A Commentary on Euripides' *Hecuba* 658-1295

with an Introduction to the Play as a Whole.

Christopher Warren Marshall BA DipCS

Ph D

University of Edinburgh

1992

A Commentary on Euripides' *Hecuba* 658-1295,

with an Introduction to the Play as a Whole.

by Christopher Warren Marshall

Abstract of a Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at Edinburgh, 1992

Revenge is a concept fundamental to a proper understanding of the *Hecuba*. The Introduction studies this relationship in six parts. Section I discusses the context of revenge as it relates to the play. Revenge is seen as a restorative action performed by a community, rather than an individual's personal vendetta. Section II shows that the notion of a restorative, morally unambiguous revenge was present in the Ancient Near East and continues into twentieth-century sociological thought. Section III connects the play with the larger body of myth, especially the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. This contrasts with the sacrifice of Polyxena, which is insufficient and non-functional: the windlessness continues, and another solution - Hecuba's revenge - must be found. Section IV pursues the consequences of this interpretation of revenge. In effect, there exists an intertextual relationship between the *Hecuba* and the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus. At every turn, Euripides undermines the Aeschylean system of vendetta, and replaces it with his own righteous revenge, as embodied by the Erinyes. In this light is Hecuba's metamorphosis, predicted at the play's end, interpreted. Section V examines the date (c.424 B.C.) and dating of the play, with reference to the *Cyclops,* which is shown to date post-409 B.C. Section VI details aspects of the play's structure and role-division. It then introduces the technique of status analysis as a meaningful way of examining character interaction in drama. The *Hecuba* is then analysed in terms of status. Hecuba's rise in status is inextricably linked with the play's presentation of revenge.

The commentary is based on Diggle's (corrected) Oxford Text, but questions his textual decisions on certain lines; there is a table of suggested divergences from his text. Then, following the 'traditional' commentary format, issues pertaining to individual lines are discussed in detail. These comments include textual, literary, thematic and dramaturgical matters.

Table of Contents

Abstract		2
Table of Contents		3
Preface		4
List of Abbreviations		6
Bibliography		8
Introduction		
I	"The Context of Revenge in the *Hecuba*"	22
II	"Durkheim, Revenge, and the Ancient Near East"	42
III	"Windlessness"	57
IV	"The Dependence of the *Hecuba* on the Text of the *Oresteia*"	65
V	"The Date of the *Hecuba*, and the *Cyclops*"	91
VI	"Status and the Structure of the *Hecuba*"	98
Notes		125
Table of Suggested Alternate Readings to Diggle's corrected (1989) text of *Hecuba* 658-1295		136
Commentary on Lines 658-1295		139

Preface

In form this is only a partial work. Because of the word limits of the degree for which this has been submitted, it was felt (rightly, I now see) by my advisor that a commentary on a full play, if done properly, would extend much beyond the given bounds. Euripides was chosen as the subject dramatist because of the three tragedians he was (proportionately) the most ignored. The *Hecuba*, while it had received much critical attention in recent articles after years of being ignored, still lacked an acceptable commentary. The release of the commentary by Christopher Collard in the Aris and Phillips 'Euripides' series was not a deterrent: the scale of the works concerned was different, and we vary considerably on the fundamental points of interpretation. The question remains, why the *second* half of a play? In part, the simple fact that the second half held more interest for me decided the matter. But there were also several assumptions in the literature which struck an odd chord. The play was considered bipartite (even by those who argued for its unity) in that the Polyxena-action was wonderful, but the revenge-action somehow lacked something. Critics who found the play most successful required Hecuba and all for which she stood to be destroyed. I find the play successful, and believe that Hecuba can remain noble and heroic throughout.

The commentary is based on James Diggle's 1989 (corrected) Oxford Text, though I have not followed his use of the lunate sigma and iota adscript except in cases of direct quotation of secondary sources. I only hope the discrepancy is not too distracting for the reader. Textual decisions made by Diggle have been questioned at many points, and a list of divergences (both small and large) has

been included. My aim in textual decisions has been to aim for what seems to be the highest degree of historical accuracy for the text. In the commentary, lists of cross references are often not exhaustive, and are of whatever length I felt was necessary at the time to support the point being made.

I am thankful for the funding support provided by an Overseas Research Studentship for two of my three years in Scotland. Acknowledgements should go to many more than I can name here, but in particular I owe a special debt of gratitude to my advisor Mr. David Robinson, and Mr. Christopher Strachan, for their advice and opinions on the commentary in its development. Sincere thanks also go to: the staff of the Classics Department at the University of Edinburgh; the Scottish Classics Postgraduate Meeting, the Scottish Universities Drama Seminar, and the University of Edinburgh Philosophy Department Staff and Postgraduate Seminar, for advice and comments on my interpretation of the play; Prof. Justina Gregory; Dr. Judith Mossman and Prof. Christopher Collard for giving me access to materials I would otherwise not have seen; Prof. Annette Teffeteller who introduced me to Euripides, tragedy, and Greek poetry; and my external advisor Mr. A.F. Garvie. My gratitude to them and to supportive friends in Canada and Britain is joyfully given.

In accordance with University regulations, I hereby declare that this work is my own as I have written it.

List of Abbreviations

ARV	Beazley, J.D. (1963) *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters.*[2] Oxford. Citations are by page number, then vase number.
Diggle	Diggle, James. (1984, corrected 1989) "ΕΚΑΒΗ" 332-98 in *Euripidis Fabulae.* Volume 1. Oxford Classical Text.
GP	Denniston, J.D., rev. K.J. Dover. (1954) *The Greek Particles.*[2] Oxford. Citations are by page number.
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott, rev. and aug. Henry Stuart Jones. (1940) *A Greek-English Lexicon.* A New (ninth) Edition. Oxford.
MT	Goodwin, William Watson. (1889, reprinted 1929) *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb.* London. Citations are by his numbered paragraphs.
PMG	Page, Denys L. (1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci.* Oxford. Citations are by his consecutive numbering of the fragments.
Smyth	Smyth, Herbert Weir. (1956) *Greek Grammar.* Cambridge, MA. Citations are by his numbered paragraphs.

fr.	fragment. From Nauck (1889) unless otherwise marked.
MS., MSS.	manuscript, manuscripts. When referred to individually, cf. Diggle pages 334-35.
Π	Papyrus. Following numbers in Diggle, page 336.
Σ	Scholiast. cf. Daitz (1979), Smith (1977), but esp Schwartz (1887).
diff. pot.	*difficilior lectio potior*

References to works have been made as clear as possible, presenting the Author's name in full and (at times) abbreviating the title. While none of these should be problematical, the abbreviations used for Homer, Pindar and Greek Drama are presented below. In each case, what seems to be the more usual name of a work is used. The consequence of this is that different langages are used in the abbreviations. Full names of plays not listed are used, e.g. Ajax, Clouds, Birds, Wasps. When fragments are cited, the source play (if known) is given in full in brackets after the fragment number. If no play name is given, assume the Hecuba; if no author, Euripides.

Homer				
	Il	*Iliad*	*Od*	*Odyssey*
Pindar				
	I	*Isthmian*	*N*	*Nemean*
	O	*Olympian*	*P*	*Pythian*
Aesch	Aeschylus			
	Ag	*Agamemnon*	*Cho*	*Choephori*
	Eum	*Eumenides*	*Pers*	*Persae*
	PV	*Prometheus Vinctus*	*ST*	*Septem contra Thebas*
	Sup	*Supplices*		
Soph	Sophocles			
	Ant	*Antigone*	*El*	*Electra*
	OC	*Oedipus Coloneus*	*OT*	*Oedipus Tyrannus*
	Phil	*Philoctetes*	*Tra*	*Trachiniae*
Eur	Euripides			
	Alc	*Alcestis*	*And*	*Andromache*
	Bac	*Bacchae*	*Cyc*	*Cyclops*
	El	*Electra*	*Hec*	*Hecuba*
	Hel	*Helen*	*Hcld*	*Heraclidae*
	HF	*Hercules Furens*	*Hip*	*Hippolytus*
	Hyps	*Hypsipyle*	*IA*	*Iphigeneia in Aulis*
	IT	*Iphigeneia among the Taurians*	*Med*	*Medea*
	Or	*Orestes*	*Phae*	*Phaethon*
	Pho	*Phoenissae*	*Rhe*	*Rhesus*
	Sup	*Supplices*	*Tro*	*Troades*
Aristoph	Aristophanes			
	Ach	*Acharnians*	*Ecc*	*Ecclesiazusae*
	Lys	*Lysistrata*	*Plut*	*Plutus*
	Thes	*Thesmophoriazusae*		

Bibliography

Texts, Commentaries and Translations of the Hecuba

Dates given are of a first printing of a particular edition. A question mark indicates the date is approximate, and is not stated in the publication. Of the editions most are so-called 'school-boy' editions and of little value; Collard, Hadley, Paley, and Tierney are worthwhile. Works are cited only by the name of the editor, using dates to distinguish where necessary.

Ambrose, J.W. Jr. (1981) *Euripides' Hecuba.* Bryn Mawr, PA.

Arnott, P. (1969) "Hecuba" *Euripides: Hecuba and Heracles.* London. 17-54. Reprinted 1991 by Methuen (London) *Euripides Plays: Two.* 1-45.

Arrowsmith, W. (1958) "Hecuba" *Euripides III: Four Tragedies.* The Complete Greek Tragedies. Chicago. 1-68.

Balgarnie, W.H. (1901 ?) *Euripides: Hecuba, a translation.* London. Bound with Jeffery.

Bond, J. and A.S. Walpole. (1902, reprint 1950) *The Hecuba of Euripides.* London.

Collard, C. (1991) *Euripides: Hecuba.* Warminster.

Daitz, S.G. (1981) *Euripides' Hekabe, Read in Ancient Greek.* Guilford, CT. Audio recording, with written translation.

----------. (1990) *Euripides: Hecuba.*[2] Teubner. Leipzig. First edition of 1971 is occasionally cited.

Garzya, Antonio. (1955) *Euripide Ecuba.* Roma.

Hadley, W.S. (1894) *The Hecuba of Euripides.* Cambridge.

Jeffery, T.T. (1901 ?) *Euripides: Hecuba.* London. Bound with Balgarnie.

King, F.W. (1938) *Euripides' Hecuba.* London.

Lembke, Janet and Kenneth J. Reckford. (1991) *Euripides Hecuba.* Greek Tragedies in New Translations. Oxford.

Major, J.R. (1833) *The Hecuba of Euripides.*[3] London. Includes a translation of Porson's notes.

Paley, F.A. (1900) *The Hecuba of Euripides.* London.

Prinz, Rudolfus. (1902) *Euripidis Hecuba.* 1-67 Vol. I Part III in R. Prinz and N. Wecklein *Euripidis Fabulae.* Lipsiae.

Russell, C.H. (1889) *Euripides: Hecuba.* Oxford.

Sheppard, J.T. (1924) *Euripides Hecuba: Partly in the Original and partly in Translation.*

Oxford.

Sidgwick, A. (1903) *Scenes from Euripides: the Hecuba.* London.

Tierney, M. (1946, 1979 reprint by Bristol Classical Press) *Euripides: Hecuba.* Dublin.

Other Editions and Commentaries of Plays Consulted

Works are cited by editor and play name.

Austin, C. (1967) *Nova Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta.* Berlin.

Barrett, W.S. (1964) *Euripides: Hippolytos.* Oxford.

Biehl, W. (1983) Cyclops. Teubner. Leipzig.

Bond, G.W. (1963) *Euripides: Hypsipyle.* Oxford.

----------. (1981) *Euripides: Heracles.* Oxford.

Broadhead, H.D. (1960) *The Persae of Aeschylus.* Cambridge.

Collard, C. (1975) *Euripides: Supplices.* 2 vols. Groningen.

Craik, E. (1988) *Euripides: Phoenician Women.* Warminster.

Dale, A.M. (1954) *Euripides: Alcestis.* Oxford.

----------. (1981) *Euripides: Helen.*[2] Oxford.

Davies, Malcolm. (1991) *Sophocles: Trachiniae.* Oxford.

Denniston, J.D. (1939) *Euripides: Electra.* Oxford.

Diggle, J. (1970) *Euripides: Phaethon.* Cambridge.

----------. (1984 (corrected 1987, 1989), 1981) *Euripidis Fabulae.* Vols 1 and 2. Oxford. *Hecuba* in vol. 1.

Dodds, E.R. (1960) *Euripides: Bacchae.*[2] Oxford.

Dover, K.J. (1968) *Aristophanes: Clouds.* Oxford.

Easterling, P.E. (1982) *Sophocles: Trachiniae.* Cambridge.

England, E.B. (1891) *The Iphigeneia at Aulis of Euripides.* London.

----------. (1911) *The Iphigeneia among the Tauri of Euripides.* London.

Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon.* 3 vols. Oxford.

Friis Johansen, H. and E.W. Whittle. (1980) *Aeschylus: The Suppliants.* 3 vols. Copenhagen.

Garvie, A.F. (1986) *Aeschylus: Choephori.* Oxford.

Griffith, M. (1983) *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound.* Cambridge.

Hutchinson, G.O. (1985) *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas.* Oxford.

Jebb, R.C. (1893-1896) *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments.* 7 vols. Cambridge.

Jerram, C.S. (1888) *Euripidis Heracleidae.* Oxford.

Kamerbeek, J.C. (1963-1984) *The Plays of Sophocles.* 7 vols. Leiden.

Kannicht, Richard and Bruno Snell. (1981) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Vol. 2. Fragmenta Adespota. Göttingen.

Lee, K.H. (1976) *Euripides: Troades.* London.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. (1979) *Aeschylus: Oresteia.* 3 vols. London.

---------- and N.G. Wilson. (1990) *Sophoclis Fabulae.* Oxford.

Méridier, Louis. (1956) *Euripide.*[2] Tome II Hippolyte, Andromaque, Hécube. Paris.

Murray, G. (1902-1909) *Euripidis Fabulae.* 3 vols. Oxford. *Hecuba* in vol. 1.

Nauck, A. (1889) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.*[2] Leipzig.

Owen, A.S. (1939) *Euripides: Ion.* Oxford.

Page, D.L. (1972) *Aeschyli Tragoediae.* Oxford.

----------. (1938, corrected 1971) *Euripides: Medea.* Oxford.

----------. (1950) *Select Papyri III: Literary Papyri, Poetry.* Loeb classical Library. Cambridge, MA.

---------- and J. D. Denniston. (1957) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon.* Oxford.

Paley, F.A. (1857-1860) *Euripides.* 3 vols. London. *Hecuba* in vol. 2.

Pearson, A.C. (1907) *Euripides: Heraclidae.* Cambridge.

----------. (1917) *The Fragments of Sophocles.* 3 vols. Cambridge.

Platnauer, M. (1938) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris.* Oxford.

Seaford, R. (1984) *Euripides: Cyclops.* Oxford.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. (1957) *Aeschylus II* Agamemnon, Libation Bearers, Eumenides, Fragments; Appendix (fragments since 1930) by H. Lloyd-Jones. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA

Sommerstein, A.H. (1989) *Aeschylus: Eumenides.* Cambridge.

Stanford, W.B. (1958) *Aristophanes: The Frogs.* London.

----------. (1963) *Sophocles: Ajax.* London.

Stevens, P.T. (1971) *Euripides: Andromache.* Oxford.

Ussher, R.G. (1978) *Euripides: Cyclops.* Rome.

Weil, H. (1879) *Sept Tragédies d'Euripide.*[2] Paris. Includes *Hecuba.*

West, M.L. (1987) *Euripides: Orestes.* Warminster.

Willink, C.W. (1986) *Euripides, Orestes.* Oxford.

General Bibliography

Works are cited by author and year.

Abrahamson, E.L. (1952) "Euripides' Tragedy of Hecuba" *TAPA* 83, 120-9.

Adkins, A.W.H. (1966) "Values in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Hercules Furens*" *CQ* 16, 193-219.

Arnott, Peter D. (1959) *Introduction to the Greek Theatre*. London.

----------. (1962) *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.

----------. (1989) *Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre*. London.

Arnott, W. Geoffrey. (1982) "Off-Stage Cries and the Choral Presence: Some Challenges to Theatrical Convention in Euripides" *Antichthon* 16, 35-43.

Arrowsmith, W. (1958) "Introduction to *Hecuba*" 2-7 in *Euripides III: Four Tragedies*. The Complete Greek Tragedies. Chicago.

Bacon, H.H. (1961) *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy*. Hew Haven, CT.

Bain, David. (1977) *Actors and Audience: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama*. Oxford.

Barlow, S. (1971) *The Imagery of Euripides*. London.

Barrett, W.S. (undated) Unpublished Note on *Hec* 578.

Bates, William Nickerson. (1930, repr. 1960) *Euripides, A Student of Nature*. New York.

Benveniste, Emile. trans. Elizabeth Palmer. (1973) *Indo-European Language and Society*. London.

Biehl, W. (1957) "Die Interpolationen in Euripides Hekabe" *Philologus* 101, 55-69.

----------. (1966) "Das Kompositionsprinzip der Parodos in Euripides Hekabe" *Helikon* 6, 411-24.

----------. (1985) "Interpretationsprobleme in Euripides' Hekabe" *Hermes* 113, 257-66.

Blundell, Mary Whitlock. (1989) *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: a study in Sophocles and Greek ethics*. Cambridge. esp. 26-59, Chapter 2 "Helping Friends and Harming Enemies".

Booth, N. (1956) "Euripides *Hecuba* 923-926" *CP* 51, 95-96.

Bremer, J.M. (1971) "Euripides *Hecuba* 59-215: A Reconsideration" *Mnem* 24, 232-50.

Brillante, Carlo. (1988) "Sul prologo dell' *Ecuba* di Euripide" *RFIC* 116, 429-47.

Brown, A.L. (1983) "The Erinyes in the *Oresteia*: Real Life, the Supernatural, and the Stage" *JHS* 103, 13-34.

----------. (1984) "Three and scene-painting Sophocles" *PCPS* 30, 1-17.

Burkert, W. trans. J. Raffin. (1985) *Greek Religion.* Cambridge, MA. also (1987) Oxford.

Burnett, Anne Pippin. (1971) *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal.* Oxford.

Buxton, R.G.A. (1982) *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge. esp. 170-86 Chapter 5.2 "Hekabe."

Calder, William M. III. (1966) "A Reconstruction of Sophocles' *Polyxena*" *GRBS* 7, 31ff.

----------. (1988) "*Vita Aeschyli* 9: Miscarriages in the Theatre of Dionysos" *CQ* 38, 554-55.

Campbell, A.Y. (1943) "The OY MH Constructions and Aristophanes *Clouds*, 295-7" *CR* 57, 58-61.

----------. (1958) "Notes on Euripides' *Hecuba*" *Hermes* 86, 172-82.

della Casa, A. (1962) "Ennio di fronte all' *Ecuba* di Euripide" *Dioniso* 36, 63-76.

Castaldi, F. (1928) "Ad Euripide, *Ecuba* vv. 74-5 e 90-1" *Riv. Indo-Greco-Italica* 12, 94-95.

Catling, H.W. (1964) *Cypriot Bronzework in the Mycenaean World.* Oxford.

Ceadel, E.B. (1941) "Division of Parts in Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*" *CQ* 35, 139-47.

Chambers, Ross. (1990) "Alter ego: intertextuality, irony, and the politics of reading" 143-58, Chapter 8 in Worton and Still (1990).

Cohen, Anthony P. (1982) *Belonging: Identity and Social Organisation in British Rural Cultures.* Anthropological Sudies of Britain, no. 1. Manchester.

Collard, Christopher. (1975) "Formal Debates in Euripides' Drama" *G&R* 22, 58-71.

----------. (1986) Review of Diggle *OCT* vol. 1 (1984). *CR* 36, 17-24.

----------. (1989) "The Stasimon of Euripides, *Hecuba* 905-52" (forthcoming). Proofs numbered 1-8 + 2 pages of notes.

Collinge, N. (1954) "*Hecuba* 924-926" *CP* 49, 35-36.

Conacher, D.J. (1961) "Euripides' *Hecuba*" *AJP* 82, 1-26 = (1967) *Euripidean Drama.* Toronto. 146-65.

Conomis, N.C. (1964) "The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama" *Hermes* 92, 23-50.

Cook, R.M. (1960) *Greek Painted Pottery.* London.

Coughanowr, E. (1984) "On the Meaning of δίστομος in Euripides" *CQ* 34, 235-36.

Craik, E.M. (1990) *'Owls to Athens': Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover.* Oxford.

Daitz, Stephen G. (1970) *The Jerusalem Palimpsest of Euripides: A Facsimile Edition with Commentary.* Berlin.

----------. (1971) "Concepts of Freedom and Slavery in Euripides' *Hecuba*" *Hermes* 99, 217-26.

----------. (1979) *The Scholia in the Jerusalem Palimpsest of Euripides: a critical edition.* Heidelberg.

Dale, A. (1950) "Stasimon and Hyporcheme" *Eranos* 48, 14-20 = (1969) 34-40.

----------. (1956) "Seen and Unseen on the Greek Stage" *WS* 69, 96-106 = (1969) 119-29.

----------. (1968) *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama.*[2] Cambridge.

----------. (1969) *Collected Papers.* Cambridge.

Davidson, J.F. (1990) "The Sophoclean Axe" *RhM* 133, 410.

Davies, Malcolm. (1987) "Aeschylus' Clytemnestra: Sword or Axe?" *CQ* 37, 65-71.

Dawe, R.D. (1973) *Studies on the Text of Sophocles.* Vol. I: The Manuscripts and the Text. Leiden.

Delcourt, Marie. (1939) "Le suicide par vengeance dans la Grèce ancienne" *Revue de l'Histoire de Religions* 119, 154-171.

Delebeque, E. (1951) *Euripide et la Guerre du Peloponèse.* Paris.

Devereux, George. (1973) "The Self-Blinding of Oidipous in Sophocles: *Oidipous Tyrannos*" *JHS* 93, 36-49.

----------. (1976) *Dreams in Greek Tragedy: An Ethno-Psycho-Analytical Study.* Oxford. esp. 259-317, Chapter 8 "Three Euripidean Dreams: Variations on a Theme (Euripides: *Rhesos, Hekabe, Iphigeneia among the Taurians*)".

Diggle, James. (1969) "Marginalia Euripidea" *PCPhS* 15, 30-59, esp. 44-47.

----------. (1972) "Notes on the *Heraclidae*" *CQ* 22, 241-45.

----------. (1973) "The *Supplices* of Euripides" *GRBS* 14, 241-69.

----------. (1974) "On the 'Heracles' and the 'Ion' of Euripides" *PCPS* 20, 3-36.

----------. (1975) Review of Daitz *Teubner* (1973). *JHS* 95, 198-99.

----------. (1977) Review of Matthiessen (1974). *CR* 27, 6-7.

----------. (1978) "On the *Helen* of Euripides" 159-77 in *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in greek Poetry by Former Pupils presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday.* Cambridge.

----------. (1981) *Studies on the Text of Euripides.* Oxford.

----------. (1982) "Notes on the *Hecuba* of Euripides" *GRBS* 23, 315-23.

----------. (1984) Review of West (1982). *CR* 34, 66-71.

----------. (1985) Review of Marcovich (1984). *CR* 35, 12-13.

----------. (1987) "The Prophet of Bacchus: *Rhesus* 970-73" *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 80, 167-72.

----------. (1991) *The Textual Tradition of Euripides'* Orestes. Oxford.

Dindorf[ius], Guielmus. (1853) *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis Tragoedias.* Vol. I. Oxford.

Dodds, E.R. (1959) *Plato: Gorgias.* Oxford.

----------. (1971) *The Greeks and the Irrational.* Berkeley, CA.

Dover, Kenneth J. (1957) "The Political Aspect of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*" *JHS* 77, 230-37.

----------. (1974) *Greek Popular Morality.* Berkeley.

Durkheim, Emile. trans. George Simpson. (1965) *The Division of Labour in Society.* New York.

Easterling, P.E. (1985) "Anachronism in Greek Tragedy" *JHS* 105, 1-10.

---------- and B.M.W. Knox. (1989) *Greek Drama.* The Cambridge History of Classical Literature Vol I Part 2. Cambridge.

Eden, P.T. (1988) "Two Notes on Euripides" *CQ* 38, 560-61.

Erbse, Hartmut. (1984) *Studien zum Prolog der euripideischen Tragödie.* Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 20. Berlin. esp. 48-59, Chapter 3 "Hekabe".

Evelyn-White, H.G. (1914, repr. 1982) *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns and Homerica.* Loeb classical Library. Cambridge, MA.

Farnell, L.R. (1896-1909, reprint. 1977) *The Cults of the Greek States.* 5 vol. Oxford.

Finley, M.I. (1965) *The World of Odysseus.*² New York.

Foley, H.P. (1982) "The 'Female Intruder' Reconsidered: Women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusai*" *CP* 77 1-21.

Fraenkel, Eduard. (1957) *Horace.* Oxford.

----------. (1962) *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes.* Rome.

Frazer, Sir J.G. (1921 reprint 1989) *Apollodorus.* 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.

Friedrich, Johannes. (1967) *Hethtiches Elementarbuch.* Zweiter teil. Heidelberg.

Fry, Northrop. (1957) *Anatomy of Criticism: four essays.* Princeton, N.J.

Gardiner, Martin. (1973) *The Annotated Snark. Lewis Carroll.* Harmondsworth.

Garland, David. (1989) "Durkheim's Theory of Punishment: A Critique" *The Power to Punish: Contemporary Penality and Social Analysis* chapter 2, 37-61, ed. David Garland and Peter Young, Aldershot Hants.

Garnet, Richard. (1990) *From Homer to Tragedy: the art of allusion in Greek Poetry.* London.

Garvie, A.F. (1969) *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy.* Cambridge.

Gellie, G. (1980) "*Hecuba* and Tragedy" *Antichthon* 14, 30-44.

Gibbon, Edward. (1910) *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* 4 vols. Everyman's

Library. London.

Girard, Rene. trans. Patrick Gregory. (1977) *Violence and the Sacred.* Baltimore, MD.

Golden, Mark. (1988) "Male Chauvinists and Pigs" *Echos du Monde Classique / Classical Views* 7, 1-12.

Goldhill, Simon. (1984) *Reading Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge.

----------. (1989) "Reading Performance Criticism" *G&R* 36, 172-82.

Gould, John. (1973) "Hiketeia" *JHS* 93, 74-103.

Grafton, A.T. and N.M. Swerdlow. (1986) "Greek chronography in Roman epic: the calendrical date of the fall of Troy in the *Aeneid*" *CQ* 36, 212-18.

Gray, John. (1970) *I & II Kings: A Commentary.*[2] The Old Testament Library. London.

Gregory, Justina. (1991) *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians.* Ann Arbor. esp. 85-120, Chapter 3 "*Hecuba.*"

Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death.* Oxford.

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

Griffith, R. Drew. (1988) "Disrobing in the *Oresteia*" *CQ* 38, 552-54.

Haigh, A.E. rev. by A.W. Pickard-Cambridge. (1907) *The Attic Theatre.*[3] Oxford.

Hajaistephanou, C.E. (1982) "Summary: A Contribution to the Interpretation of the Characters, the Unity and the Meaning of the '*Hecuba*' of Euripides" 111-13 in Συμβολη Στην Ερμηνεια Των Χαραχτηρων, Της Ενοτητας Και Του Νοηματος Της "Εκαβης" τοθ Εὐριπιδη. Nicosia.

Hall, Edith. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy.* Oxford.

Hallett, Charles A. and Elaine S. Jallett. (1980) *The Revenger's madness: A Study of Revenge Tragedy Motifs.* Lincoln, NB.

Hankey, Robin. (1991) "'Evil' in the *Odyssey*" 87-95 in Craik (1990).

Harrison, Jane E. (1903) *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* Cambridge.

Headlam, W. (1901) "Notes On Euripides" Part 1, *CR* 15, 15-25, esp. 22-23.

Heath, Malcolm. (1987) "'Jure Principem Locum Tenet': Euripides' *Hecuba*" *BICS* 34, 40-68.

----------. (1987a) *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy.* London.

Heinimann, Felix. (1945) *Nomos und Physis.* Basel.

Henderson, J. (1987) "Older Women in Attic Old Comedy" *TAPA* 117, 105-29.

Hense, O. (1902) *Die Modifizierung der Maske in der Griechischen Tragoedie.* Freiburg.

Hourmouziades, N. (1965) *Production and Imagination in Euripides.* Athens.

Hicks, E.L. and G.F. Hill. (1901) *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions.* Oxford.

Hobbs, T.R. (1985) *2 Kings.* Word Biblical Commentary 13. Waco, TX.

Hogan, J.C. (1972) "Thucydides 3.52-68 and Euripides' *Hecuba*" *Phoenix* 26, 241-57.

Humphreys, M.W. (1881) "Varia" *AJP* 2, 218-23.

Jackson, J. (1955) *Marginalia Scaenica.* Oxford.

Johnstone, Keith. (1981) *Impro: Improvisation and the Theatre.* London.

Jones, Gwyn. (1980) *Eirik the Red and Other Icelandic Sagas.* The World's Classics. Oxford.

Jones, H.L. (1917-32) *The Geography of Strabo.* 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.

Jones, John. (1962) *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy.* London.

Kaibel, G. (1895) "Kratinos' 'Οδυσσῆς und Euripides' Κύκλωψ" *Hermes* 30, 71-89.

Kazarow, Gawril I. (1930) "Thrace" *CAH*[1] VIII.534-60.

King, Katherine Callen. (1985) "The politics of imitation: Euripides' *Hekabe* and the Homeric Achilles" *Arethusa* 18, 47-66.

Kirkwood, Gordon. (1947) "Hecuba and Nomos" *TAPA* 78, 61-8.

----------. (1982) *Selections from Pindar.* APA Textbook Series 7. Chico, CA.

Kitto, H.D.F. (1961) *Greek Tragedy.*[3] London. esp. 215-221.

Kovacs, David. (1987) *The Heroic Muse.* Baltimore. esp. 78-114 Chapter 3 "Dynasts and Democrats in the *Hecuba.*"

----------. (1988) "Conjectiana Euripidea" *GRBS* 29, 115-134

Kranz, W. (1933) *Stasimon.* Berlin.

Lattimore, Richmond. (1959) "Chronological Note on the Plays of Euripides" 224-29 in *Euripides V: Three Tragedies.* The Complete Greek Tragedies. Chicago.

Laurens, Annie-France. (1988) "Hekabe" *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* IV.i.473-81, IV.2.280-83. Zurich.

Lefkowitz, Mary R. (1986) *Women in Greek Myth.* London.

Levin, Harry. (1965) *Christopher Marlowe: The Overreacher.* London.

Ley, Graham. (1987) "The Date of the *Hecuba*" *Eranos* 85, 136-7.

----------. (1991) *A Short Introduction to the Ancient Greek Theatre.* Chicago.

Lilja, S. (1976) *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry.* Helsinki.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. (1975) *Females of the Species.* London.

----------. (1983) "Artemis and Iphigeneia" *JHS* 103, 87-102.

----------. (1989) "Les Erinyes dans la tragédie grecque" *REG* 102, 1-9.

----------. (1990) "Erinyes, Semnai Theai, Eumenides" 203-11 in Craik (1990)

Lorimer, H.L. (1940) "Δίπαλτος" *ABSA* 37 (Session 1936-37) 172-86.

Luchnig, C.A.E. (1976) "Euripides' *Hecuba*: The Time is Out of Joint" *CJ* 71, 227-34.

MacDowell, D.M. (1963) *Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators.* Manchester.

Macleod, Colin W. (1974) "Form and Meaning in the Melian Dialogue" *Historia* 23, 385-400 = (1983a) 52-67.

----------. (1977) "Thucydides' Plataean Debate" *GRBS* 18, 227-46 = (1983a) 103-22.

----------. (1982) "Politics and the *Oresteia*" *JHS* 102, 124-44 = (1983a) 20-40.

----------. (1983) "Thucydides and Tragedy" 140-58 in (1983a).

----------. (1983a) *Collected Essays.* Oxford.

McDonald, Marianne. (1978) *Terms for happiness in Euripides.* Hypomnemata. Gött ingen. esp. 87-98, Chapter 7 "Hecuba".

Marcovich, Miroslav. (1984) *Three-Word Trimeter in Greek Tragedy.* Beîtrage zur klassischen Philologie 184. Königstein

Mastronarde, Donald J. (1979) *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage.* University of California Publications Classical Studies 21. Berkeley CA.

----------. (1988) Review of Diggle *OCT* vol. 1 (1984). *CPh* 83, 151-60.

Matthaei, L. (1918) *Studies in Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge. esp. 118-157, Chapter IV "The *Hecuba* of Euripides".

Matthiessen, Kjeld. (1969) "Manuscript Problems in Euripides' *Hecuba*" *GRBS* 10, 293-305.

----------. (1974) *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides.* Heidelberg.

Maxwell-Stuart, P.G. (1973) "The Appearance of Aeschylus' Erinyes" *G&R* 20, 81-84.

Meridor, Ra'anana. (1975) "Eur. *Hec.* 1035-38" *AJP* 96, 5-6.

----------. (1978) "Hecuba's Revenge: Some Observations on Euripides' *Hecuba*" *AJP* 99, 28-35.

----------. (1983) "The Function of Polymestor's Crime in the *Hecuba* of Euripides" *Eranos* 81, 13-20.

Michelini, Anne N. (1987) *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition.* Madison. esp. 131-80, Chapter 6 "*Hekabe*: The Aesthetic of the *Aischron*" and 330-33, Appendix C "Lyrics in *Hekabe*".

Mikalson, Jon D. (1991) *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy.* Chapel Hill, NC.

Milton, John (undated) *Marginalia* in his copy of *Euripidis quae extant omnia ... excudi P. Stephanus*, Paris (1602) = Oxford, Bodleian Library, Don.d.27/8, excerpted by J. Barnes for his edition of 1624. Published in part in *Museum Criticum* Cambridge (1826) I.283-91; cf. M.Kelley,

S.D. Atkins *J.Eng.Germ.Phil.* 60 (1961) 680-87. *non vidi.*

Montgomery, James A. ed. Henry Snyder Gehman. (1951) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings.* The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh.

Mossman, Judith M. (1990) *Euripides'* Hecuba*: A Re-Evaluation with Special Reference to Dramatic Technique.* Oxford. D.Phil. Thesis. Ms. D.Phil. c.8445.

Murray, Gilbert. (1913) *Euripides and His Age.* London.

Nagy, Gregory. (1985) "Theognis of Megara: A Poet's Vision of his City" 22-81 in *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* ed. J. Figueira and G. Nagy. Baltimore, MD.

Newiger, H.J. (1961) "Elektra in Aristophanes' Wolken" *Hermes* 894, 22-30.

Norgaard, Holger. (1964) "Never Wrong But With Just Cause" *Eng Stud* 45, 137-41.

Nussbaum, Martha. (1986) *The Fragility of Goodness.* Cambridge. esp. 397-421, 504-11 (notes), Chapter 13 "The betrayal of convention: a reading of Euripides' *Hecuba*".

O'Connor-Visser, E.A.M.E. (1987) *Aspects of Human Sacrifice in the Tragedies of Euripides.* Amsterdam. esp. 50-72, Chapter III "The Hecuba".

Oliver, J.H. (1960) *Demokratia, the Gods and the Free World.* Baltimore, MD.

Orban, M. (1970) "*Hecube,* Drame Humain" *LEC* 38, 316-30.

Ostwald, M. (1965) "Pindar, *Nomos* and Heracles" *HSCP* 69, 109-38.

----------. (1969) *Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy.* Oxford.

Page, Denys L. (1934) *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy.* Oxford.

Pagini, G. (1970) "Il dramma di Polissena nell' *Ecuba* di Euripide" *Dioniso* 44, 46-63.

Panagl, Oswald. (1972) "Zur Funktion der direkten Reden in den ‚dithyrambischen Stasima' des Euripides" *WS* 6, 5-18.

Parry, Milman. (1930) "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I. Homer and Homeric Style" *HSCP* 41, 73-147 = 266-324 in (1971) *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry.* Oxford.

Pearson, L. (1962) *Popular Ethics in Ancient Greece.* Stanford, CA.

Pini, G. (1972) "Sul Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς di Pindaro" *SIFC* 46, 185-210.

Pitcher, John. (1985) *Francis Bacon: The Essays.* Harmondsworth.

Pohlenz, M. (1954) *Die griechische Tragödie.* Göttingen.

Pritchard, James B. (1958) *The Ancient Near East, Volume 1: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures.* Princeton, NJ.

Pucci, Pietro. (1980) *The Violence of Pity in Euripides'* Medea. Ithaca, NY.

Quasimodo, S. (1962) *"Ecuba" Dioniso* 36, 89-97.

Raven, D.S. (1962) *Greek Metre: An Introduction.* London.

Reckford, Kenneth J. (1985) "Concepts of Demoralization in the *Hecuba*", 112-28, 209-12 (notes) in P. Burian (ed.) *New Directions in Euripidean Criticism.* Durham, N.C.

Renehan, R. (1969) *Greek Textual Criticism.* Cambridge, Mass.

Ricks, Christopher. (1966) "Tennyson's Methods of Composition" *Proc Brit Acad* 52, 209-30.

----------. (1974) "Introduction" *Laurence Sterne, The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy.* Harmondsworth.

----------. (1988) *A.E. Housman: Collected Poems and Selected Prose.* Harmondsworth.

Riffaterre, Michael. (1990) "Compulsory reader response: the intertextual drive" 56-78, Chapter 3 in Worton and Still (1990).

Ritchie, W. (1964) *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides.* Cambridge.

Roberts, Deborah H. (1987) "Parting Words: Final Lines in Sophocles and Euripides" *CQ* 37, 51-64.

Robinson, David B. (1991) "The Fragility of Fortune" *Phil Inv* (forthcoming), proofs numbered 1-16.

Robinson, J. (1976) *The Second Book of Kings.* Cambridge.

Rosivach, Vincent J. (1975) "The First Stasimon of the *Hecuba* 444ff." *AJP* 96, 349-62.

Russell, D.A. and M. Winterbottom. (1990) *Classical Literary Criticism.* The World's Classics. Oxford.

Schwartz, Eduardus. (1997) *Scholia in Euripidem.* Vol. I Scholia in Hecubam Orestem Phoenissas. Berolini.

Seaford, Richard. (1982) "The Date of Euripides' *Cyclops*" *JHS* 102, 161-72.

----------. (1984) "The Last Bath of Agamemnon" *CQ* 34, 247-54.

Séchan, Louis. (1926) *Études sur la Tragédie Grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique.* Paris.

Segal, Charles. (1971) *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad.* Mnemosyne Supplement 17. Leiden.

----------. (1989) "The Problem of the Gods in Euripides' *Hecuba*" *Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 22, 9-21.

----------. (1990) "Golden Armor and Servile Robes: Heroism and Metamorphosis in *Hecuba* of

Euripides" *AJP* 111, 304-17.

----------. (1990a) "Violence and the Other: Greek, Female, and Barbarian in Euripides' *Hecuba*" *TAPA* 120, 109-31.

Shaw, M. (1975) "The Female Intruder: Women in Fifth Century Drama" *CP* 70, 255-66.

Sher, Antony. (1985) *Year of the King*. London.

Skutsch, Otto. (1957) "*Hecuba* 923-926" *CP* 52, 173.

Smith, Ole Langwitz. (1977) *Scholia Metrica Anonyma in Euripidis Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas*. Opuscula Grecolatina 10. Copenhagen. esp. 1-10.

Sommerstein, Alan H. (1989) "Again Klytaimestra's Weapon" *CQ* 39, 296-301.

Spranger, J. (1927) "The Problem of the *Hecuba*" *CQ* 21, 154-58.

----------. (1938) "A New Collation of the Text of Euripides in the Jerusalem Palimpsest" *CQ* 32, 197-204.

Steidle, W. (1966) "Zur Hekabe des Euripides" *WS* 79, 133-42.

Steir, Hans Erich. (1928) "ΝΟΜΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ" *Philologus* 83, 225-58

Stephanopoulos, T.K. (1980) *Umgestaltung des Mythos durch Euripides*. Athens.

Stevens, P.T. (1937) "Colloquial Expressions in Euripides" *CQ* 31; 182-91.

----------. (1956) "Euripides and the Athenians" *JHS* 76, 87-94.

----------. (1977) *Colloquial Expression in Euripides*. Wiesbaden

Stinton, T.C.W. (1965) *Euripides and the Judgement of Paris*. London = (1990) 17-75.

----------. (1975) "More Rare Verse-Forms" *BICS* 22, 84-108 = (1990) 113-42.

----------. (1977) "Notes on Greek Tragedy, II" *JHS* 97, 127-54 = (1990) 271-309.

----------. (1990) *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.

Stokes, Michael. (1990) "Textual Notes in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*" 13-23 in Craik (1990).

Sutton, Dana F. (1980) *The Greek Satyr Play*. Beitr. z. kl. Phil. 90. Meisenheim am Glam.

Tanner, Rollin H. (1915) "The Ὀδυσσῆς of Cratinus and the Cyclops of Euripides" *TAPA* 46, 170-206.

Taplin, Oliver. (1971) "Significant Actions in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*" *GRBS* 12, 25-44.

----------. (1977) *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford.

----------. (1978) *Greek Tragedy in Action*. London.

Tarkow, T.A. (1984) "Tragedy and Transformation: Parent and Child in Euripides' *Hecuba*" *Maia* 36, 123-36.

Testall, R. (1954) "An Instance of 'Surprise' in the *Hecuba*" *Mnem* 7, 340-41.

Thomson, G. (1939) "The postponement of interrogatives in Attic drama" *CQ* 33, 147-52

Tosi, T. (1914) "Il sacrafizio di Polissena" *Atene e Roma* 17, 19-38

Tovar, Antonio. (1959) "Some passages of Euripides' *Hecuba*" *GRBS* 2, 129-35.

Turyn, A. (1957) *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides.* Urbana, Ill.

Ussher, R. (1957) "*Hecuba* 923-926" *CP* 52, 107-08.

Vellay, Charles. (1957) *Les Légendes du Cycle Troyen.* 2 vol. Monaco.

Vickers, Brian. (1973) *Towards Greek Tragedy; Drama, Myth, Society.* London.

Viljoen, H.G (1918) "Note on Euripides" *CQ* 12, 45.

Wace, Alan J.B. (1949) *Mycenae: an Archaeological History and Guide.* Princeton, NJ.

Webster, T.B.L. (1968) *The Tragedies of Euripides.* London.

----------. (1970) *The Greek Chorus.* London.

West, Martin L. (1973) *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique.* Stuttgart.

----------. (1982) *Greek Metre.* Oxford.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. (1921) *Griechische Verskunst.* Berlin.

Wiles, David. (1987) "Reading Greek Performance" *G&R* 34, 130-51.

Wilson, N.G. (1976) Review of Dawe (1973). *JHS* 96, 171-76.

Winnington-Ingram, R.P. (1966) "Euripides. *Bacchae* 877-881 - 897-901" *BICS* 13, 34-37.

Worton, Michael and Judith Still (1990) *Intertextuality: theories and practices.* Manchester.

Zielinsky, T. (1925) *Tragudomenon Libri Tres.* Cracow.

Zuntz, G. (1965) *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides.* Cambridge.

Introduction

I The Context of Revenge in the *Hecuba*.

> Revenge is a valuable passion, and the only sure pillar on which justice rests...
>
> A.E. Housman

Sophocles' portrayal of the Oedipus legend has, since Aristotle's *Poetics,* been held up as the paradigm for Greek tragedy. This preeminence, and a faulty Victorian logic which assumed that if the *Oedipus Tyrannus* was good drama, everything that was good drama must be like the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, has led to the large-scale disregard of Euripides' *Hecuba* as 'good drama'[1]. This is in itself surprising, considering the play's prestige in antiquity and its place as the first of the so-called Byzantine triad, and in sixteenth-century dramatic criticism.[2] Yet a convenient starting point for a vindication of the *Hecuba* is with Sophocles' Oedipus. Oedipus kills his biological father at a crossroads, unaware of the old man's identity, as he relates to us:

καί μ' ὁ πρέσβυς, ὡς ὁρᾷ,
ὄχους παραστείχοντα τηρήσας, μέσον
κάρα διπλοῖς κέντροισί μου καθίκετο.
οὐ μὴν ἴσην γ' ἔτεισεν, ἀλλὰ συντόμως 810
σκήπτρῳ τυπεὶς ἐκ τῆσδε χειρὸς ὕπτιος
μέσης ἀπήνης εὐθὺς ἐκκυλίνδεται·
κτείνω δὲ τοὺς ξύμπαντας.

And the old man, seeing this, and having watched for when I passed, from his place in the carriage swung down his two-pronged goad on the top of my head. He more than paid, though: one speedy blow from the staff in this hand, and he tumbled out head first, from the middle of the carriage, onto his back. And I killed all of them, together.

OT 807-13.

Later, in time both real and dramatic, he reflects on his actions and finds he has two valid pleas for innocence, ignorance and provocation:

καίτοι πῶς ἐγὼ κακὸς φύσιν,
ὅστις παθὼν μὲν ἀντέδρων, ὥστ' εἰ φρονῶν
ἔπρασσον, οὐδ' ἂν ὧδ' ἐγιγνόμην κακός;
νῦν δ' οὐδὲν εἰδὼς ἱκόμην ἵν' ἱκόμην,
ὑφ' ὧν δ' ἔπασχον, εἰδότων ἀπωλλύμην.

But still, by nature how was I evil? I, who suffering but retaliated, so that if I had acted with full knowledge, not even then could I be considered evil. But as it is I arrive where I've arrived in ignorance, while those by whom I'd suffered sought my death.

OC 270-74

His categoric assertions of guiltlessness are not questioned in the play, nor should they be. Oedipus at the crossroads behaved exactly as he was expected. Failure to respond to the unprovoked aggression would have been cowardly and unthinkable. Killing the whole party (except the unseen messenger)[3] for one blow is not considered excessive. The dramatic irony emerges only because this activity which in normal circumstances was excusable, in this particular instance proved to be the fulfilment of the very prophecy Oedipus was in the process of trying to avoid. Similarly, Telemachus' desire for vengeance at the beginning of Homer's *Odyssey*[4] is seen as a mark of his coming-of-age, not a morally debilitating desire.

Hecuba does not act in ignorance, nor is she forced into her actions by some known fate, but this has no bearing on her unconditional innocence in the play. She is an old woman who has suffered much.[5] The deaths of her two youngest children Polyxena and Polydorus, which form the *locus* of the play, spur her to bloody violence which is shown to be unambiguously appropriate behaviour. This is seen in the notion of revenge (τιμωρία) as presented in the play, which has not been discussed fully.[6] The modern repulsion at Hecuba's actions has not always been standard. Heath details the changing interpretations of the play through time, and his observations on sixteenth-century aesthetics of tragedy, especially those of Caspar Stiblinus, are instructive:

> Polymestor's sufferings are wholly deserved, and Stiblinus has no moral qualms concerning Hecuba's vengeance. I do not know, in fact, of any adverse judgement of Hecuba's vengeance in this period; that is the more striking when one recalls that the moral ambiguity of revenge was a recurrent theme in vernacular tragedy.
>
> Heath (1987) 47

Later interpretations have suffered from a misconception of the relationship between the *Hecuba* and Aeschylus' *Oresteia* of 458 B.C. The *Oresteia* had presented an alternative view of revenge as some moral see-saw, from which Orestes' expiation can only be attained after a trial by divine favour.[7]

What Euripides sets forth in the *Hecuba* is a revenge of a completely different sort than the Aeschylean notion. It is problematical that both English and Greek vocabulary fails to rigidly distinguish the concepts, but the distinction must be maintained, for it is precisely the presentation of revenge which gives a coherent meaning to the *Hecuba*, and precisely an obvious and concrete difference

between the two presentations that Euripides sought to establish. Aeschylus' radical view of revenge, as introduced in the *Oresteia,* will be called 'vendetta' throughout this study, to distinguish it from Euripides' 'revenge' (which might equally be called 'justified retribution', though this seems too prejudicial). The primary difference between these is the presence or absence (respectively) of moral ambiguity. The modern mind has many associations and presuppositions about revenge that are not questioned, but must be for an accurate historical view. To apply the distinction to Elizabethan and Jacobean drama: *The Revenger's Tragedy* and *The Spanish Tragedy* are plays about vendetta; *Hamlet* is a play about revenge, a point which Kovacs (1987) 148 n.6 observes, "in *Hamlet* no one questions the propriety of revenge."

Once the concept of vendetta was presented on the stage, it immediately became common currency. Euripides in the *Hecuba* returns to an earlier presentation of revenge, absolute unto itself, which is that of the *lex talionis* as it existed in the Ancient Near East.[8] The necessity which compels Euripides' revenge is shown to be steadfast when compared to the vagaries of the politician Odysseus, or the lack of consideration for justice of Agamemnon, or the random barbaric cruelty of Polymestor. Here the difference between the *Hecuba* and the *Trojan Women* of 415 B.C. becomes clear. The latter shows Hecuba's relationship with three women - Cassandra, Andromache, and Helen - when she is enslaved after the Fall of Troy. The same setting is used in the *Hecuba* to show her relationship with the three men.[9] The structure of the play, in its inevitable flow along two familiar storylines towards a third original one (or, as Conacher (1961) 146 n.1 pictures it, two tales of suffering and a tale of vengeance), reflects a literary game Euripides plays with the *Oresteia* - echoes of the first two plays with

a re-evaluation of the third - which in turn reflects his attitude towards, and presentation of, revenge.

"Such vertiginous regressions, mirrors reflected in mirrors, are a characteristic anxiety of modern literature" (Ricks (1974) 25) and parallel of the very game Euripides presents his audience. The *Oresteia* had shown a resolution of conflicts in fifth-century Athens (though Macleod (1982) minimizes direct historical references, values and conflicts presented remain those of the fifth century.) The *Hecuba* shows another possibility, turning the world of the *Oresteia* on its head. Such an overt literary game with the same text is seen in the *Orestes* (408 B.C.) which leaves the conflicts of the *Oresteia* exposed. Apollo's final solution is so artificial and contrived precisely for the purpose to show the impossibility of assigning any meaningful value to the event, and emphasizes the lack of an appropriate response.

The play opens with the appearance of a ghost, Polydorus, Hecuba's youngest son, who has been murdered for gold by a kinsman and host, the Thracian king Polymestor.[10] He is an ethereal presence floating above the stage,[11] and though Hecuba has had a mysterious dream, she does not yet know her son is dead. His presence makes it a necessary truth, as unalterable and absolute as her vengeance on his behalf later will be. As one ghost fades, another has appeared. Achilles' shade has demanded a tribute from the Greeks, lest the Best of the Achaeans go without honour. And so Polyxena, Hecuba's youngest daughter, sacrificed by Achilles' son Neoptolemus to his father, becomes the last victim of the Trojan war. As such, her death stands for the deaths of all Hecuba's children lost in the war,[12] and the ghost of Achilles clearly symbolizes the spirit of Greek heroism that had ensured the victory. Polyxena's placid acceptance of her fate,

despite Hecuba's pleas and entreaties with the guileful and politically expedient Odysseus that her daughter be spared, serve to colour Polyxena's 'noble' death with a sickly hue: her victory is for herself alone, a safe exit, and disregards ties of kinship to family or city[13] which are the marks of heroism.[14] These bonds later prove to be Hecuba's tools towards exacting her revenge. She supports her claim on Agamemnon by a supposed kinship-relationship to Polydorus because of Cassandra (824-35.)

The audience cannot help but feel disappointed at Polyxena's actions. Her self-sacrifice amounts to no more than a suicide, with Polyxena escaping the horrors that await her. She accepts her fate with too great a willingness to die (346-8.) In itself, this is an acceptable tragic response to unpleasant situations (cf. Ajax; and Sophocles did write a *Polyxena.*) In the present instance, Polyxena is helping the enemies of her mother. This completely diffuses the tension in the situation and loses Hecuba's case for her. Hecuba's daughter becomes Odysseus' trump card in the ensuing debate (ἀγῶν): "Polyxena dies only for her own honour ... so her death affirms nothing, but becomes a bitter, incidental, discordant event, as Euripides meant it to be" (Burnett (1971) 24). While the messenger Talthybius in the following episode indicates he and the whole army were moved to tears by her nobility at death, it is not an enemy which moves them, but an ally.

As one corpse is produced, so is another. Polydorus' murdered body is found adrift by an old serving-woman preparing to wash Polyxena for burial. Hecuba interprets her dream correctly in the light of this further evidence,[15] that her son was murdered by Polymestor. So she determines on revenge. Testall (1954) seems to be the first scholar to notice that this catches the audience

completely off-guard: "in the prologue Euripides has given no indication whatever of any revenge. In 749, therefore the word τιμωρεῖν, the first notion of any such idea, comes as a complete surprise" (340). That this conclusion must follow becomes clear with the familiarity the word and its cognates assume in the ensuing drama[16] (756 τιμωρουμένη, 790 τιμωρὸς, 843 τιμωρόν, 882 τιμωρήσομαι, 1258 τιμωρουμένην; the word is always used by Hecuba of her action against Polymestor; further, the revenge is presented consistently as "an official act of justice" (Meridor (1978) 30).) Hecuba seeks to avenge her son not as part of a deterioration of a formerly noble character under the pressures of adverse circumstances, but because in fifth-century Athens[17] "when a person was killed ... the killed person had suffered a wrong ... and required vengeance or retribution (τιμωρία); and it was the duty of his family to obtain it for him" (MacDowell (1963) 1). The surprise comes from Hecuba's ability to attain revenge despite the obstacles in her way, which include her servitude, her abject condition, her age and her gender. Both Agamemnon and Polymestor do not believe her capable of any genuine harm (885, 981.) The kings are laid low by the prisoner's legitimate response.

Euripides here combines two elements found in other extant plays, which demonstrate some interest in themes over his career. Hecuba is a powerful barbarian[18] woman. That the Athenian male population had a general anxiety about barbarians, women, and anyone other than themselves with power[19] is certain. Euripides employs the combination of all three in *Medea* (431 B.C.), Phaedra in the *Hippolytus* (428 B.C.) as well as in the *Hecuba* (c.424 B.C.) The second factor contributes to this: the isolated setting on the Thracian Chersonese removes any associations with 'civilization', in a modern sense, as it does in the

Iphigeneia among the Taurians, the *Cyclops*, and in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. Meridor (1983, 14 n.9) and Macleod (1983; and cf. Hogan, 1972) assumes Thrace is used to reflect contemporary interests (Hall (1989) 108-09 rightly argues against the identification of Polymestor with the historical Seuthes). If so, this must be seen as of secondary importance. Characters are found in a Hobbesian state of nature, that is unaffected by any external factors. The life and workings of the *polis*, so central to fifth-century thought, have no bearing. Free from such contingencies, Hecuba is able by the end of the play to restore a semblance of her former nobility, in contrast with the base actions and designs of Polymestor and the Greeks, such as would not be possible in the 'civilised' world of Argos, for example. The *polis* controlled private vengeance in the fifth century (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1966) 35 and 37 n.13). The *Hecuba* shows that there was a higher basis for this fact.

The Greek generals are continually dependent on their army. They can function only in community, suffering each others' vicissitudes and vagaries, ever aware of popular opinion and the value of demagoguery. Further, the Greeks (both audience and, to a more limited extent, characters) can come to understand their community, or culture, better by examining it at its periphery. The clearest way to show what makes a Greek is to show him interacting with a barbarian. This is clearly a concern of Euripides, and stresses the genuine middle ground Hecuba holds. An anthropologist has stated that this is a common phenomenon of all cultures: "people become aware of their culture as they stand at its boundaries" (Cohen (1982) 3). Though community is important for understanding revenge, Hecuba's right is presented as an absolute right, independent of human judicial process. It is only with this understanding that Meridor's claim that

"Agamemnon's appearance ... supplies Hecuba with both a social framework and the responsible authority" (1983, 15) can be seen to be correct.[20]

Agamemnon is a necessary obstacle to be overcome if the revenge is to be accomplished, and Hecuba accordingly objectifies him. He says he will not act on her behalf despite her claims of kinship with him which, under the Athenian legal principle cited above (MacDowell (1963) 1), should obligate him to act on Polydorus' behalf. Her claim on him is twofold, based on her being his slave[21] and his kinsman (and the associated paradox of such a situation), that Agamemnon will act with justice, and on her behalf, based on his (present) relationship with Cassandra (which also has mutually exclusive elements; the implicit conflict will manifest itself at the trial at the end of the play.) The power of the claim seems overwhelming, and yet he fails to act decisively, fearing the censure of the army. She will accept his inaction and tacit support for the meantime, and so dispatches her serving-woman to summon the Thracian king for an audience.

Polymestor is not known from any other sources, and so joins the ranks of other unknown Euripidean barbarian kings, such as Theoclymenus in *Helen*, Thoas in *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*, as well as any unknown unknown Euripidean barbarian kings. Three theories have been posited as to his literary origin. Méridier, Conacher (1961) and Pohlenz (1954) believe Euripides adapted the character from local lore, though this is done without any evidence, and has the sole redeeming feature of removing Euripides of a creative thought. Zielinsky (1925) 55 posited an Aeschylean play during the period of the Athenian reconquest of Thrace, 476-459 B.C. This too is the stuff of fantasy, but shows an awareness of Aeschylus' influence on the play. The existence of similar characters in other plays and the lack of plausible alternatives necessitate the conclusion that

Polymestor is a Euripidean invention (rightly Kaibel and Grégoire.) There is now a more cogent progression to be found through the three storylines, tracing Euripides' departure from his source: Polyxena is a known plot (even if Sophocles' *Polyxena* did not precede the *Hecuba* as is generally assumed, they surely shared a common source);[21] Polydorus is a known character, who is presented with considerable plot innovations (in Homer, Polydorus is the son of Priam and Laothöe, and killed in battle by Achilles);[22] and the revenge on Polymestor is a new plot. Accepting that Euripides' reappraisal of revenge is central to the play's interpretation, it is now clear that the structure of the play recognizes these divergences.

Polymestor arrives with his young sons, full of smiles and guiles, confidently asserting that Polydorus whom he had murdered is thriving in the palace. This is a statement which everyone listening - Hecuba, attendants, Chorus, audience, Polymestor himself, and presumably his sons and guards - knows to be false. Polymestor fails to know that everyone knows, and therein lies the somewhat unusual dramatic irony of the scene. The gold surety entrusted for Polydorus' care is also safe, Hecuba is told. He dismisses his bodyguard at Hecuba's request, and knowing that he can be moved by greed, Hecuba lures him into the tent with promises of further gold rewards. The second obstacle has been overcome, and she is in a position to exact her revenge. Meridor (1978) stresses the complete lack of redeeming features in the portrayal of Polymestor: "he is all lies, flattery and greed" (31); contrast Jason (*Medea* 866-975) and Pentheus (*Bacchae* 1024-1392)[23] who are shown to be more than two-dimensional villains, and (however belatedly) to have some redeeming features.

Both revenge, as expounded here, and the Oresteian vendetta can be

summarized in a common Greek maxim that may well have been proverbial,[24] "the doer suffers" (*Choephori* 313 **δράσαντι παθεῖν** is probably the tersest formulation possible, but others surely exist, e.g. *Agamemnon* 1563.) The distinction between vendetta and revenge lies in the level of society at which justice is held. Both are expressions of the phenomenon of the blood-feud. With vendetta, the *onus* shifts back and forth between two parties, as Mark Twain describes in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*:[25]

> A feud is this way. A man has a quarrel with another man, and kills him; then that other man's brother kills *him*; then the other brothers, on both sides, goes for one another; then the cousins chip in - and by-and-by everybody's killed off, and there ain't no more feud. But it's kind of slow, and takes a long time.

Obvious examples of this punitive justice are many: the Campbells and the Macdonalds, the Hatfields and the McCoys, blood-feuds as presented in the Norse sagas, and a divine vendetta can be seen between the goddesses Artemis and Aphrodite in the *Hippolytus*.[26] It is also the situation in the *Agamemnon* and the *Choephori*, made more acute because the conflict exists within the House of Atreus. The *Eumenides* introduces a change, making the rule of law paramount.

Euripides has a separate agenda. The rule of law is consistently debunked, through Odysseus' machinations, the fragility of Agamemnon's leadership, and will culminate in the trial which concludes the play. Transforming the Homeric heroes into fifth-century politicians is part of an apparently lifelong programme of Euripides to question the canonization of the traditional myths, especially Homer - compare Iphigeneia, traditionally the first casualty of the war, who does not in fact die in the *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* or the *Iphigeneia in Aulis* (which also

shows Achilles and the sons of Atreus as politicians, not generals); *Helen*, where Helen 'of Troy' never even arrives there. In the *Hecuba*, the eponymous protagonist formulates her first appeal to Agamemnon in her long speech on law (νόμος) assuming law's primacy through external arbitration (799-801.)[27] Too many interpretations rest on the importance of this speech to the play. Its importance lies in its inadequacy. It proves an unsatisfactory outlet for revenge, so the context must change: "It is to the justice represented by the Furies that Hecuba ultimately has recourse ... Her story is a kind of *Oresteia* in reverse: private vendetta comes into play after an appeal to institutionalized justice has failed." (Gregory (1991) 108.)[28] Gregory does not make the distinction between revenge and vendetta suggested here, but apart from this imprecision the sentiment is correct. Revenge - the revenge of the *lex talionis* - goes beyond punitive retribution; "it can be conceived to be the guardian of the community as a whole, for homicide law is the basis of all law and order" (Macleod (1983) 129). It is a community's expression affirming the sanctity of life, which transposes the blood-feud to a restorative context. Two details of this statement need elaboration.

Revenge is a community's expression, not that of an individual or number of individuals, such as a kin-group (for example, an οἶκος). Mossman (1990) 197 notes the same distinction is found in the historians:

> Thucydides uses τιμωρία and τιμωρεῖν almost always to express community vengeance rather than personal revenge. This provides an interesting contrast with Herodotus, who portrays Xerxes' projected revenge on Greece as far as possible as a personal matter...

The desolate setting of the play effectively isolates the community in question, which is composed of the Hellenic host, its leaders, Hecuba, her attendants, and

her fellow prisoners, who comprise the Chorus. The playwright makes entering or leaving the community difficult, but not impossible: Polymestor and his sons, and in one sense Polydorus, are all permitted access. Euripides is careful that when the revenge is enacted, Hecuba herself, though accepting moral responsibility, physically performs neither of the crimes (although 1046 makes it clear that the situation is exactly as if she had done it physically). It is her attendants who kill the children, and blind Polymestor with their brooches. Meridor (1978) plausibly explains this as agreeing "with the spirit of Attic law which specifically forbade to hand over a convicted murderer to the injured party" (30-1.)[29] While this is no doubt valid, the actions of the mute characters form an explicit assent to the inherent justice of Hecuba's revenge. Every individual who is available to pass judgement on her actions agrees:[30] for example, Agamemnon says to Hecuba (852-53),

καὶ βούλομαι θεῶν θ' οὕνεκ' ἀνόσιον ξένον
καὶ τοῦ δικαίου τήνδε σοι δοῦναι δίκην

I also wish, for the sake of the gods and for the sake of justice, that you receive your rightful satisfaction from this blasphemous friend

and the Chorus to Polymestor (1023),

οὔπω δέδωκας ἀλλ' ἴσως δώσεις δίκην

You have not yet paid, but equally you will pay the penalty.

Hecuba herself (1052-53) says,

... δίκην δέ μοι | δέδωκε. ...

He has paid me my due.

and even Polymestor (1252-53) says,

οἴμοι, γυναικός, ὡς ἔοιχ', ἡσσώμενος
δούλης ὑφέξω τοῖς κακίοσιν δίκην.

Oh no! It seems I have been beaten by a woman, a slave, and punished by my inferiors.

Each of these statements acknowledges that the action in question is right and just (δίκη.) It is the opinion of the community. That Agamemnon accedes is important. Although he is presented as a vacillating demagogue, he is the central pillar of the community, leader of the Greeks and master of the Trojan captives. His recognition of the justice of Hecuba's (intended) action is crucial since it makes the action authorised in a sense. The authorisation is not formally granted (that must wait until after-the-fact, in the agon) but it is a necessary step; this is why the third episode is dedicated to Hecuba's getting it, the same way the fourth episode is dedicated to the victim admitting his guilt.) Should Hecuba fail in her revenge, she must in no way be thought to be guilty or culpable in any sense (rightly Kovacs (1987) 107). She is determining the legal right to (rightful) revenge: the law is with her, and the victim is certain. Long before the concept of revenge had been introduced in the play, the ground had been cleared: "Two of our question marks are thus already answered in the prologue: Hecuba is right to take revenge on Polymestor to the extent that he is the guilty party and that his crime was inflicted on an innocent and inoffensive victim" (Mossman (1990) 200-01).

In this light, the purpose of revenge becomes clear. It is not retributive, providing an individual with satisfaction in seeing another suffer. It is a community restoring itself to its state before the original transgression, making it whole again, in the same way that in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, concerning Macduff's

revenge for the murder of Duncan (as a kinsman), Macduff killing Macbeth is a restorative act for Scotland. Returning to the blood-feud premiss that "the doer suffers", it becomes clear that the phrase is open to two interpretations. Vendetta maintains no overall perspective: A wrongs B who then acts according to the proverb; B has now wronged A who then acts according to the proverb *ad absurdum ad infinitum*. Revenge maintains that the community as a whole must punish the transgressor. The passive construction in "the doer suffers" reflects the absence of individual responsibility. The *status quo ante* is restored.

The play's presentation of the value of life is also nonstandard. Hecuba *de facto* is an enslaved prisoner of war. To make her plight tragic, Euripides accords a value to her life and those of her fellow prisoners that would not be found in the Homeric setting, nor in the popular morality of the fifth century. The rationale he employs gives deference to Hecuba's former state as Queen of Troy. It is this expanded perception of life which Polyxena will not endure: she is a princess, and life as a servant and concubine would be no life (351-68.) Her sentiment is noble, and therefore is not commensurable with the non-hierarchical perspective this community shares (for the Greeks too seem willing to accept this perspective, until the demands come from the deceased, which is beyond the community's direct experience.) It has been shown that Polyxena, in embracing death, undermines her own life. This must not be the model the *Hecuba* enshrines.

Hecuba mourns Polyxena and muses on her nobility (589-602) but the conclusions reached are moral - she has abandoned the original question she had formulated in terms of class. It is certainly not true that the principle established in this speech, on the immutability of one's true nature (φύσις), sets out the rule to which Hecuba will prove her own exception. This conclusion assumes that

Hecuba's revenge constitutes a moral deterioration of her character. This has been the standard interpretation of the play throughout this century, and the names of those who follow it are many, e.g. Matthiae (1918), Kirkwood (1947), Abrahamson (1952), Oliver (1960) Conacher (1961), Kitto (1961), Daitz (1971), Vickers (1973), Luchnig (1976), Tarkow (1984), King (1985), Reckford (1985), Nussbaum (1986), Michelini (1987), Segal (1989), (1990), (1990a) etc. It is held that Hecuba's royal character degenerates over the course of the play, the breaking point being usually at some point during her speech about **νόμος** (786-845).[31] This is what I shall call the 'debasement theory' throughout this study. In generalising and not referring so much to individual claims, I hope to show that the theory as a whole, and the premises which underlie it are not tenable. Pohlenz (1954) 281 called Hecuba "die erste Gestalt der Tragödie, die eine innere Wandlung durchmacht." It is the situations external to Hecuba which change, not anything inside her character.

There is a democratisation of human life, which conflicts with the aristocratic scale of values present in the language in the fifth century.[32] This is the basis for Gregory's interpretation: "The possession of might ... does not justify its abuse. The weak also possess certain rights and resources, and those who press their advantage too far will receive their ultimate check not from the gods, but from the oppressed victims" (1991, 186-7).

Polymestor is blinded, his sons murdered, and he emerges in a scene laden with transtextual influence from the *Agamemnon*.[33] He calls for help, Agamemnon appears, and in true Euripidean fashion, a fifth-century courtroom drama (ἀγῶν) ensues. Polymestor is on trial for the murder of Polydorus, even though the sentence has just been executed. Trying Hecuba is never mooted. Polymestor

then confesses to the crime in the fifth line of a 51-line speech (1136). Agamemnon is the judge, but Hecuba has already gained Agamemnon's allegiance to her cause. The verdict is assured before the trial begins. The scene thereby provides a retroactive confirmation of Hecuba's justice, which contrasts with the manifestly fallible human law which provides the confirmation. This trial is not to be perceived as legitimate judicial procedure, but a mockery of justice, invoking not laughter but indignation. Agamemnon is genuinely surprised that Hecuba has had the opportunity to enact a revenge. He did not expect her to be able to accomplish anything in a prisoner of war camp. Even he is caught off-guard by having to hold a trial.

In Lewis Carroll's 1876 nonsense poem *The Hunting of the Snark*, "The Barrister's Dream", the Snark appears as defence attorney, judge, and jury[34] ruling ultimately in favour of the prosecution. The Snark's position is really not that far removed from Agamemnon's, who is judge and jury and allied with the prosecution, with the verdict already passed and punishment completed. The sentence passed is not arrived at legally, but it is just. The play defines revenge succinctly within the terms of this paradox, as something which transcends human 'justice', which is utterly corrupt and without authority. The law Agamemnon represents is the one Aeschylus in the *Eumenides* had exalted in his aetiology of the Areopagus, which was institutionalized specifically to deal with revenge-killings.

There is a second attempt at evaluation of the revenge, which is ultimately more successful. After receiving his punishment and admitting his guilt, Polymestor ends the play citing prophecies of doom for Agamemnon, Cassandra and Hecuba. Rather than using a *deus ex machina*, Euripides invokes the

"prophecy of an acknowledged authority" (Meridor (1978) 32), Dionysus prophet of the Thracians. Suddenly to remember doom prophecies is not unique in Euripides, and are found also in the mouths of Polyphemus (*Cyclops* 696-700) citing an unspecified ancient oracle, and Eurystheus (*Heraclidae* 1028-37) citing the oracle of Loxias.[35] Like Polymestor, both Polyphemus and Eurystheus are contemptible characters. Agamemnon, the prophet says through Polymestor, will be killed in a bath with an axe by his wife, and Clytemnestra will kill Cassandra as well. One purpose of all such utterances (including divine epiphanies) is to re-establish links with the world of myth, placing the action of the drama into a larger continuum. Here though, Euripides is clearly being insidious. He shows his hand in the game he is playing with the *Oresteia*, and effectively provides enough information to prevent the *Oresteia*, retroactively, from happening within the continuum: armed with the information Polymestor gives him, even Agamemnon would be clear-sighted enough to avoid the machinations of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. Or so we should like to think. Agamemnon's blithe couplet that ends the trimeters of the play (1291-92) show that he has not even been properly listening to Polymestor's utterances.

Euripides' game continues, because Hecuba's transformation into a dog (κύων) recalls the dog-woman Furies or Erinyes, who embody vengeance. Gregory draws this comparison explicitly: "By assimilating Hecuba to a Fury, the metamorphosis offers her an escape from her degraded status and endows her with a fierce grandeur" (1991, 110). This seems to have been first posited by Pucci (1980) 216-17 n.39, who agrees that the metamorphosis cannot refer to Hecuba's shamelessness. The association of the Erinyes with dogs is made explicit in the *Oresteia* earliest, it seems (though Gregory (1991) 110 argues that dogs are

associated with vengeance also at Theognis 347-49), and the importance of this text to the *Hecuba* has already been stressed. The play several times invokes an avenging spirit (ἀλάστωρ), which for all practical purposes seems to be identical with the Erinyes.[36]

Meridor rejects this association, saying "Hecuba's transformation into a bitch should not be treated in isolation, and consequently, should not be taken as a moral evaluation of her revenge" (1978, 34); she cites the metamorphosis of Cadmus and Harmonia into snakes, also predicted, at the end of the Bacchae.[37] But in rejecting the negative evaluations, she precludes the possibility of positive ones. Meridor (1978, 34) stops at having reformulated the equation that the metamorphosis establishes. Rather than consider the meaning of 'Hecuba = κύων', she suggests Euripides' purpose was the aetiological question of how 'The Sign of the Dog (Κυνὸς Σῆμα, i.e. the promontory Cynossema) = The Tomb of Hecuba (Ἑκάβης τύμβος)', the answer to which is provided, of course, by the metamorphosis. This is clever, and to some extent correct, but it leaves no place for an evaluation of the revenge, which becomes reduced to an objective fact; Segal (1990a) 128 n.59 is right to question her scepticism. This returns her to the problem she was attempting to solve, the fact that from the fates selected by Euripides in the prophecy, "it seems that not more can be inferred for the meaning of the play" (1978, 33). The aetiological explanation is provided for specific reasons, which are ultimately not a sufficient explanation for the events that occur in the play.[38]

Aware of this, Heath contrasts the sixteenth-century views of Hecuba and Medea. While Medea's murder of her children revolts, in the case of Hecuba, "So far from being revolted, Stiblinus proposes the circumspect calm with which she

goes about retaliation as a model" (1987, 47)[39] Hecuba's transformation is not into some base animal, but as the human embodiment of the rightful spirit of Justice. The justice of the Furies is the rightful justice of revenge. Euripides has altered the continuum of myth so that the *Agamemnon* should never happen. Of course, normally variant presentations of a myth were both approved and expected, but it is clear that in this instance Euripides has an ulterior motive. Without the Aeschylean murder of Agamemnon, the Erinyes never become Eumenides, the Kindly Ones. They retain their earlier associations with revenge. Revenge is not a kind emotion, but it was intrinsic to Greek thought in the fifth century, and is a valuable passion to Euripides' Hecuba.

II - Durkheim, Revenge, and the Ancient Near East

> Publique reuenges are, for the most part, Fortunate
>
> ... But in priuate Reuenges it is not so.
>
> Sir Francis Bacon, *On Revenge*

The picture of a restorative revenge, as opposed to the retributive vendetta, seems to be both consistent and valid for the *Hecuba*. It does not function in isolation. Comparison with similar presentations of revenge outside the Greek sphere will inform a reading of the *Hecuba*, to show that the values expressed, that revenge has an appropriate and public outlet in a society, and is not something peculiar. The maxim of helping friends and harming enemies is the commonly held foundation for Greek ethics[1] in the fifth century, and for the present that premiss should suffice. Confusion and ambiguity exist because of a misunderstanding of the biblical *lex talionis*, which has entered modern society in a tacitly altered form from its original meaning. Since the concept underlies any discussion of the appropriateness of revenge, it is necessary to make clear its original formulation, untainted by centuries of reinterpretation. In its original form, the *lex talionis* represented a restorative revenge.

Revenge involves punishment. Because "the work of Emile Durkheim has traditionally been the central reference point for the sociology of punishment" (Garland (1989) 37), it is also a convenient starting point for a discussion on revenge. Durkheim's model[2] - which claims validity for any social group, and should therefore be applicable to fifth-century Athens, and by extension to Euripides' fifth-century presentation of the Late Bronze Age - is not completely consistent, and one of his inconsistencies concerns the *lex talionis* itself. Another comes at the level of definitions, where Durkheim's original conception of crime

("by this name we call every act which, in any degree whatever, invokes against its author the characteristic reaction which we term punishment" Durkheim (1965) 70) is presented in reference to punishment, the effect defining the cause. This is however resolved with his later definition, "an act is criminal when it offends strong and defined states of the collective conscience" (1965, 80), the collective conscience being a fixed system of beliefs held by average citizens in a society. Crime is thus in the first instance an offence against a community, not against an individual. It is determined not from a society's government (in the loosest possible sense) but by the society's governed. Durkheim conceives just punishment as restoration to the community, and this is consistent with the picture given in Euripides' *Hecuba*: "Punishment, then, remains for us what it was for our fathers. It is still an act of vengeance since it is an expiation. What we avenge, what the criminal expiates, is the outrage to morality" (1965, 89).[3]

This link with the past is essential for Durkheim's argument. Because by examining the past he notes a fallacy held by his predecessors in sociological analysis (Durkheim (1965) 91):

> Among primitive peoples punishment sometimes seems still more completely private, as the custom of the *vendetta* would seem to prove. These societies are composed of elementary aggregations of quasi-familiar character, and are easily described by the word *clans*. But when an attack has been made by one or several members of a clan against another clan, it is the latter which itself punishes the offence to which it has been subjected. What seemingly increases the importance of these facts is that it has very often been contended that the *vendetta* was primitively the unique form of punishment.

Though this is the prevalent theory of the nineteenth-century ethnologists, "not a single society can be instanced where the *vendetta* has been the primitive form of punishment" (1965, 92). Of course, the use of the word 'primitive' in each of these quotations is prejudicial and in some sense is symptomatic of the error being addressed. It sets off as 'other' and as 'inferior' anything which has preceded. The point is that being anterior chronologically evokes behavioural assumptions (such as in the execution of justice) that will affirm a notion of progress from that point to the present, even when there is no direct link between the two societies in question. As a result, modern researchers, who have approached the issue with a liberal, post-Enlightenment, Christian mind-set, have found themselves repulsed. The tendency has been to take all undesirable features, and form a collective lump of otherness. This is what the Greeks themselves do with the application of terms such as οἱ βάρβαροι ("barbarians", i.e. all that were not Greeks.) Durkheim abandons this prejudice and establishes an alternative model, where "the *vendetta* is evidently a punishment which society recognizes as legitimate, but which it leaves to particular persons to inflict ... It is far from true that private vengeance is the prototype of punishment; it is, on the contrary, only an imperfect punishment" (1965, 94).

The distinction then is not developmental, but in terms of extent. Vendetta is a form of private delict, whereas vengeance is the appropriate reaction (i.e. punishment) to a crime:

> It follows from this that two types of law can also be distinguished: *repressive (penal) law* which both reflects and reinforces mechanical solidarity [in a society] by harshly repressing difference and dissent; and *restitutive (co-operative) law* which reflects and facilitates organic

> solidarity by organising and regulating exchange relations between the different individuals and sectors of complex social types.
>
> Garland (1989) 42

The motive of revenge, as an expression of Garland's restitutive law, is a desire of an individual for the benefit of his society. Punishment for a crime is a public vengeance; yet private vengeance (such as that evoked by Durkheim as cited at the end of the previous paragraph) is, ultimately, no vengeance at all. Revenge is not a prerogative of an elite portion of society, and in practice has a particular appeal to weaker members of a society, who otherwise would have no claims on justice:

> It is an error to believe that vengeance is but useless cruelty ... The instinct of vengeance is ... only the instinct of conservation exacerbated by peril. Hence, vengeance is far from having had the negative and sterile role in the history of mankind which is attributed to it. It is a defensive weapon which has its worth, but it is a rude weapon.
>
> Durkheim (1965) 87

Some would surely question the use of the adjective "defensive" in this context, and the use of the word "rude" also arouses discussion. Both terms, it appears, are being used in a slightly special sense. In allowing the motivation for the vengeance to come from prisoners of war, Euripides shows that victims do have rights; these are not the individual rights cherished by modern democracy, but collective rights from which they can benefit.

