

with which the poet seeks to surround the central figure of Hecuba. The chief interest of the drama consists in its illustration of the skill with which Euripides, while failing to satisfy the requirements of artistic drama, could sustain interest by an ingeniously woven plot. It is a representative *Intriguenstück*, and well exemplifies the peculiar power which recommended Euripides to the poets of the New Comedy.

(5.) The *Andromache*, according to a notice in the *Scholion Veneta* (446) was not acted at Athens, at least in the author's life-time; though some take the words in the Greek argument (τὸ δράμα τῶν δευτέρων) to mean that it was among those which gained a second prize. The invective on the Spartan character which is put into the mouth of Andromache contains the words, ἀδίκως ἐτυχεῖτ' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα, and this, with other indications, points to the Peloponnesian successes of the years 424-422 B.C. Andromache, the widow of Hector, has become the captive and concubine of Neoptolemus, son of Achilles. During his absence, her son Molossus is taken from her, with the aid of Menelaus, by her jealous rival Hermione. Mother and son are rescued from death by Peleus; but meanwhile Neoptolemus is slain at Delphi through the intrigues of Orestes. The goddess Thetis now appears, ordains that Andromache shall marry Helenus, and declares that Molossus shall found a line of Epirote kings, while Peleus shall become immortal among the gods of the sea. The *Andromache* is a poor play. The contrasts, though striking, are harsh and coarse, and the compensations dealt out by the *deus ex machina* leave the moral sense wholly unsatisfied. Technically the piece is noteworthy as bringing on the scene four characters at once—Andromache, Molossus, Peleus, and Menelaus (v. 545 f.).

(6.) The *Ion* is an admirable drama, the finest of those plays which deal with legends specially illustrating the traditional glories of Attica. It is also the most perfect example of the poet's skill in the structure of dramatic intrigue. For its place in the chronological order there are no data except those of style and metre. Judging by these, Hermann would place it "neither after Ol. 89, nor much before"—i.e., somewhere between 424 and 421 B.C.; and this may be taken as approximately correct. The scene is laid throughout at the temple of Delphi. The young Ion is a priest in the temple of Delphi when Xuthus and his wife Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus, come to inquire of the god concerning their childlessness; and it is discovered that Ion is the son of Creusa by the god Apollo. Athena herself appears, and commands that Ion shall be placed on the throne of Athens, foretelling that from him shall spring the four Attic tribes, the Teleontes (priests), Hopletes (fighting-men), Argadeis (husbandmen) and Aigikoreis (herdsmen). The play must have been peculiarly effective on the Athenian stage, not only by its situations, but through its appeal to Attic sympathies.

(7.) The *Suppliants* who give their name to the play are Argive women, the widows of Argive warriors slain before the walls of Thebes, who, led by Adrastus king of Argos, come as suppliants to the altar of Demeter at Eleusis. Creon, king of Thebes, has refused burial to their dead lords. The Athenian king Theseus demands of Creon that he shall grant the funeral rites; the refusal is followed by a battle in which the Thebans are vanquished, and the bodies of the Argive dead are then brought to Eleusis. At the close the goddess Athena appears, and ordains that a close alliance shall be formed between Athens and Argos. Some refer the play to 417 B.C., when the democratic party at Athens rose against the oligarchs. But a more probable date is 420 B.C., when, through the agency of Alcibiades, Athens and Argos concluded a defensive alliance. The play has a strongly marked rhetorical

character, and is, in fact, a panegyric, with an immediate political aim, on Athens as the champion of humanity against Thebes.

(8.) The *Heracleidae*,—a companion piece to the *Suppliants*, and of the same period,—is decidedly inferior in merit. Here, too, there are direct references to contemporary history. The defeat of Argos by the Spartans in 418 B.C. strengthened the Argive party who were in favour of discarding the Athenian for the Spartan alliance (Thuc. v. 76). In the *Heracleidae*, the sons of the dead Heracles, persecuted by the Argive Eurystheus, are received and sheltered at Athens. Thus, while Athens is glorified, Sparta, whose kings are descendants of the Heracleidae, is reminded how unnatural would be an alliance between herself and Argos.

