’ nobility, and recalls their resolve at the end of their appearance in the prologue. The sentiment recalls that of Hector in his final conflict, *Il.* 22.304–5, and is used elsewhere by Euripides (e.g. *Hec.* 346–8, *IA* 1375–6). Kyriakou (*ad loc.*) argues plausibly that there is an air of the mock-heroic about such sentiments in a conflict with stone-throwing herdsmen.

**320** **οὔ**: the basic meaning ‘where’ is sometimes extended to mean ‘in which circumstances’, ‘at which point’.

**παρακέλευμ**: emended to restore the earlier form of the word, attested in one manuscript at 1405 and 1483; see 1405n.

**321–2** **ὅπως θανούμεθα κάλλισθ’** ‘but let’s be sure to die with glory’. ὅπως followed by future indicative with exhortatory sense (‘make sure to’) is listed by Collard and Stevens 2018: 72 as colloquial, although it is much more common in the second person.

**323 διπαλτα ... ξίφη** ‘double brandished swords’ is a poetic periphrasis for two swords, both brandished.

**324** ‘... we began to fill the rocky ravines in flight’. A νάπη is a wooded valley or dip in hilly country. ἐξεπίμπλαμεν is impf. indicating an action begun.

**325–7** ‘But if one [of us] fled, the others pressing on would pelt them (Orestes and Pylades), and if they (Or. and Pyl.) forced those others back, the part that just now had yielded would strike again.’ There is a continuous succession of attacks from different groups of herdsmen (cf. 318–19).

**ἄτεροι:** 249n.

**ῶσαίατο:** a metrically convenient epic form (Attic would be ὥσαιντο) of the 3 pl. aor. opt. of ὠθέω.

**τὸ νυν ὑπέϊκον:** the group which was giving way at that moment.

**ἤρασσον:** for a plural verb form governed by a singular collective noun, see Smyth §950.

**328–9** The Herdsman seems to suppose that the strangers are protected from wounding by divine design, since sacrificial victims must be unblemished. It is over-literal to object that if this is the sense, ἄπιστον is illogical: the whole point of a miracle is to be miraculous and to contradict ordinary experience. The Herdsman is understandably surprised that none of the many stones hurled reached its mark. (It is expecting too much forethought of the simple cowherds to suppose that if they had been worried about preserving the victims in perfect condition, they would not have thrown stones in the first place.) The audience may well suppose that Orestes and Pylades are indeed protected by the gods, but for another purpose. ἄπιστος is a recurrent word (388, 782, 1293 and with different senses 796, 1298, 1476); for the theme of wonder and (dis)belief in the play, see Budelmann 2019, esp. 296–9.

**330–3** The herdsmen are unable to defeat the pair of strangers in a fair fight (τόλμη), but succeed in wresting the swords from their hands; in this at least the stones are successful. The reading of L, ἐξεκλέψαμεν, emphasises the devious nature of this disarming, opposing the whole manoeuvre to τόλμη μὲν; the emendation ἐξεκόψαμεν may be right, however, indicating the manner in which the stones helped (‘we knocked the swords from their hands with stones’).

**333** Thoas is naturally consulted as the source of authority among the Taurians, but the herdsmen no doubt also hope for a reward.

**καθεῖσαν:** 3 pl. aor. indic. act. of καθίημι.

**334 νιν:** here dual or plural.

**335** ‘for the purpose of basins and slaughter-bowls’, i.e. to prepare to sacrifice the young men. The Herdsman returns to his point at 244–5 with

a similar \*metonymy, thus making a kind of ring composition. For χέρνιβες see 58n.; σφαγεῖα are bowls used to catch the victim's blood.

**336–9** The majority of messenger speeches end with some sort of personal or moralising reflexion on what has been said (De Jong 1991: 106–8).

**336** The idiom 'pray for such *x*' (present imperative) is equivalent to 'this is the sort of *x* you should always pray for'. Comparable is *Hipp.* 1455, τοιῶνδε παίδων γνησίων εὔχου τυχεῖν. There is therefore no need to emend to ἡὔχου (imperfect), or to understand εὔχου as an unaugmented imperfect.

**337–9** The Herdsman continues his point: Iph. ought to pray for victims such as these not merely because (as is first implied) they are an excellent catch for the goddess, but more personally because by sacrificing Greeks she will avenge her own attempted sacrifice by the Greeks assembled at Aulis. As we already suspect, and will shortly learn in more detail from her monologue, Iph.'s real feelings are more complex than this, with regard both to the Greeks and to the whole institution of human sacrifice.

**337 ἀναλίσκης:** the meaning 'kill' is not uncommon in tragedy.

**338 ἀποτείσει:** 'pay off', 'pay in full'.

**340–1** 'You have said amazing things about the madman, whoever (ποτε intensifying the uncertainty) [he is who] has come from a Greek land to the inhospitable sea.' The chorus express surprise at the description of Orestes' madness and hint at the oddity of strangers arriving among the Taurians.

**Ἑλληνος:** adjective qualifying γῆς, here doing duty as the feminine form (normally Ἑλληνίδος); cf. 495.

**342–91 Iphigeneia's speech.** After the first two lines, marking the Herdsman's exit, the speech is effectively a monologue, although the chorus remain present; Iph.'s address to them at 351 should not be deleted (see below). Her thoughts about the present situation lead her back to her own misfortunes, as she recalls the supposed death of Orestes and, at length, the events at Aulis, before indignantly rejecting the idea that a god could really desire human sacrifice.

This is already the third time that Iph. recalls her unhappy past, and the second time that she narrates the sacrifice at Aulis. (See 4–34, 209–27.) Where the prologue speech told the story with reference to Agamemnon and the army (until the climactic moment of attempted sacrifice), this version is more detailed and emotional, told through Iph.'s own experiences, moving backwards from the moment when she realises that her father is about to sacrifice her, not give her in marriage, to the memories she then recalls of leaving home as a bride. The recollection does not cast



Agamemnon in a sympathetic light, as his daughter relives her piteous appeals to him. But she throws no explicit blame on her father, reserving her hostility for Helen and Menelaos. If it were otherwise, her viewpoint would be at odds with that of Orestes, and we should have potentially a very different sort of reunion between sister and brother. In fact, it is clear at 549 and 553 that she pities the dead Agamemnon, and at 992–3 she explicitly states that she feels no anger towards him.

The speech develops in an associative rather than a strictly organised way, as Iph. further explores her feelings and experiences. The final section, in which she reflects on the rituals of Taurian Artemis, is not out of place in this loosely structured sequence of thought, since the Taurian priesthood is a direct consequence of her earlier misfortunes, but the lines do follow oddly in the immediate context: see 380n.

**342 εἰέν:** although intervocalic aspiration is unusual in Greek, this is a fairly common tragic exclamation, usually indicating a transition from one matter to another: ‘well now ...’ (Collard and Stevens 2018: 80–1, Nordgren 2015: 221–2).

**σὺ μὲν κόμιζε:** addressed to the Herdsman, who here exits. His part, if he reappears among the captors who bring in Orestes and Pylades at 456, will now be played by a mute, since the actor who has represented him is required to play Orestes or Pylades.

**343 ὅσια** ‘sacred things, things sanctioned by the gods’ is a likely emendation for L’s οἶα. The obvious sense is that (while the herdsmen fetch their captives) Iph. will make all the preparations for sacrifice. Presumably she does so during the first stasimon (392–455), which immediately follows her speech, rather than during the speech itself.

**φροντιούμεθα** ‘we shall take thought for ...’ The middle is unusual, but the word need not for that reason be considered suspect.

**344–7** ‘Poor heart, previously you were always peaceable and full of pity towards strangers, measuring out tears (‘a tear’) in proportion to your kinship, whenever you received men from Greece into your hands.’ Iph. refers to the feeling of pity based on shared Greekness (kinship, *θουμόφυλον* = τὸ ὁμό-) which she felt for her previous sacrificial victims (cf. 227–8 and n.). The address to the heart (or other body part connected with thought or feeling) is an epic trope (clearly in *τέτλαθι δὴ κραδίη*, *Od.* 20.18, but elsewhere, such as *Il.* 22.99, characters are said to address their *θυμός*) and is used in tragedy in both trimeters and lyric (e.g. *Med.* 1056, 1242, *Ion* 859, *Or.* 466; parodied in *Ar. Ach.* 480–9). Cf. also 839, 882 (address to the *ψυχή* in lyric). In the present passage the heart is so far personified as even to have hands.

**345 γαλήνός** ‘calm, gentle’, applied both to the sea and to people, is usually a two-termination adjective.

347 ἡνίκ' ἐς χέρας λάβοις: cf. 359n.

348-53 Whereas previously she had pitied the Greeks she had to sacrifice, her belief that Orestes is dead has made her less sympathetic. The argument has some resemblance to Achilles in *Il.* 21.100-7: 'Before Patroklos died, I was inclined to spare Trojans ... why do you weep and wail? Patroklos has died, who was a much better man than you', except that Achilles there addresses a kinsman of Patroklos' killer (Jacobson 2000). Lines 351-3 explain her change of heart in generalising terms (see below).

348 ἡγριώμεθα 'have grown savage', here in the metaphorical sense 'cruel, unfeeling', but perhaps with a glance also at the 'savage' Taurians, who likewise display a lack of human fellow feeling. Cf. *Soph. Phil.* 1321 (Neoptolemos to Philoktetes): σὺ δ' ἡγρίωσαι.

349 This line is weak and unnecessary, a probable interpolation to jog the audience's memory. But they are not likely to have forgotten the dream.

ἥλιον βλέπειν: 564n.

350 For λαμβάνω in the sense 'find to be', compare *Soph. Phil.* 1051, οὐκ ἂν λάβοις μου μᾶλλον οὐδέν' εὐσεβῆ, 'you will find no one more reverent than myself'. From addressing her heart, Iph. turns to speak to the unknown strangers who will shortly be brought before her.

351-3 'This too then is true, I have observed, my friends: the unfortunate, having suffered themselves, are not well disposed towards those [even] less fortunate.' Iph. now addresses the chorus in parenthesis, explaining the reason for the change of attitude she has just described, before launching into more reminiscence of her own misfortunes. The point she has just made is that whereas previously she felt pity for those Greeks she had to sacrifice, now her own troubles have destroyed those feelings and made her hostile. This is perfectly explained by the lines in the form given: one might expect people to pity those less fortunate than themselves, but the unfortunate are an exception to this, precisely because they have themselves experienced misfortune (αὐτοὶ κακῶς πράξαντες). This requires only the emendation of τοῖσιν εὐτυχεστέροις (which makes good if trite sense on its own but is irrelevant in context) to τοῖσι δυστυχεστέροις; there is no compelling reason to follow some critics in deleting the lines. The sentiment runs counter to the commoner Greek view associating suffering with the ability to feel pity for others, from Achilles and Priam in *Iliad* 24 onwards.

351 ἦν ... ἥισθημαι: the first verb is imperfect denoting a general truth, the second perfect expressing the state which results from an act of perception (cf. *Hipp.* 1403).

ἄρ(α) with imperfect here implies the realisation of something which has always been the case: cf. 369 and see Denniston 1954: 36–7, Collard and Stevens 2018: 174 (unlikely to be colloquial).

**354–8** The Herdsman believed that the sacrifice of two Greeks would be recompense to Iph. for what was done to her at Aulis (337–9), but Iph., despite her avowed lack of sympathy with the strangers, recognises that only the sacrifice of Helen and Menelaos would provide satisfactory vengeance. The chorus will respond with enthusiasm to her wish (439–46), and later Iph. and Orestes find common ground before the recognition in their hatred of Helen (521–6).

**355 Συμπληγάδας:** 124n.

**356 ἧ μ' ἀπώλεσεν:** Helen's elopement with Paris brought about the destruction of everything which made life worth living to Iph. (for ἀπόλλυμι in this sense, cf. 541). Again a point made briefly in the prologue speech (8) is expanded and given greater emotional focus.

**357 Μενέλεων:** tragedy uses both the epic form Μενέλαος and the Attic Μενέλεως; conveniently they differ metrically, which guarantees that the Attic form is correct here (with \*synizesis, scanned as three syllables).

ἵν(α) 'so that' in a final clause is followed by the indicative when, as here, the action on which the purpose depends is unfulfilled or contrary to fact (Smyth §2185c).

**358** '... setting this Aulis here (ἐνθάδε used adjectivally) against the one there (the real Aulis)'. The Taurian city is described as Aulis because in both places human sacrifice is, or was, offered to Artemis. ἀντιθεῖσα (from ἀντιτίθημι) picks up the prefix of ἀντετιμωρησάμην and emphasises the equivalence of retribution that Iph. imagines.

**359 ὥστε μόσχον:** ὥστε is equivalent to ὡς, 'as, like', as normally in Homer and fairly frequently in tragedy. In Aesch. Ag. 232 Iph. as sacrificial victim is compared to a nanny goat; both goats and cows are common sacrificial victims, and make a more decorous comparison than pigs, while still emphasising the horror of butchering a human like an animal. The comparison of a girl to a heifer also works in a non-sacrificial context: see 27n.

**χειρούμενοι:** cf. 330. The word (from χεῖρ not χείρων; see Beekes s.v. χεῖρ) usually refers to the capture or subduing of animals or human enemies. Both are appropriate here because the Danaans must treat Iph. with violence like an animal before they can fulfil the purpose of their muster at Aulis, the conquest of Troy. In a sacrificial context, the word may recall 347, ἡνίκ' ἔς χέρας λάβοις.

**360 ἔσφαζον:** the imperfect is \*conative, indicating that the Achaeans set about slaughtering her but did not do so (cf. 27, 920). But Iph. several times uses the language of slaughter to paradoxical effect; cf. especially 770, 992. See Introduction, pp. 32–3.

**ιερεὺς ... πατήρ:** although the Homeric poems are well aware of regular priests, sacrifice in the epic is usually performed by the senior member of the sacrificing community – the head of the household in peace time, the chief commander in war. Thus, it makes sense that it is Agamemnon who offers the sacrifice (and nothing is said of any regular cult of Artemis at Aulis which might provide a priestess or priest). It also of course increases the shock and pathos.

**362–3** Iph. describes herself adopting the classic position of supplication, kneeling in front of the person supplicated and grasping his knees with one hand, while stretching out the other to his chin: see *ThesCRA* 111 203, Naiden 2006: 44–9. (A less likely possibility involves deleting 363, so that she only ‘aims’ (ἐξηκόντισσα, a metaphor from javelin-throwing) her arms towards his face, and may not succeed in making physical contact at all.)

**γενείου ... γονάτων τε:** the genitive regularly follows verbs of aiming, hitting, and touching.

**ἐξαρτωμένη:** literally ‘hanging upon’, used in a context of supplication also at *Hipp.* 325 (cf. also *IA* 1226–7).

**364–5** **νυμφεύομαι νυμφεύματ’ αἰσχρά:** the construction with cognate accusative (a type of *\*figura etymologica*; see Allan on *Hel.* 785) is particularly noticeable when, as here, the relationship of the noun to the thing it represents is a metaphorical one: this ‘bridal’ is actually a human sacrifice, hence αἰσχρά perhaps = ‘unseemly’, but also ‘bringing shame’, particularly to the girl’s father. On the relationship between marriage and death, see 369, 370nn.

**365–8** Iph. imagines the normal scenes of rejoicing and music (the *aulos*, the *hymenaios* song) when a bride leaves her home for marriage; on pre-marriage customs at the bride’s house, see Oakley and Sinos 1993: 13–21, and for music and dance, 24–5. In *IA* Klytaimestra accompanies her daughter to the Greek camp, but that is for a specific dramatic purpose; here she remains at home and celebrates festivities for her daughter’s marriage there. A strong contrast is drawn between the two parents, mentioned in successive lines. The extended direct speech (to 371) gives a sense that Iph. is reliving her experiences in the present, which νῦν in 366 may hint at, as well as indicating the simultaneity of the wedding preparations in Argos and the sacrificial preparations at Aulis.

**367** **ὑμνοῦσιν ὑμεναίοισιν:** the wordplay suggests a supposed etymology for ὑμέναιος, the wedding song.

**367–8** **αὐλεῖται δὲ πᾶν μέλαθρον** ‘the whole house resounds with the music of the aulos’. Passive constructions are used in similar auditory contexts at (for instance) *El.* 691, *Hel.* 1433–4.

**368** **ἀλλύμεσθα:** by contrast with 356, the word is here used literally, to mean ‘we are (= I am) being killed’.

**369** ‘So “Achilles” was Hades, not the son of Peleus.’ For the sense of ἄρα, see 351n. Euripides exploits the common tragic equivalence of death (for an unmarried girl) with marriage: compare 856–61, juxtaposing the rituals of marriage and of sacrifice, and see Rehm 1994. Here the appearance of the underworld god in personal form as the bridegroom recalls the rape of Kore-Persephone; see following note.

**370** ἀρμάτων ... ὄχοις: ‘in carriages of chariots’, but really the whole phrase means simply ‘in a carriage’ (cf. *Hipp.* 1161, *Suppl.* 662). A bride was usually escorted to her husband’s home in some sort of wheeled vehicle: Oakley and Sinos 1993: 26–34. Given the ‘marriage to Hades’ motif, the chariot may also recall that used by Hades to abduct Kore (*Hom. Hymn Dem.* 17–20 and very many visual depictions; *LIMC* supp. 966–9, nos 177–248).

**371** This line seems to mark the end of Iph.’s remembered speech to her father, but she continues to reminisce about her departure from Argos.

**372–6** A bride’s face (ὄμμα, 372) was completely or almost completely veiled at her wedding until the moment when the veil was removed by her husband (ἀνακαλυπτήρια), and the veil was strongly associated with αἰδώς, the sense or representation of shame, modesty, or bashfulness. See Llewellyn-Jones 2003: 155–80, 219–24; Cairns 1993: 305–7. Iph. is properly modest, and therefore so abashed at the thought of her imminent wedding that she will not remove the garment placed upon her in preparation for it, even to hug and kiss her siblings. The face-coverings are λεπτά (372) – ‘delicate’, ‘finely worked’, rather than ‘thin’.

**373–7** A final parting would naturally be accompanied by kisses and embraces, and their absence is particularly poignant now that Iph. supposes her brother to be dead. But at the time she reasonably expected to make a return visit to her family as a married woman (ὥς ἥξουσ’ ἐς Ἄργος αὐτὴν, 377); the defeat of her expectations and the omission of the farewells come together to underline the pathos of her situation.

**374** ὅς νῦν ὄλωλεν interrupts the reminiscence with an abrupt cut to the present and Orestes’ supposed death, making the lack of a farewell even more bitter.

**κασιγνήτη:** Elektra, not elsewhere prominent in Iph.’s thoughts about her home in Argos.

**375–6** Πηλέως μέλαθρα: because Achilles’ father is still alive, and because Achilles will shortly be absent in Troy, the palace to which Iph. believes she will be going is described as that of Peleus.

**376–7** ἀπεθέμην ... ἐς αὐθις ‘I put aside, stored up, for another time’. For this use of αὐθις, cf. 1312, 1432.

**378–9** ‘Poor one, if you are dead, what good things you have departed from, Orestes, what an enviable state [derived from] your father.’ The recollection of the last occasion on which she saw her natal home prompts Iph. to pity her brother for being deprived in death of the happiness and prosperity he must have enjoyed there.

**πατρός ζηλωμάτων:** Iph. reasonably supposes that Agamemnon still enjoys power and prosperity (cf. 543, ὃν λέγουσ’ εὐδαιμονεῖν); she has no reason to imagine that he is dead, although the effect of her supposition is ironic.

**380** It is likely that before this line there is a lacuna in the text; otherwise the transition is extremely abrupt, though not signalled by any particle stronger than δέ, and certainly in performance a pause would be necessary. The narrative trajectory in which Iph. has been engaged leads naturally to the abortive sacrifice at Aulis and her subsequent role in the land of the Taurians, but the preceding two lines have led in a different direction altogether. The missing lines could have returned briefly to her own position as priestess in Taurike, far from the brother she presumes dead; this would give a smoother sequence of thought.

**380–91** This is one of several passages in which Euripidean characters express criticism of the gods or disbelief in some traditional aspect of divine cult or (more usually) myth. There is a fine irony in having the priestess reject the basis of the cult she has to practise (Ion’s shock when he hears that Apollo, the god he serves, has fathered a child with a mortal woman, *Ion* 436–51, is only partly comparable), but this is consistent with the play’s suggestion that it is part of the divine plan for the Taurian cult to cease and be transmuted into the ‘civilised’ worship done in Attica (see 1086–8 and n., with Athena’s endorsement of the new cult at 1438–61). Moreover, it is important that Iph. expresses this ‘improved’ understanding of the goddess’ nature, since otherwise she might later seem to be impious in pretending to Thoas that the goddess has rejected the proposed sacrifice, and in moving the image. Her conclusions in fact appear to be correct. This is unusual in Euripides, where characters’ views of the gods are often undermined by the events of the drama itself (most obviously in *HF* 1341–6), even though the author may seem to direct his audience towards agreement or at least sympathy with the characters’ viewpoint (Introduction, pp. 36–7). This is also perhaps the only such passage which explicitly moves from criticism to disbelief, although the connexion is implicit e.g. in *Bellerophon* fr. 286, which is however a much more shocking passage, arguing that the gods do not exist. Within the play itself, Iph.’s scepticism here serves as preparation for eventual acceptance of the plan to steal the cult image and her view that Artemis would actually prefer to be located in a civilised Greek setting. See also Sansone

1975, arguing that the passage is crucial in the play's exploration of civilisation and barbarism.

**380 δέ:** cf. 105n.

**μέφομαι:** with this emphatic first-person, Iph. adopts a defiant pose (see 386–8n.).

**σοφίσματα:** the basic meaning of the word is a clever device or contrivance, and it is used in that sense at line 1031. Elsewhere in Euripides it often carries negative connotations (for instance *Hec.* 258, *Phoen.* 1408) and is frequently used as here to mean 'sophistry' in the modern sense of a clever but specious argument (*Phoen.* 65, *Bacch.* 30, 489). Fr. 972 attributes deceptive σοφίσματα to the gods, but there the meaning is rather 'harmful tricks'. Here the σοφίσματα constitute an over-subtle distinction masking hypocrisy (one rule for gods, another for mortals: βροτῶν μὲν ... αὐτῇ δέ).

**381 ἥτις** refers to τῆς θεοῦ, leading into a relative clause which explains the subtleties that Iph. blames.

**382–4** Pollution or ritual impurity could be caused by homicide or by close proximity to birth or death, and rendered one unfit for contact with the gods, at least for a certain amount of time, or until a rite of purification had been performed, depending on the case. See Parker 1983, esp. 32–73, 104–43. Iph. first takes the case of a murderer (φόνος must here have the sense 'murder' rather than 'spilled blood'), to make the parallel with human sacrifice: if someone kills another, Artemis keeps him from her altars, considering him polluted (μυσαρόν), but takes pleasure herself in sacrifices which equally involve the killing of humans. But more than this, she rejects worship *even if* (ἥ καὶ ... θίγηι) someone has been in contact with a woman giving birth or has laid out a corpse. Not just killers, but blameless people engaged in necessary life-cycle events, are excluded from the goddess' sanctuaries, making the double standard more extreme. Line 382 has been suspected of being an interpolation, adding nothing to the argument, but rather seems to make an effective crescendo in Iph.'s indignation.

**383 μυσαρόν ὡς ἡγούμενη** 'as thinking him polluted', ὡς with participle supplying a (pretended?) motive.

**384 ἦδεταί:** a strong word, 'takes pleasure in', used in the same context at 35, and in the parallel Iph. draws below at 388.

**385–6** 'There is no way that Zeus's consort Leto would have given birth to such foolishness.' ἀμαθία/ἀμαθής, however, sometimes have a moral sense; cf. *HF* 347, ἀμαθής τις εἶ θεός (with Bond's note), and probably *Ion* 916. Artemis could be neither so morally deficient nor so inconsistent: Iph. moves from blaming the goddess to supposing that the Taurian view of her is incorrect.

**386–8** ‘So then, I judge the feasts of Tantalos for the gods incredible – that they enjoyed devouring his son.’ Like Pindar (*Ol.* 1.35–53), Iph. rejects the story that Tantalos tested the gods by serving up his own son Pelops at the feast he shared with them, and that Demeter, absorbed in grief for the loss of her daughter, ate one of his shoulders. Though the parallel is hardly exact, the point of contact is the idea of a deity demanding or acquiescing in the slaughter of an innocent human being. Iph.’s disbelief may perhaps apply only to the gods participating, not to Tantalos’ experiment (Sansone 1975: 288–9). Or there may be an implicit contrast: ‘*I* (ἐγὼ μὲν) don’t even believe the story about Tantalos – but these people believe and practise something worse.’ ἐγὼ μὲν thus contrasts with τοὺς δ’ ἐνθάδ’ (even though grammatically the latter depends on δοκῶ), but also, like μέμφομαι in 380, emphasises the speaker’s own choice to adopt a certain position, represented as superior to the alternative or common view. Similar is *HF* 1341–3, Herakles rejecting Theseus’ mythologically based consolation: ἐγὼ δὲ ... οὔτ’ ἠξίωσα πώποτ’ οὔτε πείσομαι, and the Pindar passage mentioned above (*Ol.* 1.52): ἐμοὶ δ’ ἄπορα ... εἰπεῖν ἀφίσταμαι. Iph.’s example here brings Greek and Taurian traditions into juxtaposition, but also refers to her own ancestor (cf. 1, 200, 988). See Introduction, p. 38 and n. 90.

**387** **θεοῖσιν**: dative because ἐστιάματα is felt to have verbal force; ἐστιάω may take a dative (Diggle 1994: 106 n. 48).

**388** **ἡσθῆναι**: the infinitive, with the gods as implied subject, is in loose apposition to Ταντάλου ... ἐστιάματα.

**389–90** ‘I think that the people here, since they are themselves inclined to homicide, attribute their defect (τὸ φαῦλον) to the goddess.’ The rationalist view that concepts of the divine originate in projections of the worshippers’ own qualities was already forcefully stated in Xenophanes’ famous observation that since Thracian and Ethiopian gods resemble their human worshippers, horses and cattle, if they could draw, would represent gods in horse and cattle form (D–K 21B 15–16).

**391** Rejection of an improper view of the gods is, as often, followed by a positive principle, here serving resonantly as scene-end. The principle enunciated is borne out, or at least not contradicted, by the play’s events.

### 392–465 FIRST STASIMON AND CHORAL ANAPAESTS

Choral odes seldom respond to the immediately preceding lines, and the first stasimon follows the general rule in reflecting the issues of the previous scene as a whole. The ode combines richly descriptive passages evoking the distant (for the audience) and strange places of the Black Sea coast with speculation about Greek travellers – those who set sail



in search of gain, and those who might conceivably be able to save the chorus members from their servitude in barbarian lands. The audience perceives that this speculation about the strangers' motives for travelling to the Black Sea is ill-founded, and can guess that the wish for rescue will have some link to the developing plot.

*First strophe:* the chorus invoke the Bosporos, recalling an early unhappy journey from Europe to Asia, that of Io, and wonder what strangers may now have arrived among the Taurians from Greece.

*First antistrophe:* Were they travelling in search of wealth? Such motivation can be harmful.

*Second strophe:* A romantic evocation of exotic maritime travel and the Black Sea area. How did they manage to reach such places?

*Second antistrophe:* If only Helen might arrive here, as Iph. wished, so that she might be sacrificed. If only some Greek traveller might arrive to put an end to my slavery and let me return home.

### *Metre*

The play's first purely choral song is metrically completely different from the anapaestic parodos. The first strophic pair mixes aeolic with iambic metres, which allied with some textual uncertainty has the result that several phrases can be analysed in different ways (indeed some scholars have characterised the metre as predominantly dactylo-epitrite). The second pair is much more straightforward aeolo-choriambic.

### *First strophic pair*

392–3	— ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — —	choriambus + alcaic decasyllable
407–8	— ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — —	cho + alc dec
394	∪ — ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪	iambus + dodrans
409	∪ — ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪	ia dod
395	— ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ — —	iambic trimeter catalectic (ia ia bacchius)
410	— ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ — —	ia trim cat (ia ia ba)
396	∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪	reizianum
411	∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪	reiz
397	— — — ∪ ∪ — —	pherecratean
412	— — — ∪ ∪ — —	pher

398-9	υ-υυυ υ-υ- υυυυ-	ia trim
413-14	υ-υ- †-υυυ υ- υ-υ-†	[ia trim]
400	υ-υ- --	ia spondee
415	υ-υ- --	ia sp
401	--υυ-υ--	hagesichorean
416	--υυ-υ--	hag
402-3	υ-υυ-υυ-υ-υ-υ--	archilochean
417-18	υ-υυ-υυ-υ-υ-υ--	archil
404	-- --	2 sp
419	-- --	2 sp
405	---υυ-υ-	glyc
420	---υυ-υ-	glyc
406	---υυ-~	pher
421	---υυ--	pher
<i>Second strophic pair</i>		
422	---υυ-υ-	glyconic
439	-----υυ-	wilamowitzianum
423	--υυ-υ-	telesillean
440	--υυ-υ-	tel
424	---υυ-	dod B
441	---υυ-	dod B
425	-υυυ υ-υυυ υ-υ-	cretic + ia dimeter
442	-υυυ υ-υυυ υ-υ-	cr + ia dim
426	-υυ-υ-~	aristophanean
443	-υυ-υ--	ar
427	υ-----υυ-	wil
444	υ--υ-υυ-	wil

428	---<->~ -	heptasyllable
445	-----~ ~ -	hept
429	--~ -~ ~ -	hept
446	-----~ ~ -	hept
430	--~ -~ ~ -	hept
447	-----~ ~ -	hept
431	-----~ ~ -	hept
448	-----~ ~ -	hept
432	-----~ ~ -	wil
449	-----~ ~ -	wil
433	---~ ~ -	dod B
450	---~ ~ -	dod B
434	--~ -~ ~ -	hept
451	-----~ ~ -	hept
435	-~ ~ - -~ ~ -	cho dim
452	-~ ~ - -~†--	[cho dim]
436	-----~ ~ -	wil
453	-~ -~ -~ ~ -	wil
437	-~ -----	wil
454	-----~ ~ -	wil
438	---~ ~ ~ ~	pher
439	---~ ~ ~ -	pher

**392-7** 'Dark, dark conjoinings of the sea, where the gadfly that flew from Argos crossed on the inhospitable [ocean] swell, exchanging Europe for the land of Asia.' The reference to the involuntary wanderings of Io, changed into a cow by Zeus and tormented by the gadfly (cattle pest) sent by Hera, would easily be understood by the audience from the conjunction of οἷστρος and Ἀργόθεν and the reference to the Bosporos (392n.). Io's story, set early in mythological time and well known to include extensive

travel to points east of the Greek world (cf. [Aesch.] *Prometheus Bound* 707-35 and Herodotus' 'rationalisation' at 1.1.3-4), and especially connected with the Bosporos, is used as a backdrop paralleling the sufferings of the chorus and Iph., also Greek women in the east.

**392** **κυάνειαι κυάνειαι**: the repetition is typical of Euripidean lyric: cf. 402 below and see 138n. **κυάνεος** refers originally to the appearance of dark blue enamel; in early Greek, it is the darkness rather than the hue which is predominant in the word, and this is probably the case here. The Symplegades (124n.) were known as **κυάνειαι πέτραι**; see 746 and n.

**393** **σύνοδοι θαλάσσης** refers to the Bosporos, the strait which joins the Propontis (Sea of Marmara) to the Black Sea, and which forms the southern entrance to the latter. The name Bosporos, whatever its actual origin, was etymologised as if from **βοῦς** and **πόρος**, 'cow ford', and said to have been the place where Io crossed from Europe to Asia ([Aesch.] *PV* 732-4; the reference thus leads naturally on to the mythological connexion).

**395** The text in L is defective, requiring two long syllables after **διεπέρασε** in order to correspond with 410 in the antistrophe. **πόντου** is the easiest supplement; **ἰοῦς** is unnecessary to supply the sense, and would be positioned uncomfortably far from **οἴστρος**.

**396-7** For 'Asia' and 'Europe' in this play, see 132-5n.

**399-401** The chorus suggest Sparta or Thebes as possible origins for the travellers, referring to each by the name of its river. The Eurotas, flowing through Laconia past Sparta itself, is characterised as reedy in *Helen* (349-50); the reed is *Arundo donax*, the Mediterranean giant reed. Dirke is a famous spring and river of Thebes. Natural waters may be characterised as **σεμνά** because they are associated with the gods, often identified themselves as divine.

**402** **ἔβασαν ἔβασαν**: 392n.

**ἄμεικτον**: literally, 'without mingling', therefore 'unsociable, inhospitable'.

**403-6** '... where human blood wets the altars and columned temples for the daughter of Zeus'. But the shocking **αἷμα βρότειον** is emphatically postponed to form the last words of the strophe. The liquid used transgressively in a religious context contrasts with the pure waters of the Greek rivers in 399-401.

**κούραι Δίαι** (dat. sg.) is equivalent to **κούραι Διός**. For this use of an adjective as patronymic, equivalent to the genitive, compare **παῖδ' Ἀγαμεμνονίαν** (1115) and **Ἀγαμεμνονείας παιδός** (1290) for Iph., and **Ἀγαμεμνόνιον θάλος** for Orestes (170-1).

**περικίονας ναούς**: i.e. temples with columns all around their exterior, in the Greek manner; cf. 72-5 and Bacon 1961: 132-5 for the Greek form of the sanctuary.

**407–12** ‘Have they, with surf twin-struck by pinewood oar (εἰλατίνας ... κώπας, gen. sg.) conveyed their naval vehicle over the sea waves, and with breezes that drive forward the linen sails, escalating for their homes the struggle that loves wealth?’ εἰλατίνας ... κώπας is gen. sg. depending on ῥοθίοις ... δικρότοισι, lit. ‘with twice-struck surf of pinewood oar’.

**407 ῥοθίοις**: properly an adjective ‘rushing, roaring’, ῥόθιος is frequently used as a neut. pl. substantive in tragedy, signifying the noise made by sea water either when it breaks as a wave on the shore, or when moved by oars. (With the transmitted text, ῥοθίοις must represent an adjective, one of three qualifying in the dative: ‘with plashing pinewood double-striking oars ...’, but the text as emended, with its form of noun-a adj.-b adj.-a noun-b, seems more characteristic of Euripidean choral lyric.)

**εἰλατίνας**: conventionally translated ‘made of pine’, but ἑλάτη actually means various types of fir (*Abies alta*, *A. cephalonica*, and others) which were commonly used for oars in antiquity. See Meiggs 1982: 118–20. The lengthened form εἰλατίνος is a metrical convenience found in epic (e.g. *Od.* 2.424), from where it enters the poetic vocabulary.

**408 δικρότοισι** might indicate a ship with two banks of oars, as is usually the case in prose, or more plausibly may refer to the impact of the oars on the water either side of the ship.

**409 ἴστειλαν**: the most likely conjecture for L’s ἐπλευσαν. The verb must govern νάιον ὄχημα as direct object (and/or possibly εἰλατίνας ... κώπας if this is to be read as acc. pl.), but πλέω never takes an accusative of the vessel sailed in.

**410** The commonest meaning of ὄχημα is ‘car’ or ‘chariot’ (used for general transportation rather than in battle), but its ultimate derivation from ἔχω suggests its more general application to mean anything which holds or supports, as a carriage holds those who ride in it, and the sense ‘vehicle’ covers most of its uses. For the application to ships, cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 468, Soph. *Trach.* 656.

**λινόποροισί τ’ αὔραις** ‘and with canvas-propelling breezes’; thus the two methods of propulsion, oars and sails, sandwich the ship and its movement.

**411 φιλόπλουτον ἄμιλλαν** ‘wealth-loving contest’ or ‘striving’, a typically close-packed phrase indicating a struggle motivated by love of wealth to attain it. Compare *Medea* 557, ἄμιλλαν πολύτεκνον, ‘striving to have many children’. ἄμιλλα is not purely a ‘struggle’, but retains something of its usual notion of competition here: merchants are said to escalate (αὔξοντες) their ἄμιλλα in their desire to surpass each other’s profits. μελάθροισιν is dative of advantage: they struggle to gain wealth for their houses.

**413-14** 'For beloved hope becomes insatiable for men, to the ruin of mortals.' This is a difficult phrase, which as given in L fails to correspond with 398-9 and where βροτῶν is highly suspect in close proximity to ἀνθρώποις. No emendation is entirely convincing. In general terms, however, it is clear that the line's function is to introduce the thought dominating the second half of the antistrophe, that the love of gain leads some into trouble. This would certainly be the case in the present instance, if the travellers were indeed motivated by profit.

**416-18** φέρονται is middle: '... people who win for themselves a weight of wealth ...' In the chorus' view, wealth becomes a burden, something unpleasant which they link with the need for toilsome travel: 'wandering over the sea-swell and travelling through barbarian cities'. The linked ideas that seafaring for the purposes of trade is difficult and hazardous and that merchants are driven by a powerful desire for wealth are found fairly often in Greek literature, e.g. Solon 13.43-6, Soph. fr. 555, Pl. *Grg.* 472d.

**419** δόξαι: i.e. the aim or expectation of gaining wealth, which all such traders share.

**420-1** 'For some their judgement of wealth is untimely, but for others it reaches due measure.' All traders act in hope of profit, but while some take risks which lead to disaster (for instance, ending up among barbarians who practise human sacrifice), others make only appropriate ventures. This interpretation depends on adopting μέτρον for μέσον, necessary because the meaning of ἐς μέσον without further specification is 'publicly', 'in plain view', 'common to all' (LSJ s.v. μέσος IIIb), which gives no sense in a context where a contrast is clearly required. Parker quotes Hes. *Op.* 689-94 and Pind. *Ol.* 13.47-8 for the association between καρπός and μέτρον.

οἷς μὲν ... τοῖς δ' is an unusual variant for τοῖς μὲν ... τοῖς δέ; the relative rather than the article in the first member is found also at Dem. 41.11, and more commonly in Hellenistic and later Greek.

**422-38** In the second strophe, under the form of a question ('how did they ...?'), the journey of the strangers is imagined, from the Bosporos around the coast northwards and eastwards to the Tauric Chersonese. The sea is depicted as a strange and magical place, associated with mythical characters and the haunt of marine goddesses.

**422** For the metre, see 439n.

συνδρομάδας πέτρας: a synonym for the 'clashing rocks', usually known as Symplegades, at the entrance to the Black Sea. See 124n.

**423-6** 'How did they pass beyond the sleepless shores of the sons of Phineus, hastening by the sea coast over the rushing waves of Amphitrite?'

**423-4** The 'coasts of the Phineidai' should refer to the area around Salmydessos on the west (Thracian) coast of the Black Sea, called by

the author of *Prometheus Bound* ‘enemy of foreign sailors, stepmother of ships’ (726–7, ἐχθρόθενος ναύταισι, μητρειὰ νεῶν). Phineus was a king of Salmydessos with a complex and variable mythology, best known for his victimisation by the Harpies (*Harpyiai*, ‘snatchers’), bird-women who seized his food and tormented him. According to the *Catalogue of Women* (Hes. fr. 156 M–W), Kalais and Zetes, sons of Boreas and among the Argonauts, succeeded by prayer in chasing the monsters away; the story was also shown on the sixth-century chest of Kypselos (Paus. 5.17.1). It is quite likely that, as in Ap. Rhod. 2.309–407, in return for this Phineus gave the Argonauts guidance on their journey. In Apollonius he begins by telling them how to pass the Symplegades and enter the Black Sea; geographically this is difficult, since Salmydessos is located some sixty miles beyond the Bosphoros, but if the tradition is old it may account for the juxtaposition of the Symplegades and Phineus here.

**ἄϋπνους**, if correct (cf. Soph. *OC* 685, ἄυπνοι κρηναί), indicates in context the stormy nature of the coast (‘the breakers were never at rest’ – England *ad loc.*), but it is also possible that it conceals some original compound in -πνους – ‘blowing, blown’.

**425** Amphitrite is one of the first mentioned Nereids at Hes. *Theog.* 240–64 (see 427–9n.) and at 930–3 she is apparently the wife of Poseidon, certainly mother by him of Triton. Her name is very frequently used in marine contexts.

**427–9** The Nereids (see also 273–4) were sea goddesses, daughters of Nereus, of whom the best known was Thetis the mother of Achilles. Many are named at *Il.* 18.37–49, and in the *Theogony* (240–62) they are said to be fifty in number. Dancing is a favourite occupation, from Bacchylides 17 (101–8) onwards. The choruses are ‘circular’ (ἐγκύκλιοι), performed in a ring, often a revolving ring. Despite some earlier assertions, κύκλιος χορός is not a synonym for dithyramb: the latter, at least in origin, is a subset of the former (Fearn 2007: 165–70, Ceccarelli 2013: 162–6), and is well attested for female choruses (Calame 1997 [1977]: 34–8). Particularly close to the present passage and also describing the Nereids is *IA* 1054–7.

**χοροί** are both dances and groups of dancers; μέλπουσιν includes both singing and dancing, which normally go together. There is an element of self-referentiality in the chorus’ singing of choruses (‘the dramatic chorus can temporarily appear to embody the one they describe’ – Weiss 2017: 80; see also Henrichs 1995), and despite the exotic setting the passage has some links with the maidens’ dances which the chorus recall at 1143–52.

**430 πλησιστίοισι**: the breezes are ‘sail-filling’, from πίμπλημι and ἰστία, cf. *Od.* 11.7, where the word is also applied to a wind.

**431–4** ‘as the bedded(?) steering-oars shrill at the stern, in the southerly breezes or the breaths of Zephyros (the west wind)’. Ships were

steered with *πηδάλια*, a pair of large oars situated at the stern, but *εὐνή* and *εὐναῖος* normally refer to stones used as anchors, which keep the vessel still as if in a bed. Here *εὐναίων* may possibly indicate that the oars are permanently fixed and never removed from the ship. *συριζόντων* vividly describes the creaking noise made by the *πηδάλια*, and suggests an imitative accompaniment on the *aulos* (Weiss 2018, esp. 154–5). The chorus continue to imagine the journey towards the Chersonese, in a north-easterly direction from the Bosphoros, facilitated by the south and west winds.

**435–7** The ‘land full of birds, the white coast, Achilles’ lovely racecourse’, if it is one place, refers to the island of Leuke, near the mouth of the Danube, west of the Tauric peninsula, currently known as Ostriv Zmiyinyy (Ukr. ‘Snake Island’). In antiquity it was famous as the posthumous abode of Achilles, who had a sanctuary on the island; it was uninhabited, and known also for the large number of seabirds which flocked there, and which according to Arrian (*Peripl. M. Eux.* 21) honoured Achilles by ritual ablutions of his temple. Arrian states that Leuke is also known as the Racecourse of Achilles (*Δρόμος Ἀχιλλέως*), which may be an inference from the present passage. But Strabo (7.3.19) locates the Racecourse in a quite different area of the Black Sea, at the mouth of the river Borysthenes (Dnieper), and it is almost certainly identifiable with the long and narrow sandbar known as the Tendra Spit, which would lie between Leuke and the Tauric Chersonese on a coast-hugging voyage. It is likely that Euripides is blurring the geographical lines of the latter part of the journey and presents the Black Sea as a more or less undifferentiated area. See also Hall 2012: 48–50 and for the sources Zeitlin 2019: 466–9.

It is strictly speaking implausible for the chorus at this point to associate Achilles with the area, since like Iph. (537) they must be ignorant of his fate. But at this point (contrast the antistrophe) the chorus are singing not so much in their character of Greek captives as in the role of a generalised commentator, with a panoramic view of mythological time and space.

**439–55** The final antistrophe, as often, marks a change of tone, in this case from detached speculation to passionate personal emotion, as the chorus first wish for vengeance on Helen, whom perhaps, like Iph., they view as the source of their troubles, and then move on to their most heartfelt wish of all: that a Greek ship would somehow arrive and deliver them from slavery. It is unusual for a chorus to make such a specific allusion to their own feelings, and there is a certain irony in the wish: though the audience cannot yet know that the events now in train will free these slave women, there must be some expectation of that possibility. The men who will bring about their desire arrive on stage immediately the song is finished.



**439** εὐχᾶσιν δεσποσύνοις 'through my mistress' prayers'. The chorus allude overtly to 354-7, where Iph. regrets that Helen has not been shipwrecked in the Taurian land, so that she might have the pleasure of sacrificing her. In fact, this passage is a kind of lyric re-working of the earlier trimeters. Metrically the line is not exactly equivalent to 422, but responsion between wilamowitzianum (as here) and glyconic (422) is not uncommon. See Diggle 1994: 195.

**442** Τρωϊάδα λιποῦσα πόλιν: not until 524 will Iph. and the chorus learn that Helen has now returned to Sparta with Menelaos.

**442-5** '... so that, encircled round her hair with a bloody dew, she might die at my mistress' throat-cutting hand' or possibly 'encircled round her hair with a bloody dew by the throat-cutting hand of my mistress, she might die'. Although the passive of ἐλίσσω is usually close in sense to the middle ('whirl around'), a true passive sense for ἐλιχθεῖσα is easy to intuit here; the construction is difficult because of the accusative δρόσον αἵματηράν, where we might expect a dative (as at Hdt. 7.90.1, τὰς κεφαλὰς εἰλίχτο μίτρησι, 'they [the Cyprian kings] were encircled as to their heads with turbans'). However, the dative here is used for the agent (λαιμοτόμῳ ... χειρὶ), and Greek sometimes retains in the passive the accusative which would be found in the active construction (δέσποινα ἄμφι χαίτῃ ἐλίσσει δρόσον αἵματηράν, 'my mistress circles a bloody dew round [Helen's] hair'): Kühner-Gerth 1.125, 7. The shocking explicitness here, compared with 354-7, is due to the vividness appropriate to lyric rather than to any differential in the characterisation of Iph. and the chorus. The picture is a composite one, as the chorus partially conflate the consecration (κατάρχεσθαι) by sprinkling water on the victim (see 40n.), which the priestess would certainly do, with the slaughter, which she would be most unlikely to perform herself even in the case of an animal victim, and which in fact we learn later (622) is not her task. The priestess is nonetheless responsible for the sacrifice, and so can in a sense be said to kill the victim, even if not literally with her own hands, as here (see 621n.).

δρόσον αἵματηράν out of context might mean simply 'blood', as δρόσος can stand for any moisture (255n.), but since it is described as encircling Helen's hair it must indicate the water of consecration, sprinkled on the animal victim's head. 'Bloody' is then used metaphorically, as the water denotes the killing which will follow; there is a striking confusion of liquids.

**446** Like Iph. (356-8), the chorus suppose that the sacrifice of Helen would be adequate recompense for Iph.'s near sacrifice and consequent sufferings.

**447-55** It now becomes clear that the previous lines, echoing Iph.'s earlier wish, were actually a foil to the sentiment that follows: of course it

would be good if Helen could be suitably punished, but what the chorus would *really* like would be for a Greek ship to turn up so that they could be rescued from slavery and return home – an ironic wish in the circumstances (see 439-55n.).

**450-1** ‘... to put an end to the pain of my miserable servitude’.

**452-5** ‘For I wish that even [only] in dreams I might be(?) in my home and my father’s city, the enjoyment of sweet sleep, the blessing of happiness which is shared by all.’ But the text here is very uncertain. It is clear that, having mentioned their greatest wish in the lines immediately preceding, the chorus now refer to the experience of being at home in dreams. συμβαίην must be wrong, since the meaning of συμβαίνω is ‘come to an agreement’, which is out of place here; σuneίην is possible (and helps the metre), but not clearly right. Otherwise, with the text as supplemented (καὶν = καὶ ἐν) something is left to be understood, and the connexion of thought is ‘Even in dreams I would choose to be home; [how much more so in reality!]’ This is very much easier with the emendation ὕπνων for L’s ὕμνων; the last two phrases, in apposition to the clause expressing the circumstances wished for, refer then to the pleasures of sleep and dreams which are accessible to everyone, no matter what their status or fortune. But with different emendations and supplements (in particular ὥς rather than καὶν or καὶ) the chorus have been supposed rather to wish that Greek sailors would arrive who could take them away to enjoy the pleasures of home which now they can experience only in dreams. Proponents of this interpretation generally wish to keep L’s reading ὕμνων, so that the chorus think particularly of the pleasure of song when they recall their home. This would anticipate their nostalgic recollection of the maidens’ dances they enjoyed in their earlier lives (1143-52, the conclusion of the second stasimon); but at this point, before the later passage, it is perhaps implausibly allusive. Whatever the difficulties of the passage, the reference to dreams suggests the parallel between the chorus and Iph., who has dreamed of being back in her home (44-55), even if it gave her no pleasure.

**456-65** At the conclusion of the chorus’ song, some anonymous Taurian attendants enter from the *parodos* representing the direction away from the town (Introduction, p. 23), leading Orestes and Pylades, bound as captives. On the identity of these attendants, see below, 466-642n. The chorus meanwhile respond to and announce the entry, as often, in anapaests, making a transition metrically between the preceding lyrics and the following trimeter scene. Anapaestic entrance announcements in Euripides are typically associated with what Hourmouziades (1965: 140-1) and Halleran (1985: 11-18) call ‘moving tableaux’: complex entrances involving more than one person, and often proceeding at a slow pace.

L gives 456–62 to Iph., but an announcement of this sort by a character other than the chorus would be unparalleled. The change was probably made because φιλαί in 458 suggested to a scribe that Iph. must be addressing the chorus. But there is no reason why the Chorus-leader should not thus address the other chorus members.

**458 πρόσφαγμα:** 243–4n.

**459 ἀκροθίνια:** 72–5n. Here, however, the word has an unusual application, appropriate to a scenario of human sacrifice: the two young men are the finest offerings from the Greeks. Similarly at *Phoen.* 203 the chorus of Phoenician women making their way to Delphi as an offering (though not a sacrifice) to Apollo use this word to describe themselves.

**461 ἔλακεν:** this poetic word (present tense λάσκω) has the primary sense ‘shout’, but frequently indicates a solemn proclamation, like that of an oracle (cf. 976). It is a rather grandiose word to describe the Herdsman’s speech, but the chorus are thinking of the strangers’ arrival in religious terms.

**463–6** ‘Lady, if this city performs these things (in a way) pleasing to you, receive the sacrifices, which *our* custom declares to be impious.’ The chorus/Chorus-leader’s address to the goddess at first seems to be couched in traditional terms, with the conditional expressing a wish that the sacrifice should be acceptable. But in context, especially after Iph.’s doubts at 380–91, it must be very uncertain whether human sacrifice is in fact pleasing to Artemis, and the chorus immediately go on to express the disjunction between Taurian custom and their own (ὁ παρ’ ἡμῖν νόμος). For Greeks, such sacrifices are very definitely not pious or permissible (οὐχ ὀσίαις).

**464 πόλις ᾗδε:** although not Greek, the community is several times called a πόλις in the play (cf. 595, 1209, 1212, 1214, 1417); see Introduction, pp. 17–18.

#### 466–1088 SECOND EPISODE

The long scene from 466 to 1088 is best analysed as a single *episodion* in which the shifting relationships between Iph., Orestes, and Pylades are displayed. The kommos at 643–56 is very short and does not function like a stasimon to mark an emphatic break between scenes, despite Iph.’s exit into the temple at that point. The lyric dialogue between Orestes and Iph. at 827–99 is longer, but does not lead up to or follow any entrance or exit. Nonetheless, the two lyric sections can be seen to subdivide the episode into three parts.

**466–642** *First trimeter section of episode.* This can further be divided into two, not through formal criteria but in terms of plot development. In

466-577, Iph. questions Orestes and discovers her brother is alive; in 578-642, she sets out the plan to send Orestes home with a letter to her family, chiefly her brother. She then enters the temple to collect the letter, which is already written.

When Orestes first speaks, he abruptly rejects the priestess' sympathy, and in the following *\*stichomythia*, in which Iph. seeks to learn more about him, he continues his hostile and uncooperative stance, eventually provoking her to criticism in 503. His attitude enables the recognition to be postponed for nearly 400 lines, but it is also psychologically appropriate for a captive condemned to death who is being interrogated by one implicated in that death. His revelations of matters following on the fall of Troy contain little news to surprise the audience; what is interesting here is Iph.'s reception of what she hears (she rejoices at the death of Kalchas and the misfortunes of Odysseus, for instance, since she blames them for her own plight) and the way in which both parties express themselves guardedly, further postponing their recognition. At several points in the long *stichomythic* exchange it seems that their identity must soon be revealed: at 499 Iph. asks Orestes' name (but he refuses to tell her), at 540 Orestes is struck by Iph.'s knowledge of Greek affairs and asks who she is (but she says only that she is from Greece), and at 550 he is surprised by her evident distress on hearing of Agamemnon's death (but she claims to be lamenting only a change of fortune). The discrepant knowledge of the two principals, each having crucial knowledge that the other lacks, and of the audience results in some particularly complex and sustained dramatic irony. At the same time, the tension mounts as the possibility that the sister will sacrifice her brother, which seems on the surface likely at the beginning of the scene, first recedes with Iph.'s plan to send Orestes home with her letter, then returns as Orestes determines to change places with Pylades.

Iph.'s questioning also leads to a gradual shift in Orestes' attitude, paving the way for the eventual recognition. Her own fellow feeling grows as she realises that like herself the stranger is from Argos (509), and hears his news that Orestes is still alive (569). But during her questioning Orestes, at first truculent, is gradually drawn into the inquiry, as he realises (540) how well informed she is about Greek affairs. Sympathy grows between the two, as even in the depths of his plight Orestes admits that the priestess has a good reason to inquire about matters in Greece (542), and his replies become less brusque, so that when Iph. puts forward her plan he responds positively and simply suggests a modification. This change in Orestes' stance allows Iph. to make important discoveries, but also reveals to the audience the extent of their shared concerns.

Iph. has probably remained on stage during the first stasimon, and at its close some anonymous Taurian attendants enter, leading Orestes and Pylades, bound as captives. The identity of these attendants and their movements on and off stage is a difficult problem. At 468–71, Iph. commands a male group to untie the captives and go into the temple to make preparations; at 638, preparing to enter the temple herself, she tells some πρόσπολοι to guard the captives without bonds; at 725–6 she re-enters from the temple and again orders a male group to go inside to assist those preparing the sacrifice. Who are these groups? There are four main solutions to the problem: (1) To delete 470–1 (Bain 1981: 38–9, tentatively). (2) To suppose that only some of the mute extras enter the temple at 471, leaving others on stage to be addressed at 638 and finally dismissed at 725–6. (3) To posit a group of male attendants already on stage at the beginning of the scene, who have entered in the parodos along with the chorus and assist with the *choai*. Orestes' and Pylades' captors are addressed at 470–1, and this other group at 638 and 725–6. (4) To suppose that the attendants are dismissed into the temple at 470–1; the πρόσπολοι addressed at 638 are the chorus; and Iph. is accompanied at her re-entrance by attendants whom she then immediately dismisses (Kyriakou 162).

All these solutions are open to objections. (1) The lines are certainly similar to 725–6, but there appears to be no plausible reason for interpolation. (2) There is no indication that only some of the attendants are addressed, and it is perhaps awkward to have Taurians on stage during the conversation between Iph. and Orestes, which includes the plan to free one of the captives – but see below. (3) There is no indication in the parodos that any attendants or ritual assistants are present other than the women of the chorus, and no need for their presence either. (4) πρόσπολοι could be attendants of either gender, and the word would certainly be an appropriate one for Iph. to use to the chorus as her temple servants (cf. δμῳαί, 143), but it would seem odd for her to be accompanied by male attendants at 725ff. and pointless, bordering on farcical, for them to enter only to exit back into the *skēnē* immediately.

On balance, a version of (2) seems the best solution. The attendants sent into the temple at 470–1 are entrusted with making ritual preparations (εὐτρεπίζετε), while those addressed at 638 and dismissed at 725–6 are asked in the latter passage to *assist* in preparations (παρευτρεπίζετε) for those in charge (τοῖς ἐφεστῶσι σφαγῇ). The first group, then, seem to belong to the temple and probably are to be identified with those who will take care of the actual slaughter when Iph. presides over the sacrifice (624 with n.). The second group are unskilled guards, perhaps in the employ of the king, at whose command they may be assumed to accompany the

captives despite having handed them over to temple authority. The distinction between the two groups could easily be seen in their dress and demeanour at their joint entrance at the start of this scene. The guards remain onstage with their charges until they are sent inside at 725–6, but retreat into the background where they can be supposed to be effectively out of earshot, and are certainly out of the audience's minds.

**466–577** *Iphigeneia asks Orestes for news of Greece.*

**467–8** 'First I must think about the affairs of the goddess, so that they may be in a proper state.' After her rebellious theological speculation in the preceding scene, and following the break provided by the first stasimon, Iph. resumes her dutiful persona as priestess of the Taurian Artemis (the \*extra-metrical εἶεν signifies her change of discourse; see 342n.). Her first concern, as she says, is to make all the cult arrangements properly.

**468–9** 'Untie the strangers' hands, so that, being sacred, they may no longer be bound.' Iph. here addresses the attendants (see 466–642n.). Just as sacrificial victims must be uninjured (cf. 328–9n.), so their looks must not be spoiled by bonds. Animal victims were in fact frequently constrained by ropes when led to the altar (Naiden 2007: 69–70), but those kept in a sanctuary and hence already, in a sense, dedicated to the deity were allowed to roam free (ἄφετα) before the sacrificial process began; see Pl. *Criti.* 119d and *ThesCRA* 111.321–3.

