THE SCAR OF ORESTES: OBSERVATIONS ON A EURIPIDEAN INNOVATION

The recognition of Orestes and Electra in Euripides' *Electra* has assumed a status as a justifiably famous scene in one of the playwright's most important and well-studied works. After an old family acquaintance has been unable to convince Electra that the traditional lock of hair, foot-print, and piece of weaving which he has found near Agamemnon's tomb betoken Orestes' arrival (487–546), he points out a scar on the face of this newly-arrived stranger (who just happens to be standing near by); he recognizes it immediately as conclusive proof that Orestes has come back; and he persuades Electra that this is in fact the case (547–574). The abundant scholarship on the scene has clearly demonstrated that it operates on a multitude of levels and with a multitude of purposes: Aeschylus is parodied[1]); regardless of which *Electra* is prior, Sophoclean canons of heroism are assaulted; a series of tantalizing delays and almost-recognitions is finally ended[2]); and various traits of Euripides' Electra herself are emphasized both in her denial of the traditional tokens (which of course turn out to be as valid now as they ever were) and in her instantaneous acceptance of the new token[3]). But in spite of its innovative quality, comparatively little has been done with the scar itself[4]), and particularly with

---

1) See esp. G.W.Bond, "Euripides' Parody of Aeschylus", *Hermathena* 118 (1974) 1–14. A recent revival of the *Oresteia* is regularly considered a likely inspiration of Euripides' play.

2) The discussion of F.Solmsen is excellent: "Electra and Orestes: Three Recognitions in Greek Tragedy", *Med. Konin. Nederl. Akad. van Wet. afd. Letterk.*, n.r. 20.2 (Amsterdam, 1967) 9–18. See too his earlier study, "Euripides' *Ion* im Vergleich mit anderen Tragödien", *Hermes* 69 (1934) 390–419, esp. 391 ff.

3) See esp. R.P.Winnington-Ingram, "Euripides: *Poetes Sophos*", *Arethusa* 2 (1969) 129, and the provocative comments of P.Pucci, "Euripides Heautontimoroumenos", *TAPA* 98 (1967) esp. 368–371.

4) It is not infrequently omitted from discussions of the play: see G.Norwood, *Greek Tragedy* (London, 1920; paperback, New York, 1960) 252–8; or it is afforded merely passing attention: e.g., A.Lesky, *Die tragi-*

what it may contribute to the sustained themes of the play; hence, this short essay which will consider the scar from the standpoint of two such themes.

I

In the first place, it is possible that Euripides found in the scar one of several means whereby he could depict Orestes as fundamentally unheroic. This is an integral characterization in a play which probes, as many have observed, the very concept of traditional heroism within its more general examination of the entire topic of the criteria according to which human worth should be judged and evaluated[5]). Recent scholarship in this connection has repeatedly established that in this play Euripides sets up mythological foils to Orestes and his actions[6]). The comparisons do not in the least enhance the stature of Orestes. The messenger, for instance, recounts in typically gruesome detail the ambush whereby Orestes slew Aegisthus from behind, while the victim was concentrating on a sacrifical ceremony (774–858). He provides us with an important clue for the proper assessment of Orestes, and a vividly transparent hint at the way Euripides is operating in this play, by announcing that Orestes

---

sche Dichtung der Hellenen (ed. 3, Göttingen, 1972) 397. Occasionally it is related to general features of the play: T.B.L.Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London, 1967) 144, argues, for example, that by changing recognition tokens, Euripides transfers the story from heroic legend to contemporary life, which he does in other ways as well. And the scar has even fit into negative assessments of the play (e.g., A.D.Fitton-Brown, "The Recognition-Scene of the *Choephori*", *REG* 74 [1961] 363–70, esp. 369f.); on the other hand, it is most interesting to note that even A.W. Schlegel, for whom the play was "the very worst of Euripides' pieces", felt compelled to judge the innovation "superb": *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*[2] (tr. J.Black; ed. A.J.W.Morrison) (London and New York, 1892) 129 (the earlier quotation is on 133).

5) See, for example, M.J.O'Brien, "Orestes and the Gorgon: Euripides' *Electra*", *AJP* 85 (1964) 13–39, esp. 32ff.