(9.) The *Heracles Mainomenos*, which, on grounds of style, can scarcely be put later than 420-417 B.C., shares with the two last plays the purpose of exalting Athens in the person of Theseus. Heracles returns from Hades,—whither, at the command of Eurystheus, he went to bring back Cerberus,—just in time to save his wife Megara and his children from being put to death by Lycus of Thebes, whom he slays. As he is offering lustral sacrifice after the deed, he is suddenly stricken with madness by Lyssa (Fury), the dæmonic agent of his enemy the goddess Hera, and in his frenzy he slays his wife and children. Theseus finds him, in his agony of despair, about to kill himself, and persuades him to come to Athens, there to seek grace and pardon from the gods. The unity of the plot may be partly vindicated by observing that the slaughter of Lycus entitled Heracles to the gratitude of Thebes, whereas the slaughter of his own kinsfolk made it unlawful that he should remain there; thus, having found a refuge only to lose it, Heracles has no hope left but in Athens, whose praise is the true theme of the entire drama.

(10.) *Iphigenia among the Tauri*, which metre and diction mark as one of the later plays, is also one of the best,—excellent both in the management of a romantic plot and in the delineation of character. The scene is laid at the temple of Artemis in the Tauric Chersonese (the Crimea)—on the site of the modern Balaclava. Iphigenia, who had been doomed to die at Aulis for the Greeks, had been snatched from that death by Artemis, and had become priestess of the goddess at the Tauric shrine, where human victims were immolated. Two strangers, who had landed among the Tauri, have been sentenced to die at the altar. She discovers in them her brother Orestes and his friend Pylades. They plan an escape,—are recaptured,—and are finally delivered by the goddess Athene, who commands Thoas, king of the land, to permit their departure. Iphigenia, Orestes, and Pylades return to Greece, and establish the worship of the Tauric Artemis at Brauron and Halæ in Attica. The drama of Euripides necessarily suggests a comparison with that of Goethe; and many readers will probably also feel that, while Goethe is certainly not inferior in fineness of ethical portraiture, he has the advantage in his management of the catastrophe. But it is only just to Euripides to remember that, while his competitor had free scope of treatment, he, a Greek dramatist, was bound to the motive of the Greek legend, and was obliged to conclude with the foundation of the Attic worship.

(11.) The *Troades* appeared in 415 B.C. along with the *Alexander*, the *Palamedes*, and a satyr-play, the *Sisypus*. It is a picture of the miseries endured by noble Trojan dames,—Hecuba, Andromache, Cassandra,—immediately after the capture of Troy. There is hardly a plot in the proper sense,—only an accumulation of sorrows on the heads of the passive sufferers. The piece is less a drama than a pathetic spectacle, closing with the crash of the Trojan towers in flame and ruin. The *Troades* is indeed

remarkable among Greek tragedies for its near approach to the character of melodrama. It must be observed that there is no ground for the inference—sometimes made an accusation against the poet—that the choral passage, v. 794 f., was intended to encourage the Sicilian expedition, sent forth in the same year (415 B.C.). The mention of the "land of Ætna over against Carthage" (v. 220) speaks of it as "renowned for the trophies of prowess,"—a topic, surely, not of encouragement but of warning.

(12.) The *Helena*—produced, as we learn from the Aristophanic scholia, in 412 B.C., the year of the lost *Andromeda*,—is not one of its author's happier efforts. It is founded on a strange variation of the Trojan myth, first adopted by Stesichorus in his Palinode—that only a wraith of Helen passed to Troy, while the real Helen was detained in Egypt. In this play, she is rescued from the Egyptian king, Theoclymenus, by a ruse of her husband Menelaus, who brings her safely back to Greece. The romantic element thus engrafted on the Greek myth is more than fantastic: it is well-nigh grotesque. We are, in fact, dangerously close to the verge of parody. The comic poets—notably Aristophanes in the *Thesmophoriazusa*—felt this; nor can we blame them if they ridiculed a piece in which the mode of treatment was so discordant with the spirit of Greek tradition, and so irreconcilable with all that constituted the higher meaning of Greek Tragedy.