Durkheim pictures revenge as a response to another action. It is not initiatory by definition; it retaliates. The important distinction that needs to be constantly borne in mind is that the action is justified in terms of collective rights - the rights of the community - rather than individual rights, the development of

which only really occurred after the Enlightenment with the other changes from liberal democracy. Because it establishes a hierarchy of collective over individual rights, there is (in theory) no specific benefit to any individual. There is a mechanism for selecting individuals who will exact the revenge on behalf of society (in Hecuba's case, it is because she is kin to the deceased) but the benefit is the restoration of the community. It is in this sense then that it is "defensive":

> Durkheim conceptualises punishment as the expression of a particular form of social relationship - a solidarity ... maintained by the enforcement of collective beliefs. It is essentially a mechanism whereby the domination of the social over the individual is reproduced.
>
> Garland (1989) 43

It is a "rude" weapon in the sense that it is misunderstood and misapplied. The use of revenge can degenerate (as it does in time and in the minds of so many critics) to the use of vendetta. It does so because "in the first place, punishment consists of a passionate reaction" (Durkheim (1965) 85), and passions are notoriously difficult to control. They represent an irrational side of individuals, which is implicitly in conflict with a legitimate collective response. Durkheim believes that vengeance "cannot regulate itself" (1965, 87). He does not clarify this belief, but it would seem that this is what he means. If so, an examination of some case studies should suggest otherwise: that it is not inconsistent to view revenge as a societal response to a violation of collective rights, which can be successfully implemented and maintained, which is the view of revenge present in the *Hecuba*. The examples to be used are from the Ancient Near East which is antecedent to Euripides, and found at an early point in each culture's legal history. This will at least argue against external corruption of ideas.

The earliest Akkadian legal code are the Laws of Eshnunna,[4] dating somewhere between 2000 and 1728 B.C. The justice it propounds is purely financial: recompense is to be paid by offenders. Violent crimes provoke extreme responses, and so it is violent crimes against persons, if any, that will invoke one form or another of revenge. While how murder was treated does not survive at Eshnunna, there is evidence for the case of rape, e.g. of a slave,

> 31: If a man deprives another man's slave-girl of her virginity, he shall pay one-third of a mina[5] of silver; the slave girl remains the property of her owner.
>
> Pritchard (1958) 136

and the case of assault,

> 42: If a man bites the nose of a(nother) man and severs it, he shall pay 1 mina of silver. (For) an eye (he shall pay) 1 mina of silver; (for) a tooth 1/2 mina; (for) an ear 1/2 mina; (for) a slap in the face 10 shekels of silver.
>
> Pritchard (1958) 137

which clearly establish the principles enshrined. There exists a graduated scale, but at some point life does become commensurate with money. Such casuistic codes (allowing one particular instance to stand for many similar instances) are standard in the Ancient Near East.

A significant innovation is to be found in the Code of Hammurabi (c. 1727 B.C.) and this is the earliest formulation of what is known as the *lex talionis*:

> 196: If a seignior[6] has destroyed the eye of a member of the aristocracy,[7] they shall destroy his eye.

197: If he has broken a(nother) seignior's bone, they shall break his bone.

200: If a seignior has knocked out a tooth of a seignior of his own rank, they shall knock out his tooth.

Pritchard (1958) 161

These are cases designed purely for the upper classes, but it does show a marked development of thought. In violent crimes against equals, there is no longer financial expiation. The former code assigned a value to life, the Code of Hammurabi puts it beyond value. It also (with its third-person plural protases) places revenge in the hands of the whole community, which in this case would be limited to the aristocracy). This is clearest in the mechanisms in place to prevent false convictions:

1: If a seignior accused a(nother) seignior and brought a charge of murder against him, but has not proved it, his accuser shall be put to death.

3: If a seignior came forward with false testimony in a case, and has not proved the word which he spoke, if that case was a case involving life, that seignior shall be put to death.

Pritchard (1958) 139

It becomes clear that life is not a matter of superficial concern, and is protected against maltreatment in every reasonable way. Revenge, in the form of the *lex talionis*, is not vindictive, but sets limits on behaviour. It enshrines the collective rights of the society before individual rights. The system, however, is not egalitarian, and 'life' means only the life of an equal:

198: If he [a seignior] has destroyed the eye of a commoner, or broken the bone of a commoner, he shall pay one mina of silver.

201: If he has knocked out a commoner's tooth, he shall pay one-third mina of silver.

Pritchard (1958) 161

Residual traces of the earlier system are still present in the Code of Hammurabi, where the eye-for-eye, tooth-for-tooth ethic no longer applies.

This positive way of dealing with violent crimes was not now universal in the Ancient Near East, and the legal codes of the Hittites[8] (c.1400-1193 B.C.) exhibit many similarities with the earlier Laws of Eshnunna. Hittite law has a notion of abstract legal persons: one's estate had a legal identity, at least for the period of the injured party's convalescence (if applicable), which it was the obligation of the offending party to maintain. This would seem to entail a productivity ethic, which is borne out by the penalties that are incurred:

1: If anyone kills a man or a woman because of a quarrel, he delivers the body and he shall give four people, either men or women, and he will look after the estate.

2: If anyone kills a slave or slavewoman because of a quarrel, he delivers the body and he shall give two people, either men or women, and he will look after the estate.

3: If anyone strikes a free man or woman and he or she dies, his hand sins; he delivers the body and he shall give two people and he will look after the estate.

4: If anyone strikes a slave or slavewoman and he or she dies, his hand sins; he delivers the body and he shall give one person and he will look after the estate.

7: If anyone blinds a freeperson or causes his tooth to fall, in the past they used to give one mina of silver, but now he will give twenty shekels of silver and look after the estate.

8: If anyone blinds a slave or slavewoman or causes his tooth to fall, he will give ten shekels of silver and look after the estate.

10: If anyone injures a person and makes him unfit then he takes care of him and gives a person in his place who works in his house until he is healthy; but when he regains his health he gives six shekels of silver and then that fellow himself gives the fee to the doctor.

The pattern remains consistent throughout the code. The Hittite solution is to add to the estate more manpower than had been removed. The manpower replacement is incremental - slaves are typically valued at half worth[9] - and it is fairly clear that the punishment was not some upper limit; there was a fixed penalty for which there could be no appeal. The priorities that seem to dominate the Hittite legal system centre on the perpetuation of the estate.

It is worth examining closer the distinction which is drawn between laws one and three, cited above (it is of course the same distinction between laws two and four.) The former describes death "because of a quarrel", and the latter has the qualifier "his hand sins." In modern parlance, both crimes are a form of manslaughter.[10] Yet the meaning of the qualifiers remains obscure. The penalty incurred in the second case is one half of that when a quarrel is involved. A consistent rationale can however be discerned if the word translated "a quarrel" refers to a blood-feud. Law one then becomes an attempt to regulate the blood-feud, by prescribing a four-to-one replacement ratio. This would leave law three for cases of manslaughter (or murder, if that is what is being described) outside the context of the blood feud. In the lesser case, there seems to be a removal of culpability from the doer: legally, it is his hand which sins. It is clear that homicide is not a capital offence, so the logical alternate interpretation, that

the phrase refers to the severity of the crime, is clearly not meant. Having only the hand sin could carry some sociological significance that it not discernible from the code itself.[11]

The overall picture of the Hittite legal system (as it concerned itself with violent crimes) is one that distinguishes between crimes committed within the context of a blood-feud, and those outside it. With the Akkadian system, as found in the later Code of Hammurabi, a fundamental aspect concerning the treatment of violent crimes was that life, or at least the life of an aristocrat, was not commensurate with property. Both of these notions are present in the legal system found in the Old Testament, and both are fundamental assumptions in Durkheim's conception of punishment and revenge. The Old Testament itself deals with law in many places, but especially the Pentateuch, the first five books ascribed to Moses in the Hebrew tradition (which are often collectively called "The Law.")[12] In particular, the 'Book of the Covenant' (*Exodus* 20:22-23:19), which is the casuistic code which immediately follows the Ten Commandments, shows particular affinity with the other Near Eastern legal systems that have already been discussed.[13]

Unlike the Akkadian law codes, the Pentateuch provides an explanation why homicide is a capital crime:

> Whoever sheds the blood of man,
> by man shall his blood be shed;
> for in the image of God
> has God made man.
>
> *Genesis* 9:6

It is Israel's special and personal relationship to Yahweh that ensures the sacredness of life. The *imago dei* theology makes life the property of its creator.[14] The death of the offender is the only way to restore what has been taken. Paradoxically, the capital punishment for murder reflects the sanctity of life, and since the offence is against the society's deity, it is the responsibility of the whole society that restitution be attained. This is in accordance with Durkheim's tenet that "If, then, in primitive societies [among whom he numbers the Old Testament Jews], criminal law is religious law, we can be sure that the interests it serves are social" (1965, 92).

There are many other indications that the system means to establish a restorative rather than punitive judicial system, and this is seen in the laws themselves. For example,

> Anyone who strikes a man and kills him shall surely be put to death. However, if he does not do it intentionally, but God lets it happen, he is to flee to a place I will designate. But if a man schemes and kills another man deliberately, take him away from my altar and put him to death.
>
> *Exodus* 21:12-14

This clearly shares many features with the other Near Eastern codes, with the addition of a provision for death by negligence, the "place I will designate" in the above passage. The importance of these places, the Cities of Refuge, in the Old Testament law is certain. Four separate accounts are given,[15] and the purpose is clear: "They will be places of refuge from the avenger, so that a person accused of murder may not die before he stands trial before the assembly" (*Numbers* 35:12), i.e. they are a mechanism to avoid the blood-feud.

In addition to the creation of formal procedures to determine culpability, and the institution of the Cities of Refuge, the *lex talionis* is part of the Old Testament blood-feud law. Its overall context is typically disregarded. The injunction is part of a supposed case, and the motivation behind the law is seen only in its fuller context:

> If men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman and she gives birth prematurely but there is no serious injury, the offender must be fined whatever the woman's husband demands and the court allows. But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise.
>
> If a man hits a manservant or maidservant in the eye and destroys it, he must let the servant go free to compensate for the eye. And if he knocks out the tooth of a manservant or maidservant, he must let the servant go free to compensate for the tooth.
>
> *Exodus* 21:22-27

The case in question is that of an innocent bystander being injured, which again is a likely starting point for a blood-feud. Again, the purpose of the law is restoration: injured slaves are to be set free, which implies an accorded status not found elsewhere in the Ancient Near East, and establishes a primacy of persons over property.[16] The law also establishes a maximum of forty stripes less one in whippings[17] which establishes a sense of proportionality. The *lex talionis* is a symbolic way of limiting the blood-feud. A final example of this is the fact that the degree of criminality is determined in proportion not to the harm caused (which is the response of the blood-feud) but rather to mental culpability: "If a thief is caught breaking in and is struck so that he dies, the defender is not guilty

of bloodshed; but if it happens after sunrise, he is guilty of bloodshed" (*Exodus* 22:2-3.) The distinction here being made is similar to the modern notion of killing in self-defence.

For the ancient Jews, the (understood) physical presence within the community of the deity demands the highest moral standards, and these are manifested in a legal system which opposes the blood-feud (which is the vendetta) and establishes mandatory restoration. This restoration, as a collective expression of values, becomes a collective responsibility. The *lex talionis* unambiguously preserves and maintains the community it governs. And it is this conception of justice which is the restorative revenge of the *Hecuba*.

As the Near Eastern examples are divided between the opposite conceptions of revenge and vendetta, so are the Greeks, and part of the problem in an analysis of a distinction that can appear quite subtle is that terminology used will not always reflect the distinction. The *Oresteia*'s pervasive presentation of vendetta obscures characteristics of revenge, though that does not mean they are not found:

> Although requital of wrongs is approved as just, it is often expressed not in its personal form ('retaliate against your enemy') but in an impersonal form ('the doer must suffer') which does not specify the agent of justice, or assert the justice of personal revenge [i.e. vendetta].
>
> Blundell (1989) 53

Similarly, the desire to see one's oppressors punished is taken into account by the legal system, which can be seen to serve the same interests as the Old Testament limits on blood-feud:

> Athenian law both acknowledged these feelings and set limits to their satisfaction, by allowing the prosecutor in a successful murder trial to witness the execution but "to do no more" (Demosthenes 23.69). From this perspective, simple retaliation appears not vengeful but a restraint on the impulse of revenge.
>
> Blundell (1989) 30-31

Of course, counter-examples do exist.[18] But what is clear is that the notion of revenge which Euripides sets forth in the *Hecuba* is one that exists throughout the ancient world; although not universal, it is clearly not merely a local idea, or even one specific to the author.

The transitional stage between the Ancient Near East and the fifth-century is important, and the poems of Homer provide a touchstone for this transition. While it is impossible to provide a complete view of the Homeric understanding of revenge, its primacy within the ethical system is undoubted:

> Revenge is, after all, a central ingredient of the whole heroic ethos, whether in epic (the plot of the *Iliad,* too [i.e. as well as in the *Odyssey*], revolves around the theme of revenge, and its culminating act of vengeance also takes place in the twenty-second book) or in tragic drama (e.g. the assumptions underlying most public and private actions in the *Ag.*, and passages like Soph. *OC* 270f., 992-6).
>
> Hankey (1991) 93

Hankey's discussion focuses on the precise usage of κάκα ("evils") in the *Odyssey,* because the word is used to describe what Odysseus does, which (it is assumed) will not be morally questionable. This is coherent, and leads to the conclusion that Odysseus' actions are evil *for someone* (i.e. the recipient, such as one of the suitors.)

The poet centres his work on the concept of revenge, and "Odysseus himself actively ponders and brings about 'evils', in contexts of revenge" (1991, 88). Hankey concludes, "Clearly what is meant by 'evils' in these passages [*Od* 9.316; 14.110; 15.178; 17.159, 465, 491; 20.5, 184] is physical revenge, the causing of bodily injury and indeed death" (*loc. cit.*) It is not mooted that seeking after revenge (in these appropriate circumstances) is in anyway wrong or morally culpable. What in Aeschylus becomes the most extreme example of morally ambiguous revenge, Orestes' ousting of the usurper Aegisthus,[19] in Homer is understood in absolute and positive terms: "Orestes' revenge (τίσις) is glorious among gods and men (1.40-6, 298-300, etc.)" (1991, 93), cf. also *Od* 12.377-419, 13.128-45. In every way is Orestes' revenge held up as a moral exemplum with which to compare Telemachus (nine times in the first twelve books of the *Odyssey*!)

Recognizing it as part of a continuum, and understanding the effective purpose of its antecedents, permits a perspective that could not otherwise be afforded which will support the literary game Euripides is to play with the *Oresteia*.[20] In failing to see this, many modern critics demonstrate prejudices that inevitably colour a view of revenge such as is presented in the *Hecuba*. Denniston goes so far as to apologise for the tragedians: "It is assumed by all three dramatists that revenge, even to the point of shedding blood, is justifiable or even laudable. That is not to say that they believed this to be true ethics. But for dramatic purposes these are the ethics they assume" (*El* xxv).[21] The fact that this interpretation of revenge also is supported by sociological thought demonstrates a consistency and universality that might not otherwise be clear.

III - Windlessness

The answer, my friend, is blowin' in the wind.

Bob Dylan

In order for the Greeks to set sail for Troy, Agamemnon had to sacrifice his daughter Iphigeneia, that Artemis might be appeased and release the winds she was withholding from the Greek fleet. The girl is killed (or whisked away at the last moment, as some versions of the legend, particularly those favoured by Euripides, have it) and the winds start blowing in the right direction for Troy. The first victim of the war is an innocent Greek princess, and shows that war affects not only soldiers, but civilians as well; the moral dilemma in which Agamemnon is placed means that he, as leader of the Greek expedition, must also lose something in the war, that before he can take many lives, he must lose one very close to him.

At the end of the same war, something quite similar happens, which is not surprising since, like so much of myth, it fits a structure (to adopt Levi-Strauss' term), or pattern. Polyxena, an innocent Trojan princess is sacrificed to appease Achilles, who died without receiving a gift of honour (γέρας). Once he has been honoured, the winds begin to blow again and the Trojan war comes to an end. Or so went the myth before Euripides: Calder (1966) hypothesises that Sophocles' *Polyxena* (which he supposes predates the *Hecuba*) ended with winds beginning to blow. It is a satisfactory, balanced conclusion. It is not, though, what happens in the *Hecuba*. The debasement theory[1] which has been so influential in interpretations of the play typically allows for Polyxena to die nobly, a willing sacrifice whereby she heroically avoids the horrors and humiliation of slavery (the reasons are hers, 351-68.)[2] Since it has been shown that the debasement theory

itself should be reconsidered, surely this corollary of the theory should also be examined anew.

The play has six passages which deal with the lack of winds explicitly, and the sparsity of details is problematical to an extent, in that no absolutely coherent view can be produced. There is enough information, though that the matter is clear. In the prologue, Polydorus relates (35-39):

πάντες δ' 'Αχαιοὶ ναῦς ἔχοντες ἥσυχοι 35
θάσσουσ' ἐπ' ἀκταῖς τῆσδε Θρῃκίας χθονός.
κατέσχ' 'Αχιλλεὺς πᾶν στράτευμ' Ἑλληνικόν,
πρὸς οἶκον εὐθύνοντας ἐναλίαν πλάτην·

And all the Achaeans stay with their ships inactive, and sit idle on the shores of this Thracian land. Achilles stopped all of the Hellenic host from steering a maritime oar homewards.

The Chorus provide several corroborative and more specific details (109-15):

τύμβου δ' ἐπιβὰς
οἶσθ' ὅτε χρυσέοις ἐφάνη σὺν ὅπλοις, 110
τὰς ποντοπόρους δ' ἔσχε σχεδίας
λαίφη προτόνοις ἐπερειδομένας,
τάδε θωύσσων· Ποῖ δή, Δαναοί,
τὸν ἐμὸν τύμβον
στέλλεσθ' ἀγέραστον ἀφέντες; 115

You know when he appeared with golden armour, mounted on his tomb, and stopped the seafaring ships, their forestays pressing upon the sails, calling out this: "Hey there, you Danaans, where are you heading, leaving my tomb with no gift of honour?"

Later in the play, Talthybius in relating the death of Polyxena recounts Neoptolemus' words to his father's spirit (538-40):

πρευμενὴς δ' ἡμῖν γενοῦ
λῦσαί τε πρύμνας καὶ χαλινωτήρια
νεῶν δὸς ἡμῖν πρευμενοῦς[3] τ' ἀπ' Ἰλίου 540

Be gracious to us and release the stems and mooring cables, and give to our ships a favourable wind from Troy.

The traditional interpretation[4] of these three passages suggests that Achilles held back the winds, or gave contrary winds, because he had not been honoured, mirroring in some sense the displeasure of Artemis who gave adverse winds (cf. Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 192-93).

Kovacs provides the most detailed argument against this view, and because of his insistence on the point should be cited at length (1987, 145 n.58):

> We must take this opportunity to clear up one misunderstanding about the plot. It should be obvious, though it has not been to many of those who have written on this play, that Achilles has not forced the Greeks by adverse winds to sacrifice Polyxena to him. For, first, the debate would have been pointless: men do not argue about whether they wish to get home, nor do they urge weaker reasons such as gratitude when stronger ones such as self-preservation are available. Second, neither of the descriptions of Achilles' ghost (37-39, 109-13) says anything about windlessness, and both suggest, on the contrary, that it was Achilles' *appearance* that checked the Greeks *while they were already sailing away*. (Just what **λαίφη προτόνοις ἐπερειδομένας** means is not entirely clear, but "being pressed upon, as to the sails, by the forestays" is more likely to refer to the rigging of a ship under weigh than to one becalmed. About ... 39 there can be no doubt: they are sailing.) ...

This solution to the standard 'misunderstanding' cannot be maintained. Kovacs raises four points that need addressing, all of which have straightforward remedies.

The debate is not pointless. The Achilles' demand for honour appears in the form of a question, in which he mentions that his tomb is "unhonoured" (115 **ἀγέραστον**). The debate, both as the Chorus describe it and as its context requires, is on the nature of the **γέρας**: did Achilles mean a *literal* prize of honour, i.e. a captive woman? They do not debate whether they owe gratitude to Achilles; Kovacs is right that that would be a weak reason in comparison with self-preservation (by which he means getting home by ship). However, the Greeks are not used to having their dead appearing and claiming prizes of honour. Hecuba (260-61) correctly notes that oxen are a more appropriate offering to the dead, and the fresh blood advocated by the sons of Theseus (126) is probably human but need not be so. The army is divided because they do not know precisely what Achilles wants. Odysseus' solution (134-35) is that slaves should not be withheld from the (former) best among them reformulates the question, so that it is not "What is the **γέρας**?" but "Can this meagre **γέρας** be refused?" It is no wonder the Greeks assent.

Kovacs is correct that windlessness is never specifically mentioned in the passages cited. This is surely being too literal. Windlessness does figure later in the play in three passages (900-01, 1019-20, 1289-90):

νῦν δ', οὐ γὰρ ἵησ' οὐρίους πνοὰς θεός, 900
μένειν ἀνάγκη πλοῦν ὁρῶντας ἥσυχον.

But now they must wait, watching silently, for an opportunity to sail, for the god[5] does not send favourable breezes.

καὶ γὰρ 'Αργεῖοι νεῶν
λῦσαι ποθοῦσιν οἴκαδ' ἐκ Τροίας πόδα· 1020

For indeed the Argives yearn to unfurl the sheets of their ships homeward from Troy.

and, at the very end of the play once Hecuba has enacted her revenge,

καὶ γὰρ πνοὰς
πρὸς οἶκον ἤδη τάσδε πομπίμους ὁρῶ. 1290

For even now I sense a breeze to convey us home.

Gregory rightly points out the error of Kovacs' conviction (1991, 114 n.5):

> *katesch'* (38) and *esche* (111) imply physical intervention, and that [i.e. windlessness] remains the most economical interpretation for the Greeks' lingering in Thrace. Otherwise it becomes necessary to imagine an initial epiphany of Achilles and a subsequent, unrelated failure of the winds.

The obviously related verbs Gregory mentions were both translated above as "stopped." More accurate would have been "held back" and "held" which emphasize the physical aspect Gregory desires. It is used specifically of beaching ships by Herodotus 6.101, and 7.59.

Thirdly, Kovacs fails to extract coherent sense from line 112. His literal translation "being pressed upon, as to the sails, by the forestays" does not facilitate comprehension, but two suitable explanations can be produced easily, neither of which supports what Kovacs maintains. Platnauer (on *IT* 1134-36) suggests that the sails are filled (with wind) so that they are bulging to the forestays (i.e. there was a very good wind for sailing) when Achilles holds them, suggesting a sudden loss of wind. Alternately, if hyperbole may be ascribed to the Chorus to relate this supernatural event, the winds were so contrary that the forestays were pressing against the sails. This would certainly justify the use of verbs of physical holding.

Kovacs' fourth point is that the Greeks were already under weigh. Line 39 refers to the fact that the Greeks had been sailing (they are no longer at Troy) and have become becalmed at (or forced back to) the Thracian Chersonese. This is made clear by lines 35-36. It appears then that the traditional crux[6] of the play's location has a dramatic motivation. A reason why this would have been the Greeks' first stop is provided by Thucydides 1.11, who indicates that in the tradition the Greeks had farmed and raided for supplies in the Thracian Chersonese during the Trojan War.

Clearly the audience is meant to think what Euripides presents the characters of the *Hecuba* thinking, namely that the appearance of the ghost of Achilles is the cause of the windlessness. We must therefore wonder why the winds do not begin to blow during the second stasimon: "Eventually the winds are favourable ... but it cannot be said that Euripides has in any way stressed the efficacy of the sacrifice" (Hogan (1972) 252). The sacrifice of Polyxena, the arguments for which having been vague and other-worldly, appears to have no immediate effect. It was an inappropriate and futile action that accomplishes nothing. Her death is sour for the audience: she ends up arguing with Hecuba in place of Odysseus[7] that she should be killed, and though her reasons seem noble, her death is hollow and merely furthers the Greek cause. What Polyxena wins is "a brief and merely symbolic freedom at the moment of her death" (Macleod (1983) 154; cf. Steidle (1966) 140) because "the price of staying alive [as Segal believes Hecuba demonstrates] is brutalization" (Segal (1990) 306). Polyxena's death may have been exalted in the Latin poets;[8] it was not by Euripides.

The Greeks remain becalmed (900-01, 1019-1020), and Hecuba thereby has an unspecified period of time in which to enact her revenge. Once the revenge is

completed, and she receives confirmation of its justice from Agamemnon (in the agon, retroactively, 1109-1251) and from Polymestor (1253 δίκην), then do the winds begin to blow. This at least suggests the whole natural order is siding with Hecuba, providing her with just enough time for her to exact the revenge (rightly Heath (1987) 66-67). What is wrong with the Polyxena-story is made right in the Polymestor-story. Windlessness has determined both the geographical setting and the timing of the *Hecuba*, and clearly suggests the power and necessity of justified revenge, which contrasts with the uselessness of the wrong-minded appeasement sacrifice.

This consequently calls into question the original identification of Polyxena as a counterpart to Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia's death was truly that of an innocent, under the protection of the huntress Artemis. Polyxena's death was a self-serving escape, differing as much from Euripides' other voluntary sacrifices as Hecuba's revenge does from the vendetta-based killings dealt with in other tragedies. The unavenged corpse of another innocent, Polydorus, is the wrong that must be made right before the winds can blow, and again it is Hecuba's revenge on Polymestor which brings this about. Erasmus, in choosing plays to translate into Latin, decided eventually on the two that dealt with either end of the Trojan War, the *Iphigeneia in Aulis* and the *Hecuba*. These two deal with two tragic heroines, both noble, but they are not both victims: Hecuba decides to remain passive no longer, and to decide her own fate, rather than be allocated one.[9] As Kovacs himself suggests (though towards a different end) "Windlessness is never without significance in Greek myth, and its significance here can be inferred from its results" (1987, 105).

This universal approval of Hecuba's revenge informs the interpretation of the

predicted metamorphosis of Hecuba into a dog (1265). That this is intended as a sign of confirmation of the worth of Hecuba's action is argued elsewhere.[10] As a corollary, I would like to briefly examine a relevant Euripidean fragment that has not received satisfactory attention, fr. 968 (from Plutarch *Isis and Osiris* 379D): the Greeks are right in saying sacred is τὸν κύνα τῆς 'Αρτέμιδος, ὡς Εὐριπίδης,

Ἑκάτης ἄγαλμα φωσφόρου κύων ἔσῃ.

the dog to Artemis, for as Euripides says "You shall become a dog, a delight to bright Hecate".

The first detail is the positive identification of Artemis with Hecate, a development from their mutual association with the moon (hence φωσφόρου).[11] It also seems to connect someone becoming a dog - a nonstandard event, and therefore Hecuba is not an unreasonable initial assumption - with the goddess who was involved with the event at the beginning of the Trojan War. By Hellenistic times, (Lycophron *Alexandra* 1174-77) Hecuba is clearly (inasmuch as anything in Lycophron is clear) made Hecate's servant (Cassandra speaks):

Ὦ μῆτερ, ὦ δύσμητερ, οὐδὲ σὸν κλέος
ἄπυστον ἔσται, Περσέως δὲ παρθένος 1175
Βριμὼ Τρίμορφος θήσεταί σ' ἐπωπίδα
κλαγγαῖσι ταρμύσσουσαν ἐννύχοις βροτούς

O mother, wretched mother, nor will your fame be unknown, but Perseus' maiden, triform Brimo [= Hecate] will make you her attendant, frightening mortals at night with your baying.

It appears quite possible then that the link that the Greeks established between either end of the war was with Artemis/Hecate (note that 1175 παρθένος was a traditional epithet of Artemis). The life lost in Iphigeneia was not avenged with the death of Agamemnon, as Clytemnestra desired, but is present somewhere along the causal chain preceding Hecuba's revenge.

IV - The Dependence of the *Hecuba* on the text of the *Oresteia*.

> You shall read that we are commanded to forgive our enemies;
> but you never read that we are commanded to forgive our friends.
> Cosimo de' Medici, Duke of Florence, d. 1574

a. Prolegomena

This essay is not called "The *Hecuba* and the *Oresteia*." I have tried to introduce two points of provocation into the title, which betray both my interests and my intentions, which are ultimately to provide a clear account of the meaning of the *Hecuba*, by constant reference to the dominant theme of the play, that of righteous revenge. The first of these points is the word "dependence". By this I mean to suggest that the one play can only be understood in terms of the trilogy. This is not, I believe, as controversial a statement as it may first appear. The *Oresteia*, first presented in 458 B.C., immediately was recognized as the masterpiece that it is. Legends (if that is indeed what they are) developed about the shocking impact of presenting the Furies visibly on stage,[1] and it presented what has become a paradigm for Classical moral thought, especially for matters such as theodicy, and moral ambiguity in matters such as (to keep our examples few) revenge. It attained this paradigmatic status not only because of its early appearance and clarity of thought, but also because it represented a marked shift from the established Archaic ethos (which is presupposed in the Homeric poems) that had so pervaded previous Greek thought. Dodds (1971) uses the labels "shame-culture" and "guilt-culture" to delineate the distinction in ways of thinking, and though these labels are necessarily incomplete representations of the transition,

they do serve the purpose of identifying the difference. It has also been suggested by Newinger (1961) Meridor (1975) and Tarkow (1984) that the *Oresteia* may have been reproduced soon after 426 B.C., when it is known[2] that reproductions of Aeschylean drama were staged at the City Dionysia. That the *Oresteia* was among those restaged is purely hypothetical, but nevertheless a reasonable suggestion.

What this means is that the *Oresteia* is a clear, familiar, memorable, significant, and (possibly) recently reviewed exposition of certain moral opinions that if they were not actually a product of Aeschylus, were certainly championed by him at an early stage in their development. My contention is that this is essential background knowledge to an understanding of the play. It is knowledge that would have been held by Euripides, certainly, but also by the vast majority of his audience. Even without the supposed reproduction, if individuals were not familiar with the exact words of the Aeschylean trilogy, they would nevertheless be familiar with its form and content. All this is of course a fair preamble to almost any Euripidean play. What makes the *Hecuba* different from, say, the *Electra*, is that in the *Hecuba* (and I believe the same claim can be made for the *Orestes*),[3] Euripides is consciously toying with the Aeschylean precursor, challenging assumptions that had developed from it, and subtly altering the conclusions that lead therefrom. There is, in short, an intertextual relationship between the *Hecuba* and the *Oresteia*, which it is necessary to recognize in order to understand the Euripidean play. It is not that Euripides is trying to be funny. In presenting a view of revenge contrary to the one popularly held in the late fifth century, he must undermine its most certain source in the medium in which he is writing.

This leads to the second intended provocative aspect of the title, reference to

the "text" of the *Oresteia*. Much of recent literary criticism (such as the work of Kristeva, Bakhtin, and Barthes) has focused on notions of text and textuality which seek to establish an independent value to a work, which leads ultimately to Barthes' bold declaration of "the death of the author."[4] One of the problems of this approach (and one of the reasons why several critics have abandoned intertextuality as a medium of constructive discourse) is that everything becomes a text, not just works of literature, and art, but any structure (including social patterns) which can *in any sense* be "read." The consequence of such broad definitions of "text" is that interpretation rests entirely with the critic: whatever intertext he or she can find becomes a legitimate claim. Any notion of "text" is of course further obscured by the very nature of presentation of Greek drama. Any single production of a Shakespeare play can legitimately be called a text independent of what is published in the folio; and it makes sense to talk about Gielgud's Lear, or Olivier's. But when the *Hecuba* is composed for one single performance, to be directed and choreographed by the playwright, and any notion of a script for public consumption is possibly only an after-the-fact makeshift of actors' memories, there is (perhaps) a notion of secondariness in any but the first performance with Greek drama (cf. Taplin (1978) 172-81, 192-93). I have chosen to emphasize this aspect of method first, partly as a warning to myself, that I be wary of the pitfalls of this method (for such I consider them to be), and also to state that there is a point where the method is no longer of genuine interpretative value. There is an aspect of the law of diminishing returns which applies to intertextual analysis.

That is not to say, however, that no value is to be gained from such analysis. Goldhill (1986) 138-67 "Text and Tradition" does interpret parts of

Greek tragedy in terms of other necessary texts in a way that clearly illuminates the overall view. In an example that has already been discussed,[5] Homer's *Odyssey* tells the story of an Oresteia, in some form, nine times in the first twelve books. The purpose of this telling and retelling is to hold up Orestes' revenge as an example to Telemachus, who is oppressed by the suitors (147-54). When Aeschylus presents the same story in terms that are morally ambiguous, the intertextual relationship is meaningful; that is, one must be familiar with the *Odyssey* and its repeated tellings of the story to understand what it is that Aeschylus is, consciously or not, doing. This critical activity is then fundamentally different from an examination of how, for example, the different tragedians adapt the story of Electra to differing dramatic ends. Riffaterre provides the following definition which if not taken in broad terms encapsulates what is being sought: "An intertext is one or more texts which the reader must know in order to understand a work of literature in terms of its overall significance (as opposed to the discrete meanings of its successive words, phrases, and sentences.)" (1990, 56). King (1985) suggests a transtextual relationship of this sort exists between Homer, his portrayal of Achilles in particular, and the *Hecuba.*

What I am proposing for the *Hecuba* is less ambitious even than Goldhill's example. For I am suggesting that identifying the *Oresteia* as Euripides' intertext is not a uniquely subjective achievement on my part, but rather is what Euripides would have thought, what his audience would have seen, and what has been identified by some later audiences, but has been lost in recent centuries, due perhaps in part to the morally ambiguous nature of revenge in vernacular tragedy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There will be some intertextualists who would object to the identification in this way of the *Oresteia* as an intertext.

There does exist a sense in which I am using the term naively, not as one intertext of many which will crystallise all interpretations of the *Hecuba*, but rather as one literary work/text which would have been known to all the original audience, but which has not been identified by modern critics to have a necessary interpretative role for the understanding of the *Hecuba*. If it is felt that the critical term is being misused, it is only to avoid confusion with related critical actions, such as source criticism.

This essay seeks to do more than just identify a source used by Euripides. Because the *Oresteia* so infiltrated the Athenian culture, Euripides could not just present an alternate scenario using the same characters (for example, another token-recognition scene between Orestes and Electra with a different outcome.) His attack on the values expressed in the *Oresteia* is a sustained use of verbal and visual allusion, reinterpretation, and toying with what is contained in the intertext. Chambers (1990) 143 explains it this way:

> certain texts have become recognised, that is 'canonised', and so come to stand for the hegemonic social forces, the system of power that gave them their status. In proposing itself as 'not-X' (where 'X' is the intertextual referent), a text claims literary status, but simultaneously distinguishes itself as a negativity with respect to the canon, and in so doing, distances itself from the socially marked discourses that, nevertheless, necessarily traverse it. Thus we know that [Gustave Flaubert's] *Madame Bovary* is not a clichéd text but a text 'about' cliché because it sets itself off intertextually from, *inter alia*, the stereotypes of a Romantic literature of sentiment.

In a similar way, the *Hecuba* proclaims its literary status. It is perhaps slightly ironical that having done so, it, too, rapidly enters the canon: certainly it heads

the Byzantine triad, but much closer to its original production, it was fit subject for parody, as is shown for example in the opening (?) lines of Aristophanes' fragmentary *Gerytades* :[6]

Καὶ τίς νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας
ἔτλη κατελθεῖν;

And who has dared to descend to the hiding-place of the dead, and to the gates of darkness?

which echoes Polydorus' opening words (*Hec* 1-2):

Ἥκω νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα και σκότου πύλας
λιπών

I come from the hiding place of the dead, and from the gates of darkness...

There are of course numerous other such imitations in the comic fragments. The *Hecuba* deliberately sets itself off from the *Oresteia* in order to subvert it. This is not a random perversity of Euripides. Rather, Euripides is out to establish a different understanding of revenge, one that runs closer to the Homeric precursor than to the more prevalent Aeschylean reinterpretation. Granted that this is his aim, it is reasonable to permit the playwright the opportunity to use any devices that would be available to him to further this aim. Euripides does not need to have thought in terms of intertextuality to have established an intertextual relationship between his play and any other text. Some of the links between the texts in question are explicit, others are latent. All of them, however, inform the relationship herein developed.

b. Exempla

I now propose to examine fifteen examples which I believe indicate a definite dependence of the *Hecuba* on the text of the *Oresteia* in the terms that I have already defined. Not all of these are of equal weight, and individually some may be suspect. I believe that the references to the *Oresteia* are sufficiently numerous and sufficiently clear to shift the burden of proof to any who deny the relationship exists. These references are grouped as "Perspectives of Revenge", "Echoes and Parallels" and "Conscious Subversions." The first category establishes Euripides' programme; the second shows how the poet ensures the necessity of the conclusions; the third suggests that in addition to constructing a case for himself, Euripides is destructing his predecessor. My purpose in listing these is not to illuminate the *Oresteia*, but only to inform a reading of the *Hecuba*. This unidirectionality is not a necessary aspect of this investigation, but something imposed for clarity's sake.

"Perspectives on Revenge"

Fundamentally, the *Hecuba* is about revenge. Revenge is unconditionally presented as a just, appropriate and expected response in certain circumstances, which seeks to restore a balance to a society that has become unbalanced because of the original transgression. Once this fact is established, the *Hecuba* is understood as a profound and significant drama. As I have suggested, Euripides establishes this in many ways, one of which is to set itself apart from the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus.

1. In the *Eumenides* 94-139 the ghost of the murdered Clytemnestra indignantly enjoins the sleeping Erinyes to avenge her murder. This is very much in her character (as we know it from the previous plays in the trilogy) whether she is in fact morally right or morally wrong about the justice of her own action (murdering Agamemnon) and the injustice of her son's (matricide). It is a pattern that certainly entered into the English revenge tragedy, cf. the ghost of Hamlet's father in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, and the ghost of Andrea in Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*. All three ghosts appear at or near the beginning of their respective plays, as does the ghost of the murdered innocent Polydorus. He however, does not call out for revenge. In fact, the request is deliberately avoided so that it can function as a surprise when Hecuba decides on revenge at 749-50 (so Testall (1954) and see note.) Though Polydorus has been murdered, revenge is not a personal desire of the wronged party.

2. There is a danger once the issue of theodicy is introduced, both because theodicy is a notoriously debated problem in Aeschylus (and it is a problem) and also because any attemptsto substantiate an explanation are, it seems of necessity, long and complicated, and beyond the scope of a paper such as this. Nevertheless, there seems to be reason for setting the *Hecuba* apart from other revenge tragedies (such as the *Oresteia*) so it is at least worth identifying some of the key elements I see pertaining to the issue in the *Oresteia*. Earlier this century, it was a common accusation that the Aeschylean universe is 'overdetermined' but I believe this notion has, rightly, been abandoned (or at least augmented.)

The *Agamemnon* represents a tragic action because the protagonist, Agamemnon, has free will but any choice made cannot affect the result: he must either kill his daughter, or else (and this option consists of no choice at all) desert

and the army will kill her. There is a deliberate ambiguity here, one which Clytemnestra at least cannot fathom. The *Choephori* represents a tragic action because the protagonist, Orestes, has free will but any choice made cannot affect the result: he must avenge his father (and as a result be pursued by the Erinyes for matricide) or else leave his father unavenged (which is to shirk the legal responsibilities as next-of-kin whose duty it was to ensure revenge is taken) to be pursued by his Erinyes. Whatever Orestes chooses, the result is the same. It seems suffering for ones own action (*Cho* 313 δράσαντι παθεῖν) is preferable for suffering for one's inaction: Orestes' "act of vengeance, required by δίκη, demanded by the gods, is itself a crime which requires in its turn to be punished ... for all his purity of spirit, he becomes as guilty as his father" (Garvie *Cho* xxxiii-xxxiv).

This is the pattern that Aeschylus establishes. Morally ambiguous revenge is demanded by a portion of the supernatural array (an array which includes heavenly gods, chthonic gods, and embodiments of abstract concepts), opposed by other supernaturals, is expected but not permitted, and guilt that needs to be expiated inevitably results. Aeschylus uses this background for his aetiology of the Areopagus, where, to summarise Macleod (1982) 129, the bloodthirsty, sleeping, ineffectual Erinyes are replaced by the just, awake, effective Areopagus. He later says, "In the *Eumenides*, then, legal justice, a pacific and effective solution of quarrels and wrongs, ends and supersedes the *lex talionis*" (135).

This is not the world of the *Hecuba*. In fact, it seems almost an inevitable conclusion, considering just these details, that Euripides has deliberately set his play at odds against those of Aeschylus.[7] Rather than presenting an ambiguous vendetta-situation where one crime leads to blood-guiltiness, which must be

expiated by another crime which leads to blood-guiltiness, etc., the model of revenge is much more straightforward in Euripides: a crime, murder of a kinsman and guest, has occurred. The murderer is nowhere presented with any of the redeeming features we get of, say, Jason or Pentheus. He is wrong, and must be punished. Following the mechanism of fifth-century judicial process for murder, the deceased's next-of-kin, Hecuba, is responsible for avenging him.

What is unexpected in the play, then, is not that Hecuba chooses to avenge her son, but that she has the opportunity to do so. As an elderly prisoner-of-war, it would not surprise an audience member if she failed in this duty. In the *Trojan Women*, the figure of Hecuba is of one who constantly is suffering. Here, Hecuba begins the play suffering, and endures much, but she is not broken. She can act and react, with a passion that Agamemnon, Polymestor and (I would suspect) the audience would not expect. Most important is that the rightness of her action is presented unequivocally. Just like the *lex talionis* in the Ancient Near East,[8] Hecuba's revenge is an approved action sanctioned by the entire community in which she functions. There is an agon after she has blinded Polymestor (1109-1251), and its function is merely to provide a retroactive (human) confirmation of what has already been established on a supernatural level. Formally, it is Polymestor who is on trial for the murder of Polydorus, not Hecuba and her women for the blinding, and murder of his sons. Basically, in no respect is Hecuba's revenge considered criminal, morally incorrect, unjust, or reprehensible. There is no suggestion that she is now blood-guilty.

Mossman (1990) 228-29 summarizes her understanding of the relationship between the *Hecuba* and the *Oresteia* in terms of their respective presentations of revenge in this way:

> In the *Oresteia* he [Aeschylus] presents his audience with a mythical situation which illustrates the morally unsatisfactory, and worse impractical primitive vendetta method of punishing violence and substitutes for it legal and public retribution. The flaws in the old system are revealed most clearly by the "most difficult case" of Orestes ... Hecuba has every excuse to take revenge, and her certainty is less unjustified than many in the *Oresteia*; in a sense Euripides gives us not a "most difficult case" but an "easiest case" and then makes us think about its problematic aspects.

To this extent I believe Mossman is right. She however thinks that Euripides refrains from any evaluation of Hecuba, and merely presents each case (fairly, one assumes) as a dialectic left for the viewer to resolve. This however leaves the notion of revenge ambiguous; the 'old system' remains flawed. I think that Euripides' reappraisal of revenge in the *Hecuba* is different from the presentation that is found in the other 'revenge plays', which share the modern associations with that label.

3. In making the previous point, one detail - in fact, a single line of the play - has been omitted from the discussion. The line in question is the famous one which predicts Hecuba's metamorphosis (1265):

> Πο. κύων γενήσῃ πύρσ' ἔχουσα δέργματα.
>
> Po. You will become a hound with burning eyes.

Most of the body of scholarship[9] in interpreting this line make two assumptions that should not go unchallenged; first, that the predicted metamorphosis implies a moral evaluation of the revenge-action; second, that such an evaluation condemns Hecuba. This can be called the 'debasement-theory'. The metamorphosis then is

the final step in Hecuba's moral debasement, where she physically becomes an animal, no better than her victim Polymestor. The debasement scholars certainly form the majority, but they are not right.

To begin with the first assumption, there is no immediate reason for believing that a metamorphosis would constitute an attempt at evaluation. The closest parallel for such an event that occurs in tragedy occurs in the exodos of the *Bacchae*, where it is predicted that Cadmus and his wife Harmonia will become serpents. If this is punishment (and such cannot be ruled out due to the fragmentary nature of the text) it at least can confidently be said that it is not punishment for anything done by the characters in the play. Even conceding this point, though, and permitting Hecuba's metamorphosis to be a means of evaluating her action, it is perhaps even more surprising at the conclusion which has been reached. Everything preceding the predicted metamorphosis favours Hecuba: her sympathetic portrayal, every character involved recognising the justice (δίκη) of her action, the structure and result of the agon, the unredeemable picture of Polymestor. Yet the debasement-scholars think all this is reversed in a single line.

I would suggest, following Gregory (1991), that the metamorphosis into a hound is not meant to evoke the animals who eat raw flesh in the *Iliad*; several references in Greek literature do exist where dogs are base animals, but there are essentially as many positive ones (cf. Lilja 1976).[10] Certainly, the Romans understood the story of Hecuba in the terms of this debasement-theory, but that has no bearing on how Euripides understood the metamorphosis. In fact it is known that the Latin tradition of the myth was pervasive, which, when coupled to the Christian understanding of revenge and related concepts, can clearly explain much later European (mis-)interpretation of the *Hecuba*. There is much to indicate

that the dog in question is not *just* a dog. It has burning eyes, which suggests a supernatural association beyond the fact that it is in fact a metamorphosed human. As Polymestor presents the sequence of events, the dog must ascend a mast of a ship before jumping into the sea, which again is nonstandard canine behaviour.

There is, however, the *Oresteia*, in which the Erinyes are described in the *Choephori* and *Eumenides*. Clytemnestra tells her son (*Cho* 924):

Κλ. ὅρα, φύλαξαι μητρὸς ἐγκότους κύνας.

Cl. Take care, beware your mother's wrathful hounds

In the following play, the chorus of Erinyes imagines itself as hunting dogs (*Eum* 131-32, and cf. 246-47):

Κλ. ὄναρ διώκεις θῆρα, κλαγγαίνεις δ' ἅπερ
κύων μέριμναν οὔποτ' ἐκλείπων φόνου. *Eum* 131-32

Cl. In a dream you pursue a beast, and you bay like a dog that never ceases to be anxious for slaughter.

It is even possible, cf. Harrison (1903) 223-32, Maxwell-Stuart (1973), that the Erinyes were typically conceived as having leathery, batlike wings. As an evocation of an Erinys, the metamorphosis fits the few details provided and constitutes a climactic finish to the continual approval of Hecuba's revenge. Agamemnon is identified as an Erinys (more explicitly) in *Ag* 55-62:

ὕπατος δ' ἀίων ἤ τις Ἀπόλλων 55
ἢ Πὰν ἢ Ζεὺς οἰωνόθροον
γόον ὀξυβόαν τῶνδε μετοίκων,
ὑστερόποινον
πέμπει παραβᾶσιν Ἐρινύν· [11]

οὕτω δ' Ἀτρέως παῖδας ὁ κρείσσων 60
ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πέμπει ξένιος
Ζεὺς πολυάνορος ἀμφὶ γυναικός

And some god above, either Apollo, or Pan, or Zeus, hearing the shrill wailing cry of birds, these cohabitants [in the sky], sends on the transgressor the late-avenging Erinyes: and in this way does Zeus of the Guest send the sons of Atreus against Alexander, for the sake of a woman with many husbands.

He is later to become the victim of the Erinyes (e.g. *Ag* 1119), however; in the *Hecuba* the identification does not waver so.

Further, Hecuba is not alone in the play in being called a **κύων**. Polymestor, in his messenger-speech/agon-defence addresses Hecuba's silent attendants (who were the ones who physically performed the revenge action) as 1173 **τὰς μιαιφόνους κύνας**, "murderous bitches". He calls them this in rage, but its significance is certain nevertheless. The women, as the instruments of the revenge, are also associated with the spirits of revenge, the Erinyes.

4. Probably the strongest argument against an identification of Hecuba with the Erinyes is the fact that they are never explicitly mentioned in the play. This would probably be no problem at all to an intertextualist, but still I feel something should be done to further establish the connection. In the literature that survives before Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, the function of the Erinyes is basically certain: whether as an embodiment of a curse of a wronged parent, or as the spirits that punish perjurers and oath-breakers, or as those which correct violations in nature for example, Achilles' talking horses in *Il* 19.418:

Ὣς ἄρα φωνήσαντος Ἐρινύες ἔσχεθον αὐδήν.

When he [Xanthus] had spoken in this way, the Erinyes held his voice.

- with all of these functions, "the Erinyes act to avenge or correct an infringement of the normal and proper order of things (δίκη)" (Sommerstein *Eum* page 7).

The concept of δίκη does figure in the *Hecuba*, specifically associated with Hecuba's revenge-action, by Agamemnon (852-53), the Chorus (1023), Hecuba (1052-53), Polymestor (1252-53), and (implicitly) by her silent attendants.[12] So although the Erinyes are not mentioned by name in the *Hecuba*, their presence and function can be felt. What is mentioned are alastores, the avenging spirits:

αἰαῖ, κατάρχομαι νόμον
βακχεῖον, ἐξ ἀλάστορος
ἀρτιμαθὴς κακῶν *Hec* 685-87

Ai ai! I commence a bacchic strain, having just [or "having recently", to follow the Scholiast] learned of the evils from an avenging spirit.

ἐξῴκισέν τ' οἴκων γάμος, οὐ γάμος ἀλλ'
ἀλάστορός τις οἰζύς· *Hec* 948-49

and he [Paris] expelled me from my house by his marriage, which is not a marriage, but a woe from some avenging spirit.

These references clearly are similar to the functions of the Erinyes (and alastores, e.g. *Ag* 1501, 1508) in the *Oresteia*. Burkert (1985) 181 defines an alastor as "a personified power of revenge for spilled blood" which clearly supports Eden (1988) 560, who suggests that elsewhere Euripides specifically identifies the alastores as being identical with the Erinyes.[13]

If these references seem too sparse to be convincing, it must be remembered that the supernatural has a particularly small role in the play anyway.[14] There are no specific deities at work behind (or above) the scenes in the *Hecuba*. The deity

who is perhaps most involved in the play is not mentioned, but invoked implicitly - Zeus Xenios: in the Polyxena-story, Odysseus refuses to acknowledge Hecuba's former kindness to him (239-57) and fails to recognize ξενία "hospitality";[15] in the Polymestor-story, Polymestor by killing his ward Polydorus clearly offends against this aspect of Zeus. Zeus Xenios (it would seem, in the usual interpretations of this play) does not respond; but the Erinyes are the avengers of Zeus Xenios (Lloyd-Jones *Ag* 742). In this light, there is a uniting force for all the supernatural elements in the play, if the alastores are identified with the Erinyes of Aeschylus. Nor is a clearer identification necessary: if popular religion made the association automatically, there would be no further need for Euripides to justify it. That they did make such an association is suggested in a most extreme form by Mikalson (1991) 14: "The Erinyes were hypothetical, imaginary spirits, created in part from bits and pieces in the literary/mythological tradition and in good part from Aeschylus' imagination." Such a sentiment need be true only in part for the immediate point to be made.

"Echoes and Parallels"

Classicists typically cite parallels in commentaries because valid parallels, even when they were not in the mind of the author when he wrote, do nevertheless inform a reading of the present microtext (be it a word, phrase, line, or speech.) Obviously, many verbal echoes will exist between any play about revenge and the *Oresteia*, due simply to its size and subject matter. What I will list here, then, will be only four examples, which have already been identified by other critics.[16] The existence of these parallels lends further support to the contention that Euripides had the *Oresteia* in mind (and perhaps open in front of him) as he composed the *Hecuba*.

5. First, though, will be one example of the straightforward verbal parallels that abound between the texts:

Εκ. ὄψῃ νιν αὐτίκ' ὄντα δωμάτων πάρος
τυφλὸν τυφλῷ στείχοντα παραφόρῳ ποδί — *Hec* 1049-50

Hec. You will see him straightaway in front of the house, blind. In blindness do his reeling steps advance.

ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ τεθυμένῳ
τόδε μέλος, παρακοπά,
παραφορὰ φρενοδαλής,
ὕμνος ἐξ Ἐρινύων
δέσμιος φρενῶν, ἀφόρ-
μικτος, αὐονὰ βροτοῖς. — *Eum* 328-33 = 341-46

Over our victim sing this song, raving, reeling, ruining the mind, a hymn from the Erinyes, binding the mind, without the lyre, withering to mortals.

The words παράφορος and παραφορά (the translation "reeling" obscures the physical action of staggering, and the mental state of being deranged, both of which are implied in the word) occur in verse only at these two places, and the clinical yet evocative sound of the word (it has medical uses, too) is thought by many (e.g. Collard) to echo between the passages. In the *Hecuba*, Hecuba uses the word as she triumphantly re-enters the stage with Polymestor blinded and his children murdered. Her revenge has been successful and just, and her victim is reeling. In the *Eumenides* passage, the Erinyes, the spirits of rightful revenge, describe in some detail the effect they have on their victim, which includes his mind reeling. So of the usages in verse, the word is applied to victims of rightful revenge, and, perhaps consciously on Euripides' part, Hecuba is identified in the same terms as an avenging spirit. Working from this then it is clear that such parallels do inform a reading of the *Hecuba*.

6. Πο. (ἔνδοθεν) ὤμοι, τυφλοῦμαι φέγγος ὀμμάτων τάλας.
Χο. ἠκούσατ' ἀνδρὸς Θρῃκὸς οἰμωγήν, φίλαι;
Πο. ὤμοι μάλ' αὖθις, τέκνα, δυστήνου σφαγῆς.
Χο. φίλαι, πέπρακται καίν' ἔσω δόμων κακά. *Hec* 1035-38

Po. (within) Oh no, I am blinded of my eyes' light. Wretch!
Ch. Did you hear the "oh no"s of the Thracian, friends?
Po. Oh no again, children! Horrible bloodshed -
Ch. Friends, unimagined evils have been done in the house.

Αγ. ὤμοι πέπληγμαι καιρίαν πληγὴν ἔσω.
Χο. σῖγα· τίς πληγὴν ἀυτεῖ καιρίως οὐτασμένος;
Αγ. ὤμοι μάλ' αὖθις δευτέραν πεπληγμένος.
Χο. τοὔργον εἰργάσθαι δοκεῖ μοι βασιλέως οἰμώγμασιν· *Ag* 1343-46

Ag. Oh no, I am struck deep with a fatal blow.
Ch. Silence: who calls out, wounded by a fatal blow?
Ag. Oh no again. I am struck a second time.
Ch. It seems to me from the king's "oh no"s that the deed is done.

Meridor has indicated that *Hec* 1035-38 and *Ag* 1343-46, the offstage cries of Polymestor and Agamemnon as they are attacked, and the Chorus' response to them, "may seem close enough to suggest indebtedness" (1975, 5). In each case the victim shouts ὤμοι, [descriptive verb]... then, ὤμοι μάλ' αὖθις.... In each case the Chorus responds with a question, then states that the deed has been done. Each Chorus refers to the cry from inside (οἰμωγήν, οἰμώγμασιν). There is also in the *Hecuba* an apparent reversal of events from the later description 1170-72, where it is stated that the children are killed before Polymestor is blinded. The reversal can be explained in several ways (see commentary), but whatever the reason, it is clearly done to heighten similarity with the Aeschylean passage. Finally, each passage comes immediately after a short act-dividing lyric that

functions as a stasimon.

Testall (1954) and Arnott (1982) demonstrate rightly that it is likely that the audience would not expect Polymestor to emerge from the tent: the convention as it survives is for killing people offstage, and the expected interpretation of 1037 σφαγῆς is "slaughter", though cf. *El* 1228 "wound". The emergence of Polymestor then also functions as a subversion of the earlier passage. In this context, it is appropriate to cite *Cyclops* 663-65:

Κυ. ὤμοι, κατηνθρακώμεθ' ὀφθαλμοῦ σέλας.
Χο. καλός γ' ὁ παιάν· μέλπε μοι τόνδ' αὖ, Κύκλωψ.
Κυ. ὤμοι μάλ', ὡς ὑβρίσμεθ', ὡς ὀλώλαμεν.

Cy. Oh no, the light of my eyes is incinerated.
Ch. What an excellent song! Sing this to me, Cyclops!
Cy. Oh no again. How I am maltreated! How I am destroyed!

which clearly shares features with each of these passages, but not nearly to the same extent.[17] Here, too, in one of the *Cyclops'* many echoes of the *Hecuba*, the victim emerges after the event.

7. There seems to be a visual allusion as Polymestor emerges from the tent, which he does on all fours, according to the Scholiast, and clearly suggested by *Hec* 1056-59 (sic):

Πο. ὤμοι ἐγώ, πᾶ βῶ, πᾶ στῶ, πᾶ κέλσω,
τετράποδος βάσιν θηρὸς ὀρεστέρου
τιθέμενος ἐπὶ χεῖρα καὶ ἴχνος; ...

Po. Oh no, where should I go? Where stand? Where find a haven, placing my steps
like a four-footed mountain beast, on hand and foot?

This is a unique event in extant tragedy,[18] with the exception of the Pythia, *Eum* 34ff. and esp. 36:

τρέχω δὲ χερσίν, οὐ ποδωκείᾳ σκελῶν.

I run with my hands, not with swift legs.

Hadley doubts that Polymestor enters on all fours in the first place. However, it does however provide a clear visual link with the *Oresteia.* Such visual links must of necessity often be quite speculative, simply because of the manner in which the information has survived. This one, however, seems fairly definite.

8. There are three parallels that Mossman draws which specifically suggest that Euripides is consciously using the *Oresteia.* Of the parodos (98-153) she writes "The *parodos* of the *Agamemnon* seems to have been its prototype" (1990, 88). Where Euripides has Talthybius stress the humanity of the sacrificial victim Polyxena, the *Agamemnon* constantly stresses that Iphigeneia is an animal (1990, 173), which serves as a deliberate counter-emphasis. Thirdly, of the strictly verbal-parallel type, 560 ὡς ἀγάλματος is, she suggests (1990, 282 n.15), derived from *Ag* 242 (and cf. 416, 1329).

9. Segal (1990a) 129 n.61 writes: "Agamemnon's 'May it somehow be well' in 902 may also be an echo of the choral refrain, 'Lament, lament, but may the good win out' in the *Agamemnon* (121, 137, 159)."

10. Though the only word actually repeated in *Hec* 946-51 and *Ag* 1455-61 is οἰζύς ("woe", *Hec* 949, *Ag* 1461) the similarity of the sentiment expressed about Helen and the misery that she caused prompted Fraenkel to say, "The end of the ephymnium (not only the last word) seems to have been in Euripides' mind when

he made the Chorus of Trojan captives sing of Helen's marriage" (*ad loc*). Garnet (1990) 214-15 labels this imitation and collusion.

11. γένος γάρ οὔτε πόντος οὔτε γῆ τρέφει
τοιόνδ'· ὁ δ' αἰεὶ ξυντυχὼν ἐπίσταται. *Hec* 1181-82

For such a race [as women] is bred in neither land nor sea: who ever has come across them understands this.

πολλὰ μὲν γᾶ τρέφει
δεινὰ δειμάτων ἄχη,
πόντιαί τ' ἀγκαλαι κνωδάλων
ἀνταίων βροτοῖσι πλή-
θουσι· ... *Cho* 585-89

Many are the dire, dreadful terrors bred on earth, and the arms of the sea teem with monsters hostile to mortals.

Similarly, Garnet (1990) 214-15 considers the similarities between these passages deliberate and noticeable, suggesting Euripides uses allusion and collusion (cf. also Segal (1990a) 119). In Aeschylus, the expression is sung by the chorus of slave women. In Euripides, the polar expression (the use of which suggesting both land and sea *and everything else*) is said of women.

"Conscious Subversions"

By now it should be clear that a deliberate, intertextual relationship does exist between the *Hecuba* and the *Oresteia*. At certain points Euripides all but shows his hand. The function of these is essentially to underscore the game he has played, and to form a deliberate bridge to the beginning of the *Agamemnon*. Since he can not present his play as a historical ancestor to the *Oresteia*, he sets it immediately prior in dramatic time. Here some might see Euripides as being too clever; perhaps that is what makes it characteristically Euripidean.

12. The absence of a wind for sailing (901 πλοῦν) is an important symbol in Euripides' play,[19] which serves to set Hecuba's revenge in bleak contrast with the inappropriateness and futility of the sacrifice of Polyxena. The arguments for her sacrifice, provided by Odysseus and reported by the Chorus, are specious and other-worldly, and Hecuba rightly suggests oxen as being a more appropriate propitiation for the dead (260-61), and Polyxena's acquiescence merely furthers the Greek cause.

It becomes apparent that the sacrifice of Polyxena should not have occurred. Polyxena was sacrificed to get the winds blowing, but this failed. Once Hecuba's revenge has been completed, and she receives confirmation of its justice, then finally the winds begin to blow (1289-90), indicating the whole natural order is on her side. What is wrong in the Polyxena-story is made right in the Polymestor-story. Windlessness permits an exploration of the power of justified revenge, which contrasts with the uselessness of wrong-minded appeasement sacrifice.

13. Beginning at *Hec* 1259, 36 lines before the end of the play, Polymestor begins to relate some oracles concerning Hecuba, Agamemnon, and Cassandra. This is a sudden transition immediately following the agon which retroactively confirmed the justice of Hecuba's revenge. The significance of the prophecy of Hecuba's metamorphosis has already been detailed. The veracity of the prophecy (which needs to be proved both within the drama - to Hecuba - and extra-dramatically - to the audience) is provided by several devices. One of these devices is to tell Agamemnon the plot of the *Agamemnon*, before (in dramatic time) the *Agamemnon* takes place. The amount of detail provided is surely significant. Polymestor tells who, what, where, when, and how:

Πο. καὶ σήν γ' ἀνάγκη παῖδα Κασσάνδραν θανεῖν.
Εκ. ἀπέπτυσ'· αὐτῷ ταῦτα σοὶ δίδωμ' ἔχειν.
Πο. κτενεῖ νιν ἡ τοῦδ' ἄλοχος, οἰκουρὸς πικρά.
Εκ. μήπω μανείη Τυνδαρὶς τοσόνδε παῖς.
Πο. καὐτόν γε τοῦτον, πέλεκυν ἐξάρασ' ἄνω.
Αγ. οὗτος σύ, μαίνῃ καὶ κακῶν ἐρᾷς τυχεῖν;
Πο. κτεῖν', ὡς ἐν Ἄργει φόνια λουτρά σ' ἀμμένει. *Hec* 1275-81

Po. And your child Cassandra must die.
Hec. Spit - I give this back for you to have for yourself.
Po. This man's bed-mate will kill her, a bitter housekeeper.
Hec. Long may it be before Tyndaris' child is that mad.
Po. And she'll kill this one himself, raising high an axe.
Ag. You there, are you mad? Are you asking for trouble? (makes threatening gesture)
Po. Kill away! For a bloodstained bath awaits you in Argos.

Even granting that attempts to avoid prophecies inevitably lead to their fulfilment, there is nevertheless something quite funny about Agamemnon being given this information just before his return home. The audience nevertheless will associate it with what it knows from Aeschylus, and be led to think that if this is true (which, objectively, it is) so must the metamorphosis also be true. While it is nice to think of this subverting the occurrence of the whole *Oresteia*, Euripides' retroactive cancellation of the trilogy he is countering, the audience is nevertheless shown that Agamemnon has neither heard nor understood the prophecy, as his simplistic couplet that end the trimeters of the play shows:

εὖ δ' ἐς πάτραν πλεύσαιμεν, εὖ δὲ τἀν δόμοις
ἔχοντ' ἴδοιμεν τῶνδ' ἀφειμένοι πόνων. *Hec* 1291-92

May we sail to our fatherland safely, and may we see our house safe, having been set free from these labours.

If nothing else, Euripides has kept Agamemnon's character consistent.

14. Associated with this point is the selection on Euripides part of the murder weapon being an axe (1279 πέλεκυν.) Debate continues to rage on what weapon Aeschylus envisages Clytemnestra as wielding,[20] but neither conclusion affects interpretation here. The Stesichorean *Oresteia* has Clytemnestra dream:

> τᾷ δὲ δράκων ἐδόκησε μολεῖν κάρα βεβροτωμένος ἄκρον,
> ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοῦ βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας ἐφάνη. *PMG* 219
>
> A serpent seemed to come to her, its head completely stained with gore,
> and from it appeared a king of Pleisthenes' race.

The standard interpretation of this is that the snake represents Agamemnon, and that a head wound would be caused by an axe. It is this version that Aeschylus either followed or abandoned.[21] If Euripides is here following Aeschylus it is a further confirmation of the details of the *Agamemnon*. And if - as is much more likely - Euripides is ignoring Aeschylus' weapon-choice, and is returning to the Stesichorean model, it can be seen as another undercutting of Aeschylus. The fact that this point can be argued both ways does not devalue it. Aeschylus, in making the original change, made a clear (at the time) and decisive step. Any decision on Euripides' part must have interpretative value.

15. Another method Euripides uses to confirm the validity of the oracle is by reference to an oracle of Dionysus (1267), which seems to have been based in fact, cf. Herodotus 7.111.2, *Rhesus* 970-73, and Diggle (1987). This information indicates the oracle was known to the Athenian dramatic audiences, and its ability rivalled Delphi. Euripides did not need to cite a particular verifiable authority. In the related situations where he has contemptible characters introducing prophetic

information at the end of a play, one (Eurystheus *Hcld* 1028) cites χρησμῷ παλαιῷ Λοξίου "an ancient oracle of Loxias", and the other (Polyphemus *Cyc* 696) merely παλαιὸς χρησμὸς "the ancient oracle." The added details provided in *Hec* 1267

ὁ Θρῃξὶ μάντις εἶπε Διόνυσος τάδε

The Thracian prophet Dionysus spoke this.

suggest Euripides here has ulterior motives. Dionysus and Apollo are the preeminent mantic gods. To my knowledge, they are the only divinities actually called μάντις - Dionysus here, and Apollo at *Ag* 1202, 1275, *Cho* 559, *Eum* 169. If as the Herodotus passage would suggest these chief oracular shrines were in competition, then it would certainly be furthering Euripides' aims to side against the Aeschylean prophetic god Apollo.

c. *Epilegomena*

What has been collated here are only some of the parallels between the texts, but nevertheless a sufficient number that it should be clear that Euripides is not unconscious of the similarities he establishes with Aeschylus. He sets forth a view in the *Hecuba* of revenge as morally correct behaviour in certain circumstances. This is a different view from what he establishes in other so-called "revenge-plays" (e.g. *Medea, Hippolytus*, and *Electra*) where revenge is morally ambiguous. This is not problematical. The traditional undergraduate exercise comparing the different tragedian s' presentations of the Electra-legend shows, amongst other things, the prevalence of the *Oresteia* in fifth-century literature and

thought. But these do not share the types of similarities that have been examined here.

In the *Hecuba*, as in the *Orestes*, Euripides plays a different game. The *Oresteia* becomes more than a model to be like or unlike. It rather is an exemplar that must be challenged. The necessity comes from what can be seen as an unsatisfactory resolution in the *Oresteia*: the decision of the newly-formed Areopagus is not obviously linked with the system that had preceded it, apart from the participation of the (also altered) Erinyes/Semnai/Eumenides. Euripides presents his revenge, that of the *lex talionis*, which limits the amount of retribution that can be exacted and is a community expression rather than an individual's vindictive reprisal. He does this while assaulting its rival, the Aeschylean system of vendetta.

V The date of the *Hecuba*, and the *Cyclops*.

Thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges.

Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* V.i.388

The awareness that conscious reference to other plays does exist in Euripides generally and in the *Hecuba* in particular demands that the question of the relationship between the *Hecuba* and the *Cyclops* be examined. Some relationship does clearly exist; its precise nature, however, is not certain. Sutton (1980, 114-120) believes the plays to be contemporary, part of the same tetralogy, dating to 424 B.C. This opinion has also been expressed by Arrowsmith (1958) 6-7 and Lattimore (1959). Ussher (1978, 193-204) tentatively suggests 412 for the *Cyclops*, and marshals much of the relevant information, from which he draws some weird inferences, discussed below. Seaford (1982 and 1984, 48-51) rebuts Sutton, point for point, concluding with a date post-411, probably 408. Garner (1990, 154-7) follows this, affirming 408. Biehl (1983), who does not list Seaford (1982) in his bibliography and therefore might be unaware of its contents, briefly suggests a date "*neque ante Hecubam* (424) *neque post infortunatam Atheniensium in Siciliam expeditionem* (415-413)" (Biehl (1983) 2).

Much of the confusion comes from a lack of absolute reference points. One set of criteria that is generally acknowledged to be valid is the frequency of resolution in iambic trimeter. This technique has many successes under its belt, especially in the case of Euripides: all the plays with known dates show a proportionally increasing number of resolutions. It has had a worthwhile value concerning the *Hecuba* itself. For example, the external factors which were

traditionally used to date the *Hecuba* have been shown by Ley (1987) to be invalid. The *terminus ante quem* of Aristophanic parody in the *Clouds* 1165-70 of lines 172-5 (a problematic passage at any rate) may be a reference that was only introduced to the play in its later rewrite several years after the original production of 423 B.C. (at least post-420 B.C.) The *terminus post quem* of the re-institution of the festival of Delos in 426 B.C. described in Thucydides 3.104 (the choruses of which are alluded to in lines 455-65) is similarly invalid, since Thucydides specifically states that the choruses were never abandoned. Nevertheless, metrical criteria support a date between 425 and 422,[1] the same years having been suggested[2] for several other Euripidean plays, both fragmentary and extant, presented here with decreasing likelihood:

Andromache	425	Stevens 15-19
Supplices	424-20, prob.423	Collard 8-14
Erechtheus	423-422 not with *Supplices*	Collard *Sup* 12-13
Electra	422-416	Zuntz (1955) 64-71
Phaethon	"within a few years of 420"[3]	Diggle 47-49, 177-78
Cresphontes	pre-424	Austin *Cres* 41
Theseus	pre-422	Aristoph *Wasps* 433
Peleus	pre-423(?)[4]	Aristoph *Clouds* 1154
Cyclops	424, with *Hecuba*	Sutton (1980) 114-120

None of the information is conclusive, however, and all that remains are many maybes. It is a reasonable operating assumption that *Hecuba* was produced 424, the year after *Andromache*, before *Supplices*, with *Erechtheus* in 422. Thematic links can be found with the *Hecuba* which might suggest a common tetralogy, but none are sufficiently strong to warrant building any further speculation: *Peleus* presents an old man making the best out of a situation full of sufferings, for

example. While it might be desirable for a critic to place *Electra* early to cluster together the plays with women taking some sort of revenge (*Medea* 431, *Hippolytus* 428, *Hecuba* 424, *Electra* (?) 422) the effect is not significantly staggering and reveals little.

The case for dating the *Cyclops* in the same year as the *Hecuba* runs along the following lines. The formal similarities between the two plays are significant: both feature an exodos where a barbarian without any sympathy is blinded; the barbarian in each case vainly gropes around the stage, and then utters prophecies of doom for the cause of the blinding; both plays have a speech exalting νόμος; both plays take place in a remote setting, etc. There are also significant verbal parallels.[5] As a single example of the genre of satyr play, and one which is (as the fragmentary examples of other satyr plays attests) particularly para-tragic[6] conclusions from trimeter resolution must be considered invalid.

The most detailed application of metrical criteria is Seaford (1982) 161-68, arguing for a date of c. 412-08 B.C. Yet as he himself later describes, the use of (for example) trimeter resolution in this play is not a subconscious feature of the poet's skill (i.e. something that would develop subconsciously over time, which it must be for metrical tests to have any validity) but rather the play shows Euripides to be very aware of the difference in diction between Odysseus ("It is worth noting that no certain cases of deviation from tragic practice occur in Odysseus' trimeters. Nor do any occur in the agon (285-346)." Seaford (1984) 46) and the other characters, whose speech "though clearly distinct in its licence from tragedy, is much closer to it than Old Comedy" (48). This at least places reasonable doubt on the late date.

Further, the desire of the playwright to parody his own work is understandable. If the *Cyclops* predated the *Hecuba* (e.g. Kaibel (1895) 84-85, Tanner (1915) 181ff) then it can only be assumed that the performance of the *Hecuba* would evoke laughter, as the audience recognizes the earlier (comic) situation.[7] The effect is, however, reversed if the *Cyclops* is performed after the *Hecuba*, be it on the same day (i.e. in the same tetralogy) or years later: *Hecuba* successfully evokes the standard tragic emotions, and the *Cyclops* capitalises on its dramatic precedent and by reproducing a similar situation, where movements become more exaggerated and actor's actions are made more extreme. The audience is then laughing at that by which it had earlier been moved. This yields a conceivable and perhaps even desirable motivation for the playwright. This is at least part of the tenor of the Arrowsmith and Sutton line, and it is dispensed with too casually by Seaford.

It is true, though, that Euripides could equally have made the allusions to the *Hecuba* over a greater time frame. When faced with writing a satyr play with an outcome similar to one he had dealt with years before in the *Hecuba*, he made the echo deliberate and clear. I believe this to be a more plausible scenario than Seaford's suggestion that an author "will draw, consciously or unconsciously, ... on a pattern of utterance and stock metrical phrases" (1984, 48-49). Milman Parry has suggested (1930, 140-41) that *Cyc* 222 ἔα τίν' ὄχλον τόνδ' ὁρῶ... (Polyphemus' initial comment on seeing the Greeks) is a recognition of Aristophanes' parody in *Thes* 1105 ἔα τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὁρῶ... (411 B.C.) of Perseus' first words in *Andromeda* (fr. 125) ἔα τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὁρῶ... (412 B.C.) Seaford concurs, "Here then, is a deliberate echo" (1984, 49), establishing the date to be post-411 B.C.

There are two reasons typically presented for believing the *Cyclops* to be post-409 B.C., both deriving from allusions to the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles. The first concerns literary allusion: "We have seen that *Philoctetes* also borrows from *Odyssey* 9, both in its general setting and with specific verbal echoes; and we have seen that Euripides, in the *Orestes*, uses the *Philoctetes*" (Garnet (1990) 155). This being so, Euripides when writing a play specifically about the events of *Odyssey* 9,[8] alluded to his rival's (less direct) use of the same source. More specifically, the second point concerns the similarity of the settings between the two plays, and in particular the cave with two mouths. In the antepenultimate line of the *Cyclops*, Polymestor mentions that he will go to the mountaintop 707 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος τῆσδε. Dale (1956, 106) notes the obliqueness of the phrase (sc. πέτρας?) and concludes that it is most likely an allusion to the only other known use of the adjective, meaning "pierced through", *Phil* 19 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος αὐλίου. Even alone, this point would be convincing (was it known to Arrowsmith?). Sophocles' other distinctive word for the cave, which would perhaps be clearer in this situation, δίστομος "with two mouths", is not used by Euripides. Coughanowr (1984) provides a reason for this, suggesting that Euripides understands the word's etymology as δισ - τομος "twice-cutting, double edged", rather than δι - στομος "with two mouths". As such, regardless of Sophocles' usage at *Phil* 16, it is unlikely that Euripides would have used it in the present circumstance.

There is another possible allusion to the *Philoctetes*, that would only really become apparent in performance.[9] The importance of the bow as a property and a symbol in the *Philoctetes* has been much discussed. Euripides might be playing on the importance of the "magic" bow[10] in the stage action of Sophocles' play, by repeated visual echoes involving the magic wineskin which renews itself

(following Kassel (1973) 102-03, and see Seaford on *Cyc* 147.) *Ab initio*, Odysseus and Neoptolemus desire the bow of Philoctetes. The object is then passed around as follows:

776 bow is given from Philoctetes to Neoptolemus;

974 both Philoctetes and Odysseus want to be given the bow;

1080 the bow is taken off with Odysseus and Neoptolemus;

1221 Neoptolemus re-enters to return the bow to Philoctetes;

1292 the bow is given back to Philoctetes, interrupted by Odysseus.

The focus of the entire play is on who has the bow at any given time. Odysseus' interaction with Philoctetes changes considerably once he has control of the bow. The same obsession with a physical object is found in the *Cyclops* concerning the wineskin. Particular stage directions are uncertain, of course, but the following exchanges seem likely or certain:

151 wineskin given to Silenus by Odysseus;

175-202 wineskin passed around by the chorus (?);

383-437 in cave wineskin given to Polyphemus, then Silenus;[11]

543-566 Polyphemus tries to take it off Silenus;

567 wineskin given back by Silenus to Odysseus.

The amount of stage business involved is of course indeterminable. However, that it would be possible to evoke the handing over of the bow in the *Philoctetes* is certain, and such an allusion would add to the slapstick effect of the play as a whole. In each case, the significant object is finally returned by the person to whom it had been originally been given.

Even without this third point, it is clearly more likely that the *Cyclops* was written c.408 B.C. than pre-409 B.C. Of the early dates, following Sutton and Arrowsmith with c.424 B.C. is certainly desirable. However, the similarities with setting, literary source, word usage, and staging technique to Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, as well as the allusion to the *Andromeda* and its Aristophanic parody, strongly suggest that Euripides wrote the *Cyclops* in 408 B.C. He was not at this time only concerned with recent dramatic works, however. Faced with the similarity of theme and outcome, the playwright also drew heavily on a play he had written 16 years before, the *Hecuba*.