6) O'Brien, *ibid.*, 16ff. is excellent. Suggestive comments are also to be found in M.Kubo, "The Norm of Myth: Euripides' *Electra*", *HSCP* 71 (1966) 15–31; and J.Ferguson, *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Austin, Texas, 1972) 388–93. Most recently G.Walsh, "The First *Stasimon* of Euripides' *Electra*", *YCS* 25 (1977) 277–89, esp. 282ff. analyzes the foil provided by Agamemnon. Of earlier works, W.Headlam, "Notes on Euripides", *CR* 15 (1901) 99–100, and J.T.Sheppard, "The *Electra* of Euripides", *CR* 32 (1918) 140 deserve mention in this connection.

is arriving back on stage bringing the head not of the Gorgon but of Aegisthus:

ἔρχεταί σοι
κάρα 'πιδείξων οὐχὶ Γοργόνος φέρων,
ἀλλ' ὃν στυγεῖς Αἴγισθον. (855–7)

This remark is certainly as fascinating for what it says of Orestes as for what it says of Aegisthus[7]), for in no way ought Orestes be judged to have acted in a manner worthy of Perseus, even if the actions of both men had, as it were, made the world a safer place in which to live. An earlier ode (432–486) had elevated Perseus (and indeed Achilles as well) to heroic levels, and had implicitly compared Orestes with them. And the slaying of Aegisthus alone, without consideration of other episodes in the play, underscores how far short of these exemplars Orestes is. It may not be a man's actions, heroic as their models may be, which determine worth.

Comparisons between Orestes and Odysseus figure as well in the play, as recent scholarship (particularly an essay by Joachim Dingel published in this journal) has demonstrated[8]). For much about Orestes' situation – his return home[9]) after a period of exile as a disguised person in his own homeland, awaiting reunion with a beloved member of his family and the opportunity to exact revenge – all this is stated in such a way as to suggest, and to contrast, Odysseus. The scar is surely to be understood in this connection. Just as an old family acquaintance recognizes the returning Orestes by means of a scar incurred years ago, so too does the old Eurycleia recognize Odysseus by

7) On which see esp. O'Brien (above, n. 5) *passim*.

8) "Der 24. Gesang der *Odyssee* und die *Elektra* des Euripides", *RM* 112 (1969) 103–109. The scar serves as Dingel's starting point (103–4), but its thematic implications are not fully explored; moreover, it will become apparent that the innovation is, in my opinion, based on recollections of more than just Book 24 of Homer's poem. Along this line, for example, the poem's sustained use of Orestes and Telemachus as foils to each other may well serve as a foil against which we may understand the play's use of Orestes and Odysseus as foils to each other. Of earlier studies, A. Hähnle's *Gnōrismata* (Tübingen Diss., 1929) appreciates the influence of the recognition scenes of the *Odyssey* (21.217ff.; 23.73ff.; 24.329ff.; in addition to that in 19) on subsequent recognition scenes; but he ignores Euripides' *Electra*, and in general offers little more than a factual catalogue of other tokens and scenes.

9) Perhaps by sea, if κέλσας (139) is not simply metaphorical; in any case the word is suggestive of an *Odyssey*-like atmosphere.

the scar on his leg as she prepares to bathe him the first night he is back home in his own estates (*Od.* 19. 386–393)[10]). But the differences are even more significant than is the essential similarity, as consideration of the two sets of circumstances under which the scars were acquired will demonstrate. As we learn in the course of a lengthy, delaying digression immediately after Eurycleia notices the scar (393–466), Odysseus journeyed long ago to the estates of his maternal grandfather Autolycus in order to receive from him honorific gifts. While there he allied himself with the sons of the noble Autolycus and participated in the hunt of a great boar on the slopes of famous Mt. Parnassus. He was indeed the boar's chief assailant (447–454). Almost killed by the beast, he managed to escape with a serious wound, which was later mended by the sons of Autolycus and which left behind a scar, visible proof of his earlier heroic feat.