(13.) *Phoenissæ* was brought out, with the *Ænomaus* and the *Chryseippus*, in 411 B.C., the year in which the recall of Alcibiades was decreed by the army at Samos, and, after the fall of the Four Hundred, ratified by the Assembly at Athens (Thuc. viii. 81, 97). The dialogue between Iocaste and Polyneices on the griefs of banishment (τὶ τὸ στέρεσθαι πατρίδος, v. 388 f.) has a certain emphasis which certainly looks like an allusion to the pardon of the famous exile. The subject of the play is the same as that of the Æschylean *Seven against Thebes*—the war of succession in which Argos supported Polyneices against his brother Eteocles. The Phœnician maidens who form the chorus are imagined to have been on their way from Tyre to Delphi, where they were destined for service in the temple, when they were detained at Thebes by the outbreak of the war—a device which affords a contrast to the Æschylean chorus of Theban elders, and which has also a certain fitness in view of the legends connecting Thebes with Phœnicia. But Euripides has hardly been successful in the rivalry—which he has even pointed by direct allusions—with Æschylus. The *Phoenissæ* is full of brilliant passages, but it is rather a series of effective scenes than an impressive drama.

(14.) Plutarch (*Lys.* 15) says that, when Athens had surrendered to Lysander (404 B.C.) and when the fate of the city was doubtful, a Phœcian officer happened to sing at a banquet of the leaders the first song of the chorus in the *Electra* of Euripides—

Ἀγαμέμνονος δὲ κόρα,  
ἤλυθον, ἠλέκτρα, ποτὶ σὸν ἡγορέραν ἀλλὰν,

and that "when they heard it, all were touched, so that it seemed a cruel deed to destroy for ever the city so famous once, the mother of such men." The character of the *Electra*, in metre and in diction, seems to show that it belongs to the poet's latest years. If Müller were right in referring to the Sicilian expedition the closing passage in which the Dioscuri declare that they haste "to the Sicilian sea, to save ships upon the deep" (v. 1347), then the play could not be later than 413 B.C. But it may with more probability be placed shortly before the *Orestes*, which in some respects it much resembles: perhaps in or about the year 410 B.C. No play of Euripides has been more severely criticised. The reason is evident. The *Choephoroi* of Æschylus and the *Electra* of Sophocles appear to invite a direct comparison with this drama. But, as the present

writer has ventured to suggest elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> such criticism as that of Schlegel should remember that works of art are proper subjects of direct comparison only when the theories of art which they represent have a common basis. It is surely unmeaning to contrast the elaborate homeliness of the Euripidean *Electra* with the severe grandeur of its rivals. Æschylus and Sophocles, as different exponents of an artistic conception which is fundamentally the same, may be profitably compared; Euripides interprets another conception, and must be tried by other principles. His *Electra* is, in truth, a daring experiment—daring, because the theme is one which the elder school had made peculiarly its own. We are unable to share Hartung's enthusiasm for the success of the experiment. But we protest against the injustice of trying it by a standard foreign to the poet's aim.

(15.) The *Orestes*, acted in 408, bears the mark of the age in the prominence which Euripides gives to the assembly of Argos,—which has to decide the fate of Orestes and Electra,—and to rhetorical pleading. The plot proceeds with sufficient clearness to the point at which Orestes and Electra have been condemned to death. But the later portion of the play, containing the intrigues for their rescue and the final achievement of their deliverance, is both too involved and too inconsequent for a really tragic effect. Just as in the *Electra*, the heroic persons of the drama are reduced to the level of commonplace. There is not a little which borders on the ludicrous, and it can be seen how easy would have been the passage from such tragedy as this to the restrained parody in which the Middle Comedy delighted. It is, however, inconceivable that, as some have supposed, the *Orestes* can have been a deliberate compromise between tragedy and farce. It cannot have been meant to be played, as a fourth piece, instead of a regular satyric drama. Rather it indicates the level to which the heroic tragedy itself had descended under the treatment of a school which was at least logical. The celebrity of the play in the ancient world,—and, as Mr Paley observes, there are more ancient quotations from the *Orestes* than from all the extant plays of Æschylus and Sophocles together—is perhaps partly explained by the unusually frequent combination in this piece of striking sentiment with effective situation.

(16.) The *Iphigenia at Aulis*, like the *Bacchæ*, was brought out only after the death of Euripides. It is a very brilliant and beautiful play,—probably left by the author in an unfinished state,—and has suffered from interpolation more largely, perhaps, than any other of his works. As regard its subject, it forms a prelude to the *Iphigenia in Tauris*. Iphigenia has been doomed by her father Agamemnon to die at Aulis, as Calchas declares that Artemis claims such a sacrifice before the adverse winds can fall.

The genuine play, as we have it, breaks off at v. 1508, when Iphigenia has been led to the sacrificial altar. A spurious epilogue, of wretched workmanship (v. 1509-1628), relates, in the speech of a messenger, how Artemis saved the maiden. We may, however, congratulate ourselves on possessing, even in its present form, so large a part of this fine work,—probably the latest upon which Euripides was engaged.

