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This thesis is in two parts. The introduction begins with an examination of the myths of Rhesus and Dolon which are independent of Iliad 10. It concludes that the author knew of these and adapted parts of them. The section on authenticity summarises those features of Rh. which have been regarded by scholars as incompatible with Euripidean authorship, as well as some evidence which has previously been ignored. It concludes that a combination of unusual features in Rh. point away from the play being an early work of E.

In particular, these are: a limited use of colloquialism; the absence of περὶ and the scarcity of ἄμοι; the lameness of many of the repetitions; intertextual allusions to other tragic texts; enjambement between strophe and antistrophe at 350-351; the presence of two sets of separated strophes and antistrophes; the delivery of a lyric monody by the deus ex machina; a preference for shorter periods in anapaests than E.; the absence of a dramatic exposition; the unannounced symmetrical entries at 264; physical contact between actor and chorus at 681; the appearance of two dei ex machina; the realistic role of the chorus and the absence of any intellectual or emotional dimension. I believe that Rh. was written after the death of E., but have found no evidence to suggest who wrote it. The introduction concludes with a brief survey of the textual sources.

The commentary is based on J. Diggle's text (1994), although some other readings or conjectures have been preferred. New conjectures have been introduced at 4-5 and 247. It is the first commentary written on lines 1-526 since that of W.H. Porter (1929) and follows the standard format except that the lyric schemata are examined in the introduction. The anapaestic opening is defended and a ἄμ. λεγ. is reported for the first time at 353 (ἀποστροφής).
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Gregory Erland Klyve M.A. Exeter College
ἐκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος
ἐμὸν καταίσχυνε βαθὺ χρέος.
όμως δὲ λύσαι δυνατὸς δεξιὰν ἐπιμομφάν
τόκος ἑθνατῶν· νῦν ψάφοιν ἑλισσομένων
ὅπου κυμα κατακλύσσει ἴχνον,
ὅπα τε κοινὸν λόγον
φίλαν τείσομεν ἐς χάριν.

Pindar Olympian 10.7-12
Few students of Greek read Rhesus, even in translation. This is to be regretted because it is a drama of considerable merit, which was popular enough in antiquity to find its way into the texts of the 'select' plays of Euripides. It should be of great interest to the modern classicist, not only because it is the sole surviving tragedy which dramatises an episode from a surviving epic model but also because, like Prometheus Vinctus, it is a rare example of a complete extant tragedy which was not written by one of the three great Attic tragedians of the fifth century. It is not simply the troublesome question of authenticity which has led to its neglect. Indeed, a great deal of scholarly work has been published specifically on this issue. What is lacking is a detailed modern commentary. At present the only two available on the entire play are by Paley (Euripides with an English Commentary vol. 1 London 1872) and Porter (Cambridge 1929). Both works are perceptive and useful, especially that of Porter.

In the introduction I have examined the principal arguments which have been used against authenticity as well as some which are new. I am convinced that E. did not write it and that unless more evidence turns up the author will remain anonymous.

The required limit of 100,000 words has confined the commentary to lines 1-526. The line numbers and lemmata are taken from Diggle's text of Rhesus (Oxford 1994), except that at those places where I wish to diverge from Diggle's text I have printed the preferred text in the lemmata and indicated my reasons for
doing so. In the section on authenticity I have made several references forward to notes in the commentary; but where the discussion concerns anything from lines 527-996 I have gone into further detail.

I was able to embark on this project through the generosity of the Governing Body of Exeter College, Oxford, which granted me an Amelia Jackson Senior Studentship for a year, and of the British Academy, which awarded me a research grant for two years. I count myself extremely fortunate to have had Dr. G.O. Hutchinson as my supervisor. He has always given most generously and patiently of his valuable time and instruction. I am grateful to my examiners Prof. C. Collard and Dr. R. Parker for their observations and recommendations. My thanks are also due to Mr. G.W. Bond, Prof. P.J. Parsons, Mr. N.G. Wilson, Dr. J. Diggle, Ms. C. Eckhard-Long, Mrs. L.P.E. Edwards, Ms. G.C. Crucioli-Holt, Ben, Dominic, Nigel, Julian, Chris and Roland.
ABBREVIATIONS

Classical authors and their works are usually referred to as in *LSJ*; periodicals as in *L’Année philologique*. Where they are not the references are unambiguous. Full titles of articles are given only in these abbreviations and in the final bibliography. References to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, *Prometheus Vinctus*, *Rhesus* and *Christus Patiens* (CP) are not attributed to an author. For references to editions and standard commentaries, only the name of the editor or commentator is used. A list of editions of Rh. is given at the front of the bibliography. References to complete tragedies are from the following editions; Aeschylus: M.L. West, *Aeschylus Tragoediae* (Stuttgart 1990); Sophocles: P.H.J. Lloyd Jones and N.G. Wilson, *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford 1990); Euripides: J. Diggle *Euripidis Fabulae* vols. 1 (Oxford 1984), 2 (Oxford 1981), and 3 (Oxford 1994). References to fragments of Euripides are from A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (TGF), with the supplement by B. Snell (Hildesheim 1964) and C. Austin *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* (NFE) (Berlin 1968). Other tragic fragments are from TGF vols. 1 (Snell, Göttingen 1971), 2 (Kannicht and Snell, Göttingen 1981), 3 (Aeschylus) and 4 (Sophocles) (Radt, Göttingen 1985 and 1977 respectively). Comic fragments are from the edition of R. Kassel and C. Austin *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin 1983-). Epic fragments are taken from the edition of M. Davies (*Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988)). KS denotes *Kleine Schriften*, KB *Kleine Beiträge*, Bei. *Beiheft*, Einz. *Einzelschriften* and Opus. *Opuscula* throughout.
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INTRODUCTION
I SOURCES OF THE PLOT

The most obvious source for the plot of Rh. is Il.10, and the many echoes from that book (and the rest of the Il. and Od.) are noted throughout the commentary. It is a nice irony that the play which stands out most from the Euripidean corpus is based on the book which stands out most from the Il. and is now often accepted as supposititious. In both pieces the action takes place at night. The Trojans are encamped outside their city. Greeks and Trojans send out spies against each other. The Trojan spy, Dolon, is slain by the Greek spies, Odysseus and Diomedes. The spies make their way into the Trojan camp, kill Rhesus, steal his horses and return to their camp. The Trojans wake and lament the death of Rhesus.

In his dramatisation of the epic source, the playwright has concentrated on the Trojan point of view. His skilful adaptation of that book, most of which is original, is pointed out in the commentary. However, there is a great deal in Rh. which is incompatible with Il.10, notably the role of Athena, the character of Rhesus, the danger which he poses to the Greeks and the disguise of Dolon. It is worth looking briefly at other sources for the myth of Rhesus and the events of the Doloneia, in order to discover whether they may have had any influence on the dramatist.

1 See also W.H. Roscher Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie (1884-1937) s. Rhesos.
3 G.C. Richards is wrong to state (CQ 10 (1916) 194) that 'The play is a transcript from the epic'.
The scholia to Il.10.435 summarise a treatment of the myth of Rhesus by Pindar (fr. 262 Maehler), which I refer to as the ‘aristeia’ version. The salient points are in Σ bT, a short note, and Σ Arn/A, a longer note, which preserves, in addition, another version of the story:

Σ bT) ὃτι καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν πολεμήσας πρῶς Ἑλληνας μέγιστα αὐτοῖς ἐνεδείξατο κακά, κατὰ δὲ θείαν πρόνοιαν [Σ Townley Ἡρας καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς] νυκτὸς αὐτὸν Διομήδης ἀναρεῖ. Ἰστορεῖ δὲ Πίνδαρος.

Σ Arn/A) Ὁῆςος...υίός δὲ Στρυμώνος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ Εὐτέρπης μιᾶς τῶν Μουσῶν. διάφορος δὲ τῶν καθ’ αὐτόν γενόμενος ἐν πολεμικοῖς ἔργοις ἐπήλθε τοῖς Ἑλλησίν, ὡς Τρωίς συμμαχησεὶ, καὶ συμβαλὼν πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπέκτεινεν. δείσασα δὲ Ἡρα περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων Ἀθηνᾶν ἐπὶ τὴν τούτου διαφθοράν πέμψει. κατελθοῦσα δὲ ἡ θεός ὀδύσθησα τε καὶ Διομήδεα ἐπὶ τὴν κατασκοπὴν ἑποίησε προελθεῖν. ἐπιστάντες δὲ ἐκεῖνοι κοιμωμένοι Ἡῆσοι αὐτὸν τε καὶ ἐταῖρους κτείνουσιν. ὡς Ἰστορεῖ Πίνδαρος.

The two accounts obviously refer to the same version of the story. Σ Arn/A goes on to give another (‘oracular’) version which is not specifically referred to in association with the ‘aristeia’ version, and is inconsistent with it. It is a version which Vergil knew of (Aen. 1.469-73):

Εἶνοι δὲ λέγουσι νυκτὸς παραχεղουέναι τῶν Ἡῆσον εἰς τὴν Τροϊάν, καὶ πρὶν γειτονεῖαι αὐτὸν τῷ ἱδατοί τῆς χώρας φονευθῆναι. χρησμὸς γὰρ ἐδέδοτο αὐτῷ, φασίν, ὅτι εἰ αὐτὸς γειτονεῖ τοῦ ἱδατος καὶ οἱ ἦπειροι αὐτὸ τῷ Σκαμάνδρῳ πιοῦσιν καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ νομής ἢδονα>, ἀκαταμήχανος ἔσται ἐς τὸ παντελές.

In the ‘aristeia’ version Rhesus proves to be a dangerous opponent for the Greeks on the day of his arrival. Because he thereby poses a great military threat, he is murdered at the instigation of Hera and Athena. In the ‘oracular’ version he dies without an aristaeia. He has arrived at night, and is killed before he gets a chance to fight. This has to happen, because he would be invincible if he or his horses had taken food or water from Troy. In Il.10, he has no part to play beyond being robbed and

4 One cannot be sure in such places that the whole account derives from the source named.
murdered. There is no connection, therefore, between II.10 and the 'aristeia' version. The only connections between the 'oracular' version and II.10 are Rhesus' lack of action and premature death. The poet of II.10 has Rhesus murdered to provide Odysseus with another feather in his cap, not because he is dangerous or potentially invincible. In the epic it is Dolon who betrays the position of Rhesus, in an attempt to save his own life (II. 10.433-45). The role of Athena is small. She sends a propitious omen to the Greeks in the form of a heron at 274-82; she is instrumental in bringing Diomede to Rhesus at 496f.; and when Diomede ponders what to do after the murder, she instructs him to return to the ships (II. 509ff., cf. Rh. 668-74).

In Rh., the revelation made by Athena at 600-4, that if Rhesus survives the night he will be irresistible, recalls an element from the 'oracular' version (ἀκαταμήχανος ἔσται ἐς τὸ παντελές), as does the fact that he dies before being able to fight. However, there is no mention in the play of an oracle. Moreover, Athena mentions only that he must not be allowed to survive the night. She does not make any reference to eating or drinking. The only elements from the 'aristeia' version of the story which may have had an influence on the playwright are that Rhesus had a personality and that Athena plays a prominent role in directing his murderers. Unfortunately we know no details about his character in that version, or what Athena says to the Greeks. It must also be remembered that the 'oracular' version may have

5 ἱκανὸν γὰρ ἐναρ πεφαλήφθων ἐπέστη ἐν τὴν νύκτ’, Οἰνείδων πάϊς at II. 10.496f. is figurative. Rhesus does not have a dream in the epic.
included some interaction between Athena and the Greeks.⁶

All we can say for sure is that the dramatist did not invent either the story of the Thracian’s potential invulnerability, which is certainly found in the ‘oracular’ version, or Athena’s direct involvement in his death, which is certainly found in the ‘aristeia’ version. Besides using Il.10, he adapted these elements from the other versions of the myth for inclusion in his tragedy. He may also have drawn on the ‘aristeia’ version for the character of Rhesus, but we can only guess to what extent. The only trace of a similarity which I can detect is Rhesus’ declaration that he will destroy the Greeks in a single day (Rh. 447ff.). This recalls the significant period of a single day in Σ Β: ὅτι καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν πολέμησας πρὸς Ἔλληνας μέγιστα αὐτοῖς ἐνεδείξατο κακά. However, this is only a tenuous connection. It must also be remembered that it is not possible to say whether the dramatist knew of Athena’s greater role directly from Pindar. Nor are we able to identify the ἓνιοι who report the ‘oracular’ version. The dramatist may even have learned of these elements from another tragedy.

Mention should be made of B. Fenik’s thesis (Latomus 73 (1964)), that the ‘aristeia’ version and the ‘oracular’ version are both based on a lost story of Rhesus from the epic cycle,⁷

⁶The presence of Hera and Athena in the spurious prologue (see Commentary ad loc.), suggests that its author may have known of the non-Iliadic element of the story in which Hera tells Athena to arrange the death of Rhesus.

⁷The poems of the epic cycle were probably written in the late 7th and early 6th centuries BC. See M. Davies Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (1988). On the difficult task of dating these works see W. Kullmann Hermes Einz. 14 (1960) 18-28. On their use by tragedians see H. Pestalozzi Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias (1945), G. Schoeck Ilias und Aithiopis (1961), D. Mülder Die Ilias
that this story is older than Il.10, and that both Il.10 and Rhesus are reworkings of it. He claims to find truncated elements from this supposed cyclic epic in Il.10. He argues that a cyclic model must have existed for Rh. because motifs of late arrival, lament and immortalisation are common in cyclic epic and regularly taken over in tragedies based on them. This argument is far from compelling. We have no evidence of a cyclic poem about Rhesus; the 'aristeia' version is incompatible with the 'oracular' version and Il.10 betrays no knowledge of either of these other versions of the myth.

When writing Rhesus, the dramatist doubtless had knowledge of these treatments of heroes who arrived late at Troy, the laments of the mothers of heroes, and the posthumous fate of those heroes, both in the cycle and in tragedy. He may have drawn on any number of them for inspiration or ideas but the presence of these motifs und ihre Quellen (1910) and E. Hall Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 32-5. For the two explicit references to the cycle in Rh., the theft of Athena's statue and the entry of Odysseus into Troy in the guise of a beggar see Davies p.52 Il.19-24 and 498-509n.

8 For the late arrival of a hero at Troy, cf. Memnon in Aethiopis (Davies p.47.14) and A. Psychostasia (frr. 279-280a), Eurypylus in Il.Parv. (Davies p.52.14f.) and S. Eurypylus (frr. 206-222b), and Penthesilea in the Aethiopis (Davies p.47.4ff.).

9 For the lament cf. Thetis in the Aethiopis (Davies p.47.26ff.) and A. fr. 350. It is likely that Europa lamented Sarpedon in A. Kares (cf. also Ovid Met. 13.576-99 and see Bömer ad loc.), that Astyoche lamented Eurypylus in Il. Parv. and S. Euryp. (see R.S. Jebb and A.C. Pearson The Fragments of Sophocles (1917) 148 and R. Carden The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles (1974) 1-51) and that Eos lamented Memnon in Aethiopis and A. Psych.

10 For the transportation of a hero and the granting of special status after death cf. Thetis' removal of Achilles εἰς τὴν λευκὴν νῆσον in the cycle (Davies p.47.26ff.) and E. And. 1260ff. Eos begged immortality for Memnon in the cycle (Davies p.47.18f.).

11 R. (80) thinks the Muse's complaint about Athena at Rh. 938ff. is based on Thetis' complaint about Apollo in A. fr. 350. H.J.G. Patin suggests it is based on that of Eos (Étude sur les tragiques
in Rhesus does not indicate the existence of a cyclic epic specifically about that hero.

We may turn now to the reference to the Rhesus myth in Hipponax (fr. 72.5ff. Degani):

\[\text{ἐπ’} \ Λάρμάτων \ τε \ καὶ \ Θρείκων \ πῶλων \ | \ λευκῶν \ τῶν \ θείων \ κατεγγύς \ Ἰλίου \ πύργων \ | \ ἀπεμναρίσθη \ Ῥῆσος, \ Κυνίων \ πάλμως.\]

All we may deduce from this is that Hipponax knew of Rhesus' white horses and his presence at Troy.

The Muse prophesies that her son will enjoy posthumous honours as a prophet of Bacchus.\(^{12}\) There is independent evidence of posthumous honours paid to a Rhesus but the sources for this are late and the stories are inconsistent with that portrayed in the play.\(^{13}\) The tragedian seems to have known of a cult, because the references at 970-3 are geographically precise and the function of the hero is clearly defined, but we cannot link the cave mentioned at Rh. 970-3 with a specific shrine to Rhesus.

One more non-Iliadic element in Rh. remains to be examined: Dolon's disguise.\(^{14}\) The dramatist does not follow the epic source (Il. 10.333ff.): κατίκα δ' ἄμφ' ἄμωσεν ἐβάλετο καμπύλα τόξα, |

grecs (1873) vol.2 166) and B. Fenik (ib. 32 and nn.1-2) suggests it may be based on that of Thetis in the Aethiopis. It is impossible to decide whether any of these suggestions is correct.\(^{12}\) See Diggle Eur. 320-7.

\(^{13}\) Philostratus, writing in the 3rd century AD (Heroic. 17.3-5, Lannoy 1977), tells of a shrine to Rhesus at Rhodope, to whose altar animals came voluntarily to be sacrificed. John of Antioch (24.6: FGH Müller 4.551 p.531) tells of a Rh. who was a general of the Byzantines and whose shrine lay outside the city. See also P. Perdrizet Cuites et mythes du Pangée (1910) 1: Rhésus. His early exploits are mentioned in Parthenius (36: On the Bithyniaka of Asclepiades of Myrlea). The cult established at Amphipolis by Hagnon in 437 BC is also inconsistent with the version in Rh.

\(^{14}\) The only other literary treatment of Dolon is found in Eubulus' comedy of the same name (frr. 29-31 Kassel-Austin). The play is in too fragmentary a state to determine any connection with Rh.
D. walks about in black, with a wolf skin about his shoulders, a cap of ferret skin on his head and carries a bow and a javelin. The clothing is designed to darken his outline in the night (Il. 10.275f.). He is not actually disguised as an animal. It is clear that the Iliadic D. is not pretending to be a wolf because when he knows he has been seen, he runs like a man (Il. 10.341 and 354-9). However, the dramatist did not invent the idea of a disguised D. There are four distinct representations of D. in his wolfskin on vase paintings.\(^\text{15}\)

One picture seems to be derived from Il.10: a black figure vase in the Ashmolean, Oxford 226, Beazley ABV 527.25 (the Athena painter), dated between 510 and 500. D. is shown being captured by Od. and Dio. who are on either side of him. He is wearing a skullcap, which may be the ferret skin cap of the Il., and the pelt hangs from his shoulders without surrounding his body.

The other three depict a D. who is clearly covered in a wolfskin, and one depicts him on all fours. Firstly there is a fragmentary vase in Paris, Cabinet des Médailles nos. 526, 743, 553 and L41.18, Beazley ARV2 319.5 (Onesimos, signed by Euphronius, but also attributed to the Panaetius painter), dated between 500 and 490.\(^\text{16}\) D. is standing upright in the centre of the picture, clad in a wolfskin which is obviously a disguise. The


skin, complete with tail, is tied by thongs across his chest and covers his whole body, including his penis, feet and hands. On his left is Diomedes and, behind Diomedes, Athena. On his right is Od., and behind Od. Hermes, abandoning D. to his fate (cf. Rh. 216ff.). D.’s outfit on the cup resembles his disguise at Rh. 208ff., esp. βάσιν τε χερσί προσθίαν καθαρμόσας καὶ κώλα κώλοις. However, on the vase he wears a helmet, not the χάσμα θηρός.

Secondly there is a cup in Leningrad, no.653 (St 879), Beazley ARV 413.23 (the Dokimasia painter), dated c.480 (see also Johansen ib. 160). In this picture D. is standing and being captured by the two Greeks. He wears the wolfskin around his entire body, tied at the waist, with the head of the beast over his own. This is not as close a disguise as the vase in the Cab. des Med., for the paws of the wolf are tied around his neck and his clothing is visible beneath the pelt. He also carries a bow and arrows.

Thirdly there is a red-figure lekythos in the Louvre, CA 1802 (see Beazley JHS 51 (1931) 301), dated c.460. This portrays D. alone and weaponless, on all fours (cf. Rh. 211f. and 254ff.), wearing the pelt on his back, not tied to his limbs, but attached to his body by the waist, with the beast’s head over his own.

These portrayals, especially the last, point to a non-Iliadic tradition of D. as a spy making a serious effort, however inadequate, to look like a wolf. Indeed, his very name suggests that the tradition of his deceitful disguise is older than Il. 10, since nothing is made of his name or his cunning in the epic. The extent of the disguise, the four-footed walk and the presence of

17
Hermes, who is not in the Doloneia, also give strong support to this theory (Fenik goes so far as to say that the author of Il. 10 knew of this tradition and that Il. 10.334 is an abbreviation of it, but such a suggestion cannot be proved.) It is clear that the poet of Rh. was using this pre-Iliadic tradition when he described the disguise.

In conclusion: as well as using Il.10, the poet of Rhesus has included elements of the myth of Rhesus which suggest knowledge of (but not complete dependence on) the 'aristeia' version of the myth represented by Pindar and the 'oracular' version. He has also included motifs which are traditionally associated with tales from the cycle and the tragedies derived from them, but is probably drawing from a common store of literary topoi in the cycles and other tragedies, rather than from a cyclic poem specifically about Rhesus. He also shows knowledge of the pre-Iliadic tradition about Dolon in which the spy is completely disguised as a wolf. He deserves admiration for the skill with which he has combined these different strands of the story into a consistent and impressive drama.
II AUTHENTICITY

Scaliger pronounced Rh. spurious and its author a 'poeta grandiloquentior' in 1600. He did not enlarge upon his argument, but he had re-opened the ancient debate on authorship. The 18th century saw the first extensive arguments against authenticity by L.C. Valckenaer and J. Hardion. Their objections were based on the structural and artistic characteristics of the play, as well as oddities of vocabulary and style, and the paucity of gnomae.

With the 19th century came a deeper evaluation of evidence, esp. in C.D. Beck (1824), R. Morstadt (1827) and G. Hermann (1828). The latter two believed Rh. to be Hellenistic. In 1837 Vater defended authenticity in his edition. Thereafter scholars who denied its genuineness continued to object on artistic grounds and concentrated on analyses of vocabulary, diction and style. In 1872 Paley defended authenticity in his commentary. Wilamowitz condemned the play on linguistic, metrical and religious grounds and believed that it was a 4th century imitation of S. Poimenes (see p. 43 below). Extensive studies of vocabulary and diction were carried out by L. Eysert (1891-3) and J.C. Rolfe (1893); both believed the play spurious.

17 J. Scaliger Prolegomena ad Manilium (1600s) 6f.
18 Diatribe, esp. chapters 9 and 10.
19 MadesI 10 (1733) 323ff.
20 See esp. F.G. Welcker ZA 76 (1834) 629-46, J. Hartung Euripides Restitutus vol.1 (1843) 1-13 who believed the play to be genuine, F. Hagenbach (1863), O. Menzer (1867), P. Albert (De Rheso Tragoedia diss. Halle (1876)) and W. Nöldeke (De Rhesi fabula aetate et forma Prog. Real. Schwerin (1877)).
21 Analecta Euripidea (1875) 197-9, (1877) 12, (1907) 41n., GV 583-9, Hermes 61 (1926) 284-8 and Glaube der Hellenen (1959s) 2.262f.
20th century scholarship before R. was mostly against authenticity and even those who thought it genuine admitted that it is peculiar.\(^{22}\) By 1964 the preference amongst these scholars was for a 4th century date. R. attempted to show Rh. to be an early work of E., composed between 455 and 440. He argues well against a 4th century date but his analyses deal with the evidence piecemeal and he failed to draw attention to the cumulative effect of the play’s peculiarities.\(^{23}\) Scholarship continued for thirty years with no arguments raised in favour of authenticity except by A. Tuilier (Sileno 9 (1983) 11-28) and A.P. Burnett (1985).\(^{24}\) D. Ebener (1966) and G. Paduano (1991) classify the play as spurious in their translations. Of recent editors Zanetto (1993 v f.) is satisfied to call it genuine; Diggle (1994 v f.) remains agnostic.

\(^{22}\)See G.C. Richards (CQ 10 (1916) 192-7), A.C. Pearson (CR 31 (1917) 25-7, CR 35 (1921) 52-61 and CQ 20 (1926) 80-81), P. Fabbri (RFil 48 (1920) 192-4), M. Maykowska (Eos 26 (1923) 52-9), W. Ridgeway (CQ 20 (1926) 1-19 and 81), A.D. Nock (CR 40 (1926) 184-86 and CR 44 (1930) 173-4), G. Seure (RP 2 (1928) 106-34), C.W. Keyes (TAPA 59 (1928) xxviii), H.E. Mierow (AJP 49 (1928) 375-8), and W.H. Porter who believed that E.’s son was the author. R. Goossens (AC 1 (1932) 93-134 and BAB 14 (1933) 11-33), H. Gregoire (AC 2 (1933) 91-133. See also their collaborations in CRAI (1932) 190ff. and AC 3 (1934) 321-331 and 431-446), T. Sinko (AC 3 (1934) 223-9 and 411-29), G. Norwood (Greek Tragedy (1948) 293) and C.B. Sneller (1949) all believed the play to be genuine. Others still thought not, esp. J. Geffcken (Hermes 71 (1936) 394-408), W. Schmidt (Geschichte der griechischen Literatur 1.3 (1940)), D.W. Lucas (CR 1 (1951) 18-20), M. Pohlenz (Die griechische Tragödie (1954)) 397, 472-5), G. Björck (Arctos 1 (1954) 16-18 and Eranos 55 (1957) 7-17), A. Lesky (Gnomon 23 (1951) 141-4 and Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen (1956) 218-9), H. Strohm (Hermes 87 (1959) 257-74) and S. Compagno (AAT 98 (1963-4) 221-62).

\(^{23}\)See esp. Ed. Fraenkel (1965)

1) EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

A) Hypothesis b and the Scholia

The earliest comments about the authenticity of Rh. are found in the critical matter of the play's first hypothesis. The first sentence reports the doubts of anonymous ancient scholars and offers the reason for their doubts (b 23-4):

τούτο τὸ δρᾶμα ἔνιοι νόθου ὑπενόησαν, Ἑὐριπίδου δὲ μὴ εἶναι· τῶν γὰρ Σοφόκλειον μᾶλλον ύποφαίνειν χαρακτῆρα.

The identity of these doubters is lost; they do not seem to have made any impression on other ancient scholars. However, whoever the ἔνιοι were, they had had access to a greater corpus of tragedy with which to compare Rh. than is now available. Doubts were entertained about the authenticity of works in antiquity and sometimes, as here, the χαρακτῆρ of a piece was used to condemn it. This term was used by ancient literary critics like Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century BC) or Libanius (4th Century AD). It can mean 'peculiar stamp' or 'style' and can also refer to word arrangement. The import of the term here is extremely vague. Any Sophoclean 'character' in Rh. is impossible to substantiate and

25 That the Sophoclean 'character' is a reported remark, rather than the judgement of the compiler, is clear from the γὰρ.
26 See K.J. Dover Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum (1968) cc. 1 and 2, and cf. the discussion on authenticity at hyp. [Dem.] 7. Cf. also H. Weil Les Harangues de Démosthène (1881) 242ff. Callimachus is known to have pronounced on the authenticity of other works. See his frr. 437, 442, 444-6 and 451. On E. And., which was not in the didascaliae, see Σ And. 445 (Pfeiffer).
27 See D. Russell and M. Winterbottom Ancient Literary Criticism (1972) 321-43. It is used at Σ E. Or. 640f. to condemn the lines, but they are not spurious and it is impossible to decide what the remark refers to (see Willink ad loc.).
28 M. Mierow (AJP 49 (1928) 375-8) thinks that the play should be judged Sophoclean on the basis of Aristotle's remark that S. portrayed men as they ought to be, while E. portrayed them as they are (Poet. 1460 B38-9), but offers no evidence to support this.
the only reference to S. in the Σ is at a point where the language of the author is contrasted with that of S. (Σ 105). The judgement is obviously a subjective one and may simply have been one way of saying that it certainly was not by E. It is also possible that the Sophoclean 'character' was the only one of the objections of the ἔνιοι which the compiler of the note reported.

The following sentence offers two reasons for accepting the play as genuine (b24-6):

ἐν μέντοι ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ὡς γνήσιον ἀναγέγραψαν, καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρρυσα ὅτε ἐν αὐτῶι πολυπραγμοσύνη τῶν Εὐριπίδην ὁμολογεῖ.

The first reason is based on external evidence. The didascaliae were chronological records of dramatic productions, started c.472 BC, dated by the archon’s name, containing the title of the play and names of the winning author and choregus. 29 Ancient scholars who made use of them, such as Aristophanes of Byzantium (257-180 BC), derived their information from Aristotle’s compilation of them. 30 However, even if we assume that the compiler’s source for his remark about the didascaliae was impeccable (and it may well not have been) it was still possible for a spurious work to have found its way into a playwright’s corpus. 31

29 See A.W. Pickard-Cambridge The Dramatic Festivals of Athens. (1988) 72f., A. Wilhelm Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen (1906) 195ff. and G. Jachmann De Aristotelis didascaliis (1909) 40 and 56f. From 447 BC the name of the winning actor was included.

30 Arist. frr. 618-30 (Rose) of which 626 is a quotation of this line in hyp. Rh.

31 E.g. Aristophanes included the spurious Peirithous, Rhadamanthys and Tennes in his edition of E. even though he had access to Aristotle’s work. They are now attributed to Critias (See TGF vol.1 43 F1-14, 15-18 and 20 respectively).
Nevertheless, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we have no good reason to doubt the statement about the didascaliae and if we wish to suggest that Rh. is spurious we must explain its presence in the notice. There are three possibilities: firstly that the Rh. mentioned was not our Rh. but the genuine Rh. of E.; secondly that the Rh. in the notice was ours, but that the E. was not the great E.; and thirdly that the E. was the choregus, not the author. The first is the likeliest explanation. Titles of plays were occasionally doubled in antiquity, and we know that a number of lost works had the same titles as extant ones.\textsuperscript{32} It is quite possible that the Rh. written by E. and mentioned in the didascaliae had been lost without trace by the time the Alexandrians produced their edition.\textsuperscript{33} According to the \textit{Vita Euripidis} and the \textit{Suda}, E. is credited with 92 tragedies, of which there survived 78 according to the \textit{Vita} and 77 according to the \textit{Suda}.\textsuperscript{34} This points to a loss of 14 or 15 plays. There is no difficulty in believing that a genuine Rh. was among those lost. Presumably the Alexandrians knew that E. had written a Rh. and included this text under his name because it was all they had.

\textsuperscript{32}See K.J. Dover \textit{Aristophanes Clouds} p.lxxxviiff. and W.H. Barrett \textit{Euripides Hippolytus} 11ff. The catalogue of Aeschylean dramas mentioned \textit{λιταναία γνήσιοι} and \textit{λιταναία νόθοι} (frr. 6-11). See A.C. Pearson \textit{CR} 35 (1921) 61.

\textsuperscript{33}As was E. \textit{Theristae}: it was mentioned in the didascaliae but no frr. have survived (see \textit{Σ hyp. Me.}). Cf. also the complete loss of Cratinius' \textit{Cheimazomenoi}, recorded in the didascaliae for the Lenaea in 425 (see hyp. Ar. \textit{Ach.} and \textit{PCG} vol.4 p.244.), and \textit{Satyrois} (see hyp. Ar. \textit{Eq.}, A. Körte \textit{RE} 11 1648 31 and \textit{PCG} vol.4 p.232.). It is clear from the confusion at \textit{Σ Ar. Ra.} 1270 that the lyrics of A. which are parodied there must be attributed to works which the commentators could not find.

The second explanation is possible, for we do know, e.g., that E.'s son took his father's name and had some experience with tragedy. The third explanation is also possible, for we know that the production of plays was sometimes undertaken by someone other than the author. However, if we accept either of these latter explanations we must assume that the great E. did not write a Rh.; this makes the Alexandrians' error much less easy to explain.

In conclusion, all that may be certainly deduced from the report of the didascalic notice is that a play called Rh., written or produced by a man called E., was performed in Athens. This is not proof that the extant Rh. is by the great E.

It is not clear whether the second reason (the remark about astronomy) is a reported counter-argument to the doubts of the ἢνωκ or the opinion of the compiler. In either case it is a very weak argument, oddly juxtaposed with the previous clause: E. is not in fact conspicuous for an interest in astronomy and the point is only applicable to lines 528-37 of the play.

The compiler goes on to record the existence of two separate prologues for Rh., neither of which has survived in our texts. He

35 See Σ Ar. Ra. 67, Vita Euripidis p.2 1.14 (Schwartz) and s. Εὔριπιδής in the Suda. He produced his father's IA, Alcmaeon and Ba. after his death and may have been the author of three tragedies attributed to a minor E.; Orestes, Medea and Polyxena (TGF vol.1 p.94.16-7).

36 Callistratus did this favour for Ar., producing Banqueters in 427, Babylonians in 426 and Ach. in 425. See Anon. De Com. 11.44, Suda s.v. Σαμίων ὁ δήμος and hyp. 1 Ar. Ach.

37 This supposed concern of his relates to the supposed influence on him of Anaxagoras' atheistic ideas. See M.R. Lefkowitz CQ (1989).

38 The penultimate clause of the second hypothesis (ὅτι [the guards καὶ προλογίζουσι]) shows that the compiler's text started with the anapaests. Rh is the only play in the Euripidean texts in which the Index Personarum starts with the chorus. For the absence of an exposition see p.68 below.
seems to accept as genuine the single line quotation which he could connect with Rh. through Dicaearchus (despite not mentioning that the play begins with anapaest), and to introduce the first 11 lines of the other prologue only in order to condemn it on aesthetic grounds:

The questions arise, how did two iambic prologues come to be in circulation for a play which starts with anapaests and does this have any consequences for authenticity? The first quotation is of only one iambic line which is an incomplete sentence, the phrase γράφει κατά λέξειν οὕτως is formulaic\(^{39}\) and Dicaearchus is mentioned (whatever the authority for his inclusion may be.)\(^{40}\) All this suggests that the compiler’s source was something like the corpus of first lines and plot summaries found in ‘Tales from Euripides’ rather than any copy of the play, and that this quotation is the genuine first line of a tragedy called Rh. Since the line survives nowhere in our texts and clearly does not belong to our Rh. it is a very strong candidate for being the first line of a genuine lost Rh. of E. The compiler, believing the extant Rh. to be genuine, simply assumed that this was the lost first line of the play because he could connect it to Rh. through Dicaearchus, and included it in order to verify it against the other prologue,

\(^{39}\)For this phrase introducing a quotation cf. Σ E. Me. 264. Cf. also γράφειν οὕτως at Σ Rh. 29, 311, 346, E. Hec. 3, 131, 194, And. 32 and Alc. 1.

\(^{40}\)See Commentary ad hyp. (a).
for which he had no such authority.

The issue of the second prologue (TGF adesp. F81) is simple. That it was intended for addition to the extant Rh. is clear from the fact that the compiler found it in some of the copies. However, it is very difficult to believe that a play which does not need a prologue would have suffered the loss of one from all surviving texts, except in a fragmentary form in one of the hypotheses. It is more likely that the very absence of an iambic prologue in Rh. tempted someone (possibly a poet, scholar or librarian rather than an actor) to supply one and that the compiler of the hypothesis had come across some copies which preserved this rogue piece of composition.

So the hypothesis of Rh. attempts to verify the genuineness of the play but does not actually provide any firm evidence either way. Indeed, the inclusion of an iambic first line on the authority of Dicaearchus suggests the existence of another play called Rh.

The question of authenticity is not explicitly mentioned in the scholia and all the scholars cited there believe the play to be genuine.41 Only in Crates' remark at Σ 528 do we find anything relating to authorship. He alleges that E. made a mistake about astronomy διὰ τὸ νέον ἔτι εἶναι ὅτε τὸν Ἁρσον ἐδίδασκε but this remark may simply be Crates' own, unfounded explanation for what he perceives to be an error on the part of the author.

41 Crates (Σ 5 and 528), Dionysodorus (Σ 508, a quotation from παρὰ τοῖς τραγικοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις), Parmeniscus (Σ 528) and Aristarchus (Σ 540). At Σ 521 E. is specifically mentioned as the author and his authorship is implied at Σ 430, where a comparison is made with E. Or. 220.
Mention should briefly be made of Wilamowitz’ view\textsuperscript{42} that the authors of the material in the first hyp. are connected to the authors of the scholia and that references to a χ in the text at Σ 41 and Σ 716 point to the existence of an ancient work condemning Rh. as spurious. This is untenable,\textsuperscript{43} as is his desire to read ἤ πραγματικά for ὁ στίχος at Σ 41. The χ is not used as a device to condemn lines but as a reference to a note on the line in an ancient commentary.\textsuperscript{44}

To conclude: we have so far found no certain evidence either in favour of or against authenticity from the ancient scholarship associated with the text. Let us now examine any possible evidence from the indirect tradition.

B) The Selection and Indirect Tradition

The criteria by which plays came to be included in the ‘select’ plays of E.\textsuperscript{45} are hard to determine. The most likely explanation is that those plays which were most widely read came to form the basis of a large group of plays which was gradually narrowed down as standards declined until, by the end of the 3rd century AD, the plays most widely available were the ten which we have now.\textsuperscript{46} One criterion may have been the availability of a commentary, and the existence of scholarship on Rh. may have helped to ensure its survival. Another point in its favour may

\textsuperscript{42}(1877) 7ff. (=KS 1.17) and cf. (1907) 152-5.
\textsuperscript{43}See esp. W.H. Porter Hermathena 17 (1913) 366-8 and R. 49f.
\textsuperscript{44}See R.L. Fowler ZPE 33 (1979) 24-8.
\textsuperscript{45}Hec., Or., Pho., Me., Hi., Alc., And., Tro., Rh. and Ba. (all except Ba. preserved with scholia).
\textsuperscript{46}See W.S. Barrett E. Hipp. (ed.) p.50-53.
have been its subject. Perhaps martial dramas were popular.

Whatever the reasons, Rh. was in the selection and references to the play appear in the works of scholars and lexicographers from the 2nd century AD onwards. What is somewhat surprising is the complete absence of any reference to the play in Aristophanes and Plutarch, authors who knew and quoted or parodied E. extensively. The scholia to Ar. contain references to quotations from 39 Euripidean plays, including all those which ended up in the 'selection', except Rh. Plutarch refers to 48 plays, including all those from the 'selection', except Rh., and the 'alphabetic' plays, as well as some spurious ones. The absence from Plut. suggests at least that the view of inauthenticity had some vogue: possibly Plut. judged it spurious, more likely it was not included in his copies of E. The absence from Aristophanes is even more suspicious but chance remains a possible explanation.

C) Supposed Contemporary References

Three arguments have been advanced for dating Rh. by supposed

47 E.g. Herodian, Hesychius, Marius Victorinus, Stobaeus and Eustathius. The play was used by the author of CP and was also included in the gnomologia gV, gB and gE (see III below). This inclusion is regarded by A. Meschini (Helicon 13-14 (1973-4) 350f.) as evidence for authenticity but all one can say for sure is that the compilers thought Rh. was by E.


contemporary references within the play. None is convincing. Firstly it has been suggested that the agon between H. and Rh. reflects Athenian relations with Sitalces between 428 and 424 BC. This is unfounded and was refuted by T. Sinko. Secondly, the use of the adj. \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \gamma \varepsilon \varphi \nu \rho \omega \) to describe the Strymon at 349 was seen by Wilamowitz as a reference to a specific bridge, mentioned as being over the Strymon in 424 BC in Thuc. 4.103. He used this as evidence for a 4th century date of composition; but this was refuted by W. Buchwald. We know from Herod. 7.24 and 7.114 that Xerxes had prepared a bridge over the Strymon in 480 BC.

Thirdly, the reference to Rh.'s posthumous cult at Rh. 962-73 has been linked to a cult of Rh. established by Hagnon at Amphipolis in 437 BC in order to ensure the success of the colony there. The theory is based on Polyaeus' report of an oracle delivered to Hagnon in 437. Hagnon brought the bones of Rh. from Troy to bury them by the Strymon. However, not only is Polyaeus' authority unreliable but also his account is at odds with the

50 See R. Goossens \( AC \) 1 (1932) 93ff., H. Gregoire \( AC \) 2 (1933) 91ff. and C.B. Sneller (1949) c.7.
51 \( AC \) 3 (1934) 233ff. and 411ff. For the supposed presence of such allegories in E. see E. Delebecque \( Euripide et la guerre du Péloponèse \) (1951), refuted convincingly by G. Zuntz \( ACMad \) 1 (1958) 155-62.
52 \( GV \) 585n.1
53 \( Studien zur Chronologie der attischen Tragödie \) (1939) 50ff. See also P. Perdrizet 'Le Pont d’Amphipolis et la date du Rhésos' \( In Mem. Lui Vasile Pârvan \) (1934).
54 See R. 360f., R. Goossens \( ib. \) 97, W. Leaf \( JHS \) 35 (1915) 6, G.C. Richards \( CQ \) 10 (1916) 192, W. Buchwald \( ib. \), J. Hartung \( Euripides Restitutus \) (1843) 6f. Against, see J. Rempe \( De Rheso Thracum heroë \) (1927) 13ff. and T. Sinko \( ib. \) 414.
55 \( Strat. \) 6.53. See I. Malkin \( Studies in Greek and Roman Religion \) vol.3 (1987) 81. We have independent evidence of the foundation of this cult by Hagnon at \( \Sigma \) Rh. 346 and Thuc. 5.11, but in these accounts the tomb is in the town itself, not on the river bank.
version of Rh.'s fate in the play. In Rh. he is not buried at Troy but ἐν ἀντροίς on Mt. Pangaeum, while in Polyaenus he is transferred from Troy to a tomb παρὰ τῶν νοταμόν.

To sum up: the external evidence to Rh. provides us with no certain indication of authenticity or spuriousness. However, the ancient allegations of spuriousness, and the evidence of quotations possess some interest; the information given in the hypothesis does not preclude the possibility of there having been two plays called Rh. From this inconclusive survey we shall now turn to the internal evidence.

2) INTERNAL EVIDENCE
A) Language and Style
i) Vocabulary
   a) Rare words

That the authorship of Rh. is still an issue is a testimony to the difficulty of assessing the language of an author's work on the basis of only a small portion of surviving texts. The extant plays and fragments of E. represent only about one quarter of his work and any attempt to draw conclusions about vocabulary from such incomplete data will always be suspect. Moreover, because of the fragmentary nature of our extant tragic corpus it is difficult to tell whether a particular word or phrase is favoured by one tragedian or is part of general tragic diction.

The rare words in Rh. are not so remarkable as to make us suspect that the play is not a 5th century work. There are some ἀπαξ λεγόμενα but as evidence they are unreliable. We see, e.g., a
number of words which Eysert thought unique until further examples were found. Of the other ἕπ. λέγ. some are hardly unusual enough to be classed as unique and, with only two exceptions, the remainder are unremarkable compounds. It is clear that the occurrence of rare words in the play is not a reliable basis for any pronouncements on authorship.

There are some words with unusual or unique meanings or usages in Rh., but none of them so unusual that they could not have been used by E. Very few words in Rh. appear in uncommon

(1891) 1.10ff.

56 See διάβασμα (215) and ἔκφρας (417). ἀμβλώφ (737) is cited by Photius from E. Θυεστής (fr. 397 a.i Snell), S. (fr. 1001), Ion (TGF 19F53a) and Plato Comicus (fr. 23.1 Demianczuk). R. (150) includes 327 ἐπίμομος with an active sense but see note ad loc.

57 See 296 προεξερευνητής, 441 κρυσταλλόπηκτος and 515 θολνατήριου. For καρανιστής (817) cf. καρανιστήρ with the same sense at Α. Ευμ. 186. For ἀριστοτόκος (909) cf. Ιλ.18.54 διασκοριτέσσεια. ἀθειείτις (965) is only a slight variation on the m. ἀθειείτης (S. Αι. 590).

58 See 296 προέξερευνητής, 441 κρυσταλλόπηκτος and 515 θολνατήριου. For καρανιστής (817) cf. καρανιστήρ with the same sense at Α. Ευμ. 186. For ἀριστοτόκος (909) cf. Ιλ.18.54 διασκοριτέσσεια. ἀθειείτις (965) is only a slight variation on the m. ἀθειείτης (S. Αι. 590).

59 κλωπεκός at 205 (q.v.) and 512 and μηνάς for μήνη at 534 (μήνη itself is in tragedy only at ΡΥ 797 and Ε. fr. 1009). For the formation of μηνάς cf. Μαίας with Μαία, πελειάς with πέλεια and δειράς with δειρή.

60 See notes on 3, 5, 9, 33, 134, 260, 273, 304, 340, 349f., 353 (ὑδροεἰδής is ἕπ. λέγ., but I have nowhere found it recorded as such), 361 (bis) and 363. At 552 νυκτιβρόμου is Pierson’s emendation of the MSS νυκτιδρόμου. The others are 712 ῥακόπους (Jo. Chrysostom (late 4th century AD) has ῥακόπους and Origenes (early 3rd century AD) has the verb ῥακοδιτέω), 716 ψαφαρόχροος (cf. ἡ. 19.32 ψαφάροχτυχα μῆλα), 716 πολυπινηής, 921 χρυσόβωλος and 964 καρποποιός.

61 See e.g. οيتها (12), κεφαλά (226), καταπνεῖ (387), παλαιός (389), διπλάδες (395) and γενουσία (401). At 924 and 949 σοφιστής means ‘skilled poet’ (Vater suggested ‘interpreter’ for 949). This is a meaning found in Pindar (Is. 5.28). In extant E. the word is pejorative, meaning ‘schemer’ (HF. 993, Hi. 921, Su. 903 and fr. 905). ἀνθρωποδαίμων (971) does not appear again until Procopius (6th century AD). In formation it belongs to an uncommon class of compounds, like ἰατρόμαντις (Α. Στ. 263, Αγ. 1623 and Ευμ. 62) and βροτοδαίμων (glossed as ήμίθεος by Hesychius (See Schwyzner Gr.Gr. 1.453f.)). The meaning ‘man-spirit’ is obvious.
b) Dialect Words

Apart from the standard use of Doric in the lyric parts of Rh. we find six words from non-Attic dialects. The only one which is remarkable is the Boeotian προταίνι at 523. E. does use dialect words, but there are so few of them that we can only guess what effect they were intended to have. Because his extant work does not contain Boeotian words, προταίνι has been seen as evidence against authenticity. However, he may have used Boeotisms in plays which have not survived. The question which cannot be answered is why the author gives Hector this word in iambics when a more common alternative is available. Whatever the case, one Boeotism is not enough to use as evidence against authenticity. What may tell against authenticity is the sheer number of dialect words in one play; far more than in any play of A., S. or E.

c) Prepositions

The prepositions in Rh. are used with almost the same regularity as in the plays of E., with two notable exceptions: ἀπό and περί. The distribution of these words in E. is as follows

62 See n.60 for μηνάς and see προκάθημαι (6), πυρό (43) and ὑποσταθεῖς (315). For δυσθησικῶν (791) and δυσόιζω (724, 805) see iv) below. ἐξαπώσατε (811) is an unusual form in Attic, if sound, but cf. ἀπώσε at S. fr. 479.

63 See notes on ἐξώστης (322), πεδαίρῳ (372), ἐπεζάρει (441) and προταίνι (523). The others are λευφόρος, an Ionic word at 881 (cf. Herod. 1.187.1) and adjectival μυριάς, a Boeotian usage at 913 (cf. Corinna 1a col.1.33f. (Page)).

64 Cf. the Aeolic ἔρτι at El. 625 (also found in Doric inscriptions, see Denniston ad loc.) and (possibly) ἐπεζάρει at Pho. 45. See also Hoffman-Debrunner Geschichte der griechischen Sprache (1953) vol.1 109ff. and Mastronarde ad loc.

65 Wilamowitz (Berl. Klass. 5.2.28). W. Morel (JAW 259 (1938) 55-66) discusses προταίνι and concludes, outrageously, that the author must have been an unknown Boeotian poet.
(figures taken from the lexicon of Allen and Italie).

\[ \dot{\alpha}\nu\rho\omicron\circ\alpha \text{: } \text{Alc. } 10(.86\%), \text{Me. } 9(.63\%), \text{Hclld. } 8(.76\%), \text{Hi. } 9(.61\%), \text{An. } 16(1.24\%), \text{Hec. } 12(.93\%), \text{Su. } 10(.81\%), \text{El. } 9(.66\%), \text{Hf } 14(.98\%), \text{Tro. } 16(1.2\%), \text{IT } 12(.8\%), \text{Ion } 11(.68\%), \text{Hel. } 14(.83\%), \text{Pho. } 15(.85\%), \text{Or. } 23(1.36\%), \text{Ba. } 11(.79\%), \text{IA } 16(.98\%) \text{ and Cy. } 11(1.55\%). \]

Rh. has only 2 examples of \( \dot{\alpha}\nu\rho\omicron\circ\alpha \) (at 113 and 449), a very small .2%. This anomaly is remarkable. The number of examples of \( \varepsilon\kappa \) in Rh. is slightly lower than those in E. (15 against an average of 21.8), so the author of Rh. is not simply using \( \varepsilon\kappa \) instead of \( \dot{\alpha}\nu\rho\omicron\circ\alpha \).

\[ \pi\epsilon\rho\omicron: \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron & \text{Alc.} & \text{Me.} & \text{Hclld.} & \text{Hi.} & \text{And.} & \text{Hec.} & \text{Su.} & \text{El.} & \text{Hf} \\
\text{+ gen.} & 3 & 4 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 5 & 2 \\
\text{+ dat.} & - & - & - & - & - & 1 & 1 & - \\
\text{+ acc.} & 1 & - & - & - & 1 & - & 1 & - \\
\text{total} & 4 & 4 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron & \text{Tro.} & \text{IT} & \text{Ion} & \text{Hel.} & \text{Pho.} & \text{Or.} & \text{Ba.} & \text{IA} & \text{Cy.} \\
\text{+ gen.} & 3 & 6 & 8 & 6 & 4 & 6 & 3 & 3 & - \\
\text{+ dat.} & - & - & - & 1 & 1 & - & - & 2 & 1 \\
\text{+ acc.} & 3 & - & - & 1 & - & 2 & 1 & 4 & 3 \\
\text{total} & 6 & 6 & 8 & 8 & 5 & 8 & 4 & 9 & 2 \\
\end{array} \]

No play has fewer than 8 instances, while Rh. does not have a single example of \( \pi\epsilon\rho\omicron \) taking any case.\(^{66}\) This is most unusual. All the plays of A., S. and E. contain \( \pi\epsilon\rho\omicron \), as does PV. It is possible that the author of Rh. preferred its synonym \( \dot{\alpha}\mu\varphi\omicron \). That preposition is used 8 times in Rh. (twice with the dat. and six times with acc.), which is close to the average number of occurrences for \( \dot{\alpha}\mu\varphi\omicron \) in E. (6.7).

In his complete omission of \( \pi\epsilon\rho\omicron \) and his rare use of \( \dot{\alpha}\nu\rho\omicron \) we may say that the author of Rh. departs significantly not only from known Euripidean practice, but from that of A. and S. as well.\(^{67}\)

\(^{66}\) Only one \( \pi\epsilon\rho\omicron \)- compound occurs in Rh.: \( \pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron \) at 773.

\(^{67}\) Cf. also the use of adverbial \( \pi\omicron\omicron\zeta \) with \( \varepsilon\pi\omicron \) meaning 'in addition'
d) Colloquialism

One important respect in which the language of Rh. differs significantly from that of E. is its infrequent use of colloquialism. E. used colloquial phrases to a greater extent than A. or S. This was an aspect of his work which struck his contemporaries and was frequently parodied by Ar. P.T. Stevens observed that the normal number of colloquial phrases in the plays of E. far exceeds that found in Rh. The following list covers only those found in iambics and trochaic tetrameters since examples from anapaests and lyrics are too few to be of significance. The number for each play is expressed in brackets as a percentage of the trimeters and tetrameters for each play. Alc. 25(3.2%), Me. 40(3.7%), Hclld. 27(3%), Hi. 30(3%), And. 33(3.5%), Hec. 25(2.7%), Su. 27(2.9%), HF 44(4.4%), Ion 39(3.4%), Tro. 20(2.5%), El. 34(3.6%), IT 27(2.4%), Hel. 49(4.1%), Pho. 40(3.2%), Or. 56(4.4%), Ba. 33(3.5%), IA 38(3.4%) and Cy. 48(8%).

The highest percentage is for the satyric Cy., which one might expect from a play outside the tragic genre. Rh. lags well behind every Euripidean play with only 7 examples of colloquialism (0.9%). The conclusion to be drawn from this is that in admitting so few colloquial phrases the author of Rh. displays a style which

at Rh. 756. This is not found in E. but occurs in A. fr. 146a (Neaniskoi). Fraenkel ((1965) 238) argues that the poet used this 'Aeschlean' device to fill up 756 which was already a complete sentence.

68 Hermes Einz. 38 (1976)

69 This includes the messenger speeches which take up 358 lines. Without them the percentage is 4.1.

70 τι χρήμα 'why' (87), καὶ πρός 'and besides' (102 and 756), τρίβων 'an old hand' (625), οἰμαί 'no doubt' (759), ἢ, a sound representing a gasp, (between 573 and 574) and ἢ ἢ (729).
is remarkably different from that of E. in his extant plays.

ii) Syntax

There are a few examples of epic syntax in Rh. A.C. Pearson considered their use contrary to the normal practice of Attic tragedians and therefore evidence against authenticity. However, like echoes of Iliad.10 and epic vocabulary, they may easily be explained as contributing to the epic *timbre* of the play.

There remain two constructions which have been seen as evidence against authenticity. Firstly, Wilamowitz considered the unusual use of ἦν ἄρα μή for εἴ μή ἄρα at 118 as evidence of a late date of composition but we may have corruption here (as Denniston and Paley suspect) so this cannot be used as firm evidence. Secondly, Ed. Fraenkel (ib. 239) considered that ὑπάρχειν (633 οὐκ οὖν ὑπάρχειν τόνδε καταθανόντα χρῆ;) meaning 'to be the first to do something' with a dependent participle is Ionic. The construction is found in Herod. at 6.133.1, 7.8.β2 and 9.78.2 but is also found in Attic at Xen. *An.* 2.3.23 and 5.5.9.

These isolated peculiarities do not give us firm evidence for doubting the play's authenticity.

71 CR 35 (1929) 56f.
72 See δέξαμεν (4), πᾶσαν ἄτι τρίγματα (42) and ἐπι δ' ἄν (469). For ἔλοιπο (for εἴθεν ἔλεγον at 720) cf. ὡς ἔλοιπο at E. Ηι. 407.
73 Hermes 61 (1926) 288 (=KS 4.415). See also Paley ad loc.
74 LSJ wrongly add Thuc. 2.67.4. Paley observes that ὑπάρχειν conveys the idea of some wrong or benefit, committed or received, which serves as the motive for further action in requital but declares that this implication is not present at 633. However, not only does Paris present an immediate danger to the Greeks but also his theft of Helen precipitated the war. To kill him would be to avenge the abduction.
iii) Stylistic Infelicities

a) Repetitions

The tendency of the poet of Rh. to repeat words and phrases without rhetorical effect has been seen by some as contributing to a flatness of style which is uncharacteristic of E.\(^7\) It is true that classical Greek audiences were less sensitive to repetition than we are,\(^7\) and it is on the basis of such supposed tolerance that R. (218-25) defends the phenomenon in Rh. To illustrate that it does not differ from other plays of E. in this respect, R. lists examples of repetition of phrases in Hi. (428 BC) and Ba. (post 407/6 BC), but even he is forced to admit that the proportion of repetitions of phrases in Rh. is far greater than in not only either of these plays,\(^7\) but all extant E.

What really makes the repetitions of phrase in Rh. so remarkable is that they rarely have a rhetorical significance and occasionally seem carelessly added to fill up the iambic lines.\(^7\)

At 169 Hector says to Dolon χρυσός πάρεστιν, εἰ τόδε αἰτήσεις γέρας and, soon after, at 181 he repeats the same phrase to him: τί δήτα μείζον τῶνε μ' αἰτήσεις γέρας; This has no rhetorical force. Perhaps the lamest repetition occurs between 395 and 423 (κοῦ διπλοῦς πέφυκ' ἀνήρ). Unlike the powerful repetition of εἰ

\(^7\)See e.g. A.C. Pearson CR 35 (1921) 58, Porter’s ed. xlviiif., R. Morstadt (1827) 64, C.D. Beck (1824) 297, O. Gruppe Ariadne (1834) 291 and W. Ridgeway CQ 20 (1926) 16.

\(^7\)For an extensive list of repetitions in tragedy see J. Jackson CQ 35 (1940) 220-222.

\(^7\)Rh. has 77 repetitions of phrase in 996 lines (7.67%), Hi. has 32 in 1466 lines (2.2%) and Ba. 48 in 1392 lines (3.4%).

\(^7\)See esp. 57 and 78 'Ἀρχεῖων στρατῶν, 127 and 146 'Ἀρχεῖων στρατῶν, 150, 155, 221 and 589 ναὸς ἐπ' 'Ἀρχεῖων μολείων and 203 and 502 ναὸς ἐπ' 'Ἀρχεῖων ὑ- and 146 and 471 ἐπ' 'Ἀρχεῖων ὑ-.
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κακός πέφυκ' ἀνήρ at E. Hi. 1031 1075 and 1191, this carries no rhetorical force at all. These kinds of repetition are features which could be regarded as evidence against authenticity.

b) Inflated language

One aspect of the style of Rh. which has attracted criticism from most scholars since Scaliger is the tendency of the poet to use what is generally termed 'inflated language' to no rhetorical or dramatic purpose.79 There is certainly some peculiar diction in Rh. but, as with vocabulary, we cannot be exactly sure whether particular phrases really are remarkable exceptions to normal tragic or Euripidean diction, or whether we simply do not have enough extant tragic texts to measure them against. We shall examine the most notable examples of this 'inflated language' at 111, 317 and 426.80

At 111 (νυκτὸς ἐν καταστάσει) the meaning of κατάστασις is not to be compared with E. Me. 1197 οὐτ' ὄμματος γὰρ δῆλος ἡ κατάστασις or Hi. 1296 ἀκούει, Θησεύ, σῶν κακῶν κατάστασιν (pace R.). The word means 'settled condition' or 'state', and a different meaning for Rh. 111 is hard to defend. Bothe compares Ps.-Plut. De Fluv. 12.1. (Sagaris), where τῶν θερινῶν καταστήματι is used for τῶν θέρει. This phrase seems to be a good example of

79 See J. Scaliger Prolegomana ad Manilium (1600s) 6ff., C.D. Beck (1824) 297ff., R. Morstadt (1827) 62ff., G. Hermann (1828) 289ff., F.G. Welcker Die griechischen Tragödien vol.3 (1841) 1118, O. Menzer (1867) 38, F. Hagenbach (1863) 27, J. Geffcken Hermes 71 (1936) 404f. and esp. Fraenkel (ib.) 237ff. H. Grégoire (AC 2 (1933) 120) believed the play to be genuine, but still believed that the style of Rh. differed from the rest of E. with respect to 'inflated language'.

80 See also notes on 8, 64, 106, 142, 203, 288 and 445. Ed. Fraenkel (ib. 238) regards 792 χερί σὺν κενή δορὸς as a stylistic howler but it would be easy to emend to σὺν κενή δορὸς χερί.
inflated language.

Fraenkel (ib. 238) considers ὅταν πολίταις εὐσταθῶσι δαιμόνες at 317 unworthy of even a young E. The most striking part of the sentence is the use of εὐσταθεῖν. The verb is not found elsewhere in tragedy and does not occur again in Greek until Plut. It usually means 'to be physically stable'. Its application to gods here is strange. Porter translates 'stand firm for the city'. but the verb does not mean 'stand firm'. Similarly Paley suggests that it may be an allusion to the μάκαρες εὐεδροί (cf. A. Se. 97), since gods were regarded as keeping their places when a city was victorious and as abandoning them when a city was defeated. The problem with accepting this interpretation is that a threat to the gods' temples at Troy is not really relevant to the situation; indeed the Trojans are particularly confident of success. This use of the verb may be an example of 'inflated language' but it may also be an accident that we have no other examples of it.

At 426 (ἀγχιτέρμων γαία μοι, Σκύθης λεώς) the apposition of γαία and λεώς is impossible to parallel and this should perhaps be considered inflated diction.

There is one peculiarity which is not so much a stylistic infelicity as a simple mistake on the part of the author. At 185 the masc. participle πεψκότες refers to the horses of Achilles. It is used of birds at Plut. Mor. 281B πνευμάτων δ' ὄντων οὐκ εὐσταθοῦσιν οἱ ὀρνιθες, of bodily health at ib. 1090A, of the sea at Lucian Ver. Hist. 1.30.4 εὐσταθοῦν τὸ πέλαγος and of the wind at A.R. 4.821.

It is probably best to adopt Dobree's αὐτός at 187 (as does Diggle), to be taken with ἀνος Ποσειδῶν. This would remove the difficulty of choosing between αὐτοῦς (OA) and αὐτάς (V).
In the *Il.* these horses, Xanthos and Balios, are masculine. However, as Σ Rh. 239 notes, the playwright clearly regards them as feminine at 237 (Φθιάδων δ' ἐπιπών) and 240 (τάς). This is hard to excuse. Teams of horses were commonly feminine in poetry, even if the individual horses were male. Cf. esp. S. El. 703f., 734f., 737f., where the team is feminine and ib. 721f. and 744, where the horses themselves are male. Perhaps the author remembered that they were masc. in the *Il.* at 185 but forgot this at 237-40 and followed the tragic convention of making chariot teams feminine.

Despite the zealousness of Fraenkel and his predecessors in objecting to the 'inflated language' of Rh., there is not as much evidence against authenticity in this aspect as they would like to see. A few phrases are unusual and perhaps they are to be regarded as bombastic but there are not enough of them to judge the author a 'poeta grandiloquentior'. The loss of so many of our tragic texts means that we cannot say with certainty that these phrases or usages could not have occurred in E.

83 See *Il.* 16.149 and ib. 23.277f.
84 A rare exception is E. *IA* 218ff. καλλίστος...ιπωλος.
85 See also Barrett on E. *Hi.* 231 and cf. ib. 1132 and E. *Pho.* 3.
iv) Echoes from Other Tragic Texts

Even from the small corpus of extant Attic tragedy it can be seen that the poets freely used and adapted material from each others’ works for their own poetic purposes. This phenomenon is present in Rh., but on a scale unlike that found in A., S. or E. R. (196-212) attached little importance to this, but other scholars have seen it as unusual and evidence against authenticity.

At one extreme, Wilamowitz took seriously the comment in the hypothesis about the play’s ‘Sophoclean character’ and maintained that the play is a fourth century adaptation of S. Poimenes (frr. 497-521), itself a dramatisation of the story of Cycnus, from the Cypria (Davies p.32, 67ff.). In support of this he pointed firstly to similarities between the shepherd’s speech in Rh., which relates the approach of Rh., and that of a goatherd in Poim., which relates that of Cycnus; and secondly to a similarity between Rh.’s boasting and that of Cycnus in Poim., especially to the claim of both heroes that they are not speaking arrogantly.

Wil. is imprudent to suggest that Rh. comes from the fourth century and is based on S. Poim; but the poet may have used the similarity of context in Poim. as inspiration for the scene in Rh. However, this sort of contextual borrowing would be nothing

86 See M. Parry HSCP 41 (1930) 97-114, D.L. Page Actors’ Interpolations in Greek Tragedy (1934) 127 and R. 205n.
88 Hermes 61 (1926) 284 (=KS 4.411), (1907) 41 n.81 and (1877) 13 (=KS 1.13).
89 See notes on Rh. 290ff. (cf. S. fr. 502) and Rh. 468 and 513ff. (cf. S. fr. 501).
peculiar in tragedy. Of more interest for the question of authenticity is, firstly, the author’s habit of using continuous passages from another play as verbal models, rather than simply contextual ones and, secondly, his habit of juxtaposing rare and striking words or phrases from different sources.