VI - Status and the Structure of the *Hecuba*

Therfor let vs shape a remedy for to reuenge their dethes

Malory *Arthur* 20.10.814

a. Structure

Oliver Taplin's 1977 study *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* aimed to provide classicists with 'a grammar of dramatic technique' (Fraenkel's phrase, commenting on *Agamemnon* 613f.) that had long been required. Other studies along these lines followed, and some had preceded, but Taplin remains the clearest and fullest expositor of the new approach. Post-Taplin criticism focuses, rightly, on the staging of the plays, and defines the dramaturgy in terms of action. Emphasis has fallen on entrances and exits as being key to an understanding of dramatic structure. Traditional criticism on the other hand has centred around Aristotle's *Poetics*, especially chapter 12 (1452b 14-27) which considers structural units. Aristotle's definitions of 'episode' (ἐπεισόδιον) and 'stasimon' (στάσιμον) have long been recognized as unsatisfactory: because the definitions are mutually dependent and circular, they become meaningless.[1]

Since there exists an *a priori* desire that any use of a technical term be done consistently and meaningfully, it becomes necessary to abandon Aristotle's definitions. For the purposes of this commentary, then, an 'episode' is "a part of the play inaugurated by the entry of a new character" (after Taplin (1977) 56,[2] but note the qualifier, below) and a 'stasimon' is "a lyric song sung by the chorus dividing episodes" (making no distinction with a hyporcheme (cf. Dale (1950) esp. 20), thereby including non-responsive act-dividing songs[3] which are not followed

by the entry of a new character. The 'exodos' follows the last stasimon. The 'parodos' is "the chorus' first utterance taken as a whole." What precedes this is the 'prologue'. These definitions have been given to leave Aristotle's account comprehensible and consistent. Some exceptions to all these definitions will exist: drama is a resilient and adaptable medium not bound by formal theories, and the exceptions are well-known. Nevertheless, these definitions do provide a meaningful vocabulary for talking about the play's structure, and representing the units into which it naturally falls. Episodes are normally in iambic trimeters, but often have extended lyric passages, such as lyric dialogues (e.g. Hecuba and Polyxena in *Hecuba* 154-215), 'kommoi' (lyric lamentation sung alternately between a character and chorus, e.g. *Hecuba* 684-722), and monodies (e.g. Polymestor in *Hecuba* 1056-1106), immediately before or after any of which an entry may take place which does not signify the beginning of a new episode.

Of course, not all these elements will be in every play. The *Hecuba* is set out clearly in this respect, and uses the conventions to balance the structure, and, as shall be later demonstrated, the meaning of the play. The following page contains a chart illustrating the formal structure of the *Hecuba*. At first glance it may appear complex, but it does demonstrate how unified the play is, as well as how tightly bound the characters and events in fact are to the structure. The earlier essays in this introduction have presented some models for examining the play's structure based upon simpler criteria, such as the tripartite divisions in terms of storyline novelty.[4] While no model is completely wrong, any model necessarily reflects particular details over others; any single attempt at such a definition is necessarily incomplete. The same is true of the present *schema*, though this more detailed analysis does more closely represent the reality of the situation.

The Structure of the Hecuba

Lines	Division	Entry	Episode	Stasimon
1-99	Prologue	entry of Polydorus	iambics 1-58	
		entry of Hecuba & servants	monody 59-99	
100-153	Parodos	entry of Chorus		Hecuba onstage
154-443	Episode A'	entry of Polyxena	lyric dialogue 155-215	
		entry of Odysseus	iambics 216-443	
444-483	Stasimon A'			Hecuba onstage
484-628	Episode B'	entry of Talthybius	iambics	
629-657	Stasimon B'			stage empty
658-904	Episode Γ'	entry of serving-woman	iambics 658-683	
		entry of Hecuba	kommos 684-722	
		entry of Agamemnon	iambics 723-904	
905-952	Stasimon Γ'			Hecuba onstage
953-1022	Episode Δ'	entry of Polymestor & sons	iambics	
1023-1034	Stasimon Δ'			stage empty
1035-1295	Exodos	entry of Hecuba	iambics 1034-1055	
		entry of Polymestor	monody 1056-1106	
		entry of Agamemnon	iambics 1107-1295	stage empty

'Entry' : which character enters, signifying a new segment of action.

'Episode' : division between lyric and iambic passages within an episode.

'Stasimon' : what characters, if any, are onstage during a stasimon.

Particularly important to the pattern is the acceptance of lines 953-1022 as an episode in its own right, and not as part of the exodos. The scene represents a significant advance of the action (Hecuba demonstrating that Polymestor is a lying murderous thief while convincing him she poses no threat to his safety) and considering it as an independent unit explains all the entries of principal characters (as permitted by the above definitions) and provides a balance with earlier scenes in terms of stage-picture during stasima. This sort of analysis of a play is standard, and has been a common phenomenon of any discussion of Greek tragedy since Aristotle's *Poetics.* But in addition to providing a convenient shorthand for the discussion of the play, it also points to some other factors concerning the play's production[5] that are less well discussed. Generally, the play does not present any serious difficulties in this respect, and in general the issues are discussed in the commentary as they arise. Entrances and exits are straightforward enough that only one door is required (into the tent of Agamemnon), with one parodos leading to the Greek army and Achilles' tomb, and the other leading to the the sea (and the rest of Thrace), which provides a visual division, placing Hecuba and her women halfway between Greek culture and wild nature. Hecuba often has shared a table with Polymestor (793) but claims kinship with Agamemnon (834).

It is conventionally assumed that fifth-century dramatic productions used a maximum of three actors in the division of speaking parts. This Rule of Three Actors is not absolute, and its very existence was questioned in 1908 by K. Rees' *The So-Called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama*, who,

> sought to expose the rule as fallacious and to show that the tragic poets did not concern themselves with the exigencies of part-distri-

bution either in the course of their composition or subsequently, since (so he held) they had as many actors at their disposal as they desired.

Ceadel (1941) 141

Generally though, it is felt to have had some bearing on the composition of both tragedies and comedies. If this is true, it can lead to some surprising insights in dramatic characterisation that occur at a meta-dramatic level; that the Greeks were conscious of theatre functioning at the meta-dramatic level is clear from regular Aristophanic allusions (e.g. *Ecclesiazusae*), and, I would argue, the role of the *Oresteia* in the *Hecuba* and *Orestes* of Euripides. With characterisation, for example, it is surely significant in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* that the same actor is required to play Deianeira and Heracles.[6] Sophocles has written a play where the characters simply can not meet, and this informs an interpretation of the relationship. In the *Ajax*, the lead actor must play both Teucer and the eponymous hero. Even in the meta-dramatic level, Teucer's identity is dependent upon the death of his brother. In the same author's *Electra*, the same actor (the second actor) plays all the members of Electra's family that appear on stage: Orestes, Clytemnestra, and Chrysothemis. The unity given to the family by the one actor's voice could be quite evocative. In the same play the roles taken by the other actor, the paedagogue and Aegisthus, represent extremes of status, the former excessively low and the latter exceptionally high.[7] The implications of this are discussed further below. In Euripides' *Troades* the second actor (in all likelihood) takes the roles of the women with whom Hecuba interacts, and the female goddess Athena, while the third actor takes the male characters and Poseidon.

The effects in comedy are even more extreme. Aristophanes requires his third actor in the *Acharnians* to:

a. Enter as Amphitheus at line 45, who runs off at 55.

b. Enter as the Ambassador at line 65, who exits at 110.

c. Return as Amphitheus at 129, shout "Here I am", and leave.

d. Enter as Theorus at 134, who cannot leave until 167.

e. Return as Amphitheus at 176, who says he has just been running.

etc.

All this business could of course be avoided if more than three speaking actors are used, but the comic potential of one character having as few as five lines to change out of one sumptuous costume and mask into another is too great to miss. Rapid costume changes and rapid movement from one parodos to a central door (for example) appear to be *de rigueur* for tragic performance, and attentive audience members would be aware of these effects the same way modern audiences are cognizant of lighting effects being used to create mood. Of course, this does not constitute a formal proof that only three actors were used. It does however suggest that playwrights were conscious of the expectation in an audience that all the roles would be divided between three performers, and could create effects based upon that assumption.

If the division of roles between the three actors can be shown to have interpretative value, does this have bearing on the *Hecuba*? Allocation of the first actor[8] is obvious: he would take Hecuba. Different opinions have been offered as to the division of the more minor roles: Pickard-Cambridge suggests the "most probable" (1953, 144) role allocation to the second actor would be Polyxena, Talthybius and Agamemnon, the third actor taking Polydorus, Odysseus, servant, and Polymestor. This has been followed by Bremer (1971) and is a factor in his argument on interpolated passages in lines 59-215. The argument centres around the actor Theodorus (fl. c.370 B.C., the lateness itself arguing against any

worthwhile interpretation of role-division) who had an "*idée fixe* of coming on stage first" (Bremer (1971) 245) according to Aristotle *Politics* 1336b28. Also mooted is that "we know that he never took male roles" (*ibid.*) What is far from clear is whether he actually ever played the *Hecuba.* Though Pickard-Cambridge asserts that he distinguished himself in the role (1953, 101; cited with approval by Bremer (1971) 245 n.1) the evidence is paltry. Two passages in Plutarch purporting to describe the same event which are adduced as proof clearly are not: it is a dreadful thing that Alexander, tyrant of Pherae, εἰ τοσούτους ἀποσφάττøων πολίτας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς Ἑκάβης καὶ Πολυξένης πάθεσιν ἐπιδακρύων (*Moralia* 334A "if, when he is slaughtering so many citizens, should be seen to weep over the sufferings of Hecuba and Polyxena"); he also weeps τραγῳδὸν δέ ποτε θεώμενος Εὐριπίδου Τρῳάδας ὑποκρινόμενον ... ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἑκάβης καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης κακοῖς (*Vita Pelop.* 29.5 "once when he saw a tragedian enact the *Troades* of Euripides ... over the misfortunes of Hecuba and Andromache.") In Aelian *Varia Historia* 14.40 the same story is told of Theodorus playing Merope, which would suggest that he was acting in Euripides' *Cresphontes.* Clearly there is some confusion, and no certainty that Theodorus ever performed the *Hecuba.*

Collard (1991, 37) raises another valid objection to Pickard-Cambridge's allocation, and that is the probability that the same (second) actor took the parts of Polyxena and Polymestor, since each role requires singing lyric. To this he adds the roles of Talthybius and the servant, noting that "other distributions of the lesser roles can be devised." I suggest that the third actor took the roles of the Greeks: Odysseus (216-437), Talthybius (484-628), and Agamemnon (726-904, 1109-1292) all speaking, in the meta-dramatic level, with a common voice. This means that

the second actor would take Polyxena (177-437), the servant (658-904) and Polymestor (953-1286.) This means that the second actor 'sits out' the second episode, which is probably why he is traditionally allocated Talthybius, which I believe to be less desirable. However, the servant does need to be onstage throughout the second episode (since the character is sent off probably at 618, and there is no obvious point of entry other than the beginning of the episode, 484, to comfort Hecuba after Polyxena has been taken away, as Talthybius approaches[9] and there is no reason to suggest that the second actor does not stand in as the silent character. The mask and costume worn would be more detailed and of higher quality than those of the *mutae personae* and the audience would have legitimate expectations that the character would speak. This could be another aspect of Euripides' game with Aeschylus: Aristophanes in *Frogs* 911-13 has Euripides deride Aeschylus his use of silent characters which "probably was a highly effective and quite legitimate dramatic device (as, for example, in Pirandello's *As You Desire Me*)" (Stanford (1958) *ad loc.*) Whether the character in the second episode is played by an extra or the second actor, the effect is the same: there is the appearance that the character might speak, and this is the illusion being sought.

The only other role that is not allocated is that of Polydorus, which can be taken by either the second or third actor. While I prefer it to go to the second actor (so that the third takes only the roles of the Greeks) Demosthenes *De Corona* 267 suggests that Aeschines played Polydorus when third actor, though it has already been suggested (note 5) that in this context the word reflects acting ability, and fourth-century role allocations cannot be taken as definitive.

Why so much discussion has been allocated to role-division is that it has

further implications for understanding the characters and the plot. These implications come from the notion of status. Status is a complex term that has been adapted from Keith Johnstone's work on (contemporary) improvisational theatre.[10] It is however a tool useful for analysing scripted drama, and especially Greek tragedy which is so removed from naturalistic theatre that the modern audience has significantly different expectations from a performance of the work. Status analysis, though being completely concerned with performance, is not affected by performance styles, in which lies at least part of its value. Nor is it something the author need be consciously aware of. It represents a realism that will be found in any good playwright, and will inform an interpretation of how a particular scene should be performed.

b. The Theory of Status

Status expresses a relationship between any two characters, one of which will always be "higher" than the other, who is then designated as "lower status." The difference need not be great: good friends, for instance, will often have almost equal status. Nevertheless, the status is always present and always changing - "status transactions continue all the time" (Johnstone (1981) 33) and "every movement, every inflection of the voice implies a status" (1981, 37). Status competitions can occur, where two characters compete for high status.[11] *Oedipus Tyrannus* 300-462 provides a clear example, with such a competition between Oedipus and Teiresias. Both are of (relatively) high status at the start. Oedipus is the great king, Teiresias the seer who knows all things (300 ὦ πάντα νωμῶν.) Almost every speech spoken in this scene affects the characters' status, with the speaker either raising himself, or lowering the other. Status works on "the 'see-saw' principle: 'I go up and you go down'" (1981, 37). The goal of

each speaker is to win the competition, by having the highest status. Oedipus, however, because he represents the suppliants (who are manifestly low status), needs to ask for information from Teiresias (e.g. 326-7.) This lowers Oedipus, and Teiresias is raised because he possesses something (prophetic knowledge) that is not shared by the group as a whole. Getting the last word in an exchange is also a high-status action. This leads to an overall victory for Teiresias, and this shows that Oedipus' power is not absolute. This has significant implications for the coming exchange with Creon.

Oedipus is obligated always to play[12] high status. Johnstone generalises about tragedy from the Oedipus example. While his conclusions about high status are not true for all tragedy, they are for *Oedipus Tyrannus*:

> Tragedy also works on the see-saw principle: its subject is the ousting of the high-status animal from the pack ... If he [Oedipus] crumbled into low-status posture and voice the audience wouldn't get the necessary catharsis. The effect wouldn't be tragic, but pathetic. Even criminals about to be executed were supposed to make a 'good end', i.e. to play high status. ... When a high-status person is wiped out, everyone feels pleasure as they experience the feeling of moving up a step. This is why tragedy has always been concerned with kings and princes, and why we have a special high-status style for playing tragedy. I've seen a misguided Faustus writhing on the floor at the end of the play, which is bad for the verse, and pretty ineffective. Terrible things can happen to the high-status animal, he can poke his eyes out with his wife's brooch, but he must never look as if he could accept a position lower in the pecking order. He has to be *ejected* from it.
>
> Johnstone (1981) 40

Even once ejected, it is important that the high-status character walk out confidently, and not accept a lower station. Euripides clearly subverts this notion in the *Orestes* where the eponymous hero begins the play curled up and asleep from his fits of madness, i.e. very low status. The fits endured by the title characters in Euripides' *Hercules Furens*, Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* serve a similar function. Each is an exceptionally high-status figure who must maintain that position consciously. The fits, since they are beyond the characters' control, expose them as being merely human, i.e. capable of playing low status. That is the secret that tragic heroes must keep to themselves.

Of course, in addition to the words themselves, status is conveyed by voice, body position (including expression in theatre not involving masks) and physical action. I will give examples of each of these from outside of theatre, any of which have dramatic applications. With voice, a loud booming voice is not necessary for high status; in some characters it would be ridiculous. Even the most soft-spoken detective revealing 'whodunnit' will take the focus in a situation due to high status. Pausing before responding increases status, since it makes the audience wait, uncomfortably. A brief "er" before an answer, though will lower status, since it implies a false start. Occupying a lot of physical space confers high status. Giants have higher status than dwarves, who are perceived as comical; "posture experts (like Mathias Alexander) teach high-status postures as 'correct'" (1981, 42). This also extends to clothing: a bride's train will be longer than a bridesmaid's, and kings and superheroes wear long flowing capes. People playing Richard III need to accommodate for the low status implied in the character's posture: both Olivier and Sher made the hump a point of extreme

debilitation (described in Sher, 1985). It is from the low status given by his posture that Richard finds his motivation to rule over others.

One of the most obvious status associations concerning expression involves eye contact. Holding someone's gaze is a challenge, and the first to look away drops in status; similarly, "if you ignore someone, your status rises, if you feel impelled to look back then it falls" (1981, 42). Anything that is commonly held to be genetically inferior also implies low status: buck teeth, cross eyes, baldness,[13] a goofy laugh, etc. These of course have less application to the masked theatre of Greece than, say, body position, but need not be completely removed from consideration. High status movements, such as strong bold strides and broad sweeping gestures, would be found in the *Hecuba* in the characters of Odysseus and Agamemnon. With notions of status incorporated into an analysis of drama, 'mirror scenes' (such as are described by Taplin (1978) 122-39, 189-90) can be understood in terms of clear, visual associations. Taplin (1971) and (1978) 131-34 note the parallel scenes in the *Philoctetes* where Neoptolemus supports (physically) Philoctetes. Though motivations are different in each case, the status relationship (Philoctetes yielding status to Neoptolemus) is exactly the same. There are similar echoes between Hecuba's confrontations with Odysseus (216-443) and with Agamemnon (723-904).

Before examining the *Hecuba* in detail, another status relationship should be recognized. In addition to the high-status challenge, status reversals are possible. In one form, this is a common everyday activity. When friends interact, their status is typically very close but it is always fluctuating, sometimes one is higher than the other, and vice versa. Regular status exchange is a part of any 'normal' relationship, and dramatists who represent such exchanges create more 'lifelike'

scenes. A familiar example of status reversal can be seen in the first episode of the *Frogs* of Aristophanes (the Aeacus Scene, 460-674). The use of a comic example should present the matter in an extreme form, and thus give a paradigm for a subsequent examination. The scene is clear and familiar, and so is a straightforward vehicle to demonstrate status analysis.

The principle characters involved are Dionysus, the god who is visiting the underworld, and his slave Xanthias. Aristophanes has subverted the traditional deity-servant relationship by presenting both characters as being low-status. Master-servant relationships form a cornerstone for so much of comedy. Johnstone makes the following crucial observation (1981, 63):

> The relationship is not necessarily one in which the servant plays low and the master plays high. Literature is full of scenes in which the servant refuses to obey the master, or even beats him and chases him out of the house. The whole point of the master-servant scene is that both partners should keep see-sawing.

So it becomes clear that characters have a *natural* status (it makes sense for Johnstone to say (*loc. cit.*) "a master-servant scene is one in which both parties act as if all the space belonged to the master") which can vary, higher or lower, according to the dynamics of the scene.

Dionysus has made up for his timidity/cowardliness/low-status by disguising himself as Heracles, the only individual who had successfully travelled to the Underworld and returned. The disguise gives Dionysus high status (he introduced himself as "the Mighty Heracles" 464 Ἡρακλῆς ὁ καρτερός).[14] In this scene the physical transfer of the disguise (which probably amounts to no more than a club

and tattered lionskin) represents the reversal of status between the two characters. As the scene begins, Dionysus plays high status and knocks on the door. Out comes the doorkeeper Aeacus, grandfather of Achilles and Ajax, renowned for his virtue and integrity, who begins a tirade against 'Heracles' (465-78). This constitutes a status challenge, which he wins, in part because Dionysus cannot get a word in edgeways. The following exchange between Dionysus and Xanthias demonstrates that both are low status. Dionysus then suggests (in fear) that Xanthias play high status, and take the lionskin and club (494-97) which Xanthias accepts.

A low-status maid enters (503) and reinforces Xanthias' high-status position by fawning, idolising, and promising him food, drink, and dancing girls. Dionysus realises that there are benefits to being high-status, and takes back the vestments that give him the status. In doing so, he has to challenge Xanthias' (natural) status, which contrasts with the status he is playing at the moment (530-31):

τὸ δὲ προσδοκῆσαί σ' οὐκ ἀνόητον καὶ κενὸν
ὡς δοῦλος ὢν καὶ θνητὸς 'Αλκμήνης ἔσει;

Surely you don't expect, thoughtless and in vain, that you, a slave and mortal, could be Alkmena's son?

The line is funny because the speaker, a god (which has automatic high-status associations undermined in the play), refers to a demigod by a (human) matronymic. The expected behaviour of course is to elevate the disguised identity by referring to Heracles as Zeus' son. Xanthias relinquishes the lionskin, Dionysus sings a song declaring his high status (541-48), and two hostesses enter (549) who begin another status challenge, assaulting Dionysus for the past wrongs of Heracles. There is a sense in which it is really only the costume which is the

object of the abuse. What is important though, for the comic situation, is that the pretence to high status by the (naturally high-status) god is always challenged and he always loses, whereas the pretence of the (naturally low-status) servant is rewarded with royal honours. The costume functions purely as a visual cue for this interchange.

Xanthias is back to playing high status when Aeacus returns and threatens to bind him (605). This initiates a status challenge (607) between Aeacus and Xanthias, which transfers to a status challenge between Dionysus and Xanthias. Where throughout the episode their status levels had fluctuated, as they are being flogged to determine which is more godlike (i.e. high status) in pain tolerance, now they compete for higher status through stoic resolution (642-66). Even though the two are competing for high status, each successive blow serves to lower status levels. This does not mean that they cease to be striving for the highest levels possible. Finally, the challenge is diffused, by relegation to a higher authority, Hades, who is credited with even higher status. This example has very clear-cut distinctions, such as are not found in tragedy. Nevertheless, the value of status analysis remains clear.

c. *Status in the* Hecuba.

When Hecuba first walks onstage,[15] she is an old and weak woman, being supported by servants, moving slowly. She recognizes that she is a fellow slave with these women (60 τὴν ὁμόδουλον) and she is confused by her recent dream. She is very low status, which is in marked contrast with her former (high-status) prosperity, as both queen and mother. As such she presents quite a startling contrast with what is expected of her in her meta-dramatic role of tragic heroine.

Mossman (1990) 62-63 too seems to have noticed the status relationship at work here:

> This entrance, emphasising visually the frail old age she bewails verbally at 59 and 64ff, and which Polyxena pities at 202ff, is our first sight of Hecuba and thus extremely important. As well as having to bear bereavement, humiliation and slavery, Hecuba is old and feeble. The frailty dwelt on here contrasts strongly with the physical strength which Hecuba commands when attempting to hold Polyxena back at 398ff. and when she emerges from this same building and exults over Θρηικῖ δυσμαχωτάτωι at 1055.

The chorus enter (98) and promptly announce further sorrow: the Greeks have determined to sacrifice Polyxena. Hecuba's next irregular song (154-76) reinforces her lowered status. Polyxena enters and comforts her mother and status levels remain still until Odysseus enters. The low status is imposed upon Hecuba, and it is not what she is used to, nor what she feels comfortable playing. There is something unnatural with Hecuba playing low status, which will (and must!) be corrected by the end of the play. Where in *Oedipus Tyrannus* the protagonist must be expelled from the community, Hecuba begins expelled, and must reintegrate herself, which she does through a community-based revenge.

Odysseus hurries on (216 σπουδῃ ποδός) and immediately relates the situation in an authoritarian and businesslike manner. He cites the authority of the group (220 'Αχαιοῖς) which, combined with his social position and strong 'heroic' associations from Homer, ascribes his character with quite high status. Despite her wretched state, she nevertheless can challenge him to a status competition (implicit in part in the words 229 ἀγὼν μέγας): the winner will have the right to determine

Polyxena's fate. It is clear that she begins at a considerable disadvantage, since it is slave *versus* free (234 τοῖς δούλοισι τοὺς ἐλευθέρους). Odysseus' response to the challenge is carefree and aristocratic. He is supported by the Hellenic host, and he secures his high status with a grant of his precious time (238). He does, however, concede Hecuba an equal footing for the moment in permitting her to ask whatever questions she likes. What she does is remind him of when their positions were reversed. When she prospered, and he had been caught as a spy disguised as a beggar within the walls of Troy (the disguise itself loaded with status-based associations, both here and in its use in the *Odyssey*), she spared his life and he admitted that he was her slave (the reverse status positions are clearly not in doubt.)

Odysseus diffuses the challenge to his status by removing the status-based element from the equation. His priority at the time was merely to save his life, and what he spoke were merely (250)

Οδ. πολλῶν λόγων εὑρήμαθ' ὥστε μὴ θανειν.

Od. Inventions of many words, spoken to avoid death.

He does not recognize the reciprocity of the two situations, and the response he gives is not one that Hecuba can match at this point. Odysseus wins the status competition. This is true regardless of the order in which the lines are taken. I suspect that the traditional order (247-48 coming immediately before 249-50 and not immediately after; so Daitz and Collard (1986) 23 *contra* Diggle) is preferable: in each of the couplets 245-46 and 247-48 Hecuba establishes Odysseus' indebtedness to her (i.e. that she has a status-based claim upon him.) Line 249 is supposed to be climactic: there is something that she remembers him

saying that she believes will clinch her case, amounting to "Thanks, I owe you one." Odysseus' expected response (acknowledging lower status) is replaced with a high-status aloofness.

This is as close to equal status as the two characters become. Hecuba's following tirade (251-95) is desperate, attempting to assert status equal to Odysseus but failing. The chorus note that Odysseus is unyielding in this (296 στερρὸς; the word is used of Necessity in 1295). Odysseus' response (299-331) reconfirms his higher status. The entire exchange, then, what Collard calls "a suppliant-scene with elements of an *agon*", preserves the expected status-relationship involving a suppliancy. The traditional position of a suppliant (see Gould (1973) 75-77) leaves him or her defenceless, exposed and physically lower than the supplicated, whose high status is thereby magnified. The success of a supplication depends on the supplicated recognizing the status difference, and acting (morally) to remove it. Odysseus does not so act. Suppliancy is a means for (naturally) low status individuals to perform a reasonably high-status action. The Chorus' response confirms this, noting that slavery (332 τὸ δοῦλον) is always a base or evil thing (332 κακὸν).

Hecuba turns to address her daughter. She suggests (334-41) that Polyxena might make a successful appeal. Hecuba's willingness to yield the dramatic space to her daughter further lowers her status, as she is now dependent on Polyxena. When Hecuba first appeared, she seemed to be low status due to her physical position and the contrast with her (understood) past which had been related in part by Polydorus' ghost in the play's opening speech. Through these exchanges, Hecuba's status has continued to fall: she is suffering and is desperate; she has been fighting to save her daughter's life and has failed. For this reason the

opening four lines (342-45) of Polyxena's long speech are particularly heartening. The delivery is confident, and makes Odysseus shy away, hiding his hand and face so as to avoid a proper suppliancy (see Gould (1973) 82-85). She is viewed as a threat to Odysseus' status, which he is hesitant to lose.

This is a false lead. Polyxena is not challenging Odysseus' status, but is acknowledging it. She for whose life Hecuba had fought is willing to give it away freely (369):

ἄγ' οὖν μ' Ὀδυσσεῦ, καὶ διέργασαί μ' ἄγων·

Lead me away, Odysseus, and so leading kill me.

Polyxena's high-status action (voluntary self-sacrifice) is done without a clear point of reference (for 'status' of necessity implies interaction.) Her suicide (for such it amounts to) accomplishes the desire of the Greeks and frustrates Hecuba's wish. Polyxena's status does rise, but it is Hecuba's which subsequently falls. She attempts to offer herself either instead of, or with, her daughter, but is refused (382-401). That Polyxena's claim to status works against Hecuba and not the Greeks is shown by the turn the episode now takes. In lines 402-40 (accepting the deletion of 441-43) Polyxena tries to persuade Hecuba that this is the right course of action. Polyxena has formally replaced Odysseus as the advocate for the Greek side. The episode ends with Hecuba, who had entered at 59 in a position of low status, noticeably diminished. She lies prostrate on the stage, wrapped tight in her mantle (487 κεῖται συγκεκλῃμένη πέπλοις; this is clearly the source for Shakespeare's "mobled queen" *Hamlet* II.ii.496-98.)[16] The position contrasts with Polyxena's 'noble' exit. Though she, too, leaves with her head shrouded, her status is high enough that she can order Odysseus to do it for her (432).

The next episode (484-628) centres around two speeches. The first is by Talthybius, the herald of the Greeks, who relates the details of Polyxena's death. Like the typical tragic messenger speech, the speaker is of fairly low status, but since Talthybius is actually involved in the action he is describing, his low status is defined in terms of Polyxena's high status, which moves him to tears (518-20). Her brave death affects the Achaeans, and as a result Talthybius credits Hecuba as being responsible for what he perceived as nobility.

That this is not what Hecuba herself sees in the action is shown by the second long speech, Hecuba on the nature (598 φύσιν) of her daughter (585-628). The paradox that Hecuba must reconcile is a paradox because of the evident status differences between her and her daughter. Neither is a wicked person (596 ὁ ... κακός) and both are good (597 ὁ δ' ἐσθλὸς). Yet Hecuba continues to suffer as a result of the actions of Polyxena. This is not the primary meaning of the speech, but it is certainly present.[17] Low though Hecuba's status is (much lower than the audience would have thought possible at the play's opening; Euripides' skill in slowly but indefatigably dropping her status is now evident) she nevertheless does retain a vestige of authority. She has a servant who obeys her order (609) to prepare Polyxena for cremation. There are several small indications that she can still drop even lower in status, that soon speaking of her former pride (623 τοῦ πρὶν τερέντες) will be even more extreme, that it is not yet a literal truth that she has been reduced to nothing (622 ὡς ἐς τὸ μηδὲν ἥκομεν). Though the audience knows of Polydorus' death, Hecuba must still learn of it.

The manner in which this information presented in the prologue is introduced into what is known by the participants of the drama is significant. The lyric kommos is initiated by the old servant woman, who is the lowest status

character in the entire episode, just as Hecuba was in the first episode, and as Polydorus will be in the exodos. The servant has further news that will so reduce Hecuba in status that it will be as if she has set a record in wretchedness.[18] This impression is continued by Hecuba's false-guesses (concerning, for example, Cassandra 676-77). She discovers her son is dead, which thereby means all her children, save Cassandra who is Agamemnon's concubine, are dead; she has no hope for posterity. Her status is as low as it gets in the play when Agamemnon, in whose tent Hecuba and her women stay, appears (726). His initial words concern Hecuba's failure to accomplish certain tasks, i.e. the preparation of Polyxena for cremation. This serves to ensure that the status relationships are as the audience expects them to be.

Now comes the transition. Hecuba was once high status, but has been reduced through the events immediately preceding and during this play to almost nothing. She will now begin consciously on her part to attempt to reclaim her former status level. The preparation for the transition is made in the longest extant series of asides in ancient drama (736-51). She wavers between becoming a suppliant and bearing her misery silently (737-38). Her previous attempt at suppliancy had failed (see above) and she (legitimately) fears the same here (741-42):

Εκ. ἀλλ' εἴ με δούλην πολεμίαν θ' ἡγούμενος
γονάτων ἀπώσαιτ', ἄλγος ἂν προσθείμεθ' ἄν.

Hec. But if he should push me from his knees, thinking me a slave and an enemy, I would bring more grief on myself.

She resolves to attempt the supplication, and in doing so introduce a concept that

has been suppressed (rightly Testall, 1954) in the play until this, the point of her status reversal (749-51):

Εκ. οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην τοῦδε τιμωρεῖν ἄτερ
τέκνοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι. τί στρέφω τάδε;
τολμᾶν ἀνάγκη, κἂν τύχω κἂν μὴ τύχω.

Hec. Without this man I would not be able to avenge my children. Why do I hesitate?
I must be bold, both if I succeed and if I do not succeed.

Hecuba's bold claim for higher status is immediately associated with revenge, and it is going to be at the moment of her revenge that her status is the highest. The remaining part of this episode consists of Hecuba's status being elevated, at the expense of Agamemnon's. By the end (904) she clearly has higher status than him, having won the right to extract the revenge. This is possible in part only because Agamemnon cannot conceive of Hecuba's status changing from what he typically associates with old, female, barbarian captives. He cannot see that status is a dynamic, despite Hecuba citing the examples of the Danaids and the Lemnian women (886-87).

To attain a status equal to Agamemnon, Hecuba uses various techniques that can be identified. She seeks and attains Agamemnon's sympathy and pity (760-85). This serves to bring them close to an equal footing. Though there is no status reversal yet, by the end of the stichomythia they are much closer than they were; Agamemnon can relate to Hecuba's predicament, and is disposed to help her (i.e. yield status in her favour.) During Hecuba's next long speech, she makes several gains. She asks that Agamemnon become her avenger (790 τιμωρὸς) against Polymestor. Though he eventually refuses this request, it does ally him with her for her future requests, and prepares him for the following status-

enhancing devices. Her bid at equal status with Agamemnon comes in the discussion of his relationship with her daughter Cassandra. Hecuba claims that he is kin (834 κηδεστὴν). Her precise claim is that he is kin with Polydorus. She is in essence claiming mother-in-law status which, jokes aside, is filled with high-status associations even in modern culture. Once she is perceived as being of higher status as him, she begins to flatter him (841-45) for to raise Agamemnon is to raise herself. It is likely in my opinion that her delivery of the speech is much more confident that it had been earlier in the play. The effects of speech patterns on status are definite, but unfortunately must always remain speculative.

The νόμος-speech is clearly important to the play, and it is possible to see how some critics perceive it as being central to the play. It is the first successful status reversal that Hecuba has accomplished, elevating herself above Agamemnon. The debasement scholars consider this a shameful turn of events, because they have become habituated to seeing Hecuba in the role of passive victim; she remains a suffering victim in the *Troades,* so why does she not in the *Hecuba*, asks the faulty logic. The status reversal is only part of Hecuba's return to high status, and therefore cannot be the turning point of the play. The Achaean host still holds considerable sway over Agamemnon (both demagogues, Odysseus and Agamemnon, are lower in status to the collective will of the Greeks) and he does not grant all. He does give Hecuba sufficient time to enact her revenge, in part because he has no faith that such is possible.

This new relationship is then shown in action (850-904). Hecuba expresses the paradox (864-69):

Εκ. φεῦ.

οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν ὅστις ἔστ' ἐλεύθερος·

ἢ χρημάτων γὰρ δοῦλός ἐστιν ἢ τύχης, 865

ἢ πλῆθος αὐτὸν πόλεος ἢ νόμων γραφαὶ

εἴργουσι χρῆσθαι μὴ κατὰ γνώμην τρόποις.

ἐπεὶ δὲ ταρβεῖς τῷ τ' ὄχλῳ πλέον νέμεις,

ἐγώ σε θήσω τοῦδ' ἐλεύθερον φόβου.

Hec. Alas! No mortal is free: for each is a slave either to money, or to chance; or else the mob of the city or written laws prevent him from following the turns of his mind. But since you are frightened, and concede too much to the crowd, I shall grant you freedom of this fear.

Hecuba now has mastery over Agamemnon, and can free him from the control of the Greek army. There is also a vivid contrast in the line ends of 880 and 881, which are metrically identical. What Hecuba calls a mob of Trojan women (880 Τρῳάδων ὄχλον) Agamemnon continues to perceive as booty of the Greeks (881 Ἑλλήνων ἄγραν). The episode ends with Hecuba sending off her servant with a message for Polymestor (889-94), and giving orders to Agamemnon (894-97).

The first and third episodes both involved a fair deal of status interaction. Similarly, the second and fourth both serve as consolidations of what has just been established. In the fourth episode (953-1022), then, Hecuba's status is shown continuing to rise as she encounters Polymestor. His confident and sympathetic entry shows he is unaware that his treachery has been known. Since this is information which is shared by all the characters, the Chorus, and the audience, Polymestor's high-status entry is perceived as false bravado. Hecuba's status continues to climb (now at the expense of the Thracian's) as she establishes his guilt beyond a doubt. That she can then play him for a fool and get him to discharge his bodyguard (981):

Πο. χωρεῖτ'· ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ γὰρ ἥδ' ἐρημία.

Po. Depart, for even alone it is safe.

and then play on his greed to convince him to enter the tent (which he does with his sons at 1022.)

Polymestor's cries are the signal of Hecuba's victory. The wheel of fortune has turned full circle for her.[19] She emerges triumphant, revelling over her glory. It would be ridiculous to imagine her moving at this point with the slow supported steps she possessed before the parodos. Her high status is demonstrated in her confident assertions, and manifested in her powerful delivery. When Polymestor emerges, his status is dropped. He speaks irregularly, is on all fours, and, in singing his monody (1056-1108) in lyric meters, associates himself with the other low-status characters in the play. When Agamemnon enters (1109) it soon becomes clear that he never expected Hecuba to be able to accomplish any real revenge (similarly, Creon does not expect Medea to be able to accomplish any meaningful action in just one day, cf. *Med* 340.) In the agon which follows (1129-1253) Hecuba's status is again consolidated. Polymestor's messenger speech demonstrates how he like Agamemnon, was lured into a trap based on making assumptions about the capabilities of apparently low-status individuals. Hecuba's speech is full of rhetorical flourishes and confident assertions. Its successful point-for-point dismemberment of Polymestor's speech is presented with a confidence in the status from which she delivers it. The result is a foregone conclusion; there is no doubt, to Hecuba or to the audience, that Hecuba will remain victorious.

Polymestor then makes a last bid for high status. He possesses information that is not shared, which gives him a legitimate claim. His slow recounting of the

oracles is done in a way that it affects both Agamemnon and Hecuba, and is self-evidently true (albeit moreso for the audience which is familiar with the events of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon.*) The predictions place Polymestor above Agamemnon in status (his response is merely to banish Polymestor to an island, dependent upon the power of the Greek army (1284-85). With Hecuba the case is different. The debasement scholars would suggest that the predicted metamorphosis into a dog serves to reduce Hecuba's status to its lowest point. This clearly goes against the entire movement of the play, which showed a slow deterioration from bad to worse until line 749 and then a sharp and ultimately triumphant rise to the high-status position she now holds. This Introduction as a whole has been seeking to establish that Hecuba's metamorphosis is a victory, recalling the spirits of rightful revenge, the Erinyes or Furies. This is a natural progression in terms of status from what has already been documented. Hecuba's metamorphosis into the Fury-dog means that she escapes the future shame she had to face as a (naturally) low-status slave to a Greek soldier.

It is common in presenting stories (especially myths and fairy tales) to assume a 'happily ever after' conclusion. Young lovers will continue to remain in love, and will die happy; any suggestion otherwise is distasteful in the terms of the common aesthetic. Similarly, Homer does not dwell on Odysseus' future wanderings once he has returned to Ithaca. What is important is that he has returned to a faithful wife. Similarly, Euripides does not want to establish a 'happy for the moment' ending. By saving Hecuba from a future of slavery, he is doing her a favour. She is old, and has had a long and productive life. Death is not something that she fears. The escape afforded by the metamorphosis means that the end of the play is (virtually) the end of her life. She ends prosperously,

having been proven morally right in her revenge, vindicated of all her shame, and with a form of posterity which will be a continual beacon to sailors. Euripides introduces the aetiological connection with the promontory Cynossema so that Hecuba will always have a memorial. There is no ignominy in her death. Rather, it is something that she desires. In Euripides' play, then, Hecuba dies fully revenged of her wrongs, with the high status she has possessed all of her life, and with an eternal testimony to the fact, a testimonial that has persisted until the modern day.

Notes to the Introduction

Introduction I - The Context of Revenge in the *Hecuba*

This paper was presented in an abbreviated form to the Scottish Classics Postgraduate Meeting, in Glasgow, March 4, 1992.

1 Those who find the play most successful are Kirkwood (1947), Abrahamson (1952), Conacher (1961), Reckford (1985), and Nussbaum (1986) - so Mossman (1990) 91 n.3, a list which is acceptable for the immediate purpose. In each of these cases, the success is gained at the price of Hecuba's character. This is a price that does not need to be paid, as I shall argue. To some extent, both Gellie (1980) and Hogan (1972) call into question the play's identity as a tragedy.

2 The attitudes of the Renaissance towards the play are detailed very well by Heath (1987) and Mossman (1990) Appendix B "The *Nachleben* of the Hecuba: The Renaissance" 243-58, 302-06.

3 Following Jebb's interpretation of this description *ad loc*, which I believe is standard.

4 Discussed in Introduction II.

5 Hecuba's age is the first thing apparent about her to an audience member (see Introduction VI). Arnott (1989) 73 discusses the generalising effect that this has: "It is impossible to look at a character and say 'He is 38'. The plays do not allow such precision. Characters are old; they are in the prime of life; or they are very young. Old in Greek tragedy means very old indeed, another case of exaggerating for stage effect ... In such matters, as in most things visual, Greek tragedy painted on a large canvas, with a big brush."

6 Of the recent interpretations of the play, Meridor (1978) - moreso than (1983) where her emphasis shifts from Hecuba to Polymestor - and Gregory (1991) come closest to this proposed understanding of the play. Mossman (1990) also elevates the value of revenge (cf. Chapter 5 "Hecuba's Revenge" 185-227, 290-99).

7 This relationship is examined in detail in Introduction IV.

8 This relationship is examined in detail in Introduction II. Expressions of the *lex talionis* in one form or another appear in the *Hecuba* at 844-45, 902-04, 1086, and 1250-51.

9 There are of course other points of contact between the two plays, much of which is dictated by the similarities already suggested (e.g. the death of innocent children.) In each play Talthybius appears, but his presence in Hecuba is not parallel to the roles of the other three male characters. In fact, Talthybius, in relating a sympathetic narrative, provides an effective contrast with the other men. Although what he delivers is essentially a messenger-speech, like that of Polymestor in the exodos Talthybius' speech is that of a biased participant in the events, rather than a low-status impartial observer.

10 For the appearance of Thracians in tragedy, cf. Commentary note 953-1022; for the relationship between barbarian and Greek, cf. note 1129-31; for the notion of guest-friendship, cf. note 710-11.

11 Collard and Mossman (1990) 62 are right in supposing that Polydorus appears above the stage.

It is almost required in light of 31 ἀΐσσω "I float". Nussbaum (1986) is perhaps the clearest voice for a walking Polydorus (she presumably translates the above verb "I dart quickly"). for this interpretation, it is necessary to take 52 literally. Nussbaum also assumes that the audience sees a child-sized figure, which again is probably not so: Polydorus has presumably been with Polymestor for the ten years of the war, and should be a young man. Lines 14-15 argue strongly against him being sent as an infant, since it is apparently conceivable that he shoulder arms in the war. See also Barrett *Hip* 1283.

12 This is the source of Hecuba's traditional appellation of *mater dolorosa*. The tradition presents two statistics concerning the extent of Hecuba's motherhood: that she had fifty children, and that she had nineteen. The latter is at least biologically possible (though this is certainly not a prerequisite in myth.) The two can be reconciled if Priam had fathered fifty children, nineteen by his (principal) wife Hecuba. That these other children would be considered Hecuba's is to be expected considering the Homeric portrayal of Troy as an extended household (οἶκος.)

13 These are virtually synonymous in the case of Troy, see note 20.

14 Hector represents the Homeric paradigm for this, which is why his death and the fall of Troy are so closely linked. He is a son, a husband, and a father, as well as being Troy's champion warrior.

15 Whether Diggle's deletion of large parts of the dream described 59-97 should be accepted or not does not matter for the moment. While I find Bremer (1971) creative, he is not convincing. I know there are other reasons for deleting these lines. There is no reason why the hexameters should not be used in this prophetic passage (as they are in the *Philoctetes*) and that an actor would compose hexameters to be casually blended into an established work is not an automatically cogent assumption. In a paper delivered in Edinburgh in 1991 specifically examining the dream, Prof. Gregory kept the dream intact, letting it refer to the deaths of both children, and I am tempted to agree.

16 Meridor (1978) 29 n.5.

17 The anachronism of applying fifth-century values onto tragic texts set during the Trojan War is a commonplace and not problematical, cf. Easterling (1985).

18 See Commentary, note 1129-31.

19 This is discussed, for example, in Shaw (1975) and Foley (1982).

20 I do not believe this to be the way the sentence is intended to be understood.

21 Even though nowhere else is Hecuba awarded to Agamemnon in the Trojan legend as it survives, this seems to be the only conclusion about the situation in this play that can be drawn; see Commentary note 754-55.

22 Cf. Homer, *Iliad* 20.407-18, 21.84-97, 22.46-8.

23 see also Dodds on Euripides Bacchae 973-6.

24 This is suggested, for example, by τάδε in Aeschylus *Choephori* 314.

25 This is cited as the epigraph of Blundell (1988) Chapter 2, a chapter summarising the principle in Greek ethics of helping friends and harming enemies.

26 Gregory (1991) 77.

27 Gregory (1991) 107.

28 This kind of compression should not surprise us in Euripides, cf. Vickers (1973) 596-97 "If we look at Euripides' plays in these terms we can see that in fact he took over the Aeschylean movement but compressed its time-scale ... In compressing Aeschylean trilogy reversals into single plays Euripides generates extraordinary energies, and we can see why Aristotle found him the most tragic of the dramatists."

29 Demosthenes 23.69 ἂν δὲ δόξῃ δίκαι' ἐγκαλεῖν καὶ ἕλῃ τὸν δεδρακότα τοῦ φόνου, οὐδ' οὕτω κύριος γίγνεται τοῦ ἁλόντος, ἀλλ' ἐκείνου μὲν οἱ νόμοι κύριοι κολάσαι καὶ οἷς προστέτακται, τῷ δ' ἐπιδεῖν διδόντα δίκην ἔξεστιν, ἣν ἔταξ' ὁ νόμος, τὸν ἁλόντα, πέρα δ' οὐδὲν τούτου.

30 Meridor (1978) 30 and Gregory (1991) 109, 119 n.60.

31 Two sample claims should suffice for the moment: Reckford (1985) 113 "Hecuba's own fate illustrates exactly what she denies for Polyxena: namely the power of time and chance to alter the nobility of the soul"; Vickers (1973) 83 "Hecuba's fate symbolizes that of so many characters in Euripides: suffering neither purifies nor ennobles but degrades, brutalizes, for she was no longer a human being in the full sense of the word when she grovelled before Agamemnon seeking revenge, and she has declined progressively since that point." The consequences of exalting Polyxena lead to conclusions such as Delebeque (1951) 147-64 who is forced to conclude the second half is tacked on as an afterthought.

32 Gregory (1991) 186 n.4, writing on the *Hippolytus*.

33 See Introduction IV.

34 Cf. the mouse's tale, in Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, chapter 3.

35 This detail may form part of an argument against the existence of a lacuna at the end of the play (as is now commonly suggested.) In *Hecuba* and *Cyclops* the citing of a prophetic authority occurs in the closing few lines of the play. Though the *Cyclops* is clearly modelled in part on the *Hecuba* (see Introduction V), it may nevertheless be substantial enough indication that the similar citation in the *Heraclidae* would occur in a similar position.

36 Eden (1988) 560 and Introduction IV, esp. note 13. Laurens (1988) 480 describes and illustrates an Etruscan mirror dating to the third century B.C., with a portrait of Hecuba holding Polyxena, and what she identifies as two Myrmidons. There is also a winged figure in the background which she tentatively identifies as Iris. I feel certain that this is a clear and early representation of an Erinys (so hesitantly Mossman (1990) 235).

37 *Bac* 1330-1339, and see Dodds ad loc.

38 For an explanation on the dramatic function of the aetiological explanation, see Commentary, note 1271-73.

39 Heath's note 49: 'Maturum et callidum consilium Hecubae super ulciscendo Polymestore, quo non praecipitat vindictam, nec ira ablata in ipsum violenter ruit ... iubet nos in arduis rebus esse tardos, circumspectos, cautos: praecipitantia enim in omni negotio periculosa est, tuta vero mora' ([C. Stiblinus, *Euripides Poeta Tragicorum Princeps* (Basel, 1562)]... 39). Cf. G.J. Vossius, *De*

Artis Poeticae Natura ac Constitutione Liber (Amsterdam 1647) 51: 'At mater Hecuba est exemplum vicissitudinis in rebus humanis. Atque eadem quoque typus est callidi consilii, quo usa in ulciscendo Polymestore ob occisum Polydorum.'

Introduction II - Durkheim, Revenge, and the Ancient Near East

1 See especially chapter 2 of Blundell (1989) 26-59, which is a good recent summary of this view.

2 The particular model being discussed is Durkheim's earliest formulation, in the first (on crime) and second (on punishment) parts of Book One, chapter two "Mechanical Solidarity through Likeness" in *The Division of Labour in Society.* This is his seminal work on the subject, and though the views expressed are at times altered or emended later, for simplicity and clarity only the early discussion will be examined. Of course, it is not possible to give a complete account of all modern sociological thought, or even of Durkheim and his specific critics. What is important for the current discussion is simply the fact that the theories have been put forward as possible explanations for societal behaviour.

3 The vocabulary of revenge is problematical, because over time moral colouring has attached to certain cognates. While "revenge" itself is relatively neutral, "vengeance" is decidedly negative (perhaps due to the use of the word "vengeful") and yet "to avenge" or to be an "avenger" is slightly positive. In the present discussion, all are being used synonymously, and with as little moral colouring as possible. The purpose of the discussion is to assign a positive value to the concept, but that should and can only be done from a neutral starting point.

4 For ease of reference, I have tried to keep external bibliography with respect to the Ancient Near East to a minimum. For the Akkadian law codes, I am using translations in Pritchard 1958, which for texts is an abridgement of the much larger *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the New Testament* [2] (Princeton UP, 1955.) The translations of the Laws of Eshnunna are by Albrecht Goetze (133-138), and those of the Code of Hammurabi are by Theophile J. Meek (138-167).

5 One mina of silver = 50 shekels, or approximately 600 grams.

6 Meek's note, Pritchard (1958) 139 n.1: "*awēlum* seems to be used in at least three senses: (1) sometimes to indicate a man of the higher class, a noble; (2) sometimes a free man of any class, high or low; and (3) occasionally a man of any class, from king to slave. I follow the ambiguity of the original and use the rather general term 'seignior,' as employed in Italian and Spanish, to indicate any free man of standing."

7 Meek's note, Pritchard (1958) 161 n.1: "Lit. 'the son of a man,' with 'son' used in the technical sense [of 'belonging to the class of, species of,' so common in the Semitic languages] ... and 'man' clearly in the sense of 'noble, aristocrat'; or it is possible that 'son' here is to be taken in the regular sense to indicate a person younger than the assailant."

8 Translations of Hittite material are my own, based on the transliterated text found in Friedrich (1967) 20-21.

9 An exception is in the case of "splitting an ear", found in laws 15 and 16. Whereas law 7 and law 8 seem to represent all kinds of permanent damage, ranging from losing a tooth to losing an eye, law 15 proscribes a penalty of 12 shekels if a free man's ear is split, but law 16 requires only 3 shekels for a slave (in addition to the maintenance of the estate, of course. Because casuistic law is being used, it becomes important to understand what is meant by "splitting an ear". It is fair to assume that deafening a person is not what it meant - were this the case, it would be similar to the injury incurred in law 7. Odd as the euphemism may sound, "splitting an ear" is probably representative of all non-debilitating personal injury that has not already been covered by law 10. This is consistent with the productivity ethic already described, since it can be assumed that the end result of these injuries is no more than a scar or a notched ear. The aesthetic disadvantages for a slave are not on the level of a debilitating injury. Productivity is not decreased.

10 Neither seems to represent premeditated murder, though such an interpretation is possible in each case. The interpretation of the phrase "his hand sins" later in the paragraph could be adduced to support the view in favour of manslaughter.

11 The Apostle Paul in *Romans* 6:13 enjoins his readers, "Do not offer the parts of your body to sin, as instruments of wickedness, but rather offer yourselves to God..." (New International Version. All biblical passages are from this translation.)

12 E.g. *Nehemiah* 8:8, *Matthew* 22:40.

13 Many of the views on the Old Testament legal system were presented in a course on "Contemporary Social Ethics: Law" given by Prof. Alvin Esau at Regent College, Vancouver, Canada in January 1989.

14 It is a misunderstanding of this application that has caused undue tension in the modern debate of capital punishment. The Jewish people in the time of Moses were nomadic and without any mechanisms for incarceration, community service, etc.

15 *Numbers* 35:9-34, *Deuteronomy* 4:41-3, 19:1-13, and, outside of the Pentateuch, *Joshua* 20:1-9.

16 The other time that the "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth" appears in the Pentateuch is *Deuteronomy* 19:21, which is a provision against false testimony.

17 E.g. *II Corinthians* 11:23 **πεντάκις τεσσεράκοντα παρὰ μίαν.**

18 E.g. **ἀνεπίφθονον αὐτῷ τιμωρεῖσθαι τὸν ὑπάρξαντα** ("Nobody can be denied retaliation against him who was the aggressor" Demosthenes 59.15.)

19 Homer does not introduce the issue of matricide so that the parallels between Telemachus' position and that of Orestes are more clearly drawn (Goldhill (1986) 147-48).

20 This is described more fully in Introduction IV.

21 That as individuals this is what they believed is suggested by, e.g. Dover (1974) 180-84. Aeschylus in the *Oresteia* presents an alternative to this historical view. His literary view however was so pervasive and persuasive that the notion of vendetta (as opposed to revenge) became common, see Introduction IV.

1 This term was introduced and defined in Introduction I.

2 For a conventional account of the sacrifice, cf. O'Connor-Visser (1987), or Méridier (note 4, below). Gellie (1980) 34 writes, "The character and behaviour of Polyxena have been designed to meet certain specifications: she must be the kind of girl who can makes us feel good when she dies ... Part of the good feeling is achieved by allowing some teasing physical detail to add its own kind of warmth." Golden (1988) 12 calls this vicarious pleasure in the young girl's death a form of pornography, which may be an extreme view, but certainly points out the wrongness of an audience warming to the sacrifice.

3 Diggle obelizes this word. None of the likely or suggested meanings affects the present interpretation.

4 Cf. for example Méridier *Hécube* 169 n.1: "C'est lui [Achille] qui retient la flotte grecque (v. 38, 111); c'est lui que Néoptolème invoque pour obtenir le départ des navires et un heureux retour (539 et suiv.). D'autre part l'armée est condamnée à l'immobilité, faute de vents favorables (900), et à la fin de la pièce, quand le sacrifice a été consommé, Agamemnon salve l'arrivée des brises attendues (1290). ..."

5 The reference to a/the god (900 θεός) could refer either indirectly and vaguely to the ghost of Achilles, or, more likely, be merely a *façon de parler* for the weather (cf. Kovacs (1987) 79).

6 Kovacs (1987) 112-13 reckons that there are three significant inconsistencies in the play, namely the location, the demands of the ghost, and the time sequence at the opening. I believe that the first two of these are solved by the interpretation offered in this essay. Neither is there need to resort to Arnott's apology (1991, 138-39): "In the context of the Greek theatre, there is no need to specify [whether it is set at Troy or Thrace]. It can be either or both, as the action dictates. In *Hecuba* Euripides weaves a tragedy from two separate and distinct sources; he uses two plots, each of which illuminates and comments upon the other. In the same spirit his theatre allows him to fuse two separate spheres of action into a no man's land which is Troy or Thrace according to the demands of the immediate moment."

7 Cf. Introduction VI.

8 For the treatment of the Polyxena story in later poets, cf. Mossman (1990) 15-18, 263 n.25-26.

9 Cf. Mossman (1990) 28 "it does seem that Hecuba is thought of as an archetypical *tragic* character as well as more generally one who suffered greatly: it is striking how often Hecuba's name is mentioned when a random example of a tragic figure is required." cf. Lucian *Nigr* 11.8, *Salt* 27.16, Stephanus of Byzantium on Aristotle *Rhet* 1403b27: εἰ μὲν γὰρ τύραννον ἢ Πολυμήστορα μιμοῖτο, δεῖ μεγαλη χρῆσθαι φωνῇ, εἰ δὲ γυναῖκα οἷον Ἑκάβην ἢ Πολυξένην, μικρᾷ καὶ οἷον ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους διακοπτομένη.

10 Cf. Introduction I, Introduction 6 and Commentary note 1265.

11 Farnell (1896) II 501-19 describes Hecate and in particular her associations with Artemis. Cf. also Aesch *Sup* 676 Ἄρτεμιν ἑκάταν, fr. 87 Smyth, Theocritus 2.33, and Eur [?] *IA* 1570-71.

This paper was first presented to the Scottish Universities [Classical] Drama Seminar, in Glasgow, June 1, 1992.

1 The story that pregnant women aborted while watching the performance, which is preserved in the anonymous *vita* of Aeschylus, has long been thought to be a fictitious and late tale. Even so, the anecdote attests to the great extent that the play captured the imaginations of its audience. Calder (1988), however, provides a parallel event from eighteenth-century European history which recognizes at least the possibility that the story of the staged Erinyes may be based in fact.

2 cf. Aristophanes *Acharnians* 9 and scholia. Newiger bases his argument on supposed recollections in the *Clouds*, and Meridor supports Newiger's case by reference to the *Hecuba*.

3 I hope to pursue this relationship elsewhere at greater length.

4 Chapter title, in Roland Barthes (1978) *Image-Music-Text* trans. Stephen Heath. New York.

5 In Introduction II.

6 Kock 149, from Athenaeus *Deipnosophists* 12, 551a.

7 The following summarizes the distinction drawn in Introduction I.

8 As described in Introduction II.

9 Exceptions include Meridor (1978) (1983), Heath (1987), and Gregory (1991). Mossman (1990) says no commitment is expected.

10 Cf. Kovacs (1987) 146 n.68: "It has been mentioned that the dog ranks so low in the scale of animal nobility and is so constantly associated with shamelessness that Hecuba's transformation cannot be anything but a degradation. Yet the dog has many associations besides shamelessness (see *RE* 9, 2 *s.v.* "Hund," esp. cols. 2567-69) and may connote tenacity (S. *Aj.* 78), hard work (X. *Mem.* 4.1.3, Arist. *HA* 608a31), and the Greek virtue of beneficence to friends and maleficence to enemies (Pl. *Resp.* 375A2-C2)." There is a slight problem in that use of the word with respect to women is much more clearly negative, and not satisfactorily explained by the examples Kovacs lists. One factor that must be integrated into the analysis must be the speaker and his state of mind. Polymestor is not abounding with goodwill towards Hecuba and her women, and a pejorative animal association is appropriate in his mouth. If this negative aspect can be ascribed to Polymestor, with the other association (that Kovacs sees) being ascribed to the prophet and (ultimately) Euripides, we are closer, I believe, to an acceptable solution.

11 I am told by Prof. E. Kerr Borthwick that Sir J.T. Sheppard believed that at this point Clytemnestra made her initial entrance, that the words had a secondary reference to her. This is an intriguing notion, and certainly possible for Aeschylus, but quite unsubstantiated. The end of the passage here cited, and its reference to the woman with two husbands, is equally appropriate, for example.

12 All are cited in Introduction I.

13 Burkert (1985) bases his distinction between Erinyes and alastores primarily on the following passages: Erinyes (427 n.31) Homer *Il* 3.278f, 19.260, and cursing 9.454, 15.204, 21.412, Aesch

Eum 417; alastores (421 n.19) Aesch *Ag* 1500f, *Per* 353, Soph *OC* 787f, Eur *Med* 1333, cf. Socrates of Argos *FGrHist* 310 F 5, Apollodorus *FGrHist* 244 F 150.

14 The Commentary note on 786 cites Reckford (1985) 126-27 to this effect, and see Introduction III.

15 For this key word in the play, see Commentary, note 710.

16 Verbal echoes to which it is more difficult to assign any certain interpretation are simply cited as parallels in the commentary, with the exception of number 5, provided as an example.

17 See Introduction V for a fuller examination of the relationship between the *Hecuba* and the *Cyclops*.

18 Though running on all fours disguised as a wolf is reported in *Rhesus* 210-11, 254ff.

19 Detailed more fully in Introduction III.

20 For bibliography and discussion, see Commentary, note 1279.

21 Cf. Garvie's discussion of this fragment in his introduction to the *Choephori* xix-xxi.

Introduction V - The date of the *Hecuba*, and the *Cyclops*

1 In the same way, the suggested date for the *Heraclidae* of c. 430 B.C. is confirmed by Zuntz (1955) 81-88, independent of reference to the Eurystheus oracle and Alcmena scene (see esp. 88 n.3.)

2 Only one authority is cited for each case. Some are controversial, most are reasonable. Undated plays for which there is no reason to believe occurred between 425 and 422 have not been included. Webster (1967) 3-5 would add *Aeolus* (427-23), *Ixion* (420-17), the Melanippe plays and *Phrixos B* (all 427-c.417).

3 Further support might be gained for proximity to the *Hecuba* if there is a resolution in a fourth foot, for which see Diggle (1970) 177-78 or commentary at 727 and 1240.

4 A reference in the *Clouds* obviously contains the possibility that the line comes from the later rewrite, post-420, as described for the *Hecuba*.

5 These are discussed in the commentary as they arise. See also Ussher *Cyc*, esp. pages 196-97.

6 Cf. Seaford (1984) 19 and n. 52.

7 Seaford (1984) 49 argues against the same phenomenon concerning a later play: "it seems unlikely that E[uripides] would introduce a ridiculous echo of a satyr play into the tragic *Andromeda*. It must be the other way around".

8 That Euripides wrote the *Cyclops* with a copy of *Odyssey* 9 in front of him, or with it locked firmly in his memory, is almost certain in face of such unambiguous parallels as *Cyc* 396-405 with *Od* 9.289-92, *Cyc* 460-63 with *Od* 9.383-86, *Cyc* 473 with *Od* 9.241-42, *Cyc* 548-51 with *Od* 9.355-70, *Cyc* 591-92 with *Od* 9.372-74, *Cyc* 608-10 with *Od* 9.391-94, and *Cyc* 696-700 with *Od*

9.507-21. It has been suggested that there is a similarity between the presentation of Polymestor and that of the Homeric Cyclops. This seems valid, and gives some motivation for the *Hecuba* to be a play recalled in the *Cyclops* if the later date, endorsed here, is accepted. Mossman (1990) 213 rightly condemns Segal (1990) for extending the identification of Polymestor = Polyphemus to Hecuba = Odysseus in the *Hecuba*, which I agree is not an intended association by the poet, but she is wrong to accept an equivalence of Hecuba = Homeric Odysseus, which is logically not valid.

9 In November 1988, I directed both plays together as a double bill in Montréal, where the parallels I suggest here became evident.

10 To what extent Sophocles uses "magic" items in any of his plays is a subject I hope to examine in greater detail in the future. Suffice it to say that the bow is necessary for the Greek victory at Troy. Depending on how the prophecy of Helenus is understood, it may be necessary that Philoctetes is also there.

11 This is suggested by 543, for example.

Introduction VI - Status and the Structure of the *Hecuba*

1 Taplin sets out the difficulties in *Poetics* 12 clearly and succinctly: see his Introduction, section 5 (pp. 49-60) and Appendix E (pp. 470-479.)

2 Taplin does however note that "Many entrances ... are clearly *within* a structural unit, and in no way mark the beginning or end of one" (1977, 53) which does reintroduce an element of circularity, but allows for instances such as are found in Aesch *PV* and Soph *Tra.*

3 E.g. in Euripides: *Hecuba* 1023-34, *Hippolytus* 1268-82 (recognized by Barrett as a stasimon), *Ion* 1229-43, *Bacchae* 1153-64, and *Medea* 1081-1115, but not *Supplices* 918-24 and *Electra* 585-95.

4 Discussed in Introduction I.

5 For general details on Classical dramatic production, Ley (1991) evaluates most factors fairly and concisely.

6 In this instance I am not suggesting that the two are meant to sound alike. Part of the skill of a good (serious) actor is the ability to lose one's individual personality into that of the character: Olivier is heralded as a good actor in part because it is possible to watch one of his films and not know which role he is playing. Opportunity for just this sort of virtuosity is afforded by the demands of playing multiple roles. Exactly the opposite is in the dynamic of comedy. The good (comic) actor often plays the same character in every role: Groucho Marx always plays Groucho Marx. This identification with expected characteristics enhances the humour involved.

7 Even with Kells' (1973, 18) division, allotting Chrysothemis to the third actor, the same actor is required to play Orestes and Clytemnestra, murderer and victim. In a 1990 production of the play I directed in Edinburgh, the same actress played Chrysothemis and Clytemnestra (low and high status respectively) and the same actor the paedagogue and Aegisthus (also, a low status role and a high.) Neither had difficulties with the technical aspects (changing costumes in short periods of

time) or with playing the opposing statuses.

8 It has become conventional to understand the terms πρωταγωνιστής, δευτεραγωνιστής and τριταγωνιστής in their rare use applying to actors in theatres, as 'first' 'second' and 'third actor' referring to decreasing theatrical demands in performance. There is slight evidence that some role allocation was done by convention: Demosthenes 19.247 suggests the king or tyrant fell (in the fourth century) to the third actor. In my suggested role allocation for the *Hecuba*, the third actor takes Agamemnon but not Polymestor. There is also a suggestion that value judgements were attached to which position was held. The use of τριταγωνιστήν of Aeschines in Demosthenes *De Corona* 267 suggests "third-rate actor", which at times no doubt was true. In much of Aristophanes, however, the first actor's comedic demands are significantly less than those of the actors taking the smaller parts. Despite this, the convention will be maintained for the purposes of discussion merely to provide points of reference.

9 That the servant is with Hecuba *ab initio* is unlikely, since she refers to the silent attendants as children (59 ὦ παῖδες) and the servant is never mentioned with this or a related term. It is perhaps even significant that Hecuba, having lost so many children in the war, has adopted her servants in this way.

10 The definitive treatment on status is Johnstone (1981) 33-74, the chapter called "Status". His many examples cannot all be reproduced here. The word 'status' is clearly being used in a special sense, which will be defined. It is in this sense that I have endeavoured to use the word throughout this dissertation. Levin (1965) esp. 213-5 charts Marlowe's tragic plots in quite similar terms, comparing them with other contemporary tragedies.

11 Though they don't have much place in tragedy, low status competitions can also occur, e.g. Monty Python's "Four Yorkshiremen" sketch, where each character seeks to 'underdo' the others in their descriptions of their poverty and living conditions when they were younger.

12 When discussing status, Johnstone speaks in terms of 'play'. The notion of status interaction is to a large extent intuitive, and every individual does make conscious decisions to play high (e.g. 'power' dressing for interviews) or low (e.g. wearing old clothes on vacation) at different (appropriate) times.

13 Baldness can have high-status associations, but typically represents low status. It is associated with other low status characteristics explicitly, e.g. in the Old Norse short story of Authun the Westfirther, of whom the reader is told, "At that time, all the money the king had given him for the journey is finished. He then takes up the path of a beggar, and begs for food for himself. He is then bald, and rather wretched".

14 Since it seems likely that the entire first half of the play, and the Aeacus scene in particular, is a sustained parody of Euripides' (fragmentary) *Perithous*, it is probable that the high-status associations of Heracles would be further elevated by the expected high-status nature of a (para-) tragic hero.

15 Polydorus' opening speech and the stasima are not being described here because 'status' exists in quite a different sense in solo-scenes and becomes much more subjective (which is why there are so many ways of delivering soliloquies.) There is none of the 'give and take' aspect presently being expounded.

16 That the circumstance of having one's head wrapped in clothing is low status elsewhere is

shown in Seaford's description of Agamemnon's last bath: "Made vulnerable by his funeral bath, Agamemnon is then trapped by his funeral robe" (1984, 250).

17 Debasement-scholars view the speech as ironic, that Hecuba will prove an exception to her own rule that the good remain good. This is clearly wrong. The speech allies herself with her daughter, and separates Hecuba from the likes of Odysseus, Agamemnon and Polymestor.

18 The odd metaphor which expresses this combines the notion of victory (and its associated high-status connotations) with misery. Note the use of 658 **παναθλία, 659 νικῶσ', 660 στέφανον, 662 κηρύγματα.**

19 In Medieval Scholastic theology, and in popular thought (as evidenced by, e.g. the *Carmina Burana*) Hecuba typically appears as the exemplar of the Wheel of Fortune, who having once prospered has followed the rotation and becomes under it: *nam sub axe legimus | Hecubam reginam* (Hilka-Schumann-Bischoff 16.3.7-8.) In general the Latinate tradition accentuated only certain aspects of the Hecuba-legend, with Ovid making much of the metamorphosis (which influences the debasement scholars). It is hard to know how the Medievals did perceive the exemplar functioning in their model of the fragility of fate. The information that survives from the period does not make the matter particularly clear. Most interpretations though suggest that the point is that Hecuba was once at the top of the wheel, but has fallen to the bottom. It is known that Euripides' play was the subject of much Byzantine attention, and when it did reach the West it was understood not as a study in moral degradation (see Heath, 1987). Though there seems no definite way to prove it, the notion of the Wheel of Fortune as regards Hecuba seems much more apposite if the wheel is allowed to continue its revolution. All circles close in on themselves, and the Wheel of Fortune should not be an exception. Hecuba begins at the top, descends, but then rises again. Though each acme has a different base (prosperity against justice) the notion of a wheel is much clearer. Whether it is anachronistic to attribute this to the West this early cannot be said with any certainty. Dante *Inferno* canto xxx 16-21 certainly follows Ovid, where,

Ecuba, trista, misera e cattiva,
poscia che vide Polissena morta,
e del suo Polidoro in su la riva
del mar si fu la dolorosa accorta,
forsennata latrò sì come cane:
tanto il dolor le fe' la mente torta.

Hecuba, sad miserable and captive, once she had seen Polyxena slain, and, saddened, noticed her Polydorus on the shore of the sea, raving she barked like a dog: so great was the sadness which tortured her soul.

Table of Suggested Alternate Readings

to Diggle's corrected (1989) text of <u>Hecuba</u> 658-1295

All of the following are discussed to some extent in the Commentary *ad loc.* Several tentative alternate readings have not been included in this list, but are discussed as they arise.

692	μ' ἐπισχήσει
740	κρανθὲν
756-57	*do not delete*
758-60	*retain the traditional order of 758, 759, 760*
793-97	*do not delete*
800	*capitalise* Νόμος
816	*capitalise* Πειθὼ
824	κενὸν
827	*delete*

831-32 *do not delete*

831 γὰρ τῶν τε

847 τὰς ἀνάγκας

859 δ'ἐμοὶ

875 *punctuate as follows:*

τὰ δ' ἄλλα θάρσει· πάντ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς.

901 ἥσυχον

917 χαροποιῶν

928/9-30 *divide the lines as follows:*

...κατ' ἄστυ Τροί- | ας τόδ'· Ὦ παῖδες...

939-40 *divide the lines as follows:*

...ἀποσκοποῦσ', ἐπεὶ | νόστιμον ναῦς...

943/4 Διοσκόροιν

948 *punctuate as follows:* γάμος, οὐ γάμος ἀλλ'

966 *remove comma at line end*

967 *insert comma after* μύθους

974-75 *do not delete*

992 *read and punctuate as follows:*

Εκ. εἰ τῆς τεκούσης τῆσδε ... μέμνηταί τί μου;

1011 τί

1041 *spoken by the Chorus, continuing with 1042-43*

1079 *do not delete* πᾷ βῶ

1155 κάμακα Θρηκίαν

1173 θηρῶ

1211 τί δ' οὐ

1217 φανῇς

Alternate readings for certain passages in lines 1-657 are discussed in the Introduction and Commentary when they ~~are discussed~~ arise, but this is not meant to be a complete examination of the textual problems of these lines. By far the best work done on the manuscript tradition for this play is Matthiessen (1973) which discusses these matters at length.

Commentary

658-904 Third Episode

The scene begins with the servant running onstage in a panic: her preparations for the burial of Polyxena have become horrific. These two notions, preparation and horror, unite the events in this episode. The audience knows that Polydorus is dead from the prologue, but it has since been focusing on the plight of Polyxena. As the Polyxena storyline is concluding (all that remains are the final preparations for the cremation), a new horror is presented to the prisoners of war: Hecuba's youngest son is also dead. It is due to this transition that the play has often been falsely labelled as 'broken-backed', and is one of the reasons for the play's lack of popularity in recent centuries (see Heath 1987.) The difficulties in maintaining this view have already been discussed (see Introduction VI.) In fact, Euripides does not allow the audience's attention to slacken: at a point where a κὄμμός for Polyxena might be appropriate, the audience is presented one for Polydorus. Hecuba's failure to identify the corpse of her son as he is brought onstage leads to further tension and links between the two children, a theme that will be expanded at the end of the episode, 896-97. Until this point, the parodos going to the sea has been underused: the servant had used it to go fetch water at the end of the last episode, and apart from that all entrances had been along the other parodos, heading towards the Greek camp (and Thrace, cf. 953-1022 note). The audience has become accustomed to disaster coming from the camp. This new disaster, from the sea, is the first sign of changes to come in the story line, as this episode makes clear.

Agamemnon enters immediately following the κομμός as Odysseus had in the first episode, and then begins a long supplication scene (Heath (1987a) 145-48.) Hecuba's intent only begins to be revealed at 749, the end of a long and exceptional series of asides: she is seeking revenge. Though she is unable to get any more from Agamemnon than a supportive neutrality, by the end of the episode she has made all the necessary preparations for her horrific revenge.

658-60 As the episode opens, the θεράπαινα (= ἀρχαία λάτρις of 609) returns with the corpse of Polydorus, which would be brought in on a bier by 'extras' (*mutae personae*) who then join others at the back of the stage or leave. It is unreasonable to assume that the body is brought on by the servant herself, since this would interfere with the delivery of her lines, which are clearly rapid and excited. It does mean there is some oddity in having such obvious functionaries. It is required, however, and the only alternative, to use the ἐκκύκλημα to reveal the corpse, is inappropriate, since its conventional use is to show interior scenes to the audience, and the body is not at present within the tent. As the anonymity of the body is essential until 679, it must be assumed that the body is shrouded. For entry of characters with corpses, cf. *And* 1166, *Bac* 1216 (where it is in pieces), and on a larger scale *Sup* 794. In Aesch *ST* bodies are brought on, followed by Antigone and Ismene at 871 (cf. Hecuba's slightly delayed entry at 667. Arnott (1962) 69, 115 suggests "dummy bodies" were used in these instances. This fulfils what was predicted at 45-48 by the ghost of Polydorus. Quite often Euripides' prologues give inaccurate, or deliberately incomplete, information, and in some ways the same is happening here. Although what Polydorus had said was true, it was an incomplete truth, and the play will soon start to focus on the effects of Hecuba's revenge, which was not anticipated in the prologue (see note 749-50.)

Hadley notes that there is a cruel and ironic ἆθλον metaphor in these lines: παναθλία (658), νικῶσα (659), and στέφανον (660), which is continued in κηρύγματα in 662. This leads to a paradox, since the conquering is in evil. παναθλία normally means "wretched", and so it would be understood on first hearing. It is only with the subsequent line's νικῶσα that the impact of the metaphor becomes clear.

θῆλυν σπορὰν while perhaps rare is not remarkable, cf. *Tro* 503 θήλεια σπορὰ.

661 σῆς κακογλώσσου βοῆς is a genitive of cause (e.g. 156, *Med* 1028.) Similar in construct to κακογλώσσου is Valckenaer's conjecture of δυσθροεῖν at Aesch *Sup* 513. There is an implied reproach of the servant, for bringing news of more trouble for Hecuba; in a sense, the chorus are shooting the messenger. The Scholiast wonders τί ἐστι τὸ βούλημα τῆς σῆς κακοφήμου βοῆς;

662 Herwerden's emendation μοι has restored a balanced sense to the line, avoiding Paley's apologetic tone ("I say, *your* evil-boding clamour, for these doleful announcements of yours know no rest, coming as they do so quickly after the bad tidings brought by Talthybius" [i.e. 484-85].)

εὕδει, "are still", cf. Homer *Il* 5.524, Solon 2.19, functions here in a way similar to σιγᾶν in Theocritus 2.38-39. The metaphor itself is very common: *Sup* 1147 οὔπω κακὸν τόδ' εὕδει;, *El* 41-42, fr. 398 (*Ino*) εὕδουσα δ' Ἰνοῦς συμφορὰ χρόνον πολὺν | νῦν ὄμμ' ἐγείρει, Aesch *Ag* 346, *Eum* 280, and Soph *OC* 511.

663-64 Her words do not concern the chorus, however: Ἑκάβῃ φέρω, sc. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑμῖν. This is probably meant apologetically. Although it could be left indefinite, it is likely that τόδ' ἄλγος, accompanied by an appropriate gesture, is a description of the corpse. Hadley, however, believes it to be abstract. This would mean that the first reference to the body is made by Hecuba in 671 when she mistakes it for Polyxena.

στόμα is an accusative of respect ("to speak propitiously *as to your mouth*".) The meaning is similar to 181, and may imply as it often does "to keep silent", cf. Aesch *Ag* 1247 εὔφημον, ὦ τάλαινα, κοίμησον στόμα, *Cho* 582, also Horace *Odes* 3.1.2, 3.14.11. εὐφημεῖν is presented as the opposite to 661 κακογλώσσου.

665 Taplin (1977) has demonstrated convincingly how verbal cues function in lieu of some stage directions, especially in terms of recognizing entrances and exits, in Aeschylus. In many ways, these principles can and have been extended for other Greek playwrights. One such formulaic verbal cue is καὶ μὴν, announcing a new entry, as at 216. Hecuba emerges from the tent.

τυγχάνει + participle = 'happens to *x*'. This gives the feel of a speak-of-the-devil entry, which are relatively common in tragedy, because of the compression of events required for the presentation of diverse happenings. It is not an 'offhand' comment.

The tent from which Hecuba emerges is δόμων (as it was in 55) but the use of ὕπο ("from beyond

the limit of") equally recalls 53 ὑπο σκηνῆς. There is some confusion between the scene represented and the theatrical reality.

666 Friis Johansen and Whittle (Aesch *Sup* 483) note that "the first element of a trimeter (being) occupied by the final word of a clause begun in the preceding line(s) ... is common in the younger tragedians." In this case, ἥδε is an elided disyllable (as at 679 and 1130) but a monosyllable is also possible. cf. *Alc* 179, 737, *Med* 612, 793, 893, 1320, *Hip* 296, 355, 890, 1097, *Hcld* 407, 455, *And* 582, Soph *El* 43, *Ant* 250, *OC* 1168, fr. 142.ii. 15, Aesch *PV* 821 (and see Griffith (1977) 97-9.)

σοῖσι λόγοις, "in time for your words", is a dative of accompanying circumstance.

667 παντάλαινα echoes 658 παναθλία, and is a relatively rare word, cf. *And* 140 ‹ὦ› παντάλαινα νύμφα.

668 This line constitutes a simple polar expression of the this-and-not-that type. ὄλωλας is used intransitively: "you are lost/destroyed". εἶ is from the copula εἰμι (as at 683) and not εἶμι (as 579), which is also serving as a verb of existence. With the concessive βλέπουσα, it can be translated "though you can see the light of day, you are no longer alive." For the hyperbole, cf. 1121 and *Alc* 1082 ἀπώλεσέν με, κἄτι μᾶλλον ἢ λέγω.