**470–1** The attendants are revealed to have some ritual knowledge and experience, as Iph. trusts them with making the correct preparations (see 466–642n.).

**ἐὺτρεπίζετε** Iph. picks up on the Herdsman's earlier injunction to have everything ready (ἐὺτρεπῆ, 245).

**ἃ χρὴ ... καὶ νομίζεται**, 'what should be done and is customary', is typically vague and inclusive religious language (cf. οἷς χρὴ ... θεῶν, *Herac.* 399–400; οἷς χρὴ καὶ οἷς θέμις, Kleidemos *FGrH* 323 F 14), but in the context of human sacrifice this vagueness may assume a menacing undertone. By contrast, in the parallel passage at 725–6 she is quite open in referring to 'those who are responsible for the slaughter' (τοῖς ἐφεστῶσι σφαγῇ).

**πῇ τοῖς παροῦσι** 'in the present circumstances'.

**471–3** The temple personnel enter the temple/*skēnē*, leaving Iph. on stage alone with the two captives, with the guards and the chorus at a distance. Once again (cf. 466) an \*extra-metrical word (φεῦ) marks a change of tone, this time from the businesslike delivery of 466–71 to a quite different mood. At 344–53 she had claimed that her own misfortunes made her less sympathetic to those of others, but now she reverts to what she then presented as her habitual mode of pity, increased here by her discernment of a situation parallel to her own. Assuming the two young men are brothers (at 498 she will learn, in response to her question, that this is

not the case), she thinks first of their mother, then their father, and finally wonders, significantly, whether they have a sister.

**473** The line is tacked loosely on to the preceding: '[who was the mother who once bore you], and your father, and your sister, if she happens to exist/have been born?' The question is a variant of the Odyssean *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἥδ' ἐ τοκῆς;* (*Od.* 1.170, etc.), but reflecting the speaker's own concerns.

**474–5** 'What a pair (= what a fine pair) of young men she will lose, and be brotherless': οἶων is exclamatory. The irony is obvious: the imagined sister is the speaker herself, who thinks her brother is already dead, but is in fact set to lose him through the sacrifice she will perform.

**475–6** 'Who knows who will have such fortunes?' or more literally 'Who knows such fortunes, to whom they will be?' The common theme of the uncertainty of the future occurs here for the first time in the play, though *τύχη* was mentioned in passing at 89. See 865n.

**476–8** The uncertainty of life is here linked to the impossibility of knowing the will of the gods and to the misleading nature of *τύχη*. Such universalising sentiments are felt to have consolatory force.

It is possible that line 478 has been incorrectly added from another play and should be deleted, or, alternatively, that in line 477 the manuscript reading *κακόν* (rather than *σαφές*) is correct and a missing line follows, containing a clause in which *κακόν* is subject (for instance 'no one knows from where any evil comes and to whom'). But the sequence of thought is clear and not unduly repetitive without such remedies: the gods' designs are unclear because (478) 'chance leads [us] astray into ignorance'.

**479** Iph. knows that the two young men are Greeks, but is naturally curious to know from which Greek city they come. The question is a conventional one in epic, yet the phrasing here also suggests pity: what Greeks would wish to come to Taurike?

**480–1** *διὰ μακροῦ ... μακρόν ... χρόνον*: the strangers have come from far off (*διὰ μακροῦ* probably with spatial sense) and are destined to spend a long time (used euphemistically to mean 'forever') under the earth, far from their own land.

**482–3** 'Why do you bewail these things, and upset *yourself* with matters which concern *us* (two)?' Orestes roughly but understandably rejects and reproves Iph.'s pity: it is nothing to do with her, he thinks.

*ἦ τις εἴ ποτ'*: *ποτε* is frequently found emphasising *ἄστις*. Orestes is not yet really interested in the priestess' identity (contrast 660–8).

**484–9** The main reason for Orestes' resentment now becomes clear: he does not want pity from his killer. He then moves on to consider self-pity, in the case of one about to die, which he rejects as both useless and demeaning. (If, however, the manuscript reading *θανεῖν* rather than

κτανεῖν is adopted in 484, the whole of 484-9 refers to those facing death, with no reference to the killer – a less interesting sequence of thought.)

**484-5** ‘I don’t consider it wise, when someone who is about to kill wants to overcome the fear of death (τοῦλέθρου = τοῦ ὀλέθρου) with pity.’ To be pitied by one’s killer does not reduce the fear of death, and pity is therefore pointless. σοφόν is probably neuter and impersonal rather than masculine (‘I don’t consider him wise who ...’); for the type of construction, see 606n.

**487 ὥς:** like ὥστε (as often in tragedy) introducing a consecutive clause, here with indicative: ‘so that he joins two ills together from one’.

**488-9** μωρίαν τ’ ὀφλισκάνει θνήσκει θ’ ὁμοίως ‘he incurs the charge of foolishness, and he dies just the same’.

**489** τήν τύχην δ’ ἔαν χρεών: not, probably, ‘one ought to let fortune take its course’, but a response to Iph.’s thoughts on τύχη at 475-8: one should forget about ‘fortune’, not talk about it (Kyriakou). ἔαν is pres. infin. of ἔάω.

**490-1** Orestes concludes his rebuff of Iph.’s expressions of pity with the point that he and Pylades are well aware of what is in store for foreign captives of the Taurians. So they knew the risks when they arrived.

**492-575** Iph. now begins to question the strangers, her main motive in doing so being to glean any scraps of information about the Greek cities. Orestes, at first unwilling to co-operate, is gradually drawn into the inquiry (see 466-642n.), and eventually Iph. learns that her brother is still alive. For a detailed analysis of the scene, in particular its use of \*stichomythia as a means of extracting and conveying information (to a character rather than the audience), see Schwinge 1968: 270-92. There is a delicate balance of power between the characters: Iph. has power and authority, but Orestes has information that she very much wants, and at first is extremely reluctant to share it.

**492-3** The largely \*stichomythic section begins with two lines given to the first speaker; for couplets at or near the beginning of stichomythia, cf. 69-70, 735-6, and see Diggle 1981: 110-11. At 249, Iph. had learned that one of the strangers was named Pylades, which remains her only clue as to their identity. This is then a natural starting point for her questioning. The text seems unlikely to be right. ‘Which of you, named here, is called Pylades?’ makes little sense. A reference to 249, where in response to Iph.’s questioning the Herdsman revealed that he had heard one of the strangers address the other as Pylades, has been suggested, and indeed the perfect passive participle ὠνομασμένος could mean ‘having been addressed by his name’. But ἐνθάδε without other qualification should mean ‘here’ (in front of the temple) rather than ‘there’ (further along the shore), and the pleonasm ὠνομασμένος ... κέκληται may also be suspicious.



**494** ‘He is – if it is really any pleasure for you to learn this.’ Orestes answers because he is already engaged in conversation with Iph., but he remains curt and dismissive of her interest.

**ἐν ἡδονῇ:** a common idiom. ἐν ἡδονῇ εἶναι τινι = ‘to be a pleasure to someone’.

**495** **Ἕλληνος:** 341n.

**496** **τί ... πλεον λάβοις;** ‘what would you gain ...?’

**497–8** Rather than pleading further, Iph. changes tack. At the beginning of the scene, she had assumed the two young men were brothers, but now she realises this is not certain. Orestes’ reply stresses their friendship over their actual kinship, that of first cousins, which is not revealed to Iph. until 916–18.

**499** The parent or parents who formally give a name are said to ‘affix’ (τίθεσθαι) the name to the child. Sometimes in hexameter verse it is the mother who is said to do this (*Od.* 18.5, *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 122), but in classical Athens it was generally the father’s prerogative, at the δεκάτη or tenth-day ceremony after the child’s birth.

**500–4** ‘Unfortunate’, hardly a probable personal name, must be felt by Orestes to be appropriate not only in view of the present situation and his imminent end, but because of his whole life story. His reluctance to reveal his name is dramatically necessary if the recognition is not to be accomplished prematurely, but his reasoning has some plausibility: his name is not necessary for the sacrifice, and by concealing it he will prevent his enemies from mocking him. The σῶμα/δνομα contrast is a variant of the distinction between names and things which is so common in late fifth-century literature and especially in Euripides, notably in the often comparable *Helen* (Solmsen 1934, Lush 2008: 173 with further bibliography). But it does not satisfy Iph., who in 503 expresses her frustration and some criticism of Orestes’ stance: ‘are you so proud?’

**500** **τὸ μὲν δίκαιον:** the phrase is adverbial, ‘rightly’. μὲν hints at another, less appropriate name, but Orestes has no intention of revealing it.

**501** Iph. continues her exploration of τύχη despite Orestes’ rejection of its relevance (478, 489). See 865n.

**502–3** These lines are almost certainly wrongly ordered in the manuscripts, and most editors agree on the order here printed. 504, ‘It is my body you will sacrifice, not my name’, makes a much better rejoinder to 501 than it does to 503, ‘Why do you begrudge this? Are you so proud?’, to which in turn 502 makes a good reply and explanation.

**505–8** This exchange at last, when Iph. scarcely expects it, results in some concrete information. At first, as she expects, Orestes refuses to give his city’s name, because (γάρ = ‘no, because ...’; see Denniston 1954: 73–4) to do so will bring him no gain, as he is about to die; this complements his

earlier (incorrect) supposition at 496 that his personal information could be of no advantage to *her*. In more normal circumstances, a stranger gives his name and origin to the people who receive him, as part of the ritual of hospitality, which will give him some protection in a foreign land. But when pressed, Orestes reveals his origins as a favour (χάρις, 507), though he expects no recompense.

**506** 'No, for you seek (something of) no profit (to me), as from one who is about to die.' To name one's city might sometimes be advantageous, leading to the discovery of unknown connexions – as of course it will do; Orestes is mistaken, and there is irony in the line.

**508** Orestes' vocabulary is now proudly epic, perhaps with irony given his plight. He produces a variation on the usual Homeric form τὸ δεινὸν εὖχομαι εἶναι, 'I claim to be x' (e.g. *Il.* 6.211), saying instead 'I claim glorious Argos as my country'. More commonly ἐπεύχομαι means 'pray' or 'curse' rather than as here 'boast'.

**509** πρὸς θεῶν intensifies a request, and here suggests eager, urgent inquiry and perhaps a degree of surprise: cf. *Ion* 265, *Hel.* 660, *Xen. Oec.* 7.9.

**510 γ'** qualifies and expands Orestes' affirmative reply: 'Yes, from Argos, and actually from Mycenae' (Denniston 1954: 133–5, and cf. below 807, 821). In this context, Mycenae indicates the city, Argos its territory, the state: see Saïd 1993: 171–3.

**515–16** The exchange underlines the very different viewpoints of the participants, with Iph. eager to hear news of Argos, and Orestes even before his capture, at 78ff., expressing his horror of the place where he finds himself. His reply to Iph.'s statement that his arrival is 'desired' (προθεινός) is sardonic: 'not by me, but if it [my coming here] is by you, then be in love with it!' See also 540–2n. For ἐρώ applied to a similar enthusiasm for information, cf. 530. Many editors, however, prefer to read τοῦθ' ὅρα: 'you see to it' = 'that is your business'. The whole sequence of question and answer reads best if these lines are transposed here. Certainly nothing should stand between 513–14 and 517.

**511** 'Having left your country as an exile, or in what manner?' The full phrase is ἀπαίρω ναῦν, with genitive of the place left, but the direct object is very frequently omitted, in prose as well as verse.

**512** 'I am in exile – at least in a certain way – unwilling and willing.' The typically Euripidean paradox in οὐχ ἑκὼν ἑκὼν (compare, for example, *Hel.* 138, τεθνᾶσι καὶ τεθνᾶσι) expresses Orestes' position well: he did not wish to be driven from Argos by Erinyes, but equally he is not an involuntary exile (φυγάς) in the normal sense. However, the formulation does not seem to encourage further questioning, and Iph. does not supply it.

**514** The comment implies assent: 'yes, as an aside to my misfortune'. A πάρεργον is a side issue, something tangential to the important thing.

Orestes means that the trouble of answering Iph.'s questions does not increase his misery very greatly.

**517** Iph. here begins to reveal why Orestes' arrival is so 'desired' (515); as someone who has left Greece only recently, he must have up-to-date news of matters which concern her. Realistically, it is likely that she could have learned from earlier Greek arrivals at least some of the information which Orestes goes on to give her, but the stranger's Argive origins suggest that he will know more detail about what concerns her most, and the dream has given her inquiries a new urgency.

**ἦς ἀπανταχοῦ λόγος:** Wright (2005: 138–9) sees here, as in many passages of the play, a meaning going beyond the immediate context: Troy is everywhere spoken of not only within the dramatic frame, but in a nod to the audience as a myth with which all contemporary Greeks are familiar. Elements of this 'metamythology' (Introduction, p. 11) can be seen throughout the question-and-answer session which follows.

**518** 'If only I did not (know of Troy, with εἰδέναι understood), not even seeing it in a dream!' ὥς is exclamatory: 'how much I wish ...' One regularly 'sees' dreams in Greek rather than 'has' or 'experiences' them.

**520 ἡκούσατε:** plural because referring to all the inhabitants of the Tauric Chersonese.

**521–6** Iph.'s first inquiry concerns Helen, whom she identifies as the ultimate cause of her misfortunes (cf. 8, 356, etc.), and this view seems to be shared by Orestes at 522 and 526. Both have suffered, and yet Helen has returned unpunished.

**521 δῶμα** probably means 'household', rather than the physical house. According to the *Odyssey* (3.305–12) it took Menelaos seven years after the fall of Troy to reach home. Orestes' ἦκει may refer to Helen's return to her old home, however, amplified at 524. When Iph. asks 'where is she?', she must still be uncertain of this, and in linking this question with the statement that Helen owes her something for an injury, she is thinking back to her earlier wish (354–8, echoed by the chorus at 439–46) that Helen and Menelaos might arrive among the Taurians to be sacrificed.

**Μενέλεω:** 357n.

**522** The statement is strictly speaking untrue, for Helen's return did not cause Agamemnon's death (τῶν ἐμῶν τινι, 'to one of mine'). Orestes' remark represents the fusion of two ideas: first that Helen's transgression was the original cause of the Trojan War, which itself indirectly entailed Agamemnon's death, and secondly that she survived while Agamemnon was killed.

**523** 'She owes me too some evil', i.e. she deserves to suffer in retribution for the ills she inflicted on me. προυφείλω (contracted form of προοφείλω), literally 'owe beforehand', probably indicates simply that the

debt is acquired before it is paid; it thus differs little in meaning from the simple form ὀφείλω.

**525 μῖσος:** 'hatred' is equivalent here to 'hated person'. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 760.

**526** 'I too have had some profit from that woman's marriage' (plural γάμοι is frequent in singular sense); as response to the previous line, ἀπέλαυσα is used ironically. Iph.'s comment has assumed that all the Greeks have reason to hate Helen, as the cause of a long and destructive war. Orestes' reply therefore, though enigmatic like 522 (and Iph.'s 523), need not arouse much curiosity; anyone who had lost a friend or family member in the war might say as much. There is a further layer of irony in this exchange in that both participants are absorbed in what they think are their private ills, little realising that their interests in fact overlap.

**528** 'How you interrogate me, putting everything together at once!' Iph.'s questioning continues, but the main thrust of Orestes' protest is the difficulty of answering the implied question referring to the differing fates of the various returning Greeks.

**529-30** Iph.'s explanation (signalled as such by γάρ) is remarkably blunt, but Orestes yields to her request, with an air of resignation. For ἐπειδὴ τοῦδ' ἔρῃς cf. 515-16 and n.

**531-3** After Helen, Iph. turns to the person next to blame, in temporal order, for her misfortunes, the prophet who announced that her sacrifice was required (cf. 16-24), and is pleased to hear of his death. Euripides omits the circumstances of Kalchas' demise, which occurred through pique when he found that his rival Mopsos was able to answer his challenging questions and so proved himself a better seer (Hesiod 278 M-W, Pherecydes *FGH* 3 F 142). The story would gratify Iph. by suggesting that Kalchas' prophetic powers were limited, but it would be a distraction in the lead-up to the question about Agamemnon which the audience must suspect will be the climax of the interrogation, and which could spark the recognition.

**533 ὦ πότνι:** Iph. calls on her patroness Artemis, perhaps implying that she has rightly punished Kalchas.

**γάρ:** the so-called 'progressive' use, common in tragedy and comedy but much less so in prose, referring forward and marking a transition to a new subject in question-and-answer exchange (Denniston 1954: 82-3).

**533-6** Iph. turns next to Odysseus, who engineered the ruse which brought her to Aulis. Orestes, who did not respond to her pleasure in the death of Kalchas, seems more sympathetic to Odysseus, who he feels has troubles enough without Iph.'s curses (κατεύχομαι = 'pray against someone', 'pray for bad things'). The *Odyssey* shows that rumours of Odysseus' survival (ἔστι δ', ὡς λόγος) reached Greece; in particular, 4.554-60 confirms

that he was still alive when Menelaos was in Egypt, while Telemachos has already (316–21) told his host of the dreadful state of Ithaca (πάντα τὰ κείνου νοσέει).

**537–40** Iph. seems to have a particular interest in the man she was led to believe she would marry (25, 216–17, 369–70). Parker suggests that the unusual word order of 537 could reflect difficulty in formulating the question, due to her emotion; πᾶς is unexpectedly delayed and separated from Θέτιδος. It is perhaps somewhat contrived that Orestes' reply should be 'he got no benefit from his "marriage" at Aulis' (he must mean 'from the expedition which set out successfully because of the sacrifice'), but it enables Iph. to display her knowledge of the event, which in turn leads to Orestes' surprise that she is so well informed and interest in her identity.

**539** δόλια γάρ: explaining ἄλλως, 'Yes, his marriage was in vain, for it was deceitful, as those who suffered it know.' This must appear enigmatic to Orestes, although it could perhaps be taken to refer to the presumed death of both 'sufferers'. In Iph.'s real meaning, οἱ πεπονθότες applies to herself, in accordance with the tragic convention whereby women may speak of themselves in the masculine plural, especially in generalising contexts (see Barrett on *Hipp.* 1102–5).

**540–2** Orestes' direct question 'Who are you?' (with ποθ' intensifying the question, as often; see 483n.) is softened immediately by 'How well you know matters from (τὰφ' = τὰ ἀπό) Greece!', so that Iph. can reply by explaining only that she is from Greece herself, and thus no progress towards a recognition is achieved. However, Orestes at last is able to feel some sympathy with her wish for knowledge; ὁρθῶς ποθεῖς (ὁρθῶς = 'reasonably', 'justifiably') picks up ποθεινός at 515, in response to which he had brusquely rejected her 'desire'.

**543–4** Iph. now reaches the questions which concern her most directly, but both she and Orestes (who clearly understands her meaning) are reluctant to name Agamemnon. εὐδαιμονεῖν, for Iph., must refer primarily to prosperity and power: Agamemnon was 'happy' above others (cf. 379 and n.). Orestes naturally sees a more basic sense: 'the one I know of is not among the happy'.

**547** ἴν' εὐφρανθῶ 'so that I may be made happy', that is 'as a very great favour'. In fact the news will not cause any happiness.

**548** τινα is Orestes himself, Agamemnon's death having started the chain of events which has brought him here.

**549** On Iph.'s attitude to her father, which here seems to begin to shift, see 211–12n.

**550** μὴν προσηκέ σοι, 'surely he was not related to you?', is obviously ironic for the audience, but may be spoken with some indignation on

Orestes' part. Why should this unknown woman weep for Agamemnon's death, when it is Orestes himself who has truly suffered from it?

**551** Iph.'s reply shows remarkable self-possession and quick thinking, as she pretends to be saddened by Agamemnon's death merely as a general example of the precariousness of good fortune.

**552** ἐκ γυναικός 'by his wife', not merely 'by a woman' (which might require τινός), since Iph. understands the killer's identity without further questioning.

**σφαγείς** 'slaughtered', not merely 'killed', as very commonly for a violent, bloody death like that of a sacrificial animal. This usage, referring properly to the cutting of the throat, is common in secular contexts (Casabona 1966: 159-62), but it may still mark a parallel with Iph.'s own supposed death.

**553** It is strange that Iph. does not yet ask why Agamemnon was murdered (she will do so at 926, after the recognition), especially since four lines later she asks why Orestes killed Klytaimestra, which by this stage in the narrative is much more perspicuous (but see 556-8n.). More plausible psychologically, perhaps, is the fact that she expresses pity for her mother as well as for her father, although she will soon approve Orestes' action (559-60 and n.).

**554** Orestes' reason for wishing to cut short this line of inquiry may be partly the shame arising from Klytaimestra's adulterous motives, especially given that his interlocutor is a priestess, perhaps – as is in fact the case – a virgin (cf. 927 and n.), but also partly that it is likely to lead to mention of his own retaliation for the action, as in fact it immediately does.

**555** τοσόνδε γ' 'just this much', referring to what she is about to say; in response to Orestes' resumed reluctance at 554, Iph. implies that her present question is the last, although she will in fact ask four more, as well as offering comments.

**556-8** From being reluctant to speak, Orestes moves to saying more than necessary. Iph.'s question (ὥς τί δὴ θέλω, 'desiring what?', effectively 'why?') might seem superfluous, but may reflect her confusion (and her sense of the family's confusion) on hearing so much shocking news so suddenly.

**558** τήνδε: the (female) person just spoken of, that is Klytaimestra.

**559** Iph.'s *\*extra metrum* exclamation (cf. 466, 472) suggests distress, not surprisingly, but her evaluation of Orestes' deed tends to the positive.

κακὸν δίκαιον, whichever way round noun and adjective should be construed ('an evil act of justice', perhaps more likely, or 'a righteous evil'), is itself an apt *\*oxymoron* for Orestes' act, but the addition of εὖ further complicates the line and tips the balance towards praise.

**560** ‘But though he is upright, he does not prosper in regard to things received from the gods.’ Orestes continues to blame the gods for failing to bring an end to his suffering.

**561** After Orestes’ heavy hint, it might be more natural for Iph. at this point to inquire after the exact fate of the brother she has believed dead, but the revelation that Orestes is alive must form the climactic conclusion to her interrogation (see also 567–8n.). Her questions about the remaining children of Agamemnon and Klytaimnestra must therefore be inserted here.

**562** In this play, as in Aeschylus and also Euripides’ own *Electra*, Elektra is Iph.’s only sister. In the *Iliad* (9.145), Agamemnon has three daughters, Chrysothemis, Laodike, and Iphianassa – all suitable names for the daughters of a *basileus*, so there may at that stage have been no strong tradition about any of them. Sophocles makes Chrysothemis a character in his *Electra*, and includes Iphianassa as a third surviving sister (157); Euripides in *Orestes* (23) has three sisters in total, Chrysothemis, Elektra, and Iph. Here, while Elektra is indispensable, it would be an unnecessary distraction to introduce other sisters.

**παρθένον** ‘maiden’, though perhaps misleading, describes Elektra’s state at the time of Agamemnon’s death; she is now a *γυνή*, the wife of Pylades, as we learn at 695–6 (and Iph. learns at 915).

**563** **τί δέ:** here a ‘formula of transition’ (Denniston 1954: 176), introducing a new question. See Collard and Stevens 2018: 73–4.

**564** **ὄρᾱν φάος:** a very common tragic periphrasis for ‘to be alive’.

**565** A pointed parallel to 553; in both places the killer and the family member who is (apparently) killed are pitied.

**566** To the quasi-prepositional phrase *χάριν* with genitive ‘for the sake of’ has been added an adjective to form an \*oxymoronic phrase of the general type *γάμος ἄγαμος*; see 144n. ‘Thankless thanks to an evil woman’ is the closest approximation in English. The same or a similar phrase is used, but without the prepositional force, at Aesch. *Ag.* 1545, *Cho.* 42–6, *PV* 545, *E. Phoen.* 1757. The evil woman is Helen.

**567–8** While Orestes’ enigmatic words at 560 might seem to invite further questioning at that point, it is perhaps psychologically as well as dramatically appropriate for Iph. to postpone asking the question to which she most fears the answer until the end of her inquiry. Ironically, while previously she was given bad news in response to unsuspecting queries, here the response is unexpectedly favourable, though heavily qualified.

**568** **κουδανοῦ καὶ πανταχοῦ** ‘nowhere and everywhere’. Iph. had asked if Orestes was alive ‘at Argos’ (Ἀργεῖ). Orestes replies that he is everywhere because of his exile and wanderings, nowhere because as an exile he has lost his rightful place and is in any case about to die.

**569** ‘Farewell, false dreams – so you were nothing!’ Iph.’s response is illogical for two reasons. First, as far as she knows the stranger can only testify that Orestes was alive at the time he, the stranger, left Argos, or at the very most, Greek-speaking lands, which is likely to have been several weeks before the action. The dream could be much more up-to-date, and might reveal that Orestes had died the previous day. This objection must be ignored for the purposes of the drama. Secondly, and more germane to the workings of the play itself, she does not consider the possibility that it is not the dream which was at fault, but her interpretation. Unsurprisingly – for it is a common folkloric and tragic pattern – this will prove to be the case, although since the dream is not specifically mentioned again (the third stasimon may bring it to mind at 1276–9), the audience is left to find the correct interpretation on their own: Iph. is in danger of literally performing the actions she imagines in her dream.

**570–1** ‘Nor are the gods, who are called wise, any more free from error than are flighty dreams.’ An attentive interlocutor might instead have picked up on the connexion of Orestes with Iph.’s dreams, thus precipitating the recognition, but Orestes is understandably preoccupied with his own affairs and blames the gods for giving him false reassurances. This comparison of two forms of prophecy, dreams and oracles, anticipates the third stasimon (1234–83), where Orestes’ view will be corrected: Apollo’s oracles are more trustworthy than nocturnal visions.

**σοφοί ... κεκλημένοι** hints at an etymology making δαίμων equivalent to δαήμων, ‘knowledgeable, skilled’ (like early uses of σοφός), a derivation suggested in Pl. *Cra.* 398b.

**572–5** ‘There is much confusion in both divine and mortal realms, but he grieves for one thing alone(?) – when one who is not foolish is persuaded by the words of seers and has perished, as those who know realise he has.’ Something seems necessary to clarify the point in relation to specifics after the general statement in 570–1, but these lines are corrupt, difficult to translate, and of doubtful relevance (having blamed the gods, Orestes should not go on to blame ‘seers’ (μάντεων, 574), who without further qualification are naturally assumed to be human). The lines are probably an interpolation deriving from a marginal parallel in the text. Alternatively, there might be a lacuna after 573, with the λείπεται (in place of λυπείται, whose subject is unclear) of one manuscript representing a ‘correction’ of an earlier λείπει, a word employed by scribes to indicate missing lines. But it is not easy to see what a lacuna should have contained, and a good deal of emendation would still be necessary.

**576–7** At the conclusion of their previous lyrics (447–55), the chorus expressed their desire to be rescued and return home. Now, having witnessed Iph.’s reception of news of her family, they wish for the same for



themselves. The chorus, displaced like Iph. herself, have their own concerns highlighted at several points in the play: see Introduction, pp. 40–1. Together with Orestes' preceding speech the lines also function to punctuate the scene, marking the conclusion of the \*stichomythia and the introduction of Iph.'s plan, which follows. Nonetheless, the personal sentiment is unusual in lines with this function.

**578–642** *Iphigeneia plans to send a letter home.* Iph. proposes to Orestes that she should release him and send him home to Argos, with a letter she has had prepared, to give to her family, leaving Pylades to be sacrificed. But Orestes prefers that he should die himself and allow Pylades to take the letter. He questions her about the mode of the sacrifice, and she exits into the *skēnē* (the temple). It appears, though it is not stated, that the sacrifice of one out of two captives will be enough to conform with the Taurian custom.

**578–80** 'Listen, for we (= I) have reached a plan, being eager for benefit to you, strangers, at the same time as to myself.'

**578–9** ἤκομεν ... σπευδοῦσ': combinations of this sort, with a plural (for singular) verb and a singular participle, are found elsewhere in Euripides, e.g. *Ion* 1250–1, *HF* 858 (with Bond's note).

**580–1** 'Good comes about most of all in this way, if the same matter is pleasing to all.' But Iph.'s suggestion can save only one of the strangers, and she ignores the pathetic interjection of the chorus (576–7), who likewise get no benefit from her scheme.

**583** τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐκεῖ φίλοις 'to my loved ones there', i.e. at Argos. The plural is perhaps designedly vague. When Iph. relates the letter's substance (769–78), it is addressed specifically to Orestes, to whom, as the young male in the family, her rescue would naturally fall.

**584** δέλτον: a writing-tablet (see 727n.). This is the word used throughout the scene for the letter as physical object, one which will later become an important stage property (see Introduction, p. 24, and 723–826n.).

**584–7** Why does Euripides introduce a previous sacrificial victim to write the letter for Iph.? Although writing is mostly absent from Homer, tragedy generally assumes that its highborn characters, male and female, are literate (Easterling 1985: 3–5). In *IA*, Klytaimnestra should probably be assumed to read Agamemnon's letter herself, and in *Hippolytus* Phaidra's secret purpose requires that she must write her own suicide note. It is possible that Euripides wished to present Iph. along more realistic, contemporary lines as a female character who is not fully literate (reading and writing capacity do not always go together), but we have little information about women's literacy in classical Athens. At all events, the fact that she must ask for help from a prisoner who will shortly die in a sacrifice she herself will make adds to the sense of her isolation and helplessness, as

well as allowing the generous unknown Greek to express his pity and thus encourage the audience to absolve Iph. of any blame for her role in the Taurian sacrifices. Torrance (2013: 153-7), drawing on a suggestion of Segal, sees the act of writing as a new metaphor for story creation, in opposition to the older one of weaving, and further suggests that Iph.'s illiteracy symbolises her inability to control her own story.

**585-7** '... not thinking of my hand as a murderer, but that he died by the law (or custom), since the goddess considered these things to be right' (νομίζων governing both an accusative and a clause with accusative and infinitive). But the manuscript text of 587 cannot stand without some changes (at least if there is no deeper corruption, ταῦτα must be emended to τάδε for metrical reasons); the papyrus fragment is in disagreement with L (having τὰ for γε, as had already been conjectured), and the exact reading remains uncertain. The meaning must be something like that given above, unless we adopt the emendation ἡγούμενος for ἡγουμένης, which would make the prisoner rather than the goddess consider the sacrifice to be right.

Iph. has perhaps already stated (40) and will certainly state later (621-2) that she does not physically slaughter the victims herself. But her hand might still be considered the agent of murder because her action of sprinkling water (cf. 56-8, 244, 335) begins and authorises the sacrifice (see 621n.).

**588** 'For I had no one who might, having gone, announce ...' (ἀγγεῖλαι, to be distinguished from ἀγγεῖλαι at 582, is aor. opt., like πέμψειε at 590, which has the alternative and commoner ending).

**589 ἐπιστολάς**: ἐπιστολή (or plural ἐπιστολαί) retains the meaning of a message or injunction sent (ἐπιστέλλω), only later becoming the normal word for a letter. The written text of the ἐπιστολαί is always called δέλτος in this play (see 584, 727nn.).

**590 σωθείς** 'having returned safely'. Cf. 593 and n.

**591 οὗτι δυσμενής**: at the beginning of their conversation, Orestes seemed anything but well disposed to Iph. and rejected her sympathy (482-91), but during the \*stichomythia he begins to appreciate her point of view and at 542 concedes that her desire for knowledge of affairs in Greece is reasonable. (The alternative δυσγενής is less precise, but would indicate that his nobility of character should dispose him to carry out the task.)

**592 τὰς Μυκήνας**: 510n.

χοῦς = καὶ οὖς.

**593 σώωθι κείσε**: κείσε is an emendation for L's καὶ σύ, which is meaningless in context. In Greek one can be 'saved to a place', i.e. brought back safely to it: cf. 1068, σώσω σ' ἐς Ἑλλάδα'.

**μισθὸν οὐκ αἰσχρόν:** Iph. means a wage or reward that is ‘not unworthy’ of a task that is a light one (κουφῶν ἕκατι γραμμάτων), but in Orestes’ view it would be ‘shameful’ (cf. αἰσχιστον, 606), since he would be purchasing his own safety at the expense of Pylades.

**594 κουφῶν ... γραμμάτων:** the writing is, literally, not heavy to carry, but there is also the implication that the task will be easy to carry out, in contrast with the benefit it will bring (σωτηρία).

**595 ἐπεὶπερ πόλις ἀναγκάζει τάδε:** it is not in Iph.’s power to save both the strangers. πόλις here indicates the source of political authority; Iph. (also at 1209), the chorus (464), Thoas (1212, 1214), and the second messenger (1417) all use the word and its derivatives for the Taurian community, which is depicted as resembling a Greek polis just as the temple of Artemis resembles a Greek temple (see 72–5n. and Introduction, pp. 17–18).

**597–608** Though the friendship of Orestes and Pylades has already been demonstrated in the prologue and especially in the report of the Herdsman (310–14), Orestes’ refusal to let his friend die while his own life is saved marks the beginning of the theme’s major development. He gives three reasons for this response: first, Pylades has willingly shared in his troubles (599–602); secondly, it is in any case disgraceful to save oneself at the cost of a friend’s suffering (605–7); and thirdly, his desire for Pylades’ survival is no less than that for his own (607–8).

**598 βάρος μέγα:** to Iph.’s request to carry her ‘light writings’, Orestes replies that it would cause him ‘great heaviness’ for Pylades to be sacrificed.

**599–600** ‘I am the one who has put disasters on board (ναυστολέω = to carry by sea), and he sails with me because of my hardship.’ The primary force is figurative; Orestes means that he is the cause of their being here, while Pylades has joined him as a ‘fellow traveller’. But the metaphor is very close to a literal application, since it was a sea journey which brought the two to the country of the Taurians.

**601–2** ‘So it is not right for me to earn your gratitude on the basis of his destruction, and myself escape from troubles.’ χάριν τίθεσθαι is to place an obligation on another by doing them a good turn. Orestes refuses to enter into a relationship of mutual obligation with the unknown Greek woman because of his prior obligation to Pylades, which he has contracted through the latter’s willingness to share his difficulties and dangers.

**603 ὥς γενέσθω:** ὥς, used as equivalent to οὕτως, looks forward to the modification of the plan which is stated in the words immediately following.

**604** ‘For he will take (πέμπω, ‘escort’) [it] to Argos, so that (result clause) things are well for you.’

**605 ὁ χρήζων:** ‘the one who wants’, ‘any who wants’.

**τὰ τῶν φίλων:** literally, ‘the affairs of friends’, but equivalent to τοὺς φίλους.

**606** ‘It is a shameful thing, whoever, hurling his friends’ affairs down into disasters, is saved himself.’ αἰσχιστος ὅστις or αἰσχιστον εἴ τις would be more logical, but the idiom is a common one. There are close parallels at *Il.* 14.81, βέλτερον ὅς φεύγων προφυγῇ κακὸν ἢ ἐάλωη (‘it is better whoever by fleeing may escape evil [rather] than be taken’) and in *E. Phoen.* 509–10, ἀνανδρία γάρ, τὸ πλεόν ὅστις ἀπολέσας τοῦλασσον ἔλαβε (‘For it is cowardice, whoever throws away the greater and gains the lesser’). In this play, 1064 is comparable (see n.); probably also 484–5.

**608 φῶς ὀρᾶν:** 564n.

**609–13** The opening of Iph.’s reply is full of unconscious irony. There is nothing unusual in the Greek literary assumption that a ‘noble’ character must spring from noble stock (though it is not always borne out in tragedy), but here it is given special point by Iph.’s ignorance that her interlocutor’s family is the same as her own (τινος is a particularly neat touch). Even more obvious is her wish that her own brother should resemble the stranger, and her proud assertion that she too has a brother – a psychologically plausible comment, since she has just learned that Orestes is alive – ‘except that I do not see him’.

**611–12 τῶν ἐμῶν ... ὅσπερ λέλειπται:** implying ‘the one of my siblings who is *in fact* alive’ rather than suggesting the predecease of others.

**613 πλὴν ὅσ’:** πλὴν ὅσον, ‘except in so far as’, ‘except that’ is common in prose, the plural πλὴν ὅσα less so.

**οὗχ ὀρῶσά νιν:** England suggests that the actor playing Iph. would here look conspicuously at Orestes.

**615–16** ‘Some great desire for this (τοῦδε = τοῦ θανεῖν) chances to possess you.’ Versions which render τυγχάνει as ‘for some reason’ (Cropp, Kovacs) introduce a sardonic note which is at odds with the admiring tone of the speech. (The emendation προμηθία for προθυμία would give Orestes ‘forethought for this man’, with τοῦδε referring to Pylades.)

**617–42** *Orestes faces his death.* A brief \*stichomythia follows, in which Orestes discovers the mode of his sacrifice and the fate of his dead body; this develops the theme of the sacrifice which was treated in 35–41 and alluded to at 72–5 and 244–5. Iph. promises to give him funeral offerings, and goes inside the temple to fetch the letter.

**617 τὰ δεινὰ τλήσεται:** for τλάω in the context of killing, see 868–72n.

**618 προστροπήν:** properly ‘supplication’, ‘address in prayer’, if correct must here mean ‘service’, ‘office’. Although Orestes probably already assumes that Iph. is Artemis’ priestess, to whom it would naturally fall to perform the customary sacrifices, he cannot be sure of Taurian procedure. Kyriakou suggests that προστροπή evokes προστρόπαιος, a

polluted murderer, thus indicating the paradox that her responsibility of human-killing normally incurs pollution. The alternative reading συμφοράν is difficult with θεᾶς: neither ‘I have this circumstance of the goddess’ nor ‘this disaster of the goddess’ sounds right.

**619** The adjectives qualify προστροπήν – ‘an unenviable service, not a happy one’.

**620** For ἀνάγκη as an excuse for undesirable actions, cf. Pindar, fr. 122 Sn–M on prostitution in Corinth: σὺν δ’ ἀνάγκαι πᾶν καλόν.

**621** Iph. has already told Orestes that she performs the sacrifice; Orestes now asks with fascinated horror whether she strikes the death blow herself. If line 40 is genuine (see n.), the audience already know the answer to this. Although on occasion a sacrificer may be praised for ‘doing everything himself’ (Isaeus 8.16), and male priests are often depicted visually with the sacrificial knife at their waist, the kill was commonly delegated to others. Whether it was priest, priestess, or another (such as the head of a household, or a figure of political authority) who offered the sacrifice, the essentials which they performed were the rites of consecration before the slaughter (such as cutting a few hairs from the victim and, especially, sprinkling it with water – χαίτην ἀμφὶ σὴν χερνίψομαι, 622), the recitation of the appropriate prayers, and the placing of the god’s portion on the altar. See further Van Straten 1995: 168–70, using largely visual evidence, and Berthiaume 1982: 17–39. In the case of female officiants, it would be felt as highly anomalous for a priestess to slaughter the victim with her own hands, but this in no way diminished her role as the one who offers the sacrifice: see Osborne 1993, esp. 401–2, and Connelly 2007: 179–89. However, the literary-mythological tradition knows of such anomalous occasions (e.g. Paus. 2.35.4–8; other examples in Connelly 2007: 182–3), and Taurian sacrifice is nothing if not anomalous, so Orestes may well feel that anything is possible. κτείνουσα, the reading of the papyrus against L’s θύουσα, makes the distinction clearer.

**ξίφει:** see 27n. The phrase κτείνουσα θῆλυς ἄρσενας recalls Aesch. Ag. 1231, θῆλυς ἄρσενος φονεύς, said by Cassandra of Klytaimestra’s planned murder of Agamemnon, and so evokes the family’s earlier history. Unlike Klytaimestra Iph. will remain in a more ‘feminine’ role and not perform the slaughter herself. Many adjectives may have either two- or three-termination forms, and θῆλυς rather than θήλεια is not unusual in tragedy.

**622** The essential priestly action of sprinkling the victim with water suggests a more literal fulfilment – or near-fulfilment – of Iph.’s dream than the one she first thought of.

**624** ‘Within this house [the temple] there are those whose concern this is.’ These men may be identified with the attendants who entered the temple at the beginning of the scene (470–1, with 466–642n.), but

equally the plural may be vague – Iph. is being somewhat evasive – and only one man may act as slaughterer. In any case, the σφαγεύς is clearly subordinate to Iph. as priestess.

**625** τάφος ‘burial’, ‘funeral rites’, rather than tomb.

**626** Earlier, Orestes and Pylades had seen the sacrificial altar outside the temple (72–5), so it seems that the victim is sacrificed at the altar and that this is followed by the rituals mentioned here – most likely the burning of his body at the ‘holy fire’ inside the temple, and the disposal of the remains in a wide (but see below) crevice in the rock, suggestive of a route to the underworld. Diodorus, however, reads the ‘holy fire’ and ‘wide crevice’ not as two things, but one (by \*hendiadys), a fiery pit, and somewhat anachronistically suggests that Euripides was inspired by knowledge of Carthaginian child sacrifice (Diod. 20.14). This is implausible, but Stephanie West suggests to me that he might have had some sort of volcanic or geothermal feature in mind. Thermal springs and mud flows are present in parts of the Tauric peninsula, and the idea that ‘the earth itself provided a means of rapidly and effectively disposing of the victims’ corpses’ is an attractive one. Herodotus (4.103; see Introduction, p. 16) states that once the victim was killed by a blow to the head (a detail omitted in Euripides; Orestes assumes he will be killed by a sword) some reporters claimed that the body was thrown off the cliff on which the temple stood, while others said it was ‘concealed in the earth’. The χάσμα ... πέτρας suggests the second tradition, but whatever the precise method of disposal, this is clearly a peculiar and exotic procedure.

**εὐρωπὸν:** Hesychius gives two explanations for the word, ‘wide’ (from εὐρύς) and ‘mouldy, dank’ (from εὐρώς).

**627** The lack of a proper funeral, carried out by the nearest relatives, causes further distress to Orestes. For the \*extra-metrical φεῦ, cf. 472, 559. It was the job of the women of the family to wash the corpse and lay it out (περιστείλειεν) for the funeral (cf., e.g., Pl. *Phd.* 115a, and see Garland 2001: 24), so Orestes naturally thinks of his closest female relative, his sister Elektra. In the plan as so far outlined it is, however, the hand of his other sister, Iph., elsewhere considered as the agent of sacrifice and death (585 and 585–7n.), which will perform these last acts of kindness (see 628–30n.).

**628–35** Iph.’s speech here gives a rough sort of ring composition to the scene, as she reiterates the pity she expressed at its outset (472–81) – ὦ τάλας expresses both pity and a degree of condescension (‘poor fool’). But by now a sort of understanding has been reached between herself and Orestes, and she backs up her pity by a commitment to practical action, to give his dead body the best care possible in the circumstances.

**628–30** The mention of Orestes’ sister is the cue for some heavy irony. What Iph. says is true as far as either of them knows, and true as regards

Elektra, but Orestes has another sister whose residence is in no way ‘far from the barbarian land’ and who goes on to describe precisely how she will lay out the dead body.

**630–1** ‘But since you chance to be from Argos, I will not omit the favour of what is possible.’ In the absence of near relatives, someone from the same city might be thought to be the next most desirable person to prepare the body and carry out funeral rites, and Iph. adduces the Argive identity she shares with her victim (but has not quite explicitly revealed – cf. 665–6) as a reason for doing what she can. The unusual split of οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ, ‘but all the same’ (a phrase found only here in a verse context) is probably for metrical reasons (Denniston 1954: 28–9).

**632–5** Iph. promises to do the following: to place ample grave-goods or adornment in Orestes’ burial place; to do something to his body with oil; and to pour honey on the fire which burns his body. The honey, in particular, in connexion with rites for the dead recalls its earlier appearance in the *choai* which she pours for her supposedly dead brother in his absence (165, ξουθᾶν τε πόνημα μελισσᾶν ~ 634–5, γάνος | ξουθῆς μελίσης) and thus plays with the possibility that she will unknowingly perform a similar ritual in his presence. She can undertake this for the dead man because the handling of the goddess’ offerings would naturally fall to her as priestess; she need only add a little extra to what she would do anyway. (A priest or priestess would not normally handle a corpse because of the pollution it conveyed, but Orestes as sacrificial victim will have been consecrated to the goddess and his body is therefore holy rather than polluted.) But there are some problems with the details of the description. Evidently Iph. does not list her actions in chronological order; she speaks first of the grave-goods, and only in third place of the pouring of honey on to the pyre. Her second action is not at all clear in the transmitted text, and it is likely that there is a lacuna. (Even if ‘I will quench your body’ could be taken to mean ‘I will put out the flames of your pyre’, this could not be done with oil.) Probably what Iph. promises is to anoint the body with oil after washing it, and to quench the flames of the pyre with wine, this being standard practice (Garland 2001: 36). Thus, there will be a sequence of three liquids (oil, wine, honey) commonly used in ritual acts.

**634–5** ‘And I will cast into your pyre the flower-flowing brightness of the darting mountain bee’, an elaborate periphrasis for honey, as often in ritual contexts: cf. 159–66n. For the meaning of ξουθός, see 165n.

**637** τὸ μέντοι ... μούγκαλῆις (= μοι ἐγκαλῆις): ‘but do not accuse me of ill-will’. Iph. speaks to Orestes, perhaps fearing that he might suspect a trick as she disappears into the temple, but then turns to address the πρόσπολοι in the following line.

**638** The command to guard the captives without bonds echoes the opening of the scene (469), but with a subtle difference: there, the reason was that as consecrated to the goddess, it was not right for them to be bound, whereas here, Iph. gives a more personal reason. On the addressees of the two orders, see 466–642n.

**639–42** ‘Perhaps I shall be sending to Argos un hoped-for news for one of my loved ones, whom most I love, and the letter, in telling him that those who seemed to be dead are alive, will announce incredible delights.’ In her final lines before exiting into the temple, Iph.’s thoughts return excitedly to her own situation and what she stands to gain. There is irony in ἔλπτα and ἀπίστους, since in the letter’s delivery (791–2) she herself will learn things ‘unhoped for’ and experience ‘incredible delights’.

ζῶντας οὕς δοκεῖ θανεῖν: see Introduction, p. 33.

**643–57** *Kommos*. Iph.’s exit is followed by a very brief *kommos*, or lament in the form of lyric dialogue. Orestes and Pylades are left on stage with the chorus (and probably mute attendants or guards: see on 466–642). The chorus sing in dochmiacs, indicative of strong emotion, pitying Orestes and rejoicing for Pylades; in each case, the character replies in spoken trimeters, dissenting from the chorus’ evaluation. There is thus a symmetry going beyond the rough metrical responsion, which is concluded by the chorus’ final lines expressing pity for both characters.

### *Metre*

644	υ υ υ – υ – υ – – υ –	2 doch
645	υ υ υ υ υ – <υ υ υ> – – –	2 doch
646		ia tr
647–9	υ υ υ – υ υ υ – υ – υ –	doch + hypodoch
	υ υ υ – υ – υ υ υ – υ –	2 doch
650		ia tr
651–3	– υ υ – – – – –	doch + sp
	υ υ υ – – – – –	doch + sp
654		uncertain (corrupt)
655	υ υ υ – υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ –	2 doch
656–7	υ υ υ – υ – υ – – υ –	2 doch

**643–5** ‘I bewail you, the concern of the bloody streams of lustral basins ...’ The metre suggests that a word (such as μέλεον, ‘miserable’) has probably fallen out after μελόμενον. The χέρνιβες (58n.) are almost personified as ‘interested in, concerned with’ the sacrificial victim. Their connexion with ‘bloodstained streams’ (αἵμακτός from αἵμασσω, ‘to make bloody’, rather than directly from αἷμα) is figurative rather than literal,



since χέρνιβες contain water, either for washing the participants' hands or for sprinkling on the victim, rather than blood. But the word is used here, as often in the play (244, 335, 861, 1190), to stand for sacrifice in general, since it is the sprinkling of water on the victim by the priest(ess) which begins the sacrifice (see 621n., 622n.).

**646** '[Don't do so], for these things are not [a matter for] pity.' For γάρ, see 505–8n. The word order here is unusual, and it has been emended to ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ οἶκτος ταῦτα to produce more normal syntax, but should probably stand. Denniston (1954: 71) explains the line as a fusion of οὐκ οἶκτος ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ χαίρετε and χαίρετε, οὐ γὰρ οἶκτος ταῦτα. χαίρετε combines the sense of 'farewell' with the literal 'be happy', contrasted with οἶκτος and κατολοφύρομαι. Orestes shows his nobility by accepting his death without lamentation.

**647–9** The chorus, who desperately wish for news of their families (576–7) and for a return home (448–55) perhaps conceal some envy of Pylades' luck. σεβόμεθ', 'we revere', is a striking word; like μάκαρ (τύχας μάκαρος), Euripides uses it commonly though not exclusively in a divine context, and the implication may be that there is something almost godlike, certainly worthy of reverence, about Pylades' good fortune in contrast with their own helplessness. These lines roughly correspond to 644–5, with the substitution of a hypodochmiac for the second dochmiac in the first line (see Metre).

**650** 'Matters for friends are unenviable when their friends are dying.' Pylades responds to the chorus' implicit envy of his good fortune. This, his first spoken reaction to the plan, anticipates his objections in the following scene.

**651–4** 'O miserable journeys – o woe! – destroying two people – alas. Which of the two ...' The chorus quickly fasten on to Pylades' point in the previous line, and their admiration of his good fortune turns to pity. Textually and metrically these lines are problematic; the text as printed continues in fairly regular dochmiacs with the exclamations φεῦ φεῦ and αἰαῖ \**extra metrum*. The manuscripts have not διολλῦσαι (pres. part. act. agreeing with πομπαί) but διόλλυσαι (2nd sg. pres. pass. indic. 'you are destroyed'); if this is right, omitting the supplement δύο, there is a sequence of three short clauses or sentences: 'O miserable journeys! O woe, you perish! Alas, which one is about to ...?' A further possibility is to read μέλλον for μέλλων, with or without a supplement τλάμων: 'which of the two is more so/more unfortunate?' In this case, the lines will probably have been split between different members or parts of the chorus; there would be good sense, but not much metrical coherence. Yet another possibility is to emend to διόλλυται, with πότερος as the postponed subject (Cropp). But it may be best to admit that πότερος ὁ μέλλων defies interpretation or emendation.

**πομπᾶι:** lit. ‘sendings’ or ‘escorts’, referring to the arrangements which will take Orestes to the altar of Artemis and Pylades, escorting the letter, home to Greece.

**655–7** ‘My mind’s inclination is still uncertain and ambivalent, whether I should first bewail you, or you, with my laments.’ μέμνε, more usually ‘wishes’, ‘is eager’, must here have a more neutral sense ‘intends’, ‘inclines to’. ἀμφίλογα and δίδυμα must be understood as the object of μέμνε: ‘inclines to evenly argued twin things’.

**658–826** *Second trimeter section of second episode.* These lines, between two sections of lyric dialogue, form the central part of the tripartite second *epeisodion*, itself the play’s central scene, and culminate in the recognition between Iph. and Orestes. At the scene’s opening, Iph. is still in the temple, and Orestes and Pylades talk between themselves. Pylades is unwilling to return to Greece without Orestes, but Orestes convinces him to return to Argos, build him a cenotaph, and look after Elektra. Iph. returns with the letter, and she and Pylades swear oaths, he to deliver the letter, she to grant him safe passage. Pylades is struck by a qualm: suppose the letter should perish in a shipwreck? Iph. therefore gives him the message orally, revealing to the men’s astonishment her own identity and that of the addressee. In a dramatic gesture, Pylades passes the letter to Orestes. Iph., at first unconvinced, is assured of her brother’s identity by his recall of four items connected with her, and the two participate in a lyric exchange which is both tearful and joyous.

**658–722** *Discussion between Orestes and Pylades.* The scene’s opening sees Orestes both interested and puzzled by the identity of the priestess – yet another possibility for the recognition to take place at an earlier point than it actually does. But Pylades is less interested in the question, having his own preoccupations, and the scene’s dynamic shifts from Orestes and Iph. to Orestes and Pylades. This section echoes the earlier scene (578–616) where Orestes rejected the plan proposed by Iph. and switched the roles of the two friends; now it is Pylades’ turn to object to a scenario in which he survives his friend. But in the absence of Iph., the dramatist is able to focus more closely and intimately on the friendship between the two.

**658 πέπονθας ταυτό** ‘have you experienced the same thing?’, that is ‘have you had the same thought or reaction?’

**πρὸς θεῶν:** see 509n.

**659** ‘You ask me when I am unable to say.’ Pylades cannot know the answer until Orestes tells him his thoughts.

**660 Ἑλληνικῶς** ‘in a Greek manner’, here ‘like a Greek woman, revealing herself to be Greek’.

**661–5** A summary of Iph.’s questioning. Although Orestes does not repeat her mention of Helen, Menelaos, and Odysseus by name, their

fates are certainly included in νόστον τ' Ἀχαιῶν. It is a nice touch that he does refer to her mention of Kalchas, not the most obvious character for an uninvolved interlocutor to inquire after, but one of special relevance to Iph. Most importantly, Orestes' summary reproduces the emphasis on the family of Agamemnon, both through the number of words devoted to the topic and through the final position, reporting also her pity (ὠκτιρ').

**663** Ἀχιλλέως τ' ὄνομα: there is no exact parallel for ὄνομα with genitive of *x* to mean 'well-known *x*', but the phrase is easily understood on the analogy of, for instance, βίη Ἡρακλῆος, 'mighty Herakles' (*Il.* 18.117).

**663–5** '... and miserable Agamemnon, how she pitied him, and asked about his wife and children'.

**666** οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε 'for *otherwise* she would never have ...' Cf. 1201 and Denniston 1954: 62–3. Orestes' deduction is perfectly reasonable. Iph. did not explicitly say that she was from Argos.

**668** '... as though if Argos did well, she would do the same'. κοινὰ πράσσοις has the sense 'sharing the fate (or circumstances)'.

**669–71** ἔφθης με μικρόν 'you're just ahead of me'. As friends think alike, Pylades represents himself as being in agreement with Orestes, although there is one important difference. He cannot really doubt that the priestess is from Argos – as Orestes has just said, she would be unlikely to want to send a letter there if she were not, and she has expressed her willingness to give him the best funeral she can because of his origin (630) – but he is evidently less inclined to attribute significance to Iph.'s knowledge than his friend, who was struck and impressed by it at 540, to the extent of wondering about her identity. The difference expresses their different preoccupations; despite his willingness to die in place of his friend, Orestes is moved by a connexion with his home, but Pylades is not Argive and is more concerned with the difficulties posed by not sharing Orestes' death. His scepticism is perhaps justified, in realistic terms, but Orestes as the more important character is closer to the truth. He must be assumed to have some unconscious sense of affinity with his sister: see Introduction, p. 40.

**670–1** 'Everyone who has paid any attention (ἐπιστροφή) knows the misfortunes of (these) kings.' Yet Iph. had shown very little knowledge of such sufferings. The line can also be taken as looking out of the dramatic context, to hint at the audience's familiarity with the tradition: see Introduction, pp. 10–11.

**672** 'But I was going through (thinking about) a different matter.'

**673** 'What? By giving it to be shared you would learn better.' Orestes probably means not that Pylades would know his own mind better if he spoke out, but that two minds are more likely to solve an issue than one.

**674–86** Pylades' speech rejecting the prospect of saving his life if Orestes is to die clearly invites comparison with Orestes' speech at 597–608, and the reluctance of each to save his own life was much admired in antiquity (e.g. *Ov. Tr.* 4.4.69–76, *Pont.* 3.2.85–9, Lucian, *Toxaris* 5–6; see Introduction, p. 47 and Hall 2012: 92–110). The circumstances are not quite symmetrical, however: while Orestes proposes that Pylades should live while he himself dies, Pylades' proposal is that they should die together. To modern tastes, Pylades' expressed motives are perhaps rather distastefully shame-culture centred. Not only is it αἰσχρόν to live while Orestes dies, Pylades seems preoccupied with the idea that 'the many' – whom he condemns – will blame him for leaving Orestes behind or even suppose that he brought about the situation in order to rule Argos himself. There is not a word of affection for Orestes, nor even mention of what is right (contrast 607–8, 601–2). But the purpose of this is probably not so much to characterise Pylades (650 could after all be taken as based on a sense of duty or affection) as to vary the arguments for the case. And these arguments are plausible enough: with no witnesses to events among the Taurians, the finger of suspicion would be sure to point at Pylades, who stands to gain by Orestes' death. With no male heirs, control of Agamemnon's family and property, and with it the kingship of Argos, would naturally pass to the husband of Agamemnon's daughter – the result which Orestes himself desires at 695–9.

**674 βλέπειν ... φάος:** see 564n.

**676 κεκτήσομαι:** fut. perf. = 'I shall have acquired the reputation of ...'

**677** Pylades thinks of his reputation suffering both in Orestes' home and his own. 'The many-folded land of the Phokians' refers to mountainous country; cf., e.g., *Il.* 8.411, πολυπτύχου Οὐλύμποιο.

**678–82** Pylades imagines two rumours circulating about him: first, that he somehow allowed the unwilling Orestes to die while saving his own skin; secondly, that he actually killed Orestes in order to profit himself.