It is easy to see that the poet used A. Se. At Rh. 19 νυκτησωρίων and 89 νυκτησωροῦσα may be compared with A. Se. 29 νυκτησωρείσθαι. The noun is very rare; the verb occurs only in these two places. In both plays the words are used in the context of an expected attack. At Rh. 987 ἀνωμθε πληρεῖν τ' αὐχένας εὐωφρίδων: must have the sense ‘harness the necks of the horses’ and may well have been suggested by πληροῦτε θωρακεῖα at A. Se. 32. Cf. also Rh. 514 πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις with A. Se. 33 πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις and ib. 58 πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις. Cf. Rh. 20ff. οὐκ οἴσθα δορὰς πέλας Ἀργείου | νυχίων ἡμᾶς | κοίτων πανόπλους κατέχοντας; with A. Se. 59f. ἐχθρὸς γὰρ ἡπόθα πάνωπλος Ἀργείων στρατὸς | ἱππεῖ. Cf. also Rh. 569 δεσμῶν ἀραξμόν ἱππικῶν with A. Se. 245 ἄκοιὼν γ' ἱππικῶν φροσυμάτων and ib. 249 ἀραξμός: a juxtaposition of words in Rh. which appear only a little further apart in a similar context.

90 Contextual too are the echoes at Rh. 608f. of S. Ai. 14ff. ὁ φυτέμ' Ἀθάνας, φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν, | ὡς εἰμαθές σου, κὼν ἀκοπτος ἑς ὀμος, | φώνη' ἄκοιω (cf. also E. Hi. 1391-3). See also notes on Rh. 179f. (cf. A. Ag. 578f.) and Rh. 360-5 (cf. S. Ai. 1199-1207).

91 Found only at Arist. fr.159, Libanius Decl. 26.23 and Porphyrius ad Il. 10.194, all referring to Agamemnon’s night council.

92 The usual meaning of the verb is ‘to fill up’ but we find similar usages: e.g λιμένα...ἐκπειρῶν πλάτη (E. Or. 54) and ναῦν πληροῦν (Herod. 1.171).

93 See Fraenkel ib. 231. Cf. also πετεινοῖς γυψί at Rh. 515 with A. Se. [1020] πετεινῶν ὦων.
context in Se. We may also have an interesting juxtaposition of 
echoes from two sources at Rh. 122 αἰθὼν γὰρ ἄνηρ καὶ πεπύργωται 
θράσει. Cf. not only A. Se. 447ff. ἄνηρ . . . αἰθὼν τέτακται λήμα,
but also E. Or. 1568 ὅς πεπύργωσαι θράσει.

It is also probable that the poet used E. Phaethon. As the 
guards leave to wake the fifth watch at Rh. 527, they comment on 
the sights and sounds which accompany the dawn. The strophe and 
antistrophe bear a strong resemblance to 63-74 of the parodos of 
Phaeth. The similarities go beyond those of vocabulary to the 
close echoing of motifs. It is likely that one passage was written 
with knowledge of the other, but deciding which came first is not 
possible from internal evidence. Of particular interest is the 
presence of the ἔγρεσθαι in both passages, since this verb is not 
found again until the Hellenistic poets. Some of the resemblances 
might be expected given the subject, but the cumulative effect is 
notable.

Cf. Rh. 529ff. καὶ ἑπτάποροι | Πλειάδες αἰθέριαι | with Phaeth. 
65f. ὑπὲρ δ΄ ἐμᾶς κεφαλᾶς | Πλειάδ[ῶν πέφυγε χορός]. Cf. Rh. 
532f. ἔγρεσθε τι μέλλετε; κοιτᾶν | ἐξεταί πρὸς φυλακῶν. with 
Phaeth. 73f. ἔγρονται δ΄ εἰς βοτάνας | ξανθᾶν πῶλον συζυγαί. Cf. 
Συμφόνοις | ἠμένα κοίτας | φοινίας ὑμεῖ ὑμνημοσύνατα | γῆρυ 
παιδολέτωρ μελοποιοῦ ἄθροισι μέριμνα. with Phaeth. 67-70 μέλπει 
δὲ δεύδρει λεπτών ἄρθρων ἀρμονίαν | ὑβρειομένα γόνες | ἵτων 
"Ιτων πολύθρυμοι. and Rh. 551ff. ἱδὴ δὲ νέμουσι κατ᾽ ἵδων | 
ποιμναὶ νυκτιβρόμου | σύριγγας ἱα τἀκακοὺς. with Phaeth. 71f. 
σύριγγας δ΄ ὑφυβάτας | κινούσιν ποιμνῶν ἑλάται. Cf. also Rh. 482 
with Phaeth. 7.

94See Fraenkel ib. 231. For minor echoes see notes on Rh. 50f. (cf. 
A. Se. 651f. ὡς οὐπότ’ ἀνδρὶ τῶν κηρυκευμάτων | μέμψις) and Rh. 
306ff. (cf. A. Se. 385f. ὑπ’ ἀσθενὸς δὲ τῶν | χαλκήλατοι κλάζοντι 
κώδων ἄλοκον). Cf. also Rh. 796 with A. Se. 593 βαθεῖαν ἁλοκα διὰ 
φρενὸς καρπουμένος. and Rh. 770 with A. Se. 287ff., beginning 
μέλει, φόβῳ δ΄ οὐχ ἐπεύσῃ κέαρ. (see Fraenkel ib. 238).

95See G.H. Macurdy AJP 64 (1943) 408-16, R. 255f. and J. Diggle 
Euripides Phaethon 95f.
He may also have used E. IA, as we seem to find echoes of IA 172-4 at Rh. 48 ναυσπόρος στρατιά (IA 172 πλάτας ναυσιπόρος)\(^96\) and Rh. 261ff. ὅς ἐπὶ γὰς Τροίων χιλιόνων ἦλθ᾽ ἔχων στρατεύα 
(IP 173f. οὔς ἐπὶ Τροίων ἔλατας χιλιόνων). Of interest is the coincidence of the relative clause, the echoes of vocabulary and also the proximity of the lines in IA.

Of some interest also is: Rh. 16 χο. θάρσει. ἀκ. θαρσῷ.\(^\)\(^97\) and E. IA [2f.] Λ. στείχε. ἀκ. στείχῳ. τί δὲ καλλουργεῖς, Ἀγάμεμνον ἄναξ. ἀκ. σπεύσεις; ἀκ. σπεύδω. The context of these passages is similar. Both are in anapaests at the start of their plays, which begin in darkness, in a military setting, with an urgent tone. In addition, while antilabe is rare in tragic anapaests, division within a metron is even rarer.\(^98\) There are no Euripidean parallels for this and some scholars believed that the presence of antilabe in the anapaestic prologues of IA and Rh. is evidence against the authenticity of both.\(^99\) Fraenkel, on the other hand (ib. 234f.), saw the echo as proof that E. started IA with the anapaestic prologue. Whatever the authorship of either passage, the echo is remarkable.

It seems that the author also used A. Pe. Cf. Rh. 441 ἄλλ᾽ οἷα πόντον θρῆκιον φυσῆματα κρυσταλλοπηκτα Παιόνας τ᾽ ἐπεζάρει with A. Pe. 501 περαὶ κρυσταλλοπηκτα διὰ πόρων. The context of Pe. 501 is very like that in Rh. The adjectives are ἄπαξ λεγόμενα and

\(^96\) The adj. normally means ‘navigable’ but in these places only it means ‘seafaring’ and refers to the expedition to Troy.
\(^97\) Diggle wishes to excise 16ff. but see note ad loc.
\(^98\) See Metre: Anapaests below.
addition there is an un-Attic verb, found elsewhere only at E. Pho. 44f. (ὡς δ' ἐπεζάρει Ἡ Σφίγξ ἀρπαγαίσαν πόλιν). 100

The poet seems also to have used the Oresteia as a source:

Cf. Rh. 790f. θερμός δὲ κρονιός δεσπότου πάρα σφαγαίς ἔδειξε με δυσθυμίζοντος αἴματος νέου. with A. Ag. 1389f. κάκφυσιῶν δέξιας αἴματος σφαγήν ἔκλεισε μὴ ἔρεμωθε ψακάδι φοινίκας ὀρέσσου.

These resemblances are striking. The vocabulary and context of Ag. 1389f. are closely mirrored in Rh. Cf. also Rh. 724 δυσοίζων and 805 μηδὲν δυσοίζων. with A. Ag. 1316 οὔτει δυσοίζω. δυσοίζω is only found in these lines and, like δυσθυμίζω in 791, is formed contrary to analogy. Compound verbs (except those consisting of a simple verb and a preposition) are formed from compound nouns or adjectives and end in -έω. δυσθυμίζω in 791 may be borrowed from the only other place it occurs: E. El. 843.

Cf. also Rh. 817 ἦτοι μάραγνα γ' ἥ καρανιστής μόρος with A. Eum. 186 καρανιστήρθες and Cho. 375 ἀλλὰ διπλῆς γὰρ τῆς μαράγνης δοῦνος ἐκνεῖται. The author may be showing off two rare words from different places in the Oresteia here101 (see Fraenkel ib. 233).

We may also compare Rh. 85f. καὶ μὴν . . . φράσαι. with E. Hec. 216f. καὶ μὴν ὃδυσσεύς ἔρχεται σπουδή ποδὸς, ἢ ἐκάθη, νέον τι πρὸς σὲ σημανών ἔπος. Although this formula is commonly used by E. to announce the arrival of a new character bearing news, this particular echo has some significance. O. Taplin suggests ((1977) 147n.) that since this is the only example of the expectation of news from an arrival which is not followed by news, Rh. 85f. may be based on this line in Hec. It might be argued that the poet

100 See also notes on Rh. 54 and 126 (cf. A. Pe. 481) and Rh. 430f. (cf. A. Pe. 816f.).

101 μάραγνα is paratragic at Pl. Com. fr.64. See Poll. 10.56.
wished to raise the audience's expectation of news only to
disappoint them, but this is still not an Euripidean practice and
Taplin's suggestion is an attractive one.

Cf. also Rh. 870 μὴ θυμήσῃ ἡλίς γὰρ τῶν τεθνηκότων ὄχλος.
with E. Hec. 278 μηδε κτάνητε τῶν τεθνηκότων ἡλίς.

Hec. 278 is full of pathos. Hecuba pleads with Od. not to
slay Polyxena. The line in Rh. conveys no such pathos. Indeed H.'s
μὴ θυμήσῃ is almost silly.102

Finally cf. Rh. 498f. ἔστι δ' αἰμμυλώτατον | κρότημα'.
'Οδυσσεύς, λήμα τ' ἀρκοῖντως θρασύς with S. Ai. 388f. τὸν
αίμμυλώτατον, | ἐχθρὸν ἁλήμα, and S. fr. 913 τὸ πάνυσοφον κρότημα
λαέρτου γόνος.

The poet has used two striking words which are also used
insultingly of Od. in two separate places by S. Moreover, κρότημα
occurs only in these two places in extant Greek.

It may be seen from the above that the poet of Rh. enjoyed
adapting rare and striking words and phrases from other tragedies,
often from similar contexts in those tragedies. It is not enough
to dismiss this phenomenon on the grounds that similar contexts
are likely to produce similar diction, because the echoes are
often those of syntax as well as vocabulary. Moreover, he was not
content simply with the adaptation and variation of such material.
He also combined and juxtaposed elements from different plays to
produce a mosaic effect in his composition. The most significant
examples of this may be seen at lines 122, 498f., 790f. and 817.103

In addition to this he made use of continuous passages from other
tragedies (Se. 29, 32f., ib. 58ff., ib. 245 and 249, E. Phaeth.
102. 'Das Verhältnis einer armeinigen Nachahmung zu einem trefflichen
Vorbild kann kaum besser illustriert werden' (Fraenkel ib. 238).
See also notes on Rh. 80 (cf. E. Hi. 519) and Rh. 395 and 423 (cf.
E. Hi. 1031, 1075 and 1191).
103. Possibly also Rh. 441f.
63-74 and, possibly, E. IA 171-4). This degree of intertextual allusion is not found in A., S., E. or PV but does occur in interpolated passages of tragedy. See Mastronarde *Euripides Phoenissae* p.593 and cf., e.g., E. Pho. [1634] with S. Ant. 29f.

Also of significance for the issue of authenticity is that some of these echoes may come from IA, a play written at the end of E.'s life.104 If the thesis of R. and Burnett is to be maintained, i.e. that Rh. is a product of the young E., we would have to assume that E. had in his youth created several uncommon words and phrases which he used in Rh., but not again for several decades until the last years of his life. More likely is that the author was familiar with a large corpus of Greek tragedy, including the last works of E., and that he drew inspiration from the martial dramas A. Se. and Pe., as well as the *Oresteia*, S. Ai., E. Hec., Hi., Or. and IA, and adapted many remarkable words and passages from these tragedies to suit his own contexts, not always with the best results (e.g. Rh. 870).

To sum up: there are some grounds for doubting authenticity on the basis of the poet's language. The remarkably small number of colloquialisms in the play is uncharacteristic of E., at any stage in his career, as is the complete absence of περί and the rarity of ἀμέδεια. The large number of repetitions, some lame, is out of keeping with Euripidean style and the use to which he puts echoes from other tragedies is a distinct characteristic of the author of Rh. and of interpolated passages of tragedy, but not of E., A., S. or PV.

104 See esp. Fraenkel *ib.* 234f. who includes far more 'echoes'.
B) Metre

1) Iambic Trimmers
   a) Resolutions

   The use of the comparative rates of resolution of long princeps and substitution of $\sim$ for $\times$ at the start of a line in the iambic trimeters of E. as a criterion for arranging his plays in a roughly chronological order was outlined by T. Zieliński. Subsequent scholarship has shown that this remains a useful criterion because it can be corroborated by external evidence for the dates of the plays. The method cannot be used to date a tragedy exactly because some plays have slightly lower rates of resolution than those which closely precede them chronologically. However, it may be used to give a general indication of the period of E.'s life in which a particular play was written.

   The table below shows the number of iambic trimeters in the tragedies of E. in col. 1 and the number of resolved feet in those trimeters (including those accommodating proper names) in col. 2. Col. 3 expresses the total number of resolved feet as a percentage of the trimeters. The purpose of this collation is to show that although scholars disagree about the numbers of trimeters and resolutions, the differences between the figures count for very little when examining the gradual increase in resolutions as E.

105 I am most grateful to Mrs. L.P.E. Edwards for her observations on the metre of Rh.
106 Tragodumenon Libri Tres (1925) 133-240.
107 For the first 3 columns I have given the parameters of the figures found in the surveys of J. Descroix (Le trimètre iambique des iambographes à la Comédie Nouvelle (1931), E.B. Ceadel CQ 35 (1941) 66-89, M.L. Philippides Certain Features of the Iambic Trimeter of Euripides (1978) (this survey covers only Alc., Me., Hi., Or., Ba. and I.A.) and M. Cropp and G. Fick BICS Supp. 43 (1985) (Rh. is not included in this survey). Ceadel's figure for Cy. is also shown, by way of comparison with another genre.
grew older. Col. 4 contains Ceadel's figures for the number of resolutions which do not accommodate proper names and col. 5 expresses those figures as a percentage of the trimeters. This is to show that even without considering resolutions which accommodate as haphazard a phenomenon as proper names, there is still a gradual increase in E.'s admission of resolution. Col. 6 shows the actual or approximate date of production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>col. 1</th>
<th>col. 2</th>
<th>col. 3</th>
<th>col. 4</th>
<th>col. 5</th>
<th>col. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alc.</td>
<td>802-806</td>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>6.6-6.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me.</td>
<td>1031-1048</td>
<td>75-76</td>
<td>7.2-7.3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hcld.</td>
<td>888-903</td>
<td>68-69</td>
<td>7.6-7.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>430-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi.</td>
<td>979-1007</td>
<td>60-67</td>
<td>6.1-6.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And.</td>
<td>932-952</td>
<td>148-150</td>
<td>15.7-16.0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>c. 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec.</td>
<td>919-934</td>
<td>181-182</td>
<td>19.4-19.8</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>pre 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>912-923</td>
<td>157-162</td>
<td>17.2-17.6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>c. 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.</td>
<td>954-967</td>
<td>205-209</td>
<td>21.5-21.6</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>420108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>984-992</td>
<td>228-230</td>
<td>23.2-23.3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>c. 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tro.</td>
<td>785-796</td>
<td>210-215</td>
<td>26.8-27.0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion</td>
<td>1027-1057</td>
<td>287-289</td>
<td>27.3-27.9</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>c. 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1067-1087</td>
<td>313-316</td>
<td>29.1-29.4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>c. 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel.</td>
<td>1253-1265</td>
<td>441-446</td>
<td>34.9-35.6</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pho.</td>
<td>1026-1190</td>
<td>357-414</td>
<td>48.8-50.0</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or.</td>
<td>1134-1175</td>
<td>561-587</td>
<td>43.4-43.9</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>post 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA.</td>
<td>918-923</td>
<td>400-405</td>
<td>43.3-43.9</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>post 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>815-873</td>
<td>354-378</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>412-08110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cy.</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>412-08110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When examining Rh. we find that the number of trimeters is 682, the number of resolved feet which include proper names is 64 and the percentage of trimeters with such resolution is 9.4%. The

number of resolutions without proper names is 55 which represents 8.1% of the trimeters. This figure places Rh. between Hi. (428) and And. (c. 425) on a narrow scale, and, on a broad scale, within an earlier period of E.'s extant work, i.e. certainly before the composition of And., but after the composition of Alc. This is a stumbling block for those like R. and Burnett who maintain that it is his earliest work.

Also of relevance is the fact that of the ten 'rules' which Zieliński formulated for the admission of resolution within the trimeters of E. throughout the course of his writing career, Rh. conforms more conservatively to every one than any play of E. This suggests that the play, if genuine, should come from a period earlier than Alc. As we have seen, this is not corroborated by the low rate of resolution in Rh.

b) Verse Weight and Caesurae

It should be mentioned briefly that E. Harrison maintained that an examination of the poet's preference for short or long anceps in the trimeters of Rh. shows that his style differs from that of E. Unfortunately his results compare Rh. with only seven of E.'s plays. Moreover, his figures only apply to the play as a whole. He does not examine the distribution of verse-weight within the scenes themselves. R. (274-280) has, in addition, examined the

111 Zieliński (ib. 142ff.) observed that E. applied these 'rules' more strictly at the beginning of his career and became more lax with them as he got older. See also R. 267-71 and A.M. Devine & L.D. Stephens TAPA 110 (1980) 93-79 and 111 (1981) 43-64.
112 CQ 8 (1914) 206-211. The analysis of J. Descroix ((1931) 46-60) is not reliable because he examines in detail only those lines without resolution. His conclusion that Rh. is an archaising work of the fourth century which slavishly imitates Aeschylean practice is founded on insufficient data.
113 Su., Hec., Hi., Tro., Or., Ba. and Cy.
verse-weight of Alc. and Hcld. and analysed the distribution of long anceps from scene to scene. His results show that Rh. differs very little from Alc. and Hcld. in this respect and that there is not enough of a disparity between Rh. and these particular plays of E. to cast any doubt on its authenticity.

Rh. has a higher proportion of penthemimeral caesura in trimeters (with and without elision) than any play of E. (89.5%). The lowest proportion is in Ba. (80.2%); the highest is in And. (86.3). It follows that Rh. has a lower proportion of hephthemimeral caesura than the works of E. (10.5%). The nearest play of E. is And., with 12.5%. None of this is sure evidence against authenticity because the proportion of such caesurae is not that much higher or lower than the rest of E. and we cannot compare it with E.’s practice in the lost plays.

In conclusion, if Rh. is genuine its conservative admission of resolution in iambics would place it before the earliest extant plays of E., while its rate of resolution places it before And. but later than Alc.

ii) Lyrics

The following is a brief survey of each song, including anything of interest for authenticity. Schemata are written out in full. Textual problems are dealt with in the commentary.

---

114 See R. (284-6) who improves upon the analysis of Descroix (1931 24ff.).

The lyric parodos opens with aeolics, followed by iambics, dactyls and dactylo-epitrite. The final, less usual colon has suffered corruption. The scheme is simple and responisn is almost total. Aeolic cola appear in all extant E. except Me. D-e cola are not found in A., but they occur in S. and PV. The metre occurs in all extant E. except Hcll., Su., Hec., Ion, IT and Ba. (although it is used sparingly after 415, except for Hel. 1137-47).
The passage is mostly dochmiac with a short appearance of iambi before the end. Dochmiacs occur in all extant tragedy and are quite at home with iambic cola (see West GM 111). Responsion is exact, despite the separation of the stanzas and the dochmiacs used are the two commonest types found.\textsuperscript{116} In addition to the close metrical responsion between the stanzas there is close syntactic correspondence. This formality and simplicity is more in keeping with early Euripidean practice than late. Cf. Alc. 393-415, \textit{Me}. 1251-1292 (esp. \textit{Rh}. 136-200 with \textit{Me}. 1281) and \textit{Hclld}. 608-629. Of particular interest is a comparison with the passage of dochmiacs at \textit{Hi}. 362-72-669-79, because there the strophe is also separated from its antistrophe. The boldness of the separation between \textit{Rh}. 454-66 and 820-32, with dialogue and two lyric passages between the stanzas is striking and can only be compared with this passage in \textit{Hi}. Moreover, separated responding stanzas occurs twice in \textit{Rh}.\textsuperscript{116} N.C. Conomis (\textit{Hermes} 92 (1964) 23-50) quotes 131-195 as an unusual example of an overlap ('dovetailing') of four syllables after the end of the metron. However, the overlap occurs \textit{before} the metron (cf. Hutchinson on A. Se. 131).
at 131-6-195-200 and 454-66-820-32. This double appearance is unique in surviving tragedy. It is uncommon enough to find separated stanzas, and when they do occur they only occur once in a play.\textsuperscript{117} W. Jens (Die Bauformen in der griechischen Tragödie (1971) 273f.) observed that the first pair of separated stanzas in Rh. are centred around the Dolon episode and the second pair around the tragedy of Rh. It is possible that they serve as parentheses for their scenes, but there is not the same closeness of context between 454-66 and 820-32 as there is between 131-6 and 195-200. We cannot be certain that separated stanzas did not occur more than once in lost tragedies.

\textbf{1st Stasimon: 1st Str. & Ant. 224-232-233-241}

\begin{verbatim}
224-233 ο — — ο — — ο — — ia D
Θυμβραῖς καὶ Δάλει καὶ Λυκίας
μόλις δὲ ναυκλῆρια καὶ στρατιάς
225-234 — ο — — — ithyphallic
ναὸν ἐμβατεύων
Ἐλλάδος διόπτας
226-235 — — — — — — e — — D —
"Ἀπολλόν, ὃ Δία κεφαλά, μόλε τοξῆ—
ίκοτο καὶ κάμψει πάλιν θυμέλας οὗ—
227-236 — — — — D
ῥης, ἵκον ἐνυψιός
κων πατρός Ίλιάδας;
228-9-237-8 — — — — — — e — D —
καὶ γενοῦ σωτηρίος ἀνέρ πομπᾶς
Φθιάδων ὃ' ἔππων ποτ' ἔπ' ἄντυγα βαίη,
230-239 — — — — — — e — D
ἀγεμῶν καὶ Ἐλλάβες Δαρδανίδαις
δεσποτοῦ πέρσατος Ἀχαιῶν Ἀρη, _OC
231-240 — — — — — — D
tὸς πάγκρατες, ὃ Τρούας
τὰς πάντες Αἰακίδαι
teiχη παλαιά δεῖμασ.
Πηλεῖ δίδωσι δαίμων.
232-241 — — — — ithyphallic
\end{verbatim}

The first strophe is formal and simple, consisting entirely of d-e with almost exact responsion. It starts with one of the

\textsuperscript{117} As well as the passage in Hi. cf. S. Phil. 391-402-507-18, OC 833-43-876-86, fr. 314 (Ichn.) 237-244-283-290, E. El. 859-65-873-79 and Or. 1353-65-1537-48 and see Wilamowitz GV 587.

53
commonest openings in d-e and ends with the commonest clausula.\textsuperscript{118}

E. sometimes has entire strophes composed of d-e.\textsuperscript{119}

\textbf{1st Stasimon: 2nd Str. & Ant. 242-253-254-263}

\begin{align*}
242-3 & -254 \quad \text{iambo-chor dim} \\
& \text{épei pró t’ oı̂kwn pró tε γας ἔτλα μόνος} \\
244-255 & \quad \text{cat. dact tetr} \\
& \text{ναύσταθμα βὰς κατιδεῖν ἱσχαμαί} \\
245-256 & \quad \text{enoplion} \\
& \text{λήματος: ἃ ἐπάνις αἰεῖ} \\
246-7 & -257-8 \quad \text{hemiepes + enoplion} \\
& \text{τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὅταν ἦ δυσάλιον ἐν πελάτει} \\
248-259 & \quad \text{epitrite} \\
& \text{kai σαλεύης} \\
249-260 & \quad \text{anacalastic paroemiac} \\
& \text{πόλις. ἔστι φρουρὸν τῆς ἐστὶν ἀλκίμος} \\
250-261 & \quad \text{dact dim resolved} \\
& \text{ἐνὶ δὲ θράσος ἐν αἴχ-} \\
251-262 & \quad \text{chor dim} \\
& \text{μᾶς. πόθι Μυσῶν δὲ ἐμῶν} \\
252-3 & -263 \quad \text{aristophanean} \\
& \text{συμμαχίαν ἄτιεῖς;} \\
& \text{ἕλθ᾽ ἔχων στρατεύ.}
\end{align*}

The second strophe starts with an iambico-choriambic colon followed by dactylic movement with an occasional suggestion of d-e rhythms. It returns to choriambics before the final aristophanean.\textsuperscript{120} The mixture recalls the metre of the parodos.\textsuperscript{120} Responsion is almost exact. As with the colometry of the parodos and the separated strophe and antistrophe, there is nothing in the first stasimon which is obviously incompatible with the metrical practices found in early extant Euripides.

\textsuperscript{118} Cf. E. fr. 303.4, And. 1012-1020 and Hel. 1145f. For the two appearances of the ithyphallic see Dale LM 181.

\textsuperscript{119} Cf. Alc. 588-596-597-605, most of the lyrics in Me. except the parodos and 1251-92, And. 1009-18-1019-1026 and Tro. 799-808-809-818.

\textsuperscript{120} Cf. also E. Me. 643-651-652-662 and Tro. 820-839-840-859.
The first strophe is mostly aeolic with some iambic-choriambic and d-e before the final aristophanean. Responsion is exact except for two anceps positions. The mixture of opening cola recalls the opening of the lyric parodos, and the brief stretch of d-e recalls the first stasimon. The scheme is uncomplicated.

At 350/351 a rhetorical enjambment occurs between strophe and antistrophe. This is a remarkable feature for tragic lyric. W. Kranz thought that this alone justified rejection of Euripidean authorship on the grounds that it is a practice of choral lyric rather than tragedy. He compared P. Ol. 2.95 and Bacch. 5.141.

For the text see note ad loc.


Stasimon (1933) 266.
These examples also have a proper name starting a stanza which belongs syntactically to the previous one (to these we may add P. Ol. 10.55 and Is. 6.35). However, in those cases there is a definite stop after the name, whereas here Στρυμίων is followed by a relative clause of which it is the subject. The name goes equally with the clauses on either side of it and serves as a pivot between strophe and antistrophe. For closer parallels in P. cf. Is. 3/4.73 and Py. 12.17.

R. (333-6) gives examples of syntactical overlap between lyric stanzas in tragedy. These contain overlap of a dependent clause after a comma or a stop (cf. also A. Se. 855-60 and Hutchinson ad loc.). However, none consists of anything as striking as a single proper name.

R. contends that since Στρυμίων goes equally well with both clauses it does not seriously disturb the unity of the strophe; but this is to miss the novelty of the phenomenon. The poet has used an epinician device to provide a particularly resounding welcome for Rh. and this can only be regarded as highly unusual. We are, for once, not hindered by our lack of texts because this is a poetic device which is found in Pindar but which seems deliberately to have been avoided by the tragedians.

Apart from the remarkable enjambement there is nothing in the 1st strophe or antistrophe which can be seen as obviously contrary to the metrical practice of early extant E.

124 Cf. A. Su. 582, Ag. 238 (see Fraenkel ad loc. n.2 and Kranz ib. 177), S. Ant. 1137, E. Hec. 943, Su. 48f., El. 157 and Hi. 131 (see Barrett ad loc.).
The 2nd strophe is a blend of iambo-choriambic and some aeolic. Wilamowitz detected the presence of ionics at 363-373. Ionics figure more in the lyrics of A. and PV than in S. or E., although E. does use them extensively in the parodos of Su. and the parodos and first two stasima of Ba. However, they can also be interpreted as choriambic and there is some (possibly deliberate) ambiguity between choriambic, aeolic and ionic elements. There is exact responsion. Apart from the remarkable enjambement the ode contains no evidence against authenticity.

125 GV 584-7. See also Dale LM: 128, R. 308 and Zanetto 68.
The stanza begins with dochmiacs and has iambo-choriambic movement throughout the rest of the stanza. Responsion is exact except for corruption in the antistrophe at 821 and 828. There is a similarity of syntactical structure between these stanzas, just as there is between the separated strophes 131-6 and 195-200. For the dochmius kaibelianus see West GM 111. For the final colon cf. E. HF 1024. The metre of the stanzas is not inconsistent with Euripidean practice.
In place of a third stasimon Rh. has a choral exit so that Odysseus and Diomedes may enter unhindered. Both strophe and antistrophe are followed by anapaests. The metre is d-e throughout. Responsion is almost exact. The scheme is simple and has a strong dactylic element. For the contracted biceps in 535-554 cf. E. Me. 980-987 and And. 774-785. The bacchiac ending at 537-556 is an Attic clausula, not found in Pindaric d-e and looks like an importation of ba into D-e. For strophes with a similar arrangement of similar cola cf esp. E. Alc. 588-96-597-605 and Me. 991-5-996-1001. There is nothing in the song which is obviously inconsistent with early extant Euripidean metrical practice.

126 See also E. Fraenkel RM 72 (1917) 342.
675a-b

Epiparodos: Astrophic Lyric 675-682

\[ \text{ia + 3 resolved an} \]
\[ \text{Éa Éa: bálcle bálcle bálcle: théne théne <théne>.} \]

676

ba

677

thyphallic

678

hypodochmius

679

tóusó̆ ἕχω, τούσο̆ ἕμαρσα

680

sync. tr tet

681

sync. tr dim

682

clampas ótines kat' ὄρφην τόνδε κινοῦσι στρατόν.

683-91 = tr. tetr.

Epiparodos: Str. & Ant. 692-703-710-721

692-710

doch

693-711

ia dim

694-712

doch

695-713

ba dim

696-714

doch

697-715

ia trim

698-716

doch dim

699-717

chor

Thestalos Ṯ̣
pollá dē taw

700-718

doch dim

701-719

ia trim

702-720

ia dim

703-721

doch dim

poión ἐπεύχεται τόν ὑπατον θεῶν;
prín ἐπὶ γὰρ Φρυγῶν ποδός ἕχος βαλεῖν.
After the strophe and antistrophe come transitional verses in iambics and bacchiacs: 704-5-722-3 = 2 ia trim, 706-7-724-5 = 2 ba dim, 708-726 = ba trim\textsuperscript{127} and 709-727 = ia trim. With the entry of the charioteer at 728 begins a passage of transitional verses before the iambics of the fifth epeisodion: 728 is an ambiguous, syncopated iambo-trochaic line. 729 (\textipa{\ddot{e}\kappa\ddot{e}\alpha'}) = excl., 730 = tr tetr cat, (\textipa{\ddot{i}\omega\ddot{i}\omega'}) = excl., 731 = tr tetr cat, (\textipa{\ddot{i}\omega\ddot{i}\omega'}) = excl., 733ff. = an, 736f. = ia, 738-44 = an, 745f. = ia and 747-53 = an.

The only passage of astrophic lyric in Rh. occurs at 675-682, accompanying the re-entry of Od. and the chorus. E. used astrophic lyrics more as he got older, especially after 420, so the presence of only one passage in Rh. is a feature more like earlier E. than later. The metre is iambo-trochaic with no complications and contains nothing obviously un-Euripidean.

The metre of 692-703-710-721 is straightforward iambo-dochmiac. The four types of dochmiac used are very common and only the opening syllable is varied. Lines 702f. are corrupt but the metre is easily ascertained from 720f., which are sound. Responsion is slightly more fluid than in the previous songs but the composition remains generally tight and simple. For the bacchiac dimeter 695-713 cf. E. HF 879 and Ion 1447. I can find no parallel for the isolated choriamb among dochmiacs at 699-717 in A., S. or E., but such a phenomenon may have occurred in texts which are now lost.

Apart from the isolated choriamb, there is nothing in the epiparodos which is obviously inconsistent with Euripidean practice.

\textsuperscript{127}For the bacchiac sequence cf. S. Phil. 514.
Strophe and antistrophe are separated by an iambic couplet from the chorus. The metre is a mixture of enoplia and dactylo-anapaestic rhythms. Responsion is almost exact. The overall composition is tight. For the uncommon dactylic ending cf. Ar. Nub. 475 (West GM 133) and for a strophe with very similar cola cf. E. Alc. 435-444-445-454 (see Dale LM 173).

E. used the monody far more often than A. or S. He has eighteen of them, some anapaestic and some lyric. A. has none, PV one and S. two. The compact, simple structure of this one, with intervening iambics, is more like those found in earlier E. than in his later works when he admitted more astrophic lyric and

For the delivery of a lyric monody between passages of iambics by a *deus ex machina* there is no parallel in extant tragedy. The poet chose to produce a mourning mother who sings her grief. This has more pathos than, e.g. the anapaests of Artemis at E. *Hi.* 1283-95. We also have enough examples of *dei ex machina* in E. to know that he avoided giving them lyric monodies. We can say, therefore, that although the monody resembles early E. metrically, both its position in the final scene and the dramatic status of its speaker are unlike E.

To sum up: The lyrics of *Rh.* are simple and compact in structure, strict in responsion and devoid of metrical innovations. They include only one passage of astrophic lyric and contain a high proportion of dactylo-epitrite and dochmiac. In this respect they resemble more the earlier works of E. than the later ones. They also contain many choriambic dimeters and trimeters which are not used by A. and are used sparingly by S. E., however, uses them frequently in his middle and later plays. Distinctly un-Euripidean, however, are the presence of two separated strophes and antistrophes (although this may have occurred in lost plays), enjambement at 350f. and the delivery of a lyric monody by the *deus ex machina*.

---

129 See R. 339f. and Griffith *ib.* 119.
130 For metrical innovations in later E. see S.G. Brown *AJP* 95 (1974) 207-34.
132 See also E. Fraenkel *RM* 72 (1917) 342.
iii) Anapaests

Recitative Anapaests are found at 1-22, 34-40, 379-87, 538-45, 557-64, 733-5, 738-44, 747-53, 882-9 and 993-6. They occur in E. at all stages of his career.

a) Ratio of Metra to Clausular Paroemiacs.\[133\]

The paragraph below shows the ratio of metra to clausular paroemiacs in those plays of E. which contain a sufficient number of metra to show whether there is any significant difference between the length of period in anapaests preferred by the author of Rh. and by E. The title of the play is followed by the number of metra, the number of paroemiacs, then the average number of metra to each paroemiac in brackets. The plays which are not mentioned contain so small a number of anapaestic metra (all have fewer than 64) that they are not likely to provide stable evidence.\[134\] It will be seen that this phenomenon is of no use for dating the plays.

Alc. 154:14 (11), Me. 273:17 (16), Hi. 240:12 (20), Hec. 100:6 (16.6), El. 136:7 (19.4), Tro. 106:9 (11.8) and Ion 88:7 (12.6). In Rh. we find 111:18 (6.2). It may clearly be seen that, compared with those plays of E. where a comparable quantity of anapaests is found (esp. Tro. and Hec.), the Rh. differs significantly from Euripidean practice in admitting far more paroemiacs, i.e. he preferred much shorter metrical periods in

133 In this discussion I have extended the argument used by Griffith ((1977) 71f.) to show differences between PV and the works of A. 134 IA has not been included because both its iambic and anapaestic prologues have been seriously called into question. D. Bain (CQ 27 (1977) 10-26) proposed the excision of both prologues and Diggle prints them as 'vix Euripidei' in his new edition. With its prologue IA has 174 and 10 paroemiacs which is a rate of 17.4 metra to each paroemiac. Without the anapaestic prologue it has only 36 metra and 4 paroemiacs which is too few to be of use.
anapaests. Figures for the longest sequence of anapaests without a paraemiac in each of these plays will show this: *Alc.* 25, *Me.* 47, *Hi.* 57, *Hec.* 25, *El.* 41, *Tro.* 20, and *Ion* 18. The longest sequence in *Rh.* is a mere 12.\(^{135}\)

By comparing these figures with those found in *A.*, *S.* and *PV* we may see that *Rh.* resembles *A.* more than *S.*, and is quite unlike *PV*. The title is followed by the average number of metra to each paraemiac and, in brackets, the longest sequence of metra without a paraemiac. *A.* *Se* and *S.* *OT* have too few metra to be of use. *PV* 13.9 (26), *A.* *Pe.* 8.7 (17), *Su.* 6.1 (14), *Ag.* 8.1 (18), *Cho.* 5.0 (14) and *Eum.* 8.0 (18), *S.* *Ai.* 11.0 (27), *Ant.* 8.1 (18), *Tra.* 7.5 (19), *El.* 8.3 (24), *Phil.* 15.0 (32) and *OC* 11.1 (25).

b) Antilabe

Antilabe (the division of verses between two speakers) is uncommon in tragedy but not unknown. In *Rh.* it occurs at 15, 16, and 540. At 15 and 540 the division occurs at the diaeresis of the dimeter. For this we may compare *S.* *OC* 173, *E.* *Me.* 1397, 1398, 1402 and *El.* 1319. Antilabe in this position is not evidence against Euripidean authorship.\(^{136}\)

The division within a metron (*Rh.* 16) is extremely rare, occurring nowhere in *A.*, in *S.* only at *Tra.* 977 (in a paraemiac), 981 and 991, and at *IA* [2f.] and, possibly, [149], which is corrupt. It occurs nowhere certainly in *E.*, and is a remarkable device; but it must be remembered that we do not have much anapaestic dialogue in *E.* with which to compare it.

\(^{135}\)The longest sequence of metra without a paraemiac in the anapaestic prologue of *IA* is 35, which resembles *E.* more than *Rh.*

\(^{136}\)It also occurs at this position in the possibly spurious melic anapaests at *Ba.* 1372 and 1379 and in the spurious anapaests at *IA* [16] and [140].
Hence, the author of Rh. departs from Euripidean practice in the anapaests firstly in his preference for much shorter periods than E. and, secondly, by admitting antilabe within a metron.

iv) Trochaic Tetrameters

At 683-91 we find twelve lines of trochaic tetrameters. This metre is found in Phrynichus, A. Pe., Ag., S. OT, OC, Phil., and in all the extant plays of E. after and including HF (c. 415), assuming that El., which has none, is earlier than HF.\(^{137}\) The presence of the metre in Rh. might therefore seem to be evidence against it being an early play of E., but, as Cropp and Fick (BICS Supp. 43 (1988) p.1) observe:

‘if new evidence presented us (say) with a tragedy of E. that contained both some trochaic tetrameters and a very low resolution rate (in both trimeters and tetrameters), the hypothesis that the very low resolution rate indicated an early date would be much stronger than the hypothesis that the presence of trochaic tetrameters indicated a late date’.

Trochaic tetrameters are used as an alternative to iambic metres in dialogue, including stichomythia. This is why antilabe occurs with this metre. However, it does not occur in the tetrameters of extant A. and in extant S. only occurs in the tetrameters of Phil. In E. it occurs in the tetrameters of IT, Ion, Hel., Pho., Or. and IA. For the rarer double antilabe within the tetrameters at Rh. 683-4 cf. E. Or. 1525 and S. Phil. 1407.

In conclusion, the use of trochaic tetrameters in Rh. is very

\(^{137}\) See W. Krieg’s analysis of the metre in E. at Philologus 91 (1936) 42-51. He is wrong to suggest that there is a steady increase in his use of the metre as he gets older. R. (293) points to a single trochaic tetrameter in a fragment of E. Phoenix (fr. 811N) τάφωντες πεκρόοισιν εἰκότως ἄλοκεται. That play is known to be earlier than 425 from an allusion at Ar. Ach. 421. However, we might start a new line with τεκμηρίοισιν and say that fr. 811 is iambic.
like that in E. (except that there are comparatively very few of them) and in tragedy generally. Although this metre is not found in E. before HF, this need not be regarded as certain evidence against the play being a early Euripidean work.

To conclude: the conservative admission of resolution in iambic trimeters suggests that Rh. is among the earliest works of E. However, the rate of the resolutions points to a period of composition between Alc. and And. This contradiction is hard to explain, if Rh. is genuine, because the growing frequency of resolutions in E.'s iambic trimeters is accompanied by a progressive relaxation of Zieliński's 'rules' governing his admission of resolution. The inclusion of trochaic tetrameters would also point, though less firmly, to a later date. The metre of the lyric passages is simple, compact and, apart from a few rarities, consistent with what we know of earlier extant Euripidean practice. However, they include the following unusual features: the occurrence of two sets of separated responding stanzas (unique for surviving tragedy); rhetorical enjambement between str. and ant. with a proper name at 350/351 (contrary to tragic practice) and the delivery of a lyric monody between iambics by the deus ex machina (unique in tragedy and contrary to Euripidean practice). In the anapaestic passages the author prefers significantly shorter periods than does E. and admits antilabe within a metron at 16. It is not possible to say with certainty that Rh. is spurious on the basis of a study of its metre. However, we can say that the metre displays a number of peculiarities which are alien to Euripidean practice. The preference for shorter periods in anapaests is especially notable.
C) Larger features of the play

i) Structure

a) The Lack of a Formal Exposition

Scholars have objected to the absence of an iambic prologue to *Rh.*, principally because the play thus lacks a formal dramatic exposition, a thing unknown elsewhere in ancient tragedy. That a tragedy lacks an iambic prologue does not mean that it also lacks an exposition. *A. Pe.* and *Su.* begin, like *Rh.*, with choral anapaests, but, unlike *Rh.*, those anapaestic passages are leisurely and include lengthy expositions of their plots. This is not to say that the lack of exposition detracts from the drama. Indeed that charge was soundly refuted by H. Strohm. R. objects (106f.) that there is a lack of forewarning for the principal events of the drama. This is not the case for the arrival of *Rh.*, which is built up well in advance and the arrivals of the Greeks and Athena are deliberately surprising. Moreover, there is internal evidence which proves that the play started without an iambic prologue, namely the amount of dramatic background which is given in the parodos. The Trojan setting is indicated at once with the mention of H. (1ff.). The identity of the chorus and dramatic time is indicated at line 5 (cf. line 15). Mythological time (the first occasion when the Trojans dared to camp outside Troy) is

General observations about structure are made in notes at the beginning of each section of the play.


Cf. A. P. Luom., Niobe and Myrmidons, which also began with anapaests less urgent than those in *Rh.* and probably also contained an exposition.

*Hermes* 87 (1959), esp. 272f. See also Taplin (1977) 63 n.4.
clear from the mention of the bivouac at line 9, the explicit reference to guarding a camped army at line 6 and the reminder of the proximity of the Greeks at 20ff. These clear indications are there to set the scene and context. They would be entirely out of place in the parodos if an explanatory iambic prologue had existed because one of the functions of the latter is to give those details at the start of the play.

What remains unusual is the simple lack of exposition. This is a problem for those who maintain that Rh. is genuine because such a feature runs entirely contrary to Euripidean practice. If the play is spurious, however, this presents no problem.

b) No Entry after the Parodos

As Taplin observes this is a rare and notable device because the end of the parodos is usually used to establish a dominant character for whom the first scene becomes a showpiece. However, the device is not unknown and in those plays where it occurs it is used to establish a dramatic relationship between a character who is already on stage and the chorus. This is precisely the case in Rh. So this feature casts no doubt on authenticity.

c) Choral Exit and Re-entry (527 and 675)

There is no general tragic convention about the exit and re-entry of a chorus during a play. The motivation and purpose of each departure and return is clear in the few surviving examples which we have.

The exit and re-entry in Rh. differs from other examples in (1977) 248 and 283f.

Cf. PV 193-284, S. El. 251-328, OC 254-324, Tra. 141-180 and E. Hel. 253-386.

See A. Eum. 231 and 245, S. Ai. 814 and 866, E. Alc. 741 and 861 and Hel. 385 and 515.
that the exit involves a lengthy choral song; but the guards' motivation for leaving is clear and their absence is necessary so that they remain unaware of what happens on stage. There is nothing in the use of this device to make us suspect spuriousness.

d) Two Divine Interventions (595 and 885)

In extant tragedy, Athena's intervention in Rh. can only be compared with that of Iris and Lyssa at E. HF 815. These scenes also have similar dramatic functions. In both cases a deity unexpectedly intervenes about two-thirds of the way through the play in order to affect the course of the plot and bring the hero low. Those scholars who maintain that Athena's intervention is contrary to classical tragic practice ignore the similarities between the scene in Rh. and that in HF.\textsuperscript{145}

The Muse's intervention 'ex machina' proves that the play was written after the introduction of the skene for she is clearly above the acting area (886 \( \tau \iota \zeta \ \upsilon \varepsilon \rho \ \kappa \epsilon \phi \alpha \lambda \eta \varsigma \ \theta \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \xi \)). Both the means by which she ascended (probably steps: see Barrett ad Hi. 1283 and Taplin (1977) 444f.) and the place where she rests while speaking require the presence of the skene. This gives us a \textit{terminus post quem} for Rh. in the late 460s.\textsuperscript{146} Apart from the lyric monody, the epiphany of the Muse closely resembles the other divine epiphanies in tragedy which occur towards the end of their plays. They are far more common in E. than in the other tragedians.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{145} C.D. Beck (1824) 269ff., R. Morstadt (1827) 48, O. Menzer (1867) 17, A.C. Pearson CR (1921) 59 and Wilamowitz Hermes 61 (1926) 287.

\textsuperscript{146} Assuming that Taplin (ib. 452-9) is correct.

\textsuperscript{147} Cf. E. Me. 1317 (Medea is not a deity but she is the descendant of one), And. 1231, Su. 1183, Ion 1553, El. 1238, Hi. 1283, IT 1435, Hel. 1642 and Or. 1625. This probably also happened in Ba. (see lacuna between 1329 and 1330). See also E. Hyps. fr. 64 col.3 (Bond p.19), Antiope fr. 48.17 (Kambitsis=Page p.64) and Erechth. fr. 65.55 (Austin). S. has only one divine intervention (Phil.
What is most remarkable about these epiphanies is that there are two of them. This is not to be compared with the straightforward use of two deities as characters, such as Apollo and Athena in A. Eum., Apollo and Death in E. Alc., or Aphrodite and Artemis in Hi. The appearance of two dei ‘ex machina’ in one play is unique in surviving tragedy.

e) The Number of Actors needed

Vater (Vindiciae 2 §56n.) believed that two actors were sufficient to perform Rh. This is only possible if Athena is off-stage, an idea which Vater supports. However, even if she were off stage (which is unlikely), someone would still have to say her lines during the three-cornered scene at 595ff., because Od. and Diomedes are both on stage. The idea should not be entertained.

There has been debate about whether four actors are needed to perform Rh. The question hangs on whether the protagonist has sufficient time to change from Od. to Alex. between 627-634 and 642 and back to Od. between 667 and 674. On the first occasion he has about 14 lines to change and on the second occasion he has at least 7 lines. Only in A. Cho. is there a shorter change. The servant leaves to change into Pylades at 886 and returns with Orestes at 892. Unless Pylades enters at a later point, these five lines constitute the quickest change in all tragedy but, as Taplin points out, one change has to be the shortest. Given that an

---

1409), extant A. has none and PV has one (944). Zeus does not appear above the stage in A. Psychostasia (see Taplin (1977) 431ff.).
149 Although Taplin is sympathetic to the idea that A. may have used a fourth actor to play Pylades (ib. 353f.).
actor had only to change masks and swap a simple costume it is likely that there was enough time for him to do so in Rh. Three actors are necessary and sufficient to perform the play.

ii) Staging

a) Unannounced Symmetrical Entrances at 264

The symmetrical entrance of two characters onto the stage from opposite eisodoi is extremely rare in tragedy. At Rh. 264 Hector and the shepherd enter from opposite eisodoi. Neither entrance has been prepared in advance. There is only one other example of such a symmetrical entry in tragedy and that is from a period before the skene and its door were available to dramatists. At A. Se. 375 Eteocles and the scout enter at the same time from opposite eisodoi (see Taplin (1977) 148f.). The audience, however, has been prepared for both entrances by the choral announcements at ib. 369-74. There is no such announcement before Rh. 264. All other tragic examples of two characters entering from different directions (and there are not many of them) come from the period when the skene door was available and one of the characters always comes through that door. This symmetrical entry is therefore unique for tragedy written after the introduction of the skene which includes all of E. It used deliberately to create not only surprise, but an atmosphere characteristic of earlier tragedy. Whether E. would have done this only once in his entire career is doubtful. This piece of staging must therefore be seen as \textsuperscript{150} H. is certainly offstage beforehand. See note on 194. \textsuperscript{151} See S. Tra. 971 and Taplin ib. 177 n.1, E. HF 701, Hcld. 784 (unannounced), Hel. 1512 and Ba. 434.
uncharacteristic of what we know of E. 152

b) Chariot Entry at 380-387 153

Although there is no specific indication of it in the text, it is most likely that Rh. entered on a chariot. He was in it when the shepherd first saw him (302-8) and he is greeted by the sort of choral anapaests which usually accompany such entries (380-87, cf. A. Pe. 155). Chariot entries in earlier tragedy are not always referred to explicitly at the moment when they occur. 154

Royal chariots entries were a natural feature of pre-skene tragedy, before the useful skene door was available to allow the entrances of royal persons from inside a palace. Examples of chariot entries after the door became available are rare. In A. we find one at Ag. 783ff. There is none in S. and only two in E., at Tro. 572 and El. 998f. During the fourth century the practice of using chariots was revived for spectacular effect. Eum. [405] was interpolated to allow Ath. to enter on a chariot for a revival of the play (see Taplin ib. 388ff. and Sommerstein ad loc.). At IA [590ff.] Clyt. and Iph. arrive in a chariot. This is confirmed at ib. [598ff.]. 155

Taplin observes (ib. 149n.1) that symmetrical entrances were exploited for comic effect, comparing Lamachus and Dicaeopolis at Ar. Ach. 1190ff. and the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors at Lys. 1072ff. However, the entrance of Lam. occurs 8 lines before that of Die. and the entrances of the ambassadors are 10 lines apart. I have found no examples of symmetrical entries in Men., nor are there any in K.B. Frost’s Exits and Entrances in Menander (1988). 154

That it was interpolated was shown by Barrett ad E. Hi. 1102-50. See also Page Actors’ Interpolations in Greek Tragedy (1934) 160ff. and Taplin ib. 77 n.1. Σ ad E. Or. 57 preserves a record of an opening procession in which chariots may have been used.

152 Taplin observes (ib. 149n.1) that symmetrical entrances were exploited for comic effect, comparing Lamachus and Dicaeopolis at Ar. Ach. 1190ff. and the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors at Lys. 1072ff. However, the entrance of Lam. occurs 8 lines before that of Die. and the entrances of the ambassadors are 10 lines apart. I have found no examples of symmetrical entries in Men., nor are there any in K.B. Frost’s Exits and Entrances in Menander (1988).
154 Cf. A. Pe. 155, not confirmed in the text until 607ff. Cf. also the reference to chariots at A. Su. 182f. which is enough to justify a chariot entry ib. 234, despite the absence of textual indications at the moment of entry (see Taplin ib. 200ff.).
155 That it was interpolated was shown by Barrett ad E. Hi. 1102-50. See also Page Actors’ Interpolations in Greek Tragedy (1934) 160ff. and Taplin ib. 77 n.1. Σ ad E. Or. 57 preserves a record of an opening procession in which chariots may have been used.
The chariot entry at Rh. 380-7 is used for spectacular effect, like those in A. and the interpolated passages of tragedy. However, one might argue that Rh.'s use of a chariot is inevitable since he is arriving from afar. There is, then, nothing in the use of the chariot entry alone to make us suspect spuriousness.

c) Actor seized by the Chorus at 681-8\textsuperscript{156}

At 675 the chorus enters in pursuit of Od. and Dio. It is clear from \(\tau\omega\sigma \xi\omega, \tau\omega\sigma \xi\mu\aro\nu\alpha\) (681) that the Greeks have been physically restrained by the guards. It is also clear that they continue to be restrained until Od. gives the password \(\phi\omega\nu\beta\omicron\omicron\) at 688, after which he is reprieved. The pursuit of a character by the chorus is a valid dramatic technique in tragedy. However, there is no other tragedy extant in which an actor is restrained by its members. This is not an argument from silence because we do have examples of pursuit, capture and escape on the tragic stage. Two points arise from this.

Firstly, we may be sure that Rh. is not a late fourth-century tragedy.\textsuperscript{157} Although there was a tragic convention observable in A., S. and E. which avoided such physical contact in the fifth century, it is probable that actors and choruses did not perform on separate levels but in a single acting space which admitted freedom of movement between them.\textsuperscript{158} Evidence for a raised and

\textsuperscript{156}I regret that I have not been able to consult M. Kaimio \textit{Physical Contact in Greek Tragedy} (1988).

\textsuperscript{157}A thesis which has, surprisingly, found favour. For an extreme example see M. Ragone \textit{RAAN} 44 (1969) 71-109 who dates the play to c.340 BC.

\textsuperscript{158}See esp. Taplin \textit{ib.} 441f. The only textual evidence which suggests that an actor is occupying an area distinct from the chorus is the reference to a rocky ledge at S. \textit{OC} 192-6 (cf. \textit{ib.} 263f.) but this is tantamount to a stage direction and need not be taken literally.
separate stage for actors and a circular orchestra for the chorus comes entirely from the remains of fourth-century theatres, such as that at Epidauros. E. Pohlmann\textsuperscript{159} lays out the archaeological evidence which indicates that the 5th century theatre of Dionysus had a roughly quadrilateral acting space, probably without a raised area, resembling more the theatre of Thorikos than the theatre of Epidaurus. Rh. was obviously written for such a theatre, since no impediment to contact must exist between chorus and actors at 675ff. We may therefore say that Rh. was written at a period no later than the middle of the fourth century.

Secondly, the author of Rh. differs entirely from A., S. and E. in admitting this sort of physical contact. There are examples of close confrontation between actors and choruses in surviving tragedies which show that such physical contact sometimes appears to be imminent, but is always deliberately avoided. The device leads to an expectation of contact which is always frustrated at the last moment. Cf. esp. A. \textit{Eum}. 244-397 and \textit{S. O.C.} 824-886.\textsuperscript{160}

To sum up: an examination of the structure and staging of Rh. provides us with a definite time period within which the play was written: i.e. after the introduction of the skene in the late 460s and while the stage in the theatre of Dionysus at Athens was still without a physical division between the area occupied by the chorus and actors, before the mid-4th century. The structure and

\textsuperscript{159}MusHel 38 (1981) 129-146.

\textsuperscript{160}At \textit{E. Hel.} 1627ff. Theoclymenus is intercepted by someone who says οὐκ ἄθρωσαν πέπλων σῶν. The person's identity is unclear, but he is most likely a slave produced for the purpose. This was suggested by Clark and is printed by Diggle. We cannot follow R. (p. 129ff.) and assume that \textit{E. Tel.} portrayed the physical capture of Telephus by the chorus on the basis of the parody of the scene at \textit{Ar. Ach.} 280ff. See E.W. Handley and J. Rea \textit{BICS Supp.} 5 (1957) 1ff. and 35f.
staging also include features which stand out against Euripidean practice and sometimes also Sophoclean and Aeschylean practice, namely: the absence of an opening exposition, unannounced symmetrical entries in post-skene tragedy at 264, two divine epiphanies at 595 and 885, and the seizure of an actor by the chorus at 675ff. In addition to these peculiarities we find phenomena which are not unknown elsewhere but remain uncommon, in particular the use of a chariot in post-skene tragedy.

Taken individually these features are unusual enough but, taken together, the sheer quantity of so many oddities in one play should make us suspicious of authenticity. If the young E. wrote Rh. (a supposition difficult to reconcile with the rate of resolution in iambics) then we would have to assume that he departed radically from contemporary dramatic practice by admitting these phenomena, yet never did so again in any extant work. Far more likely is that this combination of oddities points to spuriousness.

iii) Ethos

a) Religious Sensitivity

Wilamowitz believed that the immoderate praise of Rh. at 355 (σῶ μοι Ζεῦς ὁ φαναίος) and 385 (q.v.) 'wäre im fünften Jahrhundert ganz unmöglich gewesen'. A. Lesky considered the greeting so unthinkable in fifth century Greek that it is one of his main reasons for rejecting authenticity. However, we find praise of a similar kind in A. Pe., in which a barbarian chorus

161 Glaube der Hellenen, (1959) 2.262f.
162 Greek Poetry (1972) 397
also lavishes praise upon a king. In Pe. Darius is μυκαρητάς ἵσοδάιμων βασιλεύς (633) and Περσῶν Συναίζενήθεον (643). While he was alive he governed the Persians ὡς θεός (ib. 711, cf. Rh. 301). This does not mean that the elders regard him literally as a god or that A. assumed that the Persians worshipped their kings.163 Their attitude to him is, rather, one of the devotees of a hero-cult (cf. the distinction between deus and divus in Latin). The divine status accorded to Darius in Pe. is not prompted by his descent from Zeus via Perseus, nor by his posthumous condition but in recognition of his past achievements in the service of Persia. Before the chorus learns of Xerxes’ failure he too is ἰοσθεός φῶς (80) and the queen mother is θεοῦ μὲν εὐνάτειρα Περσῶν, θεοῦ δὲ καὶ μήτηρ ἔφυς, | εἰ τι μὴ δαίμων παλαιός νῦν μεθέστηκε στρατῶν (157f.). The situation in Rh. is similar. A king is likened to a god, not because of his divine parentage, but because his arrival seems to promise glory. For the guards Rh. is a symbol of Zeus and Ares being on the Trojan side and their hyperbolic praise expresses their joy at the arrival of their saviour.164

Athena’s deception of Alexander by impersonating Aphrodite at 646–67 has attracted much adverse criticism because its tone is judged to be alien to fifth-century dramatic practice.165 For a deity altering his or her appearance we may compare Dionysus at Ba. 53f. ὃν ὑνικ’ εἶδος θυητὸν ἀλλάξας ἔχω | μορφὴν τ’ ἐμὴν μετέβαλον εἰς ἀνδρός φύσιν and Hera appearing as a begging

163 See H.D. Broadhead The Persae of Aeschylus (1960) 69
164 Cf. also A. Su. 980–3 (Danaus to his daughters) ὃ παῖδες, Ἀρχεῖοισιν εὐξεσθαί ἔρων | θύειν τε λείβειν θ’ ὡς θεοῖς ὀλυμπίοις | σπουδάς, ἐπεὶ σωτήρες οὗ διχορρόπως.
priestess to the chorus in A. Semele (fr. 168). For one deity impersonating another we do not have another example in tragedy, but gods may do as they wish and there is nothing frivolous in Athena's motivation. We may possibly compare Venus' appearance to Aeneas as Diana at V. Aen. 1.314-20.

b) The Role of the Chorus

In addition to their seizure of the Greeks, the Trojan guards are more important for the action of their play than any chorus in E. They precipitate the action in the parodos; their absence from their posts makes it possible for the Greek spies to enter the camp; and they are even given an opportunity to alter the course of the play by capturing Od. and Dio. It is worth noting that, although Athena can deal easily with Paris (634-667), when she sees the guards approaching, she calls to the Greeks to be on their guard (668-674). The poet does not allow the goddess to help her puppets because he has an important role for the chorus to play in the following scene. The guards are almost a character in themselves and the sheer amount of activity which they engage in resembles more the business of the choruses of comedy and satyr plays. The choruses in Euripidean tragedies never have a strong influence over the plot and are sometimes only incidental to it. Despite their large role, critics have complained that the choice of Trojan guards is not realistic enough. This is a fussy

---

166 Radt attributes this fragment to Xantriae on the basis of a quotation of Asclepiades at Σ Ar. Ra. 1344, but since the Xantriae seems to have been about the sparagmos (see A. fr. 169 (Radt) and Σ A. Eum. 25f.), it is likelier that this fr. is from Semele. See K. Latte Philologus 97 (1948) 47-50 (=KS (1968) 477-80). Cf. also Pl. Res. 381D and Diogenes Epist. 34.2.


168 C.D. Beck (1824) 265f., H.J.G. Patin Euripide (1894) 331, Wilamowitz Hermes 61 (1926) 286 and G.M.A. Grube The Drama of
criticism. As Taplin observes (1977) 69, 'Only in Rh. among
post-Aeschylean tragedies is there any serious attempt to make the
chorus realistic in mundane terms'.

Another peculiarity is the content of the choral lyrics. When
they sing the guards mention only those matters which are
immediately relevant to themselves and the action of the play.
Only at 546-50 do they make any references to a myth outside their
own experience, and that is a subtle reference forward to the Muse
bewailing her son.169 In contrast, E. uses lyric passages as a
vehicle for detached consideration of the human condition,
frequently accompanied by references to the fates and deeds of
heroes and gods. In this respect Rh. differs greatly from E. Nor,
indeed, does this feature of Rh. resemble fourth-century tragedy
in which the chorus became even more detached from the action.170

The poet of Rh., then, employs his chorus quite differently
from the way E. does throughout his extant work. In this respect
he also differs from S., although we may compare the size and
importance of the role of the Furies in A. Eum. with Rh.

c) Intellectual Content

Scholars since L.C. Valckenaer (Diatribe (1768) 95) have been
troubled by what they perceive to be the lack of a didactic
element in Rh., characterised by a deficiency of gnomae.171 R.

Euripides (1941) 440n.1.

169 The lament of Procone, the nightingale, for her son Itys whom she
murdered. There is a Thracian connection with this myth: Procone’s
husband Tereus was a Thracian.

170 See Taplin ib. 170.

171 See C.D. Beck (1824) 283f., G. Hermann (1828) 274, F. Hagenbach
(1863) 25, A.C. Pearson CR 35 (1921) 53, W. Nestle Euripides
(1901) 381 n.28 and J. Geffcken Hermes 71 (1936) 406. G. Murray
(Rhesus 8) also thought that this was a feature which was
different from the ordinary style of E.
denies the significance of this argument.\textsuperscript{172} Even during his lifetime E. was regarded as a rich source of quotable sententiae of a moralising and intellectual nature. These sententiae were commonly used by anthologists and teachers in later years who used excerpts from literature for the purposes of edification and education.\textsuperscript{173} The presence of such sententiae may be observed in all E.'s plays, extant and fragmentary, regardless of date, from \textit{Peliades} (frr. 601-616) with which he won his first victory in 455 BC when he was approximately in his early twenties,\textsuperscript{174} to \textit{Ba.} and \textit{IA} which were produced posthumously. However, there is not actually a marked deficiency of sententiae in \textit{Rh.} Although the number of gnomic lines in e.g. \textit{Me.} (over 150 verses) or \textit{Hi.} (over 200 verses) is far larger than in \textit{Rh.}, the number in \textit{Alc.} (c.40) shows that we should not expect any particular number of gnomae in an Euripidean tragedy.\textsuperscript{175} Indeed, as R. observes (226f.), in the latter half of \textit{IT}, which is marked by lively dramatic action, the gnomic element is no more prominent than in the latter half of \textit{Rh.} So, as far as the quantity of individual sententiae is concerned there is no reason to single out \textit{Rh.} as un-Euripidean.

