THESIS ABSTRACT

A COMMENTARY ON *RHESUS* 1-526, WITH AN INTRODUCTION

GREGORY ERLAND KLYVE M.A. EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY HILARY TERM 1995

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 περί and the scarcity of ἀπό; 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_2) and follows the standard format except that the lyric schemata are examined in the introduction. The anapaestic opening is defended and a ἅπ. λεγ. is reported for the first time at 353 (ὑδροειδής).

A COMMENTARY ON RHESUS 1-526, WITH AN INTRODUCTION

This thesis was submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the Faculty of Literae Humaniores at the University of Oxford in Hilary Term 1995.

Gregory Erland Klyve M.A. Exeter College

BODLEIAN LIBRARY OXFORD
DEPOSITED
THESIS
17 vii . 95

DEREK HVGONI SLATER

MAGISTRO OPTIMO

ἔκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος
ἐμὸν καταίσχυνε βαθὺ χρέος.
ὅμως δὲ λῦσαι δυνατὸς ὀξεῖαν ἐπιμομφὰν
τόκος †θνατῶν†· νῦν ψᾶφον ἑλισσομέναν
ὁπᾷ κῦμα κατακλύσσει ῥέον,
ὁπᾷ τε κοινὸν λόγον
φίλαν τείσομεν ἐς χάριν.

Pindar *Olympian* 10.7-12

PREFACE

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_2) and Porter (Cambridge 1929_2). 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 discusssion 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.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS 6
INTRODUCTION 9
I SOURCES OF THE PLOT 10
II AUTHENTICITY 19
1) External Evidence
A) Hypothesis b and the Scholia 21
B) The Selection and Indirect Transmission 27
C) Supposed Contemporary References 28
2) Internal Evidence
A) Language and Style
i) Vocabulary
a) Rare Words 30
b) Dialect Words 32
c) Prepositions 32
d) Colloquialism 34
ii) Syntax 35
iii) Stylistic Infelicities
a) Repetitions 36
b) Inflated Language 37
iv) Echoes from other Tragic Texts 40
B) Metre
i) Iambic Trimeters
a) Resolutions 47
b) Verse Weight and Caesurae 49
ii) Lyrics 50
a) Separated Strophe and Antistrophe 52
b) Enjambement 55
c) Lyric Monody by *deus ex machina* 62
iii) Anapaests
a) Ratio of Metra to Paroemiacs 64
b) Antilabe 65
iv) Trochaic Tetrameters 66
C) Larger Features of the Play
i) Structure
a) The Lack of a Formal Exposition 68
b) No Entry after the Parodos 69
c) Choral Exit and Re-entry 69
d) Two Divine Interventions 70
e) The Number of Actors Needed 71
ii) Staging
a) Symmetrical Entrances 72
b) Chariot Entry 73
c) Actor Seized by Chorus 74
iii) Ethos
a) Religious Sensitivity 76
b) The Role of the Chorus 78
c) Intellectual Content 79
d) Emotional Impact 81
3) Summary and Conclusion 83
III SOURCES OF THE TEXT 86
COMMENTARY 92
BIBLIOGRAPHY 327

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.

Beazley *ABV*	J.D. Beazley *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters* Oxford 1956
——— *ARV*$_2$	——— *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* Oxford 1963$_2$
Beck (1824)	C.D. Beck *Diatribe critica de Rheso suppositicio Euripidis* Leipzig 1824
Breitenbach (1934)	W. Breitenbach *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* Stuttgart 1934 (=Hildesheim 1967)
Burnett (1985)	A.P. Burnett 'Are Smiles Allowed?' in P. Burian (ed.) *Directions in Euripidean Criticism* Durham 1985 13-51
Dale *LM*$_2$	A.M. Dale *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* Cambridge 1968$_2$
——— (*MATC*)	——— 'Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses' *BICS* supp. 21.1 (1971), 21.2 (1981) and 21.3 (1983)
Denniston, *GP*$_2$	J.D. Denniston *The Greek Particles* Oxford 1954$_2$
Diggle *Eur.*	——— *Euripidea* Oxford 1994
Eysert (1891-3)	L. Eysert *Rhesus im Lichte des euripideischen Sprachgebrauches* Prog. Böhm-Leipa 1 (1891) and 2 (1893)
Fraenkel (1965)	Eduard Fraenkel review of R. (see below) *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 228-41
Griffith (1977)	M. Griffith *The Authenticity of the* Prometheus Bound Cambridge 1977
Goodwin *M&T*	W.W. Goodwin *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* New York 1965
Hagenbach (1863)	F. Hagenbach *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. Basle 1863
Hermann (1828)	G. Hermann *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. *Opus.* 3 Leipzig 1828 262-310
K-B, K-G	R. Kühner *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* part 1 revised by F. Blass, part 2 by B. Gerth Hanover 1890-1904$_3$
LSJ	H.G. Liddell and Scott *A Greek-English Lexicon* rev. by H. Stuart-Jones Oxford 1940$_9$, suppl. 1968
Menzer (1867)	O. Menzer *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. Berlin 1867
Morstadt (1827)	R. Morstadt *Beitrag zur Kritik der dem Euripides zugeschriebenen Tragödie Rhesos* Heidelberg 1827
R.	W. Ritchie *The Authenticity of the* Rhesus *of Euripides* Cambridge 1964
RE	*Real-Encyclopädie der Altertumswissenschaft* Stuttgart 1894-

Rolfe (1893)	J.C. Rolfe 'The Tragedy *Rhesus*' *HSCP* 4 (1893) 61-97
Schwyzer, *Gr.Gr.*	E. Schwyzer *Griechische Grammatik* Munich 1939-53
Sneller (1949)	C.B. Sneller *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. Amsterdam 1949
Taplin (1977)	O. Taplin *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* Oxford 1977
Tuilier (1968)	A. Tuilier *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du text d'Euripide* Paris 1968
Turyn (1957)	A. Turyn *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* Urbana 1957
Valckenaer *Diatribe*	L.C. Valckenaer *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias* Leiden 1768 (=Leiden 1824)
West *GM*	M.L. West *Greek Metre* Oxford 1982
Wilamowitz (1875)	U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff *Analecta Euripidea* Berlin 1875 (=Hildesheim 1963)
——— (1877)	'De Rhesi Scholiis Disputatiuncula' *KS* 1 Berlin 1935 1-16 (orig. Greifswald 1877)
——— (1907)	——— *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* Berlin$_2$ 1907
——— *GV*	——— *Griechische Verskunst* Berlin 1921
Zuntz (1965)	G. Zuntz *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* Cambridge 1965

INTRODUCTION

I SOURCES OF THE PLOT[1]

The most obvious source for the plot of *Rh.* is *Il.*10, and the many echoes from that 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.[2] 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,[3] 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.

[2]See G. Danek *WSt Bei.* 12 (1988), O. Taplin *Homeric Soundings* (1992) 152f. and B. Hainsworth *The* Iliad*: A Commentary* vol.3 (1993) pp151-5.

[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.[4] 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) ὅτι καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν πολεμήσας πρὸς Ἕλληνας μέγιστα αὐτοῖς ἐνεδείξατο κακά, κατὰ δὲ θείαν πρόνοιαν [Σ Townley Ἥρας καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς] νυκτὸς αὐτὸν Διομήδης ἀναιρεῖ. ἱστορεῖ δὲ Πίνδαρος.

Σ Arn/A) Ῥῆσος...υἱὸς δὲ Στρυμόνος τοῦ αὐτόθι ποταμοῦ καὶ Εὐτέρπης μιᾶς τῶν Μουσῶν. διάφορος δὲ τῶν καθ' αὑτὸν γενόμενος ἐν πολεμικοῖς ἔργοις ἐπῆλθε τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ὅπως Τρωσὶ συμμαχήσει, καὶ συμβαλὼν πολλοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπέκτεινεν. δείσασα δὲ Ἥρα περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων Ἀθηνὰν ἐπὶ τὴν τούτου διαφθορὰν πέμπει. κατελθοῦσα δὲ ἡ θεὸς Ὀδυσσέα τε καὶ Διομήδεα ἐπὶ τὴν κατασκοπὴν ἐποίησε προελθεῖν. ἐπιστάντες δὲ ἐκεῖνοι κοιμωμένωι Ῥήσωι αὐτόν τε καὶ ἑταίρους κτείνουσιν. ὡς ἱστορεῖ 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):

ἔνιοι δὲ λέγουσι νυκτὸς παραγεγονέναι τὸν Ῥῆσον εἰς τὴν Τροίαν, καὶ πρὶν γεύσασθαι αὐτὸν τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς χώρας φονευθῆναι. χρησμὸς γὰρ ἐδέδοτο αὐτῶι, φασίν, ὅτι εἰ αὐτὸς γεύσεται τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ οἱ ἵπποι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σκαμάνδρου πιοῦσιν καὶ τῆς αὐτόθι νομῆς <ἔδονται>, 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 aristeia. 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.[5] There is no connection, therefore, between *Il.*10 and the 'aristeia' version. The only connections between the 'oracular' version and *Il.*10 are Rhesus' lack of action and premature death. The poet of *Il.*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 (*Il.* 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 Diomedes to Rhesus at 496f.; and when Diomedes ponders what to do after the murder, she instructs him to return to the ships (*Il.* 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] κακὸν γὰρ ὄναρ κεφαλῇφιν ἐπέστη | τὴν νύκτ', Οἰνείδαο πάϊς at *Il.* 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 involvment 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 B: ὅτι καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν πολεμήσας πρὸς Ἕλληνας 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 ἔνιοι 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]

[6]The 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.

[7]The 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,[8] lament[9] and immortalisation[10] 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[11] 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 ll.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):

ἐπ' ⌊ἁρμάτων τε καὶ Θρεϊκίων πώλων | λευκῶν †ὀείους κατεγγὺς† ᾽Ιλίου πύργων | ἁπληνάρισθη ῾Ρῆσος, Αἰνίων πάλμυς.

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.): αὐτίκα δ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἐβάλλετο 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 *Cultes 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.*

ἕσσατο δ' ἔκτοσθεν ῥινὸν πολιοῖο λύκοιο, | κρατὶ δ' ἐπὶ κτιδέην κυνέην, ἕλε δ' ὀξὺν ἄκοντα. There D. wears a wolfskin 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.[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 *ARV*$_2$ 319.5 (Onesimos, signed by Euphronius, but also attributed to the Panaetius painter), dated between 500 and 490.[16] D. is standing upright in the centre of the picture, clad in a wolfskin which is obviously a disguise. The

[15]See F. Lissarrague *RA* N.S. (1980) 3-31 and C. Mainoldi *L'Image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne* (1984) 19f.

[16]See J.D. Beazley *Hesp.* suppl. 8, pl. 1, 4, J.A.K. Thomson *CR* (1911) 238f., *LIMC* 3.526, J. Overbeck *Gallerie heroischer Bildwerke* (1853) 14 no.38, and table 17 fig.2, C. Robert *AZ* 40 (1882) 46ff., K. Friis Johansen *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* (1967) 160-4, R. 68, B. Fenik *ib.* 60 and A. Schnapp-Gourbeillon *Lions héros masques* (1981) 460.

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.* 216f.). D.'s outfit on the cup resembles his disguise at *Rh.* 208ff., esp. *βάσιν τε χερσὶ προσθίαν καθαρμόσας | καὶ κῶλα 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*₂ 413.23 (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

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.[17] 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[18] and J. Hardion.[19] 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.[20] In 1872 Paley defended authenticity in his commentary. Wilamowitz condemned the play on linguistic, metrical and religious grounds[21] 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* (1600$_3$) 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* (1959$_3$) 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_4) 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_2) 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)

[24]Other useful works are M. Ragone (*RAAN* 44 (1969) 71-109), G. Paduano (*Maia* 25 (1973) 3-29 and *SCO* 23 (1974) 5-30), V. Ilieuscu (*Klio* 58 (1976) 367-76), H.D.F. Kitto (*YCS* 25 (1977) 317-50), V.J. Rosivach (*Hermes* 106 (1978) 54-73), and M. Marcovich (*ZA* 23 (1983) 129-31).

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):[25]

τοῦτο τὸ δρᾶμα ἔνιοι νόθον ὑπενόησαν, Εὐριπίδου δὲ μὴ εἶναι· τὸν γὰρ Σοφόκλειον μᾶλλον ὑποφαίνειν 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 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[26] and sometimes, as here, the *χαρακτήρ* 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.[27] The import of the term here is extremely vague. Any Sophoclean 'character' in *Rh.* is impossible to substantiate[28] and

[25]That the Sophoclean 'character' is a reported remark, rather than the judgement of the compiler, is clear from the *γάρ*.

[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 ἀναγέγραπται, καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρσια δὲ ἐν αὐτῶι πολυπραγμοσύνη τὸν 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*₂ (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.[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.[33] According to the *Vita Euripidis* and the *Suda*, E. is credited with 92 tragedies, of which there survived 78 according to the *Vita* and 77 according to the *Suda*.[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.

[32]See K.J. Dover *Aristophanes* Clouds p.lxxxviiff. and W.H. Barrett *Euripides* Hippolytus 11ff. The catalogue of Aeschylean dramas mentioned Αἰτναῖαι γνήσιοι and Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι (frr. 6-11). See A.C. Pearson *CR* 35 (1921) 61.

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

[34]See A. Lesky *Greek Tragic Poetry* (1983) 201f. and M.R. Lefkowitz *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (1981) 165ff.

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.[35] The third explanation is also possible, for we know that the production of plays was sometimes undertaken by someone other than the author.[36] 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 ἔνιοι 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[37] 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.[38] He

[35]See Σ Ar. *Ra.* 67, *Vita Euripidis* p.2 l.14 (Schwartz) and *s.* Εὐριπίδης 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 δῆμος 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 (οἳ [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 anapaests), and to introduce the first 11 lines of the other prologue only in order to condemn it on aesthetic grounds:

> πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται. ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος [fr.81 Wehrli] ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως [fr.1108 Nauck]· Νῦν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρήλατος. καὶ ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος, πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδηι· καὶ τάχα ἄν τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν.

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 κατὰ λέξιν 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 Ῥῆσον ἐδίδασκε* but this remark may simply be Crates' own, unfounded explanation for what h 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[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,[43] as is his desire to read ἡ τραγωιδία 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.[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.[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.[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

[42](1877) 7ff.(=*KS* 1.17) and cf. (1907) 152-5.

[43]See esp. W.H. Porter *Hermathena* 17 (1913) 366-8 and R. 49f.

[44]See R.L. Fowler *ZPE* 33 (1979) 24-8.

[45]*Hec.*, *Or.*, *Pho.*, *Me.*, *Hi.*, *Alc.*, *And.*, *Tro.*, *Rh.* and *Ba.* (all except *Ba.* preserved with scholia).

[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.[47] 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.*[48] Plutarch refers to 48 plays, including all those from the 'selection', except *Rh.*, and the 'alphabetic' plays, as well as some spurious ones.[49] 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.

[48] *Aeo., Alex., Alc., Alcmene, And., Andromeda, Antig., Ba., Bell., Hec., Hel., Erech., El., HF., Thes., Ino, Hi., IA., IT., Cretans, Cretan Women, Lic., Mel.Soph., Meleag., Me., Oen., Or., Palam., Pel., Polyid., Sthen., Tel., Temenidae, Tro., Hyps., Phil., Pho., Phrix.A* and *Phrix.B*, as well as six frr. incerta.

[49] *Aeol., Alc., And., Andromeda, Antiope, Archel., Autol., Ba., Bell., Dan., Dict., Hec., Hel., Erech., El., HF., Hcld., Thes., Thyes., Su., Ino., Ix., Ion, Hi., Hipp.Veiled, IA, IT, Cretan Women, Cy., Lic., Me., Meleag., Mel.Des., Mel.Soph., Oed., Or., Peir., Prot., Sthen., Tel., Tro., Hyps., Phaeth., Phil., Pho., Phrix., Chres., Chrys.* and about 100 frr. incerta.

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.[50] This is unfounded and was refuted by T. Sinko.[51] Secondly, the use of the adj. καλλιγέφυρος to describe the Strymon at 349 was seen by Wilamowitz[52] 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.[53] 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.[54] The theory is based on Polyaenus' report of an oracle delivered to Hagnon in 437.[55] Hagnon brought the bones of Rh. from Troy to bury them by the Strymon. However, not only is Polyaenus' 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 Péloponnèse* (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 heroe* (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 Σ *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 ἄντροις on Mt. Pangaeum, while in Polyaenus he is transfered from Troy to a tomb παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν.

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 ἅπαξ λεγόμενα but as evidence they are unreliable. We see, e.g., a

number of words which Eysert[56] thought unique until further examples were found.[57] Of the other ἅπ. λεγ. some are hardly unusual enough to be classed as unique[58] and, with only two exceptions,[59] the remainder are unremarkable compounds.[60] 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.[61] Very few words in *Rh.* appear in uncommon

[56](1891) 1.10ff.

[57]See δίβαμος (215) and ἄησις (417). ἀμβλώψ (737) is cited by Photius from E. *Thyestes* (fr. 397 a.i Snell), S. (fr. 1001), Ion (*TGF* 19F53a) and Plato Comicus (fr. 23.1 Demianczuk). R. (150) includes 327 ἐπίμομφος with an active sense but see note *ad loc.*

[58]See 296 προυξερευνητής, 441 κρυσταλλόπηκτος and 515 θοινατήριον. For καρανιστής (817) cf. καρανιστήρ with the same sense at A. *Eum.* 186. For ἀριστοτόκος (909) cf. *Il.*18.54 δυσαριστοτόκεια. ὀφειλέτις (965) is only a slight variation on the m. ὀφειλέτης (S. *Ai.* 590).

[59]κλωπικός at 205 (q.v.) and 512 and μηνάς for μήνη at 534 (μήνη itself is in tragedy only at *PV* 797 and E. fr. 1009). For the formation of μηνάς cf. Μαίας with Μαῖα, πελειάς with πέλεια and δειράς with δειρή.

[60]See notes on 3, 5, 9, 33, 134, 260, 273, 304, 340, 349f., 353 (ὑδροειδής is ἅπ. λεγ., 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 ῥακόδυτος (Jo. Chrysostom (late 4th century AD) has ῥακοδύτης and Origenes (early 3rd century AD) has the verb ῥακοδυτέω), 716 ψαφαρόχροος (cf. *h.* 19.32 ψαφαρότριχα μῆλα), 716 πολυπινής, 921 χρυσόβωλος and 964 καρποποιός.

[61]See e.g. σῆμα (12), κεφαλά (226), καταπνεῖ (387), παλαιός (389), διπλοῦς (395) and γερουσία (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 (A. *Su.* 263, *Ag.* 1623 and *Eum.* 62) and βροτοδαίμων (glossed as ἡμίθεος by Hesychius (See Schwyzer *Gr.Gr.* 1.453f.)). The meaning 'man-spirit' is obvious.

formations.[62]

b) Dialect Words

Apart from the standard use of Doric in the lyric parts of *Rh.* we find six words from non-Attic dialects.[63] The only one which is remarkable is the Boeotian προταινί at 523. E. does use dialect words,[64] 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, προταινί has been seen as evidence against authenticity.[65] 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), πυρσά (43) and ὑποσταθείς (315). For δυσθνήισκων (791) and δυσοίζω (724, 805) see iv) below. ἐξαπώσατε (811) is an unusual form in Attic, if sound, but cf. ἀπῶσε at S. fr. 479.

[63]See notes on ἐξώστης (322), πεδαίρω (372), ἐπεζάρει (441) and προταινί (523). The others are λεωφόρος, 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 ἔροτιν 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 προταινί and concludes, outrageously, that the author must have been an unknown Boeotian poet.

(figures taken from the lexicon of Allen and Italie).

ἀπό: *Alc.* 10(.86%), *Me.* 9(.63%), *Hcld.* 8(.76%), *Hi.* 9(.61%), *An.* 16(1.24%), *Hec.* 12(.93%), *Su.* 10(.81%), *El.* 9(.66%), *HF* 14(.98%), *Tro.* 16(1.2%), *IT* 12(.8%), *Ion* 11(.68%), *Hel.* 14(.83%), *Pho.* 15(.85%), *Or.* 23(1.36%), *Ba.* 11(.79%), *IA* 16(.98%) and *Cy.* 11(1.55%).

Rh. has only 2 examples of ἀπό (at 113 and 449), a very small .2%. This anomaly is remarkable. The number of examples of ἐκ 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 ἐκ instead of ἀπό.

περί:	*Alc.*	*Me.*	*Hcld.*	*Hi.*	*And.*	*Hec.*	*Su.*	*El.*	*HF*
περί + gen.	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	5	2
+ dat.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-
+ acc.	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
total	4	4	3	4	5	4	5	6	2

	Tro.	*IT*	*Ion*	*Hel.*	*Pho.*	*Or.*	*Ba.*	*IA*	*Cy.*
περί + gen.	3	6	8	6	4	6	3	3	-
+ dat.	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	1
+ acc.	3	-	-	1	-	2	1	4	3
total	6	6	8	8	5	8	4	9	4

No play has fewer than 8 instances, while *Rh.* does not have a single example of περί taking any case.[66] This is most unusual. All the plays of A., S. and E. contain περί, as does *PV* It is possible that the author of *Rh.* preferred its synonym ἀμφί. 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 ἀμφί in E. (6.7).

In his complete omission of περί and his rare use of ἀπό 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 περι- compound occurs in *Rh.*: περιπολοῦνθ' at 773.

[67]Cf. also the use of adverbial πρός with ἐπί 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[68] 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 ~~small~~ 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%), *Hcld.* 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%)[69], *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%).[70] 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 'Aeschylean' 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] τί χρῆμα 'why' (87), καὶ πρός 'and besides' (102 and 756), τρίβων 'an old hand' (625), οἶμαι 'no doubt' (759), ἔα, a sound representing a gasp, (between 573 and 574) and ἔα ἔα (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[71] considered their use contrary to the normal practice of Attic tragedians and therefore evidence against authenticity. However, like echoes of *Il.*10 and epic vocabulary, they may easily be explained as contributing to the epic *timbre* of the play.[72]

There remain two constructions which have been seen as evidence against authenticity. Firstly, Wilamowitz considered the unusual use of ἦν ἆρα μή for εἰ μὴ ἄρα at 118 as evidence of a late date of composition[73] 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 κατθανόντα χρή;) 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.β_2 and 9.78.2 but is also found in Attic at Xen. *An.* 2.3.23 and 5.5.9.[74]

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

[71] *CR* 35 (1929) 56f.

[72] See δέξαιτο (4), πᾶσαν ἀν' ὄργναν (42) and ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν (469). For ὄλοιτο (for εἴθ' ὤλετο at 720) cf. ὡς ὄλοιτο at E. *Hi.* 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.[75] It is true that classical Greek audiences were less sensitive to repetition than we are,[76] 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,[77] 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.[78] At 169 Hector says to Dolon *χρυσὸς πάρεστιν, εἰ τόδ' αἰτήσεις γέρας* and, soon after, at 181 he repeats the same phrase to him: *τί δῆτα μεῖζον τῶνδέ μ' αἰτήσεις γέρας;* This has no rhetorical force. Perhaps the lamest repetition occurs between 395 and 423 (*κοὐ διπλοῦς πέφυκ' ἀνήρ*). Unlike the powerful repetition of *εἰ*

[75]See e.g. A.C. Pearson *CR* 35 (1921) 58, Porter's ed. xlviif., R. Morstadt (1827) 64, C.D. Beck (1824) 297, O. Gruppe *Ariadne* (1834) 291 and W. Ridgeway *CQ* 20 (1926) 16.

[76]For an extensive list of repetitions in tragedy see J. Jackson *CQ* 35 (1940) 220-222.

[77]*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%).

[78]See esp. 57 and 78 *Ἀργείων στρατόν*, 127 and 146 *Ἀργείων στρατῶι*, 150, 155, 221 and 589 *ναῦς ἐπ' Ἀργείων μολεῖν* and 203 and 502 *ναῦς ἐπ' Ἀργείων* ⏑– and 146 and 471 *ἐπ' Ἀργείων* ⏑–.

κακὸς 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 *οὔτ' ὀμμάτων γὰρ δῆλος ἦν κατάστασις* or *Hi.* 1296 *ἄκουε, Θησεῦ, 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 *τῶι θερινῶι καταστήματι* is used for *τῶι θέρει*. This phrase seems to be a good example of

[79] See J. Scaliger *Prolegomana ad Manilium* (1600₃) 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 *χειρὶ σὺν κενῆι δορός* as a stylistic howler but it would be easy to emend to *σύν κενῆι δορὸς χερί*.

inflated language.

Fraenkel (*ib.* 238) considers ὅταν πολίταις εὐσταθῶσι δαίμονες 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'.[81] 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 εὔεδροι (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 γαῖά 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 πεφυκότες refers to the horses of Achilles.[82]

[81]It is used of birds at Plut. *Mor.* 281B πνευμάτων δ' ὄντων οὐκ εὐσταθοῦσιν οἱ ὄρνιθες, 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.

[82]It is probably best to adopt Dobree's αὐτός at 187 (as does Diggle), to be taken with ἄναξ Ποσειδῶν. This would remove the difficulty of choosing between αὐτούς (OΛ) and αὐτάς (V).

In the *Il.* these horses, Xanthos and Balios, are masculine.[83] However, as Σ *Rh.* 239 notes, the playwright clearly regards them as feminine at 237 (Φθιάδων δ' ἵππων) and 240 (τάς). This is hard to excuse. Teams of horses were commonly feminine in poetry, even if the individual horses were male.[84] Cf. esp. S. *El.* 703f., 734f., 737f., where the team is feminine and *ib.* 721f. and 744, where the horses themselves are male.[85] 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. καλλίστους ..|..| πώλους.
[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.[86] 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.[87]

At one extreme, Wilamowitz[88] 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.[89]

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.

[87]See G. Hermann (1828) 289ff., F. Hagenbach (1863) 27ff., J.C. Rolfe (1893) 83ff., A.C. Pearson *CR* 35 (1921) 56, Fraenkel (1965) 231-5 and 238 and O. Taplin (1977) 147n.

[88]*Hermes* 61 (1926) 284 (=*KS* 4.411), (₂1907) 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.[90] 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 *νυκτηγορίαν* and 89 *νυκτηγοροῦσι* may be compared with A. *Se.* 29 *νυκτηγορεῖσθαι*. The noun is very rare;[91] 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 *ἄνωχθε πληροῦν τ' αὐχένας ξυνωρίδων·* must have the sense 'harness the necks of the horses' and may well have been suggested by *πληροῦτε θωρακεῖα* at A. *Se.* 32.[92] Cf. also *Rh.* 514 *πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοισιν* with A. *Se.* 33 *πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις* and *ib.* 58 *πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοισι*.[93] Cf. *Rh.* 20ff. *οὐκ οἶσθα δορὸς πέλας Ἀργείου | νυχίαν ἡμᾶς | κοίταν πανόπλους κατέχοντας;* with A. *Se.* 59f. *ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἤδη πάνοπλος Ἀργείων στρατὸς | χωρεῖ*. Cf. also *Rh.* 569 *δεσμῶν ἀραγμὸν ἱππικῶν* with A. *Se.* 245 *ἀκούω γ' ἱππικῶν φρυαγμάτων* and *ib.* 249 *ἀραγμός*: a juxtaposition of words in *Rh.* which appear only a little further apart in a similar

[90]Contextual too are the echoes at *Rh.* 608f. of S. *Ai.* 14ff. Οδ. *ὦ φθέγμ' Ἀθάνας, φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν, | ὡς εὐμαθές σου, κἂν ἄποπτος ἦις ὅμως, | φώνημ' ἀκούω* (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..ἐκπληρῶν πλάτηι* (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] *πετηνῶν οἰωνῶν*.

context in *Se.*[94] We may also have an interesting juxtaposition of echoes from two sources at *Rh.* 122 *αἴθων γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ πεπύργωται θράσει*. Cf. not only A. *Se.* 447f. *ἀνὴρ ..| αἴθων τέτακται λῆμα*, but also E. *Or.* 1568 *ὃς 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.[95] 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.* 529f. *καὶ ἑπτάποροι | Πλειάδες αἰθέριαι·* with *Phaeth.* 65f. *ὑπὲρ δ' ἐμᾶς κεφαλᾶς | Πλειά[δων πέφευγε χορός]*. Cf. *Rh.* 532f. *ἔγρεσθε· τί μέλλετε; κοιτᾶν | ἔξιτε πρὸς φυλακάν.* with *Phaeth.* 73f. *ἔγρονται δ' εἰς βοτάναν | ξανθᾶν πώλων συζυγίαι·* Cf. *Rh.* 535f. *ἀὼς δὴ πέλας, ἀὼς γίγνεται* with *Phaeth.* 63f. *ἤδη μὲν ἀρτιφανὴς | Ἀὼς ἵ[ππευει] κατὰ γᾶν.* Cf. *Rh.* 546-50 *καὶ μὰν ἀΐω· Σιμόεντος | ἡμένα κοίτας | φοινίας ὑμνεῖ πολυχορδοτάται | γήρυϊ παιδολέτωρ μελοποιὸν ἀηδονὶς μέριμναν.* with *Phaeth.* 67-70 *μέλπει δὲ δένδρεσι λεπτ|ὰν ἀηδὼν ἁρμονίαν | ὀρθρευομένα γόοις | Ἴτυν Ἴτυν πολύθρηνον.* and *Rh.* 551ff. *ἤδη δὲ νέμουσι κατ' Ἴδαν | ποίμνια· νυκτιβρόμου | σύριγγος ἰὰν κατακούω.* with *Phaeth.* 71f. *σύριγγας δ' οὐριβάται | κινούσιν ποιμνᾶν ἐλάται.* Cf. also *Rh.* 482 with *Phaeth.* 7.

[94]See Fraenkel *ib.* 231. For minor echoes see notes on *Rh.* 50f. (cf. A. *Se.* 651f. *ὡς οὔποτ' ἀνδρὶ τῶιδε κηρυκευμάτων | μέμψηι·*) and *Rh.* 306f. (cf. A. *Se.* 385f. *ὑπ' ἀσπίδος δὲ τῶι | χαλκήλατοι κλάζουσι κώδωνες φόβον*). Cf. also *Rh.* 796 with A. *Se.* 593 *βαθεῖαν ἄλοκα διὰ φρενὸς καρπούμενος*. and *Rh.* 770 with A. *Se.* 287ff., beginning *μέλει, φόβωι δ' οὐχ ὑπνώσσει κέαρ·* (see Fraenkel *ib.* 238).

[95]See 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 *ναυσιπόρος στρατιά* (*IA* 172 *πλάτας ναυσιπόρους*)[96] and *Rh.* 261ff. *ὃς ἐπὶ | γᾶν Τροΐαν χιλιόναυν | ἦλυθ' ἔχων στρατείαν* (*IA* 173f. *οὓς ἐπὶ Τροίαν | ἐλάταις χιλιόναυσιν*). 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. -Εκ. θαρσῶ.*[97] and E. *IA* [2f.] *Αγ. στεῖχε. -Πρ. στείχω. τί δὲ καινουργεῖς, | Ἀγάμεμνον ἄναξ. -Αγ. σπεύσεις; -Πρ. 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 *ἀλλ' οἷα πόντου Θρήικιον φυσήματα | κρυσταλλόπηκτα Παιόνας τ' ἐπεζάρει* with A. *Pe.* 501 *περᾶι κρυσταλλοπῆγα διὰ πόρου·* The context of *Pe.* 501 is very like that in *Rh.* The adjectives are *ἅπαξ 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.