**678 πολλοὶ γὰρ κακοί:** following on from τοῖς πολλοῖσι with the article, the meaning may be 'the many (ordinary people) are base', but the phrase itself has no article and so perhaps 'base people are numerous' is easier. Either way the sentiment is common in archaic poetry, and aristocratic disdain combined with a concern for one's reputation among one's inferiors is imagined to be typical of the great men of the heroic age: compare Hector at *Il.* 22.104–10.

**679** '(I shall seem) to have betrayed you and to have reached home safely myself alone.' For the use of σώιζω/-ομαι with εἰς or ἐκ indicating the place safely reached or the danger escaped from, see 593n. and cf. 746, 1068, 1399. The word order is unexpected, with σ' governed by προδούς rather than σεσῶσθα; this emendation (with, in Stinton's version, the

accented, emphatic form σέ rather than the enclitic σε) avoids the unparalleled \*elision of the -αι of an infinitive.

The line exhibits the heavy use of sigma (sigmatism) for which Euripides was mocked in Plato Com. fr. 29 K–A and Eubulus fr. 26 K–A. Cf. *Med.* 476 and below, 765. Clayman 1987 demonstrates that he does in fact use sigma more often than the other dramatists.

**680–2** ‘Or even that I murdered you, your house being afflicted, having arranged your fate for the sake of [gaining] your rule, being married to your sister and the transmitter of your inheritance.’ Bergk’s emendation, switching participle and finite verb, makes better sense than L’s text ‘having murdered you, I arranged your fate ...’ Similarly at 929 Iph. imagines that Menelaos might have taken advantage of Orestes’ troubles to seize power in Argos.

ἐπὶ ‘in the circumstances of’.

νοσοῦσι δώμασι suggests all the troubles which Orestes has just recounted; for the figurative sense of νοσέω, ‘suffer’, used in both poetry and prose, see LSJ 3, but cf. also below, 693–4n.

ῥάψας μόρον: Euripides uses ῥάπτω in the sense ‘plot, bring about (something evil)’ also at *Andr.* 836, 911; it is used already in the *Odyssey* (3.118, 16.379, 421).

ἐγκληρον: in the event of Orestes’ death without children, his estate (κληρος) would pass to a male connected with his sister. If Athenian law were to apply, Elektra would be called ἐπρίκληρος (too prosaic and perhaps too awkward metrically to be a tragic word), and she would be married to her father’s nearest relative – perhaps Pylades, as Agamemnon’s sister’s son, though a purely male line would be better – with her male offspring inheriting on reaching maturity. Mythology, however, has many examples of men who acquire property and power directly through their wives.

γαμῶν: the form may be either present or future, but directly after this (at 695–6) we learn that Pylades is already married to Elektra. For the present tense as ‘to be married, to have taken in marriage’, cf. line 2 and n.

**683** δι’ αἰσχύνης ἔχω ‘I am in a state of shame, I feel shame.’

**684–5** συνεκπνεῦσαι ... συσφαγῆναι ... πυρωθῆναι δέμας: the piling up of verbs is very emphatic and stresses Pylades’ willingness to share everything that will happen to Orestes. The burning of the victims’ bodies was described at 626.

**686** φοβούμενον ψόγον recapitulates at the close of his speech Pylades’ expressed motive for his choice.

**687–715** Orestes replies at greater length, pointing out the advantages of the arrangement: it is painful and shameful to him to allow Pylades to die, whereas his own misfortunes will make death easier to bear. Besides,

by returning and taking his own place in Argos, Pylades will be able to give Orestes funeral rites, continue his family, and keep his name alive. He ends with an emotional farewell to his friend, and some bitter words about Apollo.

**687** εὐφημα φώνει: ‘speak auspicious things!’, a way of suppressing mention of terrible things to come (cf. Soph. *Aj.* 362, 591). Orestes reasonably suggests in 687–8 that while his own death is inescapable, the total situation will only be worse if Pylades dies as well.

**688** ‘It being possible (acc. absol.) to bear (understand φέρειν from 687 and οἶσω) single sorrows, I shall not bear double.’

**689–91** Orestes points out that arguments similar to those that Pylades has used will apply the other way round – it is equally shameful (ἀπονείδιστον) for him to allow Pylades to die. By using the more dramatic κτενῶ he perhaps underlines the parallel with the scenario that his friend fears.

**691–2** These lines continue and extend the thought of 646: death is not a misfortune for one ‘faring as I fare at the hands of the gods’.

**693–4** νοσοῦντ’ ... μέλαθρ’ picks up νοσοῦσι δώμασι in 680, in an attempt to use the terms of Pylades’ argument against him. In juxtaposition with καθαρά, νοσοῦντ’ suggests not merely ‘ailing’ but ‘polluted’, there being a close connexion between sickness and pollution. δυσσεβῆ makes a similar point. In fact, though Iph.’s escape plan will exploit the pollution supposedly incurred by Orestes (and Pylades), Orestes’ pure or polluted status is far from clear in the play. The Athenians indeed treat him as unclean (947–54), but no purification ceremony is mentioned (other than the fake Taurian one). Rather it is first the Areopagos trial, and then the accomplishment of the mission to bring back the statue of Artemis, which ends his persecution by the Erinyes. This is similar to the situation in *Eumenides*, where the purifications he undergoes (282–3) have no effect on the Erinyes, who are only pacified by the trial and its aftermath.

**695–6** σωθεις ... κτησάμενος: conditional (‘if you are saved ...’), but the participles are left hanging as the condition continues in 697 with ὄνομα as the subject.

**696** This is the first clear statement that Elektra, whom Agamemnon was said to have left as a virgin daughter at 562, is now married. With her father dead, it would fall to her brother to give her in marriage.

**697–8** There is no need to look for a precise reference for the survival of Orestes’ name; he means simply that he will not be forgotten. With both Orestes and Pylades dead, there would be no one to bestow the widowed Elektra in marriage, and therefore no descendants for the house of Agamemnon. For γίγνομαι with ὄνομα in the sense ‘be known’, cf. Pl. *Prt.* 335a, οὐδ’ ἂν ἐγένετο Πρωταγόρου ὄνομα ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν. The combination

of τε and οὐδέ is almost unparalleled, and Diggle suggests that a line may have fallen out before 697, containing an earlier τε which τ' in 697 would pick up.

**ἐξαλειφθεῖη:** ἐξαλείφω is to smooth over drawing or writing, hence equivalent to 'erase'. The metaphor is a natural one for falling into oblivion.

**699 πατρός:** probably 'my father', not 'your father'. Orestes enjoins Pylades to take his own place as head of Agamemnon's family, imagining that his nephews, Agamemnon's grandsons, will carry on the family inheritance. Out of context the phrase would more likely mean 'live in *your* father's household', and some scholars take it that way, but given that the argument is centred on Orestes' δόμος, and especially given the sense of πατρῷος in the preceding line, this seems unlikely.

**700 ἱππῖόν τ' Ἄργος:** cf. 132, Ἑλλάδος εὐίππου.

**702–3** 'Pile up a mound and place on it memorials for me.' The cenotaph which Orestes requests is to resemble an actual grave: a mound (τύμβος) with a marker on top. μνημεῖα might perhaps indicate objects which had belonged to Orestes and so would recall him, 'mementoes' (cf. Iph.'s hair at 821, with 820–1n.), but since they are to be placed on top of the cenotaph the word probably signifies a gravestone or marker. He adds that Elektra, as his nearest female relative, should perform the rites which would be appropriate at an actual tomb – ironically the very offerings, of hair and tears, which his unrecognised sister had said she was unable to give him, being far from his burial place (172–4 and n.).

**705 ἀμφὶ βωμόν ἀγνισθεὶς φόνῳ:** 'made holy for slaughter at the altar'. Meinel (2015: 149–51) suggests as a secondary meaning the idea that Orestes might actually be purified from his pollution by death, looking forward to the purification ruse later in the play.

**706–7** 'And do not ever betray my sister, seeing your inlaws' family and the house of my father deserted.' Pylades' last duty must be to retain Elektra as his wife, the more so since there is now no one in her natal family to protect her.

**κῆδη καὶ δόμους ... πατρός:** κῆδος, with root meaning 'care, concern', also indicates 'affine(s)', the family or a member of the family from which a man has taken his wife. The same family structure is Pylades' κῆδη and Orestes' and Elektra's δόμοι πατρός.

**708 χαῖρ'** 'farewell', but retaining something of its literal sense 'be happy'. Cf. 646.

**709** The well-known tradition was that Orestes had been sent away as a small child by Klytaimnestra and brought up in the house of his uncle Strophios in Phokis (cf. Aesch. Ag. 877–85) together with Strophios' own son Pylades. As the boys grew up they would naturally take part together in the hunting expeditions which marked their passage to maturity

(cf. Odysseus, *Od.* 19.393–466). Thematically συγκυναγέ may recall the episode narrated in the Herdsman's speech, where Orestes was described as κυναγὸς ὤς (284).

**711–15** At the end of his speech, Orestes' resignation to his fate turns to bitterness as he contrasts Pylades' loyalty with what he perceives to be Apollo's trickery. He imagines that when the god realised that his oracles had been at fault, and Orestes could not escape the pursuit of the Erinyes, he covered up his mistake by sending him away from Greece on a useless and fatal mission. Of course, this pessimistic interpretation turns out to be untrue, but the idea that Apollo might feel shame or embarrassment (αἰδώς, 713) is hinted at in the conclusion of *Ion* (1557–8), while his inability to make good on his promises to Orestes is already a major issue in *Eumenides*.

μάντις properly refers to a human who is skilled in prophecy through interpreting signs sent by the gods, but Aeschylus gives Apollo the title, as god of prophecy, at *Cho.* 559 and *Eum.* 615. Cf. 1128.

τέχνην: here pejorative, 'a trick'. For τίθημι or τίθεμαι (the middle indicates Apollo's advantage) in the sense 'arrange, bring about', see LSJ *s.v.* τίθημι A VII.

ὥς προσώταθ' Ἑλλάδος 'as far away from Greece as possible'. Rhetorical exaggeration, but the remoteness of the Taurian land is central to the play's atmosphere.

πάντ' ... τὰμά 'all my affairs' (τὰμά = τὰ ἐμά).

ἀνταπόλλυμαι: with wordplay on Ἀπόλλων, as at Aesch. *Ag.* 1080–1. Apollo is Orestes' destroyer 'in return' (ἀντ-).

**718 βλέπονθ'**: sc. φῶς or ἥλιον (cf. 564n.), hence 'living'. For the omission of the object, typically when there is a contrast with death, see Collard on *Supp.* 78. That a friend can be dearer in death than in life, though paradoxical, shows well the extreme importance of duty and obligation in friendship. Pylades will demonstrate his love for his friend by the offices which he performs for him even when dead.

**719–22** Having answered the first part of Orestes' speech by assuring him that he will carry out all his requests, Pylades turns to the conclusion, in which Orestes blamed Apollo: 'The god's prophecy has not yet destroyed you, even though you are standing close (κἀγγύς = καὶ ἐγγύς) to slaughter.' His argument that extreme misfortune should bring about extreme reversals, though less commonly found than the more pessimistic idea that good fortune turns to bad, is paralleled for instance at Soph. *El.* 916–19 and Thuc. 7.77.3–4.

ἔστιν ... διδοῦσα 'it is a thing which gives ...', with the participle effectively adjectival, though still governing μεταβολάς in the accusative. The repetitions give extreme emphasis.



**723–826** *Re-entry of Iphigeneia and mutual recognition.* Iph. brings the letter from the temple, and she and Pylades swear to honour the agreement that they have made. Pylades' request to be released from his oath if the letter should be lost at sea prompts Iph. to tell him the letter's contents so that if he survives he can still convey her message. On hearing the name 'Orestes', the young men are amazed, and Pylades hands the letter to Orestes on the spot. Iph. is incredulous, but finally she is convinced of Orestes' identity by his recalling items and events from their shared past. The two embrace and celebrate their reunion.

This second part of the very long second episode is finally a three-cornered one (after Iph.–Orestes and Orestes–Pylades). Although the recognition primarily concerns Iph. and Orestes, the device of the letter enables Pylades to play a full part in the scene, and its delivery by him to Orestes is a remarkable *coup de théâtre*. The letter itself (see 584n.) is both an unusual kind of recognition token and an effective stage prop, acting as a visual cue to focus the audience's attention on the relationship between the characters on stage.

**723–6** Iph.'s entry from the central doors, representing the temple, and her commands to her attendants, mirror the opening of the preceding part of the episode at 467–71. In both she comes out of the temple and dismisses subordinates with a command to prepare things inside; *παρευτρεπίζετε* ('assist in getting ready', 725) echoes *εὐτρεπίζετε* at 470. The group addressed here should be the guards who entered along with the temple assistants at 456 (see 466–642n.).

**723–4** There is irony in Orestes' understandable assumption that the priestess' return indicates his imminent death (*οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ ... γυνή γὰρ ἦδε δωμάτων ἔξω περᾶι*), since in fact it heralds the recognition and consequent escape plan.

**726** *τοῖς ἐφεστῶσι σφαγῇ*: the slaughterers (or perhaps the vague plural conceals only one officiant) were referred to as 'inside' at 624. Iph.'s language here is much less veiled than in the comparable passage at 471.

**727** 'Here, strangers, are the many-doored folds of the tablet.' The letter, as usual in antiquity, is a tablet composed of two or more hinged 'leaves' (here 'doors') with a writing-surface of wax, folded together, bound with strings and sealed for passage. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1407b35) quotes this phrase as an example of poetic periphrasis (and fortunately gives us the correct reading, against *πολύθρηνοι* in the manuscripts).

**728–33** Iph.'s unwillingness to trust Pylades completely is plausible in the dramatic context, and justified by an equally plausible gnomic statement: 'no man is the same (*αὐτός = ὁ αὐτός*) in trouble as (lit. 'and') when he passes from fear to confidence'. *πίπτω* suggests involuntary movement

from one state to another, not necessarily from a better to a worse. ἀνὴρ is often used when ἀνθρῶπος would be more strictly accurate, even in speech given to a woman. Iph.'s next words show that she regards herself as still 'in troubles'.

**732** *θηται παρ' οὐδέν* 'might regard as of no consequence', 'set no store by'. Cf. *Or.* 569, *παρ' οὐδέν* ... ἦν.

**735–6** The oath demanded by Iph. gives rise to Pylades' worry that he might be unavoidably prevented from delivering the letter, which in turn prompts Iph. to impart its contents. This sequence of events is not strictly necessary in order for the recognition to take place, since Pylades would have to be informed of the letter's destination; but without her sudden fear that the letter might be neglected, there would be no particular reason for her to hand it over before the sacrifice, and the précis of its contents allows Iph.'s identity to be revealed simultaneously with her connexion to Orestes.

**735** *ῥρκον δότω μοι*: 'give an oath' here means 'swear it', although in technical language (e.g. *Dem.* 39.25) the meaning is to demand or administer an oath (for which *ἐξάρχειν* is used at 743).

*πορθμέουσιν*: 266n.

**737** *τούς αὐτοὺς λόγους*: not literally the same words, but a corresponding oath to keep her part of the bargain.

**740** *δίκαιον εἶπας*: 'you have said what is fair'. But Iph.'s next words, though introduced with γάρ, are not to do with fairness (that was Orestes' point with *ἀντιδώσεις*, 'give in exchange', 737), but rather state that it is to her own advantage to send Pylades away unharmed (which is evidently true, unless the whole story of the letter is a ruse for some unclear purpose). Conceivably *δίκαιον* should be emended, perhaps to *ἄρχαιον* in the sense of 'foolish', attested for Euripides in the *Suda* s.v. *παλαιγενές* (Housman 1972 [1890]: 1255).

**741–2** Iph. has not yet explained how she is able to release one of the captives (cf. 578–642n.), so Orestes' doubts are reasonable. But she is very confident of her influence in religious matters over Thoas, and though in the end the stratagem has changed, the following episode will show that she has little difficulty in persuading him to sanction a change of plan.

**741** *τύραννος*: in a work set in the mythical period this may be simply a synonym for 'king', but whereas it is used three times between Orestes and Iph. (as well as here, at 996 and 1020), compared with once for ἄναξ (1048), Thoas is always called ἄναξ by Taurians and in their presence.

**742** *εἰσβήσω* is transitive, with αὐτόν understood: 'and I myself will put him aboard the ship's vessel' (*ναὸς* ... *σκάφος*, repeated as *νεὼς σκάφος* at 1345, is a common pleonasm in Euripides).

**ναός:** the Doric form, rather than Attic νεώς, is used because the first syllable is required to be long. In such cases tragedy seems to prefer the Doric to the epic form, which would also give a long first syllable (νηός).

**743** Seemingly convinced by Iph.'s answer, Orestes speaks first to Pylades, agreeing that he should swear, then to Iph.: 'and you lay down an oath which is reverent'.

**744–52** Ordinarily one oath would be sworn at a time, but the \*stichomythic convention allows their interweaving and hence gives greater vividness to the idea of oath and counter-oath. It also highlights the three essential parts of an oath: the deity by whom the oath is sworn (normally placed first, here second, 748–9); the substance of what is sworn (744–6); and the imprecation – the curse called down on the person swearing in the event of perjury or failure to fulfil the promise made (750–2). See Sommerstein and Fletcher 2008: 2.

**744–5** Comedy permits verbatim repetition of an oath (Ar. *Lys.* 212–36), but the higher register of tragedy naturally seeks out variation (compare the oath which Medea makes Aigeus swear, *Med.* 746–55, where, however, it is Medea who specifies the deities to be sworn by). All the same, the changes which Pylades introduces are less harsh if Iph.'s line 744 is already a paraphrase of what he should say, rather than the words in his own person; thus δώσω ... τοῖς ἐμοῖς φίλοις should be emended to δώσεις (or δώσειν) ... τοῖς ἐμοῖς φίλοις, not to δώσω τοῖσι σοῖς φίλοις.

**746** For σώιζω 'convey safely', see 593n. and cf. 679, 1068, 1399.

**κυανέας ... πέτρας:** see 124n. The Symplegades were also known as the Dark Rocks (for κυάνεος, see 392n.); cf. Hdt. 4.85. The singular here suggests that as a barrier they are considered as one entity; cf. 889.

**747** 'So by which oath-connected one among the gods do you swear to these things?' The verb usually, as here, takes an accusative of the deity or thing by which one swears. τοισίδ' = τοῖσδε (neut. pl.), the substance of the oath sworn.

**748** Iph. naturally swears by the deity whom she serves (as she points out), and whom she considers not responsible for the custom of human sacrifice (385–91).

**τιμός:** the meaning 'office', of a magistracy or priesthood, is a natural extension of the literal 'honours', since such functions conveyed honour to those who held them.

**749** No connexion with a particular deity has been established for Pylades, and so he appropriately swears by Zeus, the god who more than any other has the title ὀρκιος (747); see LSJ *s.v.*

**δ(ὲ) ... γ(ε)** represents a 'lively rejoinder': Denniston 1954: 153.

**751** There is some illogicality in Pylades' imprecation (744–52n.), since he cannot be judged to have failed in the delivery of the letter

until he has already returned, at least to Argos; and since he has agreed with Orestes that he will settle there rather than in Phokis (699n.), he cannot mean that his νόστος is not accomplished until he returns to the latter place. Perhaps his meaning is ‘May I not return, if I *intend* to wrong you ...’ (ἀδικοίης ἐμέ, 750). If so, he quickly sees that this is not what he has in fact sworn, leading him to request an exception in the next lines.

**752** Iph.’s imprecation (744–52n.) parallels that of Pylades. She too keeps her oath, but it is less clear whether she is rewarded by the cancellation of the fate she calls upon herself. Her future is to be in Attica, not Argos; could she perhaps visit Argos first? But Athena’s instructions seem to suggest that the landing on the east coast of Attica will be made on the way home to Argos (cf. also 1130–1 and n.), so it would be more natural for Iph. to remain there (1440–1n.).

**753** ‘Listen now to a matter which we have passed over.’ ἀκουε δὴ νυν is a common beginning in Euripides (Denniston 1954: 218).

**754** ‘Let it be shared straight away, if it is good.’ Clearly Iph. makes a polite rejoinder to Pylades’ suggestion that something has been overlooked, but the manuscript reading is corrupt and another possible reply, closer to the reading of L but perhaps less apt in context, is Bothe’s ἀλλ’ οὔτις ἔστ’ ἀκαιρος: ‘But no λόγος is untimely (or too late), if it is good.’

**755** ‘But grant me this exception, if something should happen to the ship ...’ ἐξάρετον in this context has legal overtones (cf. e.g. Dem. 23.181.3), and the following lines continue the suggestion. An oath, with its conditional curse, suggests to the prudent that every eventuality should be thought out in advance.

**756** χρημάτων: Pylades and Orestes had presumably left their possessions in the boat in which they arrived. The antithesis between σῶμα and χρήματα, person and property, is common in the late fifth century, especially in prose works: cf., e.g., Thuc. 1.141.5 (further examples in Cropp).

**758** ἐμπεδον ‘in force’. Cf. 790, ἐμπεδώσομεν, ‘we shall make firm’, i.e. fulfil the oath.

**759–64** Pylades’ worry that he might find himself cursed through his inability to fulfil the oath prompts Iph.’s fear that the letter may after all not reach her loved ones. Her plan is designed to increase the likelihood of her message reaching Argos, but it has the side effect that Pylades is now protected.

**759** ἀλλ’ οἶσθ’ ὃ δράσω: a rhetorical question, ‘Do you know what I shall do?’, drawing attention to what is about to be said. A commoner related idiom is οἶσθ’ ὃ δρᾶσον, with the imperative, introducing a command: ‘You know what you should do?’ Cf. 1203 and see Collard and Stevens 2018: 84.

**πολλά γὰρ πολλῶν κυρεῖ:** this sounds like a proverbial expression, literally ‘many things meet with many things’ or ‘are successful in many aims’. The sense in context must be that a variety of different plans is more likely to result in success.

**761 ἀναγγεῖλαι:** the infinitive expresses purpose (Smyth §2008–10).

**762 ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ** ‘safe’. Cf. 494, ἐν ἡδονῇ. Iph. thinks primarily of the safety of her letter.

**763 φράσει σιγῶσα:** the paradox that written signs can speak is one explored by Euripides elsewhere, e.g. *Hipp.* 877–80.

**765** Another strongly sigmatic line: see 679n.

**766** Pylades recognises that the proposed solution benefits them both (τῶν τε σῶν [‘your affairs’ = σοῦ] ἐμοῦ θ’ ὕπερ). The manuscript reading τῶν θεῶν ἐμοῦ θ’ ὕπερ is much less apt; although the gods are necessarily involved in the oath, no special attention has been drawn to them.

**767 ὦι χρητή τάσδ’ ἐπιστολὰς φέρειν:** unless the letter bore Orestes’ name on its outer surface (which of course would also lead to the revelation), Iph. would have to tell Pylades where to deliver it even without reciting its contents. But by giving the message at the same time as the address, Euripides enables Orestes and Pylades to learn Iph.’s identity without the need for lengthy questioning.

**768** ‘... and what I ought to say, having heard it from you’. κλύοντα, a very likely emendation for κλύονται, is the aor. participle, acc. governed by χρητή.

**769–82** The rearrangement of the lines adopted here (Jackson 1955: 9–12) among its other merits gives expression to the double surprise that Orestes and Pylades should feel on hearing the letter: first that it is addressed to Orestes, secondly that its author is Iph. (Schwinge 1968: 238–42 defends the traditional order, which is accepted by many editors.) A letter normally begins with the name of the writer followed by his or her greetings to the named recipient. In this paraphrase the recipient’s name is given first, since this is the first thing Pylades needs to know, and elicits an exclamation of surprise from the messenger, who, however, refuses to explain himself in response to Iph.’s baffled and perhaps irritated response: ‘Why are you calling on the gods in the midst of my affairs?’ Rearrangement of the lines as printed gives a dramatic effect far superior to that of L, where the interjection ὦ θεοί is postponed until Iph. has given the whole text of her letter, and the first expression of surprise does not appear for three lines. Postponement of a spoken reaction is not in itself a problem in tragedy, but Iph.’s naming of the addressee and the first two lines of her text contain not one but two surprises (the name Orestes and the revelation that Iph. is alive), and it is surely appropriate that this should be recognised.

**769** παιδι τὰγαμέμνονος: previously Iph. had feigned a lack of personal interest in Agamemnon's family, but the pretence must now be abandoned in the interests of communicating with her surviving relatives. τὰγαμέμνονος = τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονος.

**781** ἐξέβην γὰρ ἄλλοσε: lit. 'I went out to another place', my mind was on something else.

**779** With the line in this position the repetition of the name Orestes, to impress it further on Pylades' mind, comes as a nice rejoinder to Pylades' feigned admission that he was thinking about something else.

**770** Iph.'s description of herself as 'having been slaughtered', σφαγεῖσθ', goes further than some of her other paradoxical statements about the sacrifice; see 8, 360, with nn. 992 is a closer parallel.

ἐπιστέλλει τάδε 'sends these instructions'; see 589n.

**771** '... but to those there (Argos) no longer living'.

**772** Orestes in his surprise and confusion forgets that the woman before him is the author of the letter, and asks where Iph. might be. The latter's language, conflating appearance and reality, is hard to understand, and on the basis of what he has just heard, as well as his previous belief, he naturally assumes that Iph. was really killed and can be alive now only through being somehow resuscitated.

**773** 'This woman you see here – don't distract me from my words.' Iph. delivers her astonishing clarification quickly and impatiently, being absorbed in the business of teaching Pylades the all-important message.

**774-6** 'Bring me to Argos, brother, before I die, from a barbarian land, and remove me from the slaughter-sacrifices of the goddess, at which I hold the office (τιμὰς, see 748n.) of murdering strangers.'

**777** 'Being where (ever) do we find ourselves?' ποῦ here refers to situation rather than actual location; ὄντ' is dual ὄντε, coupled with a plural verb, as often.

**778** ἀραία: from ἀρά, 'curse' (cf. *Med.* 608). Since Iph. commands her brother to bring her home before she dies, what she must have in mind here is that if she should die among the Taurians, she will after her death become a curse to him, thus suggesting the possibility of still further family hostility and further troubles for Orestes. Close kin are generally represented as able thus to hound family members who wrong them seriously (this is, after all, the basis of Orestes' sufferings), and here the vengeance is extended from sins of commission to those of omission: she will blame him for her death away from home as though he had killed her. (Seemingly Iph. has no qualms about exposing her brother to the extreme dangers faced by Greek travellers in the Tauric Chersonese.) It is a brother's duty to protect his sister, and she may further suppose that as Artemis' priestess she will be able to keep him

safe – which turns out to be the case, though not without direct divine intervention. (See further 876–99n.).

**782** ‘But perhaps (τάχ’ οὖν anticipates an objection) as he questions you he will become incredulous’ (arrive at unbelievable things, things he cannot believe). Orestes’ reaction at 772 suggested puzzlement and perhaps incredulity.

**ἄπιστ’**: 328–9n.

**783–6** Iph.’s explanation of her survival is the same that she gave in the prologue, except that here, in order to convince those in Argos that their version of events is wrong and to explain how it came about, she focalises the account momentarily on her father: ‘[a deer ...] which my father sacrificed, thinking that he was thrusting his sharp sword into me ...’ The following reactions of both her listeners show that she has indeed convinced them, while she, ironically, remains in ignorance of their identity and needs many more lines to be persuaded of the truth.

**784** ἦν: the antecedent is ἔλαφον.

**785** φάσγανον: a poetic word for ξίφος. On the use of sword rather than knife, see 27n.

**788–97** Pylades and Orestes, in five lines each, express their joy at Iph.’s news and go through a no doubt emphatic charade of delivering and receiving the letter; in terms of visual effect and stage movement, this moment, occurring very near the middle of the play, is one of the most striking in the drama.

**788–92** Pylades’ pleasure comes not only from the fact that the fulfilment of the oath which so worried him is surprisingly easy to perform, but from the supposition that both he and Orestes will now be safe, his own safety being guaranteed by the oath Iph. has sworn (κάλλιστα δ’ ὁμόσας). The supralinear correction ὁμόσας would make Pylades congratulate himself on swearing the oath, but is unnecessary.

**789** οὐ ... σχήσω ‘I will not hold back ...’

**790** ἐμπεδώσομεν: ‘we (I) shall make firm, perform’. See 757n.

**791** ἰδοῦ: ‘see’, 2 sg. aor. mid. imperative of ὁράω, but commonly and colloquially used as an interjection drawing attention to something, sometimes, as here, indicating compliance with an order. See Collard and Stevens 2018: 82–3.

**793–4** ‘I receive it; but setting aside the folds of letters, I shall first take joy (for myself) not in words.’ Orestes makes a formal statement of acceptance (δέχομαι), before setting aside the reading of the letter in favour of embracing its author. The letter, had it been delivered to him in Argos, would have conveyed pleasure (ἡδονή) through words, but he now takes joy in action (οὐ λόγοις) – an elegant variation of the very common contrast between λόγος and ἔργον.

**796** ἀπίστωι ... βραχίονι: ἄπιστος, whether with subjective ('unbelieving', as here) or objective ('unbelievable') force, need not always be taken literally (cf. 328 and 328–9n. for its extended use in the objective sense). In this case by applying the adjective to the arm with which Orestes nonetheless embraces Iph., Euripides depicts his confused state between amazement and joy (cf. ἐκτεπληγμένος ὁμῶς ... ἐς τέρψιν ... θαυμάστ' ἐμοί).

**798–9** 'Stranger, you do wrong in defiling the goddess' attendant, putting your arms round her inviolate robes.' It is usual in recognition scenes that one person realises, or already knows, the truth while the other remains to be convinced, and the unrecognising party not unnaturally may express reluctance to reciprocate the other's enthusiasm. The scene here is closest to *Ion* 517–65 and *Helen* 541–96; in all three, the unconvinced person attempts to avoid the physical contact initiated by the other, contact which would be natural among family members (father–son, wife–husband, brother–sister) but which is clearly inappropriate among strangers (here and in *Helen* of the opposite gender and therefore taboo, while *Ion* in his play clearly suspects that Xouthos' interest in him is sexual). See Kaimio 1988: 36–9. Here in addition to the impropriety of Orestes' embrace of an unrelated woman, she is a priestess, for whom ritual purity is essential (a similar consideration applies to *Ion*, *Ion* 522), and Orestes' action is thus doubly shocking. L attributes these lines to the chorus rather than to Iph., probably a mistake due to the speaker referring to herself in the third person. If the lines do belong to the chorus, Iph.'s shock and displeasure must still be shown in action, as indicated in 801.

**χέρας:** L has χέρᾱ, but the emendation restores the more usual plural: see Diggle 1994: 465.

**800–1** Orestes' language is solemn and very emphatic, and it is notable that συγκασιγνήτη occurs only here. μή μ' ἀποστρέφου shows that Iph. shrinks from his touch, depriving him of the pleasure he seeks (794).

**802** οὐ δοκοῦσ' ἔξιν ποτέ: of course the letter shows that Iph. hoped that she would be reunited with her brother one day, a hope which would have been revived by the new possibility of getting the letter to Argos but which must previously have seemed very distant.

**803** οὐ παύσῃ λέγων 'Won't you be quiet?' οὐ with fut. indic., formally a question, indicates a strong command. Iph. is indignant and amazed at the stranger's effrontery.

**804** The underlying meaning is clearly that she cannot have her brother with her, since he lives in Argos (Nauplia is the harbour of Argos), but no entirely satisfactory explanation has been proposed for the locution 'Argos and Nauplia are full of him', and it is possible that the text is corrupt (though no emendation so far proposed is satisfactory).



**805** ὦ τάλαινα ‘foolish woman’, spoken with pity and sympathy rather than scorn; another colloquialism.

**806–7** Iph. begins to hesitate, considering the remote possibility that her interlocutor might be speaking the truth, and asks first about his parentage: ‘Did the Spartan daughter of Tyndareus (Klytaimnestra, cf. 5, 1319) give you birth?’ She questions him about his mother, while his reply mentions his father: ‘Yes, to the son of Pelops’ son (Agamemnon), of whom I am born.’ (For γε in this ‘affirmative-additional’ sense, common in \*stichomythic question and answer, see Denniston 1954: 133–5; compare also 510, 821.) The patronymics and genealogies are standard tragic style, but Pelops has a particular significance in this play; his name is its first word, in Iph.’s self-presentation in the prologue, and his spear will shortly prove to be the conclusive item in the recognition (see also 985n.). Their shared knowledge of their ancestry, not only of their parents, is important to both Orestes and Iph.

**808–26** Iph. demands proof of Orestes’ identity, which is established through four tokens, none actually produced on stage (the letter has played that role in the parallel and preceding recognition of Iph. by Orestes), but all a matter of knowledge and memory. The choice of the first three tokens alludes to the recognition scene in *Choephori* and its echo in Euripides’ own *Electra*; hair and woven fabric help to seal identity between brother and sister in each case, while the lustral water which Klytaimnestra sends to Aulis along with her daughter bears some relation to the liquid offerings to Agamemnon which she sends out with her other daughter Elektra and which precipitate the discovery of Orestes’ offerings, the first two clues (the lock of hair and the footprint). See Introduction, pp. 10, 38 and Torrance 2013: 38–95.

**810** To Orestes’ proposal that she should question him about their parental home, Iph. objects, with a rhetorical question, that he should be the first to suggest a proof (τεκμήριον, 808); it is primarily up to him to confirm his own identity.

**οὔκουν** introducing a question is characteristic of tragedy, and particularly of response in \*stichomythia (Denniston 1954: 431). Here the speaker is correcting a suggestion just made: ‘No, but isn’t it ...?’ L’s οὔκουν would give a quieter, more tentative suggestion; but Iph. is still challenging Orestes.

**811–17** A piece of weaving is both a plausible and a symbolically significant object in a recognition scene involving a woman, especially if she has made it herself. In *Choephori*, the third token is a piece of Elektra’s weaving which Orestes has with him (it is unclear whether it is or forms part of the clothes he is wearing, as Euripides suggests in *El.* 539–44), so there is also a more specific allusion to the more famous meeting.

**811 ἀκοῇ ... Ἥλεκτρας:** if the piece had been left in the house after Iph. had woven it, Orestes could have seen it himself after her supposed death; it would not be necessary for him to have had the story from Elektra. On the other hand, a new bride would probably take much or all of her weaving with her to her new house, though in Iph.'s case it is pointless to speculate on what might have happened to such property after the sacrifice. In any case, the mention of Elektra serves to remind the audience of the better-known recognition scene, while the fact that Orestes has only *heard* of the first τεκμήριον, and presumably the next two, contrasts with the clinching proof of the final one (ἃ δ' εἶδον αὐτός, 822) – things seen being proverbially more reliable than things merely heard (cf. 901 and 900–1n.).

**812–13** Only a brief allusion to the story of Atreus and Thyestes is given here, with the further detail of the reversal of the sun's course at 816. The same two details were given by the chorus at 193–6, where the episode seems to be mentioned as setting off the chain of murderous events which have dogged the family ever since. Although the less suitable elements of the story (the adultery and the meal of Thyestes' children) are ignored, this is still a very grim piece of family tradition for a young girl's weaving.

**814 ἐν εὐπήνοις ὑφαῖς:** see 1465n.

**815** 'Dearest, you come very close to my mind' – that is, to something familiar to me. χρίμπτομαι means to come close or just touch the surface of something, emphasised by ἐγγύς. This figurative 'touching' contrasts with the physical touch that Iph. has rejected. ὦ φίλτατ' is here a response to one who has said something to cause surprise and pleasure (cf. for instance *El.* 229), and contrasts with the use of the address a few lines later, at 827. Cf. also 1184 and 1184–5n.

**816 εἰκὼ ... μετὰστασιν:** the two nouns are in apposition, 'an image, the sun's change of place'. It is unclear how this famous wonder could have been shown on a piece of tapestry, or indeed in any static depiction (perhaps by figures pointing to the sun suggesting their amazement?). On the tendency of poets to describe artworks as though the events depicted were actually taking place, see Becker 1995.

**817 εὐμίτοις πλοκαῖς** 'with fine-threaded interweavings'. μίτοι are properly the warp threads, which are made into cloth by intertwining (πλέκω) the weft. The phrase is a metrically equivalent variant on εὐπήνοις ὑφαῖς.

**818** 'And [do you remember] the bathing water that you received from your mother, [taken] to Aulis?' Normally a mother bathed her daughter directly before her wedding, but since Klytaimestra did not travel to where the wedding was to take place, she gave her water from Argos to take with her for the bath.

ἀδέξω = ἃ ἐδέξω, a necessary correction for L's ἀνεδέξω.

**819** The meaning seems to be, as a supralinear gloss in L suggests (τοῦτο τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι, ‘that is, not knowing’), that whatever the ‘marriage’, it at least could not take the memory of the lustral water away. If the marriage had been good, this might not be so. But in that case it is difficult to make sense of ἐσθλὸς ὦν: why should a good marriage erase memories of the ritual preliminaries? The line is very likely corrupt.

**820–1** Hair might be ritually cut on various occasions, chiefly as an offering to the dead (cf. 174, 703) and to mark a rite of passage, as an offering to a deity. Iph.’s intention may have been to send a lock of hair back to Argos for her mother to offer at a temple there, a long-distance performance of the ritual mirroring the lustral water sent by Klytaimestra to Aulis with Iph. If this was the original intention, it gives more poignancy to Iph.’s rejoinder: the hair intended as an offering on a joyful occasion becomes instead an object to mark its owner’s cenotaph (a third possible use of cut hair, not an offering as such). For μνημεῖα at a tomb, cf. 702–3 and n. On γ’, see 806–7n.

**822 & δ’ εἶδον αὐτός:** see 811n. These words introduce the climactic piece of evidence.

**823–6** The final τεκμήριον, the spear of Pelops, has no parallel in the recognition between Orestes and Elektra, but is full of symbolic significance. It is essentially the item with which the family was founded, when Pelops came to the Peloponnese and used the spear to win his bride Hippodameia. In the most familiar version, probably already in Pherecydes (*FGrH* 5 F 37a; see Gantz 1993: 541), Pelops wins the race by bribing Oinomaos’ charioteer to tamper with his chariot wheels, but Euripides’ words here may suggest an alternative in which he more heroically kills Oinomaos with a spear cast. In either case the story of the bridal is darkened by the death of the bride’s father, made clear at 825. As with the subject matter of Iph.’s weaving, the family’s chequered history is the background for the continuing story of Iph. and Orestes. The spear is an object which both have seen at different times, but which no one outside the family could be familiar with, since it was kept concealed in the bedroom of the daughters of the house, a room which Orestes knows had once belonged to Iph. (ἐν παρθενῳσι τοῖσι σοῖς). This reference to Iph.’s bedroom takes us back to the account of her dream in the prologue, where she thought that she awoke at home in Argos, and ‘corrects’ its gloomy atmosphere, the result of her misinterpretation.

Although a girl’s bedroom might not seem the obvious place to store a warlike relic, it could have seemed plausible to keep such a precious object in one of the most private areas of the house. It is also implied (with παρθένον ... παρθενῳσι) that the spear with which a young bride was won might have some appropriateness in the chamber of a young girl

destined for marriage. O'Brien (1988: 113) suggests that its placing here emphasises the parallels between Pelops and Iph.; see also Sansone 1975: 290, Xian 2020.

**824 Πισάτιδα:** 1n.

**827–99** *Lyric dialogue between Iphigeneia and Orestes following the recognition.* Iph. is convinced of her brother's identity, and both acknowledge their joy at the amazing turn of events. When Iph. recalls their ancestral home, Orestes reminds her that though they are nobly born, their lives have been harsh, which leads Iph. once more to bewail her past. Orestes supposes the family's murderous record could easily have been continued through her sacrificing him, and in the last part of the lyric passage, sung alone, she responds to the idea with agitation, and despairs of finding a way to smuggle Orestes safely out of the country.

The long-delayed recognition at last accomplished, the play reaches in these lines its emotional heart. Both parties are moved to tears (832–3) as each sees the sibling they had believed dead, and the reactions of both span extreme joy and sorrow. The dominant part is given to Iph.; up to 866 the section is true dialogue, but from 867 onwards the lines are hers alone. Throughout, her part is mostly lyric, with some iambic trimeters, which may have been sung rather than spoken, especially the lines with much resolution. Orestes' part is probably (see 832–3n.) confined to spoken trimeters, possibly indicating a greater degree of restraint (though he too is deeply moved). Perhaps rather than dialogue, then, this format might be called 'punctuated monody', in Willink's words (1989: 45), with pure monody taking over at 869.

The metre of the lyric parts is predominantly dochmiac, but with a generous admixture of other forms, mainly iambic (with cretic and bacchiac) and variants of enoplian. Lines 848, 876, 880, 884, and 895 look at first sight like anapaestic dimeters, but as Parker points out, their regularity is much more characteristic of enoplian than of true anapaestic metre; 886 and 897 are then close kin. Lines 875 and 888–9 can be analysed as dactylo-epitrite. But the dominance of dochmiacs is appropriate for strong emotion, and the use of resolution and runs of short syllables (in both iambic and dochmiac metra) is a favourite Euripidean device in such contexts.

*Metre*

827	-- ~ - ~ - ~ - ~ -	ia tr
	~ - ~ - ~ - ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	ia tr
830	- ~ ~ - ~ ~	doch
	-- ~ - ~ - ~ - -- ~ -	ia tr
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	2 doch

	υ-υ- - υ υ υ- - - υ-	ia tr
	υ υ υ υ	cr
835	υ υ υ- υ- υ υ υ- υ-	2 doch
	υ υ υ- υ-	doch
	- - υ- υ- υ υ- υ- υ υ-	ia tr
	- - υ- - υ-	ia + cr
840	υ- - υ- υ- υ υ υ-	2 doch
	υ- υ- υ- υ- - - υ υ	ia tr
	υ υ υ- υ- υ υ υ- υ-	2 doch
	υ- υ- υ- υ- υ- υ υ	ia tr
	- υ υ- υ-	doch
845	υ- υ- υ- υ- υ- υ-	ia tr
	υ- - υ-	doch
	υ υ υ- υ- υ υ υ- υ-	2 doch
	υ υ- υ υ- υ υ- υ υ-	enoplian
	- υ- - υ-	2 cr
850	υ- υ- υ- υ- υ- υ-	ia tr
	- - υ- - - υ- υ- υ υ	ia tr
	υ- - υ υ υ- - υ υ- υ-	2 doch
	υ- - υ- υ υ υ- υ-	2 doch
855	- - υ- υ- υ- υ- υ- υ-	ia tr
	υ υ υ- υ- - - υ υ- υ-	2 doch
	- υ υ- - - υ υ υ- υ-	2 doch
860	υ υ υ- υ- υ υ υ- υ-	2 doch
	- - - υ- υ- - - -	2 doch
	- - υ- - - υ- υ- υ- υ-	ia tr
	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ	2 ia
865	- υ- - - υ-	cr + ia
867	- υ- υ- υ υ	cr + ia
866	υ- υ- υ- υ- υ- υ-	ia tr
	- υ υ- - - - - - υ-	2 doch
870	υ- - - - - υ υ υ υ υ υ	2 doch
	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ- υ-	2 doch
	υ- - υ-	doch
	†- υ- - υ †- υ- - - ?	(perh. similar to following)
875	- υ- - - υ- - -	e - e - (2 tro?)
	υ υ- υ υ- υ υ- υ υ- υ-	enoplian
	υ υ υ- υ- υ υ υ- - -	2 doch
	υ υ υ- - -	doch

880	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ -	enopl
	υ υ υ υ	cr
	- υ υ - - - υ υ - - -	2 doch
	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ - υ	enopl
885	- υ υ - - -	doch
	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ	enopl
	- υ υ - υ υ - - - - υ υ - υ υ - - -	D - D -
890	υ υ υ - υ - υ υ υ - υ -	2 doch
	υ - - - -	doch
	υ - υ - υ - υ	ia + ba
895	† υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ -	enopl
	υ - υ υ - - †	doch
	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ -	enopl
	υ - - υ υ - υ - - υ -	2 doch
	υ - - υ υ	doch

**827-30** Iph., now fully convinced, expresses her recognition in song. She begins with two trimeters, the first regular, the second with considerable resolution; the shift may mark the move into song, and a definitely sung dochmiac, appropriate for extreme emotion, follows the second trimeter.

**827 ὦ φίλτατ'**: the beginning of the line is identical to 815 (see n.), spoken before Iph. is sure of Orestes' identity, but here she explains that her use of the word is entirely apt: Orestes is literally the dearest person in the world to her.

**828 ἔχω σ'**: Iph. not only 'has' her brother, but 'holds' him, returning his embrace (796). See also 902-3 and n.

**τηλύγετον**: the word is common in epic but found only here in tragedy. The derivation is uncertain, but it is usually applied to a child as seen by a parent, with the meaning 'dearly loved'. With ἀπὸ πατρίδος Ἀργόθεν, it is likely that Euripides linked it with τῆλε: 'far from your native Argos'.

**831 σέ**: emphatic form (proposed by Willink), responding to Iph.'s ἔχω σ'.

**τὴν θανοῦσαν**: Orestes echoes Iph.'s references to herself as dead or slaughtered, immediately qualifying his description by a reference to belief, as she does at 8 (see n.). Cf. 770, 992, and Introduction, pp. 32-3.

**832-3** 'Tears, lamentation together with joy, wet your eyes (lit. 'eyelid'), as they do mine.' κατὰ is in \*tmesis with νοτίζειι, with the prefix intensifying the verb, but before the main part of the verb appears it already suggests the tears falling down. L marks no change of speaker here, so that the lines continue Orestes' at 831. The previous line was, however,

an iambic trimeter, whereas 832 is dochmiac; if the attribution to Orestes is correct, this (perhaps with the trimeter 833) would be his only sung line. Willink (1989: 46–7) suggests retaining the lines for Orestes, partly on the grounds that Iph.’s sequence of thought from 830 to 834 then runs more clearly, and he compares Menelaos’ lyric role in the first part of the recognition duet in *Helen*. But this has not found general favour (and Willink himself changed his mind in 2009: 213–15). The objection that Orestes, as a male, should be depicted as calmer than the emotional Iph., and therefore should not sing, can be discounted: these lines themselves, whoever sings them, show that both parties are in a state of heightened emotion. But it is scarcely likely that the actor playing Orestes would be required to sing such a short section and then no more; Menelaos in *Helen*, though his is clearly the lesser lyric part, has several sung sections.

It is probable, therefore, that the lines should be given to Iph., who continues with 834.

**835 ἀγκάλαισι ... τροφοῦ:** at 232–5, Iph. spoke of having left her little brother in the arms of their mother, but now that she knows the later history of that relationship it is less jarring to substitute a nurse. The matricide is alluded to only in the most general and inclusive terms in this lyric section (851–2).

**837–8** Iph. expresses her happiness by speaking to her soul (cf. 344–7 and n.), saying that its joy is greater than words can express. Some editors give the trimeter ὦ κρείσσον ... to Orestes, based on L’s reading εὐτυχῶν ἐμοῦ. We must then either take ἐμοῦ ψυχά as an affectionate address to Iph., which would be unparalleled in tragedy, or emend ἐμοῦ to ἐγώ.

**842 ἄτοπον:** literally ‘placeless’, the word commonly means ‘out of place, inappropriate’. Here the meaning should rather be ‘unbelievable, unexpected, strange’ (see Lee on *Ion* 690). Kyriakou suggests there may also be literal undertones, linked with themes of dislocation throughout the play and with the fear expressed in the following lines.

**ὦ φίλοι:** Iph. turns briefly from her brother to describe her joy to the chorus, till now her only friends and fellow Greeks in this foreign land. Compare Helen in the recognition lyrics with Menelaos, *Hel.* 627, ἔλαβον ἄσμενα πόσιν ἐμόν, φίλοι.

**843–4** ‘I am afraid it (the joy) may take flight from my hands and flee into the sky.’ She imagines herself holding her happiness as she holds her brother. (This, with an emendation, is more likely than that she imagines Orestes himself flying off.) Flight is a repeated motif in the play: Iph. came to the Tauric peninsula through the air (29–30), and the chorus later wish to fly home (1138–42).

**845–9** Iph. addresses her home, never far from her thoughts, thanking it for her brother’s nurture.

**845 Κυκλωπίς ἑστία:** the building of Bronze Age walls with very large stones, such as those found at Tiryns and, as here, Mycenae (510n.), was mythologically attributed to the gigantic Kyklopes (the style is still called Cyclopean masonry). Iph. thinks of the palace of Mycenae, referring to it by its symbolic centre, the hearth (ἑστία), at which newborn infants were formally accepted into the family; hence the hearth is appropriately made responsible for Orestes' upbringing (ἐξεθρέψω, 849).

**847–9** 'I thank you for life, I thank you for upbringing, because you have raised this brother of mine for me, to be a light for our house.' With Orestes' nurture the subject matter of the last clause, it is natural to take the life and upbringing in the first part of the sentence as that of Orestes, whom Iph. has until recently believed dead, but it is possible that her own life may also be intended.

**δόμοις ... φάος:** 'light' is very frequently used in tragedy to indicate 'help' or 'deliverance', especially with reference to an individual, as earlier by Iph. referring to Orestes at 187. Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 131: φῶς τ' ἀναψον ἐν δόμοις.

**850–1** Orestes' consciousness of his own misfortune (cf. 500) now includes his sister in that state. His spoken trimeters check her joy and change the mood of what follows.

**852–4** Iph.'s thoughts turn immediately to her own experience, as often before (24–7, 215–17, 359–71).

**μέλειος** is treated as a two-termination adjective here, but μελέα below at 869. Cf. 621n. μελεόφρων (854) 'miserable-minded' repeats the root, and might mean either that Agamemnon planned a miserable fate for Iph., or possibly that his own state of mind was miserable. Iph.'s view of her father is understandably ambivalent: see 211–12n.

**φάσγανον:** 785n.

**855** This is one family misery which Orestes did not share, but can now imagine all too vividly. There is perhaps a reminiscence of the vivid narrative in Aesch. *Ag.* 228–47, with its conclusion τὰ δ' ἔνθεν οὐτ' εἶδον οὐτ' ἐννέπω.

**856–61** 'With no marriage song, o brother, I was led to Achilles' deceitful marriage bed. By the altar there were tears and groans. Alas, alas, for those *chernibes*, ah me.' As at 369 (see n.), marriage and death are juxtaposed, with death here explicitly in the form of human sacrifice as the two rituals (the deceitful marriage which never took place, and the ceremony at Artemis' altar) are contrasted, especially in the sounds evoked; instead of the happy wedding song (ὑμνοῦσιν ὑμεναίοισιν, 367) there was weeping and lamentation (δάκρυα καὶ γόοι).

**857–8** ἐς κλισίαν λέκτρων δόλιον: 'to the deceitful marriage bed'. κλισία can have the meaning 'couch', and is used of a marriage bed at *Alc.* 994;



κλισίαν λέκτρων expands the idea. However, the text printed involves emendation, and Kyriakou suggests that the correct reading might be ἐς κλισίαν λέκτροις δόλιον, in which case κλισία would have its Homeric meaning ‘hut’ or ‘tent’ and the whole phrase would mean ‘I was led to the deceitful hut of Achilles for a marriage ...’

**861** On χέρνιβες, see 58n. and on the use of the word in the play 643–5n. The metre of the transmitted text is defective; οἶμοι has been supplied from Orestes’ evident response in the following line: ‘*I too say οἶμοι ...*’

**862** ὤιμωξα: such ‘tragic aorists’ are performative (bringing about what they describe) and combine aoristic aspect with present meaning; cf. 1023, 1160, and see Lloyd 1999, Bary 2012.

**τόλμαν ἦν ἔτλη:** τόλμαν is a cognate accusative, ‘the daring he dared’, but the root τλα- covers both active audacity (often with negative force) and passive endurance. There is a clear reminiscence of Ag. 224–5, describing the same action: ἔτλα δ’ οὖν θυτῆρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός. See also below, 868–72 with n.

**864** ἀπάτορ ἀπάτορα: ‘unfatherly’. Repetition of this sort (\*anadiplosis) is relatively rare with adjectives, but the word is key. Iph. picks up the last word Orestes has spoken and converts it to an adjective qualifying her fate, thus moving from Agamemnon’s terrible act towards its ultimate origin in superhuman causation. Cf. Soph. *El.* 1184, μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ.

At this point Iph.’s song moves from dochmiacs to iambs and cretics, perhaps indicating a change of mood.

**865** ‘Things come about from other things ...’, almost ‘one thing after another’. Having invoked the idea of fate, Iph. moves on to place her own experience in the wider context of the unpredictability of human life caused by the apparently chance intervention of some god (δαίμονος τύχαι τινός). But this generalising sentiment moves Orestes to think of another possible stroke of fortune which nearly came about – his own death at his sister’s hands. England remarks ‘It would then [with transposition of lines and re-attribution of speakers, as here] look as if Iph. were becoming more tranquil with vv. 865 and 867, and that Orestes’ suggestion in v. 866, of what might have been, recalls her excitement.’ τύχη is a recurrent idea in the play, sometimes, as at 475–8, seen in a negative light as something hard to negotiate, but increasingly identified with divine action and, at 907–10, hailed as opportunity to be built upon. The prominence of the concept in the speech of the characters reflects the large number of apparent coincidences in the plot and suggests their attempts to make sense of them, moving towards a realisation that events have been divinely manoeuvred.

**866** ὦ τάλαιν’: to the usual meaning of ‘poor wretch’ is added in the context an overtone of ‘daring’ (to kill), from the word’s origin in the same root as τόλμα/τλάω. See following note.

**868–72** ‘O miserable, for my terrible daring. Terrible things I dared, I dared terrible things. Alas, brother, you only just escaped an unholy death, slaughtered by my hands.’ Iph.’s agitation is evident in her reversion to dochmiacs as well as in her use of repetition and exclamations. She echoes Orestes’ use of τόλμαν ἦν ἔτλη (862) for Agamemnon (and also τάλαινα, from the same root, for herself) with δεινᾶς τόλμας and δεῖν’ ἔτλαν, ἔτλαν δεῖν’, referring to her former (unknowing) readiness to sacrifice her brother. The root occurs several times in the play in the context of transgressive killing, whether human sacrifice, the killing of family members, or both, and looks back to Aesch. *Ag.* 224–5, ἔτλα δ’ οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός. Cf. 617, 862, 924, 1174.

ἐξ ἱμῶν ... χερῶν: cf. 585–7n.

**874** The approximate meaning must be ‘what can happen next?’ From disaster narrowly averted, Iph. turns to the bleak prospects for the future, the rest of her song being concerned with the possibilities for escape. But the text is very uncertain.

**876–99** Although in her letter Iph. had requested Orestes to come to her aid, putting himself in danger in the process (774–8 with nn.), her primary concern now is to ensure his safe departure, and only secondarily her own, a point made explicit at 991–1006.

**877 ἀπὸ ξένας:** emended from L’s ἀπὸ πόλεως, on the assumption that πόλεως is an intrusive gloss. Despite 595 (see n.), it is very unlikely that in a context contrasting it with Argos, Iph. would refer to the Tauric Chersonese simply as πόλις without further qualification. Also attractive is Sansone’s conjecture πόλεως ἀνδροφόνου for ἀπὸ πόλεως, ἀπὸ φόνου, but retaining the repetition of ἀπὸ seems more in keeping with dochmiac style.

**880** ‘... before the sword goes near your blood’. A transitive construction ‘before [I] make the sword approach ...’ is less plausible, since Iph. would now be unlikely to preside over the sacrifice even under duress. ἐπιτελάσαι is in \*tmesis.

**882–3** ‘This is your need (χρέος), miserable soul, to find (it) out.’ Iph. addresses her own soul, taking on responsibility for ensuring Orestes’ escape.

**884–92** ‘Over land, not by ship but with impulse of feet? Then you will come close to death, travelling among barbarian tribes and by pathless paths; but through the Dark Rock’s narrow pass the way is long with a ship-borne flight.’ Iph. may consider escape by land first because it is the option which pursuers would be less likely to expect. For the (singular) Dark Rock, see 746 with n.

**888** ὁδοὺς ἀνόδους: 144n.

**893** τάλαινα: 868–72n.

**894–9** Again the general sense is clear, although the text is problematic. Iph. asks what deliverance might appear, whether from god, mortal, or something else. But the repeated  $\alpha\upsilon$  is very irregular with the future indicative, and the phrase ‘which god or mortal or which unexpected thing’ does not seem right; something like *Hel.* 1137 would make better sense:  $\delta\tau\iota$  θεός ἢ μὴ θεός ἢ τὸ μέσον, ‘god, or not god, or in between’ (on which see the note of Allan). Such an agency might well *produce* something unexpected, but this cannot be got out of the text as it stands.

**897–9** ‘... bringing about a way from what is wayless, will reveal to the only two descendants of Atreus a release from troubles?’ πόρον means both literally a physical route away from Taurike, and a means to an end.

**898**  $\delta\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\iota\nu\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\nu$ : not strictly true, since Elektra is still alive, as Iph. now knows, and in any case Menelaos would qualify as an Atreid, but it is emotionally true for Iph. at this moment, given their father’s death and the extreme peril they themselves stand in. Commentators compare *Soph. Ant.* 941, where Antigone similarly ignores Ismene’s existence.

