

Notes on Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*

MARTIN CROPP

I cite the readings of ms. L (= Laurentianus plut. 32.2) except where noted, and except for routine adjustments in orthography, punctuation and colometry.¹

130–36

(Χορ.)	ὄσιας ὄσιον πόδα παρθένιον	130
	κληιδούχου δούλα πέμπω,	
	Ἑλλάδος εὐίππου πύργους	
	καὶ τείχη χόρτων τ' εὐδένδρων	
	ἐξαλλάξασ' Εὐρώπαν,	135
	πατρώων οἴκων ἔδρας.	

130 ὄσιας ὄσιον πόδα παρθένιον Seidler: πόδα παρθένιον ὄσιον ὄσιας L
 || 132 εὐίππου p: τὰς εὐίππου L || 135 Εὐρώταν Barnes

I walk in our holy maiden-procession, servant of your (i.e. Artemis') holy keyholder, having left the ramparts and towers of horse-rich Hellas and Europe with its lushly wooded pastures, site of my ancestral home.

Barnes's Εὐρώταν replaces "Europe" with the Laconian river Eurotas. Edith Hall has argued vigorously in favour of this change, and it is now accepted by James Diggle.² Hall was concerned, reasonably enough, to show that Euripides had a clear idea of the geographical location of the Taurians' land, the Tauric Chersonese or modern Crimea. The problem she saw in Εὐρώπαν is that it makes the Chorus imply that they have left Europe when in fact Greek geography placed the Taurians' land *in* Europe.

Εὐρώταν, however, has its own difficulties. First, lines 132–35 together make a pair of (a) Greece with its fortified cities and fine horses and (b) Europe with its meadows and their fine trees. The two elements together seem to make up a generic picture of Greece as a well-protected area within the fertile natural environment of Europe. While the fertility of

¹ I thank James Diggle and David Sansone for their comments on a draft of these notes.

² E. Hall, *AJP* 107 (1987) 430–33; J. Diggle, *Euripidea* (Oxford 1994) 418. Earlier editors accepting Εὐρώταν include Schoene and Paley.

Europe (134) is stressed for the sake of contrast with the barrenness of the Taurians' land (218–19), the characterization of Europe as finely treed is not in itself unexpected. It is in fact shared with Herodotus, who tells of Mardonius's using it to entice Xerxes into invading Europe: . . . ἡ Εὐρώπη περικαλλῆς χώρα καὶ δένδρεα παντοῖα φέρει τὰ ἡμέρα (Hdt. 7. 5. 3).³

Further, we might expect an identification of Sparta (or Laconia) as the Chorus's home to have some resonances later in the play, but it does not. On the contrary, in lines 399–401 the Chorus guess that Orestes and Pylades may have come "from Eurotas' beautiful waters and fresh green reeds, or Dirce's holy streams" (τὸν εὐδρον δονακόχλοον λιπόντες Εὐρώταν ἢ ῥέυματα σεμνὰ Δίρκας), i.e. from Sparta or Thebes, but they do not give Sparta any special attention. These are just two leading Greek cities, chosen here so as not to associate the unrecognised strangers with Orestes' real home, Argos, or with Iphigenia's future home near Athens. Again, we learn in a later ode that the Chorus have reached the Taurians through the slave trade after the sack of their own, unspecified city (1106–12). It would be surprising if this were Sparta or a neighbouring town. In short, there is no apparent relevance in the precise origin of the Chorus, and the naming of a precise origin would be a distraction.

Euripides may have made his Chorus sing of "leaving Europe," not through carelessness or geographical ignorance, but so as to assimilate the barbaric Taurians to Asia and oppose them to the "European" Greeks. This opposition is schematic and ideological, and need not depend on geographical niceties.

159–61

(Ιφ.) . . . (my brother) . . . ᾧ τάσδε χοῶς
μέλλω κρατῆρά τε τὸν φθιμένων
ὑδραίνειν γαίᾳς ἐν νότοις

161 ὑγραίνειν Blaydes

. . . for whom I am going to water these libations, this mixture that belongs to the dead, upon the earth's surface . . .

The conjecture ὑγραίνειν went unnoticed when Blaydes proposed it in 1901. Diggle proposed it independently in 1976 and printed it in his 1981 edition. His choice was disputed by Sansone.⁴ On both sides the arguments were largely concerned with the question of content. Diggle argued that ὑδραίνειν could only refer to the pouring of water, and noted that the other

³ Wecklein and Platnauer cite this passage. Contrast Hall (previous note) 432–33: "Strohm comments . . . that Europe was thought to be more fertile than Asia; but this goes against the ancient consensus (cf. *Aēr.* 12)." In *IT* 132–36 the contrast has to do with the Taurians' land rather than Asia as a whole.

⁴ Diggle (above, note 2) 148–49, 216–18 = *PCPS* 22 (1976) 42 and *QUCC* 8 (1981) 161–63; D. Sansone, *QUCC* 1 (1979) 157–58.

instances of this rare verb seem to connote cleansing.⁵ Sansone suggested that Euripides could have used ὑδραίνειν loosely for libations of which water was only one part (even though water is not specified in the list of ingredients which follows in 163–65) just as χέρνιψ refers to a mixed libation for the dead in Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 129, or that ὑδρ- might be understood loosely as “liquid,” as ὑδωρ sometimes is in scientific contexts.

The content of the libations does not seem to me to be the decisive issue here. Ὑδραίνειν clearly means “to water,” and it can easily enough be used with an external object, as in *Iphigenia in Tauris* 54 (αὐτόν), or with an internal object, as in *Electra* 157 (λουτρά), and, according to L’s reading, in *Iphigenia in Tauris* 159–61 (χοάς). Since Iphigenia’s libations do not consist of water, the usage here should be understood as metaphorical. In Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 129 (κὰγὼ χέουσα τάσδε χέρνιβας νεκροῖς), χέρνιβας is similarly a metaphor, and in Sophocles, *Electra* 84 and 434 libations for Agamemnon are metaphorically called λουτρά, another term that normally suggests water.⁶ *Iphigenia in Tauris* 159–61 seems to repeat this pattern, perhaps intentionally, since Iphigenia’s libation-ceremony for Orestes is modelled on Electra’s for Agamemnon.