It is during the recognition scene of the play that we learn that Orestes received his scar years ago when he slipped and fell, thereby drawing blood, during a chase with Electra of a fawn in their father's courtyard:

> Old Man: *οὐλὴν παρ' ὀφρύν, ἣν ποτ' ἐν πατρὸς δόμοις*
> *νεβρὸν διώκων σοῦ μέθ' ἡμάχθη πεσών.* (573–4)

The contrasts with Odysseus and his scar could be neither more forceful nor more explicit: the noble sons of Autolycus are contrasted with a sister, a ferocious boar with a harmless fawn, and glorious Mt. Parnassus with a father's estates. Incidentally the very sequel of our play presents a remarkably similar occasion in Orestes' life: again with his sister (and this time with her enthusiastic encouragement and help), he pursues defenseless foes[11]) in the vicinity of his father's estates, after which, as the finale so clearly certifies, his emotional happiness is drastically shaken and, we might say, scarred[12]). Euripides seems, in fact, to

---

10) The fact, but not its significance, has been noted before: cf. Barnes, *ap.* F. Paley, *ad loc.* (*Euripides, with an English Commentary* II; London, 1874) 360, *ad* 573; and D. Baccini, *Euripide, Elettra* (Napoli, 1959) *ad* 573.

11) At the time of their deaths they are defenseless; Aegisthus had, of course, earlier placed a bounty on the life of Orestes (31–3).

12) Rightly stressed, for example, by C. Whitman, *Euripides and the Full Circle of Myth* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974) 132–3; and B. Vickers, *Towards Greek Tragedy* (London, 1973) 563–4. Optimism and hope have been recently detected in the play's finale by P. Vellacott, *Ironic Drama:* A *Study of Euripides' Method and Meaning* (Cambridge, 1975) 236–7.

be establishing some sort of parallelism between two distinct events in Orestes' life. Repetition, of course, constitutes a central feature in the lives of members of the House of Atreus according to numerous treatments of their histories. In addition, as we are seeing, Euripides may be employing his innovation in order to stress specific themes and emphases with which his present play is concerned.

The mythical foil which the scar suggests thus serves to remind us of the essentially unheroic fellow Euripides is portraying in Orestes. Its implications of unheroism are most appropriate for an Orestes who returns home in order to spy on the situation and the immediately announces that he will flee if necessary (96–7)[13]). They are as befitting a "hero" who shows incessant vacillation and irresolution during the long recognition scene as well as a total lack of ability to act on his own during the sequel in which the murders are planned[14]). And they are demonstrably apt for a character who, as already pointed out, ambushes one of his victims[15]) and who has to be so goaded on to the second murder that it is possible to maintain that the moral decision to commit it is not his. Indeed, Electra goes out of the way to claim a share in the actual physical act of murdering Clytemnestra (1224–5). Whatever scars in general may have suggested to Greeks of the late fifth century (a topic which is in need of considerably more investigation than it has heretofore received), in the case of Euripides' Orestes the scar duplicates

---

13) The following actions of Orestes have received a variety of assessments. His essential cowardice is emphasized, for example, by S. M. Adams, "Two Plays of Euripides: II. Orestes in the *Electra*", *CR* 49 (1935) 120–2; H.D.F. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy*[3] (London, 1961; paperback, New York, 1966) 338–40; and O'Brien (above, n. 5) 19. His prudence is stressed by U. Albini, "L'*Elettra* di *Euripide*", *Maia* 14 (1962) 85–108; Solmsen (above, n. 2) 11. A noble and essentially sympathetic Orestes is detected by G.M.A. Grube, *The Drama of Euripides* (London, 1941) esp. 302–9 (Grube's entire discussion offers excellent comments on the character portrayals of the play); J.T. Sheppard (above, n. 6) 137–41; and, of earlier scholars, A. Mau, "Zu Euripides Elektra", *Commentationes Philologae in Honorem Theodori Mommseni* (Berlin, 1877) 291–301. Little interest seems to have been shown in E. Blaiklock's suggestion that Orestes' indecision stems from the warped imagination with which, in essence, he is cursed: *The Male Characters of Euripides* (Wellington, New Zealand, 1952) 166–73.

14) Orestes' inability to plot the murders is well-treated, for example, by Vickers (above, n. 12) 560.

15) On the details, and their dramatic value, see esp. G. Arnott, "Euripides and the Unexpected", *G & R* 20 (1973) 55–6.

other blemishes which we detect in the course of the play[16]). And whatever else Euripides may have suggested of Odysseus in such plays as *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women*, here in *Electra* he may be holding up Odysseus' accomplishments, as he is those of Achilles and Perseus, as having a genuine degree of merit to them, because of which Odysseus' inability to measure up is all the more unfortunate[17]).

