

David KOVACS

Throwing out the Baby in *Iphigenia in Aulis*

This paper, based on an article forthcoming in *JHS*, proposes a radical reassessment of the problem of interpolation in *IA*. Diggle's edition tries to separate Euripides' contribution from all later hands, somewhat tentatively by means of a new set of sigla that have reminded some of *Consumer Reports*. My aim is to recover what the audience heard at the posthumous production of 405, a text I call FP for First Performance. This was probably the incomplete script Euripides left behind, supplemented by Euripides Minor, the poet's son or nephew. The transmitted text contains, as Page showed in 1934, material added for a 4C revival, as well as additions at the end of the play from the very end of antiquity. The attempt to reconstruct FP is greatly aided by a discovery first made by Willink in *CQ* for 1971. One major result of my reconstruction is the elimination of the role of Baby Orestes, played by a doll.

The discovery is that the transmitted text contains two different conceptions of Calchas' oracle, only one of which belonged to FP. From some parts of the play (e.g. 538-40) it is plain that the oracle was known to the entire army, whereas other portions say or imply that it was known only to Agamemnon's inner circle. The "private oracle" motif, I argue, is the work of a 4C producer, whom I call the Reviser. Why this innovation? The Reviser wanted to introduce into the play scenes where Greek soldiers, not knowing why Iphigenia has come to Aulis, may make naive comments or ask questions that are ironic in view of the actual situation, this being an emotional effect he found congenial. We find two such passages in places that are under grave suspicion, the entrance of Clytaemestra, where a chorus of Argives felicitate Iphigenia on her wonderful prospects, and the first messenger, who reports similar questions from the soldiery at large. Both these passages have linguistic and dramaturgical features (e.g. the mid-line entrance at 414) that make them highly suspicious. Euripides did not write them, and it is a virtual certainty that Euripides Minor did not write them either. Here is strong evidence for the existence and characteristics of the Reviser.

We can detect his hand at other places in the play. The same naive questions about Iphigenia's coming to Aulis occur in the prologue anapaests (124-35), and a strong case will be made that FP began with the iambs 49-105, and that the anapaests and the bridge passage 106-14 are the work of the Reviser. Some words and expressions not found elsewhere in tragedy or in Euripides make several appearances in our text in places that are suspicious on other grounds. Among these are *thumon (ep)airein* in the sense "be angry" (125, 919), *mega* or *deina phusan* of the breathing of a man in high dudgeon (125, 381), and expressions involving the perfect participle of *logizomai* (386, 922, and 1021: cf. also 1409). These and similar reasons permit us to assign to the Reviser both tedious bits like 919-43 and some passages that have hitherto escaped suspicion.

The Reviser liked not only spectacle (607-30) and unintentional irony but also the pathos of having a baby take part in proceedings he does not understand. The text we have puts Baby Orestes on stage, played by a doll. Agamemnon alludes to his coming as something that makes his situation more difficult (465-6), he appears in the grand entrance scene

(622-6), and he is brought out when Clytaemestra and Iphigenia supplicate Agamemnon (1119). Iphigenia at one point asks him to weep to his father on her behalf. No weeping ensues (naturally), so Iphigenia remarks that Orestes is supplicating his father *by his silence* (1241-5). Every one of these passages except the last has other indications of spuriousness. The baby, like the secret oracle which he twice accompanies, should be thrown out.