(17.) The *Bacchæ*, unlike the preceding play, appears to have been finished by its author, although it is said not to have been acted, on the Athenian stage at least, till after his death. It was composed, or completed, during the residence of Euripides with Archelaus, and in all probability was originally designed for representation in Macedonia,—a region with whose traditions of orgiastic

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to the *Electra* of Sophocles, p. xiii, in *Classical Classicorum*, 2nd edit.



worship the Dionysus myth was so congenial. The play is sometimes quoted as the *Pentheus*. It has been justly observed that Euripides seldom named a piece from the chorus, unless the chorus bore an important part in the action or the leading action was divided between several persons. Possibly, however, in this instance he may designedly have chosen a title which would at once interest the Macedonian public. *Pentheus* would suggest a Greek legend about which they might know or care little. The *Bacchæ* would at once announce a theme connected with rites familiar to the northern land.

It is a magnificent play, alone among extant Greek tragedies in picturesque splendour, and in that sustained glow of Dionysiac enthusiasm to which the keen irony lends the strength of contrast. If Euripides had left nothing else, the *Bacchæ* would place him in the first rank of poets, and would prove his possession of a sense rarely manifested by Greek poets,—perhaps by no one of his own contemporaries in equal measure except Aristophanes,—a feeling for natural beauty lit up by the play of fancy. Mr R. V. Tyrrell, in his edition of the *Bacchæ*, has given the true answer to the theory that the *Bacchæ* is a recantation. Euripides had never rejected the facts which formed the basis of the popular religion. He had rather sought to interpret them in a manner consistent with belief in a benevolent Providence. The really striking thing in the *Bacchæ* is the spirit of contentment and of composure which it breathes,—as if the poet had ceased to be vexed by the seeming contradictions which had troubled him before. Nor should it be forgotten that, for the Greek mind of his age, the victory of Dionysus in the *Bacchæ* carried a moral even more direct than the victory of Aphrodite in the *Hippolytus*. The great nature-powers who give refreshment to mortals cannot be robbed of their due tribute without provoking a nemesis. The refusal of such a homage is not, so the Greeks deemed, a virtue in itself: in the sight of the gods it may be only a cold form of *ὑβρις*, overweening self-reliance—the quality personified in *Pentheus*.

The *Bacchæ* was always an exceptionally popular play, partly because its opportunities as a spectacle fitted it for gorgeous representation, and so recommended it for performance at courts and on great public occasions. "Demetrius the Cynic" (says Lucian) "saw an illiterate person at Corinth reading a very beautiful poem,—the *Bacchæ* of Euripides, I think it was; he was at the place where the messenger narrates the doom of *Pentheus* and the deed of *Agave*. Demetrius snatched the book from him and tore it up, saying, 'it is better for *Pentheus* to be torn up at once by me than to be mangled over and over again by you.'"

(18.) The *Cyclops*, of uncertain date, is the only extant example of a satyric drama. The plot is taken mainly from the story of *Odysseus* and *Polyphemus* in the 9th book of the *Odyssey*. In order to be really successful in farce of this kind, a poet should have a fresh feeling for the nature of the art parodied. It is because Euripides was not in accord with the spirit of the heroic myths that he is not strong in mythic travesty. His own tragedies,—such as the *Helen*, the *Electra*, and the *Orestes*,—had, in their several ways, contributed to destroy the meaning of satyric drama. They had done gravely very much what satyric drama aimed at doing grotesquely. They had made the heroic persons act and talk like ordinary men and women. The finer side of such parody had lost its edge; only broad comedy remained.

(19.) The *Rhesus* is still held by some to be what the *didascalæ* and the grammarians call it,—a work of Euripides; and Mr Paley has ably supported this view. But the scepticism first declared by Valcknær has steadily gained ground, and the *Rhesus* is now almost universally recognized

as spurious. The art and the style, still more evidently the feeling and the mind, of Euripides are absent. If it cannot be ascribed to a disciple of his matured school, it is still less like the work of an Alexandrian. The most probable view seems to be that which assigns it to a versifier of small dramatic power in the latest days of Attic Tragedy. It has this literary interest, that it is the only extant play of which the subject is directly taken from our *Iliad*, of which the tenth book,—the *Δολώνεια*,—has been followed by the playwright with a closeness which is sometimes mechanical.