II

There is a second, though related, thematic dimension of the *Electra* to which the scar gives emphasis. As do so many other works of Euripides, the *Electra* includes a striking number of passages in which, in a variety of ways, the reality of a situation is placed in sharp contrast with the reputation it enjoys; or, to state the matter differently, the truth about a situation is contrasted with current falsehoods about it. Some of the instances in the *Electra* are quite famous, such as the discrepancy between the Aegisthus portrayed by Electra and the Aegisthus described by the messenger; but these contrasts have never been studied as a sustained thematic pattern[18]), and hence they have not been related to the scar. At the start, for instance, Electra's farmer-husband refers to Orestes as his brother-in-law λόγοισι (47; cf. 1286). The comment reminds us of the fact that the farmer has not consummated the marriage to Electra, and that it

---

16) See in general S. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides* (London, 1971) chapter 5, for documentation of the fact that in most plays Euripides overturns the interrelationship, common in Homer, of moral and physical ugliness (79ff, esp. 84). It may not be without significance that a play which concerns itself with the validity of Homeric heroism presents a character who, in true Homeric fashion, is morally and physically blemished.

17) A second possibility strikes me as less likely (although, it must be admitted, more consistent with Euripides' overall conception of Odysseus: see W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme* [London, 1963; paperback, Ann Arbor, 1968] 111–17): we may judge Orestes as even worse a hero than he appears to be because his model is one whom Euripides continuously criticizes in other plays.

18) Passing comments on the theme are offered, for example, by J. Jones, *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy* (New York, 1962; paperback, 1968) 245–6; and C. R. Beye, *Ancient Greek Literature and Society* (New York, 1975) 286. Several excellent occurrences are highlighted in T. England, "The *Electra* of Euripides", *CR* 40 (1926) esp. 99–102. This is, of course, not the only play in which the theme occurs: see Whitman (above, n. 12) 35–68 on the *Helen*, for instance.

is only a marriage "in word" that the two have; appropriately Electra terms it a "deathly marriage" (*θανάσιμον γάμον*, 247). For his part Orestes states quite early in the play that "people say that Electra lives yoked in marriage and is no longer a virgin" (98–9), which we know from the farmer's description and Electra's own protestations to be false. Later (at 558ff.) Orestes contrasts the appearance of a splendid looking coin, and the enormous worth which this appearance itself implies, with its real value which emerges upon close examination and the recognition that it is counterfeit. And, of course, a famous passage presents Orestes as a questioning and sermonizing philosopher, discoursing at considerable length about the inability to discern the true worth of a human being when such external attributes as wealth, ancestral lineage, and martial valor are unreliable and deceptive, for they belong to unworthy people; and when such decent but underprivileged fellows as Electra's farmer-husband receive not a single reward befitting their genuine and inherent worth (367–400; cf. 262). Such are, he urges, the problems with any of the traditional standards which estimate worth. In light of the fact that Orestes' own earlier actions have forced us to question traditional evaluative norms, his words here are, ironically, truer than he himself would probably be able to admit or even recognize[19]).

Actually the situation is rather more complex[20]). Immediately after proclaiming these fine-sounding sentiments, Orestes, still maintaining his disguise, expresses the wish that he could have arrived at a more prosperous house on this mission which he has undertaken on behalf of Orestes:

> *ἐβουλόμην δ' ἄν, εἰ κασίγνητός με σὸς*
> *ἐς εὐτυχοῦντας ἦγεν εὐτυχῶν δόμους.* (397–8)

Elsewhere, too, in full demonstration of this blatant snobbery Orestes refers to the house as worthy only of some menial herdsman or ditch-digger (*σκαφεὺς τις ἢ βουφορβὸς ἄξιος δόμων*, 252);

---

19) Grube (above, n. 13) 304, relates the speech to an essentially honorable Orestes, as do Webster (above, n. 2) 145 and A.W.H.Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility* (Oxford, 1960) 176–7 and 195. Its thematic value for the play as a whole, together with several of its ironies, is discussed by O'Brien (above, n. 5) 32–39.