**900–1088** *Third trimeter section of second episode.* The lyric-and-trimeter dialogue between brother and sister was unaccompanied by exits or entrances, and thus cannot mark a true scene break. The final part of the second episode is the longest, and like the preceding lyric section concerns only Iph. and Orestes; after his first injunction to plan their escape (902–8), Pylades is silent, though he remains on stage. For the order in which the scene unfolds, see 912–14n.

Despite Pylades urging haste, Iph. questions Orestes further about himself and their family, and he narrates the story of the sufferings which have brought him to the Tauric Chersonese. He asks for her help in removing the cult statue and taking it back with them to Greece. At first doubtful, Iph. proposes to allow Orestes and Pylades to escape and to face the king’s anger herself, but eventually she devises a plan to allow the three of them to escape with the statue: she will tell Thoas that the image and the destined victims need to be purified in the sea, and under cover of a secret ritual they will make their escape in the waiting craft. Finally she secures the silence of the chorus, and all exit into the temple, leaving the chorus to sing the second stasimon.

**900–87** *Orestes informs Iphigeneia of family affairs and his own unlucky adventures, ending with an appeal for help in stealing the cult statue.* Iph. first questions Orestes in a \*stichomythic exchange, before he launches into a long narrative of his sufferings since killing his mother, in which Euripides elaborates on the version given at 77–92.

**900–1** The chorus respond not to Iph.’s immediate distress, but to the amazing fact of the recognition and reunion. They refer to the commonplace of the greater credibility of seeing for oneself, as contrasted

with hearing at second hand, a point which has already served to make Orestes' final τεκμήριον suitably climactic in the recognition scene (811, 822). For the thought cf. Hdt. 1.8.2, Heraclitus D–K 22 B101a. οὐ κλυοῦσ' ἀπ' ἄγγελων may also suggest theatrical awareness: no stage messenger was needed to bring a report of what has passed.

Pylades gently suggests that the trio (or he and Orestes) should now turn their minds to escape. As usual, his advice is sensible and is aimed at steadying the more emotional Orestes. These are his last words in the play, though he is to be imagined as responding in gesture to Iph.'s greeting at 922.

**902–3** 'It is reasonable to embrace (χειρῶν περιβολὰς λαβεῖν) when friends come into the view of friends.' This is an indication that brother and sister are probably still in each other's arms (see 829n.).

**904** *ἔκειν'*: explained by the ὅπως clause which follows.

*χρῶν*: 71n.

**905** *ἄμμ*: with the meaning of 'light' (LSJ III), something exceptionally desirable. This gives better sense than L's ὄνομα.

**907–8** Probably μή should be taken with 'κβάντας τύχης: 'This is characteristic of wise men, not to step outside fortune, but to seize the moment and get further delights.' Thus Pylades backs up his point that they should now consider how to save themselves rather than losing the joy of a return to Greece because of the immediate pleasure of reunion.

*τοῦτο*: a singular pronoun is normally used when, as here, it anticipates an infinitive; cf. *Hipp.* 461 with Barrett's note.

**909–11** 'Well spoken, and I think that fortune is taking care of this along with us. If one is proactive, it is reasonable (εἰκότως ἔχει) that the divine (power) should be more effective.' Orestes' reply is nicely calibrated so that while he does not dissent from his friend's opinion, it does not seem entirely inconsistent for him to give way to Iph.'s demand for information. His new belief that τύχη is on their side (see 865n.) contrasts strongly with his earlier despair (e.g. 489, 500), but is understandable as a reaction to what has just been revealed. He appears to use τὸ θεῖον as a synonym or at least as a reasonable alternative to τύχη, but is still reluctant to refer to Apollo in person. The thought more often appears in a negative form – it is useless to call on the gods without putting in any effort oneself. Cf. *El.* 80–1 and Cropp's note.

**912–14** 'You will certainly not prevent me or turn me aside from my purpose, first to find out what fate Elektra has received in life.' This is the easiest emendation for L's text, with Iph. asking Pylades not to prevent her from finding out more. A reasonable Iph. would fall in line with Pylades' suggestion, as approved by Orestes. The most urgent thing is clearly to escape from the danger in which they all find themselves, and

further questioning can be deferred till later. That order would be disastrous dramatically, however; the tension must be built up so that the attempted escape, with its attendant uncertainties, forms the climax of the play. Jerram may be right, therefore, that although later Iph. shows intelligence in devising the escape plan, she is here characterised ‘with a woman’s pertinacity’. In the end, Orestes’ narration will lead to the command to steal the cult statue, which has not so far been mentioned, and hence to the formulation of the trick to make good their escape.

**οὐ μὴ μ’ ἐπίσχηις οὐδ’ ἀποστήσεις:** this construction, with either aorist subjunctive (ἐπίσχηις) or future indicative (ἀποστήσεις) expresses a strong denial, or less likely a strong prohibition: Smyth §2754–6.

**φίλα γάρ ἐστι τὰμ’ ἐμοί:** Iph. justifies her curiosity by stating that her own matters – matters concerning those close to her – are (naturally) dear to her. This is an attractive suggestion for L’s φίλα γάρ ἔσται πάντ’ ἐμοί; of other possibilities, ἐστι ταῦτ’ ‘these things are dear to me’ is an easy change, but gives rather weak sense, while ἔστε πάντ’ ‘you (pl.) are all dear things to me’ is contorted.

**915** The meaning of εὐδαίμονα with βίον is not ‘emotionally happy’, though this is not denied, but rather ‘prosperous, well-off’. Orestes may be unlucky, but at least Elektra enjoys good fortune (though somewhat less so with Pylades now in danger).

**916** Place of origin and name(s) of parent(s) together are the usual way of identifying a person from Homer onwards: τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, πόθι τοι πόλις ἦδὲ τοκῆς; is the Odyssean formula (1.170, etc.).

**918** ‘So he (referring back to τοῦδε in 917) is (the son) of Atreus’ daughter, and my kinsman?’ The name of Agamemnon’s sister, wife of Strophios and mother of Pylades, is variously given as Anaxibia, Kydragora, or Astyoche. For this genealogical tradition, post-Homeric but probably in the *Eoiai*, see Gantz 1993: 683. Iph. appears to be aware of Strophios’ marriage but not of its offspring (920–1).

**919** **σαφὴς φίλος** ‘true friend’, one who clearly proves himself true. For σαφὴς in this sense, see Parker *ad loc.*

**920** **ἐκτείνε** ‘tried to kill me’; cf. 360 and n.

**922–3** Iph. now recognises her link to ‘this man’, which Orestes takes further – ‘my saviour, not just my relative’. Though Pylades does not reply verbally, he must make a gesture. The three are now united by bonds of affection and family ties.

**924** This is not the same question that Iph. asked at 557, when she believed that the two were talking about a third person. Then, she was inquiring about Orestes’ motives; now, she asks her brother how he was able to make himself do the deed. Orestes’ answer suits either question. For the use of ἔτλης (a key word-complex in the play), see 862, 868–72

with nn. All three actual or potential kin-killings (Iph. by Agamemnon, Klytaimnestra by Orestes, Orestes by Iph.) are terrible, whether the doer acted knowingly or not.

**927** Parallels such as *El.* 945–6, *Or.* 26–7 (self-censorship with regard to sexual matters by virginal Elektra) suggest that Orestes has in mind the less defensible of Klytaimnestra's motives, her adultery with Aigisthos, and not her anger over the sacrifice of Iph. Hence his suggestion that it is not good for his sister, a virgin priestess, to hear about such things. Line 554 (see n.) may imply similar motivation, at least in part. οὐδὲ suggests that he himself does not wish to speak on this subject: 'leave alone my mother's affairs: [I don't want to talk about them,] neither is it good for you to hear them'.

**928** πρὸς σέ ... ἀποβλέπει: 'look towards you', for government.

**929** φυγάδες ἐσμὲν ἐκ πάτρας: at 512, Orestes already gave Iph. this information, but his words were enigmatic, and it is unsurprising that she should forget momentarily the information she was given before knowing that the stranger was her brother.

**930** Iph. has already expressed her hatred of Menelaos (356–7), so her readiness to think badly of him is not surprising, though οὗ πού ('used in incredulous or reluctant questions', Collard and Stevens 2018: 62–3) indicates her hope that her brother has not been wronged in this way. The suggestion that a rival might take advantage of Orestes' misfortunes and polluted state to lay claim to the throne of Argos is only too plausible, and recalls Pylades' worries that he might be accused of the same (680–2).

**νοσοῦντας**: cf. 680, 693–4, with nn.

**934–5** Monk's transposition of these lines to precede 932–3 makes the question-and-answer flow much more smoothly. Iph. thus moves from recognising the general principle (Orestes persecuted by his mother's Erinyes) to placing the particular example she has already heard of (the attack of madness by the seashore).

**ἡλάστρουν**: from ἔλαστρέω, an alternative form of ἐλαύνω (cf. 80, ἡλαυνόμεσθα), but chosen to recall ἐλάστωρ or ἐλάστερος, names for a superhuman entity or force persecuting or 'driving' those guilty of outrages against their kin.

**935** 'So that they thrust a bloody bit into my mouth.' αἵματηρά is \*proleptic; the sharp bit becomes stained with blood. The image is of the Erinyes as riders driving on and controlling a horse which attempts to resist.

**932** ἄρ' is probably the interrogative particle, but if the line is taken as statement rather than question it is equivalent to ἄρα 'so, then', as often in poetry (Denniston 1954: 44–6).

**ἡγγέλῃς:** The aorist passive form ἡγγέλῃν, rather than the usual ἡγγέλθην, is rare, but is found in the fifth-century ‘first-fruits decree’ (IG I<sup>3</sup> 78.19).

**933 ὥφθημεν:** Meinel (2015: 165) plausibly sees this line as metatheatrical: Orestes has indeed been seen to be miserable before, in tragic productions.

**936 ἐπὶ ῥοθμεισας:** 266n.

**938 ῥήτὸν ἢ σιγῶμενον:** it is seldom specifically enjoined that an oracular command should be kept secret (although cf. *Med.* 676), but anything in the sphere of religion may attract secrecy. Silence is also frequently recommended in this dialogue between Orestes and Iph. as the best response to events (925, σιγῶμεν; 928, σιγῶ; 940 with n., σιγῶμεν).

**939–86** *Orestes’ narrative and request.* The audience has already been told something of Orestes’ experiences after the murder of Klytaimestra, at 77–92, but at that point it was not clear how, if at all, Euripides’ version related to the more familiar story in which Orestes was freed from the pursuing Erinyes after trial in Athens. This long speech fills in the gap, showing that the trial took place, but that not all the Erinyes accepted the verdict, necessitating Orestes’ return to Delphi and Apollo’s command to bring the Taurian statue of Artemis to Athens. Euripides’ version further differs from that of Aeschylus in his account of the foundation of the Areopagos court (944–6n.). Additionally, he inserts an episode before the trial in which Orestes is given a somewhat ambivalent reception by his Athenian hosts, leading to a cult aetiology unusually placed in the middle of the drama (see 958–60n.). After Orestes brings his narrative up to date with his explanation of Apollo’s second prophetic response, he begs Iph. to assist him in abstracting the statue and promises to take her back home.

**940 τὰ μητρὸς ταῦθ’ ἃ σιγῶμεν κακὰ** ‘... these ills relating to our mother, about which we keep silence ...’ Having revealed the matricide, Orestes is understandably reluctant to refer to it again in such blunt terms, and his euphemism draws attention to the need for silence; cf. 935 and 938n.

**941 ἐς χεῖρας ἦλθε:** a suitably vague phrase, with the basic meaning ‘come to be dealt with’. It frequently indicates violence, but may also hint at the pollution associated with a killer’s hands.

**941–2** ‘We were driven in flight by relays of Erinyes.’ The two half-lines are very close to 79–80: διαδοχαῖς δ’ Ἐρινύων | ἡλαυνόμεσθα φυγάδες, and μεταδρομαῖς (cf. μεταδρομοί of the Erinyes themselves, *Soph. El.* 1387) has much the same meaning as διαδοχαῖς in the earlier passage; the idea is that ever-changing groups of Furies take turns in chasing Orestes.

**942–3 ἐνθεν ... Λοξίας** ‘from which circumstance Loxias sent me (my foot) away to Athens’. Both the Erinyes and Apollo force Orestes to make journeys in exile, but Apollo’s motives are benevolent. The passage has attracted a great deal of emendation, but only δὴ γ’, a combination almost

never found, really requires it. The name *Loxias*, often used in tragedy and of uncertain meaning, refers to Apollo in his prophetic role at Delphi, and is here used for the first time in the play.

**944–6** In contrast to Aeschylus, Euripides here gives what was probably the older and usual version of the Areopagos foundation myth, according to which the court was already in existence at Orestes' trial, rather than being set up expressly for it. He gives the story in more detail at *El.* 1258–63: Poseidon's son Halirrhothios raped Ares' daughter Alkippe, whereupon Ares killed him, and was arraigned for homicide and tried by a jury of gods. See Fowler 2000: 454–5.

**944** *ταῖς ἀνωνύμοις θεαῖς*: 'nameless' is not an epithet given to the Erinyes elsewhere, but reluctance to give them their 'proper' name and to address them (e.g. *Soph. OC* 128–32) are both well attested. On 'euphemism', see Henrichs 1991, 1994, esp. 37–9 on this passage. To name a deity may well attract his or her attention, which is obviously undesirable in this case. The refusal to utter the goddesses' name is of a piece with the stress Orestes lays on silence in this part of the play (cf. 925, 940, and 949–54n.).

**945** *οἴα ψῆφος*: *ψῆφος*, 'vote', is used \*metonymically for a place where votes are cast, a law court. For the range of meanings of *οἶος*, see Peels 2015. Here the context would seem to indicate 'pleasing or acceptable to the gods'.

**946** *εἶσατ'*: from *ἴζω*. See below, 968n.

*ἐκ του δὴ χερῶν μιάσματος* 'from some (του = τινος) pollution of the hands'. It is strangely anthropomorphic to predicate pollution of a god, but was no doubt suggested to Euripides by the equally strange idea of a god's trial in a human court. Far more often, gods kill human beings with no sense of transgression and no consequences for themselves.

**947** *ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκέῖσε* is the so-called 'nominativus pendens', equivalent to 'when I had come there', and best explained by a change of construction part way through the sentence.

**947–8** The ordinary imperative to offer hospitality to strangers is trumped by the enormity of the stranger's crime. To entertain one hated by the gods is tantamount to inviting the gods to punish you along with the miscreant.

**949** *οἱ δ'* contrasts with *πρῶτα μὲν ... οὐδεῖς*, with a temporal dimension implied: at first no one would offer food and lodging to Orestes, but eventually some of the Athenians relented. *αἰδώς* is what under normal circumstances causes a person to supply the needs of a stranger or a suppliant; it is not pity, though often associated with it, but rather a combination of reverence for the gods (who protect strangers), shame lest one should be seen to behave improperly, and a possible altruistic element. See Cairns 1993: 105–13, 290.



**949–54** Those of the Athenians who felt αἰδώς took some risk in allowing Orestes under the same roof as themselves (οἴκων ὄντες ἐν ταύτῳ στέγῃ) but did not go further and share the same food and drink. ξένια μονοτράπεζα, a unique phrase, clearly indicates food and drink set before someone on his own individual table. (In fact, from 953–4 and from the related Athenian custom, each participant, not merely Orestes, can be assumed to have had his own table.) Furthermore, the meal was eaten in silence, because of the custom obliging one polluted by homicide to refrain from speech lest it cause harm to his interlocutors; cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 448–50 and Parker 1983: 371. As well as reflecting the customs of the observance for which the narrative is an aition (see below, 958–60n.), these details graphically symbolise the extent of Orestes' isolation.

**951** 'Through silence they devised (to keep) me unaddressed.' τεκταίνομαι, 'devise', properly refers to the work of a carpenter, τέκτων, but is often used metaphorically.

**953–4** 'Filling an equal measure of wine for all into a personal vessel they took their pleasure.' To camouflage (slightly) the fact that they were avoiding contact with Orestes' pollution, his hosts decreed that rather than serving wine out of a communal *kratēr* or mixing-bowl, as was customary, each drinker should fill his own drinking-vessel with an equal amount of wine, so that Orestes was treated no differently from anyone else.

**955–6** Orestes is pained by the manner of his reception, even though he does not wish to reproach his hosts for it. In any case because of his pollution he must observe silence (cf. 949–54 n.), which now is shared by his hosts.

**956–7** κἀδόκουν οὐκ εἰδέναι: 'I pretended not to notice', that there was anything untoward in this treatment. The alternative, taking οὔνεκ' ἧ μητρὸς φονεὺς with οὐκ εἰδέναι rather than with μέγα στενάζων, gives a less likely sense: 'pretending to be unaware that I was my mother's murderer'. Orestes politely refrains from criticising his hosts' behaviour, but cannot repress the groans caused by his own awareness of his guilt. It is also possible that 957 is an interpolation, intended to convey the second sense, added to complete the otherwise elliptical οὐκ εἰδέναι.

**958–60** 'And I hear that my misfortunes have become a ritual for the Athenians, and the custom still remains for the people of Pallas to honour the *chous*-sized vessel.' With these lines the implied aetiology becomes explicit, as Orestes claims to have heard that the style of the hospitality he was given is now regularly repeated in a recurring ritual. The rite in question was performed as part of the Anthesteria, a Dionysiac three-day festival of early spring held in Athens and other Ionian cities, and formed an important part of the ritual of the second day (known as Choes, after

the measures of drink consumed). The fourth-century local historian Phanodemos, who also gives the aetiology relating to Orestes (*FGrH* 325 F 11–12), says that the custom was for each man to be given a separate *chous* (about three litres) of mixed wine and water, and a prize to be offered to the first to finish his drink (the prize is mentioned also, in parodic form, in *Ar. Ach.* 1000–2). Afterwards, the participants' garlands or crowns were not taken to sanctuaries as normal, but placed around the *choes* (also the name of the vessel) and taken to the shrine of Dionysos 'in the marshes' (ἐν λίμναις) which was particularly associated with this festival. It is usually and plausibly assumed that the description of silence and separate tables reflects further aspects of the conduct of the ritual. See further Parker 2005: 290–5. The isolation of the participants and the special method of disposing of the garlands look like precautions taken against pollution, and so it is not perhaps surprising that an account of the rite's origins should introduce Orestes, one of the archetypal polluted subjects of mythology. Whether this idea was Euripides' own or whether he drew on pre-existing tradition is unknown. Phanodemos (above) and Callimachus (fr. 178 Pf.) may well have been following Euripides in making the connexion, yet if there was an earlier tradition linking Orestes with the Choes we should not necessarily expect to have any evidence of it, nor need it be linked with the tradition (invention?) of the Areopagos trial (Carrara 2007: 7–10). As Sansone suggests (1975: 285–6), the story hints at a parallel between brother and sister, both being isolated from normal interaction with Greek society (and both connected with a gloomy ritual).

It is highly unusual for the dramatist to insert an aetiology, as here, into the middle of his play (Introduction, p. 12). The only possible parallel in extant Euripides occurs in *Ion* 1391–1436, where the tokens which prompt the recognition are also those which Athenians would recognise as the lucky charms which they regularly gave to their own babies (see Mueller 2010), but there the link with the present remains unstated; it is an implicit aetiology only.

Although it would have been possible, supposing several years to have elapsed since his visit to Athens, for Orestes to have heard that the Athenians had made an annual ritual out of their meeting with him, 'and the custom still remains' (καὶ τὸν νόμον μένειν) seems more naturally to refer to the contemporary time of the dramatist and his audience – a shift of temporal focus very typical of aetiology, but striking and unusual in the middle of the play's action. Dunn (1996: 50–1) argues that as Euripidean aetiologies act to distance the audience from the drama, so here the aetiology marks a distance between the familiar Aeschylean version of Orestes' story and its modification in this play.

**959 τελετήν:** τελετή denotes a religious ritual, usually one which includes more than a simple sacrifice (the default action for public worship of a deity).

**960 χοῖρες** ‘fitting a *chous* measure’ (see above, 958–60n.), from χοῦς and ἀραρίσκω.

**962–3 θάτερον ... τὸ δ’ ἄλλο:** these are the two natural platforms of the Areopagos, described by Pausanias (1.28.5) as the stones of Ὑβρις and Ἀναιδεία, taken by the defendant and prosecutor respectively.

**θάτερον** = τὸ ἕτερον (249n.).

**πρέσβειρ** ‘spokeswoman’, feminine of πρέσβυς.

**964–6** In Aeschylus, it is Athena whom Orestes credits with saving him (*Eum.* 754), but in the present play the issue is always whether Apollo is saviour or destroyer of Orestes (cf. 975), and it is not until the end that Athena will perform her decisive saving action, allowing the trio to escape safely from Thoas and his men. Hence Apollo is said to have saved Orestes through his testimony, presumably stating that it was he who ordered Orestes to kill Klytaimestra, while Athena’s counting of the votes should indicate a role as president of the court. Her casting vote in favour of acquittal is not mentioned (contrast her own speech at 1470–2), though an audience could hardly fail to recall it.

**966 ὠλένη** is properly the forearm. The word is very frequent in Euripides, but is most often used in the context of an embrace. Whether it can be used as equivalent to χεῖρ is doubtful (though it might include the hand – see 283n.), and corruption has been suspected. An attractive alternative suggestion is that Euripides is here referring to the gesture of an outstretched arm seen on red-figure vases and presumably indicating the outcome of a vote or victory in a competition (Boegehold 1989). Athena counted out the voting-pebbles by separating them (the force of δι- in διηρίθμησε) into different piles, and finally by her gesture proclaimed Orestes victorious.

**967** ‘... and being victorious in regard to the trial for murder I left’. φόνια πειρατήρια is internal accusative with νικῶν. For ἀπαίρω, ‘leave’, see 511n.

**968–71** There is no indication in Aeschylus that not all the Erinyes were persuaded to drop their opposition to Orestes; in fact, Orestes departs satisfied to Argos two thirds of the way through the play, and the anger of the Erinyes threatens Athens instead, before Athena convinces them to accept the honours they are offered and to remain in Athens as the σεμναὶ θεαί. By inventing a hard core of implacable Erinyes, Euripides is able to prolong Orestes’ sufferings and incorporate the Taurian adventures – whether these represent another tradition or his own invention.

**968 ἔζοντο:** that is, they made the Areopagos their ‘seat’ (ἔδρα), by remaining there in perpetuity (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 892, τίνα με φῆς ἔχειν ἔδραν;). Cf. also 946: Zeus ‘settled’, ‘set up’ (εἵσατ) the court for Ares.

**969** For ψῆφος = law court, cf. 945 and n.

**ἱερόν** is substantival, a holy place: ‘they laid out a sanctuary to possess alongside the court itself’, a point which concurs with the Aeschylean version.

**971 δρόμοις ἀνιδρύτοισιν** ‘in runnings with no fixed place’. They hounded him from one place to another.

**ἡλάστρουν:** see 934n.

**972–8** Orestes here retells the story of his second visit to Delphi, which he has already told to Apollo himself – or rather the audience – at 77–92. Although he now has more hope than on the earlier occasion, he has still not performed the task enjoined by Apollo, and he vividly relives his earlier despair.

**973–5** ‘And stretched out in front of the inner shrine, fasting from food, I swore that I would break off my life by dying there, unless Phoibos saved me, he who had destroyed me.’ Orestes makes a desperate attempt to force Apollo’s hand by threatening to bring about a polluting death in the sanctuary, right in front of its inmost part (πρόσθεν ἄδυτων) where the god himself resided and from where the Pythia prophesied (1256n.). Access this far was permitted only to those who had made the proper sacrifices before consultation (*Ion* 220–8), but Orestes may be considered to be in a state of ongoing consultation with Apollo. He is ‘stretched out’ (ἐκταθείς), in a lying position – not the usual posture for an oracular consultation nor even for a suppliant, but one which suggests his desperation. The fact that he has not taken food again underlines his pitiable state and may indicate that he intends death by starvation.

**975 σώσει:** the ‘vivid’ construction retaining the tense and mood of the original gives a particularly appropriate emphasis here. The word is pointed, since Apollo had supposedly ‘saved’ Orestes earlier (Φοῖβός μ’ ἔσωσε, 965), and the root continues to be used in the following lines (979, 984), where the opposition of σώζομαι and ὀλλυμαι also continues. ὅς μ’ ἀπώλεσεν may play on Phoibos’ other name, Ἀπόλλων (cf. 715 and Aesch. *Ag.* 1080–2).

**976** Although the Pythia can be said to give a prophecy at Delphi, in theory it is always the voice of Apollo which replies to those who consult him. This is dramatised strikingly in a story from the oracle at Didyma (Branchidai in Herodotus) where a voice issues from the *adyton* with apparently no intervening human medium (Hdt. 1.159.3). Here, however, the voice comes ‘from the golden tripod’ on which the Pythia sat.

**λακών:** 461n.

**977 διοπτές:** a single adjective (Zeus-fallen = fallen from the sky; cf. οὐράνιον, 986) now expresses what was spelled out for the audience more clearly at 87–8.

**978 ἐγκαθιδρύσαι:** ἱδρύω or καθιδρύω are the terms normally used for ‘establishing’ a statue in a sanctuary where it will receive regular worship. See *ThesCRA* I.337–43.

**979–86** At the end of this long story, which Iph. requested, Orestes comes to the practical consequence: it is not enough for them to escape, but Iph. must also help him find a way to remove the statue of Artemis. The reasons he adduces to persuade her are twofold: firstly, doing this will benefit both of them (980–2), and secondly, in saving Orestes, Iph. will save her father’s house (983–6). This second argument he expresses in highly emotional terms, and identifies himself with the Pelopid descent line (984, πατρῶιον οἶκον ... δ’ ἐμέ; 985, τὰμ’ ... πάντα καὶ τὰ Πελοπιδῶν), a point which Iph. has anticipated in her reaction to his supposed death, and which she will assume at 1005–6. Cf. also 991–3.

**979–80** ‘But together (with me) bring about the safe deliverance which he laid down.’ ἀλλά is commonly used with an imperative to indicate a shift from explanation to a statement of action required in consequence of what has been said (Denniston 1954: 13–15). Cf. 983. The postponement of the imperative to the end of the sentence and beginning of a new line makes the pleading tone particularly marked.

**980 βρέτας** is used here for the first time to indicate the divine image, previously referred to as ἄγαλμα; it recurs at 986 and in ten further places (1040, 1044, 1165, 1179, 1199, 1291, 1453, 1477, 1481, 1489), as the object itself comes into view. The word is commonly used in tragedy for a statue of a deity: see Donohue 1988: 25–6, Henrichs 1978: 139 n. 55.

**981–2** ‘... and sending you in a many-oared ship, I shall settle you again in Mycenae’. That Iph. should return to her homeland is naturally both what she wants (774–5) and what Orestes plans for her, but as a prediction it is misleading. On Mycenae and Argos, see 510n.

**πολυκώπωνι σκάφει:** the ship is a penteconter (1124n.), moored in some secret place (1124, 1347; 1328n.).

**983 κασίγνητον κάρα:** κασίγνητον is used adjectivally. Addressing another as κάρα, ‘head’, carries a strongly emotional charge, the best-known example being the first line of Soph. *Ant.*, which this address somewhat resembles: ὦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα.

**985 τὰ Πελοπιδῶν:** Pelops is seen in the play as Orestes’ and Iph.’s most important ancestor, perhaps partly because he made the original journey from a barbarian land to Greece. His name is the play’s first word (see 1n.), and his spear was the climactic and defining object in the

recognition. But only three lines later the chorus will refer to the family as the seed of Tantalos, Pelops' father.

**986** The unusual rhythm of the second metron (– – ∪ ∪) is found in thirteen other places in Euripides, listed in Diggle 1994: 131 (the correction in P, ληψόμεσθα, is unnecessary and results in an unparalleled fifth-foot \*synizesis – of θεῆς – following a short syllable. See Battezzato 2000: 43 n. 6). But together with the first-foot dactyl, it results in a more than usually irregular line.

**987–1088** *Iphigeneia*, at first despairing of a means to obtain the statue, thinks up a plan and swears the chorus to secrecy.

**987–8** 'Some dreadful anger of the gods has boiled up against the seed of Tantalos, and drives it through troubles.' The choral two-line comment provides a space for the audience to adjust and reflect, after one of the play's longest speeches (forty-five lines). Their conclusion, that the family's sufferings are due to some divine anger, is suggested by them already in the parodos: 200–2, ἐκβαίνει ποιινὰ Τανταλιδᾶν | εἰς οἴκους, σπεύδει δ' ἄσπουδαστ' | ἐπὶ σοὶ δαίμων.

**987 ἐπέξεσε:** the image, found also in the closely parallel lines of *Hec.* 583–4, is of boiling water overflowing its vessel and causing harm as it spills.

**989–1006** *Iphigeneia's* reply. Not unnaturally, Iph. responds not so much to Orestes' whole narrative as to its conclusion, Apollo's command to bring the Taurian statue to Athens, and Orestes' appeal to her to help him with this. She moves from understandable doubt as to the practicality of the scheme to a position where she accepts that it might be possible for Orestes to escape with the statue and herself (999–1001), but that otherwise she is willing to face death in order to save him. This noble self-sacrifice, and its subsequent rejection by Orestes, parallels the earlier scene where Orestes and Pylades compete to face death, and indicates that Iph. is as loyal and courageous as the two male characters.

**989 τὸ μὲν πρόθυμον:** Iph.'s first three words already indicate the direction her response will take: while she wishes to do everything that Orestes suggests, she doubts whether it is possible. (For the sentiment, compare 1017–19, 1023nn.) The balancing δέ to the μὲν here does not occur until 995; δ' in 991 continues the first limb of the antithesis, introducing a subsidiary distinction between her earlier and continuing wish to return home and see her brother again (989–90) and the wish she has formed in response to Orestes' speech to help him (991–3); these are then contrasted with her fear of the consequences (995–6). The audience is well aware of the truth of Iph.'s assertion. From the prologue speech onwards, she has expressed and implied love and longing for both her home and her brother (e.g. 152–8, 217–35).

**991–3** Here Iph. continues and strengthens her point: even before (she knew of) Orestes' arrival, she wanted to return and be with him – how then, having recognised him, would she not wish to help both him and the *oikos*? In pairing Orestes and the Pelopids, she is picking up his earlier argument: see 979–86n.

**σέ τε μεταστήσαι πόνων** 'both to remove you from troubles, and ...'

**νοσοῦντά τ' οἶκον:** cf. 680, 693, and nn.

**τῶι κτανόντι:** another paradoxical use of the language of slaughter in reference to Iph.; cf. 770 with n., and Introduction, p. 33. For Iph.'s attitude to her father, see 211–12n. Here she states her considered view; her earlier feelings of distress and resentment will not affect her loyalty to her family.

**ὀρθῶσαι:** though the figure of 'righting' (putting upright) affairs is quite common, it is more visual when applied to a house (οἶκος = building or family), and here may recall the image of Iph.'s dream, when her house literally collapsed in the earthquake (46–9).

**θέλω:** the repetition has been suspected, but it gives a strong and perhaps slightly colloquial emphasis. Iph. is at pains to assure her brother that she does not in the least lack the will to help in the way that he has asked.

**994–5** 'For I should both separate my hand from your slaughter and save (our) house (family).' She backs up her insistence by giving clear reasons. The protasis of the condition is easily understood: 'if I were able to help you in this way'.

**995** Having stated that she wishes to spare Orestes from sacrifice, Iph. confronts the new (to her) and more difficult issue of the removal of the divine image. This direction of thought is suggested, rather than stated, by opening the new sentence with τὴν θεόν.

**995–8** 'But I am afraid how I can escape the notice of the goddess (i.e. I doubt whether I can) and of the king; when he finds the statue's stone base empty, how will I not die?' Iph. fears the anger of both the goddess and the king. Depriving the goddess of the accustomed sacrifice does not seem to alarm her, given her views on the subject at 389–91, but removing her image from its temple might be a step too far. The punctuation here is that of Kovacs, replacing that of the manuscript where the sentence ends at ἀγάλματος. Attaching the ἥνικ' ὅν clause to what follows rather than what precedes results in a smoother sequence of thought.

**τύραννον:** see 741n.

**κρηπίδας ... λαίνας:** a κρηπίς is a foundation or base, here the pedestal on which the statue stands.

**999–1001** The text of 999 is uncertain; the conjecture εἰ μὲν ἡμῖν ταῦθ' ὁμοῦ γενήσεται, 'if these things happen together for us', may be along the

right lines. The general meaning is clear from what follows: if it might be possible both to remove the image and to get Iph. safely on board the ship, the risk is worth taking.

**1002-3** 'But [if I am] separated from this, then I perish, but you would have your affairs in good order and would reach home.' The personal construction of τοῦτου ... χωρισθεῖς is equivalent to 'if this does not happen'. It is not clear why it should be so much easier for Orestes to escape without Iph. than with her.

**1004-5** 'I do not shrink (from this), even if I must die after having saved you.' For this use of φεύγω, see LSJ IIB.

χρεών: 71n.

**1005-6** Just like Pylades (674-86) and Orestes (597-608, 687-715), Iph. gives a reason why her own death should be preferable to that of her interlocutor. The explicit point is not that a woman's death is of less account than a man's *per se* (although that may well be implied), but that it is of less account to the *oikos* (ἐκ δόμων). A surviving Orestes would be able to perpetuate the all-important patriline where Iph. could not. ποθεινός ('longed for', 'sadly missed'), makes the contrast starker and more emotional.

οὐ γάρ ἄλλ' 'there is no way but that ...' In tragedy this expression appears only in Euripides, and it is probably colloquial: Denniston 1954: 31, Collard and Stevens 2018: 106-7.

**1007-88** *A plan is hatched to steal the statue and escape.* Discussion proceeds between Orestes and Iph.; Pylades remains silent. Orestes first suggests killing the king, which Iph. rejects on moral grounds. His next suggestion, for him to hide in the temple, she reveals as impractical. Finally she suggests telling Thoas that the impure victims have polluted the cult image, so that all are in need of purification by the seashore with secret rites. The three can then make their escape with the statue on the waiting ship. This is agreed, and Iph. succeeds in persuading the chorus to keep silent.

The planning scene follows the common pattern of two suggestions which are rejected and a third which is adopted. A similar pattern has already been seen in rough outline in Orestes' and Pylades' deliberations at 96-112, where Pylades substitutes a fourth plan of action for Orestes' own third (flight). A close parallel is *Helen* 1032-89. Menelaos suggests: (a) escape with a chariot, and (b) killing the king, both of which meet with objections; Helen suggests (c) a feigned death and funeral rites, a plan which they agree to follow and which is ultimately successful. In both cases it is a woman who comes up with an ingenious deception making use of an allegedly necessary ritual.

**1007-11** As Orestes refused to let Pylades die for him, so he refuses Iph., but the case is different: it is not inevitable that one of them should



die, and so he proposes that they either live or die together. (Pylades, though still present, as 1046 shows, is allowed to fall into the background.) Iph.'s argument along gender lines perhaps makes Orestes think of other female members of his family; he does not wish to be responsible for his sister's death as well as his mother's.

**1008 ἄλις τὸ κείνης αἶμα:** phrase and sentiment are echoed in *Or.* 1039–40 (Orestes to Elektra), though the situation is quite different.

**κοινόφρων:** though the primary sense of the word in context may be 'together with', the second part of the compound is not redundant, carrying the implication of a harmony of purpose.

**1009** 'I would like both to live united with you, and when (if) I die to receive an equal lot.' Orestes' first preference is that they should both survive, but if that is not possible he prefers that they should die together. (With Musgrave's emendation ζῶν for ζῆν, the two possibilities become parallel: 'Living and dying, I should like to receive an equal share ...') Orestes implicitly counters Iph.'s point that a man's death is a more serious loss than a woman's: as far as he is concerned, their deaths should be equivalent and equally commemorated. θανὼν λαχεῖν may suggest post mortem honours in the minds of the audience because of Orestes' earlier instructions to Pylades to construct a funeral monument for him in Argos, even though it is unclear whether Pylades would survive the death of his two companions.

**1010–11** 'I will take you home – if indeed I myself depart from here – or else I will remain with you in death.' This spells out the practical consequences of the general principle enunciated in the previous two lines.

**1012–14** With this point Orestes answers Iph.'s first fear (995), that of the goddess; the remainder of the scene will tackle the problem of the king (996–8). The argument is not merely that Apollo would not have encouraged something impious, but that he would not have commanded an action which would be displeasing to his sister Artemis. The former point may not be a secure inference in view of *Hdt.* 1.157.3–159, where he does just that to punish the Kymaians for making the suggestion, and in view of the sometimes deceptive nature of divine injunctions through oracles and dreams. But the idea of the closeness of Apollo and Artemis, picked up by Iph. at 1084–5, plays on a theme running throughout the work, the parallelism between the divine and human brother–sister pairs: see Introduction, pp. 41–2.

**1015–16** Some lines have fallen out between 1014 and 1015. Not only did Apollo's oracle not pronounce to Orestes that he should see Iph., but also and more conclusively ἅπαντα ... συνθεῖς τάδ' εἰς ἓν ('putting all these things together') must indicate several different arguments for optimism, and in our text Orestes has given only one.

**1017-19** Iph. appears to be persuaded by Orestes' asseverations, but does not yet see any way to bring about the best-case scenario.

**τῇδε γὰρ νοσεῖ νόστος** 'in this place our return is ailing' = 'there is the weakness'. νοσεῖ, 'is at fault, has a weakness', is used slightly differently from νοσοῦντά τ' οἶκον, 992, but in general the metaphorical use is quite common.

**ἡ δὲ βούλησις πάρα** 'the will is present'. Just as she did at 989-96 (cf. also 1023), Iph. contrasts wish and practicality: here her wish to survive and return (which she accepts would be preferable to dying in order to save Orestes) and the lack of any coherent plan to achieve the aim. (There is therefore no need to emend to ἥδε βούλευσις, which would give the sense 'this is what we must consider'.)

**1020** The first thought of a hero is generally to get his way by force. In the first part of the equivalent scene in *Helen*, Helen herself forestalls the suggestion, assuming it will be Menelaos' first idea (809).

**1021** 'This is a terrible thing you have said, for incomers to murder their host.' Although Thoas himself could be said to slaughter his ξένοι (guests), and Iph.'s own office is described in similar terms (τέχνην ... ξενοκτόνον, 53; ξενοφόνους τιμάς, 776), she regards herself as being in a relationship of ξενία with Thoas (ἔπηλυς = stranger), and shrinks from murdering her ξένος (host). Greek morality is shown to be superior to that of barbarians; contrast 1174.

**1023 οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην:** Iph. means not that the deed is literally impossible for her, but that it is morally unacceptable. Once again she contrasts willingness and an eager spirit with what is actually attainable (cf. 989-98, 1017-19).

**ἦινεσα:** on 'tragic aorists' see 862n. This particular formula in context is one of polite rejection, corresponding to αἰνῶ/ἐπαίνῶ, 'no thank you' (Lloyd 1999, esp. 39). For another subtype of tragic aorist see 1160 and n.

**1024** Orestes' second suggestion has some resemblance to Pylades' idea at 106-14 – to hide (presumably until night, see below) and then make off with the statue. The difference is that he hopes with Iph.'s help that they could hide inside the temple, instead of making their way in after nightfall.

**1025-6** These two lines are probably interpolated, the addition perhaps deriving from a wish to clarify what could be assumed, that Orestes would wait until night to make his move. Line 1026, 'Yes, since the night belongs to thieves/deceivers, and the daylight to truth[ful dealings]', seems out of place here, with its strongly implied disapproval.

**1027** The guards are described as ἱεροὶ because they are (temporarily or otherwise) devoted to temple service; cf. 1284, ναοφύλακες. There is no

need to emend to ἔνδον ἱεροῦ φύλακες (ἔνδον can only refer to the temple). On the identity of guards and attendants, see 466–642n.

**1029** On the sense of ingenuity here conveyed by καινόν, see D'Angour 2011: 72–3, and contrast *Helen* 1056, also in a plotting scene: παλαιότης γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ ἔνεστί τις. Iph.'s idea and Orestes' reaction are paralleled very closely in *Helen*, esp. at 1049–52. In each case the woman suggests a ruse which involves unpleasant words about the man (the reiteration of Orestes' matricide, the pretence that Menelaos is dead), and in each case the man expresses willingness to co-operate if there is a chance of success. Both schemes involve a ritual in which the woman will preside alone, or with only her attendants – Iph. as priestess of Artemis in some sort of secret purification, Helen as chief mourner in a supposedly Greek form of funeral rite.

**1031** 'I shall make use of your troubles as an ingenious trick.' Iph. is aware that the most convincing lies are those which have an element of truth (see also 1181n.).

**1032–3** These lines should probably be deleted. Line 1033 is incompatible with Orestes' query at 1036, for if Iph. has already said that she will use the matricide as pretext he does not need to be told that he will not be considered pure. The preceding or following line must then also be rejected; it would be possible to delete 1033–4, but removing 1032–3 gives smoother transitions. Line 1032, expressing a tragic commonplace (see n.), could have been imported from another play.

**1032** Women, perhaps especially in Euripides, are commonly credited with ingenuity (εὐρίσκειν τέχνας), often with considerable negativity (compare for instance *Hipp.* 480–1, where the Nurse intends the remark as self-praise, but the audience can hardly fail to react in a very different way). Here, however, both Orestes and the audience see this typical quality being put to good use. The line is paralleled in part by *Helen* 1049 (ἦν τι καὶ γυνὴ λέξει σοφόν), both drawing attention to the fact that it is a woman who comes up with a convincing scheme.

**1035** ὥς depends on λέξομεν: 'I shall say that is it not right to sacrifice you to the goddess.'

οὐ θέμις is the standard phrase prohibiting an action which is not religiously permissible, very often a forbidden form of sacrifice or incorrect sacrificial victim.

**1036** αἰτίαν here must mean 'reason', as often. (The correction ἔχουσ' for ἔχουσ', giving αἰτίαν the sense 'fault' and referring to Orestes, is therefore unnecessary.) The point will now be obvious to the audience. Even within the conventions of \*stichomythia, Orestes is allowed to 'suspect' the answer.

**1037** A sacrificial animal must be perfect – indeed, choosing the best animal could often be a very elaborate process (see *ThesCRA* I.95–6). If a

human victim is offered to a god, presumably similar rules apply (though it is curious that Orestes' fit of madness does not seem to disqualify him in the eyes of the Herdsman or of Iph.). Above all, any form of pollution, such as that incurred by homicide, and in an extreme form by the killing of kin, must be kept far from the gods. See Parker 1983: 104-30. *ῥσιον*, in the sense 'pleasing to the gods', is here used to include an unpolluted state.

**1038** 'How then is the statue of the goddess [any] more captured?' Orestes wonders how his impurity will contribute to the removal of the statue.

**1039** *πόντου ... πηγᾶς*: sea water was, conveniently, a very potent purifying agent; cf. 1193 and 1191-3n.

*βουλήσομαι* either stands for 'I shall say that I wish ...' or anticipates a polite request, equivalent to 'I would like to ...'

**1040** *ἐφ' ᾧ* 'for which', with the idea of purpose: LSJ *s.v.* ἐπὶ B iii.2.

**1041** To Orestes' objection that this scheme only furthers their own escape and does not help the whole project, Iph. replies that she will claim that he touched the goddess' image, which is now therefore itself in urgent need of purification and must also be taken to the sea. A few cults, including one in Athens for the image of Athena known as the Palladion, regularly included an annual washing of an image in the sea (*ThesCRA* 11.477-8), which may help the audience to accept the idea, though this is not, of course, supposed to be such a celebration, but a one-off observance in an emergency; Thoas' reaction on seeing the statue removed from its pedestal (1157-8) shows that this is an apparently unprecedented event. But such purification is not without parallel in the real world: a fragmentary ritual prescription from Kos seems to lay down a cathartic procedure in which the priestess removes the statue of Kourotophos from the temple and possibly washes it in the sea (*LSCG* 154 B24-5).

*ᾧς* 'as though', 'on the grounds that'.

**1042** 'Where then will you go, beside a damp inlet of the sea?' (or possibly, with punctuation after *δεῖτα*, 'Where then? Will you go alongside ...?') At 1196 Thoas points out that the temple itself is by the sea, so Orestes is asking which part of the coast Iph. intends, no doubt expecting the answer which she then gives, that they should go to the natural harbour where the ship is moored. *ἐκβολον* is of uncertain meaning in this context, but a 'thrown-out' or jutting-out part of the sea, viewed from the sea itself, should indicate an inlet. An alternative possibility is that it refers to the place where the sea 'throws out' on to the land, the place where the surf breaks; but since Iph. has already said she will say that she intends to wash the statue in the sea, this question would be otiose.

**1043** ‘Where your ship is moored with flaxen-tied bonds.’ χαλινός, properly a bridle, can be used in poetry to mean other kinds of restraining rope. Orestes mentioned the ship at 981.

**1045** It was sometimes the case that only the priest or priestess was allowed into the *adyton* (inner sanctum) of a temple (Connelly 2007: 202–3), so it would not be surprising that touching the cult statue was equally restricted.

ὄσιον is here equivalent to θέμις (1035n.).

**1046–7** The first mention of Pylades in the planning (Orestes spoke only of himself at 1024).

τετάχεται: fut. perf.

**1048–9** The question may seem superfluous, since the whole pretence would be unnecessary if the intention is to avoid the notice of the king, but perhaps Orestes thinks that the pretext might be used as an excuse if they were interrupted. However, Iph. has already suggested that the king is likely to find out that the statue has been moved (996–7), and in the next scene she will make sure that he notices her as she removes the statue from the temple. She is rightly confident that her words will convince him of the correctness of her action.

ἦ εἰ- is scanned as one syllable by \*synizesis.

**1050–2** Some rearrangement of the transmitted order of lines is necessary; the minimum solution is to transpose 1050 and 1051, so that Orestes’ reference to his ship follows Iph.’s injunction ‘you must take care of the rest, so that it turns out well’. σοὶ δὲ (1051) is emphatic, contrasting Orestes’ part in the plan with her own.

**1051** ὅπως ἔξει: future indicative with ὅπως is regular with verbs of effort (e.g. ‘take care that ...’): Smyth §2211.

**1050** Lit. ‘the well-fitted oar-sweep is present’. πῖτυλος, meaning rapid and forceful movement (cf. 307), here stands for the oars themselves.

**1052** τάσδε: the chorus. Since tragic convention generally retains the chorus on stage, they are present in many plotting scenes, and their silence has therefore to be assured; cf. *Med.* 259–63, *Hipp.* 710–12 (see Barrett’s note for further examples, and for an analysis of Euripidean variations on the theme Hose 1990: 1.299–307). In this case, the situation is particularly delicate, since they, like Iph., feel a strong attachment to their former homes in Greece (576–7) and wish to return there (447–51); they may well feel envious of her opportunity for escape.

**1053–4** Orestes plausibly recognises that Iph. is more likely to be successful than himself in gaining the co-operation of her own handmaids. For the argument that a woman is more appropriate in addressing other women, cf. *Hel.* 830 (Menelaos on Helen and Theonoe). The association

of women with pity is a commonplace (e.g. *Med.* 928), but 1054 goes further in maintaining that women are actually better at *arousing* pity ('a woman has power [directed] towards pity').

**1055** The line suggests a remote condition: '[if you could persuade them], everything else would perhaps turn out well'. Orestes is understandably uncertain of success.

**1056-74** As we have been led to expect, Iph. pulls out all the emotional stops in her appeal to the chorus, the longest and most elaborate appeal for choral silence in extant tragedy. She begins with an attempt to evoke pity by showing that the chorus have complete power over her chance of deliverance. She then draws a picture of natural female solidarity, and claims that if she gets back safely to Greece she will bring about their safe return too. Finally she gives her plea the status of a supplication, before asking the chorus for their response.

**1056 φίλταται:** the women are most dear to Iph. because of their long association, but the word heightens the urgency of her request. It also looks forward to her characterisation of her brother and sister in 1059.

**εἰς ὑμᾶς βλέπω** 'I look to you', with the sense of hoping for some action.

**1057-8** 'And my affairs (τᾶμ' = τὰ ἐμέα) are in your hands, either to prosper or to be nothing and to be deprived of ...'

**1059 φιλάτης** does not indicate that Elektra is dearer to Iph. than is Orestes, but simply caps φίλου, giving an ascending \*tricolon.

**1061-2** For the sentiment, cf. *Helen* 329 (spoken by the Chorus-leader): γυναικα γὰρ δὴ συμπονεῖν γυναικὶ χρή. Comparison with the famous speech of Medea (230-66), where the heroine attempts to get the chorus on her side by appealing to the misfortunes that all women must endure, suggests that it is the thought of their common experiences in life which draws women together. With σώζειν ... ἀσφαλίσταται Iph. approaches more closely to her request, made in the following line.

**1064** 'It is a good thing for whomever a faithful tongue is present', 'a faithful tongue is a good thing for its possessor'. On the construction of the phrase, see Barrett on *Hipp.* 426-7: 'the γλώσσα has pushed forward out of the ὅττω clause and is half felt as subj. of καλόν (ἔστι) - a compromise between καλόν τοι γλώσσα πιστή and καλόν τοι ὅττω γλώσσα πιστὴ παρῆι'. See also 606n.

**1065 τρεῖς ... τοὺς φιλάτους:** φίλος/φιλάτος is a recurrent word in this emotional speech. As a description of the three-cornered relationship between the main characters, it has varying applications. Iph. and Pylades can hardly be said to have a strong affective bond, but as close family they are certainly φίλοι, and the strong ties that Orestes has with each have been demonstrated in the course of the scene.

**1066 ἡ γῆς ... θανεῖν** qualifies μία τύχη.

**1067–8** ‘And if I am saved, so that you too may share in my fortune, I will save you [and bring you; see 593n.] to Greece.’ σωθεῖσα is equivalent to the protasis of a conditional sentence. For suppliants’ arguments from reciprocity, whether favours already given or promised in the future, see Naiden 2006: 79–84. Iph. speaks more truly than she knows, since it is the divinely ordained necessity of her safe transport to Greek soil which prompts Athena’s intervention including the safe passage of the chorus. But it is unclear how she proposes to make good on her promise.

ὥς ἄν ... κοινωνῆις: ἄν with ὥς in a purpose clause is not uncommon in verse (Smyth §2201).

**1068–70** Very unusually, Iph. addresses individual members of the chorus separately, an emphatic, emotional device in the dramatic context, but also one which is psychologically well calculated to help in swaying a group of people. At this point she becomes their suppliant (ἱκνοῦμαι, 1069), appealing to the usual body parts of the person supplicated (right hand, cheek – unusually, rather than chin – and knees), as well as to their nearest and dearest (Naiden 2006: 44–62). It is unclear whether Iph. should be supposed to approach the chorus members to act out the supplication physically; such close contact between actor and chorus is likely to have been unusual, although permitted by the relatively low (or non-existent?) fifth-century stage (Introduction, p. 22). It would certainly make a striking scene, though it is also possible that the actor playing Iph. merely gestured towards the chorus from a distance, miming the actions.

**1068** A strongly sigmatic line: see 679n.

**1071** A clumsy interpolation. At 130 the chorus referred to themselves as virgin, and none of them can have children in their homes.

**1072–3** ‘What do you (pl.) say? Which of you says [she wishes] or who [says] she does not wish – speak! – these things?’

**1073** μὴ ... αἰνουςῶν ‘if you do not agree ...’, gen. abs. with conditional force, referring to the chorus.

**1075** Even if the supplication was not fully acted out, the chorus may conceivably also have gestured their acceptance, but in any case the simple word θέσσει is enough to show that they agree. μόνον is a discreet way of dismissing Iph.’s promise to help her attendants in return for their silence.

**1077** ἴστω μέγας Ζεὺς: this is a short form of oath, but more solemn and emphatic than the ‘informal oath’ νή/μὰ (τὸν) Δία, κτλ. (see Sommerstein 2008). The chorus call ‘great Zeus’ to witness that they will not betray Iph.’s escape plan. Although Zeus is pre-eminently the god of oaths, and women in comedy frequently use the informal oath in his name, tragic women very seldom swear by him: *Andr.* 37 seems to be the only other example.

**1078** Iph.'s wish is eventually granted, as the chorus do indeed 'get the benefit' of their words.

**1079–81** These lines are addressed to Orestes and Pylades (σὸν ... καὶ σὸν suggests that she turns to each of them). They must enter the temple so as to be out of sight when Thoas arrives, and also to lend plausibility to Iph.'s story that they have touched the statue and hence polluted it. It is not clear whether they enter the temple at this point or together with Iph. after the prayer that follows. Iph.'s certainty that Thoas will soon arrive to supervise the sacrifice is well placed. His interest in the conduct of the cult may indicate barbarian bloodthirstiness, but could also be seen as the natural and proper concern of a ruler that his city carries out the traditional sacrifices.

σὸν ἔργον 'it's up to you to ...', a phrase used frequently in comedy as well as tragedy, which may be colloquial in tone: see Collard and Stevens 2018: 91–2.

**1082–8** Although Iph. has speculated on Artemis' nature (380–91), and sworn by her (747–8), this is the first time that we hear her praying to the goddess. The first part of the prayer follows the *da quia dedisti* formula (Pulleyn 1997: 17, 31–6), familiar from *Iliad* 1.453–6 and Sappho fr. 1.5–9; since the deity has shown favour in the past, (s)he should do so now too. This gives us another reason to think that Artemis might favour the plan, as well as reminding us of the play's opening and the beginning of the story.

**1083** δεινῆς ... ἐκ πατροκτόνου χερός: Iph. often recurs to her father's attempted sacrifice (8–9, 211–13, 359–60, 852–4).

πατροκτόνου: the normal meaning would be 'father-killing', and therefore emendations such as τεκνοκτόνου have been proposed; but for the sense 'killing *by* a father' cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 860–1, θηλυκτόνῳ Ἄρει, 'violence on the part of women who killed'.

**1084–5** For an attempt to persuade the god to act in a certain way by pointing out the unwelcome consequences to his cult or reputation if he does not, cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 258–9, where Orestes warns Zeus that if he and Elektra are destroyed, no one in the future will trust his signs; this is combined with the argument that the family has always been generous in sacrifice and will continue to be so if the survivors are spared. Here the case is slightly different, as it is assumed that Artemis will care for her brother's reputation as for her own. Iph., it seems, has been convinced by Orestes' view that the two children of Leto will have the same interests at heart (1012–14n.), and this helps to keep the parallelism between the two brother–sister pairs in view (Introduction, pp. 41–2). The truthfulness, or helpfulness, of Apollo's oracle was much contested in the earlier part of the play (77–8, 711–15), but now Orestes feels more confident in



the oracular god (977–80 and esp. 1012–14). Only after the recognition is Apollo's prophetic title *Loxias* used (by Orestes at 943 and 1013).

**1086–8** 'But be favourable and come away from a barbarian land to Athens; it is not fitting for you to dwell here, when you could (it being possible for you to) possess a happy city.' *παρόν* is acc. abs., 'it being possible'. Unless Orestes, trying to convince Iph. that the gods would favour the removal of the cult statue, had made some similar point in the lacuna after 1014, Iph. is the first to represent this transferral as beneficial in a wider sense than that of simply helping Orestes, by suggesting that Athens is a more fitting place for Artemis to reside than the Tauric Chersonese. She is trying to persuade the goddess, but the point tallies with her earlier revulsion from the special features of the cult, and her view that they derive from the savage nature of the worshippers (380–91). The praise of a *πόλις εὐδαίμων* (perhaps in part to be understood literally as 'favoured by the gods'; see 1482n.) looks forward to the implicitly patriotic concerns of Athena's speech (1435–89) and begins to widen the perspective from the immediate concerns of the characters.

#### 1089–1152 SECOND STASIMON

At the end of her prayer to Artemis which immediately precedes this choral ode, Iph. exits into the temple to remove the statue. The chorus are alone.

*str.* 1 Like the halcyon which weeps for the loss of its mate, I lament that I am separated from Greece, and especially from Artemis of Delos.

*ant.* 1 I wept when my city fell and I was sold into slavery, coming here as a servant of the priestess of Artemis. It would be preferable to have been consistently unfortunate; it is harder to bear misery after good fortune.

*str.* 2 And now a swift ship will carry you home to Greece, but me you will leave behind.

*ant.* 2 I wish I could fly through the air to take part once more in the maidens' dances which I used to enjoy in my earlier life.

The second stasimon echoes and reverses themes of the first (392–455), from which it is separated by the very long scene 456–1088. The earlier ode evoked voyages from Europe to Asia (or Greece to the Black Sea); this reprises the theme in the first strophic pair, but in the second evokes two journeys in the opposite direction – first the forthcoming escape of Iph.,

then the longed-for but impossible journey of the chorus themselves. Both songs end with the chorus' longing for a return home, to their earlier life in Greece.

The ode is loosely framed by two evocations of Greek festivals, the first strophe turning into a picture of the 'gatherings of the Greeks', especially for Artemis on Delos, and the second antistrophe ending with an elaborate wish to join a girls' chorus once more. Swift (2010: 207–13) sees elements suggestive of *partheneia*, 'maiden-songs', throughout the stasimon, and links these with further allusions to girls' song and dance in the parodos (221) and first stasimon (but see 452–5n.). The Delian theme, evoking Apollo as well as Artemis, connects the ode with the joyful following stasimon celebrating (and vindicating) the Delphian Apollo.