When the first protests of the comic poets were over, Euripides was secure of a wide and lasting renown. As the old life of Athens passed away, as the old faiths lost their meaning and the peculiarly Greek instincts in art lost their truth and freshness, *Æschylus* and *Sophocles* might cease to be fully enjoyed save by a few; but Euripides could still charm by qualities more readily and more universally recognized. The comparative nearness of his diction to the idiom of ordinary life rendered him less attractive to the grammarians of Alexandria than authors whose erudite form afforded a better scope for the display of learning or the exercise of ingenuity. But there were two aspects in which he engaged their attention. They loved to trace the variations which he had introduced into the standard legends. And they sought to free his text from the numerous interpolations which even then had resulted from his popularity on the stage. Philochorus (about 306–260 B.C.), best known for his *Atthis*, dealt, in his treatise on Euripides, especially with the mythology of the plays. From 300 B.C. to the age of Augustus, a long series of critics busied themselves with this poet. The first systematic arrangement of his reputed works is ascribed to *Dicaearchus* and *Callimachus* in the early part of the 3d century B.C. Among those who furthered the exact study of his text, and of whose work some traces remain in the extant scholia, were *Aristophanes* of Byzantium, *Callistratus*, *Apollodorus* of Tarsus, *Timachidas*, and pre-eminently *Didymus*; probably also *Crates* of Pergamus and *Aristarchus*. At Rome Euripides was early made known through the translations of *Ennius* and the freer adaptations of *Pacuvius*. When Hellenic civilization was spread through

the East, the mixed populations of the new settlements welcomed a dramatic poet whose taste and whose sentiment were not too severely or exclusively Attic. The Parthian *Orodes* and his court were witnessing the *Bacchæ* of Euripides when the *Agave* of the hour was suddenly enabled to lend a ghastly reality to the terrible scene of frenzied triumph by displaying the gory head of the Roman *Crassus*. Mommsen has noted the moment as one in which the power of Rome and the genius of Greece were simultaneously abased in the presence of sultanism. So far as Euripides is concerned, the incident may suggest another and a more pleasing reflection; it may remind us how the charm of his humane genius had penetrated the recesses of the barbarian East, and had brought to rude and fierce peoples at least some dim and distant apprehension of that gracious world in which the great spirits of ancient Hellas had moved. A quaintly significant testimony to the popularity of Euripides is afforded by a strange composition—probably of the 4th century A.D., the *Χριστὸς πάσχος*. This drama, narrating the events which preceded and attended the Passion, is a cento of no less than 2610 verses, taken from the plays of Euripides, principally from the *Bacchæ*, the *Troades*, and the *Rhesus*. The traditional ascription of the authorship to *Gregory of Nazianzus* is now generally rejected; a more probable conjecture assigns it to *Apollinaris* of *Laodicea*, and places the date of composition at about 330 A.D. Although the text used by the

author of the cento may not have been a good one, the value of the piece for the diplomatic criticism of Euripides is necessarily very considerable; and it was diligently used both by Valcknær and by Porson.

Dante, who does not mention *Æschylus* or *Sophocles*, places Euripides, with the tragic poets *Antiphon* and *Agathon*, and the lyric *Simonides*, in the first circle of Purgatory (xxii. 106), among those

pino  
Greci, eae già di lauro ornâr la fronte.