With ὑγραίνειν the construction would be rather harsh (“to moisten these libations on the ground” = “to pour these moist libations on the ground”) and not to my knowledge paralleled so far as this verb is concerned. The poetic expressions cited by Wecklein and Platnauer (as illustrating the use of ὑδραίνειν!)—Sophocles, *Ajax* 376 ἐρεμνὸν αἶμ’ ἔδευσα, “I drenched dark blood,” *Trachiniae* 847–48 ἀδινῶν χλωρὰν τέγγει δακρύων ἄχναν, “she soaks a fresh dew of dense tears,” Pindar, *Nemean* 10. 75 θερμὰ . . . τέγγων δάκρυα, “soaking hot tears”—seem to me more natural and effective than this.

336–39

(Βου.) εὐχου δὲ τοιάδ’ ὦ νεᾶνι, σοὶ ξένων
σφάγια παρῆναι· κἄν ἀναλίσκης ξένους
τοιούσδε, τὸν σὸν Ἑλλάς ἀποτείσει φόνον,
δίκας τίνουσα τῆς ἐν Αὐλίδι σφαγῆς.

336 ηὔχου Mekler

⁵ *El.* 157 λουτρά πανύσταθ’ ὑδρανάμενον χοαί, *IT* 54 (ἔδοξα) ὑδραίνειν αὐτόν . . . , *Hom. Od.* 4. 750 (= 4. 759, 17. 48, 17. 58) ἢ δ’ ὑδρηναμένη . . . ; cf. *Eur. Ion* 97 καθαραῖς δὲ δρόσοις ἀφυδρανάμενοι . . . I have found no others than these through the *TLG CD-ROM* #D.

⁶ Cf. Garvie on *Cho.* 129: “Electra perhaps sprinkles drops of the χοαί over the tomb, as a preliminary to the pouring of the offering as a whole at 149 . . . But χέουσα suggests more than sprinkling, and probably χέρνιβας is used, exceptionally, here as a synonym for χοάς, as λουτρά is at *S. El.* 84, 434 (cf. Hesych. s.v. χθόνια λουτρά). It means a water-libation at *E. Hyps.* fr. 1.iv.30 (see Bond).”

Young lady, pray to have strangers like these for victims. If you can execute such strangers as these, Hellas will be making amends for your murder and paying the price for your sacrifice at Aulis.

Mekler's conjecture, changing "pray" to "you have been praying," is adopted by most twentieth-century editors (including Murray, Sansone, Diggle, and—rather equivocally—Strohm and Platnauer; not, however, Grégoire). The contextual problem it creates has been discussed before, and I need only repeat the essentials.⁷ The implication that Iphigenia has been eager to sacrifice Greeks in the past so as to avenge her own sacrifice by Greeks at Aulis contradicts her characterisation elsewhere in the play, and especially in her speech just eight lines later, when she says that in the past she has always been full of pity for her fellow-Greeks when they were brought to her for sacrifice but will harden her heart now that she believes Orestes dead. The idea that she has nursed a longing for Greek victims is in no way supported by 354–58 or 439–46 (which express the thought that *Helen and Menelaus* would be her proper victims). Her distaste for her sacrificial duties has been displayed at 225–28, where the suppression of pity for her victims in favour of grief for her brother is also prepared (229–35). The status of 258–59 is too uncertain to carry weight in this argument.

It may be worth adding several further reasons why Mekler's conjecture is neither needed nor wanted:

(1) A report-speech that ends with a summary recommendation and reflection, as this one does if εὔχου is retained, is entirely normal. For the particular pattern found here compare *Hecuba* 579–82, *Bacchae* 769–74, and especially *Supplices* 726–30 τοιόνδε δὴ στρατηγὸν αἰρεῖσθαι χρεών, / ὅς ἐν τε τοῖς δεινοῖσιν ἐστὶν ἄλκιμος, etc. On the other hand, a report-speech which ends with a comment on its recipient's past prayers, made by a character who has no occasion to know them, is abnormal.

(2) Εὔχου with infinitive-phrase is an idiom often used in recommending a choice of fortunes, whether in general or in a particular situation. (So of course is εὔχομαι.) Compare, for example, *Hippolytus* 1455 τοιῶνδε παίδων γνησίων εὔχου τυχεῖν, *Electra* 563–65, *Ion* 423–24, Aeschylus, *Septem contra Thebas* 266, *Choephoroi* 212–13, Sophocles, *Ajax* 392–93, 686, Theognis 129, Menander, *Samia* 609, *Sententiae* 247 Jäkel εὔχου δ' ἔχειν τι, κὰν ἔχης ἔξεις φίλους, 773, Philemon fr. 178. 14–15 Kassel–Austin εὔχου μὴ λαβεῖν πείραν φίλων· εἰ δὲ μὴ, γνώσει σεαυτὸν ἄλλο μηδὲν ἢ σκιάν. The passages of Menander and Philemon which I have cited even parallel our passage's conditional follow-up, "And if you get (or don't get) your wish . . ." On the other hand, "You have been praying . . . , and if your prayer is granted . . ." is less coherent.

(3) Comparison with some of the examples cited above (*Suppl.* 726–30, *Hipp.* 1455) shows that the Herdsman's remark is not just a general

⁷ See J. C. G. Strachan, *CP* 71 (1976) 134–36, supported by M. Cropp, *Hermes* 107 (1979) 249 n. 2a, against D. Sansone, *RhMus* 121 (1978) 36 n. 4.

exhortation (like e.g. Menand. *Sentent.* 247, Philemon fr. 178. 14–15) but amounts to a comment on the prisoners he has described: in effect, “These are just the kind of victims you should be praying for.” So there is no cause to object that he ought logically to say, “Pray for *other* such victims,”⁸ nor to preclude this by insisting that what the Herdsman means is, “Pray for a *constant supply* of such victims . . .”⁹

To return to the dramatic context: The Herdsman’s remark has three particular effects if he is encouraging Iphigenia to vengefulness against her normal instinct. First, this encouragement prepares for Iphigenia’s announcement that she has (now) hardened her heart. Secondly, the Herdsman’s officiousness and lack of sympathy with her are advertised, somewhat comically. As a barbaric Taurian he sees human sacrifice as a *nomos* (cf. 38, 463–66) and is looking forward with enthusiasm to seeing Orestes and Pylades killed (cf. 243–45), whereas Iphigenia cannot believe that human sacrifices are called for by the gods (385–91). This characterisation of the Herdsman anticipates the characterisation of Thoas, who also is eager to get on with the sacrifices of Orestes and Pylades (1153–54, 1190) and does not see through Iphigenia’s trick because he takes it for granted that she is loyal to her duties and his community and cannot imagine she will want to spare her Greek captives or escape herself (cf. especially 1180–89, 1212–14). At that point, of course, Iphigenia encourages Thoas’s belief because it suits her escape-plan. Thirdly, the Herdsman speaks more than he knows, since Orestes and Pylades are precisely the kind of “strangers” for whose arrival Iphigenia should be praying.

