

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-01116-7 - Euripides, Volume 1  
Edited by Frederick Apthorp Paley  
Excerpt  
[More information](#)

---

**ΕΥΡΗΠΙΔΟΥ ΡΗΣΟΣ.**

## Υ Π Ο Θ Ε Σ Ι Σ.

Ῥήσος παῖς μὲν ἦν Στρυμόνος τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ Τερψιχόρης, Μουσῶν μῆς, Θρακῶν δὲ ἠγούμενος εἰς Ἴλιον παραγίγνεται νυκτὸς, στρατευομένων Τρώων παρὰ ταῖς ναυσὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων. τοῦτον Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Διομήδης κατάσκοποι ὄντες ἀναιροῦσιν, Ἀθηναῖς αὐτοῖς ὑποθεμένης, ὡς μέγαν ἐσόμενον τοῖς Ἑλλησι κίνδυνον ἐκ τούτου. Τερψιχόρη δὲ ἐπιφανείσα τὸ τοῦ παιδὸς σῶμα ἀνείλετο. ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ δὲ διαλαμβάνει καὶ περὶ τοῦ φόνου τοῦ Δόλωνος.

Ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ δράματος ἐν Τροίᾳ. ὁ δὲ χορὸς συνέστηκεν ἐκ φυλάκων Τρωικῶν, οἳ καὶ προλογίζουσι. περιέχει δὲ νυκτεγερασίαν.

Τὸ δὲ δράμα ἔνιοι νόθον ὑπενόησαν, ὡς οὐκ ἂν Εὐριπίδου· τὸν γὰρ Σοφοκλεῖον μᾶλλον ὑποφαίνει χαρακτῆρα. ἐν μέντοι ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις ὡς γνήσιον ἀναγέγραπται, καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρσια δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πολυπραγμοσύνη τὸν Εὐριπίδην ὁμολογεῖ.

Πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται· ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως·

Νῦν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἡ διφρηλάτος.

ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος, πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρόπων Εὐριπίδῃ· καὶ τάχα ἂν τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως·

ᾠ τοῦ μεγίστου Ζητὸς ἄλκιμον τέκος  
 Παλλὰς, παρῶμεν· οὐκ ἐχρῆν ἡμᾶς ἔτι  
 μέλλειν Ἀχαιῶν ὠφελεῖν στρατεύματα.  
 νῦν γὰρ κακῶς πρᾶσσουσιν ἐν μάχῃ δορὸς,  
 λόγῃ βιαίως Ἔκτορος στροβούμενοι.  
 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἄλγιον βᾶρος,  
 ἐξ οὗ γ' ἔκρινε Κύπριν Ἀλέξανδρος θεᾶν  
 κάλλει προήκειν τῆς ἐμῆς εὐμορφίας  
 καὶ σῆς, Ἀθάνᾳ, φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν,  
 εἰ μὴ κατασκαφεῖσαν ὄψομαι πόλιν  
 Πριάμου, βίᾳ πρόρριζον ἐκτετριμμένην.

ΑΛΛΩΣ.

Ἔκτωρ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐπικοιτῶν ἀκούσας αὐτοὺς πυρκαΐειν, εὐλαβήθη μὴ φύγῳσιν. ἐξοπλίζειν δὲ διεγνωκῶς τὰς δυνάμεις μετενόησεν Αἰνείου συμβουλεύσαντος ἡσυχάζειν, κατὰσκοπον δὲ πέμψαντας δι' ἐκείνου τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἱστορῆσαι. Δόλωνα δὲ πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν ὑπακούσαντα ἐκπέμπεσθαι . . . . καὶ τόπον εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀφώρισεν αὐτῷ. ἐπιφανέντες δὲ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα καὶ Δόλωνα μὲν ἀνηρηκότες, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν Ἔκτορος κοίτην ἐλθόντες, πάλιν ὑπέστρεφον οὐχ εὔροντες τὸν στρατηγόν. οὗς Ἀθηναῖ ἐπιφανεῖσα κατέσχευεν. καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἔκτορα ἐκέλευσε μὴ ζητεῖν, Ῥῆσον δὲ ἀναιρεῖν ἐκέλευσε. τὸν γὰρ ἐκ τούτου κίνδυνον μείζονα ἔσσεσθαι, ἔαν βιώσῃ· τούτων δὲ ἐπιφανεῖς Ἀλέξανδρος . . . . ἐξαπατηθεῖς δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀθηναῖς, ὡς δῆθεν ὑπὸ Ἀφροδίτης, ἄπρακτος ὑπέστρεφεν· οἱ δὲ περὶ Διομήδην φονεύσαντες Ῥῆσον ἐχωρίσθησαν. καὶ ἡ συμφορὰ τῶν ἀνηρημένων καθ' ὅλον ἦλθε τὸ στρατεύμα.