However, it is the case that the (few) rhetorical high points of the play concentrate on simple issues of loyalty and respect\textsuperscript{176} As do F. Vater (\textit{Vindiciae} (1837) ch. 5 §21), P. Albert (\textit{De Rheso Tragoedia} (1876) 21) and W. Ridgeway (CQ 20 (1926) 15).\textsuperscript{173} See C. Collard \textit{Euripides} (1981) 25 and F.A.G. Beck Greek Education 430-350 BC (1964) 117-22.
\textsuperscript{174} The frr. of \textit{Pel.} which survive contain some 23 gnomae in as many lines.
\textsuperscript{175} In \textit{Rh.} gnomae appear in lines 69, 84, 106-7, 132, 161-3, 168, 176, 197-8, 206, 245-9, 266, 317f., 332, 333, 334, 394f. (cf. 422f.), 482, 483, 484, 510f., 626, 758-60 and 980ff. The gnomologia gB, gE and gV contain some 59, 76 and 47 lines respectively. The compilers clearly had generous ideas about what constitutes a gnome.
rather than on controversial, paradoxical or intellectually provocative problems. There is, e.g., no soliloquy from a character with an agonising choice to make; and there are no rhetorical fireworks between two parties holding irreconcilible and controversial viewpoints. This is unlike E., who enjoyed thought-provoking dilemmas and did not write plays which do not contain arguments of an intellectual and morally challenging nature. In this respect Rh. is distinctly un-Euripidean.

d) Emotional Impact

Emotional impact is arguably the foremost aim of tragedy and the emotional responses which the tragedians intended to evoke are specifically horror, fear and pity, but more generally those emotions which are ordinarily found distressing. The response should be sufficiently intense to evoke shuddering and weeping.\(^{176}\) That Euripidean tragedy has this effect no one would deny. Aristotle who had access to far more of E.'s work than we do regarded him as the 'most tragic' of the three great tragedians in point of emotional effect.\(^{177}\) Heath mentions the problem of the authorship of Rh. (ib. 2 n.4), but offers only 'Rhesus must, I suppose, be fourth-century .. despite appearances.' His conclusion is surprising, because it is precisely in point of emotional effect that Rh. least resembles the works of E.

Throughout Rh. there are scenes of confusion, excitement, deceit, intrigue and folly. These are not features alien to tragedy; but neither are they alien to satyr plays or comedy. There is very little purely tragic emotion in the play. We cannot

\(^{176}\) See M. Heath *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy* (1987) 88 and 162.

\(^{177}\) *Poet.* 1453a 29-30
feel sympathy for Dolon because he is not an heroic figure; he dies a traitor (575)\textsuperscript{178} and was the victim of random misfortune which is untragic because it carries less conviction at the level of the plot. Even sympathy for the wounded charioteer lasts only until he accuses Hector of murder (833-55). Only when the Muse appears and bewails her son do we see truly tragic pathos.

If the essence of E.'s tragic art lies in his being the 'most tragic' in his depiction of distressing emotions, then \textit{Rh.}, if genuine, would be unique. It contains nothing like the agonising emotional dilemmas or horrifying cataclysms which are so potently and so frequently portrayed in every Euripidean play (including even the pro-satyric \textit{Alec.}). For E., intense moral dilemmas formed the foundation of his contribution to the tragic genre; just as he did not write plays without intellectualising arguments, so he also did not write plays which do not contain intense emotional confrontations. If we wish to support authenticity, we have to explain why E. once, and once only, wrote a play which stands out so singularly from the rest of his works in admitting none of the rhetorical and emotional fireworks which he was so obviously interested in portraying and for which he was so famous. Far more likely is that \textit{Rh.} is the work of a man who was simply interested in producing a good adaptation of a good spy story rather than an emotionally stirring work.

\textsuperscript{178}This fact is only mentioned indirectly and is not touched on again.
3) SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The external evidence for authenticity shows some belief in antiquity, perhaps widespread, that the play was spurious, and offers other points of interest, but no decisive arguments against authenticity. On the other hand, the didascalic notice mentioned in the hypothesis does not prove that it was the great E. who wrote the extant Rh., so it cannot be used as sure evidence that the play is genuine.

The broad evidence for the date of the play is unproblematic. It was performed after the introduction of the skene in the late 460s and before the acting area of the theatre of Dionysus was physically separated from the choral orchestra roughly in the middle of the 4th century.

The proponents of authenticity agree on one thing at least: that if Rh. is genuine, then it so little resembles the works of the mature E. that it must be a very early work. In favour of this argument we can point to some aspects of the author’s use of metre. His conservative admission of resolution in iambic trimeters suggests that, if genuine Rh. is a very early work. This is contradicted, however, by the rate of resolution which puts Rh., if genuine, somewhere between Alc. and And. The lyric metres used (dochmiac, dactylo-epitrite, aeolic and iambo-choriambic) are entirely consistent with the earlier period of extant E., as is the simple and formal internal structure of the odes and the limited use of astrophic composition. However, the appearance of two sets of separated, responding strophes and antistrophes (131-6-195-200 and 454-66-820-32) is unique in extant tragedy, as is the rhetorical enjambement between strophe and antistrophe at
and the delivery of a lyric monody by the deus ex machina. In the anapaestic passages the author prefers far shorter periods than does E. The admission of trochaic tetrameters is something characteristic of later E., but this is not certain proof against the play being an early work of E.

The language and style of Rh. are generally consistent with E., but a few remarkable features stand out against this picture, namely: the absence of the preposition περί and the rarity of ἀπό; the uncharacteristically low number of colloquial phrases; the lameness of many of the repetitions, especially at the ends of lines, and the large number of intertextual allusions to other tragedies (including some from the last plays of E.). This last feature is not found in A., S., E. or PV but does occur in some interpolated passages of tragedy.

The structure and staging of Rh. reveal more phenomena which are hardly compatible with even a youthful Euripides as author. The absence of an exposition at the start of the play is unique in tragedy, as is the appearance of two divine interventions and the seizure of an actor by the chorus. We also observe a collection of unusual features which, although aesthetically acceptable in themselves and comparable with events in other plays (esp. Aeschylean tragedy), nevertheless present a distinctly un-Euripidean picture when combined in one play. They are: an extremely active and important chorus, the unannounced symmetrical entries at 264, and to some extent, the chariot entry at 380ff. and the early choral exit and re-entry (527 and 675).

The most telling evidence of all against authenticity is the complete absence of rhetorical and emotional discussion, soliloquy
and debate which so powerfully characterise E. in all his extant plays (and many fragments).

We shall not know who wrote Rh. unless new evidence turns up. However, on the basis of my examination of the evidence I am convinced that it was not E. Whoever he was, the author had a good knowledge of A., S. and E. and appears to have modelled his theatrical style more on A. than on anyone else.
III SOURCES OF THE TEXT

- O -

Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana pluteus 31,10 contains the dramatis personae and lines 1-714. For Rh. O shares more readings with V than with any other MS but V was not copied from it, as can be seen from errors which O shares with L and/or Q. However, the scribe clearly had access to a better source of readings than the scribe of V, readings which did not come from A.

- V -

Vatican city, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana codex Vaticanus graecus 909. This MS contains the argument, lines 1-111, 152-550, 631-791, and 812-940. Lines 899-940 were kept for some time in Vat. gr. 2315 but were restored by Rabe (RM 63 (1908) 419ff). V is the only MS of Rh. to preserve the ancient scholia. Where V is deficient, we can consult its apograph Va.

- Va -

Vatican city, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana codex Palatinus graecus 98 (14th century). For Rh. Va is a copy of V but must be used with caution because the scribe introduced a number of readings which did not come from A.

See also Zanetto (ed.) VI-XXIII and Diggle (ed.) v f.

179 See N. Wecklein SBAW 5th Abh. (1922), Turyn (1957) 333ff., A. Pertusi IMU 3 (1960) 148 and Tuilier (1968) 146ff. The MS was thought to date from c.1320 but has been redated to c.1175 by N.G. Wilson (Scr.e Civ. 7 (1983) 161-76).

180 E.g. at 17, 161, 296, 453 and 601.

181 E.g. at 74, 179, 205, 235, 271, 343, 378, 431, 505, 537 and 548.

182 This MS is generally believed to date from c.1280, but Dr. N.G. Wilson has indicated to me that he believes it may be more than a decade older. See Wilamowitz (1907) 206, Turyn (1957) 74ff. and 90ff., N. Wilson Gnomon 38 (1966) 342 and CR 80 (1966) 288 and Tuilier (1968) 161ff.

183 See Nauck (ed.) vol.1 xli, Rabe ib. 421ff. and Turyn (1957) 91f.
interpolations for metrical reasons. Although they are clumsy they are nevertheless evidence that someone other than Triclinius was interested in metre. At 887 Va is the only source with the correct reading.

- Hn -

Copenhagen (Hauniensis), Det Kongelige Bibliothek Gamle Kongelig Samling 417 contains the argument and all the play and was copied directly from Va. It is of use only at 131, where it alone is metrically correct, and at 387, where it alone preserves an alternative reading.

- L -

Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana pluteus 32,2 was Triclinius' working copy of Eur. It contains sections c, d and b of the argument (in that order) and all of the play. After L had been copied and checked by the scribes who copied it, Triclinius checked it against its exemplar. After his first set of corrections and notes were included, P was copied from L for the book trade (see below). Triclinius returned to correct L twice more. The independent and extensive nature of his work sometimes disfigures the original readings of the MS but we can check those readings (and therefore ex hypothesi the readings of L’s exemplar) by reference to Q (see below).

185 E.g. at 388, 512 and 776. See Elmsley Euripides Medea (1822) v f. (pace Diggle) νεόδημος ιος νεόχημος V νεόκμητος Λ. The presence of the reading at CP 1456 (αἳρειν φόραδήν τον νεόδημον χρέων) is confirmation of its antiquity.


This MS, written c.1320-1325, was split into two parts c.1420: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana codex Palatinus graecus 287 and Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana Conventi Soppressi 172. It was used for the vulgate text of E. in 1503. For the ‘alphabetic’ plays of E., P is a direct copy of L after Triclinius’ first set of corrections. This is also true for Rh. It is therefore of very limited value, although the work of its correctors is of some use.

London (Harleianus), British Library Harley 5743, written between the late 15th and early 16th centuries. Q contains all sections of the argument and all of the play. It is clear that Q is linked closely to L because for the greater part of its text it agrees with the readings in L, including many of its errors. However, it was not copied from L. The precise relationship between the two is revealed by their arrangement of the sections of the hypotheses and their layout of the dramatis personae. The scribe of Q’s ancestor used an ancestor of L. What makes Q a valuable witness is that its ancestor was a mixtum compositum. Q has a number of correct readings which disagree with L, whether L has been corrected or not. Some tally with corrections in P but

---

189 See Sicherl RM 118 (1975) 205-25.
190 See Turyn (ib.) 258ff., Zuntz (ib.) 13, 134ff. 179ff. and 192ff., Tuilier (ib.) 192ff. and Diggle Eur. 513.
193 See works in previous note, Zanetto XIX and Diggle (ed.) 342.
many of them agree with readings in other MSS, without a consistent loyalty either to O or to V.

- Ao -

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, O 123 sup. f.32r \(^{194}\) contains all of section a of the first hypothesis and was presumably written out because printed editions did not then include hypotheses. \(^{195}\) It follows closely the correct readings of Q against V and looks very much like a member of the same grouping, even sharing a mistake with Q at a 16. However, it was not copied from Q, as can be seen from two peculiar errors at a 5 and a 11. The fragment is a valuable witness, descended indirectly from the ancestor of L before section a was lost from that MS.

- Af -

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana F 205 inf. \(^{196}\) has 856-884 and 985-989 written out like prose with a colon between each line. This, and the fact that 868 and 869 have been swapped around, suggests that it may have been an exercise. The text has a mixed background and follows no other source consistently.

- IIi -

Papiri della Società Italiana 12, 2 1286 [Pack. 428]. \(^{197}\) The papyrus has a column containing section a of the hypothesis from line 10 onwards. It offers the most complete version of section a.

\(^{194}\) Written at the beginning of the 16th century. See Turyn (ib.) 296ff. and Tuilier (ib.) 271ff.

\(^{195}\) Stephanus (ed. 1602) only has hyp. c.

\(^{196}\) Written in the 13th century. See A. Mai Iliadis fragmenta (1819) p.xxxv, J. Mossay AC 41 (1972) 500-18, A. Wourters AC 42 (1973) 516ff., Turyn (ib.) 341f. and Tuilier (ib.) 166ff.

Paris, Codex Panopolitanus, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Supplément grec 1099.2 (Akhmim papyrus 4) [Pack: 427] contains Rh. 48-70 on one side and 71-96 on the other. The readings are (apart from a few scribal slips) largely correct and adhere to no MS or grouping of MSS consistently. It is alone among the texts in preserving a correct or most likely reading at 52, 60, 63 and 78 and has ὀνοσκόων (correctly) with Δ at 68.

The scholia in V do not give us any independent readings for the text of Rh. The only correct reading of importance retained in these notes is the support for Q at 852. The scholia to L and Q offer no readings of interest. The margins of Q contain symbols beside some 'gnomic' lines. Some of these appear in the gnomologia but they cannot be related to a specific anthology.

The Christus Patiens (ed. Tuilier 1969) is a religious drama made up of iambic lines taken from Greek tragedy. From E. the author made use of the 'select' plays; from Rh. he used 254 lines, written in the 4th or 5th century AD. See U. Wilcken SPAW (1887) 813-816, Wilamowitz (1907) 214 n.186, P. Collart BIFAO 31 (1931) 52ff., Turyn (ib.) 97 n.156 and 313 n.301 and Tuilier (ib.) 126. V has 76 notes, L 20 and Q 2. Schwartz did not have Σ 912 and Σ 922 available because lines 899-940 were still attached to Vatic. gr. 2315. They do not contain any new readings. Of some interest is fr.128c (Maehler) of Pindar preserved at Σ 895. In Schwartz's edition of the V scholia we should read οὐκ οὕν in lemm. at 481.

At 69, 92, 106, 161, 168, 176, 185, 206, 318, 332, 394, 422-3, 510, 634 and 757-8.

It is falsely attributed to Gregorius Nazianzenus. See Turyn (ib.) 279n. and 281n. Horna (Hermes 64 (1929) 429ff.) explores the possibility that Constantine Manasses was the author. See also E.R. Dodds Euripides Bacchae lv f. and Hunger Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner (1978) vol.2 102ff.
a third of them from the first 200 lines of the play. The text
does not favour the readings of one tradition over another which
shows that its author used an edition of the 'select' plays of E.
written before any significant division of the MSS into the
groupings we now see. That it retains old readings can be seen
from its frequent agreement with Π at lines 48-96. Unfortunately,
however, its readings are not entirely dependable, because they
are frequently altered for reasons of metre or context.

- gV, gB and gE -

\textit{gV} (Athous Vatopedii 36)\textsuperscript{202} contains 47 excerpts; \textit{gB} (Vaticanus Barberini gr. 4)\textsuperscript{203} 59 excerpts and \textit{gE} (Escorialensis gr. X.1.13)\textsuperscript{204} 76 excerpts. These gnomologia contain no independent correct
readings.

\textsuperscript{203} Written c.1300. See Turyn (ib.) 1.1, Tuilier (ib.) 168ff. and K. Matthiessen \textit{Hermes} 93 (1965) 148-58.
\textsuperscript{204} Written in the early 14th century. See Turyn (ib.) 94n.151, Tuilier (ib.) 169n.1 and K. Matthiessen \textit{Hermes} 94 (1966) 398-410.
COMMENTARY
HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses to Rh. are preserved completely in V and Q, and partially in L, P, O, Ao and Π. The introductory matter is longer than that commonly found with other tragedies and is an amalgamation of material from different sources. It is of particular interest because it is the earliest source for doubt about authenticity in section b (see pp. 21-6 above).

ΤΙΤΛΟΣ ΡΗΧΟΥ: Section (a):

This summary of the plot is of a type of prefatory material which appears in the medieval MSS of ten other plays from the Euripidean corpus: Hec., I Pho., Hi., And., Tro., Ba., I Or., HF, Hclld. and Ion. Originally these summaries were not attached to the plays themselves, but appeared in compilations of summaries written out in the alphabetical order of the titles, not as introductions for those wishing to read the plays, but as substitutes for those interested in mythography. That such a collection of stories existed was suggested by Wilamowitz ((1875) 183f.) and is now confirmed by papyrus evidence from the first and second centuries AD.\(^{205}\) G. Zuntz christened this corpus 'Tales from Euripides' (The Political Plays of Euripides (1963) 135).

Where the texts are legible the format of the summaries is the same. The title of each play is followed by the formula \(\text{oú/\text{H}C/\text{òv \ ἄρχη}}\) and the first line of the play, presumably for the

\(^{205}\) See P.Oxy. 2455 (cf. 1 PAP IFAO PSP 248.2), 2457 and 420, P.Mil. Vogl. 44 and PSI 1286 (Π.), as well as C. Austin NFE 88-103, H.J. Mette ZPE 4 (1968) 173, R.A. Coles BICS supp. 32 (1974) and H. Koenen ZPE 4 (1968) 137-138. It is interesting to note that although Pirithous, Rhadamanthys and Tennes were declared spurious in the Vita Euripidis, they appear as genuine in the papyri.
purpose of confirmation.\textsuperscript{206} There then follows the phrase ἡ ἀπὸ ὑπόθεσις, after which the plot summary is written out. Eventually this corpus was dismembered and the summaries written out with the plays themselves, but without the first line which identified the work.\textsuperscript{207} The argument about the authorship of these summaries and whether they were the work of one man centres around Dicaearchus of Messene (c.340-287), a pupil of Aristotle.\textsuperscript{208}

The only explicit reference to Dicaearchus is at Sextus Empiricus \textit{Adv. Math.} 3.1-6 (697,25 Bk), who says he wrote τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων. However, this may only be an amplification peculiar to Sextus.\textsuperscript{209} It was the case in antiquity that mythographical works were wrongly attributed to an author and Rusten is probably right (\textit{ib.} 366) in assuming that an anonymous set of plot summaries to Euripidean plays was falsely attributed to Dicaearchus and became widely known under his name. Whatever the truth, part (a) of the hypothesis as part of this corpus is confirmed by its appearance in \textit{π.}

\textsuperscript{206}Cf. the conjecture of W. Luppe at (b) 28. On the appearance of οὐ ἀρχῇ generally, see E. Nachmanson \textit{Der griechische Buchtitel} (1941) 38-49.

\textsuperscript{207}For the survival of such a line in hyp. (b) below see p.25 and n.40 above.


\textsuperscript{209}See Kassel \textit{ib.} 213ff. The reference to Dicaearchus in hyp. E. \textit{Me.} (fr. 63 Wehrli) is from his \textit{Life of Greece}, not a collection of hypotheses, and the inclusion of his name in hyp. \textit{AIC.} is an addition of Triclinius. We do know of critical work by Dic. on the didascaliae (see fr. 74 Wehrli and hyp. S. \textit{OT} (= fr. 80 Wehrli)), and that he quoted authors (fr. 77 Wehrli = E. fr. inc. 969 Nauck). We also know of other scholars who produced hypotheses. Cf., e.g., Glaucus in hyp. A. \textit{Pe.} (for Glaucus see Jacoby \textit{RE} VII 1418.46).
(a) 1 ἰδείλλης The reading might be a corruption of ἰδείλλης, which Nauck suggested. ἰδείλης means ‘afternoon’, and would have to refer to late afternoon, or evening here (cf. Xen. An. 3.3.11 τῆς ἡμέρας ὀλής ἅγιλθον .. ἀλλὰ ἰδείλης ἀφίκουντο). However, the play starts a few hours before dawn so either Kirchhoff’s ὀλής νυκτὸς or Schwartz’s ὀλής νυκτὸς would seem preferable. Perhaps ἰδεινῶς should be considered because of the effect which the firelight has on the Trojans.

(a) 5-6 τεκκέμμεσθαι...αὐτῶι Diggle’s suggestion is the most convincing rendering of the sentence because it mentions Dolon’s significant disguise and reward.

(a) 6 οἱ περὶ τῶν ζΩοντεά The phrase is a late Greek periphrasis for the actual person. See S. Radt ZPE 38 (1980) 45-7 and cf. οἱ ἐ τοῖς Διομήδην below, οἱ περὶ Διομήδεα at Pindar fr. 262 (Maehler) and οἱ περὶ Γάλων Φαβρίκιον at Plut. Pyrrh. 20.1

(a) 7 κοιτῆν Hector does not sleep in a tent (see lines 1 and 9), so V’s κοιτῆν is preferable to σκηνῆν (QAo).

(a) 13 Διομήδην This acc. termination appears in MSS instead of -η. Some scholars emend; others leave it because, although the replacement of -η by -ην was a late development in Attic, it may have happened during the fifth century. See Collard on E. Su. 928 and 1218, who notes that evidence from inscriptions is not decisive, and that in Attic drama -η is only required by metre in
anapaests at Ar. Nu. 355 (cf. also S. Ant. 198 and E. Pho. 72).

(a) 17-18 ἔπινοεῖ· The verb means ‘intend’ or ‘plan’ (to do something) and so is inappropriate here. The simpler meaning ‘thinks’ is required. Perhaps a part of νομίζω was originally here.

(a) 19 Καλλιόπη Lacking Πι, Schwartz wished to insert Terpsichore in V’s lacuna here, presumably from hyp. (c) 45. Σ Rh. 346 tells us that Heracleides and Apollodorus name her as Euterpe (cf. Σ Il. 10.435), but that Marsyas the younger calls her Clio. She is not named in the text and it is unnecessary to attempt an identification (cf. Zuntz ib. 138 n.5).

Section (b): For anything of relevance to the authenticity of Rh. see pp.21-6 above.

(b) 29 [E. fr. 1108 Nauck] Νῦν εὕσεληνον φέγγος ἡ διφηλήτος εὐσέληνος is found elsewhere only at Lyr. Fr. Adesp. 981 (Page) εὐσέληνον διον οἰκον. διφηλήτοι is Menthe’s conjecture for τροχηλάτου at TGF vol.2, 39 (Agathon) F32 Ω λαμπρόν ὄμια τοῦ τροχηλάτου <ω->. However, we do find διφηλατώ at S. Ai. 845 and TGF vol. 2, 72 (Theodectas) F17.1. R. Morstadt ((1827) 72f.) points out that the line is inconsistent with Rh. 534 (οὐ λεύστες μναδός αὔγλαν;), but there is so little in the fragment that we cannot tell what is supposed to be going on with any certainty.

(b) 30ff. πεζὸς πάνω καὶ οὐ πρέπων Ἑὐριπίδη· καὶ τάχα ἤν
The compiler declines to substantiate this judgement and his criticism is odd, because the lines are neither prosaic, nor particularly un-Euripidean. Indeed, M.W. Haslam observes (GRBS 16 (1975) 167) that they are not as bad as the first line of S. El., and Valckenaer (Diatribe 92f.) even suggests that they are not unworthy of Sophocles. Whoever wrote them had a knowledge of Homer and other tragedies, so he is not to be despised. It seems that we have in the compiler's remark an example of the kind of shallow criticism associated with the Peripatetics rather than serious Alexandrian scholarship.

The authorship of the second prologue is unclear. Actors did interpolate lines into tragedy, as the compiler knew. However, since the play begins with anapaests, it is hard to see how an actor might have bold enough to insert an entire iambic prologue, contrary to the poet's wishes. It is far likelier that a poet, scholar or librarian supplied them.

(b) 34-44. The writer of the second prologue (E. fr. 1109 Nauck = TGF adesp. F81) used material from other literature as a model. (b) 42 has the phrase φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν which also occurs, also of Athena, at S. Ai. 14. Fenik has pointed out (Latomus 73 (1964) 36f.) that there are echoes of Hera's words at II. 5.714-7 and ib. 8.352-7 in the first four lines. (b) 34 is reminiscent of E. Alc. 1136 ὃ τοῦ μεγίστου Ζηνὸς εὐγενῆς τέκνων (of Heracles), 210 See esp. D.L. Page Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy (1934) passim, C.W. Willink CQ 21 (1971) 343-64, B.M.W. Knox YCS 22 (1972) 239-61, M.D. Reeve GRBS 13 (1972) 247-65, ib. 451-74 and GRBS 14 (1973) 145-71, M.W. Haslam GRBS 16 (1975) 149-74, CQ 26 (1976) 4-10 and D.J. Mastronarde Phoenix 32 (1978) 105-28 and Pho. (ed.) pp.39-48.
and (b) 44 may be compared with E. Hi. 684 πρόρριζον ἐκπρίψειν.
There is only one rare word; προήκειν in (b) 41, which is not found again until Thuc. There is one bold metrical device; the resolution of (b) 40 Κύπριδιν is contrary to the 'rules' of T. Zieliński (Tragodumenon Libri Tres (1925) 133ff.) that 1) both syllables of a resolved long element should be short, not only by position, but also by nature, and 2) that resolution is only admitted in words of three or more syllables. the former 'rule' is broken only once in Rh., the latter not at all. However, there is more metrical leeway with proper names than other words, so this should not be regarded as particularly remarkable. It is clearly Hera who speaks, from the references to the judgement of Paris at (b) 40ff. She is addressing Athena and contemplating how the two of them can help the Greeks who have suffered a reverse at Hector's hands ((b) 35-8). The author may even have drawn his material from the story of Rhesus preserved in Pindar (fr. 262 Maehler = Σ Il. 10.435).

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΙΣ ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ Section (c):
Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 237-180 BC) was the editor of the Euripidean MSS in the Alexandrian library. His name appears, or is conjectured in the titles of hypotheses to Alc., Me., Hi., And., Hec., Pho., Or., Ba., and Rh. We also find similar material in hyp. IT. The kind of information contained in these hypotheses differs from the so-called 'Dicaearchan' hypotheses in that they are much shorter and intended as an introduction to the play rather than as a substitute for them. With varying degrees of completeness they treat the subject of the drama, the scene, the
allocation of parts to actors, the date of the performance, the names of the other competing poets and the treatment of the same story by other authors. Our hyp. contains only the plot summary, scene, composition of the chorus and the fact that Rh. is a version of the Νυκτερσία, another term for the Doloneia (See Σ II. 10.435). The attribution to Aristophanes is dubious for most of these hypotheses. Brown concludes (ib. 30) that the late style of the Greek points to only four possible candidates being genuine (hyp. II Alc., II Me., II Or. and II Ba.). We cannot be sure when, or by whom, our 'Aristophanic' hypothesis was written. His text clearly began where ours does because he states that the guards speak the prologue ((c) 53).

(c) 45 (and 50) Τερψιχόρης see note on (a) 19 above.

(c) 53 περιέχει δὲ τὴν Νυκτερσίαν. Σ II. 10.435 informs us that Νυκτερσία was a title sometimes given to II. 10 (cf. Doloneia). Mention should briefly be made of J.A. Hartung’s theory that a supposed missing first episode of Rh. was used by Accius (170-c.85 BC) as a source for his play Nuctegresia, which also portrayed the events of II. 10. He imagined that this missing first episode was set in the Greek camp and that it portrayed Agamemnon calling his night council. This cannot be supported as

212 One such oddity of style is the sense of διαλαμβάνει in (c) 51. It must mean something like 'treats', but this sense is not found elsewhere, but the whole sentence seems unfinished and this may be the result of an attempt to condense an earlier note.
213 Euripides Restitutus (1843) vol.1.11-15 and Accius frr. 484-93 in Scaenicorum Romanorum Fragmenta (1953) (Klotz).
the plot of Rh. is a unified whole. G. Pacitti\textsuperscript{214} concluded that Accius used and reworked elements from both Il. 10 and Rh. Unfortunately for his argument there is no line from Accius' play which has any linguistic similarity to any line Rh. and those lines of Accius which show a similarity of context with Rh. are also similar in context to lines in Il. 10 and may well be derived rather from that work. One fr. of Accius (672) which Hartung attributed to Nuct. was rightly rejected by O. Ribbeck. as having no pertinence to the drama.\textsuperscript{215} Curiously enough, this fr. is the only one which does resembles a line from Rh. (\textit{Iamque auroram rutilare procul cerno}, cf. Rh. 535f. \textit{\'ως δή πέλας, \'ως ἀφίγνυται}). However, the approach of dawn is such a commonplace in literature that we should not use it as evidence of a connection with Rh.\textsuperscript{216}

\textit{ΓΑ ΤΟΓ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ} Section (d):

(d) 55 \textit{'Αθάνα} It is this Doric form and \textit{'Αθηναία} which are used in tragedy, rather than \textit{'Αθήνα} or \textit{'Αθηνα} (West \textit{Aeschylus Tragoediae} (1990) xxvi n.16). Cf. line 501.

(d) 56 \textit{Πάρις} Wecklein advises that \textit{'Αλέξανδρος} should replace \textit{Πάρις} in the cast list but this is unnecessary. \textit{Πάριν} appears at 586, before 627 (Wecklein's first quoted line), and \textit{Πάρις} occurs at 841. Both these names are used of him by Helen to show her ambiguity towards him at E. Tro. 941f.; \textit{εἴτε \'Αλέξανδρον θέλεις ἵνα προσφωνεῖν νυν εἴτε καὶ Πάριν.}

\textsuperscript{214}\textit{Maia} 15 (1963) 184-98.
\textsuperscript{215}\textit{Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta} (1871) 230ff.
\textsuperscript{216}The line may be based on Il. 10.251.
The protagonist plays Hector, Odysseus and Paris, the deuteragonist Aeneas, Rhesus, Athena and the Muse, while the tritagonist plays Dolon, the shepherd, Diomedes and the charioteer.
The scene is the Trojan camp before the walls of Troy. During the previous day H. had inflicted a heavy defeat on the Greeks but was stopped from destroying their camp by nightfall (cf. Rh. 59ff. with Il. 8. 485ff.). During the night the Trojans dared to camp, under arms in readiness for action, outside their walls for the first time since the Greek invasion. In Il. 8, H. urges the Trojans to keep watch lest the Greeks attempt to escape under cover of darkness or carry out an ambush (Il. 8. 507-523). In Rh. H. has not set fires to watch the Greeks. The play opens with the chorus of guards rushing on to report firelight in the Greek camp and a commotion around Agamemnon’s tent. Il. 10, the epic background to Rh., starts in the Greek camp, where Agamemnon cannot sleep for worry and calls his chieftains to a council. The author of Rh. has shifted the scene of the action but a number of echoes recall the Greek council in the epic; cf. Rh. 6f. with Il. 10.80 ὅρθωσεῖς δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπ’ ἄγκυνος, κεφαλήν ἐπαείρας; Rh. 11ff. with Il. 10.82-5 τίς δ’ οὖσι κατὰ νύκτα ἀνα στρατὸν ἔρχεται οὗτος | νύκτα δι’ ὄρφανην, ὅτε θ’ εὔδοσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι | ...! φθέγγεο ... τίπτε δὲ σε χρεώ; Rh. 25f. with Il. 10.54ff. ἐγὼ δ’ ἐπὶ Νέστορα δίων | ἐμι, καὶ ὀργνὲς ἀνεστήμεναι, αὖ κ’ ἐθέλησιν | ἐλθεῖν ἐς φυλάκων ἱερὸν τέλος ἡδ’ ἐπιτείλαι; Rh. 28f. with Il. 10.67f. φθέγγεο δ’ ἢ κεν ἤμισθα, καὶ ἐγρήγορθαι ἄνωθεν | πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὠνομάζων ἄνδρα ἔκαστον, (cf. ib. 108-10).

The play begins a few hours before dawn (see 5n.), so most of the action takes place in darkness. Rh. is the only tragedy set at night, but its epic model Il. 10 is also unusual in being a night
The darkness, of course, is an integral part of the plot: the Greek spies would not have been able to enter the camp in daylight. We are reminded of this background of darkness and the passage of the night by references to night, the dark, the difficulties which it presents, sleeping, beds and nocturnal activity. Most of these references occur in the first quarter of the play, in order to set the scene and conjure the appropriate atmosphere. There is one reference back to the previous day (59f.) and eleven references forward to the following day.

However, the darkness in Rh. is not simply a physical hindrance (or advantage) for the participants and an atmospheric background for the play, inherited from its epic model. It is actually a contributing factor to the development of the action. G. Paduano (Maia 25 (1973) 15) observes that the darkness in Rh. is more potent than that in Il. 10, being a symbol of moral incapacity and uncertainty. The significance of many of the references goes beyond scene setting. See esp. H.'s ironic remark at 69, the false dawn of hope brought by the shining Rh. (303ff., 370, 382, 360-79 and 464ff.), and the story of Od.'s last night.

The night setting of Rh. was thought indicative of spuriousness by Wilamowitz (Hermes 61 (1926) 287), G. Norwood (Greek Tragedy (1948) 293 n.4) and C.B. Sneller (1949) 56f.). It is certainly another unusual feature of the play to add to many, but it is not impossible that lost plays were also set at night. The twilight before dawn is certainly used to create the dramatic atmosphere at the start of IA, A. Ag. and S. Ai. R. suggests (136f.) that S. Lacaenae (frr. 367-369a), which dealt with the theft of the Palladium, and Ion Phrouroi (frr. 43a-49a Snell) might have taken place at night.


expedition to Troy at 501. Half-way through the play (527-55) the first signs of dawn are seen and the guards describe the activities of those whose work requires them to rise early. We are not only half-way through the play at this point, but also half-way between the night and the full light of dawn and between the chaotic darkness of the confused parodos and the light of revelation brought by the Muse. Even the Greek spies cannot penetrate the darkness without the mental illumination provided by Athena in the form of Rh.'s shining white horses (617f.). At 690f. it is fear of disturbing the allies in the dark which hinders the last opportunity of the Trojans to stop the Greeks escaping. The murder of Rh. is foreshadowed in the dream of the charioteer (779-788) and he himself expresses his disbelief that a Greek could have reached Rh. through the darkness without the help of a god (852ff.). The Muse provides the answers which illuminate what has happened, but even the dawn which reddens the sky at 992 will not bring the victory of which H. is so confident. The author has used night as an inanimate, yet disabling agent in the plot. It turns motivations, decisions and tactics into a 'negative image' of what they would be in the light of day, and mortals have to operate in fear and without certainty, relying on guesswork (see e.g. 629, 656-9, 722-7 and 820f.).

The play is set in front of the bivouac of H. The textual indications are that it was physically represented on stage rather than on the skene. 221 We may assume that H. is 'discovered' on stage at the start, because the guards wake him at 7-10. In E. Or. Orestes is asleep on stage with Electra beside him. Sometimes 221 See lines 1, 9, 88, 574ff., 581, 605f., 631 and 660. See also Taplin (1977) 455 and G. Björck Eranos 55 (1957) 13f.
tragedies began with a tableau of suppliants 'discovered' on stage, e.g. E. And., Hcll., HF, Hel, and Su. The last example is the only case of a chorus being on stage before the parodos in extant tragedy. A. P. Luom. doubtless began with Prometheus on stage. Characters who are on stage and take part in the parodos of their play are, like H., usually on stage before the chorus and closely involved with them (cf. PV, S. El., Ai., OC, Phil., E. Me., Hcll., IT, Ion, El., Tro., Hel. and Or.).

Two entrances on stage indicate routes to and from Troy and the rest of the Trojan camp (used by, e.g., Aeneas, Dolon and Paris), and to and from the Trojan plain (e.g. the shepherd, Rh. and the Greeks). There is no indication of what the guards members wear but we may assume some representation of light armour.

1-51 Parodos

The parodos sets the scene and gives a hint of H.'s character before a fuller portrait in the first epeisodion. The urgent entry of the guards at the start produces immediate excitement. The action starts with anapaests spoken first by the chorus, then by H. and the chorus (1-22). These are followed by a lyric choral strophe (22-33), more anapaests from H. (34-40) and the choral antistrophe (41-51).

Murray used paragraphoi in the parodos to indicate changes of speaker within the chorus at the beginning of each full sentence (before lines 1, 4, 7, 23, 26, 28, 30, and 33). These have no textual authority and Diggle does not use paragraphoi in the parodos. However, there are grounds for including them because the for the absence of an exposition see p.68 above, and on the chorus in Rh. generally see pp.78f. above.
sentences are in asyndeton throughout. Indeed, many of the clauses within them are also in asyndeton. In addition to this the persons of the verbs used by the chorus when they address anyone change restlessly until 41-51 which is all choral narrative, without asyndeton, related directly to H. (1 βῆθι, 4 δέξαιτο, 7 ὁρθον, 23 ὑπίζου, 27 ἀρμόσατε, 28 τίς εἰσ’ and 33 ἐγγυντε). All of this suggests that the choral sentences up to 33 should be divided between individual guards. This antiphonal entry, then, looks very much like the choral re-entry at 675-82; indeed the latter seems deliberately to mirror the former. The presence of antiphony might suggest that the chorus came on from both eisodoi, and that each semi-chorus answered the other. However, since the syntax of the first strophe is also antiphonal, we may assume that they all enter from one eisodos, especially since they are all coming from the same place.

There is no responsion between the anapaestic sections and the first set of anapaests is longer than the second. Presented with so loose a synthesis of parts we cannot strictly speak of epirrhematic structure here (pace R. 341). This mixture of anapaests and lyrics is found in earlier tragedy, but not confined to it. The parodos of A. Ag. starts with 63 lines of anapaests (40-103), followed by lyrics until 258. The parodos of S. Ai. (the only other tragedy set in the field) starts with anapaests at 134-171, followed by lyrics in which the chorus alternate stanzas of lyric and anapaests with Tecmessa. Parodoi with lyric dialogue

223 The mood and structure of the opening and the re-entry are very similar. In both places the chorus expresses urgency, with a sequence of imperatives, yet has no clear knowledge of the situation. Moreover, the epiparodos consists not just of lyric strophes but a variety of metres alternating with a lyric strophe and antistrophe.

106
occur in S.'s latest plays, Phil. (409 BC) and OC (406-5, performed 402-1 BC). In E. we find the feature as early as Me. It also occurs in E. El., (c. 420 BC. See p.48 n.108 above). Electra sings a monody at 112-166 and this is followed by the parodos which she and the chorus sing alternately. At ib. 860-879 she and the chorus alternate lyric stanzas with anapaests in which the actor, like H. in this parodos, sings the anapaests. The phenomenon is also found at PV 88-192.

Apart from Rh., the only tragedies with a choral opening are by A.: Pe. (472 BC), Su. (c.463 BC), P.Luom. (frr. 190, 191 and 192), Niobe (frr. 154a-167b in toto) and Myrmidons (frr. 131-142 in toto). We do not know much about the parodoi of the fragmentary plays. P.Luom. started with a chorus of Titans who began in anapaests which later turned into lyric. This seems also to have been the case with Niobe and Myrmidons. These openings seem to have been both longer and less urgent than that in Rh. In Pe. the parodos consists of a brief introduction followed by a long catalogue of the Persian host, delivered in anapaests, during which the elders contemplate the fate of their army (65-154). In A. Su. the suppliants explain their dilemma in anapaests (1-39), then embark on a long lyric passage during which they appeal to the gods for help and bewail their plight (40-175). Like Rh., these plays begin with marching anapaests which turn into lyrics.

226 Cf. Cratinus' parody of it in Ploutoi (fr. 73 Austin = PSI 1212), and see Taplin (1977) 425.
227 Cf. Σ V ad Ar. Ach. and see Taplin HSCP 76 (1972) 61 and 65.
There, however, the similarities end. The opening of Rh. plunges in *medias res*. It is much shorter than the other anapaestic openings, not remotely contemplative and gives only the essential details needed to establish the setting, without revealing any of the background to the plot. The excited parodos of Rh. is therefore unique in tragedy. Indeed, there is something to be said for Burnett’s remark ((1985) 18 n.13) that the parodos ‘with its shouting, its panic-stricken guard and its understandably cross Hector can only be paralleled in comedy (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 570), or in the ‘Hilferuf’ scenes of satyr drama.’ See esp. V. Steffen *Eos* 55 (1965) 1ff. and Taplin (1977) 251 and cf. Cratinus frr. 144, 169, 235K and the frr. of Ploutoi, and esp. A. *Diktyoulkoï* (fr. 464.17-20), which, like Rh. 25-32, involves raising the βοή to call those who are assumed to be nearby, but off-stage; <Ac.>

The only extant play in the Euripidean corpus with an anapaestic opening is *IA*, performed posthumously in 405 BC. However, it is not Euripidean. It starts with an anapaestic dialogue between Agamemnon and his old servant. This turns to iambics at line 49 and reverts to anapaests from 117-162. The opening of *IA* has similarities with the opening of Rh.; both plays start in darkness; both are set in a camp, and both have an

228 G. Paduano (transl. p.36 n.1) describes it as ‘emotive, practical and informative’.
229 The lost *Andromeda*, performed in 412 BC (*TGF* 114-56 Nauck), seems to have started with a lyric anapaestic monody by Andromeda, parodied at Ar. *Thes.* 101ff.
antiphonal anapaestic metron (see p.43 above). However, there is nothing else to connect them. We may safely say that an anapaestic choral opening was rare by the time E. was writing, and this one is directed deliberately at novelty and excitement.

From lines 1-10 An excited mood is established immediately by singular imperatives (1 βῆθι, 7 ὅρθου, 8 λύσον and 9 λείπει), the emphatically postponed vocative Ἐκτὸς, and the use of asyndeton until the last clause. At 11-22 H. wakes and, in an agitated tone, fires questions at the chorus. His state of mind is portrayed by the continued use of asyndeton and the fact that he does not wait for an answer until line 15. When he has established their identity (15) and exchanged a word of reassurance (16), he continues his questions in a similar state, worried about the proximity of the Greeks (20-22), and does not wait for an answer until line 22.

23-33-41-51 strophe and antistrophe. For the schema see p.51 above and see R. 297ff., Dale MATC 1.95, O. Schroeder Euripidis Cantica (1928) 166ff. and Wilamowitz GV 288. Corruption affects responsion at 25-43 and 33-51. In 25 Badham changed ἀείρειν to αἰρεῖν which restores responsion with the correct Doric form ναῦν in 43. 33-51 is more problematic. The MSS seem sound in 33, but 51 is a syllable longer than 33. Diggle adopts Lindemann’s word order for 51. He regards the metre as two resolved cretics plus bacchiac, but it is unlikely that two cretics of this form can be juxtaposed. We cannot treat the opening of the line as a hemiepes in dactylo-epitrite because the resolution of the middle princeps

\[\text{pace Dale (MATC 1.95) who suspected } \zetaνυντ ' (νυ)]\]

\[\text{Studies on the Text of Euripides (1981) 20.}\]
is unheard of in tragedy, and is rare even in the first princeps (see Dale LM, 25 n.2 and West GM 71, 132 and 134). It is better to regard the opening as dactylic.

Diaeresis after a bacchiac indicates pause in 25-43. The effect of this is somewhat to isolate the following iambic metron. Such an isolation is bold, but is admissible in the strophe because the iambic metron is occupied by a single imperative. The isolation is less successful in the antistrophe. For the dactylic catalexis at 27-45 see L.P.E. Parker CQ 26 (1976) 19 n.14.

Still in an excited state, the guards do not answer H.'s questions but continue their call to arms, now asking for the omens to be taken and for specific troops to be mobilised. In 23-7 there is continued asyndeton and urgent stream of imperatives (ὅπλίζον, βαθι, ὀτρινον, ἄφυπνισον. πέμπε and ἀρμόσατε). In 28-32 the guards fire off questions (τίς, ποῦ, ποῦ) and end with an imperative in a line with resolution. The result is a stanza full of excitement which sustains suspense by failing to give any reasons for the commotion.

By 34-40 H. has collected himself and upbraids the guards for their lack of clarity and their panic. He establishes himself with a more controlled form of address (34f. τὰ μὲν ..! τὰ ὡς, 39f. πολλὰ ..! οὔδὲν), and now demands to know their news, pointing out that they have so far given no information.

41-51 The guards at last explain their alarm fully in a calmer tone. Their urgent call to arms in the first strophe is greatly modified and their news is seen to be inconsequential. Having seen fires and a commotion in the Greek camp, they have...

abandoned their posts and called for a general mobilisation. After calming down they now simply report the fire and commotion, and add their own interpretation of this (that the Greeks are afraid). They then explain that they have brought the news to avoid being criticised for neglect of duty by H. The news does not merit a mobilisation. The guards, however, do not return to their posts until a pair of spies has already crept through the lines. Their panic, neglect of their posts and fear of their commander point to military ineptitude. This ineptitude becomes the dramatic foundation of the first episode, because, although the significance of the fires escapes the guards, H. draws his own (mistaken) conclusions from their report and, at first, does order a mobilisation. It is during this antistrophe that we first see the military incompetence which will dog the Trojans through the play.

1 βῆδα 'The marching anapaests particularly associated with entries and exits of the chorus and others have Dorian antecedents...but, being recited not sung, are not given Doric dialect colouring' (West GM 78). Cf. κοίτης at 22 and νίκης at 995. The opening singular imperative is a general one, addressed not only to the other members but to anyone nearby who might hear, as indicated by τίς in the next line.

cῶνας i.e. a bivouac, not a bed or a tent. Canvas tents do not occur in Homer; the heroes live in huts. Cf. Il. 24.448-54. and Austin on V. Aen. 1.469. The herald at A. Ag. 559 mentions cῶναι of the Greek bivouacs around the walls of Troy.
The adjective occurs in Rh. and nowhere else in tragedy. Here the metre dictates the spelling and the word has two terminations. At 762 it has an iota and three terminations (Ἐκτὸρεία χείρ).

2f. τίς ὑπαπιστών ἄγρυπνος βασιλέως 'Who of the king's squires is awake?' for ὑπαπιστής cf. E. Pho. 1213.

ἡ τευχοφόρων A contrast is being made between H.'s squires who carry his armour and sleep near him (cf. Rh.'s charioteer at 790-1), and the other troops who carry their own arms and sleep a little further off. τευχοφόρων is ἀπ. λεγ., formed from τευχεσφόρος (cf. 267 below and E. Su. 654 τευχεσφόρον μὲν λαῶν) to fit the metre.

4 δέξαιτο νέων κληδόνα μύθων. 'Let him (whoever is awake) hear the report of news'. δέξαιτο is a jussive optative which has an epic flavour. It is found in Attic also at PV 1047, 1049 and 1051. For the periphrasis cf. A. Eum. 397 κληδόνος βοήν and E. Hel. 1250 λόγων κληδόνα.

5 <παρὰ τῶν φυλάκων> οἱ τετράμοιρον νυκτὸς φρονῶν As the text stands οἱ lacks an antecedent. The alternative φυλακήν in line 5 may be a remnant of the phrase I have inserted, rather than a gloss on φρονῶν, which is not an unusual word.

tetramoirou is ἀπ. λεγ. Although tetramoiria means a
four-fold portion at Xen. An. 7.2.36, the meaning of the adj. here is obviously 'fourth.' Translate 'fourth allotted watch'. The author divides the night into five watches (cf. 543ff.). There are three in the Iliadic version (Il. 10.252-3). For details of the national contingents who keep the other watches see 538-45. At 528-30 the guards speak of the night stars setting and at 535ff. of the morning star heralding the fifth watch. The action therefore takes place an hour or so before first light and ends at dawn. On the compression of time in tragedy see Willink on Or. 1214-5 and Taplin (1977) 290ff.

6 πάσης στρατιάς προκάθυσται The verb is rare in poetry, κάθημαι being far more common. No other προκατα- compound is found in tragedy. The addition πόλεως Τροίας in Λ looks like a gloss.

8 One of the greatest burdens which a commander has to endure is that of remaining awake during times of crisis, whether through worry, as at Il.10.3ff. and 25ff. (Agamemnon and Menelaus), E. I.A. 12-15 (of Agamemnon), or through a sense of responsibility, as at A. Se. 2f. ὄστις φυλάσσει πράξος ἐν πρύμνῃ πόλεως ἐν ὀδάκα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμών ὕπνω (Eteocles) and Il. 10.159f. (Nestor to Diomedes). The same duty also affects the common man. Cf. the vigilance of the guard at Α. Αg. 1-17 and the old man at IA [4f.]

βλεφάρων γοργυπόν ἔδραν As at 554f. (ὅμματος ἔδραν), the elaborate periphrasis refers to the eye socket.

γοργυπόν The adj. is a back formation from Γοργύ (see also
306n. and Leumann *Homerische Wörter* (1950) s.v.) and has the sense 'grim to behold'. It may have been suggested here by Ἅκτωρ ... Γοργοῦς ὄματι ἔχων at II. 8.349. In tragedy the adj. is used to describe something terrifying. Cf. *HF* 868 (of the maddened Heracles), *ib.* 1266 (of the serpents sent to kill him) and *PV* 356 (of Typhon's eyes).

The word conveys the guards' dread of H. This is also displayed at 51 and 722-3, and shown to be justified at 808ff. It is a commonplace of tragedy that barbarians have an exaggerated respect for and fear of figures of authority. Cf. the Phrygian's behaviour at *Or.* 1369ff. and see E. Hall *Inventing the barbarian* (1989) 80.

9 φυλλοστρῶτος 'leaf-strewn' is ἀπ. λεγ. φυλλοστρῶς is found at Theocritus Ep. 3.1 and probably means 'flower-strewn' (see Gow *ad loc.*). The rudeness of the bivouac points to a quick improvisation of bedding (cf. the action of the beached Od. at *Od.* 5.482f.). Although H. is sleeping he remains in a position of readiness for action. Cf. 123 and 740 below, and Diomedes and his men sleeping on shields, beside their spears and outside their huts at *II.* 10.150ff. We find leaf beds in dwellings, outside a military context, to illustrate a permanently uncivilised lifestyle at *E. Cy.* 386f. and *S. Phil.* 33.

10 καιρός γὰρ ἀκούσαι Cf. ἀκούσαι καιρός at *E. Tel.* (fr.147.51 (Austin)). On καιρός generally see Barrett on *Hi.* 386f. Translate 'For now is the time to listen.' Cf.52 below.

234 It is interesting to note that ἄγρυπνος, also in *Rh.* 2, occurs nearby at *PV* 358, used of Zeus' thunderbolt.
11 The reading of Α is far preferable. An interrogative mark after \( \phi\theta\gamma\gammaος \) shows that Η. is not immediately sure who has disturbed him. On the \( \hat{\gamma} \) Barnes writes, ad loc., 'Hic loci \( \hat{\gamma} \) pro \( \hat{\omega} \) substituo veteris libri auctoritate'. I have not been able to identify this MS. The sense of the line approximates to the English 'who goes there, friend or foe?'

12 \( \tau\iota \; \tau\circ \; \sigma\eta\mu\alpha; \; \theta\rho\omicron\omicron\epsiloni \). R. suggests (p.291) that the password should be given in reply and that the line should read Η: \( \tau\iota \; \tau\circ \; \sigma\eta\mu\alpha; \) - Ψ: \( \Phi\omicron\beta\omicron\omicron\omicron, \; \theta\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\epsiloni \). The text, however, is clear as it stands and the significant password is saved for line 521. The exchange \( \theta\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\epsiloni \; - \; \theta\alpha\rho\sigma\omicron\omicron \) at 16 shows that Η.'s request for the password has simply been forgotten in the stream of questions. \( \sigma\eta\mu\alpha; \) is also used for 'password' at 688, but nowhere else in Greek. \( \tau\iota \; \tau\circ \; \sigma\eta\mu\alpha; \) occurs at E. Hyps. fr. 57.10, where it probably means 'sign' or 'symbol' (see Bond ad loc.). The author uses the more common \( \xi\nu\nu\eta\theta\omicron\alpha; \) at 521, 684 and 763 and \( \sigma\nu\nu\theta\omicron\alpha; \) at 572 (cf. \( \sigma\nu\mu\beta\omicron\omicron\omicron \) at 573). For questions not receiving an answer in tragedy see D.J. Mastronarde on E. Pho. [376ff.].

13 \( \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \upsilon\nu\kappa\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon \) For the phrase meaning 'in the night' cf. 17 and 691 below, Od. 12.286, Theognis 460 and Α. Cho. 288. As Garvie notes ad Cho. 288 (καὶ λύσα καὶ μάταιος \( \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \upsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon \phi\beta\omicron\omicron \)), the use of \( \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \) indicates that the darkness itself contributes to the apprehension.

14 \( \kappa\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\alphaς \) Acc. of motion towards after \( \pi\lambda\omicron\theta\omicron\omicron\upsilon \) (\( \pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\zeta\omega \)). Cf.
δόμα πελάζει at E. And. 1167 and see K-G 1.312.


16-18 Diggle wishes to excise these lines and keep φυλακᾶς ... στρατιῶν at 37f. R. (291f.), in the absence of Euripidean parallels for antilabe within a metron, wishes to excise line 16, but there is no dramatic or textual reason for doing so. Indeed, the curt exchanges increase dramatic tension.

The repetition at 37f. is probably a marginal cross reference to line 18, made to point out the similarity of context, which became incorporated into the text.

16 Antilabe is very rare within an anapaestic metron. Cf. IA [2f.] and pp. 43 and 65 above.

17 λόχος Confusion between this and δόλος is an easy slip because of the similarity of capital Λ, Δ and Χ (cf. 92 below). Here λόχος is preferable because of the context. On first waking H. is more concerned about an ambush than a trick.

Neither οὐκέτι (Δ) nor οὐκ ἔστι (Λ) which disrupt the metre, can stand. H.’s question does not require a negative answer. μῶν is used here as at 577 and E. Hec. 676 and Hi. 794. ‘I ask μῶν x when I am reluctant to accept x as true’ (Barrett ad loc.). Cf. num forte in Latin. Translate: ‘It isn’t a night ambush is it? Why else did you leave your posts unless etc.?’. τί σὺ γὰρ For γὰρ as the conjunction ‘else’ cf. 78 below and E. IA 1256 φιλῶ τ’ ἔμαντοι τέκνα: μαλακικὴ γὰρ ἄν. The
postponement of a particle like γάρ which normally occupies the second position in a clause, to third position is not common (see Denniston GP 96). This case is more striking than many others where a closer connection exists between the first word and the word which displaces the particle (e.g. S. Aj. 116 τὸ ὅτε σοι δ' ἐφίημαι). The poet is highlighting τί (see Fraenkel KB 1.136f.).

19 νυκτηγορίαν is very rare, occurring in only three places in extant Greek besides here: Ar. fr.159, Libanius Decl. 26.23 and Porphyry ad Il. 10.194, all referring to Agamemnon’s council. The verb νυκτηγορέω is equally rare, occurring only at 89 below and A. Se. 29 (see p.41 above), in a similar context. Translate ‘night assembly’.

20ff. cf. A. Se. 59 (see p.41 above) and, of the Trojans, Ili. 10.100 δυσμενέες δ' ἄνδρες σχεδόν ήκατει and esp. Ili. 10.160f. οὐκ ἄλεις ὡς Τρώης ἐπὶ θρωμῶν πεδίοιο ἐκεῖ ήκατει ἄχι νεὼν, ὀλίγος δ' ἐτι χῶρος ἐρύκει; (cf. also Ili. 24.364f., of the Greeks).

δορὸς For ‘spear’ meaning ‘army’ cf. 366 and 459 below, E. HF 61 and Pho. 1082.

22 For the use of κατέχω in a similar context cf. A. Ag. 1540 κατέχουσα χάθηκαν.

23 συμμάχων Hermann’s conjecture (cf. Bothe) restores resposion with 41 and makes sense of εἵνας. The corruption arises Used at CP 2199.
from the similarity in the pronunciation of o and ω. Cf. the same mistake reversed in L in the next line.

24 Ἐκτόπ This emphatic vocative is repeated in the same position in the antistrophe; cf. 10.

βῶθι etc. Anxious to rouse the camp, the guards repeat their opening phrase.

26 Does this line indicate that H.'s troop is sleeping a little away from him? At 577 Od., having learnt the precise location of H.'s bed from D., says μῶν λόχος βέβηκέ ποι;. One could emend σῶν to τῶν but the result is too vague. It is best to assume that H.'s troop is nearby, but not shown on stage.

28f. The guards call especially for Polydamas and Sarpedon because they are prominent for their wise counsel and might.

Πανθοῦδαυ There are two sons of Panthoös in the Il.; Euphorbus, who is slain by Menelaus at 17.59f. and Polydamas, who has a much greater role as a warrior and counsellor of H. at 12.60-87, 12.210-229 and 14.449-457. H. even fears his reproach at 22.100 (see M. Schofield CQ 36 (1986), esp. 18-22). Of these two Paley states 'it is impossible to decide which is meant'. Euphorbus has some prowess. He is the first to strike Patroclus at Il. 16.608ff. (cf. ib. 17.14f.), but since he is also an effeminate youth who braids his hair with silver and gold, it is preferable to assume that Polydamas is meant.236 See also 85-130n. 236 Cf. J. Milton, on p. 148 of Stiblinus' commentary in his copy of Euripides (Stephanus 1602, now in the Bodleian: Don. d. 27, 28).
Sarpedon is named, with Glaucus, as leader of the Lycians at *Il.* 2.876f. In Homer he is the son of Zeus and Laodamia (*Il.* 6.198), slain by Patroclus at *Il.* 16.501-5. The author of Rh. makes him the son of Europa because he is confusing the hero with another Sarpedon who was the son of Zeus and Europa (see Hesiod fr. 140 (Merkelbach) and Hellanicus *FGH* 4 F94 (Jacoby). Diod. Sic. rationalises the two by making the Cretan hero the grandfather of the Homeric one, to whom was attributed a mortal father, Evander (G. Paduano trans. p.38 n.3).

30 σφαγίων The taking of omens was an essential preliminary to military action. Cf. Thuc. 6.69, Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.23, 7.4.30, *An.* 4.3.18-20, Herodotus 9.61. See also W.K. Pritchett *The Greek State at War* vol.1 (1969) ch.8 and vol.3 (1979) 83-90, and J. Casabona *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec* (1966) 180ff. In military situations the divination had to be swift; by the pouring of blood from σφάγα. Cf. A. Se. 230ff., E. *Hcld.* 399ff., 673 and 821f., *Pho.* 1255f. and *Su.* 155. Cf. also *Il.* 3.264-301. Favourable omens provided a boost to morale and fulfilled the vital religious obligation of determining the attitude of the gods to the undertaking. The perils of ignoring this practice are mentioned by Theseus at *E. Su.* 230f. (cf. A. Se. 378ff.).

31 γυμνήτων is formed from γυμνής (see Fraenkel *Nomina Agentis* (1910) 6). Cf. ὀχλος ὑμνής at 312f., γυμνήτες at E.
Pho. 1147 and ὁ γυμνήτες at Tyrtaeus fr. 11.35 (West). The Persians around Mardonius are γυμνήτες at Herodotus 9.63. These troops were light armed slingers and javelin throwers, used for skirmishing.

μόναρχοι Apart from here, μόναρχος occurs in tragedy only at PV 324, where it means ‘absolute ruler’. Nowhere else in Greek does it mean officer or military commander. Porter is wrong to suggest that it means petty king because γυμνήτων refers to a type of soldier, not a national contingent (contrast line 29). Cf. the metaphorical ἀνακτεὶς ναῶ at A. Pe. 383.

32 Φρυγῶν The Phrygians are tantamount to Trojans at 75 and 250, but in this song, as at 538-45, the chorus is making a distinction between the different allied contingents fighting under H. In the II. archery is a speciality of Trojans, like Alexander (II. 11.507ff., ib. 582ff. and 13.671ff.) and Pandarus (II. 4.124ff. and 5.97-100).

Murray's interrogative mark after Φρυγῶν gives an effective asyndeton in 33.

33 κεράδενα ἀπ. λεγ., cf. χρυσόδετοις ἔρκεσι at S. El. 838. The horn-bound bow is probably the composite weapon of wood, sinew and horn (see A.J.B. Wace and F.M. Stubbings A Companion to Homer (1962) 518-20). The scholion explains the word as τὰ κερουλκά, τὰ ὑπὸ κεράτων δεδεμένα (cf. E. Or. 268).

34f. τὰ μὲν ἀγγέλλεις... τὰ δὲ θαρσύνεις Cf. A. Pe. 215f.
καθαρός is used ‘properly of water that is clear or limpid’ (Barrett on Hi. 1120-25), and ‘clearly’ is obviously the meaning here. The use of the adverb is prosaic. Porson’s καθαρός is preferable to καθαρός (L) at Ion 1333 (see Owen ad loc.), and the only other occurrence of the adverb in tragedy is at Hcl. 1055 and this line was suspected by Barrett. However, we can also point to οὐδὲν τραυῳς at 40 below, and οὗ τορως at 656.

36 ἀλλὰ Ἡ Bothe’s emendation gives the best sense; ‘Why, are you frightened by etc.?’. See Denniston GP 27.

Accounts of Pan’s parentage vary. He is generally the son of Hermes or Zeus and Callisto (Epimenides fr. 12 Diehls-Kranz), and Euphorion (fr. 164 Diehls-Kranz) makes him the son of Apollo and Penelope. It is best to accept the interpretation of the scholion as παππωνυμικόν οτι Διός δς τὸν Ἀχιλλέα Ἀιακίδην. Translate ‘Pan, the descendant of Kronos’. Cf. Nonnus 10.13 Πανιάδος Κρονίης. Cf. also Aeacides of Achilles, after his grandfather Aeacus.

Pan is a musical god who roams woods and mountains (h. 19, cf. S. OT 1100 and E. El. 702ff.). His worship came late to Athens (see Herodotus 2.145.4, 6.105.2-3 and W. Burkert Greek Religion (1985) 110 and 172). However, at A. Pe. 449f. and E. Ion 492 and 938 we find him already localised as an Attic deity. By the period of classical tragedy he had also become associated with sudden 237 For Pan generally see P. Borgeaud Recherches sur le dieu Pan (1979).
alarms and terror, as here. Cf. E. Me. 1171f. δόξασά που Ἡ Πανός ὑπεράς ἡ πνεύς θεών μολεῖν, Hi. 142 (see Barrett ad loc.) and Ar. Lys. 2 (see Henderson ad loc.). See also W. Burkert ib. 417 n.37 and Nonnus 10.4 μανιώδει Πανός ἵμασθην. Paley compares the power of Dionysus to produce panic at E. Ba. 303. Pan is also associated with orgiastic revels at E. Hel. 189f. and S. Ai. 694ff.

36f. τρομερὰ | μάστιγι The adj. is transitive. For the idea cf. Il. 12.37 Διὸς μάστιγι δαμέντες. The whip of Zeus has been transferred in its suggestiveness to Pan to carry the implication of destruction.

37f. [φυλακάς...στρατίαν] see note on 16ff.

41 Cf. Il. 10.12, of Agamemnon, θαύμαζεν πυρὰ πολλὰ, τὰ καίετο Ἱλιόθε πρό. 'Ἀργόλας is a synonym for Ἀργείος. Cf. E. fr.630 (Nauck) and Ar. fr.311 (Kassel-Austin).

42f. πάσαν ἄν δὴ ὀρφναν Here ἄνα has a temporal force; 'the whole night long' (cf. 95). ὀρφνη has overtones of the dreadful and mysterious quality of the darkness of night and is used in conjunction with idea of deviousness or mystery at lines 69, 678, 697 and 774 below. Cf. Pindar O. 1.71-3, P. 1.23-4, E. HF 45f. and 353. Cf. also Il. 10.276 νύκτα δὲ ὀρφναῖην, at the point when Athene sends an unseen heron as an omen to the Greeks (cf. Il. 10.83 and 386). The juxtaposition with διειπετῆ is effective, like ἐννύχλως with θαρύβω at 45, and ἐννυχς with φρυκτωρία at 55. Cf.
the use of ἐυφρόνη (92n.).

διεπτῇ Papyri commonly mix up i and ei. διεπτῇ is preferable as it occurs in inscriptions. The etymology is uncertain. In Homer the word refers only to rivers and seems to mean ‘descended from Zeus’ (πιπτω), i.e. swollen with rain, because Zeus as the source of rain was thereby the source of rivers (see Il. 16.174, 17.263 and S. West on Od. 4.477, in A. Heubeck et al. A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey vol.1 (1988). At h. 5.4 it refers to birds, which suggests πέτομαι (cf. διοπτής ὅπως ἀντιρή at E. fr. 971.1f.). At Alcman fr. 3.67 it is also used of a star falling through shining heaven. Etm. Mag. explains (αἰθήρ) διεπέστερος at Ba. 1267 as ἀντι τοῦ διαυγέστερος (see Dodds ad loc.). Lattimore’s translation renders the sense well; ‘The positions of their ships are clear in the firelight’.

43 πυρσοῖς is pl. of (ὁ) πυρσός, (cf. loca in Latin) found also at 97 below. Cf. the pl. τὰ σταθμά.

44ff. At Il. 10.198 Agamemnon holds his council on the open plain, beyond the ditch where H. had turned back earlier that day. The author of Rh. transfers it to Agamemnon’s tent.

46f. νέαν τιν’ ἐφίέμενοι βάξιν The long iota in ἐφίέμενοι is an Attic usage. For ἐφίημι with acc. rather than the more common gen. cf. S. OT 766 and see K-G 1. 352 n.10. Translate ‘eager for some new report.’
47 ἐφοβήθην The guards surmise that the Greeks are panicking rather than planning an attack.

48 ναυσιπόρος στρατία cf. A. Ag. 987 ναυβάτας στρατός and E. IA 172 (see p. 43 above).