669 Tricola of this type are very common, cf. *Hel* 1148 ἄπιστος ἄδικος ἄθεος, *Bac* 995 ἄθεον ἄνομον ἄδικον, *Or* 310, *And* 491, *HF* 434, *Tro* 1313-14, Soph *Ant* 876, Aesch *Cho* 55, Homer *Il* 9.63, Gorg *Pal* 36, Demosthenes 9.40, and as tetracola, cf. *Hip* 1028, *IT* 220 and Milton *Paradise Lost* 5.898-99 "unmov'd | Unshak'n, unseduc'd, unterrifi'd", *Samson Agonistes* 416-17 "ignoble, | Unmanly, ignominious, infamous". See also Fraenkel on *Ag* 412, Bond *Hyp* p.80 and Aristophanic parodies of this at *Frogs* 203, 838-9. In the present instance, notice how each word is more general than the previous: Hecuba has lost blood ties, marital ties, and political ties. That this

threefold trouble represented to the ancient mind the extremes of a woman's possible suffering is perhaps attested by Naomi's similar situation in the biblical *Ruth* 1:1-5, where 'the emptying of Naomi' is crucial to the literary structure of the narrative. Meridor (1983) 15 presents a more conventional view that "with the loss of the body-politic she and hers have lost all protection against offence."

ἐξεφθαρμένη is a *hapax* in tragedy.

670 Hecuba is thinking of Polyxena's death, and she is mistaken; she sees no special force in ἄπαις. There is an implied rebuke in εἰδόσιν, cf. Aesch *PV* 1040-41 εἰδότι τοί μοι τάσδ' ἀγγελίας | ὅδ' ἐθώϋξεν, Homer *Il* 10.250, perhaps because the tricolon might sound like an insult. ὠνείδισας is embittered, and the phrase seems to have the same tone as the English "cast it up in my teeth."

When the plural refers to oneself, it is always masculine, cf. 237, Soph *El* 399, *Ant* 926.

Note the threefold repetition of the ει sound.

671 As at 258, ἀτὰρ indicates a sudden change of topic (*GP* 52). Because the word νεκρὸν is always masculine, there is perhaps some irony here. Hecuba believes she is referring to her dead daughter, but in her grammatically-necessary imprecision, is unwittingly accurate with respect to its gender. The confusion of the corpse is dramatically similar to the climactic scene in Sophocles' *Electra*, when Aegisthus mistakenly believes the corpse of Clytemnestra is that of Orestes. The most probable date for Sophocles' play is c.413, well after the *Hecuba*. In each scene, the character enters knowing that somebody is dead, and assumes that the shrouded corpse in front of them is that dead person. In each case, they are mistaken, and the corpse is shown to be somebody else. In the case of the Electra, there is the extra detail that the individual removing the shroud (Orestes) is the same person that the mistaken character (Aegisthus) believes to be dead.

672-73 κομίζουσα cf. *Hip* 1261.

ἀπηγγέλθη cf. *IT* 932.

τάφος recalls the words of Talthybius, at 572ff. Nevertheless, it has been felt that the noun is inappropriate, most recently by Kovacs (1988) 133-34, and for τάφος suggests στρατὸς (perhaps also altering πάντων to πᾶς τῶν (cf. 530). This is attractive, though the corruption is hard to explain, and the sense is tolerable as it stands.

διὰ χερὸς = χερί, cf. *OC* 470 δι' ὁσίων χειρῶν θιγών.

Though normally active, 'to be busy', σπουδὴν ἔχειν is here passive, "to be attended to / receive attention", cf. *Or* 1056 μὴ θανεῖν σπουδὴν ἔχων.

674-75 Tierney etc. mistake these lines for an aside, based on Hecuba's reaction at 676-77. Bain (1977) 31-2, rightly argues against this (for Bain's definition of an aside, see note on 736-51.) There is no dramatic reason why Hecuba should not hear this couplet. In fact, her response makes more sense if she has heard νέων (675). The line is probably addressed to the chorus, though it too might be considered an odd thing for the servant to say. Yet there are parallels of the third person being used to refer to a person with whom the speaker is conversing, e.g. *Hcld* 435 συγγνωστὰ γάρ τοι καὶ τὰ τοῦδ'.

ἅπτεται metaphorically = "grasps", cf. 586.

676-77 μῶν = μὴ οὖν, as at 754 the questioner is appalled at the possibility of a positive answer, and is hoping the answer will be negative.

References to Cassandra in the play are few and important. Cassandra is Hecuba's last living child (though Helenus might still be alive as a prisoner: he is never introduced into the narrative of this play), as she is to discover in three lines. She has been mentioned previously at 127 and 426. She will be used as a lever to win Agamemnon's assistance towards attaining her revenge 824-32. Here there is an affectionate synecdoche (κάρα τῆς Κασσάνδρας = Κασσάνδραν, cf. 21-22, 87, 127, 724) and a double reference to her prophetic powers. There is a similar double reference in 121, when Cassandra is being considered (in report) as a possible Polyxena-substitute.

The use of βακχεῖον (cf.121) is similar to μαινάδος at *El* 1032, *Tro* 307, 415, but seems out of place in reference to Cassandra, who is typically associated with Apollo (note the use of 827 φοιβάς and 1076 Βάχκαις Ἅιδα.) It would seem from the present usage that the word could be used purely in a general sense of "inspired, frenzied" - which would not deny that she is a prophetess - without having any associations with Dionysus, much as 'divine' can be used to describe a rich dessert without theological overtones. For Dionysus as a mantic god, cf. 1267 note.

678-79 λέλακας (historical perfect) is also used of wailing at *Hel* 186, but as Lee notes at *Tro* 269, the word denotes a sound of unusual *quality* rather than volume. It is therefore also used by Agamemnon to represent the sound of Echo at 1110 of this play.

τὸν θανόντα is the first definite indication that the corpse is masculine.

For the monosyllable τόνδ' at the beginning of the line, cf. 666. The word is postponed for effect; as this sentence has been said, the servant has drawn back the shroud from the corpse, revealing who it is. This is then a clue for the interpretation of γυμνωθὲν, which normally means "naked". At 734 there is a reference to πέπλοι, which means either attendants are dressing the body during the κομμός 684-722 (which would be an unnecessary and distracting stage action) or γυμνωθὲν means something else. 'Lightly clad, *virtually* naked' is possible and would suggest Polydorus is wearing rags from being cast upon the sea, but more likely is "uncovered", a direct reference to the preceding action. The similarity with the scene in Sophocles' *Electra* (see note 670-71) suggests that there is no need to assume that the practice of enshrouding a corpse is in any way unusual.

680 παρὰ ἐλπίδας "contrary to (your) expectations", cf. *Or* 977, *Hip* 1120.

681 δὴ is used emphatically with verbs at moments of strong emotion, as at 413-4 (*GP* 215.)

682 Despite the ironic juxtaposition of ἔσῳζ' and Θρῄξ ἀνήρ, Hecuba is not yet laying blame.

She is beginning a period of gradual recognition, and interpretation of her dream 66-95.

μοι is an ethic dative, which can virtually be rendered, "I had thought" This is however the first reference to Thrace since 81 (before that it is mentioned at 7, 19, 36, and 74.) While here it is used innocently, cf. use at 710. οἴκοις is a locative dative, as it is at 457.

683 Friis Johansen and Whittle (Aesch *Sup* 908) note of ἀπωλόμην that 'the aorist indicates that something which has just happened is identified by the speaker with his ruin.' cf. 440, *Alc* 391 ἀπωλόμην τάλας, *And* 71, 74, 1077, *Hip* 575, Soph *El* 676-7, but note also the virtually synonymous *Cyc* 665 ὀλώλαμεν and 669 ἀπωλόμην.

οὐκέτ' εἰμί δή, cf. *Or* 1081 κῆδος δὲ τοὐμὸν καὶ σὸν οὐκέτ' ἔστι δή, *Hip* 778, *Hel* 279.

Mossman (1990) 73 suggestively posits that here Hecuba falls to her knees. If so, she must again be standing by 736 (since again, she can fall to her knees.) Rising at Agamemnon's entrance (say at 722) is most likely, but Mossman does also offer Hecuba's identification of Polymestor as murderer (710) as the moment when she rises. If so, this would be a visual manifestation of Hecuba's willingness to take action against him.

684-722 This is the second and final κομμός in the play (the first being that at 154-215.) Before, she had lamented that her daughter Polyxena was going to be sacrificed by the Greeks. Here, she is lamenting the discovery that her (last) son has been murdered by barbarians. The situations seem very different, but the grief remains the same. Extremes of emotion are characteristic of κομμοί. Hecuba sings in the more lyric metres (in this case predominantly dochmiac dimeters) while the chorus and servant speak in more regular iambic trimeters. This is the epirrhematic structure, also used by Euripides at *Hip* 565-95, *Tro* 235-91. The idea of κομμοί being sung for the young dead is attested as early as Homer *Il* 18.569-72.

685-87 The first two lines are iambic dimeter, and serve as a lead-in to the lyric. 687 is a dochmius - one of the so-called "Bacchic" metres. There is some problem in the interpretation of

these lines, centring around how ἀλάστορος is understood. The first difficulty is in the colometry: Diggle and most others understand a comma after βακχεῖον, but Daitz (only in his *apparatus colometricus*) and more recently Lebke and Reckford understand it after ἀλάστορος. Their argument (note on 722-4) is as follows: "the ambiguity seems clear: ... (what) Hecuba now commences is either a Bacchic 'strain' or a new Bacchic 'law' created by an avenging spirit". While both positions of the comma are testified in the MSS., this interpretation seems mundane. κατάρχομαι is a technical term used in ritual, along with ἐξάρχω. It typically takes the genitive (e.g. *Pho* 540 ἡμέρας κατάρχεται) but takes an accusative here, *Or* 960 κατάρχομαι στεναγμόν and Homer *Od* 3.444-45 (the only use of the verb in Homer, cf. Herod 4.60, 103.) cf. the use at *IT* 40 where it "refers to the sprinkling of the victim's head with water" (Platnauer) - presumably, the first stage in the process of sacrifice. What she is beginning here is νόμον βακχεῖον, which is a reference to the dochmiacs she will be singing. Mossman (1990) 187 suggests that this technical usage (without the play on words) is suggested by Aesch *Cho* 424, *Per* 935-37, and Xenophon *Sym* 9.3. The metre is "used with scenes of great excitement - of intense joy or grief" (Raven (1962) 91.) To understand the ἀλάστωρ here is possible, but less desirable than the alternative.

The idea of an avenging, malignant spirit is common in Greek tragedy (e.g. 949, *Tro* 768, Soph *OT* 788, *Tra* 1092, 1235, *OC* 788, Aesch *Sup* 415, *Per* 354, *Ag* 1501, 1508 etc.) and it is often, as here, personified to some extent. If it is taken with ἀρτιμαθὴς κακῶν, four subtly different interpretations are possible:

1. It is an unspecified ἀλάστωρ, posited by Hecuba because of her sufferings. This seems to be the standard interpretation.
2. The Scholiast suggests the ἀλάστωρ is ἐκ Πολυμήστορος. This places a greater emphasis on κακῶν in 687, but it assumes Hecuba has already guessed the cause of Polydorus' death. This is unlikely, in view of the question she asks at 699-700, etc.
3. The ἀλάστωρ is sent by Polydorus, the dead thereby having a direct effect on the world of the living. This option seems not to have been expressed previously,

though it is consistent with the use of ἀλάστωρ at *Ag* 1501, 1508.

4. The ἀλάστωρ is the ghost of Polydorus. This is one of the suggestions of the Scholiast, based upon the use of ἀρτιμαθής, and relating it to 54 φάντασμα δειμαίνουσ' ἐμόν and 75-6, lines which are also recalled by 704-5.

There is a similar, and importantly related notion in the Homeric understanding of the Erinyes, which seems to entail the notion of a specific protecting spirit that one has which seeks vengeance on one's behalf: Homer *Od* 11.271f, Oedipus is punished by the Erinyes of his mother Epicaste; *Il* 9.447f, Phoenix is punished by the Erinyes of his father Amyntor. cf. also *Od* 2.134f, *Il* 9.567f, *Il* 21.412f. All these examples concern restoration for violence within the family, but *Od* 17.475 shows that even a beggar can have an Erinyes. More detail on this can be found in Lloyd-Jones (1989) and (1990) esp. 204. Further corroboration for this thesis comes from Euripides himself where he "apparently *equates* avenging spirits with Erinyes at [*Med*] 1059, where Medea swears μὰ τοὺς παρ' Ἅιδῃ νερτέρους ἀλάστορας" (Eden (1988) 560). If this notion is analogous with the use of ἀλάστωρ here, the third option listed above is both best and clearest. It also means that parallels can legitimately be drawn between the use of "ἀλάστωρ" in this play and the role of the Erinyes in the *Oresteia*, cf. Introduction IV.

ἀρτιμαθής, "having just learned", is a *hapax* (the variation in the MS. is not significant). The Scholiast takes ἀρτι- in a slightly different sense, "having *accurately* learned". This would suggest 688 is a statement and not a question. It also makes Hadley's interpretation of παιδός in 688 even more tenuous.

Textually, the readings adopted by Porson, Paley, Daitz and Diggle are preferable to Murray's 685 γόων and 687 νόμον (which is the reading adopted by implication by Nussbaum (1986) 409). Murray nevertheless does deserve attention, since it is possible and its adoption would prejudice the interpretation presented above of ἀλάστωρ. As Mossman (1990) 291 n.6 notes, γόον or γόων make more sense as a gloss on νόμον than vice-versa. The accusative is not exceptional in this context, cf. *Or* 960 (cited above) where the genitive alternate in the MSS. does not scan. Murray sets βακχεῖον...νόμον as an accusative of apposition, to γόων, and can be construed, but is

overall less desirable and with less MSS. support.

688 ἄτην παιδός has been taken two ways. Tierney rightly places it in an immediate context, where παιδός = Polydorus, and his "ruin" is his death. Hadley has removed it from the present context, referring to Paris, ἄτην then = an active, working curse, recapitulating on the second stasimon, 629-57.

ὦ δύστηνε σύ is perhaps a colloquial expression, cf. Aristoph *Clouds* 398 ὦ μῶρε σὺ. At any rate, it shows the familiarity with which the chorus holds Hecuba. It is conceivable that the line should be attributed to the servant, which both explains the colloquialism, and is complicated by the familiarity. There is an extant difficulty of just this nature at 708.

689-90 Stanford (*Frogs* 1335-36) says Euripides "was addicted to using repetitions to stimulate [and, presumably, simulate] emotion", and notes, in addition to the four repetitions here, the 18 in *Or* 1369-1502, and the 3 in *Hel* 648-51 (as well as the 7 in Aesch *Sup* 836-63.) This is technically known as *anadiplosis*. Repetition of this type lends itself well to parody, viz. Aristoph *Frogs* 1336, 53. cf. 908, 1031, 1092, 1098. For other examples of a word being repeated after an apostrophe, cf. *And* 843 ἀπόδος, ὦ φίλα, 'πόδος, *Alc* 218, *Pho* 818, *Cyc* 510, *Rhe* 346-47, 357-58, 385, Aesch *PV* 577. It actually represents nothing remarkable linguistically, merely the speaker picking up where he left off before the interjection.

καινὰ is used euphemistically for "strange", as it is at 1038, *Sup* 92 καινὰς ἐσβολὰς ὁρῶ λόγων·, *Hel* 1513, Soph *Phil* 52, *Tra* 613. cf. the use of νεός at *Tro* 1160, *Sup* 91, 99, 1032, *Her* 382, *Hip* 79?. Latin does the same thing with *novus*.

κυρεῖ, "follow", is also used in a very similar sentiment with anadiplosis at *IT* 865, 867 ἄλλα δ' ἐξ ἄλλων κυρεῖ | δαίμονος τύχαι τινός.

691-92 Diggle accepts Hermann's emendations of these lines, and while this is clearly acceptable with ἀστένακτος ἀδάκρυτος (the reading of the MSS being nonsensical), reading 'πισχήσει for μ'

ἐπισχήσει is less certain. Two arguments can be presented in favour of excising μ':

1. Scansion. μέρα 'πισχήσει is a normal dochmiac (⏑ - - - -)

    and μέρα μ'ἐπισχήσει is not (⏑ - ⏑ - - -). However, while the passage is predominantly dochmiac with some (spoken) iambics, 706 - ⏑ - ⏑ - ⏑ - is a non-dochmiac lekuthion. Preserving the reading of the MSS, yields a kaibelianus (an abnormal dochmiac) which is also found among normal dochmiacs at *Alc* 401 ἐγώ σ' ἐγώ, μᾶτερ, and the responding 413 ἔβας τέλος σὺν τᾷδ'· Scansion is therefore not a necessary reason to excise μ'.

2. Interpretation. If μ' = μοι (an interpretation Ambrose attributes to Murray), ἐπισχήσει = "hold out", and therefore "continue", i.e. "will pass by for me". This elision would be more welcome in lyric or epic than in tragedy. This is a lyric passage, though. Ambrose's suggestion that this *means* μ' is a later interpolation is wrong. The alternative is that μ' = με. Here ἐπισχήσει = "keep", and therefore "prevent", i.e. "will stop me (from grieving.)"

There is nothing wrong with this interpretation, and so there is nothing wrong with preserving the reading of the MSS.

695/6 θνήσκεις should not be taken as a historical present (e.g. Lembke and Reckford) but rather "what is the death you died?", cf. Virgil *Aen* 8.294-5 *tu Cresia mactas prodigia.*

697 This is her first guess that Polydorus may have been murdered. Her question at 699-700 seeks to confirm this.

698 κυρῶ, a vivid present, normally takes the genitive, but cf. Aesch *ST* 699 βίον εὖ κυρήσας. Tierney's note indicates that he believes both this and 701 to be spoken by the chorus, which would be wrong.

699-701 Etymologically similar to the Latin *cadaver* and the English *carcass*, πέσημα is also found at *Pho* 1701 ὦ φίλα πεσήματ' ἄθλι' ἀθλίου πατρός and *And* 652-3.

ἐν ψαμάθῳ λευρᾷ is to be taken with ἔκβλητον (the intervening phrase being almost parenthetical.) A body washed ashore would be found on *smooth* sand, in the littoral zone of the foreshore. Hecuba does not realize that the alternatives she offers are not mutually exclusive. Porson attributed only 699 to Hecuba, and 700-01 to the θεράπαινα, which also makes sense, loses some irony, gains in factual description, but is overall less desirable.

ἐξήνεγκε cf. Thucydides 1.54.1 ἐξενεχθέντων ὑπό τε τοῦ ῥου καὶ ἀνέμου.

702-07 These lines confirm that what the audience learned from the ghost of Polydorus 1-54 was also learned, in one form or another, by Hecuba in her nightmare described 66-95. There are two echoes of her description. The first is μελανόπτερον, which recalls 71 μελανοπτερύγων. Aristophanes inflates this at *Frogs* 1336 μελανονεκυείμονα, 'black-corpse-clad'. The second is φάντασμα. Though the MSS reading φάσμα makes sense, echoes 70, and scans, Matthiae's conjecture is preferable. It still makes sense, and recalls 70 φάσμασιν. The fact that two consecutive words each recall a particular passage (70-71) suggests how the error could have been introduced originally. Stylistic variation is found elsewhere in the play (see note on 928-32.) Scansion also argues against the reading of the MSS. As it stands, the lines scan as follows: 704 doch + cr, 705 cr + cr, 706 lekuthion (named in antiquity after Aristophanes *Frogs* 1208 etc.) Abnormal dochmiacs "occur as isolated metra here and there, scarcely ever in sequences" (West (1982) 110.) Following the emendation, scansion regularizes for the most part: 704 doch + doch, 705 doch, 706, lek. This is more acceptable. (Line 702 is not *extra metrum*, but must be scanned with 703. This produces double dochmiacs.)

ἔμαθον is an instantaneous aorist, "I (just now) understood."

παραβαίνω is being used metaphorically, "escape".

ἅν = Doric ἥν, referring to ὄψιν (704). Diggle's *apparatus* omit s Hermann's conjectured

τὰν, adopted by Murray, though the only apparent purpose of this suggestion is to ensure that the final syllable in the previous line is scanned long.

σοῦ (and ὄντος) is adopted by Diggle because of the relative rarity in tragedy of ἀμφι + accusative = "concerning"; there are however a substantial number of parallels that make such an emendation unnecessary: cf. *Tro* 511 ἀμφί μοι Ἴλιον, *Or* 1538, *Rh* 932, Soph *Tra* 937, Aesch *Sup* 246, *Ag* 715 (corrupt); also, note the early use of what a hymn or ode is 'about': Homer *Hymn* 7.1, 19.1, 22.1, 33.1, Pindar *P* 2.15-6, *I* 7.9, etc. It may be right, though.

Διὸς ἐν φάει, "in the light of day", is the same as the Latin phrases *sub Jove* and *sub Divo*.

709 It is common in Greek to use οἶδα + infinitive = 'to be able to *x*.' ὀνειρόφρων is a *hapax*, "understanding dreams". The context does not allow for any interpretation other than understanding one's own dream. cf. Aesch *Per* 224 θυμόμαντις.

710-1 There are many verbal echoes of lines 6-14 in this couplet, which strengthens the connection between Hecuba's nightmare and the prologue: as she begins to interpret her dream, she uses many of the same words as Polydorus used.

For example, ξένος echoes 7 ξένου. The Greek concept of guest-friendship (ξένια) had a special set of moral obligations, which are of particular importance to this play. The word is used fifteen times, cf. 26, 715, 774, 781, 890, 1047, 1216 etc. The relationship was what bound foreigners to each other, and was the presumption of goodwill in Greek ethics that lasted until warranted otherwise. Benveniste (1973) 278-79 associates the word with the equally important notion of φίλια, and cf. Arnott (1959) 183-84 and Adkins (1966) 204-05 who argues that it is not self-evidently ἀδίκος to kill a ξένος, that "killing a ξένος as a χάρις to a φίλος" is acceptable. While I am sure that there are instances where this is true, the emphasis on the word and concept in the play is paramount. A ξένος was under the protection of Zeus Xenios, whose power can be seen to be the overriding νόμος Hecuba later invokes (800 and see note): "The stranger who had a *xenos* in a foreign land - and every other community was foreign soil - had an effective substitute

for kinsmen, a protector, representative, and ally. He had a refuge if he were forced to flee his home..." (Finley (1965) 112).

Θρῄκιος recalls 7 Θρῃκίου (see note on 682). ἱππότας echoes 9 φίλιππον (cf. Homer *Il* 10.437, 14.227.) ἵνα, "where", here refers to Thrace, though properly it should go with ξένος, "with whom". There is a ἵνα clause in 11, and it is also used with an indicative in 2, cf. *And* 652-53. πατὴρ is in both 711 and 11. Finally, κρύψας recalls 6 ὑπεξέπεμψε and 14 ὑπεξέπεμψεν, all of which imply concealment from the enemy. For possible stage direction at this line, see note 683.

713 The use of the future in τί λέξεις provides "a still more emphatic reference to a present intention" (*MT* 72); Verrall (*Med* 1310) explains it thus: "The future points to the inability of a person receiving bad news to grasp the truth at first. He speaks as though he still had to hear it." cf. 511, 1124, *Hip* 353, *Ion* 1113, *Pho* 1274 (where Jocasta's answer, οὐ φίλ', ἀλλ' ἔπου, shows she has understood the question as if it had been asked in the present or aorist), Soph *Phi* 1233.

The use of an interjection before τί λέξεις is usual, οἴμοι being the most common.

714-5 The tricolon crescendo is a common rhetorical device whereby three elements are presented such that each successive element is longer than the one preceding. It was "very much favoured by, for example, Tacitus, Macaulay, and Sir Winston Churchill" (Fraenkel (1957) 351 n.1) but is also found in Euripides at 811, *Tro* 1313-4, *Hyps* p.80. Fraenkel lists other examples. In the present instance, the second element θαυμάτων πέρα is a phrase also found at *IT* 839-40 θαυμάτων | πέρα καὶ λόγου πρόσω τάδ' ἀπέβα. Euripides also uses θαυμάτων at *Bac* 667, 716. For πέρα + genitive = "beyond" cf. *IT* 900 μύθων πέρα, Pausanias 4.5.6.10 ὡς ἀνόσιά τε καὶ πέρα δεινῶν εἰργασμένον. Nor is the use of a comparative to express amazement especially remarkable: cf. *Hip* 1217, *Cyc* 376, *Sup* 844.

Hadley is probably right in reading οὐχ ὅσι' οὐδ' ἀνεκτά as indicating an offence against

both the gods and men, but especially Zeus, cf. 345. With this in mind, ξένων should be interpreted as both subjective and objective, and translated accordingly, "between friends". The sanctity of strangers has already been established in the play, at 26. Herodotus 6.35.2 gives a similar incident in the life of Miltiades, which also transpires in the Chersonese.

The scansion here is slightly irregular because of the kaibelianus (= iambic tripody) in the second foot, but it should still be considered a double dochmiac; 1084 presents a kaibelianus in the first foot, cf. *Bac* 983 ~ 1003, *Hip* 593, *Pho* 114, 183 (which are sometimes emended away), and Dale (1968) 133f, to which Barrett adds Aesch *Prom Pyrk* (?) fr. 343.34ff Mette = Fr. 278 Lloyd-Jones, in Smyth, *Aesch.* Barrett's judgement (*Hip* 565-600) is that such "obdurate cases" are acceptable but rare, but he also cautions that many corruptions may enter the MSS tradition because of the double dochmiac's "superficial resemblance to an iambic trimeter."

716 The partitive genitive in κατάρατε ἀνδρῶν almost gives the force of a superlative (cf. 192.) Barrett (*Hip* 848-51) calls this form of address "an old use" dating to Homer. Other examples in Euripides are *Hip* 848-49 and *Alc* 460 ὦ φίλα γυναικῶν, *Hcld* 567 ὦ τάλαινα παρθένων. cf. Aristophanes *Frogs* 835, 1049, 1227, *Ecc* 567, 784, Aesch *Sup* 967, Homer, *Il* 6.305, *Od* 14.361, 443, 21.288, Theognis 1307, Theocritus 15.74.

διεμοιράσω is used literally of cleaving the body, but cf. *Hip* 1376-77 διαμοιρᾶσαι κατά τ' εὐνᾶσαι | τὸν ἐμὸν βίοτον, where it refers to Hippolytus who in his grief calls out for his own destruction. It has much the same force (and construction) as 782 διατεμὼν. The discovery of the wounds formally answers the question asked at the beginning of 695, and tells that Polydorus' death was no accidental drowning.

718 Although σιδαρέῳ is metallurgically anachronistic, this probably would not have mattered. It is possible that the word is intended to recall the geographical setting of the play, since in the fifth century, the monetary units of Byzantium were known as οἱ σιδάρεοι.

720 For scansion purposes, μέλεα is given rather than the more usual contracted form, μέλη, from μέλος "limb".

721-22 ὥς is causal. Note that what appears to be a colon at the end of 721 in Diggle's text is a typographical error and should not be there. Line 722 is repeated for the most part at 1087, where it is interpolated (see Page (1934) 103-5.) The δαίμων of this line is not to be identified concretely with the ἀλάστωρ of 686, because ὅστις, being indefinite, marks its antecedent (δαίμων) also as indefinite. ἔθηκεν (like 111 ἔσχε and 656 τιθέναι) is used in the Ionic sense, = ποιεῖν. For possible stage directions at this point, see note 683.

724-25 Strictly, this is no longer part of the κομμός, but rather a formal choral introduction preparing for the entrance of Agamemnon. "Marking the appearance of a new character on the stage" (*GP* 103) ἀλλ' εἰσορῶ γὰρ can also be found at *HF* 138 (where see Bond), 442 (add to Parry's footnote), *Or* 725, *El* 107, *Bac* 1165, *Hip* 51, Aesch *PV* 941, εἰσορῶ alone also being used to announce entries at *Alc* 24, *Cyc* 35. Parry calls the formula "a means of turning the eyes of the audience towards an actor who has just come onto the stage" (1971, 292.) It is best to translate taking εἰσορῶ γὰρ τοῦδε δεσπότου δέμας | 'Αγαμέμνονος as parenthetical. The periphrasis δέμας 'Αγαμέμνονος in some instances would recognize and welcome the actual physical presence (see Bond *HF* 1036) but here is a *formal* greeting, of their captor cf. the affectionate periphrasis in 676; also *IA* 417 σῆς Κλυταιμήστρας δέμας, *Or* 107, *El* 1341, *HF* 1036, Soph *Ant* 945, *OC* 1550, Aesch *Eum* 84, Virgil *Aen* 7.650 *corpore Turni*. The Homeric distinction between a living δέμας and a dead σῶμα does not hold in Attic. The hortatory σιγῶμεν is not that the chorus must keep the matter of Polydorus a secret, nor even particularly that they tell themselves to "hush up." It is partly coming to order on the entrance of their master, and also allowing Hecuba, their former queen, to function as their spokesperson.

726 μέλλεις + present or future indicative = "hesitate, delay".

727-28 The couplet recapitulates Hecuba's words to Talthybius at 604-8. ἐφ' οἷσπερ is relative attraction for ἐπὶ τούτοις ἅ (so Tierney and Ambrose, who render "under the conditions which") cf. *And* 821 ἐφ' οἷσιν ἦλθες ἀγγέλλουσα σύ, *Or* 564 ἐφ' οἷς δ' ἀπειλεῖς ὡς πετρωθῆναί με χρή. For the resolution in the fourth foot, cf. 1240-42 note.

729-30 The position of the epsilon in οὐδ' ἐψαύομεν is open to question. Nauck's version (adopted by Diggle) makes sense, and does avoid the violation of Porson's law (cf. *And* 346, *IA* 530) but exceptions do exist (see West (1982) 84-5) which might excuse the original reading of the MSS.

ὥστε = "so as" to astonish me. *MT* 584 notes that "we generally translate ... *so that I am astonished*, as if it were ὥστε θαυμάζω ἐγώ, simply because we cannot use our infinitive with a subject expressed." ὥστε + infinitive introduces "a result which a previous act tends to produce" (587.1).

731-32 τἀκεῖθεν refers to the preparations described 572-80. It is "matters from there" because it is at the place *from which* he has just come, cf. Latin *ex ille parte* "on that side"; also Soph *OC* 505 τοὐκεῖθεν, Aesch *ST* 40, cf. *Hec* 1152 ἔνθεν "on the other side". Although ἔχω + adverb is more common, ἐστὶν is acceptable, and is also used at 532.

καλῶς as an adjective, cf. *Hcld* 369-70 τοῦ ταῦτα καλῶς ἂν εἴη παρά γ' εὖ φρονοῦσιν;

733 In Euripides, ἔα always indicates surprise, cf. 1116. Page *Med* 1004 gives examples. As at 19, ἄνδρα is used in attributive apposition (Smyth 986). Here it demonstrates the sequence of recognized details: "What man is this I see by the tent? dead? and a Trojan?"

734-35 With οὐ γὰρ 'Αργεῖον, sc. ὄντα. While strictly speaking only a woman's garment (933, *Med* 786, in plural *Bac* 833), here and at *Cyc* 301 ξένιά τε δοῦναι καὶ πέπλοις ἐπαρκέσαι,

πέπλοι is used of "clothes" in general. The singular is used for men's clothing at *Cyc* 327, *IT* 1218. "Strangers' clothing regularly excites attention as an indication of their race" (Friis Johansen and Whittle, Aesch *Sup* 234) cf. *Hcld* 130-31 καὶ μὴν στολήν γ' Ἕλληνα καὶ ῥυθμὸν πέπλων | ἔχει, τὰ δ' ἔργα βαρβάρου χερὸς τάδε, *IT* 246, *Rh* 313, *Hyps* pp.78-9, Soph *Phil* 223-24, Aesch *Sup* 234, fr. 59 ὅστις χιτῶνας βασσάρας τε Λυδίας | ἔχει ποδήρεις, and, also from *Edonians*, fr. 61 ποδαπὸς ὁ γύννις; τίς πάτρα; τίς ἡ στολή; Lucian *Cont* 9. Yet here it seems somewhat artificial for there to be identifiable clothing on a body which has been adrift on the sea for up to three days. Both Menelaus in the *Helen*, and Odysseus in *Odyssey* 6 are naked after a shipwreck, which naturally recalls 679 γυμνωθὲν. As was mentioned there, it is less desirable dramaturgically to have a 'naked' dummy body which gets clothed by attendant servants during the κομμός, Compare the use of δέμας with 724. Based on analogy with these lines, Page prefers δέμας to χέρας at *Med* 1206-07 ᾤμωξε δ' εὐθὺς καὶ περιπτύξας χέρας | κυνεῖ προσαυδῶν τοιάδ'·

736-51 These lines constitute "one of the most striking pieces of stage action to be found in Greek tragedy" (Bain (1977) 13) in that they represent both the earliest, and the longest, extant example of the use of an aside. The use of the term tends to be imprecise and can be misleading. Though Bain gives a narrow definition, it is consistent and is the only way to understand the device as having dramatic interest. The definition is this: "When X and Y are on stage together, an aside is any utterance by either speaker not intended to be heard by the other and not in fact heard, or properly heard by him" (17). This particular formulation is useful, since it avoids meta-theatrics, dealing exclusively with the character's intentions. It is unlikely, though possible that other characters on stage (such as the chorus) do hear the lines; it is equally possible that more than one person is meant to be excluded. It would be wrong to think of Hecuba's lines as being delivered *sub voce* to the servant, who is still onstage, see note on 778. What is important with this convention of the stage is that although the lines must be delivered with sufficient volume that they can be heard at the back of the theatre, the characters in question *absolutely can not* be thought to have heard them. Lembke and Reckford's belief that the lines are "orchestrated for

Agamemnon's benefit" could not be more wrong: it is a convention of the stage that is being introduced, and not the guile of Hecuba. Lembke and Reckford's interpretation is appropriate for an equally striking, but completely different scene, that of the merchant in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*.

As an example of an aside, Bain mentions Shakespeare *Othello* III.iv.34-5:

Oth: Well, my good lady; - O, hardness to dissemble!-
How do you, Desdemona?
Des: Well, my good lord.

If Desdemona had heard "O, hardness to dissemble" (the aside) her answer would not have been "Well, my good lord". Yet her answer does demonstrate that she has clearly heard both the preceding and the following phrases. All of Hecuba's lines in this passage are spoken aside, and are not heard by Agamemnon. Agamemnon's lines help reconstruct some of the stage action (e.g. Hecuba has her back turned to him) which is useful in terms of theatre history because it suggests that the ancient attitude to, and way of dealing with, an aside is similar to the modern one. The stage action (turning) shows that at least some degree of naturalism was present in ancient acting techniques. The convention, present but not frequent elsewhere in Euripides, became commonplace in Greek and Roman New Comedy. In general, my interpretation of these lines follows that of Bain (1977) 13-19. cf. 674-75, 812-23 which are commonly, though wrongly, labelled asides (Bain (1977) 31-33.)

The sustained use of the device, however, is remarkable, and its overall effect is quite similar to Shakespeare *Henry VI part 1* V.iii.60-109 in the dialogue (if such it can be called) between Suffolk and Margaret, an excerpt of which follows (72-80):

Mar: Say, Earl of Suffolk, if thy name be so,
What ransom must I pay before I pass?
For I perceive I am thy prisoner.
Suf: [*Aside*] How canst thou tell she will deny thy suit, 75
Before thou make a trial of her love?
Mar: Why speak'st thou not? What ransom must I pay?

Suf: [*Aside*] She's beautiful, and therefore to be woo'd;

She is a woman, therefore to be won.

Mar: Wilt thou accept a ransom - yea or no? 80

The exchange continues, Margaret hearing nothing as he speaks. This example shows the complete artificiality of the situation, but nevertheless its dramatic effect. Margaret's impatience without a response is of exactly the same nature as Agamemnon's in the present example.

736-38 Self-address is present elsewhere in Euripides (*El* 112-3, *Tro* 98-104). The Scholiast wrongly applies **δύστηνε** to Polydorus, with Hecuba then turning to address herself (**πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀποστραφεῖσα λέγει**.) But **ἐμαυτὴν γὰρ λέγω**, "I mean myself", clearly shows that neither Agamemnon nor Polydorus can be meant, cf. Herodotus 7.144.7, Isocrates *Panath* 277, Cicero *de Fin* 5.3 *me autem dicebat*. Despite its use in New Comedy, the Scholiast also indicates Didymus was unfamiliar with the device (also cited by Tierney): **τὸ δὲ δύστηνε ὁ Διδυμός φησι πρὸς τὸν Πολύδωρον λέγειν τὴν Ἑκάβην, ὦ δύστηνε Πολύδορε, ἐμαυτὴν γὰρ λέγω, δύστηνον ἀποκαλοῦσα σέ**. She returns to the first person in the next line. **λέγουσα σέ** poses a slight problem, as literally she has not yet said "**σέ**", though it must be self-quotation. Hadley understands **σε** with the vocative **δύστηνε**, i.e. as if she had said "**δύστηνε σύ**." It is fair to wonder why she does not continue **τί δράσεις;** The relative novelty of the aside required such a transition to function *as a clue* to the aside, to make the audience realize that something unusual was occurring. Thus Paley rightly follows Dindorf in taking together **δύστηνε Ἑκάβη**, the rest of 736 being a justification for her self-address in the vocative. As at 260, **πότερα** introduces alternate possibilities, and often only the **ἦ** need be translated. **προσπέσω** + accusative is also found at Aesch *ST* 94-95 **πότερα δῆτ' ἐγὼ <πάτρια> προσπέσω βρέτη δαιμόνων;** (where **πάτρια** is supplied from the Scholiast.) The deliberative subjunctive does not affect how **δράσω** is understood.

739-40 The poetical form of **ὀδύρομαι** - required by the metre - is rare (hence the MSS

variations), but is also found at *And 397* (which might be spurious, see Stevens) and Aesch *PV* 271, and in lyric *Med* 159, Soph *OT* 1218, and Aesch *Per* 582 . The use of the verb suggests an audible sound to which Agamemnon is responding (perhaps he has heard only the word δύστην' and is responding to that.) This need not be the case, as stage action could easily be used to represent weeping, requiring no sound. Though this is most likely, Bain (15 n.1) offers another possibility, that δύρῃ is being used in the same way that στένων is used in Soph *Phi* 806, where it refers to *inward* groaning.

Although it is favoured by Diggle, Collard, Murray (who lists no MSS variations), Bain (1977, 14 n.1) and Biehl (1984) 131-35, I do not believe πραχθὲν, 'what has been done,' is the correct reading, even though it is found in the majority of MSS (including Triclinius.) Two other readings are found, and should be considered:

1 κρανθὲν, from κραίνω, 'what has been done / brought to pass.' It is found written in G, and in K as a correction by the first hand. This is the reading favoured by both Daitz and Matthiessen (1969) 302 and, at one time, by Diggle (1975), who called the reading "a clear gain" when reviewing Daitz. Bain says Euripides' use of τὸ κρανθέν always implies a *divine* element, but overstates his case. Though he is right about *Ion* 77, he is less certain about the corrupt *Hip* 868 (even Barrett suggests a neutral meaning: 'what has come to pass.') Though it is true that κραίνειν is 'regularly used of decrees of gods and fate' (Stevens *And* 1272, cf. Fraenkel *Ag* 369), it is often used with ψῆφος, of voting (i.e. something irrevocable, Willinck's 'the unalterable situation.') cf. 219, *Or* 1023, *Tro* 785, Aesch *Sup* 943. Bain's argument rests on his desire for a neutral meaning (cf. *Hip* 842) and is influenced by Fraenkel to believe such is not possible with κρανθὲν, which is not the case. κρανθὲν is a slightly rarer word (suggesting *diff. pot.*), has a synonymous meaning to the more common reading, and is present early enough in the tradition (the late 13th century, just before Triclinius) to warrant it being preferable to πραχθέν.

2 κραθὲν is found as the original of B and K (before each was corrected) and in Diggle's Π_1 (= Daitz' Π_4) = P.Oxy. 876 [Pack^2 389], dating from the fifth century A.D., and therefore predating all other readings by at least 500 years (Π_8 is illegible at this point.) Daitz (XIII n.1) uses this reading to strengthen his case, saying κραθὲν = κρανθὲν, by which he means the former is an abbreviation of the latter. Although the nu is not part of the κραίνω-root, it is present in every form. For it in this one instance to have an optional form could seem too convenient, did *Or* 1023 not give κραθέντ' as an alternate to κρανθέντ' in M (before correction), V, L, P. I am nevertheless tempted to posit κραθὲν, from κεράννυμι = "what has been mixed/diluted", as of wine - cf. Cyc 557 πῶς οὖν κέκραται; Ion 1016, fr. 472.5-8 (*Cretans*)

οὓς αὐθιγενὴς τμηθεῖα δοκὸς
στεγανοὺς παρέχει Χαλύβῳ πελέκει
καὶ ταυροδέτῳ κόλλῃ κραθεῖσ'
ἀτρεκεῖς ἁρμοὺς κυπαρίσσου

- being used here metaphorically for "what has been garbled." It would normally be scanned long, so there is no metrical problem.) If this reading were correct, it would then constitute another direct reference to the fact that 736-8 was spoken as an aside: the fact that Agamemnon could not make out what Hecuba had said, that it was garbled. Such a reference is appropriate for the probable novelty of the convention (no earlier example survives which suggests a recent development and possibly that this was the first use.) Serving the same function is Agamemnon mentioning that Hecuba has turned her back. This interpretation is also not limited by any way of understanding δύρῃ. It certainly is a rare word, and it is easy to imagine a transition to "what has happened" - κρανθὲν - as familiarity with the convention of the aside developed (as it clearly did with Menander and the New Comedy.)

Arguing against this possibility is Aesch *Ag* 321 οἶμαι βοὴν ἄμεικτον ἐν πόλει πρέπειν which is typically taken to refer to cries *that do not blend* being heard clearly. Since ἄμικτος and κεράννυμι are used in opposing senses in Plato *Philebus* 61b it seems unlikely that the metaphorical leap required could be effected (the notion of clarity in the passage in the *Agamemnon* being part of the verb πρέπειν.)

It therefore seems that κρανθὲν is the best of the possible readings, and that the lines should be translated: "Why do you weep, turning your back on me, and do not say what has been done? Who is this?"

741-42 Hecuba continues the aside and ignores Agamemnon's questions. The sentiment she expresses is similar to Helen's at *Tro* 914-5: ἴσως με, κἂν εὖ κἂν κακῶς δόξω λέγειν, | οὐκ ἀνταμείψῃ πολεμίαν ἡγούμενος. The parallel is not exact, since the *Troades* passage is the beginning of the *agon* between Helen and Hecuba, and supplication is not involved.

ἀπώσαιτο + genitive = "thrust (me) away from". The repetition of ἄν (cf. 359-60, three times at 1199-1200) is frequent, and it is only slightly unusual in so short a clause, see *MT* 223, and Denniston *El* 534. cf. *El* 1047-48, *Med* 250-51, 616-17, *Hip* 961, *And* 77, 934-35, *Tro* 985, 1244, *IT* 98, 245. Again there is a structural allusion to the earlier scene with Odysseus, when the possibility of the person supplicated refusing to act in accordance with the supplicator's desires is mentioned.

743-44 It is common in Greek (cf. 332) to use the perfect of φύω to mean "to be (by nature)", by extension from the primary meaning "to have been born." μὴ + participle (κλύων) creates a conditional force (*MT* 841), "unless by hearing." ἐξιστορῆσαι (cf. 236) = "to search out", or perhaps better "to follow" which preserves the metaphorical use of ὁδὸν, which itself is common: *Hip* 290 γνώμης ὁδόν, *Pho* 911 ἄκουε δή νυν θεσφάτων ἐμῶν ὁδόν, *Med* 376, Soph *OT* 67, 311, Aesch *Eum* 989, *Ag* 1154, Pindar *O* 8.13, Thuc 1.122, and also Aristoph *Pax* 124 where literal

and metaphorical meanings meet.

745-46 γε adds liveliness to the question posed by ἆρα (*GP* 50). μᾶλλον = "too much." φρένας should be taken as "purpose", as it is at *Ion* 1271-72 ἐν συμμάχοις γὰρ ἀνεμετρησάμην φρένας | τὰς σάς, ὅσου μοι πῆμα δυσμενής τ' ἔφυς·

747 εἴ τοι cf. *GP* 546, the particle combination in conditional protasis is also found at *El* 77 εἴ τοι δοκεῖ σοι, στεῖχε, *Hip* 507.

748 It is fair to assume that Agamemnon, thinking Hecuba is not going to respond to him, begins to turn away from her as if to exit where he came onstage. This line was later reused by Euripides, with change only in the last two feet, at *Or* 1280 ἐς ταὐτὸν ἥκεις· καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ τῇδ' ὄχλος. (cf. also 279 = *Or* 66 ταύτῃ γέγηθε κἀπιλήθεται κακῶν.) A similar feature has been observed in Tennyson's poetry, and is explained by Ricks (1966). Barrett notes that the phrase ἐς ταὐτόν ἥκεις can mean one of two things: "(a) you are (after a given action) in the same position as you were or would be after another action" e.g. *Hip* 273, *El* 787, *IA* 1002; "or (b) you are in the same position as someone else" e.g. *Or* 1280, where sc. ἐμοί, *IA* 665, Scholia on *Hip* 273. He wrongly identifies the present instance as (b) when it is in fact (a): Agamemnon is saying that Hecuba will soon come to a point where it will no longer matter whether she speaks to him or not. It is necessary to understand βούλομαι (from 747 βούλῃ) with ἐγὼ κλύειν. Parry (1971) 294 includes ἐς ταὔτον ἥκεις· καὶ γὰρ οὐδε (both here and at *Or* 1280) among a list of six phrases "by which a character who has just come upon the stage can begin his speech, or by which the thought can be carried back and forth between actors in the give and take of dramatic conversation". What this implies is that, despite the asides, the 'rules' of stichomythia (such as they exist) are being followed.

749-50 Verbs of avenging (like τιμωρεῖν here, or ἀμύνειν) are clearly defined in terms of the

cases which they take. The dative (τέκνοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι) indicates the person avenged (Smyth 1376). An accusative represents the person punished, with the crime itself sometimes being regarded as the offender. A genitive indicates the wrong done, or the cause (Smyth 1445). When the verb is found in the middle form (as it is in 756 and 882) it means "to avenge oneself on" and therefore at times = "to punish". Cf. Herodotus 3.145 καί σφεας τιμωρήσομαι τῆς ἐνθάδε ἀπίξιος ("And I shall punish them for coming here"); Xenophon *Anabasis* 7.4.23 τιμωρήσασθαι αὐτοὺς τῆς ἐπιθέσεως ("to take revenge on them for this attack"); *Cyropaedeia* 4,6,8 τιμωρήσειν σοι τοῦ παιδὸς τὸν φονέα ὑποσχνοῦμαι ("I promise to avenge you for the murder of your son." Revenge in Greek morality can be ambiguous (as in the modern world) but in all of these instances, it represents meet and acceptable behaviour, as should be expected with the word's etymological link with τίμη; cf. Introduction I, II, IV. The word is used in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus four times, at *Ag* 1280, 1324, 1578, and *Cho* 143.

In mentioning revenge at this point, Hecuba initiates her consolidated effort to reclaim her former glory, which she will accomplish through her righteous revenge upon Polymestor. This is the first time the word has been used (and its omission from the prologue is probably significant , cf. Introduction IV, and note its omission in 262-65 where the notion but not the vocabulary of revenge are strongly present). The use introduces a key word of the play (always used by Hecuba of this revenge-action, cf. 756, 790, 843, 882, 1258) and initiates the key movement of the story. She is at this point the lowest in status she ever is in the play (see Introduction VI), and the decline in status has been continual since she first appeared on stage. Even though at this point (cf. 751) she is as open to failure as success, she at least will no longer be passive. Testall (1954) rightly notes that this constitutes a genuine moment of surprise in the play.

Like the Latin *volvo*, στρέφω comes to = "hesitate" from its more primary meaning of 'revolving' thoughts. It is not a reference to physical position.

751 Hecuba steels her courage and ends her aside. The use of the double κἂν (crasis for καὶ ἐὰν, see *GP* 324) is stronger than just "whether ... or". Despite the grammatical irregularities in

English, a translation should include both possibilities rather than exclude one: "I must be bold, both if I succeed, and even if I do not succeed."

752-53 In addressing Agamemnon, Hecuba turns and falls in the traditional position of supplication, cf. 286 (see Gould (1973) 75-77). She surprises him before he can turn away, as Odysseus did in 342. The sanctity of the suppliant was absolute, cf. Thetis in Homer *Il* 1.407, 500-02, and Priam in book 24. Conacher (1961) wrongly believes that Hecuba's supplication constitutes a debasement. What Agamemnon *hears* is a two line speech (even though the audience has heard three other lines aside.) He responds with a two-line speech (754-55) as does Hecuba (756-57, but see note.) In effect, she has selected the former alternative that she had suggested 737-8. Murray printed an ellipse after 753, assuming that Agamemnon was cutting Hecuba off before a long supplicatory speech was under way. This is unnecessary. The sentence makes satisfactory sense as it stands, and it is normal for characters to continue one another's grammar, though this is a particular feature of stichomythia.

754-55 τί χρῆμα indicates astonishment, cf. Aesch *PV* 298. Homer uses the verb ματεύω, but by the fifth century it has become interchangeable with the more metrically convenient μαστεύω. Euripides uses both (μαστεύω: here, *Hel* 597, *Pho* 36; ματεύω: 779, 815 - note again Euripides' tendency to repeat rare words in a close proximity to each other), as does Aeschylus (*Ag* 1099 (though Schütz emends this away); *Ag* 1094; *Cho* 219) and Pindar (*P* 3.107, 4.62, *N* 8.73; *N* 3.53.) Sophocles uses only ματεύω (*OT* 1052, *Phi* 1210, *OC* 211) but this could easily be an accident of what survives. Hesiod fr.85 (Göttl.) has τὴν μαστεύων. As at 676, μῶν functions like the Latin *num*, with the questioner anticipating a negative response. ἐλεύθερον ... θέσθαι, "have made free", cf. the use of the active voice at 656, 722.

Exactly why this is ῥᾴδιον is neither clear nor spelled out. Pflugk thinks Agamemnon is suggesting suicide. This is ridiculous, wrong and inappropriate, and constitutes an unnecessarily cruel pun in ἐλεύθερον αἰῶνα θέσθαι. The alternative is that Agamemnon is ready to grant

Hecuba her freedom, either in respect to her old age and former status, or for the sake of Cassandra (cf. 823-32.) Paley takes this line when he paraphrases ἐμοὶ τοῦτο χαρίσασθαί σοι. But this is also not free from interpretative problems. If Hecuba need only ask for her freedom, it seems unlikely that the dramatic situation itself would exist. Deference to Hecuba's old age is possible (she is clearly meant to be thought of as frail and weak.) Weil seems to propose a reason in terms of practical theatricality: Agamemnon makes the offer *so that* Hecuba can prefer slavery to revenge. Though perhaps valid, this too is insufficient.

The uses of the word ῥᾴδιος in Euripides are not instructive: cf. e.g. *And* 232, 975, *Hcld* 268, 1022, fr. 20 (*Aeolus*) μὴ πλοῦτον εἴπῃς· οὐχὶ θαυμάζω θεόν | ὃν χὠ κάκιστος ῥᾳδίως ἐκτήσατο, fr. 360.54-5 (*Erechtheus*) καὶ ῥᾳδίως | οἰκοῖμεν ἄν σε κοὐδὲν ἂν πάσχοις κακόν.

The question that must be asked is, what authority does Agamemnon have over Hecuba? The evidence is slight. This problem has led a few editors to offer emendations: θέσθαι, πάλιν ὃν οὐκέτ' ἔστι σοι; F. Gu. Schmidt; ῥᾴδιον δ' οὐκ ἔστι μοι Heimsoeth; or, following Blaydes' τόδ' for γάρ, reading θέσθ'; οὐ ῥᾴδιον τόδ' ἐστί σοι (emending in this way does support cutting 756-58, or 756-59, where see note.) But all of these are also insufficient solutions. The allocation of all the prisoners of war has taken place (100-01.) In Euripides' later treatment of the same event, Hecuba is told *Tro* 277 Ἰθάκης Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔλαχ' ἄναξ δούλην σ' ἔχειν. This is especially cruel, in her mind, and demonstrates how chance seems to be working against her. At what point did this detail enter the story? The absence of evidence leaves the matter open. Presumably, every survivor is assigned to somebody in the tradition. If Hecuba is then traditionally assigned to Odysseus, her relationship with him in the first episode of this play is obscured (to what end?) and there is no reference in the *Odyssey* to the fact it is off of his ship that she falls. It certainly would not be ῥᾴδιον for Agamemnon to free Odysseus' slave (cf. the dispute which opens *Iliad* 1.) If assigning Hecuba to Odysseus is an innovation of the *Troades*, as is likely, the original question is begged. Apollodorus *Epitome* 5.23.8-11 (Frazer (1921) II 240-1) suggests that there were two traditions, the antiquity of which cannot be determined. Assigning Hecuba to Odysseus is also found in Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomerica* 14.20-23, but the alternate

tradition, where she is assigned to Helenus (Dares Phrygius *De Excidio Trojae* 43) is the one, according to Apollodorus, involving the metamorphosis (see note on 1265), though the transformation is found in *Posthomerica* 14.347-51 (where it takes place on the beach.)

One factor that can be brought into consideration is the use of the central door to Agamemnon's tent (53-54): that Hecuba and Polyxena are presented as staying there, as well as (one presumes) Cassandra whom we know in the tradition (also from 826) is assigned to Agamemnon, suggests that they too are assigned to Agamemnon, at least until what is to be done with Polyxena has been decided. The Scholiast to 99 recognizes the problem, but fails to give an adequate solution: ἦν γὰρ ἡ Ἑκάβη ἐν τῇ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως σκηνῇ, ὁ δὲ χορὸς ἐν τῇ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος. διὰ τοῦτο λέγει τὰς δεσποσύνους, τουτέστι τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὅπου ἐκληρώθην εἶναι δούλη. Hecuba is old, and clearly not a desirable prize (except in terms of cruel irony, when assigned to Odysseus as in the *Troades.*) If she had been assigned to Agamemnon, either legitimately or by 'default' as mother of Cassandra, it would explain (1) why mother and daughters are all staying with Agamemnon, (2) why Odysseus will not let Hecuba die with Polyxena, and (3) why granting her freedom is ῥᾴδιον for Agamemnon. This then is surely the solution. For the purposes of this play, a third tradition (not described by Apollodorus) is operating, wherein Hecuba the Queen of Troy is assigned as a prisoner to the Leader of the Achaeans, Agamemnon. Only this accounts for the details of stage geography as well as the problem presented by this line. It also adds a powerful nuance to 864-69 (where see note and cf. Introduction VI.)

Major suggested that these lines were in Plautus' mind when he had Leonida say at *Asinaria* 274 (=2.2.8) *Aetatim velim servire, Libanum ut conveniam modo.*

756-9 There is a problem with the text here concerning the authenticity and the ordering of the lines. The MSS. and editors variously delete and rearrange these lines. Daitz keeps all of them in the traditional order, as does Murray, and I am inclined to agree, though it is worth listing the various other possibilities and evaluating their relative merits:

1. *None of the lines are genuine.* This is supported by Diggle's Π[7] (not edited, dating from the second century A.D., from Oxyrhynchus) which omits 756-59. This invalidates Weil's half-solution to the interpretation of 754-55 (as does Diggle's solution, below) but does not significantly affect the sense of the passage. Though this might suggest interpolation, it is likely that any actor's alteration would have occurred in the fourth century B.C., and would be reflected in the much later papyrus fragment. The omission could simply represents the scribe's desire to save space. Nevertheless, since the reading of Π[8] is uncertain (there appears to be enough room for all the lines, so Mossman (1990) 57), this does represent the earliest version surviving. The fact that Π[7] also omits 761 which was *in marg. infer. add. ut vid.* (Diggle) supports either viewpoint. Though it might indicate excessive sloppiness (or selection) on the part of the original scribe, it similarly could suggest that the second hand knew 761 existed but was unaware of 756-59.
2. *Deleting 756-8.* Not a lot is gained but little is lost with this alternative, which has the support of M and O, and the original reading of B, F, G, K, Triclinius etc. It does preserve three couplets before regular stichomythia, which though not required is neater.
3. *Diggle.* Diggle deletes 756-57, and reverses 758-59. These decisions should be examined separately. Lines 756-7 are not great, surely, but they do (as Weil noted) help explain the preceding couplet to an extent, and do add to the motif of slavery, discussed by Daitz (1971). Hecuba's pronouncement that she would rather be a revenged slave than simply free is dramatically similar to Philoctetes' desire that he would rather live on alone in pain than accede to Odysseus' wishes. In reordering 758-59, Diggle creates a situation artificially which supports his case for deletion. The opening syllables make the lines seem specious:

755 αἰῶνα... 756 οὐ δῆτα...

757 αἰῶνα... 759 οὐδέν τι...

Excising the lines seems unsound. The reordering is an attempt to remove the awkward couplet of 759-60 (which is also done by both of the solutions below.) Though there are no strict rules for stichomythia, it is thought that Agamemnon's single line at 758 is somehow inelegant. The rearrangement creates two couplets, then 'regular' stichomythia (counting from where Hecuba begins to speak aloud to Agamemnon again.) Again, this solution is only elegant if 756-57 is deleted. See also 759 τούτων.

4. *There is a lacuna.* Hadley says Kirchoff suspected a line of Agamemnon's has been lost after 758. Paley gives a theoretically possible, if unfounded, guess of one beginning καὶ δὴ πέπεισμαι ('Supposing I do assent...', cf. *Med* 386.) Alternately, Hermann posits a line of Agamemnon's after 759. Either of these are possible, but solve only an imagined problem.

5. *Hirzel.* Mossman (1990) 58-59 adopts a middle road between Diggle and the lacuna-theory, resurrecting Hirzel's treatment of the problem. Hirzel was the first to transpose 758-59, and had posited a lacuna after 757 (one line of Agamemnon's.) This removes any structural inelegancies, avoids the odd repetitions discussed in (3) above, and would give 759 τούτων more than one spoken suggestion to which to refer.

6. *Hartung.* Hartung deleted 759 in his commentary on *IA* (1837) which does not injure sense and removes Hecuba's 'inelegant' couplet. The argument against this is the strength of MSS. support for this line is greater than for 756-8, which are lacking in two good MSS., etc. However, he kept it in his 1850 edition of this play, writing, "Der Vers is weder zu tilgen noch durch eine Zwischenrede und Lücke von dem folgenden zu trennen, und die Stichomythie kann nicht unterbrochen sein ehe sie noch begonnen hat."

There is nothing wrong with the verses as they stand in the received text. The 'inelegancy' is imaginary: the rules, such as they exist, of stichomythia, can only apply once stichomythia has begun. Mastronarde rightly notes that Diggle's "solution is ingenious but not self-evidently correct ... the four lines 756-59 in the traditional order produce what many have found to be convincing sense" (1988, 156-57.) However, if the text is felt to be unsatisfactory because of the inelegancy, Hirzel's solution is markedly the best.

756-57 τιμωρουμένη cf. 749-50 note. θέλω (= ἐθέλω) "I am willing" rather than "I wish."

759 Using Diggle's order, τούτων must refer to 754 τί χρῆμα μαστεύουσα, and this is strained. Following the traditional order, it refers to 758 ἐπάρκεσιν. ὧν has been attracted from the accusative of δοξάζεις to the case of τούτων.

758 Euripides uses the formula καὶ δὴ to introduce a surprised question here, *Hel* 101 καὶ δὴ τί τοῦτ' Αἴαντι γίγνεται κακόν;, *El* 655, *Or* 1188. Xen *Cyr* 4.3.5 might be analogous; Aesch *Sup* 499 καὶ δὴ φίλον τις ἔκταν' ἀγνοίας ὕπο and Aristoph *Birds* 1251 are not. cf. *GP* 250.

760 To begin a question with ὁρᾷς, which is answered with ὁρῶ is a fairly common form, cf. *Ion* 1337-38 ὁρᾷς τόδ' ἄγγος χερὸς ὑπ' ἀγκάλαις ἐμαῖς; | ὁρῶ παλαιὰν ἀντίπηγ' ἐν στέμμασιν, *Hel* 797-98, *IA* 322-23, Aesch *Per* 1018-19, *PV* 69-70. οὗ, "on which", could very well be less metaphorical than one might initially suspect: having the actor stand right over the corpse could be particularly effective. That would mean that she breaks the supplication position, see note 752-3. She could just point to the corpse (τόνδ'.)

στάζω and its compounds (such as καταστάζω here) are often used transitively for shedding tears: *IA* 1466 οὐκ ἐῶ στάζειν δάκρυ, *HF* 1354-55, fr. 407.1-2 (*Ino*) ἀμουσία τοι μηδ' ἐπ' οἰκτροῖσιν δάκρυ | στάζειν, Oppian *Halieutica* 4.343-44, cf. *Ion* 876 στάζουσι κόραι δακρύοισιν ἐμαί, Xen *Cyr* 5.1.5, Timotheus *Pers* 100-01 δακρυσταγεῖ γόῳ. An intransitive use is not out of

the question however, cf. 241. In his Latin version of the *Hecuba*, Ennius rendered the line *vide nunc meae in quem lacrumae guttatim cadunt* (this was preserved in Nonius, under *guttatim*.)

761 τὸ μέλλον "what is about to come." The adversative use of μέντοι does not always require a preceding μέν, especially in verse. cf. 885, *Pho* 272 πέποιθα μέντοι μητρί, *Ion* 812, Aristoph *Clouds* 588, *Ecc* 646, *Plut* 554, see *GP* 404. μέν can exist, e.g. at *IT* 1334-35 καὶ τάδ' ἦν ὕποπτα μέν, | ἤρεσκε μέντοι σοῖσι προσπόλοις, ἄναξ.

762 This line is an example of *hysteron proteron*, where the natural order of things has been reversed for emphasis. e.g. *El* 969 πῶς γὰρ κτάνω νιν, ἥ μ' ἔθρεψε κἄτεκεν; Soph *OT* 827 ὅς ἐξέθρεψε κἀξέφυσέ με, Homer *Od* 12.134, Virgil *Aen* 2.353. The regular expression for a pregnant womb is the periphrasis found here, ζώνης ὕπο, "under (my) girdle/belt" cf. Aesch *Cho* 992 ἐξ οὗ τέκνων ἤνεγχ' ὑπὸ ζώνην βάρος, etc. but there is some anatomical variation as to its actual location: *Ion* 15 γαστρὸς ... ὄγκον, *Sup* 919 ὑφ' ἥπατος, and Pindar and the tragedians have σπλάγχνον.

763 τίς is in an unusual position for the interrogative pronoun. If the accent is removed, the line then becomes: "So this is a certain one of your children, poor wretch..." which seems unusual.

764 How much irony is in Hecuba's comment? She is speaking to the general ultimately responsible for the fates of all her children.

765 ἦ γάρ is used for a surprised, or eager question: 1047, 1124, Soph *OC* 64, *Phi* 248, 322, 654.

766 The neuter plural ἀνόνητά γ' is being used as an adverb "in vain, unprofitably" (built from ὀνίνημι and the alpha-privative.) cf. *Or* 1501, *Hel* 886, *Alc* 412, *El* 507, 508, fr.386 (*Theseus*) ἀνόνητον ἄγαλμ', ὦ πάτερ, οἴκοισι τεκών. Barrett notes the exception of *Hip* 1144-45 ὦ

τάλαινα μᾶτερ, | ἔτεκες ἀνόνατα, which does not fit the pattern of the word being 'used when the subject himself οὐδεν ὀνίναται from his action.' Aristotle *NE* 1.10 discusses happiness after death as a way of appraising success posthumously. Bad luck can affect one's εὐδαιμονία retrospectively and retroactively. The present treatment of Polydorus' corpse continues to outrage his spirit.

767 The epicism πτόλις is used for the sake of the meter (cf. 1209.) In iambics, it always appears at the end of a line, except at *Bac* 216 κλύω δὲ νεοχμὰ τήνδ' ἀνὰ πτόλιν κακά. It does not occur in extant Sophocles, but is fairly common in Euripides and Aeschylus: full lists of occurrences in tragedy can be found at Page *Med* 641, and Friis Johansen and Whittle Aesch *Sup* 699. Variations in the MSS are metrically unsound, and merely represent the substitution of the more common word for the rarer one.

768 Strict syntax would require something like μὴ θάνῃ rather than ὀρρωδῶν θανεῖν, "fearing that he should die", but cf. *Ion* 1563-65 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνεῴχθη πρᾶγμα μηνυθὲν τόδε, | θανεῖν σε δείσας μητρὸς ἐκ βουλευμάτων | καὶ τήνδε πρὸς σοῦ, μηχαναῖς ἐρρύσατο. ὀρρωδῶ is uncommon in tragedy (*El* 831-32 Ὦ ξέν', ὀρρωδῶ τινα | δόλον θυραῖον, fr.128 ὀρρωδεῖν εἴρηται ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐλαβεῖσθαι and cf. Soph *OT* 616), though it is favoured by Herodotus, who uses the Ionic ἀρρωδῶ. Euripides does use the nominal form more often though, e.g. *Pho* 1389 διὰ φίλων ὀρρωδίαν. The accusative and infinitive is a common construction when expressing fear, cf. *Rh* 933 οὐκ ἐδείμαινον θανεῖν, *Sup* 554, *Med* 1256.

769 With ποῖ it is necessary to sc. νιν ἐξέπεμψεν from the previous line. χωρίσας, from χωρίζω, "separating *x* (accusative) from *y* (genitive)" (Ambrose.) Agamemnon is filling in the details that were set forth in the prologue and again 682; cf. 779.

770 This line is an indirect accusation, emphasized by the postponement of θανών. οὗπερ

"where". ηὑρέθη is an augmented form of εὑρέθη, cf. 270.

771 Πολυμήστωρ has been attracted to the nominative case because it has been transferred to the relative clause for emphasis, cf. 986-88, *Hip* 101 τήνδ' ἣ πύλαισι σαῖς ἐφέστηκεν Κύπρις, *Bac* 1332 ἥν Ἄρεος ἔσχες Ἁρμονίαν θνητὸς γεγώς, Pindar *P* 2.15-17, Homer *Il* 11.624-26. The name itself is relatively rare in the play: it occurs here (Agamemnon), 969, 974 (Hecuba), and 1116 (Agamemnon.)

772 πικροτάτου is proleptic, for "which was to cause his bitter sufferings," cf. *Cyc* 589 οἴμοι· πικρότατον οἶνον ὄψομαι τάχα. What is being stressed is Polymestor's role as *guardian*: the money wasn't his.

774 The γε is being used as δή, to strengthen the force of the interrogative (*GP* 124.) The construction τίνος ... ἄλλου is also found at *El* 1314, Aesch *PV* 440. Both Θρῄξ and ξένος are in emphatic positions. In a very real sense, both words are 'loaded' in this context, and together would have sounded to Athenian ears like an oxymoron. The ξένια-relationship was coveted and esteemed (cf. esp. 710-1 and note, 781, 1047, Denniston *El* 83, Collard *Sup* 930-1) while the Thracians were generally considered to be base and untrustworthy.

The play continually refers to Polymestor not by his name (cf. 771) but as "the Thracian" (here, 710, 890), "the Thracian man" (682, 873), and "the Thracian king" (856), and this systematically prejudices the audience against the character. Slave lists that survive from this period indicate that many Athenian slaves were of Thracian decent; it is therefore probable that Θρῄξ was a common slave name. The typical Athenian attitude to the Thracian character is evidenced by, e.g. Aristoph *Ach* 134-73, Thuc 2.95-101, 7.29.4-5 τὸ γὰρ γένος τὸ τῶν Θρᾳκῶν ὁμοῖα τοῖς μάλιστα τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἂν θαρσήσῃ, φονικώτατον ἐστιν (ὁμοῖα for ὁμοίως as in Herodotus.) cf. Herodotus 9.119.1, Aesch *PV* 727 and Herodotus 4.103 attest to the sacrifice of shipwrecked strangers to Artemis Orthia (so named because her temple stood on the κρημνός in

front of the city (Strabo 308)) in the Tauric Chersonese. This is still happening in Tacitus' day (*An* 12.17.4) and is a possible source for part of the Iphigeneia myth (e.g. Euripides *IT*, but this is not the only source of the myth, viz. Abraham and Issac, in the biblical *Genesis* 22.)

Though geographically more removed from the Thracian Chersonese where this play takes place, both locations are essentially anomic, and serve to remove an external human authority, requiring any law or custom to be imposed by the characters themselves. In this play, the area represents a netherworld between the Greeks and Trojans, also represented by its king, Polymestor. In the *Iliad*, Trojans are not treated as barbarians, though it is unknown whether this is a cultural or a literary creation; but by the fifth century, Greek identity was established very much along a 'them-and-us' mentality. Euripides in his plays consciously challenges this notion, by presenting barbarians (and especially barbarian women) as being more righteous, powerful and noble than the Greeks. In this context however, the Thracian fulfils the traditional expectations of a barbarian.

775 The negative nuance of **τλῆμον** is derived from the context, cf. the positive use at 562. The use of ἠράσθη (from ἔραμαι, "desires eagerly") may have recalled the equally greedy and more contemporary Thracian, Sitacles in the minds of some audience members. Of him, Thucydides 2.97.4 says **οὐ γὰρ ἦν πρᾶξαι οὐδὲν μὴ διδόντα δῶρα.**

776 Tierney, Hadley, and Stevens *And* 910 suggest **τοιαῦτα** should be rendered "just so", but Denniston *El* 645 is more apt in this context, explaining it as "a sinister litotes, 'something like that'". The gold had been kept with Polymestor against the contingency of Troy being taken, and served as the guarantee of Polydorus' safety. With the capture of Troy and the coming-of-age of Polydorus (exactly when this is is never made explicit) the gold would have to be forfeited.

778 The demonstrative ἥδε, "she," can only refer to the **θεράπαινα** of 657-701, and shows that she is still onstage (probably upstage and to the side, removed from the present dialogue but still in attendance.)

779 ματεύουσα, cf. 754, 815, and note that some MSS have the sigma as a variation. As at 774, Agamemnon is briefly being filled in on the events that transpired at the beginning of the episode, before his entrance.

780 This refers back to the orders given at 611-13. οἴσουσα is from φέρω.

781 Polydorus has not only been murdered by his ξένος (Polymestor) but the body has not properly been buried. These are regarded as two separate crimes at 796-97. For the strength of the ξένος relationship, cf. 710-11 note. The notion of the offence being more heinous because it violates two moral laws is similar to Macbeth's predicament, Shakespeare, *Macbeth* I.vii.10-16:

> This even-handed justice 10
> Commends the ingredients of our poison'd chalice
> To our own lips. He's here in double trust:
> First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,
> Strong both against the deed; then, as his host,
> Who should against his murderer shut the door, 15
> Not bear the knife myself.

The situation is slightly different as both of Macbeth's crimes are in essence violations of the ξένια relationship, to which must be added the treatment of the corpse (cf. premise of Soph *Ant.*)

782 This line assents to both the previous statements, but in doing so reverses the order, producing a chiastic structure. διατεμὼν, "having disfigured" cf.716.

784 An absolute statement such as this could only be understood to be ironic. While it might be argued (as by Collard, cf. 1274) that Hecuba is now beyond suffering, she is going to wreak κακά

upon Polymestor. Hankey (1991) discusses the paradoxical nature of κάκά in Homer *Od*, especially in how it relates to the theme of revenge, cf. also Robinson (1991) 12-13.

785 For a full account of the variation between οὕτως and οὕτω, see Friis Johansen and Whittle *Sup* 338.

786-845 Though this speech is important to the play it does not hold the primacy sometimes ascribed to it, e.g. Kirkwood (1947). Polyxena's death in the first and second episodes has been presented as noble, honourable and befitting a princess of Troy, though in the end the victory was bitter, ultimately serving the Greeks' desires. It was something Hecuba was powerless to prevent. Polydorus' murder was ignoble, dishonourable, and shamefully brutal, and this spurs Hecuba to action. Her revenge on Polymestor is, partly, to regain honour for her dead son. It is also in part Hecuba's regaining her own former dignity, and it is in this speech that her status and presence on stage surpasses that of the Greek general. Polydorus' death was due to the fall of Troy (776) despite Priam's best efforts. Hecuba remembers her former state and status and seeks, in captivity, to reclaim some of her former nobility through revenge. Medea can be considered in a similar light: in addition to wishing to punish Jason for his actions, she desires to restore to herself some of the honour she had before leaving Colchis. Of course, this similarity must not be pressed too far, as there is a significant quantitative difference between Medea's infanticides and those of Hecuba. It is in this light that one must view Hecuba's so-called abasement in the third episode and epilogue, especially 824-32.

In many ways the speech does break neatly into two halves, with 812 forming the dividing mark. Lines 786-811 present a rational appeal by Hecuba based on the traditional grounds of justice and pity. But this does not convince Agamemnon, so her plea gets more desperate (and more reminiscent of fifth-century Athenian politics) as it is an appeal of structured rhetoric, both desperate and personal. Equally telling in this respect are the three abstractions invoked, and in some sense personified, during the speech: Τύχη (786, Misfortune), Νόμος (800, Law, or - see

note - Convention), Πειθώ (816, Persuasion.) ~~These are all~~ The latter two are found at the opening of a line and are therefore emphatic by position. Further, they link together to explain the circumstances of the speech, as well as Hecuba's revenge in its entirety: because of her *misfortune*, Hecuba seeks recourse through the *law*, but can only attain her revenge if she succeeds in her *persuasion*. For this reason, I capitalise all three terms.

Some discussions of this speech include Heath (1987a) 145-47, Michelini (1987) 149-53, and Buxton (1982) 178-80.

786 The Scholiast rightly observes of τὴν Τύχην that τὴν δυστυχίαν δηλονότι. Τύχη is one of those words which is coloured by its context, cf. *Sup* 1146-47 οὔπω κακὸν τόδ' εὕδει; | αἰαῖ τύχας, *Al* 393, *And* 979, *El* 1185 (all of which imply δυστυχία), and *Hel* 1195, *Or* 154, both of which are found with συμφορᾶς and are neutral or ambiguous in terms of moral colouring. What is unusual in this context is that the word that colours it is its lexical (if not necessarily semantic) opposite δυστυχὴς in the previous line. Of the parallels normally cited, two are the wrong way round (Plautus *Capt* 521, Terence *Adelph* 761) The third is valid, though: *fortunam ipsam anteibo fortunis meis*, Trabea, cited in Cic *Tusc Disp* 4.31; and cf. Milton *Paradise Lost* 2.39 "Surer to prosper than prosperity".

Schaefer was the first to suggest τύχη was personified here, by placing the capital. Reckford (1985, 126-27) notes:

> Most everything that happens in *Hecuba* is a matter of chance, blind chance. It would be more reassuring, almost, if we could see some specific dark power at work in this play, like Aphrodite in the *Hippolytus* or Dionysus in the *Bacchae*. Then evil would have a face.

His sentiment is correct, it would be more comforting to have a particular divinity responsible, but he oversimplifies: it is less a personified chance and more the actual fall of Troy that is ultimately at fault; and Hecuba's punishment of Polymestor, even with his retributive prophecy of her doom, removes the arbitrary malevolence. On the role of the gods in the play, see also Segal (1989).

The optative in λέγοις should be retained over the simpler and more common -εις, since it states the case in the most general way (Jebb *Ant* 666 says the optative is especially suited for γνῶμαι.) cf. fr. 212 (*Antiope*) τί δεῖ καλῆς | γυναικός, εἰ μὴ τὰς φρένας χρηστὰς ἔχοι; fr. 253 (*Archelaos*) τὸ γὰρ λέγειν | εὖ δεινόν ἐστιν, εἰ φέρει τινα βλάβην, Soph *OT* 315, and Smyth 2359, 2360; *contra* Tovar (1959) 132. Weil suspected this line not to be genuine, but to remove it makes 785 both rhetorical and weak.

788 It is often possible to distinguish between justice according to divine standards (ὅσια, here adverbial), and that in a human perspective, δίκαια. Abuse of hospitality, being the concern of Zeus Xenios, is ἀνόσια, for example. Greek also makes ὅσια = "permitted for human use", opposite to ἱερά, "sacred", but here clearly Hecuba is appealing to the higher authority of divine justice because she does not want to be part of the demagoguery of Odysseus and Agamemnon, cf. Soph *Ant* 73-74 φίλη μετ' αὐτοῦ κείσομαι, φίλου μέτα, | ὅσια πανουργήσασ', Polybius 23.10 παραβῆναι καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὅσια. A similar point can be seen in Milton's *Tetrachordon*, on *Genesis* 1.27 "Men of the most renowned virtue have sometimes by transgressing most truly kept the law".

789 στέργοιμ' ἄν, "I am willing to endure it", cf. *Hip* 458 στέργουσι δ', οἶμαι, ξυμφορᾷ νικώμενοι.

σύ μοι γενοῦ "you are to become for me." The reading of M, μου, is wrong, arising perhaps due to attraction from its proximity to γενοῦ.

790 Hadley explains τιμωρὸς ἀνδρός, "an avenger upon the man," thus: "The genitive is used with adjectives of transitive action, where the corresponding verbs would have the accusative." (235) as it does, e.g. Soph *El* 14 πατρὶ τιμωρὸν φόνου. For the importance to the overall theme of the play of the word τιμωρὸς, see note 749-50.

ξένου is not "false friend", i.e. an implicit opposite (and clearly ironic) meaning as Weil seems to

think, emending to ἀνοσίου, κακοξένου. Though this removes the repetition with 792 (which in itself is unproblematical), it is more ironic to have a (continued) friendship after the murder of Polydorus. For the importance of the relationship in the play, see 710-11 note.

791 It might be that Hecuba is universalising Polymestor's offence, saying that it offends against all supernatural powers. It is more poetic to see here a reference to the two specific crimes with which Polymestor has been accused (781.) He has failed to honour the "nether gods" (τοὺς γῆς νέρθεν, sc. θεούς, which is periphrastic for χθόνιοι θεοί) in not burying Polydorus, and has offended particularly against Zeus Xenios of the "gods above" (τοὺς ἄνω, sc. θεούς) in violating his duties as a host. Non-burial of the dead would bring anger of the deceased's ἀλάστωρ (see note 685-87.) It could also be that the line is a periphrastic way of saying "absolutely every god." What is not certain is whether in fact it is valid to understand θεούς in this context (Diggle (1981) 121 strongly argues that Burges' θεοὺς for τοὺς is wrong.) Perhaps, considering the absence of a particular malevolent deity in the play (see note 786), τοὺς ἄνω = "those still alive", and τοὺς γῆς νέρθεν then = Polydorus' ἀλάστωρ. This interpretation is more in line with the supernatural world as it has already been presented in the play. Just as Achilles' ghost in the first two episodes was something to respect and honour, so Polydorus' ghost becomes something to fear in this episode.