20) Some of Orestes' points are disproved within the play, before he has even offered them. Cf. D.J.Conacher, "Some Questions of Probability and Relevance in Euripidean Drama", *Maia* 25 (1972) 205–6.

and at 554 he terms the old retainer, whose recognition of the scar we have already noted, an old remnant (*λείψανον*) of a man. There is, accordingly, a marked and hypocritical contrast between what Orestes says and what he feels (or at any rate says elsewhere)[21]). As is the case with the scar, we are reminded of Odysseus who also disguised his true feelings with eloquent and admirably self-serving speeches and yarns. But the differences are, again, as noticeable and important as are the similarities.

Additional examples of the motif will underscore its importance for Electra herself. As is well-known, Electra has grand, heroic expectations of what Orestes will accomplish when at long last he arrives on the scene[22]). He alone will release her from her difficulties (*ἔλθοις τῶνδε πόνων ἐμοὶ/τᾷ μελέᾳ λυτήρ*, 135–6); he alone is to be considered responsible for the shame which will attach itself to their house if proper vengeance is not exacted:

> *αἰσχρὸν γάρ, εἰ πατὴρ μὲν ἐξεῖλεν Φρύγας,*
> *ὁ δ' ἀνδρ' ἕν' εἶς ὢν οὐ δυνήσεται κτανεῖν,*
> *νέος πεφυκὼς κἀξ ἀμείνονος πατρός.* (336–8)

It is of course completely consistent with this expectation that she immediately rejects the old man's suggestion (518) that Orestes has come back to Argos in secret (*λάθρᾳ*) and has left a lock of hair at Agamemnon's grave; her brother, after all, is *εὐθαρσής* (526) and unafraid of the usurper Aegisthus. He would never come back in secret[23]). Indeed, Electra so trusts Orestes' abilities (cf. 583) as to believe that all of her problems will vanish when he responds, as he most certainly will, to his heroic calling. Of course matters do not work out this way at all, as Orestes is the opposite of all that Electra wants and anticipates. Far from taking the initiative, and far from responding to Electra's directive that he not fall into cowardly unmanliness (982), Orestes has

---

21) See esp. Vellacott (above, n. 12) 49–51). A more consistent Orestes is posited, for example, by T.B.L.Webster, "Euripides: Traditionalist and Innovator", in D.C.Allen and H.T.Rowell, eds., *The Poetic Tradition* (Baltimore, 1968) 41.

22) See, in general, Sheppard (above, n. 6) 138; G.Norwood, *Essays on Euripidean Drama* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954) 23; Grube (above, n. 13) 305; Bond (above, n. 1) 6. This maternal interest and protectiveness which Electra displays towards her brother is discussed (esp. with reference to Sophocles' heroine but also to Euripides') by J.-P.Vernant, *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs*[2] (Paris, 1966) 108–111.

23) Cf. esp. Pucci (above, n. 3) 368.

to be programmed, as it were, every step of the way. His heroic mettle is as counterfeit as is the coin in the metaphor which we have already noticed him use[24]). He is a man whose external status and the reputation this allows others to have of him are not balanced by, or equal to, facts of the situation. And for her part, Electra clings to her estimation of the situation rather than ever acknowledging what its real facts dictate – which certainly tells us a good deal about this unfortunate woman[25]).

As we ought to expect from a motif which criss-crosses a play, there are additional passages in which Electra's relationship to it is made apparent. Relatively early, for example, she whines about her predicament to the unrecognized Orestes: how filthy and awful are her surroundings and clothing[26]); how compelled she is to perform slavish tasks; and how deprived she has been of the opportunity to attend festivals and dances (cf. 300ff., for example). And yet we have heard the farmer tell her that she need not undertake these menial chores (64–5); and we have listened to the chorus invite her to a festival and offer to loan her clothes (167–72, 190–7)[27]). Moreover, in response to her husband's statement, she asserts that she shares in the toils as much as possible in order to relieve him of some of his many chores (72–3); but earlier she has informed us that she arose while it was still dark and began attending her duties in order to document the insolence of Aegisthus (54–8). The list seems endless; one more example will perhaps suffice. As does her brother, Electra offers a lengthy speech which, among other matters, concerns itself with the complex issue of human worth (907–56). The

---

24) On the surface there appears to be a contradiction here: the metaphor of the coin suggests that Euripides is describing something whose interior is of far less worth than its exterior, whereas we have seen Orestes' interior to be as blemished as his scar suggests. On closer examination, we have not a contradiction but rather an additional indication of the multifaceted manner in which the playwright presents his treatment of a complex subject. Indeed, this is not the only place in which Euripides develops the themes of his play in a "roundabout" way. See esp. the excellent analysis of the second stasimon (699–746) and its application to the play as a whole by V. J. Rosivach, "The 'Golden Lamb' Ode in Euripides' *Electra*" *CP* 73 (1978) 189–99.