[99]See A.C. Pearson *CR* 35 (1921) 58, H. Grégoire *AC* 2 (1933) 108, Wilamowitz (1875) 197ff. and D. Bain *CQ* 27 (1977) 10-26.

addition there is an un-Attic verb, found elsewhere only at E. *Pho.* 44f. (ὡς δ' ἐπεζάρει | Σφὶγξ ἁρπαγαῖσι πόλιν).[100]

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

Cf. *Rh.* 790f. θερμὸς δὲ κρουνὸς δεσπότου πάρα σφαγαῖς | βάλλει με δυσθνήισκοντος αἵματος νέου. with A. *Ag.* 1389f. κἀκφυσιῶν ὀξεῖαν αἵματος σφαγὴν | βάλλει μ' ἐρεμνῆι ψακάδι φοινίας δρόσου.

These resemblances are striking. The vocabulary and context of *Ag.* 1389f. are closely mirrored in *Rh.* Cf. also *Rh.* 724 δυσοίζων and 805 μηδὲν δυσοίζου· with A. *Ag.* 1316 οὗτοι δυσοίζω. δυσοίζω is only found in these lines and, like δυσθνήισκω 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. δυσθνήισκω in 791 may be borrowed from the only other place it occurs: E. *El.* 843.

Cf. also *Rh.* 817 ἤτοι μάραγνά γ' ἢ καρανιστὴς μόρος with A. *Eum.* 186 καρανιστῆρες and *Cho.* 375 ἀλλὰ διπλῆς γὰρ τῆσδε μαράγνης δοῦπος ἵκνεῖται. The author may be showing off two rare words from different places in the *Oresteia* here[101] (see Fraenkel *ib.* 233).

We may also compare *Rh.* 85f. καὶ μὴν...φράσαι. with E. *Hec.* 216f. καὶ μὴν Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔρχεται σπουδῆι ποδός, | Ἑκάβη, νέον τι πρὸς σὲ σημανῶν 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 θνῆισχ'· ἅλις γὰρ τῶν τεθνηκότων ὄχλος.* with E. *Hec.* 278 *μηδὲ κτάνητε· τῶν τεθνηκότων ἅλις.*

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 θνῆισκ'* is almost silly.[102]

Finally cf. *Rh.* 498f. *ἔστι δ' αἱμυλώτατον | κρότημ' Ὀδυσσεύς, λῆμά τ' ἀρκούντως θρασύς* with S. *Ai.* 388f. *τὸν αἱμυλώτατον, | ἐχθρὸν ἅλημα,* and S. fr. 913 *τὸ πάνσοφον 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 armseligen 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 *ἀπό*. 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[105]

i) Iambic Trimeters

a) Resolutions

The use of the comparative rates of resolution of long *princeps* and substitution of ⏑⏑ for × 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.[106] 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.[107] 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.

Play	col. 1	col. 2	col. 3	col. 4	col. 5	col. 6
Alc.	802-806	53-54	6.6-6.7	50	6.2	438
Me.	1031-1048	75-76	7.2-7.3	68	6.6	431
Hcld.	888-903	68-69	7.6-7.7	51	5.7	430-28
Hi.	979-1007	60-67	6.1-6.7	42	4.3	428
And.	932-952	148-150	15.7-16.0	106	11.3	c. 425
Hec.	919-934	181-182	19.4-19.8	117	12.7	pre 423
Su.	912-923	157-162	17.2-17.6	124	13.6	c. 423
El.	954-967	205-209	21.5-21.6	162	16.9	420[108]
HF	984-992	228-230	23.2-23.3	212	21.5	c. 415
Tro.	785-796	210-215	26.8-27.0	168	21.2	415
Ion	1027-1057	287-289	27.3-27.9	270	25.8	c. 412
IT	1067-1087	313-316	29.1-29.4	251	23.4	c. 412
Hel.	1253-1265	441-446	34.9-35.6	345	27.5	412
Pho.	1026-1190	357-414	34.8-34.9	300	25.8	411-08[109]
Or.	1134-1175	561-587	48.8-50.0	447	39.4	408
Ba.	918-923	400-405	43.4-43.9	345	37.6	post 406
IA	815-873	354-378	43.3-43.9	283	34.7	post 406
Cy.	585	244	41.7	205	35.0	412-08[110]

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

[108]See W.H. Burkert *MH* 47 (1990) 65-9.

[109]W. Luppe dates *Pho.* to 409 (*RM* 130 (1987) 29-34). Mastronarde (ed. pp.11-14) prefers 411-09, but agrees it could be later.

[110]R.G. Ussher dates *Cy.* to 412 (ed. pp.193-204). R. Seaford prefers 408 (ed. pp.48-51).

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,[111] *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.[112] Unfortunately his results compare *Rh.* with only seven of E.'s plays.[113] 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%).[114] 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[115]

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 240ff.).

[115]Schemata appear in Wilamowitz *GV* 583-9, O. Schroeder *Euripidis Cantica* (1928$_2$) 166-171, R. 296-344, A.M. Dale *MATC* and Zanetto's ed. pp.66-70. See also Fraenkel *RM* 72 (1917) 161-97 and 321-52, N.C. Conomis *Hermes* 92 (1964) 23-50, A.M. Dale *LM*$_2$, W. Jens *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (1971), S.G. Brown *AJP* 95 (1974) 207-34, K. Itsumi *CQ* 32 (1982) 59-74, *CQ* 34 (1984) 66-82, and *BICS* 38 (1992-3) 243-61.

Parodos 23-33~41-51

23~41	⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*glyconic*
	ὅπλίζου χέρα, συμμάχων,	
	πύρ' αἴθει στρατὸς Ἀργόλας,	
24~42	– – – ⏑ ⏑ – –	*glyconic*^
	Ἕκτορ, βᾶθι πρὸς εὐνάς,	
	Ἕκτορ, πᾶσαν ἀν' ὄρφναν,	
25~43	⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – ⏒ – ⏑ –	*sync ia trim*
	ὄτρυνον ἔγχος αἴρειν, ἀφύπνισον.	
	διειπετῆ δὲ ναῶν πυρσοῖς σταθμά.	
26~44	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑	*dact tetr*
	πέμπε φίλους ἰέναι ποτὶ σὸν λόχον,	
	πᾶς δ' Ἀγαμεμνονίαν προσέβα στρατὸς	
27~45	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – –	*cat. dact tetr*
	ἁρμόσατε ψαλίοις ἵππους.	
	ἐννύχιος θορύβωι σκηνάν,	
28~46	⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	⏑ D
	τίς εἶσ' ἐπὶ Πανθοΐδαν	
	νέαν τιν' ἐφιέμενοι	
29~47	– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –	e – D –
	ἢ τὸν Εὐρώπας, Λυκίων ἀγὸν ἀνδρῶν;	
	βάξιν· οὐ γάρ πω πάρος ὧδ' ἐφοβήθη	
30~48	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	D
	ποῦ σφαγίων ἔφοροι,	
	ναυσιπόρος στρατιά.	
31~49	– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏒	e – e ⏒
	ποῦ δὲ γυμνήτων μόναρχοι	
	σοὶ δ', ὑποπτεύων τὸ μέλλον,	
32~50	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	D
	τοξοφόροι τε φρυγῶν;	
	ἦλυθον ἄγγελος ὡς	
33~51	– ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – –	*dact dim + tr*
	ζεύγνυτε κερόδετα τόξα νευραῖς.	
	μήποτέ τιν' ἐς ἐμὲ μέμψιν εἴπηις.	

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 responsion 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 *Hcld.*, *Su.*, *Hec.*, *Ion*, *IT* and *Ba*. (although it is used sparingly after 415, except for *Hel.* 1137-47).

1st Separated Str. & Ant. 131-136~195-200

131~195	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*doch dim*
	τάδε δοκεῖ, τάδε μεταθέμενος νόει.	
	μέγας ἀγών, μεγάλα δ' ἐπινοεῖς ἕλεῖν·	
132~196	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – ⏑ –	*doch dim*
	σφαλερὰ δ' οὐ φιλῶ στρατηγῶν κράτη.	
	μακάριός γε μὰν κυρήσας ἔσηι.	
133~197	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*doch dim*
	τί γὰρ ἄμεινον ἢ ταχυβάταν νεῶν	
	πόνος ὅδ' εὐκλεής· μέγα δὲ κοιράνοι-	
134~198	⏑ – – ⏑ –	*doch*
	κατόπταν μολεῖν	
	σι γαμβρὸν πελεῖν.	
135~199	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*ia dim*
	πέλας ὅτι ποτ' ἄρα δαΐοις	
	τὰ θεόθεν ἐπιδέτω Δίκα,	
136~200	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – ⏑ –	*sync ia dim + doch*
	πυρὰ κατ' ἀντίπρωιρα ναυστάθμων δαίεται;	
	τὰ δὲ παρ' ἀνδράσιν τέλειά σοι φαίνεται.	

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.[116] In addition to the close metrical responsion between the stanzas there is close syntactic corresponsion. This formality and simplicity is more in keeping with early Euripidean practice than late. Cf. *Alc.* 393-415, *Me.* 1251-1292 (esp. *Rh.* 136~200 with *Me.* 1281) and *Hcld.* 608-629. Of particular interest is a comparison with the passage of dochmiacs at *Hi.* 362-72~669-79, because there the strophe is also separated from its antistrophe. The boldness of the separation between *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 *Hi.* Moreover, separated responding stanzas occurs twice in *Rh.*,

[116] N.C. Conomis (*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 *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.[117] W. Jens (*Die Bauformen in der griechieschen 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.

1st Stasimon: 1st Str. & Ant. 224-232~233-241

224~233	⏑ – ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	*ia* D
	Θυμβραῖε καὶ Δάλιε καὶ Λυκίας	
	μόλοι δὲ ναυκλήρια καὶ στρατιᾶς	
225~234	– ⏑ – ⏑ – –	*ithyphallic*
	ναὸν ἐμβατεύων	
	῾Ελλάδος διόπτας	
226~235	⏑ – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –	⏑ e – D –
	᾿Απολλον, ὦ Δία κεφαλά, μόλε τοξή-	
	῎κοιτο καὶ κάμψειε πάλιν θυμέλας οἴ-	
227~236	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	D
	ρης, ἵκοῦ ἐννύχιος	
	κων πατρὸς ᾽Ιλιάδας·	
228-9~237-8	– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –	e – D –
	καὶ γενοῦ σωτήριος ἀνέρι πομπᾶς	
	Φθιάδων δ' ἵππων ποτ' ἐπ' ἄντυγα βαίη,	
230~239	– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	e – D
	ἀγεμὼν καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις	
	δεσπότου πέρσαντος ᾽Αχαιὸν ᾿Αρη,	
231~240	– – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	– D
	ὦ παγκρατές, ὦ Τροΐας	
	τὰς πόντιος Αἰακίδαι	
232~241	– – ⏑ – ⏑ – –	– *ithyphallic*
	τείχη παλαιὰ δείμας.	
	Πηλεῖ δίδωσι δαίμων.	

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

[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.

commonest openings in d-e and ends with the commonest clausula.[118] E. sometimes has entire strophes composed of d-e.[119]

1st Stasimon: 2nd Str. & Ant. 242-253~254-263

242-3~254	∪ – ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ –	*iambo-chor dim*
	ἐπεὶ πρό τ' οἴκων πρό τε γᾶς ἔτλα μόνος	
	τίν' ἄνδρ' ᾽Αχαιῶν ὁ πεδοστιβὴς σφαγεὺς	
244~255	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –	*cat. dact tetr*
	ναύσταθμα βὰς κατιδεῖν· ἄγαμαι	
	οὐτάσει ἐν κλισίαις, τετράπουν	
245~256	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – –	*enoplion*
	λήματος· ἦ σπάνις αἰεὶ	
	μῖμον ἔχων ἐπὶ γαίας	
246-7~257-8	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –	*hemiepes + enoplion*
	τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὅταν ἦι δυσάλιον ἐν πελάγει	
	θηρός; ἔλοι Μενέλαν, κτανὼν δ' ᾽Αγαμεμνόνιον	
248~259	– ∪ – –	*epitrite*
	καὶ σαλεύηι	
	κρᾶτ' ἐνέγκοι	
249~260	∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ∪	*anaclastic paroemiac*
	πόλις. ἔστι Φρυγῶν τις ἔστιν ἄλκιμος·	
	῾Ελέναι κακόγαμβρον ἐς χέρας γόον,	
250~261	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ⏑⏑	*dact dim resolved*
	ἔνι δὲ θράσος ἐν αἰχ-	
	ὃς ἐπὶ πόλιν, ὃς ἐπὶ	
251~262	– ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ –	*chor dim*
	μᾶι· πόθι Μυσῶν ὃς ἐμὰν	
	γᾶν Τροΐαν χιλιόναυν	
252-3~263	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –	*aristophanean*
	συμμαχίαν ἀτίζει;	
	ἦλυθ' ἔχων στρατείαν.	

The second strophe starts with an iambo-choriambic colon followed by dactylic movement with an occasional suggestion of d-e rhythms. It returns to choriambs before the final aristophanean. The mixture recalls the metre of the parodos.[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.

[118]Cf. E. fr. 303.4, *And.* 1012~1020 and *Hel.* 1145f. For the two appearances of the ithyphallic see Dale *LM*₂ 181.

[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.

[120]Cf. also E. *Me.* 643-651~652-662 and *Tro.* 820-839~840-859.

2nd Stasimon: 1st Str. & Ant. 342-350~351-359

342~351	– – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ –	*glyconic*
	᾿Αδράστεια μὲν ἃ Διὸς	
	Στρυμών, ὅς ποτε τᾶς μελωι-	
343~352	– – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ –	*glyconic*
	παῖς εἴργοι στομάτων φθόνον·	
	δοῦ Μούσας δι᾽ ἀκηράτων	
344~353	⏑ – – ∪ ∪ – –	*glyconic*^
	φράσω γὰρ δὴ ὅσον μοι	
	δινηθεὶς ὑδροειδὴς	
345~354	– – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –	*hipponactean (gl-)*
	ψυχᾶι προσφιλές ἐστιν εἰπεῖν.	
	κόλπων σὰν ἐφύτευσεν ἧβαν.	
346~355	⏑ – – ∪ ∪ – ⏑	*glyconic*^
	ἧκεις, ὦ ποταμοῦ παῖ,	
	σύ μοι Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος	
347~356	– – ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –	*cat. iambo-chor trim*
	ἧκεις ἐπλάθης Φρυγίαν[121] πρὸς αὐλὰν	
	ἧκεις διφρεύων βαλιαῖσι πώλοις.	
348~357	– – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –	– D
	ἀσπαστός, ἐπεί σε χρόνωι	
	νῦν, ὦ πατρὶς ὦ Φρυγία,	
349~358	– ∪ – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –	e – D
	Πιερὶς μάτηρ ὅ τε καλλιγέφυ-	
	ξὺν θεῶι νῦν σοι τὸν ἐλευθέριον	
350~359	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –	*aristophanean*
	ρος ποταμὸς πορεύει	
	Ζῆνα πάρεστιν εἰπεῖν.	

The first strophe is mostly aeolic with some iambo-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,[122] and the brief stretch of d-e recalls the first stasimon. The scheme is uncomplicated.

At 350/351 a rhetorical enjambement 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.[123] He compared P. *Ol.* 2.95 and Bacch. 5.141.

[121]For the text see note *ad loc.*.

[122]Cf. also E. *Tro.* 1060~1071ff. and *Hec.* 905~914ff. For 347~356 cf. E. *Me.* 431~439.

[123]*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 Στρυμών 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.[124] 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 Στρυμών 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*.).

2nd Stasimon: 2nd Str. & Ant. 360-369~370-379

360~370	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – – ∪ ∪ –	*iambo-chor trim*
	ἆρά ποτ' αὖθις ἃ παλαιὰ Τροΐα	
	ἐλθὲ φάνηθι, τὰν ζάχρυσον προβαλοῦ	
361~371	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ –	*iambo-chor dim*
	τοὺς προπότας παναμερεύ-	
	Πηλεΐδα κατ' ὄμμα πέλ-	
362~372	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –	*aristophanean*
	σει θιάσους ἐρώτων	
	ταν δοχμίαν πεδαίρων	
363~373	– – ∪ – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – –	*sync. iambo-chor trim*
	ψαλμοῖσι καὶ κυλίκων οἰνοπλανήτοις	
	σχιστὰν παρ' ἄντυγα, πώλους ἐρεθίζων	
364~374	∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – –	*iambo-chor dim*
	ἐπιδεξίοις ἁμίλλαις	
	δίβολόν τ' ἄκοντα πάλλων.	
365~375	∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – –	*sync. chor dim*
	κατὰ πόντον Ἀτρειδᾶν	
	σὲ γὰρ οὔτις ὑποστὰς	
366a~376a	– – – ∪ ∪ –	*spondee + chor*
	Σπάρταν οἰχομένων	
	Ἀργείας ποτ' ἐν Ἕ-	
366b~376b	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –	*aristophanean*
	Ἰλιάδος παρ' ἀκτᾶς;	
	ρας δαπέδοις χορεύσει·	
367~377	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ –	*dodrans*
	ὦ φίλος, εἴθε μοι	
	ἀλλά νιν ἅδε γᾶ	
368~378	– ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ –	*chor dim*
	σᾶι χερὶ καὶ σῶι δορὶ πρά-	
	καπφθίμενον Θρηικὶ μόρωι	
369~379	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –	*aristophanean*
	ξας τάδ' ἐς οἶκον ἔλθοις.	
	φίλτατον ἄχθος οἴσει.	

The 2nd strophe is a blend of iambo-choriambic and some aeolic. Wilamowitz[125] 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*₂ 128, R. 308 and Zanetto 68.

2nd Separated Str. & Ant. 454-466~820-832

454~820	⏑ – ⏑ –	*ia*
	ἰὼ ἰώ.	
	ἰὼ ἰώ,	
455~821	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*doch dim*
	φίλα θροεῖς, φίλος Διόθεν εἶ· μόνον	
	†μέγας ἐμοι μέγας ὦ πολίοχον κράτος	
456~822	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ –	*doch kaibelianus*
	φθόνον ἄμαχον ὕπατος	
	τότ' ἄρ' ἔμολον ὅτε σοι†	
457~823	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – –	*cat. ia-chor trim*
	Ζεὺς θέλοι ἀμφὶ σοῖς λόγοισιν εἴργειν.	
	ἄγγελος ἦλθον ἀμφὶ ναῦς πύρ' αἴθειν·	
458~824	⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏒	*cyrenaic*
	τὸ δὲ νάιον Ἀργόθεν δόρυ	
	ἐπεὶ ἄγρυπνον ὄμμ' ἐν εὐφρόναι	
459~825	– ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ –	*lekythion*
	οὔτε πρίν τιν' οὔτε νῦν	
	οὔτ' ἐκοίμισ' οὔτ' ἔβριξ',	
460~826	– – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – – –	*an dim + sp*
	ἀνδρῶν ἐπόρευσε σέθεν κρείσσω. πῶς μοι	
	οὐ τὰς Σιμοεντιάδας παγάς· μή μοι	
461-2~827	⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑	*cyrenaic ⏑*
	Ἀχιλεὺς τὸ σὸν ἔγχος ἂν δύναιτο,	
	κότον, ὦ ἄνα, θῆις· ἀναίτιος γὰρ	
463~828	– – – ⏑ ⏑ – –	*glyconic^*
	πῶς δ' Αἴας ὑπομεῖναι;	
	†ἔγωγε πάντων†.	
464~829	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑	*enoplion*
	εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε γ' ἦμαρ	
	εἰ δὲ χρόνωι παρὰ καιρὸν	
465~830	– ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ –	*lekythion + cr*
	εἰσίδοιμ', ἄναξ, ὅτωι πολυφόνου	
	ἔργον ἢ λόγον πύθηι, κατά με γᾶς	
466~831	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – –	*ia-chor dim + sp*
	χειρὸς ἄποιν' ἄροιο σᾶι λόγχαι.	
	ζῶντα πόρευσον· οὐ παραιτοῦμαι.	

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.

Choral Exit 527-537~546-556

527-8~546-7	⏑⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ – – ⏒	⏑⏑ D ⏒ *ith*^
	τίνος ἃ φυλακά; τίς ἀμείβει τὰν ἐμάν; πρῶτα	
	καὶ μὰν ἀίω· Σιμόεντος ἠμένα κοίτας	
529~548	– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	e – D
	δύεται σημεῖα καὶ ἑπτάποροι	
	φοινίας ὕμνεῖ πολυχορδοτάται	
530~549	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	
	Πλειάδες αἰθέριαι·	
	γήρυϊ παιδολέτωρ	
531~550	⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏓	*dact tetr + ith*
	μέσα δ' αἰετὸς οὐρανοῦ ποτᾶται.	
	μελοποιὸν ἀηδονὶς μέριμναν.	
532~551	– – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –	– D –
	ἔγρεσθε· τί μέλλετε; κοιτᾶν	
	ἤδη δὲ νέμουσι κατ' Ἴδαν	
533~552	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	D
	ἔξιτε πρὸς φυλακάν	
	ποίμνια· νυκτιβρόμου	
534~553	– – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –	– D –
	οὐ λεύσσετε μηνάδος αἴγλαν;	
	σύριγγος ἰὰν κατακούω.	
535~554	– ⏒ – ⏑ ⏑ – –	D *contr.* –
	ἀὼς δὴ πέλας ἀὼς	
	θέλγει δ' ὄμματος ἕδραν	
536-7~555-6	– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – –	e – D + *ba*
	γίγνεται καί τις προδρόμων ὅδε γ' ἐστὶν ἀστήρ.	
	ὕπνος· ἄδιστος γὰρ ἔβα βλεφάροις πρὸς ἀῶ.	

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.[126] 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.

Epiparodos: Astrophic Lyric 675-682

675a-b	⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑	*ia + 3 resolved an*
	ἔα ἔα· βάλε βάλε βάλε· θένε θένε <θένε>.	
676	⏑ – –	*ba*
	τίς ἀνήρ;	
677	– ⏑ – ⏑ – –	*ithyphallic*
	λεῦσσε· τοῦτον αὐδῶ.	
680	– ⏑ – ⏑ –	*hypodochmius*
	δεῦρο δεῦρο πᾶς.	
681	– ⏑ – – ⏑ – ⏑	*sync. tr dim*
	τούσδ' ἔχω, τούσδ' ἔμαρψα	
678f.	– ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ –	*sync. tr tetr*
	κλῶπας οἵτινες κατ' ὄρφνην τόνδε κινοῦσι στρατόν.	
682	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ –	*3 cr*
	τίς ὁ λόχος; πόθεν ἔβας; ποδαπὸς εἶ;	

683-91 = *tr. tetr.*

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

692~710	⏑ – – ⏑ –	*doch*
	τίς ἀνδρῶν ὁ βάς;	
	ἔβα καὶ πάρος	
693~711	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*ia dim*
	τίς ὁ μέγα θρασὺς ἐπεύξεται	
	κατὰ πόλιν ὕπαφρον ὄμμ' ἔχων,	
694~712	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*doch*
	χέρα φυγὼν ἐμάν;	
	ῥακοδύτωι στολᾶι	
695~713	⏑ – – ⏑ – –	*ba dim*
	πόθεν νιν κυρήσω;	
	πυκασθείς, ξιφήρης	
696~714	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*doch*
	τίνι προσεικάσω,	
	κρύφιος ἐν πέπλοις·	
697~715	⏒ – ⏑ – – ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏓	*ia trim*
	ὅστις δι' ὄρφνης ἦλθ' ἀδειμάντωι ποδὶ	
	βίον δ' ἐπαιτῶν εἶρπ' ἀγύρτης τις λάτρις,	
698~716	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏒ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*doch dim*
	διά τε τάξεων καὶ φυλάκων ἕδρας;	
	ψαφαρόχρουν κάρα πολυπινές τ' ἔχων·	
699~717	– ⏑ ⏑ –	*chor*
	Θεσσαλὸς ἦ	
	πολλὰ δὲ τὰν	
700~718	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏔ – ⏑ ⏓	*doch dim*
	παραλίαν Λοκρῶν νεμόμενος πόλιν;	
	βασιλίδ' ἑστίαν Ἀτρειδᾶν κακῶς	
701~719	⏒ – ⏑ – ⏒ ⏔ ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ –	*ia trim*
	ἦ νησιώτην σποράδα κέκτηται βίον;	
	ἔβαζε δῆθεν ἐχθρὸς ὢν στρατηλάταις.	
702~720	⏑ – ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ –	*ia dim*
	τίς ἦν; πόθεν; ποίας πάτρας;	
	ὄλοιτ' ὄλοιτο πανδίκως,	
703~721	⏒ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –	*doch dim*
	ποῖον ἐπεύχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεῶν;	
	πρὶν ἐπὶ γᾶν Φρυγῶν ποδὸς ἴχνος 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*[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 (ἔα ἔα·) = *excl.*, 730 = *tr tetr cat*, (ἰὼ ἰώ·) = *excl.*, 731 = *tr tetr cat*, (ἰὼ ἰώ·) = *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 passsage 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.

[127]For the bacchiac sequence cf. S. *Phil*. 514.

Monody 895-903~906-914

895~906	⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	*enoplion*
	ἰαλέμωι αὐθιγενεῖ	
	ὄλοιτο μὲν Οἰνεΐδας,	
896~907	⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	*enoplion*
	τέκνον σ' ὀλοφύρομαι, ὦ	
	ὄλοιτο δὲ Λαρτιάδας,	
897~908	– ⏑ – ⏑ – –	*ithyphallic*
	ματρὸς ἄλγος, οἵαν	
	ὅς μ' ἄπαιδα γέννας	
898~909	⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒	*enoplion*
	ἔκελσας δδὸν ποτὶ Τροίαν·	
	ἔθηκεν ἀριστοτόκοιο·	
899~910	– – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	*sync. dact tetr*
	ἦ δυσδαίμονα καὶ μελέαν	
	ἃ θ' Ἕλλανα λιποῦσα δόμον	
900~911	⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – –	*enoplion*
	ἀπὸ μὲν φαμένας ἐμοῦ πορευθείς,	(or *anacl. an. dim.*)
	Φρυγίων λεχέων ἔπλευσε πλαθεῖσ',	
901~912	⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – –	*enoplion*
	ἀπὸ δ' ἀντομένου πατρὸς βιαίως.	(or *anacl. an. dim.*)
	†ὑπ' Ἰλίωι ὤλεσε† μὲν σ' ἕκατι Τροίας,	
902~913	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	
	ὤμοι ἐγὼ σέθεν, ὦ φιλία	
	φίλτατε, μυριάδας τε πόλεις	
903~914	⏑⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –	*dact hex + sp*
	φιλία κεφαλά, τέκνον, ὤμοι.	
	ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐκένωσεν.	

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*$_2$ 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[128] 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

[128]Not including Prometheus' soliloquy at 88-127 (see Griffith (1977) 108).

abandoned iambic interruptions.[129] Cf. the monody in *Rh.* with E. *Alc.* 393-403~404-15, *Hi.* 817-33~836-51, *And.* 1173-83~1186-96, and *Su.* 990-1008~1012-30.

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.[130] 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.[131] 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*.

[132]See R. 339f. and Griffith *ib.* 119.
[130]For metrical innovations in later E. see S.G. Brown *AJP* 95 (1974) 207-34.
[131]See K. Itsumi *CQ* 32 (1982) 59-74.
[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 paroemiac 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 paroemiac and, in brackets, the longest sequence of metra without a paroemiac. 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 paroemiac), 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 paroemiac 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) *τἀφανῆ τεκμηρίοισιν εἰκότως ἁλίσκεται*. 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[138]

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.[139] 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.[140] This is not to say that the lack of exposition detracts from the drama. Indeed that charge was soundly refuted by H. Strohm.[141] 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

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

[139]See P. Albert *De Rheso Tragoedia* (1876) 14, Wilamowitz *Hermes* 61 (1926) 288, J. Geffcken *Hermes* 71 (1936) 396, R. 101-113 and P. Carrara *ZPE* 90 (1992) 35-44.

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

[141]*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[142] 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.[143] 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.[144]

The exit and re-entry in *Rh.* differs from other examples in

[142](1977) 248 and 283f.

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

[144]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.*[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 *τίς ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς θεός;*). 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 *terminus post quem* for *Rh.* in the late 460s.[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.[147]

[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.

[146]Assuming that Taplin (*ib.* 452-9) is correct.

[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*.[148] 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.[149] 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.).

[148]In favour see O. Menzer (1867) 41f., Wilamowitz (1907) 41n., J.C. Rolfe (1893) 96 and J. Geffcken *Hermes* 71 (1936) 396. Against see R. 126-32, A.E. Haigh *Tragic Drama of the Greeks* (1896) 284, W.H. Porter *Hermathena* 17 (1913) 379 and C.B. Sneller (1949) 59f.

[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.[150] 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.[151] 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

[150]H. is certainly offstage beforehand. See note on 194.

[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]

[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 Dic. 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).

[153]See esp. Taplin *ib.* 75-9.

[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) 160f. 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[156]

At 675 the chorus enters in pursuit of Od. and Dio. It is clear from τούσδ' ἔχω, τούσδ' ἔμαρψα (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 Φοῖβος 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.[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.[158] Evidence for a raised and

[156] I regret that I have not been able to consult M. Kaimio *Physical Contact in Greek Tragedy* (1988).

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

[158] See esp. Taplin *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. *OC* 192-6 (cf. *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. Pöhlmann[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. *Eum.* 244-397 and S. *O.C.* 824-886.[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

[159] *MusHel* 38 (1981) 129-146.

[160] At E. *Hel.* 1627ff. Theoclymenus is intercepted by someone who says *οὐκ ἀφήσομαι 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. 129f.) and assume that E. *Tel.* portrayed the physical capture of Telephus by the chorus on the basis of the parody of the scene at Ar. *Ach.* 280ff. See E.W. Handley and J. Rea *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 (σύ μοι Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος) and 385 (q.v.) 'wäre im fünften Jahrhundert ganz unmöglich gewesen'.[161] A. Lesky[162] 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*$_3$ (1959) 2.262f.

[162] *Greek Poetry* (1972) 397

also lavishes praise upon a king. In *Pe.* Darius is μακαρίτας ἰσοδαίμων βασιλεύς (633) and Περσᾶν Σουσιγενῆ θεόν (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 ἰσόθεος φώς (80) and the queen mother is θεοῦ μὲν εὐνάτειρα Περσῶν, θεοῦ δὲ καὶ μήτηρ ἔφυς, | εἴ τι μὴ δαίμων παλαιὸς νῦν μεθέστηκε στρατῶι (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. ὧν οὕνεκ' εἶδος θνητὸν ἀλλάξας ἔχω | μορφήν τ' ἐμὴν μετέβαλον εἰς ἀνδρὸς 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) ὦ παῖδες, Ἀργείοισιν εὔχεσθαι χρεών | θύειν τε λείβειν θ' ὡς θεοῖς Ὀλυμπίοις | σπονδάς, ἐπεὶ σωτῆρες οὐ διχορρόπως.

[165] See C.D. Beck (1824) 269ff., R. Morstadt (1827) 48, O. Menzer (1867) 17, A.C. Pearson *CR* 35 (1921) 58f. and Fraenkel (1965) 240.

priestess to the chorus in A. *Semele* (fr. 168).[166] 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.[167] 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.[168] 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.

[167]See Taplin (1977) 251 and Burnett (1985) 18 n.13.

[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. 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 Procne, the nightingale, for her son Itys whom she murdered. There is a Thracian connection with this myth: Procne'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.

(225-8) denies the significance of this argument.[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.[173] The presence of such sententiae may be observed in all E.'s plays, extant and fragmentary, regardless of date, from *Peliades* (frr. 601-616) with which he won his first victory in 455 BC when he was approximately in his early twenties,[174] to *Ba.* and *IA* which were produced posthumously. However, there is not actually a marked deficiency of sententiae in *Rh.* Although the number of gnomic lines in e.g. *Me.* (over 150 verses) or *Hi.* (over 200 verses) is far larger than in *Rh.*, the number in *Alc.* (c.40) shows that we should not expect any particular number of gnomae in an Euripidean tragedy.[175] Indeed, as R. observes (226f.), in the latter half of *IT*, which is marked by lively dramatic action, the gnomic element is no more prominent than in the latter half of *Rh.* So, as far as the quantity of individual sententiae is concerned there is no reason to single out *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

[172]As do F. Vater (*Vindiciae* (1837) ch. 5 §21), P. Albert (*De Rheso Tragoedia* (1876) 21) and W. Ridgeway (*CQ* 20 (1926) 15).