340–41

Χορ. θαυμάστ’ ἔλεξας τὸν φανένθ’, ὅστις ποτὲ
 “Ἑλληνας ἐκ γῆς πόντων ἦλθεν ἄξενον.

340 μανένθ’ Kaehler. Lakon

It’s a marvellous story you’ve told of this man who has appeared, whoever he may be who has come from Hellene land to Unfriendly sea.

The conjecture μανένθ’ turns “this man who has appeared” into “this man who has suffered a fit of madness” (which the Herdsman has just described impressively in his report-speech). It has been adopted even more widely than εὔχου in 336 (see Bruhn, Wecklein’s school edition, Murray, Grégoire, Platnauer, Strohm, Sansone, Diggle). Yet there is no compelling reason for

⁸ This objection underlies the feeling that the sentence as it stands is somehow unsatisfactory. For example, Platnauer ad loc.: “Keeping the MSS. εὔχου (imperative) we must understand ἄλλα with τοιαῦδε or even emend to σοι θαμὰ [ξένων] (Stadtmüller) or πολλά σοι [ξένων] (Paley and Barthold), regarding ξένων as a gloss”; Paley: “With παρεῖναι it seems necessary to supply αὐθις or ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν . . .”

⁹ Strachan (above, note 7) 136.

rejecting φανένθ', and a compelling reason not to. Ellendt's *Lexicon Sophocleum* describes the relevant usage of the passive (and intransitive active) forms of φαίνω: "apparere, de rebus visui patentibus, unde de hominibus dictum aliquando venire aut venisse interpretari licet." In fact tragedy often uses these forms to denote a somehow unexpected or long-awaited appearance, arrival or "turning up," both in ordinary human situations, e.g. Euripides, *Electra* 578 (Electra greeting Orestes), *Heraclidae* 663, Sophocles, *Ajax* 462, *Trachiniae* 186, 228, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 838, *Electra* 172 (Electra complaining of Orestes' non-return), *Oedipus Coloneus* 77, 328, 1120,¹⁰ and with reference to divine epiphanies or appearances which are represented as having some supernatural motivation, e.g. Euripides, *Alceste* 92, *Hippolytus* 677, *Hercules* 494, *Bacchae* 42, 182, 1017, *Iphigenia Aulidensis* 973, Aeschylus, *Persae* 354, *Choephoroi* 143 (Electra referring to Orestes), Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 1445–46. The Messenger's narrative has indicated a supernatural element in the strangers' arrival, both in the religious peasant's guess that they are *daimones* (270 ff.; he is wrong, but not wholly off the mark), and in their miraculous invulnerability (328–29). The Chorus are interested in the origin and identity of these strangers who have appeared in such remarkable circumstances. Their comment says just this (i.e., ὅστις ποτὲ etc. elaborates on τὸν φανένθ'), and it prepares for their ode following this scene (393 ff.), which explores the topic at length. In speaking of Orestes "appearing" they (or their leader) unconsciously use a word which is also appropriate to his actual role as a divinely sponsored rescuer for themselves and Iphigenia. This sufficiently explains why the participle is singular when we might expect Pylades to be included in their comment.

569–75

Ιφ.	ψευδεῖς ὄνειροι, χαίρετ', οὐδὲν ἦτ' ἄρα.	
Ορ.	οὐδ' οἱ σοφοί γε δαίμονες κεκλημένοι	570
	πτηνῶν ὀνείρων εἰσὶν ἀψευδέστεροι.	
	πολὺς ταραγμὸς ἔν τε τοῖς θεοῖς ἐνὶ	
	κάν τοῖς βροτείοις· ἔν δὲ λυπεῖται μόνον,	
	ὅτ' οὐκ ἄφρων ὢν, μάντεων πεισθεὶς λόγοις,	
	ὄλωλεν ὡς ὄλωλε τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν.	575

570–75 assigned to Orestes by Heath, to Iphigenia with 569 by L (572–75 to Orestes probably by Triclinius rather than L) || 570 οὐδ' Hermann: οὐθ' L || 572 θεοῖς Scaliger: θεοῖς L || 573 λείπεται Triclinius

—False dreams, farewell! You prove to be nothing, then.

—Nor indeed are the gods, though reputed to be wise, any more infallible than flighty dreams. There is much turmoil in divine affairs and human ones;

¹⁰ In ordinary conversation note the beginning of Plato's *Protagoras*, πόθεν, ὦ Σώκρατες, φαίνη; and Xen. *Mem.* 2. 8. 1, πόθεν . . . , Εὐθηρε, φαίνη;

but he feels pain over one thing only—when not through being foolish, but persuaded by seers' pronouncements, he is ruined as those who know of it know he is ruined.

Lines 572–75 have caused a great deal of difficulty, as can be seen most clearly from Wecklein's apparatus and appendix and the commentary of Platnauer. Diggle expresses suspicion of all six of Orestes' lines in his apparatus, and obelizes ἐν δὲ λυπεῖται μόνον. Wilamowitz proposed to add δ' after παραγμός so as to remove the asyndeton there. This same incoherence caused Mekler to propose a lacuna between 571 and 572. Incoherence of sense caused Monk to propose a lacuna between 573 and 574, and ὄς for ὄτ' in 574.