### *Metre*

The metre is almost pure aeolo-choriambic. Glyconics and pherecrateans predominate, but there are several wilamowitzians, sometimes in metrical correspondence with glyconics. The second strophic pair concludes with a shift to dactylic rhythm and a final ithyphallic clausula.

### *First strophic pair*

1089	---υυ-υ-	glyc
1106	---υυ-υυυ	glyc
1090	---υυ-υ-	glyc
1107	-υ-υυ-υ-	glyc
1091	υυυ-υυ--	pher
1108	υυυ-υυ--	pher
1092	-υυ-υυ-υ-	ibyc
1109	υυυ---υυ-	wil
1093	υυυ-υυ-υ--	glyc + 2 sp
1110	υυυ-υυ-υ--	glyc + 2 sp
1094	υ--υυ-υ-	glyc
1111	υ--υυ-υ-	glyc
1095	---υυ--	pher
1112	---υυ-υ	pher

1096	υ-----υυ-	wil
1113	-υ-υυ-υ-	glyc
1097	υ--υ-υυ-	wil
1114	υ--υυ-υ-	glyc
1098	-υυ-υυ-υ-	ibyc
1115	-υυ-υυ-υ-	ibyc
1099	----υ-υυ-	wil
1116	-----υυ-	wil
1100	-----υυ-	hept
1117	--υ-υυ-	hept
1101	----υυυυ-	wil
1118	----υ-υυ-	wil
1102	-----υυ-	wil
1119	-----υυ-	wil
1103	-----υυ-	wil
1120	† υυ-- --υυ-	wil
1104	υυυ-υυ-υ-	glyc
1121	υυυ-υυ-υ-	glyc
1105	----υυ--	pher
1122	----υυ--	pher

*Second strophic pair*

1123	-υ-υυ----	glyc 'dragged'
1138	---υυ----	glyc 'dragged'
1124	---υυ-υ--	hipp
1139	---υυ-υ--	hipp
1125	---υ-υυ-	wil
1140	---υ-υυ-	wil

1126	- ∪ - - - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1141	- - - - - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1127	- - ∪ ∪ - - -	tel 'dragged'
1142	- - ∪ ∪ - - ∪	tel 'dragged'
1128	∪ - - ∪ - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1143	∪ - - - - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1129	∪ ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	glyc
1144	- ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	ibyc
1130	∪ - - - - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1145	∪ ∪ ∪ - - - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1131	- ∪ - - - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1146	- ∪ - - - ∪ ∪ -	wil
1132	† ∪ ∪ - - ∪ - ∪	?
1147	∪ ∪ - - ∪ ∪ -	?
1133	- - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	tel
1148	- - - - ∪ ∪ -	hept? (see n.)
1134	† - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪	?
1149	- ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪	5 da
1135	- ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ ∪	da tetr cat
1150	- ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ -	da tetr cat
1136	- ∪ - ∪ - -	ithy
1151	∪ ∪ ∪ - ∪ - -	ithy

**1089-93** 'Bird, you who by rocky sea-cliffs, halcyon, lament your fate (1091n.), a cry well understood by those who understand, inasmuch as you continually sing of your husband with melodies ...'

**1089 ὄρνις:** the chief functions of birds in choral odes are to fly to far-away places, and to sing, usually a lament. The audience has to wait till the end of the next line, where the bird is named, to discover which of these will be relevant, and reference to laments follows quickly. The escape wish

is not expressed until the second antistrophe, when the chorus imagine themselves as winged and travelling through the sky (1138–42).

**1090 ἄλκυων** is unaspirated, despite English ‘halcyon’. Descriptions of the bird such as Arist. *Hist. an.* 8.14, 616a indicate various species of kingfisher, some of which live in coastal habitats – but the ἄλκυων of poetry sings, and the kingfisher’s cry could not be described as song. See Arnott 2007: 12–13, with Thompson (1936: 46–9), who calls the ἄλκυων ‘a symbolic or mystical bird’. As early as the *Iliad*, the bird is said to have a grievous fate, and is used as a *comparatum* for a human subject (*Il.* 9.563). The mythology varies, but the usual version has the (female) bird, transformed from a woman, lamenting the loss of her husband; the metamorphosis of Alkyone and Keyx into birds appears to have been narrated in the *Eoiai* (Hesiod fr. 16 M–W), perhaps in the version given later by Apollodorus (1.7.4). Line 1093 shows that it is this story which Euripides has in mind. The halcyon’s lament is a variation on the more common tragic reference to the nightingale (e.g. Soph. *El.* 107–9, 147–9); Euripides’ use of it in lyric is parodied in Ar. *Frogs* 1309–12. The story is a suggestive rather than an exact parallel for the fate of the chorus, who have lost their homes and the possibility of gaining husbands.

**1091 ἔλεγον οἶτον αἰεῖδεις** ‘you sing a lament, your fate’, a reminiscence of the Iliadic phrase (9.563) ἄλκυόνης πολυπενθέος οἶτον ἔχουσα. ἔλεγον αἰεῖδεις is probably a verbal phrase, ‘you lament’ (so ἔλεγον is internal accusative); alternatively it is possible that ἔλεγον here functions as an adjective, qualifying οἶτον: ‘you sing your lamentable fate’. On ἔλεγος, see 145–6n. The emendation οἰκτρὸν (‘you sing a pitiable lament’) slightly eases the syntax but is not really necessary.

**1092 εὐξύνετον ξυνετοῖς** ‘easily understood by those of understanding’. The unhappy meaning of the halcyon’s song is not obvious on the surface, though it is to those who know – likely through their own experience of suffering. The sense of the phrase is like Pindar’s φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν (*Ol.* 2.85); for the type of repetition, with simple and compound forms of the same root, see Breitenbach 1934: 228.

**1093** See 1090n.

**1094–5** ‘I vie with you in lamentations, a wingless bird.’ παραβάλλομαι is literally ‘I place (for my own purposes) something beside’ for comparison or emulation.

**ἄπτερος ὄρνις**: the \*oxymoron points the difference between the chorus and the bird they invoke, but also looks ahead to the idea of flying home-wards in the second antistrophe (1138–42).

**1096–7 ποθοῦσ’ ... ποθοῦσ’**: on this type of verbal repetition, very common in Euripides (though the \*asyndeton is unusual), see Breitenbach 1934: 231–2. The verb ποθέω, ‘desire, long for [something lost or

absent]’ (cf. 515, 542 with 540–2n.), adds colour to the comparison of the chorus’ longing for home and the life they knew there with the longing of Alkyone/the ἄλκυών for her lost husband.

**1096 Ἑλλάνων ἀγόρους** ‘gatherings of Greeks’. Euripidean lyrics sometimes use the form ἀγορός rather than ἀγορά. The phrase suggests supra-regional festivals, which in the Delian context beginning to unfold in turn suggests the pan-Ionian festival of the Delia (*Hom. Hymn Apollo* 147–64). For a participation base wider than purely Ionian, see Constantakopoulou 2007: 49–58).

**1097 Ἀρτεμιν λοχίαν**: Artemis as connected with childbirth was worshipped with this epithet at several places in the Greek world, including Delos; see following note.

**1098–9** The mountain of Kynthos, a conspicuous landmark on Delos, was according to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (16–17) the actual birthplace of Apollo, Artemis having been born earlier on Ortygia. A sanctuary on the east slope of the mountain has been identified as that of Artemis Lochia (Bruneau 1970: 191–4), the main Artemision on Delos being close to the temple of Apollo. It is at first sight odd that the chorus, who left their homes as παρθένοι, should think first of the childbirth aspect of Artemis, but the choice of deity may indicate their regret for lost marriage and motherhood. There is an obvious contrast with the Artemis worshipped by the Taurians.

**1099–1102** The three trees are listed in something like ‘historical’ order. The palm tree (*Phoenix theophrasti*, the Cretan date palm, native to the eastern Mediterranean) is mentioned in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (18, 117) as a support to which Leto clung while giving birth to Apollo, and it is the Delian tree *par excellence*. Laurels (bay; *Laurus nobilis*) are Apollo’s own favourite tree, and the conjunction of palm and laurel on Delos is mentioned in other Euripidean lyrics (*Hec.* 458–61, *Ion* 919–22, the latter verbally close to this passage), both trees being associated with Leto’s labour. The olive is unique to this description, and it is obviously tempting to connect it with Athenian hegemony, but it is not a Euripidean invention, since it appears beside the personified Delos on a pyxis dated to around 440–430 (*LIMC* Delos 1).

**1099 ἀβροκόμαν** ‘with graceful foliage’. Though compounds in -κόμης properly refer to hair, a transferred use is appropriate for long palm fronds, which contrast markedly with the leaves of other trees. The same epithet is used in the parallel *Ion* passage (919), where also δάφνας ἔρνεα parallels δάφναν τ’ εὐερνέα here.

**1102 Λατοῦς ὦδιτι φίλον**: although the figurative meaning ‘offspring’ for ὦδις is very common in tragedy, in the contexts of Artemis Lochia and of Apollo’s birthplace it is more likely here to have the literal meaning

‘birth pains’ and that as Platnauer suggests the whole phrase is equivalent to Λατοῖ ὠδινούσῃ φίλον, ‘dear to Leto in travail’. In *Hom. Hymn Apollo* 117 (above, 1099–1102n.) it is the palm which aids Leto’s labour, so to substitute for this the characteristic tree of Athens may have political implications. This would chime with the harmony between Athena and Leto’s children which is expressed in the Delphian command to establish the Taurian Artemis in Athens and seen later in Athena’s *ex machina* appearance. But it is also possible that the correct reading is φίλας, referring to all the trees. (The transmitted text, identifying the holy shoot of the olive as Leto’s ὠδῖς, gives no very good sense.)

**1103–5** ‘And the lake, swirling its circling water, where the tuneful swan serves the Muses.’ κύκλιον is usually a three-termination adjective and so should qualify ὕδωρ rather than λίμναν; it is more likely to indicate a circling motion than a simple round shape. The lake has no outlet, and so the water circulates in the same place. The oval lake, mentioned in e.g. *Hdt.* 2.170, where it is said to be called τροχοειδής, is a natural feature near the Letoon, now dry. The description may evoke the idea of dancing, especially in connexion with the tuneful swan, and so resonate with the ode’s conclusion; εἰλίσσουσαν is echoed by εἰλίσσουσα in 1145 (see n.), used there as so frequently of dance, while for κύκλιος, suggesting κύκλιος χορός, see 427–9n. The swan is associated with Apollo in *Hom. Hymn Apollo* 1 and often, and its song (μελωιδός = singer of tunes), appearing in the same passage, is obviously paramount in this association. Euripides mentions the Delian lake in connexion with swans also at *Ion* 161–7.

**1106–12** This unhappy recollection gives the fullest explanation of the chorus’ presence among the Taurians. So far it has been established that they are Greek, unmarried girls, slaves attached to the service of Iph., who long to return to their home (130–6, 447–55). Now it is revealed that they are war captives, taken at the fall of their city (πύργων ὀλομένων), and sold on by their captors (ζαχρύσου ... δι’ ἐμπολᾶς) to barbarians.

**1106–10** Elsewhere it is the Trojan plays which contain most reference to the enslavement of women, always treated with much pathos. Closest to this passage is *Andr.* 111–12: πολλὰ δὲ δάκρυά μοι κατέβα χροός, ἀνὶκ’ ἔλειπον | ἄστυ τε καὶ θαλάμους καὶ πόσιν ἐν κονίαις.

**1110** ‘Through the enemy’s oars and lances’ concisely expresses the use of force to drive captives on board ships sailing away from their homes.

**1111–12** ‘And through exchange of much gold, I came on a barbarian journey.’ Although νόστος is occasionally used in both epic and tragedy to mean simply a journey, the sense ‘return home’ is far more common, and the phrase νόστον βάρβαρον must be felt as \*oxymoronic. The chorus long for a true νόστος, which they will imagine in the following strophe, but all they have experienced is the journey to a remote barbarian land.

**1113** ἐλαφοκτόνου: a variant of the usual ἐλαφηβόλος, but one which may remind the audience of Artemis' substitution of a deer for Iph. herself at Aulis. Guldager Bilde 2003 connects the epithet with images of a deer-killing 'Artemis' (more properly Parthenos; see Introduction, pp. 15-17) found on coins from Taurian Chersonesos from the fourth century onwards.

**1114-16** ἀμφίπολον ... λατρεύω: the chorus serve Iph., who is herself the servant of Artemis (ἀμφίπολος denotes both servant of a human and priest/priestess of a deity; priesthood may be constructed as servitude). λατρεύω is similarly used both for service to a human master or mistress and to a divinity.

Ἀγαμέμνονιαν: 17on.

**1116** '... and altars where no sheep are sacrificed', a phrase which may be technically euphemistic but is still sinisterly suggestive.

**1117-22** '... envying the one who is unfortunate throughout, for under compulsion he does not struggle, being a companion (to misfortune) ...' After this the text is uncertain, but the general sense of the argument is clear: it is worse to suffer ill fortune after good than never to have known good fortune at all. This is a Euripidean topos; cf. *Hec.* 375-6, *HF* 1291-3 (probably interpolated from elsewhere), *Trö.* 639-40, *Hel.* 417-19. There is a loose connexion with *Il.* 24.527-33 (the jars of Zeus), with its division of mankind into those who get only bad things from Zeus and those who get a mixture, but the conclusion is paradoxical.

**1118-19** The ἀνάγκαι (roughly synonymous with δυσδαιμονία in the following line) are lightly and indirectly personified, as the consistently unfortunate person is described as their companion (σύντροφος).

**1120** The manuscript reading 'misfortune changes' is singularly inappropriate in this context which compares good fortune changing to bad with consistent bad fortune. Markland's emendation εὐδαιμονία for δυσδαιμονία is possible (good fortune is unstable, bad luck may not be), but not obviously right.

**1121-2** 'To suffer after good fortune is a heavy life for mortals.'

**1123** καὶ σέ μέν, πότνι: the balancing δέ comes at 1132, but the contrast indicated here between Iph. and the chorus actually structures the whole of the second strophic pair, with the strophe imagining Iph.'s coming sea voyage (stripped of the difficulties which the participants foresee) and the antistrophe contrastingly evoking the impossible journey through the air which the singers would like to make.

**1124** πεντηκόντερος: a fast ship for fighting, equipped with fifty oars. At 981-2, Orestes spoke of his 'many-oared ship', and at 1347 we learn that it is indeed a penteconter.

**1125-7** 'And shrilling, the wax-bound pipe of mountain Pan will give orders to the oars.' The normal practice was for an *auletes* to set the time



for rowers by playing his instrument at an appropriate tempo, but at *Tro.* 122–7 both aulos and syrinx (panpipes) are said to play on board ship. Euripides introduces the syrinx into several of his choral odes, using the versatile aulos, the normal accompaniment of tragic lyric, to represent its sound: ‘the syrinx in the song thus becomes the aulos in the theater (and vice-versa)’ (Weiss 2018: 151, see also 156). Its choice here perhaps suits the immediate environs of the uncivilised land of the Taurians, since it is a more rustic, less cultivated instrument than the aulos (West 1992: 109–12), but it also allows the introduction of a specific deity (the aulos having no particular divine associations) to precede Apollo in 1128–31. It is not necessary to suppose that Pan is imagined as actually present and making music, like Apollo; but the whole picture suggests what proves to be the case, that the planned escape with the divine image has the favour of the gods. *συρίζων* may also recall *συριζόντων* at 431, of the steering-oar squeaking (the syrinx had a high register). On the connexions between the two stasima, see above, 1089–1152n.

**1128 Φοῖβος θ’ ὁ μάντις:** at 711, at a point of severe disillusionment, Orestes called Phoibos ὁ μάντις (see n.). Here the context is entirely positive, as Apollo himself is seen in the role of a human seer on an expedition. He also takes the role of a citharode, playing his favourite instrument (cf. *Hom. Hymn Hermes* 418–510); the seven strings were standard (ibid. 51; see also West 1992: 62–4). The evocation of music in these and the preceding lines gives the picture a bright and joyful cast. More specifically, the shift from panpipes to lyre suggests the progress of the journey, with the pipes giving the time to the rowers at the outset, and the lyre marking the shift to more relaxed sail-power on the open sea (cf. 1134–6).

**1130–1 λιπαράν ... Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ γᾶν:** the voyage is imagined as ending, or at least first reaching land, in Attica rather than Argos (cf. 752n.). *λιπαράι*, ‘shiny, oily’, a stock epithet for Athens at least since Pindar fr. 6 Sn–M; mocked by Aristophanes, *Ach.* 640. Sometimes the word may evoke the brilliance of city walls or buildings, but here qualifying γᾶ the primary meaning must be ‘fruitful’, perhaps with particular reference to the olive.

**1132–3** The contrasting δέ (cf. 1123) introduces a simple, understated clause (‘But leaving me here, you will go with oars that strike the surf’), leaving implicit the chorus’ sorrow at their inability to join Iph. on her return to Greece. The transmitted text makes good sense, but is metrically impossible, and no satisfactory solution has yet been proposed. Dale’s proposal to re-order the words, reading ἐμὲ δ’ αὐτοῦ ῥοθίοις | βήσῃ λιποῦσα πλάταις, produces exact correspondence between 1132 and 1147 (ἐς ἀμίλλας χαρίτων) but leaves an unlikely iambic rhythm in 1133, and the corresponding 1148 is equally a metrical puzzle.

**1134–6** Textually a very difficult passage. It is clear that the lines evoke a ship under sail, heading homewards from the Black Sea, but the configuration of words does not make sense as it stands: ἐκπετάσουσι appears to have two objects (ἱστία and πόδες), while πρότονοι as subject is impossible, because the ‘forestays’ do not ‘spread out’ either the sail or the sheet (rope attached to and controlling a sail). Platnauer suggests the deletion of ἀέρι and alteration of case endings to read ἱστία δ’ ἐξ πρότονον ... ἐκπετάσουσι πόδες, which he translates as ‘the sheets (i.e. being loose) spread the sails against the forestays over (i.e. so as to belly out over) the bows beyond the prow’. This is possible, but causes some difficulty in responson with the antistrophe (1149–50, taken with 1148), which is, however, another textually uncertain passage.

**1138** The ‘shining horse-tracks’ set up a momentary puzzle which is resolved by the following line: ‘where goes the sun’s lovely fire’. Unable to sail away, the chorus imagine a more fantastic mode of transport, taking the westward path travelled daily by the sun’s chariot.

λαμπροῦς: 29n.

**1139** εὐάλιον ... πῦρ: 12n.

**1140** οἰκείων ... θαλάμων: the secluded bedrooms of their own houses, where as unmarried girls the chorus would have spent much of their time. Once again, their experience parallels that of Iph., who dreamed that she was back in her παρθενών (45). In their absorption in fantasy, the chorus appear to have forgotten that their homes will have been destroyed at the capture of their city, or at least that they no longer belong to their families.

**1141–2** ‘If only I might cease the rapid movement of my wings [making them still] on my back.’ The fantastic journey is imagined not on the sun’s chariot, but with wings, as a bird; the significance of the bird is thus changed from the opening of the ode (cf. 1089n.), and the chorus in imagination reverse their self-characterisation as ἄπτερος ὄρνις. It may be relevant that both horses and birds can have associations with girls’ choruses (Weiss 2017: 30). The aerial journey reminds us also that Iph. in fact travelled in such a way to escape death and arrive in Taurike (29–30), and heightens the contrast between her privileged position and the chorus’ fate.

**1143–52** ‘And would that I might take my place in the dances, where too as a maiden belonging to a noble house, circling my foot from my dear mother’s side, stirred up to rivalry with bands of my age-mates, for contests in charm and in the luxury of delicate wealth (1148n.), throwing round me my fine embroidered wrap and my tresses, I shaded my cheeks.’ From their first imagined destination – home, the house where they lived – the chorus move to one of the few settings where girls might

respectably be seen outside their home, and one of their most enjoyable activities: group song and dance. In imagination they thus reconstitute themselves as what they are in performance fact, a chorus (Henrichs 1995), though of course the imagined and the actual chorus differ in gender. The passage resonates with the Delian festival suggested at 1096–1105, another happy gathering in civilised Greece, where the vocabulary suggests dance (1103–5n.). The text of this section is extremely uncertain, but it is clear that the singer imagines herself dancing in a group of girls of her own age, wearing fine clothes, and vying with the other girls in finery and charm.

**1143–4** ὅθι καὶ παρθένος εὐδοκίμων δόμων: παρθένος should be taken closely with the following genitive. The then–now contrast is not with a time when the chorus were virgins (in the parodos, they speak of themselves as virgins still, 130, suitable for the service of a virgin goddess, however unlikely this may be for war captives), but with their previous status as girls of good family, whose standing in the community was expressed by their participation in ritual events. In any case, the word παρθένος has both a physiological and a sociological meaning (see, e.g., Calame 1997 [1977]: 27, Sissa 1990 [1987]: 77–93). The point is obscured with the manuscript reading γάμων rather than δόμων, which would throw more emphasis on the virginity or youth of the singer; εὐδοκίμων γάμων is also very difficult to fit into the syntax of the sentence.

**1145–6** παρὰ ... φίλας ματρός: with the text as printed, this phrase should be taken together ('away from my mother's side'). Some have found the mention of a mother implausible in a scene which centres on the singer's maidenly friends and companions, but the girl is pictured *leaving* her mother temporarily to join the dancing group. The chorus remember their connexions with both family and the wider community.

**1145** πόδ' εἰλίσσουσα: 'whirling my foot', i.e. dancing, probably with circular motion implied (cf. 442–5n.). εἰλίσσω (or ἐλίσσω) is a favourite Euripidean word for dance (e.g. *HF* 690, *Tro.* 333), and is chosen in *Ar. Frogs* 1314, 1348, though with a different sense, to parody Euripides' fondness for setting several notes to one syllable.

**1147–52** The chorus envisage their own choral performance at a religious festival (or a marriage, if γάμων should somehow be retained, 1143–4n.). Such choruses of unmarried girls were commonly formed in much of Greece (Calame 1997 [1977]); they were less conspicuous, although still present, in Attica (Budelmann and Power 2015). The genre of *parthenia* or 'maiden-songs' was intended for such performances; the example which survives most completely, Alcman *PMG* fr. 1, is a self-reflexive piece much concerned with competition between the girls in beauty (hair is especially mentioned) and fine clothing.

**1147** ἐς ἀμίλλας χαρίτων: χάρις, ‘grace’, may here refer both to physical beauty and adornment, and to graceful movements in the dance.

**1148** ‘[contests of ...] and of delicately wealthy luxury’ makes a good deal more sense than L’s reading ἀβροπλούτοιο χαίτας, ‘of delicately wealthy hair’. To make the emended text into a regular heptasyllable suitable for the aeolo-choriambic metrical context, it is necessary to scan the second syllable as long, and although a syllabic division ἀβροπ-λούτου would be unusual it is not impossible in lyric. For a similar division in trimeters, where it is even less usual, see 51n. The corresponding line of the strophe, if the text is correct, is a telesillean (1132–3n). Responson between telesillean and heptasyllable is found at *Phaethon* 69, 77 (Lourenço 2010: 110).

**1149** εἰς ἔριν ὀρνυμένα: ὀρνυμένα (fem. nom. sg.) here has a figurative rather than a physical sense; she was ‘stirred up, moved’ to rivalry with her peers, expressed through the ‘contests of grace’ (1147).

**1149–52** She ‘shaded her cheeks’ by pulling her veil and her long hair (which as an unmarried girl, she wore loose) around her head and forwards to partially cover them. Archil. fr. 31 W describes a slightly different configuration (ἡ δὲ οἱ κόμη | ὦμους κατεσκίαζε, ‘her hair shaded her shoulders’), but is otherwise comparable and carries a clear erotic charge. Cf. also Men. *Dys.* 950–1: εὐήλικος προσώπου | ἄνθος κατεσκιασμένη). The φᾶρος (here plural for singular) is a large shawl like the South Asian dupatta which can be drawn over the head (see also Llewellyn-Jones 2003: 49–53); πολυποίκιλα indicates that it was a fancy piece with elaborate patterns, whether embroidered or woven (see 224n.).

### 1153–1233 THIRD EPISODE

Toas, accompanied by attendants, enters from the *parodos* representing the road to the town area and away from the boat’s mooring-place (1208). Iph. explains that the statue, temple, and victims must all be purified, and the scene ends with a solemn procession to a remote part of the seashore.

In this fast-paced scene, a short episode of only eighty lines, the audience (who already know the plan) enjoy Iph.’s ingenuity in deceiving Thoas. The king is at first taken aback to see Iph. removing the statue from the temple, but he respects her authority (McClure 2016), and is quickly convinced by her story. As her words suggested at 1031, she makes her fictional account of the ominous miracle and her subsequent examination of the prisoners include a judicious amount of truth, or near truth. More dangerously, perhaps, but in typical tragic style (Rutherford 2012: 330–1), when describing her plan to purify both statue and victims, she

several times uses phrases which draw the audience into the plot through double meanings imperceptible to the barbarian king (1195, 1197, 1213, 1221). Thoas too uses words and phrases which unknown to him have an ironic sense (1174, 1180). The scene, like its parallel in *Helen* (1165–1300), is a variant of the more commonly sinister pattern whereby a deceiver, usually a woman, lures a victim, usually a man, to his doom. In this case the woman exhibits the same stereotypical qualities of female ingenuity in deception, but the aim is to ensure the escape of herself and her φίλοι rather than to harm the man she is tricking. The negative connotations of ‘woman tricks man’ may also be counteracted by the fact that in these two instances the woman is Greek and the man a barbarian. The audience is therefore free to enjoy and admire Iph.’s cleverness.

**1153** πυλωρός ‘doorkeeper’, a functional equivalent of κληιδούχος (131n.), and therefore appropriate for a priestess. It is not, surely, contemptuous, as supposed by Bremmer 2013a: 95. Thoas’ attitude to Iph. is one of respect, and the word is repeated in a clearly neutral context at 1227.

**1154** κατήρξατο: 4on.

**1155** ‘Do they (= the strangers) gleam with fire as to their bodies in the pure inner shrine?’, that is ‘Have their dead bodies been placed in the fire?’ For λάμπονται πυρί, cf. Ar. *Frogs* 293. The line is of doubtful appropriateness, since if Thoas has just asked whether Iph. has consecrated the victims he might be thought unlikely to inquire about a later phase in the ritual (cf. 626 and n.). But it is possible either that he used κατήρξατο (1154) in a loose sense for ‘sacrificed’, or that the question characterises him as eager and impatient.

**1156** The line marks Iph.’s entrance from the stage buildings, representing the temple.

σαφῶς, as often in Euripides, here has its Homeric sense of ‘truly, reliably’ (cf. σαφῆς φίλος, 919 and n.). But the chorus’ statement is itself untrue.

**1157** ἔα: this tragic exclamation of surprise, very often *\*extra metrum*, is common in Euripides (Nordgren 2015: 218), sometimes used as here to express an entering character’s surprise at what is seen (Bain 1977: 62–6).

τόδε: the goddess’ statue. Archaic wooden statues were regularly less than life-size, sometimes much less. Since the play demands that the image be easily portable, it may have been shown as a small statuette. Platt (2011: 96) points out that in Attic vase-painting the size of the Trojan Palladion (statue of Athena) varies according to its role in the narrative; when its seizure by Diomedes is shown, it is a statuette which he can clasp with one hand. Most vases depicting the *Iphigenia in Tauris* story (one Attic, the rest South Italian; see Introduction, pp. 44–5) show the

statue in the temple somewhat less than life-size, but *LIMC* Iphigeneia 29 (Campanian, 330–320), the only one to show the flight with the statue, makes it a statuette cradled in Iph.’s left arm, perhaps corresponding to ἐν ὤλέναις (1158).

**ἀκινήτων:** a transferred epithet. It is the statue which is immovable (in the sense that it must not, for religious reasons, be moved from its pedestal), not the base.

**1159** Iph. takes control of the situation by omitting to reply to Thoas’ question, instead exercising her religious authority to issue him with a command.

**παραστάσιν:** dat. pl. of παραστάς -αδος, ‘doorpost’, referring to the whole entrance area of the temple, although Thoas is presumably not yet quite in the porch.

**1161 ἀπέπτυσ’:** this type of ‘tragic aorist’ (862n.) stands for and replaces the action it describes; actual spitting would be beneath tragic dignity (Lloyd 1999, esp. 26–8). Iph. notionally spits in order to reject the inauspiciousness of the supposed portent she will describe, and perhaps also to reject the responsibility for having been about to make an offering unacceptable to the goddess.

**῾Οσία ... τόδε** ‘I give this word to Piety’, indicating the unholy nature of what she is rejecting. ῾Οσία, lightly personified, denotes behaviour and attitude in conformity with what is approved by the gods.

**1163 ἡγρεύσασθ’:** the second-person plural ‘you hunted’ indicates that Iph. is thinking of the Taurians collectively and separate from herself.

**1164** ‘What made you realise that – or are you stating an opinion?’

**τούκδιδάξαν** = τὸ ἐκδιδάξαν (neut. sg. part.).

**1165 πάλιν ἔδρας ἀπεστράφη:** ‘turned backwards from its place’, i.e. turned round from its normal position to face the other way. There is a long and rich tradition in many different cultures of statues communicating or manifesting a response to human action in some physical way. Most attestations are later than our text, but this may be chance. Herodotus knows but rejects an Aeginetan tradition that the statues of Damia and Auxesia fell to their knees when the Athenians tried to remove them (5.86.3), and at Ar. *Peace* 682–4 Peace turns her head away when Hyperbolos’ influence on Athens is revealed (comic invention based on a familiar idea). See also Donohue 1988: 40–3, Bremmer 2013b: 10–11.

**1166–9** Thoas suggests a possible natural explanation – an earthquake – but it does not take much to convince him that the statue turned away of its own accord (αὐτόματον). Iph. adds a detail which could only be explained on a supernatural basis, that the image closed its eyes.

**1170** The king wonders whether the two Greeks might be impure by reason of having killed a Taurian at the time of their capture. Most kinds

of homicide rendered the perpetrator impure until the appropriate ritual was carried out (Parker 1983: 104–30).

**βαρβάρων** is used somewhat illogically by the king to refer to his own people (perhaps as though a true ethnic term). Cf. 1422; the usage is quite common in tragedy (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 187, 255, etc., E. *Hel.* 1210).

**1171 οἰκεῖον**, in emphatic first position, contrasts with βαρβάρων.

**φόνον κεκτημένοι** ‘having contracted blood-guilt’, with φόνον meaning spilt blood, the violence which caused it, and the consequences of pollution.

**1173 κοινωνῶι ξίφει**: the normal meaning of κοινωνός is ‘partner, accomplice’, here extended to mean ‘partnered’: Orestes and Pylades are described as partners in their use of the sword. Iph. sticks to the plan she expresses at 1047, implying that they are brothers, as she first supposed herself (472–5, 497).

**1174** ‘Apollo! Not even among the barbarians would anyone dare that.’ It is conceivable that Thoas is reacting in character to Greek views of barbarian atrocities, but more likely that the line is a piece of sly subversive humour not intended as a realistic response. Formally comparable is the outcry of another ‘barbarian’, Andromache, at *Tro.* 764: ὦ βάρβαρ’ ἐξευρόντες Ἑλληνες κακά.

**Ἄπολλον**: the exclamation, invoking Apollo ἀποτρόπαιος, is a standard expression of horror (cf. *HF* 538, *Hel.* 1204, *Men. Dys.* 293, 415), but unconsciously ironic, since it was Apollo who ordered the matricide.

**ἔτλη**: 868–72n.

**1175** This statement is close to the truth, at least as regards Orestes, but not quite in the way it sounds; it was the Furies, not human indignation, driving Orestes from place to place, and it was Apollo who told him to leave Greece.

**πάσης ... Ἑλλάδος**: gen. of separation.

**1177** Exposure to the air was not sufficient to purify a polluted object (and a polluted person might indeed avoid thus exposing himself, so as not to convey pollution further), but it was a good first step. Cf. Parker 1983: 53 n. 79 (temple roof at Lindos removed for three days for purification).

**1179** ‘I questioned [them], when (temporal use of ὥς) the goddess’ statue turned away backwards.’

**1180** Unconscious irony on the part of Thoas, who fails to realise how ‘clever’ Iph. really is, in her deception. The dialogue continues to deal in Greek–barbarian stereotypes, this time that of the greater intelligence of the Greeks (cf. *Hdt.* 1.59.3, a sarcastic treatment of the same idea).

**ὥς** is exclamatory (LSJ D 1) with causal force, explaining the reason for what has just been said: ‘Greece brought you up to be wise, (as I can tell

from) how well you perceived.’ On this usage, which ὥς shares with οἶος and ὅσος, see Barrett on *Hipp.* 877–80.

**1181** ‘And furthermore, they dangled (‘let down’; from καθίημι) a delightful bait for my mind.’ This introduces Iph.’s part-true, part-false claim about the news from Argos that the captives have brought. This is not really necessary to the deception, but it continues the theme of Iph.’s cleverness (she sees through the prisoners’ stratagem) and is probably also designed to show her imperviousness to the prisoners’ bid for mercy and hence her trustworthiness; she dangles a bait of her own in front of Thoas, and gets the desired result.

**1182** Ἀργόθεν: loosely dependent on φίλτρον. As in English ‘news from Argos’ there is present the idea of information, in this case a ‘charm’ (see following note), travelling from place to place.

φίλτρον: the ‘bait’ becomes a ‘charm’, a change of metaphor, but the two words are commonly used figuratively in similar contexts. Thoas is no doubt pleased with his own perspicacity in guessing Iph.’s meaning.

**1183** The statement’s truth is questionable: Iph. has indeed learned that Orestes is alive, but at present he could hardly be said to enjoy good fortune. Iph. implies that he is leading a prosperous and happy life in Argos.

**1184–5** Good will towards a messenger who brings good news is a standard response (cf. 815 n.), so Thoas’ assumption is a natural one. It does, however, come uncomfortably close to the truth, which may partly account for Iph.’s false claim in 1185; but the main reason why she reports that the messengers said Agamemnon was alive is presumably to intensify the suggestion that she wishes to make Greeks suffer for her father’s sacrifice (cf. 1187).

**1186–7** ‘But you quite reasonably inclined to the part of the goddess.’ ἐκνεύω, ‘turn away the head’ indicates a metaphorical turning away from the captives. There is a hint of a question here, but the words are more of a statement; despite his initial shock on seeing her carrying the statue, Thoas is convinced by Iph.’s explanation and trusts her.

**1187** γὰρ picks up and assents to Thoas’ proposition, limiting it with an explanation (Denniston 1954: 130–1). Iph. knows that the Taurians expect her to hate all Greeks (cf. 336–9), and uses this to her advantage.

**1189** The ‘law/custom already laid down’ must refer to the rites of purification necessary in cases of severe pollution. Since in the play Taurian religion seems not unlike Greek in this respect, Thoas realises that some form of purification will be necessary, but not exactly what form it should take. This he expects the priestess to know, and Iph. takes the role of religious expert.



**1190** ‘Then are your lustral basins and sword not at work?’

ἐν ἔργῳ: used \*proleptically, ‘ready for action’.

χέρνιβες ξίφος τε: for these \*metonymic references to sacrifice, see 58n. and 27n.

**1191–3** Iph.’s claim that ‘the sea washes away all human ills’ indicates quite plausibly that such serious pollution requires the most powerful purification possible; cf. 1039. The sea is especially purifying because it appears to be a limitless expanse of water, and salt too has purificatory powers (Parker 1983: 226–7). Iph.’s words may also suggest to her and the audience that the sea will provide an escape from Taurike.

**1195** The meaning which Thoas extracts is presumably that Artemis will now look with more favour on her priestess, who so nearly offended her by offering unacceptable victims; but the real meaning, referring to the escape, is obvious to the audience.

**1196–8** Thoas envisages the washing of the intended victims directly outside the temple, and wonders why they are not visible. Iph. replies with further ambiguity, hinting that besides the washing she will perform actions which only the priestess and her assistants are allowed to see. But by ‘other things’ she actually means the escape attempt, which it is equally important for Thoas not to see. Thoas takes the meaning intended for him, and responds with propriety.

τάρρηθ’ = τὰ ἄρρητα, a common word for secret rituals.

**1199** Another double meaning is possible here: the statue of Artemis will be purified from the transgressive sacrifices it has received by a sea journey and establishment in Greece with rituals that are truly holy. See Zeitlin 2011: 452–3.

**1200** κηλὶς ... μητροκτόνος ‘the stain of matricide’, but κηλὶς is not merely figurative as in the English phrase. Rather it refers to a real pollution which has defiled the image through proximity and needs to be removed.

**1201** ‘for *otherwise* I would not have moved it ...’ (for this use of οὐ γάρ, Denniston 1954: 73–4).

**1202** Iph. has now convinced Thoas that she is both pious and intelligent (προμηθία = foresight, forward planning; cf. σοφὴν, 1180). There is a touch of humour in his ready approval: ‘Quite right too.’

δίκαιος is only rarely a two-termination adjective: *Herac.* 901 is another instance.

ηὔσέβεια: ἡ εὐσέβεια, ‘your piety’.

**1203–33** The catalectic trochaic tetrameters give a sense of speeding up. This metre is used by Euripides in his plays written c.415 and after, typically in excited scenes and relatively short runs (Drew-Bear 1968). Here

it ratchets up the suspense as the escape plot nears its climax. \*Antilabe is common in this metre, as here, where it continues the rapid exchange of the preceding \*stichomythia and falls into a frequently repeated pattern in which Iph. lays down procedure and Thoas approvingly glosses or justifies the instruction.

**1203 οἶσθ' ἄ νυν ἅ μοι γενέσθω;** 'Do you know what must happen for me?', with third-person imperative. For the idiom cf. 759n.

**1204–8** Earlier Iph. had ordered the strangers to be untied (468–9). Why then does she court disaster by asking for them to be bound and, especially, given a guard (1208)? Despite the stormy sea (1393ff.), without these arrangements they would have a much better chance of getting away unobserved. Dramaturgically the thwarted escape is not necessary, as the ending of *Helen* indicates; Athena could still intervene to save the chorus from Thoas and proclaim the future for the main characters, and she could confirm the religious *nihil obstat* for the transfer of the statue of Artemis to Attica. Realistically, Iph. may wish to make her excuse look more convincing by acting as she certainly would if she were really performing her priestly duties. Kyriakou (p. 383) suggests that Euripides may also wish to emphasise the possibility, indeed likelihood, of human error. Divine action is then necessary to bring about the intended result.

**1204 ποῖ δέ σ' ἐκφύγοιεν ἄν:** the victims could run away, and the messenger (one of the guards who have been requested) even imagines that they might kill Iph. (1341), but without a ship, which Thoas knows nothing about (like the sceptic in the Herdsman's narrative at 276, he may assume they had been shipwrecked), they would be unable to escape for long.

**1205** This gnomic-sounding statement has the air of a commonplace, but in fact it is a neat reversal of the usual point that *barbarians* are not to be trusted (cf. Hdt. 8.142.5). Thoas might expect that Iph. speaks from experience, since she was herself the victim of a Greek trick (24, 370–1) and claims to hate the Greeks. In fact her words have something in common with the Cretan liar paradox (Epimenides the Cretan says that all Cretans are liars), since she is Greek herself, and engaged in deceiving the barbarian king; she speaks in a manner which is simultaneously true and misleading.

**1207** Because the sun is a god, it is important that it should be protected from polluted people and objects; so Kreon is horrified that the polluted Oedipus should be allowed to remain uncovered in the open air (Soph. *OT* 1424–8). See Parker 1983: 317.

**1208 οἶδ':** the mute attendants, or at least some of them, who have accompanied Thoas.

**1209** As in trimeter \*stichomythia, the convention requires that sometimes the second speaker must interrupt the first, asking a question to which the first speaker was, presumably, about to supply the answer unasked.

**1210–11** The point here is not so much that Iph. will perform secret rites (the supposed reason for taking the statue and the victims further along the shore) as that the pollution of the victims poses a danger to all who come in contact with it.

**1211** Thoas addresses one of his attendants.

**1212** εὖ γε κηδεύεις πόλιν: a priest's function was not merely to worship the god but to do so on behalf of the city, and so to benefit the community by maintaining its good relations with the divine. See Plato, *Politicus* 290c and Parker 2005: 95–7. Hence Thoas might reasonably expect Iph. to have the city's welfare at heart, but even so he is impressed. For the Taurian city, see Introduction, pp. 17–18 and 595n.

**1213** Another double meaning which is obvious to the audience, but so far as Thoas knows Iph. has no obvious personal φίλοι, and must therefore intend himself.

**1214** Iph.'s reply has dropped out of the text; the most plausible suggestion is εὖ λέγεις.

πᾶσα θαυμάζει πόλιν: there was some indication of this in the Herdsman's respectful dialogue with Iph.

**1216** Again, Iph.'s instructions to Thoas make sense in terms of the supposed situation (after the pollution, it is logical to purify the statue's dwelling-place in preparation for its return), but they also benefit her by keeping the king occupied until she can make her escape. Purification 'with gold', i.e. probably sprinkling water from a gold vessel, is attested in ritual prescriptions of Kos (*LSCG* 154, 156, esp. 154 B26) and at Selinous (*NGSL* 27 B11); see Parker 1983: 228 and n. 118, *ThesCRA* II.22–3. The commonly accepted emendation πυρσῶι, 'with a torch', is unnecessary.

**1218** Since Thoas will stay to purify the temple, he is not, like his subjects, able to remain in his house when the polluted men are led out; he must therefore cover himself so that he does not catch sight of them.

**1219–20** Iph. allows herself and her companions time to embark and move off, while implying that the procedure she intends is complicated and difficult. Thoas asks, 'What limit is there of this (= waiting) for me?', but Iph. avoids answering his question by completing the sentence she had already begun. The king, having already expressed his concern at the situation, is naturally drawn to allow her as much time as she thinks necessary, in the interests of the proper performance of the ritual.

**1221** The wish or prayer which is not what it appears is a common form of double meaning (e.g. Klytaimestra's prayer to Zeus at *Ag.* 973–4). Here it is complicated with the irony of Thoas praying for the same result.

**1222–33** The tetrameters spoken by Iph. alone fall neatly into three groups of four lines each. In the first section, she reacts to the emergence of Orestes and Pylades from the temple. The second section forms a proclamation to the populace, and the third is a prayer to Artemis.

**1222–5** The attendants lead Orestes and Pylades, once more bound, out of the temple, and Iph. describes the other components of the procession to the seashore – it was clearly spectacular.

**θεᾶς κόσμους:** it was very common for divine statues, especially of female deities, to wear clothes and jewellery, which would be removed if the statue was washed – as was done in Athens with the statue of Athena Polias at the annual observance of the Plynteria (Plut. *Alc.* 34.1). Presumably Iph. imagines washing and purifying the jewellery and substituting new clothes.

**νεογνούς τ' ἄρνας:** lambs for slaughter. As well as the application of water and other substances, purification normally included the killing of an animal (in our sources more often of a piglet than a new lamb), for the reason that Iph. states: to wash off spilt blood (φόνος) with blood. Heraclitus mocks the practice ('as though cleaning off mud with mud', D-K 22 B5), but there is a certain logic to the idea. The animal's blood is poured over the person to be purified, and as it is washed off it takes the impurity of the original bloodshed with it. The fullest description is that of the purification of Jason and Medea by Circe in Ap. Rhod. 4.693–720. This ritual should perhaps not be called sacrifice (Georgoudi 2017); it should certainly be distinguished from the normal style of sacrifice to the deity with which the purification of a sanctuary would end. See Parker 1983: 371–3, and for purification in general *ThesCRA* 11.1–35.

**σέλας τε λαμπάδων:** fire and fumigation were standard agents of purification (Parker 1983: 227). Torches are also particularly appropriate for Artemis, who is often shown carrying them (*LIMC* 11.1 pp. 654–62).

**τά τ' ἄλλ' ὅσα ... καθάρσια** 'all the other things I laid down for purifying the strangers and the goddess'. This might include water vessels and cathartic plants such as squill and buckthorn as well as the implements necessary for ritual slaughtering.

**1226–9** An attendant has been sent to announce that the citizens should remain at home (1209–12), but Iph. as leader of the purificatory procession makes her own announcement; there is a parallel for an 'announcer' preceding a murderer in the fourth-century law on purifications from Kyrene (*LSS* 115, Rh–Osb. 97, line 137). She addresses her command to three categories of people especially: to priests (on *πυλωρός* see 1153n.), because they more than other people must avoid pollution, as her language implies ('if any temple doorkeeper keeps his/her hands

holy for the gods'), and to those about to marry ('comes to join together a marriage') or give birth ('or is heavy with young'), because being about to pass through dangerous transitions they are especially vulnerable.

**ἐκποδῶν ... ἔχειν:** 'keep out of the way of'.

**1230–3** 'Maiden Lady, daughter of Zeus and Leto, if I cleanse these men's murder and we sacrifice where we should, you will live in a pure home and we shall be fortunate. I do not say the rest, but signal it to the gods, who know more, and to you, Goddess.' In her final four tetrameters (her final lines in the play, apart from reported speech), Iph. prays to the goddess she serves, as previously and more freely at the end of the preceding episode (1082–8). Although she is no longer addressing Thoas, the attendants, or the citizens, she is still within their hearing, and cannot say all that she wishes.

**1230–1 ἦν νίψω φόνον τῶνδε:** this condition may give some support to the idea that the ritual is not entirely a pretence, but has real purificatory force: see 1231n.

**1231 καὶ θύσωμεν ... δόμον:** The final hidden meaning in the scene. If the purification were performed as Iph. pretends, and if sacrifice took place where the Taurians think appropriate, the goddess would indeed inhabit (the Taurian version of) a pure home, but Iph.'s real meaning draws on the distinction between the barbarian temple with its bloody sacrifices and a sanctuary conforming to Greek notions of purity (cf. 1085–7).

Is there then any deeper significance to the purification ritual than a clever trick? It certainly makes sense that the image of Artemis is somehow purified by its removal to Attica and the cessation of human sacrifice, and a purification of Orestes is also hinted at, since it is only now that the final group of Erinyes will leave him (Wolff 1992: 317). But there is no indication that a regular purification rite is actually performed (see 1336n.), and Meinel (2015: 159–71) suggests that the non-existent purification may be aimed at equally non-existent pollution: there is to be no release from the moral guilt of matricide, to which pollution is irrelevant. Although Euripides is (in this play and elsewhere) certainly ambivalent about the existence and operation of pollution, this seems an unduly pessimistic interpretation. It may be simply that the idea of purification is in keeping with the move from sinister Taurike to proper, civilised Greece.

**1232–3** It was normal to speak one's prayer out loud, and silent prayer is substituted only when particularly fearsome deities are being addressed or when, as here, it is important to conceal the prayer from others present. Other tragic examples are Klytaimestra in Soph. *El.* 657–8 and Orestes in E. *El.* 808–9.

## 1234-83 THIRD STASIMON

At the end of the preceding scene, Iph., Orestes, Pylades, and the whole procession leave the stage in the direction of the shore, while Thoas enters the temple in order to perform the purification there. The chorus are left alone on stage.

*str.* The chorus acclaim Apollo, mentioning his birth on Delos and immediate transportation to Delphi in his mother's arms, where, still an infant, he killed a huge snake, took possession of the oracle, and began issuing his infallible prophecies.

*ant.* Earth was angry because her daughter Themis had been dispossessed of the oracle. She therefore produced prophetic dreams in order to compete with it, whereupon the child Apollo complained to Zeus. Zeus, delighted by his son, made dreams unreliable, and Apollo's oracle remains supreme.

The play's final choral ode is a narrative hymn to Apollo, the praise of the god possibly linking to the festival dances evoked at the end of the preceding stasimon (1144-51). No attempt is made within its text to link it to the play's action, and in this it goes further even than the 'Mountain Mother' ode of *Helen* (1301-68), which supplies a link at its conclusion, even though the claim that Helen's sufferings were due to her neglect of the Mother's worship is not backed up elsewhere in the play. Dramatically, however, it makes sense for the chorus to sing a hymn at this crucial point, though one might perhaps expect them to follow Iph.'s lead and address an appeal to Artemis rather than to hymn Apollo. Instead the ode acts as a vindication of the prophetic god, whose competence and/or benevolence have been repeatedly called into question by Orestes, but who now appears to have been right all along. Further, the story contrasts the reliability of Apollo's oracles with the uncertainty of dreams, thus providing a reflexion on Iph.'s misleading dream. At 569, Iph. had rejected the truthfulness of her dream, and in the following lines Orestes was equally dismissive of οἱ σοφοὶ γε δαίμονες κεκλημένοι, clearly having Apollo's oracle in mind. The story appears to disjoin the two, attributing true prophecy to Apollo and the opposite to earthborn dreams. Yet the plot has shown that it is not so simple. While the oracle given to Orestes may have seemed delusory, but in fact had a purpose and direction beyond what any human could have divined, neither was Iph.'s dream completely false, though it was difficult to understand.

The story of Apollo acquiring the oracle at Delphi had many versions, in several of which the oracle was in existence before Apollo took it over. The opening lines of Aesch. *Eum.*, spoken by the Pythia, relate that the first owner of the oracle was Earth, who gave it to her daughter Themis, who passed it willingly to the Titan Phoibe, who finally gave it as a birthday gift to Apollo. The emphasis on the voluntary nature of these transactions, combined with the existence of versions such as the present, strongly suggests that Aeschylus is rebutting an already existing story of Apollo's violent usurpation of the oracle. Both versions have more to do with mythological structures in which the Olympians succeed to the older gods, and the current world-order to something more chaotic, than to any real-world historical development of the oracle (Sourvinou-Inwood 1991: 217–43). Gaia and Themis were, however, both worshipped at Delphi, as Aeschylus' Pythia implies (Stafford 1997). Euripides' choice of the more conflict-ridden story suggests not only the vindication of Apollo, as a god who is truthful and can easily achieve whatever he wants, but also the victory of the male-dominated Olympian gods over older female divinities, a theme which resonates both with gender polarities and with the contrast between 'barbarism' and civilisation which the play more generally explores.

The killing of the large snake (Python, Delphyne(s)) is central to Delphian myth, and the rotting of its body was said to be the origin of the name Pytho for Delphi (πύθω, 'cause to rot', *Hom. Hymn Apollo* 370–1). Euripides' version is different from the earliest telling, in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (300–74), where an apparently mature Apollo kills a female serpent (δράκωνα). The Delphic paian of Alcaeus, at least in Himerius' paraphrase, did not mention a snake at all (fr. 307c L–P). In the next literary attestation, Simonides 68 (*PMG* 573), it is a male δράκων which Apollo kills. Meanwhile a visual depiction of the first half of the fifth century (*LIMC* Apollon 993) already shows Euripides' version of the baby Apollo in his mother's arms shooting the serpent, an innovation which may be due to Simonides, although this is not clear from the testimony. Also relevant to Euripides is Pindar fr. 55 Maehler, in which Earth seeks vengeance on Apollo for the snake's death. Further discussion with sources in Ogden 2013: 40–8; see also Fontenrose 1959.

### *Metre*

The song displays a mixture of metrical styles, with aeolo-choriambic elements predominating, thus providing a link with the almost pure

aeolo-choriambic of the preceding stasimon. The aeolo-choriambic cola incorporate a few iambic metra. There is also a significant amount of dactylo-epitrite and possibly some enoplian cola. There is perhaps even more ambiguity than usual in the analysis of some parts of the ode, not helped by textual uncertainty. What is clear is that this is a virtuoso and complex piece, which may have been designed to evoke the hymns of straightforwardly religious contexts.

1234	--υ--υ~	ia cr
1259	υ-υ--υ-	ia cr
1235	-υυ-υυ-υυ-υυ-	D D (2 hemiepes)
1260	-υυ-υυ<-υ>υ-υυ-	D D
1236	υ-υ-υυ-	hept
1261	--υ-υυ~	hept
1237-8	-υυ-υυ-υυ--	4 da
1262-3	-υυ-υυ-υυ--	4 da
1239	-υυ-υυ-υυ--	4 da
1264	-υυ-υυ-υυ-υ~	4 da
1240	υυ-υυ-υυ-	enopl?
1265	υυ-υυ-υυ-	enopl?
1241	υ-υ-υυ-υ-	enneasyll
1266	υ-υ-υυ-υ-	enneasyll
1242	-υ---υυ-	wil
1267	-υ---υυ-	wil
1243	-----υυ-	wil
1268	-----υυ-	wil
1244	---υ-υυ-	wil
1269	---υ-υυ-	wil
1245	υυ-υυ-υ-υ-υ-	tel ia (or diom cr?)
1270	υυ-υυ-υ-υ-υ-	tel ia (or diom cr?)



1246	υ υ - υ υ - υ - - - υ -	tel ia (or diom cr?)
1271	υ υ - υ υ - υ - υ - υ -	tel ia (or diom cr?)
1247-8	- υ - υ - υ υ - υ υ - - - υ -	e υ D - e
1272-3	- υ - υ - υ υ - υ υ - - - υ -	e υ D - e
1249	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ -	2 ia
1274	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ -	2 ia
1250	υ υ - υ υ - υ - υ - -	tel ba
1275	υ υ - υ υ - υ - υ - -	tel ba
1251-2	υ υ υ - - υ - - - υ υ - υ υ -	e e - D
1276-7	υ υ υ - - υ - - - υ υ - υ υ -	e e - D
1253-4	υ υ υ - υ υ - - - υ - - - - υ -	dod B 2 ia
1278-9	υ υ υ - υ υ - - - υ - - - - υ -	dod B 2 ia
1255	- - - υ - - υ - υ -	mol ba ia
1280	- - - υ - - υ - υ -	mol ba ia
1257	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - - - υ -	enopl? ia
1281	υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - - - υ -	enopl? ia
1258	- υ - υ - -	ithy
1282	- υ - υ - -	ithy

**1234 εὔπαις:** compounds in -παις more usually refer to the parent ('having a good (etc.) child'), but Euripides sometimes uses them to refer to the offspring ('being a good child'), e.g. *Alc.* 904-6, κόρος ... μονόπαις; *Or.* 964, Περσέφασσα καλλίπαις θεά; and very close to the present passage *HF* 689, τὸν Λατοῦς εὔπαιδα γόνον; the reference there to Delian women singing paians may suggest that this phrase echoes a traditional paian for Apollo (see Bond's note *ad loc.*).

**1235-6** '... whom once she bore in the fruitful valleys of Delos'. The subject, Leto, is easily supplied from the previous line. For Apollo's birth on Delos, here recalling themes of the preceding stasimon, see 1098-9n. Delos is in fact a notably barren island, but in imaginative geography it is characterised by the group of trees at Apollo's actual birthplace (see 1099-1102n.), identified with the 'gardens of Zeus' at *Ion* 922.

**1236 χρυσοκόμαν:** though other deities are sometimes said to have golden hair, the feature is most characteristic of Apollo, whose hair is both golden and uncut, marking him out as ever young. Cf. *Suppl.* 975, *Tro.* 254, *Ion* 887–8 for the golden colour, and for Apollo ἀκερσεκόμης *Il.* 20.39, *Hom. Hymn Apollo* 134.

**1237–9** In hymnic style, the deity's most familiar characteristics are mentioned: his (long) golden hair, and his particular associations with music, especially that of the lyre, and with archery. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* the god himself claims these as his special interests, along with divination: εἴη μοι κίθαρίς τε φίλη καὶ καμπύλα τόξα | χρήσω δ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν (*Hom. Hymn Apollo* 131–2). Here, divination is held back because Apollo's acquisition of the oracular shrine of Delphi and its unrivalled supremacy is the main subject of the ode.

**1238 ὄστ':** ὄστε is sometimes used as equivalent to ὅς in tragic lyric: examples in Diggle 1994: 325. Here it is Burges' emendation for the manuscript reading ἄ τε (fem. sg.), which would refer to Leto's other child Artemis. A reference to Artemis is not out of place in a hymn to Apollo, but there seems no point in characterising Artemis as 'delighting in the bow' in distinction to Apollo's 'skilled at the lyre', when Apollo is associated with both.

**1239–44** 'She carried her child away from the seagirt ridge, leaving the famed place of her labour, to the mother of abundant waters, the peak of Parnassos, which joins in bacchic revel with Dionysos.' Like the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the narrative moves from Apollo's birth on Delos to his arrival at Delphi and the establishment of his oracle and cult honours there. Unlike the *Hymn*, however, Euripides represents Apollo as still an infant at this point.

**ἴνιν:** a poetic word for offspring, used by all three tragedians but only in lyric.

**δαιράδος:** properly a mountain ridge, δειράς here stands for the rocky island of Delos, dominated by Mt Kynthos.

**λοχεῖα:** neut. pl., 'things connected with childbirth', here the place where the birth happened.

**1241–2** For the simple accusative, without preposition, following a verb of motion (a poetic usage) see Smyth §1588.

**1242 ματέρ' ἄστακτων ὑδάτων:** Mt Parnassos is personified as the origin of torrents of water (ἄστακτος, 'not [merely] dripping', cf. ἄστακτί, 'in floods [of tears]', *Soph. OC* 1251, 1646).

L's reading is problematic both metrically and in sense. In particular the genitives, which are left loosely dependent on κορυφάν, are awkward, and it seems likely that the mention of 'mother' suggested Leto herself to some reader and thus in part gave rise to the corruption.