[173]See C. Collard *Euripides* (1981) 25 and F.A.G. Beck *Greek Education 430-350 BC* (1964) 117-22.

[174]The frr. of *Pel.* which survive contain some 23 gnomae in as many lines.

[175]In *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)[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 *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 *Alc.*). 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 *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.

[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

350-1 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 tetramteters 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[179]

- O -

Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana pluteus 31,10[180] 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[181] However, the scribe clearly had access to a better source of readings than the scribe of V, readings which did not come from Λ.[182]

- V -

Vatican city, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana codex Vaticanus graecus 909.[183] 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[184] but must be used with caution because the scribe introduced a number of

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

[180]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).

[181]*E.g.* at 17, 161, 296, 453 and 601.

[182]*E.g.* at 74, 179, 205, 235, 271, 343, 378, 431, 505, 537 and 548.

[183]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.

[184]See Nauck (ed.) vol.1 xli, Rabe *ib.* 421ff. and Turyn (1957) 91f.

interpolations for metrical reasons.[185] 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.[186]

- Hn -

Copenhagen (Hauniensis), Det Kongelige Bibliothek Gamle Kongelig Samling 417[187] 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.[188] 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.

[186] (*pace* Diggle) *νεόδμητον* Va *νεόχμητον* V *νεόκμητον* Λ. The presence of the reading at *CP* 1456 (*αἴρειν φοράδην τὸν νεόδμητον χρέων*) is confirmation of its antiquity.

[187] Written c.1475. See Turyn (1957) 329ff. and Tuilier (1968) 164.

[188] Written between 1300 and 1320. See Turyn (1957) 222ff., Zuntz (1965) 126ff., 144-151 and 192, Tuilier (1968) 188ff. and Diggle *Eur*. 508-13. See also N.G. Wilson *Scholars of Byzantium* (1983) 249ff.

- P -

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.[189] 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.*[190] It is therefore of very limited value, although the work of its correctors is of some use.[191]

- Q -

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.[192] 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.[193] 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. 179f. and 192f., Tuilier (*ib.*) 192ff. and Diggle *Eur.* 513.

[191]See A. Turyn *Codices Graeci Vaticani Saeculis xii aut xiv Scripti* (1964) 127, Zuntz (*ib.*) 289 and O.L. Smith *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I: The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius* (1975) 6f.

[192]See Turyn (1957) 288-98, Tuilier (*ib.*) 180ff., Zuntz *ib.* 144-51, N.G. Wilson *Gnomon* 38 (1966) 337 and Diggle *Eur.* 324f.

[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.

- Π_1 -

Papiri della Società Italiana 12, 2 1286 [Pack$_2$ 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.

[197]Written towards the end of the 2nd century AD. See C. Gallavotti *RivdiFil.* N.S. 11 (1933) 177-188, Austin *NFE* p.93, G. Zuntz *The Political Plays of Euripides* (1963) 136 n.1, W. Luppe *Anagennesis* 2 (1982) 74-82, Turyn (*ib.*) 237 n.217, 241 n.220 and 289.

- Π_2 -

Paris, Codex Panopolitanus, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Supplément grec 1099.2 (Akhmîm papyrus 4) [Pack$_2$ 427][198] 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 *θυοσκόων* (correctly) with Δ at 68.

- Σ -

The scholia in V do not give us any independent readings for the text of *Rh.*[199] 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.[200] Some of these appear in the gnomologia but they cannot be related to a specific anthology.

- *CP* -

The *Christus Patiens* (ed. Tuilier 1969) is a religious drama made up of iambic lines taken from Greek tragedy.[201] From E. the author made use of the 'select' plays; from *Rh.* he used 254 lines,

[198]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.

[199]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 οὖν* in lemm. at 481.

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

[201]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_2 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 -

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

[202]Written in the mid 12th century. See Turyn (*ib.*) 92f., G.A. Longman *CQ* 9 (1959) 129-41 and Tuilier (1968) 150ff.

[203]Written c.1300. See Turyn (*ib.*) 1.1, Tuilier (*ib.*) 168ff. and K. Matthiessen *Hermes* 93 (1965) 148-58.

[204]Written in the early 14th century. See Turyn (*ib.*) 94n.151, Tuilier (*ib.*) 169n.1 and K. Matthiessen *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_1. 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).

ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΡΗΣΟΥ: Section (a):

This summary of the plot is of a type of prefatory mtaerial which appears in the medieval MSS of ten other plays from the Euripidean corpus: *Hec.*, *I Pho.*, *Hi.*, *And.*, *Tro.*, *Ba.*, *I Or.*, *HF*, *Hcld.* 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 *οὗ/ῆς/ῶν ἀρχή* 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_1), 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.[206] There then follows the phrase ἡ δὲ 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.[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.[208]

The only explicit reference to Dicaearchus is at Sextus Empiricus *Adv. Math.* 3.1-6 (697,25 Bk), who says he wrote τινὰς ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων. However, this may only be an amplification peculiar to Sextus.[209] It was the case in antiquity that mythographical works were wrongly attributed to an author and Rusten is probably right (*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 Π_1.

[206]Cf. the conjecture of W. Luppe at (b) 28. On the appearance of οὗ ἀρχή generally, see E. Nachmanson *Der griechische Buchtitel* (1941) 38-49.

[207]For the survival of such a line in hyp. (b) below see p.25 and n.40 above.

[208]See G. Zuntz *ib.* 134ff., M.W. Haslam *GRBS* 16 (1975) 150-6, J. Rusten *GRBS* 23 (1982) 357-67, esp. 358 nn. 8 & 9, R. Kassel ΣΧΟΛΙΑ (1985) 53-60 (=*KS* (1991) 207-14), W. Luppe *ZPE* 84 (1990) 11ff. and 'Dicaearchus' ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου μύθων' in Moraux *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung* (1985) 610-15.

[209]See Kassel *ib.* 213f. The reference to Dicaearchus in hyp. E. *Me.* (fr. 63 Wehrli) is from his *Life of Greece*, not a collection of hypotheses, and the inclusion of his name in hyp. *Alc.* is an addition of Triclinius. We do know of critical work by Dic. on the didascaliae (see fr. 74 Wehrli and hyp. S. *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. *Pe.* (for Glaucus see Jacoby *RE* VII 1418.46).

(a) 1 †δείλλης† The reading might be a corruption of δείλης, which Nauck suggested. δείλη means 'afternoon', and would have to refer to late afternoon, or evening here (cf. Xen. *An.* 3.3.11 τῆς ἡμέρας ὅλης διῆλθον .. ἀλλὰ δείλης ἀφίκοντο). However, the play starts a few hours before dawn so either Kirchhoff's δι' ὅλης <τῆς νυκτὸς> or Schwartz's δι' ὅλης <νυκτὸς> would seem preferable. Perhaps δεινῶς should be considered because of the effect which the firelight has on the Trojans.

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

(a) 6 οἳ περὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα The phrase is a late Greek periphrasis for the actual person. See S. Radt *ZPE* 38 (1980) 45-7 and cf. οἳ δὲ περὶ Διομήδην below, οἳ περὶ Διομήδεα at Pindar fr. 262 (Maehler) and οἳ περὶ Γάιον Φαβρικιον at Plut. *Pyrrh.* 20.1

(a) 7 κοιτὴν Hector does not sleep in a tent (see lines 1 and 9), so V's κοιτὴν is preferable to σκηνὴν (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 †ἐπινοεῖ† 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 Π_1, 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 *εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρήλατος* *εὐσέληνος* is found elsewhere only at *Lyr. Fr. Adesp.* 981 (Page) *εὐσέλανον δῖον οἶκον. διφρηλάτου* is Menthe's conjecture for *τροχηλάτου* at *TGF* vol.2, 39 (Agathon) F32 *Ὦ λαμπρὸν ὄμμα τοῦ τροχηλάτου* <∪–>. However, we do find *διφρηλατῶ* 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 λεύσσετε μηνάδος αἴγλαν;*), 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 πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδηι· καὶ τάχα ἄν*

τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν. 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.[210] 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 *Il.* 5.714-7 and *ib.* 8.352-7 in the first four lines. (b) 34 is reminiscent of E. *Alc.* 1136 ὦ τοῦ μεγίστου Ζηνὸς εὐγενὲς τέκνον (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 ἐκτρίψειεν*. 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 *Κύπριν* 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).

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ 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 Νυκτεγερσια, another term for the *Doloneia* (See Σ *Il.* 10.435). The attribution to Aristophanes is dubious for most of these hypotheses.[211] 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.*).[212] 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 Νυκτεγερσίαν. Σ *Il.* 10.435 informs us that Νυκτεγερσία was a title sometimes given to *Il.* 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 *Il.* 10.[213] 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

[211]See Rusten *ib.* 358 n.6, Zuntz *ib.* 139 and A.L. Brown (*CQ* 37 (1987) 427-31.

[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[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.[215] Curiously enough, this fr. is the only one which does resembles a line from *Rh.* (*Iamque auroram rutilare procul cerno*, cf. *Rh.* 535f. ἀὼς δὴ πέλας, ἀὼς | γίγνεται). However, the approach of dawn is such a commonplace in literature that we should not use it as evidence of a connection with *Rh.*[216]

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ Section (d):

(d) 55 ᾽Αθάνα It is this Doric form and ᾽Αθηναία which are used in tragedy, rather than ᾽Αθήνα or ᾽Αθηνᾶ (West *Aeschylus Tragoediae* (1990) xxvi n.16). Cf. line 501.

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

[214] *Maia* 15 (1963) 184-98.
[215] *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (1871) 230ff.
[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.

TEXT

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 ὀρθωθεὶς δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος, κεφαλὴν ἐπαείρας; *Rh.* 11ff. with *Il.* 10.82-5 τίς δ' οὗτος κατὰ νῆας ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἔρχεαι οἷος | νύκτα δι' ὀρφναίην, ὅτε θ' εὕδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι | ...| φθέγγεο ... τίπτε δέ σε χρεώ; *Rh.* 25f. with *Il.* 10.54ff. ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ Νέστορα δῖον | εἶμι, καὶ ὀτρυνέω ἀνστήμεναι, αἴ κ' ἐθέλησιν | ἐλθεῖν ἐς φυλάκων ἱερὸν τέλος ἠδ' ἐπιτεῖλαι; *Rh.* 28f. with *Il.* 10.67f. φθέγγεο δ' ἧι κεν ἴησθα, καὶ ἐγρήγορθαι ἄνωχθι, | πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον, (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

episode.[217] 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.[218] There is one reference back to the previous day (59f.) and eleven references forward to the following day.[219]

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.[220] 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

[217]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.

[218]See esp. 1f., 5, 7ff., 13, 17, 19, 20ff., 25, 41f., 44f., 55, 64, 71, 87ff., 92, 95, 111, 124, 139, 228, 285, 289, 292f., 587f., 611-15, 643, 678f., 697, 736f., 762-5, 774 and 824f.

[219]66, 96, 223, 331, 447, 600, 615, 771f., 850, 985 and 991f.

[220]Cf. A.P. Burnett (1985) 178 n.9 and H. Strohm *Hermes* 87 (1959) 260.

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.*, *Hcld.*, *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.*, *Hcld.*, *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.[222] 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

[222]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 *ὄρθου*, 23 *ὄπίζου*, 27 *ἁρμόσατε*, 28 *τίς εἶσ'* and 33 *ζεύγνυτε*). 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.[223] 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.

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.*[224] 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),[225] *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.[226] This seems also to have been the case with *Niobe* and *Myrmidons.*[227] 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.

[224]See also W. Kranz *Stasimon* (1933) 20ff., Schmid-Stählin *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, vol.3 815n., W. Nestle *Tüb. Bei.* 10 (1930) 115ff. and R. 341ff.

[225]See A.F. Garvie *Aeschylus'* Supplices *Play and Trilogy* (1969) 1-28.

[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.[228] 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. *Diktyoulkoi* (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; <Δι.> καὶ δὴ β]οὴν ἵστημι τοῖσδ' ἰύγμασιν. | [ἰού· π]άντες γεωγοὶ δεῦτε κἀμπελοσκάφοι, | [βοτήρ τ]ε ποιμήν τ' εἴ τίς ἐστ' [ἐ]γχώριος, {cf. *Rh.* 2f.} | [πάραλ]οί τε κἄλλο [πᾶν ἁλιτ]ρύτων ἔθνος.

The only extant play in the Euripidean corpus with an anapaestic opening is *IA*, performed posthumously in 405 BC.[229] However, it is not Euripidean.[230] 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.* 1015ff.

[230] See C.W. Willink *CQ* 21 (1971) 343ff., B.M.W. Knox *YCS* 22 (1972) 239ff. and D. Bain *CQ* 27 (1977) 10-26.

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 ὄρθου, 8 λῦσον and 9 λεῖπε), the emphatically postponed vocative Ἕκτορ, 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*₂ (1928) 166f. and Wilamowitz *GV* 288. Corruption affects responsion at 25~43 and 33~51. In 25 Badham changed ἀείρειν to αἴρειν which restores responsion with the correct Doric form ναῶν in 43. 33~51 is more problematic. The MSS seem sound in 33,[231] but 51 is a syllable longer than 33. Diggle adopts Lindemann's word order for 51.[232] 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

[231] *pace* Dale (*MATC* 1.95) who suspected corruption and suggested ζεύγνυτ' <εὖ>.

[232] *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (1981) 20.

is unheard of in tragedy, and is rare even in the first princeps (see Dale *LM*$_2$ 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.[233] 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 (*ὅπλίζου*, *βᾶθι*, *ὄτρυνον*, *ἀφύπνισον*. *πέμπε* and *ἁρμόσατε*). 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 δὲ*, 39f. *πολλὰ* .. | *οὐδὲν*), 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

[233]For bacchiacs within a verse see M. Griffith (1977) 259f. and L.P.E. Parker *CQ* 26 (1976) 20.

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 *βῆθι* '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. *κοίτην* at 22 and *νίκην* 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.

εὐνὰς 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 *εὐναί* of the Greek bivouacs around the walls of Troy.

῾Εκτορέους 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 (῾Εκτόρεια χείρ).

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

ἢ 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 ἅπ. λεγ., formed from τευχεσφόρος (cf. 267 below and E. *Su.* 654 τευχεσφόρον μὲν λαόν) 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> οἳ τετράμοιρον νυκτὸς φρουρὰν As the text stands οἳ lacks an antecedent. The alternative φυλακὴν in line 5 may be a remnant of the phrase I have inserted, rather than a gloss on φρουρὰν, which is not an unusual word.

τετράμοιρον is ἅπ. λεγ. Although τετραμοίρια 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 στρατιᾶς προκάθηνται* 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. *ὅστις φυλάσσει πρᾶγος ἐν πρύμνηι πόλεως | οἴακα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμῶν ὕπνωι* (Eteocles) and *Il.* 10.159f. (Nestor to Diomedes). The same duty also affects the common man. Cf. the vigilance of the guard at A. *Ag.* 1-17 and the old man at *IA* [4f.]

βλεφάρων γοργωπὸν ἕδραν As at 554f. (*ὄμματος ἕδραν*), the elaborate periphrasis refers to the eye socket.

γοργωπὸν The adj. is a back formation from *Γοργώ* (see also

306n. and Leumann *Homerische Wörter* (1950) s.v.) and has the sense 'grim to behold'. It may have been suggested here by Ἕκτωρ ... Γοργοῦς ὄμματ' ἔχων at *Il.* 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).[234]

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 φυλλοστρώτους 'leaf-strewn' is ἅπ. λεγ. φυλλοστρώς 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 *Il.* 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 καιρὸς γὰρ ἀκοῦσαι Cf. ἀκοῦσαι 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 Δ is far preferable. An interrogative mark after φθόγγος shows that H. is not immediately sure who has disturbed him. On the ἦ Barnes writes, *ad loc.*, 'Hic loci ἦ pro ὦ 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 τί τὸ σῆμα; θρόει. R. suggests (p.291) that the password should be given in reply and that the line should read H: τί τὸ σῆμα; - Ch: Φοῖβος, θάρσει. The text, however, is clear as it stands and the significant password is saved for line 521. The exchange θάρσει - θαρσῶ at 16 shows that H.'s request for the password has simply been forgotten in the stream of questions. σῆμα is also used for 'password' at 688, but nowhere else in Greek. τί τὸ σῆμα occurs at E. *Hyps.* fr. 57.10, where it probably means 'sign' or 'symbol' (see Bond *ad loc.*). The author uses the more common ξύνθημα at 521, 684 and 763 and σύνθημα at 572 (cf. σύμβολον at 573). For questions not receiving an answer in tragedy see D.J. Mastronarde on E. *Pho.* [376ff.].

13 ἐκ νυκτῶν For the phrase meaning 'in the night' cf. 17 and 691 below, *Od.* 12.286, Theognis 460 and A. *Cho.* 288. As Garvie notes *ad Cho.* 288 (καὶ λύσσα καὶ μάταιος ἐκ νυκτῶν φόβος), the use of ἐκ indicates that the darkness itself contributes to the apprehension.

14 κοίτας Acc. of motion towards after πλάθουσ' (πελάζω). Cf.

δῶμα πελάζει at E. *And.* 1167 and see K-G 1.312.

15 θορύβωι 'din'. Cf. E. *Hec.* 872 and *IA* 317.

16-18 Diggle wishes to excise these lines and keep φυλακὰς ... στρατιάν 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 X (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 γάρ as the conjunction 'else' cf. 78 below and E. *IA* 1256 φιλῶ τ' ἐμαυτοῦ τέκνα· μαινοίμην 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 τοῦτο σοὶ δ' ἐφίεμαι). 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 Porphyrius *ad Il.* 10.194, all referring to Agamemnon's council. The verb νυκτηγορέω is equally rare, occurring only at 89 below[235] 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, *Il.* 10.100 δυσμενέες δ' ἄνδρες σχεδὸν ἧαται and esp. *Il.* 10.160f. οὐκ ἀίεις ὡς Τρῶες ἐπὶ θρωσμῶι πεδίοιο | ἧαται ἄγχι νεῶν, ὀλίγος δ' ἔτι χῶρος ἐρύκει; (cf. also *Il.* 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 κατέχοντα χάμευναν.

23 συμμάχων Hermann's conjecture (cf. Bothe) restores responsion with 41 and makes sense of εὐνάς. The corruption arises

[235]Used at *CP* 2199.

from the similarity in the pronounciation of *ο* and *ω*. Cf. the same mistake reversed in L in the next line.

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

βᾶθι 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 *σόν* to *τόν* 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.

Πανθοΐδαν 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).

τὸν Εὐρώπας 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 σφάγια. 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.).

ἔφοροι Translate 'overseers'.

31 γυμνήτων is formed from γυμνής (see Fraenkel *Nomina Agentis* (1910) 6). Cf. ὄχλος | γυμνὴς at 312f., γυμνῆτες at E.

Pho. 1147 and ὦ γυμνῆτες at Tyrtaeus fr. 11.35 (West). The Persians around Mardonius are γυμνῆτες 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 to a type of soldier, not a national contingent (contrast line 29). Cf. the metaphorical ἄνακτες ναῶν 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 *Il.* archery is a speciality of Trojans, like Alexander (*Il.* 11.507ff., *ib.* 582ff. and 13.671f.) and Pandarus (*Il.* 4.124ff. and 5.97-100).

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

33 κερόδετα ἅπ. λεγ., cf. χρυσοδέτοις 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.

οὔτ' ἄγαν φοβεῖν λόγοις | οὔτε θαρσύνειν.

καθαρῶς 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 καθαρῶς (L) at *Ion* 1333 (see Owen *ad loc.*), and the only other occurrence of the adverb in tragedy is at *Hcld.* 1055 and this line was suspected by Barrett. However, we can also point to οὐδὲν τρανῶς at 40 below, and οὐ τορῶς at 656.

36 ἀλλ' ἦ Bothe's emendation gives the best sense; 'Why, are you frightened by etc.?'. See Denniston *GP* 27.

Κρονίου Πανὸς Accounts of Pan's parentage vary.[237] 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 παππωνυμικὸν ὅτι Διὸς ὡς τὸν Ἀχιλλέα Αἰακίδην. 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 | ἢ Πανὸς ὀργὰς ἤ τινος θεῶν 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 Πανὸς ἴμάσθλῃ. 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. τρομερᾶι | 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. [φυλακὰς..|..στρατίαν] see note on 16ff.

41 Cf. *Il.* 10.12, of Agamemnon, θαύμαζεν πυρὰ πολλά, τὰ καίετο Ἰλιόθι πρό.

Ἀργόλας is a synonym for Ἀργεῖος. Cf. E. fr.630 (Nauck) and Ar. fr.311 (Kassel-Austin).

42f. πᾶσαν ἀν' ὄρφναν Here ἀνα has a temporal force; 'the whole night long' (cf. 95). ὄρφνη 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 δι' ὀρφναίην, 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 ἐννύχιος with θορύβωι at 45, and ἔννυχος with φρυκτωρία at 55. Cf.

the use of εὐφρόνη (92n.).

διειπετῆ Papyri commonly mix up ι and ει. διειπετῆ 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' (πίπτω), 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. διοπετὴς ὅπως | ἀστὴρ at E. fr. 971.1f.). At Alcman fr. 3.67 it is also used of a star falling through shining heaven. *Etm. Mag.* explains (αἰθὴρ) διειπετέστερος 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' ἐφιέμενοι βάξιν The long iota in ἐφιέμενοι 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 ἐφοβήθη 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. ὕποπτον at 79. At A. *Ag.* 489-92 the chorus of old men display suspicion about the nature of the fire signal.

50 ἦλυθον 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 troch. 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 (*Il.* 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 *Il.* 8.175ff., 12.235-6 and 13.825ff.) and partly from consciousness of his own might, which makes him egotistical (54 ὅμμα τοὐμὸν, 55, 56 and 65 με, 63 κ'ἀγὼ, as well as 58 τῶιδ'...δορί and 62 τῆιδε 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' ἐκποδών μοι στῆθι (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 Cantica*$_2$ (1928) 167. There are no significant metrical problems in the stanza. Nauck's ὅδ' in 197 and Seidler's excision of δέ in 199 provide exact responsion.

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

Dochmiacs occur in every extant tragedy (see West 108ff.) and are associated with outbursts of tension and excitment. 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; σὺ μὲν αὐτοῦ ἐρύκακε πάντας ἀρίστους, | αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κεῖσ' εἶμι 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 φατέ; τίς ὑμῶν φησιν; ἢ τίς οὐ θέλει | - φθέγξασθε - 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 ἐν [τοῖσι] Πέρσηισι αἱ ἀγαθοεργίαι ἐς τὸ πρόσω μεγάθεος τιμῶνται. Cf. also the reward of the εὐεργέτης Zopyrus 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. σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ οὐχ ἅλιος σκοπὸς ἔσσομαι οὐδ' ἀπὸ δόξης. | τόφρα γὰρ ἐς στρατὸν εἶμι διαμπερές, ὄφρ' ἂν ἵκωμαι | νῆ' Ἀγαμεμνονέην, ὅθι που μέλλουσιν ἄριστοι | βουλὰς βουλεύειν κτλ. with *Rh.* 155f. πάντ' .. ἐκμαθὼν .. | ἥξω). 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

[238]See Menzer (1867) 13, M. Pohlenz *Die griechische Tragödie*$_2$ (1954) 472, C.D. Beck (1824) 261, R. Morstadt (1827) 47, P. Albert *De Rheso Tragoedia* (1876)14, A.C. Pearson *CR* 35 (1921) 59, A. Lesky *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*$_3$ (1972) 144 and G. Björck *Arctos* 1 (1954) 17.

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 *σοφοῦ παρ' ἀνδρός*. 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 *Il.* 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. *Il.* 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 φιλόπτολις, 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.[239] There is also the foundation of a contrast between these horses of Ach. which are D.'s planned

[239]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 witholds 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 naïve.

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 (ἐς *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 (*κἀκεῖθεν* 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. πρεπόντως (202) and πρέπουσαν (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 practise 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,[242] 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 ἐς καιρὸν ἥκεις Cf. E. *Hec.* 666, *Hi.* 899, *HF* 701, *Tro.* 744, *Hel.* 1081, *Ph.* 106 and *Or.* 384, and καιρὸν γὰρ ἥκεις at *Hyps.* 60.27 (see Bond *ad loc.*). R. (251ff.) calls this phrase 'characteristically Euripidean', but cf. καιρὸν δ' ἐφήκεις at S. *Aj.* 34 and ἐς αὐτὸν καιρὸν .. | πάρεισιν at *ib.* 1168. ἥκεις has more immediacy than ἦλθες, which was probably written under the influence of ἦλυθον ἄγγελος (cf. ἀγγέλων 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 ἥκω.

καίπερ ἀγγέλλων φόβον 'although you bring alarming news'.

54 ἀρεῖσθαι Fut. inf. middle after μέλλουσι, restored by Wecklein. The lengthening of the initial α comes from the contraction of the fut. middle of ἀείρω, the Ionic form of αἴρω. Cf. A. *Pe.* 660 and *Se.* 759 (both in lyric). For the phrase ἀρεῖσθαι φυγὴν cf. 126 αἴρωνται φυγήν and A. *Pe.* 481 αἴρονται φυγήν (αἴρονται Elmsley (see *ad* E. *Hcld.* 505) αἰροῦνται 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 αἴρεσθαι πόλεμον (fr. 50), αἴρεσθαι κίνδυνον (*Hcld.* 504)'. This is so, but we also find, with the same sense, πόλεμον ἄρασθαι at A. *Su.* 342, πόλεμος αἴρεται 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 <ποτι>σαίνουσα* [Hermann] *τὸ πρῶτον παράγει | βροτὸν εἰς ἀρκύστ<ατ>' Ἄτα* and S. fr. 577.3f. (*Teucr.*) *ἢ δ' ἄρ' ἐν σκότωι λήθουσά με | ἔσαιν' Ἐρινὺς ἡδοναῖς ἐψευσμένον*, or negative, as at E. *Ion* 685.

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

56 *ὦ δαῖμον*. *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 means 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 *ὦ στυγνὲ δαῖμον, ὡς ἄρ' ἐψευσας φρενῶν | 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.

εὐτυχοῦντ' The verb reflects H.'s frustration well because *εὐτυχέω* is used of prosperity which comes from the gods. See esp. Pindar *I.* 3.1-6 for the sentiment, E. *Tro.* 1162 *Ἕκτορος μὲν εὐτυχοῦντος εἰς δόρυ* 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 *ἐγὼ δὲ κύων*. 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 *ὁμοῦ ἅρδην* 'altogether' (cf. *PV* 1051), and this is the sense required.

59f. †*ξυνέσχον*†. *ξυνέχω* means to hold something together and

requires an object so the reading is difficult to accept. Perhaps Wecklein's *'ξέλειπον* should be read. R. (p.243) notes the similarity of constuction between 59-62 and E. *Alc.* 360ff. *μ' οὔθ' ὁ...κύων | οὔθ'...ἂν Χάρων | ἔσχ' ἄν πρὶν ἐς φῶς σὸν καταστῆσαι βίον.*

60 *οὔτἂν* Attic crasis for *οὔ τοι ἄν.* The enclitic particle *τοι* has the force of 'be sure' (see Denniston *GP* 547). For the crasis cf. Brunck's *οὐ τἄν* at S. *OC* 1351.

εὐτυχοῦν δόρυ cf. 58 *τῶιδ'...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.* 8.535f. *ἐμὸν ἔγχος |...ἐπερχόμενον*, and the vivid personification at *Il.* 11.574 [*δοῦρα*] *ἐν γαίηι ἵσταντο, λιλαιόμενα χροὸς ἆσαι.* Cf. also *Il.* 8.493ff., 16.834f. and 19.387ff.

61 *πρίν ναῦς πυρῶσαι* 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 πρὶν πὰρ νηῶν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι, | πρὶν πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπρῆσαι, κτεῖναι δὲ καὶ αὐτούς* (cf. also *ib.* 9.240ff.). The ship of Protesilaus is the first to be burned at *Il.* 16.122f.

62 *τῇιδε πολυφόνωι χερί* Cf. 465f. *πολυφόνου | χειρὸς* and E. *HF* 420 *πολυφόνου κύνα*. The adj. is rare but the formation is not remarkable. Cf. also 222 *οὐδ' ἀναιμάκτωι χερὶ*.

63ff. *κἀγὼ μὲν...| ἐν νυκτί...| ἀλλ'* There is strong emphasis in the positioning of these words as H. 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...ἀλλά* see Denniston *GP* 5.

63 *ἦ* Barrett points out at E. *Hi*. 700 that the first person form *ἦ* was by far the more common form in the fifth century, and that *ἦν* was positively avoided 'even when metrically convenient'. However cf. E. *Alc.* 655 *ἦν ἐγώ σοι*, which is printed by Diggle to avoid correption (see also Jackson *CQ* 35 (1941) 170f.). Against this, and in favour of Nauck's *ἦ γεγώς σοι* see Dale *ad loc.*

ἰέναι δόρυ Cf. the same periphrasis at E. *Pho.* 1247.

64 *χρῆσθαί τ' εὐτυχεῖ ῥύμηι 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. ἀλλ' οἳ σοφοί...| μάντεις 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...ἔπεισαν The incorrect reading of VO (Attic aor. 3rd pl. is ἔφασαν) is probably an aural error for ἔπεισαν which led to the alteration of με to μοι in 65.

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

θυοσκόος in Homer means specifically a sacrificing priest (*Il.* 24.221 ἢ οἳ μάντιές εἰσι θυοσκόοι ἢ ἱερῆες). Cf. also E. *Ba.* 224, of the Maenads. *LSJ* etymologises the word as θυοσ-σ-κοϝ- cf. κοέω = *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

(see also 510-11n.). At *Il.* 14.81 Agamemnon expresses no shame at the idea of fleeing under cover of night: *βέλτερον ὃς φεύγων προφύγηι κακὸν ἠὲ ἁλώηι.*

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

70 ἀλλ' 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.: *ἀλλ' ὥς τις τούτων γε βέλος καὶ οἴκοθι πέσσηι, | βλήμενος ἢ ἰῶι ἢ ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι | νηὸς ἐπιθρώισκων.*

72 ὡς ἄν 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..|..ῥάνηι The sing. of *τις* is commonly used with a pl. reference. Cf. E. *Hec.* 650 *στένοι δὲ καὶ τις ἀμφὶ...Εὐρώταν* and *Il.* 2.382ff.

καὶ νεὼς θρώισκων ἔπι i.e. even in the very act of escaping. Cf. 100 κἀπιθρώισκοντας νεῶν. Cf. also A. *Pe.* 358f., where the messenger reports the deceitful plan of the Greeks to fake escape by sea: ἀλλὰ σέλμασιν ναῶν ἐπανθορόντες. νεῶν (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 νῶτον χαραχθεὶς Cf. Pindar *P.* 1.28, where Typhon's back is ripped by his rocky bed under Aetna στρωμνὰ δὲ χαράσσοισ' ἅπαν νῶτον ποτικεκλιμένον κεντεῖ. This is a particularly savage phrase. Traslate '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 οἳ δ' are those who may survive H.'s onslaught. Making defeated enemies till one's soil was an established punishment in the ancient world. Cf. Herod. 1.66.3-4.

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

75 Φρυγῶν Trojans could be tantamount to Phrygians. Cf. Ἀργεῖοι and Ἀχαιοί 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

G. Björck *Das Alpha impurum* (1950) 114ff.).

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 γάρ 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).