A better course is to delete 572–75. Lines 570–71 stand very well on their own, given the dramatic situation. In commenting on Iphigenia's declaration about false dreams, Orestes does not know that the dream she has dismissed concerned his own death. His comment refers to the poor guidance he has received, or thinks he has received, from Apollo (cf. 77 ff., 93–94, 711–23), but this is so far as he knows none of Iphigenia's business, and at this point she must get no inkling of who he is. He criticises Apollo briefly and obliquely, just as he complains about his own plight in 500, 548, 560, 568.

Lines 572–75 give tolerable sense in themselves: Life is all confusion, but the real pain which has arisen (in the situation to which these lines refer) has arisen because a well-meaning man has consulted seers and their advice has proved ruinous to him. This does not fit Orestes' situation, for Orestes was advised not by seers but by Apollo himself through the Pythia (85, 976). Apollo is called a seer in 711–13, 720, 1128 (cf. *Or.* 1666–67), but in 574 it is impossible to take μάντεων λόγοις as alluding to Apollo's advice, and unreasonable to suppose that Orestes is for the time being talking as if his advice came from seers and not from the god. Lines 572–75, then, look very much like a quite separate comment, probably cited as a marginal "parallel" and then mistakenly introduced into the text. Without them, the Chorus's enquiry about their own parents (576–77) follows rather more naturally on the conclusion of the discussion of Iphigenia's family at 569.

578–81

Ιφ. ἀκούσατ'· ἐς γὰρ δὴ τιν' ἤκομεν λόγον,
 ὑμῖν τ' ὄνησιν, ὧ ξένοι, σπεύδουσ' ἅμα
 κάμοί· τὸ δ' εὖ μάλιστά τ' γ' οὕτω γίγνεται 580
 εἰ πᾶσι ταύτῳ πρᾶγμ' ἀρεσκόντως ἔχει·

579 σπεύδουσ' Musgrave: σπουδῆς L || 580 τὸ δ' Markland: τὸδ' L | γ'
 ὦδε Porson: τῆιδε Heimsoeth

Listen: I have just arrived at a plan, pursuing your advantage, strangers, and mine—and this is the best basis for good results, when the same transaction is pleasing for all.

The difficulty in 580 is minor, and Iphigenia's point is clear enough: The best results are achieved by planning which aims for the advantage of both (or all) the parties concerned. She makes the point in order to make her plan look attractive. It is made much more crisply without the laboriously phrased 581, which I think is an editorial interpolation of the kind intended to explain the sense to inexperienced readers.¹¹ As often happens, it explains rather badly since *πρᾶγμα* is not quite the right word for "planning" or "project," and "advantageous" would be apter sense than *ἀρεσκόντως*, "pleasing." The adverb is rare but available to an interpolator from 463 (it is otherwise attested in classical literature only in *Pl. Rep.* 504b6, *Xen. Oec.* 11. 19, *Menand. Dysc.* 69).

617–22

Op.	θύσει δὲ τίς με καὶ τὰ δεινὰ τλήσεται;	
Ip.	ἐγώ· θεᾶς γὰρ τήνδε προστροπὴν ἔχω.	
Op.	ἄζηλον, ὦ νεᾶνι, κοῦκ εὐδαίμονα.	
Ip.	ἀλλ' εἰς ἀνάγκην κείμεθ', ἦν φυλακτέον.	620
Op.	αὐτὴ ξίφει θύουσα θῆλυς ἄρσενας;	
Ip.	οὐκ, ἀλλὰ χαίτην ἀμφὶ σὴν χερνίψομαι.	

618 τήνδε P. Hibeh 24 (and Bothe): τῆσδε L | συμ[. .]ραν ε[χω P. Hibeh ||
619 ἄζηλον Bothe: ἄζηλά γ' L || 621 κτείνουσα P. Hibeh: θείνουσα
Maehly || 622 οὐκ Triclinius: οὐκουν L

—But who will sacrifice me and bear the terrible deed?

—I shall; this is the duty I have from the goddess.

—An unenviable duty, maiden, not a happy one.

—But I am under compulsion, and must heed it.

—And will you sacrifice me with the sword yourself, female killing male?

—No; but I'll sprinkle holy water around your head.

In 621 L's *θύουσα* has been the reading of choice both before and after the publication of P. Hibeh 24 in 1906, although the editors of the papyrus remarked that "*κτείνουσα* is preferable to the traditional *θύουσα* . . . Maehly's acute conjecture *θείνουσα*, though not actually confirmed, is thus seen to have been on the right track." I think they were right to recommend *κτείνουσα*; this is not simply a banalising substitute in the papyrus like *συμ[φο]ράν* for *προστροπὴν* in 618. The verb *θύειν* often refers generally to the process of sacrificing. It can easily include the striking of the death-blow, but it is surprising that it should be used to *specify* the striking of the

¹¹ Such interpolations in the text of *IT* include 294 (del. Wilamowitz), 299 (del. West, *BICS* 28 [1981] 62), 317 (del. Bothe), 349 (del. Nauck), and quite possibly 278 (del. Herwerden).

death-blow in contrast with the rest of the process, and the more so when it has just been used to denote the role of Iphigenia who will *not* strike the death-blow (617).¹² Platnauer's reference to the sense of *θυομένοισιν* in Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 137 (the eagles killing the hare) does nothing to alleviate this difficulty. On the other hand, *Agamemnon* 1231 *θῆλυς ἄρσεως φονεύς* does seem to be recalled in our passage, so that the horror of wife killing husband is evoked with respect to the possibility that their daughter will kill their son; and *κτείνουσα* perhaps sharpens this allusion.

827–33

- If. ὦ φίλτατ'—οὐδὲν ἄλλο, φίλτατος γὰρ εἶ—
 ἔχω σ', Ὀρέστα, τηλύγετον χθονὸς
 ἀπὸ πατρίδος Ἀργόθεν, ὦ φίλος. 830
 Or. κἀγὼ σὲ τὴν θανούσαν, ὡς δοξάζεται.
 κατὰ δὲ δάκρυ κατὰ δὲ γόος ἅμα χαρᾶι
 τὸ σὸν νοτίζει βλέφαρον, ὡσάντως δ' ἐμόν.

—O dearest one—nothing else, for you are my dearest—I hold you, Orestes, long lost from your homeland of Argos, O dear one!

—And I hold you, who are supposed to have died! A tear, a sob along with joy bedews your face, and mine as well!