**1243 συμβακχεύουσαν Διονύσωι:** personification continues as the mountain is said to join in the Dionysiac ritual with the god himself. Euripides reused the idea at *Bacch.* 726, πᾶν δὲ συνεβάκχευ' ὄρος. Even if much of our evidence for Dionysos at Delphi comes from Plutarch in a much later period, it is still clear from fifth-century sources that Dionysos was at home there: Aesch. *Eum.* 24–6, Soph. *Ant.* 1126–30, E. *Ion* 550, 714–18. See Clay 1996.

**1244 Παρνάσιον:** two-termination adjective qualifying κορυφάν.

**1245–8** 'Where a huge wine-coloured snake with spotted back, bronze-plated in the shadowy, leafy laurel, a vast monster of the earth, frequented the earthy oracle.' For the tradition of Apollo killing the snake at Delphi and taking possession of the oracle, see 1234–83n. Euripides' account emphasises the connexion of the snake with the earth (1247n.) and its possession or guardianship of the pre-existing oracle.

**ποικιλόντως οἶνωπός ... κατάχαλκος:** the adjectives all relate to the snake's appearance. Its back (νῶτον) has patches of different colour or appearance, but although οἶνωπός is traditional (cf. Homeric οἶνοπα πόντον, from the alternative form οἶνοψ), it is more difficult to grasp its semantic range, as with most descriptions of colour and associated phenomena; in different texts it seems to refer to a dark or a reddish colour, and Irwin 1974: 202 is probably right in suggesting a meaning 'dark and gleaming' or 'dark with highlights'. The second part of the compound (from ὄψ, gen. ὀπός) is sometimes used with its literal force of 'face, eye', which may be the case here; the serpent's dark, glinting eyes would fit the context well, and perhaps suggest an etymologising play on δράκων and δέρκομαι.

**κατάχαλκος** 'covered all over with bronze' is normally used to describe armies and the like (cf. *Heracl.* 376, *Phoen.* 110). If it is the correct reading here, it is a bold and striking metaphor likening the snake/dragon's scales to bronze armour and shields, shiny and overlapping. A commonly accepted emendation is Burges' κάτεχ' ἄλσος, with change of εὐφύλλωι to εὐφυλλον: '[the] snake occupied the leafy grove with its shade-giving laurel'. This further necessitates the addition of τε after ἄμφεπε.

**1246 σκιερᾷ ... εὐφύλλωι δάφναι:** the datives have locative force; the sinisterly gleaming dragon lurks in the dark foliage of the laurel grove.

**1247 γὰρ πελώριον τέρας:** snakes of all sorts are thought of as 'chthonic' creatures, and in mythology the earth typically produces giants and monsters. A huge snake therefore must originate from the earth, the more so in this case because, as the audience may know and as is made clear in the antistrophe, the oracle has heretofore belonged to Earth (Gaia) and her immediate family (see 1234–83n.). In this version, the snake/dragon is the guardian which Apollo must kill in order to take possession of the oracle.

**1248 ἄμφεπε μαντεῖον χθονός:** the metre of 1247 is evidently dactylo-epitrite, but the line as given in L does not correspond metrically to 1272–3 in the antistrophe. There, the textual and metrical problems can be relatively easily cleared up by (a) inverting L's θεᾶς μῆνιν to μῆνιν θεᾶς, and (b) relocating L's νυχίους [τ'] ἐνοπᾶς to 1277, where δονείρους can be assumed to be a gloss. If those changes are accepted, along with ἄμφεπε here rather than ἀμφέπει, the only remaining problem is χθόνιον, where ∪ – (or ∪ ∪) is required; the suggestion χθονός is a simple change. However, it is impossible to feel completely confident about either this line or the corresponding one in the antistrophe.

**1249–50** For the version in which it is the infant Apollo who kills the snake, see 1234–83n. Divine children often manifest their powers at a very young age, as does Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn* (127–32), seeming to grow up immediately and claiming the activities he will preside over; Hermes, in his hymn, shows his power and divinity while remaining like a baby in other respects.

**ἐτι βρέφος, ἐτι ...:** the repetition of ἐτι may be hymnic; cf. Ap. Rhod. 2.707, evoking a hymn to Apollo in which the oracle possession story is narrated and which probably alludes to this passage. But cf. also 233.

**1251 θρώσκων:** literally, leaping; 'frolicking' (Cropp, Kovacs).

**1253–8** 'And you are seated on a golden tripod, on your throne free from all deception, dealing out to mortals oracles of divine decrees, from down in the inmost shrine, a neighbour to the streams of Kastalia, and possessing as your dwelling the centre of the earth.' The mythological narrative moves suddenly to the present: the child Apollo killed the snake and has sat on the tripod ever since.

**1253–4 τρίποδι τ' ἐν χρυσέῳ:** Apollo sits on the tripod also at *Or.* 956 (cf. 164, 329, and Aesch. *Eum.* 18), as his priestess the Pythia did, or was believed to do, in actuality (*Ion* 91–3, Aesch. *Eum.* 29, *LIMC* Aigeus 1); there is thus a homology between them, and it is his words that she delivers. The tripod is golden as befits a deity, but especially Apollo: Callim. *Hymn* 2.32–4 explains that every item of Apollo's dress and accoutrements is of gold, πολύχρυσος γὰρ Ἀπόλλων. The ∪ of χρυσέῳ is here short, as sometimes elsewhere in lyric.

**ἐν ἀψευδεῖ θρόνῳ:** the tripod, or perhaps the whole *adyton* as Apollo's 'seat' (cf. ἔδρα, 968n.), is called a θρόνος also in Aesch. *Eum.* 18, 29. ἀψευδής ('undeceiving') is a word very commonly applied to divine or divinely inspired prophecy. Here it has a special point, since the song vindicates Apollo's truthfulness against Orestes' earlier doubts.

**1255 μαντείας ... θεσφάτων:** θέσφατα are literally 'things spoken by a god', hence divine ordinances, things that must and will happen. Stories of oracles sometimes partly elide the difference between prediction

and causation (does the oracular god also decide upon, or bring about, the events that he predicts?), but here it seems clear that – rather more helpfully (cf. 1281–2) – Apollo's job is to reveal to mortals what has been independently decreed, presumably by Zeus. This picture suits the co-operative relationship between father and son which is depicted in the antistrophe.

**1256 ἀδύτων ὕπο:** an ἄδυτον or inner sanctum is literally that into which one does not go down (from ἀ- and δύω). The *adyton* at Delphi could be entered only on the few days of the year appointed for consultation, and only by the Pythia (inquirers were probably positioned just outside). It was therefore the place from which prophecies were said to issue. The primary meaning of ὑπό with genitive is 'from beneath'; unlike some sanctuaries, where *adyton* designates simply the inmost, holiest part of the temple, in Delphi it was literally lower than the other parts.

**Κασταλίας ῥεῖθρον:** the spring of Kastalia is situated a little way outside the sanctuary of Apollo, and its water was used for purification (*Ion* 95–7, 146–9). In the *Homeric Hymn* (300–1), it is beside a spring, presumably Kastalia, that Apollo kills the δρᾶκαινα.

**1257–8 μέσον γᾶς ... μέλαθρον:** the Delphic ὀμφαλός or navel, a sacred stone in the *adyton*, was supposed to mark the centre of the earth.

**1259** For the role of Themis in the traditions about the early Delphic oracle, see 1234–83n.

**Γαῖαν:** adjective indicating parentage (here the mother; cf. 403–6n.), 'child of Earth'.

**1260 ἀπενάσσατο:** the subject is Apollo. The verb ἀποναιῶ (from ναιῶ, '[make to] dwell') means to drive away an inhabitant. As such, it is transitive, and one might expect an active form, which some editors produce by emendation and supplement. The metre shows that three syllables (– – ∪) have fallen out, perhaps supplying the subject (Λατῶιος?). Alternatively, Hermann's Πυθῶνος (genitive depending on ζαθέων χρηστηρίων) would give a more explicit link with the strophe.

**1261–3** Dreams are sometimes said to come from Zeus (e.g. *Il.* 1.63, 2.1–34), but an origin from Earth is suggested for instance in *Hec.* 70–1, and by the idea that sleeping directly on the earth is conducive to truthful dreams (1266–7n.). The suggestion here, probably Euripides' own invention, is that only at this point did Earth produce prophetic dreams (nothing is implied about ordinary, non-veridical dreams).

**Χθών:** synonymous with Gaia (1267).

**ἐτεκνῶσατο:** rather than create the dreams, in accordance with her usual practice, Earth gives birth to them, no doubt parthenogenically.

**1264 πόλεσιν μερόπων:** an adaptation of the Homeric πόλεις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, 'cities of mortal men' (e.g. *Il.* 18.342). μέροψ is a poetic word

of uncertain meaning applied to humans (see Silk 1983: 325); ‘cities’ may indicate simply people in their communities, but in historical times the oracle gave responses to cities as well as – perhaps more than – to individuals. Some editors print πολέσιν (the original reading of L before alteration by Triclinius), but the resulting meaning ‘to many among mortals’ is less apt (why not to all mortals?) and there is no good evidence for the use of the athematic plural forms of πολὺς/πολλός in tragedy.

**1264–5** τὰ τε πρῶτα τὰ τ’ ἔπειθ’, ἃ τ’ ἔμελλε τυχεῖν: prophecy deals not only with the future but can reveal what is hidden in the past and present as well. Thus Kalchas in *Il.* 1.70 knows τὰ τ’ ἔόντα τὰ τ’ ἐσσόμενα πρό τ’ ἔόντα, and this is probably the meaning here: ‘the first things, those which followed, and those which will come about’. L’s reading ὅσα τ’ ἔμελλε, which is unmetrical, is sometimes emended to ὅσ’ ἔμελλε rather than ἃ τ’ ἔμελλε. This would qualify τὰ τ’ ἔπειθ’ (‘and the things which follow, all those which will happen’), resulting in a twofold rather than threefold division of time, which (τὰ τ’ ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα) is found in contexts concerning prophecy at *Ion* 7, *Hel.* 14, 923.

**1266–7** ὕπνου κατὰ δνοφερὰς χαμεύνας ‘throughout the dark earth-beds of sleep’. χαμεύνας is an emendation for γᾶς εὐνάς (which probably results from a gloss), meaning a sleeping-place made directly on the earth. In those early times people followed a simpler lifestyle, but more importantly lying directly on the earth allowed a closer contact with the origin of dreams; thus in Pausanias’ time those who consulted the dream oracle of Amphiaraos at Oropos probably slept on the ground, wrapped in the skin of the animal they had sacrificed (Paus. 1.34.5); the prophetic Selloi of Dodona were also said to sleep on the earth (*Il.* 16.234–5).

**1267–9** ‘Gaia took away from Phoibos the esteem of the oracles, in resentment for her daughter.’

τιμάν: not Apollo’s oracular office, since Earth does nothing to prevent Apollo directly from delivering his oracular responses in Themis’ former domain; rather, she devalues the uniqueness of the oracle by producing cheaper competition. There is no longer any need to go to Delphi, since knowledge of what is hidden is available free from any part of the earth.

φθόνῳ θυγατρὸς: normally a genitive depending on φθόνος refers either to envy felt by someone or envy felt towards someone. The meaning here ‘on behalf of her daughter’ seems to be unique, but is easily understood from the context. Lines 1259–60 have already provided a reminder that Themis, the former owner of the oracle, is the daughter of Earth.

**1270–3** ‘Swiftfoot rushing to Olympos, the lord wound his infant hand from (round) Zeus’s throne, to take away the goddess’ earthy wrath from the Pythian halls.’ The rhythm, opening with short syllables and

contrasting with the preceding lines, may suggest the speed of Apollo's movement and the new direction in the narrative.

**ἄναξ χέρα παιδνόν:** the combination continues to play with the paradox of the divine child, as does the strophe (1249–50n.).

**1271 ἔλιξεν ἐκ Διὸς θρόνων:** the gesture is one of supplication, with the throne substituted for a part of Zeus's body. ἐκ seems to add to the idea of the child Apollo winding his hand around the throne legs a picture of him clinging to (hanging from) the throne.

**1273 ἀφελῆν:** infinitive because the preceding words carry the suggestion of a request: 'he asked Zeus to ...'

**χθονίαν ... μῆνιν:** more prosaically, 'the anger of [the] Earth [goddess]', with χθονίαν as transferred epithet. For the text, see 1248n.

**1274 γέλασε:** the subject is Zeus. Zeus laughs as a father delighted by his child's precocity. The atmosphere evoked is similar to that in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, which ends with Zeus and Apollo laughing at the baby god's tricks. Sourvinou-Inwood (1991: 231) observes that here the father-son relationship is implicitly compared with the mother-daughter pair of Gaia and Themis, and found superior.

**1275 πολύχρυσα ... λατρεύματα:** suitably for a child, Apollo is eager not so much to receive the intangible honour that possession of the oracle conveys, still less to help his worshippers, as to receive the rich, shiny offerings that visitors to the oracle will bring once it recovers its monopoly on prophecy. λατρεύματα are properly 'services', hence 'worship'; and hence by an easily understood extension, the fees and gifts given in worship.

**1276 ἐπὶ δὲ σείσας κόμαν:** this gesture of assent recalls the famous scene in the *Iliad* where Zeus nods in response to Thetis' request (1.524–30). A simple nod suffices for Zeus to put an end to the 'utterances of night'. νυχίους ἔνοπας is restored to the text here from its transmitted position at 1272, where it fits poorly with Πυθίων δόμων and creates severe problems for the metrical respension.

**1278–9** '... and stole away from mortals the nocturnal truthfulness'. Zeus did not, presumably, even in this account, put an end to all prophetic night visions, but mixed them up with ordinary, untrue dreams and also made them hard to interpret, as demonstrated by Iph.'s misunderstanding of her prophetic dream.

**ὑπὸ ... ἐξέτλεν:** \*tmesis. The ὑπο- prefix implies an element of secrecy or underhandedness.

**ἀλαθοσύναν:** the transmitted λαθοσύναν 'forgetfulness' makes little sense in context.

**1280–2** 'And he restored his honours to Loxias, and, at his seat thronged with strangers, confidence to mortals in the songs of divine pronouncements.' The song thus ends with Zeus upholding his son's place

at Delphi and an assertion of the oracle's reliability. With this version of the text, L's δ' in line 1281 must be altered to τ', so that τιμάς ... Λοξίαι is balanced by θάρση βροτοῖς, both being objects of θῆκε. Nauck's proposal to read πολυάνορι δ' ἐν ξενόεντι θρόνῳ θάσσει βροτοῖς θεσφάτων αἰοιδός ('and the singer of prophecies sits on his throne ...') has found some favour, but involves an awkward unexpressed change of subject from Zeus to Apollo.

**1280 τιμάς:** by contrast with 1268, τιμαί here must indicate cult honours. Apollo's worship had fallen out of use because of the successful competition of the dreams sent by Earth, and now it resumes.

**Λοξίαι:** cf. 1084–5n. In narrating Apollo's re-establishment at Delphi, Euripides gives him the name most closely associated with his function there as prophetic god.

**1281–2 πολυάνορι δ' ἐν ξενόεντι θρόνῳ:** for θρόνος, see 1253–4n. Alongside Olympia, Delphi was pre-eminent among panhellenic sanctuaries, and the description of it as full of strangers must be accurate. The oracle's numerous clients are evidence of the esteem in which Apollo is held.

## 1284–1499 EXODOS

After the third stasimon, the play's final section falls into two main parts, the first comprising the arrival of the Messenger, his exchange first with the chorus and then with Thoas, and his narrative of the attempted escape; the second consists of the appearance of Athena *ex machina*, giving commands to the main characters, the brief capitulation of Thoas, and the choral anapaestic conclusion. The tension is gradually increased, as through the Messenger's narrative we see in some detail the preparations for escape and then learn that this seems certain to be thwarted, before Athena's intervention prevents disaster and in quieter mood reveals what must happen in the future.

**1284–1326** *Entry of second Messenger and preliminaries to his narrative.* The lead-in to the Messenger's speech is longer and more exciting than usual, as it exposes the gap in trust between the Messenger, who like the Herdsman in the first episode is strongly if not individually characterised as a loyal Taurian, and the chorus, who are allies of Iph. He ignores the chorus on entry, calling instead to the male Taurian helpers and servants in the temple; equally, instead of giving his narrative as usual to the first group he finds on stage, he waits for the arrival of Thoas, underlining the mistrust between Taurian men and Greek women. Meanwhile the chorus have intensified this mistrust by their attempt to influence the action in the manner of *Choephori* (770–3), by giving a false message; their story is not good enough, and the attempt fails. They are thus represented



as deceitful, so conforming to stereotypes of women (ὁρᾷτ' ἄπιστον ὡς γυναικεῖον γένος, 1298), but their attempt at deception is practised in a good cause. Their Greekness, identified with civilisation and humanity, trumps gender distinction here. It is clear that the Messenger and Thoas, when he enters, do not deserve audience sympathy.

**1284** The Messenger, one of the attendants deputed to accompany the purification group (1208), enters in haste, calling to the Taurian temple personnel (ναοφύλακες, cf. 1027n.) inside the building.

**1285–7** 'Open the well-joined doors and call the ruler of the land out of these halls.' The Messenger first asks the king's whereabouts, then correctly supposes that he is still in the temple, which he entered via the *skēnē* door at the end of the previous episode.

**1288** **μὴ κελευσθεῖσαν**: concessive ('even without being told to') and diffident, because on his entry the Messenger has ignored the chorus.

**1289–92** The four-line reply summarises the escape attempt which will be the subject of the narrative to Thoas, making it clear that the fugitives' plot has been discovered, but not yet their extreme danger caused by the adverse winds.

**1289** **δίπτυχοι**: cf. 242 and n.

**1290** Almost a three-word trimeter, which together with the somewhat grandiose adjective Ἀγαμεμνονείας (170n.) and, as often to accommodate proper names, anapaestic opening (the first foot scans ∪ ∪ – ∪ –) gives the line a special emphasis. Iph.'s treachery is at the heart of the Messenger's news.

**1291** **φεύγοντες**: present tense, because they are still in flight; the Messenger makes it clear at the end of his speech (1411–13) that there is a good chance of preventing the escape.

**1292** **Ἑλλάδος**: adjectival with νεώς (cf. 1345). The Taurians were previously unaware of Orestes' ship, the first sight of which will be vividly described at 1345–53.

**κόλποισιν**: the ship's hold is like the hollow of a lap or a fold in a garment.

**1293** **ἄπιστον** expresses wonder and/or disbelief (cf. 328 and 328–9n.). The chorus are dissembling.

**1293–4** 'The one you want to see, the ruler of the land, has gone, having rushed out of the temple.' ἀνοκτα is attracted into the case of the relative ὅν. The chorus, loyal to Iph., go further than their promise to her (1075–7); not only are they silent about the escape plan, but they attempt to send the Messenger off on a false trail, thus playing for time by preventing Thoas from finding out what has happened.

**1296–7** 'We don't know – but go after him and wherever you find him announce these words.' διώκω here contains the idea of pursuit to a

place: ‘pursue him [to] whichever [place] where, coming upon him, you will announce ...’

**ἀπαγγελεῖς** is future indicative used as imperative (jussive future, Smyth §1917). The chorus’ failure to specify a direction in which the king departed rouses the Messenger’s suspicions.

**1298** The untrustworthiness of women is a favourite topos in tragedy and elsewhere (e.g. *Od.* 11.427–8, 456, *E. Med.* 421–2), so this is familiar ground. From another point of view, though, the audience may recall Iph.’s more positive picture of women’s solidarity (1061–2), a feature of many Euripidean tragedies, however it is evaluated. In this case the direction is clearly to support Iph. and the chorus against the Taurians (see above, 1153–1233n.).

**ἄπιστον** is used in a different sense from the chorus’ comment five lines previously (1293), and perhaps counters it (‘you are the ones really unworthy of belief/trust’).

**1300** ‘You’re crazy. What do we have to do with the strangers’ flight?’ **μέτα** is equivalent to **μέτεστι** (LSJ F): ‘what share is there for us of/in ...’

**1301** Rather belatedly, the Chorus-leader suggests a plausible direction in which the king might have gone: **κρατούντων πρὸς πύλας**, ‘to the doors of those in power’ = to the palace.

**οὐκ εἴ**, another jussive future (cf. 1297 and n.), in the commoner negative form (‘won’t you go ...’; Smyth §1918).

**1302–3** ‘Not before an interpreter has said this – whether the ruler of the land is inside or not.’ **ἐρμηνεύς** is unexpected, but the Messenger may be drawing an implicit contrast with the unreliability of the women’s report: ‘not until I get a clear answer’ from one of the temple officials.

**1304** The Messenger bangs on the *skēnē* doors and shouts to those inside (cf. 1308). Such behaviour is more frequent in comedy than tragedy, but is not necessarily comic in itself: see Brown in Gōdde and Heinze 2000: 1–16.

**χαλᾶτε κληῖθρα** ‘loosen the bolts’. The door is secured from the inside.

**1306** ‘... announcing a new cargo of troubles’. The nautical metaphor is particularly suitable for the narrative about to be introduced.

**1307–8** Rather than eliciting a reply from the attendants, the Messenger’s cries and thumps cause Thoas himself to come out from the temple, indignant at the disturbance.

**1309** The text of the line opening is uncertain, but it must either state or imply that the chorus were lying in their report of Thoas’ whereabouts. The manuscript has, unmetrically, **ψευδῶς ἔλεγον αἶδε**. England suggests that **ἔφασκον** with a hint of false allegation could have given rise to **ψευδῶς ἔλεγον** as a gloss, which then displaced the original.

**μ’ ἀπήλαυνον** ‘they tried to drive me away from ...’

1310 ἄρα: 351n.

1312 αὐθις ‘later on’ (cf. 377, 1432). The Messenger draws a contrast between the non-urgent matter of the chorus’ complicity (τὰ τῶνδε, ‘matters to do with these women’) and the immediate need to prevent the escape of the Greeks and the theft of the statue.

ἐν ποσὶ: a common phrase for a matter of immediate importance.

1312–16 Previously, to the women of the chorus, the Messenger had centred his report on the two young men, though recognising Iph.’s crucial role. Now, for Thoas’ benefit, he makes Iph.’s disappearance central and her deceit the crowning explanation (δόλια δ’ ἦν καθάρματα).

1316 Since καθάρματα means both ‘purifications’ and the ‘impurities’ removed in the action, and hence ‘worthless people’, there is a possible double meaning here. The purification was a trick, but the scumbags who pretended to perform it were also deceitful.

1317 ‘What made her do that?’ (lit. ‘having what breeze of circumstance/misfortune?’). πνεῦμα suggests a change in events.

1318 σωίζουσ’: \*conative, ‘trying to save’.

1319 To avoid tedious explanations, Thoas must recognise the name and the relationship. He could have heard it from Iph. herself, for whom he appears to have a great deal of respect.

Τυνδαρις ... κόρη: cf. 5, 806.

τίκτει: for the tense, cf. 23n.

1320 ‘The one whom she had consecrated to the goddess at these altars.’

καθωσιώσατο (cf. Ar. *Wealth* 661, a paratragic line), uniquely in the middle form, must here indicate the intention to sacrifice rather than the performance of the preliminary ritual. (With the manuscript reading θεά, the meaning is ‘whom the goddess had consecrated’, but even with the middle this seems much less natural; there is no parallel for consecration *by* a deity.)

1321 ‘O marvel! How may I rightly (τύχω, succeed in) call her something greater?’ (‘What greater thing can I rightly call her?’) The king picks up the Messenger’s statement that he ‘will be amazed’ (θαυμάσει, 1318). He searches in vain for a more forceful expression. σφε is an emendation for σε (Diggle 1981: 91), referring to Iph., who has been mentioned by implication in the previous line (reading θεάι, so that the priestess is the subject of καθωσιώσατο). This is preferable to either a direct address to Iph. or making σε refer in effect to a set of facts, the Messenger’s revelation of the true state of affairs.

1322–4 The Messenger shows a practical side, as his sense of urgency reasserts itself. His address to the king is almost peremptory.

1323–4 ‘When you have clearly reflected and heard (\**hysteron proteron*), devise a pursuit which will hunt down the strangers.’

**1325–6** ‘For it is no short (‘near-sailing’) crossing that they are fleeing, so as to escape my ship/spear.’ Thoas is confident (rightly, it seems, apart from Athena’s intervention) that the Greeks will not be able to escape, and hence there is time to hear the Messenger’s narration and plan more accurately in response to it. This intensifies the suspense. On another level, there may be an element of metatheatre here, as Euripides draws attention to the conventional long narrative given by messengers.

**δόρυ:** while the commonest meaning is ‘spear’, the word in that context properly refers to the shaft of the spear, since its basic meaning is a piece of wood. In other contexts, it refers to a ship’s mast, and hence \*metonymically to the ship itself (LSJ I.2), which may be what is intended here.

**1327–1419** *Speech of the second Messenger.* Already we have seen that like the Herdsman, the second Messenger, one of the king’s servants, is characterised as a loyal Taurian bent on the capture and death of foreigners. His narrative is detailed and vivid, involving not merely observation but action performed by himself and by his companions; again like the Herdsman, he describes a hostile encounter between his own party and that of Orestes, in which the Greeks show superior strength and courage, a flattering message for the audience despite the narrator’s opposing sympathies. His implicit aim is partly to justify himself and his fellows for allowing the escape to happen, and partly to urge Thoas to action (explicit at the speech’s conclusion (1411–19)). However, his overt pro-Taurian stance gradually gives way to a more neutral narrative which allows secondary focalisation (see 260–339n.) provided by the direct speech from the Greek side (1361–3, 1386–9, 1398–1402); this continues until he reaches the point of his own mission to the king (1409). For the audience, fear and suspense continue as they are led to contemplate the various points in the narrative when the escape might have been made good. They are therefore aligned with the chorus (who respond directly after the speech, at 1420–1) against the barbarian king.

Unusually among messenger speeches, but like the closely parallel speech in *Helen* (1526–1618), the dominant mode is that of ‘narrating focalisation’ (De Jong 1991: 49–56), that is, the Messenger infuses hindsight into his account rather than letting the narration reflect his knowledge and feelings at the time (‘experiencing focalisation’, seen at 1345ff.). This reflects his indignant realisation that the Taurians have been deceived, and expands on his shorter summaries of events at 1289–92 and 1313–16.

**1328** Already the Messenger allows what he learns only during the course of the narrative to colour his description. Although he did not know it at the time, the presence of the ship was the real reason for approaching that part of the coast (cf. 1196).

**κρύφιος:** unusually two-termination, agreeing with ναῦς.

**1329–33** ἡμᾶς μέν ... αὐτῇ δ': the language emphasises the separation between Iph. and her Taurian escorts.

**1329** οὕς σὺ ... συμπέμπεις: the Messenger not so subtly indicates Thoas' own responsibility for the plan, and the fact that he himself was obeying orders.

**1330** ἐξένευσ': with the procession from the temple to the place of purification, the 'ritual' was already under way, and so the priestess observes silence, nodding towards the guards to indicate that they should stand at a distance (πρόσω).

**1331–2** 'because (on the grounds that) she was performing a secret sacrifice (sacrificing a secret flame) and the purification she was in quest of'. ἀπόρητον qualifies both φλόγα and καθαρμόν.

**θύουσα:** present participle with \*conative force, 'she intended to sacrifice ...'

**1334** The Messenger again seems to be speaking with hindsight. After all, if Iph. had indeed been about to perform a secret rite, there was nothing odd in her separation from the escorts; and see below, 1340–1n. But he may also wish to hint that he and his companions had been wise before the event, but prevented from acting on their suspicions by Thoas' orders. In the parallel passage from *Helen* (1549–52), the messenger is explicit that suspicion was felt at the time, but again not acted on because of the king's orders.

**1336** '... so that she might seem to us to be doing something further ...' Although there is some thematic appropriateness in the idea of purification (1230–1n.), the Messenger must be correct in his assumption that Iph.'s next actions were a blind to give the impression that she was engaged in ritual actions. Evidently overhearing some of the accompanying words and sounds did not infringe the ritual's secrecy (note εἰσορᾶν at 1342).

**1337** ἀνωλόλυξε: the ὀλολυγή was a high-pitched, trilling cry (ululation) typically made by women at sacrifices and in other religious and auspicious contexts. See Diggle 1994: 477–9, Pulleyn 1997: 178–81.

**1337–8** βάρβαρα μέλη: βάρβαρος is normally used by Taurian characters in this play to refer to their own country and culture (see 1170n.), but in this context, with μαγεύουσα ('playing the magician', always pejorative in tragedy), it seems to incorporate a derogatory description of the unintelligible syllables sometimes used in obscure and secretive ritual.

**1338** ὥς ... νίζουσα δῆ: δῆ with participle very frequently expresses irony or scepticism (Denniston 1954: 230).

**1340–1** ἐσῆλθεν ἡμᾶς μή: 'fear/suspicion came upon us that ...' The fact that the Taurians first think that the Greeks might have overpowered and killed Iph. shows that they do not yet suspect her complicity.

**1342** ‘We sat in silence, through fear of seeing what we should not.’ The infinitive εἰσορᾶν depends on the noun φόβος, as it would more regularly depend on a verb of fearing.

**1343** The unanimity here contrasts with the decision to act in the events narrated by the Herdsman, where it is merely the majority who decide (ἔδοξε ... τοῖς πλείοσι, 279).

**1345** A periphrastic expression, ‘a vessel of a Greek ship’, Ἑλλάς being used in its original adjectival sense (cf. 1292). The ship is characteristically Greek, it seems. For νεὼς σκάφος, cf. 742 and n.

**1346** Perhaps ‘[A ship] winged in regard to sweeping capacity with fitted oar[s]’, a very difficult phrase, which has been variously explained, emended, transposed, or deleted. If the line is to be retained here, ἐπτερωμένον must qualify σκάφος; πῖτυλον is accusative of respect, ‘winged as to its oars’ (for πῖτυλος = ‘oar’ cf. 1050) or perhaps rather ‘as to its motion-of-oars’; and κατήρει either should be changed to κατήρες to agree with σκάφος (‘fitted with oars, winged as to motion’) or accepted as applicable to the object fitted, beside the more usual idiom where it qualifies the larger object to which something in the dative is attached. Hermann attempted to solve the problems of 1395 by postulating that this line had somehow been moved from its original place immediately preceding the later line. A papyrus fragment (P. Oxy. 4565) seems to show the line already in its transmitted place here, but any transposition could well have been early. More serious is the inappropriateness of such an elaborate description in the later position, where it merely holds up the fast-paced action. It is much more appropriate here, expressing the surprise with which the Taurians first see the large and unexpected ship (‘experiencing focalisation’; see above, 1327–1419n.). Diggle (in his edition) considers deleting the line as an interpolation.

**1347–8** ‘... and fifty sailors holding their oars on the tholepins’. The ship is a penteconter (see 981–2, 1124 with nn.). A tholepin supports an oar and acts as a fulcrum for its rowing action; the sailors were therefore ready to depart. See Casson 1971: figs 99, 100.

**1348–52** ‘... and [we saw] the young men free from their bonds ... [words missing; the sailors] from the ship’s stern, standing, hastily passed the stern-cables through their hands, and [some] held the prow (steady) with poles, while some were fastening the anchor to its resting-places, and others let down ladders into the sea for the two strangers’. This is a difficult passage, best solved by Koechly as above, positing a lacuna equivalent to one line between ἐλευθέρους and πρύμνηθεν (1349), transposing 1352 to follow 1349, and reading ἐστῶτες for ἐστῶτας. In this way the whole of 1349b–1353 can refer to the sailors without the awkward unexpressed subject which would otherwise be necessary, and Orestes and Pylades are

more plausibly about to board but still at this point on shore with Iph. and the statue, allowing them later to attack the Taurians at close quarters (1366–71). See also 1353n., where further textual uncertainty casts some doubt on who is supposed to board via ladder(s) at this point. The alternative, retaining ἔστωτας and the transmitted order of the lines, requires the change of πρυμνήσια to πρύμνης τ' ἀπό at 1352 and probably κλίμακας to κλίμακα at 1351: '[we saw] the young men free from their bonds standing at(?) the ship's stern. Some (ellipse of οἱ μὲν) held the prow (steady) with poles, some fastened the anchor to its resting-places, while others hastily passed a ladder through their hands and from the stern let it down into the sea for the foreign woman' (reading τῇ ξένῃ). Aside from the difficulty of the missing subject of εἶχον, this makes πρύμνηθεν problematic (see following note), and puts Orestes and Pylades already on board. Morrison and Williams (1968: 201–2) thought it plausible that they would be on board at this stage to supervise departure, but while it might conceivably be possible for them to leap off later to attack the Taurians without this being spelled out by the narrator, could they realistically be represented as having embarked without first boarding Iph. and the statue?

**1349 πρύμνηθεν:** with the text as here printed, the sailors (or some of them) are standing *on* the stern, but more importantly they are passing the cables *from* the stern, explaining the -θεν suffix. With L's text, Orestes and Pylades are simply standing πρύμνηθεν while the sailors steady the ship with poles; but there is no evidence that the word can mean 'at the stern' or 'behind the stern' (in the latter case, they would be on land), as it would have to.

**1350 κοντοῖς ... εἶχον:** since the anchors have already been pulled up in preparation for departure, poles are stuck into the seabed to keep the ship steady.

**1350–1 ἐπωτίδων ἄγκυραν ἐξανῆπτον:** two anchors were normally used, so ἄγκυραν is singular for plural. When not in use, the anchors were hung from the ἐπωτίδες – 'outrigger cheeks', or ear-like beams forming part of the outrigger (a projecting structure holding the tholepins; see 1347–8n.). See Casson 1971: 86–7. ἐξανάπτω, like the commoner ἐξάπτω, means to hang or fasten something (acc.) from or to something else (gen.).

**1353 τοῖν ξένοι:** Orestes and Pylades are mentioned rather than Iph. because they are seen to be in charge of the escape attempt; it is not clear whether the Taurians yet understand Iph.'s role (but see following note). But some editors read τῇ ξένῃ, emended from L's τὴν ξένην; this reading is necessary if we believe that Orestes and Pylades are already on board ship while Iph. remains on land, however unlikely that may seem (see 1348–52n.). However, the reading of P, τὴν ξένοι, suggests otherwise;

both τὴν ξένοιον and τὴν ξένην are, at the date of these manuscripts, possible homophonic corruptions of τοῖν ξένοιον.

**1354 ἀφειδήσαντες:** ‘without holding back’ captures the ambiguity in the two senses of ἀφειδέω: the men not sparing their exertions, nor feeling any restraint in regard to Iph. δόλια τεχνήματα may suggest that they now realise that Iph. is not a victim but an accomplice of the two strangers.

**1356–7** ‘... and we took (? tried to take) the steering-oars out of the fine-sterned ship through the sockets’.

**ἐξηροῦμεν** may be \*conative. εὐθυντηρία is probably here a hole through which the steering-oar or rudder passes and which holds it in the correct place.

**οἶαξ** is properly the tiller (handle of the rudder), here used by \*synecdoche for the whole rudder. See on these Casson 1971: 224–8 and fig. 128.

**εὐπρύμνου:** a standard ornamental epithet for a ship, but appropriate here as the action takes place around the stern (De Jong 1991: 84–5).

**1358 λόγοι δ’ ἐχώρουν:** χωρέω is often used figuratively of words or beliefs. Here the phrase suggests the words passing swiftly from the Taurians to the Greeks.

**τίνι λόγῳ** ‘with what reason?’ or ‘what justification?’

**πορθμέετε:** 266n.

**1359 ξόανα ... θυηπόλους:** only one *xoanon* and one priestess are being removed, but the hyperbolic plural suggests indignation. For ξόανον as a word for the statue (uniquely here in this play, but cf. 111–12n.), see Donohue 1988, esp. 19–21. θυηπόλος = ‘sacrifice-performer’, of anyone who habitually performs religious functions, cf. *IA* 746, where it is used of Kalchas.

**1360 τίνος τίς ὦν <σύ>:** the address changes from the Greeks in general to Orestes in particular, with σύ sounding accusatory. The question ‘who are you, and who were your parents?’ is a standard one to strangers (see 473n.), but here it is almost merged with ‘what gives you the right ...?’

**ἀπεμπολαῖς** ‘sell’. The Taurians imply that Orestes is abducting Iph. with a view to selling her as a slave. The accounts of the abduction of women in *Hdt.* 1.1–5 show that this scenario could to some extent be blurred with that of women’s willing participation.

**1361–3** Although Orestes’ reply is a literal answer to the Taurian question, there is a strong sense of pride in his assertion of his identity, and his words are reminiscent of Odysseus’ boastful parting revelation of his name to Polyphemos at *Od.* 9.502–5, likewise from on board ship. He also asserts his superior right to Iph.: he is not ‘stealing’ her, but retrieving his own. Hence the middle voice of κομίζομαι (cf. 1473 and n.).

**1363 ἀπώλεσ’:** first person, ‘whom I had lost’.



**1365** The imperfect may be \*conative: ‘we were forcing her/we tried to force her to follow (us) towards you’.

**1366** τὰ is demonstrative: ‘whence these dreadful blows to (my) jaws’. The Messenger makes a display of his injuries to Thoas. It is unclear whether his mask would have shown signs of rough treatment such as bloodstains or bruises.

**1367–78** The description of the fight shows some similarity to the conflict between Greeks and Taurians described in the Herdsman’s speech. Both incidents pit Greek nobility and athleticism against Taurian savagery (the barbarians’ favoured technique is stone-throwing). But in this case the Greeks are not greatly outnumbered (although see 1369n.) and Orestes is not incapacitated by a fit of madness.

**1367–8** ‘They did not have iron in their hands, and neither did we.’ Orestes and Pylades had lost their swords when captured by the herdsman (331–2), but it is strange that the guards are not carrying arms. γάρ shows that this point is introduced to explain the blows mentioned in the previous line, and the speaker then describes the fist fight in more detail.

**1368–70** ‘But there were blows from fists, being struck (striking?) against (our bodies), and legs from both young men were being aimed at (our) ribs and livers.’

ἐγκροτούμεναι may have either passive or middle sense, describing the blows rather than forming a periphrastic imperfect with ἦσαν.

**1369** ἀπ’ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν νεανίαιν: it was primarily Orestes and Pylades who fought the Taurians at close quarters, and thus proved their superior strength and skill against larger numbers. The sailors come to their aid from the ship at 1377–8.

**1370** πρὸς ἥπαρ: that is, to the belly. The liver is often mentioned as a potential or actual source of injury, including metaphorical pain (e.g. Soph. Aj. 938, χωρεῖ πρὸς ἥπαρ ... γενναία δύη).

ἡκοντίζετο: their kicks were aimed like the hurling of a javelin.

**1371** ‘... so that our limbs were completely painful and exhausted’.

**1372–4** ‘and marked (‘sealed’) with terrible signs we fled to the cliff, some with bloody wounds to the head, others to the face/eyes’.

σημάντροισιν: properly seals marked with a device, these are here the bruises from the blows the Taurians had received. The metaphor is of stamping an image into wax with a seal.

**1375** εὐλαβεστέρως ‘more prudently’, ‘more cautiously’, though the unsympathetic audience may hear an excuse for cowardice here; the word εὐλάβεια was capable of acting as a cover for various types of bad behaviour (see Bond on HF 166). Though they must use whatever is to hand, the throwing of stones is scarcely heroic, and even so, they are forced back further by archery, itself a questionably heroic form of fighting.

**1378** ὥστ' ἀναστεῖλαι πρόσω 'so as to force [us] further back', aor. infin. in consecutive clause. Though πρόσω typically has the meaning 'forwards', here the notion of 'further away' is dominant, so that the Taurians are forced backwards away from the Greeks.

**1379–80** This κλύδων is the first indication of the wind which will afflict the ship at the harbour mouth. For the present it does no more than bring water over a previously dry area of the beach, but Iph.'s fear prefigures the very real danger to come. τῇ ξένῃ, used already by the Messenger for Iph. at 1353, is Kirchhoff's supplement for a gap in L, indicating damage in the manuscript from which Nikolaos Triklines was copying, almost certainly corresponding to the one-word gap at 1404. Other editors prefer Badham's παρθένωι, which would harmonise with the gradual shift in this passage from a clearly Taurian viewpoint to a more neutral narrative allowing the audience to empathise with the danger in which the fugitives find themselves.

**1381–5** Although Iph. has so far been the leader in the escape, she is now a helpless, fearful woman who must be helped by her brother, in line with her expectations at 774–8 (see 778n.). Torrance (2019: 75–6) suggests that her fear may be because she cannot swim. She later recovers her courage and authority when praying to Artemis (1397n.).

**1383** Like εὐπρύμνου (1357), the word εὐσέλμου is particularly appropriate in context, since Orestes must place his sister and the statue on the ship's σέλα – a deck at the stern where passengers would travel.

**1384** τὸ τ' οὐρανοῦ πέσημα: see 88n. πέσημα here = 'thing fallen'. Iph. is still holding the statue, so evoking a rather strange visual impression when Orestes hoists her on his shoulder.

**1386–9** The 'shout' is probably intended to suggest, without actually stating, a divine origin. The first-person verbs would then represent the deity taking the role of an anonymous sailor, or perhaps Orestes himself, in order to encourage the crew. The direct speech here and in Iph.'s subsequent prayer aids the 'secondary focalisation' in this part of the speech (see 1327–1419n.), in which the narrator's viewpoint recedes into the background and the audience is led to feel the tension of the moment from the Greek point of view.

**1386** The sailors are urged on with an explicitly patriotic appeal to their status as Greeks, escaping from a distant barbarian land (ἄξενον πόρον, 1388), in a manner reminiscent of the shout of the fleet at Salamis in Aesch. *Pers.* 401–2, ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων ἴτε, | ἐλευθεροῦτε πατρίδ' ..., also narrated by the non-Greek enemy.

**1387** 'Hold to your oar(s) and whiten the roaring sea.' A variation on the epic formula ἐξῆς δ' ἐζόμενοι πολιτὴν ἄλα τύπτον ἑρετμοῖς (e.g. *Od.* 9.104); still closer is 12.171–2, οἱ δ' ἐπ' ἑρετμά | ἐζόμενοι λεύκαινον ὕδωρ ξεστής ἐλάττησιν.

**1388** ἔχομεν ... ὥνπερ οὖνεκ' 'we have (the things: ellipse of αὐτά, as commonly before a relative pronoun) for the sake of which ...' In fact by rescuing Iph. they will have achieved rather more than their original aim.

**1389** Συμπληγάδων: see 124n. The line forms a three-word trimeter, giving a resonant conclusion to the mysterious speaker's words.

**1390** στεναγμόν ἤδύν: a 'sweet groaning' is clearly \*oxymoronic, but why is the word στεναγμός used? Of the various suggestions, perhaps the least implausible is that it relates to the physical effort of the rowers. ἐκβρυχώμενοι, 'roaring', adds to the paradoxical effect.

**1391–3** 'While the ship was inside the harbour, it continued to make progress (impf.), but as it was crossing the mouth it encountered a violent wave and was overpowered.' The sense is much the same whether punctuation is placed before or after στόμια; in the latter case, the accusative case of στόμια would express motion towards (Smyth §1588): 'made progress towards the mouth'.

ἡπείγετο: the basic meaning of ἐπείγω is 'press, push'. When the ship met the wave it was driven back towards the shore.

**1395** L's text can only mean 'For a sudden advancing wind was pushing back the ship's stern-cables', but this makes poor sense. The emendations proposed are not convincing. Mekler's παλίμπρυμν' ἴστι, '[was pushing] the sails back to the stern', is doubtful, since sails were unlikely to be deployed within the harbour and have not previously been mentioned. Hermann's παλιμπρυμνηδόν ('backwards stern-foremost'), based on Hesychius, is ingenious but demands either the unlikely transposition of 1346 to precede this line, or Paley's change of νεώς to σκάφος. However, the basic sense is clear: a sudden wind pushed the boat back towards the coast.

**1396** πρὸς κύμα λακτίζοντες: 'resisting, struggling', rather than literally 'kicking against the wave', alluding to the proverbial phrase πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν 'kick against the goads' (e.g. Aesch. Ag. 1624).

**1397** παλίρρους: 'backward-flowing' applied to a wave might be expected to describe its ebb, but instead πάλιν refers to the perspective of the ship: the wave carries the vessel back towards the shore. *Od.* 9.485 is a parallel: τὴν δ' αἶψ' ἡπειρόνδε παλιρρόθιον φέρε κύμα.

σταθεῖσα: standing was the normal Greek posture for prayer, but Iph.'s willingness to stand while on board ship in a storm contrasts with her earlier timidity in boarding, and invests her with authority; it is up to her to save them now.

**1398–1402** Iph.'s prayer in the moment of crisis, but among friends, is quite different from her more guarded utterance at 1230–3. There she had expressed the hope that Artemis would favour her plans; now, alarmed by the storm, she is less optimistic about the goddess' intentions, and prays for forgiveness for the theft and deceit. But her words also

suggest some reasons why Artemis should still look on her favourably: she is her priestess, and (implicitly) she supposes that the goddess might sympathise with her wish to return to Greece from a barbarian land. Above all, she imagines that Artemis should understand her wish to help her brother because of her own love for Apollo. The relationship between Apollo and Artemis has already been explored in terms of the brother–sister dynamic in the play (1012–14, 1084–5), but this is the climactic moment for the theme, when divine and human pairs are set side by side.

**1399** **ιέρειαν:** 34n. For the construction with σῶζω, see 679n.

**1401–2** **δόκει:** imperative. Iph. invites Artemis to consider the parallels in their situations, marked by parallels in the wording (φιλεῖς δὲ καὶ σύ ... φιλεῖν δὲ καὶ μέ ... δόκει). It is only reasonable, she suggests, for the goddess to sympathise with her motives.

**1403–4** **ἐπευφήμησαν ... παιᾶνα:** the sailors echoed Iph.’s prayer with auspicious words as they sang a paian (see 181–5n.). Paians were sung, with prayers and libations, at the departure of a ship or fleet (cf. Thuc. 6.32, the Sicilian expedition), and could also implore deliverance from danger; a paian is further appropriate because of the connexion of this type of hymn with Apollo. Iph. prays to Artemis, mentioning the goddess’ brother, and the crew respond with an invocation to Apollo.

**1404–5** ‘... at the command setting their shoulders, bared from their clothes, to the oar’. <πέπλων> is Markland’s supplement for a gap in L (cf. 1379–80n.).

**ἐπωμίδας:** properly shoulder joints, here probably used to indicate the movement of the shoulders in rowing. This sense is more likely than ἐπωμῖς ‘sleeve’, which is a doubtful meaning at *Hec.* 558, and necessitates further changes in the text to read γυμνὰς <ὠλένας> ἐπωμίδος.

**1405** **ἐκ κελεύματος:** the older form of the word, given in one manuscript (Paris. gr. 2887) as also at 1483, rather than κελεύσματος. The command is the shout of the boatswain (κελευστής) giving time to the rowers.

**1406** **μᾶλλον δὲ μᾶλλον** ‘more and more’, a colloquial phrase more at home in comedy (Collard and Stevens 2018: 51).

**1407–8** ‘One of us dashed wading into the sea, while another tried to attach plaited nooses’, i.e. attempted to lasso the ship with a rope (πλεκτός of objects made of twisted strands like rope; ἀγκύλη refers to an object which is bent or sharply curved). The singulars may be generalising, indicating that several men were engaged in each activity. At this point the Taurians re-enter the narrative, as they appear to have regrouped and come down from their vantage point on the cliffs, attempting to recapture the struggling ship.

**χὼ μὲν τις:** the combination of definite article (χὼ = καὶ ὁ) with the indefinite τις indicates that the speaker is interested in the various

actions performed by different individuals (ὁ μὲν ... ἄλλος δέ), not those individuals' identity.

**1409** **κἀγὼ μὲν**: probably the Messenger intends to contrast his mission to inform Thoas of these events with what Thoas should then do: 'I was sent ... now *you* ...', but changes direction in using a simple imperative.

**1411** A sense of urgency is recaptured towards the end of the speech, a place where messengers frequently attempt to draw some sort of moral from the events witnessed. The Messenger appears to command the king himself to 'go, taking bonds and nooses (= ropes) in [his] hands', meaning presumably that Thoas should give the command for this to happen (as he does).

**1412–19** The Messenger gives first a naturalistic explanation for the likelihood that the fugitives can be recaptured (the storm is, by implication, unlikely to abate and therefore they will not be able to escape) before, like the Herdsman, he ends his narration with an attempt to place events in a religious framework in which everything works out for the benefit of the Taurians and their relationship with the gods.

**1414–15** The Messenger follows the non-Iliadic tradition in which Poseidon is consistently in favour of Troy (cf. *Tro.* 6–7). So he does not seem to be deceived about Poseidon's allegiance in general, but it is less clear whether he is correct in his belief that the storm is caused by Poseidon because of his hostility to the Pelopidai. Indeed, although we are in no doubt that the eventual calming of the storm is due to divine intervention (1444–5), it is left to the audience to decide whether its outbreak is due to natural or divine causes.

**ἐπεσκόπει**: as a favourable and protecting deity, Poseidon 'watched over' Troy. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1136.

**1416** **καὶ νῦν** picks up **τ'** in 1414. Poseidon was an enemy of Agamemnon's family during the Trojan War and now too he will act against the same family. The Messenger is confident in the gods' consistency, just as Greeks more tentatively in their prayers remind gods of their past favours; see 1082–8n.

**1418–19** As usual (cf. 337–9, 1187), the Taurian assumption is that Iph. ought to feel only hatred for all Greeks because of what happened to her at Aulis. Her failure to do so is therefore seen as a betrayal of the goddess she serves.

**1420–34** *Capture of the fugitives seems inevitable; the chorus and Thoas react.*

**1420–1** The chorus have been consistently portrayed in a sympathetic light; though they long to return home themselves, they do not begrudge Iph. her good fortune (1075–7), and now their first thought is of her, and not the danger they themselves are in (shown by Thoas' threats at 1431–3).

δεσποτῶν χέρας: in verse a simple accusative without preposition may follow a verb of motion (Smyth §1588).

**1422–30** Thoas amply fulfils the expectations of both chorus and audience in ordering immediate action with the use of force. His short speech shows qualities we have already come to expect in him: his decisiveness (he is, in his way, a good ruler); his religiosity (he expects impiety to be punished); and his cruelty, both in the proposal for the escaping trio of what are probably intended as traditional punishments (below, 1429–30n.), and in his intention to punish the women of the chorus at a later time.

**1422** βαρβάρου χθονός: cf. 1170n.

**1423–5** ‘Will you not throw reins on horses, run along the seashore and await the wreck of the Greek ship?’ Thoas commands the use of horses not only to reach the ship with all possible speed, but also to hunt down the Greeks if they try to escape by land (1428). πῶλος, properly a foal or young horse, is often used in verse for a horse in general.

εἶα accompanying the negative form of the jussive future (cf. 1301n.) encourages action, ‘come on!’ Comparable are *Hel.* 1561, 1597 and *Or.* 1622. See Diggle on *Phaethon* 221, Collard and Stevens 2018: 79, Nordgren 2015: 220. It is possible, but by no means certain (papyri show both forms), that the correct spelling should be οὐχ εἶα.

**1425–6** σὺν δὲ τῇ θεῳ ... ἄνδρας δυσσεβεῖς: like the Messenger, Thoas is indignant at the apparent impiety of the Greeks, and believes that the gods, particularly Artemis herself, are likely to offer help to the Taurians.

**1427–30** ‘And others of you drag swift oarblades into the sea, so that we can catch them from the sea, and from land on horseback, and either throw them down the sheer rock or impale their bodies on stakes.’ The Messenger suggested the use of ropes and chains to prevent the ship’s movement out to sea again, but Thoas is taking no chances: his men are to embark in pursuit, and if need be to hunt the fugitives on horseback.

ἔλξετ’: again a jussive future (see 1297n.).

**1429–30** The two alternative punishments recall Herodotus’ account of Taurian customs (4.103). After sacrificing humans by clubbing them to death, they throw their bodies from a cliff (in the first version) and place their heads on poles, and when they kill their enemies in battle they again place their heads on stakes, which they fix above their houses. The combination seems too striking to be coincidental, but Euripides has changed the context from sacrifice (which he depicts in a different way, 618–26) and war to punishment, and from disposal of dead bodies to killing the living. Cruel and savage punishment was thought characteristic of barbarians, and fairly frequently represented as such in tragedy, although impaling and crucifixion were associated particularly with the Persians; see Hall

1989: 111–12, 158–9. In this play, however, Euripides is not interested in ethnographic distinctions; there is, as often, a binary contrast between Greek and barbarian, and the confusion therefore is an easy one. Thoas' eagerness for punishments of this sort is of a piece with his enthusiasm for human sacrifice.

**1431–3** Thoas' intention to punish the women of the chorus is unsurprising and threatens to leave a loose end, but he gives way to Athena's command that they should be sent to Greece with (or following) Orestes and Iph. (1467–9, 1482–3).

**ἴστορας:** Thoas rightly sees that the women are 'knowers of these plans'.

**1432** αὐθις 'later on', 'some other time'; cf. 377, 1312.

**1433–4** τὴν προκειμένην σπουδὴν: the article refers to something already mentioned or implied (Smyth §1120b), here the fact that immediate action is necessary (σπουδὴν picks up σπεύδοντες, 1426).

**1435–74** *Athena's appearance and speech.* The play's ending is in many ways characteristically Euripidean, displaying the arrival of a god who gives commands and prophecies, some of which take the form of aetiologies, and generally ties up loose ends while pointing to the immediate or remote future. Whether gods arrived on the μηχανή in fifth-century performance conditions is debated. It is clear from the evidence of *Ar. Peace* 174–6, where Trygaeos calls out to the μηχανοποιός, that the late fifth-century Theatre of Dionysos did have a type of crane at its disposal for transporting characters, but many scholars have been reluctant to suppose that it was used at this date to effect the entrances and exits of gods. The epiphanic gods who appear in the final scenes of nine of Euripides' extant tragedies generally, as here, need to appear suddenly, which to our way of thinking might seem to make the use of the crane unlikely, but we cannot know what degree of realism was demanded by a fifth-century audience. The alternative is to suppose that actors playing deities reached their position on the *skēnē* roof by means of some sort of ladder and perhaps a trapdoor. But such solutions are better suited to a proscenium stage than to theatres with curved or rectangular auditoria, where the audience is effectively arranged around three sides and far less can be hidden. It would be hard in these conditions to conceal the actor behind a pediment, and disastrous if he were to be spotted ascending into position: Olympian gods cannot be seen to arrive from below. However, it is possible that theatres in the demes and even outside Athens could have used such makeshift methods, while the prestigious Theatre of Dionysos used its μηχανή. See on the whole question Mastronarde 1990.

The appearance of Athena, rather than Apollo or Artemis, is perhaps unexpected, but it is not entirely unprepared for given the earlier references to Attica. This is not the only occasion in tragedy when Athena



arrives to tidy up a situation only partially resolved by Apollo; in *Eumenides* she is the one whose casting vote saves Orestes, as she herself recalls here (1469–72), and in *Ion* she draws attention to the fact that it is she rather than Apollo who appears *ex machina*. The speech pauses the rapid action which has just been put in train by Thoas' preceding speech. Athena first explains to the king that Orestes' arrival and the removal of the statue were part of a divine plan, and reveals that the fugitives will after all escape on a sea now made calm by Poseidon. She then addresses Orestes, telling him where exactly he must establish the statue (Halai Araphenides on the east coast of Attica) and what rituals he should institute in its honour. Next, Iph. is directed to serve Artemis as her priestess in Brauron, and told of the honours she will receive there after her death. The women of the chorus are to be sent home to Greece, and though a probable lacuna causes some uncertainty as to the sequence of thought, the speech nears its end with a brief recollection of Athena's role in Orestes' Areopagos trial, referring also to the custom of acquittal following a tied vote, before the goddess finally urges Orestes and Thoas to their respective courses of action.

As is often the case in the long concluding speeches of Euripides' tragedies, particularly the speeches of gods, Athena refers both to the immediate future (what each of the characters must do and experience following on the events of the drama) and to the remote future, seen in an aetiological context whereby some of the immediate and recently past actions will give rise to customs extended into an indefinite subsequent time (τὸ λοιπόν, 1457). This future is the audience's present (see Introduction, pp. 11–12), and along with the shift in temporal perspective comes a change in geographical emphasis: though Greece in general and Athens in particular have not been absent from the play so far, Attica is now the focus of attention, with Athena's directions for two new local customs (rituals at the sanctuaries of Halai and Brauron) and recollection of one already established (the Areopagos procedure). With this typical aetiological shift (an example of what Sourvinou-Inwood calls 'zooming', e.g. Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 25–40), the audience adjusts to the end of the story proper, as Euripides lays the ground for the drama's conclusion by the introduction of references to the here and now.

**1435 ποῖ ποῖ:** the repetition suggests the urgency of the intervention.

**πορθμεύεις:** the literal meaning of the word is to cause something to cross over a tract of water (used in this sense at 1445); here it is extended to indicate carrying out a pursuit (διωγμόν) by sea. See 266n.

**ἄναξ:** the title applies equally to gods and to human rulers, but as a deity Athena is noticeably polite in using it to address Thoas.