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

79 ὕποπτον See 49n.

80 H. tries to shame the chorus into agreement by implying that they are cowards. Cf. E. *Hi.* 519 πάντ' ἂν φοβηθεῖσ' ἴσθι· δειμαίνεις 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 | τροπάς, and A. *Ag.* 1237 ἐν μάχης τροπῆι.

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' ἐχθροῖς to produce a general motto (*pace* Vater). Cf. E. (*Arcelaus*) fr. 253 ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος, μὴ λέγ' εὖ, A. *Cho.* 554 ἁπλοῦς 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_2, the scholion, *CP* 2373 and Basil. Cf. 99 below and E. *Or.* 926 μήθ' ὁπλίζεσθαι χέρα.

85f. The chorus expect Aen. to bring news, but he does not. (see p.44f. above). καὶ μήν is used regularly to indicate the arrival of a new character in drama, often with the demonstrative pronoun, the phrase σπουδῆι 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.

Αἰνέας 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 δέμας in periphrases see H. Burkhardt *Die Archaismen des Euripides* (1906) 90.

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

σέθεν The reading of L (τὸ σὸν) 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: (ἐλπίδα) στήσουσι and S. *OT* 699 μῆνιν...στήσας.

εὐφρόνην 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 δοκοῦσιν, where he admits he is guessing after Aeneas has requested proof.

94 For the desire for proof cf. E. *IT* 1164 τί τοὐκδιδάξαν τοῦτό σ; ἢ δόξαν 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.

εὐσέλμων 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 φυγῆι at the beginning of the line stresses that the Greeks' departure will be in flight, not in victory. Cf. φεύγοντας 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' ὅς 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 ὅς with the interrogative cf. S. *OT* 1174 ὡς πρὸς τί χρείας.

πρὸς τάδ' 'in that case'. Cf. S. *Phil.* 568f. πῶς οὖν Ὀδυσσεὺς πρὸς τάδ' οὐκ αὐτάγγελος | πλεῖν ἦν ἑτοῖμος; Otherwise the phrase implies indifference to what has previously been said (see Hutchinson on A. *Se.* 312).

ὁπλίζηι 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 βαρύς. 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. *Hcld*. 4.

102 αἰσχρόν...κακόν 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. θεοῦ διδόντος 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 θεῶν διδόντων οὐκ ἂν ἐκφύγοις κακά. Just as κακά serves as the object of both διδόντων and ἐκφύγοις in A. *Se*. 719, so πολεμίους here serves as the object of both διδόντος and ἐᾶσαι.

ἄνευ μάχης | φεύγειν cf. *Il*. 8.512 μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδί γε νεῶν ἐπιβαῖεν ἕκηλοι.

105 The sense is 'If only you were as wise as you are valiant'. It is a gentle reproach, explained in 106-8. The scholion contrasts S. fr.896 Radt; εἴθ' ἦσθα σώφρων ἔργα τοῖς λόγοις ἴσα. Cf. also E. *Hcld*. 731 εἴθ' ἦσθα δυνατὸς δρᾶν ὅσον πρόθυμος εἶ.

ὡς δρᾶσαι χερί sc. e.g. ἀγαθός, to balance εὔβουλος. See K-G 2.10. The infinitive is thus sound (*pace* Porter).

106ff. 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 γάρ marks the non-fulfillment of a wish. See Denniston *GP* 104.

αὖτὸς...βροτῶν The phrase is sound 'The same one among men'.

109 ὅστις = individual after generic.

110 φλέγειν There are three problems with retaining the reading φεύγειν: 1) It leaves πυρὸς λαμπτῆρας dependent on κλυὼν which does not take an acc. when it means 'hearing about'; 2) ἐξήρθης would have to govern φεύγειν Ἀχαιούς 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 φεύγω at the start of lines 100 and 104 may have influenced a scribe to write φεύγειν.

ἄγειν A fut. infin. normally follows μέλλω but it often controls the pres. and the aor. with a sense different from the fut.

111 *τάφρους* 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 αὐλῶνα περίδρομον στρατοῦ*, of the same ditch. It means 'hollow' at S. fr.549 and 'strait' at *PV* 731.

113 *κυρήσεις* O has the aor. subj. *κυρήσηις*, but the fut. indic. conveys the conditional more vividly. For *κυρέω* with the acc. cf. A. *Cho.* 214, 714 and *Se.* 699. See also Schwyzer *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 βλέψαντα καὶ λόγχης ἀκμὴν* 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 μέν* is balanced by *νικῶν δ'* in 119.

τήνδε μὴ οὐ μόλῃς πόλιν We must assume the ellipse of δέδοικα here. The readings of ΔQ and Tr_3 cannot stand because of the omission of οὐ. Reiske objected to πόλιν because the action is not set at Troy itself and suggested πάλιν (adopted by Diggle). However, this also necessitates a change of τήνδε. 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 ἱππηλάται 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 ἡνίοχος, 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 ἦν ἆρα 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 ἆρα in place of ἄρα cf. S. *El.* 1179, *OC* 409, E. *El.* 1229 and see Denniston *GP* 45.

ἀντύγων χνόας The word ἄντυξ 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 πελάζων ἄντυγι ξυνείπετο. Cf. also S. *El.* 745f. ἔθραυσε δ' ἄξονος μέσας χνόας | κἀξ ἀντύγων ὤλισθε. We see from Call. *Hy.* 3.140 ἄντυγες αἵ τέ σε ῥεῖα θηητὴν φορέουσι that ἄντυγες 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 νικῶν δ'...ἕξεις ἔχω + pres. part. = future.

ἔφεδρον 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

Troy. Cf. A. *Cho.* 866. It appears in the plural at E. *Pho.* 1095. On wrestling generally see Gardiner *JHS* 25 (1905) 14-31.

120f. The fut. indic. *οὐκ ἐάσει* shows Aeneas' certainty that Achilles will resist.

ὧδ' Ἀχαιούς...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 *πεπύρωται* was not a simple omission of *γ*, but written under the influence of *αἴθων*. On the metaphorical use of *πυργόω* (not in S.) see Bond on E. *HF* 238 *σὺ μὲν λέγ' ἡμᾶς οἷς πεπύργωσαι λόγοις*. and cf. A. *Pe.* 192 *χὴ μὲν τῆιδ' ἐπυργοῦτο 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 μέν* is answered by *κατάσκοπον δὲ* in 125.

124 *ἐκ πόνων ἀρειφάτων* The variant *κόπων* is common in *Κοινή* and more likely to be a gloss on *πόνων* than *vice versa*, although the corruption could easily be a calligraphic slip. *ἀρείφατος* is formed from *Ἄρης* 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. *ἀρειφάτων...| ἀγώνων*. See also 25n. above on *τρομερᾶι*.

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 κἀγὼ καὶ κατοπτῆρας στρατοῦ | ἔπεμψα, τοὺς πέποιθα μὴ ματᾶν δδῶι·* and E. *Hcld.* 337f. *πρῶτα μὲν σκοποὺς | πέμψω πρὸς αὐτόν, μὴ λάθηι με προσπεσών*. A scout informed Od. of Ajax' mad behaviour at S. *Ai.* 29f.

126 *αἴρωνται 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 τῶνδ' ἀκούσας οὔ τι μὴ ληφθῶ δόλωι*.

129 *κατασκόπου* 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 ἡγεμὼν θρασύς.

οὐ φιλῶ For this use of the first person cf. Theognis 579 and 581 ἐχθαίρω κακὸν ἄνδρα..|..| ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον and Archil. 114 (West) οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν 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 H. was called ἄναξ. Specifically στρατηγός is used of Rh. at 298 and 642, and of H. at 670. Athena refers to Rh. as Θρήικιος 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...κατόπταν The adjective is a ἅπ. λεγ., but is not an unlikely compound. Cf. ἁβροβάται at A. *Pe.* 1072.

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

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

136 κατ' ἀντίπρωιρα ναυστάθμων When the ships were beached, their prows pointed landwards and the camp was set in front of those prows. For ἀντίπρωιρα used absolutely cf. E. *El.* 846 ἔστησαν

ἀντίπρωιρα σείοντες βέλη.

138 κοίμα Pierson's suggestion gives the best sense (cf. 662 κοιμήσων στρατόν), κόσμει (OL) does not. The army is to be calmed, not marshalled, as ἂν κινοῖτ' indicates (*pace* Paley).[243] 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.

139 νυκτέρους The adjective has 2 terminations elsewhere: O's reading is an obvious assimilation.

142 σὺ πάντ' ἀκούσηι καὶ παρὼν εἴσηι λόγον 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' ... εἴσηι λόγον cf. E. *El.* 346 τὸν πάντα δ' εἴσηι μῦθον.

143 For ὁρμώμενοι with ἐς φυγήν cf. Thuc. 4.14.1.

144f. σάλπιγγος αὐδὴν προσδοκῶν καραδόκει, | ὡς οὐ μενοῦντα μ'· '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. ἀνῆιξε δ' ὀρθὸς λαὸς εἰς ἔριν λόγων, | ἡμεῖς μὲν ὡς νικῶντα δεσπότην ἐμόν and *Ion* 965 ὡς τὸν θεὸν σώσοντα τόν γ' αὑτοῦ γονόν.

[243]The army is not actually marshalled until 986-7, when all the damage has been done.

145f. As in the *Il.* H. is anxious to get to grips with the enemy. Cf. *Il.* 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 *μει* and *μι* in this verb. The spelling appears in inscriptions after E. (see West *Aeschylus Tragoediae* xlviii).

νεῶν | δλκοῖσι is a periphrasis for *ναυστάθμοις*. The *δλκοί* 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 πρυμνῆισι νέεσσι* (*Il.*14.51) and *ἐπὶ πρύμνησι μάχοντο* (*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. *ἀσφαλῶς* picks up Aeneas' request for *ἀσφαλὲς τεκμήριον* in 94 and the chorus' dislike of *σφαλερά...κράτη* at 132.

148 *ὅταν δέηι* 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 λόχωι 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*$_2$ (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 ὑπασπισταί 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 chidren 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 ὢν λόγου* at 641 below, of Paris, who is off stage. Cf. also S. fr. 314 (*Ichneutai*) 39f. *[ὡς εἴτε ποι]μὴν εἴτ' ἀγρωστή[ρων τις ἢ | μαριλοκαυ]τῶν ἐν λόγωι παρ[ίσταται.*[244]

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 ἔργον ὑποσχόμενος τελέσειε.*

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 γαίας* D. starts with a confident, patriotic

[244] At Ar. *Av.* 30 *ὦνδρες οἱ 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. *Hcld.* 148f. κίνδυνον ἐξ ἀμηχάνων ῥίπτοντες.

157 ἥξω· 'πὶ τούτοις. ἥξω 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,[245] 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

[245] He compares [Dem.] 25.36 τί γὰρ οὐκ ἐξελήλεγκται τούτων ἐπὶ πάντων πολλάκις.

(with ἐπωνύμωι δὲ κάρτα), *Ag.* 681-90 and 1080ff., A. *Eum.* 90f. Ἑρμῆ, φύλασσε· κάρτα δ' ὢν ἐπώνυμος | πομπαῖος ἴσθι., S. *Ai.* 430f., *Ant.* 110f., E. *Pho.* 636f. and *Ba.* 367.

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

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

μέν V alone preserves what is surely the correct reading given the sequence πονεῖν ... πονούντα δέ.

162f. μισθὸν φέρεσθαι ... | κερδος Even in the epic, the idea of the gift of horses is regarded as a payment for the spying mission. See *Il.* 10.304 δώρωι ἔπι μεγάλωι; μισθὸς δέ οἱ ἄρκιος ἔσται.

163 ἔργωι For ἔργον as a patriotic deed cf. Alcaeus 34

(Lobel and Page).

τὴν χάριν τίκτει διπλῆν 'produces mutual gratitude' (cf. S. *Ant.* 14 μιᾶι θανόντοιν ἡμέραι διπλῆι 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 κοὐκ ἄλλως λέγω is very much an Euripidean tag (see R. 206). Cf. 271 below, *Hec.* 302, *El.* 1035 (μῶρον 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 ἐρεῖς and οὐκ ἄλλως ἐρῶ respectively. Outside tragedy the phrase occurs only paratragically at Ar. *Ran.* 1140.

165 τάξαι δὲ μισθόν The δέ here stands for οὖν. See Denniston *GP* 170.

πλὴν ἐμῆς τυραννίδος Σ here reads γελοῖον τὸ οἴεσθαι ὅτι βασιλείαν αἰτήσει. 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.

πολιόχου 'protecting the city' (cf. 821 ὦ πολίοχον κράτος). -οχος, 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. πολιούχος (V, cf. A. *Se.* 312f. and *ib.* 822f.), πολιάοχος (cf. Pind. *Pae.* 10.12 and A. *Se.* 109) and πολιέοχος in *CEG* 235.

167 σὺ δ' ἀλλὰ ... γενοῦ. Here δ' ἀλλὰ means 'Well then' (see Denniston *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 ὣς γαμέω· ὃ δ' Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλον ἐλέσθω, | ὅς τις οἱ τ' ἐπέοικε καὶ ὃς βασιλεύτερός ἐστιν. For the sentiment that it is wisest to marry within one's own social degree cf. *PV* 890 τὸ κηδεῦσαι καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀριστεύει μακρῶι. Cf. also Call. ep. 1.11-16 and Pindar *Py.* 2.33f. On γαμεῖν

ἐκ 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.

αἰτήσεις Porter defends V's αἰτήσηι but 'even the future indicative with εἰ may be used in a present condition if it expresses merely a present intention' (Goodwin *M&T.* §407-8).

171 Ἴλιον Diggle rightly observes (*Eur.* 324 n.9) that the nom. Ἴλιον should be preferred to Ἴλιος 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 ὅσα τε πτόλις ἥδε κέκευθε. In the epic the proverbial wealth of Troy had been greatly reduced since the advent of the Greeks (see *Il.* 18.288-92).

173 δώσω· 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' ἀπόσχωνται.

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

Οἰλέως is scanned - -. For the form cf. E. *IA* 193 and 263. We find Ὀϊλῆος .. υἱός 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.

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

176 D.'s assumption is that the captive will work his land (see note on 74f. above).

177 ἀποινᾶσθαι is the middle of ἀποινᾶν 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; ἀποινᾶν· 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.[246] 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 μὴν sets off a new train of thought and may be a slight display of impatience. γε emphasises λαφύρων. The particles are repeated at 184 with a more adversative force.

αὐτὸς αἱρήσῃι παρών 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).[247] 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); θεοῖς λάφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ' Ἑλλάδα | δόμοις ἐπασσάλευσαν. Cf. also E. *Hcld.* 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. ἵππους 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

χρὴ...πονεῖν Cf. 161. There is great irony here because D. himself is not worthy of the horses.

183 *ἐν κύβοισι 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 δ' ἐν κύβοις Ἄρης 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 μήν 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 φόβοισί γ' αὐτὸν ἐξελυσάμην*.

ἐρῶντι γ' ἀντερᾶις 'You are a rival in desire to me who also desire the horses'. The verb *ἀντεράω* is used like this at Plut. *Lycurg.* 18.4.7 *τὸ ἀντερᾶν 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 ἀντερώντων ἵμέρωι*

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).

πεπληγμένοι) the participle means 'those who love in return'. At 839 below (ἵππων ἐρασθείς), 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. μή μ' ἔρως ἕλοι | τοιοῦτος ἵππων κτλ. When ἐράω 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 ἐρᾶν). 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 συννικᾶις ἐμοί and *Hcld.* 26f. ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν φεύγουσι συμφεύγω τέκνοις | κἀι σὺν κακῶς πράσσουσι συμπράσσω 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).

αὐτὸς See p.38 n.82 above.

188 ὃς λέγουσι Cf. λόγος ἦν 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 δώσω δέ σοι. Cf. *Il.* 10.305 δώσω γὰρ δίφρον τε δύω. 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 οἴκοις κτῆμα cf. 620 κάλλιστον οἴκοις σκῦλον, and E. *Pho.* 88 ὦ κλεινὸν οἴκοις ... θάλος. For the dat. cf. E. *El.* 1003 καλὸν δὲ κέκτημαι δόμοις. 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 *αἰνῶ·* 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 *δέχεσθαι*, but it must stand second in its clause. See K-G 1.242 and cf. Thuc. 1.11.2.2, *ῥαιδίως ἂν μάχηι 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. *εὔσπλαγχνος* appears in a fr. of A. at *P.Oxy.* 2246.34, and we find a number of tragic words ending in *-σπλαγχνος* (A. *Se.* 237 *κακοσπλάγχνους*, S. *Aj.* 472 *ἄσπλαγχνος*, *Ant.* 511 *δμοσπλάγχνους*, E. *Me.* 109 *μεγαλόσπλαγχνος* and *Hi.* 424 *θρασύσπλαγχνος*). 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*ₛ (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.[249] There are also examples of characters remaining silent on stage for long periods of dialogue.[250] 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 ἀγών refers to D.'s mission and μεγάλα to the reward he hopes to win.

[249]See Taplin (1977) 110-113 and cf. Creon at S. *Ant.* 582-630, Oedipus at S. *OC* 1211-1248, Theseus at E. *Hi*. 1268-1282, Hecuba at E. *Hec*. 905-951 and Hecuba at E. *Tro*. 511-571.

[250]E.g. Lycus and Amphitryon at E. *HF* 252-331.

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 ... | πέλειν 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' ἀνδράσιν (for δέ without a previous μέν where the contrast is obvious, see Denniston *GP* 165). But what do τά...τά 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' ἀνδράσιν the rewards offered by H. However this interpretation is too forced, especially for the imperative ἐπιδέτω. Lattimore supplies σε with ἐπιδέτω 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 *παρ' ἀνέρων* (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 A. *Se.* 415f. *Δίκη δ' ὁμαίμων κάρτά νιν προστέλλεται | εἴργειν τεκούσηι 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 Aeneas; 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 *ἄν* For the opt. with *ἄν* expressing a fixed resolve see Jebb on S. *Ant.* 1108 *ὧδ' ὡς ἔχω στείχοιμ' ἄν. στείχοιμ' ἄν* 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 *ἐλθόντ' ἐς δόμους ἐφέστιον*. Cf. also E. *Me.* 712f. *μ(ε) ..| δέξαι δὲ χώραι καὶ δόμοις ἐφέστιον* and A. *Ag.* 851f. *δόμους ἐφεστίος | ἐλθὼν*, and see Hutchinson on A. *Se.* [73].

202 *καθάψομαι* 'I shall cover'. For the construction cf. *Anth. Pal.* 9.19, *ὃ πρὶν ὑπαὶ μίτραις κῶλα καθαψάμενος*, where the aorist middle is used as if it were a passive (cf. E. fr. 752.2 *νεβρῶν*

δοραῖς καθαπτός). At S. *Tra.* 1051f. the verb means 'fasten to' καθῆψεν ὤμοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς ..|.. ἀμφίβληστρον. It appears with a preposition at E. *Ion* 1006 ἐν τῶι καθάψασ' ἀμφὶ παιδὶ σώματος;.

203 ἥσω ... πόδα cf. 798 ἵεσαν...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 ἧκα δ' ἐγὼ καθύπερθε πόδας καὶ χεῖρε φέρεσθαι at *Od.* 12.442 'I let my hands and feet go from above' is quite different, and that any attempt to read ποῖ δ' ἥσω πόδα or ποῖ πόδα δ' ἥσω for the corrupt ποῖ [or πῇ] δ' ἥσω; at E. *Hec.* 163 on the basis of either *Rh.* 203 or 798 is invalid (Diggle suggests ποῖ δὴ σωθῶ there).

204 ἐπεὶ τίν' ἄλλην...στολήν; For the use of ἐπεί plus τίς Paley compares A. *Cho.* 214 ἐπεὶ τί νῦν ἔκατι δαιμόνων κυρῶ; and E. *Or.* 526 ἐπεὶ τίν' εἶχες, ὦ τάλας, ψυχὴν τότε. στολήν 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 (κλωπικὰς ἕδρας). 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. *γῆρυν .. κλύων | σοφὴν σοφοῦ παρ' ἀνδρός.*

207 *σαγή* Cf., also in context of disguise, A. *Cho.* 560 *ξένωι γὰρ εἰκώς, παντελῆ σαγὴν ἔχων.*

208 *νῶτ' ἐνάψομαι* Cobet (*Variae lectiones*$_2$ (1873) 583) objects to *νῶτον ἅψομαι* (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' ἀμφίβολά σοι τάδ' ἀνῆψα.* It is conjectured by Scaliger at E. *HF* 549 *θανάτου τάδ' ἤδη περιβόλαι' ἐνήμμεθα* (*ἀνήμμεθα* 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. ξανθὸν κρᾶτ' ἐπινωτίσας | δεινοῦ χάσματι θηρός.

211f. τετράπουν The ε 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 θηρὸς ὀρεστέρου | τιθέμενος ἐπὶ χεῖρα κατ' ἴχνος; (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 κελεύθου, is probably too metaphorical to use as a parallel.

213 νεῶν 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, [τετρ]ασκελής γ' ἆρ' ἢ δίβαμ[ος ἔρχεται;]. By way of analogy Musgrave compares Pind. *Py.* 9.20 παλιμβάμους ὁδούς. Cf. also E. *Tro.* 517, of the Trojan horse, τετραβάμονος ὡς ὑπ' ἀπήνας, and *Hel.* 375 τετραβάμοσι γυίοις.

For τῆιδε 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.

ὁ 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 ἀλλά σ' ὁ Μαίας πομπαῖος ἄναξ | πελάσειε δόμοις (cf. also A. *Eum.* 90f.). Hermes is also a lover of the guileful who is here asked to escort the guileful Dolon.[251] Cf. S. *Phil.* 133 Ἑρμῆς δ' ὁ πέμπων δόλιος ἡγήσαιτο νῶιν, and S. *El.* 1394 Ἑρμῆς σφ' ἄγει δόλον σκότωι, and for Ἑρμῆν τὸν κλέπτη see *CIG* 2299. He also escorted the dead as ψυχοπομπός (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; ἐκεῖσε, but not πάλιν.

217 ὅς 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, φηλόω and φῆλος, and therefore to be connected with σφάλλω (cf. A. *Ag.* 492 ἐφήλωσεν E. *Su.* 243 φηλούμενοι). However, as M. West observes

[251] It is known from a vase painting (Beazley *ARV*₂ 319.5; see p.16f. above) that Hermes was also in the pre-Iliadic version of D.'s exploits.

at Hes. *OD* 375 (ὃς δὲ γυναικὶ πέποιθε, πέποιθ' ὅ γε φιλήτησιν) 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) τ[ῆι] δὲ γίγνεται Ἑρμ[ῆς] φιλήτης, ὅτι αὐτῆι φιλησίμ[ως] συνεκοιμ[ᾶτο. Cf. also Archil. 46. Ancient grammarians connected the word to ὑφείλετο (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 - οἴσω - φήσεις - ἥξω. 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 570f.), and because the corruption of τε to τοι is any easy one when καί follows (cf., e.g., E. *Alc.* 38).

219f. κτανὼν Ὀδυσσέως | οἴσω κάρα σοι For the syntax cf. 258ff. κτανὼν δ' Ἀγαμεμνόνιον | κρᾶτ' ἐνέγκοι | Ἑλέναι.

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

222 παῖδα is the obj. of κτανών (219).

ἀναιμάκτωι The adj. is found once in A. (*Su.* 196) and once in E. (*Pho.* 264). For the expression cf. 62 above τῶιδε πολυφόνωι 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.

φάος is the subject of μολεῖν. Cf. 78 αἴθειν .. στρατόν.

D. now makes his exit back to Troy and the guards, alone for the first time, sing the first stasimon.

224-263 First Stasimon[252]

224-232~233-241: first strophe and antistrophe.

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 *LM*$_2$ 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.[253]

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 Δ and two syllables shorter in Λ. Despite the variety of readings at the end of 256, there is a uniform number of syllables. The fault lies in the strophe. *σπανία*, 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.

224-263 The development of the stasimon mirrors the development of D.s mission from that of a spy (154-218) to that of an assassin (219-23). The guards spend the first strophe invoking Apollo as D.'s guide, using imperatives and a succession of adjectives (226-9 *μόλε τοξή-|ρης, ἵκοῦ ἐννύχιος, | καὶ γενοῦ*

[252]For the schemata see p.53f. above. See also A.M. Dale *MATC* 21.1,96, O. Schroeder *Euripidis Cantica*$_2$ (1928) 167f., R. 300-5 and 338, W. Jens *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (1971) 113, T.C.W. Stinton *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (1990) 339 and Wilamowitz *GV* 583f.

[253]See Collard on E. *Hec.* 905-52.

σωτήριος, 230f. ξύλλαβε ..|.. ὦ παγκρατές, ὦ ..|.. 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 ἵκοιτο, 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 ἕλοι, 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 πόντιος Αἰακίδαι | Πηλεῖ δίδωσι δαίμων with 187f. δίδωσι δ' αὐτὸς πωλοδαμνήσας ἄναξ | Πηλεῖ Ποσειδῶν; 242f. with 154f.; 255ff. τετράπουν | μῖμον ἔχων ἐπιγαίου | θηρός with 211f. τετράπουν μιμήσομαι | λύκου κέλευθον and 258f. κτανὼν δ' Ἀγαμεμνόνιον | κρᾶτ' ἐνέγκοι | Ἑλέναι with 219f. κτανὼν Ὀδυσσέα | οἴσω 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 ὦ .. ὦ, 242 πρό τ' .. πρό τε, 249f. ἔστι .. ἔστιν, 251 ἔνι .. ἐν and 261 ὃς ἐπὶ .. ὃς ἐπὶ. Cf. also 131 τάδε .. τάδε, 195 μέγας .. μεγάλα, 345f. ἥκεις .. | ἥκεις, 455 φίλα .. φίλος, 527 τίνος ..

τίς and 906f. ἄλοιτο ..| ἄλοιτο.

The ode opens with an address to Apollo who is a strong supporter of Troy in the *Il.* (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 ὦ Φοῖβ' Ἄπολλον 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 *Il.* 16.514 κλῦθι, ἄναξ, ὅς που 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' (Vg1 ὦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Διὸς κεφαλή) cf. *PV* 619, E. *Hec.* 461, *Ion* 200 and *Ba.* 245. The use of the word 'head' in addresses

[254] See G.W. Elderkin *CPh* (1935) 349f., Farnell *ib.* 113-23, W. Burkert *RhM* 118 (1975) 4, *Homo Necans* (1983) 108, *Greek Religion* (1985) 145, W.E. Higgins *PP* 31 (1976) 201ff., R.P. Eckels *Greek Wolf Lore* (1937) 63f. and T.R. Bryce *CJ* 86 (1990) 144-9, and cf. *Il.* 4.101, A. *Ag.* 1257, *Se.* 146f., *Su.* 686f., S. *OT* 919 and *El.* 6f., 645, 655, 1379, Paus. 2.19.3 (see P. Gardner & R.S. Poole *CGC Peloponnese* (1887) liii, 136ff., plates 27, 28 and C.M. Kraay *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (1976) 96) and 10.14.7.

displays warmth and familiarity, as befits the relationship between Apollo and the Trojans. Cf. 902f. ὦ φιλία | φιλία κεφαλά. In Homer we find φίλη κεφαλή (*Il.* 8.281) and ἠθείη κεφαλή (*Il.* 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 ὦ κακὸν κάρα, and cf. also A. *Ag.* 905, S. *Ant.* 1.

226f. μόλε τοξή-|ρης '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 (*Il.* 1.14 and *ib.* 45-49).

227 ἵκοῦ ἐννύχιος 'come in the night'. Apollo is not a god who comes much by night. The poet may well be imitating *Il.* 1.47 ὃ δ' ἤϊε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς, 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. Ἑρμῆ χθόνιε,... | σωτὴρ γενοῦ μοι ξύμμαχος τ' αἰτουμένωι, A. *Se.* 146f. and E. *Alc.* 377. For the format καὶ γενοῦ in prayer cf. E. *Alc.* 223f., also addressed to Apollo, καὶ νῦν | λυτήριος ἐκ θανάτου γενοῦ.

σωτήριος .. πομπᾶς | ἄγεμὸν Having wished that Hermes escort D. (216ff.), the chorus ask Apollo to take up the task, as a

guide. Cf. of Dionysus, E. *Ba.* 965 πομπὸς δ' εἶμ' ἐγὼ σωτήριος. For πομπή meaning escorted journey cf. Pind. *Py.* 4.164 ὀτρύνει με τεύχειν ναὶ πομπάν.

230 καὶ ξύλλαβε Δαρδανίδαις 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.* 1510f., *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 ὦ Ζεῦ διόπτα καὶ κατόπτα πανταχῆι at *Ach.* 435 in what is very likely a paratragic line (possibly from E. *Tel.*). The verb διοπτεύειν occurs at S. *Ai.* 307 and we find δίοπος meaning 'overseer' at A. fr. 232.

235 κάμψειε for this verb followed by acc. without a preposition, also following ἱκνέομαι cf. E. *El.* 955f. πρὶν ἂν πέρας | γραμμῆς ἵκηται καὶ τέλος κάμψηι βίου. For πάλιν translate 'back' and cf. E. *Ba.* 1225 πάλιν δὲ κάμψας εἰς ὄρος.

235f. θυμέλας ..|..ʾΙλιάδας The noun means 'hearth'. Cf. A. *Su.* 669 and E. *IA* [152] ἐπὶ Κυκλώπων ἱερὰς 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 δίφρου (*Il.* 3.262, 5.364 with ἐς, 18.531f. with ἐπί plus gen. and *Od.* 3.481). When βαίνω has this meaning and is followed by ἐπί the preposition usually takes the gen., but there are some occurrences with the acc. Cf. E. *Tro.* 783f. βαῖνε πατρώιων | πύργων ἐπ' ἄκρας στεφάνας, and *And.* 401 αὐτὴ δὲ δούλη ναῦς ἐπ' Ἀργείων ἔβην. The dat. reading of V was adopted by Wecklein. The dat. can also follow the preposition in this phrase. Cf. A. *Ag.* 37f. βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσηι μέγας | βέβηκεν, E. *Pho.* 691, of a sailor in storms ὃ δ' ἐπὶ λαίφεσιν βεβώς. However, the agreement in a possible reading between OΛ makes the acc. preferable.

ἄντυξ 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 δεσπότου πέρσαντος Ἀχαιὸν Ἄρη. The word δεσπότης 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).

δίδωσι for the present tense used for a past event after a

relative pronoun cf. 501f. ὃς..|..φέρει and 945 ὃν κατακτείνεις.

242 ἐπεί 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. *Hcld*. 362 and 777.

ἔτλα μόνος Cf. E. *Alc.* 460ff., in the ode of praise to Alcestis, σὺ γάρ, ὦ μόνα...|σὺ..|ἔτλας πόσιν...ἀμεῖψαι. βάς should be taken with μόνος.

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

245 ἦ is affirmative. See Denniston *GP* 280.

247 δυσαλίωι The reading of Δ and Σ; δυσάλιον, gives a prosaic sense 'when it is sunless on the sea' (cf. Xen *Cyn*. 8.1 ὅταν ἦι βόρειον). 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 δυσάνιος, 'hard to control', but this is unnecessary. Hutchinson's δυσαλίωι gives the best sense: 'When the city is on a sunless sea and lurches.' For the correption of -ωι cf. 344 γὰρ δὴ ὅσον. For 'sunless' as an image of darkness cf. A. *Eum*. 396 (also in lyric) κνέφας δυσ.

σαλεύηι πόλις The verb occurs also at *PV* 1081. For the metaphor of the ship of state cf., with the same verb, S. *OT* 22f.

πόλις γάρ...ἄγαν ἤδη σαλεύει. Cf. also A. *Cho.* 824, *Se.* 760f., 795f., S. *Ant.* 162f., *ib.* 994, *OT* 922, *Ai.* 1083f. and E. *Su.* 269 and 473.