Casaubon, in a letter to Scaliger, salutes that scholar as worthy to have lived at Athens with *Aristophanes* and *Euripides*—a compliment which certainly implies respect for his correspondent's powers as a peace-maker. In popular literature, too, where *Æschylus* and *Sophocles* were as yet little known, the 16th and 17th centuries testify to the favour bestowed upon Euripides. Gascogne's *Jocasta*, played at Gray's Inn in 1566, was a free transcript from the *Phœnissæ*. Among early French translations from Euripides, may be mentioned the version of the *Iphigenia in Tauris* by *Sibilet* in 1549, and that of the *Hecuba* by *Bouchetel* in 1550. About a century later *Racine* gave the world his *Andromaque*, his *Iphigénie*, and his *Phèdre*; and many have held that, at least in the last-named of these, "the disciple of Euripides" has excelled his master. *Bernhardy* notices that the performance of the *Hippolytus* at Berlin in 1851 seemed to show that, for the modern stage, the *Phèdre* has the advantage of its Greek original. *Racine's* great English contemporary seems to have known and to have liked Euripides better than the other Greek tragedians. In the *Reason of Church Government* Milton certainly speaks of "those dramatic constitutions in which *Sophocles* and *Euripides* reign;" in the preface to his own drama, again, he joins the names of *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, and *Euripides*,—"the three tragic poets unequalled yet by any." But the *Samson Agonistes* itself clearly shows that Milton's chief model in this kind was the dramatist whom he himself has called—as if to suggest the skill of Euripides in the delineation of pathetic women—"sad *Electra's* poet;" and the work bears a special mark of this preference in the use of Euripidean monodies. In the second half of the 18th century such men as *Winckelmann* (1717–1768) and *Lessing* (1729–1781) gave a new life to the study of the antique. Hitherto the art of the old world had been better known through Roman than through Greek interpreters. The basis of the revived classical taste had been Latin. But now men gained a finer perception of those characteristics which belong to the Greek work of the great time, a fuller sense of the difference between the Greek and the Roman genius where each is at its best, and generally a clearer recognition of the qualities which distinguish ancient art in its highest purity from modern romantic types.

Euripides now became the object of criticism from a new point of view. He was compared with *Æschylus* and *Sophocles* as representatives of that ideal Greek tragedy which ranges with the purest type of sculpture. Thus tried, he was found wanting; and he was condemned with all the rigour of a newly illuminated zeal. *Niebuhr* (1776–1831) judged him harshly; but no critic approached *Schlegel* (1767–1845) in severity of one-sided censure. *Schlegel*, in fact, will scarcely allow that Euripides is tolerable except by comparison with *Racine*. *Tieck* (1773–1853) showed truer appreciation for a brother artist, when he described the work of Euripides as the dawn of a romantic poetry haunted by dim yearnings and forebodings. *Goethe*—who, according to *Bernhardy*, knows Euripides only "at a great distance" (der ihn aus weiter Ferne kennt)—certainly admired him highly, and has left an interesting memorial of Euripidean study in his attempted reconstruction of the lost *Phaethon*. There are some passages in *Goethe's* conver-

sations with *Eckermann* which form effective quotations against the Greek poet's real or supposed detractors. "To feel and respect a great personality, one must be something oneself. All those who denied the sublime to Euripides, were either poor wretches incapable of comprehending such sublimity, or shameless charlatans, who, in their presumption, wished to make more of themselves than they were." "A poet whom *Socrates* called his friend, whom *Aristotle* lauded, whom *Alexander* admired, and for whom *Sophocles* and the city of Athens put on mourning on hearing of his death, must certainly have been some one. If a modern man like *Schlegel* must pick out faults in so great an ancient, he ought only to do it upon his knees." (*Symonds, Greek Poets*, i. 230.) We yield to no one in admiration of *Goethe*; but we cannot think that these rather bullying utterances are favourable examples of his method in æsthetic discussion; nor have they any logical force except as against those—if there be any such—who deny that Euripides is a great poet. One of the most striking of recent criticisms on Euripides is the sketch by *Mommsen* in his history of Rome. It is, in our opinion, less than just to Euripides as an artist. But it indicates, with true historical insight, his place in the development of his art, the operation of those external conditions which made him what he was, and the nature of his influence on succeeding ages.

The manuscript tradition of Euripides has a very curious and instructive history. It throws a suggestive light on the capricious nature of the process by which some of the greatest literary treasures have been saved or lost. Nine plays of Euripides were selected, probably in early Byzantine times, for popular and educational use. These were,—*Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *Hippolytus*, *Medea*, *Orestes*, *Phœnissæ*, *Rhesus*, *Troades*. This list includes at least two plays, the *Andromache* and the *Troades*, which, even in the small number of the extant dramas, are universally allowed to be of very inferior merit—to say nothing of the *Rhesus*, which is generally allowed to be spurious. On the other hand, the list omits at least three plays of first-rate beauty and excellence, the very flower, indeed, of the extant collection—the *Ion*, the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and the *Bacchæ*—the last certainly, in its own kind, by far the most splendid work of Euripides that we possess. Had these three plays been lost, it is not too much to say that the modern estimate of Euripides must have been decidedly lower. But all the ten plays not included in the select list had a narrow escape of being lost, and, as it is, have come to us in a much less satisfactory condition.

