

manuscript containing it. Naturally the views of scholars on the spuriousness of particular passages have varied greatly. On the main question however Matthiae is found to be in company with Hermann (1831 and 1847), Hartung (1837), Monk (1840), Dindorf, Kirchhoff, Nauck, Paley, Klotz, Hennig<sup>1</sup> and Vitelli<sup>2</sup>.

While these scholars differ among themselves in the appreciation and interpretation of the external evidence, they agree in holding that the internal evidence which condemns parts of the play is overpowering—that the inconsistencies, the superfluities, the inequalities of style, and (in the epilogue) the imperfections of the metre are so numerous and important as to compel the belief that other hands than that of Euripides have had a share in the work:—that if they did not make the gaps, at all events they filled up large gaps which they found.

Two scholars of note, however, stand champions for the integrity of the play as it has come down to us. Firnhaber (*Eurip. Iph. in Aulis*, Leipzig, 1841), and Weil (*Sept Tragédies d'Euripide*, Paris, 2nd ed. 1879) maintain that the text is genuine from beginning to end: that such imperfections as disfigure it are due to the ordinary accidents of manuscript transmission, and are not beyond the cure of an acute and learned textual criticism.

The full force of the internal evidence can only be brought out by a detailed commentary. Many of the debateable points turn on the interpretation of particular words and sentences which cannot be understood apart from their context. But there are one or two features of the text which may with advantage be viewed separately in this introduction, and which, I think, are enough to prove that the majority of modern scholars are right in their judgement of the general question.

To begin with: the prologue (vv. 1—163) consists of two passages of anapaestic dialogue with a long speech in iambics coming between them. If we leave the *Rhesus* out of account—partly because of its doubtful authorship, but still more because we are told in the second *ὑπόθεσις* to the play that it originally had an iambic prologue which had been lost, and for which another spurious prologue (also in iambics) had been substituted—the only other tragedy of Euripides which we have any reason to think began with anapaests was the *Andromeda*. The scholiast on v. 1065 of the *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes says of the passage beginning ὦ νύξ ἱερά that it is τοῦ προλόγου Ἀνδρομέδας εἰσβολή, and again at v. 1070 he says καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> *De Iph. Aul. forma ac condicione*, Berlin, 1870.

<sup>2</sup> *Osservazioni intorno ad alcuni luoghi della Ifigenia in Aulide* (Florence, 1877).