

As to Menelaus, he is cool and crafty in the pursuit of his object—the recovery of his wife and the punishment of her lover. It is open to doubt, but I think his renunciation of his claims at *vv.* 471 ff. is meant by the poet to be only a simulated one. The suddenness with which he admits the force of the arguments he has just been combating, and the artful suggestion at *v.* 495—*ἴτω στρατεία διαλυθεῖσ' ἐξ Αὐλίδος*—of the consequences of the abandonment of the pursuit—and at *v.* 498 of Agamemnon's interest in the expedition—*εἰ δέ τι κόρης σῆς θεσφάτων μέτεστί σοι*—all point to the conclusion that he sees his brother is but half-hearted in his protest, and that all that is needed to decide him to sacrifice his daughter is that he should be brought face to face with the alternative. Such a character is consistent with the picture of Menelaus which Euripides gives of him in the *Andromache* and in the *Orestes*. It is natural too that such should be the character in Euripides of the king of that people of whom he wrote at *Andromache vv.* 446 ff. that they were

δόλια βουλευτήρια,  
 ψευδῶν ἄνακτες, μηχανορράφοι κακῶν,  
 ἐλικτὰ κοῦδέν ὑγίης, ἀλλὰ πᾶν πέριξ  
 φρονοῦντες.

It has been held by many that in the *Bacchae*, which like the *Iphigenia Aulidensis* was a work of the last days of the poet, Euripides had the special object of vindicating his belief in the supernatural against a charge of infidelity. It is well known that he had been called a woman-hater as well as an infidel by his contemporaries. Is it not possible that he designed in this other work of his old age to show the world that, in his fancy at least, a woman might be perfect?

#### *State of the Text.*

Having thus attempted to show that in the Euripidean *Iphigenia at Aulis* we have a great subject nobly treated—that the arrangement of the plot and the elaboration of the main scenes reveal consummate dramatic art—I now propose to consider what are the indications that the play as we have it has suffered something more than the usual 'wear and tear' of literary transmission.

The two manuscripts on which we depend for our text are No. 287 of the Palatine manuscripts in the Library of the Vatican, which I follow Prinz in calling P (Kirchhoff's *B*), and No. 32, 2 in the Laurentian Library at Florence, Prinz's L (Kirchhoff's *C*). Both of these mss. appear to have been copied from the same original, and to