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-01116-7 - Euripides, Volume 1  
 Edited by Frederick Apthorp Paley  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

## R H E S U S.

---

THE *Rhesus* is remarkable as being the only extant Greek drama, the plot of which is taken from the direct action of the Iliad. Numerous as are the plays (nearly half of those which have come down to us) relating to the capture of Troy and the events subsequent to it, ἡ Τρωϊκὴ πραγματεία, the Tragic writers seem to have avoided the ground hallowed by the immortal poet,—the ἱερός λειμῶν,—and to have preferred borrowing their themes from the Cyclic poems which formed as it were the sequel to his great work.

In this instance however the poet has adapted the narrative of the Δολωνεία, or tenth book of the Iliad, and the outline of the play is as follows :—Hector is aroused in the night by his sentinels, who have observed an unusual commotion in the Argive camp; and he prepares for an immediate night attack, full of confidence that the Greeks, finding their post no longer tenable in the Troad, are about to attempt a secret escape. Aeneas however, suspecting treachery, checks his ardour by representing the uncertainty of the movement and the great danger of a sudden assault, and advises that a spy should be sent into the Grecian camp to ascertain the meaning of the bale-fires which have been seen there during the whole night. Dolon, a soldier in Hector's company, volunteers to undertake this office on the promise of being rewarded with the horses of Achilles. He returns to his house for a proper outfit, the skin of a wolf, with which he proposes to cover his whole body, and so disguised to walk on hands and knees close up to the camp. While he is absent, news is brought to Hector, by a shepherd of the royal flocks, of the arrival of Rhesus, King of Thrace, in a splendid chariot drawn by snow-white steeds, and attended by a countless host (v. 310). Hector, on the first interview, testily rejects his services, as having arrived too late; and Rhesus defends himself on the plea of having been detained by an irruption of the Scythians which he had to quell while on his march to Troy. At length, after loudly boasting of the services he will speedily perform against the Greeks, he is admitted by Hector, though rather as a guest than an ally. Meanwhile, Ulysses and

Diomed had captured Dolon, and having ascertained from him the watchword and the exact position of Hector's tent, they stealthily enter the Trojan lines, with the intention of slaying him. Finding however that he is absent, they are preparing to attack some other of the Trojan chiefs, when Pallas appears, and points out to them that the white steeds of Rhesus will be a more magnificent prize. Their design is nearly frustrated by the approach of Paris to warn Hector that Greek spies are among them; but Pallas, under the guise of the friendly Cypris, succeeds in persuading him that his information is unworthy of credit. Rhesus is then slain and the horses are captured; but the Trojans are now roused, and Ulysses is seized. With his usual craft and self-possession he pretends to be a friend, gives the right watchword and is allowed to depart. The charioteer of Rhesus, who has been badly wounded, then relates the capture of the steeds, and charges Hector openly with treachery, in the belief that the aggressors were Trojans. Hector lays the fault on the sentinels for letting enemies pass unchallenged; and with difficulty appeases the wounded man by promising that the slain Thracians shall have an honourable interment in Troy. The play ends (faultily, as some think,) with the lamentation of one of the Muses, the Mother of Rhesus, for her slain son. She upbraids Pallas, whose city of Athens the sisterhood had ever honoured, for ungratefully instigating the deed; and she confers on Rhesus the divine honours of a hero among the Thracians for all time.

Homer has treated the subject somewhat differently. Agamemnon and Menelaus take counsel together what is best to be done after the unusual and important successes of Hector. Nestor advises that the Greek chiefs should be roused, the sentinels visited, and a scout sent to see what the Trojans are intending to do. Diomed and Ulysses proceed on this mission, and are encouraged on the way by a favourable omen from Pallas; but Hector also is awake, and on his part sends spies at the very same time into the Greek camp. Dolon accepts the service on condition of receiving the horses of Achilles, and, as in the play, is arrested by Diomed and Ulysses, who extort from him the confession that he is sent by Hector to see whether the Argives are planning their departure, and to ascertain whether a guard is kept over their ships. He also, in the hope of his life being spared, informs them of the arrival of Rhesus with his white steeds. But no quarter is shown him; Diomed strikes off his head, and the two proceed to the Thracian encampment. They suddenly attack the sleeping and weary host, slay many of them, including Rhesus, and drive off his horses, leaving the chariot behind, safely into the Grecian camp.