792 ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον is a poetic formula (see Parry (1971) 294-5 and 295 n.6) Euripides also employs, also at verse ends, at *Med* 796 φεύγουσα καὶ τλᾶσ' ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον and *Or* 286 ὅστις μ' ἐπάρας ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον.

793-97 Diggle accepts Nauck's deletion of these lines, also adopted by Weil (who calls them "bavardage vague et mal écrit"), Page (1934), Mossman (1990) 147, etc., but not Murray or Daitz. Page is particularly damning: they are "ill-composed and quite unworthy of Euripides. This is a rather bad interpolation, written by an actor specially for this context, perhaps as late as 250 B.C."

(1934, 68). This seems to be more an emotional response than anything else. Page provides no objections to 793, three to 794-95, and one to 796-97. Other editors have been more prudent: Matthiae deleted only 794-95; Dindorf 794-97. There is a significant and obvious hermeneutical error in Page's assumption that every line of Euripides must be perfect. The vicissitudes of the MSS. tradition alone prevent its feasibility. Collard makes a fivefold argument against all the lines. Mossman (1990) 147 accepts their deletion. Problems in these lines will be discussed as they arise. None are insurmountable, and I believe all the lines are authentic in origin, though Dindorf may be right to the extent that only 793 (and perhaps 797) survives in the MSS. as it was originally written.

Even discounting viability, the lines do contribute three notions to the play which on thematic terms alone suggest their preservation. First, they separate and define the two separate crimes that Polymestor has committed (see note 781). This picks up on what the ghost of Polydorus established 26-27. Secondly, the references to ξενία further a theme that is being developed (see note 710-11). Finally, the notion of Hecuba having eaten often at a common table (see next note) with Polymestor furthers the tacit notion that she too is of Thracian decent (implied by 3, picked up perhaps later in 1129-31.)

793 The phrase κοινῆς τραπέζης is also found at *Ion* 651-52 θέλω γὰρ οὗπέρ σ' ηὗρον ἄρξασθαι, τέκνον, | κοινῆς τραπέζης, δαῖτα πρὸς κοινὴν πεσών, *Or* 8-9 ὅτι θεοῖς ἄνθρωπος ὢν | κοινῆς τραπέζης ἀξίωμ' ἔχων ἴσον, and is not as 'vague' as Tierney and Weil believe. It refers to the speaker's own dinner table, and that is clearly the desired meaning here. It is possible to construe 794 ξενίας with τραπέζης though this is in no way easier or more obvious. There is a non-Euripidean parallel for this interpretation, at Homer *Od* 14.158 = 17.155 ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα θεῶν ξενίη τε τράπεζα. That these lines may also be alluded to in line 794 is perhaps significant, but also note that πρῶτα is not adverbial.

794 Page believes this line to be "very odd." This is not so. ξενίας ἀριθμῷ can be construed

with little difficulty, "in rank (lit. number) of hospitality." Similarly, πρῶτα does not stand for τὰ πρῶτα but should be taken adverbially, as it is at Homer *Od* 14.158 = 17.155 (cited in previous note.) Porson wrote at exceeding length on this line, and concludes by suggesting an emendation to πρῶτος ὢν but this is not necessary as has been demonstrated (nor, for that matter, is Pflugk's πρῶτ' ἔχων (which Murray claims as his) nor Wakefield's πρῶτα τ' ὢν.) Porson's purpose was to make 793-94 stand in the place of 795-97, making them excisable. Many MSS have ξένων instead of φίλων, and Euripides does end two other lines with ξένος (19, 1235), but reading φίλων prevents repetition within this one line. The use of ἀριθμῷ is at variance with a use common in Euripides = "a member of a collection considered in isolation from the rest" (Dodds *Bac* 209 where see note.)

795 τυχὼν is weakly repeated from 793. Page would again have us believe that λαβὼν προμηθίαν is "very odd", whether it means "with a base regard for his own interests" (Paley), "s'étant chargé du soin de Polydore" (Weil), or "having received consideration at our hands" (Pearson), but cf. Aesch *Sup* 178 προμηθίαν λαβὼν and Soph *Tra* 669-70 ὥστε μήποτ' ἂν προθυμίαν | ἄδηλον ἔργου τῳ παραινέσαι λαβεῖν. If nothing more, these show the emendations προμισθίαν (Musgrave) and προθυμίαν (Hermann) to be unnecessary. I translate with Pearson (and Hadley) with the phrase being correlative to ἔχω προμηθίαν, cf. *Alc* 1054 ἐγὼ δὲ σοῦ προμηθίαν ἔχω.

796-7 The problem in these lines is the brevity of εἰ κτανεῖν ἐβούλετο, which must mean "even if he was wanting to kill (my son.)" This is not as bad a compression as most people make out, but it is an unlikely concession for Hecuba to make. Virgil *Aen* 6.329 states the fate of an unburied soul: *centum errant annos volitantque haec litora circum*. It is likely that at least part of this notion is present in this context; the ghost himself has emphasized the fact (30.) Hecuba's concern is not just to restore an appropriate level of honour to her son (as had been the case in sacrificing Polyxena to Achilles), but to put the shade to rest. ἀφῆκε πόντιον, cf. *OT* 1411

θαλάσσιον ἐκρίψατε. For the use in the predicate of a local adjective, cf. *IT* 1427 ἐλίξετ' ἐς πόντον, *OT* 477-79 (where Jebb emends wrongly), 1340, *OC* 119, *Ant* 785, *El* 313.

798 The meaning here is double-edged. This fact could not be missed by the audience, nor by Hecuba, but must be thought to have been missed by Agamemnon. *Prima facie*, she is speaking of herself, and of her physical predicament: the use of the masculine plural when the speaker (regardless of gender) speaks in the plural is a commonplace (cf. 237.) On a secondary level, she is generalising and speaking for all humanity, both Greek and barbarian, both general and prisoner-of-war. She is therefore in these cosmological terms equating herself with Agamemnon. By calling him "weak," however indirectly, she undermines his authority, as she will continue to do especially in the second half of this speech. This interpretation avoids the need for a gap after this line.

799 ἀλλά responds to the μέν in 798 (*GP* 5.)

800-01 Kirkwood (1947) views this examination of νόμος as being central to an interpretation of the play. While Kirkwood is right to stress the importance of νόμος and this speech, he overstates his point. Sophistic philosophy contemporary with Euripides often weighed the relative merits of νόμος (both 'law' and 'custom') and φύσις ('nature.') The contrast is stated explicitly in favour of Nature, in ignoring νόμος and letting animals speak, in Euripides fr. 920 (*incert*) ἡ φύσις ἐβούλεθ', ᾗ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει (the original citation, Aelian *NA* 4.54 refers to an asp, and cites Hom *Il* 19.404). Plato has Hippias (*Prot* 337a1-3) contrast φύσις and νόμος, and makes the latter the stronger: ὁ δὲ νόμος, τύρρανος ὢν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πολλὰ παρὰ τὴν φύσιν βιάζεται. He seems to be implying that human decision (be it through choice or convention) can bind or restrict things independent of human control. cf. also Hippocrates, *On Airs Waters and Places* 16, 23, 24. Since the death of her daughter, Hecuba has already philosophised on φύσις (592-602, esp. 598) and concluded that it was unalterable in humanity, though it was subject to variation in agriculture.

Here, she posits the supremacy of νόμος. Her eventual conclusion, however, abandons both in preference for πειθώ (816.) In each of these three instances (598, 800, 816; cf. Τύχη in 786) the key word is given prominence at the beginning of the line. It would be cynical but not too far wrong to see in this a Hegelian pattern of *thesis* φύσις, *antithesis* νόμος, *synthesis* πειθώ.

Ostwald (1969) 26 says here "we find a general νόμος controlling even the gods, presumably identical with the source of ordinances dispensed by the gods". The presumption requires elucidation. It would be wrong to think that νόμος = *human* law or convention. This Sophistic idea is believed to have originated in Protagoras' Περὶ Θεῶν, which Tierney says had received public reading in Euripides' household. Plato rejects the notion that the gods exist by certain human conventions (νόμοι) in *Laws* 10, 889e. Other interpretations are possible, however. If νόμος = enacted law, then Euripides is saying τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγούμεθα because the state can dictate which divinities could be worshipped (viz. Socrates being tried for inventing false gods.) cf. the νομικὸν δίκαιον in Aristotle *NE* 5.10, *Pol* 1.3 (1253b20-3; see note on 864.) This atheistic view seems to be what Heinemann (1945) 121-22 suggests, that this passage seems to both accept a faith and to suggest that faith is weakly grounded, cf. Oliver (1960) 91-102. A significant Euripidean fragment exists supporting νόμος = *human* law or convention: fr. 292.4-6 (*Bellerophon*)

> νόσοι δὲ θνητῶν αἳ μέν εἰσ' αὐθαίρετοι,
> αἳ δ' ἐκ θεῶν πάρεισιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ νόμῳ
> ἰώμεθ' αὐτάς.

Otswald's interpretation of this passage (38 n.4) is probably right. αὐτάς can mean *both* self-inflicted and god-inflicted, or only the latter. He suggests the second makes better sense: "although the presence of these diseases is due to the gods, we nevertheless act in the conviction that we can cure them." (Note though that the reading may be suspect.)

The alternate possibility is that νόμος is to be understood in supernatural terms, i.e. that νόμος = *divine* law. This is closer to the way it is used in other Presocratics. If νόμος = Law, holding a place corresponding to the Anaxagoran Mind, Νοῦς, it becomes something positioned above the gods, creating a hierarchy:

NOMOS ---------> GODS ---------> MEN

cf. *adespota* fr. 471 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς μέγιστος ἀνθρώποις νόμος, which is almost the same thing. Such a placement does not pose the theological difficulties that it would for monotheists, since omnipotence is not typically found attributed to members of a pantheon. Support for this view can be gathered from the threefold emphasis on ὅσια (788, 790, 792; "divinely just", as opposed to "humanly just" = δίκαια.) Euripides gives a similar place to Ἀνάγκη (Necessity) in *Alc* 962-83, whose assent Zeus requires to do anything (978-79), and cf. *adespota* fr. 502 οὐδεὶς ἀνάγκης μεῖζον ἰσχύει νόμος. For ἀνάγκη in this play, see note 1295. Too legalistic an interpretation is probably wrong for the present instance. Empedocles fr. 9.5 ἣ θέμις ‹οὐ› καλέουσι, νόμῳ δ' ἐπίφημι καὶ αὐτός shows an acceptance of a *common usage* in speech, and Democritus 9.125 "accepts the way people talk (νόμῳ) about colour, sweetness, and bitterness, even though he knows that in truth (ἐτεῇ) only atoms and the void exist" (Otswald (1969) 39.)

The Scholiast offers a different interpretation, that the νόμοι in question are those established by the gods: ὁ νόμος ἐκείνων ἤγουν τῶν θεῶν, ὁ κρατῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων δηλονότι. This would imply that the standards the gods set for themselves should also be the object of human dealings; we believe in the gods therefore by virtue of the applicability and inherent rightness in their law, which becomes the model for our own. Although a lack of context can often prohibit complete understanding, this interpretation can shed light on fr.294.7 (*Bellerophon*) εἰ θεοί τι δρῶσιν αἰσχρόν, οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί. There is a need to obey the νόμοι, even in adverse conditions, or when they seem incomprehensible, cf. fr. 433 (*Hippolytus*) ἔγωγε φημὶ καὶ νόμον γε μὴ σέβειν | ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖς τῶν ἀναγκαίων πλέον, and *adespota* fr. 99 πῶς οὖν τάδ' εἰσορῶντες ἢ θεῶν γένος | εἶναι λέγωμεν ἢ νόμοισι χρώμεθα; These νόμοι "are thought of as universally acceptable, valid and binding" (Ostwald (1969) 26.) This seems to me to be the best interpretation of νόμος in the present passage. It is also Paley's preference.

There is some blurring of meaning, though, and the huge treatises written serve nothing to remove this: one thinks of Aristotle *Rhet* 1.13.2 where law (νόμος) is distinguished as either ἴδιον ("particular", human) or κοινόν ("universal", divine) The universal law is that according to nature,

τὸν κατὰ φύσιν, which recalls the Hegelian ideas mentioned above. cf. Soph *OT* 865-66 ὧν νόμοι πρόκεινται ὑψίποδες, and Jebb's note, *Ant* 453-55. cf. Steir (1928). The Scholiast's interpretation is seeking to establish a ground for morality. Any such moral law would be κοινόν. Secondly, any discussion of νόμος must take into account Pindar fr.169 Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς | θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων | ἄγει (cf. also Herodotus 3.38.) This fragment can be understood either as something which rules over both gods and men, or as "dispensations" or "ordinances" from Zeus (so Kirkwood (1982) 347-49, with its secondary bibliography); Dodds (1959) 270-72.) This view has the support of Hesiod *WD* 276-79 where Zeus has one νόμος for animals and another for men, cf. Polyphemus' speech on νόμος *Cyc* 332-33 ἡ γῆ δ' ἀνάγκῃ, κἂν θέλῃ κἂν μὴ θέλῃ, | τίκτουσα ποίαν τἀμὰ πιαίνει βοτά (see also 338.) Though this is the likeliest meaning of the Pindar fragment, it must be remembered that the fragment is extraordinary in that it presents Heracles in a very poor light (which Kirkwood et al. believe is significantly odd for Pindar) and it is possible that the intended meaning is similar to the *Protagoras* passage cited above, but with application also to the gods. Otherwise, the *Protagoras* passage must be seen as a reaction to this fragment - the verbal similarities (τύρρανος, βασιλεύς) ensure this, cf. also Otswald (1965). Unfortunately, though a larger context is available for the Pindar fragment, it sheds no further light on the interpretation of this fragment. cf. 816 note. The role of Zeus is probably important, and it is just possible that the νόμος being referred to is that specifically of Zeus Xenios, whose tacit presence is felt throughout the play (cf. Introduction IV and note 710-11).

τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγούμεθα, cf. *El* 583-84 ἦ χρὴ μηκέθ' ἡγεῖσθαι θεούς, | εἰ τἄδικ' ἔσται τῆς δίκης ὑπέρτερα, *Bac* 1325-26 εἰ δ' ἔστιν ὅστις δαιμόνων ὑπερφρονεῖ, | ἐς τοῦδ' ἀθρήσας θάνατον ἡγείσθω θεούς, Aristophanes *Knights* 32, Plato *Apology* 27D.

The ζῶμεν clause is also governed by νόμῳ, though it could be understood to be an example of νόμος. The perfect middle of ἄδικα καὶ δίκαι' ὡρισμένοι should probably be interpreted with Paley, "having justice and injustice defined for us", as opposed to Ambrose's more extreme "having defined for ourselves justice and injustice."

802 Tierney views ἀνελθὼν "having been referred" (~~from~~ used for ἀναφέρειν) as an anachronistic appeal to the fifth century notion of the δῆμος as the source of law; Hadley rightly recognizes that these issues would come before Agamemnon since the Homeric notion of kingship was as viceregent of the gods.

εἰ + future indicative, for a future condition is used for a strong appeal to feelings, a threat, or a warning (*MT* 447) and is more vivid than ἐάν + subjunctive, "since", cf. 1233 note.

803-4 θεῶν is to be scanned as a monosyllable, which is not unusual. ἱερὰ is generally used of "sacred things or rights" which is not entirely appropriate here. It might be rhetorical amplification (Sidgwick) but also present is the notion of νόμοι being sacred to the gods (cf. 800.) Though ἱερά often means 'sacrifice victims' in particular, it would be wrong to see an allusion to the death of Polyxena here. Hecuba knows that Polymestor can in no way be held responsible for the death of her daughter, but it would be natural to conflate the day's tumultuous events in this way. The consequence of this view is that the most obvious candidate described by this phrase is Agamemnon himself, picking up on the implied threat of 802. φέρειν also means "plunder" at *Bac* 758-9 οἳ δ' ὀργῆς ὕπο | ἐς ὅπλ' ἐχώρουν φερόμενοι βακχῶν ὕπο, but here it also contains the notion of sacrilege, and defilement, derived from the present context.

805 σῶν is an emendation by Kayser (not Radermacher, as Tierney says) from the reading of all the sources, -οις ἴσον. Because the appeal to equality is inappropriate for a Homeric queen, even one enslaved as Hecuba is, Kayser has preferred an appeal to safety or certainty. The anachronism in the MSS reading is hardly un-Euripidean, and if it is a corruption, it is very early. Besides, Hecuba might be making the point in spite of her position.

Porson says this verse is again employed by Euripides in an uncertain play in Stobaeus, p.165 ed.Grot. (cf. Stob 4.41.34, 4.1.13.)

806 Méridier's translation is instructive: "rougir d'en venir là, respecte ma misère." αἰδέσθητί με

is another anachronism. In the Attic law courts, αἰδέομαι meant "to feel pity for," and by extension, "to pardon." Hecuba's use of legal language urges Agamemnon to make a concrete decision, linking it with 802 εἰ διαφθαρήσεται. This also relates to the use of ταῦτα which leaves open the possibility, however dishonourable, that Agamemnon may not give justice.

807 Agamemnon is told to view the situation dispassionately, but there is a "subtle indication he is responsible" (Sheppard.)

γραφεύς, only here in Euripides, is the reading of all the MSS except *perhaps* one, which is illegible in the first and fourth letters. Murray insists that the true reading is βραβεύς, "arbiter"; King also doubts. γραφεύς is a nicer image, somewhat supported by the incidental detail provided by the *Suda* that says Euripides studied painting in his youth (of course, the source of this detail may very well be this very line, though lines such as 558-60 which refer to contemporary art also support the contention, albeit indirectly.) Murray and Daitz cite 528 and (wrongly) *And* 972 as places where letters are illegible obscuring a true reading. Murray's reading foreshadows 1109-1295, when Agamemnon is the judge in the conflict between Hecuba and Polymestor. One can also see Murray's point: if Agamemnon is being flattered, he would rather be compared to a judge than an artist. It is just as possible to argue the other way, however, where the allusion to the visual arts picks up the famous lines in the narration of Polyxena's death, esp. 560 ὡς ἀγάλματος. Though γραφεύς is right (most certainly from the bulk of the MSS. weight, but also because βραβεύς is a more obvious image), in either case the sentiment is the same: sound judgement, be it of artwork or a case at law, comes from distancing oneself (ἀποσταθεὶς repeats an idea also found at *Ion* 585-6 οὐ ταὐτὸν εἶδος φαίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων | πρόσωθεν ὄντων ἐγγύθεν θ' ὁρωμένων.)

If the reading of ἀποσταθεὶς were ἐπι-, a case could be made that it meant "having been appointed" which would be appropriate for a βραβεύς, but also acceptable for γραφεύς = "scribe."

808 ἀνάθρησον "reckon, study", normally a prose word, is a poetry *hapax*.

809 Meridor (1983) 15-16 suggests, rightly, that there is one clear political advantage that Hecuba achieves by this statement. As Agamemnon's slave (see note 754-55) she is entitled (under fifth-century Athenian law, though this anachronism should not cause concern, see Easterling 1985) to his protection as master, and he is morally bound to act on behalf of her free son according to the γραφὴ ὕβρεως (Demosthenes 21.47.) A similar position is found in Adrastus' supplication to Theseus, *Sup* 164-66 ἄναξ Ἀθηνῶν, ἐν μὲν αἰσχύναις ἔχω | πίτνων πρὸς οὖδας γόνυ σὸν ἀμπίσχειν χερί, | πολιὸς ἀνὴρ τύραννος εὐδαίμων πάρος·

810 εὔπαις "blessed with children", cf. *Ion* 469-70 τὸ παλαιὸν Ἐρεχθέως | γένος εὐτεκνίας, *Sup* 66, 955, *Tro* 583, *Phae* 155, fr. 520 (*Meleager*)

ἡγησάμην οὖν, εἰ παραζεύξειέ τις
χρηστῷ πονηρὸν λέκτρον, οὐκ ἂν εὐτεκνεῖν
ἐσθλοῖν δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν ἂν φῦναι γόνον.

This form of the compound can also mean "blessed *as* a child", e.g. *IT* 1234 εὔπαις ὁ Λατοῦς γόνος, *HF* 689, *Or* 964, *Bac* 520. There exist many similar compounds, with the same ambiguity. φιλότεκνον means "loving children, except when used of cats at Herod 2.66.2.5-6 φιλότεκνον γὰρ τὸ θηρίον, where it means having a lot of children. Euripides could be playing with both meanings here.

Hecuba emphasizes her age (γραῦς) because it means she is no longer physically capable of bearing children (she is now to be ἄπαις permanently, forgetting for the moment about Cassandra, cf. 821, 826.) There was a particular duty in Athenian society for children to care for aged parents, hence the emphasis of this grief in tragedy: *Ion* 618-9 ἄλλως τε τὴν σὴν ἄλοχον οἰκτίρω, πάτερ, | ἄπαιδα γηράσκουσαν, *Alc* 735-36, *Sup* 170, 966, fr.369.1-2 κείσθω δόρυ μοι μίτον ἀμφιπλέκειν ἀράχναις, | μετὰ δ' ἡσυχίας πολιῷ γήρᾳ συνοικοίην.

811 For Euripides' use of alpha-privatives in tricola, cf. 669. Both ἄπολις and ἔρημος are found

at *Hyps* 1.4.15-19:

ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἀνθρώποισιν αἵ τ' ἐκδημίαι 15

ὅταν τε χρείαν εἰσπεσὼν ὁδοιπόρος

ἀγροὺς ἐρήμους καὶ μονοικήτους ἴδῃ

ἄπολις ἀνερμήνευτος ἀπορίαν ἔχων

ὅπῃ τράπηται·

Here ends the first part of the speech, where the argument has been based on appeals to justice and pity.

812 Agamemnon begins to move away, to avoid Hecuba's persistent entreaties, much as Odysseus tried to avoid the supplicating Polyxena 342-45. Because there are so many parallels between the conflict with Agamemnon in this scene with the earlier scene with Odysseus (see Introduction VI) it would be particularly effective if the stage-picture created at each of the moments mentioned above were the same, creating a visual echo, linking the scenes.

ὑπεξάγεις πόδα is being used here as if = φεύγεις, which is why it takes the accusative με. Tierney believes the double prefix implies *secret* escape, cf. 6, *OT* 227 κεἰ μὲν φοβεῖται τοὐπίκλημ' ὑπεξελὼν, though this is wrong. If any nuance is to be added, it should be "*gradual* escape."

813 The normal idiom would be ὡς ἔοικεν rather than ἔοικα, but cf. *IA* 847-8, Herodotus 1.155, and Cicero *Lael* 9 *sed, ut mihi videris, non recte iudicas*. With the infinitive, = "I seem likely to..." (the future infinitive is used because the thing desired is in the future.)

814-5 Here begins an apology for the Sophistic training in persuasive public speaking that had begun with the arrival of Gorgias from Sicily in 427. It has been suggested that both Gorgias and Euripides, as well as Sophocles and Pericles, had been students of Anaxagoras. μαθήματα is the standard Sophistic word for subjects studied, but Plato *Laws* 817E provides a definition which is

closer to the modern notion of mathematics, embracing arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. What Hecuba is saying is that she has put her case and has failed. In a sense, she does back down. Rather than be defeated, she continues in the style of a forensic orator. Though formally (see note on the structure of the speech, 786-845) she abandons the truth, in actuality she needs both the truth and rhetoric.

816 Πειθὼ is the third personified abstraction in this speech (cf. 786-845, 799-801 νόμος) and here = "persuasion in court, demagoguery" (as the object of μανθάνειν), cf. the Achaeans and Agamemnon in *IA*, though it originally was 'persuasion in love', cf. note 831-32, Aesch *Ag* 105-07 'persuasion in song' ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνείει | πειθοῖ μολπᾶν | ἀλκὰν σύμφυτος αἰών· This is significant because Euripides' descriptive phrase (τὴν τύραννον ἀνθρώποις μόνην) is similar to ones found elsewhere describing Ἔρως: *Hip* 538 τὸν τύραννον ἀνδρῶν, fr.136.1 σὺ δ' ὦ θεῶν τύραννε κἀνθρώπων Ἔρως. "Only" is used in the present context to usurp any claim νόμος might have on the title (cf. 799-801.) The passage does not say that Πειθώ is τύραννος over the gods, which affects how νόμος is understood in the earlier passage. Kirkwood and Nussbaum miss this. Hecuba favours νόμος, but is unable to act because of 866 νόμων γραφαί, as in Sophocles' *Antigone* where the title character yields to a superior νόμος.

The line is imitated in the *Hermione* of Pacuvius: *O flexanima atque omnium regina rerum oratio* (cited Cicero *de orat* 2.44, referred to at Quintilian 1.12.18 *illam (ut ait non ignobilis tragicus) reginam rerum orationem.*) *Oratio* is a neutral word, and does not contain the negative overtones present in its Greek counterpart.

817 οὐδέν τι μᾶλλον "not all the more" = "least of all."

ἐς τέλος "to the end" = "thoroughly", cf. 1193 note.

818-19 μισθοὺς διδόντες μανθάνειν is an anachronistic reference to the Sophistic practice of accepting fees for instruction, cf. Xenophon *Mem* 1.6.13, Aristophanes *Clouds* 876, etc.

The reading of the majority of the MSS, ἵν' ᾖ, can be construed even though a subjunctive would be preferable in the indefinite clause (e.g. ἃ ἄν τις βούληται.) The optative reading βούλοιτο is defensible: Soph *OT* 979 ὅπως δύναιτό τις and *Ant* 666 ὃν πόλις στήσειε (though this line has been deleted by Dawe, followed by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson) provide parallels of its use in the primary time of the principal clause. This however "puts the case in the most general way" (Jebb); to avoid such indefiniteness, most editors follow Elmsley's emendation ἵν' ἦν, which denotes "that the purpose is dependent upon some unaccomplished action, or unfulfilled condition, and therefore *is not* or *was not* attained" (*MT* 333), cf. *Hip* 647-48 ἵν' εἶχον μήτε προσφωνεῖν τινα | μήτ' ἐξ ἐκείνων φθέγμα δέξασθαι πάλιν, Soph *OT* 1389 ἵν' ἦ τυφλός τε καὶ κλύων μηδέν, Aristoph *Knights* 850-51 ἀλλ' ἐστὶ τοῦτ' ὦ Δῆμε μηχάνημ', ἵν' ἦν σὺ βούλῃ | τὸν ἄνδρα κολάσαι τουτονί, σοὶ τοῦτο μὴ 'κγένηται. Elmsley is clearly correct, providing "would have been" to the MSS. "will be." βούλοιτο then functions as a cue to ἦν. However, Sidgwick notes the difficulty with this, that it would expect the principal verb to be past rather than present.

820 The hiatus τί οὖν is also found at Soph *Phi* 100 τί οὖν μ' ἄνωγας ἄλλο πλὴν ψευδῆ λέγειν; Aesch *ST* 208, 704 τί οὖν ἔτ' ἂν σαίνοιμεν ὀλέθριον μόρον; *Per* 787, *Eum* 902. cf. *Hip* 598 πῶς οὖν, Soph *OT* 959 εὖ ἴσθ'. This then is not an argument against its preference over πῶς; see also Tovar (1959) 133.

οὖν ἔτ' ἄν, cf. *Sup* 447 πῶς οὖν ἔτ' ἂν γένοιτ' ἂν ἰσχυρὰ πόλις, *Tro* 961 πῶς οὖν ἔτ' ἂν θνῄσκοιμ' ἂν ἐνδίκως.

While τις is a generalising question, Hecuba has herself in mind.

ἐλπίσαι is an alternative though rarer form of the 1st aorist optative.

821 The natural way to understand οἱ παῖδες is as "children", which of course is not true (in the same way 810 ἄπαις was not true): Cassandra is still alive, as Hecuba is to mention in 6 lines time. Yet that reference is effectively going to alienate mother from daughter, giving a strangely appropriate truth to the present statement, which is only *prima facie* true if "sons" is meant. cf.

826 παῖς. Méridier 212 n.2 makes the same mistake, referring to "les deux enfants qui lui restaient après la ruine de Troie."

822 Two MSS. read αὕτη rather than αὑτή, and this is followed by Verrall and Murray (with a full stop after αἰχμάλωτος) and sc. *Cassandra quae intus est.* This cannot be right, as it removes all irony from 821, alludes to somebody who hasn't been mentioned by name since 677, removes meaning from οἴχομαι, etc.

823 Hecuba continues to muse on all that she has lost. This line does raise two questions about ancient dramatic production.

First, *painted scenery.* Set as the play is in the Thracian Chersonese, Troy would be less than twenty miles from where the characters are. It would be natural to imagine Troy as being, literally, behind the characters. The question then arises whether behind the entrance to Agamemnon's tent would be painted the ruins of Troy. Haigh (1907, 183-85) emphasizes the simplistic character of Greek σκηνή-painting but of course evidence either way is slight. In many cases, details would be left to the imagination (e.g. the parodos of *Ion.*) *Hecuba* poses the additional problem of distant scenery being required in addition to immediate scenery. It is assumed the 'hemikyklion' (Haigh (1907) 218) - used for representations of distance - is a fourth century development, and would be out of place here. Painting in any form would need to be simplistic, both because it needed to be seen from the back of the theatre and because it would need to be easily changed for other performances at the festival (the modern method of using flats or canvas could not be too far wrong.) It must nevertheless be admitted that, at least to modern sensibilities, some visual representation of the ruins of Troy would be appropriate, particularly during the stasima when there would be no movement onstage. Contrary to this view is Brown (1984).

Second, *smoke effects.* The deictic quality of the line can be taken to mean either that the actor playing Hecuba is pointing to nothing at all, and is suggesting the presence of smoke, which

is to be imagined; or is pointing to smoke which could either be painted on the scenery or represented by genuine smoke, i.e. a pyre burning behind the σκηνή. A pyre of some sort is also suggested at *Sup* 1071 ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ τῷ συμπυρουμένῳ πόσει, and could also have been used in the earthquake scenes of *Bac* 576ff, *Her* 904ff, and at the end of Aristoph *Clouds*. The surprisingly active participle ὑπερθρῴσκονθ᾽ seems to favour the presence of real smoke, but would not be out of place if the actor were merely suggesting its presence to the audience. Smoke is also mentioned at 1215 and *Tro* 1295ff, but in these cases it need not be genuine, or even seen. Arnott (1962) 129 believes the audience sees smoke rising from a fire offstage.

824-25 Having indicated that she is beginning a new thought (καὶ μήν is used to introduce new arguments, *GP* 352, cf. 1224, *Hel* 1053), Hecuba then prefaces the thought, beginning at 826, with an apology for it.

μὲν ... ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως (*GP* 6) is a particularly common structure in Euripides: 843, *Hip* 47-48 ἡ δ᾽ εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως ἀπόλλυται | Φαίδρα, 795, *Hel* 1232, *El* 753, *Bac* 776, 1027, *IA* 904, *Or* 1024, *Alc* 353, *Hcld* 928 (cited below), etc. ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως, "but still," is also found in Sophocles (*OT* 998) and (in parody?) Aristophanes *Clouds* 1363, *Ach* 402, 407, 956.

τοῦ λόγου is a partitive genitive, depending on τόδε: "this part of my argument".

Nauck's emendation ξένον (adopted by Diggle) is unsupported and unnecessary. The unanimous reading of the MSS, κένον, "fruitless, vain" gives better sense for the context. This is the opinion of Collard (1986) and (1988), an opinion which he revises in his 1991 commentary, interpreting it as "foreign to the argument." I nevertheless believe his earlier arguments in favour of the original reading are stronger (Collard (1986) 23):

> 'foreign to, unconnected with' τοῦ λόγου (cf. S. *O.T.* 219) it is not, rather it is a plank of the argument 826-30. But why is it 'unusual' to plead on the strength of Agamemnon's enjoyment of Cassandra? 'Useless' or 'vain', κένον it may indeed prove to be - for Ag. is forced to be devious in acknowledging Hec.'s claim on him

through his [sic; "her" is meant] daughter, 855ff.

The infinitive Κύπριν προβάλλειν, "to mention Love (or Sex)", is in apposition to τόδε; this is her new argument, which is expanded 826-32. By invoking love in this way, Hecuba uses the most powerful formulation available to her, the name of the goddess herself. There is irony here too, that Agamemnon who sacked Hecuba's city to restore a woman stolen by Aphrodite, should now be under her influence. But even this invocation is in vain.

The use of the future middle for passive is found elsewhere in Euripides, cf. *Hcld* 928 δέσποιν', όραις μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως εἰρήσεται, *Hyps* 1.5.27, and "to denote unpleasant or dangerous revelations" (Bond) *Med* 625, *Ion* 760, *Pho* 928, *Bac* 776.

826-27 What κοιμίζεται, "is stilled," means in this context is clear, despite its more usual use for a periphrasis of death 473-4, *Hip* 1387-8 (sic) εἴθε με κοιμάσειε τὸν | δυσδαίμον' Ἅιδα μέλαι|να νύκτερός τ' ἀνάγκα, cf. its use of storms at Soph *Aj* 674-5 δεινῶν δ' ἄημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε | στένοντα πόντον· There is irony here, in that Hecuba using Cassandra as a lever to work her revenge, she is behaving not like a mother should, and in some sense their relationship is now dead, cf. 677, 821.

Rather than take φοιβάς as 'radiant, pure,' it makes good sense to translate "inspired (by Phoebus Apollo)" cf. 676 βακχεῖον. The Scholiast supports this by glossing ἡ μάντις (Cassandra was a priestess of Apollo.) cf. *IA* 1064 μάντις ὁ φοιβάδα μοῦσαν.

There is a problem with the accusative Κασσάνδραν (the double sigma is for scansion; there seems to be no other distinction between the single- and double-sigma spellings), in that it seems to imply that she had two separate names, one used exclusively by the Trojans, the other by the Greeks (such as is found with Paris and Alexandros, and Pyrrhus and Neoptolemus.) The Scholiast says that the other name was Alexandra: ἡ Κασάνδρα πρώην 'Αλεξάνδρα ἐκαλεῖτο, ὡς καὶ Λυκόφρων φησίν, ἐκλήθη δὲ Κασάνδρα παρὰ τῶν Τρώων διὰ τὸ κάσιν καὶ ἀδελφὸν ἀνδρεῖον ἔχειν τὸν Ἕκτορα. But this explanation is unsatisfactory, since it contitutes a renaming, rather than an alternate naming (though it might be seen to be supported by Homer *Il* 22.506

'Ἀστυάναξ, ὃν Τρῶες ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν.) The alternate name was certainly part of the general fabric of myth (it is the title of a poem by Lycophron that survives, for example, though the poem itself is a *tour de force* of arcane and obscure mythological detail, which could also argue against its value here) though its familiarity cannot be determined. Hermann posited the nominative form, which was later found to be in the 2 MSS. (Rw, Zu) *pace* Diggle, i.e. "Cassandra, whom the Trojans call the inspired one" (that is, a prophet.) This is more satisfactory, still leaves some questions unanswered. Haupt deleted the entire line and I am inclined to agree. Hecuba knows her daughter's name, and telling a Greek what the Trojans call the woman he shares a bed with seems extraneous. It also is the type of flourish that could be added by a fourth-century actor.

828-30 Diggle (1982) 321-23 makes a strong case for all of his emendations (supported by Collard (1986) 20): λέξεις from δείξεις (though *Hel* 1603-4 should be included with *Or* 802 and *IA* 406 in using ποῦ with δείκνυμι; even this emendation is not certain, since the present passage has an object, which needs to be understood in the *Or* and *IA* passages), and ᾗ ... τιν' for ᾗ ... τίν'. The emendations do make the lines easier to read, though the weight in favour of the traditional reading (including the Scholiast on Soph *Aj* 520) suggest an early corruption. For the separation of δῆτα from ποῦ, cf. *GP* 270-71. εὐφρόνας "kindly times" is a euphemism for "nights" (appropriate in this context) intended to prejudice Agamemnon towards Hecuba. Nonius, under *modice* gives Ennius' version of 829-30: *Quae tibi in concubio verecunde et modice morem gerit*, though this is a milder, active sense. Hecuba is attempting to gain some moral hold over Agamemnon, as she had earlier attempted to do with Odysseus in reminding him of how she had once spared his life (239-57.) Her desperation is betrayed in the following lines. χάριν "thanks, reward" puns on the usual meaning of (often sexual)'pleasure, delight.' Hecuba is not seeking vicarious sexual pleasure, but desires to cash in on that of Agamemnon. The same *double entendre* is found in 832. The word represents a key idea in the play (discussed by Segal (1990a) 124, Tarkow (1984) 134, Adkins (1966) 209, Conacher (1961) Oliver (1960), etc.) which is later recalled in its adverbial

uses in 855, 874, 1175, 1201, 1243.

Hecuba is saying that her daughter has been cooperative. φιλτάτων can be understood as either active or passive, though passive (= "so much enjoyed") is too direct. The ἀσπασμάτα have been φιλτάτα both in Agamemnon's enjoyment and in that Cassandra has been loving to him. Since she is making this very direct point, she could very well spend five lines on it (thereby keeping 831-2, where see note.) In her bluntness about talking about the sexual aspect of her daughter's relationship with Agamemnon, Hecuba is not "taking to herself the status of a pimp" (Michelini (1987) 151; cf. also Buxton (1982) 179, Reckford (1985) 121 and Σ Soph *Ajax* 520 μαστροπικώτατα εἰσάγει τὴν Ἑκάβην λέγουσαν) As Gregory (1991) 106 notes, Menelaus in *And*, Hecuba in *Tro*, Danaus in Aesch *Sup*, Heracles in Soph *Tra* and Creon in *Ant* "all concern themselves openly and in detail with their children's sexual lives."

831-2 The seemingly indelicacy of these lines in Hecuba's mouth is probably modern (see previous note), though they are compared by Page to 606-8 (these two are "therefore unlike any other interpolation in tragedy" (1934, 67). Most editors have followed Matthiae's deletion of them, but recently Garzya, Daitz and Michelini (1987)have preserved them. There is a traditional connection between Ἔρως and Πειθώ, cf. 816 note, Buxton (1982) 32-34, 38-39, as well as Πειθώ being a cult title of Aphrodite (Farnell (1977) 2.664); and regardless, the indelicacy is not at all out of place for a pleading prisoner of war bent on revenge. Also in their favour is the fact that they are cited (albeit inaccurately) in Orion *Anth* 8.17 Scheiddewin, the Scholiast on Hom *Od* 10.481, and Tzetzes *Exeg* p. 86 Hermann.

There are three significant MSS problems, and the most minor concerns the particles. Diggle favours τε ... τε, Daitz γὰρ ... τε. The MSS are split, but γὰρ makes better sense in that it gives the air of a connected argument, though asyndeton is possible *by way of illustration* and may not need a particle connecting it with the previous line. Next, I tentatively accept Nauck's emendation νυκτερησίων (which is also accepted by Diggle) because it is so much easier to construe than Daitz' reading νυκτέρων βροτοῖς. Another possible reading, which was favoured by some

Victorian editors, is νυκτέρων πάνυ, but πάνυ is rare in tragedy and is no easier to construe. Whatever the reading, it does recall 828 εὐφρόνας. If this is accepted, third MSS problem disappears: Daitz reads θνητοῖς to the better alternate βροτοῖς, since he reads βροτοῖς in the previous line.

φίλτρων are mentioned here not for their own sake but as things which create bonds, in a slightly transferred sense. Michelini sees in φίλτρων another reference to the Sophists: "The argument suggests the *Helene* of Gorgias, where, defending the most beautiful of women against offended sexual morality, the rhetorician likened the charms of the *logos* to that of *erôs* itself, assimilating both to enchantments (*philtra*) and potions (*pharmaka*) that intoxicate the mind and body" (1987, 151-2) - referring to Gorgias *Helene* DK 2:82 fr. IIB 8-10 and 14, but this is not necessary. In general, it seems that the lines should be kept since, though outrageous, they are linked verbally and semantically with 826-30, and pave the way for the rhetoric Hecuba will use 836-40.

833-5 These lines raise the argument above a basic sexual level, with Hecuba arguing (to what degree of precision one cannot be sure, see below) that Agamemnon has married into her family. Euripides uses the expression ἄκουε δή νυν (cf. *GP* 218) often: *Pho* 911 ἄκουε δή νυν θεσφάτων ἐμῶν ὁδόν, 1427, *Cyc* 441, *Sup* 857, *HF* 1255, *Ion* 1539, *IT* 753, *Hel* 1035, *Or* 237, 1181, *IA* 1009, 1146, Aristoph *Knights* 1014, *Birds* 1513, cf. Plato *Laws* 693D.

καλῶς is also to be understood with 835 δράσεις.

κηδεστὴν "kin-by-marriage" = τοῦτον = 833 τὸν θανόντα τόνδ' = Polydorus. Michelini believes this argument to be fallacious: "The *kêdestês* takes part in a social relation whereby men exchange women; slaves taken in war are not given by their male relatives, who have been killed by the conquerors. Cf. the ode following this scene." (1987, 152 n.84.) The question must then be asked why Hecuba would lie in this way. Surely Agamemnon would know the social bond that does exist, however much prompting he may need to remember it. I therefore believe there must exist some justification for Hecuba's use of this term. The κηδεστής-relationship is valid, and

Agamemnon has genuine social obligations which he acknowledges by his compliance later in the play. Nor is the claim itself surprising. The Homeric Agamemnon was particularly proud of his relationship with Chryse (*Il* 1.133-15):

καὶ γάρ ῥα Κλυταιμνήστρης προβέβουλα
κουριδίης ἀλόχου, ἐπεὶ οὔ ἑθέν ἐστι χερείων,
οὐ δέμας οὐδὲ φυήν, οὔτ' ἂρ φρένας οὔτέ τι ἔργα.

836-40 One wonders what Hadley meant in saying, "this beautiful passage comes as a relief." Michelini is much closer to the mark in saying, "It might just be possible to tolerate the bizarreness of Hecuba's speaking anatomy, and to repress the picture of an eloquent foot embracing Agamemnon's knee, if the reference to Daidalos' arts did not suggest some actual grotesque realization of what otherwise would be mere wordplay" (1987, 152.) But she goes too far in calling it "astonishingly grotesque." The mixture of bathos and hyperbole is intended to shock the listener, and in this light the reference to Daedalus is probably an extension of the wordplay involved: cf. the Scholiast, cited in note 838. Modern sensibilities are coloured by, e.g. Charles Wesley's hymn "O for a thousand tongues...", which if taken literally, could sound a grotesque wish, but is an imaginative conceit with some rhetorical power, cf. Fama in Virgil *Aen* 4.181ff. That it was at least tolerated as mere wordplay, perhaps elevated by the reference to Daedalus, but still not a thing of (rhetorical) beauty, cf. the similar passages in Euripides,

HF 487-89 πῶς ἂν ὡς ξουθόπτερος
μέλισσα συνενέγκαιμ' ἂν ἐκ πάντων γόους,
ἐς ἓν δ' ἐνεγκοῦσ' ἀθρόον ἀποδοίην δάκρυ;

El 333-35 πολλοὶ δ' ἐπιστέλλουσιν, ἑρμηνεὺς δ' ἐγώ,
αἱ χεῖρες ἡ γλῶσσ' ἡ ταλαίπωρός τε φρὴν
κάρα τ' ἐμὸν ξυρῆκες ὅ τ' ἐκεῖνον τεκών.

Hecuba has already sought rhetorical skill (816); what she now says she needs is just many voices. This is, of course, another rhetorical device; cf. also Gregory (1991) 119 n.69.

836 The combination of εἰ (without -θε or γάρ) + optative is rare, but is used for "unattainable wishes, when they refer to the future" (Smyth 1818), cf. *MT* 723, Soph *OT* 863 εἴ μοι ξυνείη φέροντι μοῖρα, Homer *Il* 10.111, 15.571, 16.559, 24.74, cf. *si* for *utinam* at *Aen* 6.187, Horace *Sat* 2.6.8.

838 Daedalus is here cited because he was the preeminent mortal craftsman of the ancient world, as a sculptor (the present reference, he is purported to be able to make moving statues at Homer *Il* 18.417), an architect (viz. the labyrinth, cf. Diodorus Siculus 1.97.5), and an inventor (Icarus' wings.) The Scholiast gives much information that is useful: περὶ τῶν Δαιδάλου ἔργων, ὅτι ἐκινεῖτο καὶ προΐει φωνήν, αὐτός τε ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἐν Εὐρυσθεῖ λεγει [fr.373]· 'οὐκ ἐστιν, ὦ γεραιὲ, μὴ δείσης τάδε· τὰ Δαιδάλεια πάντα κινεῖσθαι δοκεῖ βλέπειν τ' ἀγάλμαθ'. ὧδ' ἀνὴρ κεῖνος σοφός'· καὶ Κρατῖνος ἐν Θρᾴτταις [fr.74]· †πανὺ κακὸν δεῦρο μαστεύων τινὰ ποτὲ χαλκοῦν ἢ ξύλιον καὶ χρύσεον προσῆν οὐδαμῶς ξύλινος ἐκεῖνος ἀλλα χαλκοῦς ὢν ἀπέδρα. πότερον Δαιδάλειος ἦν ἤ τις ἐξέκλεψεν αὐτόν'· καὶ Πλάτων [*Comicus* fr.188]· 'οὗτος τίς εἶ, λέγε ταχύ, τί σιγᾷς· οὐκ ἐρεῖς. Ἑρμῆς ἔγωγε Δαιδάλου φωνὴν ἔχων ξύλινος βαδίζων αὐτόματος ἐληλυθα'. cf. Horace *Od* 4.2.2 *ope Daedalea*. The Scholiast passage is the only one where the statues both talk and move; in the Homeric passage mentioned above, they only move.

839 Wackernagel prefers the epic form ἀμαρτῇ to the Attic modification found in all the MSS. In favour of this reading are *Hcld* 138 δίκαι' ἀμαρτῇ δρᾶν, fr.680 (*Sciron*) ἀμαρτεῖν, and Barrett *Hip* 1195, but cf. *Rh* 313 ὁμαρτῇ and variants. Hesychius glosses it with ὁμοῦ, as "together."

The plural verb ἔχοιντο is used despite the neuter subject (πάντα), cf. *MT* 181 for use after ὡς.

840 κλαίοντα is "wailing" here, rather than "weeping", since voices and not eyes (or tear-ducts) are the subject, cf. Denniston *El* 842-3 for asyndeton, as well as 70, 1171, 1173 (where see note),

1175, *And* 1154, *Cyc* 465, *Pho* 1193, *Sup* 529 with different verbs.

ἐπισκήπτοντα can be used for serious entreaty, cf. Aeschines *Against Ctesiphon* 157 κλαίοντας ἱκετεύοντας ... ἐπισκήπτονας μηδενὶ τρόπῳ τὸν ἀλιτήριον στεφανοῦν, but also "is the verb used of a dying man who urges his family to take vengeance for him" (MacDowell (1963) 20). He continues, "the duty of the relatives of a killed slave was simply to urge his master to obtain vengeance for him by taking legal action against the killer." Meridor (1983) 16 n.29 cites Antiphon 1.29-30, and Lysias 13.41-42, 92 in their contexts, and cf. Demosthenes 47.72. The situation is not exactly parallel, however, and this is not in fact the action that Agamemnon undertakes on Hecuba's behalf. Nevertheless, if this was the sort of thing that would be associated with the word, then the full legal force of Hecuba's speech becomes clear: 824-35 Agamemnon must act as a kinsman; 836-445 Agamemnon must act as a master.

841 By addressing Agamemnon in this elaborate way, Hecuba admits to herself that she is now without any social status. She is desperate, and is now completely dependent on Agamemnon's beneficence. Yet though she lacks any real rank, she nevertheless does have power, and that she can embarrass him in this way is a sign of that power. Agamemnon is meant to be uneasy: Hecuba's address recognises that she is a slave, but also reminds him of Cassandra. The metaphorical use of φάος for people is also found at *Ion* 1439 ὦ φῶς μητρὶ κρεῖσσον ἡλίου, *HF* 531, Homer *Il* 18.102. For the use of the dative Ἕλλησιν, cf. *Sup* 278 and *HF* 1017 Ἑλλάδι.

842-43 Dale distinguishes two uses of πιθοῦ, used in contexts of appeal: alone, referring to a previous appeal (here, *Alc* 1101, 1109, *IA* 739, 1209, *Or* 1101); and in phrases such as ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ (402, *Hel* 323) it precedes a petition.

Although *HF* 1210-1 κατάlσχεθε λέοντος ἀγρίου θυμόν gives a parallel for the reading of the majority of the MSS, -σχε, it is generally emended away to παράσχες (2nd aorist imperative "lend.") 895 demonstrates Euripides' use of -σχες in ἔχω-compounds.

χεῖρα ... τιμωρόν "an avenging hand", cf. note 749-50

ἀλλ' ὅμως is a common Euripidean aposiopesis, cf. note 824-25.

844-45 "For it is the part of a good man to administer justice, and always in every case punish the bad." This expression of the *lex talionis* is fundamental to an accurate interpretation of the final trial scene, and for an appreciation of Hecuba's revenge; that it closes the appeal to Agamemnon is not accidental. It is the moral crunch of the speech, both flattering Agamemnon, and calling him to duty. In his role of Greek commander, his job is to mete out justice, and as a result, he has an obligation *to the gods* (cf.800) to act in a way appropriate for this, as an ἀνὴρ ἐσθλός. cf. Simonides in Plato *Rep* 332D τὸ τοὺς φίλως εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἐχθρους κακῶς (to which Socrates says the good man cannot harm others. cf. the biblical Sermon on the Mount, esp. *Matthew* 5.43-4.

846-49 The chorus expresses a straightforward paradox, with reference to νόμος (cf. 800.) It is implied that Hecuba has persuaded Agamemnon with her speech, which is misleading in that it will be demonstrated to be only partly true. Still, οἱ νόμοι are cited as being the reason Agamemnon is now a friend, and Polymestor has fallen into disfavour. The chorus is referring in particular to Hecuba's argument based upon kinship, 833-35 (see 847 note.)

846 Diggle *Phae* 164 says δεινόν γε is 'a common preface to an indignant reflection', cf. *Ion* 1312-3 δεινόν γε θνητοῖς τοὺς νόμους ὡς οὐ καλῶς | ἔθηκεν ὁ θεὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ γνώμης σοφῆς, Soph *El* 341-2, fr.103 δεινόν γε τοὺς μὲν δυσσεβεῖς ... πράσσειν καλῶς, *fr. adespota* 295.1-2 δεινόν γε τὴν μὲν μυῖαν ἀλκίμῳ σθένει | πηδᾶν ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν σώμαθ', 462 δεινόν γε ταὐτὸν τοῖς μὲν ἀνδάνειν βροτῶν, | τοῖς δ' ἔχθος εἶναι, Aristoph *Birds* 1269, and also *GP* 127.

Paley summarizes the three interpretations of συμπίτνει given by the Scholiast and periphrasts:

1. how all things collapse and perish
2. how all evils conspire against man

3. how all things turn out

but prefers "how strangely one thing falls in with another," which is along the right track for explaining the irony and reversal of natural order (in terms of relationships) intended by Euripides here.

847 Busche's emendation της ἀνάγκης adopted by Diggle is intended to tie the word closer with οἱ νόμοι, "the laws of necessity." This is both unnecessary, and as Tierney notes, runs contrary to the principle of *diff. pot.* Considering what follows, it is more likely the intended meaning is "ties of kin, relationships" (cf. Latin *necessitudines*) and that the MSS. reading should be preserved. Ambrose's "primitive laws" for νόμοι is unnecessarily prejudicial. Musgrave's emendation to χρόνοι at least makes sense, but also is not needed, cf. *Bac* 484 οἱ νόμοι δὲ διάφοροι.

διώρισαν "determine" gnomic aorist.

848 τιθέντες = ποιεῖν as 656.

γε, cf. *GP* 117.

851 δι' οἴκτου ... ἔχω, cf. *Sup* 194 δι' οἴκτου τὰς ἐμὰς λαβεῖν τύχας, *IT* 683 δι' αἰσχύνης ἔχω, and see Denniston *El* 1183. But *Or* 757 διὰ φόβου γὰρ ἔρχομαι has ἔρχομαι rather than ἔχω.

852-53 θεῶν is scanned as a monosyllable by synezesis, cf. 24. A breach against the laws of hospitality offends in particular Zeus Xenios. cf. 844-45, note 710 and Introduction IV.

τοῦ δικαίου, taken with οὕνεκα = "justice among men" cf. 791, *Hcld* 569-70 τῆς τε σῆς εὐψυχίας | καὶ τοῦ δικαίου. It is important thematically that Agamemnon use the word δίκην here, that he too (like the Chorus, Hecuba and Polymestor) recognise the justice of Hecuba's revenge against Polymestor (cf. Introduction I.) Tovar (1959) 133-34 however argues for χάριν, which, while it is a word that does have thematic importance in the play, is not preferable at this point, and is a corruption probably just picked up from 830 χάρις.

854-56 Two interpretations of εἴ πως φανείη are typically put forward, depending on whether or not δίκη is understood. If it is (Hadley), there is a conflation of two constructions yielding "provided that it should appear right". Better is the impersonal alternative, "provided that it should appear possible." Agamemnon's stress on appearances is significant: he is using Hecuba's arguments concerning Cassandra against her. This is not too subtle an interpretation for Agamemnon; in fact, it accords with his cowardly nature and desire for self-preservation evidenced throughout the play. The use of εἴ πως "for the elliptical expression of a hope or aim" (Jebb on Soph *Tra* 584), cf. *And* 54-55 εἴ πως τὰ πρόσθε σφάλματ' ἐξαιτούμενος | θεὸν παράσχοιτ' ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν εὐμενῆ, *Hel* 429 and Diggle (1978) 167-68 on *Hel* 741, *MT* 489.

Throughout extant tragedy the portrait of Agamemnon is of someone continually dependant on his soldier's approval, cf. 868, *Or* 1167-8 ὃς Ἑλλάδος | ἦρξ' ἀξιωθείς, οὐ τύραννος, Soph *Ajax* 1100-01, Aesch *Ag* 844-5. This colours how one understands στρατῷ. Agamemnon's fear is one of rebuke from the masses, a humiliation he suffers in the *Iliad* (before this story) in the famous episode with Thersytes 2.225ff. His fears are well grounded in all likelihood, due to his relationship with Cassandra, cf. note 833-5.

The optative δόξαιμι expresses Agamemnon's doubt that his providing assistance could remain a secret.

χάριν = εἵνεκα, also at 874.

Meridor (1978) 30 believes that Agamemnon here indicates what the Chorus suspects at 1032-34, that Hecuba's vengeance will mean killing Polymestor. This reckons the suggestions at 876 and 878 as being serious (so Meridor (1983) 17 n.36). Agamemnon's suggestions are meant in jest (see note 876-79) and here he does not genuinely believe Hecuba to be capable of accomplishing anything in real terms. This is markedly different from Creon's acquiescence to Medea's request, *Med* 340 μίαν με μεῖναι τήνδ' ἔασον ἡμέραν, which recognises the possible danger, *Med* 350 καὶ ὁρῶ μὲν ἐξαρμαρτάνων.

857 Agamemnon, in indicating that he has been touched by apprehension, demonstrates considerable embarrassment over his relationship with his troops.

858-63 Agamemnon's attitude, the conflict between political and individual allegiance, is similar to that found elsewhere in tragedy:

Demophon (*Hcld* 411-13) παῖδα δ' οὔτ' ἐμὴν κτενῶ
οὔτ' ἄλλον ἀστῶν τῶν ἐμῶν ἀναγκάσω
ἄκονθ'·

Theseus (*Sup* 247, 349-50) τί πρὸς πολίτας τοὺς ἐμοὺς λέγων καλόν;
δόξαι δὲ χρῄζω καὶ πόλει πάσῃ τόδε,
δόξει δ' ἐμοῦ θέλοντος·

Pelasgus (Aesch *Sup* 368-69, 398-401)
ἐγὼ δ' ἂν οὐ κραίνοιμ' ὑπόσχεσιν πάρος,
ἀστοῖς δὲ πᾶσι τῶνδε κοινώσας πέρι.
. . .
εἶπον δὲ καὶ πρίν, οὐκ ἄνευ δήμου τάδε
πράξαιμ' ἄν, οὐδέ περ κρατῶν, μὴ καί ποτε
εἴπῃ λεώς, εἴ πού τι κἀλλοῖον τύχοι,
'ἐπήλυδας τιμῶν ἀπώλεσας πόλιν.'

It is also of course part of Antigone's dilemma, in Sophocles' *Antigone*. ταραγμὸς is significant, in that by it Agamemnon does recognize that he has two loyalties: he concedes her argument that she has a moral claim on him as mother of Cassandra. Nevertheless, there is still a rejection of active participation. That the army would behave as Agamemnon expects is likely, in light of their reaction to Polyxena's sacrifice 127-29.

859-60 Elmsley's δ' ἐμοί is clearer than the MSS. δὲ σοι, as ὅδε then = Polydorus, but Tierney is wrong to ask for "something like ἀνήρ": ὅδε is used poetically for ἐγώ (perhaps with a demonstrative gesture) also at Soph *El* 1004 εἴ τις τούσδ' ἀκούσεται λόγους, *Tra* 305 τῆσδε γε ζώσης ἔτι (cf. Smyth 1242.)

χωρὶς τοῦτο, sc. ἐστί, "that is a separate matter."

861 πρὸς ταῦτα, "in view of this," indicates a fixed resolution rather than a reason, cf. Soph *El* 383-84 πρὸς ταῦτα φράζου, καί με μή ποθ' ὕστερον | παθοῦσα μέμψῃ, 820, *OT* 426.

862 ταχὺν προσαρκέσαι, "swift to help you," includes a significant though suppressed protasis along the lines of "if I could do so without angering the Greeks and there was no other way but with my help." Only part of this is detailed in the next line.

863 εἰ διαβληθήσομαι, "if I am to be slandered," but the slander has bite, also containing nuances of "fall into disfavour with," cf. *Hcld* 420-22 ταῦτ' οὖν ὅρα σὺ καὶ συνεξεύρισχ' ὅπως | αὐτοί τε σωθήσεσθε καὶ πέδον τόδε, | κἀγὼ πολίταις μὴ διαβληθήσομαι, Thuc 4.22.3, 8.81. For the construction, cf. 802, *MT* 407.

864-69 The dynamic of these few lines serves to clearly indicate the reversal of status that has occurred. In a real and visible sense, Hecuba is now the master, cf. Introduction VI. The vocabulary in this passage is discussed in detail also by Daitz (1971).

864 φεῦ is not of sorrow but of contempt. Hecuba's statement echoes her earlier sentiments (cf. 800) in their levelling effect. Despite the great status difference between the two, in a broader perspective both Hecuba and Agamemnon are captives and subject to the whims of the Greek army. The phrase οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν is similar to that in Aristotle *Rhetoric* 2.21 οὐκ ἔστιν

ἀνδρῶν. θνητῶν is a partitive genitive after ὅστις, which is intentionally vague.

865 The postponement of γὰρ to the third position is well precedented, cf. *GP* 96. The idea of ἢ χρημάτων ... δοῦλός is common is Euripides: *Pho* 395 ἀλλ' ἐς τὸ κέρδος παρὰ φύσιν δουλευτέον, *Sup* 876-77 ὥστε τοὺς τρόπους | δούλους παρασχεῖν χρημάτων ζευχθεὶς ὕπο, fr.1029.2-3 οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρετῆς δοῦλον οὔτε χρημάτων | οὔτ' εὐγενείας οὔτε θωπείας ὄχλου.

866 πλῆθος has democratic nuances, and is therefore at least partly anachronistic. πόλεος is written for πόλεως, *metri gratia*, cf. *Or* 897 ὃς ἂν δύνηται πόλεος ἔν τ' ἀρχαῖσιν ἦ, *El* 412, *Ion* 595, and Jebb on Soph *Ant* 162ff (where he omits this occurrence.)

This line constitutes the earliest implicit reference to written law being a guarantee for democracy (νόμων γραφαί), i.e. a measure of personal freedom (the earliest explicit reference in *Sup* 429-37, for which see Stinton in Collard *ad loc in addenda* pages 440-42.) Stinton suggests, following Ostwald (1969), that lack of any earlier testimony is accidental, that the almost casual reference here assumes the notion was already common at the popular level. There is of course further anachronism in this notion, since the earliest written laws were those of Solon. Stinton is wrong: no one is ἐλεύθερος, because he is tied down by the laws. Stinton's is not the usage here. What Hecuba saying in an odd way amounts to, "You cannot be an absolute tyrant." Even the fact that the laws are written implies at one level that there are those who do not accept the law *prima facie* (Ostwald (1969) 47.)

867 "prevents him from following his character, according to his mind" i.e. from acting as he would. μὴ should precede χρῆσθαι, but metre demands otherwise. It is the redundant (in English) μή after verbs of preventing, cf. *IA* 661 μ' ἴσχει, *HF* 197 ῥύεται μὴ κατθανεῖν, Soph *El* 518, *OT* 1388. Due to its frequent use in comedy, τρόποις, "humour, character" may be a colloquialism.

868 δὲ expresses a break-off, like ἀτάρ (*GP* 167) cf. 1237, *Cyc* 286, 597, *El* 297, *Hel* 143, *Bac*

657. ὄχλῳ is used with contempt, as στρατῷ had in 855. πλέον νέμεις sc. μέρος, cf. *Sup* 241 νέμοντες τῷ φθόνῳ πλέον μέρος, *Hel* 917-8 οὔκουν χρή σε συγγόνῳ πλέον νέμειν ματαίῳ μᾶλλον ἢ χρηστῷ πατρί, fr.183 (*Antiope*) λαμπρός θ' ἕκαστος κἀπὶ τοῦτ' ἐπείγεται | νέμων τὸ πλεῖστον ἡμέρας τούτῳ μέρος, | ἵν' αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ τυγχάνει κράτιστος ὤν, Thuc 3.3.1.

869 There is irony in this reversal of status, the slave setting the master free. It is yet another manifestation of the topsy-turviness of the world as presented in the play.

870-71 Hecuba offers a compromise whereby Agamemnon need only give consent. Hecuba will undertake the action of her revenge herself. The phrasing is subtle: the polar expression used is not balanced. The passive role Agamemnon is to play is presented only as "sharing knowledge" (σύνισθι) which is a necessary and completed action, as she has already told him of her intended revenge. The active role Agamemnon need not play is presented as a prohibition (μη + aorist subjunctive = "don't!", cf. 183), as if she were urging him against an action towards which he would normally be inclined. Hecuba tacitly assumes the assent she seeks then urges Agamemnon not to do or think anything other than what he now does, which he willingly obeys.

872-74 Aphaeresis - inverse elision - occurs here in ἢ 'πικουρία, as well as 387 and (using the same phrase as here) at 878. Since it would normally take a dative, πάσχοντος is to be understood as a genitive absolute. ἀνδρὸς Θρῃκὸς is contemptuous, cf. 682 note.

οἷα πείσεται is a grim euphemism avoiding any direct explanation of the form her revenge is to take, cf. 1000, *El* 289 and Denniston's note on 1141. Though the audience would recognize that this conceals her intended actions, it is left guessing as to what those actions are to be.

The aorist passive φανῇ τις goes with θόρυβος ἢ 'πικουρία.

μὴ is used with δοκῶν rather than οὐ because of the imperative cf. *Hip* 119 μὴ δόκει τούτου κλύειν where it is used because of the infinitive. οὐ δοκῶν is found at *Med* 67, *El* 925, Aristoph *Knights* 1146, *Plutus* 837.

ἐμὴν χάριν "for my sake" cf. 855 note, 25, 892, 1175, Soph *Tra* 485.

875 Reiske's dashes (adopted by Diggle) are unnecessary and make the line choppy. Daitz' solution - a semicolon at the caesura - is better. ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς in context is "a euphemism so transparent that it is ominous" (Bond *HF* 605, where he also cites *HF* 938, *Hip* 709, *IA* 672, *Bac* 49, Soph *El* 1434, etc.) for the impending blinding of Polymestor. The clause itself Euripides uses elsewhere (cf. *Hip* 521, *Or* 1664, *IA* 401), always at the end of a verse. In this respect, Parry (1971) 295 is right to call it a formula.

876-79 Agamemnon's questions are leading, sarcastic, and heavily ironic. There is also some alarm. The alarm grows to a critical point at 885. In some ways, the questions are dramatically unnecessary, but this exchange does affect how Agamemnon is viewed when he becomes the arbiter 1109ff. Euripides uses πῶς οὖν as a rhetorical device for eliciting hypothetical suggestions, cf. *Hip* 598, 1261, *Med* 1376, *Hel* 1228, 1266. The two possible solutions suggested by Agamemnon are also found at *Ion* 616-7 ὅσας σφαγὰς δὴ φαρμάκων <τε> θανασίμων | γυναῖκες ηὗρον ἀνδράσιν διαφθοράς, where Dindorf deleted them, believing them to be interpolated, perhaps from another play. In the present context, the murder by sword is impossible in Agamemnon's point of view for a woman; poison is a more realistic possibility for a woman (cf. Heracles' lament Soph *Tra* 1062-63 γυνὴ δέ, θῆλυς οὖσα κἄνανδρος φύσιν, | μόνη με δὴ καθεῖλε φασγάνου δίχα, and the source of her poison being 1140 τοσοῦτος φαρμακεὺς) but quite impractical for a prisoner of war. In the present context, these unrealisable possibilities (in Agamemnon's view) prepare for the eventual cruelty of the revenge, as well as the means by which it is delivered (1161 φάσγανα.)

ἢ 'πικουρίᾳ cf. 872. The accent on τίνι shows it to be an interrogative, not an enclitic: "or with what assistance?" cf. *Hip* 803 λύπῃ παχνωθεῖσ' ἢ ἀπὸ συμφορᾶς τίνος;

880-81 The verbal structure of these two lines establishes the tone of the entire passage: the mirror

construction shows how opposite each of the character's views in fact is. Gender, social status, origin and potential power are all invoked in a very compressed time. στέγαι is probably accompanied by a demonstrative action demonstrating the tent of Agamemnon immediately behind them (cf. 59 πρὸ δόμων.) Euripides often elides the 3rd person plural perfect, as he does with κεκεύθασ', cf. *Ion* 1622 πεφύκασ', *Tro* 879 τεθνᾶσ' (and 350, depending on the reading of the MSS. adopted), *HF* 539. The MSS. here also give the Doric form of the verb, which is less preferable.

Τρῳάδων ὄχλον is virtually an oxymoron, intended to surprise Agamemnon in answering his (supposed) rhetorical question. Just twelve lines previous, ὄχλος had been used by Hecuba to describe the Greek army. She equates her followers with his. He counters this phrase with Ἑλλήνων ἄγραν. Hecuba had presented her fellow captives as "a mob of Trojan women" who would support her revenge. Agamemnon's rebuff occurs at the same position in the line, scanning identically but emphasizing not their unpredictability (ὄχλον also means "riot") but their servitude ("the booty of the Greeks".) Note the subtle shift from a defining genitive to a possessive genitive which accomplishes the same thing.

εἶπας is a momentary aorist cf. 583.

882 Scaliger's emendation ἐμῶν is an attempt to remove the problem of a murdered Hecuba speaking the line. Tierney's interpretation of the received text, ἐμὸν, "my particular murderer" is unnecessary and not altogether convincing, even when it is recognized the murdering is metaphorical, in that he has cut off her family line. The possessive pronoun is being used without the noun to which it refers, much as in English one can wish greetings to "you and yours," cf. *And* 374-75 δούλων δ' ἐκεῖνον τῶν ἐμῶν ἄρχειν χρεὼν | καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἡμᾶς τε πρός, *Sup* 320 μὴ δῆτ' ἐμός γ' ὤν, ὦ τέκνον, κεχρημέναις;

τιμωρήσομαι should take the accusative (cf. 749-50 note.) Though normally a spondee by synezesis, φονέα is also scanned as a tribrach at *El* 599 λέξον, τί δρῶν ἂν φονέα τεισαίμην πατρὸς, 763.

883 καὶ πῶς loads the question with disbelief.

ἀρσένων ... κράτος means either "victory over men" (objective genitive) or "the strength of men" cf. *Tro* 949-50 ὃς τῶν μὲν ἄλλων δαιμόνων ἔχει κράτος, | κείνης δὲ δοῦλός ἐστι. Line 884 can be taken to answer either question. Most editors favour the former, and a singular is not necessarily preferable, since Agamemnon would assume that Polymestor would be protected by many men. I prefer the latter interpretation, but cf. the questions at 515, 1064, *Alc* 482, *Hip* 1171, Soph *Tra* 68.

885 Having confirmed the previous statement (δεινόν) Agamemnon qualifies this with the adversative particle μέντοι (*GP* 404.) The repetition of δεινόν indicates a sort of one-upmanship contest occurring between Hecuba and Agamemnon. μέμφομαι "I think little of" is rendered correctly by the Scholiast φαῦλον ἡγοῦμαι, cf. fr. 199 (*Antiope*) τὸ δ' ἀσθενές μου καὶ τὸ θῆλυ σώματος | κακῶς ἐμέμφθης. This fragment only partly supports Jenni's emendation σθένος: the MSS. reading γένος makes as much sense and is appropriate in Agamemnon's mouth. The two examples Hecuba gives in 886-87 are equally representative of the potential *strength* of women and what can be accomplished by the female *gender*. This last of course is (in a modern sense) a prejudicial reading of γένος which strictly = "race," but it should not be surprising that Agamemnon considers himself wholly different from females, cf. 1181 note. Similarly, the Chorus doubts Medea's intent to murder her children, *Med* 856-65.

886-87 τί δ' "Expressing surprise or incredulity, and usually introducing a further question ('What?!')" (*GP* 175.) εἷλον is from αἱρέω "kill."

The story of the Danaids was common in myth (e.g. Aesch *Sup*) wherein the fifty daughters of Danaus married the sons of his brother Aegyptus (Αἰγύπτου τέκνα.) On their wedding night they killed their cousin-husbands at the request of their father, because of a fight he had had with his brother. However, Hypermnestra (the *splendide mendax* of Horace *Odes* 3.11.35) disobeyed

and spared her husband Lynceus. The myth itself varies considerably in its various presentations, and the details above are the only ones which are not contradicted by any of the sources. The best summary of the various presentations is that of Garvie (1969) 163-83. The Scholia on this line actually constitute one of the key sources for the story. Λῆμνον refers to the Lemnian women, another common story (e.g. Aesch *Cho* 631-38): neglected by their husbands due to Aphrodite's curse, they killed them (ἄρδην "utterly," cf. *Ion* 1273-74 ἔσω γὰρ ἄν με περιβαλοῦσα δωμάτων | ἄρδην ἂν ἐξέπεμψας εἰς Ἅιδου δόμους) and lived under Hypsipyle until found by the Argonauts, cf. Pindar *P* 4.251, Herod 6.138 νενόμισται ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὰ σχέτλια ἔργα πάντα Λήμνια καλέεσθαι.

These two exempla are chosen to show the potentially destructive power of women. In each case, the power of a large number of women is demonstrated: this mirrors the fact that it is the attendants of Hecuba who actually perform the revenge upon Polymestor. Exemplars could have been found had Euripides wanted individual actions: Aerope and Atreus; Eriphyle and Amphiaraus (cited Soph *El* 837-41). Clytemnestra and Agamemnon also fit this pattern, but it is an action which follows this play, so could not have been cited in this context. It is however invoked later by the blinded Polymestor: he converts what he has suffered at the hands of many women to an *ad hominem* mention that he knows a prophecy of a similar harm to befall his judge (see note 1277-81.) ἐξῴκισαν, is used here almost euphemistically = "to depopulate" (cf. 948) + accusative of the land so emptied, + genitive of the people removed from the land.

888 ἀλλ' ὧς γενέσθω "but let it be so" seems to be a fixed phrase concluding an argument, cf. *Tro* 726, *IT* 603. μέθες "let be, break off" effectively forms a rapid transition from theory to practice: "That's enough talk," Hecuba is saying, "now we must act."

889 πέμψον ... ἀσφαλῶς "give safe conduct to." τήνδ' points to the woman addressed in the next line. Weil rightly notes that this is the θεράπαινα of 658, the other actor who has not yet left the stage. The alternative to this view requires this actor to have left the stage without mention (an

unlikely possibility) and for this to be addressed to a non-speaking attendant. The θεράπαινα leaves the stage at the caesura of 894.

890 πλασθεῖσα is an irregular form of the aorist passive πελάζω "having drawn near" cf. *And* 25 πλασθεισ' Ἀχιλλέως παιδί, *Tro* 203, *Rh* 14, 557, and the MS. variation at 776, Aesch *PV* 897, Bacchylides 16.35. ξένῳ can be taken ironically as "friend" or "stranger."

891-94 The language of καλεῖ ... Ἑκάβη is reminiscent of Theocritus 2.101. It is probably best to write δή ποτ' as one word, following Schwyzer II.563. The meaning (common for tragedy) is *olim* (*GP* 213) "usually implying an irrecoverable happier condition" (Collard *Sup* 1131) cf. *Tro* 506-07 ἄγετε τὸν ἁβρὸν δή ποτ' ἐν Τροίαι πόδα, | νῦν δ' ὄντα δοῦλον, *Phae* 96. χρέος is being used like χάριν, cf. 855, *Pho* 762, Soph *Tra* 485 etc.

These lines begin a direct quotation of what the servant being sent is to say to Polymestor. The quotation continues to ...τοὺς ἐξ ἐκείνης (who therefore = Hecuba herself.)

895 ἐπίσχες, cf. 842. τάφον, cf. 672.

896-97 The structure of this purpose clause alternates between unity and division: "so that these two siblings together, in a single flame, the divided care of their mother, may be buried in the ground." The initial division is emphasized by the dual τώδ' ἀδελφὼ, which is united in πλησίου (taken closely with the verb) and μιᾷ φλογί. It is then divided again by διοσὴ (that this would be noticed is likely, due to the common contrast in tragedy between μία and a number word, cf. *Ion* 539 δύο μίαν θαυμάζομεν, *Or* 1244 τρισσοῖς φίλοις γὰρ εἷς ἀγών, δίκη μία, and Barrett *Hip* 1403.) What is unclear is in what precise sense διοσὴ is to be understood: whether as double (i.e. twice as big) trouble, or as two troubles. The context rules out the possibility of a divided trouble, based on analogy with Aesch *Ag* 122 λήμασι δισσούς (where Dindorf suggests λήμασιν ἴσους.) κρυφθῆτον (another dual form) recalls πλησίον and brings them together to a common ground,

χθονί. Statius *Theb* 12.429-32 speaks of the divided flame of the cremations of Eteocles and Polyneices. If the body is removed at the end of the episode, these lines function as instructions to silent attendants to do so.

898-900 Any solemnity in the preceding words (ἔσται τάδ' οὕτω "so shall it be") is ruined by καὶ γὰρ, the tone of which amounts to "But let me make one thing perfectly clear...", followed by a μὲν ... δὲ polar expression, finishing in 901. πλοῦς, unlike its use in 901, "can mean 'sailing-wind' as an extension from the meaning 'possibility of sailing'" (Webster on Soph *Phi* 1449.) νῦν δ' "but as it is..."

Fraenkel (1962) 79 believes that Agamemnon's assent is only to the last petition, concerning the treatment of the dead children. Lines 902-04 show that it applies to the entire plan of revenge, even though as yet he does not comprehend its magnitude.

901 πλοῦν, see previous note.

Unnecessary difficulty has been made of the word ἡσύχους. Hartung's emendation is not needed, and most of the Scholiast's worries just display an assumption that the calm must be connected with the opportunity to sail. Hadley is right in saying the MSS. reading ἥσυχον is to be taken adverbially, with μένειν, as at *Hcld* 476-77 γυναικὶ γὰρ σιγή τε καὶ τὸ σωφρονεῖν | κάλλιστον εἴσω θ' ἥσυχον μένειν δόμων.

Early in the play it was implicitly established that the spirit of Achilles was responsible for the stopping of the winds (38, 111-12), and not until he had received some γέρας would he free the winds. Talthybius makes it clear that this is his own belief 538-41. That this is a mistaken assumption is demonstrated by the patent inconsistency in the facts, that the winds didn't start after the sacrifice. This in itself is probably a variation on the tradition, and quite possibly Sophocles' play, in which the sacrifice of Polyxena does restore the winds and thereby forms a mirror-scene to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia: sacrifice of Greek king's youngest daughter to get to Troy to begin Trojan war; sacrifice of Trojan king's youngest daughter to leave Troy to finish Trojan war. The

present instance is the first of the subsequent references to the winds, coming at a point where Hecuba has completed the first step of her revenge: she has secured Agamemnon's (passive) support. The next reference comes at the completion of the second step, as Polymestor enters Agamemnon's tent with his sons, at the end of the next episode (1019-20.) The final reference to the winds comes in the last actor's speech (1289-90), when, Hecuba's revenge having been completed, the winds begin to blow. This motif that runs throughout the play is the only clear supernatural sign of the correctness of Hecuba's actions.

902-04 Agamemnon concludes with banal moralising: the πως is telling, "may there be good in this *somehow.*" It would seem he has already forgotten his alarm of 25 lines previous. He then expresses two sentiments (both infinitive clauses in apposition to τόδε) which are κοινὸν πᾶσι, "common to all." What he is doing is accepting Hecuba's intended justice (albeit passively) as proposed 842-45 (cf. 870-71 note.) The contrast between ἰδίᾳ "privately" and πόλει is also found at *Sup* 129 ἰδίᾳ δοκῆσάν σοι τόδ' ἢ πάσῃ πολει;, and the sentiment itself is echoed in fr. 1036 κακὸν γὰρ ἄνδρα χρὴ κακῶς πάσχειν ἀεί.