**1436 τῆσδ' Ἀθηναίας:** gods appearing on stage normally announce themselves, even when they are instantly recognisable visually. ὅδε/ῆδε



referring to the speaker is common from Homer onwards: ‘here I am’. The epic form Ἀθήνη was not used by fifth-century Athenians; Ἀθηναία, sometimes varied by the Doric form Ἀθάνα (cf. 1475), is used in tragedy and the contracted Ἀθηνᾶ in prose.

**1437** ‘Cease from pursuing, cease from sending forth (this) stream of an army.’ For ῥεῦμα in this context cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 87, 412.

**1438–9** Athena reveals to Thoas the plan behind events, and confirms that Apollo’s mantic utterances were authentic. θεσφατος, literally ‘god-spoken’, can refer both to divine decree and to prophecy, and since there is often some blurring between the revelation of fate and its causation, it can be assumed that Apollo both laid down the plan and guided Orestes towards its fulfilment (but contrast 1255 and n.).

**Λοξίου:** see 1084–5n.

**1440–1** ἐστέμψων ... ὄξων: future participles indicating purpose. Orestes did in fact travel to the Taurian land in order to retrieve the statue of Artemis, but had no intention of bringing his sister back to Argos, being unaware she was alive. But bringing her back (to Greece if not to Argos) could nonetheless be classified as a purpose of the journey from the divine point of view. A few lines later, Athena will reveal that Iph. is not in fact to return to Argos, at least permanently, but to remain in Attica as a priestess.

**1441b** The line is omitted in P, the manuscript which formed the base for early editions, and therefore is not accounted for in the traditional numeration.

**ἀναψυχάς:** acc. pl. in apposition to the preceding lines: ‘as relief from the troubles that now beset him’. Deities intervening in the final scenes of tragedies sometimes point out the change of fortune which they bring, directly or indirectly, after the characters’ suffering: cf. *Hipp.* 1423–5, *Supp.* 1187–8, and especially *Ion* 1604, τῆσδ’ ἀναψυχᾶς πόνων.

**1442–5** ‘The one whom you expect to kill, Orestes, capturing him in the sea-swell – Poseidon for my sake already makes the sea’s surface waveless, conveying him by oar (ship).’ The accusative phrase ὃν δ’ ἀποκτενεῖν δοκεῖς Ὀρέστην is governed by the participle πορθμεύων rather than the main verb. Almost all editors unnecessarily emend L’s πορθμεύων to πορθμεύειν, and most πλάττηι to πλάττην, giving a different sense: ‘Poseidon makes (LSJ *s.v.* τίθημι B.I.4) his ship convey Orestes across the waveless surface of the sea.’ But τίθησι makes perfect sense in its immediate context with πόντου νῶτα as object and ἀκύμονα as complement, and to disjoin it in sense from this word-cluster is harsh and not easily intuited.

**χάριν ἐμὴν** suggests doing a favour; evidently Poseidon is happy to comply with Athena’s wishes, though it is not yet clear exactly why Athena is involved. Even less is it clear whether the Messenger was correct in

attributing the outbreak of the storm to Poseidon (1415–18, in which case we must see the sequel as Athena's), or whether we should see it as a chance occurrence. What is certain at this point is that several deities (Athena, Poseidon, Apollo, Artemis) are working together to bring about the safe return of the ship and its passengers to Greece. Athena thus corrects the assumption of the Messenger and of Thoas that the gods are on their side (1414–19, 1425–6).

**1446–7** Deities appearing in the final scenes of Euripides' tragedies usually address more than one of the human characters, and frequently signal the change of addressee in mid-speech (*Hipp.* 1431, 1435, *Supp.* 1213, *Ion* 1571–2, *Helen* 1662, *Or.* 1627, 1643, 1660; *Erechtheus* fr. 370.63 is unusual in that the address shifts from immortal Poseidon to mortal Praxitheia). In this speech the change is signalled first at 1442, πρὸς μὲν σ' ὅδ' ἡμῖν μῦθος, before Athena adds the clinching argument about Poseidon to Thoas; the follow-up address to Orestes starts here.

The audience is reminded that it is often possible to hear a divine voice without a vision (cf. *Hipp.* 85–6, *Soph. Aj.* 15–17), perhaps because the addressee is off stage and might seem unlikely therefore to be able to view the divinity who is in front of the audience. However, Kastor in the parallel passage in *Helen* (1662) addresses the offstage Helen without any such comment.

**1446** ἐπιστολάς: see 589n.

**1449–52** The oracle had told Orestes that he must retrieve the statue of Taurian Artemis and bring it to the territory of Athens (85–91), so he already knows that he must stop there on the way home; the east coast of Attica is conveniently situated for a land-hugging route to Argos. But Apollo had said nothing to indicate where within Attica the image should be established (οὐδὲν ἐρρήθη πέρα, 91). Athena now reveals the actual location.

**1449–50** ὅταν ... χῶρός τις ἔστιν: 260–3n.

**1449** θεοδμήτους: the same word is applied to Athens at *Hipp.* 974 and *Soph. El.* 707, but we know of no tradition that Athens was actually 'built by gods' (as was Troy, for instance). Delphi is given the same epithet at *Andr.* 1263; probably it is intended to convey a general sense of association with the divine.

**1450–2** Halai Araphenides (so called in full to distinguish it from Halai Aixonides, on the opposite coast of Attica) was an Attic coastal deme south of Araphen (Rafina) approximately on the site of modern Artemida (formerly Loutsas), and named from a saltwater lagoon, now dried up. The sanctuary of Artemis there (securely identified from inscriptions) has yielded finds from the Late Helladic period onwards, with a small temple of fifth- to fourth-century date (Kalogeropoulos 2013, McInerney 2014: 291–2.)

**Ἀτθίδος πρὸς ἰσχάτοις ὄροις:** as being on the coast. Ἀτθίς, properly a feminine adjective (with γῆ/χώρα understood), is usual in poetry for ‘Attica’.

**1451 δειράδος Καρυστίας:** the mountain above the city of Karystos, on the Euboian coast opposite.

**1452 οὐμός ... λεώς:** unsurprisingly, Athens and the Athenians are presented as the pre-eminent objects of Athena’s affection in the human world (cf. 1480–1, σὴν ... γαῖαν). The mention of Athens and Attica – perhaps already the appearance of Athena – has already begun the process of ‘zooming’ (above, 1435–74n.), and here the focus is as close as possible, as the audience recognises itself as ‘Athena’s people’ (οὐμός = ὁ ἔμος).

**1453** ‘There build a temple and establish the statue.’ For ἰδρύω/καθιδρύω of placing and inaugurating a cult image for worship, see 978n.

**1454–7 ἐπώνυμον,** qualifying βρέτας, is explained by what follows. The epithet of Artemis, in the form of her statue, in her new home is to be Ταυροπόλος, explained with reference to the Taurian land and to the troubles experienced by Orestes as he wandered (περιπολῶν) through Greece with the Erinyes in pursuit. (The real meaning of the word is almost certainly ‘bull-herd’, referring to Artemis’ links with animals.) For the establishment of cult to memorialise suffering cf. *Hipp.* 1428–30: ἀεὶ δὲ μουσσοπίοις ἐς σὲ παρθένων | ἔσται μέριμνα, κοῦκ ἀνώνυμος πεσῶν | ἔρωσ ὁ Φαίδρας ἐς σὲ σιγηθήσεται.

**1458–61** ‘And lay down this law: when the people celebrate the festival, in compensation for your (aborted) slaughter let (someone) hold a sword to a man’s neck and draw out blood, for piety’s sake and so that the goddess may have her honours.’ Having accounted for the origins of the cult at Halai and for the epithet in use for the goddess there, Euripides proceeds to an aetiology for an otherwise unknown feature of the Tauropolia, the letting of blood from a male human ‘victim’ in imitation of sacrifice. The sword, rather than the knife, is used as the typical instrument of human sacrifice (27n.). There is an analogy with the ritual bloodletting through scourging in the cult of Artemis Ortheia at Sparta, also in one version linked with a story of human sacrifice: Hughes 1991: 79–81, Bonnechere 1994: 48–62. We need not suppose that because the practice is otherwise unattested for the Tauropolia in Attica that it is Euripides’ invention; it is possible, however, that Euripides was the first to connect it with Orestes. See Introduction, pp. 12–13, and on the festival in general Bathrellou 2012.

**νόμον τε θεῖς:** τίθημι is the normal verb used for the establishment of a νόμος, whether law or custom.

**1459 τῆς σῆς σφαγῆς ἄποιν’:** in apposition to the verbal phrase expressing what must happen. These ἄποινα are compensation for the fact that the goddess never received her destined victim Orestes, and presumably also for the lack of human sacrifice in the future. If pressed,

the implication would be that – contrary to Iph.’s view, 385–91 – Artemis herself had indeed demanded human sacrifice, but has now reduced her original requirement.

Wolff (1992: 314) points out that τῆς σῆς σφαγῆς, taken on its own, could describe Orestes’ killing of Klytimestra, and suggests that the idea of Orestes’ payment for matricide ‘is not entirely erased’. Apollo had told him that the removal of the statue to Greece would finally bring about the end of his troubles (85–92); the transfer of the statue and the new cult also mark the end of the troubles of the descendants of Pelops (Amiech 2019: 95–6).

ξίφος: the implement of imagined human sacrifice, 27n.

**1462–7** ‘But you, Iphigeneia, must hold the temple keys for this goddess at the holy steps of Brauron, where you will also be buried when you die, and they will make offerings to you of well-woven cloths, which women dying in labour leave behind in their houses.’ So far there has been no indication that any other fate awaits Iph. than to return to Argos. But this would pose difficulties in the future perspective: a suitable marriage and, perhaps, descendants would have to be found for her, and of course (since traditionally she either died or was apotheosised at Aulis) no such marriage is known. Euripides remains within range of the tradition by committing her to a lifetime of apparently celibate priesthood in a polis which, though Greek, is far away from her home and family.

But was Iph. really worshipped in Brauron? Early excavators and scholars were quick to identify either the temple *adyton* or a small structure in the cave area as Iph.’s *herōon*. More recently, Hollinshead (1985) and Ekroth (2003) have argued the evidence for such identifications is flimsy at best, with other functions suiting the areas more convincingly. The fact that Iph.’s presence at the sanctuary remains unconfirmed by any epigraphic testimony does not prove that it is fictitious, and it would be strange for Euripides to invent Attic cult practice out of the blue: see above, 1435–74n. and Introduction, pp. 12–13. For a convincing ritual context, see Zografou 2005. The death in childbirth motif is not a particularly good fit for the story of Iph. in any of its variants; if Euripides were describing a fictitious ritual, would he not have chosen something more appropriate to his story? One possibility might be that the Brauron sanctuary included two forms of Artemis (we know of some double cults of this type elsewhere in the Greek world), and that the practice was performed for one of these forms; Euripides, perhaps inspired by the passage in the *Eoiai* (fr. 23a.17–26 M–W, Introduction, pp. 4–5) in which Artemis transforms her intended sacrificial victim into Artemis Einodie, could have made a speculative identification of this Brauronian Artemis with Iph. But this must remain guesswork.

**1462 κλίμακας:** the word can refer to sets of steps as well as to portable ladders (e.g. *Od.* 1.330), and be applied to natural or manmade gradations on a hill (Diod. Sic. 19.21.2; cf. κλιμακώδης, Str. 12.6.2, Hsch. *s.v.* ἀρπέζας). Pierson's emendation λείμακας, 'meadows', has found much favour because it suits the low-lying, marshy area of Brauron; but the temple of Artemis was located on the slopes of a small hill, and κλίμακας might therefore refer to terraces on the hillside, or alternatively to actual steps on the northern side of the temple (Nielsen 2009: 101–2), and perhaps steps cut in the hillside linking different parts of the sanctuary area (Papadimitriou 1963: 113).

**1463 κληιδουχέιν:** 130–1n.

**1465 ἄγαλμα:** literally 'delight'; here, as often, of gifts offered to please gods and heroes.

**θήσουσιν:** like the more specialised compound ἀνατίθηναι, the simple verb may have the meaning 'dedicate'.

**εὐπήνους ὑφάς:** the same phrase is used in the Herdsman's speech, at 312 (see n.), but it is difficult to see a connexion. More plausible is a link with its use at 814 to describe Iph.'s weaving. Offerings of textiles are particularly appropriate for goddesses and heroines because weaving is closely associated with being female.

**1466 ψυχορραγείς** 'at the point of death', literally 'breaking the soul/life' or 'making the life burst out'. The verb ψυχορραγέω is very much more usual than this adjectival form.

**1467 λείπωσ'**: Tournier's emendation λῖπωσ' is often accepted, which would indicate a focus on each individual occasion of death in childbirth. Retaining the present subjunctive more appropriately emphasises the continuing practice, as does the plural γυναικες.

**1467–9** Athena turns next to the fate of the chorus, signalled by the first word of the new sentence τάσδε, but the object of her address, though unnamed, is presumably Thoas: ἐξεφίεμαι, 'I command (you ...)', leading into a three-word trimeter. It is Thoas who responds to this part of the speech at 1482–3. (Less plausibly Kovacs 2000: 19–20 takes the addressee as Orestes: see following n. and 1490–1n.) Thoas has declared his intention of punishing the women at a later date (1431–3), so the audience needs to know that they will escape; in addition, the play has throughout presented them as suffering in their barbarian exile no less than Iph. (Introduction, pp. 40–1).

**1469 γνώμης δικαίας οὐνεκ'**: the chorus have consistently shown themselves to be loyal and brave, and are therefore rewarded for those qualities. If the reading found in the scholia to Aristophanes, ἐξέσωσα, is accepted rather than L's ἐκώσωσα, and if no lacuna is assumed, it is possible to refer the phrase to Orestes, who is addressed in the following lines, so that

Athena would say that she ensured Orestes' acquittal at the Areopagos trial 'because of his upright mind/right decision'. But this would make the section on the chorus extremely brief and give a very abrupt transition to the next topic, as well as confusingly switching addressee from Thoas to Orestes (but see previous n.) without a vocative until three lines into the change. Without a lacuna, the lines do not read much better even if we take γνώμης δικάϊας οὔνεκ' to refer to the chorus, necessitating an almost equally abrupt transition mid-line. It is better to suppose that some lines have been lost, perhaps giving more detail on the fate of the chorus (Grégoire (in Parmentier and Grégoire), with the second stasimon in view, thought they might have been sent to Delos, while Cropp suggests they could have accompanied Iph. to Brauron), and somehow leading back to Orestes (see following note). Budelmann and Power (2015: 282–3), following the Brauron solution, see these lines as giving an aition for female choruses at Brauron and perhaps at the Tauropolia at Halai; girls' choruses in Attica, they suggest, were marginalised in male perception and seen as characteristic of other Greek cities, and so given an extra-Athenian origin.

**1469b–1472** As the text stands, it is not easy to see why Orestes is again addressed at the end of Athena's speech. If, however, we suppose that there is a lacuna of a few lines, it is possible to guess at the sequence of thought. Athena has dealt with Thoas, the statue of Artemis, Orestes, Iph., and the chorus; the one loose end remaining is the group of hitherto unpacified Erinyes (we know that Orestes will be saved from their attentions by bringing the statue of Artemis to Attica, but not precisely how this will come about). Cropp therefore suggests that the missing part of the speech explains that they will join the rest of the band established on the Areopagos as Semnai Theai. This allows the introduction of a final aetiology, connecting the trial of Orestes with the Areopagos custom of acquittal in the event of equal votes. Euripides does not spell this out at length because it would have been familiar to most of his audience from *Eumenides* (see Introduction, p. 6); this is then the play's final allusion to the more established tragic version of Orestes' story.

**ἐκώσασά σε καὶ πρὶν γε:** Athena reminds Orestes that she has saved him 'previously, too', in addition to saving him now.

**1473–4** The last two lines of Athena's speech gently summarise the immediate instructions to the current principal players and suggest the fulfilment of the divine plan.

**ἐκκομίζου:** middle, because Orestes, as he argued at 1362–3, is acting in relation to himself, taking his own sister away from the Taurian country.

**1476–99** *Conclusion: Thoas and the chorus react.* Thoas agrees to Athena's injunctions, and the chorus wish the escapees well on their journey, while celebrating their own unexpected good fortune.

**1475–85** Thoas gives way with a good grace, echoing some of Athena's terms. His piety, earlier suggested in his respect for Artemis and enthusiasm for the traditional local sacrifices, is here shown to have a practical base. Only the mad or foolish would attempt to resist the gods.

**1475 Ἀθάνα:** 1436n.

**1476 ἄπιστος:** though the meaning here is 'disobedient', the word has frequently appeared in the play with the meaning 'incredible'; see 328–9n.

**1478 οὐχὶ θυμοῦμαι:** Thoas responds directly to Athena's final command that he should abandon his anger, previously amply expressed in his desire to punish the runaways at 1429–30.

**1479** 'Is there any glory in competing against the gods, who hold power?' Some editors excise this line on the basis (a) that τί γάρ; ('why should I?', 'what would be the point?'), together with 1475–6, is sufficient to explain Thoas' abandonment of his anger, and (b) that the point is not appropriate as a reason for not being angry with Orestes and Iph. Neither objection seems valid. An expansion of τί γάρ is perfectly idiomatic (Denniston 1954: 85–6), while Thoas shows his obedience to Athena precisely in relinquishing his anger (see 1478n.).

**1480 ἴτωσαν:** the third-person plural imperative in -τωσαν is common in later Greek but appears first only in the late fifth century, and is found only here and at *Ion* 1131 in extant Euripides (Schwyzer 1.802). At this date it may perhaps have sounded colloquial (Collard and Stevens 2018: 170).

**1481 καθιδρύσαιντο:** 978n.

**1482 Ἑλλάδ' εἰς εὐδαίμονα:** Thoas' words give no clue as to whether Athena's speech supplied a more specific destiny for the women of the chorus (see 1469n.), nor is it clear whether they will be able to return to their own cities and families, but in general terms they have the happy ending they desire (cf. 1495–6). That Greece is called εὐδαίμων may reflect less the king's own perception than that of the Greek characters, the gods, and the audience, but for non-Greek appreciation of the fertility and prosperity of Greek lands see 132–5n. The word is probably also intended in a literal sense, that Greece is well supplied with gods, blessed by the gods, hinting at the point made earlier at 1086–8: Greek piety is far more in line with the gods' real nature than is Taurian custom, and a πόλις εὐδαίμων will suit Artemis better than her residence in Tauroi; the women will be happy in their god-favoured home.

**1483 κέλευμ':** 1405n.

**ἐφίεται:** another close reference to Athena's words (ἐξεφίεμαι, 1468).

**1486 αἰνῶ:** literally 'I praise [you/your decision]', expressing satisfaction with the response. Athena extends Thoas' point that humans



cannot realistically compete with the gods, who are stronger (1479); necessity, that which must happen (τὸ χρεῶν), is stronger than both mortals and gods.

**1487–9** ‘Go, breezes, convey the child of Agamemnon to Athens, and I will travel too, bringing to safety the venerable statue of my sister.’ The escape was almost prevented by an adverse wind, but now the winds perform Athena’s will and are bidden to speed the return to Greece. Athena gives further divine sanction to Iph.’s view that Greece is a better place for Artemis’ statue than the Tauric Chersonese in describing herself as ‘saving’ it.

Though Artemis’ only full sibling is Leto’s other child Apollo, and though that relationship has been important in the play, it is significant that in the widening of perspective which Euripidean closure typically offers we find a broader view of family relationship; as daughters of Zeus, Athena and Artemis are half-sisters. With these words Athena probably disappears from view, either transported by the μηχανή or somehow concealed by the stage building (see 1435–74n.).

**1490–9** The drama concludes with anapaests spoken by the chorus. Anapaestic endings are frequent in both Euripides and Sophocles. Barrett (on *Hipp.* 1462–6) argued with impressively circular logic against the authenticity of most examples, including these lines, but there is no good reason to reject them.

**1490–1** Probably ‘go, being happy, in the good fortune of those who are saved’. μοῖρα here is likely to mean ‘portion’ in the sense of a group of people (LSJ A.I.3); the phrase τῆς σωζομένης μοίρας recurs in this sense in Aelius Aristides (33.31 Keil, 11 p. 582 Dindorf). Alternatively, the phrase might be equivalent to τῆς τοῦ σώζεσθαι μοίρας, ‘the state of being saved’ (cf. LSJ A.V). The words are continued as part of Athena’s speech in L, but apart from the oddness of the switch to anapaests for only two cola, it makes little sense for the goddess to tell the escapees to ‘go’, when she has just said she will travel with them. (The previous ἦτε was addressed to the winds.) The chorus remain behind, in the knowledge that Thoas will shortly give them an escort to return to Greece. (For a different view, see Kovacs 2000, arguing that the chorus must be supposed to travel with Orestes and Iph.; this seems unlikely, given that with the cessation of the adverse wind (1444–5) their ship must already be on its homeward voyage, as is implied by the present lines.)

**1494–6** In what remains of Athena’s speech, the chorus have not been told to ‘do’ anything; only Thoas has been instructed to send them back to Greece. The missing portion could have included some instruction for the women of the chorus (see 1469n.), which they here agree to carry out. Alternatively, the chorus might be speaking here, at the play’s conclusion,



for all the human characters, although the following two lines seem more suited to their own specific situation. Conceivably a distinction could be hinted at in the shift from plural δράσομεν to singular δέδεγμαί, although such variation is not uncommon in choral language.

**1497–9** This ending, found also as the final lines in the texts of *Phoenissae* and *Orestes* and in two manuscripts of *Hippolytus*, is clearly extra-dramatic; the chorus speak no longer as women of Greece enslaved in Tauroi, but as a chorus in a dramatic festival, praying for victory for themselves, their poet, and their choregos. The majority of critics have thought it spurious, in part because it occurs in several plays and in part because of its extra-dramatic nature, which they regard as inadmissible for tragedy. Neither point is conclusive. It is possible that here and in the lines of closure found in *Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Helen*, and *Bacchae*, and with a variant in *Medea*, a genuine piece of Euripides has been added to plays where it did not belong, but we cannot rule out the possibility that the dramatist himself might have reused the lines, perhaps even expecting them to be recognised, especially at the point where the ‘dramatic illusion’, if it can be so called, is coming to an end. Again, we cannot be certain that Euripides, who after all is fond of self-referential and perhaps metatheatrical tropes, would have regarded a closural reference to the play in its agonal context as inappropriate: see Roberts 1987, esp. 62–4. An appeal to Nike, worshipped in Athens as a form of Athena, might have seemed not inappropriate after the chorus’ prayer to Athena. However, the immediately preceding lines themselves give satisfactory closure, so in this play, unlike some others, if we wish to delete the lines we are not faced with the problem of explaining how a coda added later came to displace an original ending. It is difficult to be confident either way.

## GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS

---

**Anadiplosis:** repetition of the word immediately preceding, doubling of a word (e.g. 138, ἀγαγες ἀγαγες).

**Antilabe:** division of a single line between two or more speakers.

**Asyndeton:** omission of conjunctions where they would normally be expected (e.g. 310, βάλλων, ἀράσσω).

**Conative:** verb form, tense, or mood indicating an attempted action.

**Crasis:** a form of contraction between two vowels or diphthongs in adjacent words, marked in writing by the coalescence of two words, the loss of one of the vowels and/or a change in the vowels, and in most cases by the placing of the *coronis*, in modern orthography identical to the smooth breathing sign, over the contracted syllable.

**Elision:** the omission of one or other vowel or diphthong where two such occur together, marked by an apostrophe.

**Extra-metrical, *extra metrum*:** describes a word, usually an interjection, which is placed outside the metrical scheme of the verse.

***Figura etymologica*:** appearance of a word in close connexion with an etymologically related word; frequently of a verb used with a related noun as its object (e.g. 364–5, νυμφεύομαι | νυμφεύματ’).

**Hendiadys:** designation of a single entity using two words (e.g. 288, πῦρ ... καὶ φόνον, ‘deadly fire’).

**Hiatus:** juxtaposition of two vowels, usually across a word boundary, without elision or modification of either.

***Hysteron proteron*:** description or narration of two events in reverse chronological order (e.g. 1323, ἀθρήσας καὶ κλυών).

**Metonymy:** reference to a thing by use of a word denoting something closely connected with it (e.g. 58, χέρνιβες for ‘sacrifice’).

**Oxymoron:** phrase which at first seems nonsensical or self-contradictory, but which usually presents a point as paradoxically true (e.g. 559, κακὸν δίκαιον).

**Polyptoton:** repetition of the same word in a different case or with another grammatical ending.

**Proleptic:** described or referred to as in a future state (e.g. 243, πρόσφαγμα καὶ θυτήριον (the strangers are not yet a sacrifice)).

**Stichomythia:** tragic dialogue in which two characters speak alternating lines.

**Synecdoche:** a type of metonymy (*q.v.*) in which a part is expressed by a whole, or more commonly a whole by a part.

**Synizesis (or synecphonesis):** the sounding together of two adjacent vowels as one syllable. Synizesis is not marked by any written sign and is detected from the metre alone.

**Tmesis:** separation of the parts of a compound word, usually a verb with prepositional prefix (e.g. 832-3, *κατὰ δὲ γόος ... νοτίζει βλέφαρον*).

**Tricolon:** series of three related and juxtaposed phrases or clauses. In an ascending tricolon, the three are of increasing length, giving most emphasis to the final phrase.

## WORKS CITED

---

### EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME ONLY

- Amiech, C. and L. (2017) *Euripide: Iphigénie en Tauride*. Paris.
- Cropp, M. J. (2000) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Warminster.
- Diggle, J. (1981) *Euripidis fabulae* II. Oxford.
- England, E. B. (1886) *The Iphigeneia among the Tauri of Euripides*. London.
- Jerram, C. S. (1900) *Iphigenia in Tauris*. Oxford.
- Koechly, A. [H.A.T.] (1864) *Emendationum in Euripidis Iphigeniam Tauricam partes quinque*. Zurich.
- Kovacs, D. (1999) *Euripides: Trojan Women, Iphigenia among the Taurians, Ion*. Cambridge, MA.
- Kyriakou, P. (2006) *A commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*. Berlin.
- Parker, L. P. E. (2016) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Oxford.
- Parmentier, L. and Grégoire, H. (1942) *Euripide*, vol. 4: *Les Troyennes, Iphigénie en Tauride, Électre*. Paris.
- Platnauer, M. (1938) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Oxford.
- Sansone, D. (1981) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Leipzig.
- Schöne, F. G. and Köchly, H., with Bruhn, E. (1894) *Tragödien des Euripides: Iphigenie auf Tauris*. 4th ed. Berlin.
- Wecklein, N. (1904) *Euripides: Iphigenie im Taurierlande*. 3rd ed. Munich.

### EDITIONS OF OTHER EURIPIDES PLAYS

- Allan, W. (2008) *Euripides: Helen*. Cambridge.
- Barrett, W. S. (1964) *Euripides: Hippolytus*. Oxford.
- Bond, G. W. (1963) *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Oxford.
- Collard, C. (1984) *Euripides: Supplices, edited with introduction and commentary*. 2 vols. Groningen.
- Cropp, M. J. (1988) *Euripides: Electra, edited with translation and commentary*. Warminster.
- Dodds, E. R. (1966) *The plays of Euripides: Bacchae, edited with introduction and commentary*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2021) *The Rhesus attributed to Euripides*. Cambridge.
- Fries, A. (2014) *Pseudo-Euripides 'Rhesus', edited with introduction and commentary*. Berlin.
- Hunter, R. and Laemmle, R. (2020) *Euripides: Cyclops*. Cambridge.
- Kannicht, R. (1969) *Euripides Helena, herausgegeben und erklärt*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.
- Lee, K.H. (1997) *Euripides: Ion*. Warminster.

- Mastronarde, D. J. (1994) *Euripides: Phoenissae*, edited with introduction and commentary. Cambridge.
- Mastronarde, D. J. (2002) *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge.
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., and Lee, K. H. (1995) *Euripides: Selected fragmentary plays I*. Warminster.
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., and Gibert, J. S. (2004) *Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays II*. Warminster.
- Collard, C., and Cropp, M. J. (2008) *Euripides: fragmentary plays*, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.

## EDITIONS OF OTHER TRAGEDIES

- Sommerstein, A. (1969) *Aeschylus: Eumenides*. Cambridge.

## OTHER WORKS CITED

- Alexiou, M. (2002) *The ritual lament in Greek tradition*. 2nd ed. rev. by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos. Lanham, MD etc.
- Allen, W. S. (1947) 'The name of the Black Sea in Greek', *CQ* 41, 86–8.
- Amandry, P. (1977) 'Notes de topographie et d'architecture delphiques VI: la fontaine de Castalie', *BCH Suppl.* 4, 179–228.
- Amiech, C. (2019) 'Que devient la malédiction des Atrides dans *Iphigénie en Tauride*? Ou d'Aulis à Brauron en passant par la Tauride', *Pallas* 109, 85–99.
- Arnott, W.G. (2007) *Birds in the ancient world from A to Z*. London.
- Asper, M. (2013) 'Minding the gap: aetiology and (false) closure', in F. F. Grewing, B. Acosta-Hughes, A. Kirichenko, eds, *The door ajar*, 63–82. Heidelberg.
- Bacon, H. H. (1961) *Barbarians in Greek tragedy*. New Haven.
- Bain, D. (1977) *Actors and audience*. Oxford.
- Bain, D. (1981) *Masters, servants and orders in Greek tragedy*. Manchester.
- Bary, C. (2012) 'The ancient Greek tragic aorist revisited', *Glotta* 88, 31–53.
- Bathrellou, E. (2012) 'Menander's *Epitrepontes* and the festival of the Tauropolia', *ClAnt* 31, 151–92.
- Battezzato, L. (2000) 'Synthesis in Euripides and the structure of the iambic trimeter: the case of  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ', *BICS* 44, 41–80.
- Becker, A. S. (1995) *The shield of Achilles and the poetics of ekphrasis*. Lanham, MD.
- Bernabé, A. (2012) *Poetae epici graeci, testimonia et fragmenta, pars I*. Leipzig.
- Berthiaume, G. (1982) *Les rôles du mégéiros: étude sur la boucherie, la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne*. Leiden.

- Bilby, M. G., and Lefteratou, A. (2022) 'A dramatic heist of epic proportion: Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* in the Acts of the Apostles', *HThR* 115.4, 496–518.
- Black, E., Edgar, J., Hayward K. M. J., and Henig, M. (2012) 'A new sculpture of Iphigenia in Tauris', *Britannia* 43, 243–9.
- Bobrick, E. (1991) 'Iphigenia revisited: *Thesmophoriazousae* 1160–1225', *Arethusa* 24, 67–76.
- Boegehold, A. L. (1989) 'A signifying gesture in Euripides, *Iphigeneia Taurica* 965–6', *AJA* 93, 81–3.
- Bonnechere, P. (1994) *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne* (Kernos Suppl. 3). Liège.
- Bonnechere, P. (2013) 'Victime humaine et absolue perfection dans la mentalité grecque', in Bonnechere and Gagné 2013: 21–60.
- Bonnechere, P., and Gagné, R., eds (2013) *Sacrifices humains: perspectives croisées et représentations / Human sacrifice: cross-cultural perspectives and representations*. Liège.
- Bowie, E. L. (1986) 'Early Greek elegy, symposium and public festival', *JHS* 106, 13–35.
- Braund, D. (2018) *Greek religion and cults in the Black Sea area*. Cambridge.
- Braund, D., Hall, E., and Wyles, R., eds (2019) *Ancient theatre and performance culture around the Black Sea*. Cambridge.
- Breitenbach, W. (1934) *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik*. Stuttgart.
- Bremmer, J. N. (2013a) 'Human sacrifice in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*: Greek and barbarian', in Bonnechere and Gagné 2013: 87–100.
- Bremmer, J. N. (2013b) 'The agency of Greek and Roman statues from Homer to Constantine', *Opuscula* 6, 7–21.
- Brown, P. G. McC. (2000) 'Knocking at the door in fifth century Greek tragedy', in Gödde and Heinze 2000: 1–16.
- Bruneau, P. (1970) *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*. Paris.
- Budelmann, F. (2019) 'Dare to believe: wonder, trust and the limitations of human cognition in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*', in Braund, Hall, and Wyles 2019: 289–304.
- Budelmann, F., and Power, T. (2015) 'Another look at female choruses in Athens', *ClAnt* 34, 252–95.
- Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek religion: archaic and classical*, trans. John Raffan. Oxford.
- Burnett, A. P. (1971) *Catastrophe survived: Euripides' plays of mixed reversal*. Oxford.
- Cairns, D. L. (1993) *Aidōs: the psychology and ethics of honour and shame in ancient Greek literature*. Oxford.

- Calame, C. (1997 [Fr. orig. 1977]) *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece: their morphology, religious role, and social functions*. Lanham, MD etc.
- Calame, C. (2009) 'Iphigénie à Brauron: étiologie poétique et paysage artémisien', in L. Bodiou and V. Mehl, eds, *La religion des femmes en Grèce ancienne: cultes, mythes et société*, 830–92. Rennes.
- Carpenter, T. (1997) *Dionysian imagery in fifth-century Athens*. Oxford.
- Carrara, L. (2007) 'Il processo areopagítico di Oreste: le *Eumenidi* di Eschilo e la tradizione attica', *Philologus* 151, 3–16.
- Casabona, J. (1966) *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec, des origines à la fin de l'époque classique*. Aix-en-Provence.
- Casson, L. (1971) *Ships and seamanship in the ancient world*. Princeton.
- Ceadel, E. B. (1941) 'Resolved feet in the trimeters of Euripides and the chronology of the plays', *CQ* 35, 66–89.
- Ceccarelli, P. (2013) 'Circular choruses and the dithyramb in the classical and Hellenistic period: a problem of definition', in B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson, eds, *Dithyramb in context*, 153–70. Oxford.
- Clay, J. S. (1996) 'Fusing the boundaries: Apollo and Dionysus at Delphi', *Métis* 11, 83–100.
- Clayman, D. L. (1987) 'Sigmatism in Greek poetry', *TAPhA* 117, 69–84.
- Cleland, L. (2005) *The Brauron clothing catalogues: text, analysis, glossary and translation*. Oxford.
- Collard, C., and Stevens, P. T. (2018) *Colloquial expressions in Greek tragedy: revised and enlarged edition of P. T. Stevens's Colloquial expressions in Euripides (Hermes Einzelschriften 113)*. Stuttgart.
- Conacher, D. J. (1967) *Euripidean drama: myth, theme and structure*. Toronto.
- Connelly, J. B. (2007) *Portrait of a priestess: women and ritual in ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- Constantakopoulou, C. (2007) *The dance of the islands: insularity, networks, the Athenian Empire, and the Aegean world*. Oxford.
- Cousland, J. C. R., and Hume, J. R., eds (2009) *The play of texts and fragments: essays in honour of Martin Cropp (Mnemosyne Suppl. 314)*. Leiden.
- Croisille, J.-M. (1963) 'Le sacrifice d'Iphigénie dans l'art romain et la littérature latine', *Latomus* 22, 209–25.
- Cropp, M., and Fick, G. (1985) *Resolutions and chronology in Euripides: the fragmentary tragedies (BICS Suppl. 43)*. London.
- Cropp, M., and Fick, G. (2005) 'On the date of the extant "Hippolytus"', *ZPE* 154, 43–5.
- Cropp, M., Lee, K. H., and Sansone, D., eds (1999–2000) *Euripides and tragic theater in the late fifth century (= ICS 24–5)*. Champaign, IL.
- Crowfoot, G. M. (1936–7) 'Of the warp-weighted loom', *ABSA* 37, 36–47.

- Csapo, E. (2004) 'The politics of the new music', in P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds, *Music and the Muses: the culture of mousike in the classical Athenian city*. Oxford.
- Csapo, E., with Goette, H.-R. (2007) 'The men who built the theatres: *theatropolai*, *theatrones*, and *architektones*', with an archaeological appendix, in P. Wilson, ed., *The Greek theatre and festivals: documentary studies*. Oxford.
- Cunningham, I. C. (2004) *Herodas: Mimiambi, cum appendice fragmentorum mimorum papyraceorum*. Munich and Leipzig.
- D'Alfonso, F. (2006) *Euripide in Giovanni Malala*. Alessandria.
- D'Angour, A. (2011) *The Greeks and the new*. Cambridge.
- D'Angour, A. (2020) "'Old" and "new" music: the ideology of *mousikē*', in Lynch and Rocconi 2020: 409–20.
- Davidson, J. (2003) 'Carcinus and the temple: a problem in the Athenian theater', *CPh* 98, 109–22.
- Davies, M. (1998) 'Euripides *Electra*: the recognition scene again', *CQ* 48, 389–403.
- Denniston, J. M. (1954) *The Greek particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Devereux, G. (1976) *Dreams in Greek tragedy: an ethno-psycho-analytical study*. Oxford.
- Di Maria, S. (1996) 'Towards an Italian theater: Rucellai's *Oreste*', *MLN* 111, 123–48.
- Diggle, J. (1969) 'Marginalia Euripidea', *PCPhS* 15, 30–59.
- Diggle, J. (1981) *Studies on the text of Euripides*. Oxford.
- Diggle, J. (1994) *Euripidea: collected essays*. Oxford.
- Donohue, A. A. (1988) *Xoana and the origins of Greek sculpture*. Atlanta.
- Dowden, K. (1989) *Death and the maiden: girls' initiation rites in Greek mythology*. London.
- Drew-Bear, T. (1968) 'The trochaic tetrameter in Greek tragedy', *AJPh* 89, 385–405.
- Dunn, F. M. (1996) *Tragedy's end: closure and innovation in Euripidean drama*. New York and Oxford.
- Dunn, F. M. (2000) 'Euripidean actiologies', *CB* 76, 3–27.
- Easterling, P. E. (1985) 'Anachronism in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 105, 1–10.
- Easterling, P. E. (2014) 'Narrative on the Greek tragic stage', in D. Cairns and R. Scodel, eds, *Defining Greek narrative* (Leventis Studies 7), 226–40. Edinburgh.
- Eidinow, E. (2011) *Luck, fate and fortune: antiquity and its legacy*. London.
- Ekroth, G. (2003) 'Inventing Iphigeneia? On Euripides and the cultic construction of Brauron', *Kernos* 16, 59–118.
- Ekroth, G. (2005) 'Blood on the altars? On the treatment of blood at Greek sacrifices and the iconographical evidence', *AK* 48, 9–29.



- Ercoles, M. (2020) 'Music in classical Greek drama', in Lynch and Rocconi 2020: 131–44.
- Ewans, M. (2007) *Opera from the Greek: studies in the poetics of appropriation*. Aldershot.
- Fearn, D. (2007) *Bacchylides: politics, performance, poetic tradition*. Oxford.
- Finglass, P. J. (2007) *Pindar: Pythian Eleven*. Cambridge.
- Finglass, P. J. (2015) 'Reperformances and the transmission of texts', *Trends in Classics* 7, 259–76.
- Fischer-Hansen, T., and Poulsen, B., eds (2009) *From Artemis to Diana: the goddess of man and beast* (Acta Hyperborea 12). Copenhagen.
- Fontenrose, J. (1959) *Python: a study of Delphic myth and its origins*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Fowler, R. L. (2000–13) *Early Greek mythography*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek myth: a guide to the literary and artistic sources*. Baltimore and London.
- Garland, R. (2001) *The Greek way of death*. 2nd ed. London and Ithaca, NY.
- Georgoudi, S. (2017) 'Reflections on sacrifice and purification in the Greek world', in Hitch and Rutherford 2017: 105–35.
- Gibert, J. C. (1997) 'Euripides' Hippolytus plays: which came first?', *CQ* 47, 85–97.
- Gödde, S. (2011) *Euphēmia: die gute Rede in Kult und Literatur der griechischen Antike*. Heidelberg.
- Gödde, S., and Heinze, T. (2000) *Skenika: Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption: Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Horst-Dieter Blume*. Darmstadt.
- Golden, M. (2015) *Children and childhood in classical Athens*. 2nd ed. Baltimore and London.
- Graf, F. (1979) 'Das Götterbild aus dem Taurerland', *AW* 10, 33–41.
- Guldager Bilde, P. (2003) 'Wandering images: from Taurian (and Chersonesean) Parthenos to (Artemis) Tauropolos and (Artemis) Persike', in P. Guldager Bilde, J. M. Højte, and V. F. Stolba, eds, *The cauldron of Ariantas: studies presented to A. N. Ščeglov on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, 165–83. Aarhus.
- Guldager Bilde, P. (2009) 'Quantifying Black Sea Artemis', in Fischer-Hansen and Poulsen 2009: 303–32.
- Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*. Oxford.
- Hall, E. (2012) *Adventures with Iphigenia in Tauris: a cultural history of Euripides' Black Sea tragedy*. Oxford.
- Halleran, M. R. (1985) *Stagecraft in Euripides*. London.
- Hamilton, R. (1974) 'Objective evidence for actors' interpolations in Greek tragedy', *GRBS* 15, 387–402.

- Hamilton, R. (1992) *Choes and Anthesteria: Athenian iconography and ritual*. Ann Arbor.
- Harris, W. V. (2009) *Dreams and experience in classical antiquity*. Cambridge, MA.
- Hartigan, K. (1991) *Ambiguity and self-deception: the Apollo and Artemis plays of Euripides* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 50). Frankfurt am Main.
- Heath, M. (1987) *The poetics of Greek tragedy*. Stanford.
- Heitner, R. R. (1964) 'The Iphigenia in Tauris theme in drama of the eighteenth century', *Comparative Literature* 16, 289–309.
- Henrichs, A. (1978) 'Greek maenadism from Olympias to Messalina', *HSPH* 82, 121–60.
- Henrichs, A. (1991) 'Namenlosigkeit und Euphemismus: zur Ambivalenz der chthonischen Mächte im attischen Drama', in H. Hofmann, ed., *Fragmenta Dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*. Göttingen.
- Henrichs, A. (1994) 'Anonymity and polarity: unknown gods and nameless altars at the Areopagos', *ICS* 19, 27–58.
- Henrichs, A. (1995) "'Why should I dance?'" Choral self-referentiality in Greek tragedy', *Arion* 3.3.1, 56–111.
- Herington, C. J. (1967) 'Aeschylus in Sicily', *JHS* 87, 74–85.
- Hester, D. A. (1981) 'The casting vote', *AJPh* 102, 265–74.
- Hitch, S., and Rutherford, I., eds (2017) *Animal sacrifice in the ancient Greek world*. Cambridge.
- Hollinshead, M. B. (1985) 'Against Iphigeneia's adyton in three mainland temples', *AJA* 89, 419–40.
- Hose, M. (1990–1) *Studien zum Chor bei Euripides*. 2 vols. Stuttgart.
- Hourmouziades, N. C. (1965) *Production and imagination in Euripides: form and function of the dramatic space*. Athens.
- Housman, A. E., ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (1972) *The classical papers of A. E. Housman* 111. Cambridge.
- Hughes, D. D. (1991) *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece*. London and New York.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2004) 'Euripides' "other" Hippolytus', *ZPE* 149, 15–28.
- Irwin, E. (1974) *Colour terms in Greek poetry*. Toronto.
- Itsumi, K. (1982) 'The "choriambic dimeter" of Euripides', *CQ* 32, 59–74.
- Jackson, J. (1955) *Marginalia scaenica*. London.
- Jacobson, H. (2000) 'Homeric Iphigeneia', *CQ* 50, 296–7.
- Jameson, M. H. (1993) 'Sacrifice before battle', in V. D. Hanson, ed., *Hoplites: the classical Greek battle experience*, 197–227. London and New York.
- Jim, S. F. (2014) *Sharing with the gods: aparchai and dekatai in ancient Greece*. Oxford.

- Johnson, S. F. (2006) *The life and miracles of Thekla: a literary study*. Washington, DC.
- Jones, S. C. (1998) 'Statues that kill and the gods who love them', in K. J. Hartswick and M. C. Sturgeon, eds, *Στέφανος: studies in honor of Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway*, 139–43. Philadelphia.
- Jong, I. de (1991) *Narrative in drama: the art of the Euripidean messenger speech*. Leiden.
- Kaimio, M. (1988) *Physical contact in Greek tragedy: a study of stage conventions*. Helsinki.
- Kalogeropoulos, K. (2013) Το ιερό της Αρτέμιδος Ταυροπόλου στις Αλές Αραφηνίδες (Λούτσα). 2 vols. Athens.
- Kitto, H. D. F. (1961) *Greek tragedy: a literary study*. 3rd ed. London.
- Kovacs, D. (2000) 'One ship or two: the end of the *Iphigenia in Tauris*', *EMC* 44, 19–23.
- Kovacs, D. (2003) *Euripidea tertia* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 240). Leiden.
- Kowalzig, B. (2006) 'The aetiology of empire? Hero-cult and Athenian tragedy', in J. Davidson, F. Muecke, and P. Wilson (eds), *Greek drama III: essays in honour of Kevin Lee*, *BICS* 87, 79–98.
- Kowalzig, B. (2013) 'Transcultural chorality: *Iphigenia in Tauris* and Athenian imperial economics in a polytheistic world', in R. Gagné and M. Govers, eds, *Choral mediations in Greek tragedy*. New York.
- Larson, J. (2017) 'Venison for Artemis? The problem of deer sacrifice', in Hitch and Rutherford 2017: 48–62.
- Livingstone, N. (2001) *A commentary on Isocrates' Busiris*. Leiden.
- Llewellyn-Jones, L. (2003) *Aphrodite's tortoise: the veiled woman of ancient Greece*. Swansea.
- Lloyd, M. (1999) 'The tragic aorist', *CQ* 49, 24–45.
- Lourenço, F. (2010) *The lyric metres of Euripidean drama*. Coimbra.
- Lush, B. (2008) 'Recognition and the limits to knowledge in Euripides'. Diss., Wisconsin-Madison.
- Lynch, T. A. C., and Rocconi, E. (2020) *A companion to ancient Greek and Roman music*. Hoboken, NJ.
- McClure, L. (2016) 'Priestess and polis in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*', in M. Dillon, E. Eidinow, and L. Maurizio, eds, *Women's ritual competence in the Greco-Roman Mediterranean*, 115–30. London.
- McInerney, J. (2014) '"There will be blood": the cult of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai Araphenides', in K. F. Daly and L. A. Riccardi, eds, *Cities called Athens: studies honoring John McK. Camp*. Lewisburg.
- Marshall, C. W. (2003) 'Casting the *Oresteia*', *CJ* 98.3, 257–74.
- Marshall, C. W. (2009) 'Sophocles' *Chryses* and the date of *Iphigenia in Tauris*', in Cousland and Hume 2009: 142–56.

- Mastronarde, D. J. (1990) 'Actors on high: the skene roof, the crane, and the gods in Attic drama', *ClAnt* 9, 247–94.
- Matthiessen, K. (1964) *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und zur dramatischen Form im Spätwerk des Euripides (Hypomnemata 4)*. Göttingen.
- Meiggs, R. (1982) *Trees and timber in the ancient Mediterranean world*. Oxford.
- Meinel, F. (2015) *Pollution and crisis in Greek tragedy*. Cambridge.
- Menci, G. (2012) 'Due corrigenda a P.Oxy. LXVII 4565 (Euripide, IT 1352, 1371)', *ZPE* 183, 27–9.
- Mills, S. (2015) 'Iphigenia in Tauris', in R. Lauriola and K. N. Demetriou, eds, *Brill's companion to the reception of Euripides*, 259–91. Leiden.
- Mitchell-Boyask, R. (2009) *Aeschylus: Eumenides* (Duckworth Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy). London.
- Moretti, J.-C. (1999–2000) 'The theater of the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus in late fifth-century Athens', *ICS* 24–5 (= Cropp, Lee, and Sansone 1999–2000), 377–98.
- Morrison, J. S., and Williams, R. T. (1968) *Greek oared ships, 900–322 B.C.* Cambridge.
- Mueller, Martin (1984) *The Iliad*. London and Boston.
- Mueller, Melissa (2010) 'Athens in a basket: naming, objects, and identity in Euripides' *Ion*', *Arethusa* 43, 365–402.
- Naiden, F. S. (2006) *Ancient supplication*. Oxford.
- Naiden, F. S. (2007) 'The fallacy of the willing victim', *JHS* 127, 61–73.
- Naiden, F. S. (2012) *Smoke signals for the gods: ancient Greek sacrifice from the archaic through Roman periods*. Oxford.
- Nielsen, I. (2009) 'The sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia', in Fischer-Hansen and Poulsen 2009: 77–109.
- Nordgren, L. (2015) *Greek interjections: syntax, semantics and pragmatics*. Berlin.
- Oakley, J. H., and Sinos, R. H. (1993). *The wedding in ancient Athens*. Madison, WI.
- O'Brien, M. (1988) 'Pelopid history and the plot of *Iphigenia in Tauris*', *CQ* 38, 98–115.
- Ogden, D. (2013) *Drakōn: dragon myth and serpent cult in the Greek and Roman worlds*. Oxford.
- Osborne, R. G. (1993) 'Women and sacrifice in classical Greece', *CQ* 43, 392–405.
- Pache, C. O. (2004) *Baby and child heroes in ancient Greece*. Urbana, IL.
- Papadimitriou, J. (1963) 'The sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron', *Scientific American* 208.6, 110–23.
- Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma: pollution and purification in early Greek religion*. Oxford.

- Parker, R. (2005) *Polytheism and society at Athens*. Oxford.
- Peels, S. (2015) *Hosios: a semantic study of Greek piety*. Leiden.
- Phillips, T., and D'Angour, A., eds (2018) *Music, text, and culture in ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1968) *The dramatic festivals of Athens*. 2nd ed., rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford.
- Platt, V. (2011) *Facing the gods: epiphany and representation in Graeco-Roman art, literature and religion*. Cambridge.
- Pöhlmann, E., and West, M. L. (2001) *Documents of ancient Greek music: the extant melodies and fragments*. Oxford.
- Pucci, L. (2016) 'The purification of Orestes at Troezen: a case of submer-sion between ancient and modern', in A. Ercolani and M. Giordano, eds, *Submerged literature in ancient Greek culture: the comparative perspec-tive*. Berlin.
- Puleyn, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek religion*. Oxford.
- Rehm, R. (1994) *Marriage to death: the conflation of wedding and funeral rit-uals in Greek tragedy*. Princeton.
- Rehm, R. (2002) *The play of space: spatial transformation in Greek tragedy*. Princeton.
- Rijksbaron, A. (1976) 'How does a messenger begin his speech?', in J. M. Bremer, S. L. Radt, and C. J. Ruijgh, eds, *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek*. Amsterdam.
- Rijksbaron, A. (1991) *Grammatical observations on Euripides' Bacchae*. Amsterdam.
- Roberts, D. H. (1984) *Apollo and his oracle in the Oresteia*. Göttingen.
- Roberts, D. H. (1987) 'Parting words: final lines in Sophocles and Euripides', *CQ* n.s. 37, 51–64.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. (2013) 'The appearance of letters on stages and vases', in O. Hodkinson, P. A. Rosenmeyer, and E. Bracke, eds, *Epistolary nar-ratives in ancient Greek literature*. Leiden.
- Roux, J. (1961) 'À propos du décor dans les tragédies d'Euripide', *REG* 74, 52–60.
- Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's Paeans: a reading of the fragments with a survey of the genre*. Oxford.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012) *Greek tragic style: form, language and interpretation*. Cambridge.
- Saïd, S. (1993) 'Tragic Argos', in Sommerstein, A. H., et al., eds, *Tragedy, comedy and the polis*. Bari.
- Sansone, D. (1975) 'The sacrifice-motif in Euripides' *IT*', *TAPhA* 105, 283–95.
- Santelia, S. (1991) *Charition liberata (P.Oxy. 413)*. Bari.

- Schwinge, E.-R. (1968) *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides*. Heidelberg.
- Scullion, S. (1999–2000) 'Tradition and invention in Euripidean aitiology', *ICS* 24–5 (= Cropp, Lee, and Sansone 1999–2000: 217–33).
- Scullion, S. (2003) 'Euripides in Macedon, or the silence of the *Frogs*', *CQ* 53, 389–90.
- Seaford, R. (1982) 'The date of Euripides' *Cyclops*', *JHS* 102, 161–72.
- Seaford, R. (1995) 'Historicizing tragic ambivalence: the vote of Athena', in Goff, B. E., ed., *History, tragedy, theory: dialogues on Athenian drama*, 202–22. Austin.
- Seaford, R. (2009) 'Aitiologies of cult in Euripides: a response to Scott Scullion', in Cousland and Hume 2009: 221–34.
- Sider, D. (2017) 'The meaning of the title Ἰφιγένεια ἡ ἐν Ταύροις (*Iphigenia in Tauris*)', *SIFC* 15, 89–94.
- Silk, M. S. (1983) 'LSJ and the problem of poetic archaism: from meanings to iconyms', *CQ* 33, 303–30.
- Sissa, G. (1990) *Greek virginity*. Cambridge, MA. [Fr. orig: *Le corps virginal*, 1987.]
- Solerti, A. (1887) *Le tragedie metriche di Alessandro Pazzi de' Medici*. Bologna.
- Solmsen, F. (1934) 'Ὄνομα and πᾶγμα in Euripides' *Helen*', *CR* 48, 119–21.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2008) 'Cloudy swearing: when (if ever) is an oath not an oath?', in Sommerstein and Fletcher 2008: 125–37.
- Sommerstein, A. H., and Fletcher, J., eds (2008) *Horkos: the oath in Greek society*. Exeter.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1991) 'Reading' *Greek culture: texts and images, rituals and myths*, Oxford, 217–43.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1997) 'Tragedy and religion: constructs and readings', in C. Pelling, ed., *Greek tragedy and the historian*, 161–86. Oxford.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2003) *Tragedy and Athenian religion*. Lexington.
- Stafford, E. (1997) 'Themis: religion and order in the archaic polis', in L. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes, eds, *The development of the polis in archaic Greece*, 87–91. London and New York.
- Stamatopoulou, Z. (2012) 'Weaving Titans for Athena: Euripides and the Panathenaic peplos (*Hec.* 466–74 and *IT* 218–24)', *CQ* 62, 72–80.
- Stevens, P. T. (1976) *Colloquial expressions in Euripides*. Wiesbaden.
- Stinton, T. C. W. (1977) 'Notes on Greek Tragedy 11', *JHS* 97, 149–52 (= *Collected papers on Greek tragedy*, 271–309).
- Straten, F. van (1995) *Hiera kala: Images of animal sacrifice in archaic and classical Greece*. Leiden.
- Swift, L. A. (2010) *The hidden chorus: echoes of genre in tragic lyric*. Oxford.

- Taplin, O. P. (2007) *Pots and plays: interactions between Greek tragedy and Greek vase-painting of the fourth century B. C.* Los Angeles.
- Taplin, O. P., and Wyles, R., eds (2010) *The Pronomos Vase and its context.* Oxford.
- Thompson, D. W. (1936) *A glossary of Greek birds.* 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Torrance, I. (2013) *Metapoetry in Euripides.* Oxford.
- Torrance, I. (2019) *Iphigenia among the Taurians.* London.
- Trieschnigg, C. P. (2008) 'Iphigenia's dream in Euripides' *Iphigenia Taurica*', *CQ* 58, 461–78.
- Turyn, A. (1957) *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides.* Urbana, IL.
- Varadpande, M. L. (1981) *Ancient Indian and Indo-Greek theatre.* New Delhi.
- Versnel, H. S. (2011) *Coping with the gods: wayward readings in Greek theology.* Leiden.
- Vickers, B. (1973) *Towards Greek tragedy.* London.
- Weiss, N. (2017) *The music of tragedy: performance and imagination in Euripidean theater.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Weiss, N. (2018) 'Hearing the syrinx in Euripidean tragedy', in T. Phillips and A. D'Angour, eds, *Music, text, and culture in ancient Greece*, 139–62. Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1982) *Greek metre.* Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1992) *Ancient Greek music.* Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1997) *The east face of Helicon: West Asiatic elements in early poetry and myth.* Oxford.
- West, S. R. (2003) "'The most marvellous of all seas": the Greek encounter with the Euxine', *G&R* 50, 151–67.
- Whitman, C. H. (1974) *Euripides and the full circle of myth.* Cambridge, MA.
- Wiles, D. (1997) *Tragedy in Athens: performance space and theatrical meaning.* Cambridge.
- Wiles, D. (2000) *Greek theatre production: an introduction.* Cambridge.
- Willink, C. W. (1989) 'The reunion duo in Euripides' *Helen*', *CQ* 39, 45–69.
- Willink, C. W. (2006) 'Iphigenia in Tauris 392–455', *CQ* 56, 404–13.
- Willink, C. W. (2009) 'Electra 432–486 and Iphigenia in Tauris 827–899', in Cousland and Hume 2009: 205–17.
- Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian institution of the khoregia: the chorus, the city and the stage.* Cambridge.
- Wilson, P. (2007) 'Pronomos and Potamon: two pipers and two epigrams', *JHS* 127, 141–9.
- Wolfe, R. M. E. (2020) 'Human sacrifice, nuns and gender-bent kings: the effect of religious change on gender presentation in early modern adaptations of *Iphigenia among the Taurians*', *Ecumenica* 13, 21–51.