*Kirchhoff* has been the first, in his editions, thoroughly to investigate the history and the affinities of the Euripidean manuscripts. All our MSS. are, he thinks, derived from a lost archetype of the 9th or 10th century, which contained the nineteen plays (counting the *Rhesus*) now extant. From this archetype a copy, also lost, was made about 1100 A.D., containing only the nine select plays. This copy became the source of all our best MSS. for those plays. They are,—(1) *Marcianus* 471, in the library of St Mark at Venice (12th century): *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *Hippolytus* (to v. 1234), *Orestes*, *Phœnissæ*; (2) *Vaticanus* 909, 12th century, nine plays; (3) *Parisinus* 2712, 13th century, 7 plays (all but *Troades* and *Rhesus*). Of the same stock, but inferior, are (4) *Marcianus* 468, 13th century: *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Medea* (v. 1–42), *Orestes*, *Phœnissæ*; (5) *Havniensis* (from *Hafnia*, Copenhagen, according to Mr Paley), a late transcript from a MS. resembling *Vat.* 909, nine plays. A second family of MSS. for the nine plays, sprung from the same copy, but modified by a Byzantine recension of the 13th century, is greatly inferior.

The other ten plays have come to us only through the preservation of two MSS., both of the 14th century, and both ultimately derived, as *Kirchhoff* thinks, from the

Momm-

sen.

Manu-

script

tradition

of Euri-

pides.

The nine

plays.

Kirch-

hoff's ac-

count of

the MSS.



archetype of the 9th or 10th century. These are (1) Palatinus 287, Kirchoff's B, usually called Rom. C., thirteen plays, viz., six of the select plays (*Androm., Med., Rhes., Hipp., Alc., Troad.*), and seven others—*Bacchæ, Cyclops, Heracleidæ, Supplices, Ion, Iphigenia in Aulide, Iphigenia in Tauris*; and (2) Flor. 2, Elmsley's C., eighteen plays, viz., all but the *Troades*. This MS. is thus the only one for the *Helena*, the *Electra*, and the *Hercules Furens*. By far the greatest number of Euripidean MSS. contain only three plays,—the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phœnissæ*—these having been chosen out of the select nine for school use—probably in the 14th century.

It is to be remembered that, as a selection, the nine chosen plays of Euripides correspond to those seven of Æschylus and those seven of Sophocles which alone remain to us. If, then, these nine did not include the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, the *Ion*, or the *Bacchæ*, may we not fairly infer that the lost plays of the other two dramatists comprised works at least equal to any that have been preserved? May we not even reasonably doubt whether we have received those masterpieces by which their highest excellence should have been judged?

The extant scholia on Euripides are for the nine select plays only. The first edition of the scholia on seven of these plays (all but the *Troades* and *Rhesus*) was published by Arsenius—a Cretan whom the Venetians had named as bishop of Monemvasia, but whom the Greeks had refused to recognize—at Venice, in 1534. The scholia on the *Troades* and *Rhesus* were first published by L. Dindorf, from Vat. 909, in 1821. The best complete edition is that of W. Dindorf, in 4 vols., 1863. The collection, though loaded with rubbish—including worthless analyses of the lyric metres by Demetrius Triclinius—included some invaluable comments derived from the Alexandrian critics and their followers.

*Editiones principes.*—1496. J. Lascaris (Florence), *Medea, Hippolytus, Alceſtis, Andromache*. 1503. M. Musurus (Aldus, Venice) *Eur. Tragg.* XVII, to which in vol. ii. the *Hercules Furens* was added as an 18th; i. e., this edition contained all the extant plays except the *Electra*, which was first given to the world by P. Victorius from Florentinus C. in 1545. The Aldine edition was reprinted at Basel in 1537.

The complete edition of Joshua Barnes (1694) is no longer of any critical value. The first thorough work done on Euripides was by L. C. Valcknær in his edition of the *Phœnissæ* (1755), and his *Diatribe in Eur. perditorum dramatum reliquias* (1767), in which he argued against the authenticity of the *Rhesus*.