250f. ἔστι .. ἔστι .. | ἔνι Separated anadiplosis occurs in the choral songs of *Rh.* at 346f. ἥκεῖς, 357 ὦ, 357f. νῦν, 385 θεός, 535 ἀώς 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.

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

252f. πόθι Μυσῶν ὃς ἐμὰν | χυμμαχίαν ἀτίζει; The Mysians appear as allies of Troy at *Il.* 2.858, led by Chromis and Ennomus, and at *ib.* 13.5 they are described as ἀγχεμάχοι. Their disposition is mentioned by D. at *Il.* 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.[255] As inhabitants of a distant land (see *Il.* 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 οὐδενὸς λόγου 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 ὥσπερ οἱ πόνου πολλοῦ πλέωι). 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.

being attached to the Mysians.[256] In accepting Hoffmann's *πόθι* 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 *συμμαχίαν* (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 *ὁ πεδοστιβὴς σφαγεύς* The phrase refers to Dolon himself in the guise of a wolf. As *τετράπουν* suggests, the adj. means 'moving on the ground', cf. 763f. *πεδοστιβεῖ κόπωι δαμέντες*. It occurs also at A. *Su*. 1000, of animals, *κνώδαλα πτεροῦντα καὶ πεδοστιβῆ*, *Pe*. 127, of infantry, *πεδοστιβὴς λεώς*, E. *Me*. 1123 *ὄχον πεδοστιβῆ*, and *Hel*. 1516 *πεδοστιβεῖ ποδί* and fr. 670.3f. *οὐ πεδοστιβὴς τροφός | θάλασσα*. 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 peformed. It occurs at A. fr. 57.8f. *ταυρόφθογγοι ..|..μῖμοι*, where it usually taken as personal

[256] Vater takes *Μυσῶν* with *ἐμὰν 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 *μῖμον ἔχων* remains unclear.

257 *Μενέλαν* 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).

259 *κρᾶτ'* is masc. Cf. Σ E. *Pho.* 1149 *ἀμφίβολον πότερον τὰς κρᾶτας εἶπεν ἢ τοὺς κρᾶτας· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν Ἀρχελάωι* [fr. 243]· *'ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν σὸν κρᾶτ' ἀναστέψαι θέλω'...καὶ Ἴωνι* [fr. 61]· *τύπτων* [vel *τύπτου*] *τὸν αὑτοῦ κρᾶτα.*

260 *Ἑλέναι* 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 *ἅπ. 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 *κακονυμφοτάταν ὄνασιν*. The presentation of the head may be based on *Il.* 17.39f. *εἴ κεν ἐγὼ κεφαλήν τε τεὴν καὶ τεύχε' ἐνείκας | Πάνθωι ἐν χείρεσσι βάλω*. Cf. also *Il.* 18.334f. *πρίν γ' Ἕκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι | τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλήν*.

261 *ὃς* Agamemnon.

262f. *χιλιόναυν | ἦλυθ' ἔχων στρατείαν* Cf. A. *Ag.* 45 *στόλον Ἀργείων χιλιοναύτην*. *ἦλυθ'* is epic aor. (see 50n.).

264-341 Second Epeisodion

The shepherd and Hector enter simultaneously, and unannounced, from opposite eisodoi.[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.

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΠΟΙΜΗΝ 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.

[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' οὐκέθ' 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.* 992f. *παισὶν οὐ κατειδὼς | ὄλεθρον βιοτᾶι προσάγεις.*

σκαιά 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 γάρ* In this combination *καί* means 'also' (see Denniston *GP* 66, 108). *γάρ* 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 τὸν σὸν ἀγγελῶν | ὡς οὐκέτ' 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.

δεσπόταις 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 *οἳ* The adverb 'whither' is used after *χρῆν γεγωνεῖν* because of the notion of movement implied in H.'s suggestion that

the shepherd should go to Troy with his news.

γεγωνεῖν 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.

εὐτυχοῦντα 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 θανόντ' ἤγγειλαν*; 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 *κεδνούς* is also used of good news at A. *Ag*. 622.

273 *παῦσαι λέγων* The use of *παῦσαι* 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. *παῦσαι* plus participle is not used by A. or S. It does occur in Ar. Cf. the paratragic *Ach*. 1107 *Ὠνθρωπε, παῦσαι καταγελῶν μου τῶν ὅπλων*. Hector's impatience is conveyed by asyndeton at the

beginning of the next line.

προσαυλείους is ἅπ. 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 | τήνδ' ἣν πρὸ χερῶν ἔτι βαστάζεις, and see Schwyzer *Gr.Gr.* 2.506). The poet was probably imitating *Il.* 16.630f. ἐν γὰρ χερσὶ τέλος πολέμου, ἐπέων δ' ἐνὶ βουλῇι. 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 πάλλοντα χεροῖν. 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 ἀλκῆς μυρίας For the gen. after στρατηλατέω, as if it were στρατηγέω, cf. E. *HF* 61 στρατηλατήσας...Καδμείων δορός.

For ἀλκή referring to military force cf. E. *Or.* 690 σμικρᾶι σὺν ἀλκῆι τῶν λελειμμένων φίλων. It is interesting that *Or.* 689 contains the word μυρίοις, and it is not impossible that the idea

for ἀλκῆς μυρίας 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 πέδον cf. E. *And.* 314 ἐρημώσεις πέδον.

279 Θρήικης· 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...κικλήσκεται 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 Ἠιὼν, 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.[258] 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 ῾Ρῆσον This is the first mention of the eponymous hero of the play. For his name see 388-453n.

281 ἔγνως· 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 ἔγνως at S. *Tra.* 1221 and ἔγνων 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 ὀργᾶν, meaning to swell and grow, and therefore meaning a lush area of land, or from ἔργειν, 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*

[258] 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. ὀργή. The Σ observes that ὀργάδες 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 ὀργάς (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.* 1138f., *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 δέ μοι | πάρεστι), the shepherd can only guess at the truth, but it is a good guess. γε μήν, 'but at least' (see Denniston *GP* 348 and cf. 196 above), answers οὐκ οἶδ' ἀκριβῶς.

285 νυκτὸς γὰρ οὔτι φαῦλον ἐσβαλεῖν στρατόν 'For it is no light matter to come upon an army by night.' The reading ἐμβαλεῖν is illogical and ἐσβαλεῖν is supported by εἰσβαλεῖν at *CP* 2096 and 2452 (see Diggle *Eur.* 515). For ἐσβαλεῖν cf. E. *Cy.* 99 Βρομίου πόλιν ἔοιγμεν ἐσβαλεῖν. For οὔτι φαῦλον cf. E. *El.* 760 οὔτοι βασιλέα φαῦλον κτανεῖν.

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 χερός and may even have influenced this line), *Hcld.* 70, 211 and *Hi.* 1029, 1223.

κλυόντα 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 κλυών | φλέγειν.

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 πρὸς 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 Ἰδαῖον κατοικίσαι λέπας.

288 αὐτόρριζον ἑστίαν χθονός is in apposition to Ἰδαῖον 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 (ἑστίαν χθονός, 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 ἑστία· ἡ τοῦ Χείρωνος παρόσον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι διῆγεν, but αὐτόρριζος is not synonymous with αὐτόχθων.

289 *δρυμὸν νυκτὸς ἔνθηρον μολών*. *ἔνθηρος* 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.

ῥέων The comparison of the movement of a large army with the flow of water is a powerful one. Cf. A. *Se*. 80 *ῥεῖ πολὺς ὅδε λεώς*, *Pe*. 88 *μεγάλωι ῥεύματι φωτῶν*, *ib*. 412 *ῥεῦμα Περσικοῦ στρατοῦ*. Cf. also S. *Ant*. 129, E. *IT* *παῦσαι διώκων ῥεῦμά τ' ἐξορμῶν στρατοῦ* and fr. 146.

293 *καὶ* emphasises *σά .. σταθμά*.

294 *πρίν* plus indic. (cf. 568 below) meaning 'until' is found six times in E. See Goodwin *M&T* (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 δή* emphasises the exact moment when the shepherds heard that the voice was not Greek (see Denniston *GP* 220).

γῆρυν οὐχ Ἑλληνικήν 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 | πρόσφθεγμα τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν χρόνωι μακρῶι*. We

find at 297, that the newcomers are Thracian.

295 ἐδεξάμεσθα For this verb meaning 'to catch (a sound)' cf. δέξαιτο at line 4 above, E. *El.* 110 ἦν τι δεξώμεσθ' ἔπος and *Ba.* 1086 ἠχὴν οὐ σαφῶς δεδεγμέναι.

296 προυξερευνητὰς is ἅπ. λεγ. See Ernst Fraenkel *Nomina Agentis* (1910) 2.35 and Eduard Fraenkel (1965) 234. The verb occurs at E. *Pho.* 92 ὡς ἂν προυξερευνήσω στίβον (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 τοιοῖσδέ τοί νιν ἀξιῶ προσφθέγμασιν. 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;

> ἐν δέ σφιν Ῥῆσος βασιλεύς, πάϊς Ἠϊονῆος.
> τοῦ δὴ καλλίστους ἵππους ἴδον ἠδὲ μεγίστους·
> λευκότεροι χιόνος, θείειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι.
> ἅρμα δέ οἱ χρυσῷ τε καὶ ἀργύρῳι εὖ ἤσκηται·
> τεύχεα δὲ χρύσεια πελώρια, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι,
> ἦλυθ' ἔχων· τὰ μὲν οὔ τι καταθνητοῖσιν ἔοικεν
> ἄνδρεσσιν φορέειν, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν.

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 Θρηικίαν 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.* 84f., 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: *οὐδ' ἐξέπληττον αὐτοὺς | Κύκνους ποιῶν καὶ Μέμνονας κωδωνοφαλαροπώλους.* 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· ὁρῶ, provides a powerful change of gear as the shepherd begins his detailed description.

ὥστε δαίμονα. For ὥστε see Denniston *GP* 527.

302 This line is strongly reminiscent of *Il.* 11.198 ἑσταότ' ἔν θ' ἵπποισι καὶ ἅρμασι κολλητοῖσιν. For Rhesus' entry on the chariot see 379n. and p.73 above.

303 πλάστιγξ 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 πλάστιγγι ('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 πώλους .. ζυγηφόρους and E. *Hi.* 1183 ἵππους .. ζυγηφόρους.

304 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 *λευκῆς 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 οἴκοις σκῦλον*) as Hector used of Achilles horses at 190 (*κάλλιστον οἴκοις κτῆμ'*). 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.[259]

The association of Thracians with horses was a strong one, even as early as Homer (*Il.* 13.4).[260] *Ἱπποκόων* 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 *φίλιππον λαόν*, 710 *Θρήικιος ἵππότας* and 1088ff. *ἰὼ Θρήικης .. εὔιππον .. 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.[261]

[259] See p.11 above.

[260] 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.).

[261] 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.

ἐξαυγεστέρων is ἅπ. λεγ. from ἐξαυγής. Pindar has εὐαυγέα at Πα. 7B.47 and τηλαυγέστερος at *Py*. 3.75. εὐαγής (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 πελτασταί. 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 Peisitratus 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 Θρηικίας 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.

χρυσοκολλήτοις 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 φλύοντα.* At E. *Pho.* [1130], the shield of Capaneus is decorated *σιδηρονώτοις...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 (*ἐκτυπει φόβον*, cf. A. *Cho.* 1048f. and *Eum.* 48f.). The adjective *γοργός* is often used in connection with eyes, from *γοργῶπις* and, ultimately *Γοργώ* (See M. Leumann *Homerische Wörter* (1950) 154f.). Cf. 8 above.

Γοργών This form of the nom., instead of *Γοργώ* 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*, *ἀηδών* and *ἀηδώ* 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.

οὐδ' ἂν ἐν ψήφου λόγωι '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 ψήφοις ἀλλ' ἀπὸ χειρός*). Cf. A. *Ag.* 570 *ἐν ψήφωι 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 *θέσθαι* 'to reckon', as at *Me.* 532 *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸ θήσομαι λίαν.*

ἄπλατον 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 ἄπλατον (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. πολλοῖς μὲν ἵπποις, μυρίοις δ' ὅπλοις βρέμων, *ib.* 1147 γυμνῆτες, ἱππῆς ἁρμάτων τ' ἐπιστάται, and A. *Pe.* 39f. ἑλειοβάται ναῶν ἐρέται | δεινοὶ πλῆθός τ' ἀνάριθμοι.

311 τέλη 'ranks', cf. A. *Pe.* 47 δίρρυμά 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). ἄτρακτος occurs at A. fr. 139.2 and S. *Phil.* 290.

ὄχλος Cf. E. *Cy.* 199f. μυρίον δ' ὄχλον | Φρυγῶν ὑπέστην πολλάκις σὺν ἀσπίδι.

313 ἅμαρτῆι 'in a mass'. Triclinius conjectured ὅμαρτῆι at E. *Hcld.* 138, but the more common form is ἅμαρτῆι. Cf. E. *Hi.* 1195

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

Θρηικίαν ἔχων στολήν 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.

τοιόσδε...ἀνήρ Cf. A. *Se.* 547 ὁ δὲ τοιόσδ' ἀνήρ, of Parthenopaeus, after the scout has described him and his arms.

315f. ὑποσταθείς Elsewhere in tragedy ὑποστας is preferred over ὑποσταθείς. Cf. 375 below, E. *Pho.* 1470 κοὐδεὶς 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 εὐσταθῶσι 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. *συμφορὰν ..|.. κακῶν ῥέπουσαν εἰς τὰ μάσσονα*).

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 χρὴ τοῖς φίλοισιν ὠφελεῖν· | ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων εὖ διδῶι, τί δεῖ φίλων.* For the sense of *πρός* cf. A. *Se.* 516 *πρός τῶν κρατούντων δ' ἐσμέν, οἷς δ' ἡσσωμένων.*

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

321f. *πάλαι | μὴ ξυμπονοῦσιν* When followed by the present

tense πάλαι conveys the sense of the imperfect. Cf. 329 below, S. *Ai*. 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. ἡνίκ' .. πνέων For the metaphor with Ares cf. A. *Se*. 63f. πρὶν καταιγίσαι πνοὰς | Ἄρεως, *ib*. 115 καχλάζει πνοαῖς Ἄρεος ὀρόμενον and 343f. μαινόμενος 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'Aristophane*₂ (1965) 180ff. For the idea cf. also S. *Ant*. 136f., of the attacking Capaneus, βακχεύων ἐπέπνει | ῥιπαῖς ἐχθίστων ἀνέμων.

322 ἐξώστης This Ionicism is found only here in tragedy. Cf. the ἐξῶσται 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 .. ἐξωσθέντες and *Hi*. 1087.

323 ἔθραυε Cf. A. *Eum*. 557 θραυομένας 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 ἔλθηι 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 .. συγκαμὼν* is *ὕστερον 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 H.'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 δέ 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 H. 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.

κἀπίμομφος Compound adjectives may be active or passive, according to context. This adj. is passive at A. *Ag*. 552f. *τὰ μέν τις ἂν λέξειεν εὐπετῶς ἔχειν, | τὰ δ' αὖτε κἀπίμομφα*, and *Cho*. 830 *οὐκ ἐπίμομφον ἄταν*. Here it is active.

329 For the sense cf. E. *Alc*. 383 (of Alcestis) *ἀρκοῦμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ προθνήισκοντες σέθεν*. Cf. also S. *Ant*. 547 *ἀρκέσω θνήισκουσ' ἐγώ*. The use of the present tenses with *πάλαι* emphasises that Hector was, and still is a sufficient defence for Troy. L'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. *δαίμων* at 56 above). Cf. esp.E. *Su.* 331 *πέποιθ'· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς πάντ' ἀναστρέφει πάλιν*, as well as E. frr. 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 *μίσησεν δ' ἄρα μιν δηίων κυσὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι*. For the idea cf. E. fr. 886.1f. (= Ar. *Ra.* 1427f.) *μισῶ πολίτην ὅστις ὠφελεῖν πάτραν | βραδὺς φανεῖται*.

ὕστερον βοηδρομεῖν Cf. 412 below ὕστερος βοηδρομεῖς, and E. *Pho.* 1432f. ὑστέρα βοηδρόμος | πάρειμι. 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 Βοηδρομιών, 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.[262] 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 stubborness 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.

[262] *Pace* 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 ὃ δ' οὖν (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;[263] 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

[263]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 *ξένος*, without having to share his glory with him on the battlefield. *ξενία* 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. *ὃ δ' οὖν..|..|.. ἥκέτω* For *δ' οὖν* with the imperative indicating defiance or contempt see Denniston *GP* 466f. and cf. 868 below *σὺ δ' οὖν νόμιζε ταῦτ'*.

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 *οὗτοι σοί γ' ἀπόλλυται χάρις* and fr. 736.5f. *ἣ δ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς χάρις | ἀπόλωλ'* (*ὄλωλ'* 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.

ἐπίφθονον is passive, meaning 'invidious', as at *Ag.* 921f. *μηδ' εἵμασι στρώσασ' ἐπίφθονον πόρον | τίθει*, and Ar. *Eq.* 1274 *λοιδορῆσαι τοὺς πονηροὺς οὐδέν ἐστ' ἐπίφθονον*. The word has an

active sense, meaning 'likely to take offence' at A. *Ag.* 134f. and A. *Su.* 201.

335 Αγ. <.....>
φόβος γένοιτ' ἂν πολεμίοις ὀφθεὶς μόνον.

φόβος here means 'a source of terror', in apposition to Rhesus who is referred to by *ὀφθείς*. For this sense of *φόβος* cf. S. *OC* 1651f. *ὡς δεινοῦ τινος | φόβου 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 διεπτόησε πρὶν λόγχης θιγεῖν*. *ὀφθείς* is preferable to *ἐλθὼν* (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 *σύ τ' .. καὶ σὺ* The scholion takes the first *σύ* as referring to the messenger. However the sense of the clauses suggests the reverse. *καὶ σὺ καιρίως σκοπεῖς* 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 σκοπῶσ' ὀρθῶς θεοί*. For *τε .. καί* instead of *μέν .. δέ* 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 *σύ*

in the previous line, because these lines are a king's 'impersonal' command.

χρυσοτευχής is ἅπ. λεγ.

οὕνεκ' 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 lvi 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' οὕνεχ', ὡς μάθηις, λόγων | δώσω τόδ' αὐτῆι.*

For *οὕνεκα* instead of *εἵνεκα* 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*$_2$ (1928) 168 R. 305-8 and A.M. Dale *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 ἀριστεῖαι 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 (257f. ἕλοι...ἐνέγκοι), but when speaking of Rh. they use indicatives, reflecting their greater confidence (375ff. οὔτις...χορεύσει· ἀλλά νιν ἅδε γᾶ...οἴσει).

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 ὥστε δαίμονα with 355 σύ μοι Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος, 358f. τὸν ἐλευθέριον | Ζῆνα πάρεστιν εἰπεῖν and 385 θεός, ὦ Τροία, θεός, αὐτὸς Ἄρης: 302 ἑστῶτ' ἐν ἵπποις Θρηικίοις τ' ὀχήμασι with 356 ἧκεις διφρεύων βαλιαῖσι πώλοις: 305f. πέλτη...| ἔλαμπε with 370ff. τὰν ζάχρυσον ..|...πέλ-|ταν: 307f. χαλκῇ ..|..φόβον with 383f. κλύε ..|.. κελαδοῦντας and 315f. with 375ff. (cf. also H.'s ὁ χρυσοτευχής at 340 with 382 ἵδε 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 φθόνος, 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. *Ai.* 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 E. *HF* 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 (ἥκεις, ὦ κτλ.), 355 (σύ μοι κτλ.) and 357 (νῦν, ὦ κτλ.), and later in two consecutive sentences at 367 (ὦ 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 θεῶι (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 οἰνοπλανήτοις .. ἁμίλλαις), accompanied by music (ψαλμοῖσι. 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) ἦ ποτ' ἀνὰ πόλιν ἀλαλαῖς ἰὴ παιὰν | κ]αλλίνικου 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 σὺν Ἀδραστείαι 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 ἀ-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

Gr.Gr. 1.475).

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|ei Adra|steiai 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. *μέζον μὲν ἢ γυνὴ γρύξω, | λάθοιμι δ' Ἀδρήστεια* (see W. Headlam *Herodas The Mimes and Fragments* (1922) 294f.).

μέν For *μέν* without a δέ, 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 δέ 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

[264]It is unlikely that Fraenkel is correct to believe that the δέ 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 μή τις πρόσωθεν ὄμματος 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 ὅσον On γὰρ δή as an emphatic rhetorical opening see Denniston *GP* 243. Correption would be avoided by adopting Hermann's παρ' for δή. Correption occurs mostly with diphthongs (cf., in lyric, lines 255 οὐτάσει ἐν, 457 θέλοι ἀμφί and 825 ἐπεὶ ἄγρυπνον. However, we do find correption with a long vowel at S. *Phil.* 839 ὁρῶ οὕνεκα. West (*GM* (1982) 11f.) says that correption 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 ὑμνεῦσαι ἀπιστοσύναν, and *ib.* 426 ἐπεὶ ἀντάχης.

μοι | 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 ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ 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)

19 above.

ἥκεις .. ἥκεις, ἐπλάθης The word ἥκεῖς is repeated in excitement. It is interesting to observe that ἥκεις occupies the same strong rhetorical position in the antistrophe as in 347. ἐπλάθης is the poetic aor. pass. of πελάζω (cf. 920 below). The commoner form would be ἐπλάσθης which the scribe of P has written, 'correcting' what he assumed was a mistake in L.

Φρυγίαν The reading φιλίου (Λ) 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*$_3$ (1967) vol.2, 1.808ff. and Wilamowitz *GV* 585. At E. *And.* 603 we find τὸν σὸν λιποῦσα Φίλιον, where the word must mean something like Ζεὺς Ἕρκεῖος. 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 particlar αὐλή of Z. Ph. What is required is a stress on the αὐλή being that of Troy, and that is provided by Δ's Φρυγίαν. For the words of warm welcome cf. Theseus

at S. *OC* 633 *κοινὴ παρ' ἡμῖν αἰέν ἐστιν ἑστία.*

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.

καλλιγέφυ|ρος is *ἅπ. λεγ.*, but cf. *καλλιπρώιρος* at A. *Ag.* 235.

πορεύει is ironic because Rh. came expressly against his parents' wishes (900f., 934f.). However the guards assume that he has been sent with their blessing, which must be the sense of *πορεύει*.

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

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.

μελωι|δοῦ 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.

ὑδροειδής is ἅπ. λεγ. See p.31 n.61 above.

ἐφύτευσεν The subject is usually male, as here (cf. Pindar *Ne.* 7.84, followed by ὑπό plus gen.), but need not be (cf. E. *Me.* 834 of Harmonia, mother of the Muses).

355 σύ μοι The juxtaposition of the pronouns gives a personal dimension to the valediction, cf. εἶθε μοι | σᾶι χερὶ καὶ σῶι δορί at 367f. The sentiment is nicely balanced by the address to their fatherland at 357.

Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος The adjective comes from φανῆναι 'to appear' and is equivalent to the later word ἐπιφανής. 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 διφρεύων is also used with dat. of conveyance at E. *And.* 1011f.

βαλιαῖσι 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 'δύναται δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ταχείαις' (cf. the confusion over ἀργός, wrongly reported in LSJ as meaning white, when it means swift). This meaning of βαλιός 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 *Hi.* 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 λευκοστίκτωι τριχὶ βαλιούς, and it is the name of one of them in Homer (cf. *Il.* 16.149). Another possibility is that διφρεύων βαλιαῖσι 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 *νῦν* with the sense 'at last', cf. *χρόνωι* at 348. *ξὺν θεῶι* has a sense similar to *deo volente* in Latin. Cf. E. *Me.* 625 *σὺν θεῶι δ' εἰρήσεται* and *σὺν δ' Ἀδραστείαι λέγω* at 468 below. For the cry to the fatherland cf. E. *Hec.* 905 *σὺ μέν ὦ πατρὶς Ἰλιάς·*

ἐλευθέριον | Ζῆνα Cf. 991f. *πέποιθα Τρωσί θ' ἡμέραν ἐλευθέραν | ἀκτῖνα τὴν στείχουσαν ἡλίου φέρειν*, where H. is as mistaken as the chorus here. Zeus Eleutherios stands for 'freedom'. For the title cf. Pind. *Ol.* 12.1f. *παῖ Ζηνὸς Ἐλευθερίου |...Τύχα*. For the cult of Zeus eleutherios see W.S. Barrett *JHS* 93 (1973) 23-35, W.K. Pritchett *The Greek State at War* vol.3 (1979) 181f. and n.97, L.R. Farnell *The Cults of the Greek States* vol.1 (1896) 61ff. and 116.

360f. *ἆρά ποτ' ..|.. παναμερεύ|σει* For *ἆρά ποτ'* cf. E. *Erech.* 65.5ff. (Austin) *ἦ ποτ' κτλ*. There is a strong resemblance between these lines and E. *Ba.* 862ff. *ἆρ' ἐν παννυχίοις χοροῖς | θήσω ποτὲ λευκὸν | πόδ' ἀναβακχεύουσα*, 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 *φροῦδαί σοι θυσίαι χορῶν τ' | εὔφημοι κέλαδοι κατ' ὄρφ-|ναν τε παννυχίδες θεῶν* and S. *Ant.* 152f. *θεῶν δὲ ναοὺς 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 (*αὖθις* 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 ἅπ. λεγ., is transitive, governing τοὺς προπότας θιάσους (for verbs in -ευω with a transitive sense cf. 434 ὁμηρεύσας τέκνα, 446, κυβεύων τὸν .. Ἄρη, E. *Su.* 417 μὴ διορθεύων λόγους and *Or.* 405 ὃς σὸν ὤρθευεν δέμας). Using a city as the subject of a transitive verb is a bold device cf. E. *And.* 341 οὐχ ὧδ' ἄνανδρον 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 ἅπ. λεγ. (see Fraenkel *Nomina Agentis* 115). θίασος 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 | ψαλμοῖσι 'with the music of loves', i.e. love songs accompanied by the lyre. ψαλμοῖσι 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.

οἰνοπλανή|τοις is ἅπ. λεγ. and active, meaning 'intoxicating'. It agrees with ἁμίλλαις. This is the interpretation of the scholion; ταῖς διὰ τοῦ οἴνου παραγούσαις τὸν νοῦν. In most other -πλάνητος compounds the prefix refers to the place, time, or degree of wandering (*Orphic Hymns* 38.5 θνητῶν ποντοπλανήτων, Ar. *Ach.* 264 ἑταῖρε νυκτοπεριπλάνητε and E. *Hi.* 1109f. αἰὼν | πολυπλάνητος).

364 ἐπιδεξίοις 'passing to the right' is transferred to ἁμίλλαις 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 ὑποδέξιος and explain it as ὑποδεχεύς. The poet was probably thinking of *Il.* 1.597f. αὐτὰρ ὃ τοῖς ἄλλοισι θεοῖς ἐνδέξια πᾶσιν | οἰνοχόει.

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. ὦ φίλος Nom. for voc. is common in poetry (see Schwyzer *Gr.Gr.* 1939-71 2.64), esp. for this adj. (see Griffith (1977) 121 and n.95). Cf. *Il.* 4.189 φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε, A. fr. 807 (*Dict.*), S. *OT* 1321, E. *Me.* 1133, *And.* 510, 530, 842 (*pace* Collard

ad Su. 278), 1205, *IT* 830, *Tro.* 267, 1081 and *Su.* 278. 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.

πρά|ξας τάδ' i.e. having swept the Greeks away and restored peace to Troy. For the sense of πράσσω, and the phrasing, cf. A. *Ag.* 111 ξὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι.

ἐς οἶκον ἔλθοις 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 noone.

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 ἔλθοις and the imperative ἐλθέ (cf. 381f. ἰδεῖν. | ἴδε). 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 ἆρά ποτ' αὖθις...παναμερεύσει and the optative clause εἴθε...ἔλθοις, we now have three strong imperatives in one line, ἐλθέ, φάνηθι ... προβαλοῦ, as well as the confident future indicative clauses, οὔτις ... ποτε ... χορεύσει and ἅδε γᾶ...οἴσει. We are returned to the adulation of Rh. as a god-like saviour. This mood continues until the end of the anapaests.

ἐλθέ, *φάνηθι* 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 *ἴθι, ἵκοῦ,* | *ἔλθ' ...* | *κροκόβαπτον ποδὸς εὔμαριν ἀείρων,* | *βασιλείου τιήρας φάλαρον πιφαύσκων.* | *βάσκε ...*| *...* | *ὦ φάνηθι.*

ζάχρυρον The prefix *ζα-* has an intensifying force. For the adjective cf. 439 below and E. *IT* 1111. At E. *Alc*. 498 *Ἄρεος, ζαχρύσου Θρηικίας 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 στόμα* 'face to face' at 491 and 511

πέλ|ταν δοχμίαν 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 *πεδα-* for *μετα-* at *Cho*. 590 *λαμπάδες πεδάοροι* (of meteors), *πεδάρσιος* at *ib*. 846 and *πεδοίκου χελιδόνος* 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 σχιστὰν παρ' ἄντυγα The phrase goes with πέλ. δοχ. πεδ., not with what follows. ἄντυξ 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 ἄντυξ is split (σχιστάν) in that it stands separately from the body of the chariot, and is therefore divided from it. ἄντυξ appears nowhere else with σχιστός in Greek. At *Il*. 5.728 we read of δοιαὶ .. 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.

374f. δίβολόν τ' ἄκον|τα πάλλων The adj. is found nowhere else in A., S. or E., although Ar. has καὶ τῶν πλατυλόγχων διβολίαν ἀκοντίων 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 ἔγχεσιν 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. [ἐνάριξεν ... ἀκμᾶι | ἔγχεος] ὥστε μιᾶι βολῆι δισσὰ τὰ τραύματ' ἀπεργάζεσθαι., S. fr. 152 ἢ δορὸς διχόστομον πλᾶκτρον | δίπτυχοι γὰρ ὀδύναι μιν ἤρικον | Ἀχιλλείου δόρατος and E. *And.* 1133 ἔκλυτοι 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. διπλῆι μάστιγι, τὴν Ἄρης φιλεῖ, | δίλογχον ἄτην, φοινίαν 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, λιγυρᾶι 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 ἄκοντε δύω, 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 χεροῖν | {παλίνοντα} ἐν ἔργωι βέλη πιπάλλων Ἄρεως | σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα νωμῶν 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 ὑποστῆναι βέλος, *Cy.* 199f. μυρίον δ' ὄχλον | Φρυγῶν ὑπέστην, Thuc. 1.144.4 οἱ γοῦν πατέρες ἡμῶν ὑποστάντες 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 τὰν Ἀργει μέλπουσ' Ἥραν.

377ff. ἅδε γᾶ | .. | φίλτατον ἄχθος οἴσει 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. *Il.* 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 *ἐχθρὰ δ' ἔχοντας ἔκρυψεν*, and, of the same, E. *Tro.* 375-9, esp. 378f. *ἐν ξένηι δὲ γῆι | κεῖνται*. 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 ἂν εἶχες | τάφον διαπουτίου γᾶς, | δώμασιν εὐφόρητον.*

καπφθίμενον is apocope for *κατεφθίμενον*. Cf. E. *Su.* 984 *καπφθίμενου* and *El.* 1299 *καπφθιμένης*.

Θρηικὶ μόρωι. Θρῆιξ is the Ionic form of Θρᾷξ. 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 ὦ βασιλεῦ 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 *RÉG* 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.

πολίαρχον ἰδεῖν 'A prince to behold', in apposition to σκύμνον.

382f. ἴδε ..|.. κλύε 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 σάγματος).