I do not concern myself here with lines 829–30, which have been thoroughly discussed by others,¹³ but with 831–33. L's assignment of all three of these lines to Orestes is unsatisfactory because 832 with its three resolved cretics will be his only line in the recognition duet which is not a non-lyric iambic trimeter—and sandwiched between two spoken trimeters. This seems too irregular (the fact that Menelaus breaks into song in the recognition duet of *Helen* is a different matter), although until recently most editors have been prepared to tolerate it.¹⁴

Three alternatives have been proposed. Lohmann in 1905 assigned 832 to Iphigenia, leaving Orestes with 833;¹⁵ but the division of the sentence in

¹² *Κτείνουσα* is briefly defended by C. Prato, *SIFC* 36 (1964) 72, comparing *IT* 27 *ἐκαινόμεν ξίφει*, 1173 *κατηργάσαντο κοινῶν ξίφει*, *Hel.* 1044–45 *τί δ' εἶ . . . κτάνοιμ' ἄνακτα . . . ξίφει*, and noting that Euripides never uses *θύω* with such a qualification. J. Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en Grec* (Aix-en-Provence 1966) 76–80, discusses the use of *θύειν* to include the death-blow and accepts *θύουσα* in *IT* 621, commenting that the addition of a word such as *ξίφει* gives *θύω* the same value as *σφάζω*; but he provides no parallels. That *θύειν* and *κτείνειν* can refer to the same act looked at from different points of view as legitimate or illegitimate (Casabona 78–80) is a separate matter—although it speaks if anything in favour of *κτείνουσα* here.

¹³ See especially J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford 1955) 34–35, with discussion of earlier conjectures; T. C. W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1990) 15–16 = *CR* 15 (1965) 145–46; Diggle (above, note 2) 184 n. 18 = *Dionysiaca* (Cambridge 1978) 175 n. 18.

¹⁴ See also C. Willink, *CQ* 39 (1989) 46.

¹⁵ As did P. Maas, *Hermes* 61 (1926) 240.

this way is very awkward, not least because, as Sansone has noted, it splits the *temesis* κατὰ . . . νοτίζει between the two speakers. Sansone himself deletes 832–33, partly in order to assist Bergk's change in the next line of τὸ δέ τι το τὸν (better ὄν) ἔτι;¹⁶ but this cutting of the Gordian knot should only be a last resort. The best of the three previous proposals was made by Bauer in 1872 and again by Diggle,¹⁷ assigning 832–33 together to Iphigenia, which at least presents no major difficulties.

Better still, however, is the solution suggested to me by Professor K. H. Lee: Assign κατὰ . . . βλέφαρον to Iphigenia, and ὡσαύτως δ' ἐμόν to Orestes. This also requires changing τὸ σόν to τοῦμόν, but it is not surprising that τοῦμόν should have been altered so as to provide sense when the mid-line speaker-change was lost.¹⁸ The advantages of this arrangement over Bauer's are several: (1) It allows Orestes to comment on his own tears of joy rather than leaving Iphigenia to do it for him; (2) the pattern, "I weep for joy," "And so do I," matches the pattern of the previous exchange (829–31), "I hold you, Orestes," "And I you . . ."; this pattern is more natural in a recognition duet than, "You weep for joy, and so do I," and it gives full value to the emphatic ὡσαύτως δ'; (3) we get a clear sequence of topics in the exchanges between Iphigenia and Orestes: embrace (827–31), tears of joy (832–33), miraculous reunion after long separation (834–41), and so on.

A single half-trimeter for Orestes (who in this recognition-duet otherwise has five whole trimeters and one couplet) is unusual but not implausible. The recognition duet of *Ion* has seven iambic interjections for Ion (1453, 1472, 1478, 1481, 1483, 1497, and probably 1500) along with trimeters and couplets. In the recognition-duet of Sophocles' *Electra*, Orestes has whole trimeters and couplets in the strophe and antistrophe, then in the epode a half-trimeter interjection (1276), a whole trimeter (1279), and a bacchiac echoing Electra's (1280).

837–40

(Iφ.) ὦ κρείσσον ἢ λόγοισιν †εὐτυχῶν ἐμοῦ·
 ψυχᾶ† τί φῶ; θαυμάτων πέρα
 καὶ λόγου πρόσω τάδ' ἀπέβα.

837 εὐτυχῶν p || 839 ψυχᾶ P || 840 ἀπέβα Reiske: ἐπέβα L

O . . . more strongly than for (my?) words, what can I say? Beyond marvels, beyond account have these things turned out!

With εὐτυχῶν (p), ψυχᾶ (P), and a comma following ψυχᾶ, it is (just) possible to understand the beginning as, "O soul (sc. Orestes), more

¹⁶ D. Sansone, *Maia* 31 (1979) 240.

¹⁷ J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford 1981) 20.

¹⁸ Alternations and repetitions of "my" and "your" can easily cause confusion. Compare for example *IT* 744–45, where L has "my" (τοῖς ἐμοῖς) in place of the first "your" (τοῖσι σοῖς).

fortunate than my words can express,” or, with another comma before ἐμοῦ, “O one more fortunate than words can express, my soul (sc. Orestes),” and to explain the masculine εὐτυχῶν with feminine ψυχὰ as suiting the reference to Orestes. This is printed by e.g. Wecklein in his large edition and (with two commas) Sansone. More popular in recent times has been Wecklein’s conjecture εὐτυχοῦσά μου / ψυχὰ (following Markland’s εὐτυχοῦσ’ ἐμὰ / ψυχὰ), which allows Iphigenia to be addressing her own soul (which in itself is not implausible: cf. 882, *Ion* 859). Wecklein’s appendix lists many negligible conjectures on this passage and a few which plausibly substitute a form of τύχα for ψυχᾶ, though none of these is finally convincing.¹⁹ The best solution, I suggest, is:

ὦ κρείσσον ἢ λόγοισιν εὐτυχοῦσά μου
τύχα,

O stroke of fortune more fortunate than my words can express,

so that there is no question of anyone’s soul being addressed or experiencing good fortune, and μου is seen to depend clearly on λόγοισιν (which is what the phrasing suggests in any case).²⁰ The rhetoric of 837–40 as a whole becomes coherent: “O inexpressibly great good fortune, what can I say? This outcome is more than a miracle, beyond description.” The point is taken up in Orestes’ response (“May our good fortune continue”), and the theme of their dependence on unpredictable strokes of fortune (τύχαι) recurs in Iphigenia’s later reflections (865–67, 875). The phrasing is artful (compare *Tro.* 471 δυστυχῆ . . . τύχην,²¹ *Hipp.* 818 ὦ τύχα, ὡς μοι βαρεῖα καὶ δόμοις ἐπεστάθης), and sufficiently contrived to cause confusion and corruption. Confusion of τύχη with ψυχὴ is known elsewhere, including *Supplices* 622.²²

876–79

(Iφ.) τίνα σοι πόρον εὐρομένα
πάλιν ἀπὸ πόλεως, ἀπὸ φόνου πέμψω
πατρίδ’ ἐς Ἀργεῖαν . . . ;

¹⁹ Bothe: ὦ κρείσσον’ ἢ λόγοισιν εὐτυχῶν ὁμοῦ / τύχαν, “O (Orestes) enjoying together (with me) a fortune more fortunate than words can express,” from which Hermann subtracted ὁμοῦ. Elmsley, *Mus. Crit.* 2 (1826) 297: ὦ κρείσσον ἢ λόγοισιν εὐτυχῶν (gen. pl.) [ἐμοῦ] τύχαι (nom. pl.), apparently intending “O fortunes of those (i.e. us) more fortunate than words can express.”

²⁰ Postponement of a dependent genitive is common in Euripidean lyrics, especially with a verb intervening; see W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart 1934) 249–51. The neat interlacing of κρείσσον . . . εὐτυχοῦσα . . . τύχα with ἢ λόγοισιν . . . μου is also characteristic of Euripides; cf. e.g. *Suppl.* 377, *El.* 714–15, *Or.* 164–65, 341–42, *IA* 1330–31 (all amongst Breitenbach’s examples, *ibid.*), and Breitenbach 260–61 on other kinds of interlacing. On the other hand μου (or ἐμοῦ) / τύχα (or ψυχὰ) across the colon-break is unwelcome.

²¹ Also *Alc.* 926 εὐτυχῆ . . . πότμον, *Tro.* 244 πότμος εὐτυχῆς, 631 εὐτυχεστέρωι πότμωι.

²² See the notes of Elmsley (above, note 19) and Paley.

876 τίνα σοι <τίνα σοι> Diggle

What path shall I find for you, to bring you back from this *polis*, from a bloody death to our Argive homeland . . . ?

There are two problems: (1) the metre of 876, three anapaests where four might be expected; (2) the sense of ἀπό πόλεως. The second has sometimes been attacked separately (e.g. Reiske's πελέκεως or Koechly's ξένας replacing πόλεως), sometimes together with the first (e.g. Bruhn's τίνα σοι πόρον εὐρομένα πάλιν <αὐ̂ / ξένας σ'> ἀπό πόλεως . . .). Diggle treats the first simply and plausibly by duplicating τίνα σοι, and adds his opinion that πόλεως is sound in view of the use of πόλις with reference to the Taurian community in 464, 595, 1209, 1214 (to which one may add 1212).²³ But in the passages compared (and also 38, though that verse may be inauthentic), "the community" is relevant as authorising human sacrifices, being served by Iphigenia, and being ruled by Thoas. In 877 there is no contextual basis for the word πόλις, and awkward sense (" . . . back from this *polis*, from a bloody death . . .") is hardly justified by parallel phrasing (ἀπό πόλεως ~ ἀπό φόνου).

Better than this, I think, is to read ἀποπόλεως as a single word, so that the phrase means, "back from a city-absent slaughter," i.e. "back from a violent death in exile." All other instances of ἀπόπ(τ)ολις refer to people (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1410, Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 647, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1000, *Oedipus Coloneus* 208; in Euripides, *Hypsipyle* fr. 70 the context is unclear), and the impersonal uses of ἄπολις are not exactly similar to what I propose here, but a bold extension of the word's usage is not unexpected in Iphigenia's overwrought monody. And there is a nice balance between ἀποπόλεως ἀπό φόνου and πατρίδ' ἔς Ἀργεῖαν.²⁴

1017–19

Ιφ. πῶς οὖν γένοιτ' ἄν ὥστε μήθ' ἡμᾶς θανεῖν
λαβεῖν θ' ἄβουλόμεσθα; τῆιδε γὰρ νοσεῖ
νόστος πρὸς οἴκους, ἡ δὲ βούλησις πάρα.

1018 νοσεῖ Markland: νόει L || 1019 ἦδε βούλευσις Markland (ἦδε M. Crusius: see J. A. Spranger, *SIFC* 11 [1934] 252)

So how can it come about that we escape death and get what we want as well? This is where our return home languishes, although we have the will for it.

²³ Diggle (above, note 2) 150–51 with n. 17 = *PCPS* 22 (1976) 44–45 with n. 17. The list of other recent editors who have printed L's text as it stands includes Weil ("ἀπό πόλεως équivaut à ἀπό χθονός"), Grégoire ("échapper à ce peuple") and Sansone.

²⁴ David Sansone suggests another way of supplying the epithet which πόλεως seems to need: For ἀπό φόνου read e.g. ἀνδροφόνου. In his 1940 edition of the play J. D. Meerwaldt proposed reading ἀποφόνου, which barely makes sense.

Markland's reading in 1019, "This is the deliberation before us," has been widely adopted (although Bruhn, Grégoire and Murray for example retain L's text). Sansone objected that βούλευσις is a prosaic word first found in Aristotle (which the *TLG* CD-ROM #D confirms), and prints ἦδε βούλησις πάρα, "This is the wish we have." The change to ἦδε is superficially attractive because it creates the anaphora τῆιδε . . . ἦδε, but it destroys the more pointed rhetoric of the original; ἦ δὲ βούλησις πάρα is far from "intolerably weak" (as Platnauer claims). Iphigenia's first sentence (1017–18) indicates that they need to find a way of getting what they want, which is to escape safely while also carrying off the image of Artemis. Her second sentence stresses that wanting is not enough: "We know what we *want*, but *how* to do it is the problem." This is well explained by E.-R. Schwinge, *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides* (Heidelberg 1968) 119, with note 12.²⁵

1024–27

Op.	τί δ' εἴ με ναῶι τῶιδε κρύψειας λάθραι;	
Iφ.	ὡς δὴ σκότον λαβόντες ἐκσωθεῖμεν ἄν;	1025
Op.	κλεπτῶν γὰρ ἡ νύξ, τῆς δ' ἀληθείας τὸ φῶς.	
Iφ.	εἴς' ἔνδον ἱεροῦ φύλακες, οὓς οὐ λήσομεν.	