49 ὑποπτεύων τὸ μέλλον Traditional choral caution is also displayed at 332. Cf. ὑποπτοῦν at 79. At A. Ag. 489-92 the chorus of old men display suspicion about the nature of the fire signal.

50 ἠλθὼν ἄγγελος This epic aorist occurs also at 263 (lyric) and 660 (iambic). It is not found in A., only once in S. (Ai. 234, in anapaests), but is not uncommon in E. (9 times in lyric, once in troca. tetr., twice in iambic trim.). R. adds Neophron fr. 1 (iambic trim.).

51 H. acknowledges this as prudence in 52, but we should take fear to be their motivation (their fear of H.'s criticism is understandable. He threatens them with scourging or beheading for neglect of duty at 817). This prudence is, ironically, a neglect of their duty, which is to watch the Trojan lines. For a similar dread of royal anger when delivering news cf. S. Ant. 238ff., E. Ba. 670f., ib. 775 and Hel. 1550f. For the guards' assurance that they are doing their duty conscientiously cf. the scout to Eteocles at A. Se. 649-52 (see p. 42 n. 95 above).
52-223 First Epeisodion

For no new entry after the parodos see 69 above. H. orders a mobilisation for an attack against the Greeks and ignores the chorus’ cautious advice (53-84). Aeneas arrives and advises caution and a spying mission (85-130). After a choral strophe approving A.’s advice, H. consents (131-148). Dolon is chosen for the mission and sets off (137-223).

52-84: H. thanks the chorus and states his suspicion that the Greeks are trying to escape (52-5). He bitterly reproaches his bad luck (56-62) and the folly of his seers (63-9) before ordering an attack (70-5). The chorus leader questions the haste of H.’s decision but makes no impression upon him (76-84).

The epic source for H.’s speech is Il. 8.497-541, when H. orders the Trojans to camp outside the city and light fires to watch for the possibility of a Greek escape. Cf. esp. Il. 8.498-501, Rh. 57-64; Il. 8.510-11, Rh. 53-5; Il. 8.513-5, Rh. 72-3; Il. 8.515-6, Rh. 74-5. During the speech his character is established and remains consistent throughout the play. He was portrayed in the parodos as alert and responsible, but here, as well as daring fearlessness, he displays a ferocity and hot-headedness reminiscent of the epic H. The advice of the seers gives him a reason for stopping the fight against his will (cf. Il. 15.721ff.), and he displays a contempt for omens which is also a characteristic of his epic counterpart (see 65f.). Since the play is set in the field the dramatist ignores the tender side of H., as portrayed in his domestic surroundings in Il. 6. There is, moreover, a less noble side to him in Rh. than in the Il. This is illustrated by his reaction to D.’s request for the horses of
Achilles (184f.). The Iliadic H. assents immediately (II. 10.328-32) with dignity and generosity. Here Hector’s confidence is greater than his prudence, as he orders an attack without seriously considering the intent or disposition of the enemy. This confidence he derives partly from a belief that the gods are on his side (see 56n. and cf. also H. at II. 8.175ff., 12.235-6 and 13.825ff.) and partly from consciousness of his own might, which makes him egotistical (54 ὁμα τοῦμον, 55, 56 and 65 με. ὡς ἀγώ, as well as 58 ἀνε...δορί and 62 τῆς...χερί). In all, his diction displays a loftiness consistent with his imperious character.

The short exchange with the chorus before Aeneas’ entry raises doubts about H.’s wisdom, a matter taken up more fully by Aeneas. H. shows a tactless impatience with the chorus similar to that shown to the shepherd at 266ff. and to Rh. at 396ff.

H.’s proposal to attack at 70-75 is the first of four ambitious desires to decide the issue of the war at a stroke expressed in the play. Cf. the chorus’ hope that Dolon will slay Menelaus or Agamemnon (257f.), Rh.’s plan to sweep the Greeks from Troy (447ff.), and Greeks’ intention to assassinate H. (575ff.). It is the gradual thwarting of these desires which forms one of the strongest themes of the play (indeed of the tragic genre itself), namely the true weakness of man, which reveals itself at the time when he believes he is most likely to succeed.

85-130: The chorus leader announces the arrival of Aeneas (85f.). After an initial exchange with H. which establishes the details of the commotion and H.’s intentions (87-104), Aeneas politely informs his leader that his plan is ill conceived and dangerous, stating: 1) that H., as a warrior, should leave
planning to more able counsellors (105-8), 2) that he may encounter serious resistance (109-18) and 3) that Achilles remains a danger (119-22). He then suggests sending a spy to gather information before any action is taken (123-30).

At Il. 10.303-12 H. promises a chariot and pair as a reward for anyone willing to spy on the Greeks to discover whether they are contemplating flight or still guarding their ships. The idea of a spying mission is H.'s alone. In Rh. he is too carried away with the desire for action to think cautiously. Aeneas therefore thinks of the idea, just as Menelaus does for the worried Agamemnon at Il. 10.37.

Aen.'s part is small, but big enough to endow him with a personality. He is reminiscent of the Iliadic Aeneas, who is also an adviser, as seen at Il. 5.166-78 and 217-28, and a man held in high esteem, as seen at Il. 5.467f. (although it must be remembered that Aen. is not honoured by Priam in the Il. Cf. Il. 13.459ff. and 20.179-83). In Rh. he is even more reminiscent of the Trojan hero Polydamas (see 28n.). Cf. Rh. 105-8 with Il. 13.726-34 and ib. 18.250ff., Rh. 109-17 with Il. 12.60-79 and esp. Rh. 119-22 with Il. 13.746f. (Ritchie states, incorrectly, on p.66, that the menace of Achilles is added by the dramatist.). He shows a warm concern for H. and provides a stable foil to the other's impetuosity (contrast Diomedes' blunt disagreement with Agamemnon at Il. 9.37ff.). However, his advice, far from being useful, is pure folly. Had H. succeeded in mobilising the army he would have thwarted the Greek spies, who would not have found the camp quiet and would not have been able to get the password from the spy. The poet has made the military incapacity of the Trojans
an important theme of his tragedy and this piece of specious wisdom from Aeneas is a good example of it.

At 105-130 Aen. convinces H. to restrain himself until he has more certain information about the activity of the Greeks. At 474ff. below H. himself plays the role of dissuader as he tries to get Rh. to abandon his idea of an attack on the Greek mainland. At Il. 18.254-83 Polydamas advises H. to retreat within the walls. H. rejects the advice at ib. 285-309. Attempts are made to dissuade a character from fighting, also in vain, at A. Se. 676-719 and E. Hcld. 680-717. The same type of scene may have been used by the fourth century tragedian Astydamas in Hect. (TGF vol. 1 Astydamas II Hec. fr. **1 i), where a king (possibly H.), is about to arm for battle but is impeded by someone (ib. line 8) ἀλλ' ἐκποδῶν μοι στῆθοι (see Taplin (1977) 160 n.2).

131-136~195-200 Separated strophe and antistrophe: For the schema, and on the phenomenon of separated strophe and antistrophe see p.52f. above. See also R. 299f., A.M. Dale MATC 3.150 and O. Schroeder Euripidis Canticae (1928) 167. There are no significant metrical problems in the stanza. Nauck's ὂς in 197 and Seidler's excision of ὂς in 199 provide exact responson.

As well as the close metrical correspondence between strophe and antistrophe there are four syntactical correspondions: the cognate repetitions τάδε [nom.] ...τάδε [acc.] (131) and μέγας [nom.]...μεγάλα [acc.] (195), the infinitives μοιεῖν (134) and πέλειν (198), and the final finite verbs δαίμων (136) and φαίνεται (200).

Dochmiacs occur in every extant tragedy (see West 108ff.) and are associated with outbursts of tension and excitement. Cf.
especially A. _Eum._ 254-275, S. _OT_ 1313-1368 and E. _Ba._ 977-1023.

After their initial panic and call to arms in the parodos the guards grew less enthusiastic for instant action when H. himself urged it (76ff.). Here, after hearing Aeneas’ plan, they have completely changed their minds and urge H. to do so also. At this important point in the drama they provide the final encouragement, in urgent dochmiacs, for H. to abandon the mobilisation of the army. Had he followed his own instincts he would seriously have jeopardised the Greek spies’ chances of success. As it is now the army is vulnerable. This change of heart in the chorus is in keeping with the theme of the military incompetence of the Trojans (see Strohm 264). They are dangerously impressionable and careless of basic safety in military matters which should demand attention from any good soldier. The ultimate consequence of this is the assassination of Rh. There is, therefore, irony in their words, esp. line 132, which they deliver in ignorance of their own folly. C.W. Barlow (_TAPA_ 72 (1941) xxvii), who believes Rh. genuine, sees in this stanza a foreshadowing of later Euripidean technique by which a rhetorical contest between principal actors is decided by a third party ‘acting as judge’. This is plausible, since there is a similar _volte face_ by H. at 339ff. after a contribution from the chorus and the messenger (q.v.), but generally Rh. lacks the rhetorical fireworks displayed by E. (see p.83f. above).

137-148: Having given way to his seers the night before, H. now gives way again, to what _seems_ a good argument but is actually an ironic military blunder (see H. Strohm _Hermes_ 87 (1959) 259 and 264). Had H. had his way, the Greek spies would not have arrived
undetected, nor would they have acquired the password from the Trojan spy. In trusting the over-cautious Aen. he commits his first act of folly in the drama. His indecisiveness is also shown in 137, as he announces his reason for changing his mind: because the plan pleased everyone else. Such behaviour does not suggest decisive generalship and we discover, as the play progresses, that H.'s authority is gradually undermined as he fails to assert his authority in the face of opposition. Cf. esp. 339ff., where he is persuaded to accept Rh. as an ally after a blank refusal to do so at 319-26 and see 388-453n. For 137ff. cf. esp. Il. 13.748ff., where H. gives way to Polydamas' suggestion that the Trojan attack should be halted while they gather their strength. In the epic also (ib. 751f) H. divides the action which is to be taken between himself and his counsellor, whose task is like that of Aeneas here; ὥμεν αὐτοῦ ἐρύκακε πάντας ἀρίστους, | αὐτὰρ ἔπω κεῖος εἰμι etc.

149-53: H. asks thrice for a volunteer. When Nestor asks for a volunteer at Il. 10 204-17 he promises a rich reward; an ewe and a lamb from each of the commanders and a place at feasts and drinking bouts. Even so (ib. 218) the Achaeans fall silent until Diomedes speaks up. So too in Rh. a reply does not come until the third time of asking. The dramatic tension is thus heightened (Cf. E. IT 1072f., where Iphigenia begs the chorus to save her and Orestes; τί φατε; τίς ὑμῶν φησιν; ἢ τίς οὗ θέλει | - φθέγξασε - ταῦτα;). However, in the drama the idea of a reward comes from D. himself and H. appeals to patriotism alone, especially through the use of the word εὐεργέτης (see 157n.). We may have here a reference to the Persian practice of rewarding an εὐεργέτης of the
Great King (see Herod. 3.140.1 and esp. ib.154.1; κάρτα γὰρ ὑν [τοῖς] Πέρσης αἱ ἀγαθοεργίαι ἐς τὸ πρόσω μεγάθεος τιμῶνται. Cf. also the reward of the εὐεργέτης Ζώρυς at ib. 160.1-2.). This is possible, since H. is a barbarian king and Persian practices reported in Herod. frequently found their way into the behaviour of barbarians of all races on the tragic stage, regardless of their nationality (see E. Hall Inventing the Barbarian (1989) passim). There is an ironic overtone to the word here, however, because D. not only fails in his mission but also betrays both the Trojan password and the position of his commander’s bivouac.

154-194: D. appears at Il. 10.314. In the epic he is one brother among five sisters (Il. 10.317), a possible reason for his over-confidence when volunteering and his cowardice when faced with death. He is wealthy (cf. Il. 10.315 with Rh 170 and 178), of good family (cf. Il. 10 314f. with Rh. 159) and very self-confident (Cf. Il. 10. 324ff. σοι δ’ ἐγὼ οὖχ ἀλιος σκοπός ἔσσομαι οὐδ’ ἀπὸ δόξης. ἠ τόφρα γὰρ ἐς στρατόν εἰμι διαμπερές, οὐφ’ ἂν ἐκομιαὶ νη’ Ἀγαμεμνονέων, δῇ ποι μέλλουσιν ἢριστοὶ βουλάς βουλεύειν κτλ. with Rh. 155f. πάντ’ .. ἐκμαθῶν .. | ἡξω). In the drama however he is a different sort of character. He is arrogant, and is even impolite to H. at 193f. We are not told about how ugly or swift he is (Il. 10.316), nor are his sisters mentioned. The most important technical difference is that he does not play any role in the death of Rh. in the drama, whereas in the epic D. reveals the whereabouts of the Trojan leaders, the fact that the camp has not set any special guard, the disposition of the Trojan allies and the details of Rh.’s contingent, pointing out the prince as a potential victim for Odysseus and Diomedes.
(Il. 413-45). In the play this task is Athena's at 598ff. D. leaves, in disguise (see 201-23n.), full of hopes and boasts at 223, without meeting the Thracian. He is not seen again. H. mentions him at 524f., and the chorus at 557-60. We know from 573ff. and 591ff. that he has been slain by the Greeks and given away both the password (something obviously given out at the start of the night) and the whereabouts of H.'s bivouac. It is not explicit which of the Greeks kills him in the play, but the situation seems to mirror that in the epic. Diomedes strikes the fatal blow at Il. 10.455, although both are given credit for a part in the exploit at ib. 478, 526 and 561 (see Stagakin Rh.M. 130 (1987) 193-204). In Rh. Diomedes seems to be more knowledgeable about what D. had to say at 573 and 575, whereas Odysseus claims they both killed him at 591f. Finally D. is referred to by H. again at 864, when the general worries that his spy may be dead.

What then is the function of the dramatic D. if he does not betray Rhesus? Obviously it is of a different kind to that of the epic D., and he is not introduced solely to betray the password and the position of H.'s bivouac. Even so, this lack of connection between the spy and the Thracian prince has been seen by scholars as disruptive to the structure of the plot, and therefore the unity of the play. 238

The principal purpose of D. in the drama is to set the stage for the later appearance of Rh. with whom D. is contrasted and

compared. As far as the technicalities of the plot are concerned there is little difference between D. and Rh. Both are boastful and over-confident. They both assume that they will not only succeed in their exploits but take them even further. D. intends not only to gather information but to assassinate Odysseus and Diomedes (219-22). Rhesus intends not only to sweep the Greeks from Troy but to ravage Greece as well (469-72). Both are seen as figures of hope for Troy and both are assassinated ingloriously. However, the two are radically different in character. D. considers himself both brave and clever, and proposes to prevail by stealth. Rhesus believes only in fighting man to man (510f.). The Trojans first pin their hopes on the subtle spy who, because of his reliance on guile (though not his motivation), may be considered a Trojan version of Odysseus (e.g. 206 σοφοὶ παρ’ ἄνδρός. See also G. Paduano Maia 25 (1973) 23). When he departs from the scene their attention is focused on an even more impressive champion who, in his attitude to fighting and his desire for personal glory, resembles a Trojan version of Achilles. That Greek hero is matched against him in the imagination of the messenger at 16, of the chorus at 371 and by Rh. himself at 491. However both are killed within hours of offering themselves for the service of Troy. Both lack εὐβουλία: D. in putting too much confidence in his wolfskin, and Rh. in having too much confidence in his host and failing to set a special guard over his contingent (764ff.). The contribution of the dramatic D. is in the form of another step in the increasingly foolish over-confidence of the Trojans. He does not need to have known of Rh. to play his part in the drama. Indeed, even the information which he does give to the
Greeks has to be supplemented by Athena for their mission to be effective.

Another important difference between the epic and the drama here is the guessing game which H. and D. play over the nature of D.'s reward. At I. 10.303-12, H. asks the Trojans for a volunteer and explicitly promises the reward of a chariot and pair to be taken from one of the Greek commanders, without specifying which one (ib. 303-7). He then stipulates the task (ib. 308-12) and, after a brief silence, D. asks for the team of Achilles (ib. 321ff.). H. immediately consents, displaying dignity and generosity (ib. 328-32).

The author of Rh. has made his volunteer have the idea of a reward himself (161ff.). The situation is different to that in the epic where the glory of the reward, which H. has already offered, goes hand in hand with the glory of the exploit. This is also in the minds of the Greeks as they set off in the epic having been promised a reward (cf. I. 10.212ff., 281). That D. has already decided on his reward is clear from his indication that it should come from the Greek camp (172). The poet has also introduced the idea of D.'s patriotism into the play, which was not stressed in the epic. H. praises D.'s family and calls him φιλότολος, but this idea is only introduced to be undermined by D.'s motivating desire for a reward. This is an interesting variation on the epic theme; making D. stipulate that he will undertake the mission conditionally as well as wanting the immortal pair of horses which H. also expresses a desire for. There is also the foundation of a contrast between these horses of Ach. which are D.'s planned  

For horses as a possession suitable for princes cf. PV 465f.
reward, and those of Rh. which come to the Greeks as a stroke of good luck. All of this goes to show how poorly H. is served by those around him. His chorus is panic stricken and confused; his advisor Aeneas lacks foresight and his spy is motivated only by personal gain.

In the passage of stichomythia at 165-182 H. offers a series of rewards which he considers appropriate for someone of D.'s status and for the type of mission to be undertaken. Firstly, from Troy's own resources, he offers marriage to a member of the royal family (167) and gold (169). When D. intimates his desire for something from the Greek camp he offers a captured Greek to work as a slave (175) or to provide a ransom (177), and the right to make a personal choice of the spoils of war (179). He explicitly withholds only his command (165, see note) and the right to decide the fate of the principal Greek leaders (173). These rewards may appear particularly generous (especially the royal marriage, cf. 198), but from H.'s point of view they are all things which may be easily spared. Priam had many daughters and there was no shortage of gold in Troy. The lesser Ajax was a prominent Greek warrior, but he was not one of their greatest leaders, and H. would take the pick of the spoils before D. (cf. Il. 1.163ff.). When D. refuses all of them he cannot think of anything better to offer. Then, when the spy demands the horses of Achilles, H. is surprised that such a man should equate himself with his general by insisting on a prize more appropriate to a king than a minor noble and one which, moreover, H. himself desires (184). Nevertheless, H.'s word stands and he selflessly promises the team. D. then glories in the reward prematurely and tactlessly advises H. not to
be envious, adding, almost comically, that as ruler of Troy he has no shortage of things to delight him, even if he does not get the horses of Achilles. D. thus shows the limits of his understanding as well as his patriotism, for, by assuming that his commander is as motivated by gain as he is, he brings H. down to his own level of greed. At the end of this exchange we are in no doubt that D. is both greedy and arrogant. In the following scene (201-223) his valour is also shown to be naive.

201-223: D. tells the chorus how he will approach the Greek camp in the guise of a wolf. They wish him luck and he boasts of killing Od. or Diom. Unlike the epic D., the dramatic character has to go home (ἐκ δόμους ἐφέστιος 201) to get his ‘appropriate gear’; a wolfskin which he has kept at home, perhaps awaiting an opportunity to put it to use. He will set out to the Greek camp from his home (κακείθεν 203). At 223 we should assume that πρὸς οἴκους means simply ‘homewards’ and is not referring specifically to D.’s house. H.J.G. Patin (Euripide, (1894) 2.155) thinks that he intends to return to his tent, but the Trojans are bivouacking in this play and are not under canvass. Porter simply maintains that the poet has forgotten that D. is in the camp. But this would be too absurd a lapse for such an otherwise careful dramatist.

There are two objections to his return home; firstly, that his mission is delayed. This should not concern us in the drama because, whatever amount of time he takes, he is going to die at the hands of the Greeks. Secondly, he appears to be showing off. However these objections ignore the contribution which this incident makes to the action. Dramatic sense is possible because he hints at some sort of secret which will help him. This serves
to build tension, especially in the allusiveness of his references before explaining the disguise. \(\pi\rho\nu\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\) (202) and \(\pi\rho\nu\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omega\omicron\) (205) arouse the interest and excitement of the chorus. He now has their (and our) attention when he reveals his cunning plan, which is to dress up and to go beyond the requirements of his mission and assassinate someone. Thus, as the consideration of a reward rather than patriotism prompted him to volunteer in the first place, now he is prepared to ignore the urgency of his mission in order to show off his cleverness and indulge in a personal fantasy. His cleverness proves useless because the disguise does not work. Moreover it is not even necessary to wear a disguise in order to go spying.

Disguise is a common device in tragedy. Contrast the reference to the successful disguise of Od. at 530ff. and 710-15 below (cf. Od. 4.244-50 and E. Hec. 239-41). Cf. also E. frr. 679 and 698 (Tel.), Ba. 927-46 and S. Phil. 127ff.\(^{240}\) For animal disguise cf. Od. 4.435-53. Josephus (BI 3.192)\(^{241}\) says that Vespasian sent out messengers disguised as animals, a ruse also practised by North American Indians (see Wilamowitz KS 1.11 and Schreiber Ann. Inst. Arch. Rom. 47 (1875)). Cf. also Alcaeus 130.25 (=P.Oxy. 3711.32).

D. attempts to use the wolfskin as a realistic disguise for combat in the field. This is foolish because he cannot pretend to be a wolf if he is caught. He will tie its feet to his hands and legs, pull its head over his own head and walk on all fours if he is seen. For the pre-Iliadic tradition which is the source of this

\(^{240}\)See also Aen. 2.389-430, esp. 390 dolus an virtus, quis in hoste requirat?

\(^{241}\)See ZPE 68 (1987) 10f.
disguise, see p.15 above.

The precise origin of the pre-Iliadic tradition of D. in disguise is not possible to establish with certainty. However, it may well owe something to a religious practice of simulated lycanthropy. L. Gernet (Anthropologie de la Grèce antique (1968) 125-139) sees both in D.'s wolf disguise and his promise to return with the head of an enemy on what is probably his first military exploit, an echo of a primitive initiation ceremony into a band of warriors in which the initiate retires alone in the ritual semblance of an animal, and does not return until he has proved himself by decapitating an enemy as proof of valour and confirmation of his new status in the group (cf. 220). D., however, is a failure as a wolf. He intends to bring the head of an enemy, for which he will receive a pair of immortal horses, but ends up being decapitated himself in Il. 10. The failed initiate becomes the sacrifice himself (see Burkert ib. 46). The disguise is intended to characterise D. as cunning and deceptive; a warrior to mirror Od. in intelligence and to contrast with Rh. in bravery.

52 ἔς καιρὸν ἰκεῖς Cf. E. Hec. 666, Hι. 899, HF 701, Tro. 744, Hel. 1081, Ph. 106 and Or. 384, and καιρὸν γὰρ ἰκεῖς at Hyps. 60.27 (see Bond ad loc.). R. (251ff.) calls this phrase 'characteristically Euripidean', but cf. καιρὸν ἐς ἐφήκεις at S. Aj. 34 and ἐς αὐτὸν καιρὸν . . . πάρεισιν at ib. 1168. ἰκεῖς has more immediacy than ἰλθεῖς, which was probably written under the influence of ἰλθεῖν ἄγελος (cf. ἄγελων in L). We may add CP 1249

242 The pelt confers a symbolic invisibility, like the cap of Hades. See Gernet ib. 130 and W. Burkert Homo Necans (1983) 88, 90f. and 129. Cf. also the practice of calling younger boy scouts 'wolf cubs'.
to the sources which have a part of ἢκω.

καίπερ ἄγγέλων φόβον 'although you bring alarming news'.

54 ἀρείσθαι Fut. inf. middle after μέλλοντι, restored by Wecklein. The lengthening of the initial a comes from the contraction of the fut. middle of ἀείρω, the Ionic form of αἰρω. Cf. A. Pe. 660 and Se. 759 (both in lyric). For the phrase ἀρείσθαι φυγήν cf. 126 αἱροῦντα φυγήν and A. Pe. 481 αἱροῦντα φυγήν (αιροῦνται Elmsley (see ad E. Hcd. 505) αἱροῦνται vel αἱροῦνται codd.). R. (p. 199) mentions the phrase in Pe. but, wishing to bolster Euripidean elements in Rh., states 'Although this phrase is not found elsewhere, Euripides has such comparable expressions as αἱρεσθαί πόλεμον (fr. 50), αἱρεσθαί κίνδυνον (Hcd. 504)'. This is so, but we also find, with the same sense, πόλεμον ἀρασθαί at A. Su. 342, πόλεμος αἱρεται at Ar. Av. 1188 and κίνδυνον...ἀράμενος at Antiphon 5.63, so there are no grounds for regarding the phrase as peculiarly Euripidean (see also Fraenkel (1965) 231).

55 σαίνει. The meaning of this verb varies according to context. It is used of a dog wagging its tail (see Garvie on Cho. 194) and therefore of a creature fawning (A. Ag. 725). Cf. also, of people, A. Ag. 798, Cho. 420, Se. 383 and 704. Jebb says at S. Ant. 1214 (παιδός με σαίνει φθόγγος) 'It could be said of a sight or sound which appeals for recognition by vividly striking our senses' (cf. S. OC 320). Here the verb clearly contains the idea of an 'attracting' or 'appealing' effect on H., but the effect may
also be ironic, as at A. Pe. 97f. φιλόφρων γὰρ <ποτὶ>σαίνουσα [Hermann] τὸ πρῶτον παράγει | βροτὸν εἰς ἄρκυστ<ατ> Ἀτα and S. fr. 577.3f. (Teucr.) ἢ δ’ ἀρ’ ἐν οἰκότωι λήθουσά με | ἐσμ’ Ἐρινύς ἡδοναῖς ἐφευσμένου, or negative, as at E. Ion 685.

ἔννυχος φρυκτώρια cf. A. Ag. 588 νύχιος ἄγγελος πυρός. The noun is used of the fire signal from Troy at ib. 33.

56 ὁ δαίμων. δαίμων has a rich variety of application in Greek. In Homer it refers to a specific deity (Aphrodite) at Il. 3.420. Otherwise it may also mean fate. In this play it refers to a specific deity at 241 (Poseidon), and to deity generally here, at 183, 317, 729, 884 and 996. The use of ὅστις shows that H. knows that a god is against him but that he does not know which one. When used unspecifically like this the word commonly refers to any divine being whose attitude may be favourable, but also indifferent or even malevolent. Cf. esp. A. Pe. 472 ὁ στυγνὲ δαίμων, ὡς ἄρ’ ἐφευσας φρενὼν | Πέρσας. Cf. also ib. 158, 345, 354, 724f. and 911, S. OT 1311., E. Alc. 384, 913f., 935, IT 157, 204, Ion 752, Hel. 455 and Tro. 101. We may compare the English phrase ‘bad luck’. See also R. Schlesier Saeculum 34 (1983) 267-79.

eὐτυχεῖνη. The verb reflects H.’s frustration well because eὐτυχεῖ is used of prosperity which comes from the gods. See esp. Pindar I. 3.1-6 for the sentiment, E. Tro. 1162 Ἑκτορός μὲν eὐτυχεῖνης εἰς δόρυν and E. Hec. 18, where the phrase is also used of H. (cf. ib. 1210). Cf. also Rh. 60, 64, 319 and 390 and the
sentiment of 103 θεοῦ διδόντος πολεμίους. For luck in Rh. cf. also lines 218 and 728.

ἐνόσφισας with acc. of person robbed and genitive of thing stolen. Cf. E. Su. 539 and Alc. 43. For the sentiment cf. H.'s complaint to Zeus at Il. 8.236f. and Ach.'s complaint to Apollo at ib. 22.15-18.

57 λέοντα The omission of a comparative conjunction (such as ὡς) makes the metaphor a bold one. For the association of the speaker with an animal cf. Theognis 347 ἐγώ ὃς κώστα. For the lion metaphor cf. Il. 17.61-7 (see H. Fraenkel Die homerischen Gleichnisse (1927) 63ff.), A. Ag. 827f., of the Greeks emerging from the Trojan horse, ib. 1258 and E. El. 1163, of Clytaemnestra, Or. 1401 and 1555, of Orestes and Pylades and V. Aen. 12.4-9, of Turnus. The effect of the metaphor of a lion and his prey is to emphasise H.'s conviction in his own might and his belief that he is personally responsible for victory. Compare his annoyance later in the play at the prospect of having to share his victory with Rh., displayed first at 319ff.

58 σύρδην A rare word, from σύρω I drag or trail along. Paley compares A. Pe. 54 ('in a long trailing line', see Broadhead ad loc.), but the meaning here is slightly different. The scholion reads ὄμοι ἄρδην 'altogether' (cf. PV 1051), and this is the sense required.

59f. ἔξωσέχοντ. ἔξωσέχω means to hold something together and
requires an object so the reading is difficult to accept. Perhaps Wecklein’s ἔξελειπων should be read. R. (p.243) notes the similarity of construction between 59-62 and E. Alc. 360ff. μ’ οὖθ’ ὁ...κύων | οὖθ’...ἀν Χάρων | ἓρχ’ ἄν πρίν ἐς φῶς σὺν καταστήσαι βίον.

60 οὖτ’ ἀν Attic crasis for οὗ τοι ἄν. The enclitic particle τοι has the force of ‘be sure’ (see Denniston GP 547). For the crasis cf. Brunck’s οὗ ταῦ at S. OC 1351.

eὔτυχοιν ὁρν cf. 58 τῶι...δορί. For the relationship between a hero and his weapon cf. Turnus’ address to his spear at V. Aen. 12 95ff. H. extols his own might by personifying his spear so that he virtually becomes synonymous with it. This is a device frequent in Homer (see J. Griffin Homer on Life and Death (1980) 36). Cf. esp. Il. 8.535ff. ἐμοῦ ἐῷχος l...ἐπερχόμενον, and the vivid personification at Il. 11.574 [δοῦρα] ἐν γαῖῃ ἑσταντο, λιλαιόμενα χρός ἅσαι. Cf. also Il. 8.493ff., 16.834f. and 19.387ff.

61 πρίν ναῦς πυρῴσαι For πρίν plus infin. see K-G 2.458. For the idea of burning the ships and slaughtering the Achaeans cf. H.’s words at Il. 8.182ff. and cf. esp. Agamemnon’s report of H.’s threat at ib. 14.46f. μὴ πρίν πᾶρ νηῶν προτὶ θλιοῦ ἀπονέεσθαι, | πρὶν πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπήσαι, κτείναι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὺς (cf. also ib. 9.240ff.). The ship of Protesilaus is the first to be burned at Il. 16.122f.
62 τὴν δὲ πολυφόνων χερὶ Cf. 465f. πολυφόνου ἡ χειρός and E. HF 420 πολυφόνου κύνα. The adj. is rare but the formation is not remarkable. Cf. also 222 ὁδὲ ἀναμάκτων χερὶ.

63ff. κἀγὼ μὲν...! ἐν νυκτὶ...! ἄλλα There is strong emphasis in the positioning of these words as Ἡ. contrasts his previous intention to fight at night with the folly of his seers' advice. He lays stress upon the true wisdom of his own instinct as opposed to the defective technical wisdom of his seers. The use of θεός in 64 may a deliberate contrast with τὸ θεῖον in line 65 to highlight this. For μὲν...ἄλλα see Denniston GP 5.

63 Ἡ Barrett points out at E. ΗΔ. 700 that the first person form Ἡ was by far the more common form in the fifth century, and that ἢ was positively avoided 'even when metrically convenient'. However cf. E. ALC. 655 ἢ ζυγὸ σοι, which is printed by Diggle to avoid corruption (see also Jackson CQ 35 (1941) 170f.). Against this, and in favour of Nauck's Ἡ ζυγὸς σοι see Dale ad loc.

ἐέναι δόρυ Cf. the same periphrasis at E. Pho. 1247.

64 χρησθαί τ' εὔτυχε̣ ῥυμὴ θεοῦ. The word ῥυμή means rush, force or impetus. It appears in tragedy only here, although we find examples in comedy (Ar. Nu. 407, Ec. 4, Pax 86, Av. 1182) and prose (e.g. in Thuc., Xen., Arist. and Plut.). Although the sense of the idiom is obvious (H. wished to take advantage of an opportunity offered by god), the phraseology is unique. Fraenkel ((1965) 237) regards it as the senseless bombast of a tragic style.
which was already in a state of decay. Perhaps it is less bombastic than idiomatic, like the American English phrase 'a lucky break'.

65f. ἄλλ' οἱ σοφοὶ...μάντες is highly sarcastic, like 68f. For σοφός meaning wise in the sense of expert in divination cf. E. Ba. 185, of Teiresias, and Me. 686, of Pittheus. H.'s contempt for omens appears at Il. 12.195-250, when a bird of ill omen appears above the Trojans carrying a snake. He is urged by Polydamas to turn back from the fighting at the wall but rebukes him and refuses to acknowledge the omen.

με...εἶπεν The incorrect reading of VO (Attic aor. 3rd pl. is ἔφασεν) is probably an aural error for εἶπεν which led to the alteration of με to μοι in 65.

68 μένουσι The present tense makes an effective contrast with μεῖναι in 66.

θυσιάκος in Homer means specifically a sacrificing priest (Il. 24.221 ἦ οἱ μάντες εἶσι θυσιάκοι ἦ ἐρήμος). Cf. also E. Ba. 224, of the Maenads. LSJ etymologises the word as θυσ-σ-κοφ- cf. κοφ = cave. See P. Chantraine Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue grecque (1968) p.448. On sacrifices before battle see 30n.

69 An ironic touch. In darkness a heroic characteristic (μέγα σθένει) can be adopted by a runaway coward. There is also a foreshadowing of the parts played by D. and Od. later in the play
At Il. 14.81 Agamemnon expresses no shame at the idea of fleeing under cover of night: \( \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau \rho \epsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \delta \; \phi \epsilon \upsilon \gamma \omicron \nu \; \pi \rho \omicron \phi \upsilon \gamma \eta \) κακού \( \hat{\eta} \) ἀλώη.

δραπέτης Cf. E. Hcld. 140 (of the children of Heracles). The word is first used as an adjective at E. Or. 1499 δραπέτη\( \upiota \)...πόδα.

70 ἄλλ' marks an emphatic change of gear as H. stops complaining and turns to the matter of an attack. See Denniston GP 13f.

71 πρόχειρα 'at hand'. See Bond on E. HF 161.

72f. A vivid and ferocious picture. Cf. 100f. Cf. also the savagery of Agamemnon’s wish to destroy the Trojans, even their unborn children, at Il. 6.57-60. The lines are surely based on H.'s words at Il. 8.513ff.: ἄλλ' ὡς τις τούτων ἐν βέλος καὶ οἴκοθι πέσοντι. ἰ ὡς ζήλευς ἦ Ἰὼν ἦ ἐγχει ἐξυάντει ἤνη ἐπιθρώπωσκων.

72 ὡς ἃν expresses 'a purpose of the speaker which is capable of fulfillment in the future' (J.F. Dobson CR 24 (1910) 144). Cf. 420 and 473 below, Od. 2.111f., PV 61f., A. Cho. 439, 1021, S. Phil. 989, E. And. 589 and Or. 534f.

τις...δάνη The sing. of τις is commonly used with a pl. reference. Cf. E. Hec. 650 στένωι δὲ καὶ τις ἄµφι...Εὐρώτων and Il. 2.382ff.
καὶ νεῶς θρόλικων ἐπὶ i.e. even in the very act of escaping. Cf. 100 κάπιτρωσκοντας νεῶς. Cf. also Α. Ρε. 358f., where the messenger reports the deceitful plan of the Greeks to fake escape by sea: ἀλλὰ σέλμασιν ναὸν ἐπαυθορόντες. νεῶς (Δ) is probably a mistake due to the plural κλίμακας. The messenger at E. IT 1351f. reports the use of ladders to enter a ship from the shore.

73 νῶτων χαρακθείς Cf. Pindar P. 1.28, where Typhon’s back is ripped by his rocky bed under Αετνα στρωμά δὲ χαράσσοις ἀπὸν νῶτων ποτικεκλιμένων κεντεῖ. This is a particularly savage phrase. Translate ‘with his back ripped open’. Wounds in the front of the body brought one credit; a fatal wound in the back would mean disgrace for the victims (see Tyrtaeus fr. 7.21-6).

74 οἵ δὲ are those who may survive Η.’s onslaught. Making defeated enemies till one’s soil was an established punishment in the ancient world. Cf. Herod. 1.66.3-4.

λελημένοι Perf. pass. part. of λαμβάνω. λελημένοι (VL), a passive form of ληίζομαι, implies seizure and removal to another place, so is inappropriate. Paley is wrong to call λελημένοι the Ionic form. That would be λελαμένοι (Herod. 9.51.4).

75 Φρυγίων Trojans could be tantamount to Phrygians. Cf. ’Αργείοι and ’Αχαιοί in Homer.

γαπονεῖν To toil over the soil, i.e. to till it. γηπονεῖν (L) is more likely to be the result of a change than γαπονεῖν (see
76f. In complete contrast to their attitude during lines 1-33, the guards now warn H. not to jump to conclusions before any sure evidence is available. This is precisely the stance of Aen. at 94 below.

78 For γὰρ meaning 'else' see 16f.n.

πρόφασις Translate 'reason'. The word has a wide variety of meanings from 'pretext' (e.g. E. IA 884, 1180, Hec. 340) to 'underlying cause' (l.c. Thuc. 1.23.6). See H.R. Rawlings Hermes Einz. 33 (1975).

στρατώι Morstadt's dative gives an easier construction than the acc. in the text (pace Diggle). Porter wished to retain στρατώι and cited the accusatives in 108 to support it. However, the word governed by the verb in 107f. is, strictly speaking, ἀλλω. Cf. S. Phil. 1034 ἀυτὴ γὰρ ἦν σοι πρόφασις ἐκβαλεῖν ἔμε (Mollweide deemed this spurious, but see P.H.J. Lloyd Jones and N.G. Wilson Sophoclea (1990) 205).

79 ύποπτον See 49n.

80 H. tries to shame the chorus into agreement by implying that they are cowards. Cf. E. Hi. 519 πάντ' ἂν φοβηθεῖο' ἵσθι· δείμαινεις δὲ τί and see p.45 n.102 above.
stands for army (cf. 20). W.K. Pritchett (The Greek state at war vol.4 (1985) p.71) explains τρόπη as the moment when one side withdraws, without necessarily breaking into a rout. Here it means the moment when the tide of battle turned, and in this case a rout did follow. The same phrase is used, with the same sense, at S. Ai. 1275. Cf. also 116 below, ἐν τροπῇ, S. Ant. 674f. δορὸς ἐν τροπάς, and A. Ag. 1237 ἐν μάχης τροπῆς.

83 'That was your doing, now for the rest take care'. The chorus leader is politely reminding H. that it is his responsibility to take decisions (cf. the chorus' words to Electra at A. Cho. 113), with the implication that he should take them with circumspection.

84 Impatient with talk H. says 'It is a simple utterance: arm your hand to deal with the enemy'. μῦθος should not to be taken with ἐπ' ἐξθροᾶς to produce a general motto (pace Vater). Cf. E. (Arcelau) fr. 253 ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος, μὴ λέγ' εὖ, A. Cho. 554 ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τήνδε μὲν στείχειν ἔσω.

ὁπλίζειν χέρα The change in attitude of the chorus is highlighted as H. echoes their own words from 23 above. The sing. χέρα is supported by Π, the scholion, CP 2373 and Basil. Cf. 99 below and E. Or. 926 μὴ' ὁπλίζεσθαι χέρα.
85f. The chorus expect Aen. to bring news, but he does not. (see p.44f. above). καὶ μῆν is used regularly to indicate the arrival of a new character in drama, often with the demonstrative pronoun, the phrase οπονομὴν ποδός, and the verb of motion in the following line. See Denniston GP 356, C.D.R. Arnoldt Die chorische Technik des Euripides (1878) 346ff. and cf. 627 below.

Ἀνέας is scanned as two syllables, as at 90 below.

87 τί χρῆμα (adverbial acc.) serves as an interrogative for both verbs in 89. When meaning 'why?' this colloquialism is confined to E. See R. 252, Denniston on E. El. 831 and P.T. Stevens Hermes Einz. 38 (1976) 22. See also p.33f. above. The author has Aen. use a colloquialism when speaking to H. to illustrate the intimacy between them. There is no trace of the epic rivalry between the two men in Rh.

89 νυκτηγοροῦσι See 19n. Translate 'assemble at night'.

90 The sentence is a periphrasis for 'arm yourself'. For ὅμως in periphrases see H. Burkhardt Die Archaismen des Euripides (1906) 90.

πῶκας The middle voice is admissible but, as well as textual support for the active in CP 91, cf. πῶκας θάσσου at S. Aj. 581.

σέθεν The reading of L (τὸ σῶν) is a gloss on σέθεν.
92 δόλος (cf. 17 above). Valckenaer (Diatribe 102n.4) preferred λόχος, which is attested at CP 94 and written above the line by (possibly) Io. Catrares, the corrector of P (see Diggle Eur. 510.). δόλος is bold with ἔστάναι, but it is the more poetic alternative. Cf. also E. IA 788: (ἐπίδα) στήσοναι and S. OT 699 μὴν...στήσας.

eὐφρόνην was originally a poetic euphemism for night but in classical tragedy was synonymous with night. Cf. 736 and 852 below as well as 518, 617, 825 and S. El. 259.

93 In order to provoke a strong reaction from Aen., H. answers his τί δ' ἔστι; with an exaggeration of the situation and the use of two main verbs. Contrast 95ff., esp. ΜΟΙ δοκούσω, where he admits he is guessing after Aeneas has requested proof.

94 For the desire for proof cf. E. IT 1164 τί τοῦκδιδάξαν τοῦτο σ; ἤ δάξαν λέγεις;.

96 ἐς αὔριον 'until the morning'. Cf. 600 and Od. 11.351.

97 ἐκκέαντες Cf. E. Cy. 633, 657 and Ar. Pax 1133. For the ε after κ in this older Attic form cf. A. Ag. 849 κέαντες, and see Platnauer on Ar. Pax 1133.

eὔσέλμων The adjective is a common epithet of ships in Homer and gives the line an epic flavour. It occurs only here in
tragedy, although it is conjectured by Pierson at E. IT 1383 (εὐσέλμου Pierson: εὐσήμου L).

98 The position of φυγῆ at the beginning of the line stresses that the Greeks’ departure will be in flight, not in victory. Cf. φεύγουσις in 100.

99 Aeneas does not point out that H.’s words do not constitute sure proof, but politely leads him into discussing the practical implications of his hasty conclusion.

σὺ δ’ ὃς τί δράσων  Aen. uses σὺ δ’ to contrast H. with the Greeks. The fut. part. gives the phrase the feeling of a final clause. Cf. E. Me. 682. For ὃς with the interrogative cf. S. OT 1174 ὃς πρὸς τί χρείας.

πρὸς τάδ’ ‘in that case’. Cf. S. Phil. 568f. πῶς οὖν ὁ Ὅδυσσεὺς πρὸς τάδ’ ὁκ ἀυτόγγελος ἢ πλεῖν ἢν ἐτοίμας; Otherwise the phrase implies indifference to what has previously been said (see Hutchinson on A. Se. 312).

ὅπλίζει Middle, as at 23, because it refers to H. specifically. It is unlikely that H. arms himself on stage as there is no actual mobilisation until 986ff. (pace Burnett (1985) 19). His armour may be at hand however (cf. 71), possibly carried by his attendants (cf. 2f.).

101 Again H. speaks with great emphasis, using two main verbs
and the strong, metaphorical \( \text{\textbeta\textalpha\textrho\textupsilon\textomicron\textomicron}\). This word is used strongly at the end of a line by all three tragedians. Cf., e.g., PV 77, A. Pe. 515, S. Ant. 767 and E. Hclld. 4.

102 \( \alpha\lambda\sigma\chi\rho\omicron\lambda\nu\kappa\alpha\kappa\alpha\nu\) Disgraceful and harmful. On the dread of disgrace in Greek epic and tragedy see C.E.F. von Erffa Philologus supp.30,2 (1937). Cf. the sentiment expressed by Poseidon to Apollo at Il. 21.437f.

103f. \( \theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\delta\iota\delta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta\) For a similar belief that the gods are favourable to a military cause, cf. A. Se. 21, 23 and 35. For the phrase itself cf. A. Se. 719 \( \theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\delta\iota\delta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta\ \omicron\nu\kappa\ \omega\varepsilon\kappa\phi\upsilon\upomicron\omicron\zeta\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\alpha\) Just as \( \kappa\alpha\kappa\alpha\) serves as the object of both \( \delta\iota\delta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta\) and \( \epsilon\kappa\phi\upsilon\upomicron\omicron\zeta\) in A. Se. 719, so \( \pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\zeta\) here serves as the object of both \( \delta\iota\delta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta\) and \( \epsilon\alpha\omicron\omicr
The sentiment of these lines is a common one. Cf. Diomedes' words at 626 and cf. Il. 13.726-34, Od. 8.167ff., Pind. Ne. 1.25-8, E. Pho. 745, Su. 161 and, in Latin, V. Aen. 8.63.

ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ marks the non-fulfillment of a wish. See Denniston GP 104.

αὐτὸς...βροτῶ The phrase is sound 'The same one among men'.

109 ὁστίς = individual after generic.

110 φλέγειν There are three problems with retaining the reading φεύγειν: 1) It leaves πυρὸς λαμπτήρας dependent on κλίνω which does not take an acc. when it means 'hearing about'; 2) ἐξήρθης would have to govern φεύγειν Αχαιοὺς and mean 'carried away (at the thought of) the Greeks escaping', an awkward construction; 3) It does not chime in with the point of Aeneas' speech, which is to persuade H. that Greeks may not be fleeing. The idea of flight comes from H. alone. Musgrave's φλέγειν solves the problem. Translate 'You have been elated at hearing the Achaeans were lighting torches of fire'. For a compound of φλέγω with a similar object cf. E. Tro. 320 ἀναφλέγω πυρὸς φῶς. Parts of φεῦγω at the start of lines 100 and 104 may have influenced a scribe to write φεύγειν.

ἀγεῖν A fut. infin. normally follows μέλλω but it often controls the pres. and the aor. with a sense different from the fut.
111 τάφρονις The digging of the rampart and ditch in the Il. is suggested by Nestor at 7.337-43 and described at Il. 7.436-41. The γέφυραι (117) are causeways across it (first appearing with this meaning at Il.4.371), and the σκόλοπες (116) are stakes planted in it (see Dodds on E. Ba. 983 and W.K. Pritchett The Greek State at War vol.2 (1974) 139n.11). In the epic, H’s horses refuse to cross the trench at Il. 12.50-57. Eventually he is the first to breach the wall at Il. 12.437f.

νυκτ. ἐν κατ. See p.37 above.

112 αὐλώνων The word also means ditch at A. fr. 419 Radt and Herod. 2.100. Cf. also Carcinus TGF 1, 70.1d (Achilles) βαθεῖαν εἰς αὐλώνα περιδρομον στρατοῦ, of the same ditch. It means ‘hollow’ at S. fr.549 and ‘strait’ at PV 731.

113 κυρήσεις Ο has the aor. subj. κυρήσεις, but the fut. indic. conveys the conditional more vividly. For κυρέω with the acc. cf. A. Cho. 214, 714 and Se. 699. See also Schwyzler Gr.Gr. 2.104.5 and K-G 1.350.

114 βλέποντας ἐς δόρυ ‘facing your spear’, i.e. ‘standing up to you’. Cf. E. Su. 318 εἰς κράνος βλέψατα καὶ λόγχης ἀκμῆν and HF 163f. This is indeed the situation which greets H. when he gets into the Greek camp at Il. 13.145-8.

115 νικώμενος μὲν is balanced by νικῶν δ’ in 119.
We must assume the ellipse of δέδοικα here. The readings of ΔQ and Tr, cannot stand because of the omission of οὐ. Reiske objected to πάλιν because the action is not set at Troy itself and suggested πάλιν (adopted by Diggle). However, this also necessitates a change of τίμωδε. Cobet's οὔτι, which intensifies οὐ, is also adopted by Diggle. However, it is not easy to justify changing the text to this extent when an easier solution exists in adopting Schaefer's conjecture (μὴ οὐ in synizesis). There is nothing odd in equating the camp with the city here. The essence of Aen.'s concern is that H. might not return home. At Il. 6.367, H. expresses the same idea of himself, with great pathos, during his conversation with Helen.

116ff. The risks outlined will affect not only H., but the whole Trojan army. As well as outlining the dangers involved in an attack Aeneas is reminding H. of his responsibility for the safety of his forces which should be considered above his own zeal for victory. Cf. the chorus' concern at 131f. At Il. 16.370f., when the Trojans are routed from the Greek camp, many of their chariot poles are broken in the trench.

117 ἰππηλάται. Charioteers. The word is used in Homer of the hero in the chariot rather than the squire who holds the reins (who is usually a ἱππόρχος, like Rh.'s charioteer). See also 373n. and P.A.L. Greenhalgh Early Greek Warfare (1973) esp. 59-61. It is even used as a heroic epithet where there is no military context (e.g. Il. 4.387, Od. 3.436). We do not know whether the author of Rh. means heroes or squires here. It occurs elsewhere at A. Pe.
126 and possibly also A. fr. 36b, 4.3 (conjectured by Siegmann).

118 ἡ ἄρα μὴ (see also p. 35 above) is equivalent to εἰ μὴ ἄρα. K-G give examples of this (2.486f.), but they are mostly from prose. However, the disagreement in the MSS suggests corruption, so this peculiarity may not be problematic. For ἄρα in place of ἄρα cf. S. El. 1179, OC 409, E. El. 1229 and see Denniston GP 45.

ἀντύγων χνόας. The word ἀντυξε means rim or edge, and when applied to a chariot usually refers to the rail on top of the car itself, over which the reins pass (see Il. 5.262). When describing the destruction of Hippolytus' chariot E. uses the word of the rail at Hi. 1231: σιγῇ πελάξων ἄντυξι ἐνειπέτο. Cf. also S. El. 745f. ἔθρανε δ' ἄξονας μέσας χνάς καὶ άντυγων ἀλισθε. We see from Call. Hy. 3.140 ἄντυγκες αὐτέ τι ἐπὶ ἤρεια θηνήν φορέουσι that ἄντυγκες can mean chariot in synecdoche. χνόη means axle box.

119-22 Achilles will be a force to be reckoned with if the Greek camp is to be taken, even though he has retired from the fighting (cf. 491-5). In the epic Achilles is not drawn into the fighting, even though the Trojans breach the wall. At Il. 9.650-3 he considers intervening only when his own ships are threatened.

119 νικών δ'...ἐχεῖς ἔχω + pres. part. = future.

ἐφεδρον is a technical term from wrestling, cf. Pindar N. 4.96. Achilles is likened to a third combatant in a match who sits out the first bout and takes on the winner. At 954 the word is used in a non-technical sense, of the entire Greek army besieging

120f. The fut. indic. ὁκ ἔσετι shows Aeneas' certainty that Achilles will resist.

ὡς Ἀχαιοὺς...ἀναρπάσαι refers back to 100f., not to 74 (Paley) because Aeneas was not on stage at that point.

122 πεπύργωται θράσει Cf. E. Or. 1568 πεπύργωσαι θράσει and see p.42 above. It is possible that O's πεπύργωται was not a simple omission of γ, but written under the influence of αἴθων. On the metaphorical use of πυργός (not in S.) see Bond on E. HF 238 σὺ μὲν λέγ', ἥμας ὅς πεπύργωσαι λόγοις. and cf. A. Pe. 192 χ' μὲν τῇ δ' ἐπυργούτο στολῆι. Cf. also Od. 15.330 and 17.575. For αἴθων used of a man cf., as well as A. Se. 447f., S. Aj. 221 and 1088.

Achilles is by far the mightiest of the Greeks (Il. 1.88f. et passim). When Patroclus goes into battle in Ach.'s armour the Trojans are terrified (Il. 16.278-83). See also 491n.

123 For ἀλλὰ see 70n. στρατὸν μὲν is answered by κατάσκοπον ὅτι in 125.

124 ἐκ πόνων ἀρείφατων The variant κόπως is common in Koivī and more likely to be a gloss on πόνως than vice versa, although the corruption could easily be a calligraphic slip. ἀρείφατος is formed from Ἀρης and πέφαται, 3rd sing. perf. pass. formed from *φένω, I slay. In Homer the adjective is passive and means slain in war. Compound adjectives in Pindar and tragedy may be active or
passive according to context. Here it is active and means murderous, as at A. Eum. 913f. ἄρειφατοι ... ἄγὼν. See also 25n. above on τρομεράι.

125 κατάσκοπον R. believes (p.105) that it is only from this line onwards that people in the audience may begin to guess that they are watching a dramatisation of Il. 10, because it contains the play’s first reference to spying. He uses this idea to support the theory that a prologue is missing, but this is quite wrong. Knowledge of Il. 10 itself would have been enough to make the setting obvious as early as the parodos (q.v.) The idea of sending a spy in the epic comes from Menelaus at Il. 10.37f. Cf. also A. Se. 36f. σκοποὺς δὲ καὶ κατασκοπῶν οἱ στρατοῖ | ἐπεμψα, τοὺς πέποιθα μὴ μετὰν δῶς: and E. Hcid. 337f. πρῶτα μὲν σκοποὺς | πέμψω πρὸς αὐτόν, μὴ λάθη με προσπεσόν. A scout informed Od. of Ajax’ mad behaviour at S. Ai. 29f.

126 αἰρομέναι φυγήν See 54n. Cf. also Il. 10.310ff.

127 στείχοντες στείχω Cf., in a military context, Her. 9.11.2

128 For the idea cf. A. Se. 38 καὶ τῶν ἀκούσας οὐ τι μὴ ληφθῶ δόλωι.

129 κατασκόπον is genitive of source.

130 For the short summing up cf. the straightforward words of the herald at A. Ag. 582 πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον.
131f. τάδε...τάδε Great emphasis lies on these words as the guards give strong support to what they take to be the propriety of Aen.’s idea.

μεταθέμενος the aor. middle is preserved by Hn. alone.

132 For δέ where one might expect γάρ see Denniston GP 169.

σφαλερὰ ... | κράτη For the sentiment cf. E. Su. 508 σφαλερὸν ἡγεμόν θρασύς.

οὐ φιλῶ For this use of the first person cf. Theognis 579 and 581 ἐχθαίρω κακὸν ἄνδρα... And ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον and Archil. 114 (West) οὐ φιλέω μέταν στρατηγῶν etc. It is a common feature of tragic choruses that they are free to express their opinion during the iambics, whatever their status.

στρατηγῶν E. Hall observes (Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 158 and n.180) that a political contrast exists between free Greeks and slavish or despotic barbarians in tragedy and that this is nowhere better observed than in Rh., ‘where the Greek kings are designated either by their names alone...or collectively as generals (stratelatai 173, 495). In contrast, Hector and Rhesus are always anax or basileus...The Greeks’ epic kings have become fifth or fourth century generals while the barbarian kings have turned into oriental despots’. I do not see this political contrast at all in Rh. There is a contrast between Greek and barbarian but it is one of military cunning and skill, in which
both sides are ultimately the puppets of the gods (see also 294ff., 404f. and 833f.). More importantly, it is not the case that the terms used for the commanders in Rh. are as neatly applied as Hall believes. Here, at 132, the chorus use στρατηγός as a generic term only two lines after Η. was called ἄναξ. Specifically στρατηγός is used of Rh. at 298 and 642, and of Η. at 670. Athena refers to Rh. as Θρήκηκος στρατηλάτης at 670 and the verb στρατηλατέω is used of Rh. at 276.

133ff. Translate: ‘For what is better than that a swift-footed spy should go close to the ships (to see) why ever fires are blazing among the enemy in front of the ship stalls?’

134 ταχυβάταν...κατόπταυ The adjective is a άπ. λεγ., but is not an unlikely compound. Cf. ἄβροβάται at A. Pe. 1072.

μολείν Wecklein altered μολείν to σκοπείν to give the ὅτι clause something to depend on, but νεῶν...πέλας would make little sense with σκοπείν. The indirect question depends on the verbal noun κατόπταυ; a construction for which I can find no parallel.

135 ἂρα In questions where ἂρα follows an interrogative it is used to enliven the question by anticipating a clarifying answer (see Denniston GP 40).

136 κατ' ἀντίπρωπα υποστάθμων When the ships were beached, their prows pointed landwards and the camp was set in front of those prows. For ἀντίπρωπα used absolutely cf. E. El. 846 ἔστησαν
Pierson’s suggestion gives the best sense (cf. 662 tomos OL) does not. The army is to be calmed, not marshalled, as ἄν ἔνοιτ’ indicates (pace Paley). Contrast this calming but unwise instruction with the excited imperatives of the chorus at the start. The Trojans’ natural alarm has been turned into a careless complacency by Aeneas’ folly and H.’s impressionability.

The adjective has 2 terminations elsewhere: O’s reading is an obvious assimilation.

Aeneas will have to be recalled from his job of calming the army if H. learns of a Greek trick, hence the participle. ‘You will hear of it and, being present, will know the whole story.’ For πάντ’ ... εἰση ἔνοιτ’ cf. E. El. 346 τοῦ πάντα δ’ εἰση μῦθον.

For ὁρμώμενοι with ἐς φυγήν cf. Thuc. 4.14.1.

‘keep watch, expecting the blast of the trumpet, as I will not be waiting.’ For the participle of a personal verb with ὡς in an acc. absolute see K-G 2.95d and cf. E. Pho. 1460f. ἀνήξε δ’ ὀρθός λαὸς εἰς ἔριν λόγων, ἠ ἡμεῖς μὲν ὡς νικῶντα δεσπότην ἐμῶν and Ion 965 ὡς τὸν θεὸν σώσοντα τὸν γ’ αὐτοῦ γοῦν.

The army is not actually marshalled until 986-7, when all the damage has been done.
145f. As in the II. H. is anxious to get to grips with the enemy. Cf. II. 8.530f. In the epic H. is prepared to let the night go by first, whereas in the first two epeisodia of the play H. is obsessed with the idea of an attack, even after agreeing to call it off. ‘But I will mingle with the ship-stalls this very night, against the Argive army.’

προσμείξω By the end of the fifth there was little difference between μεί and μ in this verb. The spelling appears in inscriptions after E. (see West Aeschylus Tragoediae xlviii).

νεών ἔλκοισι is a periphrasis for ναυστάθμοις. The ἔλκοι were either the channels into which the ships were drawn (Vater) or windlasses used to haul the ships ashore. It is possible that the dramatist has in mind the Homeric phrases μάχεσθαι ἐπὶ πρύμνησι νέεσσι (Il.14.51) and ἐπὶ πρύμνησι μάχεστο (Il. 15.385).

147 νῦν γάρ is heavy with dramatic irony. A fatal mistake has been made but Aeneas can only congratulate H. on his agreement to leave the army undisturbed. ἄσφαλῶς picks up Aeneas’ request for ἄσφαλες τεκμήριον in 94 and the chorus’ dislike of σφαλερά...κράτη at 132.

148 ὅταν ἰδη Indefinite temporal clause. After this line the actor playing Aeneas leaves and changes into the shepherd-messenger. Taplin ((1977) 8n.3) believes that he may leave at 223, but not only would he serve no purpose by remaining on stage for so long, he would also prove unnecessarily tardy in
carrying out H.'s order to calm the troops.

149 Scholars are divided as to whether D. is already on stage or not when H. makes his request. Vater, printing λόχων at the end of 149, believes that he has been present in the chorus (i.e. the λόχος) from the start as a παραχορήγημα (cf. Morstadt (1827) 8 n.1. For the παραχορήγημα see A.W. Pickard-Cambridge The Dramatic Festivals of Athens (1988) 137). However, a παραχορήγημα was not taken from the chorus but supplied as an extra to supplement the cast, nor should an individual member of the chorus leave the orchestra to take on even a minor role. Moreover D. is not a guard but a minor noble (cf. 159f.). Porter suggests that he is one of H.'s ὑπασπισται mentioned in line 2. Burnett suggests (1985) 20) that he came on with Aen., and Taplin (1977) 8 n.1) simply asks 'when did he enter?'. I follow R. (113-5) in believing that he enters as he speaks his first line at 154. The fact that the entry is unannounced is not a problem. Half of the 272 entrances in extant drama are unannounced, as R. Hamilton observes (HSCP 82 (1978) 64). But he considers D.'s entry to be 'unanalysable' (ib. 70). It is possible for an actor to enter and remain silent for some time on the tragic stage, especially children or messengers (cf. E. Alc. 244ff., where Eumelus is silent for 149 lines, and IT 1205, where the messenger is silent until 1329). However, if D. had been on stage when H. asked first, why does he not answer until 154? An assumption that D. is present before 154 undermines the dramatic impact of the initial lack of response. The most dramatically satisfying interpretation is that D. enters after the last question and resolves the tension with his sudden arrival and
confident opening words at 154.

D. was offstage when H. asked his question, but within earshot, as his repetition of κατόπτης...μολεῖν clearly indicates. In tragedy, characters who are off-stage can overhear action and words on stage. Cf. 87ff. below, S. OT 634 and E. Hcld. 474. Characters may also enter in reply to a request from the stage. Cf. E. Hcld 646, El. 751, Hel. 437, Pho. 301, 1072 and Ba. 172 and 918. ἐν λόγῳ means 'within earshot' (i.e. within [the sound of] my word). Cf. ἐγγὺς ἐν λόγου at 641 below, of Paris, who is off stage. Cf. also S. fr. 314 (Ichneutai) 39f. [ὡς εἰτε ποι]μὴν εἰτ' ἀγροστή[ρων τις η] μαριλοκαν]τῶν ἐν λόγῳ παρ[ίσταται.]

In conclusion it is dramatically preferable for D. to enter as he speaks line 154. Textually it makes little difference, because, as Taplin observes ((1977) 8) 'The entry of a character (as opposed to an actor) occurs, in effect, when the character newly engages in or impinges on the words and actions of the play - and his exit when he withdraws from or disengages from them'. Cf. the exit of H. at 194.

149f. Cf. Il. 10.303 τίς κέν μοι τόδε ἔρχουν ἱπποχόμενος τελέσεις.

152f. H. declines to go himself and adds a note of irony with οὗτοι. He is busy and cannot be the only man available to help Troy and her allies at every turn.

154 ἐγὼ πρὸ γαῖας D. starts with a confident, patriotic At Ar. Av. 30 ἵνα τρέξη τοὶ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ the phrase refers to the audience.
statement which belies his true motive.

155 ῥίψας We find ἀναρρίπτω κίνδυνον meaning 'risk danger' in the historians. Cf. also E. Hclld. 148f. κίνδυνον εξ ἀμηχάνων ῥίπτοντες.

157 ἕξω 'πι τούτοις. ἕξω is like adero in Lat. 'I shall be back.' The Greeks sometimes use a simple verb of coming to give a sense of coming back cf. 223 below, A. Cho. 3 (cf. Ar. Ra. 1128) and A. Se. 41.

The conditions which D. sets are not mentioned until 161-3, yet ἐπὶ τούτοις normally refers back. Paley compares the phrase at E. Alc. 375, but that also refers back to the stipulations which Alcestis has made. Moreover H. does not acknowledge this remark and D. has to try again in 161. Jackson wishing to be rid of the problem altogether, suggested that τούτοις should be altered to τούτων, to stand for ἐπὶ τούτων μαρτύρων, but this introduces the unnecessary idea of witnesses, while D.'s principal concern is for his reward.

ὑφίσταμαι πόνον for the metaphor cf. E. Su. 189.

158f. ἐπώνυμος ...! Δόλων. H. recognises D. at once without the need for an introduction, so he is not an insignificant Trojan. The adj. means 'true to your name'. D. is guileful (δόλος, cf. 215 and see H. von Kamptz Homerische Personennamen (1982) 7c, 10a1, 47b3 and 68c2). Significant names are the objects of ironic punning throughout tragedy. Cf. e.g. PV 85f., A. Se. 577f. and 658 He compares [Dem.] 25.36 τι γὰρ οὐκ ἐξελήλεγκται τούτων ἐπὶ πάντων πολλάκις.

165
(with ἐπωνύμως δὲ κάρτα), Ag. 681-90 and 1080ff., A. Eum. 90f.
Ἐμῆ, φύλασσε· κάρτα δ' ὕν ἐπωνύμως | πομπαῖος ἔσθι., S. Ai. 430ff., Ant. 110f., E. Pho. 636f. and Ba. 367.

159 πατρός D. is Εὐμήδεος νῖθα | κήρυκος θείοιο at Il. 10.314f. The exploits of D.'s family which merit H.'s καὶ πρὶν εὐκλεᾶ δόμων are unknown. This is probably an invention of the dramatist.