382 χρυσόδετον σώματος ἀλκήν is enallage (see V. Bers *Enallage and Greek Style* (1974)). For the adjective cf. A *Se.* 105f. Ἄρης ... | ὦ χρυσοπήληξ δαῖμον.

383 κλύε καί κόμπους κωδωνοκρότους The position of καί 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 καί (*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 ἀσπίς). 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, αὐτὸς Ἄρης 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 *Il.* 13.301, *Od.*

8.361, S. *Ant.* 969ff. and E. *Alc.* 498.

386f. ὁ Στρυμόνιος ... | Μούσης For the genitive of parent cf. Pindar *Ol.* 2.12 ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας, A. *Su.* 311 ὁ Δῖος πόρτις .. βοός.

πῶλος a foal, used of Orestes at A. *Cho.* 794.

387 κατέχει σε 'possesses', i.e. 'inspires', by analogy with E. *Hec.* 1088-90 αἰαῖ, ἰὼ Θρήικης λογχοφόρου ἔνο|πλον εὔιππον Ἄρει κάτοχον γένος is Collard's suggestion. The reading καταπνεῖ σε,[265] 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 ἀμπνοὰς δίδωσι, 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 καταπνεῦσαι ..| αὔρας, where αὔρας 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 εὐωδίαι κατέπνεον, and observing that καταπνέω nowhere *certainly* governs a gen.

388-526 Third Epeisodion[266]

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.

ΡΗΣΟΣ 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 Ῥῆζος, might have signified simply *rex*, and been cognate with the word for king in other Indo-European languages. Cf. French roi, Gothic reiks, Sanskrit rãj, Old Irish rí and the Gaulish suffix -rix. Cuny offers the following etymology; Ῥῆσος = Thraco-Phrygian rêzos; rêz = Ind.-Eur. rêg (z for g; cf. Skt. raj for rêg); ê because Thracian retained Ind.-Eur. ê; rêzo (for the addition of o cf. Skt. raj changed to raja); rêzos 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

[266]See 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.*[267] This play does not seem to have provided Aristophanes with any material for *Ach.*,[268] nor indeed for any of his comedies.

[267]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 *κομπολακύθου* (*Ach.* 589) is based on *κωδωνοκρότους* (*Rh.* 383) and Burnett's remark that *ὦ βλέπων ἀστραπάς* (*Ach.* 566) is 'all too much like' *Rh.* 355 and 359 is extremely forced.

[268]I take the similarity between *Rh.* 675b and *Ach.* 281 *βάλλε βάλλε βάλλε βάλλε | παῖε πᾶς τὸν μιαρόν* 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 *παῖε παῖε* 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 agons 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

---

A. *Eum*. 130 λαβέ. λαβέ. λαβέ. λαβέ.

269 *Diatribe* 104. Cf. P. Albert *De Rheso Tragoedia* (1876) 12, Wilamowitz *Hermes* 61 (1926) 288, M. Pohlenz *Die griechische Tragödie* (1930) 473 and G.M.A. Grube *The Drama of Euripides* (1941) 444.

270 For detailed discussions of the agon in tragedy see H. Strohm *Euripides: Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form* (1957), J. Duchemin *L'ΑΓΩΝ 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 τοὐπὶ σὲ, 401 σε, 404f. σύ..|..ἡμᾶς προύπιες τὸ σὸν μέρος, 406f. σε..|..ἄνακτα τῆιδ' ἔθηκ' ἐγὼ χερί, 410f. σοὶ δέ..λεὼν | παρέσχον· ὧν σὺ λακτίσας, 419 ὡς σύ, 421 μέμφομαί σοι καὶ λέγω κατ' ὄμμα σόν. 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 *ἐγὼ δὲ μεῖζον ἢ σύ*, 433 *σύμμαχόν τέ σοι μολεῖν*, 438 *οὐχ ὡς σύ κομπεῖς τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας*, 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: *ἤτοι μάραγνά γ' ἢ καρανιστὴς 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 Cantica*$_2$ (1928) 169. Responsion 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 τόδ' ἔτ' ('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 †μέγας .. μέγας†. Cf. 131 τάδε .. τάδε and 195 μέγας .. μεγάλα. The sequence οὔτε .. οὔτε

and the word εἰ 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'*ΑΓΩΝ *dans la tragédie grecque*₂ (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 ἰὼ ἰώ with 380, 455 φίλα...φίλος with 367 ὦ φίλος, 455 Διόθεν εἶ with 342 Διὸς παῖς, 456 φθόνον with 343, 456 Ζεύς with 355 and 359 Ζῆνα, 457 θέλοι...εἴργειν with 343 εἴργοι, 457 ἀμφὶ σοῖς λόγοισιν with 343 στομάτων, 458 τό...δόρυ with 365 κατὰ...οἰχομένων, 460 ἐπόρευσε with 350 πορεύει, 461 πῶς...δύναιτο with 370 προβαλοῦ...πέλταν, 463 πῶς...ὑπομεῖναι with 375 σέ...ὑποστάς, 464 εἰ γάρ...εἰσίδοιμι with 367 εἴθε μοι...πράξας τάδε, 465 ἄναξ with 380 ὦ βασιλεῦ and 465 πολυφόνου...λόγχαι with 368 σᾶι...δορί.

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 epeisodion 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 *τειχοβουλία* 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. *Se.* [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* 1111f. (see Bond), 1403f., *El.* 651f. (see Denniston), 965f., *IT* 735f., 811f., *Hel.* 1197f., *Ba.* 1269f., *IA* 1437f.), *El.* 553ff. and 1124ff. (a large

[271]For stichomythia generally see A. Gross *Die Stichomythie in der griechischen 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.), *Hcld.* 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 κακὴν κακοῦ οὐ μελεδαίνει ἐσθλὸς ἀνήρ; E. *Su.* 42 ἱκετεύω σε, γεραία, γεραιῶν ἐκ στομάτων, *ib.* 598 ὦ μέλεαι μελέων ματέρες λοχαγῶν (see Collard *ad locc.*), fr. 15.1 ἴδοιμι δ' αὐτῶν ἔκγον' ἄρσεν' ἀρσένων; fr. 727 ἀπέπτυσ' ἐχθροῦ φωτὸς ἔχθιστον τέκος, and in addresses S. *Ant.* 379f. ὦ δύστηνος καὶ δυστήνου | πατρὸς Οἰδιπόδα; E. *Pho.* 1701 ὦ φίλα πεσήματ' ἄθλι' ἀθλίου πατρός; *Tro.* 790 ὦ παῖ παιδὸς μογεροῦ; *And.* 590 ὦ κάκιστε κἀκ κακῶν (see Stevens *ad loc.*). The reading of O 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 σχῆμα, 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 ὦ 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 Wörten gleich lauteten, hat sich eine formale Gleichheit auch in anderen Fällen analogisch verbreitet'. Cf. *PV* 595 ὦ τάλας, A. *Se.* 129f. σύ τ' ὦ Διογενὲς...|ὀυσίπολις γενοῦ | Παλλάς, S. *Ai.* 903 ὦ ταλαίφρων γυνή, E. *Ba.* 55f. ἀλλ' ὦ λιποῦσαι Τμῶλον...| θίασος ἐμός, γυναῖκες and *And.* 348 ὦ τλήμων ἀνήρ (see Stevens *ad loc.*). Cf. also *Il.* 4.189 φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε, *h.* 30.17 χαῖρε θεῶν 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 ἅμα τῆι κλήσει, 'ὦ Φαληρεύς' ἔφη,' οὗτος Ἀπολλόδωρος' .. καὶ ὅς, 'Ἀπολλόδωρε', ἔφη' (for the formal tone of οὗτος cf. S. *Aj.* 71f. οὗτος, σε..|..καλῶ, and *OC* 1627 ὦ 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 τύραννε | Ἕκτορ, 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 παῖ 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 Ἕκτορ· alone is too bald a greeting.

389 παλαιᾶι .. 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 ἦ που παλαιᾶι μὲν σύντροφος ἁμέραι, 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 τόδ' ἡμέρας 'to this time'. This use of παλαιός 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. μακρᾶι | φλογὶ φαεσφόρωι (see Kannicht *ad loc.*).

προσεννέπω '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.

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 εὖ πράσσοντ' ἐπιχαίρω (cf. *Phil.* 1314), E. *Hi.* 1339f. τοὺς γὰρ εὐσεβεῖς θεοὶ | θνήσκοντας οὐ χαίρουσι and fr. 673 χαίρω σέ ... | ... τὸν τε μιαρὸν ἐξολωλότα (Nauck), Σ *Il.* 6.479ff., K-G 1.298 and 2.53f. (cf. also, for the opposite effect *Il.* 13.352f. ἤχθετο γάρ ῥα | Τρωσὶν δαμναμένους).

εὐτυχοῦντα 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 πύργοισιν. 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. *Il.* 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 *συν-* implies that Rh. will act in concert with H., the pronoun *ἐγώ* 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 *συγκατασκάπτοις ἂν ἡμᾶς*, used of people at E. *Or.* 735.

392 *πάρειμι* governs the future participles. Cf. E. *Pho.* 604 and *Ba.* 658.

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. *ὑπτιοῦτο δὲ | σκάφη νεῶν* and S. *Ai.* 1278f. *ἐς δὲ ναυτικὰ σκάφη | πηδῶντος ἄρδην*

Ἕκτορος. The word σκάφος does not occur again in *Rh.*, but there are five other examples of periphrasis with νεῶν, 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.

Μουσῶν μιᾶς Cf. E. *Ion* 2f. θεῶν μιᾶς ἔφυσε Μαῖαν. 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 ἃ μὴ φρονῶ γὰρ οὐ φιλῶ λέγειν μάτην, and Thuc. 4.28.3 οἷον ὄχλος φιλεῖ ποεῖν.

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. διπτύχωι γλώσσαι 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 ἀνὴρ 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 ὥσπερ Τισσαφέρνους οὐδὲν πώποτέ μου οὔτε ποιήσαντος οὔτ' εἰπόντος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχοιτ' ἂν κατηγορῆσαι, 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)) *μισῶ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν διπλοῦν πεφυκότα | χρηστὸν λόγοισι, πολέμιον δὲ τοῖς τρόποις*. It is not a tragic fragment (see Wilamowitz *KS* 1.195).

We do find an example of *ἁπλοῦς* with a moral overtone at E. *IA* 927 *ἔμαθον τοὺς τρόπους ἁπλοῦς ἔχειν*. It is used of Achilles, and may well be based on *Il.* 9.312f. *ἁπλοῦς*. We also have *ἁπλοῦς* 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, *Hcld.* 2, *Hi.* 1031, (*εἰ κακὸς 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 ἦσθ' ἵν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλ' ἀπῆσθ' ἵν' οὔ σ' ἔδει*.

396 *πάλαι πάλαι* This is the only example of unseparated anadiplosis in *Rh.* and one of only two examples of anadiplosis in the dialogue (cf. *θρασύς...θρασύς* at 579). This statistic sheds no light on dating however. Lyric anadiplosis is more relevant (see 250n.). The same words occur at Ar. *Av.* 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 *παλαιᾶι .. ἡμέραι* in 389.

συγκάμνειν H. takes up the idea of cooperation in Rh.'s *συγκατασκάψων* (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 ξυμπονοῦσιν* and 326 *οὐδὲ συγκαμὼν δορί*.

τοὐπὶ σ' The pronoun is an adverbial acc.; 'as far as you were concerned'. See Willink on E. *Or.* 1345 *ὅσον γε τοὐπ' ἐμέ*, and Jebb on S. *Ant.* 889 *τοὐπὶ τήνδε τὴν κόρην*.

398 *Τροίαν ἐᾶσαι πολεμίωι πεσεῖν δορί.* For the figure of speech cf. especially E. *Hec.* 5 *δορὶ πεσεῖν Ἑλληνικωι*. This parallel supports Bothe's dat. *πολεμίωι* for the MSS *πολεμίων* (*pace* Vater who describes it as 'prosaicum').

399f. *οὐ γάρ τι λέξεις ὡς* κτλ. The *γάρ* is explanatory and gives the motive for what has just been said (see Denniston *GP* 60). The future tense makes the statement tantamount to 'you cannot say that..'. Cf. also at E. *Alc.* 658 *οὐ μὴν ἐρεῖς γέ μ' ὡς* κτλ. (see Goodwin *M&T* 16.69). For the explicit prohibition with *μή* and the subjunctive cf. 843 *μὴ γάρ τι λέξηις ὡς* κτλ.

ἄκλητος ὢν 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'.

ἤμυνας is not used absolutely by A. or S., but E. has it. Cf. *Hcld.* 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 οὐκ 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 ταῖσιν αὐταῖς γάρ μ' ἐπισκήψω κέδροις | σοὶ τούσδε θεῖναι*).

401 κῆρυξ ἢ γερουσία Cf. A. *Su.* 727 *ἴσως γὰρ ἂν κήρυξ τις ἢ 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

Schwyzer *Gr.Gr.* 218 n.1.[272] Cf. δημογέροντες at *Il.* 3.149, οἱ γέροντες in Herod. and γεροντία at Xen. *Lac. Cons.* 10.1. Xenophon also has γερουσίαι at *Mem.* 4.4.16. Hesychius has γερωνία. Plut. often uses γερουσία for the Roman senate. However, apart from here and 936 below the Attic word does not appear in tragedy; nor does it appear anywhere outside tragedy until Dem. 20.17. Arist. has it only twice (*Pol.* 1207b 24 and *ib.* 1272b 37). The word may be from a later period than E., but the presence of γερωχία in Ar. *Lys.* means that the Attic word was likely to have been known at the time.

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 ποῖον δὲ δώρων 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 πέδον). Here ποῖον .. κόσμον gives the correct emphasis. Cf. E. *Hcld.* 441 ποῖον δὲ 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.

ἔρκος οὐκ ἀφίγμεθα;.

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. ἐγγενής 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. ἐγγενὴς ὢν βάρβαρός τε 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 ἐγγενὴς. The alternative reading εὐγενὴς in OQ does not have the same force and the repetition of the idea at 413 supports ἐγγενὴς 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. *οὔποτ' ἂν φίλον | τὸ βάρβαρον γένοιτ' ἂν Ἕλλησιν γένος* and *Me.* 536ff. (cf. E. fr. 719 (*Tel.*) *Ἕλληνες ὄντες βαρβάροις δουλεύσομεν*).

For the paregmenon *βάρβαρός τε βαρβάρους* cf. E. *IT* 31f. *οὗ γῆς ἀνάσσει βαρβάροισι βάρβαρος | Θόας*, in a play where the Greeks are also seen by the king as an indiscriminately alien group, whatever their city.

405 *προύπιες* The verb *προπίνω* means principally to pledge with drink. Cf. Pindar *Ol.* 7.4 *νεανίαι γαμβρῶι προπίνων.* The scholion on that line also preserves a fr. of Anacreon (62 Page) *ἀλλὰ πρόπινε | ῥαδινούς, ὦ φίλε, μηρούς*. 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 ἐκπωματ' ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ προὔπινεν αὐτοῖς*. Harpocration (*Gloss.* 259) explains *προπεπωκότες* as having the meaning *προδεδωκότες 'ἐκ μεταφορᾶς'*. Cf. Dem. 18.296 *τὴν ἐλευθερίαν προπεπωκότες .. Φιλίππωι*) 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), *οὓς σὺ π[ροπιν* (Lobel; *προπίνεις* 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 *μικρᾶς...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 μικρᾶς ἐκ τυραννίδος μέγαν | ... ἄνακτα* For the change from the abstract to the personal cf. E. *Hel.* 1021 *ἐκ δυσσεβείας ὅσιον εἰ τίθημί νιν*. For the sequence cf. also A. *Cho.* 262f. *ἀπὸ σμικροῦ δ' ἂν ἄρειας μέγαν | δόμον*.

τῆιδε ἔθηκ' ἐγὼ χερί For H.'s emphasis on his own prowess cf. *τῶιδε...δορί* at 58 and *τῆιδε πολυφόνωι 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 ΡΗΣΟΣ 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 (ἐμπεσών ... | 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 ἀρίστοις. 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. *Hcld* 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, ἀντίον, ἀντίβιον and ἐναντίβον. 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 ὕστερος βοηδρομεῖς Given the influence of ὕστερον βοηδρομεῖν at 333, ὕστερον is more likely to have replaced the more poetic ὕστερος, than vice versa.

413-8 H. now acknowledges the help of those allies who came to Troy. They are divided into οἳ μέν (414) who have died, and οἳ δέ (416) who are still alive. The first clause is participial, leaving the rhetorical emphasis of the sentence on the present tenses κεῖνται, 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 σὺ δ' ἐγγενὴς ὤν), 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 A. has *πολύχωστον ... | τάφον* at *Cho.* 351f. and S. *ἔρμα τυμβόχωστον* at *Ant.* 848.

415 *πίστις οὐ σμικρὰ* 'no small pledge (of loyalty)'. Cf. E. *Hi.* 1037 *ὅρκους παρασχών, πίστιν οὐ σμικράν, θεῶν.*

416f. Although the Trojans and their allies are spending only their first night outside the walls, H. 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 *ἔν θ'*. For *ἐν ὅπλοισι* meaning 'under arms' cf. E. *Su.* 1150 and *Ba.* 303. Cf. also E. *Su.* 357f. *παρ' ὅπλοις θ' ἥμενος.*

ἄησιν Besides here, this noun occurs only in E.; at *Phaethon* 255 (Diggle) *καπνοῦ μέλαιν' ἄησις ἔνδοθεν στέγης* and, from a quotation in Photius which glosses *χειμών* (see R. Reitzenstein

Anfang des Lexikons des Photios (1907) 39), at *Alcmaeon* fr.78a.2 (Snell) ἐν τοῖσδε ἄησιν καὶ θέρος διέρχομαι. The word is derived from ἄημι and means a gust (of wind, smoke etc., see P. Chantraine *Dict. Et.* (1968) 1.26). Like its synonym ἄημα (A. *Eum.* 905, S. *Ai.* 674), it is a rare, poetic word.

δίψιον is intransitive, meaning 'thirsty', not 'parching', because the sun absorbs moisture. Cf. A. *Ag.* 495 and S. *Ant.* 246f., of dust.

πῦρ θεοῦ 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 καρτεροῦντες 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 οἰνοβαρές, 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 δεμνίοις on couches, a luxury compared with bivouacing.

ἄμυστιν occurs nowhere else in tragedy. The scholion refers to a line from *Auge* (σὺν τῶι βαθείας καὶ πυκνὰς ἕλκουσι τὰς ἀμύστιδας), assumed by Nauck to be the work of a comic poet rather than E (see *TGF*₂ 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), Pherecrates 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

one go. Cf. the verb at E. *Cy.* 565 ἡδέως ἠμύστισα.

δεξιούμενοι 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. δεξίος). Cf. S. *El.* 975f. τίς ... ἡμᾶς ἰδὼν | ... οὐχὶ δεξιώσεται. 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 θεοῖσι πρῶτα δεξιώσομαι. However, as Fraenkel says *ad loc.*, 'the use of the dative with δεξιοῦσθαι 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 δεχόμενοι. 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 φιλῶ..|..ἀνήρ.

ταῦθ' ..|καὶ μέμφομαί σοι καὶ λέγω κατ' ὄμμα σόν 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' οὖν ὑμῖν μέμφομαι | τοῖς σοφοῖς. κατ' ὄμμα σόν has a hostile sense, as at 371 (cf κατὰ στόμα at

409). The phrase does not occur with a hostile sense elsewhere.

420 ὡς ἂν εἰδῆις 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. ἥδε γὰρ γυνὴ | δούλη μέν, εἴρηκεν δ' ἐλεύθερον λόγον, E. *And.* 152f. Μενέλαος ἡμῖν ταῦτα δωρεῖται πατὴρ | πολλοῖς σὺν ἔδνοις, ὥστ' ἐλευθεροστομεῖν, *IA* 313 μέθες· μακροὺς δὲ δοῦλος ὢν λέγεις λόγους, *Ba.* 775 and the tragic adespoton 304 (*TGF* vol. 2 fr. 304 (Kannicht and Snell)) δοῦλος πέφυκας, οὐ μέτεστί 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 κοὐ διπλοῦς πέφυκ' ἀνήρ is lame. It does not have the same effect as the repetition of εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνήρ 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.

εὐθεῖαν 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 μέσου γὰρ αἰθέρος | τέμνων κέλευθον*, Pindar *Ol.* 12.6 *ψεύδη μεταμώνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ' ἐλπίδες*, and, in Latin, *via secta* at V. *Geo.* 1.238. Cf. also E. *Pho.* [1] *ὦ τὴν ἐν ἄστροις 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 δέ* often marks the transition from the introduction to a speech to the opening of the speech proper (see Denniston *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 achievments and his future intentions.

λύπηι πρὸς ἧπαρ is to be taken with *ἐτειρόμην*; *δυσφορῶν* with *τῆσδ' ἀπὼν χθονός*. 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 γαία and λεώς see p.38 above and Fraenkel (1965) 238). For the idea cf. A. *Pe.* 349 ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἔρκος ἐστιν 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', εἴ τι μέμφηι τῆς ἐμῆς ἀπουσίας, | σχές· τυγχάνω γὰρ ἐν μέσοις Θρήικης ὅροις | ἀπών, ὅτ' ἦλθες 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. πόλεμον 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

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 *RÉG* 26 (1913) 151-213 and E. Hall *Philologus* 133 (1989) 38-54).

428 *νόστον* Σ *ἁπλῶς τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ τὸν πλοῦν ἔφη*. The common meaning of the word is 'return', but it does mean 'a safe journey' at E. *IA* 966 and 1261.

περᾶν intransitive, but with the acc. of the place passed by.

μοι .. | μέλλοντι .. | ξυνῆψε πόλεμον cf. A. *Pe.* 335f. στρατεύματι | *μάχην ξυνάψαι* and, without a dat., E. *Su.* 144 Τυδεὺς *μάχην συνῆψε* Πολυνείκης θ' ἅμα and *ib.* 683 *συνῆψαν ἀλκήν*.

ἀξένου .. πόντου There are only five other instances of εὔξενος (or εὔξεινος) appearing in the MSS of the Euripidean corpus. ἄξενος is now read for all of them: *An.* 1262, *IT* 125, 395, 1388 and *HF* 410. We also find the prefix εὐξ- in *P.Hib.* 1.24 at *IT* 253, where L, rightly, has *ἀξένου*. In each case the scribes have assumed that the Euxine is referred to. However, ἄξενος was the original form of the adjective when applied to the Black Sea, and εὔξενος a later euphemism. ἄξενος itself was possibly an etymological misconception of the Avestan aχsaena 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).

πορθμεύσων Vater's defense of *πορθμεύσας* (Δ) 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 *πορθμεῦσαι* in Q. See Diggle *SI* 5 (1988) 171 (=*Eur.* 324) and cf. E. *Me.* 1303 *ἐμῶν δὲ παίδων ἦλθον ἐκσώσων βίον*, where there is also the aor. inf. variant *ἐκσῶσαι*. For the inf. after a verb of motion cf. S. *OC* 12 *μανθάνειν γὰρ ἥκομεν*, E. *Phaeth.* 97 *προσέβαν ὑμέναιον ἀεῖσαι*, Neophron fr. 1.1 *ἦλυθον .. μαθεῖν*.

430f. Cf. A. *Pe.* 816f. *τόσος γὰρ ἔσται πελανὸς αἱματοσφαγὴς | πρὸς γῆι Πλαταιῶν Δωρίδος λόγχης ὕπο*. The verbal resemblance is striking, as well as the context (see Fraenkel (1965) 232). Cf. also E. *Alc.* 851 *πρὸς αἱματηρὸν πελανόν*. For the idea cf. also E. *Pho.* 718 *τάχ' αὐτῶν πεδίον 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 *τοί* emphasises *τοιάδε*, countering the reasons which H. gave for Rh.'s lateness. See Denniston *GP* 540.

ἀπεῖργε governs the infinitives in 433. For verbs of preventing with the infinitive and without *μή* see K-G 2.214-5. The

variant ἀπῆγε 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. πέδον ... ἵκέσθαι For the acc. of motion towards something without a preposition see K-G 1.311f. and 223n.

434 ἐπεὶ δ' ἔπερσα, 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 γῆν; 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) 150f.

δμηρεύσας 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. οὐδ' ἔτι δασμοφοροῦσιν at A. *Pe.* 586.

436 ἥκω 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 (*περῶν* 437).

Ποντίου στόμα 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 *ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς* The phrase echoes *ὡς σύ* 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. *δράσας δ' ἐγὼ | δεῖν', ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς, τόνδ' ἔπαυσα τὸν νόμον*, where the context is similar. For the sequence of conjunctions in Rh.'s denial cf. Medea at E. *Me*. 555ff. *οὐχ, ἣι σὺ κνίζηι..|..|οὐδ'..|..|ἀλλ'*.

τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμύστιδας Grammatically these accusatives are governed by *κοιμώμενος* in the next line, because the poet has omitted a participle like *δεξιούμενος* 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 *οὐκ οἶδα τοὺς σοὺς οὓς λέγεις Ὀδυσσέας*. Cf., with the singular pronoun, Hippolytus' scorn of Aphrodite at E. *Hi*. 113 *τὴν σὴν δὲ Κύπριν πόλλ' ἐγὼ χαίρειν λέγω* and Demophon's reply to Copreus' threats at E. *Hcld*. 284 *τὸ σὸν γὰρ Ἄργος οὐ δέδοικ' ἐγώ*.

439 *ἐν ζαχρύσοις δώμασιν* 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 ἄησιν* 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 *ἐπωιδὸν Θρηικίων ἀημάτων*.

441 *κρυσταλλόπηκτα* The transmitted reading refers to *φυσήματα* and is therefore transitive. Kirchhoff's alternative conjectures, which agree with *πόντου*, are based on A. *Pe.* 501 *περᾶι κρυσταλλοπῆγα διὰ πόρου*, 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 elewhere.

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.

ἐπεζάρει 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' ἐπεζάρει | Σφὶγξ ἁρπαγαῖσι πόλιν. The word is the Arcadian form of ἐπεβαρεῖ (see Eustathius 909.26 and F. Bechtel *Die griechischen Dialekte* vol. 1 (1921) 389). Blaydes suggested ἐπιζαρεῖ and the present tense should perhaps be considered in this general context.

442 ξὺν τοῖσδ'.. πορπάμασιν The use of σὺν to refer to things that belong to someone is found in epic. Cf. *Il.* 5.220 σὺν ἔντεσι and 11.386 σὺν τεύχεσι. 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.

ἄυπνος 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 σὺ μὲν γὰρ is answered by ἐμοὶ δέ at 447. The γάρ goes with the entire statement, especially 447ff.

αἰχμάζεις is not in E., but occurs at A. *Pe.* 756 ἔνδον αἰχμάζειν and with an object at S. *Tra.* 354f. Ἔρως δέ νιν | μόνος θεῶν θέλξειεν αἰχμάσαι τάδε.

ἤμέραν 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 ἤμεραν. 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 ἐξ ἑορτῆς, and Gygli-Wyss *ZVS* 18 (1966) 69f.

446 πίπτεις Sallier's ῥίπτεις 'You risk on a gambler's throw your warfare with the Argives',[273] is unnecessary. πίπτεις 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.

κυβεύων...Ἄρη This use of the verb with an object is not found elsewhere in tragedy, but cf. *Anth. Pal.* 12.47.2 (Meleager) τοὐμὸν πνεῦμ' ἐκύβευσεν Ἔρως. Cf. also *ib.* 7.427.13f. (Antipater of Sidon) τὸ κυβευθὲν πνεῦμα. For the metaphor of dicing in *Rh.* see 155n.

447 φῶς ἓν ἡλίου καταρκέσει For the idea cf. H. at 331 δείξει τοὐπιὸν 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 *παῦσαι· καταρκεῖ τοῦδε κεκλῆσθαι πατρός.*

448f. *πέρσαντι* 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.

ναυστάθμοις ἐπεσπεσεῖν On *ναυστ.* see 136n. We should expect the acc. (Δ) after the compound infin., as at E. *HF* 34 *τήνδ' ἐπεσπεσὼν πόλιν* and *Ba.* 753 *ἐπεσπεσοῦσαι πάντ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω.* However, there is a parallel for the dat. (Λ), in prose, at Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.27 *ἐπεισπίπτουσιν 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 *τῇι ἑτέραι ἡμέραι.* Cf. S. *OT* 782 (where Lloyd Jones and Wilson prefer *θἠτέραι* to *θἀτέραι*) and see Schwyzer *Gr.Gr.* 2.158.

συντεμὼν cf. *συγκατασκάψων* 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 δέ...ἐγὼ γάρ) 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 δέ indicates the start of a new train of thought.

ἄρηται for specific prohibition with aor. subj. Cf. E. *Hec.* 548f. μή τις ἅψηται χροὸς | τοὐμοῦ and see Schwyzer *Gr.Gr.* 2.315, K-G 1.220 and Goodwin *MET* section 259.

452 γάρ explains the reason for his instruction in 451.

ἐγὼ γὰρ †ἔξω† etc. 'I shall stop the big-talking Greeks with my spear when I have slain them.' Hermann's ἕρξω ((1828) 304) would require the construction ἕρξω (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.

τοὺς μέγ' αὐχοῦντας For 'talking big' cf. *Od.* 22.287f. μή ποτε πάμπαν | εἴκων ἀφραδίης μέγα εἰπεῖν, E. *Hcld.* 353 εἰ σὺ μέγ' αὐχεῖς and E. fr. 1007 λευκοὺς λίθους χέοντες αὐχοῦσιν μέγα. Its use is ironic here, because it is Rh. who has been boasting, not the Greeks.

453 καίπερ ὕστερος μολών takes up 443.

455f. *φίλα θροεῖς, φίλος Διόθεν εἶ* The verb *θροέω* is common in tragedy, found in comedy only in a quotation from A. (see *TGF* vol. 3 p.56) at Ar. *Ra.* 1276 *κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν* (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 ξύν..|..Ζηνὶ συγγένοιτό 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. *οἷον μή τις ἄγα θεόθεν κνεφά|σηι προτυπὲν στόμιον μέγα Τροίας | στρατωθέν*.

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 *ὕβρις* at A. *Ag.* 769.

ὕπατος 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 Ζεὺς ὕπατος see A.B. Cook *Zeus* vol.2 875f.

459ff. For the sentiment cf. Ajax's words of himself at S. *Ai.* 421-6 *οὐκέτ' ἄνδρα μὴ | τόνδ' ἴδητ' - ἔπος | ἐξερῶ μέγα -| οἷον οὔτινα | Τρωία στρατοῦ | δέρχθη χθονὸς μολόντ' 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 Ἀχιλεύς is an epic form, found seven times in E. and nowhere in A. or S.

ὑπομεῖναι 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' ἦμαρ | εἰσίδοιμ' ἄναξ, ὅτωι πολυφόνου | χειρὸς ἄποιν' ἄροιο 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 ἄξιον ἦμαρ ἔδωκε, | νῆας ἑλεῖν.* For *εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε γ'*

ἦμαρ cf. E. *Cy.* 437f. *εἰ γὰρ τήνδ' ἴδοιμεν ἡμέραν | Κύκλωπος ἐκφυγόντες ἀνόσιον κάρα.*

ὅτωι Musgrave prints the reading ὅπως in his text, but says of the line 'frustra in his sensum quaeras' and proposed ὅτωι.

πολυφόνου χειρός 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 μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας* at 467.