905-52 Third Stasimon

As Agamemnon goes offstage (with any silent attendants he might have), Hecuba remains onstage, with the corpse of Polydorus, which is probably towards the back of the stage, and perhaps has been reshrouded. It is possible that it is carried away here (as many editors suggest) but dramatically it is much more effective if the audience can see the corpse throughout the fourth episode. It then bears a silent witness to Polymestor's lies. The death of children is a running motif throughout the play, beginning with Polyxena, carrying through Polydorus, and ending with the corpses of Polymestor's murdered children. If it is removed, in light of Hecuba's recent comments (896-97) attendants probably remove the body following Agamemnon, to prepare both dead children for the single flame. Characters remaining onstage, presumably motionless, throughout a stasimon is not exceptional: it happened earlier in the play (first stasimon) and also, Medea in *Med* 410-45, 627-62, Pentheus in *Bac* 370-433 etc. This establishes a *tableau* for the play's longest choral ode, wherein they recall the horrors of the night Troy was sacked (the Ἰλίου Πέρσις.) This theme is made explicit with 908 πέρσαν. Euripides adapts a popular story, probably from two books of the so-called epic cycle by Arctinus of Miletus (fragments and hypothesis in Evelyn-White (1982) 521-5), which he also used *Tro* 511-67, *IA* 751-800, and is found in *TGrF* Kannicht *adespota* 644.20-43. Webster (1970) 208 notes that Euripides uses 'epic' narrative in contrast with an ugly present. Euripides seems quite 'modern' in portraying the event through the eyes of a noble woman: "by taking the Trojan war into the bedroom, Euripides is being consistent in his theme of a sacked city as women see it. In this lay his original contribution to the Trojan saga." (Barlow (1971) 31, commenting on *Tro* 531-50 but equally relevant here as she notes.) The chorus are narrating in the first person, adding πάθος to the dramatic situation. While both this ode and *Tro* 511-67 present a shift from celebration to horror, the latter passage only has direct narration in lines 551-54. Personal suffering is present in each case, cf. *Tro* 517 ὀλόμαν, *Hec* 914 ὠλλύμαν.

The previous episode has shown the final effects that the Fall of Troy has had on Hecuba. Her family has been destroyed, and this stasimon serves to show that similar losses have been

suffered by all the Trojan women. This is not to trivialise Hecuba's situation: rather, as queen, the sufferings of her people are very much her own. The positioning of this ode is clearly significant: the suffering has been far reaching, and with the impending revenge, some sense of justice will be restored. The stasimon contains two strophic/antistrophic pairs and an epode, forming a direct address to the fallen city:

Strophe α'	*O Ilium, you were sacked*
Antistrophe α'	*When my husband was tired from feasts*
Strophe β'	*And I was setting my hair for bed;*
Antistrophe β'	*I was taken away by ship.*
Epode	*May Helen be cursed!*

Sandwiched between the opening apostrophe of the dead city (cf. Polymestor's opening apostrophe of its dead king, 953) and the closing curse of Helen which is very strongly reminiscent of Aesch *Ag* 1455-61 (for which, see Introduction IV), is a story of Troy's last night. It seems hard, in view of this summary, to substantiate Hourmouziades' claim that the destruction of Troy in the *Hecuba* is "so dimly implied by the onstage action" (1965, 121.) The structure actually represents a reversed time-frame, beginning with the ruined city, moving back to the night of the ruin, and closing with the original cause. Collard (1989) rightly calls the ode "forcibly suggestive" and relevant to the overall dramatic structure, rather than merely a diverting narrative. Lines 936-52 are analysed in detail by Biehl (1985) 260-3.

In the *Hecuba*, Euripides consciously links the three stasima thematically. This has been noted in detail by Michelini (1987) Appendix C, and Gellie (1980) 42-44. Mossman (1990) 82-110 discusses the role of the Chorus in this play at length, and this stasimon in particular 103-08. That the act-dividing lyric 1024-34 should be considered as a stasimon is discussed *ad loc*, and its place in the overall intent for the stasima should become clear. The four lyrics are linked by nautical references: in the first stasimon, the women hypothesize on where the Greek ships will take them (444-74); the second relates Paris' abduction of Helen by ship (634); the third tells of the women being dragged into the Greek ships and torn from their country (936-41); the fourth uses nautical

terminology to predict the fate of Polymestor (1025-28). Of course, nautical references are to be expected due only to the location of the story. The pattern here does seem more deliberate, and the presence of the *motif* in the stasima is supported by the lack of winds for sailing (see note 901) as well as Polydorus' body cast upon the waves (26-9, 36, 697-701) Barlow *Tro* 98-152 notes the combination of literal and metaphorical nautical imagery there. Also uniting the odes is a sense of impending doom: 475-79; 629-30; 910-13; 1024, where it is no longer their own doom, but that of Polymestor - another sign of moral victory. The idea of journey is also present: in the first stasimon, from Troy to Greece; in the second from Greece to Troy; in the third from Troy to Greece; and the fourth explicitly concerning someone who has just travelled from Thrace to the Chersonese. There is also an oscillation in the chronological sequence involved: the first lyric deals with an undetermined future; the second with the distant past; the third with the immediate past; and the fourth with the immediate, determined future.

There is an evident time violation in the ode, noted by Collard (1989). At 890 Hecuba sends her handmaid to Polymestor in Thrace - a journey of several hundred miles - and he appears at 953. It is fair to assume that at least several days pass during the stasimon. This is not a unique phenomenon in extant Euripides: about a week passes during *And* 1009-46; at least several hours and probably a night pass during *Cyc* 356-74. These examples suggest that Euripidean stage convention preferred such chronological suspension to artificial plot twists to perpetuate tension and maintain internal logic in *tableaux*.

The metre is primarily aeolic, with many interspersed iambic lines. Such a mixture was found in the previous stasimon (629-57) as well as *And* 274-308, *HF* 348-407, *Ion* 184-237, *Tro* 1060-1117, *Hel* 1107-64 (Raven (1962) Appendix, page 125.) While some of the scansion and line division is found in Daitz (80-81), he does differ from Diggle at several places which shall be discussed as they arise. Since Diggle's text does not number individual lines in the stasimon, and some lines have been joined since the traditional numbering, the following is the number I shall use of each successive line in his text, as deduced from his apparatus: 905, 906/7, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913; 914, 915/6, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922; 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928/9, 930,

931, 932; 933, 934, 935, 936/7, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942; 943/4 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951/2. Kranz (1933) 254ff. considered this the earliest of the "dithyrambic" stasima.

Nussbaum (1986) 510 n.45 calls the ode "the most solipsistic lyric of all", revealing "the degree to which each woman, as an 'I', is obsessed with private dreams of revenge." This is far too narrow a reading. Yes, the chorus like Hecuba, are concerned to attain revenge, but it is not a random lashing out at someone to compensate for their loss, but revenge particularly for Hecuba because her son has been murdered. In detailing the Sack of Troy, the Chorus does focus on its (collective) loss, a loss also endured by Hecuba (which if anything shows what binds these women together, not what isolates each.) To suggest as Nussbaum does that "there is no cooperation or mutuality here, but only parallel projects of revenge" is to miss the purpose of the ode, of the meaning of revenge in the play and (perhaps) of the fact that it is Hecuba's servants and not the Chorus who perform the eventual revenge.

905 The chorus' immediate concern is for their πατρίς, a key word which is echoed towards the end of the stasimon at 947 πατρίας and 951 πατρῷον.

906/7 The verb λέγω is one of the verbs (a complete list of which can be found at Smyth 809) which uses both the future middle (as here) and the future passive forms in a passive sense. The former is durative, the latter aoristic. cf. *HF* 582 ὡς πάροιθε λέξομαι, *Alc* 322 ἀλλ' αὐτίκ' ἐν τοῖς οὐκέτ' οὖσι λέξομαι.

The partitive genitive τῶν ἀπορθήτων (sc. πόλεων) "among the unsacked (cities)" was one of the traditional boasts of Athens, cf. *Med* 824-26 Ἐρεχθεῖδαι τὸ παλαιὸν ὄλβιοι | καὶ θεῶν παῖδες μακάρων, ἱερᾶς | χώρας ἀπορθήτου τ' ἄπο, Aesch *Per* 348 ἔτ' ἆρ' Ἀθηνῶν ἔστ' ἀπόρθητος πόλις; Its use here, at the beginning of the ode, is emphatic, as perhaps a reminder to the Athenians that their city too though great, could fall if the Peloponnesian War were to continue. Such suppositions must remain only that, but the phrase is not unproblematical when applied to Troy, for Troy had been sacked by Heracles when Priam's father Laomedon was king (hence in the

story of Philoctetes, the bow of Heracles is needed to sack the city, since it had been used to do so once before.) Presumably Euripides' lack of concern with this detail suggests he wishes the contemporary reference to be particularly clear.

908-12 Weil wrongly says Ἑλλάνων is dependent on δορί, when in fact it is a genitive of material, dependent upon νέφος, which is used metaphorically, cf. *Pho* 250-51 νέφος ἀσπίδων, Pindar *N* 9.38, 10.9, *I* 3.35, Homer *Il* 17.243 πολέμοιο νέφος περὶ πάντα καλύπτει. Epic vocabulary or allusion is also found 915-16, 20, 35, 45.

This strophe contains three tmeses, the fractured verbs perhaps invoking the breaking of the city's defences: ἀμφί σε κρύπτει (= ἀμφικρύπτει σε), ἀπο - κέκαρσαι (cf. *HF* 875-76 ἀποκείρεται | σὸν ἄνθος πόλεος) and κατὰ - κέχρωσαι (cf. *Med* 497-98 ὡς μάτην κεχρῴσμεθα | κακοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρος, *Pho* 1625 σοί τ' εὖ λέλεκται γόνατα μὴ χρῴζειν ἐμά.) For tmeses in dialogue, cf. 1172-75 note. It retains κηλῖδα as a cognate accusative, modified by αἰθάλου, genitive of material ("with the stain of soot.") Smoke is a typical element in the sack of a city, cf. *Hip* 551 σὺν αἵματι, σὺν καπνῷ, *Tro* 145, Aesch *ST* 342, Pindar *P* 5.84, Virgil *Aen* 2.609. The καπνοῦ of the MSS is unmetrical and clearly a gloss. Collard (1989) 6 suggests the repeated tmeses are purposeful: "The separations of preverb and verb become one by one longer, 907 by an enclitic pronoun, 910 by a noun, 911 by a whole phrase; gradual extension of the ruin is thus suggested." He also posits a crescendo of guttural consonance, with 907 κρύπτει, 910 κέκαρσαι, 911-13 (κατὰ) κηλῖδ' οἰκτροτάταν κέχρωσαι. For the repetition of δορὶ δὴ δορί, see note on 689-90. δὴ is used here emphatic of the previous substantive δορί (*GP* 214.)

Troy's towers are also στεφάνας at *Tro* 783-84 βαῖνε πατρῴων | πύργων ἐπ' ἄκρας στεφάνας, Pindar *O* 8.32, *AP* 9.97, Kannicht *TGFr adespota* 644.38 [στε]φάνας, for other cities cf. Pindar *I* 6.4, *O* 5.1, 9.19. The women lament the loss of Troy's (personified) crown because it is a symbol of their own abasement, both in terms of having lost a city as well as (most acutely for Hecuba) the loss of royal honours. Such female personification of a city is common in ancient thought, e.g. the biblical *Lamentations* 1:1-10. Tierney notes that "the great Mother-goddess,

Cybele, widely worshipped in Asia Minor, is regularly represented with a crown of towers." She is so pictured on coins from Hellenistic Smyrna, and both Seneca and Virgil describe her as *turrita*.

Daitz divides 910 and 911 (= his 909 and 910) which are coordinated with 919 and 920 (= his 918 and 919) after the final syllable in κέκαρσαι and ἔκειτο rather than the penult, as Diggle does. The advantage of Daitz' division (which produces an enoplian and a telesilean) is that line ends coincides with word end. This however is not required, and Diggle's division (yielding a telesilean and a pherecratean) is perhaps preferable in that it is more clearly aeolic.

913 Hadley and Collard note that this verb is used especially of protecting deities when used in tragedy: of Dionysus Soph *OC* 678-80 ἵν' ὁ βακχιώ|τας ἀεὶ Διόνυσος ἐμβατεύει | θείαις ἀμφιπολῶν τιθήναις, and of Pan Aesch *Per* 448-49 ἣν ὁ φιλόχορος | Πὰν ἐμβατεύει. It is also used of persons, though, cf. *El* 595, 1251.

914 Some adjectives of time (or place, or order of succession, etc. (Smyth 1042)) are used as predicates where English would have an adverbial phrase. Here, μεσονύκτιος = "at midnight", cf. 797 ἀφῆκε πόντιον, 926 ἐπιδέμνιος. Σ *Lycophron* 344 preserves a line from the *Little Iliad* (of the so-called 'epic cycle') confirming the traditional hour of the fall: νὺξ μὲν ἔην μέσση, λαμπρὴ δ' ἐπέτελλε σελήνη (Evelyn-White (1982) 516-7 = fr. 9 Bernabé = 11 Kinkel) which was used twice in Tzetzes' *Posthomerica* (720, 773, cf. *Tro* 543, Virgil *Aen* 2.255 (for which see Grafton and Swerdlow (1986) 212-18), Petronius 89.54ff. Aesch *Ag* 826 sets the fall ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν which would seem to connote time of year (where see Fraenkel) rather than time of night. If nothing else, reckoning by constellation would suggest the night was clear. The Chorus' "destruction" is a hyperbolic conceit, as are Hecuba's similar claims at 167-68, 284, and 1214.

915/6-8 These lines constitute two temporal clauses: the first (ἦμος ... σκίδναται) modifies line 914 (here Collard (1989) sees deliberate sigmatism); the second (μολπᾶν ... καταπαύσας) modifies 918 (Collard (1989) n.6 follows Wilamowitz in coordinating participial and prepositional

phrases, cf. 346-47, 1197-98, and list at Diggle (1972) 244. This produces an ABBA structure which would seem to justify strengthening the punctuation in 916.

Only used with the indicative, ἦμος "when" is an epicism found only here in extant Euripides, never in Aeschylus or comedy, but at Soph *OT* 1134, *Aj* 935, *Tra* 155, 531.

For the temporal use of the preposition in ἐκ δείπνων, cf. Xenophon *Anab* 4.6.21 ἐκ τοῦ ἀρίστου "after breakfast." The use of ἐκ is paralleled in the next clause by ἀπό, cf. *Anab* 2.5.32 ἀπὸ τῶν σίτων "after meals." In all these cases the genitive is ablatival.

For the supposed sigmatism, cf. 1208-10 note.

There is no semantic difference between σκίδναται and the other form found in the MSS, κίδναται. Both are epicisms. Neither is found elsewhere in extant tragedy, and the terminal sigma in the preceding line only obscures the problem. Tierney prefers this reading because of a use in Hippocrates (Ionic prose) αἱ κόραι σκίδνανται "the pupils are dilated" which may be valid, cf. Thuc 6.98 ἀποσκίδνασθαι.

While a slightly inferior MSS reading, χαροποιῶν "gladdening" makes far better sense than χοροποιῶν adopted by Daitz and Diggle. The Doric μολπᾶν (= μολπῶν) is coordinated with χαροποιῶν θυσιᾶν (= θυσιῶν) through καὶ: "after the songs and gladdening sacrifices ['gladdening' since they celebrated the end of the siege] had ceased." The plurals here and in δειπνῶν suggest the celebrations at the apparent departure of the Greeks had been city-wide, cf. Virgil *Aen* 2.265, where the Greeks *invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam.*

919-20 This line is parenthetical, since the subject of 920 ὁρῶν is 918 πόσις. This is the only extant use of ξυστὸν in tragedy, = "polished (lit. shaved) shaft", hence "spear." Whether this was a fixed meaning is uncertain, since significantly different interpretations exist both later (e.g. Xenophon *Cyr* 4.5.58 = cavalry lance) and earlier (e.g. Homer *Il* 15.677-8 νώμα δὲ ξυστὸν μέγα

ναύμαχον ἐν παλάμῃσιν, | κολλῆτον βλήτροισι, δῦω‿καιεικοσίπηχυ = 22-cubit (= 32-foot) naval pike.)

There exists some ambiguity in *πασσάλῳ*. It is uncertain whether the implication is that the husband is ready for any eventuality (cf. Theocritus 24.43, where Amphytrio when summoned at night takes his sword *περὶ πασσάλῳ*), or if it signifies he was (finally) at leisure.

For scansion differences between Daitz and Diggle, cf. 908-12 note.

921-22 The Doric **ναύταν** is adjectival, not in apposition to **ὅμιλον**. Editors and translators have needlessly stretched the sense of **ὁρῶν**: e.g. Tierney's "no longer on the watch for", Arrowsmith's "forgetting" and Ambrose's nightmare-visions theory. Lembke and Reckford also misconstrue with "He never saw what the sea brought." Simply, the husband is *no longer seeing* the Greeks because they have pretended to sail away. Although verbs of seeing do recur in this ode (925, 936, 939) it is not a dominant *motif* in the play as a whole, and should not be connected with Polymestor's blinding. The notion of the geographical region of the Troad (**Τροίαν**) comes from Homer, e.g. *Il* 3.74. **Ἰλιάδα** is in apposition to this, elision preventing the possibility of the dative singular.

The epic perfect participle **ἐμβεβῶτα** "treading on" is an echo of 912/3 **ἐμβατεύσω**, but with poignant contrast. The **ἐμβ-** syllable is in the metrically identical place, cf. **ἄτας** in Soph *Ant* 615 and 625.

923-24 Structurally, **ἐγὼ δέ** in opening the second strophe, corresponds to the **σὺ μέν** which began the first strophe. In sense, the responsion is between the situation of the woman, and that of her husband just detailed 916-22. The datives of means **ἀναδέτοις μίτραισιν** have caused some problems for translators. The word **μίτρα** has particular Eastern associations (e.g. Lydian in Alcman, Babylonian in Herodotus, Trojan in Euripides, etc.) but nowhere *requires* a meaning beyond "something that is worn that somehow binds," hence its most common associations are as a girdle (binding the waist) and as a headband (binding the hair.) Of the latter, use is not gender-specific: **μίτραι** are found on male athletes in Pindar *O* 9.84, *I* 5.62, though elsewhere there

is a hint of effeminacy when worn by males, e.g. Herodotus 1.195, where LSJ translates "turban." Dionysus in Soph *OT* 209 is χρυσομίτρης. In cases where it is worn by females, there is no reason why it should = "snood" rather than "headband" or "ribbon." That most citations happen to be singular (*Bac* 833 ἐπὶ κάρᾳ δ' ἔσται μίτρα, 929, 1115, Alcman 23.67, Aristoph *Thes* 257, 941, Sappho 98 (a) 10, (b) 3 (if μιτράνα = μίτρα) and Virgil *Aen* 4.216) is insufficient. In addition to Herodotus' plural, Euripides *El* 163 has μίτραισι, which Booth rejects as a "generalizing plural" (?, cf. 925 χρυσέων ἐνόπτρων) but Denniston takes it as a genuine plural, which at least allows for μίτραισιν here = "ribbons", cf. Méridier's "bandelettes", being used to tie back the hair at night rather than a poetic use of plural for singular yielding "snood" or somesuch. There is a *hapax* in ἀναδέτοις, though Tierney draws a parallel in Homer *Il* 22.469 πλεκτὴ ἀναδέσμη.

It is probably best to take ἐρρυθμιζόμαν to mean "I was arranging." However, Paley, citing *Med* 1161 σχηματίζεσται, suggests that the middle implies the presence of a κομμώτρια, which Collinge feels is demanded by the "general air of opulence" (1954, 36), i.e. "I was having (my hair) arranged." cf. *El* 1071 ξανθὸν κατόπτρῳ πλόκαμον ἐξήσκεις κόμης. The upsilon in 924 ἐρρυθμιζόμαν is scanned short because it is in weak position.

925 Though both Hadley and Collinge (1954) believe the reference to golden mirrors (χρυσέων ἐνόπτρων - genitives of source, from which light rays, in the Greek view, shot forth) to be anachronistic, archaeology of the heroic period suggests otherwise: Wace (1949) 36 "it contained two bronze mirrors with carved ivory handles and an inlaid ivory wing", and fig.55, the so-called 'Tomb of Clytemnestra'; and two pairs of Mycenaean mirrors are among the 13 Cypriot items discussed by Catling (1964) 224-27. Most editors believe this to be a poetic plural (cf. 924 μίτραισιν which is also mistaken as a poetic plural) though the rationale behind this is weak. Archaeologists tend to find mirrors in pairs (Wace) and Euripides regularly uses the plural in this context (though both *Tro* 1107 χρύσεα δ' ἐνόπτρα, and *Or* 1112 οἵους ἐνόπτρων καὶ μύρων ἐπιστάτας concern Helen.) Of the interpretations of ἀτέρμονας εἰς αὐγάς presented below, only Collinge's requires a literal plural here. Only Collard (1989) 6 talks of "the flashing mirrors" but

he does not translate so in his commentary. Typically mirrors would be of bronze or silver; χρυσέων (disyllabic by synezesis) is used "to heighten the picture of luxurious ease" (Hadley.)

The phrase ἀτέρμονας εἰς αὐγάς has received much attention, and has suffered many interpretations. The Scholiast suggests ἀτέρμονας = περιφερεῖς = κυκλοτερεῖς = "round", of the mirrors. Though such an interpretation makes sense and the similarly-constructed word ἄπειρος does mean "circular" in Aristotle *Phys* 3.6, 10, it requires a shift of both case and number through attraction to αὐγάς. Such a stretch is not even desirable, since a mirror would be round at any rate, cf. finds listed above, Aristoph *Clouds* 751 στρογγύλον, *AnthPal* 6.18. The presence of εἰς is easily explained: clearly the idiomatic αὐγάς λεύσσειν "to look into the light (of the sun), i.e. to live" is *not* meant (it is meant, for example, at *Pho* 1084 εἰ λεύσσει φάος and *Tro* 270 ἆρά μοι ἀέλιον λεύσσει;, and cf. 1154); the context does however require = "looking *into* αὐγάς ἀτέρμονας." For αὐγή = "reflected beam", cf. *Ion* 890 χρυσανταυγῆ "reflecting back golden rays" of Apollo. Collinge adopts this view, and is followed by Barlow (1971), where she praises the imagery of "light reflections in mirrors described as extending back without limit" (11) as being representative of Euripides' distinctive use of light and colour. Collinge posits two mirrors held so as to produce "an endless series of images."

Booth (1956), Ussher (1957) and Skutch (1957) all object to this but for what I believe to be weak reasons. Nor does accepting this view *require* the presence of a κομμώτρια (cf. 924 note): both ῥυθμίζω and λεύσσω are durative verbs and therefore remain simultaneous (required by the present participle) with one person alternating between handling ribbons and mirrors. Alternative views remain unconvincing. Booth needs ἀτέρμονας = "not having a τέρμα at the mirror" which may be true but is not in the Greek. Skutch suggests the phrase is periphrastic for τηλαυγῆς which would be valid if "not having a τέρμα" = "having a τέρμα far away", i.e. alpha-privative = τῆλε which is not so. Ussher's "boundless gleamings" can work, though his citation of Aesch *Eum* 634-35 ἐν δ' ἀτέρμονι | κόπτει πεδήσασ' ἄνδρα δαιδάλῳ πέπλῳ implies ἀτέρμονας = "seemingly endless", which is equally valid for Collinge's theory. Ussher, followed by Collard (1989), cites Pindar *N* 4.132 ὁ χρυσὸς ἑψόμενος αὐγὰς ἔδειξεν ἁπάσας. In fact, Collinge's

theory only falls down if the actual phenomenon of observing multiple reflections is beyond the physical experience of the audience. This is unlikely. Even if mirrors were expensive or rare in households, the chorus could suggest the action and symbolically represent the action of viewing the back of one's head. In specific reference to these lines, Dale (1968) 214 says that the song "seems to call for mimetic accompanying action" (though she does believe there to be only one mirror.) The verbal image is complex, but it is not incomprehensible. Quite cleverly, αὐγάς is kept in the ~~singular~~ plural, as it is the same image which is iterated repeatedly, "looking into the endless reflection of the golden mirrors."

Daitz divides 925 into two lines (= his 925a and 925b) coordinating with 935 (= his 935a and 935b), reading an iambic tripody and a glyconic. Keeping Diggle's (lack of) division, 925 and 935 constitute a single iambic metron + a rare Aeolic (Raven (1962) 122c).

926 For the use of ἐπιδέμνιος (*hapax*) see μεσονύκτιος (914.) The use of πίπτειν corresponds to that at *Bac* 1111-13 ὑψοῦ δὲ θάσσων ὑψόθεν χαμαιριφὴς | πίπτει πρὸς οὖδας μυρίοις οἰμώγμασιν | Πενθεύς, Aesch *Ag* 566. Michelini (1987) 331-33 sees a sexual nuance here, cf. note 933.

927 The rapid tribrachs reflect the suddenness and the speed with which the Greek attack came (for the unusual metron ˘˘ - ˘˘ - ˘ - ˘ - - here and in 937, cf. *Ion* 457, *IT* 884 and Diggle (1974) 19-21. Properly, πόλιν is the acropolis around which the ἄστυ (928 "lower town") gathered, cf. Homer *Od* 8.508 ἐπ' ἄκρης. Though Troy had no polis proper, Euripides would assign standard features in Greek urban planning, especially Athens, cf. 906 note, *Tro* 555-7, *IA* 778.

928/9-32 The initial phrase "and this word of command was throughout Troy's lower town..." introduces direct speech in 929-32, a prominent feature of Dithyrambic stasima (so Panagl, 1972), cf. *Tro* 524ff. Despite the unanimous reading of the MSS Prinz, Tierney, and Daitz adopt κέλευμα for the slightly older form κέλευσμα. The use of κατά + accusative is also found Lycurgus 40

καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν "throughout the entire city." The use of the phrase ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλάνων is reminiscent of Aesch *Per* 402 ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων (Garnet (1990) 214-15 calls it imitation), cf. Herodotus 1.27 Λυδῶν παῖδες, Homer *Il* 1.162, 2.83 υἷες Ἀχαιῶν. The poet uses variation twice in these lines: Ἰλιάδα = Τροίας; σκοπιὰν "hilltop" = πόλιν. The word οἴκους connotes both the notion of "residences" as well as "families", hence "homes."

The division of 928/9 and 930 by Diggle (= Daitz' 928 and 929/30) and the corresponding 939 and 940 (= Daitz's 938 and 939/40) is less preferable. It makes more sense to understand the cretic (929 -ας τόδ'· Ὦ and 939 νόστιμον with the dactylo-epitrite rather than the iambic dimeter.

933-5 The metre prohibits the use of λέκτρα (accusative plural of λέκτρον) = "marriage bed" (plural used for singular object, as often in Sophocles, see Stanford *Ajax* p.272-73), so λέχη is being used as an equivalent, hence plural. The repeated reference to the bed (cf. 926) prepares for the horror of losing the husband (936-7), cf. *Sup* 55 φίλα ποιησαμένα λέκτρα πόσει.

The contempt in the phrase Δωρὶς ὡς κόρα describing μονόπεπλος cannot be concealed. There is at least an implied reference to Helen of course (cf. 651, 943-52), but the immodest fashion of Spartan girls - wearing a sleeveless χιτών cut above the knee - was infamous throughout the Greek world: cf. *And* 598 γυμνοῖσι μηροῖς καὶ πέπλοις ἀνειμένοις (for which, Stevens writes, "They [Spartan girls, generalising from Helen] wore a single garment ... open at the sides in such a way as to show their thighs when they moved about."); Ibycus fr.61 φαινομηρίδες; Pindar *N* 1.74-75 καὶ γὰρ αὐτά, ποσσὶν ἄπεπλος ὀρούσαισ' ἀπὸ στρωμνᾶς; Virgil *Aen* 1.315-20 *virginis os habitumque gerens, et virginis arma, Spartanae ... nuda genu, modoque sinus collecta fluentes.* Collard (1989) 5 notes that "Michelini [1987] 332 is surely wrong to import from *And.* the notion of 'loose sexuality', despite the clear sexual nuance of 926 and 933." There may also be a small joke in the reference to Dorian dress in the Doric dialect.

The use of σεμνός "august, holy" in Athens was especially of the Erinyes. Perhaps the chorus here attributes the goddess Artemis with their vengeful qualities, as it feels forsaken. Artemis is appropriate here for many reasons: traditionally, both Artemis and Apollo favoured the

Trojans in the war (e.g. Homer *Il* 5.477); historically, her cult originated in Asia Minor; in Aesch *ST* 149-50 she is invoked because of her martial abilities; Paley says she had some special tutelary relationship with married women (perhaps when worshipped as παιδοτρόφος?); in Athens, she was the principal women's goddess (every Athenian girl would be dedicated to her in childhood) and it is natural to call on her when in distress. Ambrose says it is common to use a deity's name when its shrine is meant. The point is that the prayers of the chorus, sitting as suppliants, were not answered.

The Doric ἁ τλάμον (= ἡ τλήμων) is in apposition to the subject of ἤνυσα, cf. *Bac* 1100.

For the lack of division of 935, see 925 note.

936-37 In light of the previous references to the marriage bed (918, 26, 33) the reference to the husband as ἀκοίταν "bed-mate" is surely significant, as 1277 ἄλοχος is. The superposition of two near-synonyms (ἅλιον ἐπὶ πέλαγος "over the main of the sea"), and the rapid metre of the line (cf. 927, 50) gives the feel of the chorus being rushed to the Greek ships immediately after the fall of the city: they are embarking on a long voyage and have not had time to mourn the dead properly.

For the scansion of 937, see 927 note.

938-41 ἀποσκοπέω = ἀποβλέπω = "gaze at" i.e. turning away (ἀπο-) from all else and focusing on a particular thing. Tragedy is replete with obscure nautical expressions of this type: ἐπεὶ νόστιμον ναῦς ἐκίνησεν πόδα lit. "after the ship *had set in motion* a returning *foot*", Ambrose "after the ship *had started on its* return *course.*" Here, ποῦς is functioning much as in English one talks of a *leg* of a journey, but there is some ambiguity, recognized by both Paley and Collard, who also adopt the nautical meaning of πόδα which means sail/sheet, cf. 1020, *Or* 706. νόστιμον is used not from the perspective of the chorus, but of the ship.

For the line division of 939 and 940, see note 928/9-32.

942 τάλαινα (here appositional nominative, of the speaker) echoes its use in 913 (vocative, of Troy) thereby linking the fates of the one with the other.

943/4-47 The epode marks a decided change of tone for the stasimon. Until this point, the chorus has spoken as an individual lamenting its personal loss at the Sack of Troy. This approach helps personalize and individuate the chorus: the listener is told of a particular private situation, from many voices, and so knows that there must have been many similar situations - *every* soldier was finally at ease, and *every* wife was relaxing, preparing herself for bed after the celebrations when the Greek shout rang out. Euripides shows himself sensitive to the innocent sufferers in war, a message that would ring true in war-torn Athens. The beautiful, balanced narrative of the stasimon serves to bind the chorus to its distant homeland (the way the first stasimon took them away from it; Euripides often employed the motif of forced separation from one's homeland, viz. *Bac, Cyc, Hel, Hip, IT, Pho.*) Yet the stasimon is completed with a curse upon Helen and Paris. External to the narrative and irrelevant to the plot of the play, this sudden transition and *dénouement* can disappoint modern sensibilities. It must be seen as a virtual convention in any reference to Troy's capture. It does provide a weak link to the second stasimon, describing the judgement of Paris (cf. *And* 274-308), and clearly shows whom the chorus blames for its state (cf. *And* 103-16.) A much stronger link with the previous stasimon is in the enjambment of the epode with the previous antistrophe. Such a device is not found elsewhere in extant Euripides outside of these two instances (it does happen between strophe and antistrophe at *Sup* 47-48, *Hip* 130-31, *Rhe* 351) but drawing any conclusions as to the possible significance remains uncertain.

Paris is also called βουτάν at 646, *And* 280 ἔπι βούτας (where the Scholiast says τὰς ἐπαύλεις τοῦ βουκόλου Πάριδος) cf. Stinton (1965) esp. 16 n.2. It seems Greeks were so habitually cursing Paris that compounds such as αἰνόπαριν (which is better to be taken capitalised, as if it were a proper name) are found regularly: Homer *Il* 3.39, 13.769 Δύσπαρις, Alcman (*PMG* 77 = Diehl 73) Δύσπαρις Αἰνόπαρις κακὸν Ἑλλάδι βωτιανείραι. Also found is *Or* 1388 δυσελένα (the Phrygian speaks), and of their marriage, *Hel* 1120 αἰνόγαμος, Aesch *Ag* 713 αἰνόλεκτρον,

Kannicht *TrGF adesp* 644.40 αἰνογάμου. The construction begun in the 2nd antistrophe is continued with κατάρᾳ διδοῦσα "giving over to curses" cf. Hom *Od* 19.167 ἀχέεσι με δώσεις. Daitz is probably right to follow the minority of MSS. in reading Διοσκόροιν rather than Diggle's Διοσκούροιν, cf. *Hel* 1644, *El* 1239, and Tovar (1959) 134. The emendations of the editors in 946-7 are to resolve metrical difficulties, see Stinton (1975) 91, 97, who goes against West's interpretation, cf. Diggle (1984) 70. Collard (1986) 20 includes this among Diggle's treatments that are definitely better.

948-49 ἐξῴκισεν (aorist of ἐξοικίζειν) "eject, expel" + genitive of separation. The many parallels typically given for γάμος οὐ γάμος are not exactly equivalent: *Or* 819 τὸ καλὸν οὐ καλόν, Soph *El* 1154 μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ, *OT* 1214 τὸν ἄγαμον γάμον, *Ajax* 655 ἄδωρα δῶρα, Aesch *PV* 544 ἄχαρις χάρις, Aristoph *Frogs* 1334 ψυχὰν ἄψυχον. The ἀλλά implies a *corrective* force rather than simply this simply being an oxymoron. Truly parallel are the more clearly punctuated 1121, *Hel* 1134 γέρας, οὐ γέρας ἀλλ' ἔριν, *Pho* 1495 ἔρις - οὐκ ἔρις, ἀλλά φόνῳ φόνος, *Alc* 231 οὐ φίλαν ἀλλὰ φιλτάταν (see also *GP* 480). The use of γάμος = wife = Helen is substantiated by *And* 103-04 Ἰλίῳ αἰπεινᾷ Πάρις οὐ γάμον ἀλλᾶ τιν' ἄταν | ἀγάγετ' εὐναίαν ἐς θαλάμους Ἑλέναν. ἀλάστορός is a genitive of source, cf. 686. οἰζύς is also used of Helen at Aesch *Ag* 1461, and also in the terminal position. Euripides is making his borrowings from the *Oresteia* blatant, so that the audience will be prepared for further wholesale adaptations 1035ff.

950-51/2 There is an evident reluctance to speak Helen's name: ἂν (=ἣν) = οἰζύς = Helen. The repetition of πέλαγος ἅλιον from 937, again in a burst of ten short syllable, ties the epode closer to the second strophic pair, and repeats the regret at the haste with which the chorus was taken from Troy. With ἵκοιτε the chorus finally addresses Helen directly, using an allusive plural (cf. Smyth 1007), cf. Clytemnestra of Orestes at Aesch *Eum* 100 παθοῦσα πρὸς τῶν φιλτάτων. The Alcaic decasyllable (951/2) is found elsewhere in tragedy, e.g. *PV* 132, 148, 167, 185. Horace of course adopted the pattern into his verse, e.g. *virginibus puerisque canto*.

953-1022 Fourth Episode

Hecuba has remained onstage throughout the preceding stasimon, as she had during the first stasimon. Through the sustained use of irony, and word repetition, and manifested in the stage action with the dismissal of Polymestor's retinue at 981, an effect is created which reverses the status of the two characters: Polymestor enters with his sons seemingly in control, and confident, while Hecuba plays up her weakness and femininity; this results in Hecuba attaining exactly what she requires towards the fulfilment of her revenge, and Polymestor's duplicity is shown to all for what it is. The use of the two parodoi throughout the play is quite vague and nonspecific, but it seems that one parodos leads to the sea, and perhaps is where the sacrifice of Polyxena took place (if it is fair to call this Achilles' tomb), and the other leads to the Greek camp. It seems likely that Polymestor appears along the latter parodos (889 **διὰ στρατοῦ**; so also Mossman (1991) 76).

The dynamic that exists in this scene is clever. Everyone on stage knows that Polymestor is lying in everything that he says; what Polymestor does not know is that Hecuba and the chorus do know this. No age is given for Polymestor's children (the use of **παῖς** and **τέκνον** being inconclusive), but 1158 implies that, unlike Polydorus (contra Nussbaum), these are not full- or almost full-sized figures on the stage. For the division of these lines as the fourth episode, see Introduction VI.

The sustained use of irony in this passage combines many of the usually distinct meanings of the (English) word: the literal meaning is the opposite of what is intended (e.g. the crocodile tears, **δακρύω**, in 954; 1004 **εὐσεβὴς ἀνήρ**); there is more truth in a statement than the speaker means or intends (e.g. 956 where Polymestor himself is not **πιστόν**; 959 Polymestor himself is in ignorance; 995, 997 the gold is now safe from Hecuba); a situation or utterance has a significance unperceived at the time (e.g. 957 Polymestor will not fare well soon; 1006 although Polymestor will not die immediately, this is the impression Euripides is trying to leave with the audience, which he does later with the echoes of Aesch *Ag*); a condition where one seems to be mocked by the facts (e.g. 953-55 the fourfold use of the second person pronoun when Polymestor will be shown to care only for himself; 968-74 Hecuba's use of the same words she has earlier used with

Agamemnon; 1017 where the absence of men and safety do not coincide.) There are many more examples of each of these types, and the question is begged, why does Euripides do this? At least part of the answer is that he can.

The purpose of this episode is to have Polymestor appear onstage and to bring him into the tent, and this could be accomplished in a very few lines. He has chosen to include a testing of Polymestor's guilt, the questions of Polydorus' well-being 986-97, since all the evidence (regardless of how one understands the dream) is circumstantial. This is the 'proper' (or expected) place in the play for the second agon, which only appears after Hecuba's revenge has been enacted. This, too, is ironic. When it does come, the agon serves a non-obvious purpose, that of retroactively confirming the moral correctness of the revenge, human procedure thereby mirroring divine rights. The function of the irony is to prolong and heighten the audience's anticipation of the events to come, events which (cf. note 1034) the audience members are deliberately misled to believe will lead to Polymestor's death.

Burnett (1971) 15, however, critiques the value of the technique:

> Ordinary tragedy did not deal with baseness or with foolishness, but it had made the blindness of men one of its principle tenets, and tragic irony, the device for conveying this blindness, had become the chief stylistic ornament of the classic stage. It was an elegant and indispensable tool, but irony had a major fault as a teacher of humility, since it depended on the creation of a knowing audience. The spectator who joined the poet in watching over the blindness of Oedipus forgot to see himself in the blind man, for irony appreciated had made him feel as all-knowing as a god.

This observation concedes too little to the power of irony (or perhaps concedes the wrong thing.) It s ornamental use serves to enliven the style, and specifically to make the audience pay more attention to what is transpiring on stage. Certain lines in this episode may make a modern viewer cringe at the 'obvious' double-entendre, but it is important that the audience follow precisely what is happening. The scene is very compact, and very important: in it Hecuba gets the necessary proof of Polymestor's guilt, as he swears Polydorus is alive and well, with the corpse of Hecuba's

son serving as an ironic and mute testimony to the falsehood. Euripides does not want the spectator here to "see himself in the blind man". It is Hecuba who receives sympathy, and who is above the irony. She is not blind, but rather blinds physically him who is already blind metaphorically. This then functions as another confirmation of Hecuba's vengeance: she does not act contrary to nature, but according to the limits and parameters already established and demonstrated clearly in this scene.

Euripides is infamous for his use of repetitions, but it is for his lyric passages (e.g. the Phrygian in *Or* 1369ff, and also Polymestor 1056ff) that Aristophanes parodies him (*Frogs* 1331ff.) These instances seem to be used to portray heightened emotion. Yet Euripides' word repetition is not confined to these passages and seemingly unmotivated repetitions seem prevalent throughout the play:

e.g.			
	1. 85 ἀλίαστον	98 ἐλιάσθην	
	2. 522 πλήρης	527 πλῆρες	
	3. 526 χεροῖν	527 χεροῖν	528 χειρὶ
	4. 538 πρευμενὴς	539 πρύμνας	540 †πρευμενοῦς†
	5. 601 μάθῃ	602 μαθὼν	603 μάτην
	6. 655 τίθεται	656 τιθεμένα	
	7. 676 βακχεῖον	686 βακχεῖον (lyric)	
	8. 745 δυσμενὴς	746 δυσμενοῦς	

Even this brief list gives some idea of the scope of these repetitions. Their presence calls for explanation: are they accidental, or deliberate, and if accidental, is it a fault (i.e. stylistically unsatisfactory)? That they are not accidental is suggested by their prominence in the present episode (I count sixteen instances, not including σέθεν, cf. note 990):

1. 953 φίλτατ'	953 φιλτάτη	990 φίλταθ'
2. 956 πιστόν	1017 πιστὰ	
3. 958 αὐτὰ	960 ταῦτα	
4. 964 ἀφικόμην	967 ἀφικόμην	

5. 969 Πολυμῆστορ 974 Πολυμῆστορ

6. 977 τί χρῆμ' 1001 τί χρῆμ'

7. 980 χωρὶς 981 χωρειτ'

8. 981 ἐρημία 1017 ἐρημία

9. 983 χρή 984 χρὴ

10. 983 σημαίνειν 999 σημανεῖς 1003 σημῆναι

11. 984 εὖ πράσσοντα 984 πράσσουσιν εὖ

12. 988 δεύτερόν 991 δεύτερον

13. 994 σῶς 995 σῶς 996 σῶσον 1012 σῶσαι

14. 998 οἶσθ' 999 οἶδα

15. 1000 φιληθεὶς 1000 φιλῇ

16. 1008 στέγαι 1014 στέγαις 1016 στέγαι

There is also a prevalence of such repetitions in the following stasimon (where see note.) The difficulty lies in interpreting their purpose. Some of these (e.g. 2, 6, 8) may be mere coincidence, but the bulk are clearly deliberate (cf. also 45 δυοῖν δὲ παίδοιν δύο, 84 γοερὸν γοεραῖς, 156 δειλαία δειλαίου, 203 δειλαίῳ δειλαία, *Med* 513 μόνη μόνοις, a figure described in detail by Denniston *El* 337. The purpose when used in lyric, simulating extremes of emotion, fails to give a satisfactory account. In many languages, the repetition of a morpheme with a different semantic value in each use is considered stylistically clever, but here (generally) words are being used to mean the same thing. Nor can the conventions (inasmuch as they exist) of stichomythia be used to account for the repetitions. The mere existence of the feature would imply that Euripides was attempting to be stylistically clever, and whereas in a modern aesthetic he may not succeed, in the ancient one he probably does.

Polymestor is the most despicable character in the play, and it is worth speculating as to how he was presented on stage. It seems likely that he would be wearing long Thracian-style robes that would look like they were of expensive cloth (the women in the tent fawn over the cloth, and much of the conversation in this episode concerns gold and riches; it would be a logical dramatic

touch to have Polymestor's opulence visibly manifested.) If the robes are removed during the fourth stasimon so that Polymestor appears in a different, simpler costume (and changed mask) when he is blinded, the effect could be quite extreme. But it seems that there was something distinctive about the appearance of Thracians that made them particularly striking when presented in a dramatic context: viz. Aristoph *Ach* 135ff., *Lys* 557ff., Soph *Tereus* (and therefore Aristoph *Birds*?), Aesch *Lykourgeia*, etc. Beginning with a hypothesis, then, that when Thracians were presented on stage (and in visual art as a whole) they were shown with some kind of exaggerated headpiece, what can be said to confirm or disprove this contention? Thracians are often described by their red hair, which suggests the head was distinctive in some way. The Tereus legend, with the metamorphosis into a hoopoe (ἔποψ) provides more corroboration: the bird has a large distinctive crest, which could serve as an aetiological link between the Thracian Tereus and the bird he became. Most convincing, however, is the iconography of the *Hecuba* itself, as described by Séchan (1926) 319-22, Laurens (1988) - an excellent and apparently complete summary - and Mossman (1990) Appendix A. One vase in particular, an Apulian loutrophoros (British Museum 1900.5-19.1, Séchan (1926) 321 fig. 95), shows the blinded Polymestor wearing what appears to be a tall pointed hat. This feature appears not to have been satisfactorily explained, but I believe that it is a distinctive feature of Thracian dress, recalling the crest of the ἔποψ, that marks Polymestor out as foreign (and particularly Thracian) as well as providing visual stimulation through the use of costumes.

953-55 Polymestor enters apostrophizing the dead Priam, and then switching his focus to Hecuba. Nauck deleted 953 because of its seeming oddness. Though this is understandable, the opening words of an episode are an unlikely place for an interpolation, and its place in context can be explained. Priam is addressed first for five reasons: he has priority as King of Troy; he has priority due to his recent death (compare the respect the Greeks give Achilles as their greatest hero, despite his being dead, cf. also *HF* 217ff); it makes Polymestor's δακρύω seem more sincere; it steeps the opening words with irony (cf. also his later address of his just-murdered children, 1037);

finally it colours his future use at 1114 of ὦ φιλτατ', where see note. There is a subtly different use in φιλτάτη, with respect to the name of the person addressed:

Πρίαμε	is in apposition to	φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν
σύ	is in apposition to	φιλτάτη...Ἑκάβη.

The objects of δακρύω with σ'εἰσορῶν form a tricolon, culminating with ἔκγονον = Polyxena, but understandable as Polydorus. The play contains three speeches which talk of the mutability of things, and this is the third. The voices Euripides uses to express this sentiment are wide ranging, the other speeches being Talthybius (488ff.) and Hecuba (621ff.)

956-57 φεῦ is *extra metrum*, as usual. Diggle follows the reading of most MSS. with οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν πιστόν, though Murray, etc., perhaps troubled by the double negative, followed the 11th century M, ἔστι πιστὸν οὐδέν. This is unnecessary: the second negative "simply confirms the first negative" (Smyth 2761.)

958 Note the quantities of φύρουσι (long first syllable) and θεοὶ (monosyllabic.) αὐτὰ = human fortunes. Though Murray's αὐτοὶ is closer to the MSS, φύρουσι requires an object.
πάλιν τε καὶ πρόσω, "back and forth", following the kneading procedure; but it is also a variation on the usual πρόσω και ὀπίσω, "past and future", in view of 957.

959 Hadley rightly notes that ἐντιθέντες is a continuation of the culinary metaphor in the previous line, here "putting in as an ingredient." Though properly a dative of accompanying circumstance (Smyth 1527), the presence of a subjunctive implies ἀγνωσίᾳ should be understood as a dative of cause (Smyth 1517.) The Scholiast explains τῇ ἀδηλίᾳ τῶν πραγμάτων τῶν μελλόντων.

961 The accusative προκόπτοντα agrees with the assumed accusative of person in the previous clause (=ἐμέ) = the subject of θρηνεῖν. The metaphorical use ("advancing, making progress" also at *Alc* 1079, *Hip* 23) becomes standard in later moral philosophy. The assumed subject could also be

τινά, and the word takes οὐδέν.

Though the general meaning of οὐδὲν ἐς πρόσθεν κακῶν is clear, the grammar remains obscure:

1. κακῶν is a genitive of separation (Smyth 1392) The phrase εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν = "forward" (cf. Herodotus 8.89, Aristoph *Ach* 43, Plato *Rep* 437a etc.) If the τὸ had been omitted (say, for metrical or poetical convenience), the present phrase would = "advancing forward not at all from evils." This is Collard's interpretation. κακῶν can either be dependent upon πρόσθεν, or a vague partitive genitive.
2. By emending ἐς to ἐκ, κακῶν is no longer a problem: "(advancing) not at all out of former evils." There is no need for τῶν as the evils are clear to everybody involved (though other examples of πρόσθεν = "former, ancient, of old" do have the article, cf. Soph *OT* 268, *OC* 375, *El* 504, Aesch *Sup* 52, Homer *Il* 9.524, and so is probably wanted.)
3. Perhaps the most satisfactory solution is to emend οὐδεν ἐς to οὐδενός, which removes the difficult preposition: "(advancing) from none of the former evils." This is without any support, though, so (1) is probably right.

962 τι, adverbial with εἴ = "at all."

τῆς ἐμῆς ἀπουσίας, genitive of cause (Smyth 1405) = "on account of my absence" cf. *Hip* 1402, Thucydides 8.109.2.

967 Murray's punctuation - avoiding Diggle's comma at the end of 966 and placing one at the caesura in this line, after μύθους - emphasizes the relationship between δμοῖς and λέγουσα, and

strengthens the consequential ὦν. The cases taken by verbs of hearing are *normally* an accusative of the sound heard, genitive of source (so Denniston *El* 851-52); but cf. also Soph *OC* 1187 λόγων δ' ἀκουσαι τίς βλαβή; for another exception.

968-75 Diggle deletes 974-75, believing them to be interpolated, followed by Collard (1986) 20. Similarly, Dindorf removes 970-75, and Hartung 973-75. Page believes these objections are "not very strong" (68.) Arguments for deletion object to a "maidenly restraint" (Hadley) inappropriate for the (former) Trojan queen, as well as anachronistic. But anachronism is not a problem in Euripides, and Hecuba's attitude is clearly ironic in the light of 870-87. She is fulfilling Polymestor's expectations of a woman (as well as those Agamemnon expressed 876ff) and thereby gaining the upper hand. The commentators are right in thinking that the action is inappropriate for the powerful heroine of the play; they fail to see that her strength is due in part to her expected weakness. Even the more charitable interpretations are unsatisfactory: her restraint is feigned; she is not so uncertain in her resolve that she fears her face may belie her. Nor is overemphasis of her actions a plausible reason for deletion of any of these lines. In fact, ending with a proverbial tone is even desirable, in light of Polymestor's response (see 976 note.)

The repetition of Πολυμῆστορ (969, 974) and προσβλέπειν / βλέπειν (968, 975) might be the cause of secondary objection, and this has been discussed in the introduction to this episode. Also in favour of the authenticity of these lines is the repetition of basic terms from moral philosophy that she has already used in her νόμος-speech in the previous episode: αἰσχύνομαί (968, cf. 806 αἰσχρῷ), κακοῖς (969, cf. 808 κακά), αἰδῶς (970, cf. 806 αἰδέσθητι), νόμος (974, cf. 800.) These echoes show that Hecuba remembers her earlier argument to Agamemnon and that she is functioning within the same moral confines as before. This is one of the more straightforward reasons why Kirkwood's (1947) interpretation of the play - that Hecuba relinquishes νόμος and adopts πειθώ due to the Greek and Thracian injustices - is unsatisfactory. The lines are also kept by Mossman (1990) 297 n.37.

The syntax treats the phrase αἰδώς μ' ἔχει as if it were αἰδοῦμαι, hence the nominative

τυγχάνουσα instead of an accusative. Tierney calls this sense-construction (κατὰ σύνεσιν) as at *Ion* 927, cf. *Hip* 23, *Cyc* 330, *HF* 185, *IT* 695, 947, 964.

ὀρθαῖς κόραις, "with unfaltering gaze" (Hadley) is a standard image, cf. *IA* 851, Soph *OT* 528, 1385, Lucan 9.904 *lumine recto*, Ovid *Met* 2.776 *recta acies*, Claudian *Praef ad iii Con Hon* 6 *et recto flammas imperat ore pati*. Hecuba's refusal to make eye contact (the words clearly describing the stage action) serves to drop her status onstage, thereby raising his. She is trying to make him feel secure and confident. I agree with Mossman (1990) 297 n.37 that Nussbaum's (1986) 412 pun on κόρη is unconvincing. Denniston *El* 343-4 compares the impropriety here with his immediate passage, *Hcld* 474-77, *And* 876-78. fr. 521 (*Meleager*) ἔνδον μένουσαν τὴν γυναῖκ' εἶναι χρεὼν | ἐσθλήν, θύρασι δ' ἀξίαν τοῦ μηδενός, and cf. *IA* 821-34.

Tierney states that this is the earliest recorded usage of δύσνοιαν (taken with the objective genitive σέθεν) followed by Soph *El* 654, then only in prose. Bond *HF* 1160-62 seems to imply that Hecuba's face is here veiled, but that this is meant literally is unlikely.

976 Polymestor is doing more than merely recognizing the appropriateness of the proverb when he says καὶ θαῦμά γ' οὐδεν. It demonstrates that Hecuba has succeeded in making Polymestor secure, as he himself says at 981. For καί...γε, cf. 993, and Jebb on *Phil* 38. Here, γε helps καί introduce a new fact, cf. Soph *OT* 1132 κοὐδέν γε θαῦμα, 1319, etc. The phrase ἀλλὰ τίς χρεία σ' ἐμοῦ (sc. ἔχει) corresponds closely to the Homeric τί δέ σε χρεὼ ἐμεῖο (*Il* 11.606.)

978-79 Denniston notes that δή τι implies the speaker "can, and does, particularize in his own mind, but keeps the particularization to himself" (*GP* 212) cf. *IT* 526, 578, *IA* 661, Soph *Phi* 573. He continues, "There is an air of mystery about most of these."

By including the children in her statement, Hecuba shows that she has already planned her coming action. Yet it is a private understanding: the chorus do not fully understand until she recounts the details 1044-46.

The earliest use of the word ὀπάονας means a comrade, esp. in war. This lends support to

the supposition that the attendants are armed.

982-83 Polymestor claims a φίλια-relationship both with the Greeks (the Scholiast explains διὰ τὸ μὴ συμμαχῆσαι αὐτὸν τοῖς Τρωσί) and with Hecuba (this had been sealed with the pledge of Polydorus, a pledge both he and Hecuba now know to be void, despite the claims made 986-97.)

Diggle restores the reading of most MSS. (also Aldus, Porson), χρή. Murray, etc. had adopted the imperfect χρῆν, on analogy with 265.

986-88 That the subject of ζῇ is παῖδα Πολύδωρον is not as unusual as the commentators imply, cf. Homer *Il* 5.85. Apparent difficulties emerge from the prolepsis.

989 μάλιστα = "certainly" as in modern Greek. μὲν can be under-stood either as looking forward, preparatory for an antithetical δέ-clause which is left incomplete (*GP* 369ff), or looking back, contrasting with the description of her fortunes that have preceded (*GP* 377-78.) The latter is preferable.

990 ὦ φίλταθ' clearly recalls 953, in sarcastic echo. The irony is lost on Polymestor, though, who repeats the phrase with Agamemnon, 1114. ἀξίως is adverbial, as at *Med* 562, Thuc 3.39.

The isolated reading of the MS. L λέγεις σέθεν has been preferred almost universally (holdouts include Kirchhoff and Paley) over the unanimous reading of the remaining MSS. σέθεν λέγεις. Daitz' reasoning is based on analogy with 955, 966, 973 (and he could add 1003), all of which end with σέθεν. Tovar rightly questioned this opinion: "the reading λέγεις σέθεν is a consequence of the old recognized authority of L or P. The order εὖ κἀξίως σέθεν seems preferable, and as we have reason to doubt the value of L, nothing justifies maintaining L's reading against that of all the rest of the codices" (1959, 134). A corruption towards λέγεις σέθεν, because of the common line-end, seems more plausible.

992 cf. Virgil *Aen* 3.341 *Ecqua tamen puero est amissae cura parentis?* Adoption of the reading of the MSS, μου, requires Murray's ellipse at the caesura, and a question mark at the end of the line. Tierney's emended μοι may be "more elegant" but serves nothing, and Herwerden's που (adopted by Diggle) though easily explainable in terms of corruption is also unnecessary.

993 καὶ...γε as at 976. ὡς σὲ "to you": ὡς + accusative "of persons only, used after verbs expressing or implying motion" (Smyth 1702.)

The imperfect in κρύφιος ἐζήτει μολεῖν is suspicious, considering Polydorus' fate. The question is begged, what is meant by κρύφιος? Tierney supposes "without being caught by the Greeks," but this absurdly requires him to have accompanied Polymestor to the Chersonese and to have been stopped just outside the Greek encampment. It is preferable for Polydorus to be hidden from Polymestor, i.e. that he had tried to escape and that this is an ironical representation of the facts. It makes Polymestor's guardianship something from which to escape, which would then (since Hecuba is in the know) lead naturally onto the matter of the financial pledge, discussed immediately.

994 γε "adds detail to an assent already expressed" (*GP*106) as at 1004.

996 The caesura separates the two imperatival clauses. The aorist in the first half expresses urgency ("I beg that you..." Smyth 1841b) but the present which follows gives almost a proverbial tone (Smyth 1841e, cf. biblical *Exodus* 20.17.)

τῶν is used pronominally, with the adverbial πλησίον = "of those nearby" (Smyth 1100) = "of your neighbour." τοῦ χρυσοῦ (Hadley) or ὄντων (Major) must be understood (actually anything that fits, transferred from αὐτὸν = the pledge of gold.) Tovar (1959) 132 argues for the MSS. alternate τοῦ.

997 Hadley suggests that we should understand οὕτως before ὀναίμην, on analogy with Aristoph

Thes 469 οὕτως ὀναίμην τῶν τέκνων.

998 Having gathered her evidence, Hecuba moves on to the matter at hand using the normal particle for proceeding onto a new point, οὖν, *GP* 426.

1000-02 φιληθεὶς "beloved" cf. *IT* 983.

Hermann's emendation ἔστι...κατώρυχες is generally accepted, yielding an example of the *schema Pindaricum* (singular verb connected with a masculine or feminine plural subject, the verb always appearing first) cf. *Ion* 1146, Hesiod *Theog* 825, Plato *Gorg* 500d, *Euthyd* 302c, Pindar fr. 45.16, and Gildersleeve on *O* 11.6.

κατώρυξ "excavated chamber" is here used for the location of the treasure (χρυσοῦ) but is used for a tomb at Soph *Ant* 774. This may be a secondary meaning, derived from opulent grave goods. Whether the audience would here an overtone in this of Polymestor being lured to his death is uncertain. Note the alliteration in 1002.

The conventional requirements of stichomythia require Polymestor's interruption at 1001, cf. 1271-73 note.

1004 The postponement of γε is common when used with a preposition (*GP* 149) and here is used to add detail to a previous assent (995, cf. *GP* 136.)

1005 The question must be understood to be asked innocently, without suspicion.

1006 This line deliberately provides a false lead, which provides an expectation for the Chorus (1028, 1034) which is eventually frustrated, only to be replaced with a much grimmer reality.

1007 Boissonade's semicolon is essential. Following a demonstrative, καὶ binds it "more closely with the following words (*GP* 307.)

1008 The reading of the MSS Ἰλίας requires it to be used as an adjective. Scalinger's emendation Ἰλιάδος, adopted by Diggle, makes sense and is an easily justifiable corruption: attraction with Ἀθάνας (which is a genitive) of a peculiar noun, to a more regular metre.

In context (cf. 1002), στέγαι probably implies an underground treasury, cf. the so-called Treasury of Atreus at Mycenae (now known to be a tomb). In Athens, though, Athena's temple on the Acropolis was the state treasury, and this is likely the primary association. Earlier (see 927 note) Euripides assigned Troy somewhat artificially with features of Greek urban planning.

1009 σημεῖον δὲ τί is a common interrogative structure in Euripides at a line end, cf. *Hel* 141 θάτερον δὲ τί; 604 ἀγγέλλεις δὲ τί; 818 (see Diggle (1978) 169-71), *Tro* 74, *Hip* 519, *Pho* 1338, *IA* 1354, Aristoph *Clouds* 1186, *Frogs* 630 *Plutus* 917 and Thomson (1939).

1010 This grim landmark is the play's most explicit reference to the existing ruins that remain at Troy. Hourmouziades (1965) 122 suggests "In the *Hecuba* the 'city' is as remote as, but at the same time dramatically more relevant than, Argos in the *Electra*. Although it is mentioned only once (823) [sic] the vision of its lost splendour and utter destruction dominates the play."

1011 Stokes (1990) 15 suggests (probably rightly) that interrogative τί is better than the indefinite τι preferred by the editors. This would then echo 991, and is paralleled by the questions in the middle of interrogations at Aesch *Sup* 306 τί οὖν ἔτευξεν ἄλλο δυσπότμῳ βοΐ; and *Cho* 114.

1012 The absence of particles suggests that Hecuba has ignored the question just asked, perhaps because of the validity of the landmark.

1016 ἴδιαι read by Weil, Méridier, ~~Murray~~ and Diggle, is preferable to the MSS reading.

In 53, the σκηνή is Agamemnon's (see note 754-55), and that σκηνή = these στέγαι. Can it

therefore be private to have smuggled the treasure into the tent? If not, the question becomes important for the decoration of the σκηνῇ itself: at what is Polymestor looking when he and his sons enter?

1017 Polymestor's choice of words confirms that Hecuba has successfully duped him. ἄρσην means "male" but connotes strength and ferocity (cf. ἀρρηνής.) For ἐρημία, cf. *Bac* 875. The sense is different than it was in 981.

1018 Polymestor is eagerly awaiting this answer. Hecuba draws it out by using as many long syllables as is metrically permitted.

1019-20 Singularly appropriate for Polymestor, ἕρπε (which is picked up on with 1021 ὡς) assumes secrecy is required, i.e. that the Greeks are watching them.

νεῶν λῦσαι πόδα οἴκαδε "to loose the sheets in the wind for a homeward journey" (Hadley.) πόδες were the ropes (sheets) at the *foot* of the sail, cf. Homer *Od* 5.260, Virgil *Aen* 5.830, and note 938-41.

1022 Everyone but the chorus enters the tent: Polymestor, Hecuba's (silent) attendants, Polymestor's sons and Hecuba. If the entry were made in this order (or its reverse) there would be a visual echo when the characters emerge, cf. 1049-53 note.

1023-1034 Fourth Stasimon (Act-Dividing Lyric)

This song is short and astrophic, but does constitute a formal division between the two natural actions of the Fourth Episode and the Exodos (see Introduction VI and Kranz (1933) 162) Whereas the three responding (strophic) stasima have been shown to be interrelated both among themselves and with the play as a whole (see note 905-51), this song remains closely associated with the action of the plot, and is directly predictive (however inaccurately) of the coming action of the Exodos. As with previous stasima, these lines represent a compression of time: the events purported to transpire during the singing of these lines must take longer than the singing itself. This is a common feature of stasima, and not requiring further discussion. The lines contain both iambic trimeters and dochmiac dimeters, the dominant rhythms of the second κόμμός, 684-723. The dochmiacs are exceptionally regular, upset only by 1031 (a single dochmiac and an iambic ~~foot~~ metron) and the (unremarkable) hyperdochmius in 1032.

The chorus apostrophise Polymestor. The fact that he is not onstage at the time is not important (cf. the address to Ilium at 905, or Polymestor's address of Priam in 953): the words are addressed to him for rhetorical purposes only, and to leave no doubt that it is him shouting offstage at 1035. The language used in the ode is exceptionally metaphorical and allusive, but not inscrutable: Murray's obols on 1026-30 are unnecessary. An important literary feature is the word repetition within these lines. Such repetition has been observed to play a large part in the play already, and in particular in the preceding episode (see note 953-1022.) Here though the doubling is quite dense, with notable contrasts:

1. 1023/4 — δέδωκας, δώσεις — past and future
2. 1023/4, 1030 — δίκην, δίκᾳ — penalty and trial
3. 1025, 1026/7 — πεσὼν, ἐκπεσῇ — simile and metaphor
4. 1028/9, 1034 — βίον, βίον — Polydorus' life, and Polymestor's
5. 1031 — ὀλέθριον, ὀλέθριον — standard Euripidean anadiplosis, see note 689-90 and Willink *Or* 999.

1023 Nauck, Weil, and Tierney view οὔπω δέδωκας as redundant, and have postulated reading οὔτοι δέδωκας ἂν ἴσως δώσεις δίκην instead. This is done without authority and blind to the placement of the statement. The line is being said as Polymestor is within the tent, in the process of being blinded. The two tenses, looking back to the previous episode and looking forward to the Exodos, are used deliberately in order to mark the transition, in lieu of a responding stasimon.

1024/5 The notion of falling into a sea of troubles (ἀλίμενόν...εἰς ἄντλον) is not unique in Euripides, cf. *Hip* 469-70 εἰς δὲ τὴν τύχην | πεσοῦς' ὅσην σύ, πῶς ἂν ἐκνεῦσαι δοκεῖς; 822-23 κακῶν...πέλαγος εἰσορῶ | τοσοῦτον ὥστε μήποτ' ἐκνεῦσαι παλιν. Why this passage is often labelled a crux is due to a failure to view the metaphor as somewhat appropriate to the situation at hand. As the chorus makes clear, the general (τις) situation described is directly applicable to Polymestor who is being punished for causing Polydorus to *fall*, into *salt water*, where he washed up on a beach, i.e. *had no harbour*, both literally and figuratively. (25-27, 700-01.) This threefold reference to the plight of Polydorus (made explicit by 1028 ἀμέρσας βίον) isolates what the chorus is saying: Polymestor will suffer exact retribution for what he did to Polydorus, and his suffering shall figuratively represent that of Hecuba's son. King's likening Polymestor to a man suffering a shipwreck is wrong. The metaphor is used with precision to show the parallel situations. For this reason also Paley's ἀλίμενον = "where there is no rest for his foot" is unacceptable.

This rationale is integral to the understanding of the play. The immediate parallel is that of Polymestor's blinding: as Hecuba will no longer see her murdered son, so too Polymestor will no longer see his (murdered) children. Reciprocation will come at 1259, 1261 where Polymestor predicts Hecuba will *fall* into the *salt water* near the promontory which will take its name from the event (1273, where there is *no harbour*, cf. *Hel* 1211 Λιβύης ἀλιμένοις ἐκπεσόντα πρὸς πέτραις where the same idea is found of cliffs.) ἀλίμενος means "without a harbour" (a straightforward description of fact) and can be used both of shores, as at *Hel* 1211 (cited above) and Aesch *Sup* 768 μολόντες ἀλίμενον χθόνα, and of seas, as at Thuc 4.8.41 πρὸς τὸ πέλαγος ἀλίμενα ὄντα. By extension it can mean "without a shelter" as with mountains, *Hel* 1132 ἀλίμενα δ' ὄρεα, or the

air, Aristoph *Birds* 1400 ἀλίμενον αἰθέρος αὔλακα. These are the parallels normally adduced for an extended meaning in the present instance. But an enclosed bilge is not parallel with mountains or the air, and to call it ἀλίμενος ("inhospitable"? or (Collard) "with no escape"?) because it is either dirty, or one can drown there, is not the same metaphor and unacceptable (still another metaphor exists at *Cyc* 349 ἀλίμενον τε καρδίαν.) The ἄντλος then is ἀλίμενος firstly because it offers no protection (Polydorus is dead), and secondly to establish the figurative correspondence for retribution suggested above.

The meaning of ἄντλος as (metaphorically) "filthy water" derives from its meaning of "bilgewater", i.e *literally* filthy water. Such is the meaning at *Tro* 691 ὁ δ' ἄντλον εἴργων ναός, and, involved in the same sort of metaphor, Aristoph *Thes* 796 (where bilge = enemies), Pindar *O* 9.53 ("flood"), *P* 8.12 (where the ship of ὕβρις is scuttled), and *Hcld* 168 παίδων ‹τε› τῶνδ' ἐς ἄντλον ἐμβήσῃ πόδα (to get into difficulty, cf. the phrase "come hell or high water.") On this last example, Elmsley suggested that ἄντλος, however wrongly, is being used to mean πέλαγος. To these examples may be added the later (also metaphorical and derivative) use to mean a threshed but uncleaned pile of grain, as at Nicander *Theriaca* 114, 546, Q. Smyrnaeus 1.352 and Adaeus *AP* 6.258. The only other extant uses of the word are extended from the primary meaning, to "hold of a ship" (the same extension is found in English, where one can store things "in the bilge") at Homer *Od* 12.411, 15.479 (where someone is falling into it.) Manetho Astrologus 6.424 "bucket" should be considered in this category. The fact that so many examples of the word's use are metaphorical, and that the present instance is a metaphor, suggests that it is best to translate "into a harbourless sea of troubles", ἀλίμενος assuming that the dirty water is outside the ship, following the use at *Hcld* 168.

1026/7 The Scholiast rightly renders λέχριος as πλάγιος "sideways" (as he does when the word is used at Soph *Ant* 1344-5 πάντα γὰρ | λέχρια τἀν χεροῖν) and it can be taken:

1. with πεσὼν (so Paley, Weil, Tierney, Pflugk etc.) where it represents the lurch of the ship; or

2. with ἐκπεσῆ to mean either "headlong" (Hadley) or "sideways" (Collard) i.e. awry. This can be metaphorical as at Soph *Ant* 1345 (cited above), Shakespeare *Richard II* II.iv.24 "And crossly to thy good, all fortune goes", or literal, representing the blind staggering of Polymestor (1056ff.) unable to get where he wants (his heart's desire.) The closest parallel for this is *Med* 1168-70:

χροιὰν γὰρ ἀλλάξασα λεχρία πάλιν
χωρεῖ τρέμουσα κῶλα καὶ μόλις φθάνει
θρόνοισιν ἐμπεσοῦσα μὴ χαμαὶ πεσεῖν.

The second, literal option is preferable, though there is merit in all the interpretations.

ἐκπεσῆ is adopted by all modern editors, though in previous centuries ἐκπέσῃ was preferred, a subjunctive with no stop after 1024 δίκην, "as one might lose his life falling..." (see Paley.) The accepted reading is a more standard Attic construction, though, and agrees with the Scholiast στερηθήσῃ.

φίλας καρδίας, not "his dear life" but "his heart's desire" is the treasure he seeks, a goal from which he has fallen (awry) cf. Soph *Ant* 1105 καρδίας τ' ἐξίσταμαι. In both these cases, καρδία is being used for θυμός, cf. *Hip* 1324 πληροῦσα θυμόν, Homer *Il* 13.784 νῦν δ' ἄρχ', ὅππῃ σε κραδίη θυμός τε κελεύει.

1028-30 ὑπέγγυον is used in two senses: with δίκᾳ, "liable to be called to account for a (human) judicial action" (referring both to the punishment he will suffer (1024) and the after-the-fact trial (1109ff); and with θεοῖσιν "responsible to the gods" (Polymestor's crimes have offended against divine standards, too, see 800 note, cf. Aesch *Cho* 39 θεόθεν ἔλακον ὑπέγγυοι.) The capitalisation of δίκᾳ is unnecessary, and is the source of part of the confusion exhibited by Tierney. There is perhaps some wordplay on the notion of ἐγγύη, the pledge or surety for which Polymestor has murdered Polydorus. Tierney believes "no Greek would make a distinction between such debts" and cites Didymus in the Scholiast, ὑπέγγυον τὸ ἀληθὲς οὔτε παρὰ τῇ Δίκῃ οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς ἐμπεσὸν ἀφανίζεται. τοῦτο δέ φησι διὰ τὸν Πολυμήστορα, ὅτι μέλλει

τιμωρεῖσθαι πρῶτος ἀρξάμενος τῶν ἀτόπων. Barrett calls this "fantastic rubbish ... in defiance of usage, syntax, and mere common sanity" (p.48.) It is stated that the meanings coincide (συμπίτνει, cf. 846, 966): they do, however interpreted, hence the adoption of Hemsterhuys' οὗ for the MSS. οὐ (accepted by Biehl (1985) 263-67.)

LSJ understands ἀμέρσας βίον passively, i.e. "losing your life", but Mossman (1990) 109 suggests an active interpretation, i.e. "destroying your life", but neither of these explanations satisfies. The life in question is that of Polydorus, so Collard is closer with "for your robbery of life."

1032 Some have taken ὁδοῦ with ψεύδει, but it should be taken metaphorically with ἐλπὶς "hope from this path." King, Jeffrey miss this metaphor and believe it refers to the journey to the Greek tents, but Polymestor's hope (for monetary gain) only begins at 1001. For the falsity of Hope, cf. Collard *Sup* 479, and fr. 650 (*Protesilaus*) πόλλ' ἐλπίδες ψεύδουσι καὶ λόγοι βροτούς.

1033 θανάσιμον is never used of persons in Euripides, and goes tautologically with 'Αίδαν (cf. 571, 1145) 'Αίδαν as a cretic is also found at *Sup* 811 (cf. Diggle (1981) 21.) A contrary view is given by Conomis (1964) 33. Though most MSS. read ἰὼ τάλας, this removes the direct apostrophe of the (offstage) Polymestor, which is desirable. Diggle is right to follow Porson in reading ὦ. Some MSS. attribute this to Polymestor, but this is clearly wrong: the chorus are still singing dochmiacs.

1034 ἀπολέμῳ δὲ χειρὶ "by no warrior's hand" = "by the hand of a woman" cf. *Ion* 216-8 καὶ Βρόμιος ἄλλον ἀπολέμοι|σι κισσίνοισι βάκτροις | ἐναίρει Γᾶς τέκνων ὁ Βακχεύς.

λείψεις βίον is of course false, but indicates that the chorus is unaware of Hecuba's plan. It also prepares for the coming echoes of Agamemnon's death in Aeschylus, where he did lose his life. Euripides is deliberately creating false expectations in the audience, as he commonly did with the so-called "lying" prologues.

1035-1295 Exodos

To this point the play has shown Hecuba the former queen of Troy, interacting with various men from the Greek camp, and with her false-friend Polymestor, who also will soon ally himself with the Greek camp (1032ff.) This has prepared for her eventual victory, which comes in the Exodos. Because the progress of events is rapid and detailed, these last lines will be considered in smaller sections.

1035-55 The Revenge

The chorus begins the Exodos alone onstage. The only sound provided is by Polymestor's voice offstage, yielding a scene that is consciously modelled on Aesch *Ag* 1343ff. There is also a marked and deliberate similarity with *Cyc* 663ff, which is discussed in Introduction IV and V, and is noted by Arnott (1982) and Meridor (1975). While far from the naturalistic theatre of today, keeping violent acts offstage was an accepted and standard practice in the tragic theatre (though not an absolute rule, e.g. Pearson *Soph Frag* 2 p.96-97 where one of Niobe's daughters is killed by Artemis; the actor Timotheus of Zacynthus' portrayal of the suicide of Ajax (Scholiast Soph *Ajax* 864) was late and cannot be thought to be representative, or the standard interpretation of the scene.) Cries from inside serve to fix the *actual moment* of the event in the mind of the audience, cf. especially *Ag* 1343, 1345, *Or* 1296, 1301, *Cyc* 663, 665, 666-68, *Hip* 776, Soph *El* 1404ff, Aristoph *Frogs* 1214, *Plutus* 934-35.

Arnott (1982) discusses in detail the phenomenon of the offstage cry, and notes "how quickly the convention ... became stabilized and even stereotyped" (40). In the earlier use of a complex theatrical convention (the aside, 736ff) Euripides carefully signposted its use because (in all probability) of the novelty of the convention itself. With the offstage cry, however, audience recognition is assured and a spectator would know to anticipate certain features (Arnott lists a 'canon' of seven such features, (1982) 38) based, it would seem, originally on the twofold use in the *Oresteia* (Aesch *Ag* 1343ff, *Cho* 869 ff.) Yet unlike these examples, or for that matter, Soph *El* 1404ff, Eur *Med* 1271ff, *HF* 750ff, *El* 1165ff, the present instance does not lead to the death of

the victim. Euripides, in remaining so faithful to the convention's canon, creates a surprising effect (1982, 41):

> In the *Hecuba* Euripides seems to have taken particular care towards his achievement of a powerfully new effect by keeping as close as possible to the details of the traditional model (with the Aeschylean echoes and the verbal ambiguity underlining this closeness), and then making the one change that sets this scene completely apart: the victim lives on before the eyes of the audience. The effect is all the stronger because the one transforming and shocking novelty is set in a context of totally conventional details.

Euripides plays with the same convention in a different way at *Or* 1296ff, and echoes of the present passage, with the same eventual effect, can be seen in *Cyc* 663ff (*pace* Arnott.)

It therefore seems 1035 apparently refers to the blinding and 1037 to the murder of the children (which Polymestor can presumably detect from their shouts, since it seems too gruesome a possibility to contemplate him being blinded in one eye (1035) his children being murdered (1036) and then losing the other eye (1037), with one ὤμοι per eye) which reverses the order of events as narrated 1160-72. Meridor (1975) 6 notes "This reverse arrangement seems to be due to the impact of the pattern of Aesch. *Ag*. 1343-46 and may point to an unusually vivid impression made on Euripides by the Agamemnon [sic] of Aeschylus". The similarity of this punishment with the punishment of Zedekiah (also mentioned in Meridor, 1975) is discussed in note 1049-53.

1035 φέγγος accusative of respect, cf. 910. The line is spoken in high tragic diction (Barrett *Hip* 799 notes that οἴμοι is vernacular Attic, as opposed to ὤμοι which is literary Attic; see notes 1036 and 1037) cf. *Cyc* 663 ὤμοι, κατηνθρακώμεθ' ὀφθαλμοῦ σέλας, where parody of (at least) the assignment of such diction to violently-minded characters is intended. In the shouting, the syllables of the interjection would likely have been drawn out.

1036 The chorus must react to the offstage shouts, but it is far from clear in what way the lines

are to be divided. Daitz prints semichoruses as marked in some MSS. but such marks reflect copyist's opinions (based on analogy with the imitated passage in the *Agamemnon*), not authorial intent. Though there are some clear cases of semichoruses (e.g. *Or* 1258ff, Soph *Aj* 866ff, Aristoph *Lys*) they are not to be thought of as normative. If used here it would be more clear. Since there are many parallels with the Aeschylean blinding of Agamemnon, also possible is assigning each speech - 1036, 1038, (1041), 1042-43 - to different individuals. This also is unlikely: Aesch *Ag* 1346-71 is an extended passage which conveniently provides a couplet for each chorus member and this is not; nor are there any significant verbal allusions. Much more likely is that the lines are spoken all by the chorus leader, who is responsible for interacting with characters during episodes. This explains the use of φίλαι (both here and in 1038) which would be acceptable if the chorus were speaking as a whole, but altogether less satisfactory.

The use of οἰμωγήν does not affect the reading ὤμοι in 1035, 1037, cf. Soph *OC* 820 ὤμοι, οἰμώζειν, Aesch *Ag* 1343-46 ὤμοι, οἰμώγμασιν and Barrett *Hip* 1401.

1037 The reading of G and K, οἴμοι is inappropriate in light of the preceding two lines. The repetition of an interjection is common, and μάλ' αὖθις makes it a formulaic commonplace, cf. *Med* 1009, *Pho* 1069, *Tro* 629, Aesch *Cho* 876, and especially *Ag* 1345.