160 διὰ τόσως ἔθηκας. With διὰ τόσως we might expect εὐκλεᾶ rather than the comparative, but the phrase seems to be an Euripidean tag. Cf. E. Me. 1195 μᾶλλον διὰ τόσως ἐλάμπετο.

161f. D. now reveals that he sees his mission in commercial terms rather than as the patriotic exercise envisaged by H. in 151. When Diomedes volunteers to spy on the Trojans at Il. 10.222 he sensibly asks for a companion, having already been offered a reward by Nestor at ib. 215-7.

μὲν V alone preserves what is surely the correct reading given the sequence πονεῖν ... πονοῦντα δὲ.

162f. μισθὸν φέρεσθαι ... | κερδός Even in the epic, the idea of the gift of horses is regarded as a payment for the spying mission. See Il. 10.304 δύων ἐπὶ μεγάλω; μισθὸς δὲ οἱ ἄρκτος ἔσται.

163 ἔργω For ἔργον as a patriotic deed cf. Alcaeus 34
τὴν χάριν τίκτει διπλῆν 'produces mutual gratitude' (cf. S. Ant. 14 μιᾷ θανόντοιν διμέραι διπλῆν χερί and see Palmer CR 4 (1890) 228). The gratitude is mutual because thanks are due both to the one who undertakes the task and the one who gives the reward.

164 κοῦκ ἄλλως λέγω is very much an Euripidean tag (see R. 206). Cf. 271 below, Hec. 302, El. 1035 (μῷρον μὲν οὖν γυναῖκες, οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω, a close parallel to Rh. 271), Or. 709, Hel. 1106. E. El. 226 and A. Se. 490 have οὐκ ἄλλως ἔρεις and οὐκ ἄλλως ἔρω respectively. Outside tragedy the phrase occurs only paratragically at Ar. Ran. 1140.

165 τάξαι δὲ μισθῶν The δὲ here stands for οὖν. See Denniston GP 170.

πλὴν ἐμῆς τυραννίδος Σ here reads γελοίου τὸ οὖν τὸ ἁπτόμενον, ὅτι βασιλείαν αὐτῆς. But H. is simply displaying largesse and effectively offering D. anything he wishes. He is more concerned with his forthcoming victory over the Greeks as commander of the Trojans, than with assuming that D. would want that command. What is amusing, however, is that D. reassures him that he does not want it. We must surely assume that H.'s phrase serves to prompt D.'s absurd reply and to illustrate the spy's narrow understanding of the military situation.
πολιόχον ‘protecting the city’ (cf. 821 ὁ πολιόχον κράτος). οὐχὸς, formed from ἔχω, is not a common adjectival ending, but its presence in both O and Q here shows good grounds for retaining it. We do find other formations. Cf. πολιόχος (V, cf. A. Se. 312f. and ib. 822f.), πολιάρχος (cf. Pind. Pae. 10.12 and A. Se. 109) and πολιέχος in CEG 235.

167 σὺ δ’ ἀλλὰ ... γενοῦ. Here δ’ ἀλλὰ means ‘Well then’ (see Dennistont GP 10). The tone of the imperative is dramatic as H. offers the best reward he can think of (marriage with his family), expecting D. to accept at once. Offers of marriage are also made as gifts in return for action in the Il. When Agamemnon repents of his anger against Achilles he offers him the hand of one of his daughters (Il. 9.144ff.). Cf. Orthyoneus of Cabesus who offers to sweep the Greeks from Troy in return for the hand of Cassandra (Il. 13.366-382).

168 οὐδ’ gives more continuity after 166 than οὐκ.

μειζόνων clearly means ‘too great’ here. It is revealing that D. considers himself too lowly to marry royalty yet worthy of the handsome prize of Achilles’ horses. There is more subtle irony in the words of Achilles when he refuses the hand of one of Agamemnon’s daughters at Il. 9.391f. οὐδέ μιν ὡς γαμέων ὃ δ’ Ἀχαῖων ἄλλων ἔλεσθω, ἢ ὃς τις οἴ τ’ ἐπεόικε καὶ ὃς βασιλεύτερος ἔστιν. For the sentiment that it is wisest to marry within one’s own social degree cf. PV 890 τὸ κηδεύσαι καθ’ ἐαυτὸν ἀριστεύει μακρῶν. Cf. also Call. ep. 1.11-16 and Pindar Py. 2.33f. On γαμεῖν
εκ meaning 'marry with' see K-G 2.309 and cf. Theognis 189, 190
and, with ἀπό, E. Or. 1676 and And. 975.

169 χρυσὸς πάρεστιν Cf. 178.

αἰτήσει λογίν Porter defends V's αἰτήσει but 'even the future
indicative with εἰ may be used in a present condition if it
expresses merely a present intention' (Goodwin M&G. §407-8).

171 Ἰλιον Diggle rightly observes (Eur. 324 n.9) that the
nom. Ἰλιον should be preferred to Ἰλιος in tragedy because the
latter is attested only in elegiacs at E. And. 103 and Tro. 1295,
which are both corrupt. Cf. Ilium in Latin. The line may have been
based on Il. 22.118 ὀσα τε πόλις Ὄδε κέκενθε. In the epic
the proverbial wealth of Troy had been greatly reduced since the
advent of the Greeks (see Il. 18.288-92).

173 δῶσω H., confident of his ability to defeat the Greeks
and award the prize, uses the future indicative. He puts another
condition on his offer (πλὴν στρατηλάτας νεῶν), but, like πλὴν
ἐμῆς τυραννίδος at 165, this is more of an indication of H.'s own
desire, which is to have the Atreidae at his mercy, than that he
seriously believes D. would ask for one of them.

174 D. mentions Menelaus assuming that H. would wish to
capture him above all the other Greeks because it was on his
behalf that the Greeks came to Troy.
σχέσθαι χέρα instead of ἀποσχέσθαι. Compare the construction with the ablative gen. at A. Su. 755f. οὐ ... ἡμῶν χεῖρ' ἀπόσχεωνται.

175 οὐ μὴν 'Surely you do not ask' etc. Cf. Alc. 518 οὐ μὴν γυνὴ γ' ὀλωλευ Ἀλκηνωις σέθεν. Denniston (GP 334) quotes both passages to illustrate a use of οὐ μὴν which follows a rejected suggestion and 'tentatively and half incredulously' offers an alternative.

Ὁλέως is scanned -. For the form cf. E. IA 193 and 263. We find Ὅληος .. νιός at Il.13.701. This character is Ajax the Less. He came from Locris and, in the epic, excelled with the spear (Il. 2.527-30). His followers wore no armour, but fought with bows and slings (Il. 13.712-18). He is often found in the company of the greater Ajax (Il. 13.66-80 and ib. 13.701f.), and is a particularly vicious and zealous warrior (see Il. 13.202ff., 14.442f., ib. 520ff. and 16.330-33). He it was who raped Cassandra in the temple of Athena after the fall of Troy (Iliu Persis (Allen 108.2f.). See also V. Aen. 2.403ff. and 414.). H. does not include Ajax the Less in the list of formidable Greek opponents at 496ff. His appearance here shows that H. considers him to be on an equal level with D. as a minor warrior.

ἐξαίτης is Middle; 'ask (for yourself)'.

176 D.'s assumption is that the captive will work his land (see note on 74f. above).
177 ἀπολυνῶσαι is the middle of ἀπολύω and rare. From D.'s reply the verb clearly means 'to hold to ransom'. Porter attempts a comparison with 466 but we have corruption there (see ad loc.). The active form is more common with the meaning 'to release for ransom' (see Hesychius; ἀπολύω: ἀπολυτροῦν and Dem. 23.33.4). The practice of sparing the lives of the enemy in order to make money from the ransom is a common feature of the Il., first appearing at 6.46ff., where Adrastus tries (unsuccessfully) to offer Menelaus gold, bronze and iron in payment for his life (cf. also Il. 21.34-135). It is worth noting the size of H.'s ransom at Il. 24.228-35. The situation in the drama is slightly different because the ransoming will occur after the war is over, not as the result of a chance encounter in combat.

179 καὶ μὴ sets off a new train of thought and may be a slight display of impatience. γς emphasises λαφύρων. The particles are repeated at 184 with a more adversative force.

αὐτὸς ἀἵρησι παρῶν D. is invited to attend the division of spoils after the fall of Troy in person and to make his own choice of them rather than having to be content with an allocation. The general took first choice while the rest usually took what they were given (cf. Il. 1.118-29 and E. Tro. 273). For the division

246 Twelve cloaks, robes, coverlets, mantles and tunics, ten talents of gold, four cauldrons, two tripods and a Thracian cup.

247 Agamemnon offers Achilles the pick of the spoils of Troy at Il. 9. 135-140. When he sees the success of Teucer's archery at Il. 8.280-291, he offers him second place at the choice of the spoils, after himself. At Il. 17.229-32 Hector offers to halve the spoils between himself and the man who drags Patroclus' corpse over to the Trojan side.
of spoil after a battle see W.K. Pritchett The Greek State at War vol.1 (1969) ch.3.

180 For the practise of hanging up spoils to the gods see Pritchett ib. 3.278, and cf. Il. 7.81ff., A. Se. 278 and 479. The herald’s boast at A. Ag. 578f. has a similar phrasing (see p.41 n.91): ὶθεοῖς ἀφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ’ Ἑλλάδα | ὀμοῖς ἐπαυάλειναν. Cf. also E. Hcid. 698 where Iolaus asks for his armour to be taken from the peg where it hangs, and E. And. 1121f., where the unarmed Neoptolemus snatches arms pegged to a column. At E. Ba. 1213f. Agaue calls for a ladder so that she may nail her spoil (Pentheus’ head) to the triglyphs.

181 H. has now exhausted what he considers to be suitable rewards for D. A team of horses has not occurred to him.

182f. ὧπποις Ἀχιλλέως. D.’s announcement is in a strongly emphatic position, to add to the surprise after his rambling lead-up. For the varying sex of the horses in Rh. see p.38f. above. Xanthus and Balius were born of the Harpy Podarge and Zephyrus. They were given to Peleus by Poseidon and given in turn to Achilles (see 188f. and 240f. below, Il. 16.149, 381, 867, 17.443ff. and 23.277f. and Apollodorus 3.13.5). They were as swift as their father Zephyrus (Il. 16.149, 19.415f.) and were immortal (cf. 185 below).248

248 At Il. 17.437ff. they mourn silently for the death of Patroclus and at Il. 19.405-17 Hera grants them the gift of speech and prophecy, just before they bear Achilles to battle. The horses of Achilles are the best team in the Greek force in the Il. (2.770), and are seen as great potential prizes by H. as he watches them with Aeneas at Il. 17.486-9. When Od. captures D. in the epic he
χρῆ...πονεῖν Cf. 161. There is great irony here because D. himself is not worthy of the horses.

183 ἐν κύβοις δαίμονος Cf. 446 below. Dicing is a soldiers’ game, so the image readily occurs to D. Cf. Eteocles, also in a military context, at A. Se. 414 ἔργον ὑ' ἐν κύβοις Ἀρης κρινεῖ. Cf. also E. Su. 330f. and fr. 402.6. For the metaphor see F. Chapoutier Ent. Fond. Hardt 1 (1952) 210.

184 At Il. 10.328-31, H. consents at once to D.’s request and swears an oath to that effect. The dramatist has invented H.’s desire for the same horses. The effect of this is to emphasise their value as an appropriate prize for a general of H.’s standing and therefore their inappropriateness for a man like D.

καὶ μὴν has a strongly adversative force here, raising a difficulty affecting the previous speaker’s proposal. See Denniston GP 357 and Jebb on S. Aj. 531, where Tecmessa has been asked to fetch Ajax’s son; καὶ μὴν φόβοισι γ’ αὐτὸν ἐξελυσάμην.

ἔρωτι γ’ ἀντεράς ‘You are a rival in desire to me who also desire the horses’. The verb ἀντερᾶω is used like this at Plut. Lycurg. 18.4.7 τὸ ἀντερᾶω οὐκ ἦν. Porter says it does not occur in Gk. until Plut. Soll. An. 972d7, but the noun ἀντεραστής meaning ‘rival in love’, is found at Pl. Resp. 521b5, [Pl.] Amat. 132c5, 133b3 and Ar. Eq. 733, and at A. Ag. 544 (τῶν ἀντεράστων ἐμέρων mocks him for his desire for the horses because they can only be mastered by Achilles (Il. 10.401-4). The same warning is given to H. by Apollo at Il. 17.75f. (cf. the reluctance of Pandarus to drive the horses of Aeneas because they are not familiar with his hands at Il. 5.230-4).
the participle means ‘those who love in return’. At 839 below (ἐπιπτών ἐφασθείς), the first suspicion of Rhesus’ charioteer is that H. is so carried away by desire for Rh.’s horses that he has arranged for the Thracian to be murdered in order to steal them. H. denies this emphatically at 859f. μὴ μ’ ἐρως ἔλοι | τοιοῦτος ἐπιπτω κτλ. When ἐρῶ is followed by the gen. rei, it implies intense desire for something which is not necessarily sexual (cf. A. Se. 392 μάχης ἐρῶν and E. Pho. 359 πατρίδος ἐρῶν). Use of the verbs here creates the impression of an intensity of competition between H. and D. like that between rivals in love.

The rhetorically effective paregmena here and in the following line display H.’s shock at discovering that D. also wants the horses. For examples of paregmenon with a combination of simple and compound verb cf. S. OT 306 πέμψασιν ἡμῖν ἀντέπεμψεν, E. Alc. 1103 νικῶντι μέντοι καὶ σὺ συννικάίς ἐμοί and HclD. 26f. ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν φεύγουσι συμφεύγω τέκνοις | καὶ ὁν κακῶς πράσσουσι συμπράσσῳ κακῶς.

185 When Patroclus takes the chariot and arms of Achilles to fight the Trojans, he adds Pedasus, a mortal trace horse, to the team (Il. 16.152ff.), who is eventually killed by Sarpedon at Il. 16.468f.

187f. Cf. 240f. In the Il. the horses of Aeneas also have a pedigree as god-given gifts; from Zeus to Tros. They were then stolen by Anchises who gave them to Aeneas (Il. 5.265-720).

αὐτῶς See p.38 n.82 above.

174
188 ὃς λέγουσι Cf. λόγος ἦ at 493. For the idiom generally see Willink on E. Or. 5 (and 8) and T.C.W. Stinton Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy (1990) 242f. and cf. Pindar Ol. 7.55f.

189 δῶσω δὲ σοι. Cf. Il. 10.305 δῶσω γὰρ δίφρον τε δῶ. H. now makes his second concession in the play (see 137n.). He has invited D. to make his own choice of reward, with certain limits expressed at 165 and 173. However, not knowing what was in D.’s mind, he did not exclude these horses from the offer. When D. asks for the team the general can do no more than ostentatiously express his own desire for them and magnanimously promise them. Although the concession is not an important one with consequences for the action of the play, it nevertheless contributes to the picture of H. as a man who, despite being commander-in-chief, is unable to realise his personal desires when they are at odds with the wishes of others.

189 σ’ ἐπάρας nom. aor. part. of ἐπαίρω. ‘Having raised you [i.e. your hopes].’

190 κάλλιστον ὁκοίς κτῆμα Cf. 620 κάλλιστον ὁκοίς σκῦλον, and E. Pho. 88 ὃ κλεινὼν ὁκοῖς ... θάλος. For the dat. cf. E. El. 1003 καλὸν δὲ κέκτημαι ὁμοῖοι. Cf. also the glory which awaits Diomedes and Sthenelus if they win the horses of Aeneas at Il. 5.273. D. takes up κάλλιστον in the following line.
191 ἀἱνὼ is used alone to mean ‘yes’ in the same position in the line at E. fr. 603 (Pel.) and IT 1486. Cf. also E. HF 275 and Alc. 1093.

δ’ ἄν Verrall’s ἄν is needed because D. is speaking of a future hypothetical situation. The particle can be taken with ὄχεσθαι, but it must stand second in its clause. See K-G 1.242 and cf. Thuc. 1.11.2.2, ὅσιδίως ἄν μάχη κρατοῦντες εἶλον, where ἄν goes with εἶλον, but is positioned at the start of the sentence.

192 εὐσπλαγχνίας The noun is not found in A., S. or E. The sense of ‘courage’ is easy to deduce (cf. ‘guts’ in English). It is not found again until papyri later than the fourth century, but the adj. εὐσπλαγχνος appears in a fr. of A. at P.Oxy. 2246.34, and we find a number of tragic words ending in -σπλαχνος (A. Se. 237 κακοσπλάχνους, S. Aj. 472 ἄσπλαχνος, Ant. 511 ὄμοσπλάχνους, E. Me. 109 μεγαλόσπλαχνος and Hi. 424 θρασύσπλαχνος). D. is stressing his courage here, but it is his ingenuity that he truly prizes (see 201-23n.).

After these lines H. does not speak again until 264, when the messenger addresses him with ἄναξ. He is clearly on stage at 194 because D. is still addressing him. Does he then leave the stage before the separated antistrophe to reappear at 264, or is he on stage throughout the stasimon? R. (115-8) prefers the latter; Wilamowitz (Hermes 61 (1926) 287) thought that textual ambiguity
over such a question is clumsy and uncharacteristic of E. and earlier tragedy, and W. Kranz (Stasimon (1933) p.263ff.) believes that H. does remain on stage and sees the phenomenon as a mark of deliberate archaising. H.J.G. Patin (Euripide, (1894) 2.155) believes that he retires into a tent, but there is no tent on stage (see note on prologue). There are examples of characters remaining on stage during choral songs which are neither archaic nor archaising. There are also examples of characters remaining silent on stage for long periods of dialogue. However, where the presence of a character is ambiguous we must make a judgement based on sense. H. clearly must go straight after 194. During the discussion about the wolfskin, the guards and D. speak only to each other and H. is completely unaware of this significant disguise. If he were present D. and the guards would not ignore their commander, especially after his remark ἐπώνυμος ... Δόλων at 158f. Since it is usual for the dramatically dominant character to have the last word before his departure (see Taplin (1977) 205 and 310), the silent, unmotivated exit of H. focuses our attention strongly on D., who is to emerge as the new hope of the Trojans.

195-200 Antistrophe of 131-6 (q.v.). The guards comment on D.'s enterprise and reward in excited dochmiacs.

195 μέγας ἄγων refers to D.'s mission and μεγάλα to the reward he hopes to win.

196 μακάριός The word is not in A or S but is used frequently by E. As opposed to μάκαρ, it is used solely of men and not gods (see M. Macdonald IllinoisCS 4 (1979) 27-33.). Cf. felix in Latin.

198 μέγα ... ι πέλενυ refers to D.'s rejection of a royal bride at 168. The chorus are impressed that D. has been offered and has refused such a reward because to men of their lowly status such a prospect is too remote.

199f. Gasparus writes (in Stephanus' ed. (1602)) 'varie haec verba exponi solent. Lector suo utatur iudicio'. The problem has remained for modern scholars. Clearly τὰ θεόθεν is balanced by τὰ δὲ παρ' ἀνδρᾶσιν (for δὲ without a previous μὲν where the contrast is obvious, see Denniston GP 165). But what do τὰ...τὰ refer to? Vater explains 'ubi divina praemia largiatur Dica, hominum res videntur perfectae, h.e. quae apud homines in honore sunt, spernenda prae iis videntur'. He assumes that τὰ θεόθεν are the horses of Achilles and τὰ παρ' ἀνδρᾶσιν the rewards offered by H. However this interpretation is too forced, especially for the imperative ἐπιδέω. Lattimore supplies ὅκε with ἐπιδέω and translates; 'May the gods grant that Right's eyes be on you as men now grant that all you deserve shall be yours'. The sense preferred by Paley, Porter and Way is 'As for what comes from the gods [i.e. success or failure] let Justice see to it; but as to men's part in the matter [i.e. what is in their mortal power to grant] the perfect lot seems yours'. The problem with this is that παρά with the dat. is the equivalent of apud in Latin, whereas for
the last interpretation we would rather expect Wecklein's πορ' ἀνέρω (from men), to balance τὰ θεόθεν. This is an attractive proposal, but I think that the dat. can be defended if we translate: 'Let Justice see to what comes from the gods [i.e. success or failure], but in mortal terms things seem perfect for you'. Perhaps the author had in mind Λ. Se. 415f. Δίκη δ' ὁμαίμων κάρτα νῦν προστέλλεται ἵνα ἐξέρχεσθi τεκούση μητρὶ πολέμιον δόρυ.

The antistrophe closes at a point in the drama where all immediate problems of the night seem to be solved. The army is being calmed by Αeneas; a scout has been chosen and his reward decided. All the Trojans seem to have to do is wait for the scout’s news and act upon it. In fact the Trojans’ troubles have yet to begin.

201 ἂν For the opt. with ἂν expressing a fixed resolve see Jebb on S. Ant. 1108 δ' ὃς ἔχω στείχοιμ' ἂν. στείχοιμ' ἂν is sometimes used in E. by people announcing an intention to depart. Cf. Ba. 515, 845, Ion 418 and 668.

ἐλθὼν...ἐφέστιος cf. the almost identical phrase at S. Tra. 262 ἐλθόντι ἐς δόμους ἐφέστιον. Cf. also E. Me. 712f. μ(ε) ...! δέξαι δὲ χώραι καὶ δόμους ἐφέστιον and Λ. Ag. 851f. δόμους ἐφεστίος ἵνα ἐλθῶν, and see Hutchinson on Λ. Se. [73].

202 καθάφομαι 'I shall cover'. For the construction cf. Anth. Pal. 9.19, ὁ πρὶν ὅπαι μίτραις καλὰ καθαφάμενος, where the aorist middle is used as if it were a passive (cf. E. fr. 752.2 νεβρῶν.
At S. Tra. 1051f. the verb means 'fasten to' καθήψεν ὁμοίας τοῖς ἐμοίς ..1. ἀμφίβλητρον. It appears with a preposition at E. Ion 1006 ἐν τῷ καθάψαι ἀμφὶ παιδὶ σώματος;.

203 ἦσω ... πόδα cf. 798 ἔσων ... πόδα. There is nothing comparable for the use of this phrase meaning 'go' with πόδα at the end of the line. Fraenkel ((1965) 237f.) believes that such line endings are symptomatic of the senseless bombast of a style of tragedy which was already in decay (cf. 142n.). He also points out that the phrase ἄκα δ' ἐγὼ καθύπερε πόδας καὶ κείρε φέρεσθαι at Od. 12.442 'I let my hands and feet go from above' is quite different, and that any attempt to read ποὶ δ' ἦσω πόδα or ποὶ πόδα δ' ἦσω for the corrupt ποὶ [or πῆ] δ' ἦσω; at E. Hec. 163 on the basis of either Rh. 203 or 798 is invalid (Diggle suggests ποὶ δὴ σωθῷ there).

204 ἐπεί τίν' ἀληθ..στολῆν; For the use of ἐπεί plus τίς Paley compares A. Cho. 214 ἐπεί τί νῦν ἔκατι δαιμόνων κυρῦ; and E. Or. 526 ἐπεί τίν' εἶχες, ὦ τάλας, ψυχήν τότε. στολῆν means 'garb'. Cf. 313, 503 and 712. The guards assumed that the ordinary garb of a soldier would have sufficed for the mission.

205 κλωπικοῖς τε βήμασι The adj. occurs in Greek only here and at 512 below (κλωπικᾶς ἔδρας). R.'s citation of κλωπικόν at Pl. Crat. 408A is inaccurate (see Fraenkel (1965) 230). Adjectives in -ικος (apart from proper names) are not common in Homer or pre-fifth century literature, but their numbers increased greatly to accommodate sophistic and philosophical language in the fifth
and fourth centuries (see C.D. Buck & W. Petersen *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (1944) 636ff. and T.C.W. Peppler *AJP* 31 (1910) 429ff.). Rh. has three other such adjectives; ἱππικός at 307 and 569, πτωχικός at 503 and πωλικός at 567, 621, 784 and 797. κλωπικός and πτωχικός occur only in Rh.; ἱππικός and πωλικός are found in A., S. and E.

206 The chorus display their own limited understanding by acknowledging that they consider D. to be clever. For the paregmenon cf. E. Ba. 178f. γῆρων .. κλών | σοφήν σοφοῦ παρ’ ἀνδρός.

207 σαξή Cf., also in context of disguise, A. Cho. 560 ἔσων γὰρ εἰκώς, παντελὴ σαξῆν ἔχων.

208 νῦν ἐνάψωμαι Cobet (*Variae lectiones* (1873) 583) objects to νῦτον ἁψωμαι (Δ), because, when referring to the act of clothing or covering something the compound verb is used. The word does not occur with this meaning in A. or S. Cf. E. Ion 1490, with the dative of person clothed, σπάργαν’ ἄμφιβολα σοι τάδ’ ἄνηψα. It is conjectured by Scaliger at E. HF 549 θανάτου τάδ’ ἦδη περιβόλαι’ ἐνήμεθα (ἀνήμεθα codd.). Diggle accepts the conjecture here. This creates elision at the close of the third foot, giving a weak caesura. Rh. is generally sparing in the admission of rarer caesurae and this instance is comparable only with 986 below.

209 The gaping jaws of the wolf will sit on his head like the
jaws of Heracles' lionskin at HF 362f. ξανθῶν κράτ' ἐπιμυαίσας ἔδεινοι χάσματι θηρός.

211f. tetrapous The e is long (positio debilis). The scholion says that the four-footed walk is incredible (ἀπίθανον), but ἀπίθανον is used here of a very subjective judgement (cf. Σ E. Hec. 241 and Σ Or. 176), and takes no account of E. Hec. 1058f., τετράποδος βάσιν θηρός ὀρεστέρον τιθέμενος ἐπὶ χειρα κατ' έχυνος; (see also R. Goossens AC 1 (1932) 93ff., esp. 132).

212 κέλευθον here seems to depart slightly from its usual meaning of 'path', and instead means 'way of walking'. This is a highly unusual sense, not found elsewhere. The nearest example, at E. Tro. 887f. δι' ἀψόφου βαίνων κέλευθον, is probably too metaphorical to use as a parallel.

213 νεών προβλήμασιν i.e. the palisade guarding the ships.

215 δίβαμος The word occurs in Greek only here and in E. Cret. (P. Oxy. 2461.1.15, see also H.J. Mette Hermes 91 (1963) 256), where it confirms the use of the word in a similar context, of the Minotaur, [τετράσκελῆς γ' ἀφ' ἀ. δίβαμος ἔρχεται:]. By way of analogy Musgrave compares Pind. Py. 9.20 παλλιβάμοις ὀδοὺς. Cf. also E. Tro. 517, of the Trojan horse, τετραβάμονος ώς ὑπ' ἀψόνας, and Hel. 375 τετραβάμοι γνίσις.

For τῆδε σύγκειται δόλος cf. 158f.

216 ἀλλ' Translate 'well'. ἀλλά is sometimes used to begin an
answer which takes the form of a wish and does not form a strong
adversative break with what went before. See Denniston GP 15 and
cf. esp. E. Me. 759f.

δ Μαίας παῖς According to Hesiod Th. 938 Hermes was the son
of Zeus and Maia, daughter of the Titan Atlas (cf. h. 4.1,
18.3f.). Hermes mentions Maia as his mother in the opening lines
of E. Ion. He was herald of the gods and an escorter of men. Zeus
bids him escort Priam to Achilles’ hut at Il. 24.334–8 and he is
escorting Perseus on Achilles’ shield at E. El. 462f. These lines
in Rh. may be compared with E. Me. 759f., where Medea invokes
Hermes to accompany Aegeus home ἄλλα σ’ ὁ Μαίας πομπαίος ἄναξ ἀπ’
πελάσσει δόμοις (cf. also A. Eum. 90f.). Hermes is also a lover of
the guileful who is here asked to escort the guileful Dolon. Cf.
S. Phil. 133 Ἐρμῆς ὡς ὁ πέμπων δόλιος ἔγγισεντο νῶν, and S. El.
1394 Ἐρμῆς σφ’ ἔγει δόλου σκότωι, and for Ἐρμῆν τὸν κλέπτη see
CIG 2299. He also escorted the dead as ψυχομπός (cf. S. OC
1547f.), and there is some irony here in asking Hermes, prince of
thieves and escorter of the dead, to watch over D. there and back
again, because it to death that D. is going; ἐκεῖστε, but not
πάλιν.

217 ὡς γε is equivalent to cum sit; ‘since he is’.

φηλητῶν is found also at h. 4. 67, 292 and (of Hermes
himself) 446. Porter maintains it is cognate with ἀποφώλιος, φηλὼ
and φῆλος, and therefore to be connected with σφάλλω (cf. A. Ag.
492 ἐφήλωσεν E. Su. 243 φηλούμενοι). However, as M. West observes
It is known from a vase painting (Beazley ARV² 319.5; see p.16f.
above) that Hermes was also in the pre-Iliadic version of D.’s
exploits.
at Hes. OD 375 (ὅς δὲ γυναικὶ πέποιθε, πέποιθ' ὦ γε φιλήτημι σει) φιλ- often appears as a varia lectio for φηλ- (see e.g. Jebb on S. fr. 314 (Ich.) 332 and fr. 933, LSJ s.v. with suppl. and West Aeschylus Tragoediae lii). The antiquity of the spelling φιλ-, used also of Hermes, is attested at Hellanicus 4F 19(b) τῇδὲ γίγνεται Ἑρμῆς φιλήτης, ὅτι αὐτὴ φιλήσιμως συνεκοιμάτω. Cf. also Archil. 46. Ancient grammarians connected the word to ἵφειλητο (see Pfeiffer at Call. fr. 260.64f.) which explains the long iota. P. Maas (BPW (1912) 1076) suggested that φιλ- should replace φηλ- in this word universally (see also F. Bechtel Die griechischen Dialekte 3.336f., Schwyzer Gr.Gr. 1.500.17f. and cf. A. Cho. 1001). Given the connection of φηλητῶν with φηλοῦν, the evidence weighs in favour of φηλητῶν.

218 μόνον is tinged with irony. The chorus speak as if the successful completion of his task were a mere formality, but luck is just what he does not enjoy (for εὐτυχεῖν see 56n.).

219-23 D. now has grander ideas than simply finding out what the Greeks are up to. He intends to assassinate Od. and return with his head. He promises the head as a σύμβολον not only to prove his valour, but principally to prove that he has actually made it to the enemy camp. It is a nice touch that first, he chooses to mark Od., the cleverest of the Greeks, as his natural target, while his boast to kill Diomedes (the very man who will slay him) occurs as an afterthought. His ironic bravado is a hint at the future boasting of Rh. (see 467ff.n.). D.'s departure is very confident. Four future indicatives at the start of as many
lines display his certainty of success and return:  σωθήσομαι -
οἷος - φήσεις - ἦξοι. Contrast the chorus' optatives when echoing
this at 257-60.

219 τοι is Diggle's conjecture (Eur. 513ff.) for the weak τε, Because τοι is regularly used in answer to a command (Denniston GP
541 and cf. line 570ff.), and because the corruption of τε to τοι
is any easy one when καὶ follows (cf., e.g., E. Alc. 38).

219f. κτανὼν Ὀδυσσέως ὧν κάρα σοι For the syntax cf.
258ff. κτανὼν δ' Ἀχαιμενίδου | κράτ' ἐνέγκοι | Ἐλέναι.

σύμβολον here means 'token of proof'. At S. Phil. 403 we find
a similar phrasing as Philoctetes, referring to himself, says
ἲχνοντες, ώς ἔοικε, σύμβολον σαφές.

222 παίδα is the obj. of κτανὼν (219).

ἀναμάκτων The adj. is found once in A. (Su. 196) and once in
E. (Pho. 264). For the expression cf. 62 above τῶνε πολυφόνων
χερί.

223 The coming dawn is an important reference point in the
drama and this is an ironic note for D. to leave on, since neither
he nor Rhesus, with whom he is contrasted in advance, will see
this dawn.

φῶς is the subject of μολεῖν. Cf. 78 αἰθεῖν .. στρατῶν.

D. now makes his exit back to Troy and the guards, alone for
the first time, sing the first stasimon.
224-263 First Stasimon


Dactylo-epitrite strophes do not occur in A. They are present in PV and the earlier plays of S. In E. they are not found in Hcld., Su., Ion or IT, and are not used in any considerable quantity after 415 with the exception of Hel. 1137-47 (412 BC). On dactylo-epitrite in tragedy generally see Dale IM2 178ff., MATC 21.1 and West GM 132ff. The dactylic element in this metre easily identifies with epic narrative and this may be the deliberate conjuring of an heroic atmosphere as D. departs on his mission.

242-253-254-263: Second strophe and antistrophe

The only textual problem which affects responsion is at 245-256; 245 being a syllable shorter than 256 in A and two syllables shorter in A. Despite the variety of readings at the end of 256, there is a uniform number of syllables. The fault lies in the strophe. οπανία, the more poetic of the alternatives for 245, does not occur before Diod. Sic. 24.1.4. (1st cent. BC). Wilamowitz's suggestion is probably the better.


253 See Collard on E. Hec. 905-52.
σωθήριος, 230f. ἔγγαλαβε ... ὁ παγκρατές, ὁ ... δείμας). In the first antistrophe they express the wish that D. may reach the enemy camp and win his reward as a spy (225 διόπτας). This stanza is dominated by optatives (233 μόλοι, 235 ἐκοίτο, κάμψειε, 237-8 βαίη), as the chorus stands further back from the engagement in an act of prayer that he may succeed. The antistrophe ends with a relative clause (240f.). This pattern is followed in the second strophe and antistrophe. In the former indicatives are more prevalent when the chorus praises D. as the representative of Trojan valour, while in the latter the guards use the future indicative (255 οὐτάσει) and optatives (257 ἔλοι, 259 ἐνέγκοι) as they muse over his plan to assassinate one or more of the chieftains. The second antistrophe also ends with a relative clause (261ff.). The guards remain closely involved with the plot, displaying a keen anticipation for the outcome of D.'s mission. Indeed they are dependent on the previous scene for much of the material in their ode. Cf. 233ff. with 150, 155 and 216f.; 240f. τὰς πόντιας Αἰακίδαι | Πηλεῖ δίδωσι δαίμων with 187f. δίδωσι δ' αὐτὸς πωλοδαμνήσας ἀναξ | Πηλεῖ Ποσειδῶν; 242f. with 154f.; 255ff. τετράπονων | μὲνον ἐχθρὸν ἐπιγαίον | θηρός with 211f. τετράπονων μιμήσαι | λύκου κέλευθον and 258f. κτανῶν δ' Ἀγαμεμνόνιον | κράτ' ἐνέγκοι | Ἰλίναι with 219f. κτανῶν ὁδυσσέα | οὖν κάρα σοι (see also W. Jens Die Bauformen (1971) 113).

Rhetorical repetition at or near the beginning of cola is something of which the poet of Rh. is particularly fond. See 231 ὃ .. ὁ, 242 πρὸ τ' .. πρὸ τε, 249f. ἔστι .. ἔστιν, 251 ἐν .. ἐν and 261 δὲ ἐπὶ .. δὲ ἐπὶ. Cf. also 131 τάδε .. τάδε, 195 μέγας .. μεγάλα, 345f. ἡκεῖς .. ἡκεῖς, 455 φίλα .. φίλος, 527 τίνος ..
The ode opens with an address to Apollo who is a strong supporter of Troy in the *II.* (see 230n.) He is addressed with cult titles which link him to centres of his worship (see L.R. Farnell *The Cults of the Greek states* vol.2 (1896) 98-252). Thymbra was a town in Mysia, in the Troad, with a plain named after it (Strabo 13.1.35, V. Geo. 4.323, *Aen.* 3.85). Θυμβραῖος occurs nowhere in *A.*, *S.* or *E.* In *Rh.* it also occurs at 508 (see n.). Delos was traditionally the god's birthplace. Lycia (cf. E. fr. 700 = Ar. Eq. 1240 ὁ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων Λύκιε) was a centre of Apollo's cult, based at Patara, (Strabo 14.3.6, see also V. *Aen.* 4.143ff.). He is only mentioned once in connection with Lycia in the *II.* 16.514 κλνθεν, ἄνωξ, ὅς ποὺ Λυκίης ἐν πίονι δήμωι. Although there is no explicit mention of it in *Rh.*, Apollo does enjoy the status of a wolf god elsewhere in literature,²⁵⁴ so it may be particularly appropriate that he should be called upon to escort D. the wolf man.

²²⁵ For ἐμβατεύω used of tutelary gods in trag. cf. *A.* Pe. 449, *S.* OC 679 and *E.* fr. 696.3 (Nauck).

²²⁶ Δία is scanned as two long syllables. For the adj., meaning 'of Zeus' (*Πολ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Διὸς κέφαλή*) cf. *PV* 619, *E.* Hec. 461, *Ion* 200 and *Ba.* 245. The use of the word 'head' in addresses.

displays warmth and familiarity, as befits the relationship between Apollo and the Trojans. Cf. 902f. ἡ φιλία ἡ κεφαλή. In Homer we find φιλία κεφαλή (II. 8.281) and ἢθείη κεφαλή (II. 23.94). Ar. has μιαρὰ κεφαλή at Ach. 285. However, as Fraenkel observes ((1965) 239), elsewhere in tragedy κάρα is always used, never κεφαλή, and κεφαλή is not used of gods. See Barrett on E. Hi. 651 ὡ κακῶν κάρα, and cf. also A. Ag. 905, S. Ant. 1.

226f. μόλε τοξή-ιρης 'Come furnished with the bow' (ἀραρίσκω). The adjective is used of Apollo's hand at E. Alc. 35 (cf. HF 188, 1063). Apollo's oldest literary characteristic is his archery (II. 1.14 and ib. 45-49).

227 ἕκοι ἐνυχλιος 'come in the night'. Apollo is not a god who comes much by night. The poet may well be imitating II. 1.47 δ' ἠ' ἱε νυκτί ἐοικός, also of Apollo.

228ff. καὶ γενοῦ .. Ἀνέρι The postponement of καὶ γενοῦ to the end of its clause in the MSS is awkward. Dindorf's repositioning gives the better syntax. For γενοῦ plus noun in apposition followed by the dat. of advantage cf. A. Cho. 1f. 'Ερμῆ χθόνιε...! σωτῆρ γενοῦ μοι ἐξύμμαχος τ' αἰτουμένω, A. Se. 146f. and E. Alc. 377. For the format καὶ γενοῦ in prayer cf. E. Alc. 223f., also addressed to Apollo, καὶ νῦν ἐκ θωφάτου γενοῦ.

σωτῆριος .. πομπὰς ἀγεμῶν Having wished that Hermes escort D. (216ff.), the chorus ask Apollo to take up the task, as a

230 καὶ ξίλαβε Δαρδανίδως Apollo is a constant aid to the Trojans in the Il. See Il. 4.507ff., 5.344, 15.360, 16.703, 715ff., 788ff., 17.71ff. and 20.443f. Dardanus, the forefather of the Trojans, was the son of Zeus and Electra, daughter of Atlanta.

231f. Apollo and Poseidon together built a wall around Troy for king Laomedon. See Il. 7.452, 21.442-7, E. Hel. 1510ff., Tro. 5f. and 814, And. 1009f., Pindar Ol. 8.31f., E. Or. 1388 and Theognis 773ff.

232 δείμας aor. part. from δέμω which occurs only here in tragedy. The verb is found in Homer.

233 μόλοι For μολεῖν plus acc. cf. 115.

ναυκλήρια stands for ναύσταθμα here (cf. 136, 244). Elsewhere the word occurs only in, or later than the fourth century. Cf. Demosthenes 23.211 (also in the plural) and Plut. Apophth. Lac. 234.F.1. In these places, however, the word seems to mean ships which are out to hire, or even the cargoes which are in them. The sense here then appears unique. A., S. and E. have ναύκληρος, meaning helmsman, shipmaster or, metaphorically, charioteer. S. and E. have ναυκληρία meaning sea voyage or ship. The verb ναυκληρεῖν 'steer', used metaphorically, occurs governing πόλιν at
A. Se. 652 and πόλιν at S. Ant. 994.

234 διόπτας. διοπτήρ is used of D. at Il. 10.562. See Er. Fraenkel Geschichte der griechischen Nomina Agentis (1910) 133. Aristophanes has ὣς Ζεὺς διόπτα καὶ κατόπτα πανταχῆν at Aich. 435 in what is very likely a paratragic line (possibly from E. Tel.). The verb διοπτεύειν occurs at S. Ai. 307 and we find δίσωπος meaning 'overseer' at A. fr. 232.

235 κάμψειε for this verb followed by acc. without a preposition, also following ἵκνεωμαι cf. E. El. 955f. πρίν ἄν πέρας ἐν γραμμής ἤκηται καὶ τέλος κάμψη βίον. For πάλιν translate 'back' and cf. E. Ba. 1225 πάλιν δέ κάμψεις εἰς ὄρος.

235f. θυμέλας ..I. Ιλιάδας The noun means 'hearth'. Cf. A. Su. 669 and E. IA [152] ἐπὶ Κυκλώπων ἰείς θυμέλας. Elsewhere it means 'altar' (cf. E. Su. 64 and Ion 114).

237-8 Φθιάδων is the fem. adj. The masc. would be Φθίων. For the sex of the horses see pp.38f. above. Phthia, in Thessaly, was the home of Achilles.

Either ποτ' (V) or τοτ' (O) must stay, for it is difficult to see how either could have been invented if it had not been in the text, and there is some point in a temporal conjunction here as the chorus refers to a possible future event. Of the two the indefinite πότε, meaning 'eventually', is preferable to τότε, which implies that D. will get his reward as soon as he returns.
238 ἐπ' ἄντυγα βαίη The phrase refers to D.’s mounting Achilles’ chariot. Perhaps it was suggested by the Homeric βήσασθαι διόφρου (II. 3.262, 5.364 with ἐς, 18.531f. with ἐπὶ plus gen. and Od. 3.481). When βαίη has this meaning and is followed by ἐπὶ the preposition usually takes the gen., but there are some occurrences with the acc. Cf. E. Tro. 783f. βαίνει πατρώων ἐπὶ πύργων ἐπὶ ἄκρας στεφάνας, and And. 401 αὕτη ὀδ θαύλη ναῦς ἐπὶ Ἀρχείων ἔβην. The dat. reading of Β was adopted by Wecklein. The dat. can also follow the preposition in this phrase. Cf. A. Ag. 37f. βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσση μέγας ἐβείκεν, E. Pho. 691, of a sailor in storms ὁ ὕπι λαίψεσιν βεβώς. However, the agreement in a possible reading between OA makes the acc. preferable.

ἄντυγα stands for the whole chariot. It refers properly to the rail of a chariot, over which the reins passed (cf. 373 and 567 below) and to which they might be attached. See H.L. Lorimer Homer and the Monuments (1950) 326 and A.M. Snodgrass Early Greek Armour and Weapons (1964) 160ff.

239 ἐκείποτον πέρσαντος Ἀχαίων Ἀρη. The word ἐκείποτος means ‘master’ (of slaves), and is not normally a military term. The use of it underlines the slavish attitude which the guards have towards H. The Achaean Ares is Achilles, the present owner of the horses who will have to be killed before they can be given to D.

240f. τὰς is Article for relative to avoid hiatus, cf. e.g. S. Phil. 14 (see K-G 1.588).

dίδωσι for the present tense used for a past event after a
relative pronoun cf. 501f. ὁ...ι.φέρει and 945 ὅν κατακτεῖνεις.

242 ἐπεῖ For tragic strophes opening with a clause closely connected to the previous one cf. A Su. 49, S. Ant. 1137, OT 179, 1197, El. 1070 and E. Hcd. 362 and 777.

ἐτια μόνος Cf. E. A1. 460ff., in the ode of praise to Alcestis, ὑ γάρ. ὅ μόνα...οὐ...ἐτιας πόσιν...ἀμείψαι. βάς should be taken with μόνος.

244f. ἁγαμαι λήματος 'I marvel at his courage'. The verb takes the gen. in a similar context at Ar. Ach. 488 ἁγαμαί καρδίας (cf. Ar. 1744).

245 ἰ is affirmative. See Denniston GP 280.

247 δυσαλίω The reading of Δ and Ε; δυσάλιον, gives a prosaic sense 'when it is sunless on the sea' (cf. Xen Cyn. 8.1 ὅταν ἰ βάρειον). It was, however, printed by Dindorf, Vater, Paley, Wecklein and Porter. Murray adopts the nominative δυσαλίος, to agree with πόλις, but it is awkward to refer to a city being on the sea with a transferred epithet. Musgrave and Wilamowitz independently conjectured δυσάνως, 'hard to control', but this is unnecessary. Hutchinson's δυσαλίω gives the best sense: 'When the city is on a sunless sea and lurches.' For the corruption of -ω cf. 344 γάρ δὴ ὅσον. For 'sunless' as an image of darkness cf. A. Eum. 396 (also in lyric) κνέψας δύσ.

σαλεύῃ πόλις The verb occurs also at PY 1081. For the metaphor of the ship of state cf., with the same verb, S. OT 22f.
Separated anadiplosis occurs in the choral songs of Rh. at 346f. ἤκεις, 357 ὄ, 357f. νῦν, 385 θεός, 535 ὄς and 821 μετά. Although separated anadiplosis is more common in the earlier extant plays of E. (R. 238), it is not enough to use these examples as evidence for an early date for Rh. Anadiplosis is a common enough feature of Euripidean style for Ar. to parody it at Ra. 1352-5 (see also the statistics of J. Smereka Studia Euripidea vol.2 (1937) 169-71, 190 and W. Breitenbach (1934) 217-221). The occurrence of anadiplosis, separated or not, bears no relation to the date of composition in Euripides. Smereka’s table (ib. 190) shows that in the lyrics of his last three plays, Or., IA and Ba., anadiplosis occurs 38, 6 and 19 times respectively. The device is also common in S. (see Schmidt-Stählin vol.2 489 n.7 for examples), and although separated anadiplosis is less common it does occur; cf. Phil. 753, 855, 989f., Ant. 200f., 1319f., OT 483, Tra. 408 and El. 459.

Coming after a declaration that there is a shortage of reliable men in times of trouble, this sentence celebrates D.; ‘There is, there is someone valiant among the Phrygians’. But their celebration is heavily ironic. D. is not only a coward, he also betrays his cause and his commander.

250f. θράσος This word often has a negative tone in tragedy but for a positive sense, as here, cf. E. Su. 609. At Il. 10.41
Menelaus mentions the need for a spy to be θρασυκάρδιος.

αιχμάλ cf. also the use of δορός to mean military force at 82 and 459.

252f. πόθι Μυσῶν ὃς ἐμὰν ἐν χυμαχίαν ἀτίζει; The Mysians appear as allies of Troy at II. 2.858, led by Chromis and Ennomus, and at ib. 13.5 they are described as ἀχεμάχοι. Their disposition is mentioned by D. at II. 10.430. In Rh. They are the contingent which kept the watch before the chorus (line 541). Interpretation of these lines is difficult. The scholion says that the author (who is explicitly named as Euripides) is anachronistic, because the line refers to a contemporary proverb, ἔσχατος Μυσῶν. As inhabitants of a distant land (see II. 13.5 and E. Hall Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 53), they may have been synonymous with rudeness and a lack of sophistication. This is certainly the interpretation of the scholion which follows the MSS in reading ποτὶ and explains that anyone who disdains an alliance with the chorus is like a Mysian (ποτὶ Μυσῶν being equivalent to e partibus Mysorum), "ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔσχατος καὶ οὐδὲνος λόγον ἄξιος". This remark would be a pointless insult to the Mysians who are allies of the guards. A.C. Pearson (CQ 12 (1918) 79) interprets the proverb as meaning the Mysians were negligible, not because they were worthless, but because they dwelt in so remote a place that they were never seen. He also points out that proverbs are employed without a thought to their origin (cf. S. Aj. 1112 ἦσπερ οἱ πόνοι πολλοὶ πλέω). However, this also requires a negative quality.

255 See Magn. fr. 5 K, Pl. Theaet. 209b8, Philem. fr. 80 (K-A), Menand. frr. 50, 175, 778 (Körte) and cf. Pl. Gorg. 521b.

195
being attached to the Mysians. In accepting Hoffmann’s πόθε we have ‘where [is he] of the Mysians who scorns my alliance?’ This gives a better sense. The Trojans are so famous for their valour that even the Mysians, who live so far away, are happy to be their allies.

253 συμμαχίαι (cf. ξυμμαχίαι 994) does not occur in E. But it is not a late word, occurring at A. Ag. 213 and in inscriptions (see L. Threatte The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions (1980) 612).

254 ό πεδοστιβής σφαγεύς The phrase refers to Dolon himself in the guise of a wolf. As τετράπων suggests, the adj. means ‘moving on the ground’, cf. 763f. πεδοστιβεῖ κόπω δαμέντες. It occurs also at A. Su. 1000, of animals, κυνόδαλα πτεροίντα και πεδοστιβῆ, Pe. 127, of infantry, πεδοστιβῆς λεώς, E. Me. 1123 ὁχον πεδοστιβῆ, and Hel. 1516 πεδοστιβεῖ ποδί and fr. 670.3f. οὗ πεδοστιβῆς τροφὸς ἤθάλασσα. The tone of the phrase is ambiguous. The murderer who creeps on the ground and kills his enemies in their tents by stealth does not present a heroic picture and the chorus’ idea about D.’s method of fighting is a far cry from their picture of Rh. in action (370ff.).

256 μῖμον The precise meaning of the noun cannot be easily determined here. It is used in the fourth century to mean the mime actor or the mime performed. It occurs at A. fr. 57.8f. ταυρόφθογγοι ...μῖμοι, where it usually taken as personal

Vater takes Μυσῶν with ἐμῶν συμμαχίαν to get ‘Where [is he] who scorns alliance with the Mysians?’ But this too relies on some negative quality in being allied to the Mysians.
meaning ‘imitators’. R. (161) regards both examples as having the sense ‘imitation’. This conveys the idea but the logic of the phrasing μέμον ἕχων remains unclear.

257 Μενέλαω The Doric form of Menelaus occurs only in E. Cf. And. 487, Tro. 212 and 1100 (see H. Burkhardt Die Archaismen des Euripides (1906) 30).


260 Ἔλεναι Helen is mentioned at 910, where she is also viewed as responsible for the war, and therefore Rh.’s death. The hatred of the guards for her is obvious from their grisly wish.

κακόγαμβρον ἐς χέρας γόον The adj. is ἀπ. λεγ. Agamemnon is Hel.’s brother in law by her marriage to Menelaus (see Il. 3.180). γόον is acc. in apposition to the whole of the sentence. See Barrett on E. Hi. 756 κακονυμφώτατον ὄνασιν. The presentation of the head may be based on Il. 17.39f. εἰ κεν ἐγὼ κεφαλὴν τε τεῦχη καὶ τεῦχε’ ἐνείκας ἔν πάνῳ ἐν χεῖρεσι βάλω. Cf. also Il. 18.334f. πρὶν γ’ ἑκτορος ἐνθάδ’ ἐνεικαί τεῦχεα καὶ κεφαλὴν.

261 ὃς Agamemnon.

262f. χιλιόνων ἤλιθο’ ἕχων στρατεύων Cf. Α. Αγ. 45 στόλου Ἄρχειῶν χιλιονούσην. ἤλιθ’ is epic aor. (see 50n.).
The shepherd and Hector enter simultaneously, and unannounced, from opposite eisodoi.\footnote{257} This surprising piece of staging is probably intended to underscore a point in the drama at which the author departs from the Iliadic version of the myth, as Dolon leaves knowing nothing of Rhesus. The shepherd tells of the approach of Rhesus' army. Hector reacts to Rhesus' arrival with annoyance and rejects him as a false friend who arrives for the feast without having taken part in the hunt. After a short exchange he is persuaded to accept the new arrival as an ally.

A πειρόμενος ΠΟΙΗΜΑΝ A shepherd is an ideal choice for a messenger here because such a man would be watching his flocks far from the camp with only a few companions when Rhesus' army arrived. We are thus given an account of the noise and spectacle of that arrival from the perspective of the humble rustics, who are at first frightened, then awed. Cf. the cowherd at Ba. 660ff., who brings to Pentheus news of the women's madness from a distant, mountainous area, and the cowherd at IT 238ff., who tells Iphigenia of the arrival of the Greeks at a secluded part of the shore where he had gone to wash his cattle.

It is also ironic that the shepherd brings news of Rh.'s arrival since such a duty should rightly be performed by the guards. But they are still away from their posts, having left them unnecessarily after a false alarm. His function is to prepare the characters and audience for the arrival of the central tragic hero of the play. In this he resembles the herald in A. Ag. who prepares the way for Agamemnon's arrival.

\footnote{257} See p.72 above.
The relationship between Hector and the new character is quickly established in 264-74. We discover the messenger's identity as soon as H. recognises him as one of his shepherds in his opening line. He is dismissive of the man because he has only military matters on his mind. The shepherd’s opening words are polite but deliberately vague and he holds back his news until 276. Cf. S. Ant. 223ff., where the guard enters but delays the point of his message until 245, indulging in self-justifying banter with Creon first; Alcmene, who mistakes the henchman's purpose at E. Hcld. 646ff., esp. 665 τοῦδ’ οἰκέτη’ ἡμῖν τοῦ λόγου μέτεστι δή; and Iphigenia, who questions the herdsman’s purpose at the shore at E. IT 254.

266 ἦ gives a sarcastic slant to H.'s words.

ἀγρώσταις MS L originally had this word. Triclinius deleted the sigma (see Diggle Eur. 509). It is a form of ἀγρότης and is the more usual form for 'countryman' in tragedy. Cf. 287 below, A. fr. 46c.5, S. fr. 94, fr. 314.39, E. HF 377 (see Wilamowitz and Bond ad loc.), and see Ernst Fraenkel Geschichte der griechischen Nomina Agentis (1910) 1.40f. For the double dat. ἀγρώσταις...φρενί, cf. E. Me. 992ff. παλεῖν οὐ κατελίθως ἐλεθρων βιοτῶι προσάγεις.

σκαλί Cf. 271. Here the word refers to foolish or uneducated ignorance of appropriate behaviour. Cf. Alcm. fr. 16.2 and Ar. Ve. 1183. Hector misunderstands the shepherd’s purpose, accusing him of having no sense of propriety or timing.
267f. καὶ γὰρ In this combination καὶ means ‘also’ (see Denniston GP 66, 108). γὰρ is equivalent to γοῦν, used to introduce an example of what H. has just referred to.

ποίμνας...ἀγγελῶν Porter observes that ἀγγέλλειν meaning ‘to bring news of’ with a concrete direct object is Homeric (cf. Od. 14.122) and does not occur in tragedy. R. does not accept this, comparing S. OT 955f. πατέρα τῶν σῶν ἀγγελῶν ὡς οἴκετ' ὄντα. There, however, the construction is indirect statement with ὡς and the accusative is anticipatory. The poet of Rh. freely imitates epic vocabulary and syntax.

dεσπόταις τευχεσφόροις. δεσπόταις takes up δεσπόταισιν in 264. τευχεσφόροις (cf. line 3 τευχοφόρων) is emphatic. A contrast is being made between those at home who should be told about the flocks, and those who are about to fight and should not be bothered (cf. 274). There is no reason to believe that H. is in the process of arming here. The mobilisation of the troops has been stopped pending D.’s return. Rather, he is pointing out that the shepherd is in the wrong place. He should not come to the military camp with news of the farmyard but should go to Troy. There is some dramatic irony in this statement, because the shepherd not only brings important news, but also has sensible views on military matters (see 282n. and 335n.).

270 οἱ The adverb ‘whither’ is used after χρῆν γεγονείν because of the notion of movement implied in H.’s suggestion that
the shepherd should go to Troy with his news.

γεγονεῖν means 'announce aloud', and has a rather grand tone, associated with e.g. prophecy or revelation (cf. PV 193, 523, 657, 784, 787 and 990, S. OC 213 and E. Ion 696). There is sarcasm in H.'s use of the word in the context of mundane agricultural news.

eὐτυχοῦντα ποίμνια Paley prefers ποιμνίων from O, assuming that εὐτυχοῦντα agrees with σε as the object of the infin. and that ποιμνίων is a qualifying gen. This is incorrect. σε (acc. after χρῆν) is the subject of the infin. and εὐτυχοῦντα is the subordinate verb of the indirect statement, agreeing with ποίμνια. For a participle after a verb of announcing in an indirect statement cf. S. El. 1452 ἦ καὶ θανόντι ἡγείλαν; Porter observes that σ' could be σά, agreeing with εὐτυχοῦντα ποίμνια. This is possible, but would result in an unnecessary emphasis and be far less effective.

271 οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω see 164n.

272 κεδονούς is also used of good news at A. Ag. 622.

273 παύσαι λέγων The use of παύσαι with a participle to convey a strong prohibition is found seven times in E. Cf. Hi. 706, Ba. 809, Alc. 707, Ion 1410, IA 496, IT 1437 and Or. 1625. παύσαι plus participle is not used by A. or S. It does occur in Ar. Cf. the paratragic Ach. 1107 ὡνθρωπε, παύσαι καταγελῶν μου τῶν ὀπλῶν. Hector's impatience is conveyed by asyndeton at the
προσαυλείονες is ἀπ. λεγ. meaning 'of the farmyard'.

274 Paley objects to taking μάχας with πρὸ χειρῶν βαστάζομεν as 'scarcely correct', and wishes to assume ἔχομεν. It is true that πρὸ χειρῶν is usually used of material things visible in the hands. Cf. S. Ant. 1279 τὰ μὲν πρὸ χειρῶν τάδε φέρεις, E. Tro. 1207f. πρὸ χειρῶν...φέρουσι κόσμον, IA 35f. δέλτον τε γράφεις | τὴν δ’ ἕν πρὸ χειρῶν ἔτι βαστάζεις, and see Schwyzer Gr.Gr. 2.506). The poet was probably imitating Il. 16.630f. ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ τέλος πολέμου, ἔπεων δ’ ἐνὶ βουλή. Cf. also V. Aen. 7.455 bella manu, letumque gero.

δόρη acc. pl. of δόρυ, found also in tragedy at A. fr. 74.7 τρία δόρη πάλλουτα χειρῶν. It is possibly accidental that the word is not found more frequently, as it occurs also in Theopompus, the writer of Old Comedy (fr. 26 Kassel-Austin). The plural form δόρατα is itself not common in tragedy, occurring only at E. HF 127 and IA 1495 (both in lyric).

275 τοιαῦτα i.e. military matters.

276 ἀλκής μυρίας For the gen. after στρατητάτω, as if it were στρατηγέω, cf. E. HF 61 στρατητήτσας...Καθεὶς ἄνδρός.

For ἀλκή referring to military force cf. E. Or. 690 σμικρὰι σὺν ἀλκῆι τῶν λειπομένων φίλων. It is interesting that Or. 689 contains the word μυρίοις, and it is not impossible that the idea
for ἀλκῆς μυριας came from the lines in Or.

277 The distinction made here between Rhesus as a φίλος of Hector and Rhesus as a σύμμαχος of Troy is more than a rhetorical flourish designed to please H. and encourage the Trojans. At 336ff. a more pointed distinction is made between Rhesus' right to hospitality as a guest-friend and his pretensions to sharing victory with Hector as an ally. One might be the friend of a foreigner even when a state of war existed between the cities of both parties. Cf. Il. 6.212-31 of Glaucus and Diomedes, and Thuc. 2.13.1.4, where Thuc. says Archidamus, king of Sparta, is the guest-friend of Pericles (see D.M. Lewis Sparta and Persia (1977) 47).

278 By asking for the new ally's origins before his name, Hector is able dramatically to anticipate the shepherd's identification. For ἐρημώσας πέδου cf. E. And. 314 ἐρημώσεις πέδου.

279 ἡρήκης. That there are already Thracian allies at Troy in Homer (led by Acamas and Peirous. See Il. 2.844f., 4.517ff. and 5.462), is part of the proof that Il. 10 is supposititious.

πατρὸς...κικλῆσκεται The same clause ends line 652 which was rightly deleted by Lachmann as an interpolation. In Homer Rhesus is the son of Eioneus (Il. 10.435). Paley and Porter observe that Ἡλὼν, a Thracian city meaning 'shore' situated at the mouth of the Strymon (Herod. 7.25), is contained in the name Eioneus and
that this may be an alternative name for the Strymon. The river is the largest in W. Thrace. At A. Su. 254f. Pelasgus of Argos declares that it is the boundary of his power. The river may therefore have something of a symbolic quality as a distant limit of civilisation.

280 'Ppiosou This is the first mention of the eponymous hero of the play. For his name see 388-453n.

281 eγυνως also appears at the start of a line to confirm what the previous speaker has said at E. And. 884, 920, El. 617, Ion 1115, Or. 1131 and Pho. 983. It is a habit more associated with E. than the other tragedians. But we do find eγυνως at S. Tra. 1221 and eγυνων S. Ai. 36 and Ant. 1004.

282 πῶς here means 'how is it that?' or 'why?'. H. asks why Rh. bothered to come through the mountains, where the shepherd keeps his sheep, instead of travelling by road. The shepherd displays a better sense of tactics than H. and makes a good guess at the reason.

ὀργάδας 'meadows'. Cf. E. Ba. 445. This may come from ὀργαῖνω, meaning to swell and grow, and therefore meaning a lush area of land, or from ἐργαίνω, meaning to enclose. The former is preferable, esp. because its use in the context of the wilderness at E. El. 1163 implies a lack of enclosure. See also K. Latte KS 102 n.13 and P. Chantraine Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue.

See Conon FGH fr. 4=1.190 (Jacoby) and J. Rempe De Rheso Thracum Heroe (1927) 7ff. Contra see W. Leaf JHS 35 (1915) 1-11.
grecque (1968) p.815 s.v. ὄργη. The Σ observes that ὄργανος are properly the places of the gods, but this may be a reference to the tract of land between Athens and Megara sacred to Demeter and Persephone which was called ἡ ὄργα (Plut. Per. 30, Paus. 3.4.2).

The Messenger's Speech: 284-316

In Rh. there is more than one scene with a messenger's speech, or more precisely, a narrative of events offstage; the other occurs at 722ff. There is more than one such scene in some Euripidean tragedies also: cf. Hec. 484ff. and 1132ff. The latter is delivered by Polymestor. He is one of the principal characters of the play but the speech is a report of significant events offstage and is therefore tantamount to a messenger's speech. Cf. also IT 238ff. and 1284ff., Hel. 597ff. and 1512ff., Or. 852ff. and 1395ff. (in lyric), IA 414ff. and 1540ff., and Ba. 660ff. and 1024ff. We find this phenomenon in S. Cf. Ant. 249ff., 407ff. and 1192ff., with a small part for another messenger at 1278ff. Cf. also the narrative by Hyllus at S. Tra. 749ff. and the nurse at 899ff. Messengers are most commonly characters of low social status who are not principal characters in the drama and are eye-witnesses of the events they describe, either as attendants to the principal characters involved (cf. Rhesus' charioteer below, S. Ant. 1196, E. Me. 1138ff., El. 767, IT 1329, and Hi. 1195), as characters whose duty it is to spy (cf. S. Ant. 217, 223ff. and 408), or as chance onlookers (as here and at IT 238ff.).

This speech follows the conventional pattern of narrative messenger speeches found in tragedy in which an important off-stage event is described with vivid detail. I see nothing in
its format to arouse doubt about authorship. Strohm, however, maintains (Hermes 87 (1959) 257-74) that both messenger scenes differ in form and technique from those of E. His objections to this scene are that the shepherd speaks of an action which is still in progress and that he takes an active part in the scene after his speech is over (335, see also 333-41n.). R. (138f.) deals most effectively with these points, indicating Ba. 660ff. (the first report of the women’s frenzy) and Alc. 152ff. (the report of Alcestis preparing herself for death) as exceptions to the former objection; and Su. 752ff. and the remarkable intervention of the messenger at Hel. 700ff. as exceptions to the latter. We may add to this Or. 1507-1526. However it is also worth noting that the shepherd’s later contribution occurs in an area of textual difficulty (see 333-41n.)

The messenger’s purpose is to introduce Rhesus in advance of his entry at 379. This establishes an atmosphere of excited anticipation which the guards take up and augment in the second stasimon. Although the entire scene is an invention of the poet, there are a number of echoes from Il. 10 in his speech (see 301-13n.). The confused equations of darkness with uncertainty and light with deliverance and triumph are introduced again at 285, 289 and 303-6. The darkness of night conceals wild beasts and Greeks, while Rhesus’ armour shines through the darkness as a metaphor for the bright hope which he brings to the Trojans.