25) See, e.g., D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama* (Toronto, 1967) 204.

26) Dingel correctly points to the parallels offered by Laertes in *Odyssey* 24: (above, n. 8) 104, one of several common denominators which he discusses.

27) See esp. F. Zeitlin, "The Argive Festival of Hera and Euripides' *Electra*", *TAPA* 101 (1970) 645–69.

remarks are delivered after the arrival of Aegisthus' corpse on stage and the invitation given by Orestes that she vent all the feelings for him which she had feared to vent earlier. It is a remarkable tirade for many reasons, not least important being the obvious point that concerning the same topic on which Orestes had nothing but uncertainties and questions Electra has all the definitive answers. At any rate Electra accuses Aegisthus of basing his power on wealth and sexual activity rather than on any internal values or qualities. Of course, wealth, social status, and sexual activity – such as her mother and Aegisthus enjoy – have been on Electra's mind as the things of most value to her. Moreover, she magnanimously informs the dead Aegisthus (945) that she will not discuss the women who have figured in his life (because she herself is a maiden, as if we needed to be reminded), and then proceeds to do just that; and of course she has been doing so all along with her never-ending discussions of Clytemnestra. Further, she criticizes him for his excessive concern with physical beauty and exquisite clothing, and it requires no effort to document Electra's own obsessive fascination with these matters. Indeed, although in this speech she praises a person's *φύσις* as the true determiner of worth as opposed to external *χρήματα* (941–4), we know how essential these *χρήματα* are to her. And her desire, announced in this speech (948–50), to have a manly husband and therefore manly sons only underscores how ironic her estimation of Orestes is[28]): she may well be unable to recognize manliness when and if it is present, however it be defined. Hers is a fine speech, as was Orestes' on the same general topic, and for many of the same thematic reasons[29]).

The motif is, accordingly, a pervasive one. It offers, I submit, a unifying thematic thread for a play which until rather recently has not normally been allowed to have one. And the scar

---

28) Many of these ironies are discussed by O'Brien (above, n. 5) 31. It is difficult not to assume that intentional humor was one of the playwright's goals here. See in general B.M.W.Knox, "Euripidean Comedy", in A.Cheuse and R.Koffler, eds., *The Rarer Action: Essays in Honor of Francis Fergusson* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1970) esp. 70–73.

29) It is hardly surprising that there are a number of additional similarities between Electra and Orestes. F.Stoessl, for instance, compares the quality of their joint guilt and redemption: "Die *Elektra* des Euripides", *RM* 99 (1956) 47–92; and R.Corrigan shows how the two are so helpless, and otherwise alike, as to necessitate a middle-man to effect the recognition: *The "Electra" Theme in the History of Drama* (Diss., Minnesota, 1955) 273.

of Orestes serves as one emphatic example of the motif, for it suggests one of several external similarities between Odysseus and Orestes – similarities which are not at all substantiated by the actualities of the situation. The innovation in the recognition, whereby a new token is added to the canonical list, is made explicitly relevant to the play of which it is a brief, but famous and memorable part. Perhaps even more significantly, the motif, and therefore the scar to which it relates, is obviously appropriate for a playwright whose entire career examined the externals of mythic traditions and accepted intellectual beliefs in light of the inner realities of life, of suffering, and of tragic fact[30]).

Columbia, Missouri Theodore A. Tarkow

30) See esp. W. Arrowsmith, "A Greek Theater of Ideas", *Arion* 2 (1963) 32–56 (now in E. Segal, ed., *Euripides. A Collection of Critical Essays* [Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1968] esp. 16–24). From a different standpoint, it can also be argued that the motif is also appropriate for a playwright who once again has been asking "What kind of person is it who actualizes these old myths?" (cf. Beye [above, n. 18] 281–8 and "What kind of person is it who automatically follows what Apollo urges?" (cf. O'Brien [above, n. 5] 30; and esp. L. Moulinier, *Le Pur et l'impur dans la pensée des grecs d'Homère à Aristote* [Paris, 1952] 195 ff.).