σφαγῆς can ambiguously refer either to the death of his children (which Collard, while recognising the ambiguity, suggests is indicated by δυστήνου) or to his own blinding (so Weil, cf. *El* 1228 σφαγή = wound.) The vocative allows for either (see also Fraenkel *Ag* 1389). If the former, a kind of parallelism exists, with 1035 referring to the blinding, and 1037 to the murder. But the latter is more in character with the monody as a whole, which is completely self-obsessed: 1075-78 are clearly hyperbolic, and refer to himself as much as to his sons; Polymestor only directly addresses his sons' murder at 1160. Until then the suffering is his, which does include the loss of progeny, but is primarily internalised. This meaning could be made clear by the actor stressing the caesura in the fourth foot, rather than in the third: "Oh no, again. Children! - Horrible bloodshed- ". The audience does not yet know the fate of the children, nor could

reasonably be expected to guess with any certainty. The line then reads as an address to the children, informing them (and the audience) of what has happened. Nor is there an inconsistency when the narration of the events takes place (1145-75.) In retrospect, the line simply has Polymestor addressing his just-murdered sons, cf. 953 for the irony.

1038 **καίνα** cf. 689 note.

1039 **οὔτι μὴ** + aorist subjunctive constitutes a strong denial of the future, cf. *MT* 295, but see Campbell (1943) and *Cyc* 666 **ἀλλ' οὔτι μὴ φύγητε τῆσδ' ἔξω πέτρας,** and also *Sup* 1069 **οὐ γὰρ μὴ κίχῃς μ' ἑλὼν χερί,** *El* 982 **οὐ μὴ κακισθεὶς εἰς ἀνανδρίαν πεσῇ.**

1040 That **βάλλων** refers to Polymestor's fists is clear by the dramatic necessity of 1155: he had been disarmed of his javelins (*pace* Tierney) and blinded. The **βάλλω**-root is also used by Hecuba at 1044 and Polymestor at 1175, both times of the hammering of his fists at this moment, cf. the English expression "to *throw* a punch." Ambrose is wrong to tie the interpretation with **βέλος** in the next line, where see note.

Whether Agamemnon's tent is laid out like a Greek household with "the women's apartments" being innermost is not at issue with the use of **μυχούς**: the word here represents *where the women stay* in the tent.

1041 It has been tacitly assumed by most modern scholarly opinion that the Scholiast on this line contains both one correct fact (Polymestor speaks this line) and one incorrect fact (that he is throwing stones): **τοῦτα δέ φησιν ὡς βάλλων λίθους ἐν τοῖς οἰκήμασιν, ἵνα καταπαίῃ τὰς αἰχμαλώτους.** The obvious methodological error in making these assumptions should not go unquestioned.

That the line is Polymestor's is not "clearly correct" (Collard.) **ἰδού** does not necessarily refer to a *visual* stimulus (it is used of sounds *El* 566, Soph *Aj* 870, and of silence (!) *And* 250.) Weil's

belief that βέλος is a javelin which bursts through the σκήνη and lands by the chorus shows a lack of awareness of this. Though it would create a powerful image (the 1988 Royal Shakespeare Company's production of *Macbeth* did something quite similar in the closing scene) the idea is too modern for the present context (nobody imagines Orestes firing genuine arrows at *Or* 268-74.) A near-parallel can be found in *Ag* 1344 σῖγα· τίς πληγὴν ἀυτεῖ καιρίως οὐτάσμενος; which is a line of the chorus (both ἰδού and σῖγα meaning "attend!".) If the line is the chorus', Tierney is right in that they say only what they believe they hear; they have been wrong before (1034) after all. The Scholiast's notion of rocks is wrong - there would be no rocks in the tent, but it is reminiscent of the Homeric Cyclops' action of reaching for a large rock, *Od* 9.416. This would then explain βαρείας.

The use of βέλος for fists is possible (cf. Virgil *Aen* 5.438 *corpore tela modo atque oculis vigiantibus exit* - Entellus is boxing) and, as Paley notes, also gives a clear meaning to βαρείας. I therefore suggest that the Scholiast is wrong on both accounts, and that the chorus hear a loud banging noise (made perhaps by a stagehand behind the σκήνή) which they assume is made by the javelins they saw Polymestor holding when he entered the tent.

1042 βούλεσθ' ἐπεσπέσωμεν seems almost to suggest the chorus believes it rude to "burst in" on the happenings within (ἐπεσπεσεῖν contains the notion of violent entry, cf. *HF* 34, Soph *OC* 915, Herod 7.42.2, Xenophon *Cyr* 7.5.27 and Aesch *Ag* 1350. The "dithering" of the chorus is conventional, cf. *Ag* 1346-71 as an extreme. βούλεσθε often precedes a deliberative subjunctive (Smyth 1806, *MT* 287.)

ἀκμή, the critical moment, cf. Aesch *Ag* 1353.

1043 It is important to remember that the chorus have not participated in the revenge: it is Hecuba and her silent attendants that have done the deed. This seems to be missed by Arnott (1991) 37, "In *Hecuba* the women of the chorus, fellow prisoners in the Greek encampment, actively assist the former queen of Troy in her revenge." The most independent action of the

Euripidean chorus that is extant is probably the breaking of the promises in *Med, Ion.*

1044 Hecuba enters, triumphant. The evident strength of her presence is a marked contrast to her initial entry from the tent, and demonstrates that a complete status reversal has occurred (see Introduction VI.)

φείδου μηδέν is almost a cliché, cf. *HF* 1400, Soph *Aj* 115, and Page *Med* 401.

ἐκβάλλων echoes 1040 βάλλων, but is the standard word for breaking down doors, cf. Lys 3.23. The prefix ἐκ- suggests the central door opened outwards, and this is corroborated by the most probable (and simplest) mechanism of the ἐκκύκλημα. The word is not "tearing up" (Paley) as suggested by the Scholiast's ἀνασπῶν, ἐς γῆν ῥίπτων, cf. Soph *OT* 1261, and Bond *HF* 999.

1045-46 The doors burst open (that Greek all doors opened outwards is mentioned by Plutarch, *Publicola* 20.3, but such would be suggested anyway for the stage at least, by the simplest operation of the ἐκκύκλημα) and Hecuba, emerging, announces the actions of her revenge. Though formally addressed to Polymestor (cf. 1032-34), she does not intend him to hear (though unlike an aside (see 736-51 note) it does not affect the action if he does.

There is of course a double sense to the pronouncement that οὐ παῖδας ὄψη ζῶντας: they are no longer alive, and he can no longer see. Nevertheless, this is the fate that Hecuba shares (she can only see the dead Polydorus) which establishes a kind of reciprocity between the situations.

οὓς ἔκτειν' ἐγώ, which also ends line 1051, means "whom I sentenced to death" or "whom I had killed", cf. Plato *Apol* 38d1-2, 39c4. Lines 1161-62 make clear that Hecuba is however clearly accepting the responsibility for the actions undertaken, and is merely stating that her hands remained unbloodied. In terms of retaining the spirit of Attic law, in this, cf. Meridor (1978) 30-31, which is only partially convincing.

1047-8 καθεῖλες is a wrestling metaphor, "thrown down"

The line is packed with double meanings: the oxymoron in κρατεῖς ξένον is almost as strong as that in Θρῇκα...ξένον (cf. 710 note, 774, 890, 1124.)

καὶ δέδρακας οἷάπερ λέγεις, cf. *Cyc* 701 καὶ δέδραχ' ὅπερ λέγω.

1049-53 Again, Hecuba emphasizes the twofold nature of her revenge, clearly taking full moral responsibility for the actions (1051 οὓς ἔκτειν' ἐγώ) while acknowledging the help of the Trojan women. The events as related by Polymestor 1160-71 (and there is no reason to suppose Polymestor is giving a false report) suggest the actual deeds were perpetrated by the women, thereby bringing the revenge more in line with the mythological paradigms of 886-87 (where see note.)

It is my opinion that these lines would be accompanied by considerable spectacle, in terms of stage action. Hecuba announces the use of the central door three times, and it is natural to view this as an immediate succession, in a structured and formal emergence from the tent, signalling Hecuba's victory:

1051 ἐκκύκλημα carrying the *bodies of the two murdered sons of Polydorus.* ὄψῃ clearly indicates that the bodies do appear, and here is the most effective moment, and the only announcement of their entry. Line 1118 again shows that they are onstage. Collard 1109-1295 and pages 36-37 fairly notes that it is equally possible that the bodies are revealed as the door opens, in a 'discovery space', cf. Taplin (1977) 442-43, Hourmouziades (1965) 106-7. At the Athens Festival of 1955, an ἐκκύκλημα was used in the production of the *Hecuba.*

1052 *Hecuba's attendants* emerge, probably looking no different than they had when they entered at 1022. Their entry is signalled by ταῖσδ' and a gesture from Hecuba.

1053 ὡς ὁρᾷς suggests *Polymestor* appears here rather than at 1056. ὅδε makes this clear, cf. *Hip* 1156, *Phae* 311, Soph *Ant* 386, *Antiope* 18 Page. He is

wearing a new mask (see note 1056-1108) and perhaps a new costume (cf. notes on 1155-56 and 953-1022). Mossman (1990) 78-79 believes that Polymestor appears riding the ἐκκύκλημα.

Such a focused use of the door (which has already been referred to, in 1044) could be a direct reversal of the group entry at 1022, and though circumstantial does provide a clearer and more reasonable *tableau* than haphazard emergence of these individuals.

For the repetition of τυφλὸν τυφλῷ, cf. 953-1022 note. The idea of τυφλῷ...ποδί is present in *Pho* 834, 1545, 1616, and see Porson on 1722 (=1708) to which list add Lycophron 1102 and Milton, *Samson Agonistes* 1-2 "A little onward lead thy guiding hand | To these dark steps, a little further on" Ovid *Met* 13.560-62 *atque ita correpto captivarum agmina matrum | invocat et dignos in perfida lumina condit | expilatque genis oculos.*

For οὓς ἔκτειν' ἐγω see note 1046.

παραφόρῳ "reeling" is described in the Introduction IV. The word is used of the Erinyes at Aesch *Eum* 330 παραφορὰ φρενοδαλής, and has medical usages too (see LSJ.)

Hecuba has announced her crime and the results have been made manifest. Meridor has noted that the similarities between Hecuba's treatment of Polymestor and Nebuchadnezzar's of Zedekiah (in the biblical *II Kings* 25:6-7) "seems of real importance" (1978, 35 n.24.) The biblical passage comes immediately after the siege and fall of Jerusalem by Babylon (25:1-5) in 586 B.C. (*New International Version*):

> (6) and he [Zedekiah, the last king of Judah] was captured. He was taken to the king of Babylon at Riblah, where sentence was pronounced on him. (7) They killed the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes. Then they put out his eyes, bound him with bronze shackles and took him to Babylon.

The similarities are indeed striking: after a long siege, a treacherous king has his sons murdered before his eyes, is then himself blinded, and then sent far away. While the Greeks were known (at times, cf. Herodotus 9.120) to kill an offender's children before his eyes, the severity in the present instance seems extreme. Polymestor has committed murder, and betrayed a trust, but does

this warrant the punishment he (and more importantly, perhaps, his children) have suffered? Meridor (1978) 35 n.24 believes that "Hecuba's revenge can be claimed to agree with the spirit of the *lex talionis* much more than a sentence of death upon Polymestor, for as he was by his act, so was he by her revenge, doomed to a life of bereavement without hope or light." As it stands, this is too fishy. There is something wrong with Hecuba's metaphorical loss of light and Polymestor's visceral counterpart. It seems that Meridor's understanding of the *lex talionis* aims towards an exact tit-for-tat, not recognizing the intended regulatory function of the *lex talionis* (described in Introduction II) which strives to draw a line, i.e. no more than tit-for-tat.

An examination of what commentators have made of the passage in *II Kings* does start to provide an answer. Since Josephus *Antiq* 10.138-39, responsibility for the fate of Jerusalem has fallen on Zedekiah, who broke his covenant-relationship with his souzerain, Nebuchadnezzar. More recent observers have noted of the murder (Robinson (1976) 243 n.7)

> the Hebrews had no belief at this time in a personal immortality [which developed at some point during the Inter-Testamental Period]. A man's hope for the future lay in his family. By this action, Nebuchadnezzar intended to wipe out the family and memory of a rebellious vassal.

and of the blinding (Montgomery (1951) 562) "such mutilation destroyed the royal potency". The fullest interpretation is by Hobbs (1985) 363 n.7:

> The punishment of Zedekiah seems inordinately cruel, though it was by no means unusual in warfare in the ancient world. If, however, Zedekiah had broken faith with Babylon and contravened treaty regulations, the punishment is understandable, though no less cruel. The verb ... [translated above as "they killed" which properly =] "they butchered" is often used in the killing of sacrifices (Lev 6:25) and in this context implies a brutal slaughter of the sons of Zedekiah. The rabbis saw in the blinding of Zedekiah a fulfilment of Ezek 12:13 [that he would die in Babylon, but not see it]. Blinding of prisoners was a common Assyrian practice [as shown, e.g. in Assyrian reliefs], but little evidence is found for the practice by the Babylonians.

> The symbolic significance of such an act is obvious. The eyes are important as gateways to the intellect and will (see the frequent "in the eyes of"), and without them a person is rendered powerless.

The punishment of Polymestor, then, if it is indeed fair to transfer these interpretations to the similar crime, frustrates any hope of a future for Polymestor, as well as any power - royal or otherwise - in the present. This is surely in some way "worse than death", yet Hecuba can always say that she has not killed him.

To expand Devereux's study of Soph *OT* to the present play, it seems fair to assume that he would see the blinding of Polymestor as a symbolic removal of the possibility for Polymestor to have any further children: "Greek data confirm the clinical finding that the eyes tend to symbolise the male organs, and blinding castration ... blinding and castration are *mutually exclusive* punishments" (1973, 49). Devereux's argument cannot be lightly dismissed. The evidence he has culled from Greek mythology is significant. If this argument is accepted (and I myself am still not totally convinced) there is a more exact equivalence between the crime and the punishment: Hecuba lost her last son and (due to age) will not be able to replace him; Polymestor lost his sons and (now symbolically) can sire no more. For the violence against the children, see note 1293-95. The question remains as to whether Devereux' symbol is more convincing than Meridor's metaphor.

There is a final similarity between *II Kings* 25:6-7 and the punishment of Polymestor, and that concerns the phrase translated above as "sentence was pronounced on him", which Grey (1970) 766 n. 25 understands as follows: "The phrase indicates that Zedekiah had the semblance of a fair hearing, but as a rebel against a suzerain who had, in fact, appointed him to preserve order under his authority, the result was not in doubt." Just as the result of Polymestor's trial is assured before it takes place (see note 1109-1295 and Introduction I) so there was no doubt of Zedekiah's guilt despite being granted due process. This perhaps sounds totalitarian, but the rule of law, so key a concept in modern democracies, is not a necessary element in the ancient jurisprudence. All these similarities of course do not depend on Euripides using the Hebrew scriptures as a source. What is

shown is that similar ideas of crime and punishment were present throughout the Mediterranean in the fifth century B.C.

1054-55 Hecuba announces her plan of action. ἀλλά cf. *GP* 8. ἐκποδών "out of the way" cf. 52, *Sup* 1113, *Pho* 40, *Bac* 1148.

θυμῷ ζέοντι "boiling with rage" is preferred (correctly) by Zuntz (1965) p.156-57, cf. Soph *OC* 434, also *Hec* 583. A strong case can however be made for the reading of the majority of MSS., adopted by Murray and Daitz, "raging like a torrent with rage," the parallels for which are Homer *Il* 5.87-88, Aristoph *Knights* 526-27, Dem *de Cor* 272, and Horace *Serm* 1.7.26, 28 of Persius.

1056-1108 Polymestor's Monody

Polymestor emerges singing a long astrophic monody. This also happens with the Phrygian slave, *Or* 1369ff., and Io in Aesch *PV* 574ff. (where a note of contempt also can be detected.) Monodies were a distinctive feature of Euripidean tragedy (Aristoph *Frogs* 944.) Monodies allow the playwright to have characters express intense and personal feelings, which need not be regular or rational, which explains the abandoning of strophic responsion in this case. This was emotion unbound and wild. Though in the early plays, monodies are responsive (*Alc* 393ff, *Hip* 816ff, *And* 1173ff, *Sup* 990ff, *Rh* 895ff, as well as the parody at Aristoph *Frogs* 1331ff.) the dictates of the form appear to have lapsed to permit more extreme expression. Astrophic lyric then became normative (though not exclusive, viz. *Tro* 308ff.)

In many ways, the monody is a continuation of the spectacle begun in 1051 (or even from 1035.) Metrically, the dochmiacs are interspersed with anapests, iambs and cretics, allowing for the appearance of sudden mood changes. The difficulty scholars have had in establishing metrical periods lends the passage the feel of a run-on sentence, and the complete absence of connective particles (noted by Collard) gives a staccato and disjointed feel. Though word-repetition has been noted as a key feature throughout the play (see 953-1022 note), its presence in this lyric passage

recalls the parody in Aristoph *Frogs* 1331ff. (which does have some echoes of this play despite being closely modelled on the Phrygian's speech in *Orestes*.) It divides into two uneven parts, the first (1056-84) where Polymestor chases his opponents alone, and the second (1088-1106) where he calls for assistance from all and sundry. Each part is followed by a couplet of trimeters from the Chorus.

There is also considerable visual stimulus. Polymestor emerges wearing a new, bloodied mask (shown 1066, 1117, cf. *Cyc* 663, 670, Soph *OT* 1297-1306 and Hense (1902).) The scene in the *Cyclops* also shows a blind villain groping after his assailants, cf. 679-82, and the drunken (sexual) groping after Silenus 567-89. Since it is known that the *Cyclops* is closely related with the *Hecuba* (see Introduction V), it does not require a huge imaginative leap to allow for similar staging techniques of these scenes, extending to direct visual echoes. There would likely be much rapid movement about the stage. As Mossman (1990) notes, the monody virtually choreographs itself: Polymestor describes his movements in detail because he himself cannot see what he is doing. Finally, Polymestor enters on all fours (1058), the only other extant example of which in tragedy is Aesch *Eum* 35ff., but cf. *Rh* 210-11, 254ff where Dolon imitating a wolf is described as being on all fours.

The question then arises, what information would the audience retain during this *tour-de-force*: rapid movement of a singer in a new mask in an unusual position, performing an uneven song with musical accompaniment. The impact is both visual and auditory, but the existence of parodies suggests the audience could recognise specific verbal allusions, which is surprising enough in trimeters, let alone lyric. Perhaps this provides one reason for the relatively straightforward sentence construction and word repetition: similarities with *Or* 1369ff would certainly corroborate this. For the repetition, cf. 953-1022 note. In his commentary Collard notes that he has an article forthcoming discussing the monody.

1056/7 The excitement induced by the dochmiacs in these and following lines is heightened by the repetitive sentence structure. There is almost a helplessness in the tricolon.

πᾷ βῶ, πᾷ στῶ These verbs are often used together, vaguely to represent all possible action, cf. *Alc* 863 ποῖ βῶ; ποῖ στῶ; *Sup* 1012-3, Soph *Aj* 1237, *Phil* 833-4. The interrogative subjunctive is used in the first question for "*questions of appeal*, where the speaker asks himself or another *what he is to do*" (*MT* 287), cf. 1099.

πᾷ κέλσω "to run (a ship) ashore" which is frequently used as a metaphor in Greek for finding a haven, cf. *Hip* 139-40 θανάτου θέλουσαν, | κέλσαι ποτὶ τέρμα δύστανον, *Rh* 752-53 χρῆν γάρ μ' ἀκλεῶς Ῥῆσόν τε θανεῖν, | Τροίᾳ κέλσαντ' ἐπίκουρον, *El* 138-39, Aesch *PV* 183.

1058-60 Of the many suggested interpretations of these lines, two present themselves as particularly viable:

1. *Porson* cleverly emended MSS. κατ' to καὶ, yielding a phrase = "on hand and foot" (for ἴχνος = "foot" rather than "track", cf. *Bac* 1134 ἡ δ' ἴχνος αὐταῖς ἀρβύλαις, fr. 530.6-7 οἱ δὲ Θεστίου | παῖδες τὸ λαιὸν ἴχνος ἀνάρβυλοι ποδός.) This is followed by Tierney, Diggle, and Collard, who nevertheless feels the language is somewhat strained. This need not be so: Polymestor is unaccustomed to walking on all fours, so his steps need to be deliberately placed. At any rate, clear sense should not be required of a character represented as being in pain. Similar language is used at *Rhe* 210-12:

   βάσιν τε χερσὶ προσθίαν καθαρμόσας
   καὶ κῶλα κώλοις, τετράπουν μιμήσομαι
   λύκου κέλευθον πολεμίους δυσεύρετον,

2. *Hadley* keeps the reading of the MSS. and by repunctuating, translates: "planting the tread of a four-footed beast of the mountains, following on their track (κατ' ἴχνος), in which direction (ποίαν ἐπὶ χεῖρα), this or that, am I to direct my shifting path (ἐξαλλάξω)?" Though this retains the MSS. reading and presents an idea similar to *Cyc* 681 ποτέρας τῆς χερός;, the word order remains tenuous. Hadley does not believe Polymestor enters on all fours

(suggested by the Scholiast), but such is not precluded by his interpretation. Both interpretations remain not completely convincing, and a further complicating factor is introduced because imperfect sense is what is expected in this context. I tentatively follow Porson.

For the use of ἐξαλλάξω, he compares Xen *On Hunting* 10.7 ἵνα εἰς τὰς ἄρκυς ποιῆται τὸν δρόμον μὴ ἐξαλλάττων.

1061 ἀνδροφόνους is hyperbole, though Polymestor does clarify his metaphor in 1062. Nevertheless, it echoes Hecuba's actions with those of her mythological exemplars, 886-87. The word is used significantly of the hands of Achilles in the *Iliad* 18.317 = 23.18 χεῖρας ἐπ' ἀνδροφόνους θέμενος στήθεσσιν ἑταίρου, 24.479 δεινὰς ἀνδροφόνους: "In all three passages the adjective occurs in a context which reveals how sharply Achilles' intense soul swings between the outermost extremes of love and hate" (Segal (1971) 50.) So here, Polymestor becomes aware that his artificial friendship in the previous episode was known for what it was to Hecuba all along; his false love has become a genuine hatred. Hecuba avenging her son upon Polymestor is identified with Achilles' vengeance on Hector for Patroclus.

1063-64 The contempt of Polymestor for the Trojan women is reciprocal with Hecuba's of him, cf. 716 ὦ κατάρατ' ἀνδρῶν.

1065 There is great conceit in this question of the victim, asked about the attackers: onstage, it would be natural to present silent characters avoiding the futile blind groping of Polymestor. For the use of καὶ in a request for supplementary information, cf. 515, 1201, *GP* 312-13. μυχῶν is repeated from 1040, inappropriately since he is now out of doors (unless the word may also have been used to refer to the corners of the stage.) The conflated construction in this sentence is justified by the implied motion in φυγᾷ. There is an echo of *Cyc* 679 πρὸς θεῶν πεφεύγασ' ἢ μένουσ' εἴσω δόμων;, also *Cyc* 407-08 ἄλλοι δ' ὅπως ὄρνιθες ἐν μυχοῖς πέτρας | πτήξαντες εἶχον. πτήσσω is also used of birds cowering at *HF* 974, Soph *Ajax* 171.

1066-68 Amidst the standard εἰ + optative construction for a wish, there has been some confusion due to the oxymoron in τυφλόν...φέγγος. The figure is used to recall Polymestor's original cry in 1035. βλέφαρον...ὀμμάτων, lit. "eyelid of (my) eyes," cf. *Sup* 48-49 ἐσιδοῦσ' οἰκτρὰ μὲν ὄσσων | δάκρυ' ἀμφὶ βλεφάροις, *Cyc* 483-86 ἄγε, τίς πρῶτος, τίς δ' ἐπὶ πρώτῳ | ταχθεὶς δαλοῦ κώπην ὀχμάσαι | Κύκλωπος ἔσω βλεφάρων ὤσας | λαμπρὰν ὄψιν διακναίσει; Helios, the Sun, is invoked as the giver of light to the world, cf. 68, and see Soph *El* 86ff. Compare Orion's being healed of his blindness by the sun, Apollodorus *Bibl* 1.4.3 ἐκεῖ δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀνέβλεψεν ἐξακεσθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς ἡλιακῆς ἀκτῖνος, καὶ διὰ ταχέων ἐπὶ τὸν Οἰνοπίωνα ἔσπευδεν. This might be an oblique continuation of the hunting metaphor (see also 1100-06.) Collard (see his note) suggests the repetition of ἀκέσαιο indicates Helios = Apollo. There are examples of each healing blindness, and the two gods do seem to merge in the fifth century. ἀπαλλάξας cf. 1197-98 note.

The unusual metre being used here, enoplians, has not been satisfactorily discussed in the secondary literature, but cf. Ritchie (1964) 310, and Willink *Or* page 288.

1069 σίγα: Commands to oneself are common in tragic lyric, cf. 725 but also *Cyc* 488 σίγα σίγα, καὶ δὴ μεθύων... The duplication in the *Cyclops* does not prejudice in favour of the alternate reading of some MSS., and *Christus Patiens*; duplication would be impossible metrically.

Tierney sees similarities in this scene with the short horror plays of the *Grand Guignol* in eighteenth-century Paris.

1070-71 ποδά is often used redundantly in Greek, cf. 53 - Diggle (1981) 37. Porson (on *Or* 1427) suggests verbs of motion take an accusative of the instrument or limb used, Denniston *El* 94 cites other examples, and cf. Jebb on Soph *OC* 113-4 (but Lloyd-Jones and Wilson's more recent *OCT* reads σιγήσομαί τε καὶ σύ μ' ἐξ ὁδοῦ 'κποδὼν | κρύψον κατ' ἄλγος, adopting Tournier's emendation over the MSS. ἐξ ὁδοῦ πόδα.)

τε is a simple connective, uniting the two actions, cf. *GP* 497.

The cannibalistic desire Polymestor expresses is of the same ferocity as Achilles' threat to Hector, Hom *Il* 22.346-8

> αἲ γάρ πως αὐτόν με μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἀνείη
>
> ὤμ' ἀποταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἷα ἔοργας,
>
> ὡς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὃς σῆς γε κύνας κεφαλῆς ἀπαλάλκοι

- an utterance Segal (1971) 38 characterises as "one of the most savage utterances of the poem." cf. *Cyc* 366-67 ξενικῶν | κρεῶν κεχαρμένος βορᾷ, 409, and *Cretans* Austin fr. 82.38-39 εἶτ' ὠμοσίτον τῆς ἐμῆς ἐραῖς φαγεῖν | σαρκός, πάρεστι. Perhaps most relevant to the present passage are Hecuba's words at Hom *Il* 24.212-13 τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἧπαρ ἔχοιμι | ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα· Though there are no verbal parallels, the wish is a striking counterpoint to the Achilles speech (Segal (1971) 61.) It comes after Achilles' anger has begun to abate, and shows the ferocity inherent in the character of Hecuba in the myth which Euripides inherits. What Polymestor desires on the death of his sons is something Hecuba has herself desired on the death of one of hers.

1072 extends the metaphor begun in 1058.

1073-74 Both the Scholium λαμβάνων καὶ ἀφαιρούμενος ἀντέκτισιν τῆς ἐμῆς βλάβης καὶ τυφλώσεως, and the phrase 213 λώβαν λύμας τ', suggests Hadley's correction of λώβας λύμας τ' is right. Diggle (1984) 68 agrees, and accepts Seider's ὦ which removes the "unwelcome resolved anapaest".

1075-78 Polymestor's question becomes victim to some rhetorical exaggeration, suggesting perhaps excessive self-interest. φέρομαι refers to mental seizure, cf. *HF* 1246 ποῖ φέρῃ θυμούμενος; but Polymestor's awareness of his being transported in this way removes credulity. There is irony in the care he expresses for the fates of *his* children after their death when compared

to his treatment of Hecuba's child, Polydorus. Mossman suggests that the children are eventually left unburied onstage at the end of the play. **Βάχκαις Ἅιδα** are women possessed by Hades, and driven to a Bacchic frenzy. There is not a necessary inconsistency here (cf. note 676-77) in two deities being represented as the single source of the frenzy. **Ἅιδα** = "hellish", cf. *HF* 1119 **εἰ μηκέθ' Ἅιδου βάχκος εἶ, φράσαιμεν ἄν**, Aesch *Ag* 1235 **θύουσαν Ἅιδου μητέρ'.** For the genitive, Seaford on *Cyc* 397, cf. also *Pho* 1489 **αἰδομένα φέρομαι βάχκα νεκύων**, *Or* 1492-3. That Bacchants could rend one limb from limb is clearly a conscious possibility to the audience, here two decades before the first production of the *Bacchae*. By using **διαμοιρᾶσαι** (to indicate the possible result - for this use of the infinitive cf. 1107 **φέρειν** and *MT* 97 which indicates these infinitives express purpose, cf. Russell p.64 = complimentary acc.), Polymestor echoes Hecuba's descriptions of his actions in 716. By using **ἐκβολάν**, Polymestor echoes Agamemnon's descriptions of his actions in 781. To be a banquet for dogs is the worst atrocity that can befall a corpse in Homer: cf. a single example, why Achilles will not sack Troy, *Il* 18.283 **πρίν μιν κύνες ἀργοὶ ἔδονται** (see Segal (1971) *passim* - the index has an entry under **κύων**), and in Euripides *HF* 567-68 **κρᾶτα δ' ἀνόσιον τεμὼν | ῥίψω κυνῶν ἕλκημα**, *Hcld* 1050-51 **κομίζετ' αὐτόν, δμῶες, εἶτα χρὴ κυσὶν | δοῦναι κτανόντας**. See Collard on *Sup* 47 for other scenes involving abandoned corpses.

1079-83 **πᾷ βῶ** was deleted by Nauck as an intrusive gloss, which Diggle and Collard follow, the latter speculating that the copyist did not read **πᾷ κάμψω** as "where am I to rest?", lit. bend my knee (sc. **γόνυ**, cf. 1150.) While this is clearly an attested meaning (also Soph *OC* 85 **ἔκαμψ' ἐγώ**), there are several valid arguments against it, and therefore for preserving **πᾷ βῶ**, for want of any valid reason to remove it:

1. the normal phrase **πᾷ βῶ πᾷ στῶ** (see note 1056-57) which represents all possible action, should not be quickly removed. If Euripides were using rhetorical variation, **πᾷ στῶ** would be the intrusive question (but this has not been suggested.) Removing **πᾷ βῶ** instead merely creates two parallel questions.

Porson's tidy adjustment moving the question to the beginning of the line strengthens its integrity, but ultimately is not necessary.

2. Collard suggests that the presence of the third question makes the line "metrically disruptive." If a paroemiac is less desirable than a single dochmius, the paroemiac in 1072 then need also be explained away.
3. line 1056, the opening line to this first part of the monody, asks πᾷ βῶ πᾷ στῶ and then uses a nautical metaphor (πᾷ κέλσω.) The same happens here, at the close of this part of the monody. Weil went so far as to emend κάμψω to κέλσω.

I believe this last point to be decisive, whether πᾷ βῶ is at the beginning of the line (with Porson, a mistake easily explained) or at the end, with the majority of MSS.

Euripides has Polymestor exhibit considerable confusion, with a continual mixing of metaphors. As has been stated, κάμψω is a nautical metaphor for tacking, borrowing the idea of 'rounding the post' from running, cf. Aristoph *Ach* 96 ἦ περὶ ἄκραν κάμπτων νεώσοικον σκοπεῖς; The nautical metaphor is preserved as he compares himself with a ship at sea, furling its sail with ropes (as it might while tacking) - but instead of a sail, it is λινόκροκον φᾶρος, his flax-woven robe (sailcloth was made from flax, and λίνον was used = sailcloth (Aristoph *Frogs* 364 ἀσκώματα καὶ λίνα καὶ πίτταν διαπέμπων εἰς Ἐπίδαυρον.)) His literal meaning, that he wants to lift his robes to be able to move quicker, is not concealed as he says this, and would be made explicit by the actor performing the action itself. Jeffrey also sees metaphors from guardship and blockading squadrons.

Many then see in κοίταν a return to the animal imagery that has been so prevalent in the monody so far, i.e. "lair" (and see note 1172-75.) This is probable, but the primary association in the present usage is as a lying-place of *death*: while a bed at *Med* 151-52 τᾶς ἀπλάτου | κοίτας ἔρος, it need not be, viz. *El* 158 κοίτᾳ ἐν οἰκτροτάτᾳ θανάτου (θανάτου being essentially redundant) and Aesch *Ag* 1494 κοίταν τάνδ' ἀνελεύθερον.

The Scholiast offers alternate explanations of the last lines: Σ AB suggest Polymestor is

seeking to protect his children's bodies from exposure, an ironic interpretation in light of Polydorus, surely - mutilation (1076) is also a threat. Since the monody has been so self-obsessed, it is better to follow Σ M, the reference to the children being only in passing: "to this place where my children lie dead" (Collard.)

ὀλεθρίον is a two-termination adjective, cf. *HF* 415 ὀλεθρίους, *Sup* 116 ὀλεθρίαν: see Collard on *Sup* 101 Καδμείας, and Kannicht *Hel* 335.

For the scansion of 1083, see note 714-15.

1085-86 The chorus' bland interjection both pities and chastises Polymestor. Its purpose is purely functional, breaking the monody into two uneven parts. σοι is the dative of advantage (Smyth 1481.) The warning of the chorus is very much a Greek commonplace for revenge, on how retribution is a necessary consequence of wrong action (cf. 902-04) preserved most succinctly in Aesch *Cho* 313 δράσαντα παθεῖν, but cf. *Ag* 1563-64 μίμνει δὲ μίμνοντος ἐν θρόνῳ Διός | παθεῖν τόν ἔρξαντα· θέσμιον γάρ, Eur. fr. 979:

οὔτοι προσελθοῦσ' ἡ Δίκη σε, μὴ τρέσῃς,
παίσει πρὸς ἧπαρ οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων βροτῶν ποδὶ
τὸν ἄδικον, ἀλλὰ σῖγα καὶ βραδεῖ ποδὶ
στείχουσα μάρψει τοὺς κακοὺς ὅταν τύχῃ.

and Horace *Odes* 3.2.31-32 *raro antecedentem scelestum* | *deservit pede poena claudo.*

1087 Barrett, in making a case for keeping *Hip* 1049 in light of 898, rightly says interpolation from 723 here is certain, and reflects a common phenomenon, see Page (1934) 103-05.

1088 Collard's psychological justification for Polymestor's calling for his spearmen "as a man of violence himself (9, 25, 877 etc.)" is not necessary. In terms of dramatic necessity, Polymestor shows that he is utterly alone. Having dismissed his personal bodyguard at 981 he is now attempting to summon them. In one sense, everyone that he calls - his spearmen, the Achaeans,

and the Atridae - are just offstage, but nevertheless beyond an ability to help him. He uses ἰώ, which is standard for invoking assistance, Soph *Phi* 736 ἰὼ θεοί (this also being an instance of intense pain and loud noise onstage), Eur *HF* 884 ἰὼ πόλις, *Or* 1296 ἰὼ Πελασγὸν Ἄργος.

λογχοφόρον "bearing the cavalry lance" is particularly appropriate for the εὔιππον Thracians (cf. 9, Hom *Il* 14.227 ἱπποπόλων Θρῃκῶν.) The Thracians are associated with Ares at *Alc* 498 Ἄρεος, ζαχρύσου Θρῃκίας πέλτης ἄναξ, *Rh* 379-87. While Collard's interpretation of κάτοχος = "Ares' own *subject* people" is defensible, the traditional interpretation of (frenzied) possession (Scholiast κατεχομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ πόθου τοῦ Ἄρεος) is preferable, cf. *Or* 791 μή θεαί μ' οἴστρῳ κατάσχωσι, *Pho* 784-85 ὦ πολύμοχθος Ἄρης, τί ποθ' αἵματι | καὶ θανάτῳ κατέχῃ...; *Hip* 27-28, *Bac* 1124, Soph *Tra* 978. While several words with Ionic associations show ablaut between the thematic alpha and eta, θρῄκης remains consistent, cf. Aesch *Per* 566, Barrett *Hip* 735-37.

1092-99 As his desperation increases, Polymestor's scansion becomes more irregular. The thrice-utterred βοάν, the standard cry for help, in 1092 betrays this desperation.

1093 ὦ ἴτε, μόλετε πρὸς θεῶν has a ceremonial sound to it, cf. the ritual cry at *Bac* 152 ὦ ἴτε βάχκαι, and *Phae* 112 ὦ ἴτε λαοί, Plutarch *Thes* 25.1 δεῦρ' ἴτε πάντες λεῴ, Aristoph *Peace* 298 δεῦρ' ἴτ', ὦ πάντες λεῴ. Dale (1968) 73 wrongly states that when "resolution precedes syncopation ... [there is] a license not found in iambo-trochaic." Diggle (1981) 18 notes the folly of this opinion, citing *Hip* 1145, *Ion* 689-90 = 707-08, 1449-50, *And* 1219, and Aesch *ST* 565-67 = 628-30 where resolution takes precedence. Daitz prints ἰὼ ἴτε (therefore scanning a dochmiac and a cretic) but it is clear that the formula is ὦ ἴτε, cf. *Bac* 152, *Phae* 112 (both cited above), Callimachus 5.13, Antagoras *AP* 9.147.1.

1094 ἦ οὔδεις is scanned dissyllabic, by synezesis, cf. *HF* 184 ἦ οὐ παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν, ὅν σὺ φῂς εἶναι δοκεῖν; *Hel* 137, *Ion* 999, *Or* 597, *Bac* 649.

1095 This is another notable similarity with the *Cyc* 672 οὖτίς μ' ἀπώλεσ', cf. Introduction V.

1099 For the use of the subjunctive in questions, cf. 1056-57 note.

1100-06 Having received no response yet to his pleas for help, Polymestor vainly desires suicide, as the chorus notes 1107-08, wishing either to fly up to heaven (which Tierney notes does mean death; he cites the fifth-century Potidaean inscription in Hicks and Hill (1901) 54.6-7 αἰθὴρ μὲμ φσυχὰς ὑποδέχσατο, σώματα δὲ χθὼν | τῶνδε) or descend to Hades. This antithesis seems to have been common in Euripides when characters are in similar desperate situations:

Ion 1238-9	τίνα φυγὰν πτερόεσσαν ἢ χθονὸς ὑπὸ σκοτίων μυχῶν πορευθῶ
HF 1157-8	οἴμοι, τί δράσω; ποῖ κακῶν ἐρημίαν εὕρω, πτερωτὸς ἢ κατὰ χθονὸς μολών;
Med 1296-7	δεῖ γάρ νιν ἤτοι γῆς γε κρυφθῆναι κάτω, ἢ πτηνὸν ἆραι σῶμ' ἐς αἰθέρος βάθος
Hip 1290-3	πῶς οὐχ ὑπὸ γῆς τάρταρα κρύπτεις δέμας αἰσχυνθείς, ἢ πτηνὸς ἄνω μεταβὰς βίοτον πήματος ἔξω πόδα τοῦδ' ἀνέχεις; (which may be corrupt, see Barrett)
Phae 270-3	τάλαιν' ἐγὼ τάλαινα ποῖ πόδα πτερόεντα καταστάσω ἀν' αἰθέρ', ἢ γᾶς ὑπὸ κεῦθος ἄφαν- τον ἐξαμαυρωθῶ;

See also *Sup* 829-30 κατά με πέδον γᾶς ἕλοι | διὰ δὲ θύελλα σπάσαι, Soph *Ajax* 1192-94 ὄφελε πρότερον αἰθέρα δῦ|ναι μέγαν ἢ τὸν πολύκοινον Ἅιδαν | κεῖνος ἀνήρ, Herodotus 4.132.3 ἢν

μὴ ὄρνιθες γενόμενοι ἀναπτῆσθε ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἢ μύες γενόμενοι κατὰ τῆς καταδύητε..., Gibbon (1910) 525 "unless you could soar into the air like birds, unless like fishes you could dive into the waves" etc. Wings clearly form a *topos* in these expressions, ἀμπτάμενος (Aeolic ἀμ- for Ionic ἀνά, cf. Wilamowitz' conjecture at Aesch *Ag* 985 which is the only (potential) use in the indicative): cf. above, and *Ion* 796-99 (sic) ἀν' ὑγρὸν ἀμπταίην αἰθέρα πόρσω γαίας Ἑλλανίας, ἀστέρας ἑσπέρους, | οἷον οἷον ἄλγος ἔπαθον, φίλαι, *HF* 650-54, *Hip* 732-34, Bible *Psalm* 55:6. Though Bond is right to compare the magical association of transferring the evil to another object, the listing of alternatives in the present instance does more than this. By expressing the situation in an either...or construction, there is a suppressed protasis which dupes the evil: it ensures that the *status quo* (i.e. the evil remaining with the speaker) is not a possibility. In all these wishes, the speaker eliminates formally anything but being raised up or dragged down, which in the present instance means death in either case. As it turns out, Polymestor's wish is not answered.

In Polymestor's antithesis, there is a light/darkness contrast which, though without irony in the use of ὄσσων, nevertheless does bear on Polymestor's situation. The constellations mentioned (note stars are also mentioned at *Ion* 796-99 cited above) are appropriate for several reasons:

1. Orion and his dog (found together also, e.g. at Hesiod *WD* 609-10 εὖτ' ἂν δ' Ὠρίων καὶ Σείριος ἐς μέσον ἔλθῃ | οὐρανόν) are clearly associated with hunting, thereby maintaining the metaphor used throughout the first part of the monody, as well as 1172-75, as well as with blindness and cures for blindness (= Polymestor's desire?) See note 1066-68.
2. Rising near the summer solstice, the constellations are associated with great heat (hence the redundant πυρὸς φλογέας; Σείριος = "the scorching", where one literally should sc. ἀστήρ) cf. Virgil *Aen* 10.274 *Sirius ardor,* Homer *Il* 22.25-29.
3. As Orion constantly flees the constellation *Scorpio* (see Frazer (1921) I. 33 n. 2) so Polymestor now flees the Trojan women.
4. Sirius is described as having burning eyes, which gives another positive, divine

association to Hecuba's eventual metamorphosis (see note 1265).

Stanford *Ajax* p. 289-90 Appendix E "A Note on Suicide", mentions that suicide is a concern particularly of many Sophoclean characters. Of the three motivations he suggests for Ajax, two can be brought to bear for Polymestor: fear of ridicule and mockery (at having been defeated by captive, barbarian (he is to ally himself with the Greeks 1133-82 esp. 1175-76) women), and a desire for vengeance ("suicide after a ritual cursing of one's enemies, was a recognized form of revenge in ancient society" (Stanford *Ajax* page 289), cf. Delcourt (1939) who discusses suicide in tragedy but does not address this passage because it merely consists of the wish (neither though does she address willing sacrifices, who in tragedy often act as if their death possesses this same nobility (see Introduction III). Stanford *Ajax* 835 associates suicides with the role of Erinyes and alastores, cf. note 685-87. Before the Platonists and Pythagoreans, suicide was not condemned, but was viewed as a legitimate means of escape from an uncomfortable life. Tierney suggests we *contrast HF* 1247-48 and 1351. Bond, writing on the former, details the instances of disapproval of suicide. The latter is a notorious *crux*, ~~dealt with~~ which I believe should be understood with the MSS. reading θάνατον, cf. *And* 252.

Hermann deleted αἰθέρ' which is clearly a gloss, read at the beginning of 1100. Daitz and Diggle cite the Scholiast.

ἀφίησιν, while grammatically only of Sirius, in sense applies equally to Orion.

Strictly speaking, Ἅιδα is the ruler of the underworld and not the place itself. It is nevertheless a commonplace to use the one for the other, cf. 418, 483, and to an extent 1076. μελάγχρωτα seems to be used = "black as death" cf. *Or* 321 μελάγχρωτες εὐμενίδες, and *Hec* 71, 705. These lines serve to realize the ironic potential of certain lines in the fourth episode, e.g. 954, 968, 972.

πορθμόν, accusative of motion towards, used here poetically without a preposition, referring to the Styx.

1107-08 The chorus provide a sympathetic voice, stating the common popular moral sentiment

(see above note) that suicide is an acceptable means of escape for Polymestor. The Scholiast's comment εἰρωνευόμενος ὁ χορὸς ταῦτά φησι πρὸς τὸν Πολυμήστορα does not impugn this, but suggests that they dissemble in the sense that they conceal the fact that they are passive accessories to the crime, and offer their pity. It is idiomatic in poetry to omit ὥστε between ἢ and φέρειν as would be expected, cf. 844-45 κρείσσον' ἢ λέξαι λόγῳ | τολμήμαθ', fr. 1083.10 μεῖζον ἢ λόγῳ φράσαι, Soph *OT* 1293 τὸ γὰρ νόσημα μεῖζον ἢ φέρειν. Sometimes ὥστε is found, however: e.g. at Xenophon *Ana* 3.5.17 φοβοῦμαι μή τι μεῖζον ἢ ὥστε φέρειν δύνασθαι ξυμβῇ, Herodotus 3.14.10 μέζω κακὰ ἢ ὥστε ἀνακλαίειν. The Ionic form ζόη (note accent) is required by meter, in iambic trimeters also at Soph fr. 556(*Skyrioi*) οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλγος οἷον ἡ πολλὴ ζόη, fr. 592 (*Tereus*) 4 τὰν γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ζόαν. See Page *Med* 976 for other metrical restrictions affecting the form this word takes.

1109-1295 Trial and Final Judgment of Polymestor

The conclusion to the play helps unite the overall structure: as in the first and third episodes, the interplay between characters in the exodos commences after an extended lyric passage from the person of lowest status on stage (see Introduction VI.) The action is a formal *agon* (see below) as at 216-443, and breaks down as follows:

1109-31	Agamemnon establishes himself as the judge	
1132-82	Case for the defence: Polymestor's *rhesis*	
1183-86		Choral couplet - end of speech.
1187-1237	Case for the prosecution: Hecuba's *rhesis*	
1238-89		Choral couplet - end of speech
1240-92	Agamemnon's judgment and Polymestor's prophecies	
1293-95		Final choral comment

Collard (1975) 63 observes "the Athenian audience no doubt responded as readily as we do to courtroom drama, because of its immediacy to our own experience and our easy identification with the emotions of the stage-persons." Euripides does not make it that easy for his audience,

however. He challenges it with the moral ambiguities of the situation. The scene begins with Agamemnon's unannounced entry. This suggests that he has been waiting nearby, not at the Greek camp as would be suggested by 1109-11 (note also only he responds to Polymestor's cries for help.) He is attended by silent characters, presumably an armed guard, who become dramatically necessary at 1282. There are several indications in the text that the character is acting a part in the role of an impartial judge, see notes 1116, 1127-28. In this respect, he is like the merchant in Soph *Philoctetes*, or the protagonist in Shakespeare's *Macbeth* II.iii.89-94, on Duncan's murder:

> Had I but died an hour before this chance,
> I had but liv'd a blessed time; for, from this instant, 90
> There's nothing serious in mortality -
> All is but toys; renown and grace is dead;
> The wine of life is drawn, and the mere lees
> Is left this vault to brag of.

Hecuba has already gained Agamemnon's duplicity (a fact she tactfully omits in her *rhesis*) at 898-99. It has therefore been noted that the *agon* between Hecuba and Polymestor is a farce. That is not to say the scene is "weak in dramatic logic" (Collard (1975) 65). The purpose of the scene is to provide a retroactive confirmation of Hecuba's just position, which is set against Agamemnon's pseudo-justice and Polymestor's injustice. Some judgement is required, and the dramatic logic dictates that it be a repeat of the earlier judgement. Also, Polymestor in his defence does attack Hecuba's position. This means, crucially, that in her *rhesis* she must provide some justification of what she has done.

Polymestor's *rhesis* (1132-82) is "more a messenger speech than a lawcourt defence" (*loc cit*) and this helps to define the (moral) short-sightedness of the character. This does serve a secondary function, since the result of the trial is never actually in doubt, the narration of the details of what transpired offstage maintains interest. Kovacs pointedly remarks that "We have heard the false Greek pretending to aloofness from matters barbarian, matters in which he is actually quite intimately involved. Now we must hear the false barbarian showing that he is, at

heart, a loyal servant of the Greek cause" (1987, 106). In contrast, Hecuba's inherent rightness is demonstrated in her rebuttal, which is "a conventionally methodical demolition of Polymestor's case" (*loc cit.*) The trial before Agamemnon allows the audience as well as the judge to be informed of what transpired within the tent - compare the dramatic effectiveness of this with the way sketchy details are given to Agamemnon at 774, 779. Sheppard believes the audience's reaction is completely negative: "We despise his pretence, and can have no respect for his verdict." But this is to impose what we know of the situation onto Agamemnon. Though he agreed to allow Hecuba's attempts at revenge, he could not know nor be expected to know what form it would take; even the chorus have already been shown to be unaware of the precise details, cf. 1034 and 1037 note. It is surely a more extreme situation than Agamemnon envisaged as being possible by women, however appropriate her actions are in the situation. He is then genuinely surprised on four counts:

(1) to hear Polymestor's cries in the first place, 1108,

(2) to discover Polymestor blinded, 1117,

(3) to discover his children dead, 1118, and

(4) that it was all done by Hecuba, 1122.

This surprise has an effect on his language, which "quickly becomes simpler after his surprise at 1116" (Collard on 1113.) Polymestor presents his case as though he were in the right, and acting in Agamemnon's interests, that it is Hecuba who should be on trial for her atrocities rather than he for his. He admits his guilt in the opening lines of his speech, by confessing to the murder of Polydorus. Hecuba's rebuttal removes all his assumptions, leaving only this fact and his guilt. In Aeschylus *Eumenides* 566ff., Orestes' case is so balanced that a trial (agon) needs to be held to determine his innocence or guilt, with Athena presiding. Euripides here rejects this indeterminacy, and shows his character to be absolutely morally correct and blameless in her actions. That Polymestor is a significant character in the play, and not a mere messenger brought on specifically for the purpose, means the details are narrated with a definite opinion in mind, not as an impartial observer (and there were surely enough witnesses to the event had Euripides desired.) Taplin

(1977) 82 n.2 lists other examples of this: *Tro* 1123ff, *Rh* 756ff, Aesch *Sup* 605ff, *Ag* 1380ff, Soph *Ajax* 1380ff, *OT* 771ff, *Ant* 249ff, 407ff, the *Gyges* fragment *POxy* 2382; to which add Bond *Hyps* fr. 18.

This is all reinforced by the structure of the agon: in the contemporary Athenian lawcourts, as today, and in most examples of the tragic agon, the prosecution initiates debate and the defendant closes it, "but there is a tendency to put the stronger case, if there is one, second - stronger either in justice or in debating-points - and occasionally, as with Helen v. Hecuba in *Tro.*, this is allowed to invert the normal order" (Dale *Alc* 697.) Euripides is therefore stating explicitly, simply by the structure of the scene, that Hecuba's case is the stronger and the just one. In *Med* 465-575 Medea's stronger case is first, and she, like Hecuba here, is formally the prosecutor, but Medea is the exception: typically, the 'sympathetic' character speaks second, cf. Iolaus in *Hcld*, Theseus in *Sup*, Hippolytus in *Hip*, Orestes in *Or*, and Hecuba in *Tro*. The *Troades* debate Dale cites (903-1059) and *Or* 470-629 are like the present debate also in that there is a judge present during the agon, Menelaus in each case. For an *agon* without a judge, see Stevens *And* 184ff. Collard (*ad loc* and (1975) 64-66) also notes the similarities between the present passage and *Medea* 1317 and *Heraclidae* 928-1017. In all three scenes, there is an enmity which is not resolved within the context of the agon and endures well after the play. Both of the agon speeches are 51 lines long, whereby Euripides clearly gives each speaker 'equal time', cf. *Med* 465-575 where Medea and Jason each speak 54 lines (accepting the deletion of 468.) Page says this phenomenon is "very rare in Euripides", clearly opposing Paley, who lists twelve instances in the preface to *Euripides* vol. 2 xix-xxiv. Though all may not be valid, it is at least clear that Euripides did use the technique from time to time.

Arnott (1991) 110 wrongly identifies Polymestor as the plaintiff, and Hecuba as the defendant. This simply cannot be sustained: Polymestor is not seeking legal redress, he is seeking pity.

1109 It is common for characters to justify an entry by mentioning a loud noise: *Hip* 790, 902

(cited below), *IT* 1307, Aristoph *Ach* 1072. The normal word for such a sound is βοή, but κραυγή (= "shriek" or "croak" of a raven) is used at *Hip* 902-3 κραυγῆς ἀκούσας σῆς ἀφικόμην, πάτερ, | σπουδῇ, *Or* 1510, 1529, *Ion* 893.

1110-11 For this use of παῖς, cf. *Hcld* 900, fr. 989 ὁ τῆς τύχης παῖς κλῆρος. λέλακ' see note 678-79.

This is the earliest extant personification of an echo. It is generally supposed that Echo delivers the prologue in Euripides' *Andromeda* (412 B.C.), assumed from the Scholiast on Aristoph *Thes* 1065 τοῦ προλόγου τῆς 'Ανδρομέδας εἰσβολή, cf. also *Thes*1018ff = Eur fr. 118.

1112 ᾔσμεν, "had we not known", is the reading of the *Etymologicon Magnum* (c. A.D. 1000) and makes sense where the undisputed MSS. reading ἴσμεν does not.

1113 The objections of Elmsley and Weil that παρέσχ' ἄν is not Attic and would have been written παρέσχεν ἄν (as in some MSS.) cannot be maintained. Though παρέσχεν "would have caused" represents a phenomenon rare in Greek, ~~but~~ it is surely not inconceivable: *Tro* 397 εἰ δ' ἦσαν οἶκοι, χρηστὸς ὢν ἐλάνθανεν (despite Diggle), where Lee writes, "The omission of ἄν stresses the fact that the idea in the apodosis would definitely be true if the condition had been fulfilled." Cf. Jeffrey: "the sentence starts as a hypothetical form, and suddenly changes into a statement of fact", and also *Hec* 1218. This use of the indicative for the subjunctive is more common in Latin: Virgil *Georg* 2.132-3 *et, si non alium late iacaret odorem, | laurus erat*, and cf. also Shakespeare *Romeo and Juliet* III.ii.114-15 "Tybalt's death | Was woe enough, if it had ended there." See *MT* 432, Smyth 2320,

Diggle (1981) 100 (on *Ion* 354-59) is in the end correct, though: the six MSS. Daitz reads as having παρέσχ' ἄν do in fact read παρέσχεν ἄν. Further "Dr K. Matthiessen tells me that, according to his collations, 'there are twelve manuscripts which have παρέσχεν ἄν, the rest have παρέσχεν, *none* have παρέσχ' ἄν'. Another probable

instance of this elision is *Or.* 502 ἔλαβ' ἂν ἀντὶ (Bergk: ἔλαβεν ἀντὶ uel ἔλαβεν ἂν τῆς codd.)." (1981, 100) and cf. Diggle (1974) 16-19, (1975) 198.

οὐ μέσως cf. *And* 873 πόλεώς τ' οὐ μέσως εὐδαίμονος, is found also as litotes without the negative at *HF* 58, Thuc 2.60.7, and in fourth-century comedy.

1114-15 Cf. *Bac* 178 ὦ φίλταθ', ὡς σὴν γῆρυν ᾐσθόμην κλύων (and *Christus Patiens* 1148) which echoes these lines. Theseus is likewise recognized by the blind Oedipus at Soph *OC* 891 ὦ φίλτατ', ἔγνων γὰρ τὸ προσφώνημά σου, cf. *Rh* 608-09 where Odysseus recognizes Athena's voice. For the use of γάρ in the parenthetical clauses, cf. *And* 64 ὦ φιλτάτη σύνδουλε - σύνδουλος γὰρ εἶ, *Med* 465 ὦ παγκάκιστε, τοῦτο γᾶρ σ' εἰπεῖν ἔχω, and *HF* 217-18 ὦ γαῖα Κάδμου, καὶ γὰρ ἐς σ' ἀφίξομαι | λόγους ὀνειδιστῆρας ἐνδατούμενος, also *HF* 174-76. The use of φίλτατη here is instructive: it is clearly the appropriate form of address for Polymestor to use with Agamemnon (cf. 505 and Collard's note), but our perception is coloured by Polymestor's earlier double use in his first line (953), and in Hecuba's sarcastic echo at 990. The present instance is not morally neutral: like the stereotypical Hollywood director who calls everyone "Darling", so Polymestor's repeated use demonstrates how empty the sentiment in fact is.

1116 ἔα *extra metrum* cf. 733.

1117 For alterations to Polymestor's mask, cf. note 1056-1108.

1118 For the visibility of Polymestor's sons, cf. note 1049-53.

1119 ἄρα used after ὅστις (is there irony in the use of the masculine?), cf. *Bac* 894 ἰσχὺν τόδ' ἔχειν, ὅ τι ποτ' ἄρα τὸ δαιμόνιον, Plato *Laws* 692 B and *GP* 40.

1121 For the corrective force, with ἀλλὰ, cf. note 948-49. For the hyperbole, cf. note 668.

1122 τοὔργον εἴργασαι is a *figura etymologica*, used for emphasis, here in the commonest form of verb + cognate accusative, cf. *Sup* 1072 δεινὸν ἔργον ἐξειργάσω, Soph *Ant* 1228 οἷον ἔργον εἴργασαι.

1124 Polymestor bursts into renewed frenzy when he discovers that Hecuba has not fled completely (as it is natural for him to expect a woman to act) and may in fact be within arm's reach, again recalling *Cyc* 679-82, cf. note 1056-1108. ὤμοι, τί λέξεις; cf. 713 note. Line 1128 shows that during this speech Agamemnon signals to his attendants who grab Polymestor and restrain him; Agamemnon performing this action would be unlikely, cf. Philoctetes held by Odysseus' sailors, Soph *Phi* 1003.

1125 There is a rare double elision, 'σθ' for ἐστι.

1126 Tierney accords this line an "almost Aeschylean weight."

διασπάσωμαι recalls the vivid threats of 1071, 1076, cf. *Bac* 338-39 ὃν ὠμόσιτοι σκύλακες ἃς ἐθρέψατο | διεσπάσαντο, *Sup* 830 διὰ δὲ θύελλα σπάσαι.

καθαιμάξω cf. *And* 588 σκήπτρῳ δὲ τῷδε σὸν καθαιμάξω κάρα, *Or* 1527, *IA* 311.

1127 Despite Agamemnon's earlier rhetorical flourish, his pretence is shown here for what it is, by the double colloquialism he utters when caught off guard: οὗτος "you there" (Stevens (1977) 37) is used to introduce a question, and is also found at *Alc* 773, Aesch *Sup* 911, and in its more usual form with σύ at 1280, Soph *OT* 532, Aristoph *Ach* 564; τί πάσχεις; "what's up with you?" (Collard; Stevens (1977) 37.)

1128 This form of the participle μαργῶσαν appears only here, and the word indicates wildness, idiocy, and lust, cf. *HF* 1005 φόνου μαργῶντος, 1082, *Pho* 1156, 1247, of Helen's lust at *El*

1027, of the Furies at Aesch *Eum* 67. Dawe (1973) 83 believes the variant in H at *Ajax* 50 μαργῶσαν is an "emendation by learned reminiscence", which may or may not have been introduced deliberately. Wilson (1976) 173 approves of this interpretation.

1129-31 Agamemnon establishes himself in the same role as an Athenian dicast. Such opening statements to an agon are common: some are overt (229, *Or* 491 πρὸς τόνδ' ἀγὼν, *Hcld* 116 πρὸς τοῦτον ἀγών), and others slightly more circumlocutious (*Pho* 465 λόγος μὲν οὖν σὸς πρόσθε, *Tro* 907-08 καὶ δὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους λόγους | ἡμῖν κατ' αὐτῆς, *Hel* 944-46.)

By applying τὸ βάρβαρον "savagery" to Polymestor, Agamemnon anticipates much of what will follow. Technically, a βάρβαρος was any non-Greek and the concept therefore should apply equally to Hecuba. Meridor (1978) 32 believes that the fact that Hecuba is never presented as barbaric means that "Hecuba's act ... does not place her outside of civilized society" and therefore means the audience is more inclined to sympathise. Sympathy for Hecuba is not however a genuine problem - it has long since been won - and the purpose of the isolated setting of the play is to remove any possible influences of 'civilized society'. The distinction does not seem to be Homeric (despite *Il* 2.867 βαρβαρόφωνος) and is clearly an indication of contempt, signifying either rudeness and a lack of (Hellenic) culture, or, as here, cruelty and brutality, cf. *Hel* 501-2 ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε βάρβαρος φρένας, | ὃς ὄνομ' ἀκούσας τοὐμὸν οὐδώσει βοράν, *Med* 536-8 πρῶτον μὲν Ἑλλάδ' ἀντὶ βαρβάρου χθονὸς | γαῖαν κατοικεῖς καὶ δίκην ἐπίστασαι | νόμοις τε χρῆσθαι μὴ πρὸς ἰσχύος χάριν, Demosthenes 21.150. There is particular irony here because Polymestor is going to ally himself with the Greek cause (cf. Hecuba's reply to this point, 1199-1201). In this matter, too, he has been prejudged.

The issue only really exists because Hecuba, too, is presented as a sometime Thracian. In line 3 (and by allusion in the following lines), she is described as the child of Cisseus, a famous Thracian king in myth. This is the more significant because there were many other options available to Euripides in his selection of Hecuba's parents that would not hold what becomes an ironic coincidence: Cisseus is listed in the ancient sources by Nicander of Colophon fr.62.1, Virgil

Aen 7.320, 10.705, Servius *ad loc*; Dymas by Homer *Il* 16.717, Strabo 13.1.21, Dictys 1.9.6; and Sangarius by Apollodorus *Bibl* 3.148.1. Suetonius *Tib* 70.3 represents the issue of Hecuba's parentage (specifically her mother) as the sort of arcane mythological knowledge that Tiberius carried to a laughable extreme (see also Mossman (1990) 264 n.33). It would therefore seem that Polymestor and she are meant to be thought of as cousins (surely not as brother and sister!), a detail the debasement scholars seem to have missed though could do much with. Her heritage provides a legitimate rationale for Polymestor having been chosen as ward of Polydorus. The reference to him here and at 1200 as ~~as~~ a barbarian, then, must be understood in the first instance as a value judgement, rather than as a straightforward description of objective fact. In the agon both Polymestor and Hecuba present their cases in terms of how 'Greek' they behaved, though Hecuba need not make so much of this because of her earlier dialogue with Agamemnon. For how this relates with the notion of ξένια in the play, see notes 710-11 and 793-97. For further discussion of the barbarian in Greek drama, cf. Hall (1989) and Bacon (1961).

1132-35 These lines clearly repeat the facts Polydorus established in lines 4-15.
Optative + ἄν provides a 'courteous' future, cf. 485. Used to commence a speech, cf. *El* 1060 and *IT* 939 λέγοιμ' ἄν, *Sup* 465 and *Or* 640 λέγοιμ' ἂν ἤδη, *Hip* 336 σιγῷμ' ἂν ἤδη.
It is necessary to identify Polydorus as Ἑκάβης παῖς (cf. 3) in this context because this is one of the divergences from the Homeric story Euripides adopts: whereas at *Il* 21.88 he is the son of Laöthoe and Priam, he becomes a greater potential threat to the Greeks in this play by being the son of Hecuba.
Adjectives in -τος are usually passive (cf. Barrett *Hip* 768) but here ὕποπτος is active, "suspecting", cf. *IT* 1476 ὅστις κλύων ἄπιστος, and Jebb on Soph *OC* 1031. Thucydides uses τὸ ὕποπτον = "suspicion" at 1.90.2, 6.89.1. δή, cf. *GP* 205.

1136-37 To attribute cunning to Polymestor here is to credit him with too much. It is preferable to have him not fully understanding the judicial process occurring around him, heightening one

manifestation of his savagery in comparison with Hecuba. The rhetorical effectiveness of τοῦτον κατέκτειν' is equally powerful as an unwanted early confession. There is no dramatic urgency that Polymestor have 'a good showing' at the trial since it has already been shown to be a misguided assumption, since the trial serves merely to confirm Hecuba's vengeance retroactively, in a format (the agon) that would have been pleasing to the Athenian audience. This is reflected in the final judgement, cf. 1243. There is therefore an ironic echo in προμηθίᾳ, recalling 795, regardless of the interpretation of the word there.

1138-41 Polymestor invokes a common Greek notion that your foe's children must not live (*Hcld* 1005-8, *And* 519-21, *Tro* 723, *HF* 166-67. This notion was of course also present when Hecuba's women killed Polymestor's sons, the event he will describe 1157ff.

There has been considerable discussion of the significance of the various moods used in the verbs in these lines. The main verb, ἔδεισα, is historic. μή after verbs of fearing indicates something that may happen, but is not desired: "The subjunctive can also follow secondary tenses to retain the mood in which the object of the fear originally occurred to the mind" (*MT* 365), e.g. Xenophon *Sym* 2.11 ὥστε οἱ μὲν θεώμενοι ἐφοβοῦτο μή τι πάθῃ. The vivid subjunctives ἀθροίσῃ and ξυνοικίσῃ present the immediate consequences (recalling the συνοίκισις of Attica by Theseus described at Thuc 2.15.2), which leaves room for more remote consequences to be presented in the optative, ἄρειαν.

1142-5 Polymestor seems bitter at the recent (νῦν + imperfect ἐκάμνομεν, a word also at line-end at *Med* 768) marauding presence of the Greeks in his country, whose activities correspond to those Thucydides credits them in 1.11.1 ἀλλὰ πρὸς γεωργίαν τῆς Χερσονήσου τραπόμενοι καὶ λῃστείαν τῆς τροφῆς ἀπορίᾳ. LSJ II.3 says the use of 1142 τρίβειν to mean "ravage" is unique. While there may be justice in his indignant attitude, Polymestor's self-motivation may not sit well with Agamemnon. It certainly would not have been accepted by the Athenians of 427 B.C. (Diodotus at the Mytilenian Debate): Thuc 3.43.1 ἤν τις καὶ ὑποπτεύηται κέρδους μὲν ἕνεκα τὰ

βέλτιστα δὲ ὅμως λέγειν, φθονήσαντες τῆς οὐ βεβαίου δοκήσεως τῶν κερδῶν τὴν φανερὰν ὠφελίαν τῆς πόλεως ἀφαιρούμεθα.

1148 The postponement and enjambment of χρυσοῦ emphasizes the power the lure had on him. For the seeming contradiction in μόνον δὲ σὺν τέκνοισί, cf. *Med* 513 σὺν τέκνοις μόνη μόνοις, *El* 628 ἢ μόνος δμώων μέτα.

1150 κάμψαν γόνυ is redundant after ἵζω, but does stress that Polymestor will be slower to react later, cf. 1079 (where the idea of "resting legs" is more immediate), Aesch *PV* 32 οὐ κάμπτων γόνυ, Soph *OC* 19.

1151-54 The complex word order of these lines has led to many corruptions, but I am convinced the original readings have been restored, as printed in Diggle's text.
αἱ μὲν is in partitive opposition to the subject of the sentence, πολλαὶ...Τρώων κόραι. This is only clear with Milton's emendation of χειρός from MSS. χεῖρες, the reading which is adopted by Daitz and Dodds *Bac* 745 who reads it as a "grim anonymous threat" which while poetic impoverishes the overall sense (for Milton's work on Euripides in general see entry in bibliography.) For ἔνθεν, cf. note 731-32. δὴ is deprecatory (*GP* 231) as at *Bac* 224.

A failure to see κερκίδα as the object of ᾔνουν led to the corruption θάκουν for θάκους, which Hermann emended. While at 363 κέρκις, literally the shuttle that is thrown back and forth between the woof of a loom, = the loom itself (synecdoche), here it is used for the *product* of the loom, the cause for effect, in the same way πόνος is used for the product of labour at *Or* 1570 τεκτόνων πόνον, Aesch *Ag* 53-54 δεμνιοτήρη | πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες. The Edonians were a particularly familiar Thracian tribe, based on the East bank of the river Strymon: they had destroyed the first Athenian colony in 465 at what was to become Amphipolis. Thracian textiles were particularly highly regarded, cf. Kazarow (1930) 543 and Hall (1989) 137-38. χερὸς can function two ways: since the garment is referred to as its creating device - the shuttle on the loom

- so the hand that throws the shuttle is the referent for the final product; perhaps more straightforward, however, is to read χερὸς as "handiwork", cf. Hom *Od* 15.126 μνῆμ' Ἑλένης χειρῶν.

λεύσσω and αὐγή are also used together at 925, where see note. The preposition ὑπό is used because in a Greek house (as well as, one must assume, a Greek tent) light is admitted from the ceiling. The action, to see how much light would pass through the cloth to determine the tightness of the weave and therefore the cloth's approximate value, seems to have been common enough to become a normal adverb, cf. Aristoph *Thes* 500 ὡς ἡ γυνὴ δεικνῦσα τἀνδρὶ τοὔγκυκλον ὑπαυγὰς οἷόν ἐστιν, Plato *Phaedrus* 268A ταῦτα δὲ ὑπ' αὐγὰς μᾶλλον ἴδωμεν, τίνα καί ποτ' ἔχει τὴν τῆς τέχνης δύναμιν.

πέπλους need not refer to female garments, as it did at 933 (but see next note), cf. the flowing robes of Agamemnon, *IA* 1550 πρόσθεν ὀμμάτων πέπλον προθείς, of a barbarian, Aesch *Per* 468 ῥήξας δὲ πέπλους κἀνακωκύσας λιγύ, and see Jebb *Tra* 602.

1155-56 A *prima facie* reading of the MSS. leads one to conclude that the women inspect a single Thracian lance, and then remove Polymestor's twofold "equipment." While the etymology and usage of στόλισμα and its cognates would suggest that the meaning is seldom beyond that of clothing, and therefore that the twofold equipment here constitutes the aforementioned spear and an outer garment. This is perhaps reinforced by the common use of πέπλος to mean an undergarment (cf. 933) which is easily visible, perhaps suggesting a full costume change for Polymestor at his entry at 1053, thereby adding to the overall spectacle described in note 1049-53, but cf. *Sup* 559 ἐστολισμένον δορί, *IA* 255. Daitz (1981) provides an alternate translation of these lines, avoiding this: "Others pretend to inspect my Thracian lance and so strip me of my double-edged weapon." It seems that after such a clear reference to the clothwork (1154), it is preferable to preserve the idea that the women were encouraging him to relax completely, taking his spears and loosening his clothing. This supports the idea that Athenian men had a genuine anxiety about a female sexual threat. This straightforward interpretation of στολίσματος seems to be all but universally

disapproved of, I believe unfairly. Part of the difficulty lies in the visualisation of this scene. The audience is not witness to the event, merely to the retelling of it. There are no visual clues to help them envisage what transpired, apart from the lack of one or two spears, and perhaps an ornate outer cloak. The words of the narrative itself need to be considered. The two nouns immediately preceding the word στολίσματος are 1154 πέπλους and 1155 κάμακα (see below) followed by a word meaning "twofold"; to take these nouns as the twofold equipment is the most natural interpretation. The Scholiast cites Hom *Od* 21.340 which, when viewed in a larger context (21.338-41), also links a single spear with outer clothing, albeit as part of a longer list:

εἴ κέ μιν ἐντανύσῃ, δώῃ δέ οἱ εὖχος Ἀπόλλων,

ἕσσω μιν χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, εἵματα καλά,

δώσω δ' ὀξὺν ἄκοντα, κυνῶν ἀλκτῆρα καὶ ἀνδρῶν,

καὶ ξίφος ἄμφηκες·

Nevertheless, since the preceding lines have been shown to be corrupt, and because the present lines use unusual vocabulary, there has been a tendency to alter the text.

Not without merit is Hartung's "particularly ... crucial correction" (Collard) adopted by Diggle et al. changing the κάμακα θρηκίαν to the dual, κάμακε Θρηκίω (an emendation apparently also made by Weil, "Je corrige".) It is of course a commonplace that Homeric heroes carried two spears (*Od* 1.256 ἔχων πήληκα καὶ ἀσπίδα καὶ δύο δοῦρε, *Il* 4.495 πάλλων δ' ὀξέα δοῦρε), but Lorimer (1940) suggests that this was not the case in the fifth century. Fraenkel at Aesch *Ag* 643 says δίλογχον and Soph *Ajax* 408 δίπαλτος refer to two spears, where Stanford follows Lorimer, = "double (spear) wielding", and therefore "fully armed", *contra* Jebb and Scholiast, = "double-wielded", i.e. "two-handed" as apparently *IT* 323, cf. also Pind *P* 4.79 αἰχμαῖσιν διδύμαισιν. There is sufficient iconographic evidence to argue either way: 2 spears, e.g. the 'bilingual' (red and black figure) amphora by the Andokides Painter (*ARV* 4, 7), a lekythos by the Pan painter (*ARV* 557, 113); one spear, e.g. an amphora by the Kleophrades Painter (*ARV* 181, 1), an amphora depicting Athena by the Nikoxenos Painter (*ARV* 220, 5.) Though the latter seems slightly more prevalent, ultimately the evidence for the emendation is inconclusive. In

Homer, a κάμαξ is a vine-pole (*Il* 18.563), but it appears as a spear (synecdoche) in tragedy at *El* 852 ἔσχον κάμακας, Aesch *Ag* 66, as well as Aristophanes fr. 404 (*Holkades*) λόγχαι δ' ἐκαυλίζοντο καὶ ξυστὴ κάμαξ. It should also be noted that Polymestor's spear or spears would at most be formal requirements, that exist only to be taken away from him to render him defenceless.

Granting that there is merit in Hartung's emendation, the editors are forced to evaluate στολίσματος, which though uncontested in the MSS., does possess a Scholiast's variant στοχίσματος, which Bond (at *HF* 1096 on Diggle) equates with στοχάσματος and calls "an apt reference to the δύο δοῦρε of a Homeric warrior." The reading στοχάσματος was originally the emendation of Hartung (so Daitz, *pace* Diggle.) A word derived from στόχος, "pillar", is clearly preferable for spears, cf. *Bac* 1099-1100 "aim" ἄλλοι δὲ θύρσους ἵεσαν δι' αἰθέρος | Πενθέως, στόχον δύστηνον, Aesch *Sup* 243 (metaphorical) "guess" (obolized by Page), and most importantly *Bac* 1205 "missile" οὐκ ἀγκυλητοῖς Θεσσαλῶν στοχάσμασιν. It is my opinion that if one accepts Hartung's emendation in 1155, it only makes sense to remove the allusion to clothing and follow him and the Scholiast later in the same sentence, in 1156. This is not necessary, as the MSS. reading can be clearly construed.

1157-59 τοκάδες, while used of a human mother at *Hip* 560-1 τοκάδα τὰν διγόνοιο Βάκ|χου (and this is in lyric), is otherwise always used by Euripides of animals: *Med* 187-8 (lions) καίτοι τοκάδος δέργμα λεαίνης | ἀποταυροῦνται δμωσίν, *Cyc* 42 (sheep) γενναίων δ' ἐκ τοκάδων, cf. Theocritus 8.63 (goats.) The present usage should be taken as a contemptuous slur on the women who have wreaked these atrocities on Polymestor, = "dams", either alluding to their fierceness, or merely their being subhuman.

ἐκπαγλούμεναι is always found as a participle, cf. *Or* 890 ("a very strong epic-toned word" Willink), *Tro* 829, Aesch *Cho* 217.

ἔπαλλον perhaps recalls the use of the same verb with Astyanax in Hom *Il* 6.474 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ὃν φίλον υἱὸν ἐπεὶ κύσε πῆλέ τε χερσίν.

γένοιντο is plural, despite the neuter τέκνα, because it refers to living persons (Smyth 959, Porson.)

Diggle follows Elmsley's διαδοχαῖσ' since he "everywhere disallows exactly bisected trimeters unrelieved by elision" (Collard), cf. Diggle (1973) 263-64; (1984) 67, but this is far from universally accepted: Denniston *El* 546 "no fatal objections to the text", Dodds *Bac* 1125 "The absence of caesura may be deliberate ... an insufficient ground for drastic emendation, particularly in a play which shows Aeschylean influence" (for which see Introduction IV), Ussher *Cyc* 7 "flavour of pomposity", Collard *Sup* 699 "Some defend the phenomenon particularly in messenger speeches (Page on Mel[anippe] D[esmotis] 31 = fr. 495.6 [ὀρθοσταδὸν λόγχαις ἐπείγοντες φόνον]; Broadhead Persae 300)" and cf. 355, 549 (if παρέξω γὰρ is counted as one word), *Hel* 86, *And* 397, *Sup* 303, West (1982) 83 n. 18, Humphreys (1881) 222. Paley posits an intrusive gloss, tentatively suggesting the unattested reading διαδοχαῖσί τ' ἤμειβον χερῶν. This is not necessary.

1160-62 The absence of αἱ μὲν to correspond with 1162 αἱ δὲ is not abnormal, cf. *HF* 636 ἔχουσιν, οἱ δ' οὔ (= οἱ μὲν ἔχουσιν, οἱ δ' οὔ), *Or* 730, *IT* 1349-53, Soph *Tra* 117, *OT* 1229, *El* 1291, *GP* 166. Collard notes that "some..." is not required in English translation either. Cf. Diggle (1981) 92 on *IT* 1350.

πῶς δοκεῖς appears as a parenthetical comment also at *Hip* 446, *IA* 1590, Aristoph *Ach* 24, and gives vividness to the description, as does the tense of κεντοῦσι.

The weakness of the simile of πολεμίων (despite 1152 παρὰ φίλῳ which is not being alluded to, and *Bac* 752 ὥστε πολέμιοι which "is so different that it does not protect the MSS here" (Collard (1986) 23.) has been countered by Verrall's vivid suggestion (adopted by Diggle, doubted by Collard) of πολυπόδων. The octopus is found in Homer, also in simile, at *Od* 5.432-5:

ὡς δ' ὅτε πουλύποδος θαλάμης ἐξελκομένοιο
πρὸς κοτυληδονόφιν πυκιναὶ λάϊγγες ἔχονται,
ὣς τοῦ πρὸς πέτρῃσι θρασειάων ἀπὸ χειρῶν

ῥινοὶ ἀπέδρυφθεν·

Collard lists later references to the octopus, though he himself doubts the validity of Verrall's conjecture (1986, 23). A complicating factor is that this is the only adverbial use of δίκην in Euripides, but for want of any better suggestions, I follow Verrall. Mossman (1990) 217 agrees, and sees the image as a deliberate change in the animal metaphor Polymestor uses: "The action of the women in the tent might indeed recall dogs pulling down a beast but Euripides introduces at just that moment the off-key image of the octopus." If right, this would suggest that the allusions to dogs earlier are not meant to be an identification to be pressed literally, but merely an evocation. This then informs an interpretation of Hecuba's metamorphosis, cf. 1265 note.