ἄποιν' ἄροιο is Diggle's suggestion (*Eur.* 515ff.)[274] for *ἀποινάσαιο* (aor. mid. opt; the opt. is due to the attraction of the mood of *εἰσίδοιμι*. See K-G 1.255f. and Goodwin *M&T* section 177). In tragedy the verb occurs only at 177 above and here, and does not occur again until the fourth century.[275] In 177 it means 'hold to ransom' i.e. exact *ἄποινα* 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. *ἄποινα σᾶι φέροις* (Hartung) and *ἄποινα σᾶι θάνοι* (Murray)

[275] Dem. explains the active sense to his contemporaries while expounding a statute at 23.33.4 *μηδὲ ἀποινᾶν. ταῦτα δ'ἐστὶν τί; .. μὴ χρήματα πράττεσθαι· τὰ γὰρ χρήματ' ἄποιν' ὠνόμαζον οἱ παλαιοί.*

τοιαῦτα μέν object of πρᾶξαι. R. compares the format of this line with E. *Me.* 545f. τοσαῦτα μέν σοι τῶν ἐμῶν πόνων πέρι | ἔλεξ', which has an answering δέ at *ib.* 547. τοιαῦτα 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 ξὺν σοὶ.

τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας is genitive of payment. Cf. E. *Me.* 534f. μείζω γε μέντοι τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας | εἴληφας ἢ δέδωκας (see Page *ad loc.*) and S. *Tra.* 287f. εὖτ' ἂν ἁγνὰ θύματα | ῥέξηι πατρώιωι Ζηνὶ τῆς ἁλώσεως (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).

πρᾶξαι For πράσσειν with the sense 'exact' cf. 368f. above and see Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 111.

σὺν δ' Ἀδραστείαι λέγω The δ' does not answer μέν, 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 ξὺν θεώι at 358 above. Cf. Herodas 6.35 λάθοιμι δ' Ἀδρήστεια 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 ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν Cf. A. *Se.* 734. Murray keeps ἐπειδὰν (cf. A. *Se.* 734) and wishes to alter μέν to μήν in 467, but ἐπειδ' ἂν (followed by an unnecessary δ') occurs in V, and μέν, which surely points forwards to a δέ 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 (ἐπειδὰν = ἐπειδὴ + ἂν).

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.

ἀκροθίν' 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.

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. *ὡς 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.* 8.515f.

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 *κακόν* of Troy is of more importance than

the future, hypothetical *κακόν* of Greece.

475 *ὣς τὸ πρίν ποτ' ἀσφαλῆ* i.e. in its stable condition before the arrival of the Greeks. Cf. *Il.* 22.156 *τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν.*

477f. *τὰ δ' ἀμφί τ' Ἄργος* The δ' is strongly adversative: 'But as for Argos'. As at 474, H. counters Rh.'s zeal by taking up his own words. Cf. *Ἄργος ... Ἑλλάδος | ... πορθεῖν ... 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 *ἀμφιθάλαττον νομόν*, of Rhodes. Its use here is surely connected to *νεμοίμην* in 475.

οὐχ...ῥάιδι' 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 *φασὶν* illustrates Rh.'s second-hand knowledge of the war. Cf. *λόγος γ' ἦν* at 493.

ἀριστέας. Hutchinson on A. *Se.* 327 observes that 'Attic poets do not normally run together ε + α in disyllables.' C.G. Cobet (*Variae Lectiones*$_2$ (1873) 583f.), following the scholion (*οὐχ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἄριστοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων*), conjectured *ἀρίστους*, but

see K. Meisterhans-E. Schwyzer (1900) 141.

480 *κοὐ μεμφόμεσθά γ'* The *καὶ* implies 'yes', as often in stichomythia, and *καὶ...γέ* 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' ἄδην 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. *ἄδην* is the adverbial acc. of *ἄδη*, meaning 'satiety' (the alternative sense provided by Λ's *ἀλλὰ δὴν* (*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 *ἄδην* referring to the object driven, meaning to drive someone else to a satiety of something (in the genitive). Cf. *Il.* 13.315 *οἵ μιν ἄδην ἐλόωσι καὶ ἐσσύμενον πολέμοιο*, *ib.* 19.423 *οὐ λήξω πρὶν Τρῶας ἄδην ἐλάσαι πολέμοιο* and *Od.* 5.290 *ἀλλ' ἔτι μέν μίν φημι ἄδην ἐλάαν 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 κατακτὰς πάντ' ἔχεις*. For the perfect used of a future event cf. S. *Phil.* 75f. *ὥστ' εἴ με τόξων ἐγκρατὴς αἰσθήσεται | ὅλωλα* and *OT* 1166 *ὅλωλας, εἴ σε ταῦτ' 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 *πόρσω* 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 *ἔοικε* (cf. E. *Me.* 337) and the postponement of *μή*. 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. *Hcld.* 881f. *παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ οὐ σοφὸν τόδε, | ἐχθροὺς 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.

ἄρχω 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 κεφαλὴν κόρακος ἔχων.*

κἀνθάδ' ὢν The sense is 'since I am here'. Cf. *ἀριστεύων* at 194.

485ff. H. breaks the stichomythia with a strong *ἀλλά*, 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 *λαιὸν* 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.

ιινε γὰρ κέρας | τὸ λαιὸν ἡμῶν, E. *Hcld.* 671 καὶ δὴ λαιὸν
τηκεν κέρας. For the substitute cognate acc. cf. also E. *Su.*
7f. δεξιὸν τεταγμένον | κέρας (see Collard *ad loc.*).

488 Rh. takes the discussion back to an extravagant level by
peating his intention of 451ff., thereby undermining completely
ιe generosity of H.'s offer. He condescendingly invites H. to
ιin him in the victory and thereby save face. μόνος is placed
rst for strong emphasis. For a similar exaltation of one's own
ιrth cf. Achilles at A. *Myrm.* fr. 132c 9f. ἀλλ' εἴ]περ εἷς ὤν, ὡς
γουσι σύμμαχοι, | [...]ν τοσαύτην ἔκτισ' οὐ παρὼν μάχηι, | [
]μ' ἐγὼ τὰ πάντ' Ἀχαικῶι στρατῶι;. For the might of a single
ιrrior cf. *ib.* 15f. ὑμᾶς εἷς ἀνὴρ ἠικίζετο | ...τ]αράσσων καὶ
λυσκεδεῖς [τιθείς]. The desire to fight alone against the enemy
ecalls the solo aristeiae of the heroes of the *Iliad*, although
ιly the aristeia of Achilles threatens to decide the issue of the
ιr (see *Il.* 20.26-30).

489f. This is a particularly ironic statement, given that
.'s zeal for burning the ships is an obsession which he voiced
ιroughout the first epeisodion. Rh. has forgotten that at 392 he
comised to assist H. in burning the ships. Now he invites H. to
ɔin him in the task. The compound συνεμπρῆσαι is not found
lsewhere in tragedy.

πονήσας τὸν πάρος πολὺν χρόνον As at 444ff. Rh. emphasises
ιe length of H.'s inadequate efforts against the Greeks.

491-517 The discussion now turns to individual Greek pponents and Rh. displays a remarkable ignorance not only of the ffairs of the war, but the identity of his enemies. He has heard nly of Achilles' presence, and that at second hand (λόγος γ' ἦν). e does not know of his quarrel with Agamemnon and, when he is isappointed 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 n the τειχοβουλία at *Il.* 3.161-242. In the epic the scene is used o express the admiration of the Trojans for their valorous Greek pponents. Mention is made of Agamemnon, Odysseus and Ajax (cf. *h.* 497). The praise of Od. is the most lengthy (*ib.* 191-224) and ays stress upon his skill as an orator as well as a warrior. Most mportantly, this high praise comes from the wise Trojan elder ntenor. In the tragedy, Rh. has not even heard of Od. (cf. 866), nd when H. stresses his personal knowledge of the harm which Od. s 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 hat the man soon to murder him might be a difficult opponent. His gnorance 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. *hil.* 403-446 (cf. also his loathing of Od.). The unique value of d. to the Greek cause is emphasised by Agamemnon at A. *Ag.* 841f. ινος δ' Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἑκὼν ἔπλει, | ζευχθεὶς ἕτοιμος ἦν οἰ σειραφόρος.

491 στρατοῦ κατὰ στόμα i.e. opposite the Myrmidons. κατὰ στόμα goes not only with Ἀχιλλέως, but also with στρατοῦ. Cf. E. *Hcld.* 800f. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλοισιν ὁπλίτην στρατὸν | κατὰ στόμ' ἐκτείνοντες ἀντετάξαμεν.

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'.

ἀντᾶραι is Reiske's suggestion for the difficult ἐντάξαι. This use of ἐντάσσω for ἀντιτάσσω is not found elsewhere. Porter's comparisons with ἐνστάτης (S. *Aj.* 104) and ἐνστῆναι (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 correption. Cf. *Il.* 1.247, 422 and 488 etc. It is found also in tragedy at E. *Hi.* 1146 (lyric) *μανίω 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.*

οὐ συναίρεται δόρυ 'He does not lift his spear in company with the others'. The *συναίρειν* in MSS M, S and A of S. fr. 724 (Radt, Stobaeus 3.8.5) has not found favour over *ἐναίρειν*, but see Ellendt-Genthe s.v. *ἐναίρειν*: 'sed *συναίρειν* corrigi potest'. It is conjectured at A. fr. 357 and occurs in E. at *Or.* 767 *ὅτι συνηράμην φόνον σοι μητρός*. R. (124) regards this periphrasis as especially characteristic of Euripidean diction, comparing *Hcld.* 313 *αἴρεσθαι δόρυ*, *Hel.* 1597 *αἰρεῖται δόρυ* and *Pho.* 434 *ἠράμην δόρυ*, but we also have *κἀπαναίρονται δόρυ* at S. *OC* 424.

496 For *δή* at the opening of an interrogative answer see Denniston *GP* 239.

μετ' αὐτόν cf., in a similar context, Ajax at *Il.* 7.226ff. *Ἕκτορ, νῦν μὲν δὴ σάφα εἴσεαι οἰόθεν οἷος* | *οἷοι καὶ Δαναοῖσιν ἀριστῆες μετέασι,* | *καὶ μετ' Ἀχιλλῆα ῥηξήνορα θυμολέοντα.*

εὐδοξεῖ is not used elsewhere in tragedy and occurs nowhere earlier than the fourth century, but we find *εὔδοξος* and *εὐδοξία*

in tragedy.

στρατοῦ after τίς: 'who else in the army'. Cf. 2 τίς ὑπασπιστῶν;

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 Ἀχαιῶν, *ib.* 414 τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν and *Il.* 6.98f. ὃν δὴ ἐγὼ κάρτιστον Ἀχαιῶν φημι γενέσθαι. | οὐδ' Ἀχιλῆά ποθ' ὧδέ γ' ἐδείδιμεν. At *Il.* 9.53 Nestor also addresses him with a great compliment: Τυδείδη, πέρι μὲν πολέμωι ἔνι καρτερός ἐσσι. 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.

ἐμοί stresses H.'s personal knowledge of Ajax's might.

χὠ Τυδέως παῖς is the second subject of οὐδὲν .. δοκεῖ. Cf.

πῶς δ' Αἴας at 463. For χὠ see A.E. Housman *Classical Papers* (1972) 3.1097f.

498-509 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.[276] 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 ἄγαλμα 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.

[276]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 unrecogniseable, 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.

αἰμυλώτατον | κρότημ' 'that most glib fixer'. Cf. *Ai.* 388f. τὸν αἰμυλώτατον, | ἐχθρὸν ἄλημα (cf. also *ib.* 380ff. ἅπαντων ἀίων, | κακῶν ὄργανον, τέκνον Λαρτίου, | κακοπινέστατον τ' ἄλημα 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) οὔ τἄρ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἐστιν αἰμύλος μόνος· | χρεία διδάσκει, and E. *Cy.* 104 οἶδ' ἄνδρα, κρόταλον δριμύ, Σισύφου γένος.[277]

αἰμύλος 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 'ὀξὺς ἐν τῶι λέγειν'. Vater points to a verse of Solon on Peisistratus (fr. 11.7f. West) εἰς γὰρ γλῶσσαν ὁρᾶτε καὶ εἰς ἔπη αἰμύλου ἀνδρός | εἰς ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν γιγνόμενον βλέπετε. At *Od.* 1.56 Calypso detains Od. μαλακοῖσι καὶ αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν (where it probably means 'wheedling', like *blandus* in Latin). Cf. also the fragment of E. *Tel.* mentioned above and αἰμύλον δόρυ, 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'.

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 χρυσέα κρηπὶς ἱεραῖσιν ἀοιδαῖς, and Theocritus 15.49 ἐξ ἀπάτας κεκροτημένοι ἄνδρες).[278] At *Od.* 1.1. πολύκροτον is a *varia lectio* on πολύτροπον. Cf. Hes. fr. 198.3 (West) (also of Odysseus) πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδώς, and Call. fr. 67.3 πολύκροτος (see Pfeiffer *ad loc.*). The scholion on this word gives alternative meanings for κρότημα: οἷον 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.*

λῆμά τ' ἀρκούντως θρασὺς In verse ἀρκούντως is usually found in the idiom ἀρκ. ἔχει. (cf. A. *Cho.* 892 and E. *Hec.* 318). However, we do find οὐ ζῶ; κακῶς μέν, οἶδ', ἐπαρκούντως δ' ἐμοί at S. *El.* 354.

500 καὶ πλεῖστα χώραν τήνδ' ἀνὴρ καθυβρίσας The use of ἀνήρ, in a late position and in apposition to the man's own name is striking. In the MSS at S. *OC* 563 we find ὥσπερ σύ, χὥστις πλεῖστ' ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ ξένης | ἦλθησα. χὥστις 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 εἷς (cf. 946 below) and Blomfield's χὡς εἷς is now adopted. A similar difficulty occurs at E. *Hec.* 309f., also with an aor. participle and superlative adverb, ἡμῖν δ' Ἀχιλλεὺς ἄξιος τιμῆς, γύναι, | θανὼν ὑπὲρ γῆς Ἑλλάδος κάλλιστ' ἀνήρ. Jebb wished to read the difficult κάλλιστ' ἀνὴρ εἷς Ἑλλάδος θανὼν ὕπερ there. It is possible that the ἀνήρ of *Hec.* 310 might have come from the end of *ib.* 307. However ἀνήρ remains in Diggle's text at the end of the line, without εἷς. 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 εἷς for καὶ will not work), and secondly, τήνδ' is needed to qualify χώραν (so Boissonade's εἷς for τήνδε will not work).

σηκὸν 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 ἤδη δ' 'and formerly'.

ἀγύρτης occurs also at 715. Cf., of Teiresias, S. *OT* 388. ἀγύρτρια, 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. '*ἀγύρτης* ... 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.*).

πτωχικὴν For adjectives in *-ικος* see 205n. *πτωχικός* does not occur elsewhere in tragedy, but *πτωχός* 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 *πτωχικῶς* at E. *Tel.* 147.6.1 (Austin *NFE* 76) *πτωχὸς ὢν οὐ πτωχ*[. Clearly Od.'s disguise was more convincing than that of Dolon.

505 *ἠρᾶτο* 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* (Δ) at 347 and see Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1391.

507 ἐν λόχοις 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.* 11.370f., 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.

508 Θυμβραῖον ἀμφὶ βωμὸν 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 Paully-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 οἰκειότερόν ἐστι τῶι παλαιῶι κτίσματι· πλησίον γάρ ἐστι τὸ πεδίον ἥ Θύμβρα καὶ ὁ δι' αὐτοῦ ῥέων ποταμὸς Θύμβριος, ἐμβάλλων εἰς τὸν Σκάμανδρον κατὰ τὸ Θυμβραίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερόν, τοῦ δὲ νῦν Ἰλίου καὶ πεντήκοντα σταδίους διέχει. Hesychius says Θύμβρα, τόπος τῆς Ἰλίου περὶ τὸν Θύμβρον λεγόμενον ποταμόν, οὕτως

ὀνομασθέντα, τῆς ἀρχαίας πόλεως ἀπέχοντα σταδίους δέκα, ὅπου γε καὶ ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος Θυμβραίου. 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.

ἄστεως is the normal tragic form for ἄστεος.

509 θάσσων is listed by R. (169) as not occuring in A., but it is conjectured by Lobel at fr. 132a 8.3 (Radt) and θάσσειϛ occurs at fr. 157a which has been attributed to A. For εὑρίσκομαι and the participle cf. S. *Tra.* 411 and *OT* 839.

μερμέρωι 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 kämpfen.'

510-7 Rh. despises those who fight by guile and thinks only open combat is suitable for an ἀνὴρ εὔψυχοϛ. For the sentiment cf. *Il.* 7.242f., E. *HF* 162ff. and *El.* 525f. However, this attitude also smacks of naïvety 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 ἴζειν is used of an ambush at *Il.* 18.522. The English 'skulks' conveys the tone here.

κλωπικὰς ἕδρας 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. (ἢ σκῦλον οἰωνοῖσιν, αἰθέρος τέκνοις, | πήξασ' ἔρεισον

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.

ζῶντα Ajax expresses his desire to keep Od. alive in order to inflict maximum suffering at S. *Aj.* 106 (cf. also S. *Ant.* 309).

ἐγὼ contrasts with σὺ in 512. With characteristic pride Rh. promises action to remove a problem which has defeated H.

514 πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοισιν Cf. A. *Se.* 33 and 58 (see p.41 above).

ἀμπείρας For the apocope of ἀνα- see Kühner-Blass 1.1.180. Neither this verb, nor its variant ἐμπείρω occur elsewhere in tragedy.

515 πετεινοῖς γυψὶ The word γύψ 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.

θοινατήριον For the long alpha see Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1281. The word is ἅπ. λεγ., but similar words exist in tragedy. Cf. A.

Ag. 1502 θοινατῆρος, E. *El.* 638 συνθοινάτορ', *Ion* 1206 θοινατόρων and *ib.* 1217 θοινάτορας. Hesychius recognises θοιναστήριον. See also Willink on εὐνατήριον at *Or.* 590 (p. 174). The reading of Hn, θηρατήριον, 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 Denniston 108f. and cf. 525 below and S. *Tra.* 416 καὶ γὰρ οὐ σιγηλὸς εἶ.

520 νυχεῦσαι ('pass the night') is not found in A. or S., or before E. We find it at E. *Hyps.* (Cockle p. 79, fr. 8/9.13f., see also Bond *ad loc.*), and Hermann rightly altered χεύω to νυχεύω at E. *El.* 181. E. may have written νύχευματων 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 τεταγμένου 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 ἀπάνευθε νεήλυδες ἔσχατοι ἄλλων. 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 Φοῖβος 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.

ἤν τι καὶ δέηι ('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.

προταινὶ[279] Σ states 'Παρμενίσκος τὴν προταινὶ λέξιν Βοιωτικήν φησι [καὶ] μετ' οὐδεμιᾶς πίστεως. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἔμπροσθεν.' We may be sure that the word is Boeotian because it occurs three times in Boeotian inscriptions, with the spelling προτηνί; *IG* 7 1739.14 κα [μ]ῖον εὕρει, τὸμ προτηνὶ ἐμβάντα ἐν τὸ ... (Thespis, see Dittenberger *ad loc.*), *ib.* 2406.6 τῶν [ἀγα]θῶν τῶν προ[τ]ην[ὶ πεπρ]αγμέ[νων] ... (Thebes) and Colin *BCH* 21 (1897) 554.2 ὑπάρχι δὲ ἐν τῆι π[ροτ]ηνὶ π[ρ]οῤῥείσει ... (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 προτηνί, see Buck *ib.* section 136.1 'πρό with the dat. in Boeotian. προτηνὶ 'formerly', *i.e.* πρὸ ται-νί (sc. ἁμέραι)'. 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 612₂, 619,3, vol.2 507₈, P. Chantrainne *ib.* s.v. προταίνιος, H. Frisk *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* s.v. προταινί and Lejeune *RPh* 17 (1943) 120-30.

In the inscriptions the word means πρότερον. 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 προταινί. Hesychius renders προταίνιον as πρὸ μικροῦ. 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions and Translations of *Rhesus* in chronological order:

editio Aldina Εὐριπίδου τραγωιδίαι ἑπτακαίδεκα vol.2 Venice 1503

Oporinus I. (ap. I. Hervagium) Εὐριπίδου τραγωιδίαι Basle 1507₁, 1544₂, 1551₃

Brubachius P. Εὐριπίδου τραγωιδίαι ὀκτωκαίδεκα Frankfurt 1558₁, 1560₂

Stiblinus G. *Euripides in Latinum sermonem conversus* Basle 1562

Canter G. Εὐριπίδου τραγωιδίαι ιθ΄ Antwerp 1571

Portus M.A. (ap. H. Commelinum) Εὐριπίδης Heidelberg 1597

Stephanus P. Εὐριπίδου τραγωιδίων ὅσα σώιζεται vol.2 Geneva 1602

Barnes J. Εὐριπίδου σωιζόμενα ἅπαντα vol.1 Cambridge 1694 (=Leipzig 1778)

Musgrave S. Εὐριπίδου τὰ σωιζόμενα Oxford 1778₁ and vol.2 Glasgow 1797₂

Beck C.D. *Euripidis Tragoediae* vol.1 Leipzig 1778

Schaefer G.H. *Euripidis Tragoediae* Leipzig 1810

Matthiae A.H. *Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta* vol.2 (text) and vol.8 (notes) Leipzig 1814 & 1824

Dindorf L. Εὐριπίδου δράματα Leipzig 1825

Bothe F.H. *Euripidis Dramata* vol.2 Leipzig 1826

Vater F. *Euripidis* Rhesus *cum scholiis antiquis* Berlin 1837 (with comm.)

Dindorf G. *Euripidis Tragoediae Superstites* Oxford 1832-40₁, vol.2 1851₂

Hartung J.H. *Euripides Werke* Leipzig 1848-53

Nauck A. *Euripidis Tragoediae* Leipzig 1854₁, 1857₂, vol.2 1871₃,

Kirchhoff A. *Euripidis Tragoediae* vol.1 Berlin 1855

Paley F.A. *Euripides with an English Commentary* London 1857-60₁, vol.1 1872₂

Schwartz E. *Scholia in Euripidem* vol.2 Berlin 1891

(Prinz R.-) Wecklein N. *Euripidis Fabulae* vol.3 pt.6 Leipzig 1902

Murray G. *Euripidis Fabulae* Oxford 1902-9₁, vol.3 1913₂

——— (tr.) *Euripides* Rhesus London 1913

Way A.S. (tr.) *Euripides* vol.1 London and Cambridge (Mass) 1912

Porter W.H. *The* Rhesus *of Euripides* Cambridge 1916₁ 1929₂ (with comm.)

Lattimore R. (tr.) *Euripides* vol.4 in *The Complete Greek Tragedies* edd. D. Grene & R. Lattimore Chicago 1958

Ebener D. (tr.) Rhesos *Tragödie eines unbekannten Dichters* Berlin 1966

Braun R.E. (tr.) *Euripides.* Rhesos New York 1978

Paduano G. (tr.) *Pseudo-Euripide* Reso Milan 1991

Zanetto J. *Euripides* Rhesus Stuttgart & Leipzig 1993

Diggle J. *Euripidis Fabulae* vol.3 Oxford 1994

Other works in alphabetical order:

Adcock F. and Mosley D.J. *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece* London 1975

Ahrens H.L. *De Dialecta Dorica* (Vol. 2 of De graecae linguae dialectis Göttingen) 1882₂

Albert P. *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. Halle 1876

Allen J.T. and G. Italie *A Concordance to Euripides* Cambridge 1954 suppl. C. Collard Groningen 1971

Allen W.S. 'The Name of the Black Sea in Greek' *CQ* 41 1947 86-8

Arnoldt C.D.R. *Die chorische Technik des Euripides* Halle 1878

Arnott P.D. *Greek Scenic Conventions* Oxford 1962

Austin C. (ed.) (*NFE*) *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* Berlin 1968

Bacon H.H. *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* New Haven 1961

Badian E. 'The deification of Alexander the Great' in *Ancient Macedonian Studies* Thessalonica 1981 27-71

Bain D. 'The Prologues of Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*' *CQ* 27 1977 10-26

Barlow C.W. 'Rhetorical Elements in the *Rhesus*' diss. Holyoke College 1941 (See *TAPA* 72 1941 xxvii)

Barlow S.A. *The Imagery of Euripides* London 1974₂

Barrett W.S. *Euripides* Hippolytus Oxford 1964

——— 'Pindar's Twelfth *Olympian* and the Fall of the Deinomenidai' *JHS* 93 1973 23-35

Bates W.N. 'Notes on the *Rhesus*' *TAPA* 47 1916 5-11

Beare J.I. 'Miscellanea' *Hermathena* 13 1904 70-79

Beazley J.D. (*ABV*) *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters* Oxford 1956

——— (*ARV*₂) *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* Oxford₂ 1963

Bechtel F. *Die griechischen Dialekte* Berlin 1921-3

Beck C.D. *Diatribe critica de Rheso suppositicio Euripidis dramate* Leipzig 1824

Beck F.A.G. *Greek Education 430-350 BC* London 1964

Bentley R. *Q. Horatius Flaccus* Berlin 1869₃

Bergk T. (ed.) *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* vol.3 Leipzig 1914

Bers V. *Enallage and Greek Style* Leiden 1974

——— *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age* New Haven 1984

Best J.G.P. *Thracian Peltasts and their Influence on Greek Warfare* Groningen 1969

Biehl W. *Euripides* Troades Heidelburg 1989

Björck G. Ἦν διδάσκων Uppsala 1940

——— *Das Alpha impurum* Uppsala 1950

——— 'Rhesos' *Arctos* 1 1954 16-18

——— 'The Authenticity of *Rhesus*' *Eranos* 55 1957 7-17

Boeckh A. *Graecae tragoediae principum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis num ea quae supersunt genuina omnia sunt* Heidelberg 1808

Bömer F. *Ovid* Metamorphoses Heidelberg 1969-86

Boisacq E. 'L'etymologie de grec RESOS' *REG* 39 1926 332-4

——— *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* Heidelberg 1950₄

Bond G.W. *Euripides* Hypsipyle Oxford 1963

——— *Euripides* Heracles Oxford 1981

Borgeaud P. *Recherches sur le dieu Pan* Rome 1979

Bothe F.H. *Poetarum Scaenicorum Graecorum quorum integra opera supersunt Fragmenta* vol.3 Leipzig 1844

Bowra C.M. *Pindar* Oxford 1964

Breitenbach W. (1934) *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* Stuttgart 1934 (=Hildesheim 1967)

Broadhead H.D. *The* Persae *of Aeschylus* Cambridge 1960

Brown A.L. 'The Dramatic Synopses attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium' *CQ* 37 1987 427-31

Brown S.G. 'Metrical Innovation in Euripides' later plays' *AJP* 95 1974 207-34

Bruhn E. *Anhang* to F.W. Schneidewin and A. Nauck *Sophocles* Berlin 1877-1914

Bryce T.R. 'Lycian Apollo and the authorship of *Rhesus*' *CJ* 86 1990 144-9

Buchwald W. *Studien zur Chronologie der attischen Tragödie 455 bis 431* diss. Königsberg 1939

Buck C.D. *The Greek Dialects* Chicago 1928

——— and Petersen W. *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* Chicago 1944

Burkert W. *Homo Necans* Berlin 1972 (Engl. trans. Berkeley 1983)

——— 'Apellai und Apollon' *RM* 118 1975 1-21

——— *Die griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* Stuttgart 1977 (Engl. trans. C. Raffan *Greek Religion* Oxford 1985)

——— 'Ein Datum für Euripides' *Elektra*: Dionysia 420 ~~A.C.~~ v. Chr.' *MH* 47 1990 65-9

Burkhardt H. *Die Archaismen des Euripides* Hanover 1906

Burnett A.P. (1985) 'Are Smiles Allowed?' in P. Burian (ed.) *Directions in Euripidean Criticism* Durham 1985 13-51

Burton R.W.B. *The Chorus in Sophocles' Tragedies* Oxford 1980

Cannata Fera M. 'Schol. Eur. *Rh.* 895 e Pind. fr. 128c (S-M)' *RFIC* 115 1987 12-23

Carden R. *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* Berlin 1974

Carrara P. 'Dicearco e l'Hypothesis del Reso' *ZPE* 90 1992 35-44

Casabona J. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec* *AFLSHAix-Marseilles* 56 1966

Castiglioni L. 'Decisa forficibus VI' *RIL* 70 1937 58-60

Ceadel E.B. 'Resolved feet in the trimeters of Euripides and the Chronology of the Plays' *CQ* 35 1941 66-89

Chantraine P. *Histoire du parfait grec* Paris 1927

——— *Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue grecque* Paris 1968

Chapouthier F. 'Euripide et l'accueil du divin' *Entr.Fond.Hardt.* 1 1952 203-237

Clay D.M. *A Formal Examination of the Vocabularies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides* 1957 Diss films 820.