*Principal editions of selected plays.*—J. Markland (1763–1771): *Supplices, Iphigenia A., Iphigenia T.*—Ph. Brunck (1779–1780): *Andromache, Medea, Orestes, Hecuba.*—R. Porson (1797–1801): *Hecuba, Orestes, Phœnissæ, Medea.*—H. Monk (1811–1818): *Hippolytus, Alceſtis, Iphigenia A., Iphigenia T.*—P. Elmsley (1813–1821): *Medea, Bacchæ, Heracleidæ, Supplices.*—G. Hermann

(1831–1841) *Hecuba* (animadv. ad R. Porson's notes, first in 1800), *Orestes, Alceſtis, Iphigenia A., Iphigenia T., Helena, Ion, Hercules Furens.*—C. Badham (1851–1853): *Iphigenia T., Helena, Ion.*—R. Y. Tyrrell (1871): *Bacchæ.*—For young students: A. Sidgwick (1871–1873): *Cyclops, Electra, Ion, Iphigenia T.*

*Recent Complete Editions.*—W. Dindorf (1870, in *Poet. Scenici*, ed. 5).—A. Kirchoff (1867).—F. A. Paley (1872, 2d. ed.) with commentary.

*English Translations.*—R. Potter.—*Bacchæ*: Milman, Thorold Rogers, E. S. Shuckburgh.—*Medea*: Mrs Webster.—*Alceſtis* (a "Transcript," in *Balaustion*): R. Browning.—*Hecuba* ("A Trojan Queen's Revenge"): Beesley.

Goethe's reconstruction of Euripides's lost *Phaethon*, in the 1840 edition of his works, vol. 33, pp. 22–43. (R. C. J.)

EUROPA, in Greek mythology, a daughter of Agenor, or, as some said, of Phoenix. According to the story, she was born in Phœnicia, the purple land, a region belonging to the same aerial geography with Lycia, Delos, Ortygia, Lycosura, and many others. When Phœnicia became to the Greeks the name of an earthly country, versions of the myth were not long wanting which asserted that Agenor was born in Tyre or Sidon. Agenor, it is said, was the husband of Telephassa; but Telephassa is the feminine form of the name Telephus, a word conveying precisely the same meaning with Hecatus, Hecate, Hecatebolus, well known epithets of the sun and moon. The beauty of Europa attracted to her the love of Zeus, who approached her in the form of a white bull, and carried her away to Crete, where she became the mother of Minos, Rhadamanthus, and Sarpedon. Meanwhile her brother Cadmus, under a strict charge never to return without her, set out on the weary search with his mother Telephassa, who died on the plains of Thessaly. At Delphi he learnt that he must follow a cow which would guide him to the place where he must build the city. The cow lay down on the site of Thebes; but before he could offer the animal as a sacrifice to Athene, he had to fight with the dragon which haunted the well. Cadmus alone could conquer it; and he did so, like Apollo, in single combat, while the dragon's teeth which he sowed produced a harvest of armed men who slew each other, leaving five only to become the ancestors of the Thebans. Athene now made him king of Thebes, while Zeus gave him Harmonia as his bride. According to one version of the tale, Cadmus and his wife, at the end of their career, were changed into dragons, and so taken up to Elysium. The names in this myth may seem to explain themselves completely by a comparison with those of other Greek legends. Among these are Agenor, Telephassa, Sarpedon. Others are not less clearly Semitic, Cadmus being the ground form of the Semitic Kedem, the East, just as Melicertes reproduces the Syrian Melcarth or Moloch

## EUROPE

EUROPE is the smallest of those divisions of the land-surface of the globe which are usually distinguished by the conventional name of continents; but favoured as it is at once by its position, its configuration, and its climate, it has played the most important part in the modern history of the world, more especially since the 16th century. The ultimate civilization of mankind must in great measure be what Europe makes it; and though, as centuries roll on, the auxiliary energies of other regions and races, receiving new impulse and development, will undoubtedly lend potent contributions to the common historic movement, the period must still be distant when Europe shall have fallen from its position of controller and pioneer. It has justly become a commonplace of geography to describe it as a mere peninsula of Asia, but, except in a purely geographical aspect, it is a peninsula as the head is a peninsula of the

body. Its individuality and its solidarity with the neighbouring continents, its originality and its indebtedness, must be equally emphasized if a just conception is to be formed of its characteristics. All its dominant and, perhaps, nearly all its distinguishable peoples, its languages, its religions, its philosophies, its social organizations, have had their origin outside of its boundaries, and have been forced by modern science to recognize their kindred elsewhere. But under its modifying influences everything has been deeply and permanently differentiated: its people are more thoroughly conscious of their dissimilarities from, than of their consanguinity with, the peoples of the East and the South; its dominant religion at least has in large measure forgotten or belied its original character and scope; its philosophies have taken colouring and shape from the practical and political life of the people; and its