It will be seen that the incidents are in the main identical. But Euripides lays the scene wholly in the Trojan camp, while Homer opens with the doings of the Greeks. Euripides also enlarges on some of the circumstances, as the arrival of Rhesus and his slaughter, the intervention of Pallas, and the stratagem of Dolon to escape observation; while others he has added, as the accusation of Hector by the charioteer, the epilogue of the Muse, &c.

Great doubts have been entertained in modern times respecting the authorship of the Rhesus; and critics and commentators have generally acted on the suspicion, by citing from the play as "Incerti Rhesus." These doubts seem to have originated in the remark in the Greek Argument, that "some have considered the play spurious, because it shows indications of the Sophoclean style; but," it is added distinctly, "*it is given as the genuine work of Euripides in the Didascalie.*" Now it so happens, that of all the ancient grammarians who have quoted or mentioned the play, or written comments, *ὑπομνήματα*, upon it, not one speaks of it as the work of any other poet than Euripides. If they do not all expressly assign it to him by name, at least they throw no suspicion upon it. The style of the play, its beautiful versification, and its pure Attic idioms, are evidences that it came from a master's hand; nay, the very assertion, that some attributed it to Sophocles, is the highest testimony to its acknowledged merit and antiquity. But then, it is said, certain words, and constructions, and epic licences occur in it (it is needless here to append a list of them), which are not found in the other plays of Euripides; and the plot is tame and deficient in tragic interest. For the first, it is sufficient to reply, that there is hardly a play to which the same remark does not apply more or less; for the second, that the plot is Homer's, and not the poet's; and for both, that it is said in the scholia to be an early production of his (*Κράτης ἀγνοεῖν φησὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην τὴν περὶ τὰ μετέωρα θεωρίαν, διὰ τὸ νέον ἔτι εἶναι ὅτε τὸν Ῥῆσον ἐδίδασκε.* S. on v. 528.) From the same scholia we learn that the celebrated grammarians Aristarchus, Parmeniscus and Dionysodorus his pupils, and Crates who belonged to a rival school, all assigned the drama to Euripides. Tzetzes, Stobaeus, and Eustathius, in much later times, did the same. According to Vater (in whose learned and elaborate *Vindiciae* the whole subject is most amply discussed,) Scaliger was the first of the moderns who doubted the authorship of the play; but his objection seems to have rested mainly on what is really, according to the Greek Argument, an evidence directly the other way, the astronomical passage in v. 528 seqq. The notion of Hermann (the keenest opponent of the ancient opinion that Euripides wrote the play,) was, that the Rhesus was the work

of some Alexandrine imitator; but this cannot for a moment be sustained, if we compare the simple and elegant style of the play with the affected bombast and obscurity of that school of writers. In truth, if it resembles any style but that of Euripides, it is rather Aeschylean than Sophoclean; for the occasional use of his words and a rather elevated tone of diction do point somewhat in that direction. Vater (with whom the present editor agrees) is a strenuous advocate for Euripides as the real author. He truly says (p. xxiv) “*Licet in multis dissimilis haec Rhesus sit reliquis Euripidis Tragoediis, tamen insunt haud pauca, quae artem et ingenium hujus poetae produunt.*” And he proves the assertion by a minute examination of the details, doctrines, and allusions in the play. Of recent critics, Matthiae and Elmsley, though they formerly assigned it to some other poet, latterly changed their views. Bothe also and G. Dindorf take the same view, the latter admitting that “*vetustissimis quibusque et doctissimis grammaticis genuinam hanc visam esse fabulam Euripidis.*” And he thinks (though this opinion is barely plausible) that like the *Alcestis* and possibly the *Heraclidae*, it may have been the fourth of a tetralogy, and so have taken the place of a Satyric drama. Valckenaer, in a long but not altogether just critique on the plot of the *Rhesus*, founds his doubts principally on certain weak points in the character of Hector, whom he conceives none of the three great tragic poets would have so represented. Vater replies to these cavillings *seriatim*, and so far from judging the play a poor and second-rate production, he says, “*tantum abest ut hoc drama ineptum judicem, ut ceteris Euripidis tragoediis praestare paene dicam*” (p. xliv). Unquestionably, it has great merit: it is *worthy* of Euripides, if he did not write it. Moreover, it contains some internal evidences of his style. Such are, the frequent mention of σοφοὶ and σοφιστᾶι, the passage about an unmarried life being happier (v. 980—2), the several *altercations*, of which Euripides was so notoriously fond, as between Hector and Aeneas, Hector and Rhesus, &c., the *sententious* verses which occur, though rather sparingly, (see Vater, p. clvi.) and not a few peculiarities of diction which, as Vater well says, “*sentiri possunt, exponi nequeunt.*”

But after all, it is rather a question of *testimony* than of style. If that testimony is distinct, consistent, and given by several competent writers of early date *for* the genuineness, and if the style is not very decidedly *against* it, then we have no right to take the side of incredulity. And this is just the state of the case. No man can *prove* the play to have come from another hand: the Didascaliae, the grammarians, and the *constans fama* of antiquity, assert that Euripides was the author.