Cobet C.G. *Variae Lectiones* Leiden 1873₂

——— *Collectanea Critica* Leiden 1878

——— *Miscellanea Critica* Leiden 1876

Coles 'A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus' *BICS* supp. 32 1974

Collard C. *Euripides* Supplices Groningen 1975

——— 'Formal Debates in Euripides' drama' *GR* 22 1975 58-71

——— *Euripides* (*GR. New Surveys in Classics*) Oxford 1981

——— *Euripides* Hecuba Warminster 1991

Collart P. 'Les papyres grecs d'Achmîm à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris' *BIFAO* 31 1931 33-111

Compagno S. 'Sull' autenticità del *Reso* di Euripide' *AAT* 98 1963-4 221-62

Conomis N.C. 'The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama' *Hermes* 92 1964 23-50

Cook A.B. 'Unconscious Iterations' *CR* 16 1902 146-158 and 256-267

——— *Zeus* Cambridge 1914

Croiset A. and M. *Histoire de la littérature grecque* vol.3 Paris 1913$_3$

Cropp M. and G. Fick 'Resolution and Chronology in Euripides. The Fragmentary Tragedies' *BICS* supp. 43 1985

Cunningham I.C. *Herodas* Mimiambi Oxford 1971

——— (ed.) *Herodas* Mimiambi Leipzig 1987

Dale A.M. *Euripides* Alcestis Oxford 1954

——— (*LM*$_2$) *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* Cambridge$_2$ 1968

——— (*MATC*) 'Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses' *BICS* suppl. 21.1 (Dactylo-epitrite) 1971, 21.2 (Aeolo-choriambic) 1981 and 21.3 (Dochmiac, Iambic, Dactylic, Ionic) 1983

Danek G. 'Studien zur Dolonie' *WS* Beiheft 12 1988

Davies M. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* Göttingen 1988 (*Prolegomena and Paralegomena NAWG* 1986 89-111)

——— 'The Date of the Epic Cycle' *Glotta* 65 1989 89-100

Dawe R.D. 'The End of *Seven Against Thebes* Yet Again' in *Dionysiaca* (Festschrift for Page) Cambridge 1978

Decharme P. *Euripide et l'esprit de son theâtre* Paris 1893

Delebecque E. *Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse* Paris 1951

Demiańczuk J. *Supplementum Comicum* Krakow 1912 (=Hildesheim 1967)

Deubner L. *Attische Feste* Berlin 1932

Denniston J.D. *Euripides* Electra Oxford 1939

——— (*GP*) *The Greek Particles* Oxford$_2$ 1954

——— *Le trimètre iambique des iambographes à la Comèdie Nouvelle* Mâcon 1931

Devine A.H. and L.D. Stephens *TAPA* 110 1980 and 111 1981 43-64

Diggle J. *Euripides* Phaethon Cambridge 1970

——— *Studies on the Text of Euripides* Oxford 1981

——— 'The Prophet of Bacchus: *Rhesus* 970-3' *SI* 5 1988 167-72 (=*Eur.* 320-7)

——— 'Orestes' *CQ* 40 1990 100-23

——— *The Textual Tradition of Euripides* Orestes Oxford 1991

——— (*Eur.*) *Euripidea* Oxford 1994

di Gregorio L. *Le scene d' annuncio nella tragedia greca* 1967 Pubb. Univ. de sacro cuore 6 Milan

Dimitrov D.P. 'Motifs historiques dans le drame Rhésos' *BSHSofia* 10 1930 19

Dobson J.F. '᾽ΩΣ ᾽AN and ᾽ΟΠΩΣ ᾽AN in the tragedians' *CR* 24 1910 143-4

Dodds E.R. *The Greeks and the Irrational* Berkeley 1951

——— *Euripides* Bacchae Oxford 1960

Dover K.J. *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* Berkeley 1968

——— *Greek Popular Morality* Oxford 1974

——— *Greek Homosexuality* London 1978

Duchemin J. *L'ΑΓΩΝ dans la tragédie grecque*₂ Paris 1968

Easterling P. 'Anachronism in Greek Tragedy' *JHS* 105 1985 1-10

Ebener D. 'Der *Rhesos*' *SPFB* 12 1963 E8 59-72

——— 'Textkritisches zum *Rhesos*' *WZRostock* 12 1963 205-7

Eckels R.P. *Greek Wolf Lore* diss. Pennsylvania 1937

Edmonds J.M. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* Leiden 1957

Elderkin G.W. 'Dolon's Disguise in the *Rhesus*' *CP* 30 1935 349-50

Ellendt F. and E. Genthe *Lexicon Sophocleum* Berlin 1872

Elmsley P. *Euripides* Heracleidae *and* Medea Oxford 1828

Erbse H. *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem* Berlin 1959-88

Erffa C.E.F.von 'ΑΙΔΩΣ' *Philologus* suppl. 30.2 1937

Eysert L. (1891-3) *Rhesus im Lichte des euripideischen Sprachgebrauches* Prog. Böhm-Leipa 1 1891 and 2 1893

Fabbri P. 'De nonnullis Rhesi tragoediae locis discrepantibus' *RFil* 48 1920 192-4

Farnell L.R. *Cults of the Greek States* Oxford 1896-1909

Fehling *Die Wiederholungsfiguren* Berlin 1969

Fenik B. '*Iliad X* and the *Rhesus*' *Latomus* 73 1964

Ferguson J.A. *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* Austin 1972

Fowler R.L. 'Reconstructing the Cologne Alcaeus' *ZPE* 33 1979 17-28

Fraenkel Ed. 'Lyrische Daktylen' *RhM* 72 1917 161-97 and 321-52

——— *Aeschylus* Agamemnon Oxford 1950

——— (1965) review of Ritchie (*q.v.*) *Gnomon* 37 1965 228-41

Fraenkel Er. *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina Agentis* Strasburg 1910

Fraenkel H. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* Göttingen 1921

Fraser P.M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria* Oxford 1972

Friis-Johansen K. *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* Copenhagen 1967

——— and E.H. Whittle *Aeschylus* The Suppliants Nordisk 1980

Frisk H. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* Heidelberg 1960-70

Frost K.B. *Exits and Entrances in Menander* Oxford 1988

Führer R. 'Formproblem - Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik' *Zetemata* 44 1967

Gagé J. 'Dieux cavaliers' *Md'Arch.* 43 1926 103-23

Gallavotti C. 'Nuove hypotheseis di dramma euripidei' *RFil* 11 1933 177-88

Gardiner E.N. 'Wrestling I' *JHS* 25 1905 14-31

Gardner P. and R.S. Poole *CGC Peloponnesus* London 1887

Garvie A.F. *Aeschylus* Supplices *play and trilogy* Cambridge 1969

——— *Aeschylus* Choephoroi Oxford 1986

Geffcken J. 'Der *Rhesos*' *Hermes* 71 1936 394-408

Gernet L. 'Dolon le Loup' *Mél. F.Cumont* 4 1936 189-208

——— *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique* Paris 1968

Goodwin W.W. (*M&T*) *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* New York 1965

Goossens R. 'La date du *Rhésos*' *AC* 1 1932 93-134

——— 'Rhésus et Sitalkès' *BAB* 41 1933 11-33

Gould J.P. 'Law Custom and Myth' *JHS* 100 1980 38-59

Gow A.S.F. *Theocritus* Cambridge 1952

Greenhalgh P.A.L. *Early Greek Warfare* Cambridge 1973

Grégoire H. 'L'authenticité du *Rhésos* d'Euripide' *AC* 2 1933 91-133

——— and R. Goossens 'La date du *Rhésos*' *CRAI* 1932 190

——— and R. Goossens 'Sitalkès et Athènes dans le *Rhésos* d'Euripide' *AC* 3 1934 321-331 and 431-446

Griffin J. *Homer on Life and Death* Oxford 1980

Griffith M. (1977) *The Authenticity of the Prometheus Bound* Cambridge 1977

Gross A. *Die Stichomythie in der griechischen Tragödie und Komödie* Berlin 1905

Grube G.M.A. *The Drama of Euripides* London 1961$_2$

Gruppe O. *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* Munich 1906

Gruppe O.F. *Ariadne* Berlin 1834

Gygli-Wyss B. 'Das nominale Polyptoton im älteren Griechisch' *ZVS* 18 1966

Habicht C. 'Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte' *Zetemata* 14 Munich 1970$_2$

Hagenbach F. (1863) *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. Basle 1863

Haigh A.E. *Tragic Drama of the Greeks* Oxford 1896

——— *Attic Theatre*$_3$ Oxford 1907

Hall E. *Inventing the Barbarian* Oxford 1989

——— 'The Archer Scene in Aristophanes' Thesmophoriazousae' *Philologus* 133 1989 38-54

Halliday W.R. *Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend* Cambridge 1933

Hamilton R. 'Announced Entrances in Greek tragedy' *HSCP* 82 1978 63-82

Handley E.W. and J. Rea 'The *Telephus* of Euripides' *BICS* suppl.5 London 1957

Hansen P.A. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca saeculorum VIII-V a Chr.* Texte und Kommentare XII Berlin 1983

Hardion J. *Dissertation sur la tragédie de Rhésos MAdesI* 10 1731 323ff.

Harrison E. 'Verse-Weight' *CQ* 8 1914 206-211

Harsh P.W. 'Repetition of lines in Euripides *Hermes* 72 1937 435-49

Hartung J. *Euripides Restitutus* Hamburg 1843

——— *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik* 1875

Haslam M.W. 'The Authenticity of Euripides *Phoenissae* 1-2 and *Electra* 1' *GRBS* 16 1975 149-174

——— 'Interpolations in the *Phoenissae*: Papyrus Evidence' *CQ* 26 1976 4-10

Headlam W. *Herodas the Mimes and Fragments* Cambridge 1922

Heath M. *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy* London 1987

Henderson J. *Aristophanes* Lysistrata Oxford 1987

Hermann G. (1828) 'De Rheso Tragoedia diss.' *Opus*. 3 Leipzig 1828 262-310

——— 'Recension einer Antikritik und zwei Recensionen von Herrn K.O. Müller' *NJb* 16 1836 279-306 (=*Opus*. 7 1839 25-64)

Higgins W.E. 'Wolf-god Apollo in the *Oresteia*' *PP* 31 1976 201ff.

Hoddinott R.F. 'The Thracians and their Religion' in A. Fol, B. Nikolov and R.F. Hoddinott (edd.) *The New Thracian Treasure from Rogozen, Bulgaria* London 1986

Hoffmann O. and A. Debrunner *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* Berlin 1969

Horna K. 'Der Jerusalem Euripides-Palimpsest' *Hermes* 64 1929 416-31

Hunger H. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* Munich 1978

Hutchinson G.O. *Aeschylus* Septem Contra Thebas Oxford 1985

Iliescu V. 'Zeitgeschichtliche Bezüge im *Rhesus*' *Klio* 58 1976 367-76

Irigoin J. *Recherches sur les mètres de la lyrique chorale grecque. La Structure du vers* Paris 1953

Italie G. *Index Aeschyleus* Leiden 1964

Itsumi K. 'The Choriambic Dimeter of Euripides' *CQ* 77 1982 59-74

——— 'The Glyconic in Tragedy' *CQ* 34 1984 66-82

——— 'Enoplian in Tragedy' *BICS* 38 1992-3 243-261

Jachmann G. *De Aristotelis didascaliis* Göttingen 1909

Jackson J. 'Marginalia Scenica II' *CQ* 35 1940 163-88

Jacoby F. (ed.) (*FGH*) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* Berlin and Leiden 1923-58

Jakob D. 'Bibliographie sélective concernant Eschyle, Sophocle et Euripide (1500-1900)' *Metis* 3 1988 363-407

Jebb R.S. *Sophocles the plays and fragments with Critical Notes* Cambridge 1883-1914

——— and A.C. Pearson *The Fragments of Sophocles* Cambridge 1917

Jenkins K. *Coins of Greek Sicily* London 1966

Jens W. 'Die Stichomythie in der frühen griechischen Tragödie' *Zetemata* 11 Munich 1955

——— (ed.) *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* Munich 1971

Kaibel G. (ed.) *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* Berlin 1899

Kaimio M. *Physical Contact in Greek Tragedy* Helsinki 1988

Kamerbeek J.C. *The Ajax* (Engl. trans. H. Schreuder) Leiden 1953

Kamptz H. von *Homerische Personennamen* Göttingen 1982

Kannicht R. review of Ritchie (*q.v.*) *Gymn.* 73 1966 295-7

——— *Euripides* Helena Heidelberg 1969

——— and B. Snell (edd.) (*TGF*) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vol.2 Göttingen 1981

Kassel R. 'Hypothesis' in Σχόλια Holwerda (edd. W.J. Aerts etc.) Groningen 1985 53-9 (=*KS* 1991 207-14)

——— and C. Austin (edd.) *Poetae Comici Graeci* Berlin 1983-

Kelly M. and S.D. Atkins 'Milton's Annotations of Euripides' *JEGP* 60 1961 680-7

Keyes C.W. 'Apollo and Athena in the *Rhesus*' *TAPA* 59 1928 xxviii (See also *CPh* 24 1929 204-7)

Kirchner J. *Prosopographia Attica* Berlin 1901-2

Kirchhoff A. 'Das Argument zum Rhesos' *Philologus* 7 1852 559-64

Kitto H.D.F. *Greek Tragedy*$_3$ 1961

——— 'The *Rhesus* and related matters' *YCS* 25 1977 317-50

Klinger F. 'Über die Dolonie' *Hermes* 75 1940 337ff.

Klotz A. *Scaenicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* Monaco 1953

Knox B.M.W. 'Euripides *Iphigenia in Aulide* 1-163' *YCS* 22 1972 239-61 (=*Word and Action* 274-94)

Körte A. 'Euripides' *Skyrier*' *Hermes* 69 1934 1-12

Kraay C.M. *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* London 1976

Kranz W. *Stasimon* Berlin 1933

Krieg W. 'Der trochaische Tetrameter bei Euripides' *Philologus* 91 1936 42-51

Kühner R. (*K-G, K-B*) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* pt.1 rev. F. Blass, pt.2 rev. B. Gerth Hanover 1890-1904$_3$

Kullmann W. 'Die Quellen der *Ilias*' *Hermes* Einz. 14 1960 18-28

Lannoy L.de (ed.) *Philostratus* Leipzig 1977

Latte K. 'Augur und templum in der Varronischen Auguralformel' *Philologus* 97 1948 47-50 (=*K.S.* 477-80)

Lauer S. *Zur Wortstellung bei Pindar* Winterthur 1959

Leaf W. 'Rhesos of Thrace' *JHS* 35 1915 1-11

——— *Strabo on the Troad* Cambridge 1923

Lefkowitz M.R. *The Lives of the Greek Poets* London 1981

LeJeune M. 'Sens et emploi des démonstratifs ὄνε, ὄνι, ὄνυ' *RPh* 17 1943 120-130

Lesky A. *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen* Göttingen 1972$_3$ transl. New Haven 1983

Leumann M. *Homerische Wörter* Basel 1950

Lewis D.M. *Sparta and Persia* Leiden 1977

Liddell H.G. and R. Scott *A Greek-English Lexicon* revised by H. Stuart-Jones Oxford 1940$_9$ suppl. 1968

Lissarrague F. 'L'iconographie de Dolon le Loup' *RArch* 1980 3-30

Lloyd M. *The Agon in Euripides* Oxford 1992

Lloyd Jones P.H.J. *The Justice of Zeus* Berkeley 1971

——— and N.G. Wilson *Sophoclis Fabulae* Oxford 1990

——— and ——— *Sophoclea* Oxford 1990

Longman G.A. 'Gnomologium Vatopedianum: The Euripidean Section' *BICS* 4 1957 60-1 (A Summary of the following item).

——— 'Gnomologium Vatopedianum: The Euripidean Section' *CQ* 53 1959 129-141

Luppe W. 'Die Hypothesis zum *Rhesos PSI* 1286. Kolumne I' *Anagennesis* 2 1982 74-82

——— 'Dicaearchus' ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου μύθων' in *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung* (ed. Moraux) 1985 610-15

——— 'Zur Datierung der *Phoenissai* des Euripides' *RhM* 130 1987 29-34

——— 'Dikaiarchos und der 'Rhesos'-Prolog' *ZPE* 84 1990 11-13

MacDowell D.M. '*Hybris* in Athens' *GR* 23 1976 14-31

Maclaren M. 'On the Composition of Xenophon's *Hellenica*' *AJP* 55 1934 121-39 and 249-62

Macurdy G.H. 'The Dawn Songs in *Rhesus* (527-56) and in the Parodos of *Phaethon*' *AJP* 64 1943 408-16

Mai A. *Iliadis fragmenta* Milan 1819

Mainoldi C. *L'Image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce Ancienne* Paris 1984

Malkin I. *Religion and Colonisation* in *Studies in Greek and Roman Religion* vol.3 Leiden 1987

——— *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* Cambridge 1994

Malzan W. *De Scholiis Euripideis quae ad res scaenicas et ad histriones spectant* Darmstadt 1908

Mantziou M. 'Notes on the Text of Euripides' *Dodone* 14 1985 91-102

Marcovich M. '*Rhesus* A Poor Poet's Play?' *ZA* 23 1983 129-31

——— 'Three Word Trimeters in Greek Tragedy' *BKP* 158 1984

Masqueray P. *Théorie des Formes lyriques de la tragédie grecque* Paris 1895

Mastronarde D.J. *Elektra, IT und Helene* 1964

——— *Euripides* Phoenissae Cambridge 1994

Matthiessen K. 'Exzerpte aus sieben Tragödien des Euripides im Codex Vaticanus Barberini Graecus 4' *Hermes* 93 1965 148-158

——— 'Ein Weitres Euripidesgnomologium (Escorialensis Graecus X.1.13)' *Hermes* 94 1966 398-410

——— *Studien zur Text überlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides* Heidelberg 1974

Maykowska M. 'De Rhesi compositione' *Eos* 26 1923 52-9

McKay K.L. 'The Use of the ancient Greek Perfect down to the Second Century A.D.' *BICS* 12 1965 1-21

McLennan G.R. *Callimachus* Hymn to Zeus Rome 1977

Meiggs R. and D. Lewis *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions Oxford* 1969 rev. 1988

Meisterhans K. *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* Berlin 1900

Menzer O. *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. Berlin 1867

Meschini A. 'Sugli gnomologi bizantini di Euripide' *Helikon* 13-14 1973-4 349-62

——— 'Su alcuni luoghi de Reso' *Scr.Diano* 1975 217-26

——— 'Altre note al *Reso*' *AFLFP* 1 1976 177-84

Mette H.J. 'Euripides, *Kreter*' *Hermes* 91 1963 256

——— 'Hypothesis von Euripides *Syleus*?' *ZPE* 4 1968 173

Michelini A.N. *Euripides and the Tragic tradition* Wisconsin 1987

Mierow H.E. 'The Sophoclean Character of the *Rhesus*' *AJP* 49 1928 375-8

Morel W. 'Berichte über die Literatur zu Euripides aus den Jahren 1930-1933' *JAW* 259 1938 35-66

Morstadt R. *Beitrag zur Kritik der dem Euripides zugeschriebenen Tragödie Rhesos* Heidelberg 1827

Mossay J. 'Les fragments d'Euripide du parchemin R. de Langhe' *AC* 41 1972 500-18

Mouterde R. 'Dieux cavaliers' *Mel.Beyrouth* 11 1926 309-22

Mülder D. *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen* Berlin 1910

Murray G. *Euripides and his Age*$_2$ Oxford 1946

Nachmanson E. *Der griechische Buchtitel* Göteborg 1941

Nauck A. (ed.) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* Leipzig 1889_2 repr. with suppl. by B. Snell Hildesheim 1964

Nestle W. *Euripides* Stuttgart 1901

——— *Die Struktur des Eingangs in der attischen Tragödie* Tüb. *Beitr.* 10 Tübingen 1930

Nilsson M.P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* Munich 1967_3

Nisbet R.G.M. and M. Hubbard *A Commentary on Horaces:* Odes 1 Oxford 1970

Nock A.D. 'The End of the *Rhesus*' *CR* 40 1926 184-6

——— 'The *Rhesus*' (rev. of Porter) *CR* 44 1930 173-4

Nöldeke W. *De Rhesi fabulae aetate et forma* Prog. Real. Schwerin 1877

Norwood G. *Greek Tragedy* London 1948_4

Overbeck J. *Gallerie heroischer Bildwerke* Braunschweig 1853

Owen A.S. *Euripides* Ion Oxford 1939

Pacitti G. 'Il *Reso* e la Nyctegresia di Accio' *Maia* 15 1963 184-98

Paduano G. 'Funzioni drammatiche nella struttura del *Reso*' *Maia* 25 1973 3-29

——— 'Ettore e la frustrazione del piano eroico' *SCO* 23 1974 5-30

Pagani G. 'Il *Reso* di Euripide, il dramma di un eroe' *Dioniso* 44 1970 30-43

Page D.L. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* Oxford 1934

——— *Euripides* Medea Oxford 1938

——— *Corinna Hellenic Society* suppl. 6 London 1953

——— (ed.) *Poetae Melici Graeci* Oxford 1962

Palmer C.E. 'Notes' *CR* 4 1890 228-9

Parker L.P.E. 'Split Resolution in Greek Dramatic Lyric' *CQ* 18 1968 241-269

——— 'Catalexis' *CQ* 26 1976 14-28

Parry H. 'The Approach of Dawn in the *Rhesus*' *Phoenix* 18 1964 283-93

Parry M. 'Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-making' *HSCP* 41 1930 73-148

Patin H.J.G. *Études sur les tragiques grecs* Paris 1873

——— *Euripide* Paris$_7$ 1894

Pearson A.C. 'The *Rhesus* of Euripides' (rev. of Porter's 1st ed.) *CR* 31 1917 25-7

——— 'Some Passages of Greek Tragedy' *CQ* 11 1917 57-68

——— 'Notes on Euripides, *Rhesus* 252, 340' *CQ* 12 1918 79

——— 'The *Rhesus*' *CR* 35 1921 52-61

——— '$^{\prime}$Ατακτα' *CR* 38 1924 13-15

——— 'The *Rhesus*' *CQ* 20 1926 80-81

Peppler T.C.W. 'The Termination -κός, as used by Aristophanes for Comic Effect' *AJP* 31 1910 428-44

Perdrizet P. *Cultes et Mythes du Pangée* Nancy 1910

——— 'Le Pont d'Amphipolis et la date du Rhésos' *Mel. in mem. L.V. Pârvan* Bucharest 1934 284-90

Pertusi A. 'La scoperta di Euripide nel primo Umanesimo' *IMU* 3 1960 101-152

Pestalozzi H. *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* Zurich 1945

Pfeiffer R. *Callimachus* Oxford 1949-53

Pfister F. 'Der Reliquienkult im Altertum' *RGVV* 5 1909 197f.

Philippides M.L. *Certain Features of the Iambic Trimeter of Euripides* diss. Princeton 1978

Pickard-Cambridge A.W. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* revised Gould and Lewis Oxford 1988$_2$

Platnauer M. *Aristophanes* Peace Oxford 1964

——— 'Euripides *Rhesus* 787-8' *Eranos* 62 1964 73

Platt A. 'Euripides *Rhesus* 720' *CQ* 13 1919 153-4

Pöhlmann H. 'Die Proedrie des Dionysostheaters in 5 Jahrhundert und das Bühnenspiel der Klassik' *MH* 38 1981 129-146

——— *Sucheszenen auf der attischen Bûhne des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts Festschr. R. Werner* Constance 1989

Pohlenz M. *Die griechische Tragödie* Göttingen 1954$_2$

Porter W.H. 'The Euripidean *Rhesus* in the Light of Recent Criticism' *Hermathena* 17 1913 348-80

——— 'On some passages in the *Rhesus*' *CQ* 11 1917 159-60

——— 'Note on *Rhes.* 717-721' *Hermathena* 50 1937 86

Posnansky H. 'Nemesis und Adrasteia' *BPW Abh.* 2 1890

Pritchett W.K. *The Greek State at War* Berkeley 1971-85

Rabe H. 'Euripideum' *RhM* 63 1908 419ff.

Radt S. (ed.) (*TGF*) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vols.3 and 4 Göttingen 1985 and 1977 respectively

——— 'Noch einmal Aischylos, *Niobe* fr. 16N.$_2$ (278M.)' *ZPE* 38 1980 47-58

Ragone M. 'Contributo all critica del Reso pseudo-euripideo' *RAAN* 44 1969 71-109

Rawlings H.R. 'A semantic study of *prophasis* to 400 BC' *Hermes Einz.* 33 1975

Reeve M.D. 'Interpolations in Greek Tragedy I' *GRBS* 13 1972 247-65, 'II' *GRBS* 14 1972 451-74 and 'III' *GRBS* 14 1973 145-71

Reiske J.J. *Animadversiones in Euripidem et Aristophanem* Leipzig 1753

Reitzenstein R. *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios* Leipzig 1907

Rempe H. J.J. *De Rheso Thracum heroe* Münster 1927

Rennie W. *The* Acharnians *of Aristophanes* London 1909

Ribbeck O. (ed.) *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* Leipzig 1871

Richards G.C. 'The Problem of the *Rhesus*' *CQ* 10 1916 192-7

Ridgeway W. *The Origin of Tragedy* Cambridge 1910

——— 'Euripides in Macedon' *CQ* 20 1926 1-19

——— 'Rejoinder' *CQ* 20 1926 81

Ritchie W. (R.) *The Authenticity of the* Rhesus *of Euripides* Cambridge 1964

Roberts W.R. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus the three literary letters* Cambridge 1901

Rolfe J.C. 'The Tragedy *Rhesus*' *HSCP* 4 1893 61-97

Romilly J.de *La Crainte et l'Angoisse dans le théâtre d'Eschyle* Paris 1958

↑ Rohde E. Psyche Freiburg 1998$_2$

Roscher W.H. *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* Leipzig 1884-1937

Rosivach V.J. 'Hector in the *Rhesus*' *Hermes* 106 1978 54-73

Rostovtsev M. *Skythien und der Bosporus* vol.1 Berlin 1931

Roux G. 'Commentaires à l'Orestie' *RÉG* 87 1974 65-72

Russell D. and N. Winterbottom *Ancient Literary Criticism* Oxford 1972

Rusten J. 'Dicaearchus and the *Tales from Euripides*' *GRBS* 23 1982 357-67

Saïd S. 'Bibliographie tragique 1900-1988. Quelques Orientations' *Metis* 3 1988 409-512

Scaliger J. *Prolegomena ad Manilium* Leiden 1600$_3$

Schlesier R. 'Daimon und Daimones bei Euripides' *Saeculum* 34 1983 267-79

Schmid W. and O. Stählin *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* Munich 1929-1948

Schmidt H.W. *Der Deus ex Machina bei Euripides* Tübingen 1963

Schnapp-Gourbeillon A. *Lions héros masques* Paris 1981

Schoeck G. *Ilias und Aithiopis* Zurich 1961

Schofield M. 'Euboulia in the *Iliad*' *CQ* 36 1986 6-31

Schrader O. *De notatione critica vet. gramm. in poet. scaen. adhibita* Bonn 1864

Schroeder O. *Euripidis Cantica* Leipzig 1928$_2$

Schweitzer B. 'Dea Nemesis Regina' *JbDAI* 45 1931 175-246

Schwinge E.R. *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides* Heidelberg 1968

Schwyzer E. *Griechische Grammatik* Munich 1939-53

Seaford R. *Euripides* Cyclops Oxford 1984

Seure G. 'Le roi Rhésos et le heros chasseur' *RP* 2 1928 106-34

Severyns A. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* Bull. de la Fac. de Phil. et Lett. de Liége II 1928

Sheppard J.T. 'Note on Euripides, *Rhesus* 287ff.' *CR* 28 1914 87-8

Sicherl M. 'Die Editio Princeps Aldina des Euripides und ihre Vorlagen' *RhM* 118 1975 205-25

Sinko T. 'De causae Rhesi novissima defensione' *AC* 3 1934 223-9 and 411-29

Smereka J. *Studia Euripidea* Lwów 1936-7

Smith O.L. 'Studies in the Text of Aeschylus I: The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius' MT 21-2 1973 48-66.

——— 'On the Scribal Hands in the MS P of Euripides' *Mnemosyne* 35 1982 326-331

Snell B. *Bacchylides* Leipzig 1961

——— (ed.) (*TGF*) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vol.1 Göttingen 1971

——— and H. Maehler (edd.) *Pindari Carmina* Leipzig 1975-87

Sneller C.B. *De Rheso Tragoedia* diss. Amsterdam 1949 (reviewed by J.C. Kamerbeek *Mnemosyne* 3 1950 347ff., R. Goossens *RBP* 29 1951 1209-13, A. Lesky *Gnomon* 23 1951 141-4, D.W. Lucas *CR* 1 1951 18-20 and G.M.A. Grube *CP* 47 1952 56)

Snodgrass A. *Early Greek Armour and Weapons* Edinburgh 1964

Sommerstein A.H. *Aristophanes* Acharnians Warminster 1980

Spengler R. *De Rheso Tragoedia* Prog. Gymn. Düren 1857

Stagakis G. 'Dolon, Odysseus and Diomedes in the *Doloneia*' *RhM* 130 1987 193-204

Stanford W.B. *Sophocles* Ajax London 1963

Starkie W.J.M. *The* Acharnians *of Aristophanes* London 1909

Steadman S.H. 'A Note on the *Rhesus*' *CR* 59 1945 6-8

Steffen V. 'Der Hilferuf in den *Netzfischern* des Aischylos' *Eos* 55 1965

Steiger H. *Euripides, seine Dichtung und seine Persönlichkeit* Leipzig 1912

Stevens P.T. *Euripides* Andromache Oxford 1971

——— 'Colloquial Expressions in Euripides' *Hermes Einz.* 38 1976

Stinton T.C.W. 'Pause and Period in the Lyrics of Greek Tragedy' *CQ* 27 1977 27-66 (=*Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* 310-61 Oxford 1990)

Strohm H. 'Beobachtungen zum *Rhesos*' *Hermes* 87 1959 257-74

Svennung J. *Anredeformen* Uppsala 1958

Taillardat J. *Images d'Aristophane*₂ Paris 1965

Taplin O. 'Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus' *HSCP* 76 1972 57-98

——— (1977) *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* Oxford 1977

——— *Homeric Soundings* Oxford 1992

Thomson J.A.K. 'Dolon the Wolf' *CR* 25 1911 238-9

Threatte L. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* Berlin 1980

Tuilier A. *Recherches Critiques sur la tradition du text d'Euripide* Paris 1968

——— *Gregoire de Nazianze. La passion du Christ* Paris 1969

——— 'Nouvelles remarques sur le Rhésos d'Euripide' *Sileno* 9 1983 11-28

Turyn A. *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* Urbana 1957

——— *Codices Graeci Vaticani Saeculis xii ad xiv scripti* Vatican City 1964

Ussher R.G. *Euripides* Cyclops Rome 1978

Valckenaer L.C. *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias* Leiden 1768 (=Leipzig 1824)

Vellacott P. *Ironic Drama* Cambridge 1975

Verrall A.W. *The* Agamemnon *of Aeschylus* London 1904

Wace A.J.B. and F.M. Stubbings *A Companion to Homer* London 1962

Wackernagel J. *Vorlesungen über Syntax* 2nd series Basel 1926-8

——— *Über einige antike Anredeformen* (=*KS* 2.970-1000 Göttingen 1953)

Waern I. Γῆς ὀστέα Uppsala 1951

Walda E. *Zur Rhesosfrage* Prog. Prachatitz 1908

Webster T.B.L. *Art and Literature* London 1956

——— *The Tragedies of Euripides* London 1967

Wecklein N. *Studien zu Euripides* Leipzig 1874 (=*JbCP* supp.6)

——— 'Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides' *SBAW* I 1895 479-543, II 1896 449-538, III 1897 445-496, IV 1898 385-440 and V 1899 297-342

——— 'Textkritische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern' *SBAW* 5th Abh. Munich 1922

Wehrli F. *Dicaearchus in Die Schule des Aristoteles* Basel 1941

Weil H. *Les Harangues de Démosthène* Paris 1881

Welcker F.G. 'Der Rhesos' *ZA* 76 1834 629 (=*Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet* vol.3 Bonn 1841 1101ff.

West M.L. *Hesiod* Theogony Oxford 1966

——— *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* Oxford 1989-92$_2$

——— 'Tragica VII' *BICS* 31 1984 171-192

——— *Greek Metre* Oxford 1982

——— *Carmina Anacreontea* Leipzig 1984

——— and R. Merkelbach *Hesiodi Fragmenta Selecta* Oxford 1990$_3$

——— *Aeschylus Tragoediae* Stuttgart 1990

——— *Studies in Aeschylus* Stuttgart 1990

West S. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey vol.1 ed. A. Heubeck *et al.* Oxford 1988

Wilamowitz(-Moellendorff) U.von *Analecta Euripidea* Berlin 1875 (=Hildesheim 1963)

——— *De Rhesi Scholiis Disputatiuncula* diss. Gryphswald 1877 (=*K.S.* vol.1 Berlin 1935 1-16)

——— *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* Berlin 1907₂

——— *Euripides* Herakles Berlin 1895₂ (=Darmstadt 1959, 1969)

——— *Griechische Verskunst* Berlin 1921 (=Darmstadt 1962)

——— *Pindaros* Berlin 1922

——— *Hellenische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* Berlin 1924

——— 'Die griechischen Heldensage' *SPAW* 7 17 1925 41-62, 214-42 (=*KS* 5.2 Berlin 1937 54-126)

——— 'Lesefruchte' *Hermes* 61 1926 277-303 (=*KS* 4 Berlin 1962 404-30)

——— *Der Glaube der Hellenen* Darmstadt 1959₃

Wilhelm A. *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen* Vienna 1906

Wilcken U. 'Die Achmîm-Papyri in der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris' *SPAW* 1887 807-20

Wilkins J. *Euripides* Heracleidae Oxford 1993

Williger E. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen* zu den Komposita der griech. Dichter des 5 Jahrhunderts Göttingen 1928

Willink C.W. 'The Prologue of *Iphigenia at Aulis*' *CQ* 21 1971 343-64

——— *Euripides* Orestes Oxford 1986

Wilson N.G. (review of Zuntz (1965)) *Gnomon* 38 1966 334-42

——— (review of di Benedetto V. *La Tradizione Manoscritta Euripidea* Padua 1965) *CR* 80 1966 288

——— *Scholars of Byzantium* London 1983

——— 'A Mysterious Byzantine Scriptorium. Ioannikios and his Colleagues.' *SeC* 7 1983 161-76

Wouters A. 'The hand and the date of the R. de Langhe parchment' *AC* 42 1973 516-18

Wright M.R. *Empedocles: the extant framents* New Haven 1981

Xanthakis-Karamanos G. 'The Influence of the Rhetoric of Euripides in Fourth-century Tragedy' *CQ* 29 1979 66-76

——— *Studies in Fourth Century Tragedy* Athens 1980

Zieliński T. *Tragodumenon Libri Tres* Cracow 1925

Zuntz G. *The Political Plays of Euripides* Manchester 1955 corr. repr. 1963

——— *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* Cambridge 1965