1165-66 The status reversal is here complete: the women - unnamed, silent women - are treating Polymestor the way he would be expected to treat a woman, cf. *Or* 1469 (sic) ἐς | κόμας δὲ δακτύλους δικὼν 'Ορέστας, *And* 710, *Tro* 882. The verb is used in a context of a woman "pulling down" her father for a kiss, *Sup* 1100-01 κάρα τόδε | κατεῖχε χειρί. For ἐξανισταίην, cf. *Med* 1212-3 χρῄζων γεραιὸν ἐξαναστῆσαι δέμας | προσείχεθ'.

1167 οὐδὲν ἤνυτον, cf. *And* 1132 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἦνον, Herod 9.66.1 οὐδὲν ἤνυε.

1168-69 τὸ λοίσθιον is connected with an internal accusative as at *HF* 196, which itself is a common hyperbole, cf. 233, Aesch *Ag* 864-65 τὸν δ' ἐπεισφέρειν κακοῦ | κάκιον ἄλλο πῆμα.

1170-71 While it is true that brooches would be necessary to hold male garments together as well as female, πόρπαι seem to indicate long, slender pins, perhaps always made of gold, used particularly by women, cf. of Oedipus' blinding *Pho* 62 χρυσηλάτοις πόρπαισιν αἱμάξας κόρας, Soph *OT* 1368-9 ἀποσπάσας γὰρ εἱμάτων χρυσηλάτους | περόνας ἀπ' αὐτῆς, and also Herod 5.87.2 κεντεύσας τῇσι περόνῃσι τῶν ἱματίων. If it would be automatic to assume the πόρπαι used here are made of gold, then there is some irony in that ultimately Polymestor did get some

gold within the tent. The active agents of the blinding have not been identified before this. Shakespeare uses this description to effect a pun in *Titus Andronicus* I.i.135-39:

> Then, madam, stand resolved, but hope withal
>
> The selfsame gods that armed the Queen of Troy
>
> With opportunity of sharp revenge
>
> Upon the Thracian tyrant in his [Theobald reads "her"] tent
>
> May favour Tamora, the Queen of Goths.

In Ovid's rendering of the story, Hecuba herself blinds Polymestor, and the contrast "may have influenced Hecuba's image ever since" (Meridor (1978) 30 n.11). For asyndeton, cf. 840 note. The use of ἀνὰ suggests *further up* into the recesses of the tent.

1172-76 With the several difficulties that this passage holds, I am tempted to follow at least in part Diggle (1969) 45-46 in his tentative suggestions, not later printed in his text (noted by Collard (1986) 23). Reading θηρῶ for θήρ ὥς avoids the awkwardness of the inappropriate simile. The initial verbal asyndeton created (see 840 note), as Diggle observes, is very much at home in a passage with two others, 1171 κεντοῦσιν αἱμάσσουσιν and 1175 βάλλων ἀράσσων. Whether this is stylistically desirable or not is a separate matter. The beast throwing missiles is now a hunter. Either reading recalls 1058-82. Mossman (1990) 298 n.45 believes Diggle was right to change his mind, comparing Soph *Ajax* 5-8 for the same mixed metaphor. θήρ is used of a murderous person in 1073, *Or* 1271-72 κεκρυμμένους | θῆρας ξιφήρεις αὐτίκ' ἐχθροῖσιν φανεῖ, *Pho* 1296, but it is unlikely that even Polymestor would use it of himself in his own defence in the agon. The fact that his quarry are τὰς μιαιφόνους κύνας only becomes problematical when the reader (editor) assumes the dogs belong to the hunter. The women have been called κυσίν by Polymestor in 1077 and the concept is clear. It will also factor in the prophecy of Hecuba's metamorphosis (cf. 1265 and note, 1273) into a dog.

In 907-11 the use of tmesis could be seen to have rhetorical purpose. Here, though, ἐκ δὲ πηδήσας offers little more than metrical convenience. For other tmeses in dialogue, cf. 504, *Alc*

548 εὖ δὲ κλῄσατε, *HF* 53, Soph *Ant* 420.

Prinz deleted 1174 to remove the second difficulty Diggle (1969) addresses, but that is not the answer: for one thing, the speeches should be kept equal in length (as opposed to only one line difference) and 1191 is the only line that has been suggested (Nauck) for deletion in Hecuba's speech. The problem is that the hunter is searching every *wall*, which is said not to be a typical activity of hunters. Diggle tentatively suggests the anagrammatic κοῖτον for τοῖχον, because searching every *lair* is more appropriate (for the noun, cf. *Ion* 154-55 φοιτῶσ' ἤδη λείπουσίν τε | πτανοὶ Παρνασοῦ κοίτας. Homer *Od* 22.470, Theocritus 13.12, Callimachus 3.96 and (*pace* Diggle) *Hec* 1083 (where see note.) Diggle (1969) 46 n.1 adduces 1040 μυχούς and 1065 μυχοῦν as supporting the new reading (*corners* of the lair) but these can also be read with τοῖχον: walls of the tent, vs. corners of the tent. Reading the anagram would be preferable if there were any support in the MSS. Without it, it is acceptable to stay with τοῖχον. Other solutions can be found in Viljoen (1918) 45 and Campbell (1958) 182 neither of which is convincing.

βάλλων ἀράσσων appears to be a stock phrase, found also at *And* 1154 and *IT* 310, which is particularly appropriate because it brings the audience to a point they have actually witnessed: 1040 βάλλων, 1044 ἄρασσε.

Polymestor's claim that he was pursuing Agamemnon's interests is echoed in Hecuba's sneering questions 1201-03. Polymestor is assuming that one's enemy's enemy is one's friend, which is not logically consistent, nor a necessary conclusion in Greek ethics. Diggle's correction from τε to γε (1981, 88) is undoubtedly right, cf. 615, *Alc* 847, *Hcld* 794, *Or* 118, *Bac* 816.

1177-82 To ascribe Polymestor's views to Euripides himself is of course naïve, and Aristophanic parody of misogynistic views (e.g. *Thes*) proves nothing. Euripides does often present his male character deriding women (e.g. Agamemnon 876ff., Hippolytus *Hip* 616ff.) The problem is discussed by Lefkowitz (1986) 112-32, notes 143-44, ch. 7 "Misogyny".

1177 The rhetorical flourish of (mildly) deprecating too much talk is common: *Med* 1351, *Sup*

566, Soph *Ajax* 1040, Aesch *Ag* 916, 1296.

1178-79 One example of such men of old (from Euripides' perspective, not Polymestor's) is Semonides of Amorgos, fr. 7 Diehl, cf. Lloyd-Jones (1975). For the repeated τις...τις of the same indefinite person, cf. *And* 733-34 ἔστι γάρ τις οὐ πρόσω | Σπάρτης πόλις τις, *Or* 1218-19 (though Herwerden deletes 1219), Soph *Tra* 3.

λέγων ἔστιν is an example of the *Schema Chalcidiacum* (Lesbonax Grammaticus *De Schematis* IV), an Ionic idiom for λέγει, cf. *Cyc* 381 ἦτε πάσχοντες, Aesch *Ag* 1178 ἔσται δεδορκώς, Herodotus 3.64 ἀπολωλεκὼς εἴη, 3.99 ἀπαρνεόμενός ἐστι, 9.51 ἐστὶ ἀπέχουσα.

1180 συντεμών, sc. λόγον from 1077 λόγους = "condensing", cf. *IA* 1249 ἓν συντεμοῦσα πάντα νικήσω λόγον, *Tro* 441 ὡς δὲ συντέμω, fr. 28 (*Aeolus*) παῖδες, σοφοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ὅστις ἐν βραχεῖ | πολλοὺς καλῶς οἷός τε συντέμνειν λόγους, *Telephus* 102.8 Austin καὶ πόλλ' ἐμόχθησ', ἀλλὰ συντεμῶ λόγον.

1181-82 For women being a separate race from men, cf. 885 note, and for their evil, cf. fr. 1059.4 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτω δεινὸν ὡς γυνὴ κακόν. For explanatory γὰρ, cf. *GP* 59. It is typical to represent all nature with a polar expression, such as οὔτε πόντος οὔτε γῆ, cf. Barrett on *Hip* 1277-80.

αἰεὶ is here used in a standard idiom, also found in English, "ever" = "at any time", cf. *PV* 973 θῶπτε τὸν κρατοῦντ' ἀεί, Cicero *Verr* 5.12.29 *omnes Siciliae semper praetores.*

It is probably best to take ἐπίσταται in the strongest sense possible, "knows for certain." Plato contrasts ἐπιστήμη with δόξα "opinion."

1183-84 Polymestor had sought to conclude his speech with an emotional appeal to Agamemnon "man-to-man" by generalising about women. It is immediately countered by this couplet of the chorus, reprimanding both Polymestor's general attitude (present imperative θρασύνου for

prohibitions against a continual action) and the specific sentiment (aorist subjunctive μέμψῃ for prohibition against a momentary action.) θρασύνου "show shamelessness, act over-bold", cf. 1286, *Bac* 491 ὡς θρασὺς ὁ βάκχος κοὐκ ἀγύμναστος λόγων, *Or* 607, *Phae* 214 (see Diggle (1970) 142 and Aristoph *Frogs* 846, Aeschylus speaking about Euripides.) The sentiment is also found in fr. 657 (*Protesilaus*):

> ὅστις δὲ πάσας συντιθεὶς ψέγει λόγῳ
> γυναῖκας ἑξῆς, σκαιός ἐστι κοὐ σοφός,
> πολλῶν γὰρ οὐσῶν τὴν μὲν εὑρήσεις κακὴν
> τὴν δ', ὥσπερ αὕτη λῆμ' ἔλουσαν εὐγενές.

and cf. *Med* 747 θεῶν τε συντιθεὶς ἅπαν γένος.

1185-86 That these two lines should be deleted as spurious is all but certain: not only is a couplet expected between two long speeches (though Hadley page 117 rightly notes the couplet at 1238-39 is only contributory evidence), but the lines are incomprehensible and struggle to find an adequate sense. A contrast is being established (αἱ μέν...αἱ δ') which suggests a polar expression. Unfortunately, the most obvious way of translating each of the alternatives is with a negative nuance, when a positive nuance is the point of the contrast. Each can be seen as positive, at a stretch: αἱ μέν εἰσ' ἐπιφθονοι "some are regarded with jealousy (because of goodness or excellence)" (Ambrose) ; αἱ δ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν τῶν κακῶν πεφύκαμεν "and the rest, we come up to the number of the bad" (after Russell.) Neither of these interpretations convinces, nor do the various emendations (discussions of which are in Diggle (1969) 46-47, Jackson (1955) 159-60, Hadley 117-18, and cf. Paley's μὴ κακῶν for τῶν κακῶν.) Hermann's ἀντάριθμοι comes closer to the positive sense suggested above, and Reiske's εἰς ἀριθμὸν τῶν καλῶν is plausible, the corruption perhaps even due to Stobaeus to better suit his purposes, but the point is not worth pressing. Stobaeus cites it out of context with other passages condemning women, and the interpolation suits his purpose. This it does not do for Euripides.

Diggle's suggestion of ἡμεῖς for ἡμῶν is unneccessary: "for we are many:..." is not

sufficiently better than "for there are many of us:..." to warrant the change.

1187-1237 The audience knows that the trial is specious: Hecuba has already been granted the support of Agamemnon. In order for the trial to have any bearing on an evaluation of the revenge, any conclusions drawn *must be self-evident* - they cannot, in any way, be dependent upon the verdict given by the judge, or from the fact that judgement has been passed. To a large extent, Euripides has already achieved his aim. Polymestor's speech has rambled, in form more a messenger's speech than a defence. He acknowledges his guilt to the charge, and formulates empty arguments. Hecuba's speech reinforces this, and clearly clinches the debate. Polymestor did make some accusations of Hecuba, though, and to these she provides sufficient responses. The rhetorical flourishes and point-for-point dismemberment of Polymestor's speech can and have been seen to be Hecuba 'selling out' to the sophistry she had earlier disparaged (814-20.) In that earlier great speech, rhetorical effects were present, and Euripides here has a much more immediate dramatic purpose, i.e. to make the contrast between this speech and Polymestor's previous one as sharp as possible. Hecuba needs to persuade both Agamemnon and the audience, and persuasion (πείθώ) is the end of rhetoric. The speech falls into three parts (the division alone being a rhetorical device) which will be discussed as they arise. Similar threefold divisions can be found in the speeches of Theseus in *Sup* 426-62 and 517-63, with Collard's discussion *ad loc.*

1187-96 Hecuba's argument opens with comments directed at the arbiter of the case. It is full of pretence, but a pretence which is comfortable and even to be expected in a forensic oration. Hecuba formally identifies it as an opening 'set-piece' (1195 φροιμίοις), functioning much the same as Hippolytus' "Unaccustomed as I am to public-speaking..." piece *Hip* 983-91. Similarly, Plato represents Socrates as speaking a particularly oratorical (and perhaps ironic) *exordium* (*Apology* 17a1-18a6.)

Hecuba is expressing a philosophical point that good words should accompany only a good (i.e. just) cause, and should prove false when applied to an evil cause. The premise clearly

underlines the characters of the Right and Wrong Arguments in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, and is a notion also found in Theseus' words (*Hip* 928-31):

> **δισσάς τε φωνὰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἔχειν,**
> **τὴν μὲν δικαίαν τὴν δ' ὅπως ἐτύγχανεν,**
> **ὡς ἡ φρονοῦσα τἄδικ' ἐξηλέγχετο**
> **πρὸς τῆς δικαίας, κοὐκ ἂν ἠπατώμεθα.**

Hecuba talks of the "clever men", 1192 **σοφοί**, who have made persuasion a fine art, yet who necessarily fail - 1194 "nobody has escaped." Collard suggests this is a reference to demagogues such as Odysseus (as presented in this play.) That this is not so is shown by the fact that he had success: Polyxena was taken and killed. On the contrary, Hecuba is speaking directly to the point. By momentarily including Polymestor among the **σοφοί**, she compliments him, only to reveal that all **σοφοί** must fail if they present a bad case. The audience (dramatic and extra-dramatic) knows that Polymestor has not been eloquent. How much more must he therefore fail! See esp. Dodds on *Bac* 266-71 for the message elsewhere in Euripides.

1187-89 **οὐκ ἐχρῆν ἰσχύειν** and **ἔδει λέγειν** are examples of "a peculiar form of potential infinitive" (*MT* 415) with an infinitive and the imperfect of a verb of obligation, propriety or possibility. The sense given is "ought", cf. *Hip* 467 **οὐδ' ἐκπονεῖν τοι χρὴ βίον λίαν βροτούς, 619 οὐκ ἐκ γυναικῶν χρῆν παρασχέσθαι τόδε, 925.**

1190 σαθροὺς, "rotten, decayed, unsound" is often used metaphorically by Euripides: *Rh* 639 **σαθροῖς λόγοισιν**, *Sup* 1064 **τί τοῦτ' αἴνιγμα σημαίνεις σαθρόν;** *Bac* 487. The words do not "ring true." The metaphor being found earlier only at Pindar *N* 8.34 **σαθρὸν κῦδος** and Herodotus 8.109.5 **πρίν τι σαθρὸν ... ἐγγενέσθαι**, but becoming more common in the fourth century. The word is not found in the other tragedians.

1191 This is the line that, unprovoked, Nauck erroneously sought to delete. For the sentiment

expressed, cf. Diodotus in the Mytilenian Debate of 427, Thucydides 3.42.2 βουλόμενός τι αἰσχρὸν πεῖσαι, εὖ μὲν εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἂν ἡγεῖται περὶ τοῦ μὴ καλοῦ δύνασθαι.

1192 μὲν οὖν is transitional cf. *GP* 471.

1193 διὰ τέλους "through and through", cf. 817 ἐς τέλος "thoroughly".

1194 ἀπώλοντ': gnomic aorist, cf. 598. For the reading, cf. Matthiessen (1969) 303-04.

1195-96 In these lines Hecuba clearly indicates the transition of her addressee: the introduction (φροιμίοις, cf. *El* 1060 ἀρχὴ δ' ἥδε μοι προοιμίου) was directed at Agamemnon (1195); she will now turn to confront Polymestor directly, either "in argument" or "(responding) to his words", depending on how λόγοις is understood.

1197-1232 Turning to address Polymestor, Hecuba presents her arguments against his case, such as it is. She makes four points:

i. 1197-1205 Polymestor had claimed to be preventing any possibility of a second war between the Greeks and the Trojans (1136-44) in killing Polydorus. Hecuba counters by suggesting that Polymestor was motivated only by self-interest (1142-44) and that there could be no alliance of any kind between Barbarian and Greek (conveniently forgetting for the sake of her argument two details: that she has Agamemnon's compliance, and that she is the daughter of the Thracian King Cisseus (3, cf. Homer *Il* 6.297, 11.223.) While 1202 κηδεύσων does echo 834 κηδεστὴν, it must be remembered that Hecuba's immediate purpose must be seen entirely within the context of the agon.

ii. 1206-16 Hecuba presents a joint accusation of cowardice (in not acting when Troy flourished) and greed. The two points converge, since the only gold Polymestor has mentioned (1148 χρυσοῦ) is the fictional treasure Hecuba had promised in the irony-laden fourth episode.

iii. 1217-23 A direct rebuttal of 1175-76 where Polymestor claims to be pursuing Agamemnon's interests, Hecuba notes the inconsistencies between his words and his actions, in keeping the gold for himself.

iv. 1224-32 Her concluding point establishes a polar opposition between what favours Polymestor could have enjoyed, and what he now has for himself. Her summary of his final state shows the reciprocity her revenge has had on Polymestor.

After this she concludes, addressing Agamemnon the arbiter directly again.

1197-98 ὅς is surely a better MSS. reading than the less direct ὡς and the less appropriate question πῶς. It also provides a valuable precedent for 1219 ὃν φῄς where see note. ἀπαλλάσσων (present, indicating continuous action, taken with Ἀχαιῶν, cf. 1068 with τυφλὸν φέγγος, and 1222 with χερός) contrasts with the (momentary) aorist κτανεῖν.

1199-1201 For the repeated ἄν, cf. 742 note. Hadley suggests an allusion to Athenian dissatisfaction with the Thracian Alliance of 431, but if so (and it seems unlikely) this must be seen as being of secondary importance and inconsequential to the present situation. For the distinction between barbarian and Greek, and Hecuba's ambiguous position, cf. 1129-31 note.

In this speech, Hecuba denies any kind of relationship between Polymestor and the Greeks. Here and at 1218 she denies the possibility of φίλια existing, and cf. 1216 where she suggests Polymestor has an incomplete understanding of the bonds of ξένια.

Paley is convinced by, and argues strongly for, Hermann's emendation: πρῶτα ποῦ ποτ' for πρῶτον οὔποτ', and οὐτἂν (i.e. οὔτοι ἂν which is "obviously a great improvement to the

sense") for οὔτ' ἂν, and punctuating with a question at the end of 1200. He therefore suggests ποῦ is being used in the same way as at *Hcld* 369-70 ποῦ ταῦτα καλῶς ἂν εἴη παρά γ' εὖ φρονοῦσιν; The question is rhetorical, and Hecuba supplies her own definite answer, "In no way could it be so..." However, Dindorf's οὐδ' in 1201 is an easier step, which makes the full two-and-a-half lines a powerful, absolute statement: "You coward, first of all the Greek race will never have friendship with a barbarian (sc. such as you), nor could it."

σπεύδων χάριν is repeated from 1175 in sarcastic reference (the sarcasm clear from the emphatic καί, seeking supplemental information (*GP* 312) cf. 515, 1066.) It is more than an echo: it is a direct quotation of Polymestor's words. Collard suggests that there is a subtle shift from the question that should be asked, τινὸς χάριν "whose interest...", to that which in fact is asked, and which contains an assumed answer, τίνα χάριν "what interest (of yours)..."

1202 The transitive use of κηδεύειν is found only here and at *Phae* 241 ὃς θεὰν κηδεύσεις. For intransitive use, cf. *Hip* [634] κηδεύσας καλῶς, the heavily ironic *Med* 888 νύμφην τε κηδεύουσαν ἥδεσθαι σέθεν, Aesch *PV* 890 κηδεῦσαι καθ' ἑαυτόν.

1204-5 The subject of ἔμελλον is the (hypothetical) Greek army, omitted by Hecuba to prevent any mention of concrete possibility. Hecuba is stressing the unlikelihood of the event in the first place, thereby ignoring a potential accusation of self-interest so that nothing is conceded. She addresses self-interest in the form of greed in the next line.

πείθω + double accusative = "persuade *x* of *y*", the second accusative (*y*) being internal.

δοκεῖς persuasively suggests that any attempt Polymestor might make to persuade would fail.

1206 ὁ χρυσός, stated so clearly and prominently, becomes unambiguous as Hecuba begins to revile Polymestor's greed. Agamemnon picks up on its prominence in his verdict (1245.)

1207 κέρδη can be used both for "gain, profit" (*Sup* 236 ἄλλος δὲ κέρδους οὕνεκ', Soph *Ant*

221-22 ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἐλπίδων | ἄνδρας τὸ κέρδος πολλάκις διώλεσεν) and the hope for it (here, *Hcld* 3, fr. 659.7-8 οἱ δ' αἰσχρὰ κέρδη πρόσθε τοῦ καλοῦ βροτῶν | ζητοῦσιν, Aesch *Eum* 704 κερδῶν ἄθικτον τοῦτο βουλευτήριον.

1208-10 ἐπεὶ δίδαξον τοῦτο is a direct challenge (which must go unanswered, by the conventions of the *agon*) to Polymestor to present facts which contradict what she is about to say, cf. Soph *OC* 969 ἐπεὶ δίδαξον, εἰ..., *OT* 390. The situation Hecuba describes has many links with the words of the deceased victim (cf. 16-18), providing a subtle but undeniably deliberate authorial connection between the two accounts, further supporting Hecuba's case.

The alliteration observed by some in 1209 is no more concentrated than, e.g. 1205 and is probably accidental (so Collard), cf. Barrett *Hip* 656 "Eur. was notoriously indifferent to the accumulation of sibilants ('sigmatism')", 22-23 *in add.*, and Owen *Ion* 1294 esp. the apposite anecdote of Tennyson; cf. also *Hec* 915.

Ἕκτορός τ' ἤνθει δόρυ, cf. 18, *Tro* 1162.

1211-12 Wecklein's deletion of δ' (=δή emphatic (*GP* 228) as at Aesch *Cho* 410 δαὖτε) is completely unnecessary, and creates a hiatus which, though it can be explained away (e.g. West (1982) 14-15) is undesirable. The particle emphasizes the question τί, which replaces 1208 πῶς which began a question that was never completed.

τῷδ' refers to Agamemnon, and probably was accompanied by an appropriate gesture.

χάριν θέσθαι + dative = "store up favours with, oblige *x*" cf. *Bac* 721 χάριν τ' ἄνακτι θώμεθ' (following Elmsley), *El* 61, *IT* 604 (sc. σοι), *Ion* 1104 (πρὸς clause replaces dative), and also δοῦναι χάριν *El* 1138, *HF* 778.

1214 For a similar conceit, cf. 914 and note.

1215 This line has needed much correction, and Diggle's text gives the clearest and most probable

sense, understanding ἐσήμην' in an absolute sense, sc. ὄν. The whole line then becomes almost parenthetical, reflecting the truth of 1214 (which mentioned individual ruin) on a larger scale, and thereby making the consequences in 1216 (the murder of Polydorus) seem more extreme. For the use of ὑπό + dative, cf. *Hcld* 231 ὑπ' Ἀργείοις, *Or* 889 ὑπὸ τοῖς δυναμένοισιν.

For the possibility of genuine smoke effects, cf. 823 note. In Aesch *Ag* 818, Agamemnon mentions smoke as being representative of the destruction of an entire city: καπνῷ δ' ἁλοῦσα νῦν ἔτ' εὔσημος πόλις. There is however something odd about the verb Euripides has chosen, almost as if to suggest that the smoke from the destruction was the first of the chain of beacons, the other end of which the watchman spies in the opening speech of the *Agamemnon* (cf. also *Ag* 292-93 ἑκὰς δὲ φρυκτοῦ φῶς ἐπ' Εὐρίπου ῥοάς I Μεσσαπίου φύλαξι σημαίνει μολόν· 496-97 οὔτε σοι δαίων φλόγα I ὕλης ὀρείας σημανεῖ καπνῷ πυρός·)

1216 The non-thematic (poetic second) aorist form κατέκτας, an epicism, is found elsewhere in Euripides (*Bac* 1289 σύ νιν κατέκτας καὶ κασίγνηται σέθεν) and Aeschylus (*Eum* 460 κατέκτα), cf. *HF* 424 ἔκτα (in lyric) and Soph *Tra* 38 ἔκτα (in dialogue.) She seems to imply that Polymestor has no understanding of any social relationships: ξένια here (and see 1221 note) and φίλια in 1199 and 1218.

1217 Diggle has adopted Gloël's conjecture φαίνῃ "(how base) you appear." This is unnecessary. Either of the MSS. readings are viable: Daitz' choice of φανῇ "(how) you will appear (base)" (though this line is rendered very loosely in Daitz' published translation, "Next, I'll show you what a contemptible person you really are"); Murray's second aorist subjunctive passive φανῇς, being used in a clause of purpose rather than in an indirect question, "(that) you may be shown to be (base)", which has the best MSS. support and makes perfect sense. It also follows the standard rhetorical practice of telling an audience what it is that it is about to be told.

1218-20 For the omission of ἄν with χρῆν σ' ... δοῦναι, see 1113 note. Here the omission

stresses that the protasis (that Polymestor is a friend to the Greeks) is definitely not the case. For Polymestor not understanding the basic relational concept of φίλια, see 1199-1200 note, and 1216.

The use of ὃν φῂς is suggestive, since it provides evidence for Hecuba's case as if it came from Polymestor. Whereas in 1197 when she uses ὃς φῂς it is true, Polymestor has not said the gold was not his in his speech (though that that is what he believes may reasonably be gleaned from the earlier (pre-blinding) interchange at 994-97. The device makes Hecuba appear to use all the same evidence the defendant used, while clearly arguing for the opposite conclusion. Since she knows she has the last word, this makes for strong argumentation. Again, the fifth-century audience is going to respond more favourably to rhetorical skill than to simple statements concerning innocence or guilt.

1221 ἀπεξενωμένοις would probably provide a noticeable echo of 1216 ξένον, and thereby further emphasise Polymestor's lack of relational understanding. For the verb itself, cf. Soph *El* 776-77 μαστῶν ἀποστὰς καὶ τροφῆς ἐμῆς, φυγὰς | ἀπεξενοῦτο. The use is derived from the secondary meaning of ξενόω = "to exile", as at *Hip* 1085, *Ion* 820, Soph *Tra* 65 (as opposed to the more common meaning = "to entertain", where ξένος is a guest, rather than a foreigner; the verb literally means "to make a ξένος of *x*."

1222-23 ἀπαλλάξαι χερὸς, sc. τὸν χρυσόν, cf. 1197-98 note.

τολμᾷς, cf. *Med* 589-90 ἥτις οὐδὲ νῦν | τολμᾷς μεθεῖναι καρδίας μέγαν χόλον.

ἔχων καρτερεῖς, cf. *IT* 1395-96 οἳ δ' ἐκαρτέρουν | πρὸς κῦμα λακτίζοντες.

1224-25 καὶ μήν, as at 824.

παῖδα seems slightly out of place; in sense it should go before ὥς σε.

σώσας is also weird, in that to save Polydorus in this instance means not to murder him, which is clearly an unusual rescue. The odd feel reproduces the wrongness of the action.

1226-27 The two lines are parenthetical, providing proverbial support for the thesis being developed.

ἀγαθοὶ is crasis for οἱ ἀγαθοί (note rough breathing and long initial alpha.)

αὔθ' = αὐτά = *per se*. For the potential variation of αὖθ', see MSS. variations and emendations at 958, *Pho* 557, *Or* 1393, *Tro* 1171, none of which represent αὖτε.

τὸ χρηστόν, cf. *Sup* 199 πλείω τὰ χρηστὰ τῶν κακῶν εἶναι βροτοῖς· *Or* 451 καὶ μὴ μόνος τὸ χρηστὸν ἀπολαβὼν ἔχε, Soph *Tra* 3. There survives a translation of 1226 by Ennius (in Cicero *De Amic* 17 *amicus certus in re incerta cernitur*, which clearly follows the sentiment of Ovid *Trist* 1.8.5-6 *donec eris felix, multos numerabis amicos; | nullus ad amissas ibit amicus opes* and Shakespeare *Hamlet* III.ii.217-19

Who not needs shall never lack a friend
And who in want a hollow friend doth try,
Directly seasons him his enemy.

as well as in several Euripidean passages: e.g *IA* 408 ἐς κοινὸν ἀλγεῖν τοὺς φίλοισι χρὴ φίλους, *Or* 665-7 τοὺς φίλους | ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς χρὴ τοῖς φίλοισιν ὠφελεῖν· | ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων εὖ διδῷ, τί δεῖ φίλων; The Scholiast however interprets the passage differently, with τὸ χρηστόν = "goodness" and combining it with αὔθ' ἕκαστα: Σ 1226 ἡ γὰρ εὐτυχία πάντας φίλους ποιεῖ. Σ 1227 τὰ χρηστὰ αὐτὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔχει τοὺς φίλους. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀνατραφέντος τοῦ παιδὸς σὺ μὲν ἐστέρησο χρημάτων, ὁ δὲ παῖς ἐπλούτει, πάντως ἂν ἐκοινώνεις αὐτῷ τοῦ πλούτου τὰ τροφεῖά σοι ἀποτινύντι, by the use of which Paley suggests interpreting as "If you had acted honestly by Polydorus, you would have found him a friend; for he would have supplied you with money in your need."

1228-29 ὁ δ' = Polydorus (παῖς in 1229.)

Collard notes Hecuba's pun in θησαυρὸς, Polydorus being prized both as an ally (*El* 565 λαβεῖν φίλον θησαυρόν, ὃν φαίνει θεός) and as a source of revenue (1231.) The same double meaning is found at *Sup* 1009-11

καὶ μὴν ὁρᾷς τήνδ' ἧς ἐφέστηκας πέλας
πυράν, Διὸς θησαυρόν, ἔνθ' ἔνεστι σὸς
πόσις δαμασθεὶς λαμπάσιν κεραυνίοις.

cf. also fr. 518 (*Meleager*)

καὶ κτῆμα δ', ὦ τεκοῦσα, κάλλιστον τόδε,
πλούτου δὲ κρεῖσσον· τοῦ μὲν ὠκεῖα πτέρυξ,
παῖδες δὲ χρηστοί, κἂν θάνωσι, δώμασιν
καλόν τι θησαύρισμα τοῖς τεκοῦσί τε
ἀνάθημα βιότου κοὔποτ' ἐκλείπει δόμους. 5

and *El* 497 θησαύρισμα Διονύσου τόδε.

1230-31 As she closes her main address to Polymestor, Hecuba sums up the wretchedness of his condition. It presents the punishment he has already received as an inevitable consequence of his earlier actions, both prejudging Polymestor and prejudicing Agamemnon. The οὔτε ... τε ("neither ... and") combination seems strange but was common in the tragedians: *Alc* 70-71, *Med* 441-45, Soph *OC* 1397-98, *OT* 653, *Phil* 1321, *Ant* 763, *El* 350, 1078. ἐκεῖνον refers to Polydorus, giving a balanced structure, though it is possible to understand it as indicating Agamemnon.

1232 With the formulaic phrase which Collard finds "slightly threatening" (σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ λέγω, cf. *Hcld* 372, *Or* 622.) Hecuba turns back to Agamemnon for the closing peroration, emphasizing the injustice should Agamemnon acquit Polymestor. In addition to the straightforward assertion that she is right, it is also a backhanded recognition that Polymestor has already received his punishment, and failure to pass the appropriate verdict (as had been earlier agreed, though not in so much detail) would be unjust.

1233 It is standard to use εἰ + the future indicative to represent a future condition, as at 802, perhaps implying a subtle threat, which is intensified perhaps both by the formula in the previous

line and the echo of Hecuba's words here to Agamemnon, κακὸς φανῇ, with those she has so recently used against Polymestor, 1217 ὡς φαίνῃ κακός. The echo is deliberate (not sloppy as Hadley suggests) and powerful. Both phrases appear at line-ends, and after the complete decimation of Polymestor's argument (such as it was), under no circumstances would Agamemnon wish to appear in the same way that Polymestor does, which he would if Agamemnon supports Polymestor in the *agon*.

1234-35 The conclusion is climactic and absolute: the four negatives again sum up Polymestor's state, this time in words addressed to Agamemnon. The adjectives form two pairs of associated concepts: A- εὐσεβῆ, ὅσιον; B- πιστὸν, δίκαιον. This yields not a chiastic pattern (ABBA), but a more regular ABAB. For the combination οὔτε ... οὐ, cf. *GP* 510. The doubled use is found elsewhere only at Soph *Ant* 952-44 (sic) οὔτ' ἄν νιν ὄλβος οὔτ' Ἄρης, οὐ πύργος, οὐχ ἁλίκτυποι I κελαιναὶ νᾶες ἐκφύγοιεν.

1236-37 The closing couplet represents a complete status transformation (the break-off signalled by δὲ cf. *GP* 167, 868 note), where Hecuba returns from being a high-status prosecutor to her appropriate servile position. The oratorical style she has exhibited throughout her speech has clearly been that of a master, confirming the appropriateness of her earlier behaviour within the context of the *agon* to all who have heard her. There is however, a judge present, who must officially pass the sentence. Though he is corrupt, Hecuba must 'step off her soapbox' with a mild reproof to herself. In 1233 she had stopped just short of calling Agamemnon κακός. This couplet is her reparation for that. For the imprecise use of τοιοῦτον, cf. *El* 53 ἴστω καὐτὸς αὖ τοιοῦτος ὤν, which also concludes a long speech. For the generalising plural to avoid speaking directly of her master, cf. 237, 403, 404, 1253.

1238-39 φεῦ φεῦ can be used for admiration, as here, cf. the chorus at *Hcld* 535-36 φεῦ φεῦ, τί λέξω παρθένου μέγαν λόγον I κλύων, Aristoph *Birds* 1724 ὦ φεῦ φεῦ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ κάλλους

as well as for distress, e.g. Theocritus 27.55, the use of which has survived into Modern Greek. The chorus' comment is a direct counterpoint to its earlier condemnation of Polymestor's speech (1183-84.) Collard's suggestion that the couplet is sententious and incongruous before Agamemnon's speech fails to recognise that there is no decision to be made: even if the audience did not know already which way Agamemnon was to vote, the words would speak for themselves. This in effect is what the chorus says: providing a positive formulation of Hecuba's earlier sentiment about evil speech (1190-91), the chorus states correct actions help a fine speaker. ἀφορμὰς is a technical term for an orator's brief, or case, and is often used by Euripides to mean the factual basis for an argument, to be contrasted with λόγων, the words used in its presentation, cf. *Bac* 266-67 ὅταν λάβῃ τις τῶν λόγων ἀνὴρ σοφὸς | καλὰς ἀφορμάς, οὐ μέγ' ἔργον εὖ λέγειν, *HF* 236 ἀφορμὰς τοῖς λόγοισιν, *Pho* 199 ἀφορμὰς τῶν λόγων. For ἐνδίδωσ', cf. Aristoph *Knights* 847 λαβὴν γὰρ ἐνδέδωκας.

1240-42 Agamemnon's sentence is spoken only to Polymestor: he is the defendant. The opening three lines sound ridiculous after all that has preceded, but even now Agamemnon seems reluctant to commit himself. There is resolution in the fourth foot of 1240 which is found elsewhere in Euripides only at 727 and perhaps *Phae fr.inc.sed.* 4 (so Zieliński, denied by Diggle *ad loc.*) The problem is that the fragment (Plutarch *Moralia* 608E so poorly resembles tragic trimeters, that one or more *lacunae* have been suggested. Therefore Zieliński's reading γυμνάσια in the fourth foot can be at best regarded as conjectural, and not a meaningful factor for dating that play, based on analogy with the *Hecuba* lines.

1243-44 Agamemnon echoes Hecuba's request in 874 not to seem to act on her behalf, when he here denies he is doing it for his own sake, or for that of the Achaeans. For the combination οὔτε ... οὔτ' οὖν, cf. Soph *OT* 89-90, and with μή *OT* 271 (*GP* 420.)

1245 For the subjunctive ἔχῃς rather than an optative after 1244 ἀποκτεῖναι, cf. 27. The effect is

to stress vividness. Agamemnon picks up the emphatic reference to the gold (τὸν χρυσὸν) from 1219.

1246 The sentiment is similar to *Tro* 1008-09 ἐς τὴν τύχην δ' ὁρῶσα τοῦτ' ἤσκεις, ὅπως | ἕποι' ἅμ' αὐτῇ, τῇ ἀρετῇ δ' οὐκ ἤθελες.

1247-49 In these three lines, Agamemnon provides an excuse for his judgement. Rather than give reasons for his guilty verdict, he vacillates, worrying only about the possibility of censure (ψόγον, something he had feared earlier - see note 854-56.) The only other use of the word in this play (384) also entails escaping it (here the deliberative φύγω; 384 φυγεῖν.) Agamemnon is not precisely echoing the contrast between Greek and barbarian that he had broached earlier in the *agon* (see note 1129-31), but rather is mentioning the renowned savagery of Thracians in particular (see note 774) who (Agamemnon supposes) treat lightly (ῥᾴδιον) something the Greeks rank on a level with sacrilege (e.g. Aesch *Eum* 269-75, esp. 269-70.)

The particle combination δέ γ' is rare in tragedy, and is strongly adversative (*GP* 155): Agamemnon is setting his moral view clearly in opposition to Polymestor's. μὴ ἀδικεῖν (trisyllabic by synezesis, as at *Hip* 997 φίλοις τε χρῆσθαι μὴ ἀδικεῖν πειρωμένοις, where it occurs at the same place in the line), the negative μή marking the conditional force of κρίνας.

1250-51 It is apparent that Agamemnon at no point actually says Polymestor is guilty. After excusing the verdict he is about to make (1247-49), he now muses on the consequences of the verdict, indicating merely that it would be impossible (οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην) to escape censure if he did not cast a guilty vote. This conclusion takes the form of a trite and succinct couplet, with two cognate words being used in different senses (of "enduring": ἐτόλμας, τλῆθι) and the rhyming line-ends -πεὶ τὰ μὴ καλὰ and καὶ τὰ μὴ φίλα, features which reinforce the pithiness of the lines. While rhymes do occur in tragedy for rhetorical effect (e.g. *Med* 408-09 γυναῖκες, ἐς μὴν ἐσθλ' ἀμηχανώταται | κακῶν δὲ πάντων τέκτονες σοφώταται, *Hcld* 541-42, *Alc* 631-32, Soph *OT*

110-11) here it marks the finality of Agamemnon's comments, cf. *Med* 408-09, cited above, which mark the end of a 46-line speech and the episode.

1252-53 Polymestor's cry shows that he does not fully understand what has happened. He still conceives Hecuba as an inferior (τοῖς κακίοσιν, note the generalising plural, as at 1237.) He does not however deny that the sentence is δίκην, which is the final proof that Hecuba's blinding him had been appropriate. For ἡσσώμενος + genitive of cause, cf. *Alc* 696-98 εἶτ' ἐμὴν ἀψυχίαν | λέγεις, γυναικός, ὦ κάκισθ', ἡσσημένος, | ἣ τοῦ καλοῦ σοῦ προύθανεν νεανίου; and *Hip* 727, 976.

1254-84 The sudden and unexpected break into stichomythia also marks another transition, the introduction of the prophecies. It is a rapid and attention-drawing device with which to end a play (thereby serving the same function as, say, a *deus ex machina.*) Sophocles uses the technique to end his *Electra.*

1254 Only one MS. (P) correctly assigns the line to Hecuba. The finality of Agamemnon's previous words (1250-51) shows that this cannot belong to him. Agamemnon in fact is to remain silent until Polymestor presents a prophecy which threatens him directly. Hecuba's question is not answered; Polymestor merely wallows in his own suffering.

1256 Diggle's text is clearly right, marking three separate questions. Hecuba is gloating when she asks ἀλγεῖς;, and the lack of response prompts τί δ', perhaps accompanied by a shrug or similar gesture (cf. *Or* 672, 1326, *GP* 175-76.) The aphaeresis in Bothe's emendation is not exceptional (cf. *El* 343 ἦ 'μοῦ δεόμενοι;) and reads much better than, for example, the minority reading δαί, which is colloquial and inappropriate for Hecuba. The whole line is similar in structure to *Alc* 691 χαίρεις ὁρῶν φῶς· πατέρα δ' οὐ χαίρειν δοκεῖς;

1257-58 A *prima facie* reading of 1257 can lead to the commonest misinterpretation of the play; it is not the only source for the particular reading, but it is the most obvious. Polymestor says Hecuba has a debased motive, and addresses her as ὦ πανοῦργε σύ "you knave/villain/rogue". If this opinion represents the view of Euripides (i.e. what he wants his audience to understand of the character of Hecuba), those who believe the play maps the debasement of a once-noble character are correct. But what reason is there to believe Polymestor's judgement? The speaker is a self-confessed murderer, a greedy barbarian, who has just been found guilty of a crime he believed he had concealed (even granted the trial was a sham.) His children are dead; he has lost his sight. It is plausible that the playwright would develop a rash, angry and spiteful outburst at this juncture.

Hecuba's victory is secure: she has attained her retribution for the murder of her son in a just revenge, which has been retroactively confirmed by human justice. This she has done contrary to the adversity she herself faced. The use of ὑβρίζουσ' does invoke certain prejudices in the audience (and probably moreso in the modern reader who is schooled to believe ὕβρις is the preeminent tragic flaw) in terms of a moral evaluation of the overall situation. That these prejudices represent Polymestor's view is certain. To ascribe it to Euripides - in fact, to suppose that it could belong to Euripides - would be rash.

Hecuba's response is telling: she substitutes the word τιμωρουμένην (see 749-50 note) for ὑβρίζουσ'. That she is taking rightful revenge is her correction of Polymestor's suggestion that she is committing outrage. It is a clear and unequivocal contrast, substituting right for wrong, and adding the notion of necessity (χρή.) This is the culmination of the tragedy; there is nothing more to be said on the subject. Polymestor, to continue the stichomythia, must introduce further information - the prophecies.

1260 The aorist subjunctive ναυστολήσῃ (also transitive at *Or* 741 καὶ δάμαρτα τὴν κακίστην ναυστολῶν ἐλήλυθεν; and Pindar *N* 6.33 ἴδια ναυστολέοντες ἐπικώμια) continues the temporal clause begun by Polymestor in the previous line. In the conventions of stichomythia the interruption is essential, but also is a simple device for delaying the actual statement, increasing the

dramatic tension, cf. 1271-73. μῶν = "surely not", *num forte*. ὅρους, accusative of motion towards, cf. 209, 1106. Hecuba sarcastically suggests the obvious. As a prisoner of war, she knows she is bound for Greece, cf. the second stasimon 444-83. Polymestor's prophecy (that it is a prophecy is only made clear in 1267 once the details have been described) indicates that she will never get that far.

1261 Hecuba's wrong suggestion is countered by Polymestor, signalled by μὲν οὖν = "nay, rather", *immo vero* (cf. *GP*475.) A corrective force is implied, κρύψῃ replacing ναυστολήσῃ. Polymestor continues his original construction giving few details and thereby inciting Hecuba's curiosity, and so regains some status. The notion of falling into water recalls the fourth stasimon, cf. esp. 1024/5 note. She will fall ἐκ καρχησίων "from the crow's nest". The καρχήσιον is a narrow-waisted drinking cup, "a kind of footless kantharos" (Cook (1960) 365), e.g. Sappho 141.4-5 κῆνοι δ' ἄρα πάντες | καρχάσι' ἦχον. The word is used to mean the rope-hold on the mast-head, by direct visual analogy, also at Pindar *N* 5.51 ἀνὰ δ' ἱστία τεῖνον πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου. The Scholiast on line 3 preserves a fragment of Nicander (3rd century B.C.) which attests to Hecuba falling into the sea [fr. 62]:

> ἔνθ' Ἑκάβη Κισσηΐς, ὅτ' ἐν πυρὶ δέρκετο πάτρην
> καὶ πόσιν ἑλκηθεῖσα παρασπαίροντα θυηλαῖς,
> εἰς ἅλα ποσσὶν ὄρουσε καὶ ἣν ἠλλάξατο μορφὴν
> γρήιον Ὑρκανίδεσσιν ἐειδομένη σκυλάκεσσιν;

The alternate versions of the metamorphosis are summarised in Frazer *Apollodorus* II p.241n.4.

1263 Euripides consistently uses ναὸς over νηὸς, and this consistently causes confusion. That it is right is shown clearest by the papyrus, but also by *diff. pot.* The confusion is also shown by the MSS. variations at *Med* 523 and *Tro* 691, and by the general acceptance of Nauck's emendation at *IT* 1385, and Blaydes' at *Cyc* 239.

As at 1100, ἀμ- is being used for ἀνα-, ἀμβήσῃ ποδί = "climb up". βαίνω can take many

prefixes, e.g. *El* 1288 ἐμ-, Soph *El* 456 ἐπεμ-. Only ἀμ- is appropriate here. The same variations in the MSS. (ἀμ- being correct over ἐμ-) can be found at *Alc* 50, *Tro* 1277.

1264 As it stands, the image of Hecuba shimmying up the mast is ridiculous. She responds by suggesting something that seems equally ridiculous - that she will sprout wings and fly, only to fall again.

1265 No single line is more important to the interpretation of the play, and there is therefore an inherent danger in any attempt to explicate it. I do not believe ~~that~~ the standard and traditional view to be correct, which is to say Euripides' view. As I understand it, the traditional view is a development of rationalising Alexandrian scholars (or perhaps fourth-century interpreters) who took the line as a literal statement of fact and nothing more; that is, they failed to see the metaphor. The standard view is that Hecuba's metamorphosis into a dog (κύων) serves as a supernatural punishment befitting her violent and excessive revenge (viewed negatively, as 'vendetta', see Introduction I.) This interpretation is adopted by the Latin tradition, esp. Ovid *Met* 13.565-75, but also Cicero *Tusc Disp* 3.26. Quintus Smyrnaeus 14.437 remains essentially neutral, and Juvenal 10.271-72 and Plautus *Menaechmi* 701-05 move a further step, to precisely the notion in modern slang of "bitch". The view is confirmed by all the debasement-theorists, most recently Collard: "It is a transformation suiting at least Polym[estor]'s view of her" (referring to 1257, where see note.) If this interpretation is right, Euripides must be imagining the scene as Hecuba, aboard ship, is changed into a dog, whereupon she climbs to the mast to leap into the sea.

There are many reasons why this view cannot be tenable as it stands. If it is improbable that an old woman would be able to climb the mast (1264) it is unlikely that a dog would manage any better. Since most interpretations of the line take it literally, it is necessary to address the problem even at this level. Secondly, the cause of the transformation is nowhere specified. It is related by an oracle (see note 1267) and divinities have at any rate been conspicuous by their absence in this play (see note 786 and Segal (1989).) The only divinities that do have an active

place are the Erinyes and the alastores, which are one and the same, the spirits of rightful revenge, at least for the purposes of this play (see 687 note.) Dion of Prusa (ed. von Arnim xxxiii 59) is the only source to identify specifically the cause of the transformation, which is the Erinyes. It is thought that Hecuba being a dog reflects her moral degradation to the baseness of an animal. It is suggested that as a four-legged dog, she is equated with Polymestor who was on all fours at 1057. But this does not follow. In the prologue to Aesch *Eum* the Pythia also appears on all fours (see 1057 note), and that these three constitute all the examples of appearances in tragedy of characters on all fours (plus the reports in *Rhesus*) should show that Hecuba *predicted to become* a base animal on all fours should not necessarily mean she has become identical in terms of moral evaluation with Polymestor.

I have made a point of always speaking of 'base animals' because the general assumption is that Hecuba becoming a dog is degrading, and signifies her moral ruin. There is one other metamorphosis in extant Euripides, also reported in a prophecy at the end of a play of an event that has yet to happen. It is predicted at the end of the *Bacchae* that Cadmus and his wife Harmonia (who has not appeared in the play) will become snakes. This is (generally accepted as) in no way a moral judgement on the characters (at least, not for any actions done during the play), despite the fact that they become, like Hecuba, a 'base animal.' The standard interpretation of this line therefore rests on two faulty assumptions, first that in Euripides a metamorphosis into an animal reflects a moral judgement (because it does in Ovid!?) as well as that to become a dog will automatically evoke the associations of, say, Homer *Il* 1.4-5. Gregory (1991, 110-11) makes this point, that from the Homeric world onwards there are as many positive associations of dogs as negative. Taking this second point alone, however, only means that *if* the metamorphosis is a value judgement, it could still signify reward. For dogs in Greek literature, see Lilja (1976). Nussbaum (1986) 414 gives a selection of negative associations; Kovacs (1987) 146 n.68 gives some more positive ones. Euripides uses the mertamorphosis in the *Bacchae* to link characters with the larger picture of myth, however improbable it may seem in rationalising terms. This is at least part of the solution here.

But if the standard view is untenable, what is the meaning of the prophecy of metamorphosis? It is reasonable to assume that the Erinyes are involved: there is no other divinity suggested in the tradition (for it would be unfounded to suggest that Dionysus were the cause from 1267), and the Erinyes are appropriate considering the revenge action of the play, and the conscious repeated allusion to the *Oresteia*. The *Oresteia* is the most clear place which identifies the Erinyes with dogs (there is a possible reference in Theognis, for example, for which see Gregory (1991) 110 and Nagy (1985) 68 n.1; for a possible connection with Hecate, see Introduction III.) There is every reason to believe that Euripides is making an innovation in the myth in presenting the metamorphosis: there is certainly no earlier evidence for the metamorphosis, and no different contemporary versions that have survived. It would be well in accordance with Euripides' programme of Oresteian allusion to introduce the Erinyes as somehow associated with his protagonist. Hecuba then becomes a human embodiment of the divinities of revenge. Her women have already been associated with dogs (1173) and Hecuba has accomplished all that she needs to concerning her revenge. This interpretation gives a clearer link to the overall fabric of myth, and gives yet another sign of approval of Hecuba's revenge action. Hecuba dies in glory, having been provided with an escape that contrasts directly with the ignominious one selected by Polyxena in the first half of the play.

The line itself provides further evidence that it is not a literal κύων that Hecuba becomes. The animal's eyes (δέργματα = ὄμματα, Hesychius) are fiery-red (πύρσ') which seems to suggest some supernatural quality apart from the transformation itself. Further, that Hecuba ascends to the masthead with wings, literal or otherwise, is never contradicted. In stichomythia it is common for successive lines to 'pick up' on an element in the previous line, either by the use of a particle, e.g. 1258 γὰρ, 1259 ἀλλ', 1260 μῶν, 1261 μὲν οὖν, or by repeating words, e.g. 1270, 1271 θανοῦσα, etc. The lack of an adversative particle suggests that the previous detail is not actually refuted. Representations of Erinyes in fifth-century art do divide between presenting them with and without wings (see Harrison (1903) 223-39) but it is certainly not a remote possibility that Euripides would envisage his Erinyes as flying. The metamorphosis is much clearer if it is seen to

invoke the Furies, the only active divinities in the play, rather than suggest the moral degradation of the queen of Troy. Clearly an actual change in shape is envisaged (see next line) but it is not into the hound envisaged by the Romans. The transformation is supernatural, made appropriate since Hecuba has transcended human/worldly justice with her rightful revenge.

Supporting this interpretation is an anonymous fragment (*PMG* 965) that survives in Dio Chrysostom 33.59 ὥσπερ τὴν Ἑκάβην οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς δεινοῖς τελευταῖον ποιῆσαι τὰς Ἐρινύας

χαροπὰν κύνα· χάλκεον δέ οἱ
γνάθων ἐκ πολιᾶν
φθεγγομένας ὑπάκουε μὲν Ἴ-
δα Τένεδός τε περιρρύτα
Θρηίκιοί τε φιλήνεμοι πέτραι. 5

Dio explicitly associates the metamorphosis as being caused by the Erinyes, and abstains from any negative moral judgement. Stephanopoulos (1980) 82-83 believes that this fragment indicates that the metamorphosis is not a Euripidean innovation. Mossman (1990) 25-26 is right to point out that there is no way to assign a date to this fragment, and it need not be pre-Euripidean. For Mossman's discussion of the metamorphosis, cf. (1990) 218-27, 298-99.

1266 For οἶσθα + accusative, with no preposition, for knowledge of a thing, cf. *Hel* 877 οὐδ' οἶσθα νόστον οἴκαδ', *Ion* 987 οἶσθα γηγενῆ μάχην; *IT* 517 Τροίαν ἴσως οἶσθ'.

1267 The prophecies Polymestor cites are to be though of as valid and binding on the characters that they concern. In some ways, the truth of the prophecy concerning Hecuba could be seen as quite weird, so the truth of the fulfilment needs to be substantiated. The prophecies which follow, concerning the murders of Agamemnon and Cassandra are/have been fulfilled in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, a text with which Euripides assumes his audience is familiar. That these come true (in the context of the larger fabric of myth) is a clear indication that the associated prophecy -

Hecuba's metamorphosis - will also be fulfilled. The present line lends further support, by alluding to an actual oracle that existed in contemporary (for Euripides) Thrace as the provenance for what Polymestor is now saying. On the slopes of Mt. Pangaeon there was an oracle which served the Satrae, a Thracian tribe. It seems to have functioned much like Delphi, with a priestess delivering oracles from the god Dionysus. It would appear that the oracle's fame and accuracy were noted in Athens, and that some thought that it was 'better' than Delphi. That assumption at least provides an appropriate context to understand Herodotus 7.111, where he defends Delphi: **οὗτοι οἱ τοῦ Διονύσου τὸ μαντήϊόν εἰσι ἐκτημένοι· τὸ δὲ μαντήϊον τοῦτο ἔστι μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων τῶν ὑψηλοτάτων, Βησσοὶ δὲ τῶν Σατρέων εἰσὶ οἱ προφητεύοντες τοῦ ἱροῦ, πρόμαντις δὲ ἡ χρέωσα κατά περ ἐν Δελφοῖσι, καὶ οὐδὲν ποικιλώτερον.** Tierney suggests that Aeschylus may have been the first poet to associate Dionysus with Thrace, in the *Lykourgeia*, though that it had some basis in fact is probable since the association is so long-lasting: an oracle to Dionysus is attested in Amphikleia in Phocis in the first century A.D. (Pausanias 10.33.11) and cf. Suetonius *Aug* 84. The familiarity in Athens is further supported by Aristophanes *Wasps* 9-10, where the god is called Sabazios, of which the Scholiast on *Wasps* 9 says: **Σαβάζιον δὲ τὸν Διόνυσον οἱ Θρᾷκες καλοῦσιν.**

The contrast with Delphi is perhaps significant, since Dionysus rivals Apollo as a mantic god. Euripides refers to prophecies of Dionysus at *Bac* 298-301 (cited by the Scholiast on the present line) and (specifically associated with Thrace) *Rhe* 972-73 **Βάχκου προφήτης ὥστε Παγγαίον πέτραν | ᾤκησε, σεμνὸς τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν θεός** (for which see Diggle (1987).) The use of the word **μάντις** "seer, prophet" in the transferred sense of the god who delivers the prophecy is found in Aeschylus of Apollo: *Ag* 1202 **μάντις μ' Ἀπόλλων τῷδ' ἐπέστησεν τέλει**, *Cho* 559 **ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων, μάντις ἀψευδὴς τὸ πρίν**, *Eum* 169 and (of both Apollo and Cassandra) *Ag* 1275. There are other prophetic associations with Thrace, e.g. Orpheus (cf. *Alc* 966-69, also cited by the Scholiast on the present line) Linus, etc.

The prophecy therefore comes from an acknowledged prophetic authority, and should be believed, even though its immediate source is the contemptible Polymestor. In many ways it is

like the prophecies uttered at the ends of the *Heraclidae* and the *Cyclops*. In the former instance (*Hcld* 1028-37) Eurystheus cites an oracle of Loxias given to him long before. In the latter (*Cyc* 696-700) Polyphemus cites 696 παλαιὸς χρησμὸς, which may have been given to him by his father Poseidon, though this is never stated explicitly. All three oracles also contain more than one prophetic element, where details familiar to the legend (the murder of Agamemnon, the burial place of Eurystheus, the wanderings of Odysseus) inform the validity of the innovated or less certain elements (see also Introduction I.)

The use of the dative Θρῃξί is not exceptional, depending as it does on the strength of the verbal associations implicit in the noun μάντις, cf. *Or* 363 ὁ ναυτίλοισι μάντις and also *Hec* 816, *Pho* 17, *IT* 387.

1268-69 These lines introduce two issues concerning prophetic utterances, yet which are left unexamined and unresolved. These are: (1268) the apparent lack of application of oracles, and (1269) the belief that it is possible to avoid their fulfilment. Hecuba asks if the prophecy given (χράω is used for an answering oracle, χράομαι for the one consulting it) contained information only about others, and none concerning Polymestor himself. The seeming uselessness to his situation at least provides some rationale for Polymestor putting the prophecy in the back of his mind (cf. the *Cyclops* where the ancient oracle to comic effect is much more relevant to the immediate situation of the absent-minded Polymestor.) The following line shows some hesitancy on Polymestor's part about the inevitability of prophecy. He believes that had he been armed with the prophecy he could have avoided what he has suffered. It is not necessary to extend this to the logical conclusion that it is conceivable that Hecuba will be able to avoid her metamorphosis, etc. Polymestor's statement is made in anger, and tragedy is full of examples (most notably Oedipus) of individuals who believed they alone could avoid fulfilling a prophecy. εἷλες is a word borrowed from legal terminology, and may be intended to invoke the recent *agon*, though such an understanding is not necessary, cf. *And* 289, Aesch *ST* †83†, Demosthenes 26.11 τῶν ἑλόντων = "the successful litigants".

1270 The difficulty with this line was summarized by Musgrave, writing of ἐκπλήσω βίον, "*hoc cum* θανοῦσα *conjunctum ridiculi aliquod habet; cum* ζῶσα *tautologici.*" Surely something is wrong with the line's interpretation, since as it stands, what editors say must be understood is not in the least bit clear or obvious. Hadley thought θανοῦμαι was an acceptable emendation to θανοῦσα, but the whole phrase θανοῦσα δ' ἢ ζῶσ' seems unimpeachable, especially in light of Polymestor's one-word response in 1271, without particles, which clearly picks up on the entire context of the present line (though I have no doubt that with this same evidence Hadley justifies his correction.) Weil (once) suggested ἐκστήσω for ἐκπλήσω but this too is unlikely since ἐκπλήσω seems to be a particularly Euripidean word., cf. *Or* 293, 463, 657, *IT* 90 *Ion* 1108, *Hel* 753. Again this is not proof, but it does make the suggestion unlikely. Of the proposed emendations to βίον, Brunck's μόρον is unlikely, due to the standard associations in the tragedians with death. Weil's φάτιν is better, but if βίον is to be replaced, Musgrave's πότμον, "destiny, fate"is blessed with an analogous corruption in Soph *Ant* 83 μὴ 'μοῦ προτάρβει· τὸν σὸν ἐξόρθου πότμον where in 2 MSS. βίον is written above πότμον, and βίον appears as the only reading in some later MSS.

Does the line actually need correction? Most interpretations of the line as it stands are not tenable, but it is possible that the tautology feared by Musgrave is tolerable. Aristoph *Frogs* 1151-76 shows Euripides attacking Aeschylus for almost exactly this same fault, and as the commentators are keen to point, the practice is also found in Euripides himself, e.g. *Cyc* 210 τί φάτε, τί λέγετε; *Hip* 380 τὰ χρήστ' ἐπιστάμεσθα καὶ γιγνώσκομεν *Ion* 1446-47 τίν' αὐδὰν ἀύσω, | βοάσω; While the device is easily parodied, it is a form of elevated language, or tragical diction, cf. the liturgical "meekly kneeling upon our knees." To ask "By dying or living am I to complete my life here?" may not be absolutely clear but its sense is sure. This may be preferable to Musgrave's emendation.

The final difficulty is determining the referent of ἐνθάδε. It is not specified, and ultimately not important, as long as "here" is understood in terms of the progress of Polymestor's predictive

narrative, as opposed to Hecuba's immediate situation or position. Various suggestions have included: after leaping (Ambrose); in the sea (Collard); in slavery (Hadley); in this world (Jeffrey; cf. 418 ἐκεῖ = in Hades, however the word "Hades" is mentioned in the same line); in the shape of a dog (LSJ II.1, Scholiast.) I believe that the most obvious referent is none of these, but rather that ἐνθάδε = at this point in Polymestor's predictive narrative, i.e. she wants to know if any further information or details were imparted in the prophecy.

1271-73 As at 1259-61, adherence to the strict form of stichomythia requires Polymestor's sentence to be fragmented, and again the effect of postponement heightens tension. Polymestor responds to Hecuba's previous question with a one-word repetition of the correct alternative. He then builds on that, giving detail. His sentence, however, is very abstract, its barest structural form being "its name (ὄνομα) ... will be called (κεκλήσεται) ... the sign (σῆμα)." τύμβῳ, dative of thing affected, is similarly abstract, as it does not (immediately) refer to anything physical, since someone drowned at sea has no sepulchre (so Meridor (1978) 32 n.14, followed by Collard.) It is possible that the feature is a bronze-age barrow grave, which could serve as a marker, could overlook the sea, and could be called σῆμα, cf. Hector's challenge in Homer *Il* 7.84-91 esp. 86 σῆμα. It would seem Euripides is implying that once drowned, Hecuba is buried (in her metamorphosed state?) on the nearest shore, which will be renamed and shall serve as a marker (which will last until at least the time of Strabo, cf. 7 fr.55 ἐνθαῦτα δ' ἐστὶ τὸ Κυνὸς Σῆμα ἄκρα, οἱ δ' Ἑκάβης φασί· καὶ γὰρ δείκνυται κάμψαντι τὴν ἄκραν τάφος αὐτῆς, and 13.1.28 ἐν τῇ Χερρονήσῳ τὸ Κυνὸς σῆμά ἐστιν, ὅ φασιν Ἑκάβης εἶναι τάφον. Tombs often have such a significance in tragedy, cf. *Hcld* 1030-44, *Sup* 1205-12, Aesch *Eum* 767-74, Soph *OC* 1518-32. Segal (1990) 209 treats the usage of σῆμα as paradoxical: "The σῆμα that Hecuba will have, however, belongs to shame and monstrosity rather than the godlike immortality of κλέος ἄφθιτον." This seems artificially contrived: if Euripides had wanted to represent shame, Hecuba would be left unburied, washing in with the tide as Polydorus had done. The use of σῆμα is surely intended to evoke the noble grave.

The use of κεκλήσεται indicates that Euripides is establishing an aetiological connection, which is a common feature of Euripidean exodoi, cf. *El* 1275 ἐπώνυμος δὲ σοῦ πόλις κεκλήσεται, *Or* 1646-47 κεκλήσεται δὲ σῆς φυγῆς ἐπώνυμον | Ἀζᾶσιν Ἀρκάσιν τ' Ὀρέστειον καλεῖν, *Ion* 1593-94 κἀπισημανθήσεται | κείνου κεκλῆσθαι λαὸς ὄνομ' ἐπώνυμος, *HF* 1329-31 ταῦτ' ἐπωνομασμένα | σέθεν τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκ βροτῶν κεκλήσεται | ζῶντος, *Hel* 1674 Ἑλένη τὸ λοιπὸν ἐν βροτοῖς κεκλήσεται, *Sup* 1224-25 Ἔκγονοι δ' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα | κληθέντες ᾠδὰς ὑστέροισι θήσετε, *Erech* 65.92-94 κεκλήσεται δὲ τοῦ κτανόντος οὕνεκα | σεμνὸς Ποσειδῶν ὄνομ' ἐπωνομασμένος | ἀστοῖς Ἐρεχθεὺς ἐμ φοναῖσι βουθύτοις, and the MSS. corruptions at *Tro* 13. It will be noticed that many of these examples use a form of ἐπώνυμος, which supports (or at least explains) the Scholiast's view that ἐπῳδὸν = ἐπώνυμον (Nauck went so far as to emend to μορφῆς ἐπώνυμόν τι.) Though this must be a correct understanding, it is not especially clear. Paley takes it in an active sense of "charming against", based on the model of Aesch *Ag* 1418 ἐπῳδὸν Θρῃκίων ἀημάτων, therefore understanding it as "to console me for my change of shape", but this is more tenuous still.

The difficulties presented by lines 1270-73 are many, and one can understand Kvíčala's desire to delete all of them, restoring clarity. They are however clearly in line with Euripidean practice, and the aetiological connection is an important one for him to make. By establishing a link between his play and a specific geographical location or custom (even if it is not based in fact), the events in the play are accredited with some notion of 'truth' within the world of myth, which functions in the historical continuum much as 'prehistory' does in modern historical thought. From myth did the world the audience knew develop. It is the same motivation for linking a play solidly with a Homeric context, and (in the specific case of the *Hecuba*) with Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (or, for that matter, with a specific known oracle (see 1267 note) or by anachronism.) There is an idea that the information thus presented is somehow verifiable - that one could go to Cynossema and see a barrow grave which would be that of Hecuba. Establishing aetiologies is therefore a purposeful and useful action for the playwright. The confusion comes because Euripides is condensing several details into a single event:

1. the existence of a promontory called Cynossema, perhaps originally named after some astronomical phenomenon (Paley) or because the promontory was in some way shaped like a dog's head. This in 411 B.C. was near the site of the last battle related by Thucydides (8.99-109.)
2. use of the highest point on the promontory by sailors as an aid to navigation, used (perhaps) as a reference point for triangulation (ναυτίλοις τέκμαρ), cf. Thucydides 8.104.5 ἄλλως τε ... καὶ τοῦ χωρίου τοῦ περὶ τὸ Κυνὸς σῆμα ὀξεῖαν καὶ γωνιώδη τὴν περιβολὴν ἔχοντος, ὥστε τὰ ἐν τῷ ἐπέκεινα αὐτοῦ γιγνόμενα μὴ κάτοπτα εἶναι.
3. the need for some kind of memorial to Hecuba, either (as the debasement theorists would say) as a warning, or (rightly, see above) as a positive testimonial to the value of revenge.
4. the invocation by the dog-shape of the Furies, spirits of rightful revenge who have had a continual, though covert, presence throughout the play (see 1265 note.)

By inventing the metamorphosis for Hecuba (or, less likely, adapting an earlier tale) all four are reduced to the one feature being described. ταλαίνης is to be understood as an 'editorial' comment by Polymestor, separating as it does what is effectively two halves of a proper name. Lefkowitz takes a different view of the metamorphosis, suggesting that Hecuba's "death will be sordid ... and more significantly, anonymous" (1986, 85). If the point of anonymity were a valid one, it would be a necessary consequence of the aetiological compacting of details suggested above. That it is not valid is determined from the fact that "The Sign of the Dog" is used interchangeably with "The Sign of Hecuba" by Strabo (cited above.)

The reading of the papyrus Π^2 in 1272 is clearly preferable to any alternative, since it avoids Hecuba asking two separate questions in what is an interruption (adopted by Diggle (1981)120).

1274 This is Hecuba's final triumphant claim: death matters not, since she has her revenge. The wheel of fortune has turned full circle, and the former Queen of Troy, who had been reduced to slavery and suffering, has achieved a moral and physical victory, cf. *Cyc* 693 δώσειν δ' ἔμελλες ἀνοσίου δαιτὸς δίκας.

1275 Polymestor responds by reintroducing ἀνάγκη. She who has lost so much will lose everything, for her last living child will also be killed. This forms another definite bridge to the *Agamemnon* (see Introduction IV).

1276-77 ἀπέπτυσα (instantaneous aorist, as at *Hip* 614, to suggest that her action is so close in time to that which provoked it) is Hecuba's instinctive reaction to the ill omens of Polymestor. She is (vainly) performing the popular superstitious ritual for avoiding evil (cf. Theoc 6.39 and Gow's note, 7.127). The reaction is protective of her last living child, and shows that Hecuba in her victory has not become some abstraction of revenge, but retains her human foibles and maternal concern. Most editors understand the colloquial αὐτῷ ταῦτα σοὶ δίδωμ' ἔχειν as referring to Polymestor's death. The expression itself is probably parallel to *Cyc* 270 αὐτὸς ἔχ', and makes much more sense if it refers to the the clarifying of the parallel situation - Polymestor recounts a prediction of absolute childlessness for Hecuba, and she has made him childless (therefore ταῦτα = the death of his children) - or if it simply expands ἀπέπτυσ' (ταῦτα = the *rejection* of Polymestor's prophecy.) Understood in this last way, Polymestor's response makes sense. Hecuba (perhaps irrationally) rejects the information of her daughter's pending death, so Polymestor provides further details, confirming its likelihood. The description of Clytemnestra as οὐκουρὸς πικρά echoes the description of Phaedra in *Hip* 787 πικρὸν τόδ' οἰκούρημα δεσπόταις ἐμοῖς, and recalls Clytemnestra's ironic self-description in Aesch *Ag* 606-12.

1278 This is Hecuba's last line in the play. It would be wrong to think in terms of the ending 'forgetting' the protagonist: her story is complete, and there is no more to be said about it.

Mossman agrees: "it is interesting that Hecuba is silent after 1278. Her task has been accomplished; there is no more to say." There is an irony in the use of μήπω "long may it be before...", as at *Hcld* 357-60 (sic) μήπω ταῖς μεγάλαισιν οὕ|τω καὶ καλλιχόροις 'Αθά|ναις εἴη, Soph *El* 403 μήπω νοῦ τοσόνδ' εἴην κενή. Hecuba's reasons for wanting this do extend beyond a protective maternal concern for her daughter. Clytemnestra's actions would (and do) constitute wrongful revenge - the unjust vendetta - and would reintroduce an imbalance which Hecuba by her actions has resolved. It is clear by the patronymic that Clytemnestra is envisaged as committing these crimes, which further suggests that it is the Aeschylean (and Stesichorean? - see next note) and not the Homeric version of the story to which Euripides alludes. Hecuba's last line, though outwardly motivated, captures both roles her character has represented in the play, mother and avenger.

1279 αὐτόν and τοῦτον refer to Agamemnon.

If the reading of the majority of the MSS. were followed (σε) it would be necessary to attribute the previous line to Agamemnon, which clearly is not desirable. However, the reading of the papyrus Π^2 is unambiguous, and shows that γε is correct. The next direct bridge from this play to the *Agamemnon* is the prediction of Agamemnon's death. In Stesichorus' account (fr. 15; cited, translated and discussed in Introduction IV) Agamemnon is killed by an axe, which runs counter to the Homeric version (*Od* 11.424) where he is murdered by a sword. Tragedy seems to favour the axe (*El* 160, 279, 1160, *Tro* 361, Soph *El* 97-99, 195-96, 384-87.) The *Oresteia* identifies Aegisthus as having used a sword (*Cho* 1011) but is ambiguous about Clytemnestra's weapon. For sword, cf. Fraenkel *Ag* vol. 3 Appendix B, pages 806-09, Sommerstein (1989), Prag (1991). For axe, cf. Davies (1987), supported by many vase paintings, e.g. a cup by the Brygos Painter, *ARV* 378, 129. Correlation with Soph *El* is probably not valid evidence, cf. Davidson (1990). The weapon used in the *Oresteia* is ultimately not important for an interpretation of the present line, cf. Introduction IV.

1280 Agamemnon enters the conversation brusquely (for the colloquialism, see 1127 note) as soon as the prophecy affects him directly. It would seem that either Agamemnon, or his (silent) guards (whom he addresses 1284-86), makes a threatening gesture as he asks, "Are you asking for trouble?" This is suggested by Polytmestor's response κτεῖν' in the next line.

1281 The imperfect imperative κτεῖν' = "kill away!, kill me as much as you like!", recognizes that Polymestor is in some way threatened. It also suggests that Polymestor believes in these prophecies: hurting him will not affect what he sees as being the eventual punishment of all his oppressors (reading Agamemnon as banishing Polymestor at Hecuba's request, because of his relationship with Cassandra.)

There is a conflation in that Agamemnon is murdered in the bath, combining the two separate events of his death, and the washing of a corpse (cf. 609-13 for Polyxena, *Or* 367 λουτροῖσιν ἀλόχου περιπεσὼν πανυστάτοις, *El* 157-8 λουτρὰ πανύσταθ' ὑδρανάμενον χροΐ | κοίτᾳ ἐν οἰκτροτάτᾳ θανάτου.) Returning after ten years' absence, a bath awaiting (ἀμμένει = ἀναμένει) his arrival should be welcome and desired. That Agamemnon's bath will prove to be his place of death is bitterly ironic. This is the end of the prophetic utterance, and Polymestor has made prophecies known concerning Hecuba's death, and all the events of the *Agamemnon*.

The neighbouring cities of Argos and Mycenae both date from the Bronze Age and both were inhabited in the fifth century. Agamemnon's capital was Mycenae, and both cities were situated on the plain which bordered on 'Ελλάς. The plain also was called Argos, and it was this that is Agamemnon's kingdom. ἐν Ἄργει refers not to the city but to the kingdom, and therefore the explanation of Bond and Walpole, that the capital is transferred to Argos in fifth century drama since it is the larger city, is unnecessary.

1282-84 The stichomythia ends with Agamemnon barking orders (οὐ + interrogative future = stern command (Jebb *Ajax* pp.213-17) cf. Soph *Ajax* 75 οὐ σῖγ' ἀνέξει; *Tra* 1183, *OT* 637-38) to his bodyguard to drag Polymestor away and to stop his mouth (and, 1284-86, to desert him on an

island.) Polymestor responds to these orders defiantly, recognizing that the only victory he can win is with Agamemnon: the only hold he has is over the corrupt judge of his trial.

1285 To be marooned on a desert island or otherwise deserted location was not an uncommon penalty in antiquity. Philoctetes is the most obvious example, but cf. Aegisthus and the minstrel in Homer *Od* 3.270-71 δὴ τότε τὸν μὲν ἀοιδὸν ἄγων ἐς νῆσον ἐρήμην | κάλλιπεν οἰωνοῖσιν ἕλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι, Hippolytus to Theseus in Eur *Hip* 1055-56 οὐδ' ὅρκον οὐδὲ πίστιν οὐδὲ μάντεων | φήμας ἐλέγξας ἄκριτον ἐκβαλεῖς με γῆς;, and Juvenal 1.73-74 *aude aliquid breuibus Gyaris et carcere dignum, | si vis esse aliquid.*

1286 καί, cf. *GP* 297

θρασυστομεῖ, cf. 1183-84 note.

Polymestor is forcably removed by Agamemnon's personal guards.

1287-88 For the postponed δέ, cf. *GP* 189 and *Hec* 372.

διπτύχους is merely a long word for the number "two", used often by Euripides *metri gratia*, cf. *Med* 1136 δίπτυχος γονή, *And* 472 δίπτυχοι τυραννίδες, 578 τῆσδε χεῖρας διπτύχους.

Agamemnon is providing a rationale for characters to get off the stage, as is indicated in the Scholiast about ὑμᾶς: καλῶς πρὸς τὸν χορὸν ταύτά φησιν, ἵνα εὐπροσώπως ἀναχωρήσῃ.

1289-90 The revenge having been accomplished, the world is back in order and the winds begin to blow. The timing shows definitively that the winds were being held back by some force other than Achilles, and that the sacrifice of Polyxena was unnecessary (see Introduction III "Windlessness" for a full discussion.) Ussher sees a similarity in these lines with *Cyc* 701-02 (p.196) but this is tenuous: any similarities that do exist are necessitated by the context. The lines recall the close of Seneca's *Troades*, which borrows heavily from this play: *repetite celeri maria captivae gradu, | iam vela puppis laxat et classis movet.*

1291-92 These lines are clearly ironic, and show that Agamemnon, though hearing, has not been listening, and does not understand what the future holds for him (in the *Oresteia*.) They form a suitable close to a play that has been laced with irony and allusions to the Aeschylean trilogy.

For the construction in 1292, cf. *Med* 1002 ἀφεῖνται παῖδες οἵδε σοι φυγῆς.

Characters begin to exit, Hecuba and her attendants most likely back into Agamemnon's tent, and Agamemnon back to the Greek camp, or perhaps, if Polymestor had been led off towards the sea, following him (there is effectively no difference between the two for the sake of the drama.)

1293-95 All of Euripides' extant plays end with an anapaestic tailpiece spoken by the chorus. Often these have nothing to do with the play itself, cf. the repeated ending in *Alc, And, Hel, Bac* and (with only minimal alteration) *Med.* This means of course that any and all of the tailpieces may be suspect. Of the five non-recurrent endings (*Hec, HF, Sup, Hcld, El*) only *Electra* is not what Barrett (p.418) calls "a brief anapaestic 'let's go'." The existence of any tailpiece in the MSS. suggests some basis in fact, and I believe the present lines to be a fitting and Euripidean close to the play. For a fuller discussion of these tailpieces, cf. Roberts (1987) and Barrett *Hip* 1462-66.

For the evils of slavery, cf. Aesch *Per* 586-87 δασμοφοροῦσιν | δεσποσύνοισιν ἀνάγκαις. ἀνάγκη, which has been a key word throughout the play, is involved in the final axiom, which recognises that fate is hard (cf. *IT* 205-07, *And* 98-99) and an appropriate perspective on justice is often difficult to discern.

The play is over, and Hecuba has regained her former status through her righteous revenge. What is left on the stage though, might be a factor. Mossman (1990) 81 suggests that the bodies of Polymestor's children might be left onstage after all have left (making his words at 1075-76 uncomfortably true.) This is certainly a bold stroke, and perhaps not too modern. The play has been motivated by the deaths of children, and taking revenge, even a just revenge, requires at times the death of innocents: cf. *Cypria* fr. 22 νήπιος ὃς πατέρα κτείνας παῖδας καταλείπει (and see Bond *HF* 166ff.) This is a harsh reality, and shows (perhaps) that there are costs in revenge.