There is no evidence by which the date of the *Rhesus* can be determined. The statement of Crates, that Euripides wrote it when young, is to a certain extent confirmed by the early style, viz., the approximation to Aeschylean and Sophoclean choiceness of words, and the absence of the *common-place* diction which he afterwards affected. Vater draws an ingenious inference from the apotheosis of Rhesus (v. 962 seqq.) that it was acted about the time when Hagnon conducted an Attic colony to Ἐννέα Ὀδοὶ in Thrace, and translated thither the bones of Rhesus from Troy. This was in Ol. LXXXV. 4, or B.C. 437, two years before the *Alcestis*. Though but little credit attaches to this conjecture, the date assigned, or thereabouts, is likely enough in itself. Obviously however this does not suit the statement that Euripides was *young*, since he was born B.C. 480.

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-01116-7 - Euripides, Volume 1  
Edited by Frederick Athorp Paley  
Excerpt  
[More information](#)

*ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ.*

---

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΦΥΛΑΚΩΝ ΤΡΩΙΚΩΝ.

ΕΚΤΩΡ.

ΑΙΝΕΙΑΣ.

ΔΟΔΩΝ.

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ.

ΡΗΣΟΣ.

ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ.

ΔΙΟΜΗΔΗΣ.

ΑΘΗΝΑ.

ΠΑΡΙΣ.

ΜΟΥΣΑ.

ΡΗΣΟΥ ΗΝΙΟΧΟΣ.

## ΕΥΡΥΠΙΔΟΥ ΡΗΣΟΣ.

### ΧΟΡΟΣ.

Βάθι πρὸς εὐνάς τὰς Ἐκτορέους  
 τις ὑπασπιστῶν ἄγρυπνος βασιλέως,  
 εἰ τευχοφόρων δέξαιτο νέων  
 κληδὸνα μύθων,  
 οἷ τετράμοιρον νυκτὸς φρουρὰν  
 πάσης στρατιᾶς προκάθηται.  
 ὄρθου κεφαλὴν πῆχυν ἐρείσας,

5

1. There are but four of the extant Greek tragedies which commence without a prologue, properly so called, but with a system of anapaests, viz. the *Suppliants* and the *Persians*, the *Rhesus* and the *Iphigenia at Aulis*. The two last alone are in the form of a dialogue, and indeed bear some striking resemblances to each other. It is singular that these two plays should be the earliest and the latest of our author. The two prologues spoken of in the Greek argument were doubtless spurious additions. That quoted at length is far from περὶ πάντων καὶ οὐ πρότερον Εὐρύπιδου. The very fact however of their being *two* shows that they were both attempts to supply a supposed deficiency.

The chorus, consisting of Trojan sentinels who constitute the fourth night-watch, (cf. v. 5, 541,) τευχοφόροι, i. e. ὄπλιται, approach the stage, and call on any one of Hector's staff (ὑπασπιστῶν) who may be awake to rouse their general, on account of some sudden and unusual commotion seen in the Grecian camp. After a momentary pause at v. 6, they address Hector himself, in somewhat hur-

ried and excited tones, as appears from v. 15.

5. τετράμοιρον, i. e. τετάρτην, the compound alluding also to the allotment of the sentinels, κλήρου κατὰ μοῖραν, inf. 545. There is an unimportant variant φυλακὴν for φρουρὰν. The Aldine ed. with one Paris MS. adds πόλεως (MS. βασιλέως) Τροίας before προκάθηται. Vater here follows Aldus; but Dind. rightly omits the words. Grammarians were very fond of patching up catalectic anapaestics. For the accusative, which falls under the head of a cognate object (= καθῆσθαι ἔδραν πρὸ στρατιᾶς), cf. ἡμένα κοίτας inf. 548, κοιμάσθαι φρουρὰν Ag. 2. The Schol. reminds us that οἱ ἀρχαῖοι εἰς τρεῖς φυλακὰς νέμονται τὴν νύκτα. Ὅμηρος, Ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην, μετὰ δ' ἄστρα βεβήκει. But πέμπτη φυλακὴ is mentioned inf. 543.

7. πῆχυν ἐρείσας. 'Planting the forearm so as to prop the head,'—the attitude of one just roused to listen. Probably from Il. x. 80, ὀρθωθείς δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος, κεφαλὴν ἐπαείρας, Ἀτρεΐδην προσέειπε. So κοιμώμενος ἀγκαθεν, Ag. 3. This verse is omitted in the Aldine.