- Wolff, C. (1992) 'Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians*: aetiology, ritual, and myth', *CLAnt* 11, 308–34.
- Wright, M. E. (2005) *Euripides' escape-tragedies: a study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians*. Oxford.
- Xian, R. (2020) 'Scepter and spear in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*', *MH* 77, 188–93.
- Zeitlin, F. (2006) 'Redeeming matricide? Euripides rereads the *Oresteia*', in V. Pedrick and S. Oberhelman, eds, *The soul of tragedy: essays on Athenian drama*, 199–225. Chicago.
- Zeitlin, F. (2011) 'Sacrifices holy and unholy in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*', in F. Prescendi and Y. Volokhine, eds, *Dans le laboratoire de l'historien des religions: mélanges offerts à Philippe Borgeaud*. Geneva.
- Zeitlin, F. (2019) 'Life trajectories: Iphigenia, Helen and Achilles on the Black Sea', in Braund, Hall, and Wyles 2019: 453–69.
- Zieliński, T. (1925) *Tragodumenon libri tres*. Kraków.
- Zografou, A. (2005) 'Élimination rituelle et sacrifice en Grèce ancienne', in S. Georgoudi, R. Koch Piettre, and F. Schmidt, eds, *La cuisine et l'autel: les sacrifices en questions dans les sociétés de la Méditerranée ancienne*, 197–213. Turnhout.
- Zuntz, G. (1965) *An inquiry into the transmission of the plays of Euripides*. Cambridge.



## GENERAL INDEX

---

- Achaia 5, 6  
 Achaeans 4, 111, 113, 148, 157  
 Achilles 4, 34, 113, 138, 147, 156,  
     159, 169, 170, 218, 219  
     racecourse of 18, 170  
 Achilles Tatius 48  
 actors 19, 22, 25–6, 27–30, 42, 43, 125,  
     142, 155, 190, 217, 241, 289  
 interpolations by 42–3  
*Acts of the Apostles* 49  
*Acts of Paul and Thekla* 48–9  
 Admetos 34  
 Adorno, Theodor 52  
 adultery 39, 184, 212, 224  
*adyton* 13, 230, 239, 270, 271, 294  
 Aegean Sea 19  
 Aelius Aristides 298  
 aeolo-choriambic metres 28, 163, 244,  
     254, 265, 266  
 Aerope 38, 39, 136  
 Aeschylus 3, 9, 21, 39, 42, 43, 116,  
     167, 185, 225–8  
     *Agamemnon* 9 n. 21, 34, 39, 110,  
         112, 113, 117, 132, 144, 160,  
         157, 185, 191, 201, 202, 218,  
         219–20, 230, 261, 285  
     *Choephori* 10, 25, 117, 121, 123, 135,  
         148, 185, 202, 211, 218, 242,  
         274  
     *Eumenides* 6, 8, 14, 121, 147, 200,  
         202, 225–7, 229, 230, 265, 269,  
         270, 290, 296  
     *Oresteia* trilogy 5, 9, 22, 30, 120,  
         185  
     *Persae* 4, 26, 124, 133, 134, 257,  
         284, 291  
     *Prometheus Bound* 166, 169  
 aetiology 6, 8, 9, 11–15, 39, 42, 121,  
     225, 227–8, 289–90, 293–6  
 Agamemnon 4–8, 10, 18, 33–5, 37,  
     39, 110, 112, 118, 131, 137,  
     141, 144, 154, 155, 158, 160,  
     174, 185, 191, 197–200, 211,  
     218–20, 223, 224, 258  
     daughters 4, 185  
     murder of 10, 136, 138, 181–4, 191  
     sacrifices Iphigeneia 4–8, 33–5,  
         154–5, 158, 219–20, 224  
 Agathon 122
- Agaue 148  
 Aigeira 6  
 Aigeus 205, 270  
 Aigina 256  
 Aigisthos 5, 224  
 Ajax 148  
 Akalaitis, JoAnne 53  
 Alcaeus 265  
 Alcman 253  
 Aldus Manutius 44  
 Alkestis 34  
 Alkippe 226  
 Alkmaion 37  
 Alkyone 247, 248  
 alphabetical plays 43, 47  
 altar 24, 110, 113, 115, 119, 133, 140,  
     191, 192  
 amoibaion 20, 40  
 Amphiaraios 272  
 Amphitrite 168, 169  
 Amyklai 5  
 anachronism 111, 192  
 anadiplosis 131, 219, 300  
 anapaests 28, 126, 136, 138–40, 163,  
     172, 214, 274, 275, 298  
 Anaxibia 223  
 anchors 170, 280, 281  
 animals 25, 114, 148, 157, 176, 237,  
     262, 293  
 ‘announcer’ 262  
 Anthesteria 13, 227–9; *see also* Choes  
 antilabe 260, 300  
 aorist 112, 133, 138, 223, 225  
 ‘tragic aorist’ 219, 236, 256  
 Aphrodite 24, 309  
 Apollo 31, 40–2, 51, 135, 160, 173,  
     226, 244, 248, 251, 257,  
     264–74, 289–92, 294  
     and Artemis 36, 41–2, 45, 235, 286,  
         298  
     and Orestes 5–6, 14, 35–7, 40,  
         120–3, 202, 222, 226, 229–30  
     oracles 186, 242, 271–4  
 Apollodorus 146, 247  
 Apollonius Rhodius 129, 169, 262,  
     270  
 apotheosis 4–6, 9, 15, 294  
 appearance and reality 32–3, 134, 208,  
     300, 311

- Araphen 292  
 Arcadia 5, 6, 14, 35  
 Archelaos of Macedon 1  
 archery 112, 268, 283  
 Areopagos 120–1, 200, 225–30, 290,  
     295, 296  
 Ares 226, 230  
 Argo (Argonauts) 19, 129, 169  
 Argos 116, 133, 139, 185, 186, 220,  
     235, 258  
     Iph. and Or. both Argive 174, 180,  
         193, 197, 210  
     kinship of 198–200, 224  
     return to 14–15, 206, 208, 251,  
         291–2, 294  
 Aristophanes 3, 44, 48, 295  
     *Acharnians* 155, 228  
     *Birds* 8  
     *Frogs* 1, 29, 42, 109, 130, 131, 140,  
         247, 253, 255  
     *Lysistrata* 112, 205  
     *Peace* 256, 289  
     *Thesmophoriazousae* 44  
     *Wealth (Plutus)* 277  
 Aristophanes of Byzantium 42–3  
 Aristotle 29 n. 62, 84, 203, 247  
     *Poetics* 4, 19, 23 n. 49, 30, 37, 45,  
         50, 149  
 Arrian 170  
 Artemida 292  
 Artemis 4–7, 12–14, 25, 34, 40–2, 45,  
     48–52, 111–15, 117–21, 125,  
     129–31, 139, 158, 176, 182,  
     189, 242–4, 248–50, 259, 262,  
     264, 268, 284–6, 288–9, 292–4;  
     *see also* Hekate  
     and Apollo 31, 235, 244, 268, 286,  
         298  
     and human sacrifice 4, 33, 36–7,  
         40, 48, 111–12, 115, 155, 157,  
         160–2, 173, 294  
     at Brauron 14, 114, 290, 294–5  
     at Ephesus 48  
     at Halai Araphenides 12–13, 25,  
         292–3, 296  
     Einodie 5, 294  
     Lochia 137, 248  
     lunar 48, 112  
     Ortheia 293  
     Phosphoros 112  
     statue of 12, 14, 117–221, 200, 225,  
         231, 260, 163, 291, 293, 296,  
         298  
     Taurian sanctuary of 17, 19, 22–4,  
         189  
     Tauropolis 12, 13–14, 17, 293–4,  
         296  
 Assyrian prayers 116  
 Astyoche 223  
 asyndeton 138, 139, 151, 247, 300  
 Athena 7, 14, 21, 23, 26, 121, 122,  
     129, 139, 140, 238, 249, 255,  
     262, 278, 299  
     at the play's conclusion 9, 12, 21,  
         23, 25, 31, 36, 42, 50, 51,  
         160, 241, 243, 249, 260, 274,  
         289–99  
     saves Orestes at the Areopagos 6, 8,  
         120, 229, 290, 296  
 Athens 1, 12, 14, 21, 31, 34, 50, 122,  
     139, 199, 238, 248, 249, 251,  
     262, 290, 292, 293, 299  
     bringing Artemis to 242, 36, 120,  
         232, 243  
     Orestes in 6, 12, 121, 200, 225–9  
     *see also* Attica  
 Atreus 4, 10, 38–40, 110, 125, 136,  
     212  
     descendants of 131, 137, 221, 223  
 attendants 25–6, 45, 129, 134, 155,  
     172, 175–6, 191, 194, 203, 237,  
     254, 260–2, 275, 276  
 Attica 14, 17, 27, 139, 251, 253, 260,  
     289, 290–5  
     Artemis in 12, 24, 36, 118, 121–2,  
         160, 260, 263, 292, 296  
     Iphigeneia in 6, 9, 42, 206, 291  
     *see also* Athens  
 Attic forms 5, 111, 153, 157, 205  
 Aulis 4, 7, 35, 39, 47, 111, 137–8, 158,  
     183, 211–13, 250, 294  
 aulos 27, 29, 132, 158, 170, 250–1  
 Auxesia: *see* Damia  
 Babylonian prayers 116  
 bacchants 23, 148  
 Bacchylides 169  
 barbarians 32, 48–50, 114, 117, 135  
     ‘barbarism’ 17, 36, 50, 53, 114, 242,  
         257, 265, 288  
     clothing 36  
     contrasted with Greeks 26, 36, 47,  
         51, 53, 231, 236, 255, 257, 260,  
         283, 289  
     escape from 48–9  
     human sacrifice 34–8

- basins, sacrificial 16, 24, 117, 153,  
194, 259  
bears 114  
beasts: *see* animals  
bedroom, girl's 10, 116, 213, 252  
birds 170, 246, 247, 252  
birth: *see* childbirth  
Black Sea 18–19, 46, 122, 129, 145,  
146, 162, 165–70, 243, 252  
blood 12, 15, 24, 36, 119, 120, 143,  
150, 154, 171, 194, 224, 257,  
262, 293  
*bomolochos* 48  
Boreas 169  
Borysthenes 170  
Bosporos 18–19, 163, 165–70  
*boukrania* 45  
Bousiris 35  
Branchidai 230  
Braun, Volker 52  
Brauron 6–7, 9, 12–15, 42, 114, 130,  
290, 294–6  
Bretzner, Christoph Friedrich 49  
Britomartis 130  
brothers: *see* sibling relationships  
buckthorn 262  
burial: *see* funeral rites  
  
caesura 122  
Callimachus 228, 270  
Carthage 35, 192  
catharsis: *see* purification  
cattle 119, 130, 133, 143, 145, 148,  
150, 162, 165, 166  
cenotaphs 6–7, 196, 201, 213  
Chalandri 1  
chariots 25, 110, 121, 138, 159, 167,  
213, 234, 252  
*Charition* 48  
Chersonese, Tauric 7, 8, 17–19, 36, 46,  
130, 168, 170, 181, 208, 220,  
221, 243, 298  
Chersonesos (city) 17, 250  
childbirth, birth 12–13, 15, 110, 117,  
137, 138, 161, 179, 248, 249,  
263, 268, 271, 294, 295  
*choai* 125, 134, 175, 193  
Choes 13–15, 227–9  
chorus (of *IT*) 40, 41, 52, 125,  
129–32, 287–90, 295–9  
identity and fortunes 40–1, 118,  
129–31, 172, 186–7, 195,  
248–9, 252, 290, 295–7  
silence and secrecy 239–42, 255,  
276–7  
sing about choruses 29, 169, 244  
solidarity with *Iph.* 52, 125, 217,  
287  
choruses  
dramatic 25, 27–30, 125, 298  
non-dramatic 130, 169, 244, 253–4  
chorus-leader 27, 173, 240, 276  
Chryseis 8  
Chryses 8–9, 44, 46  
Chrysothemis 4, 115, 185  
Cicero 46  
Circe 49, 262  
Clashing Rocks: *see* Symplegades  
clothes 10, 12–13, 15, 24, 120, 152,  
211, 212, 253, 262, 270; *see also*  
costume; textiles; weaving  
colloquialism 142, 149, 152, 157, 209,  
211, 233, 234, 242, 286, 297  
colonialism 51–2  
colour 43, 120, 134, 268, 269  
Columella 143  
columns 17, 116–19, 166  
comedy 30, 35 n. 84, 48, 109, 149,  
182, 205, 241, 242, 276, 286  
conative 157, 223, 276, 277, 279, 282,  
283, 300  
conch 151  
consecration 16, 47, 115, 142, 171,  
191, 193, 194, 255, 277  
copings 119, 130  
Corinth 14, 191  
*coronis* 300  
correspondence, metrical: *see* respon-  
sion, metrical  
costume 26–7, 30, 130, 141–3, 176  
cowardice 123–4, 190, 283  
cowherds 143–53  
crane (*mēchanē*) 23  
crasis 143, 300  
cretics 164, 214, 219  
Crimea 17, 53, 54; *see also* Chersonese,  
Tauric  
crucifixion 16, 288  
curses 180, 182, 205–6, 208  
Cyclopean masonry 218  
*Cypria* 4, 7, 9, 15, 112–14  
  
dactylo-epitrite 163, 214, 266, 270  
Damia and Auxesia 256  
dance 27–30, 41, 139, 169, 172,  
243–4, 249, 252–4, 264

- Danube 18, 170  
 Darius 133  
 decapitation 16, 24, 45, 119, 120, 288  
 deceit 31–3, 51, 144, 161, 183, 218,  
     234, 254–60, 275, 277, 278,  
     285  
 dedications 12, 13, 120, 176, 295  
 deer 4, 44, 113–14, 209, 250  
 Delos 244, 248–9, 253, 267–8, 296  
 Delphi 14, 51–2, 173, 225, 226,  
     230–1, 244, 264–74, 292  
 Delphyne(s) 265  
 Demeter 162  
*deus ex machina* 11, 37, 50, 122, 249,  
     274, 290  
 Diana 50, 51  
*didaskaliai* 1, 3, 45  
 Didyma 230  
 Dikynna 130  
 Diodorus 192, 295  
 Diomedes 255  
 Dionysia 1, 3, 21  
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus 27 n. 58,  
     28 n. 59  
 Dionysos 23, 42, 227–8, 269  
 Dioskouroi 31, 37, 146, 292  
 dirge: *see* lament  
 Dirke 131, 166  
 disbelief 11, 147, 160, 162, 275  
 dithyrambs 26, 27, 29, 169  
 divination 112, 113, 268; *see also*  
     prophecy  
 Dnieper 18, 170  
 dochmiacs 28, 194–5, 214, 216, 217,  
     219, 220  
 Dodona 272  
 dogs 148–50  
 doorkeepers 255, 262  
 doors 22–4, 122, 123, 203, 275, 276  
 Doric forms 205, 291  
 dragons 269  
 dreams 181, 235, 264, 271–4  
     Iph.'s dream 9, 33, 37, 115–18, 119,  
         131–3, 181, 186, 191, 213, 233,  
         235, 252, 264, 273  
 drinking 13, 227–8  
 drink-offerings: *see choai*  
 earthquakes 116, 117, 233, 256  
 Egypt 7, 31, 35, 114, 183  
 Einodie 5, 294; *see also* Artemis,  
     Hekate  
*eisodoi* 22; *see also parodoi*  
*ekkyklēma* 23  
 Elektra 9–10, 40, 51, 139, 151, 159,  
     185, 192–3, 196, 199–201,  
     211–12, 213, 221, 222–3, 224,  
     235, 240, 242  
 Eleusis 34  
 elision 199, 300  
 embroidery 140, 252, 254  
 enslavement: *see* slavery  
 entrances 2–3, 22–3, 25, 129, 141,  
     172, 173, 176, 221, 255, 274–5,  
     289  
*Eoiai* 4, 5, 111, 223, 247, 294  
*epeisodia* 19–21  
 Epic Cycle 4–5, 113; *see also* *Cypria*;  
     *Nostoi*  
 epic forms and usage 132, 133, 134,  
     150, 153, 155, 157, 167, 177,  
     180, 205, 216, 249, 284, 291  
 epilepsy 121, 148  
 epinician 124  
 epiphany 25, 51, 122, 145, 289  
 Eratosthenes 32 n. 75  
 Erinyes 5, 6, 8, 31, 39, 118, 120,  
     147–50, 200, 224, 263, 296  
     at the Areopagos 6, 120, 225–6, 229  
     cause madness 39, 121, 148, 224  
     seen by Orestes 148–50  
 escape plot 30–3, 38, 44 n. 103, 45–9,  
     236–43  
 ethnicity 36, 118, 257; *see also* barbar-  
     ians; Greekness; race  
 ethnography 15, 289  
 etymology 8, 114, 124, 132, 138, 142,  
     158, 166, 186, 269, 300  
 Euadne 34  
 Euboia 111, 293  
 Eubulus 199  
 euphemism 177, 225, 226, 250  
 Euphron 6  
 Euripides  
     life and career 1–3  
     *Alcestis* 2, 31, 34, 43, 299  
     *Andromache* 2, 14 n. 35, 43, 299  
     *Bacchae* 2, 3, 23, 36, 43, 144, 299  
     *Cyclops* 2, 32  
     *Electra* 2, 5 n. 14, 10, 14, 25, 37  
         n. 88, 119, 121, 125, 136, 139,  
         144, 146, 148, 158, 185, 211,  
         212, 222, 224, 226, 263  
     *Hecuba* 2, 14, 34, 41, 43

- Helen* 2, 3, 7, 22, 25, 31-3, 44, 49,  
51, 110, 113-14, 125, 132, 138,  
143, 144, 158, 166, 179, 180,  
210, 217, 221, 234, 236-7, 239,  
240, 250, 255, 257, 260, 264,  
272, 278-9, 288, 292, 299
- Heracidae* (*Children of Herakles*) 2, 34,  
113, 125, 142, 176, 259, 269
- Hercules Furens* (*Mad Herakles*) 3,  
148, 151, 160-2, 187, 250, 253,  
257, 267, 283
- Hippolytus* 2, 11 n. 26, 14, 24, 36, 43,  
114, 129, 154, 156, 158, 159,  
183, 187, 207, 222, 237, 239,  
240, 245, 258, 291-3, 298, 299
- Ion* 2, 3, 11, 14, 31, 36, 110, 114, 118,  
125, 130, 135, 155, 160, 161,  
180, 187, 202, 210, 217, 230,  
248, 249, 267-72, 290-2, 297
- Iphigeneia at Aulis* 3, 113, 152, 158,  
169, 187, 282
- Medea* 2, 7, 14, 43, 125, 129, 155,  
167, 199, 205, 208, 225, 239,  
240, 276, 299
- Orestes* 2, 5, 7, 27, 29, 31, 37, 43,  
110, 111, 114, 117, 121, 124,  
125, 144, 148, 149, 151, 155,  
185, 204, 224, 235, 267, 270,  
288, 292, 299  
scholia, 38 n. 92
- Phoenissae* (*Phoenician Women*) 2, 7,  
24, 34, 43, 110, 112, 120, 123,  
124, 132, 144, 161, 173, 185,  
190, 269, 299
- Rhesus* 3, 43, 111, 116
- Supplices* (*Suppliant Women*) 2, 34
- Troades* (*Trojan Women*) 2, 3, 43, 125,  
250, 251, 253, 257, 268, 287
- fragmentary plays 11, 34  
*Alkmaion in Corinth* 3  
*Andromeda* 32-3, 42 n. 96, 44  
*Antiope* 3  
*Archelaus* 124  
*Bellerophon* 160  
*Cretans* 149  
*Cretan Women* 125  
*Erechtheus* 3, 34, 292  
*Hypsipyle* 3, 130  
*Meleager* 124  
*Phaethon* 3, 254, 288  
*Temenidai* 1  
*Temenos* 1
- Euripos 111
- Europe 18, 130, 131, 163, 165, 166, 243
- Eurotas 166
- Eurystheus 34
- Euxeinos 122; *see* Black Sea
- exits 22, 23, 26, 119, 141, 154, 155,  
173, 175, 187, 221, 243, 289
- exodos 19-22, 274-99
- exoticism 16, 18, 32, 48, 50, 163, 169,  
192
- extra-metrical words 176, 184, 192,  
195, 255, 300
- face-coverings: *see* veils
- families 37-41, 190, 298  
of Agamemnon 35, 191, 197-8,  
200-1, 214, 287  
of chorus 186-7, 195, 252-3, 297  
of Tantalos and Pelops 10, 18, 109,  
135-41, 212-13, 232-3  
*see also* Pelopidai
- Fassbinder, Rainer Werner 52
- fate 219
- feminism 52-3
- festivals 13, 110, 114-15, 139-40, 244,  
248, 252-4, 264  
dramatic 1, 21, 299  
*see also* Anthesteria; Tauropolia
- fighths 46, 144-5, 150-3, 283-4
- figura etymologica* 137, 158, 300
- firs 167
- first-fruits decree 225
- flying 41, 149, 217, 243, 246, 247
- focalisation 144, 151, 209, 278, 280,  
284
- fortune 177-8, 184, 195, 202, 222,  
243, 250, 291
- friendship 19, 39, 46-8, 50, 144, 151,  
179, 189-90, 195-7, 202, 223  
female 116, 139, 217, 253
- funeral rites and burial 10, 14, 16, 37,  
40, 117-18, 125, 133-4, 142,  
192-3, 200, 234, 237
- Furies: *see* Erinyes
- future tense 142, 152, 199, 221, 223,  
239, 276, 288, 291  
future perfect 198, 239  
jussive future 210, 276, 288
- Gaia 265, 269, 271-3
- Camel, Mary-Kay 53
- garlands 228

- genitive 115, 131, 132, 137, 140, 150,  
     152, 180, 185, 197, 253, 258,  
     268, 271, 272  
   absolute 112, 150  
   descriptive 130  
   of exclamation 133  
   patronymic 134, 166  
   possessive 130  
   with verbs of touching 138, 158  
*Geoponica* 143  
 gestures 30, 146, 222, 223, 229, 241,  
     273  
 giants 139, 269  
 Gluck, Christoph Willibald 50  
 goats 113, 157  
 gods  
   and pollution, 161, 238  
   battles of 139–40  
   blamed or criticised 120–2, 160–2,  
     185–6  
   in final scenes and aetiologies 11,  
     14, 289–92  
   oaths sworn by 205, 207  
   offerings to 13, 117, 213; *see also*  
     dedications; libation; prayer;  
     sacrifice  
   Olympian 140, 146, 265, 289  
   problematic nature of 36–7, 51,  
     160–2  
   unknowable will of 177  
 Goethe 50–3  
 gold 130, 133, 261, 268, 270  
 graves: *see* tombs  
 Greekness 135, 155, 275; *see also*  
   barbarians  
 guards 175–6, 194, 203, 236, 237,  
   260, 279, 283; *see also* atten-  
   dants  
 Guillard, Nicolas-François 50–1  
  
 Hades 135, 159  
 hair 116, 117, 119, 211, 213, 248,  
   253, 254, 268  
   as offering 10, 134, 201, 211, 213  
 Halai Aixonides 292  
 Halai Araphenides 12–14, 25, 290,  
   292, 293, 296  
 halcyon 243, 246, 247  
 Halirrthothios 226  
 Harrison, Tony 53  
 Hekate 5, 52, 112; *see also* Artemis  
   Einodie  
 Helen 34–5, 39–40, 110, 114, 138,  
   155, 157, 166, 170–2, 179,  
   181–2, 185, 196  
 Heliodorus 48  
 hendiadys 149, 192, 300  
 Hera 139, 140, 165  
 Heraclitus 222, 262  
 Herakles 2, 34, 35, 148, 162, 197  
 Hermes 114, 270, 273  
 Hermion 6  
 hero-cult 6–7, 12, 14–15, 146, 294  
 Herodotus 5, 7, 9, 15–18, 35, 119,  
   131, 166, 192, 230, 256, 288  
 Hesiod, Hesiodic corpus 4  
   fragments 5, 138, 169, 182, 247  
   *Theogony* 169  
   *Works and Days* 145, 168  
 Hesychius 71, 192, 285, 295  
 hiatus 136, 300  
 Himerius 265  
 Hippocratic Corpus 122  
 Hippodameia 38, 213  
 Homer 4, 111, 112, 117, 157, 158,  
   180, 187, 219, 223, 255, 269,  
   273, 291  
   *Iliad* 4, 8, 111, 114, 141, 150, 156,  
     185, 242, 247, 273  
   *Odyssey* 4, 5, 32, 129, 146, 177, 181,  
     182, 199, 223  
 Homeric Hymns 159, 179, 248–9, 251,  
   265, 268, 270–1, 273  
 homicide: *see* murder  
 honey 133, 134, 193  
 horses 110, 121, 131, 136, 138, 162,  
   224, 252, 288  
 hospitality 12, 138, 180, 225–7, 236  
 hunting 4, 113, 120, 147, 148, 201,  
   256  
 Hyginus 8, 9, 47, 51  
   *hymenaios* 158  
 hymns 125, 129, 264, 266, 268, 270,  
   286  
 Hyperbolos 256  
 hypodochmiac 195  
   *hysteron proteron* 277, 300  
  
 iambic metre 2, 138, 139, 163, 214,  
   217, 219, 251, 266  
 illiteracy 187–8  
 imagery 29, 117, 121, 150, 152, 224,  
   232, 283  
 impaling 288  
 imperative 154, 206, 209, 231, 276,  
   286, 287

- third-person 260, 297  
 imperfect 151, 152, 154, 157, 285  
   conative 283  
   contrasted with perfect 156  
   of action begun 113, 152  
 impurity: *see* pollution  
 indefinite pronoun 142, 286  
 India 28, 48  
 indicative 152, 153, 195, 210, 221,  
   223, 239, 276  
   in consecutive clause 178  
   with  $\text{ἵνα}$  in final clause 157  
 infinitive 117, 124, 162, 178, 188, 199,  
   222, 280  
   in consecutive clause 284  
   of purpose 143, 207  
   with request 273  
 inheritance 141, 199–201  
 Ino 146  
 insanity: *see* madness  
 inscriptions 7, 17, 292, 294  
 Io 165  
 Ionian festivals 227, 248  
 Iphianassa 4, 185  
 Iphimede 5, 6, 111  
 irony 111, 131, 143, 146, 160, 170,  
   172, 174, 177, 180, 182, 183,  
   185, 190, 192, 194, 201, 203,  
   209, 255, 257, 261, 279  
 Isaeus 191  
 Ismene 221  
 Isocrates 35, 309  
 Isthmia 146  
  
 Jason 262  
 javelins 158, 283  
 Jephtha 112  
 jewellery 25, 262  
 Jocasta 7  
  
 Kadmos 36  
 Kalais 169  
 Kalchas 4, 34, 37, 39, 110–13, 138,  
   174, 182, 197, 272, 282  
 Karkinos 23  
 Karystos 293  
 Cassandra 191  
 Kastalia 270–1  
 Kastor 37, 146, 292  
 'keyholder' 130  
 keys, temple 27, 130, 294  
 Keyx 247  
 kingfishers 247  
  
 Kleidemos 176  
 Klytaimestra 115, 117, 138, 141, 149,  
   158, 185, 187, 201, 211, 229,  
   261, 263, 294  
   adultery of 39, 184, 224  
   murdered by Orestes 4, 5, 33, 35,  
   36, 39, 110, 118, 120, 136, 184,  
   224, 229, 294  
   murders Agamemnon 5, 35, 37,  
   110, 136, 191  
   prepares Iph. for wedding 10, 158,  
   212–13  
 knife, in sacrifice 16, 113, 115, 130,  
   191, 209, 293  
*kommos* 20, 21, 173, 194–6  
 Kore 34, 159  
*koryphaios*: *see* chorus-leader  
 Kos 238, 261  
 Kourotrophos 238  
*kratēr* 12, 133, 227  
 Kreon 34, 260  
 Kreousa 31  
 Kydonia 130  
 Kydragora 223  
 Kyklopes 218  
 Kyme 235  
 Kynthos, mountain on Delos 248, 268  
 Kypselos 136, 169  
 Kyrene 139, 262  
  
 Laconia 5, 166  
 ladders 123, 280, 281, 289, 295  
 Lagrange-Chancel, François Joseph  
   50, 53  
 Laios 112  
 lament 28, 12–16, 131–7, 194–6, 218,  
   246–7  
 Langner, Ilse 52  
 Laodike 4, 185  
 laurel 248, 269  
 Leto 41, 130, 161, 242, 248, 249, 263,  
   267, 268, 298  
 Letoon 249  
 letter, Iph.'s 24, 40, 45, 46, 187, 188,  
   194, 196, 203–11, 220  
 Leuke 18, 170  
 Leukothea 146  
 libation 10, 117–18, 126, 132–4, 135,  
   211, 286; *see also* *choai*  
 lies 237, 276; *see also* deceit  
 Lindos 257  
 lions 150  
 liquid offerings: *see* libation

- literacy 187–8  
 Livy 111  
 Loutsa 292  
 Loxias 226, 243  
 Lucian 44, 47, 50, 198  
 Lydia 109  
 Lykos 148  
 Lykourgos 42  
 lyres 27, 132, 251, 268  
  
 Macedonia 1, 21 n. 44  
*machina*: *see* *deus ex machina*; *mēchanē*  
 madness 121, 147–8, 150–1, 154, 224, 238  
 Maiden goddess (of Taurians) 5, 7, 9, 15–16  
 maidens' dances 29, 41, 139, 169, 172, 252–4  
 maiden-songs 244, 253  
 Malalas, John 47  
 manuscripts 43–4  
 Mardonios 130  
 mares: *see* horses  
 Marlowe, Christopher 111  
 Marmara, Sea of: *see* Propontis  
 marriage (ceremony) 13, 32, 137–8, 158–9, 212, 153, 263  
     Iph.'s fake marriage 4, 10, 34, 38, 113, 139, 154, 183, 212–13, 218  
 marriage (state) 15, 110, 199–200, 213, 248, 294  
 masculine plural, of women 183  
 masks 26, 283  
 matricide 5, 12, 37, 39, 41, 217, 225, 237, 257, 259, 263, 294; *see also* Klytaimestra  
 McLaughlin, Ellen 52  
*mēchanē* 23  
 Megara 6  
 Melikertes 146  
 melodrama 31  
 Menander 13  
 Menelaos 34, 35, 110, 155, 157, 171, 181, 183, 196, 199, 221, 224  
     in *Helen* 22 n. 46, 31, 33, 217, 234, 236–7, 239  
 Menoikeus 34  
 merchants 167–8  
 messenger speeches and scenes 20, 21, 42, 112, 141–54, 189, 222, 260, 274–8, 288, 291, 292  
 metamythology 11, 181, 197  
 metatheatre 142, 225, 278, 299  
 metonymy 118, 129, 154, 226, 259, 278, 300  
 metre 2–3, 27–8, 126–7, 164–5, 194, 214–15, 244–6, 265–7; *see also* *names of specific metres*  
 Mexico 53  
 milk 133  
 mime 48  
 miracles 153, 254, 256  
*mise en abîme* 15  
 misfortune 156, 176, 180, 199, 200, 202, 240, 250  
 mixing-bowl: *see* *kratēr*  
 modes, musical 28–9  
 modesty 159  
 Moirai 137  
 Molossia 14  
 monody 19, 28, 214  
 monologue 20, 109, 115  
 monsters 149, 269  
 monuments, funeral 7, 27, 46, 235; *see also* tombs  
 Mopsos 182  
 mothers, motherhood 177, 179, 212, 248, 253, 267–8, 271–3; *see also* Klytaimestra; matricide  
 mourning 28, 125, 134–5, 237; *see also* funeral rites; lament  
 Mozart 49  
 murder 31, 37, 110, 113, 136, 137, 161–2, 188, 199, 226–7, 236, 238, 257, 262; *see also* Agamemnon; Klytaimestra; matricide  
 murex 145  
 music 27–30, 132, 135, 158, 251, 268  
 Mycenae 14, 180, 218, 231  
 myth 4–6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 34, 52, 181, 226  
     questioning of 11  
     rationalisation of 166  
  
 names 143, 179  
 Nauplia 210  
 Nazism 52  
 Neoptolemos 156  
 Nereids 29, 146, 169  
 Nereus 146–7, 169  
 nets 120  
 Nike 299  
 nobility 26, 124, 190, 214, 283  
 Nonius Marcellus 46



- non-'tragic' tragedy 30-3  
*Nostoi* 5  
 Nowra, Louis 53  
 nurses 141, 217, 237  
 Nyssa 47
- oars 167, 170, 239, 250, 280  
 oaths 112, 196, 203-7, 209, 232, 241  
 Odysseus 5, 34, 39, 112, 113, 117,  
 146, 174, 182, 196, 202, 282  
 oil 133, 193  
 Oinomaos 38, 110, 213  
 olive 248-9, 251  
 Olympia 110, 274  
 omens 112, 116, 143, 254, 256  
 opera 49-50  
 oracles 173, 186, 230, 264-5, 268-74  
 oracular responses and commands  
 112, 173, 225; *see also* Delphi  
 Apollo's to Orestes 42, 120, 123,  
 125, 202, 235, 242-3, 292  
*orchestra* 22, 24, 29  
 Oropos 272  
 Ortygia 248  
 Ostriv Zmiyiny (Leuke) 170  
 Ovid 46, 47, 50  
 oxymoron 132, 139, 184, 185, 247,  
 249, 285, 300
- Pacuvius 46, 47  
 paians 135, 265, 267, 286  
 Palaimon 146  
 Palestine 47  
 Palladion 121, 238, 255  
 Pallas 139; *see also* Athena  
 palm trees 248-9  
 Pan 250-1  
 Panathenaia 139-40  
 panpipes 251  
 Panyassis 35  
 papyri 27, 29, 43, 188, 191, 280, 288  
 Paris 157  
 Parnassos 268  
*parodoi* 22, 23, 129, 172, 204  
 parodos 5, 10, 19, 23, 27, 38, 118, 125  
 of *IT* 19, 20, 28, 40, 118, 125-  
 41, 163, 175, 232, 244, 253  
 parody 10, 29, 44 n. 102, 114, 131,  
 140, 155, 228, 247, 253  
*partheneia* 244, 253  
 participles 123, 140, 142, 151, 161,  
 178, 187, 199, 200, 202, 207,  
 279, 291
- passive forms and constructions 158,  
 171, 178, 219, 225, 283  
 Patroklos 41, 135, 156  
 patronymics 134, 166, 211  
 Pausanias 5, 6, 136, 169, 191, 229, 272  
 Pazzi de' Medici, Alessandro 49, 312  
 Peleus 159  
 Pelopidai 4, 10, 18, 40, 136, 231,  
 233, 287, 294; *see also* families;  
 Pelops; Tantalos  
 Peloponnese 5, 109, 213  
 Pelops 18, 37-8, 109-10, 136, 141,  
 162, 211, 213-14, 231-2  
 spear of 10, 116, 141, 213  
 Penelope 117  
 penteconters 231, 250, 280  
 Pentheus 23, 148  
 peplos, Panathenaic 139  
 Perseus 32, 33  
 Persian Wars 4, 111  
 personification 155, 194, 248, 250,  
 256, 268, 269  
 Phanodemos 13, 228  
 Phasis 131  
 Pherecydes 5 n. 14, 182, 213  
 Philodemus 5  
 Phineus 18, 168-9  
 Phlya 1  
 Phoibe 265  
 Phoibos: *see* Apollo  
 Phokis 198, 201, 206  
 pigs 157, 262  
 pillars: *see* columns  
 Pindar 4-5, 39, 124  
 fragments 191, 251, 265  
*Olympians* 109, 136, 137, 162, 168,  
 247  
*Pythians* 5, 39, 129, 134, 139  
 Pisa (Olympia) 110  
 pity 39, 40, 112, 138, 140, 141, 155-6,  
 160, 176-8, 184, 185, 188, 192,  
 194-5, 197, 211, 226, 240  
 Planktai 129  
 Plato 28, 29, 35, 111, 117, 261  
 Plato Comicus 199  
 Plautus 48  
 plural  
 for singular 130, 138, 187, 254, 281  
 plural verb with singular or dual sub-  
 ject 153, 208  
 Plutarch 44, 115, 262, 269  
 Plynteria 262  
 polis 17, 25, 189, 294

- pollution 23, 36, 161, 191, 193, 200,  
     225–8, 230, 238, 256–63  
     of Orestes 23, 39, 200–1, 224–34,  
     237–8, 263  
 Pollux, Julius 23  
 Polydeukes 146; *see also* Dioskouroi  
 Polyidos 45, 46, 50  
 Polyphemos 282  
 polypotton 114, 300  
 polyschematist: *see* wilamowitzian  
 Polyxene 34  
 portents: *see* omens  
 Portunus 146  
 Poseidon 169, 226, 287, 290–2  
 pottery: *see* vases  
 Praxitheia 292  
 prayer 42, 48, 115, 116, 129, 134, 146,  
     147, 154, 169, 171, 180, 182,  
     190, 191, 242–3, 261–3, 284,  
     285–7, 299  
 predictions: *see* prophecy  
 present tense, historic 112, 150  
     with verbs expressing relationships  
     110, 114, 138, 199  
 Priam 156  
 priestesses 6, 24, 27, 48, 49, 52, 53,  
     115, 117, 130, 139, 143, 158,  
     171, 176, 184, 191–3, 210, 224,  
     238–9, 250, 255, 258, 270, 286,  
     290, 291  
     Iphigeneia as priestess 14, 24, 47  
     n. 13, 52, 53, 114, 129, 143,  
     160, 184, 190–3, 208, 210, 224,  
     258–9, 282, 286, 290–1, 294  
 priests, priesthood 8, 115, 117, 130,  
     139, 158, 191, 193, 195, 205,  
     239, 250, 261, 294  
 Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 4, 5, 15, 112, 113  
 prolepsis 141, 142, 150, 224, 259, 300  
 prologue (*prologos*) 11–12, 19–21, 27,  
     37, 109–25, 131, 136, 137, 144,  
     152, 154, 157, 189, 209, 211,  
     213, 232  
 Pronomos 27  
 properties, stage 24, 187, 203  
 prophecy 9, 11, 14, 34, 112, 116–17,  
     123, 182, 186, 202, 225–6, 230,  
     264–5 270–4, 289, 291; *see also*  
     oracular responses  
 Propontis 18, 19, 129, 166  
*protagonistēs* 25–6  
 Proteus 114  
 proverbs 111, 207, 212, 285  
 punishment 16, 35, 149, 172, 182,  
     226, 235, 288, 289, 295, 297  
 purification 10, 19, 23, 25, 48, 117,  
     143, 161, 166, 200, 201, 221,  
     234, 238, 254, 257–9, 261–4,  
     271, 275, 277, 279  
 purity 36, 133–4, 166, 210; *see also*  
     pollution  
 purple: *see* murex  
 Pylades  
     encouragement of Orestes 122–4  
     friendship with Orestes 46–7,  
     49–50, 150, 195, 198, 202, 232  
     husband of Elektra 185, 199, 223  
     scepticism of 40, 197  
     with the letter 24, 45, 196, 204–9  
 Pythia 230, 265, 270, 271  
 Python 265  
 Pythos 265  
 pyxis: *see* vases  
 race 52; *see also* ethnicity  
 racing 110, 121, 213  
 Rafina 292  
*rāgas* 28  
 realism 145, 181, 187, 197, 257, 260,  
     289  
 reciprocity 241  
 recognition 9–10, 31, 32–3, 45–7, 48,  
     50, 182–4, 207–14  
 reeds 166  
 reperformance 42 n. 97  
 repetition 28, 114, 131, 166, 202, 205,  
     208, 219, 220, 233, 247, 270,  
     290  
 rescue 32, 40, 42, 48, 51, 163, 172,  
     186, 187  
 resolution, metrical 2, 216  
 responsion, metrical 30, 126, 135,  
     166, 168, 171, 194, 195, 244,  
     251, 252, 254, 270, 273  
 Reyes, Alfonso 53  
 Ritsos, Yiannis 52  
 rivers 131, 166, 170  
 ‘romantic melodrama’ 31  
 Rossini, Gioacchino 49  
 rowing 251, 280, 285, 286; *see also* oars  
 Rucellai, Giovanni 49  
 sacrifice 22, 24, 45, 47, 48, 51–3,  
     113–14, 117–19, 135, 142,  
     158–9, 171, 179, 188, 190–2,  
     228, 237, 262

- before battle 16, 113  
 human 5, 10, 15–17, 21, 24–5,  
     33–7, 48, 51, 53, 115, 119, 130,  
     145, 154–8, 161–2, 166, 171,  
     176, 187–8, 190–2, 218, 220,  
     238, 263, 282, 288–9, 293–4  
 of Iphigenia 4–5, 7, 38–40, 52,  
     110–13, 137–8, 154, 160,  
     208–9, 218, 224, 258  
 sails 251, 252, 285  
 Salmydessos 168, 169  
 Šamaš 16  
 Sappho 242  
 sarcophagi 46  
 satyr-plays 2, 3, 9, 30, 35, 42  
 scepticism: *see* disbelief  
 Scythia, Scythians 12, 17, 26, 35, 47, 130  
 sea 19, 143, 168, 170, 189, 238, 259;  
     *see also* Black Sea  
 seers 182, 186, 251; *see also* prophecy  
 self-referentiality 132, 169, 253, 299  
 Selinous 261  
 Selloi 272  
 Semnai Theai 296  
 Sevastopol 53  
 shame 158, 159, 184, 198–9, 202, 226,  
     304  
 ships 41, 123, 167, 204, 206, 231, 239,  
     250–2, 275, 278, 280–6  
 shipwreck 7, 16, 146, 147, 171, 196,  
     206, 260  
 sibling relationships 9, 39–42, 121,  
     141, 177, 192, 193, 197, 208,  
     228, 298; *see also* family  
 sigmatism 199, 207, 241  
 Simonides 4, 265  
 sisters: *see* sibling relationships  
 slavery 19, 170, 172, 243, 249, 250, 282  
 Sminthe 8  
 snakes 117, 149, 265, 269, 270  
 Snake Island (Leuke) 170  
 Socrates 117  
 Solon 168  
 Sophocles 1, 3, 21, 25, 30, 42, 43, 109,  
     116, 141, 151, 298  
     *Ajax* 30 n. 67, 148, 151, 200, 283, 292  
     *Antigone* 30 n. 67, 182, 221, 231,  
     269, 287  
     *Electra* 5 n. 13, 9 n. 22, 52, 115, 133,  
     185, 202, 219, 225, 247, 263,  
     292  
     *Oedipus at Colonus* 133, 169, 226,  
     268  
     *Oedipus Tyrannus* 30 n. 67, 132, 135,  
     260  
     *Philoctetes* 156  
     *Trachiniae* 30 n. 67, 109, 113, 167  
     fragmentary plays 35 n. 83, 38, 168  
 Chryses 8–9, 44  
 Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane 290  
 spitting 256  
 spondees 126, 136  
 squill 262  
 stasimon 19–20  
 statues 6, 24, 33, 121, 122, 124, 149,  
     231, 255, 256, 262  
 statue of Artemis 12, 14, 25, 36, 46,  
     50, 51, 52, 122, 124, 200, 221,  
     225, 231–4, 238–9, 242–3,  
     254–60, 282, 284, 290–4, 296,  
     298  
 Stephanie, Gottlieb 49  
 Stesichorus 4, 5  
 stichomythia 21, 119, 120, 174, 178,  
     187, 188, 190, 205, 211, 221,  
     237, 260, 261, 300  
 Strabo 170, 295  
 strophic form 27, 30; *see also* respon-  
     sion  
 Strophios 118, 201, 223  
 subjunctive, in strong denials 112, 223  
 Suda 204  
 sun 41, 252, 260  
     reversed course 10, 38, 136, 212  
     telling dreams to 115–16  
 supplication 22, 158, 226, 230, 240–1,  
     273  
 swans 249  
 swearing: *see* oaths  
 sword, used in sacrifice 16, 17, 33,  
     113, 192, 209, 220, 259, 293  
 Symplegades 18, 19, 129, 145, 166,  
     168, 169, 205  
 synecdoche 282, 300  
 synzesis 157, 232, 239, 301  
 syrinx 251  
 tableaux, moving 172  
 Tanais 18  
 Tantalids 136–7; *see also* Pelopidai  
 Tantalos 11, 38, 136, 149, 162, 232  
 Taurians 5, 9, 15–19, 26  
     savage and uncivilised 33, 35–6,  
     156, 283  
     viewed positively in later works 50, 53  
     *see also* barbarians; Chersonese

- Tauropolia 13–15, 293–4, 296  
 Telemachos 183  
 Telephos 37  
 temples 17, 24, 130, 166  
   Taurian temple of Artemis 17, 19,  
     22, 24, 45, 118–24, 130, 192,  
     236–8, 254, 264  
 Tendra Spit 18, 170  
 tetralogies 3, 32  
 textiles 10, 140, 151–2, 212–13,  
   254, 295; *see also* clothes;  
   weaving  
 Thebes 4, 24, 31, 34, 131, 166  
 Theoklymenos (in *Helen*) 35–6, 51  
 Theonoe 31, 36, 49, 239  
 Theseus 162  
 Thetis 169, 273  
 Thoas 254–61, 275–9, 295–8  
   and Iphigeneia 33, 204, 236,  
     254–61  
   cruelty of 16, 258, 288–9  
   in *Chryses* story 8  
   in later versions 46–7, 49–53  
   piety of 36, 242, 288, 297  
   title of 204  
 Thrace 14, 117, 162, 168  
 Thyestes 4, 10, 37 n. 89, 38, 110, 136,  
   212  
 Tiryns 218  
 Titans 139, 140, 265  
 tmesis 216, 220, 273, 301  
 tokens 10, 24, 38, 45, 110, 116, 203,  
   211–14, 228  
 tombs 14, 24, 27, 118, 130, 133–4,  
   201, 213  
   Agamemnon's 10, 144  
   Iph.'s 7, 294  
   *see also* cenotaphs; funeral rites  
 torches 25, 112, 261, 262  
 tragicomedy 31  
 Triclinius, Demetrius 43, 55, 272  
 tricolon 240, 301  
 triglyphs 17, 124  
 Triklines, Nikolaos 43, 284  
 trilogies 32  
 trimeters  
   relation with lyric 131, 132, 194,  
     214, 218  
   resolution in 2  
 tripod, anapaestic 126, 138, 139  
 Triton 169  
 trochaic tetrameters 259  
 Troizen 5, 14  
 Trojan War 4, 7, 11, 34, 38, 41, 112,  
   174, 181–2, 287  
 Troy, Trojans 4, 41, 121, 129, 174,  
   181, 255, 287, 292  
 two-termination adjectives 141, 155,  
   191, 218, 259, 269, 279  
 Tyndareus 110, 211  
 Ukraine 53–4  
 Ukrainka, Lesya 53  
 ululation 279  
 vases 24, 26–7, 35, 44–5, 120, 130,  
   148, 229, 248, 255  
 veils 159, 203, 254  
 Vietta, Egon 52  
 virgins, virginity 6, 29, 32, 47, 130,  
   139, 184, 185, 200, 224, 241,  
   253  
 volcanic activity 192  
 voting 3, 6, 120, 226, 229, 290, 296  
 wall-painting 25, 46  
 warfare 16  
 wars: *see* Persian Wars; Trojan War  
 water, ritual use of 10, 16, 115–17,  
   133, 171, 188, 191, 195,  
   211–13, 238, 261, 262, 271  
 weaving 10, 38, 136, 139–40, 152,  
   188, 211–13, 254, 294–5; *see*  
   *also* textiles  
 weddings: *see* marriage (ceremony)  
 wilamowitzian (metrical unit) 3, 32,  
   171, 244  
 wine 12, 48, 133, 193, 227, 228  
 writing-tablet 187, 203  
 Xenophanes 162  
 Xenophon 180  
 Xerxes 26, 130  
 Xouthos 210  
 Zephyros 169  
 Zetes 169  
 Zeus 37, 165, 166, 242, 250, 261, 267,  
   271  
   father of Artemis and Apollo 41,  
     166, 264, 272–4, 298  
   god of oaths 204, 241  
 Zieliński, Tadeusz 2  
 'zooming' 290, 293

# INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES

- ἄ χρή 176  
 ἀβροκόμης 248  
 ἄγαλμα 147, 231, 295  
 Ἀγαμεμόνιος (-ειος) 134, 275  
 ἀγκύλη 286  
 ἄγορος 248  
 ἀγριόομαι 145  
 ἄδυτον 271  
 Ἀθηναία 291  
 αἰδώς 159  
 αἰτία 237  
 ἀκουε δὴ νυν 206  
 ἀκροθίνια 120, 173  
 ἄλκυων 247  
 ἀλλά with imperative 231  
 ἄλυρος 132  
 ἀμαθία/ἀμαθής 161  
 ἀμφίπολος 250  
 ἀνάγκη 191  
 ἀναλίσκω 154  
 ἄναξ 204, 290  
 ἀνήρ 204  
 ἀνοίγνυμι 123  
 ἀνολοιούζω 279  
 ἀνώνυμος 226  
 ἄξενος 122, 129  
 ἀπαίρω 180  
 ἀπέψη (ἀποψάω) 151  
 ἄπιστος 153, 210, 275–6, 297  
 ἀπλοία 111–12  
 Ἄπολλον 257  
 ἀπόλλυμι 157  
 ἀποναιά 271  
 ἀποτίνω 154  
 ἄρα 157  
 ἄρα 225  
 ἀραῖος 205  
 ἄρρητος 259  
 ἄστακτος 268  
 ἄτερος 143  
 ἄτη 132  
 Ἀτθίς 139, 293  
 ἄτοπος 217  
 αὐθις 159, 277  
 ἀφειδέω 282  
 ἀψευδής 270  
 βάρβαρος 257, 279  
 βρέτας 231  
 γαληνός 155  
 γαμέω 110  
 γάρ 179, 182  
 γε 120, 180, 211, 258  
 δαίμων 133, 146, 186  
 δέ 123  
 δέ γε 124, 205  
 δέλτος 187  
 δὴ 279  
 δὴ γε 225  
 διαδοχή 121  
 διαρρῶς 145  
 δίπαλτος 153  
 δίπτυχος 142  
 δόρυ 278  
 δράκων 149  
 δρόσος 143  
 δῶμα 181  
 εἰ 132  
 εἶα 255  
 ἔγκληρος 199  
 ἔζομαι 230  
 εἶα 288  
 εἶέν 155  
 εἰλάτινος 167  
 ἔκβολον 238  
 ἐκνέω 258  
 ἔλακε 173  
 ἐλαστρέω 224  
 ἐλαφηβόλος 113  
 ἐλαφοκτόνος 113, 250  
 ἔλεγος 132, 247  
 ἐλίσσω (εἰλ-) 171, 253  
 Ἐλλάς, Ἑλληνες 111  
 Ἑλλην fem. 154  
 ἔμπεδος 206  
 ἔμπυρα 112  
 ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ 207  
 ἐν ποσὶ 277  
 ἐξαίρετος 206  
 ἐξαλείφω 201  
 ἐξανάπτω 281  
 ἐξαρτάομαι 158  
 ἐξέρχομαι 133  
 ἐπείγω 285  
 ἐπὶ 238  
 ἐπίκρανον 117

- ἐπιστολή 188  
 ἐπωμῖς 286  
 ἐπωτίδες 281  
 ἐρώ 180  
 ἐρείψιμος 117  
 ἐς μέτρον 168  
 ἐς χεῖρας 225  
 ἕτερος 143  
 ἔτι 270  
 εὐδαίμων 243, 297  
 εὐθυντηρία 282  
 εὐλαβής 283  
 εὐμιτος 212  
 εὐμουσος 132  
 εὐναῖος 170  
 εὐξεινος 129  
 εὐπαις 267  
 εὐπήνους ὑφάς 295  
 εὐπρυμνος 282  
 εὐρωπός 192  
 εὐσελμος 284  
 εὐφημέω 129  
 εὐχου 154  
 ἔχιδνα 149  
  
 ζώνη 137  
  
 ἡγγέλη 225  
 ἡνεσα 236  
 ἦπαρ 283  
  
 θαλάσσιος 141  
 θάλος 134  
 θάσσω 147  
 θάτερος 143  
 θελκτήρια 134  
 θεόδητος 292  
 θέσφατα 270  
 θήλυς 191  
 θρίγκος, θριγκώματα 119–20  
 θυηπόλος 282  
  
 ἰδοῦ 209  
 ἰδρύω 231  
 ἱερέα 114  
 ἱνις 268  
  
 καθάρματα 277  
 καθιδρύω 231  
 καθοσιόω 277  
 καί μήν 141  
 καινός 237  
 καλλιστεῖον 113  
  
 κάμπιμος 121  
 караδοκέω 152  
 κατάργματα 142  
 κατάρχομαι 115  
 κατάχαλκος 269  
 κατεύχομαι 182  
 κέλευμα 286  
 κερκίς 140  
 κῆδος 132, 201  
 κηλῖς 259  
 κληιδούχος 130  
 κλῖμαξ 295  
 κλισία 218–19  
 κλύδων 152  
 Κλυταιμήστρα 112–13  
 κοινωνός 257  
 κρατήρ 134  
 κρηπίς 233  
 κρύφιος 279  
 κυάνεος 166  
 κύκλιος 249  
  
 λακτίζω 285  
 λαμβάνω 1556  
 λάσκω 173  
 λατρεύματα 273  
 λατρεύω 250  
 λεπτός 159  
 λόγος vs ἔργον 209  
 λοιβαί 133  
 Λοξίας 274  
 λόχιος 137  
  
 μάλλον δὲ μάλλον 286  
 μάντις 186, 202, 251  
 Μενέλεως 157  
 μέροψ 271–2  
 μήν 141  
 μοῖρα 298  
  
 ναῖω 129  
 ναός/νεώς σκάφος 204  
 νοσέω 199  
 νόστος 249  
  
 ξανθός 117, 120  
 ξεστός 124  
 ξόανον 124  
 ξουθός 134  
  
 ὁ (μέν) τις 286–7  
 ὅδε, ἦδε 290–1  
 οἶαξ 282

- οἷς μέν ... τοῖς δέ 168  
οἷσθ' ὁ δράσω, κτλ. 206, 260  
ὀλολογή 279  
ὄμμα 124, 222  
ὄνομα 197, 200  
ὅπως with fut. indic. 152, 239  
ὄραω (βλέπω) φῶς/φάος (ἥλιον) 185  
ὅστε 268  
οὐ with fut. indic. 210  
οὐ γάρ 259  
οὐ γάρ ἀλλά 235  
οὐ θέμις 237  
οὐ μὴν ... ἀλλά 193  
οὕ 152  
οὐδαμοῦ 124–5  
οὕκουν 211
- παλίρρους 285  
παρακέλευμα 152  
πάρεργον 180  
παρθένος 185, 253  
παρθενών 116  
πατροκτόνος 242  
πατρῷος 138  
πέλαγος 150  
πεντηκόντερος 250  
πέσημα 284  
πηδάλια 169–70  
πίτυλος 151, 239  
πλεκτός 286  
πλήν ὅσα 190  
ποινή 137  
πόλις 189, 220  
πορθμεύω 146  
πόρος 143, 221  
ποτε 177  
πρέσβειρα 229  
πρὸς θεῶν 180  
προστροπή 190  
πρόσφαγμα 142  
πρόσω 284  
προύργου 151  
προυφεῖλω 182  
πρύμνηθεν 281  
πυλωρός 255
- ράπτω 199  
ρόθιος 167
- σαφής (-ως) 223, 255  
σέβομαι 195  
σήμαντρον 283  
σκῦλα 119–20
- σὸν ἔργον 242  
σόφισμα 161  
σοφός 186  
σπονδαί 133  
στεναγμός 285  
συλάω 133  
συμβακχεύω 269  
συντείνω 137–8  
συστέλλω 150  
σφαγεῖον 154  
σφάγιον 113, 138  
σφάζω/σφάττω 111, 184  
σχῆμα 142  
σώζω 188
- τάλαινα 211, 219  
τάλας 192  
τάφος 192  
τάχ' οὖν 209  
τε ... οὐδέ 201  
τεκταίνομαι 227  
τελετή 229  
τέχνη 122, 202  
τηλύγετος 216  
τί γάρ; 297  
τί δέ; 185  
τίθημι, τίθεμαι 179, 202, 293  
τίκτω 110  
τιμαί 205, 274  
τλάω 219–20  
τοῖος 133  
τόλμα 219  
τροχήλατος 121  
τύραννος 204  
τύχη 122, 177, 219
- ύγραίνω 132  
ύδραίνω 117  
ύμέναιος 158
- φάσγανον 209  
φθόνος 272  
φίλτρον 257  
φόνος 257  
φωσφόρος 112
- χαλινός 239  
χαμεύνη 272  
χάριν ἄχαριν 185  
χάριν ἐμήν 291  
χάριν τίθεσθαι 189  
χάρις 254  
χειρόω 157

χέρνιβες 117–18

χοαί 118, 133

χόρης 229

χρεών 119

χρίμπτομαι 212

χρόνιος 143–4

χρύσεος (short first syllable) 270

χρυσοκόμης 268

χωρέω 282

ψῆφος 226

ψυχορραγής 295

ῶδῖς 248–9

ῶλένη 148, 229

ῶς 132, 161, 238, 241, 257

ῶς 189

ῶστε 157