1025–26 deleted by Markland || 1025 σκότον Dindorf: σκότος L | ἐκσωθεῖμεν Brodaeus: ἔξω θεῖμεν L || 1027 ἱεροῦ Dobree: -οἶ L

- Then suppose you hid me secretly here in the temple?
- As though we could get out safely by clothing ourselves in darkness?
- Well, night belongs to thieves, daylight to openness.
- There are guards in the sanctuary; we won't evade them.

The plan in question here is of course the same as the plan mooted in 110–12, that the theft of Artemis' image should be attempted *at night*. One weakness of Markland's deletion (adopted among more recent editors by Paley, England, Weil, Bruhn, Wecklein, Platnauer, Diggle, though not by Murray, Grégoire, Strohm, Sansone) is that it eliminates all reference to night.²⁶ There is also a compositional reason why it should be retained, which once again is well explained by Schwinge (cited above) 119–20, with note 14. The pattern of 1021–24 is the same as the pattern of 1020–23: Orestes makes a suggestion, Iphigenia raises an objection, Orestes tries to counter the objection, and Iphigenia completes her rebuttal. Nor is there anything wrong with the language. ὦς δὴ . . . ἐκσωθεῖμεν ἄν is not a

²⁵ For the phrasing, David Sansone now aptly compares Hdt. 1. 42. 1 οὔτε τὸ βούλεσθαι πάρα.

²⁶ Cf. D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1934) 78: "1025–6. Another very doubtful case. 1027 follows 1024 very well; ἐκσωθεῖμεν ἄν is suspiciously like σωθεῖμεν ἄν 1029; the lines have the appearance of a slightly irrelevant interruption. But we can hardly afford to lose 1026."

purpose clause (in which the optative with ἄν would be out of place) but a potential clause responding to Orestes' conditional in the previous line and introduced by a sceptical "as if."²⁷ For σκότον λαβόντες, cf. *Orestes* 467 τίνα σκότον λάβω προσώπωι; Orestes' gnomic-sounding remark about thieves' affinity with the night²⁸ is almost a debating point, and is countered in Iphigenia's reply; he has claimed that "non-evasion" (ἀ-λήθεια) is confined to daylight hours, and she replies that in any case they cannot "evade" (οὐ λήσομεν) the temple-guards.²⁹

1042–43

Op. ποῖ δῆτα πόντου νοτερόν εἰ παρ' ἔκβολον;
 Ip. οὐ ναῦς χαλινοῖς λινοδέτοις ὀρμεῖ σέθεν.

1042 εἰ παρ' Reiske: εἶπας L

—So where will you go to along the sea's damp shore?

—To where your ship is moored with flax-woven hawsers.

Ἐκβολον has usually been understood as "inlet" or "promontory" (cf. LSJ s.vv. ἔκβολος II.3, ἔκβολή VII, and commentators such as England or Platnauer). What this ἔκβολον is that Iphigenia has in mind is then obscure, and the treatment of the line by editors has been correspondingly bizarre. Almost all place a question-mark after ποῖ δῆτα, and many retain L's εἶπας: hence, e.g., "Whither then? Do you allude to the watery creek of the sea?" (Paley). But the question Iphigenia answers is, "Where will you go to?" not, "Do you mean the inlet?" or "Will you go to the inlet?" All of this, not to mention the wilder conjectures printed e.g. by Weil and by Wecklein in his school edition, is I think entirely off the mark.

Ἐκβολον means literally "cast-off." Euripides applies it to babies abandoned (*Ion* 555) or "cast" from a mother's womb (*Bacchae* 91), and to ship's wreckage (*Helen* 422, 1214). In *Iphigenia in Tauris* 1196 the sea "falls out" (ἐκπίπτει) close to the temple, and in 1424 the expected wreckage of the Greek ship is "cast-offs from the ship" (ἐκβολὰς νεώς). Here, I suggest, πόντου . . . ἔκβολον is either simply the breakers breaking on the shore, or what is left by the breakers after they recede, a surf-dampened strand. The phrase thus emulates epic phrases like παρὰ θῖν' ἄλός. Apart from its other advantages, this understanding gives a descriptive function to νοτερόν, which refers either to the spray from the breakers or to their damp residue.

²⁷ For this use of ὡς δή, see J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1954) 229—although Denniston himself surprisingly classifies our passage as a final clause like *IT* 1184 and 1233.

²⁸ David Sansone notes that this remark has a precedent in *Hom. Il.* 3. 11.

²⁹ Strohm observes, "κλέπτειν ist [Orestes'] Ziel von Anfang an (vgl. 1400), und dazu gehört λανθάνειν, das in ἀλήθεια noch herausgehört wird."

1068–71

(Iph.) ἀλλὰ πρὸς σε δεξιᾶς
 σὲ καὶ σ' ἰκνοῦμαι, σὲ δὲ φίλης παρηίδος
 γονάτων τε καὶ τῶν ἐν δόμοισι φιλτάτων 1070
 [μητρὸς πατρός τε καὶ τέκνων ὅται κυρεῖ].

1071 deleted by Dindorf | πατρός τε TrP: πατρός L

Come, by your right hand I beseech you, and you, and you by your dear cheek, and your knees and those who are dearest to you at home, [your mother and father, and your children, those of you that have them].