The speech displays a balance of composition with that of the charioteer at 733ff. They both begin with confusion: cf. 287-95 with 733-88. They contain powerful descriptions: cf. 301-13 with 782-98, and they conclude with a sentiment from the speaker as a
character rather than simply as a narrator: cf. 314-16 with 799-803. In contrast, the shepherd's speech brings hope while the charioteer's plunges the action into a deeper state of confusion and pessimism.

284 εἰκάσαι γε μὴν πάρα Like the charioteer at 802f. (εἰκάσαι δὲ μοι ἵ πάρεσθι), the shepherd can only guess at the truth, but it is a good guess. γε μὴν, 'but at least' (see Denniston GP 348 and cf. 196 above), answers οὐκ οἶδ' ἀκριβῶς.

285 νυκτὸς γὰρ οὔτι φαίλον ἔσβαλεῖν στρατῶν 'For it is no light matter to come upon an army by night.' The reading ἐμβαλεῖν is illogical and ἔσβαλεῖν is supported by εἰσβαλεῖν at CP 2096 and 2452 (see Diggle Eur. 515). For ἔσβαλεῖν cf. E. Cy. 99 Βρομίου πόλιν ἐοιμεν ἔσβαλεῖν. For οὔτι φαίλον cf. E. El. 760 οὗτοι βασιλέα φαίλον κταυεῖν.

286 is the only iambic line in Rh. with more than one resolution. The earlier plays of E. are very sparing of multiple resolutions in iambics. There are only two in each of the four earliest extant ones; Alc. 159, 108, Me. 324, 1322 (which also ends with the words πολεμίας χερὸς and may even have influenced this line), Hcld. 70, 211 and Hi. 1029, 1223.

κλαύοντα is acc. after an implied impersonal verb. The participle is aorist and should be paroxytone. See M. West BICS 31 (1984) 178. Cf. also 109f. above κλώνω λ' φλέξειν.
287 λέπας refers to the hillside of Ida rather than its ridge. A. Ag. 283 and ib. 298, where Clytemnestra describes the course of the fire signal from Troy, λέπας obviously means a mountain top or ridge. At E. Ba. 677 πρός λέπας means towards the ridge. Dodds (ad loc.) describes λέπας as a collective term for broken country where forest, rock and upland pasture mix. Cf. also ib. 751 and 1045, Pho. 24, Rh. 921 and esp. And. 295, in a similar context, πρὶν Ἥδαιον κατοικίσατι λέπας.

288 αὐτόρριζον ἐστίαν χθονὸς is in apposition to Ἥδαιον λέπας. The adj. occurs nowhere else in Greek until after the fourth century BC. Cf. Babrius (2nd century AD) 36.1 (with a single rho) and Diodorus Siculus 4.12. However, Fraenkel ((1965) 238) suggests that despite its rarity it may be Aeschylean. This is a possibility as there are 26 compounds of αὐτο- in extant A., while the larger corpus of E. has only 14 (see also Stanford at Ar. Ra. 146). The meaning is 'self-rooted' i.e. without man-made foundations. The general sense is clear enough. Mt. Ida is regarded as the focal point of the Trojan plain (ἐστίαν χθονὸς, cf. the same phrase of an altar at A Su. 372), and the shepherds working and living on its slopes inhabit a place even older (and more permanent) than the city of Troy (cf. Il. 20.216ff.). J.T. Sheppard (CR 28 (1914) 87), follows the interpretation of the scholion and believes (wrongly) that the shepherds are troglodytes, quoting Hesychius on a tragic fragment (Adesp. 201) αὐτόχθων ἐστία: ἡ τοῦ Χείρωνος παρόσου ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι διήκει, but αὐτόρριζος is not synonymous with αὐτόχθων.
289 ὅρμων γυμνός ἐνθρούς μολὼν. ἐνθροὺς occurs also at A. Ag. 562, S. Phil. 698, fr. 314.222 and E. fr.669.2. A wood where wild beasts abound is not a place where one would expect to find peaceful men, so the shepherds assumed the noise came from Greek marauders making a night sortie.

290. For the frightening effect of the noise cf. 301-13n. and 565ff.

ῥῆων The comparison of the movement of a large army with the flow of water is a powerful one. Cf. A. Se. 80 ῥέει πολὺς ὁδε λεῶς, Pe. 88 μεγάλως ῥέεματι φωτῶν, ib. 412 ῥέεμα Περσικῶν στρατοῦ. Cf. also S. Ant. 129, E. IT παῦσαι διώκων ῥεῖμα τ' ἐξαρμῶν στρατοῦ and fr. 146.

293 καὶ emphasises σά .. σταθμά.

294 πρὶν plus indic. (cf. 568 below) meaning 'until' is found six times in E. See Goodwin M&G (1965) 633 and cf. Alc. 128, And. 1147, Hec. 131, IA 489, Me. 1173 and Tel. 15. In prose it regularly denotes a definite past action after a negative. πρὶν δὴ emphasises the exact moment when the shepherds heard that the voice was not Greek (see Denniston GP 220).

γῆρων οὐχ Ἑλληνικῶν is a nice touch of realism. The shepherd thinks that Greeks are on the prowl, but when he hears the Thracians' voices he realises they present no threat. Cf. the relief of Philoctetes at hearing Greek at last at S. Phil. 234f. φεῦ τὸ καὶ λαβεῖν ἐπὶ πρόσφειςμα τοῖοῦτον ἄνδρος ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ. We
find at 297, that the newcomers are Thracian.

295 ἐπεξέφεσθα For this verb meaning 'to catch (a sound)' cf. δέξατο at line 4 above, E. El. 110 ἤν τι δεξώμεσθ᾿ ἐπος and Ba. 1086 ἥχὴν ὡς σαφῶς δεδεγμέναι.

296 προφερευνητάς is ἀπ. λεγ. See Ernst Fraenkel Nomina Agentis (1910) 2.35 and Eduard Fraenkel (1965) 234. The verb occurs at E. Pho. 92 ὡς ἄν προφερευνήσω στίμον (and only once more, in the fourth century, at Aen. Tact. 15.5). In Pho. the προ- is temporal while here it is spatial. These people are the scouts sent in front of the army to reconnoitre the road (ὁδοῦ).

297 There are four trimeters in Rh. which contain only three words (cf. 441, 775 and 922). M. Markovich (Bei. zur Klass. Phil. 158 (1984) maintains that this line 'stresses the fact that the shepherd speaks Thracian'. This is too simplistic. It is perfectly acceptable that the shepherd should come into contact with people who speak other languages or dialects because of the nature of his work, far from the city. The effect of the three words is to stress the fact that Rh. is a Thracian, and to convey formality as the shepherd hails the strangers for the first time. Cf. Clytemnestra's greeting to Agamemnon at A. Ag. 903 τοιοοῦδε τοί νῦν ἄξιω προσφέγμασιν. This tone is sustained in the following lines by the traditional request for the new arrival's name and patromynic.

298f. Asyndeton and the direct question create a vivid
quotation.

301-8 The shepherd’s description is based on Dolon’s description of him at Il. 10.435-441;

In the epic the stress falls firstly on the horses, as they are the potential spoil of the Greeks. Then come the details of his golden chariot and armour. The impression created in both works is one of awe at Rhesus’ wealth and appearance. The dramatist however, goes further than the author of Il. 10. In the epic Rhesus’ arms were worthy of a god; in the play Rhesus himself is like a god (cf. 355 and 385). The gorgeous visual effect of golden chariot and armour in the epic is reproduced here by the gleaming gold of his chariot-yoke and shield, and the pure white of the horses (303-6, cf. 616ff.) reproduced almost exactly. Cf. also the shield of Achilles at Il. 18.478-617 (cf. E. IA 1071f.) and the shield of Nestor at Il. 8.192f. To this the dramatist has added a vivid aural effect, created by the fearsome jangling of the bells from the Gorgon on the horse brasses (see 306ff. and cf. 383f.). The incalculable vastness of his army is conveyed by the sentiment of 309f. and the repetition of πολλοί, πολλά, πολλοί, πολύς; and their foreign appearance is underlined by θηρικίων στολήν in 313.

The emphasis on gold in connection with Rhesus as a barbarian is also significant. Cf. 340 (where Hector is sarcastic about it),
370, 382, 439 (again a scornful remark from Hector) and 921 (the gold of Mt. Pangaeus). Gold is symbolic of barbarian luxury in tragedy, as Hall observes (Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 127f.). The Athenians minted silver, not gold, but the peoples of the East were rich in it. Cf. the Persian troops who glitter with gold at Herod. 7.83.9. Cf. also Il. 2.229f., S. Phil. 394, E. IA 786f. and Ba. 13f. In general, characters wearing armour or trappings of gold are regarded as ripe for ruin. Cf., of Polyneices, E. Pho. 168, and, of the Argives who attacked Thebes, S. Ant. 130. The picture of a luxuriously wealthy man is taken up by the chorus in the ode before Rhesus enters. So the shepherd begins what the chorus finishes: the dangerous act of praising a man for his apparent blessings of wealth and prowess. Dangerous because such praise and such wealth attracts the envy of the gods (see esp. 342ff. and 455ff.).

The frightening noise of the bells on the horse trappings is another feature symbolic of alien modes of expression. Confused or loud noise is associated with uncontrolled and wild behaviour, and is likely to produce fear. Cf. esp. A. Se. in which the attacking captains make a great deal of threatening noise with their armour, horses, horse trappings and chariots. This affects the morale of the chorus (A. Se. 84ff., 103, 121ff., 150f., 161, 203ff., 213, 239, 245ff., 385f. and 461-4). That the effect of bells on the tragic stage is intimidating can be inferred also from Ar. Ra. 962f., where E. criticises A. for browbeating his audiences: οὐ τὰ ἐξέπληττον αὐτοῖς τῆς ἰδίᾳ καὶ Μέμονας κωδωνόφαλαρπούς. Cf. also 383 below.

The overall effect of this preview of Rhesus is to call to
mind, from a traditional poetic stock of attitudes, a picture of a
foreign prince decked with the trappings of luxury and possessed
of a mighty army who arrives late at Troy and is soon to do
wonders (see also pp. 13f. above).

300f. The shepherd lays stress on the first-hand nature of
his report. The juxtaposition of emphatic aorist and vivid present
at the start of 301; ἔστην ὁ ρώ, provides a powerful change of
gear as the shepherd begins his detailed description.

ὦστε δαίμονα. For ὥστε see Denniston GP 527.

302 This line is strongly reminiscent of Il. 11.198 ἡμαίοτ'
ἐν θ' ἐσποισι καὶ ἀρμασι κολλητοΐςιν. For Rhesus’ entry on the
chariot see 379n. and p. 73 above.

303 πλάστιες originally meant the scale of a balance and
thereafter the cross beam of a balance, hence the yoke of a
chariot. Cf. A. Cho. 290 χαλκηλάτωι πλάστιει (‘aeneo iugo’ M.
West ad loc. See also Garvie ad loc.). Porter notes that ζυγόν
underwent a similar change from yoke, to beam (A. Su. 822) and
finally to balance (Pl. Re. 55E).

ζυγηφόρου The link vowel for second declension nouns is
usually omicron, but quite often eta appears. In this word we find
it at A. fr. 465.1 πόλους .. ζυγηφόρους and E. Hi. 1183 ἔπους ..
ζυγηφόρους.
The horses of Rhesus are distinguished by the outstanding whiteness of the coats. Here they are whiter than snow. Athena says they are as white as a swan's wing at 616ff. (cf. Il. 10.437). At Il. 10.547 they are like the rays of the sun. Cf. the comparison of the Argive army to an eagle λευκής χιόνος πτέρυγι στεγανός at S. Ant. 114. In Homer, as here, the horses are a counterpart to the horses of Achilles which Hector promises to Dolon. The actual outcome of the episode is reversed so that it is the Greeks who win a pair of horses unexpectedly, not the Trojan, as a reward. At 620 Athena praises the team with almost the same phrase (κάλλιστον οἶκοις σκύλον) as Hector used of Achilles horses at 190 (κάλλιστον οἴκοις κτήμ'). They are central figures in the charioteer's dream at 780-88 and at 839 the charioteer actually accuses Hector of murdering Rhesus to get them. Beyond the Il. and tragedy they take on greater significance.

The association of Thracians with horses was a strong one, even as early as Homer (Il. 13.4). Ίπποκόων is the name of the Thracian noble, a kinsman of Rhesus, who discovers the carnage at Il. 10.518. In tragedy this association continues. Cf. E. Hec. 9 φίλιππου λαόν, 710 θρήκιος ἵπποτας and 1088ff. ἦν θρήκιης ἐνεπίπποι γένος. See also a vase-painting of Eumolpus taken from E. Erechtheus (see E. Hall (1989) 138 and Weidauer AK (1969) p.93 fig.41). Rhesus is commonly depicted as an equestrian warrior.

See p.11 above.

Thracian kings were buried with their horses (see R.F. Hoddinott 'The Thracians and their religion' in The New Thracian Treasure from Rogozen, Bulgaria (1986) 27ff.).

See G. Seure RevPhil 2 (1928) 106-34, J. Gagé Mel.d'Arch. 43 (1926) 103-23, and R. Mouterde Mel.Univ.deBeyr. 11 (1926) 309-22.
έξαιρεστέρων is ὑπ. λέγ. from ἐξαιρής. Pindar has εὐαγγέλα at Πα. 7Β.47 and τῆλανγέστερος at Πυ. 3.75. εὐαγγέλα (long alpha), with the same meaning, is common. Cf. A. Pe. 466, S. Ant. 521, OT 921 and E. Su. 652.

305 πέλτη This small shield was a standard piece of Thracian equipment, carried by πελτασταὶ. Σ 311, quoting Aristotle (fr. 498), describes it as a shield covered with goatskin, without a rim, metal covering or boss. It was familiar to the Athenian audience from the time of Peisistratus who had a bodyguard of Thracian mercenaries (Arist. AP 15.2). References to this shield occur in comedy after the Athenian alliance with Sitalces in 431 BC (Thuc. 2.29, Ar. Ach. 155ff., 160 and Lys 563. See also J.G.P. Best Thracian peltasts and their influence on Greek warfare (1969). From tragedy cf. E. fr. 369.4, fr. 530.1 and Ba. 783. For the golden πέλτη in association with Ares, see 370f. and cf. E. Alc. 498 Ἄρεος, ζαχρύσου θηρικίας πέλτης ἄναξ. The πέλτη has been imported anachronistically into this description of an epic Thracian for the sake of vividness. At 410 and 487 below, the shield is used to denote those who carry it.

χρυσοκολλητοῖς τύποις V reads δίφροις, most probably under the influence of E. Pho. [2] χρυσοκολλήτοισιν .. δίφροις, which is spurious (See M.W. Haslam GRBS 16 (1975) 149-174). It may be an interlinear or marginal comparison with that line which came to displace τύποις. The adjective does not occur before Pho. [2], but cf. χρυσόκολλος at S. fr. 378.3 and E. fr. 587. We are not told what the τύποι are but one is clearly reminded of the bold devices
on the shields of the attacking captains in A. Se. Cf. e.g. Se. 660f. χρυσότευκτα γράμματα | ἐπ’ ἀσπίδος φλισάντα. At E. Pho. [1130], the shield of Capaneus is decorated σιδηρονότοις...τύποις.

306 The snake-haired head of the Gorgon Medusa was given by Perseus to his patroness Athena. E. calls her Γοργοφόνα at Ion 1478, because in Attic legend the goddess is the slayer of the monster (see Wilamowitz on E. HF 883). She attached it to the centre of her shield, as a boss, where it commonly appears in literature, graphic art and sculpture. She is visually represented with the aegis around her body, in the form of a cloak, in which case the Gorgon’s head acts as a brooch. See L.R. Farnell Cults of the Greek States vol.1 (1896) plates xva and xxvii and cf. Il. 5.741. The Gorgon appears on the shield of Agamemnon at Il. 11.36. Her gaze turned men to stone, even after death. She is thus a figure of terror (ἐκτυπεὶ φόβου, cf. A. Cho. 1048f. and Eum. 48f.). The adjective γοργός is often used in connection with eyes, from γοργώπις and, ultimately Γοργό (See M. Leumann Homerische Wörter (1950) 154f.). Cf. 8 above.

Γοργόν This form of the nom., instead of Γοργό is uncommon. Cf. E. HF 883 (guaranteed by the metre). At Ion 1421 L. Dindorf conjectured Γοργὼ, explaining that tragedians do not use the termination -ων ' nisi metro postulante'. Diggle wishes to read Γοργόνα there. There are other words with such alternative nom. terminations. Cf. εἰκών and εἰκώ, ἀγών and ἀγώ and χελιδών and χελιδώ (see Eustathius ad Il. 3.145.20 and ib. 146.2 where these alternatives are given). The ending -ων is also found once in Athenaeus, once in Libanius and once in Lucian.
307 μετώποις The horses' frontlets. The word usually means that part of the forehead between the eyes.

308 The echoes of vocabulary and context between this line and A. Se. 385f. are so close that R. (199f.) cannot be right to maintain that this line is not dependent on it (see p.42 n.95 above, Fraenkel (1965) 232 and Porter ad loc.).

ἐκτύπει φόβον For the accusative after an intransitive verb see K-G 1.306.

309f. The description of the Thracian army is reminiscent of Herod. 7. 61-99.

οὔδ' ἂν ἐν ψῆφοι λόγοι 'not even by estimation of pebble' i.e. accurately. The reference is to calculation by abacus or a similar method, in contrast to rough calculation (Ar. Ve. 656 μὴ ψῆφοις ἀλλ' ἀπὸ χειρός). Cf. A. Ag. 570 ἐν ψῆφωι λέγειν. Rhesus' army is so vast that it is impossible to reckon its numbers precisely. Cf. at Herodotus 7.60 Xerxes' method of counting his enormous host by creating a fenced area to contain ten thousand troops and passing his men through it until an approximate number was arrived at (a method rightly dismissed by How and Wells).

310 θέσωι 'to reckon', as at Me. 532 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸ θήσομαι λίαν.
ἀπλατοῦ is generally used of something fearsome. Cf. Pindar Py. 12.9 (of the Gorgons’ snaky heads), Pindar Py. 1.21 and PV 371 (of lava from Mt. Etna), S. Tr. 1093 (of the Nemean lion), E. Me. 151 (of the tomb), and HF 398 (of the coiled serpent in the garden of the Hesperides). Translate ‘awesome’ and cf. for this sense Archestratus S.H. 190.9 ἔχει γὰρ τοῦτο χρόνου διὰ μῆκος ἀπλατοῦ (of the smell of Phoenician wine).

311ff. The change of subject and omission of a verb in this clause creates a syntactical flow which intensifies the impression of the vastness of the army. Cf. also Od. 8.323, S. OT 1304f., Ar. Av. 586 and see Denniston GP 164. For the idea cf. E. Pho. 113. πολλοὶς μὲν ἵπποις, μυρίοις δ' ὀπλοὶς βρέμων, ἵππης ἀρμάτων τ' ἐπιστάται, and A. Pe. 39f. ἐλειοβάται ναῶν ἔρεται ἡ δεινοὶ πλῆθος τ' ἀνάρριθμοι.

311 τέλη ‘ranks’, cf. A. Pe. 47 δίρρυμα τε καὶ τρίρρυμα τέλη.

312 ἀτράκτων τοξόται ‘shooters of arrows’. τοξότης has the sense of τοξευτής, not τοξοφόρος (see Fraenkel Nomina Agentis (1910) 135 n.12). ἀτράκτως occurs at A. fr. 139.2 and S. Phil. 290.

ὤχλος Cf. E. Cy. 199f. μυρίον δ' ὦχλον οὐ Φρυγῶν ὑπέστην πολλάκις σών ἀσπίδι.

313 ἀμαρτῇ ‘in a mass’. Triclinius conjectured ἀμαρτῇ at E. Hcll. 138, but the more common form is ἀμαρτῇ. Cf. E. Hi. 1195

218
(see Barrett ad loc.) and Hec. 839. The ending was originally -τη, but in MSS -τη πρέβλευεν.

The dress of the light armed Thracian troops is described at Herod. 7.75. They carried javelins, small daggers and the πέλτη, and wore caps of skin, tunics, patterned cloaks and fawnskin boots. It is most likely that there is little or no difference between these troops and peltasts, and that the shepherd makes this observation to add to the effect of vastness.

314ff. The shepherd now includes his own observation about the impact of this new ally. Whether he resists or flees Achilles will be no match for him. This is reminiscent of Il. 22.131-366, where Hector attempts both flight and, when Athena halts his flight, resistance, but is still slain by Achilles.

τοιόσοδε...ἀνήρ Cf. A. Se. 547 ὅ δὲ τοιόσοδ' ἀνήρ, of Parthenopaeus, after the scout has described him and his arms.

315f. ὑποσταθείς Elsewhere in tragedy ὑποσταθείς is preferred over ὑποσταθείς. Cf. 375 below, E. Pho. 1470 κοῦδείς ὑπέστη and Tro. 934. Apart from here and five examples in Sextus Empiricus the participle ὑποσταθείς occurs nowhere in Greek.

ἐκφυγεῖν Here we see the change of emphasis which a compound verb can effect upon its absolute form.

Taplin ((1977) 90) believes that the messenger should leave
at this point and that he does not have a line at the end of the scene (see 336-41n.).

317 εἰσταθῶσι is a striking usage. See p.38 above. The sense is that when the gods are at peace with the citizens, the city will enjoy good fortune. Contrast this with the image of Ares blasting the city at 322f.

318 κατάντης means 'downwards' and occurs only here in tragedy. Porter, following C.E. Palmer (CR 4 (1890) 229) suggests that the metaphor is drawn from a pair of scales, the favourable side descending (cf. A. Pe. 439f. συμφοράν . . . κακῶν ῥέπουσαν εἰς τὰ μάσσωνα).

320 Throughout the play Hector remains convinced that Zeus has guaranteed him success. Cf. 103, 331 and 991. Here his predicament is like that of Agamemnon in the Iliad, who is falsely tempted to believe that he will succeed without Achilles (Il. 2.5ff.). For the sentiment cf. E. Or. 666f. ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς χρή τοῖς φίλοισιν ῥφελεῖν . . . ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων εὗ διδῶι, τί δεῖ φίλων. For the sense of πρός cf. A. Se. 516 πρὸς τῶν κρατούντων δ' ἐσμέν, οἳ δ' ἕσσωμένων.

321 Cf. Eum. 829 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν αὐτοῦ δεῖ. The use of the plurals, αὐτῶν .. οἵτινες, and the indefinite pronoun is contemptuous because H. is actually referring only to Rh.

321f. πάλαι ἡ εὐμποροῦσιν When followed by the present
tense πάλαι conveys the sense of the imperfect. Cf. 329 below, S. Li. 20 ἰχνεύω πάλαι and OT. 289 πάλαι δὲ μὴ παρὼν θαυμάζεται. The indicative is used instead of the subjunctive (Δ) because it is a certainty that Rh. did not help.

322f. ἤνικ' .. πνέων For the metaphor with Ares cf. A. Se. 63f. πρὶν καταλιγίσαι πυραὶς Ἓ̄ρεως, ib. 115 καχλάζει πυραὶς Ἓ̄ρεος ὄρομενον and 343f. μαυσόμενος δ' ἐπιπνεῖ  ... ἄρης (cf. also S. OT 190ff. and Il. 20.51). The image is used of Cleon’s words at Ar. Eq. 430, 437 and cf. also ib. 760 (see J. Taillard Images d’Aristophanez (1965) 180ff. For the idea cf. also S. Ant. 136f., of the attacking Capaneus, βακχεύων ἐπέπνει  ... ἔχοις ἐχθρῶν ἄνεμων.

322 ἐξώστης This Ionicism is found only here in tragedy. Cf. the ἐξωσταὶ ἄνεμοι which drive ships off course at Herod. 2.113 and ἄνεμος ἐξώστης at [Aeschin.] ep. 1.3 (see Ed. Fraenkel (1965) 239 and Ernst Fraenkel Nomina agentis 1. 241). The verb ἐξωθέω, occurs seven times in S., and twice in E., at Cy. 278f. πνεύμασιν θαλασσίοις .. ἐξωθεόντες and Hi. 1087.

323 ἔθθαυς Cf. A. Eum. 557 θαυμομένας κεραίας. The imperfect is better than the aorist variants when referring to the whole period of the Trojan war so far.

μέγας πνέων Cf. E. Ba. 640 κἂν πνέων ἔλθη μέγα.

324 The line is a deliberate echo of 314. Hector denigrates
the messenger’s picture of Rhesus because he does not want the new arrival to steal his thunder.

325f. παρὼν .. συγκαμών is ὑστερον πρότερον, with the literal image of fighting coming after the metaphorical image of hunting.

327f. For the second time in the play (cf. 76ff.) the chorus politely tries to change Η.’s mind. The sense is ‘you are right to be critical of your friends (i.e. Rhesus), but accept those (friends) who wish to help the city’. Bothe suggested a question mark after φίλοις, but the δὲ of 328 indicates that a contrast exists with a statement in 327.

ἀτίζεις The verb means ‘to deprive someone of their due honour’, which is what Η. is doing to Rh. by refusing to accept him as an ally. J. Jackson (CQ 35 (1940) 204) thought ἀτίζεις inappropriate and suggested ἀγάζεις, but this is unnecessary.

καπίμομφος Compound adjectives may be active or passive, according to context. This adj. is passive at Α. Αγ. 552f. τὰ μὲν τὶς ὁ ν λέξεειν εὐπετῶς ἐχειλν, ῥ̣ τὰ δ' αὐτὲ καπίμομφα, and Cho. 830 οὐκ ἐπίμομφον ἄταν. Here it is active.

329 For the sense cf. E. Άλκ. 383 (of Alcestis) ἀρκοῦμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ προθυήσκοντες σέθεν. Cf. also S. Άντ. 547 ἀρκέσω θυήσκουσ’ ἔγω. The use of the present tenses with πάλαι emphasises that Hector was, and still is a sufficient defence for Troy. Λ.’s πόλιν was probably written under the influence of the end of the previous line.
330f. The chorus are well aware of Hector’s belief that the Greeks are doomed from the first epeisodion and again urge a more cautious approach. His reply shows that his opinion is completely entrenched.

331 πέποιθα is used often at the start of lines in tragedy to express firm confidence. Cf. A. Se. 444, 521, Me. 733f. and And. 268f. (the last two also following πέποιθας from the previous line). Such confidence is typical of H., and πείθειν is frequently used in this tragedy when an assurance is far from certain in reality. Cf. 66, 663, 838, 991 and 993, and see Strohm Hermes 87 (1959) 265 n.4.

δείξει .. θεοῦ For the sentiment cf. Agamemnon’s confidence that Troy will fall at Il. 4.163f. Cf. also Il. 8. 537-41. With this ironic remark the theme of light and darkness occurs again. The dawn will, in fact, bring no such joy for the Trojans.

332 θεός The chorus takes up Hector’s θεοῦ, which refers specifically to the sun, and apply the word to ‘god’ indefinitely (cf. δαιμον at 56 above). Cf. esp.E. Su. 331 πέποιθ’ ο γὰρ θεός πάντ’ ἀναστρέφει πάλιν, as well as E. frs. 254.1, 536 and 554.

333 The sense is ‘I hate the act of coming too late to help one’s friends’. For μισῶ plus inf. see K-G 2.73 n.3 and cf. Eupolis 385.1 (Kassel-Austin) μισῶ λακωνίζειν and Il. 17.272 μίσην δ’ ἀρα μὲν δὴν κυρία γενέσθαι. For the idea cf. E. fr. 886.1f. (= Ar. Ra. 1427f.) μισῶ πολίτην ὡστις ὕφελεῖν πάτραν βραδὺς φανεῖται.
The verb occurs six times in E., and in A. fr. 46c.6. The word occurs first in tragedy (see Willink on E. Or. 1290), and does not appear again until Plutarch. For the Attic festival Βοηδρόμια, held in the month Βοηδρομίων, commemorating the help given by Theseus against the Amazons, see A. Mommsen Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum (1898) 176. See also L. Deubner Attische Feste (1932) 202.

336-41 The attribution of the lines in the MSS does not have papyrus authority. Nauck’s redistribution of the parts makes the best sense. Line 334 sounds like the kind of diplomatic advice which guards might give to their general and 335 comes better from the shepherd who has actually seen Rh. Moreover, only H. has the authority to say 336f. and the motivation to say 338. He appears to change his mind and accept Rh. not just as a guest but as an ally after only two lines of protest (334f.). We have already seen him change his mind after a period of stubbornness at 137f., but this change of heart seems excessively sudden (see H.D.F. Kitto YCS 25 (1977) 336). V.J. Rosivach (Hermes 106 (1978) 58 n.12) thinks that Nauck’s arrangement makes H. look like ‘a fickle ninny’, and suggests the retention of the MSS order, with Nauck’s attributions, and a lacuna between 338 and 339. This lacuna would contain elaborations of the objections to Hector’s initial decision which were raised in 332, 334 and 335. In this way the end of the epeisodion would resemble the end of the debate between H. and Aen., and make his change of heart seem more believable.  

262Pace Taplin (1977) 90 n.4, who suggests that the messenger should leave at 316 and that 334f. should go to the chorus leader.
However, by this arrangement Hector would accept Rhesus as a guest at 336 on the basis of 334-5; lines which clearly plead for his acceptance as an ally. Moreover δ δ' ἐν (336) would normally mark a return to the main subject after a digression, but there is no digression in the text. By this arrangement also, 335 is particularly out of place, being more suited to the moments before Hector's final decision.

M.L. West has indicated to me that 336-8 and 339-41 may well be alternative endings for the same scene which have coalesced, whereby Hector is either convinced by words which are now lost and accepts Rhesus fully (339-41), or accepts him only as a guest, postponing a final acceptance until he has had a chance to call him to account (336-8). The problem with this is explaining the presence of two endings for the scene in the first place. Moreover, if we excise 339-41, then the episode ends with H. accepting Rh. only as a guest, whereas it is clear from the following stasimon that the chorus assumes he has been accepted as an ally.

It is, in fact, debatable whether the messenger has only one line; firstly, because it would give H. very little motivation to change his mind; secondly, because it is odd to find a character intervening in a two-way dialogue with only one line; and thirdly, because asyndeton in 335 suggests that this line may be the end of a speech rather than a 'one-liner'. The most satisfactory answer seems to be to retain Nauck's word order, but with a lacuna between 334 and 335, containing a speech (the length of which we can only guess) spoken by the messenger, pleading for.

Cf. the inappropriate attribution of S. Ant. 572 to Antigone in the Aldine text.
the acceptance of Rh. as an ally. It is even possible that 335 is a truncated summary of such a speech. The result is that H. is persuaded to accept Rh. after a greater lapse of time, which makes his change of heart more plausible.

336-8 Hector now compromises his antipathy to Rh. and ensures that he shows him appropriate hospitality as a ἔνος, without having to share his glory with him on the battlefield. ἔνος was an important concept in Greek life, illustrated particularly well at E. Alc. 539-567, where Admetus cannot bring shame upon himself and his house by refusing hospitality to Heracles, despite his recent bereavement (cf. also Glaucus and Diomedes at Il. 6.224f.).

336ff. ὄ ὅ  ὄ ὄ... ὃ κέτω For ὅ  ὄ with the imperative indicating defiance or contempt see Denniston GP 466f. and cf. 868 below ὄ ὅ  ὄ ὄ μιξες ταὐτ'.

338 χάρις ... διώλετο translate 'for the gratitude of the sons of Priam to him has perished utterly'. It is possible that ἀπώλετο (L) is correct, cf. E. Hcld. 438 οὕτω σοί γ' ἀπαλλυται χάρις and fr. 736.5f. ἴ ὃ ἐν ὄφθαλμοῖς χάρις ἴ ἀπόλω (ἄλω' Nauck).

334 The chorus leader uses a diplomatic tactic against Hector. He should not lay himself open to criticism for closing his doors, especially to an ally.

ἐπίθοιουν is passive, meaning 'invidious', as at Ag. 921f. μη' εἴμαι στρώσας ἐπίθοιουν πόρον ἴ τίθει, and Ar. Eq. 1274 λοιδορήσαι τοὺς πονηροὺς οὐδέν ἔστ' ἐπίθοιουν. The word has an
active sense, meaning 'likely to take offence' at A. Ag. 134f. and A. Su. 201.

335 Ag. .......................................................
φόβος γένοιτ' ἄν πολεμῶις ὑφείς μόνον.

φόβος here means 'a source of terror', in apposition to Rhesus who is referred to by ὑφείς. For this sense of φόβος cf. S. OC 1651f. ὡς δεινοῦ τινος ὑφόβου φανέντος. For the position of φόβος in the sentence and a similar idea, cf. E. Ba. 304, of the affect of Dionysus' appearance upon an army. φόβος διεπότοσε πρὶν λόγχες θιγεῖν. ὑφείς is preferable to ἔλοών (O) because it is Rhesus' appearance which is terrible. Translate 'He would become a source of terror to the enemy if he were merely seen.' The messenger finally succeeds in persuading H. by pointing out the military advantage of accepting Rh.: the effect he will have on the Greeks. As at 284ff., he displays a more perceptive attitude to military matters than his commander.

339 σὺ τ' .. καὶ σὺ The scholion takes the first σὺ as referring to the messenger. However the sense of the clauses suggests the reverse. καὶ σὺ καυριῶς σκοπεῖ means 'and you view things opportunely', and refers, like ἀγγέλου λόγων in 340, to the latest (lost) words of the messenger. For this absolute sense of σκοπῶ cf. E. Pho. 155 μὴ σκοπῶ' ἀρθῶς θεοί. For τε .. καὶ instead of μὲν .. δὲ see K-G 2.250.

340f. Translate 'Let the gold-armoured Rhesus, because of the words of the messenger, come as an ally to this land'. The messenger is referred to in the third person, even after H.'s σὺ
in the previous line, because these lines are a king's 'impersonal' command.

χρυσοτευχής is ἀπ. λέγ.

οὖν ἐκ Porter believes that the preposition renders the meaning 'as far as the messenger's words go', to be taken with ὁ χρυσοτευχής, with a sarcastic tone (see Porter 1vi and his note ad loc.; contra, A.C. Pearson CQ 12 (1918) 79). However the meaning 'because of' is preferable, as at E. Tro. 912f. τῶν σῶν δ' ὁ νεκ', ὡς μάθηις, λόγων ἐν δῷσι τὸς αὐτήν.

For οὖν ἐκ instead of εὕνεκα in texts see West (ed.) Aeschylus Tragoediae 1990 xlix, J. Wackernagel KS (1954) 592f., Barrett on E. Hi. 453-6 and Stevens on E. And. 251 (pace Dover on Ar. Nu. 238 and 420).

There is no indication as to whether H. leaves the stage for the second stasimon, but there is no objection to his remaining and he has no motivation for leaving.
342-387 Second stasimon and anapaests at the entry of Rhesus

For the schemata and the enjambement at 350\351 see pp. 55ff. above. See also Wilamowitz GV 584-7, W. Kranz Stasimon (1933) 263, O. Schroeder Euripidis Cantica\textsubscript{2} (1928) 168 R. 305-8 and A.M. Dale \textsc{MATC} 1.98.

After H.'s initial decision that he will accept Rh. as an ally the chorus now launch into an ode of generous praise for the new arrival in the form of a cletic hymn. Rhesus forms the focal point of the whole song. In the first two stanzas, after an initial prayer to avert envy (342-45), the chorus expresses joy at his arrival and glory in his divine lineage. In the second strophe they long for a return to the joys of peace which they hope his arrival will bring. In the second antistrophe they imagine the deeds he will perform for Troy. There follow lines of welcome in anapaests as the hero enters and they glory in his appearance.

By now the chorus has forgotten D., the hero of the last stasimon. However, it is in this ode that the relevance of D. to the dramatic structure becomes clearer, i.e. the comparison and contrast to be drawn between himself and Rhesus. Both are hailed as heroes who will attack the Greeks and return safely, having restored Trojan confidence and prestige (cf. esp. 242-59 with 360-68). However, the circumstances of their respective \textit{árhoṣeía} are to be quite different. D. will creep about the ships at night, in disguise, to spy on the Greeks. If he kills the Atreidae (257f.) it will be through stealth and trickery, and he will only get the horses of Achilles when H. has defeated the Greeks. Apollo is asked to look after D. and Troy (cf. the wish that Hermes will do so at 217). Rh. on the other hand is spoken of not as needing
the help of a god, but as coming to aid Troy in place of two gods, Zeus and Ares. He will attack the Greeks openly, not by stealth, even facing Achilles (370ff.). His shining arms proclaim him while Dolon's wolfskin hides him. When speaking of D. about to kill the Atreidae the chorus used optatives (257ff. ἐλοι...ἐνέγκοι), but when speaking of Rh. they use indicatives, reflecting their greater confidence (375ff. οὕτις...χορεύσει: ἀλλὰ νιν ὕδε γὰ...οἶσεν).

The irony behind these similarities and differences between D. and Rh. is that, for all his perceived potential, Rh. will fare no better than D. In fact his fate is to be murdered that night, before he even leaves the Trojan camp, by the same man who murdered D.

In addition to providing a contrast to their first ode, the guards mould this song, and the anapaests at Rhesus' entry, on the words of the shepherd messenger who was an eye witness to the hero's arrival. The guards elaborate his account to the level of fantasy, even after Rhesus is physically present at 380. Cf. 301 ὠστε δαίμονα with 355 σὸν μοι Ζεὺς ὁ φαναίος, 358f. τὸν ἔλευθεριον ἦν πάρεστιν εἰπεῖν and 385 θεός, ὁ Τροία, θεός, αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀρης: 302 ἑστῶτ' ἐν ἑποίης θρησκίως τ' ὀχύμασι with 356 ἰκείς διφρεύων βαλλαῖσι πῶλοις: 305f. πέλτη... ἔλαμπε with 370ff. τῶν ζάχυσουν...πέλ-ιτων: 307f. χαλκῆ...φόβου with 383f. κλύε...κελαδοῦντας and 315f. with 375ff. (cf. also H.'s δ χρυσοτευχῆς at 340 with 382 ἢς χρυσόδετον σώματος ἀλκήν).

A particularly impressive elaboration occurs in the first two stanzas. We are told the identity of Rhesus' father at 279 and the chorus mention his parents and describe his conception at 348-354.
As well as looking back the ode also contains expressions which are echoed in the isolated strophe at 454-66 (see note ad loc.)

In the opening words of the ode the chorus is self-consciously aware that the praise they are about to heap on Rhesus might attract envy. However, what ultimately renders the ode more pathetic than hybristic is the fact that Rhesus will be slain, not because he has incurred θόνος, but because Athena, patroness of the Greeks, knows he will be invincible if he survives the night (600-604). In this respect the poet ultimately confounds any expectations that Rhesus will perish as the result of an outrageous word or deed. This excessive praise is not designed to attract a divine envy which will ruin Rh.; it is designed to point out the over-confident expectations of the Trojans. At the end of the first ode, they fantasised about the murder of the Atreidae as a result of D.'s spying mission; now they fantasise about once more enjoying the pleasures of peacetime in Troy after the Greeks have been swept away by Rhesus. Just as their confidence and their praise is now greater at the prospect of Rhesus' arrival, so much greater will be their ultimate disappointment. We may compare the premature rejoicing of the chorus of sailors at the prospect of Ajax's safety at S. Αἰ. 693ff., the premature rejoicing of Deianeira and the chorus at the prospect of Heracles' return at S. Tra. 205ff. and the premature celebration of Heracles' victory by the chorus at Ε. ΗF 763ff.

To sum up, the ode glances backwards, contrasting Rh. with D., builds up dramatic tension before the entry of the new character and looks forwards, with irony, to the ἀριστεία he will
never perform. The poet has combined the Trojans’ naïve expectations of success with an impressive lack of restraint in praise (appropriate to barbarians), in order to produce a colourful but ironic ode of welcome.

First strophe and antistrophe: 342-350-351-359

The stasimon opens with a typically Pindaric sentiment (see 342f.n.), including stress on the speaker’s desire (344n.). To convey their excited state the guards use asyndeton in three consecutive sentences at 346 (ἠκείζ, ὃ κτλ.), 355 (σὺ μοι κτλ.) and 357 (νῦν, ὃ κτλ.), and later in two consecutive sentences at 367 (ὡ φίλος κτλ.) and 370 (ἐλθέ, φάνηθι κτλ.). To increase this wild excitement there is a deliberate fluctuation between the chorus’ adulation of Rh. as a god (355, 359 and 385) and the phrases Διὸς παῖς (342) and ξὺν θεῶ (358), which clearly shows that the guards do not regard Rh. as an actual personification of deity (see pp. 76ff. above).

Second strophe and antistrophe: 360-369-370-379

In a single sentence spanning 360-66 the Trojans muse over the happiness they expect to enjoy again as a result of Rh.’s advent. At 367-69 they turn their attention to Rh., expressing directly the hope that he will achieve this success for them. At 370-74 they urge him on to warlike acts and at 375-79 declare what fate the Greeks can expect as a result of his coming.

The second strophe has a homely tone, in keeping with the humble concerns of some other tragic choruses. After the exalted praise of Rh. the guards turn to nostalgic reminiscence of the pleasures of the symposium; a carefree and festive activity which they associate with the days of peace before the arrival of the
Greeks. In classical Athens symposia took the form of drinking parties to which one brought one's own food (see Pl. Sy. passim and Dover Plato Symposium (1980) p.11). Participants lay next to one another on couches, ate and got drunk in a strictly regulated fashion, through the imposition of toasts or competitive drinking (κυλίκων οἶνοπλανήτωις .. ἀμίλλαις), accompanied by music (ψαλμοίσι. For flute playing at symposia cf. Pl. Sy. 176E 6f.). As the party continued it tended to turn into a debauch, perhaps with the playing of cottabos and sex with hired girls. See K.J. Dover Greek Homosexuality (1978) plates R200, R283 and R295, for vase paintings of symposia involving music, drinking and sex.

Such activities as symposia properly belonged to a time of peace, when a people were not continuously on guard against the possibility of attack. War leaves no space for deep drinking or joyful music and it carries off one's dearest friends, either by death or enforced separation (cf. Bacch. Pae. fr. 4.61-80 and A. (Myrm.) fr. 138 (Radt). One may compare this strophe with S. Ai. 1199-1210, in the only other extant tragedy in which the cast and chorus are under arms in the field. In that ode the chorus of sailors from Salamis lament that war has cut them off from the pleasures of symposia, sweet music, peaceful sleep and love-making. Kamerbeek (ad loc.) objects that in the passage from Ai. 'What the chorus desire is not only anachronistic - the pleasures they yearn for are those of fifth-century Athens - but also ill suited to the standing of the chorus, since they are the pleasures of the bonne société of Cimon, Sophocles or Alcibiades'. His criticism of anachronism applies also to this strophe in Rh. but it is not a serious objection to make. The tragedians had no
qualms about introducing anachronisms into their works (see P. Easterling JHS 105 (1985) 1-10). The second objection is also invalid. Drinking, music and sex are not the preserves of bonne société, but common to all; and the nostalgic reminiscences of the guards are meant to provoke a feeling of sympathy in the hearts of the audience, like the desire of Ajax’s sailors to see Cape Sunium again (S. Ai. 1219ff.). Since the concerns of H. and the other principals are those of national security and personal glory, such fond nostalgia would be inappropriate in their mouths. Note the fact that deep drinking is particularly associated with peace and is regarded as a symptom of idleness and a source of reproach in time of war (cf. H. and Rh. at 419 and 438). The chorus of ordinary men, however, is well placed to reflect on the consequences of war for the ordinary person and add another dimension to the pathos of the tragedy. One might compare the words of the herald at A. Ag. 551-566. This minor character laments the discomforts which the Greeks suffered under at Troy; the cramped conditions, damp, vermin, freezing cold and scorching heat. Such complaints would be inappropriate from a character of a higher status but the herald’s concerns are lowly, like those of the chorus here.

For other examples of nostalgia in tragedy cf. E. Tro. 149ff., where the newly enslaved Hecuba remembers leading the prayers at Troy; ib. 1071-6, where the chorus laments the passing of dances and festivals. Cf. also Erech. fr. 369.1ff. (Snell 60.1ff., Austin NFE 22), esp. ib. 371.5f. (Snell 65.5f., Pap. Sorb. 2328, Austin ib. 33) ἡ ποτ’ ἀνὰ πόλιν ἀλαλαῖς ἵνα παλὰν | καλλίνικον βοάσω μέλος and Chres. fr. 453 (Austin ib. 41). From
comedy cf. Dicaeopolis' longing for his village while cooped up in Athens during the Peloponnesian War at Ach. 32f. and the revulsion from war at Ar. Pax 1127-32 We also find touches of pathos in Homer which recall the more carefree days in Troy before the Greeks came. Cf. esp. Il. 22.153-6 and 18.288.

342f. Excessive praise of anyone in Greek literature was fraught with the danger of incurring φθόνος. Lines 342-5 are reminiscent of Pindar's cautious piety when praising a man. 'der Vorspruch...könnte ein pindarisch-bakchylideisches Lied einleiten' says Kranz (ib. 264). Cf. Nem. 8.19-22, Ol. 8.55, and Is. 7.39. However, in the drama these words have an ironic significance. The chorus, having produced their own lavish praise of Rh. after paying lip service to Adrasteia, consider his own boasting at 447-453 so excessive as to pray that he will not himself incur φθόνος (455ff.). In turn Rhesus' reassurance that he speaks ὡν Ἀδράστεια at 468 provides the most ironic remark of all. His ambitions are beyond even the fantasies of the chorus and his self confidence has no bounds.

Ἀδράστεια The scholion says that the name of this goddess comes from the town of the same name on the Troad which is itself named after king Adrastus. Strabo mentions this (13.588C), but neither town nor king has any association with the goddess (see Leaf 78). The origin is likely to be ἄ-διδράσκω (cf. the name of the Fate Atropos and see P. Chantraine Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue grecque (1968) 1.279; 'à qui on ne peut échapper'). The ending -εια is commonly used for female names (see Schwyzer
Sources vary as to her relationship with Zeus. Here she is his child. At Callimachus Hy. 1.47, she is one of his nurses and the daughter of Melisseus (see G.R. Mclennan Callimachus Hymn to Zeus (1977) 79). Cf. also A.R. 3.133. Here she is mentioned in her capacity as a punitive deity. In this rôle she was synonymous with Rhamnusian Nemesis (see Plut. de sera num. 25.564E, Callimachus Hy. 3.232, and fr. 299.2 (Pfeiffer). There is an altar inscribed Nemes lei Adralsteiai at Cyzicus (see Arch.epigr.Mitt. 15.95.15 and cf. Schweitzer JbDAI 45 1931 206). For a detailed survey of this rôle see H. Posnansky, BPW Abh. 2 (1890), esp. 75; ‘Sie wurde angerufen, wenn der Grieche fürchtete, durch seine Worte sich einer Sünde schuldig zu machen und dadurch die Ungnade der Götter zu erregen.’ She is also mentioned in this capacity at line 468 below, at PV 936, Plato Re. 451A, [Dem.] 25.1.37, and Menander Samia 503. Cf. also Herodas 6.34f. μένον μέν ἡ γυνὴ γρύξω, λάθοιμι δ' Ἀδρήστεια (see W. Headlam Herodas The Mimes and Fragments (1922) 294f.).

μέν For μέν without a δὲ, implying that the speaker wanders from his point before supplying an answering clause, see Fraenkel on A. Ag. 1 and Denniston GP 384. Cf. also the use of μέν without δὲ at the start of the parodos at A. Ag. 40.264

στομάτων is a ‘separative’ genitive (see V. Bers Greek Poetic Syntax (1984) 99ff.)}. Translate ‘Let her keep φθόνος away from...’ It is unlikely that Fraenkel is correct to believe that the δὲ in Ag. 72 could answer this μέν. A separation of thirty-two lines between the particles surely precludes such a connection.
what I say'. For this sense of στόμα see Jebb on S. OC 130ff.

ϕθόνον Envy which comes from the gods and begrudges success. Cf. A. Ag. 947 μὴ τις πρόσωμεν ὁμματος βάλοι ϕθόνος. Cf. also A. Pe. 362, Ag. 904 and E. Alc 1135. A preliminary prayer to ϕθόνος is necessary before Neoptolemus can take hold of Philoctetes' bow at S. Ph. 776.

344f. φράσω 'I shall declare'. Cf. E. Hec. 219 and Hel. 976.

γὰρ δὴ δοσον On γὰρ δὴ as an emphatic rhetorical opening see Dennistont GP 243. Correction would be avoided by adopting Hermann's παρ' for δὴ. Correction occurs mostly with diphthongs (cf., in lyric, lines 255 οὔτασεν ἐν, 457 θέλοι ἀμφί and 825 ἐπεὶ ἄχρυπνον. However, we do find correction with a long vowel at S. Phil. 839 ὀρὼ οὖνεκα. West (GM (1982) 11f.) says that correction in dramatic lyric is a particularly Sophoclean feature and Wilamowitz (GV 586) points to this as a feature not to be found in E., but cf. Me. 423 ἵμνεύσαι ἀπιστοσίνων, and id. 426 ἐπεὶ ἀντάχης.

μοι ἴ ψυχᾶι The dat. of the personal pronoun is used as a possessive pronoun. The stress on the speaker is reminiscent of Pindaric usage. Cf. also Il. 7.68 ὃφρ' εἶπω τά με θυμός ἐνι στήθεσσι κελεύει.

346f. The scholion on 345 discusses the identity of Rh.'s mother who is not named in the play. See note on Hypotheses (a)
The word ἤκεις is repeated in excitement. It is interesting to observe that ἤκεις occupies the same strong rhetorical position in the antistrophe as in 347. ἐπιλάθης is the poetic aor. pass. of πελάζω (cf. 920 below). The commoner form would be ἐπιλάσθης which the scribe of P has written, 'correcting' what he assumed was a mistake in L.

The reading φιλίου (A) could only refer to H. (as a friend of Rh.), but φιλίος is not used as a noun meaning 'friend'. By printing Φιλίου with a capital letter here, editors are assuming that it refers to Ζεὺς Φίλιος, 'ὁ τὰ περὶ τὰς φιλίας ἐπισκοπῶν' (Photius Lex.). If this is correct Zeus is mentioned here in the capacity of a host to Rh. For a detailed study of this particular cult see A.B. Cook Zeus vol.2. 1160-1210, Harrison Prolegomena to Greek Religion 357f., See also M.P. Nilsson Geschichte der griechischen Religion (1967) vol.2, 1.808ff. and Wilamowitz GV 585. At E. And. 603 we find τὸν σῶν λαπόσα φίλιον, where the word must mean something like Ζεὺς Ἐρκεῖος. We find examples of the colloquial use of (Zeus) Philios in comedy (cf. Ar. Ach. 730 and Menander Andr. fr. 49 (Koerte) and Plato (cf. Phaedr. 234E, Gorgias 500B, 519E Euth. 6B and [Alc.] 109E). However, there is a problem in taking Φιλίου with αὐλή. Since altars of Zeus Philios are usually located in an αὐλαί, there is no point in welcoming Rh. to any particular αὐλή of Z. Ph. What is required is a stress on the αὐλή being that of Troy, and that is provided by Δ's Φρυγίων. For the words of warm welcome cf. Theseus
at S. OC 633 κοινὴ παρ' ἡμῖν αἷλν ἐστὶν ἐστία.

348 ἀσπαστός does not appear elsewhere in tragedy, but we find ἀσπασίως (also unique for tragedy) at A. Ag. 1555.

χρόνωι cf. tandem in Latin. Here it refers to the present; at 830 and 893 below, to the future.

349 Πιερίς is a title commonly applied to the Muses in Pindar. Cf. Py. 1.14, Ol. 10.96, and Ne. 6.32. Mount Pieria, N. of Olympus, was one of their abodes.

καλλιγέφυρος is ἀπ. λεγ., but cf. καλλιπρώρος at A. Ag. 235.

πορεύεται is ironic because Rh. came expressly against his parents' wishes (900ff., 934f.). However the guards assume that he has been sent with their blessing, which must be the sense of πορεύεται.

351-54 Burnett ((1985) 29) believes that the details of Rhesus' conception 'seem almost to ask for a titter' (cf. Kitto YCS 25 (1977) 337). But reference to birth or conception in tragedy is not usually comic, especially if one or more parent is divine. There is nothing inappropriate in the reference or amusing in the expression, on the contrary, it is an elegant periphrasis for sexual union, especially the detail of the river god approaching the Muse in his liquid form. Cf. his mother's own
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description of the circumstances of Rh.'s conception at 919f. and Od. 11.420, where Poseidon is lying with Tyro and the couple are engulfed by a wave. Descriptions of the sexual desires and unions of the gods, and the birth of their offspring are not a taboo subject for poets. Cf. Pindar Py. 9.36f., of Apollo's desire for Cyrene, Ol. 6.39-45, of the birth of Iamos, h. 5.107-167, Call. H. 1.14ff., of Rhea's labour, ib. 4.209ff., of Leto's labour, and Hel. 18-21 and 258f., of Leda's labour.

μελωιδοῦ is not found before E. It appears at IT 1104f., IA 1045, Hel. 1110 and Hy. 1.2.14. In prose it is used as a noun meaning 'singer' at Pl. Leg. 723D. Cf. μελωιδία at 923 below, which also does not occur before E.

ὁδοιτὴς is ὁπ. λεγ. See p.31 n.61 above.

ἐφύτευσεν The subject is usually male, as here (cf. Pindar Ne. 7.84, followed by ὅπο plus gen.), but need not be (cf. E. Me. 834 of Harmonia, mother of the Muses).

355 σὺ μοι The juxtaposition of the pronouns gives a personal dimension to the valediction, cf. εἰθε μοι ἵ σῶι χερὶ καὶ σῶι δορὶ at 367f. The sentiment is nicely balanced by the address to their fatherland at 357.

Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος The adjective comes from φανῄνει 'to appear' and is equivalent to the later word ἐπιφανῆς. See Paley ad loc. and Wilamowitz GV 585. φαναῖος itself is not in Chantraine, but
see A.B. Cook Zeus (1914) vol.1.7 n.6 and L.R. Farnell Cults of the Greek States vol.4 (1907) 138. Zeus does not have the title elsewhere in Greek literature. There was a cult of Apollo φαναῖος on Chios but this was no more than a local adjective from the harbour of Phanae, where his temple stood (Strabo 645C 14.1.35).

356 διφρέυων is also used with dat. of conveyance at E. And. 1011f.

βαλιαίοι πώλοις The adjective means ‘dappled’. At 304 they are whiter than snow, and at 618 they shine like the wing of a swan. The scholion, wishing to excuse this inconsistency, says ἐς ἄντι τοῦ ταχείας (cf. the confusion over ἄρτος, wrongly reported in LSJ as meaning white, when it means swift). This meaning of βαλλός does not occur before authors as late as Ps.-Oppian and Nonnus. However, this is not simply a matter of poetic arbitrariness. The adjective may well have a deliberately exotic effect. Where it appears in E. (it does not occur in A. or S.) the adjective is used in exotic, outlandish contexts, of fawns at Ht. 218 and at the spurious Hec. 90 (composed by the fourth century actor Theodectes. See Bremer Mnemosyne 24 (1971) 232ff.), and of the lynx at Alc. 579. Most interestingly, it is used of Achilles' horses at IA 222 λευκοστίκτω τρίχι βαλλούς, and it is the name of one of them in Homer (cf. Il. 16.149). Another possibility is that διφρέυων βαλλαίοι πώλοις is to be imagined as going specifically with the image of Z. ὁ Φαναῖος, rather than specifically with Rhesus.
357-9 'At last o fatherland, o Phrygia, at last, God willing, you can speak of Freedom.' For ῥή with the sense 'at last', cf. χρόνωι at 348. εἴνθεών has a sense similar to deo volente in Latin. Cf. E. Me. 625 σὺν θεῶ δ' εἰρήστεαι and σὺν δ' Ἀδραστεία λέγω at 468 below. For the cry to the fatherland cf. E. Hec. 905 σὺ μὲν ὑ πατριὶς Ἴλιας.


360f. ἄρα ποτ᾽ |...παναμερεύοισει For ἄρα ποτ᾽ cf. E. Erech. 65.5ff. (Austin) ἦ ποτ᾽ κτλ. There is a strong resemblance between these lines and E. Ba. 862ff. ἄρ' ἐν παννυχίοις χοροῖς | θήσω ποτὲ λευκῶν | πόδ' ἀναβακχείονσα, especially in the compound of παν- which relates to a temporal idea. Cf. also the lament of the chorus at E. Tro. 1071ff., after the fall of Troy φρούδαι σοι θυσίαι χορῶν τ' | ἐυφῆμοι κέλαδοι κατ' ὀρφ-ίναν τε παννυχίδες θεών and S. Ant. 152f. θεῶν δὲ ναοῖς χοροῖς παννύχοις πάντας ἐπέλ-θωμεν. What is particularly striking here is the idea of the revels lasting all day, rather than all night. Perhaps we are intended to think that the Trojans led a dissipated life before the Greeks came (ἀνοίς would support this interpretation). But it
should also be remembered that it was after an entire day of drunken revelry, held to celebrate the initial departure of the Greeks from Troy, that a picked band emerged from the Trojan horse to open the city to the marauding invaders. Thus the sentence is laden with irony, for the Trojans will enjoy the pleasures of peace and freedom again, but it will be their last day.

The verb, which is a ἀπ. λεγ., is transitive, governing τοὺς προπότας θιάσους (for verbs in -ευω with a transitive sense cf. 434 διηρεύσας τέκνα, 446, κυβεύων τὸν Ἀρη, E. Su. 417 μὴ διορθείων λόγους and Or. 405 ὃς σῶν ἔρθενεν δέμας). Using a city as the subject of a transitive verb is a bold device cf. E. And. 341 οὐχ ὡς ἀνανδρον αὐτὸν ἡ Τροία καλεῖ, where, as here, the actual action of the verb is properly carried out by Troy’s inhabitants.

361f. τοὺς προπότας θιάσους Porter takes the article as indicating that revelling bands were a regular feature of victory celebrations, but it is best to take it as possessive. προπότας is ἀπ. λεγ. (see Fraenkel Nomina Agentis 115). θιάσος is used of maenad bands (cf. esp. E. Ba. 56, 115, 532, 558, 584, 680 and 978) and was doubtless chosen to give the impression of riotous revelry.

362f. ἐρώτων ψαλμοίς ‘with the music of loves’, i.e. love songs accompanied by the lyre. ψαλμοίς properly refers to the noise made plucking of harps (cf. Pindar fr. 125.3). The dat. is instrumental after the verb. The word does not come literally to mean a song (psalm) until later centuries.
σινοπλαύητως is ἀπ. λεγ. and active, meaning 'intoxicating'. It agrees with δυμίλλαις. This is the interpretation of the scholion; ταῖς διὰ τοῦ οἶνου παραγώγαις τῶν νυμῶν. In most other -πλάνητος compounds the prefix refers to the place, time, or degree of wandering (Orphic Hymns 38.5 θυτῶν ποντοπλάνητων, Ar. Ach. 264 ἐταῖρε νυκτοπεριπλάνητε and E. Hi. 1109f. αἰῶν | πολυπλάνητος).

364 ἐπιδεξίους 'passing to the right' is transferred to δυμίλλαις from κυλίκων. It is L. Dindorf's conjecture for ὑποδεξίαις which occurs nowhere else in tragedy and the meaning of which is hard to determine. At Herod. 7.49.3 (λιμένων ὑποδεξίων) it means 'of adequate capacity', but this is not attested elsewhere. The Suda and Photius recognise ὑποδεξίος and explain it as ὑποδεξχός. The poet was probably thinking of Il. 1.597f. αὐτάρ ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς ἐνδέξια πᾶσιν | οἶνοχόει.

366 Σπάρταν The seat of Menelaus, husband of Helen, is used to denote Greece generally. There are no grounds for R. Goossens (AC 1 (1932) 130f.) to assume that this is a topical reference to the Peloponnesian war and thereby date the play to 424 BC. The device is synekdoche, commonly used of places (cf. 376 below).

367ff. ὁ φίλος Nom. for voc. is common in poetry (see Schwyzser Gr.Gr. 1939-71 2.64), esp. for this adj. (see Griffith (1977) 121 and n.95). Cf. Il. 4.189 φίλος ὁ Μενέλας, A. fr. 807 (Dict.), S. OT 1321, E. Me. 1133, And. 510, 530, 842 (pace Collard
We find φίλε in E. rarely: at Tro. 673 and Cy. 74 (although the text there is probably corrupt. See Seaford ad loc.), and in some MSS at Su. 278 and And. 842. Cf also PV 545.

πράλεξας τάδ' i.e. having swept the Greeks away and restored peace to Troy. For the sense of πράσων, and the phrasing, cf. A. Ag. 111 είν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πρόκτορι.

ες οἶκον ἐλθοίς is heavily ironic, as well as the statement at 375f. that no Greek who meets Rh. will get home safely. The warrior will die within the night, having harmed none.

370 With bold asyndeton between strophe and antistrophe the chorus change gear from a contemplative mood to a more direct and excited one. This change is precipitated by the juxtaposition of two moods of the same verb; the optative ἐλθοίς and the imperative ἐλθέ (cf. 381f. ἰδεῖν. ἰδε). R. overlooked these paregmena, stating, (240), 'The figure is not used in the lyric portions of Rh.', yet this particular one has a powerful rhetorical effect. Whereas the strophe contained the questioning ἄφα ποι' αὕτις...παναμερεύσει and the optative clause ἐθε...ἐλθοίς, we now have three strong imperatives in one line, ἐλθέ, φάνηθι ... προβαλοῦ, as well as the confident future indicative clauses, οὕτις ... ποτε ... χορέυσει and ἄδε γά...οἶσει. We are returned to the adulation of Rh. as a god-like saviour. This mood continues until the end of the anapaests.
The use of imperatives is common in cletic hymns and other addresses to deities, e.g. to Bacchus at E. Ba. 1017 and S. Ant. 1149. Cf. also for addresses to exceptional mortals E. HF 494, to Heracles and esp. A. Pe. 657-71, to the ghost of Darius who, like Rh., is asked to come performing actions which the chorus associate with him ἔθος, ἴκνα, ἔθος ... | κροκόβαπτον ποδὸς εὐμαριν ἄείρων, | βασιλείου τιήρας φάλαρον πιφαύσκων. | βάσκε ...! ... | ὕ φάνηθι.

ζάχρυφον The prefix ζα- has an intensifying force. For the adjective cf. 439 below and E. IT 1111. At E. Alc. 498 Ἰχρος, ζαχρύσον Θηρικίας πέλτης ἄναξ, it is applied to the shield of Thracian Ares. The adj. is not found again until much later, e.g. Libanius (4th century AD) Orat. 11.140. For πέλτη see 305n.

371f. κατ’ ὄμμα means 'in his face'. Cf. 421 and cf. also κατὰ ὀπόθεμα 'face to face' at 491 and 511

πέλτην δοξήν πεδαίρων The πέλτη was circular and did not have a slanting side. The sense is that since Rh. is in a chariot his shield will be raised not upright and directly in front of him, as it would if he were on foot, but aslant and alongside the chariot rail.

πεδαίρω is the aeolic form of μεταίρω. The verb does not occur in A. or S., but A. also has πεδε- for μετε- at Cho. 590 λαμπάδες πεδάροι (of meteors), πεδάροις at ib. 846 and πεδοίκοιν χελιδόνοις at fr. 246d. Cf also PV 269 710 and 916. E. uses the verb outside dialogue at HF 819, 872 and Pho. 1027, and μεταίρω in
dialogue at *IT* 1157.

373 σχιστάων παρ' ἄντυγα The phrase goes with πέλ. δοχ. πεδ., not with what follows. ἄντυγα means chariot rail here and not the rim of the shield (the latter is the interpretation of the scholion because V does not have πώλους ἐρεθίζων). Cf. 237-8 and 568 below and, also with παρά, E. *IA*. 229.

The ἄντυγα is split (σχιστάων) in that it stands separately from the body of the chariot, and is therefore divided from it. ἄντυγα appears nowhere else with σχιστός in Greek. At *Il*. 5.728 we read of δοιάι ... περίδρομοι ἄντυγες. W. leaf’s explanation is that the phrase in the *Il*. refers to the two ends of a single chariot rail which formed handles at the rear of the chariot. However, see K. Jenkins *Coins of Greek Sicily* (1966) plates 1g and 2, where two rails, one above the other, are clearly visible above the chassis of the chariot. Other coins clearly show only one rail.