1071 is certainly inauthentic, since the Chorus are unmarried women like Iphigenia (cf. 130, 1143 ff.). I suspect that 1070 is part of the same melodramatic interpolation. In lines 1068–69 Iphigenia enacts her supplication, or at least speaks as if she is enacting it, by approaching first one, then another, then a third chorus-member and grasping the hands of the first two and the cheek of the third. Line 1069 is an ascending tricolon, its rhetorical effect somewhat spoiled by the continuation. If we accept the pairing of “knees” with “cheek,” we also have to accept the awkward addition to these of “your dearest ones at home.” And we might expect Iphigenia to remember that these women all come from a city which has been destroyed and its population enslaved (1106–10), which makes “those who are dearest to you at home” rather inappropriate. Line 363 of this play, also expanding a description of supplication for emotional effect, is probably a similar interpolation (deleted by M. L. West in Diggle’s apparatus).

1117–22

(Chor.) . . . ζηλοῦσα τὸν διὰ παν-
 τὸς δυσδαίμον'· ἐν γὰρ ἀνάγ-
 καις οὐ κάμνει, σύντροφος ὦν.
 μεταβάλλει δυσδαιμονία· 1120
 τὸ δὲ μετ' εὐτυχίαν κακοῦ-
 σθαι θνατοῖς βαρὺς αἰών.

1117 ζηλοῦσα τὸν Greverus (-σαν τὸν Bothe 1803, -σα τὰν Bothe 1824):
 ζηλοῦσ' ἄταν L || 1119 κάμνει Milton: -εις L || 1120 δ' εὐδαιμονία
 Markland | μεταβάλλειν δυσδαιμονία Bergk (μεταβάλλειν δ'
 εὐδαιμονία Musgrave) || 1121 εὐτυχίαν Scaliger: -ας L

I envy one who is constantly ill-starred; he languishes less in hardships, being their fellow. Ill fortune changes, and affliction after prosperity makes a heavy life for mortals.

The slightly paradoxical claim that ill-fortune is only painful if you are not used to it is familiar in Euripides; cf. *Hecuba* 375–76, *Hercules* 1291–93,

Troades 639–40, *Helen* 417–19, *Bellerophon* fr. 285. 15–18, fr. 821 N², fr. 964 N².

In 1120, “Ill fortune changes” does not fit the argument. The variety of attempts to improve on it has been extreme and highly confusing (as can be seen, for example, if one tries to read Platnauer’s note). Only two alternatives are really worth considering: Markland’s μεταβάλλει δ’ εὐδαιμονία (“But good fortune changes”), and Bergk’s μεταβάλλειν δυσδαιμονία (“To change is ill-fortune”).³⁰ Markland’s conjecture, which I think is clearly right, was accepted by some nineteenth-century editors (e.g. Hermann, Paley) but has received very little attention in recent times, whereas Bergk’s is printed by Bruhn, Grégoire, Strohm and Diggle.

With μεταβάλλειν δυσδαιμονία the argument runs: “Constant ill-fortune is enviable. Change (of fortune) is (real) ill-fortune, and suffering ill-fortune after enjoying good fortune is painful.” This is rather difficult, because it requires understanding the single word μεταβάλλειν (= “changing”) as “experiencing a change from good to ill fortune,” and the single word δυσδαιμονία as “real ill-fortune.” And the Chorus has not in fact claimed that the ill-fortune of the constantly unfortunate man is not *real*, but merely that it is (comparatively) enviable because he is used to bearing it. Nor is it allowable to adjust the sense so that a change from good to ill fortune is understood to be the *greatest* ill-fortune (as in Bergk’s own paraphrase, “und so wird . . . der Wechsel des Geschickes für das grösste Unglück erklärt”).

On the other hand, the sense of μεταβάλλει δ’ εὐδαιμονία is entirely clear, and the argument becomes: “Constant ill-fortune is enviable. Good fortune, by contrast, changes, and suffering ill fortune after enjoying good fortune is painful.”³¹ That good fortune changes is of course a truism, but it is important to this train of gnomic thought. In the background lies the assumption that constant good fortune is impossible for mortals, as is famously explained, for example, in Achilles’ description of Zeus’s jars of good and bad fortune, Homer, *Iliad* 24. 527–33. Good fortune is *sure* to change, and the change is sure to be painful. The only man who can avoid this is the constantly unfortunate one, and that is why he has to be envied.

1321

Θο. ὦ θαῦμα· πῶς σε μείζον ὀνομάσας τύχω;

σφε Diggle: μείον Markland

O marvel—how can I call you by a greater name?

³⁰ T. Bergk, *RhMus* 18 (1863) 216.

³¹ One reason for Bergk’s dissatisfaction with μεταβάλλει δ’ εὐδαιμονία is that he understood τὸ γὰρ μετ’ εὐτυχίας to be the transmitted reading (γὰρ is in fact a conjecture of Triclinius)—which does indeed make it unattractive.

Everything needed for understanding this line is contained in Diggle's discussion.³² I do not see great difficulty in taking $\sigma\epsilon$ as addressed to the $\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha$ on which Thoas has just exclaimed (which leads to Diggle's conjecture $\sigma\phi\epsilon$ and his suggestion that both $\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha$ and the pronoun refer to Iphigenia), but I do not discuss that here. (Compare, however, *Hipp.* 818, cited above on 836–38.) Concerning the logic of the $\pi\omega\varsigma$ -clause, Diggle quite rightly explains that it expresses “the speaker's inability to find any name more suitable than the one he has already found . . .” But he continues, “The only obstacle to so taking the sentence is $\mu\epsilon\iota\zeta\omicron\nu$,” citing Markland's opinion (“*potius putarem μείον. quo enim minore nomine recte te possim appellare?*”), and referring to Platnauer's comment (“ . . . we should expect not so much ‘what *more* can I call it . . . ?’ as ‘what *less* . . . ?’”).

In fact (as Weil for example explains), the sense of the $\pi\omega\varsigma$ -question is not, “How can I *hit the mark if I call you* by a greater name?” (which would indeed call for the change to “lesser”), but, “How can I *succeed in calling you* by a greater name (when there is no greater name available).” The rhetorical point is similar to that of 837–40 (discussed above), *Hecuba* 714, *Bacchae* 667, *Helen* 601, *Phoenissae* 389, 407, all of which Diggle cites on p. 89. Cf. also *Hippolytus* 826–27, *Hecuba* 667 (cited by Weil).

University of Calgary

³² Diggle (above, note 17) 89–91. It should be noted that Diggle prints L's text unchanged in his edition.