πώλους ἐρεθίζων The chorus do not imagine that Rh. will drive his chariot and brandish a shield and javelin. ἐρεθίζων refers to his vocal urging of the horses while his charioteer, himself a character in the play, handles the reins. Paley assumes that Rh. can both drive and fight, comparing him to Iolaus at E. *Hcld*. 729 and 846. However, Iolaus is nowhere spoken of as performing both actions at once. In epic, heroes who had a chariot always had a charioteer who would drive them to and from the action while the hero concentrated on fighting. Cf. *Il*. 5.578-82, the impressive scene at *ib*. 835-9, where Athena herself supplants Diomedes’ charioteer Sthenelus, *Il*. 11.47ff., 102ff. and 17.463ff.
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374f. δίβολον τ' ἀκούτα πάλλων The adj. is found nowhere else in A., S. or E., although Ar. has καὶ τῶν πλατυλόγχων διβολίων ἀκούτιων at fr. 476 (Kassel-Austin). Its precise meaning has been a point of controversy. An obvious sense from the etymology δι- βάλλω is something which can be thrown in a two-fold fashion, possibly a javelin with a point at both ends so that it can be thrown with either end facing the target (cf. Ar. fr. 476 above and Od. 16.474 ἐγκέσων ἀμφιγύοισι, although these may refer to the two curved edges of the tip. See Heubeck and Hoekstra on Od. 16.474). Vater suggests that the weapon is a two-pronged dart which would inflict a double wound. Cf. Σ Pindar Ne. 6.54f. [ἐνάρεξεν ... ἀκμάι | ἐγκέσος] ὅστε μοί βολή διῆκα τὰ τραύματ' ἀπεργάζεσθαι., S. fr. 152 ἧ δορὸς διχόστομον πλάκτρον | δίπτυχοι γὰρ ὀδύναι μιν ἦρικον | ἀχιλληνίου δόρατος and E. And. 1133 ἐκλυοι τ' ἀμφώβολοι. Of the latter Stevens says (ad loc.) 'a two-pronged spit would in effect be a similar weapon to the δίβολος ἄκων in Rh. 374'. This interpretation is supported by πεμπώβολα (Il. 1.463 etc.), which can only refer to five-pronged forks. For a similar weapon, a favourite of Ares, cf. A. Ag. 642f. διπλῆς μάστιγι, τὴν Ἀρης φιλεῖ, | διλογχον ἄτην, φοινίων ξυνωρίδα. Some editors take this to be a double whip, but Fraenkel (ad loc.), Verrall (ad A. Ag. 647) and Leaf (on Il. 23.387) envisage it, correctly, as a rod with two prongs at the end; a combination of whip and goad (cf. S. Ai. 242, λιγυρὰς μάστιγι διπλῆι, although Jebb interprets this as a whip with two thongs made by doubling the strap). Porter believes the weapon in Ag. 642 is the same as the one in Rh., but we cannot be sure of this and
should give serious consideration, instead, to G.C. Richard’s suggestion (CQ 10 (1916) 196) that the phrase may be no more than the poet’s way of saying the Homeric ἀκοντε δῶ, referring to the Iliadic custom of carrying two javelins into battle. In view of the poet’s frequent use of epic imagery, this is certainly the best suggestion.

For the actions associated with the new hero cf. A. Cho. 161ff. Σκυθικά τ’ ἐν χειρίν | {παλίνοντα} ἐν ἔργῳ βέλη πιπάλλων Ἀρεώς | σχέδια τ’ αὐτόκομπα νυμῶν βέλη.

ὑποστάς The verb also takes the acc. at 315 above and refers to an identical situation; someone opposing Rh. The verb also takes the acc. when it means ‘resist’ at E. HF 1350 ὑποστήναι βέλος, Cy. 199f. μυρίον δ’ ὄχλον | θρυγὼν ὑπέστην, Thuc. 1.144.4 οἱ γοῦν πατέρες ἦμῶν ὑποστάστες Μήδους. Elsewhere we find the dat., as at A. Pe. 87f.

376 In contrast to the renewal of the past envisaged for the Trojans, any Greek who opposes Rh. will be denied the chance to celebrate his own civic festival ever again. Argos was one of the largest cult centres of Hera. See W. Burkert Greek Religion (1985) 131 n.3. and L.R. Farnell The Cults of the Greek States 1 ch. 7. It is used for all Greece again at 459. For a Greek’s reminiscence of the Heraia cf. E. IT 221 οὐ τῶν Ἀργεί μέλπουσ’ Ὑραν.

377ff. ἂδε γὰ | .. | φίλτατον ἄχθος οἶς εἰ is used in contrast to the reference to Argos and in close connection with the reference to Thrace. As at 360ff., it is the land which is the
subject of the sentence. Cf. 380 and the personification of Troy at 385.

For a feeling of repugnance at being buried in enemy soil cf. II. 4.174-7, where Agamemnon fears lest Menelaus rot in Troy and his tomb become a source of gloating for the Trojans. Cf. also A. Ag 452-5, of the dead at Troy, esp. 455 ἐχθρᾶ δ' ἔχουσας ἐκρυφεν, and, of the same, E. Tro. 375-9, esp. 378f. ἐν ξένη δὲ γῆ ἔκειναι. By way of contrast, Orestes says at A. Cho. 351ff. that the corpse of Agamemnon would have brought credit to his house had he died and been buried at Troy πολύχωστον ὅν εἶχες ἔν τάφον διαποτίσιον γὰς, ἓ δέμασιν εὐφόρητον.

καπφθίμενον is apocope for κατεφθίμενον. Cf. E. Su. 984 καπφθίμενον and E1. 1299 καπφθιμένης.

Θηνίκη μόρων. Θηνίς is the Ionic form of Θὴνίς. A Thracian doom may have meant a particularly savage one. See 513ff.n.

380-387 For the strong likelihood that Rh. made his entry on a chariot see p.73f. above. Burnett ((1985) 181 n.49) objects that he cannot have entered on a chariot because ‘there is no point .. at which Rh. could step down .. we would see the horses as well, and no actual pair could be represented as the most beautiful in the world (after Achilles’).’ This is not a valid objection. Rh. can step down at any point during the anapaests and the audience’s suspension of disbelief would be enough to cope with a pair of ordinary horses. Spectacle does not require verisimilitude to be effective.
380 μέγας ὃ βασιλεύ The voc. of μέγας is rare (see Hutchinson on A. Se. 822).

381 σκύμνον The noun means the young of an animal, especially a lion or wolf cub. The word became a conventional expression for valiant youth, of which E. was fond (it occurs outside E. in tragedy only at S. Ai. 987, in a simile). See Collard on Su. 1223, R. 232, Breitenbach (1934) 153 and cf. E. And. 1170, of Neoptolemus, and Su. 1223, of the Epigonoi. In contrast, the noun emphasises vulnerability at Hec. 205, of Polyxena, and contempt at Or. 1213, of Hermione (see G. Roux REG 87 (1974) 69 and Willink ad loc.). For the animal imagery used by E. see J. Smereka Studia Euripidea 2 (1937) 112f. and cf. πῶλος at 386.

πολίαρχοι ἵδείν 'A prince to behold', in apposition to σκύμνον.

382f. ἵδε ... κλέε These emphatic imperatives at the start of the lines are a sure indication that Rh. is onstage, visible and audible. The phrases are striking because the poet uses two verbs of perception with two abstract nouns which are in turn qualified by concrete adjectives. The result is a colourful periphrasis for the mighty Rh. in his golden armour and the triumphant sound of his shield bells (although Wecklein considered the first periphrasis too stretched and suggested σάζματος).

382 χρυσόδετον σώματος ἀλκῆν is enallage (see V. Bers Enallage and Greek Style (1974)). For the adjective cf. A Se. 105f. Ἀρης ... ὁ χρυσοπήλης δαίμον.
383 κλύε καὶ κόμπους κωδωνοκρότους The position of καὶ as second word in the clause is unusual. It normally appears as first word if it is copulative, and before the word emphasised if adverbial (Denniston GP 325). Here it appears to link the imperative clauses rather than emphasise κόμπους and is therefore delayed. Denniston does not mention this line in his examples of wayward positions for καὶ (ib. 326f.).

384 πορπάκων The bells are attached to the straps of his πέλτη. These were attached to the inner side of the shield by pins (πόρπαι). The word is elsewhere found only in the singular with this meaning (cf. S. Ai. 576, where the shield is the heavier and larger σάκος, and E. Pho. 1127, where it is an ἄσπίς). Burnett ((1985) 28) is surely wrong to suggest that the chorus is ‘subsuming the rider into his steed’ (cf. 308 and 386) and that Rh. is ‘clad in horse trappings which jangle.’

385 θεός .. θεός, αὐτός Ἀρης For the repetition of the powerful word θεός at points of excitement cf. E. HF 772 and S. (Ich.) fr. 314.100, and, in Latin, Lucr. 5.8 deus ille fuit, deus inclute Memmi, V. Ecl. 5.64 deus, deus ille, Menalca.

Ares was not worshipped widely in Greece (see Hutchinson on A. Se. 104-8), but had a strong association with Thrace from early literature, because of the violence of its inhabitants. See E. Hall Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 151 and R.F Hoddinott The Thracians (1981) 169 and cf. Herod. 5.7 (cf. also the account of Scythian worship of Ares at Herod. 4.62). See also II. 13.301, Od.
8.361, S. Ant. 969ff. and E. Alc. 498.

386f. ὁ Στρυμόνιος ... Ἕλεις For the genitive of parent cf. Pindar Ol. 2.12 ὁ Κρόνιε παῖ 'Ρέας, A. Su. 311 ὁ Δίος πόρτες .. βοῶς.

πῶλος a foal, used of Orestes at A. Cho. 794.

387 κατέχει ἐκ 'possesses', i.e. 'inspires', by analogy with E. Hec. 1088–90 αἰαί, ἵ ὦ Θρήνης λογχοφόρου ἐνωπιου εὐππον Ἀρεί κάτοχον γένος is Collard's suggestion. The reading καταπνεῖ ἐκ, would mean 'breathes upon', and it is hard to see how Rh.'s breathing upon Troy will help the Trojans. Porter rightly objects to this verb in reference to the odour which gods exude (cf. PV 115f. and E. Hi. 1391ff.); firstly, because Rh. is not a god and secondly, because there is no notion of odour in the text. Instead he adopts Verrall’s καταπλεῖ (who also conjectured the verb at Me. 838), with the meaning 'is come and lands on your shore'. He explains that because Rh. has had to sail part of the way to Troy (cf. 436). However, not only does καταπλεῖν appear nowhere else in tragedy, the sense is very weak for the culmination of the choral greeting. Paley suggests that serious consideration should be given to Haun's ἀναπνεῖ (gives you time to recover breath), by analogy with ἀμπυνωάς δίδωσε, but that also is too weak an expression for the triumphal mood of the chorus.

265 For the acc. after the verb cf. the MSS at E. Me. 838f. χώραν καταπνεύσαι ... ἀνείας, where ἀνείας is the direct obj. of the verb and χώραν is governed by κατα-. Nauck suspected the verb there. Reiske's χώρας offers the solution. However, Page (ad loc.) prefers to keep the acc., comparing Rh. 387 and Heliodorus Aeth. 3.2.1 τὸν τόπον εἰνώδια κατέπνευεν, and observing that καταπνέω nowhere certainly governs a gen.
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Rh. greets H. who upbraids him for his lateness (388-421). Rh defends himself and promises to rid Troy of the Greeks in a single day (422-53). The guards welcome his words, though with some reservation, in an isolated strophe (453-66). Rh. then expresses a desire to invade Greece and, after some restraining words from H. discusses the forthcoming battle, displaying his ignorance of the current state of the war and the identity of any Greek hero apart from Achilles. After a promise to impale Odysseus at the city gates Rh. is led to bed by H. who reminds the chorus to keep a look out for Dolon.

PHEDOS The eponymous hero has a name which is not from Greek, like some other barbarians in the story of the Trojan war. Cf. Priam, Paris, Assaracus and Sarpedon and see H. von Kamptz Homerische Personennamen (1982) 45-52 and 335-67. W. Tomaschek WienSB 130 (1894) 53) and Cuny (REA 11, 3 (1909)) believe that the name is pure Thracian, and, if softened from Ρῆξος, might have signified simply rex, and been cognate with the word for king in other Indo-European languages. Cf. French roi, Gothic reiks, Sanskrit rāj, Old Irish rí and the Gaulish suffix -rix. Cuny offers the following etymology: Ρῆξος = Thraco-Phrygian rézos; réz = Ind.-Eur. rēg (z for g; cf. Skt. raj for rēg); e because Thracian retained Ind.-Eur. ē; rézo (for the addition of o cf. Skt. raj changed to raja); rézos because s is the usual nom. ending for Ind.-Eur. and s for z as the nearest Greek equivalent, because ζ = sd. The derivation is an attractive one and although 266See also notes on 452, 491-517, 510-17 and 518-26.
our knowledge of Thraco-Phrygian language is so limited that I have met two philologists who claim that it is often used as a depository for words whose origin is actually unknown, this is the most convincing argument available for the etymology of the hero.

In historical times the word was not used as a title for king, but Cuny argues that it may still have been used as the title of a deceased king who had become an object of worship, as does Rh. in the play. However, there is no reason for supposing that the poet of Rh. knew this.

Mention should briefly be made of Burnett’s contention ((1985) 29) that Lamachus in Ar. Ach. is a figure based on Rh., and that we thus have a terminus ante quem for the play (425 BC). The connection is forced. R. Goossens, in his analysis of similarities between Rh. and Ach. (AC 1 (1932) 124f.) makes no mention of a connection between these two characters. Rather he stresses the similarity between H. and Dicaeopolis. If Lamachus is a parody of a literary figure it is far more likely that his characteristics are drawn from A. Se. than from Rh. This play does not seem to have provided Aristophanes with any material for Ach., nor indeed for any of his comedies.

Rh. does not have a triple plume like Lamachus (Ach. 963ff.), but Tydeus does (Se. 384). The repeated reference to a Gorgon (on Lamachus’ shield) has only one parallel in Rh., at 306, and that Gorgon is on the horse trappings. When looking for a parallel for a device on a shield A. Se. is a more obvious place to look, perhaps Hippomedon’s (Se. 489-96) or Parthenopaeus’ (Se. 539-42). We cannot say with confidence that κομπολακίθων (Ach. 589) is based on κωδωνοκρότος (Rh. 383) and Burnett’s remark that ὁ βλέπων ἀστραπάς (Ach. 566) is ‘all too much like’ Rh. 355 and 359 is extremely forced.

I take the similarity between Rh. 675b and Ach. 281 βάλλε βάλλε βάλλε βάλλε ἵππες τῶν μετάφορον to be coincidental. The line in Ach. may be parodying a part of E. Tel., although we see from Xen. An. 5.7.21 and ib. 28 that ἵππες παῖς and βάλλε βάλλε may well be standard cries used by attackers. The line in Rh. may owe more to
I do not detect the comparison between the character of Rh. and the miles gloriosus which was suggested by Valckenaer and others. 269 Nor do I agree with Pohlenz's extension of this idea, that Rh. is one of a literary type based on the fourth-century mercenary soldier. He owes more of his characterisation to the lines spoken of the overconfident Aeschylean Xerxes or the vaunting Argive captains in Se. than to the miles gloriosus.

388-453 The 'agon'. 270 The variety of the agonistic format is such that only the sketchiest of definitions will apply to all agonas equally. We can say only that they involve a verbal contest between two or more characters who present their cases in speeches of varying length and style. There may not even be an important dramatic conclusion to the contest, as it may take place after the action or issue under discussion has already occurred, such as this agon in Rh., the argument between Pheres and Admetus at E. Alc. 614-740. after the death of Alcestis, and that between Haimon and Creon at S. Ant. 633-765, after the immolation of Antigone. It may also serve to entrench the resolve of the participants, such as that between Hecuba and Polymestor at E. Hec. 1129-1292, and that between Jason and Medea at E. Me. 1317-1404. The format of the agon in Rh. is a very simple one. There are two long speeches of similar length: 393-42 (29 lines) and 422-453 (32 lines), following each other without any iambic interjection from the


270 For detailed discussions of the agon in tragedy see H. Strohm Euripides: Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form (1957), J. Duchemin L'ARGON dans la tragédie grecque (1968), Collard on E. Su. 87-262 and GR 22 (1975) 58-71, esp. 59 n.1.
chorus or a continuation of the argument in stichomythia. There follows an unusually placed choral strophe, and 60 lines of dialogue which are not closely connected with the debate. This resembles what Collard calls 'the starkest debate, least natural in effect' (ib. 62). Lloyd too has his doubts (The Agon in Euripides (1992) 7f.).

The debate starts well. The audience has been prepared for a confrontation since H. first complained about Rh.'s lateness at 319ff., while the messenger's speech and the second stasimon have gradually built up expectations about the hero without losing the tension which surrounds the question of his late arrival. This question remains in the air, even though H. has reluctantly and sarcastically admitted him at 340f. The hero enters and, as is common in scenes of acrimonious debate, begins with a formal, polite greeting, since he believes that he will be well received. This opening creates a situation of tense calm 'before the storm'. Cf. S. Ant 631ff. (Creon and Haimon), ib. 988ff., (Creon and Teiresias), E. Alc. 614ff. (Pheres and Admetus) and Hi. 902ff. (Hippolytus and Theseus).

H. quickly launches into an angry attack on Rh. for his lateness, first warning him that he is a plain speaker (393ff). His language is such that the argument takes place on a very personal level; 397 τούπι σε, 401 σε, 404f. σοι...'ημᾶς προύπης τὸ σών μέρος, 406f. σοί...ἀνακτα τὴς 'έθηκ' ἐγὼ χερί, 410f. σοι δὲ...λέγω ἵ παρέσχον· ὧν σύ λακτίσας, 419 ὃς σύ, 421 μέμμομαι σοι καὶ λέγω κατ' ὁμια σών. His objections to Rh.'s behaviour are clear and valid. He makes four points: the Thracian's help was badly needed and often requested, yet did not come (396-403); he
left fellow barbarians to suffer at the hands of Greeks (404f.); he displayed ingratitude for H.'s past services (406-412) and his conduct has been ignoble compared to that of H.'s other allies who have long been at Troy, some never to return (413-419). H. ends with an indirect challenge to Rh. for an explanation (420f.). He does, however, refrain from accusing Rh. of attempting to gain unjustifiable credit for taking part in H.'s victory at the last minute, although we know that this thought was uppermost in his mind at 319ff.

Contrary to what one might expect, Rh.'s reply fails to deal with all of H.'s objections and is a poor attempt at self-vindication. It is often the case that the second speaker in an agon prevails by his argument and an expectation must exist that the second speech will be at least as rhetorically powerful as the first (see A.C. Schlesinger CPh 32 (1937) 69f.). Rh., however, is not concerned to mollify H. To balance H.'s military exploit on Rh.'s behalf (406-11) the poet has given Rh. his own military history as a reason for arriving late (424-437), but makes no mention of H.'s pleas or gifts, the ties of duty between the two men as barbarian princes or the personal debt which he owes to H. He uses the same personal focus as H. did; 424 ἠγῷ δὲ μεῖζον ἤ σὺ, 433 σύμμαχόν τέ σοι μολεῖν, 438 οὐχ ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύπτιδας, 444 σὺ μὲν, 447 ἐμοὶ δὲ and 450 τοὺς σοὺς πόνους. His tone is unapologetic. He denies the charge of soft living (438-442) and even concludes by boasting that he will accomplish in one day what H. has failed to do in ten years (443-453). This final remark is particularly galling for H. because it justifies his fear that Rh. will try to eclipse him, but H. makes no
reference to his own claim to imminent victory during the scenes with Rh.

What then is the dramatic point of the debate if H. has done no more than vent his spleen and Rh. has not apologised to his host? The function of this debate is not to resolve an issue, nor to harden the resolve of the characters towards a particular course of action, but to provide a transitional scene which takes the spotlight away from H. and turns it onto Rh., the victim of the tragedy. H. has gradually been seen to give way on all manner of issues as the play progresses. He gave way to his seers on the previous night (65ff.), to Aeneas over the mobilisation (137), to Dolon over the horses (189f.) and to the shepherd and the chorus over admitting Rh. as an ally (339-41). The anger which he displays in the agon is effectively the last speech in which his powerful character dominates the stage. In the following scene (467-526) he does not take up any of the objections which Rh. refused to address, but acts as a sober realist to counter Rh.'s absurd ambitiousness, as Aen. did for H. himself earlier in the play. He eventually persuades Rh. to go to bed, having given him the password (of significance for the scene between Od. and the chorus), and positioned him outside the lines; a final act of folly which seals the fate of his ally. At his re-entry at 808 his anger is impotent because the harm has been done, and attention is focused more on the charioteer's accusation that the Trojans, and ultimately H., had assassinated Rh. Even his threat to behead the chorus at 817 is undercut by a bathetic alternative, flogging: ἦτοι μάραγνα γ' ἦ καρανιστής μόρος. The hero of Troy is now defensive and after the entry of the Muse at 890 he is in effect
only a bystander. His final call to arms at 986ff. can only be viewed as pathetic because, despite the trauma of the night's events he is still in the foolishly confident mood with which he began the first epeisodion. The audience knows that the proposed attack will not bring victory to the Trojans.

What we see at 393-421, then, is H.'s last period of dramatic dominance. From 422 onwards the play is focused on first the potential, then the reality, of Rh.'s destiny at Troy. The debate certainly does not have the sophistication or structure of any Euripidean agon (see also p.79-82 above.).

454-466-820-832 Separated strophe and antistrophe.

For the schema see p.58 above. See also A.M. Dale MATC 1.100, Wilamowitz GV 587f., R. 308-313 and O. Schroeder Euripidis Canticae (1928) 169. Respenson is disrupted by corruption in the antistrophe. I have assumed that the strophe is largely sound (apart from 464ff.) and that the antistrophe cannot be adequately restored, especially at 828. Rather than adopting Headlam's πάρωρον in 829 (CQ 15 (1901) 103), it is preferable to assume that 464 is a syllable shorter than 829. Of the alternative suggestions offered, Hermann's τόδε γ' ('May I at least see this day .') is more forceful than Dindorf's τόδε ἐτ' ('May I yet see this day ') For 465f. see note ad loc.

The chorus sings a strophe of congratulation and exhortation to Rh. The similarity in verbal shape which the separated stanzas at 131-136-195-200 displayed (see note ad loc.), is repeated between these two stanzas. There is paregmenon at 455 φίλα .. φίλος and (possibly) repetition at 821 τμέγας .. μέγας. Cf. 131 τάδε .. τάδε and 195 μέγας .. μεγάλα. The sequence οὔτε .. οὔτε
and the word εἶ appears at exactly the same point in both stanzas (464~830). J. Duchemin observes that it is unusual for a choral song to interrupt an agon in E. (L'ΑΓΟΝ dans la tragédie grecque (1968) 81 n.2). However, what follows the lyrics cannot properly be regarded as part of the same discussion.

There is also a close link between the language of this stanza and the previous stasimon because the guards have the same concerns on their minds. It recalls several expressions, either by repetition, verbal echo or contextual similarity.. Cf. 454 ἰῶ ἰῶ with 380, 455 φίλα...φίλος with 367 ὕ φίλος, 455 Διὸς εἶ with 342 Διός παῖς, 456 φθόνον with 343, 456 Ζεύς with 355 and 359 Ζήνα, 457 θέλω...εἴργειν with 343 εἴργοι, 457 ἀμφί σοις λόγοισιν with 343 στομάτων, 458 τὸ...δόρυ with 365 κατὰ...οἷχομένων, 460 ἐπόρευσε with 350 πορεύει, 461 πῶς...δίνατο with 370 προβαλοῦ...πέλταν, 463 πῶς...ὑπομείναι with 375 σὲ...ὑποστάς, 464 εἶ γὰρ...εἰσίδοιμι with 367 εἴθε μοι...πράξας τάδε, 465 ἂναξ with 380 ὦ βασιλεῦ and 465 πολυφόνου...λόγχαι with 368 σὰν...δορὶ.

There is, however, a far more cautious tone to this stanza. It contains no imperatives and the praise of Rh., so blatant in the last stasimon, is more muted here. Where previously the chorus asked Adrasteia to be indulgent with their words, now they ask Zeus himself to forgive the boasts of Rh., having some qualms about the propriety of his simplistic and ambitious tone. This is not to undermine the validity of what he said, for they still allow that he may succeed (cf. Athena at 600ff.).

467-526 The final scene of the second epeisidion provides a relief from the acrimonious argument which has just taken place and creates a mood of anticipation, also full of irony, for what
follows. It is divided into three sections. From 467-484 the proposal of Rh. to sack Greece as soon as he has won the war is tempered by H., rather as Aen. had tempered H.'s original proposal to attack at 105-130. 485-517 consists of a discussion of the battle dispositions for the morning and of the Greek opponents. This is reminiscent of the τειχοβολία at Il. 3.161-242, especially the prominence given to Odysseus. At 518-526 H., in sending Rh. to bed, gives him the password and gives him his position outside the Trojan ranks.

As H. was a man of action now it is the turn of Rh. He has grandiose plans and a thirst for glory. He also underestimates the Greeks. Cf. especially Rh. at 473 with H. at 72-5, for the desire to punish the Greeks; H. at 477f. with Aen. at 113-121, for the necessity of a realistic attitude towards fighting the Greeks; H. at 482 with the chorus at 83, for the need for prudence and caution and Rh. at 483 with H. at 102ff., for the shamefulness of inaction. However, whereas in the first epeisodion H. was speaking with understandable zeal in the period of excitement after the chorus' news, here Rh. is inappropriately extravagant in a period of calm. Moreover, Aen. was able to temper H.'s mood, but Rh. becomes more extravagant with each attempt to bring him down to earth. This continues throughout the scene until H. tells him to go to bed (518ff.). These lines therefore give us further insights into the character of Rh. and show us a more sober, realistic H. who, far from worrying that his glory may be eclipsed, now simply provides advice and a foil for Rh. and concludes by making his worst military blunder of the play: positioning his ally outside the protection of the Trojan lines. As regards Rh., we are shown
his ignorance of the course of the war so far. He knows only of Achilles' presence and when he finds out that the warrior is not taking part in the fighting, he has to ask who else in the Greek camp is a worthy opponent. His arrogant dismissal of H.'s first-hand knowledge of the danger presented by Od., the man who will find him during the night, is heavily ironic. Rh.'s ignorant folly thus prepares the minds of the audience for his eventual ruin.

The stichomythic passage at 479-96 is disrupted at 484-91 and 495. Disruption in stichomythia is far more common in S., who tends much more towards a flexible, naturalistic stichomythic style, than in A. or E.271 The following are passages of tragic stichomythia which are disrupted, or else the disrupted lines themselves: PV 622f. (see Griffith (1977) 138 n.3), A. Cho. 770-3 and 885ff. (see Garvie on ib. 770 and 929), A. Sc. [1051ff.] (see Hutchinson ad loc.), S. OT 87-131, 316-44, 356-79, 572-75, 622-26 (see Jebb), 726-57, 934-44, 1002-6 and 1142-47, OC 579-607, Ai. 96-112 and 541f., El. 660-79, 924f., 1103f. and 1339-53, Phil. 1247ff., E. ALC. 817-20 (Dale suspects corruption here; 'Disturbance of stichomythia, though rare, is occasionally found in Eur., e.g. IA 1438, 1461 - a late play however'), ib. 1119-25 and 1133-9, Ion 936f. Here Owen observes that 'in the plays of his middle and late period E. often has such breaks, chiefly at the beginning or end of the dialogue, cf. HF 111f. (see Bond), 1403f., El. 651f. (see Denniston), 965f., IT 735f., 811f., Hel. 1197f., Ba. 1269f., IA 1437f.), El. 553ff. and 1124ff. (a large 271For stichomythia generally see A. Gross Die Stichomythie in der gregischen Tragödie und Komödie (1905), W. Jens Zetemata 11 (1955) and M. Heath The Poetics of Greek Tragedy (1987) 128-30.
breach, comparable to Rh. 484ff.), Hclld. 678-81; Pho. 904f. and 912ff., Or. 257-67 (see Willink) and Ba. 927ff. (Dodds here observes 'Eur. allows such breaches of symmetry especially towards the beginning of a stichomythic passage...perhaps in order to soften the transition from natural dialogue to the artificial stichomythic form. They seem to occur chiefly at places where the actor may be expected to pause and make a gesture (A. Gross Die Stichomythie in griechischen Tragödie und Komödie (1905) 35)'. The breach at Rh. 484-91 coincides nicely with a decisive change of tack in the conversation and that at 495 comes towards the end of the stichomythia, to smooth the transition back to naturalistic dialogue (see Hutchinson on A. Se. 1051). The breaches should not be regarded as evidence for or against authenticity.

388 ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλοῦ παῖς The paregmenon with the 'Genetiv der Abstammung' gives a formal and courteous tone to Rh.'s greeting. On this combination see B. Gygli-Wyss ZVS 18 (1966) 93, Schwyzer Gr.Gr. 2.124, and cf. Theognis 185f. γῆμαι δὲ κακήν κακοῦ οὖ μελεδαίνει ἐσθλὸς ἄνήρ; E. Su. 42 έκετεύω σε, γεραιά, γεραιῶν ἐκ στομάτων, id. 598 ὥ μέλεαι μελέων ματέρες λοχαζῶν (see Collard ad loc.), fr. 15.1 έδοιμι δ' αὐτῶν ἐκχων 'ἀρσεν' ἀρσένων; fr. 727 ἀπέπτυσ' ἐχθροῦ φωτός ἐχθριστον τέκος, and in addresses S. Ant. 379f. ὥ δύστηνος καὶ δυστήνου ἑ πατρὸς Οἰδιπόδα; E. Pho. 1701 ὥ φίλα πεσήματ' ἀθλη' ἄθλοι πατρός; Tro. 790 ὥ παῖ παιδὸς μογεροῦ; And. 590 ὥ κάκιστε κὰκ κακῶν (see Stevens ad loc.). The reading of ὥ may be the result of a cross reference to S. Phil. 96.

There are many examples of the use of nom. for voc. Murray points to Hermann on E. And. 1 Ἀσιάτιδος γῆς σχήμα, Θηβαία πόλις
(Murray himself prints πόλι). Paley says ad loc. ‘ubique nominativus, quem pro vocativo positum volunt, non vocantis sed declarantis esse videtur’. One may compare also E. Hel. 1399 ὁ καινὸς ἡμῖν πόσις of which Kannicht says ‘die Anrede im Nominativ ist, ihrer betörenden Absicht entsprechend, von gesuchter Solennität’. J. Svennung (Anredeformen (1958) 207) says of the feature ‘Besondere Beachtung verdient aber auch hier .. dass in der dritten Deklination aus formalen Gründen früh der Nominativ statt eines Vokativs gebraucht wurde .. da die beiden Kasus in manchen Wörtern gleich lauteten, hat sich eine formale Gleichheit auch in anderen Fällen analogisch verbreitet’. Cf. PV 595 ὅ τάλας, A. Se. 129f. σὺ τ’ ὁ Διογένες .. ἱψούπολις γενοῦ | Παλλάς, S. Ái. 903 ὁ ταλαίφρων γυνη, E. Ba. 55f. ἄλλ’ ὁ λιπούσαι Τμώλων .. ἀνθρόπος ἐμός, γυναῖκες and And. 348 ὁ τλήμων ἀνήρ (see Stevens ad loc.). Cf. also Il. 4.189 φίλος ὁ Μενέλαε, h. 30.17 χαῖρε βέβων μήτηρ. See also K-G 1.47f., K. Wackernagel Vorlesungen über Syntax (1920) 1.306f., Schwyzer Gr.Gr. 2.63f. and West on Hes. Th. 964.

That the nom. instead of voc. carries a tone of formality is shown in its overtly jocular use at Pl. Sy. 172A, where the nom. is used to attract attention and is closely followed by the voc., ἐκάλεσε, καὶ παίζων ἀμα τῇ κλήσει, ὃς Φαληρεῖς ἔφη, οὗτος Ἀπολλόδωρος .. καὶ ἔς, ὁ Ἀπολλόδωρε', ἔφη' (for the formal tone of οὗτος cf. S. Aj. 71f. οὗτος, σε .. καλὼ, and OC 1627 ὁ οὗτος οὗτος, Οἰδίπους). So too here the tone (that of the formal greeting) and the position (at the introduction of a new character and a new scene) both indicate that we have the nominativus declarantis instead of the vocative, followed by the true vocatives τῷραννε | Ἑκτόρ, the latter in a powerful rhetorical
position at the start of 389. I think (pace Diggle SI (1988) 171 n.10 = Eur. 324 n.10) that there is some point to the use of the nom. In this way, a deliberate contrast exists between Rh.'s formal greeting and H.'s brusque start at 393 where the less formal παί is used as first word. His desire to delete the line is based on the fact that the elaboration of a two-line address looks like an interpolation (see Willink on E. Or. 71-2). I disagree; the use of Ἐκτό παί alone is too bald a greeting.

389 παλαία .. ἡμέραι The rough breathing on ἡμέρα is peculiar to Attic and not original in the word. It appears in inscriptions after the middle of the fifth century (see L. Threatte The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions (1980) 500 and West Aeschylus Tragoediae (1990) XXIX). Porter translates this phrase 'late in the day'. At S. Ai. 622 ἡ ποιν παλαία μὲν σύντροφος ἡμέραι, the time referred to by 'day' is the period of one's life, whereas here the day refers to the period of fighting at Troy. A closer parallel is S. OC 1138 ἐς τὸ δ' ἡμέρας 'to this time'. This use of παλαίας to mean 'late' is unique, but we have no proof that it is a late usage. Fraenkel ((1965) 238) is mystified; 'Porters verzweifelte Anmerkung hat mein volles Mitgefühl'. A possible comparison is with E. Hel. 628f. μακρὰν ἐς φλογὶ φασσφόρω (see Kannicht ad loc.).

προσενέπω 'I address you' (see Fraenkel ad A. Ag. 323). The compound is often used in an address which precedes a larger speech (see R. Führer Zetemata 44 (1967) 25f.), but is not itself common in tragedy, where ἐννέπω is more likely to be found (cf. 266
the use of προσαγορεύω in prose). Its use in addresses to deities shows that the verb has formal overtones (see Fraenkel on A. Ag. 162 and Barrett on E. Hi. 99). Cf. also E. Tro. 48ff. where Athena first addresses Poseidon.

390 When χαίρω is followed by the acc. and participle it means 'I rejoice that x is so'. See S. Ai. 136 σὲ μὲν ἐὰν πράσσοντι ἐπιχαίρω (cf. Phil. 1314), E. Hi. 1339f. τοῖς γὰρ εὐσεβεῖς θεοὶ οὐ καίρουνται and fr. 673 χαίρω σὲ ... ἐκ τῶν τε μιαρῶν ἐξολωλότα (Nauck), Σ Ι. 6.479ff., K-G 1.298 and 2.53f. (cf. also, for the opposite effect Ι. 13.352f. ἦχθετο γὰρ ἤτα τρωσίν δαμναμένους).

eὐτυχοῦντα Rh. applies a verb to H. which H. himself is fond of applying to himself. See 56n.

προσήμενον 'besieging'. For this meaning of the word cf. A. Ag. 1191 (of the Furies) and S. OT 15 (of suppliants around an altar). However in those examples the military term has been transferred to a poetic context. Only here in tragedy does it apply to a real military situation.

391 πύργοις. πύργοι are normally the towers of a walled city and a πύργος could be the city wall itself (Od. 2.262). τεῖχος (392) also means the wall of a city. Here, however, both are applied to the Greek camp (cf. πύργους at 448). This is also the case in Homer (cf. Ι. 7.338 and ib. 436f., where the building of the palisade around the Greek camp is described). The effect of
these nouns and the participle προσήμενον is the reversal of the roles of besieger and besieged. Until this night the Trojans have been penned up inside their walls and towers; now they are camped like invaders on the plain and threaten the Greek fortifications as if they were those of a native town.

391f. Rh. is extremely conscious of his own worth and these confident words are a foretaste of his boasting at 447-53 and 467ff. Although the prefix σων- implies that Rh. will act in concert with H., the pronoun ἐγὼ and the verbs in the first person go some way towards undermining the idea of cooperation.

συγκατασκάψων The verb (compound or simple) is normally used of destroying cities. Cf. esp. Pho. 884 (with the same verb), A. Ag. 525, Se 46, E. Tr. 1263 and Xen. Hell. 2.2.23 (of the Long Walls). Contrast συγκατασκάπτων ἡν ἡμᾶς, used of people at E. Or. 735.


νεῶν...σκάφη R. (233ff.) says that the frequent use of 'colourless periphrasis' in Rh. underlines the play's stylistic similarity to the works of E., rather than those of A. and S. (for a wider discussion see J. Smereka Studia Euripidea 2 (1937) 64-74). He singles out this phrase as a colourless one with a particularly Euripidean stamp, but cf. A. Pe. 418f. ὑπτευότο δὲ ἢ σκάφη νεῶν and S. Ai. 1278f. ἐς δὲ ναυτικὰ σκάφη ἢ πηδῶντος ᾠρδην
The word ὀκάσμα does not occur again in Rh., but there are five other examples of periphrasis with νεών, at 43, 145f. 213, 489f. and 768f.

πρήσων The threat of fire is of crucial importance in the Il., for the obvious reason that the Greeks could not escape if their ships were burned. It is at Il. 16.122f. that the Trojans first set fire to a ship, and the danger is such that Achilles allows Patroclus to take his armour into battle and lets the Myrmidons fight for the first time since his quarrel with Agamemnon. In Rh. H. has already expressed his desire to burn the ships at 61 and 97.

393f. Hector opens with an address which uses some of the vocabulary of the chorus at 350f.

μητέρος A Homeric form, used elsewhere in tragic dialogue only by E., nine times.

Μοῦσα μίας Cf. E. Ιον 2f. θεών μίας ἔφυσε Μοῦσα. At 891 the Muse refers to herself as Μοῦσα...μία.

394f. φιλῶ...ἀνήρ There is a famous epic precedent for this sentiment at Il. 9.312ff., where Achilles expresses his hatred for the man who says one thing and thinks another (contrast Herod. 7.101.3, where Demaratus asks Xerxes if he wishes to hear the truth or what is pleasing to him). There is irony in the epic passage, because Achilles says it in the presence of Odysseus,
some of whose prowess consists in doing just what Achilles loathes. The force of the remark is to stress H.'s honesty as opposed to a dishonest man who might speak glibly to cover his real thoughts. Cf. esp. Hecuba at E. Hec. 1187ff. and see M. Heath The Poetics of Greek Tragedy (1987) 131.

φιλῶ here means 'I am accustomed to'. Cf. e.g. S. OT 1520 ὃ μὴ φρονῶ γὰρ οὗ φιλῶ λέγειν μάτην, and Thuc. 4.28.3 οἶνον ὥχλος φιλεῖ ποιεῖν.

διπλοῦς...ἀνήρ H. excuses himself in advance for the undiplomatic speech which he is about to make. The phrase approximates to the English 'a forked tongue'. Cf. διπτύχων γλῶσσαι at E. Tro. 287. Porter points to Bentley's comment on Horace's use of the word at Odes 1.6.7 (Nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei) 'Et sane Graecis διπλοῦς ἀνήρ est, qui aliud loquitur, aliud sentit'. Porter also maintains that this sense is a Platonic usage, not found elsewhere in tragedy. The only examples in Plato which come near this sense, however, are not exact parallels and have no overtones of moral duplicity about them. At Pl. Lach. 188C and Resp. 8554D the word refers respectively to the state of being in two minds about something, and to internal dissent. At Resp. 397E it refers to someone's ability to engage in two activities. A much closer parallel is Xen. Hell. 4.1.32, where Pharnabazus says to Agesilaus καὶ διπλοῦν ὤσπερ Τισσαφέρνους οὐδὲν πώποτε μου ὁτὲ ποιήσως τοὺς ὁτ' εἰπόντας πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχοιτ' ἢν κατηγορήσαι, where διπλοῦς clearly means 'double dealing'. Nowhere else before Xen. do we have διπλοῦς in
this moral sense. There is an example of the moral application of
the word in an undatable adespoton which is probably based on Il.
9.312ff. (TGF 28 (Kannicht and Snell) = AP 10.95 (Zenob. 3,23
Paroem. Gr. 1,64))) 
μεσῶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν 
τῶν διπλῶν πεφυκότα 
κρηστῶν λόγους, 
πολέμου 
δὲ 
τοῖς 
τρόποις. 
It is not a tragic fragment 
(see Wilamowitz KS 1.195).

We do find an example of ἀπλοὺς with a moral overtone at E.
IIA 927 ἔμαθον 
τοῖς 
τρόποις 
ἀπλοὺς 
ἐξεῖν. 
It is used of Achilles, 
and may well be based on Il. 9.312f. ἀπλοὺς. We also have ἄπλοὺς 
at Rh. 84 with the simple sense of ‘single’. But it must be 
remembered that simplex is older than duplex in Latin.

The repetition of the phrase at 423 suggests that the usage 
is not innovative and may have been familiar to the audience. The 
sense does not occur elsewhere before Xen. composed Hell. 4.1.32 
(in the 350s BC; see M. Maclaren AJP 55 (1934) 121-39 and 249-62).

πέφυκ’ ἀνήρ. 
Apart from here and at 423 below, this phrase 
occurs only in E. and only at the end of iambic trimeters. Cf. Me.
294, Hcll. 2, Hi. 1031, (ἐν 
κακῶς 
πέφυκ’ 
ἀνήρ, repeated at ib.
1075 and 1191. See also p.36 above.), Or. 540, fr. 325 (Danaë) and 
fr. 425 (Ixion).

396f. The tone of H.’s complaint contrasts with that of the 
second stasimon. There the emphasis was on Rhesus arriving in time 
to save Troy; here H. makes clear that he has come too late. Cf. 
the taunt invented by Neoptolemus at S. Phil. 379 οὐκ ἠπόθ’ ἵν 
ἡμεῖς, ἀλλ’ ἠκῆσθ’ ἵν’ οὔ σ’ ἔδει.
This is the only example of unseparated anadiplosis in Rh. and one of only two examples of anadiplosis in the dialogue (cf. θραυσίς...θραυσίς at 579). This statistic sheds no light on dating however. Lyric anadiplosis is more relevant (see 250n.). The same words occur at Ar. Ἀν. 921, where the 'Pindaric' poet praises Cloud-cuckooland in a parody of encomiastic verse. For a comprehensive list of anadiplosis in the three tragedians see Schmidt-Stählin 2.296 for A., ib. 2.489 n.7 for S. and ib. 3.802 with J. Smereka Studia Euripidea vol.2 (1937) 167-172 for E.

It may be seen from Smereka's table (ib. 169) that lyric anadiplosis is much more common, but that most of the Euripidean examples in iambics are also at the beginning of a line.

Anadiplosis is used as a rhetorical device at moments of high emotion and, for that reason, is commoner in lyric than in dialogue. Here the device, combined with asyndeton, establishes H.'s excited state and launches his complaint proper. It may well be intended as a rejoinder to παλαίαι...ἡμέραι in 389.

H. takes up the idea of cooperation in Rh.'s συγκατασκάψιν (391) and implies that if he wants to take part in the coup de grâce he should have taken part in the difficult fighting. The clause echoes 321f. οἵτινες πάλαι μὴ ἔμποινούσιν and 326 οὗδε συγκαμῶν δορί.

The pronoun is an adverbial acc.; 'as far as you were concerned'. See Willink on E. Or. 1345 ὅσον γε τούπ' ἐμέ, and Jebb on S. Ant. 889 τούπι τήνδε τὴν κόρην.
Troian ἐγὼι πολεμίων πεσεῖν δορί. For the figure of speech cf. especially E. Hec. 5 δορί πεσεῖν Ἑλληνικῶν. This parallel supports Bothe's dat. πολεμίων for the MSS πολεμίων (pace Vater who describes it as 'prosaicum').

399f. οὖ γάρ τι λέξεις ὡς κτλ. The γάρ is explanatory and gives the motive for what has just been said (see Dennistion GP 60). The future tense makes the statement tantamount to 'you cannot say that...'. Cf. also at E. Alc. 658 οὖ μὴν ἔρεις γε μ' ὡς κτλ. (see Goodwin M6T 16.69). For the explicit prohibition with μὴ and the subjunctive cf. 843 μὴ γάρ τι λέξεις ὡς κτλ.

ἄκλητος ὡς φίλοις This is the first time we hear specifically of the requests for help which the Trojans have sent to Rh. in the past (although line 324 might imply that Rh. was asked to come). We are told by the Muse that these inducements had a persuasive effect at 935ff., but H. has no way of knowing this and thinks that Rh. has simply chosen to ignore them. φίλοις is dat. of agent after ἄκλητος and does not go with the verbs in 400.

400 Successive negatives are common in Greek and do not always have rhetorical force. Here however the cumulation has an obvious rhetorical effect. See K-G 2.288-95ff. and cf. A. Eum. 55-8 and 69f., A. (Niobe) fr. 161.1ff., E. Hi. 1055, ib. 1397ff. (an interrupted sequence but effective for that reason), Or. 1f., Tro. 732ff. and PV 479f. ἐπεστράφης comes last, and has the strongest condemnatory force: 'you did not even pay regard'.
ῆμινας is not used absolutely by A. or S., but E. has it. Cf. Hclld. 70 (cf. Ar. Ve. 197), IA 907 and Or. 1473.

ἐπεστράφης Aor. pass. with an intransitive sense. Examples of this verb used absolutely tend to mean 'turn around', both literally and metaphorically cf. E. Alc. 187 and 666, S. Tra. 566, Ant. 1111, Ar. Ve. 422, Herodotus 2.103.2. and esp. Dem. 23.136 νομίζων ἀποστερήσειν οἶκ ἐπεστράφη.

401f. γάρ This γάρ introduces a clause dependent on the γάρ in 399.

σε...ἀμύνειν Acc. and inf. after ἐπέσκηψεν. The dat. is more common (cf. E. Alc. 365f. ἐν ταίσιν αὐταίς γάρ μ' ἐπισκήψω κέδροις ἵσοι τούσδε θεῖναι).

401 κήρυξ ἡ γερουσία Cf. A. Su. 727 ἐσοφ γάρ ὄν κήρυξ τις ἡ πρέσβη μόλοι. The roles of herald and embassy were quite distinct (see F. Adcock and D.J. Mosley Diplomacy in Ancient Greece (1975) 152ff.). A herald was the more ancient means of diplomatic exchange and is common in the Il. They usually worked alone, often preparing the groundwork for larger scale diplomatic exchanges which would probably involve an embassy of senior men. These would have brought the gifts of inducement mentioned in 403.

γερουσία is the Attic word for γερωχία, the Spartan council of elders. The Doric word occurs in 411 BC at Ar. Lys. 980 (see Henderson ad loc.) For the word in Laconian inscriptions see
It is clear that the meaning here is not 'council of elders' but 'embassy' and this sense is unique (Rh. 401 does not appear in RE s.v. Gerontes). It is particularly remarkable to find γερουσία with πρεσβεύματα in 936, the latter with its meaning 'embassy' (abstract for concrete; see Collard on E. Su. 173). I assume the use there is hyperbolic. The Muse is stressing H.'s repeated calls for help, which constantly increased her anxiety for the safety of her son. Perhaps the poet simply treated γερουσία and πρέσβευμα as synonymous.

403 ποίον ἃ δ' ἄρων κόσμον Opinion is divided about the text. Kirchhoff, Vater, Paley and Nauck prefer ποίων, but that is more likely to be the corruption, and undermines the point of κόσμον (Vater's comparison with 278 is not valid. There the emphasis of the interrogative is clearly on γῆς, not πέδων). Here ποίον .. κόσμον gives the correct emphasis. Cf. E. Hcld. 441 ποίον ἃ γαίας

272 See also F. Bechtel Die griechischen Dialekte 2 (1933) 311 γερωχία and 318 γεροντία, C.D. Buck The Greek Dialects (1928) 59 and H.L. Ahrens De Dialecta Dorica (1882) 63f.
The sending of gifts as an inducement to fight is seen in the myth of Eurypylus. At Od. 11.520f. we have a reference to this story, which is in the Il. Parv. (Davies p. 52). Eurypylus, the son of Telephus and Astyoche, a sister of Priam, was forbidden to fight for the Trojans by his mother, despite the tie of blood (cf. ἔγγευνης at 404 below), until she relented after being bribed with a golden vine (Il. Parv. fr. 6). Cf. also the gifts of inducement offered to Ach. by Ag. at Il. 9.574ff., and the gift of the golden necklace of Harmonia which Polyneices gave to Eriphyle, in order to persuade her to get Amphiarus to join his expedition against Thebes.

404f. ἔγγευνης ὃν βαρβαρός ἄν There are two ideas expressed here; Rh.'s family kinship with H. and his wider kinship with all barbarians as a non-Greek racial unit (cf. the linguistic bonds between barbarians at 294). There was an ancestor of king Priam's called Strymo (see Hellanicus F139 Jacoby) and the poet may have this in mind when he writes ἔγγευνης. The alternative reading εὐγευνῆς in OQ does not have the same force and the repetition of the idea at 413 supports ἔγγευνης here. In addition to this family connection, Rh. is a barbarian and, as such, has a kinship with other barbarians like the kinship between Greeks of different states. E. Hall (Inventing the Barbarian (1989) has made an extensive study of the treatment and definition of the barbarian in Greek tragedy. The accepted idea that there was such a sense of community between barbarians appears as early as A. Pe., in which references to barbarians are made by other barbarians (see Pe.
187, 255, 337, 391, 423, 475, 634, 798 and 844). For references which reflect a polarisation of the world into Greek and non-Greek, with the assumption that panbarbarism and panhellenism are natural opposites cf. E. Hec. 1199f. ὁποτ' ἂν φίλου | τὸ βάρβαρον γένοιτ' ἂν Ἐλλησιν γένος and Me. 536ff. (cf. E. fr. 719 (Tel.) Ἐλληνες δυντες βαρβάροις δουλεύσομεν).

For the paregmenon βάρβαρος τε βαρβάρους cf. E. IT 31f. οὐ γῆς ἀνάσσει βαρβάροις ἐν τῷ θόος, in a play where the Greeks are also seen by the king as an indiscriminately alien group, whatever their city.

405 προύπιες The verb προφίνω means principally to pledge with drink. Cf. Pindar Ol. 7.4 νεανίας γαμβρῶι προφίνων. The scholion on that line also preserves a fr. of Anacreon (62 Page) ἀλλὰ πρόπινε | ῥαδινοὺς, ὥ φίλε, μηροὺς. However here the verb clearly means ‘betray’, as the scholion says; προδέδωκας ἡμᾶς. The development of the meaning came from the habit of giving away a cup used in a toast as a gesture of friendship. Cf. Pindar Ol. 7.1-6. Thence it refers to giving something away as if it were no consequence to the giver. Cf. Dem. 19.139 καὶ τελευτῶν ἐκπωμάτι ἄργυρα καὶ χρυσά προφίνειν αὐτοῖς. Harpocration (Gloss. 259) explains προπεπωκότες as having the meaning προδεδωκότες ἐκ μεταφορᾶς. Cf. Dem. 18.296 τὴν ἐλευθερίαν προπεπωκότες . . . Φιλίππων) and some lines from the beginning of A. Myrmidones (fr. 131.1ff. Radt, see also P.Oxy. 2163, 1.2), where Achilles is said to be betraying the Greeks by refraining from the fighting), οὐς σὺ προφίν (Lobel; προφίνεις Blomfield). For τὸ σὸν μέρος ‘for your part’, cf. S. OC 1366, OT 1509 and Ant. 1062.
406-11 This detail is the first we hear of Rh.'s obligation to H. There are no stories extant of H. participating in actions outside Trojan territory and the dramatist has probably invented the story for the purpose of putting Rh. in H.'s debt. H.'s picture of Rh. is that of a petty Thracian vassal who owes his status as overall king of the Thracians to another man's valour (underlined especially by the sequence μικράς...μέγαν). This completely undermines his status as the saviour of Troy which both the shepherd and the chorus have accepted. However, the idea is not developed (see Vater Vindiciae xxviii), and one must conclude that it is a device used solely to embarrass Rh. at this moment in the argument. Rh. does not answer this point precisely, but provides his own military anecdote as proof of his valour, as well as a reason for lateness.

Mention of a conflict between Trojans and Thracians, like Rh.'s war with the Scythians at 426ff., does not undermine the idea of anti-Greek panbarbarism because such conflicts also occurred between Greek states.

406f. σε μικράς ἐκ τυραννίδος μέγαν | ... ἀνακτα For the change from the abstract to the personal cf. E. Hel. 1021 ἐκ ἀυσσεβείας ὅσιον εἰ τίθημι νῦν. For the sequence cf. also A. Cho. 262f. ἀπὸ σμικροῦ δ' ἄν ἄρειας μέγαν | δόμον.

τῇδε ἔθηκ' ἐγὼ χερί For H.'s emphasis on his own prowess cf. τῇδε...δορί at 58 and τῇδε πολυφόνω χερί at 62.

408 Mt. Pangaeus lies to the East of Amphipolis, in Southern
Thrace. Paeonia lies inland of Mt. Pangaeus, to the North West. There was a shrine to a Rhesus at Rhodope, nearby (see ἘΘΕΟΣ n.). The names are used because they are prominent parts of Thrace recognisable to the audience. The Paeonians are allies of H. at Il. 2.848ff. Their leader Asteropaeus is slain by Achilles at Il. 21.154-183. He too is the son of a river god. Any attempt to connect H.'s campaign there with events in Greek history, and thereby date the play, are invalid.

409f. H.'s vocabulary here is ferocious in tone (ἐμπεσὼν ... ἔρρηξα ... δουλώσας) and reminiscent of his zeal for physical combat and enslavement at 57f., 61f., 74f. and 100f. Here, as in the first epeisodion he views himself personally as the embodiment of Trojan might. Note especially the dismissive use of ἀριστοῖς. H. implies that he was capable of dealing with the best of the Rh.'s Thracian rivals on his own. Cf. Rh. at 479, 481 and 488 below.

κατὰ στόμα 'face to face' The phrase reccurs at 491 and 511. Cf. E. Hclld 801 (also in the context of military conflict) and A. Cho. 573. Cf. also κατ’ ὄμμα at 371 and 421. Its sense is like the Homeric ἀντικρύ, ἀυτίου, ἀντίβιον and ἐναντίβιον. Cf. also the Homeric πολέμου στόμα at Il. 19.313.

δουλώσας This is not an exaggeration. All the subjects of barbarian monarchs were regarded as slaves by the Greeks. But it must be remembered that Greeks also enslaved fellow-Greeks.

λεών is the object of both δουλώσας and παρέσχον, and not
predicative.

411 λακτίσας πολλὴν χάριν 'having spurned a great favour'. The obligation to repay a service was strong in the ancient world. πολλὴν χάριν means 'much gratitude' at 476 below.

412 ὑστερος βοηδρομεῖς Given the influence of ὑστερον βοηδρομεῖν at 333, ὑστερον is more likely to have replaced the more poetic ὑστερος, than vice versa.

413-8 H. now acknowledges the help of those allies who came to Troy. They are divided into oι μέν (414) who have died, and oι ὅε (416) who are still alive. The first clause is participial, leaving the rhetorical emphasis of the sentence on the present tenses κεῖναι, at the beginning of 415, and μένουσι at the beginning of 418. For H.’s dependence on his allies in the Il. cf. Il. 5.472-483.

413 ἐγγενεῖς Cf. S. OC 1167. These allies did not owe H. an automatic service through ties of kinship, as Rh. does (cf. 404 συ δ' ἐγγενῆς ὁν), but stood by him of themselves. Again he is trying to shame Rh.

414 ἐν χωστοῖς τάφοις The graves are made of earth which is heaped over the ashes or corpse. A Homeric grave might also consist of a stone chamber which held the funerary urn and was covered in earth (Il. 23.795-9). Here only the covering of earth is referred to. This was all that was required by custom for a
symbolic burial (cf. S. Ant. 245ff., where Antigone’s handful of earth serves as a grave for Polyneices). The fact that the allies have been buried in a foreign land adds a note of pathos to the description of the dead (cf. 377ff. and see note ad loc.). χωστός is not found again until after the 4th century BC, but Α. has πολύχωστον ... τάφον at Cho. 351f. and S. έρμα τυμβόχωστον at Ant. 848.

415 πίστις οὐ σμικρὰ ‘no small pledge (of loyalty)’. Cf. E. Hi. 1037 ήρκος παρασχών, πίστιν οὐ σμικράν, θεῶν.

416f. Although the Trojans and their allies are spending only their first night outside the walls, Η. describes conditions which normally affect men who bivouac in the field, in armed readiness, next to their chariots under the open sky. Such conditions are more applicable to the Greek camp (cf. A. Ag. 558-66). He does this in order to provide a manly contrast to the luxury which he accuses Rh. of indulging in at 418f. For the extremes of discomfort experienced under the alternating conditions of day and night cf. the torments of Prometheus at PV 22-5.

καὶ παρ’ balances ἐν θ’. For ἐν ὀπλοῖσι meaning ‘under arms’ cf. E. Su. 1150 and Ba. 303. Cf. also E. Su. 357f. παρ’ ὀπλοῖς θ’ ἡμενος.

ἀστιν Besides here, this noun occurs only in E.; at Phaethon 255 (Diggle) καπνοῦ μέλαιν’ ἀστίς ἐνδοθεν στέγης and, from a quotation in Photius which glosses χειμῶν (see R. Reitzenstein
Anfang des Lexikons des Photios (1907) 39), at Alcmaeon fr.78a.2 (Snell) ἐν τοῖς ἄνθρωποι καὶ θέρος διέρχομαι. The word is derived from ἄνθρωποι and means a gust (of wind, smoke etc., see P. Chantraine Dict. Et. (1968) 1.26). Like its synonym ἄνθρωπος (A. Eum. 905, S. Ai. 674), it is a rare, poetic word.

διψαν is intransitive, meaning ‘thirsty’, not ‘parching’, because the sun absorbs moisture. Cf. A. Ag. 495 and S. Ant. 246f., of dust.

πῦρ θεός For πῦρ of the sun’s heat cf. E. fr. 981.3 (Nauck), Theodectas fr. 17.4 (Snell) and Pindar Py. 3.50. The use of θεός for the sun is common in tragedy, especially in E. See Collard on E. Su. 208 and Diggle on Phaethon 6 for examples. Cf. also 331 above.

418 καρκεροῦντες is heavily emphatic, appearing at the end of the clause, to be balanced by δεξιούμενοι.

418f. H.’s slight is not simply a throwaway insult. Firstly, Northern barbarians had a reputation for hard drinking, in contrast to the Greeks who drank their wine with water. See Herod. 6.84, E. Hall Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 133, Long Barbarians in Greek comedy (1986) 9 and 116, and Yarcho Eirene 18 (1982) 31-42. Secondly, the charge of drunkenness is a grave one for a man in a position of responsibility. The prominence which nobles enjoyed at feasts and drinking bouts was a public acknowledgment of thanks for the military service which they performed for their communities (see J. Griffin Homer on Life and Death (1980) 14). Cf. esp. Il. 12.310-21, where this obligation, and the social
consequences of ignoring it, are outlined by Sarpedon. At *Il.* 10.217 Nestor offers a place at feasts and drinking bouts to the man who dares to spy on the Trojans. Cf. also *Il.* 4.257-63, *ib.* 343-8 and 17.249f. If, however, a nobleman indulges in the pleasures of wine without earning it, he is behaving in an irresponsible and dishonourable way. Cf. H.'s refusal of wine at *Il.* 6.264f. The first insult which Achilles hurls at Agamemnon during their quarrel is *oînobařeç*, followed closely by an accusation of cowardice (*Il.* 1.225. Rh. takes H.'s charge of luxurious living so seriously that it is the only charge he answers directly (438f.).

ἐν δέμωιαίς on couches, a luxury compared with bivouacing.

*ἀμφωτίν* occurs nowhere else in tragedy. The scholion refers to a line from *Auge* (*σὺν τῷ βαθεῖας καὶ πυκνὰς ἐλκουσι τὰς ἀμφωτιδας*), assumed by Nauck to be the work of a comic poet rather than E (see TGF 1964 437). The word is common in fifth century comedy and satyr plays. See E. *Cy.* 417 (see Seaford *ad loc.*), Ar. *Ach.* 1229, Epicharmus fr. 34.4 (Kaibel), Cratinus fr. 322 (Kassel-Austin), Pherocrates fr. 217 (Kassel-Austin) and Ameipsias fr. 213 (Kassel-Austin). It also occurs in non-dramatic verse; Anacreon 11.2 (Page), *Anacreonta* 9.2 and 18.2 (West) and esp. Call. *Aet.* fr. 178.11f. (Pfeiffer), CEG 465 (Hansen), and, in Latin, Hor. *Od.* 1.36.13f. (see R.G.M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard *ad loc.*).

The precise meaning of the word is like English 'sconce'; a cup from which a draught is drunk, or the act of drinking it in
The verb normally means 'greet' and here it may mean 'greet' in the sense of 'toast'. δεξιοῦσθαι normally takes an acc. when it means 'greet someone (with the right hand)', i.e. shake hands with them (see P. Chantraine Dict. étym. de la langue grecque (1968) s.v. δέξιος). Cf. S. El. 975f. τίς ... ἡμᾶς ἰδών | ... οὐχὶ δεξιώστεται. Paley suggests that the correct meaning here may be that of toasting someone, i.e. taking the cup (acc.) in the right hand in honour of someone (dat., to be assumed). He maintains that such an interpretation would make sense of the dat. at A. Ag. 852 θεοίσι πρώτα δεξιώσομαι. However, as Fraenkel says ad loc., 'the use of the dative with δεξιώσομαι to indicate the person greeted seems to be without parallel'. Moreover there is no one in the dative indicated here to whom the toast could be offered. Vater takes the participle as simply equivalent to δεξόμενοι. However, there is nothing inappropriate in understanding the phrase as 'greeting the brimming cup', meaning gladly reaching for it with the right hand.

420f. H. closes with asyndeton, and words which echo his statement at the beginning of his speech φιλάω...ι. ἀνήρ.

ταῦθ' ...ικαὶ μέμφομαι σοι καὶ λέγω κατ' ὁμα σῶν H. is direct and personal; 'I cast this [the whole of his complaint] in your teeth, and I say so to your face'. For the construction with μέμφομαι cf. Ar. Nu. 525f. ταῦτ' ὑμῖν μέμφομαι καὶ τοῖς σοφοῖς. κατ' ὁμα σῶν has a hostile sense, as at 371 (cf κατὰ στόμα at
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The phrase does not occur with a hostile sense elsewhere.

420 ὡς ἄν εἶδης The tone of this phrase is not one of giving useful advice, but of ensuring that the listener is in no doubt about the seriousness with which the speaker regards his statement. See also note on 72 above.

ἐλεύθερον One of the greatest differences between a slave or exile and a free man stressed on the tragic stage is the freedom of the latter to say what he wished. Cf. S. Tra. 62f. ἑδε γὰρ γινή ἕν δοῦλη μέν, εἴρηκεν δὲ ἐλεύθερον λόγον, E. And. 152f. Μενέλαος ἡμῖν ταύτα δωρεῖται πατήρ ἱ πολλοῖς σὺν ἐδύνατι, ὡστ' ἐλευθεροστομεῖν, IA 313 μέθες μακροὺς δὲ δοῦλος ἄν λέγεις λόγους, Ba. 775 and the tragic adespoton 304 (TGF vol. 2 fr. 304 (Kannicht and Snell)) δοῦλος πέφυκας, οὔ μετεστὶ σοι λόγου. The right of free speech, which has the advantage of providing a greater variety of advice upon which to act, is highly valued in Homer. Cf. esp. Achilles' defence of Calchas at Il. 1.85-91. παρρησία was considered the jewel in the crown of Athenian democracy. See A. Momigliano RSI 83 (1971) 513-8 and cf. esp. E. Ion 671-75 and Hi. 421ff.

422f. Rh. launches into his reply with asyndeton and words which mirror those of H. at 394f. The exact repetition of κοῦ δέπλος πέφυκ' ἄνηρ is lame. It does not have the same effect as the repetition of εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἄνηρ at E. Hi. 1031, 1075 and 1191. There the concern of Hippolytus to prove that he is guiltless is central to the latter part of that play (cf. ib. also
1070f.). In Rh. the repetition has no such rhetorical force, especially because it is simply a direct reference back to the words of another speaker in the same context. See also p. 36 above.

εὐθεῖων λόγων | τέμνων κέλευθον The metaphor is from navigation, itself taken from ploughing. Cf. Od. 3.174, τ. πέλαγος, ib. 13.88 τ. κύματα, E. Andromeda fr. 124.3f. (Nauck), quoted by Ar. at Thes. 1099ff., διὰ μέσον γὰρ αἰθέρας | τέμνων κέλευθον, Pindar Ol. 12.6 ψεύδη μεταμόρφωσι τάμωνοις κυλίνδουν ἔλπιδες, and, in Latin, via secta at V. Geo. 1.238. Cf. also E. Pho. [1] ὁ τὴν ἐν ἀστρομικὸν οὐρανοῦ τέμνων ὁδὸν (which is spurious. See 305n. above and M.W. Haslam GRBS 16 (1975) 149-74). In this context the metaphor stresses the speaker’s direct and single-minded attitude to the truth.

424f. ἐγὼ δὲ often marks the transition from the introduction to a speech to the opening of the speech proper (see Dennistons GP 171). Rh.’s unprovable claim that he is more aggrieved than H. at his late arrival is not simply a weak remark which is irrelevant to his excuse for absence; it sets the tone for the rest of the speech, in which he concentrates entirely on his own attitude to his past achievements and his future intentions.

λύπη πρὸς ἦπαρ is to be taken with ἐτειρόμην; δυσφορῶν with τῆς ἀπὸν χθωνός. As in renaissance English literature the liver is regarded as the seat of emotion. Cf. A. Ag. 432, ib. 791, Cho. 272, Eum. 135, S. Ai. 938 (see Kamerbeek ad loc.), E. Hi. 1070, Su. 599 (see Collard ad loc.), fr. 979.2 (Nauck), and see J. de
Romilly *La Crainte et l'angoisse dans le théâtre d'Eschyle* (1958) 28ff.

426 ἀγχιτέρμων is not in A. or E. It appears at S. Lemniai (fr. 384 Radt) and in the fourth century-tragedian Theodectas (fr. 17.1 Snell). Scythia bordered Thrace to the North East.

For the apposition of γοής and λεώς see p. 38 above and Fraenkel (1965) 238. For the idea cf. A. *Pe.* 349 ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ὅτι ἔρκος ἐστὶν ἀσφαλές.

Σκύθης λεώς This conflict with the Scythians, like that between H. and Rh.'s rival Thracian princes at 408ff., is an invention of the poet. It gives Rh. a military background to balance the prowess of H. It is reminiscent of the Thracian king Polymestor's excuse for his absence at E. *Hec.* 962ff. σὺ δ', εἰ τι μέμφη τῆς ἐμῆς ἀπουσίας, ἵππες τυγχάνω γὰρ ἐν μέσοις Θρηκυκης ὀροὶς ὁ ἄμων, ὃτ' ἠλθες δεῦρ'. It should also be noted that Menelaus' excuse for departing from the action at E. *And.* 733-8 involves putting down a troublesome neighbour.

Rh. describes only a battle with the Scythians, not a war, which would have taken longer. πόλεμων is therefore used figuratively. It is the process of taking hostages and arranging the Scythian tribute (434f.) which must have taken ten years (cf. 444). However, despite the weakness of the excuse, we must accept it at face value because it is clear that Rh.'s desire to help is genuine, and, later, that his help would be decisive (600-3).

Another excuse for the lateness of Rh. survives. Parthenius (*Amat. Narr.* 36, ed. Martini 1902) says that he was hunting and
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feasting with Arganthone, the Amazon queen of Ceos (cf. 418f.). For this kind of explanation for the absence of a hero (albeit against their will) cf. Odysseus with Nausicaa (Od. 1.13ff.) and Heracles with Omphale (S. Tra. 248-53). G. Seure (Rev. Phil. 2 (1928) 106-34) argues that this is an earlier strand of the Rhesus myth than that in Philostratus.

The Scythians were a notoriously warlike and savage semi-nomadic people (see Herod. 4.1-144, esp. 46 and 64-6), although in some traditions they have a reputation for being well governed, 'noble savages' (see A. PL fr. 198 and Lovejoy & Boas Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity (1935) 315-44). Barbarian races in tragedy for the most part live in settled communities and are literate. Egyptians, Persians, Trojans and Lydians were not as backward as the Scythians, whose land was a desert and a byword for remoteness (see PV 2, 417f. and 709f.). It is worth noting that Scythians play no part in Euripidean drama, despite his interest in the portrayal of foreigners. Indeed they appear in tragedy only as the chorus in S. Scythae (frr. 546-52). For the Scythian setting of PV see E. Hall Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 113ff. The comic Scythian in the parody of Andromeda at Ar. The. 1001ff. is less likely to be based on a character from E. than to be a caricature of the Scythian public slaves who were used as policemen at Athens (see Plassart REG 26 (1913) 151-213 and E. Hall Philologus 133 (1989) 38-54).

428 νόστον Σ ἀπλῶς τὴν ὀδὸν καὶ τὸν πλοῦν ἐβῆ. The common meaning of the word is 'return', but it does mean 'a safe journey' at E. IA 966 and 1261.
περάν intransitive, but with the acc. of the place passed by.

μοι ..| μέλλοντι ..| ξυνήψε πόλεμον cf. A. Pe. 335f. στρατεύματι | μάχην ξυνήψαι and, without a dat., E. Su. 144 Τυδεύς μάχην συνήψε Πολυσείκης θ' ἁμα and ib. 683 συνήψαν ἀλκήν.

ἀξένον .. πόντον There are only five other instances of ἀξένος (or ἀξένους) appearing in the MSS of the Euripidean corpus. ἀξένος is now read for all of them: An. 1262, IT 125, 395, 1388 and HF 410. We also find the prefix εἰς- in P.Hib. 1.24 at IT 253, where L, rightly, has ἀξένον. In each case the scribes have assumed that the Euxine is referred to. However, ἀξένος was the original form of the adjective when applied to the Black Sea, and ἀξένος a later euphemism. ἀξένος itself was possibly an etymological misconception of the Avestan ah-saena meaning 'dark in colour' (see Bond on HF 410 and W.S. Allen, CQ 41 (1947) 86ff.). The Bosporus was the route to Europe chosen by Darius for his abortive Scythian expedition in 513 BC (Herod. 4.118).

πορήμενον Vater's defense of πορήμενος (A) is based on a misconception of Rh.'s route and intentions. He believes that Rh. came to the Black Sea (ἀφικόμην) not in order to cross over to Troy, but to meet the Scythians in battle, and translates 'Veni ad Ponti litora castris motis'. If we accept this, the sentence loses its force because not only is there little point in Rh. explaining where he went to do battle with the Scythians, but also his war with them then becomes a deliberate expedition undertaken in spite of his obligations to H. What Rh. wishes H. to know is that he was
on the point of crossing over to Troy when, during his last moments in Europe, he suffered a surprise attack which delayed him. Hence the frustration he expressed in 424f.

The future participle has some competition from the aorist infinitive πορθμεύον in Q. See Diggle SI 5 (1988) 171 (=Eur. 324) and cf. E. Me. 1303 ἐμῶν δὲ παιδῶν ἠλθον ἐκσώσων βίων, where there is also the aor. inf. variant ἐκσώσω. For the inf. after a verb of motion cf. S. OC 12 μεθάνειν γὰρ ἤκοιμεν, E. Phaeth. 97 προσέβαν ὑμέναιον ἀείσαι, Neophron fr. 1.1 ἠλθον .. μαθεῖν.

430f. Cf. A. Pe. 816f. τόσος γὰρ ἔσται πελανός αἰματοσφαγής | πρὸς γῆι Πλαταιῶν Δωρίδος λόγχης ὑπ. The verbal resemblance is striking, as well as the context (see Fraenkel (1965) 232). Cf. also E. Alc. 851 πρὸς αἴματηρον πελανόν. For the idea cf. also E. Pho. 718 τάχ'/ αὐτῶν πεδίων ἐμπλήσω φόνου.

πελανός For the accentuation see Fraenkel on A. Ag. 96. The precise etymology of this word is obscure (see P. Chantraine Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue grecque (1968) 872f.). It seems to mean 'thick liquid' and there is a considerable variety in its application, e.g. to foam (cf. E. Or. 220), oil (A. Ag. 96, see Fraenkel ad loc.), honey (E. Cret. fr.467.5). See LSJ s.v. The scholion is wrong to question its application to blood.

432 τοῖ emphases τοιάδε, countering the reasons which H. gave for Rh.'s lateness. See Denniston GP 540.

ἀπείρψε governs the infinitives in 433. For verbs of preventing with the infinitive and without μὴ see K-G 2.214-5. The
variant ἀπηγεῖ in V means lead something away from something else. It only comes to mean 'divert' as a rhetorical term (cf. Thuc. 2.59.3, 2.65.1 and Pl. Phaedr. 262B).

432f. πέδου δ'. ἱκέσωι For the acc. of motion towards something without a preposition see K-G 1.311f. and 223n.

434 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπερσα, τῶνδ' The verb is not normally used absolutely and Wecklein, objecting to the use of the demonstrative τῶνδ', in the absence of the people referred to, provided an object with τῆν; but it is possible to use the demonstrative pronoun to refer to people who are absent. See Diggle Eur. 36 n.3., Hutchinson on A. Se. 408, Hunger WSt (1950) 19ff., Platnauer on E. IT 558, P. H. J. Lloyd Jones Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy (1990) 397f. and Taplin (1977) 150ff.

ὁμηρεύσας τέκνα This is the only example of a transitive use for this verb (cf. παναμερεύσει 361). For the taking of hostages cf. A. Panagopoulos Captives and Hostages in the Peloponnesian War (1978).

435 ἔτειον δασμὸν Darius divided the Persian empire into satrapies for the purpose of assessing and collecting an annual tax (Herod. 3.89ff.).

δασμὸν occurs twice in S., at OC 635 and OT 36, and not at all in E. or A., but cf. οὗτος ἔτη δασμοφοροῦσιν at A. Pe. 586.

436 ὦκω has a strong rhetorical emphasis, being the pivot of the sentence spanning 434-7. The other verbs refer directly, or
indirectly, to the events leading up to Rh.’s arrival. The aor. περάσας indicates that the sea crossing took place before the journey overland (περὼν 437).

Ποιμέν οτόμα refers to the Thracian Bosphorus.

437 After crossing the Bosporus Rh. marched to Troy through the lands of her neighbours, Mysia and Phrygia.

πεζός balances ναυσί in 436. It is not found in E. S. has it at fr. 15. The six occurrences in A. are all in Pe.

438 ώς σὺ κομπείς The phrase echoes ώς σὺ at 419. The same words appear at 876 and appear to be idiomatic, for in both places the verb has the sense ‘complain’ rather than ‘boast’ or ‘vaunt’ (not in LSJ). Cf. 875f. below and E. Or. 570f. διὰ δασοπάσες δ’ ἔγω οὔτε, ἦσα σὺ κομπείς, τόνδ’ ἕπαυσα τόν νόμον, where the context is similar. For the sequence of conjunctions in Rh.’s denial cf. Medea at E. Me. 555ff. οὔχ, ὦ σὺ κτίζῃ...οὔδ’...οὔδ’...οὔδ’.

τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας Grammatically these accusatives are governed by κομπείνων in the next line, because the poet has omitted a participle like δεξιούμενον here. But the sense is clear. The use of the plural and the possessive pronoun gives a dismissive tone to the phrase. Cf. Rh. to H. at 450 συντεμὼν τοὺς σοὺς πόνους and the charioteer’s reference at 866 οὔκ οἶδα τοὺς σοὺς οὕς λέγεις Ὀδυσσέας. Cf., with the singular pronoun, Hippolytus’ scorn of Aphrodite at E. Hi. 113 τίνι σὴν δὲ Κυπριν πόλι’ ἔγω χαίρειν λέγω and Demophon’s reply to Copreus’ threats at E. Hclid. 284 τὸ σὸν γὰρ Ἀργος οὐ δέδοικ’ ἔγω.
439 ἐν καρφύσοις δόμασιν Rh. elaborates H.'s couches (418) into golden halls, to emphasise the contrast between the luxury he is supposed to have enjoyed with the hardships which he actually suffered.

440ff. The construction could be indirect statement; ‘I know that I endured’ etc, but there is greater rhetorical force in the direct statement; ‘I know what icy winds harry the Thracian sea .. having endured them’.

φυσήματα The icy blasts balance H.'s ψυχρὰν ἀποιν at 417. For the cold North wind which batters Thrace cf. Hesiod OD 505-8 (see West ad loc.) and cf. also A. Ag. 1418 ἐπωιδόν Θρηκίων ἀημάτων.

441 κρυσταλληπηκτα The transmitted reading refers to φυσήματα and is therefore transitive. Kirchhoff's alternative conjectures, which agree with πόντου, are based on A. Pe. 501 περάτι κρυσταλληπηκτα διὰ πόρον, where the adjective is passive. R. does not include this word in his resemblances to the diction of A., but the parallel with Pe. 501 is impossible to ignore, especially since the context is so similar (see Fraenkel (1965) 233) and nothing resembling these adjectives occurs elsewhere.

Παιόνας The point is not that Paeonians are traditionally hardy, because they can resist the blasts, or even soft, because it oppresses them (cf. 408f.), but that the locality they inhabit is cold. Porter assumes that the Paeonians formed a contingent in
Rh.'s army, but this has no dramatic point and there is no indication of it in the text.

ἔπεζάρει The MS reading ἐπεζάτει is meaningless. Scaliger's conjecture (cf. the glosses in V and Q) is made on the basis of E. Pho. 45f. ὡς δ' ἔπεζάρει | Ἐφίγει ἄρπαγαισι τόλμην. The word is the Arcadian form of ἔπεβαρεῖ (see Eustathius 909.26 and F. Bechtel Die griechischen Dialekte vol. 1 (1921) 389). Blaydes suggested ἔπιζαρεῖ and the present tense should perhaps be considered in this general context.

442 ἔνν τοῖσθ'. . . πορπάμαιν The use of σών to refer to things that belong to someone is found in epic. Cf. Il. 5.220 σών ἔντεσι and 11.386 σών τεῦχεσι. Cf. also Xen. Hell. 2.2.7 and see Diggle Studies in the Text of Euripides (1981) 60.

πορπάματα is used by Attic writers only in the Doric plural. Cf. E. El. 820 and HF 959 (see Wilamowitz ad loc.). The plural probably stems from the brooches (πορπαί) which fastened it. It means a cloak, but not specifically a soldier's cloak.

ἄνυπνος For sleeplessness as a bane of the soldier's life cf. S. Ai. 1203f. and Il. 9.325.

443 ἀλλ' implies an objection to H.'s complaint at 412; 'So (you say), I have come late; even so I have come in the nick of time'. See Denniston GP 7 and cf. rhetorical at in Latin.

444 σ' μὲν γὰρ is answered by ἐμοὶ δὲ at 447. The γὰρ goes with the entire statement, especially 447ff.
\( \alpha \chi \mu \alpha \zeta \varepsilon i \zeta \) is not in E., but occurs at A. Pe. 756 ἐνδον \( \alpha \chi \mu \alpha \zeta \varepsilon i \nu \) and with an object at S. Tra. 354f. Ἐρως δὲ νην ἀ μόνος θεόν θέλειν α\( \chi \)μάσαι τάδε.

ἡμέραν δ᾽ ἐξ ἡμέρας ‘day in, day out’. Cf. Heniochus (Kassel-Austin vol.5, 556), where the same phrase occurs, and Herod. 9.8.1 ἐξ ἡμέρης ἐς ἡμέραν. This kind of prepositional phrase is frequently used to convey a sense of continuity, and here emphasises the length of H.’s struggle. See Headlam on Herondas 5.85 ἑορτὴν ἐς ἑορτής, and Cgygli-Wyss ZVS 18 (1966) 69f.

446 πῖπτεις Sallier’s ‘You risk on a gambler’s throw your warfare with the Argives’,\(^{273}\) is unnecessary. πῖπτεις here means ‘you fail’. Cf. Ar. Eq. 540 and Pl. Phaedo 100E. There is a veiled insult in this metaphor, because if H. is dicing for victory then his success would be a matter of chance, not valour. This contrasts strongly with H.’s own vision of his conquering spear backed by divine favour.

κυβεῖνων... Ἀρη This use of the verb with an object is not found elsewhere in tragedy, but cf. Anth. Pal. 12.47.2 (Meleager) τούμων πνεῦμα ἐκύβευον Ἐρως. Cf. also ib. 7.427.13f. (Antipater of Sidon) τὸ κυβεῦόν πνεῦμα. For the metaphor of dicing in Rh. see 155n.

447 φῶς ἐν ἥλιον καταρκέσθαι For the idea cf. H. at 331 δεῖξει τούπιον σέλας θεοῦ. However, this is more than a boastful echo of H.’s words. At 600-604 Athena declares that if Rh. survives the night he will be unbeatable. This later revelation gives validity.

\(^{273}\)See also A.C. Pearson CR 31 (1917) 26 and Valckenaer (Diatribe) 105 n.7.
to Rh.’s apparently arrogant boasting. The period of a single day is important also at S. Ai. 754-57. The prophecy of Calchas stated that Ajax would be safe if he did not leave his tent that day.

The verb is not found in A. or E., but occurs at S. Aleadai fr. 68.1 παύσαι· καταρκεῖ τούδε κεκλήσθαι πατρός.

448f. πέρσωνι Cf. μοι .. μέλλοντι at 426f. For the boast cf. H.’s plan of action at 59-62 which is also frustrated by the lack of light.

πύργους see 391n.

ναυτάθμοις ἐπεσπευσίν On ναυτ. see 136n. We should expect the acc. (A) after the compound infin., as at E. HF 34 τὴν ἐπεσπεύσων πόλιν and Ba. 753 ἐπεσπευσθεὶς πάντι ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω. However, there is a parallel for the dat. (A), in prose, at Xen. Cyr. 7.5.27 ἐπεισπίπτονσιν αὐτοῖς πίνουσι.

449f. There is heavy irony in the straightforward language of this sentence because, for all his simplistic confidence he will never see the morning after this night, let alone the morning after the following one.

θατέραι for τῇ ἔτερᾳ ἡμέρᾳ. Cf. S. OT 782 (where Lloyd Jones and Wilson prefer θὴτερᾳ to θατέραι) and see Schwyzer Gr.Gr. 2.158. συμπεμένῳ cf. συγκατασκάφῳ at 391.

451-3 Rh. now goes further than offering to do H.’s job for him. He specifically declares that he will enter the battle alone.
(ὑμῶν δὲ...ἐγὼ γὰρ) and sweep the Greeks away. There is nothing remarkable in a hero performing a solo ἀριστεία during a battle (cf. Il. 5.1ff., of Diomedes and ib. 11.91ff., of Agamemnon), but Rh. assumes that he will be able to win the war with one. The contrast between ἀσπίδα and δορί is also insulting to the Trojans; by telling them not to lift their shields he puts them in the category of defenders while he will use the offensive weapon.

451 δὲ indicates the start of a new train of thought.


452 γὰρ explains the reason for his instruction in 451.

ἐγὼ γὰρ τέξωτ etc. ‘I shall stop the big-talking Greeks with my spear when I have slain them.’ Hermann’s ἔρξω ((1828) 304) would require the construction ἔρξω (I perform) τι (some harm) τινα (upon someone). See J. Jackson MS 110f. I do not see the problem with retaining ἔξω. For the use of the verb cf. 60 ἔσχον and 101 καθέξω.

τούς μέγ' αὐχοῦντας For ‘talking big’ cf. Od. 22.287f. μὴ ποτε πάμπαν | εἰκὼν ἀφραδίης μέγα εἰπεῖν, E. Hcl. 353 εἰ σὺ μέγ' αὐχεῖς and E. fr. 1007 λευκοὺς λίθους χέντες αὐχοῦσιν μέγα. Its use is ironic here, because it is Rh. who has been boasting, not the Greeks.

453 καὶ περ ὑστερος μολὼν takes up 443.
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The verb ὑπερεῖν is common in tragedy, found in comedy only in a quotation from A. (see TGF vol. 3 p. 56) at Ar. Ra. 1276 κύριος εἴμι ὑπερεῖν (see Bond on E. Hyps. 10.7). It is often used in urgent questions as in 12 and 38 above (cf. S. Ant. 1287, E. Tro. 153, Hi. 212 and 571), and also, as here, has the sense of 'declare aloud'; cf. A. Ag. 1137, Eu. 510, S. Ai. 864, Tra. 188, E. Pho. 1341, IA 143 and 1345.

Διόθεν The adverb is applied twice in the Il. to ἄγγελος (Il. 24.194 and 561), and once in Pindar to με (fr. 75.7). In A. and E. (it does not occur in S.) it is generally confined to things inanimate or abstract, such as wind, stones and death (see A. Ag. 470, Su. 437, E. El. 736, Hel. 1505, IT 354, fr. 916.6 and PV 1089).

μόνον introduces a 'saving formula'. See Garvie on A. Cho. 244f, where μόνος also occur in the MS, <μόνον> Κράτος τε καὶ Δίκη εἴναι συγγενεῖτο μοι. Cf. also A. Su. 1012, S. Tra. 596, 1109, Phi. 528, E. Cy. 219 and Herondas 2.89 (see Headlam ad loc.). For the sentiment cf. A. Ag. 131ff. οἴον μή τις ἄγα θεόθεν κυνεφάλσῃ προτυπέν στόμιον μέγα Τρόιας διεστρατωθέν.

φθόνον see 343n. The word comes in a prominent position to highlight the chorus' cautious reaction to Rh.'s words.

ἄμαχον It is natural that divine forces should be considered irresistible. Cf. its use with ὑβρίς at A. Ag. 769.

ὑπατος in Homer is used of Zeus alone (cf. Il. 19.258, etc).
The application to deities is more general in tragedy. Cf. 703 below, A. Ag. 55, 90 and Su. 24. For the cult of Ζεύς ὑπάτος see A.B. Cook Zeus vol.2 875f.

459ff. For the sentiment cf. Ajax’s words of himself at S. Ai. 421-6 'οὐκέτ' ἀνδρα μη | τόνδ' ἢνητ' - ἐπος | ἐξερω μέγα - | οἶον οὔτινα | Τρώι. στρατοῦ | δέρχθη χθονὸς μολὼν' ἀπὸ | Ἑλλανίδος.

νάιον .. δόρυ A highly poetic periphrasis as at Pindar Py. 4.27 εἰνάλιον δόρυ. Originally meaning ‘plank’, it has developed into ‘spear’ but also has a nautical sense. We find it meaning ‘ship timber’ at Il. 15.410 and ‘mast’ at E. Tro. 1148. It is often used for ‘ship’ in A. Cf. Pe. 411, Su. 135, 846, 852, 1007 and Ag. 1618. Cf. also S. Ph. 721, E. Hel. 1611, And. 793, Cy. 15.

461 Ἀχιλεὺς is an epic form, found seven times in E. and nowhere in A. or S.

ὑπομείνανε means ‘withstand’ here, like ὑποστάς at 375. For the idea cf. Il. 6.126, 8.535f., 13.829f. At S. OT 1323 it means ‘endure’.

464ff. εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε γ' ἡμαρ | εἰσίδοιμ' ἄναξ, ὅτων πολυφόνου | χειρὸς ἂποιν' ἀροῖ σᾶι λόγχαι. ‘May I see that day at least, lord, when you exact requital for his murderous hand with your spear’. For the day of recompense cf. Il. 15.719f. νῦν ἡμῖν πάντων Ζεὺς ἔξειν ἡμαρ ἔδωκε, | νῆς ἔλειν. For εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε γ'
Musgrave prints the reading ὅπως in his text, but says of the line 'frustra in his sensum quaeras' and proposed ὅτωι.

The adjective means 'murderous' (Cf. 62 above). Stephanus conjectured it for the metre at E. HF 420. It is a simple enough compound and may have been constructed at any time (see Fraenkel (1965) 235). The hand is that of Achilles. It is a 'genitive of price'. Cf. τῆς ἐμῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας at 192 and τῆς μακρὰς ἀπουσίας at 467.

ἀπολύν' ἄροιο is Diggle's suggestion (Eur. 515ff.) for ἀποινάσαιο (aor. mid. opt; the opt. is due to the attraction of the mood of εἰσίδοιμι. See K-G 1.255f. and Goodwin MST section 177). In tragedy the verb occurs only at 177 above and here, and does not occur again until the fourth century. In 177 it means 'hold to ransom' i.e. exact ἀπολύνα for. However, it cannot bear the meaning 'punish' or 'exact vengeance from', which is what is required here.

467f. The sense is 'I shall give you the opportunity to exact these things in return for my long absence'.

---

274 Cf. ἀπολύνα σαί φέροις (Hartung) and ἀπολύνα σαί θάνοι (Murray)
275 Dem. explains the active sense to his contemporaries while expounding a statute at 23.33.4 μηδὲ ἀπολύναν. ταύτα δ' ἔστιν τί; .. μὴ χρήματα πράττεσθαι· τὰ γὰρ χρήματ' ἀπολύν' ἔνομαζον οἱ παλαιοί.
toiauta μὲν object of πράξαι. R. compares the format of this line with E. Me. 545f. toiauta μὲν σοι τῶν ἐμῶν πόνων πέρι ἔλεξ', which has an answering δέ at ib. 547. toiauta probably refers both to Rh.'s last words and the last words of the chorus. He is picking up where he left off and also taking up what the chorus said. Cf. the acknowledgement of the short choral song at S. Phil. 404ff. and 519ff. See also 469n.

σοι dat. with παρέξω. Rh. continues in the spirit of 450, as if he were performing a personal favour for H. Cf. the tone of 471 εἴνω σοι.

theid μακρᾶς ἀποσίας is genitive of payment. Cf. E. Me. 534f. μεῖζω γε μέντοι θῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας | εἴληφας ἡ δέδωκας (see Page ad loc.) and S. Tra. 287f. εὖτ' ἂν ἄχνα θύματα | βέξη πατρώων Ζηνὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως (see Jebb and Easterling ad loc., and cf. also this line with Rh. 470) and see J. Diggle The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Orestes (1991) 95 n.5).

πράξαι For πράσσειν with the sense 'exact' cf. 368f. above and see Fraenkel on A. Ag. 111.

σῶν δ' Ἀδραστεία λέγω The δ' does not answer μὲν, but isolates the phrase as a parenthetical expression which goes with what precedes it. This particular phrase does not occur elsewhere in tragedy but may be paralleled by phrases like εἴν ὑεκ at 358 above. Cf. Herodas 6.35 λάθοιμι δ' Ἀδραστεία and, in Latin, Catullus 66.71 (itself a translation of Callim. Aet. 4, fr. 110)
pace tua fari hic liceat Ramnusia virgo (cf. also Cat. 68.77).

469 ἐπειδὰν Cf. A. Se. 734. Murray keeps ἐπειδὸν (cf. A. Se. 734) and wishes to alter μὲν to μὴν in 467, but ἐπειδὴ ὅν (followed by an unnecessary δ') occurs in V, and μὲν, which surely points forwards to a δὲ here, is in all MSS. See Denniston GP 382, R. 181 and Hutchinson at A. Se. 734. Porter, ad loc., points also to the unlikelihood of the short final syllable (ἐπειδὸν = ἐπειδῆ + ὅν).

470 θῶμεν...ἐξέλης The first verb could refer both to Rh. and H., but the stress which Rh. places on his own contribution at 447-53 and the presence of a separate verb in the second person singular for H. suggests that by θῶμεν Rh. is making an exaggerated reference to himself. He will undertake the brunt of the battle (thereby winning the glory) and leave H. with only the formal task of dedicating the spoils to the gods.

ἀκροθίνια ἐξέλης The ἀκροθίνια were the first-fruit offerings of war booty, paid to the gods in gratitude for victory in order to mark it in concrete terms. See W. Burkert Greek Religion (1985) 69. The duty would fall to H. as the local chieftain. Heracles used such ἀκροθίνια to establish the Olympic games (Pindar Ol. 2.4). The first-fruits (one sixtieth) of the tribute from Athens' empire was dedicated to Athena. ἀκροθίνια are also commonly the first fruits of a land's produce, such as those used by Athena to bribe the Furies into abating their wrath at A. Eum. 834.

302
471f. The subordination in 469f. leads up to Rh.'s main ambition, the conquest of all Greece. For the idea of continuing the war into Greece cf. V. Aen. 2.192ff. and 11.285ff. Such an ambition is typical of Rh., especially his overweening confidence of success in a second victory before he has even achieved his immediate objective, as H. reminds him in 482. Cf. A. Pe. 975ff., where the Persian nobles suggest raising a new force against Greece, only to be told by Darius that their last force will scarcely return intact. Cf. also from history, Herod. 8.108, where Eurybiades suggests allowing Xerxes to escape to Persia and pursuing the war there. Themistocles in reply persuades the Greeks not to look so far ahead.

472 The positioning of πᾶσαν is highly emphatic. Rh. intends not simply to sack individual towns but the whole country. For ἐκπέρσαι δορί cf. 58 ἀναλῶσαι δορί.

473 The grim simplicity of the language conveys well the desire for vengeance. ὃς ἄν is used to express a purpose of the speaker which is capable of future fulfilment (see Dobson CR 24 (1910) 142ff.). For the desire to punish the Greeks for their invasion of Troy cf. 72-5 and H. at Il. 8.515ff.

474 H. begins tactfully, not by opposing Rh. but with a conditional clause stressing his own position. Then he turns to Rh.'s suggestion. τοῦ παρόντος τοῦδ'...κακοῦ picks up κακῶς in 473. The present, real κακὸν of Troy is of more importance than
the future, hypothetical κακόν of Greece.

475 ὃς τὸ πρὶν ποτ' ἀσφαλῇ i.e. in its stable condition before the arrival of the Greeks. Cf. II. 22.156 τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἔλθειν υἷς Ἀχαιῶν.

477f. τὰ δ' ἀμφὶ τ' Ἀργος The δ' is strongly adversative: 'But as for Argos'. As at 474, H. counters Rh.'s zeal by taking up his own words. Cf. Ἀργος Ἐλλάδος ἴδιον... palthein... δορί with 471f. This is a common feature of animated stichomythia.

νομόν normally means pastureland, but can be used in verse of an entire district as at Pindar Ol. 7.33 ἀμφιθάλαττων νομῶν, of Rhodes. Its use here is surely connected to νεμοίμην in 475.

οὐχ...ῥάδιτι' This is not simply an ironic understatement, but a sober warning based on personal knowledge of Greek might, which Rh. lacks.

479 Rh.'s question prepares the way for his clever question in 481. H.'s reply shows that he does not understand the point of Rh.'s remark. The use of φασίν illustrates Rh.'s second-hand knowledge of the war. Cf. λόγος γ' ἦν at 493.

ἄριστας. Hutchinson on A. Se. 327 observes that 'Attic poets do not normally run together ε + α in disyllables.' C.G. Cobet (Variae Lectiones2 (1873) 583f.), following the scholion (οὐχ οὕτωι εἰσὶν οἵ ἄριστοι τῶν Ἐλλήνων), conjectured ἄριστους, but
see K. Meisterhans-E. Schwyzer (1900) 141.

480 καὶ μεμφόμεσθα γ'. The καὶ implies 'yes', as often in stichomythia, and καὶ...τε places strong emphasis on the words between them. See Denniston GP 157. The sense must be 'Yes, and we do not despise them'. This is the interpretation of the scholion.

ἀλλ’ ἀδὴν ἐλαύνομεν 'but we get our fill of them.' For the rough breathing see W. Schulze Quaestiones epicae (1892) 452 n.2 and Fraenkel on A. Ag. 828. ἀδὴν is the adverbial acc. of ἀδη, meaning 'satiety' (the alternative sense provided by Α’ς ἀλλὰ δῆν (sed diu) is not appropriate to the context). Hartung conjectured ἐλαύνομαι, to produce the meaning 'and I am driven to satiety [by them]', but the change from the plural μεμφόμεσθα to the singular ἐλαύνομαι is harsh. ἐλαύνω is used intransitively in a metaphorical sense (as at Tyrtaeus fr. 11.9 and the quotation from Solon at Ar. Ath. Pol. 5.3). In epic parallels of this phrase the verb is used in the active with ἀδὴν referring to the object driven, meaning to drive someone else to a satiety of something (in the genitive). Cf. Il. 13.315 ο’ μὲν ἀδὴν ἐλώσι καὶ ἐσσύμενον πολέμου, ib. 19.423 ο’ ἱῆξω πρὶν Τρίκας ἀδὴν ἐλάσαι πολέμου καὶ Od. 5.290 ἀλλ’ ἐτί μὲν μὲν φημι ἀδὴν ἐλάσων κακότητος.

481 This remark is the only example of a cleverness of style which we might expect to find more frequently if the play were Euripidean.

πάντ’ εἰργάσμεθα For the reading see Diggle SI (1988) 171
(=Eur. 324) and cf. Σ πάντα διαπεπραξόμεθα. πάντα has a wider application than the singular, cf. 605 τοῦτον κατακτάς πάντ’ εξείς. For the perfect used of a future event cf. S. Phil. 75f. ὠστ’ εἰ με τόξων ἐγκρατῆς αἰσθήσεται ἡ ὅλωλα and OT 1166 ὅλωλος, εἰ σε τοῦτ’ ἐρήσομαι πάλιν (see K-G 1.150).

482ff. H. does not answer Rh. directly but again shifts the emphasis back to the immediate problem with a gnomic expression. Rh. counters with a gnomic expression himself (cf. Pindar Py. 10.61ff. and Py. 3.21ff.). H.’s reply in turn shows clearly the difference in priorities between the two men now. H. wants his country restored; Rh. wants the glory that comes with vengeance and victory.

482 πόρω Dindorf’s conjecture is probably correct. See Diggle on E. Phaeth. 7.

483 Rh. shows impatience with H. and accuses him of failing to seize the chance of vengeance. His impatience is conveyed by the scornful tone of ἐοικε (cf. E. Me. 337) and the postponement of μὴ. Failure to take vengeance was considered by the Greeks to be a sign of weakness which involved the stigma of losing face (See K.J. Dover Greek Popular Morality (1974) 182). Cf. 102ff., 589f. below and esp. E. Hclld. 881f. παρ’ ἦμῖν μὲν γὰρ οὐ σοφὸν τὸδε, ἔχθροις λαβόντα μὴ ἀποτείσασθαι δίκην. Cf. also the relish of the herald at the sufferings of Troy at A. Ag. 532f. and Medea’s joy at Jason’s suffering at E. Me. 1362. H.’s own position at 102ff., which reflected that of Rh. here, has now been
reversed.

484 γάρ 'yes, for...'. For this use of γάρ in answers see Denniston GP 73f. and Hutchinson on A. Se. 695.

ἀρχω H. takes up Rh.'s ἀρκεῖν with a pun. For puns in Greek involving the variation of a letter (παρονομασία) see Roberts on Dion. Hal. Ad Amm. 2.136.3 and cf., e.g., Ar. Ve. 45 θέωλος τὴν κεφαλήν κόρακος ἔχων.

κανθάδ' ὡν The sense is 'since I am here'. Cf. ἀριστεύων at 194.

485ff. H. breaks the stichomythia with a strong ἄλλα, changing the subject decisively to the important matter of battle positions for the following morning. For the arrangement of troops of mixed origin in a line of battle see W.K. Pritchett The Greek State at War vol.2 (1974) 190-201. Cf. also Il. 13.307ff. In general, to hold the right wing brought the greatest honour because it was the point of greatest danger. The left wing was second in prestige and the centre the last. In offering Rh. a choice of position H. is showing him respect and generosity by giving him ample opportunity to shine as a warrior. This prepares the way nicely for Rh.'s arrogant reply.

485 λαιὼν The normal expression for the left wing of a battle is τὸ εὐώνυμον κέρας. This example appears to be a poetic exception (see W.K. Pritchett ib. 190 n.2). Cf. E. Su. 704f.
πουνήσας τὸν πάρος πολίν χρόνου As at 444ff. Rh. emphasises the length of H.'s inadequate efforts against the Greeks.
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491-517 The discussion now turns to individual Greek opponents and Rh. displays a remarkable ignorance not only of the affairs of the war, but the identity of his enemies. He has heard only of Achilles' presence, and that at second hand (λόγος γ' ἠν). He does not know of his quarrel with Agamemnon and, when he is disappointed of a fight with Ach. he has to ask H. who else there s who might be a worthy opponent. The scene is probably modelled on the τειχοβολία at Il. 3.161-242. In the epic the scene is used to express the admiration of the Trojans for their valorous Greek opponents. Mention is made of Agamemnon, Odysseus and Ajax (cf. h. 497). The praise of Od. is the most lengthy (ib. 191-224) and stress upon his skill as an orator as well as a warrior. Most importantly, this high praise comes from the wise Trojan elder ntenor. In the tragedy, Rh. has not even heard of Od. (cf. 866), and when H. stresses his personal knowledge of the harm which Od. capable of doing (cf. the instinctive suspicion of the chorus nd H. himself that Od. was the intruder in the camp at 704, 708 nd 861), Rh. despises the man's cunning as the trait of a coward nd promises to catch and impale him, without even considering that the man soon to murder him might be a difficult opponent. His ignorance of the present state of the war is due to his previous istance from it. One may compare this ignorance with that of the arooned Philoctetes, who has also been far from the war, at S. ἱλ. 403-446 (cf. also his loathing of Od.). The unique value of i. to the Greek cause is emphasised by Agamemnon at A. Ag. 841f. ὦν ἤν ὧδηκσεύοντες, ὅτε περ ὢκξ ἐκὼν ἐπλευ, ἡ ζευχθεῖος ἐτοιμος ἦν ὠί σειραφόρος.
491 στρατοῦ κατὰ στόμα i.e. opposite the Myrmidons. κατὰ στόμα goes not only with Ἀχιλλέως, but also with στρατοῦ. Cf. E. Hcl. 800f. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ὑπλίτην στρατὸν κατὰ στόμι ἐκτείνοντες ἀντιτάξαμεν.

492 Palmer (CR 4 (1890) 228f.) takes this line to mean 'It is not possible for that man [Ach.] to interpose his furious spear'. This must be wrong. The context of the remark is Rh.'s desire to oppose Achilles, not vice versa, and Achilles' withdrawal from the fighting was voluntary. The line only makes sense as 'It is not possible to lift your furious spear against that man'.

ἀντάραι is Reiske's suggestion for the difficult ἐντάξαι. This use of ἐντάσσω for ἀντιτάσσω is not found elsewhere. Porter's comparisons with ἐντατάτης (S. Aj. 104) and ἐντανήμαι (Lys. 3.8), and R.'s with ἐνίστημι (Thuc. 8.69.2) are not sound because the prepositional prefix ἐν- is an integral part of those words and does not simply stand in for ἀντι-.

493 καὶ μὴν...γε The καὶ μὴν is adversative, introducing a new thought while γε throws emphasis on the word preceding it (see Denniston GP 352 and 357 and Jebb on S. Ai. 531 (also in stichomythia)). Translate 'And yet, the story certainly was that etc.'

494f. ἔπλευσε καὶ πάρεστιν Again H. picks up Rh.'s words in a forceful phrase, with two main verbs: 'He did indeed sail, and is still here'.
μηνίων στρατηλάταισιν The short penultimate iota in the present and imperfect of the verb is an epic corruption. Cf. Il. 1.247, 422 and 488 etc. It is found also in tragedy at E. Hi. 1146 (lyric) μηνίω θεοῖσιν. After Agamemnon confiscated his slave girl Briseis, Achilles withdrew from the fighting. This information is given by Apollo to encourage the Trojans at Il. 4.512f. μηνίων is doubtless meant to recall the first word of the Il.

οὗ συναίρεται δόρυ 'He does not lift his spear in company with the others'. The συναίρεται in MSS M, S and A of S. fr. 724 (Radt, Stobaeus 3.8.5) has not found favour over ἐναίρεται, but see Ellendt-Genthe s.v. ἐναίρεται: 'sed συναίρεται corrigi potest'. It is conjectured at A. fr. 357 and occurs in E. at Or. 767 ὃτι συνηράμην φόνον σοι μητρός. R. (124) regards this periphrasis as especially characteristic of Euripidean diction, comparing Hcld. 313 αἰρέσθαι δόρυ, Hel. 1597 αἰρέται δόρυ and Pho. 434 ἡράμην δόρυ, but we also have καπαναιροῦνται δόρυ at S. OC 424.

496 For δῆ at the opening of an interrogative answer see Denniston GP 239.

μετ' αὐτῶν cf., in a similar context, Ajax at Il. 7.226ff. Ἔκτορ, νῦν μὲν δῆ σάφα εἴσται οἰόθεν οἶος 1 οἵοι καὶ Δαυδαὶςιν ἀριστῆςις μετέχαι, 1 καὶ μετ' Ἀχιλλῆς ῥηξῆνορα θυμολέοντα.

εὑδὸξεῖ is not used elsewhere in tragedy and occurs nowhere earlier than the fourth century, but we find εὑδόξος and εὑδοξία
497f. The first two heroes mentioned by H. are acknowledged to be the best of the Greek fighters at Troy after Achilles. H. himself fights a duel with Ajax which ends inconclusively, with an exchange of gifts at Il. 7.244-312. Ajax is also mentioned, in connection with Achilles at 462f. above and 601 below. Traditionally Ajax is regarded as second best fighter after Achilles (cf. Il. 17.279f.) and was the natural successor to own Achilles’ arms after the latter’s death. He was tricked of them by Od., a man who cannot even be trusted by his fellow Greeks and is therefore all the more dangerous to Troy (see F. Bömer on Ov. Met. 12.620-13.398). Diomedes, however, also enjoys outstanding accolades from Trojans at Il. 5.103 βέβληται γὰρ ἄριστος Ἀχαῖων, ib. 414 τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαῖων and Il. 6.98f. οὖν ἡ ἐγὼ κάρτιστον Ἀχαῖων φημι γενέσθαι. | οὐδ’ Ἀχιλῆα ποθ’ ὃδε γ’ ἐδείξαμεν. At Il. 9.53 Nestor also addresses him with a great compliment: Τυδείδη, πέρι μὲν πολέμωι ἐνὶ καρπερὸς ἐσσί. Although Diomedes turns out to be the man who actually kills Rh. (624 below), he is given less prominence than Od. here because the latter is the ‘brains’ of the partnership (cf. 580-93 and 625 below), and has wrought harm to Troy with his cunning in the past.

ἔμοι stresses H.’s personal knowledge of Ajax’s might.

χῶ Τυδέως παῖς is the second subject of οὗδέν .. δοκεῖ. Cf.
The readiness with which H. recognises the hand of Od. at 861f. illustrates how constant a danger the Greek hero has been to the Greeks. Here, before the scene in which Od.'s latest act of bravado (stealing Rh.'s horses) is portrayed, H. describes what harm his most troublesome enemy has done to Troy in the past. The story of his entering Troy as a spy and murdering Trojans in the guise of beggar is told at Od. 4.242-58 and E. Hec. 239ff., and is mentioned again at 710-21. In both sources he is recognised by Helen, but that detail is not relevant to the story here.

The disguised entry and the theft of Athena's καλαθος is not in Homer but belongs to the epic cycle (see p.13 n.7 above). S. wrote the tragedy Lacaenae on the subject (frr. 367-9 Radt). The normal Greek version of the story is that the wooden statue of Athena which Zeus had thrown off Olympus in a rage (since Electra, tricked by him, had taken refuge there), fell in Troy. Helenus the seer, captured by Od., told him of an oracle which said that as long as the image of Athena remained at Troy the city would be safe. Od., also in partnership with Dio., entered Troy secretly and stole it. For a full account of the sources of the story and the subsequent history of the Palladium see F. Bömer on Ov. Fasti 6.417, Austin on V. Aen. 2.163 (cf. Aen. 9.151) and Pearson on S. frr. 367-9. In this play Od. is reported as acting alone when he stole the image.

See also W.H. Roscher Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie s.v. Odysseus and RE s.v. Odysseus.
The scholion on this line points out that the theft belongs to a period of the war later than the arrival of Rh. But this is not to be criticised. The dramatist has skilfully manipulated the chronology of both the theft and the incident with the beggar's disguise to provide an ironic link between Od.'s past knavery and the later murder of Rh.: Od. came at night, was unrecognisable, killed and hoodwinked the Trojans (cf. 506 with 789ff. and 504f. with 683-91), and escaped unharmed (cf. 507 with 692ff.).

There is another point to this anachronism. The theft of the Palladium was one of the events which had to occur before Troy could be taken, comparable with the possession of the bow of Philoctetes. Cf. also the first meal of the horses of Rh. at V. Aen. 1.472f. (not known in Rh; the horses are fed by the charioteer. See line 771). For the theft of the statue of a god one may also compare Apollo's instruction to Orestes that he should steal the image of Artemis from her temple in Tauria before he can find rest from his troubles (see E. IT 86-92, 110, 112 and 978ff.). In IT this theft forms part of the plot and is worked out before the eyes of the audience (as is the theft of the bow in S. Phil.). In Rh., however, the theft of Athena's statue has already taken place and therefore a significant step has been taken towards the destruction of Troy. The inclusion of this story therefore not only displays the skill and danger of Od., it also reminds the audience that the divine machinery which establishes the fatal conditions on which Troy's doom depends has already been at work, and that the Trojan cause is thereby even weaker than has already appeared. This chimes in nicely with the later prophecy of Athena regarding Rh.'s invincibility should he survive the night,
a factor which is absent from the epic and, in the play, has consequences for the course of the war beyond the immediate action on stage.

498f. ἔστι δ' separates Od. from the others as a special case, because he is the most formidable enemy.

αιμιλώτατον | κρότημ' 'that most glib fixer'. Cf. Ai. 388f. τὸν αἰμιλώτατον, ἐχθρὸν ἀλήμα (cf. also ib. 380ff. ἀπαντῶν ἀίων, ἵνα κακὼν ἄργανον, τέκνον Λαρτίου, ἵνα κακοπυνεστάτον τ' ἀλήμα στρατοῦ), and fr. 913 τὸ πάνσοφον κρότημα Λαέρτου γόνος. On the resemblances to these passages see p.45 above. For this kind of abuse against Od. in tragedy cf. also E. Tel. (fr.715) οὐ τὰρ' ὄσασεις ἔστιν αἰμίλος μόνος. | χρεία διδάσκει, and E. Cy. 104 οἶδ' ἀνδρα, κρόταλον ὁρμή, Σινύφου γένος.

αιμίλος is of uncertain etymology (see S. West on Od. 1.56, P. Chantraine Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue greque (1968) s.v. and H. Frisk Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch s.v.). It is used to describe spoken words and has a negative tone. Hesychius renders it ὀφεῖ ἐν τῷ λέγειν'. Vater points to a verse of Solon on Peisistratus (fr. 11.7f. West) εἰς γὰρ γλῶσσαν ὤρατε καὶ εἰς ἔπη αἰμίλου ἄνδρός | εἰς ἔργον ὃ' οὐδὲν γιγνόμενον βλέπετε. At Od. 1.56 Calypso detains Od. μαλακοῖσι καὶ αἰμιλίοισι λόγοισιν (where it probably means 'wheedling', like blandus in Latin). Cf. also the fragment of E. Tel. mentioned above and αἰμίλον δόρν, also of Od., at 709 below. Whereas the epic Od. was a persuasive and powerful orator (see esp. Il. 3.216-224, W.B. 277 Seaford says ad loc. 'Od. in tragedy attracted abuse more appropriate to comedy'.
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Stanford *The Ulysses Theme* cc. 7 and 8, and D. Russell *Greek Declamation* (1983) 110), in tragedy he has the reputation of a babbler. Indeed at S. Phil. 439ff. Philoctetes asks for news of a glib-tongued man (meaning Thersites), and Neoptolemus assumes that he means Od.

κρότημα has its origin in κροτέω (see P. Chantraine *ib.* s.v.). This means 'knock' and can refer to the noise made by the knocking or the act of fashioning something by knocking (cf. Pindar fr. 194 κεκρότηται χρυσά κρηπίς ἐραίσιν ἀοιδαῖς, and Theocritus 15.49 ἐξ ἀπάτας κεκροτημένοι ἄνδρες). At Od. 1.1. πολύκροτον is a varia lectio on πολύτροπον. Cf. Hes. fr. 198.3 (West) (also of Odysseus) πολύκροτον μήδεα εἴδως, and Call. fr. 67.3 πολύκροτος (see Pfeiffer *ad loc.*). The scholion on this word gives alternative meanings for κρότημα: οἶνον συγκρότημα μηχάνημα.

'Fixer' best conveys the sense. The use of the neuter with reference to a person is pejorative. Cf. λῆμα in the same line and V. Aen. 4.569 varium et mutabile semper femina.

λῆμα τ’ ἀρκοῦντως θραυσάς In verse ἀρκοῦντως is usually found in the idiom ἄρκει. ἔχει (cf. A. Cho. 892 and E. Hec. 318). However, we do find οὗ ζῶ; κακῶς μὲν, οἶδ’, ἐπαρκοῦντως δ’ ἐμοί at S. El. 354.

500 καὶ πλείστα χώραν τήνδ’ ἄνηρ καθυβρίσας The use of ἄνηρ, in a late position and in apposition to the man’s own name is striking. In the MSS at S. OC 563 we find ὡσπερ σὺ, χώστις πλείςτ’ ἄνηρ ἐπὶ ἐξένης ἐλθοῦσα. χώστις is awkward in itself, and Jebb 278 κρόταλον means ‘castanet’ or ‘rattle’ at Ar. Nu. 260 and 448, where it must refer to a fluent talker (cf. E. Cy. 104 above).
observes that this idiom normally requires εἰς (cf. 946 below) and Blomfield’s χῶς εἰς is now adopted. A similar difficulty occurs at E. Hec. 309f., also with an aor. participle and superlative adverb, ἦμιν δ' Ἀχιλλεύς ἠξίος τιμῆς, γύναι, ἄθων ὑπὲρ γῆς Ἐλλάδος κάλλιστ' αὖνήρ. Jebb wished to read the difficult κάλλιστ' αὖνήρ εἰς Ἐλλάδος θανῶν ὑπὲρ there. It is possible that the αὖνήρ of Hec. 310 might have come from the end of ib. 307. However αὖνήρ remains in Diggle’s text at the end of the line, without εἰς. The emendations suggested for Rh. 500 do not solve the problem. Firstly καὶ must be retained because the clause dependent on καθυβρίσας is distinct from the previous clauses and should not be taken as an expansion or explanation of them (so Hermann’s εἰς for καὶ will not work), and secondly, τήνος’ is needed to qualify χώραν (so Boissonade’s εἰς for τήνος will not work).

σηκῶν means a sacred precinct without a roof, as at S. Phil. 1328 (see Jebb), and is properly applied to a hero’s cult site. However, it is used loosely by poets to mean shrine, as here (see Collard on E. Su. 30). Cf. E. Ion 300 and Ba. 11. R. (170) lists this word as not occurring in A., but see A. fr. 273a.2.

502 φέρει The vivid present shows H.’s indignation at Od.’s audacity.

503 ἦδη δ’ ‘and formerly’.

ἀγύρτης occurs also at 715. Cf., of Teiresias, S. OT 388. ἀγύρτητα, used perjoratively of herself by Cassandra, occurs at A.
Ag. 1273 (see Fraenkel's extensive note ad loc.). The meaning 'beggar' is not the original one. ἀγάπτης ... denotes above all a person who as a priest or prophet collects gifts, at first really for the god or goddess, but later, as the institution degenerated, more and more as a 'beggar' for himself' (Fraenkel ib.).

πτωχικης For adjectives in -ικος see 205n. πτωχικος does not occur elsewhere in tragedy, but πτωχος is not unusual. It is found three times in E. Telephus, a play whose eponymous character is a king disguised as a beggar (E. frr. 697.1, 698.1 and 703.2. The latter two fragments are known from Ar.'s parody of them at Ach. 440 and 498). Snell conjectures πτωχικος at E. Tel. 147.6.1 (Austin NFE 76) πτωχος ὁυ οὗ πτωχ[. Clearly Od.'s disguise was more convincing than that of Dolon.

505 ἤρατο The imperfect conveys well the picture of Od. repeating his curses over and over again.

Ἰλίου κατάσκοπος is used with the objective gen. of the person or thing spied upon. Cf. 125, 140, 524, E. Hec. 239 (the same phrase as here) and Ba. 916.

506 φρουροὺς καὶ παραστάτας πυλῶν. These refer to different contingents of guards, the latter being specifically the defenders of the gates. The reading φρυγῶν in V is the kind of corruption suggested both by context and similarity in calligraphy to the word it has replaced. Cf. φρυγίαν (A) at 347 and see Fraenkel on Λ. Ag. 1391.
The ambush was a common tactic of warfare in Greek literature as old as Homer. In the Il. participation in an ambush required courage and self-discipline. It would put a hero to the test and was not beneath his dignity (I do not regard Paris' sniping during the battle at Il. 11.370ff., 505ff. and 581-4 as ambushing). See W.K. Pritchett *The Greek State at War* vol.2 (1974) 177f. and Il. 13.276-86, 18.513-29, Od. 14.216-21 (cf. also the behaviour of Od. in the Trojan Horse at Od. 4.266-89 and Od. 14.469ff.). In tragedy however, the idea of heroic behaviour precluded such activity and its association with Od. in addition to the night attack and beggar disguise already mentioned, is typical of the negative qualities of that hero on the tragic stage.

The altar was Apollo’s (see Coleman on Stat. Silv. 4.7.22f. venit ipse Thymbrae rector). It was the scene of Troilus’ death (see Σ Il. 24.257 and S. frr. 618-35 Radt) and was later the scene of Achilles’ death (see Bömer on Ov. Met. 12.580-619 and W.H. Roscher *ib.* s.v. Thymbraios and Pauly-Wissowa *RE* s.v. Thymbraios).

The scholion, quoting Dionysidorus, puts the altar not ‘near’ Troy, but fifty stades away. Strabo says of the Thymbre (13.1.35) at Il. 10.430 οἰκειότερον ἐστι τῶν παλαιῶν κτίσματι πλησίον γὰρ ἐστι τὸ πεδίον Ἡ Θύμβρα καὶ ὃ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἰέων ποταμὸς Θύμβριος, ἐμβάλλων εἰς τὸν Σκάμανδρον κατὰ τὸ Θυμβραίον Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν, τοῦ δὲ νῦν Ἰλίου καὶ πεντήκοντα σταδίους διέχει. Hesychius says Θύμβρα, τόπος τῆς Ἰλίου περὶ τῶν Θύμβρων λεγόμενον ποταμόν, οὕτως
dTjnoKad4vita, t~s 4paxi~oc pOleos 4pexvita sTa~ivoc deka, onou ye
kai ierO~ yP~llovo~c yThvracos. W. Leaf argues (Strabo on the
Troad (1923) 180) that both Strabo and Hesychius are wrong about
the position and supposes that the original site of the Thymbrios
was between thirty and forty stades from Troy, and that the site
fell into obscurity, to be re-applied to the stream ten stades
North of Troy. The title is used to add local colour to H.'s
words.

Aotw~c is the normal tragic form for Aotwv.

509 theOov is listed by R. (169) as not occurring in A., but
it is conjectured by Lobel at fr. 132a 8.3 (Radt) and theOov occurs at fr. 157a which has been attributed to A. For eyp~sowane and the participle cf. S. Tra. 411 and OT 839.

merwv is found only here in tragedy. It occurs in Homer
(always in the neut. pl.), where it means 'baneful'. The meaning
shifts to 'cunning' or 'crafty' in later authors (see LSJ), but
the Homeric sense would be equally appropriate here. Ebener's
translation conveys it well: 'Ja, schrecklich ist das Unheil,
gegen das wir kampfen.'

510-7 Rh. despises those who fight by guile and thinks only
open combat is suitable for an av~p eypw~voc. For the sentiment cf.
Il. 7.242f., E. HF 162ff. and El. 525f. However, this attitude
also smacks of naivety because Rh. takes H.'s words as evidence of
Od.'s cowardice but will be killed by a stealthy assassin who is
also one of the most courageous of the Greeks. He is also, ironically, condemning the actions of D. without knowing it, and his boast of capturing and spitting Od. is reminiscent of D.'s promise to return with the head of a Greek chieftain at 219-22.

512 ἰζεῖν is used of an ambush at Il. 18.522. The English 'skulks' conveys the tone here.

κλωπικᾶς ἐδρας For the locative acc. after the intransitive use of the verb cf. E. Ion 1314, IA 141 and Ba. 1048. It is followed by the locative dat. at A. fr. 281a 10, but this is very rare in tragedy. As at 438, the plural is used contemptuously. Contrast this phrase with 205, where D. uses the word with no overtone of shame.

513-5 The impaling of whole bodies or heads seems to have been a practice associated with barbarians, although, in their more spiteful moments, Greek characters in literature also advocate it. The point of the punishment was not just its cruelty but public exposure of the victim, to shock and deter observers (cf. the use of a gibbet). Oenomaus, king of Pisa, nailed the heads of Hippodameia's suitors to his house to deter other wooers. See also E. Hall Inventing the Barbarian (1989) 158f. and 205, and cf., of barbarians, Il. 18.176f., where Iris reports H.'s desire to impale Patroclus' head and display it on the wall of Troy, Herod. 1.128, 3.132, 3.159, 4.43-4, 4.103 (cf. E. IT 1430) and 4.202, and, of Greeks, Il. 14.498ff., Herod. 7.238, 9.79, E. El. 897f. (ἥ σκύλον οἶωνοῖσιν, αἰθέρος τέκνοις, ἵ πῆξας' ἔρεισον
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σκόλοπι) and Ba. 1141. Cf. also A. _Eum_ 189f. and Pl. _Gorg._ 473C. For the proverbial cruelty of Thracians see Hall _ib._ 105 and W.R. Halliday _Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend_ (1933) 104 (cf. also Thuc. 7.29). We cannot judge exactly what impression this promise makes on the Trojans because there is no response to it, but it is clearly meant to convey an impression of barbaric cruelty to the audience.

_ζώντα_ Ajax expresses his desire to keep Od. alive in order to inflict maximum suffering at S. _Aj._ 106 (cf. also S. _Ant._ 309).

_ἔγὼ_ contrasts with _ὡ_ in 512. With characteristic pride Rh. promises action to remove a problem which has defeated H.

514 _πυλῶν ἑπ’ ἐξόδοσιν_ Cf. A. _Se._ 33 and 58 (see p.41 above).

_ἀμνείρας_ For the apocope of _ἀνα-_ see Kühner-Blass 1.1.180. Neither this verb, nor its variant _ἐμείρω_ occur elsewhere in tragedy.

515 _πετεινοῖς γυψί_ The word _γυψί_ is used several times by E., but not by A. or S., who prefer _αἰγυπίος_ (A. _Ag._ 50 and S. _Aj._ 169). For the form of _πετεινός_ see H. van Looy _Zes verloren Tragedies van Euripides_ (1964) 221.

_θωνατήριον_ For the long alpha see Fraenkel on A. _Ag._ 1281. The word is _ἄμ. λέγετο_, but similar words exist in tragedy. Cf. A.
Ag. 1502 ὑπονάτηρος, E. El. 638 ὑποποινώτορν, Ion 1206 ὑποπατόρων and ib. 1217 ὑποπάτωρας. Hesychius recognises ὑποπατήριον. See also Willink on ἔνατηρίου at Or. 590 (p. 174). The reading of Ἑν, ἑπατήριον, looks like a gloss on the rarer word.

The fate of being left for birds to devour was universally dreaded in Greek literature. Cf. esp. Il. 1.5f., ib. 11.453ff., ib. 22.335f. and S Ant. 22.

518-26 H. once again changes the subject to bring Rh.'s attention to matters immediately before him. He will show him where his contingent may rest and tells him the password for the night. He then tells the chorus to be on the look-out for D., who is due back from his spying mission. H. and Rh. then leave the stage before the choral song.

518 καταυλίσθητε I do not see the advantage of adopting Kirchoff's καταυλίσθητι. The plural is possible, not only because Rh. is the leader of a group but because the instruction is a military term which would normally apply to a group.

καὶ γὰρ εὐφρόνη 'For indeed it is night'. See Dennistorn 108f. and cf. 525 below and S. Tra. 416 καὶ γὰρ οὐ σιγηλὸς εἰ.

520 νυξεῖσαι ('pass the night') is not found in A. or S., or before E. We find it at E. Hyps. (Cockle p. 79, fr. 8/9.13ff., see also Bond ad loc.), and Hermann rightly altered χεῦω to νυξεῖω at E. El. 181. E. may have written νυξειματῶν at Su. 1135, but this is by no means certain (see Collard ad loc.). It is worth noting
that in these other lines the reference is to people staying awake at night, whereas here it must refer to sleeping.

τοῦ τεταξμένου δίχα At Il. 10.416-22 D. reports that a guard has not been put on the allies' lines because they left that job to the Trojans. At ib. 434 he adds that the Thracians are camped ἀπάνενθε νεόλυδες ἐσχατοί ἀλλων. The reason for their separation in the epic is their lateness. In the drama more stress has been laid on H.'s expectation of victory in the morning. On the human level this decision is a great military blunder, implicitly criticised on the divine level by Athena at 613ff. Although ultimately Rh. should have set a guard, he was convinced by H.'s confidence (767ff.), and the Trojan general stands convicted of over-confidence and military ineptitude.

521 Φοίβος Cf. 573 and 688. The password is invented by the poet for dramatic effect. The choice of this pro-Trojan god's name as the password for this significant night is heavily ironic. Just as they vainly trusted in Apollo to look after D. in the first stasimon, so his name will enable Od. to escape them after the murder of Rh. The creatures of Athena overcome those who trust in Apollo.

ἢν τι καὶ δέη (‘if there is really any need for it’) stresses H.'s confidence in the Trojan position and provides Rh. with reassurance that the Greeks are unlikely to attack. The latter point turns out to be important when the charioteer accuses the Trojans of killing Rh. (see 803, 833-55, 867 and 873). For the
use of καὶ see Denniston GP 303.

523 ὑμᾶς i.e. the guards.

προταῖνι 279 Σ states 'Παρμενίδικος τὴν προταῖνι λέξιν Βοιωτικῆν
φησι [καὶ] μετ' οὐδεμιᾶς πίστεως. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἐμπροσθεν.' We
may be sure that the word is Boeotian because it occurs three
times in Boeotian inscriptions, with the spelling προτηνὶ; IG 7
1739.14 κα [μ]ίον εὐρεί, τὸ προτηνὶ ἐμβάντα ἐν τὸ ... (Thespis,
see Dittenberger ad loc.), ib. 2406.6 τῶν [ἀγα]θῶν τῶν προ[τ]ην[ι]
πεπραγμένων ... (Thebes) and Colin BCH 21 (1897) 554.2 ἐπάρχει
δὲ ἐν τῇ π[ροτην]ὶ π[ροπορείσει] ... (Thespis). There is nothing
to support W. Ridgeway's guess that the word is Macedonian (CQ 20
(1926) 16f. On the replacement of αι by η in Boeotian in the early
fourth century see C.D. Buck The Greek Dialects (1928) section 26,
D.L. Page Corinna (1953) p.59, and, on προτηνὶ, see Buck ib.
section 136.1 'πρὸ with the dat. in Boeotian. προτηνὶ 'formerly',
i.e. πρὸ τα[υ]ν [sc. ἀμέρα]. See also F. Bechtel Griechische
Dialekte vol.1 (1921) 309f., E. Boisacq Dictionnaire étymologique
de la langue grecque (1950) s.v., Schwyzer Gr.Gr. vol.1 612s,
619,3, vol.2 507s, P. Chantrainne ib. s.v. προταῖνος, H. Frisk
Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch s.v. προταῖνι and Lejeune
RPh 17 (1943) 120-30.

In the inscriptions the word means πρῶτερον. The meaning (and
spelling) used here is found nowhere else. R. (159) cites other
examples of words with a comparable variety of use; πάροιθε, πάρος, πρόσθεν and esp. πρόπαρ, which is also rare (see Fraenkel
279 See also p.32 above.
on A. Ag. 1019, Johansen and Whittle on A. Su. 791, and cf. E. Pho. 120 and 827). There is no difficulty in accepting the disparity of meanings for προταίνει. Hesychius renders προταίνειον as πρὸ μικρὸῦ. The lexical register of the word is impossible to determine.

524ff. With these subtle lines the poet makes the departing H. remind us of D. and sets the scene for the ensuing action.

525 δέχθαι is not found elsewhere in tragedy. This correction, made for the metre, is the Homeric form of δέχεσθαι.

σῶς R. (170) lists this as not found in A.; it is conjectured at fr. 451 m 27(b). I, 7 (Radt) in the fragmenta dubia.

526 πελάζει The present tense leaves the audience with an exciting sense of immediacy just as the choral song is about to begin.
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